CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

88th Congress 1st Session

Volume 109

Proceedings and Debates

Parts 3 and 4

February 22, 1963 - April 3, 1963

Pages 2869-5658

REEL 3

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Mich.

PART 3

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 109—PART 3

FEBRUARY 22, 1963, TO MARCH 14, 1963
(PAGES 2869 TO 4306)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1963

J
11
.R
v.109,
pt.3

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. B. Pascale, minister, Silver Lake Baptist Church, Belleville, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we call upon Thee to hear our prayer, and answer it according to Thy loving kindness and tender mercy. We acknowledge Thee to be our Creator and the Giver of all things. Grant unto us the disposition of our hearts to work together with pure motive and unselfish purpose for the advancement of righteousness which exalts our Nation. Remove weakness and passion from our hearts and give us Thy infinite wisdom and understanding, that in Thy service we may find perfect freedom and joy.

We remember with gratefulness the former days, when our Founding Fathers, who, by faith, acknowledged Thee in all their ways, and this fair land to be a place of refuge, promise, and hope, and have left us so great a heritage. We today remember the Father of our Country, whose sincere faith and prayer led him to safety and victory. Give us the same grace and dedication to keep America great.

Renew our faith in Thee and in one another, so that in this common bond of divinity, we may rediscover the common tie of humanity, praying and working together for the advancement of peace on earth and good will among all men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 21, 1963, was dispensed with.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, until the reading of the Farewell Address of the Father of our Country, I shall withhold a request in regard to the morning hour.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], heretofore designated by the Vice President, under the order of January 24, 1901, to read to the Senate today Washington's Farewell Address, will now perform that duty.

Mr. PROUTY advanced to the desk and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the People of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism, the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free Constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth, as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, suffering and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south* in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated, and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyments of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliance, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute: they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power and the right of the people to establish government, presupposes the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations, under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state it is requisite, not only, that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be involved, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding of them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetuated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism. But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; forments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, Where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties), ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessary parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forgo the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as

experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

Geo. Washington.

United States,
17th September, 1796.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR PROUTY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his very fine presentation of Washington's Farewell Address. His reading of the address was most inspiring.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, under the rule, statements in the morning hour, for the conducting of routine business, be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 898. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Dimitris Kokkitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 899. A bill for the relief of Pericles Ioanis Zombolas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and Mr. Magnuson):

S. 900. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Proxmire when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 901. A bill for the relief of William Herbert vom Rath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution making the 17th day of September in each year a legal holiday to be known as "Constitution Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. INDEPENDENCE AND A WORLD'S FAIR IN CHICAGO

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a resolution (S. Res. 94) relative to the 200th anniversary of U.S. independence and a World's Fair in Chicago, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

REDUCTION OF DAIRY SURPLUS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a dairy bill.

Dairy leaders in marketing order areas have been clamoring for the opportunity to pay the actual class I price to their farmer producers for their fluid milk production and a lower class III price for excess production that is generally sold for manufacturing purposes.

These dairy leaders recognize that the present compulsory blend system which requires one flat price for all production gives an explicit incentive for overproduction.

Since 50 percent of all the milk sold is sold in marketing orders, this bill would go a long way toward reducing the dairy surpus.

The bill incorporates a specific request by President Kennedy in his farm message of January 31 to permit producers in Federal milk marketing orders to do exactly what this bill provides.

The principles of the bill have been overwhelmingly approved by Secretary Freeman's Dairy Advisory Committee.

Dairy farm leaders in marketing orders in every section of the country took part with me in preparation of the bill and support it with remarkable unanimity.

As a Senator from Wisconsin, I am very conscious of the impact of this bill on the three-quarters of Wisconsin farmers who are not now producing in a Federal marketing order.

The bill should serve their interests for two reasons: First, it will reduce production of milk, especially manufacturing milk, and therefore tend to improve the income position of those dairy farmers outside marketing orders who produce primarily for manufacturing purposes.

Secondly, the only opposition I have encountered to the principles incorporated in this bill comes from those who fear that dairy farmers now outside of the lucrative marketing order areas might be fenced out through legislation of this kind.

I have drafted the bill to require specific access for new producers into marketing orders. To assure this, my bill provides that dairy farmers now producing under marketing orders can only take advantage of this legislation if provision is first made for access to the marketing order for new producers.

To be sure that this access will be just and certain, the bill specifies that whenever any dairy farmer desires to become a new producer under an order an equitable percentage of total sales shall be allocated to him on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe on the basis of a hearing record.

The Secretary would be required to make provisions for new producers before the legislation could take effect.

I am convinced that if Congress will pass this bill farm producers in many marketing orders will cast the necessary two-thirds vote to put it into effect.

The result will be good for the dairy farmers—both those inside and those outside marketing orders; and it will be good for the taxpayers, inasmuch as the cost of the dairy program is bound to fall as the dairy surplus falls under an incentive to sharply reduce the one-half of all milk production now produced under Federal orders.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk until Tuesday, in case other Senators wish to join in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 900) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Proxmire (for himself and Mr. Magnuson), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DESIGNATION OF SEPTEMBER 17 OF EACH YEAR AS CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on August 16, 1962, I introduced a joint resolution to provide that September 17 in each year shall be a legal holiday to be known as Constitution Day. In connection with that joint resolution, I submitted some observations printed in a report which went with it. As I recall, it came from a very distinguished committee or subcommittee consisting of three members, and I have the honor to be chairman of the subcommittee.

I now reintroduce the joint resolution—in ample time for passage this year; and, in connection with the joint resolution, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record some appropriate portions of the report which was filed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the portions of the report will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 48) making the 17th day of September in each year a legal holiday to be known as Constitution Day, introduced by Mr. Dirksen, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The portions of the report presented by Mr. Dirksen are as follows:

The 175th Anniversary of the Constitution of the United States of America

Mr. Dirksen. Mr. President, a little over 175 years ago, the Constitution of the United States of America was concluded in Convention by the unanimous consent of the States present on the 17th day of September in the year of our Lord, 1787, and of the independence of the United States of America the 12th. Unto this document the names of those who participated in Convention were subscribed.

In this world of turmoil and with this constant struggle between freedom and communism, this great document, the Constitution of the United States, becomes more and more significant not only to us in the United States but to freedom-loving people everywhere. On the 175th anniversary of the Constitution, not only are we concerned with serious issues in the Far East, the Near East, the captive nations, and at the Berlin wall, but with the ominous threat to free people which has reached the very doorstep of the United States on Soviet Cuba, an island only 90 miles off our coast. This is not only a threat to our people in the United States of America; it is in violation of one of our basic declarations of freedom, the Monroe Doctrine, since it poses a threat by a foreign nation to the whole Western Hemisphere. The Monroe Doctrine was enunciated December 2, 1823, when President James Monroe stated to the Senate and to the House, as follows:

> "We owe it, therefore, to candor and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Mr. President, this Constitution of the United States of America was written with the blood of the brave men, women, and children who suffered and even died to make this great Nation free. There are others who sacrificed and bled and died to extend her from one ocean to the other, and in the words of Abraham Lincoln:

> "The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Mr. President, although there are times when we feel some people take too much for granted these great sacrifices that gave us this great liberty, it takes occasions such as Constitution Day to reawaken all of us to the many blessings this country has given us and to reemphasize our solemn duty to preserve it for our children and our children's children for ages to come. You will note I have quoted from three documents of freedom in my remarks above and I think it would be fitting and proper on this day to ask unanimous consent that the "Documents of Freedom," as copyrighted by the Freedom Documents Foundation, be placed at this point in the Congressional Record. Included are the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States of America, the Bill of Rights, the Monroe Doctrine, the Gettysburg Address, November 19, 1863, the "Star-Spangled Banner," and the pledge of allegiance:

> "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. INDEPENDENCE, AND A WORLD'S FAIR IN CHICAGO

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the people of Illinois and the people of Chicago are extremely forehanded and foresighted. They realize that in 1976 we shall observe the 200th anniversary of our independence, and that that should be a great and felicitous day, with appropriate ceremonies all over the Nation. Because they are forehanded and because they have vision, I wish to assist them in bringing this matter to the attention of the country, in the hope that there in Cook County, on the shores of Lake Michigan, the Committee of '76 can be encouraged to make bold and imaginative plans for a world's fair to be held in the city of Chicago.

You see, Mr. President, that is only 13 years from now. Although many things can happen in that period of time, we must be ready. After all, Mr. President, 13 years is not so long. Recently we have gone through 3 weeks of stress and strain in connection with the attempt to modify rule XXII, in order to accelerate and expedite and push measures through this great deliberative body.

This spirit of acceleration is catching, and it has caught on among the citizens of that great metropolis on the shores of Lake Michigan.

So I submit this resolution. It would be appropriate to commemorate this great event; namely, the 200th anniversary of our independence, in Chicago and Cook County and the State of Illinois. Already the Committee of '76 has selected the city of Chicago as the geographic heart of the country for this celebration. So I respectfully submit this proposal for consideration if, as, and when, in my own committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 94) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas in 1976 the United States will commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of its independence; and

Whereas it would be appropriate to commemorate this great event by holding a world's fair where by proper ceremony the history of the Nation from 1776 to 1976 might be suitably depicted; and

Whereas there has been constituted in the State of Illinois a Committee of '76 consisting of public-spirited citizens who are presently engaged in planning such a world's fair; and

Whereas the aforesaid Committee of '76 has selected the city of Chicago, located near the geographic heart of the United States as the proper place to observe this epochal and historic event; and

Whereas the city of Chicago, the county of Cook, and the State of Illinois have all gone on record as encouraging this Committee of '76 to make bold and imaginative plans for such a world's fair in the city of Chicago: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the United States Senate that it looks with favor on this proposal and hereby gives encouragement to the Committee of '76 in its efforts to plan and bring about this two hundredth anniversary commemorative ceremony in the city of Chicago.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of February 14, 1963:

S. 807. A bill to encourage local and State initiative in urban transit development and to preserve the status of privately owned local carriers, and for other purposes: Mr. Anderson, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Williams of Delaware.

Authority of February 19, 1963:

S. 859. A bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes: Mr. Douglas, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Pell.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Address delivered by Senator Morton to the Georgia Press Institute, at Athens, Ga., on February 21, 1963.

VISIT TO WASHINGTON BY LOUISIANA MARDI GRAS QUEENS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on this occasion we are honored by a visit to the Capitol of a number of very beautiful young ladies from Louisiana. First is Miss Maurine Perez, of New Orleans, who is queen of the Mardi Gras ball to be held in Washington. Accompanying her are the young women selected by various festival and fair associations of Louisiana to represent our State at the Mardi Gras ball which the Louisiana State Society sponsors in Washington each year. Tomorrow night, when they appear at the ball, they will be escorted by midshipmen from the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of these young queens, the members of the king's court, and their traveling chaperons, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Queens and Sponsoring Associations

1. Elizabeth Azar, Town House Order of the Troubadours, Lafayette, La.
2. Suzanne Bienvenu, Louisiana Fur and Wildlife, Cameron, La.
3. Mariana Broussard, Southwest Louisiana Mardi Gras Association, Lafayette, La.
4. Mary Bush, Bogalusa Paper Festival, Bogalusa, La.
5. Gwendolyn Sue Cooper, Future Farmers of America, Baton Rouge, La.
6. Janet Dautrieve, Chalmette Tomato Festival, Chalmette, La.
7. Sharon Elliot, International Rice Festival, Crowley, La.
8. Joan Fagan, Louisiana Strawberry Festival, Hammond, La.
9. Charlotte Foreman, Vermilion Fair and Festival Association, Kaplan, La.
10. Glenda Hansford, Louisiana Forest Festival, Winnfield, La.
11. Sandy Ann Hebert, Yambilee Festival, Opelousas, La.
12. Rosemary Hudspeth, Cotton Festival, Ville Platte, La.
13. Carol Jackson, Louisiana Gulf Coast Oil Exposition, Lafayette, La.
14. Trudy Johnson, Delcambre Fish Industry Festival, Delcambre, La.
15. Cathy Kornegay, Louisiana Shrimp Festival and Fair Association, Morgan City, La.
16. Virginia LeBas, Louisiana Tournoi, Ville Platte, La.
17. Patsy Lowderback, Holiday in Dixie, Shreveport, La.
18. Sharon McClendon, The Rose Festival, Bogalusa, La.
19. Becky McKenzie, Louisiana Peach Festival, Ruston, La.
20. Jeanne Morris, Louisiana Livestock Show and Festival, Marksville, La.
21. Pamela Munson, Louisiana Farm Bureau Federation, Baton Rouge, La.
22. Kathy Nastasi, American Legion, Bogalusa, La.
23. Diana Mae Nicol, Louisiana Sugar Cane Festival, New Iberia, La.
24. Jane Parks, Louisiana Soybean Festival, Jonesville, La.
25. Betty Powers, Louisiana Dairy Festival, Abbeville, La.
26. Judith Waite, New Orleans Floral Trail, New Orleans, La.
27. Linda Yates, Ozone Camellia Club, Slidell, La.

Members of the King's Court

1. Miss Rosemary Chandler, reigning Miss Catahoula.
2. Miss Donna Lynn Felps, reigning queen, Pine Tree Festival.
3. Miss Claridel Hurst, reigning Miss Wool of Louisiana.
4. Miss Lelone James, reigning queen, Natchitoches Christmas Festival.
5. Miss Jo Elizabeth Ragusa, reigning queen, Baton Rouge Easter Festival.
6. Miss Dianna Smith, reigning Miss Louisiana.
7. Miss Catherine Thompson, Miss Cover Girl, 1962 Louisiana Mardi Gras program.

Chaperones

Dr. Gabriel A. Ackal, chairman of arrangements, New Iberia, La.

Mrs. Gabriel A. Ackal, official chaperone, New Iberia, La.

Mrs. Milton H. Knox, official chaperone, Lafayette, La.

Mr. Milton H. Knox, Lafayette, La.
Dr. Paul Azar, Lafayette, La.
Mrs. Paul Azar, Lafayette, La.
Miss Rosemary Azar, Lafayette, La.
Miss Bea Saloom, Lafayette, La.
Mrs. Lucille Amacker, Bogalusa, La.
Mrs. J. A. Fagan, Hammond, La.
Mrs. Frank Diesi, Opelousas, La.
Mrs. Robert Munson, Cheneyville, La.
Mrs. Lee James, Natchitoches, La.
Miss Cecelia Cook, Natchitoches, La.
Mrs. J. Otto Broussard, Lafayette, La.
Mrs. Joyce S. Allen, Denham Springs, La.
Miss Margie Hannaman, Baton Rouge, La.
Miss Charlotte Rielly, Baton Rouge, La.
Mrs. Schaffer Nichal, Golden Meadow, La.

COMMUNIST TAKEOVER OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on February 24, 15 years will have passed since the Communists took over the government of Czechoslovakia. I should like to speak about that incident and about the Czechoslovakian people.

The modern history of the Czechoslovak people has had an uneven but glorious course. These worthy descendants of the great 14th century reformer Jan Hus and the equally great 17th century educator John Comenius were dauntless and daring, even when subjected to oppressive alien rule in their homeland. They carried on their struggle for freedom against the Austrian-Hungarian monarchy successfully and regained their national independence at the end of the First World War. They then reconstituted their new state, the Czechoslovak Republic, under the unfailing leadership of the late Thomas Masaryk, and in a relatively short time they made it a model democracy, a really effective force in Europe. But the able followers of the great Masaryk—Eduard Benes and Masaryk's son Jan—could not withstand the surging tide of evil and destruction. Even before the outbreak of the last war the Czechoslovak Republic became a victim of Hitler's aggression; and to the end of that world struggle the unhappy Czechoslovak people were held down by Hitler's henchmen.

At the end of the war these people had the right to expect freedom and independence. But they and their leaders were grievously disappointed when they learned that the freedom given them appeared as a gift from the masters in the Kremlin. From then on, from early 1945 until the final takeover of Czechoslovakia Republic by the Communists on February 24, 15 years ago, the Czech people and their helpless leaders worked hard to retain what little freedom they had salvaged, but, just as they were powerless by themselves to deal with Hitler's forces 10 years earlier, so in February of 1948 they were not in position to save themselves and their people from Communist enslavement. They knew and we knew that in spirit, in action, and in words these true heirs of the spirit of Masaryk and Benes have no more in common with deadly and godless communism than have the good people of this great Republic. But fate has been most unkind to Czechoslovakia during the last two decades, and today we find these stout-hearted and stanch champions of democracy in Central and Eastern Europe suffering under Communist totalitarian tyranny. Fifteen years after their enslavement by Russian communism they still hope and work for their freedom. We all join in the fond hope that they will attain their richly deserved goal, freedom and independence.

As we listen to their voices, coming out of the Tatra Mountains, we learn of the hardships they are enduring.

Czechoslovakians, do not give up hope. Have faith in the future. Believe that the day will come when the independence and the sovereignty of the Czechoslovakian people will be restored.

I am sure the people of the United States live in full sympathy with those brave and genuine devotees of freedom. We pray and hope with them that independence will again be their lot.

I personally hope and pray that our country will not forget the brave people of the captive nations, whose governments by compulsion are now Communist, but whose people want to be free. Let our relationship to them be everlastingly allied, and let not the intent of Communist Khrushchev be allowed to dilute the fidelity of those people to us and our responsibility to them.

REFUSAL BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY TO CRITICIZE REPRESENTATIVE POWELL

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record an article entitled "President Refuses To Criticize Powell—Gives Committee Pat on Back," written by Warren Rogers, Jr., and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 22, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Anything Goes," commenting on the same subject, and published in today's issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Feb. 22, 1963]

Gives Committee Pat on Back—President Refuses To Criticize Powell

(By Warren Rogers, Jr.)

Washington, February 21.—President Kennedy declined Thursday to criticize Adam Clayton Powell, the much-criticized Negro Congressman from Harlem, and instead gave him a pat on the back.

The President's action, at his press conference, came as no surprise.

Powell, dapper and elegant, is one of the Democratic Party's most impressive vote-getters: In 1962, he won 69.8 percent of the vote in his 18th Congressional District (Harlem), polling 58,712 to his Republican opponent's 17,981, with 7,394 left over for an independent Democrat. In 1956, in pique at local Democrats, he sent shivers throughout the party by supporting then President Eisenhower for reelection.

PERSONAL FIEF

Powell is equally powerful on Capitol Hill. The House Education and Labor Committee, which he runs like a fiefdom, controls all health-education-welfare bills except those imposing taxes. President Kennedy verbally genuflected in that direction by commenting:

"What I am most interested in is the passage of legislation which is of benefit to the people. I thought last year that committee did a good job * * * in passing out bills which were very useful.

"I would hope we would have the same kind of record this year.

"I would think that is the best answer to any attacks (on Representative Powell). I hope the chairman (Powell) holds the same view."

WILLIAMS' CRITICISM

The President was responding to a question by Charles Stone, a reporter for the Afro-American, an influential Negro newspaper. Stone's takeoff point was the recent criticism of Powell by Senator John J. Williams, Republican, Delaware.

Stone wanted to know what Mr. Kennedy thought of "the propriety of Senator Williams' attack on Powell," whether Powell's activities were "embarrassing to the White House," and what was the President's assessment of Powell "as a Congressman and as a Negro leader."

The President—smiling, as if at the length of the question—commented that Powell "has proved in his life that he is well able to take care of himself." In reply, he declined comment on the Williams-Powell dispute, declared he has "not been embarrassed by Congressman Powell," and added, "I would not attempt to rank Congressmen."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1963]

Anything Goes

It is an appalling standard of morality that Representative Adam Clayton Powell has set forth for congressional conduct. The lowest common denominator of taste and decency appears to be good enough for him. Criticized for night club junketeering abroad on public funds, the Congressman shrugged his shoulders and said only, "I will always do what every other Congressman has done, is doing and will do." Asked if he thought it all right to have relatives on his payroll, Mr. Powell answered, "Yes, as long as more than 100 other members of the House do."

Mr. Powell is a minister of the gospel as well as a Congressman. In reply to his critics, and in particular to Senator John J. Williams, he has successively wrapped himself in the mantle of his religion and in the mantle of his race; but he has provided no refutation of the Senator's charges. It would be just as silly to call Senator Williams antireligious for having criticized a clergyman as to call him anti-Negro for having criticized a colored colleague.

In point of fact, there is something especially distasteful—and especially irreligious—in the spectacle of Mr. Powell, who has over and over again used his pulpit for political purposes, suddenly assuming an aura of sanctity and upbraiding newsmen for coming to his church and asking him some quite reasonable questions.

PRICE SUPPORT PURCHASES OF DAIRY PRODUCTS DROP SHARPLY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Mr. A. C. Knudtson, director of the dairy section of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperative, has prepared a very persuasive analysis which shows that—contrary to everything we read in the newspapers—the Commodity Credit Corporation has purchased less dairy products this year than it did last year; and the difference is a very sharp one.

The fact is that we are not in such a condition that we have to adopt the kind of drastic dairy legislation which some Senators seem to be proposing.

I ask unanimous consent that this very careful analysis of the purchases by the Commodity Credit Corporation of dairy products be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Price Support Purchases Drop Sharply

(By A. C. Knudtson)

Commodity Credit Corporation price support purchases of butter totaled 8.5 million pounds for December 1962; this level of purchases amounted to only 38 percent of 22.5 million pound purchases recorded in December 1961.

December cheese purchases dropped even more sharply below year earlier levels. The CCC purchased 2.2 million pounds of cheese in December 1962 or 12 percent of the 17.9 million pounds purchased in December 1961.

Nonfat dry milk purchases in December totaled 23.1 million pounds; this was equal to 13 percent of the 165.4 million pounds purchased in December a year earlier.

The sharp declines noted in December CCC price support purchases may in part reflect erratic movements and, taken alone, these figures are not indicative that the surplus burden has eased.

However, a review of price support purchases for the last 6 months of 1962 clearly indicate a favorable trend. During the period July through December of 1962 the purchases of butter were below year earlier levels every month. And, the total butter purchases, July–December 1962, at 82.2 million pounds, were down 39 percent from the same period of 1961.

Similarly cheese purchases for the July–December 1962 period were below the 1961 level by 33 percent. And likewise, cheese purchases monthly for every month from July through December, with the exception of August, were below year earlier levels.

The purchases of nonfat dry milk at 591 million pounds during the July–December 1962 period were approximately equal to the purchases during the same period in 1961. This, however, is a substantial reversal from the situation reported for the first 6 months of 1962. During January through June, nonfat dry milk purchases totaled 709 million pounds, up 18 percent from the 603 million pounds purchased during the first 6 months of 1961.

Thus, in total, substantial evidence is accumulating that a better consumption-production balance is developing.

Undoubtedly regional summer droughts played a part in the declines noted in price-support purchases during the last 6 months of 1962. And, the aftermath of those droughts may be having some continued effect. However, it is very likely that the figures reflect a combination of drought, an adjustment in dairy cow numbers, a brighter consumption picture. Later estimates of dairy cow numbers will tend to confirm or deny this suspicion.

Since developing evidence indicates that a correcting production-consumption adjustment is occurring at 75 percent of parity, lower levels of support which have been introduced as a part of voluntary supply control programs should not be considered necessary or acceptable.

Such voluntary supply management programs should be revised in the light of present evidence and offered on the basis of a 75 percent of parity minimum level of support.

THE PRESIDENT'S TAX MESSAGE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday, Mr. Dan Throop Smith, professor of finance at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, and visiting professor at the Stanford Graduate School of Business, who was identified with the Treasury and with the economic

advisers under the Eisenhower administration, appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee and presented some views on the President's tax message. I think it is generally conceded that Dan Throop Smith is one of the real authorities in the tax field in this country. In one small package he has done a rather fabulous job in pointing out the weaknesses and the acceptable portions of the President's tax program. I ask unanimous consent that his statement before the Ways and Means Committee be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement Before Ways and Means Committee, House of Representatives, on the 1963 Tax Message, February 21, 1963, by Dan Throop Smith, Professor of Finance, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, Visiting Professor, Stanford Graduate School of Business

In the state of the Union message our tax system was properly criticized as exerting "too heavy a drag on private purchasing power, profits and employment. * * * It discourages extra effort and risk. It distorts the use of resources." These were welcome words. They built up hopes that the country would receive a balanced program for tax revision and reform.

The program actually presented in the tax message is a bitter disappointment. It proposes a net cut in revenues of over $10 billion, on top of a prospective current deficit of over $9 billion. This is a dangerous gamble with the country's currency and basic well-being

The great bulk of the revenue loss is in the lower income brackets where the only possible economic stimulation comes from an increase in disposable income. The present bottom rate of 20 percent cannot be said to discourage extra effort or risk or to distort the use of resources. The only stimulation from tax reduction in these rates is, to repeat, through artificial increases in net income.

Stimulation through increased disposable income was tried and found wanting in the 1930's. It is little more than the proverbial shot in the arm. The emphasis on disposable income ignores the fact that our unemployment is concentrated in the relatively unemployable. A surge of spending, even if it did occur, would have to go a long way to bring unskilled older people and young people who have dropped out of school into employment. Before a general boom reached a point where it would provide employment for such people, we would be well on the way up another round of inflationary wage and cost increases.

Specific measures are necessary to increase the employability of those presently unemployed. Deficit spending, to repeat, is likely to be largely ineffective in securing its desired result, while endangering the currency which is the very basis of our whole economic system.

This least effective method of tax relief, through an increase in disposable income, is also the most expensive. As indicated in table 3 of the tax message, rate relief in the bottom brackets is disproportionately large and particularly expensive. Furthermore a large part of the disproportionately small relief in the middle and upper brackets is nullified by structural changes. At the bottom a 28-percent reduction in tax liabilities is increased by structural changes to give a total reduction in tax of 39 percent. But the 22-percent relief in the upper brackets is reduced by structural changes to give a net reduction in taxes of only 9 percent.

At the very least, it would have been expected that tax relief would have been proportional in all income brackets. This point is well recognized in Secretary Dillon's statement concerning the proposed reduction in individual rates:

"The proposed across-the-board reduction in individual rates * * * will reduce tax liabilities by $11 billion (at 1963 levels of income). This reduction will be fairly spread among all income levels" (p. 36, committee print).

On economic grounds alone, the tax reduction should be greatest in the middle and upper brackets where it will increase disposable income and reduce barriers to extra effort and risk. The inappropriateness of the structural changes is demonstrated by the way it distorts the pattern of even proportionate relief. If there are to be structural changes which fall especially heavily on middle and upper brackets, on grounds of fairness as well as economics, this should be a basis for greater proportional relief in the tax rates on those incomes.

The most serious error in the entire tax program is that when the parts are put together they contradict the standard of fairness stated by the Secretary of the Treasury and at the same time nullify much of the economic benefit which might be achieved.

The state of the Union message criticized the corporate tax rate "which gives the Government today a majority interest in profits." This is a valid criticism, but it seems even more applicable to individual incomes. The President recognizes that it is bad for the Government to have a majority interest in the income of an inanimate and unfeeling corporation. But it is even worse for the Government to have a majority interest in the personal income of sentient individuals with deep human feelings. For this reason, the maintenance of a top tax rate of 65 percent is unsound and inconsistent with the rest of the program.

A reduction to a maximum of 50 percent in the individual income tax would have a negligible direct effect on the revenue. But a limit of 50 percent would be an important symbol. It would clear the atmosphere and do more than anything else to remove the tax discouragement to extra effort and risk. It is one of the few changes on which it could confidently be predicted that it would actually increase revenue through expansion of the tax base.

The country cannot risk the effect of so large a net reduction in revenue while Government expenditures are climbing. General relief from income taxation would be desirable, but it can be undertaken only if expenditures are cut or other and less discouraging forms of taxation are adopted as substitutes.

On expenditures, others better informed than I am on the details on the budget, can be more helpful in making specific suggestions. But with the economic advisers in the administration deploring the idea of any reduction in expenditures, it seems likely that proposals for budget outlays have not been as stringently reviewed as they should be.

For alternative sources of revenue, either a broad-based excise tax or a value-added tax would add balance to our entire tax system and would permit reductions in the rates in the income taxes. Even those who favor income taxation on grounds of equity, now recognize that it is the income taxes which are most likely to discourage extra effort and risk and distort personal and business decisions. All forms of taxation have their own distinctive bad effects. But with the continuing need for large total revenues in this country, we would be much better off to have a better balance in our tax system and thereby avoid a concentration on the bad effects of income taxes. This is especially true when economic growth is made a principal objective of the Nation.

Though some of the proposed structural changes are reasonable and even desirable, the combination presented in the tax program is on balance very bad. In the aggregate, the structural changes would go a long way in nullifying those parts of the reductions in tax rates which might otherwise be counted on to be most effective.

Lest these comments be considered entirely unfavorable to the tax proposals, I should like to note several of the proposed structural changes which seem thoroughly desirable. These include the proposal for income averaging for individuals, elimination of the sick pay exclusion, a floor for minor casualty losses, liberalization of the tax rule on moving expenses, the proposed current deduction for the costs of machinery and equipment used in research, the capital loss carryover, a tighter rule on multiple corporate surtax exemptions and elimination of the 2 percent penalty tax on consolidated returns. In conjunction with these last two proposals, it would also seem appropriate to remove the penalty tax on intercorporate dividends.

Much tighter tax treatment of the gains on the sale of depreciated real estate are needed. In my opinion, the changes proposed can be criticized only on the ground that they are not tight enough. Tighter rules are also needed for personal holding companies; though I am not certain of the full implications of the specific changes suggested in this area, they seem to be in the right direction and reasonable. I shall not waste the time of the committee in elaborating on the reasons given by the administration for proposals for the foregoing structural changes.

Furthermore, I believe that some limitation on personal deductions, with a floor comparable to that on medical expenses, would be useful in the interests of simplicity. It might well be acceptable as part of a package involving and making possible substantial reductions in tax rates. A broader tax base, with a lower marginal tax rate would be better than the present system, even if the total dollar tax burden were identical. But—and here I hope my criticism of the proposal is as vigorous as I can make it—if itemized deductions are to be restricted, then the only fair thing to do would be to reduce the optional standard deduction or to give a smaller proportionate reduction in the bottom bracket tax rates where the optional standard deduction is used. The proposed program does just the reverse. It increases the optional standard reduction, while reducing the itemized deductions, thereby adding to the disparity in the entire package, and the feeling of unfairness of those whose extra efforts and risks are supposed to be encouraged.

The denial of the unlimited charitable deduction seems unfortunate. The net cost of giving will be increased for people in the upper brackets through the much needed reduction in the middle- and upper-bracket rates. For those who might still be willing to commit 90 percent of their income to the service of the public, through a combination of compulsory taxation and voluntary contributions, it seems unfortunate to change a technical rule. A too big government should not begrudge the efforts of its citizens to maintain some public services through private charities. On the other hand, the prevention of real abuses, such as through valuation of contributed art objects, probably needs statutory as well as administrative changes.

It is discouraging to note the persistence of the administration in proposing the repeal of the dividend credit and exclusion. The sound arguments against repeal prevailed with this committee in 1961 and do not need to be repeated now. But the fact that the recommendation is made again emphasizes the inconsistency between the avowed desire to encourage extra effort and risk and the specific program presented.

The proposed reduction in the percentage of capital gains included in taxable income is sound. It recognizes the peculiar character of capital gains and the fact that a tax on capital gains is likely to be paid from capital, instead of income to a much greater extent than almost any other form of tax except the estate and gift taxes. The extension of the holding period to 1 year also seems reasonable, in conjunction with the reduction in rates. But the present 25-percent ceiling rate should also be reduced in line with the reduction in the percentage of gains included. A failure to bring the ceiling rate down to 15 percent (which would be in proportion to the reduction in the capital gains rate for lower bracket taxpayers) would be another example of discrimination against the higher brackets in the so-called reforms.

The minimum modification in the capital gains proposal would be to continue the principle of a ceiling rate, with the same proportionate reduction to 15 percent. This would be both fair and sound economic policy.

It would be still better to give a further reduction for really long-term gains. Gains on property held over 10 years might well be included at only 10 percent, or at most taxed at 10 percent. Such gains are especially likely to be reinvested and any tax on them is a capital levy which reduces the country's supply of capital. A low rate would minimize the drain on capital; it would free investment funds; and it would probably increase tax revenue.

The proposed imposition of a capital gains tax at death and on gifts seems peculiarly inappropriate. It would increase the capital levy at death. The idea of the presumptive realization of gains at death is an old favorite among some writers on tax theory, along with the inclusion of the rental value of owner-occupied homes and employers' contributions to pension trusts in the individual income tax base. It should be rejected, as these other theoretical proposals have been rejected. The fact that it is proposed now is doubtless another reason for the sense of frustration and resentment among those who are presently discouraged from extra effort and risk by the tax laws and who had hoped for significant relief.

Though restricted stock options have been abused under the present law, a long-term proprietary point of view by management is so desirable that it justifies some special treatment of options. Several technical changes in the law could be made which would largely eliminate the abuses while maintaining the economic advantages of putting executives in a position where their personal gain coincides with long-term growth in the economy. Repeal would be much too drastic, especially since limited changes are available.

A repeal of the capital gains treatment of cash lump-sum distributions from pension plans seem fair. But the present capital gains treatment of stock of the employer company, whether received in lump-sum withdrawals or in periodic distributions from profit-sharing plans, seems fair and desirable as a matter of economic policy. A change in the law regarding the tax treatment of stock in the employer company would discourage present corporate policies which tie in the personal interests of officers and employees with increased efficiency and long-term growth.

The proposed reduction in the corporate income tax rate is desirable. The corporation income tax is coming to be recognized more and more as a tax which, regardless of its final incidence, peculiarly burdens the efficient producers, in proportion to their efficiency. We can ill afford to continue this tax penalty on efficiency, especially in view of the increasing severity of foreign competition and our continuing problems in the balance of payments.

But the proposal to pull forward the time of payment of the corporate tax will much more than nullify the effects of the rate reduction on available corporate funds during the next 5 years. It would seem much wiser, in any attempt to minimize the revenue loss, to start to substitute in a modest way some other form of tax which falls on the inefficient as well as the efficient. The value-added tax appears to be particularly worthy of consideration as a partial substitute for the corporation income tax.

In summary, the proposed program seems on balance to be a bad one. It is much too expensive, and unnecessarily expensive, in terms of revenue forgone to give the very modest relief which is so vitally needed to reduce the present tax discouragement to extra effort and risk.

By concentrating the overwhelming bulk of the tax reduction on changes to increase disposable income, the program has adopted the most expensive and the least effective way of stimulating expansion. Voluntary increases in the deficit for this purpose is a poor gamble and a dangerous gamble.

Many of the proposed structural changes would work directly counter to the objective of removing tax penalties on enterprise. The combination of reduced deductions in the middle and upper income tax brackets with an increased optional standard deduction serves to shift the balance of relief against those who are most frustrated by the present law. Other proposed changes, most importantly the repeal of the dividend credit, the presumptive realization of gains at death, and the complete repeal of the present stock option provisions, would positively discourage effort and risk and, in the case of the additional tax on death, would reduce the Nation's supply of capital at the very time we are trying to increase capital to speed up economic growth.

In view of the earlier general statements about the objectives of tax relief and tax reform, the specific program is as surprising as it is disappointing. But we should not lose sight of the splendid objectives of tax rate revision and tax reform stated by the administration. These objectives are good. The statement of principle for reliance on the private sector of the economy, though inadequately applied, is good. This committee and the Congress have a great opportunity to make an effective tax reform, which is so greatly needed, at a cost in revenue which will not involve too great a risk. But the development of such a program will require drastic changes in the specific proposals submitted by the administration.

GENERAL DE GAULLE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I served in the House of Representatives with a very distinguished public servant who later served as our Ambassador to Italy. I refer to the Honorable Clare Boothe Luce, a very perceptive student who diligently follows all matters in the public domain.

She has taken careful account of our relationship with France and the action taken by President de Gaulle; and she has written a number of expository articles on this subject, two of which have already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

She has honored me by writing me a letter from Phoenix, Ariz. The letter is dated February 2, and contains further observations by her. In the letter she enclosed an article by Drew Middleton, appearing in the New York Times, western edition, on Saturday, February 2, and still another article, by C. L. Sulzberger, in the same edition.

I ask unanimous consent that her observations and the clippings from the New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *February 2, 1963.*

DEAR SENATOR: The New York Times of February 2, 1963, carried excellent columns by C. L. Sulzberger and Drew Middleton on the position of Charles de Gaulle, in respect of his intention to give France its own nuclear force. They were characterized by a clarity of understanding which certainly is not reflected in Times editorial—"The Aftermath of De Gaulle."

General de Gaulle is a realist. The outcome of the Cuban crisis was surely conclusive proof to him—as it should be to any sensible person—that the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. now have a de facto, if undeclared, nuclear peace pact, and that neither will initiate war against the other if this can possibly be prevented, because to do so means mutual obliteration. De Gaulle sees that both the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. will seek to limit any conflict over a third country, and that in the end it will become a subject of U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. negotiation. He does not intend, if he can help it, to have France ever become an item of U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. negotiation, like Cuba.

President de Gaulle sees quite well, that because of the U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. nuclear peace pact, the day U.S. divisions are withdrawn from Germany, France and Germany both will become U.S.S.R. "limited war" targets, unless at that time they have the instant nuclear capacity to retaliate. He does not believe that once U.S. divisions leave Europe the Soviets will fail to seek to regulate the German question by military movement. Would the U.S.A. then press the NATO buttons, which lie on the desk of the Pentagon, and initiate a nuclear strike against Russia, which would result in the destruction of the United States, Europe, and Russia? Charles de Gaulle is taking no chances. He thinks France would be safer if it became the third scorpion in the nuclear bottle.

For the rest, it is difficult to see what is Napoleonic about the desire of a President to encompass the security of his nation by securing the most effective deterrent known, the nuclear deterrent. This view, in America, is called patriotism and prudence.

As for Charles de Gaulle's contention (which the Times also calls Napoleonic) that Europe extends from its western coast line to the Urals, this is no more than the recognition of a racial and geographical fact. The U.S. proponents of the longtime U.S. policy of containment have also always asserted this same fact, and indeed it is a cogent reason why the United States should coexist with the U.S.S.R., while patiently waiting for a peaceful evolution of Moscow communism. The United States too, has wished, like Charles de Gaulle, to bring the Iron Curtain down without war. Why De Gaulle should now be vilified for holding the same view that has been held for 17 years by the Department of State, is hard to see. As for trade, European nations have traded with Russia for many years now. Italy has busily sought oil deals with Russia—but has not been publicly insulted for doing so.

General de Gaulle has not sought to break up or discard NATO. He has repeatedly insisted that France, even though it should achieve a nuclear force of her own, will continue to cooperate with NATO, and that France considers herself the faithful ally of the U.S.A.—which De Gaulle proved at the time of the U.S.A.-U.S.S.R. Cuban showdown. De Gaulle's crime, then, is that he asserts the national right to hold in France's own hands the command decision if the "Red or dead" question should ever suddenly confront her.

The President of the United States would be impeached if he were ever to hand over the pushbuttons for nuclear war to the French Department of War, or if he were to lay the right to take a decision concerning our national survival in the hands of NATO. Suppose NATO had been given substantial control of nuclear power and U.S. forces at the time of the Cuban crisis. What decision would it have made for President Kennedy? The question is silly, because the very thought of putting the United States in such a position seems preposterous to us. Nevertheless, the United States today, while demanding the right to conduct its own military and economic policies according to America's own self interests, at the same time demands that France shall conduct its national military and economic policies in the way that seems best to Washington and the Pentagon.

The plain fact is that there is no United States of Europe, and that America cannot force unity on the Europeans. Only the Europeans themselves can create a United Europe.

What does recall the Napoleonic concept is the attempt of the White House to conduct from Washington and the Pentagon the economic and military policies of every European nation, by exerting the pressures of its own vast military and economic strength upon them.

The rebellion against this policy began some time ago. The British have for a long time openly resented it. Charles de Gaulle has openly challenged it—and so, most recently, have the Canadians.

If the U.S.A. does not soon begin to treat the sovereign nations of the Western Alliance as though they were indeed sovereign, it may achieve still the unity of Europe. But in the end it may be a Europe united against "nuclear U.S. imperialism."

Sincerely,

CLARE BOOTHE LUCE.

[From the New York Times, western edition, Feb. 2, 1963]

DE GAULLE VIEWS A CHANGING EUROPE—BUT HE IS SAID TO BELIEVE NATO INDISPENSABLE TO FRANCE FOR PRESENT

(By Drew Middleton)

PARIS, February 1.—Although appearances may be to the contrary, President de Gaulle, in the view of his associates, believes in the indispensibility to France of the North Atlantic Alliance under present conditions.

That does not mean, however, that he has put away his plans for changing the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or that he believes present conditions will last indefinitely.

Europe, in the French Government's view, is defended at present by the U.S. Army in Germany and 10 West German divisions. But France's leader has not abandoned his conviction that the Alliance's dogma of integrated forces must be replaced by complete cooperation among the defense systems of NATO members.

Any renewal of the general's proposals, first put forward in 1958, evidently would meet with a cool reception from other members of the North Atlantic Council. It is felt there that General de Gaulle's proposals would, if accepted, result in the creation of a tripower directorate, the United States, France and Britain, and a sharp decrease in the role of smaller allies.

VIEWED AS IRRELEVANT

French sources also rejected with equal vehemence reports in Britain, Norway and Eastern Europe that the general has approached the Soviet Union on a deal for demilitarization in Central Europe.

Such a move, the source insisted, would run counter to the whole French approach to the Communist bloc at present.

With sardonic emphasis, some diplomats have insisted that whether the French have or have not moved toward the Soviet Union is irrelevant. In their view, the Russians know that power in the West resides in the United States and that only an agreement with Washington would be meaningful for them.

WAR OF FUTURE U.S. ROLE

From the French standpoint, the command structure of NATO is a minor issue. The Government accepts the importance of having an American officer as Supreme Allied Commander. But it believes that if the United States wants her European allies to pull their full weight within the Alliance, then they must be given more responsibility for defense planning.

This, it is argued, will come only if cooperation is substituted for integration; that is, when national governments, not NATO, decide what national defense policy is to be. This is said to be the true starting point for NATO cooperation.

A distinction must be made, however, between what President de Gaulle thinks about Europe and NATO today and his view of what it will be 10 or 15 years hence. This is especially true of the development of American and Soviet policy.

Persons with every reason to know say the President has great confidence in present U.S. defense policy. He regards the maintenance of large U.S. forces in Europe 18 years after World War II as remarkable.

But the General, looking into the future, cannot be sure that 10 years hence the United States will be willing to maintain that army in Europe. He reasons that no country will continue forever to maintain large forces in another, especially if they are not indispensible to the defense of the United States.

This reasoning apparently is behind his belief that France must have an independent nuclear deterrent and his conviction that NATO must be revised to create for the future a European defense force not reliant upon American arms.

This distinction between General de Gaulle's present views and his long-term approach also govern his present attitude toward the Soviets. Much has been made of his remarks about a future Europe stretching from the Atlantic to the Urals as a result of political ties between Western and Eastern Europe.

The feeling in the French Government now is that there is nothing in present relations between Communist China and the Soviet Union to encourage a belief in an enduring split between the two.

President de Gaulle's vision of an East-West rapprochement in the future rests, it was said, upon two factors. One is open national, in addition to ideological, hostility between the two Communist giants. The second is the development within the Soviet Union of definite changes in Russian society that would make both the people and leaders more amiable to improved relations with the West.

Neither of these has happened in the French view. In consequence, General de Gaulle intends to maintain his intractable attitude on any United States or British proposals for a change in the Berlin situation.

This political intransigence, however, does not prevent the French from concluding trade pacts with the Soviet Union like the one signed today in Moscow.

[From the New York Times, western edition, Feb. 2, 1963]

RULING OUT A WESTERN TRADE WAR?

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS, February 1.—Washington and London will probably in the end avoid an internecine Western trade war which some people had foreseen as a consequence of Britain's Common Market exclusion. Tariff barriers against French goods would be provocative and costly because they would invite retaliation. Clearly any economic efforts to bring General de Gaulle to his knees could have boomerang effects.

High quarters have contemplated a temporary trade war with all its inconveniences for the sake of ultimate Western unity goals. It appears, however, that less emotional statesmen are persuading the hotheads that economic measures against France would not help bail England out and would probably be unworkable because France itself could not easily be isolated from its five Common Market partners.

Already some of the clouds of political passion, generated in Brussels, are beginning to dissipate. Cold-blooded logic seems to be prevailing even in those capitals still shaking with fury at De Gaulle.

SHE'S STILL AN ALLY

It would be not only unwise but politically insane to try to penalize France for independent views; furthermore, France remains an ally, as it showed during the Cuban crisis when France stood up to be counted. This should not be forgotten entirely because De Gaulle interprets the shape of alliance quite differently from the rest of NATO and is being tiresome.

More pragmatically, France is booming, on the economic upsurge, while several other continental nations are beginning to slacken off. The French economy burgeons; gold reserves rise; the currency is stable; trade prospers. The temporary Achilles heel, oil, is in the process of being protected by the new trade treaty with Russia.

Nor is it sure the United States is even legally in a position to try and sequester France for retribution. Our new trade act is designed to encourage arrangements with the Common Market as an entity—although we had hoped this would include England—and not with its component members. If we strike at the Common Market in an effort to punish Gaullist policies we dislike, we will place the Benelux countries, Germany and Italy in a difficult position. They are already beaten together in an omelet from which individual eggs cannot be separated. Europe's big business has made plans for years to come on the basis of scheduled interchanges.

Were the United States, out of pique and an honorable wish to help England, to hit at this complex, we would arouse anti-American feelings and commercial resentment. We would wind up by handing De Gaulle continental support he doesn't at this moment have.

The Common Market is way ahead of schedule on tariff reductions. And, until 1966 it is subject to the veto of any single member. Under existing circumstances it obviously won't undertake any new arrangements for some time because anything proposed by the French would be negated by the others; and vice versa. But its arterial stream already pumps.

TRADE WAR FRUITLESS

A trade war would hurt ourselves, the British and their EFTA and the Common Market. It would help the Soviet Union which could hope for nothing better than an opportunity to bargain with rival blocs.

The only sensible approach is that of the so-called "empty chair." In NATO, for some time, the French seat has been but partially occupied. General de Gaulle withdrew his

Mediterranean fleet and has refused to restore divisions originally sent to Algeria. He has spurned our concept of a multilateral nuclear force.

But the alliance has accepted the habit of proceeding to plan without active French participation. In a more closely knit sense, the Common Market must now acknowledge an empty chair at Brussels. The French will veto new market ideas and the other partners will veto new French ideas—for a while. But a while is not forever.

Both the British and their five Common Market friends already tend to this less excitable approach. The five friends even hope their nuclear branch, Euratom, can soon continue discussions with London. And Britain's chief negotiator, Mr. Heath, has pledged that his Government will persevere in its efforts to "join Europe."

Ultimate unity is not to be achieved by temporary disunity. And partial unity is preferable to chaos. There is no sense in trying to cut off De Gaulle's nose to spite our own face.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). Is there further morning business?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I thought I had other morning business. But, somehow, some of my business gets lost in the great accumulation which is on my desk. However, tomorrow is another day—and tomorrow and tomorrow. What was it that Shakespeare said? "Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow"——

Mr. METCALF. "Creeps in this petty pace from day to day."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; "this petty pace from day to day, to the last syllable of recorded time."

So, Mr. President, on that basis, I think I shall wait until the next session of the Senate to submit other matters.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1963

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move, pursuant to the order entered on February 20, that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m., Monday, February 25.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order entered on February 20, until Monday, February 25, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address by Senator Morton to Georgia Press Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 22, 1963

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Congressional Record a very eloquent and pointed address delivered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] to the Georgia Press Institute, at Athens, Ga., on February 21, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Senator Morton to Georgia Press Institute, Convened in Athens, Ga., February 21, 1963

Your profession and mine have a problem in common these days. We are becoming obsolete. News and legislation are being fully automated. There is a giant new machine that grinds out both commodities; grinds them out, serves them up, ties a bib around your neck, spoon feeds you, and even sends a doctor around to examine you if the diet happens to disagree with you.

The newspaperman is expected to pass the package along to his readers. The legislator is expected to pass the package along to his constituents. The linotype machine and the legislative machine, in this grand design, can both be replaced by rubberstamps.

The machine is the executive branch of the Government. And your old friend Arthur Sylvester, who used to be a newspaperman himself, is one of its chief operators. I'm sure you remember the development of his blueprint. It started in October, when a number of conscientious newspapermen suddenly realized that news of the Cuban crisis was being controlled by a system of censorship tighter even than that of the Second World War. At least during that war newsmen often were taken into the Government's confidence.

Arthur Sylvester had a different view. Remember his classic explanation? "News generated by actions of the Government as to content and timing are part of the arsenal of weaponry that a President has in the application of military force and related forces to the solution of political problems, or to the application of international political pressure. In the kind of world we live in the generation of news by actions taken by the Government becomes one weapon in a strained situation. The results, in my opinion justify the methods we used."

Two months later Sylvester was still sticking to his weapons of news management. This time he made a public statement that should be tacked up in every news room—either as a grim reminder or as a replacement for the usual creed of the journalist. He said that "it would seem to me basic, all through history, that it's an inherent government right, if necessary, to lie to save itself * * *."

On another occasion Sylvester elaborated this truth-strangling policy to the Air Force Association in Nevada. He said that Air Force public relations officers must manage news to keep it in harmony with the actions of the President and his top advisers.

Now I don't question for a moment the right of a government to protect vital military security secrets. We have plenty of laws to cover that and we also have the conscience of your profession. In the Second World War, for instance, many reporters were entrusted with military secrets and they kept them. But a deliberate policy of lying is something else again.

It is also something else again when Government policy, as it did at both the State Department and the Defense Department during the Cuban crisis—and as it still does at Defense—requires officials to check in with the boss every time a reporter drops around.

Arthur Krock, the distinguished correspondent of the New York Times and the respected dean of the Washington press corps, recently had this comment on muzzling by memo:

"There is a basic functional conflict involved. The responsible press is trained to recognize, and will not publish, news inimical to national security. The press knows that international crises do and must enlarge this category. But if and when a government has shown a tendency to inflate the category, and also virtually polices the contacts of officials with news reporters, both press and public are denied the legitimate information which, as the President himself acknowledged * * * 'any administration must depend on as a check on its own actions'."

That's a fine statement and, as Mr. Krock meant it, its quotation of the President is ironic. I can't recall any administration in our history that has seemed less interested in checks on its own actions than this one.

In Look magazine last August another famous newsman, Fletcher Knebel, compiled this bill of particulars. It's an overflowing menu of kingly Kennedy reactions to reporters trying to do their jobs.

Hear the charges:

"Kennedy personally has called down at least six Washington correspondents either for their writings or for their publications."

"Three Kennedy administration officials have threatened to sue newspapers."

"Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy has reproved at least four newspapermen for stories he disliked."

"The Federal Bureau of Investigation questioned six newspapermen in connection with stories concerning policies of the Kennedy administration."

"Pentagon security officials quizzed three correspondents."

"The White House canceled 22 subscriptions to the New York Herald Tribune."

"Administration officials, reporters charge, put 'the freeze' on some reporters who had offended them."

"White House Special Counsel Theodore C. Sorenson has reprimanded some newspapermen."

"White House Press Secretary Pierre Salinger has rebuked about a dozen reporters for their stories."

"White House Aid Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., a Pulitzer Prize historian, called one columnist 'an idiot.'

"Even the Kennedy women have gotten into the act. Ethel Kennedy, wife of the Attorney General, and Mrs. Jean Smith, sister of the President, braced one correspondent for his story about dunkings in the Bob Kennedy swimming pool."

"What amazes many in the huge Washington newspaper fraternity in the Kennedy era is not the fact of White House disenchantment, but the volume, extent, and dexterity of its expression. Never before have so few bawled out so many so often for so little. Says Merriman Smith, of United Press International, the senior White House correspondent, 'Every administration develops Potomac sunburn sooner or later. The main difference with the Kennedy people is that their hypersensitivity developed so early. One reason is the close attention they pay to everything written about them. How they can spot an obscure paragraph in a paper of 3,000 circulation 2,000 miles away is beyond me. They must have a thousand little gnomes reading the papers for them.'"

Its attitude toward the press is just one example, but it covers virtually the whole scale of executive excess. It descends to the pettiness of canceling subscriptions to the New York Herald Tribune when that paper's needle got too sharp. It includes the barrage of pressures we keep hearing about against

newspapers in Florida which insist on printing news of the Cuba buildup in the face of White House denials of such a buildup.

It included the ridiculous but actually ominous request some months ago for voluntary self-censorship of the American press, a censorship that was couched in terms so vague that even the comic strips and the advice to the lovelorn columns could be included according to the sensitivity of a bureaucrat's feelings.

And it included what, to me, remains one of the most appalling misuses of government power on record—the incident in which the FBI was sent to rout reporters from their beds in the small hours of the morning to check the sources of their stories on Kennedy's steel crisis.

There is some drama and considerable danger in all of those incidents. There is another example of executive news management, that is far more subtle and every bit as disturbing. It involves the manipulation of facts and figures—the sort of offense for which bookkeepers can go to jail but for which bureaucrats don't seem called upon to pay at all.

As some of us recall rather vividly, there was an election last year. One of the hot issues involved was that of employment, or lack of it. Many a candidate was running on the administration's record in that area. In October, with all the precision of a military maneuver, the Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, released his regular report on employment.

In an election period it was a blockbuster. It said that "over 4,500,000 more Americans have jobs than when this administration took office in January 1961." It said that unemployment was, and again I quote, "over 2 million less than in January of 1961."

No one can accurately count just how many votes those statements were worth. If they were true they were worth votes. They deserved it. If they were true.

Now you saw those figures. A lot of you undoubtedly used them. A lot of legislators used them in considering their positions as well as in appealing for votes. After all, they were Government figures. And we've come to accept Government figures as something just about sacred.

And so we went into the election and you went into your newspapers with that inspiring batch of statistics. After the voting was over, Secretary Wirtz had a little confession to make. It turns out that he hadn't really checked those figures quite as closely as he should have. Just an error, he said. No political motivation. So sorry.

Let's look at the slight errors. Remember that the official certified pasteurized, cauterized, sanitized Government figures showed 4½ million more Americans at work than when the administration took over.

Well, the actual figure turned out to be 1,224,000 almost exactly the sort of labor force increase we have been experiencing right along through normal growth in our population and markets. The little error was a little error of more than 200 percent—that's all.

What about the other figure, of 2 million less unemployed. That was a slight error too. The correct figure, the figure we got on second thought, after the elections were over, turned out to be 784,000—again, nothing startling. Of course, we have to admit that the second figure was pretty near perfect on a relative scale of New Frontier mathematics. It was slightly less than 100 percent wrong.

In Kennedyland, as in Disneyland, a 100 percent slip from reality is scarcely anything to get excited about. We should expect it.

That was an example of rewriting the present. What about rewriting history? That, too, is a function of the well-oiled machine that is attempting to operate a government by handout.

In one case it also involved a clear exposition of the theory that there is one set of rules for the ordinary people and another set altogether for the Kennedys.

You will recall that another of the big stories you weren't permitted to cover was the action in the Bay of Pigs. Four high-ranking officials of the Government were assigned the job of investigating the reasons for its failure. They were pledged to secrecy. Last month one of them broke that pledge. But it was all right, his name was Kennedy, Bobby Kennedy. In the face of an accumulation of evidence that would have impressed a mere mortal, he blandly said that the invasion simply hadn't been promised any air cover. His real thrust, of course, was that story after story pinning the responsibility for withdrawal of air support on Brother Jack's shoulders were all wrong. Kennedys can do no wrong. The invasion fiasco was all the fault of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the CIA.

The main point here, however, is that Bobby broke the secrecy pledge. His brother backed him up, of course. But the others involved in the investigation are still wearing their muzzles.

When you can control the truth as tightly as that, who can say that the muzzle doesn't fit almost everyone in one way or another? A group of editors who recalled the President mentioning air cover in a private interview have been blandly told that their memories are faulty. No such mention was made. Where can you find truth in a situation like that?

What about the famous Saturday Evening Post article on the Cuban affair. Most of us probably remember it chiefly for its none-too-subtle stabbing of Adlai Stevenson. Personally, I think that was just a secondary matter. The real significance is in who wrote the story and what it was based upon. The authors were Stew Alsop and Charlie Bartlett, the latter being a close friend of the President and the man who introduced him to Jackie. The main burden of the story portrayed the President and his advisers as a magnificent team, operating flawlessly to face down the foe. It included access to information of such a high order of secrecy that other reporters might have reasonably expected a flying call from the FBI. Certainly it involved more sensitive areas than those that brought the FBI to reporters during the Kennedy steel crisis. But not in this case. Kennedys, you must remember, can do no wrong nor, apparently can their friends.

Much of this whole question, it seems to me, involves this kingly concept of right, of always being right, of always appearing right. It's no longer all the news that's fit to print—now it's all the news that fits the Kennedy image.

Part of that image, so far as Bobby is concerned, has been bent under the eight-wheel weight of the Teamster's Union. Brother Jack once said that any competent Attorney General could clap Jimmy Hoffa in jail. But then he appointed Bobby.

This year, in Nashville Bobby was still trying to get the job done. You know what happened. The Nashville Banner obtained a report that an attempt had been made to tamper the jury. The Banner didn't have any more reason than Bobby for wanting to see Hoffa get off the hook. But its journalistic mission and even reputation were directly challenged. Bobby directly applied pressure to keep the Banner from printing its story. The Banner refused.

The point was the same. It was the Kennedy image that was at stake and the facts had to fit.

I said at the outset that our problem was one in common. We both have our troubles in this era of executive excess.

You recall the story of the psychiatrist who admitted a beautiful blond patient into his inner sanctum. After an amorous interlude, he said, "that takes care of my problem—now what's yours?"

Well, I certainly haven't taken care of your problem, but I'd like to touch on mine. Actually it's still your problem because it is a problem in the whole structure of representative government.

Again, executive excess sums it up. The same sort of executive excess that permits bureaucrats to presume to tell you what to print, when to print it, and even how to interpret it.

Until right now there has been pretty general agreement that the success of our form of government rests on the balance of powers between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government.

But things have changed. We have some fellows in Washington who equate checks and balances with brakes—brakes on their vehicle of executive pride and power.

James McGregor Burns, a biographer of both Franklin Roosevelt and John Kennedy, has just recently called the Congress a stumbling block to democracy.

The President himself insisted that the rules of the House of Representatives had to be changed so as to not interfere with his programs, his powers, his desires.

The Budget Director has told the Congress that its Members can't consider the budget properly because they "fragment" it by dividing it into receipts and expenditures. Only the President, he says, can view the budget properly.

What's that leave for the Congress or the Senate? If the budget is opposed, or trimmed, the Congress and the Senate stand accused of obstructionism. Actually, of course, they should stand complimented for representing their own constituencies and their own consciences.

The administration's education bill is now before us. It's an omnibus bill, a fully packed grab bag of administration plans. Some of its items may be fine, others may not. Senators and Congressmen are supposed to exercise some judgment in these matters. But not in this case. The administration prefers that the bill be considered as a total piece of legislation. Take it or leave it. The Executive has spoken.

When Franklin Roosevelt tried to pack the Supreme Court with men who would bend to his executive will there was an outcry that rocked the country. There should be a similar outcry now against the attempts to pack the executive with so much excessive power that all the other branches of Government are subordinated.

When the Congress refused to pass a bill creating a Department of Urban Affairs, the President tried his best to override their wishes by establishing a department by Executive order. His first attempt didn't work but the pressure is still on, experts are still collecting in the executive offices. Most importantly, it showed a trend or tendency—a trend or tendency away from legislative government and toward executive government.

Rooted in the urban affairs proposal also was another extension of Executive excess—the notion that the great cities of America should be cut away from their State moorings and hauled into the Federal harbor.

Perhaps we could be excused for shrugging off these Executive excesses. One by one they seem relatively innocent. Together they are far from it. And nowhere is this more alarmingly apparent than in the life-or-death matters of our national security.

Key members of congressional committees recently awoke to read newspaper stories describing our negotiations to remove missile bases from Turkey and Italy; negotiations based upon Executive decisions. Just a few weeks earlier Khrushchev's demands that we remove those missiles in return for his removal of missiles from Cuba had been hooted down as another Munich. But suddenly, without consultation and without the opportunity to obtain congressional expressions, the Munich was underway, prettied up with a new set of clothes supposed to represent modernization of our weapons systems. Even if Polaris is considered sufficient, extra insurance in Italy and Turkey won't hurt.

The Nassau agreement with Prime Minister Macmillan was another example of negotiation in sunny secrecy, of decisions which affect us all but which were arrived at quickly, perhaps precipitously by the Executive alone. Perhaps Congress should feel no pain at being left out of that one, however. The President's own Secretary of State, or at least the man who carries the title, wasn't even present. Maybe that was a simple division of labor. The President took on the job of imperiling Mr. Macmillan's government and the Secretary of State was held in reserve to do the same sort of job on Canada's Prime Minister.

When, if ever a disarmament agreement finally is reached, one wonders what razzle-dazzle of public relations will be used to break the news to the American people and their representatives in Congress. What are the guidelines for disarmament? I hope they are clearer, more solid, and more definitive than the shifting sands of the Executive's statements and press releases on the subject.

But where, instead, are the policymolding position papers on disarmament being written? Many of them are coming from the special, private research corporations which, through contracts with the executive branch, are springing up like mushrooms, or toadstools, in Washington today.

The excuse for these groups is simple. Government can't pay the salaries needed to get top rate men, it's said. So the private corporations are founded, with massive Government contracts, to provide the thinkers who wouldn't work for ordinary wages. These policy technicians have become virtually a counterpart government, responsible to no constituency but fully integrated into the Executive's excessive power structure.

This shadow government is just another way around Congress, another way toward an all-powerful Presidency no longer harnessed to Government institutions responsible for their decisions but free to use the whole Nation as the guinea pig for special theories and special interests.

Other Presidents have had their kitchen cabinets, even their shadow cabinets. This one is the first to have a shadow government.

Of course, there are excuses aplenty for this Executive excess. One is that our society has become so complex it can no longer rely on the cumbersome machinery of representative government to get its job done. There seems to be some magic mathematical limit on individual responsibility.

Planning is another magical excuse word. Our society is said to be so interdependent that it can't rely on individual responsibility to accomplish the integrated planning needed to get us moving.

I think those excuses are nonsense. The root of the growing tree of Executive power is simply distrust of the people.

The New Frontier is simply a frontier of fear—fear that people can no longer manage their own lives, fear that they might take some course other than that plotted and planned in the all-wise, all-knowing ivory tower.

Taxes are described in this new philosophy as not merely a means to raise revenues but as a way to distribute income. The free market doesn't do a good enough job. People spend their money on the wrong things. The solution? Simple, let the Government take the money and spend it for you.

It's really ironic. In this period of our history, since the turn of the century anyway, our average incomes have doubled and doubled again. Our individual education has grown from a grade school average to a high school average and is now approaching a full college average.

Nevertheless, we find that the prevailing theory is that we are not smart enough to handle our own affairs. We must be protected from ourselves.

We can't insure ourselves against sickness or old age. The Government must do it and do it all, without options, given its way.

We can't build our own schools in our own communities. The Federal Government must do it for us.

We can't settle our own affairs in business and industry, the Federal Government alone is wise enough.

We can't raise prices, we can't lower prices, we can't work short hours, we can't work long hours. We can't be trusted even to take someone to lunch for a business chat.

That's the nub of it. Mistrust of the people.

One of the administration's economic oracles spelled it out in a book when he wrote that "the marginal tax dollar has currently a much higher social utility than the marginal pay-envelope dollar. The former goes to schools; the latter into tail fins." The author was Alvin Hansen, professor emeritus of political economy at Harvard.

Simple, isn't it? Government is wise. Individuals are foolish.

Nobody denies that some people do act foolishly. Even people in government act foolishly. Even Senators do—although rarely.

But today we see public policy based upon the sweeping assumption that most people would behave foolishly if left to their own devices and not herded by government.

The picture is alarming. Parents would stop sending their children to school and then they'd stop building schools. Everybody over 50 would be ground down under the poverty induced by a misspent youth. Our cities would lie in rubble because the residents wouldn't have enough sense or money to keep them up. The countryside would be a tangle of weeds because there would be no one to tell the farmers what to grow. Detroit would be making cars 50 feet long, costing $50,000 which would be sold in great numbers to the 6 or 7 bloated millionaires who had made billions by merging railroads and forcing everyone to buy high cost steel. Why there might even be some extremists in our midst who would hold meetings to criticize the Soviet Union.

Far fetched? It may sound so, but it is precisely this sort of mistrust of the individual that lies behind every attempt to usurp the power of the people in order to protect the people.

I prefer, and I think most Americans either do or will, when given a clear choice, prefer the sort of government envisioned by the late Supreme Court Justice Jackson when he said, "It is not the function of our Government to keep the citizens from falling into error; it is the function of the citizens to keep the Government from falling into error."

Fortunately, we can still do this. The Congress may be unpopular in some quarters, but it is still there. And you still elect it. You, in particular, are involved, because you still cover those elections and can accord to them the importance they deserve.

This is not a partisan matter. My good friend, the late great Democratic Senator Robert Kerr was alert to it when he said that he honored the President but he honored the wishes of the people of Oklahoma more.

He was sensitive to it also when he obtained a virtually unprecedented unanimous vote from his colleagues to try to prevent the President from administering the public works funds as a tool of political pressure.

Our challenge today is to the structure of our government, its entire system of checks and balances, not just to one party or another. The Presidency is fast becoming a party unto itself, aloof, alone, lordly, and disdainful of the individual. Rule by machine has been a disgrace in some of our major cities. But rule by machine is becoming a crisis in our capital. The population explosion may be a peril elsewhere in the world but it is the power explosion in Washington that is the peril here.

Government of the people, by the people, and for the people is the great goal of our liberty. We must not now, on pretexts of efficiency or new problems and new answers abandon that goal and substitute in its place government of the Executive, by the Executive and for the Executive—or, to put it bluntly, government of the Kennedys, by the Kennedys, and for the Kennedys.

SENATE

Monday, February 25, 1963

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in whose eternal peace, which passeth understanding, our fretful, restless spirits are quieted. The fierce tempests sweeping across our sadly sundered world leave us weary with watching and guarding the ramparts of freedom. These testing times find out our every weakness.

In the midst of our bewilderment and perplexity, we turn to the infinite calm of Thy changeless love, that we may find inner sustenance, wells of living water restoring our souls, and bringing serenity under strain, as in Thy name we battle for the truth.

In these confused times, when so often the props of moral support seem bending with the weight of secular ambitions, make plain to our understanding that legislative enactments alone are futile, and that except they be undergirded with a sustaining strength, not our own, we labor in vain to bring order out of the chaos which threatens to engulf the selfish schemes of willful men who have not Thee in all their thoughts.

We ask it in the Name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 22, 1963, was dispensed with.

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to meet during the remainder of the week while the Senate is in session.

The subcommittee is conducting hearings on the Youth Employment Act of 1963, which is S. 1.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that, under the agreement reached last week, the time limitation begins at 12 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. The order is as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on Monday, Feb. 25, at 12 o'clock noon, debate on the amendments to be offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] (S. Res. 91, 92, and 93) to S. Res. 90, to amend rule XXV, be limited to 2 hours to be equally divided between the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark].

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour until 5 minutes to 12, and that there be a 3-minute limitation on statements during that period.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Federal Civil Defense Contributions Program

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Department on the Federal contributions program, for the quarter ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Provision of War Risk Insurance and Certain Marine and Liability Insurance for the American Public

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Federal Aviation Agency

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, covering the fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Section 902, Federal Aviation Act of 1958, Relating to Penalties for Falsification of Records

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to penalties for falsification of records, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Additional Authority for Federal Communications Commission

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend paragraph (2) (G) of subsection 309(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by granting the Federal Communications Commission additional authority to grant special temporary authorizations for 60 days for certain nonbroadcast operations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Civil Aeronautics Board

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, covering fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of Office of Coal Research

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Coal Research, dated February 15, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Lead and Zinc Mining Stabilization Program

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the lead and zinc mining stabilization program, for the year ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Delivery of Water to Lands in the Third Division, Riverton Reclamation Project, Wyoming

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Visa Petitions of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports concerning visa petitions which that Service has approved, according to beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Positions Filled in Certain Grades of Classification Act of 1949

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report from the Office of Emergency Planning on positions filled under the Classification Act of 1949, in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Resolution 8

"Concurrent resolution relating to Devils Jump Dam

"Whereas a condition of intense economic distress and basic regional underdevelopment exists in an area of southeastern Kentucky and northeastern Tennessee; and

"Whereas an intensive total development program is underway in this area in which the efforts of local, State, and Federal interests are devoted more aggressively than ever before to every aspect of area development; and

"Whereas one real opportunity to create the necessary foundation for significant achievement within this overall program exists in the potential of the proposed Devils Jump Dam and Reservoir; and

"Whereas the Devils Jump project would accelerate and expand the success of the development program in this area more than any other factor, and, at the same time, the overall development activity would add to and multiply the benefits of this project far beyond those calculated in establishing the feasibility now recognized by the U.S. Corps of Engineers; and

"Whereas the Devils Jump project, by itself, would create an unusual and outstanding mountain area reservoir in the existing national forest area of unexcelled natural and unspoiled scenic beauty, and this project represents a unique opportunity to establish a major conservation and recreation area; an outstanding fish and wildlife habitat; and a principal tourist mecca, all with great benefit to the economy to this area and the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky (the Senate concurring therein)*:

"Section 1. That the U.S. Bureau of the Budget is requested to approve appropriation for the planning and developing of Devils Jump Dam and Reservoir.

"Sec. 2. That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky petitions the Appropriations Committees in the U.S. Congress to include the Devils Jump Reservoir in appropriations of the 88th Congress.

"Sec. 3. That the U.S. Corps of Engineers is requested to expedite construction and development of Devils Jump Dam and Reservoir to assist in the economic development of southeastern Kentucky and northeastern Tennessee.

"Sec. 4. That the congressional delegation from the Commonwealth of Kentucky use their good offices to achieve the ends mentioned in section 1 to 3, preceding.

"Sec. 5. That the clerk of the Kentucky House of Representatives be directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Kentucky Members of the U.S. Congress, to the chairmen of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, to the Director of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, and to the Chief of the U.S. Corps of Engineers."

Resolutions of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Resolution 15

"Resolution relating to the promotion of State commercial fishery research and development projects

"Whereas the several States of the Union have taken the initiative in fishery research and development; and

"Whereas the off-shore fishery resources of the United States are the proper concern of both the Federal and State Governments; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has an obligation to encourage and assist in State research and development programs; and

"Whereas a bold program to assist the States in their efforts to develop their fishery resources is essential to the proper conservation and utilization of this basic resource: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Congress is respectfully requested to give favorable consideration to S. 627 introduced by the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, U.S. Senator from Alaska, a bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce; the Honorable Herbert Bonner, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate February 19, 1963.

"Frank Peratrovich,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"Secretary of the Senate."

"SENATE RESOLUTION 16

"Resolution relating to the food-for-peace program

"Whereas the Federal Government has embarked on a program of Food for Peace to facilitate the purchase of domestic food surpluses for sale to needy foreign nations; and

"Whereas the use of high-protein value fishery products would contribute to the value of the program; and.

"Whereas the development of the offshore fishery resources of the United States can be protected only if expanding domestic and foreign markets are provided and developed; and

"Whereas the untapped offshore fishery resources of the United States are being harvested by foreign powers unconcerned with proper conservation measures: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That Congress is respectfully requested to give favorable consideration to S. 702, introduced by the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson with Senators E. L. Bartlett and Theodore Kennedy, a bill which would make a domestically produced fishery product available for distribution under the food-for-peace program to assist that program and the development of the domestic fishery resource; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce; the Honorable Herbert Bonner, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate February 19, 1963.

"Frank Peratrovich,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION TO REDUCE FEDERAL TAXES WITH TAX REFORMS

"Whereas an early Federal tax reduction coupled with tax reforms will increase the strength and vigor of our economy; and

"Whereas the stimulus of this proposed Federal tax reduction with tax reforms would release investment capital, create jobs, increase consumer spending and raise profits; and

"Whereas it will release the economy from the shackles of an overly repressive income tax structure so that it can move ahead to full capacity utilization of its human and physical resources; and

"Whereas it would avoid the recurring recessions that have characterized the postwar years; and

"Whereas the Commonwealth as well as every other State will benefit from the new tax program through additional job opportunities and more money to spend: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to reduce Federal taxes with tax reforms as proposed by the President of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate February 11, 1963.

"Thomas A. Chadwick,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and His Excellency, the President of the United States, regarding the lumber industry in the United States

"Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

"Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forest to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes; and

"Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay high wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

"Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canadian, due to the latter's advantages, including: Depreciated currency, low stumpage rates, noncompetitive bidding, less costly and restrictive forest practices, lower wage rates, high tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada, low charter rates for coastwise and intercoastal shipping, a cooperative Government; and

"Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

"Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 38th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein) do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States and His Excellency, the President of the United States, to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes, and deterioration of communities; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the Congress, to His Excellency, the President of the United States, and to the Representatives in the Congress from the State of South Dakota.

"Nils A. Boe,
"President of the Senate.
"Mills P. Jensen,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"Paul E. Brown,
"Speaker of the House.
"W. J. Matson,
"Chief Clerk."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska, That the following article proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by the Congress of the United States through the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 29, 87th Congress, 2d session, is ratified:

" 'ARTICLE—

" 'Sec. 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" 'Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation'; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of Alaska shall send a certified copy of this resolution to the Administrator of General Services and direct facsimile copies to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate February 1, 1963.

"Frank Peratrovich,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the house February 11, 1963.

"Bruce Kendall,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

Patricia R. Slack,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"Approved by the Governor February 18, 1963.

"William A. Egan,
"Governor of Alaska."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 1009

"Resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the payment of a poll tax or any other tax as a qualification to voting

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the United States and the U.S. Senate, by the constitutional vote of two-thirds of each House concurring therein, did enact at the 2d session of the 87th Congress of the United States of America in 1962, a proposed amendment of the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas said proposed amendment was submitted to the States for ratification and said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America is in the following words, to wit:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll or other tax.

" 'Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations does hereby ratify the above proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Administrator of General Services of the United States."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS AND THE POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES TO PREVENT THE AUTOMATION OF OUTGOING MAIL FROM THE POST OFFICES IN THE CITIES AND TOWNS IN BRISTOL COUNTY

"Whereas on January 22, 1963, outgoing mail from the post offices in the cities and towns of Bristol County will be processed at the automated post office in Providence, R.I.; and

"Whereas this new process will result in a job loss as well as a huge dollar loss to said cities and towns, with no guarantee of improved mail service: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts urgently requests that the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to prevent the automation of outgoing mail in said cities and towns; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Postmaster General of the United States rescind the order providing for the processing of outgoing mail from said post offices in said cities and towns at the automated post office in Providence, R.I.; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Postmaster General, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, February 12, 1963.

"William C. Maiers,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

Kevin H. White,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Hawaii, Hilo, Hawaii, favoring authorization for further and continued work projects and restoration programs in and for the City of Refuge National Historical Park, Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

S. Res. 79. Resolution to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on strategic and critical stockpiling; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments:

S. Res. 75. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to national defense; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Manuel F. L. Guerrero, of Guam, to be Governor of Guam.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably a total of 465 appointments and promotions of general and flag officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. I ask that these names be printed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Edmondson in the chair). The nominations will be placed on the Executive Calendar, as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

The nominations are as follows:

Lt. Gen. Samuel Leslie Myers, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list;

Lt. Gen. John Knight Waters, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general;

Maj. Gen. Theodore John Conway, U.S. Army, and Maj. Gen. Charles Granville Dodge, U.S. Army, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. Albert Watson II, U.S. Army, and Maj. Gen. Harvey Herman Fischer, U.S. Army, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general;

Robert E. Cushman, Jr., and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Marine Corps;

Brig. Gen. William Joseph Hixson, Jr., and sundry other officers, for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army;

Rear Adm. Kleber S. Masterson, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons in the Department of the Navy;

Edwin S. Miller, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Navy;

Maj. Gen. James C. Jensen (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Rear Adm. George C. Towner, U.S. Navy, to have the grade of vice admiral on the retired list;

Rear Adm. Ephraim P. Holmes, U.S. Navy, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of vice admiral;

Col. Donald J. Campbell, Air Force Reserve, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Air Force Reserve;

Maj. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright, U.S. Army, and Maj. Gen. Ben Harrell, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. George Robinson Mather, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Alfred Dodd Starbird, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general; and

Francis Stevens Greenlief, Army National Guard of the United States, for promotion as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably 21,719 nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, in the grade of colonel and below. Since these names have already been printed in the Congressional Record, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk, for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

The nominations are as follows:

Jimmie M. Anderson, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Thomas C. Fleury, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army;

Harold R. Aaron, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Robert A. Campbell, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Marine Corps;

Raymond L. Abbott, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force;

Gene W. Oehlman, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force; and

Asher D. Abelon, and sundry other Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates, for appointment in the U.S. Navy.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 902. A bill to provide for further research relating to new and improved uses for farm and forest products and for development of new crops, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 903. A bill for the relief of Anna B. Dreyspring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 904. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not exceeding $175,000 with which to make a survey of proposed national parkway extensions or connection to Blue Ridge Parkway, Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Foothills Parkway, Mammoth Cave National Park, and Natchez Trace Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 905. A bill for the relief of Jasper Y. Willoughby; and

S. 906. A bill for the relief of Maria Carraro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG (for himself and Mr. Inouye):

S. 907. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard in Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FONG (for himself, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Bartlett, and Mr. Gruening):

S. 908. A bill to amend section 305(b) of title 37, United States Code, relating to foreign duty pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 909. A bill for the relief of Mrija Lovsin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 910. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNamara when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 911. A bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 912. A bill approving a compromise and settlement agreement of the Navajo Tribe of Indians and authorizing the tribe to execute and the Secretary of the Interior to approve any oil and gas leases entered into pursuant to the agreement; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 913. A bill for the relief of Anthony F. Bernardo and Ambrose A. Cerrito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. Mansfield):

S. 914. A bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, for certain lands embraced within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, for the validation of titles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Metcalf when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 915. A bill to encourage planning and the programing, on a coordinated basis, of land-use projects in the development of metropolitan areas, and to require, after a reasonable preparatory period, the approval by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator of workable programs as a condition to the granting of Federal assistance in the financing of certain projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Case when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 916. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth J. Padilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (by request):

S. 917. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. Edmondson):

S. 918. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton project, Oklahoma, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Monroney when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Mechem):

S.J. Res. 49. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, in New Mexico and Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Anderson when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SMATHERS submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) to create a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Smathers, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

FUNDS FOR ADDITIONAL STAFF FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HILL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 95); which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, seven additional professional staff members, and nine additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

DESIGNATION OF MAJORITY AND MINORITY MEMBERS ON STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Dirksen) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 96) designating majority and minority members on standing committees of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appears under a separate heading.)

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. Dirksen) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 97) appointing members of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appears under a separate heading.)

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK REGARDLESS OF SEX

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex.

This bill is the administration bill. It is similar to a measure which passed both Houses during the last Congress but which died because of the press of business at the end of the last session.

I believe that this bill is absolutely essential if we are to provide the kind of economic structure which I believe a democracy requires. The majority of employers in this country do pay equal wages for equal work.

But all too many employers—unfortunately aided at times by misguided employee representatives—have exploited their female employees by the payment of discriminatory wages.

This exploitation not only creates a severe hardship for the nondiscriminatory employer who must compete with the employer who pays unequal wages, but also contributes to poor morale among workers and substandard living conditions in a large number of families where the woman is the principal wage earner.

I am hopeful that both Houses of Congress will quickly ratify their action of last year by the speedy passage of this measure.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, along with the accompanying letter and statement of the Secretary of Labor, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, with accompanying letter and statement, will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 910) to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination, introduced by Mr. McNamara, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the existence in industries engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce of wage differentials based on sex—

(1) depresses wages and living standards for employees necessary for their health and efficiency;

(2) prevents the maximum utilization of the available labor resources;

(3) tends to cause labor disputes, thereby burdening, affecting, and obstructing commerce;

(4) burdens commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce; and

(5) constitutes an unfair method of competition.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this Act, through exercise by Congress of its power to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, to correct the conditions above referred to in such industries.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 3. When used in this Act—

(a) "Person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, legal representative, or any organized group of persons.

(b) "Commerce" means trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or between any State and any place outside thereof.

(c) "Goods" means goods (including ships and marine equipment), wares, products, commodities, merchandise, or articles or subjects of commerce of any character, or any part or ingredient thereof, but does not include goods after their delivery into the actual physical possession of the ultimate consumer thereof other than a producer, manufacturer, or processor thereof.

(d) "Produced" means produced, manufactured, mined, handled, or in any other manner worked on in any State; and for the purposes of this Act an employee shall be deemed to have been engaged in the production of goods if such employee was employed in producing, manufacturing, mining, handling, transporting, or in any other manner working on such goods, or in any closely related process or occupation directly essential to the production thereof, in any State.

(e) "Employ" includes to suffer or permit to work.

(f) "Employer" means any person having twenty-five or more employees in any place of employment and includes any person acting directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to an employee, including any person having the authority to hire, dismiss, and control the work of such employee, but shall not include the United States or any State or political subdivision of a State.

(g) "Employee" includes any individual employed by an employer.

(h) "Wage" paid to any employee includes the reasonable cost, as determined by the Secretary, to the employer of furnishing such employee with board, lodging, or other facilities, if such board, lodging, or other facilities are customarily furnished by such employer to his employees: *Provided,* That the Secretary is authorized to determine the fair value of such board, lodging, or other facilities for defined classes of employees and in defined areas, based on average cost to the employer or to groups of employers similarly situated, or average value to groups of employees, or other appropriate measures of fair value. Such evaluations, where applicable and pertinent, shall be used in lieu of actual measure of cost in determining the wages paid to any employee.

(i) "State" includes a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, Wake Island, the Canal Zone, and Outer Continental Shelf Lands defined in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

(j) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor.

(k) "Labor organization" means any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

Sec. 4. (a) No employer having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce shall discriminate, in any place of employment in which his employees are so engaged, between employees on the basis of sex by paying wages at a rate less than the rate at which he pays wages to any employee of the opposite sex in such place of employment for equal work on jobs the performance of which requires equal skills, except where such payment is made pursuant to a seniority or merit increase system which does not discriminate on the basis of sex: *Provided,* That an employer who, on the date of this enactment, is paying a wage rate differential which would be in violation of the Act on its effective date may adjust the lower wage rate as follows:

(1) On the effective date of this Act, all wage rate differentials shall be reduced by an amount equal to 10 per centum of the higher wage rate in effect on the date of enactment;

(2) One year from the effective date of this Act, remaining wage rate differentials shall be reduced by an amount equal to 15 per centum of the higher wage rate in effect on the date of enactment;

(3) Two years from the effective date of this Act, any remaining wage rate differential shall be removed.

(b) No employer shall discharge, cause to be discharged, discipline, or otherwise discriminate against any employee on account of any action taken by such employee to invoke, enforce, or assist in any manner in the enforcement of the provisions of this Act. No labor organization, or its agents, representing employees of such an employer shall cause or attempt to cause such an employer to discriminate against an individual in violation of this Act.

ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 5. (a) The Secretary of Labor—

(1) shall prescribe such regulations and rules as he deems necessary and appropriate for the administration of this Act, including regulations to protect against violation of the wage standards of any other applicable law and to safeguard wage levels in the elimination of wage rate differentials under section 4(a) of this Act;

(2) may investigate and gather data regarding the wages, hours, and other conditions and practices of employment in any industry subject to this Act, and may enter and inspect such places and such records (and make such transcriptions thereof), question such employees, and investigate such facts, conditions, practices, and matters as he may deem necessary or appropriate to determine whether any person has violated any provision of this Act, or which may aid in the enforcement of the provisions of this Act;

(3) if a violation is found to exist, the Secretary may, before taking further action hereunder, by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion, endeavor to eliminate discriminatory practices prohibited by this Act and to secure restitution of wages which an employee would have received had the employee been paid at the rate paid the opposite sex as required by this Act and reinstatement to employment where an employee has been discharged in violation of this Act;

(4) may enter and serve upon any employer or labor organization found by the Secretary, after notice and hearing in conformity with sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act, to be engaged in or to have engaged in any violation of section 4 or section 7 of this Act, an order requiring such employer or labor organization (A) to cease and desist from such violation, and requiring such employer (B) to pay to each employee who has been adversely affected a sum equal to the amount of the wages due such employee at the rate paid to an employee of the opposite sex, plus up to an additional amount as liquidated damages not to exceed the back wages found to be due; and

(5) may enter and serve upon any employer found by the Secretary, after notice and hearing as provided in paragraph (4) hereof, to have discharged or otherwise discriminated against any employee on account of any action taken by such employee to invoke, enforce, or assist in any manner in the enforcement of the provisions of section 4 or section 7 of this Act, an order requiring such employer to reinstate such employee, or to remove such discrimination, and to pay to such employee a sum equal to the amount of the wages of which such employee has been deprived by reason of such discharge or other discrimination plus up to an additional amount as liquidated damages not to exceed the back wages found to be due.

(b) For the purposes of any investigation or proceeding conducted under this Act, the provisions of section 307 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920 (16 U.S.C. 825f), shall be applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Labor or any officers designated by him.

(c) The Secretary shall have power to petition any United States district court, within the jurisdiction of which the violation of this Act occurred or such person resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of any order issued under this section and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall file in the court the record in the proceedings. Upon filing of such petition, the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such person, and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding, and shall have power to grant such temporary relief and restraining order as it deems just and proper, and to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Secretary. No objection that has not been urged before the Secretary or hearing officer, shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances. The findings of the Secretary with respect to questions of fact, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive. If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Secretary or hearing officer, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Secretary or his hearing officer and to be made a part of the record. The Secretary may modify his findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and he shall file such modified or new findings, which findings with respect to questions of fact, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive, and shall file his recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of his original order. Upon the filing of the record with it, the jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals.

(d) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Secretary issued under paragraphs (4) and (5) of subsection (a) of this section may obtain a review of such order in any United States district court within the jurisdiction of which the action in question was alleged to have been engaged in or such person resides or transacts business by filing in such court within sixty days of such order a written petition praying that the order of the Secretary be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary, and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court the record in the proceeding, certified by the Secretary. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Secretary under subsection (c) of this section, and shall have the same jurisdiction to grant to the Secretary such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Secretary; the findings of the Secretary with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall in like manner be conclusive.

(e) When granting appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order, or making and entering a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part an order of the Secretary, as provided in this section the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes", approved March 23, 1932 (47 Stat. 70; 29 U.S.C. 101–115).

SUPERVISION OF WAGE PAYMENTS

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to supervise the payments of any amounts owing to any employee which have been withheld in violation of this Act. Any sum owed an employee and paid to the Secretary under this Act shall be held in a separate account and shall be paid, on order of the Secretary, directly to the employee. Any such sum not paid to an employee because of inability to do so within a period of three years shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) No wage restitution shall be required with respect to any violation of this Act for any period which preceded by more than two years the date of commencement by the Secretary of Labor of the first administrative or judicial proceeding relating thereto.

(c) No person shall be subject to any liability for the commission of any action prohibited by this Act if he pleads and proves that the action complained of was in good faith and in conformity with and in reliance on any written interpretation or opinion of the Secretary.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

SEC. 7. (a) Except as hereinafter provided in this subsection, in any contract made and entered into by any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency or instrumentality of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any corporation all of the stock of which is beneficially owned by the United States (all of which are referred to hereinafter as agencies of the United States), for the manufacture or furnishing of any materials, supplies, articles, or equipment, in any amount exceeding $10,000, there shall be included stipulations under which the contractor (1) is required to compensate all persons employed by him in the manufacture or furnishing of such materials, supplies, articles, or equipment, in conformity with the requirements of this Act, and (2) shall be subject to all other provisions of this Act. The Secretary of Labor may, when he deems that special circumstances in the national interest so require, exempt a contracting agency from the requirement of including the provisions of this subsection in any specific contract.

(b) No contract shall be awarded by the United States or any agency thereof to any person finally determined to have violated any of the provisions of this Act or any stipulation entered into in compliance with subsection (a) of this section, or to any firm, corporation, partnership, or association in which such person has a controlling interest, until or unless the contractor has satisfied the Secretary of Labor that he is complying with his obligation hereunder and that he has in good faith established and will carry out wage policies and practices to assure future compliance. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to distribute to all agencies of the United States a list containing the names of persons ineligible for contract awards under this section. The Secretary of Labor shall cause the names of persons whom he determines to have made a satisfactory showing of present and future compliance with this Act to be removed from this list.

POSTING

SEC. 8. Every employer subject to this Act shall keep a copy of this Act posted in a conspicuous place in or about the premises where any employee is employed. Employers shall be furnished copies of this Act by the United States Department of Labor on request without charge.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 9. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 10. This Act shall take effect one hundred and twenty days after the date of its enactment.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. McNAMARA are as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting an administration proposal to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination, and for other purposes. I am also enclosing a summary statement explaining the need for the legislation and the purpose and effect of the bill.

The existing practice of some employers in paying discriminatory wage rates with respect to the same or comparable work has an undesirable effect on many aspects of the life of our Nation. The attached draft is intended to work toward the elimination of these effects in interstate commerce channels. Among other compelling reasons for its enactment is the necessity to utilize fully the skills of women in our labor force. The number of women workers is expected to increase to more than 30 million within the next 10 years.

The proposal is in the nature of new legislation and would not amend any existing law.

Yours sincerely,
W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE EQUAL PAY WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION ON ACCOUNT OF SEX IN ENTERPRISES ENGAGED IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

This proposal, which is on the legislative program of the Department of Labor, has as its purpose the elimination of discrimination in wage rates based on sex where men and women are performing comparable work for the same employer. Employers having employees engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce and Government supply contractors whose contracts exceed $10,000 would be subject to its coverage. "Employer" is defined to mean any person having 25 or more employees in any place of employment.

Those employers would be prohibited from paying a lower wage to one employee than they pay to an employee of the opposite sex in the same place of employment for work of equal character requiring equal skill. The bill would permit employers to adjust these lower wage rates over a period of time, not to exceed 2 years. Further, labor organizations would be prohibited from causing or attempting to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee in violation of the act.

Express provision is made for the Secretary of Labor, who is to administer and enforce the act, to eliminate discriminatory practices through conference and persuasion and to secure voluntary wage restitution. It is contemplated that educational and compliance programs will be emphasized to secure maximum employer and labor organization cooperation.

The Secretary would be vested with the authority to make rules and regulations necessary for the administration of the act. Regulations which might be necessary to protect against any application of the act in contravention of the wage standards of any other applicable law and to safeguard wage rate levels in eliminating differentials would be included in this authority.

When compliance is not forthcoming, the Secretary is authorized to hold administrative hearings with respect to alleged violations. He could issue cease and desist orders and orders for the restitution of wages withheld in violation of the act, plus up to an equal amount as liquidated damages. The Secretary is also authorized to issue orders requiring reinstatement of, and wage restitution to, any employee discharged for assisting in the enforcement of the act. If necessary, the Secretary could seek a court order requiring compliance with his orders.

In addition, an employer would be subject to the sanction of ineligibility for Government contracts after a final determination of violation of the act. This sanction would not be applied and would be immediately discontinued when the Secretary of Labor determined that the employer has come into compliance and would, in all likelihood, continue to comply in the future.

Equal-pay legislation is an essential step toward the administration's goals of economic growth and social justice. The need and justification for a Federal equal pay law, a matter of common knowledge, was well substantiated by the record of testimony in hearings on equal-pay legislation in the 87th Congress.

The burden of the present unfair practice of paying lower wage rates for the same or comparable work to workers of one sex falls most heavily on those least able to bear it, that is, women who do not belong to unions. The large proportion of working women susceptible to this discriminatory treatment is shown by the fact that only 3.5 million of the 24.5 million women presently employed are covered by collective bargaining agreements.

A significant number of employers freely acknowledge payment of wage rates on a double standard basis. When reporting job vacancies to employment offices, many employers in States without equal-pay legislation list vacancies with a single job title but with a higher hiring rate for men than for women. It cannot be expected that discriminatory pay practices will voluntarily be discontinued on any widespread basis in the foreseeable future because these practices are evident in new companies and in new industries.

The present practice of paying discriminatory wage rates on the basis of sex has an undesirable effect on many aspects of the life of our Nation. It tends to affect adversely the general purchasing power and the living standard of workers. It offers an unfair competitive advantage for employers who follow this practice. The resulting low wage levels often prevents the maximum utilization of worker skills to the detriment of morale and, in turn, of production.

The contributions employed women are currently making to our economy are vital to the production of essential goods and services. The demand for these goods and services will grow materially in the next decade when the national population is expected to increase by 28 million persons. Six million more women workers will be required by 1970 to meet growing consumer needs. This means that within 10 years there will be at least 30 million women in the labor force.

To facilitate the effective use of these workers and to encourage the highest development of their skills, widespread application of the equal-pay principle should be promoted by Congress. This principle is of vital importance in times of economic recession when the employment of women at a lower wage rate than men on comparable jobs may be used to undercut the wage rate of men or cause their displacement.

In addition, discriminatory wage practices are inconsistent with the fundamental American principle of justice. The knowledge of their existence reflects on the prestige of the United States in affairs around the world.

It is of great importance that Congress act without further delay to eliminate these practices from the channels of interstate commerce.

COMPENSATION TO THE CROW TRIBE OF INDIANS, MONTANA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, for certain lands embraced within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, for the validation of titles, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 914) to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, for certain lands embraced within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, for the validation of titles, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) there is hereby authorized to be transferred in the Treasury of the United States, to the credit of the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, and expended pursuant to the exclusive decision of the Crow Tribal Council, for its use and benefit, and the benefit of its members, a sum of money as hereinafter provided. Said sum is intended to include both just compensation and other justifiable considerations for terminating and extinguishing all of the right, title, estate, and interest of said Indian tribe in and to the lands of that part of the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation to be determined by a survey to be made, as hereinafter provided.

(b) That the United States shall cause a survey to be made of the perimeter boundaries of the tract of land within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, which lies easterly of the lands which were allotted on the Crow Indian Reservation and the one hundred and seventh degree longitude west of Greenwich meridian.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior shall appraise the fair market value of said lands as surveyed, taken by this Act, and said fair market value shall be determined as the effective date of this Act, and shall also appraise the fair rental value of said lands from the year of 1891 to the effective date of this Act; that said appraisals shall be made within ninety days after the effective date of this Act, and offer that sum to the Crow Tribe. The Crow Tribe may also appraise the fair market value of the lands taken by this Act and shall also appraise the fair rental value of said lands from the year of 1891, to the effective date of this Act, and determine whether the appraisal of the Secretary of the Interior is acceptable to the Crow Tribe. If the offer of the Secretary of the Interior is not accepted by the Crow Tribe within sixty days after receiving notice of the appraisal of the Secretary of the Interior, the Crow Tribe is authorized to commence in a court of competent jurisdiction an action for determining the just compensation payable for such taking of said lands.

SEC. 2. All minerals, including oil and gas, on all unentered and vacant lands within the area described in section 1 hereof, are hereby reserved for the benefit of the Crow Tribe of Indians, which shall be leased or otherwise disposed of under the laws and regulations relating to Indian trust lands.

SEC. 3. All patents, trust patents, and conveyances, and other instruments of title, heretofore issued, executed, and made upon said lands by the United States, within the area described in section 1 hereof, are hereby validated, ratified, and confirmed.

SEC. 4. Neither the initial transfer of such funds to the tribe, as provided herein, nor any subsequent per capita distribution thereof, shall be subject to taxation.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to perform any and all acts necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

PROGRAMING OF LAND-USE PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT OF METROPOLITAN AREAS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to encourage planning and the programing, on a coordinated basis, of land-use projects in the development of metropolitan areas.

The bill would accomplish these objectives by requiring:

First. That locally initiated, comprehensive plans for long-range development of individual communities be submitted to the Federal Housing Administrator for his approval as a condition to the grant of Federal financial assistance for public projects in such communities. This requirement would become effective 2 years, after the enactment of the new legislation.

Second. That after 4 years following enactment, locally initiated comprehensive plans of an areawide character be submitted to the Federal Housing Administrator for his approval as a condition to the grant of Federal financial assistance for public projects in individual communities within metropolitan areas designated by the Administrator.

Expanding population and other pressures in the Nation's metropolitan areas often result in public projects which are poorly planned, uncoordinated and wasteful. Projects undertaken without adequate coordination and planning too often serve conflicting purposes or fail to meet future needs.

Where careful, coordinated planning precedes the undertaking of projects, costly mistakes can be avoided and the realization of desirable goals hastened.

The Federal Government assists the States and their localities through a variety of programs in the financing of many public projects. Accordingly, it has a proper interest in seeing that they are soundly conceived and effectively executed. It has a responsibility to ensure, in every possible and appropriate way, that the taxpayer's dollar is wisely spent. It is impossible to justify the expenditure of billions of dollars of Federal funds for highways and mass transportation, intercepting sewers, sewage treatment plants, housing and urban renewal projects, airports, purchase of open land, and a wide variety of other federally assisted works, in the absence of overall plans for the use of private, local, State, and Federal resources in meeting the growing problems of these urban areas.

I am not alone in this view. In 1962, a distinguished panel known as the Municipal Manpower Commission urged this same approach.

The commission, financed by the Ford Foundation at the urging of the American Municipal Association, the American Society of Planning Officials, and the American Institute of Planners, was first headed by James E. Webb, now Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and, subsequently, by John J. Corson, distinguished management consultant. The commission included such other leaders from the ranks of business, government, and education as William O. Baker, scientist and vice president of research for the Bell Telephone Laboratories; Edward W. Barrett, dean of the Graduate School of Journalism, Columbia University; William H. Draper, Jr., investment banker; Luther H. Gulick, director of the Institute of Public Administration; Ralph Lazarus, president of Federated Department Stores; Robert E. Merriam, author and former White House assistant; Quigg Newton, president of the University of Colorado and former mayor of Denver, and John A. Perkins, president of the University of Delaware.

In its discussion of the relationships of the Federal Government to metropolitan areas, the commission said:

> The impact of Federal activities on metropolitan areas requires better coordination of its programs. The Federal Government must establish some organizational machinery for this purpose. * * * It is patent that the Federal Government either must take immediate steps in this direction or must accept responsibility for accentuating the metropolitan problem even while it strives to resolve segments of the whole problem.
>
> The Federal Government's partnership role should also involve increased incentive for effective State and local action on metropolitan problems. Several actions point the way: (1) Federal grants are available now for metropolitan planning, and (2) local governments must have a program of community improvement (workable program) and must be making progress toward carrying out that program in order to receive grants for urban renewal and community facilities. Similarly, any area receiving aid for mass transportation must have a program for the development of a comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation system. In the new open space program, grants are dependent upon the existence of an areawide plan.

After the commission's report, Congress passed an amendment to the Federal Aid Highway Act requiring the Secretary of Commerce to withhold Federal highway funds in the absence of continuing comprehensive planning for coordination of highway and mass transportation in urban areas of more than 50,000 population.

The commission's report continued:

> The Federal Government can give substantial impetus to local efforts by applying such requirements to other programs of Federal assistance, and by specifying high procedural standards for the conduct of these activities at the local level. In particular, Federal assistance should be conditioned on plans covering the whole metropolitan area, rather than only single units of government. The purpose of Federal grants should be to help communities to do the things they want to do, but to do them better and on an adequate scale. The basic initiative must remain with the local community leaders—both civic and governmental.

In 1954, at former President Eisenhower's urging, Congress made the so-called workable program part of the housing law of the land.

Today, the workable program means that a community which wants Federal dollars for individual urban renewal projects, for mortgage insurance commitments in redevelopment areas and for public housing to relocate families, must show that it has an overall plan for community improvement. Once the plan is approved by the Housing Administrator, Federal funds may be made available on a project-at-a-time basis, consistent with the plan.

Essentially, my bill proposes an extension of this concept. I believe the requirements it imposes for planning in the housing field should be expanded to include other programs where local communities rely on the Federal Government for assistance. And I believe the new requirement should properly emphasize planning on an areawide basis.

As urban life grows more complex, the pressures of population surges compound the efforts of the central city to grapple with the difficult problems left in their wake. But these problems of urban overcrowding, of slums and downtown decay, of depressed business and industrial sections are not the problems of the city core alone. For the problems of growth extend across city lines into suburbia. The older suburbs face the same fate as the downtown cities. The rapid changes caused by the mobility of our population obliterate the old boundaries, and new problems of urban growth are leapfrogging into once rural areas.

The workable program idea was first recommended to President Eisenhower in late 1953 by the President's Advisory Committee on Government Housing Policies and Programs, which included such housing experts as Albert M. Cole, former Administrator of HHFA; Norman P. Mason, his successor at HHFA under Eisenhower; Aksel Nielsen, Denver banker; James W. Rouse, former president of the Mortgage Bankers Association; Richard J. Gray, former head of the Building Trades, AFL, and Alexander Summer of Teaneck, N.J., builder.

On the workable program, excerpts from the report of the President's Committee said:

> During the past three decades the number of Federal programs directly affecting the physical development of our urban communities has steadily increased. With two or three notable exceptions there has been little if any conscious effort on the part of Federal agencies administering these programs to cope with the local problems created by the cumulative effect of the Federal programs upon the communities, and very little concern as to whether the local developments undertaken with Federal financial assistance were in conformity with the general plan for the development of the community as a whole.
>
> There are several Federal programs which vitally affect community development and which to insure most efficient use of Federal funds, if for no other reason, should include as one of the basic requirements the existence of an up-to-date general plan of the community and conformity of Federal or federally aided projects with the general plan.
>
> The accumulative effect of these programs upon the community is such as to place upon the Federal Government the responsibility for actively promoting and encouraging adequate and sustained local planning to insure the coordination of the Federal or federally aided projects with each other and with local plans for future development, as well as to insure the existence and use of a plan and a continuing planning agency as a focal point for consultation and advice in each community with respect to plans for future development of the community.

And the President's Committee found that:

> HHFA is in a position to do more for the orderly and economical development of the urban communities of the country than any Federal agency has done to date. * * * This new coordinated planning approach to the solution of urban problems by the Federal Government would give new and concrete meaning to the national housing policy. No longer would the Federal Government neglect its responsibility to encourage sound local planning and to recognize the integrity of sound local plans locally prepared, a responsibility which is implied but not specifically required by so many Federal aid statutes.

Testifying before the House Banking Committee in 1954 in a successful effort to convince Congress of the need for the workable program concept, then Administrator Cole of HHFA stressed the pragmatic approach to the planning problems of communities which seek Federal assistance.

Mr. Cole said:

> This workable program requirement is intended to stimulate and encourage the community to undertake to develop better and more up-to-date codes and regulations and vigorous, effective enforcement of those codes in an effort to see that its housing is brought within at least minimum decent standards. It is intended to stimulate and encourage the community to undertake positive measures to bring about the conservation and rehabilitation of neighborhoods and areas that are economically sound and worth saving in order to prevent the creation of new slums, and to see that practical steps are taken to assure adequate rehousing and fair treatment for families who may be displaced by subsequent clearance or rehabilitation operations.
>
> There should be no straitjacket applied by reason of the workable program requirement. From those cities more advanced in bettering their conditions we should expect more. From those cities just beginning this long road to removing slums and blight and to preventing it through realistic codes and aggressive enforcement, we should be understanding of the time and effort it takes to develop and put into effect a full-scale local attack. We should take full account of varying local situations and the different circumstances confronting the large and the smaller city. What we are seeking, I think, is a bona fide and practical expression of the community's own projected program to deal with its own problems, presented in good faith and with the firm resolve to carry that program through to accomplishment.

Since enactment of the workable program, the Housing Agency which administers it has followed this practical, step-at-a-time approach. I would like to see the same logic applied to the expanded workable program concept which I advocate for the coordination of all Federal aid programs, particularly as it applies to areawide planning.

The new requirements proposed by my bill, far from slowing the processing of applications from local, State, and regional to Federal agencies would, I believe, speed up the process. For communities and regional agencies would know in advance that coordination of their activities must lead to the kind of comprehensive planning which the Federal Government would require. Differences would be ironed out more promptly than they are today, with more effective utilization of all our resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my formal remarks there be included in the RECORD editorials from the Newark, N.J., Evening News and the Passaic, N.J., Herald News, as well as a recent newsletter I wrote on the subject for release January 30, 1963.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the last-mentioned material the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Feb. 2, 1963]

GETTING TOGETHER

Senator CASE is proposing legislation to bring coordination and commonsense to Federal programs affecting urban and suburban areas. He wants to end especially the present competition for land by Government agencies. His bill would provide that no Federal funds would be made available for any project unless it is consistent with a "locally drawn, long-range workable program."

The "workable program" concept, already the controlling factor in Federal decisions on slum clearance and urban renewal, would be extended to airports, water systems, sewers, and sewage plants and other public works.

Although Mr. CASE doesn't mention highways, he implies he wants them brought into his coordination system. For he cites as an example of cross-purpose the original plans for constructing the Essex East-West Freeway as an elevated road. This type of construction, which is all the Federal Bureau of Public Roads would pay for, would have damaged redevelopment programs approved by the Federal Housing Administration.

As another example of lack of consultation, Mr. CASE points to the conflicting aims of the Department of the Interior, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Army Corps of Engineers in plans affecting the Great Swamp in Morris County.

One further difficulty that Mr. CASE may want to cover in his bill arises from the fact that highway planning and other projects frequently affect more than one municipality and create serious disagreements among them. Coordination among Federal agencies is necessary, but there should be some machinery for achieving it at the local and regional level as well.

[From the Passaic (N.J.) Herald-News, Feb. 4, 1963]

THIS IS OUR UNCLE SAM

Report of U.S. Senator CASE, of New Jersey, on lack of coordination between Federal Government agencies:

"Since September 1960, the Department of the Interior has been acquiring land for its new national wildlife refuge to preserve the great swamp area in its present unspoiled form. But in July 1961 the Federal Aviation Agency publicly testified to the suitability of the great swamp area over other sites for the location of a fourth major airport for the greater New York area. And the Army Corps of Engineers, which is putting the finishing touches on a major flood control plan for the Passaic River Valley, proposes the drainage of the great swamp area and its consequent use for industrial and residential purposes as a partial justification for their proposal to build the Little Falls-Nutley Tunnel to regulate overflow. Has there been consultation between these three separate Federal agencies? None is discernible. Frequently lost sight of, I fear, are the will and the desires of the communities and the larger areas which would be affected by federally assisted public works projects."

Senator CASE thinks something should be done about it and has proposed legislation which would require coordination between Federal agencies and "restore the initiative to the community, the county, the urban area and the State for the best utilization of their own resources." It will be a real accomplishment if he can make the agencies pull together in harness, with the community in the driver's seat.

Ever since the Port of New York Authority first announced its preference for a major jetport in the great swamp area of Morris County, N.J., the calm of that conservationists' paradise has been disturbed by almost continuous debate.

On a quieter note, but to me, equally disturbing, is the conflict among several Federal agencies, each with a different interest, as to the use of the great swamp area. The elimination of conflicts of this sort is one of the objectives of a bill I am introducing next week which would utilize existing programs of Federal financial assistance to help promote orderly community and regional growth in urban and suburban areas.

Since September 1960, the Department of the Interior has been acquiring land for its new National Wildlife Refuge to preserve the great swamp area in its present unspoiled form. But in July 1961 the Federal Aviation Agency publicly testified to the suitability of the great swamp area over other sites for the location of a fourth major airport for the greater New York area. And the Army Corps of Engineers, which is putting the finishing touches on a major flood control plan for the Passaic River Valley, proposes the drainage of the great swamp area and its consequent use for industrial and residential purposes as a partial justification for their proposal to build the Little Falls-Nutley tunnel to regulate overflow. Has there been consultation between these three separate Federal agencies? None is discernible.

Frequently lost sight of, I fear, are the will and the desires of the communities and the larger areas which would be affected by federally assisted public works projects.

The legislation which I propose would require the formulation of carefully coordinated, locally initiated community and regional land-use plans on a long-range basis before the Federal Government contributes tax dollars (often in the hundreds of millions) for any specific land-improvement or public works project.

And, by assigning to a single Federal official, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the responsibility for determining the extent of Federal financial participation in such locally initiated land-use plans, my bill would put an end to the present uncoordinated competition for land space by competing agencies.

Northern New Jersey residents will recall the controversy over the design of the East-West Freeway across Essex County as another example of lack of coordination between Federal agencies.

In that fight, the Federal Bureau of Public Roads refused to allow an additional several million dollars for the below-grade construction of this vital interstate route through Newark, Orange, and East Orange. But these communities protested the proposed elevated construction of this highway across their boundaries, pointing out correctly, in my judgment, that the extensive slum clearance and housing redevelopment going on in each of these cities—to which the Federal Government is contributing millions through the Housing Agency—would be jeopardized. For elevated structures tend to depress property values and create slums where they pass through already densely populated urban areas.

The freeway will, finally, be built below grade, even as was the Garden State Parkway through this highly urban area. But only an ingeniously devised local solution fought off the threat posed by a divided Federal responsibility—with no thanks due the Federal Government for the happy outcome.

My bill would attack these inconsistencies by expanding the workable program concept, which was initiated by former President Eisenhower. Under existing law, before Federal financial help for slum clearance, urban renewal or public housing is extended to any locality, the community itself must present a workable program for dealing with both the causes and the consequences of slums and urban decay. Once the community has presented an approved workable plan, the Federal Government makes available its various resources for individual projects.

Why confine this sensible requirement for planning to federally aided housing projects alone? Under my bill, after 2 years, no Federal funds would be made available to a community unless the project—whether it be for a new airport, water system, sewage treatment plant, intercepting sewer or other public works projects—is consistent with a locally drawn, long-range workable program.

And after 4 years, the Housing Administrator may, as appropriate, require a workable program for urban areas as a whole.

Not only would the bill encourage coordination of local plans on an areawide basis, help resolve conflicts among Federal agencies and eliminate much duplication of effort and wasteful spending, but it would restore the initiative to the community, the county, the urban area and the State for the best utilization of their own resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorials, newsletter, and bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 915) to encourage planning and the programing, on a coordinated basis, of land-use projects in the development of metropolitan areas, and to require, after a reasonable preparatory period, the approval by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator of workable programs as a condition to the granting of Federal assistance in the financing of certain projects, introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That expanding population pressures in many of the Nation's metropolitan areas frequently result in developmental activities which are poorly planned, uncoordinated, and wasteful. Projects undertaken without adequate coordination and planning too often serve conflicting purposes or fail to meet future needs. Where careful planning and coordination between interested agencies precedes the undertaking of projects, costly mistakes can be avoided and the realization of desirable goals hastened. The Federal Government assists the States and their localities through a variety of programs in the financing of many of these projects. It has a vital concern, therefore, in the manner in which they are carried out, and a responsibility to insure, insofar as is possible, that public moneys are expended to best serve the public interest. It is the purpose of this Act to encourage careful and coordinated planning and programing of federally assisted projects in metropolitan areas, and to require, after a reasonable preparatory period, the approval by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator of workable programs as a condition to the granting of Federal assistance in the financing of certain projects.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act.—

(1) The term "Administrator" means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

(2) The term "land-use project" means the undertaking of an urban renewal or public housing project, the acquisition of land to be used as open-space land (as defined in section 706 of the Housing Act of 1961), or the construction of any public work or facility, including, without limitation, any

highway, airport, or other transportation facility.

(3) The term "workable program" means an official plan of action, as it exists from time to time, meeting such standards as the Administrator may by regulation require, for the programing and undertaking, on a coordinated basis, of land-use projects within a metropolitan area.

(4) The term "metropolitan area" means an area defined as such for the purposes of this Act by the Administrator.

Sec. 3. Except as provided in section 4, no Federal loan or grant for any land-use project in a locality within a metropolitan area shall be made after the expiration of two years after the date of enactment of this Act (except pursuant to a commitment entered into prior to the expiration of such two-year period), unless (1) there has been prepared and presented to the Administrator a workable program for such area, (2) on the basis of his review of such program, the Administrator determines that such project is in furtherance of, or consistent with, such program, and (3) the Administrator certifies that the assistance requested is in conformity with such program.

Sec. 4. The Administrator shall by regulation designate those metropolitan areas where he determines that the undertaking of land-use projects, on a coordinated basis, requires planning on an areawide or regional basis by an official State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency empowered, under State or local laws or interstate compact, to perform metropolitan or regional planning for the metropolitan area within which any such project is to be undertaken. No Federal loan or grant for any land-use project in any area so designated shall be made, after the expiration of four years from the date on which the regulation designating such area becomes effective (except pursuant to a commitment entered into prior to the expiration of such four-year period) unless (1) there has been prepared and presented to the Administrator by an agency of the type hereinabove described a workable program for the area, (2) on the basis of his review of such program, the Administrator determines that such project is in furtherance of, or consistent with, such program, and (3) the Administrator certifies that the assistance requested is in conformity with such program.

Sec. 5. (a) The Administrator shall cause any certification required to be made under this Act with respect to any Federal assistance administered by an agency other than the Housing and Home Finance Agency to be forwarded promptly to the head of the department or agency concerned.

(b) In the performance of his function under this Act, the Administrator shall maintain close liaison with departments and agencies of the Government administering programs affected by this Act.

Sec. 6. (a) Section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by inserting in the fifth sentence, after the word "includes", the following: "(1) the preparation of workable programs for the undertaking of land-use projects in metropolitan areas, and (2)".

(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect the requirements of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the administration bill to assist in the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas. I ask unanimous consent that the President's letter of transmittal be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The White House,
February 18, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I am submitting with this letter a draft bill, the "Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963," to establish a long-range program of assistance to urban areas in solving their mass transportation problems. The bill is based on the mass transportation legislation which I proposed last year and which was formally reported—but not brought to a vote of the full membership—in both Houses.

Urban mass transportation is one of the most urgent problems facing the Nation and this Congress. As I said in my recent message on the state of the Union, "Nearly three-fourths of our citizens live in urban areas, which occupy only 2 percent of our land, and if mass transit is to survive and relieve the congestion of these cities, it needs Federal stimulation and assistance."

It is a Federal responsibility, particularly in this field, to encourage balanced use of all modes of transportation to the end that there may be satisfactory service at minimum cost. A long-range program of Federal assistance for mass transportation is urgently needed, so that local communities may freely decide for themselves the proper balance of local public investment in highways and in mass transportation systems, whether rail or bus.

As indicated in the attached letter from the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, language is being prepared dealing with the subject of protecting the rights and interests of employees who might be adversely affected by projects undertaken or assisted by the mass transportation program and will be transmitted to the appropriate committees at the earliest possible opportunity. It is our expectation that the Secretary of Labor will discuss this very important subject in detail in testimony on the bill.

Enclosed also are a section-by-section summary of the bill and an outline of its major features.

Sincerely,

John F. Kennedy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 917) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Williams of New Jersey, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CANTON RESERVOIR PROJECT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the construction of the Canton project in Oklahoma.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement relating to that project be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 918) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Canton project, Oklahoma, by the Secretary of the Interior, introduced by Mr. Monroney (for himself and Mr. Edmondson), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. Monroney is as follows:

Canton Project

The Canton Reservoir project was authorized in 1938. Construction was started in 1940, was interrupted by the war, and the project completed in 1948. At the time the project was authorized, it was estimated to cost $12,300,000. It actually was completed for $10,300,000, or $2 million less than the estimate.

When the project was planned, the Corps of Engineers recognized the necessity of including conservation storage for irrigation and, as a result of negotiations of the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board, not only was 100,000 acre-feet of storage, above the flood control requirements, added to the project but the outlet works for release of irrigation water were built into the dam.

A paragraph from the House document, used as a basis of authorization of the project states: "Further analysis in connection with the maximum utilization of the stream flow with respect to its conservation at Canton by storage indicates that the practical efficient limit for this purpose is 100,000 acre-feet. Storage in this amount would insure an annual supply of 156,000 acre-feet needed for domestic use, dilution purposes, and irrigation or other uses."

The Bureau of Reclamation Project report of June 22, 1954 (H. Doc. 445, 83d Cong., 2d sess.) recommends the irrigation of 16,000 acres below the Canton Dam, and using the conservation storage for the project lands. The irrigation project is estimated at about $4,500,000, consisting of the main canals, laterals, and necessary drainage works. The annual charges would be about $72,000 for 70 years. Of the 16,000 acres almost one-third is Indian owned. The benefit-cost ration is 2 to 1.

The Canton Dam, as operated by the Corps of Engineers since its completion in 1948, has reduced flood damages by about $5 million. Other income from the project has been $125,000 from leasing of lands, and over $1,900,000 from leasing of storage space for municipal water supply. Thus, the Federal investment has paid more than 5½ percent per year. Add the return that will come from irrigation and it is easy to see that the annual return may reach 7½ or 8 percent.

In every Congress since 1946, bills have been introduced to bring the irrigation benefits nearer to reality. First there were bills to legislate the necessary storage in the Canton Reservoir, and 69,000 acre-feet of storage has so been designated. Still there remains the job of getting the irrigation project authorized.

The local people are to be commended for their long and determined efforts on this project. Less determined people would have given up years ago, but not so with these. They have cooperated fully with the State and Federal agencies to remove roadblocks.

There was the matter of securing the court adjudication of the water rights, which was completed in the District Court of Oklahoma County in December 1949.

There was the formation of the Canton Irrigation District by an overwhelming vote of the irrigation landowners on December, 15, 1945.

There was the job of getting the Bureau of Reclamation Survey Report to Congress. This was finally accomplished in 1953.

There were negotiations with the Indian Service relating to the 30 percent Indian-owned land in the project, and the tedious task of working out water supply problems with Oklahoma City and Enid.

All of this required leadership of the first order.

The job is not complete. The "climate" in Washington has improved.

Budget A47 with which we wrestled for years has been scuttled, and a more realistic approach has been adopted by this administration. The President in his budget message has said:

"Natural resources development is a key requisite to the present and future economic growth of the Nation.

"Land, water, and power resources: Most of these expenditures will be to continue construction of projects for flood control, navigation, irrigation, water supply, and hydroelectric power. Related developments of recreational facilities and fish and wildlife resources will be carried forward. These projects represent investments which will yield benefits for years to come.

"With funds requested for 1964 the Corps of Engineers will initiate construction of 32 projects, the Bureau of Reclamation 8 new projects, and the Tennessee Valley Authority 2 new projects."

Here is the new view. We should build such projects as Canton. It fits into the pattern of developing our basic natural resources.

In the President's request for funds is an item of $200,000 for advance engineering and design for the Optima project on the North Canadian River upstream from Canton Reservoir. This project will provide 260,000 additional acre-feet of capacity which should insure the availability of 100,000 acre-feet of storage capacity for irrigation of 16,000 acres of land below Canton. At the same time no adverse effect will be had on flood control and water supply.

With these new developments, I am hopeful for favorable consideration and authorization of the Canton irrigation project as recommended in the bill I am introducing.

PROGRAM TO REDUCE NONBENEFICIAL CONSUMPTIVE USE OF WATER, PECOS RIVER BASIN, NEW MEXICO AND TEXAS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide authority to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive uses of water in the Pecos River Basin in New Mexico and Texas.

I am sure the Members of the Senate are well aware of the importance of water in the arid regions of the western part of the United States. The studies of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources have shown that water shortage and water quality are not only a problem of the West but are becoming major problems elsewhere. We must therefore use every practical means at our command to solve these problems as quickly as possible if we are to provide water for irrigation, industrial, and domestic uses and for recreation purposes to meet the demands of the population.

We have in the Southwest a menace in the form of certain phreatophytes that is consuming nonbeneficially each year over 25 million acre-feet of our water. The principal culprit is a plant known as Tamarix gallicia, more commonly known as saltcedar. These plants were introduced into the United States from the Mediterranean region, east Asia, or India, where they are indigenous. The climate and other conditions of the West are ideal for the rapid growth of this plant and since 1914 it has spread to nearly all of the streambeds of the West and is spreading rapidly and now covers nearly 15 million acres of bottomlands in the 17 Western States.

We have initiated, through the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, a program on the Rio Grande above Elephant Butte Lake to remove some of these saltcedar and to build a floodway and channel into the lake. This project was started 11 years ago and during construction, up until 1961, has saved 550,000 acre-feet. The Bureau of Reclamation states that beginning this year they expect to save 100,000 acre-feet annually for Elephant Butte Reservoir. This project has already demonstrated that this type of water salvage work is profitable.

The Pecos River Basin is one of the most heavily infested river basins in the West. From 600 acres found in the McMillan Delta in 1915, the infested area has grown to 43,000 acres in 1957 and is well over that amount now. The National Resources Planning Board reported that the saltcedar in this area is consuming approximately 5 acre-feet of water per acre annually. According to the U.S. Geological Survey, these phreatophytes could consume virtually the entire flow of the Pecos River in this area in 50 years if the growth goes unreined.

Some of New Mexico's chief farming and population centers lie in the Pecos Valley. The economic growth of this area and the Red Bluff area in Texas will be greatly hampered unless we can provide an increased supply of water. Due to drought and the consumption of water by these wasters New Mexico has become indebted in the amount of 60,000 acre-feet to Texas under the provisions of the Pecos River compact. It is hoped that when this project is completed New Mexico will be able to repay its debt with the increased supply of water, and at the same time improve the economy of the entire area dependent upon the Pecos for water.

One thing is certain: Further delay in dealing with this problem will give rise to additional problems and greatly increase the cost of eradication and control work as well as curtail the economic growth of the area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the joint resolution printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 49) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, in New Mexico and Texas, introduced by Mr. Anderson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas for many years there has been an inadequate supply of water for established uses in the Pecos River Basin of New Mexico and Texas; and

Whereas the growth of saltcedar (tamarix pentandra) and other undesirable phreatophytes in the Pecos River Basin is responsible for the nonbeneficial consumption of tens of thousands of acre feet of water annually; and

Whereas the prolific growth of saltcedar and other nonbeneficial phreatophytes has progressively intensified the water shortage in the Pecos River Basin; and

Whereas in addition to consuming great quantities of water annually, the growth of such nonbeneficial vegetation also interferes with water flow and canal maintenance, clogs stream channels, and creates flood hazards; and

Whereas many water users that have heretofore entered into repayment contracts for the construction of works are now facing hardships in meeting their financial obligations as a result of the water shortage in the Pecos River Basin; and

Whereas the problem of nonbeneficial consumptive use of water by vegetation has become so severe and widespread that State and local interests are incapable of effectively combating it; and

Whereas there is a continuing need for actions to aid in conversion from nonbeneficial to beneficial use of the water; and

Whereas it is estimated that if such vegetative growth in the Pecos River Basin of New Mexico and Texas is not controlled, such growth will consume practically the entire flow of the Pecos River within the next fifty years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to prevent further decreases in the supply of water in the Pecos River Basin, and in order to increase and protect such water supply for municipal, industrial, irrigation, and recreational uses, and for the conservation of fish and wildlife, and to provide protection for the farmlands in such basin from the hazards of floods, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized and directed to take such measures as he deems necessary and appropriate to carry out a continuing program to reduce the nonbeneficial consumption of water in the basin, including that by salt cedar and other undesirable phreatophytes. Such program shall be carried out in the Pecos River Basin from its headwaters in New Mexico to the town of Girvin, Texas: *Provided, however,* That no money shall be appropriated for and no work commenced on the clearing of the floodway authorized by the Act of February 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 17) unless provision shall have been made to replace any Carlsbad Irrigation District terminal storage which might be lost by the clearing of said floodway.

Sec. 2. As a condition to undertaking the program authorized by the first section of this joint resolution, the Secretary shall require the States of New Mexico and Texas to give such assurances as he deems adequate that such States will acquire such lands, easements, rights-of-way, and other interests in lands as the Secretary considers necessary effectively to carry out such program.

Sec. 3. (a) As a further condition to undertaking the program authorized by this joint resolution, the Secretary may, with respect to those beneficiaries in New Mexico and Texas which the Secretary determines to be likely to benefit directly from the results of such program, require such commitments as he deems appropriate that such beneficiaries will repay the United States so much of the reimbursable costs incurred by it in carrying out such program as do not exceed the value of the benefits accruing to such beneficiaries from such program. The Secretary shall not require the repayment of such costs unless he determines that it is feasible (1) to identify the beneficiaries that are directly benefited by the program, and (2) to measure the extent to which each beneficiary is benefited by such program.

(b) Repayment contracts entered into pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, except that the amount of the repayment installment in the case of any beneficiary shall be fixed by the Secretary in accordance with the ability of such beneficiary to pay, taking into consideration all other financial obligations of such beneficiary.

(c) Any costs of the program which the Secretary determines should be assigned to flood control, recreation, or restoration of stream flow shall not be included in computing the costs properly allocable to the beneficiaries under this section, but shall be considered as nonreimbursable costs.

Sec. 4. Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed to abrogate, amend, modify, or be in conflict with any provisions of the Pecos River compact.

Sec. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, just a few days ago I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by the very able and distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] with respect to certain activities engaged in by the Central Intelligence Agency, and their impact on U.S. security and foreign policy.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon expressed the view that this Agency should be under a measure of congressional control. This is a view I share with him, and, have been of such a mind for a long time.

As far back as the 1st session of the 84th Congress, in 1955, I cosponsored a concurrent resolution introduced by the now majority leader [Mr. Mansfield] to create a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, similar to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, because, I, too, believed that no agency of the Government spending taxpayers' funds should be free to do as it pleases without the Congress maintaining its proper measure of control.

There has been criticism about the Central Intelligence Agency over the years concerning its activities and its failure to make any report to the Congress. It should not necessarily be placed under congressional control, but it should periodically be subjected to congressional scrutiny.

We all realize this Agency annually spends approximately billions. There have been, and will be, those who say this Agency's activities are so secret—no one should know—in the interests of national security. However, this is not a valid argument.

No harm was done from the standpoint of security or in maintaining secrecy in connection with the development of the atomic bomb. A joint congressional committee of the Congress certainly maintained this secret, while at the same time it promoted the best interests of the Nation in maintaining a watchdog setup over the Atomic Energy Commission.

I feel as many other Members of Congress that there should be a congressional watchdog committee to look over the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. I think it is in the public interest that such a committee be appointed.

To achieve this objective, I am submitting at this time a concurrent resolution which would establish a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, to be composed of six Members of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives; not more than four Members appointed from either the Senate or the House shall be of the same political party.

The measure provides that the committee would make continuing studies of the activities of this Agency and the problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security, and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government.

In turn, the Central Intelligence Agency would be required to keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to all of its activities.

I sincerely trust that the committee to which this resolution is referred will take prompt and favorable action on it.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution remain at the desk for a period of 3 days so that any of my colleagues who would like to join with me as cosponsors may do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Florida.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence to be composed of six Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of the six members to be appointed from the Senate, three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate. Of the six members to be appointed from the House of Representatives, three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and three shall be members of the Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives. Not more than four members appointed from either the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be from the same political party.

Sec. 2. (a) The joint committee shall make continuing studies of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and of problems relating to the gathering of intelligence affecting the national security and of its coordination and utilization by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government. The Central Intelligence Agency shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to its activities. All bills, resolutions, and other matters in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the Central Intelligence Agency shall be referred to the joint committee.

(b) The members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are (1) referred to the joint committee, or (2) otherwise within the jurisdiction of the joint committee.

Sec. 3. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

Sec. 4. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report public hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate. The cost of such services to report executive hearings shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the joint committee.

Sec. 5. The joint committee is empowered to appoint such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

Sec. 6. The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

DUTIES ON IMPORTS OF CATTLE, BEEF, AND VEAL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 557) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas, introduced by me, for myself and other Senators, on January 28, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when there is a reprinting of the bill S. 558 and the Senate Joint Resolution, S.J. Res. 30, which deal with our educational and cultural exchange programs, and which I introduced on January 28 of this year, that the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] be added as a cosponsor. During the last meeting of the NATO parliamentary conference in Paris last November the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] and I served as members of the American delegation to the NATO parliamentary committee dealing with education and cultural exchange programs. The Senator from West Virginia made some very valuable contributions during the NATO conference. He saw these bills in the Record. I did not confer with anyone before introducing them. The Senator from West Virginia would like to become a cosponsor, and I would be honored and happy to have him join me as a cosponsor of the measures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF MEASURING DEVICES IN POSTAL SERVICE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 720) to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs, or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service, introduced by me on February 6, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the names of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] be added as cosponsors to the bill S. 736, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of treatment works to control water and air pollution by permitting the deduction of expenditures for the construction, erection, installation, or acquisition of such treatment works, and to the bill S. 737, to promote water and air pollution control and abatement by authorizing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide certain assistance to small business concerns in obtaining necessary treatment works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] be added as a cosponsor to the bill (S. 816) providing for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology, submitted by me on February 18, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I welcome the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut as a cosponsor. We are delighted to have his support and are glad to have him identified with this effort to secure legislation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of February 11, 1963:

S. 774. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguished brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes: Mr. Inouye, Mr. Carlson, and Mr. Randolph.

Authority of February 20, 1963:

S. 869. A bill to authorize the burial of certain news correspondents in national cemeteries: Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. Moss.

Authority of February 21, 1963:

S. 880. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries: Mr. Bayh, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Kennedy, and Mr. Nelson.

THE WILDERNESS BILL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 20, 1963, the names of Senators Bartlett, Bennett, Cannon, Dominick, Fong, Goldwater, Hayden, Jordan of Idaho, Lausche, Mechem, Mundt, Randolph, Simpson, and Thurmond were added as additional cosponsors of the amendment submitted by Mr. Allott on February 20, 1963, to the bill (S. 4) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert M. Morgenthau, of New York, to be U.S. attorney, southern district of New York, for a term of 4 years—recess appointment.

Homer Lester Benson, of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Parole for term expiring September 30, 1968—recess appointment.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Monday, March 4, 1963, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 5, 1963, beginning at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

William J. Nealon, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge, middle district of Pennsylvania—recess appointment.

Carl E. McGowan, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge, District of Columbia circuit, vice Henry W. Edgerton, retiring.

H. Vearle Payne, of New Mexico, to be U.S. district judge, district of New Mexico, vice Carl A. Hatch, retiring.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and myself, as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Washington's Birthday address by Senator Stennis, delivered on February 22, 1963, at Richmond, Va., together with the introduction by Senator Robertson.

VISIT BY THE KING OF LAOS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President and the people of the United States today have the honor of greeting the King of Laos, his Majesty Sri Savang Vatthana. It has been my privilege to know the King of Laos for over a decade, and, I believe, to understand and appreciate the difficulties and the complex problems which have been his, and, quite likely, will continue to confront him in the years ahead.

He is fully aware of the difficulties which face Laos, and is prepared to serve as a catalyst to help solve them. With his dignity, prestige, knowledge, and understanding, he is extremely well qualified to preside over a reunification of his country and to attend to the needs and the wants of his people.

We are indeed happy to have him as our guest, Mr. President; and, on behalf of the Senate of the United States, I extend to him our greetings, our cordial best wishes, and our hope that the friendship between our two countries will continue on the basis of mutual cordiality and understanding, and that the future of Laos will be enhanced and strengthened as a free, independent, and wholly sovereign nation.

FOURTEENTH ANNUAL INTERNATIONAL PANCAKE DAY RACE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the 14th annual International Pancake Day Race will be run tomorrow. This great good-will event between the housewives of Liberal, Kans., and Olney, England, is always held on the Tuesday before Ash Wednesday.

This race is sponsored by the junior chamber of commerce of Liberal, for the promotion of international relations between England and the United States. It is based on competition between the young ladies of Olney, England, and the young ladies of Liberal, Kans.

Some years ago the people of Liberal heard of this 500-year event of pancake racing over a 415-yard course from the town pump to the church. The city of Liberal challenged the women of Olney, England, to this race; and the challenge was accepted by Rev. R. C. Collins, the Vicar of Olney.

In old England, it was customary for the housewives to drop whatever they were doing and hurry to the church at the tolling of the bell, to be "shriven" of their sins. In 1445, a wife in Olney, England, started baking her pancakes rather late. They were not quite finished when the church bell rang; but she hurried off to the "shriving," carrying her griddle and pancakes with her. Thus, an annual sporting event was born.

I am inviting the Members of the U.S. Senate and their staffs, the Kansas congressional delegation, and the press to be my guests tomorrow morning, for breakfast in the Senate dining rooms, here in the Capitol, where they will be served the finest pancakes in the world, made from the finest flour in the world, furnished by the Liberal Junior Chamber of Commerce, directly from the "Pancake Hub of the Universe."

Mrs. Vicki Campbell, a Liberal, Kans., housewife and mother of two young children, is in Washington, to help with this breakfast. Mrs. Campbell won the Liberal Pancake Race last year, and is here representing the Liberal Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The resolution will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 90) amending rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to standing committees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has asked unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio yields to the Senator from South Dakota with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor.

UNITED NATIONS AID TO CUBA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion about the wisdom and justification of the United Nations, through its Special Fund, giving aid to Cuba. Within the last few days I heard a number of comments and read some articles contending that our Government, in objecting to the grant-of-aid out of the Special Fund to Cuba, was making a serious mistake. I do not agree with that view. In my judgment, the United Nations grant-of-aid to Cuba out of the Special Fund would perpetrate a direct affront upon the United States.

My reasons for making that statement are as follows: I recognize that the Special Fund set up in the United Nations is contemplated for use in helping distressed people around the world, keeping in mind that political and ideological leanings should not be considered. Recognizing fully that principle as being in force, I still am of the opinion that the Special Fund should not have been made available to Castro and his communistic government.

I direct the attention of the Senate to a bit of the statistical background of the United Nations Special Fund. It is a voluntary Fund created by the contributions of various nations of the world. From 1959, the date of the establishment of the Fund, down to 1963, the sum of $251 million has been expended from the Special Fund of the United Nations. Of that $251 million, the U.S. Government put up $100,400,000, or 40 percent of the amount.

In the same period all of the Communist nations of the world, including Yugoslavia, pledged the total sum of $8,228,225. Red Russia pledged and put up $5 million. We pledged and put up $100 million. The other Communist nations, consisting of Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Mongolia, Rumania, Ukraine, Cuba, and Yugoslavia put up $8,228,225.

I repeat that the total contributed by all the Communist countries to the special fund was $8,228,225. Our Government alone contributed $100,400,000.

Cuba is a member of the United Nations. It pledged $55,000 for the Special Fund, as follows: $5,000 in 1960, nothing in 1961, $25,000 in 1962, and $25,000 in 1963, making a total of $55,000.

Of the $55,000 pledged, Cuba has not paid 1 penny. It has paid not 1 penny of its obligation to finance the operations in the Gaza Strip and in the Congo. It is in arrears in the payment of its normal assessments for the management of the United Nations. As of this date Cuba is in arrears $496,000 of its obligations to the United Nations. It has paid practically nothing.

Two or three months ago Cuba paid $160,000 of its arrearage in the special operating assessments because it wanted to avoid being expelled.

Let us keep in mind the picture. Cuba is in arrears $496,000, and has paid not 1 penny of its pledges for the Special Fund and not 1 penny for its obligations in maintaining the operations of the United Nations in the Congo and in the Gaza Strip. Cuba wants the benefit of the work of the United Nations and of the funds of the United Nations but does not wish to bear its obligations.

Let us see what is contemplated by way of aid to Cuba. The item which is immediately in controversy is a $1,157,000 grant out of the Special Fund to help the Cuban Communist government solve its agricultural problems. There have also been pledged to the Government of Cuba two other sums. In the 1961–62 financial period, Cuba is programed to receive $445,883 covering 10 projects to be carried out in Cuba by the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization; the International Labor Organization; the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; and the World Health Organization. In addition to the sums I have already mentioned—$1,157,000 and the last sum of $445,883—there is programed an additional sum of $405,780. The program to be covered by this third sum envisages $69,000 for an ILO social security project in Cuba, $160,000 for an FAO fisheries project, $54,000 for a UNESCO marine biological project, $13,500 for a UNESCO education project, $17,280 for an ICAO civil aviation project, and $152,000 for the WHO public health work.

As closely as I have been able to figure out, since Castro became the chief of Cuba and since the Communists have taken over, Cuba has paid into the United Nations $160,000 and is in arrears in the sum of $496,000, while Cuba is to receive the sum of $2.2 million. With due respect to some who are trying to justify this action on the part of the United Nations, I must say that what is being done does not reconcile itself with my concept of fairness and decency either to the people of the United States or to the people of the world.

Castro and his Communist government want all of the benefits which can be provided by the United Nations without being willing to bear any of the obligations.

Our Government has put up $100 million, while all of the Communist governments of the world, in 5 years, as I have indicated, have pledged $8,228,000, and, as I have said, Castro is in arrears $496,000.

One can recognize the charter provisions that there should be no decision made on the basis of ideology and politics, but there were grounds to make a decision that Cuba was in arrears, was flouting its responsibilities to the United Nations, and therefore was not entitled to the charity and beneficence of the citizens of the United States.

Finally, this is an affront and an insult to every taxpayer of the United States. In effect, it states to the U.S. citizen, "You give. We will not hold others even morally responsible, but you must continue with your charity and observe your high ethical principles, regardless of the insults perpetrated upon you."

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am very much interested in what the Senator from Ohio is saying and the point he is making at this particular time. I presume the Senator would be in favor of Cuba and the other nations which are in arrears either paying up or getting out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I want them to make an honest effort to pay their obligations and pledges; not to adopt the position that they shall give nothing and take everything.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I agree with the Senator thoroughly. I think they ought to be given a certain time limit in the near future to pay up. Then, of course, they would be in good standing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The United Nations now has a provision that if a nation is in arrears for 2 years with respect to a certain category of obligations it must step out, and that is the only reason why the Communist government of Cuba paid the sum of $160,000 recently, while remaining in debt and in arrearage in the sum of $496,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Would not the Senator be in favor of nations in arrears not being allowed to receive money out of any United Nations fund until they pay up?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I agree with the Senator emphatically.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDICAL CARE AND WYOMING'S LEGISLATURE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in regard to the upcoming debate on a federally controlled program of medical care for the Nation's aged, I am proud to report an action by Wyoming's distinguished governor, Clifford Hansen, and the 1963 State legislature, in providing an enabling act for the Kerr-Mills medical care law.

This enabling act was signed into law by Governor Hansen February 14. It had cleared Wyoming's Senate without a dissenting vote, and was passed by the house of representatives with a comfortable 39 to 16 margin.

The Equality State's Kerr-Mills law will provide $570,000 in State funds which will be matched by Federal funds for the first 2 years of the program.

Unlike the proposal backed by the administration, this Wyoming approved Kerr-Mills program will not be under tight or arbitrary Federal control.

It is a voluntary program in which no aged person is forced to participate. I consider the action of Wyoming's Legislature in implementing the Kerr-Mills approach to medical care for its senior citizens an outstanding example of what a State can do to handle its own medical problems with Government assistance but without Government excesses or control.

In the context of this subject, I request unanimous consent to have published in the Congressional Record, with this statement, an editorial by the noted columnist David Lawrence, who with great candor and fairness points out the pitfalls of a federally dominated, mandatory medical care program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Federal Hand in Medical Care—Administration Plan Criticized as Likely To Intensify Shortage of Doctors

(By David Lawrence)

It's going to be harder to get a doctor when you are sick, harder to get into a hospital, and harder to take care of the young as well as the old who become ill in the future—if the Federal Government intervenes in the field of medical care as just recommended to Congress by President Kennedy.

Time was when, if you were sick, you could get a doctor to come to your home. Today most patients have to go to the doctor's office except when gravely ill.

There simply aren't enough doctors now. This is primarily because medical aid is covered in part by private insurance plans that make it less costly. Persons who used to take care of minor ailments themselves often seek medical aid nowadays. The insurance idea, itself, is a good one. But until the shortage of doctors produced by the existing plans is overcome, the proposed intervention by the Federal Government with free medical care for certain age groups will only intensify the problem for almost everybody. Elderly persons require individual care and continuous observation, but if there is a shortage of physicians, these patients will be neglected, no matter how much of the bill the Government is willing to pay.

It's good politics, of course, for any President to champion social-welfare legislation, but free medical attention for millions of citizens will constitute in the field of welfare benefits the biggest single expense imposed on all the people.

Taxes are to be raised to finance the medical plan proposed by the President. Not only will everybody's social security rates go up, but the tax will be imposed on the first $5,200 of salary instead of the current figure of $4,800 a year. The purpose, of course, is to collect about $10 billion more over the next 5 years. Just what this does to the administration program for a "tax cut" is not readily calculated, but it is another example of how the much-talked-about "tax cut" is rapidly turning into a tax rise.

With the objective of the President's plan—to provide medical care for the aged—there will be little dissent. But the question really is whether those families which can afford to take care of their own aged members shall be required to pay taxes to support a plan in which their own relatives—though able to afford the medical care—would get it at Government expense.

The medical care agitation will, moreover, raise false hopes. The proposed plan doesn't cover medical treatment but mostly the charges for hospitalization and related services. The political value, however, of proclaiming "medical care for the aged" will continue to be there, and it's politics that's really back of the whole crusade.

The vast majority of doctors are vehemently opposed to the new plan. They feel it will demoralize the whole system of medical care in America, and they ought to know. They constitute a dedicated profession. They are on call in serious cases at the hospitals or at private homes day and night. They must be precise in their findings, because errors can be fatal.

The members of the profession are men and women who know medical conditions in this country and are familiar also with what "socialized medicine has meant in various other countries. They fear that the new plan some day will result in "socialized medicine"—a scheme in which the Government runs the medical-care program, pays the fees of doctors and standardizes their incomes. The administration denies that its plan will ever bring "socialized medicine," but the doctors know that, if the medical profession is overwhelmed with cases due to the free service programs provided by the Government, the demand on the time of all doctors will be so great that the Government will have to step in to try to bring order out of the chaos that will ensue.

Nobody objects to better medical care for the aged, as, well as for everybody else, but there are serious differences of opinion as to whether those who seek to make political capital of the issue will produce frustration in the medical profession and a lowering of the high standards of medical care which have long prevailed in America.

THE WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the war in South Vietnam is very remote to most of us and its meaning is limited to what we read in the newspapers or hear about it on television and radio. I have been fortunate enough to be there and thus to realize some of the conditions there.

But none of us here in the U.S. Senate really know what our servicemen are going through there—and I doubt if we really have a true appreciation of what they are doing.

Lt. Douglas Emery, a graduate of the University of Maine, and the son of Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Emery, of Hartland, Maine, is one of our servicemen fighting in South Vietnam.

He has written one of the most unforgettable letters I have ever read. It is a very moving letter about the deep appreciation that the free people of Vietnam have of our aid to them.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter, and an article in the Waterville, Maine, Morning Sentinel of January 31, 1963, be placed in the body of the Record at this point—and I urge all Members to read it.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Waterville (Maine) Morning Sentinel, Jan. 31, 1963]

Hartland Lieutenant Writes Home of Life in Vietnam Service

The following letter was received from Lt. Douglass Emery, son of Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Emery, of Hartland.

Lieutenant Emery graduated from the University of Maine in June 1959 when he was commissioned second lieutenant. In November he went to Fort Benning, Ga., for training and in February 1960 he arrived at Fort Dix, N.J. While at Fort Dix, N.J., he received his commission as first lieutenant, and served as company commander until May 1962.

He left for Fort Bragg, N.C., in June for a 4-week training in guerrilla warfare, and then went to Monterey, Calif., to a language school for 5 weeks' training before going to South Vietnam.

From Saigon he went to the northern part of South Vietnam to Quang Tri where the headquarters were located. From there he went to Tabat, an outpost, and then to Ashau, about 20 miles away, which was another outpost. He expects to return to Tabat soon.

The rainy weather makes it necessary to wait for the landing of a plane to pick up the mail where he is located. Also the delivery of mail, which is dropped from a helicopter, brings much delayed correspondence, since in January of this year he has just received some of his Christmas mail.

Lieutenant Emery's period of service in Vietnam is 1 year, and he arrived there about September 1, 1962.

The letter:

"Thanksgiving 1962.

"Dearest Mum and Dad: It's Thanksgiving night of 1962, approximately 8 p.m.—you will be just getting up to prepare for Thanksgiving Day. I have a very beautiful, heartwarming story to tell you, despite all the ironies involved. Please excuse my messy writing, as I can hardly hold my eyes open.

"This afternoon we returned from a 2-day patrol during which we had a pretty rough time. We lived on cold boiled rice balls, and it poured continuously by the buckets; we were getting very discouraged, cold, wet, and hungry.

"My cigarettes were ruined when we swam two rivers, and I shared the bamboo pipe of the fellow whom I mentioned in my last letter. The leeches were clamping onto us by the dozens, and we had to stop often to pull them off each other. We were all bleeding from at least 25 little holes caused by the leeches.

"On our way back, we were ambushed by the Viet Cong. After this deal we continued back with the rifles, grenades, papers, letters, etc., of the enemy dead (whom we buried), and carrying our wounded (and dead).

"When we got back to base, I undressed from my drenched clothing, pulled the remaining leeches off, and wrapped in a blanket, which was the only dry thing around. I lit a dry cigarette, feeling damn sick, scared, and homesick. As I sat there, Lieutenant Liem came and told me that Captain Tung (battalion commander) wanted to see me immediately.

"Still wrapped in my blanket, and wondering what I had done wrong, I ran barefoot through the rain to Captain Tung's hut. As I went in I was greeted by this scene:

"In the middle of the hut, there was a small bamboo table laden with rice, big pieces of deer meat, duck meat, tea, and one tin cup with one swallow of whiskey (all they had) in front of my bowl of rice. Seated around the table were the company commanders, Lieutenant Suu, the battalion intelligence officer, and Lieutenant Liem, the battalion executive (who ran to his seat as soon as I made room in the doorway for him) and Captain Tung, who stood at the head of the table. The whole room was illuminated by one candle made of pig fat and rope.

"I stood with my mouth hanging open (with 2-day's beard plus my moustache), not knowing what to say. Captain Tung put his hand on my shoulder and said: (If I remember correctly, for my head was clouded with joy, and my eyes were clouded with tears. Bear in mind, he speaks only that English he has learned from me, Captain Lynch and Sergeant Sink). 'We learn from history today great holiday in America. Not much hours back, we fight other men like us, and many of them and us die. Possible some of them are family men of us, but they learn wrong. It is very sad we must fight but c'est la guerre' (in French, 'that is war'). Now we have very bad food, but we make this meal to bless you, your father, mother, and family because they give us great American man to help us fight for freedom like America has. We love you, we ask you to forgive our simple ways' (simple ways? Elegant people, only by different culture), 'and we ask you to be blessed by Buddha and Christ, the Lord.'

"Then Captain Tung led me out in the pouring rain where all the troops stood, soaking wet, where they said in unison, something I could not understand.

"Captain Tung interpreted: 'May the seven bright paths of Buddha show you the way to Eternal Life, fellow man.' (The seven paths of Buddha are so much like the Ten Commandments, one can interpret them as the same.) I cried. Then we crawled back into the hut to eat the most beautiful and delicious Thanksgiving dinner I have ever had.

"I did not mean to tell you about the sickening part of death, but it was part of this most beautiful story that I could not keep from you. So, you see, I'm halfway around the world from my loved ones, yet the spirit of love and brotherhood brings us together—at least, by heart. I would like everyone in the family to read this, as I think it is worthwhile to all of us.

"Happy Thanksgiving to all the family, and

"Lots of love,

"Doug."

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Estonians form one of the smallest and most distinct ethnic groups in all Europe, numbering slightly more than a million in their historic homeland in a northeastern corner of the continent. These rough and rugged peasants and shrewd traders have always struggled for their individual freedom and national independence. Their struggle did not cease when they were brought under the powerful autocracy of Russian czars early in the 18th century. From then on they were the oppressed subjects of the czars, their chance for freedom coming only after the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia in 1917. Early the next year they proclaimed their national independence. That historic event of February 24, 1918, marked a turning point in Estonia's modern history, and thus began a new era for its people.

Under the democratic form of government then established in free Estonia the people worked and lived happily for a little over two decades. During that relatively short time they succeeded in making Estonia a progressive, prosperous model democracy. Then came the Second World War, bringing with it misfortune and tragedy. In 1940 the country was invaded and overrun by the Red army, and in August of that year it was made part of the Soviet Union. Since then the people of Estonia have been prisoners of totalitarian tyranny in their homeland. Even under such abominable circumstances they still yearn for their freedom. On this 45th anniversary celebration of their independence day we wish we could be of some aid to them in their struggle. Unfortunately, as I have stated on an earlier occasion, we are not in position to extend them effective aid now. But we ardently hope and pray for these freedom-loving and freedom-seeking people, for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE TO PLACE LUMBER INDUSTRY ON COMPETITIVE BASIS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, just in the last few days the lumber industry of the United States was the victim of a decision by the Federal Tariff Commission which is going to result in continued depressive prices for American lumber producers. The decision to which I refer is the one which the lumber industry had brought before the Commission dealing with imports of Canadian lumber and the effect of those imports are having on the prices of our own homegrown lumber.

The Legislature of South Dakota has taken note of this action by the Tariff Commission and has approved a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to initiate action to place our lumber industry on an equal and competitive basis with foreign manufactures through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment and loss of taxes to the deterioration of our local communities.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the President will take the necessary steps to protect our great American lumber industry and if he does not that then the Congress will take the steps through enactment of legislation to protect the industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the entire concurrent resolution as adopted by the South Dakota Legislature.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 6

Concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States and His Excellency, the President of the United States regarding the lumber industry in the United States

Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes; and

Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay high wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canadian, due to the latter's advantages, including: Depreciated currency; low stumpage rates; noncompetitive bidding; less costly and restrictive forest practices; lower wage rates; high tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada; low charter rates for coastwise and intercoastal shipping; a cooperative government; and

Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 38th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States and His Excellency, the President of the United States, to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes and deterioration of communities; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the Congress, to His Excellency, the President of the United States, and to the representatives in the Congress from the State of South Dakota.

Paul E. Brown,
Speaker of the House.
W. J. Matson,
Chief Clerk.
Nils A. Boe,
President of the Senate.
Nills P. Jensen,
Secretary of the Senate.

ARE THERE PIRATES IN THE INDIANA DUNES?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Chicago's American and its extremely capable staff reporter, C. Owsley Shepherd, have just completed a probing independent study of the alleged economic feasibility of the proposed Burns Ditch Harbor.

The American carried last weekend on its front pages a series of three searching articles which Mr. Shepherd based on his study of this question. The series is one of the finest expositions which has appeared on this very complicated subject, both with respect to the question of the economic feasibility of public works projects in general and with respect to Burns Ditch in particular.

The American cannot be praised too highly for its willingness to commit its expert resources to a thorough examination of a difficult and technical subject, even though that subject is severely controversial and any attempt to get at the facts is likely to bring on the wrath of powerful interests. Indiana and the Midwest should be grateful that such fearless and vigorous journalism still is carried on.

Mr. President, all Members of Congress have been in the position of both promoting and opposing public works proposals, so we all know a little of the intricacies which often are part of the economic studies put forward to support public works projects. Knowing this, Mr. Shepherd's exacting work in getting the relevant facts and his lucid presentation of them will be well appreciated. I commend it to the citizens of Indiana and of other States. I believe the press of Indiana would do well to publish more of this material since in general they have not given a full account of all the issues at stake.

These articles speak forcefully for themselves of the very doubtful justifications provided for the harbor which would destroy the irreplaceable Indiana Dunes at great cost for the almost sole benefit of two selfish steel companies. Nevertheless, I would make one addition. While it often appears that the Corps of Engineers have put forward questionable or inaccurate data, the fact is that these data are supplied by the so-called local interests—in this case the Indiana Port Commission, National and Bethlehem Steel, and certain Porter County interests—and the Corps has been made the fall guy because the local interests say "you have to take our word" and "you challenge our sovereignty if you ask for proof." Therefore, while criticisms of information in the Engineers' reports appear to apply to the District Engineer, it should be understood that in large part his hands have been tied by powerful local interests.

While Mr. Shepherd in part discusses questions which the Save the Dunes Council lawyers, other conservationists, and I have raised, his study is truly independent in that he has dug out new and devastating information. For example, he has gone into the question of tug costs, on which crucial alleged benefits have been based, and has acquired expert testimony that the certain development of bow-power thrust will wipe out alleged savings due to tug costs. He has also determined that no commitments exist which assure that the largest source of alleged benefits; namely, the Rail-to-Water Transfer Corp., of Chicago, will in fact be switched to Burns Ditch.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these three articles which appeared in Chicago's American for February 21, 22, and 23, be printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Chicago American, Feb. 21, 1963]

Coverup of Dunes Harbor Facts?—The Dunes—Haven for Pirates?

(By C. Owsley Shepherd)

(Note.—Why has the U.S. Budget Bureau locked up special reports by the Army's Corps of Engineers which might affect the current Dunes Harbor controversy in Indiana? As Congress awaits action by the Bureau on the Burns Ditch Harbor proposal, expected to cost taxpayers more than $25 million in Federal funds if approved, Chicago's American publishes a special analysis of the mysterious engineering reports. This is the first of a series.)

Gov. Matthew E. Welsh, of Indiana, is charged with seeking downstate support for an economic development fund, 71 percent of which would go for a harbor at Burns Ditch, by emphasizing that proposed projects include two Ohio River bridges.

The allegation was made by the Fort Wayne chapter of the Izaak Walton League, whose president, Sam Ropchan, said "this strikes us as a misrepresentation."

The chapter introduced a resolution opposing the development fund at a public hearing in Indianapolis last night conducted by two legislative committees studying Welsh's proposal to double the 3-cent cigarette tax.

DOUGLAS FIGHTS

Under the administration plan, the added revenue from a tax increase would go to the proposed $35,435,800 fund, of which $25.5 million is earmarked for dredging and building outer breakwaters for a dunelands port.

Welsh has said that Indiana would be reimbursed should the Federal Government decide to pay for these portions of the $68 million harbor.

Senator Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, leader of conservationists in Washington opposed to the Burns Ditch project, charges Welsh is attempting to rush a start on a port to confront dissidents with an accomplished fact before Congress has had an opportunity to vote on the matter.

Although a recommendation for Federal participation was submitted more than a year ago by the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers, it still is being analyzed by the Bureau of the Budget.

The proposed harbor would run between properties owned by the Midwest and Bethlehem Steel Cos. The corps in part bases its economic justification for its recommendation on projected benefits to steel interests if a public port were built instead of their having to build their own.

DOUGLAS CHARGES FAKE

Two savings totaling $270,000, the Engineers say, would result from eliminating vessel delays caused by wave action and storms.

Senator Douglas alleges these estimates "obviously are faked."

Douglas protests that for a year the corps has refused to furnish him with detailed calculations, proof that it studied alternate sites, or copies of secret agreements between the State of Indiana and the steel interests.

The Illinois Senator, who has introduced a bill for the Interior Department to acquire 9,000 acres of dunelands to be preserved in a national park, has appealed to the Budget Bureau to get information from the corps on 12 specific points he challenges.

PIRATE INDUSTRY

In a letter to Elmer Staats, Deputy Director of the Bureau, Douglas demands to know if the Army Engineers and other groups "have conspired to pirate away an Illinois industry in order to justify the Burns Ditch proposal and destroy the dunes."

This reference is to the corps analysis of the alleged effect of the improvement upon the activities of the Rail to Water Transfer Corp., an association of 28 Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky producers, which transfers coal from rail cars to ships at its docks at East 101st Street and the Calumet River.

The corps estimates the harbor would handle 5 million tons of coal shipments annually, and rail to water is the only concern in this part of the Midwest with access to such sizable supplies.

Douglas says the corps uses this projected coal traffic as the chief anticipated source of revenue with which the State of Indiana could amortize $38 million in bonds to pay for land and facilities it is to provide.

Since economic justification for any such project is a prerequisite to Federal participation, Senator Douglas states in his letter:

"The public is entitled to know whether these alleged benefits are nothing more than a wholesale pirating of coal transfer operations from an existing port to a proposed port which would serve the same area."

Engineers among tho membership of the Save the Dunes Council, a group of conservationists, have made their own analysis of the feasibility recommendation issued in January 1962 by the Chicago district of the Army Engineers, as well as comparing it with the district's October 1960 report which was ordered withdrawn a month later.

In 1962, it was concluded shippers of coal, grain, and overseas general cargoes would save $610,000 a year through elimination of vessel delays and tug costs by using Burns Ditch instead of the Calumet River and harbor.

It also was figured that the steel interests would save $700,000 a year by not having to build an alternate private port, as well as $135,000 on each of two other factors. It is the latter two benefits which Senator Douglas says "obviously are faked."

SIX CONCLUSIONS

The corps dealt at length in both reports on results of wave action. It listed six conclusions in the 1960 document and five of these were repeated verbatim in 1962. The one that was omitted read, "A westerly oriented entrance is considered undesirable." Douglas says this is significant.

For purposes of comparison, the Army Engineers describe both the proposed public harbor and a private alternate. In dealing with the first, provision is made for only an easterly entrance. But the private port is depicted as having two entrances—one to the west.

The corps then says that the public undertaking would save $135,000 annually by eliminating lost time in unloading due to wave action in the berthing areas of the smaller port attributable to its westerly opening.

SAKE OF ECONOMY

The corps says it laid out the private project as it did for purposes of economy. The Illinois Senator scoffs at this as a specious claim.

The other $135,000 benefit item is credited to reducing delays in vessels entering the public harbor during storms.

Yet the corps states elsewhere that the port is not designed to provide areas for anchoring of ships that might require refuge because Calumet harbor furnishes such protection.

Besides, the conservationists point out, Bethlehem Steel wants to fill an area east of the proposed harbor and the length of future Great Lakes bulk carriers is expected to increase, which would add to the hazards of entering the port.

RAISE QUESTIONS

Experts for the Save the Dunes Council charge the "corps apparently found it necessary to create some fictitious benefits" in other areas. They raise these questions:

1. Why should an annual maintenance cost of $100,000 be set for each project when the private port would be much the smaller?

2. Why should all the riprap along the base of the breakwater cells be priced at $17 per ton for a private project, but be divided into filter stone at $6 and protection stone at $17 per ton for the public harbor?

3. Why should it take 39,000 tons of stone along the base of the cells for the 2,000-foot north breakwater of the private harbor, but only 34,500 tons for 5,376 feet along the base of the public breakwater?

4. Why should it cost virtually as much per foot of length for a private breakwater in water 27 feet deep as for the public project in a depth of 42.2 feet where a greater diameter of the breakwater cells would be required? The former figure, the Engineers indicate, would be $2,496.50; the latter, $2,594.50 per foot.

ENGINEER REPLY

In computing the ratio of benefits to costs, Col. J. A. Smedile, district head of the Engineers, considers only Federal costs because he deems to be self-liquidating the State's share and the $4.5 million to be invested by steel interests.

The Save the Dunes Council contends there are two items which are not self-liquidating and, therefore, should have been considered in determining the benefit-to-cost ratio. These are:

1. The United States says the State must be responsible for repairing the 27,000 cubic yards of shore erosion expected to result each year from construction of the harbor.

2. The Engineers say that the State must reimburse the Federal Government for any outer harbor dredging costs in excess of $3.7 million.

[From the Chicago's American, Feb. 22, 1963]

CHARGE DUNES DATA FAKED

(By C. Owsley Shepherd)

(NOTE.—As Congress waits action by the Budget Bureau on an inland port for Indiana expected to cost taxpayers more than $25 million in Federal funds if approved, Chicago's American publishes this analysis on the mysterious actions of the Army Corps of Engineers and its reports on the Burns Ditch project. Herewith is the second article in this special report.)

The Great Lakes Towing Co. has told Chicago's American that the Army Corps of Engineers never studied the records upon which it bases certain favorable recommendations for a harbor at Burns Ditch in Indiana.

The corps states that its figures were derived from a "study of actual transit and detention time, 1959 records."

Capt. Donald McGarity, vice president of the towing company's western division, which handles all tug services in the Calumet River, said Army Engineers never requested this information.

And this company is the only source of complete data.

CHECK ON FIGURES

Since Congress is being asked to vote for spending $25.5 million of taxpayers' money for a harbor to chiefly benefit Bethlehem and Midwest Steel Cos., it first should determine if the Army Engineers' figures pass muster.

The Corps says shippers of coal, grain, and general cargo could save $610,000 a year through operating out of Burns Ditch, were a public port to be built there, rather than the Calumet River and harbor.

The Engineers reason that an open port on the lake would save shippers time and money in avoiding the complications of river transit, including the raising of drawbridges, towing costs, and vessel delays.

Senator Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, who is fighting to save Indiana's remaining dunelands, agrees that this approach is valid, but he charges the corps ballooned its estimates for the purpose of showing economic justification for Federal participation in the harbor project.

COMPLETE STUDY

Since no analysis ever has been published, and the public does not have access to the records, Chicago's American has made a complete study of the corps' 1960 report, which was ordered suppressed, and its 1962 report, which now is being reviewed by the Bureau of the Budget.

A comparison of these and other documents released by Col. J. A. Smedile, head of the Chicago district, Army Engineers, shows a perplexing tangle of jacked-up figures, all of which tend to justify the Burns Ditch plan.

ARMY ESTIMATES LOADS IN FUTURE

In a report on the Calumet Harbor and River issued in December 1961, the corps estimated that over the next 50 years the average load for vessels would be 16,400 tons for coal, 16,600 for grain, and 4,000 for general cargo.

One month later, in a Burns Ditch report, the corps estimated these same loads at $12,500, 9,400, and 3,000, respectively.

Obviously, these discrepancies tend to increase appreciably the number of vessel trips necessary to handle the anticipated traffic.

In 1962 Burns Ditch report doubles the 1960 estimates of vessel delays; it raises the projected average tug cost for coal traffic from $305 to $780, and it hikes the average vessel operation cost per hour for grain traffic from $134 to $191.

Senator Douglas has asked the Bureau of the Budget to press its inquiry into these revisions.

SOME PREDICTIONS BY THE EXPERTS

In view of the fact that the Engineers are dealing with a 50-year projection, and purportedly basing their conclusions on a 1985 estimated average, Chicago's American took a look into the future.

Ken Moreland, of the American Bureau of Shipping, said it is possible there will be no tug movements at all in 25 years, since the Great Lakes fleet by then might be so maneuverable as to not require this service.

Frank Nugent, president of the Freeman Coal Mining Corp., says that within a few years the majority of the ships probably will have bow power thrust (a forward propeller), which would reduce tugs from two into the river and one out to one in and none out—a cut of two-thirds.

E. B. Williams, vice president of American Shipbuilding Co., has prepared a crystal-ball forecast in which he foresees redesigning of the entire ore fleet to eliminate tug usage.

PLAN SWITCHOVER IN 4 YEARS

Howard H. Scott, vice president of the Bird-Johnson Co. of South Walpole, Mass., manufacturer of marine propellers, says "we are rather hopeful that all self-unloading vessels will be equipped with bow thrusters within the next 4 years."

It is reported that all Ford Motor Co. ships soon will be converted to forward propellers, which will allow them to turn under their own power, and Captain McGarity says independent operators will have to change over "to stay in the picture."

The J. R. Sensibar, a coal carrier operated by the Columbia Transportation Co. of Cleveland, is a bow thruster which made 131 trips in the Calumet River from April through September of last year.

This is approximately one-third of the total coal vessel trips made. The Sensibar needed only one tug escort into the river and none on the way out, and its average delay was less than 1 hour.

JUST WHAT DO ENGINEERS MEAN?

So the question is, Where do the Army Engineers get their projection?

In sharpshooting the engineers' 1962 report, one might start at the very beginning—the opening sentence of the syllabus, which reads:

"The district engineer concludes that the proposed Burns waterway harbor is economically justified by anticipated transportation savings on transshipments of grain, coal, and oversea general cargo, and on receipts of iron ore, limestone, and coal for the Midwest Steel Corp."

What receipts of iron ore, limestone, and coal? The report doesn't indicate. Nor is there mention of savings to steel interests if taxpayers should finance a port for them.

It is true that in 1960 the corps based its favorable recommendation on the benefits Midwest would realize if it did not have to ship its incoming supplies by rail from the Calumet or Indiana harbors to its Burns ditch mill.

But this was based on two false presumptions: First, that Midwest in the immediate future would set up an integrated steel plant, to which it still is not committed; second, that there was no alternative but for the company to transship supplies.

Presumption No. 2 was exploded by Midwest's statement at a public hearing in Indianapolis August 30, 1961, that it would construct its own private port at Burns Ditch if the Federal Government didn't come through with a subsidy.

The corps then had to start from scratch and seek an entirely different approach to economic justification for Federal participation.

Thus in 1962 the pitch was that steel interests (including Bethlehem) would benefit by $940,000 a year if they didn't have to build their own harbor.

QUESTION RAISED ON TRANSSHIPPING

In either event, whether the project were public or private, iron ore, limestone, and metallurgical coal would be shipped directly to the docks at Burns Ditch. There would be no transshipment involved.

So what is Colonel Smedile trying to say in his syllabus?

Senator Douglas comments: "Either the Corps of Engineers is confused or they are attempting to confuse the public."

Earlier this month, Chicago's American detailed at length the tremendous political pressure and the motives behind the Burns Ditch project.

But one thing that has not been told is that Indiana taxpayers had absolutely nothing to say about selection of the site and that Indiana politicians dictated the choice to the Corps of Army Engineers.

In Indianapolis on May 3, 1961, a public hearing was conducted by the Indiana Port Commission for the announced purpose of determining the desired location for a deepwater harbor along the Lake Michigan shoreline.

What all of the John Q. Publics and their wives who attended the session did not know was that the Burns Ditch deal already had been signed, sealed, and delivered.

As far back as January 22, 1960, the Indiana Board of Public Harbors and Terminals, the Indiana Department of Conservation and Midwest Steel had entered into a secret agreement to place the port adjacent to the steel company's 750 acres of property at Burns Ditch in Porter County.

[From the Chicago American, Feb. 23, 1963]

DUNES HARBOR: WHO PAYS, WHO PROFITS?

(By C. Owsley Shepherd)

Do you owe any money to Bethlehem Steel Co. or to the Midwest Division of the National Steel Corp.?

Don't be too sure. Taxpayers from Hawaii to Maine and from Alaska to Florida soon may be told to pick up a tab of $25.5 million for a deepwater harbor at Burns Waterway in Indiana.

And if you live in the Hoosier State, you face an additional bite of $38 million—courtesy of Gov. Matthew E. Welsh.

For what? To give the steel companies a readymade port, private slips, terminal facilities, the whole works.

Indiana officials are attempting to convince Congress that they can guarantee repayment of a proposed revenue bond issue to finance the State's promised contribution to the project.

Clinton Green, Governor Welsh's administrative assistant who doubles as Port Commission secretary, testified before a Senate subcommittee:

"You see, we have an organization, for instance, that transfers coal from rail cars to ships. They want to come in and locate."

Green was referring to the Rail to Water Transfer Corp., which operates at cost from its docks on the Calumet River in Illinois.

The Army Corps of Engineers has built its castle in the sand around the theory that Rail to Water will move all of its operations to Burns Ditch. But will it?

Leo M. Geissal, president of the corporation, told the Chicago American that he never has gone beyond the original letter of intent, which stated that the facilities might be switched over if there were economic benefits to its customers.

One of the principal movers of coal that is alined with Rail to Water is the Freeman Coal Mining Corp. Its president, Frank Nugent, and Geissal are extremely disturbed over the rate of 53.7 cents that the Belt railway of Chicago charges per ton for hauling coal 1¼ miles from the Illinois Central yards to the Calumet River transfer point.

They would move in a minute if it were economically feasible. But how can they beat their present rate of 18.5 cents per ton for the transfer from rail cars to ship by moving to Burns Ditch, where their rentals would be the chief hope of Indiana's amortizing its bonds?

CAN'T SEE PROFIT IN DUNES MOVE

Rail to water is hooked on the horns of a dilemma, but neither Geissal nor Nugent believes it will be profitable to move.

This newspaper checked a persistent rumor that a large Chicago brokerage house had expressed interest in underwriting the proposed Indiana bond issue. A partner in the firm said that preliminary examination indicated it might be a sound proposition. He added.

"Why shouldn't it be if it is backed by these two large steel companies?"

This possibility was explored adversely in testimony before the Senate public lands subcommittee:

Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Democrat, of New Mexico—"Do they [Bethlehem and Midwest Steel companies] guarantee in any way the repayment of these revenue bonds?"

Green. "No sir."

NO GUARANTEE ON BONDS CERTAIN

Anderson pursued by asking: "There will be at some stage a financial guarantee by Bethlehem and by Midwest?"

Green. "I am not so sure of that, because there will be a financial guarantee by these other users."

Green introduced "letters of intent" from eight companies, whereupon Senator Anderson remarked that there is a considerable difference between a letter of intent and a firm commitment.

One of Green's letters was from Rail to Water.

The second was from American Oil Co. [of Indiana], which is enthusiastic and seeks an exclusive franchise to sell all petroleum products to users of the port area.

N.Y.C. INTERESTED IN COAL DOCKS

The third is from the New York Central Railroad, which requests first refusal rights [or an option] to coal docks, warehouses, and other concessions.

The others are innocuous, neither saying "yes" nor "no" to anything.

Senator Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, a bitter opponent of a plan he says will mean using taxpayers' money to wreck the dunes for the convenience of two big steel companies, claims that these letters are window dressing and do not represent one nickel of guaranteed investment.

Nevertheless, the harbor project is being backed to the hilt by nearly all Indiana politicians and by the Army engineers, who in a 1960 report conceded that 97.3 percent of all benefits would accrue to the steel interests.

SUGGEST A SITE IN LAKE COUNTY

This subsidy is opposed by the Save the Dunes Council, a group of 2,400 conservationists; by Senator Douglas, who gave the dissenters a voice in Washington, and by many scientists.

They say they want to see Indiana get a deepwater public harbor, but they insist it should be located where it would spare the dunelands and yet be of maximum economic value to the State. They suggest a site in Lake County, which would connect the Calumet and Indiana Harbors.

It would be politically naive to ask why the steel companies don't end the rumpus by building their own private harbor, since they have expressed a willingness to do so in the absence of Federal aid.

The point is, say critics of the plan, that Governor Welsh has bet all of his chips on this one deal. In one form or another, he has to deliver a public harbor or be dead politically, since, in Indiana, a governor cannot succeed himself.

An interesting sidelight is that eight owners of industrial property fronting on the lake near Whiting sponsored a port feasibility study of the Whiting-Hammond-East Chicago area.

The New York City firm of Parsons, Brinkerhoff, Hall, & MacDonald [now Parson, Brinkerhoff, Quade, & Douglas], of which Morris N. Quade is consulting engineer, was retained to do the work.

The riparian property holders entered into an agreement that only a preliminary survey would be undertaken unless there was unanimous consent to go deeper.

STUDY DUMPED BEFORE REPORT

This condition doomed the project to failure. Two months before the preliminary report was submitted in February 1958, the New York Central was dickering for an option at Burns Ditch and American Oil was worrying about how much it would cost to extend its refinery's water intake and outlet pipes several miles farther out into the lake to reach beyond the proposed harbor.

The engineering consulting firm was told to bow out of the picture.

Quade, however, didn't think his work should go unnoticed. He accepted an invitation to address the Hammond Chamber of Commerce. He then detailed his reasons for deciding that the Tri-City area in Lake County, Ind., would be ideal, meeting all six of his criteria for a deepwater port.

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAW 874 NECESSARY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues in the Senate to a situation which, I feel, calls for early action. Across the Nation, at this season of the year, thousands of school boards and superintendents are wrestling with the problems of estimating budgets, hiring teachers, and planning curricula for the next academic year. As a former educator, I know how difficult these problems can be and how thoroughly they can affect an entire community.

This year, however, some 4,000 school districts face additional uncertainty because of the expiration of certain portions of the federally affected area laws on June 30, 1963. These districts enroll one-third of all public elementary and secondary school pupils in the Nation. The Federal payments to eligible school districts under Public Law 874 during the 1962 fiscal year amounted to 5.2 percent of the total current operating expense budgets of these districts, and in some cases to much more. Many school districts face a serious crisis if they cannot know until June or later whether they have the money to support decisions that must be made in March.

In my State of South Dakota, many educators are troubled and anxious about the future of this legislation. They fear that the attachment of this legislation to an omnibus education bill will mean months of delay and make impossible an early decision on extending Public Laws 874 and 815. They remember the battle of 2 years ago, when they were unable until late summer to hire teachers and buy needed textbooks and teaching supplies. They are most anxious that this rather noncontroversial legislation not become embroiled in the controversy over comprehensive Federal aid to education.

The extension of this legislation is vital to educational planning in my State. In the 71 school districts in South Dakota receiving payments under Public Law 874, a fifth of their operating budgets comes from this source. I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the net entitlement and current expenditures of the 71 school districts in South Dakota receiving aid under this law be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

South Dakota

Total	$2,425,471	$12,267,467
2 Flandreau Independent School District No. 3	16,740	243,300
3 Hot Springs Independent School District	62,476	316,730
4 Piedmont Independent School District No. 34	6,115	46,500
7 Rapid City Independent School District No. 1	683,357	3,833,920
8 Ravinia and Plain Center Independent School District No. 98, Ravinia	---------	---------
9 Sturgis Independent School District No. 12	92,368	440,753
10 Lake Andes Independent School District	6,725	115,000
14 Todd County Independent School District, Mission	199,834	473,650
201 Pickstown Independent School District No. 96	51,648	68,000
202 Chamberlin Independent School District	36,170	247,000
204 Douglas School District No. 3, Ellsworth Air Force Base	387,665	558,284
205 Newell Independent School District No. 7	8,668	142,800
206 Black Hawk School District No. 45	2,989	11,723
402 Sisseton Independent School District No. 1	15,245	345,875
403 Custer Independent School District	13,199	217,000
404 New Underwood Independent School District No. 23	$14,797	$825,000
405 Whitewood Consolidated School District No. 66	8,967	40,000
406 Wagner Independent School District No. 99	5,978	170,975
407 Rapid Valley Consolidated School District No. 4 Rapid City	14,946	80,000
502 Hill City Independent School District	4,323	96,170
503 Cleghorn Consolidated School District No. 85, Rapid City	5,978	50,000
504 Shannon County Consolidated School District, Pine Ridge	156,340	237,000
701 Dupree Independent School District No. 12	5,081	70,000
703 Blunt Independent School District No. 2	4,035	50,000
704 Harrold Independent School District No. 3	1,943	63,213
705 Big Bend School District No. 32, Rapid City	1,943	7,000
706 Washabaugh Unorganized Consolidated School District, Wanblee	14,788	70,000
708 Eagle Butte Independent School District No. 3	52,910	135,500
801 Rosebud Consolidated School District No. 24	1,793	7,048
802 Gettysburg Independent School District No. 1	15,544	184,884
803 Eastern School District No. 15, Dupree	1,644	9,000
805 Fairview School District No. 3, Dupree	2,481	13,050
807 Interior Independent School District No. 55	3,801	44,506
808 Bennett County I.H. School District, Martin	5,762	100,000
809 White River Independent School District	27,053	85,500
810 Martin Consolidated School District No. 2	11,931	130,000
811 Timber Lake Independent School District No. 2	4,633	138,000
813 Wood Independent School District No. 1	2,391	48,167
814 McLaughlin Independent School District No. 3	28,398	15,000
902 Mobridge Independent School District No. 13	7,473	436,083
903 Nemo Consolidated School District No. 55	2,839	8,970
904 McIntosh Independent School District No. 1	28,547	203,450
1001 Wahehe School District No. 83, Greenwood	19,196	19,469
1002 Smee Independent School District No. 4, Wakpala	34,825	121,175
1003 Boulder Park Consolidated School District No. 14, Deadwood	3,288	11,510
1005 St. Charles Consolidated School District No. 104	8,370	27,000
1006 Elvira Township Independent School District No. 4, Gann Valley	9,117	67,286
1008 Blackpipe Consolidated School District No. 8, Norris	12,256	34,427
1009 North River School District No. 16, Dupree	5,530	33,000
1102 Provo Independent School District No. 36, Igloo	177,722	224,584
1103 Washington Consolidated School District No. 26, Norris	2,690	4,292
1104 Edgemont Independent School District No. 37	19,579	158,983
1201 Victory School District No. 8, Fort Thompson	12,080	23,500
1202 Wall Independent School District No. 58	13,969	80,386
1203 Wasta School District No. 1	4,179	16,950
1204 Keystone Consolidated School District No. 2	5,429	20,000
1205 Martin Consolidated School District No. 3	7,253	38,000
1206 Evergreen Consolidated School District No. 17	5,978	55,000
1207 Pukwana Independent School District No. 1	3,288	15,000
1208 Duncon Consolidated School District No. 2, Keldron	4,483	25,000
1210 Sisseton Consolidated School District No. 4	5,081	84,012
1301 Buffalo Gap Independent School District No. 4	2,690	37,000
1302 Philip Independent School District	5,978	135,114
1303 Spearfish Independent School District No. 4	8,071	268,228
1304 Oral School District No. 34	3,288	23,500
1305 Belle Fourche Independent School District No. 26	---------	---------
1306 Highmore Independent School District No. 1	22,347	120,000
1307 Oacoma Consolidated School District No. 2	4,185	18,000
1308 White Eagle School District No. 18, Rapid City	$2,690	$15,000
1309 Cherry Creek School District No. 2, Dupree	2,391	12,000
1310 Faith Independent School District No. 8	---------	---------

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I should like to call special attention to the situation that exists in Rapid City, S. Dak., as a result of the uncertainty about this legislation. Mr. Paul C. Stevens, superintendent of the Rapid City public schools, informs me that he is anticipating an increase in enrollment of 800 pupils in the Rapid City school system next fall. This means the hiring of 25 more teachers, the provision of more classrooms, and the purchase of many additional books and supplies. Already the school budget requires a levy of 39.76 mills—the State limitation is 40 mills—and the half-million dollars being received under Public Law 874 accounts for 11 percent of the total budget. About 3,000, or 24 percent, of the 12,500 pupils enrolled in the Rapid City schools are classified as federally connected. Because of the rapid pace in construction of the Minuteman missile projects in the area, this proportion is rising.

And yet Mr. Stevens, like other superintendents across the State, cannot compete for high quality teachers or make commitments for needed supplies, until the fate of this legislation is known. Already I have received urgent letters from superintendents and citizens in Hot Springs, Igloo, Pierre, and other cities expressing their concern. I expect to receive many more.

Why is it, Mr. President, that many of our Nation's educators and school boards already harrassed by mounting problems of school administration, must be subjected to this additional uncertainty? Is it because there is any doubt about the intentions of Congress about this vital legislation? On the contrary, no laws affecting education have received more consistent support than Public Laws 815 and 874. Is it because the President has not recommended the continuation of this legislation? No, in his admirable message on education to the Congress, the President recommended a 4-year continuation of the portions of these laws which expire on June 30, 1963.

What, then, is the problem? Why are our educators and school boards being denied swift action on their plea for continuation of Public Laws 815 and 874? The answer lies in the political deadlock in the Congress which has hamstrung action on comprehensive legislation for many years. The opponents of Federal aid to education are, above all, political realists who recognize the universal popularity of the impacted areas legislation. They will vote for these measures because they know that thousands of educators and parents in their home States are immediately concerned about them. The President, too, is a political realist. He knows that these programs are proven and popular and wishes to make their extension part of a vitally needed comprehensive program of national help to schools. He is right

when he says that "the growing demands of modern education which Federal financing is better able to assist make it necessary to expand Federal aid to education beyond the existing limited number of special programs."

But should these schools which desperately need some early decision on this legislation bear the entire burden of our indecisiveness in national policy toward education? May I make a suggestion, Mr. President, that may perhaps be helpful in satisfying the educators' concern and yet preserve the lines in the legislative struggle over this matter?

Can we not agree to a 1-year extension of the present provisions of these laws, without change, and leave the question of the longer extension requested by the President for resolution in the give-and-take of debate on S. 580? Would not this satisfy both parties to the legislative struggle over the future aid to education? Above all, it would enable thousands of educators and school boards to make their decisions now on faculty, classrooms, and supplies in the fall. This seems to me a sensible and practical way out of the biennial pressure to which we subject the teachers and administrators of schools responsible for educating several million American youngsters.

I would welcome an expression of the thinking of my colleagues in the Senate on this important matter. If education, as the President so well put it, is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress, then it is certainly our duty in the Congress to assist rather than hamper those who are building the arch.

TAX CONSIDERATION FOR THE GOLD MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, 1 week ago today my senior colleague from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and I introduced S. 824 for the relief of one of America's most hard pressed industries—the gold-mining industry. I want to call attention to the fact that assistance for this industry is in no sense a partisan matter. In South Dakota informed people are deeply concerned about the future of mining. Most of the commercial gold mining still being done in the United States is conducted in the Black Hills of South Dakota, and the Homestake Gold Mine, once known as the world's largest gold mine, is located at Lead, S. Dak. Yet, this large mine is facing a difficult struggle to remain operative in the face of mounting obstacles.

It is truly ironic that in a time when the Nation is confronted with a rapidly diminishing reserve of gold, some of the most highly productive gold mines within our country have been closed. In actual fact, more than 95 percent of the gold mines in the United States have been forced to close in recent years. As the Senator from South Dakota put it:

> No other industry in this country is compelled by law to sell its product at the price which prevailed in 1933, while at the same time it endeavors to conduct its activities and to pay its costs in terms of the steadily increasing inflationary prices which have prevailed in this country since 1933.

While gold production in the United States continues to decline, the world production of gold rose in 1962 for the ninth successive year establishing a new high estimated at 49.5 million ounces. Since the need for gold is clearly urgent, I submit that it is imperative we do something to stimulate gold mining in the United States. Of all the means readily at hand, I feel that an increase in the gold depletion allowance, as provided in the bill introduced by the two Senators from South Dakota, is the most feasible and would have the most immediate effect.

OVERALL MILITARY POSTURE OF THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION PROGRAM

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, last Friday at the military posture hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I asked Secretary of Defense McNamara the question, "What is the U.S. policy on Cuba?" It does not violate security to reveal what his answer was, since on that day the chairman of the committee did reveal his answer, which was that there were two objectives in the policy on Cuba: First, overthrow Castro and eliminate Communist control of Cuba; and second, prevent export of aggression by force from Cuba into other parts of the hemisphere.

I asked the Secretary of Defense other questions, which I request be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the questions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS OF SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH TO DEFENSE SECRETARY MCNAMARA, AT THE 1963 DEFENSE POSTURE HEARINGS, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. SENATE

OVERALL IMPRESSION

1. President Kennedy and General Taylor have said there would be no winners in a nuclear war. You and the President have stressed the growing power of Russia's nuclear forces. Under Secretary Gilpatric has publicly stated that he doesn't know how war can be limited "once you start using any kind of a nuclear bang."

It is reasonable to conclude that the overall impression created by these statements is that the United States is afraid to use nuclear weapons for fear doing so would immediately and automatically escalate to a holocaust war. That's the impression I get—and I think it is probable that it is the impression Khrushchev gets.

Yet, the world knows that the Communists have a vast superiority in combat forces for conventional warfare, including first-rate armored units and the largest tactical air force in the world. Coupled with this they have interior lines of supply and communication—an aggressive attitude to conquer the world—and some pretty weak opponents on their borders, like Iran, Burma, India, Thailand.

If, in view of these facts, Khrushchev decides to challenge the United States and Allied conventional forces on a broad scale, what do you propose to do about it?

2. Is your long term objective to create large enough conventional forces in the free world to cope with major Communist aggressions without resort to nuclear weapons?

3. Or are we really much bolder about nuclear weapons than our public statements would indicate?

4. If so, are we programing sufficient tactical nuclear capabilities to win such a conflict without carrying it to the point of an ICBM exchange?

INFORMATION PROGRAM

1. We have read a great deal about the managed news policy and operation of the Department of Defense. Would you please explain that policy, the reasons for it, and how it works?

2. Is it not a fact that there is a policy, regulation or firm practice in the Department of Defense that news information, particularly notices to Members of Congress, has to be cleared through the Department of Defense by each of the services?

3. What does that clearance consist of? Does it include approval as to the timing of such notices to Members of Congress?

4. I have been told by reliable sources inside the Pentagon that there is a requirement that no notice shall go to Members of Congress by the services until at least 48 hours after such notice has been given to the Department of Defense—is this true? What is the exact situation?

5. I have been told by the same reliable sources that at least 48-hour advance notice must be given to the White House—is this true? What is the exact situation?

6. Although I am a member of this committee—and a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense—both in 1961 and in 1962 I have had the experiences of information being given on Maine military construction contracts to the junior Senator by the White House and withheld from me. In 1962 on one occasion through a committee staff member I requested information from the Navy Department on a submarine award 2 days prior to the time it was given to the junior Senator from Maine by the White House and the Navy Department refused to provide the information—again within a few minutes after the junior Senator from Maine announced the award and it had appeared on the wire service teletype a request was made on my behalf and again the Navy Department refused to give me the information that the White House had given the junior Senator and which had been announced by the junior Senator—in fact, the Navy Department refused to give me that information until about 3 hours later.

With this having happened annually in the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration—in 1961 and 1962—will this pattern be repeated in this third year of the Kennedy administration, in 1963?

7. For your information, the so-called split-second current timing by Army, Navy, and Air Force officers on notices to members of congressional delegations—when favored Democratic Senators and Congressmen have been given the information by the White House at least hours ahead if not days ahead—has cast them in the degrading role of Gilbert and Sullivan, comic-opera-like military officers and made such scenes as their synchronizing their watches in order to appear in, or contact, each individual office at the same split second, so ludicrous that it has become a topic of ridicule and they have become a laughing stock in such operations—almost like Keystone Cops.

Do you approve of casting them in such degrading messenger boy roles delivering messages that have already been delivered hours or days before by the White House to the favored few Democratic Senators and Democratic Congressmen and even already announced by the favored Senators?

8. Do you think that this is a practice that any administration should tolerate?

9. Do you plan to do anything about it?

10. There was a rare time when I learned in advance—not from the White House, not

from your legislative affairs office, and not from the Army Legislative Liaison Office—that an Army award had been given to a Maine concern. I made the announcement first. Subsequent to that, I was informed by some persons that two investigations had been made to attempt to determine how I got that information—one investigation conducted by the Army Inspector General, another investigation by Army Intelligence—and that persons had been interrogated as to whether they had given the information to me

Apparently it was all right for the White House to give the information to the junior Senator and the Navy deny such information to me even though I asked for it both before and after the White House had given it to the junior Senator—but when I got the information ahead of the junior Senator, such was apparently a crime—enough to prompt what was reported a reaction that was not satisfied with only one investigation on my getting the information but required two investigations.

I would appreciate your supplying me with such information as you can on these investigations.

11. Mr. Secretary, recently on a telecast interview I was asked if I felt that I was getting the information that I should from this administration. My answer was "No" and I referred specifically to my work as a member of this committee and the Appropriations Committee.

I had in mind a very specific example—the request that I made for a percentage breakdown of the planned defense budget for fiscal year 1965 according to the categories of (a) offensive capability weapons, (b) general purpose capability weapons, (c) defensive capability weapons, and (d) research and development. I call your attention to pages 43 and 44 of the printed record of January 19, 1962. While you agreed at that time to furnish information later in response to my question, what followed thereafter was initial great resistance by the Department of Defense, particularly the office of Under Secretary Gilpatric, to provide the information which I requested.

When I confronted Mr. Gilpatric's office with the fact that not only had the information I had requested—but even more—been given to the 9999th Air Reserve Squadron on the Tuesday following your Friday appearance before the committee when I asked for the information, Mr. Gilpatric's office denied that such was the case. In fact, he formalized his denial in a letter dated February 15, 1962, to me and which you will find on pages 43 and 44 of the hearing record. I call your attention to his letter of denial and my reply.

I then called for the visual chart that had been shown to the 9999th Air Reserve Squadron; and when I did Mr. Gilpatric came to my office and brought the chart with him, admitted that his denial was incorrect, that what I had asked for and had previously been denied as a member of this committee, had actually been given to a large group of Reserve officers, most of whom had no connection with this committee and whose rank was as junior as that of lieutenant.

This is what I mean by being denied information as a member of this committee. Will it continue to be necessary for me to attend the meeting of Barry Goldwater's 9999th Air Reserve Squadron in order to receive information that is deliberately withheld from this committee as it was in this instance up to the very end when I confronted your office with identification of the very visual chart displayed to that group?

FEARLESS NEWSMAN

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, all in the Congress—indeed all in our Government and all in our excellent press corps who knew the late Robert W. Richards—deeply mourn his sudden passing.

Bob Richards was the chief of the Washington bureau of the Copley Newspapers. Many excellent Copley publications are located in the State from which I come. I was proud to call Bob Richards a friend; so was my wife. He was highly respected by his colleagues in our free press, and also by all in the Congress who knew him. All of us will miss him greatly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial appearing in the San Diego Union for February 13, 1963, commenting on the great loss we have suffered because of the passing of Bob Richards.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fearless Newsman

The death of Robert W. Richards, chief of the Copley Newspapers Washington bureau, comes as a personal shock to his newspaper and political friends across the Nation.

More importantly, the untimely death silences a man who spoke fearlessly of government regardless of how high the criticism might reach.

Mr. Richards covered an era of almost continual crisis for this country and the world. In his 20 years as a war correspondent and Washington reporter, he won the respect and friendship of top military and political leaders.

Mr. Richards was of the old school of newsmen who covered every phase of government from local through national. His outspoken opinions were respected by White House advisers, Congressmen, military and naval leaders and countless thousands of American newspaper readers.

His wit was a source of pleasure to friends and associates on the Washington scene and wherever he traveled.

Copley Newspaper readers will greatly miss the informative reporting under the byline of Robert W. Richards, a reporter who literally exhausted himself covering the world to bring them facts.

A CURE FOR SICK CITIES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in a recent article entitled "A Cure for Sick Cities," which appeared in the February 9, 1963, issue of Saturday Review, our distinguished colleague, Senator Clifford Case, of New Jersey, perceptively and skillfully presented several suggestions which, if adopted, might indeed bring realism to the coordination of the Federal programs which are designed to better the lives of those who dwell in our great urban and suburban areas.

As a Senator from a burgeoning metropolitan State and with a long and deep interest in urban problems, Senator Case's comments should be of particular interest to all who want to bring efficiency and economy to these programs.

There seems to be some question as to the administration's desire to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Senator Case notes the reasons why the administration's reorganization plan failed in the last Congress. The administration might well want to adopt the Senator's suggestions in any new proposal. The Federal interest in urban affairs includes more than housing; it includes also mass transportation, air pollution, highways, and water pollution to name but a few areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include Senator Case's article, "A Cure for Sick Cities," at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Cure for Sick Cities

(By U.S. Senator Clifford Case, of New Jersey)

The years since 1950 in America have brought the revolution of urbanization, as it has been rightly called. About 125 million people and nearly 80 percent of our productive capacity are now located within our 212 metropolitan areas. In the decade ending in 1960, 84 percent of our total population growth was in these areas. In the next quarter century our urban population is expected to increase by another 100 million people.

William Wheaton, of the University of Pennsylvania, recently told the Conference on Urban Life that we will be required to duplicate the size and capacity of all American cities existing in 1940 in order to accommodate our population growth in the next 20 years. To do this will involve an estimated investment of more than $1,000 billion.

With this growth, the problems of urban life confronting us today—in education, employment, housing, recreation, discriminatory practices, open spaces, sewage disposal, urban sprawl, health services, transportation, crime prevention, water and air pollution, slum clearance, and taxation—will become enormously more difficult. The States and local communities have the primary responsibility for meeting these problems. Yet the State and local governments can no longer do the job alone, both because of its increasing magnitude and because many of the problems cross local and even State boundaries.

Each level of government must share the responsibility for seeing to it that we meet the problems of this revolution of urbanization, of technology, of population migration, and of social mobility and fluidity. And there is no escaping the fact that the role of the Federal Government has assumed increasing importance in the affairs of metropolitan areas.

This was recognized by the Kennedy administration in its proposal to the past Congress that a new Cabinet position be created—a Secretary of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Congress failed to approve this plan for two basic reasons, I think:

1. Congress is governed by a loose affiliation of rural-living, rural-oriented, and rural-voting Members of Congress of both parties. That this is the real focus of congressional power has been apparent for years. In the hinterlands, it is still politically popular for the country cousin to flail the city slicker. For the country man, these political scalps on his belt continue to be prime assets at the polls. The importance of this fact of congressional life has rarely been more clearly demonstrated than in the defeat of the administration's reorganization plan this year.

2. The reorganization plan itself was inadequate. Its greatest weakness was its failure to bring all the Federal programs affecting urban development under one administrative roof. All the administration plan proposed was to elevate the Housing and Home Finance Agency to Cabinet level. Yet the jurisdiction of the HHFA by no means covers the range of problems confronting urban and suburban communities.

Because of this the administration was unable to muster the full political support of even those members of Congress who

come from our urban and suburban areas. Its plan failed to meet what should be one of the basic objectives of this new department, namely the elimination of waste and duplication through the coordination of the currently fragmented Federal programs affecting our metropolitan areas.

I believe that the President should now seek to determine which of the activities of the Federal Government need to be brought under the jurisdiction of a new Department of Urban Affairs. With this objective in mind, Mr. Kennedy could appoint an advisory commission from within and without Government to study this matter and make recommendations to the President and to Congress as to how best to strengthen the existing—and once-defeated—reorganization plan.

There is no doubt, I believe, of the need for such a new Cabinet post. The report of the Senate Government Operations Committee, in approving the proposed reorganization plan in 1961, said that a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would assist States and localities emerging from the transformation of the American scene from a predominantly rural society to a vast urban complex. This transformation is moving at an accelerated pace.

Our cities have been caught between two population surges—rural people pressing in on the older cities for jobs, for better educational opportunities, for conveniences, while city residents are moving to the suburbs. Under these pressures, the process of city deterioration sets in. Taxes rise to meet the resulting increased cost of police and fire protection and of other municipal services. As city people, many of them from the relatively prosperous middle class, move to the suburbs, they leave the central city weaker in tax revenue and in many other ways. Further decay of the city core follows.

And, in many areas of the country, our problems go beyond urban overcrowding, beyond slums and downtown decay, beyond the slowdown in transportation, beyond the problems of depressed business and commercial sections, beyond strangling traffic in downtown areas.

Our problems extend far into suburbia itself. They cross city lines. We face the cancer of unplanned and uncontrolled suburban growth. The older suburbs are threatened with the same fate as the downtown cities. Those who move to the suburbs seeking better living and some tax relief must, once again, provide those services, particularly schools, already established in the cities they have left. Our transportation planners confront incredibly difficult problems of moving suburban residents into and out of the cities where they work, handicapped by a transportation system weighted heavily on the side of highway facilities as compared with rail and rapid transit.

Civic, labor, and business groups have joined in many of our cities in a comprehensive effort to reverse this trend. For these groups, it is a matter of good business, of stabilizing downtown property values, and of creating more jobs and better housing. It is a matter of eliminating slums and replacing blight with new buildings and new tax ratables which can eventually lead to real estate tax reduction. But it is more than that—it is a matter of local pride as well.

To further this new civic resolve, the Federal Government has lent a hand. At the urging of both Republican and Democratic administrations, earlier Federal aid, notably mortgage insurance for homeowners, has been expanded over a period of years to include such new programs as urban renewal, loans for home improvements, for public facilities, for public works planning, for housing for the elderly and for college students, and a wide range of other activities.

The Federal Government has recognized that this is not just a problem of the central city. It has properly sought to encourage the solution of urban problems through State and local action, including area-wide regional and interstate cooperation. For example, it provides grants to assist regional and metropolitan efforts toward comprehensive planning.

These programs are under the Housing and Home Finance Agency. But under other agencies, there are activities equally important to urban areas. Under the proposed Reorganization Plan, these would not be brought under the new department. For example, highway planners find their concern is often exclusively with traffic needs while local housing agencies have as their objective the avoidance of new slums and the replacement of existing ones. The clash for space, as each seeks to accomplish its own task, is often inevitable. The Federal Government, through two separate agencies—the Bureau of Public Roads and the Housing and Home Finance Agency—provides funds for each, in cooperation with the States and localities.

There are problems, too, in the urban scheme of things, with regard to the relative place of highways and rapid transit plans. Recently, the White House released a technical report prepared by a group of experts which suggested, in part, that more express buses, operating in reserved traffic lanes, might be mass transit's answer to the growing problem of traffic jams that threaten to strangle our metropolitan areas. Conceivably, legislation proposed by the administration to assist and supplement mass transportation facilities, under the Housing and Home Finance Agency, would result in a significant increase in express buses on our highways. The Federal Government would contribute financially to this end. But regardless of the ultimate fate of the administration's mass transit program, a modest program of mass transportation assistance, already on the books, would also lead to greater utilization of express buses. This program is administered today by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

There is clearly no objection to locating mass transit programs under the Housing and Home Finance Agency. But a significant increase in the number of buses on the streets would quite obviously affect what another agency of Government is trying to do to combat air pollution. And this is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Today these activities of the Federal Government are unrelated. Nor would they be related under the proposal as submitted by the President to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Beyond this, duplication and waste would inevitably follow if mass transit plans are centered in the new department while another Federal agency—the Department of Commerce—continues to guide, finance, and control the construction of urban and suburban roads.

We cannot divide responsibility and expect sound decisions or the most efficient use of the taxpayer's dollar in meeting overall community needs.

Here is where a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing could work to the greatest advantage. It could coordinate Federal programs which have as their purpose the promotion of orderly community planning and growth.

The reorganization plan, as first submitted, can be a start but will not fully meet this purpose. For, as I have stated, it does not now provide for bringing all the Federal programs affecting urban development under one administrative roof.

If the planning problems and fiscal needs of urban centers and of suburbia, too, can be reviewed by one agency, it will not be at the cost of local and State home rule. Rather, I believe, local governments will be stimulated to develop their own comprehensive plans for the solution of areawide problems if we center already available Federal assistance and existing Federal functions in a single agency.

We need to come up with a better plan than the one proposed by the Kennedy administration. It would be my hope that renewed consideration of its deficiencies might lead not only to a better plan, but to one that would draw for the first time the sympathetic support, including political support, of the increasingly important suburbs. One minor improvement that comes readily to mind might be in the name of the new agency itself—why not call it the Department of Urban and Suburban Affairs? But details aside, if we are to have a delay in reconsideration of the need for a new department, we should make maximum use of the time available to us by strengthening the Reorganization Plan.

I do not suggest that all the administrative problems of Federal assistance to metropolitan areas will be solved simply by reallocating functions and organizing a new Cabinet department.

Only by continually strengthening Federal policies and programs that seek to deal with these complexities are we likely to reach our objectives. For there are basic changes in the nature and composition of Federal assistance programs which need to be made, quite apart from the creation of the new department.

For example, I plan to introduce legislation to require the approval by the Federal Government of a unified community plan for all projects to be financed with Federal funds before funds for any single project will be allocated by the Government. In some cases, an areawide plan should be required.

This principle is already applied to urban renewal projects. Today, no city or suburb can receive Federal loans and grants to assist in clearing slums and redeveloping cleared areas without the prior approval of a so-called workable program. In general, a workable program sketches out the community's development pattern for future years. No single urban renewal project today is eligible for Federal financial assistance unless it conforms with the objectives of that community's workable program.

There is no reason why the same prohibition against wasteful spending of the taxpayer's dollar in the pursuit of inadequately planned improvements should not be extended to all Federal programs affecting cities and suburban communities.

And as we attempt to strengthen the capacity of the executive branch of the Federal Government to give more effective help in the solution of metropolitan area problems, we would be well advised to give thought to improving the way Congress itself functions in this area. Today, for example, an agreement between States on resolving problems of water or air pollution would be passed upon, not by the congressional committees which deal with health problems or with urban matters, but by the Judiciary Committee of both House and Senate, good lawyers all. And while, to take another example, programs to build better sewage treatment plants go before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee for approval, similar programs to aid in the construction of intercepting sewers leading to these treatment plants require the approval of still another committee, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

After a new Department of Urban and Suburban Affairs is established in the executive branch by Congress, we should set our own house in order by creating congressional committees on Urban and Suburban Affairs.

I cannot forecast just when these improvements will be made. Soon, I believe, the swift-running currents of urban life will require it. The creation of a new Cabinet department can be a vital first step.

FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AWARD TO BAKERSFIELD PRINCIPALS ASSOCIATION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on February 22—Washington's Birthday—the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge announced its annual awards. This year the highest award in the community program category went to the Bakersfield, Calif., Principals Association, for their citizenship program which includes the kindergarten through the first eight grades.

Mr. Thomas W. Curran, past president of the Board of Education of Bakersfield City School District, and Mr. Frank Schimandle, principal of the John L. Compton Junior High School, accepted the Thomas Jefferson Medal and $500, as well as the George Washington Honor Medal. The mayor of Bakersfield appropriately declared the day to be Freedoms Day in Bakersfield. I join the many people in California and in the whole country in congratulating the board of education and the administrators, the teachers, and the students of Bakersfield who made this award possible.

SERIOUS ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on Sunday, February 17, our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] appeared with Mr. Howard K. Smith on the American Broadcasting Co. television program, "News and Comment."

In the course of the program, ABC's cameras, correspondents, and Mr. Smith did an excellent job of dramatizing some of the serious economic problems facing our Nation, particularly those in areas of so-called structural unemployment like parts of West Virginia.

May I say, Mr. President, that parts of my State of Montana are experiencing some of these same economic difficulties. I agree with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], who said during the program that we are not moving vigorously enough in meeting some of our very serious economic problems.

At the end of his program, Mr. Smith came to some conclusions regarding what steps might be taken to stimulate our lagging economy and ease the plight of the 30 to 40 million people who he reports are living in abject poverty.

Mr. President, I concur with many of the opinions expressed by Mr. Smith. But whether we agree or disagree with him, I think we all would acknowledge that he has made a thoughtful contribution to the discussion of the economic problems we face in this age of rapid technological change. I wish to congratulate Mr. Smith for his thought-provoking discussion of alternatives we might consider in attacking and overcoming some of our economic ills. I also believe we should be grateful to ABC and the sponsor, Nationwide Insurance Co., for focusing the Nation's attention on these problems.

Because of the provocative nature and timeliness of Mr. Smith's February 17 program, and because some of my colleagues may have missed the opportunity of viewing it, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the program be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From "News and Comment," with Howard K. Smith, Feb. 17, 1963, ABC Television]

WHAT IS WRONG WITH THE AMERICAN ECONOMY?

These films were made in Olcott, W. Va., a State where the unemployment rate is over 11 percent; where 54 percent of the children never reach high school; and where a quarter of a million people out of a total population of less than 2 million receive public assistance.

There are in America's affluent society between 30 and 40 million people who live in abject poverty.

Tonight: News and comments on the Nation's economy and the other America.

* * * * *

Mr. Smith. Good evening. The cold war, Castro, De Gaulle have all been displaced as America's No. 1 problem. Far the greatest concern to the current session of Congress is, What is really the matter with America's economy?

The Joint Economic Committee and the Ways and Means Committee of the House are daily holding hearings inviting the Nation's leaders and its experts to state what they think wrong.

Though still the richest economy in the world, the American economy has for 10 years been stumbling from recession to recession. President Kennedy expressed fear of a new recession in his news conference 4 days ago. Now at a peak period, nearly 5 million Americans are unemployed. One-fifth of our magnificent industrial plant capacity is idle and useless. We are losing gold at an alarming rate to foreign countries to balance our adverse payments.

Inside America, law enforcement authorities say the slack is partly responsible for a national crime rate that is rising five times as fast as our population. It is at this moment safer to walk in wild jungles than on some of our city streets in America.

It is no exaggeration to say that if we do no better over the next generation at getting our economy moving, the United States will have a hard time remaining in the great power class.

Last year, the administration suggested that passage of the foreign trade bill would help. That was the bill to allow the President to negotiate mutually lower tariffs with other countries to stimulate trade. It is now widely acknowledged that the Foreign Trade Act will do some good—but it will in no degree improve our limping national economy.

This year the administration seeks hope in a tax bill. Taxes will be cut to give people more money to spend; and the tax structure will be reformed to give more incentives to expanding activity. This program believes that playing with taxes will not help much either, as we will argue later.

What is really wrong, and what will really help? This program believes that what is wrong is that some 40 million Americans have been short-circuited, virtually cut out of the American economy. Nearly a quarter of our people in the richest country in the world live in poverty. What has to be done is to convert that huge minority into an effective force in the economy. Then it will hum and our growth rate will rise and our crime rate will fall. We would like to explain what we mean in a moment. But first a message from our sponsor.

* * * * *

Mr. Smith. What is poverty? Writer Dwight Macdonald defined it recently in the New Yorker magazine:

Mr. Macdonald. Statistics for a family of four, any income that's less than $4,000 a year. For an individual, $2,000 a year.

Mr. Smith. How many people live in poverty in America? Herman Miller of the Census Bureau in Washington gives a conservative estimate:

Mr. Miller. We can estimate from the 1960 census that there were roughly 10 million families, about 30 million or so people, with incomes under $3,000. I would say that most of the poor are in this group. In addition, we have about another 3 million unrelated individuals, people living alone—mostly older people—I'd say, with incomes under $1,000.

Mr. Smith. Senator Jennings Randolph, of West Virginia, perhaps the leading expert on the question in Congress, tells who make up America's huge minority of poverty-stricken:

Senator Randolph. These groups are largely the persons and the families often that are both unemployed and underemployed. There are 800,000 unemployed teenagers in the United States—they comprise in a large part the dropouts from school. They have few skills to contribute to a mechanized America and the unemployment rate in this group of teenagers is above the national average—it's almost three times above it—it's 15 percent. There are then approximately 17 million senior citizens, some call them elderly men and women, and these persons by and large, at least many of them, are living on meager incomes. They have shameful substandards of health and of housing and of nutrition and of recreation. Then we would add that third group, the 2 million migrant farm laborers and their families. They lack decent housing. They lack health conditions as they should be. The educational conditions are not adequate. They are only sporadically or seasonally employed. Then there are those racial minority groups. Some 17 million Negroes—and we must add the new immigrant Puerto Ricans. And then we must not overlook the Southwest and California, where the Mexicans are a large group of this overall group of which I have spoken. The unemployment among these people is 13 percent. And that's more than twice what the unemployment rate is among the white population within the United States.

Mr. Smith. There's one particular category of people that you know a lot about and these are the people unemployed for what are called structural reasons. Could you tell me about them?

Senator Randolph. Those are the unemployed men and women who are the victims of what we call structural changes in our economy. A cutting machine moves its nose into the coal under a mountainside in West Virginia. And the 100 men who once did that job are unemployed. We now produce almost as much coal as we did 15 years ago. But we produce that coal with approximately one-third of the manpower of the period that I have mentioned. I've been in these coal-mining towns. I've talked with these men who sit there often in idleness on the steps of the once-busy company store, or near the entrance to the mine. They have a home that hangs on a hillside. It is not a mansion, but it is a home. In that home they've reared their children. And their lives—these men—have been spent there in West Virginia.

Mr. Smith. Typical of the homes described by Senator Randolph is this one in Olcott, W. Va. It is 20 miles from the State capital of Charleston, but removed many times that distance from the comforts most Americans

consider normal. The house is occupied by the Fletcher family and is reached by a bumpy dirt road that winds through the valley. Mrs. Fletcher has lived in these hills all her life. Her home is too small for her family and the facilities are primitive. But the rent is cheap, and so they go on living here. Mr. Fletcher used to work as a plasterer, but there are no jobs around now and so he has been assigned to a Government relief project.

Reporter Don Dixon talked to Mrs. Fletcher about what it is like in the mountains:

Mr. Dixon. How many children do you have, Mrs. Fletcher?

Mrs. Fletcher. I have nine.

Mr. Dixon. And your husband gets $165 a month?

Mrs. Fletcher. Yes.

Mr. Dixon. Does he get anything else besides that?

Mrs. Fletcher. No, that's all he gets.

Mr. Dixon. How do you manage to raise a family on $165 a month? Can't be easy.

Mrs. Fletcher. Our rent's not high. We pay rent of $7 a month. Then, there's my electricity—that runs right smart—on account of my stove. We make out pretty good. Just those two bills—my electric and rent.

Mr. Dixon. How about the food?

Mrs. Fletcher. We always have something to eat. It may not be fancy, but we always have something.

Mr. Dixon. What do you miss most out here? What would you most like to have?

Mrs. Fletcher. I'd like to have a lot of the conveniences that people have that live in town. I have to carry my water. We burn coal. And I don't have no automatic washer. I just wash my clothes and dry them outside. But we make out pretty good.

Mr. Dixon. Would you like to leave here if you could?

Mrs. Fletcher. Well, I'd like to live in town, but I'd never leave West Virginia. I'd never go out of the State of West Virginia.

Mr. Smith. This school is half a mile down the road from the Fletcher house. For most of these children, education is their only chance of escape from the poverty which hangs heavy on the hills.

Donna is the oldest Fletcher child and she wants to be a teacher when she grows up.

Mr. Stern. How old are you, Donna?

Donna. Eleven.

Mr. Stern. And how many children are there in your family?

Donna. Nine.

Mr. Stern. Well, there are 11 in your family. How many beds are there in the house?

Donna. Around four or five.

Mr. Smith. The mining areas are not the only ones to have suffered. This is the house of the Allman family on the outskirts of Charleston. For his family of six, Mr. Allman who works on a relief project gets $169 a month and a commodity ration of surplus foods. Mrs. Allman told us how she makes out.

Mr. Dixon. What will you be having for dinner tonight, Mrs. Allman?

Mrs. Allman. Well, I'll fix some beans. We call them pinto beans. And then I'll have some mashed potatoes and gravy and possibly some hamburger, and maybe a green salad. We don't have that every day, but I try to get a salad in once a week.

Mr. Dixon. Do you find it hard to make the money and the commodities stretch?

Mrs. Allman. Yes, I do. I tell you, you have to be a good manager, I think. Of course, sometimes my husband says I'm not—but we do have to stretch it. Every dollar has to be stretched until it almost breaks before we can do anything with it.

Mr. Dixon. Well, you know, this is supposed to be a very rich country. Do you feel any resentment about not having a lot of money in a country like this?

Mrs. Allman. No, I'm not resentful. I'm thankful for what I've got. I'd like to have more, of course, but I'm not resentful to anybody. I'm glad that everybody else has got something.

Mr. Smith. This broken down old building in Charleston used to be a school. But the times change, and now it is a distribution center for surplus food commodities. The food is given out once a month to those who qualify and in West Virginia that number keeps growing. For many of these people, commodities are the difference between starving or not. The menu isn't elaborate—canned meat, rice, dried beans, butter, cheese, flour, dried milk, shortening.

The amount varies, depending on the number of people in the family. But it averages out to about half a pound of food per person per day. Some of the food was packaged to be shipped overseas under the foreign aid program; but the need was found to be greater at home.

People must bring their own boxes or bags to carry the commodities home and sometimes a wagon comes in handy. Reporter Dixon talked to some of the men who receive the commodities.

Mr. Dixon. How long have you been on commodities, Mr. Heffman?

Mr. Heffman. About 3 months.

Mr. Dixon. How much do you get?

Mr. Heffman. I get it for seven which consists of lard, butter, flour, and so on, which it don't last a month, like it's supposed to.

Mr. Dixon. How long does it last?

Mr. Heffman. From 2 to 3 weeks.

Mr. Dixon. What do you do after that?

Mr. Heffman. That's a good question. I can't answer it.

Mr. Dixon. What did you do the last couple of weeks?

Mr. Heffman. Well, my dad helped me some and my mother-in-law helped me some. If it hadn't been for them, we couldn't have made it.

Mr. Ross. I get $85 plus my commodities; $85 covers my room rent, doctor, and medicine. What I have left over, it goes for food.

Mr. Dixon. Is that for you and your wife?

Mr. Ross. That's for me and my wife, yes sir.

Mr. Dixon. Is that enough?

Mr. Ross. Well, sir, it's not enough to live good on, but a man can make out on it if he has to. I pinch a penny and make it last—but sometimes it don't last. Sometimes I run out 3 or 4 days before I get my commodities. My check comes in first of the month. We don't throw anything away. It's all used.

Mr. Dixon. Are there times when you might go 3 or 4 days without food?

Mr. Ross. At times—a couple of days, yes. I'll say that.

Mr. Dixon. Every month?

Mr. Ross. Not every month.

Mr. Dixon. Does it seem things are getting worse in West Virginia, or better, or about the same?

Mr. Ross. It seems to me to be about a little worse than it has been.

Mr. Dixon. Do you get any entertainment at all? Do you ever get to the films, or to buy a magazine or a newspaper?

Mr. Ross. We don't take any of it. We don't even take a paper. I used to, but I quit taking a paper. Just couldn't afford it.

Mr. Dixon. How long have you been on commodities, Mr. McAllister?

Mr. McAllister. Well that will be 2 years the 16th of next March.

Mr. Dixon. Have you tried to look for work in the meantime?

Mr. McAllister. Yes, sir, everywhere I could find a job—I've tried.

Mr. Dixon. There just isn't anything around?

Mr. McAllister. There just isn't anything to find.

Mr. Dixon. What sort of work have you looked for?

Mr. McAllister. Well, sir, I tried commercial house painting, outside painting, inside painting—just take anything I can find. Ditch digging. Anything.

Mr. Dixon. Well, even if a man is willing to work around here, there aren't jobs around, are there?

Mr. McAllister. None at all. Even if you prove yourself here, you don't have much of a chance—not in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. Dixon. What about your kids? Are they going to stay here?

Mr. McAllister. If I have anything to do with it, no.

Mr. Smith. Those are a very few of the forgotten and neglected Americans, the 30 to 40 million people who are permitted neither to receive the benefits nor contribute their labor to the wealth of the world's richest nation. We are doing practically nothing for them. Our generous farm programs dole out billions to well-off farmers, not to the impoverished ones. Our housing schemes build homes for middle-class Americans. For the poor, housing programs simply mean the bulldozer chases them from one slum to a worse-crowded slum to make space for homes for the better off. They are mostly not covered by social security. The President's planned tax cut will not reach them, for they do not make enough money to pay taxes anyhow.

Their existence exacerbates every national problem. Race troubles like those in industrial Birmingham, Ala. are made severe by unemployment and the fear of low-paid white workers that they may be displaced by lower-paid Negro workers.

Crime is made worse. Today crime rises 5 times as fast as our population.

In the Nation's Capital this week, it was announced that crime in January this year is 17 percent higher than it was in January last year.

Typical of dozens of crimes, on this spot on this street, Congressman Harlan Hagen of California was attacked and beaten recently, within half a mile of the Capitol Building.

At this place, after dark last week, an elderly woman arriving at the railroad station was attacked and beaten by a man. This is within 200 yards of the Capitol Building in Washington.

This week, churches in the Nation's Capital announced they were reversing a century's practice and locking doors to stop vandalism which is growing fierce in a society in which teenagers drop out of slum schools and can find no jobs, so they seek both excitement and money in a life of crime.

The quality of American life is in danger. There are two Americas—the rich and rather complacent top three-quarters, and the frustrated, left-out, bottom one-quarter, now growing savage and antisocial. One of their consequences is that they play no affirmative role in our economy. They starve the economy of a vast stimulus of consumer demand for the products of our industry. That is why our growth rate is the lowest in the Western World; why recession follows recession; why manpower and plant are idle and wasted.

What can be done about it? We will offer some answers in a moment. But first another message from our sponsor.

* * * * *

Mr. Smith. What can be done to articulate the silent, idle market of the impoverished who could make our economy boom? One suggestion is that the Federal Government guarantee every family of four a minimum income of $4,000. It was made by writer, Dwight Macdonald:

Mr. MacDonald. I think it should be the right of a citizen just the way we have free public schools. It seems to me that we should not exclude so many of our citizens from our life because, really, to live in poverty is not to be a full-fledged American citizen.

Mr. SMITH. Herman Miller of the Census Bureau believes getting the economy going is the first priority.

Mr. MILLER. In the first place, the thing that we would have to do, and that would help most people would be to get full employment again. How many of the low-income groups won't be helped by full employment: the aged, your widows, others people who don't work. But for many of the unskilled, if they had regular employment, they would at least have a means of regular source of income and could keep going.

The second thing we have to do is to equalize opportunities for employment and for education. There are very large numbers of people in the United States who are simply never given the chance to get a good job, or to get good training. Many of them are educated and then they go out into the labor market and they can't find jobs. This not only makes people poor, it makes people bitter. And society pays in two ways: it pays because of their low incomes, their poverty; it pays to control them. It pays to put policemen in the schools; to keep them in our jails.

And the third thing we have to do is to stop the transmission of poverty from one generation to the next. And there is much more of this than we realize. So that somehow we must find the best talents that exist within our poor, within our discriminated, and develop them.

Mr. SMITH. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH believes in work projects Congress has been stalling on, projects to be supported by Federal Government expenditures.

Senator RANDOLPH. It's not just an expenditure. It is a capital investment. And when I say capital, it's an improvement to that community and the well-being of the people who live there. And I feel that when we employ these people, when we construct that project, we have returned not a hundred cents on that original dollar which is expended, but we have a dividend which is paid in a better America.

I feel that the President must be frankly more vigorous on meeting these so-called homefront problems. Because you know if we're not really a happy people here at home—if we're not a people to a relative degree—are, well, let us say, in an economy that gives us some substance, I don't think we're going to attach ourselves to these other problems international in scope. And I feel the President has not only the personality and the power to do this job, but if today I could spur him to do this by the words I speak—if the viewers and the listeners to this program, if they feel as do I, they might well through their own contacts—indirect and direct in some instances—impress upon the Chief Executive of our Republic the need to move more affirmatively, to act more positively in the areas which I discussed.

Mr. SMITH. The rest of this is going to be strictly my own opinion.

The President's tax-cut plan will give the economy a temporary shot in the arm.

But it evades the basic problem of the Nation's economy. No matter how much you stimulate the investing public by cutting their taxes, they will not make many bold investments if the market for their goods remains sluggish.

What is needed is government action on a very large scale long-range plan to get income to the 30 to 40 million Americans who live in poverty. They are so poor that they will pour that money back into the economy as quickly as they get it. With a tremendous spurt in sales, investors will then invest—tax cut or not.

The money should not be just a handout as it often was under the New Deal. It should be paid out to do things in America that will permanently end poverty.

Build more schools to replace overcrowded slum schools. Have a bolder education plan in general. Have urban renewal programs for the very poor and for no one else for awhile.

For the elderly, have a real medicare plan like those in allied Western Europe. In my opinion no American over 65 should pay a dollar for health care.

For youth, the President's youth employment plan sent to Congress last Thursday is good enough as a starter.

There are a hundred other programs that in 5 or 10 years' time would change America greatly for the better, decrease crime, raise our growth rate, and in every way make this Nation unbeatable in the cold war or any kind of competition.

The programs take money—lots of money. Spending, our negative legislators call it; but the proper name is investment, the shrewdest, most profitable investment we can make.

It means forcing the negative men who dominate Congress to become affirmative. And that means that the President will have to do what to date he has been allergic to doing—fight for his legislation. And fighting does not mean speaking a few words on this subject among 30 others at an occasional news conference.

What is wrong with the American economy is—it is being starved of purchasing power some 35 million impoverished American should have.

What needs to be done is to get that purchasing power to them for projects that will permanently elevate them to first-class American citizenship.

Good night.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR DODD

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on Friday, February 22, 1963, I had the pleasure of addressing the New York State Society of the Cincinnati Union Club, an organization which dates back to the Revolutionary War. The first president of this society was George Washington.

My remarks dealt with what I feel are the right ways and the wrong ways for dealing with Communists and other subversives in America.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD AT THE ANNUAL WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY DINNER OF THE NEW YORK STATE SOCIETY OF THE CINCINNATI UNION CLUB, NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 22, 1963

We meet in New York tonight to celebrate the memory of the father of our country.

All who reflect upon the life of Washington will be touched by the feeling that there is something inscrutable, something elusive, something difficult to capture about this great man who is separated from us by a span of two centuries.

The artist who conceived the monument to Washington in our Nation's Capital must have been similarly baffled.

When the Lincoln Memorial was erected, it was Lincoln the man, in all of his humanity, that was immortalized in stone; it was the qualities of the man that were reproduced: his humility, his simplicity, his melancholy, his brooding passion for justice.

When we raised a monument to Thomas Jefferson it was, again, Jefferson, the man, who emerged, standing lifelike, surrounded by engravings of his most famous words, in a beautiful setting which is so in harmony with what we know of Jefferson the artist and statesman.

But there was something about Washington which defied such a representation. He represented to the artist and to succeeding generations of Americans something that could not be captured in a statue, something larger than life, something unnaturally noble and lofty, solid, upright, shining. And so the national monument to his memory took the form of a great and gleaming shaft, soaring skyward, possessing a hint of eternity.

It was what Washington did, what he stood for, what he left to us and to all men that comes to mind when we think of him.

When Washington first took command of the Continental Forces at Cambridge, he found a group of men so undisciplined, ill-equipped, and disorganized as to be unworthy of the name of an army; and through the force of his genius and his character he left it 7 years later, an army victorious in the War for Independence.

Washington found 13 subjugated colonies, under the heel of the world's greatest power, and he left them free and independent States.

He found a group of discordant, disunited States, and through his stature, his counsel, and his patience he provided a unifying force and left a nation united under the noblest of all charters, the Constitution of the United States.

He found a new and untried government, a strange and infant phenomenon on the face of the earth; and he left the Great Republic which, under his leadership and through his example, emerged as a going concern, ready for the long journey envisioned by the Founding Fathers.

What should be our sentiments as we reflect upon Washington? Respect, gratitude, admiration, reverence? Yes, all of these and more. And because his life was inseparably woven into the fabric of our national life, our veneration of Washington is inseparable from patriotism; from respect for our Nation's role in history, from gratitude for its citizenship, from admiration for its achievements, from reverence for its free institutions, which we rightly look upon as the fountainhead of all our manifold blessings.

We are here tonight, then, not only to venerate the memory of a great man; we are here to dedicate ourselves anew to the ideas and the ideals of Washington which live on and flourish in perilous times.

So far as Washington and the Founding Fathers were concerned, the ideals of the American Revolution were self-evident propositions, and they so stated in the Declaration of Independence. Even at that early day, Washington and the others believed that the validity of man's rights and freedoms was a closed issue, something that was forever decided, something that they fought a war over and wrote immutably into the Constitution of the United States.

This concept of eternal, self-evident rights, arising from the nature of man and his relationship to the Creator, is under a mighty challenge today, a twofold challenge.

From without, totalitarianism makes a direct challenge; from within, doubt, disbelief, and indifference make an insidious challenge.

Most of the time this second challenge, like an iceberg, is largely beneath the surface. Occasionally, some controversial event will bring it to the forefront, such as the invitation to Alger Hiss to appear on television, or the public appearance of George Lincoln Rockwell the Nazi leader, and Gus Hall the Communist leader, before highly respected groups.

The public appearances of these warped and discredited figures are not of great

importance, in themselves. But the attitudes of loyal Americans who promote and defend these spectacles is significant and it is of this that I shall speak principally tonight.

The fundamental ideal of our Nation is freedom of choice. Upon this principle all of our institutions are founded and from it, all have evolved. Our approaches to government, to economics, to education, to the press—all are fashioned out of this principle of free choice.

In the nature of things, a nation founded upon free choice must indulge freedom to the widest limit possible. There must be not only freedom for the wise and the responsible and the respectable, but freedom for the ignorant, the irresponsible, the ridiculous, even the contemptible. To preserve freedom to be right, we must also preserve freedom to be wrong.

But there is one extreme latitude that even advocates of free choice cannot indulge and that is the freedom to destroy free choice—the dissent which threatens the right to dissent. There is one intellectual position that men who believe in freedom cannot entertain with any feeling other than loathing and contempt, and that is the proposition that men ought not to have freedom.

We in America are tolerant of almost any view but some things we have decided upon for all time; among these things are freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of the ballot box. These freedoms are so fundamental to our heritage that they are, to use the diplomatic term, nonnegotiable.

Yet there are groups among us which, openly or covertly, challenge these assumptions.

Chief among them is the Communist Party of the United States. I need not labor the point that the Communist Party makes a complete and total challenge to everything we believe about freedom and the nature of man. Where they are able, the Communists impose their ideology by force and terror. Where they cannot do this, as in the United States, they seek our destruction through subversion, through espionage, through poisoning our intellectual and moral climate, through covertly attempting to mold our public opinion and public policy so as to coincide with the interests of the Soviet Union.

This internal challenge of the Communists is of tremendous importance. The threat, in itself, is important and the proof of this is the sorry history of its successful manipulation of Government policy at critical times, its stealing of vital secrets, its misdirection of public opinion. But it is not my purpose to discuss this aspect tonight.

The threat is also important because of the reaction to it of the American people. Our reaction demonstrates what we think of our American heritage; and it is what we think of our heritage that will, in the final analysis, determine whether it shall or shall not survive.

There are three types of mistaken reactions to this threat:

If we react to the Communist challenge by establishing police state methods in this country we begin to build up a machinery of repression which is foreign to our ideals, alien to the Constitution, and which can at any time be turned by unscrupulous or misguided men against legitimate dissent (that is, dissent which accepts the ideal of free choice). I never want to see a law in the United States which would prevent Gus Hall from speaking because under other circumstances, at other times, the same law might be used to silence a future John Kennedy or a future Dwight Eisenhower.

A second misguided reaction is to go to the other extreme, as some are doing today, and contend that our free heritage dictates that we must not only forbear to lock up Communists, but that we must also welcome them on our public platforms, on our campuses, on our school faculties, in radio and television, and in public office. I oppose this just as strenuously as I oppose the first alternative.

Out of respect for our own free institutions and out of concern for their preservation, we permit our sworn enemies to exercise the basic rights of Americans. But I believe it should end there. They are not entitled to any position of authority or influence; to any position of favor or respect or dignity in our country. They must always be singled out for what they are, and that is as sworn enemies of everything good that America has brought to the world.

The third mistaken reaction to the challenge of those who deny the validity of man's freedom is the reaction of indifference.

Some say, or reveal by their actions, that they do not care about an issue which all Americans should and must care about.

Some faculties say, "let our students invite Communist agents to lecture to them. We do not endorse the invitation, but we say it is their business."

A television executive will say, "Let a traitor and a convicted perjurer appear on our network to ridicule the character of a great public servant who has lived by the processes of free debate, free choice, and free elections. We despise the traitor and what he represents," says the executive, "but he is free to use our facilities."

Others will defend the right of known subversives, or those with many subversive affiliations, to occupy Government posts or positions on college faculties.

This is the attitude of indifference to the trampling upon of what ought to be held sacred. Let me illustrate:

Three years ago, when Khrushchev was visiting this country on a state visit there was a considerable movement afoot to bring him onto the floor of the Senate to address that body. When I thought of those great bronze doors to the Senate Chamber, upon which are engraved memorable scenes in the life of Washington, being thrown open to admit the archenemy of everything which Washington and this country represent, I felt sick at heart.

It was not that I feared that Khrushchev would make any conversions or do any direct damage to the country by appearing in a forum hitherto reserved for the friends of freedom. I was depressed not because of this, but because of the mockery involved, because of the desecration. If you saw someone pull down the American flag and trample upon it, you would not fear for the future of the country, but you would feel an inner revulsion and a sickness at heart to see the desecration of something noble and sacred.

This is exactly what happens when a Communist makes a public appearance at a free university. The danger stems not from him but from the indifference and apathy and blindness that our acceptance of these appearances signifies about ourselves.

There is a right way for a free people to deal with avowed enemies of freedom without violating our Constitution, our convictions, or our self-respect. That way is twofold:

First, there are constitutional legal remedies enacted by the Congress and approved by the Supreme Court, for dealing with certain overt acts of treason, acts which violate even the broadest interpretation of the Bill of Rights. So far as the actual forceful repression of Communists goes, it should be left to these laws.

Let the Communists enjoy all the legal protections afforded by our system of justice, not because it is owed to them, but because we owe it to ourselves, to our great past and to our free future.

These laws need to be strengthened in some respects and I favor strengthening them so long as it is done within the spirit of the Constitution. But such laws will always be to a large extent inadequate because the Constitution is designed to protect freedom and not to impose repression.

The larger protection against the spread of totalitarian doctrines must reside in the hearts and minds of the American people. They can react to Communists and other purveyors of twisted doctrines by exercising their freedom to ignore and reject them; by refusing to listen to the unspeakable, by refusing to honor the dishonorable.

Let me illustrate this by recounting to you an event that took place in New Haven, Conn.

A year ago there was an attempt made by some Yale students to bring Gus Hall, the head of the American Communist Party, to the Yale campus to deliver a lecture as he has done at many other American universities and colleges.

This is a significant example because Hall is not merely a suspected Communist or some mooney radical, he is the top Communist in the United States; a hardened conspirator, trained in Moscow in everything from the use of explosives to the use of propaganda. He was convicted under the Smith Act for conspiring to forceably overthrow our Government and has served several years in the Federal penitentiary. He is currently under indictment for further violations of our security laws. He is therefore a conscious agent of a foreign enemy which is attempting to destroy academic freedom and all other freedoms in this country.

The question of whether or not to invite him was openly debated a year ago. Those who opposed the invitation effectively argued that inviting Hall would be a needless debasement of the principle of academic freedom. The end result was that the students exercised their free choice by refusing to invite Hall.

This year another group did invite Hall to speak. Last week he came to the campus and addressed an overflow audience of students and faculty members. According to the New Haven newspapers he was warmly applauded both at the beginning and at the end of his remarks and evoked frequent laughter during his half-hour address.

Thus was a well-known and unmistakable enemy of our Nation's free traditions welcomed at one of the foremost universities in the free world.

Now I do not believe that Hall's greeting at Yale, regrettable though it was, signifies that he made any conversions to communism. I say this despite the fact that the political editor of the Yale Daily News wrote me a letter describing Hall as a "moderate socialist who wants to help man, but is not quite sure how to do it."

We can only hope that the Yale student body is a little more sophisticated than its political editor.

The real tragedy here is that several hundred young men, products of the finest training that free society can give, so forgot their free heritage as to pay tribute and show favor to a man who is the embodiment of everything that free men should shun and abhor.

The Yale Daily News defended Hall's appearance as a vindication of academic freedom by the Yale student body. But there was no question of academic freedom involved.

Their right to invite Hall was not challenged so they need not wear false martyrs robes. They are not in any way denied all the information they want about communism. They have a library full of books about communism, written by Communists and non-Communists alike. They have available to them the Communist newspapers in which they can read Gus Hall's speeches to their hearts' content. They all know this. And they know also that in listening to Hall they are getting no exchange of free ideas. Free speech is impossible for a true Communist. They knew they would hear the party line and they know that if the party line changes tomorrow Hall will change his speeches tomorrow to reflect it.

They had, therefore, other motives:

They were curious to get a look at a real live Communist agent and so they placed their curiosity above their patriotism.

They wanted to lay a wreath before the shrine of nonconformity, so they listened to a speech by the No. 1 conformist in America.

They got a childish psychological kick out of applauding the leading American representative of organized inhumanity, and they were willing to purchase this kick at the price of degrading their own inheritance as trustees of the free heritage of America.

Their reasons are unimportant really, except that they demonstrate that the reverence for freedom is held so cheaply by some that they are willing to trade it in for such trinkets and trivia as I have described.

The students of Yale may further exercise their freedom by inviting George Lincoln Rockwell to lecture them about the virtues of nazism and, in the name of academic freedom, to defend the mass murder of millions of Jews and the glories of tyranny.

The same false logic that prompted them to invite Hall should prompt them to invite Rockwell, and probably will. If it does, so much the worse for them; so much the worse for Yale; so much the worse for our country.

Hall would not have been invited to Yale by men who placed the same value upon liberty as did Washington and the Founding Fathers. And had he appeared uninvited in the midst of such men, he would have been greeted not by a large and friendly audience but by the silence and contempt of an empty hall.

Washington knew that freedom was not an invitation to intellectual anarchy. He knew that freedom carried with it the responsibility for men and for nations to make final decisions about things; to stand irrevocably for some things and to hold certain basic assumptions about freedom to be unchallengeable and incontrovertible, because they were self-evident.

Why is all this important? It is important for this reason:

If our free tradition does not imbue our people with a love for freedom so fervent that it shudders at the thought of the Halls and Rockwells and all the apparatus of slavery, how can we expect them to feel the zeal for preserving and advancing freedom which they must feel if our Nation is not only to survive but to go forward and attain in fuller measure the ideals of freedom and democracy for all men?

Those of us who have in our hands a responsibility for influencing public opinion and guiding the education and development of our young people must look to this problem. We must, through our informational media, through our pulpits, through our schools, through our public forums and through the example of our lives do a much better job than we are doing of portraying the ideals of the American Revolution.

If we succeed in this then we will not have to lament the fact that Communists and Nazis are taking advantage of our American freedoms. For our people will use their freedoms to reject and isolate the wrong and to affirm and embrace the right.

It has been said that the example of a good life is more effective in influencing people than the greatest sermons ever preached. In the end, the example of the lives of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln and others will do more to inspire a reverence for human freedom than any words of ours.

That is why I am honored to have been invited to take part in this commemoration of the birth of perhaps the greatest of all Americans.

The English poet, Lord Byron, said this of Washington:

> "Where may the wearied eye repose,
> When gazing on the Great,
> Where neither guilty glory glows,
> Nor despicable state?
> Yes—one—the first—the last—the best—
> The Cincinnatus of the West,
> Whom envy dared not hate,
> Bequeath the name of Washington,
> To make man blush there was but one!"

Our presence here tonight is but one unneeded proof that the passage of time has vindicated Byron's judgment.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF CONSUMER CREDIT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on February 11, at the sixth annual Alumni Consumer Credit Management Conference at Columbia University, held at Arden House, near New York City, our colleague, Senator EDWARD V. LONG, of Missouri, presented a masterful analysis of the question raised by proposals to use the power of the Federal Government to control and police the extension of consumer credit.

This analysis ranged far beyond the limited proposal contained in S. 750, which is back again before the Senate. I think the statement is very valuable to all Senators, because it puts the so-called credit disclosure bill into focus. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EDWARD V. LONG BEFORE THE SIXTH ANNUAL ALUMNI CONSUMER CREDIT MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 11, 1963

It is a real pleasure to be here today and to participate in your program.

I would like to begin our discussion by posing a question. That is, "When, in what form, and for what purposes should the Federal Government legislate in the field of consumer credit or should the Federal Government directly regulate consumer credit at all?"

In general terms, I believe we can all agree on an answer to this question if directed to the broad field of business. Most of us can agree that regulation by the Federal Government may be necessary in times of war or national emergency and also may be necessary to preserve economic opportunity. We can also agree that legislation designed to regulate business may be necessary when the separate States cannot effectively carry out laws which will promote the economic well-being of individuals. On the other hand, we can also agree that it is difficult and time consuming to change laws once they are enacted and that the administration of some laws leaves much to be desired.

With few caveats we can agree on principle because we have inherited and absorbed essentially the same ideals. We accept a basic belief in freedom with its inherent limitations. Hard as it is to define, each of us has an understanding of the ideas involved.

But having agreed on principle, we are still left a wide area for discussion and disagreement. This disagreement stems from the fact that each of us as an individual has his own set of deep-seated beliefs about economic regulation. Some of these beliefs are well founded. Some beliefs are based on information obtained over the years, some of which is currently applicable and some really irrelevant. These differing beliefs arise in part because we are members of a particular profession, business organization, political party or other group. Being involved in specific pursuits, we not only have deep-seated beliefs but we also have interests which we want protected. Each of us in our own mind develops solutions to problems which arise in the field of consumer credit—or in any other area for that matter.

In particular, each of us is committed to a favorite interpretation of constitutional provisions concerning trade and finance. However, we must face the fact that the Constitution is couched in broad terms—there is a wide area for interpretation. If this were not so, we would find many times 23 amendments. In fact, there have been really only 13 amendments since the first 10 were adopted almost simultaneously with the original document. It is nothing short of a miracle that a written Constitution could provide a sound government for an 18th century agrarian society and a 20th century industrial society without greater change.

As the complexion of business activity has changed over the years, its relationship to the commerce clause and the money clause has changed. This has resulted in a continuous development of the law. It is important that our system of law evolve with changing economic and social conditions. But before change takes place we should establish that the change will result in improvements. For example, we cannot assume that Federal regulation of consumer credit has some very definite advantages over State regulation. It is well to remember that largeness results in increased administrative problems and possible increased costs. As those of you in large companies know—it is a real problem to establish procedures or detailed policy on a companywide basis and have these regulations followed. Even when they are followed there is the danger of destroying individual initiative at all levels. A very similar situation exists with the Federal Government.

Given these preliminary and very general statements, I will try to develop some more specific ideas concerning consumer credit and Federal legislation. My comments will be in the following main directions: (1) The general success of State legislation and some areas that suggest change; (2) the entry of the Federal Government directly into consumer credit regulation; and (3) the effects of general legislation on those who lend to consumers. During the course of this discussion I hope to be able to bring out some ideas that may suggest ways that businessmen and others could be somewhat more helpful in legislative matters—and at the same time obtain at least some of the results they seek.

Consumer credit is an area which to date with the exception of regulation W, has not been subject directly to Federal legislation. The present institutions specializing in consumer credit all came into being early in this century. If you recall, this was the time when the effects of the wage system were being felt on a wide basis. We had reached the stage where money came into real importance for everyday exchanges. Reflecting this monetization of the economy, the Federal Reserve System was brought into being, State legislation governing hours and conditions of work was widespread and State legislation in the consumer credit field began to appear.

The need for consumer credit legislation was well established by the studies of the Russell Sage Foundation. The resulting legislation was supported by social reformers and a considerable segment of lenders. They recognized that wage earners were forced into borrowing for emergencies and had no alternative but to pay whatever was asked. But equally important they saw the need for laws which recognized that there was an economic demand for loans and that to make small loans was a costly proposition. Thus, an important step forward was taken from the age-old concept of usury. The new approach was one of permitting an interest rate which would provide for a sufficient return on capital to encourage legitimate businessmen to enter the field but at the same time would protect the consumer borrower. This concept is still the basis for State regulation and should remain so no matter what government imposes regulations.

Following the enactment of this legislation early in the 1900's two different types of organizations appeared almost simultaneously. Both were able to make charges which were considerably above those previously allowed by law. The uniform small loan law was geared to having business firms supply cash loans. The credit union was adapted from the cooperative approach becoming important in continental Europe—the idea of a group of people with a community of interests helping each other. The Morris plan sprang up about the same time, and subsequently, the commercial banks entered the field of consumer credit. Both the Morris plan and commercial bank lending to consumers were permitted by changing interpretations of the general interest or usury laws.

For some decades no serious thought was given to the Federal Government entering the field of regulating consumer credit. Then came our entry into World War II. It became an important national objective to divert the productive capacity of the country into the production of armaments and war goods and to direct as much as possible of consumer income into financing the war effort. To achieve these objectives, the production of automobiles and other consumer durables was curtailed, and price controls, wage controls, and rationing were instituted. By this time consumer credit had become an important element in the economic picture. At the end of 1941, total short and intermediate term consumer credit was $9.2 billion. These credit obligations amounted to 9.6 percent of the $96.3 billion personal income received during that year. Thus along with other forms of price control and wage control, the so-called regulation W type of selective control of credit was instituted. Essentially, this regulation required all credit grantors to register and specified certain downpayments and contract maturities for each type of durable consumer goods.

This regulation also specified conditions for the renewal and extension of existing credit. In effect, regulation W was instituted as an anti-inflationary device—the idea being that this direct limit on the amount of credit available to consumers would help reduce their demand for goods in short supply. This regulation was retained, again as an anti-inflationary device until toward the end of 1947. It was suspended temporarily, then reimposed for 9 months in 1948–49, was again suspended in 1949 and reimposed late in 1950. Finally an act of Congress as of June 30, 1952, terminated the authority of the Federal Reserve Board to impose the regulation W type of control.

Since that time there has been no direct regulation of consumer credit by the Federal Government. At intervals there have been suggestions that a need exists for the Federal Reserve to have stand-by authority to impose this selective control over consumer credit. Especially was this true during, and immediately following the year 1955, during which installment credit outstanding increased by 25 percent. This very rapid increase in the outstandings of installment credit led the President to request a study by the Federal Reserve Board of installment credit and its impact on the economy. The result of this study was the very imposing six-book "Consumer Installment Credit Study," published in 1957. This study provides an excellent statement of views of individuals on the usefulness of regulations as well as economic analyses of the effects of consumer credit on the economy. It is the source of the most comprehensive and authoritative information available, up to that time, on consumer credit.

Since that time there have been occasions when the subject of selective controls on consumer credit has been considered in Congress. However, there has been a growing awareness that the application of such controls entails often unforeseen difficulties and raises many new problems. William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in his letter to me dated January 16 of this year referred to the following statement of the Board's views which summarize these difficulties:

"As indicated above, the selective regulation of the use of credit by consumers raises many problems beyond those implied in the general restraint of credit-financed demands. Such regulation has been vigorously opposed by interested groups whenever it has been proposed. After weighing the many conflicting arguments enumerated in the study submitted by the Board in 1957 (see pt. I, vol. I, ch. 16), the Congress may determine that the balance favors establishment of permanent authority to regulate consumer credit. To be fully effective, such authority would have to cover long as well as short and intermediate term credit and should be permanent, broad, and flexible in character. Application of the regulations should be limited to periods when the need is sufficient to justify the considerable burden such regulation imposes on the businesses directly affected and toleration of the discriminatory aspects which are unavoidable.

"The Board does not feel justified, at this time, in taking the initiative in a recommendation to Congress in this matter. The effectiveness and workability of this kind of selective regulation depends heavily on broadly based acceptance and support. Whether such support exists can best be determined in the forums of the Congress itself."

This is a good summary of the disenchantment with the selective type of control over consumer credit as an effective adjunct to general monetary controls.

Administrative difficulties in implementing selective controls on consumer credit were also commented upon in "The Report of the Commission on Money and Credit" published in 1961. The report on page 74 points up these problems:

"The difficulty of efficient administration of selective controls over consumer credit is a major argument against them. Past experience shows that evasion is a constant problem. A minimum ratio of downpayments on some durable goods, such as automobiles, have been bypassed by changing ostensible trade-in allowances. The growth of leasing could permit consumers to acquire cars on terms which might differ significantly from those being imposed by the credit authorities.

"Regulation of consumer credit terms might contribute to cyclical stability, but it would require a large and complex administration to be fully effective. The benefits to stability promised by such a system might be weighed against the cost and inconvenience of installing and managing it."

The bills before Congress which would require the statement of total finance charges in dollars and as the simple annual rate which the charge bears to the principal amount of credit are different in substance from regulation W. They are based on the dual assumption that the consumer does not know the cost of credit, and if he did he would use less credit, or behave differently. Bills of this type have been introduced in both Houses in the past two Congresses.

The House bills have been referred to committee and then no further action was taken. On the other hand, the Senate bill, in each case, has been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and hearings have been held. The first Senate bill was introduced in the 2d session of the 86th Congress. At that time, 1960, it was given the number S. 2755 and the title, "Consumer Credit Labeling Bill." Hearings were held before the Senate Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization, and an 898-page hearing record resulted. In 1961, a very similar bill was introduced in the 1st session of the 87th Congress. It was entitled "Truth in Lending Bill," was assigned number S. 1740, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Hearings were again held before the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization and a hearing record of 1,388 pages resulted. In 1962, during the 2d session of the 87th Congress, hearings were held on S. 1740 with certain modifications and a hearing record of 416 pages resulted. We now have 2,702 pages of testimony and exhibits relating to the question of whether all credit grantors should be required to state their finance charges as total dollar amount and also as a simple annual rate on the amount financed.

During the course of these hearings, much heat and some light was generated. Governmental agencies testified to the need, or lack thereof, for such a type of bill. Some agencies referred to the administrative difficulties in enforcing the requirements of such a bill and made various other comments concerning this type of legislation. Consumer groups testified to the need for consumers to understand what credit costs them. They also related a number of examples of unfortunate individuals who had been taken in. The affected business groups testified as to the difficulties and even the impossibility of complying with regulations of this type. Retailers produced a massive amount of evidence to suggest that the cost of credit might well be intermingled with the price of goods resulting in a situation where the cash customer would absorb some of the costs of credit and there would be less known about its cost than is true today. The President last year in his consumer message to Congress endorsed in general terms credit disclosure legislation.

As a result of these hearings, there is a wider understanding among the American people of some of the problems involved in the field of consumer credit; there is probably a better understanding of the various trade practices in stating consumer credit charges, and there may be even a better understanding of what various percentages mean. Also, it may well be that some State legislation has been speeded up—legislation to help correct some of the abuses brought out in the hearings. For example, legislation requiring that retail installment contracts spell out the finance charges, fees, delinquency charges, and closing costs is now in effect in 24 States and Michigan will become the 25th on March 28. Along the same line, there is the growing acceptance by the States of the Uniform Commercial Code—14 States have adopted this code since 1953, Georgia and Oregon are scheduled to adopt it this year, and Michigan and New York in 1964.

The question still remains, however, "Would the Douglas-type bill serve to correct problems which face the consumer in the credit marketplace?" This question has not been answered to the satisfaction of all legislators concerned. In fact, I am one who believes it would not correct problems which face the consumer.

Experience with this legislation does illustrate one point that I would like to make today, that is, the need for more effective communication between legislators and those who would be affected primarily by legislation. One of the problems in effective communication is the resort to emotional labels. In its original form, Senator Douglas' bill was entitled the "Consumer Credit Labeling Bill." Somewhere along the line it developed other names. Its sponsors called it the truth in lending bill. Its opponents called it the credit control bill, or the credit proportion distortion bill. This bit of labeling certainly reduced the area of objective consideration of the need or lack of need for this type of legislation. These problems of semantics arise in everything we do, so it may be too much to hope to do away with emotional labeling of legislative bills.

The real question is how to live with this approach at labeling and still solve legislative problems in an equitable manner. One thought is that more attention should be given by those who testify to defining clearly the problem and providing factual evidence to back up the position taken. In the case of business firms, this can be done by having a strong research unit in a trade association with the assigned task of having data as complete as possible on the industry and related areas. Combine this with a definite policy stand and a knowledgeable public relations presentation and there is a tremendous impact on legislators and their constituents. A good example of the results of this combination of efforts—research, policy stand, and public relations—is the volume "The Consumer Finance Industry" which was recently published by Prentice-Hall as one volume in the "Library of Money and Credit." All too frequently, however, there is no well-defined policy stand and too little attention to the establishment of the factual basis.

Before closing, I would like to summarize current legislation which is being proposed or considered and which concerns the field of consumer credit. Senator Douglas has stated that he will again introduce his bill requiring specific forms for the disclosure of finance charges and rates. At least two bills of this sort have already been introduced in the House. Thus the question of disclosure of finance charges and rates and the Federal Government's entry into this field will still be the subject of discussion in the legislative arena this year. Another area of direct interest to consumer credit is that of H.R. 71, commonly referred to as the Celler bill, which is described as "a bill to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States against restraint of trade or commerce by preventing manufacturers of motor vehicles from financing and insuring the sales of their products."

Though not directly related to consumer credit, the Federal bankruptcy law is necessarily of concern to all those who finance consumers. This law, as in previous years, will no doubt be subject to minor changes during this Congress. There appears to be no likelihood of a very comprehensive or widespread revision in this law at this time. As you no doubt know, the consumer bankruptcy committee of the American Bar Association is studying the problem of consumer bankruptcies, including the use of chapter 13, and other specific sections of the Bankruptcy Act having to do with consumer bankruptcies. Also it is studying the problem of State laws with regard to garnishment and other provisions as they are related to the Federal Bankruptcy Act. It will no doubt be some time before these studies are complete and before there are suggestions brought out for a comprehensive revision of the bankruptcy law.

Credit life insurance has become an important aspect in the field of consumer credit. The investigation by the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee of the insurance industry could conceivably at some time in the future have a bearing upon the field of consumer credit. The subcommittee has already investigated aviation and ocean marine insurance and State rating bureaus. It is planned to look into other types this year. It is possible that life insurance will be considered some time in the future and with it the operations of credit life insurance. However, there are no specific plans at this time.

Of much broader scope, but still of interest to every business enterprise are the tax revisions which are coming up before this Congress. Revisions in the corporate income tax are, of course, of concern to the vast majority of private companies. The President in his state of the Union message, budget message, and economic message suggested that the corporate income tax structure should be reformed to eliminate some of the so-called loopholes which have developed in the implementation of the present law. Of all the changes in the corporate tax structure recommended by the President in his tax message of January 24, I believe the one relating to the surtax exemption for subsidiaries is of greatest concern to most of you here. The President in his message said:

"Since the $25,000 surtax exemption and the new 22 percent normal rate are designed to stimulate small business, this reduction should be accompanied by action designed to eliminate the advantage of the multiple surtax exemptions now available to large enterprises operating through a chain of separately incorporated units. I, therefore, recommend that legislation be enacted which, over a transitional period of 5 years, will limit to one the number of surtax exemptions allowed an affiliated corporate group subject to 80 percent common control. This proposal would apply both to affiliated groups having a common corporate parent and to enterprises sharing common individual ownership. It will add $120 million annually to tax receipts.

"On the other hand, if affiliated corporations are treated as an entity for the surtax exemption and other purposes, they should be permitted to obtain the advantages of filing consolidated returns without incurring the present tax of 2 percent on the net income of all corporations filing such returns. The 2-percent tax was removed in 1954 from consolidated returns of regulated public utility enterprises, and I recommend that it be repealed for all corporate enterprises beginning in 1964. This proposal will contribute to a more realistic corporate tax rate structure and reduce the adverse effect of high marginal tax rates on growth—at an annual cost to the Treasury of only $50 million."

These recommendations and the others contained in the message are just beginning their course through the Congress. It is highly probable that many changes will come about as the pros and cons of these recommendations are brought out before the Congress. Some of the recommendations may be deleted entirely.

In actual practice, any tax bill enacted is put together by the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. Normally, few significant changes are made in such a bill once it is before the House or Senate for debate. Therefore, I would urge you to bring your suggestions and objections to the attention of the proper committee in time for their study and consideration. This can be done directly or through your Senators and Congressmen.

In conclusion, I would summarize my own views pretty much as follows:

1. From my own experience in State government, I know that State regulation of consumer credit can be effective and think it is in most States.

2. There are already many and diverse regulatory agencies whose policies affect consumer credit. The Federal Reserve through its rediscount and other policies encourages or discourages credit expansion. In this way, the supply of consumer credit and other forms of credit are effectively regulated. Commercial banks are subject to examination and/or various forms of regulation by the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Reserve Board, and State banking examiners. Consumer finance companies, since they borrow funds from commercial banks, are indirectly subject to all of these regulatory bodies and directly regulated by State banking departments.

3. If a disclosure bill is passed, and I do not believe it will be, it should be based on the following principles:

(a) Provide for full disclosure in a workable manner.

(b) Be a law which can be easily and equitably administered and one which does not unduly increase the costs of doing business.

(c) Apply only to those consumer credit areas not regulated by State statutes which require disclosure; and

(d) Be limited strictly to the disclosure of the costs of credit.

4. Lastly, any law which is passed should not turn the already overburdened Federal courts into police courts for thousands of infractions which arise from an unworkable law.

Now I will throw the floor open to your discussion of what has been said and will be happy to answer, or try to answer, any and all questions.

COMMUNISM IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, 15 years ago on February 24–26, 1948, the democratic Government of Czechoslovakia was overthrown by means of a bloodless coup and the people of this once free nation were subjugated by a Communist regime which destroyed their liberty and brought them under the control of Soviet Russia. On the anniversary of this tragic event the Czechoslovak National Council of America has prepared a report based on a study of personal letters from Czechoslovak citizens to their relatives in the United States and illustrating what communism has meant to the people of Czechoslovakia.

I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the Record along with my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Report on Communism in Czechoslovakia as Told to Americans

Fifteen years ago, on February 24, 1948, Communists took over Czechoslovakia with Soviet assistance, under the personal supervision of Moscow's hatchetman Valerian Zorin, the recent troublemaker at the United Nations. At first, the Communists made an effort to bluff the free world into believing that the seizure had been the act of a free people. Now that pretense is no longer necessary, the Communists brazenly describe how they plotted the overthrow of the democratic government and how much they depended on Soviet help.

What communism has meant to the people of Czechoslovakia and how much it has changed their lives is born out in thousands of letters received by American relatives. The Czechoslovak National Council of America, an organization of Americans of Czechoslovak descent, with headquarters in Chicago and branches in a number of cities, has made a study of personal mail from Czechoslovakia and on the basis of this information concludes that Christmas 1962 in Czechoslovakia was the worst since 1945, the first postwar Christmas when the country was left bare by the Nazis.

In their letters, Czechoslovak citizens complain: "If one is not young enough and strong enough to queue up for hours from very early morning for a ration of 4 ounces of butter and 1 pound of margarine, there is nothing left within a few hours. Electricity is shut off early. Prague streets are dark. Trains are unheated. There is a fuel shortage. In the mining town of Kladno near Prague, people stood in line for 20 pounds of coal, which they had to carry home in sacks, when and if they got any. Water pipes are frozen, but former plumbers are not allowed to take house calls and repair the damage; instead, people must wait until a government agency assigns a workman to the job. Since industry, farms, business, and professions have all been expropriated without compensation by the government and are government-owned and operated, government agencies alone decide what should be done, by whom, for whom, and when, if at all. Consequently, the average citizen waits for weeks for the repair of pipes, furnace, roof or crumbling wall. Should he wish to repair it himself, he is not given the material with which to do it, not even a bag of cement.

Service to customers is also very poor as there is no business competition and personal initiative. One waits for weeks, even for months, for a suit to be cleaned and shoes to be resoled. The quality of goods is far inferior to what it used to be. Despite the fact that every able-bodied—and not so able-bodied—man and woman are hard at work, there is a scarcity of almost everything and the prices of consumer goods are very high.

The reason for this is Red Czechoslovakia's foreign policy: acting as a spearhead for the Soviet Union, the Prague regime gives considerable economic aid to the underdeveloped and neutralist countries the Soviets are trying to woo to their side. This is why the Prague regime has been supplying Castro with food, considerable technical aid, and arms. In return, Czechoslovakia has received some unwanted Cuban sugar, for Czechoslovakia herself has always been a heavy exporter of beet sugar.

Most of all, people lament the loss of freedom in their letters to American friends: "There is work for everyone, but that is all we have. Nothing is as it used to be. We have only our memories." Families with young children are afraid to attend church in their hometown because their son and daughter would be barred from a higher school of learning and from a better job. The letters reflect the weariness, apathy, and despair of the writer.

American relatives are anxious to send gift packages of American goods to their close of kin. It would be simple for a daughter to send a warm sweater to her mother in Czechoslovakia who writes: "My room is unheated and it is so cold that I stay in bed and cry myself to sleep. A wool sweater is not to be had and a cotton sweater isn't worth anything." The Communists have made it impossible, however, for Americans to send gift packages by placing in 1961 an astronomical duty on new goods and an almost prohibitive duty of 50 crowns on a kilo of used clothing (approximately $7 for 2.2 pounds; hourly wage of average officeworker is 6 crowns; of farmworker as little as 12 crowns a day).

The Red regime has a definite purpose in mind: to squeeze dollars out of Americans. If Americans wish to help their needy Czechoslovak relatives, they must send dollars to the Red regime with which Czechoslovak citizens can then buy Czechoslovak goods, if and when available, in a government store called Tuzex.

The Red regime then has dollars for anti-American propaganda and Communist subversion in Latin America and elsewhere in the world. In view of these facts it is hard to understand why our Government is so careful to observe strictly all the niceties and why it has not restricted the Red government monopoly which bars American goods. After all, we are in a strong position for we have the dollars. We could insist, for instance, on gift packages of American goods (limited in size and value) if we continue to send dollars (unlimited, so far) and to travel to Czechoslovakia with unlimited spending money. In order to curtail the flow of American dollars abroad, the United States limits its citizens on how much they can bring back into this country duty free and exacts other limitations on its citizens as well. Why not set up reciprocity regulations or limitations when dealing with the Reds?

So far, Americans of Czechoslovakia have been asking this question in vain.

DISAGREEMENT ON MAJOR DEFENSE DECISIONS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, this morning at the military posture hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I asked General Taylor, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff two questions.

I ask unanimous consent that those questions be placed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the questions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Questions of Senator Margaret Chase Smith to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 1963 Defense Posture Hearings, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate

1. General Taylor, I would appreciate it if you would tell this committee on what major decisions of the Secretary of Defense—or the President—with respect to national defense and weapons systems, a majority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are in disagreement with the Secretary of Defense or the President—or were at any time in disagreement with either of them—and the reasons for any such disagreement.

2. I was prepared to ask you many questions just as I directed many questions to the Secretary of Defense, but before coming to the hearing this morning I read the current issue of U.S. News & World Report—specifically the article entitled "'Whiz Kids' Versus Military Men: Who Is Shaping Defense?" at pages 46 and 47.

I would appreciate your reading that article if you have not already done so—and giving this committee in written form your appraisal of the article as to whether it is accurate or inaccurate—and if it is inaccurate in what specific respects—before these hearings are closed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EULOGIES OF DECEASED SENATORS ON MARCH 1

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that Friday, March 1, will be devoted to eulogies of our late departed colleagues, Senator Dworshak, Senator Kerr, and Senator Chavez. I ask unanimous consent that on that sad occasion there be a limitation of 1 hour on remarks, speeches, and eulogies on each of our departed colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 90) amending rule XXV of the standing rules of the Senate relating to standing committees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the time now under control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 12 o'clock noon having arrived, the order of February 20 becomes effective; and debate on the so-called Clark amendments, as set forth in Senate Resolutions 91 to 93, to the so-called Mansfield-Dirksen resolution, Senate Resolution 90, will now proceed under a 2-hour limitation, in controlled time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I desire to modify further Senate Resolution 90, by transposing to page 17, line 23, after the word "Operations," the following language, preceded and followed by a comma, beginning on line 25, namely: "as well as any Senator who is appointed temporarily to fill any vacancy arising out of this proviso."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in connection with that modification, I wish to emphasize again and again the word "temporarily."

I also wish to make the following routine corrections in subsection numbers, due to arrangement of committees in alphabetical order, namely:

On page 6, in line 16 strike out "c" and insert "d". On page 15, in line 24, and on page 16, in line 5, strike out "n" and insert "o".

On page 17, in line 22, after "Sciences," strike out the word "and" and insert the word "or".

On page 4, in line 1, amend section "2" to read as follows:

2. The Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force generally.

Strike out section "3.", and renumber succeeding sections accordingly.

On page 4, in line 9, amend section "7." to read as follows:

Size and composition of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modifications will be made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I reserve the balance of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time required for it to be chargeable to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask whether the Senate is under controlled time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is under controlled time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who is acting as floor leader for his amendments, I yield not to exceed 2 minutes to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA].

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, human life is too high a price to pay for the empty propaganda of the American Medical Association. I am certain that every Member of Congress will be as shocked as I have been over a tragedy which we might have prevented.

Shortly before Christmas, two older Americans, Henry and Irene Jaggi, committed suicide in Hallandale, Fla., because, according to an editorial I have in my hand, they were overwhelmed with hospital and medical expenses and could not see any way of coping with them.

This tragedy was the subject of a compassionate editorial in the Daytona Beach Sunday News Journal. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SUFFICIENT UNTO THE DAY"

Shortly before the holiday which preceded the one the Christian world will observe Tuesday, there was an occurrence in Florida which put a pall of depression over the reason for thanksgiving.

In an apartment at Hallandale, north of Miami, a man and wife were found dead—her body sprawled across a bed, his found crouched on the floor, his hands still clasped around her lifeless feet.

His position indicated that in the last moment of their lives, he was trying to give her comfort and assurance.

The couple had comfort—material comfort—but they did not have assurance.

Otherwise, surely, they would not have entered into a suicide pact.

Their story is a harsh one to be telling in the Christmas season because Christmas is celebrated as a symbol of life, not death. It is a time of rejoicing, of forgetting care and sorrow momentarily, of bright lights and shining young faces.

But it is a story which needs to be told when it can be shocking—told now in order to get its message through before Congress reconvenes next month.

That Congress, yet an unknown quantity because it is a new one, could act at least to wipe out the cause for the Hallandale tragedy. At least, it should be used to offset the great pressure that is to be used by one organized group to prevent Congress from acting on the problem.

Why did the couple in Hallandale decide to quit this world via the medium of taking an overdose of sleeping pills?

They left notes which poignantly gave the reason, some stated, some read between the lines.

Beside the notes was a mass of accumulated doctor and hospital bills, some paid, some unpaid. In fact, the major paid ones among them were for the services of doctors; the biggest unpaid one was for the wife's most recent stay in a Fort Lauderdale hospital. Canceled checks also recorded payments for quantities of drugs used to ease the pain of illness.

The notes, addressed to their daughter, asked forgiveness for their act. But, the notes indicated, the step simply had to be taken because they could not meet those unpaid bills now, and they could not see their way to do it in the future and still pay for the other essentials of life.

Police didn't reveal whether the notes—from both the husband and the wife—also said they did not want to be a burden on their daughter and granddaughter, also an adult. Quite possibly the parents had rationalized their suicides thus, else they would have been living with their daughter now that her own child was grown and married.

As you can see, these people are a cause for the administration's projected medicare program—a plan that would take care of society's neglect of its nearly 17 million elderly people in their last days on earth. The Hallandale couple affords stark and dual evidence of the need to give the elderly help in their loneliness and despair.

Will it be done in 1963?

The question is necessary because just south of Hallandale lives Dr. Edward Annis, president now of the American Medical Association, and the organization's leading spokesman in opposition to such assistance—to any kind of medical help that would not include the purchase of private medical insurance.

AMA put on a big drive in November to defeat all candidates who indicated they might approve of medicare or were solidly for it. Mostly, the political campaign failed. Too many people have become weary of the kind of opposition being used by organized doctors, and they failed to heed the fear ridden arguments.

A postelection survey of the cause of failure led Annis to this explanation: "The siren songs of the politicans were more appealing than the voices of reason and experience." And: "Although the AMA's public relations reserves were substantial, they were not sufficient."

He addressed a meeting of the Public Relations Society of America in Boston last month, and he said AMA is planning a massive "public relations war" in advance of Congress being asked again to pass medicare as part of the social security program. So still more money will be poured into the coffers of AMA in order to have a "sufficient" amount with which to conduct a still more subtle war against "politicians."

(The Nation sorely needs more doctors to quicken the competition and to hold down their cost. But it also needs politicians—it is the politician who interests himself in government and keeps our free political system going. Would Dr. Annis dispense with them—or only those willing to bow to certain lobbying and pressure groups?)

Christians—in fact, all Floridians—can hope Dr. Annis stumbles across the story of the tragedy in Hallandale, and, pondering it, question whether he is giving AMA proper leadership.

Will he think of the couple's loneliness in those last hours of life, and wonder at the thoughts of the husband as he pressed his lips to the feet of his dying wife?

On Tuesday, particularly, we only can hope Dr. Annis may find a new definition of the word "sufficient" as he thinks of the debt-ridden couple who did not want to be a burden to the young, but whose hopes for future relief had been dashed by pressure on the last Congress by a special interest group.

Perhaps, then, Dr. Annis would use the word along these lines: "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." And the new Congress would not feel the pressure from money spent on a public relations war to perpetuate a great social evil in America.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, a great nation cannot countenance such tragedies and retain its self-respect. We cannot delay any longer. We must enact, now, a program of hospital and related benefits under social security, a program such as would be provided under my bill, S. 65, or the administration's bill, S. 880, introduced last week by our colleague the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO STANDING COMMITTEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 90) amending rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to standing committees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum and that the time for the call of the roll be charged to both sides. If the sponsor of the amendments is not on the floor shortly, I shall have to ask, unfortunately, for a live quorum and give up a lot of my own time in the process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none; and, without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], I request that the Senator from Pennsylvania speak first and that I may be permitted to conclude this debate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, of course, that is the privilege of the majority leader. My understanding is that, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate is to vote at 2 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not later than 2 o'clock.

Mr. CLARK. How much time does the majority leader desire to speak at the end?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We each have 42½ minutes left, I believe, and I would like 42½ minutes, or 10 minutes, or even 35 minutes, in order that I may yield for questions. I would like all that time because I have some remarks to make. When I get through with them, I would like to yield for questions.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator desire to utilize the whole time himself?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator will excuse me if I ruminate, will he not, because I had not anticipated this position.

Mr. MANSFIELD. While the Senator from Pennsylvania ruminates, I may state to him that, so far as the majority leader is concerned, it is not his intention to ask for a rollcall on any of the Clark resolutions in the nature of amendments or the resolution itself.

Mr. CLARK. I think the majority leader will understand what I have in mind when I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will it come out of the time of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Pennsylvania suggested the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to address a question to the able Senator from Pennsylvania before he suggests the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator would like to have it come out of my time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It looks as if it is coming out of the time of both of us.

Mr. KUCHEL. Two or three of us are going to be absent who would like to be recorded if there is to be a yea-and-nay vote. Under those circumstances, on the vote, if the roll is to be called at 2 o'clock, I would like to have a little time.

Mr. CLARK. It was in order to accommodate to that situation, having come to the floor for the first time from an important committee meeting, that I wanted to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Whose time is this coming out of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Out of the time of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How much time does the Senator from Montana have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 44 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 31 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I understand that the resolution before the Senate is Senate Resolution 93, which would increase the membership of the Committee on Finance from 17 to 21. I rise in support of that resolution.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The three amendments proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania are before the Senate, with the right of the Senator from Pennsylvania to withdraw any one or all of them.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up Senate Resolution 93, dealing with the Committee on Finance, and I ask that the first vote be on that resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In Senate Resolution 90, on page 7, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "seventeen" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-one."

Mr. CLARK. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment carries with it also the implicit assumption that the membership of the committee will be composed of 14 Democrats and 7 Republicans, instead of the present composition of 11 Democrats and 6 Republicans.

The first argument for increasing the membership is that the membership of the various committees should reflect the approximate distribution of the parties in the Senate itself.

There are now 67 Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle and 33 on the Republican side of the aisle. Therefore the party ratio, as officially declared, is slightly in excess of 2 to 1. However, the composition of the Finance Committee under the proposal advanced by the Senator from Montana and the Democratic steering committee would not be 2 to 1, but 11 to 6. Therefore it seems to me that a very strong case can be made for enlarging the membership to 21, so that the parties may be represented on the committee in proportion to their membership on the floor of the Senate and that we may avoid having an even numbered committee, which may result in deadlocks; and, instead, produce an odd-numbered committee, so that the committee can come to definite decisions.

A little mental arithmetic shows that 14 to 7, with a total of 21, is the only figure which meets these two requirements.

Therefore, I believe a conclusive case can be made for enlarging the membership of the Finance Committee from 17 to 21.

Of course this is not all of the story. As I tried to point out in my remarks of last Thursday, in reality, there are in the Senate, not two political parties, but four. First, there are the liberal and progressive Democrats of the North and West, who try to be loyal to the national platform of the Democratic Party and to the general program of the President, although reserving the right to disagree on certain issues.

The second party is that of the conservative Democrats, who certainly disagree with the platform of the party on civil rights, and generally on economic and financial matters, as well.

The third political party is that of the conservative Republicans—they form the overwhelming mass of the Republican Party in both the Senate and House.

Finally, there is the small but gallant band of liberal Republicans.

These are the four political parties. I should think that certainly on the question of civil rights the liberal Democrats plus the liberal Republicans probably comprise a majority of the Senate, and I believe that on basic economic issues they also comprise a majority of the Senate.

But the Senate has been dominated for a great many years in the past by a coalition of the conservative Democrats and the conservative Republicans. This has been possible because of the very close cooperation between the two groups. As the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] brought out in his very able and commendable address of last week, the machinery of the Democratic Party in the Senate is almost entirely in the hands of the conservative Democrats.

The Committee on Finance will be perhaps the most important committee in the Senate during this Congress. Through it will pass the tax measures. Through it will pass proposals for hospital and medical care for the aged. These are the two most important issues at present scheduled for action.

I have been a member of the Committee on Finance for some 7 years. I have been treated with conspicuous courtesy and fairness by the chairman of that committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I have had pleasant associations with others upon that body. At times, our disputes became quite heated, but I have enjoyed my associations on that committee. I have appreciated the personal treatment which I have received.

However, it is an open secret that the Republicans on the Committee on Finance present a virtually solid front, and that on virtually every basic and fundamental issue enough of the Democrats side with the Republicans so that they hold a secure majority in the committee itself.

It is always ungracious to classify people. I do not like to be classified myself. I like to think that I judge individual issues on their merits. I certainly do not charge every member of the Committee on Finance with having fixed and unalterable opinions. There is always hope. But I think it is fair to say that of the present composition of the committee, there are at a very minimum four Democratic votes which on virtually all occasions will side with the six Republicans. I may be wrong in that belief, but I think that is a conservative estimate, giving the benefit of the doubt to one or two individuals. So I should say that the vote on these basic matters of principle will be at least 10 to 7, possibly 11 to 6, and that on this decision really hangs whether the program of the President will be enacted.

We all know the prestige which a report from the committee has upon Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Illinois 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is always a given percentage of Senators who will accept the decisions of the majority of a committee, and those who oppose the decision of the committee start from an extremely disadvantageous position. So we face an issue not merely as to whether the composition of the committee is to conform to the party position of the Senate. The basic issue we face is whether the program of the National Democratic Party and of the President of the United States will be put into effect, or whether it will be smothered to death, asphyxiated, crippled, and enfeebled in the Committee on Finance. That is the issue; we cannot avoid it or disguise it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Democrat Joe," written by James Reston, and published in the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin of February 24, 1963; an editorial entitled "Unrepresentative Senate," published in the Washington Post of February 20, 1963; and an editorial entitled "For History's Sake," published in the Washington Post of February 22, 1963.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin, Feb. 24, 1963]

DEMOCRAT JOE

(By James Reston)

Washington, February 23.—One of the most attractive things about Washington is that every once in a while somebody stands right up and tells the truth, just to see what will happen.

Take Joe Clark. He's a Senator from Pennsylvania. As such, he's supposed to accept the rules of the club, respect the leaders of the Senate establishment, and defend the Senate as "the greatest deliberative body in the world."

But not Joe. He got right up in the Senate the other day and attacked the whole system. He even suggested that the Democrats in the Senate ought to introduce a little democracy into their proceedings, and what he said about "the establishment" was even more daring.

QUITE UNRESPONSIVE

"The Senate establishment, as I see it," said Joe, "is almost the antithesis of democracy. It is not selected by any democratic process. It appears to be quite unresponsive to the caucuses of the two parties, be they Republican or Democratic. It is what might be called a self-perpetuating oligarchy with mild, but only mild, overtones of plutocracy."

Of course, this is very largely true and it helps explain why President Kennedy won a victory in the Senate races last November but hasn't got anything out of the Senate since.

The facts are clear enough. In the last election, the Democrats increased their liberal wing in the Senate—Nelson, of Wisconson; McGovern, of South Dakota; Bayh, of Indiana; Kennedy, of Massachusetts—and now outnumber the Republicans, 68 to 32.

This was a net gain of four Democrats, and Clark had the original idea that the liberal gains should be reflected in the Democratic steering committee, which has the immense power of recommending committee assignments for all Democratic Members of the Senate.

In 1961 and again at the start of the present 88th Congress in January, the Democratic Members of the Senate, meeting in conference, approved a statement by the Senate Democratic leader, Mike Mansfield, that "the composition of the Democratic steering committee should reflect both the geographical distribution and the ideological views of the Members of the Senate.

This, however, was not done.

Clark estimates that there are 28 conservative Democrats and 40 liberal Democrats in the Senate, and that northern and western Democratic Senators outnumber southern Democratic Senators. But 7 of the 15 members of the powerful steering committee are southerners, and with the addition of 2 conservative Democratic members from elsewhere, the conservatives dominate the steering committee, 9–6.

Efforts to change this situation failed in a vote of all the Democratic Senators, and "they failed largely, I think," said Clark, "because the leadership announced against it and spoke against it in conference and threw the full impact of its undoubted moral authority against what, to me, at least, seems to be this badly needed reform."

It is not hard to analyze why the liberal Democratic leaders, Mansfield and Humphrey, rejected the reform. Seven of the nine conservatives on the steering committee are also chairmen of other key Senate committees:

Senator Bible, of Nevada, is chairman of the District of Columbia Committee; Senator Ellender, of Louisiana, Agriculture and Forestry; Senator Hayden, of Arizona, Appropriations; Senator Johnston, of South Carolina, Post Office and Civil Service; Senator McClellan, of Arkansas, Government Operations; Senator Robertson, of Virginia, Banking and Currency; and Senator Russell, of Georgia, Armed Services.

The other two conservatives on the steering committee are Smathers and Holland, both of Florida.

Clark didn't want to kick any of these eminent gentlemen off the steering committee; he just wanted to make the committee larger to get a better break for the northern liberals. But he was voted down and he's still growling.

He even went so far as to look into the committee assignments recommended by the steering committee, and came up with these interesting statistics: Of 8 nonfreshman Senators who voted against changing the present filibuster rule in the Senate, 6 were assigned to the Senate committee of their first choice, but of the 14 nonfreshman Senators who voted to liberalize the filibuster rule, only 1 got the committee of his choice.

PUT INTO THE RECORD

Of course, Clark didn't say that the conservatives were being rewarded by the steering committee or the liberals punished, but all the same, he thought the figures were interesting enough to go into the Congressional Record.

This is what adds spice to the capital—somebody always fighting for lost causes.

Politics was first defined as "the art of preventing people from minding their own business" and then as "the art of forcing people to decide things they don't understand." Joe Clark is less cynical. He persists in thinking that democracy should have a chance, even in the Democratic Party in the Senate.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1963]

UNREPRESENTATIVE SENATE

Majority Leader Mansfield's impatience over the continued wrangling in the Senate is quite understandable and will be widely shared. After 5 weeks of filibustering, maneuvering, and quarreling over committee assignments, the Senate ought to settle down to its legislative business. It would be a mistake, however, merely to sweep under the rug the deficiencies which Senator Clark and some of his colleagues have brought to light.

No doubt the majority leader is right in saying that these weaknesses cannot be corrected now. Nevertheless, Senator Clark has made a powerful case for changes in the Senate's control mechanism with the object of making it a more responsible legislative body. Despite the overwhelming preponderance of Democrats, and the liberal leanings of a substantial majority of them, the Senate is still dominated in large measure by a loose coalition of conservative Democrats and Republicans. The liberals have not yet succeeded in making their influence felt in proportion to their numbers.

Mr. Clark's analysis of the situation in the Democratic steering committee was very enlightening. This 15-man leadership committee of the dominant party consists of seven members from the South, three from the Northeast, three from the Pacific, and Mountain States, and two from the Midwest. By Senator Clark's classification, nine of these steering committee members are conservatives and only six liberals who can be generally counted on to support measures sponsored by the Kennedy administration. Since there are about 40 "Kennedy Democrats" in the Senate, this makes the steering committee, which assigns Senators to all the legislative committees, highly unrepresentative of the Democratic Senate membership. "I suggest in all candor," Mr. Clark said, "that * * * the present membership of the steering committee accordingly does not fairly represent either the geography or the ideology of the Democratic membership of the Senate."

The Senator's other prize example of the Senate's unresponsiveness to what happened at the polls last November is the Finance Committee. This most powerful committee of the Senate has 11 Democrats and 6 Republicans, a ratio slightly more favorable to the minority than is justified by its membership of 33 out of the 100 Senators. There is also a disproportionate number of southern Democrats on the committee. Mr. Clark was not exaggerating when he charged that the Finance Committee lineup does not reflect the views of the entire Senate but rather those of the "well-known conservative bipartisan coalition opposed to the President of the United States."

It was for this reason that Senator Clark proposed, and is still fighting for, the addition of two members to the Finance Committee. His proposal is entirely reasonable, but the cards are stacked against him. Apparently the only hope for achievement of the basic reforms that Mr. Clark and his colleagues are seeking lies in the creation of a new committee or commission on the organization of Congress to make a detailed study aimed at moderation of both the Senate and the House. This is the project toward which the major efforts of the liberal forces should be directed.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1963]

FOR HISTORY'S SAKE

In his major complaint over the obsolescence of the Senate's operations, Senator Clark made a commendable effort to open some of that body's secret files. Why, he asked, should the minutes of the Senate's Democratic steering committee remain indefinitely under lock and key? Why should the members of even Senate staffs be denied access to the proceedings of the Democratic conferences? Senator Clark made clear that he is advocating, not open meetings of the steering committee and the party conferences, but only a relatively mild relaxation of the present secrecy.

These records, the Senator rightly said, are a part of the history of our times. Mr. Clark was especially perturbed because he had to go to the office of the secretary of the majority and get the books unlocked before he could read what happened in the days of Woodrow Wilson. Even the State Department discloses its confidential documents after a reasonable lapse of time. Certainly it would not be unreasonable for the congressional party groups which meet behind closed doors to open their records to the public as well as to senatorial staffs after a reasonable interval. Senator Clark suggested from 3 months to a year.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this has been a very interesting controversy over committee places, mainly because we have been engaged in an unusual review of the internal activities of the majority party. It is a fact that the total Senate must vote upon the number of places and upon the designations to these places, but this rarely is in practice too meaningful to Senators other than those of the majority, because the majority agrees and is then at one and can work its will. This is respected as normal party function.

However, we are confronted with an unusual situation, in which members of the majority have come forward with some very interesting revelations. The most interesting and important, so far as I am concerned, is the one relating to the factual analysis which, as the Senator from Pennsylvania points out, demonstrates that Senators who favored a rule XXII change—and that includes me—suffered the most seriously in the reshuffling of committee places, as compared with Senators who did not favor such a rules change.

I understand perfectly the attitude of the Senator from Pennsylvania in reading no motives into anything, because he has no evidence, beyond what he experienced in his party's deliberations, on which to do so. I naturally have even less than that, not having participated in those deliberations. Hence I have taken the position that these are the vicissitudes of political and public life. Although there were other ways to realine committees, those ways were not chosen. We cannot refrain from taking cognizance, first, of the fact that those who were in the rules fight suffered; and, second, of the natural feeling of confusion on the part of people in my State about what occurred. The Governor of my State issued a statement on February 15, commenting on this matter, setting forth how displeased the State was that one of its Senators was dropped from the Committee on Appropriations by virtue of the reduction in numbers in the Republican membership on the committee, and then stating:

> I believe the people of New York State will join with me in protesting this arbitrary, politically motivated discrimination against them.

Under these circumstances, taking these two facts together, it seems to me that I must take my position with those who seek to change the conditions which brought about this situation, in which those who were advocating a rules change allegedly felt the heavy hand of adverse selection in their committee places, as compared with those who were not advocating a rules change. It seems to me that simply the spirit of cooperation with those who worked with me in the rules fight, which we considered to be in the Nation's interest, dictates that I stand together with those who would change those conditions.

Hence, I shall support the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself as much of the time remaining to me as I may require.

On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of last week I undertook to make my case on the floor of the Senate with respect to the need to change the size of three Senate committees, in order to enable Senators who support, in general, the program of the President, and who, in particular, were denied seats on these committees, to which, in my opinion, in equity and justice they were entitled, to join those committees.

I shall now very briefly summarize the case I attempted to make.

My proposal, which is pending, is to increase the size of the Finance Committee from 17—consisting of 11 Democrats and 6 Republicans—to 21, 14 Democrats and 7 Republicans. I believe this change to be highly desirable, for three reasons:

First, to bring the ratio between the Republican members and the Democratic members more nearly into line with the more than 2-to-1 majority which the Democrats presently have in the Senate—that is to say, 67 Democratic Senators and 33 Republican Senators.

Mr. President, what valid excuse can there be for leaving the ratio on the Finance Committee 11 to 6, or substantially less than 2 to 1? This committee is one of the most important of the Senate's committees. It will have before it most important proposals recommended by the President. The committee presently is controlled—as was so well pointed out by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas]—by a conservative coalition composed of southern Democratic Senators and western and northern Republican Senators, so that it does not represent the will of the majority of the Senate, nor will it, in my opinion, honest and able though each of these Senators is. I do not challenge the integrity of any Senator, nor do I challenge the sincerity of any Senator's economic views, but this committee does not represent the country or the majority of the Senate. For that reason, to maintain the present ratio with the present membership of that committee is, in my opinion, unsound and unwise.

My second reason is to make additional seats available to Senators who are entitled to them on the basis of their records in the Senate—whether by seniority or otherwise. Seniority was ignored nine times in the assignments made by members of the Democratic steering committee, who themselves rule by seniority. Yet, Mr. President, when it seemed to them desirable to ignore seniority, they did so.

I do not challenge the motivation or impugn the good faith of anyone. All I say is that those who live by seniority should be prepared to die by it, if as a result their own position is going to be adversely affected. I suggest they should allow others to live by the same rule which they have so often invoked in support of their own position.

Let me say that, on other occasions, the size of the Finance Committee has been substantially larger than it presently is—and, indeed, larger than my proposal would make it. As recently as 1937, the Finance Committee consisted of 21 members—in other words, the same size I now propose to make it. So in this body, so devoted to precedent, there is excellent precedent for changing the size of the Finance Committee.

My third reason is to open the committee's membership to Senators who will support the programs of the President, particularly his programs with respect to taxes and medicare. I believe the power of the Executive should be increased to the extent necessary to make it possible for the legislature to give the Executive fair consideration of all measures which the Executive sends to the legislature—in short, Mr. President, that, in effect, the President should be entitled to a hearing on all the bills he favors before the appropriate committees, and before committees which properly represent the membership of the Senate, and whose membership is not based solely and alone upon the power of such a coalition as that referred to to control these important committees.

The Senate establishment opposed this proposed change. If the Senate establishment wins—and I am under no illusion in regard to this matter—I submit that the present sterile, ultraconservative control of the Finance Committee will be continued, and that the programs of the President will be crippled, if not actually destroyed.

Mr. President, let me ask how much time remains available to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the great historian, Arnold J. Toynbee, in his massive study of history, has pointed out that a civilization advances when it is under the control of a creative minority, and that civilization decays when the minority—which to date has controlled all civilizations, and, indeed, controls ours today—is not creative, but merely is dominant, when it supports the status quo, when it is intent only on preserving power, not on advancing a forward-looking civilization, which must advance with its time.

Mr. President, I submit that today there is in the Senate a creative majority which must sooner or later wrest control from the dominant minority, if the Senate is to play its proper constitutional part in our Government's efforts to keep America moving forward in a world of change and crisis. I submit that the Senate cannot afford to stand still while every other governmental institution in the world is moving ahead to meet the challenges of our time.

Something has been said about "packing" a committee. I have said before, and I repeat now, that neither I nor any of the Senators who support the position I take is attempting to engage in a "packing" movement. This is an effort to "unstack" the committee, which presently is "stacked" against the President's supporters in the Senate.

I hope Senators will vote against keeping the clock turned back to suit the wishes of a small minority which is out of touch with the facts of modern life.

Mr. President, this controversy may seem to some to be a mere haggle over procedure. But I submit that procedure is the heart of liberty and the heart of freedom; and I submit that until the Senate frees itself from the outmoded and archaic procedures under which it is governed, there can be little hope for the enactment of a meaningful legislative program.

I call the attention of Senators and the attention of the press and the attention of the public generally to what I regard as a very pertinent quotation from one who has thought deeply about the survival of Western civilization. I refer to Sir C. P. Snow, of England. In his brilliant Reed lecture entitled "The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution," after expressing his grave concern that the Western democracies were not moving ahead fast enough to meet the challenges of our time—not fast enough to deal with the problem of nuclear warfare, and not fast enough to bridge the gap in their alliances and to move forward in the interest of freedom—he said:

> More often than I like, I am saddened by a historical myth. Whether the myth is good history or not, doesn't matter; it is pressing enough for me. I can't help thinking of the Venetian Republic in their last half-century. Like us, they had once been fabulously lucky. They had become rich, as we did, by accident. They had acquired immense political skill, just as we have. A good many of them were tough-minded, realistic, patriotic men. They knew, just as clearly as we know, that the current of history had begun to flow against them. Many of them gave their minds to working out ways to keep going. It would have meant breaking the pattern into which they had crystallised. They were fond of the pattern, just as we—

In the Senate—

> are fond of ours. They never found the will to break it.

Mr. President, may the Senate find the will to break the pattern before it is too late.

I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the motion before the Senate to increase the size of the Committee on Finance. The majority leader has indicated that he does not desire a yea and nay vote on either the change that he has proposed in the rule or any of mine. Unless some other Senator forces it, I am not willing to put Senators into what essentially would be an embarrassing position. I know there is no chance of victory.

Mr. President, this is the first Battle of Bull Run. Those of us who wish to modernize the Senate and make it capable of performing its constitutional obligations in a time of great stress, in a time of constant change, and in a time of recurring crises, are going to get licked. But the fight will continue. It will continue until it is won.

The reception in the press and with the public has been far more favorable toward my efforts and those of my colleagues than is the case in the Senate. I shall continue to press, with those who desire to update and streamline the Senate, for the changes of the rules which are now pending in the Committee on Rules and Administration, on which I now have the honor to serve. From time to time we shall bring before the Senate Senate Resolution 9 in order to shock the conscience of the Senate into a realization that it is unethical, wrong, and immoral to deny the right to vote to 56 Senators who desire to change our own rules.

Mr. President, the fight will go on, and one day it will be won.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has indicated that he will not ask for a yea-and-nay vote. I would ask the Senate to concur in that suggestion because I feel that the sooner we face the business now before the Senate and decide it one way or the other, the better off we shall be.

Let me say at the outset that the Senator from Pennsylvania has acted entirely within his rights in pursuing the matter which he has been discussing on the floor for the past week. He has been doing what any Senator may do and many have done when they are obsessed with one of the many issues which lie within the purview of the Senate.

I am sure the Senator's intentions are of the best and that there was no thought in his mind of attacking the Senator from Montana. Nevertheless, his remarks, in some respects, constitute a reflection direct or indirect on the caliber if not the intent of the leadership. For that, I bear him no rancor. He is entitled to his views. He is entitled to express them in caucus, on the floor of the Senate or wherever his discretion may lead him to express them.

Insofar as the Senator's remarks of the past week concern the rules of the Senate, I reiterate what I have said on a number of occasions: There is nothing sacrosanct in the rules. They are not beyond discussion or change. They have been changed before and, indeed, we are about to amend a rule, today, one way or another.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has performed a useful service by suggesting from time to time, in the past, reforms which he believes will render more efficient and more responsive the operation of the Senate. His election to the Rules Committee, which I was delighted to support in the steering committee, offers him an opportunity to pursue this matter in the most appropriate forum and I hope, most sincerely, that he will do so.

In fact, I know that he will. But the Senator's remarks in the past week were not primarily directed at the rules—the written rules—which however wise or foolish, however antiquated or modern, apply equally to all Members. To be sure, the Senator touched on these matters in passing, but only in passing. He aimed his fire at the organization of the democratic majority of which he is a member and he tilted his lance at something which he termed the "Senate establishment."

Since I do not know what the Senator from Pennsylvania means by the Senate establishment—although I followed his remarks most carefully—I can neither join him in criticism of it or rise to defend it. I can only say, as I have said many times, one Senator, one voice, one vote. We are all equal here, and insofar as the majority leader is concerned, he has operated in good conscience, under that principle. There is only one establishment in the Senate which the majority leadership seeks to foster. That is an establishment of 51 votes on behalf of the President's program. And whenever the Senator from Pennsylvania can assure him of 51 votes for that purpose, the Senator from Montana will be only too happy to support him for the presidency of the 51 club.

Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania is within his rights when he tilts his lance and charges at the windmills of evil which he perceives in the Senate. But so, too, is the Senator from Montana when he objects to finding himself, his leadership and his party, at the end of the charge, impaled upon the point. For what is the burden of the Senator's attack if it is not his disapproval of his own party? If I interpret his remarks correctly, he makes two principal points:

First, that the organization of the Senate, which is controlled by the Democratic majority in the caucus, has been carried out in a deliberately inequitable, if not a vindictively inequitable, pattern against what he would term the liberal group of Democrats;

Second, that it would be feasible to organize the majority and the Senate in a pattern much more conducive to the passage of the President's program and that in failing to do so the leadership has failed the President.

May I say to the Senator that he is right on both counts and he is wrong, very wrong on both counts. Each Democratic Senator defines the needs of the Democratic Party in terms of his own dictionary. The Senator from Pennsylvania has his dictionary and according to his dictionary he is right. But I remind the Senator that he is not using the same book as the Senator from Missouri or the Senator from Texas or the Senator from Georgia. Yet all are Democrats, and their States helped to elect a Democratic President. According to the Senator from Pennsylvania, the organization of the majority in the Senate is inequitable. According to these other Members it may also be inequitable in another way.

According to the Senator from Pennsylvania, the organization is equitable when he is elected to the Committee on Rules and Administration but it is inequitable when it does not place him on the Foreign Relations Committee. The organization is equitable when it places the majority leader or the whip on the Appropriations Committee but it is not equitable when it places the Senator from Alaska on the same committee.

The organization is not equitable when it does not change the total membership of the Foreign Relations. But it would be equitable if it added several members to the committee and, I presume, accommodated the wishes of the Senator from Pennsylvania as regards his membership on it. It is inequitable when it follows the principle of seniority or ignores the principle of seniority in an appointment of which the Senator does not approve. And it is equitable either way if the result is an appointment of which he does approve.

I would say to the Senator that the decisions in these matters are never easy. What is meat for one Senator is another's poison. But the decisions have to be made. In the last analysis, the responsibility rests with the conference to see that equity is done for the steering committee and the leadership are but its creatures.

May I say that the Senator from Pennsylvania has had every encouragement from the leadership and every opportunity to test his concepts of equity. His concepts have been rejected time and again, in the steering committee and by the conference.

That is not to say that the concepts are wrong in an historical sense. The Senator from Pennsylvania may have some mysterious wisdom which enables him to determine what is right for the Demorcatic Party—a wisdom which is denied to ordinary Democrats. But wise or not, his concepts of equity are clearly not applicable in this Senate of the 88th Congress, not because an establishment has ordained it but because the votes of his colleagues deny their applicability.

As for his concepts on committee reorganization, again I would point out that the Senator from Pennsylvania has had every opportunity to test his proposals time and again in caucus and in steering committee, and repeatedly they have been rejected.

Yet, one cannot study the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania without gaining the impression that he believes these tests were unfair to him, and, in particular, that the leadership was unfair. It is as though he believes that if the majority leader had but waved his baton in the direction of the good and the true according to the doctrine of the Senator from Pennsylvania, the results would have been different. The Senator from Montana has his views on the matters at issue. Sometimes they agree with those of the Senator from Pennsylvania and sometimes they do not.

But whether they agree or disagree, it would be well to get straight what is involved in the baton which rests in the hands of the majority leadership. I can assure the Senator that there is no magic in it. I cannot recall that the Senator from Pennsylvania once suggested strengthening this baton, in the steering committee or in the caucus. I cannot recall his proposing, for example, that the majority leader be assigned full authority for deciding the majority party position on organization or on committee assignments. Yet somehow he suggests that the majority leader has this authority in his baton. Well, Mr. President, what is the power in this baton that the majority leader is supposed to wave on organizations and assignments? In specifics, it is the power of appointment, after consultation with the other members of the leadership and with the concurrence of the caucus, to fill vacancies on the steering committee and the policy committee. It includes, too, one vote—I reiterate—one vote on each committee. That is all that there is in this baton in connection with the question at issue. How has the Senator from Montana used these great powers in his 2 years of tenure as majority leader?

He has used it to appoint the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to the steering committee. I know these appointments pleased the Senator from Pennsylvania but I cannot in all honesty claim that I made them for that purpose. They were made solely for the purpose of carrying out the instructions of the conference to which the majority leader is answerable. But pleased though he may be with the appointments, still the Senator from Pennsylvania is not satisfied. What more would he have the Senator from Montana do? Since there are no mysterious powers of which I am aware in the leadership, what else is there for him to do? Would he have the majority leader make campaign speeches or deals for the doctrine according to the Senator from Pennsylvania? In the first place, the majority leader is not much of a speaker and not a dealer for any group in the Senate—neither for the old establishment or the Clark establishment. The Senator from Montana has a responsibility not only to the Senator from Pennsylvania but also to all the members of the Democratic conference, and he has a responsibility to the President as President and as head of the Democratic Party. The majority leader has to choose his own course and his own words in terms of what is feasible and fair to both responsibilities. He may make mistakes, and he does, mistakes of judgment—but he makes them not out of malice, not to support one establishment as against another, but solely within the framework of an effort to discharge his twin responsibilities to all Democrats and to the President, as best he knows how.

The Senator from Montana is by choice as well as necessity, a Democrat, nothing more, nothing less.

I, for one, do not think that a position of support for the President is maintained by depreciation of Democratic Members of the South or West, and the record of the 87th Congress bears this out. Let me go over a few of the key votes during that time, with an eye to what would have happened to that program if Senators from the South, and Senators HAYDEN, BIBLE, and CANNON—whose names are frequently linked together—had voted against the measures concerned.

The 1-year emergency feed grains program, which carried 58 to 31, would have been defeated without 13 southerners and Senators HAYDEN, BIBLE, and CANNON.

The Bush amendment to cut $150 million from NIH appropriations would have carried without 15 southerners and the 3 westerners.

The Scott substitute for the Area Redevelopment Act would have carried without 16 southerners and the 3 westerners.

On aid to education, the Goldwater loan substitute would have carried without 20 southerners and Senators HAYDEN, CANNON, and BIBLE. The authorization for the program by $252 million would have carried without them. The bill itself would have been defeated without eight southerners and the three westerners.

The Capehart amendment to cut the foreign aid development loan authority in half, which was defeated by a vote of 50 to 45, would have carried without 11 southerners and the westerners.

The Prouty amendment to require all economic aid projects to be referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee would have carried without 16 southerners and the westerners.

The Capehart amendment to cut public housing units to 37,000 would have passed without the votes of 11 southerners and Senators BIBLE and CANNON. His amendment to cut urban renewal by $700 million would be law today except for the votes of 10 southerners and the westerners.

The Prouty amendment to cut the term of the manpower retraining program, which was defeated 44 to 43, would have carried without 10 southerners and the westerners.

The first farm bill of 1962 was passed by a vote of 42 to 38. Without the aid of southerners and the westerners it would have been lost. The same is true of the second farm bill.

The standby Public Works Act of 1962 would have been defeated without the votes of nine southerners, and Senators HAYDEN, BIBLE, and CANNON.

I must say that the approach of the Senator from Pennsylvania, insofar as it involves allegations of discrimination and the so-called Senate establishment, as distinct from his advocacy of rules changes which are certainly in order, have tended to be, in my opinion, both presumptuous and divisive. In my opinion, they have not helped the Democratic Party. In my opinion, they have not helped the President's program.

But leaving aside matters of opinion on which differences are to be expected, there are certain allegations of fact which the Senator from Pennsylvania has raised with regard to committee reconstitution and assignments and it is time to set them straight. For they have not come straight in either his remarks of the past few days or in the debate which accompanied them.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has presented three amendments to rule 25 which would, if adopted, increase the size of the Finance Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and the Foreign Relations Committee. And the majority leader must and will oppose these amendments. In the eyes of the Senator from Pennsylvania this will undoubtedly constitute evidence that the majority leader is not only opposed to the President and the Democratic Party but is also a member in good standing in the establishment.

But the cruel facts of life concerning the Finance Committee are well known to the Senator. It is his contention that we should fly in the face of them. He knows that the Senator from Montana originally supported the increase, which in the first instance, as far as the Finance Committee was concerned, was initiated by the Senator from Pennsylvania. He knows the Senator from Montana sought an estimate of support in the Senate for it, and that his best information was that the move would fail by a substantial majority if it were contested, as it would be, on the Senate floor. He was told that Senators on the Finance Committee had promised that the President's tax bill would not be bottled up in committee.

I have informed the steering committee that the Senate would stay in session all this year and into next January 3, if need, so we will consider a tax bill on the floor of the Senate. And yet the Senator from Pennsylvania chose—as was his right—to make the fight in the steering committee; and having lost there by a vote of almost 3 to 1, he has chosen to prolong the matter by bringing it onto the Senate floor.

The Senator also knew that there was firm resistance to enlarging the Appropriations Committee on the part of the chairman. Already 27 Senators serve on the Appropriations Committee. The Senator would increase it to 29. His purpose, I believe, is to preserve for the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] a seat on the committee. No matter that many great and esteemed Members of this body in the past—liberal and conservative, northern and southern—lost their positions on the Appropriations Committee, when the power balance shifted in the Senate; the Senator from Pennsylvania insists that the present case is one in which vengeance was had upon the Senator from New York by the steering committee. That charge was not specifically made by the Senator from Pennsylvania, although the inference of his remarks was that a calculated job of "bumping" the Senator from New York had been done.

I have said on the floor that had the minority leader been prepared to favor enlarging the Finance Committee, the majority leader would have been prepared to support the enlargement of the Appropriations Committee so that the Senator from New York might have kept his seat. So if there has been any bumping, the responsibility does not rest on this side of the aisle.

Lastly, the Senator from Pennsylvania proposes to make the Foreign Relations Committee a 21-man group, divided 14 and 7. I am at a loss to understand how this increase would serve the interest of a "bipartisan foreign policy" supporting the President, as the Senator contends, although it would offer our Republican friends the opportunity to place two additional members on the committee. I can understand the Senator's opinion that the addition of two Democrats, chosen from the "modern, forward-looking" segment of our party—as defined by the Senator from Pennsylvania—would benefit the committee and the country generally.

And now, since the Senator has to a considerable degree opened up the deliberations of the steering committee, I shall undertake a brief examination of the committee assignments we made. I may say that I was struck by the Senator's opinion that freshman Senators had been unduly favored over those of the class of 1958. We have indeed come full circle from the days when freshmen were given the leftovers after their seniors had feasted on the choice assignments. Now, we learn, we are force feeding them like prize livestock.

I think it is strange that the Senator, who received initial assignments to the Banking and Post Office and Civil Service Committees, and subsequently to the Labor Committee, on all of which his contributions to his State and country have been considered, should be exercised about freshman committee assignments.

But let us take up the nominations that seem to be most in controversy.

For the Aeronautics and Space Committee, the steering committee chose the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. The chairman of that committee during the 87th Congress was the former senior Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Kerr. If geography should be a consideration in assigning Members, as the Senator from Pennsylvania thinks it should be, the steering committee acted wisely in choosing Mr. EDMONDSON to fill the vacancy. And, judging by his record as Governor of Oklahoma, no more wholehearted support of the President can be found in the Senate than Senator EDMONDSON.

May I say he was put on the second major committee, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because agriculture is, in his State, the No. 1 industry, because he is a rancher, because he knows farm problems, and because he is interested in agricultural legislation.

For the Armed Services Committee, Senator INOUYE was chosen. Mention has been made of the fact that Senator INOUYE voted against amending the cloture rule of the Senate, and consequently received choice committee assignments from his grateful colleagues. Oddly, the assignment of other freshman Senators, who received their choice of committees, and who voted 7 to 2 for liberalization of the cloture rule was not mentioned. And yet all but two of these nine Democratic Senators received at least one of the major committees of their choice, and most of them received both. Obviously an attack on the freshman committee assignments, based on the cloture vote, will not stand up in court—in any court. But little defense of the Inouye assignment is required. DAN INOUYE knows the military service as few men in the Senate can claim to know it. He knows military service in his body; and he knows it in his spirit. He knows what it means to fight for freedom even when freedom itself lapses into temporary injustice. Add to these considerations the fact that the State he represents is as heavily dominated by military problems as any other in the Union. Add to it, his experience in the House. If there is any decision of the steering committee which was wise and beyond reproach on any count, it is this one. And I salute him as the noblest American of us all.

Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN was assigned to the Agriculture Committee. The Senator from Pennsylvania spoke of "shanghaiing" members to serve on that committee. I can testify that if any "shanghaiing" was done, the Senator from South Dakota did it himself, and he did it with great vigor and determination.

He wrote to me and to other Senators immediately following his election and requested assignment to the committee having jurisdiction over his State's largest industry. I am glad to say he received it.

The nomination of Senator RIBICOFF to Finance meets the criteria of geography and experience and I trust no one will question his allegiance to the Democratic administration.

I cannot understand the criticism which the Senator from Pennsylvania has leveled at the practice of assigning new Members to at least one committee of their choice wherever possible or of the equity of the assignments which were made under the practice. The assignments have been equitable beyond any reasonable doubt and the practice itself has done an immense amount of good for the vitality of the Democratic Party in the Senate. The Senator from Pennsylvania or any other Member of the Senate can criticize until he is blue in the face, but I shall stand by this practice and the assignments which have been made under it in the present Congress.

But to proceed, Mr. President, to the other appointments by the steering committee, which have been criticized.

The Appropriations Committee assignment has excited some controversy. I am grateful that the steering committee gave me one of the available seats on the committee.

I wrote a letter to every member of the committee asking for his support. Senator BARTLETT, of Alaska, was given the other assignment. This committee is perhaps the most heavily balanced on the southern side. Some suggestions were made that another southern or southwestern Senator be named. On geographical terms, this made no sense. I voted for the Senator from Wisconsin to fill the vacancy. A majority of the steering committee chose the Senator from Alaska. It was a good choice. Neither of our new States has had representation on the Appropriations Committee, and it is about time that they were given such consideration.

The nomination of Senator SMATHERS, secretary of the Democratic conference, to the Foreign Relations Committee was based on seniority. Geographically, it was also a fact that the last four Senators to go on that committee were from the Midwest, the Far West, and the East. As a matter of fact, I should say the last five Senators, including the distinguished assistant majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Those who initiated this discussion suggest that the so-called Senate establishment is anticivil rights, against the change in the Senate rules, and rewards or punishes those Senators accordingly, by committee assignments, depending upon their position on rules or cloture votes.

On page 2842 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Senator from Pennsylvania inserted a list of 21 so-called preferred Senators, preferred because they hold 3 major committee assignments, allegedly bestowed by the so-called establishment.

Yet of this very list of establishment-favored Senators, a majority of Senators, 11, voted for cloture in the recent rules debate. What kind of pattern of bias does this fact indicate? I submit it indicates there is no pattern.

The charge is made that the establishment controls the steering committee, and prevented its enlargement to reflect the true desires of all Democratic Senators.

This is also quite patently untrue. The Democratic Senators voted on this question in the Democratic caucus by secret ballot at the suggestion of the majority leader, and they voted to keep the size of the committee as it was by over 2 to 1. Who is better able to reflect the true desires and philosophy of all the Democratic Senators than all the Democratic Senators? It seems to me the answer should be obvious. We must grant Senators at least the intelligence and integrity to vote their own convictions.

The Senator from Pennsylvania placed in the RECORD last Wednesday another table showing the assignments given Senators who supported the present cloture rule, and those who voted to liberalize it. The purpose of this table, it was said, was to enable Senators to determine whether a pattern of favoritism or discrimination emerged from the new assignments, based on the recent rules controversy. I shall not attempt to explain away each assignment—as Senators know that a group of 15 men may be guided by many considerations. But the following should be made a part of this RECORD, as to the treatment Senators have received during their tenure in the Senate at the hands of the steering committee.

Of those who voted to liberalize the cloture rule, Senator BURDICK asked for the Agriculture Committee when he came to the Senate, and received it. This time he asked for Judiciary; but the available seats were filled by Senators KENNEDY and BAYH.

Senator CLARK was elected to the Rules Committee; the majority leader, may I say, voted for him twice.

Senator ENGLE, when he first came to the Senate, requested Armed Services, and got it; he sits on the Commerce Committee. Senator BARTLETT, who came to the Senate with him, received the Appropriations seat this year.

Senator HART was originally assigned to Judiciary and Agriculture and has now relinquished the latter in favor of Commerce.

Senator LAUSCHE, who requested the Finance Committee vacancy, had received an assignment to Foreign Relations during his first term.

Senator LONG of Missouri applied for Finance and Appropriations. His first preference when he came, the Judiciary Committee, had been given to him.

Senator MOSS requested Appropriations and Space; his first preference when he came, the Interior Committee, had been given to him.

Senator MUSKIE informed the leadership this year that he would be interested in moving to the Foreign Relations Committee.

The single vacancy on that committee went to Senator SMATHERS, although I voted for Senator PELL. I am happy to say, since I am speaking of the distinguished Senator from Maine, that he will be chairman of the legislative review committee for this year and the next.

Senator NEUBERGER was to have been assigned to the Interior Committee, but lost that seat upon Senator HAYDEN'S request for it.

Senator PELL was placed on the Government Operations Committee, to comply with the rule assuring each Senator two major committee assignments.

Senator PROXMIRE had received his choice of assignments within a year after coming to the Senate. I supported him for both Finance and Appropriations, to neither of which he was assigned.

Senator YARBOROUGH, a present member of the Commerce and Labor Committees, requested appropriations. I have described the circumstances which I believe brought about the nomination of Senator BARTLETT.

In three cases where Senators who supported the present cloture rule were given a major committee assignment—Senator CANNON on Commerce, Senator HAYDEN on Interior, and Senator JORDAN on Public Works—the Members affected were clearly entitled to a second major committee when the Rules Committee became a minor committee. In two other cases where Senators supporting the present cloture rule received their first choice of assignments—Senator MCGEE on Post Office and Civil Service, and Senator SMATHERS on Foreign Relations—they were the senior applicants for the vacancies.

So far as Post Office and Civil Service is concerned, there were only two vacancies on that committee. There were two applicants, and Senator MCGEE was one of the two applicants.

These, then, were the principal appointments of the steering committee. As I have said, the practice of assigning new Members to committees of their choice and the assignments thereunder were wise and any honest examination of them, it seems to me, reveals no pattern except a reasonable and equitable one, which is for the good of the Senate, for the good of the party, and for the good of the Members concerned.

As for the rest of the appointments, they are not perfect as each Member may interpret perfection. It might have been better in some eyes if I had not been appointed to the Appropriations Committee or the Senator from Pennsylvania to the Rules Committee or the Senator from Florida to the Foreign Relations Committee, and so on. Certainly I differed with some of the choices.

But I do not question the motives behind anyone's vote on the steering committee. I do not insist that I alone know what is good for the party, the Senate, the President's program, or the Nation.

It is never easy to balance such factors as geographic distribution, seniority, Member interest. There are bound to be disappointments and disagreements. But in the framework in which the steering committee functions I have no criticism of the results. The Members did a conscientious job, and there is no instance in which I do not wholeheartedly approve of the assignments which were finally made, even though I did not vote with the majority on all of the selections.

Now I have about done. I think it is time we got down to work. The Senator from Pennsylvania has had his day on this matter, I hope, for this session; he had two votes by the Democratic membership in the caucus on enlarging the steering committee, and several more in the steering committee itself. The judgment of the caucus and that of the steering committee was that his dissent, while courageous, was not well taken, under the circumstances.

I dislike bringing the names of Senators and the process of choices onto the Senate floor in patches and dribs and drabs. I would prefer to have this whole process of caucus and steering committee in the open if the alternative is the leak, the rumor, or the half-fact. What ought to be brought to the floor is legislation. The committees are waiting to organize and to hold hearings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement of prospective committee activity.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF PROSPECTIVE COMMITTEE ACTIVITY

Senate Agriculture has the omnibus farm message before it and had hoped to hold hearings on the dairy program the week of February 25; however, due to the delay in committee assignments, the committee has not yet had its organizational meeting.

Senator Morse has announced he intends early hearings on the omnibus education bill now before Senate Labor Committee. The committee started hearings today on the youth employment bill; mental health bills and the general health bills are ready for hearings if and when the subcommittees are properly organized to function with full memberships.

Senate Banking has the all-important mass transit bill, the bill to revise the silver policy, and the measure to extend the life of the Export-Import Bank—due to expire—and would like to schedule hearings as soon as the committee can have its organizational meetings.

Senate Armed Services is holding briefings and hearings on military posture and procurement; in addition it has before it bills introduced by Senator Russell to extend the Selective Service Act, due to expire, to increase the compensation of the military, to provide for the civil defense fallout shelter program—all ready for committee consideration.

Senate District of Columbia Committee, when properly organized, has the very important measure increasing the existing authorization governing appropriations to the District of Columbia—our Federal City.

Senate Public Works, when it has a chairman, would like to schedule hearings on the air and water pollution control bills, amendments to the highway program, and other measures.

Due to the emergent times, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been holding hearings, briefings, has reported nominations, but it has numerous important bills before it affecting disarmament, the establishment of a National Academy of Foreign Affairs, a Foreign Service bill, all waiting consideration of a properly organized committee.

Senate Interior Committee has held hearings and are ready for final action on the water resources research program, the outdoor recreational opportunities program—with hearings scheduled on the wilderness bill, the comprehensive water resources planning program.

The House will soon send over the temporary public debt increase for finance considerations. Senate Appropriations has scheduled hearings on our appropriation bills to begin early in March.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in my opinion it is time for all Senators to begin their examinations of substantive measures. It is time for Democrats to get down to the work they were sent here to do. I know of no group of men better qualified to do it. We are a diverse, active, and aggressive party; there are many divisions of opinion among us; and the fact is that at no time in our history have we been able to make progress without reconciling ourselves to those differences and capitalizing on that which holds us together.

What I believe those who complain of an "establishment" are, in the final analysis, complaining against is the ever-present fact of frustration, the frustration of working in this body, the frustration of half a loaf, the frustration of compromise that of necessity is always with us. Who among us does not feel this heavy cloak of dissatisfaction? Less than absolute power to achieve one's will is the essence of frustration. Yet less than absolute power to achieve one's will is also an essential of democracy. The practice of democracy is therefore frustrating, and let us be sure that when it ceases to be so for any group or faction, at that same time there will also have ceased to be a democracy. That same principle pervades all we do here, and we should thank God it does.

Now let us begin the substantive debates of the 88th Congress. I urge the Senate to get off the business of the Senate and get on with the business of the Nation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. In view of the rather extraordinary comments just made by the Senator from Montana, I wonder whether he would join with me in a unanimous consent request that I may have not more than 3 minutes in which to speak before the vote is taken.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I so request.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—have the yeas and nays been ordered?

Mr, MANSFIELD. No. We hope the yeas and nays will not be ordered. I hope that no Senator will ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. This subject has been holding up the Senate for more than a week. It is certainly entitled to a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am sorry that the yeas and nays have been ordered. I had hoped that the Senate might vote without having the yeas and nays; but the will of the Senate must be observed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not more than 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for not more than 3 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall not attempt to reply in detail to the Senator from Montana; I am content to rely upon the pages of the Congressional Record for what I said and for what can be fairly implied from what I said.

There is no vindictiveness in my heart.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may we have order, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. CLARK. There was no vindictiveness in my words. My effort has been, and will continue to be, to democratize the procedures of the Senate, so that the Senate can play its part in our constitutional framework of government in the modern world.

The majority leader is entitled to his opinion. He has stated it most forcefully. Senators who are interested can see my views set forth in the pages of the Record last Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. Those purposes and the case I made in support of them can all be summarized in a quotation from a report.

I should like to conclude by saying that my purpose and that of the small band who followed me, and who have fired the first shot of what has now become the "First Battle of Bull Run," is a purpose which was well stated in a report of the Democratic steering committee made in March 13, 1913, just before the Senators of the Wilson administration organized the Senate of the United States so as to make possible the passage of legislative measures of the New Freedom. I quote:

> We propose that this great body shall be democratic, not only in name but in practical reality, and that the charge so often made that it is controlled by a few men through committee organization, and otherwise, shall no longer have any basis in fact.

Mr. President, that is my continuing purpose. So long as there is breath within me and I am a Member of the U.S. Senate, I shall fight that good fight.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 minutes altogether.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I honor the Senator from Pennsylvania for the courage, tenacity, determination, and devotion he has shown. However, I only express the hope that some of the statements which have been made on the floor of the Senate during the past week will not come back to haunt some of the Democrats who will be running for reelection next year. I think we ought, at least, to look after our own. I think we ought to use a little discretion. I think we ought to help our colleagues, no matter from what part of the country they come.

I have noted some of the statements made in the course of this debate, statements not made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania in this instance, wherein civil rights and the oil depletion allowance are tied together. I think I have a pretty good record on civil rights. It is not a perfect one, but it is a fairly good one. So far as oil depletion allowances are concerned, I believe in the depreciation law, because I come from an oil-producing State.

Then I find a further statement, one which I shall quote this time:

> Sometimes, Mr. President, in my sardonic moments, I wonder whether this is also a part of the plan—to discredit the party, to defeat the Senators from the North and the Senators from the West who otherwise might threaten the supremacy of the bipartisan alliance, and then to emerge with an even tighter control over the Senate than before, with the bipartisan coalition swollen in numbers and the liberal opposition diminished.

This is something about which we Democrats had better do a little thinking, if we are going to come back in sizable numbers following the elections in the years ahead. So I plead with all Senators—not only with the Senator from Pennsylvania—to try to get together on this side of the aisle and try to help one another—because from now on the races will be tough—to do what we can, instead of creating divisiveness within the party, to bring the party together and to bring about an amalgamation or amelioration of the views which divide us at this time. The old saying, "In unity there is strength," applies to all Democrats, and I hope the Democrats will live up to their responsibility.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since the Senator from Montana has quoted from the Congressional Record, although he did not state which Senator spoke the words he quoted, let me say that those words which he quoted were mine. I wondered then; I wonder now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois still adheres to his opinion, in connection with which he stated:

> Sometimes, Mr. President, in my sardonic moments, I wonder whether this is also a part of the plan—to discredit the party, to defeat the Senators from the North and the Senators from the West who otherwise might threaten the supremacy of the bipartisan alliance.

And so forth and so on.

Certainly the Democrats will not get very far, with such language.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] to Senate Resolution 90.

Mr. RUSSELL. Which one is it, Mr. President? There are three of them. Are they to be voted on en bloc?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as found in the language of Senate Resolution 93.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] to Senate Resolution 90. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the distinguished occupant of the chair state the resolution or motion now before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The effect of the pending amendment is to strike out "17" and insert "21", as the membership of the Committee on Finance.

On the question of agreeing to this amendment, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on this vote, I have a pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton]. If the Senator from New Hampshire were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] is absent to attend the funeral of a friend.

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], would each vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] has been previously announced by the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger].

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 68, as follows:

[No. 24 Leg.]

YEAS—17

Anderson
Burdick
Case
Clark
Douglas
Engle
Hart
Javits
Keating
McNamara
Morse
Moss
Nelson
Pell
Proxmire
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—68

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Pastore
Pearson
Prouty
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Young, N Dak.

NOT VOTING—15

Boggs
Cannon
Church
Cotton
Gore
Gruening
Kefauver
Magnuson
McCarthy
McGee
Muskie
Neuberger
Randolph
Saltonstall
Williams, Del.

So Mr. Clark's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment embodied in Senate Resolution 91, which would increase the membership of the Committee on Appropriations by two.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. In paragraph (b) (dealing with the Committee on Appropriations) of subsection 1 of rule XXV, it is proposed to strike out the word "twenty-seven" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-nine".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, which would have the effect of increasing the membership of the Appropriations Committee by two members. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, no debate is in order. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HART (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton]. If he were present, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withold my vote.

Mr. McNAMARA (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr.

CANNON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is absent to attend the funeral of a friend.

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] has been previously announced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

The pair of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has been previously announced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 70, as follows:

[No. 25 Leg.]

YEAS—12

Case
Clark
Douglas
Engle
Keating
Morse
Moss
Nelson
Neuberger
Proxmire
Scott
Yarborough

NAYS—70

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
McClellan
McGovern
McIntyre
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Boggs
Cannon
Church
Cotton
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Javits
Kefauver
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McNamara
Muskie
Randolph
Saltonstall
Williams, Del.

So Mr. CLARK's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, pursuant to the authority vested in the unanimous-consent agreement, I withdraw Senate Resolution 92 from consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn. The question recurs on agreeing to the pending resolution, as modified.

The resolution (S. Res. 90), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which Senate Resolution 90, as modified, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on page 10 of Senate Resolution 90, under "Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs," line 25, item No. 7, the following is stated:

> Measures relating generally to Hawaii, Alaska, and the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting their revenue and appropriations.

I move that the words "Hawaii, Alaska, and" at the bottom of page 10 be deleted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution, as modified and amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 90), as modified and amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Resolutions 91, 92, and 93, submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], now on the table, increasing the membership of certain mittees, be postponed indefinitely.

Mr. CLARK, Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. My understanding is that Senate Resolutions 91 and 93 were defeated, and that Senate Resolution 92 was withdrawn.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They were defeated as amendments to Senate Resolution 90, but they are still on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I submit a resolution containing a list of both the majority and minority members of the standing committees of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated, for the information of the Senate.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the majority and minority members on standing committees of the Senate shall be:

MAJORITY MEMBERS

AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

Mr. Anderson, chairman; Mr. Russell, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Symington, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Holland, and Mr. Edmondson.

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. Ellender, chairman; Mr. Johnston, Mr. Holland, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Jordan, Mr. McCarthy, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Edmondson.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Hayden, chairman; Mr. Russell, Mr. Ellender, Mr. Hill, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Holland, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Bible, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. McGee, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Mansfield, and Mr. Bartlett.

ARMED SERVICES

Mr. Russell, chairman; Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Symington, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Engle, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Young of Ohio, and Mr. Inouye.

BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. Robertson, chairman; Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Clark, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. McIntyre.

COMMERCE

Mr. Magnuson, chairman; Mr. Pastore, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Engle, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Hartke, Mr. McGee, Mr. Hart, and Mr. Cannon.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. Bible, chairman; Mr. Morse, Mr. Hartke, and Mr. McIntyre.

FINANCE

Mr. Byrd of Virginia, chairman; Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gore, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Fulbright, and Mr. Ribicoff.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. Fulbright, chairman; Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Morse, Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Gore, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Church, Mr. Symington, Mr. Dodd, and Mr. Smathers.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McClellan, chairman; Mr. Jackson, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Pell, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Ribicoff, and Mr. Brewster.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. Jackson, chairman; Mr. Anderson, Mr. Bible, Mr. Church, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Moss, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Hayden, Mr. McGovern, and Mr. Nelson.

JUDICIARY

Mr. Eastland, chairman; Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Johnston, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Hart, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Kennedy, and Mr. Bayh.

LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. Hill, chairman; Mr. McNamara, Mr. Morse, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Clark, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Pell, and Mr. Kennedy.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. Johnston, chairman; Mr. Monroney, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Randolph, Mr. McGee, and Mr. Brewster.

PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. McNamara, chairman; Mr. Randolph, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Moss, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Bayh, and Mr. Nelson.

RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Jordan, chairman; Mr. Hayden, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Pell, Mr. Clark, and Mr. Byrd of West Virginia.

MINORITY MEMBERS

AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

Mrs. Smith, Mr. Case, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Curtis, and Mr. Keating.

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. Aiken, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Boggs, and Mr. Mechem.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Allott, Mr. Cotton, and Mr. Case.

ARMED SERVICES

Mr. Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Beall, Mr. Goldwater, and Mr. Case.

BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. Bennett, Mr. Tower, Mr. Javits, Mr. Simpson, and Mr. Dominick.

COMMERCE

Mr. Cotton, Mr. Morton, Mr. Scott, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Beall.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. Beall, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Dominick.

FINANCE

Mr. Williams of Delaware, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Morton, and Mr. Dirksen.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Williams of Delaware, and Mr. Mundt.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. Mundt, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Javits, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Pearson.

INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Allott, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Mechem, and Mr. Dominick.

JUDICIARY

Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Keating, Mr. Fong, and Mr. Scott.

LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Javits, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Jordan of Idaho.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. Carlson, Mr. Fong, and Mr. Boggs.

PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. Cooper, Mr. Fong, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Pearson.

RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Curtis, Mr. Cooper, and Mr. Scott.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution containing the membership of the committees.

The resolution (S. Res. 96) was agreed to.

MEMBERSHIP OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I submit a resolution containing the majority and minority members of the Select Committee on Small Business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 97) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the following be members of the Select Committee on Small Business: Mr. Sparkman (chairman), Mr. Long of Louisiana, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Morse, Mr. Bible, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Engle, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Harrison A. Williams, Jr., of New Jersey, Mr. Moss, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Javits, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Scott, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Cotton.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 97) was considered and agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EULOGIES ON FRIDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, and after discussion with the distinguished minority leader, I should like to announce—and this will cause some difficulties—that the Senate will meet next Friday to do honor to three of our departed colleagues, the late Senator from Idaho, Mr. Dworshak, the late Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Kerr, and the late Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez. It has been agreed that not more than 1 hour will be allocated to eulogies and speeches for each of those Senators. So I hope that on Friday next, March 1, which is the date agreeable to Mrs. Kerr, Mrs. Chavez, and Mrs. Dworshak, the Senate will meet to do honor to those three former colleagues of ours, who contributed so much to the welfare of their States and the country.

CATTLE PRICES AND AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, complaints are coming in about cattle prices, as well as many other agricultural prices. These complaints are based not only on present prices, with their recent declines, but they involve the prospect as to future agricultural prices.

Agriculture is facing serious trouble because of the lack of realism and clear thinking on the part of the Government and because of unsound policies being followed with respect to world trade. Agriculture suffers also because it does not have a champion in the Department of Agriculture. Too many of the Department of Agriculture's decisions are based upon erroneous State Department policies and a political eye is focused upon the heavy consumer vote in our cities. Added to all of this are a few people in the Agriculture Department whose first love is a desire to change our traditional agricultural economic system and impose more paternalism. As a result, there has been no dynamic leadership exerted in behalf of the families who live on our farms and whose sole business is agriculture.

Mr. Dave Grasmick, a qualified radio commentator in the field of agriculture in the Middle West writes me as follows:

> In the past year, if you will check the records, you will find that our import over export of meat products will be roughly 4½ to 5 percent. If the United States were called upon to produce this extra 4½ to 5 percent import of meat over export, it would require 44,600,000 acres of American production of grass and feed crops to produce that extra 4½ to 5 percent of meat imported over export.
>
> In the meantime our Federal Government tells us farmers that it has become necessary to retire 50 million acres of food production to bring production in balance with consumption. And here, and here alone, on this extra meat tonnage, we would have an opportunity to set aside—or utilize rather—44,600,000 acres to produce the extra 4½ to 5 percent of meat which is imported over our exports.

I have always spoken out in behalf of the European Common Market. I believe it is an excellent thing for Europe. It will bring political unity. It will be a bulwark against communism and it is based upon private enterprise. I do not believe that the trade policies of the United States are based upon an adequate understanding of what the Common Market really is. People have been told that it is a free trade movement. It is not; it is a protectionist movement. It involves the same principles as were followed by the United States in the founding of our Republic and which gave us a strong economy.

When the trade bill was before the Senate, I supported a number of agricultural amendments that would have been helpful to the American farmer. They were all defeated primarily because of administration opposition. I offered one amendment which would have provided a guideline for our negotiators. It would have set as a goal the holding of agricultural imports to not to exceed the 1957 level.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article by Mr. Eldon Griffiths which appeared in the Washington Post on February 23, 1963. It was written from Topeka, Kans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSATLANTIC FARM WAR

(By Eldon Griffiths)

TOPEKA, KANS.—It was the biggest thing in sight on the flat Kansas horizon, a gargantuan building the size of the *Queen Mary*. At first sight it looked like a cathedral, and in a sense it was. With its half dozen tall towers strapped together by soaring walls and concrete buttresses, the building was an American cathedral of plenty—one of those huge grain elevators used to store the surplus grain of the Middle West.

All told, America's elevators contain just under $5 billion of grain that the Nation cannot eat or feed to its animals. Simply to keep it from spoiling costs the taxpayer $1.4 million a day. Yet in spite of every effort to cut down farm acreages and sell—or give away—the surplus food, America's farmers are in danger of being drowned in a flood of their own golden grain.

Another big concrete building I visited last month in Rotterdam gave proof that this danger is growing. This was the headquarters of a Dutch firm that specializes in scalding the holds of oil tankers so as to make them clean enough to carry grain. Given the recent slump in tanker earnings it had become highly profitable to transform surplus tankers into bulk grain carriers for the North Atlantic trade.

Today, however, the Dutch firm is running into trouble. Its owners, looking ahead, have concluded that the mass transport of American grain to Europe is likely to fall off rapidly as European output increases. French wheat farmers in particular are expanding their production by consolidating tiny peasant holdings into factory farms big enough to use the same multiple plows and combine harvesters one sees in the Middle West. And French President Charles de Gaulle is determined to help them by insuring that the Common Market's external tariff wall is used to keep out competing grain from the prairies of America and the Commonwealth lands, leaving French agriculture the master of Europe.

De Gaulle's drive to restore French farming to the position it held before the First World War—as Europe's granary—is easy to understand. But in the process America's farmers, not to speak of those in Argentina and the Commonwealth lands, are going to get hurt. For if France, with the support of the West German farming lobby, succeeds in maintaining high Common Market tariffs against oversea farm products, the United States alone stands to lose more than 30 percent of all its exports to Europe.

This figure is taken from a report prepared for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The report predicts that between now and the late 1960's the U.S. wheat farmers will suffer the complete loss of their European market, that U.S. exports of oats, barley, sorghum, and rye will level off, then drop sharply, and that in the long run the whole of the European market for imported meat and poultry will be lost by the United States.

What these losses are likely to mean to the U.S. balance of payments is not hard to see. Farm sales now account for 32.4 percent of all U.S. exports to Europe, and if only half of them are lost, Washington will find that its presently favorable balance of trade with Europe is rapidly turned into deficit. Pressure on U.S. currency reserves inevitably would increase. The stability of the dollar once again might be called into question.

The more immediate—and noisier—result of the Common Market's closing its doors to American farm products would be a howl of rage from the farmers. Middle western farmers, already had been pressing to keep up the payments on their farm mortgages, their air-conditioning units, their TV sets, and their cars, are apt to reach for their political pitchforks if they see their incomes shrinking because of Europe's tariff walls. The farmers' attitude is that the United States "liberated Europe" in 1945, "fed Europe" under the Marshall plan, and "defended Europe" under NATO. If Europe now responds by shutting out U.S. products—"the height of rank ingratitude," as the farmers see it—the United States will have no alternative but to close the American market to European products, e.g., French wines and Volkswagens.

Unfortunately for its farmers, the United States is not well placed to get tough with the Common Market on the economic front. America sells to Europe not only more farm products but more industrial goods than Europe sells the United States. A tariff war might well hurt America more than Europe.

The administration may therefore be driven to protect its balance of payments—as well as its political rear in the key farm States—by cutbacks in other fields. For the American farmer, quite likely with the support of many of his urban compatriots, is determined that Europe shall not have it both ways. No longer can Europe expect the United States to go on spending tens of billions to defend it if Europe—led by France—moves toward an autarchy that excludes cheaper, better, and more plentiful American grain.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, great opportunities for the use of our agricultural products in industry are available. It cannot be brought about without a sincere, dynamic, and determined effort on the part of the Government. The recommendations of the bipartisan Commission, appointed by President Eisenhower, to recommend new industrial uses for farm surpluses, has never received sympathetic effort toward its implementation by the Washington bureaucracy. At another time I expect to speak at some length on the question of industrial uses.

There is one other matter that I would like to mention in reference to farm prices and especially in reference to prices of cattle and hogs. Today the largest buyers of meat are our chain grocery stores. Their economic power exceeds the power of cattlemen, feeders, farmers generally, and the packing industry combined.

I am reliably told that meat buyers for large chain grocery concerns approach packing companies, both large and small, and inform them how much they will pay for meat. The question is not asked, what is the seller's price. If the price offered by the chains does not appeal to the packer, the potential buyer merely walks out and the chainstore features something else as its leader in the retail business. This in turn, forces the packers to beat down the price to the farmers, ranchers, and feeders, or the business will be lost to imports or other protein products.

What I have said about the power of chainstores in the buying market for meat has been reported to me, not by one or two sources, but by many sources over a period of many months. It is not a charge made by radical individuals or radical groups. It is an opinion held by many well-qualified conservative individuals who know the picture and have the interests of agriculture at heart.

It might be well for the Congress to investigate the marketing of meat and the impact of the chainstores on the same. It would be interesting to know what the Department of Agriculture is doing about it. Thousands of our farm families would welcome such an investigation.

BUREAUCRATIC TYRANNY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the very essence of the liberty which we not only highly prize, but which has built for us a strong economy and a strong Nation, is the right of choice. Individual citizens have the right to choose. They have the right to choose with whom they will affiliate, where they live, where and how they worship, where they spend their money, and where they want to work.

Our workers should have a right to choose whether or not they have a union and have that union represent them in bargaining. If their right to decide whether or not they want a union at all is in any way infringed or hampered, unionism then becomes compulsory.

Government should not be antiunion or prounion. Government should not be antimanagement or promanagement. Government should protect the rights of all and the right of the individual to make choices.

This philosophy is totally alien to the National Mediation Board. Its action in regard to the proposed organizing of United Air Lines employees amounts to nothing less than tyranny. The Board proceeds from a paternalistic notion that it is duty bound to so conduct its proceedings as to give the United Air Line workers what the Board thinks is good for them.

In this United Air Lines case the Board is denying the men and women involved as employees of United Air Lines the right to make a clear and understandable choice as to whether or not they want a union as their bargaining agent. The law places no such mandate on the National Mediation Board. It is a usurpation of power and it not only violates American tradition and principles, but it is grossly unfair. The Board proposes to force these workers to decide between two unions which are anxious for the business of serving as bargaining agents for the employees in question. The proposed ballot does not give any clear and understandable opportunity for the employees to first decide whether or not they want to organize.

These workers in question should have an opportunity to vote in two elections. The first one would be a sort of a primary election. It would decide whether or not they want a union. If a majority want a union, then there should be a subsequent election so that they could express their right of choice as to what union they wanted. I hope that the Board will reverse its position, abandon its tyrannical procedure, and preserve the right of choice for these splendid American citizens involved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks an article which appeared in the Omaha World Herald on February 15, 1963, entitled "No-Union Vote Space is Asked," and also a brief editorial from the Wall Street Journal of February 21, 1963, entitled "Land of Opportunity."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 21, 1963]

Land of Opportunity

Cleaning women in the employ of United Air Lines learned the other day that America is, indeed, still the Land of Opportunity. The opportunity is being provided by the National Mediation Board, which ruled that the women, along with a wide assortment of United's ticket agents, clerical, and passenger service employees, may vote to join one of two unions, the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks or the International Association of Machinists.

There's a catch, to be sure. As United noted when it appealed to a court to prevent the vote, the employees won't have a chance to vote for no union at all. In other words, they'll have to give up a little freedom. But all that aside, where else could Cinderella be magically transformed into a railway clerk, not to mention a machinist?

[From the Omaha World-Herald Feb. 15, 1963]

"No Union" Vote Space Is Asked

Washington.—A group of nonunion United Air Lines employees asked Thursday to be given a chance to stay that way.

In a unique petition to the National Mediation Board, the group requested that a no-union vote space be placed on the ballot in a coming union representation election involving 13 thousand workers.

"We are not antiunion, but we are happy the way we are," said Donald McIntosh, a passenger agent in Chicago. "If a union becomes our bargaining agent we will no longer be on a merit system for pay raises."

Backing Mr. McIntosh was James K. Lamona, a San Francisco passenger agent, who gave this explanation for the move:

"We feel we can plead our own case individually—with the management—rather than through collective bargaining."

IF GEORGE WASHINGTON WERE ALIVE TODAY

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, last Friday it was my high honor and privilege to read George Washington's Farewell Address on the floor of the Senate. Many persons have asked me what would be our first President's reaction to the problems posed in his Farewell Address if he were alive today.

Any answer, of course, must be in the realm of conjecture. But, in my opinion, logic would suggest that if Washington were President in this year of our Lord 1963, he would:

First. Be steadfast in his devotion to the principles inherent in our Constitution.

Second. Vigorously oppose various pressure groups whose chief objectives are to secure for themselves certain advantages and emoluments which may be detrimental to the general welfare.

Third. Insist on sound fiscal policies, knowing full well that failure to implement these could result in the destruction of everything Americans hold precious and dear, including liberty itself.

Fourth. Bitterly condemn any suggestion that the President should constantly seek more and more power for himself under the guise that this would be in the national interest.

Fifth. Recognize that in today's world the luxury of isolationism which we as a nation enjoyed for many years is no longer possible, but fully comprehend that in formulating our relations with other nations the question must always be asked: Is this in the best interest of the United States of America?

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, each Sunday morning I look forward to reading "Spires of the Spirit" from the gifted pen of the beloved Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris and carried in the Washington Star. The Spires are always informative, eloquent, and challenging. The Spires in yesterday's Star beautifully and inspiringly told the story of Constantino Brumidi who is most appropriately acclaimed as the Michelangelo of the U.S. Capitol. I ask unanimous consent that yesterday's Spires so truly captioned Walls That Speak may be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From "Spires of the Spirit," by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate]

Walls That Speak

Many years ago from the land of Mona Lisa an Italian immigrant came to the United States. For him freedom beckoned in this blessed land of room enough. His name was Brumidi (pronounced Brew-meed-dee). He was nearly 50 years of age. For years he had steeped himself in the mural glories of the Vatican and had helped to restore the faded Raphael frescos.

With that background he yearned, somehow with his art, to express his growing gratitude for the vast benefits he found waiting in his adopted land. He had personally felt the spell of the miracle of form and color which comes to pass when, as one has put it, "there is a lump of greasy pigment at the end of Michelangelo's bristle brush and by the time it has been laid on the stucco there is something there all men with eyes recognize as divine." This artist immigrant had as his ruling passion the humble desire to express the divine that for him with his brush glimmered through the greasy pigment, the hog bristle and the stucco.

Once in America his gifted brush and soaring imagination were dedicated to sacred subjects. He was asked to paint altar pieces of the crucifixion in New York and Philadelphia churches. During a visit south of the border he tried his skill at beautifying a cathedral in Mexico. Shortly after he was given his great chance when he was commissioned to embellish the expanding Capitol of the United States. This opportunity thrilled him. His toiling hands began their long tryst with beauty before Lincoln entered the White House to face the heartbreaking task of saving the Union. When a tragic accident, as he fell from the dome of the rotunda, snatched him from his unfinished task and sentenced him to end his life as an invalid, Hayes had succeeded Grant as President of the Republic.

Wherever Brumidi toiled in the vast Capitol the walls began to speak. In spite of detracting criticism and a lack of appreciation he kept patiently at his task for almost a quarter of a century. At 72 this neglected and unapplauded master of paint and fresco closed his weary and saddened eyes and was buried in an unmarked grave in the Capital City he adored. Less than a week after his death a prophecy was uttered on the floor of the U.S. Senate, "One day Brumidi will be crowned by the gratitude of succeeding generations." But, alas, the long years passed and a preoccupied Government allowed his memory to gather dust on the high shelves of oblivion.

This was in spite of the fact that it is no exaggeration to say that this adopted son of America is worthy to be acclaimed, as he is today, as the Michelangelo of the monumental edifice which is the shrine of each patriot's devotion. Millions of pilgrims, from all parts of the Nation and the globe, now gaze with admiration on the speaking walls where Constantino Brumidi breathed on them the haunting beauty that burned in his poetic soul. His loving signature to his grateful I O U for his loved America is written in heroic depictions, in human portraits, and for good measure in romantic landscaped etchings, as well as in birds and flowers and fruits. Out of his artistic cornucopia, across the years as he kept patiently on, came varied forms and figures clinging to the walls and ceilings in gorgeous colors and rich designs.

Perhaps the climax of all his Capitol treasures is what is known as the President's Room on the Senate side. For more than 6 years he toiled terribly on that jeweled ceiling from which human eyes follow one in all parts of the room. But the bequest he left there has given it the distinction of being called the most exquisitely decorated room in America.

Republics are notoriously ungrateful. It seems to be an unfortunate trait of democracy that often its most shining servants and saints are those who are cannonaded while alive and canonized only long after death has removed them beyond the reach of praise and blame.

At long last it was a determined woman, her great heart shamed by such flagrant ingratitude, who was destined to lift Brumidi to his rightful niche in the Westminster Abbey of our Nation's remembrance. That elect woman, Dr. Myrtle Cheney Murdock, is the cultured wife of a former congressional legislator. By persistent research and the gathering of historical facts she burnished anew the annals of this immigrant's inspiring achievements. In her beautifully adorned volume, "Constantino Brumidi, Michelangelo of the United States Capitol," a lovely example of the bookmaker's art, she has reproduced in glorious colors the immortal frescos for all to see and admire. This that she has done deserves to be told in all the land now that largely through her efforts Brumidi has come into his own.

At a great gathering in the rotunda almost a dozen years ago, in the presence of an admiring throng, there was dramatically lifted up the artist's worn copy of the Bible. In it the hand that adorned the Capitol has entered the date of his arrival on the shores of this new sweet land of liberty as he fled from the thraldom of the old. In the sacred book he had inscribed, "Presented to me by the American Bible Society." It was in the inspiration from that Book of Books that he put upon the walls of the historic Capitol his offering to the God of Liberty and of Beauty from whom his genius was a golden gift. With what moving emotion this Italian refugee declared, "My daily prayer is that I may live long enough to make beautiful the Capitol of the one country in the world in which there is liberty." In the beauty of those speaking walls Brumidi still lives.

Under the white dome on a mammoth mural in simple eloquence, with his brush, he signed himself in this opulent manner, "C. Brumidi, artist, citizen of the United States."

THE PROGRESS OF AGRICULTURE UNDER THIS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, recently there has been some pessimism with respect to the progress of the farm program under this administration. A survey I have just made does not justify this pessimism. In that regard, the following facts are of interest:

FARM INCOME

In 1961 farm income was $12.8 billion.

In 1962 farm income was $12.9 billion.

The 1962 farm income is 10 percent higher than 1960, and the highest since 1953.

AVERAGE FARM INCOME

Average farm income is up 18 percent from 1960. In 1960 it was $2,960; in 1961 it was $3,360; and in 1962 it was $3,500.

HOURLY FARM INCOME

In 1960 it was 87½ cents; in 1961 it was $1.05; and in 1962 it was $1.05.

BUSINESS ACTIVITY IN FARM STATES

Bank deposits and business activity in 20 major farm States are 41.6 percent above that of 1960.

The following facts are also of interest:

The 1961 and 1962 programs will cut feed grain surpluses 28 percent. Note, the 1962 crop year ends October 1, 1963.

The 1961 program reduced corn surpluses 368 million bushels, and the 1962 program is reducing corn surpluses 340 million bushels.

The wheat programs enacted will reduce wheat surpluses to their lowest level since 1957.

Further, as a result of these programs the cost of storing and handling wheat has been cut approximately $215 million.

Feed grain stocks can be reduced to needed reserve levels by 1965.

In wheat stocks, 1,400 million bushels can be cut in half by the midsixties.

In summary, Mr. President, it is clear that under this administration the American farmer is making steady and significant progress, and I believe the American people will be interested in the above facts.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Did the Senator say how much interest income has increased over 1960?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No; I did not refer to that. If the Senator from Louisiana wishes to insert that figure, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thought perhaps the Senator from Missouri referred to that point. It is my impression that interest income is far greater than it was in 1960.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

CASTRO-COMMUNIST SUBVERSION AND THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—COMMUNIST ATTACKS ON VENEZUELA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is important for us and for all citizens to give our attention not just to headlines about developments in Cuba, but to the problems, challenges and opportunities of the whole Caribbean and Latin American areas.

This past weekend, at a United Jewish Appeal dinner in Palm Springs, Calif., I spoke on some of the continuing problems and challenges relating to the security and progress of the Western Hemisphere and in particular, the countries of Latin America.

I ask that excerpts of my address, titled "Castro-Communist Subversion and the Alliance for Progress," be printed in the Record at this point, along with a statement I issued to the press on February 18, titled, "Humphrey Warns of Communist Attacks on Venezuela."

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address and press release were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Castro-Communist Subversion and the Alliance for Progress

(Excerpts of remarks by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, United Jewish Appeal dinner, Palm Springs, Calif., February 23, 1963)

Tonight I wish to speak to you about an area of the world which now demands much of my attention as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and which should command your attention as interested citizens.

I speak of Latin America, which for so many decades was given low priority by our Government, and thought of in terms of a "land of mañana"—"tomorrow"—by most of the people of the United States.

Our national mood and our Government's policy has changed. In the past few years, the United States has recognized the critical needs of Latin America, the tender balance in which it hangs—between freedom and communism—and the need for new policies and programs now exemplified by the Alliance for Progress.

The objectives of our foreign policy have remained constant in Latin America as they have around the world. Our desire is to assist our friends and allies in maintaining national independence and in building progressive democratic governments. This requires the creation of a viable economy and a capability for self-defense. When these have been achieved within a country, that country can then share its achievement, can then assist other countries in building stable free societies. This has been done in Europe in the decades following the war. It is now being done in Israel. It must be done in future decades in Latin America.

ISRAEL CONTRIBUTES TO AFRICA, ASIA, AND LATIN AMERICA

Many of the problems confronting Latin American countries today are those faced by Israel during the past 15 years. Before Israel could begin building a viable economy and a democratic government, she was forced to fight for her life—for her very existence as an independent state. Once her independence as a nation was secured, she turned to making the desert bloom, to building a model progressive democracy in the Middle East.

Israel has achieved this by a truly remarkable mobilization of her own resources, and by generous outside capital assistance. Israel has encouraged private investment, while using the power of government to improve the social and economic welfare of her people.

Having achieved this remarkable economic vitality and political stability within the framework of a democratic government, Israel is now sharing her abundance.

Israel during the past 5 years has extended technical assistance to almost 80 countries in Africa and Asia. It is now accelerating its aid to Latin American countries. Specifically, Israel plans to train about 200 Latin American students in the field of agriculture during the next year.

Israel has already shown what a small country with limited funds can do in the field of foreign aid. Her foreign aid program is very similar to our old point 4 programs—which concentrated on extending technical assistance to underdeveloped countries, rather than on large loans or grants for economic development. Israel is favored with a large pool of trained experts in the fields of agriculture, health, and education. The expertise that made the desert bloom in Israel will now be extended—by the Israelis themselves—to Latin America.

This new program for training agricultural specialists is not the first Israeli activity in Latin America. Already Israeli technicians are working on projects in Brazil, Ecuador, Bolivia, and Venezuela.

In all of these activities, Israel is again demonstrating the value of human resources in developing less-developed countries. It is once again demonstrating that trained manpower is as essential to the economic and social development of a country as the large development loans which are now being given by larger countries and international lending institutions.

LATIN AMERICA MUST MOBILIZE ITS RESOURCES

If our Latin American neighbors are to achieve political stability and economic progress, they must mobilize their own resources as Israel has mobilized hers. They must install efficient, honest governments. They must overhaul their tax and agrarian systems. They must encourage private enterprise. They must devote more resources to education and health. Yet even if they do all of this, this will not be enough.

There will still remain a threat from the outside, a threat which will doom all other attempts to failure unless it is resisted. I refer to the threat of Castro-Communist aggression from Cuba.

We have heard far too much about the military threat of Castro to the United States and far too little about the Castro-Communist threat to the countries of Latin America.

This threat to Latin American nations, particularly those in the Caribbean, is not mythological. It is real. What are the facts?

The fact is that Red Cuba has become a base for the subversion of the hemisphere. It is now a base for the indoctrination and training of hundreds of Latin Americans, who have become experts in sabotage, terrorism, and guerrilla tactics. Cuba supplies covert material support, largely financial, to subversive groups. It is the base for an intensive propaganda campaign using printed materials, news services provided by Prensa Latina and powerful radio transmitters. In disseminating this propaganda, it cooperates with front organizations in Latin American countries in the form of friendship soceties or committees for the defense of the Cuban revolution.

CASTRO-CUBA'S SUBVERSION

This systematic attempt to subvert democratic governments in Latin America is best seen in the case of Venezuela. Venezuela has become the No. 1 target of Communist attack in Latin America. The Communists have concentrated their attacks on Venezuela because the Alliance for Progress is succeeding in that country and giving it a chance for real progress under freedom. It has become the key target because President Rumulo Betancourt, who has just visited this country this week, has given the country 4 years of progressive democratic government.

From Cuba, the Communists have unleashed a continual torrent of intimidation, violence, and terror in Venezuela. It is no surprise that of the 1,500 persons from Latin America trained in Cuba in 1962, the largest number have been Venezuelans. These young men have received a heavy dose of indoctrination in Castro-Communist ideology and guerrilla warfare. They have reported that they go through simulated offensive and defensive guerrilla exercises, are taught how to survive in the jungles, are given map and weapons instruction, as well as other training that every good guerrilla should have. The recent burning of the Sears Roebuck warehouse, the sabotage of the Maracaibo oil refineries, and the pirating of a Venezuelan ship are all a part of this pattern of violence and subversion.

Venezuela has withstood attacks from Communist conspirators because its democratic government has been capable of defending itself against armed attack from within. It has equipped itself, with generous support from the United States, to combat armed attacks, dynamiting, street riots, assassination, bombings, and plain murder. All of this violence is part of the strategy announced by Che Guevara, the Cuban Minister of Industries, in a recent interview with the Havana correspondent of the London Daily Worker: "The Cuban revolution has shown that in conditions of imperialist domination such as exist in Latin America, there is no solution but armed struggle." Both the Betancourt government and the U.S. Government have realized that to cope with such attacks, to cope with repeated attempt at armed insurrection, surplus soybeans are not of much help.

THE DEFEAT OF COMMUNIST SUBVERSION

The control and defeat of Communist subversion requires men trained in riot control, counterguerrilla operations and tactics, intelligence and counterintelligence, public information, psychological warfare, and counterinsurgency units. The United States is assisting Venezuela and other Latin American governments by training selected Latin American personnel at U.S. military schools at Fort Bragg, N.C., and in the Canal Zone. Special U.S. counterinsurgency units are on 24-hour alert in Panama at this very moment. We are assisting through AID programs in public safety. We are helping through civic action programs designed to contribute to economic and social development and to establish a closer rapport between the military and the civilian population.

All of these programs are designed to provide a shield of security behind which the Alliance for Progress can develop. They are essential to preserve the stability and internal security which are necessary to carry the Alliance for Progress forward.

We have heard many suggestions recently for improving the Alliance. Some are justified. The administration of AID should be improved. The Washington bureaucracy should be shaken up. Latin American development plans should be more carefully developed and documented. Latin American reforms should be more rapidly implemented.

But even if all of these were accomplished, the threat to the Alliance for Progress would still remain so long as the Soviet-armed, Communist government governs Cuba and uses it as a base for subversion. The Alliance will remain endangered until the Communist government is removed.

U.S. POLICY ON CUBA

The United States must make it clear to all that our policy on Cuba is firm. Our policy is to remove Castro and communism from the Caribbean. This Red satellite will never be permitted to gain the status of an eastern European satellite—tolerated for the time being. Here the commitment itself is more important than the particular means and methods chosen to enforce the commitment. But the commitment must be enforced. The first step in enforcing it must be the removal of Soviet troops from Cuba. So long as the Soviet troops remain, Red Cuba can terrorize its Caribbean neighbors without fear.

The United States must make clear to the Soviet Union that the presence of her troops in the Western Hemisphere will no longer be tolerated. I am encouraged by recent indications that this lesson is beginning to sink home in the minds of Soviet policymakers. I am encouraged by the report that Premier Khrushchev will withdraw some of the Soviet troops in the next few weeks. But if our current diplomatic efforts fail, then the United States must forthrightly, if reluctantly, impose any measures necessary to insure the speedy achievement of this essential goal.

Once the Soviet troops have been removed, the United States and its partners of the OAS must decide on what further steps are needed to restore a government responsible to the Cuban people, a government genuinely dedicated to the welfare of its subjects. They must decide then which methods are most appropriate to pry loose the iron grip of communism on Cuba—whether economic pressure, a progressively stringent blockade of Cuba, or other measures.

In pursuing this aim of removing the Communist government from Cuba, we must allow our leaders wide latitude in choosing the means suitable to achieve this end. We must permit them considerable leeway in determining the timing and tactics in negotiations with the Soviet Union. Calm resolute leadership can often achieve the same results through patient negotiation as through belligerent threats.

In making this commitment we must make it unmistakably clear that the Castro-Communist tyranny will be replaced with a progressive government. A Cuban government dedicated to political liberty and economic and social reform will have the firm support of the United States, just as the progressive Government of Venezuela does today.

Those countries in the Caribbean most directly threatened by Cuba might consider special measures to counteract Communist subversion. The Central American countries might consider the formation of a regional police force to preserve the security of the area. This should be considered next month when President Kennedy meets in San José, Costa Rica, with the presidents of the Central American Republics.

Our policy must make certain that the Alliance for Progress succeeds. The Cuban-Communist government must be removed not so much because it is an immediate threat to the security of the United States, but because it threatens directly the independence, the security and freedom of the Alliance. Merely removing Castro's Marxist-Leninist regime will not make the Alliance succeed. The U.S. Government has already made clear that it will generously support any government carrying out the social and economic development programs prescribed by the Alliance Charter. We are supporting Venezuela. We are supporting the Colombian 10-year-development plan through the international consortium. We are committed to helping President-elect Bosch transform the Dominican Republic into a model progressive democracy in the Caribbean.

With the removal of the Communist government in Cuba, the wholehearted support of progressive governments in Latin America, the Alliance for Progress will succeed.

Humphrey Warns of Communist Attacks on Venezuela

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota, said yesterday that the government of President Romulo Betancourt in Venezuela has become the number one target of Communist attack in Latin America.

Humphrey issued the statement in advance of the scheduled arrival in Washington tomorrow (Tuesday) of President Betancourt, who plans to meet with President Kennedy during his visit to the United States.

"The Communists have occupied Cuba," Humphrey said. "Now they seek to conquer Venezuela. The battle is on.

"Operating from Castro's Cuba, the Communists have unleashed a continual torrent of intimidation, violence, and terror in Venezuela.

"The recent burning of the Sears Roebuck warehouse, the sabotage of the Maracay oil refineries, and the pirating of a Venezuelan ship all are part of a pattern of violence and subversion."

Humphrey said that the Communists have aimed their attacks on Venezuela because the Alliance for Progress is succeeding in that nation and is giving it a chance for real progress under freedom.

"The attack is motivated also," the Senator added, "by designs on Venezuela's huge resources of oil and iron ore. Those resources could provide the economic base of Communist penetration of the entire South American Continent. They are part of a Communist goal of converting the Caribbean into a Communist sea."

Humphrey urged that the United States give the strongest support to the present Government of Venezuela headed by President Betancourt.

"Venezuela is now a progressive democracy," he said. "It is open and friendly to the United States and vigorously supports us in all international councils.

"President Betancourt's government respects private property and private investment. At the same time, it sponsors the broadest social welfare programs for its people."

The Senator added a call for a clear pronouncement by the United States that an attack of any type on Venezuela will not be tolerated.

"We should make it clear," he said, "that any attack will be repelled, regardless of the cost.

"The Betancourt government has made progress despite the torrent of terror from the extreme left and economic harassment from the extreme right.

"With the help of the United States, it will survive the current external Communist attack and continue to represent a beacon of democracy in the troubled Caribbean area."

SPACE SCIENCE AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN THE MIDWEST

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Minneapolis Morning Tribune editorial of Thursday, January 31, tells the story of a most important development in the upper Midwest. The editorial said:

> There are some occasions, in the life of a community or of a region, which have about them an air of history in the making. One senses that a milestone is being passed, that momentous beginnings are being made, that the occasion will be long remembered. Such an air of history being made could be sensed Tuesday night at a dinner meeing in Minneapolis when plans for an upper Midwest research organization were unfolded. This will be called the North Star Research & Development Institute.

The editorial goes on to comment on the address of Mr. James Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In this remarkable address Mr. Webb demonstrated the intimate relationships between research and economic development and progress. Mr. Webb emphasized the importance that a great university can have to the economic development of an area. This is particularly true in this age of scientific and technological specialization.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks the full text of the editorial be printed.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune, Jan. 31, 1963]

A Historic Occasion

There are some occasions, in the life of a community or of a region, which have about them an air of history in the making. One senses that a milestone is being passed, that momentous beginnings are being made, that the occasion will be long remembered.

Such an air of history being made could be sensed Tuesday night at a dinner meeting in Minneapolis when plans for an upper Midwest research organization were unfolded. This will be called the North Star Research & Development Institute. It will be sponsored by the Midwest Research & Development Council and the University of Minnesota, at the same time remaining an autonomous operation.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the potential impact of this institute on the upper Midwest's growth and development.

James Webb, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, gave a clue to what might be expected when he told his Minneapolis audience that those regions and businesses which are quickest to comprehend scientific and technological change "will be in the forefront of progress and prosperity during the years ahead."

The research to be carried on through this institute is expected to attract new industries to the region and to encourage the retention—and development—of present industries.

To the institute, as it becomes increasingly recognized as a center of scientific talent, there should come a growing allocation of federally financed research and development work to the upper Midwest.

The area served by the institute should act as a magnet to research specialists. Trained men and women whom the region now exports should be encouraged to remain here.

It would be impossible to list here the many public-spirited citizens who have pushed to success the plans for this research institute. The raising of funds—the institute gets under way with assets in excess of $3 million—was in itself a remarkable achievement. But we feel that special mention should go to J. Cameron Thomson for the tireless and dedicated zeal with which he has worked to make the institute a reality.

Yes, Tuesday night's meeting was indeed a historic occasion. And the kind of history which this institute will make for the upper Midwest, in due time, should make very pleasant reading.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the establishment of the North Star Research & Development Institute, working in cooperation with the University of Minnesota and other Midwest colleges and universities, represents a dramatic and significant development in the long-range economic progress of the upper Midwest area. This area is blessed with an abundance of modern, competent, energetic business management; highly trained and skilled workers; an ever-increasing number of scientists and technicians; and many colleges and universities that are recognized for their high academic standards.

The meeting of January 29 at Minneapolis, Minn., was opened by Mr. J. Cameron Thomson, former chairman of the board of the Northwest Bank Corp. and presently president of the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council. The address of Mr. Thomson outlines the broad scope of activity of the Research & Development Council. Mr. Thomson presented to his audience the summaries of the economic studies that have been made by the upper Midwest.

Those in attendance at the dinner meeting of the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council represented the financial, industrial, agricultural, labor, and scientific and educational resources of the upper Midwest area. The speeches of Mr. James Webb, Administrator of NASA, and Mr. J. Cameron Thomson, the president of the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council, outlined a program of economic and scientific development that will have a far-reaching effect upon our Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the addresses of Mr. J. Cameron Thomson and Mr. James Webb be printed at this point in the Record.

I also ask unanimous consent that a list of the officers and directors of the North Star Research & Development Institute be printed in the Record, along with a press release of the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council, dated December 26, 1962.

There being no objection, the addresses, list, and press release were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by J. Cameron Thomson, President, Upper Midwest Research and Development Council, at a Dinner Meeting of the Council in Minneapolis, January 29, 1963

The upper Midwest, thanks to you, thanks to the generosity of the Minneapolis Area Development Corp., the Hill Family Foundation and the area's business leaders, and particularly to the University of Minnesota for its splendid cooperation, is definitely going to have a regional research and development institute. I predict that it is going to be a source of invaluable service to our economy and of pride to all of us.

The organization meeting of its board of directors, including the election of the initial slate of officers, was held this noon. Its name is the North Star Research & Development Institute. The institute is a major breakthrough for our economy; its establishment will effectively symbolize that our part of the country is on the move.

The present decade has witnessed highly significant developments, all part of an adjustment process leading to new growth, and now the institute adds a new dimension to our economy. The $250,000 pledge of the Hill Family Foundation and $500,000 from businessmen, together with the stock of the Minneapolis Area Development Corp., assures us of getting off to a sound financial start.

The institute results from the organization of the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council by business leaders of the area in 1959. The following factors, affecting our economic growth rate, were the principal basis for the businessmen's concern and their determination to develop sound means to change the trend:

A decline in agricultural employment of 27 percent in the decade between 1950 and 1960.

A higher than average dependence on agriculture as a source of income and a lower than average percent of employment in manufacturing.

A per capita income in the region for 1960 roughly 13 percent lower than the U.S. average of $2,223.

A growth in nonagricultural employment during the decade of 13 percent as compared to the national increase of 18.2 percent.

The resulting outmigration of 392,000 persons during the 1950's—this net outmigration was concentrated among the younger age groups, and resulted in increasing the dependent nonlabor force members (persons under 15 and over 65 years of age).

Two basic factors in developing the program were these: First, that we must have the understanding and cooperation of leaders in government, education, agriculture, labor, and business in general; and, second, that we must find a basis for agreement on what needs to be done to promote economic growth. At this point an arrangement was made whereby the University of Minnesota and the Council went into partnership to provide an economic study of the major sectors of our economy.

This study is independent of the council's supervision and is being carried forward under a research committee headed by Frederick L. Deming, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, and Dr. James M. Henderson, research director, with the aid of qualified scholars. Up to date the upper Midwest economic study has issued the following study papers: "Upper Midwest Agriculture: Structure and Problems"; Migration and Population Growth in the Upper Midwest: 1950–60"; "Employment and Earnings in the Upper Midwest: 1950–60"; "Upper Midwest Agriculture: Alternatives for the Future."

Three technical papers also have been issued: "Upper Midwest Agriculture: Structure and Problems (Statistical Supplement)"; "The Geographic Impact of the Federal Budget"; and "Upper Midwest Commodity Flows, 1958."

Succeeding reports will deal with other major phases of the economy of the Ninth Federal Reserve District. This should facilitate open-minded consideration by the diverse elements in our economy because they can all approach the subjects from the same objective, competent analysis.

The study develops the facts as to the significance, history, and status of each major sector of the economy. It includes projections as to the probable status of each sector in 1975, based on present trends, and it will provide a summary of the alternative courses of action available in each sector to accelerate our economic growth rate. Dr. Henderson reports that the balance of the research material will be in the hands of the research committee by June 30, this year, where it will be reviewed, edited if necessary, and approved for publication.

Summaries of the economic study reports, as well as the reports themselves, are available to those requesting them and are distributed to a broad, representative list of citizens throughout the area.

The council's program is not simply a research project but is designed to aid in accelerating the economic growth of the Ninth Federal Reserve District. Based on the reports developed by the study, and further consideration by the council's action report committee and its coordinating committees dealing with agriculture, urban planning, and industrial development, the council will develop a tentative action program. This will be used as a basis for discussions with members of our advisory committees, other leaders throughout the area, and representative State groups. It is hoped that responsible consensus of opinion can be developed, which will reflect the broad public interest, rather than that of any particular group, industry, or political party.

The action report committee is headed by Joyce A. Swan, executive vice president of the Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co., with Julian B. Baird, retired chairman of the First National Bank of St. Paul, and Allen S. King, president of Northern States Power Co., serving as vice chairmen, and a generally representative committee from the area and different economic sectors. The specific coordinating committees are headed by the following people: Agriculture, Dean McNeal, executive vice president of the Pillsbury Co.; industry, Goodrich Lowry, president of Northwest Bancorporation, and Granger Costikyan, president of First Bank Stock Corp.; urban planning, C. David Loeks, director of Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission.

The industry committee will develop suggested programs which will take into account the distance from major markets, the resulting increased transportation costs, the relatively small purchasing power developed in the area, automation and its effect on employment opportunities generally, and specific effects on agriculture, mining, and transportation in our area. It will consider the continuing decline in agricultural employment and the resulting outmigration.

In the Department of Agriculture's booklet, "Food and Agriculture, a Program for the 1960's," the following statement relating to the decline in agriculture was made: "About 60 percent of the Nation's farms produce only about 13 percent of the agricultural output. New economic opportunities must be found for these people."

The booklet further states: "These larger commercial farms ($5,000 annual sales and above) make 87 percent of all farm product sales, but they represent only 39 percent of all farms. Most income from farming is earned by these larger farms." And again it says: "These two important goals—improving income and reducing costs—can be achieved together only if farm output can be reduced below needs for several years and then be allowed to increase over the long run at a rate equal to the rate of growth in demand."

According to one of the Department of Agriculture's own economists, John A. Schnittker, the administration's supply management approach is not designed to cope with all the complex problems of agriculture. Schnittker says the administration's program can help stablize markets but "it cannot provide good incomes to farmers on small, inadequate units. It cannot stop the trend to larger and larger farms. And it cannot provide managerial ability where that capacity is lacking."

The action report committee's basic objective will be to formulate policies which will enable the efficient farmer, meeting competition in the market, the opportunity for a reward equal to that in other sectors of the economy.

Consideration will have to be given to the effect of the Common Market's increase in tariffs that may limit the ability of farmers to sell their products in Europe on a competitive basis. Certainly the committee will give special consideration to the interest of efficient producers of hard spring and Durum wheat which are generally not in surplus. They should be permitted to continue to produce on a competitive basis without being subject to overall quota reductions on wheat which include those varieties in large surplus.

Consideration will be given to improving the position of our dairy farmers in their right to compete for a share in major metropolitan markets without artificial restrictions. Attention will be given to means for encouraging constant improvement in agricultural production and to the development of broader markets for our agricultural products.

I am sure the agriculture committee is interested and qualified and will welcome the cooperation of agricultural leaders in developing its tentative program for consideration.

As to urban planning—we are living in an urban age. In the Ninth Federal Reserve District 51 percent of the nonfarm population lives in 29 urban centers. Half of the total population of the State of Minnesota lives in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. The problems of the relation of thousands, and even millions of people living closer together are continuous. They include congestion of traffic in population centers, unplanned suburban growth, the problem of unforeseen rapid growth in some localities as well as necessary urban renewal projects in declining areas, and the overlapping units of government serving metropolitan areas. It is quite evident that the urban planning study is an essential part of the upper Midwest economic study. If these problems are not adequately dealt with, they affect the cost of doing business and, therefore, our ability to compete in the market.

We are fortunate in being able to avail ourselves of the excellent staffs of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Commission and the University of Minnesota which will facilitate the study and development of an action program.

Consideration must be given by the action report committee to the possibility of additional development of natural resource industries and to increasing the processing of materials produced in the area.

The effect of taxes, particularly those on property, will be studied. Recently I was advised of the tax situation affecting a major national industry which has its headquarters and manufacturing facilities in Minnesota, but also manufactures an identical product in a number of other States. Their total taxes, real, personal, franchise and income, reduced to a cost per hundred units, were 15 percent higher in Minnesota than in the next highest State and over four times as high as in the lowest competitive State. If we are to increase the employment possibilities in our area, with the resulting benefits to all citizens, we must make sure that efficient local manufacturers of products which are sold in the national markets are not handicapped by materially higher tax costs for similar goods and services than their competitors in other States.

Before considering the relationship of the research institute to the providing of additional job opportunities, I want to cite several favorable instances of progress in recent years.

The percentage of successful farms in the Upper Midwest has grown steadily in the past decade, and in 1959 more than one-fourth of all farms in the region had cash receipts in excess of $10,000. The percentage of farms in this "over $10,000" category is above the national average.

The per capita personal income of the farm population in the Upper Midwest remains somewhat above the U.S. average.

The upper Midwest has far fewer farms in the noncommercial (less than $2,500 cash receipts category) than any other region in the Nation.

Percentage growth rate, 1950–60

	Upper Midwest	United States
Oil and gas production	98.9	17.9
Electrical machinery	91.3	45.9
Machinery, except electrical	50.1	21.6

After another successful year of growth, the Minnesota electronics companies total 159, employing approximately 47,000 people with an estimated payroll of $260 million.

In terms of education and the quality of the labor force which the region has available, the upper Midwest fares better than the national average on several counts. The illiteracy rate is considerable lower than nationally, the percent of selective service registrants failing the mental ability test has been less than half the national average, and the per capita expenditure on education is higher than in the Nation as a whole. While the region loses some of its better trained people through outmigration, the residual adult population in upper Midwest urban areas is particularly well-trained when compared with urban areas in most other parts of the country. Among the urban adult population, the upper Midwest has a higher percentage of persons who have completed grade school than any other major region in the Nation. In terms of the percentage of those who have finished high school or college, the upper Midwest is exceeded only by the West.

Early research reports developed the major reliance of the area's economy on agriculture and the less-than-average employment in industry with agricultural employment continuing to decline. In seeking sound opportunities for new employment it is obviously necessary to think in terms of growth industries that are not particularly affected by freight rates and that are geared to the talents and skills of the area's people. The scientific-technological development affecting both defense and civilian employment and the growth possibilities in that type of industry suggested that we would add to the attractiveness of our area if it were fully equipped to compete in the production of scientific-technological products. It was noted that the areas showing the greatest growth in these fields had important research facilities and in some cases outstanding research institutes. Therefore, after consideration of the general question of accelerating our employment opportunities in the scientific and technological fields and consulting with leaders in industry, research and Government, we established the Research Institute Committee with Otto A. Silha, vice president of the Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co., as chairman. Without exception, those consulted concurred in the desirability of establishing a research institute. The committee recommended and the council approved the establishment of an institute, assuming we could have the cooperation of the University of Minnesota and the project could be soundly financed. The regents of the university joined in the plans which were developed to create an autonomous research institute which has just been incorporated. The requisite finances have now been assured, and the research institute is now in being. It is the first specific achievement of the council's action program.

The institute should enable the area to obtain its share of contract research from Government and Government agencies, from industry in the area, and from others seeking to utilize the skills that will be available through the research institute. It will aid the university in retaining desirable talent through affording its staff people opportunities for participation in research projects at the institute at their option. It will aid business generally by providing for research beyond the ability of an individual company to develop such research facilities, and by taking temporary overload projects for industries maintaining their own research staffs. It will add to the number and broaden the base of scientific-technological talents in the area. Through its direct and indirect benefits, it should be a major factor in stepping up our economic growth rate.

The research institute project could not have been completed without the enthusiastic support of those directly connected with the Upper Midwest Council; the services of the Research Institute Committee, the University of Minnesota and Government officials; the financial support developed by the council; and the major contribution by the Minneapolis Area Development Corp. The latter's gift and its potential, realizable value has materially strengthened and insured the research institute's ability to provide much of the capital that will be required for buildings and equipment.

The Upper Midwest Council's program, including the research institute, is in the interest of all Midwest citizens because it aims to increase their economic opportunities and their standards of living. It is by and for the people. It is challenging in its scope and its objectives. It is sound in attempting to accelerate our economic growth rate by objective study, analysis of opportunities and seeking cooperation in translating opportunities into more and better jobs. In so doing, it may merit the comment made by Henry Heald, president of the Ford Foundation, that: "Those who have organized the upper Midwest economic study have acted in the best of the American tradition. They have combined energy and intellect to understand the sweeping forces which are industrializing and urbanizing our exploding population, and by understanding them, to direct, shape, and if possible, master them."

ADDRESS BY JAMES E. WEBB, ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, TO UPPER MIDWEST RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., JANUARY 29, 1963

As many of you know, this is not the first occasion on which I have participated with the business, civic and educational leaders of this area in discussions of the scientific potential of the upper Midwest. I have met on several occasions, here and in Washington, with many of you and with your Senators and Representatives, to consider ways in which this region could participate more fully in our national space effort and utilize the scientific and technological advances to assist in solving your upper Midwest regional problems of development.

I am happy, therefore, to have this opportunity to participate in this meeting tonight because it represents, in essence, the fruition of a long period of effort on the part of many dedicated people. It is a significant occasion not only because of the contribution which the Upper Midwest Research Center can make to economic and other areas of progress in this region—something of concern to all of you—but because of what it can contribute to the success of our expanding national effort to achieve enduring preeminence in space.

My primary objective tonight is to discuss with you the effects of our space program—of our total national effort in scientific research and technological development—on the economic development of the Nation, and the means by which the business and industry of this or any other region can contribute to and participate in the benefits inherent in this effort.

First, however, I think it might be useful to examine what we are doing in space, why we are doing it, how we are doing it, and with what result.

Let me begin with a discussion of the major considerations which make it clear that an understanding of the space environment, and development of the technology which will enable us to operate in space, are an imperative of our times.

President Kennedy has said that "our leadership in science and industry, our hope for peace and security, our obligations to ourselves as well as to others, all require us to make this effort * * * and to become the world's leading spacefaring nation.

"We set sail on this new sea," the President said, "because there is new knowledge to be gained, and new rights to be won, and they must be won and used for the progress of all people. For space science, like nuclear science and all technology, has no conscience of its own.

"Whether it will become a force for good or ill depends on men, and only if the United States occupies a position of preeminence can we help decide whether this new ocean will be a sea of peace, or a new terrifying theater of war."

You will note that the President did not say that our national goal is that of landing the first man on the moon, or, for that matter, of being first with respect to any single achievement in space. We have done many things first, and we will do many other things first—including, we feel confident, sending the first explorers to the moon—but this is not the objective which the President stated.

Rather, he forcefully declared our determination to attain "a position of preeminence" in space and to "become the world's leading spacefaring nation."

It is essential that this distinction be clearly understood. The mastery of space, and its utilization for the benefit of mankind, will not be determined by any single achievement. Superiority in the space environment will be won and held by that nation which first accumulates all of the scientific knowledge, all of the technology, all of the experience, all of the space testing, launching, and terminal facilities for massive space machines, and all of the aids to space navigation required for safety and regular service.

These are the capabilities and resources which the United States is now engaged in bringing together and using in our national space effort.

President Kennedy's eloquent description of the urgency of our space activity might be more specifically defined by citing four major motivations for the effort now underway:

First, the rocket engine, which can operate in the vacuum of space by carrying its own supply of oxygen, has given us and other nations the means to explore and utilize the space medium. Given this ability, and the spectacular achievements already made, our citizens and those of other nations assuredly will not remain confined to this small planet. We and they will explore space, and knowing this, we, as Americans, can settle for nothing less than a position at the forefront of that pioneering effort.

Second, the first Soviet sputnik, and further demonstrations of Soviet advances have made it evident that the United States cannot retain its position as leader of the free world—that, in fact, there may be no free world to lead—if we forfeit to any other nation the opportunity for preeminence in this important new field of science and technology.

Third, it is apparent that our national defense—perhaps even our national survival—demand that we act to insure that no hostile force will be permitted to use space as an unchallenged avenue of aggression against us.

The fourth and most important of the major reasons for undertaking a broad national program of space research and development—the one which promises the greatest rewards for mankind—is the certainty that the basic scientific knowledge gained, and the technological applications which will flow from it, will offer vast returns on our space investment here on earth over many years ahead.

How do we use the capability which the rocket engine has given us—the capability that has enabled us to discard such ancient maxims as "what goes up must come down," or "the sky is the limit"?

For our program in the space sciences we use more than a hundred sounding rockets a year to speed outward from the earth, take measurements near the earth and out to a distance of one earth radius, and fall backward to the earth's surface.

For measurements over longer periods of time and outward to greater distances, we use larger rockets to send out satellites carrying a wide variety of scientific instruments which orbit the earth, some in circular orbits at a few hundred miles, some in elliptical orbits that reach outward several hundred thousand miles. These scientific satellites pass time and again through the various regions of space surrounding the earth, taking continuous measurements and monitoring such phenomena as the radiation in the Van Allen belts, which is caught by the earth's magnetic fields and held in the regions surrounding the earth.

You are probably familiar with some of these scientific satellites such as our own orbiting solar observatory, and the two international satellites, Ariel and Alouette, which were launched as cooperative ventures with Great Britain and Canada.

To explore space beyond the reach of satellites, we use deep space probes like Mariner II which we sent within 21,600 miles of the planet Venus, which measured important features of the planet and transmitted great quantities of data back to earth across 36 million miles of space.

Probes such as Mariner II permit the taking of measurements far out from the earth and the correlation of these with measurements taken near the earth and on the surface of the earth. The ability to measure energy streaming from the sun out millions of miles, then again just above the earth's atmosphere, and again as it reaches the surface of the earth, is expanding our knowledge in many areas related to the earth's atmosphere and weather.

In addition to the data obtained, the flight of Mariner II gave us important experience. The successful use of the highly complicated midcourse correction maneuver, and the very long range tracking and transmission of data—which lasted until January 4 when Mariner was about 54 million miles from the earth—will help to insure the success of future missions.

Even larger spacecraft are required for manned exploration of space. Learning from the Mercury spacecraft which first circled the earth under automatic control and then again carrying Enos the chimpanzee, and then under the control of man as John Glenn circled the earth, we now have designed and are building the two-man Gemini spacecraft. This will give us experience with the weightless condition and other factors in space for a week or more. And beyond this, the three-man Apollo spacecraft which we have under contract will have a capability to orbit the earth a month or two and later will serve as the basic mother craft for manned landing and exploration of the moon.

Parallel with the use of sounding rockets, scientific satellites, deep space probes, and manned spacecraft goes the development of those specialized spacecraft which already are performing useful functions. The Tiros weather satellite has been launched successfully six times and has vastly expanded our understanding of the weather and of the amount of energy absorbed by the earth and reradiated by the earth—knowledge essential to improvements in our capability for understanding the weather and using it most effectively.

The experimental communications satellites, Telstar and Relay, have proved the usefulness of satellite relay stations in space and have begun to lay a foundation on which the ability of man to communicate by telephone, other types of messages, and by television, can be vastly expanded. The world's international communications network bids fair to undergo a revolutionary period of progress as a result of our new knowledge about how to use satellites.

All of the activities which I have described, and additional ones we will undertake in the future, form the basis for a continuing driving U.S. effort to achieve preeminence in space.

The efforts in space of the United States and the Soviet Union have attracted widespread attention throughout the world, not only because of the expansion of knowledge of the universe but because achievements in space have come to be taken as a measure of a nation's scientific leadership, technological capacity, and industrial strength. As we in the United States proceed to carry out our own space program, we are without doubt being judged on our ability to make decisions, concentrate effort, and manage vast and complex technological programs.

The road to preeminence in space may be a long one. It certainly will not end on the moon, regardless of which nation lands the first explorers there.

To achieve and maintain preeminence we must conduct scientific investigations on a broad front. We must demonstrate a continuously advancing technology which enables us to utilize increasingly large vehicles in orbit around the earth and to send both robot and human explorers to the moon and the planets. We must substantially improve our propulsion systems. We must devise reliable means for supplying large amounts of internal electrical power for spacecraft. We must develop instruments and life-support systems that will operate unattended and without maintenance for long periods. And we must improve our equipment and techniques for transmitting and receiving great quantities of data over vast distances.

The success of our space program is dependent upon rapid advances in increasingly efficient use of energy; the development of new materials, metals, fabrics, and lubricants which can withstand wide ranges of temperature, vibration, radiation, and vacuum; the most advanced electronics; and the marriage of all of these with the life sciences.

Important for you, who are leaders in the upper Midwest, is the fact that all of these are the very same forces which underlie and determine economic growth.

But also worthy of your attention is a new situation, so new it is little understood, related to the developments of the past decade. Today this new situation involves the radically new concept that the inventions and innovations which make the best use of the newest advances in these new physical science areas can come only from intellects which have acquired a sophisticated, complete understanding of the basic laws of nature as they have unfolded at such a rapid rate. This means a research-oriented, university-trained, and frequently a university-based mind.

And just ahead of us is yet another new area. This comes from the situation that the new frontiers of knowledge in the physical sciences have laid a foundation for the same type of rapid advance in the life sciences. I am told that just ahead is a breakthrough in understanding of the life processes, just as we now understand the atomic processes.

What this means to you, to me, to all of us, is that the full development of the possibilities inherent in the application of scientific and technical advances can usher in, has the potential for, a period of economic growth that will bring a flowering of human progress, education, and culture. But because the application of this new knowledge must be more sophisticated than it has been before, the university, one of the few powerful continuing institutions in our society, which by its nature must do research and must prepare the graduate and postgraduate trained minds for this new period, must also somehow find a closer relationship with the business community.

It is more important than ever to preserve and foster the concept that in our society it is the entrepreneurial mind of the practical businessman that provides the means for the application and realization of these benefits. Innovation in this new field of industrial-university relationships can, I have no doubt, be pioneered on the science-technology-engineering frontier of the upper Midwest if you who are leaders of this community really desire to apply foresight to the most pressing problems of your region and participate in the development of widely shared goals.

In the past, many of our Nation's largest programs in research and development have either been of a defense or atomic nature, and therefore classified for national security reasons.

Now much of our space program, under the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, is unclassified. Under this law, NASA is required to consult with the scientific community, which largely means the university community, in the design of its program and experiments, and to report not only to this scientific community, but also to the general public on the agency's activities and the results thereof. Further, the fullest measure of cooperation with other nations and with scientists from all the world is specified in this basic act of Congress that established the space policy of the Nation.

Under these circumstances, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is not building up large classified Government laboratories, but is contracting as much as possible of its advanced research and development to qualified industrial firms, private research organizations, and to colleges and universities. Our policy is to place research contracts and grants at those universities where the scholars themselves, the consensus of the faculty, and the administration of the university are interested in having the work progress on a broad interdisciplinary basis, drawing together creative minds, knowledge, and resources from many fields such as mathematics, physics, astronomy, chemistry, biology, sociology, management, economics, and medicine for widely shared participation. Under this policy, NASA research proceeds within the university in the closest association with graduate and postgraduate education, thereby replenishing and augmenting the supply of highly qualified scientists, social scientists, engineers, and technical experts.

It is an important fact to education, to industry, and indeed, to all persons and groups interested in economic, social, and political growth, that the technical fields in which most of our advanced work is done embody the very forces with which regional and community leadership are concerned. These are the forces with which regional leadership must work for progress, improvement, and greater efficiency.

It is also true that the institutions through which citizens and regional community organizations and leaders cooperate to utilize these forces are not as yet strong and reliable. It is our hope that the policies underlying NASA's contracts and grants with universities, its contracts with industry, and the new means we are creating to bring these groups into closer working relationships will make for a widespread strengthening of these institutions of local and regional cooperation, as well as understanding and capability for applications yielding benefits beyond the scope of the specific instruments and devices in our space program.

These policies can, we believe, increasingly create situations within which the interdisciplinary groups working with us in the universities, if joined with other forces for progress and growth in the community, lay the base for even more rapid assimilation and use.

Today, it is accepted that growing industries tend to concentrate in regions where research facilities are best. No part of the country can afford to neglect investments in advanced scientific and engineering education and in first-class research facilities.

Modern industry, too, has much to gain from regional cooperation in support of the universities and associated research efforts. Industrial leaders are beginning, more and more, to look to the universities of their region for the most important resource of the age—ideas, scientific brainpower, and advanced technological skill, experience, and judgment.

It is not a question today of whether a region can already qualify—can now offer the human and natural resources required—for a particular industrial plant or Government facility.

The question is whether the region is creatively doing what it can to equip its citizens to serve their area and their Nation in a period when our prosperity and our very existence as a free people depend on scientific and technological leadership.

This discussion implies that a corporation, or even a regional area, will remain competitive, and prosper in this new age, only through the closest coordination between educational institutions and business and industry, with the institutional scientists finding a more clear-cut role in feeding into the industrial stream the new knowledge which flows from a vast research and development effort.

But, in my view this would be quite incomplete and skewed dangerously in one direction unless this process also encompasses an effective means for a feedback into the more powerful and intellectually oriented institutions from the entrepreneurial mind of the practical businessman, the man who under our system must take the risk for profit or loss, and his associate, the experienced engineer who must see that things—even new things—work and give service.

As this becomes more fully realized, those regions and businesses which are quickest to comprehend the significance of this tide of change, and move with this tide will be in the forefront of progress and prosperity during the years ahead.

How, then, does all this relate to the establishment of a research center to serve the upper Midwest region?

I have indicated that we in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration consider it essential that, to the extent possible, our contracts for basic research be placed with universities. Thus, while achieving our research objectives, we also contribute to the development of a continuing supply of highly trained scholars who know how to use brainpower, the most critical resource in this new age of science and technology.

Meanwhile, however, we regard most seriously our responsibility to try to assure that the results of this research are available for use by the industrial community, for the benefit of every American.

Since 1955, the Federal investment in scientific research and development has grown fivefold—from slightly over $3 billion to almost $15 billion included in President Kennedy's budget for fiscal year 1964. Industry is expending an additional $5 billion a year for the same purpose.

As a result of this tremendous research effort, there are published each day, worldwide, scientific papers in quantity sufficient to fill seven complete sets of the Encyclopedia Brittanica—60 million pages throughout the world each year.

Because of this vast research and development effort, scientists and engineers are compressing into one 10-year period—this decade of the 1960's—an intensified research and development program that would normally take 50 years.

In the space program, the principal incentive is the fact that we must learn to understand and operate in a new and hostile environment, under conditions which man has not encountered before: very high vacuums, cosmic rays, ionized gases, tremendous accelerations, great extremes of temperature, violent stress of vibration and shock.

Coping with these conditions has resulted in lighter materials, increasing use of chemicals for applications heretofore considered impossible, new electronics systems, new coatings, new materials capable of withstanding the temperature of liquid hydrogen, 423° below zero, as well as rocket thrust chamber temperatures ranging almost to 5,000° above.

The businessman, it has been said, needs to know more about these new materials than his father knew about steel. The executive whose understanding of materials is limited to the difference between a metal and a plastic may find his competitor passing him by. And the same may be said for the new processes and manufacturing techniques developed in space research.

But how can the businessman know what he needs to know about this great mass of research in an era in which, for example, a young chemist who decided to spend his life reading the literature of chemistry would fall 10 years further behind during each year of effort?

The answer may lie, as I have suggested, in the development of close relationships between university-based scientists and the industrial community, with evolving but differing ratios of attention to basic research, and to the development of applied research to convert basic knowledge to practical applications.

It is for this reason that the memorandum of understanding announced today running parallel with a grant of about $700,000 to the University of Minnesota for the construction of research facilities, provides that the university "will undertake, in an energetic and organized manner, to create a broadly based multidisciplinary team to explore mechanisms whereby the progress and research results achieved in space science and technology may be fed into the industries and segments of the economy with which the university normally has close relations."

This memorandum of understanding also specifies that "research is to be encouraged on ways and means to expand and search for practical applications and in the economic and social impact of our national involvement in space exploration. Furthermore, the university will undertake to make the scientific community, as well as the industrial and business communities, aware of new opportunities for application of specific developments or processes stemming from the space program."

Supplementing these efforts of the university, your Upper Midwest Regional Research Center can make a great contribution to the area which it serves. And, if you will permit me to make a suggestion, to the business and industrial representatives here, one way to start in your pioneering of new approaches, would be to consider a reciprocal arrangement to the one I have just described—one in which you reach out to the universities of the region in the manner that the University of Minnesota has just agreed to reach out to you.

An outstanding example of what can be accomplished is the Midwest Research Center in Kansas City, Mo. Over the past 18 years this nonprofit institution has worked with about 900 industrial firms and 200 State and Federal agencies, performing some 2,500 different research assignments.

Recently, under contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, this research institute has explored the problem of effecting industrial application of space research in several Midwestern States. Although only a pilot project, conducted on a limited scale, many potential applications of space research results have already been uncovered. Perhaps the most spectacular example was that of a firm which was about to build a $4 million facility to manufacture a new product. Midwest Research Institute acquainted them with an explosive metal forming process which the firm now plans to use. It is estimated that it will reduce the firm's construction costs by $1½ to $2 million.

There is no doubt that the Midwest Research Institute has been of great value to the area which it serves, and I have no doubt that the research center planned here can be of equal value to you, particularly because of the close association which it will enjoy with the universities of the region.

I strongly believe, as my presence here indicates, that it is a project which deserves support, not in competition with, but as an addition to university activity in the region. May I suggest, however, that those who support it, should do so only while recognizing their continuing obligation to support the basic research programs of the region's universities, which are, after all, the heart of progress in the fast-moving age in which we live.

May I close by congratulating all of you for the progress which you have made in the development of this research center during the period since I first became aware of your interest in it, and by expressing my confidence, and that of my associates in NASA, that it will fulfill not only your, but our, hopes for it.

NORTH STAR RESEARCH CHOOSES OFFICERS

Officers of the North Star Research and Development Institute were elected at a luncheon meeting Tuesday.

Chairman is O. Meredith Wilson, president of the University of Minnesota.

Other officers include J. Cameron Thomson, president of the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council, vice chairman; Philip H. Nason, president of First National Bank of St. Paul, treasurer; Wendell T. Burns, executive secretary of the Upper Midwest Council, secretary.

Vice presidents will be Philip B. Harris, senior vice president of Northewestern National Bank of Minneapolis; Lloyd A. Hatch, vice president, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.; A. A. Heckman, executive director, Hill Family Foundation, and Otto A. Silha, vice president of the Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co.

The officers are also directors of the institute. Other directors include:

Prof. Neal R. Amundson, department of chemical engineering, University of Minnesota; Dwayne O. Andreas, executive vice president, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul; Julian B. Baird, retired chairman, First National Bank of St. Paul; Charles H. Bell, chairman, General Mills, Inc.; Judson Bemis, president, Bemis Bros. Bag Co.; Prof. Sherwood O. Berg, department of agricultural economics, University of Minnesota.

Christian P. Beukema, president, Oliver Iron Mining Division, United States Steel Corp., Duluth; James H. Binger, president Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.; H. William Blake, president, Northwestern National Bank of St. Paul; Prof. John R. Borchert, Department of Geography, University of Minnesota; Herbert P. Buetow, president, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co.; Francis E. Butler, St. Paul; Prof. John A. Buttricfi, Department of Economics, University of Minnesota.

Dr. Edgar M. Carlson, president, Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.; Frank G. Chesley, president, Central Research Laboratories, Inc., Red Wing, Minn.; Prof. Preston E. Cloud, Jr., Department of Geology, University of Minnesota; J. E. Corette, president, Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.; H. H. Corey, chairman, Geo. A. Hormel & Co., Austin, Minn.; Granger Costikyan, president, First Bank Stock Corp., John Cowles, president, Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co.

Dean Bryce Crawford Jr., Graduate School, University of Minnesota; Richard E. Crawford, president, Minnesota Valley Natural Gas Co.; Thomas M. Crosby, president, Northwest Growth Fund, Inc.; Harold J. Cummings, president, Minnesota Mutual Life Insurance Co., St. Paul; Albert H. Daggett, president, Gould-National Batteries, Inc., St. Paul; John Daniels, president, Archer Daniels Midland Co.

Provost Raymond W. Darland, University of Minnesota, Duluth; Prof. Emeritus Edward W. Davis, Silver Bay, Minn.; Donald C. Dayton, president, Dayton Co.; Frederick L. Deming, president, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis; Robert Faegre, president, Minnesota & Ontario Paper Co.; L. E. Felton, president, Green Giant Co., Le Sueur, Minn.; Daniel C. Gainey, Josten Manufacturing Co., Owatonna, Minn.; Frederick R. Gamble, vice president, Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.

Paul S. Gerot, president, Pillsbury Co.; Dean Paul V. Grambsch, School of Business Administration, University of Minnesota; F. Peavey Heffelfinger, chairman, F. H. Peavey & Co.

Robert E. Hess, Minnesota AFL–CIO, St. Paul; Prof. Leonid Hurwicz, Department of Economics, University of Minnesota; A. B. Jackson, president, St. Paul Fire & Marine Insurance Co.; St. Paul; E. F. Johnson, president, E. F. Johnson Co., Waseca, Minn.; A. J. Jordan, Jr., president, Jordan Millwork Co., Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; David G. Kelly, Grand Forks, N. Dak.; Allen S. King, president, Northern States Power Co.

David M. Lilly, president, Toro Manufacturing Corp.; Chester C. Lind, president, First National Bank of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, S. Dak.; Goodrich Lowry, president, Northwest Bancorporation; Prof. Walter O. Lundberg, Hormel Institute, Austin, Minn.; Laurence R. Lunden, vice president, University of Minnesota; Robert S. Macfarlane, president, Northern Pacific Railway Co., St. Paul; Dean Harold Macy, Institute of Agriculture, University of Minnesota; Dr. C. W. Mayo, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn.

Adrian O. McLellan, president, Merchants National Bank, Fargo, N. Dak.; Donald G. McNeely, president, McGill-Warner Co., St. Paul; Arthur C. Melamed, president, Coast-to-Coast Stores Central Organization, Inc.; D. C. Minard, president, Trane Co., La Crosse, Wis.; John A. Moorhead, president, Northwestern National Bank of Minneapolis; Gerald T. Mullin, president, Minneapolis Gas Co.; Gordon Murray, president, First National Bank of Minneapolis; Leonard H. Murray, president, Soo Line Railroad Co.; John M. Musser, vice president, Weyerhaeuser Co., St. Paul.

Prof. Will M. Myers, Department of Agronomy and Plant Genetics, University of Minnesota; Prof. Alfred O. C. Nier, Physics Department, University of Minnesota; William C. Norris, president, Control Data Corp; Donald Nyrop, president, Northwest Airlines, Inc.; Jay Phillips, president, Ed Phillips & Sons Co.

John S. Pillsbury, Jr., president, Northwestern National Life Insurance Co.; Ed W. Rawlings, president, General Mills; B. H. Ridder, Jr., publisher, St. Paul Dispatch & Pioneer Press; Paul Schilling, chairman, Waldorf Paper Products Co., St. Paul; the Right Reverend Monsignor James P. Shannon, College of St. Thomas, St. Paul; Prof. W. G. Shepherd, Department of Electrical Engineering, University of Minnesota.

Dean Athelstan Spilhaus, Institute of Technology, University of Minnesota; Francis C. Sullivan, attorney, Duluth; Dean W. T. S. Thorp, College of Veterinary Medicine, University of Minnesota; Prof. Maurice B. Visscher, Department of Physiology, University of Minnesota Medical School; Dr. Cecil J. Watson, Mayo Memorial, University of Minnesota.

Stanley J. Wenberg, vice president, University of Minnesota; Paul B. Wishart, chairman, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.; R. G. Woodworth, senior vice president, Cargill, Inc.; Cyrus G. Wright, chairman, Otter Tail Power Co., Fergus Falls, Minn., and Willis D. Wyard, First American National Bank, Duluth, Minn.

Minneapolis, Minn.—Minnesota, excluding the Twin Cities, gained 56,325 nonagricultural jobs during the decade from 1950 to 1960.

Employment growth in out-State towns and cities was a substantial 13.3 percent but 4.9 percent less than the national average,

according to the Upper Midwest economic study report on "Employment and Earnings Growth" prepared by R. Stephen Rodd and Dr. James M. Henderson with the assistance of John S. Adams.

The study is being jointly sponsored by the Upper Midwest Research & Development Council and the University of Minnesota. Results of the research are to be used in the council's action program aimed at accelerating the economic growth of the region.

The report treats the Twin Cities metropolitan area and the remainder of the State as to two separate economic areas, "with different structures and patterns of change."

Employment growth in Hennepin, Ramsey, Anoka, Dakota, and Washington Counties, included in the Twin Cities metropolitan area, was 101,475 or 20 percent, 1.8 percent above the national average for the decade.

Nonmetropolitan Minnesota is dominated by the farming economy but to a lesser degree than other States in the Upper Midwest, the report states. Manufacturing provides almost 17 percent of all nonagricultural employment; iron mining accounts for 3.3 percent. Railroads, retailing, and local government have comparatively high shares in total employment.

Although employment rose less rapidly than nationally, manufacturing grew by 15.5 percent, one-third faster than the U.S. average. Growth was especially strong in dairy products, paper, chemicals, fabricated metals, machinery, and instruments. Most service activities showed less rapid gains than in the Nation, the exception being Federal Government employment.

Almost all of the decade's growth took place in the first 5 years of the decade, when an 11.9 percent growth slightly exceeded the national rate. The latter 5 years were a period of decline in construction, retailing, and railroads, offset by expansions in manufacturing and local government.

For the region as a whole the gain in nonagricultural jobs during the decade was reported as 211,000. Job losses and gains were distributed among the areas as follows: Minnesota (as a whole) 157,800; Montana 20,700, North Dakota 20,174, South Dakota 23,698, northwestern Wisconsin −5,142, and Upper Michigan −6,809.

National average earnings per employee in 1960 were $4,764 and in Minnesota were only $106 less than this amount. For the other areas the earnings per employee were: South Dakota $3,798, Montana $4,330, North Dakota $4,026, northwestern Wisconsin $4,148, and Upper Michigan $4,346. The report explained that these below average levels of earnings were partially the result of "weighting toward relatively low earnings sectors—trades, services, and State and local governments."

Manufacturing employment for the region grew by 8.3 percent, contrasted with the national growth of 9.8 percent. Percentages for each area: Twin Cities 13.8, other Minnesota 15.5, South Dakota, 12.7, Montana 8.7, South Dakota 4.6, northwestern Wisconsin −3.2, Upper Michigan −32.1.

The report concluded, "Mining, trade, services, government and railroads are of greater than average relative importance in the Upper Midwest—manufacturing less important." The region's historical ties are becoming less apparent with passage of time. With the exception of northwestern Wisconsin, the employment distribution more closely resembled the national distribution in 1960 than in 1950.

ADEQUATE HOUSING IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on January 30, 1963, at the International Housing Workshop here in Washington, two major addresses were delivered which illuminate the critical problem of the development of adequate housing in Latin America. One address was by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Housing Subcommittee, the Honorable John Sparkman, and the other was by the Honorable Joseph P. McMurray, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

I commend both of these addresses to those who are interested in accelerating the construction of housing in Latin America.

Housing is unquestionably one of the priority needs throughout all of Latin America, and unquestionably the growth of the savings and loan movement, and the interest of American builders in constructing in Latin America are promising developments. Both should be strongly encouraged by our Government, in addition to the self-help cooperative and public housing programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an address by the Honorable John Sparkman and an address by the Honorable Joseph P. McMurray to the International Housing Workshop on January 30, 1963, in Washington, D.C., entitled "The Savings and Loan Movement in South America."

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL HOUSING WORKSHOP, JANUARY 30, 1963, NATIONAL HOUSING CENTER, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am pleased to have been invited to make the keynote address at this morning's workshop session on international housing.

There is gathered here today a small but select group of housing and foreign aid experts and representatives from the home building industry all interested in oversea housing. An all-day meeting of such a group, representing the points of view of both the hardheaded businessmen and the more theoretical internationalist, should come up with some practical recommendations for improving our housing assistance programs abroad.

Some of you builders who have had experience in building abroad have come here to discuss existing aid programs and to make recommendations for improving them. Some of you who are new to this subject are anxious to learn about the programs and what the prospects are for the future. These are worthwhile objectives but I understand that the organizers of this meeting want to broaden the discussion as wide as possible to answer the question—how can housing become a more effective instrument of U.S. foreign policy?

It is indeed gratifying to see on all sides so much interest being generated in the subject of international housing. Only last week in Lima, Peru, a large number of U.S. housing and savings and loan experts met in conference with representatives from practically all the Latin American countries to promote the expansion of thrift and home ownership in those countries. Also last week in New York, the United Nations held a meeting of the new Housing Committee of the Economic and Social Council. Concurrent with that meeting, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment officials conferred on international housing.

I only hope that meetings like these will crystallize the interest in international housing into specific recommendations for action. I say this because our accomplishments to date are not particularly noteworthy and we need the benefit of the thinking and support from groups like these to get the program off the ground.

In talking to you about foreign aid housing, I am sure there is no need to dwell on the housing problem in the foreign countries. The United Nations published a report recently stating that two billion people, or two-thirds of the human race, live in countries where dire poverty and deprivation prevail. Of this number, about one-quarter billion live in countries which are underdeveloped and friendly to the free world and desirous of our help for advancing their economic well-being.

In past centuries, the people of these countries have been content to live in their squalid condition. Today, through improved communication and transportation, these people have learned that the world has better things to offer than the inevitable hunger, disease, and slums of the past. They are no longer content. They want something better and they intend to get it one way or another.

The United States has committed itself to help these people. President Truman's point 4 program was the first recognition of our responsibility to the people of the underdeveloped countries of the world. Much has transpired since then and many hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent by our Government in its effort to stabilize the world through economic and social assistance programs.

Assistance for housing, however, was never considered very important and nothing of any great consequence was accomplished up until 1960 when the Development Loan Fund was first used to finance the purchase of homes.

The first big breakthrough in the legislative front occurred in 1961 when the Congress appropriated $394 million for the social progress trust fund to be administered by the Inter-American Development Bank to make loans for housing and other activities for the social development of the Latin American countries.

Also the 1961 act initiated a program of investment guarantees for housing. This, the so-called all-risk guarantee, was to insure U.S. investors against loss up to 75 percent of the investment in pilot or demonstration private housing projects of the FHA type in Latin America. This provision was welcomed by the homebuilders at first as a most attractive device for getting the mortgage money to finance homes to be built in Latin America. But the program did not click. The 75-percent guarantee was not acceptable to our institutional lenders which meant that the sponsors would have to deposit assets to cover the other 25 percent in order to get a loan.

In recognition of the difficulty, the 1962 Foreign Assistance Act was written to authorize the U.S. Government to guarantee the investor against all losses provided there was an appropriate participation by the investor in the risk. This very liberal guarantee applied not only to housing loans for Latin America, but for all the less-developed countries participating in our foreign-aid program. A new ceiling of $180 million of guarantees was established under the 1962 act for the all-risk provision under section 221(b), and $60 million was earmarked specifically for Latin America housing under section 224.

As of now, we have had one project approved. This is for a housing project of 2,000 homes for middle-income families in Cali, Colombia. The financing arrangements as you would expect, are somewhat complex, involving a $7 million long-term loan by a U.S. firm to a Colombian institution. Our Government, under section 224 of the 1961 Foreign Assistance Act, will cover 75 percent of the loan, or $5¼ million. The

Colombian Government is joining our Government in guaranteeing the U.S. investor against loss, either due to normal economic factors or currency devaluation. The downpayments by the purchasers will comprise 20 percent of the purchase price and monthly payments over a 10-year amortization period. The houses sell for about $5,500.

I understand that one other project is ready for approval under this provision, and several others are in the final stages of approval. No more applications are being accepted at this time because the Agency says that applications on file are for amounts well over the statutory limit. There is some criticism of this because none of the section 221 money has been committed for housing. The statutory limit referred to by the Agency is the $60 million under section 224.

There are many questions about this program which I am sure you will raise today. This is not an easy program to administer. Builders have objected to the slowness of the application approvals and some of the so-called redtape involved not without justification. However, there have been many difficult problems faced by the small staff assigned to this. Considering its international aspects, I should think that FHA underwriting would be relatively simple compared to this type of underwriting, and I hope in your discussions today that you will keep this fact in mind and that your comments will be of a constructive nature to help the Agency improve its processing.

As you know, I sponsored the 1962 amendments on investment guarantees for housing because I saw the great need and opportunity to get U.S. builders and American capital together to get the international housing program underway. At the same time, I realized the risks involved and cautioned the Agency on its administration of the program. I proposed that an advisory committee of well-qualified mortgage and homebuilding experts be established to help the Agency formulate policy. I was told by Mr. Hamilton, the AID Administrator at that time, that it was a good idea but, as of today, nothing has happened. The last time I checked, I was told that the President was about to name the committee. I do not wish to scold the Agency but its performance under this program has not been very satisfactory.

The other active program of the Agency for International Development is the promotion of savings and loan associations in the less-developed countries. Thrift and homeownership are concepts which have been deeply instilled in our American tradition and we are proud of the part that the savings and loan associations have played in making our country the best housed in the world. This accomplishment is shared by our great homebuilding industry. But these groups could never have done the job unless there was a ready market financially capable of purchasing the house.

It is this combination of economic forces that needs to be brought together in the less developed countries to insure an adequate production of housing.

As of today, the U.S. Government is helping, through technical and financial assistance, to start savings and loan systems in Peru, Chile, Ecuador, Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, and one African country, Ethiopia.

The most successful has been the Chilean program. Let me tell you about it because it can well represent a model on which other countries can build.

In 1958, a team of U.S. technicians made recommendations for the establishment of a savings and loan system with a central bank to operate on a quadruple capacity as supervisor, an insurer of mortgage loans, a guarantor of deposits, and a secondary mortgage facility. In addition, because of the inflation problem, a maintenance of value system was recommended to solve the problem of currency devaluation.

The first charter for a savings and loan association was issued in 1961. Today there are 20 associations chartered and accumulating savings at a rate of $1 million a month.

Savings per person are small—only about $300—but this is not bad considering that the average wage paid to workers is about $1 a day. As of August, about 2,000 mortgages had been approved by the board of directors of the associations.

One of the features of the Chilean system is the maintenance of value provision. This is an extremely intriguing device to counteract the effect of inflation. By its terms all savings accounts and all outstanding mortgage loan balances are adjusted annually in accordance with the changes in the index of salaries and wages.

There were many critics of these provisions who doubted that an adjustment formula would ever work. It was said that savers would not mind because they received an upward adjustment in their account, but the borrowers would complain bitterly if their unpaid balance were to be increased significantly by the adjustment.

This is a problem and I would not want to discount its possible impact on certain nonwage earning people, but all I can say is that the Chile experience has survived its first year. On June 30, 1962, the system applied its first adjustment—12 percent to both savings and lendings. For savers, the 12-percent increase was added on top of a dividend paid, amounting to 3 to 4½ percent.

There have been many problems in creating the Chilean system and in watching over it as it grew. There is one feature which I think may have initially accounted for the Chilean success whereas other countries have failed. Our Government has followed through in Chile by retaining an outstanding technician to work along with the new organizations and to help them in every way. This necessity for follow through, I strongly feel, cannot be stressed enough. Like golf or bowling, the game may be lost if accuracy is marred by failing to follow through.

All of this leads me to the current bill before our committee to establish an International Home Loan Bank. The bill, introduced by Senator SMATHERS and cosponcored by me, has two purposes—first, to accumulate capital and, secondly, to provide trained technicians for the establishment of mutual thrift systems in underdeveloped countries. I consider these two purposes of equal importance. One cannot function without the other. U.S. dollars alone, flowing into these countries, would be worthless unless accompanied by technicians trained in how to use these dollars to create a self-supporting thrift system within the recipient country. Likewise, technical assistance would be worthless without U.S. dollars backing it up and acting as a "big stick."

The bill would limit the investment of a U.S. savings and loan association to 1 percent of its assets, so certainly no one can say that this is a profiteering activity even if the rate of return might be somewhat higher than for domestic loans. In Chile and Venezuela, the maximum interest charged the buyer is 7 percent on these loans.

The bill would provide for ex officio representation on the Board of one person from Treasury Department and one from State Department in order to avoid the criticism leveled at an earlier bill that the Board may act independently of our foreign policy in making dollar loans to foreign governments. This charge was the most serious one raised against the bill and will be probably the most difficult hurdle to overcome in getting administration support. Whether the ex officio representation will answer the objection will not be known until we have a chance to hear from the State Department.

We also heard questions about how the International Bank would be assured of its repayment in U.S. dollars by foreign governments. I assume that some guarantee will need to be given by the recipient government, but I am not sure what would happen in case of a change in the government or if the government had such a dollar shortage that it could not possibly repay the Bank in dollars.

Although we do not hear much about it in the open discussion, I believe that another objection to the bill involves the feeling of some that a big savings and loan program would be a lopsided one in accord with the need. Its beneficiaries would be mainly middle-income rather than the low-income families, where the greatest need exists.

There are many answers to this objection, but I think most important of all, the program is not proposed as a Government subsidy program. It is a private enterprise activity seeking Government acquiescence to carry out the intent of our foreign aid program to help these countries in their economic and social development.

Regarding the economic level reached by such housing, I recall an interesting observation made by several Latin Americans that communism is fired up more by frustrated intellectuals than by the uneducated poor. These people, many of whom have white-collar jobs, feel their lack of housing just as badly as the poor peon. They know that much of the housing shortage is unnecessary and can cause a lot of trouble. A middle-income program of home financing, therefore, is critically needed for this group.

There is not much question but that a good comprehensive program should be concerned about housing for all levels of family income. Cooperative housing has had some success in providing housing for the middle-income families. Self-help housing and Government-owned housing seem to be the most common method suggested to take care of the great masses of ill-housed low-income people. But our Government can do relatively little here, other than to provide some technical assistance, because of the very magnitude of the problem.

This leads me to tell you about a study currently being undertaken by our subcommittee on the subject of international housing.

The purpose of this study is to review our programs of housing assistance in the less developed countries and to consider proposals for improvements. We invited 36 scholars and housing experts to submit papers on a number of topics relevant to this subject. Those papers are on their way to the printer and should be available sometime this month.

In addition to the papers, we have requested reports from the Agency for International Development, the Organization of American States, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Inter-American Development Bank.

Among the topics in the study, one of the most important is the relationship between housing and economic development. As you know, many economists have claimed that housing as a consumer good should be a low priority item in our foreign assistance program. They have said that U.S. dollar assistance should be given or loaned to less developed countries only for productive enterprises which would result in earning foreign exchange for the recipient country. Otherwise such assistance would be inflationary.

We have received several excellent papers on this subject which provide support for

an entirely new point of view. After reading these papers, I feel that there will be a great deal more understanding, not only of the economics involved, but also of the sociopolitical factors in housing assistance, both of which are of important consideration in our foreign assistance program.

I am sure that this subject is bound to come up today in your discussions, and I shall look forward to the conclusions you might reach on it.

We also have requested papers on topics involving organizational problems, that is, what agency (AID, the U.N., IADE, OAS, etc.) should do what. The jurisdictional issue is always a matter for discussion at meetings of this kind.

Other papers raise questions about where private enterprise fits into the program. We also asked what the city planners could do and how the building materials industry could be stimulated in the foreign aid countries.

Also how does our Government insure that proper community facilities are installed as a prerequisite to construction of homes financed with U.S. funds.

Aided self-help, cooperative housing, slum clearance, and public housing are covered.

We also have papers on what can be done to train the people of these countries to do the job themselves. We wanted to know what new educational devices should be developed. Is our OAS school in Bogotá doing an efficient job and should such a school be expanded further? Should similar training schools be established in other parts of the world?

We tried to cover all facets of the subject and we are very pleased with the responses. The papers represent a lot of hard work on the part of the writers and the committee is very grateful to them.

Many of these same topics will be discussed here today because they are fundamental to the issue and our Government is still searching for answers in order to establish policy. I understand there are some Government people here today so you can be assured that your discussions will not go unnoticed. Furthermore, the subcommittee would be very happy to receive from you any resolutions that might result from this meeting.

THE SAVINGS AND LOAN MOVEMENT IN SOUTH AMERICA

(By Joseph P. McMurray[1])

It is truly a privilege of a high order to say a few words today on the savings and loan movement in Latin America.

The very fact that it is now possible to refer to such a movement in that part of our hemisphere which lies to the south of us speaks volumes. Until quite recently, accuracy would have permitted no more than references to surveys, proposals, or beginnings.

It is not so today. The existence of such a movement is attested by the number of countries in which the legal foundations have been laid for systems of these institutions, by the progress which has attended their establishment in a number of those countries, and by the enthusiastic support which was given to the first Inter-American Savings and Loan Conference, held last week in Lima, Peru, and attended by my colleague on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Mr. Joseph J. Williams, Jr., who has given me most favorable reports of its success.

Most of you are not directly connected with savings and loan associations, and I think I should give at least a very brief background statement about them.

The typical savings and loan association is a privately owned, operated, locally organized and managed thrift and home financing institution. It holds itself open to receive savings from members of the public, to whom it pays earnings on those savings periodically, and it invests those funds in long-term loans on homes and other residential properties, including construction loans. The ability with which it performs these functions is illustrated by the fact that the approximately six thousand savings and loan associations in this country presently hold such savings in the amount of some $80 billion, their total assets exceeding $93 billion.

While privately owned, and privately operated by their own boards of directors and managers, they are, like banks, examined and supervised by State officials or bodies, or, in the case of those which are federally chartered, by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, of which I am Chairman. That Board also supervises the Federal home loan banks, which are credit facilities for all Federal associations and for such State-chartered associations as become members. It likewise directs the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, which insures, up to the statutory limit, the savings of members of the public in all Federal associations and in State-chartered associations which avail themselves of this insurance.

No one who attends this workshop will, I am sure, leave without a keen awareness of the appalling lack of adequate housing in Latin America. Two primary causes of this situation have been, first, the absence of modern techniques in housing construction, and, second, and not least, the dearth of long-term home-mortgage financing for the building and purchase of homes. At the root of this shortage of available financing has been the lack of such a group of financial intermediaries as the savings and loan associations which we have here.

Experience both in the United States, with its savings and loan associations, and in Britain and the British Commonwealth, with their similar institutions known as building societies, has given impressive demonstration for many years of the way in which institutions of the savings and loan type can serve the small saver, the home builder, and the ultimate home buyer and owner.

The belief that such institutions can fill a similar role in Latin American countries has been a natural outgrowth of that demonstrated success. It has been fostered by the experience in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, where ethnic backgrounds and other factors have been similar to those in Latin America and where, in approximately a decade savings and loan associations have been established and now have approximately $115 million in assets, they have fully proved their viability both in the savings and in the home financing field.

With this background of experience in this country and elsewhere, a number of the leading personalities in the savings and loan industry of this country, beginning at least as far back as 1958, made surveys of greater or lesser depth in some 12 Latin American countries to sound out the feasibility of the establishment of savings and loan associations in those countries. They did this quite generally under the auspices of the International Cooperation Administration and its successor, the Agency for International Development, although in some cases on their own initiative. Outstanding contributions of time and effort were also made to this work by executives and staff of leading savings and loan trade organizations.

Passing from the survey stage, comprehensive legislation has been drafted for many of these countries, and in some five of them there are now associations in operation.

In Chile, within approximately 2 years, according to information received through channels which are unofficial but which I believe to be reliable, there have been established 21 associations with over $16 million in savings and some 22,000 investors, and with approximately 3,000 mortgages approved or in process. In Peru, according to information similarly received, eight associations are underway, and these associations have generated approximately $2 million in savings and have granted more than 800 loans.

The types of facilities provided have generally paralleled those in this country, with the addition of a facility similar to the Federal Housing Administration.

They have, therefore, generally included four distinct elements. The first is a facility to charter and supervise savings and loan associations. In our country these functions are performed by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or, in the case of State-chartered institutions, by the State authorities. The second is a facility with functions similar to those of the Federal home loan banks, to provide funds for the associations for seasonal and emergency needs, as well as additional funds for home lending. The third is a facility similar to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to insure the savings placed in the associations. The fourth is a facility to insure residential mortgages in a manner similar to the Federal Housing Administration.

With the passing of the survey stage, the primary need in the area of what I may call human assistance, as distinguished from financial assistance, is first, for aid in developing sound patterns of law and regulations; and, second, but second only in point of time, for assistance in the training of executive and operating personnel.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board, along with other governmental agencies and the savings and loan associations and their trade organizations, has been happy to be of help in this field.

Thus, the Board provided a member of its legal staff to assist in the development of legislation and regulations in El Salvador. It made available its Director of Federal Home Loan Bank Operations as a member of a two-man team of consultants for the Agency for International Development in connection with the establishment of a savings and loan system in the Dominican Republic.

Later, it provided a staff member of its division of supervision to serve, with a vice president of one of the Federal home loan banks, in a consultant capacity in the drafting of regulations to implement the newly enacted savings and loan laws in that country. The other Board members and I have made ourselves freely available for consultation by savings and loan officials of interested countries, and have encouraged our staff to do so.

I would not have you conclude that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has been the sole or even the major source of such assistance. The desire to aid our Latin American friends in this respect has been a real grassroots project in the savings and loan industry. The associations themselves and their trade associations, together with the Agency for International Development and the Inter-American Development Bank, have responded ably and enthusiastically to the need and have sent trained savings and loan personnel on mission after mission to the south, and several associations have opened their offices to on-the-job training of Latin American personnel in the United States.

Perhaps the most dramatic measure has been the recent joint action of the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, and one of the national savings and loan industry organizations in sponsoring a group of some 30 Peace Corps volunteers who, after a period of training in this country, will assist in the establishment and operation of savings and loan associations in Peru. I am proud to say that one of the members of our examining staff has taken leave from his work with us to become a member of that group and thus contribute the benefit of his specialized skill as an examiner of savings and loan associations.

---

[1] Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., before the International Housing Workshop, National Housing Center, Washington, D.C., Wednesday, Jan. 30, 1963, 12:30 p.m.

There is, however, great need in this field not only for human assistance but also for financial assistance, in the form of "seed capital" to aid in the establishment of these new associations. The Inter-American Development Bank and the Agency for International Development have supplied some $40 million in loans for this purpose, but there is need for much more.

For some time now there has been a view on the part of responsible persons, both within and without the savings and loan industry, that the savings and loan associations of this country could themselves provide at least a part of the funds needed for this purpose.

Among other recommendations, it has been felt that such a course would provide an additional element of good will as a people-to-people approach and would afford a just measure of recognition to the savings and loan associations of this country in their furnishing of the technical aid and specialized knowledge which is such a vital part of the operation.

A number of bills were introduced in the last Congress with the general object of providing such assistance through an International Home Loan Bank which would be under the supervision of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board but would be operated through its own board of directors.

This bank would have authority to sell its shares to savings and loan associations and to savings banks in this country and to provide assistance for the development of similar institutions in underdeveloped countries, either by making direct investments in such institutions or by making its funds available to the central savings and loan facilities in those countries, which in turn would make them available to the individual associations.

While the administration reached the conclusion that it would not favor the enactment of such legislation at that time, it was made clear that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board was expected to continue its study of the situation and to continue its cooperation in the rendering of advice and technical assistance in this area, which it has done.

In the present Congress legislation of this nature has been introduced both in the Senate and in the House. In the Senate, sponsorship has been from both sides of the aisle, in the form of a bill by Senator SMATHERS, cosponsored by Senator SPARKMAN, and a bill by Senator DIRKSEN. In the House the sponsorship has been of an equally distinguished nature, including bills by Representative PATMAN and by Representative MULTER, of my own State of New York.

I would suggest that these bills deserve the careful study and consideration of all who feel, as I do, that the interests of this country would be aided by the development of a strong element of savers and homeowners in the underdeveloped countries, and particularly in Latin America, and by the emergence of an efficient and effective home construction industry in those countries.

A beginning has been made If we want this movement to flourish it will need the interest and enthusiastic support of people like yourselves and the organizations which you represent. But all our efforts and all your efforts, in my opinion. will not do the job unless there is set up some sort of an international organization for this specific purpose. I suggest to you that the International Home Loan Bank, or some similarly organized institution, may do the job. The administration and the Congress will be studying it and I respectfully suggest that it also deserves your careful study, deliberation and action.

PROPOSED COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Monday of this week I was necessarily absent from the Senate on official business. I understand that at that time the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], introduced a bill to create a Commission on Science and Technology It is S. 618.

It is a privilege for me to join with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations in sponsoring the proposal to create a Commission on Science and Technology. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, it has been a great source of satisfaction to me to work along with the chairman in conducting studies and holding hearings on various proposals which were directed toward bringing about more efficiency and economy in the operations of the numerous scientific research and development programs being carried on or supported by the Federal Government, which is the objective of the bill.

As the chairman has pointed out, the cost of these Federal activities has risen from less than $5 billion in 1956 to a budget estimate of approximately $15 billion for fiscal year 1964. Beginning early in 1958, the Committee on Government Operations and the Subcommittee on Reorganization began hearings on various Federal activities in the field of science, directed primarily to the deficiencies in the Federal science information processing programs. At these hearings, held in the 85th and succeeding Congresses, the committee developed much information on the need for reorganization and better coordination of Federal science activities. The bill being introduced by the chairman is therefore the culmination of nearly 5 years of study by the committee and its staff, during which period a number of reports and documents have been submitted to the Senate for the information of Members of Congress.

These studies developed a pressing need for constructive action by the Congress in effecting essential reorganizations in the administration of the Federal research and development programs, in order to eliminate unnecessary duplication of activities, thus effecting economies of operation and insuring better utilization of funds made available for these programs and, even more important, the conservation of our limited number of highly qualified scientific and technical personnel.

The committee, in attempting to draft and submit legislation to the Senate directed toward eliminating existing deficiencies and effecting necessary reorganizations of Federal science programs, was unable to develop agreements among the scientists, technologists, educators, and other officials concerned with these activities, and after hearings directed toward these objectives in the 86th and 87th Congresses, concluded that there was an urgent need for a coordinated study of the problems involved by those who were best qualified to recommend remedial legislative action. Therefore, the committee recommended the creation of a Hoover-type commission to conduct such a study and to submit appropriate recommendations for action by the President and the Congress. The Senate approved, by unanimous action, a bill—S. 2771—late in the 87th Congress, which failed of final approval in the House of Representatives last year.

The subject bill is identical to the committee's proposal which passed the Senate on August 8, 1962. I assure the chairman that I shall give him my wholehearted cooperation and support of the measure he is introducing on behalf of the committee, so that it can receive early consideration by the Senate and the House in the present Congress.

Mr. President, I believe Members of the Congress will be interested in extracts from a Summary of Activities of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations, of which I am chairman, during the 87th Congress, as it relates to scientific research and development and, specifically, to scientific information and communication.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these extracts be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROVED INTERAGENCY COOPERATION ON BUDGET PLANS

In the subcommittee's review of Federal budgeting for research and development, it found that there was inadequate exchange of long-range plans and programs, involving literally billions of dollars of Federal expenditures.

A principal focus of the hearings was on the need for fuller exchange of budget forecasts and plans between, on the one hand, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and, on the other hand, the many other Federal agencies which contribute to research and development in the Nation's civilian space program. These other agencies include the Department of Defense, Department of Commerce, National Science Foundation, and others.

In the wake of the subcommittee's interest, Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric and James Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, for the first time, in July 1962, exchanged letters providing for review by each agency of the other's long-range program for space research.

This type of mutual review had been a principal goal of the subcommittee's hearings.

B. COOPERATION ON SCIENCE INFORMATION

As a result of the subcommittee's efforts in the field of interagency coordination of information, numerous further improvements in information systems are being made throughout the executive branch. The principal such changes are occurring in the Agency with the largest single research and development program, the Department of Defense. The Secretary of Defense has issued an important new directive for a "vigorous, well-organized, thoroughly coordinated, comprehensive technical information program."

In addition, in the Defense Department, as in all principal Departments and Agencies, a single individual is, for the first time, being made responsible for direction of programs of scientific information. This action, long suggested by the subcommittee, is a major step forward toward increased efficiency.

In the near future, a report from a panel on information of the President's Science Advisory Committee is expected to be issued. The establishment of this high level, expert group and of an information committee in the Federal Council for Science and Technology, represent direct results of this subcommittee's efforts.

Recognizing that the taxpayer's interests could best be served by apprising the Appropriations Committees of the Congress, the Reorganization Subcommittee has made available special analyses. Thus, within a 3-month period the chairman of the subcommittee submitted four separate mimeographed reports to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees. Each of these reports documented serious weaknesses in information programs of major agencies, which were at the time asking for funds for the 1963 fiscal year.

Subsequently, both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees utilized judgment expressed within these Reorganization Subcommittee reports in the course of reports on fiscal year 1963 fund bills.

Throughout its endeavors, this essential fact has been stressed by the subcommittee, the American taxpayer continues, unfortunately, to suffer serious losses because of shortcomings in Federal information programs. The yield from billions of dollars of taxpayer-supported research and development effort is lowered; scientific manpower is often squandered in needless, unintentional duplication of effort. A regrettable fact is that literally tens of thousands of federally sponsored scientific and other reports have been "lost" or "buried." A single report may cost the American taxpayer $1,000 or $1 million or more. Conversely, its location and timely use may save incalculable sums and man-years.

C. COOPERATION ON DRUG RESEARCH AND REGULATION

Among the many results of the subcommittee's efforts in the field of interagency coordination of drug research and regulation, are the following:

(1) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, has asked interested Federal agencies, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration, to review the coordination of their respective drug programs.

(2) Efforts toward increased coordination are under way within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as for example, between the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health.

(3) The World Health Organization has been encouraged to improve international cooperation in exchange of drug information.

D. COOPERATION ON TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ABROAD

As a result of the subcommittee's efforts in the field of oversea technical assistance, increased coordination is under way between: (1) the Agency for International Development, and (2) those domestic departments of the U.S. Government which are technically competent to render technical assistance to the emerging nations. These domestic departments include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, etc.

Specifically, a series of new agreements between the Agency for International Development and the domestic departments has been and is being negotiated. Under these agreements, the domestic agencies will take over an increasing share of the workload abroad.

FORMER SENATOR BENTON'S ARTICLE POINTS UP SCIENTIFIC CHALLENGE OFFERED BY U.S.S.R.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is clear that the 88th Congress will make some of the most important scientific decisions in American history.

As we are all aware, the President's budget proposes a little under $15 billion for support of scientific research and development, testing, and evaluation.

This is more than one out of every $6 in the Federal budget.

This is big money, but it is for big purposes—national security, national growth, national health. None of these goals is obtained at the "bargain basement."

In connection with our future scientific policies, I commend now to the Congress an important article by one of our former colleagues, the Honorable William Benton, president of Encyclopedia Britannica.

He brings to bear upon this as on other issues an encyclopedic knowledge, drawn from the experiences of a remarkably varied career.

Businessman, educator, former high official of the State Department, political scientist, Bill Benton knows how to extract from specialists the best of their insight and to communicate it to the Nation.

In a notable article which he wrote for the Saturday Evening Post, former Senator Benton cited his observations at one of the most significant locations on the face of the earth, namely: Novosibirsk, in western Siberia. The article was entitled, "Inside the Siberian Science City."

The fact is that Bill Benton, who has covered much of the world, including the Soviet Union on four occasions, was the very first American to see in operation this remarkable center of Soviet research. Up until that time, Novosibirsk had been "off limits."

In that city, as elsewhere, he astutely recognized the larger implications of what he was permitted to see. He recognized, for example, the meaning of the Soviets' "big push" in applied science. He noted, too, the significant facts of Soviet scientific education.

Thus, "In the basic Soviet primary-secondary school, every student is required to take 10 years of mathematics, 5 of physics, 4 of chemistry, and 2 of biology."

Meanwhile, Soviet scientific efforts are concentrated, he noted, not in universities, but in research institutes directly related to the industries which they are intended to serve.

Bill Benton has, of course, neither suggested nor implied that we slavishly imitate the U.S.S.R. But he, like other keen students of East-West competition, stresses in effect that we keep our eyes and ears and minds open. He emphasizes that we understand what the U.S.S.R. is doing, why, and how well or poorly Soviet means are working. We will then be in a better position to come to our own decisions for our own purposes in our own way.

We as a Nation do not ever propose to be "second best" in science or technology. Former Senator Benton's article helps to make sure that we keep informed on this scientific race.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of his vital article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE THE SIBERIAN SCIENCE CITY

(By William Benton)

Deep in the forests of Siberia, near a vast manmade lake, the Soviets are building one of the most extraordinary scientific centers in the world. Its implications can be ominous for us. The only way to suggest an American counterpart would be to imagine the U.S. Government merging the theoretical-research departments of Harvard and the University of Chicago with the applied research divisions of General Electric & Bell Telephone Laboratories—and establishing them all in a new headquarters on the outskirts of Detroit. This is roughly what the Soviets are planning for their science city outside the industrial center of Novosibirsk in Siberia.

The new establishment, just now nearing completion, is a striking symbol of the Soviet intellectual challenge to the West. It is a complex of 15 separate scientific institutes designed to house 50,000 research workers. It is dedicated not merely to theoretical research of the highest order but to solving practical problems in fields ranging from hydraulic mining to the translation of ancient languages. And this new science city is only the first of several that the Soviets plan to build across Siberia.

Since Novosibirsk is closed to most foreign visitors, only a handful of Americans have seen even the site of this science city. Among them are former Vice President Richard Nixon, Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover, and Ambassador Adlai Stevenson. What they saw was largely a blueprint. It was only recently, when I visited Russia, as a guest of the newly created Institute of Soviet-American Relations, that an American first saw the science city actually in operation. Perhaps I should add that I had told the Russians that I had no training in science and that I wouldn't recognize a secret if my nose were rubbed in it.

CEREMONIAL AT DAWN

It was 5:20 a.m. when I landed in Novosibirsk, 1,750 miles east of Moscow, together with Mrs. Benton and our 20-year-old son, John. A representative of the mayor, plus the chief learned secretary of the Siberian department of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and a third official welcomer were on hand to meet us and drive us to our hotel. Our suite there, according to our escort, was indisputably the most luxurious hotel suite in the entire Soviet Union. It had ceilings at least 20 feet high, beautiful oriental rugs, a piano in the living room, and stiff, uncomfortable furniture.

Like the rest of Siberia, Novosibirsk scarcely corresponds to the Western image of a cold slave-labor prison. For one thing, it was hot when I was there, as hot as any town in Iowa. A village of a few thousand at the turn of the century, Novosibirsk was originally used as a camp for construction workers building the Trans-Siberian Railroad. Its big growth came during World

War II, when the Soviets brought in great industrial plants evacuated before the Nazi push into western Russia. Today it is an industrial city of 1 million, roughly comparable to Detroit or Cleveland, a producer of turbines and steel and mining machinery. Its paved central square is about the size of four or five New York City blocks, without greenery of any kind, and its opera house is the biggest in the U.S.S.R. Across the tops of the buildings on the main square are four great electric signs saying "Peace to the world, glory to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, long live Leninism, long live the Soviet people." Most of the city's buildings are a drab gray. In winter the temperature falls to 50 below zero. All things considered, it is not surprising that the president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences originally opposed the plan to build a costly academic center there.

"You won't be able to persuade top scientists to move to Novosibirsk," he said.

"We can get the brilliant young ones," Khrushchev reportedly answered, "and we can train them there. The young scientists do the creative work."

HOW THE CITY BEGAN

When Khrushchev decided to go ahead with the science city 4 years ago, it was only part of a regional plan for the development of the whole area. One of the first steps was to dam the mighty Ob River, creating the Sea of Ob, 125 miles long, and providing enough power, heat, and light for both Novosibirsk and the science city. Then teams of construction workers arrived, and 12,500 of them are still at work on the project.

When we reached the science city—a 12-mile drive along a broad and modern but nearly empty highway from Novosibirsk—our car pulled up in front of the Institute of Geology. Waiting to greet us was Mikhail Lavrentiev, chairman of the Siberian department of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and head of the science city. He is a tall, stooping man with friendly eyes, and an eager host.

The 15 new institutes occupy great squat 3- and 4-story buildings somewhat resembling Soviet "efficiency apartment" houses. The unadorned facade of each institute faces a wide Avenue of the Institutes. Two main buildings have been in use for 3 or 4 years. Others were incomplete, still encased in scaffolding. None of these massive oblong structures had yet acquired the red stars or statutes of Lenin that typify many public buildings in the U.S.S.R. Virgin forests behind the institutes provide room for expansion while shielding them from bitter Siberian winter winds. "We tried to preserve as much of the forest as possible," said Lavrentiev.

The names of the institutes give an idea of the scope of these drab new scientific palaces. Squarely in the center of the compound is the Institute of Geology and Geophysics. Next door is the Institute of Automation and Electrical Measuring Techniques. Then comes the Institute of Genetics, then the Institute of Experimental Biology and Medicine, then Hydrodynamics, Kinetics and Combustion, Applied Mechanics, and so on. I asked about nuclear reactors but was told this particular science city had no need of one.

The layout makes each institute an autonomous unit. Yet the institutes depend horizontally on each other for support—as shown by their locations. The Institute of Inorganic Chemistry, for example, stands next to the Institute of Thermophysics so that the scientists in one can work closely with those in the other.

Not far away from the institute buildings, on newly cleared forest land, workmen have already completed the first big physics and chemistry building of the new University of Novosibirsk, begun at the same time as the science city. The university already has 1,000 students, and the enrollment will increase to 4,000. The students will work at the institutes in research projects.

What goes on in this remote research center? As one example, which seemed rather strange in the middle of Siberia, the Soviets report that their computers have deciphered a Mayan Indian script which philologists had worked on for decades. Sergei Sobolev, head of the Institute of Mathematics, proudly presented me with a three-volume account of the work. Another group, the Geology Institute, has 92 survey teams investigating Siberia's wealth of iron, sulfur, copper and oil. "There is so much unknown and so much to be discovered," said the group's director, Andrei Trofimuk, a solidly built man of about 40. "Siberia has every mineral that exists."

"BETTER THAN MOSCOW"

The most spectacular demonstration that I saw was the use of a mining machine called a water-pressure cannon, developed by the Hydrodynamics Institute. It looks like a bundle of pipes, perhaps 10 feet in circumference and 8 feet long. From a safe distance we watched while the cannon fired at a 3-foot-thick chunk of granite. There was a loud bang. The granite splintered into a dozen fragments. In the same laboratory we saw a piece of copper about 8 inches thick with a hole shot through its center by one of these water cannons. Lavrentiev boasted of the machine as "15 times better than Moscow has been able to do." We in the United States have nothing comparable to this for our mining industries.

The opportunity to work and get ahead in such laboratories—along with the comparative luxury of a house and garden of one's own—has indeed brought young scientists to Novosibirsk, as Khrushchev predicted. By now there are 12,500 of them (as well as 11 members of the Soviet Academy of Sciences). Arnold Romanov, for example, at the age of 29, is the head of a key section in the Institute of Automation and Electrical Measuring Techniques. A fascinating young man who has read widely in English literature and speaks our language well, Romanov sparkles with enthusiasm about his work. Here, he says, a gifted man "gets a bigger job quicker." "The scientists are not alone," Lavrentiev added. "They have wives and children and grandchildren, and we take care of them."

The scientists don't spend all their time in laboratories. After our first morning at the center we lunched at the clubhouse for the institutes' top research scholars. There was a lavish array of 30 or more dishes—red and black caviar, tomatoes, cheeses, meats, bottles of wine and vodka. The next day we joined Lavrentiev and four colleagues in a 50-foot motor launch and chugged across the Sea of Ob to a camp run by the Academy of Sciences.

The camp, in a forest of tall, aromatic pines, consisted of three or four substantial log houses, together with half a dozen tents and small cabins. We saw a number of women and children—though we got little chance to talk to them. A rotund, tanned, bearded individual greeted us with a load of fish he had caught that morning. By the time we had all taken a swim, the bearded man had prepared a steaming fish soup with a chunk of pike floating in it. With that came caviar, salad, cheese, wine and vodka, all served as a picnic beneath the tall white birches near the water. It made me think of some fantasy—portrayed by Manet, described by Tolstoy, and catered by Brillat-Savarin.

I wanted to find out more about how the Soviet scientists viewed their own role in the world. I asked Lavrentiev whether he didn't feel that many sciences were getting so specialized that a scientist found himself learning more and more about less and less. Lavrentiev thought not—at least in his own case. As a boy of 11, he said, he had fallen in love with a mathematical puzzler called the four-color problem. The problem is this—how many different colors would you need to use on any map so that no two adjoining states are the same color, no matter how many states there are or what their shape? Lavrentiev said mathematicians had proved that five colors would be enough for any possible map, and that three would not be enough, but nobody had been able to prove mathematically that four would suffice. He named a Swedish scientist who had devoted a lifetime to this problem, but, as for himself, he had gone on to other things.

We agreed that there should be more exchange of information between our countries, but I mentioned the problem of the Soviets' unwillingness to abide by international rules of copyright and royalties. Sobolev, head of the mathematics institute, asked whether Russian writers got any royalties in the United States. When I said they did, he remarked that a publisher asked his permission to publish two of his mathematical works but there had been no royalties. He couldn't remember who the publisher was, and I never found out what had happened to the books in the United States. I said that books of this sort sold on such a small scale that there were few royalties.

As for more popular writers, I recalled that I first heard of the American ex-Communist novelist, Howard Fast, when I learned some years ago of his great popularity in the Soviet Union. I added that he had become better known in the United States since he abandoned communism in 1957. "It's exactly the reverse here," laughed Sobolev. And in fact I no longer found Fast's books on sale in the U.S.S.R.

I asked the members of the group to speculate on the future. What did they foresee?

"How can we foresee the future?" Sobolev asked. "All we know is that there will be more changes in the next 50 years than have been created in all the past history of the world put together."

I asked whether he agreed with the assertion by some experts that 90 percent of all the scientists who have ever lived are alive today. He thought a moment and then nodded in agreement. But not everyone accepted the implication that many scientists means great scientists. "There is no Newton alive today," said Academician Ilya Vekhua, rector of the University of Novosibirsk.

In their conversation, as in their work, the scientists of Novosibirsk revealed an important difference in the way scientific training is organized east and west of the Iron Curtain. In the basic Soviet primary-secondary school, called the 11-year school, every student is required to take 10 years of mathematics, 5 of physics, 4 of chemistry, and 2 of biology—in addition to such humanistic studies as history, literature, and a foreign language. On the basis of this broad background the student is encouraged to specialize as soon as he has finished the 11-year school. Since the tuition at all levels is free, a gifted student, no matter how poor, can develop his talents for the benefit of both himself and the state. Nor are these talents trained independently of the nation's industrial growth. There is no sharp division, as in the West, between the applied science of industry and the more prestigious theoretical science of the university.

"The graduates of the university must be as close as possible to industry," Lavrentiev told me. "You look to your universities to train your scientific personnel and to do your basic theoretical research. In the U.S.S.R. the really great scientific achievements do not develop within the walls of the universities but within the walls of the research institutes like this one."

The reality of the Soviet scientific achievements can scarcely be disputed. It is obvious not only in their space triumphs but in less spectacular fields such as surgery, oil drilling and oceanography. Judging from what I saw at Novosibirsk, there will be further achievements at the new Siberian science cities (the next such center will be at Irkutsk near the Mongolian frontier). Today the Kremlin is systematically developing all its science and education according to its current view of what Soviet society needs.

If the Russians have sacrificed butter for guns, they have sacrificed meat for education and research. Are we Americans making similar sacrifices?

The U.S. Government is indeed pouring massive amounts of money into the scientific programs at our universities and elsewhere. It is encouraging more applied research as part and parcel of the theoretical investigations to which our great scientists have been traditionally devoted. Our corporations, too, are intensifying projects to bridge the gap between theoretical and applied research. Some are building research laboratories near the campuses of our universities.

If the Soviets forge ahead of us in science it will not be because their highly coordinated system is necessarily better than our system. Prof. Robert Marshak, a University of Rochester physicist who has been appraising recent advances in Soviet science, believes the United States will continue to lead in pure and theoretical science for some time to come because our system is more ideally suited to such research. But he warns that we should expect the Russians—because of their greater stress on applied research, their expanding budgets and their ability to focus almost unlimited resources on selected problems—to make "numerous short-range breakthroughs in applied science." A case in point is the Soviet lead in booster rockets for space capsules.

Shortly before leaving Novosibirsk I commented to Lavrentiev that the Soviet educational system was designed not for the individual but for the state. He did not disagree. As for myself, I told him I once had been the only young man in the United States to get 100 percent in the comprehensive college-entrance examinations in mathematics. Following my own inclinations, I have led a widely varied life as an advertising executive, a U.S. Senator, a top State Department official, a trustee of several universities and head of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. In the Soviet Union the Communist system would inevitably have directed me toward a career in science.

With the calm confidence of the new Soviet scientific elite, Lavrentiev said, "Perhaps you would have been better off in mathematics."

Like most other Americans, I certainly want to go on deciding such questions for myself.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Sunday was the 45th anniversary of the birth of a new nation. On February 24, 1918, the Estonian National Council proclaimed the independence of the small Baltic Republic of Estonia. More than a formal proclamation, however, was needed to transform the Estonian declaration of independence into reality. For nearly 2 years—in the midst of one of the bitterest and most savage conflicts in the history of modern Europe—the Estonians fought for and won their de facto independence. We should pause to pay homage to those patriots who gave their last measure of devotion in this struggle.

Sometimes it is difficult for an American to conceive of the turmoil, the anarchy, the indescribable sufferings which accompanied these battles on the eastern marches of Europe. Contrary to the widespread impression, the last shots of World War I were not fired on November 11, 1918. The Estonian War of Independence lasted long after the armistice on the Western Front. It coincided with the incredibly brutal conflicts of the Russian Civil War and the Soviet-Polish War. At one point it appeared that bolshevism was destined to spread to the heart of Western Europe. Thanks to the bravery of the Baltic populations and other peoples, this disaster was avoided for many years. We who are dedicated to freedom owe these peoples a debt of gratitude.

The Estonian freedom fighters were engaged, in effect, in a two-front war: one against the Red army, which was trying to restore Imperial Russia's domination of the Baltic states, and another against a corps of German volunteers, who sought to turn Estonia into a German colony. These were turbulent times, but still one is struck by the cost of the war in terms of human life and property. Out of an Estonian army of more than 80,000 men, 3,588 were killed and 13,755 were wounded. This is a casualty rate of almost 30 percent, exclusive of the ravages inflicted upon the civilian population. Yet all this suffering was not in vain: the Soviet-Estonian Peace Treaty was signed on February 2, 1920, and the Estonians' struggle for independence was crowned with success.

During the 1920's the young republic continued to be the target of Communist subversion and infiltration. Indeed, in 1924 the Soviet Union openly prepared and directed a coup d'etat in the Estonian capital of Tallinn, in an effort to overthrow the existing democratic regime. Soviet troops were massed near the frontier ready to march into Estonia at the expected "invitation" or "appeal" of an insurgent government. Soviet designs, however, were frustrated. The Estonian Government suppressed the uprising and outlawed the Estonian Communist Party. Not until 1940, under the umbrella of the infamous Nazi-Soviet pact, were the Soviets able to impose their will on this small Baltic State. Since World War II, Estonians have lived unwillingly but helplessly under the direct rule of the Soviet Union. Only charlatans could expect us to swallow the myth that this was a "voluntary" act of union with the U.S.S.R. The facts speak differently.

It is important to recall these events on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of Estonian independence, for they remind us of the unfulfilled aspirations of the Estonians and millions of other Baltic citizens for freedom and national self-determination. We were tragically mistaken to think that the struggle for these goals ended with the proclamation of Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points and the establishment of the post-Versailles political order in Europe. To the contrary, the struggle against political, economic, and cultural subjugation continues. Of all oppressors in the past, the Soviet Union has offered the most obdurate and hypocritical resistance to the just demands of the Estonians and scores of other peoples. What is theirs by right is the opportunity to decide their own destinies in freedom.

KEATING URGES MORE REALISTIC BIPARTISAN CUBA POLICY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it would be unfortunate if the debate on Cuba degenerated into a name calling, political brawl.

What the United States does or refrains from doing in regard to the Soviet base in Cuba may determine the peace and security of the whole world. We must consider this issue as Americans, not as Republicans or Democrats. And our goal must be to find solutions, not to develop campaign fodder for the coming elections.

Let it be conceded that the mistakes in Cuba go back many years to periods of Republican as well as Democratic administrations and that both parties bear a heavy responsibility for the tragic conditions which now exist in Cuba. Let it also be conceded that there are men and women in both parties equally dedicated to the task of ridding this hemisphere of its first Communist military base.

If there is a concerted campaign to exploit the present situation in Cuba for partisan purposes, I refuse to be, as I have refused to be, a participant in any such course. In fact, I have consistently refused to discuss the Cuban problem in political terms, although efforts have been made to goad me into that position. In January 1960, under the Eisenhower administration, I said:

> It is high time for a massive reappraisal of American policies toward Cuba.

In February 1960 I frankly declared:

> Cuba is Russia's and Red China's most noteworthy victim in the Caribbean.

By the same token, I hope that those who put the national interest first now will also repudiate any partisan campaign to discredit every suggestion for dealing with the Communist takeover in Cuba which does not emanate from the White House.

In recent weeks, I have had an opportunity to discuss the Cuban situation with both the Secretary of State and Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. I believe it is correct to say that we all share basically the same view as to the objectives of U.S. policy in Cuba. The real challenge, however, is how to achieve those objectives. My recommendations for a course of action have been transmitted to the President, and I have every reason to believe that they are being given serious and sincere consideration. But in an area such as this, there is no one right course or plan and in my judgment it is very much in the national interest for many alternatives and proposals to be made and considered. That should be the function of the Senate's dialog on Cuba; and if this debate is carried on and viewed in that spirit, I am confident that it will enhance rather than undermine bipartisanship and strengthen rather than weaken our national resolve.

My own judgment is that Cuba is now the No. 1 testing ground in the struggle between international communism and the free world. This is not because of any fear of an invasion of the United States from Cuba, as some have said in an effort to belittle concern with the problem of Cuba. Did anyone fear an invasion of the United States from South Korea if it fell to the Chinese Reds? Does anyone now fear an invasion of the United States from South Vietnam if it should fall to the Communists? We have recognized in these areas and in such places as Greece and Turkey and Lebanon as well as in Berlin, that you cannot appease a tyrant, that the appetite of the Communists is insatiable, and that the only way to prevent the Communists from swallowing up the world piece by piece is to make sure they get indigestion every time they reveal their hunger pains.

Churchill was not acting the part of a warmonger when he uttered his prophetic warnings about Munich. Neither was Harry Truman when he committed the United States to the defense of South Korea, or Dwight D. Eisenhower when he ordered Marines to land in Lebanon, or John F. Kennedy when he took us to the brink of nuclear war during the October missile crisis. These men on those occasions recognized that retreat in the face of danger would increase the danger and multiply the likelihood of an eventual catastrophe. The real warmongers are not those who are determined to forestall aggression at every turn, but those who are ready to surrender to fear in every crisis.

No two situations are entirely alike and there are elements in the Cuban situation which certainly are unique. The Soviet takeover of Cuba was accomplished not by an invasion but by subversion. Obviously, this is a more difficult tactic to detect and forestall, but its consequences are no less grave or menacing. Hitler had his Quislings, and the Communists have their Castros not only in Cuba, but in many areas of the world. We cannot blind ourselves to conquest by subversion or covert aggression, anymore than we can to conquest by overt and naked aggression. The same loss of freedom and expansion of communism is involved in both cases and neither can be tolerated without imperiling world peace. If we condone what has happened in Cuba, how can we possibly prevent the same pattern from repeating itself in British Guiana, after it achieves independence, or in Venezuela or Brazil or Mexico, or in any other country in which Communist agents are busily at work?

It seems to me that the first ingredient of any effective policy with regard to Cuba is that we recognize the nature of the threat. There is no possibility of success in efforts to eliminate the Soviets and their military equipment from this hemisphere if we downgrade the implications of the Cuban takeover. Our allies cannot be expected to join in the kind of concerted action which is necessary to deal with this situation, if important figures in our own country portray the problem merely as an irritant or a nuisance, and indicate a readiness to accept the status quo. Our leaders must make clear, not only to all Americans, but to the whole world, that the Soviet takeover in Cuba presents, at the very least, the same threat to the peace, security, and freedom of the world as the attempted Red takeovers of South Korea, South Vietnam, and the Congo.

We have acted boldly and with great determination in all of those areas, and there is no reason for us to respond with any less vigor to a threat in our own hemisphere just off our own shores. I believe that our partners in the struggle against international communism would fully understand our concern with the Soviet base in Cuba if our views were effectively articulated and skillfully conveyed.

Mr. President, no effort to silence those who want to express their concern about the situation in Cuba today can possibly serve the national interest. The public will not be deceived by charges that Members of Congress are "hectoring"—one spokesman used that word, but I do not know exactly what he meant—the administration or that public discussion of the facts about Cuba gives aid and comfort to the Communists. They will no more be influenced by opportunist cries of "McCarthyism" than by an Izvestia's polemic against "rabid men" sitting in the U.S. Senate. No matter what slurs or insinuations are spread against those speaking out on the Communist menace in Cuba, and I am confident that they will continue to discuss the facts and problems involved in this critical area.

Mr. President, this is in no sense a repudiation of bipartisanship in foreign affairs. The truth is that there is no coherent and consistent policy toward Cuba to which to give bipartisan support. And the truth also is that members of both parties have joined in the criticism of efforts to downgrade the Communist threat in the Caribbean Sea.

I believe it would be more constructive to discuss the merits rather than the motives of this controversy, and that is what I intend to do today.

The dissatisfaction and uncertainty which are evident throughout the Nation today with regard to what is going on in Cuba and what it really means do not stem from congressional statements on the subject. The real cause for the crisis of confidence, the credibility gap, that exists widely throughout the Nation, lies in the complete failure of our Government leaders to articulate a clear and firm policy toward the Soviet takeover in Cuba. This is not a partisan issue or an attempt to lay the blame at anyone's door. As I have said, our mistakes in Cuba go back many years. When Castro came to power, many were unable to decide whether Castro was a Robin Hood or a Mao Tse-tung, whether we should greet him officially or see him privately, whether we should continue the Cuban sugar quota or cut it, or what exactly we should do.

Whatever reason there may have been for hesitation when Castro first came to power, surely events since the end of 1959 have made clear that Castro has sold out the Cuban people and has converted that island into a Soviet military base. It is clear, too, that Khrushchev is prepared to stay in Cuba as long as his position is tolerated. We would do well to put wishful thinking aside, and to face the facts as to what Communist Cuba means today.

The present crisis of confidence with respect to Cuba can be traced directly to an increasing disillusionment with the zigzag policy of improvisation which has characterized the executive branch's pronouncements on this subject. At times, the improvisation has been good, as it was last October, when our Government acknowledged that strategic missile systems were in Cuba, and responded with determination and boldness. At other times, such as the Bay of Pigs, our improvisation was disastrous. In the long run, this policy has inevitably tended to undermine national confidence.

Our zigzag policy over Cuba has left the people in doubt at times as to whether the Communist threat in Cuba was ever regarded as serious by Government officials. There is no need to dwell on past history. But it is interesting to recall that one of the principal reasons given for the Bay of Pigs invasion at the time was the arrival and imminent deployment of a great supply of Soviet weapons, including among them Mig's. In other words, in the early months of 1961, our Government officials were sufficiently concerned over the presence of Mig's in Cuba to proceed with a plan for even military action against Castro. Yet, today we are told that the same Mig's—in fact, even later and better models than those available to Castro in April 1961—are no cause for concern and no threat whatsoever to the United States or to our Latin American friends.

After the Bay of Pigs invasion, the significance of these and other Soviet weapons in Cuba was strongly downgraded. Our policy shifted abruptly. Instead of being a terrible menace, Soviet forces in Cuba were said to be merely a nuisance, and it was said that Castro would wither on the vine if the United States simply ignored him. As a result, for nearly a year after the Bay of Pigs, there was no genuine attempt to put economic pressure on Castro. There was no trade embargo, and there was very little effort to discourage anyone else from aiding or trading with Castro. Our Cuba policy was no policy; we were just to wait and see what would happen next.

Requests for State Department guidance during that period received polite replies indicating that the matter of trade restrictions was being studied, but conclusions were never reached. The standard reply went something like this letter to me, dated July 7, 1961:

> The Department [of State] appreciates your continuing interest in this matter and, as you know, shares your concern that the hostile Castro regime continues to derive benefits from trading with the United States, although on a greatly reduced scale. I can assure you that the administration has the question of Cuban-United States trade relations under intensive study. A final decision on this matter, however, has not been reached at this writing.

Mr. President, the United States did not lift a finger to put an embargo into effect until February of 1962.

The next important development was the intensive Soviet military buildup which began in July of 1962. When I indicated, in a very conservative way, the extent of this buildup and the threat which it offered, I was confronted by a barrage of denials and attacks from various Government spokesmen. These included a written denial from the State Department, dated August 30—I repeat that its date was August 30—stating:

> We have no information that any Soviet bloc troops have landed in Cuba.

To confuse the issue even more, at the same time when we were thus told that there was no evidence "that any Soviet bloc troops have landed in Cuba," other Government sources were claiming, in so-called background press briefings, that the buildup had already been fully revealed. Now, of course, it is admitted that the Soviet buildup was increasing steadily during that period.

I indicated during the same period that Soviet amphibious vehicles were in Cuba. This also was promptly denied by official sources, only to be later confirmed.

When it was suggested that the Soviets might be attempting to link Cuba and Berlin, and devise some kind of a deal to offer the United States in this regard, a virtual tirade of criticism was unleased; but in due course these same critics were contending that the United States must take a more moderate position in Cuba, lest we invite a retaliation on the Western position on Berlin. This new line of reasoning, publicly endorsed by the President, lasted for only about 1 month, at which time it became undeniably clear that the Soviets were putting missiles in Cuba, and did, indeed, hope to gain in Berlin by threatening us from Cuba.

On October 10, when I disclosed information which I had received regarding the construction of medium range missile bases, there were again vigorous denials—not only by public affairs officers, who probably did not know any better, but also by top Government officials, who should be presumed to have known the facts.

In a forthcoming book about Cuba, the statement is made:

> From early August [the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. John] McCone had been warning the administration that the Kremlin might try to plant offensive missiles in Cuba.

It is my understanding that this book, which will be published shortly, was cleared with the White House, Department of Defense, and Central Intelligence Agency.

And only now are we publicly told by Secretary McNamara that these missiles arrived on the island of Cuba as early as the middle of September, but without being perceived or reported by American intelligence sources, and that intermediate range bases were also under construction.

When the President finally confronted the Nation with the Soviet missile threat in Cuba, the entire country united behind him and applauded his firm action in forcing withdrawal of the missiles and Ilyushin bombers. The country stood 100 percent behind the President's policies in this crisis and the Soviets backed down.

I well remember where I was on the night of October 22. I was addressing the largest meeting that had ever been held in the city in New York State where I was then speaking. I was addressing a partisan crowd. I had released an address. I scrapped it entirely and devoted my entire effort that evening to a speech in support of the President of the United States in the great crisis which our Nation faced.

Unfortunately, we failed to press our advantage and were unwilling to insist on on-site inspection to make certain that the Soviets were living up to their agreement. As a result of this improvisation of policy, there is doubt again as to just what the Soviets are doing in Cuba.

It is not hard to understand why the American people are confused when they are first told that on-site inspection is essential and then that no such inspection is needed. Let me quote a statement made by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roswell L. Gilpatric on November 11, 1962. When he was asked how the United States could be certain that the Soviets left no missiles behind without on-site inspection, Mr. Gilpatric replied:

> We never knew how many missiles were brought into Cuba. The Soviets said there were 42. We have counted 42 going out. We saw fewer than 42. Until we have so-called on-site inspection of the island of Cuba, we could never be sure that 42 was the maximum number that the Soviets brought into Cuba.

Contrast with that statement Secretary McNamara's unqualified assurance that our security is being fully safeguarded without on-site inspection. In his nationwide television presentation, Secretary McNamara declared:

> I am satisfied that there are no major elements of offensive weapons systems in the caves of Cuba. It is unlikely beyond any reasonable doubt that offensive weapons systems equipment could not (sic) have been unloaded and moved into caves without our detection.

And yet he did not deny that the Government had no record of the number of missiles originally brought to Cuba. And it is a fact even now that U.S. knowledge of the cargo of certain vessels landing in Cuba is considerably less than we would like. The Director of the CIA made his position clear when he admitted that without on-site inspection, we can have no absolute assurances that these missiles have been completely removed.

The changing winds of an inconsistent policy also have blown the shipping question in every direction. First, as I have noted, there was an inordinate delay in the imposition of an embargo on U.S. trade with Cuba. As the Soviet military buildup proceeded through the months of August, September, and October of last year, some informal efforts were made to alert our NATO friends or the rest of the free world that this shipping was a threat to the security of the United States and our Western Hemisphere allies. Prior to the imposition of the quarantine in late October, it was widely reported that Government regulations were being drawn up to restrict these shipments, but nothing was done until the beginning of February. Finally, a limited order was announced applying only to the shipping of U.S. Government cargoes from the United States in ships which have visited Cuba since January 1, 1963. This was a step in the right direction, but it is far too early to assess the results now. High officials have said that none of the 12 free world ships which stopped in Cuba in January picked up any U.S. goods—but since the east coast shipping strike did not end until January 26, the fact is not very significant. Shipping data for February, not yet available, should be more revealing. It is, of course, my hope that none of those ships coming in February to supply Castro have been able to profit by taking back cargo from the United States.

Moreover, if our Government really wishes to make shipping more difficult for the Soviet Union and to put a tight economic squeeze on Soviet efforts in Cuba, it should welcome the cooperation of such groups as the International Longshoremen's Association. Our officials should throw their arms around these public-spirited union members who are prepared to sacrifice a measure of their own economic well-being for the sake of a firm U.S. move against communism. The cooperation of the longshoremen is invaluable, but instead of seeking such cooperation, the Department of State is in the peculiar position of berating and restraining a union for attempting to carry out in a determined manner a policy that the State Department is itself carrying out with apparent timidity.

Another area of doubt and uncertainty has been created because of the announced withdrawal of land-based American missiles from Turkey and Italy. When this decision was publicly announced, after a few unfortunate leaks had appeared in the press, it was officially stated that these missile bases were becoming obsolete and that they would be more than replaced by an increase in the Polaris fleet of missile-bearing submarines. This may be sound but it does not jibe with statements made by the Defense Department officials before the Cuban crisis was resolved. For instance, on November 11, Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilpatric declared:

> We don't contemplate closing down any of our foreign bases or oversea bases. I consider all bases we have today as important to us. Our whole NATO base structure is the foundation of our planning both as a—as our national forces and the NATO forces and therefore we have no thought of giving up any of our oversea bases. As of now we need all the weapons we have deployed.

These very strong statements were followed by articles reputedly detailing the inside story of what went on in the White House during the week of the Cuban crisis. These stories criticized Government officials for "Munich" like suggestions that the Turkish and Italian bases be traded in exchange for a Soviet missile withdrawal from Cuba. Naturally, I have no personal knowledge of what went on there, but against this background, is it surprising that doubts have been raised about the proposed withdrawal of missiles from Turkey and Italy? The whole sequence of events raises questions which cannot be avoided.

Let us consider finally the question of Castro-based subversion throughout the Western Hemisphere. First, let us recall the statement made in a fine and stirring speech by the President of the United States directly following the Bay of Pigs invasion:

> The message of Cuba, of Laos, of the rising din of Communist voices in Asia and Latin America—these messages are all the same. The complacent, the self-indulgent, the soft societies are to be swept away with the debris of history. Only the strong, only the industrious, only the visionary can survive. No greater task faces this Nation or this administration. No other challenge is more deserving of our every effort and energy. Too long we have fixed our eyes on traditional military needs, on armies prepared to cross borders or missiles poised for flight. Now it should be clear that this is no longer enough—that our security may be lost without the firing of a single missile or the crossing of a single border.

Again I characterize that as a fine speech and statement by the President of the United States.

On January 31, I declared on the Senate floor:

> What the Soviets are planning to do—in fact they are already doing it—is mount an increasing wave of sabotage, terrorism, political subversion, and agitation throughout Latin America. Already riots in Venezuela, Peru, Brazil, clearly and demonstrably are the work of Communists training and armed in Cuba.

Shortly after my statement, on February 6, Defense Secretary McNamara, in a nationally televised appearance witnessed by millions, was asked specifically about the use of Cuba as a training base for subversion or sabotage. At that time, he made the incredible reply:

> I have no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion directed against other Latin American countries.

Yet barely a week later, my statement was fully supported and amplified in a 58-page report presented by the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs to the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

And then compare the categorical assurances of the Secretary of Defense—that there was no evidence of the export of subversion or sabotage—also with the testimony of the Secretary of State, and the Director of the CIA, further detailing Cuba's attempts to subvert other Latin American countries. Until Secretary McNamara repudiates his statement and admits that he was wrong, confusion and doubt are bound to continue.

When the nations of this hemisphere first met at Punta del Este 1 year ago, the United States did take the lead in pressing for an embargo between Cuba and the other nations of this hemisphere. Our effort to win Latin American cooperation at that time petered out into a mere statement of condemnation.

And the Punta del Este Conference was generally recognized as not having accomplished very much. But one of the achievements that can be traced to that Conference—practically the only one of substance—was the creation of a committee within the Organization of American States to study the problem of subversion and to make recommendations for action. Now the report has been prepared. The report finally was released last Friday. Ironically, however, it now appears that the United States discouraged the full release of this report, an act which raises the most serious questions about our present confidence and support for the OAS.

Last year, the OAS was criticized for not taking a stronger stand against Castro before the missile crisis.

Those of us who were urging a stronger stand were constantly told, "You can't take a stronger stand because the Latin American countries will not back you up." When the crisis came in October and November, OAS support for the United States was strong and unanimous. Now, a hesitant U.S. policy over this report, over the shipping question, and over the matter of subversion, and other incidents, has weakened the resolve of the OAS. What we should be following is a consistent U.S. policy of mobilizing OAS cooperation in meeting the peril in Cuba, and this is not helped at all by any downgrading of the Cuban threat.

The significance of the 17,000—which is the figure given by the Government officials—Soviet military personnel in Cuba has also been the subject of conflicting interpretations. At first, it was denied that there were any Soviet troops in Cuba. Only after 5,000 had been withdrawn was it conceded that over 22,000 military troops and technicians were known to have been in Cuba at the time of the missile crisis. This is a figure far beyond any figure ever used by me or by others, so far as I know.

In his press conference on February 14, the President suggested that the Soviet technicians or military or paramilitary people in Cuba may be participating in training programs, training other Latins for subversion. It has also been suggested that the Soviet troops may still be in Cuba for the purpose of training Cubans in the operation of some of the weapons systems which remain in that country. For some reason—unknown to me—this is regarded as less of a danger than other activities which they might be undertaking. Yet, throughout the missile crisis, we were told that at least we could take some comfort from the fact that the Soviet retained the medium and intermediate missile facilities completely under their own control. We were told to take comfort from the fact that Khrushchev was a reasonable man who would not plunge the world into nuclear warfare. Now, we are being told to take comfort from the fact that the Soviets have remained in Cuba not to man the new weapons but to train Cubans in their operation and maintenance. Frankly, I cannot take comfort in anything but a complete withdrawal of the Soviets from this hemisphere.

Moreover, I cannot take much comfort from the new effort some Government officials are now making to silence criticism again on the grounds that Khrushchev has already promised to withdraw some of his troops and that continued discussion of the situation may lead him to change his mind. To my mind, this is a complete misreading of events. If Khrushchev has actually promised to withdraw several thousand troops—and we cannot be sure until the text of the note is published and the troops are actually back in the Soviet Union—it will be because of vocal American objections and outrage, not in spite of it. Khrushchev retreats only when he feels the pressure upon him is becoming intolerable. A determined American Nation, vocal in criticism of Soviet imperialism and strong in pressure for action, has always carried more weight with Khrushchev than diplomatic notepassing.

Khrushchev and his emissaries may well say that the present discussion of the Cuban situation makes it difficult for him to withdraw. That is what we would expect of him. But how can anyone familiar with recent history accept this line? Since when has Khrushchev or any other dictator yielded to a policy of appeasement? It is not what we do not say or do not threaten to do that makes an impression on him; it is what he sees we actually mean and will do that persuades him to move, either backward or forward, depending on his interpretation of our intent.

What we have lacked most in Cuba is a long term, consistent, and effective policy for ridding this hemisphere of Soviet conquest. When such a policy is enunciated, it will not lack support from either side of the aisle in this Chamber, or from any segment of the American people. Until that time, however, disunity and national concern are unavoidable. Suggestions by Government spokesmen that the Government has the right to lie on certain occasions of course shake public confidence and aggravate our uncertainty. Assistant Secretary of Defense Sylvester would perform a great service to the Government and American people if he would repudiate this managed news philosophy and restore faith in what our Government's spokesmen say.

To date, some Government officials appear to be more intent in demonstrating that the Assistant Secretary's cynicism was justified. The news has been managed, not only in the moment of crisis, when secret preparations may at time be necessary, but in the weeks and even months before and following the crisis. This management has been obvious even though sometimes indirect. A variety of so-called inside facts are planted designed to play up the drama of events and to play down the inaccurate assessments that made 11th hour action necessary. All the while, there is an attempt to belittle those warning of the continuing Communist threat in Cuba.

I strongly believe in a bipartisan foreign policy. My whole record in this body and the other body demonstrates that. And when the President takes action, either successfully as in October or unsuccessfully as at the Bay of Pigs, he can expect bipartisan support without recriminations of any kind. But there has to be a policy before anyone can complain about a lack of bipartison support. When no action is taken, when no policy is followed other than wait and see, there is absolutely no basis for criticizing Members of Congress of either party for offering their views on this issue.

One Senator who now loudly complains about bipartisanship had this to say in 1961:

> The possibility of Soviet missile bases and jet aircraft bases in Cuba is frequently noted. I suppose we would all be less comfortable if the Soviets did install missile bases in Cuba, but I am not sure that our national existence would be in substantially greater danger. Nor do I think that such bases would substantially alter the balance of power in the world.

Another senatorial critic of the critics said this on September 11, 1962:

> So I do not want the people of my State to lose a night's sleep worrying about the might of Cuba. It is misleading and mischievous to say that Cuba represents a military threat to the United States. Castro can triple or quadruple his imports of Soviet technicians and arms without requiring us to assign a single additional destroyer or fighter squadron to our Caribbean forces.

This was a month and 11 days before October 22, when the President spoke out.

I hope that the Cuba debate will continue. I believe that it will offer enlightenment to those who will listen whether or not they agree with all that they hear. Of course, we must weigh our words with care and do whatever possible to strengthen the President's hand. That is the course I have followed in the past and the course I shall continue to follow until I am convinced that the Communist threat to the peace and security of this hemisphere has been removed.

Whatever our differences in the means to be used, the American people are united in the end to be achieved—peace. But we do not want the peace of communism, the peace of the totalitarian state, the peace of the grave; we want a peace where freedom can flourish and where men can differ without the need to silence their differences by bringing in thousands of troops and establishing missile bases.

The best way to achieve that peace, as we saw only too well from the dismal efforts of the 1930's, is not by appeasement, and not by a policy of retreat that can only encourage the Soviets to attack us elsewhere. Certainly, one of the big lessons of the Cuban crisis of October, for Berlin, and for the rest of the world, is that a strong and determined stand by the United States can ultimately ease tensions. It can show the Soviets that we mean what we say. It can show them that they have nothing to gain by belligerent activities.

In the long run it is paradoxical, but true, that the real peacemakers of this world are not the Neville Chamberlains and the Pierre Lavals who try to make accommodations with an unscrupulous aggressor, but the Winston Churchills, who see the danger in time.

Peace is not something that the Soviets are ever going to give us. It is something that we and the whole free world have to win, through policies which prove to the Soviets beyond doubt that they have nothing to gain by hostility or provocation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I listened with great interest to the speech of the Senator from New York, as I always do to the speeches he makes on any subject, and most especially in recent months to what he has had to say relative to the Cuban situation.

I am glad that he states he believes in a bipartisan foreign policy, and, of course, I take him at his word, and I know when he says he believes the President's hand should be strengthened he will do what he can in that respect to give him his support.

I did not hear all the Senator's speech, although I was in the Chamber most of the afternoon, but I believe in the beginning he said something about this administration's improvising in the field of foreign policy——

Mr. KEATING. In the Cuban situation. I was dealing only with that facet of foreign policy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I accept the correction. But I would point out to the Senator that it is pretty hard to lay down a hard and fast policy as to any part of the world where we have difficulties; there are areas in the world which call for discernment on the part of the President, and demand action along various lines from time to time.

The Senator knows better than I do that, in addition to the cancer of Cuba, there is the question of unrest and dissatisfaction, and revolutions of sorts, in Latin America. He knows the situation in Africa is far from settled. He knows the Western alliance is going through some agonizing reconsiderations at the moment.

He knows the situation in the Middle East is quite difficult, especially in view of the recent revolts in Yemen and that country's tie-ups with Egypt. He knows of the more recent revolt in Iraq and the possibility of a tie-up between that country and Egypt. He knows of the delicate situation in south Asia, where we find the Pakistanis and the Indians meeting over the question of Kashmir. He knows of the situation between the Indians and the Chinese, resulting from the Chinese aggression of last fall.

We see the situation in southeast Asia, where we have something like 12,000 troops in South Vietnam.

We know of the precarious situation in Laos, whose King, Sri Savang Vatana, honors us with a state visit today. We know of the ever-present danger in the Formosan Straits, to Taiwan, and the ever-present danger in Korea, where we have two military divisions stationed this side of the 38th parallel.

These are matters which the President—not merely President Kennedy, but any President—must contend with during his tenure of office. These are problems no President can throw back on his predecessor, nor should he, because once he assumes office he assumes full responsibility.

But it is difficult to lay down a hard-and-fast policy in one area in view of the way conditions in the world are changing today.

While the Senator from New York may not have said so, he indicated that there was a question raised at a time subsequent to the Cuban crisis of a "deal" which would cover both Cuba and Berlin. I say that, to the best of my knowledge, there never was any deal. I say also—and I am glad to see the assistant minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], in the Chamber—that when we met with the President on October 22 at his request, and came back here from all parts of the country—the Senator from California, I believe, came back from the Pacific coast—the leadership was then told what the facts were, and there was a strong possibility raised that the reaction might well be against Berlin. We understood that perfectly. We understood all the implications involved. We understood that if anything happened at Berlin, this country would almost certainly be engaged in nuclear war. The people knew it, too.

Most important, Mr. Khrushchev knew it. And because of that, these missile sites were destroyed and the IRBM, the medium-range ballistic missiles, were withdrawn.

I note that the Senator stated—and I hope I am not taking too much of his time, because I did not hear all of his speech—that on October 10 he warned of the IRBM's on Cuba and that the information was not given to the American people or to the leadership until 12 days later—which is correct; but I would point out that when the leadership was called back to Washington on the 22d of October, we were told by the President that on the preceding Tuesday, when he had received his information from the Director of Central Intelligence, Mr. John McCone, he had ordered more photo reconnaissance, flown at lower levels, to make absolutely certain that the initial information given to him was accurate.

When he was absolutely sure in his mind, he sent out a call to both the Republican and the Democratic leadership. We did not know what it was all about. We came back to Washington and we were told the facts at that time.

I am sure that even though the Senator from New York made the statement, as he says, on October 10, that there were ICBM's on the island of Cuba——

Mr. KEATING. May I interrupt the Senator at that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. I did not say that there were missiles there. I said there were medium-range missile sites under construction.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Medium-range missile sites under construction. I accept the correction. If I remember correctly, the 22d was Monday. Therefore Sunday was the 21st, Saturday the 20th, Friday the 19th, Thursday the 18th, and that it was on the 16th of October that the President received his first information from Mr. McCone. It was on the following Sunday, the 21st, that he finally corroborated that information and was absolutely certain in his own mind that it was correct.

It was on that day that he sent out the call for the leadership to come to Washington.

On the next day he laid the story before us, and that evening he laid it before the American people.

In the meantime, when he received his first information on October 16, he immediately ordered the Strategic Air Command on an ever-ready alert. He also ordered the embarkation of marines at Pendleton, Calif. When the leadership met with the President on Monday, those marines, if my memory serves me correctly, were at sea for 4 days on the way through the canal, and from there, of course, they would go to the Caribbean.

The Director of Central Intelligence, a man for whom I have great admiration and respect, did notify the President at the first chance and did bring to him all available information he had at his disposal.

I mentioned the fact that on the 22d the leaders on both sides were called in by the President.

The leadership on both sides was called in many times before October 22, and the latest time we were called in, from both sides, was one day last week.

The Senator from New York said, in effect, that Mr. Gilpatrick and Mr. McNamara made certain statements about onsite inspections; that Under Secretary Gilpatrick is supposed to have said, "We are never sure," and that Secretary McNamara was quoted as having said he was "reasonably satisfied."

I see nothing wrong with these statements attributed to Mr. Gilpatrick and Mr. McNamara. They, too, depend on the same kind of information upon which the President depends, and that is furnished by Mr. McCone as coordinator of all intelligence activities. That means that the intelligence activities of the Defense Department are brought to Mr. McCone's attention.

I wonder who is ever sure that he is right about such things. I wonder if Secretary McNamara, in stating he was "reasonably satisfied" was not in fact making an accurate and honest statement. I am sure he was. Unfortunately, it is true that onsite inspection has not come about, but I believe it is also true that on a daily basis further reconnaissance is taking place, and we are as well aware of what is going on on the island of Cuba as we can be, minus onsite inspection.

The Senator from New York mentioned the longshoremen embargo on certain ships.

I invite the Senator's attention to a fact which I learned in the civics course, namely, that the conduct of the foreign policy of this country is in the hands of the President of the United States, who delegates that authority on occasion to the Secretary of State, and is not in the hands of a labor union. I think that ought to be kept in mind.

There are limits as to what should and should not be done. The President and the Secretary of State conduct American foreign policy.

The Senator also mentioned something about the withdrawal of missiles from Turkey and Italy, and said that such withdrawal is at odds with previous Defense Department statements. Of course it is. The matter of withdrawing Jupiter missiles from Italy and Turkey was considered long before the Cuban crisis of last October. Certainly nothing was to be said at that time which would indicate that the Jupiter missiles were to be withdrawn, just as the Thor missiles were to be withdrawn from England, and were to be replaced by the Polaris missile. I believe the administration acted in good faith at that time and that the Defense Department made the only kind of statement that could have been made. Very likely because of the Cuban crisis the Jupiter missiles were maintained, in Italy and Turkey especially, longer than they would have been, because of the critical situation which arose.

The Senator also mentioned something about the note which Mr. Khrushchev sent to the President, and he indicated, not some doubt about it, but that he had not seen its contents. The text of the Khrushchev note, not to the President, but to the State Department, was read in part at the leadership meeting last week. It was read several times. It was indicated in that note that it was the intention of the Soviet Union to withdraw "several thousand" of the Soviet troops and technicians in Cuba.

Mr. KEATING. If the Senator will permit me to inquire at that point—and I would not want him to answer me at all if he feels he should not—I should like to ask whether Khrushchev's statement was that they intended to withdraw them or that they promised to withdraw those troops?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That question I could not answer definitely, to be honest about it. I do not believe it was a hard and fast promise. As I recall, it was something pretty close to that.

I would not even be mentioning this today, and I know the Senator would not be either, if the news story had not appeared the next day after this so-called secret meeting. I must confess in all honesty that I cannot specifically answer the question of the Senator in that respect.

The Senator says that we lack a long-term consistent policy in Cuba. It is hard to develop a long-term consistent policy in any part of the world. Events make the most careful policies of little use to us. As I indicated in the earlier part of my remarks, I wish it were possible to lay down a pat policy, to operate it on a checks-and-balance basis, and to be sure that the policy, in spite of changing situations, would be successful.

I point out—and the Senator knows this better than I—that the United States has become the leader of the free world, not from choice, not because it sought the role, but because of necessity—in other words, it had no choice.

We shall make some mistakes as we go along. We have made plenty so far, and we will make some in the future. However, I believe we are learning, too.

Of course I agree with the Senator that there should be no appeasement and no retreat. I agree with him on the fine words he has to say about one of the world's great statesmen, Winston Churchill. However, I would also say that in the Presidency we have a man of courage, tenacity, and understanding, a man who is learning a good deal about some of the problems the hard way, a man who will make mistakes on occasion, but a man who always has the interest of the United States at heart first.

He is the man who will look after the best interests, the security, and the well-being of not only the 185 million Americans who live in this country, his own fellow citizens, but also of the people who live in countries which are dependent, through alliances and other arrangements, on the United States.

So I hope that the Senator from New York will continue to be constructive in his statements. I am glad he has said that he believes in a bipartisan foreign policy. I am sure he does. I am glad he has said he will do what he can to strengthen the President's hand. I believe we ought to think of our own country first, and never America last. I believe that all of us—Democrats and Republicans alike—have that thought in mind. If we criticize, as Democrats have done under a Republican administration, and as Republicans have criticized, and will continue to criticize, under a Democratic administration, I hope that the criticism will be constructive and that where fault is found, alternatives will be offered. I feel, deep down in my heart, that that will be the attitude of the Republican critics; and I feel also that they will not attack the President or his policy in Cuba, or elsewhere, merely for the sake of criticizing.

I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for yielding to me and giving me the opportunity to make this statement at this time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I express my gratitude to the distinguished majority leader for his comments. I am sure he does not need to be told that at no time in any of my comments on the Cuban situation was one word ever uttered impugning the motives, the patriotism, or the sincerity of the President of the United States or any other Government leader who might differ with my position.

Furthermore, I am sure the Senator from Montana, who is familiar with my record both in the Senate and in the other body, knows that I am completely sincere when I say that I believe in and have always supported a bipartisan foreign policy. No one has ever suggested, however, that a bipartisan foreign policy requires us to refrain from all discussion of our foreign policy and I have not hesitated to criticize when a Republican President was in the White House, if I felt criticism was justified—and there were times when I felt it was; and I think it is proper to criticize now when criticism is justified. Of course, many Senators on the other side of the aisle have, in deed and in fact, criticized certain aspects of our present policy. The distinguished majority leader himself has been critical of the lack of a sound, long-term policy in southeast Asia, to give one example.

I agree that at times, we must, improvise. I pointed out in my speech—and I call this to the attention of the Senator from Montana, because he said

he did not hear all that I said—instances in which I considered the improvisation good, and instances in which I thought it was bad.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I recall the Senator doing that. I was speaking in general terms.

Mr. KEATING. But I also think we need basic guidelines of policy. We need to know how we plan to deal with particular problems on a long-range basis, whether to ignore them or devise long range and immediate means to combat them. Frankly, I think some of our efforts to gain the support and cooperation of our allies in Latin America and of our NATO allies in a long-range policy with respect to the Cuban situation have been disappointing. I believe that concerted action at the very least should be vigorously attempted. I hope it will succeed.

I believe it will succeed if it is properly presented. In doing so, the worst thing in the world is to try to downgrade the crisis and downgrade the Soviet buildup in Cuba. If the news with reference to the crisis in Cuba is to be managed, it might better be done by building up the Soviet menace rather than downgrading it, but there is no need to exaggerate any of the facts to convince the world of the serious implications of the present situation.

The Senator from Montana referred to alternatives. I agree with him that those who are critical of a particular policy, normally should be prepared to advance constructive alternatives. That is exactly what the junior Senator from New York has done. My recommendations for dealing with this crisis have been presented to the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, who stated he came to me at the request of the President.

I have given him my recommendations—which certainly are not infallible—for dealing with this situation. None of these recommendations involves military action against Cuba. Last Wednesday I received a call from the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, indicating that the President felt that at this time it might be harmful to the national interest to have those recommendations made public. When the Commander in Chief makes a statement like that to a Senator, I believe it is entitled to respect. Therefore, I have not made public the recommendations which I have transmitted to the President.

Most of the other points made by the distinguished Senator from Montana are dealt with in my remarks. One point I would like to emphasize, however, is that there is no desire on the part of the junior Senator from New York to belittle a crisis anywhere in the world or to indicate that the resolution of any of these problems is easy. It is not easy; it is difficult. But in my judgment, firm action in Cuba is more likely to prevent such crises than a position of weakness. I believe the results of the October confrontation proved this conclusively.

I now wish to say a word concerning the reference to the Longshoremen's Union. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Montana that we cannot leave the determination of our foreign policy to a labor union.

But when a labor union takes what it believes to be a public-spirited position in regard to the handling of Communist cargo, I believe that instead of being pilloried and attacked, it might be more in the interest of our country if the union were called in, and if the matter were discussed with the union. Certainly it was voicing general sentiment among many of the people of this country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HRUSKA in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Relative to the attitude of the Longshoremen's Union, I would agree with the latter part of the Senator's statement; namely, that there should be discussion of these matters, there should be consideration of the foreign policy of our country, and there should also be recognition as to where the responsibility for the conduct of our foreign policy lies.

As for the Longshoremen's Union being pilloried, I had not heard of that; this is the first indication I have had that anything of that sort was happening to the Longshoremen's Union. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that I have heard more praise of the union than anything else.

But let me point out the difficulty: If a Longshoremen's Union or any other union can operate on this basis, what is there to prevent a businessman's union or a housewives' union, or some other union from operating in the same way? Is a businessman's union or a housewives' union to conduct the foreign policy of our country? The Constitution clearly states that the President of the United States is the one who has that responsibility; and the one who acts for him is the Secretary of State.

Even Senators are circumscribed to some extent, because the power of the Senate in the field of foreign policy was set forth quite clearly in the Constitution. Although that power of the Senate has been broadened in recent years, it has been broadened, not because of what the Constitution states or does not state, but because of the fact that our country has become the world's major power, and also because of the fact that, as the years pass, control of the purse strings is becoming more and more important in connection with foreign policy.

So, Mr. President, although I would not wish to disagree with the statement the Senator from New York has just made, I would point out that too many foreign-policy cooks can spoil the broth, and the result of that would not be beneficial either to our country or to the rest of the free world.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I agree that we could not have a labor union or a businessman's group or any other group of private individuals determine our foreign policy. But my recollection of the position taken by the longshoremen is that it was in accordance with our announced policy to discourage other nations from supplying Castro. I believe that voluntary organizations can do a great deal of good in support of an announced policy.

The announced policy of our Government was not being wholeheartedly carried out by our Government. Perhaps the longshoremen went too far; but they "picked up the ball," which seemed to many to have been dropped by the Government in carrying out its own policy. Sometimes the Government announces a policy, but then is not too careful about enforcing it.

I know that the Senator from Montana would—as would almost any other Senator—recognize that when Congress passes a foreign aid bill which contains some of the "sense of the Congress" amendments, we mean that we expect that they will be lived up to, although we are not tying the hands of the administrators of the program. But many times, Mr. President, after a policy of that sort has been announced, after the measure has been signed by the President, and after it is said that that is the announced policy of the Government, still what is done could not be recognized as a part of that Government policy. Such instances have occurred during previous administrations—namely, that after Congress passes a foreign aid bill containing certain "sense of the Congress" provisions, it is found that that is the end of any action on that score.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a brief comment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I rather like the phrase "loyal opposition," which is used in the Government of the United Kingdom to describe the party out of power. I think it actually means about the same as the old American axiom that "politics stop at the water's edge." For, Mr. President, the liberty which you and I enjoy in this country is not partisan in nature, and the responsibility to defend it must be exercised by all our countrymen, Republicans and Democrats, and all others.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from New York has served this country in peace and in war. He has spoken out firmly and honorably, time and time again, in regard to the grave and dangerous problem in Cuba and elsewhere, as he has seen the light. Today, once again, he has made a great contribution in the comments which have been made by him on this floor.

I, myself, hope to speak later on some of these problems; but at this time I wish to refer briefly to my colleague's comments. I speak as an American, not as a partisan. My comments would be exactly the same if I sat on the side on which my friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] sits.

The distinguished Senator from New York recalls the comment made last November by a responsible, able, patriotic member of the executive branch of the Government; namely, a comment in regard to missile bases maintained for a lengthy period of time overseas, by agreement with the European countries involved, because the maintenance of those bases was deemed to be in the interest of the defense of those countries and also in the interest of the defense of our own country. The comment made by a very able American—the Deputy Secretary of Defense—was, "Those bases are not going to be closed down." But shortly thereafter, Mr. President, we were told that they were going to be closed down.

I am no military expert. I come here as a lay Senator. But it is difficult for me, and, I think, for the American people to understand an abrupt change of that sort; and I congratulate my friend, the Senator from New York, for talking about it.

I returned to the capital of our country last October when the White House asked me to. I was asked to do so because I have been permitted by my Republican colleagues to be their whip. There was then a magnificent exhibition by Americans representing the legislative branch of the Government of the United States, both those who belong to the Democratic Party and those who belong to the Republican Party. Our people stood together in time of danger.

Mr. President, certainly no one in this country has any greater bitterness than does this Senator when he recalls that the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union told our President a falsehood in the White House, when he told the President of the United States, "We do not have in Cuba any weapons that are offensive in character, and we do not contemplate having in Cuba any weapons offensive in character." He made a false statement—indeed, several—to our President.

When the junior Senator from New York comments in his speech that the leader of our Government is the President of the United States, whether he belongs to one party or the other, he is eternally correct. We need to weigh our words with care. We must do whatever is possible to strengthen the hand of the President. For that reason, a year ago the distinguished Senator from New York indicated in the Senate that the time had come to write into law a prohibition against American trade and shipping with the infamous Castro regime, so far as it lay within the power of the American people through their Congress to prevent it. The Senator from New York was on the floor of the Senate last year, fighting for proposed legislation which is now the law of our land in the amendments that were written into the Mutual Security Act to prevent such shipping.

The Senator from New York was on the floor of the Senate, acting not as a partisan, but as an American when the resolution relating to Cuba passed the Congress, stating to the American people and to the world that the legislative branch of the Government of the United States was behind the commander in chief of our country in a policy of firmness, indicating that the American people and the American Government would not and will not tolerate any attempt to convert that unhappy and disgraced Communist island into a launching pad for nuclear weapons. Communism must be extirpated from this hemisphere.

I share the inward pride of every Senator and every other American in our country when I recall that the President of the United States, in his message last October, said with firmness that our country would hold the Soviet Union responsible if missiles were launched from Cuba against any part of the Western Hemisphere.

There will not be any carping criticism in the Senate on this side of the aisle. At any rate, there should not be. There will be constructive criticism, I hope and believe.

I have listened with great interest to the vigorous and searching comments that the Senator from New York has made today. I want particularly to point out the almost nonsequitur with respect to one of our defense policy decisions—or announcements—only to see it, apparently, overruled a short time thereafter. We want our country strong so that it may remain free. I trust my Government to act as it believes is in the best interest of our people, but the missile base situation in Europe, the seeming switch is most puzzling. I salute the Senator from New York for getting up and saying so—to indicate that we share an apprehension caused by statements which are made on one day to indicate a certain course of action and to find subsequently that a diametrically opposed course of action is to be followed.

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, I thank my friend the distinguished Senator from California for his comments.

Mr. **COOPER**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **KEATING**. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. **COOPER**. It was my good fortune to be present in the Senate Chamber last August, when the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] made his speech notifying the Senate, and I think the Nation, of the presence of Soviet troops and offensive weapons in Cuba. Others have spoken on the subject since that time.

Because the statement of the Senator from New York at that time turned out to be correct, I have followed everything he has said with great interest and confidence. I believe that the facts have demonstrated that when the Senator from New York has spoken, he has done so on the basis of careful study and of knowledge.

I have said here and in other places that I thought the Senator has always spoken responsibly and I think that responsibility is necessary. I pay my tribute to the Senator because he has spoken with a desire to be responsible and constructive.

The Senator from New York has spoken of bipartisanship. There is always debate about what bipartisanship means. Opinion in the country has been aroused in this case, I believe, because of the obvious fact of Cuba's proximity, the missile threat last fall, and the continuing uncertainty aroused by the presence of Soviet troops.

Bipartisanship can bear upon this situation, and be helpful in strengthening policy and supporting the President in his decisions. The first condition of bipartisan support is the responsibility of the administration to provide to the people, and to the Congress, the greatest amount of information possible within the limits of security. I always feel better if the information comes directly from the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense, rather than from news articles based on information perhaps supplied by the administration. Not knowing the source, we cannot really say that it is correct or incorrect.

So I believe the first responsibility for bipartisanship is that of the administration. Then I believe responsibility attaches to all of us.

There is great temptation to speak on the subject of Cuba, because we know that it is a serious situation. But there is also a responsibility to be constructive about it.

I believe a policy could be developed to deal with the problem of Cuba. Two weeks ago today, in one of the few speeches I have made on the subject, I suggested that for the immediate future the crux of policy is to urge the withdrawal of the Soviet troops and this the President is doing. Then, I suggested we should develop a policy in relation to the hemisphere, which would exclude Soviet bases.

We know the means for the implementation of policy are in the hands of the Executive. And thus another important element of bipartisanship comes into play. The President must have elbow room, as the majority leader said the other day. He must have the elements of maneuverability, so that the United States will not be forced into a position in which it could find no alternative except war, unless our security is absolutely at stake. Today, I believe the Congress must afford the President such room to conduct foreign policy, and to make decisions—decisions respecting Cuba.

These are great issues. The Senator from New York has contributed effectively to the discussion of the problem of Cuba. I know that such will be his course in the days to come.

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. There is no one in this Chamber, on either side of the aisle, who has more universal respect for his views and his innate good intentions than the Senator from Kentucky.

I am sure that his views and mine as to the necessity for responsible discussion are the same. Whether we would reach exactly the same conclusion as to the method of dealing with the situation is neither here nor there, nor is that question before us today.

I read the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky with great interest. I know he has made a distinct contribution to this discussion and that he is capable of making more contributions in the future, particularly in the field of foreign relations. He has had a wealth of experience not only as a Senator but also as a distinguished ambassador.

No commendatory words would mean more to the junior Senator from New York than those just uttered by my friend from Kentucky.

ROBERT LEROY COCHRAN

Mr. **HRUSKA**. Mr. President, death this past weekend claimed one of Nebraska's most distinguished citizens, the Honorable Roy Cochran.

Governor Cochran was the first chief executive in Nebraska's history to serve three consecutive terms. He came to the Governor's office after an outstanding career as its chief highway engineer.

Upon his retirement as Governor, he continued his public service, first as an Army colonel and commander of Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., then as a consultant on highway matters to the Federal Bureau of the Budget, a position which recognized his eminence in his field. And even during his term here in Washington, he was called to still further service when the late Dwight Griswold, one of our former colleagues, prevailed upon him to take a leave of absence to assist the Greek Aid Mission, which Governor Griswold headed.

It would have been reasonable to expect that upon retirement from these Federal positions, Governor Cochran would have considered his obligation to public service more than fulfilled.

But that was not the case. Governor Cochran responded to a call to return to his old position as Nebraska highway engineer when a particularly difficult situation arose there about 3 years ago.

Those of us who were privileged to know and work with Governor Cochran were not surprised at this evidence of the deep feeling he held toward serving the people of his State, in whatever way he could. There is no previous record of a former Governor returning to work in a subordinate position in State government.

But this was characteristic of Governor Cochran. So long as he was able, he was willing to serve. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article from the February 23, 1963, issue of the Omaha World-Herald, together with an editorial from the Lincoln Journal of the same date, entitled, "Nebraska's Loss," describing the distinguished career of one of Nebraska's finest public servants.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COCHRAN DIES; WAS GOVERNOR—HAD 45 YEARS OF PUBLIC SERVICE

Robert LeRoy Cochran who went from a sodhouse on Nebraska's plains to the Governor's mansion in Lincoln, died at 5 a.m. Saturday in a Lincoln hospital.

He was 77, having observed his last birthday on January 28.

Mr. Cochran, who became Nebraska's 24th Governor in 1935, also for many years was Mr. Highway of Nebraska. He was Nebraska State engineer for 12 years, starting in 1923. In 1959 he returned to the position.

SUFFERED STROKE

In all, he logged 45 years of public service.

Mr. Cochran, in a hospital since last December 20 when he suffered a severe stroke, had been active until last October, when he suffered a slight stroke.

Born in Cass County, Roy Cochran, after his mother's death, traveled across the State by covered wagon with his father and grew up on a Lincoln County farm between Brady and North Platte.

He got his early schooling in a small sod shanty near his home. Graduating from Brady High School, he sold his pony for $70, walked 20 miles to a railroad depot and boarded a train for Lincoln and the University of Nebraska.

SERVED OVERSEAS

Working his way through school, he was graduated with a bachelor's degree in civil engineering in 1910.

After two terms as Lincoln County surveyor, he was appointed a State bridge inspector and 2 years later was promoted to deputy State engineer.

After time out for World War I service overseas, Mr. Cochran returned, was married, and in 1923 was appointed State engineer by Gov. Charles W. Bryan.

In 1934, after considerable urging Mr. Cochran entered the gubernatorial arena. Running as a Democrat, he won the nomination over a field of nine candidates.

He was elected Governor by about 22,000 votes over Dwight Griswold. He was to defeat Mr. Griswold once more and then serve a third term after defeating Charles J. Warner and Charles W. Bryan, who was running by petition.

He sought election to the U.S. Senate in 1940 but lost to Hugh Butler.

After leaving the Governor's mansion, Mr. Cochran returned to Army service as a colonel and for a time was commanding officer at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo.

In October 1945, he was summoned to serve the Federal Government. He held various jobs for 10 years with the Bureau of the Budget, except for a 7-month stint when he responded to a request by old friend Dwight Griswold to be Deputy Greek Aid Administrator.

HIGHWAY WORK

Mr. Cochran was twice chairman of the Conference of State Governors and was former president of the Council of State Governments.

He was the father of Nebraska's modern highway system.

And he was largely responsible for getting Nebraska out of the mud. In 1923, when he became State engineer, there were fewer than 100 miles of surfaced roads in Nebraska, including gravel.

When he left office as Governor in 1941, Nebraska had 3,500 miles of concrete and oil-topped roads and nearly 5,000 miles of gravel.

GREAT GOVERNOR

Later, as State engineer at 73, he was to help direct interstate highway work.

Saturday Governor Morrison said: "The State has lost one of its great Governors and outstanding public servants, a distinguished Nebraskan who contributed much to his State and country."

Mr. Cochran was a member of St. Matthew's Episcopal Church in Lincoln and the Masonic Lodge.

Survivors include his wife, Aileen, a son, Robert L., Jr., Lincoln; a daughter, Mrs. Lee Grimes, Oxnard, Calif., and seven grandchildren. Services will be at 10 a.m. Tuesday at St. Matthew's Church in Lincoln.

NEBRASKA'S LOSS

As it must to all men, death has come to former Gov. Roy Cochran. Nebraskans in all corners of the State will feel a touch of sadness. Mr. Cochran, though he held many important jobs in the National Government, was a Nebraskan, first, last, and always.

He was a symbol of rugged individualism. He had known the hardship of the earlier days. He was a builder and a believer in the future of Nebraska and Nebraskans. He served 12 years as State engineer and 6 years as Governor.

When he retired from Federal service, he came back to Nebraska to make his home.

At a time when he could have sat back and enjoyed the fruits of his long and successful life, he consented to return to State government as State engineer in the Brooks administration. When he found himself out of tune with that administration he resigned with dignity.

Few men were more widely known and affectionately regarded than Mr. Cochran. He was a man of deep convictions, sometimes out of tune with the latter-day policies of his Democratic Party.

Most of all he was a man of the people, a man who respected the dignity of all men.

RECOGNITION OF WAR CORRESPONDENTS

Mr. **HRUSKA**. Mr. President, I am pleased to join in the sponsorship of S. 869, which has been introduced by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]. This measure authorizes the burial of war correspondents in national cemeteries.

I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor on the next printing.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, the name of the Senator from Nebraska will be added as a cosponsor on the next printing of S. 869.

Mr. **HRUSKA**. Mr. President, this seems to me to be an appropriate, if somewhat inadequate, recognition of the brave men and women who exposed themselves to the same dangers, hardships, and sacrifices as our fighting men, in order that they could send their eyewitness accounts of the war to our newspapers, magazines, and radio.

When we hear the term "war correspondent" we may be inclined to think of a dashing fellow in a trenchcoat and what the Air Corps called a 50-mission cap, dashing off cables on the big picture of the war. There were, indeed, such men.

But by far the greater number were in the mold of the late Ernie Pyle, dressed in a wrinkled and muddy wool uniform, sharing a foxhole with a scared and lonely infantryman from a little town most of us never heard of.

The war correspondent's life was never so glamorous as the movies would have us believe. This was especially true in the island-hopping campaign in the Pacific where mere survival was a task and getting one's copy filed next to impossible.

In approving S. 869, the Congress will be recognizing the war correspondent for what he was—a soldier, a sailor, an airman—who contributed a great deal to the writing of history and keeping the public informed.

THE COST-PRICE SQUEEZE ON THE AMERICAN FARM FAMILY

Mr. **HRUSKA**. Mr. President, the value of a legislator's mail is often talked about. In spite of its heavy volume and the sometimes tedious nature of assembly line or generated mail, it serves as an indispensable link between the legislator and the people he represents.

Every once in a while there comes to our desk a message which is especially clear and effective—striking at the very core of a situation and expressing the innermost concern of the author.

The other day such a letter came to me, registering in simple but heartfelt words the distress of a farm wife who is part of a team on a midwestern farm, courageously battling with hard work and constant optimism, but with disappointing progress. This is the life of a Nebraska farm family.

The letter treats of a theme which has become tragically familiar; namely, the financial beating being taken by today's farmers. For the past 10 years farm commodities have brought about the same price, but the things the farmer must buy have gone up so terrifically. For example, to quote from this letter:

> When beginning to farm (1951) our tractor cost $1,500; now the same size tractor costs $4,500.

And a little later on:

> Maybe the surplus farm products would be used up if groceries would be down in line with what farmers get for their products * * * what seems so unfair is this for example—we get 20 to 30 cents a dozen for eggs and in grocery stores they charge 40 to 50 cents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be set out at this point in the RECORD the entire text of this letter from Mrs. Edwin Krepel, of Howells, Nebr.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOWELLS, NEBR.,
February 12, 1963.

DEAR SENATOR HRUSKA: First let me introduce myself, Mrs. Edwin Krepel, from Howells, Nebr. We had the privilege of seeing you in Howells on its 75th jubilee celebration last June. This letter will be far from a formal one for which I apologize but this letter is more a person-to-person chat.

My husband and I live on a 235-acre farm which we rent. Let me begin this way—farmers are taking a terrific financial beating. Ever since we started farming (1951) farm commodities are quite the same price—corn $1 to $1.30—hogs $15 to $20 (and $20 is gotten very seldom); cattle never got over $30 and that price was obtained by few, very few farmers, for only a short time did that price hold. But take things farmers buy—for instance tractors. When beginning to farm our tractor cost $1,500—now the same size tractor costs $4,500. This goes all the way down the line of machinery. Maybe the surplus farm products would be used up if groceries would be down in line with what farmers get for their products. If meat, eggs, etc., would be priced lower then city people could afford to buy more. I believe in this theory very much. What seems so unfair is this—for example—we get 20 to 30 cents a dozen for eggs—and in grocery stores they charge 40 to 50 cents. This spread on farm to grocery price goes on down the line of products farmers sell. What would help farmers is to have the price of machinery down. Then more farmers could buy more.

I don't think it's right for professional men—lawyers, doctors, etc.—to buy cattle and farms for investments. They make more money than the farmers and don't give the farmers a chance. The farmers don't pry in their businesses—why should they? If they buy farms, they should be taxed double. Maybe this letter won't be given any consideration, but we're urged to write our Representatives and Senators. Please try your hardest to help the farmer out of this plight by getting some legislation started to help us—maybe by suggesting some of the things I did.

Thank you for taking time out of your busy life to read my letter.

Sincerely.

MRS. EDWIN KREPEL.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, such a letter is difficult to answer. What indeed is the answer to her appeal—

> Please try your hardest to help the farmer out of this plight by getting some legislation started to help us.

There are two developments since the first of the year which are deserving of comment.

PRESIDENT ABANDONS COMPULSORY FEED GRAIN CONTROLS

A year ago at this time, the Congress and all of the farm world were in something of an uproar about the compulsory feed grains program proposed by Secretary Freeman. It was defeated. The Congress rejected it. That was good.

In the President's farm message delivered to Congress on January 31 of this year, it was gratifying to note the abandonment of that objectionable and unworkable compulsory feed grains program approach. In its place, the President calls for legislation authorizing a voluntary program, flexible enough to meet varying conditions and needs, and based upon the same basic principles which have proven successful in the past 2 years.

This change in concept is a distinct gain in the farm legislative picture. It makes much more sense. If care is taken in drafting the farm bill, we will have much more workable and acceptable legislation.

INFLATION CAUSES ARE CONTINUED

It can be seen from Mrs. Krepel's letter that the very basis of the complaint is one-sided inflation applying to things the farmer must buy. The tractor which cost $1,500 in 1951 and now costs $4,500 shows how disastrously the purchasing power of the dollar has shrunk.

The largest single cause of inflation is heavy Government spending and continued deficits.

The budget proposed for next fiscal year calls for $99 billion in spending. This is $18 billion more than the amount recommended for spending by President Eisenhower in his last budget message only 2 years ago. This $18 billion difference represents an increase of over 20 percent.

The deliberately planned deficit—the shortage betwen spending and Government revenues—is $12 billion. The President has indicated that there will not be a balanced budget sooner than about 1967. There are many competent economists who believe it will not be balanced for another 10 years under the course of financing which the President outlined in his budget message. If the President's spending-taxing plan is adopted, the Nation will face a decade of deficits.

This is very disheartening, indeed. It means the further encroachment and advance of the inflation about which Mrs. Krepel and her many millions of fellow farm wives complain.

This is a frightful fate to visit upon the Nation's farmers, as well as the rest of America. Consider the testimony of the President's Budget Director, Mr. Gordon, who testified recently that a balanced budget would actually be harmful to the Nation. The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], a Democrat and chairman of the Finance Committee, has called for the immediate discharge of Mr. Gordon as being one who has fiscal ideas dangerous and unsuitable for the post which he holds.

Mr. President, Nebraskans generally will be found in accord with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. They will be found in accord with the idea that the proper approach is an effort to really reduce Government spending and to make every effort to approximate a balanced budget as soon as possible.

But the administration turns a deaf ear to those who cry for fiscal responsibility. It persists in doing the very things which will defeat continued ravages of that ruinous inflation about which Mrs. Krepel complains.

Mr. President, only a year ago, almost to the day, I stood in this Chamber and attempted to point the way in which our farm policies must be directed. I remain convinced that we shall never really come to grips with the problem until we accept some basic truths about American agriculture:

The first truth is that there is great competition within the industry we call farming. Only highly restrictive and repressive measures that farmers themselves will not accept will dull the edge of this competitive sword. That is to say that, in the ultimate, any attempts to control total farm output is foredoomed to failure.

Second, modern science and technology has committed us to an irrevocable course of abundant production. Progress lies in the direction of that abundance being used effectively, not in its atrophy.

Third, the laws of economics are as immutable as the law of gravity and Ohm's law. We cannot repeal laws of economics any more than we can the physical laws. They were not passed by man. They are the result of human behavior in a free society. And the only way they can be amended is by enslavement.

A recognition of these truths would force us to aim our farm planning toward less control, not more. Managed abundance is a favorite slogan with a slogan-happy administration. Compulsory programs can create only mismanaged scarcity and the destruction, perhaps forever, of real opportunities for progress in agriculture.

We are only a step away from making of agriculture a public utility with a Washington bureaucracy issuing licenses and franchises. If we adopt that we may as well prepare to create a new

alphabetical regulatory agency. We will rename the Department of Agriculture the "Rural Office of Planned Economics"; its initials provide the "ROPE" with which the farmer is invited to hang himself.

Fortunately, there are alternatives. One is to set for ourselves the same goals proposed by the President in his message to us, but to start in precisely the opposite direction; that is, toward fewer, not more, Government controls. Let us decide on a transition with order and equity.

We should begin by taking the farmer from the precipice where the Kennedy-Freeman schemes put him with an order of jump, or else, and lead him gradually to the safety of the free and open market.

We should develop a long-range program which each year sees the Government withdrawing more and more, as farmers adjust to the changing situation. During the transition period, the farmer must be assisted financially, and, even more important, he must be supported with sensible programs of research which finds new uses for his products, new markets, and new approaches to reducing his cost of doing business.

The direction toward a solution to our difficulty has already been pointed out. Its ingredients include an effective land retirement program which profits from mistakes of the past and avoids them in the future; elimination of the vicious competition between the farmer and the Government with its hoards of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks; an orderly cutoff of wheat allotments and marketing quotas; a relationship between the support price for wheat and that for corn; limitation of agricultural conservation payments; export payments in kind; support of the parity concept.

Mrs. Krepel's plea—expressed by farm wives and their husbands the Nation over—for "getting some legislation started to help us" cannot be answered wholly by any farm bill, however good it may be. It would be of very little use to increase the farmer's income if concurrent steps were not taken to assure that his costs will not soar to even greater heights.

There should also be restored financial commonsense, fiscal responsibility. That will mean a stable dollar. It will mean greater progress the country over.

I am indebted to Mrs. Krepel for writing so sincerely to remind us of these fundamental truths.

U.S. WHEAT HELPS TO BUILD SCHOOL IN PAKISTAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would like to invite the Senate's attention to an important event which has demonstrated the effectiveness and future potential of the U.S. food for peace program. Surplus wheat supplied the village of Gangu Bahadur in Pakistan by the United States assisted the villagers in the construction of a school building where formerly classes were held in an open courtyard. Villagers donated the funds for the building material, the Pakistani Government made a grant, and 976 bushels of U.S. wheat were given to the village council for labor costs.

The potentialities of this program are enormous. The use of surplus American commodities to assist in the construction of educational facilities in Pakistan and in other countries as well would be of benefit to both ourselves and those countries so aided. The present program in Gangu Bahadur village is a pilot project and is expected to provide information as to the feasibility of expanding donations of food for peace products.

The dedication ceremonies for the school took place at Gangu Bahadur October 29, 1962, while concurrent ceremonies were held in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a press release issued by the Department of Agriculture and the remarks of Secretary of Agriculture Freeman on the occasion of the joint ceremonies.

There being no objection, the release and remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEDICATION CEREMONIES MARK COMPLETION OF SCHOOL U.S. WHEAT HELPED TO BUILD

Ceremonies in Washington and Pakistan today marked completion of a school which U.S. wheat has helped to build for Pakistani children.

While the school was being dedicated in Gangu Bahadur village, Pakistan, there was similar observance of its completion at a U.S. Department of Agriculture ceremony in which Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, His Excellency, Aziz Ahmed, Ambassador of Pakistan, and many others participated.

The building of the school, initiated by Secretary Freeman, has shown how U.S. food-for-peace wheat can help provide educational facilities in developing countries.

The Secretary toured the village of Gangu Bahadur, a village near the historic Khyber Pass. He was so impressed with the village and the strong desire to improve the village that he found in his talk with villagers and village officials, especially Malik Mohammed Shafi (chairman of the village council) that the Secretary asked the mayor what the village needed most and he was told a school. The Secretary then told the chairman that if American wheat could help build that school he would try to make the wheat available. That conversation a year ago started a chain of events which resulted in the fine new school of today.

The project was turned over to Wheat Associates, Inc., a major cooperator with the Foreign Agricultural Service in foreign market development. Chairman Shafi, Pakistani cooperator, and Ivan Packard, Pakistan country director of Wheat Associates—U.S.A. Inc., with headquarters in Karachi, Pakistan, gave leadership to the project. The Government of Pakistan and the United States cooperated wholeheartedly.

Approximately 1,000 bushels of U.S. wheat was released from Pakistan Government storage to help pay labor costs. Villagers donated the funds for building material, and their contributions were augumented by a Pakistani Government grant. The school building will accommodate 100 children from six different villages.

Construction and operation of the school is expected to provide information as a pilot project that will prove useful in expanding school construction in Pakistan and possibly other countries.

The Gangu Bahadur School serves six villages in an area about 25 miles from Rawalpindi, the capital of Pakistan and near Taxila, which was an important seat of learning in the second century B.C. Fifteen villages in all comprise the area governed by the Union Council Usman Khattar. The aggregate population is 10,000.

Before the new school building was constructed, classes were held in an open courtyard.

The building covers 1,960 square feet, and includes a kitchen and toilet facilities. Wheat Associates, Inc., will soon institute a school lunch program here in cooperation with the village council.

Total cost of the building was 23,500 rupees ($4,971). The local villagers provided 57 percent of this cost. U.S. wheat, 976 bushels, was given to the village council for labor costs. Total market value of the wheat was $2,114.

Wheat Associates-USA, Inc., is an organization representing U.S. wheatgrowers in Asia, in cooperation with the USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, AT CEREMONIES IN THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OCTOBER 29, 1962, HELD IN OBSERVANCE OF THE DEDICATION OF AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL U.S. WHEAT HELPED TO BUILD IN PAKISTAN

This is a happy occasion, Your Excellency, for us and others assembled here today to rejoice in the completion of the school in Gangu Bahadur village.

I offer you and the people of the village my heartiest congratulations on this day of dedication of your new school. How well I recall my visit to your village just a year ago when I met Malik Mohammed Shafi, and he pointed out to me your need for a school building. This school, which you have built with your own materials and with the help of the people of the United States who have sent U.S. wheat to help pay labor cost, is truly an example of a cooperative effort to fill a community need.

A school is a place of learning. This school has taught us things long before the first student has entered its doors. We see here the results of combining Pakistan's capable manpower, your own voluntary contributions and U.S. agricultural abundance.

Your country places great emphasis on education. One of our early statesmen, Thomas Jefferson, said: "A democracy is based on an enlightened public." Thus we, as well as you, who believe in the dignity of man, have come to realize the essential importance of schools—to enlighten the minds of men.

I sincerely hope that the success of this project will inspire the people of other communities to strive for similar objectives; so that more of the needs of the people of Pakistan can be satisfied through cooperative efforts between our two countries.

May this be only one of many schools built because our two countries who share common goals also are learning to share our common resources to the benefit of the free world.

SOVIET FARMS IN RED—AMERICA PLOWS AHEAD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on an article by Julius Duscha which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Sunday, November 25, 1962. The article describes the extraordinary difference between the Soviet and American agricultural systems.

A comparison of the two systems provides a quite remarkable commentary on the effectiveness of the Soviet and American efforts to mobilize agricultural resources. During the past 10 years, surplus farm production has been one of the principal concerns within our agricultural economy while the Soviets have been plagued by continuing crop failures. Since 1950 average U.S. crop production per acre has increased by 33 percent while that of the Soviet Union has remained constant or even declined. This growing disparity in production has occurred at the same time that the amount of land in the United States devoted to crop production has declined and the absolute number of farmers has also decreased.

In the Soviet Union, on the other hand, the amount of land being developed for agricultural production has been constantly increasing and the proportion of the population working on the land is 25 percent compared to 8 percent in the United States.

There are a number of reasons for the startling differences between the agricultural economies of the two countries, but certainly an important, if not primary one, is that of individual incentive. The Soviet farmer is regimented by strict bureaucratic controls and suffers from wholly inadequate incentives to produce. His American counterpart has been free to make his own decisions and has substantial incentives to produce.

American success in agricultural productivity compared to Soviet difficulties is a fine tribute to the American agricultural community and sadly underlines the failure of a totalitarian regime to effectively mobilize its agricultural resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Post be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIET FARMS ARE IN THE RED WHILE AMERICA PLOWS AHEAD

(By Julius Duscha, staff reporter)

In the Soviet Union another effort was made last week to increase Russia's lagging farm production. In the United States farmers were completing the harvest of another bumper crop.

Nowhere else are the differences between the results of the Soviet and American economic systems so pronounced as they are in agriculture.

While the Soviet Union has had disappointing crops for 4 successive years, farm production in the United States has set records in each of the last 5 years.

American farmers have produced an agricultural economy of unparalleled abundance. But no matter how the Russians organize and reorganize their farm program they cannot seem to meet Soviet food needs.

Why does American farm production keep increasing while Soviet crops lag?

This is a question that Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev might have asked himself as he prepared the speech he delivered to the Soviet Communist Party's policymaking Central Committee last week in Moscow.

In his 5½-hour address Khrushchev announced a reorganization of Soviet controls over industry as well as farming. It was the second time within a year that Khrushchev revamped the Soviet farm system.

His latest effort was to order Communist Party officials to set up a hierarchy of industrial and agricultural committees to replace the single party committees that have been concerned with all aspects of the country's economy and life.

Last March Khrushchev reversed the Soviet trend toward decentralization of economic activities and ordered tighter controls over agriculture, particularly over collective farms.

Khrushchev's moves this year were typical of the reaction of Communist officials to the lagging farm production that has plagued the Soviet Union since the Russian Czar was overthrown in 1917.

Soviet agriculture has suffered from bureaucratic controls and meddling as well as from brutal purges, a serious shortage of capital for machinery and fertilizer, wholly inadequate incentives for the farmers themselves and extreme weather conditions.

And why are American farmers the agricultural success story of the world?

There are many reasons, but the principal ones are:

U.S. farmers have been able to make their own decisions, within the limits of Government controls that have imposed restrictions on acreage planted to crops in surplus but not on the ways in which farmers can operate their farms.

The Federal Government has helped farmers by encouraging efficient farming practices through research programs and by rewarding farmers with minimum price supports and other subsidies.

American farmers have had adequate incentives to produce more so that they could buy tractors and other farm machinery, automobiles, washing machines, refrigerators, and other household appliances as well as many other consumer goods.

The Government has not controlled the U.S. economy and plenty of capital has been available to develop farm machinery, fertilizers, pesticides and all of the other aids to modern and highly efficient farming.

So spectacular has been the success of American agriculture that for the last 10 years surplus production has been the No. 1 farm problem in the United States while crop failures have been the big story in Soviet agriculture.

Since 1950 crop production per acre in the United States has increased by more than one-third. In the last 5 years alone per acre production has gone up 21 percent.

Corn yields, for example, have mounted in the last 5 years from 48 to 61 bushels to the acre. By contrast, Soviet corn yields are less than 40 percent of the U.S. average.

"Many factors," the Agriculture Department has noted, "contributed to the greater yields, including shifts to higher yielding crops, better seed, more fertilizer, wider use of pest controls and improved tillage practices."

Government controls over acreage of such surplus crops as wheat, corn, and cotton were another factor contributing to an increase in production per acre.

When acreage is cut back farmers inevitably seek to increase yields on their remaining acreage. Also, poorer land is always taken out of production first.

Only 74 percent of all the land in the United States suitable for the production of crops is now being used for crops. And only 8 percent of the total population still lives on farms.

In the Soviet Union new land is still being put into production and farmers make up almost a fourth of the total Russian population.

In the United States output per man-hour on farms has doubled since 1950, as fertilizer and machinery have replaced both land and labor. In the meantime, Soviet farm output has stagnated.

And Americans are eating better than ever, with meat production alone having increased 10 percent since 1950.

The Soviet diet continues to be drab and meat is still in short supply as Khrushchev struggles with Russian agriculture.

However spectacular the American farm success story may be, all is not yet well with U.S. agriculture.

Per capita farm income in the United States increased from $960 in 1955 to $1,430 this year, but is still about 40 percent below the figure for the rest of the population.

Farmers now depend on nonfarm sources for almost a third of their income, and more and more small- and medium-sized farmers are having difficulties keeping up with their highly efficient competitors on larger farms.

Nevertheless, there is no comparison between American and Soviet agriculture or between the productivity of the two systems.

American experts on farming as well as U.S. specialists on Soviet agriculture agree that the Russian farm system can be made to work only if farmers are given adequate incentives and if agriculture is provided with plentiful amounts of capital.

Khrushchev himself must know this, but he continues to place higher priorities on industrial rather than farm production because he obviously believes that an evergrowing industrial plant is far more important.

But even if enough capital were alloted to Soviet agriculture and to the production of consumer goods for Russian farmers to buy it is doubtful that the Soviet system of collective and state farms would work.

American farmers have demonstrated time and again that the agricultural system which works best is the one that leaves basic decisions to the highly individualistic, independent, and hard-working men who are farmers.

But the Soviet Union has never been willing to let farmers run their own farms.

POPULARITY OF FOREIGN AID WITH AMERICAN PUBLIC

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a recent Gallup Poll released which indicated that, contrary to a widespread mythology, foreign aid is more popular with the American public today than 5 years ago. According to this poll the foreign aid program today has the support of 58 percent of the public as compared to 51 percent 5 years ago. The percentage of those recorded against the foreign aid program has declined from 33 percent in 1958 to 30 percent in 1963.

I would attribute much of this to the interest of the American people in the Alliance for Progress, a program dedicated to the economic, social, and political well-being of our neighbors in the Latin American area.

In general, the statistics cited by this Gallup Poll confirm once again the American public's support of the foreign aid program which has been enthusiastically endorsed by three successive administrations—the Truman administration, the Eisenhower administration, and the Kennedy administration—and which has consistently won the support of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this release be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUNDAY'S GALLUP POLL SHOWS PUBLIC SUPPORTS FOREIGN AID IN PRINCIPLE

The Gallup Poll release for February 3 stresses that "foreign aid, in principle, has the endorsement of a substantial majority (6 out of 10) of the American public." It adds, however, "many persons who support foreign aid in principle voice criticism of certain aspects of the current program."

The latest poll shows greater popular support for aid today than 5 years ago, and it points to majority approval in all regions of the Nation and by Republicans, Democrats and Independents. The exact question follows:

"In general, how do you feel about foreign aid—are you for it or against it?"

	For	Against	No opinion	Total
1958—March	51	33	16	100
1963—February	58	30	12	100
Republicans	54	35	11	100
Democrats	59	28	13	100
Independents	61	28	11	100
East	60	27	13	100
Midwest	58	33	9	100
South	55	29	16	100
Far West	59	32	9	100

CRITICISMS

"One theme running through many of the comments," says the Gallup release, "is that the United States should be a little more discriminating in its dispersal of foreign aid funds—to insure, in effect, that we get our money's worth." The release adds: "Of particular irritation to some Americans are cases where countries receiving such aid have turned against us in international disputes."

AMOUNT OF AID

The release reports widespread misinformation about the amount of money the United States spends annually on foreign aid—with a tendency to inflate the proportion of the budget such aid constitutes. Only 9 percent of the public cited a figure that was close to $4 billion, and only 9 percent know that this is 5 percent or less of the budget. As many as 49 percent think the proportion is greater—ranging up to one-fourth and even half of the Nation's yearly outlay.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, February 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 112: 6: *The righteous shall be held in everlasting remembrance.*

Almighty God, we thank Thee for that great day in our national life when we are again united to commemorate the birth of George Washington, whom we reverently and affectionately call the "Father of his Country."

Our hearts expand with gratitude and pride as we think of his intrepid spirit of adventure, his fortitude in times of hardship, and his fidelity to the principles of righteousness and justice which inspired him to champion the cause of the oppressed colonists.

We rejoice that he bore witness to a lofty idealism when he urged his fellow men to keep alive within their breasts that little spark of celestial fire called "conscience."

Above all we are thankful for his humble and devout faith which sent him down upon his knees in prayer at Valley Forge in order that he might know how to march and keep in step with the eternal will and wisdom of God.

Grant that the memory of his life may strengthen and sustain the soul of our Republic and constrain us to labor in faith and faithfulness for the blessedness of all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 21, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1(a)(1) of Public Law 87–586, had appointed Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. SMATHERS to be members of the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS FOR PUBLIC LAW 480 AND COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION OPERATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order to consider on Wednesday, February 27, a special resolution and report from the Committee on Appropriations which will provide supplemental funds for Public Law 480 and Commodity Credit Corporation operations for the balance of the fiscal year 1963.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what was the date?

Mr. WHITTEN. Wednesday of this week, February 27.

Mr. GROSS. Is this an emergency situation?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is an emergency situation. The Corporation is just about out of funds, and unless these funds are made available they will have to notify the Nation that no more funds for the commodities now supported will be available unless action is taken in the next week or 10 days. What we are doing here is bringing forward from next year's budget request funds to enable them to operate at the present time and not have to stop all price supports. There has been talk about reducing price supports on certain classes of cotton. Then, in regard to corn, they have on hand about 400 million bushels which they could sell, but at the present time, to dump it on the domestic market would have a depressing effect on the market.

In effect it is bringing forward into this fiscal year some of the funds which were requested for the coming fiscal year so as not to have all of this chaos in regard to it.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, does this bill in any way deal with pending special privilege legislation relating to cotton?

Mr. WHITTEN. No; no, this is directed to the Commodity Credit Corporation in order for it to have funds with which to operate for the balance of this fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a further question: Is not this advance or transfer of funds that would be due for price-support purposes for agricultural products in fiscal year 1964 to be used in this fiscal year 1963 because the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, found it impossible to make good on the very glorified promises he made the American people and the American farmers about a year ago as to how he was going to reduce the cost of farm price supports? Is not that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would have to say that there are other factors involved.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is that one of the factors involved?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly the situation is not as good as I had hoped it would be, and as the gentleman from Ohio hopes, but in actuality the Congress last year reduced the budget request by some $800 million, and that is about $300 million more than is being restored here.

There are a good many factors that enter into it. We tried to hold it down. However, unless we give them some relief, we will have chaos throughout the country.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it not a fact that the Secretary of Agriculture certainly did not properly estimate his needs for price-support money last year, and did not inform the Congress properly; is not that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will have to say this: That the Department and the Bureau of the Budget erred on the side of too much, because they requested $800 million last year and the Congress approved. And, may I say the Congress approved the amount I recommended. We tried to hold it down. But the request was far more than we permitted. This restoration will leave them with $300 million less than the Bureau of the Budget requested last year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But it is still more than the Secretary pledged the American people it would be, is it not?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly there are many places where I do not think it has worked out as many people hoped. As the gentleman from Ohio recalls, I did not vote for the farm bill because I did not see soundness of paying cash, when we had surplus commodities. I also differed in other respects.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the facts are that millions of farmers have a contract with Uncle Sam which Uncle Sam must honor. The only way Uncle Sam can keep his word and make that contract good in this instance is for Uncle Sam to pay the bill which he promised to pay; is not that right?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly, we have to honor the contracts. May I say in this situation as far as the Commodity Credit Corporation is concerned, on the one hand the law says they have mandatory obligations. They have to support prices as fixed by law. Then they have another statute which says if they do support them and they do not have the money, then they violate that law.

Mr. JENSEN. I am receiving letters from many farmers saying that Uncle Sam has not delivered the checks to them that were promised under contract.

Mr. WHITTEN. We will have to carry out those contracts.

Mr. JENSEN. It is an obligation, and if Uncle Sam makes a contract with 1 American or 1 million Americans, it is our duty as Representatives in the Congress to see that Uncle Sam does keep his word.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. Under the conservation reserve the Government entered into a contract, and it is an obligation that must be honored.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

OAS AWAITS U.S. LEADERSHIP BEFORE ACTING ON CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, only yesterday on a national television network the Chairman of the Council of the Organization of American States, Dr. Gonzalo Facio, reiterated his plea for U.S. leadership before the OAS can act on the Cuban problem. The OAS leader said that the OAS can only play a role secondary to the United States in relations with Cuba.

In addition to these encouraging statements, the OAS President stated that growing dissatisfaction with the Cuban military and civilian establishment makes anti-Castro moves particularly timely. He recommended internal action as an adjunct to concerted action by the nations of this hemisphere.

As a further indication of OAS receptiveness for U.S. initiative, Dr. Facio stated that in his judgment the hemispheric organization would even go as far as supporting a total U.S. blockade of Castro's island, thus placing Cuba in solitary confinement in this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, in the more than 3 years of Castroism in Cuba, we have seen this island reinforced almost daily under our very noses. There have been heightening cries for action from the Congress and other areas of prominence such as the press throughout the Nation. However, this is the second time this year that the president of the international organization has called for solid U.S. initiative.

I reiterate my call that the United States close its seaports to ships calling in Cuba as a first act of U.S. leadership. After so doing, this Government should then turn to the OAS quickly, proposing that the hemispheric body adopt the following U.S. recommendations:

First. Close the seaports of this hemisphere to ships calling in Cuba.

Second. Close the airports of this hemisphere to airlines with flights into Cuba.

Third. Ban relay of telecommunications messages to and from Cuba.

Fourth. Impose a travel curb on movement of Castro agents and propaganda throughout Latin America.

Fifth. Freeze all Cuban Government funds now on deposit in Latin American financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, Latin America awaits U.S. initiative while we engage in a debate of semantics as to whether or not Russian military strength in Cuba is offensive or defensive. One Soviet soldier in Cuba is one too many. Whenever the question comes up of whether Soviet missiles, rockets, jet fighter planes, tanks, rifles, and troops in Cuba are offensive or defensive, we would do well to recall the incident of last week when the Cuban Mig's fired on the unarmed U.S. shrimp boat *Ala*. The sting of that incident is still with us.

Should such an attack happen again, "Remember the *Ala*" should be the signal for blistering U.S. retaliation.

CHICAGO, FISK UNIVERSITY AND LEONTYNE PRICE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the story of a great city, a great university and a great singer. It is a story in Americania that projects the true image of our beloved country. It was related, 92 years after its inception, by Mayor Richard J. Daley, of Chicago.

The occasion was Leontyne Price's triumphant appearance in the vast auditorium in McCormick Place before the largest and perhaps the most wildly and enthusiastically applauding audience in Chicago's musical history. Leontyne Price had come to sing at a benefit to raise money for Fisk University. The response was recordbreaking. It followed the pattern in the many foreign countries and in the American cities where a public admiration and adoration of Leontyne Price reflected the universal sentiment of millions. The needed money raised for Fisk University also was recordbreaking as the proceeds from a single concert.

But this was the climax of a story that started 92 years ago, a story told by Mayor Richard J. Daley as he spoke briefly at the concert, welcoming Leontyne Price. In 1871, the year of the great fire in Chicago, the Fisk Jubilee Singers sang their first concert. Every cent of their fee, $50, they sent to the then Mayor Joseph Medill to help out the homeless, suffering people of the metropolis that fire had all but wiped out.

And when Leontyne Price came to the city that had been rebuilt from the ashes, came to raise money for Fisk University, that in the intervening years like Chicago had been growing and expanding and servicing mankind, Mayor Daley paid back the $50 gift of the Fisk Jubilee Singers of 1871, with interest. This is Americania.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following review of Leontyne Price's triumphant appearance in Chicago by Claudia Cassidy in the Chicago Tribune:

Leontyne Price's Fisk Benefit Lures $41,000 Gross and a Dividend From Mayor Daley

(By Claudia Cassidy)

Leontyne Price came back with honey in the mouth and fire in the heart, an enticing combination. She enticed a capacity audience and a gross of $41,000 to the Fisk University benefit in the big house in McCormick Place yesterday afternoon, when there also was a visit, a brief speech, and a dividend from Mayor Daley.

The mayor said that back in 1871 the Fisk Jubilee Singers sang their first concert. It was in Chillicothe, Ohio, and their total, inclusive fee was $50. Then they heard of the Chicago fire and they sent every penny of it to Mayor Josep Medill, to help out. Mayor Daley returned the gift, with interest, but he did not say how much, and neither did Edward W. Beasley, who thanked him for the check. On inquiry, it turned out to be $500.

No one had quite known in advance what even a singer of Miss Price's potency would make of a song recital in a theater seating 5,000. At least where I sat on the fifth row it worked out surprisingly well. The gray steel curtain had been lowered, the piano pushed out front, and a kind of "Aida" or "Cleopatra" effect set up by five tall pillars in muted fireglow, with discreet lighting for shadows. Except for occasional slight huskiness in the low voice—it blurred the Mozart trill—Miss Price was singing superbly, and the quality projected even when she spoke.

If you thought, as some did, that you never had heard her to better advantage, it was partly because in opera she so often sings dramatic soprano roles, while in recital she could cling to her true realm of the lyric or lirico spinto. It was also an advance in musicianship, in presence, in ease before a large audience, but primarily it was voice. This is one of the loveliest voices in the world, in its luster, its purity, its soaring excitement, its sudden depth of feeling, and the way it can wrap opera right around its little finger.

That last happened when she invaded Renata Tebaldi's domain for the two caressing arias from Cilea's "Adriana Lecouvreur"—for even poison caresses Adriana before it kills her. Here for just a second Miss Price

turned into the tiger cat coaxed out when Hervert von Karajan conducts. Her Donna Anna was more stately than when she does the role with him, but no less beautiful.

Her program was rather a brave one for a benefit performance, Schubert, with "An die Leier," "Liebesbotschaft" and "Die Allmacht" outstanding; an interesting group of Poulenc songs programed before his death and sung in his memory and to do him honor; four Samuel Barber songs set to poems by James Joyce, "Nuvoletta" in particular done with a special and capricious skill.

At the back of the house for the spirituals, acoustics backfired. What had been David Garvey's dull piano sounded fresher, but you would not have recognized Miss Price.

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of pleasure and of pride to all the Members of this body when one of our colleagues, regardless of the side of the aisle he occupies, is accorded editorial commendation all must regard as richly deserved.

Roman Pucinski was an Air Force pilot. He led his bomber group in the first B–29 bombing raid over Tokyo. In all he flew 48 combat missions over Japan. Now as a distinguished Member of the Congress he was called upon that wartime experience to render a service that well may result in the giving of greater safety to, travel by air and the minimizing of the number of plane crashes.

I include in my remarks the editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of February 23, 1963, that tells the story and pays to the Honorable Roman C. Pucinski, a tribute in which I am sure the Members of the House will join.

Pucinski Commended

Representative Roman C. Pucinski, Democrat, of Illinois, is to be highly commended for winning his long fight to establish crashproof tape recorders in commercial airliner cockpits. The installation of such devices should go a long way toward clearing up the mystery of the last few moments in any future air tragedy.

Pucinski is a former Air Force pilot who led his bomber group in the first B–29 bombing raid over Tokyo. He flew 48 combat missions over Japan and holds the Distinguished Flying Cross and Air Medal with clusters. Pucinski has been fighting to install such tape recorders in airline cockpits since 1959. He maintains, and his judgment as a flyer is sound, that in the last few moments preceding an air tragedy the cockpit crew is far too busy trying to save their aircraft and passengers to make formal reports to a ground station. A crashproof tape recorder, operating automatically during flight will preserve a record of everything said in the cockpit for the investigators.

Australia has already made such an instrument mandatory for their airliners. The United States should follow swiftly and it is to be hoped that no airlines resistance is encountered. This measure is for the best interests of the traveling public.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE IN MICHIGAN

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today a bill to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan. This is a companion bill to the one recently introduced in the Senate by Senators McNamara and Hart.

We in Michigan pride ourselves on being known as the "Water Wonderland." Outstanding among our natural assets are the water resources available for recreation along our shorelines.

The Sleeping Bear Dunes area, because of its many unique features, has been designated as an area worthy of national preservation. Here there are sand dunes, scenic islands, unexcelled stretches of Lake Michigan shoreline, examples of natural history reaching back across the ice ages, and scenic vistas across inland lakes unequaled in beauty anywhere in the Great Lakes region.

It is the objective of this legislation to preserve and develop this natural beauty while at the same time providing for continued private ownership of the existing homes and cottages within the suggested boundaries.

The bill proposes that Congress, building on the experience already gained in the establishment of national seashore areas on the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts, provide a law under which both the public and private interests will be adequately protected in the preservation and development of the Sleeping Bear Dunes area.

I am confident that, with the growing support evident in Michigan and throughout the Nation for the prevention of this segment of our fourth shoreline, sound and reasonable legislation can be enacted by this Congress. I will work toward this end with my colleagues in the House and with the Senators who have spent so much time in recent months giving leadership to the effort to find solutions to the many complex problems which always arise when we consider the establishment of new national park areas.

We, in Michigan, have another very real interest in bringing this Federal investment to the northwest corner of our State. There is an increasing tendency for tourists and summer vacationers to seek out the most scenic and remote spots for their trips. The system of interstate highways today brings these parts of our country, and even of Canada, within a few hours drive of most Midwestern cities.

The economic importance to Michigan's tourist industry of this national development at Sleeping Bear has been estimated as equalling that gain from the establishment of 10 average-size Michigan industries within the area. A thriving tourist industry is of the greatest importance to the total economy of Michigan.

We seek, then, the dual objective of preserving a unique corner of America for ours and future generations, and obtaining for Michigan this Federal investment in park and recreation land so sorely needed in our populous area of the Nation.

RECIPROCAL TARIFF TREATMENT OF BREAD IMPORTS

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a proposal to provide reciprocal tariff treatment of bread imports. It applies specifically to pan loaf bread or pan-type loaf bread made with the use of yeast, whether sliced or not, and imposes a duty of 7½ percent on these imports.

For many years, bakers in the Buffalo area have suffered because of bread imports from Canada. I understand other areas along the Canadian border have been faced with this problem also.

This imported bread has sold at lower prices than bread produced in Buffalo. While our country grants duty-free treatment to bread imported from Canada, Canada maintains a duty on U.S. bread amounting to 7½ percent last year. I do not think this is fair and if Canada continues the tariff on this product, then certainly we should not hesitate to place the same tariff rate on their bread.

My bill would also provide that the 7½-percent duty would not apply during any period that Canada may extend duty-free treatment for U.S. bread.

SUPERVISORS AS EMPLOYEES UNDER NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I am again reintroducing a measure which will permit supervisors in private industry to be considered as employees under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. My bill would strike out the definition of "supervisor" which is depriving the foremen in American industry of all the benefits provided by this law to other employees.

Today we have strong representation for management at the top. We have strong representation for the rank and file worker at the bottom. In the middle, we find a group of foremen who have no representation at all.

There is no reason why the foremen of America should be denied the right of collective bargaining. They deserve equal status with all the rights and privileges accorded to the rank and file worker. Correction of this injustice is long overdue, and I urge speedy enactment of this legislation.

TAX REFORMS CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to those proposed tax reforms in the President's message which I fear will have an adverse impact upon charitable contributions to educational institutions. Essentially, they are three in number.

First. The President proposes a so-called 5-percent floor under itemized deductions, that is, itemized deductions will be authorized only to the extent that they exceed 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income. This 5-percent floor will have the effect of reducing the amount deductible on the average of 20 to 30 percent. In other words, in the average case, more than one-fifth of the taxpayer's charitable contributions will be disallowed as a tax deduction. The overwhelming majority of substantial contributions to educational institutions comes from taxpayers who itemize their deductions. The 5-percent floor will significantly curtail the incentive which the present law offers.

Second. Present law authorizes certain individual taxpayers in high income brackets to take unlimited deductions for charitable contributions. The President proposes to erect a so-called 30-percent ceiling on deductions for contributions made by such taxpayers which he says would increase Government revenue by some $10 million. That revenue figure illustrates the magnitude of the total charitable contributions which might be lost to colleges and other institutions if the ceiling is imposed.

Third. Present law authorizes taxpayers to take an additional 10-percent deduction over and above the basic 20-percent limitation if the charitable contribution is made to an educational institution, a church or a medical facility—as distinguished from other types eligible charitable organizations. The President recommends that this preference be discontinued and that all types of charitable organizations stand on the same 30-percent footing. Congress authorized this bonus deduction and granted this preference for a specific, legitimate, legislative purpose; namely, to encourage citizen support of institutions regarded as most essential to the Nation's growth and welfare. If the President's proposal is adopted, it will have the effect of diverting donations heretofore received by educational institutions into other charitable channels such as, in the President's own words, "symphony orchestras and the work of community chests and cultural centers."

One final point needs to be made. To the same extent that these three tax reform proposals will curtail citizen support of our educational system, they will intensify our educational system's dependence upon governmental appropriations. Philosophically, some may view this as a desirable objective. I do not. On the contrary, I view the converse as the best goal. Tax deductions, and/or tax credits, for educational purposes should be increased, rather than decreased, in order that the people might be encouraged to finance their own educational system and thereby retain control over its curriculums, its standards and its performance.

MONROE DOCTRINE

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, with continued deep concern for the welfare and security of our Nation, I have today introduced a resolution calling for the restatement and full implementation of the Monroe Doctrine. The resolution calls upon the United States, bilaterally or unilaterally, to take whatever steps are necessary to rid the hemisphere of the Castro Communist threat.

The proof is in the pudding. Surely, after the shrimp boat incident, even the eggheads in the State Department should be convinced that whether a weapon is offensive or defensive is determined solely by the state of mind or intent of the individual controlling the weapon.

The evidence is conclusive that Cuba is a Communist outpost from which dedicated efforts are being effected to subvert the Western Hemisphere.

At a recent meeting of the Supreme Soviet, Khrushchev stated:

> Socialist Cuba exists. Cuba remains a beacon of Marxist, Leninist ideas in the Western Hemisphere. The impact of her revolutionary example will grow. The Government of the United States has given a pledge not to invade Cuba.

The United States is spending hundreds of millions of dollars and risking American lives daily in an effort to halt communism in Vietnam, yet our effort to combat that same menace within throwing distance of our own shores is very feeble.

The recent OAS Security Committee report indicates that Russia, through its bastion of operation in Cuba, has given orders for unremitting subversive pressure against Latin America. The presence of approximately 14 training camps for saboteurs, subversive and infiltration agents is confirmed in the report.

This all constitutes a very grave threat to the security of the United States and the entire Western Hemisphere. My resolution clearly restates the Monroe Doctrine as being the policy of the United States and any attempts on the part of a Communist country to extend its system to any portion of this hemisphere is dangerous to our peace and safety. The resolution urges the President to take jointly with other free nations or unilaterally, such political, diplomatic, economic or military action as may be necessary to fully implement and enforce the Monroe Doctrine throughout this hemisphere.

The American people are fed up with the futile policy of spending billions of dollars in foreign aid, ostensibly to defeat and combat communism throughout the world and, at the same time, assuring the Communists of a base of operations in Cuba from which to enhance their activities.

If the defeat of communism is a valid reason for spending billions in foreign aid, then certainly that same reason is ample justification for implementing the Monroe Doctrine, to say nothing of the protection of our own freedom.

MR. TRUMAN ON THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, we have now heard from the oracle of Independence, Mo., on the subject of Cuba.

In a syndicated newspaper article published yesterday, Harry S. Truman essayed the double role of history teacher and prophet of hope.

On both counts he was a dismal flop.

He would have rendered a far greater service by silence.

In this article, believe it or not, Mr. Truman undertook, among other things, a dissertation on the Platt amendment.

One provision of this Platt amendment, incorporated in the Cuban Constitution on our insistence after we liberated Cuba from Spain, asserted:

> The Government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence [and] the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty.

Having called attention to this provision, Historian Harry offered this comment in yesterday's article:

> It seems to me that when it appeared that the situation in Cuba was getting out of hand and that a threat to the security of this hemisphere was clearly in the making, we should have considered that the basic implications of the Monroe Doctrine were at stake, as well as the reservation imposed by the Platt amendment, which anticipated precisely such a development. These provisions, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Platt amendment, were there as much for the welfare and protection of Cuba as for the security of all the other nations of this continent.

But Mr. Truman overlooked, or chose not to mention, one other historical fact. The Platt amendment was not there in 1959, when Castro took over in Cuba. It had not been there for a quarter of a century.

The Platt amendment was abrogated by the United States in May 1934, at the specific behest of Democratic President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

And one of the direct effects of this action was a downgrading, in both national and hemispheric respect, of any unilateral dedication of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine.

I happen to believe that the Eisenhower administration is open to criticism in its handling of the Cuban situation and the Castro takeover. I have been saying so publicly since October 1959. I deplore its overhasty recognition of Castro, its disregard of clear evidence of his Communist ties, and its tardy declaration that the United States would not permit establishment of a regime dominated by international communism in the Western Hemisphere.

Yet this declaration was made by President Eisenhower in July 1960. And I do not now propose to accept Mr. Truman's Monday morning quarterbacking invocation of the Platt amendment as the basis for action we ought to have taken—the selfsame Platt amendment which Mr. Truman's immediate predecessor in the Presidency consigned to the ashcan and which fact Mr. Truman conveniently forgot to mention.

I might add that Mr. Truman's evaluation of much more recent history is equally deficient.

He declared:

> The Cuban crisis provided the United States with an opportunity to make clear to the Communist aggressors that once the line is drawn we stand firm.

Stand firm? By a declared willingness to give a no-invasion pledge? Stand firm? By a complete backdown on our on-site inspection demand? Mr. Kennedy, in his February 7, 1963, press conference, acknowledged that this demand is "now a dead letter."

Stand firm? What has happened to the President's repeated pledge that "Communist domination in this hemisphere can never be negotiated?" The record is abundantly clear that this, too, is another "dead letter."

As much a dead letter, Mr. Truman, as the Platt amendment.

And what of Mr. Truman's attempted role, in his syndicated article, as a prophet of hope? His contribution on this score also leaves a great deal to be desired—alike by the American people and the tragic people of Cuba:

> Somehow we must seek a way of helping the Cuban people to liberate themselves once and for all.

Not only are there no specifics offered toward this desired goal but there is an aura of hope deferred, of fantastic resignation, of larger problems which must first be solved—again with not specifics offered. Mr. Truman wrote:

> Cuba has become a colony again—a colony of Communist Russia.

Unmistakably true—but hardly a solution.

Mr. Truman also said:

> The Cuban people are now pretty much in the same fix as the Hungarians.

This assessment brings to mind President Kennedy's equally glum and negative appraisal of the situation in his February 7, 1963, press conference—a sequel to the October "triumph" of "firmness":

> I couldn't make any prediction about the elimination [of commumism in Cuba]. I am quite obviously hopeful that it can be eliminated, but we have to wait and see what happens. I remember a good deal of talk in the early 1950's about liberation, how Eastern Europe was going to be liberated. Then we had Hungary, Poland, and East Germany and no action was taken. The reason no action was taken was that they felt strongly if they did take action it would bring on another war.

Mr. Truman did go one step beyond President Kennedy's wait-and-see policy:

> It is my opinion that until the sources of all the world's tensions and dangers are overcome within those nations that constitute the centers of the Communist conspiracy; namely, the police states of Russia and China, there is little chance for the occupied satellites to settle matters for themselves.

How ironical that it was the let-the-dust-settle variety of a wait-and-see policy, in President Truman's own administration, that saw China lost to the free world. On December 1, 1961, President Kennedy told his press conference:

> I always have felt that we did not make a determined enough effort in the case of China.

Belatedly, Mr. Truman has identified the real enemies, even though he seems to persist in the illusion that the internal revolt which will not work in Hungary—or Cuba—will somehow accomplish miracles in Soviet Russia and Red China.

But there is still a strange reluctance to suggest specific policies of firmness and bold action from without.

His statesmanship of victory—the same statesmanship which first hamstrung and then fired MacArthur—consists of the plaintive litany:

> We, of course, continue to hope that someway, somehow.

BIPARTISANSHIP IN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, because of the use of the term "bipartisan foreign policy" I believe there is a great misconception in the minds of many people, including some Members of Congress. I have asked for a special order for today, and immediately after the regular order of business and the special orders heretofore entered I intend to discuss what I believe to be bipartisan foreign policy, or my idea of it. I want the RECORD to be straight because when I take the floor, as I did a couple of weeks ago, I do not want anyone to say I am violating bipartisan foreign policy or bipartisanship in our foreign policy. If any Members want to participate in this discussion, I shall be glad to yield them time during that special order.

EIGHTY-EIGHT MEMBERS OF HOUSE SIGN JOINT LETTER OPPOSING EXPORT-IMPORT BANK INCREASE IN OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY BY BACK-DOOR METHOD

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a letter over the signature of 88 Members of the House.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Banking and Currency is holding committee hearings today and tomorrow on H.R. 3872. This bill would increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington and likewise would extend the period within which the Bank may exercise its functions.

Since this legislation would provide $2 billion additional authority to expend from public debt receipts or, as it is generally called, by the back-door spending method, a group of 88 Members of the House are urging that instead, any additional financial provisions found necessary for the Bank be made through the normal traditional appropriations procedure.

For the general information of the Congress, I include at this point the text of a joint letter to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee expressing our opposition to the back-door spending provision and listing the names of the 88 Members of the House whose names are appended to this letter.

FEBRUARY 23, 1963.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in opposition to the financing provisions contained in H.R. 3872 and represents the views of 86 Members of the House of Representatives whose names are appended below. We are hopeful that your committee will give consideration to our views and make this letter a part of the record of the hearings which we understand are being held on February 25 and 26.

We understand that the only significant recommendation from the President in the pending budget for new obligating authority through the so-called back-door procedure is the $2 billion additional authority for the Export-Import Bank to expend from public debt receipts, for which provision would be made in H.R. 3872 now pending in your committee. We strongly recommend that any additional financial provision found necessary for the Bank be made through the traditional congressional appropriations process.

After some years of debate and contention about the dimensions and undesirable characteristics of the various back-door practices, the last session of the 87th Congress produced the most significant results from past efforts to alert the Congress and the country to this diffusive method of legislating the finances of the Government. According to available tabulations, only 2 such bills were enacted, to the amount of about $437 million, in sharp contrast to the year before when the Executive requests in 11 such bills totaled $28,670 million plus; some $19,673 million plus was enacted into law.

Discontinuance of the practice, it seems clear, undeniably enhances the opportunities to legislate for functions of Government in a more responsible and orderly manner within a framework of competitive priorities. Especially is the question important to the maintenance by the House of its prerogatives and supremacy in money matters. As you doubtless know, the other body has indulged heavily in some recent years in the origination of back-door bills.

It is of course true, as in the case of some other going programs no longer funded through back-door methods, that the borrowing and lending authority for the Bank has heretofore been furnished through public debt authorization carried in legislative, rather than the regular appropriation, bills.

But there is recent parallel for the change we now urge. Last year the President was supplied, through the usual legislative authorization (Public Law 87–490) and appropriation method (Public Law 87–872), with $2 billion additional for subscription to the International Monetary Fund; U.S. participation in the Fund had theretofore been furnished by public debt expenditure authority carried in a legislative bill. In fact, as you know, this change in method of funding for the IMF was recommended by the executive branch and the Committee on Banking and Currency. We are not aware of any hindsight dissatisfaction with the change. Nor can we perceive of any valid objections to a similar change for the Export-Import Bank. The Bank's operating budget is already subject to annual review and approval in regular appropriation bills—as are virtually all other Government corporations—and in the last two, limitations on certain expenditures, as was contemplated might be done when the corporation budget law was adopted, have been written into the bills by the Committee on Appropriations and approved by the House without objection or without apparent adverse results to necessary operations of the Bank.

A similar example is the Small Business Administration; additional loan capital is supplied as necessary through the regular appropriation bills.

With the recent significant progress made by the House in the matter, we believe it especially important that the pending bill authorize the necessary appropriation in lieu of a direct public debt expenditure authority and we earnestly hope that your committee will see it that way.

Sincerely,

Thomas M. Pelly,
Representative in Congress.

The following Members of the House have authorized the use of their names as cosigners of this joint letter:

Hon. Homer E. Abele, 10th District of Ohio.

Hon. John B. Anderson, 16th District of Illinois.

Hon. James C. Auchincloss, Third District of New Jersey.

Hon. William H. Avery, Second District of Kansas.

Hon. Walter Baring, Congressman at Large, Nevada.

Hon. William H. Bates, Sixth District of Massachusetts.

Hon. James F. Battin, Second District of Montana.

Hon. Frank J. Becker, Fifth District of New York.

Hon. E. Y. Berry, Second District of South Dakota.

Hon. Jackson E. Betts, Eighth District of Ohio.

Hon. Bill Brock, Third District of Tennessee.

Hon. James E. Bromwell, Second District of Iowa.

Hon. James T. Broyhill, Ninth District of North Carolina.

Hon. Elford A. Cederberg, 10th District of Michigan.

Hon. J. Edgar Chenoweth, Third District of Colorado.

Hon. William C. Cramer, 12th District of Florida.

Hon. Steven B. Derounian, Third District of New York.

Hon. Edward J. Derwinski, Fourth District of Illinois.

Hon. Samuel L. Devine, 12th District of Ohio.

Hon. W. J. Bryan Dorn, Third District of South Carolina.

Hon. John Dowdy, Seventh District of Texas.

Hon. Thomas N. Downing, First District of Virginia.

Hon. Robert F. Ellsworth, Third District of Kansas.

Hon. Gerald Ford, Fifth District of Michigan.

Hon. J. Vaughan Gary, Third District of Virginia.

Hon. Milton W. Glenn, Second District of New Jersey.

Hon. H. R. Gross, Third District of Iowa.

Hon. Charles S. Gubser, 10th District of California.

Hon. Edward J. Gurney, 11th District of Florida.

Hon. James A. Haley, Seventh District of Florida.

Hon. Durward G. Hall, Seventh District of Missouri.

Hon. William Henry Harrison, Congressman at Large, Wyoming.

Hon. William H. Harsha, Sixth District of Ohio.

Hon. Ralph Harvey, 10th District of Indiana.

Hon. Charles B. Hoeven, Sixth District of Iowa.

Hon. Walt Horan, Fifth District of Washington.

Hon. Frank J. Horton, 36th District of New York.

Hon. Craig Hosmer, 32d District of California.

Hon. Charles R. Jonas, Eighth District of North Carolina.

Hon. Clarence E. Kilburn, 31st District of New York.

Hon. Carleton J. King, 30th District of New York.

Hon. John C. Kunkel, 16th District of Pennsylvania.

Hon. John Kyl, Fourth District of Iowa.

Hon. Melvin R. Laird, Seventh District of Wisconsin.

Hon. Glenard P. Lipscomb, 24th District of California.

Hon. Robert McClory, 12th District of Illinois.

Hon. Clifford G. McIntire, Second District of Maine.

Hon. Robert T. McLoskey, 19th District of Illinois.

Hon. Clark MacGregor, Third District of Minnesota.

Hon. Charles McC. Mathias, Sixth District of Maryland.

Hon. Catherine May, Fourth District of Washington.

Hon. William E. Miller, 40th District of New York.

Hon. Ancher Nelsen, Second District of Minnesota.

Hon. Hjalmar C. Nygaard, First District of North Dakota.

Hon. Harold C. Ostertag, 37th District of New York.

Hon. Otto E. Passman, Fifth District of Louisiana.

Hon. John R. Pillion, 39th District of New York.

Hon. Alexander Pirnie, 32d District of New York.

Hon. Richard H. Poff, Sixth District of Virginia.

Hon. Albert Quie, First District of Minnesota.

Hon. Charlotte Reid, 15th District of Illinois.

Hon. Ben Reifel, First District of South Dakota.

Hon. John J. Rhodes, First District of Arizona.

Hon. R. Walter Riehlman, 34th District of New York.

Hon. Howard W. Robison, 33d District of New York.

Hon. Richard L. Roudebush, Sixth District of Indiana.

Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg, First District of Wisconsin.

Hon. Herman T. Schneebeli, 17th District of Pennsylvania.

Hon. Fred Schwengel, First District of Iowa.

Hon. Don L. Short, Second District of North Dakota.

Hon. Eugene Siler, Fifth District of Kentucky.

Hon. M. G. Snyder, Third District of Kentucky.

Hon. Bill Stinson, Seventh District of Washington.

Hon. Robert Taft, Jr., Congressman at Large, Ohio.

Hon. Charles M. Teague, 13th District of California.

Hon. Vernon W. Thomson, Third District of Wisconsin.

Hon. Thor C. Tollefson, Sixth District of Washington.

Hon. William M. Tuck, Fifth District of Virginia.

Hon. James B. Utt, 35th District of California.

Hon. William K. Van Pelt, Sixth District of Wisconsin.

Hon. J. Ernest Wharton, 28th District of New York.

Hon. William B. Widnall, Seventh District of New Jersey.

Hon. John Bell Williams, Third District of Mississippi.

Hon. Bob Wilson, 36th District of California.

Hon. John W. Wydler, Fourth District of New York.

Hon. J. Arthur Younger, 11th District of California.

Hon. John M. Ashbrook, 17th District of Ohio.

Hon. Joe D. Waggonner, Jr., Fourth District of Louisiana.

NUCLEAR HELP FOR COMMUNISTS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the United Nations Special Fund is planning a project in Communist Yugoslavia that would use American tax dollars to strengthen a nation dedicated to a bloc that says it wants to bury us.

The project has been approved by the Governing Council of the U.N. Special Fund and calls for a Federal center—in Yugoslavia—for nuclear research.

I have studied a publication of the U.N. Special Fund in which I find these statements, and I have pursued development of the project by checking with the U.S. Department of State, Department of Agriculture, and Atomic Energy Commission.

This proposed 3-year U.N. project is planned for a total cost of $1,752,400 with

$546,000 of that coming from the Special Fund, and the rest from Yugoslavia. As has been widely noted in the past few days in this House, the Special Fund receives 40 percent of its funds from U.S. contributions.

Even more shocking is the fact that this provision for nuclear assistance to a Communist-bloc nation apparently has been neatly disguised as only an agricultural project.

The project, which will be administered by the International Atomic Energy Agency if final details are agreed to by that Agency, Yugoslavia and the Special Fund, is designed in the words of the Special Fund to:

> Assist in extending research and training facilities at the Institute for Application of Nuclear Research in Agriculture, Forestry, and Veterinary Sciences at Zemun, near Belgrade.

However, in the first sentence of its project analysis—which interestingly enough is marked by the United Nations for "Restricted" distribution—the Special Fund calls not only for the application of nuclear research to the field of agriculture, but also for a Federal center for nuclear research and training at the Zemun Institute.

The plans of the Special Fund call for financing which would increase the staff of the nuclear research Institute from 32 resident scientists to 90 by 1965. It also calls for an expansion of buildings, more equipment, 12 research fellowships, and for providing of a "phytotron" to Yugoslavia.

A phytotron is an uncommon instrument for plant research used in connection with radioactive isotopes in creating artificial environments.

My colleagues, even if the American taxpayers were not being asked to pay in large part for a nuclear center in a Communist nation, it is highly unclear to me why they should be asked to subsidize solution of agriculture problems which, if solved, will enable one of our enemies to grow stronger.

The Special Fund itself notes that the Yugoslav plan is to increase from output by 41 percent within just 4 years, mainly in production of grain and livestock.

We have a quite unbelievable farm subsidy program right here at home. If the United States has any extra money left in these deficit days, it would be well for us to apply it to our own agriculture problems—not to give it to the U.N. for use in alleviating Communist problems.

This Yugoslav project would concentrate in its agricultural phases on soil fertility and plant nutrition, plant breeding, and animal husbandry. But the project plan leaves a loophole whereby agriculture may not be the only goal of this research.

I note that the educational program under the project calls for training of about 25 Yugoslav nuclear research specialists at the graduate level. Presumably these graduates, once trained, could work on things other than farm problems.

Here is a breakdown of the moneys programed by the United Nations Special Fund for the Yugoslav project:

Experts, $180,900. Fellowships, $60,000. Equipment, $258,700. Miscellaneous, $10,900. Overhead of the International Atomic Energy Agency, $32,500. Preliminary investigations, $3,000.

The American officials with whom I have checked about this project tell me they presume that the agricultural research under this program would involve the use of radioactive isotopes, but they remain uncertain about just where these isotopes for Yugoslavia will come from.

As this House knows, I am a doctor. As a doctor I am familiar with the many uses for isotopes in medical research. I know also that such tracer isotopes are equally valuable in plant and animal research and in work with fertilizers.

Most of the isotopes used in the United States are produced by the Atomic Energy Commission's Oak Ridge, Tenn., Laboratories. But I have been told by the AEC that it is highly unlikely that a license could be issued and American isotopes provided to a Communist bloc nation.

However, isotopes are available from any nation that can produce them via nuclear reactors or electron accelerators. The United Kingdom sells some commercially, I understand, and the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia also have reactors.

Yugoslavia also has a small research reactor, but it is not certain whether that reactor can produce the isotopes necessary for this United Nations program.

It must be noted here that isotopes once provided have many other uses than agricultural research. They can be used, for instance, to trace the flow of liquids and gases in pipelines, and to test and measure strengths and dimensions of metals and other materials. Isotopes also can be used in studies of insecticides and other biological and chemical materials including materials for chemical and bacteriological warfare.

In short, these radioactive, nuclear isotopes are not the sort of thing which American taxpayers should be helping to provide or to buy for the use of the Communist bloc.

The Members of this House may be assured that I am continuing my investigation into this vital matter concerning nuclear research in Red Yugoslavia subsidized by the American taxpayer. One would think that even our one-worldly State Department would have learned the lesson of experience long ago—that there no longer is any justification for wooing or trying to purchase the loyalty of another sovereign nation, particularly a Communist nation.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the uses of radioactive isotopes, I am including at this point in my remarks portions of an article from a special report of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission listing a number of the uses for these isotopes in industry, medicine and agriculture:

AGRICULTURAL USES OF ISOTOPES

In agriculture, radioisotopes are an important tool that is helping scientists to unlock secrets of the growth of plants and animals and the pests and diseases that injure or destroy them. They are contributing to increasing productivity and better economy. They have been applied in a variety of research on plant nutrition, crop diseases, fertilizer application and effectiveness, soil conditions, animal diseases, milk production, insect eradication, and development of new plant varieties through mutations. Over $5 million per year of agricultural research is performed with radioisotopes.

Agricultural research often requires years to mature because of crop cycles, and additional time which elapses before results can be applied on the farms. Except in a few instances, the agricultural benefits of isotopes lie chiefly in the future.

MEDICAL USES

Following the discovery of radium in 1898, medical researchers soon recognized the possibilities of using radioactivity.

The supremacy of radioactive elements as tracers to define physiological processes is readily apparent in medical and biological fields. The tracers correspond in size and kind to the thing they trace. They are not foreign or chemically different—they are the material or a true part thereof. Some disease processes that have been studied are cancer, leukemia, heart malfunctions, arteriosclerosis, virus infections, multiple sclerosis, arthritis, anemia, gout, and nutritional deficiencies.

In addition to such universal use of tracers for biomedical research, radioisotopes have made possible some advances in medical diagnosis. Dynamic tracer diagnostic tests of the functions of organs in patients have been developed for thyroid, heart, liver, kidney, bone marrow, and spleen. Tracer tests are used routinely for the total volume of plasma, blood or water in the body, for lifetime of blood cells, and for localization of tumors, particularly of the brain. Over 2,000 hospitals or medical groups use isotopes for diagnosis.

In the area of radiation treatment, radioisotopes found early applications in medicine. Many of the therapeutic uses, particularly in cancer treatment, follow the principles established with X-rays and radium. Radioisotopes have greatly extended these treatments. At the end of 1959 over 300 radioisotope teletherapy units were licensed for use in the United States alone. These units may contain as much as several thousand curies of either cobalt 60 or cesium 137.

INDUSTRIAL USES

Most of the widespread applications of radioisotopes that industry has developed use very little radiation and fall into two categories: radioisotopes for tracing, and small radiation source for gaging or testing.

Radiotracing applications now in use include: wear and lubrication tests to find best lubricants and conditions of operation, involving piston rings, gears, and machine parts; wear tests on paints, varnishes, wax coatings, and other protective agents; study of detergents and various cleaning agents on cloth and fabrics; finding leaks inside complicated systems and underground gas storage depots; tracing flow in pipelines, streams, catalytic crackers, chemical processing plants, and fluid or slurry systems.

In the area of radioinspection, industry has expanded radioisotope radiography as an efficient and cost-saving way of meeting the higher quality and greater safety specifications required for many products today—both for civilian and military use. Welds are routinely radiographed with radioisotope cameras on ships, tanks, pipelines, and containment vessels. Such radioeyes also are used to tell whether the fuel in rockets meets the rigid requirements of uniformity so necessary for successful operation. Construction of a single ship often requires the radiographing of as many as 10,000 welds. The savings in rejects and elimination of destructive tests for welds, casts, and other fabricated products, is significant. Even more important is the greatly reduced chance of failures and accidents. Another important factor is radiation beam inspection of rapidly moving packages, cans, sheet material, metal strip, and fluid products. Isotope gages have been developed to penetrate through or reflect from material to measure levels, content, thickness, or density of a number of kinds of products.

A broad scope of products now is controlled and improved by isotope gages. Since they permit products to be made much more uniform and of higher quality, the user or consumer benefits directly as well as indirectly through the assistance isotopes can give to improved efficiency and productivity to aid segments of the economy.

High intensity radiation is starting to receive its first routine uses, but its full development depends on considerable research. The intense radiation from large quantities of fission products may ultimately find use as a new industrial process reagent and create new products. Some types of grafted plastics, such as selective ion exchange membranes used in desalting sea water, can best be produced by irradiation.

DEVELOPMENT OF RADIATION INSTRUMENTS

Since the human senses cannot detect nuclear radiations except at extremely high levels, the development of systems of detection and measurement of radiation has been essential to development of the practical applications of radioisotopes. The design and manufacture of such instruments was the first branch of the private atomic energy industry established. Many instruments originally were designed and manufactured in the Government's atomic laboratories, but immediately after the war the Commission supported development of commercial manufacture. Significant advances have been made by industry in the development of more stable and sensitive circuits for radioisotope measuring applications. By 1959 some 120 companies were manufacturing a variety of instruments, detectors, special components, and accessories.

Nuclear radiation detectors developed to date may be classified according to several types.

In pulse systems, the output of the detector consists of a series of signals, each of which represents the interaction of a nuclear particle or gamma ray with the detector. The well-known Geiger counter is an example of a pulse detector. Another is the proportional counter which is able to identify different radioisotopes according to their characteristic radiations. Still another example is the scintillation counter which operates on the principle that when ionizing particles pass through certain crystals, liquids, or organic polymers, flashes of light (scintillations) are emitted. An electron multiplier phototube picks up the faint scintillations and amplifies the resulting pulses to be detected and identified by the measuring apparatus.

In nonpulse detection systems, the output is the average of the cumulative effects due to many interactions of radiation with the detector; no attempt is made to resolve the individual events. The current-producing ionization chamber is a good example; the output is proportional to the total ionization current produced within the detector. Another example is the photographic system. When a piece of film is exposed to radiation, the emulsion reacts in the same way as when struck by visible light. The amount of radiation can be estimated from darkening of the film. Colorimetric detection is another example. When radiation reacts with certain chemicals containing chlorine (i.e., trichlorethylene and water, or chloroform and water), hydrochloric acid is formed. This causes a change in color of certain dyes, and the degree of color change produced is dependent upon the amount of radiation received.

Several other detector systems have been used for specialized problems. These include cloud chambers for laboratory studies, nuclear-track photographic emulsion plates, crystal conducting counters, chemical detectors, and colorimetric devices for detection of large doses of radiation. In addition, a number of systems have been designed to detect and measure neutrons. Most of these have used boron, lithium or cadmium, in conjunction with one of the detector types discussed (except colorimetric), to detect the secondary radiation resulting from neutron capture by these materials.

In the field of low-level counting, university work on radiocarbon dating of archeological materials was important in early developments. Noteworthy in this field was the pioneering research on the screen wall counter by W. F. Libby at the Universities of California and Chicago. Libby's technique involved placement of the sample inside a counter that operated on the sensitive and simple Geiger principle.

In more recent years, some investigators have substituted acetylene gas synthesized from radiocarbon samples used in proportional counters for the screen wall counter. Other techniques are based on a variety of liquid scintillators that respond well to soft beta radiation when the sample is mixed with the liquid scintillators.

These developments in low-level counting are pointing a way for applying these techniques to industrial processing. Present-day instrumentation is suitable only for laboratory needs, and designs must be modified to meet the rigid requirements of industrial applications.

THE STRANGE CASE OF PEREZ JIMENEZ

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is tremendous interest among some of my constituents about the plight of Perez Jimenez, former President of Venezuela, now in Florida, who is involved in extradition proceedings brought by the U.S. Government.

One of my constituents has sent me an article dealing with this subject from the Wanderer of January 10, 1963, with the request that it be printed in the RECORD.

I have also studied the State Department paper on this subject and, although I may not agree entirely with either treatment of the matter, I think it will serve a useful purpose to place them here side by side.

The article follows:

THE STRANGE CASE OF MARCOS PEREZ JIMENEZ

(Condensed from an account in Popular, Miami Spanish-language weekly, December 30, 1962.)

Certain legal cases, due to a strange series of incidents, coincidences and paradoxes, tend to become famous in the annals of jurisprudence. The case of Marcos Perez Jimenez has all the indications of becoming one of these cases. The former President of Venezuela is now languishing in a Dade County jail, held virtually incommunicado, and subjected to the treatment usually accorded highly dangerous convicted felons.

Why?

No person in authority can give, or dares to give, a reasonable answer.

Has the ex-President violated any U.S. law?

No.

Has the ex-President been convicted in Venezuela?

No.

Has the ex-President, holder of the U.S. coveted Legion of Merit, with the rank of commander in chief, broken any conditions imposed upon political exiles in the United States?

Again, no.

Then why is he imprisoned and denied benefit of bond? There are many apparent answers. For one thing, his arch-enemy, President Betancourt of Venezuela, has hired a very influential law firm in Washington in an effort to satiate his vengeance on Perez Jimenez. The law firm is headed by Presidential Adviser Dean Acheson.

Perez Jimenez has been denied the right to post bond. Spies and saboteurs are granted this right in the United States. Why is it denied in this case?

Betancourt of Venezuela wants it that way.

As a former Communist leader, Betancourt can do no wrong. He's even the darling of most of the U.S. press which consistently views Communist dictators as "premiers" or "chairmen," never as bloody autocrats. This name is only reserved for the rightist dictators friendly to the United States. As the Turkish Ambassador recently said in Washington: "Americans love their enemies and despise their friends."

Every believer in the sacred principles of the U.S. Constitution, its Bill of Rights and what used to be a government of laws and not of personalities would do well to study the strange pattern of the Perez Jimenez case.

BACKGROUND

Who: Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez, President of Venezuela, 1952–58, now behind the bars of Dade County jail.

Age: Forty-eight.

Family: The former Venezuelan President lived at 4609 Pine Tree Drive, Miami Beach, Fla., with his wife, the former Flor Chalbauld, and four daughters: Margot, 17; Florangel, 14; Maria Sol, 10; and Flo de Maria, 6.

"It is my hope and desire that the U.S. Government will continue to allow me to live peacefully and quietly here with my family, as I have done the last 3 years, in order that my daughters may continue their American education, and that my wife and I may be a part of this community," said Gen. Perez Jimenez.

Church: The entire family regularly attends St. Patrick's Catholic Church, Miami Beach.

Friendship with the United States: Gen. Perez Jimenez, was one of the United States of America's stanchest supporters in this hemisphere.

In 1954 he was awarded the highest rank of the Legion of Merit by the United States for "his sound foreign-investment policies," and his government was cited by the late Secretary of State Dulles as "an example to other countries in Latin America."

Under his administration, American companies and individuals found Venezuela an ideal business climate for investment and operation. According to the Encyclopedia Britannica, those investments were drastically cut back in 1957 after Romulo Betancourt came into power. The country went from a policy of encouragement to one of discouragement where essential foreign investment was concerned.

Anti-Communist record: Not only was communism outlawed under the administration of Perez Jimenez, but members and sympathizers left Venezuela and their activities were practically nonexistent. The general severed relations with Russia and other satellite countries.

During this period the Accion Democratica and Communist parties entered into a coalition to overthrow the anti-Communist Perez Jimenez government.

It is interesting to note that the Communist Party had been officially recognized during the years 1945–48 after Betancourt headed a seven-man ruling junta. With Betancourt's return to head of the government in 1958, communism again became legal in Venezuela and is flourishing there right now. The Encyclopedia Britannica reports that the number of Communists in Venezuela jumped from 20,000 in 1957 to 35,000 in 1959 and to 40,000 in 1960.

Status in the United States: Perez Jimenez entered the United States with a valid visitor's visa. Subsequent events in Venezuela made it impossible for him to return to that country. Consequently, he overstayed his temporary visa. Deportation proceedings were instituted and then deferred pending action on his application for permanent residence in the United States.

Perez Jimenez also applied for stay of deportation in formal proceedings provided by law on the ground that he would be subject to political persecution if deported to Venezuela. All immigration proceedings have been deferred pending outcome of the extradition matter. The Immigration Service had never required that the general be placed under bond, nor were his actions substantially restricted.

Attempts to extradite: General Perez Jimenez and his family came to the United States in 1958; thereafter sought political asylum. The general remained unmolested until August 25 of that year when extradition proceedings were formally instituted by the Betancourt regime. It is ironic that while the country seeks the return of Perez Jimenez, his wife and children are political exiles and are not permitted to return to Venezuela. It is also ironic that during Perez Jimenez' regime his government prepared for the extradition of Romulo Betancourt as a result of an assassination attempt upon the general's life; Perez Jimenez halted the proceedings to avoid involving the United States in his country's internal politics.

The Venezuelan Government has charged Perez Jimenez with complicity in the alleged murder of four persons and alleged misappropriation of funds. Upon completion of extradition proceedings in June 1961, U.S. District Judge George W. Whitehurst found that Perez Jimenez had no connection with the alleged murders but found probable cause as to the alleged financial charges. Evidence in the proceedings has been forwarded to the U.S. State Department. A petition for writ of habeas corpus was filed by counsel for Perez Jimenez which was predicated upon, among other things, a statement by Judge Whitehurst that he had in fact not read the evidence in the financial charges.

Appeal to U.S. court of appeals: The habeas corpus petition was denied on August 23d by U.S. District Judge William A. McRae, Jr. An appeal was made. A $100,000 bond was posted by the general.

The general, in a recent press conference, announced his intent to use every legal remedy at his disposal to remain in the United States.

Military career: Perez Jimenez graduated from military school in Caracas in 1933 as the most prominent student during 3 years of studies. He was given the rank of sublieutenant on July 5, 1933; entered the artillery division. He was then made professor of ballistics, professor of armaments, and professor of military information at the military institute and served at the school as staff officer until 1939. He went to Peru and continued his military studies; received his diploma as an officer of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He has received decorations from Venezuela, Guatemala, Ecuador, Bolivia, Argentina, and the United States.

Political career: Following the 1945 revolution which deposed President Medina Angarita, Perez Jimenez launched his political career by opposing the seven-man junta headed by Romulo Betancourt. He continued to oppose the Gallegos regime of 1947, and the Leftist Accion Democratica. In 1948; when the Accion Democratica government was forced to retire, he became Defense Minister and a member of the military junta that ruled the country and which later became the Independent Electoral Front. In December of 1952 he became Provisional President of Venezuela; was elected Constitutional President in 1953. He held office until January 1958, when the Government was overthrown by a coalition opposition which included Accion Democratica and the Communist party.

Prosperity under his administration: Venezuela experienced astonishing material progress under the Perez Jimenez regime; reported a surplus in the national budget in 1954 of $64 million. Petroleum production in that year was at a high of 2,112,000 barrels of oil per day. Fifty-seven percent of the national income was used to build highways, housing projects for workers, schools and hospitals. The Venezuelan Treasury at Perez Jimenez' resignation contained $750 million.

According to the Encyclopedia Britannica: "The Perez Jimenez regime concentrated on the development of cities, stimulating the growth of an urban middle class * * * during this period the Nation boasted the highest per capita income among the Central and South American countries."

According to the New York Times: Perez Jimenez was "a man with a mission" who had "dedicated himself to make Venezuela, a tropical underdeveloped country of 6 million inhabitants, the economic and social center of Latin America."

According to Life magazine: The economy under Perez Jimenez "enabled many Venezuelan workers, whose average wages have doubled in 10 years, to replace their rope-soled sandals with shoes, buy canned goods in the supermarkets and satisfy a craving for chicken and ice cream."

According to Collier's encyclopedia: "The spectacular economic boom continued unabated. After earmarking an additional $23 million for public works in 1957, the richest country in Latin America looked around for impressive projects on an international scale. The Government pledged money at the United Nations for the proposed Special U.N. Fund for Economic Development * * * it gave credit to Paraguay estimated at $30 million and another $15 million loan for development went to Ecuador."

According to the National City Bank of New York: Venezuela was in sound financial condition, and it distributed to its depositors a report that recommended the country for foreign investments.

According to the Book of Knowledge: "Venezuela (under Perez Jimenez) was never more prosperous. It has new iron mines, manufacturing, a steel mill, oil refinery, new railroads, highways, and ports. The Government enjoys more than a billion dollars a year in revenue from the oil industry alone. This wealth has permitted a spectacular public works program."

PUBLIC WORKS

According to Collier's encyclopedia: "The multimillion-dollar income from the foreign petroleum companies completely transformed Caracas and other cities with the largest program of public works ever undertaken anywhere in Latin America. Old buildings were torn down by the hundreds to make way for wide avenues and skyscrapers. Hillside slums were being cleared away and occupants were moving into modern apartments bought on easy terms. Superhighways were carved through the mountains to connect seaports with interior industrial cities. In 10 years, Venezuela quadrupled its highway mileage and had more good roads than Brazil, a country nearly 10 times as large."

Because slums were created by the sudden influx of agricultural workers to the industries in the cities, "the Government organized Banco Obrero, built 10 low-rental apartment houses in 1954 and transferred 30,000 families from shacks into new quarters. Construction was started in 1955 for about 30 more blocks to accommodate 15,000 more people.

According to the Book of Knowledge: "In April 1953, Venezuela adopted a new constitution * * * 2 days later, Marcos Perez Jimenez was elected President. He launched a program of countrywide improvements. In the 1950's, for instance, Venezuela invested hundreds of millions of dollars in public projects such as housing, waterworks, schools, highways, harbor improvements, churches, buildings, and agriculture. Income from petroleum furnished the money for almost all of the projects. Huge housing projects have changed the living habits of thousands of people in the northern highlands. Many people have moved from tiny shacks into comfortable Government-built apartment buildings."

Venezuela encouraged immigration, and more than 340,000 immigrants came from Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, and Austria.

Relations with Betancourt: Shortly after Perez Jimenez assumed the Venezuelan presidency, former President Romulo Betancourt started an 8-week tour of South America, making protests and charges against the new regime. Simultaneously, the Accion Democratica and Communist Parties commenced agitation, and this resulted in decrees that outlawed both and made their political activities illegal. The two parties had fomented strikes in the oil industry with a view to crippling it and creating economic crisis. The strikes were accompanied by acts of sabotage and violence on a nationwide basis. Colonel Delgado Chalbaud had been killed in ambush in 1950; there were four attempts on the life of Perez Jimenez in the period from 1952 to 1954.

THE EXTRADITION CASE OF MARCOS PEREZ JIMENEZ

BACKGROUND

Mr. Marcos Perez Jimenez served as President of Venezuela from 1952 to 1958.

He fled from Venezuela to the Dominican Republic early in 1958 when his government was overthrown. He applied for admission to the United States on March 28, 1958, as a visitor. He entered the United States in a parole status pending determination of his eligibility for admission. On January 7, 1959, he was admitted to the United States as a visitor until February 15, 1959, and that visit was extended to March 13, 1959. Further requests for extension were denied and, when he failed to leave the United States within a reasonable time after expiration of his lawful stay, deportation proceedings were instituted against him. After full hearings, Mr. Perez Jimenez was ordered deported and that determination by the Immigration and Naturalization Service was affirmed on appeal by the Board of Immigration Appeals on September 8, 1959.

EXTRADITION REQUEST

While the deportation proceedings were pending before the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Government of Venezuela, on August 25, 1959, filed a formal complaint in extradition under the United States-Venezuela Extradition Treaty of 1922 and section 3184, title 18, United States Code, seeking the return for prosecution of Mr. Perez Jimenez for alleged complicity in 4 homicides and for approximately 15 financial crimes such as embezzlement and fraud by which he allegedly obtained in excess of $13 million. He was arrested at Miami pursuant to a warrant issued by the U.S. district court at Miami and was immediately released on bond.

PROCEEDINGS IN U.S. COURTS

The extradition hearing before a U.S. district judge sitting as an extradition magistrate extended over a period of almost 2 years and resulted on June 16, 1961, in the determination by the extradition magistrate that probable cause of Mr. Perez Jimenez' guilt of the financial crimes had been established but that his responsibility for or complicity in the homicides had not been shown. Pursuant to section 3184, title 18, United States Code, the extradition magistrate certified his finding and the record of the extradition hearing to the Secretary of State and ordered the commitment to jail of Mr. Perez Jimenez. He was immediately released on bond pending a decision on his petition for habeas corpus challenging the finding of the extradition magistrate.

Hearings on the habeas corpus petition were heard before a U.S. district judge on August 23 and 24, 1961. At the conclusion of the hearings the district judge found that the extradition proceedings had been conducted in accordance with law, that due process had been accorded Mr. Perez Jimenez, that the evidence presented showed probable cause to believe Mr. Perez Jimenez committed the financial crimes charged, that the crimes charged were crimes enumerated in the treaty between Venezuela and the United States which, had they been committed in this country, would be offenses against our laws and that the offenses were not political in character and thus not exempt from extradition. Accordingly, the petition for habeas corpus was dismissed. Mr. Perez Jimenez was again released under bond pending further order of the court.

Appeal was taken by Mr. Perez Jimenez to the U.S. court of appeals. In a lengthy opinion released on December 12, 1962, the court of appeals affirmed the district court's judgment. Immediately upon such affirmance and on the same day that the decision was announced, the district court, on its own motion, entered an order revoking the bond under which Mr. Perez Jimenez was at liberty and he was taken into custody. No doubt the action of the court was based, in part, on the consideration that his continued liberty on bond would enable him to flee which might result in this Government being unable to fulfill its treaty obligations should the final decision in the case be that extradition should be granted.

BAIL

The laws of the United States make no provision for bail in an international extradition case. The Supreme Court of the United States has stated that a court's discretion to grant bail in such cases should be exercised only in unusual and extraordinary circumstances prior to the holding of the extradition hearing and that allowance of bail after a finding of probable cause is inconsistent with the extradition laws of the United States. Nevertheless, Mr. Perez Jimenez was at liberty on bail not only before but after the extradition magistrate found that a proper case for extradition had been made out under the treaty and U.S. law and remained at liberty on bail until first the U.S. district court and then the U.S. court of appeals, on habeas corpus proceedings, had reviewed the case and rendered their decisions which, in effect, affirmed the finding of the extradition magistrate.

POLITICAL ASYLUM

The admission into the United States and the continued presence in the United States of aliens is governed by the laws of the United States, principally the Immigration and Nationality Act. These laws contain no provision according an individual a right to remain in this country because he claims "political asylum." Whether a person in this country is subject to extradition to a foreign country where he is accused of crime is unrelated to his status under the immigration laws or his status as an alleged "political asylee" or whether he has committed a crime in this country but is dependent upon the application of the extradition treaties and related laws of the United States.

EXTRADITION TREATIES AND LAWS

In the extradition treaties the countries agree to surrender, on a reciprocal basis, persons found in one country who are charged in the other country with any of the crimes enumerated in the treaty. These treaties and laws prescribe the procedure which must be followed and the requirements which must be met to obtain the extradition of an alleged fugitive from justice. Under these treaties and U.S. laws the alleged fugitive, whether alien or U.S. citizen, has the opportunity to resist extradition in the courts to the full extent of the law with, in accordance with traditional standards of American justice, the assurance of equal treatment under the law. Among the issues the alleged fugitive may raise in opposition to the request for his extradition is that the offenses charged are political in character and thus not a proper basis for extradition. This was among the issues raised by Mr. Perez Jimenez at the extradition hearing and in the habeas corpus proceedings. The courts found against Mr. Perez Jimenez.

Under the laws of the United States the extradition of an alleged fugitive may be granted only for those [illegible]enses for which the extradition magistra[illegible] has found probable guilt has been shown. Under the extradition treaties of the United States, including the United States-Venezuela Treaty, a person extradited may be tried only for those offenses for which extradition has been granted. In addition, like most extradition treaties of the United States, the United States-Venezuela Treaty prohibits the punishment for political offenses of persons extradited under the treaty. In the case of Mr. Perez Jimenez, he can be extradited and tried in Venezuela only for the financial crimes for it was only with respect to these crimes that the extradition magistrate, the U.S. district court and the U.S. court of appeals found that the probable guilt of Mr. Perez Jimenez had been shown.

DECISION ON EXTRADITION

Mr. Perez Jimenez may petition the U.S. Supreme Court for review of the decision of the court of appeals. In the event that the final decision of the courts is that extradition is warranted under the laws and the treaty, the determination as to whether Mr. Perez Jimenez' extradition is required under the United States-Venezuelan Treaty will rest with the Secretary of State. In making that determination careful consideration will be given to every aspect of the case.

MR. PEREZ JIMENEZ' ANTICOMMUNIST POSITION

It has been noted that many of the individuals expressing sympathy or support for Mr. Perez Jimenez have pictured him as a stanch anti-Communist. From the standpoint of objectivity, it should be noted as well that Mr. Perez Jimenez, while President of Venezuela from 1952 to 1958, headed one of the most brutally repressive and corrupt dictatorships in recent Latin American history.

While the record clearly shows that Mr. Perez Jimenez' government undertook action against many leaders of the Venezuelan Communist Party, it was even more severe in its harassment of democratic opposition groups. Moreover, there were indications in the final years of the Perez Jimenez dictatorship that it was coddling Communists in organized labor, the press, and in education. It apparently did this to make of them a counterfoil to the dominance of democratic opposition political groups in those key fields whom it considered a greater threat to itself than it did the Communists.

As a result of infiltration during the Perez Jimenez dictatorship, which became apparent after the overthrow of that regime in January 1958, the Communist Party of Venezuela emerged more strongly entrenched in labor, journalism, and education than ever before.

Since 1959, under a representative government, democratic political groups have managed to restore their position of dominance in labor, journalism, and education and greatly reduce Communist strength in these fields.

POLITICAL COMPLEXION OF THE VENEZUELAN GOVERNMENT

It has also been noted that many of the persons expressing sympathy for Mr. Perez Jimenez have done so in apparent belief that the present Government of Venezuela is Communist and pro-Communist and seeks to have him extradited to wreak its vengeance on him for his purported anticommunism. The similarity of their allegations suggests that they may be responding to solicitations from an organization or organizations conducting a campaign to discredit the Government of Venezuela and its President, Romulo Betancourt. Their allegations about the present Venezuelan Government are not supported by the facts and are at considerable variance with accurate information which has reached the Department of State from numerous reliable and competent close observers of Venezuela for many years.

The present Venezuelan Government is a coalition of the Democratic Action (AD) Party of President Betancourt, the Social Christian (Christian Democratic or Catholic) COPEI Party and political independents who are among the democratic leaders of the professional and business community.

The former Communist affiliation of President Betancourt during the beginning of his political career in the early 1930's has been common knowledge for many years. However, it is equally well known that he severed his connections with communism more than a quarter of a century ago, subsequently organized his own political movement, the AD Party, and formulated a political program based on democratic concepts of social reform related to the unique character of Venezuela's national problems.

The AD Party in its formative years was influenced by Marxist ideas and some of its leaders have been avowed radical Marxists of the extreme left. However, the leftwing extremist leadership has been expelled from the party or has bolted from it. As presently constituted, the AD, under President Betancourt's leadership, is a nationalistic mixture of moderate social democrat and liberal. It advocates political, social, and economic changes through representative democratic means and does not seek to abolish the free enterprise system or private property. It is a "polyclass" party which stands for basic reforms by constitutional means which permit the participation of all democratic groups in the political process. It does not advocate revolution through class struggle.

Since its founding 23 years ago, the AD Party under Mr. Betancourt has been a bitter political adversary of the Venezuelan Communists and a target of international Communist attack. Mr. Betancourt's firm stand against communism in general and particularly against its most recent manifestation in this hemishpere, as represented by Fidel

Castro, has been clearly and forcefully demonstrated many times during his Presidency.

Mr. Betancourt's government has been subjected to severe and continuing attacks by the Communist Party of Venezuela and an allied left-extremist group which had been expelled from the AD Party. Since late 1961 the Communist Party and its ally, the Movement of the Revolutionary Left, have embarked on an all-out campaign of terrorism, sabotage, crime, and guerrilla warfare to overthrow the Venezuelan Government.

As a result, the Venezuelan Government in May 1962 banned the activities of these two subversive, conspiratorial groups. More recently, the Government petitioned the Supreme Court to declare them illegal on the basis of evidence which it has supplied; and has undertaken increasingly severe and energetic security measures to counter Communist insurgency.

During the recent Cuban crisis, the Venezuelan Government strongly supported the U.S. position and contributed two warships to the naval quarantine of Cuba. In reprisal, Venezuelan Communists severely sabotaged some of the petroleum installations which are Venezuela's economic mainstay. The Venezuelan Government brought this Communist-directed sabotage, on behalf of the Communist Cuban regime, to the attention of the Organization of American States.

Indicative of the opinion of the resident U.S. citizen in Venezuela (about 30,000 in number), the English language Daily Journal of Caracas, Venezuela, whose publishers include several leaders of the U.S. community, carried the following editorial on November 7, 1962, which stated in part:

"North Americans all over the world can expect, these days, to be in the front line, and should not be surprised if Fidelistas and Communists attack them. Their answer should be compounded of composure and commonsense and appreciation of the fact that the vast majority of Venezuelans are with them.

"They can also remember that the President of Venezuela has said that attacks on American companies are attacks on the economy of Venezuela, no more and no less.

"North Americans have good reason to hold their heads high. Their country has been the symbol of the fight against tyranny. And Venezuela has joined it in that fight."

The Communist Cuban regime has been carrying on a propaganda campaign against the Venezuelan Government, and particularly against President Betancourt, that is exceeded in its ferocity and provocation only by the Castro Government's vilification of the United States. The Communist Cuban regime has clearly sided with the terrorist insurrection of the Venezuelan Communists.

A recent communique of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Venezuela stated that "the principal enemy of the Venezuelan people today is the government of Betancourt, through which U.S. imperialism and its allies, the local privileged classes, effect their rule. The plenary session of the central committee calls for joint action with all opposition groups against Betancourt." This theme is being echoed by the propaganda organs of international communism.

PRESIDENT BETANCOURT'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Venezuela was the first Latin American country which President Kennedy visited after his inauguration. He went there in December 1961, as a guest of President Betancourt to dramatize the cooperative effort being made by the United States, Venezuela, and the other Latin American countries to accelerate their economic and social development under the Alliance for Progress. The President's trip demonstrated the intense concern of the United States for the programs of the Venezuelan Government aimed at improving the welfare of the greatest number of its people.

President Kennedy recently invited President Betancourt to visit the United States. President Betancourt has accepted this invitation and will come to Washington on February 19 and 20. This visit will enable President Kennedy to reciprocate the hospitality of the visiting chief of state of a country with which the United States has formed so many close and cordial ties. It will also afford the two Presidents an opportunity to exchange views on matters of mutual interest.

The Venezuelan Government of President Betancourt has demonstrated a firm desire to maintain the traditional friendly relations between our countries. Our friendly cooperation has furthered our mutual interest in the following objectives which are the antithesis of international communism: (a) extension of representative democracy, (b) accelerated economic, social, and cultural development within a framework of free institutions, and (c) inter-American cooperation in the defense of the security of this hemisphere against aggression or subversion.

The Government of Venezuela, under President Betancourt, has demonstrated its active interest in assuring economic and social progress with political stability and with freedom. It apparently is making strong efforts to meet the needs of the Venezuelan people and to strengthen democratic institutions. And it seems firmly determined to maintain the political independence of Venezuela. Such independence, of course, is contrary to the objectives of international communism.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have three unanimous-consent requests. First, that the distinguished Speaker may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD on the subject of Estonian Independence Day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Estonia is one of the three Baltic countries in northeastern Europe, and the Estonians constitute one of three Baltic peoples. With an area of about 18,000 square miles, and a population of not much more than 1 million, Estonians have always figured as one of the smallest nationality groups in all of Europe. But to these gallant and gifted people mere size in numbers has not been of any real account. They have always faced their far more powerful enemies, invariably many times their size, with courage and determination, convinced that theirs has been a righteous and sacred cause. They have fought courageously against all their foes, and even in defeat they have made themselves glorious and great. In the course of their eventful history, when it was impossible for them to maintain their national independence, they refused to bow their heads to their conquerors and overlords. During the two centuries before 1918 they were subjected to cruel treatment at the hands of Russia's callous agents. They were fiercely persecuted for some of the beliefs they held and the ideas they advocated, but these dauntless champions of freedom and liberty could neither be silenced nor subdued. They clung to their ideals until the time came for their freedom. In 1917 when the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, they saw their chance, seized upon it, and proclaimed their national independence on February 24 of 1918.

Since then world-rocking events have brought about many revolutionary changes everywhere. But the disheartening change brought about in the first years of the last war ushered in a new tragedy to many peoples. Unfortunate Estonians could not defy their fate. Early in 1940 Estonia was invaded by the Red army, occupied, and soon it was made part of the Soviet Union. In the course of the war the Estonians exchanged their Communist overlords for Nazi invaders, but that did not change their lot; they suffered equally under both. Toward the end of the war the Communists returned with more force and unbridled fury, and there they remain to this day. They have turned once independent and free Estonia into a large prison camp where all Estonians work for their taskmasters in the Kremlin. They are completely cut off from the free world, and we really know little of their actual status. Without any personal and political freedom, under abominable conditions, they lead a miserable life. But they have not lost heart, and they still hope for their deliverance from misery and servitude, from Communist totalitarian tyranny. On this 45th anniversary celebration of their independence day we ardently hope and fervently pray for their freedom and independence.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Second, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate on February 25, 26, 27, 28, and March 1, 4, and 5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is going to be the business of the House on those days? Does the gentleman have any idea whether there will be important legislation before the House on those days?

Mr. ALBERT. There may well be important legislation on some of those days, but I would like to advise the gentleman the reason for this request, as I understand it, from the Committee on Banking and Currency is to do just exactly what the gentleman wants done, and that is to process the committee part of legislation and get it to the floor so that we can proceed with the business of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, we all want to proceed with the business of the House, but not at the expense of Members being in committees and not on the floor of the House when important legislation is being considered.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman recognizes that this permission for the committee to sit extends only to such time as the House is engaged in general debate and not while the House is considering legislation in Committee of the Whole on amendments under the 5-minute rule or during the consideration by the House of any other matter pertaining to the actual processing of bills and other legislative matters.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I will not object to this request but later when the legislative machinery starts to roll, the gentleman from Iowa will be constrained to object to projecting unanimous consent requests of this nature into the unknown future.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I understand from the press reports that the matter to be taken up by the Committee on Banking and Currency is this so-called mass transportation bill that is to cost a minimum of $500 million to take care of some of the transportation problems of some of the large cities at the cost of all the taxpayers of the Nation. Is that the bill to be considered?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, I am not prepared to advise specifically what legislation will be involved here, but like the gentleman, and like the party of the gentleman, we are all concerned with the problems of the city as we are concerned with the problems of other elements of our society.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Some of us are concerned just a little bit with the budget situation and the situation of the Federal Treasury too. There are some of us who may not be quite as inspired with the idea that we ought to pay for mass transportation of the great cities as some of the rest of you. I am just wondering if this is an attempt to speed up consideration of legislation of this type, and whether or not it should not follow the orderly procedure of handling legislation here in the House so that Members would have an opportunity to attend hearings and know exactly what is going on. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. ALBERT. I am not prepared to answer the specific question of the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then I will object, Mr. Speaker, at this time.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not press the other consent request?

Mr. ALBERT. I renew the request made on behalf of the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. Patman].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the latter request until I know what the committee is going to take up and discuss during the time the House is in session on other important legislation.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. When that information is furnished me I will discuss the withdrawal of the objection.

ADDITIONAL PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 25

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House that the several bills out of the Committee on Ways and Means which were scheduled for today are being put over until tomorrow at the request of the distinguished chairman of the committee. I may add that two of these bills will come at a later date, H.R. 2862 and House Resolution 57.

Mr. Speaker, I desire also to advise the House that the first order of business on Wednesday will be the supplemental appropriation bill, commodity credit, Public Law 480, and also that on Wednesday the Committee on House Administration will bring up several resolutions, including the following:

House Resolution 239, Agriculture.

House Resolution 146, Armed Services.

House Resolution 204, Banking and Currency; Housing.

House Resolution 202, District of Columbia.

House Resolution 243, Foreign Affairs.

House Resolution 80, Government Operations.

House Resolution 165, House Administration.

House Resolution 135, Interior and Insular Affairs.

House Resolution 226, Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

House Resolution 35, and House Resolution 100, Judiciary.

House Resolution 30, Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

House Resolution 152, Post Office and Civil Service.

House Resolution 236, and House Resolution 237, Public Works.

House Resolution 177, Science and Astronautics.

House Resolution 222, Small Business.

House Resolution 249, Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 74, Veterans' Affairs.

House Resolution 227, Ways and Means.

There may be some additional resolutions from this committee which will meet in executive session on Tuesday. If more are added they may be programed for Wednesday and the balance of the week also.

I may advise, Mr. Speaker, that these resolutions may not necessarily be called up in the order in which I have announced them, and I would like also to advise the House again that any further program for the week will be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, I note the presence of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I suggest that he submit the request which I attempted to make earlier and to which the gentleman from Ohio objected.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be allowed to sit during general debate in addition to the time already granted, on February 25, 26, 27, 28, and on March 1, 4, and 5.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder what bills are coming up?

Mr. PATMAN. We have the Export-Import Bank hearings going on now. We will also take up mass transportation Wednesday.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Wednesday of this week?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. That will go over to the end of this period. This is just for afternoons.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What length of time will the gentleman have on the mass transportation bill?

Mr. PATMAN. We will have probably a week of hearings.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is that a statement we can depend on?

Mr. PATMAN. We will finish the hearings on March 5.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes. Will the chairman arrange for an opportunity to be given to those persons who oppose this proposition?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. This morning one came in and wanted to be heard.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This will not be a hearing in which the proponents alone will have the opportunity to be heard?

Mr. PATMAN. No. We have fair hearings in our committee, and we hear both sides. We give every witness an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. How much money is involved?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know about the terms of all the different bills. There are several bills. It is quite a sum.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that the amount mentioned is $500 million to start the program.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. But I think it is contemplated that only a small part will be available the first year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. For the first year. Then the total cost will run into millions?

Mr. PATMAN. The $500 million is the outside figure. Only about $10 million will be taken up the first year. I would not like to be committed to that, however.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It will run into the millions of dollars?

Mr. PATMAN. It will run into millions of dollars, yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the chairman wants to have the hearing and will assure the House there will be at least 1 week of hearings, with an opportunity for opponents to be heard also, I have no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. I so assure the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science and Astronautics may be allowed to sit during general debate in the afternoon session of the House for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPACE PROGRAM—ANYTHING GOES?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, news coverage in recent days, which states that NASA has failed to entice away from the Air Force two of its top space aces with hefty pay increases, fails to give a true picture of what is happening. There is another word for this. It is called pirating. NASA has unlimited funds and too little concern for cost. This action must be called disregard for the American taxpayer. Military space programs are, in the opinion of many, even more important than NASA's programs. Bidding by Government agencies against each other for personnel is a bad practice for all the Government. When that takes place, the only answer is for each agency or service to try to outbid the other and to do so each must constantly justify to Congress higher grades and bigger salaries. We, in the United States, seem to have gotten ourselves into a dangerous attitude over space efforts. Anything goes as long as it is for space. This is not conducive to sound accomplishment and it plays havoc with budget problems. Someone upstairs needs to talk to the space people about realism.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the 24th day of February, the Estonian Republic would have celebrated its 45th anniversary.

I use the term "would have celebrated" since obviously, the Estonian people now held in bondage by the Soviet Union are not free to celebrate the legitimate anniversary of their freedom. Certainly, they are no longer a free people but do look forward to the day when their legitimate desire for self-determination will once again produce a free and independent Estonia.

However, it is noteworthy that Estonian refugees from Soviet persecution scattered around the continents of the world continue to observe this anniversary and remain a vigorous, forceful, and effective voice in the maintenance of the spirit of the captive Estonian people. Their heroic struggle for freedom and their perseverance equip them well to continue the struggle; their militant anticommunism and their desire to be free from Soviet Russian oppression make them one of the leading voices calling for restoration of freedom to all the peoples of the captive nations.

In the United States, the Estonian National Committee serves as a very effective spokesman for Estonian groups, and their counterparts in other lands are equally effective.

In paying my respects to the 45th anniversary of the independence of the Estonian Republic, I voice the hope and the prayer not only of the Estonian people but of all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world, that the people of Estonia and the other nations which suffer tyranny under Communist rule, will soon see the day when their freedom is restored. To this end they and we pledge ourselves.

PARTISANSHIP IN SUMMER STUDENT EMPLOYMENT

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the disclosure last week that the White House was considering applying a patronage clearance system to summer student employment has evoked considerable newspaper comment by impartial observers.

Foremost among these are three articles which under unanimous consent I will include following my remarks. The first of these is the original story on the patronage clearance operation appearing in the Washington Star of Wednesday, February 20, and written by Joseph Young. The second is an editorial condemning the proposed practice which appeared in the February 21 Washington Star. Finally, there is an excellent column by John Cramer, which was published in the Washington Daily News of Friday, February 22.

In his column, Mr. Cramer calls attention to the need for a complete reevaluation of summer employment practices within the Federal Government. He contends that of the 10,000 or 12,000 positions available, the majority are make-work jobs which benefit neither the student nor the agency. The disclosures of last week, and Mr. Cramer's comments, have led me to several conclusions.

First, there is a need to take as many of these summer jobs out of the patronage pie as possible, placing them under a merit hiring system within civil service, with greater cooperation between the hiring agents and school placement officers. I am certain that the number of partisan policy making positions open to summer employees is rather limited in number.

Second, an evaluation of the reasons for hiring summer help should be made. If Mr. Cramer's observations are correct, and I have occasion to believe they are, a majority of the present jobs are unjustifiable, unless simply excused as a patronage tool or a madework project. I would assume that an investigation by the General Accounting Office would be appropriate if the executive branch does not put its own house in order. To my knowledge, no appropriations measure has ever passed this body which authorized any agency to set up a summer version of the Youth Conservation Corps or the WPA.

There are legitimate reasons, of course, for some hiring. One obvious reason is to take up the slack left by vacationing employees. Another is a commendable effort to interest young people in a Government career, through an internship approach. Some agencies plan their work in such a way that with respect to routine matters a backlog is built up which is erased by summer staff members.

Third, there is a need to provide the serious minded student with opportunities to enrich his knowledge of the process of Government and the science of politics and administration. White House seminars, filled with 1,500 students, with famous New Frontiersmen as speakers, are inadequate substitutes for informal, small, seminar sessions under the guidance of an objective organization such as the American Political Science Association or the younger member section of the Federal Bar Association. The number of students motivated to participate in such seminars would be small in relation to the past White House program participants, but the rewards both for the student and, ultimately, the country, would be infinitely greater.

That is why in December of last year, I suggested such an approach to the American Political Science Association. The association has expressed a lively interest in the possibilities. I hope that this program would not be limited to those participating in the White House program, but would include summer students working with Congress, the political parties, and private associations with an interest in Government. However, cooperation by the White House personnel, particuarly Mrs. Dorothy Davies, is essential if the program is to have a chance at success.

There are some who may wonder at the amount of response students would show for such an activity. Those who participated in last year's program, while interested in some phases, did not find it entirely to their liking. Even the so-called representatives from among the students in each department who were asked to evaluate and make suggestions in reports to Mrs. Davies, I am sure, were not completely happy with the program as their reports would disclose.

I should like to call attention, furthermore, to the cocurricular programs of seminars and speakers within our colleges and universities. Many of them, such as the Yale Law School Forum and the UCLA public administration seminar program, are student run. They all suffer from two obstacles: first, the difficulty of getting speakers who are not, generally, in close proximity to the campuses; and second, the competition with regular school work for the intellectual interests and time of the student.

A summer program in Washington, D.C., nearly eliminates these obstacles. The availability of participants is obvious. As the excitement of the first contact with government work wears off, and routine becomes the rule rather than the exception, there are many students who would welcome voluntary, informal, intellectual opportunities in the evening which are missing during the rest of the week.

Hopefully, the White House will see fit to cooperate in this educational experiment. Those who have instituted the spoils system with respect to summer jobs should be warned that no amount of cooperation with impartial outside groups will cover up this disgraceful partisanship. The American college student is not so insensitive that such a cynical display will go unheeded. Indeed, I can think of no better way to discourage qualified graduates from seeking Government employment in the future.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Feb. 20, 1963]

WHITE HOUSE TO CONTROL STUDENT JOB PATRONAGE—CIVIL SERVICE NOT TOLD OF MEETING WHICH SET UP CLEARANCE SYSTEM

(By Joseph Young)

The White House has taken control over the patronage of the more than 10,000 student summer jobs in Government.

At a White House meeting last week, which was held without the knowledge of the Civil Service Commission, some of President Kennedy's aids met with the political appointees of various agencies who are involved in patronage work.

A clearance system was set up whereby the names of all students who have filed applications for summer employment in Government agencies will be sent to the White House.

The State from which the student hails, plus the college he is attending (if any), will be included in the information sent to the White House.

WASHINGTON JOBS

The jobs mainly are in Washington and last from June through August.

Mrs. Dorothy Davies, a White House staff assistant, who was in charge of the meeting, said the purpose of the new system was to assure "coordination" in order that the agencies could make best use of the student's talent.

Mrs. Davies did not deny that political patronage is one of the aims of the White House clearance system, but declared that the Kennedy administration's primary concern is that the student talent be put to the best use possible and groomed for regular Federal employment when they graduate.

Civil Service Commission officials have privately expressed dismay at the latest turn of events.

While there has always been quite a bit of personal patronage involved in summer Government jobs, applicants have had to pass civil service exams for clerical, typists, and stenographer jobs. And in the case of student trainee jobs, in which college students take Federal summer employment in connection with what the Government hopes will be their Federal professions after graduation, they are selected from civil service registers.

TOP YOUTHS CERTIFIED

The feeling among Government career personnel officers is that it is wrong to play politics where young people are concerned, particularly among college students who are the Government's hope for the future as far as filling key career jobs are concerned.

It's no secret that a goodly portion of the summer student jobs are filled on a personal patronage basis each year. Government officials—political and career—have hired their own sons and daughters as well as the children of friends or Members of Congress. However, the Civil Service Commission has been careful to certify only the top qualifiers on the student trainee exam.

The White House job clearance system may be an effort to channel these jobs in a more political patronage area, whereby more sons and daughters of Democratic Members of Congress and key Democratic supporters and contributors may get summer jobs in Government.

Congress has shown increased interest in these summer jobs. Last year the House approved a bill to apportion these jobs on a State-by-State basis. This would have the effect of giving most of these jobs to students outside of the Washington area. However, the Senate failed to act on the bill before adjournment.

This year a half-dozen bills have been introduced in Congress to achieve the same objective.

In discussing the White House job clearence system, Mrs. Davies said it was a move to channel the best possible talent to the places in Government where it could be used most effectively.

She said that, for example, if an agency finds that its summer job vacancies are all filled up, a place for a bright student could be found in another Government agency through a coordinated placement system set up in the White House.

Mrs. Davies refused to answer directly whether the program also involved political patronage, other than saying that there always has been some patronage in summer student jobs in Government.

Presumably, students still will have to pass an exam to get the summer jobs.

Last year's Government summer job program for students was given great emphasis by the administration, with President Kennedy and other top Government officials addressing the students.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Feb. 21, 1963]

PATRONAGE AT A PRICE

"The Democratic administration will establish and enforce a code of ethics to maintain the full dignity and integrity of the Federal service and to make it more attractive to the ablest men and women" (1960 Democratic platform).

Now, the above is a passel of mighty pretty words which, canned in July 1960, may become downright indigestible in July 1963. That's the time of year when Washington is invaded by all those bright young students who spend the summer picking up a few bucks working for, and learning about, their Government.

This summer, Federal Columnist Joe Young tells us, they are going to learn more than they bargained for. They are going to be indoctrinated into the political boss system, known otherwise simply as patronage. And their lessons are coming from the very Olympia of plum dispensaries, the White House.

Somebody there, we are told, is going to save the Civil Service Commission the trouble of deciding what students will work where. Being set up at the White House level is a sort of superemployment service, unhampered by rules and regulations, to which agency personnel officials have been told they should channel all job applications. Avowedly, this system will guarantee that the talents of each applicant will be used to best advantage. But it doesn't take a political genius to perceive that the talents of a worthy Democrat's son may just happen to be more worthy than those of a misguided outsider.

No exception in the White House lottery is planned for a select group of student trainees who expect to make Government their careers. These are the young men and women the Government hopes to attract "to maintain the full dignity and integrity of the Federal service." But it wouldn't be too surprising if the trainees, after learning the true facts of political life, packed up their shattered ideals and departed forever.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Feb. 22, 1963]

CLEARANCE PLAN ON JOBS IS SCORED

(By John Cramer)

As might be expected, there's outcry against the word that the White House plans to clear the youngsters appointed next summer to temporary, student-type jobs in the Washington area.

The first cry comes from Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey.

He's most concerned about the impact on the so-called summer interns, graduate students and serious undergraduates contemplating Government as a career.

He calls the White House move an attempt to "brainwash the American college student." He says the loss to "students, faculty, and the nation will be incalcuable."

INSTRUMENTAL

Representative WIDNALL goes on to say that he, personally, was instrumental in getting the American Political Science Association interested in conducting after-hours seminars next summer for student interns.

The APSA, he says, was ready and eager. The White House, he says, didn't show much interest.

He said:

"Although this is not the first time that such a political clearing house operation has been employed by the administration in terms of summer jobs, it is the first to be enacted openly and on an overall scale."

Mr. WIDNALL can be nothing but right.

The clearance program obviously is the invention of White House people with time on their hands. Nothing better to do and little judgment.

NOT PLEASANT

The truth about summer, student-type jobs in the Washington area—about 11,000 last year—isn't pleasant.

The truth is that about 5,000 jobs may be justified. The rest are padded and made jobs.

For years, Federal agencies have made it a practice to save up routine tasks, and unencumbered funds, so as to be able to provide summer employment to the sons and daughters of agency bigshots and others favored.

There is excuse for hiring summer replacements for necessary employees who are on vacation.

There's no excuse for the summer job racket which has grown up, or for the ill-advised White House attempt to take advantage of it.

BECKWORTH BILL

The worst solution of all has been offered by Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH, Democrat, of Texas.

Representative BECKWORTH has Congress all set to vote a Texas millionaire bill to control the summer jobs.

Under it, the jobs would be allocated to the various States on the basis of population.

Members of Congress find it hard to vote against such a proposition.

But what they'll be voting for is a proposal that the summer jobs be restricted to the sons and daughters of the wealthy youngsters whose parents can well afford to pay their college bills—kids who think a work-play vacation in Washington would be a lot of fun.

Many could find equally well-paying summer Government jobs in their own localities. In the longrun, happily, the White House clearance program is all to the good. It focuses attention on a messy situation which needs cleaning up.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NYGAARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing legislation to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to eliminate discriminations against married female employees.

Under present law, the widower of a deceased female Government employee must be dependent upon her for his support in order to receive an annuity in the event of her death. However, the widow of a deceased male employee can receive such an annuity regardless of need.

Similarly, under the Employees Health Benefit Act, a married female employee with nondependent husband must pay a greater share of her health insurance premium than the male employee, regardless of his wife's need. For instance, a married woman whose husband is self-employed pays a monthly premium of $13.42 for her family plan health insurance, while a male employee pays only $10.70 for the same insurance, regardless of his wife's need.

I hope favorable consideration will be given to this legislation to eliminate the present discrimination that has existed since the enactment of this legislation.

THE DEATH OF A PEACE CORPS MAN

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleagues in this distinguished body will be moved, as I have been, with an article from the Quincy, Mass., newspaper written by Nicholas Gage.

The article describes in detail the personality and devotion of Peace Corps Volunteer Dave Mulholland who died in the Philippines while working for the Corps.

Dave's death was a tragic occurrence coming as it did at such an early time in his life. Yet, it is amazing, Mr. Speaker, to reflect upon what he accomplished in this short time.

Shortly before his death, as Mr. Gage relates, he wrote to a Filipino friend and urged him to "Try someday to do something that is immortal, and perhaps then everything will seem worth while."

This Peace Corps man, Mr. Speaker, did do something that was immortal, and I pause here today to pay tribute to this courageous young man who did not, indeed could not, give up the battle of decency, charity, and genuine human fellowship among men.

As one of the earliest and most active supporters of the Peace Corps, I sincerely hope that every Member of this body will read the moving story of David Mulholland's life.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD, this article about his life from the Quincy, Mass., Patriot Ledger of December 21, 1962:

PEACE CORPS WORK IS QUINCY MAN'S EPITAPH

(By Nicholas Gage)

(NOTE.—Nicholas Gage, author of this article, was a close friend of the late David Mulholland's when both of them worked for the Worcester Evening Gazette. He worked with him just a year before Mr. Mulholland died in the Philippines as a member of the Peace Corps. Mr. Gage gathered much of the material for this article from the personal letters and mementos of the Mulholland family in Quincy.)

"Try someday to do some little thing that's immortal," Dave Mulholland wrote a Filipino friend. "Perhaps then everything will seem worth while."

REACHED GOAL

In an abbreviated life Dave Mulholland found his immortality and purpose in a novel experiment called the Peace Corps. He was the first to sacrifice his life to this idea in the Philippines and became a "martyr to peace" and a symbol of quiet heroism and dedication.

He was among the first to join the Peace Corps and was sent to a "hardship post" in southern Philippines in October of 1961 as an educational aid. When schools closed for the summer in April of this year, he refused the vacation due him to help start the first free summer camp for children in the Philippines and head a journalism seminar for high school teachers.

The unrestrained energy he poured into these and other projects began to undermine his health and he was offered a less strenuous position at Peace Corps headquarters at Manila. He refused to abandon his work. Shortly after, he contracted amoebic dysentary and died June 10 in a Manila Air Force Hospital from a resulting liver infection. He was 23.

Just a year before, Dave was working with me on the reporting staff of the Evening Gazette in Worcester, Mass. He was lanky and boyish but his character embodied a mature sensitivity and perceptiveness that touched those who knew him.

He had seldom left Massachusetts—he was born and grew up in Quincy and joined the Worcester paper following graduation from Tufts University in Medford—but he had a hungry concern for the whole world.

SHY, BUT STRONG

He was basically shy, despite his strong convictions, but was quickly and deeply moved by sincerity and friendship. We would often have lunch at a Greek restaurant where Dave was always enthuastically received by the Greek immigrants who frequented it. They would joke with him uninhibitedly, offer him wine or coffee, teach him Greek card games. Such spontaneous gestures never ceased to delight and amaze him.

But what marked Dave Mulholland was a rare combination of two qualities—an anger at things wrong and a drive to do something about them. He singlehandedly took on John Birch Society supporters in Worcester County when he was with the paper. The group sponsored weekly discussions in the county on anti-Americanism based on Birchite invectives. Dave attended every meeting, never allowing any point of extremism to pass unchallenged. "The Mulholland Crusade," we called it in the cityroom.

He took the first Peace Corps exams and was accepted in late July of 1961. "I feel like I've been in prep school for 22 years, and I'm finally getting acceptance to life," he said.

He left for special training at Pennsylvania State University July 27; the 6-week course was an academic nightmare he told his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Henry Mulholland of 29 French Street, Quincy, when he returned home for 10 days in late September. There were classes from morning to evening, 7 days a week. Those who didn't wash out were notified during the home visit.

"David was so anxious," his mother told me, "he never left the house until the acceptance telegrams came."

RECALLED WELCOME

With 218 other volunteers, he arrived in the Philippines October 12 after a long plane trip and was greeted by a vicious rainstorm and "the wildest, most wonderful reception ever imagined. All along the route," he wrote home, "school kids were lined up, waving flags, shouting 'Mabuhay' (welcome) and shoving school notebooks at us for autographs. All this in a rainstorm."

He was assigned as an educational aid at the elementary school in Ilog, an isolated barrio (small town) surrounded by a river, about 350 miles from Manila, at Negroes Occidental Province in southern Philippines. "I have been told this is a poor, depressed, disease ridden and generally undesirable 'hardship post,'" he wrote. "I have found only sincerity and unbelievable hospitality."

But the misery was there. Shortly after arriving, a group of volunteers found a young girl on the road, dead from malnutrition. As they placed her on the bier for the funeral, her jaw swung open and her mouth released a mucous ball packed with worms.

CHILDREN MOVED HIM

"It was the children that got David," his mother said. "He would ask his classes about a missing student. "Oh, he died," they would tell him. "It pains me to watch these kids come to school shoeless and pale with hunger," he wrote in one of the four letters he sent me from the Philippines.

"I have to travel 3 miles to get to school," he said. "I ride a bike to the river, put it in a banca (dugout canoe with outriggers), cross the river and ride through sugarcane fields to school. For someone whose only communion with nature was the Boston Common, this is quite an adventure.

"I am teaching at the elementary school in Ilog, assisting native teachers under conditions less than ideal. The reader I use in one of my classes was published in 1923.

Students are provided only desks in schools here and must furnish their own chairs."

He started a chair-building campaign to alleviate the shortage, volunteer John Lagomarsino, who was one of Dave's closest friends, reports from the Philippines. There were 7 teachers instructing 300 students in the crowded school. Dave taught part of his sixth grade class in the schoolyard to avoid the congestion.

He reached the children from the first. "Call me Dave" he told his pleasantly shocked students, forged in the rigid protocol of Philippine schools. "He delighted them by going to their desks and sitting near them while he taught," a friend wrote his parents.

When Dave arrived at the school the day before Christmas vacation began, each class presented him with a gift. "I received from one class a cellophane bag of four soda crackers, a face cloth from another, five pearl eggs, a handkerchief, a bar of soap. That little bag of soda crackers from grade 5 is among the most precious gifts I have ever received."

With the arrival of Christmas, Dave became the town hero. It is the custom of Filipinos in towns and villages to build a nativity scene at Christmas time for display in the plaza. Judges travel from town to town and give prizes to the best efforts.

The nativity scene in Ilog never won a prize. It was traditionally carved from wood and therefore small. Dave suggested this time they make a big one by using papier mache figures. Everyone agreed and placed him in charge of the project.

"In my enthusiasm, I forgot I didn't know anything about papier mache," he wrote his mother. "Fortunately, I had an old science text which gave instructions. * * *"

When the project was finished, he was asked to lead the dedication procession. The judges gave it third prize for the area. Ilog was ecstatic and so was Dave. "Unlike the United States," he wrote, "where a town decorates by buying the latest plastic materials and hires workmen to put them up, here everyone contributes and everyone takes pride. One can say, 'I made Joseph's lantern;' another, 'I painted the donkey;' 'That's my star.' "

RECOGNIZED PROBLEMS

Dave recognized the particular qualities of the Filipinos and fought their weaknesses. When the parent-teachers group which virtually controls progress in Philippine schools, showed little energy in improving conditions in Ilog, he called the local group together.

"Today you face not the challenge of an invading army," he told them in terms they understood, "not the fury of a raging river, but a challenge perhaps less obvious, but every bit as threatening * * * the threat of complacency, the temptation to resign to defeat." They responded.

As the school year came to a close (in April at the Philippines because of early hot weather), Dave prepared for completion exercises. The salutarian in his sixth grade class missed rehearsals for a week and Dave went looking for him. He found him working in a sugarcane field covered with ashes from the waste fire he was tending in 110° temperature.

The boy told him he had to work if he wanted to go on in school. Dave knew his family would not accept his personal help. ("They are painfully proud here"), so he set up a scholarship fund for the boy. He did the same for others, sending one to a university and hoping to send others to America.

"He saved what little we could send him to give the scholarships," his mother told me. "It only costs $35 for a boy to go to college for a year in the Philippines." With contributions from friends, his parents are expanding the scholarship program Dave established.

When school ended in April, he dismissed all suggestions of rest and exhausted his strength in two new projects.

With 17 volunteers, he helped establish Camp Brotherhood—the first free summer camp in the Philippines. "The Government gave us a plot of land by the site of a volcano and left the rest to us." The volunteers built a mess hall and swimming pool, set up tents for the boys, shelters for nature study and handicrafts, and quarters for the staff.

MATURE JUDGMENT

While working at Camp Brotherhood, he also taught journalism to high school teachers at a summer seminar at La Salle College. "Though he had a boyish look," a student remembered, "he was respected. His judgment was mature."

The endless work he put into Camp Brotherhood, the journalism seminar, and his scholarship program soon began to have its affect on Dave's health. But when he was offered a less demanding post at Peace Corps headquarters, he quickly refused. "I have decided," he wrote a friend, "I would rather stay at my assignment. I have projects and commitments I would not cancel."

Soon after he contracted dysentery and was rushed to Clark Air Force Base in Manila. His parents flew to him. He began to show signs of improvement, but his condition suddenly turned and he died at noon on June 10.

Two hours before his death, he asked his doctors when he could return to his work in Ilog. "I have much to do there," he told them.

In one of his last letters he wrote prophetically: "Maybe I will die in the Philippines. It seems a good place to die."

His death was felt by everyone who knew him and many who recognized the significance of his sacrifice, including President Kennedy, Peace Corps Director R. Sargent Shriver, U.S. Ambassador to the Philippines William E. Stevenson, Philippines President Macapagal, and Vice President Emannueal Palaez, who offered Dave Mulholland's most fitting epitaph:

"He was a martyr to the cause of winning the peace."

EXECUTIVE-LEGISLATIVE CLASH OF IDEAS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for 30 years the clash of ideas between the executive branch and the legislative branch has dominated our political history. Thinking back over this period, one remembers best the Supreme Court packing, growth of executive initiative in legislative programs, the constant battle between the legislator and the bureaucrat for control of the Government and the direction government is to take.

Mr. Speaker, it is also apparent that in this battle of ideas and approach to government, the legislative branch is badly outnumbered and outfought in getting its ideas to the people. Consider the multitude of executive agencies, the wealth of funds available to them, the organization at national and lower levels and the ability to concentrate this tremendous organization to attain the goals of the executive leaders.

I think it is safe to say that over 100,000 employees in the executive branch are in the business of supplying information to the public, perhaps twice that number. I do not say that they are all public relations and mass media experts. Far from it. But they are there, and they are in business, and they constitute a powerful and frighteningly large force for propaganda.

We are faced under this administration—even more than in previous administrations of either party—with an admitted view that managed news is here to stay. This admission has caused concern among the American people.

We find the Inter-American Press Association's executive committee condemning the concept of "managed news and news as weaponry." According to press reports, this group finds such practices "endanger the very foundations of a free and responsible press."

The president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Lee Hills, said Friday that the administration should end the debate over "managed news" by disavowing publicly its use as part of national policy. And Arthur Krock of the New York Times, writing in the March issue of Fortune magazine, accuses the President, of whom he is "absolutely personally fond," of managing the news with "cynicism, boldness, and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history."

There is concern in Congress also over this managed-news policy. It carries one step further the practices of earlier administrations to promote and publicize the administration position to the exclusion of all others. And for the first time, it now uses not only top political appointees here in Washington, but tries to force career civil service employees to promote the party line.

Some may shrug this off as part of the art of politics, and to a degree that is the case. But under this administration I fear it has been carried to new lengths and is being extended to "friendly" members of the press to the exclusion of "uncooperative" reporters.

It is also being carried to new lengths in the degree to which various Government agencies through their press releases, statements, and leaks to the press mimic the New Frontier approach to economic, legislative, or other areas.

Indeed, as the senior Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. PROXMIRE, has said:

> The American taxpayer is the victim of the greatest publicity snow job of our time.

Douglass Cater in his book, "The Fourth Branch of Government," wrote in 1960 about congressional efforts to investigate and expose secrecy in the executive branch. But, he commented:

> A more fruitful course for government would be to consider how the flow of information may be better timed and coordinated so that the public receives a balanced story. Too often the real damage caused by public disclosures comes from the fact that the information is partial and biased.

Cater also wrote:

> More and more in recent years the Washington correspondent has been aware of the managed news event which he is expected to report without paying attention to the props and staging devices.

It could well be argued that all publicity efforts by executive agencies are illegal, for we find in title 4, United States Code, this language:

> No money appropriated by any act shall be used for the compensation of any publicity expert unless specifically appropriated for that purpose (sec. 54).

Congress has concerned itself from time to time about these activities, as found in these comments from "Secrecy and Publicity" by Francis E. Rourke, written in 1961:

> Over the years Congress has used a variety of techniques in an effort to curb what it regards as improper activitly on the part of executive agencies in the field of publicity, including prohibitions upon the employment of publicity experts, legislation forbidding certain Government agencies from sending information through the mail except in response to specific requests from the public, and restrictions upon the use of appropriated funds for public relations activity. None of these barriers to executive publicity has been altogether effective as is evident from the fact that it has proven necessary to reenact such restrictions so frequently over the past half-century, and no one has ever been prosecuted for violating any of these statutes. The ban on the employment of publicity experts, for example, has been commonly evaded by giving these employees somewhat different titles, including information specialist, director of public relations, and chief educational officer.

The first Hoover Commission studied this area, faced facts, and reached the conclusion that no matter what you call it, Government information is controlled. To quote from the Hoover Commission:

> All programs of education by the Government tend eventually to reflect official thought, official opinion and official aims. In these circumstances, the function of education inevitably is diluted by the pressures of politics and propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, thoughtful reporters and commentators of all shades of political thought have examined this situation. We are presently faced with a President who has the know-how, personality, family and staff to dominate national publicity. James Reston of the New York Times summed up this situation in these words:

> It is not a situation that promises to maintain a political balance of power in the United States.

Reston pointed out that Congress has been overshadowed by the Executive in the news field. He expressed concern for the views of the loyal opposition. It is an opposition which received 48 percent of the votes cast in the recent congressional elections and within a hair of 50 percent of the votes for President. Yet it is an opposition that is up against a well-planned, well-financed—by tax dollars—and well-executed publicity and propaganda program of benefit solely to the legislative and economic goals of the executive branch.

David Lawrence comments that "criticism was never more important to the administration and to the country" and states what we all must certainly agree with—that voters want to know "the real impact of national and international policies on their own lives and on the future of their children."

It is impossible to determine just how many persons are involved in the publicity apparatus of the executive branch. Estimates in recent years as to the size of the information and/or publicity staffs in executive agencies range from 1,400 to over 100,000. It is difficult to determine, because each survey has its own guidelines.

But as I have said, in my judgment there are at least 100,000 tax-supported Federal employees who spend at least a portion of their time propagandizing the voters, and the vast majority of them are propagandizing in such a way as to try and make a favorable impression for the executive branch and its programs.

Now I do not stand here and claim for 1 minute that each day President John F. Kennedy now or any other President in the past issues his secret orders for the day's publicity campaign, and that hundreds of mimeograph machines, teletypes and eager messengers then spread the word throughout official Washington and to the far reaches of the executive empires. Far from it.

My point, and it has been made by those much closer to the news business than I am, is that there is this huge propaganda information publicity apparatus in being; I do not think there is argument about that. And it can be and is being used consciously or otherwise to promote the legislative program, economic and political theories, and odd ideas in some cases of the top echelon in the executive branch.

Let me refer to Thomas J. Bennett, who spent some time on this matter and devoted his doctoral thesis to the subject of Government publicity. Dr. Bennett wrote just last year in his thesis:

> Most of those interviewed agreed that two factors contribute to the de facto uniformity of administration public pronouncements. First of all, although there is little or no coordination of public information officers, there is close consultation among their superiors, at least in the case of the agencies that are properly part of the executive. It makes little difference whether Webster at Agriculture is in touch with Manning at Treasury, if their immediate superiors, from whom they take their orders, and upon whose pleasure their positions depend, meet regularly.

Dr. Bennett put it on the line for us later in his thesis:

> It would seem from this that the testimony of the newsmen and the publicists interviewed, which indicated a lack of formal centralization of Federal publicity, was correct in adding that such centralization is unnecessary in view of the localization of issues within a few agencies. It no longer seems unreasonable to speak of the single voice of the Federal Government.

And he winds it up this way:

> It must be concluded, therefore, that the publicity operation of the National Government is big enough, active enough, and important enough to warrant concern by the critics.

Let me refer now to the New Leader. In an article in 1960 concerning interservice rivalry, the comment was made in its pages:

> What is more, the chief consequence of successfully stifling all public demonstrations of interservice controversy would be the exposure of a single administration view of national security policy. In an area of governmental activity where the executive holds all the trump cards, where the requirements of security classification can be used to bury legitimate opposition within the Government, where there is no pressure group that can make a meaningful impact on the policy process without help from the executive departments, and where such a tremendous part of national resources are being devoted, democratic controls over executive power would become weaker than they are already.

A responsible opposition is necessary in this country, as it is in every country and under any form of government where the people decide their course, directly or indirectly through their representatives. It is the constitutional duty of Congress as a full partner in the Federal Government to explore and develop the alternatives, to present them to the people, and to cause and encourage full discussion of such matters. When only one side is present, when the alternatives are stifled, when one view is preached from all sides, there is not the choice available for the people. Yet one of the most common expressions in this country is that there are two sides to every story.

There might be little we in Congress can do, no matter what party we belong to or what party controls the administration, to effectively and truly cut back the executive's information-publicity-propaganda staffs and activities.

But certainly we should allow full debate in our own processes, full development of alternatives by the minority, full exposure to the people of the two or even more sides to every story. To do otherwise is an indication that the majority is afraid of the other side, that the minority has right on its side.

And I must remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that there are other battles than those between the parties, or between major blocs in the Congress. There is this constant battle, pulling and tugging, between the executive and legislative branches. In this battle all in Congress need to be alert to what is happening to the constitutional rights of this equal partner.

The people are being brainwashed by the Executive's tremendous power of publicity, propaganda, and persuasion to believe that it is time to change the historic proposition that the President proposes and Congress disposes.

How important is this presentation of both sides? It has been called the basis of representative government by a former Senator:

> An informed citizenry is the basis of representative government. Democracy—as we know it—cannot exist unless the American people are equipped with the information which is necessary if they are to make the informed political choices on which the proper functioning of the democracy depends. An informed people—able to examine, and when necessary, to criticize, its government—is the only guarantee of responsible democracy.

So said Senator John F. Kennedy in 1960.

In his new book, "Washington Cover-Up," Clark Mollenhoff assesses the importance of information about government:

> No single factor is more important to the strength of our democracy than the free flow

> of accurate information about the government's operation. The citizen in a democracy must know what his government is doing, or he will lack the soundest basis for judging the candidates and the platforms of our political parties.

A recent issue of the Economic Council Letter was addressed to the problems of Congress in this tug of war with the executive branch. It commented:

> As we have said repeatedly, the executive branch of the American Government has been operating, since 1933, at an accelerating rate, above the Constitution and the law. The only power in the Nation which can stand against a militant executive establishment with unlimited resources of men and money, is the Congress.
>
> A great many arguments can be raised against this statement, but they have no validity. When all is said and done, the only political force which can oppose the growth of governmental absolutism is the body directly representing the people not in government.
>
> It is possible Congress may not be able to stand against the increasing pressure of big government. The answer to that is known to no living man. It is true Congress cannot stand alone. It must have the support of the people. But the people cannot come to Washington and tell the bureaucrats what to do. From election to election the voters are dependent on their representatives to speak for them.
>
> We said in our last council letter that the planners (who do control executive policymaking) are making a revolutionary change from limited to unlimited government without our knowledge or consent. Of necessity, the planners are engaged in a war against Congress. But Congress does not yet realize it is engaged in a war with the planners.
>
> It is good for responsible political leaders to avoid factionalism, or anything that smacks of it, as long as possible. But if the planners do not desist from their attacks, someone must come to grips with them. They refuse to settle the issue by open and free debate.
>
> How can a Congress made up of two Houses and nearly 600 Members come to grips with a hierarchical executive branch which operates under a command structure not unlike an army, and supported by a propaganda machine and militant pressure groups equal to those of wartime?

While we fight our legislative battles in these Halls, while our own district interests operate to put us in one group or another at various times, let us remember that we are always engaged in another battle.

We are for better or for worse, in economic sickness and health, wedded to the executive and judicial. But each member in this three-sided marriage must be independent. When the legislative branch fails to exert its independence, it is the people who lose their voice in day-to-day government. The courts remain, but there is no remedy there such as that which the people have in Congress, with its great controls and grants of authority to set policy.

BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Becker] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I, like millions of Americans, have been listening for many years over our news media, in the press and in statements made by Members of Congress, and people in political life, about a bipartisan foreign policy.

The phrase "bipartisan foreign policy" is one of the greatest misnomers that could possibly be used. Everyone knows our foreign policy is strictly and solely in the hands of the President under the Constitution of the United States.

The term "bipartisan foreign policy" implies in my mind, and I am sure it implies in the minds of many of our citizens, because of letters I have received and questions I have been asked, that the President of the United States when he is discussing the matter of a particular policy in our foreign affairs, would call in not only his own Cabinet members, not only the congressional leaders of his own party, but leaders of the opposition party. And this applies to previous administrations as well as this one.

Now, to my knowledge, the President just does not do this. I have written a report this week which I am going to read. I sent this to all of my weekly newspapers, because of recent letters I have received, in which I have been asked: Were the Republican Members of Congress a party to the foreign policy announced in respect to Cuba, in respect to Canada, in respect to the Skybolt, England, and with respect to our policy insofar as France is concerned?

My report reads as follows:

> BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY?
>
> I receive many letters in which people ask: "What is meant by bipartisan foreign policy."
>
> The Cuban fiasco again has pointed up the complete fallacy of what the Kennedy administration likes to put on a sanctimonious pedestal in the guise of "bipartisan foreign policy."
>
> Believe me, there is no such thing.
>
> Certainly, when the President of the United States, who has sole constitutional authority for our foreign policy, makes an irrevocable agreement, even though it may be dangerous, as he did with Castro, all Americans, regardless of politics, back him up.
>
> But, that doesn't mean that his errors are the result of what some of the eggheads like to call bipartisan foreign policy.
>
> What the President does is to make his decisions and then call in the responsible people of both parties and say, in effect: "Well, I've done this. Now, you must be good Americans and go along with me."
>
> This may imply that the opposition sit back and say and do nothing. Well, as an American and as an elected Representative of the people, I never have and never will do that.
>
> The Cuban mess is a good example. So are southeast Asia, Katanga, etc. The President set a policy; then he told us what he had done and expected us to say amen.
>
> Finally, in October of last year, he did what I and others had recommended—he blockaded Cuba. It should have been done long before that, but anyway he finally did it. So, we pledged our full support to a measure which was overdue, but to which there was no alternative. In the pitifully inadequate measures which followed, we were told nothing—not even the real facts about the Russian buildup in Cuba.
>
> What, then, would have been the result if some of us had swallowed the high-sounding philosophy of "bipartisan foreign policy" and said nothing.
>
> The thousands of Russian troops which are still there would have gone unnoticed. Castro would have gone blithely along, uninterrupted to set up, with Russian help, the Communist base from which to infiltrate all of Latin America, which is his real aim, all the time prepared to protect himself against any U.S. interference because he had missiles which could devastate our cities and the Russian technicians who knew how to operate them.
>
> This, in truth, would have completed the Communist lease of Cuba which President Kennedy all but signed when he pledged that the United States would not invade Cuba.
>
> Certainly, there was no bipartisan approach to that noninvasion policy. The President simply did it and then told us so.
>
> So, there is no such thing as a bipartisan foreign policy. There shouldn't be and I'll never be a party to any such arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that we, as Members of the House of Representatives, particularly those on the Republican side, who believe in a sound foreign policy, should be told what is going on, if our foreign policy is to be bipartisan in its preparation and in its actual conduct. I know that under the Constitution, both past and present, this has not been done. I am not asking that it be done. But, at least what we should understand and what our people should be told, is that these decisions are the decisions of the President. The President has full and complete responsibility.

But, Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago a statement was issued by the State Department pulling the props out from under the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Diefenbaker, by insisting that nuclear warheads go into Canada.

Now, I understand that the President was furious about that statement when he was apprised of it in the press. Yet, I did not hear that anyone lost his job. I did not hear that Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, who stated that he would accept the full responsibility for the statement, discharged anyone. I did not hear the President denounce anyone or deny the validity of the statement. Nor did I hear that anyone was discharged who was responsible for preparing or releasing the statement.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State had every means to find out who was responsible for it.

The decision was made at a meeting, or prior to a meeting down in Bermuda, between the President and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Macmillan. It was decided to stop the production of the Skybolt missile, a missile that England was preparing its bomber force to use. No one I know of who had Republican Party responsibility, was called in, prior to that decision, and I am not sure that anybody with Republican responsibility was called in after the decision or informed that the decision was being made.

Mr. Speaker, for the good of our country we should as Members of Congress advise our constituents just what this so-called bipartisan foreign policy means. I am not, at this moment, just talking about the present administration. The term seems to be used almost every day. Only last week I read in the press about 'Kennedy pledges leaders at secret session at the White House."

And down further in the article there is one very significant paragraph:

> There was some speculation at the session * * * was an effort by Mr. Kennedy to slam the door on any charges that his foreign policy was more partisan than bipartisan.

I am not in agreement with that paragraph because I do not charge the President and his foreign policy with being just a political foreign policy in that it is partisan politically. I merely say it is a fact that he makes the decisions. It is his responsibility and the decision is not bipartisan. There is no basis for the implication that Republican leadership as well as Democratic leadership of the Congress had agreed to that policy before the decision was made. This is the point I am trying to make. It is the point I am going to insist upon. It is the point I am going to constantly and continuously advise the people in my district about whenever and wherever I can get the information across.

Mr. Speaker, that is about the gist of what I have to say. I want that to get in the Record just the same as the statements I shall issue from time to time.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BECKER. I would be happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the gentleman from New York in his discussion and his definition of the use and misuse of the word "bipartisan." My question is this: Does the gentleman not feel first of all that it is the prerogative, indeed, the duty of Members of Congress to be critical of foreign policy and, secondly, not to be shut off by the use of the word "bipartisan" as though they are not supposed to be critical of the foreign policy which affects all of us?

Mr. BECKER. This is exactly the intent of my remarks today. I believe that we would be irresponsible—irresponsible to the *n*th degree—if we attempted to roll over and play dead every time the President makes a mistake, whether it be our domestic or foreign policy.

The mistakes that have been made during the past 2 years, from the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion right on down the line to Laos—keep occurring. What happened recently during the so-called blockade of Cuba as to whether missiles were or were not in Cuba? What happened in the situation with reference to Canada? These things create a responsibility on the part of Members of Congress to let the American people know that we are not parties to that decision. I assure the gentleman I would not have been a party to them myself.

Mr. ALGER. If the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman feel that some of the concern expressed now by the administration is the fear indeed of congressional criticism of policies that do not reflect the will of the people?

Mr. BECKER. I am quite sure of that. Permit me to call the attention of the gentleman to this: You know when the situation with the administration had become very, very critical and bad in recent months and when the people were catching up with it, you know what happened. They pulled a 50-mile hike out of the bag in order to get front-page publicity. They got important news off the front pages and off the radio and television. Instead we heard and read about 50-mile hikes. The minds of the people are supposed to be taken off the real problems confronting us. This is the type of thing that is going on, and I think we should make the people understand why.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I comment further and ask another question of him?

Mr. BECKER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by very dedicated Americans who are sincerely concerned, and who are also worried about criticism of the Commander in Chief if, indeed, we are weakening his posture and the posture of our Nation today when we are critical; so I want to ask the gentleman, Is there not even greater danger that if we stifle and eliminate freedom of speech in this country in order to defeat the enemy, we have actually adopted the enemy's techniques and have already been defeated by him, so that there does not need to be any party or parties, except one party and a dictatorship?

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I might call the gentleman's attention to an article that appeared yesterday in the Washington Star, "Krock Calls Kennedy Policy Cynical on News." I suggest the gentleman read that article. I intend to put it in the Record.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. ALGER. Do I understand that the gentleman speaking to us at this time will include the article just mentioned as part of his remarks?

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I intend to include, after my remarks, the article by Arthur Krock which appeared in yesterday's Washington Star, the title of which I have just read.

Mr. Speaker, may I add this? The gentleman has hit on the most salient point of my discussion and what I am trying to do. It is simply this: Our people, by a virtually controlled press, it would seem, or news media, on news and information not only from the White House but from our departments of Government, including the State Department and the Department of Defense, are no longer being apprised of the facts and the truth of what is happening throughout the world. If we are going to let this go by under the guise of what is called bipartisan foreign policy then I say that we are subject justly to the wrath of the people. We should be condemned not only as individual Members of Congress but as individual citizens because we are not living up to our responsibility and to the oath that we have taken on this floor in every session since we became Members.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to return for just a moment to the reference that was made to the article in the Washington Star of yesterday by Mr. Krock. I think first it should be made clear in the Record at this point that Mr. Krock himself states that he is a personal friend of the President and has been a personal friend of the family for many years. So certainly this very pointed criticism by Mr. Krock should not be viewed as a partisan comment. This was an observation of a highly respected and senior member of the Washington press corps. I think it should be pointed out in connection with this that apparently Mr. Krock's article drew some attention from the administration, because it is my understanding from an article in the Washington Post of Saturday morning that the administration now, under the direction of Mr. Sallinger, has proposed a "retreat" from spokesman for the administration and the press corps, so that either the press corps may better understand the administration, or else the administration may better understand the press corps.

I would hope however that whatever transpires at this retreat near Warrenton, Va., that representatives of the press will carry out the historic responsibility of that profession in America to defend their right to speak out and keep the public entirely informed.

Mr. BECKER. I certainly agree with the gentleman. I would hope the press would resume its responsibility from the publishers to the editors to the newsmen in publishing the news, in publishing and reporting as they always did the news and the facts as they see them, and not accept the brainwashing when they get down to this retreat.

Mr. AVERY. I think we ought to point out now that this controversy should not be confused with the Moss committee's 5-year project to guarantee the "right to know." As I understand the objective of the Moss committee, it is not the management of the news but relates to the Executive privilege of not making available to the press such information that is classified. The objection to making classified information available is entirely separate from the management or misrepresentation of the news as described by Mr. Krock.

Mr. BECKER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. In regard to Cuba, it seems to me as though we miss the point when we take so much time arguing about whether they have missiles or whether they have cannons or airplanes. It makes little difference whether they have those or whether they have slingshots. The Communists want a base of operations. Their technique and their method of operation is not military but is intrigue, infiltration, and sabotage. As long as any one Russian is there that danger exists. Is that not true?

Mr. BECKER. May I say to the gentleman that I do wish the American people had been better informed as to our objectives in imposing a blockade last year in Cuba, not merely to protect the security of the people of the United States from a missile attack but because this was a kickoff base not only to infiltrate subversively in all the countries of Latin America and South America but to help formulate guerrilla forces in those countries, to induce guerrilla operations and revolution in those countries from a Communist base in Cuba. This is what we tried to do all last year and are still trying to do, but we still cannot get the show on the road, so to speak.

I might refer the gentleman to an article by a great and knowledgeable lady, which appeared in U.S. News & World Report. The author I refer to is a distinguished former Member of the House, Clare Booth Luce. The article last week deals with this very effectively. I am inserting the article in its entirety in the RECORD.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman further realizes that a submarine base there is far more important than some of the missiles and other things?

Mr. BECKER. I agree with the gentleman, but we get into the area now of asking: Do we have proof the submarines are there? We do not have proof the submarines are not there. Do we have proof that missiles are there? We do not have proof missiles are not there. In other words, we have no proof. We tried to get it on the demand of the President last fall when he set up the blockade of Cuba. He should have stuck to his guns and insisted upon on-site inspection. If we were not strong enough to do it then, we ought to give up.

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank the gentleman, and congratulate him on his remarks and upon bringing this subject to the attention of the House.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman has addressed the House on the subject of bipartisan foreign policy. I think the RECORD should show that the father of the bipartisan policy, Senator Vandenberg, made it very clear that he expected that foreign policy should be debated fully. I think his words actually were that it should be debated totally down to the water's edge. I think we should all remember that we do have a responsibility as a minority to discuss this subject fully but not to go out of our way to try to use any partisanship in our arguments.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution referring to the late Senator Vandenberg, because that was his position. I want to make this abundantly clear, that when the President made the decision on October 22 to blockade Cuba, we backed him up, but that does not mean we should roll over and play dead when he did not follow through.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. It would be a serious act on our part to sit here and do nothing. That is what I think the gentleman from New York was trying to bring out. Does the gentleman think there is any correlation between the timing of the announcement on the Cuban crisis, which happened just before the election, and the possibility this might have been done for a political reason or a party reason?

Mr. BECKER. Far be it from me to charge President Kennedy with politics. Actually, I think he is one of the most astute politicians on the American scene in many, many a year.

While I do not know the President's intent it was certainly in my mind at the time and it did have its political effect.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time to insert in the RECORD with my remarks an article concerning Arthur Krock in the Washington Star of yesterday and an article by Claire Boothe Luce, former Member of this House and a great lady and former Ambassador to Italy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAGAN of Georgia). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. With reference to the last point raised by our colleague about the timing and the political implication of the Cuban quarantine, or blockade, or whatever you want to call it, has the gentleman considered what a reversal of 2 weeks might have done to the November 1962 election—if instead of bringing out the Cuban situation 2 weeks before November 6 and the $7.8 billion deficit 2 weeks after, if those 2 items had been reversed? I wonder what the complexion of this House would have been today in such an event. I wonder if the gentleman has given consideration to those two alterations of simple facts and timing from the political point of view?

Mr. BECKER. Let me assure my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri who is very astute, that I am never averse to considering political consideration and statements made and the timing of them. Certainly, I will say with all the sincerity at my command that I believe the President of the United States waited until the most dangerous time in all history to order the blockade of Cuba on October 22. This should have been done months before—not when we knew all these missiles were in there—and launching pads were being built. And as to the great distortions of facts, the question is going to come up in the next couple of weeks as to the time when we knew these missiles were in there, when photographs were taken. I am sure some factual material will come out in the next couple of weeks. As to the other part of your question, the $7.8 billion deficit that was announced 2 weeks after election, I do not know whether in the minds of the people this would have had as much offsetting effect—I am talking about the political effect—as the Cuban blockade announced on October 22 because we all as American citizens were forced to make statements backing up the President's action at that time. We could not have done otherwise.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I would like to say I was among the first to back the President and say that the die had been cast and we should rally and not let partisanship interfere with us or go beyond our shoreline at that particular point. Of course, I expected we would finish the job when we "drew the mark," and had everything in our favor. But I think if history is to be objective and to describe where the error was made, it will not be on this question of elections of last year, but will go clear back to the Bay of Pigs, April 17, 1961. Finally, I would say it takes more than a bad cold in Chicago to make one change the course of history and come back from the campaign trail and invoke a quarantine. It takes the feeling of the American people, and I would hope that just as the gentleman in the well of the House, my esteemed colleague from New York, is today bringing up the question of the amorality of not debating foreign policy, be it good, bad or indifferent, so would history in its objectivity point out when you expect to have a $500 million excess in the budget as predicted in the state of the Union message and in the campaign message and in the 2d session of the 87th Congress budget message, then suddenly it turns into a $7.8 billion deficit, announced like this—afterward instead of before the election—it has its moral or lack of moral implication. I commend the gentleman on his exposé and his expertise today in the well of the House.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Missouri. We sit on the same committee and I know how well he does on that committee. Let me point this out. You have brought out something which is most important, when the President—and this talk goes on all the time—about bipartisanship—particularly in this administration—I wonder what he called it during the campaign of 1960 and prior. Senator John F. Kennedy went from one end of this land to the other bemoaning a missile gap, day after day—one of the most dangerous things that any Member of this or any other body could do. He was telling our enemies that we were not prepared with missiles and that there was a great missile gap between what we had and what they had. And the then Senator John F. Kennedy was going from one end of the land to the other constantly harping about our loss of prestige and about how low our prestige was in the world.

Well, I say to President John F. Kennedy: If you felt that way about our prestige at the time of the election how do you feel about our prestige today? You do not have to take any poll to know how low our prestige is now. If that was bipartisanship, Mr. Speaker, then I am right in what I am saying about bipartisanship today and that is why I think more of our Republicans must make their voices heard so the American people will have no doubt as to the facts. I want to call these facts to the attention of the American people, for it is badly needed.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman on his cogent remarks on bipartisanship. During the course of the gentleman's remarks the question of "news management" suggested itself. I had prepared for delivery in the House today some remarks on news management. They include the article about Mr. Arthur Krock, the distinguished New York Times correspondent which has been referred to by the gentleman. Also an Associated Press article regarding the Cuban news situation reporting the views of my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY]. Finally, a statement from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS]. I wonder if their relationship to news management would not be a little more effectively presented if the three articles were set out in the RECORD at one place?

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman wishes to insert it following my remarks?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Yes; if it can be done at this time.

Mr. BECKER. I am about finished. I have no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I understand what the gentleman is attempting to do? Is he attempting to spread his remarks among those of the gentleman from New York, or afterward?

Mr. BECKER. After.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire.

There was no objection.

[From the Washington Star]

KROCK CALLS KENNEDY BOLD, CYNICAL ON NEWS

(By the Associated Press)

Arthur Krock, prize-winning newsman, accuses President Kennedy of managing the news with a cynicism, boldness and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history.

But, the veteran newsman says: "If Mr. Kennedy has achieved any success in these efforts, the principal onus rests in the printed and electronic press itself."

Mr. Krock, for 21 years chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times and more recently a Times Washington columnist, levels his indictment in the March issue of Fortune magazine.

He cites, as an affront to Jeffersonian principles of a free press, "the 'information directives' prescribed for the Pentagon and the Department of State when the crisis over Cuba began to harden." He said that "weapon" of news management has been improperly used to inflate success or gloss over error "in the aftermath of half-won showdowns—such as President Kennedy's with respect to the Soviet rearmament of Cuba."

HITS "SOCIAL FLATTERY"

Mr. Krock says Mr. Kennedy and high subordinates indirectly manage news by "social flattery of Washington reporters and commentators," and by "selective personal patronage."

In the latter category he included exclusive interviews, attributable to the President, which he says have ceased to be a rarity.

"But Mr. Kennedy," he writes, "prefers the intimate background briefings of journalists, and their publishers, on a large scale, from which members emerge in a state of protracted enchantment evoked by the President's charm and the awesome aura of his office.

"The success of his efforts is attested by a continent-wide glow in news reporting, editorializing, and comment, which otherwise might register the lower temperature of impersonal objectivity."

Mr. Krock accuses Mr. Kennedy also of spreading "a false first impression" last year that a budget balance was in prospect. And he charges administration officials with anonymous prevarication on such subjects as the balance-of-payments problem which, Mr. Krock said, "is visibly growing worse."

There was no immediate White House comment on Mr. Krock's article. At his news conference last Thursday, the President said in response to a question: "Let me say we have had very limited success in managing the news, if that is what we have been trying to do."

LONGTIME FRIEND

Mr. Krock has been a longtime friend of the Kennedy family, and he told an Associated Press reporter that he is "absolutely personally fond" of President Kennedy.

In his Fortune article, Mr. Krock says that on the strength of almost 50 years as a newsman, he would make two judgments on what he calls "management of the news" by Mr. Kennedy and administration officials:

"1. A news management policy not only exists but, in the form of direct and deliberate action, has been indorsed more cynically and boldly than by any previous administration in a period when the United States was not in a war or without visible means of regression from the verge of war.

"2. In the form of indirect but equally deliberate action, the policy has been much more effective than direct action in coloring the several facets of public information, because it has been employed with subtlety and imagination for which there is no historic parallel known to me.

OUTLINES KENNEDY METHODS

"In the narrow twilight zone between the direct and indirect methods, the administration incessantly resorts to three ways to push its news product that work deplorably well with the press. Vulnerable and/or discreditable acts in foreign policy—such as forcing the Dutch to surrender West New Guinea to Indonesian blackmail, promoting U.N. Charter violation in the Congo, etc.—are explained on the purely assumptive ground that they were necessary to 'prevent a confrontation with Soviet Russia likely to result in nuclear war.' Executive decisions sure to be unpopular are explained as in line with or compelled by policies adopted by the Eisenhower administration."

"And when the White House is the center of such revelations of ineptness in the Kennedy regime as our public intrusion in the Canadian parliamentary debate on nuclear policy, his subordinates make oath that the President, though daily represented as omniscient, knew nothing about it and is 'furious.' (But nobody gets fired.)"

In conclusion, Mr. Krock says:

"But it is the indirect methods * * * by which 'management of the news' is chiefly accomplished by the Kennedy administration. This is a public-relations project and the President is its most brilliant operator. Since the immediate objectives of this selling job are the news reporters in general (most definitely including the TV and radio broadcasters), widely read commentators and flattered editors, publishers, and network moguls in particular, the project is much more accurately identified by the phrase 'managing the purveyors of the news.' And for any degree to which this project has been successful the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself."

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 18, 1963]

CUBA CRISIS AND NUCLEAR ARMS—WHY DE GAULLE GOES HIS OWN WAY

(By Clare Boothe Luce)

The President was asked in his press conference [on January 24] what he thought of the theory put forward in Europe that the outcome of the Cuban crisis was linked in General de Gaulle's mind with his determination to have his own nuclear deterrent force, because Cuba showed that the United States would not defend Europe.

The President replied that this charge had, indeed, been directly made, and he indicated that some Europeans had deduced from the fact that the naval blockade had ended with Moscow in unchallenged control of Cuba that, "since the Soviet developed their own nuclear capacity there is a balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. and neither would use it, and, therefore, Europe cannot rely on the United States." This he called peculiar logic.

But, after Cuba, not only "some, in some parts of Europe," but also many in many parts of America, and in Latin America, no longer believe in the U.S. commitment to defend other countries from communism, if to do so should mean to initiate a nuclear war with Soviet Russia.

And, the President's remarks notwithstanding, there is much recent evidence that Mr. Khrushchev himself is now thoroughly convinced that, once the 400,000 American troops in Germany are withdrawn, America's nuclear commitment will then extend no farther than its own coastline.

If memory serves, after the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion Mr. Kennedy repeatedly warned Mr. Khrushchev that communism in this hemisphere was "not negotiable." Mr. Khrushchev, strongly suspecting that this warning was merely for U.S. domestic political consumption, boldly seized the opportunity to put it to the acid test: Fully aware that he would be detected in the end, he sneaked nuclear weapons into Cuba, and zeroed them in on the White House.

When the President found this out—quite a long while after Cuban intelligence sources had told him it was happening—his reaction was immediate. He called out the Navy, which called Mr. Khrushchev's brilliantly and carefully calculated bluff.

This was probably precisely what Mr. Khrushchev intended. Mr. Khrushchev had long been in the position of having to lose his face in order to save it. He wanted to lose his ugly nuclear "mug"—the face of the "nuclear aggressor." He was anxious to show the world that he was not the man to start a nuclear war against anybody over a third country, and he certainly wanted to have it made plain that Mr. Kennedy wasn't the man either. A solid basis for negotiations of all kinds—and popular fronts of all kinds—could be built on the foundations of a U.S.-U.S.S.R. nuclear-peace pact.

One can only imagine Mr. Khrushchev's satisfaction when his theory vis-à-vis the U.S. military position was proven correct. But he could hardly have been prepared for the next surprise. No sooner had he agreed to remove all the nuclear hardware U.S. air surveillance had spotted than Mr. Kennedy at once referred to him as a "great statesman" and, to show that there needn't be any hard feelings over the little episode, gave him Cuba.

Mr. Khrushchev did not naturally bother to return the President's compliment. He realized, of course, that it had been made to gentle him—Mr. Khrushchev is as easy to gentle as a king cobra.

A few weeks later at the East Berlin World Communist Congress Mr. Khrushchev was bragging to the world that his missile play in Cuba had achieved its real objective—to scare Mr. Kennedy into giving up Cuba. After accepting the thunderous applause of the 2,500 Communist Party delegates present from 70 nations, Mr. Khrushchev vowed all over again to "bury us," this time with his 100-megaton bombs, but only if we were ever so rash as to initiate a nuclear attack on him.

Ever since Cuba, Mr. Khrushchev has worked hard on his new image. Each passing day he sounds more and more like John Foster Dulles: He will never launch missiles at the United States, or Europe, but he will—if attacked—produce "massive retaliation."

The fact is that Mr. Khrushchev had long ago opted for nuclear peace with the U.S.A. Since Cuba, he knows that the United States has also opted for nuclear peace with Soviet Russia. There is today an undeclared nuclear-peace pact between the U.S.S.R. and the United States for the simple reason that the initiation of nuclear war is not to the best interests of either.

The United States press, following the President's lead, is currently taking a benign view of Mr. Khrushchev's new nuclear posture. Besides, it feels so good since he stopped poking his Cuban missiles into our solar plexus. The vials of their wrath have been saved up for Gen. Charles de Gaulle, who has had the gall to say, since Cuba, that he thinks France would now certainly be more safe under its own nuclear umbrella than under America's.

FRANCO-RUSSIAN DEAL? "PREPOSTEROUS"

Because of this, General de Gaulle's "image" is being rapidly worked over, with the enthusiastic help of the American left, to resemble a half-mad Napoleon, or an Abominable No-man. It is even being suggested that General de Gaulle wishes France to become a nuclear power in order to make a deal over Germany with Russia. This is to suggest that France desires to have Russia on her own borders, instead of Germany's, which is, of course, preposterous: If either France or Germany falls to the Reds, all Europe falls with them, and every European knows it.

It is interesting to inquire what General de Gaulle was doing the first tense hours of the United States naval blockade, while Soviet missiles were being leveled by Russian troops on American cities.

Was he threatening to pull out of the grand alliance if the United States invaded Cuba?

Was he begging us to throw the whole business into the U.N.?

Was he reminding us that the French feel that the United States let France down in Indochina, Algeria, and Suez, so France couldn't be expected to sympathize with our troubles about Cuba?

Was he advising President Kennedy to make a deal with Khrushchev about Cuba fast, because if the United States invaded Cuba Khrushchev might retaliate by striking at West Berlin and thus trigger world war III?

He was not. The general was offering to fight by the side of the United States if we felt our vital interests required us to kick Castro and Khrushchev both out of Cuba. And by this very fact he was pledging France to take all the nuclear risks we felt we might be incurring.

The President, in his recent press conference, acknowledged that General de Gaulle "responded when we were in difficulty in Cuba." "But" he added, with some extraordinary peculiar logic of his own, "I would hope that our confidence in him would be matched by his confidence in us."

This whole sentence must have been a typographical error.

The President had just admitted a period back that, when we were in difficulties, President de Gaulle had shown the ultimate in confidence by his willingness to risk nuclear war—if risk there was—by the side of America.

What the President really meant to say, of course, was that, whereas President de Gaulle had shown confidence in us at the time of the naval blockade, the final U.S. political capitulation to Khrushchev and Castro had diminished that confidence, and that the President hoped that somehow it could be restored.

The hope is an idle one. The fault is by no means entirely the President's. France has grown economically strong enough to stand on her own legs. It would follow naturally, in any case, that she should desire sooner or later to stand on her own legs militarily.

The significance of the two Kennedy backdowns over Cuba is that what was a desire now seems—or at least to General de Gaulle—to be an urgent necessity for France's own survival.

The character of the U.S. nuclear commitment made in 1946 changed in the 1950's when Russia became itself a nuclear power. Today, as in 1946, that commitment is to launch a nuclear attack on Soviet Russia if she moves against Germany.

But in 1963 the same commitment means a willingness to destroy the United States for the sake of Europe. When the matter is put in this blunt fashion, how many Americans are for it?

Khrushchev took the full measure of President Kennedy and U.S. public opinion in the Cuban crisis. So did Charles de Gaulle. His conclusion: If the war chips should ever go down in Europe, the United States will not initiate nuclear war on Russia until Russia wages nuclear war on America—and vice versa. The effect of this undeclared nuclear pact is to subtract both U.S. and U.S.S.R. nuclear forces from the European military equation.

Europe is today, without its own nuclear force, a limited war area. Consequently the outcome of any European conflict would then be decided by Russia's 125 divisions and NATO's 23—or a negotiation.

Militarily Europe is Germany and France. Their choice today is as plain as the nose on General de Gaulle's face. It is to get their own nuclear umbrella or to trust the United States, if they are attacked by Russian conventional weapons, to launch her missiles at Russia, knowing that she would get Russia's 100-ton megaton bombs right back.

General de Gaulle has made the only choice a patriotic Frenchman could possibly make. Like the rational Frenchman he is, he chooses to build up his own nuclear establishment.

He knows that the day U.S. troops are pulled out of Germany, France will be unable to defend itself without its own nuclear force.

In his youth, President Kennedy wrote a book called "Why England Slept." It described how England, in 1939, was caught militarily napping by the Germans, and its very sound thesis was that no nation can afford to wait until it is attacked to prepare its own defenses, and that, above all, it cannot rely on the military or economic strength even of its allies to save it from destruction.

IF UNITED STATES PULLS OUT OF EUROPE

Charles de Gaulle has paid the author of "Why England Slept" the compliment of taking his advice. He does not intend to be caught napping if at some future date the United States, in order to prevent a world holocaust—and its own destruction—yanks its nuclear umbrella away from Europe.

It is hard to see what is "Napoleonic" about a Frenchman's desire to protect France, or why the desire to remove France from the category of a limited war area should be considered a folie de grandeur. What is much more a folie de grandeur is the desire of the United States to keep Europe a United States nuclear colonial area and to keep Great Britain, France, and Germany forever in the United States nuclear nursery.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in my view bipartisanship in foreign affairs is wrong. Agreements may indeed occur between members of both parties inasmuch as Americans do indeed stand together as a Nation in a hostile world. The ties that bind Americans are far greater than the divisive forces at work in the world today that separate us from Socialist-Communist societies. Our Republic and our people, blessed with freedom are a world apart from Communists and those dictatorships that deny freedom and self-determination to their people.

But agreements that result in bipartisan harmony must never preclude, foreclose or in any way or to any degree limit freedom of speech. Most of all, in foreign affairs we must freely express our views. More heads are better than a few. Our free criticisms result in a final policy which Americans will support as we have many times. But these decisions and policies were amalgams of many and various views, sometimes highly critical. Our Republic's strength is in our differences and contrasts of views that result in thorough analysis. If now we must abandon our right to speak freely and criticize then indeed our constituents are voiceless, are not represented and we have a dictatorship—the very form of government we abhor the most. Let us not adopt the enemy's views in order to discredit and defeat him.

Indeed, our very lack of policy today—the so-called no-win policy, the bewildering conflicts of U.S. sovereignty and U.N. decisions, the countless forms of aid to the enemy that we give in many kinds of foreign aid, the suicidal acceptance of Monroe Doctrine violation, the supine refusal to stand up for U.S. sovereignty as we back down in concessions to countless demands by Communists—these and more partially demonstrate, I believe, our error in having adopted a posture of so-called bipartisan foreign policy.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. Becker] said, the unilateral decisions of President Kennedy are not the policies and decisions of Republicans. The mistakes under this administration in foreign policy are not, therefore, Republican mistakes. Nor should mistakes—and there are now many—be whitewashed or buried from view by blocking criticism by accepting a policy of bipartisan agreement.

Indeed, on the contrary, the administration should right now be championing a foreign policy so firm, so clearly

understood by all, so protective of U.S. sovereignty, that it could withstand all Republican criticism—or if it cannot—then the valid criticisms of Republicans should be recognized, analyzed, and adopted.

It is at this point that this administration's lack of policy breaks down so clearly. The lack of overall policy and the fitful reacting without a basic policy to the various threats to freedom and peace as they arise in the world are now the reason, apparently, for the President calling for bipartisanship—so that the mistakes will be glossed over and the blame not cast on him. The President cannot escape this responsibility but more important—the countless mistakes of Cuba, Vietnam, Laos, the Congo, France, Canada, and Latin America must be corrected. So it is that the President's only hope, as I see it, is to call on the Republicans—correct the continuing mistakes and protect our Nation and her people. Not dodge, delay, or sidestep the continuing errors that need correction now.

As a starting point let me suggest that we reimpose the Monroe Doctrine, clarify the Vietnam war where Americans are being killed in a war that is not a war, eliminate the foreign aid that goes to the enemy, the Communists, and stop supporting the United Nations aid to the enemy.

There are other solutions available to troublesome problems if the President would first not worry about covering up criticism by bipartisan appeals; second, contradict those in the administration who say it is proper for government to lie to her people; third, get about really protecting U.S. sovereignty instead of apologizing for U.S. determination to protect freedom, justice, and decency, and finally stop managing the news, preferring at last to confide in the people, telling them and us, their representatives, what world situations really are, so that we can all join in protecting ourselves and our beloved land.

NEWS MANAGEMENT

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, expanding means of communication have created a promise of better news coverage for Americans. From a technical viewpoint, we must applaud such achievements as Telstar.

However, in the age of Telstar, Mazors, and the like, a new phenomenon has arisen known as news management. Some aspects of news management are reminiscent of George Orwell's 1984.

My distinguished colleague from Maryland called attention to this phenomenon in a statement on the House floor February 21, 1963.

The reprint of the statement follows:

WASHINGTON "CON" MEN

Mr. Mathias. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General is ignoring a confidence game being played in Washington and so we must warn the public about it. The object of the game is to use the people's money to bamboozle them on a national scale. The scheme is simple. An administration tipster calls a political favorite who has played no prior part and breaks the news of the award of a Government contract in his State. The favorite then calls the news media at home and releases the glad tidings with at least the implication that he is making a personal benefaction to his constitutents.

Honest citizens who are familiar with complex Government procurement procedures are not impressed. Reporters, editors, and newscasters are not fooled by this hocus-pocus. Let us hope that they will expose it for the deception that it is.

On Sunday, February 24, 1963, the Washington Post and Times Herald printed the views of the distinguished columnist, Mr. Arthur Krock, concerning news management. It says:

KROCK CHARGES CYNICAL NEWS MANAGEMENT, DISTORTION TO KENNEDY

Arthur Krock, prize-winning newsman, accuses President Kennedy of managing the news with a cynicism, boldness, and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history.

But, the veteran newsman says, if Mr. Kennedy has achieved any success in these efforts, "the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself."

Krock, for 21 years chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times and more recently a Times Washington columnist, levels his indictment in the March issue of Fortune magazine.

He cites, as an affront to Jeffersonian principles of a free press, "the 'informational directives' prescribed for the Pentagon and the Department of State when the crisis over Cuba began to harden." He said the "weapon" of news management has been improperly used to inflate success or gloss over error "in the aftermath of half-won showdowns, such as President Kennedy's with respect to the Soviet rearmament of Cuba."

Krock says Mr. Kennedy and high subordinates indirectly manage news by social flattery of Washington reporters and commentators, and by "selective personal patronage."

In the latter category he included exclusive interviews, attributable to the President, which he says have ceased to be a rarity.

"But Mr. Kennedy," he writes, "prefers the intimate background briefings of journalists, and their publishers, on a large scale, from which members emerge in a state of protracted enchantment evoked by the President's charm and the awesome aura of his office.

"The success of his efforts is attested by a continent-wide glow in news reporting, editorializing, and comment, which otherwise might register the lower temperature of impersonal objectivity."

Krock accuses Mr. Kennedy also of spreading "a false first impression" last year that a budget balance was in prospect. And he charges administration officials with anonymous prevarication on such subjects as the balance-of-payments problem, which, Krock said, "is visibly growing worse."

There was no immediate White House comment on Krock's article. At his news conference last Thursday, Mr. Kennedy said in response to a question: "Let me say we have had very limited success in managing the news if that is what we have been trying to do."

When the questioner, correspondent May Craig, remarked that she doesn't believe in managed news at all and thinks "we ought to get everything we want," the President brought a laugh by replying: "Well, I think that you should, too, Miss Craig; I am for that."

Krock, 76, first covered the National Capital during the administration of William Howard Taft. As chief of the Times Washington bureau, 1932–53, he won two Pulitzer Prizes and a citation equivalent to third.

He has been a long-time friend of the Kennedy family, and he told an Associated Press reporter that he is "absolutely personally fond" of President Kennedy.

In writing that quotable exclusive interviews with the President no longer are rare, as they formerly were, Krock recalls the protests that arose from the Washington press corps when President Franklin D. Roosevelt gave one in 1937, and President Harry S. Truman gave another in 1950. Both interviews were obtained by Krock.

Asked whether he believes those Presidents did wrong in giving the interview and whether he feels that he should not have participated in them, Krock said:

"Not at all. It served their (the Presidents') purpose and they were doing me no favor."

He said the two Presidents felt that "the best and most effective medium" of publicizing what they had to say was the New York Times.

In his Fortune article, Krock says that on the strength of almost 50 years as a newsman, he would make two judgments on what he calls "management of the news" by Mr. Kennedy and administration officials:

1. A news management policy not only exists but, in the form of direct and deliberate action, has been enforced more cynically and boldly then by any previous administration in a period when the United States was not in a war or without visible means of regression from the verge of war.

2. In the form of indirect but equally deliberate action, the policy has been much more effective than direct action in coloring the several facets of public information, because it has been employed with subtlety and imagination for which there is no historic parallel known to me.

"In the narrow twilight zone between the direct and indirect methods, the administration incessantly resorts to three ways to push its news product that work deplorably well with the press.

"Vulnerable and/or discreditable acts in foreign policy—such as forcing the Dutch to surrender West Guinea to Indonesian blackmail, promoting U.N. charter violation in the Congo, etc.—are explained on the purely assumptive ground that they were necessary to prevent a confrontation with Soviet Russia likely to result in nuclear war.

"Executive decisions sure to be unpopular are explained as in line with or compelled by policies adopted by the Eisenhower Administration.

"And when the White House is the center of such revelations of ineptness in the Kennedy regime as our public intrusion in the Canadian parliamentary debate on nuclear policy, his subordinates make oath that the President, though daily represented as omniscient, knew nothing about it and is 'furious'. (but nobody gets fired)."

In conclusion, Krock says:

"But it is the indirect methods * * * by which 'managements of the news' is chiefly accomplished by the Kennedy administration. This is a public relations project and the President is its most brilliant operator.

"Since the immediate objectives of this selling job are the news reporters in general (most definitely including the TV and radio broadcasters), widely read commentators and flattered editors, publishers and network moguls in particular, the project is much more accurately identified by the phrase 'managing the purveyors of the news.' And for any degree to which this project has been successful the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself."

On the same page of the Washington Post and Times Herald, there appeared a story entitled "Representative Pelly Says State Misled Congress, Press."

The statement is herewith inserted in the RECORD:

REPRESENTATIVE PELLY SAYS STATE MISLED CONGRESS, PRESS

> A Republican Member of Congress charged the State Department yesterday with deliberately misleading Members of Congress and the press last fall on the Cuban situation.
>
> Representative THOMAS M. PELLY, of Washington, registered his complaint in a letter to Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton.
>
> Last September 25, PELLY said, the State Department informed Members of Congress that there was no evidence of any organized combat force in Cuba from any Soviet-bloc country. On the same day he received his summary, PELLY said, Assistant Secretary of Defense William Bundy was telling a House Military Appropriations Subcommittee in secret session that missile sites of an offensive nature were being constructed in Cuba.
>
> "I believe the facts regarding the offensive military buildup in Cuba were in the possession of the Department of State when you issued the summary stating there was no evidence of Cuban offensive capabilities, including offensive ground-to-ground missiles under Soviet direction or guidance," PELLY said in his letter to Dutton.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter and a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today the State of Wyoming became the 36th State of the Union to ratify the 16th amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Thereupon, three-fourths of the several States had acted favorably in pursuance of a joint resolution of the Congress to authorize a Federal income tax. The U.S. Senate had passed this resolution on July 5, 1909, and by a vote of 318 to 4, the House had passed it a week later.

Mr. Speaker, little did the Members of Congress of that day realize the extent to which their action would change Government and the Federal system. Little did Cordell Hull and other supporters of this tax realize its ultimate effect. Actually, it was believed the tax would never exceed 2 percent.

Today, Mr. Speaker, our House Committee on Ways and Means is holding hearings on proposed reduction and reform of the income tax, and for me, as for my colleagues and the taxpayers we represent, it is a time for us to decide as to what is best in the way of lowering and improving the tax structure.

In this connection, I have been reading the proceedings of the 61st Congress, 1st session, and have reviewed the debate on the resolution to amend the Constitution, which was Senate Joint Resolution 40.

Actually, the issue was not one of taxing incomes of individuals equally, but rather to overcome a U.S. Supreme Court decision which held that under the then language of the Constitution, Congress was not authorized to levy a tax on corporations, because that would not be apportioning the taxes equally as between States.

Mr. Speaker, the 16th amendment, according to its advocates, was to be a war power that could be vital to the existence of the country. But it was not to be a peacetime tax.

I want to read today to the House in commemoration—if that is a proper term—and in any event in sadness, certain excerpts from the House debate on Senate Joint Resolution 40, but I point out first, Mr. Speaker, that this was a tax measure which originated in the Senate, contrary to the Constitution. Most of our fiscal problems, in my opinion, have originated in the other body. If only the House had originally been given sole and exclusive power by the Constitution over taxes and expenditures, there would be no national debt of any consequence today, nor any need for such a burdensome system of taxation, requiring at the moment admittedly much in the way of reduction and reform.

However, Mr. Speaker, then as now, there were some wise heads in the House. Listen to what Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts, said on July 12, 1909. Compare the vision and views of this erstwhile Member of the House with the opinions and political foresight of some of Massachusetts' sons and political leaders of today.

Here are Mr. McCall's words as to equal taxation and representation in regard to the proposed change in the system of taxation:

> In the Constitutional Convention, States having only one-third of the population of the country were in a majority; but today States having only one-sixth of the population elect a majority of the Senate, and yet it is proposed to throw away incontinently this important safeguard of the Constitution, this great democratic feature, and the Democratic Party proposes to take a hand and throw the rule of apportionment to the winds. I submit that if you are going to give up the rule of apportionment, you should confer upon the representatives of the people some compensating power to take the place of the safeguard you take away. You should at least provide that the House and the Senate should not amend them; that its power should be confined either to vetoing or accepting them—the power which the House of Lords in Great Britain has in reference to all tax bills.

Mr. Speaker, again let me quote Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts. His arguments made against the income tax amendment are interesting:

> So, Mr. Speaker, while they say that they desire this power for time of war, we see today in time of peace the attempt to exercise the power to its utmost extent. And why not, then, limit it expressly to time of war? Why not, for the just protection and the equal rights of the people of New York and of the other great States of this Union, five of which probably will pay nine-tenths of an income tax, although they will have only one-ninth of the representation in the Senate—why not preserve the limitation upon the power of the Central Government? Why drag every governmental power to Washington so that a vast centralized government may devour the States and the liberty of the individual as well? I say this amendment should be more carefully considered than it has yet been considered.
>
> It is liable to go into the Constitution of the United States and be forever a part of the organic law in the form of which it has been. I may almost say, extemporized or improvised. The character of the argument which has been made, that this tax is for use in time of war, leads me to observe that the chief purpose of the tax is not financial, but social. It is not primarily to raise money for the State, but to regulate the citizen and to regenerate the moral nature of man. The individual citizen will be called on to lay bare the innermost recesses of his soul in affidavits, and with the aid of the Federal inspector, who will supervise his books and papers and business secrets, he may be made to be good, according to the notions of virtue at the moment prevailing in Washington. And, incidentally, since every business secret in the country can be had access to by the authorities at Washington, the citizen may be made to see his political duty if you happened to have a President who confused the attainment of his ambition with the highest good of the universe and was willing to abuse his power in order to coerce the citizen. You are creating here an ideal condition for corruption and for the political Jack Cade of the future to levy blackmail.

A statement by a Member from Connecticut, Mr. Hill, is worth reading. In his remarks, he said:

> I am a firm believer that in times of peace the revenues of this country should be derived from customs duties and internal-revenue taxes, and that if these are not sufficient, as prudent people we ought to reduce our expenses to a point where they will be covered by such revenues.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read also from the remarks of Representative Harrison, of New York. He favored the bill, but listen to this wishful bit of thinking. Mr. Harrison said:

> If the resolution prevails, it should be incumbent on the conferees upon the tariff to drop immediately from consideration the proposed corporation tax put into the bill by the Senate. This resolution now before the House provides for the taxing of incomes from whatever source derived. That means taxes upon incomes of corporations as well as individuals. In my opinion the corporation tax as it passed the Senate is unconstitutional; but if this resolution prevails, and the States give us the constitutional right to pass a law taxing the incomes of corporations as well as individuals, such doubts will be at once removed. Moreover, as it now stands, alone, without an individual income tax, the corporation tax is the most grossly unfair impost ever levied by motion of either Chamber of Congress. It is unfair because it will allow one man with a $100,000 income to go free, while another man who may get $10,000 in income must pay the tax because his business is incorporated. It allows the man conducting a grocery business upon one corner of the street to go scotfree, while another man that carries on the same business on the next corner of the same street is obliged to pay a tax because he has incorporated his business. It thus violates the fundamental principle of taxation, namely, that its burdens should be equally distributed.

Mr. Harrison's remarks bring to my mind, Mr. Speaker, that an inequitable and heavy burden of taxes such as constitutes the income tax today was one of

the major objectives of the Communist Manifesto. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels wrote their guidebook to communism in 1848, and one of their key points was to tax the middle class into submission. In his directive to the proletariat, Marx flatly said a heavy progressive or graduated income tax was essential to destroy capitalism

Mr. Speaker, frankly, it must be recognized that under the cold war conditions and continuing world crises, the Treasury of the United States needs revenue. However, when we hear the advocating of tax cuts without any spending curtailment in order to increase the employment and stimulate business, I keep thinking of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Would not all this massive spending with no tax revenues to provide for it delight those two masters of mischief?

On this 50th anniversary of the income tax, let me show the progress in the direction urged by those two men. Here is a tabulation of per capita Federal tax receipts showing the changes in tax rates in selected fiscal years from 1789–1962. This table is from "Facts and Figures on Government Finance," published by Tax Foundation, Inc. It indicates the trend toward Marxism:

Per capita Federal tax receipts

Year	Per capita
1789–91	$1.12
1800	1.92
1810	1.22
1820	1.61
1830	1.75
1840	.81
1850	1.75
1860	1.73
1870	9.72
1880	6.31
1890	6.03
1900	7.07
1910	6.89
1920	54.81
1930	29.78
1940	43.56
1941	59.28
1942	101.16
1943	168.54
1944	314.63
1945	334.04
1946	308.53
1947	285.71
1948	295.72
1949	278.60
1950	268.32
1951	342.22
1952	431.67
1953	454.60
1954	447.78
1955	415.15
1956	461.64
1957	484.30
1958	474.93
1959	466.69
1960	527.17
1961	530.97
1962	550.64

In discussing the results of the income tax, I think mention especially should be made as to its effect on Government. On this subject, let me quote from an address of Alfred J. Schweppe before the North Carolina State bar on October 26, 1962. Listen to this:

> Actually the first big step in the direction of unlimited Federal power was the 16th amendment adopted in 1913 authorizing Congress to levy, without limit, a tax on incomes from whatever source derived. Those persons who at the time strongly objected to this unlimited taxing power were soothed with the pious declaration that it was inconceivable that the tax on incomes would ever go over 2 percent. Congress passed the first Income Tax Act in 1916. Within 2 years during World War I it went up to 85 percent on the highest incomes, and is today, and for many years last past, has been in the same general area. So far as the 16th amendment is concerned, it permits a 100-percent confiscation of all incomes and the reduction of the American people to the status of recipients of Government doles.
>
> The 16th amendment authorizing an income tax without limit was, in the judgment of many, a great mistake. But all efforts to impose a limitation belatedly have proved and will probably continue to prove abortive, because governments do not give up powers, particularly taxing powers, once deferred; rather they stretch the powers they already have.

Mr. Speaker, I think the caliber of the present members of the House Committee on Ways and Means is very high. The comments I receive from my constituents on the President's tax proposal are far from favorable. I hope and I believe the House Committee on Ways and Means will not report out such a bad bill as has been proposed. Rather, my fear is that Congress may not reduce Federal expenditures sufficiently to justify any tax cut.

It seems to me the very desirable objective of stimulating business and increased prosperity can only come through a combination of reducing both taxes and Government spending. I would favor about $5 billion cut in each.

If, however, this Nation really wanted to improve employment and step up the economy, the corporation tax is the place to do it.

When, Mr. Speaker, the 16th amendment to the Constitution was adopted, the deterrent to business and industrial expansion and growth by killing profit incentive began. I suggest that if the current movement to repeal the 16th amendment should prevail, the machinery of business in this country would start to hum and employment would increase as never before in the lifetime of any of us.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, a substantial cut in the corporation tax, with a reduction in nonessential Federal Government spending will help a great deal.

Yesterday the Washington Post printed an article, "Stifled Cheers Will Hail Income Tax 50th Year," by Harry Gabbett.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article as a rather fitting conclusion to my comments:

STIFLED CHEERS WILL HAIL INCOME TAX 50TH YEAR

> The Internal Revenue Service marks a big milestone Monday—and if the printer should make that "millstone" he won't be changing the meaning very much.
>
> On February 25, just 50 years ago, the State of Wyoming became the 36th to ratify the 16th amendment to the Constitution.
>
> That was the income tax amendment and by its authority last year the Internal Revenue Service collected almost $100 billion from you, yew, and y'all. The rousing success of last year's drive has inspired IRS to conduct it again this year and it takes no seer to suggest that this will be another banner year.
>
> IRS concedes that it will be entirely fitting that this year's milking should outproduce all others. It will impart that much more significance to the golden anniversary of the process.
>
> It is probably no accident that nobody is known as the "father of the income tax." The idea had long smoldered in a variety of legislative breasts, but Abraham Lincoln was the first President to use it on anything like a grand scale. He considered it the only way the Civil War ever would get paid for, and when that crisis eased, the income tax was allowed to expire without much fanfare in 1872.
>
> During the next several years the Government was able to keep its financial head above water with the proceeds from excise taxes on alcohol and tobacco and customs duties from tariffs. But advocates of the income tax still believed it the more equitable means of meeting the country's growing financial obligations.
>
> Congress finally took a shot at it in 1894, enacting an income tax as part of a tariff law passed during Grover Cleveland's administration.
>
> Levied was a flat 2-percent tax on individual incomes in excess of $4,000 and on corporate incomes in excess of $5,000, but the Supreme Court held in 1895 that the tax was illegal and it never was collected.
>
> The landmark decision held that an income tax was a direct tax and as such could be levied only by apportionment among the States on a basis of population.
>
> In 1907, however, President Theodore Roosevelt observed publicly that "most great civilized countries have an income tax and an inheritance tax. In my judgment, both should be a part of Federal taxation."
>
> Two years later supporters of the tax launched a congressional drive to have the 1894 law reenacted and President William H. Taft called for the constitutional amendment which would get around the Supreme Court's apportionment objections.
>
> Taft's suggestions were incorporated into the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act of 1909—a piece of legislation which served mightily to cloud paternity of the income tax as it operates today.
>
> Alabama ratified the proposed amendment the same year and with Wyoming's "yes" 3 years later the United States was in most everybody's business.
>
> Corporations were taxed 1 percent on net incomes in excess of $5,000 and the Supreme Court in 1911 called it an excise tax on the privilege of doing business. Individuals were allowed a $3,000 exemption—$4,000, if married—and there was a graduated surtax on incomes over $20,000. At those prices, less than 1 percent of the population was affected, however, and it wasn't until World War II that everybody began to feel the bite.
>
> In 1939 only 4 million individuals paid an income tax, but in 1945, 43 million out of 50 million filed returns were taxable. About 62 million personal income tax returns were filed last year.
>
> Progressive rates of taxation, a key feature of the 1913 legislation, have been retained through the years, making the income tax—in the words of an early champion of the tax, Senator Joseph W. Bailey, Democrat, of Texas, the only tax ever devised that "rose or fell with a man's ability to pay it." Current individual tax rates, changed but little from World War II, range from 20 to 91 percent.
>
> By 1965, IRS expects to be coping with the annual flood of income tax paperwork completely on a pushbutton basis. High-speed computers, electronic memory systems, and magnetic tape will be calling the painful shots each spring and IRS offices are abuzz with not-so-incredible rumors of wonders to come.
>
> High school teachers are pretty much in agreement that the 16th amendment to the

Constitution presents a consistent stumbling block for pupils who somehow are able to identify the rest of them with little or no trouble.

They are also pretty much in agreement that there is no accounting for this blind spot, especially in view of the fact that no other amendment to the Constitution has done more for or to so many citizens of this country in the 50 years since Wyoming put it on the books.

LEGISLATION TO REGULATE SALE OF SECURITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the regulation of the business of selling securities in the District of Columbia and for the licensing of persons engaged therein, and for other purposes.

The District of Columbia has, for a considerable time, needed such legislation. Questionable practices by a small minority of dealers in securities has made this legislation necessary.

May I say that by and large the great majority of the stock securities dealers in the District of Columbia have been honest and above reproach. However, the number of complaints that have come to the members of the District of Columbia Committee in the past few years has been considerable. Let it be to the credit of the National Association of Credit Dealers that they have filed complaints in many cases in an attempt to give some kind of self-enforcement and intergrity to the responsible securities dealers in the District. In 1960, this association filed complaints against 25 percent of the District members. This is considerably above the national average of only 8 percent. This gives some idea of the necessity of adequate legislation to govern the industry in the District. In view of this large percentage of complaints filed by the National Association, it certainly behooves the District of Columbia to take some action which is legally enforceable and will protect the investors within the District of Columbia.

Almost all of the States of the Union have "blue sky" laws. It is unfortunate that the District of Columbia itself has not had this legislation in the recent past. The lack of this legislation has made it possible for many unscrupulous dealers in securities to operate within the District. Many investors in the small, medium, and large fields have been bilked by these unscrupulous people.

There ought to be legislation on the books which will make regulation possible and correct this unfortunate situation. The Commissions of the District of Columbia have submitted a draft bill and that is the one that I have introduced today.

I think as a result of hearings on this bill we could bring out more fully the situation as it has existed in the District in the past few years. Through those hearings, I am sure we can bring forward some kind of legislation that will be helpful and will protect the investing public in the District of Columbia. This is the purpose of the legislation.

WALTER KRAWIEC, EDITORIAL CARTOONIST, CHICAGO'S MAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening Walter Krawiec, editorial cartoonist for the Chicago Polish Daily News was honored by that newspaper and the people of Chicago and Illinois as the Man of the Year for 1962.

In an elaborate banquet in the grand ballroom of the Sherman House in Chicago, Mr. Krawiec was presented the annual Veritas et Caritas Medal by the Polish Daily News for his 50 years of work as an editorial cartoonist for this fine newspaper.

Mayor Richard J. Daley, speaking for the people of Chicago, and Gov. Otto Kerner, speaking for the people of Illinois, by personally appearing at this magnificent tribute, in their own messages described the depth of gratitude and respect which all of the people in our community hold for Walter Krawiec.

He indeed exemplifies the spirit of truth and charity.

In receiving this highly coveted award, Mr. Krawiec joins the ranks of former famous Men of the Year selected by the Polish Daily News who include President John F. Kennedy and Mayor Richard J. Daley.

It is fitting that Walter Krawiec, an editorial cartoonist, should be selected as the Man of the Year. During the span of five decades this man, through his unique grasp and understanding of world events, has been able to bring to the people of Chicago a quick understanding, in his daily editorial cartoons, of those complexities in our society which authors of books and papers frequently require volumes to describe.

The editorial cartoon has played a singularly important role in civilization's efforts to better understand the complex nature of our society. Walter Krawiec exemplifies the very essence of his noble profession. Even though he is an accomplished artist in his own right and is recognized as one of the great illustrators of the modern circus, he has earned world renown for his oil portraits.

Walter Krawiec has won numerous awards as a frequent exhibitor at the Corcoran Gallery in Washington, D.C.; the National Academy in New York; the Chicago Art Institute, and museums throughout the country.

I prefer, however, to honor him as a chronicler of world events. Soft spoken by nature, he is transformed at the easel into a veritable crusader; pen and ink, brush and paint become weapons which he wields forcefully and courageously against evil in the world. The downtrodden and oppressed find in him a champion, while the evildoers feel the full force of his struggle for truth and justice.

Walter Krawiec is a deeply religious man and he employs his art for the noble enrichment of life. He does not permit man or society to be disillusioned, substituting purely material progress for Christian perfection. Yet as a great poet or musician would, Walter Krawiec has the unique capacity to settle into artistic serenity when there is no need for a crusade; when critical times pass, painting, and drawing with warmth and understanding the persons and places of everyday living.

In the five decades that he has served as editorial cartoonist for the Polish Daily News, Mr. Krawiec has recorded the most spectacular half-century in the development of our Nation.

We Americans are that much richer for having the panorama of American and world progress recorded for posterity by men such as Walter Krawiec. We as a Nation are that much wiser and better equipped to understand the great challenges of a complex world because men like Walter Krawiec are able to reduce this complexity through the use of a few bold strokes of the pen to an understanding which even those with a very limited education can grasp.

His editorial cartoons in my very humble judgment have helped translate the very essence of democracy to the people of the Midwest.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the brief but meaningful remarks delivered by Mr. Krawiec in accepting this award will describe this ingenious man better than anything I might say. In his brief acceptance speech, Mr. Krawiec demonstrates at once a lifetime of fruitful contributions to society and a humility which has made his work a testament to his life.

His speech can serve as an example to students of speech because its depth of thought is nurtured in a concept of brevity. Mr. Walter Krawiec's remarks follow:

Remarks of Walter Krawiec in Accepting Veritas et Caritas Award in Chicago February 23, 1963

Mr. Toastmaster, Father Provincial, very reverence and reverend Fathers, distinguished guests and friends, there was a time more than half a century ago that the seed of this eventful day was sown. It was a day in which my career took a formal step at the suggestion of some firemen, who watched me sketch some horses on rough cardboard at the firehouse.

These good men urged me to go to the Art Institute where I could develop a talent they thought I had. Maybe because I saw them jump to action so often that I too that afternoon followed their advice promptly.

Somewhat antecedent to today's "hike" craze, I walked from Chicago and Milwaukee Avenues and up to the art institute. Up to this moment, I was all determination, all courage. But standing barefooted in what seemed a different world, I experienced that frightful feeling that I didn't belong. It was long, but a friendly hand touched my shoulder. You know something—that

same frightful feeling is back again here, at a speaker's rostrum.

For the man who by habit has expressed himself through pictures all of his life, I find this spotlight too bright. Yet, the aura of this spot is somewhat dispelled by the realization that I am surrounded by friends. You must be true friends to give me an evening like this.

If I had my easel at hand, I would sketch a cartoon something like. I would picture myself in a little world of my own, standing with my mouth wide open in amazement as people of great stature and noble hearts came to me as if from another planet and they brought with them the friendly handshake, good wishes, honors and appreciation, and as they passed, I would murmur, "Thank you for your kindness."

Yes, thank you to the Resurrection Fathers and their great newspaper for this signal honor of the Man of the Year, and thank you, friends, for this warm gathering.

I have no regrets this evening, only a humble satisfaction that I have tried to use whatever talents God gave me to add, however small the contribution, to a better world. In my 50 years with the Dziennik Chicagoski, I have been a privileged spectator in watching the world change from a horse and buggy existence into a space age of rockets.

I spoke in pictures to each generation as best I knew how; particularly did I speak to my own ethnic group as it slowly transformed from a small band of immigrants into a powerful group, loving their fatherland, but putting their shoulders to the plow of the great American way, until they have emerged into dutiful sons and daughters of America.

In this growth of our people, I remember sad moments as my editorial cartoons went on page 1—sharp, critical, and at times denouncing—because a sin is not to be covered but exposed and eradicated. But then what a pleasure it was to present persons and groups as they progressed to goodness and greatness.

On my board I saw the rise of the great fraternal and charitable organizations, the magnificent churches and schools, the men in politics and other services. To all these, I spoke and I say the privilege was mine.

So this evening as I accept the Truth and Charity Award, grateful to all of you who made this possible, I cannot forget the great men and women who give substance to my work. Thank you all very much.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Harvey of Indiana (at the request of Mr. Bell), for 10 minutes, on Tuesday, February 26.

Mr. Weaver, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, February 26, 1963.

Mr. Pelly, for 1 hour, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend his remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Pelly and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Dulski.

Mr. Boland.

Mr. McCormack (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Brademas (at the request of Mr. Waggonner) and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the Record and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $270.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Bell) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Alger.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Waggonner) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dingell.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 26, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

> "I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by each of the following Members and Resident Commissioner of the 88th Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

ALABAMA

At large

George Grant.
George W. Andrews.
Kenneth A. Roberts.
Albert Rains.
Armistead I. Selden, Jr.
Carl Elliott.
Robert E. Jones, Jr.
George Huddleston, Jr.

ALASKA

At large

Ralph J. Rivers.

ARIZONA

1. John J. Rhodes.
2. Morris K. Udall.
3. George F. Senner, Jr.

ARKANSAS

1. E. C. Gathings.
2. Wilbur D. Mills.
3. James W. Trimble.
4. Oren Harris.

CALIFORNIA

1. Don H. Clausen.
2. Harold T. Johnson.
3. John E. Moss.
4. Robert L. Leggett.
5. John F. Shelley.
6. William S. Mailliard.
7. Jeffery Cohelan.
8. George P. Miller.
9. Don W. Edwards.
10. Charles S. Gubser.
11. J. Arthur Younger.
12. Burt L. Talcott.
13. Charles M. Teague.
14. John F. Baldwin, Jr.
15. John J. McFall.
16. B. F. Sisk.
17. Cecil R. King.
18. Harlan Hagen.
19. Chet Holifield.
20. H. Allen Smith.
21. Augustus F. Hawkins.
22. James C. Corman.
23. Clyde Doyle.
24. Glenard P. Lipscomb.
25. Ronald Brooks Cameron.
26. James Roosevelt.
27. Everett G. Burkhalter.
28. Alphonzo Bell.
29. George E. Brown, Jr.
30. Edward R. Roybal.
31. Charles H. Wilson.
32. Craig Hosmer.
33. Harry R. Sheppard.
34. Richard T. Hanna.
35. James B. Utt.
36. Bob Wilson.
37. Lionel Van Deerlin.
38. Patrick Minor Martin.

COLORADO

1. Byron G. Rogers.
2. Donald G. Brotzman.
3. J. Edgar Chenoweth.
4. Wayne N. Aspinall.

CONNECTICUT

1. Emilio Q. Daddario.
2. William L. St. Onge.
3. Robert N. Giaimo.
4. Abner W. Sibal.
5. John S. Monagan.

At large

Bernard F. Grabowski.

DELAWARE

At large

Harris B. McDowell, Jr.

FLORIDA

1. Robert L. F. Sikes.
2. Charles E. Bennett.
3. Claude Pepper.
4. Dante B. Fascell.
5. A. Sydney Herlong, Jr.
6. Paul G. Rogers.
7. James A. Haley.
8. D. R. (Billy) Matthews.
9. Don Fuqua.
10. Sam Gibbons.
11. Edward J. Gurney.
12. William C. Cramer.

GEORGIA

1. G. Elliott Hagan.
2. J. L. Pilcher.
3. E. L. (Tic) Forrester.

4. John J. Flynt, Jr.
5. Charles L. Weltner.
6. Carl Vinson.
7. John W. Davis.
8. J. Russell Tuten.
9. Phil M. Landrum.
10. Robert G. Stephens, Jr.

HAWAII

At large

Thomas P. Gill.
Spark M. Matsunaga.

IDAHO

1. Compton I. White.
2. Ralph R. Harding.

ILLINOIS

1. William L. Dawson.
2. Barratt O'Hara.
3. William T. Murphy.
4. Edward J. Derwinski.
5. John C. Kluczynski.
6. Thomas J. O'Brien.
7. Roland V. Libonati.
8. Dan Rostenkowski.
9. Edward R. Finnegan.
10. Harold R. Collier.
11. Roman C. Pucinski.
12. Robert McClory.
13. Donald Rumsfeld.
14. Elmer J. Hoffman.
15. Charlotte T. Reid.
16. John B. Anderson.
17. Leslie C. Arends.
18. Robert H. Michel.
19. Robert T. McLoskey.
20. Paul Findley.
21. Kenneth J. Gray.
22. William L. Springer.
23. George E. Shipley.
24. Melvin Price.

INDIANA

1. Ray J. Madden.
2. Charles A. Halleck.
3. John Brademas.
4. E. Ross Adair.
5. J. Edward Roush.
6. Richard L. Roudebush.
7. William G. Bray.
8. Winfield K. Denton.
9. Earl Wilson.
10. Ralph Harvey.
11. Donald Cogley Bruce.

IOWA

1. Fred Schwengel.
2. James E. Bromwell.
3. H. R. Gross.
4. John Kyl.
5. Neal Smith.
6. Charles B. Hoeven.
7. Ben F. Jensen.

KANSAS

1. Robert Dole.
2. William H. Avery.
3. Robert F. Ellsworth.
4. Garner E. Shriver.
5. Joe Skubitz.

KENTUCKY

1. Frank A. Stubblefield.
2. William H. Natcher.
3. M. G. (Gene) Snyder.
4. Frank Chelf.
5. Eugene Siler.
6. John C. Watts.
7. Carl D. Perkins.

LOUISIANA

1. F. Edward Hébert.
2. Hale Boggs.
3. Edwin E. Willis.
4. Joe D. Waggonner, Jr.
5. Otto E. Passman.
6. James H. Morrison.
7. T. A. Thompson.
8. Gillis W. Long.

MAINE

1. Stanley R. Tupper.
2. Clifford G. McIntire.

MARYLAND

1. Rogers C. B. Morton.
2. Clarence D. Long.
3. Edward A. Garmatz.
4. George H. Fallon.
5. Richard E. Lankford.
6. Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.
7. Samuel N. Friedel.

At large

Carlton R. Sickles.

MASSACHUSETTS

1. Silvio O. Conte.
2. Edward P. Boland.
3. Philip J. Philbin.
4. Harold D. Donohue.
5. F. Bradford Morse.
6. William H. Bates.
7. Torbert H. Macdonald.
8. Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr.
9. John W. McCormack.
10. Joseph W. Martin, Jr.
11. James A. Burke.
12. Hastings Keith.

MICHIGAN

1. Lucien N. Nedzi.
2. George Meader.
3. August E. Johansen.
4. Edward Hutchinson.
5. Gerald R. Ford.
6. Charles E. Chamberlain.
7. James G. O'Hara.
8. James Harvey.
9. Robert P. Griffin.
10. Elford A. Cederberg.
11. Victor A. Knox.
12. John B. Bennett.
13. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.
14. Harold M. Ryan.
15. John D. Dingell.
16. John Lesinski.
17. Martha W. Griffiths.
18. William S. Broomfield.

At large

Neil Staebler.

MINNESOTA

1. Albert H. Quie.
2. Ancher Nelsen.
3. Clark MacGregor.
4. Joseph E. Karth.
5. Donald M. Fraser.
6. Alec G. Olson.
7. Odin Langen.
8. John A. Blatnik.

MISSISSIPPI

1. Thomas G. Abernethy.
2. Jamie L. Whitten.
3. John Bell Williams.
4. Arthur Winstead.
5. William M. Colmer.

MISSOURI

1. Frank M. Karsten.
2. Thomas B. Curtis.
3. Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.) Sullivan.
4. Wm. J. Randall.
5. Richard Bolling.
6. W. R. Hull, Jr.
7. Durward G. Hall.
8. Richard H. Ichord.
9. Clarence Cannon.
10. Paul C. Jones.

MONTANA

1. Arnold Olsen.
2. James F. Battin.

NEBRASKA

1. Ralph F. Beermann.
2. Glenn Cunningham.
3. Dave Martin.

NEVADA

At large

Walter S. Baring.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Louis C. Wyman.
2. James C. Cleveland.

NEW JERSEY

1. William T. Cahill.
2. Milton W. Glenn.
3. James C. Auchincloss.
4. Frank Thompson, Jr.
5. Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr.
6. Florence P. Dwyer.
7. William B. Widnall.
8. Charles S. Joelson.
9. Frank C. Osmers, Jr.
10. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.
11. Joseph G. Minish.
12. George M. Wallhauser.
13. Cornelius E. Gallagher.
14. Dominick V. Daniels.
15. Edward J. Patten.

NEW MEXICO

At large

Joseph M. Montoya.
Thomas G. Morris.

NEW YORK

1. Otis G. Pike.
2. James R. Grover, Jr.
3. Steven B. Derounian.
4. John W. Wydler.
5. Frank J. Becker.
6. Seymour Halpern.
7. Joseph P. Addabbo.
8. Benjamin S. Rosenthal.
9. James J. Delaney.
10. Emanuel Celler.
11. Eugene J. Keogh.
12. Edna F. Kelly.
13. Abraham J. Multer.
14. John J. Rooney.
15. Hugh L. Carey.
16. John M. Murphy.
17. John V. Lindsay.
18. Adam C. Powell.
19. Leonard Farbstein.
20. William Fitts Ryan.
21. James C. Healey.
22. Jacob H. Gilbert.
23. Charles A. Buckley.
24. Paul A. Fino.
25. Robert R. Barry.
26. Ogden R. Reid.
27. Katharine St. George.
28. J. Ernest Wharton.
29. Leo W. O'Brien.
30. Carleton J. King.
31. Clarence E. Kilburn.
32. Alexander Pirnie.
33. Howard W. Robison.
34. R. Walter Riehlman.
35. Samuel S. Stratton.
36. Frank J. Horton.
37. Harold C. Ostertag.
38. Charles E. Goodell.
39. John R. Pillion.
40. William E. Miller.
41. Thaddeus J. Dulski.

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Herbert C. Bonner.
2. L. H. Fountain.
3. David N. Henderson.
4. Harold D. Cooley.
5. Ralph J. Scott.
6. Horace R. Kornegay.
7. Alton Lennon.
8. Charles Raper Jonas.
9. James T. Broyhill.
10. Basil L. Whitener.
11. Roy A. Taylor.

NORTH DAKOTA

1. Hjalmar C. Nygaard.
2. Don L. Short.

OHIO

1. Carl W. Rich.
2. Donald D. Clancy.
3. Paul F. Schenck.
4. William M. McCulloch.
5. Delbert L. Latta.
6. William H. Harsha.
7. Clarence J. Brown.
8. Jackson E. Betts.
9. Thomas L. Ashley.
10. Homer E. Abele.
11. Oliver P. Bolton.
12. Samuel L. Devine.
13. Charles A. Mosher.
14. William H. Ayres.
15. Robert T. Secrest.
16. Frank T. Bow.
17. John M. Ashbrook.
18. Wayne L. Hays.
19. Michael J. Kirwan.
20. Michael A. Feighan.
21. Charles A. Vanik.
22. Frances P. Bolton.
23. William E. Minshall.

At large

Robert Taft, Jr.

OKLAHOMA

1. Page Belcher.
2. Ed Edmondson.
3. Carl Albert.
4. Tom Steed.
5. John Jarman.
6. Victor Wickersham.

OREGON

1. Walter Norblad.
2. Al Ullman.
3. Edith Green.
4. Robert B. Duncan.

PENNSYLVANIA

1. William A. Barrett.
2. Robert N. C. Nix.
3. James A. Byrne.
4. Herman Toll.
5. William J. Green, Jr.
6. George M. Rhodes.
7. William H. Milliken.
8. Willard S. Curtin.
9. Paul B. Dague.
10. Joseph M. McDade.
11. Daniel J. Flood.
12. J. Irving Whalley.
13. Richard S. Schweiker.
14. William S. Moorhead.
15. Francis E. Walter.
16. John C. Kunkel.
17. Herman T. Schneebeli.
18. Robert J. Corbett.
19. George A. Goodling.
20. Elmer J. Holland.
21. John H. Dent.
22. John P. Saylor.
23. Leon H. Gavin.
24. James D. Weaver.
25. Frank M. Clark.
26. Thomas E. Morgan.
27. James G. Fulton.

RHODE ISLAND

1. Fernand J. St Germain.
2. John E. Fogarty.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. L. Mendel Rivers.
2. Albert W. Watson.
3. W. J. Bryan Dorn.
4. Robert T. Ashmore.
5. Robert W. Hemphill.
6. John L. McMillan.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Ben Reifel.
2. E. Y. Berry.

TENNESSEE

1. James H. (Jimmy) Quillen.
2. Howard H. Baker.
3. W. E. (Bill) Brock.
4. Joe L. Evins.
5. Richard Fulton.
6. Ross Bass.
7. Tom Murray.
8. Robert A. Everett.
9. Clifford Davis.

TEXAS

1. Wright Patman.
2. Jack Brooks.
3. Lindley Beckworth.
4. Ray Roberts.
5. Bruce Alger.
6. Olin E. Teague.
7. John Dowdy.
8. Albert Thomas.
9. Clark W. Thompson.
10. Homer Thornberry.
11. W. R. Poage.
12. Jim Wright.
13. Graham Purcell.
14. John Young.
15. Joe M. Kilgore.
16. Ed Foreman.
17. Omar Burleson.
18. Walter Rogers.
19. George Mahon.
20. Henry B. Gonzalez.
21. O. C. Fisher.
22. Bob Casey.

At large

Joe R. Pool.

UTAH

1. Laurence J. Burton.
2. Sherman P. Lloyd.

VERMONT

At large

Robert T. Stafford.

VIRGINIA

1. Thomas N. Downing.
2. Porter Hardy, Jr.
3. J. Vaughan Gary.
4. Watkins M. Abbitt.
5. William M. Tuck.
6. Richard H. Poff.
7. John O. Marsh, Jr.
8. Howard W. Smith.
9. W. Pat Jennings.
10. Joel T. Broyhill.

WASHINGTON

1. Thomas M. Pelly.
2. Jack Westland.
3. Julia Butler Hansen.
4. Catherine May.
5. Walt Horan.
6. Thor C. Tollefson.
7. K. W. (Bill) Stinson.

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Arch A. Moore, Jr.
2. Harley O. Staggers.
3. John M. Slack, Jr.
4. Ken Hechler.
5. Elizabeth Kee.

WISCONSIN

1. Henry C. Shadeberg.
2. Robert W. Kastenmeier.
3. Vernon W. Thomson.
4. Clement J. Zablocki.
5. Henry S. Reuss.
6. William K. Van Pelt.
7. Melvin R. Laird.
8. John W. Byrnes.
9. Lester R. Johnson.
10. Alvin E. O'Konski.

WYOMING

At large

William Henry Harrison.

PUERTO RICO

Resident Commissioner

Antonio Fernós-Isern.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

459. A letter from the Adjutant General, United Spanish War Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the 64th National Encampment of the United Spanish War Veterans, held in Peoria, Ill., September 9 to 13, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. 73); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

460. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report of Federal contributions for the quarter ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

461. A letter from the Acting President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to utilize volunteers for active police duty"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

462. A letter from the Acting President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the regulation of the business of selling securities in the District of Columbia and for the licensing of persons engaged therein, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

463. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the Annual Report of the Civil Aeronautics Board for fiscal year 1962, pursuant to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

464. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1963 Report of the Office of Coal Research, on coal research activities, pursuant to Public Law 86–599; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

465. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the first annual report of the lead and zinc mining stabilization program for the year ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 347 of the 87th Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

466. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill permitting the

Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the Third Division, Riverton Reclamation Project, Wyoming"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

467. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

468. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report relating to the providing of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public as of December 31, 1962, pursuant to title XII of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

469. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report from the Office of Emergency Planning relating to positions in grades GS–16, 17, and 18, which has been received since transmitting our annual report under a letter dated January 29, 1963, pursuant to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

470. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove restrictions on charges for forms, copies, and certifications"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4147. A bill to withhold Federal aid from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 4148. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 4149. A bill to provide for the satisfaction of claims arising out of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 4150. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Martinez, Calif., as the Charles C. McGonegal Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 4151. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the county of Lincoln, State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 4152. A bill to authorize the addition of certain donated lands to the administrative headquarters site, Isle Royale National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 4153. A bill to amend section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act (relating to compensation of Members of Congress) to provide for a method of incentive pay increases for Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (by request):

H.R. 4154. A bill to amend section 104(b) (3) of title 23, United States Code, relating to the apportionment of funds for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 4155. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4156. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the U.S. district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4157. A bill to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4158. A bill to enact title 5, United States Code, "Government Organization and Personnel", codifying the general and permanent laws relating to the organization of the Government of the United States and its civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4159. A bill to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4160. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the minimum benefit payable thereunder to $75; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4161. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that men who have attained the age of 62 may retire on a full annuity thereunder upon completion of 30 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 4162. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4163. A bill making the 12th day of October in each year a legal holiday to be known as Columbus Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4164. A bill to amend section 610 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of hospital care at Veterans' Administration facilities for Gold Star Mothers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4165. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the duty treatment of certain bread; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4166. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4167. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4168. A bill to provide that cigarettes sold in interstate commerce shall be packaged and marked so as to show the nicotine content and the tar content of the cigarettes in each package; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 4169. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services for aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4170. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4171. A bill to amend section 501 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that under certain conditions, service on the Mexican border before World War I may be included in determining whether a veteran meets the service requirements applicable to the payment of pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4172. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4173. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 4174. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1964, the suspension of duties for metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 4175. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 as it relates to clinical thermometers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4176. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 4177. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of St. Paul, Minn., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands heretofore conveyed to such city; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 4178. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Dixie project, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4179. A bill to amend section 2276 of the Revised Statutes in order to extend the right of selection granted therein to the States to unsurveyed unappropriated public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 4180. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to clarify the status of air freight forwarders as air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4181. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to provide for the certification of air freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4182. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 4183. A bill to declare a policy as to the existence of public domain in Wisconsin in lands erroneously meandered and lying between the original meander line and the lakeshore, and to protect the rights of landowners whose title to water-fronting property has been brought into question by reason of errors in the original survey; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4184. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4185. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4186. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended (48 Stat. 1246; 12 U.S.C. 1701), to require the use of domestically grade-marked lumber and wood products in the construction of housing federally financed and/or federally insured, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4187. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to impose a duty upon the importation of montan wax produced in Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas of Germany; to the Committee on Wsys and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4188. A bill to assist in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4189. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4190. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4191. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4192. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon the attainment of retirement age) will be payable to both men and women at age 60; to the Committee on Wsys and Means.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 4193. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs, or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 4194. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 4195. A bill relating to the reclassification and sale of certain desert land on which entries have been made; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4196. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 4197. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that upon request made by a State or political subdivision thereof, surplus real property will not be disposed of until such State or political subdivision has had not less than 2 years to perfect a plan of use for such property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4198. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of soluble and instant coffee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 4199. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 4200. A bill to provide for the regulation of the business of selling securities in the District of Columbia and for the licensing of persons engaged therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STAEBLER:

H.R. 4201. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4202. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 4203. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4204. A bill to amend the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act so as to establish an additional fund for fishery research programs and fisheries rehabilitation and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 4205. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 4206. A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYMAN (by request):

H.R. 4207. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.J. Res. 277. Joint resolution designating the week of May 20–26, 1963, as National Actors' Equity Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.J.Res. 278. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba, to restate and implement the Monroe Doctrine, and to encourage adherence to the principles of self-determination and human freedom; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 279. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.J. Res. 280. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, in New Mexico and Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.J. Res. 281. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6-percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 263. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives to permit the broadcasting and telecasting of public hearings of committees of the House under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota to give immediate attention and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes, and deterioration of communities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the promotion of State commercial fishery research and development projects; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, proposed by the Congress of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to directing the Bureau of Land Management to withhold any adjustments in domestic livestock grazing fees prior to the holding of the requested congressional hearings in the affected State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to being opposed to all legislation similar to H.R. 7640 of the 87th Congress, relating to imposing further Federal controls in the field of unemployment insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting approval of appropriation for the planning and developing of Devil's Jump Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States and the Postmaster General of the United States relative to presenting the automation of outgoing mail from the post offices in the cities and towns of Bristol County; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enacting legislation to reduce Federal taxes with tax reforms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the payment of a poll tax or any other tax as a qualification to voting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United

States relative to requesting congressional action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means including the requirement that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 4208. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Leandro Pastor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4209. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Pugliese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 4210. A bill for the relief of Joseph Wielkosz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4211. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in South Carolina to the record owners of the surface of that property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 4212. A bill for the relief of Surender Lal Berry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4213. A bill for the relief of Stephen Lee (also known as Lee Fung Yew and Lee Shiu Keong); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 4214. A bill for the relief of Stella Reorganized Schools R–I, Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 4215. A bill for the relief of Barbara Bukowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 4216. A bill for the relief of Takeshi Morozaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 283. Joint resolution declaring Sir Winston Churchill to be an honorary citizen of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

51. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Margaret M. Kaaua, county clerk, Hilo, Hawaii, requesting Congress to authorize further and continued work projects and restoration programs in and for the City of Refuge National Historical Park, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Washington's Birthday Address by Senator Stennis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Virginia Chapter, Sons of the Revolution, all members of which are descendants of officers in the Army of George Washington, celebrated the anniversary of the birth of the Father of our Country last Friday evening in Richmond, and the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] was the guest speaker. I was privileged to introduce Senator STENNIS and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my introduction and the brilliant speech he made on that occasion.

There being no objection, the introduction and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION OF SENATOR JOHN STENNIS, DEMOCRAT, OF MISSISSIPPI, BY SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, AT DINNER MEETING OF SONS OF REVOLUTION, RICHMOND, VA., FEBRUARY 22, 1963

Nearly 16 years ago, JOHN STENNIS promised the people of Mississippi that if they elected him to the U.S. Senate, he would "plow a straight furrow right down to the end of the row."

As we all know, Mississippians elected this former State legislator, district attorney, and circuit judge, in 1947 to represent that State in the Senate and we have all benefited because he has kept his plow deep and his furrow straight.

In the Senate, he has compiled a record of diligent, dedicated, and devoted public service, and has honored the seat which Jefferson Davis occupied, when he was a Senator from Mississippi.

Your speaker tonight is a ranking member of the Armed Services, Appropriations, and the Space Committees of the Senate. Two years ago, he was given the key assignment as chairman of the powerful Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, the "watchdog" committee that oversees our national defense program. At the present time, he is conducting hearings on the conflicting reports about the buildup of Soviet military forces in Cuba to determine the true facts about that threat to our national security. He is the most qualified man I know for that vital assignment.

While the name STENNIS is synonymous with national defense and military preparedness, he is also an authority on constitutional law. He serves as permanent captain of one of the three southern teams organized in the Senate to lead the fight to protect the sovereign rights of the States and to preserve southern traditions and constitutional government. Last year, he played a key role in the defeat in the Senate, after weeks of debate, of vicious legislation to abolish the literacy test established by Mississippi and 20 other States as one of the qualifications for voting. An encroachment on the rights of the States to determine these qualifications. Only a few weeks ago, he was one of those leading our successful battle to preserve rule 22 and the right to engage in extended debate in the Senate, thus assuring our right to be heard and to protect our people against vicious and ill-advised legislation. He was one of three authors of the southern manifesto, and this declaration of constitutional principles, signed by more than 100 Members of the Congress, remains unchallenged as the most forceful statement of the position of the South.

He has been frequently mentioned as a future Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. Former President Eisenhower named him as one of three Democrats qualified to serve as President of the United States.

JOHN STENNIS is esteemed and respected by his Senate colleagues on both sides of the aisle—Republicans and Democrats.

And I am proud to say that Virginia had a major role in the career of JOHN STENNIS, for it was in our State that he obtained his legal education and spent 3 key years of his life. Anyone elected to membership in the University of Virginia chapter of Phi Beta Kappa has earned that honor. Senator STENNIS is truly Virginia's third Senator.

It is with gratitude and pride that I present to you a truly great American, a distinguished statesman, U.S. Senator JOHN STENNIS.

GEORGE WASHINGTON

(By Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi)

It is a special pleasure for me to be with you tonight in celebration of the 231st anniversary of the birth of Gen. George Washington.

The tributes paid to George Washington are legion. Perhaps the best known is that expressed by Gen. Henry Lee when he characterized his beloved fellow Virginian as "First in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Having spent some fond years at the university at Charlottesville, I developed a great admiration for the wisdom of the Sage of Monticello. The keen insight of Thomas Jefferson into men and governments has helped shape the destiny of this country. It was he who fought to preserve the integrity of the States in our Union—and would that there were more modern-day Jeffersons to help regain that measure of respect for the sovereignty of the States that he struggled so hard to establish in the founding days of this Republic.

And it was Thomas Jefferson, who, to my way of thinking, paid the highest tribute of all to his friend, George Washington. Jefferson said:

"His integrity was most pure, his justice the most inflexible I have ever known, no motives or interest or consanguinity, or friendship or hatred, being able to bias his decision."

This observation indicates the sensitive regard of Washington to the public trust implicit in the office of the President. He abhorred any possible violation of this trust by the suggestion of interest or bias in the administration of this office. This fine example set by our first President should be closely followed by Chief Executives of our time and future times.

Jefferson continued:

"He was indeed, in every sense of the words, a wise, a good, and a great man. * * * On the whole his character was, in its mass, perfect * * * in nothing bad, in few points indifferent; and it may truly be said, that never did nature and fortune combine more perfectly to make a man great, and to place him in the same constellation with whatever worthies merited from man an everlasting remembrance."

Certainly it is most fitting and proper that we meet together tonight to consider this great man of history. He is indeed a man of history, for he, like all history,

teaches great lessons to succeeding generations.

I want to speak to you tonight about Washington as a symbol—a symbol of liberty—and a symbol of the fundamentals of our democratic way of life. When we speak of Washington as a symbol, however, we must never lose sight of his very human qualities. He was no god—but a humble servant of humanity and the country which he helped to establish. He was no military genius, though he was one of the ablest field commanders and army administrators in all history. He was no intellectual, but a man of simple, yet methodical judgment.

As a symbol of liberty, Washington is best seen as the commander in chief of the Continental Army. Through his inspired leadership of this ill-equipped, ill-trained, but magnificently motivated Army, he wrenched from the most powerful military force of that day the victory which gave us our liberty.

When I think of Washington as the leader of the Revolutionary Army, I see in my mind's eye two great paintings. The one showing General Washington at the bow of a boat on a bleak night, his jaw firmly set and a determined gaze fixed upon the objective, crossing the Delaware River. A picture portraying with all of the artist's power the determination and courage of this great leader. And then I see the magnificent study in compassion, showing Washington at Valley Forge. These two paintings show us the full measure of George Washington as a military commander.

All of the greatness of this man cannot be seen on the battlefield, however, or even on the great field of honor at Yorktown. His service to his country did not end with the surrender of Lord Cornwallis. To my mind, it had just begun.

As commander in chief of the Continental Army, he held the balance of power in this emerging Nation. His success in gaining victory firmly fixed him in the minds and hearts of his countrymen. With a discontented army still in arms and with no real government in existence, Washington was the only source of authority and law that had anything more than a local influence. There was the matter of the long overdue pay for the Army and the adjustments to peaceful ways, both fermenting unrest among the men in arms. Early in 1783, petitions were circulated by the officers denouncing the constituted authorities and expressing the impatience of the young officers for their just rewards. As the feelings reached the fever pitch, General Washington appeared before his assembled officers and received their petitions. He took from his uniform a letter just received from a Member of Congress explaining the delays of the young Government and its good faith. He started to read the letter, but faltered. He paused, reached into his pocket, took out his new spectacles, and put them on. "Gentlemen," he said, "you must pardon me for I have grown gray in your service and now find myself growing blind." How petty must the problems of that group seemed by comparison. This simple observation quelled what might have been a mutiny within the Continental Army against the newly formed Government.

Repeatedly, Washington was suggested as the head of a monarchy to be established in the place of a republican government. Col. Lewis Nicola, leading a group of the staff officers of the Continental Army, proposed this idea to their commander in chief. When he heard this, he expressed pain that such an idea existed among his colleagues. He said:

"I am much at a loss to conceive what part of my conduct could have given encouragement to an address which to me seems big with the greatest mischief that can befall my country. * * * Let me conjure you, if you have any regard for your country, concern for yourself or posterity, or respect for me, to banish these thoughts from your mind."

Isn't it ironic that the man who became our first President could have become a king? There is a real lesson in humility in this—one which all his successors to this high office might well ponder. The greatness in a man is best seen when he refuses to assume power which would be detrimental to the best interests of those he serves.

As he shrank in distress from the idea of ruling his fellows as a monarch, so did Washington recoil from acceptance of lesser emolument pressed upon him by grateful contemporaries. A good example is a gift to him by his native State of Virginia in gratitude for his services to the State and the Nation. The gift was 100 shares of James River Co. stock. Washington donated this canal company stock to Liberty Hall Academy in the heart of the valley of Virginia, which thereupon bestowed upon him the title of "Patron of the arts and literature." This donation is significant in showing his attitude toward education and significant in the history of the small school which eventually became Washington and Lee University. This donation was the first large gift of securities to a college in the United States. It sustained the college through some of its most difficult years, and it inspired other gifts to this and other schools.

The university still derives annual financial support from George Washington's gift, which, in 1928, was merged with the university's general endowment and reinvested, and now yields over $2,000 per year.

Washington and Lee University's historian, Dr. Ollinger Crenshaw, writes of Washington's gift:

"Perhaps the gift of George Washington to Liberty Hall Academy in 1796 was exceeded in importance to the school's development only by the appointment of Gen. R. E. Lee to its presidency in 1865. Not only did the income from President Washington's donation come as a godsend to an institution which had desperately striven to maintain itself, but the academy's future became interwoven with the name of the father of his country."

We in the United States have a rich heritage in the institutions of our Government, beginning with the Declaration of Independence * * * an indictment against a despotic monarchy, but yet we see in this document the aspirations of a people determined to govern themselves. This will of the people for self-government is manifested in that greatest of all charters of freedom, our Constitution, which established the framework of a form of government unparalleled in the long history of mankind.

The stamp and thread of Washington can be seen in these two great instruments of freedom. Indeed, it was Washington who presided over the Convention in Philadelphia which gave us the Constitution. He used his great influence to bring about its ratification, writing many letters and even engaging in debate with the opponents of ratification. In a letter to Thomas Jefferson, James Monroe made this sharp appraisal of the role Washington played in the ratification of the Constitution:

"Be assured [General Washington's] influence carried this Government."

In my opinion, Washington never rose to greater heights than he did in certain remarks at the Constitutional Convention in 1787.

The suggestion was that as an adequate part would be rejected anyway, that an extreme makeshift proposal should be quickly adopted.

He said: "Too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If to please the people we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

History's brightest pages record no achievements more illustrious than those of the Founding Fathers of our Nation, and none more calculated to instill pride and patriotism. How often do we turn for inspiration to the men of those troubled Revolutionary times, replete with example after example of rarest courage. They wrote and proclaimed the Declaration of Independence with no army and pitiable resources. Indeed, when they fired the first shot at Lexington, they had no army. And after victory at Yorktown, and for a good number of years thereafter, they had no effective government. Yet with foresight and fortitude they wrote the Constitution of the United States, founded on high principle but adopted with doubt and apprehension that its noble purposes might never be achieved. Thus, a feeble nation of free people embarked on its uncertain course, but on the way to growth and development beyond their highest dreams and beyond precedent.

What made the difference? What was it that set the ship of state off on its magnificent voyage to greatness and achievements unmatched in all history? Many fearless and determined patriots contributed, but we are mindful that it was the leadership and great spirit of George Washington that made the difference.

Having fought to gain freedom from the oppression of George III and nurtured the establishment of a republican government through the Constitution, it was only natural that Washington should counsel Congress upon leaving the Office of President. His farewell address is not only a stirring valedictory of our first President, but it carries many profound truths in it which are applicable even today.

In its contemporary setting, the address was made at a time when our Nation was still in the stage of its early development. Each of the Thirteen Colonies had been a political entity. They had joined together in a common cause * * * the war for their independence. Under the Articles of Confederation, the separate status of each State was preserved and they delegated only certain areas within which Congress could act for their collective good. There had to be a great deal of blending and compromise to weld these 13 sovereignties into a union. It required all of the statesmanship imaginable to accomplish this feat. We are indeed fortunate that destiny provided that statesman in the person of our first President.

But now the Father of our Country was relinquishing the helm of the ship of state.

What was the counsel of this great American?

First, he set the pattern by clearly stating the bedrock principle of our Government. "The basis of our political system," he said, "is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government." He had led many men into the supreme sacrifice that Americans might be the arbiters of their political institutions. He did not lightly regard the role of the individual citizen, through his freely elected representatives, to determine the course that his country should take.

Washington strongly advised his people as follows:

"Toward the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthown."

Heeding this advice of George Washington, Senator Robertson and I, together with many of our colleagues in the Senate, have recently fought to preserve the tradition of debate in the Senate. This rule was invoked to assure protection for minorities in this country; but those who would impose cloture to this body say that it stifles not only the President's program, but legislation sought in behalf of minority groups. Is this not a specious pretext for an innovation which George Washington sagely counseled against?

He further speaks of caution in making changes with this admonition:

"In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions; that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country; that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion."

How do you think the hypothetical economic theories concocted in the Harvard traditions of Messrs. Heller and Schlesinger would fare in the light of Washington's admonition here? If there has ever been a more graphic illustration of the very thing which Washington cautions us against it is the theoretical approach of these two intellectuals to solving our country's economic dilemma. Somehow I feel that the American public will be intelligent enough to see through the fiscal mania which has been proposed for our consideration at this session. Your distinguished Senator and my good friend, Harry Byrd, has not been taken in by this scheme. And I am proud to say that there are many of our colleagues who also will act to resist this unproven and highly dangerous change in the fiscal affairs of the country.

Washington emphasized the vital importance of the defined powers of government and pointed to the departmentalization of powers in our own constitutional government. He said:

"It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another."

Chief Justice Warren would have been better advised to give due regard to these pointed words from our first President, rather than the opinion of the Swedish sociologist, Gunder Myrdal, in his leading of the Supreme Court in its unprecedented legislative decision in the case of *Brown* v. *Board of Education*. Even Chief Justice Marshall with his rather liberal view would have reeled at the usurpation of the prerogative of Congress in the school desegregation decision.

Thus, George Washington counseled an infant nation—a nation which he helped to establish, a nation which he led as its first President for two terms. He was a man of true greatness. His first thought was always of his duty to his country. This principle motivated him to become the great commander in chief of the Continental Army—to reluctantly assume the Office of President and to decline a third term in this high office. His greatness lay in his selfless adherence to that which he knew to be right.

Let us apply some of these principles to the Cuban situation. We all know that this is one of the more critical and crucial problems of our time.

We all welcomed the announcement that the Soviets would withdraw several thousand troops from Cuba. This is only as a limited step in the right direction. Neither this withdrawal nor any other partial withdrawal should be considered as a final solution of the basic Cuban problem and threat.

The basic problem, and the real threat to the Americas, lies in the fact that international communism now has a firm foothold in the Western Hemisphere. The "Made in Moscow" government is in Cuba for the primary purpose of increasing and spreading communism's influence and power in Latin America. We know that it is here to stay—if we permit it to do so.

Public debate during the past few weeks has focused largely on whether Khrushchev has or has not withdrawn his offensive weapons from Cuba. Certainly, this is important. None of us can afford to be unconcerned about the threat of missiles and planes which can rain nuclear death and destruction on us in a matter of minutes. However, we must not allow our attention to be preoccupied entirely by an overly meticulous concern about whether the military threat to us has been increased or decreased fractionally by the introduction or withdrawal of certain types or numbers of weapons. If we do we may very well fail to face up to the proposition that, regardless of how many or how few troops support it, the alien and antidemocratic government now being maintained in Cuba by Russian armed soldiers is in and of itself the real and basic threat to the peace and security of the American Republics. International communism at our very doorstep, without regard to the supporting weaponry, is offensive to me, and, I believe, to a majority of my fellow Americans.

I am not primarily concerned over the exact number of troops Khrushchev has in Cuba. Even ten would be too many. I believe that it is the fact that the Russian Bear now stands astride the unhappy island of Cuba which most troubles the average American. The American people are disturbed and uneasy because they know that we cannot live with this menace indefinitely.

Therefore, they want to be assured that our responsible officials recognize the problem and recognize also that it will not just disappear with the passage of time. They want to be convinced that we have the national will and purpose to do everything within our power to wipe out all Soviet-dominated governments in this hemisphere and that we have a firm and hard plan and policy to accomplish this.

In short, I believe that our people take the same position which the Congress itself took when it adopted Senate Joint Resolution 230 last October 3. In adopting this resolution we in Congress expressly reaffirmed the Monroe Doctrine and declared that we were "determined to prevent by whatever means necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere." The resolution declared we were "determined to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of any externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States."

The American people ask only, I believe, that we adhere to this resolution and that we demonstrate once again that the historic Monroe Doctrine is still an integral part of our national policy and that we do, in fact, consider any attempt by foreign powers "to extend their system to any part of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and security."

When these things are done—and when our people are convinced that our Nation is still strong, resolute, vigorous, determined, and above all, unafraid—I know that the patriotic people of this Nation will unite four square behind the Government as they have always done in times of national crisis.

The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, in the real course of its inquiry, will develop all of the facts and I hope that it can make a real and tangible contribution in shaping a hard and firm policy which will finally rid the Americas of this cancerous communistic growth.

This is no time for despair. Fear has no place in our thinking. We have every reason to face the future with faith in our form of government and in our ability to make it work. Endowed as we are with individual liberty and our national resources, with faith in a Higher Power and a determination to do our part, we shall meet and conquer the problems of our time. May God sustain us as we go.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following newsletter of February 23, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman Bruce Alger, Fifth District, Texas)

TIMID AND FEARFUL LEADERSHIP COSTING U.S. PRESTIGE

The week's news is frightening to every American citizen concerned with the future of the United States. More and more the American people are becoming deeply concerned with the timidity and almost childish fear of the President to make decisions. The result is that the prestige of the United States has never been lower. Our allies are losing confidence in us because they are not sure they can depend on us. Some results of the President's confused policies, or rather lack of policy: (1) De Gaulle's insistence on Europe going it alone without depending on the United States; (2) the collapse of the Diefenbaker government in Canada and a rise in anti-American feeling which is jeopardizing our entire defense perimeter in the north; (3) increased unrest in Latin America with more bold action by Communists openly swearing allegiance to Castro and the Soviet Union; (4) the hesitancy of Italy and Spain to renew our bases or to permit the establishment of bases for Polaris submarines; (5) a tougher attitude by Khrushchev and renewed arrogance on the part of the Soviet Union in the nuclear test ban treaty talks and in its cynical offer to remove several thousand Russian troops from Cuba sometime.

The President's cautious reaction to the Mig attack on an American boat is not what this world so badly needs. A strong policy statement, dealing from strength, that we will protect American lives, property, freedom, and way of life from any and all encroachments—that any attack on us will result in instant and deadly retaliation. Such a position is our only hope to stop aborning the "war by miscalculation"—some other nation miscalculating the American people by

thinking the weak posture of our President represents the people. I say we are not weak, not afraid, nor cautious, nor watchfully waiting when it comes to our way of life. We know we are right, and will brook no opposition. "Give me liberty or give me death," is not an old-fashioned homily, but a present, vibrant truth. So it is that we can reasonably question our future conduct when our own leadership confuses and bewilders us. Think how uncertain other nations must be as they see us successfully attacked; as we fail to make any attempt to follow up the shot across the bow of a ship that disregards us; when we let a dictator who threatens to bring us ruin keep a military and subversive bastion in our hemisphere; see him get a promise from our leader of no attack; and watch him work to subvert other Latin and South American countries, some of which will fall in future months if we do nothing now. So we see the Keynesian socialism continue its course toward full subjugation of our economy at home and communism continue to advance abroad.

The failure of President Kennedy to act is increasing the danger to the United States. At a time when bold, brave leadership is needed, our country finds itself headed by a party machine whose energies are being spent in political maneuvering, reckless domestic experiments, and complete refusal to enunciate a foreign policy to protect our country and preserve freedom. The one ray of hope is that the people, from my observation across the country, are far ahead of the administration and it may be that public opinion will force the administration into a role of national leadership in spite of itself. In the meantime, it is up to Congress to do all possible to strengthen the country and preserve our free institutions.

PRESIDENT CALLS FOR INCREASE IN DEBT CEILING

Here we go again. As expected and as I predicted last year, President Kennedy is now calling upon Congress for a further increase in the debt ceiling. So long as Federal spending is uncurtailed, there will be no limit to the debt ceiling as America continues on its reckless course toward fiscal collapse and national suicide. The temporary increase in the public debt limit, as enacted during the last Congress, and which I opposed, provides as follows: (1) $308 billion to March 31, 1963; (2) $305 billion April 1 to June 24, 1963; (3) $300 billion June 25 to June 30, 1963. The administration has requested that the ceiling of $308 billion be extended to June 30, 1963. Otherwise, the administration will be confronted with a decrease of $9 billion in the debt ceiling on April 1 and another decrease of $5 billion on June 24. In effect, an extension of the $308 billion ceiling beyond April 1, 1963, is the equivalent of a $311 billion ceiling on an annual basis. An extension of the $308 billion ceiling beyond June 25, 1963, is the equivalent of a $316 billion ceiling on an annual basis. Hearings on the President's request will begin before my Committee on Ways and Means next Wednesday, February 28. This is just another example of the failure of the Kennedy administration to face fiscal facts. I warned last year when I voted against increasing the debt ceiling that we would be called upon to push it higher unless the President made some effort to cut spending. We know now, too, that another debt increase will be requested by J.F.K. later this year. Instead, he has presented us with the biggest peacetime budget in history, $98.8 billion. His refusal to even attempt to practice some discipline in spending the peoples' money can only result in bigger deficits, continued pressure for an expanding public debt, and the inevitable climax, national bankruptcy.

PRESIDENT'S TAX PLAN CONTRADICTORY AND SELF-DEFEATING

In hearings this week before the Ways and Means Committee on the President's tax scheme, one of the Nation's top tax experts confirmed my charge that the Kennedy plan is contradictory and self-defeating. Dan Throop Smith, tax expert of the Eisenhower administration, denounced the Kennedy tax proposals as a "bitter disappointment." He said, "by concentrating the bulk of tax cuts in the lower brackets to increase disposable income, the program has adopted the most expensive and the least effective way of stimulating expansion." Mr. Smith also condemned President Kennedy's plans for increasing the Federal deficit. "The proposal for a net $10.3 billion cut in revenues on top of a prospective current deficit of $9 billion is a dangerous gamble with the country's currency and basic well-being," Smith said, bearing out my prediction that if we follow President Kennedy's fiscal policies we will devalue our currency. Smith concluded his testimony with this damaging statement in pointing up the complete fallacy of President Kennedy's tax proposals: "The most serious error in the entire program is that when the parts are put together they contradict the standard of fairness stated by the Secretary of the Treasury and at the same time nullify much of the economic benefit which might be achieved."

In my opinion the President's tax proposals could be likened to a doctor who prescribes the wrong prescription (his unworkable tax proposals) after making a wrong diagnosis (that the American economy needs more government). In a bland statement the President then says, "those who oppose the program must take the responsibility for any deterioration in the economy which might come about over the next months." In other words, the doctor, having prescribed the wrong prescription for the wrong illness, now says that if the patient dies it will be because he refused to take the medicine. What is really needed for economic growth is less government, less spending, and tax cuts in stable dollars.

JUNKETING MEMBER'S ACTIVITIES NOT REPRESENTATIVE OF CONGRESS

Under the protocol procedures of Congress, Members of one body are not supposed to criticize those of the other body. Indeed, Members of the House are not supposed to note by name another member or to question his integrity or honesty. However, Members of Congress have a responsibility to the people to maintain the integrity of the Congress of the United States. Under the Constitution, Congress is the sole judge of the conduct of its membership. It is our duty to call attention to known indiscretions so that unethical practices are stopped by the House or Senate, or the people be given the facts so that they may properly discipline a Senator or Representative who abuses the power of his office. In recent weeks, the newspapers have reported the activities of one Member of the House and attention has been called to some of his practices by a Member of the Senate. He is now attempting to discredit all Congressmen by his own indiscretions. Fortunately, he is the exception, not the rule—nor can there be any excuse or justification for misuse of public funds by Members of Congress. The vast majority of the Members of Congress are extremely conscientious in doing their work and in discharging their responsibilities as representatives of the people. To charge them all with irresponsible action and mishandling of the people's money is to seriously impair the image of Congress and of the American people because a Congressman usually represents the people who elect him, and fortunately, for our system of government, Congress and the people are morally strong, honest, and dedicated. The danger in the twin policies of a weak administration which refuses to stand up to international gangsters, and in downgrading the image of Congress by unworthy deeds, is that it encourages the lawless and criminal element within our country. Hoodlums, seeing the success of Khrushchev and Castro and being given the impression that disregard of honesty and integrity is the rule in Congress, are made bold in defiance of our conventions and laws. Strict adherence by Congress and the people to our moral codes of ethics is the only hope this free Nation will survive these times of peril.

Local Communities and the States Must Meet School Needs To Avoid Federal Education Octopus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy put 24 separate proposals dealing with everything from elementary to graduate school Federal aid to education into one big omnibus request. The President thus issued an open invitation to the Congress, with his message giving the program a label of high priority, for an immediate creation of a new bureaucratic octopus to cost during the first 3 years a total of $4.6 billion.

Since the President's Federal aid to education request was received by the Congress I have tried to point out in my own State that we must adequately support our schools on the local and State level or the Federal Government will take over the function of financing education with the inevitable creation of a bureaucratic octopus similar to the powerful and ever-growing Agriculture Department that regiments our farmers.

Mr. Speaker, under previous permission to do so, I include at this point the text of a letter dated February 21, 1963, to members of the Washington State Legislature urging adequate local and State support of schools to avoid having them under the control of a Federal agency:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., February 21, 1963.
To the Members of the Washington State Legislature, Olympia, Wash.

Dear Friends: The purpose of this letter is twofold; first, to express my keen appreciation for the courtesies afforded me when in Olympia recently, and second, to expand and point up more specifically the views that I offered in addressing the senate and house of the State legislature on that occasion.

As to the first point, it was certainly gratifying to observe firsthand the conscientious, objective, and responsible way in which members of the State legislature are fulfilling their responsibilities. Certainly, Washington State's public interest should have priority over partisan advantage in the conduct of political duties.

Now, as to the second point—you will recall that my remarks to the legislature took notice of Federal preemption of major sources of money and the upset in National-State equilibrium which the Supreme Court of the United States vested in the States such as our State of Washington, when, contrary to earlier interpretation of the U.S. Constitution, in 1937 in a series of decisions, the Federal Government obtained unlimited power to tax and spend for the general welfare. Thereby, we created a grey area of responsibility with subsequent Federal legislation requiring matching funds, which often added to our State's financial difficulty in meeting normal public service needs.

In other words, often the Federal Government, by intervening in such important areas as education, has increased rather than provided relief for your difficulty.

You may recall my saying to the Washington State Legislature, in all frankness, that in my view government is best which is closest to the people. I spoke for retaining on the State and community level the control and management of our schools.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture is the best example of what happens when a Federal agency takes over local and State problems. In 1933 the Federal Government began a new program of assisting our farmers. The resultant Federal control and regimentation is generally understood. To maintain the Federal Government octopus of bureaucracy in fiscal 1964, the administration has said it will need 121,583 Government employees and the cost to the taxpayers of the agricultural program is estimated as $8.4 billion. This is nearly five times the amount required to operate the Department of Agriculture 10 years ago and 49 times the amount when the farm program began.

Meanwhile, the number of farmers has been diminishing and, as I say, the program indicates what might happen if the Federal Government under the general welfare clause of the Constitution, takes over the major responsibility for public education.

Certainly, as I said, State financing problems will increase if local communities fail to vote special school levies when, from time to time, there are crises due to population growth and special local education needs. In turn, then, if the States fail to provide regularly through adequate budgetary appropriations for schools, then the pressure for the Federal Government to take over this responsibility will increase, and thereby the danger of centralized Federal control over the schooling of American children is increased.

People laugh when some of us suggest that we could have a situation here in America such as with Adolph Hitler in Germany through thought control over young people. But rather than recite history or speculate over the future, it is easier to point up the present, such as with the Federal agricultural program.

However, I never fail to point out the importance of local communities meeting their school needs, as with the 9.8-mill school levy decision that the voters of Seattle face on Tuesday, March 12.

As for the State legislature, I have not studied the current budget, but I would be hopeful that enabling legislation to expand the community college program is being considered favorably.

I know the Legislative Interim Committee on Education in its 1962 report recommended "that the numerical limitations on community colleges be eliminated" and bills to accomplish this have been introduced. Frankly, this strikes me as extremely important. In the First Congressional District, in the Shoreline School District, there are plans for such a project and I believe the necessary financial measures for it were voted a year ago. So, please count me as being in strong support of removing the limit on the number of such colleges which can be established.

Reverting again to the general subject of education, let me emphasize again my belief that if the citizens reject extra tax burdens when and wherever local school boards find it necessary to go to the people for additional funds, there will inevitably evolve more pressure for more money at higher levels of government. Furthermore, as you know, in such event, and wherever the Federal Government is called upon to expend funds, it must, under a Supreme Court decision, look to the way that such expenditures are made. In other words, if the parents of our schoolchildren, through their local school boards, desire to preserve their power of decision over the education of their children, and not turn the management over to a bureaucrat in Washington, D.C.—similar to the farm program—then the local community, and of course the State, also, must support their schools adequately.

Again, expressing appreciation for your courtesy in allowing me to address the House and Senate of the Washington State Legislature to outline my understanding of our community of interests between our respective legislatures, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS M. PELLY,
Member of Congress.

Fifteenth Anniversary of Communist Takeover of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we have just passed another milestone in the history of the Soviet Russian colonial empire. Yesterday marked the 15th anniversary of the takeover of Czechoslovakia by the Communists. They remain in control today, backed as always by Russian troops.

The Czechoslovak National Council of America continues to keep alive the spirit of Czech freedom for Americans with their heritage in Czechoslovakia and others throughout the free world who share their concern over the plight of the people in Czechoslovakia.

The council has called attention to the tragic situation in which unreasonably heavy duties are placed on packages sent from America to Czech people. For example, the council reports that there is a duty of 50 crowns—approximately $7—on a kilo of used clothing, about 2.2 pounds. This duty of 50 crowns is in a society where the average office worker receives 6 crowns an hour and farmworkers as little as 12 crowns a day.

The council asks why American authorities allow this blackmail to continue, for it is a pure and simple device to secure American dollars for use in international trade.

Indeed, many in this country wonder about the present policies toward all the captive nations in the Soviet colonial empire. What is behind the reluctance and even opposition to congressional resolutions to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations? What is behind the weak proclamations during Captive Nations Week? Why are we afraid to assert ourselves in our position as leader of the free world?

Many of us in the Congress hope that the executive branch will move ahead in this field. It is the executive that is charged with foreign policy, but it becomes increasingly apparent that foreign policy toward the captive nations question is being handled with no more ability than our foreign relations with Canada, Portugal, Britain, and other old friends.

On this occasion, when we mark the Czech people's 15th year under Communist rule, we all hope that future U.S. actions will inspire the Czech people and the peoples of all the captive nations to continue their opposition to Russian communism. We hope they can find in our foreign policies some ray of hope and encouragement for their cause. We hope they will continue to find reason to believe that this Nation—now and in the future—believes that the people of each country on the earth should be allowed free and open elections and determination of their own destiny.

Hospital Care for Gold Star Mothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which would authorize hospital care for Gold Star Mothers at Veterans' Administration hospitals. It is my feeling that it is our Government's obligation to care for those who have suffered in battle, and also for their dependents and survivors which they have left behind.

These brave mothers raised sons and daughters to be good citizens and to give their lives, if necessary, to defend this great country of ours. We ought to do more for them than to pay honor and tribute on special holidays.

Many of these Gold Star Mothers are in need. My bill in permitting them to avail themselves of such medical care would not jeopardize the availability of facilities for the furnishing of hospital care to veterans.

The 45th Anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my insertion of remarks, I am pleased to include for the information of the House a very timely and informative speech delivered by the Honorable Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires ad interim of Lithuania at a commemoration of the 45th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. His talk was delivered in Los Angeles, Calif., on February 10, 1963:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the consular corps, other distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is an honor and a great pleasure for me to be with you today, and I must begin by thanking you most sincerely for the kind invitation which brought me here. Several times in the past few years I had wanted to visit Lithuanians and their friends on the west coast, and finally I have the great happiness of being with you as we commemorate the 45th anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence.

For just a moment, I would like to share with you the thoughts that strike me as a first-time visitor to Los Angeles. One of the things that affects my imagination most deeply is the vast energy and dedication whereby the American frontier was extended from the east coast, where I have lived for some years now, to this City of Angels on the shores of the Pacific Ocean. The thought of a pioneer toiling bravely to reach the Rocky Mountains, the Sierra Nevadas, the desert, pausing in a lonely clearing uninhabited by men—all this thrills the imagination. This kind of initiative and self-possession, however, is familiar to me and to you in a different way, because these traits of boldness and courage are part of the story of Lithuania; and it is that story which has gathered us here today.

The American pioneer, as has often been pointed out, pursued a dream on the western horizon with an almost relentless passion. Even before the gold rush years, the eminent French visitor, Alexis de Tocqueville, was amazed by the speed with which this westward migration was taking place, and he said:

"It would be difficult to describe the avidity with which the American rushes forward to secure this immense booty that fortune offers. * * * He is unimpressed by the silence of the woods; the approach of beasts of prey does not disturb him, for he is goaded onwards by a passion stronger than the love of life. Before him lies a boundless continent, and he urges onward as if time pressed and he was afraid of finding no room for his exertions."

One of the principal characteristics of this relentless drive westward is particularly important, and many authors have commented on it at length. Briefly, it seems that the American pioneer, alone in the silence and challenge of the frontier, could easily imagine that he was leaving the east entirely behind him, and that a literally new world lay ahead. His ancestors, who had originally reached the eastern United States from their native Europe, had never ventured as far as this pioneer, and he could well imagine that he no longer had any ties left with the Europe whence his ancestors sprang. He was, he could assume, a new man, the so-called American Adam who no longer had a historical past or a geographical origin. There was only the future, and the far horizon to conquer; everything lay ahead.

This was, no doubt, a splendid dream, and it brought vast numbers of settlers to the shores of the Pacific. The boundless continent of which De Tocqueville had spoken was finally circumscribed. But the content of that dream of historical and geographical detachment, if I may twist a few Shakespearean words, was "such stuff as dreams are made on," and that dream soon vanished "into thin air." Already when I was a little boy in Pennsylvania shortly after the turn of the century, the children of the American pioneers were learning that they could not entirely divorce themselves from European events. And even though, for several years following the First World War, America could still attempt to avoid the "foreign entanglements" against which George Washington had warned, the outcome was inevitable. One of the most graphic illustrations of that outcome is the fact that the United Nations was formed on this very west coast of the United States, a west coast which was once thought by its settlers to be at the farthest possible removed from Europe.

The world has grown even smaller in the years since the Second World War. Anyone who lives on this west coast today knows that, farther to the west, there lie Korea, Vietnam, Laos, China, India—and the list could be expanded. There is not an area of the world west of Los Angeles that does not bear directly upon the happiness of every inhabitant of Los Angeles. And if we look back far to the east, whence came the ancestors of the men who settled this west coast, we see a Europe confronted with a new and ever more terrible enemy, with Berlin as one focal point of that conflict. If we try to see what lies in the future, inevitably we focus on the menace of imperialistic world communism, which threatens that very pursuit of happiness within a free society which led to the establishment of this great city of Los Angeles. And those of us in this room today can add one further dimension of experience to that glance eastward and westward: if we look to the east, we see our homeland of Lithuania, cruelly subjugated for over 20 years by the ruthless tyrants of the Kremlin; if we look to the west, we see Siberia, land of deportations and genocide, a terribly tangible demonstration of that disregard for the dignity of the human person which is central to the Communist credo. There is, in other words, no escape from the struggle in which all freedom-loving peoples are involved; the struggle surrounds us on all sides. The protagonists in the struggle are all peoples who believe in human liberty, peace and justice and are willing to dedicate their efforts to the attainment of those ends. The struggle against deceit and treachery, however, is a long and arduous one, and this can easily be seen if one reviews for a moment the events surrounding the barbarous absorption of Lithuania into the control of the Soviet Union.

Lithuania became a sacrifice to an infamous accord between Hitler and Stalin. When Soviet treachery materialized in the aggressive act of occupation, the first to protest were Lithuania's representatives abroad, while the first foreign reaction was the condemnation of the aggression by U.S. Acting Secretary of State Sumner Wells. Thus, the Lithuanian cause was from the very beginning projected into an international arena. From that time on, the Soviets have repeatedly attempted to present the supposed incorporation of Lithuania as a free choice of the people. It has thus become part of the Lithuanian struggle to regain freedom and independence that such a clumsy lie be unmasked, and that the facts behind the Soviet occupation of Lithuania be accurately revealed as an ill-concealed act of criminal aggression on the part of the Kremlin. The efforts of Lithuanians living in the free world have long been dedicated to a full and accurate presentation of the facts, and their efforts were saliently supported when a U.S. congressional committee under the direction of Congressman Kersten of Wisconsin investigated the Soviet aggression in the Baltic States and came to this conclusion:

"The evidence is overwhelming and conclusive that Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania were forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the U.S.S.R. Any claims by the U.S.S.R. that the elections conducted by them in July 1940 were free and voluntary (or that the resolutions adopted by the resulting parliaments petitioning for recognition as a Soviet Republic were legal) are false and without foundation in fact."

In the light of all the evidence, the Soviet action in the Baltic States has become one of the clearest examples of Soviet aggression and neo-colonialism. Even though the Soviets have tried to achieve recognition of the status quo in the Baltic States, the free world has seen their attempts as only a continuation of the series of clumsy lies to which the free world is now accustomed. Other nations of the free world have joined with the United States in refusing to recognize the forcible incorporation of the Baltic States, realizing that the expression of any such sanction, whether directly or indirectly, would be tantamount to the awarding of a prize for unprecedented disregard of international agreements and the principles of justice and peace among nations. This position has great political and legal significance, for it enables Lithuanian representatives to continue their duties and the defense of Lithuanian rights and interests.

Even a Soviet representative such as Litvinov did not fail to note the significance of the nonrecognition policy, for he said:

"It would be quite wrong * * * to assert that resolutions on nonrecognition are in themselves devoid of any particular value. While such resolutions have in every case a certain moral significance, and give satisfaction to public opinion, they also cause the aggressor some preoccupations and inconveniences, as is evident by the efforts which aggressors usually make to obtain recognition of their conquests, if only in an indirect way. But, according to circumstances, nonrecognition may be of vast importance, not only morally, but also politically—particularly when the victim of aggression itself continues to fight for its independence and for the integrity of its territory. In such cases, the recognition of the results of violent aggression or the abandonment of the policy of nonrecognition, would be equivalent to abbetting the aggressor directly, and to stabbing his victim in the back by discouraging and demoralizing it." (League of Nations Official Journal, 1938, pp. 340–341.)

Finally, I might note in this respect that the refusal of Western nations to recognize the illegal annexation of the Baltic States conforms to an old principle of law, namely that unjust actions do not have just consequences. Ex injuria jus non oritur. It is with regard for this principle, as well as for the other considerations I have mentioned, that the Lithuanian diplomatic representatives maintain the just aspirations of Lithuania to freedom and independence. And part of their task has repeatedly been that of combating Soviet attempts to achieve indirect recognition of the illegal situation in Lithuania and the other Baltic States. This task has been carried on in conjunction with the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation and the American Lithuanian Council, as well as other organizations which perform special functions related to the common task confronting Lithuanians living in the free world.

In this struggle for justice, the Lithuanian people have many good friends, and it is my pleasure to mention some of them here. I speak first of all of Mayor Samuel Yorty of Los Angeles, who has often demonstrated a keen awareness of the effort involved in combating Communist propaganda and treachery. We are most grateful to him for his official proclamation in connection with this commemoration, and for the ceremony whereby the Lithuanian flag was raised in honor at city hall this morning. We also cherish the presence here today of the distinguished dean of the Los Angeles Consular Corps, Dr. Mong-ping Lee, the Consul General of China; and the Consul General of Canada, the Honorable George R. Paterson and Mrs. Paterson. Lithuanians everywhere are particularly grateful for the friendship of the Chinese people, who are also engaged in a struggle to regain their rightful freedom and territorial sovereignty. We deeply appreciate the numerous occasions on which the Chinese representative at the United Nations has espoused the Lithuanian cause, at a time when the official voice of the Lithuanian people is silenced in that body. And Lithuanians are also grateful to the government and people of Canada for having made possible the reestablishment of an Acting Consul General in Canada. We are also very happy to have with us today the last American Minister to Lithuania before the forcible Soviet occupation, Dr. Owen J. C. Norem and Mrs. Norem. I happened to be the first person to greet Dr. Norem officially when he arrived in Lithuania, and so I am very happy, during this visit, to renew an acquaintance of long standing. In days when such travel was difficult, Prof. Malbone Graham twice visited Lithuania, and has always been a great friend of our country; he has also dedicated much effort to numerous scholarly writings on Lithuania. He is not able to be with us today because of illness, and I know that I express the desire of all of us in wishing him a speedy recovery.

In other words, ladies and gentlemen, the Lithuanians who gather here today do not stand alone; they have friends who share their aspirations for a better world in which justice will be the cornerstone of individual and national liberty. This kind of alliance is a natural one by virtue of our goals, but it can never be taken for granted. The solidarity that the free world is ever seeking to strengthen is the result, not of idle maxims chanted, but of difficult lessons clearly learned. Just as the descendants of the American pioneer learned through bitter experience that freedom-loving peoples must stand together, so too have freedom-loving peoples learned that mere noble desires and aspirations do not guarantee peace and happiness. The tragic fate of Lithuania is one of the clearest examples of this. Even where dedicated men gave of all their energies to build a free and independent Lithuania, their noble work was overwhelmed by treachery and ruthless greed. And the reason is simple: evil men have an unlimited number of means available whereby to achieve nefarious ends, whereas seekers after justice have but a narrow path of principle and faith to follow.

Yet in spite of this, all of us gathered here are determined to believe in justice, and to work for it. It is only the strong of mind and heart who are able to believe perseveringly in justice—who are able to set aside doubts and fears, and to see truly that mankind's yearning for peace and freedom is rarely rewarded overnight. And even when peace and freedom are achieved, they cannot be maintained without courage and hard work. As Erasmus once said, "God indeed preserves the ship, but the mariner conducts it into harbor." And it is above all faith in a just cause which enables men to persevere, in spite of obstacles, in the noble quest for a better world.

Neither the Hitlerite nor the Soviet occupation has dimmed the Lithuanian people's bright hope of freedom. History teaches that tyrants may have temporary success in defeating just aspirations, but in the end they fall to very low depths indeed. Such, even in our own time, is the paradoxical fate of Josef Stalin. His removal from honored interment to an obscure grave by the Kremlin wall shows quite well that justice has a habit of burying its own undertakers. And this pattern will persist as long as men are willing to fight and die for the freedom which is synonymous with life for them—whether at Thermopylae or Bunker Hill or Budapest or the Berlin wall or the forests of Lithuania.

This is a year of anniversaries. Not only do we mark the 45th year since Lithuania's Declaration of Independence in modern times, but also the 710th anniversary of the foundation of the kingdom of Lithuania under King Mindaugas. And at the same time that we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation, we commemorate the 100th anniversary of the great Lithuanian uprising against czarist domination. The pattern of liberty and justice is woven firmly into the lives of Lithuanians. Though they now experience "the perilous night," as did Francis Scott Key, they know that the day will come and that, "with the dawn's early light," their flag will still be there. Long may it wave.

In closing, I would like to read to you the text of a letter for which Lithuanians everywhere will be grateful. It speaks for itself. It is in connection with this anniversary, and I am happy that it reached me in time for me to read it to you:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, February 8, 1963.

"DEAR MR. CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES: Permit me to convey, in the name of the Government and the people of the United States, the warm regard of this country for the Lithuanian nation on the occasion of its 45th anniversary of independent statehood. Americans remain strongly convinced that your people, like all other nations, are entitled to freedom and national self-determination. For this reason our Government continues not to recognize the forced incorporation of Lithuania in the Soviet Union. We are confident that the proven devotion of Lithuanians to liberty and justice, with which many of them have enriched our own shores, will serve their nation well in its efforts to achieve the eventual restoration of its rights.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marks the 45th anniversary of Estonian independence, and I am honored to join my fellow Americans in observing this important milestone in the life of a brave captive nation.

It was on February 24, 1918, that the Estonian National Council declared that "as of today Estonia within its historical and ethnic boundaries, is proclaimed an independent, democratic republic." Since 1710 when Peter I conquered their homeland the Estonians had been living under the Russian yoke. Independence came after many uprisings and brutal reprisals, including the important 1905 revolution.

After Estonia's liberation the Russians tried to restore their control of the new Republic. The Communists staged an unsuccessful coup in 1924 and were outlawed. They went underground, however, to continue their subversive propaganda and espionage. The Soviets aggressive designs were finally realized in 1940 when they seized control of Estonia in violation of their pledges to respect Estonian sovereignty and to abstain from interference in the internal affairs of the country. Shortly Estonia was invaded by Nazi Germany and then reoccupied by the Red army in 1944. Since then the Estonians have been forcibly maintained as a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R.

During its 20-year period of independence Estonia developed a stable and well-balanced economy, founded on the principles of private enterprise and initiative. But the expropriation and sovietization policies of the Kremlin destroyed the economic structure of independent Estonia and forced it into the economic mold of the Soviet Union. Estonia's farms were collectivized and its workers subjected to a 20th-century version of medieval serfdom.

The forcible annexation of Estonia and her Baltic neighbors is a bitter reminder of the dangers of Soviet totalitarianism. Although Estonia has fallen victim to Communist tyranny, the Estonian people are determined to resist their oppressors. On this anniversary we reaffirm our refusal to recognize the Soviet annexation of the Baltic peoples and express our faith in their ultimate victory over tyranny.

Estonian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the observance of an anniversary of the declaration of independence is an occasion for festivities and celebrations in most countries throughout the world. Yesterday we observed the 45th anniversary of the gaining of independence by the small Baltic country of Estonia. It is unfortunate that we cannot join in a celebration of this occasion with all our Estonian friends. The observance of this day serves more as a reaffirmation of the hope that Americans, and free Estonians

everywhere, have of seeing the reemergence of a free independent Estonia. It will only be then that we would join our Estonian friends in a joyful and glorious celebration.

Being a small nation Estonia has, for most of its modern history, been subjected to foreign rule. Its domination by Sweden was only replaced by Russian czarist rule. The realization of the national goal, nurtured throughout the centuries in the hearts of all Estonians, was finally achieved when Russia was in the chaos of a revolution. The Estonians proclaimed their independence on February 24, 1918. With the attainment of independence the Estonians undertook the responsibilities as citizens of a free nation and succeeded in not only rebuilding their devastated and ruined country, but also in advancing in all phases of national activity. However, the ever present Russian threat, now in the clothing of Soviet imperialism, brought about the annexation of Estonia by the U.S.S.R. in 1940.

In spite of all the odds against them, these hearty and valiant people, mindful of the hardships their ancestors went through to achieve independence, have not given up hope that their country will again be free. We admire this persevering hope and on this anniversary we reaffirm our determination never to recognize the Soviet annexation of the Baltic nations and express our hope and prayer for their liberation.

Addresses Given on Occasion of Presentation of 1962 Freedom Award to Jean Monnet, January 23, 1963: Roscoe Drummond, Walter Lippmann, Christian A. Herter, George W. Ball, Jean Monnet, and a Letter from President John F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the 1962 Freedom Award, which is presented annually by Freedom House, was presented on January 23, 1963, to Jean Monnet of France.

Because of present discussions of the state of the Western alliance and because of the great contributions which Jean Monnet has made to the building of that alliance, I believe that Members of Congress will find particularly interesting the speeches which were delivered by a number of distinguished Americans on this occasion.

I, therefore, under unanimous consent, include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the texts of the addresses made by Roscoe Drummond, Walter Lippmann, Christian A. Herter, George W. Ball, and by Jean Monnet together with the text of a letter to Mr. Monnet from President Kennedy.

I should like first, however, to include at this point an editor's note concerning the Freedom House dinner which was published in the February 1963 issue of the journal, Freedom and Union. This issue of Freedom and Union carries the texts of these several addresses.

FULL TEXT OF FREEDOM HOUSE DINNER—MONNET, GAINING FREEDOM AWARD, UPHOLDS HIS PLAN FOR UNITED KINGDOM JOINING SIX AND ATLANTIC UNITY AGAINST DE GAULLE—BALL GIVES HIM J.F.K.'S BACKING

High drama marked the presentation of the 1962 Freedom Award to Jean Monnet by Freedom House in New York City January 23. Only 9 days before its long-announced dinner for him, the basic strategy for European and Atlantic unification he had long led in developing was jeopardized by President de Gaulle at his press conference in Paris January 14, whose text we give on page 9. Most jeopardized were such essential parts as British entry into the Common Market and the concepts embodied in President Kennedy's Trade Expansion Act and Atlantic partnership speech July 4.

The upheaval was basic and world shaking indeed, for reasons we seek to clarify in our editorial on page 1. Mr. Monnet almost canceled his trip to New York for the dinner, but ended by coming there to make his most important public statement after the upset—answering De Gaulle without naming him.

All this served to magnify the already great interest in his speech, and the preceding ones by George Ball, Under Secretary of State (who read a letter to Mr. Monnet from President Kennedy), former Secretary of State Christian Herter, now the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, and columnist Walter Lippmann. To hear them, a distinguished crowd of some 1,400 packed the ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria; and press and TV-radio widely reported them. There follows the text of these speeches, in the order made. On page 25 we add a much fuller exposition of the views of Mr. Herter, a key figure in the coming acts in this drama * * *.—EDITORS.

ROSCOE DRUMMOND, CHAIRMAN, FREEDOM HOUSE, PRESIDING

I welcome you to the company of Freedom House and thank you for joining us in doing honor to the foremost European of our time, a great citizen of France who, more than any of his compatriots, strides with the tide of history.

I offer a brief word about Freedom House itself. In the dark days before Pearl Harbor, Freedom House grew out of the organizations of citizens who were deeply concerned about the mood of Americans who tended to regard Hitler and the Nazi threat to freedom as something about which we could be neutral. And we are not neutral today, when freedom is under more deadly attack than ever before.

Freedom House is an educational and service organization created to help preserve and strengthen our free society. Through the commitment of the time and talent of its board of directors and a contributing membership throughout the country, Freedom House has managed to carry its message to the American people in many ways—its message that today the real enemies are those who would bury freedom, and that in this struggle there is no alternative to the proposition—and the goal—that freemen shall prevail.

Liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats are comfortable under the roof of Freedom House, because within the framework of divergent judgments of how our ends can best be achieved, there is fundamental agreement.

The freedom award has been presented each year since 1943. Its first recipient, Walter Lippmann, will follow me soon on tonight's program in honor of Jean Monnet. Others on this platform who have previously received the freedom award are Gen. Lucius Clay, Dr. James Conant, Paul Hoffman, and David Lilienthal. The roster of previous recipients also includes Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, Dean Acheson, Bernard Baruch, Gen. George Marshall, Edward R. Murrow, Sir Winston Churchill, and Mayor Willy Brandt. Tonight, Jean Monnet honors us by his visit and his acceptance of the freedom award, symbolizing our recognition of his great contribution to freedom.

MONNET TO PREVAIL

(By Walter Lippmann)

My friendship with Jean Monnet goes back to the early days of the League of Nations. Even then he was already launched on his great career. Amidst the violence and the tumult of the 20th century he stands out as the most constructive of the peacemakers.

He has spent his life in a persevering and persistent, in an ingenious and resourceful, labor of planning and negotiation and persuasion. In all his projects and enterprises there has been one central theme, which is how to induce and cajole men to work together for their own good. He has not asked men to be angels and saints, he has asked them to be sensible. He has not preached to them and he has never allowed himself to use the resounding generalities about peace and the unity of mankind. But he has been and he is now, at the summit of his career, the most effective planner and engineer of human unity whom we have known in our time.

I am presuming on a long friendship when I say a few words, not about what he has done, but about what he represents.

The principle of his work has been that peace and prosperity will come as men become enlightened in the pursuit of their interests. This is, I believe, the first article of the democratic credo—that enlightenment is possible and will produce the good life. The democratic credo does not say that men are born to govern themselves. It says that they can learn to govern themselves. And then, when education has enlightened the people, most of them will see that they can realize their own best private interest by working with and not against the enlightened public interest. This may be, as many think it is, a naive faith. I myself have wondered about it in some of the dark times we have lived through, and it may be that the good society can be realized on this earth only if mankind is reborn.

Jean Monnet has been a witness to the democratic faith—which is that there is a rational order in human affairs wherever and whenever men listen to reason and obey it. This faith in the paramountcy of reason is the source of that dauntless optimism which has made Jean Monnet so persevering—many of us would at times have said so stubborn—but so remarkably able to get done what he wants to do.

I am only too well aware that these are anxious days for all who are concerned with the great projects which he has initiated. This country is most concerned with them and with the unanswered questions of how the European Community will come to terms with its partners and allies in the Western World, and beyond them with its rivals in the Eastern World. All will depend, I imagine, on whether in the negotiations across the channel, and then across the Atlantic, those who will make the decisions can conceive the future as closed and restrictive or as open and inclusive.

Enough of the faith and stubbornness of Jean Monnet has rubbed off on me so that I venture to say that there is no doubt as to whether the open conception will prevail over the closed. In the end it will prevail.

What we are anxious about these days is when and how soon it will prevail, whether we are to be set backward into separatism and division with all the wastes and the dangers that go with them or whether we can move forward toward greater unity in a progressively free world.

Partnership Cannot Remain Final Objective of Europe and America—Deeper Tie Ahead

(By Christian A. Herter)

We have come here tonight to welcome and to honor a man who symbolizes for us in a very special way the new Europe that is coming into being.

Jean Monnet is in a real sense one of the principal founding fathers of this Europe. He is, at one and the same time, the foremost private citizen of the European community and also an undisputed son of France. In this dual citizenship he embodies a quality which is essential for everyone of us who wishes to contribute to strengthening the free world. Those of us who are on this side of the Atlantic must learn to live in the same moment as genuine Americans and also as citizens of the whole Atlantic area in our cares and outlook.

We are accustomed to welcoming distinguished French gentlemen to our shores, but seldom have we extended a warmer welcome than we do tonight to Jean Monnet. Many of his predecessors in the 17th and 18th centuries helped to bring a new world into being in North America, and some of them contributed decisively to the establishment of this Republic. But Monnet has dared to undertake a far more formidable task than was ever undertaken by even the most distinguished of his predecessors. They explored and settled a virgin continent unbound by the traditions of the past, while he has called a new world into being in an old world bound by centuries of tradition.

It is an ironic and impressive fact that, if one looks for the newest frontier in the Western World, he will find it not in North America but in Western Europe. Jean Monnet is the most authentic new frontiersman of our time. He, more than most other men, understands the secret of how the miracle of remaking Europe was wrought.

What Jean Monnet has done, if he will permit me to say so, was to recognize and take advantage of one of those rare moments in history when it is possible to recreate society and build institutions better adapted to the requirements of the 20th century. He would be the first to recognize that his achievement has been possible only because the tides of human affairs were running in the direction of what he wanted.

After World War I it was evident that Europe must unite or run the risk of decline. The chance to unite came after World War II. That chance was seized and success appears probable.

But the forces of history are working over a wider area than Western Europe. What has been true of the Continent since 1918 is now true of the whole North Atlantic area. We have learned our lesson. The Atlantic area must achieve greater unity or we will be progressively weakened until eventually we lose our freedom. Unity of free men and of free societies is the price of survival as well as of liberty.

There is, of course, nothing inevitable about our achieving the unity necessary for survival. We know, however, that centuries of human struggle and suffering have produced the unique opportunity that now lies before us. Further, we believe that the achievement of this unity is in the nature of things and that the forces of history are working toward this end. We also know that the moment of opportunity could pass and that Western society could succumb once more to the barbarians hammering at our gates if people like ourselves in America and Western Europe are not equal to the task.

Progress has been made. There is an operating military alliance, though a good deal remains to be done if it is to become as effective as it should be.

On July 4 last, the President defined the relationship between the new Europe that is coming into being and the United States as one of active partnership. The practice of partnership involves, as a first major step, the establishment of trade relations between the two partners that will serve their common interests, as well as the interests of each, to the maximum degree possible.

Partnership, however, good as it is, can never remain the ultimate and final objective of Europe and America. The forces of history are working toward a broader and deeper relationship than that. We are all (Europeans and Americans alike) heirs of the same great cultural heritage with similar views about the nature and destiny of man and the character of human society. In other words, we already belong to each other. Our task in the years ahead is to find out how to express the reality of this fact in institutional terms.

Some of us in this country prefer to talk about the future in terms of an Atlantic Community. I know that our European friends shy away from this phrase because for them the word "community" has already acquired a clear and precise meaning—technical, economic, and political—as the emerging structure of their continent. In short, they feel that the use of the word has already been preempted by Europe and that its use here to describe our ultimate goal merely produces confusion of thought and intention.

ATLANTIC COMMUNITY—GOAL TOWARD WHICH JEAN MONNET LEADS

At the same time, for many Americans, "community" is such a good word to describe relationships between people that I suspect some of us will continue to use it. I am a New Englander. In New England we say "community" when we are thinking about a society in which people live together as good neighbors, with a common recognition of the supremacy of law, and sharing the benefits of varied economic and political institutions while united by their common cultural heritage and by their feeling of a common destiny. It is in this sense that I speak of the Atlantic community—a goal toward which Jean Monnet's path leads.

The path to that community or partnership, if you prefer, will at times be steep and hazardous. The road upon which we have embarked will not be easy. Setbacks of the kind we are now witnessing are perhaps to be expected. It is inherent in a free society that men should differ on matters of policy between those who see their proper interests or the interests of their respective nations in different terms. At times these differences may well appear to be irreconcilable but I am confident that with the momentum already achieved we will overcome these differences.

History does not consist of a stream of events flowing at the same rate of speed. History unfolds by fits and starts. In the course of our human pilgrimage, sometimes centuries have passed by without there existing much possibility of creative change. Then a moment comes when change is possible if men are at hand who are willing to take advantage of it. Such a moment, thanks to Jean Monnet, is now with us.

Mr. Europe Can Become a Majority

(By George W. Ball)

First of all, I am serving as a courier to deliver a letter from the President of the United States to Jean Monnet, and I would like to read this letter [printed at end of speech].

And now, if I may, let me add a few personal observations about a man whom it has been my great fortune to know for 20 years. All who have enjoyed the close friendship of Jean Monnet—and our number is legion—can recount innumerable incidents to illustrate his qualities as a friend—his generosity and compassion, his warmth and thoughtfulness, his genuine concern for the problems of others.

But Jean Monnet would be impatient with me were I to pursue this theme tonight. No man has ever cared less for personal adulation and he has not come here for that purpose. Jean Monnet has not flown across the Atlantic at a time of crisis to receive personal honor but rather to participate in honoring and explaining those ideas of which he is a symbol in the hope that they may be even better understood.

ATLANTIC TIE MOST SIGNIFICANT

So tonight I shall not speak of Jean Monnet, that warm, gallant, and modest friend from Cognac. Neither shall I seek to expound his ideas, for he will do that much better himself. Rather I shall say a few words about that almost legendary figure of epic stature who has become known to an admiring world as Mr. Europe.

Jean Monnet has become Mr. Europe, it seems to me, because he is preeminently a modern man. More deeply than any of us he has perceived the central discord of our complex time—the discord between our technology on the one hand, with its rapid pace of advance and its requirements of scope and scale, and, on the other hand, the institutional arrangements under which we live, so slow to change and so often parochial in character. The consequences of this discord are familiar to all of us. They are evident in the problems we deal with every day—the problems of our cities, of our schools, and of our transportation systems—not to mention our newspapers. But they find their most significant expression in the relations between the peoples of the Atlantic world, where defense is indivisible, where economic life is interdependent, and where the major political decisions must of necessity be taken in concert if the full strength of the free world is to be effectively mobilized against a common danger.

OBSOLETE, FIERCELY HELD IDEAS

Because Jean Monnet has seen this fact with crystal clarity he has striven to transform the nation states of Europe into a new unity, not merely to end forever the frictions that more than once have embroiled the whole world in sanguinary conflict but to enable Europe to contribute its full potential to the shaping of a better world. And at the same time he has sought to promote between Europe and the United States that close cooperation which can give real content and meaning to the Atlantic partnership.

These objectives have represented no utopian dream. Jean Monnet is indubitably hardheaded and pragmatic, but he recognizes a compelling logic in world affairs.

I have called Jean Monnet a modern man, but this does not mean that he is unaware or disdainful of the past. Indeed he has, I think, a profound sense of the meaning of history and of the deep forces it has generated. He has had the insight to recognize that history is not a static affair, not the constant replaying of old themes, but a flow of events which, if man is to survive, must be channeled in directions that meet the requirements of an evolving new age.

He has, therefore, never been tempted into the unhappy error—induced by a nostalgic longing for a world that never was—of seeking to recapture the past. He has not sought to unfurl ancient banners, reinstate old forms, revive the vanished symbols that beglamored the centuries gone by. Instead

he has pursued the more relevant purpose of bending men's efforts toward a nobler future.

It is because Jean Monnet so clearly perceives the nature of the great tidal forces at work in the world that he is sturdily immune to transient disappointments. I have been with him on more than one occasion when the movement of new ideas has seemed to many of us irrevocably halted by the abrupt intrusion of obsolete—yet fiercely held—ideas that echoed a distant and earlier age. Invariably—and sometimes almost alone—Jean Monnet has remained undismayed. At such moments of crisis his reaction is always the same. "What has happened, has happened," he is inclined to say, "but it does not affect anything fundamental. The important point is for us not to be deflected, not to lose momentum. We must go forward. We may alter our tactics but never our main objectives."

MONNET AN INCORRIGIBLE OPTIMIST

It is because of this apparent imperturbability that Jean Monnet is known—to the admiration of his friends and the exasperation of his opponents—as an incorrigible optimist. This attitude of mind does not stem from any panglossian idea that all is the best in the best of all possible worlds, but rather from a dauntless faith in the logic of events and the essential rationality of man—a faith in the ineluctable direction of deeply moving forces. Jean Monnet is an optimist because he is a practical man with a passionate desire to get things done—and for such a man optimism is the only useful working hypothesis.

As a practical man he pursues his purposes in a most practical way—a way that is peculiarly his own. Mr. Walter Lippmann has just spoken of him as a man who can "induce and cajole men to work together for their own good." To say it in other words, Jean Monnet is the supreme practitioner of the art of personal diplomacy. And he practices that art with unfailing perception of the loci of power and with an extraordinary singlemindedness.

Optimism works for him because he accepts opponents but not defeat. I still remember a book he once gave me—the story of an Arab prince who, in a time of troubles, went out to the desert to find the wisdom of the ages. The prince returned from his sojourn with this motto:

> May God bless even my enemies.
> For they too are a means to my end.

[Applause.]

It is by the vital force of his deep convictions, in short, that Jean Monnet has become Mr. Europe—the keeper of the conscience of a continent. And he has demonstrated anew the ancient adage that a resolute man, plus the truth, can become a majority.

Essential United Kingdom Join Market

(By Jean Monnet)

I am moved and embarrassed by what Mr. Lippmann, Mr. Herter, and Mr. Ball have said. I shall not try to answer them.

I am very honored to receive from the board of trustees of Freedom House the Freedom Award at your hands today. That you are giving this award to a European is a proof of the deep community of mind and feeling that unite the people of Europe and North America.

I am convinced this feeling is rooted in our common civilization, the essence of which is its tradition of freedom. This freedom truly is the main issue between the two ways of approaching life that compete for men's minds today.

So many people have written and spoken about liberty more thoroughly than I can that I want to limit myself to what seems to me the most important and urgent practical problem confronting the West and its tradition of freedom, the one that requires action from us today.

The worst enemies of freedom have been, and still are, the spirit of domination and its consequences, the threat of war.

While within our frontiers we have organized liberty and, by mutual consent, maintained the rule of law that largely eliminates the spirit of domination, internationally we are still maintaining peace by force.

Now we must go beyond national frontiers and create new forms of relationships between countries.

The next step ahead of us must clearly be to complete the unity of Europe including Britain [applause], and gradually develop a strong partnership of equals between the United States and Europe. [Applause.]

PEACE AND FREEDOM

These are essential for the organization of peace in the world and the maintenance of freedom.

For, as we progress toward the unity of the West, we will create the conditions favoring a lasting peace between the West and the Soviet Union.

Naturally, the process of putting these great aims into practice involves great changes in the form of relationships now existing between our nations. This brings us up against difficulties.

I would like to talk of the one that looms largest over us all at this moment. It is more than important, it is essential that Britain should join our European Community under the same conditions as the present members. The negotiations have been going on too long but they can be rapidly concluded.

We must remember that on fundamental issues, as two world wars have proved, Britain is part of Europe.

People in Britain and on the Continent must free their minds of the obsolete and static idea that Britain, because an island, is bound to be insular, that she does not belong to Europe and that her commercial policies and interests will keep her forever apart from the natural trend toward European unity.

Entry into Europe would be good for Britain, for Europe, for the West and for world peace. [Applause.]

I still hope and believe, like most people in the Six, that the negotiations on Britain's entry into Europe will succeed.

Those who have had anything to do with European unity known from their own experience that the difficulties encountered at any moment do not matter so long as the objective is kept clearly in view.

EUROPEAN ECONOMIC UNITY

The world has recently become aware of the success of European economic unity, and people everywhere see political unity emerging in Europe. But this sudden awareness has concealed the 12 years of work, and often of serious trouble, that lie behind the achievement.

When the treaty for the European Defense Community was rejected in 1954, most competent observers thought unity in Europe was dead and buried. And yet the progress we have made during the last 12 years shows that, despite all the difficulties, we are on the way.

The countries of continental Europe—France, Germany, Italy, and the Benelux—are uniting in a European Economic Community of nearly 200 million people.

Germany and France, which have struggled to dominate one another for centuries, are now coming together, accepting the fact that they have the same destiny. In the European Economic Community they are pursuing a common course of action which is gradually transforming their mutual relations and the outlook of their peoples. They have even been considering closer cooperation in all fields. I have no doubt that France, which has been, from the start, a founder of European unity, will follow this course. [Applause.]

Why is this profound change taking place?

It is because the countries of the European Community have agreed that their economic problems which, in the past, were national responsibilities, have now become common responsibilities and being common, unite them instead of dividing them.

It is because they have established common rules and common institutions that they can do the job.

It is because each of the steps they have taken one after another, as circumstances allowed, have been designed to further the same objective.

The European Coal and Steel Community which was the beginning of all this enterprise, was not set up just to pool coal and steel, but as a first step on the way to European union.

THE COMMON MARKET

The Common Market has not been created just to build a better system of exchanging goods, or to create a new power. We have had, and have, as our objectives, essentially the creation of a united Europe and the elimination between nations and their peoples of the spirit of domination that has brought the world close to destruction many times.

To produce such a change, it was essential to eliminate the feeling of discrimination between nations that was the inevitable consequence of the many European wars.

To begin to unite Europe only 5 years after the war, it was vital that everyone should see that there were no more victors or vanquished, but only partners equal before the common law.

The institutions of the Common Market work in such a way that discrimination between European nations has now been ended.

The independent European Commission is the authority empowered to propose the economic policies of the Community. The national governments whose representatives sit in the Council of Ministers, decide on the common policies proposed by the Commission according to the rules and spirit of the Rome Treaty. In a widening field its decisions no longer require unanimity.

The attitudes of the people of Europe are rapidly changing. The peoples of these Community countries, the producers, the farmers, labor and the members of the professions, have become partners in change and are taking on the same Community outlook.

In fact when you look at it, they are the same people as they have been for centuries, but their attitudes toward one another have changed.

This is the process of civilization itself.

This process is taking us faster and further than anyone would have dared to hope after the war.

Britain's request to enter the European union is one sign of it.

Another is your President's speech on the last 4th of July, where he called for a partnership of equals between the United States of America and the European Community. You are now preparing to negotiate new trade links across the Atlantic which must serve the interests of the world as a whole.

AMERICAN SUPPORT FOR EUROPEAN UNITY

Ever since the Marshal plan, and the Schuman plan, American support for European unity has never faltered.

I can testify from my own experience that this support has been invaluable in bringing European unity to the point where it is today. For once, the most powerful country in the world has helped others to unite instead of adopting the old principle of divide and rule.

But during all those years, the United States took her decisions alone. Now the partnership means a new form of relations.

Let me read to you what the Action Committee of the United States of Europe said on this matter in its joint declaration of June 26 last:

"The partnership between America and a united Europe must be a relationship of two separate but equally powerful entities, each bearing its share of common responsibilities in the world. This partnership is natural and inevitable because the peoples of Europe and America share the same civilization based on freedom and conduct their public life in accordance with common democratic principles."

I think this has implications for defense which, with the entry of Britain into the Common Market, is the main problem that looms over the great debate in the West.

We must recognize in this nuclear age, that while making every effort to disarm, we must pursue and improve our common defense with all its political implications on both sides of the Atlantic.

Europe and America must both acknowledge that neither of us is defending a particular country, that we are all defending our common civilization. [Applause.]

You, in the United States, must realize that the claims of Europe to share common responsibility and authority for decisions on defense, including the nuclear weapons, is natural since any decision involves the very existence of the European peoples.

EUROPE'S SHARE OF DEFENSE

On the other hand, I think the Europeans must understand that the nuclear terror is indivisible and that they too must shoulder an adequate share of the common defense.

Today, however, the countries of the Atlantic Alliance have such divergent views of their immediate interests that a common approach to the problem has to be developed if agreement is to be achieved.

To achieve the partnership between Europe and America, we must create an increasingly common interest by acting in common on a growing number of questions. When sufficient points of common interest have been created, a degree of community in defense will be accepted that today appears utopian.

In my opinion, while progress on defense must be sought continuously, the field where results can be most promptly obtained is the economic one.

There are urgent problems which neither Europe nor America can settle alone. These are, to my mind, the monetary stability of the West, the organization of agriculture in an increasingly industrial world, help to the developing countries to speed their growth and, of course, the freeing of trade to be negotiated between yourselves and the Common Market.

I realize that economic partnership will not automatically lead to a partnership for defense. In Europe too, the Common Market alone is not enough to create political union. But without the Common Market, political union would never have been raised as a practical issue. Similarly, the creation of the rules and institutions needed to build up the economic partnership between the United States and Europe will change the context for dealing with defense. It will then appear in a new light on both sides of the Atlantic.

The unity of Europe and its partnership with the United States will not only change the relationship between us, it will fundamentally change the relationship of the West with the Soviet Union.

As long as Russia believes the West can be divided, it will be tempted to upset the balance of power in its favor.

As we organize new forms of relationship between the Western nations, we will be showing ourselves, the Soviet Union and the rest of the world, that as a result of the union of Europe and its partnership with the United States, the West cannot be divided.

The conditions will then exist for establishing the basis of lasting peace between the Soviet Union and ourselves.

I believe this development can come much faster than we imagine today. My hope is based on my experience of European unity. This experience has been that once people are convinced a new situation is inevitable, they adapt themselves to it spontaneously and by doing so, hasten the process itself.

This is the most helpful road to the creation of peace today, and to the consolidation of freedom. [Ovation.]

UNITED STATES, EUROPE DEFEND COMMON CIVILIZATION

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 22, 1963.

His Excellency JEAN MONNET,
President, Action Committee for the United States of Europe.

DEAR MR. MONNET: I am delighted to join my friends at Freedom House in doing honor to your great achievements. You come at a moment of high importance—and you come as the exemplar of disinterested service to Europe and to the Atlantic world.

For centuries, emperors, kings, and dictators have sought to impose unity on Europe by force. For better or worse, they have failed. But under your inspiration, Europe has moved closer to unity in less than 20 years than it had done before in a thousand. You and your associates have built with the mortar of reason and the brick of economic and political interest. You are transforming Europe by the power of a constructive idea.

Ever since the war the reconstruction and the knitting together of Europe have been objectives of United States policy, for we have recognized with you that in unity lies strength. And we have also recognized with you that a strong Europe would be good not only for Europeans but for the world. America and a united Europe, working in full and effective partnership, can find solutions to those urgent problems that confront all mankind in this crucial time.

I have been happy, therefore, to read your statement of January 16 in which you call attention to the responsibility of Europe to share with the United States in the common defense of the West. I believe, with you, that "Americans and Europeans must recognize that neither one nor the other is defending a particular country, but that the ensemble is defending a common civilization." The United States will be true to this conviction, and we trust that it will have the support of Europeans too.

Your practical wisdom, your energy in persuasion, your tested courage, and your earned eminence in Europe are the reasons for this celebration in your honor. They are also a great resource for freedom, and I wish you many years of continued strength in your service to our cause.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Nahum 1: 7: *The Lord is good, a stronghold in the day of trouble; and He knoweth them that trust in Him.*

Eternal God, our Father, grant that daily we may be lifted by the mighty tides of Thy gracious spirit into the glad assurance that Thou art able and willing to help us meet faithfully all our tasks and responsibilities.

Grant that we may be inspired to put the various problems of life in the right perspective for we are frequently far more conscious of our perplexities than we are of Thy divine power which we may appropriate by faith.

May it be our highest wisdom to trust in Thee and go forth with a firm and calm reliance that we shall be guided by Thee in the high adventure of building a nobler civilization.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

UNITED STATES MUST FIND WAY TO LIBERATE CUBANS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Russian occupation of Cuba, a nation of the Western Hemisphere, has sounded an alarm in every city, village, and hamlet of the New World. The voices of concern raised in the United States are many. One voice raised Sunday merits the careful study and, in my judgment, the support of every straight-thinking American. I refer to that great man from Independence, Mo., the Honorable Harry S. Truman.

Former Presidents of our country by tradition are properly regarded as the elder statesmen and their counsel in times of crisis has much significance. The man from Independence is known throughout the world as the man of decision. In the stormy days of his administration when our Nation carried almost singlehanded the great burden of freedom's cause against the imperial tyranny of the Russians, it was he who stemmed the tide of Communist aggression and launched programs to buttress the frontiers of freedom throughout the world. When the chips were down he acted with a resolute will and determination which rallied our Nation and the friends of freedom on farflung fronts. Harry S. Truman has won a special place in the hearts of his countrymen by the boldness of his vision and the determination of his purposes.

Now, when the frontiers of freedom are many, when the United States has strong and able allies in common cause, when the Russian empire shows strong signs of internal conflict which the masters in the Kremlin cannot control, when the security of the entire Western Hemisphere is directly challenged by the new imperialism of Moscow—the man from

Independence, Mo., has spoken out in the Washington Post in a thoughtful article entitled "United States Must Find Way To Liberate Cubans."

By leave obtained, I insert this article in the RECORD and commend this guidepost to action to all who share the responsibility for the future of freedom's cause:

UNITED STATES MUST FIND WAY TO LIBERATE CUBANS

INDEPENDENCE, MO., February 23.—Along with everyone else, I have been concerned about the situation in Cuba. The Cuban people have been beset with internal problems almost from the time Cuba was discovered by Columbus. One set of tyrants seems to be succeeded by another in guise of liberators.

In an open society such as ours it is natural for people freely to express their opinions, or in other words to sound off. This tendency is particularly apparent in times of crisis. There is now much talk about Cuba. There are those who read and talk about it—and there are those who tell those in charge what to do and how to do it.

That is all right, as far as it goes, but it does no good and could do much harm if we get into a political hassle about it. Foreign policy should never be an issue between the great political parties. The United States should agree on and have but one approach to dealings with other nations.

Is there no hope for Cuba? Is Cuba now doomed to become the Balkan satellite of the American continent? Are the Cuban people without hope of becoming a genuinely free and independent people? These and many other questions are being raised.

The one thing that history teaches us over and over again is that no system of government that defies the will of its people can long endure and, while modern weapons in the hands of a new crop of quislings make the task of liberation more formidable, it is as true today as it ever was that the will of a people to be free is irresistible.

Any government that imposes its will from the top will be overthrown in time. This happens when the people reach that certain point of loss of patience and the congealment of their will to resist.

Cuba, historically, has suffered a long series of misfortunes, from its rulers and their depredations, greed, and corruption. From the time in 1898 when the United States intervened in Cuba to set her free and to help her establish and maintain a free government for the benefit of all of her people, she has experienced one failure after another.

We have always been sympathetic toward the Cuban people, but for one reason or another things never seemed to work out so that the affairs of Cuba could be administered by honest and devoted patriots rather than the greedy, selfish, grafting dictators that kept succeeding one another.

The present situation in Cuba defies all reasoning. Castro, as a revolutionary leader fighting to unseat dictator Batista, attracted sympathetic support from many quarters in this hemisphere, and from the United States in particular. There was some reason to hope that here at long last there may have arisen a true patriot and able leader, who would devote his energies to the establishment of representative government and put through necessary reforms for the benefit of all the Cuban people.

But again our hopes were doomed to disappointment. The man, Castro, became inflated and power mad—and incapable of the kind of leadership Cuba needed in her period of reconstruction.

Instead of applying his energies to the solution of the needs of Cuba, Castro betrayed his revolution by delivering the Cuban people to the political imprisonment of a Russian-made Communist dictatorship. He thus committed Cuba to a life of crisis, aggression, oppression and intrigue.

PUT OFF RESPONSIBILITY

We admit that our policies toward Cuba, and I would include my own administration as well, have left something to be desired. For some reason we have put off for too long our responsibility to put pressure on the Cuban leaders to institute badly needed reforms.

The situation in Cuba today is not unlike that of the plight from which many satellite nations are suffering, except that the tragedy of Cuba could have been prevented by us.

Somehow we must seek a way of helping the Cuban people to liberate themselves once and for all. The world situation today is vastly different from what it was at the time we liberated Cuba from Spain. We now have the United Nations, which could have been helpful and perhaps could be in the future. We have the Organization of American States and other cooperative agencies that also could have been enlisted in dealing with that situation. But all of that is water over the dam.

MODERN WEAPONS

There is one thing we cannot do and must not do and that is to abandon Cuba to her self-imposed tyrants and new conquerors. For as long as these people enforce their will by the use of modern weapons the Cuban people will be compelled to undergo prolonged suffering, before they can hope to restore themselves by the process of spontaneous popular uprising.

The Cuban people are now pretty much in the same fix as the Hungarians who found that they could not liberate themselves by attempting to meet mechanized Russian divisions with rifles and home made explosives.

But Cuba is in our own frontyard where we have a direct responsibility to make her people free again. The first time we "remembered the *Maine*"—now we should never forget to "remember the missiles." Now we must seriously consider the Communists and their Asian and Eastern European ideas.

IN DIFFERENT CATEGORY

It is my opinion that until the sources of all the world's tensions and dangers are overcome within those nations that constitute the centers of the Communist conspiracy, namely, the police states of Russia and China, there is little chance for the occupied satellites to settle matters for themselves.

But I repeat that the Cuban situation is in a different category and should not be confused with the, other satellite victims within the Russian-Chinese orbit. Cuba was delivered to Communist control and domination by a betrayal of a modern-day Quisling, Castro. He perpetrated this act of treason against Cuban people and even his revolutionary followers in the name of liberation from "colonialism." But instead of winning her freedom from her own dictatorship, Cuba has become a colony again—a colony of Communist Russia.

I think that it is well that we take a look at the record of our past relations with Cuba. From early 1899 to mid-1902, while Cuba was under temporary U.S. military rule following her liberation from Spain, most of the offices were placed under Cuban nationals. During that period much was done to build public works, strict measures of sanitation were put into effect, the civil service was reformed and public education significantly improved. Yellow fever, which had been plaguing Cuba for centuries, was eradicated.

At the same time a constitutional convention was called to establish a system for self-government. The first Cuban Continental Congress met on May 5, 1902, and we turned over control of the government to the people of Cuba.

In restoring Cuba to self-government the so-called Platt amendment was accepted by Cuba on June 12, 1901, as a part of its constitution.

AMENDMENT PROVISIONS

Among the several provisions of the Platt amendment were these:

1. The sanitation measures set up by the military were to be maintained.
2. Naval stations were authorized to be leased to the United States.
3. The United States reserved the right to interfere in the affairs of the island if it became necessary.

It seems to me that when it appeared that the situation in Cuba was getting out of hand and that a threat to the security of this hemisphere was clearly in the making, we should have considered that the basic implications of the Monroe Doctrine were at stake, as well as the reservation imposed by the Platt amendment, which anticipated precisely such a development. These provisions, the Monroe Doctrine and the Platt amendment, were there as much for the welfare and protection of Cuba as for the security of all the other nations of this continent.

FAR FROM EXHAUSTED

The situation is clear, the problem is obvious, the solution not so apparent. But, like the bubonic plague of cholera, quarantining is one remedy that every public health authority knows must be imposed until a virulent epidemic abates.

As a nation devoted to peace, we have had to suffer much abuse and provocation at the hands of the Communists, but we have been patient. And our patience, though often sorely tried, is far from exhausted. We, of course, continue to hope that someway, somehow, the Cuban people will see to it that these latter-day quislings are overthrown and that freedom and the needed reforms are established for the benefit of all the Cuban people.

A former President, much as he might try, cannot detach himself from events, even long after he is out of office. On one of my walks a thought kept going through my mind on how I might have dealt with Castro if it had been mine to do. This is how I saw it: Immediately after the conclusion of the revolution in Cuba, I would have invited Castro to the White House. This is the way I might have put it to him:

"Mr. Castro, your revolution is over and now you have the responsibility and the big job of reconstruction. You have made a great many promises to your people in enlisting their support. How are you going to make good in those promises? You don't have the resources of your own in Cuba, and there are no means in sight to enable you to perform the things you promised the Cuban people.

"Now, there are only two places where you might get the necessary economic support to put over your program of reforms. We are close to Cuba and we have historic ties with your country. All we would expect in return for our support would be that you keep the Cuban institutions free, and the Cuban people free, and that you get rid of corruption. This is all we would ask, this is all we would expect, and Cuba would enjoy complete sovereignty and independence as a nation. But if you should elect to go the other way—the Communist way—you will become a puppet and that can only lead you to more trouble and bloodshed."

WE STAND FIRM

I would have hoped that after some such exchange we should have come to an understanding and I think we might have reached a friendly agreement. All this, of course, needed to have been quietly negotiated within the privacy of the White House. With that out of the way I might have closed our meeting with a friendly suggestion, perhaps something like this:

"Now that we understand each other, Fidel, let us get to work and do all we can for the cause of your people."

The Cuban crisis has served one useful purpose—it again smoked out the Russian capacity for bluff and their hit-and-run type of international piracy. And it provided the United States with an opportunity to make it clear to the Communist aggressors that once the line is drawn we stand firm.

A NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, if anyone had any doubts about the gambling spirit of the American people such doubts should have been removed as the result of the activities last night at Yonkers Raceway in New York.

Not only did we witness 28,732 legal bettors going through the turnstiles to wager over $2 million but we saw how this instinctive universal human trait was unruffled by inclement weather. This tremendous crowd of decent citizens braved the snow and 30° temperature to enjoy an evening of relaxation, pleasure, and recreation.

Mr. Speaker, last night was the earliest opening of horse racing in New York State not because of the State's interest in the improvement of breeding horses but because of the State treasury's need for additional tax revenue.

Last night's activities, profitable to the State and the National Government as well, clearly indicated that the urge to gamble is deeply ingrained in most human beings and that neither snow nor cold weather will stop people from gambling—legally or illegally.

Mr. Speaker, if we had the courage to recognize and accept the obvious, we could easily, painlessly, and voluntarily pump into our Federal treasury over $10 billion a year in additional income through a national lottery. A national lottery would provide the answer to our Government's great need for more revenue and the American taxpayers' demand for tax relief.

MANAGED NEWS

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include an article from the Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, during the session yesterday there was much said about the management of the news. The American Society of Newspaper Editors are also very much concerned over this situation, as is indicated by the following article appearing in the Washington Evening Star on Saturday, February 23, 1963:

> ### Editors Irked on Managed News Policy
>
> Athens, Ga., February 23.—The President of the American Society of Newspaper Editors says the Kennedy administration should end the debate over managed news by disavowing publicly its use as part of national policy.
>
> Lee Hills, executive editor of Knight newspapers, told the Georgia Press Institute yesterday that such a disavowal might restore public confidence and end the managed news debate.
>
> "Manipulation of the news is the Soviet way of manipulating people, and this manipulation of human beings is the biggest difference between communism and our system," Mr. Hills said.
>
> Mr. Hills noted that while he was in Russia last summer as head of a group from the newspaper editors society, one of his Russian hosts mentioned that the Russian press is a weapon in the ideological struggle.
>
> "Is it any wonder then, that there was an outcry in America when a U.S. spokesman said that managing the news was part of the weaponry of our national policy in the Cuban crisis last October?" Mr. Hills said.
>
> "When this was followed by the astonishing statement that it is all right to lie—to practice news deception—a crisis of confidence was created that even Secretary McNamara's remarkable TV briefing didn't dispel."
>
> The American people do not want to be told security secrets, Mr. Hills added, but neither do they want to be misled.

PUBLIC WORKS BUILDING PROGRAM

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to call attention to a public works building program that was proposed by the Post Office Department and approved by the General Services Administration some time last fall. Members of Congress were furnished copies of the proposal December 11, 1962.

The proposed program contemplated the acquisition of sites, design and construction of 145 small public buildings, ranging in cost from $115,500 to $399,400, for use of the Post Office Department and/or other Federal agencies. The total estimated maximum cost of the 145 projects was placed at $32,064,200 at that time. The justification of this program was, quoting from the prospectus:

> In many cities throughout the United States there is a serious shortage of Federal office and postal space and an urgent need to provide adequate space and facilities in which Federal agencies can carry out their programs. At least two major factors are responsible for this situation. For a period of 20 years, from immediately prior to World War II to the late 1950's, there was virtually no public building construction to provide adequate space. Secondly, in the period following the war there has been a phenomenal growth and shifting in the population of the United States. There is every reason to believe that this growth will continue in the foreseeable future.
>
> Traditionally the Congress has authorized and appropriated funds for the construction of public buildings to accommodate postal and other governmental operations throughout the United States. Recognizing the urgent need for public buildings construction, the Congress by enactment of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 authorized and directed the Administrator of General Services to make a continuing investigation and survey of the public buildings needs of the Federal Government and provided a procedural charter for securing authorization for such urgently needed construction. GSA's initial efforts under the act have emphasized the public building needs in the larger communities and urban centers where there are greater concentrations of Federal activities. However, there is an equally urgent need for public building construction in the smaller communities.
>
> Post Office facilities are totally inadequate to meet the requirements of the postal service for the efficient handling of a constantly increasing volume of mail. Substantial growth of Federal agency programs has forced agencies to house their operations in whatever privately owned space could be made available. There is an urgent need to provide a public building in the smaller community which will offer better service to the general public doing business with the Federal activities located in the community for carrying out local programs. In addition to providing adequate and efficient workspace for the Government's programs, such public buildings are the symbol of the Government of the United States to the people in the communities they serve.

I was in Washington attending a subcommittee meeting of the House Committee on Agriculture on the day that this prospectus reached my office. Out of curiosity I examined the report to see if any projects were proposed for the State of Missouri. There were three—located in towns and villages ranging in population from 658 to 1,887. The three projects were estimated to cost respectively $187,200, $190,300, and $245,000. Each of these buildings was to be used primarily as a post office building with 750 square feet to be reserved for other agencies. Being more or less familiar with each of these communities, and also being aware of the fact that several adequate and attractive post office buildings had been built in communities of the 10th Congressional District under the lease arrangement that has been in effect for the past several years, I began making a comparison of cost in communities of similar size. For instance, in communities of approximately 1,250 population, buildings have cost in the neighborhood of from $25,000 to $35,000; and in one small city of more than 5,000 population in my home county, a most attractive modern, air-conditioned building located on a large lot with adequate parking facilities for the public and postal employees, was constructed at a cost of approximately $75,000 including the cost of the site.

Less than a week after I had questioned the justification of many of the buildings on this list, I was advised that I was correct in my conclusion to the extent that the one building which was proposed to be built in a small town of less than 750 population in the 10th Missouri District at an estimated cost of $187,200 could not be justified and therefore was being removed from the list of proposed projects.

However, out of fairness, I must say that this was not the only project removed, for in a revised prospectus under date of January 31, 1963, only 84 projects of the original 145 proposed projects were retained and 2 new projects added, and the estimated cost was cut from $32,064,200 down to $20,543,800. This does not mean, however, that all of the 86 projects can be justified because under no stretch of the imagination can an expenditure of $245,000 be justified for a post office building in a community of approximately 2,000 people. Particularly is this confirmed when we see beautiful buildings with every modern facility and of adequate size being built in towns of more than 5,000 population at a cost of approximately $75,000.

I appreciate the fact that all of these buildings are proposed for communities that have been designated as eligible for area redevelopment projects. I am not opposed to the purposes of the accelerated programs, but I am opposed to programs that waste public funds by spending five times as much for a facility as has been found necessary to spend on comparable projects.

I hope that the members of the House Committee on Public Works will examine this program very carefully before giving the General Services Administration the go-ahead sign.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CREDIT AGAINST ESTATE TAX FOR TAP ON CERTAIN PRIOR TRANSFERS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 780), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers in the case of decedents dying after December 31, 1947, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 814 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 is hereby amended—
>
> (1) by striking out in subsection (a) of such section "December 31, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1949";
>
> (2) by striking out "within two years" wherever appearing in subsections (a) and (b) of such section and inserting in lieu thereof "after December 31, 1947, and within three years"; and
>
> (3) by adding at the end of subsection (c) of such section the following new paragraph:
>
> "(3) Reduction of credit in certain cases.—If the transferor predeceased the decedent by more than two years, the credit shall be 80 percent of the amount determined under subsections (b) and (c) (1) and (2)."
>
> Sec. 2. A timely claim based upon a deduction for property previously taxed under section 812(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 may be deemed to be a claim based upon a credit for prior taxed property under section 814 of such Act as amended by the first section of this Act.
>
> Sec. 3. No interest shall be allowed or paid on any overpayment resulting from the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes] and I may extend our remarks in connection with the bills that may be passed by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 780, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable Eugene J. Keogh, of New York, is to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers in the case of decedents dying after December 31, 1947.

Section 812(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 provided a deduction in computing estate tax, as distinguished from a credit, for the value of property left to a decedent within 5 years of his death if such property had been taxed as a part of the estate of the donor-decedent or had been subject to gift tax. However, because of difficulties presented by the interrelationship of section 812(c) and the marital deduction provided by section 812(e), no deduction for prior-taxed property was allowed to the extent that property in question exceeded 50 percent of the decedent's estate and had been acquired from the decedent's spouse. As a result, double taxation resulted where more than 50 percent of a decedent's estate was acquired from his spouse, because no marital deduction had been allowed to the extent of the excess over 50 percent.

Because of this double taxation where the property passing to a spouse was in excess of the amount for which a marital deduction could be taken, as well as other features of the deduction for property previously taxed which were found objectionable, Congress in the 1954 code substituted a credit for this deduction. Under the 1954 code provision, a credit is allowed against the decedent's tax for all, or a portion, of any estate tax previously paid with respect to property transferred to the decedent within 10 years prior to his death—or 2 years after. Moreover, this credit takes into account any estate tax previously paid with respect to property which had been included in the estate of a predeceased spouse, to the extent the transfer to the current decedent was in excess of the amount for which a marital deduction could be taken.

The credit under the 1954 code, however, applied only in the case of decedents dying after the effective date of the 1954 code, that is, August 16, 1954. In 1956, the Congress recognized that hardship ensued from limiting this credit to cases coming under the 1954 code and enacted Public Law 417—84th Congress—which extended the credit to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1951, and before August 16, 1954.

The Committee on Ways and Means agrees with the action taken previously to prevent the diminution of estates of husbands and wives who die within a short time of each other, but is of the opinion that the provision is too narrow in its application. The committee believes that there is an equal justification for allowing a credit in such cases where the spouses died within 3, instead of 2 years of each other, so long as the credit allowed is reduced, where the deaths occur more than 2 years apart, to 80 percent of the credit otherwise allowable—the rule presently applicable under the 1954 code in such cases. Moreover, hardship cases have come to the attention of the committee where the decedents died before December 31, 1951, and the committee has concluded that the provision should be extended to cases where the decedents died after December 31, 1949, but only in those cases where the prior decedent died on or after January 1, 1948, the date the marital deduction first became effective and the deduction for property previously taxed under the 1939 code became inapplicable in the case of transfers between spouses.

Accordingly, H.R. 780 would amend section 814 of the 1939 code to make it applicable to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1949, to make the credit available where the death of the first spouse to die occurred within the 3 years prior to that of the decedent in question but after December 31, 1947, and by providing that, where the deaths of the husband and wife occurred more than 2 years apart, the credit for prior estate taxes is to be 80 percent instead of 100 percent.

The pending bill is the same as a bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and unanimously passed by the House of Representatives in the 87th Congress—H.R. 7859—and the committee is unanimous in again recommending its enactment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 780 would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that a credit would be available against the estate tax for estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers in the case of decedents dying after December 31, 1947.

The amendment is designed to remove an inequity which arose in connection with the disallowance of a deduction for property passing to a spouse of the decedent under the 1939 code. Originally, section 819(c) of the 1939 code provided for a deduction from the gross estate for the value of property passing to a decedent within 5 years of his death. No deduction for property previously taxed was allowed, however, where the property was received from the decedent's spouse. This was based upon the presumption that such property would constitute a part of the marital deduction and not be previously taxed. This was not always the case. Therefore, in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the Congress substituted a tax credit for this deduction in order that the full amount of any tax on property previously taxed might be reflected in the estate tax liability of the decedent. This credit applied only to decedents who died after the effective date of the 1954 code; namely, August 16, 1954.

The effect of this bill is to make the credit applicable to estates of decedents dying after December 31, 1949, so that the credit would be available where the death of the first spouse occurred within 3 years prior to the death of the surviving spouse but after December 31, 1947. In addition, the bill would provide that where the deaths of the husband and wife occurred more than 2 years apart, the credit for prior estate taxes would be 80 percent instead of 100 percent.

This legislation was approved by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed by the House in the last Congress. It is appropriate that it should pass the House at this time.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX TREATMENT OF REDEEMABLE GROUND RENTS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 1597) to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a deduction for payment of redeemable ground rents, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 163 (relating to deduction for interest) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) Redeemable Ground Rent Deduction.—Annual or periodic payments with respect to a redeemable ground rent (but not payments in redemption of a ground rent) shall be treated, with respect to the payor, as interest to which subsection (a) applies."

Sec. 2. Effective Dates.—(a) The amendment made by section (1) of this Act shall be effective with respect to interest paid or accrued after December 31, 1961.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That (a) section 163 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction for interest) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

" '(c) Redeemable Ground Rents.—For purposes of this subtitle, any annual or periodic rental under a redeemable ground rent (excluding amounts in redemption thereof) shall be treated as interest on an indebtedness secured by a mortgage.'

"(b) Part IV of subchapter 0 of chapter 1 of such Code (relating to special rules for determining gain or loss on disposition of property) is amended by redesignating section 1055 as section 1056 and by inserting after section 1054 the following new section:

" 'Sec. 1055. Redeemable Ground Rents.

" '(a) Character.—For purposes of this subtitle—

" '(1) a redeemable ground rent shall be treated as being in the nature of a mortgage, and

" '(2) real property held subject to liabilities under a redeemable ground rent shall be treated as held subject to liabilities under a mortgage.

" '(b) Application of Subsection (a).—

" '(1) In general.—Subsection (a) shall take effect on the day after the date of the enactment of this section and shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after such date of enactment.

" '(2) Basis of holder.—In determining the basis of real property held subject to liabilities under a redeemable ground rent, subsection (a) shall apply whether such real property was acquired before or after the enactment of this section.

" '(3) Basis of reserved redeemable ground rent.—In the case of a redeemable ground rent reserved or created on or before the date of the enactment of this section in connection with a transfer of the right to hold real property subject to liabilities under such ground rent, the basis of such ground rent after such date in the hands of the person who reserved or created the ground rent shall be the amount taken into account in respect of such ground rent for Federal income tax purposes as consideration for the disposition of such real property. If no such amount was taken into account, such basis shall be determined as if this section had not been enacted.

" '(c) Cross Reference.—For treatment of rentals under redeemable ground rents as interest, see section 163(c).'

"(c) Section 163(d) of such Code (as redesignated by subsection (a) of this section) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" '(5) For treatment of redeemable ground rents and real property held subject to liabilities under redeemable ground rents, see section 1055.'

"(d) The table of sections for part IV of subchapter O of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking out

" 'Sec. 1055. Cross references.'

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" 'Sec. 1055. Redeemable ground rents.

" 'Sec. 1056. Cross references.'

"Sec. 2. The amendments made by subsection (a) of the first section of this Act shall take effect as of January 1, 1962, and shall apply with respect to taxable years ending on or after such date. The amendments made by subsection (b) of the first section of this Act shall take effect on the day after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after such date of enactment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 1597, which was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable Samuel N. Friedel, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, in effect deals with the tax treatment in Maryland of both the buyer of a home subject to a redeemable ground rent and the person selling this real property subject to the redeemable ground rent. For the home buyer the ground rent paid would be treated as a mortgage interest payment and, therefore, deductible by him for tax purposes. The seller of the real property subject to the redeemable ground rent is treated under the bill as if he had sold the property subject to a mortgage in a face amount equal to the redemption price of the redeemable ground rent. As a result, the redeemable ground rent is taken into account in determining his sale price for the property and, therefore, is reflected in any gain—or loss—recognized to him. Under the bill, as reported, the deduction of the ground rent would be available for 1962 and subsequent years. In the case of the seller of the property, however, the new treatment in general would apply only in the case of transactions occurring after the date of enactment of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, for over 30 years the Treasury Department took the position that a ground-rent arrangement was analogous to a mortgage. This meant that the seller of property subject to a ground-rent arrangement would be required to include the capitalized value of the ground rent in the proceeds he realized on the sale of property for the purpose of determining the gain or loss he realized on such sale. Consistent with this position, the Treasury Department also permitted ground rents paid by homeowners to be deducted as mortgage interest.

Certain court decisions, however, in cases involving the tax liability of the sellers of property subject to a ground-rent arrangement, have held that such an arrangement is, in effect, a lease of the property rather than a mortgage with the result that the sellers of such property were not required to include the capitalized value of the ground rent in their sale proceeds for tax purposes. Consistent with these decisions, the Treasury Department felt constrained to reverse its longstanding position regarding the deductibility of payments of ground rents as mortgage interest and to take the position that these payments were rent which would be deductible only by business taxpayers. This reversal of the Treasury's position, which would adversely affect a large number of homeowners, was made effective January 1, 1962.

The Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that the result obtained under the court decisions in practice is the wrong result. It sees no reason why the home buyers in Maryland should receive smaller deductions for tax purposes with respect to payments made on their

homes than is true of taxpayers elsewhere with respect to similar payments made on their homes. On the other hand, there also appears to be no justification in permitting the seller of the property in these cases to reduce the gain at the time of his sale below that which would be realized in other States merely by making use of the redeemable ground rent device available in Maryland, rather than a purchase money mortgage which generally would be used in most other States to achieve substantially the same results.

Accordingly, the pending bill, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, would restore the old rules and regulations of the Treasury Department. First, the code is amended to provide that annual or periodic rentals under a redeemable ground rent—except the amounts paid in redemption of this rent—are to be treated as interest paid on a mortgage indebtedness. Second, the special rules of the code dealing with gain or loss on the disposition of property are amended to treat a redeemable ground rent as a mortgage and to provide that real property held subject to liabilities under a ground rent is to be treated as being held subject to liabilities under a mortgage. Transition rules are provided to deal with those situations where homes have been sold in earlier years.

H.R. 1597 is substantially the same as a bill which was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and unanimously passed by the House of Representatives in the 87th Congress—H.R. 8754—and the committee is unanimous in again recommending its passage. Enactment of this legislation as reported by the committee is also favored by the Treasury Department.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 1597, will allow the home buyer to treat ground rent paid in the State of Maryland as a mortgage interest payment, and, therefore, will allow him to deduct it for tax purposes. As to the seller of the real property, the property will be treated as if sold subject to a mortgage in a face amount equal to the redemption price of the redeemable ground rent. As a result, the redeemable ground rent will be taken into account in determining his sale price for the property and will be reflected in any gain or loss recognized to him.

In the State of Maryland private homes are often sold subject to ground rents. The ground rent is an obligation by the home buyer to pay a fixed amount per year on the property. Under Maryland law, 5 years after the creation of ground rent, any holder of the property may redeem the ground rent by paying an amount computed by capitalizing the rental payment at 6 percent. From 1921 until recently, the Treasury Department treated ground rents as mortgages in every respect. As described above, the annual rents under Treasury rules and regulations were deductible as interest by the homeowner with the seller of the home including the redemption price of the ground rent in his sale price in the same manner as the face amount of a purchase money mortgage.

As a result of two court decisions, the Treasury Department, as of January 1, 1962, has taken the position that the obligation for Maryland ground rents is not the equivalent of mortgage.

The bill would reinstate the Treasury's original rule. It is only fair to accord Maryland home buyers and sellers the same treatment with respect to the so-called ground rents as home buyers and sellers in other States would receive with respect to mortgages. The bill, as amended, is substantially the same as H.R. 8754, which was passed by this body in the last Congress. I, therefore, urge passage of this bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCOME TAX DEDUCTION FOR CHILD-CARE EXPENSES IN CASE OF WOMAN DESERTED BY HUSBAND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2085) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child-care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman, which was reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 214(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to determination of marital status for purposes of the deduction for child care expenses) is amended by inserting "(1)" after "if" and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", or (2) she has been deserted by her husband, does not know his whereabouts (and has not known his whereabouts at any time during the taxable year), and has applied to a court of competent jurisdiction for appropriate process to compel him to pay support or otherwise to comply with the law or a judicial order, as determined under regulations of the Secretary or his delegate".

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "(1)" and insert in lieu thereof "(A)".

On page 1, line 7, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(B)".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2085, as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to make the $600 child-care deduction available, on the same basis as for widows, to women who have been deserted by their husbands.

The provision of present law relating to the deduction of child-care expenses do not cover the type of situation dealt with under the pending bill, in that a woman who is married is required to file a joint return with her husband in order to claim this deduction. Present law also places a limitation on the deduction allowed a married couple by requiring that the maximum $600 deduction be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis to the extent that the joint incomes of husband and wife exceed $4,500. No comparable restriction is imposed in the case of widows or unmarried women. For purposes of this provision, a woman is not considered as married if she is legally separated from her husband under a decree of divorce or of separate maintenance.

The Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that where a woman has clearly been deserted by her husband, she should be eligible for the child-care expense deduction in the same manner as a widow. Under present law, a deserted wife cannot obtain this deduction because of the requirement that a married woman must file a joint return with her husband, since obviously a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband is patently precluded from filing a joint return with him. Moreover even apart from this restriction, the deduction under present law would be of limited value because of the income limitation imposed in the case of a married couple.

For the treatment provided by the pending bill to be available, a woman must not know of the husband's whereabouts nor have known of his whereabouts at any time during the taxable year, also, she must have applied to a court of competent jurisdiction to compel him to pay support or otherwise comply with the law or judicial order governing such matters.

H.R. 2085, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable William J. Green, Jr., is the same as a bill reported by the committee in the 87th Congress—H.R. 12470, which was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives. The committee is unanimous in again recommending enactment of this legislation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2085 places a woman, whose husband has deserted her, in the same category as a single woman for purposes of determining the deduction for child care. Under existing law, a married woman cannot obtain a deduction for child care unless she files a joint tax return with her husband. In such case, the deduction is reduced dollar for dollar by the amount by which the combined income of the husband and wife exceeds $4,500.

In adopting the original child-care provision in existing law, the committee did not take into account the fact that a woman who has been deserted by her husband should be, as a practical matter, in the same category as one who is divorced, or is a widow. The woman who has been deserted must normally work and provide for child care.

This bill, as amended, is the same as H.R. 12470 which was passed by the House in the last Congress. I urge your support of this bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR ARTICLES IMPORTED IN CONTAINERS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2513) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1304), is amended by striking out "subsection (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (b) or (e)".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 304 is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Whenever an article is excepted under subdivision (3) of subsection (a) of this section from the requirements of marking, the immediate container (if any) of such article, or such other container or containers of such article as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be marked in such manner as to indicate—

"(1) to an ultimate purchaser in the United States the English name of the country of origin of such article, and

"(2) to any person who repackages such article, that subject to penalties of law the new package must be marked as described in subdivision (1), subject to all provisions of this section, including the same exceptions as are applicable to articles under subdivision (3) of subsection (a) of this section. The Secretary of the Treasury may by regulations authorize the exception of any article from the requirements of subdivision (2) of the preceding sentence if such article is not usually repackaged before delivery to an ultimate purchaser."

(c) Such section 304 is further amended by relettering subsection (e) as subsection (f), and by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) MARKING OF NEW PACKAGES.—When any imported article the container of which is required to be marked under the provisions of subsection (b) is removed from such container by the importer, or by a jobber, distributor, dealer, retailer, or other persons, and offered for sale, or used as the container for other goods offered for sale, or repackaged, and offered for sale in the new package, such article, container, or new package shall be marked in such manner as to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the English name of the country of origin of such article. This subsection shall not apply in cases where the Secretary of the Treasury finds that compliance with the marking requirements of this subsection would necessitate such substantial changes in customary trade practices as to cause undue hardship and that repackaging of the article in question is otherwise than for the purpose of concealing the origin of such article. Subsection (d) of this section shall not apply in respect of the marking requirements of this subsection unless the articles are repackaged before release from customs custody."

(d) Subsection (f) (as relettered by subsection (c) of this section) of such section 304 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "Any person who violates subsection (e) shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both. Any article offered for sale [by the person repacking such article] in violation of subsection (e) shall be subject to seizure and forfeitures under this subsection shall be that the duties with respect to seizures and forfeitures under this subsection shall be performed by such officers, agents, or other persons as may be authorized or designated for that purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after the sixtieth day following the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 10, strike out "subdivsion" and insert: "subdivision".

On page 2, line 21, strike out "PACKAGES." and insert: "PACKAGES, ETC.—".

On page 2, beginning in line 25, strike out "persons" and all that follows down through "package" in line 3 on page 3 and insert: "person, and offered for sale for use as (or used as) the container for other goods offered for sale, or repackaged and offered for sale in the new package, such container or new package".

On page 3, line 10, strike out "and that repackaging of the article in question" and insert: "and, when the article is repackaged, that the repackaging".

On page 3, lines 18 and 19, strike out "Any person who violates subsection (e)" and insert: "Any person who, with intent to conceal the country of origin of any article, violates any provision of subsection (e) with respect to such article".

On page 3, lines 21 and 22, strike out "Any article offered for sale [by the person repacking such article] in violation of subsection (e)" and insert: "Where any container or package which is required to be marked in accordance with subsection (e) is not so marked, such container or package and the contents of such container or package".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 2513, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable A. S. HERLONG, JR., would amend section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to the marking requirements in the case of articles which are imported in containers required to be marked to show country or origin.

It is the purpose of the bill—

First, to provide, when such articles are repackaged in the United States and offered for sale, that the new packages be marked to show the country of origin of their contents;

Second, to require that the containers in which such articles are imported be marked—in addition to the country-of-origin marking—to indicate to any person who repackages such articles that subject to penalties of law the new packages must be marked to indicate to an ultimate purchaser the country of origin of their contents; and

Third, to require, when such articles are sold for use as—or used as—containers for other goods offered for sale, that such containers be marked to indicate to an ultimate purchaser of the goods offered for sale in such containers the country of origin of such containers.

The report of the committee spells out in more detail the specific background which gave rise to this bill, as well as a more detailed description of the manner in which it will apply. The committee was of the opinion that the bill is necessary and that the amendments which would be made by it will strengthen the marking requirements contained in the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

This bill is similar to the bill which was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means in the last Congress and which passed the House unanimously, except for certain changes which expand the bill in some degree. The report makes clear these additional amendments. The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of H.R. 2513.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 2513 would amend the customs provision of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to protect the American public by requiring more adequate marking of repackaged imported articles.

Information has been presented to the Committee on Ways and Means that articles imported into the United States and repackaged often are not designated as imported on the new package. The repackaging process results in the deletion of the designation of the country of origin. The failure to include the country of origin on a package often results in the conclusion that the contents therein are of American origin. The failure to reveal the source of an article results in the failure of a potential American purchaser to be fully informed prior to the time he makes a purchase.

H.R. 2513 would make three substantive changes in existing law to correct this problem. First, it would be required that articles removed from a container be marked to show the country of origin on the repackaging. Second, containers for articles for export to the United States must be marked to indicate that in the event of repackaging, such repackaging must contain the designation of the country of origin. Third, when such articles are themselves used as containers, they must be marked so as to indicate the country of origin. Moreover, there is a penalty provision for failure to comply with these marking requirements with intent to conceal the country of origin.

It was the view of the committee in unanimously approving this legislation that the provisions of H.R. 2513 would further serve to protect the consumer by informing him as to the origin of articles he may purchase. This bill would aid in the fulfillment of the basic purpose of existing marking requirements as presently contained in the law, and I therefore urge its favorable consideration.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished chairman of the committee has described the overall purposes of H.R. 2513. I would simply like to add a few words concerning this legislation.

The Committee on Ways and Means has been advised that practices have developed under existing law under which articles, imported in containers marked to show the country of origin, are removed from the containers and then either first, repackaged and sold without noting on the new packages the country of origin of the contents or the fact that the same are of foreign origin, or second, sold for use or used as containers for other goods offered for sale without marking such containers to show their country of origin. Understandably, these practices have created confusion in the minds of certain purchasers as to the origin of the articles inside the new packages or as to the origin of the containers. In some cases, the absence of any indication of foreign origin has caused purchasers to assume that the package or container and the contents were of American origin. Thus, one of the purposes of our marking laws—namely, to give the purchaser information as to country of origin—is thwarted in these cases.

Subsection (b) of section 304, as amended by the bill, would continue without change the existing requirement that the immediate container—if any—or such other container or containers as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, of any article excepted from the marking requirements by subdivision (3) of section 304(a), be marked in such a manner as to indicate to an ultimate purchaser in the United States the English name of the country of origin of such article. The bill would add a requirement that any such container or containers shall also be marked in such manner as to indicate to any person who repackages such article that, subject to penalties of law, the new package must be marked to indicate to an ultimate purchaser the English name of the country of origin of its contents. The marking requirements of subsection (b), as amended by the bill, are subject to all the provisions of section 304, including the same exceptions as are applicable to articles under section 304(a)(3). With respect to the requirement that the containers of certain imported articles must be marked to indicate to any person who repackages such articles that the new package must be marked to show the English name of the country of origin of its contents, the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to except any article from this requirement if such article is not usually repackaged before delivery to an ultimate purchaser.

A new subsection (e) would be added by the bill to section 304 of the Tariff Act. The new subsection applies with respect to imported articles the containers of which are required to be marked to show the country of origin of such articles. When such an article is removed from such a container and either first, is offered for sale for use as—or used as—the container for other goods offered for sale, or second, is repackaged and offered for sale in the new package, new subsection (e) requires the container—the imported article—or the new package to be marked in such manner as to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the English name of the country of origin of the imported article. The new subsection would not apply in cases where the Secretary of the Treasury finds first, that compliance with the marking requirements of the subsection would necessitate such substantial changes in customary trade practices as to cause undue hardship, and second, when the article is repackaged, that the repackaging is otherwise than for the purpose of concealing the origin of the article.

Mr. Speaker, the bill contains other provisions which include certain safeguards with respect to the operation of the basic provisions of the bill.

Without any intention to be all inclusive, the following are examples of the types of situations which would be covered by the basic provisions of the bill: repackaging of woodscrews that are brought into the United States in bulk containers; repackaging of tomatoes which are brought into the United States in bulk containers; the importation of glass containers in bulk where such containers are sold for use as, or used as, containers for other goods offered for sale, such as Coca-Cola bottles.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a new subject, as has been indicated by the statement of our distinguished chairman, since a similar bill passed the House of Representatives by unanimous consent last year, and a bill on this subject also passed the House of Representatives in the 86th Congress. I believe this legislation will serve a good purpose.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE IMPORTATION OF WILD BIRDS AND WILD ANIMALS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 1839) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman whether this provides for the importation of any wild bovine or wild hog meat since the bill deals with wild animals.

I ask this question because in 1962 there was imported into this country a record of 1,700 million pounds of dressed meat. I am told that this displaced the consumption of some 500 million bushels of corn necessary to feed out the beef, mutton, lamb, ham, pork, and other meat products representing these imports. Do I understand that this does not permit further importation of edible meats?

Mr. MILLS. It does not. This applies only to the importation of wild animals and wild birds such as are imported specifically for exhibit, or for sale for exhibit, in zoos and places of that sort. It could not be used for the purpose the gentleman mentions.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman think it is a highly contradictory position for the House to pass a trade expansion act which permits this heavy inflow of dressed and edible meats and at the same time subsidize the farmers who produce corn, and then these farmers not be able to feed half a billion bushels of surplus corn to meat animals in this country? Would the gentleman think there was something highly contradictory about this kind of situation?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Iowa is well aware of the statements made in connection with the presentation of the Trade Expansion Act, and he is well aware that there is nothing in the legislation itself that causes tariffs to be reduced.

We were giving the President the authority in connection with other countries of the free world to enter into trade agreements if they were willing and it was possible to accomplish that purpose of mutual lowering of duties. We were not saying to him that he reduce the duty with respect to any meat products, and the gentleman knows the procedure that is available under that act for hearing and discussion on any article that may be selected for purposes of the lower duty consideration.

I would like to point out to the gentleman if he would yield further——

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLS. That he is aware, I am sure, of the fact that the duty on Polish ham, for instance, has never been the subject matter of a trade agreement during all the history of the trade agreements program—I repeat, during all the history of the trade agreements program—so that the hams that may come in in competition with those fine hams that are produced here in the United States come in under the rate of duty that has been in effect since 1930.

Mr. GROSS. The able chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the committee which handles the legislation dealing with tariffs, could be of immeasurable help to the gentleman from Iowa if he would give him some help toward imposing tariffs that would shut off at least a substantial part of these meat imports from foreign countries so that we would not be confronted with the situation of paying subsidies to the farmers who are unable to feed

500 million bushels of corn because the equivalent in meat products have been supplied by foreign farmers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That paragraph 1607(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1201, par. 1607(b)) is amended to read as follows:
>
> "(b) Wild animals and wild birds imported specially for exhibition, whether intended to be used by the importer or for sale for such purpose."
>
> SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall take effect on the tenth day following the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 1839, which was introduced by our colleague the Honorable CHARLES M. TEAGUE, of California, is to amend paragraph 1607(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to permit the free importation of wild birds and wild animals imported specially for exhibition, whether intended to be used by the importer or for sale for such purpose.

At the present time, paragraph 1607 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 permits the free importation of wild animals and birds intended for exhibition in zoological collections for educational or scientific purposes, and not for sale or profit. The pending bill would extend this duty-free treatment to wild animals and wild birds imported by any importer for exhibition for any purpose and also such animals and birds imported by a person or firm who in turn would sell the animals or birds for ultimate use in exhibitions for any purpose.

Wild animals which would most likely be imported under the provisions of paragraph 1607(b), as amended by this bill, would include monkeys, elephants, leopards, lions, and snakes. Wild birds which most likely would be imported would consist principally of plumage birds, such as ostriches, parrots, flamingoes, and so forth.

In the light of the noncompetitive character of the imports in question, the Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that all animal and bird exhibitors should be able to purchase directly or from dealers those live specimens which they believe enhance the quality of their exhibitions without having to pay import duties directly or indirectly on such specimens. The bill would also serve to eliminate certain customs procedures which surround dutiable importations, and thereby would permit rapid customs clearance of specimens which could be damaged by delayed customs clearance.

H R. 1839 is identical to a bill reported by your committee and unanimously passed by the House of Representatives in the 87th Congress—H.R. 7678—and the Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in again recommending enactment of this legislation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1839 would amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the free importation of wild birds and wild animals imported for exhibition whether intended to be used by the importer or to be sold by him for exhibition purposes.

Present law now authorizes the free importation of wild animals and birds that are to be exhibited in zoological collections for educational or scientific purposes provided they are not intended for sale or profit. The bill would extend the duty-free treatment to such animals and birds imported by an importer for exhibition for any purpose as well as animals and birds imported by an individual who in turn would sell the animals and birds for exhibition purposes.

The animals and birds to be imported under this legislation would essentially be of a noncompetitive character with anything available domestically. In addition, the bill would eliminate certain custom procedures which make the importation of such animals and birds a difficult practice.

This legislation, which was cosponsored by our distinguished colleagues, the gentlemen from California [Mr. UTT and Mr. TEAGUE], in the 87th Congress, was unanimously passed by this body in that Congress. The present bill is identical to that legislation, and I, therefore, urge its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTIES ON CORKBOARD INSULATION AND ON CORK STOPPERS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 2053) to provide for the temporary suspension of the duty on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means whether it is necessary to import cork for stoppers in flasks and other such devices? The report does not say whether these are water or liquor glasses. Cannot stoppers for flasks be made in this country?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the domestic industry is the one asking for this particular legislation, because the cork insulation and cork stoppers dealt with in this bill are no longer produced in the United States. This is a request from the industry itself.

Mr. GROSS. I do not doubt that, and I am sure the gentleman is aware of the rash of bills introduced in this session of Congress that are going to his committee, many of them in the nature of special privilege, to protect certain industries in this country against the inroads of foreign imports due to low tariffs. So that I am not surprised that an industry would want treatment of this kind.

Mr. MILLS. This is the industry that produces these articles here in the United States. The gentleman knows that cork itself is not produced in the United States but is imported from abroad.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, effective with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, during the three-year period beginning on the day after the date of the enactment of this Act, and with respect to articles covered by entries the liquidation of which has not become final on the date of enactment by virtue of the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930, no duty shall be imposed upon articles described in paragraph 1511 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as—
>
> (1) "cork insulation, wholly or in chief value of cork, cork waste, or granulated or ground cork, in blocks, slabs, boards, or planks";
>
> (2) "stoppers, over three-fourths of one inch in diameter, measured at the larger end, wholly or in chief value of natural cork bark"; or
>
> (3) "stoppers, three-fourths of one inch or less in diameter, measured at the larger end, wholly or in chief value of natural cork bark".

With the following committee amendment: Page 2, line 5, after the semicolon, insert "or".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 2053, which was introduced by our colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable HERMAN SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania, is to suspend for a 3-year period the duties imposed under paragraph 1511 of the Tariff Act of 1930 on cork insulation and certain cork stoppers.

The Committee on Ways and Means has been informed that cork insulation and cork stoppers dealt with in the pending bill are no longer produced in the United States. In fact, the former domestic producers of these products support this legislative proposal to temporarily suspend the duties on these products.

Cork insulation is a material particularly suitable for low-temperature applications, such as cold storage rooms, refrigerator cars and trucks, refrigerated warehouses, ice cream hardening rooms, fur storage vaults, and so forth. After cutting and fitting, cork insulation is also used for pipe coverings in U.S. Navy vessels, for ammunition plugs for guns on naval cruisers, and other slow-fire ammunition used by the Navy.

Cork stoppers are cylinders of cork which are used for closing the apertures of bottles, jars, flasks, and similar containers.

The pending bill will be effective with respect to articles entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, during the 3-year period beginning on the date after the date of enactment, and also with respect to articles covered by entries the liquidation of which has not become final on the date of enactment by virtue of the provisions of section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

The bill is similar to a bill—H.R. 12213—which was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and unanimously passed by the House of Representatives in the 87th Congress, on which favorable reports were received by the committee from the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, and Labor. The Committee on Ways and Means is unanimous in recommending enactment of this bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 2053 would temporarily suspend for a 3-year period the duties imposed on cork insulation and certain cork stoppers under the Tariff Act of 1930. Cork insulation and stoppers have a variety of domestic uses, including use by our Navy with respect to naval guns and ammunition. It is my understanding that similar materials are no longer produced in the United States and that former domestic producers are supporting this legislation. This bill was unanimously passed by this body in the last Congress and I strongly urge that we again act favorably upon it.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUTY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN BREAD AND TARIFF TREATMENT OF CERTAIN ELECTRON MICROSCOPES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it has been our purpose to call up two additional bills, H.R. 370 and H.R. 2874, both of which passed the House by unanimous consent in the last session; but because the chairman has been notified by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] that he would object to H.R. 370 being called up today, that bill will not be called up; and because the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SIBAL] has advised the chairman he would object to H.R. 2874 if it is called up, that bill likewise will not be called up by unanimous consent at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why should not those bills be called up today?

Mr. MILLS. Because the present chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, as the gentleman from Iowa knows, has on numerous occasions in the past, where any Member of the House notified him ahead of time he would have to object to one of these bills being called up, has refrained from calling the bills up for unanimous-consent passage and has made the statement that the chairman has made today.

Mr. GROSS. Well, is this because the sponsor or the author of the bill is not present?

Mr. MILLS. That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. GROSS. Then, what is the reason?

Mr. MILLS. I do this to be considerate of Members. It is not necessary for the individual Member even to be present, in cases where he has notified me that he finds the bill objectionable at this point. It is merely for the purpose of trying to be considerate of the Members of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Is there something going on today that obstructs the business of the House?

Mr. MILLS. No. If the gentleman from Iowa would suggest to me in any way, in connection with any bill that was voted out of the committee by unanimous consent, that he had some question about it, some reservation, and that if I called it up today, for unanimous-consent passage, he would have to object to it today, then I would agree with the gentleman that I would not call it up. It would not even be necessary for the gentleman to make his objection to the bill under those circumstances.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, if he is offering me this privilege and opportunity, let me say to him that I will object every day to bringing up bills providing for an increase in the debt ceiling or a continuation of the Trade Expansion Act.

Mr. MILLS. I may assure the gentleman that I will not undertake to do that by unanimous consent.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I will say to the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Iowa that what the chairman of the committee in this instance is doing is perfectly proper. This is a Consent Calendar operation. How silly it would be to call up bills that he knows would be objected to.

Mr. GROSS. Why not? Let us dispose of them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

REPORT ON MISSISSIPPI

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include the text of a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, a Mississippi Advisory Committee has just submitted to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights "Report on Mississippi," dated January 1963. This is a summary of documented cases and findings concerning legal developments in the State of Mississippi constituting a denial to Negro citizens of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call this report to the attention of the U.S. Congress. I hope that through the reprinting of this full summary report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it will come to the attention of citizens of this country everywhere. It remains fearfully true that good men of good nations lose themselves their freedom, their liberties, opportunities, dignity, and all they hold sacred as they stand silent in the face of great evils suppressing and violating the rights of some.

In its preface to this report, the Advisory Committee has this to say:

> All of us are Mississippians and some of us have lived all our lives in Mississippi. Yet the extent and the manner of apparent denials of equal protection of the law on the basis of color, as revealed in these meetings, has been a profound shock to us. We are alarmed at the direction our society seems to be taking, and we believe that the overwhelming majority of Mississippians will share this alarm as the facts become known to them.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the overwhelming majority of all the membership of the U.S. Congress and the overwhelming majority of all the citizens of this Nation will share this alarm as the facts become known to them and they will respond to a national emergency as perilous to the safety of this Nation as a new Pearl Harbor or Cuban missile buildup.

This is a shocking report of brutalities and terror of Nazi regime type. I have had occasion to read other official Government reports on Mississippi which make the Advisory Committee's summary I wish to place on the RECORD a pale tale in contrast. Yet no one can read this report without full realization that there exists in the United States of America a full-scale regime of legally sanctioned police terror, violence, and oppression.

Not even those of Mississippi who perpetrate this regime can obscure this report by the usual charge that these are the exaggerated tales of troublemaking outsiders from the North. The Mississippi Advisory Committee which submitted "Report on Mississippi" is one of the 51 committees established in every State and the District of Columbia by the Civil Rights Commission pursuant to section 105(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957. It is composed of Mississippians, people living in that State—"interested citizens of standing who serve without compensation." Those persons making up the nine member Advisory Committee are:

Mrs. Wallis I. Schutt, chairman, Jackson, Miss., vice president, Mississippi Church Women; secretary, Mississippi Council on Human Relations, member, various church organizations and of various women's organizations.

Dr. James Lucius Allen, vice chairman, Columbus, Miss., pharmacist; trustee, Okolona Episcopal College; vice president, Security Life Insurance Co.; director, Tri-State Bank of Memphis, Tenn.

Dr. A. D. Beittel, secretary, Tougaloo, Miss., educator and president of Tougaloo Southern Christian College; chairman, Mississippi Council on Human Relations; national secretary, united Negro college fund, former president, Talladega College, 1945–52; and former chairman, the Alabama division, Southern Regional Council, 1945–52.

Adm. Robert P. Briscoe, Liberty, Miss., retired naval officer; former NATO Commander of Southeastern Europe.

Dr. Albert B. Britton, Jackson, Miss., physician; member, board of directors of the YMCA; secretary, the legislative assembly of Mississippi's Medical and Surgical Association.

Very Rev. Robert C. Hunter, Bay St. Louis, Miss.; Catholic clergyman; provincial superior of the Society of the Divine World, directing southern province—Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas; director of southern province, 1958–62; director of eastern province, 1946–55; high school principal, 1955–58; teacher and prefect of studies, 1933–38.

Rev. Thomas E. Johnson, Jackson, Miss., missionary with the American Sunday School Union, working with Negro people in the State of Mississippi; member, Mississippi Psychological Association.

Rev. Charlemagne P. Payne, Sr., Jackson, Miss., Methodist minister; member, Mississippi Conference, 1943–61; chairman, Conference Board of Missions of Board of Ministerial Training; delegate and member, executive committee of the Human Relations Conference, 1959.

Dr. George E. Powers, Pass Christian, Miss., dentist; secretary-treasurer of the Gulfport, Miss., Dental Society, 1957–59.

Of the nine members of the Mississippi Advisory Committee, one is a Negro citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I present what this committee reports:

REPORT ON MISSISSIPPI

PREFACE

This report was submitted to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights by the Mississippi Advisory Committee. The Mississippi committee is 1 of the 51 committees established in every State and the District of Columbia by the Commission pursuant to section 105(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957. Its membership consists of interested citizens of standing who serve without compensation. Among the functions and responsibilities of the State Advisory Committee, under their mandate from the Commission on Civil Rights, are the following: (1) To advise the Commission of all information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution; and (2) to advise the Commission upon matters of mutual concern in the preparation of its final report. The Commission, in turn, has been charged by the Congress to investigate allegations, made in writing and under oath, that citizens are being deprived of the right to vote by reason of color, race, religion, or national origin; to study and collect information regarding legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws; to appraise Federal laws and policies with respect to equal protection; and to report to the President and to the Congress its activities, findings, and recommendations.

REPORT OF THE MISSISSIPPI ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

This is a summary report of the activities of the Mississippi Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights during the 14-month period ending in January 1963. The Advisory Committee held six open meetings in this period, in Jackson, Greenville, Clarksdale, and Meridian, and received approximately 150 complaints of alleged denial of equal protection of the law.

The procedure followed by the Committee in holding open meetings may briefly be described as follows: A public announcement was made of our intention to hold a meeting, and the press and the public were invited to attend. Persons desiring to submit pertinent information or complaints were invited to appear. The Committee has been gratified by the response of many of the citizens of the State to these meetings. Attendance increased with nearly every meeting and as many as 29 persons have testified at a single meeting. In some instances, citizens were unwilling to voice their complaints in open session because they feared violent reprisals. Such complainants were heard in executive session. Whenever the Committee had an indication that certain law enforcement agencies or officials were to be involved in a complaint, advance notice was sent to such agencies or officials together wtih an invitation to participate. Although we usually received no response to these invitations, sheriffs have occasionally attended meetings as spectators, though declining to participate. The press has usually been in attendance and has, on the whole, reported our proceedings fairly and objectively.

Our purpose in holding open meetings was to collect factual information regarding possible denials of equal protection of the law in Mississippi. We believe this purpose has been accomplished to the extent that we have established beyond doubt that a formal inquiry into alleged civil rights denials in this State is an urgent necessity. We have also been able to forward to the Commission specific complaints which involved infractions of existing Federal statutes.

All of us are Mississippians and some of us have lived all our lives in Mississippi. Yet the extent and the manner of apparent denials of equal protection of the law on the basis of color, as revealed in these meetings, has been a profound shock to us. We are alarmed at the direction our society seems to be taking, and we believe that the overwhelming majority of Mississippians will share this alarm as the facts become known to them. It is our hope that the open meetings have been useful in making these facts known.

The Committee regrets to report that its factfinding efforts were actively opposed by agents and instrumentalities of the State government. It might be assumed that equal protection of the laws, particularly as it applies to the administration of justice, is such an intrinsic part of the American system, or of any true democracy, that officials would be eager to demonstrate their respect for this basic concept. Unfortunately, such is not the case at this time in Mississippi. State officials advised other officials and private individuals who were questioned by the Committee in 1961 to refuse to provide information. In 1960, the Mississippi Legislature passed an act designed, we believe, to intimidate persons who might wish to assert their rights as citizens by appearing before this Committee. This act alters the requirements of proof for prosecutions of perjury solely in cases where the defendant has testified before this Committee, Commission on Civil Rights, the FBI, or another U.S. agency on the subject of deprivation of rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States or of Mississippi.[1] The act contains the following remarkable wording:

"Corroboration or proof by more than one witness to establish the falsity of testimony or statements under oath is not required in prosecutions under this act. It shall not be necessary to prove, to sustain, or charge under this act, that the oath or matter sworn to was material, or, if before an executive, legislative, or judicial tribunal committee or commission had jurisdiction." (The full text of the act, enacted as secs. 2155.4–2155.6 of the Mississippi Code, is appended to this report.)

The Committee has also learned, in at least one case, of the intimidation of a witness who appeared before us.

The Committee's investigations have indicated that in all important areas of citizenship, a Negro in Mississippi receives substantially less than his due consideration as an American and as a Mississippian. This denial extends from the time he is denied the right to be born in a nonsegregated hospital, through his segregated and inferior school years and his productive years when jobs for which he can qualify are refused, to the day he dies and is laid to rest in a cemetery for Negroes only. This Committee could have chosen to concentrate on any aspect of discrimination and found a plethora of examples of denial of equal protection of the law. This includes the denial of the fundamental right to vote and have that vote counted in elections. Sixty-five sworn voting complaints from 13 Mississippi counties have been received by the Commission. This is third highest in the Nation.[2]

In spite of the seriousness of the inequities in these areas of citizenship, this report is concerned with another subject which recurred constantly in the testimony at our meetings. It is a subject that has implications even more damaging to the principles of the American way of life than denial of the right to vote. That subject is police brutality. The following incidents are illustrative of the alarming number of complaints on this subject received by this Committee.

A word of caution and explanation is in order. In view of its lack of adjudicative power, the Committee was at first hesitant to delve too deeply into this sensitive area. Our Committee can offer no relief to individual complainants and is not in a position to make final determinations regarding the validity of the complaints it receives. Yet, it soon became apparent that no conscientious group that is concerned with constitutional rights could ignore the innumerable charges of police mistreatment in our State. The complaints are too numerous; too many of them are made under oath; too many complainants have corroborative evidence; and only too rarely have we seen any indication that the State is eager or even willing to punish those who, in its name, engage in the terrorization of the innocent and the defenseless.

We name no names in this report, and reach no final conclusions in individual cases. We do, however, believe that a pattern exists in our State that leads to the denial of constitutional rights and, in some instances, to brutality and terror. From the moment a Negro adult is hailed as "boy" or "girl" by a police officer, through his arrest, detention, trial—during which his Negro lawyer is treated with contemptuous familiarity by the judge and other officers of the court—and eventual imprisonment, he is treated with a pernicious difference. This difference is incompatible with Christian ideals about the dignity of man and with the principles of Anglo-Saxon criminal law.

How often this atmosphere produces actual terror and brutality is a question that demands further investigation. We feel strongly that we have probable cause to believe that police brutality is a continuing problem in at least certain sections of our State, and that a formal investigation into this problem must be undertaken. The cases that follow give some indication of the severity of the problem. The names, places and dates have been omitted to protect the witnesses. All incidents reportedly occurred in Mississippi in the last three years. Unless otherwise indicated, all of the statements that are included in this report were made under oath.

---

[1] The ordinary rule of perjury in Mississippi is that conviction of perjury is not sustained by the uncorroborated evidence of a single witness (*Lee* v. *State,* 105 Miss. 539, 62 So. 360 (1913)).

[2] The voting problem remains serious in the State. Activity by the Justice Department in Mississippi promises some slow relief in counties where suits have been initiated. Yet the State Government continues to erect all possible barriers to equal access to the franchise by our Negro citizens. In 1962, the Mississippi Legislature enacted a new law requiring the publication of the names and addresses of all new voting registrants for 2 weeks in a newspaper of general circulation. This law is ostensibly designed to facilitate challenges of registrants on moral grounds. In fact, it can be used to facilitate reprisals against Negroes who seek to register.

Example A: A Negro boy

"On * * * at approximately 11:40 p.m., I along with several other Negro boys of my community were walking along highway * * * in * * * when someone on the opposite side of the street started throwing rocks at a carload of white people.

"About 10 minutes later a police car with two policemen in it pulled up near us and started shooting; my friend and I did not know what had happened so we started running toward our homes on * * * Street; one policeman came behind the house where we were and hit my friend; at that time he did not hit me; he then told us to 'get in the car' and drove down to a short street where he stopped the car and told us 'get out' and asked the other policemen 'should I put the dog on them?' He replied 'yes' at that time the dog, which they called 'Rex' was sicked on us; we were cursed and told to 'run.' We then ran back to * * * Street; I ran up on my porch where the dog 'Rex' caught me, the officer then grabbed the dog, while I was being put in the police car and asked 'do you belong to CORE, or the NAACP' to which I replied 'no,' and the officer then called me a 'liar' and asked me if 'I had attended their meetings' and I told him 'I had attended some of them.'

"At that time my mother came out on the porch and asked 'if the dog had bitten my son' and the policeman said 'no, and get back in the house,' and asked 'what has he done' when the policemen did curse and told her 'none of your * * * business. * * * I've been looking for him for 3 months.'

"Following that they drove to the home of a friend of mine on * * * Street, where they told my friend's father to 'bring your son to the jail when he comes home.'

"I was then taken to the city jail, questioned, and cursed; at that time I was asked to identify a friend of mine, which I did; I was then questioned again and taken up to the second floor where my belongings were taken and the jailer then placed me in a cell.

"I was held in jail from 12:30 a.m. until 4 p.m., when I was released after my parents paid $100; I was charged with 'mischief.'

"Although I did see someone throw at a car, I do not know why police brutality was taken out on me. I would like an investigation into this matter, because my mother was also taken to jail and charged with 'interfering with the law' and had to pay a fine of $25. Please help me."

Example B: A Negro woman

The following incident was not received under oath. The account is based on recorded testimony at one of the open meetings.

A 53-year old Negro woman told the committee that she had been arrested on the street after walking home with a female visitor. The police gave no reason for forcing her into their car. When they stopped the car to check a disturbance in the neighborhood, the alleged victim got out of the car and continued on her way home. The police again apprehended her and put her back in the police car. One of the police then allegedly hit her in the face with his fist causing her eye trouble for which she is still under treatment. She was kept in jail overnight and released.

Example C: A Negro boy

This incident was related to the Advisory Committee on behalf of the complainant by one of his teachers. The complainant permitted the teacher to appear for him, but would not come forward in public himself because of fear of retaliation upon himself and his family. The incident was told as follows:

"On * * * about 10 o'clock in the evening, four male students and another young man who lives in the community were returning from * * * to * * * by car. When they turned from the highway into the road leading to * * * they saw a car parked near the railroad track which appeared to be a car belonging to a police officer.

"On the short stretch of road between * * * and * * * the car was stopped by the police car in which were two men presumably deputy sheriffs. The driver of the car containing the students got out immediately and went to the car of the deputy sheriffs.

"Asked by one of the men whether he had been drinking, the student answered no. Asked whether he was a freedom rider, he said he was not. All five occupants of the car were lined up and frisked by the two deputy sheriffs.

"The driver of the car was asked to produce his driver's license. When he did so, neither deputy sheriff seemed interested in seeing it.

"Without provocation, one of the deputies hit and kicked the driver of the car. The other deputy drew his gun and threatened to blow his brains out.

"One of the deputies then told the driver of the car that he was under arrest, put handcuffs on him, and let the rest of the occupants go.

"On the way to the sheriff's office, one of the deputies talked about his intense hatred for Negroes, saying they were being ruined by white people from the North. The student was promised a good deal of abuse on the way to * * *.

"When they reached the sheriff's office, the deputy in the office was told by the other deputies that the student was a prizefighter. The handcuffs were removed and the student was told to put up his fists for fighting. He did not do this. He said he was not a boxer.

"Then all three of the deputies beat him on the arms and head with blackjacks. They aimed to hit him on the head but he warded off as many blows as possible with his arms. This violence continued for 8 or 10 minutes, interrupted with snatches of conversation among the deputies.

"The student was taken to the office of the jailer who was asked whether he had a cell that would hold a boxer. The jailer gave him a blow which knocked him against the wall. The jailer examined his wallet carefully, took it from the student, and threw him into the cell insisting that he was a freedom rider.

"On the docket that evening, he was charged with drunken driving. This charge was changed to reckless driving the next morning.

"The student's parents paid $45 to have the young man released. The student does not know how this amount is divided between fine and cost."

The teacher then described his activity on behalf of the students.

"Later, I went to the office of the sheriff of * * * to inquire about this case. I discovered that the deputies who made the arrest were * * *.

"According to the records in the sheriff's office, the case was disposed of by a justice of the peace, named * * *.

"The sheriff was not available when I called at the sheriff's office so I talked with officer X. Officer X told me that the student was charged with reckless driving and resisting arrest. He told me that he was charged $45, but * * * was not able to tell me how much of this was fine and how much costs.

"Apparently no formal hearing was held before the justice of the peace. The student did not see the justice of the peace nor go to his office at any time. His parents went to the office of the justice of the peace, paid $45, and arranged for the release of their son.

"I called at the office of the justice of the peace, who was not in at the time I called. I talked with his secretary who told me that the charges had been originally reckless driving, drinking, and resisting arrest. The secretary informed me that the drinking charge was dismissed and the student was charged simply with reckless driving and resisting arrest. I asked for a breakdown of the $45 between costs and fine and the secretary was unable to give me this.

"After getting information from officer X concerning the officers who made the arrest, I asked officer X how much violence deputy sheriffs were permitted to use against a person when they were bringing them to the sheriff's office. He was obviously not pleased with the question, and told me quickly that they could use as much violence as necessary by cracking the prisoner on the head or killing him if necessary if any resistance is offered."

Example D: A Negro woman

"On * * * at approximately 1:30 a.m., a policeman in * * * stopped the car in which I was riding; he asked the driver of the car to get out and also, 'what have you been drinking?' the driver replied 'beer' after which they went around to the back of the car and talked.

"The policeman then returned to the car, told me to 'open your purse' and I did not do so, and he then repeated 'open your purse' then I handed it to him, and he threw it back in the car to me, and then told me to get in the police car.

"When I asked him 'what are the charges?', he replied, 'for being a nigger.'

"The other lady in the car and I were taken to jail, and on the way she asked the policeman 'may I make a phone call?' He replied, 'Shut up, before I knock you out.'

"After arriving at the jail, we went upstairs, the jailer asked me my name, and I replied * * * and the same policeman who had arrested me, slapped me, knocked me down and kicked me twice, which caused me to tussle with him."

Example E: A Negro man

"On * * * about 11:30 a.m., I * * * was trailed about 3 miles by a highway patrolman, immediately after leaving. Knowing that I was being followed, I took extreme caution in my driving.

"When the officer decided to stop me he blew his siren, and I pulled to the side of the road and stopped.

"At this point the officer got out of his car, walked to the rear of my car and demanded that my friend remain in the car and I come to the rear. When I approached the officer he asked me for my license. As I began looking through my belongings for my license, I asked the officer what were the charges. The officer replied 'nigger you keep your damn mouth shut, I'll ask the questions.' At which time the officer raised his blackjack and began hitting me on the head and the shoulders. In an attempt to protect myself from him I threw my arms up. The officer still trying to hit me on the head demanded that 'you move them damn arms boy,' 'move them god-damn-it.'

"Because I did not move my arms from around my head, the officer drew his gun and declared 'damn you, nigger, I'm going to kill you.' I begged him not to shoot me and he told me to 'shut up nigger' and hit me, with his gun on me, declared 'I will make you move them arms nigger, put your arms out here' at which time he handcuffed me, and hit me several more times, pushed me to the side of his car, opened the door, pushed me in, hit me on the head and told me to 'sit there you black b * * * and shut up.' The officer then walked over to my car, where my friend was sitting. With his pistol in his hand, he pulled the door open and demanded that he get out and get in the car. When the officer got in his car, I informed him that I had dropped my wallet, and asked him could I get it. At that moment, again he began hitting me as he was saying, 'I thought I told you to shut your damn mouth.' 'Move your hands you damn nigger, god-damn-it, I'm going to kill you.' After he had finished beating me, he placed his gun under his left leg and proceeded to drive.

"On our way to the police station he asked me 'where were you going boy?' I told him we were just riding. Then he asked me 'what are you going this way for boy?' I told him I had planned to visit some friends, where he said, 'you are telling me a damn lie boy' and then asked my friend where he was going. My friend said he just came along with me, then the officer asked 'you mean you just go along with people, without knowing where in the hell you are going?' In reply my friend said, 'he is my friend—I don't have to ask him where he is going; if he was a stranger I would have.'

"When we reached the station he demanded us to get out of the car and head for those two doors on the right, he was walking behind us. Upon entering the building, he demanded my friend to sit down in the hall and continued to trail me into the clerk's office.

"Before we had reached the center of the room he began hitting me with his blackjack on my head and arms, as he was saying 'boy I am going to kill you'—'this damn nigger scratched me'—'I'm going to kill this nigger.'

"There were eight or nine other men in the room and I pleaded with them to stop him from hitting me, but not a one said a word, as the officer continued his inhuman attack.

"When the officer did stop, I asked to use the phone and was told by the officer, 'you ain't using nothing. The desk clerk, wearing glasses, took a leather strap out of a drawer (a brown strap about 4 or 5 inches wide and about 2½ or 3 feet long) and said, 'let's take him down.' When my friend got up to come along he was told to stay there.

"The officer that brought me in, the desk clerk, with the glasses on, the warner (sic) and two other men escorted me to a little room in the building where the cells were.

"With the five men standing around me the clerk said, 'drop your pants nigger.' I did as he said and some of the other men began instructing me, how to lay across a chair. My hands were handcuffed around the foot of the chair as I lay across the back of it.

"After I was in a position to please them the clerk said 'If you holler, nigger, we will kill you.' The officer said 'nigger we are going to tear your * * * off,' and hit me again on the head with his blackjack. 'As all of them took turns beating me with the strap I could hear statements as, 'let's kill this nigger.' 'This nigger knows what he has done wrong—a nigger going to hit an officer.'

"This beating continued while two men held my legs and one my hand.

"The officer asked the jailer did he have anything to keep me from swelling? In reply the jailer stated he had some whiskey and poured some over my back and legs.

"During that time the clerk said 'get up nigger, you are lucky you are not dead.' As the other men began leaving the room the officer said 'What is your name nigger?' When I told him my name he said 'Wipe the whiskey on your * * * nigger and pull your pants up.'

"After I had dressed, the jailer carried me to a cell. I again asked to use the telephone, but he said 'No, not now, maybe later.'

"During my 28½ hours in jail I asked the jailer for four times, each time he brought my meals, to let me use the phone, and he said 'later'."

Example F: A Negro serviceman

"On * * * two of my mates * * * were on liberty and we were at a township not far from the * * *. We approached, and attempted to enter an establishment, which by its display signs indicated that it was a restaurant. There existed no display to indicate as to whether this place was designated for the exclusive use of colored or white patrons * * * upon our attempt, was forcibly evicted by one white man. After being evicted, the man * * * pointed out a store and directed us to it; at the same time asserting that this store was an establishment for colored people. We departed to the store, and the man * * * followed us there. We were then shown where the colored restaurant was. No sooner than we arrived at the restaurant another white man arrived (after events of the day it was alleged that he was Constable * * *). Some white persons had proceeded to the colored restaurant, and they identified me. I, at about this point, had become very uneasy and was in fear of my bodily safety.

"At this point the man who later alleged that he was constable approached me and asked, 'Boy, did you go into a white restaurant?' I replied, 'Yes, I did and if it is such a sin I am sorry.'

"After this exchange he drew a revolver on me and ordered me to come with him. During this period of incidence, I had not been informed that I was under arrest, nor had the man identified himself as an officer of the law. At this instant, seeing all of these white men around, I began to think of the mob violence that I had heard and read of that existed in Mississippi, and I really began to feel fear for my safety. Just about this time the man. * * * made an inquiry, employing words to this effect, 'Boy, where is your smart friend?' The man who was later alleged to be the constable then said, 'Yes, where is he?' Notwithstanding the foregoing, no one had identified himself as a law enforcement official. Sensing the predicament that I found myself in, I told these men that * * * was out in the back and that I would lead them to him. When I got out of the back door I slammed it behind me and fled, leaving * * * on the scene, without having identified him. We were both wearing civilian clothing. In my flight I heard shots, which only caused me to attempt to increase the rate of my speed. There were some flat cars parked on a nearby railroad track, loaded with pulpwood, and I jumped over the couplings between two of them. After hurdling the couplings, I noted two cars loaded with white men coming down the side road approaching U.S. Highway * * *.

"After attempting to hurdle the couplings in the railroad car, I fell and before I could continue my flight, one was running toward me with a chain. He reached me first and began to kick. I rolled, got to my feet and by this time two other men subdued me. I was steadily being pummelled by fists, and was using all of my energy to continue my flight. The man who, I later was told, was a constable, hit me on the head with a pistol at least twice. I was not unconscious, but naturally I was dazed as a result of the physical violence being inflicted upon me. I was handcuffed above the ankle and at the wrists. They tried to make me get into a car, but I was still afraid, not knowing what was going to happen. I put up a struggle, and was subdued.

"At no time did I strike anyone, because under the apprehension that existed, and numerical strength opposing me, I knew it would be futile; therefore, I remained as peaceful as is possible under such circumstances.

"I advised medical attendants at * * * how these injuries were sustained. There I was given an X-ray and a test for drunkenness. The drunkenness test was negative."

Example G

"I was arrested by * * * on Thursday at about 5 a.m. The charge was stealing cattle. The officers admitted that they did not have any evidence.

"I was taken to * * * and placed in the * * * jail at about 10:00 a.m. the same day. Witnesses to my arrest were my wife and * * *.

"I was placed in a cell which was small, unventilated, no windows, dark, and extremely hot. One of the other prisoners who had been in this cell referred to it as a hot box.

"The only food I was given was one piece of cornbread on Thursday, two pieces on Friday, and two pieces on Saturday. The only water I received was one glass on Thursday, two on Friday, and two on Saturday. I was sweating a great deal and very thirsty. I asked for more water but the trustee would not give me any more because he had been instructed not to.

"On Saturday night, I was taken from the hot box about 10:00 p.m. I was questioned again by deputy * * * and * * * for about 1 hour. I could not give any more information so they told the jailer to put me back in the box and they made like they were leaving. I was put back in the box for about 15 minutes. I was then taken out and returned to my home.

"While in this hot box the only air I could get was the air coming through a crack under the door. If it had not been for my laying on the floor and getting this air from under the door I believe that I would have died.

"I am afraid that if this information comes to the attention of the local authorities I will lose my life. When I bought my auto tags in October, the sheriff, * * * told me that I am one nigger he wants but he can't get any proof. I better never had to come after you.

"I cannot understand his attitude because I have only been in jail once about 11 years ago for fighting. This was long before the sheriff ever had any position with the sheriff's office."

FINDINGS

1. The first finding of this Committee is that justice under law is not guaranteed for the Negro in Mississippi in the way that it is for the white man. This is true to the extent that much of the basic meaning of being an American citizen is denied to nearly half the citizens of the State. The idea of the dignity and worth of every individual is fundamental to the American way of life and to the Christian code of ethics on which our system is based. These concepts are systematically violated and an injustice done to us all when 42.3 percent of the citizens of this State must either accept an inferior station in life and an attitude of servility or endanger themselves and their families by protesting. All Mississippians are thereby denied the privilege of living under the best and fairest form of government yet devised. We find that terror hangs over the Negro in Mississippi and is an expectancy for those who refuse to accept their color as a badge of inferiority; and terrorism has no proper place in the American form of government.

2. The second finding of this Committee is that the State government of Mississippi is not sufficiently concerned with the task of protecting the rights of all the citizens of Mississippi. Even if police brutality were less severe and widespread than we have believed, a responsible State government would take energetic steps to ascertain the facts and punish the wrongdoers. A firm position on this matter by the State government would reduce the tendency of lesser officials to abuse their authority and would enhance the respect of the people for the State government. As matters stand today, we are forced to report that the attitude of the State government, rather than being one of protection, has been one of obstruction of the realization of the rights of our citizens. Sections 2155.4–2155.6 of the Mississippi Code are an indication of the current official attitude. These sections make a conviction for perjury in a civil rights case easier to obtain than in any other perjury case. Since Negroes represent the overwhelming majority of persons likely to be forced to make sworn statements in order to secure basic rights, this 1960 legislation seems designed to intimidate or punish those of the Negro race who would assert these rights.

3. While this Committee feels that the accounts of its meetings in the press of the State have usually been fair and objective, we find that in general the press is failing to meet its obligation to our society. When an element of government exceeds or neglects its proper role in a free society it is the duty of the press to alert the people to the situation. The people of Mississippi are largely unaware of the extent of the problem of illegal official violence and the press is partly to blame. It is a zealous crusader against governmental injustice when the Federal Government is believed to be at fault, but closes its eyes to State or local official mistreatment of Negro citizens.

4. This Committee finds that the Federal Government has not provided the citizens of Mississippi the protection due them as American citizens. The Department of Justice has acted in good faith, but the present interpretation of the function of the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department is unduly and unwisely narrow and limited. This may be due to the inadequacy of funds available to the Division for staff and the like, and it may be due to a reluctance to bring cases to trial under existing Civil Rights Acts in view of the prospect of facing an all-white jury likely to return a verdict in favor of a white law enforcement official accused by a Negro. Whatever the reason, the fact that police officers are rarely tried on civil rights charges has led the public to believe that few serious charges are ever made, and has reinforced the belief among offending peace officers that they may treat or mistreat Negroes as their whims direct them.

5. We also find that the Commission on Civil Rights itself continues to have an unfulfilled obligation in regard to Mississippi. It is our opinion that a formal civil rights hearing, such as only the Commission can conduct, is more urgently needed in Mississippi than in practically any other State of the Union. Yet the Commission has never met in this State in the course of its 5-year existence.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As individuals and as members of the Mississippi Advisory Committee we believe the powers reserved to the States in the United States Constitution must be zealously guarded. They can only be guarded if they are fairly and responsibly exercised by the State administrations. When a State disregards the constitutional rights of a large segment of its population, the Federal Government is compelled to intervene in behalf of the victims. The rights of the State under the 10th amendment were reserved because it was thought necessary to protect individual rights from suppression by an all powerful Federal Government. The important concept in the 10th amendment is the protection of individual rights of the people. However, if these individual rights, which are further guaranteed by the 14th and 15th amendments, are denied by the State to a segment of its citizenry, these citizens have no choice but to turn to the Federal Government for protection. This is the dilemma we face when we find, as we have above, that Negro citizens of Mississippi are denied the equal protection of this State's laws. Equal protection of the laws is a right of all citizens of the United States. The country was founded on the principle of liberty and equality for all, and that principle will not permit the rights of over 40 percent of the people of the State to be neglected simply because the State administration chooses to neglect them. It is our belief that the situation revealed by the work of this committee could and properly should be corrected by the State government of Mississippi. But it is our finding that the State government is not sufficiently concerned about the denial of equal protection of the laws for Negroes. We therefore recommend:

That the President direct the Department of Justice to investigate every allegation of physical abuse of authority by State or local officials in Mississippi, and institute criminal proceedings in all cases in which such action appears to be warranted, regardless of the prospects for conviction;

That the Commission on Civil Rights hold formal public hearings in Mississippi on charges of denial of equal protection of the law on account of race, and that these hearings be held periodically so long as the present situation exists and the Commission remains in force; and

That the Commission on Civil Rights make recommendations to the Congress for the passage of further legislation designed to protect American citizens from being physically abused by persons acting under the color of governmental authority at any level.

Respectfully submitted,

The Mississippi Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights: Mrs. Wallis I. Shutt, Chairman, Jackson, Miss.; Dr. James L. Allen, vice Chairman, Columbus, Miss.; Dr. A. D. Beittel, Secretary, Tougaloo, Miss.; Adm. Robert P. Briscoe, Liberty, Miss.; Dr. Albert B. Britton, Jackson, Miss.; Rev. Thomas E. Johnson, Jackson, Miss.; Rev. Charlemagne P. Payne, Sr., Jackson, Miss.; Dr. George E. Powers, Pass Christian, Miss.

(NOTE.—Rev. Murray Cox, of Gulfport, and Rev. Richard Ellerbrake, of Biloxi, were our chairman and secretary, respectively, during the period covered in this report. Reverend Cox died in November 1962, and Reverend Ellerbrake moved out of the State during the summer of 1962. Rt. Rev. Robert C. Hunter, of Bay Saint Louis, Miss., was appointed to the committee in December 1962.)

APPENDIX

1960 cumulative supplement to Mississippi Code, 1942 annotated

SEC. 2155.4. False statements to federal authorities as to denial of constitutional rights by the state or its agents

1. It shall be unlawful for any person or persons to wilfully and knowingly, whether orally or in writing, make or cause to be made, to any agency, or board, or commission, or member, or officer or official, or appointee, or employee, or representative thereof, of the Executive, or the Legislative, or the Judicial Department, of the United States or any subdivision thereof, which may be now in existence, or who may be now appointed, or hereafter created or appointed, including but not limited to any commissioner, or referee, or voting referee now appointed or who may be hereafter appointed by any court of the United States or any Judge thereof, and further including but not limited to any member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and any agent or representative, or investigator, or member of the Commission on Civil Rights of the United States, or the Advisory Committee or Board of the Commission on Civil Rights of the United States appointed in and for the State of Mississippi, any false or fictitious or fraudulent statement or statements, or to use any false writing or document asserting or claiming, that such person, or persons, or any other person or persons have been, or are about to be denied or deprived of any right, or privilege, or immunity granted or secured to them, or to any of them, by the U.S. Constitution and Laws, or by the Mississippi constitution and Laws, by any officer, or agency, or employee, or representative, or board, or commission, or any member thereof of the State of Mississippi, or of any county or municipality, of the State of Mississippi, or of any other political subdivision of the State of Mississippi, or by the State of Mississippi and any person or persons violating the provisions of this act shall be guilty of the crime of making a false statement, which is created by this act, a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by imprisonment in the county jail for not less than 6 months nor more than 5 years in the penitentiary, or by a fine of not less than $100, nor more than $1,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

2. If any paragraph, sentence, or clause of this act shall be held to be unconstitutional or invalid, the same shall not affect any other part, portion, or provision of this act, but such other part shall remain in full force and effect.

Sources: Laws, 1960, ch. 263, secs. 1, 2.

Cross references: Secs. 2155.5, 2155.6, this title.

SEC. 2155.5. False swearing—false sworn statements to Federal authorities as to denial of constitutional rights by the State or its agents.

1. It shall be unlawful for any person or persons to willfully and knowingly make any oral or written sworn false statement, or affidavit, or attestation, or complaint, or allegation before any individual or officer authorized to administer oaths, to any agency, or board, or commission, or member, or official, or appointee, or employee, or representative thereof, of the executive, or the legislative, or the judicial department, of the United States, or any subdivision thereof, which may be now in existence, or who may be now appointed, or hereafter created or appointed, including but not limited to any member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and any agent, or representative, or investigator, or member of the Commission of Civil Rights of the United States, or the Advisory Committee or Board of the Commission on Civil Rights of the United States appointed in and for the State of Mississippi, that such person, or persons, or other persons have been or are about to be deprived of any right, or privilege, or immunity granted or secured by the U.S. Constitution and laws or by the Mississippi constitution and laws, by any officer, or agency, or employee, or representative, or board, or commission, or any member thereof of the State of Mississippi, or of any county or municipality, of the State of Mississippi, or of any other political subdivision of the State of Mississippi, or by the State of Mississippi, and any person or persons violating the provisions of this act shall be guilty of the crime of false swearing which is created by this act, a felony, and upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by imprisonment in the county jail for not less than 6 months nor more than 5 years in the penitentiary, or a fine of not less than $100, nor more than $1,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

2. Corroboration or proof by more than one witness to establish the falsity of testimony or statements under oath is not required in prosecutions under this act. It shall not be necessary to prove, to sustain or charge under this act, that the oath or matter sworn to was material, or, if before an executive, legislative or judicial tribunal, committee or commission that the tribunal committee or commission had jurisdiction.

3. If any paragraph, or sentence, or clause of this act shall be held to be unconstitutional or invalid, the same shall not affect any other part, or portion or provisions of this act, but such other part shall remain in force and effect.

Sources: Laws, 1960, ch. 256, secs. 1–3.

Cross references: Secs. 2155.4, 2155.6, this title.

SEC. 2155.6. False swearing—false sworn statements to Federal authorities as to denial of constitutional rights by the State or its agents with intent or purpose to deceive or cause investigation.

1. It shall be unlawful for any person or persons to wilfully make any oral or written sworn false statements or affidavit or attestation or complaint or allegation before any individual or officer authorized to administer oaths, that such person or persons or other persons have been or are about to be deprived of any right or privilege or immunity granted or secured by the U.S. Constitution and laws, or either, or by the Mississippi constitution and laws, or either, knowing the same, or any material part thereof to be false, with the intent or purpose to cause or encourage an investigation or which causes or contributes in any way to causing an investigation thereof, or any other action to be taken as a result thereof by any executive or legislative or judicial department, officer or agent, or representative of the United States, including but not limited to any member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or member or representative or employee of, the Commission on Civil Rights created by an act of the Congress of the United States, or the State Advisory Group or Council, or Committee of the Commission on Civil Rights appointed in or for the State of Mississippi, and any person or persons violating the provisions of this act shall be guilty of the crime of false swearing which is created by this act, a felony, and upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by imprisonment in the county jail for not less than 6 months nor more than 5 years in the penitentiary, or a fine of not less than $100, nor more than $1,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

2. Corroboration or proof by more than one witness to establish the falsity of testimony or statements under oath is not required in prosecutions under this act. It shall not be necessary to prove, to sustain any charge under this act, that the oath or matter sworn to was material, or, if before an executive, legislative, or judicial tribunal, committee, or commission that the tribunal, committee, or commission had jurisdiction.

3. If any paragraph, or sentence, or clause of this act shall be held to be unconstitutional or invalid, the same shall not affect any other part, or portion or provisions of this act, but such other part shall remain in force and effect.

Sources: Laws, 1960, ch. 255, secs. 1–3.

Cross references: Secs. 2155.4, 2155.5, this title.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights owes a profound debt of gratitude to the dedicated Americans throughout the Nation who serve on its advisory committees without compensation. We recognize that our debt is particularly great in the case of the Mississippi Committee. This selfless group of Mississippians has served the cause of constitutional principles in the face of official and unofficial hostility, as well as serious abuses, amounting—in some instances—to violence. In the circumstances, the Mississippi Advisory Committee might well have decided that the climate was too hostile to permit it to conduct an active program. Instead, the Committee chose to hold open meetings in various parts of the State to gather facts, and at least to give a hearing to citizens who consider themselves not only deprived of their constitutional rights, but wholly excluded from American citizenship as we know it.

The organization of the Mississippi State Advisory Committee was not completed until December 1959, when Rev. Murray Cox of Gulfport accepted the chairmanship. Reverend Cox guided the Committee ably and courageously until his death in November 1962. His unswerving dedication, his gentle but firm idealism, and his willingness to sacrifice all personal interests to that idealism made a profound impression on all of us.

The Committee's work was difficult from the first. In addition to official obstacles put in their part by the State government, and described in this report, the Committee members were in some instances subjected to personal abuse from private sources. They encountered social ostracism in some cases, and received numerous derogatory letters and telephone calls. One member reluctantly relinquished his pastorate of two churches rather than permit them to be split by dissension over his association with the Committee. Another member was threatened by a sheriff, who was also the president of the local White Citizens' Council, and was hit in the face by a neighbor; his children have been taunted and teased at school at the instigation of adults because of the father's religious work and membership on the Committee. Recently, an incendiary device of the Molotov cocktail type was thrown into the home of the Committee's vice chairman.

Despite these obstacles, the Committee has carried on an active program, culminating in this report. The Commission recognizes with profound appreciation the selfless devotion of the Mississippians who have served and are now serving on the Advisory Committee. Their firm and unswerving dedication to constitutional principles is eloquent proof of the continued vitality of our Nation's ideals.

JOHN A. HANNAH,
Chairman,
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

F-111—TFX—CONTRACT AWARD, FEBRUARY 26, 1963

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, on January 23, 1963, I asked the Secretary of Defense to provide the Congress with a full report on the bases for the Department of Defense decision to award a multibillion-dollar contract to the General Dynamics Corp. for development of the F-111-TFX—tactical fighter.

My request to the Secretary was made after Drew Pearson in his column, "Washington Merry-Go-Round," published on January 14, 1963, made certain allegations indicating that "for the first time, the civilian chiefs ignored the recommendations of their military boards on a major contract." Mr. Pearson's column also reported that political strings had been pulled in Washington to get the contract for General Dynamics.

Needless to say, I received many letters from constituents of mine who were understandably disturbed, as was I, over the implications that politics may have been a major factor in the awarding of an important defense contract. Therefore I asked the Secretary of Defense to provide me with the facts in this matter in order that I could reply responsibly to my constituency. That was on January 23, 1963, and it was not until yesterday, February 25, 1963, that I received an answer to my inquiry from the Office of the Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that a Member of Congress must wait for more than 30 days to get a reply to such an inquiry as I made of the Secretary of Defense. It is even more shocking and disturbing that when the reply did arrive, it did not irrevocably refute the allegations made by Mr. Pearson.

Instead I was informed that since the matter is under review by a congressional committee it would not be appropriate to "comment in any further detail on this matter."

It seems to me that such allegations as the pulling of political strings to get a defense contract would be factually refuted at every opportunity. There is no room for politics when the defense and security of the United States is involved. There is no room for politics when it comes to spending the taxpayers' money for procurement of the complex and expensive weapons systems which we must have to preserve our freedom.

It is urgent that the American people, and their representatives in Congress, have their confidence in the integrity of our Defense Department restored through the hearings which have begun today regarding the awarding of the F-111—TFX—tactical fighter development contract.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, I ask that the "Washington Merry-Go-Round" column of January 14, 1963, and my letter to the Secretary of Defense, dated January 23, 1963, be printed along with the reply which I received February 23 and which was dated February 22, 1963, from David E. McGiffert, Assistant to the Secretary of Legislative Affairs:

[From the Wichita (Tex.) Eagle & Beacon, Jan. 14, 1963]

HOW GENERAL DYNAMICS GOT CONTRACT

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—Senate Rackets Chairman JOHN MCCLELLAN, who has been investigating labor racketeers, has turned to the probe of a $62 million research contract to General Dynamics. He has even asked the Defense Department to hold up the contract until his investigators can lay their cards on the table.

At stake is far more than the original $62 million. The contract calls for the development of a supersonic fighter both the Navy and Air Force can use, and in the end should lead to contracts worth more than $5 billion to General Dynamics.

This column which has done its own investigating of the General Dynamics deal, can describe the cards MCCLELLAN holds:

For the first time, the civilian chiefs ignored the recommendations of their military boards on a major contract. Secretary of Defense McNamara, Secretary of the Navy Korth, and Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert spent less than 3 weeks reviewing the intricate paperwork, then arbitrarily overruled the findings of an elaborate evaluation process which had taken 18 months.

Their decision will rescue General Dynamics from the financial rocks where it has been floundering for 2 years as the result of a $425 million blunder. The loss has been blamed upon mismanagement. This is not reassuring to the taxpayers, who will have to pay the bill on any further mismanagement.

General Dynamics' biggest stockholder, Chicago Financier Henry Crown, who took charge of an emergency committee to save the ailing corporation, pulled political strings in Washington. Effective in the backrooms, Crown is credited with hooking the desperately needed contract.

Only a few insiders knew how desperately General Dynamics needed the fighter plane contract to bail its stockholders out of the red. The great corporation lost $425 million on jet airliners, an ill-considered venture that exposed shockingly bad management and poor organization.

Meanwhile, the alarmed directors set up a seven-man, emergency committee which shook up the management and sought a financial transfusion.

The biggest transfusion, more than enough to save the stockholders from additional losses, is coming from Uncle Sam.

How General Dynamics got this contract, potentially the biggest ever offered by the Kennedy administration, is a story of high-powered negotiations.

The details aren't supposed to be known outside the Pentagon, but this column can summarize what transpired.

Early in 1961, Secretary of Defense McNamara invited airplane manufacturers to submit proposals for a supersonic fighter that could be used by both the Navy and the Air Force.

Designs came in from most of the big manufacturers and were processed through the Air Force's procurement machinery. However, Navy representatives sat on all the boards to make sure the best plane was selected for carrier operations.

The first joint evaluation board, headed by Col. Charles Gayle, concluded after 4 months that Boeing had submitted the best design. Boeing had been the first, for instance, to develop the variable wing, which could be pulled in for supersonic flight and spread out for slow landings on carriers.

But the Navy was not satisfied with the Boeing model. The studies went through the Air Force Source Selection Board, were then bucked up to the Air Council. Rear Adm. F. L. Ashworth, who represented the Navy on the Board, and Vice Adm. Robert Pirie, who sat on the Council, objected to the Boeing design.

As a result, Secretary McNamara decided to ask the top two competitors, Boeing and General Dynamics, to go back to their drawing boards. Each company was given a million-dollar grant to redesign a plane that would satisfy the Navy.

Both companies came back with blueprints and cost studies that were processed through the same machinery. Again, the Joint Evaluation Board recommended the Boeing plane.

The Selection Board and the Air Council, after their own painstaking reviews, also selected Boeing. But this time, the Navy representatives went along with the decision.

What was handed up to Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert was a unanimous recommendation, based upon 18 months of careful study, that Boeing should get the contract. This was then reversed at the very top.

What part political wirepulling played in the final decision is the $62-million question.

JANUARY 23, 1963.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary, Department of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Within the past week I have received many letters from constituents of mine who are quite disturbed by the implications of allegations made by Drew Pearson on January 14, 1963, in the enclosed column. I share the concern of my constituents in this matter.

It is imperative that the Congress be given a full report regarding the basis for the decision on this contract. It has been my understanding that defense awards are based on merit and the capability of a contractor to provide a quality product at an economical price. The integrity of the Defense Department is severely challenged by the charges made by Mr. Pearson.

Mr. Secretary, I would appreciate hearing from you in this matter in order that I can reply responsibly to my constituency, and to assure myself of the integrity of our Government in its procurement policies.

Sincerely yours,

GARNER E. SHRIVER,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., February 22, 1963.
Hon. GARNER E. SHRIVER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SHRIVER: You inquired in a letter to Secretary McNamara on January 23 about the recent selection of the General Dynamics Corp. as prime contractor for the development of the F-111 (TFX) tactical fighter.

The decision to select General Dynamics was reached only after a long and careful evaluation of the two proposals submitted indicated that the General Dynamics proposal offered the best chance of developing an airplane that would not only be operationally acceptable to and compatible with the requirements of both the Navy and the Air Force but would also have the maximum feasible degree of commonness between Air Force and Navy versions.

As you may know, the circumstances surrounding the award of the TFX contract are presently under review by a congressional committee. While this review is in progress, I believe it would be inappropriate to comment in any further detail on this matter.

Sincerely,

DAVID E. MCGIFFERT,
Assistant to the Secretary, Legislative Affairs.

SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, during recent days there has been a great deal of discussion with reference to the situation in the schools of the District of Columbia. From what I have observed in the press and heard from witnesses appearing before the Committee on the District of Columbia, it appears to me that the time has arrived for Congress to take positive action to improve conditions in the schools of the District.

Because of this conviction on my part I am today introducing two measures which I believe will bring order out of the chaos which seems to exist. One of these bills would permit corporal punishment of pupils by principals and teachers in the public schools, and the other would permit the expulsion or dismissal of unruly students by the principal of a particular school.

There is nothing new about the proposition that a schoolteacher or principal should have authority to inflict reasonable corporal punishment upon unruly students. As a matter of fact, most of us attended public schools in the days when reasonable corporal punishment was inflicted upon nonconforming students. Few of us can honestly say that we ever saw abuse of this authority by the school authorities. I am sure that the authorization of the use of corporal punishment in the schools of the District of Columbia will not be abused if all doubt is removed as to the right of the school authorities to exercise their discretion in punishing children under their care and tuition. The Superintendent of Schools of the District of Columbia has recommended this procedure but seems to be thwarted in his efforts by tenuous contentions made by certain members of the Board of Education.

I have been very much interested in some of the unusual statements as to the law which appeared in the press as quotations from members of the Board of Education regarding corporal punishment of school pupils. In order to give my colleagues the general law on the subject I call to their attention the treatment of this subject in 47 American Jurisprudence, 427 and the following, and 79 Corpus Juris Secundum, section 502, schools and school districts.

In 47 "American Jurisprudence" we find the following:

Section 175. Corporal punishment: A teacher is responsible for the discipline of his school, and for the progress, conduct, and deportment of his pupils. It is his duty to maintain good order and to require of his pupils a faithful performance of their duties. To enable him to discharge such a duty effectually, he must necessarily have the power to enforce prompt obedience to his lawful commands. For this reason, in proper cases, he may inflict corporal punishment on refractory pupils, this authority extending generally to all subordinate teachers who have charge of classes and are responsible for discipline, as well as to those who, although not teachers by legal appointment, are teachers in fact at the time.

While teachers are clothed with a discretionary authority with respect to the infliction of corporal punishment on their pupils, the punishment must be reasonable and confined within the bounds of moderation; that is, it must not be cruel or excessive, and the teacher must not act wantonly or

> from malice or passion. This rule has been made the subject of statutory enactment in some jurisdictions. However, no precise rule can be laid down as to what is excessive or unreasonable punishment. Each case must depend on its own circumstances. The punishment should be proportioned to the gravity of the offense, the apparent motive and disposition of the offender, and the influence of his example and conduct on others. Consideration must be given to the age, size, sex, and physical strength of the pupil to be punished, and the instrument used must be one suitable and proper for the purpose.
>
> The legitimate object of chastisement is to inflict punishment by the pain which it causes, as well as the degradation which it implies. It does not follow, therefore, because pain is produced that a chastisement is either cruel or excessive. Teachers exceed the limits of their authority when they cause lasting mischief, but act within the limits of it when they inflict temporary pain.

To the same effect is 79 Corpus Juris Secundum, section 502 dealing with corporal punishment, where it is said:

> Section 502. Corporal punishment: As a general rule a schoolteacher, insofar as it may be reasonably necessary to the maintenance of the discipline and efficiency of the school, and to compel a compliance with reasonable rules and regulations, may inflict reasonable corporal punishment upon a pupil for insubordination, disobedience, or other misconduct, even though he is over school age, and may take him away from the school and outside the school grounds to chastise him, but he cannot assault and beat the pupil on the school playground merely because they differ in opinion on a play in the game in which the teacher takes part with the pupils on equal terms. A teacher is not justified in inflicting corporal punishment to enforce an unreasonable rule, to compel a pupil to pursue a study forbidden by his parent, or to compel him to do something which his parent has requested that he be excused from doing. The infliction of corporal punishment by a teacher is largely within his discretion; but he must exercise sound discretion and judgment in determining the necessity for corporal punishment and the reasonableness thereof, under the varying circumstances of each particular case, and must adapt the punishment to the nature of the offense, and to the age and mental condition and personal attributes of the offending pupil, using an instrument suitable to the purpose, and, considering the circumstances and conditions of the particular offense and pupil, the punishment must not be inflicted with such force or in such a manner as to cause it to be cruel or excessive, or wanton or malicious. The fact that a child appears unsubdued does not in itself justify a continuance of the punishment; but, on the other hand, punishment is not necessarily excessive because the pupil suffers pain or bruises.
>
> Where a statute in express terms confers on the teacher the authority to inflict corporal punishment, a school superintendent has no such authority, nor does he derive any such authority from usage. A school principal may, however, inflict punishment on a pupil for violation of school rules under a statute permitting a teacher to use force to restrain or correct a pupil and may determine the nature and extent of the punishment, it being necessary only that it be reasonable in manner and moderate in degree. The teacher's right to inflict corporal punishment is not limited to pupils in the teacher's own classroom.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that there will be some who will immediately say that I am recommending cruel and unusual punishment to pupils in the District of Columbia when I propose and support the legislation on that subject which I am today introducing. Let me put this contention to rest immediately by saying that my own children attend the public schools of North Carolina under the supervision and direction of principals and teachers who have the identical authority to inflict corporal punishment as would be given to the principals and teachers of the District of Columbia under the language of the bill which I have introduced.

As a matter of fact, the language of my proposal, insofar as the authority sought to be vested in the principals and teachers is concerned, is identical to the language contained in the "General Statutes of North Carolina," section 146, chapter 115. The language contained in the bill that I have offered is not a hangover from the remote past in school management in North Carolina. It was enacted into law by the general assembly of my State in 1959 and has not brought any unfortunate results in our State so far as I know.

With reference to the other measure I am offering, giving to principals the authority to expel and suspend pupils who violate the rules of the school or otherwise constitute a menace to the school, I do not believe that such legislation is necessary as a matter of law. In view of the confusion that has been generated in the District of Columbia by some rather bizarre statements of law that have appeared in the press as coming from persons having law licenses, I do believe, though, that we can clarify the atmosphere by the enactment of legislation making it crystal clear that school authorities do have the authority to suspend and expel students.

The contention has been made that because of the compulsory attendance law in the District that it is not within the authority of school principals and superintendents to remove undesirable students from the classroom. It has always been my understanding of the law that school authorities have the inherent power where the interests of the school require it, to suspend or expel a student, notwithstanding the existence of a compulsory school attendance law. This proposition finds support in "Corpus Juris Secundum" and in "American Jurisprudence." I see no basis for any contention between individuals having responsibility for the administration of the public schools in this jurisdiction having any difference of opinion as to the rights of the authorities to promote the general welfare of the educational program in the District by ridding the schools of undesirable student characters.

Realizing, though, that the situation is so critical that we cannot tolerate the creation of a debating contest between the Superintendent of Schools and the Chairman of the Board of Education on this subject, I believe that the Congress in the exercise of its legislative jurisdiction should promptly remove any possibility of argument about this subject. For that reason I have offered legislation which would spell out the authority of the school authorities in connection with the removal of unsavory students from the rolls of the schools. In my bill I have provided ample safeguards to protect students from abuse by the school authorities.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no more important subject that could come before this Congress insofar as legislating for the District of Columbia is concerned. I hope that it will be possible to act promptly and favorably upon the two measures I am introducing today.

EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE FUNDS SHOULD BE CUT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the first things that a new Member of Congress learns is the so-called rule of congressional courtesy. Bluntly stated, these rules and precedents make it virtually impossible to criticize the conduct of another Member of this body without subjecting the criticizing Member to a point of order which could result in loss of the floor and thereby bring an abrupt end to the speech at that point. It is said that these rules are necessary to prevent abusive references to one another on the floor. Others have calmly noted that these rules of courtesy have probably prevented duels, fist fights, and other breaches of gentlemanly conduct which would have reflected on the decorum of the House. Congress is virtually a law unto itself. There are no loyalty checks, no behavior checks, no rules of decorum which are enforceable for all intents and purposes, no standards which are set the breach of which can be said to be an affront to the other Members of the House. The wrath of constituents is the only check on a Member. Almost anything is tolerated under the heading of "Congressional Courtesy."

It can be said that the House has done relatively well through the years laboring under these supposed handicaps. The answer to this would probably be yes, but then, on the other hand, it cannot be rebutted when one states that the Congress of the United States does not, by and large, carry the same respect that it did through the first 150 years of our Republic.

Yes, the rules of the House probably prevent abuse. Undoubtedly, some lives have been saved because of a remark that was never made on this floor. Outbursts of temper have probably been kept to a minimum because of the rules which are so stringent in this area. The rules have done all of this but, I humbly submit, a lot more. Congress is the final authority in many ways and pretty much a law unto itself. Being the final authority, if the Members are not allowed to speak out on abuses then who can? Surely the press does from time to time but is this enough? Couple this inability to speak out in debate here on the floor with a tendency on the part of the entire body of Congress to refrain from sufficient self-discipline and a searching investigation of its own affairs and you have what I feel is an untenable situation. Under practice, any expense that a committee chairman certifies is paid as long as the appropriations have not been depleted and the date of the invoice does not patently show it to be without authorization under current appropriation. Couple this with another practice of the House whereby the Committee on House Administration has ruled that we, as Members of this body, cannot examine vouchers which have been paid at the order of the chairmen of the various committees and I believe you can readily see why so little is known about the financial transactions of this House. In my own State of Ohio, we are always speaking in terms of transactions being a matter of public record. State legislators and other officials from the statehouse to the courthouse have been far more zealous in putting their transactions, audits, hearings, and so forth, out where public scrutiny can be reckoned with than have their fellow legislators in Washington.

We consistently denounce waste and duplication in the executive branch of the Government. Oratory abounds concerning the proliferation of bureaucratic agencies, their expensive habits, and so forth, ad infinitum. A cloak of secrecy covers all too much of what we do in this branch of government. Do we have waste? Expensive habits? Nepotism and favoritism? If we do, under the rules of congressional courtesy it better be someone other than a Member of Congress who discusses it.

I am not impetuous enough to think I could change the rules. I will abide by them and not willingly abuse them because the essence of our representative system is that we obey the rules and work for the change of those rules and regulations which we feel are improper or cumbersome. The rules of the House, to say the least, are not conducive to a public airing of our own dirty linen—in fact, they practically preclude such inquiry. This makes it even more imperative that we exercise stern self-discipline and vigilance over wasteful practices and abusive conduct on our own part since, if we do not, no one will. This we can do but it requires the efforts of every Member of the House. We cannot simply throw this in the laps of the Committee on House Administration. I appeared before their Subcommittee on Accounts today to protest our $697,000 budget for the House Committee on Education and Labor and cited areas where I feel we have had abuse. We all must do this when we see such practices.

In the 87th Congress, the Committee on Education and Labor expended the following amounts, not including miscellaneous expenses of approximately $15,000:

Telephone	$7,402.54
Travel expenses	48,902.38
Investigation staff salaries	550,496.30
Contracts	13,135.00
Total	619,936.22

It is my judgment that far too much of the taxpayer's money has been expended by this committee and I would urge the Committee on House Administration to trim at least $200,000 from the chairman's request for the 88th Congress which is $697,000. In the 85th Congress, under the chairmanship of former Representative Graham Barden, this same committee had an appropriation of $125,000 and did not expend $10,405 of this amount. In the 86th Congress, during Representative Barden's last 2 years as chairman, the committee was authorized a total of $328,000 and had $53,649 left over at the end of the session, a net expenditure in 4 years of $388,000. Now in just 2 years of the 87th Congress, spending by this committee increased to $633,000 and the current request, as I said before, is for $697,000. One can readily ask: Why?

Any perusal of the expenditures will tell you very quickly that increased payroll has brought about the big hike in the cost of operating this committee. In 1954, the last year the Republicans controlled the committee, eight employees were on the staff. In 1960, at the close of Representative Barden's chairmanship, there were 16 employees as follows:

Committee on Education and Labor, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1960

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Russell C. Derrickson	Chief investigator	$8,772.00
Charles M. Ryan	General counsel	8,772.00
Melvin W. Snead	Minority clerk	8,772.00
Charles T. Lane	Assistant clerk	8,772.00
Levi K. Alderman, Jr.	Chief clerk	8,772.00
Kathryn Kivett	Assistant clerk	3,917.22
Jeanne E. Thomson	do	3,917.22
Gladys M. Rafter	do	3,917.22
Ida S. Miller	do	3,917.22
James B. Wells	do	4,118.82
Olive M. Gibbons	Stenographer (July 1 to 10, inclusive).	130.54
Colie V. Williamson	Field investigator (July 1 to 10, inclusive).	185.39
Elizabeth W. Adams	Stenographer (through Sept. 10).	1,009.04
Harry V. Barnard	Research assistant (through Aug. 31).	1,612.90
Reva Beck Bosone	Legal counsel	6,733.38
Mary M. Callaway	Stenographer	2,691.84
Ruth P. Ebersole	Assistant subcommittee clerk.	1,347.66
Mary Sue Leonard	Secretary	3,301.17
Robert E. McCord	Subcommittee clerk	5,325.00
John D. Messick	Assistant to director	6,982.20
J. Noble Richards	Staff assistant (minority).	5,378.16
Russell H. Riggs	Clerk (through Sept. 15).	1,578.92
W. Wilson Young	Counsel	6,733.37
Jane L. Wilson	Stenographer (effective Aug. 22).	2,115.38
Charles E. Wilson	Clerk (effective Sept. 1).	2,668.84

The 1961 report filed with the House in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 10, pages 13125–13126, details the tremendous growth of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The first 6 months looked like this:

Committee on Education and Labor, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Louise M. Dargans	Chief clerk	$8,726.69
Russell C. Derrickson	Staff director	8,726.69
Wray Smith	Education chief	5,853.16
Howard G. Gamser	Chief counsel for labor-management.	8,726.69
Livingston L. Wingate.	Associate counsel for labor-management.	7,418.92
Teresa Calabrese	Administrative assistant to the chairman.	4,945.14
Richard T. Burress	Minority clerk	7,339.30
Melvin W. Sneed	Minority staff assistant.	8,292.48
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant.	3,855.11
Cabell Waller Berge	do	2,041.73
Anne K. Fernbach	Administrative assistant (to Mar. 22, 1961).	1,208.37
Charles E. Wilson	Staff assistant (Feb. 1–28, 1961).	1,470.79
John H. Young III	Administrative assistant (to Jan. 31, 1961).	1,372.74
J. Noble Richards	Administrative assistant to the minority (Jan. 4–31, 1961).	806.72
Jeanne E. Thomson	Administrative assistant for the minority (to Jan. 31, 1961).	652.87
Charles T. Lane	Assistant clerk (to Jan. 2, 1961).	97.47
Charles M. Ryan	General counsel (to Jan. 2, 1961).	97.47
Ida S. Miller	Assistant clerk (to Jan. 2, 1961).	43.52
Levi K. Alderman	Clerk (to Jan. 2, 1961).	97.47
Kathryn Kivett	Assistant clerk (to Jan. 2, 1961).	43.52
Melvin W. Sneed	Minority clerk (to Jan. 2, 1961).	97.47
Russell C. Derrickson	Chief investigator (to Jan. 2, 1961).	97.47
Gladys M. Rafter	Assistant clerk (to Jan. 2, 1961).	43.52
James B. Wells	do	86.96
INVESTIGATING STAFF		
General Subcommittee on Education, Representative Cleveland M. Bailey, chairman:		
Reva Beck Bosone	Legal counsel (to Mar. 15, 1961).	$2,166.94
Ruth P. Ebersole	Assistant subcommittee clerk.	2,950.77
Robert E. McCord	Subcommittee clerk	7,377.24
General Subcommittee on Labor (Representative Carl D. Perkins, chairman):		
Peggy Lia Amburgey.	Secretary	250.46
Joe Lee	Counsel (to May 31, 1961).	3,033.58
Hartwell Duvall Reed, Jr.	Counsel	583.51
Jeanne F. White	Secretary (to Mar. 31, 1961).	350.09
Marian Ruth Wyman.	Secretary (to May 31, 1961).	455.56
Special Subcommittee on Education (Representative Edith Green, chairman):		
Betty R. Pryor	Subcommittee clerk	3,501.64
Nicholas H. Zumas	Counsel	3,501.64

Committee on Education and Labor, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1961—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Special Subcommittee on Labor (Representative James Roosevelt, chairman):		
Doris G. Smith	Secretary	$2,751.68
W. Wilson Young	Counsel	7,377.24
Select Subcommittee on Labor (Representative Herbert Zelenko, chairman):		
Harvey B. Cohen	Counsel	833.45
Mollie D. Cohen	Administrative assistant.	3,168.40
Joseph I. Paper	Counsel (to May 31, 1961).	3,751.14
Select Subcommittee on Education (Representative Frank Thompson, chairman):		
Mary E. Corbin	Secretary	2,237.40
William P. Gerberding.	Counsel	4,500.64
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation (Representative Elmer Holland, chairman):		
Walter Buckingham.	Director of automation study.	2,744.56
Olive M. Gibbons	Secretary	1,983.85
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports on American Employment (Representative John H. Dent, chairman):		
Barbara Dash	do	1,983.85
Stanley D. Metzger	Subcommittee counsel.	2,500.76
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the National Labor Relations Board (Representative Roman Pucinski, chairman):		
James McConnell Harkless.	Counsel	5,001.52
Laurine Pemberton	Secretary	1,500.39
Full committee staff:		
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant.	2,333.61
Patricia Bergman	Secretary	1,350.86
Cabell Waller Berge	Administrative assistant.	233.39
Adrienne Fields	Receptionist	1,400.90
Mary Sue Leonard	Secretary (to Jan. 31, 1961).	484.29
Mary D. Pinkard	Administrative assistant.	2,448.34
Charles E. Wilson	Assistant education chief.	3,157.75
Anne K. Fernbach	Administrative assistant (to Mar. 22, 1961).	458.35
Investigative task force:		
James E. Branigan	Counsel	4,375.02
Ilene Tena Bushman.	Clerk-receptionist (to June 30, 1961).	1,116.96
Olga Cano	Administrative assistant (to June 30, 1961).	1,875.06
Odell Clark	Assistant chief investigator.	4,167.25
Marvin R. Fullmer	Chief investigator	4,751.44
Ann I. Jordan	Secretary	1,500.39
Waldo E. Parrish	Administrative assistant.	1,500.39
Jose Lumen Roman	Investigator	3,333.80
Ludwig Teller	Consultant	3,751.14
Minority staff:		
Walter P. Kennedy	Clerk (to Mar. 31, 1961).	201.26
Beverly Pearson	Minority secretary	2,741.15
Joanne E. Thomson	do	3,585.00

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 1, pages 800–801, discloses the statistics for the last 6 months of the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

Committee on Education and Labor, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Louise Maxienne Dargans.	Chief clerk	$8,824.74
Russell C. Derrickson	Staff director	8,824.74
Wray Smith	Education chief	8,824.74
Howard G. Gamser	Chief counsel for labor-management.	8,824.74
Livingston L. Wingate.	Associate counsel for labor-management.	7,502.28
Teresa Calabrese	Administrative assistant to the chairman.	5,000.70
Richard T. Burress	Minority clerk	8,807.16
Melvin W. Sneed	Administrative assistant.	8,504.04
Louise M. Wright	do	4,251.36
Cabell Waller Berge	do	3,833.66

INVESTIGATING STAFF

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
General Subcommittee on Education (Representative Cleveland M. Bailey, chairman):		
Salig L. Bendit	Assistant subcommittee clerk (July 19–Dec. 31, 1961).	$1,802.41
Ruth P. Ebersole	Assistant subcommittee clerk.	3,000.78
Robert E. McCord	Subcommittee clerk	7,502.28
General Subcommittee on Labor (Representative Carl D. Perkins, chairman):		
Gertrude L. Moser	Secretary (from Sept. 18, 1961).	1,717.11
Hartwell Duvall Reed, Jr.	Counsel	7,502.28
Peggy Lia Amburgey.	Secretary (June 13–Aug. 31, 1961).	834.86
Special Subcommittee on Education (Representative Edith Green, chairman):		
Betty R. Pryor	Subcommittee clerk	5,252.46
Nicholas Zumas	Counsel (Mar. 1–Oct. 24, 1961).	3,326.56
Special Subcommittee on Labor (Representative James Roosevelt, chairman):		
Carolyn A. Latimer	Secretary (Aug. 1–Dec. 7, 1961).	2,334.68
Don Lowe	Director (from Sept. 1, 1961).	5,001.52
Doris G. Smith	Secretary (Apr. 1–Aug. 7, 1961).	719.86
W. Wilson Young	Counsel (Jan. 3–Oct. 31, 1961).	3,751.14
Select Subcommittee on Labor (Representative Herbert Zelenko, chairman):		
Harvey B. Cohen	Counsel	5,000.70
Mollie D. Cohen	Administrative assistant.	4,959.35
Select Subcommittee on Education (Representative Frank Thompson, chairman):		
Mary E. Corbin	Secretary	3,502.02
William P. Gerberding.	Counsel (Mar. 1–Aug. 31, 1961).	2,250.32
John D. Hawke, Jr.	Counsel (from Sept. 1, 1961).	3,333.80
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment (Representative John H. Dent, chairman):		
Barbara Dash	Clerk (Mar. 2–Dec. 31, 1961).	3,000.78
James L. Gallagher	Counsel (from July 17, 1961).	5,470.33
Stanley D. Metzger	Counsel (May 1–July 10, 1961).	416.79
Mary Orndoff	Clerk (from Nov. 27, 1961).	378.28

Committee on Education and Labor, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1961—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on the National Labor Relations Board (Representative Roman Pucinski, chairman): James McConnell Harkless.	Counsel (Mar. 1–July 18, 1961).	$750.23
Full committee staff:		
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant.	4,251.36
Patricia Bergman	Secretary	2,251.44
Adrienne Fields	Receptionist	2,251.44
Corrine Annette Huff.	do	1,500.80
Mary D. Pinkard	Administrative assistant.	3,750.12
Jeanne Thomson	do	4,302.00
Charles E. Wilson	Assistant education chief (Feb. 1–Aug. 31, 1961).	1,334.42
Investigative task force:		
Leon Abramson	Assistant counsel (from July 15, 1961).	6,918.77
Ida P. Bailey	Secretary (from Dec. 1, 1961).	325.34
James E. Branigan	Counsel	8,750.04
Odell Clark	Assistant chief investigator.	6,250.08
Marvin R. Fullmer	Chief investigator	7,502.28
Olive M. Gibbons	Secretary	2,392.48
Johnnie L. Graves	Secretary (from June 26–Aug. 25, 1961).	801.10
Ann I. Jordan	Secretary (from Apr. 1–Sept. 30, 1961).	1,500.39
Waldo E. Parrish	Administrative assistant.	3,000.78
Jose Lumen Roman	Investigator (from Mar. 1–July 31, 1961).	833.45
Minority staff:		
Beverly Pearson	Minority secretary	3,289.38

The pattern was the same for 1962 as shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 11, page 14805:

Committee on Education and Labor, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1962

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Louise Maxienne Dargans.	Chief clerk	$8,824.74
Russell C. Derrickson.	Staff director	8,824.74
Wray Smith	Education chief (ending Feb. 28, 1962).	2,941.58
Deborah P. Wolfe	Education chief	5,883.16
Howard G. Gamser	Chief counsel for labor-management.	8,824.74
Livingston L. Wingate.	Associate counsel for labor-management.	8,604.33
James E. Branigan	Counsel (ending May 14, 1962).	5,055.58
Marvin R. Fullmer	Chief, investigative task force (effective May 15, 1962).	2,255.21
Teresa Calabrese	Administrative assistant to the chairman (ending Feb. 15, 1962).	1,250.17
Richard T. Burress	Minority clerk	8,807.16
Melvin W. Sneed	Administrative assistant (ending Jan. 31, 1962).	1,417.34
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant.	4,240.26
Cabell Waller Berge	do	4,251.36
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant (effective Feb. 16, 1962).	3,188.52

Committee on Education and Labor, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1962—Continued

INVESTIGATING STAFF

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
General Subcommittee on Education (chairman, Representative Cleveland M. Bailey):		
Robert E. McCord	Subcommittee clerk	$7,502.28
Ted Ellsworth	Special assistant (Mar. 1, 1962, to June 30 1962).	5,001.52
Ruth P. Ebersole	Assistant subcommittee clerk.	3,000.78
General Subcommittee on Labor (chairman, Representative Carl D. Perkins):		
Hartwell Duvall Reed, Jr.	Counsel	7,502.28
Gertrude L. Moser	Secretary	3,000.78
Special Subcommittee on Education (chairman, Representative Edith Green):		
John F. Morse	Director (effective Mar. 1, 1962).	5,883.16
Betty R. Pryor	Subcommittee clerk	5,252.46
Mary June Wall	Administrative assistant (effective Feb. 1, 1962).	3,336.05
Muriel Greenhill	Assistant director (effective Apr. 16, 1962).	2,083.62
William O'Hara	Counsel (effective Apr. 15, 1962).	1,901.90
Joanne M. Clark	Secretary (effective Apr. 22, 1962).	1,074.61
James B. Harrison	Counsel (Jan. 1 to 31, 1962).	833.45
Special Subcommittee on Labor (chairman, Representative James Roosevelt):		
Edmund D. Edelman.	Counsel (effective Feb. 19, 1962).	5,501.67
Adrienne Fields	Secretary	3,000.78
Don Lowe	Director (ending Feb. 18, 1962).	2,000.61
Select Subcommittee on Labor (chairman, Representative Herbert Zelenko):		
Harvey B. Cohen	Counsel	5,000.70
Mollie D. Cohen	Administrative assistant.	5,000.70
Edmund Smythwick.	Staff assistant (Jan. 1 to 31, 1962).	400.55
Select Subcommittee on Education (chairman, Representative Frank Thompson)		
John D. Hawke, Jr.	Counsel	6,250.08
Mary E. Corbin	Secretary	3,502.02
Carla Otten	Assistant clerk (Jan. 1 to Feb. 14, 1962) effective June 25, 1962.	166.40
Susan Liela Gordon	Assistant clerk (effective June 13, 1962).	155.03
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Impact of Imports and Exports on American Unemployment (chairman, Representative John H. Dent)		
James L. Gallagher	Counsel (ending Feb. 28, 1962).	2,001.34
Mary A. Orndoff	Clerk (ending Feb. 28, 1962).	1,000.26
Barbara Dash	Secretary (Feb. 15 to Mar. 31, 1962).	766.87
Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Integration of Federally Assisted Education (chairman, Dominick V. Daniels):		
Aurora Harris	Secretary (Mar. 1 to May 31, 1962).	1,500.39
Barbara Freygang	Secretary (Mar. 12 to May 31, 1962).	1,317.01
Lillian M. Kelley	Secretary (May 7 to 24, 1962).	300.08
Carla Geraghty	Secretary (Feb. 16 to Mar. 7, 1962).	366.77

Committee on Education and Labor, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1962—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Full committee staff:		
Jeanne Thomson	Administrative assistant.	$4,302.00
Tamara J. Wall	Assistant counsel (effective Jan. 1, 1962).	4,001.58
Johnnie L. Graves	Administrative assistant (effective Feb. 22, 1962).	2,687.59
Mary D. Pinkard	Administrative assistant (ending Apr. 15, 1962).	2,312.88
Deborah P. Wolfe	Education chief	2,255.21
Corrine Annette Huff.	Receptionist	2,253.63
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant (ending Feb. 15, 1962).	1,062.84
Nancy L. H. Hastings.	Secretary (Jan. 1 to Mar. 8, 1962).	680.36
Marcia Sue Nathanson.	Receptionist (Apr. 4 to 30, 1962).	292.81
Patricia Bergman	Secretary (ending Mar. 31, 1962).	208.20
Judith Matheny	Receptionist (Mar. 17 to Apr. 3, 1962).	198.77
James Saxon	Assistant clerk (effective June 18, 1962).	94.09
Investigative task force:		
Leon Abramson	Chief counsel	7,502.28
Odell Clark	Chief investigator	6,250.08
Marvin R. Fullmer	Chief investigator (ending May 14, 1962).	5,585.03
Ludwig Teller	Consultant (ending Mar. 31, 1962).	3,751.14
Waldo Parrish	Administrative assistant.	3,167.86
Olive Gibbons	Secretary	2,669.98
John Young	Consultant (effective Apr. 1, 1962).	2,500.35
Edward J. Drum, Jr.	Assistant investigator (Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1962).	2,500.35
Alfredo Vidal	Investigator (effective Apr. 1, 1962).	2,500.35
Zelda E. McNeal	Clerk (effective Apr. 1, 1962).	1,500.39
James E. Branigan	Counsel	1,458.34
Ida Bailey	Secretary (ending Mar. 15, 1962).	813.35
Arnold Block	Investigator (effective May 1, 1962).	650.68
Minority staff:		
Beverly Pearson	Minority secretary	3,289.38

The payroll of the last 6 months of the 87th Congress is published in the January 24, 1963, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 1032–1033:

Committee on Education and Labor, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Louise Maxienne Dargans.	Chief Clerk	$9,082.14
Russell C. Derrickson	Staff Director	9,082.14
Deborah P. Wolfe	Education chief	9,082.14
Howard G. Gamser	Chief counsel for labor management.	9,082.14
Livingston L. Wingate.	Associate counsel for labor-management (ending Dec. 16, 1962).	8,401.72
Marvin R. Fullmer	Chief, investigative task force.	9,082.14
Richard T. Burress	Minority clerk	9,064.04
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant to the chairman.	4,375.36
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant.	4,375.36
Cabell Waller Berge	do	4,375.36

Committee on Education and Labor, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

INVESTIGATING STAFF

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
General Subcommittee on Education (chairman, Representative Cleveland M. Bailey):		
Robert E. McCord	Subcommittee clerk	$7,721.08
Ruth P. Ebersole	Assistant subcommittee clerk.	3,088.30
General Subcommittee on Labor (chairman, Representative Carl D. Perkins):		
Hartwell D. Reed, Jr.	Counsel	7,721.08
Gertrude L. Moser	Secretary	3,088.30
Special Subcommittee on Education (chairman, Representative Edith Green):		
John F. Morse	Director	9,082.14
Betty R. Pryor	Subcommittee clerk	5,921.40
William T. O'Hara	Counsel	4,891.22
Muriel Greenhill	Assistant director (ending Sept. 15, 1962).	2,083.62
William F. Gaul	Assistant director (effective Sept. 16, 1962).	3,062.92
Mary June Wall	Administrative assistant.	4,120.03
Joanne M. Clark	Secretary	2,885.07
Special Subcommittee on Labor (chairman, Representative James Roosevelt):		
Edmund D. Edelman.	Counsel	7,721.08
Adrienne Fields	Secretary	3,088.30
Select Subcommittee on Labor (chairman, Representative Herbert Zelenko):		
Harvey B. Cohen	Counsel	5,146.55
Mollie D. Cohen	Administrative assistant.	5,146.55
Loriece Hackney	Staff assistant (Sept. 1 to 30, 1962).	616.58
Denis A. Weinstock	Staff assistant (Aug. 1 to Sept. 30, 1962).	1,069.44
Select Subcommittee on Education (chairman, Representative Frank Thompson):		
John D. Hawke, Jr.	Counsel (ending Dec. 15, 1962).	5,875.08
Mary E. Corbin	Secretary	3,604.17
Susan Liela Gordon	Assistant clerk (ending Oct. 15, 1962).	904.33
Carla Otten	Assistant clerk (ending Aug. 31, 1962).	646.08
Full committee staff:		
Jeanne Thomson	Administrative assistant.	4,427.48
Corrine Annette Huff.	Receptionist	2,577.63
Tamara J. Wall	Assistant counsel (ending Dec. 31, 1962).	4,635.90
H. Roy Partridge, Jr.	Assistant clerk (Aug. 6 to 31, 1962).	180.95
Johnnie L. Graves	Administrative assistant (ending Nov. 25, 1962).	3,079.27
James J. Saxon	Assistant clerk (ending July 31, 1962).	217.14
John M. Henshaw	Assistant clerk	220.35
Investigative task force:		
Leon Abramson	Chief counsel	7,721.08
Arnold F. Block	Investigator	2,008.97
Manuel Casiano	do	2,160.20
Odell Clark	Chief investigator	6,432.38
Olive M. Gibbons	Secretary	3,088.30
E. Zelda McNeal	Clerk	3,085.62
Charles L. Mitchell	Special investigator (effective Aug. 1, 1962).	3,359.65
Ruben I. Ortz	Investigator (effective Sept. 1, 1962).	1,742.77
Waldo E. Parrish	Administrative assistant.	3,601.17

Committee on Education and Labor, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Investigative task force—Continued		
Herbert Ratner	Special investigator (Oct. 1 to 31, 1962).	$634.66
Alfredo Vidal	Investigator	5,146.55
John M. Young	Consultant (ending July 31, 1962).	833.45
David Hepburn	Investigator (effective Dec. 1, 1962).	615.50
Stanley E. Michels	Special counsel (Oct. 1 to 31, 1962).	952.74
Minority staff:		
Beverly Pearson	Secretary	4,120.03

It can readily be seen that in only one area was any real economy exercised as far as the committee payroll was concerned—that of reducing the number of minority employees. At the start of the session the minority had 4 employees out of a total staff of 16. A very short time after the new chairman assumed the leadership of the committee, the Republicans found themselves with only 2 employees, 2 regular employees being taken to serve on the majority side. Employees came and employees went—many stayed but it is safe to say that the total payroll of the Education and Labor Committee had zoomed to a level of anywhere from 35 to 50 at any given time. Curiously enough, although the minority needed all of the assistance it could get from a competent staff, it was confined to but two full-time employees although Republicans constituted almost 40 percent of the House membership. The ratio under the new committee averaged out at about 35 or 40 to 2, hardly a fair situation to say the least.

From our standpoint, this was not the only problem. We were met with persistent demands to vacate our minority suite. It is not an exaggeration to say we were harassed. There is talk of increasing the minority appropriation to $110,000 in the 88th Congress but few of us are much impressed with this proffer. It is no secret that this committee is coming under heavy fire and many of us are rather skeptical of what may seem to be generous at the time of need—need of our support, that is.

The Congress is always talking about economy. It could well turn its attention on this committee through its proper controlling overseer, the Committee on House Administration. Close scrutiny of the payroll, consultant fees, contracts, telephone and travel expenditures would, in my judgment, lead this committee to cut Education and Labor some $200,000 and bring its expenditures down to a realistic figure. Expenditure on contracts which were let by our committee were cut in half by the action of the House Committee on Administration, from $28,000 to $13,000.

In the same manner, this committee was one of the most freely traveling groups in the entire Congress. While a good case can be made for the oversea travel of anyone for just about any cause any more, on the face of it the Committee on Education and Labor would seem to have less reason to travel than most other committees of the Congress. Such was not the case as the figures clearly reveal. Our expensive domestic travel was matched by our oversea travel. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 5, pages 6422–6423, the report of the expenditure of foreign currency and appropriated funds was printed. It indicates that $21,272.99 was spent by committee members and staff for the year 1961. Last year's figures are not yet available. I will not be so unkind as to refer to these travels as junkets since many items appear to be worthy such as attending international commissions and conferences.

In my judgment one typical example of a questionable trip, however, was made by John Young, 3d, New York press agent, who made a 30-day cultural survey in South America as a special consultant for the Committee on Education and Labor. Mr. Young spent approximately $2,000 for hotel, meals, and taxis, et cetera, and about $1,000 for transportation. His report tells very little that any Member of Congress could not obtain on a straight request for information from the Library of Congress. In addition, he was paid well over $1,000 for contract or consultant services as a special investigator. The Committee on House Administration could determine whether or not we have received adequate value for these expensive services.

Incomplete details at this point make it necessary to postpone until a later date more instances of junket travel by staff members of the Committee on Education and Labor. These details will be forthcoming as soon as the intricate process of checking expenditures is complete. The difficulty in gaining access to information relative to the expenditure of Federal funds and counterpart funds is enough to deter anyone with ordinary vigor.

With an interest in economy and cutting down unnecessary expenditures I would suggest that the Committee on House Administration take a close look at what seems to me to be inordinately high expenditures in New York City. Vouchers on file in the Committee on House Administration indicate the following expenditures for telephone services in New York City:

Voucher No.	Date	Payee	Amount
1008	July 7, 1961	New York Telephone Co.	$356.08
783	Aug. 2, 1961	do	164.65
2920	Nov. 13, 1961	do	80.57
4525	Jan. 17, 1962	do	19.00
5338	Feb. 9, 1962	do	177.17
7532	May 3, 1962	do	94.54
8440	June 6, 1962	do	228.85
8441	do	do	123.17
8950	July 19, 1962	do	222.98
2843	Nov. 1, 1962	do	122.85
2844	do	do	180.80
2845	do	do	190.64
2846	do	do	215.32
3297	Dec. 6, 1962	do	113.25

As can be seen, this amounts to no small sum—approximately $2,500. In addition to this, the records of the Committee on House Administration indicate that numerous services were performed by the General Services Administration for which they were reimbursed out of our committee funds. These should be thoroughly checked also.

In the area of travel, I believe we could live on a much smaller budget. Travel items to New York City and Puerto Rico constitute an undue expenditure of funds. Excessive expenditures in these areas lead to the very natural conclusion that the same practices exist in the huge payroll, the largest single item of our committee expense. The best way to correct these abuses is to turn off the money spigot so this committee will be required to live within a reasonable budget.

Only a thorough investigation will disclose the total picture in this field. My original interest in this area was whetted last year when I saw an employee of the Committee on Education and Labor purchase tickets at the airport. The machine ran off more than a dozen blank tickets which were charged to this committee. I asked an airline employee if this was customary practice and got a terse reply:

> We don't question what the Government does although we don't generally issue no-name tickets.

By the same token, employment of consultants and investigators in New York City seemed to receive major emphasis during the past 2 years. The effective action of Chairman OMAR BURLESON, of the Committee on House Administration, has been credited with cutting the contract expenditures from about $28,000 to the $13,000 sum actually expended. Last September, Chairman BURLESON cited the employment of Herbert Hill who was concurrently employed by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, an organization which lobbys before the Congress. Mr. Hill had contracted for services as a consultant at a rate which could have brought him as much as $10,000 per year although he received only $2,415 up to the time of his resignation. Close study of the payroll and contract lists will disclose an overwhelming majority of people working in the New York City area as against the rest of the entire country.

Also, sound economy would dictate trimming the expense of trips to Puerto Rico. Checking the airline bills, I find that taxpayers have paid for over 30 trips to Puerto Rico for members and staff. Next to New York City, the problems of Puerto Rico seemed to call for the largest single outlay of our travel funds. At a time when we are mortgaging the future and maybe the hereafter, too, it would seem wise to limit our studies and trips to that island. As I pointed out earlier, the rules of the Committee on House Administration make it impossible for me to study the vouchers for traveling expenses incurred since

July 1, 1961, even though these vouchers will be printed in sketchy detail in the next month by this same committee. Vouchers for the first 6 months of the 87th Congress have already been printed. They disclose the following information regarding the reimbursed travel of our chairman:

Voucher	Date	Payee	Purpose	Amount
5001	Mar. 20, 1961	Adam Clayton Powell.	Reimbursement per diem to Puerto Rico Jan. 16–21, 1961, on minimum wage. Authorized by the Committee on Education and Labor.	$132.00
5226	Apr. 24, 1961	do	Reimbursement for transportation to Puerto Rico, Jan. 16–21, 1961. Authorized by Committee on Education and Labor.	90.56
5227	do	do	Reimbursement per diem and transportation to Puerto Rico, Mar. 10–13, 1961, for official business of Committee on Education and Labor.	88.80
5266	Apr. 26, 1961	do	Reimbursement for per diem in lieu of subsistence on official business for the Education and Labor Committee in San Juan, P.R., Mar. 31–Apr. 5, 1960.	96.00
5542	May 31, 1961	do	Reimbursement round trip to New York by auto, per diem, May 18–20, 1961, in connection with official business of Committee on Education and Labor.	97.50
5596	June 13, 1961	do	Reimbursement per diem in the Virgin Islands, May 12–15, 1961. Official travel for the Committee on Education and Labor.	60.00
152	July 7, 1961	do	Per diem and calls, June 2 and 3, June 23 and 24; place not known.	171.00
499	July 25, 1961	do	Per diem, July 5–8, place not known	40.00
536	July 26, 1961	do	Mileage and tolls, June 3–24, place not known	123.00
3586	Dec. 13, 1961	do	Per diem, Nov. 13 to Dec. 6, place not known	112.00
4280	Jan. 5, 1962	do	Per diem, Dec. 13–15, place not known	48.00
4668	Jan. 19, 1962	do	Per diem, Jan. 6–8, place not known	72.00
5517	Feb. 23, 1962	do	Per diem, Feb. 13–19, place not known	168.00
8648	June 12, 1962	do	Per diem Apr. 19–26, place not known	192.00
2652	Oct. 25, 1962	do	Per diem, Oct. 9–13, place not known	120.00
2653	do	do	Per diem and taxi, place not known	105.00
2882	Nov. 14, 1962	do	Per diem, taxi, etc., Oct. 27, place not known	25.00
2960	Nov. 19, 1962	do	Per diem, taxi, Nov. 3, place not known	25.00
3298	Dec. 6, 1962	do	Per diem and taxi, Nov. 19–24, place not known	89.00
4566	Jan. 30, 1963	do	Miscellaneous and per diem, Dec. 3–15, place not known.	178.00
4567	do	do	Per diem Jan. 1–3, place not known	90.00

I would further urge that the House Committee on Government Operations take a close look at the arrangements that exist relative to a $250,000 grant which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has made to a nonprofit organization in Harlem. The administrative head of this organization is Livingston Wingate who has been on the staff of the Education and Labor Committee but now is reportedly on leave. According to reports, the organization will set up a domestic peace corps to deal with the problems of juvenile delinquency in Harlem. HEW claims that their allocation of funds is authorized under the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act which was reported out of the Education and Labor Committee and became law in the last Congress.

This domestic peace corps vanguard is quartered at 197 West 137th Street, New York City, which backs up to 132 West 138th Street, the Abyssinian Baptist Church. It is reported that 197 West 137th Street is owned by the Adam Clayton Powell Foundation, named after the father of the Representative from New York and chairman of our Committee on Education and Labor. The reported rent is $2,000 per month which may or may not be fair, based on the prior rental history of this building and the general rent level of the neighborhood. Under House rule XI establishing committees, the House Committee on Government Operations is charged with the responsibility of investigating and studying "the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency."

Chairman POWELL in his February 20 press conference publicly praised Mr. Cecil Holland for the article which he wrote in the February 17, 1963, issue of the Washington Sunday Star. Representative POWELL is a director of the organization which received this grant. I ask unanimous consent that this article be included in the RECORD following these remarks. As the House Committee on Government Operations is now organized, the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations has jurisdiction over the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and an investigation on their part could either clear any cloud on this venture or establish the presence of wasteful operation or possible unauthorized or unwise use of funds.

I have mentioned the press conference of the gentleman from New York, Mr. POWELL, which was held last Wednesday. I certainly do not question his right to make any of the statements that he made. It is clearly his right. I do not impute his motives in any manner. In my own defense, however, I would like to say that the impression was given that Mr. POWELL was only doing what every Member of Congress does and in my case at least I would hasten to say that this is not correct. Regarding oversea trips and visits to Paris nightclubs paid out of counterpart funds, Chairman POWELL told reporters:

> I wish to state very emphatically that I will always do just what every other Congressman and committee chairman has done and is doing and will do.

I do not frown on useful oversea trips. Quite frankly, I think that it is a good investment for our country every time Representative OTTO PASSMAN goes overseas to see how our foreign aid dollars are being spent or squandered, whichever is the case. When Mr. PASSMAN returns, it always seems that the American taxpayer gets a break when he takes the knife to foreign aid requests. I reject, however, the idea that all of us would do what Representative POWELL would consider proper. People differ and I would certainly reserve the right to differ in my conduct from my chairman just as he would surely want to differ from what I do.

The interview contains the following colloquy:

> Reporter. Mr. POWELL, do you view any of these things such as the use of counterpart funds for attending nightclubs or going to resorts as abusive of congressional privilege?
>
> Representative POWELL. No, because it's done by all of them.
>
> Reporter. You mean whether it is right or wrong.
>
> Representative POWELL: Well, there is no right or wrong in it, its nonprohibitive. It was set up that way.
>
> Reporter. Was it set up to go to nightclubs?
>
> Representative POWELL. Well, I am sure that you don't go to Paris and stay all the time in Notre Dame.
>
> Reporter. But is that part of committee business?
>
> Representative POWELL. Of course it is part of it. You are going abroad, travel is a very broadening kind of education and I wish to assure you that it is practiced by every Member of the House and the Senate. I think you ought to talk to some of my colleagues and ask them where they were when I was over there. You know there were a lot over there when I was there.

Mr. Speaker, again I reiterate my point. I object to the reference that we all practice this type of activity. I certainly would not nor would many Members of the House and yet the impression is given, accidentally or otherwise, that this is the standard routine for all of us. Representative POWELL should respect our right to courteously disagree with these practices as far as our personal beliefs are concerned and it is an affront to the dignity of the House to categorically state that we all have done or will do these things.

I believe that the reputation of this august body is at stake. We should look with penetrating concern at the expenditures of this committee and every other committee of Congress. At a time of grave fiscal crisis we cannot afford to neglect the duty of making sure our own house is in order. A conscientious effort to do this will lessen the hostile attitude of the taxpayer toward his Government. As one person told me recently while I was back in my district in Ohio:

> I sometimes feel like the crows are guarding our corn.

Let us show them otherwise. Unless the Committee on House Administration and this body cuts this appropriation request or sets out some more distinguishable standards we will all in effect be ratifying the actions of this committee and its chairman in the 87th Congress and be further indicating we will be glad to have 2 more years of the same thing.

Appendix A

Adam Clayton Powell Press Conference, February 20, 1963

Representative Powell. O.K., it's 4 p.m. You ladies and gentlemen know Mr. Derrickson, who is staff director. I just asked him to drop by. What I have to say, will be mimeographed—it is being mimeographed and will be distributed before we break off. I have called this press conference today not to answer any charges nor because I, nor my family are the slightest bit disturbed by anything that has appeared in the press. I also am calling this conference with the firm knowledge that none of the facts which I will now present will receive the same publicity as the statements, inaccuracies, and lies which have appeared recently. I am also calling this conference without immunity. I would like to interrupt and say that as I came down this paper was just delivered, which is typical of what is happening. It says, "Hundreds of aids payless as Powell balks."

Reporter. What paper is that?

Representative Powell. This is Roll Call, sir; and when you read the article it says, that because of the fact that I balked at appearing before Mr. Burleson's committee yesterday, hundreds of aids are payless. Now, I didn't balk at all, I was scheduled to appear yesterday at 2 p.m. and was ready, but at 2 p.m. the Attorney General of the United States was scheduled to appear before Mr. Perkins' subcommittee and in a Democratic caucus held yesterday morning where—by the way I'd like to announce, all the Democrats are now in favor of the omnibus bill in the Federal aid to education—at that caucus, they all said they would like to hear Mr. Kennedy and they all wanted to go and which is customary with the chairman to the hearing on the budget. We called up Mr. Burleson and asked him if he could move us up to 1 p.m. Mr. Burleson said it was impossible due to a tight schedule of committee hearings already arranged. We then asked him when it would be possible to hear our committee at the earliest opportunity and he said next Thursday. I didn't balk at all—it is a total lie. In the second place, I only have—Mr. Derrickson, how many people on the payroll at this present moment who are payless?

Mr. Derrickson. There are 16 of them. They are all aware of the situation and know that it is not your fault that they're not paid——

Representative Powell. And also they know that they can borrow money from you or myself. We've told them that before.

Reporter. Mr. Powell, wasn't the appearance of the Attorney General scheduled after you had scheduled the House appearance?

Representative Powell. Correct, sir. Afterwards and that's why the conflict arose.

Reporter. Mr. Powell, you did not meet with the Attorney General.

Representative Powell. I know that, but I said my committee members wanted to go with the chairman, which is customary to the hearing on the budget and they were the ones that asked that it be postponed in the Democratic caucus yesterday morning.

Reporter. Sir, would you say that 16 members of your committee are payless now?

Representative Powell. Are what?

Reporter. Are payless?

Representative Powell. That's right, 16 now.

Reporter. Well, where do you get this money to take care of them if they want to borrow some money from you?

Representative Powell. Out of my pocket.

Reporter. Just out of your own pocket?

Representative Powell. Yes, hoping they'll pay me back. Now I'd also like to point out that now that factually that 2 years ago when Congress was organized, the resolutions of approval of pay for all the employees on this Hill, were not adopted until February 28.

Mr. Derrickson. They were heard on February 22. It was February 28 before it passed the House.

Representative Powell. February 28, this is nothing unusual. This is an aside though, but it is just typical.

Reporter. Congressman, have you any bills left over from last year?

Representative Powell. Yes, we have left over from last year that were blocked in the Rules Committee 16 bills. I'd like—16.

Reporter. How about unpaid committee bills?

Representative Powell. I don't know. I don't know. The chief clerk wouldn't know it either. Oh, I'm sure there is.

Reporter. You're all paid up as far as last year?

Representative Powell. I don't know, I don't know. I'm sure December bills haven't been paid yet.

Reporter. December bills?

Representative Powell. I'm sure. I don't know. The chief clerk does that.

Reporter. Well, she says you have.

Representative Powell. Well, she's wrong.

Reporter. Mr. Powell, do you have any controversy with the House Administration Committee relative to whether your bills will or will not be paid?

Representative Powell. Not that I know of.

Reporter. Not that you know of?

Representative Powell. Mr. Derrickson, do you know, he has this, he handles this by the way.

Mr. Derrickson. All vouchers that were to pay expenditures have been forwarded to the Disbursing Office and if they have not been paid yet, it is not the committee's fault, but because the Disbursing Office has not yet paid them. To my knowledge, they haven't got any question to this committee or to the chairman as to why they haven't been paid.

Representative Powell. May I proceed and as I said we'll have this all ready for you as you leave, mimeographed. Now I want to thank the Washington Evening Star in its Sunday edition of February 17, for its very fair and objective story and its writer, Mr. Cecil Holland, whom I do not know if he's here, thank him personally. I want to thank also Newsweek which I just saw for trying to be objective in their story. I also wish to thank the entire Negro press of this Nation from coast to coast for their 100-percent unsolicited support. Now I am breaking this conference down into five subdivisions with a preamble. The preamble you have in your hand. Now as regards the first two parts of the conference. There will be absolutely no questions now or any more answered by me nor no comments now or anymore. The matter is completely closed as far as I am concerned. As regards the preamble, I know it is a little lengthy, but I don't have immunity and I therefore would like to state this without immunity.

Now the gentleman from Delaware purchased property prohibiting sale for use by people other than Aryans, an old Hitler concept. August 29, 1952, Senator John J. Williams and his wife Elsie Williams purchased from William D. Brasure, et ux., lots 25, 26, 27, 28, block 38, subdivision Rehoboth Heights at Rehoboth Beach, city of Rehoboth, Sussex County, Del., so forth and so forth, recorded you have it before you. The last sentence in that "said property not to be sold, conveyed, leased or mortgaged to premises or permitted to be occupied by any person not of the Aryan race," etc. I don't know what that means, the Aryan race, etc. Voting record: on all these issues affecting civil rights—housing, confirmation even on President Eisenhower's appointees, changing of the rules of the Senate—Senator Williams has opposed them.

At the opening of the 87th Congress, an attempt was made to liberalize the filibuster rule. He opposed Javits' amendment to desegregate the airport facilities. He opposed Senator Clark's amendment to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission, opposed Senator Javits' amendment to give the Attorney General the right to protect civil rights by injunctive action, opposed Senator Keating's Federal assistance to school desegregation amendment, opposed rule and change XXII again, he opposed the reorganization plan which would have made Dr. Robert Weaver member of the U.S. Cabinet, February 20, 1962. He opposed a civil rights bill offered by Senator Dirksen, August 9, 1960; he opposed Javits again on Federal funds airport segregated facilities. He opposed the cloture petition on March 10, 1960. He opposed part 3 of the civil rights bill.

Reporter. What has this got to do with the——

Representative Powell. It has got to do a lot and I'd like an opportunity to be heard without immunity. He opposed the establishment of the Commission on Equal Job Opportunity under Government contracts without racial discrimination. He opposed that; then he opposed Senator Keating again; amendment to give technical assistance to areas desegregated. He opposed Javits on antipoll tax. He opposed rule XXII again; 85th Congress, he opposed rule XXII again, civil rights bill again, he opposed item No. 18, he opposed the confirmation of the appointment of W. Wilson White as head of the Civil Rights Division, Mr. Eisenhower's appointee for the Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice, on and on we go. Item 22, he opposed President Eisenhower nominating Solicitor General Sobeloff to be a circuit court judge. Sobeloff represented the Department of Justice in opposing school segregation before the Supreme Court. On and on we go. He opposed item 25, Senator Lehman's sponsoring amendment which would have made violence against servicemen punishable as a Federal crime. Item 26, when Vice President Barkley gave a ruling that would make it easy to break a filibuster, he opposed Mr. Barkley's ruling.

Reporter. Congressman Powell, today on the Senate floor Senator Williams said that he had never made any charge relative to race or religion.

Representative Powell. Well, I didn't either.

Reporter. Or anything like this and that he contended that you had tried to cloud the issue by bringing up what he considers to be an immaterial point, now——

Representative Powell. When did I, this is the first time I have said anything.

Reporter. Well, I wondered if, yesterday you said something relative to the group that was involved in one of these housing operations or in your youth program in New York was composed of white people, Negroes and others——

Representative Powell. Yes; an integrated board of directors.

Reporter. And that he stated that he felt you were trying to cloud the issue by bringing a race problem in. I wondered if you felt you have done that or are doing that?

Representative Powell. Yes, yes, very definitely. Yes, and as I proceed, but the record there without immunity is before you: restrictive covenant in opposition to public housing, Robert Weaver, civil rights right through the years. Now, may I proceed? Under me as the new chairman, incoming chairman, the Committee on Education and Labor in 2 years produced laws and more legislation, than any other major committee in the House: 19 laws, 43 bills were passed out of the committee. Not one newspaper mentioned this. I can assure you that after caucusing with my subcommittee chairmen and with the Democratic majority, this session we are ready, willing, and able to duplicate this again in these 2 years of this Congress. Now——

Reporter. Well, Mr. Chairman, on that particular point, you'd made some point yesterday of a trip that you'd made abroad with two young ladies——

Representative Powell. Two staff members.

Reporter. Two staff members studying a problem of equal opportunity for women and that this had resulted in passage of some legislation, was that correct?

Representative Powell. I said that the women in charge of the group had brought about the passage through her efforts as the counsel was hired just for that purpose. For the first time in 25 years in the attempts by Republican and Democratic administrations, the passage in the House of equal pay for equal work——

Reporter. Well, Senator Williams made the point that the trip was made after the legislation had been passed in the House.

Representative Powell. Correct.

Reporter. And, he couldn't see how the trip would have helped pass the legislation if it came after.

Representative Powell. Because the Senate had no equipment for this at all and the result was it did die in the Senate.

Reporter. Your trip was to help——

Representative Powell. My trip was not that trip, sir.

Reporter. Well, the trip which the young ladies made——

Representative Powell. The trip that the staff members took; yes, sir.

Reporter. The young lady staff members was for the purpose of helping the Senate in its deliberations.

Representative Powell. Its purpose of bringing before us and not on our side because we were finished, the truth about equal pay for equal work in other parts of the world.

Reporter. Mr. Chairman.

Representative Powell. Now wait. I'm going to finish this first. Then we're going to ask questions.

Reporter. Well, Congressman, may I ask——

Representative Powell. You're my dear friend, so you may.

Reporter. Are you saying that Senator Williams is criticizing your expenditure of Federal funds because you are a Negro?

Representative Powell. I am saying, as I will develop here, that I haven't spent any Federal funds. That's what I am going to say. I have not spent one penny of Federal funds.

Reporter. Well, just his charges are motivated because you are Negro.

Representative Powell. Yes, sir, yes, sir.

Reporter. Mr. Chairman, I am from the Denver Post. I have a question. What report did you file regarding the impact of the Common Market on the United States. What form did this report take?

Representative Powell. This report—is Mr. Gamser here? Please step forward please, Mr. Gamser is chief counsel for labor. This report was printed and it's the only report, and I develop it in my remarks here, the only study made by the Senate or the House on the impact of the European Common Market on the U.S. economy was made by me. It was collated by my chief counsel, Mr. Gamser, and it ran 109 pages and it was a bestseller because the first day it came out, every print was exhausted. I had to order others, in fact Barratt O'Hara of the Foreign Affairs Committee personally ordered 100 copies for use of the Foreign Affairs Committee. May I proceed and I'll be glad to answer any questions. Now as regards section 1 which it deals with the counterpart and section 2, relatives on payrolls, I wish to state very emphatically that I will always do just what every other Congressman and committee chairman has done and is doing and will do. In the House of Representatives, six other committees—Appropriations, Armed Services, Government Operations, Judiciary, and Banking and Currency—spent much more money than the Committee on Education and Labor on counterpart funds. Now may I repeat again for my beloved friend from "Meet the Press," not one penny of committee funds and not one penny of taxpayers' dollars was or could even have been used by the Committee on Education and Labor.

I have had a report prepared by the Library of Congress who assigned Mr. Vladimir Pregel, analyst in International Trade and Finance Economics Division. And he explains in two sentences what counterpart funds are and I think that this is very important because one of my very dear friends of the press yesterday didn't understand. The U.S. Foreign Currency Accounts is the title of this paragraph. Within the scope of this report to me, this is counterpart, are only those foreign currency accounts which have been acquired without the expenditure of dollars. Foreign currency is derived from some specified sources which may be used without reimbursement in appropriated dollars. These are the funds used for congressional foreign travel. Not one penny of dollar funds used in any congressional travel.

Reporter. Mr. Chairman, Chairman Smith, of the Rules Committee, wrote into your resolution a prohibition against your committee using any counterpart funds on any travel out of the United States. Is that going to inhibit the action of your committee this year? Will your committee adhere to that decision?

Representative Powell. Well, let's get that when the time arrives, but I do say that not only my committee, but there were several other committees. Right? Now, I say that when the House assumed second-class status and forbids the committees of the House not to travel although the Senate can travel freely and the Senate does not disclose its itemized expenditures, when the House assumed second-class status, I had a further analysis made.

Reporter. Mr. Congressman, are you opposed to disclosures?

Representative Powell. No, but I think the Senate should do it. I am opposed to the House being second class.

Reporter. You don't want to lead the way on what you think is a good thing.

Representative Powell. No, I'd love to lead the way and we are doing it in the House.

Reporter. Well, now there was some question raised, I think in the House Administration Committee about the use of the term "miscellaneous" to cover large amounts. Now, do you feel that you have done a good job in breaking that down?

Representative Powell. Surely.

Reporter. Do you feel the committee was rather arbitrary in criticizing you and the members of that committee?

Representative Powell. Much better than my colleague Mr. Lankford.

Reporter. Well, do you think he is a pattern you should follow?

Representative Powell. No. What the trouble is, the trouble is there are no standards. The standards have just been adopted for the first time. But only for the House——

Reporter. But do you object?

Representative Powell. I object to the House being made second-class status.

Reporter. But do you think this is a good thing, wouldn't you be leading the way, rather than making the House second class?

Representative Powell. The Senate has never followed the House in these things, we led the way a long time ago on itemizing by Members. The Senate hasn't done it.

Reporter. Getting right down to the point, Are you willing at this time to make your spending on counterpart funds available for general scrutiny just to show everyone how?

Representative Powell. On March 1, I will, that's the date due.

Reporter. In detail, there will be no miscellaneous this time?

Representative Powell. No, sir.

Reporter. It's going to be right out on the line in every respect.

Representative Powell. Correct, I promise you that. But will the Senate do it? No. The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, told Congressman Jerry Cohelan, of California, when asked, what would happen to counterpart funds now that the House had stopped the use of them. He said the only thing there is to do is to put a match to them.

In 1961, $24 million of counterpart funds were unused and never will be. In 1962, $14 million unused. This is given to me by the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Reporter. Mr. Congressman, are you making the point here that you think, you agree with Mr. Dillon that these should just be done away with or are you in favor of a little loose spending, more loose spending to get rid of them.

Representative Powell. No; I am in favor of equal status with the Senate. That's all.

Reporter. Well, are you making the point here that you shouldn't limit the use of counterpart funds?

Representative Powell. No; but I say that they should be used.

Reporter. They should be used, but accounted for.

Representative Powell. Yes, sir. Mr. Derrickson will testify that in March of last year, I became the first chairman in the history of the Congress, House or Senate, to limit the expenditure of counterpart funds in a written memorandum to him. No other committee chairman in the House or the Senate has ever done this. Nobody allowed to spend more than—the top was $40, right, $40.

Mr. Derrickson. Fifty dollars in some places—to every penny accounted for.

Representative Powell. The only chairman that limited the expenditures on counterpart funds. That was in March.

Reporter. You limited members of your committee to a maximum of $50 a day on the travel.

Representative Powell. I think it was $40—he says $50. I take Mr. Derrickson's word.

Mr. Derrickson. In some cases, but every bit accounted for.

Representative Powell. Accounted for.

Reporter. This applies to the chairman as well as the members?

Representative Powell. Oh, yes, I've always lived on lower than that. Now, and under Mr. Graham Barden, who as you know was not my boon friend. Every year Mr. Barden gave me counterpart funds. Every single year. And he gave it to all of them.

Reporter. Mr. Congressman, may I go back one moment, to the trip in September of 1961 or 1962. Will that trip be reported in your report?

Representative Powell. Yes, sir, in detail, in detail, itemized.

Reporter. That involved the use of counterpart funds.

Representative Powell. Yes, sir, and not one penny of committee funds and not one penny of Federal funds. Must emphasize that.

REPORTER. Mr. Chairman, if they are not Federal funds, they belong to the people of the United States.

Representative POWELL. No, they don't. You see it is one of the peculiar things of the act as I point out, these are funds in foreign currency that cannot be utilized and as Mr. Dillon said, all we can do is stick a match to them.

REPORTER. Couldn't Congress, by an act of both Houses signed by the President, order——

Representative POWELL. No, sir, because it is foreign currency. Mr. Gamser, will you give me a list of——

REPORTER. Mr. Chairman, aren't those spent, they're spent now by the Embassy, aren't they?

Representative POWELL. No, sir.

REPORTER. They are not spent by the Embassy, not at all?

Representative POWELL. No sir. This is money going right down the drain.

REPORTER. They can't be used for military?

Representative POWELL. Yes, they can, now I want to point out something——

REPORTER. I thought there were a number of ways they could be spent.

Representative POWELL. Surely, I want to point out something very interesting, while you mention that point. The General Accounting Office lists disclosed last year that the Pentagon spent $7 million sending people overseas by commercial airliners while the Military Air Transport Service were going over with plenty of empty seats and while they had unused counterpart funds totaling $14 million unused.

REPORTER. Do you think you should crack down on the military?

Representative POWELL. I think crack down on anyone that does a thing like that. Another cute one, I don't know how you fellows missed this. The General Accounting Office also in its report to Congress last year pointed out the Department of Agriculture on public lands had operated for 4 years a house of prostitution. On public land.

REPORTER. You're not making any suggestion about counterpart funds to——

Representative POWELL. Well, there ought to be some solution there.

REPORTER. Are we talking about the degree of magnitude of the sin or the sin itself here?

Representative POWELL. No.

REPORTER. Aren't the counterpart funds used by the USIS to combat Communist propaganda?

Representative POWELL. Correct, may I go ahead?

REPORTER. Will more be available for that?

Representative POWELL. Surely, now let us look at counterpart a little more. The Senate with 100 Members and the House with 433, the past 2 years has sent more staff members than the House and spent more money than the House in counterpart funds. To show how much further the House becomes second class, in 1961, the average amount of money spent by a House Member counterpart was $850 and by the Senate in excess of $2,000. I would also like to point out all this comes from the report of the Library of Congress. I would also like to point out that in 1959 President Eisenhower, that is, there was appropriated to the President $688,000 and in 1961, President Kennedy $680,000 in counterpart. In other words the executive branch spent more than combined totals of the Senate and the House.

REPORTER. Well, now on specifics do you feel that you have gone second class?

Representative POWELL. I always travel tourist.

REPORTER. Well, I just wondered, with regard to your own operation do you feel you haven't been treated in a second-class manner? Do you feel that you have spent enough counterpart funds to be first class?

Representative POWELL. I would say, I don't know what you mean first class, the House has reduced itself to second class on this counterpart issue.

REPORTER. They didn't spend as much on the over all?

Representative POWELL. Correct.

REPORTER. Do you feel that you have kept up with the Senators on the——

Representative POWELL. No, indeed, indeed no, no—why the night that the press said I was in a nightclub in Paris, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER was in the same nightclub at the same time with 10 guests. And the—wait a minute, may I proceed—and the reservations for his party had been made by the U.S. Embassy. And he was provided with counterpart funds to pay for all of the 10.

REPORTER. Did you have guests that night?

Representative POWELL. No.

REPORTER. Did you use counterpart funds?

Representative POWELL. Me, surely at $40 a day I couldn't take 10 people to the Lido.

REPORTER. Well, how many did you have with you that night?

Representative POWELL. Never more than $40 per day. Yes sir, never more. Now, let's go to the question of relatives on payroll. Mr. Vance Trimble did a story on this and got a prize for doing it. Over 100 Members of the House of Representatives have their relatives on payrolls that we know about. There are many others on payrolls in other areas of the legislature and executive branches. The House is again reduced itself to second-class status, publishes in detail the names, while the Senate refuses to do this. But we do know there are innumerable relatives on the payroll on the Senate side either in their offices or in the committees, including wives.

REPORTER. Well, now on this point here, the Senate does make available the payroll of——

Representative POWELL. Not like the House.

REPORTER. Well, probably not like the House, but it is a payroll made available periodically that shows—do you think that having relatives on the payroll is a good thing?

Representative POWELL. Yes, very good, very good.

REPORTER. You think it should——

Representative POWELL. As long as 100 plus Members of the House and "X" numbers of Senators, then I am going to do it.

REPORTER. Well, you're not criticizing the 100 Members—what you're really doing is complimenting them.

Representative POWELL. I compliment all my colleagues. Now, now let's get down to section 3 on my agenda and that regards housing. No loans have been made by the HHFA because the FFHA does, insures mortgages. Statement 2: No insurance of mortgages by any agency of the Federal Government has ever been made to me. The Adam Clayton Powell Foundation was established by me in honor of my father, who was a pioneer in housing for senior citizens in Harlem - when in 1926, backed by the church, the Adam Clayton Powell Home for the Aged was opened at 732 St. Nicholas Avenue, Manhattan, the first one of its kind. That's my heritage. I set up the Adam Clayton Powell Foundation in honor of my father and resigned from that foundation almost a year ago. I do not even know the new board members, I haven't met with them. I do know the board is interracial and I will continue to help them and any other group in the United States of America to establish nonprofit housing for senior citizens or any other form of housing for those who desperately need it in the lower income bracket.

REPORTER. Well, on this point, Mr. Congressman could you tell us just exactly what you did to help this group in their application for insurance for loans.

Representative POWELL. Nothing.

REPORTER. You did absolutely nothing?

Representative POWELL. Nothing.

REPORTER. Did you do anything to help them obtain——

Representative POWELL. Except I did find out that one of the obstacles, and I am not going to release his name today, but I have already informed the appropriate officials, one of the obstacles to them achieving certain justifiable insurance was that the chief executive in this particular branch of the Federal Housing Authority, after the President had issued his no-bias order had a restrictive covenant on his own house. When I did call this to the attention of his boss, he was then promoted to be a regional director.

REPORTER. Do you criticize the Kennedy administration for having promoted him?

Representative POWELL. No, I just found out, talking to the White House this week that they didn't know about it.

REPORTER. Well, you criticized the man; you do not feel that he should have been kept on that kind of job.

Representative POWELL. Absolutely. How can a man have restrictive covenants on his house and this one not only excluded Negroes but Jews and Orientals and try to put through the President's no-bias housing order and then be promoted in honor of it.

REPORTER. Have you made any suggestions to the President relative to this particular matter?

Representative POWELL. No, but I have discussed it with appropriate officials of the White House.

REPORTER. Do you plan on taking any further action?

Representative POWELL. Yes, sir, I do. I am not going to give the name now; no, I am not even going to whistle if you call his name. Now, let's get to the question of ACT; there has been established in Harlem, where it is desperately needed, a project to help teenagers, young people in our community, under the group called the Associated Community Teens or ACT. I do not know the members of the board of directors. I have never attended a board of directors meeting. I do not know the staff members; I have never attended a staff meeting. I do not know what the project looks like, having never entered the building since the project began, but I do know from a survey made by the Attorney General and the director of the project, Mr. Hackett, that it is one of the best. I do know in a statement made by the gentlelady from Oregon, Mrs. GREEN, the authoress of the bill, yesterday morning that it is the only one in the United States with an action program, and I do know from Mr. Holland's article in the Sunday Star, which, I believe, is a Republican paper, where he spent 3 days surveying it. That the rental being paid is, quote, "reasonable" and that the salaries being paid, quote, "are not out of line," in fact, quote, "they are less than some of the other projects in this particular act." A veteran New York social worker, Mr. James E. McCarthy, said, and I quote again, "we look favorably upon it," and that Mr. Chester S. Page, the director of the Red Cross, New York, said to Mr. Holland, and I quote, "this is the best idea that has ever happened here." And now, last, yes, sir.

REPORTER. In both of these projects, the housing and the ACT, you seem to have been active in instigating it but immediately withdrew.

Representative POWELL. Correct.

REPORTER. Would you explain what your function was and why you withdrew so rapidly?

Representative POWELL. The reason why I withdrew was because there would not be any conflict of interest. That's why I withdrew.

REPORTER. Well, how would that be a conflict of interest of your remaining active in this teenage project.

Representative POWELL. Because without being active in it, I have been accused of being involved in a conflict of interest. With being active, so if I had been active——

REPORTER. Because of the use of Federal funds.

Representative POWELL. I guess that would be it, yes, sir. And may I point out that the amount of money appropriated for ACT with the only action program in the United States, $250,000, while right down the street on the lower east 57th side, Mobilization for Youth now has $12 million.

REPORTER. Senator WILLIAMS today stated that he has received correspondence from HEW in this particular case and it did identify you as an official of ACT.

Representative POWELL. Yes.

REPORTER. And that this correspondence was as of last November, in which that was the information which came to him. When did your status change?

Representative POWELL. I have not resigned from the board of directors of ACT. But I never attended a meeting.

REPORTER. You're still on the board of directors.

Representative POWELL. Twenty-five-member board, yes, sir.

REPORTER. You have not been active?

Representative POWELL. Have not been to a board meeting.

REPORTER. Did you do anything to contact HEW to help this along?

Representative POWELL. Oh, yes, yes, indeed, of course, the whole concept.

REPORTER. What did you do?

Representative POWELL. The concept of the Domestic Peace Corps was mine and this was the concept that I sat and talked with Mr. David Hackett, the director of the program, and they said this is the concept that they were thrilled over. And it was on the basis of that they drew up the contract establishing for the first time in the United States of America a Domestic Peace Corps which has been praised, as I have said already by these objective people, and which I think is going to make a major contribution.

REPORTER. Do you feel that you are the father of the Domestic Peace Corps then?

Representative POWELL. If you want to make me a father—my wife talks about—well, never mind. Now as regards taxes, I always pay my taxes promptly. It is amazing for a U.S. Senator to ask the head of the Internal Revenue what my taxes were for 1962 when none of us file them until April 15 of 1963. There has been nothing dilatory on the part of the Federal Government concerning my taxes. In fact, I think I have been the victim of both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations in this area. I was tried under the Eisenhower administration for criminally evading taxes. You do not pay taxes in excess on years that you are being tried for until the trial is over. I beat that trial and when the trial was over, my attorney, Edward Bennett Williams went to work with the Government which then was the Kennedy administration on what they claimed was owed and what we claimed was owed, which is a perfectly normal way of always conducting tax settlements. No agreement was reached and my lawyer, Edward Bennett Williams, then entered the matter into the tax court, the United States Tax Court, and you can check, is 3 to 4 years behind in the cases in its docket. It'll probably be there for a year or more before my case is reached in due order, unless again, the Government wants to be unduly harsh with me and put my case ahead of those that have been pending. Also, may I point out that the vast majority of the excess taxes which the Government claims is owed to them is not mine, but because of joint returns—my former wife, Miss Hazel Scott.

REPORTER. Mr. POWELL, on that particular point you said you always paid your taxes promptly and Senator WILLIAMS was making the point today in the Senate, he said that he was informed by the Internal Revenue Service that you are delinquent in your taxes for 1949, that the Internal Revenue Service states to him in a letter that you are delinquent in your taxes for 1949, 1950, 1951 and so forth, that they filed a letter with, a 90-day letter, in which they stated that you must pay up or else, that was also due with regard to this civil fraud penalties of 50 percent. In other words, the present administration has made the findings that there is a delinquency due to them plus civil fraud penalties.

Representative POWELL. Correct.

REPORTER. Now, do you feel that the administration is all wrong as well as Senator WILLIAMS?

Representative POWELL. No, my lawyer says they're all wrong, Edward Bennett Williams.

REPORTER. How do you feel about it personally, you spent the money?

Representative POWELL. I feel that my lawyer is correct and that's why we are going into Tax Court.

REPORTER. But you feel that you do pay your taxes promptly and there is no justification——

Representative POWELL. Yes, sir. There has not been a single year in my life that my taxes have not been paid on time. This is a dispute between the Government and my lawyer on whether it is a correct amount or not for those years. And you must recognize also, sir, that today there is no one in the United States who makes in excess of $25,000 whose tax return is not audited and ofttimes there is the Government claims that more is owed and they sit down at table and try to reach a compromise on this. And you can pick up the papers which you write and see that a person owes "X" amount of money and it was settled between them and the Government by a much, much less sum. In this case they won't do it.

REPORTER. Didn't the administration in its filing of the 90-day letter with you contend that there was a willful evasion of tax?

Representative POWELL. Surely, that's why we went to court, it was on that basis.

REPORTER. But they contended that it was a willful evasion not because——

Representative POWELL. I didn't willfully evade—no, no.

REPORTER. Didn't they contend that?

Representative POWELL. I don't know what they contended on that, all I can say is that on the advice of Mr. Williams who received the letter that day that he says we should go to court on this because they are wrong.

REPORTER. Well, didn't they assert a civil fraud penalty?

Representative POWELL. Correct and that's what we were going to——

REPORTER. And didn't they assert then also that it was this administration and the past administration assert that it was willful evasion?

Representative POWELL. The past administration asserted criminal fraud.

REPORTER. But isn't the present administration asserting that it was civil fraud?

Representative POWELL. Oh, yes. That's why I say that the present administration has not been dilatory.

REPORTER. Then it isn't Senator WILLIAMS, it is the administration really that is wrong.

Representative POWELL. Yes, but I say Senator WILLIAMS is wrong when he blames the Kennedy administration for being dilatory. I'm proving that they're not. Not dilatory.

REPORTER. You're proving they're doing a good job.

Representative POWELL. Proving it with my aching back.

REPORTER. Mr. Chairman, yesterday you were asked why you thought you were being made a target and you said you thought perhaps that some people in the Congress were jealous. Today you say it is because you are a Negro, would you——

Representative POWELL. Yes, I say unequivocally, it was because I am a Negro. Unequivocally, unequivocally, against the background especially of this record of Senator WILLIAMS. I say unequivocally. This Congress and you gentlemen know it, the House and the Senate are filled with men and women who have done and are doing the same things. Using counterpart funds, relatives on the payroll, getting projects for their districts, you know that, in fact, projects that aren't of any value they're getting. Yes, sir.

REPORTER. I believe you said that there were some December bills still due which would go beyond your budget——

Representative POWELL. No, I didn't say that, I didn't say anything about going beyond my budget.

REPORTER. Then there are no outstanding bills——

Representative POWELL. I don't know, I imagine that a bill, that anything you contract for in December cannot be paid until January. I imagine that, that is usual bookkeeping.

REPORTER. Then your report filed at the end of January is complete——

Representative POWELL. Complete as far as the committee is concerned. Mr. Derrickson, who is the old pro on the committee and Miss Dargens, they handle that.

REPORTER. Nothing owed for the last 2 years?

Mr. DERRICKSON. If there is, I don't know anything about it, they haven't told us. These vouchers are sent to the disbursing office by our committee. They make the payments. If there has been a delay or any question about a payment, it exists between the disbursing office and the person that which I am to pay. As far as I am, the committee is concerned, payment has been authorized. The committee does not make direct payment they are made through the disbursing office.

REPORTER. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that you will name some names of other people who are doing this?

Representative POWELL. No, sir. That's Vance Trimble's job. That's obvious, let's not talk about the obvious, all you fellows know.

REPORTER. You said that you didn't know anyone on the ACT board, isn't Mr. Wingate on the board?

Representative POWELL. I said I did not know the board of directors, meaning I did not know the 25 people on the board. I just found out, for instance, from Mr. Holland's article about the superintendent of schools. You must tell me which one you mean.

REPORTER. Well, the Senator WILLIAMS from Delaware.

Representative POWELL. OK, I am just kidding you.

REPORTER. Senator WILLIAMS made the point today that the Eisenhower administration, that you felt that the Eisenhower administration also had been what he called soft on you and that particularly he made reference to some reports that you had received some large amounts of money in 1956 in connection with some political campaign for political support. I am sure you are aware of the general contentions at that time. Could you tell us something about that whole matter. Did you receive any large amount of money in connection with political support?

Representative POWELL. I didn't receive one penny in campaigning that year, that money was given by the Republican National Committee to this fellow married to Harvey Firestone's daughter, Charles Willis, and he operated this entirely from a check account. I had no access to it, whatsoever and do not know how much it was or what was spent—me personally.

Reporter. Was it used for your benefit?

Representative Powell. My benefit, no indeed, it was used——

Reporter. Well, now did you support the Eisenhower administration in 1956?

Representative Powell. You know well I did, you know that.

Reporter. Well, I just wondered why did you feel compelled to do that at that stage when there was no monetary consideration involved.

Representative Powell. Will you stop beating your wife, you're going back to 1956.

Reporter. No, no, I am just asking——

Representative Powell. It has already been told, it is a matter of record.

Reporter. Well, I thought that since it came up again you could straighten the whole record out for us.

Representative Powell. October 1954 Reader's Digest will tell you why I supported Eisenhower. I wrote an article, the late Dr. Stanley High, who was a dear friend of mine. We sat together one day and he said why don't you put in an article and I wrote it in October 1954, what Eisenhower had done detail by detail, date by date, in the field of civil rights. I tried to get a commitment from Mr. Stevenson, and Carmine DeSapio couldn't get me to see him. Bill Green, of Philadelphia, whose man was Stevenson's campaign manager, said Stevenson refused to see me. All I wanted Stevenson to do was to make a certain statement on civil rights and here was the choice, between a man who wouldn't make it, wouldn't see me and a man who had a record which I had already detailed in October 1954 Reader's Digest. I came up Eisenhower.

Reporter. Mr. Chairman, you apparently are going to ask the committee for about $65,000 more as I recall it, for the next 2 years of operation.

Representative Powell. Well, I don't want to go into that at all because that's the committee's province, but I will say that since it's $65,000 more you're worth, I'm giving the Republicans on the committee $80,000 more and giving the subcommittee chairmen of the committee $120,000 more which means I'll be cutting down the full committee by approximately $150,000.

Reporter. Mr. Powell, the Republicans say that 2 years ago in your proposal you had $42,000 for the minority, the minority only got $22,000, they don't believe that they'll get the $110,000.

Representative Powell. Well, if they don't believe, well that's their choice. I keep my word when people keep theirs. It so happens that Mr. Kearns did not keep his word with me. Mr. Frelinghuysen and I have discussed this. I have given him my pledged word. I have put it in writing to him and I intend to keep my word and I am sure he will keep his.

Reporter. What ratio of minority staff employees will that lead to?

Representative Powell. That's up to him, he can take the $110,000 and spend it any way he wants. Whatever voucher he brings to me, he can't go over the limit which is $18,895. But as many people as he wants to employ or whatever he wants to spend it for, I'll sign any voucher Pete Frelinghuysen has up to $110,000.

Reporter. One Hundred and ten thousand dollars is the amount; is that right?

Representative Powell. That's correct—plus two people on the standing committee getting paid $18,895 and what does Beverly get—$8,000 to $50,000 more for 2 years—that makes $160,000 altogether. The largest amount of money that any minority has received in the history of Congress and that's for salaries only, we pay expenses for them in addition, I think that's very fair. No committee chairman has ever done this.

Reporter. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask you a question on this civil rights. There's been some suggestion that all of this publicity and criticism to which you have been subjected, has been somewhat unfavorable to the cause of civil liberties for Negroes in the United States, what would you say?

Representative Powell. I would say that that might be the effect of it. Especially when you view that the man who's doing it, is a man who is 100 percent opposed to civil rights. But I am sure that when the chips are down that people will vote as they always have, will vote their conscience.

Reporter. Mr. Chairman, in the light of your feelings along this line, do you feel that you would have any obligation at all to lean over backward to avoid criticism so these people wouldn't be picking on you?

Representative Powell. No, no, first thing, it doesn't matter. It doesn't bother me.

Reporter. Do you feel as an individual, that there is any problem relative to the civil rights cause and so forth——

Representative Powell. No, that's the view, you see, that a lot of people say, the minorities have got to be twice this as compared to others, I take the view that equality is equality and I take the view that I am a Member of Congress as good as anybody else. As long as it is within the law it's not wrong—violating the law, then its wrong. If the law is wrong—change the laws, but I resent the House being made a second-class body. I think everything that the House has done is good and should be adopted by the Senate but, until the Senate adopts it, I don't think we should practice it.

Reporter. Mr. Powell, do you view any of these things such as the use of counterpart funds for attending nightclubs or going to resorts as abusive of congressional privilege?

Representative Powell. No, because it's done by all of them.

Reporter. You mean whether it is right or wrong?

Representative Powell. Well, there is no right or wrong in it, it's nonprohibitive. It was set up that way.

Reporter. Was it set up to go to nightclubs?

Representative Powell. Well, I am sure that you don't go to Paris and stay all the time in Notre Dame.

Reporter. But is that part of committee business?

Representative Powell. Of course it's part of it. You're going abroad, travel is a very broadening kind of education and I wish to assure you that it is practiced by every Member of the House and the Senate. I think you ought to talk to some of my colleagues and ask them where they were when I was over there. You know there were a lot over there when I was there. Senator Maurine Neuberger was there, oh, Senator Frank Moss was there, by the way, and in a private plane of the U.S. Air Force with two full colonels all by himself. All the way from Washington, all over Europe and back. Paid for by your dollars, not counterpart. Otto Passman was there, Vic Anfuso, what did you say, am I going to run again?

Reporter. In 1964?

Representative Powell. Most assuredly now, you of the press have just put me in an untenable position, I've got to run whether I want to or not.

Reporter. Are you serious about this or is that kidding?

Representative Powell. About running again? Sure I'm going to run again; if I didn't run again, it would look like I am running out.

Reporter. Was there any doubt in your mind before?

Representative Powell. Yes, very definitely, very definitely.

Reporter. Why?

Representative Powell. Why wouldn't I run again? They've got too many old people to begin with around here now, not including you, Mae Craig. You're as young looking now as when I first knew you 20 years ago. But I resent the chairmanship system by senility—by seniority is all right, but senility, no.

Reporter. You don't anticipate any problems?

Representative Powell. Of senility?

Reporter. No.

Representative Powell. I might, I might.

Reporter. I would have thought that perhaps you were moving to Puerto Rico.

Representative Powell. That's what I would really like to do; I'm 55 years old this year—retirement age, you see.

Reporter. And become Puerto Rican?

Representative Powell. Become Puerto Rican? A Puerto Rican is a citizen of the United States.

Reporter. I said become Puerto Rican.

Representative Powell. You can't become Puerto Rican, you got to have ethnic background and Spanish descent and so forth. I could become Puerto Rican by osmosis and it is working pretty good.

Reporter. What reaction is there in your district now because of the charges of Senator Williams?

Representative Powell. Well, I think—I don't know whether it is Time magazine or Newsweek this week which has the headline from the leading Negro newspaper in New York. Right across the top of the headline was "Ho Hum, They're After Adams Again."

Reporter. What about your mail from constituents?

Representative Powell. Oh, the constituents—100 percent.

Reporter. They're right in back of you 100 percent? Do you know of any Negro or Negroes or group of Negroes, who do not support you wholeheartedly?

Representative Powell. As I said to you, Mr. Stone, earlier, that every paper in this country—they're here before me, Republican and Democrat Negro—20 million Negro people. Their press—100 percent.

Reporter. Mr. Powell, don't you feel any personal urgency I gather in your plans to draw a bill of your own that might curb some of this excess gallivanting around Europe by other people?

Representative Powell. No, no; that's Judge Smith's province.

Reporter. I would think you'd feel probably that you want to crusade on this—you've talked about it so much.

Representative Powell. I haven't talked about it, you talked about it.

Reporter. You're here to explain, I was just asking questions.

Representative Powell. Frankly, I don't know what I came to explain for, but as I said I am not here to answer charges, I just wanted to clear up a few misstatements, inaccuracies.

Reporter. I am sure that none of this disturbs you, does it not bother you to be called an adult delinquent?

Represenative Powell. No, no; not at all.

Reporter. What effect within the committee, Mr. Chairman?

Representative Powell. Well, I think one of the nicest things happened, was when I saw President Kennedy with regards Federal aid to education. I went to the White House directly from a caucus of the Democrats where unanimously they said they were against the omnibus Federal aid to education bill. I told the President that I was in favor, but politically a realist I was—it didn't have a chance. But I would let the hearings go along for 2 or 3 weeks and then in the language of the President, and I can't quote the President, I would take a second

look. We took a second look yesterday morning and the committee now is 100 percent in back of me. That is, Democrats—100 percent in back of the omnibus approach. What the final shape of the omnibus bill is it will not be the same. No, I don't know what that'll be.

Reporter. You said that Senator Williams had been 100 percent opposed to civil rights. Isn't it right that he voted for each of the major civil rights bills that have come out?

Representative Powell. Yes, after he had voted against every amendment.

Reporter. Thank you.

Appendix B

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 17, 1963]

Peace Corps in Harlem Toils To Get Off Ground

(By Cecil Holland)

New York, February 16.—There's bustle and excitement—and also some concern—in a building up in central Harlem here.

This is the headquarters of a fledgling domestic peace corps which is struggling to get off the ground despite a bombardment of senatorial criticism.

The project is the acknowledged brainchild of Adam Clayton Powell, New York Representative. But its leaders vehemently deny charges by critics that it was the Kennedy administration's tender concern for the Negro Democratic Congressman that led to a $250,000 Federal grant for an opening attack on Harlem's surging juvenile delinquency.

"It's a fact that Adam Clayton Powell negotiated this grant," said Livingston L. Wingate, the project's director. "His influence was used to get it."

"How in the hell does a community get a grant if not through its Congressman? If he didn't negotiate it, he should be run out."

Mr. Wingate, a Harlem lawyer on leave as associate counsel of Mr. Powell's House Education and Labor Committee, rattled off reasons why Harlem, suffering from social and economic stagnation should receive Federal assistance.

The sprawling Negro community in upper Manhattan, he pointed out, has the highest delinquency rate in New York. In admissions to mental institutions, infant mortality, arrests for narcotic violations and other indices of social ills it also ranks at the top.

"This is the worst juvenile delinquency spot in America," Mr. Wingate continued. "How could they refuse to give us a grant?"

Senator John J. Williams, Republican, of Delaware, recently cited the project as one of several examples of "the loose manner in which the administration has been shoveling the taxpayer's money" out to Mr. Powell.

But Mr. Wingate pointed out that the grant was made not to the Negro Congressman, but to an organization known as Associated Community Teams, Inc.—ACT, for short. The agency, he emphasized, is run by a 16-member board representing a cross-section of the community.

"Adam hasn't interfered and practically couldn't," Mr. Wingate went on. "He would have to sell the board, and as a consequence he doesn't try."

Members of the board include Dr. Charles Shapp, superintendent of schools for the Harlem district; Andrew Tyler, president of the Harlem Bar Association, and a number who were described as not friendly to Adam.

The Negro Congressman is one of the incorporators of ACT and one of the directors. But Mr. Powell, who was vacationing in Puerto Rico at latest reports, has never attended a meeting of ACT's board and has "never been over the premises since we opened up," Mr. Wingate says.

"He's done his job and doesn't need to interfere," the director went on. "All he needs is for it to be clean and work. Assuming he is a practical politician, he can leave it alone and have the gratitude of Harlem. You can't get his mark off this project."

SECOND GROUP AIDED

If it were not for Mr. Powell's connection with it, the project might have escaped national attention. Two blocks away from its offices there is another organization known as Harlem Youth Opportunities, Inc., with which Mr. Powell is not personally identified.

Haryou, as it is called, has received a Federal grant of $230,000 for mapping out a broad-scale program attacking Harlem's delinquency. It has received little or no attention.

As now contemplated, the two organizations eventually will merge their efforts and seek multimillion-dollar Federal and other assistance for a major Harlem project. In purpose it would be similar to the $12.6 million, 3-year program now underway, with great acclaim, in New York's lower East Side with Federal, city and private funds.

Whether this comes about for Harlem will depend, to a large extent, on the success of Mr. Powell's peace corps under the eyes of a critical Congress.

ON ITS OWN

With its present $250,000 grant and the expectation of getting $125,000 more, ACT is very much on its own. Peace Corps officials in Washington said it has no connection whatever with the Kennedy administration's foreign showpiece. And those working on President Kennedy's projected domestic program for youth disclaim any connections with it and deny that it is a "pilot project."

It is an orphan as far as New York City is concerned, too. Mayor Wagner's staff currently is drafting recommendations it will present to the Kennedy administration about its own proposed domestic organization.

"In general, we think ACT is a very interesting idea," said one of the city's administrators. "But we have nothing to do with it."

ACT received its $250,000 grant last August from the Health, Education, and Welfare Department under authority of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. More than 30 similar grants have been made throughout the country.

The law requires that recipients contribute money, facilities or services for carrying out the project. An HEW official said $9,000 had been contributed to the Harlem project by the Adam Clayton Powell Foundation, but this, it was learned here, seemed to be in error.

Mr. Wingate said it was planned to raise $9,000 by public subscription, but no campaign so far had been launched.

ACT has been slow in getting underway, receiving its first trainees only last month. They numbered 28 college students—16 men and 12 women—and they came from 21 States. Seven are from the Harlem area itself.

Mr. Wingate said it was planned to have at least a third of the trainees white, but arrangements could not be completed in time for them to leave their schools. Applications are pending, he added, from white students at Harvard, Radcliffe, and Bennington. ACT hopes to start a second class in June.

PAID $75 A MONTH

The students will undergo 2 months of intensive training and then will be assigned to social agencies and hospitals for a year's work in Harlem.

The peace corps men will receive travel pay, subsistence, a $2-a-day spending allowance and $75 a month, to be paid to them at the end of their service.

As outlined by Mr. Wingate and others, ACT's program includes three features: The Peace Corps, the use of the corpsmen to train and direct an urban service corps, and a third goal, which is not yet designed, aimed at aiding adults.

Mr. Wingate and others said they hoped the undertaking would pull together "under one umbrella" all the groups working in the Harlem area, as has been done in the lower East Side project.

Senator Lausche, Democrat, of Ohio, has questioned the administrative costs of the project, including rent and staff salaries.

NEAR POWELL CHURCH

ACT occupies 7,694 square feet on two floors of a building on 137th Street, just off Seventh Avenue, and backing up against the Abyssinian Baptist Church of which Mr. Powell has been pastor for many years. The building is owned by Adam Clayton Powell Center, Inc., named for Mr. Powell's father and the church's former pastor, and is, it was explained, in effect an extension of the church.

ACT pays a rental of $2,000 a month or about $3 a square foot. According to an appraisal Mr. Wingate had made before the lease was signed, the rate is in line with other rental properties, and the building was the only one in the Harlem area where such an amount of space was available.

Others in New York described the rate as reasonable. "Even in the depressed areas space is at a premium and rental rates are not low," one man familiar with the situation said.

At present the Harlem "peace corps" has a staff of 26 and 3 part-time consultants. It has contracted with New York University for two-fifths of the teaching services of Dr. Jeanne Noble, an expert on community relations, and 20 days of consulting time at a total cost of $3,400. In addition, Dr. Wingate said, Dr. Nable is doing research free for the agency.

SALARIES COMPARED

Staff salaries range down from a top of $16,000. A source not connected with ACT said this is not out of line. The lower East Side project known as mobilization for youth has 192 on its staff with salaries ranging up to $21,000. Haryou, the other Harlem project, employs 16 persons. A spokesman declined to say what the salaries are.

James E. McCarthy, director of the lower East Side project and a veteran of New York social work, commended the Harlem project as a step in meeting a community need.

"We look favorably upon it," he said. "We think it will work."

The trainees and the agency itself received an unexpected lesson in community work in a recent Harlem apartment fire which left several hundred homeless.

Under Mr. Wingate's direction the new agency tried its wings by helping out at the fire scene and later by finding homes and organizing a clothing drive for the victims. They brought a response from all over New York.

According to Chester F. Page, director of Red Cross disaster services in New York and formerly of Kensington, Md., the corps did "a very good job" in mobilizing community resources.

"This is the best idea that has ever happened here," Mr. Page said. "They are working toward developing a do-it-yourself program."

If it succeeds, Mr. Page said ACT will become a part of the New York's disaster relief program.

But just where the Harlem organization goes from here depends not only on itself, but on what Congress will do in providing additional funds for a long-range program. Here is an area where everyday living is in itself a problem, if not something of a disaster.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, my experience in the House is limited to 2 years and, consequently, I have not attended too many special orders, but I would like the RECORD to show that this special order just concluded was very well attended by Members of the House who gave it their very close attention. Mr. Speaker, that fact speaks for itself.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. I listened attentively to the gentleman's remarks. I want to commend him for doing something that many Members have felt needed to be done on the floor of the House. I think there is no question but that this House is going to have to do something toward establishing proper ethics and rules of conduct for its Members so that the kind of statement referred to by the gentleman from Ohio cannot be made unchallenged by any Member of the House. I think these actions are improper. I think they are probably illegal. I have not researched to that extent. Certainly, they are not the ordinary practice of the Members of the House, and unless I am in error overwhelmingly, the Members of the House regard this as improper practice and something that they would not indulge in. I could not agree with the gentleman more, that the entire reputation of the Congress is at stake and the reputation of the House and of the Senate has been lowered in the eyes of the people because of these inaccurate and untrue remarks that have been made according to the press release. I do not know whether the statements actually were made, but if the press releases are accurate, and I know the gentleman has the press releases and read those accurately, but if the press releases are accurately reported, and I think they undoubtedly are, then I would say those are untrue statements, that this is not done by every Member of the House. Most Members do not condone it. They are opposed to it. I do not want to interject partisan remarks, but I must make this remark: This Congress is under the control of the Democratic leadership. I think that there is a responsibility of the leadership to do something about this.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to add my commendation and say to the gentleman that he has said some things that badly needed to be said. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALGER. I, too, want to join with the gentleman and thank him for having the courage as well as the forthrightness to say what needed to be said. And so that my colleagues understand, even as each of us, of course, is responsible for his own conduct, and I have the honor as has each other Member to represent some mighty fine people, I put my views on this in the RECORD yesterday at page 2987 with reference to the expenditures made by one of the Members of this body when he was overseas.

It is my further contention that there are times when the Members of this body not only must travel the world but should travel all over the world when we have so many commitments abroad, but there are many trips that might very well be curtailed. I am going into my ninth year here. I have not been called upon to travel abroad. I hope some day if I can make any contribution to the matter then under consideration I may have the opportunity, but I do not intend to be reckless.

I am sure there are many others who will say that the conduct of one of our colleagues does not speak for the rest of us in this body. Certainly it does not speak for the Member from the Fifth District of Texas. I join with others who feel that we should do whatever housecleaning is necessary when this body is not properly represented, as the representatives of the people not only of Texas but throughout the United States.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield.

Mr. McCLORY. I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio on his statement here this afternoon during his special order, and particularly with reference to the attempted setting up of a peace corps without any legislative authority and the expenditure of funds which is reported without any proper appropriation by the House and Senate, a measure of questionable wisdom in the first place, but one which is certainly without any legislative sanction. As a member of the Committee on Government Operations of the House, I am hopeful that the chairman of the committee will see fit to have this subject investigated as suggested by the gentleman from Ohio, so that we can determine ways and means by which greater economy can be developed.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am sure that in the matter of setting up this particular group the gentleman will remember that during the debate last year covering this juvenile delinquency act it was stressed that there would be cooperation with the State and local groups. It was also stated that the latter groups would make expenditures on their own part. As to this point, no contribution has been made by this particular group in Harlem. I think it is a subject that should be studied carefully.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGER. I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Ohio for bringing up this matter on the floor. Recently on a trip home the one question that was presented to me by more people than any other one question was: "What is the matter with the Members of Congress? You are all tarred with the same brush. Why do you not do something about the actions of this Member of the House?" And I want to say frankly that we are all tarred with exactly the same thing which he accuses us of; and I, for one, resent being accused of that because I have not committed those things which he says we all did. I think it is incumbent upon the Members of this House and especially upon the majority party to do something to curb this type of operation, because it has brought the House and the Members of the House into disrepute everywhere.

In my district that is the one burning question: "Why do you not do something about it?" And I certainly am delighted that a Member on our side has brought this matter before us. I hope that our own Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will take unto itself some investigation as to the use of the HEW fund on this private so-called operation of a domestic peace corps in Harlem.

REPORT OF UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE LESS DEVELOPED AREAS, GENEVA, SWITZERLAND, FEBRUARY 4–20, 1963

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege for me to serve with the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman JOHN W. DAVIS, as an observer for the Congress of the United States at the recent U.N. Conference on Science and Technology for the Benefit of the Less Developed Areas in Geneva.

I should like to present to you and the House of Representatives a report of my views concerning this Conference.

First, I must state that the U.S. delegation under the direction of Prof. Walsh McDermott and with the guidance of Ambassador Jonathan B. Bingham and Ambassador Roger W. Tubby was exceptionally well qualified for the task. The daily detail work of David Tilson and Thomas W. Wilson as well as all members of the staff was commendable.

THE CONFERENCE

The purpose of the Conference was stated by President Kennedy that we should have a decade of development for underdeveloped nations. This would help to disseminate acquired scientific and technological knowledge to all nations.

Nearly 2,000 delegates from 87 countries were represented at this Conference. The contrasting viewpoints of the Western World with the Soviet bloc of nations was secondary to science and technology in the minds of the less developed nations of Africa, Asia, and the Middle East. An attempt to inject politics on the first day of the Conference was made by the chief Soviet delegate when he stated:

> The ridiculous circumstances which bring about the absence of such peace-loving countries as [Communist] China, North Vietnam, North Korea and People's [East] Germany.
>
> We cannot and will not consider those people who do not actually represent anybody as representative of the great Chinese people and its science—

He said, gesturing toward the Nationalist Chinese delegation.

He also expounded at length on the merits of Soviet technical aid to developing nations.

Jerome B. Wiesner, Mr. Kennedy's scientific adviser, spoke immediately after the Soviet delegate, Mr. Fedorov, but did not respond to his theme. Instead he confined his speech to the reasons why the United States feels the Conference is of supreme importance:

> Mr. President, it is an honor for me to come to this United Nations Conference to discuss pure science. [Long pause.]

This brought spontaneous applause, and was a master stroke which set the tempo for the entire Conference.

The mechanics established by the U.N. for this Conference were formal, rigid and often stiffling to the viewpoints of the undermanned representatives of the less developed nations. One description of the Conference likened it to the sterility of outer space with the familiarity of the mating cry of the whooping crane. Problems developed conducive to political exploitation by speakers concerned with the cold war.

However, the temperament of the delegates determined that science and technology was to be the language of the meeting, and not political ideology. The U.S. delegation acted accordingly and with proper restraint.

Simultaneous translation through five languages helped to expedite the speeches. The U.S. initiation of specialized conferences on particular technological and scientific subjects outside of the rigid format of the Conference was most productive. The personal communications between delegates of all nations occurring during mealtimes and evening hours was probably productive of more U.S. good will than the rigid formalized speeches.

The following are my comments on the respective delegations:

I. SOVIET BLOC DELEGATES

Led by the U.S.S.R. representatives, their speeches contained a constant theme song mostly overt but often subtle, emphasizing state planning. This theme was that the underdeveloped nations can do it better under communism than the Western World has done under democracy. This was an attempt to identify development in the U.S.S.R. since World War I with the problems to be met by underdeveloped nations.

Often the example of the central Asian provinces and their so-called development was placed before the delegation. Emphasis was placed on the success of state planning when there was an elimination of the profit system, which included the removal of land ownership. Underdeveloped nations were encouraged by the U.S.S.R. to believe that they must all have heavy industry, extensive agriculture, general medical, and research programs for their people.

This utopia with the sugar coating of the 7-hour workday with increased wages was placed before these countries, in my opinion, to encourage them toward unobtainable goals. Such goals if not reached under free enterprise with governmental cooperation could leave a vacuum of financial and moral bankruptcy for the Communists to step into.

I felt the Soviet bloc presented for these nations a wonderful menu, but with very little to eat.

II. U.S. DELEGATION

Over 100 highly talented delegates of all branches of science and technology filled every breach that occurred or could have occurred during this meeting. Chairman McDermott held early morning briefings at which an assessment was made of the previous day's progress, and considered the new day's problems. Delegates were then selected according to their talent and experience to appear and speak where their knowledge was needed.

The cooperation of all was outstanding, especially in view of the fact that many were serving at their own expense, and through their desire to be of service to the United States. The energy of these men was such that they initiated many small meetings at the request of the delegates from the less developed nations for the purpose of discussing both scientific and technological problems. These were held at dinners, panel discussions, and through person-to-person communication. This was truly the great strength of the Conference which I feel will result in future benefit to the United States.

The cooperation of the other nations of the Western World, particularly the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia with the United States was wonderful to behold.

The French delegation was the largest with over 200 present. There seems no question that the French intend to assume leadership of a third power; namely, the Continent of Europe.

III. LESS DEVELOPED NATIONS

Unfortunately, these nations were overwhelmed by the massive delegations from the larger countries. They were often undermanned scientifically and technologically and unable to cope with the vast amounts of material presented to the Conference. Many of them from their own experiences gave knowledge and occasionally propaganda to the more developed nations, but for the most part they were restless observers. Often there were sparks of brilliance exhibited by many of these delegates, and occasionally a blowing off of steam through unrelated speeches. This, however, only illustrated to me the vast hunger and desire of these people to work cooperatively in advancing their own countries through science and technology. The U.S. delegation constantly placed at their service its members for consultation and aid.

This was greatly appreciated and so expressed by many of their delegates. Incidentally it was a pleasant surprise to find such a large number of these leaders from the newer nations who were graduates of universities in the Western World. Many of these delegates spoke English, and astonishingly enough so did many of the Soviet-bloc representatives. I express some concern whether the few scientific and technological leaders will be politically potent enough in their governments to transform this information into practical development programs.

The population explosion is a problem which many of these nations are unprepared to face. There are many approaches that are being explored so that these nations can adjust to these increases.

The development of an educational system in many less developed nations is most obvious not only to us, but to them. They crave teachers to educate their people so that they might have a work force capable of modern agriculture and industry. One called it developing a happy people.

IV. PERSONAL RECOMMENDATIONS

First. The United Nations should be reevaluated as to the effectiveness of the existing Economic and Social Council. It did not appear to me that they are now able to serve properly in this particular field. The gaps now present must be filled by this council or it should be replaced.

It seems that the devotion of the United Nations to the assistance of poor nations in their development might prove more effective than some of their attempts to settle political disputes.

This Conference is a challenge to the United Nations to coordinate and develop economic, technological and scientific information for all nations to mutually share.

Second. Less developed nations should have local motivation based on evaluation surveys to establish either crash or long-term programs. When they are willing to participate in the development of these plans then we should consider giving the aid that is necessary for rapid national development through modern technology and science.

Each of these nations must have individualistic priorities in the fields of education, agriculture, industry, science, and health. It is obvious that they will have to be tailored to the particular needs of the country.

However, I reemphasized that I feel that there must be a sincere motivation with sensible planning by these nations prior to extended help.

Third. The United States should continue to offer technological and scientific consultation to these nations. The guidance of the United States may lead to private enterprise with enlightened governmental aid becoming predominant in their philosophy rather than the centralized governmental philosophy advocated by the Soviet bloc. Our consultation can lead to multiple plans with alternatives and decentralized planning which can be adjusted to the economic needs of these countries.

Fourth. The U.S. role of offering teachers and scientists for their education systems is commendable. In this respect the Peace Corps teachers have done a notable job in such countries as Nigeria.

Fifth. The harnessing of nuclear energy—atomic—for industrial purposes should be a priority for the United States and can be a great guidance factor in the future of the world.

Sixth. The intriguing prospect of improved diplomatic relations with other countries was always present. It was suggested that the discriminate use of social scientists as members or observers at all international conferences might help the United States to better develop its viewpoint and to anticipate its opponents' attacks. Social scientists proved their knowledge and their value in the help they gave to the direction of the U.S. delegation in Geneva. It might be well to consider the use of such social scientists at other conferences to evaluate the nature of our friends and opposition to help to better our viewpoints.

CONCLUSIONS

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank you and the gentleman from Indiana, Minority Leader HALLECK, for the opportunity of being an observer at this United Nations Conference. It was a privilege to have had an opportunity to give a speech before this Conference.

This Conference can be the first step toward a new era for the development of these nations through science and technology. I feel that we should continue communications through the men of the delegation and diplomatic channels so that these nations may feel free to call upon us for the help they need.

It is also my feeling that the Congress of the United States should continue to be represented at such U.N. meetings to receive knowledge concerning specialized fields. Thus we shall be better prepared to legislate effectively and humanely for the best interests of the United States.

Again I express commendation for Prof. Walsh McDermott, the staff and the 100 U.S. delegates who served so untiringly and unselfishly in the interests of their country.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. WEAVER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania for a very thorough and informative report which the gentleman has made as a delegate from this body to the Conference of the U.N. in Geneva.

In my opinion it has been most helpful to us and I can readily see that the gentleman has utilized his knowledge and experience in portraying a correct image of the United States at this Conference. I am also pleased to note that the gentleman traveled to and from Geneva on an economy round trip ticket and defrayed his own oversea expenses over and above the $15 per day allowance which was insufficient to meet the ordinary expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I have been extremely interested in the gentleman's remarks. I understand that a speech was delivered at this Conference by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I am hopeful that that speech will be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of today.

Mr. WEAVER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY] has expressed interest in my speech before the delegates attending the U.N. Conference, I include it as part of my remarks. It was my privilege to address the delegates on February 12 as follows:

COORDINATED HEALTH PROGRAMS

Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates, it is my privilege to have this opportunity to discuss briefly some experiences and ideas that have been put into effect in relation to coordination of public health programs. I speak as a private family doctor on this subject. The emphasis in the past has been upon acute diseases. During the past few decades preventative medicine has come to the fore and received its just consideration. With these two fields now approaching their proper perspective the field of chronic disease is being further evaluated in our country. Our aim has been to have coordinated health programs under local control, that is, the region, or State involved.

The combination of private endeavors both by qualified individuals and qualified organizations such as voluntary health bodies has been brought into the total program under the guidance and partnership of the governmental public health departments.

SOLUTIONS

1. Surveys

We consider the Federal or National Public Health Department as being the consultant. The State, or one might call it provincial health department, is the partner and the regional or county health department one might call the boss subject to the will of the people.

Surveys are encouraged on the local level utilizing fully the State and Federal public health agents to discover needs and overlaps of existing problems or services. It is obvious that surveys in different areas will vary due to differing economic factors such as mining areas or farming areas. Other variables are the dietary factors which lead to what Mr. Dubois called environmental. Many other variables such as industrial health and urban life problems could be elaborated. Further, there are geographical differences, and these make possible an emphasis on specific problems and diseases which might require specialized research. Again I refer to the problems of the coal miners with pneumoconiosis or farmers with problems of fungus infections. Thus we find the surveys differ in the needs and the emphasis that must be placed. There is a disease selectivity which varies with our areas depending on climate, and, therefore, no overall selection of needs covers each survey equally.

2. Selection of priority needs

Priority needs are determined through statistical findings of the area both as to environmental and communicable factors. If the major problem is receiving attention, then priority is placed upon other public health needs. Preventative medicine is emphasized in the survey. The list is then compiled according to importance and plans are made to attack the particular problems as economic and manpower factors will permit. Thus the survey in the selection of needs is tailored to the area involved.

3. Public and provincial education

The many obvious problems often are already apparent to the professional community. The solutions to some of the problems may entail pioneering of new procedures and new methods. To this extent it is necessary first, we find in our experience, to be sure that the professions (doctors of medicine, nurses, dentists, and paramedical associates) are fully aware of the planned solutions and have a part in determining it. Once this is concluded, then we proceed through modern public relations methods to inform the public by individual contact, organizational contacts, or exposure to newspaper, radio, and television information.

4. Coordination of efforts

The teamwork then begins between the private citizen as an individual, the voluntary bodies on an organizational basis and the public through public health governmental efforts.

5. Results

The teaming of the above factors of survey for determination of needs and overlaps, proper selection of priority needs, public and professional education, then consideration of efforts can result in success or failure. We have found out that these key factors entail local participation with motivation in conjunction with enlightened governmental aid. This system may be attacked but has proven to be a successful one and we as private citizens and governmental officials are working together to see that it is constantly improved.

CONCLUSIONS

It has been my purpose to present to you the team action that we have used in the United States not in criticism of other systems but only to tell you what has worked best with us and how we are constantly seeking to improve our public health. If all of us will lend of our experiences in the fields of science freely and openly to each other we will be able to mutually move forward. The challenge of the coming decades means accentuation of not only acute and preventive disease measures but the development of new solutions for chronic diseases and other public health problems. We use local motivation with proven needs for joint private efforts with enlightened Federal support without control.

Thank you Mr. Chairman for this opportunity to present some basic views on coordinated public health programs.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on October 11, 1962, the Trade Expansion Act became law. I voted against the bill. In my opinion it was a very bad bill. A number of us who voted against the bill felt that aside from the many bad provisions, that action if merited at all was premature. We contended that Congress could not intelligently deal with the question of the Common Market until we knew what countries would comprise the Common Market. Specifically we pointed out that it was not known whether or not Great Britain would be a Common Market member. We urged that the bill be allowed to go over to this year. We were shouted down. The bill was passed and signed by the President.

Even though the bill contained mostly undesirable provisions as far as many of us were concerned, it did contain one good provision, that is, section 231. This

section required that the products of Yugoslavia and Poland pay the same full duty rates as the other Communist countries. What could be more sensible than that? Why should we treat the products of the Communist countries on the same favored basis as the products produced in the countries of the free world?

Let me read the precise language of section 231. It provides as follows:

> The President shall, as soon as practicable, suspend, withdraw, or prevent the application of the reduction, elimination or continuance of any existing duty or other import restriction, or the continuance of any existing duty-free or excise treatment, proclaimed in carrying out any trade agreement under this title or under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, to products, whether imported directly or indirectly, of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism.

Please note that the provision states that the President shall deny most-favored-nation treatment to all Communist countries. Under the former law, which denied most-favored-nation treatment to countries which were members of the international Communist conspiracy, it was ruled that since Yugoslavia and Poland were so-called independent Communist countries that the products of these countries were entitled to most-favored-nation treatment or in other words reduced tariff rates. Therefore, recognizing this to be wrong, our able and most distinguished chairman of our Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, proposed and his committee adopted this amendment which logically would require all Communist countries, including Yugoslavia and Poland, to have their products dutiable at the full duty rate.

Of course all of you know the difference between the full duty rate and the reduced duty rate. The full duty rates were those established by the Tariff Act of 1930, but those duty rates have been reduced on an average of 80 percent under our trade agreements program through international negotiations. These reduced duty rates are applicable to the products of all countries which are not members of the international Communist conspiracy.

There are two principles involved here which I believe run very deep. One is why should we treat any Communist country on the same favorable trading basis as countries of the free world? Does it serve to build our friendships in the free world if they know that Communist Yugoslavia and Poland receive the same tariff treatment as they receive?

Secondly, this country always has been the foundation for private enterprise, although in recent years many have attempted to shake and shatter this foundation. Under the private enterprise system, costs are vital in determining selling prices. Under Communist governments, the government may determine the price without regard as to whether a particular product is sold in the United States at a profit or whether it is sold at a loss. This makes the most unfair competition for American private enterprise. I can say that business and employees engaged in manufacturing in my district are being seriously injured by these unfair imports from Communist Yugoslavia.

I think every American owes a debt of gratitude to the chairman of our Ways and Means Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, who is responsible for having had this amendment inserted. Although the amendment was taken out in the Senate Finance Committee, upon the urging of our State Department which frequently takes strange positions on many issues, the conference committee of the two Houses in its wisdom, restored this provision. It is true that the administration and especially the State Department vehemently objected to the amendment and pleaded with the conferees not to have it included. The conferees, of course, listened and considered these pleadings, but in the end decided that it should not be the policy of the United States to grant the same low tariff treatment to Communist Yugoslavia and Poland as is extended to the free countries of the world. You know the result. The conference report was adopted both by the House and the Senate and the President signed the bill. He could have vetoed it. If he had vetoed it on balance I am convinced he would have done a good thing for America. But he did not veto it. He elected to sign it, but he has not taken the action which this provision clearly requires him to take.

It is reported that the State Department contends that an 1882 treaty between the United States and Serbia requires that either country give the other country at least 1 year's notice before any tariff increase is established. Now first we all know that Serbia no longer exists. However, the geographical area which once was Serbia is now a part of Yugoslavia. It is questionable at best whether this 1882 treaty with Serbia is controlling, particularly in this case because the United States would not be raising its duty in the legalistic sense. We would be simply withdrawing most-favored-nation treatment which is a unilateral benefit which we have extended inasmuch as neither Yugoslavia nor Poland are members of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. However, even if we were bound in this instance by this 1882 Serbian treaty, why does not the President give the 1-year notice which the administration contends is required? In any event it is not applicable in the case of Poland.

Let me emphasize, the law states that the President "shall" act "as soon as practicable." He has now had more than 6 months and to my knowledge he has done nothing to implement this provision of law and has not indicated that he is contemplating action. If there ever was a government of men rather than a government of law, this is it. Are we Members of Congress going to let the President openly flout the requirements of the statute? I say we should not and should not give the President any additional power until he acts in accordance with the provision of section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act and requires Yugoslavia and Poland to pay the same full duty rates as the other Communist countries.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. I was a member of the conference committee, and of course of the Committee on Ways and Means, which considered this amendment. There can be no question that the gentleman has stated accurately what transpired. The section in previous law was that it was determined that neither Yugoslavia nor Poland was a Communist nation. This amendment provided that a nation under Communist domination in effect was a part of the international Communist conspiracy and should not be accorded most-favored-nation treatment. That made it clear beyond any peradventure of a doubt.

After this amendment was adopted by the Committee on Ways and Means and this body the other body reached its position and the matter went to conference. The managers on the part of the House repeatedly refused to recede. There can be no doubt as to the intent of the Congress nor can there be any doubt as to the express language of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 that most-favored-nation treatment shall not be accorded to Poland and Yugoslavia, neither of which nations is a member of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

I compliment the gentleman on his forthright statement and join with him in his strong insistence that the President of the United States take all necessary steps to carry into effect this language of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; and I might go further and say this mandate, for that is what it is, of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman.

May I say in conclusion that having to arise to make this statement on the floor of the House is not a task that I have enjoyed. First of all, I am very reluctant to have to scold the President, as I have had to do in this instance. Secondly, it was my privilege to visit Poland and Yugoslavia, particularly Yugoslavia, shortly after it disaffiliated with Communist Russia. I was assured by them that they were going to work directly into the orbit of the free nations of the world. Certainly I think they have failed to do that. Much of the assistance that we have given them has met with a very unappreciative response on their part.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman. I think he has made a very accurate and forthright speech today. I have in mind that in last Sunday's paper, there was an article which indicated that Tito and the Kremlin are getting very much closer together again. In my opinion, our hopes of drawing Yugoslavia out of the Communist orbit have been futile. I also would like to indicate the recollection I have that our Secretary of State last year in testifying on the export control act did indicate very definitely the position of our administration, that Poland is in the

Communist bloc and I think the gentleman in saying what he has said today has made a very valuable contribution toward what our policy should be and I compliment him.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman. I would just like to say in conclusion that over my desk this morning there came a report from the Secretary of Commerce entitled "Export Control." This is a very elaborate presentation on the subject of export control. I would like and appreciate very much if a similar attention would be given to import control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania). The time of the gentleman has expired.

WHY CAN'T THE BRITISH FIGHT COMMUNISM IN THIS HEMISPHERE TOO?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American people would like to know.

In the past 6 weeks a total of nine British merchant vessels representing some 120,000 gross tons put into Cuba. Thus it is business as usual for our partner in the Anglo-American alliance, as British trade with Communist Cuba continues.

A number of our allies have suspended their practice of allowing merchant vessels to aid the Soviets in Cuba. They have cooperated because their allegiance to the free world means more to them than the few rubles which come from the cargo runs between Russia and Cuba.

But the principal offender, namely, our ally Great Britain, seems to value rubles more than American friendship.

Hopefully, British trade with Cuba will just come to a quiet end. But signs seem to be in the other direction. The British shipowners association is reported by United Press International today as being wholly opposed to the U.S. position against allied shipping to Cuba. This association, known as the Chamber of Shipping of the United Kingdom, did concede that the temporary interruption of the British cargo runs to Cuba during the October missile crisis was, in their words, "readily understandable."

Mr. Speaker, relations with Cuba have not improved one iota since last October. In fact, they have worsened. Is the British shipping industry unable to sense the inroads of communism in this part of the world, and its continuing contribution to it?

I urge that the United States close its seaports to all nations which allow their flags flown in commerce with Cuba.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I would like to say to the gentleman, I concur in the statement he has just made, that relations with Cuba have not improved since last October and they have worsened. I concur with not only what the gentleman has had to say today with regard to our relationships with Cuba, and Great Britain's refusal to help us in this instance, but I concur as well with the statements he has made in recent days and in recent weeks with regard to the problem in Cuba and I want to endorse wholeheartedly his recommendations to help solve this ever-growing problem.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman and I want to say his continuing interest in this fight to get rid of communism in this hemisphere, certainly, is a contribution toward bringing communism to an end more quickly.

Also, I think it is well to point out that it is a strange thing that here we are now continuing to build up the military strength of Great Britain with Polaris missiles; and I also read in the paper today that they are contemplating now a sale of airplanes to Red China which could be converted to military use. It is not a very logical policy, I think, to continue this course to help allies who are not willing to help in this fight on communism all over the world.

Furthermore, I think our State Department needs to make more explicit the great concern of the American people with this problem, and very decidedly make it clear that we want Allied shipping to Cuba stopped and stopped quickly.

Mr. WAGGONNER. May I say further the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY EXPECTS TO BECOME REVITALIZED—HAS PENDING PERHAPS THE FULLEST LIST OF BANKING PROPOSALS EVER PLACED BEFORE A LEGISLATIVE SESSION—IS ASKING FOR FUNDS WITH WHICH TO CARRY OUT ITS DUTIES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on House Administration is now considering funds for the committees of the House, funds which the various committees have requested in order to carry out their duties assigned under the rules of the House.

On February 11, I addressed a letter to the gentleman from Maryland, the Honorable SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, chairman of the Accounts Subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration, concerning the budget request of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House.

The reason I wrote that letter was that, just looking at the figures, the budget request for the Committee on Banking and Currency might seem out of line in relation to requests for previous years, although not out of line as compared to the funds requested and made available to the other committees.

The truth is that both the minority and majority members of the committee recognize that the committee has been somewhat dormant for a decade or more, and the committee is now to become more active. In order to do so it needs the additional sums of money that are requested in the budget.

Indeed, the march of events now requires us to become more active, because we now have facing us a very large accumulation of legislation within our jurisdiction. This is well recognized throughout the financial community.

To illustrate, on January 9, the day Congress convened, the American Banker reported, in an article by its Washington bureau chief, as follows:

> The 88th Congress, convening today, faces perhaps the fullest list of banking proposals ever to be placed before a legislative session.
>
> Every major trade group within the banking and financial community, including representatives of the mutual savings bank and savings and loan industries, have programs. So do most of the Federal supervisory authorities which control these industries. In addition, several Members of Congress have indicated their intention of introducing legislation affecting the financial community in one form or another.

SCOPE OF COMMITTEE'S JURISDICTION

My letter to the chairman of the Accounts Subcommittee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL], is self-explanatory. Attached to the letter is a statement of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Our committee has to do not only with banking generally, including the Federal Reserve banks and the national banks, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and reserve requirements of banks and bank holding companies, and mergers, consolidations, and conversions of insured banks, and the branches of national banks, but also coins, and coinage, Commodity Credit Corporation, creation of Government corporations, currency, economic stabilization and defense production measures, export controls, Federal credit unions, Government lending, housing, insurance, international finance, including the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, the International Finance Corporation, the International Development Association, the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Wheat Agreement, mass transit, monetary policies, including gold, silver, and Government bonds, the price level, the operation of the Federal Open Market Committee, credit terms, the National Monetary Commission, interest rates on bank deposits, residential mortgage credit, savings and loan associations, silver, small business, the Small Business Act, the Small Business Investment Act, and many related subjects.

It is believed that our committee has as much to do as any committee of the entire Congress, House or Senate.

FUNDS REQUEST IS MODEST AND JUSTIFIED

We have asked for a modest amount as requests go. The last 2 years special and other committees have asked for more than we are now asking for including the Committees on Appropriations, Education and Labor, Government Operations, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Public Works, the Select Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Inter-American Activities, but also many others. They have spent much more, in some cases 100 percent more than the amount requested in the budget for the Committee on Banking and Currency.

We believe the amount is modest, we believe the amount is justified, we believe it will be spent in a very prudent and careful way and that the Congress will benefit by reason of these expenditures if the committee and the Congress grant this request. The letter to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] along with the attachment showing the jurisdiction of the committee are as follows and I hope these will receive careful consideration by Members of the House:

FEBRUARY 11, 1963.

Hon. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
Chairman, Accounts Subcommittee, Committee on House Administration, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Please let me express to you the reasons why there is now a budget request for the Committee on Banking and Currency, although for many years the committee has not made a budget request.

You will find, I believe, general agreement among both the majority and minority members of the committee that this committee has, in effect, been dormant for a decade or more. I would amplify by saying, without meaning any criticism of any past chairmen, that we have not for many years undertaken the studies, investigations, and hearings that were needed to keep up to date with even the pressing matters under the committee's jurisdiction.

The consequences are illustrated by the fact that several private, semiofficial and executive groups have recently been making investigations and studies into the legislative needs of the Nation's public and private financial institutions. One private group, the Commission on Money and Credit, has recently completed a study that took almost 3 years and cost almost $2 million, and has filed a report making 85 legislative recommendations. The Comptroller of the Currency has similarly appointed a private study group which has made 50 legislative recommendations. In addition, the President has had at work for many months three Presidential Inter-Agency Groups who are supposedly taking a new look at matters under the committee's jurisdiction.

The committee also has pending an exceptionally large volume of legislative proposals. The FDIC, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Reserve Board have all made recent recommendations for legislation, and we expect to have shortly the reports and recommendations of the Presidential interagency groups.

Twelve of the thirty-one members of the committee are new. I have been told, furthermore, that every new Democratic Member of the House requested assignment to the Committee on Banking and Currency and that the committee was similarly popular with the new Republican Members of the House. The new Members have asked to be assigned to this committee because they are expecting activity and, indeed, I believe that all Members desire the committee to become more active.

The kind of hearings, studies and investigations I have in mind—and other members of the committee have in mind—are aimed at objective factfinding investigations and reports of a high scholastic order. Certainly, it is not intended that we will undertake any investigation calculated to embarrass any person, group, or political party. Similarly, the committee's activities will be nonpartisan; the staff will be nonpartisan. Indeed, I expect that most of the staff assistants will be drawn from distinguished experts in the academic community who will serve the committee only briefly during its investigation and study of a particular subject in their field of expertise.

In short, all I am proposing is to carry out section 27 of rule XI of the rules of the House which commands that:

"Each standing committee of the House shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the House by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government."

Matters under the jurisdiction of the committee according to section 4 of rule XI are as follows:

4. Committee on Banking and Currency:

(a) Banking and currency generally.

(b) Control of price of commodities, rents, or services.

(c) Deposit insurance.

(d) Federal Reserve System.

(e) Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule.

(f) Gold and silver, including the coinage thereof.

(g) Issuance of notes and redemption thereof.

(h) Public and private housing.

(i) Valuation and revaluation of the dollar.

To be more specific, there is attached an appendix A setting out in more detail the areas of legislation under the committee's jurisdiction.

The budget which has been requested is for $530,000 to cover the 2 years of the 88th Congress, an amount which I believe is not excessive in relation to the volume of important work the committee must undertake.

Appropriations for the committees of the House in the 87th Congress were as follows:

Committee on Agriculture	$75,000
Committee on Appropriations	600,000
Armed Services	150,000
Banking and Currency	[1] 205,000
District of Columbia	10,000
Education and Labor	633,000
Foreign Affairs	155,000
Government Operations	1,040,000
House Administration	30,000
Interior and Insular Affairs	60,000
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	585,000
Judiciary	250,000
Merchant Marine	75,000
Post Office and Civil Service	125,000
Public Works	1,100,000
Science and Astronautics	300,000
Small Business	580,000
Un-American Activities	681,000
Veterans' Affairs	150,000
Ways and Means	25,000

[1] $200,000 appropriated to Subcommittee on Housing.

Please accept my assurance that the funds appropriated to the Committee on Banking and Currency will be expended only in a most careful manner and for purposes which we believe will serve the public interest.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

APPENDIX A

Banks and banking:
National Bank Act.
Federal Reserve Act.
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act.
Reserve requirements of Federal Reserve member banks.
Bank holding companies.
Mergers, consolidations, and conversions of insured banks.
Chartering, regulation, conservation, and liquidation of national banks.
Insurance of bank deposits.
Examination of national banks, insured banks and Federal Reserve member banks.
Investments by national banks.
Branches of national banks.
Unclaimed deposits in national banks.
Capital requirements of State banks for membership in Federal Reserve System.
Coins and coinage:
Commemorative coins.
Denominations, value, and weight of coins.
Metals used in coinage.
U.S. mints.
Commodity Credit Corporation.
Creation of Government corporations:
Federal National Mortgage Association.
International Finance Corporation.
Federal Minerals Corporation.
National Disaster Relief Corporation.
War Damage Corporation.
Currency:
Denominations, value, and design.
Issue and redemption.
Printing.
Economic stabilization and defense production measures:
Redevelopment of economically distressed areas.
Encouraging maximum employment.
Price controls on commodities and services.
Wage controls.
Rent controls.
Credit controls: Consumer and installment credit terms; and real estate credit terms.
Allocations and priorities.
Government requisition and condemnation of commodities and facilities.
Rationing.
Dispersal of defense plants.
Hoarding.
Guarantee of bank loans.
Business loans.
Government purchase or resale of metals, minerals, and other raw materials.
Installation of Government-owned equipment in private plants.
Subsidy payments.
Voluntary agreements regarding prices, wages, service, or credit.
Export controls.
Federal credit unions:
Chartering, regulations, examination, and supervision.
Insurance of share accounts.
Government lending:
Flood and catastrophe loans.
Housing loans in Alaska.
Slum clearance and public housing loans.
Loans to small business.
Export-Import Bank loans.
Defense production loans.
CCC loans.
Municipal loan program.
Loans for community facilities.
Loans for prefabricated housing.
Loans for college housing.
Housing:
FHA insurance of single family, and multiple unit rental projects.
FHA insurance of repair and improvement loans.
FHA insurance of disaster housing.
FHA insurance of servicemen's housing.
FHA insurance of housing in urban renewal areas.
FHA insurance of defense housing.
FHA insurance of military and atomic energy installation housing.
FHA insurance of cooperative housing.

FHA insurance of equity investments in rental housing.

FHA insurance for elderly family housing.

Construction, operation, and disposition of Government-owned permanent and temporary war and defense housing.

Low rent public housing.

Prefabricated housing.

Trailers and trailer camps.

Veteran preferences in housing occupancy.

College housing.

Alaska housing program.

Farm housing.

Housing census.

Housing research.

Moderate income housing.

Slum clearance and urban renewal.

Construction warranties.

Insurance:

Of deposits in national banks.

Of share accounts in savings and loan associations.

Of share accounts in Federal credit unions.

By Export-Import Bank against loss caused by war or expropriation of U.S. commodities stored abroad.

Against property damage caused by floods.

International finance:

Bretton Woods Agreements Act.

International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

International Monetary Fund.

International Finance Corporation.

International Development Association.

Inter-American Development Bank.

International Wheat Agreement.

Mass transit.

Medals: Issuance and striking.

Monetary policies:

Valuation and revaluation of the dollar.

Gold and gold standard.

Support of Government bonds.

General price level.

Bank reserves.

Operation of Federal Open Market Committee.

Federal Reserve rediscount rates.

Issue of, and reserves behind, Federal Reserve notes.

Gold payments and ownership.

Credit terms.

Establishment of a National Monetary Commission.

Interest rates on bank deposits.

Residential mortgage credit, insurance, and guarantee:

FHA insurance programs.

Government secondary mortgage market (FNMA).

National bank real estate loans.

Voluntary home mortgage credit program.

Savings and loan associations:

Federal Home Loan Bank System.

Chartering and supervision of Federal savings and loan associations.

Insurance of accounts in savings and loan associations.

Savings and loan holding companies.

Silver: Coinage, value, and use.

Small Business:

Small Business Act.

Small Business Investment Act.

Tin:

Texas City tin smelter.

Government purchase and sale.

THE WHEAT CERTIFICATE PLAN

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, no one can deny that in recent weeks the American wheat farmer has been subjected to an intensive and expensive barrage of publicity and propaganda from administration officials urging him to approve its wheat certificate plan in the forthcoming referendum. Neither can it be denied that an all-out effort to garner a favorable vote on this unfair and inequitable wheat program is the order of the day.

The Department of Agriculture has erected a wall of propaganda between the farmer and the facts in opposition to this plan and is telling the wheat farmer only what it thinks he ought to know. I have not found where this administration has even attempted to point out how adversely the certificate plan contained in the referendum would affect our small wheat producers. Nowhere have I found the administration acknowledging that the referendum's alternative proposal of price supports at 50 percent of parity was also a part of its bill containing the certificate plan and that they take full responsibility for it.

No one would deny that the small wheat farmers of America ought to be fully informed on both sides of this issue. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I take this time to point out some of the many adverse effects which this wheat certificate plan will have on our small wheat farmers. I am particularly concerned as we have approximately 152,000 wheat farms in Ohio—more than any other State in the Union. Of these wheat farms, 121,000, or 81 percent, have allotments of 15 acres or less. About 105,000 farms have allotments of 10 acres or less.

Mr. Speaker, being familiar with the problems of these small wheat farmers, and after having listened to all the testimony presented in support of and against this certificate plan, I voted against this proposal when it was before the House. I was as convinced then as I am now that it does not provide equity to the small family-size wheat farmers of Ohio and the other States in which some 1.2 million of them live.

Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, many other Members of the House felt as I did on this subject, as it passed the House by a scant 5 votes, the vote being 202 yeas and 197 nays.

I opposed this new law for several reasons:

First, it will further reduce the already low incomes of our small wheat producers.

Second, it permanently repeals their 15-acre exemption.

Third, it permanently repeals the 30-acre wheat for feed exemption which will preclude farmers from growing wheat outside the program for use on their own farms.

Fourth, the method used for establishing allotments and quotas for producers under this new law is unfair. By using the 3-year average of 1959, 1960, and 1961, rather than the highest plantings, it further reduces the acreage these small farmers can plant. In practice, since most of our 15-acre farms produce Soft Red Winter wheat, it further restricts the production of a class of wheat which has not been significantly adding to our surpluses.

Fifth, it requires farmers to take a percentage of their land out of production after 1965 without payment and in such amounts as may be set by the Secretary of Agriculture under the provisions of the act.

Sixth, it closes the door on future wheat producers and on those farmers who for some reason did not plant wheat during the base years.

Seventh, in a cleverly disguised but well calculated effort to keep the small wheat farmers from voting, the Department of Agriculture has put more restrictions on him for voting in a referendum than are placed on the larger producers.

Let us examine some of these reasons in a little more detail.

In 1963, any wheat producer could plant up to 15 acres. Beginning in 1964, however, this 15-acre exemption will be terminated permanently. Instead, farmers with allotments of 15 acres or less will be permitted to plant the smaller of the 1959–61 average planted acreage, or 15 acres. For example, a farmer previously operating under the 15-acre exemption but having only an average of 9 acres for these 3 years, can plant only 9 acres in the future—not up to 15 acres—without a penalty.

Thus, the first move to lower the income of this particular wheat farmer is made by this reduction in his acreage from 15 to 9 acres. There are, of course, thousands who will be cut more than the amount indicated by my example.

Second, if the farmer in my example plants the 9 acres, he will not be eligible for the wheat certificates valued at 70 cents per bushel. He will not be eligible for any price supports, nor will he receive any land diversion payments. He will be required to sell his production at a feed-wheat price based on the $1.30 per bushel noncertificate support price.

Formerly, these farmers operating under the 15-acre exemption could sell their wheat at market price. I want to reemphasize this unfair treatment of the small producer. First, he takes a sharp acreage cut and, second, if he then plants his permitted acreage, he is not eligible for the wheat certificates necessary to bring his price into line with the larger producers. This shabby treatment can only result in reduced incomes for these small wheat farmers and their families. Mr. Speaker, I would think that this reduction in income would be of some concern to this administration, but apparently it is not. I would, however, point out that this is no small matter as it will affect two out of every three wheat producers in the United States, and four out of every five in our State of Ohio.

It is certainly possible that many Members were not aware of the adverse effect this legislation would have on the incomes of so many of our small family farmers at the time they supported it. This being the case, I would suggest that each Member of the House request the Department of Agriculture to furnish him with information on the number of farmers in his State or district having allotments of less than 15 acres. This information might just shock a sufficient number of the Members into supporting remedial legislation forthwith to restore some semblance of equity and equality among the wheat producers of this Nation.

Let us go a step further and examine another facet of this legislation. The Department of Agriculture's January 1963 pamphlet entitled "Wheat: The Program for 1964," states on page 9:

> Participating growers will be assured of price support at $2 as a national average for wheat representing the farm share of the national marketing allocation. This will be about 80 percent of the normal production on the farm acreage allotment.

We all understand, of course, that small wheat growers can become eligible for the $2 per bushel if they take the further cut in acreage and divert about 10 percent of the base to conserving uses. This means that if the small farmer takes a double cut in his acreage—which could be in terms of percentage several times greater than that required for the larger wheat producers—he can secure wheat certificates necessary to bring his price to $2 per bushel on 80 percent of his crop. Can anyone defend the fairness of this proposal requiring the small producer to take a greater percentage cut than the larger producer?

Let us examine what this will mean with respect to the price received by Ohio wheat farmers for their 1964 crop. When you take into consideration the amount of wheat grown by the cooperators and estimate an average return of $1.85 per bushel for all their wheat sold—remembering that even cooperators will be required to sell some 20 percent of their wheat at the noncertificate price of approximately $1.30 per bushel—and the fact that the noncooperating small wheatgrowers will get only $1.30 for their wheat, one arrives at an average price, including the value of the certificates, of approximately $1.50 per bushel for all wheat produced in Ohio.

I have checked the wheat prices in Ohio and one is required to go back to 1945 to find the time when our farmers received as little as $1.50 per bushel for wheat. If this certificate program goes into effect, our Ohio farmers' income will be reduced between $15 and $20 million per year. All this at a time when farmers' costs are up about 65 percent from 1945 and reached an alltime high about a week ago.

Aside from the income losses to our farmers under this program, there is another facet which particularly disturbs me. Under the law a farmer with an allotment of less than 15 acres cannot vote unless he elects in writing on a form and within the time prescribed by the Secretary to be subject to the farm acreage allotment and marketing quota.

In the informational material issued by the Department of Agriculture, it has gone one step further by insisting that the small wheat farmer who wishes to vote in the wheat referendum, must so indicate prior to the balloting. This could well mean that a farmer would be required to make an additional trip to town to indicate his desire to vote. Personally, I do not see why the Secretary or the Department should make it so difficult for these small wheat farmers to vote. Certainly it cannot be that he is fearful that they will vote against his program?

Why not, in accordance with the law, have the small farmer sign a form indicating his desire to vote at the same time he secures his ballot? By so doing, he would be more apt to vote and the voting procedure would be less expensive to the Government, as well as to the farmer. In addition, the same treatment and opportunities would be afforded the small producers as are given to the larger producers.

However, if there is some special reason why the Secretary of Agriculture should so discriminate against these small producers, he should advise them as well as the Congress. Otherwise, I suggest that the Secretary eliminate this prior intent provision from the voting procedure for our small producers.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot urge too strongly that every small wheat farmer study carefully the issues presented in this referendum and, even though the Department is making it unusually difficult for him to do so, to register and vote. For many years these referendums have been decided by the large wheat producers of the Nation who represent only a small percentage of the total number. This year, however, the small producer has a chance to voice his opinion. He will have the opportunity of saying whether or not he wants any part of supply-management for agriculture. He may not have this opportunity again.

Mr. Speaker, should this certificate plan be defeated, it will then be in order for this Congress to enact a sensible and equitable wheat bill for 1964.

HUMAN VALUE AGAINST MATERIAL VALUE AND HOMELAND AGAINST FOREIGN NATIONALITY

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SILER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, as we continue to consider one of the serious and major problems of our Nation, the one pertaining to the importation into our country of foreign residual oil, we may always ask ourselves this basic, simple question, Is it right or is it wrong? Now such a thing as this foreign importation cannot be both right and wrong, but it must be either the one or the other. So, just what are the chief arguments for the importation or against it. The arguments seem to line up about as follows:

FOR IMPORTATION

First. Saves money—a material value—for many fuel users and consumers up in the New England area of our country.

Second. Helps Venezuela—a foreign nationality—by giving that country a rich outlet for its product, residual oil.

AGAINST IMPORTATION

First. Preserves and stimulates jobs—a human value—for many coal miners, putting bread on their tables and making them self-sustaining citizens of high morale and justifiable pride in themselves.

Second. Helps America—our own homeland—by enabling one of its great industries, coal, to keep operating as a vital part of the overall economy of this great free nation of ours.

Therefore, it appears that President Kennedy and the Congress are merely confronted with a problem of human value against material value and of Americanism against a foreign nationality. The answer should be quick and direct. Human value should come first and Americanism should be first, last, and always.

NATIONAL HARMONY WEEK

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 282) in the House to designate the week of April 15 to 20 as National Harmony Week, in recognition of the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America. The resolution requests the President to issue a proclamation to this effect, and inviting the people of the United States to join in observance of such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The SPEBSQSA is a nonprofit, fraternal organization dedicated to the preservation and promotion of the unique American art form known as the barbershop quartet style of close harmony singing. Through its 650 chapters and 30,000 members, the society has made an important contribution to America's native culture by its programs to preserve this traditional American music and to keep America singing.

This traditional American singing has long been a favorite in my area and we are proud and pleased that the present international president of the society, Mr. S. Wayne Foor, is from Rochester, N.Y. Mr. Foor came to the Capitol yesterday to be on hand for the introduction of this resolution, and he was accompanied by the Wanderers, a leading barbershop quartet from Arlington, Va.

Barbershop singing has nationwide appeal and interest, and I hope that my colleagues in the Congress from all over the country will lend their support to this resolution so that we may show our encouragement and appreciation for this uniquely American artistry.

NEED FOR EARLY WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

Kansas [Mr. Dole] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which would require the Secretary of Agriculture to proclaim the 1964 national acreage allotment and set the date for the wheat referendum on the 1964 wheat program not later than May 15, 1963.

Under existing law the referendum could be held as late as June 15, 1963, or earlier, depending upon the Secretary. The 1961 wheat referendum was not held until August 24 and in 1962 not until August 30. Under existing law the referendum could be held earlier—within 60 days after proclaiming the national acreage allotment which could be done any time but which must be done prior to April 15.

There can be no reasonable excuse this year for not holding the referendum prior to May 15, for the 1964 wheat program was enacted and signed by the President on September 27, 1962, some 5 months ago.

Farmers complain, with justification, particularly in winter wheat areas, that the wheat referendum comes too late to permit them to do any prior planning. This year an early referendum would also give Congress adequate time to pass other wheat legislation should the referendum fail, and if it passes farmers will have time to make necessary decisions.

Many farmers have indicated a late referendum will have a strong bearing on the final outcome of the referendum in winter wheat areas. I do not believe any wheat producer eligible to vote, regardless of his views, should be subjected to this unnecessary indirect pressure. The farmer should be permitted to cast his vote, yes or no, freely without being confronted with unnecessary obstacles.

I have written Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman suggesting the Secretary act promptly. If the Secretary responds accordingly, and I hope he does, no legislation would be necessary.

By May 15, or before, the American wheat producer will have had time to determine his position and, in my opinion, to delay the referendum beyond that date will do a disservice to the wheat producer. An early referendum would also save the taxpayer a large chunk of the money now being expended by Freeman in efforts to sell, not explain, the program.

USDA ACTS TO BREAK GRAIN PRICE IN 12 STATES

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Latta] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared last month in the Feedstuffs publication has just come to my attention. I am certain that portions of it are now of particular interest to some of my colleagues. I submit the article for inclusion in the Congressional Record:

USDA Acts To Break Grain Price in 12 States

(By John Cipperly)

Washington.—This week in a controlled news announcement, the U.S. Department of Agriculture acted to break the feed grain price in 12 States of the Southeast from Maryland and Delaware south to Florida.

USDA set a price for Commodity Credit Corporation corn stocks at 25 cents a bushel over the Chicago cash market price for 5 or more jumbo freight cars or 10 or more ordinary freight cars. In quantities of one through four jumbo cars or two through nine ordinary cars, the f.o.b. price will be 27½ cents above the Chicago cash market price.

The sales program is facilitated by use of reduced rail rates under section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

This means nothing less than flat pricing by areas in this Nation.

It rejects flatly any recognition of free markets wherein high regional prices would accelerate imports of a commodity. This would bring prices down to the economic value of the commodity from an interior terminal plus freight to the 'consuming deficit area.

This sudden price decision on the part of USDA follows the same pattern of last year when USDA used a section 22 freight rate to break the local market or perhaps to satisfy local politicians—who seem to dominate USDA price policy.

Most observers here are aghast at the arbitrary action by USDA. The pricing policy for CCC corn was quietly announced by a single posted notice on a bulletin board during market trading hours without any prior discussion of the action with the grain industry.

One may only describe this type of administrative procedure as arbitrary, capricious, and possessing political connotations. The ASCS office of USDA and the front office are now dominated by southeastern officials who have a local interest in feed grain shipments from the midwest producing areas to key States such as North Carolina and adjacent States.

In short, the slide-rule experts here in control of USDA repudiate the free market and are deciding what the price of corn should be in the 12 States.

DEFENDS ACTION

To the astonishment of this reporter, one leading USDA economic official said that his study of USDA data pertaining to this matter showed that the CCC price reflected an adequate return to the exporter of grain to the southeastern deficit area.

But the shippers of grains into that area who had already moved supplies into the States would be penalized to the extent that CCC had later capriciously fixed a price for its corn.

However, that is the situation, and the grain trade must live with it and with the uncertainty about how long this punitive situation can exist—a situation in which an individual or a group of politically minded individuals slip the slide rules and push buttons to determine what is a fair price in any area of the Nation.

TRADE FACES CATASTROPHE

The grain trade stands on the brink of catastrophe. The trade, with some significant exceptions, is revealed as an utter failure in anticipating and fighting the towering wave of administered prices as now appear inherent in the Orville Freeman-USDA philosophy.

The free, competitive markets are slowly being strangled by the Lilliputians of the USDA. The grain trader is a fallen foe.

The announcement of administered pricing by CCC is nothing less than the forerunner of catastrophe for the independent grain merchant as well as a danger signal to the processing industry, which prices its products on the basis of competitive buying of raw materials.

The U.S. Government can raise merry hell with the U.S.S.R. and its centralized control, but it will take a long week of Sundays to explain away the distinction between Nikita's fiats and those which are now being reached pricewise by USDA in commodities.

This decision for the southeastern price of corn can be merely the first step in a Government-price dominating program all over the country. Officials here are now saying that prices have been too high. Consequently, using their leverage of huge surplus stocks, they intend to break prices into line with their ideas of what they should be.

The trade is dealing with a tough, intelligent and determined group at USDA. It is about time that they took off the kid gloves and started fighting with no holds barred.

COMMITTEE STAFFING

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the importance of good committee staffing to the work of this House is an acknowledged fact. The imbalance between staff members responsible to the minority and the majority parties has caused increasing concern and not a little comment. Because of the importance of this question I would like to insert herewith a cogent and excellent column on this subject by Roscoe Drummond appearing in the Washington Post, February 26, 1963:

Committee Staffing

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Well, well, what should happen but that the most powerful Democrat in the House of Representative, Speaker John W. McCormack, says right out that he is downright annoyed that the Republicans think the minority party should have the right to a better proportion of the professional staffs of congressional committees.

Maybe that's a little too strong. He didn't quite say the Republicans shouldn't think about correcting the egregious imbalance in professional committee staffing. Speaker McCormack allows they could think about it as long as they didn't try to do anything about it.

Doing something about this injustice, he said, was just foolishly "stirring things up," making a "nuisance" of themselves—almost un-Democratic (at least with a capital D); anyway, he is against it.

The fact is that a number of Democrats recognize that an adequate staff for the minority party (whether Republican or Democratic) will make a more effective Congress and better legislation.

The purpose of this column is to report that progress that is being made, to clarify the real issue behind this reform and to indicate the roadblocks and prospects ahead.

The Republican reformers have not yet broken into a clear field, but, they have gained strength and momentum.

Two years ago Representative Thomas Curtis, of Missouri, and one or two others were prescient voices pointing out how the 12-to-1 imbalance in committee staffing was handicapping the minority party. They weren't even getting an audience with their own party colleagues.

In less than 2 months this year—that is, since the party activists under the leadership of Representative Gerald Ford, of Michigan, took over the Republican conference—here is what has happened:

Staffing reform has become an active objective of the whole party. Last week the Republican conference voted overwhelmingly to press until they win for the right of the minority party to have the services of up to 40 percent of the professional staff of House committees whenever the minority so votes.

The conference has put a seven-member subcommittee, headed by Representative Fred Schwengel, of Iowa, to work continuously to generate action.

For nearly 2 weeks, the House Administration Subcommittee on Accounts has been reviewing the committee budgets. For the first time such able Republicans as Representatives Charles Goodell, of New York, and John Kyl, of Iowa, have made a detailed case for proper minority staffing. They have won a handful of isolated victories.

How near did they come to a big victory—to getting 40 percent allocation of professional staff to the minority? When the issue came before the whole House Administration Committee, the Republican motion lost by only a 10-to-9 vote.

What is the issue behind this urgent reform? It has nothing to do with hiring Republican experts to work for Republicans. It has only to do with allocating to the minority membership of each House committee a fair proportion of objective, competent, professional specialists and investigators so that the minority can discharge its own responsibility.

One serious roadblock the Republicans still face is that some of their senior committee members are so unaware of what needs to be done that they are themselves blocking action.

The case for staffing reform is irrefutable. The need is great and the demand for reform is growing continuously.

AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Leggett] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the Glenn County chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution has drafted a resolution designating February as American History Month. I think that this is a commendable interest. The people of this area are very interested in the heritage of this great country of ours. For example, most counties have historical societies which study the origins of the region. The old missions and landmarks of California are cherished by all of her citizens. And most recently, this interest in history is reflected in the launching of a new nuclear powered Polaris submarine at Mare Island Naval Shipyard in Vallejo, Calif., Solano County. This great ship was christened the *Woodrow Wilson* and the date of its launching was February 22, 1963, the birthday of our first President, George Washington.

In respect to the proud tradition of American history, we join the Daughters of the American Revolution in the observance of February as American History Month.

HEMISPHERIC FREEDOM

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, last week Marshal Rodion Malinovsky, Russia's Minister of Defense said:

> We would like to warn the aggressive circles of the United States that an attack on the Cuban Republic would mean the third world war.

Although this statement can be somewhat discounted as rocket rattling, it might some day again be made by Khrushchev. Therefore, we should take this opportunity to make it clear that this is a Communist move which must not and will not deter or neutralize U.S. efforts to protect itself in the freedom of this hemisphere.

Our answer to Russia and the Communists is:

That they are the ones who imperil the peace of the world;

That they have violated the peace and security of this hemisphere and threatened the security of the United States;

That it is the Communists who maintain a dangerous and hostile government in Cuba;

That it is the Communists who introduced a substantial offensive military threat in Cuba and although removed, continue their military operations in that country;

That it is the Communists who support and encourage acts of aggression by the Communist government in Cuba against the United States and its citizens;

That it is the Communists who are using Cuba as a base for exporting subversion and have embarked on a campaign of subversion with violence and terror to destroy all democratic institutions in this hemisphere;

That it is the Communists who, by their actions, continue to threaten the peace and security of the United States.

Therefore, the United States has made it clear, and must continue to do so, that—

The existence of a Communist government in Cuba is incompatible with our inter-American system and a threat to the security of the United States and all our policies will be and are directed toward the eradication of this threat;

Force will be met with force;

The United States will take all military action determined necessary to protect itself against acts of aggression, including pursuit into the territory of Communist Cuba;

We will take all action, military or otherwise, together with Latin American governments to meet and prevent the Communists' hemispheric plan of violent subversion.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S SPEECH BEFORE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great interest the text of President John F. Kennedy's speech and responses to questions before the American Bankers Association's symposium on economic growth yesterday. This is a remarkable record, and it tells us much about our President, in addition to being most informative on the economic matters discussed. In my opinion, there have been few such occasions when the fiber and caliber of the President have been so clearly shown as they were on this occasion yesterday. When one considers the substance of the President's answers to questions that were penetrating and difficult, it is clear that he has a profound group of the intricacies of these problems, even in his off-the-cuff statements.

I confess I am impressed by the President's abilities in this regard. They reflect much study and very mature reasoning on some of the most perplexing questions before this Congress. They are our problems, and it is my hope that we can match the wit and ability of the President in dealing with them. This is a challenge and an opportunity. We have been given the proposals of a strong leadership, and now our task is to demonstrate the same maturity and wisdom in responding to those proposals.

I ask that the Record include herewith the complete transcript of the President's speech to the American Bankers Association, as it appeared in the Washington Post today, and I respectfully call the attention of the Members to this and his answers to questions from the bankers:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 26, 1963]

Transcript of President's Speech to Bankers and Question Period

(Note.—The following is the text of President Kennedy's speech yesterday as delivered to the American Bankers Association symposium on economic growth at the Mayflower Hotel here, with the question and answer period after the President's speech.)

The President. Mr. (David) Rockefeller (symposium chairman), Mr. Secretary (Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon), Mr. (Walter) Heller (chairman, President's Council of Economic Advisers), Dr. (Per) Jacobsson (managing director, International Monetary Fund), gentlemen, a 100 years ago today, in the darkest domestic crisis this

Nation has ever known, the national banking system was founded. It was a farsighted act and provided for a sound basis for the extraordinary economic expansion which has brought the United States to its present unrivaled position.

Today, many Americans tend to think of developing underdeveloped countries in terms only of faraway nations, but in 1863, even measured by 1963 dollars, our own per capita income—and this should be a source of encouragement to many who are laboring with the problem of underdevelopment in far-off countries—our own per capita income was less than $1 a day, approximately the same as Chile's.

Nearly 60 percent of our labor force was engaged in agriculture, the same percentage as is today engaged in the Philippines. An estimated 20 percent of our population was illiterate, the same percentage of the population of Ceylon.

Only one-fifth of our 34 million people lived in towns or cities of over 5,000 in population, as is roughly true now of Turkey. In 1863, this Nation had fewer railroad tracks laid than India has today, and its children had a shorter life expectancy than a child born this year in Thailand or Zanzibar.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

What can be summed up in the past 100 years, I think, the history of it, can be summed up in two words, and that is "economic growth." No nation in the history of the world has ever experienced a century of economic growth comparable to that of the United States in the last 100 years.

In 100 years, the growth of our free-enterprise economy under a free political system, and under the development effectively of our national and local and State educational systems, has brought our citizens to an unprecedented standard of living.

It has brought to our Nation an unparalleled position in the world, as the world's foremost banker, merchant, manufacturer, and consumer. It has demonstrated the power of freedom for all to see, and sustained the cause of freedom through hot wars and cold, at home and abroad.

All this and more has been made possible by economic growth, and yet we have heard in recent times that economic growth is too abstract a concept; that it is too academic for politicians and voters; that it is too theoretical a basis for proposals to the Congress.

I do not see anything abstract or academic about economic growth. It means finding 1.2 million additional jobs every year for the men and women pouring into our labor market, half of them below the age of 25. It means preventing the periodic recessions which have hit our Nation, three times in the last 10 years.

It means ending the persisting slack which has kept our unemployment rate at 5 percent or above for 62 out of the last 63 months. It has kept output $30 billion to $40 billion below our productive capacity and kept corporate investments in 1962 actually below the levels of gross retained earnings. There is nothing theoretical about that.

CONCRETE FIGURES

There is nothing academic about pushing our economy to 4 percent instead of 3 percent, which might total over the next 10 years in today's prices $400 billion more in output of goods and services, with all that this would mean to family incomes, wages, profits, and governmental revenues.

These are the concrete, not abstract, figures that growth represents. That is why I am pleased that the American Bankers Association has devoted this conference to that subject. And that is why I believe the most urgent piece of business before the Congress this year is Federal tax revision.

Last year, a year of recovery and prosperity for most Americans, unemployment averaged the same high 5.6 percent of the labor force as it did in the recession year of 1954. Business spending on new plant and equipment was at a lower level last year than it was in 1957, although total output and profits were much higher. These are deeply disturbing statistics, and yet there is nothing deeply wrong with our economy.

We have the most productive skilled workers in the world, and the most ample national resources, and a respected currency. We have no lack of savings or technicians or mass markets or price stabilities, such as hampers economic progress in so much of the world today. We have, in short, no basic obstacle to growth, and we have opportunities for greater growth.

I do not believe that any thoughtful American could look at the statistics and impartial facts about this Nation's economy over that period and not conclude that we need to step up our growth. But it will not be stepped up by political slogans or homely analogies. It will not be stepped up by canceling defense contracts or lowering the debt ceiling.

In my opinion, it will be stepped up only by lightening the repressive rate of wartime tax rates which put a damper on private purchasing power and profits.

PROGRAM UNDER ATTACK

The tax program I have put forward to meet this need is now under attack from the left and the right. I do not say it is a perfect program that cannot be changed by the Congress or will not by changed by the Congress, or which will satisfy the desires of all groups, or which will achieve all the growth we need as fast as we need it. But those who admit the problem, but oppose the proposed solution, of a $10 billion top-to-bottom tax revision, are under some obligation to put forward some proposals of their own.

Would they expect the Congress to accept, instead, $10 billion increase in Federal spending, or a $20 billion Federal deficit? Would they propose, instead, a $10 billion injection of credit at lower rates of interest without regard to the balance of payments?

At a time of record profits, would they increase tax reductions solely for corporations or investors who received a $2.5 billion tax cut last year and thereby attempt to stimulate new capacity without increasing the purchasing power of the American consumer who cannot afford to buy enough now to make use of our existing capacity? Do they feel that tax concessions, loopholes, and deductions are preferable to lower tax rates as a spur to economic growth?

These are the questions which must be answered if we Americans mean business about boosting American business. Tax reduction will not be passed if each group continues to treat growth as a crop to be divided, or if each group examines what is available through the wrong end of the telescope.

Of course, if the low-income man looks at the dollar amounts of the cut, he will decide the rich are getting all the breaks, and if the high income looks at the percentage cuts, he will decide the opposite. Meanwhile, those in the middle, hearing all this, will be convinced that they will get less than either the rich or the poor.

FAIR DISTRIBUTION SEEN

The facts of the matter are that the reduction is fairly distributed through all income brackets, and I would hope that all groups would put national interest first and recognize that the prospects for tax reduction and economic growth must not be endangered by squabbles over who is going to get what, for it is the Nation that will benefit most from the passage of the program, and the Nation that will suffer, and all the people who make up the Nation, if the program is defeated.

The tax program we have submitted is, in fact, consistent with all legitimate ends. It is designed to expand demand among both investors and consumers, to boost the economy, in both the short run and the long run, and to achieve in time both a balanced full employment economy and a balanced Federal budget.

Heated talk about budget increases should not obscure the fact that civilian expenditures under the proposed budget will be decreased, an accomplishment which has occurred only four times in the last 15 years. Partisan talk about swollen Federal payrolls should not obscure the fact that this budget calls for fewer Federal employees to serve every 100 people in this country than there were only a few years ago.

Exasperated talk about increasing the deficit should not obscure the fact that the enactment of the proposed tax program would add only $2.7 billion to next year's deficit, but if we slide into another recession, pulling annual gross national product down by as little as 3 percent, the deficit would be increased twice as much.

In other words, the deficit, without a tax cut, would then be far higher than the projected deficit we face with a tax cut higher even than the record deficit of $12.4 billion which followed the recession of 1958, only a few months after the President of the United States had submitted a budget which provided for a surplus of a half-billion dollars. That is how quickly a deficit can unbalance a budget.

NO RECESSION PREDICTION

I am not predicting a recession for 1963, but we cannot escape the fact that the period of expansion between the first and second postwar recessions lasted 45 months. The period between the second and the third lasted 35 months. The period between the third and the fourth lasted 25 months and the American economy is now in its 24th month of recovery from the fourth postwar recession.

Finally, rash talk about a crushing debt burden should not obscure the fact that by every meaningful measure, that burden under the proposed budget and tax cut will actually decline.

It is true that our current national debt would be a crushing burden for an economy less vigorous than ours. It would have been a crushing burden for the U.S. economy in 1923, or 1863, but as a proportion of our gross national product, our debt burden is not only manageable, but is steadily declining. Its weight as a proportion of our gross national product has been cut more than in half since 1947, and it will continue to fall in the years ahead.

Bankers understand better than most people that a debt, prudently undertaken, for gainful purposes, by one whose income is capable of carrying it, can greatly strengthen the debtor. Corporate debt has increased over 200 percent in the last 15 years, compared to an increase in the Federal debt of 15 percent, not because our business enterprises are wasteful or irresponsible or swollen of profit, but because they believe in growth.

A transitional Federal deficit now, as a result of a tax cut, reflects a prudent investment in this Nation's future growth, but the chronic deficits, produced by a lagging economy, and the record deficit produced by a new recession would surely increase the real burden of any debt and set back that future growth.

PLEDGES ARE MADE

Let me make clear the framework of fiscal prudence and economic necessity in which this tax program is submitted by making the following predictions and pledges if the

full tax reduction program I have submitted is enacted this year:

First, that this program will, in a short time, result in increased tax revenues, as did the 1954 tax cut, and a substantial portion of that increase will be used each year to reduce the deficit until the budget is once again balanced.

Second, that any increases in the Federal debt resulting from these transitional budget deficits will be kept proportionately lower than the increase in our gross national product, and thus the real burden of the Federal debt can be reduced.

Third, that any necessary increases in Federal employment will be kept proportionately lower than the increase in the national population, the increase in State and local government employment, and, through efficiencies in management and operation, the increase in the Federal workload required to serve the Nation.

Fourth, that every effort will be made to continue the present downward trend in our balance-of-payments deficit, and the present stable levels of our wholesale and consumer prices, levels more stable in the past 2 years, in fact, than any major industrialized country, with the sole exception of Canada.

As one of your distinguished guests here this morning, Dr. Jacobsson, has said, our problem since 1959, in his speech he made in that year, prophesying that the end of the great inflationary spiral had come about at a time when most of us were still talking about the dangers of inflation, in 1959, 1960, 1961, and even 1962, our problem is not inflation, providing we use prudence in the management of our wages and prices and in our monetary policy; our problem is to maintain our economy against the pressures of deflation in the free world.

Fifth, that no budget will be submitted by this administration which does not continue a persistent and surprisingly unpopular program of cutting costs, increasing efficiency, and weeding out obsolete activities.

DIFFERENT PREDICTIONS

I realize that all such economic prophesies and commitments in these times are subject to being displaced by national and international crises, but subject to the same allowances, if no tax cut is enacted, I would be willing to venture a wholly different set of predictions:

First, that tax revenues will continue, year in and year out, to be insufficient to balance the budget, no matter how tight the administration and Congress control expenditures.

Second, that the country will, in the not too distant future, be struck by its fifth postwar recession, with a heavy loss of jobs and profits, a recordbreaking budget deficit, and an increased burden of national debt.

Third, that unemployment and unused business capacity will remain at or above their present high levels, creating a lack of investor confidence at home, and a lack of confidence in the dollar abroad.

Fourth, that the pressure for a 35-hour week, for restrictions on imports and automation, and for large quickie tax cuts, and sharply increased Federal spending, will all grow beyond manageable limits.

Fifth, that this Nation's rate of economic growth will not match over the next 10 years the record of most other industrial powers, or our own record in this century.

WARNING IS SOUNDED

I hope the members of this association and the delegates to this conference on growth will carefully weigh these alternate sets of predictions. If the first set is borne out by the facts, we will have established in this country a brisk climate, for business, investment, and confidence; but if the second is set upon us by the failure of the Congress to enact an adequate tax program this year, the consequences will be with us for some years to come.

This symposium, I know, is dedicated to the proposition that such serious issues must not be decided by rules of party politics, public-opinion poles, and prejudices. Your awareness of the facts and the alternatives uniquely enables you to bring objectivity and reality to a discussion now too often obscured by superficial details, and too often conflicting claims and interests.

As bankers who lend to both consumers and investors, to both management and labor, to rich and to poor, to middle-income groups, you recognize the needs of all, for you have witnessed in your own enterprises that the businessman's greatest need is new market demand, and the wage earner's greatest need is expanding business activity. The Nation's greatest need is a tax bill that will help fulfill both of these objectives.

Tax revision, may I say in conclusion, is not the only ingredient in a policy for growth. Education—I would certainly put that up near the top of those things which, if well invested in, can provide a substantial return. Investment in education yields a substantial return in new research, new products, new techniques, in higher wages and purchasing power, and a greater supply of college-trained manpower.

Unfortunately, a staggering 40 percent of all young people are dropping out before graduating from high school. Only 16 percent are completing college, and only about one-half of 1 percent are achieving the Ph. D. degrees upon which the advance of knowledge depends. We must improve the quantity and the quality of our education if we are to have growth.

There are other steps we must take if we are to step up economic growth to improve the knowledge and mobility of our labor force, to encourage the development of new technology, to support the growth of basic science, to make the most of our national resources. But today there is no more single fruitful or urgent business than tax revision in the interest of fiscal responsibility, equity, and efficiency, but above all, in the interest of the United States in 1963.

Thank you.

BUDGET BALANCE

David Rockefeller. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

The President has very kindly said he would answer some questions from the floor for a few moments.

Question. I am in the manufacturing business, heavy industry, in Milwaukee. I believe all of us in business are sold on a tax reduction, providing it is of the type that will stimulate business, but the question I should like to ask the President is: After all, the sanctity of the dollar is the basis of free enterprise and the basis of commerce in the free world. We have lost $12 billion in gold in the last 12 to 15 years, largely by virtue of our giveaway and by virtue of not insisting that our military allies carry their share.

I ask the question whether in order to restore a stable economy and bring about growth in private industry, whether it isn't as essential that the Government budget is balanced as it is in my business or in the banking business or in any business?

The President. Well, to go through the number of questions—at least the number of answers, which your statement and question suggests, in the first place, I don't think you have explained fully why we have lost gold. The fact of the matter is that private industry in this country has invested about $2½ billion a year over the last 10 years, and that is a dollar drain. Now, it is matched against equity in the country involved.

If Chrysler spends $65 million for Simca a month ago, that is a $65 million loss for us. That dollar can end up as a potential drain on our gold. As France keeps 75 percent of its reserves in gold, that is what 75 percent of that investment will end up as, a gold loss. If Ford Motor Co. spends $350 million 2 years ago to buy Ford in Great Britain, that can end up as a dollar loss and can end up, as Britain keeps nearly 100 percent of its reserves in gold, that can end up as a gold loss.

ASSETS AGAINST GOLD

There are assets against that gold. They are not liquid in the sense that the dollar claim upon it is liquid, but there is an asset, there is a Simca Co., there is a Ford Co., there are dividends. Great Britain conducted for years investments overseas which brought them and maintained their balance of payments between the wars, so that I am not adverse to these investments overseas, but I do not think we should point out—in fact, they bring back nearly $2,500 million. But in pointing out the losses in dollars, it seems to me you oversimplify.

We lose a billion dollars in tourists every year. There is no asset in that loss, but it is a billion dollars, and represents a dollar which can be cashed against us in gold.

We have attempted to tie our purchases as much as possible, our military expenditures—we now tie about 80 percent of our aid to expenditures here in the United States, and we are trying to do even better. So that we hope to cut that dollar loss, gold loss, and we are attempting to tie our military expenditures, as much as we can, and persuade our allies to pay a greater share of the burden, which they are well able to do.

We have done that most recently with Italy, which is offsetting whatever expenditures we make in Italy. We have done it in Germany; under the Gilpatric-Strauss equipment, whereas Germany pays to us for new equipment for their army what it costs us in dollars to maintain our six divisions in Western Germany.

We still lose some in Spain, we still lose some in France, and some in Great Britain, and we lose about $300 million in Japan for military reasons, and some in Vietnam and other places.

So I agree with you that this is a matter which deserves our closest attention. We do have, however, $50 billion of assets of the United States overseas in these investments which are against the dollar. We still do have substantial gold reserves. We still have a Western economy which is dependent upon the dollar.

If you didn't have the dollar, then you would have solely an economic system based on gold, and you would have a system which is so restrictive that you would have no economic development in the United States or trade in any other country.

THE BUDGET MOVES UP

So I think it is a serious problem, and one that we have to give a good deal of attention to. Now, your last point is that you seek a balanced budget, and so do I. But we spend about $52 billion for our Defense Department. We spend about $2 billion of our foreign aid also going to our Defense Department to buy surplus military equipment, so we are not giving away quite as much as you think.

We spend about $2.5 billion for our atomic energy, which is tied up with our national security. We spend $10 billion for interest on the debt. Some of you may even hold some of that debt. So that begins to move us up.

Then we spend $5.5 billion for our veterans. Then we spend $6.5 billion for agriculture. But when we suggested last year that those who benefit from this program in agriculture—at least they should put some restraints upon their production, I heard many speeches made by manufacturers from Wisconsin and other places saying this was an unfair interference by the Federal Government in free enterprise.

So the result is that you buy all that they can produce at 75 percent of parity, and they can outproduce us as far as what our demands would be every year in agriculture, as really we could in any other commodity, if we made up our mind. So that the economy, the budget, moves up.

DEBT REFINANCED

Now, we have submitted a budget which provides for a reduction in expenditures with the exception of defense, space, and interest on the debt. Interest on the debt has to be refinanced at a higher rate than it was originally years ago and is obviously an increased cost. Space is also important to our security, and defense.

The rest of the budget, even though we have an increase in population of several million, even though we are distributing, for example, in the post office, a million and a half new addresses a year, even though we have many more children in school, and from 1960 to 1970 you are going to double the number of children trying to get into colleges, so that means you will have to build as many buildings in 10 years as you did in 150 years, we are still attempting to keep our economy under restraint.

Our budget would be in good condition if our economy grew as fast as it ought to. I accept your view that a balanced budget is desirable, but what I am saying is that my opinion is that unless you get a tax cut this year, you increase the chances of a recession which will unbalance your budget to a far greater extent.

I already mentioned in my speech about President Eisenhower's 1958 experience, a half-billion surplus and within a few months it was a $12.5 billion deficit. If you have another recession, with the deficit we have, then I think you would be in a far more serious position.

So I don't think, sir, that your alternative is as you would hope, between a balanced budget and an unbalanced budget. My opinion is that the alternative today is between keeping this economy moving ahead and a recession, and in my judgment, the best medicine for that recession is a tax reduction.

AN ALTERNATIVE

Question. Mr. President, you mentioned in your remarks that increased expenditures of the Government would constitute one alternative to the tax reduction. I think it would be interesting if you would give us your reason for that choice, sir.

The PRESIDENT. Well, there are many people who feel that that is what we ought to do, that cities and towns have a good many problems. In fact, in the Washington Post this morning I saw the National Housing Conference, which is meeting in Washington, is charging the White House is lagging in its development of urban renewal, housing for the elderly, and passed, almost unanimously, I believe, 10 resolutions, 7 of which would result in an increase in Government expenditures of $4 million.

So if you run into a recession, you are going to have a good many people who feel that Government expenditures will be needed. People aren't going to—you are not going to have 6 million, 7 million, 8 million, or 9 million people out of work in this country without somebody thinking something should be done about it.

Something is going to be done about it. You are going to have either the Government spending the money to keep them at work, or somebody else is going to. You are not going to have them around unemployed, and have the United States, in these years, as leader of the free world, accept it.

The fact of the matter is if you take this action in time—I don't oversell it—I think we will have a lot of economic problems anyway. This is a very complicated economy, at a particular point in its development, and I am not overstating the desirability of the tax cut, but I think it is most useful at this time.

But I do think that if we fail, and if we have a recession, which is prolonged, then you will have a great number of people out of work, and you will have a good many remedies put forward, some of those that I suggested—increased governmental expenditures, a 35-hour week, which has already been advanced by the AFL–CIO, and other proposals which I don't think are in our interest.

A 35-hour week at today's cost would increase your cost about 14 percent, and that would just about price us out of the international market. So I am against the 35-hour week. The thing to do is to take the action as I have said.

TEN-BILLION-DOLLARS

Question. Mr. President, I believe you said that you did not predict a recession in 1963, and you say that without a tax cut we are liable to have a recession. Now, with a tax cut, tied so closely to tax reform, isn't it possible that the tax reform angle might delay this to the point where the tax cut might be lost?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, and I would be opposed to that. What we suggested was a tax cut of over $13 billion, and reforms which would bring in about $3 billion, roughly, of revenues, giving us a total tax cut of $10 billion. We felt that, therefore, the goal is the $10-billion tax cut in the length of time which we have recommended.

If we cannot get the reform, then quite obviously you are going to have to rewrite the package. It might be possible to send up, or for the Congress to pass, a $10-billion tax cut without the reform, but that would mean changes, of course, in the rate reduction structure. So it was our feeling that from the national interest, even though I realized that some taxpayers may find it more desirable to have the simple $10-billion cut with consequent adjustments of all the rates, than they would the $13-billion cut, with the reform, it may be that Congress will come to that conclusion.

That isn't our judgment of the best action. But I quite agree that what we need is the bill this year, and nothing should stand in its way. Our feeling is that the best bill that can be gotten will be the one we recommended. But I would say the first priority is a bill. We have to realize that if we don't get the reform, then, of course, the tax bill would have to be rewritten, unless the Congress made a judgment that it would accept a tax cut of $13 billion.

Our concern is that they might take a tax cut of less than $10 billion, which would be, I think, a mistake. If we are going to do this, we might as well do it right or not do it at all. But that is the choice. But to answer your question, I would say the important thing is to get the bill this year. Whatever is necessary to get that bill, I would support.

PRODUCTIVITY

Question. Mr. President, doesn't the prospective deficit, as well as the continuing deficit in our international balance of payments, make it even more important than previously to prevent wage rates from increasing faster than productivity?

The PRESIDENT. I would think that wage rates would follow—I hope they would follow the general guidelines which have been suggested on several occasions, which are tied to the principle which you just described, that wage rates should be tied to productivity increases. The difficulty, of course, is arguing that productivity increases and also discussing how increases in productivity should be divided. But I think the general principle is one we certainly support and continue to support.

The fact of the matter is that it represents that, and the other point would be a real concentration by American corporations on the export market. We have never really given it—some companies have—the attention it deserves as a nation. But there are these markets throughout the world, and I would hope that every American corporation—that is the greatest contribution they could make.

In my earlier answer, the American businessmen benefits, as well as our security benefits from the dollar as an international mechanism. I would hope that they would concentrate as a national service as well as one that would bring them a private return, that they would concentrate their energies on developing their export market. That can make a great difference to us. If management and labor can be responsible in the next year or two, and there is a concentation on export markets, I think we have a much better chance to lick the problem.

OTHERS AFFECTED

One of the points that I think is worth making is that there are these dollars overseas which represent a call on our gold. If our economy is doing well, then I think that people will have confidence in the dollar, and that serves the whole Western community.

If we were dependent only on gold, and gold which, after all, increases by what—$700 million a year, probably, how could you possibly finance the tremendous movements of trade which we now have in the world unless you have sterling and the dollar which gold supports? If you just use gold, we would be back to 1929, and you would have the most restrictive effect on our economy, our free flow of trade and, therefore, the defense of the Western World.

What we are really talking about is not only the national security, but if the United States does not maintain its economy in good position, then Great Britain cannot afford to take those steps to provide a stimulus to her economy at home, and in addition, those countries of Latin America, particularly, which sell their raw materials to us, would be depressed, so everything hangs upon us.

Everything hangs upon our maintaining our economy effectively and maintaining the kind of discipline which your question suggests.

Can I have one more? I know you have other speakers.

STIMULATIVE

Question. Mr. President, you have commented on the potential or possible recession and its magnitude, referring back to 1958. Would you care to comment, if your tax proposal is enacted, what the magnitude of the potential might be with regard to economic stimulation?

The PRESIDENT. Well, I think we have talked about the three or four times stimulus which a $10 billion tax cut would have, which would be $30 billion, three times, 300 percent, which we would hope, and also, of course, that it would also bring a return in revenues.

That is why we feel that the combination of the stimulation on our economy of the multiplication factor of three times, and also the additional returns this would bring to Federal revenues, makes us feel that the proposed tax cut is fiscally responsible.

As I said at the beginning, if we were going to err, I would certainly err on the side of a large enough tax cut, not to go through this laborious, painful procedure which we are all going through and then bring forth a mouse. I would hope that we would bring forth one that would do the job.

Thank you very much.

A FEDERAL BANKING COMMISSION

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today, H.R. 4253, to create a Federal Banking Commission. This is a most important bill and I trust that action can be taken on it during this Congress.

The proposed Banking Commission would gather together in one agency all of the bank supervisory and insurance powers presently exercised by the Federal Government. The experience of the past 30 years has shown that the multiplicity of Federal banking supervisory agencies has resulted in conflict, duplication, and in a general vagueness about which agency does what.

Under this bill the FBC will take over the functions and powers of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Comptroller of the Currency; it will assume jurisdiction over charters, branches, mergers, holding companies, and fiduciary and foreign banking operations. It will relieve the Federal Reserve Board of the administrative functions it now has and allow the Board to devote its time to its primary function, monetary policy.

I would like to point out that the bill makes no substantive changes in the law and does not add any new powers; that is, it does not increase the Federal Government's regulatory power, only its efficiency.

If, during the course of hearings on this bill, it is thought that substantive changes in the law must be made, then this should be done with separate legislation.

H.R. 4253 is necessary for the effective and efficient regulation of our banking system. The Government owes the banking community the best possible service and it owes the public the best possible protection that the regulatory function of the Federal Government can provide.

This bill will strengthen the dual banking system.

It is my opinion that this bill, together with my bill, H.R. 729, should be set for hearing at the same time. If the Congress agrees with the principle set forth in my bill, H.R. 729, then we will combine in one agency all of the insuring functions of the Federal Government and then add a separate banking commission which will devote itself to all banking functions other than insurance. Obviously, if the latter principle prevails, H.R. 4253 will be amended accordingly.

OMINOUS OUTBURST BY CUBAN REFUGEES IN MIAMI EXPOSES DANGEROUS MOUNTING TENSIONS

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to again draw the attention of the House to the ominous outburst by Cuban refugees in Miami last Thursday—February 21—during which exiled Cubans engaged in street rioting accompanied by threats and imprecations against local police authority and the American way of life.

So dangerous was this situation, so disruptive of the usual quiet life of a peaceful community, that it was headlined in the responsible Miami News of that date in these words: "350 Howling Cuban Exiles Battle Police, Pickets Here—Officers Stoned—Rioters Arrested."

And Milt Sosin, reporter of the Miami News, placed the tragic and ugly incident before the public in his following news story, part of which I shall now read:

> A howling, rock-throwing mob of more than 350 Cuban exiles battled with Miami police today in front of the Cuban Revolutionary Council headquarters in protest against picketing by four members of a nationwide pacifist organization.
>
> The rioting, which lasted about 30 minutes, attracted several hundred spectators to the scene at 17th Street and Biscayne Boulevard and resulted in the arrest of 13 Cubans on charges of disorderly conduct and breach of the peace.
>
> At one point the angry, screaming exiles, many of them women, hurled rocks weighing 2 to 5 pounds into the ranks of some 100 police and fire department officers who were rushed to the scene.
>
> At the height of the brawling, police received word that friends of the arrested Cubans were threatening to storm the Miami Police Station at 1145 Northwest 11th Street.
>
> Immediately 20 patrol cruisers surrounded the station and 25 helmeted officers, many leading police dogs, blocked entrances to the station. The mob failed to show up.
>
> The crowd at the Revolutionary Council headquarters first became restive when Donald D. Pomerleau, city of Miami public safety director, showed up and asked the Cuban leaders to break up the demonstration.
>
> This apparently put the exiles in an ugly mood, for they began surging toward police lines, and across the street from council headquarters a handful of exile women shouted "Fuera, Fuera" (go away) and began tossing rocks.
>
> The situation reached its peak at 10:02 a.m. when the pickets, three youths and an elderly woman, appeared on Biscayne Boulevard walking south with placards.
>
> The signs said, "Oppose Military Solutions." Thou Shalt Not Kill," and "Peace Corps, Not Marine Corps, in Latin America."
>
> The pickets turned west on 17th Street and were met headlong by the now wildly infuriated crowd. Rocks, bottles, and eggs rained down on the heads of police who were trying to force the Cubans back behind heavy ropes on private property lines.
>
> Pomerleau and Assistant Police Chief Glenn Baron called for more reinforcements, including three pieces of fire department equipment.
>
> A hook-and-ladder truck arrived and plugged a hose into a corner fire hydrant and stood by in readiness.
>
> A husky 225-pound Cuban broke loose from the lines and rushed police who threw him to the ground in the median parkway strip of 17th Street.
>
> Several times the screaming exile knocked five officers off his back, until finally he was overpowered, handcuffed, and led to a patrol wagon.
>
> The five pickets from the Committee for Nonviolent Action were finally hustled into a patrol wagon and taken to police headquarters where they were interrogated, but not booked.
>
> Pomerleau said the four promised they would not picket again in the city of Miami adding they planned to leave after their release by police.
>
> Pomerleau also issued a statement saying he had warned the picketers they would be arrested if they stage any future demonstrations within the city.
>
> Police said efforts to place Spanish-speaking officers in the crowd to calm them down had failed, and apparently only served to further enrage the exiles.
>
> About 50 policemen remained at the scene where a handful of Cubans appeared with a sign reading, "Enemies protected by democracy kill freedom."
>
> This was interpreted to mean the Cubans felt the arrest of their own people and the freeing of the pickets was unfair.
>
> At one point, about 10:20 a.m., all available Miami police except those who were needed on key assignments, were at the riot.
>
> Police were under orders not to draw guns, and relied mainly on their numbers and the threat of using nightsticks to battle back the infuriated mob.
>
> The elderly woman who led the pacifist pickets was not identified by name but told police intelligence officers she had come here from New York to lead the demonstration.
>
> Leaders of the Cuban Revolutionary Council had been advised 5 days ago of the pickets' intentions of demonstrating, but apparently declined to try to keep exiles from the scene.
>
> Several members of the Cuban Invasion Brigade 2506 were among the rioters, wearing their combat uniforms and urging the exiles on.
>
> The Committee for Nonviolent Action has its national headquarters in New York City and is dedicated to the banning of nuclear weapons, and a halt to military conscription in this country.
>
> The arrested Cubans are scheduled to appear in municipal court at 9 a.m., February 27.
>
> A small crowd of spectators still were hanging around the riot scene at noon, but police had dispersed the Cubans and reopened 17th Street to vehicular traffic.
>
> At the peak of the rioting, three men believed to be Federal agents were spotted atop a building about a block away. An investigator for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee was on the scene making photographs of the mob members.

Mr. Speaker, so shaken was the Miami community by the danger signals raised by this Cuban refugee outburst that the respected Miami Herald of February 22, 1963, carried an editorial which I would like to read into the record:

NO RIGHT TO RIOT

> It was an ugly business at the Cuban Revolutionary Council where yesterday a group of refugees reacted violently to a group of peace pickets.
>
> The damage was more than some bruised heads. The refugees resisted police who sought to impose order and some arrests were made.
>
> Our Cuban guests must understand that picketing is a legal expression of free opinion in this country. We do not need violence to register dissent, which is also an inherent right.
>
> But this in no way excuses the pickets who exercised their right in what was clearly a

> provocative manner. The kind of peace these pickets appear to seek is strange indeed.

It is apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the fears for the safety and the future of the Miami community which I have so often and for so long expressed are here drastically revealed as based in fact and that these disrupters of the peace and quiet of Dade County have fallen prey to those who would add fuel to the Communist propaganda line.

So ominous do I consider the present situation, Mr. Speaker, that I wish to reiterate my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 21 in which I referred to the following newspaper reports from Miami:

From the Associated Press, Thursday, February 21—

> At 10 a.m. this morning four pacifists carrying picket signs began to picket the Cuban Revolutionary Council at 17th and Biscayne Boulevard, Miami. A riot began. One of the revolutionary council officials, with a loudspeaker, asked all to be calm. Thereupon, some 200 or more Cubans entered the foray with bottles, eggs, stones, and other items.
>
> The police were called. The riot squad of police and dogs tried to break up the gathering. Six policemen were seen fighting with one Cuban in an effort to get him under control. Thirteen Cubans were picked up by the Miami police, four of whom are reportedly members of the 2506 Brigade. Firetrucks were called to the scene ready to use water hoses to disperse the crowd. Attempts by members of the Cuban Revolutionary Council to quell the violence were responded to by jeers and catcalls by their fellow Cubans. During the riot, Cubans were heard screaming:
>
> "Even Castro does not permit this," followed by denunciatory statements to the effect that they did not like nor did they want "this kind of democracy," the kind that would let this type of people run around loose. The rioters fighting the police screamed and denounced them as "Communists."

The same day the following was carried on the wires of the United Press:

> Violence erupted today when a group of pacifists attempted to picket the headquarters of the Cuban Revolutionary Council. Club-wielding police quickly broke up the demonstration when 200 angry Cubans clashed with the pickets. About half a dozen exiles were arrested by police, who entered the headquarters of the council, prepared for what looked like the beginning of a street riot. The police were denounced violently by the Cubans, many of them members of the Cuban invasion brigade, who shouted, "Communists—even Castro doesn't do this in Cuba." Three firetrucks moved into a side street and prepared to douse the area with water if necessary. Police, under command of Miami Safety Director Col. Don Pomerleau, broke up the disorders within 10 minutes. Trouble started even before the arrival of the pickets when Spanish-speaking police, using a portable loudspeaker, requested the Cubans to remain inside the property limits of the council grounds.
>
> Jose A. Hernandez, a spokesman for the council's labor organization, speaking to the Cubans through a microphone from the headquarters porch, urged them to go home peacefully and not play into the hands of the Communists who want to cause disorder here.
>
> The exiles reacted violently against the request and denounced Hernandez and shouted epithets at him. Another council representative, Raul Mendez, then appealed over the microphone for the crowd to go home.
>
> His petition was greeted with loud boos and angry shouts. For a few minutes, it looked like some members of the crowd were going to attack the two council representatives. At this point, the police, who originally posted about 15 men, summoned reinforcements including about 15 motorcycle officers.
>
> A few minutes later, the pickets, men and women, apparently Americans, arrived carrying signs bearing pacifist slogans such as "War will end man or man will end war" and "We oppose military service."
>
> The pickets massed on a grassy mall directly in front of the council headquarters entrance, and then suddenly violence erupted when one Cuban darted across the street and ripped a sign out of a picket's hands. Stones and bottles were hurled at the police by the Cuban exiles.
>
> Police roped off the property of the council and refused to let anyone in or out.
>
> Later, a group of about 100 Cubans, most of them members of invasion brigade 2506, set out on a protest march to police headquarters.

The citizenry of Miami, Fla., has long borne with patience the burden of an onslaught of dispossessed Cubans—a burden which should long ago have been shared by the entire United States.

Valiant efforts have been made by our President, the Federal and State agencies, our churches, business institutions, and individual citizens, to assist in every way possible.

Arriving in Miami penniless and with just the clothes they were wearing, almost all of these Cuban refugees had been forced to give up their homes, their businesses, their life savings, and all their personal property.

To help them meet the basic needs of existence, the Federal Government has made financial and other assistance available to them until they can become self-supporting.

Employment opportunity in Miami is limited. There simply are not enough jobs to accommodate both local residents and refugees. There arose open competition and economic conflict between the permanent citizenry and the incoming refugees. The balloon had to burst.

I have noted the ever-increasing frustrations, stresses, strains, and economic ills imposed on the people of my area. For this reason, I have for over 2 years fought for a more realistic approach to this long-festering situation.

I have repeatedly advocated—to two Presidents and Government officials—that Dade County and Florida had reached a saturation point on the acceptance of Cuban refugees.

Long ago I urged, and have continued fighting for, the establishment of an additional port of entry and reception center.

Long ago, and many times since, I urged extension and amplification of the resettlement program under which the Government—through January 25, 1963—has resettled 53,974 Cubans, not quite one-third of the 157,525 persons entering and registering from Cuba. Again I reiterate, no community the size of metropolitan Dade County could conceivably be expected to absorb such a shock.

Time and time again, I have met with the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and other top echelon governmental officials concerned with the Cuban refugee programs, to discuss the need to reevaluate the overall program. Long ago, it was obvious that this was no longer a temporary situation; the facts demanded that priority attention be devoted to resettlement—to opening a reception center elsewhere.

Admirable efforts have been made by this administration and the agencies of the Federal Government in their attempts to alleviate this situation. While the programs instituted have been highly successful, we have to do more.

On February 5 of this year, I addressed myself to reports that a so-called Cuban GI bill was being considered. At that time, I publicly stated my opposition before top echelon officials of executive agencies having jurisdiction of the Cuban refugee program. I told all that I felt that the present programs are more than adequate and that I am opposed to any new or additional benefits. I am grateful that no more has been heard of this proposition.

I again respectfully submit that Cuban exiles must be allocated to communities all over the United States and not concentrated in one already greatly overburdened area, and no further flow should come to the Miami area.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to spread on the RECORD a letter which as recently as February 15 I directed to Mr. John Frederick Thomas, director of the Cuban refugee program:

> I am quite concerned over the Cuban refugee program in my district. The residents of Dade County have been extremely patient and understanding of the problems of these refugees and have cooperated to the fullest. However, as I have emphasized many times before, Dade County has long ago reached the saturation point.
>
> I have been deluged with mail from my constituents indicating their dissatisfaction with the rate of resettlement of these refugees (the latest official figures indicate a severe drop in resettlements) and their strong opposition to any additional benefits to the Cuban refugees. I am in full agreement with these views, and I might add that I believe the present programs to be more than adequate and I am opposed to the establishment of broad new programs for any Cuban refugees. I fully support the previously granted authorization for qualified Cuban refugees to serve and be trained in the U.S. Armed Forces, but not to be granted any special benefits or privileges for this service.
>
> I would respectfully request, first, that if any additional Cuban refugees are to be permitted to enter the United States in the future, they be assigned to a port of entry and processed through a reception center other than Dade County or the State of Florida; second, that additional emphasis be placed on the resettlement program and that it be accelerated and implemented to the fullest degree; and third, that I be notified at the earliest practicable moment if any new programs or broadening of present programs are being contemplated.

I respectfully go on record, Mr. Speaker, urging the immediate attention of the House to this most urgent request. The situation in the Miami area is dangerous and explosive. It is made for those who

would deliberately attempt to set citizen against refugee—yes, even refugee against refugee—and to utilize the pent-up emotions of American and Cuban alike to supply the fuel of the Communist propagandist.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that now is the time for us to act on some conclusive solution for this problem which will relieve all possibilities of a further attempt to exploit the frustrations and stresses of residents of the Miami area. The need is not tomorrow, but right now.

It is imperative that action be taken to permanently alleviate the economic and psychological ills that have beset the long-suffering Miami community. We must expeditiously implement the humanitarian and intelligent programs which will relocate large numbers of Cuban exiles immediately—until such day as they can be returned to a free, democratic Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise that, partially in response to my letter to Mr. Thomas, a meeting was held between officials of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and four national voluntary agencies which have major responsibility for carrying out the Cuban resettlement program. Dr. Ellen Winston, Commissioner of HEW's new Welfare Administration, told the group that the resettlement program has her full support and the full support of the Department and the Federal Government. She said:

> We want to secure the best possible resettlement of the refugees in the least possible time so that the fathers and mothers and children in Miami, who so urgently need new homes and new jobs, can begin new lives. In the case of the refugees, the path to independence and self-support can follow only one major route—resettlement.

It is a source of deep satisfaction to me to note that the good work of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will be continued—that relocation is to be immediately accelerated and diligently pursued. This is one constructive step toward the ultimate solution.

I have received the following letter from Mr. John F. Thomas, director of the Cuban refugee program, in response to my February 15 letter, to which I have referred earlier in this statement, in which I called his attention to the urgency for an immediate solution of the Cuban refugee resettlement problem:

> FEBRUARY 22, 1963.
>
> Hon. DANTE B. FASCELL,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. FASCELL: Thank you very much for your letter of February 15. Although I have only been on the job for a few weeks I have also noted a change in the tenor of opinion with regard to the Cuban refugees. These reports have served to stimulate in my office an already existing sense of urgency to accelerate our resettlement program. To that end I have met, individually and collectively, the top ranking staff of the voluntary agencies with whom the Government holds contracts for resettlement purposes. I can assure you that we will have their full support in our drive to resettle the refugees to areas of the country other than the Miami/Dade County area.
>
> I hope that I will have the opportunity of meeting you personally to discuss my observations on this refugee problem and to review with you my plan of approach toward resolving it as humanly and as expeditiously as possible.
>
> In closing may I add my word of praise for the generous, warmhearted, democratic attitude of the people of Dade County toward the Cuban refugees. It will go down in history in the book that records great deeds on the part of people for persons caught in the whirlpool of persecution.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> JOHN F. THOMAS,
> *Director, Cuban Refugee Program.*

This is indeed encouraging information, Mr. Speaker. But again I must stress, with all the force of which I am possessed, the need is not tomorrow, but right now.

THE ROSE AS NATIONAL FLOWER

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today submitting a joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States.

The rose is representative of the beauty that is America. Horticulturists have given us purple, silver, gold, yellow, pink, white, lavender, and orange roses along with varigated ones to add to the red rose. Roses today are of almost every hue and tint and shade, practically covering the spectrum.

Roses are well known and as well loved in Europe, China, and Japan as they are in America. They have been known and cultivated from earliest times, having been planted by the Persians in their gardens along the Tigris and Euphrates. The Hanging Gardens of Babylon reportedly contained roses. The Island of Rhodes is named after the rose, and King Midas in all his wealth cherished roses, so history relates.

There is a worldwide love of roses. They appeal to persons of all ages, all races, all countries. The rose has very often been called the "queen of flowers." It is also referred to as "everybody's flower."

Most of them can grow in almost any climate and under almost any reasonable condition. In our country, roses thrive from Alaska to Florida, and from Hawaii to Maine. No other flower in the United States begins blooming in spring and continues right up to the first hard frost. Only a few flowers when planted continue to live year after year like the rose without being replaced.

The beauty of roses is soothing on the eyes and the wafted perfume a sedative to the nerves. Roses have greater versatility than any other flower—some grow 12 inches tall and others climb 12 feet. There are roses that can be grown outdoors, others than can be grown indoors; there are roses that produce masses of color in the landscape; roses that can be planted in borders, in beds, as hedges, as fences, as screens to hide undesirable places, as ground covers, and even screens against the weather.

For centuries, roses have been used to make rose wine, rose sachet, rose water, rose perfume, attar of roses, rose honey, candied rose petals, rose soap, and so forth. All flowers are beautiful and all contribute to our enjoyment of them. But many people hold that the rose is a flower that stands alone—apart from and distinguished from all others.

The rose is known to men and women everywhere as the symbol of peace and hope, and it is recognized as the badge of courage, loyalty, and devotion.

Mr. Speaker, we are the only major nation that does not have an officially designated national flower. Nearly all of the principal countries of the world have a national flower or floral symbol, and the rose is the most frequent one chosen to honor a country. England, Iran, Turkey, Bulgaria, Czechoslavakia, Rumania, and Honduras have all chosen the rose to be identified as their national flower. Most other major countries apparently have a national flower.

Bills to adopt an official flower for our country have been introduced in Congress before. But to date no national flower has been adopted mainly because there is lack of agreement as to which flower and as to just what should constitute the requirements of a national flower. There is no question in my mind but that the rose meets every requirement. What single flower can boast of so many varied employments and enjoyments? The rose can be said to be, indeed, the queen of flowers. It can be readily understood why, and I am hopeful that this Congress will soon adopt the rose as our national flower.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ROGERS of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. SISK), for 60 minutes, on February 27, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HORTON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. CURTIS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SISK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POOL.

Mr. STEPHENS.

Mr. TOLL.

Mr. FRIEDEL.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 27, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

471. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation for the year ended December 31, 1961 (H. Doc. No. 74); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

472. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

473. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

474. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 382, 383); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

475. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 383); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 284. Supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, 1963 (Rept. No. 35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 4217. A bill to provide full indemnities for sheep slaughtered in connection with the scrapie slaughter program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4218. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the highway use tax in the case of certain motor vehicles used primarily to haul unprocessed agricultural products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4219. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit for amounts paid for tuition or fees to institutions of higher education or for occupational training or retraining, to allow a credit for taxes paid for public education, and to exempt from income tax certain scholarships, fellowships, and student assistantships and certain earnings by undergraduate college students; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4220. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 4221. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 4222. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to request the assignment of U.S. marines to assist in law enforcement in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4223. A bill to provide for audit of accounts of private corporations established under Federal law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4224. A bill to extend the benefits of the Panama Canal Construction Service Annuity Act of May 29, 1944, to certain additional civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4225. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish in cooperation with the several States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 4226. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 4227. A bill to provide that the retailers excise tax on jewelry and related items shall not apply to articles sold at retail for less than $5; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4228. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4229. A bill to terminate the retailers excise tax on cosmetics and other toilet preparations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4230. A bill to provide for the transfer of income taxes to the States for use for educational and other purposes without Federal direction, control, or interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4231. A bill to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4232. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in the District of Columbia because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 4233. A bill to require the national referendum on wheat to be held prior to May 15, 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4234. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Old Ninety-six Star Fort National Park in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4235. A bill to amend section 2112 of title 28 of the United States Code to require that certain proceedings must be instituted in the judicial circuit where the controversy arose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 4236. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act to increase the amount of insurance applicable to bank deposits and savings and loan accounts to $25,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 4237, A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor and secretary, and an elected legislative assembly and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4238. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4239. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 4240. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and range, and of recreational areas; and to authorize pilot local youth public service employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 4241. A bill to repeal section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act, as amended, and to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to revise and consolidate authority for deferment from, and exemption from liability for induction for, training and service for certain Reserve membership and participation, and to provide a special enlistment program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 4242. A bill to provide for the release and transfer of all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to certain tracts of land in Pender County, N.C.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 4243. A bill to clarify paragraph 4 of section 15 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 4244. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 4245. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 4246. A bill to extend for 2 additional years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4247. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 4248. A bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the State and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 4249. A bill to provide that those persons entitled to retired pay or retainer pay under the Career Compensation Act of 1949 who were prohibited from computing their retired pay or retainer pay under the rates provided by the act of May 20, 1958, shall be entitled to have their retired pay or retainer pay recomputed on the rates of basic pay provided by the act of May 20, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 4250. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4251. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to legislative proposals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4252. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on maleic hydrazide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4253. A bill to establish a Federal Banking Commission to administer all Federal laws relating to the examination and supervision of banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 4254. A bill to change the name of the lake formed by Kentucky Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 4255. A bill to establish the U.S. Academy of Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4256. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4257. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise taxes on automobiles and on parts and accessories, and to reduce the manufacturers excise tax on trucks and buses to 5 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 4258. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to eliminate discriminations against married female employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 4259. A bill to promote public knowledge of progress and achievement in astronautics and related sciences through the designation of a special day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern rockets, missiles, and astronautics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 4260. A bill to confer jurisdiction in certain cases on the Secretaries of the military departments to authorize payment from appropriated funds of the military departments of amounts determined to be owing to contractors under armed services housing contracts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 4261. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit restraints of trade carried into effect through the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 4262. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 4263. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to require compliance with the provisions thereof in the performance of certain agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4264. A bill to amend section 8(b) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4265. A bill to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; and related sections of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 4266. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 4267. A bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 4268. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Martinez, Calif., as the Charles C. McGonegal Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 4269. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 4270. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to all unremarried widows and widowers and to all individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 3 years or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 4271. A bill to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 4272. A bill to create a commission on the establishment of a Council of Free Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 4273. A bill to amend section 207, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4274. A bill to amend section 103, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHITENER (by request):

H.R. 4275. A bill to amend section 2(a) of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 relating to the annual payment to the District of Columbia by the United States; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4276. A bill to provide for the creation of horizontal property regimes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4277. A bill to authorize an increase in the borrowing authority for the general fund of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.J. Res. 285. Joint resolution designating the 8-day period beginning on the 12th day of October of each year as Patriotic Education Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.J. Res. 286. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.J. Res. 287. Joint resolution designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALL:

H.J. Res. 288. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6-percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.J. Res. 289. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumptive use of water in the Pecos River Basin, in New Mexico and Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POOL:

H.J. Res. 290. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to carry out a continuing program to reduce nonbeneficial consumption of water in the Pecos River Basin, in New Mexico and Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.J. Res. 291. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6-percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. Con. Res. 101. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties between the United States and the Republic of Panama may only be made pursuant to treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts presented a memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts protesting against the processing of outgoing mail from Bristol County, Mass., communities by the automated post office at Providence, R.I.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 4278. A bill to amend the act of June 29, 1960 (Private Law 86–354); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H.R. 4279. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Duffy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 4280. A bill for the relief of Bernardo Colella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 4281. A bill for the relief of Regine Irene Calef, Marion Calef, and Monica Calef; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4282. A bill for the relief of Amrik Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 4283. A bill for the relief of Bela Daszkal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4284. A bill for the relief of Chrysanthos Kyriakou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4285. A bill for the relief of Estrellita Tongco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 4286. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tomasa Martinez de Pina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4287. A bill for the relief of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 4288. A bill for the relief of Mrs. M. Orta Worden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4289. A bill to waive the statute of limitations in a certain case; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 4290. A bill for the relief of Armenouhi Eghiazarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 4291. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cecilia (Cecylia) Bonkowski Ruminska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 4292. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tsai Shai Goon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 4293. A bill to authorize the admittance of the vessel, *City of New Orleans*, to American registry and to permit the use of such vessel in the coastwise trade between the State of Alaska and the State of Washington; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 4294. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rene A. Arcilla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 4295. A bill for the relief of Gaspare Terranova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4296. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nora Gomez Dagan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 4297. A bill for the relief of the John V. Boland Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

52. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of residents of Graettinger, Spencer, Emmetsburg, and Terril, Iowa, urging the Congress to give full and public consideration to any Presidential guarantee which might in effect abrogate the Monroe Doctrine by permitting Soviet Communist influence and control to continue in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

53. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Petition of Miss Elizabeth Mould and 18 others, to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

54. Also, petition of Mrs. Louise H. Harrison and 105 others to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

55. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Ohio Bell, Chicago, Ill., relative to a redress of grievance relating to being denied certain inherit birthrights, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Excerpts From an Address by Congressman William Jennings Bryan Dorn in Atlanta, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding speakers of the House, the Honorable WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, of the Third District of South Carolina, made a timely and thought-provoking address in Atlanta, Ga., at a joint meeting of the Alabama-Florida, Carolinas, and Georgia Cotton Ginners Associations and the Southeastern Gin Suppliers Exhibit at the Biltmore Hotel on February 11.

Because of the clarity with which the statements are made expressing the problems of agriculture in the Southeast and in America, I recommend to all Members the excerpts from the address set out hereafter:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN DORN

Mr. President, I could not do justice to any occasion in Atlanta or anywhere in Georgia without paying tribute to Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL. He is not just Georgia's Senator, but the South's leader and spokesman. He is our Senator, and we are equally proud of his guidance and able leadership. I know of no delegation to the Congress superior to that of Georgia in both the House and the Senate.

Georgia's illustrious junior Senator, HERMAN E. TALMADGE, has from time to time introduced the nationally known Talmadge farm bill. The farm bill of Senator TALMADGE warrants the earnest consideration of Congress and the American people. Senator TALMADGE's bill has much merit. It is far superior to the farm programs of the past which resulted in forcing the family-size farmer from the land and making the American farmer less competitive in the markets of the world. Senator TALMADGE advocates a completely "fresh start" in the field of farm legislation. He is convinced his farm plan could reach the following desired objectives: (1) Let the farmer farm; (2) guarantee the farmer his proportionate share of the national income; and (3) place American agricultural commodities back on the world markets at competitive prices.

The farm problem is this Nation's No. 1 domestic headache. The situation is bad and gradually gets worse. In a comparatively few short years, we have seen our farm population, nationwide, go from 40 percent to a dangerously low today of approximately 11 percent—dangerous because I know of no great civilization in the history of the world with only 11 percent of its population living on the farm. Where have these people gone? Many of them are receiving welfare in the great cities of this Nation. Juvenile delinquency and crime have skyrocketed. The stage is being set for socialism and Government regulation of every act of the individual. Federal Government farm programs which have sponsored mass exodus from the land, surpluses, scandals, and big corporation farming were born in the minds of a strange assortment of young, theoretical attorneys namely: Alger Hiss, Nathan Witt, Frank Shea, Rex Tugwell, Lee Pressman, Henry A. Wallace, and Felix Frankfurter. These gentlemen wrote the first Agricultural Adjustment Act in the 1930's. These brilliant young eggheads launched this Nation into the farm mess we are in today—a farm program where industrialists, corporate farms, and even foreign combines get Federal price supports to the detriment of the family-size farmer.

In considering any farm program in the United States, we should remind ourselves of the fact that every single country in the world is increasing its farm acreage. Farmers are encouraged in the rest of the world to grow more and more. In many countries, such as Rhodesia and Turkey, farmers are extended tax advantages and tax exemptions to grow more and more; while the farmers in the United States are regimented, controlled, harassed, and denied the privilege of growing and expanding. I am reliably informed that Soviet Russia has increased her cultivated acres more than a hundred million acres in the last few years. Red China is desperately, relentlessly, expanding its farm acreage. Someday we will be faced with Communist farm products invading the markets of the world at fantastically low prices. This is not a bright picture; however, it must be faced.

Our farm problems cannot be solved by subsidizing our farmers to go out of business while we subsidize other segments of our economy to stay in business and to expand.

The family-size farmer is the backbone of America. The family-size farm philosophy is one of independence, individual initiative, and opportunity. This philosophy has been the foundation stone of our American way of life. Upon this foundation we built the highest standard of living in all history.

I still believe there is a future in agriculture in the Southeast. I believe there is a future in cotton. I believe there is a future for the family-size farmer in the Southeast.

The future of cotton in the South is inevitably tied in with cattle and pine trees. We must resist control of our infant cattle industry by resisting feed grain controls. If the Secretary of Agriculture controls feed grains, he can and will limit our growing cattle industry. Likewise, if the Secretary of Agriculture is given the power to confiscate farmland for recreation and is given dictatorial power over every action of the farmer, he can and will control the production of pine trees. In order to grow cotton profitably in the Southeast, we must have

a free hand in cattle and tree farming. With this diversified approach, we can stay in the cotton business.

The Talmadge plan could well be the solution to our farm problem, and failing of enactment, I see no alternative as a solution but the gradual elimination of acreage controls and price supports. We must in some way eliminate the two-price cotton system so that our great textile industry will continue to buy and consume cotton. The greatest consumer of the American farmer's cotton is the American textile industry. This industry cannot continue to consume 70 percent of all cotton grown in the United States under the present two-price cotton system. This system hurts both the farmer and causes unemployment in the mills.

We must accelerate our research program on boll weevil control and weed and grass control. This in turn will reduce production costs and will put cotton in a more competitive position. Cost of producing cotton has always been high and shortage of labor continues to increase production costs.

The "grassy cotton" program for loan rates to farmers should be continued.

As long as we continue to have allotments, farmers should be provided with a reasonable floor under the price of cotton.

We should endorse and support the program of the National Cotton Council of America. I know they will continue to find new ways of using cotton and cottonseed products. They have made much progress in their research program designed to lower the cost of cotton production. It is predicted that the present program of the National Cotton Council will decrease the cost of producing cotton by 10 to 30 percent. They are making fantastic progress to control boll rot, insects and disease, chemical control of grass, and so on. If their program is fully realized, then we can gradually eliminate controls and price supports, and cotton will be competitive in the world market.

Two-thirds of our cotton crop used to be exported abroad. We must recapture our foreign market. The program of the National Cotton Council will, in a few years, permit our cotton farmers to compete in the world market.

We should vigorously oppose any proposed revisions to existing law with respect to allocation of cotton acreage to States that would cause the Southeast to receive any less percentage of the national allotment than it received in 1962 under the existing law.

House Joint Resolution 279: National Harmony Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution (H.J. Res. 279) to designate the 6-day period, beginning April 15, 1963, as National Harmony Week. Further, the resolution would authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to join in the observance of National Harmony Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In offering this resolution, I wish to pay tribute to the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc. This nonprofit, fraternal organization is dedicated to the preservation and promotion of the uniquely American art form known as the barbershop quartet style of close harmony singing. Its more than 650 chapters in all 50 States and most of the Provinces of Canada comprise over 30,000 members.

I am proud to note that this year's international president of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., S. Wayne Floor, is a resident of my home community of Rochester, N.Y. and a constituent of the district I am privileged to represent in Congress.

I hope my colleagues will give favorable consideration to the resolution.

Hopeful Trends in Employment of the Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, a subject of great concern to me has always been employment opportunities of our handicapped workers. I was pleased, therefore, to see a U.S. Department of Labor news release of November 1962 indicating that the placement of handicapped workers showed a 15-percent increase in October.

In spite of these advances, there is a continuing need for employers to discard their common prejudices against the handicapped and recognize the useful contribution which they can make in our society.

Because of my interest in this area, I wrote to Secretary Wirtz and requested additional information on handicapped jobseekers. The Secretary's reply shows that the job still to be done in this area is immense. As a matter of public interest, under unanimous consent, I insert the original Labor Department press release, my letter to Secretary Wirtz, and his reply, in the RECORD at this point:

PLACEMENTS OF HANDICAPPED WORKERS SHOW 15 PERCENT INCREASE IN OCTOBER

Public employment service placements of handicapped workers in October showed a 15-percent increase over the previous month, largely as a result of the annual observance of National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, the U.S. Labor Department's Bureau of Employment Security announced today.

State employment services affiliated with the Bureau's U.S. Employment Service reported a total of 29,800 job placements of workers with physical handicaps in October, of which 10,518 represented placements of disabled veterans. This is a 6.3-percent increase over October 1961, when such placements totaled 28,068, of which 10,064 were placements of disabled veterans.

The U.S. Employment Service said that during the first 10 months of the current year the public employment offices made 240,276 placements of handicapped workers, an increase of 26,272 over the same period last year. Each month showed an increase over the corresponding month in 1961.

Robert C. Goodwin, Administrator of the Bureau of Employment Security of which the U.S. Employment Service is a part, said that he attributed the continuing improvement in job placements for handicapped workers to the overall step-up in placement activity by the local State employment offices and the growing acceptance by employers of the value of such workers.

JANUARY 9, 1963.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for sending me U.S. Department of Labor–5523, release for Wednesday, November 28, 1962, entitled "Placements of Handicapped Workers Show 15 Percent Increase in October."

I am interested in obtaining additional data regarding the subject and would appreciate receiving your answers to the following questions:

1. How many handicapped persons are registered for placement service?
2. How many applications from newly handicapped persons are received each year?
3. Number of deaths versus those newly handicapped.
4. How many are rehabilitated?
5. How many are being rehabilitated at the present time?
6. What is the percentage of those who could be rehabilitated, but are not being rehabilitated?

Thank you very much for any information and advice you are able to provide me regarding the above.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: This is in reply to your request of January 9, 1963, for additional information on handicapped jobseekers. Your questions are answered below in the order listed:

1. A count of active applications on file in public employment service offices is taken twice a year. The November 1962 file count indicated that there were 227,168 applications of the handicapped jobseekers on file with the local public employment service offices throughout the Nation.

2. During calendar year 1962, there were 461,156 new applications filed by handicapped jobseekers.

3. Information on total number of deaths of handicapped persons is not available. However, the National Vital Statistics Division of the Public Health Service reports there were 1,454,000 deaths during the period from January through October 1962. The National Health Survey Division produced the figure on newly handicapped for the fiscal year ending June 1960, indicating that during this period there were 2.1 million persons of all ages who were physically limited in their major activity for 1 year. They estimate that there are some 13.6 million persons in the United States with some form of permanent disability. (Reference: Health Statistics Series B, No. 31, published by Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.)

4. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation reports that during fiscal year 1962 there were 102,400 persons rehabilitated.

5. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation further reports 34,400 persons were rehabilitated during the 5-month period (July–November 1962) of fiscal 1963. Their scheduled goal for 1963 is 110,400 rehabilitants.

6. According to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, approximately 2.5 million persons in the Nation need some form of rehabilitation. Based on their scheduled goal for fiscal 1963, the number of rehabilitants represents only 5 percent of the total number of persons that could be rehabilitated.

I trust that this is the information you need. Please let me know if I can be of further service to you.

Yours sincerely,

W. Willard Wirtz,
Secretary of Labor.

Homeowner Protection for Maryland Residents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 1597, as I originally introduced it, would merely have continued a right which hundreds of thousands of Maryland homeowners have enjoyed for decades.

I realize that the Maryland ground rent system is a subject which is unfamiliar to most of my colleagues, and this is understandable since only five States have ground rent arrangements. But it is a way of life to most of the citizens of my great State of Maryland.

Briefly stated, it is a system whereby the home buyer defers paying a portion of the purchase price of his property. Instead of paying for the land, he pays interest on it at the rate of 6 percent annually. As a result of this system, Baltimore and Maryland have one of the largest percentages of homeowners in the country.

Because the ground rent is interest, the Treasury Department has always regarded it as such for income tax purposes and the Maryland homeowners paying it have been permitted to deduct such payments for Federal income tax purposes.

On the other side of the coin we have the homebuilder who usually creates the ground rent, and defers paying taxes on that portion of the purchase price on which the homeowner defers payment, until such time as he actually receives his money.

In recent years the Treasury Department objected to this practice and attempted to collect taxes from the builder on the full amount of the purchase price of the property, including that portion deferred by the homeowner and paid as ground rent. A suit was filed on at least two occasions and the courts in both instances sustained the builders.

Having been thwarted in its attempt to tax the builder at the time of sale, the Treasury Department then attempted to tax the small homeowner—in contradiction of its own longstanding policy.

It was because of this action that I introduced H.R. 1597 to protect the small homeowners of Baltimore and Maryland. Unfortunately, the Treasury Department was opposed to my bill and succeeded in having it amended to require the builders to pay taxes on the full amount of the purchase price of the property, including the deferred amount, at the time of the sale.

Thus, in effect, the Treasury Department seeks to accomplish by legislation what it was unable to do by the judicial process.

As much as I deplore the injustice done to the builders by this bill as amended, the alternative injustice to the homeowners would be even worse. For this reason I am supporting H.R. 1597 as it was amended by the Ways and Means Committee—but I am doing so in the hope that the Senate will restore the original language to my bill so that we in Congress will not take away from the builders what they have already won in the courts.

With this understanding, I urge my colleagues to support this measure—and I would like to stress again that it only affects the citizens of Maryland. Incidentally, this bill is identical to the one passed by the House last year.

The Candy Twins: LaVona and LaVelda Rowe of Iowa City, Iowa, Please Capital's Sweet Tooth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to tell my colleagues about the Candy Twins, two constituents and longtime friends of mine who visited the Nation's Capital recently. They are Misses LaVona and LaVelda Rowe, identical twins born and raised in Iowa City, Iowa.

The lovely Rowe sisters, who were my guests here in Washington several years ago, are representing the Candy, Chocolate, and Confectionery Institute on a 6-month tour of the United States. They have already visited some 30 cities from San Antonio to Boston. Being somewhat familiar with always-on-the-go political campaigns, I sympathize with and congratulate the girls for the useful work they are doing.

To give you some idea of the tour, I would like to point out a few of the things the Candy Twins did in Washington when they were here. They visited such places as Junior Village, the Metropolitan Police Boys' Club, homes for the aged, children's, veterans' and general hospitals—and dispensed candy everywhere they went. Valentine candy was presented at the White House to the First Family.

LaVona and LaVelda also appeared on radio and television interviews to discuss questions concerning candy and health. They pointed out the growing popularity of the "candy break" for plant and office workers, and the recognition of candy's quick-energy value by athletic coaches, medical authorities and military leaders. Candy's ability to promote alertness has been recognized by the National Safety Council as a safety factor in preventing highway fatigue. Incidentally, exhaustive research is currently being conducted on this question by the Institute of Traffic and Transportation Engineering, Los Angeles, under a grant from the Candy, Chocolate, and Confectionery Institute.

The twins discussed how candy can be utilized in a weight-control plan, noting that confections often do not add many calories—a hard candy, for example, provides but 14 calories. The girls also suggested ways in which homemakers can create chocolate and candy centerpieces for luncheons, dinners, holidays, and parties.

In conjunction with the twins' visit here, a local group calling itself the Capital Candy Twins Committee sponsored a twin contest. Five-pound boxes of fine chocolate candy were awarded to parents of twins born during the visit of the Candy Twins; to date six twice-blessed prizewinners have received their sweet awards.

Candy, of course, is one of our most familiar foods. In addition to tasting mighty good, candy satisfies the biological need to provide energy-giving nutrients quickly and easily. Thanks to technological achievements and a sound agricultural base, the United States is the largest candy producer in the world.

Many ingredients are used to make confectionery products. The candy industry draws upon exotic fruit and nut trees, cacao tree plantations, roots and herbs, dairy lands, sugar fields, and corn for its raw materials. Raised in and representing an agricultural area, I am well aware of the close relationship between the candy industry and agriculture.

For example, many of my constituents grow corn, and a portion of their crop eventually finds its way into all kinds of confections. Corn wet millers located in and around my district process corn kernels into corn starch, corn sirups, and sugars, all of which are important ingredients in candy. As a matter of fact, products from corn comprise 20 to 30 percent of the total weight of confectionery products.

And so the Candy Twins are telling the story of candy from one coast to the other. From a personal point of view, I can think of no one I would rather hear that story from than LaVona and LaVelda. Not only are they charming and intelligent, but they also qualify for their task by virtue of having had nurses training as well as experience at retail candy counters as salesgirls.

By way of background information, the Rowe sisters attended Iowa City grade and high school and then enrolled in the State University of Iowa, both taking a premed course. They were, incidentally, classmates of my daughter Dorothy. But after 2 years of study the girls decided they were simply not cut out to be doctors and turned their efforts for 3 additional years of study to a new field—news photography.

Their first photographic assignment was as Iowa City correspondents for WMT–TV, Cedar Rapids, and United Press-International News, Davenport. Other jobs followed with Iowa newspapers and television stations. Before their present candy tour began the girls, fully accredited members of the National Press Photographers Association, were staff photographers for the Chicago Daily News.

That the twins look very much alike is apparent to anyone who has had the pleasure of meeting them. Some years ago a professor of zoology concluded from a series of tests that the Rowe sisters were one of America's most identical set of twins. I recall that back in 1960 these young ladies were chosen as "Miss Iowa City"—a neat trick that resulted from the inability of the beauty contest judges to tell them apart.

I salute the Rowe twins for their efforts in behalf of candy, and I wish them success in their careers.

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure, as a newly appointed member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, to be in attendance and testify this forenoon at a meeting of the House Rules Committee which met in public session to receive testimony relating to the proposed resolution offered by Messrs. Roosevelt, Lindsay, and Farbstein, to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities and to transfer its functions to the Committee on the Judiciary. I am pleased to learn that following the public hearing, the Rules Committee agreed to table the resolution. Because of the limitation of time, I was not in a position to extend my remarks in opposition to the proposed resolution. I now avail myself of the opportunity to state my views.

I have long since reached the conclusion that it is of the utmost importance to continue the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee. The evidence indicates that this view is shared by the overwhelming number of the Members of Congress and of the American people.

During the past 3 months, I am advised by the staff of the committee, countless petitions have been received at its office—presented by many, many thousands of American citizens expressing to Congress their great concern as to the action that might be taken pursuant to the proposal of a small minority to weaken the committee by altering its composition as a standing committee. Indeed, on the morning of the hearing—in just 1 day—the committee received from all parts of the country more than 500 telegrams expressing this same concern and urging the Congress in its wisdom to continue the House committee as a standing committee.

In the overall picture of the fight against communism, as we assess it in the world today, the most significant change is that Communist power has grown tremendously, reaching into all corners of the earth and threatening new conquests by daily aggressions. In the years that have passed since the adoption of the Reorganization Act of 1946, which established the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee, hundreds of millions of people, and nation after nation, have fallen under the Communist yoke. This is the situation as it exists beyond the boundaries of the United States.

At the same time, within the United States, there has been a significant decrease in Communist strength. Needless to say, the United States would be in a most difficult position today if a weakening of this internal grouping of the world Communist conspiracy had not taken place.

What has brought about this change—the weakening of the party within the United States while, at the same time, its power has increased beyond our borders? Various factors—some external, such as the Korean war, the cold war, the Hungarian revolution, and the exposure of Stalin's crimes; certain internal developments, such as the prosecutions of the Communist Party leaders under the Smith Act, and proceedings against the party and its members before the Subversive Activities Control Board—have undoubtedly played a role in reducing the party's strength within the country.

At the same time, serious students of the problem and well-informed observers have agreed that the Committee on Un-American Activities through its investigations and hearings, and the legislation it has devised—such as the Internal Security Act—the information it has given to the Congress and the American people, have played a major, though by no means the sole, role in bringing about this decline in Communist strength within our own country, so that we can meet our responsibilities with united and concerted strength.

This is concrete evidence of the quality of the committee's work. It would seem to me to be most unwise at the very time we are confronted with such strong evidence of the committee's effectiveness in combating communism, to abolish the committee and turn its functions over to a newly created subcommittee lacking the experience, background, and know-how on this subject. Is it logical to dump a winner and pin our hopes on an unknown? Quite obviously the House Rules Committee, after hearing the testimony, has reached a sound conclusion. I commend them for their decision.

Moreover, it is most important that we approach the problems involved in subversion as a united Congress and a united people. The House Committee on Un-American Activities is a bipartisan committee. It is not constructed—as is the Committee on the Judiciary—to reflect the requirements of partisan politics. The membership on the Committee on Un-American Activities is divided equally between the members of both the Republican and Democratic Parties, with the exception of the chairman who represents the majority party. The committee has functioned as a bipartisan committee and it can function as such only by maintaining its independence as a standing committee of the Congress. As such it has met its responsibilities and commands the confidence of the Congress and the American people. Created by a far-sighted Congress, extended today by the decision of the Rules Committee, its existence continues unimpaired. This decision will be applauded throughout the entire Nation.

Child-Care Expenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to support the bill—H.R. 2085—introduced by my distinguished colleague, Congressman William J. Green, Jr., to allow income tax deduction for child-care expenses in cases of women deserted by their husbands. A similar bill passed the House in the 87th Congress but did not get through the Senate.

The Internal Revenue Code, as now worded, requires a "legally separated" status to justify such a deduction by a mother who has been deserted by her husband. Some mothers who did take deductions for their children are required to refund the money to the tax office. There are a good many such cases in the country where mothers are employed to support themselves and their children, and the whereabouts of their husbands are unknown.

The bill imposes certain suitable conditions in order to give proper status to the mother. She must have been deserted by her husband; not know his whereabouts at any time during the taxable year, and must have applied to a court to compel him to pay support.

I am pleased that the bill passed the House today, and I hope that the Senate takes early action. This amendment to the Internal Revenue Code will do justice to many deserving citizens.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lamentations 3: 40: *Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord.*

Most merciful and gracious God, whose amazing compassion and love we cannot comprehend, we thank Thee for Ash Wednesday, ushering in the solemn and sacred Lenten season, when we are enjoined to cultivate self-examination and self-discipline.

We penitently confess that in our hearts there are sins and transgressions which only Thy mercy can forgive and hidden splendors and potentialities which only Thy grace can bring to fulfillment and fruition.

Grant that we may be filled with the spirit of humility and hope as we daily turn to the cross to meditate upon the suffering and sacrifice of the Great Captain of our salvation.

Hear us through the merits and mediation of our blessed Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REDUCING GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during our childhood days most of us have heard the lyric, "A man of words and not of deeds is like a garden full of weeds." Words have been flying incessantly of late in regard to Government expenditures. Everyone seems to be outwardly for cutting of expenditures, balancing the budget, and reducing taxes. It is obvious to me that many either do not know where and how to go about reducing expenditures or do not care to put forth the necessary effort to be effective.

For those who are really interested, I am detailing for you one case which I am today presenting to the Departments of Defense and Justice and to the General Accounting Office. This case, as you will see, is outlined in every detail so that any question of authenticity or propriety is completely eliminated.

I am sure you will find it interesting reading and that after it reaches the Secretary of Defense today, a savings of approximately 50 percent can be effected on this one item of defense procurement. It has taken long hours of hard work to develop this particular case and develop it before the fact in order that this money can be saved.

Almost daily from now on for awhile I will be presenting additional cases. I hope those who are interested in saving the taxpayers' money will read this one case very carefully, and assist me in my efforts to stretch the defense dollar.

The Secretary of Defense has been quoted as saying he can save $2.5 billion in defense costs this year. I am going to show a way today in which much more can be saved, and I hope to prove that a Navy officer has made a false certification of fact that will cost the taxpayer 50 percent more for a small piece of equipment than necessary. There ought to be some red faces in Navy today after the way in which false pretenses are used by Government servants to waste national defense money by the billions is exposed. There also ought to be a full investigation and punishment for any people found guilty of wrongdoing in the case I am about to describe.

The case I plan to cite today is typical of much larger examples of bureaucratic waste, mismanagement, and questionable action. There are many more, and I will be bringing them to the attention of the House very soon.

Stating this case in simple A, B, C, D terms would enable the Members of this House to understand the waste that is being perpetrated in the name of national defense. Simplification, however, is not possible when you are talking about defense purchasing. The procurement picture is as tangled a can of fishing worms as you have ever seen. It has been wrapped in a shell of directives, policies, regulations, restrictions, exceptions, amendments, and procedures that protects it like the shell protects the armadillo. To understand how wasteful the purchasing policies of our defense people are, you must strip away the shell piece by piece. There is no shortcut.

If a detailed examination of one small purchase is difficult to understand, consider how difficult it is to understand the larger, more complicated and costly procurements. Think how many more avenues exist for waste and worse in these larger purchases.

The bureaucrats of Government and the slicksters in industry count on the fact that you and I will be drowned in details and technicalities. When this happens, they have a blank check and operate with impunity.

The sharp operators in industry can continue to buy lunches and dinners, arrange for various forms of social entertainment, buy gifts and manifestations of good will for the Government bureaucrats who accept them as favors to set the stage for Government contracts.

Let me make it clear that I am not speaking here of the admirals and generals, the secretaries of the services, the line and fleet commanders, the second echelon officers and the enlisted men on our ships, planes, and fronts of the world. I speak of the middle-grade civil and military servants who are wined and dined and much more to set the stage for contracts to favored companies.

Eighty percent of the purchasing done by these people for our national defense is done without open competition. As a result of what is called sole-source buying, the Navy now proposes to make a purchase of an equipment identified as the AT–948/U—radar—antenna. This is a simple piece of electronic equipment consisting of a 50-inch vertically polarized omnidirectional antenna with an overhead coverage to fill the cone of silence. It operates between 400 and 500 megacycles and can be installed on ship or shore. It is not a sophisticated piece of equipment. Scores of industries can manufacture it.

Under a negotiation numbered 269–63–Q, dated February 1, 1963, by the Navy Purchasing Office, a buy of 90 of these antennas was authorized on a sole-source basis from Chu Associates, Inc., Post Office Box 387, Littleton, Mass. The Navy estimated the equipment will cost about $1,500 each with a total cost of $135,000.

This is a small purchase when compared to the $55 billion defense budget that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee called "staggering" and stated could be cut intelligently and prudently. But it is typical of so many other procurements. In it is the ingredient for saving money on defense buying. To do this, however, you cannot talk generalities. You have to fight the bureaucrats in their own redtape, and understand the gobbledygook language and deal in specifics.

Here is the way it works: The Navy wants to spend $135,000 under negotiation 269–63Q. Due to a recent change in Armed Services Procurement Regulations which I have detailed in the past, the Navy was required to make a public announcement of this purchase. In this publication it listed a February 15 closing date, giving the industry only 8 working days to secure bid forms, analyze the equipment, prepare and submit a bid. This time span would not be sufficient, even had the door to competition not been closed beforehand.

This whole transaction was approved as sole-source. The last man to sign the papers was Capt. C. A. Appleby, in charge of the naval purchasing office here in Washington. He signed a document stating that only Chu Associates possesses the necessary manufacturing drawings and data required to make the antenna.

Mr. Speaker, that certification is false. There are drawings and microfilms which should be made available to other manufacturers in this case as in countless others. They exist right now in Washington, but Captain Appleby says they do not. I think you will agree that a Navy captain who spends a large part of the $55 billion defense budget should know what he is talking about when he signs a paper. If he does not—if he just signs what is laid on his table—then this is unconscionable bad management, and he should be removed. If he does know the facts put in front of him to be wrong but proceeds anyway, then other action by the Government is clearly indicated.

How do I know drawings exist? During my study of this case, I decided to get at what I considered to be the crux of this whole matter—drawings. If drawings exist, then Captain Appleby's one reason for sole-sourcing this purchase evaporates and we have another example of bureaucratic bungling and wanton waste of tax money.

Mr. Speaker, at 1 p.m. on February 26, I had made the sixth in a series of phone calls tracing the drawings for this equipment—drawings which Captain Appleby says only Chu Associates have. At that time, Lt. Comdr. Francis McCord, Bureau of Weapons, section head of RN Weapons Control No. 54—telephone OXford 6–1524—said over the telephone that his section had the drawings for this equipment. He further said the microfilms for it were located in another area where a woman named Mrs. Frieda Kripp—telephone Oxford 6–1262—is the section head of a group known as RREN 63—a group that deals in microfilms of drawings. Lieutenant Commander McCord's statements were repeated back to him to obviate any chance of error.

There you have it. Captain Appleby says only one firm has the necessary data, but Lieutenant Commander McCord says manufacturing information is in Navy files—the very files that are supposed to exist to help encourage competition for defense work.

The plans were delivered under terms of an earlier contract—62–0975—dated June 22, 1962. It called for $1,072 each and a total price of $83,616. An earlier contract was for 136 antennas at a unit price of $1,451.29, and a total price of $197,375.44.

After buying this antenna twice at unit prices of $1,451 and $1,072 via the sole-source route, one might expect a lower price the third time around. Instead, the price is going to jump 50 percent according to Navy estimates. I will tell you today that when this antenna is bought via competitive bidding the price will fall by almost 50 percent.

There you have the pattern. A false certification by a responsible Navy official sets the stage for a 50-percent waste of the taxpayers' dollar—only this time he has been caught before the contract is let. This is just a small contract, and it is not as complicated as many of the larger ones I have studied. It does graphically portray in understandable fashion the way in which our money is being poured down the drain.

Mr. Speaker, every ounce of my being rebels at this false certification by this Navy capain, whose action makes the American taxpayer sweat just a little more to pay a heavier tax for defense.

Actions such as Captain Appleby's contribute to the severe financial problems of our Nation, but he is only one of many officials—civilian and military—who have been riding the gravy train aboard the sacred cow of national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I have today made an official protest to the General Accounting Office to halt this current procurement and to reschedule it for competitive bidding. The drawings are available and can be given to industry to introduce the force of competition into this purchase.

I am also referring this matter to the Secretary of Defense with the hope that there will be, at the least, some severe reprimands forthcoming. I hope a full investigation is made, but if, as in the past, the Navy refuses to clean its own house and tries to sweep the drawings under the rug to protect its own, then the time may have come when substantial, across-the-board cuts should be made in its appropriations by this Congress. Maybe that will force it to institute economies that will stop this flushing of our tax dollars down the drain. In addition, I am referring this entire file to the Justice Department for its perusal.

It is my hope that this typical example will spur other Members of Congress to take a longer, harder look at this sacred cow and see where some more fat may be cut from its diet.

TAX REDUCTION AND TAX REFORM

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I asked for a special order of 1 hour and utilized part of it, and many Members participated in the discussion. I have just asked for a special order on Monday next. At that time I intend to take about 15 minutes myself to discuss why President Kennedy asked last June at Yale University for a dialog on the economy of the United States. I think with the great discussion going on now on taxes and tax reduction and tax reform and unemployment in many areas, this House should be concerned about what is happening and what will happen in the future. On Monday it will give us an opportunity, and I invite all Members on both sides of the aisle to participate in the discussion and find out what we can come up with ourselves in this House.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1963

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on Monday, February 25, I call up the resolution (H.J. Res. 284) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, what will be the nature of the parliamentary procedure this afternoon?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is my understanding that under the rules, the resolution will be considered under the 5-minute limitation on debate. I would trust and hope that, if Members wish to use more time than that, within reason that they will be permitted to use such extra time as they might wish to have. I certainly hope that Members will have the opportunity to discuss the items involved in this resolution. It will be my purpose to go along with that approach. I do think we are faced with a great emergency and that we should move ahead with the resolution.

Mr. HORAN. I certainly concur in that. I want to point out to the House that this is a matter of picking up the check for a half billion dollars and I trust that any Member who has anything to say this afternoon will receive consideration and that the House will be lenient in allowing such Member to receive additional time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Foreign assistance programs

Public Law 480

For an additional amount for "Public Law 480", to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation due to expenses and costs of sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies pursuant to title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1701–1709), $508,172,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the Commodity Credit Corporation was organized as a corporation so that it would have corporate powers and be able to buy and sell commodities. The Commodity Credit Corporation is charged with the responsibility among others of financing the price support system, which has been in existence, if I recall correctly, since 1933 or 1934. This corporation has three means of financing the obligations which it is directed to carry out by the Congress. One is to increase the borrowing authority. The second is to restore capital impairment, and the third is from the returns which they get from the sale of commodities. The present financial situation is such that the corporation is down to about $100 million so far as its financial ability to meet the obligations of price supports plus the many other things that the Congress has directed the corporation to do. Last year the corporation asked the Congress to do something that we have been accustomed to doing in the last number of years, namely, to restore the capital impairment in considerable amount. The Congress, on the recommendation of our subcommittee, reduced the amount requested by some $800 million. We were in hopes that the funds we appropriated to the corporation would be ample to meet their needs. It has developed in recent months that they are inadequate.

I would like to explain to my colleagues the reasons for this that have been given to us, and which I subscribe to. First, the corporation has about 1 billion bushels of corn which it has authority to sell. If the corn were sold, the proceeds would be usable by the corporation to meet its other obligations. However, it is believed that to force that corn on the domestic market at this time would force the price down to the point where it would cost the Government and the producers much more money than would otherwise be the case if this corn was not forced on the market at the present time.

In addition to that, in recent weeks there has been much agitation about reducing the price of cotton. No action has been taken in that regard, but because of discussions and the press releases on this subject nobody has been buying cotton. Where it was believed by the corporation that much of it would go into the domestic trade, the trade has been holding off in hopes of a lower price. The farmer having no market has had to turn to the Corporation for a loan so that the Corporation has a great deal more money invested in cotton on loan than anticipated.

What we have done here is to bring forward about half a billion dollars from the request for the next fiscal year into this fiscal year so the Corporation will have funds with which to operate and with which to carry out its price support obligations for the rest of the current fiscal year.

I would like to point out here that if the Congress should not act favorably on this resolution—and I hope it will—it would leave the Corporation in a deficit position possibly within a week or 10 days.

They find themselves in this difficult position because of the wording of the very act itself. The law says they shall support prices and make loans, but it also says that if they do so and do not have the money they also violate the law. The Secretary told us that, should this money not be appropriated, he would have to send out notices that it would be impossible to carry out further price supports and make further loans on agricultural commodities. This the Secretary said would result in chaos.

I repeat again, the Corporation has commodities to which they have title and can sell. It also has others which are securities for loans and which cannot be sold until the loan is due.

In this resolution we have brought forward funds from the next fiscal year to this fiscal year to the extent of half a billion dollars. I do not see that anybody on either side of the aisle can do anything but go along with this resolution in view of the emergency facing the Corporation at the present time.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am sort of reminded of a couplet today as we bring up this bill for over half a billion dollars for repairment of the Commodity Credit capital structure.

There was a dachshund once so long it had
not any notion
Of how long it took to notify his tail of his
emotion;
And so it happened that one day while his
eyes were filled with woe and sadness
That his little tail went wagging on because
of previous gladness.

Today we are picking up a check for money that has already been spent. It is difficult for us to ride herd on such an expenditure. I am aware that those of us on the Appropriations Committee are not apt to win any popularity contest any place, but we do have a responsibility to check on items that come out of the Federal Treasury, and this is one of them.

At a time when our national debt is over $300 billion, at a time when we are talking about tax reductions and controlled deficits, this half billion dollars will be added to the already large deficit of fiscal year 1963. I just want to serve notice on those in control of the Commodity Credit Corporation that they have a job to do as well as the Congress, and that is to see that our Federal moneys are not squandered. Commodity Credit began as a comparatively small corporation; now it is a $14.5 billion corporation. It began as a means of making price supports effective. It has already added $20 billion to the national debt, I might add that since we started repairing its capital structure we have added commodity export items to the Commodity Credit responsibility; part of our supply and farm purchase program is added to the Commodity Credit responsibilities. A good share of Public Law 480 is now being added to the Commodity Credit liabilities. The International Wheat Agreement is in the same category as are bartered materials. Through investigations by the General Accounting Office we know that there have in the past been loose practices under this enormous operation, and at this time I want to serve notice as a member of our subcommittee that we will expect the internal audit of the Commodity Credit Corporation to do a better job.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, that a critical financial problem exists in the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot be denied. If Congress fails to approve this appropriation, the Commodity Credit Corporation will have to choose among several courses of action, all of them undesirable. But this is the appropriate and proper place to ask why the Commodity Credit Corporation is today in trouble. One would think that $14.5 billion is enough money for anybody to play with.

From reading the documents and the testimony in the hearing report on this bill, one might conclude that this is the result of inexorable forces that have moved against Secretary Freeman, that the blame belongs at the door of Congress and at the door of the weatherman and marketplace conditions over which Mr. Freeman can have no control.

I invite your attention in the committee hearings to the repeated use of the expression "mandatory obligations."

On page 3 of the report, the Secretary's written report says the appropriation is needed so the Corporation "can meet its mandatory price support obligations." Again, on the same page, it is stated the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation has dropped "to such a low level that its ability to finance the mandatory price support programs has been seriously impaired."

In the next paragraph the phrase "mandatory obligations" is repeated. It appears again near the top of page 4.

The report does not disclose who established the level of supports which led to these mandatory obligations. Was it Congress? It was not. Was it the farmer? It was not.

The responsibility for the financial plight of the Commodity Credit Corporation should be laid at the door of Orville L. Freeman, the Secretary of Agriculture.

Time after time, in his conduct of his office, he has used discretionary authority to set price supports at unrealistic levels.

In dairy, he increased the level of supports in 1961 to an unrealistic level, causing an accumulation of dairy inventories in Commodity Credit about a half a billion dollars higher than when he took office.

In 1962 he begged the Committee on Agriculture to take him off the hook for this unwise action by passing a resolution fixing dairy supports at this unwise level. The committee quite properly refused to do so, and the Secretary in a belated, too late effort to meet the problem, lowered the support level. But the damage was done, and this unwise action by Secretary Freeman contributed to the financial crisis now before the House.

In cotton, he increased the level of price supports to 32.5 cents a pound, more than 8 cents a pound above world levels. More and more, the Commodity Credit Corporation has become the market for American cotton, and today about $200 million more in Commodity Credit Corporation funds are tied up in cotton inventories than when Mr. Freeman took office.

The Commodity Credit Corporation supplies about 40 percent of the needs of American cotton today, and if we continue to move in the present direction, we can expect a greater and greater demand on the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Worse is yet to come in cotton. The inventory of Government cotton is expected to reach 10 million bales by August 1 of this year—an unprecedented level.

Of course, this will tie up still more of Commodity Credit Corporation funds.

The Committee on Agriculture has been considering the cotton problem. It is still considering this problem. Cotton is in a critical condition today, the worst in its history, due mainly to the unrealistic level of price supports in recent years.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] has expired.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Freeman set the level last year at 32.5 cents a pound, despite growing inventories and the relatively low level of world markets. On the day before the Committee on Agriculture was expected to take final action on this cotton bill Mr. Freeman had the gall to announce that the support level for cotton would again this year be at the same unrealistically high level; it would stay at 32.5 cents a pound. Mr. Freeman had authority to set cotton supports at 30 cents a pound or 28 cents a pound or 26 cents a pound and he could have thereby helped to relieve the critical financial problem which is now before us. But he did not. He left the level at 32.5 cents a pound—the level which has caused such a heavy buildup of Government stocks.

I invite your attention to law which should govern the action of the Secretary in setting the level of price supports for cotton. I refer to section 401, page 137 of the compilation of statutes relating to the Department of Agriculture. It lists the factors which the Secretary is supposed to take into account in determining the level of cotton support. No. 3 is "the availability of funds."

Less than a month ago the Secretary of Agriculture, obviously with full knowledge of the critical financial plight of the Commodity Credit Corporation, still took the unwise action of once again fixing the level of cotton support at 32.5 cents a pound, ignoring the requirement spelled out in the statute.

In wheat, Mr. Freeman again used discretionary authority when he took office to jack up the level of supports to $2 a bushel, once more inviting excessive production. As a result of this unwise action on the Secretary's part, about a half a billion dollars more is tied up in wheat inventories than when he took office.

In soybeans, the wonder crop of the farm belt, a commodity that was healthy and in good condition and selling well at home and abroad when Mr. Freeman took office, he took the unwise action of raising price supports for soybeans and today we have about $50 million tied up in soybean inventories.

In corn the Secretary had the same latitude in fixing price supports.

Is the feed grains program a success? I invite your attention to the reasons given by Secretary Freeman in requesting over half a billion dollars more for the Commodity Credit Corporation. Each of the four reasons he gives—and they are listed on page 4 of the committee hearings—indicate a failure of the feed grains program, and failure of other supply management programs about which he speaks so highly.

For 2 years we have heard about cotton and tobacco as being success stories in supply management, the pattern after which we should plan control of corn and wheat and other commodities.

I invite your attention once more to the committee hearings, page 10. The fact is brought out there of the highest takeover in years by CCC of flue-cured tobacco; about 17 percent of all the production was brought under loan, which means once more increased tieup of CCC funds.

The problem which we have before us today could properly be labeled "made by Secretary Freeman." It is true we have these obligations which we must meet but it is important that we know where the responsibility lies.

In this same hearings record there are listed several alternative courses of action if the Congress should fail to pass this bill. And, as I said earlier, all of them are undesirable. I would like to suggest one other course of action which might help, and that is to have a new Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois who just a moment ago, spoke so eloquently in developing the true facts of this matter. He is a very studious member of the House Committee on Agriculture and his knowledge, ability, and hard work has won him the respect of Members on both sides of the aisle. Those of us from Illinois are especially proud to claim him as a member of our State delegation.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking today about a half billion dollars—$508 million, to be exact. This is an item which we cannot treat lightly.

The able chairman of our subcommittee would say that what we are doing is taking an appropriation for the fiscal year 1964 and juggling it back to the year 1963, so this is not really too much to be concerned about. But, I just want to remind you that later on in the year we are going to be coming out with the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill of a specific figure, and I wonder if next year, at this very same time, we will not be back here picking up the tab again for a supplemental bill in the neighborhood of half a billion dollars. It cannot be treated lightly. We are simply switching it from one fiscal year to another.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I think if you take the total amount obligated now and the fact that $20 billion has been appropriated to repair that capital structure, you will find you will wind up with obligations that total $34 billion. That is more money than I ever expect to have in my life, I will tell you that.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

It has been true that in the last several years we have used the mechanism of restoring the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation by direct appropriations. The question was raised as to whether it might not be wise to raise the statutory limit of borrowing authority of $14.5 billion. This kind of legislation would have to come from the Committee on Banking and Currency. It may not be a bad idea for that committee to take a look into the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Maybe a good ventilating of the problem would benefit all of us.

I do not appreciate the Secretary's attitude of referring to all of this increase as being attributed solely to the denial of funds by Congress for the foreign assistance program. By his own admission, for some time he has withheld corn and feed grains from the home market. I might say to those Members who come from the consuming areas of the country, when you go to buy steak and hamburger and pork chops and the price is pretty high, bear in mind that the Secretary says, "One of the reasons I am withholding corn and feed grains from the market is that livestock production is running about 4-percent above last year. If we put more feed on the market it might increase production even more." You and I know the law of supply and demand says the more there is the cheaper the price is going to be. Is this foreign assistance or is it a fictitious manipulation by the Secretary of Agriculture to get more funds to keep feed off the market and prices high at home? You folks from the consuming areas ought to be concerned about this. The same scheme applies to cotton and the prices you pay for its products.

Our good chairman of the subcommittee said that 562 million bushels of corn were in the Commodity Credit Corporation's stocks. I think to get the real impact of this we ought to talk about it in terms of dollars and cents. Currently, as of February 15, we have in the Commodity Credit Corporation corn valued at $999,623,000; wheat, $1,911,450,000. Cotton is valued at $810,583,000, and grain sorghums at $521,082,000, as of the date of February 15.

As our subcommittee chairman has indicated and our ranking minority member from Washington [Mr. HORAN] has said, at this juncture there is very little we can do but simply go along, but let's keep the record straight as to who is responsible and why. We ought to bear in mind also that there are going to be some other measures coming before this House both from the legislative committees and our Appropriations Committee. Now is the time to start some serious thinking about what we are going to do for the long haul.

One other thing we ought to bear in mind. You remember those acreages we put into the conservation reserve some years ago, and for which we paid farmers—well, 1,300,000 of those acres came out of the reserve as of December 31, 1962. In this current calendar year 6 million acres will come out of that reserve. The question presents itself, Now what do we do? Does it go back into production of more stocks for Commodity Credit Corporation or do we pay them again not to grow something in a so-called conservation area?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MICHEL was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman is a member of the committee and of the subcommittee that held these hearings. Would the gentleman kindly comment on cheese and butter? We seem to have got into a situation here where the increase in the Commodity Credit Corporation holdings in 1 year have increased approximately $75 million in butter alone, and in the cheese program, as I understand it. Would the gentleman comment a little on that?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes, and I must refer back to the debate during consideration on the bill when an amendment was being offered on the floor and I pointed out that the cost was going to be in the neighborhood of $300 million and would have to go up. So we see it at the half billion mark today.

Currently, as of February 15, we have in the Commodity Credit Corporation butter valued at $202,869,000; cheese, $16,233,000; and dried milk $78,149,000. In total these products alone represent an increase of $117,467,000 over last year.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on page 7 of the committee hearings, there is a conversation reported between the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and Secretary Freeman in which it is indicated, and I quote:

> Once the cotton picture settles down pricewise, this cotton will either be redeemed or title will go to the corporation, so you (meaning the Department) in turn can sell it.

Now my question is, Where do we sell these 10 million bales of cotton? I point to the fact that American cotton is already priced so high that domestic mills are no longer choosing it but are swinging instead to manmade fibers.

Second, I point to the fact that American cotton despite the heavy export subsidy of 8.5 cents per pound is losing its world markets. So when the Commodity Credit Corporation does get title to this cotton, I am wondering what we are going to do with it—are we going to sell it to the Smithsonian Institution or what?

Mr. MICHEL. I think the gentleman has raised a very good question. It is a question which I have asked of a number of people including the department, and some of my colleagues. I do not think anyone has come up with a satisfactory answer where we have a picture of the budget proposal by the department with the very optimistic view that, oh, well, there is no problem and we are going to take it over now but we will get rid of it next year.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to my chairman because as knowledgeable as he is in these affairs, particularly with respect to the cotton producing situation, we will be most happy to have his comment.

Mr. WHITTEN. I appreciate the generous statement of my colleague. I just want to point out that during the preceding administration, once our subcommittee got the department to offer cotton on the world market in world trade, they sold in excess of 7 million bales in 1 year. I would also point out that the law requires that it be sold in world trade.

Further, in reference to the export subsidy which was mentioned, that was determined to be the best way to move this cotton some several years ago. But nothing in the law requires that approach. Cotton will move in world trade any time it is offered at world prices.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, may I inquire further why it is then that American cotton is no longer going to this world market?

Mr. WHITTEN. The reason for it is that the Department has been offering it at a fixed amount of loss, what is called PIK payments. That is not required by law. And the minute the Department will do what I think it should do and what we have been trying to persuade the Department to do, in my opinion, and they offer this commodity in world trade where they have the authority, it will move. The record shows that it will move.

Mr. FINDLEY. Can the gentleman suggest what then can be done with the 10 million bales of cotton owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. WHITTEN. I think quite clearly that some 5½ to 6 million bales can move in world trade if it is offered at prices that are competitive, but if the prices are not competitive, then you cannot sell anything.

Mr. FINDLEY. Does the gentleman then anticipate that it will not be offered at competitive prices?

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, at this same hearing the Secretary committed himself to carry out the law and agreed that the law required him to.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate the colloquy between the two gentlemen because obviously there will be some legislation to come before us later and we will be able then to refer to this exchange of views.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman spoke of the high price, if I understood him correctly, of wheat to consumers? I am sure he is aware that choice cattle prices have dropped about $7.25 per hundred pounds very recently.

Mr. MICHEL. That is true. We have not seen it reflected, however, in the shops and stores around the country.

Mr. GROSS. That is right. I should like to repeat what I said yesterday on the floor of the House that last year we imported into this country and the Government permitted to come into this country 1,700 million pounds of edible meats of all kinds. That is dressed meat. This displaced the necessity for 500 million bushels of corn alone in this country to feed out the animals represented by this 1,700 million pounds of meat. How do you expect to cure that sort of situation and the question of surpluses of that kind?

Mr. MICHEL. Perhaps the gentleman from Iowa would supply for the RECORD who is responsible for the importation of these vast quantities of these commodities?

Mr. GROSS. The people who are responsible for that are those people who advocate free trade and those people who advocate the taking off of all tariffs. They are the people who are responsible.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEERMANN. It seems that we are being asked to be a party to the crime here. Price supports on corn were set at $1.02 with an 18 cent payment in kind. Part of this supplemental appropriation is for that 18 cents a bushel on corn. If the Secretary sold the corn for $1.20 a bushel, which was the support rate, we would not be asked to carry this part of the burden.

In addition, if the Secretary is selling corn at $1 a bushel, it encourages more cattle feeders and builds up the number of cattle in the feed yard and reduces the price of beef on the hoof that the gentleman from Iowa just spoke about.

I might say that as long as Congress permits the Secretary of Agriculture to sell commodities for less than the Government pays there is always going to be difficulty.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

(By unanimous consent and at the request of Mr. PELLY, Mr. MICHEL was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. Can the gentleman say how much of this $508 million impairment was due to shipment of surplus commodities to Communist Poland and to Communist Yugoslavia?

Mr. MICHEL. There is no way to break this supplemental request down in that manner; however, I can say to the gentleman that since the program began in 1954 around $900 million worth of commodities have been supplied to Yugoslavia under this program, and some $590 million worth of commodities have been supplied to Poland.

Mr. PELLY. Could the gentleman indicate as to whether he would support a limitation on this appropriation to prevent this business of selling to these Communist countries?

Mr. MICHEL. I would support such a limitation at the appropriate time. At a time when we are dealing with an emergency supplemental, it is impractical.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi a question in relation to the use of section 32 funds. On page 12 of the report there is a paragraph in connection with section 32 funds. I note that Mr. Grant, who, I understand, was the representative of the budget officers, makes a statement that in connection with section 32 funds, they shall be used principally for parity. My question is directed to the extent section 32 funds are also being used in connection with the disposition of commodities which are under price support and in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that some years ago the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and I first insisted as members of the subcommittee that these funds be used primarily for parity. Later that was incorporated in basic law.

It is my understanding that the Department has held in prior years that if they spend as much as 51 percent on parity they have met the requirements of the act and that they can use the rest on quite a wide number of things. One is the farmers' purchasing power from which the cranberry people benefited a few years ago. Presumably they would be available for other commodities with the limitation that not over 25 percent could be used on any one commodity.

Mr. McINTIRE. Some of us would like to establish the principle that the Department should advise the proper congressional committee of any proposed use which the Congress had not authorized in the preceding year. We think the appropriate committee of Congress should be put on notice.

Would it be a proper inference to draw from the gentleman's statement that this fund has been used to relieve losses which otherwise have been borne by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. WHITTEN. It would be. But as the Secretary points out here, if this bill should not be signed in time to permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to discharge its functions, a chaotic situation would result. If this bill is not enacted into law in time and the Secretary had to send out notices cutting all price supports by using section 32 funds, chaos would result.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment in order to ask the gentleman from Illinois, if, in connection with the question of the gentleman from Washington for information, he would also include figures not only of goods that were shipped to Communist countries, but also the part of this deficit which is caused by foods being included in the so-called foreign aid program.

Mr. MICHEL. Yes, and at this particular point, to the credit of the American farmer, we ought to make it absolutely clear how much of this in total dollars and cents is going abroad in the name of foreign assistance rather than payment to American farmers.

Since 1954 about $9 billion worth of foreign currencies has been generated by Public Law 480 agreements. Of this amount around $7 billion has been or will be loaned back to the countries involved for economic development and mutual defense purposes. It can be said, therefore, that our regular foreign aid program has been augmented by this amount through the Public Law 480 program.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman, because that is the point I had in mind.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington: Am I correct in judging from the gentleman's remarks, as well as the hearings of the committee, that he does not agree with the statement of the committee at the bottom of the page where it says:

> These factors are expected to correct themselves in the next fiscal year.

Does the gentleman see anything in the future, based on his knowledge, which would lead him to that conclusion?

Mr. HORAN. Not right now. I think there is room for an awful lot of improvement in this operation. I think the gentleman will find our subcommittee agrees to that. I know we are going to go into this thing fully when we have the Commodity Credit Corporation bill before us. We have certain findings by the General Accounting Office in connection with a study of Public Law 480 which the General Accounting Office is making. I hope that will be available at the time we have our hearings on the Commodity Credit Corporation, because somebody has to use discipline in connection with the expenditure of these funds.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman, if this summer we dump some 10 million bales of Government cotton on the world market at whatever price might be selected, would that be in accord with the administration's avowed goal of promoting friendly relations abroad? I ask this in light of the fact that a number of undeveloped countries are trying to develop a cotton-producing industry of their own.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The gentleman knows well that I cannot speak for the administration.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the chairman. Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, and the Director of the Budget, Mr. Gordon, have just testified before the Committee on Ways and Means this morning. I asked the question whether this $500 million item had been included in the 1964 budget as presented—the recent budget message. The statement was that this would be an amendment to the budget as submitted to us a couple of weeks ago. I want to confirm that. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is my understanding from the presentation made by the Department that these funds will be withdrawn from the budget estimate for the coming fiscal year. It is expected that they will get cash from sales in the coming fiscal year to replace the funds made available now. In effect this is an amendment or a supplemental request for this year's budget, and the coming year's budget will be reduced in the same amount.

Mr. CURTIS. Then the obligational authority for fiscal year 1964 would be reduced?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, that will take place.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

Now, on another point, Secretary Dillon said in his remarks that the reason for this situation came from the fact that the Congress failed to pass the request of the administration in connection with the agriculture program; but in reading your committee report I do not see that that is the reason. Will the gentleman comment on that? Possibly he did heretofore.

Mr. WHITTEN. Our subcommittee recommended to the Congress that we reduce last year's request for funds by $800 million plus. It was our thought then and the thought of the Congress that they could get through the year on the amount recommended. They have not been able to do so. In our hearings, since we worked with appropriations for this Corporation, the necessity for the funds at this time was so clear and apparent, that we had to take this action. We did not attempt to develop the whole story as to what the effect of the last farm bill has been dollarwise, productivewise, and acreagewise.

May I say to the gentleman that we will develop those facts later. There probably will be some differences of opinion on the two sides about the matter. But those facts will be developed in our regular hearings on next year's appropriation bill. We did not do it here, because it was so clearly apparent that these funds had to be made available.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman. Also you say, "However, due to unforeseen circumstances which have developed in recent months, the Corporation has felt it unwise to place on domestic markets its stocks of corn and feed grains."

That would appear to be something that developed in recent months. The other item that the committee seems to itemize is that dairy product inventories are much higher than a year ago. Was that something that a law would have changed?

Mr. WHITTEN. As the gentleman knows, there are many folks on his side of the aisle who say that the increase in price supports was the major factor; there are others who say that that might not have been the factor. Others might say that it is the declining use of milk and butter. I doubt that I am in a position to say what the sole cause is. I just stated, as chairman, in the report, that it is the fact. From that anybody can draw his own conclusions as to what might have been the causes. Probably there were several.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this program which I think sets up abuses both of counterpart funds and certainly in perpetuating the creation of surpluses of our commodities.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, having exhausted billions of dollars, the Department is now asking for an additional $508 million due to what it calls "unforeseen circumstances."

There is no point in our cutting appropriations in the first place if the various governmental agencies feel that they can come back for supplemental appropriations if they run short.

I might add that the entire agricultural program gives a planned economy to the farmers. It is strange to hear some Congressmen who oppose all social legislation as socialistic and alien argue the merits of the price-support program.

It seems they champion free enterprise for everyone except the farmer; the rugged individualists are not so rugged or individualistic when it comes to themselves.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. Normally, representing a district of consumers, I would vote against any appropriation for subsidies which would in turn create greater costs for consumers. However, today I rise in support of this legislation as this is an appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation whose activities are governed by legislation passed by the Congress and this appropriation is needed to fulfill the obligations of legislation previously passed. In addition, the 1963–64 budget is reduced by the amount we appropriate today.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, in questioning the Secretary of Agriculture, he specifically set forth that unless this money is appropriated the Government would not be able to meet its commitments to the people and this would affect the economy not only of the farmers but of the entire Nation.

I will continue to work for the benefit of the consumers and the reduction of subsidies to the end result that one day subsidies may be entirely eliminated. This, I believe, will be to the benefit of all, consumers and farmers.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, there are reservations in my mind as to the necessity or propriety of supporting this particular measure.

After listening to the compelling arguments of the subcommittee chairman from Mississippi and the admission by the Republican leadership that we have no alternative at this time but to approve the requested appropriation, I am reluctantly supporting the resolution.

Everyone seems in unanimous accord that Congress has ordered that the Commodity Credit Corporation perform a certain job and that adequate money for the performance of this congressional order is not available because of factors beyond the control of the Corporation itself. Additionally our failure to appropriate the needed funds now would result in serious hardship, even chaos as one suggested, to many of our farmers who are already facing difficult financial circumstances.

I am supporting this supplemental appropriation because the subcommittee chairman has assured us that it is his full expectancy that the amount presently being appropriated under this resolution will be deducted from the proposed budget of this Department for the next ensuing fiscal year. Nevertheless, it is wise for us to serve notice on this agency and others similarly situated that we shall expect them to operate within their budgets and, that in the absence of a real national emergency, this body will not resort to such promiscuous supplemental appropriations.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, my opposition to House Joint Resolution 284, supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, is very basic. Public Law 480 has become not just a means of disposing of surplus foods, but a reason for continuing the piling up of surpluses. The tail is wagging the dog. An emergency program has become self-perpetuating. Further, this program is really a foreign aid program, yet has seldom been so considered except incidentally in totaling yearly aid. The abuse or misuse of taxpayers' money is best seen on those many occasions when we have shipped these foods to Communist countries.

Nor is there much to commend the generating of counterpart funds. We get no pay, except in local currency that must be used locally, and which has been subject to much abuse.

Finally, the Federal Government is not intended to be in the business of feeding people. It is unconstitutional.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 254, nays 154, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—254

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Avery
Barrett
Bass
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Berry
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bonner
Bray
Bromwell
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cohelan
Colmer
Cooley
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Duncan
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Farbstein
Fascell
Finnegan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gross
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harvey, Ind.
Hechler
Henderson
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Rains
Randall
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roush
Roybal
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staebler
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Watson
Watts
Weltner
White
Whitten
Wickersham
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Winstead
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—154

Abele
Adair
Alger
Arends
Ashbrook
Auchincloss
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bates
Becker
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Betts
Bolton, Oliver P.
Brock
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Bruce
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clausen
Cleveland
Collier
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dwyer
Ellsworth
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Ford
Foreman
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Gibbons
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Herlong
Hoffman
Horton
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Joelson
Johansen
Jonas
Keith
Kelly
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Latta
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McLoskey
Mailliard
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Moore
Mosher
Norblad
Osmers
Ostertag
Pelly
Pike
Pillion
Pool
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rich
Riehlman
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Sibal
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stafford
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tollefson
Tupper
Utt
Van Pelt
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Weaver
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
Whitener
Widnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Ind.
Wydler
Younger

NOT VOTING—27

Blatnik
Bow
Brademas
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Fallon
Gavin
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Hemphill
Karth

Macdonald
Madden
Mathias
Meader
Morse
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Quillen
Rostenkowski
Sheppard
Teague. Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Walter
Wyman

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Gavin against.

Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. Morse against.

Mr. Hemphill for, with Mr. Wyman against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Until further notice:

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Meader.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Bow.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 264

Resolved, That JAMES E. BROMWELL, of Iowa, be, and he is hereby elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Veterans' Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION OF U.S. COAST GUARD APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 79) to amend title 14, United States Code, to require authorization for certain appropriations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That after December 31, 1963, funds may not be appropriated to or for the use of the Coast Guard for the construction of shore or offshore establishments, or for the procurement of vessels or aircraft, unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after that date.

SEC. 2. Chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 656. Use of appropriations to restore, replace, establish, or develop facilities

"(a) The Secretary may use any funds appropriated to or for the use of the Coast Guard for other construction purposes to restore, repair, or replace facilities that have been damaged or destroyed, including acquisition of sites.

"(b) The Secretary may use any funds appropriated to or for the use of the Coast Guard for other construction purposes to acquire, construct, convert, extend, and install at Coast Guard installations and facilities, needed permanent or temporary public works, including the preparation of sites and the furnishing of appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, but excluding the construction of family quarters, costing not more than $200,000 for any one project.

"(c) The Secretary shall report every six months to the Committee on Commerce of the Senate and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives on the administration of this section."

SEC. 3. The analysis of chapter 17 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new item at the end thereof:

"656. Use of appropriations to restore, replace, establish, or develop facilities."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 146) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 4, 1963, the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 84, by the Committee on Armed Services, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $150,000, including expenditures for the employment of special counsel, consultants, investigators, attorneys, experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants appointed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 1, strike out "January 4" and insert "January 3".

Line 5, strike out "$150,000" and insert "$75,000".

Line 13, add the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, there are 20 resolutions to be considered today. The other resolutions carry the same provision as appears in this amendment, that the chairman of any committee that receives funds must report to the chairman of the Committee on House Administration before initiating any study or investigation, in order to avoid duplication and conflict of jurisdiction with other committees. This amendment was adopted by a unanimous vote.

I may say that all the other resolutions we will be considering today are limited to 1 year.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. May I inquire of the gentleman from Maryland if it will be the policy of the gentleman from Maryland to allot one-half of the time for debate to this side of the aisle?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The rules of the House give the manager of the bill control of the time. If the gentleman desires any time I will gladly yield to him, or anyone else on his side who wants some time. However, if we take an hour on each one of these 20 resolutions it will take 20 hours to consider them.

Mr. SCHENCK. I should like to request the gentleman from Maryland to yield our side 30 minutes on each of these resolutions, not that we expect to use the time in each instance but there are some statements that should be made. As a matter of well-established precedent, I believe that the same procedures as followed by the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Appropriations should be followed in the considerations of these measures here today and that we, the minority, should be allotted half the time on this side of the aisle.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I think the gentleman from Ohio knows I have been very fair on all these resolutions. I do not intend to yield him 30 minutes, but I will yield to him if he wants to make a statement.

Mr. SCHENCK. We would like to be on record as saying that we feel deeply that the time should be equally divided, and that this is an important principle. However, if the gentleman will yield further, I have a statement to make.

Mr. FRIEDEL. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. SCHENCK. Ten minutes.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on House Administration has given very careful consideration to these several resolutions that are before us today. There has been a question discussed at some length as to the division of the committee staff between the majority and the minority members of each of these legislative and investigative committees.

It seems to us on our side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the wrong impression has been allowed to become widespread and therefore our efforts have become misunderstood. In the first place, the minority feel that the staff members should be appointed without regard to any political affiliation, as is provided under rule 11 of the Reorganization Act for the statutory professional staff of the committees. Secondly, we feel that the staff members should be appointed on the basis of their professional competency and ability to serve the committee and best public interest.

We also feel, however, that it would serve a better purpose and be of greater value if the minority professional staff people who are to be paid from the contingent funds, were assigned to the supervision and responsibility of the minority side. This would enable the minority to have any needed research work done properly. It would also greatly assist the minority to prepare such minority reports as may be required from time to time and so on.

So, Mr. Speaker, while we have made efforts in each instance in the Committee on House Administration, which have been refused, to amend these resolutions along these lines, it is my hope to correct any impression, if such exists, that we were attempting to do it on a partisan, political basis. Our efforts have been entirely upon the basis of responsibility and control as to the work of the minority staff members and which we believe is in the best interest of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of the 10 minutes allotted to me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, of course, has been yielded 10 minutes, but the gentleman cannot reserve the balance of his time under the rule and the custom of the House. The principle of the rule in question has existed from time immemorial. Therefore, if the gentleman from Ohio desires to yield to another Member while the gentleman from Ohio has time remaining within his 10 minutes, he may do so.

Mr. SCHENCK. Will the Speaker advise the gentleman from Ohio the amount of time left?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot yield a specific amount of time, but he may yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand it, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] has said that he would yield time to Members on the minority side, and that is what we want. If there is another minority Member who wants to be recognized at this time, it would be in order under the rules for that Member to be granted time in order that he might make such statement as he might want to make.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that under the rules of the House and pursuant to custom that has existed from time immemorial, on a resolution of this kind the Member in charge of the resolution has control of the time and he, in turn, yields time. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] in charge of the resolution has yielded 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio. If the gentleman from Ohio desires to yield to some other Member, he may do so but he may not yield a specific amount of time. The net result, of course, is probably the same but nevertheless there is a clear distinction so that the custom is observed and the rule is preserved.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio yield and, of course, I will request that the gentleman be given an additional minute.

Mr. SCHENCK. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Following the statement of the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Ohio made the statement that he is in favor of the principle involved here. Of course, the principle is well established under the rules of the House and has been observed by both parties from time immemorial, that the Member recognized to call up the resolution has control of the time under the 1-hour rule. But, I would like to advise the gentleman, as the gentleman from Maryland has, I am sure the gentleman from Maryland will yield at least half of the time to the minority.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, as the resolutions authorizing committee expenditures were considered in the Committee on House Administration, the minority sought to amend them in one particular. The amendments had as their purpose, adequate staffing for both the majority and minority members of the various committees. There has been considerable discussion of this purpose, most of it irrelevant or misdirected. Therefore, I seek to define exactly what we are trying to do. The thought is not revolutionary. It should not be disturbing. We seek to enforce the rules of the House. These rules make the following provision:

> Each standing committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) is authorized to appoint by majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members in addition to the clerical staffs on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office; and said staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable. Services of professional staff members may be terminated by majority vote of the committee.
>
> The clerical staff of each standing committee, which shall be appointed by a majority vote of the committee, shall consist of not more than six clerks, to be attached to the office of the chairman, to the ranking minority member, and to the professional staff, as the committee may deem advisable. The clerical staff shall handle committee correspondence and stenographic work, both for the committee staff and for the chairman related to committee work.

Mr. Speaker, we are simply trying to return to the spirit and the letter of House rules.

The gentleman from Iowa recognizes that in some committees of this House, the chairmen have been guided by the essence of the rules. They have supervised and administered their committees in exemplary fashion, making every effort to provide adequate staff assistance for both the majority and minority. In some cases the spirit of the rule has been ignored and in some instances the rule has been violated. There are occasions when members of the majority party have been just as frustrated as have minority members as they seek the kind of staff assistance which is so necessary when subjects of legislative discussion concern matters ranging from the human needs of an individual to the most sophisticated scientific materials.

This certainly is not a partisan concern. Sometimes, the minority seeking assistance of staff members is made up of both Democrats and Republicans who are outnumbered in final determinations on specific pieces of legislation. The rules indicate that professional staff members are to be nonpartisan. We do not want partisan staffing. We represent a need for staff members who are responsible to the minority regardless of who constitutes that minority. We endorse the principle of a truly professional staff.

Perhaps the technique we have selected to secure adequate staff assistance is not the most feasible or proper. At the present time, it is the only alternative afforded. It is my hope, and the hope of my colleagues who have been pursuing this vital proposition, that we will be assisted by all Members of this body and those who govern our operations under the rules of the House. Improvement of legislative procedures is a subject worthy of our best talents and our time. We earnestly ask your assistance in this proposition.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this very short statement, that the committee in considering these resolutions has placed a limitation of 1 year on each. This will permit the chairmen of committees to return to the Committee on House Administration for further adjustment of their requests if, as, and when such need arises and they will receive full, complete, and careful consideration from the entire committee. Making these resolutions on a 1-year basis, however, does give the Committee on House Administration a better and continuing opportunity to exercise its proper responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen from Maryland for yielding to me.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I address myself to the matters referred to by my able colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] with respect to the views of the minority and particularly the amendment offered in the committee dealing with this matter of a division of staff or a division of funds to pay for the employment of people assigned solely to the minority.

I am not certain that this is the time to argue the merits of this proposition; on the other hand, as I understand the parliamentary situation, this being a privileged resolution and the opportunity, shall I say, not given to offer amendments, the "day in court" would come on either a motion to recommit or a vote on the previous question. Should either motion be carried the matter would then be open to whatever action the House desired by way of amendments. In this event debate would occur on the merits of the issue.

Should circumstances develop causing debate on the direct issue of the charges proposed by the minority, I feel it in order to refer to what I consider to be the principal factors involved. Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote a portion of a letter from the distinguished and able chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who has been many years a Member of this House and is respected by all. I know of no better opinion on this subject. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] wrote to the distinguished Speaker on February 11, 1963, as follows:

> What is needed are professional staffs which are nonpartisan in nature and which provide assistance to all of the members of their respective committees regardless of political affiliation. For this we need no resolutions, and no new legislation. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 contemplates the appointment of professional staffs on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office.

Mr. Speaker, we should listen to these words and be reminded of the provisions of the Reorganization Act in order that we may have a refreshed memory of the responsibility which rests upon us all.

We have heard remarks about amending the rule. I do not attempt to argue with my able and respected colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], who offered an amendment in the House Administration Committee to carry out the idea of dividing funds for the majority and the minority. The gentleman performed well and responsibly. I disagreed with the method, leaving less emphasis on the merits of this proposition. The better procedure would be to introduce a resolution, have it referred to the Rules Committee and if cleared for floor action, that it be brought here for debate on the direct issues and not presented as an amendment to an appropriation resolution.

In this same letter the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] had this to say:

> It seems to me that the proposal to divide staffs along political lines is not only unnecessary and unrealistic, but I think would result in creating built-in obstruction to the legislative processes by establishing duplicate staffs that can produce only incentives for needless disagreement. Each staff—Republican or Democrat—will feel the need to justify itself by differing with its counterpart. Each staff member will consider himself an adversary of his opposite number. If we want the work of the Congress to bog down in a continuing series of skirmishes, this is the way to do it.

Mr. Speaker, this seems to be excellent advice. The chairman indicates all these things are either inequitable, unjustifiable, or costly. The distinguished chairman of the Judiciary in analyzing this question, expresses the opinion that three alternatives are available should the system of allotting 60 percent of funds appropriated to committees go to the majority and 40 percent to the minority.

> The first of these is to discharge incumbent staff members to make room for those who are to be responsible to the minority—

He says.

To further quote:

> This, I submit, would be to deprive ourselves of the services of people who, over the years, have become acknowledged experts in their particular areas. Beyond that, on a personal basis, I think that we would also consider it grossly unfair to treat, in this fashion, people who have served ably and devotedly.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it obvious that this system, if adopted, would be extremely awkward and unworkable.

In his letter the chairman describes his practices of both the majority and minority of the committee he heads.

May I say here, Mr. Speaker, the assumption is, with such a directive on the part of the House of Representatives, it would certainly evidence the intent of the mandatory nature of the arrangement. Exceptions might or could be made, but once that principle is established, it would doubtless in most instances be the practice of each committee to inaugurate this system of division.

The result of this will be that within a given area, either the majority staff or the minority staff will have exclusive responsibility. Thus, in the place of a nonpartisan, professional staff serving all members impartially, we would create two partisan staffs, one with responsibility in specified areas but only to the majority, and the other with responsibility in the remaining areas, but responsible only to the minority. This is plainly unworkable.

Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances it seems obvious that the proposal such as may be presented in some form or other is unworkable, is impracticable, and will add people to the payroll of the committees. It will take away a responsibility of the committee chairmen. I should say, it would take away authority for which he has a responsibility. I know of nothing worse than to have a responsibility and not have commensurate authority. That is exactly what would happen under any similar proposal however it may be worded.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I think it should be made perfectly clear that what a vast number, if not all, of the Republicans have in mind is not a violation of the intent or spirit of the Reorganization Act of 1946, but, rather, that a fair portion of the professional staff be assigned to the minority, so that the minority can be certain and positive they have members of the committee staff in whom they can place trust and give direction to in the preparation of studies or legislative recommendations.

May I compliment the gentleman from Maryland and the gentleman from Texas on the way the hearings have been held this year by the Accounts Subcommittee. The record shows that because the hearings were in greater depth there has been substantial progress made in the number of positions available to the minority. That has been worked out in agreements between the chairman and ranking minority member of most of the committees. This has produced some salutary results which will be beneficial to the House as a whole.

Second, I think it is a great step forward for the committee to have decided that all committees of the House should have only 1-year appropriations. This means that a year from now your committee can take an honest look to see whether progress has been made, whether agreements have been abided by; and if they have not then the House in its wisdom can take what action is necessary to remedy any violation of agreements or action which was not in accordance with the committee's recommendations.

Frankly, there were people on our side of the aisle who felt that specific action ought to be taken today to try and have a 40 to 60 split in committee staffs. On the other hand, there was a feeling among some, that under the circumstances, since progress had been made, that it was not the proper floor tactic to do it today.

Because of the progress that has been made in a number of instances where the minority are better off staffingwise, and also because of the fact that we are dealing with only 1-year availability of committee funds I am willing to see how it works for the next 12 months. It seems to me that in the long run or over the long haul the better procedure is to go to the Committee on Rules. This I believe the gentleman from Iowa and his committee intend to do with the full support of the Republican leadership.

Then may I conclude by saying that I want to compliment the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] and others, as well as those on the gentleman's committee, for bringing this matter, which I think is very important, to a head, and for the progress which has been made.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to compliment the committee upon the manner in which these resolutions have been brought to the floor. I want to compliment the distinguished chairman of the committee for reading into the RECORD extracts of a letter—and I hope he will put the entire letter into the RECORD—written by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary who has drawn on his experience over a long and brilliant career in preparing a scholarly essay on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, the language of the Legislative Reorganization Act was considered by one of the most outstanding joint committees that ever served in the Congress. That joint committee held hearings for a period of over 5 months. They listened to over a hundred witnesses. More than 60 Members of Congress testified. If there was anything that joint committee intended to do that is clear from the debates on that bill it is that the staffs of the committees of the Congress of the United States should not be partisan or under partisan control, but should be nonpartisan. Any arbitrary requirement, without reference to the considered judgment of each committee separately, making it necessary that a certain percentage of staff members be put under the jurisdiction of either party, would change the concept of the role of committees as contemplated by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and would be a step backward, not forward. It would be progress in reverse.

Mr. Speaker, I think those who advance this subject—and I am glad they are not pressing it today—find themselves supporting either one of two proposals. First, that we are going to return to the patronage system under which Republicans or Democrats as parties select employees; and it was that very thing that brought about staffing provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. If that is not the purpose, then the only other purpose, as outlined in the opening statement of the gentleman from Ohio, would be to enable them to do research in various areas and to prepare documents for the minority.

Just who is the minority, in committee after committee, on bill after bill? Is it the Republican or the Democratic Members? Is it the conservative or the liberal Members? Is it the isolationists or the internationalists? Is it the reciprocal-traders or the protectionists? Just who is the ideological minority and majority on many of these bills? Do those who hold a point of view have the right through staff assignments to them to pursue a certain point of view?

I think, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that a partisan application of this rule would be wrong; that an application of this rule on the basis of ideological differences would be unworkable and impracticable. This thing must fall on both grounds. I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be a step backward to say that we were going to change the concept of the Reorganization Act and make the staffing of committees of Congress a partisan matter or a matter which tends to splinter us when most of the legislation we consider is of a national rather than of a partisan or an ideological character.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. At one time the gentleman from Maryland was the chairman of the Subcommittee on House Administration on which I served. I do not know how many Republicans there were on the committee at that time, but I remember I was at the foot of the class.

Apropos of the statement just made by the majority leader, I should like to make an observation or two on my responsibility as minority leader.

First of all, as has already been pointed out, as I understand the views of the people on my side of the aisle, and I think they are rather unanimously held, it is not that there should be some sort of completely partisan arrangement in respect to committee staffs, it is rather that there should be an arrangement by which the minority can have people on the various staffs to whom they can go with complete confidence insofar as there arise occasions when such service would seem to be indicated.

I think it also should be pointed out that the suggestions which have been made for a division have been qualified by language to the effect that only if a majority of the minority voted for such an arrangement would it be invoked.

To go back to the Reorganization Act of 1946, and I voted for it, it became my duty as the majority leader of the 80th Congress to implement that act. We cut the committees from some 40 down to 19. There were provisions in that act heralded as great accomplishments. I think I might say with some degree of humor that there were some people who said at the time that the principal support for the Reorganization Act of 1946 was that it was going to raise our pay, and, as a matter of fact, this did happen, although I doubt that it was a factor in our deliberations.

One provision in that act stated that by February 15 the Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the House and the Finance Committee and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate should make a determination about the money that we would be able to collect for the Federal Government and then determine as to how we should spend it. In the 80th Congress we tried to comply with that and did comply with it, but nobody has heard about it since.

As far as the arrangement about staffs is concerned, I want to say this, Mr. Speaker. It is fair to say that many of the committees have followed the concept of the Reorganization Act and there have been no real, fundamental differences insofar as staff matters are concerned between the majority and minority. I think that fact has been brought out in the hearings recently held before the Committee on House Administration. But I should like to point out to my colleagues here in the House that there have been committees here that have violated the concept to the rankest degree, and when that is done it is only natural that the minority would seek to protect their rights in some of these very important areas where partisanship has been injected, not on the minority side but on the majority side, with respect to the appointment of these staff members. The subcommittee appointed by our conference has been working diligently and effectively on this matter and I commend them.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. May I state to the gentleman with respect to two of the main points he has made, committees controlled by his party launched the Reorganization Act in the 80th Congress when the gentleman was majority leader. I think on the whole the gentleman's side of the aisle did a splendid job. So far as I can recall not one word was said on this side of the aisle with respect to the manner in which committee staffs were selected. We made no demands for minority staff members, and we have made no such demands since so far as I know.

May I state further to the gentleman that some of the outstanding staff members of this House were hired during the 80th Congress. They have been kept on for Congress after Congress and are still in the service of the House at this time.

On the last point, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for just one further observation, there may have been committee staff members who have been partisan and arrogant and who have not lived up to the spirit of the Reorganization Act, but should we for that reason repeal the Reorganization Act? I would admonish the House that we should not upset the applecart every time we find a rotten apple in the barrel.

Mr. HALLECK. That is the difficulty around here, we cannot take the bad apples out and leave the good ones in. We have to take them all or none.

In response to the gentleman, this first resolution has to do with the Committee on Armed Services. One of the members of that staff was appointed by Ham Andrews, of New York. Another was appointed by Dewey Short, of Missouri.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will yield, to keep the record straight, the two members that have been with the staff for 17 years, both belonging to the minority party at this time, were appointed by Mr. Andrews.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me say further with respect to the Committee on Armed Services, from what I can find out here from the 17 members on the minority side, as far as the staff is concerned, they are going along very well.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad to make that statement. But again might I say that there have been committees where on the majority side in the last few years, the purpose and intent of the Reorganization Act with respect to committee staffs have been honored in its breach. I think those situations have been flagrant. I think such situations are completely wrong. All I can say is that as far as I am concerned, unless these arrangements which have heretofore existed can be straightened out, we are going to have to fight to do something about it. We want the spirit of the Reorganization Act to be honored and we intend to see that it is honored. Now that is not to say that you are going to be asked to change the armed services situation. There are many other committees that I can name. I do not want to be asked to specify which ones I have in mind when I say that there has been flagrant disregard of the purpose of the Reorganization Act. But what I am saying is that in those instances the minority have been run over roughshod. Yes, and as pointed out by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] on yesterday, too many times we have had staff reports that are highly critical of many situations in the country and our people on the committees have never had a chance to see them. I think that is a bad practice that has developed. There are a great many things here that need

to be investigated and as far as I am concerned, I hope at the proper time this will be done.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader has suggested that the letter of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee be made a part of the Record. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter, from which I quoted, inserted in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, may I refer again to the majority leader's statement with reference to the fact that there is, of course, no claim made by anyone that the conduct of committee chairmen is perfect in carrying out the provisions of the Reorganization Act or that complete consideration in matters of staffing committees is accorded the minority. Perhaps, in his enthusiasm to do a job, let us say, a chairman may not give complete consideration to every aspect of this matter which the minority may think it is entitled to. On this matter of majority and minority I would again refer to the majority leader's statement, "What is a minority?" I know that on the other committee on which I serve, no one at times could be any more in the minority than I have been. But I did not need 40 percent of the staff to help me get out of something or get further into something or to do whatever it was that I was trying to do. So it seems to me, it just does not make much sense to think of it in these terms.

We have a sound, workable and fair rule as it is under the Reorganization Act. Certainly, the responsibility is on the majority to see that it works. I want to admit that freely. I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] who spoke earlier and I want to express appreciation for his comments very much. They were eminently fair and I agree with practically everything he said. But it is a principle involved and an existing provision of law which only needs compliance. What we have is workable. I repeat it is the responsibility of the majority to see that the rule and the principle is fairly applied. The machinery is there and if the proper buttons are pushed and the proper levers are pulled, it is going to work. I do not think we will have too many complaints if we assume the responsibility that is ours.

The letter of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee follows:

House of Representatives, United States, Committee on the Judiciary.
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1963.
Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Speaker: During the past few weeks we have all heard a great deal about proposals to place committee staffs on a partisan basis with 60 percent of a staff responsible to the majority and 40 percent to the minority. As you now, I have been a Member of Congress for the past 40 years and I have served as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for over 11 of those years. In view of this experience, I thought it might be appropriate for me to comment upon these proposals.

First of all, it seems to me that proposals such as these proceed upon the fallacious assumption that the business of Congress is conducted as a running war between the Republicans and the Democrats. This view is totally unrealistic. The fact is that the great preponderance of legislative activity proceeds upon unanimous consent. What is more, where there is disagreement, it is not a disagreement which follows party lines. This becomes apparent merely from the scope of legislation dealt with by the Congress. Consider, for example, the Committee on the Judiciary. It handles legislation dealing with bankruptcy, patents, copyrights and trademarks, State and territorial boundary lines, Federal penal institutions, judicial proceedings, holidays and celebrations, and codification of the laws. It is hard to conceive of how one can draw partisan political lines in matters like these. Indeed, it has been my experience that it is not done.

There are, of course, some areas which have political overtones. In the Committee on the Judiciary these are normally civil rights and antitrust. But even here, divisions of opinion do not follow party lines. Who can accuse either the Democratic Party or the Republican Party of a solid front on issues like civil rights? It has been my experience that differences among Members are far more likely to follow individual philosophies or sectional attitudes rather than the strict categorizations of Republican or Democrat. While it is no doubt desirable for there to be staff assistants for every Member who holds a view different from that held by the majority on a particular issue, the division of staffs into Republicans and Democrats is obviously not the answer.

What is needed are professional staffs which are nonpartisan in nature and which provide assistance to all of the members of their respective committees regardless of political affiliation. For this, we need no new resolutions and no new legislation. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 contemplates the appointment of professional staffs on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office.

It has been the policy of the Committee on the Judiciary to adhere to this principle in its staff appointments. There are at least five members of the professional staff of this committee who have served continuously under both Republican- and Democratic-controlled Congresses. I believe that both Democratic and Republican members of the committee will attest to the fact that every member of this staff will provide assistance to all Members on a professional, nonpartisan basis. While I cannot speak for other committees, I am sure that the policy and experience of this committee are hardly unique.

It seems to me that the proposals to divide staffs along political lines are not only unnecessary and unrealistic, but that they would result in creating built-in obstructions to the legislative process. By establishing duplicate staffs they can produce only incentives for needless disagreement. Each staff—Republican or Democrat—will feel the need to justify itself by differing with its counterpart. Each staff member will consider himself an adversary of his opposite number. If we want the work of the Congress to bog down in a continuing series of skirmishes, this is the way to do it.

There are three alternatives available in going over to a 60 to 40 or similar system. All are either inequitable or unjustifiably costly. The first of these is to discharge incumbent staff members to make room for those who are to be responsible to the minority. This, I submit, would be to deprive ourselves of the services of people who, over the years, have become acknowledged experts in their particular areas. Beyond that, on a personal basis, I think that we would also consider it grossly unfair to treat, in this fashion, people who have served ably and devotedly.

The second possibility is that we make 40 percent of the incumbent staff members responsible to the minority. Today, on the Committee on the Judiciary, and on other committees as well, it takes the entire staff to handle the legislative responsibilities of the committee. Assigning 40 percent to the minority and 60 percent to the majority can only result in greatly increasing the size of the staffs. One of two things will happen. The first possibility is that both the majority and the minority staffs will range over all subjects, duplicating each other's work. In that event, neither the majority staff nor the minority staff will be able to handle effectively the work which now requires 100 percent of the existing staff.

The second possibility is that subjects within the committee's jurisdiction will be distributed on a 60–40 basis between the majority and minority staffs. The result of this will be that within a given area, either the majority staff or the minority staff, will have exclusive responsibility. Thus, in the place of a nonpartisan, professional staff serving all Members impartially, we would create two partisan staffs, one with responsibility in specified areas but only to the majority, and the other with responsibility in the remaining areas, but only to the minority. This is plainly unworkable.

Under the circumstances, it is obvious that should a proposal for proportionate political staffing be adopted, the committees and the House will be under irresistible pressure to increase the staffs sufficiently to maintain the current volume and quality of work. This would require an additional 40 percent to replace those assigned to the minority. However, if the minority is to maintain a ratio of 40 percent of the staff, the staff will have to be increased by 67 percent rather than 40 percent.

The final alternative for achieving 60 to 40 proportionate political staffing would be simply to increase the size of existing staffs. However, as I have just indicated, this would entail not an increase of 40 percent, but an increase of 67 percent in the size of committee staffs. Furthermore, the cost of such an increase is not limited to the salaries of professional personnel. We must also add in the cost of additional secretaries, typewriters and similar equipment, telephones, etc., and beyond this, there is the ever-present problem of office space—where are we going to put the men?

The Congress constantly scrutinizes and frequently criticizes the personnel expenditures of executive agencies. Where these are excessive, the criticism is well justified. It seems to me that if we adopt a proposal for proportionate political staffing, we, too, would be guilty of an unjustifiable use of the taxpayers' money. By continuing to insist upon adherence to the principles of the Legislative Reorganization Act we can best assure staffing which will provide competent, nonpartisan services to all Members. Staff members should continue to be technicians; we should not turn them into politicians.

I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that in deliberating this matter you will bear these considerations in mind.

Sincerely yours,
Emanuel Celler,
Chairman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this resolution as a member of the Armed Services Committee, as a Republican, as a member of the minority, and as a partisan, of all I am also proud. I have no quarrel with how inequitable staffing is corrected in the interest of the American people be they majority or minority of voters. I even still believe in majority rule while respecting the rights and duties of the minority. I deeply respect the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] but question the lengthy document he has read here as proving that any one person is the epitome of judiciousness or the final oracle or authority on matters of justice, or the judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, I would recall to the minds of our colleagues who were here in the 87th Congress the colloquy of April 19, 1961, wherein we were discussing the new Federal judgeships and their selection. Many of us recall a remark from the chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary to the effect that the then majority party—Democrats—had gambled for 6 years on these appointments and vacancies and having now won the Presidency and appointments plus confirmation expectancy in the Senate—with a majority of Democrats 2 to 1—the Democrats certainly could be expected to capitalize thereon.

Mr. Speaker, such statements cannot be interpreted as rubies of justice or pearls of wisdom from any man—much less an oracle of justice or sine quo non of dependability and reference.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Accounts, I have listened attentively as we have heard these requests for these funds for the respective committees and we have heard these arguments with regard to committee staffing and their assignments. I yield to no man in this House so far as nonpartisanship is concerned, but for the life of me I cannot see how, in time to come, a provision such as this could be put into effect without it eventually involving partisanship. I think that would be most disastrous to the operation of all these committees. Admittedly, there have been some few abuses, but abuses that we have no control over. If we go out here on the streets of Washington and consider the fact that this afternoon some individual commits a crime, we are not going to require that the police lock up everyone on the streets because some one individual did something wrong. Similarly, we cannot attempt to penalize the operation of this Congress and all its committees by saying that somebody has done something wrong. Partisanship is sure to result by adopting a proposal such as this. I am glad to see that the minority is not going to push this further. Then, too, I raise the question which has been raised before today and that is "Who is the minority?"

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me a little time?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to this colloquy here this afternoon and I think there is fairness generally in what has been said. I noted that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] and the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], directed their remarks primarily toward the professional staff aspect of this discussion, and in that regard I believe I could not take too much issue with what they have said.

I think, however, the most basic objection on this side of the aisle is not so much the professional staff as it is the special investigatory staffs that are authorized from time to time. I would only hope with all the admonitions and propriety that have been expressed this afternoon, that when the various committees come before the Committee on House Administration that the committee will admonish the chairman to proceed with the same nonpartisan approach to staff selection to the special committees that they have expressed here this afternoon in regard to the professional staff of the legislative committees.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Iowa 1 minute. How much time would the gentleman like?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like at least 10 minutes. One minute is entirely inadequate.

Mr. FRIEDEL. We have 17 minutes remaining. I need about 10 minutes on the Democratic side. But in the spirit of fairness I yield the gentleman 3 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say first of all that my interest in this question and this problem extends over several years and is based upon serious study and experience. I agree with what has been said on the minority side and that is that we do not want to do anything but to implement the spirit of the Reorganization Act that was passed in 1946. If it had been observed we would not be here on the proposition to change the act.

Now, just a word or two about the proposition that has been introduced, and let me say that this is the result of serious study and consultation with serious and I think good students of government. They are in agreement that this is the right approach and this approach will assure that the minority and majority will live up to the spirit of the Reorganization Act of 1946.

The Reorganization Act provides, I would point out, that 40 percent, or rather up to 40 percent of the staff be allotted to the minority when a majority of a minority acts on that question and only then—and states that in the case you indicate where many committees have never acted—but in the committee where the spirit of the act has been violated it would give the minority a chance to make a constructive contribution. I want to point out that. Much more could and needs to be said about this.

First of all, after serious consideration the Republicans in the conference assembled this year made this a policy question, and they appointed a subcommittee of which I have the privilege of being chairman. The subcommittee has been working diligently on the problem. We have made some progress and I think we have made some contributions by way of suggestions and in the way of propositions that can be looked into, and suggested ways and means not only to make the voice of the minority more effective but the Congress more effective; and I want to point out and make it very clear, something that everybody ought to appreciate, that the very essence of representative government demands the right of effective opposition and that it should not only be preserved, but it should also be actively fostered by both sides. I think with the situation as it now prevails that is not true. The most significant assurance of the basic health and growth and the adequacy of a representative system of government is the existence of a vital dynamic opposition party.

Perhaps this is not the time to make the issue on the floor here today, but I want to assure the majority that the committee will be prepared to appear before the Rules Committee in behalf of the proposition that we believe will make a constructive contribution to the legislative processes of this great body.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that since we of the minority have made the question of adequate staffing a policy and a part of this program for a more effective Congress, the majority has recognized the problem also by granting the minority, according to statements by both the majority and minority, at least 22 additional staff members.

This will help attain some of the goals that the minority has in mind.

The Subcommittee on Staffing is grateful for these gains. It whets our appetite, because it confirms our position, and it also serves to give us encouragement to carry on this very necessary activity.

Mr. Speaker, in order to further clarify the problem of adequate staffing I include the following:

REMARKS ON STAFFING MADE IN IOWA AND ELSEWHERE DURING WEEK OF LINCOLN RECESS

(By FRED SCHWENGEL)

Before legislation is voted on by Congress, it is shaped into final form by a congressional committee. Each of these committees is in itself a repository of statistics and information about past legislation and activities it has handled.

You are not getting your money's worth out of these committees today. Due to the application of the spoils system by the Democratic majority in Congress, your voice, the voice of fiscal responsibility, of free flow of information, is not being heard.

During the last congressional election, the Republican Party got 48 percent of all the votes cast for Congressmen. Due to Democratic gerrymandering, we elected only 40 percent of the Congressmen. It required 137,000 votes to elect a Republican to Congress, while the Democrats averaged only 100,000 votes per congressional seat.

Naturally, we could not expect to have the same number of staff employees as the Democrats, for they are statistically the majority party. However, your interests are not served by the fact that there are 461 Democratic staff members and only 43 Republican staff members on House committees.

A more equitable staffing of these committees in no way would swell the public payrolls. A greater percentage of staff employees responsible to Republican Members would be advantageous in detecting and cutting waste out of the administration's spending proposals that come up to Congress. It would assist us in presenting sound Republican legislation to Congress. Men who are knowledgeable in their fields would be retained to ferret out the cleverly concealed payroll padding and uneconomic projects which abound in any New Frontier legislation. At present, we don't have the manpower to do the job you deserve.

For instance, the Judiciary Committee, which handles civil rights legislation, has 45 Democratic staff members. We Republicans have just one. This one man must serve 177 Republican Congressmen. Nearly all of them, sometime during the year, will need information on some phase of civil rights. The minority staff of the Judiciary Committee is the logical place to go for this information. You can understand that no matter how diligent this one employee may be, he cannot do the thorough job that should be done on each request. It is you, the taxpayer, who is being deprived of the service your Congress should be giving you.

There are many controversial facets in the proposal to give Federal aid to education. A mistake in the legislation could do irreparable damage to our Nation's educational system. The Democrats have 45 staff members on the House Committee on Education and Labor, all working vigorously to justify Federal intervention in the affairs of your local school district. We have two staff members, one of them a secretary, to assemble the information which accurately pictures the needs of our schools.

There are eight joint Senate and House committees. The Democrats have 70 people on the staffs of these committees. We Republicans have two.

This inequity is being attacked by a special committee of Congressmen headed by Representative FRED SCHWENGEL of Iowa. These men believe that a healthy two-party system is good for America. They believe that Republicans should have the same percentage of committee staffing as they have members. Mr. SCHWENGEL has introduced H.R. 570, which would correct the imbalance between majority and minority congressional staffs.

You can help us with this fight. You and your friends can write your local papers, calling attention to the fact that the waste in the President's staggering $98.9 billion budget may well get by Congress because 10 out of every 11 committee staff people are trying to add to Federal expenditures.

The House of Representatives is your direct liaison with the Federal Government. It is responsive to your wishes. By making yourselves heard, you can help right a wrong that is not only politically immoral, but actually dangerous to the future of our Nation.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to prolong this further.

I think the Committee on the Armed Services has justified the appropriation for 1 year of $75,000.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 100, with a committee amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 36 of the Eighty-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $200,000 including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, after line 13, insert:

"SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY UNDER PUBLIC LAW 86–272

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 35, with a committee amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the studies authorized by Public Law 272 of the Eighty-sixth Congress, as amended, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $113,000 including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, after line 13, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, as I understand both the preceding resolution, House Resolution 100 and House Resolution 35 were approved in the amounts requested?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes, for 1 year.

Mr. SCHENCK. For 1 year.

Do I understand that House Resolution 35, which is currently under consideration, is for a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, which will complete or is expected to complete its work this year?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is my understanding.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the subcommittee studying the impact of State taxes on goods and services moving in interstate commerce has one of the most important tasks of any subcommittee in the House of Representatives. What it does or fails to do might well affect the economy of this country for the foreseeable future.

The subcommittee is chairmaned by that able colleague of ours, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS]. He has been most careful in the use of funds by this subcommittee, in a most important work.

I hope the resolution will be adopted.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 226) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 17, Eighty-eighth Congress, by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $491,900 including expenditures for employment of experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the

House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 5, strike out "$491,900" and insert "$245,950".

Line 11, insert the following new paragraph:

"Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 239) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by H. Res. 38, Eighty-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 5, strike out "$50,000" and insert "$25,000".

Line 14, insert the following new paragraph:

"Sec. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 204) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 153, Eighty-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $150,000, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 5, strike out "$150,000" and insert "$100,000".

Line 13, insert the following new paragraph:

"Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS, COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 202) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 142 by the Committee on the District of Columbia, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 5, strike out "$50,000" and insert "$25,000".

Page 2, line 11, insert the following new paragraph:

"Sec. 4. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, while we are talking about committee staffing, may I say this is one of the committees about whose staff there are questions. No effort will be made at this time to do anything further on this, but I thought it would be appropriate to make it clear that some of us feel that a great deal needs to be done in this particular committee and its staffing in order to abide by the spirit and intention of the Reorganization Act of 1946.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to.

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 243 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations, authorized by H. Res. 55, Eighty-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $225,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 5, strike out "$225,000" and insert "$112,500".

Line 6, strike out "such".

Line 12, insert the following new paragraph:

"Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 80 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $750,000 including expenditures for employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic and other assistants, which shall be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees within and without the continental limits of the United States, the authority and jurisdiction of said committee and subcommittees in such areas being hereby confirmed, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 5, strike out "$750,000" and insert "$600,000".

Lines 9, 10, and 11, strike out "the authority and jurisdiction of said committee and subcommittees in such areas being hereby confirmed,".

Page 2, line 1, after "committee" insert "signed by the chairman thereof".

Page 2, line 6, insert the following new paragraph:

"Sec. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is one where our committee reduced the request by $150,000. I believe the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson], is here. I should just like to say that his committee did present a very fine statement to our Committee on House Administration. They also indicated by their statements that they had in various investigations saved a considerable sum of money for the taxpayers of this Nation.

In that connection, and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois can correct me if this is not true, the chairman assured the Committee on House Administration that his Committee on Government Operations makes available to all other committees of the House, including legislative and appropriation committees, information which his committee has developed in its various investigations, in an effort to implement the economies that the gentleman's committee claims it has been able to develop. Is that true?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is true. That has been testified.

Mr. SCHENCK. The Committee on Government Operations is one of the committees, also, Mr. Speaker, where there can easily be a certain amount of overlapping of jurisdiction and investigation in some of the very same questions being properly considered in other committees, so the amendment placed in this resolution, and included in all the other similar resolutions today is the same language which was included in the authorization resolutions adopted heretofore as proposed by the Committee on Rules, requiring that the chairman clear with the Committee on House Administration as to any possible conflict of jurisdiction and/or duplication of efforts. Is that not true?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That applies to all these resolutions today.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I thought it would be well that this be emphasized at this point. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. I want to thank the gentleman and to take this time to point out, as I did before, that this is another committee concerning which considerable evidence developed as to whether the spirit of the 1946 act is being carried out, as so ably expressed I might say by the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert]. I think probably with this kind of notification and later discussion with the chairman of a committee and others on this committee, perhaps these alleged abuses, and they may not be abuses, but at least the allegations and difficulties experienced in the past will be worked out. This is particularly important because under the rules of the House this is the main investigating committee of the House and has a great deal of responsibility. Here is where partisanship is apt to creep more readily, I say that not in the way of criticism but as comment. The function of the committee is such that it has a more difficult job trying to abide by the spirit of the 1946 act.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to my colleague that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson] and the ranking minority member [Mr. Riehlman] appeared to be in perfect agreement as to the use of minority staff employees on subcommittees. Although Chairman Dawson would not pin himself down to percentages, they seemed to be in agreement as to the matter of representation of the minority.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. I appreciate that and that is one reason that nothing further is being pushed here at this time. However, I do point out, I think anyone reading the Record and looking into this matter in the past, will find abuses. Incidentally, one reason we established an ad hoc committee here was to take off the shoulders of the individuals who might be on these particular committees the onus of seemingly having to criticize their own committee. These converts here, perhaps, will bring about a healthier relationship. I do call attention to the fact that there have been abuses here in the past and I am very hopeful that this will be cleared up and carried through as I think it will.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Burleson], and also the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert], the distinguished majority leader, when they indicate to the House that the majority party does assume and will assume the responsibility for the proper administration of these various staffing questions.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I would like to say further that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson], the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, appeared before our committee and made a very good case. He stated before the committee that $1,300 million has been saved for the Government as a result of his committee investigations.

I think that is very good business. Of course, if the distinguished chairman of the committee wants to come back, and if the committee feels that they need more funds, and if they can justify the request before our committee, of course, our committee will be very glad to listen to the request.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 165) providing funds for the Committee on House Administration, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1963, in carrying out its duties during the Eighty-eighth Congress, the Committee on House

Administration is authorized to incur such expenses (not in excess of $10,000) as it deems advisable. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and approved by such committee, and signed by the chairman thereof.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to express my deep appreciation to the chairman of our full committee and to the chairman of the subcommittee and to all the members of both the subcommittee and the full committee, and especially my colleagues on the minority side for the fine cooperation and work that our committee has done. I believe the committee has been completely conscientious and very hardworking and that it has tried to do a good job. I personally think they have succeeded. I feel the leadership of our committee and the members of our committee staff are to be commended and I am happy to congratulate and express my appreciation to each and all of them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 135 with committee amendments and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of investigations and studies to be made pursuant to H. Res. 79 by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $60,000, including expenditures for the employment of stenographic and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Line 4, strike out "$60,000" and insert "$30,000".

Line 10, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 30, with committee amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 29 by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Line 5, strike out "$75,000" and insert "$37,500".

Page 2, line 11, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 4. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 152, with committee amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the investigations and studies pursuant to H. Res. 151, by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $125,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia if not otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Line 5, strike out "$125,000" and insert "$62,500".

Line 14, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the Chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE STUDIES, INVESTIGATIONS, AND INQUIRIES AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 56

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 236, with committee amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 56 by the Committee on Public Works, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $975,000 including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, as the chairman deems necessary, shall be paid out of the contigent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, is authorized and empowered to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any other departments or agencies of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments:

Line 4, strike out "$975,000" and insert "$450,000".

Page 2, line 8, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by the Committee on Post Office and Civil penditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Public Works shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the subcommittee that investigated highways and that is what this matter concerns.

I want to observe that I have some very serious complaints about the way the subcommittee has been functioning. There have been violations of both the spirit of the act and the act itself, in my opinion.

One of reasons that makes necessary the type of legislation the committee is studying comes from this.

I want to say to the House we will be pressing for an improvement of this situation so that the minority may have an opportunity to fully and properly function and to make contributions and be recognized. It has been inadequate, in some ways unfair. There has been a certain kind of arrogance here also that makes necessary some attention by the House to this subcommittee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This is the first of two resolutions dealing with the Public Works Commission. Each of the two resolutions is on a 1-year basis, providing a total of more than a half-million dollars for the purpose of investigations, is that correct?

Mr. FRIEDEL. For 1 year it will be $475,000.

Mr. GROSS. I said over a half-million dollars.

Will the gentleman tell me why these two were not brought in together in one resolution? Why do we have two resolutions from the same committee providing an expenditure for investigative purposes?

Mr. FRIEDEL. One is for real property acquisition. That is a subcommittee. The other was for the full committee and highway investigation.

Mr. GROSS. One is for real property acquisition?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman means through this process the committee is acquiring land?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes; acquiring land through legislation, including rights-of-way.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is dealing with the title of a subcommittee, is he not?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This is a special subcommittee of the Public Works Committee that deals with real property acquisition.

Mr. GROSS. That is different. This does not deal directly with the acquisition of land?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No.

Mr. GROSS. This is for the purpose of financing a subcommittee which is investigating the acquisition of land?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Why could not these have been brought in together?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Because one is a select subcommittee.

Mr. GROSS. I do not understand why the appropriation of this money is not brought in or called for under one resolution.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I should like to make an explanation. This select committee came at the request of many Members of this House and from the Budget Bureau, as well as the Executive Office of the President.

It will be remembered that I explained the purpose of it 2 years ago.

This committee was authorized unanimously by the Committee on Public Works to come after these other committees had been constituted. I am delighted to say to the gentleman from Iowa and to the membership of the House that this is purely a bipartisan committee. We have selected able people. We have borrowed capable people from the Bureau of Public Works and the Corps of Engineers. It is a real factual study. It is a laborious study, and we hope to finish it this year.

Mr. GROSS. I do not care to prolong this discussion, but I still do not have an answer to the question of why this money is not being provided through the process of one resolution. Why do we have two resolutions to finance two investigations by the same parent committee?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. This was a select committee. I can say to my distinguished friend and colleague that this select committee is delighted to stand on its own feet.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I do not question that, I will say to my friend from Tennessee, I do not question the committee or its jurisdiction. The question I would like to have answered is, Why do we have two resolutions calling for money for two investigating committees? Why do we not have one resolution covering both of them?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. This covers only the Committee on Real Estate Acquisition. But if you put both of them together, all you have to do is add the two figures.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if that is the reason, since this would total more than half a million dollars—if it would look smaller in two resolutions.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. This committee was constituted after the other committees and I am delighted to repeat that this committee is proud to stand on its record of accomplishment of real work and pure bipartisanship. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON], the ranking minority member, and I can tell you that there have been no politics there whatsoever. We have worked that happily together.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Of course, the Public Works Committee has a Highway Investigating Subcommittee, and then there is this Rights-of-Way Acquisition Subcommittee and there is the full committee. I think for the purpose of the record it should be stated that this happens to be a situation that relates back to the remarks of the distinguished minority leader, and is somewhat of a unique situation, although I understand it applies also to certain other committees. That is a situation where the caucus of the minority members of the committee itself asked for additional staffing. I might say that I do not think it was on a partisan basis that the request was made, but was rather an attempt to carry out the spirit and intent of the Reorganization Act which I do not think can ever be construed to mean that the minority shall not have adequate tools with which to work to do the job that has to be done under our two-party system in America. So the minority in this instance specifically asked the majority, and it was brought up in the full committee, for an additional staff member for the Investigating Committee on Highways and an additional staff member for the full committee. The majority did agree to one additional staff member to be assigned to the full committee as a member of that full committee staff, but also assignable to the Subcommittee on Highways.

I will say that I think the request of the minority was reasonable, for one additional member on the Investigating Committee for Highways and one for the full committee. I do not think it was on a partisan basis, because I think this House well knows that there have been many instances where there were differences of opinion on policy matters and on basic issues; and it so happens that it was largely that the minority was in disagreement with the majority. We could enumerate many issues, many bills that came before the House on which minority reports were filed. The position of the minority has been that in order to carry out the duty of providing the facts and to do proper research on both sides of these issues it is essential that the minority have available an adequate staff to do research on these questions, to write or to help write minority reports, and so forth. So I think the RECORD should clearly show that the minority did ask for two, the majority did permit one. So some headway is being made. And I am hopeful that an additional staff member will be forthcoming in the near future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up the resolution (H. Res. 237) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by H. Res. 56 of the Eighty-eighth Congress incurred by the Committee on Public Works acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $150,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all meetings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 1, following "That" insert "effective January 3, 1963,".

Line 4, strike out "$150,000" and insert "$125,000".

Line 13, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the Chairman of the Committee on Public Works shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 177 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by H. Res. 143, incurred by the Committee on Science and Astronautics, acting as a whole or as a duly authorized subcommittee, not to exceed $300,000, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of attorneys, experts, and consultants (including personnel of the Library of Congress performing services on reimbursable detail) and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 5, strike out "$300,000" and insert "$150,000".

Line 13, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 222 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1963, the expenses of the study and investigation to be conducted by the select committee created by H. Res. 13, not to exceed $614,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 3, strike out "$614,000" and insert "$275,000".

Line 10, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Small Business of the House is one of the few House committees that has no legislative authority. In view of that fact, that part of the requested appropriation approved by the Committee on House Administration is a very substantial one.

I am pleased to say I have discussed this matter with the chairman of this committee and there is a definite commitment that we will have three minority staff members, together with one additional minority staff member, if it be necessary, under conditions we experienced in the last session of Congress, when proposed reports came to us near the end of the session in great number and in great length.

I notice the chairman of the committee is at the committee table. I hope he will verify the statement I have made.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman and I have discussed this matter. Three members will be assigned to the minority, and the full staff of the committee will be available to all members of the committee at any time. The staff will serve all members of the committee. In the past staff members have been assigned to the members of the minority and they have not used those staff members. So the staff will serve all members of the committee.

Mr. McCULLOCH. The gentleman from Tennessee agrees that the report I have made is correct, that there will be three staff members to be selected by and responsible to the minority, together with what other additional staff people may be necessary if conditions warrant it?

Mr. EVINS. Yes, whatever is justified and needed and is justified before the Committee on House Administration. As I said to the gentleman, three members will be assigned to the minority and the full staff of the committee will always be available to serve the committee at any time. If justification and need for additional staff members for the minority is shown, we will certainly take that matter into consideration. We want the staff to serve all members of the committee.

Actually, we have been trying to reduce the staff somewhat and make it more economical in its operation. But the reason the funds were increased this time is because of the request of the minority. I say again to the gentleman that the services of the full staff will always be available, of course.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield 1 more minute to the gentleman.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, of course, a part of the cost of operation of this committee is by reason of the request, or demands if you please, of the minority. As of this time, Mr. Speaker, those requests or that demand was for three staff members for that committee.

Mr. EVINS. That is correct.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I want the RECORD to reflect that fact. We have not asked, at this time, for more than three members and we make contingent request for additional minority staff now so that the House may know if conditions develop as they developed last year, additional minority staff will be needed, and will be available.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH] who is the ranking minority member both of the Committee on the Judiciary of which I am a member and the Committee on Small Business. I am also a member of the Schwengel Committee on Minority Staffing. In general, and I think the point has to be made again and again, what we are seeking to do is to see to it that there are adequate professional staffs, adequate in the sense that all members, including those on the minority, have adequate professional help whenever it is necessary for us to use the services of professionals to do our jobs as members of the minority.

I would like to compliment the gentleman from Ohio for his cooperation and for the pressure that he has exerted to see to it that the staff is up to snuff. He has done so on the Committee on the Judiciary and on the Committee on Small Business—with results in both cases.

I think the point should be made also that those of us who are members of the committee chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] are putting the House on notice that we do not intend to let up on this subject. We are going to be watchdogs on the subject of staffing and staffing practices. We will continue to insist upon our rights. We intend to report on this subject from time to time and our special committee will be a continuing committee. We will point out weaknesses where they exist and ask for improvements where improvements are desirable.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member of our committee [Mr. MCCULLOCH] has said with respect to the allocation of three staff members to the minority is true and accurate. There has been a definite understanding and agreement as to it and as to this I agree. But I am a little bit taken by surprise when he now says that there was a promise or an agreement or a definite commitment for another appointment. I did say to the gentleman, if it could be justified and needed and if it could be shown that it was necessary, we would try to work the matter out and that the staff of the full committee would always be available to serve the gentleman and all members of the committee. But I have not gone so far as to make a definite commitment for an additional minority staff appointment and I wanted the record to be clear on that point.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to convey the opinion or the theory or the fact that there was a definite commitment for an additional minority staff employee, at this time. But I do mean to imply and I reiterate the implication that there was a definite understanding so far as I remember the understanding, and I am sure my memory is accurate, that if we ran into the same conditions that we ran into last fall when it took us into the third day of January 1963, when staff people were working 10 and 12 and 14 hours a day, that there would be need for and additional minority staff help, would be forthcoming. That was my understanding then and it is my understanding now. If it be not accurate, then I would be in opposition to the resolution now before the House.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 249 with committee amendments and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 4, 1963, expenses of conducting the investigations authorized by section 18 of the rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $360,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, investigators, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and which shall also be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees outside the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. That the official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Line 1, strike out "January 4" and insert "January 3".

Line 6, strike out "such".

Line 7, strike out "such".

Line 8, strike out all after the word "assistants", and strike out all of line 9 and through "States" in line 10.

Page 2, line 7, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, along with several of my colleagues, I appeared before the Rules Committee in support of my resolution, House Resolution 69, to eliminate rule XI, which provides for the Committee on Un-American Activities, and to transfer its legitimate jurisdiction over matters involving the security of our Nation to the Committee on the Judiciary. In going before the Rules Committee, my ardent hope was that it would act favorably by reporting out House Resolution 69 so that its merits or demerits could be debated by the full membership of the House. In my judgment, this is the only place such a resolution should be considered in view of the fact that it is so vitally important to a number of us here and a large number of the people that we represent. However, my resolution, and two similar resolutions presented by my colleagues, were tabled, thereby preventing their consideration by the full House membership.

At the outset, I want to make it explicit that I do not consider the appropriations of the House Un-American Activities Committee the real issue. Every legally constituted committee of the House must have appropriations to function, though I have always felt that in the case of House Un-American Activities Committee, it received a great deal more than it could possibly use without excessive waste. In my mind, the real issue was to get my resolution favorably reported by the Rules Committee so that the full House could act in the manner it deemed necessary. I reiterate that by tabling the resolutions before it, the Rules Committee did not allow the House to take action. Therefore, for the record, I must use the occasion for consideration of House Un-American Activities Committee's appropriations to make my position clear.

I also call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial which appeared in the February 26 Washington Post, the text of which reads as follows:

ORDERLY PROCEDURE

The House Rules Committee is to hold hearings today on a resolution introduced by Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, a Republican, and cosponsored by Democratic Representatives ROOSEVELT and FARBSTEIN, to transfer the functions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to the House Committee on the Judiciary. We hope that the Rules Committee will give the House itself a chance to vote on the issue promptly, with provision for full and free debate.

The proposal is a reasonable and serious one, advocated by House Members of the highest integrity and urged for many years by respected students of congressional procedure. It deserves to be considered and discussed on its merits. Unfortunately, however, the chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Representative FRANCIS WALTER, is not willing to keep the debate on this level. This is the way he opened a recent attack on the proposal:

"At the direction of Moscow, one of the most intense Communist drives to destroy the House Committee on Un-American Activities that has ever been waged is now in

> full swing. * * * It is to demand outright abolition of the committee by amending the House rules. Knowing, however, that there is no possibility of achieving this at present, the party is concentrating on a half-a-loaf strategy. It has called for the transfer of the committee's functions to a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and, failing that, a large cut in the committee's appropriation. Either move would drastically impair the committee's operations and, the party hopes, pave the way for its complete destruction."
>
> This is really unworthy of a Member of the House of Representatives. Whatever the hopes of the Communists may be, there is an abundance of sound, practical reasons for making the House Un-American Activities Committee subordinate to the Judiciary Committee.
>
> With its present independent status, the House Un-American Activities Committee roves all over the congressional domain, intruding into all sorts of matters—foreign affairs, communications, criminal law, immigration, labor, education—which lie within the jurisdiction of regular, established legislative committees. The principal legitimate focus of the House Un-American Activities Committee interest is in the devising of criminal statutes to counter subversive activities in the United States. The Judiciary Committee ought to have exclusive control over all criminal statutes, assigning to a subcommittee on subversive affairs whatever may belong there.
>
> In a letter to this newspaper, September 13, 1955, Mr. Walter himself wrote as follows: "I have advocated * * * altering the status of the committee to make it a part of the Committee on the Judiciary. I believe that both Houses of Congress should have committees to investigate subversion and un-American activities. The Senate established the Internal Security Committee as a part of the Judiciary Committee with results that are well worth studying. I have proposed this change * * * solely in order to achieve the best possible coordination of the present investigative role of the Committee on Un-American Activities and the legislative purposes of the Committee on the Judiciary, the source of all our major antisubversive legislation."
>
> If this be communism, or pro-communism, let Mr. Walter make the most of it.

So wrote the Washington Post, and in the same spirit the words I speak today are not said as a personal attack upon the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Rather I speak in a positive and hopeful spirit to urge the reestablishment of full and meaningful freedom of speech, press, and assembly in our land, while retaining a committee with jurisdiction over actual threats to our Government, such as sabotage and espionage.

I cherish our democracy with all my heart, and I believe with Mr. Justice Black that the "very foundation of a true democracy and the foundation upon which this Nation was built is the fact that government is responsive to the views of its citizens, and no nation can continue to exist on such a foundation unless its citizens are wholly free to speak out fearlessly for or against their officials and their laws." Black, J., dissenting in *Braden* v. *United States*, 365 U.S. 890, 1961; 81 Supreme Court 584, 592.

This fundamental concept of democracy is enshrined in the first amendment to the Constitution, which declares:

> Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

I urged a transfer of the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to the Committee on the Judiciary because it has, for many years, made a mockery of the fundamental right of our people to "be wholly free to speak out fearlessly for or against their officials and their laws." It has done this by effectively and falsely correlating many legitimate causes, such as the quests for peace, civil rights, and civil liberties with communism and un-American activities. By misusing the authority of Government to thus define what is politically American or un-American, the committee has suppressed the constitutional rights of many people with diverse and anti-Communist views. Many such persons are now afraid to speak out on the great issues of the day for fear they will be labeled as "Communists," "dupes," or "pinks." Many also fear that by taking an unpopular, but perhaps correct, stand, they will lose their jobs, or, worse yet, someday be hauled before a congressional inquisition, with all its dread implications.

However, the personal damage to witnesses and the fear it strikes into the hearts of many others is not the full extent of the havoc the committee has wreaked on our democratic system of government. More important is the fact that its effect of silencing criticism has created a dangerous situation whereby our Government may undertake stupid or perilous policies, and only a few, brave, ineffective voices may be raised in opposition. We cannot allow such an intolerable situation to persist. We cannot do so not only on the ground of upholding our oaths to uphold the Constitution, but also on the practical and crucial ground that in an age when, as President Kennedy has warned, a "nuclear sword of Damocles" hangs over mankind, we cannot let Government make life and death decisions without the citizenry being able to criticize and help to determine them. We, as a body charged with the sacred constitutional duty to protect our land and its people must, therefore, end those functions of the Un-American Activities Committee which prohibit our people from fully and fearlessly exercising their constitutional rights of freedom of speech, press, and assembly.

Lest there be any doubt as to what the committee actually probes, for the most part it investigates the lawful expression of lawful ideas, peaceful and constitutionally protected activities such as petition campaigns, rallies, picket protests, and so forth, or it simply asks friendly and unfriendly witnesses for names of other alleged Communists. Thus, most of the committee's investigations fall within the areas of speech and peaceful assembly, activities protected against Government interference by the first amendment.

Nor do I need to emphasize that many of the inquisitions conducted by the committee are unrelated to the only legitimate purpose of a congressional investigating committee, the gathering of information for possible legislative use. As Chief Justice Warren warned Congress in the case of Watkins against United States:

> The power of the Congress to conduct investigations is inherent in the legislative process. That power is broad * * *. But, broad as is this power of inquiry, it is not unlimited. There is no general authority to expose the private affairs of individuals without justification in terms of the functions of the Congress. * * * Nor is the Congress a law enforcement or trial agency. These are functions of the executive and judicial departments of Government. No inquiry is an end in itself; it must be related to, and in furtherance of, a legitimate task of the Congress. Investigations conducted solely for the personal aggrandizement of the investigators or to punish those investigated are indefensible. *Watkins* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. 178. 187, 1957.

The committee members and staff have made all too clear many times that their primary purpose is exposure, rather than gathering evidence for legislation. Since the Watkins decision, their language has been somewhat more circumspect about their real purpose. However, that primary purpose of exposure of recalcitrant witnesses still exists, no matter how cleverly concealed by failure to state it baldly.

There are a number of other unanswerable counts against the committee, as presently constituted. First, the committee has become an agency for the destruction of human dignity and constitutional rights other than those embodied in the first amendment. The committee is notorious for its contempt for the legal rights of its victims. It bears a large share of the blame for the unfortunate and dangerous public contempt for the fifth amendment's vital protection of the accused against self-incrimination. The committee has all too thoroughly and disastrously destroyed the real meaning of that immunity; namely, that it protects the innocent as well as the guilty against such abuses as forced confessions and proof of guilt by clever cross-examination.

We have become inured to thinking of those called to testify by the Un-American Activities Committee as victims, rather than as witnesses. They are endlessly dragooned before the committee and accused. Secret sources, arrogance, rudeness, maximized defamation, and the threat of prosecution for perjury or contempt if the witness does not cooperate are constant ingredients in this spectacle. Those willing to testify about themselves are then coerced into accusing others, and thus become agents of further havoc.

Second, despite the existence of the police and prosecuting agencies of the United States, the 50 States, and thousands of localities, and their effectiveness, the committee has commissioned itself as a roving police and prosecution agency to haul persons and groups before it, accuse them, and force them to either answer under oath or claim their constitutional rights. Yet it acts with the aid of immunities, such as that which protects it against libel and slander suits, and with powers which we would never dream of giving to the police or public prosecutors.

7

Third, the committee also wrongly acts as a court, for it judges and severely punishes those persons and groups who refuse to cooperate. The punishments of loss of the ability to earn a living and the worse punishment of being labeled as a "Red" are often meted out by the committee. Yet, again it is not subject to the restraints of fairness and impartiality which we require of our courts.

Fourth, there is no longer any need or justification for the committee, if ever there was. The committee, contrary to what it would have us believe, is not this Nation's major shield against domestic communism. On the contrary, it is the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other counter-espionage agencies of the Federal Government which have the basic responsibility for guarding us against those who would commit sabotage, espionage, or other such overt acts aimed at our destruction. State and local officials and police also have important roles in defending us against such acts.

Let us face facts—the committee does not catch spies or saboteurs. For example, when Harry Gold, who was involved in the Rosenberg case, was arrested, his name was not among the thousands of names contained in the committee's ubiquitous files. Nor was it the committee which exposed the master Soviet spy, Rudolph Abel. Neither can the fact that 12 years ago the committee unmasked Alger Hiss be used as proof of a current need for its continued existence as it presently functions. In fact, about all the committee really produces these days is embarrassing confrontations with women seeking a peaceful world, phony movies about student opposition to its hearings, and the usual lists of alleged Reds. These alleged Communists are almost all already well-known to the FBI, the agency charged with apprehending criminals, for most committee evidence is simply a repetition of the tales of FBI undercover agents or disillusioned ex-Communists who are cooperating with the FBI. Thus, the titillating revelations about newly uncovered alleged Communist Party members is pretty old hat by the time the committee dramatically reveals its latest findings. We all remember the absurd situation a couple of years ago when the committee traipsed about the country and repeatedly had a customs official open the same mail sack containing foreign Communist propaganda to the surprise and shock of the committee.

Occasionally, of course, the committee does obtain a contempt of Congress conviction against a recalcitrant witness, when the appellate courts do not reverse the decision. However, I cannot recall the committee's investigations resulting in the conviction of anyone for sabotage, espionage, the unconstitutional denial of a qualified southern Negro's right to vote, or any other crime directed against our form of government.

It is partly because the committee has no real role in guarding us against internal threats to law and order that the committee tends to stray over into other jurisdictions, and has repeatedly shown its inability to mind it own business. It appears to have an uncontrollable urge to encroach upon the jurisdiction of other committees and governmental agencies, including the police, the Justice Department, the courts, and other levels of Government. A shameful example of this was the 1959 incident when it tried to pressure local California school boards into firing certain teachers. However, this House never committed such policing functions to the committee.

It is also difficult for me to find any rational correlation between the fact that the committee received an appropriation for $50,000 in 1945, when there were 64,500 known Communists, and $665,178.36 for 1961 and 1962, when there were fewer than 10,000 Communists in a population of 180 million. Not even inflation and the higher costs of Government can justify that increase. Of course, when I refer to the excessive cost of the committee's operations, I have not included its staff payroll nor the additional appropriations which we regularly make to cover the costs of additional printings of its invaluable reports.

To criticism that funds for the committee are disproportionately high, the committee and its supporters will probably respond that while it is true that the number of hard core Communists has reached its lowest point in history, the number of dupes has increased. Thus the danger is greater than ever and we must continue the committee with even higher appropriations. Does this mean that by some weird process of diminishing numbers, when we have no Communists we shall still have a great danger of internal subversion? To me, this argument of the committee is absurd.

We also face the fact that our bipartisan attempt to transfer the jurisdiction of the Un-American Activities Committee to the Judiciary Committee again met with the charge that the Communists are behind the campaign.

As I have said before, we are obviously living in a hostile, dangerous world in which communism poses a grave international threat. But that does not mean we must make all of our decisions by reaction—by determining on which side of every question the Communists lie, and then automatically voting the opposite way.

Of course, I do not care if the Communists do or do not applaud my efforts to seek the transfer of the jurisdiction of the House Un-American Activities Committee. I am not doing it for them or for any other group. I speak only for those who like myself believe we can fight communism without discarding basic and fundamental American rights. I do it to help our citizens once again feel free to fully use their constitutional rights without fear. I also propose the transfer of jurisdiction to strengthen the good reputation of this House.

Lastly, the new Members of Congress may be surprised to know that among those who favor the transfer of the jurisdiction of the Un-American Activities Committee is its present chairman, the distinguished Francis E. Walter, of Pennsylvania. In sworn testimony during 1960, yes, 1960, in the case of *United States* v. *Yellin*, Criminal No. 3023, U.S. District Court, Northern District of Indiana, Hammond division, Chairman Walter stated:

> Answer. No. If you want my personal feeling about the matter, I am 1 of the 42 men who voted against creating the committee. I thought that its function should be within the framework of the Judiciary Committee, just as it is in the Senate, where this work is done by a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.
>
> Question. Do you still feel that way?
>
> Answer. Of course.

I hope I am not too severe when I say to Mr. Walter that he should not change his mind now just because the Communists have come around to his way of thinking. I refer, of course, to Mr. Walter's article in the January 31, 1963, newsletter of the American Security Council, entitled "To Still Freedom's Voice."

Mr. Speaker, again I must declare that it is an unfortunate thing that we have continued such a committee and lent it our powers and prestige. However, we can end its course and regain our powers by transferring its legitimate jurisdiction to the House Committee on the Judiciary. The Supreme Court has upheld the bare legality of what we have done in establishing and continuing the Committee on Un-American Activities. However, the mere fact of bare legality should not be the test for this Congress. The Court did not say we have a duty to continue the committee. We have no mandate to continue the abrogation of the constitutional rights of our people, nor are we obligated to profane ourselves any longer in the eyes of the rest of the world. Nor should we be too proud to recognize that we have made a mistake and now rectify our error.

I urge my colleagues to have courage. This issue is not communism versus anticommunism, but as Justice Black has so eloquently declaimed in his dissent in *Barenblatt* v. *United States*, 360 U.S. 109, 1959:

> Ultimately all the questions * * * really boil down to one—whether we as a people will try fearfully and futilely to preserve democracy by adopting totalitarian methods, or whether in accordance with our traditions and our Constitution we will have the confidence and courage to be free.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan].

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, once again we are asked to sanction the activities of the House Un-American Activities Committee by providing it with the largest appropriation in its 25-year history—$360,000 for 1963. When I opposed the appropriation 2 years ago, I pointed out that the committee was not only costly to the taxpayers but was violating fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution and stifling freedom of dissent. That assessment was confirmed during the 87th Congress.

During its existence the committee's demand for funds has steadily increased. Today it is asking for an appropriation of $360,000 for this one session of Congress alone.

In the 87th Congress, of the 19 standing committees that received appropriations, only 2 were given more than the Committee on Un-American Activities. The $681,000 appropriated for it during the 87th Congress was considerably more than twice the sum allocated to the Banking and Currency Committee—$250,000. It received more than three times as much money as the Foreign Affairs — $155,000 — and Armed Services—$150,000—Committees, and more than nine times as much as Agriculture—$75,000. And today the $360,000 in House Resolution 249 is the third largest appropriation before the House.

For many years the committee's staff has been one of the largest in the House. According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 24, 1963, page 1036, the committee's 50-member staff is exceeded in size only by the staff of the Appropriations Committee. It is roughly three times as large as the staffs of the Committees on Foreign Affairs—15—Banking and Currency—16—and Armed Services—17—and over four times the size of the Agriculture Committee staff—12.

By any test, this committee has been an expensive operation. During the 87th Congress its printing costs, for example, exceeded the appropriations figures of seven standing and two select committees. Indeed, the $126,493.50 expended on printing, which was in addition to the $681,000 appropriation, was $1,493 more than the sum of the appropriations for the District of Columbia, Ways and Means, House Administration, and Interior and Insular Affairs Committees.

Exact figures are difficult to come by, but the printing bill for the committees' reports, consultations, and hearings for the 87th Congress was within a few thousand dollars of equaling the total cost of printing for all other committees in the House.

Traditionally, a committee has been judged by its contributions to legislation. Tested by this criterion, the output of the House Un-American Activities Committee has been notably unimpressive.

Of the 13,420 public bills that were introduced in the 87th Congress, 59 were referred to the committee. Among the 59 bills, there were 20 separate legislative proposals. Among the 20 separate bills, 6 were combined in an omnibus bill—H.R. 6. Five bills were actually brought to the floor of the House. Of these five, one—H.R. 11363—was defeated for failure to obtain the two-thirds vote required for passage. Three others—H.R. 4469, H.R. 5751, and H.R. 12082—passed the House and were quietly interred in the Senate. The fifth—the sole legislative product of 2 years of investigations, reports, speeches, and a $681,000 appropriation—passed both the House and Senate and was signed by the President.

What was the character of this bill? H.R. 9753 amended a provision in the committees' own Internal Security Act of 1950 that had required the Defense Department to publish a list of strategic defense facilities at which members of Communist organizations were barred from employment. This requirement, according to a witness from the Department of Justice, "created a situation dangerous to the national defense, and jeopardized the national security, since that list could be used as a guidebook for sabotage and for the selection of military targets by any potential enemy." This correction of the committee's own mistake was highly desirable. Whether so high an appropriation and so large a staff was needed to amend the law is a question the taxpayers may well ask.

Although the primary business of any standing committee should be legislation, this record of lack of legislative activity is typical.

Increasingly sensitive to the criticism that it has not served a useful legislative purpose, the committee in 1958 requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare a list of the legislative recommendations made by the committee since 1941. The report, entitled "Legislative Recommendations by the House Committee on Un-American Activities," deserves close attention. It contains every legislative recommendation by the committee from 1941 to 1958.

Of the 79 recommendations listed, 34 are identical, having been made in more than one session of Congress.

Of the 45 separate recommendations, 30 were relevant to six statutes: The Internal Security Act of 1950; the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; the Espionage and Sabotage Act of 1954; the Immunity Act of 1954; the Communist Control Act of 1954—amending the Internal Security Act of 1950—and the Act of August 1, 1956, providing for the registration of individuals trained in foreign espionage schools. Only the first and fifth statutes were reported out as bills by the committee. The remaining four were referred to the Judiciary Committee. Five other recommendations concerned either statutes of limitation or penalties for various criminal offenses and were, accordingly, considered by the Judiciary Committee.

An examination of the 20 legislative proposals, which were referred to the committee in the 87th Congress, will show that the subject matter, with equal or greater propriety, could have been referred to other committees if this committee did not exist at all.

In fact, 12 were identical with, or closely similar to, bills under consideration by other committees of Congress. Only eight had not been taken up by any other committee. It hardly follows, however, that no other committee had jurisdiction over these eight bills. At least four of the bills might have been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The remaining four bills fell within the jurisdiction of such varied committees as Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Post Office and Civil Service. In no case did the House have unique jurisdiction—or competence—to deal with the bill.

For example, H.R. 7914 provided that individuals who refused to testify before a Federal agency with respect to subversive activities would lose their rights, privileges, and benefits under the Constitution and, for good measure, under any law of the United States. As I have pointed out previously, legislation denying an individual's rights under the Constitution and all laws of the United States is a textbook illustration of a bill that belongs in the Judiciary Committee. The same comment applies to H.R. 13398, a bill which set forth the finding that the Communist Party of the United States operates under the control of the Soviet Union and would permit actions in district courts to enjoin the activities of such organizations, with absolute priority and precedence to be given to trials involving Communist activities. H.R. 4469, which would have prohibited employment at a waterfront facility or aboard a merchant vessel to any person who willfully failed or refused to appear before a Federal agency when subpenaed or refused to answer questions concerning Communist Party membership, was a matter for either the Judiciary or the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

The Ways and Means Committee might have been expected to consider H.R. 4700, a bill providing that no Communist organization should be allowed any deduction or exemption for Federal income tax purposes and that no deduction should be allowed for contributions to a Communist organization. H.R. 596 would have established penalties for labor organization representatives who interfered with the movement of defense materials in foreign commerce during a national emergency. This would seem to fall within the jurisdictions of the Education and Labor Committee. And either the Judiciary or the Post Office and Civil Service Committees were fully qualified to assume responsibility for H.R. 12082, which would have added a new title to the Internal Security Act of 1950 to establish personnel security procedures for the National Security Agency.

There remain two bills, H.R. 9481 and 9944, both amending the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 in certain respects. This act, as I have pointed out, is one of the three pieces of enacted legislation for which the committee has itself been responsible. Presumably, then, the two proposed amendments do fall within the jurisdiction of the committee. Yet even in these instances the committee possesses no unique competence to deal with the issues they raise. Inasmuch as the first establishes rewards for persons furnishing information leading to convictions under the Subversive Activities Control Act and the second pertains to procedures for determining whether an organization is a Communist organization, they would seem to be matters within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee.

It is no accident that virtually every bill before the committee equally or more properly belongs under the jurisdiction of some other House committee. Usually, the enabling legislation for a standing committee spells out with some precision the committee's intended jurisdiction. But the House Un-American Activities Committee is charged with investigating activities that are "un-American"—a vague term capable of indefinite expansion. If the search for

"un-American" activities has led the committee into areas specifically assigned to the Committees on the Judiciary, Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Post Office and Civil Service, we must blame not only the committee but also its mandate.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the committee has been singularly unproductive of legislation and its ill-defined mandate has repeatedly led it into areas better reserved for other committees of the House.

When we realize that in 24 years the House Un-American Activities Committee has been responsible for just three public laws, we may be tempted to ask: What does the committee do with its money? A significant clue, I believe, lies in the $126,493.50 printing bill—a bill which is, of course, entirely separate from the committee's appropriations. The committee appears to be most in its element when holding hearings and publicizing the results. A glance at the record of its printed reports is accordingly instructive.

Reports on hearings, together with research by the committee's staff and reprints from earlier years, brought to 25 the number of publications issued during the 87th Congress. Here again a rough method of classification is useful. Thirteen of the publications are essentially reports on the results of legislative hearings, staff research, and consultations. Five are written as a defense of House Un-American Activities Committee activities. Seven others present the results of investigations into the beliefs of individuals and organized groups.

A conspicuous feature of the reports on staff research and consultations is that they deal preponderantly with the nature of Soviet and world communism. Typical of this group are such titles as: "Facts on Communism—Vol. II: The Soviet Union, From Lenin to Khrushchev"; "The Kremlin's Espionage and Terror Organizations"; "Communist Psychological Warfare—Brainwashing"; "The Ideological Fallacies of Communism"; "World Communist Movement—Selective Chronology, 1918–1957, Vol. I"; "Soviet Total War—Historic Mission of Violence and Deceit." These subjects would seem to be the proper concern of the Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department, and the Foreign Affairs Committee.

As I have already suggested, five of the reports appear to have been written explicitly in response to public criticism of the committee. This practice is understandable—but hardly a justifiable use of the taxpayers' money.

The remaining seven reports record committee investigations of individuals and organizations suspected of harboring un-American beliefs. This notoriously vague and pliable term has sanctified the use of the subpena, the technique of cross-examination without judicial protection, and the contempt citation in a manner calculated to intimidate and discredit, and the publication of committee proceedings are vital to this purpose.

To disseminate information of dubious validity on foreign policy questions; to defend the committee against all critics; and to discredit the beliefs and patriotism of these critics—this, I believe, is the melancholy but not unfair summary one must make of the ends advanced by the publication of the reports.

Up to this point, Mr. Speaker, I have mainly discussed the financial costs of maintaining this committee. But the most serious costs of supporting the committee arise from the damage it has done, and is doing, to our constitutional liberties. These are, ultimately, the costs that we shall have to face.

The primary purpose of the committee's hearings is not to gather information for legislative purposes but to expose and thereby to punish individuals whose opinions the committee considers to be un-American. Mr. Justice Black has demonstrated this in the appendix to his opinion in *Barenblatt* v. *U.S.* (360 U.S. 109, 163–166). Mr. Justice Black notes:

> The chief aim, purpose, and practice of the House Un-American Activities Committee, as disclosed by its many reports, is to try witnesses and punish them because they are or have been Communists or because they refuse to admit or deny Communist affiliations (360 U.S. 109, 153).

Examples are legion of the committee's use of exposure to intimidate dissent. I shall choose only one.

Last December when we were commemorating the 171st anniversary of the Bill of Rights, the committee subpenaed a number of women who had expressed their concern for peace through the Women Strike for Peace. Whether we agree or disagree with the goals of Women Strike for Peace is immaterial. They have an absolute right under the Constitution to gather together, express themselves, to campaign for their ideas. Thousands of housewives all across the country have taken part in the Women Strike for Peace program. But the committee presumably selected specific women upon whose loyalty the committee would cast doubt. The effect would be to discredit the Women Strike for Peace movement, intimidate people from taking part, stifle dissent, and induce conformity of thought and action.

Let us face this issue squarely. We cannot underestimate the threat of international communism. Never before have our democratic principles been in such jeopardy. However, in the struggle to preserve our freedom, we must not lose our freedom. Those who would erode our civil liberties have lost faith in America and the overpowering logic of the words which Thomas Jefferson spoke in his first inaugural address. He said:

> If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments to the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated when reason is left free to combat it.

Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress, the House contributed over two-thirds of a million dollars to assaults on civil liberties. For how long are we going to underwrite the undermining of the Bill of Rights?

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to support the resolution to continue to give funds to the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House for the next year.

I do not know of any committee of this House that has a more important task to render to the people of this country than the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House. During the past 20 years that committee has performed a faithful service by calling the attention of the people of this Nation to the dangers and inroads of communism.

The people who take advantage of the fifth amendment, a part of the U.S. Constitution they intend to destroy, desire to take away all liberties from the American people.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House has done a commendable job, and wish to commend the members of that committee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] during the past years.

I sincerely hope that the House will vote unanimously for adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am not one of those who is in accord with the killing of the other resolution in the Rules Committee yesterday. I would rather have that brought on the floor here and let the Members vote on it, and let the people of the country know where the Members stand.

Transferring the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House to another committee would, in effect, destroy the committee. The proof of this is the fact that the people who propose this, oppose the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution wholeheartedly

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I jotted down three or four points on what the gentleman who spoke to you said in opposition to this committee.

First, it was indicated that the price of the committee was high. That was an issue before the Committee on House Administration. The committee reported out this resolution after full discussion of the situation, and reported it unanimously.

Second, he claimed that the functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House could possibly be better performed by the Committee on the Judiciary. That question was an issue before the Rules Committee yesterday, and that committee voted 12 to 1 against his claim and in favor of retaining this committee as presently set up.

He also claimed a lack of legislation coming from the committee, and stated, as I recall it, that over the years this committee had been responsible for the enactment of only three laws. The actual fact is—for we should keep the record straight—that 42 laws have been passed by the Congress, and signed by the several Presidents over the years, based on the recommendations of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The committee, I wish to point out, did not report out all these bills—because their subject matter was something within the jurisdiction of other committees—but these bills were based on the committee's recommendations which in, turn, were based on its investigations and hearings. The committee was ultimately responsible for them.

Finally, the gentleman said that the price is high. Well, the price of internal security and national defense will never be cheap. So I should hope that this resolution will be adopted by an overwhelming vote, as usual.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support adequate appropriations for the Un-American Activities Committee of the House this year as I have each year of my membership in this body. This committee is doing a vital job for our country and I urge the Members of this House to vote favorably for adequate funds for this committee.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution authorizing the appropriation of funds to the House Committee on Un-American Activities so that it may continue its important work in these critical days of our history. It having been decided by the will of the House—and indeed, I believe it is the sentiment of the entire Nation that the House committee continue to function—it follows that the appropriation be adequate to conduct the work which has been authorized and directed. This is a mere act of consistency. That means should be adequate to the end, would seem to admit of no controversy.

The sums requested are truly modest in contrast with the magnitude of the task imposed upon the committee; namely, to inform the Congress and thereby the American people as to the facts and operation of a secret conspiratorial apparatus which has already enslaved a great portion of God's earth. The sums requested are perhaps too modest when we consider the billions being expended by the Communist conspiracy to confuse, degrade, and enslave the world. We must not be pennywise and pound foolish. Let us cheerfully and unanimously authorize this appropriation, in God's name and in the name of every American who has died in the cause of liberty and constitutional government. We cannot, we dare not, do less.

Many years ago a wise English philosopher said: "Knowledge is power." And it is the wisdom of the ancient patriarchs that only the truth shall make us free. We support this appropriation in the interest of knowledge, and in the interest of truth, so that we may be armed with the power of knowledge, to chart our course wisely and effectively as we now grapple with the power of a worldwide conspiracy, which would strangle and suffocate the liberties won for us by generations of noble forebears.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the appropriation for the House Un-American Activities Committee because I feel it to be a legitimate function of Congress to investigate internal subversion and the need for legislation to combat it.

It would be as unsound to deny the committee funds because of disapproval of some of its acts as to refuse to vote funds to our courts because of disagreement with some of their decisions.

However, I think that the very name of the committee encourages some of the members to impose a subjective test of the term "un-American." It is very tempting to brand as "un-American" anyone with whom we disagree.

It is to be hoped that the committee in the future will not attempt to set itself up as a censor of American political thought and expression, but will confine itself to investigation of internal subversion.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities is costly. May I remind the Members of this House that freedom never comes cheaply. It certainly would be sheer idiocy to spend 50 billion of the taxpayers dollars each year for military defense of the front door of our Nation and count it too costly to spend $360,000 a year to defend the back door against subversion that could as easily cost us our freedom as loss in military action against the enemy. This appropriation is modest indeed when one considers what would happen to our freedoms if our enemies were allowed to sow the seeds of rot unchecked and uncontested.

The gentleman from New York has attacked the Committee on Un-American Activities for its publications. I want to state for the record that I am very proud of the committee publications and make no apologies for them. I am so proud of them, in fact, that I will now provide him with some statistics about these publications which he, if he so desires can try to use in further attacks against the committee.

In its almost 25 years of existence, the committee has published 497 separate volumes of hearings, reports and consultations. They occupy about 11 feet of shelf space. Over 7 million copies of these publications have been distributed.

The Communists, some not-so-principled liberals and, I regret to say, some Members of this House would have you believe that the information contained in these publications is unrealiable, or actually misleading and false, and that the release of these documents is, therefore, not only a waste of the taxpayers' money, but has done more harm than good.

The truth of the matter, of course, is that the information contained in these publications is factual, reliable and most valuable. Not only Members of the Congress, but educators, clergymen, civic leaders, businessmen, officials of the executive branch, writers, and newsmen use the committee's publications as sources of material for public addresses and articles on communism. The committee's documents are also used as texts and as supplemental reading material in high schools and colleges, seminars, Government training books and even by foreign governments.

Most significant, I believe, is the fact that recognized authorities and scholars, in writing books on the subject of communism, use the committee's hearings and reports as source material. I will not burden the RECORD with a list of all or most of the authors of works on communism who have done this, but I do believe it appropriate to mention a dozen or so at this point.

The late David Dallin, in his book, "Soviet Espionage" published in 1955 by the Yale University Press. The author of about a dozen works on the Soviet and world communism, Dallin was recognized as an outstanding authority on these subjects not only in this country but abroad.

J. Edgar Hoover, in his book, "Masters of Deceit," published by Henry Holt & Co., 1958.

Harry and Bonaro Overstreet, "What We Must Know About Communism," W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1958.

David J. Saposs, "Communism in American Unions," McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959.

Max M. Kampelman, "The Communist Party Versus the CIO," Frederick A. Praeger, 1957.

Theodore Draper, "American Communism and Soviet Russia," the Viking Press, 1960.

James Burnham, "The Web of Subversion," the John Day Co., 1954.

Robert F. Delaney, "The Literature of Communism in America," the Catholic University of America Press, 1962.

Ralph de Toledano and Victor Lasky, "Seeds of Treason," Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1950.

Donald Drew Egbert and Stow Persons, "Socialism and American Life." Princeton University Press, 1952.

Sanche de Gramont, Pulitzer Prize-winning foreign correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune, "The Secret War," G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1962.

Dr. Anthony T. Bouscaren, "A Guide to Anti-Communist Action," Henry Regnery Co., 1958.

Louis F. Budenz, "Men Without Faces," Harper & Bros., 1948; and "The Techniques of Communism," Henry Regnery Co., 1954.

The Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order was formed to unite men and women of all faiths in a great spiritual counteroffensive against world domination by communism. Among the leaders of this organization are such prominent Americans as Thomas E. Murray, Henry Luce, Gordon Gray, William Yandell Elliott, Rev. Billy Graham, Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, Rev. Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, Rev. Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, Rev. Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of University of Notre Dame, George Meany, president of AFL–CIO,

Herbert Hoover, and Albert J. Hayes, president of International Asociation of Machinists.

In 1960, the foundation decided to compile a basic reading list of the best books available in paperback editions on the struggle between democracy and communism.

The foundation called on outstanding educators and clergymen to work with four representatives of the Department of Defense. Among those who aided in the selection of the 19 books finally chosen on the list were Merrill F. Hartshorn, Executive Secretary of the National Council for Social Studies; Dr. B. E. Powell, librarian of Duke University and past president of the American Library Association; Rev. John F. Cronin, assistant director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference; Dr. Stefan T. Possony of Stanford University's Institute on War, Peace, and Revolution, and former special adviser to the Air Force on strategic intelligence; Col. William E. Kintner of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of University of Pennsylvania, and formerly of the Special Warfare Division of the Department of the Army.

The documents published by the House Committee on Un-American Activities were included in the list of 19 books finally selected by the Foundation for Religious Action. The selection committee rated these two committee documents with the works of such well-known writers as George Orwell, Arthur Koestler, Alexis de Tocqueville, Alan Moorehead, J. Edgar Hoover, and David Shub.

Through the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order, this bookshelf on communism has been shipped to many countries throughout the world where it is playing an important role insuring victory for the forces of democracy and freedom in the battle for men's minds.

On October 16, 1959, the Soviet Union accused Russell A. Langelle, chief security officer of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, of espionage and ordered him to leave the Soviet Union. The State Department immediately rejected the accusation and sent a note of protest to the Soviet Foreign Ministry. It stated that five Russians had threatened Langelle and his family and then had tried to bribe and blackmail him into becoming a Soviet espionage agent.

On October 26, 1959, after Langelle had returned to the United States, the State Department held a press conference at which he answered questions for 75 newsmen. Langelle had been our chief security officer in Moscow for over a year and a half. He denied the Soviet charges and expressed his conviction that Moscow officials had provoked an incident and then expelled him because he had thwarted their efforts to spy on the Embassy. Many of the questions asked him naturally concerned the security problems he faced in Moscow. Referring to Soviet espionage efforts directed against the American Embassy, one reporter asked:

> Has this been an unusually active period in this field or are they more active now than they had been. Can you give us some idea of the kind of activities that one could expect at the Embassy in Moscow?

Langelle replied:

> I think the description of the type of activities and the scope of activities were set forth pretty much in detail in a House Un-American Activities report of January of this year.

He was referring to a committee study entitled "Patterns of Communist Espionage." There are, of course, many people who would have you believe that the Committee on Un-American Activities produces no useful or reliable information. But here we have a case of the chief security officer of what is probably the most difficult security assignment of the Foreign Service telling the press that if they want to find out what is going on in Moscow in the field of Soviet espionage directed at our Embassy, they should read the report of the committee.

I might point out that shortly after this report was published, the State Department ordered 500 copies of it to assist in the instruction of its Foreign Service personnel and to acquaint them with techniques used by Communist agents in their efforts to compromise and subvert Western diplomats. The Military Assistance Institute, which trains our military attachés for service with our embassies and consulates abroad, also uses this committee document as a text. In addition, the British and West German Governments have also purchased quantities of it for the enlightenment of their diplomatic personnel.

This same report, at the time it was published, contained up-to-date information on Soviet espionage operations in this country, particularly as they were directed against Americans of foreign birth who have close relatives behind the Iron Curtain. One of the best television documentaries on espionage. "The Spy Next Door," presented on the Armstrong Circle Theater, used this report for source material.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, J. Edgar Hoover tells us that the Communist Party in the United States is not out of business, not dead, not even dormant. He has warned that those who try to minimize the internal activities of the Communist Party within the United States are either uniformed, or have a deadly ax to grind. We are terribly conscious of the 90 short miles which separate us from Communist troops in Cuba. We cannot forget nor ignore the internal menace from the Communist Party, which is directed from and by the Kremlin just as certainly as are the Soviet soldiers in the Caribbean.

One of our best insurance policies against internal subversion is the House Un-American Activities Committee. Undaunted by vilification and slander, it continues to show its mettle, not only in revealing cases of espionage and infiltration, but by educating the American public to methods of Communist infiltration.

I wholeheartedly approve and will vote for the full appropriation requested by the committee for its activities during this session.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, through unanimous consent granted this day for members of the committee to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of House Resolution 249 relating to the annual appropriation of the House Un-American Activities Committee, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD herewith the text of my statement at the opening meeting of the House Rules Committee in opposition to the Roosevelt resolution, House Resolution 69:

> Mr. Chairman and members of the Rules Committee, the committee is presently considering House Resolution 69, introduced by the gentleman from California, Mr. ROOSEVELT, which would abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities and, it is alleged, transfer its functions to the Judiciary Committee. Two other resolutions—House Resolution 42, introduced by Mr. FARBSTEIN, of New York, and House Resolution 140, introduced by Mr. LINDSAY, of New York, are identical with the resolution introduced by the gentleman from California.
>
> It is my belief, and the belief of all members of the Committee on Un-American Activities, that these resolutions should not be approved. Our reasons are as follows:
>
> First, we must give the most careful consideration—beforehand—to the legal and constitutional complications and implications inherent in any fundamental change in the nature of the committee charged with investigating activities which are designed to bring about the violent destruction of our constitutional form of government. The House of Representatives certainly should not create constitutional problems for itself whenever it can be avoided.
>
> For 25 years now, the House has been investigating Communist activities through its Committee on Un-American Activities, which has operated with an authority spelled out in rule XI, paragraph 18(b) which has stood unchanged during all these years. Despite the derogatory insinuations made by some persons about the vagueness of the committee's resolution, the fact of the matter is that there is no question today about its constitutionality and the basic jurisdiction and powers of the committee.
>
> Over and over again during these years, the Supreme Court, as well as other courts, has carefully weighed the basic constitutional issues involved in the committee's mandate and operations and has found for the committee. Moreover, it has done this in the face of the most persuasive arguments against the committee on real, as well as contrived, constitutional issues which the most ingenious lawyers of the Communist Party have been able to devise. Moreover, too, the Court has done this whether it has been generally considered as conservative, middle of the road, or liberal in nature.
>
> In the vital Barenblatt decision of June 8, 1959, the Supreme Court found that "in the domain of national security, the House has clothed the Un-American Activities Committee with pervasive authority to investigate Communist activities in this country."
>
> In the same decision, the Court also found that "it can hardly be seriously argued that the investigation of Communist activities generally, and the attendant use of compulsory process, was beyond the purview of the committee's intended authority under rule XI."
>
> If the House were to create a new committee or subcommittee at this time with a differently worded resolution and authority, as the resolutions the Rules Committee is now considering provide, it would immediately open up for Communist exploitation a whole new area of litigation. Twenty-five years of deliberation on the part of the committee, the Department of Justice, and

courts of this land could be rendered useless. The newly created committee would find itself operating with an authority, and in an area, characterized by great uncertainty. The proper scope and limitations of the committee would be clearly defined only after many additional years of courtroom struggle.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure all of us will agree that it would be most unwise for the House at this time to throw away a clearly defined power which it knows it possesses beyond all doubt—and then attempt to continue exercising the same power under a resolution that may be open to constitutional challenge and rejection by the courts of the land.

This issue is most important, Mr. Chairman, because the three resolutions being considered would change the mandate under which the House would continue—or try to continue—its investigations of communism. They would change the mandate by eliminating it completely, by utterly destroying it. As a substitute, they would merely add the words "un-American activities" to the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee and provide that "the Judiciary Committee shall establish a Subcommittee on Un-American Activities."

The resolutions provide not a word in definition of un-American activities. They delete paragraph 18(b)—which defines the jurisdiction and duties of the Committee on Un-American Activities—from rule XI and substitute for it absolutely nothing.

The designation of the proposed Judiciary Subcommittee's jurisdiction and powers under these resolutions is the very essence of vagueness. In effect, these resolutions give the proposed subcommittee no power whatsoever. It is my conviction that if these resolutions should be adopted, no court in this land would ever sustain them or the work of any subcommittee performed under their authorization.

It seems strange to me that the resolution of the gentleman from California should be so worded, inasmuch as he has so often complained about the alleged vagueness of the Committee on Un-American Activities present mandate.

Why has he stripped from his resolution the committee's court-tested mandate, whose constitutionality is unquestioned, whose delineation of jurisdiction is clear—and substituted for it no more than the very three words about which he has been complaining for so long? Perhaps it was just an oversight on his part. I hope that's all it was.

There is one other important point about these resolutions which should be emphasized. They do not give to the proposed Judiciary Subcommittee the power of subpena which the Committee on Un-American Activities has always had. Do the authors of these resolutions believe that any committee of the Congress could investigate communism, subversion, un-American activities—without the power of subpena? Do they honestly believe that any Communist would voluntarily appear before a committee to testify about the operations of the conspiracy of which he is a member and whose goal is the destruction of our Government?

By failing to grant the proposed subcommittee the power of subpena, the authors of the resolutions have guaranteed that it will be stillborn, having no effective life or vitality. They have taken away from the Congress a power that has been universally recognized as essential in this area.

This glaring defect in these resolutions, coupled with the one concerning the subcommittee's mandate—or complete lack of mandate—which I mentioned previously, makes me wonder whether these resolutions are truly designed to transfer the work of investigating subversion to the Judiciary Committee, or whether they are designed to end all such activity on the part of this House.

On this matter, there is an additional question to which the most careful consideration should be given. It is this: What would be the implication for the courts and the people of this country if these resolutions were adopted after being amended so that they conferred upon the proposed subcommittee the very same mandate the Committee on Un-American Activities has had for 25 years?

The implication would be all too clear, I am afraid, that despite the findings of the courts upholding its actions, the House has actually had serious misgivings, has been subject to doubts and uncertainty, as to the correctness of what it has been doing for the past 25 years. Implicit in the act of transfer would be a kind of confession of years of guilt and wrongdoing and a belated—very belated—effort to correct it.

I say this, because it has yet to be argued on the floor of the House that this transfer should be made in the interest of better administration or economy, or for any other reason unrelated to the quality of work the Committee on Un-American Activities has done. To the contrary, the arguments advanced for transfer have uniformly implied that the Committee on Un-American Activities—for years and years—has operated in an irresponsible, highhanded manner, disregarding individual rights and engaging, to a great extent, in no more than character assassination and intimidation. This has often been hinted and implied rather than stated openly—but never in my many years in the House have I heard such gross impugning of the motives and actions of so many Members of this body as has been expressed in the past by the gentleman from California who has introduced House Resolution 69.

Will the Members of the House go along with—can they be expected to support—this not too subtle condemnation of themselves and their colleagues, past and present? I think not.

A second reason—and these facts concern the Judiciary Committee itself:

During the debate on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] then, as now, chairman of the Judiciary Committee protested that the reorganization bill would reduce the members on the Judiciary Committee from 27 to 25, even while imposing more work on the committee by giving it jurisdiction previously exercised by four standing committees.

He pointed out that as a result of its "avalanche of business", the Judiciary Committee had already been divided into five subcommittees and all five were then behind in their work because of a "tremendous number of bills" which were continually referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. He enumerated the additional duties being imposed on the committee, their complexity, the hundreds of additional bills it would have to consider each year because of them, and then stated: "How we are going to do all that work with 25 members is beyond my comprehension."

That, gentlemen, was almost 20 years ago. What is the situation today as far as the Judiciary Committee is concerned? The committee has had its membership enlarged to 35. Despite this, everyone knows that it is the most overworked committee in the House. It now has 19 subjects within its jurisdiction. I can say without fear of contradiction because it is known to everyone that it is having difficulty—and has always had difficulty—keeping up with all the work that is assigned to it.

Imposing on the already overworked Judiciary Committee the numerous problems associated with the operations of the Committee on Un-American Activities would mean either one of two things: that much less would be done in the field of countering subversion, or that other vital matters which are already within the province of the Judiciary Committee would be neglected.

Would it be advisable to add to the Judiciary Committee, which is now the third largest in the House, nine new members—the number now on the Un-American Activities Committee? This would give it 44 members—more than any other committee except the Appropriations Committee. This, I believe, is too large and unwieldy a number to have on a committee that has so much important day-to-day work before it throughout both sessions of each Congress. The problems of the Appropriations Committee, which has 50 members, are, as you all know, quite different and it can operate effectively with so large a number. The Judiciary Committee is in a completely different situation.

I believe there can be no question about the fact that, from the viewpoint of getting vital work done efficiently and well in both the legislative and investigative fields in this most important area, shifting the functions of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Judiciary Committee would be a disastrous and most unwise move.

Mr. Speaker, here is the text of my opening statement at the hearings of the women for peace movement:

Everyone in the world, every nation in the world—if you can believe their words—wants peace. The cry is universal. It comes from neutralists, from Communists, from anti-Communists. Yet there is no peace because certain persons, groups and nations in the world—even while they cry peace—foment war and unrest. They plot and carry out military attacks on neutralist India, on anti-Communist South Vietnam. They plot sabotage in the United States. They dynamite electric power stations in Venezuela. In every nation, in small and in big ways, they disrupt peace or make it impossible of attainment.

There is good reason, unfortunately, to doubt Communist claims that they desire peace, as others understand the term. Late in 1948, Stalin launched a spectacular peace offensive. It was marked in major nations of the world by so-called peace conferences and congresses, which were supported and attended by the cream of the Communist and fellow traveling intellectual crop in those nations. A Moscow-directed World Peace Council, still operating in Vienna, was born of these gatherings. In June 1950, however, even as Stalin was directing the creation of this so-called World Peace Council (which was formally established about 5 months later), he launched a military attack on South Korea. That attack marked the beginning of 3 years' undeclared war between the forces of communism and freedom. Over 33,000 Americans were killed in battle in that Communist peace action. More than 123,000 other Americans were casualties of it—20,000 of them also losing their lives.

These facts alone indicate that we must give careful consideration to just what the word "peace" means to Communists. Studying what they say about war will help us determine what they mean by peace.

A pamphlet on basic Communist doctrine prepared by the National Education Department of the U.S. Communist Party and sold in Communist Party bookstores in the United States at the very time Stalin's peace offensive was at its peak—and during the Korean war—made the following doctrinal statement: "Wars do not occur through accidents of history or the mistakes of statesmen. They are the inevitable result of capitalism and its contradictions."

Volume 8 of the Large Soviet Encyclopedia (Bol'shaia sovetskaia entsiklopedia), published in 1951, defines war as follows (p. 570): "War is a social phenomenon inherent in a society containing classes and antagonism."

Two pages later, in its discussion of war, the encyclopedia states: "Wars will cease only with the destruction of capitalism and the victory of the Socialist system in all the world."

Again, the Small Soviet Encyclopedia (Malaia sovetskaia entsiklopedia), third edition, volume 2, published in 1958, states: "The basic cause for contemporary wars is the capitalist economic system and the irreconcilable internal contradictions in it."

In other words, according to fundamental Communist doctrine, there will be wars—there can be no real peace—as long as capitalism exists. To end wars, to achieve peace, capitalism must be destroyed.

According to their own words, Communists believe that there can be no real peace until they have conquered the world, eliminating all other systems. They say to one another, and to those who will make an effort to study their doctrine, that they really do not believe in peace in our time.

Why then do they talk of peace? Because it serves Communist interests in two ways:

(1) The initiated Communist, understanding his Marxist-Leninist doctrine, knows that a Moscow call to intensify the "fight for peace" means that he should intensify his fight to destroy capitalism and its major bastion, the United States. This is the way to peace—according to his Communist doctrine. Thus Communist peace propaganda is a call to action for all Communists, spurring them to increased activity and effort aimed at achieving the Communist goal of world conquest—by war or any other means.

(2) As events have proved, peace propaganda and agitation have a disarming, mollifying, confusing and weakening effect on those nations which are the intended victims of communism. Moreover, throughout history, aggressors, dictators, and governments bent on conquering others, or the whole world, have known that pacifism or an unrealistic and exaggerated desire for peace on the part of their intended victims is a tremendous asset to ultimate victory for the aggressor. Excessive concern with peace on the part of any nation impedes or prevent adequate defense preparation, hinders effective diplomacy in the national interest, undermines the will to resist and saps national strength. For this reason, in today's world, intense peace propaganda and agitation in non-Communist nations obviously serves the aggressive plans of world communism.

In 1917, Lenin wrote: "We are not pacifists. We are opposed to imperialist wars for the division of spoils among the capitalists, but we have always declared it to be absurd for the revolutionary proletariat to renounce revolutionary wars that may prove necessary in the interests of socialism."

This is still Communist doctrine. It was restated in only slightly different words in a declaration unanimously adopted by 81 of the world's Communist Parties which met in Moscow in November–December 1960 to devise the strategy they hope will bring them world victory.

This same unanimously adopted statement had other things to say which are vitally important to all Americans and which touch on the purpose of these hearings. I quote: "Today, as never before, it is important to fight perseveringly in all countries to make the peace movement thrive and extend to towns and villages, factories and offices."

On January 6, 1961, shortly after this meeting, Khrushchev made a major strategy speech directed to Communists in all parts of the world. He said, in part: "Every day bigger sections of the population should be drawn into the struggle for peace * * *. The banner of peace enables us to rally the masses around us. By holding aloft this banner we will be even more successful."

Following Khrushchev's cue and also the declaration of the 81 Communist Parties, U.S. Communist Party Leader Gus Hall, in a major report to the party's national committee on January 20, 1961, made the following statement:

"It is necessary to widen the struggle for peace, to raise its level, to involve far greater numbers, to make it an issue in every community, every people's organization, every labor union, every church, every house, every street, every point of gathering of our people.

"It is imperative to bring everyone—men, women, youth and yes, even children—into the struggle.

"It is essential to give full support to the existing peace bodies, to their movements and the struggles they initiate, to building and strengthening their organizations.

"It is also necessary to recognize the need for additional peace organizations.

"Above all Communists will intensify their work for peace, and their efforts to build up peace organizations."

These very blunt Communist statements make one thing very clear: Present Communist strategy gives No. 1 priority to peace agitation and propaganda in the United States and all other non-Communist nations. It calls for Communist infiltration of and support for existing peace organizations, Communist or non-Communist. It calls for the creation of new peace organizations, controlled or infiltrated and manipulated by Communists. It calls for assemblies, picket lines, marches, delegations, walks—every possible kind of demonstration for so-called peace.

Basically, it is because of the Communist directives I have just quoted that these hearings are being held. Preliminary investigation by the committee indicates that Communists, in carrying out these directives—as they would be expected to do—have both infiltrated existing peace groups and created or infiltrated newly formed organizations.

For reasons already discussed, this Communist activity intensifies the security problems faced by this Nation. This is internal psychopolitical warfare directed by Moscow and waged within our own borders. The aim of this activity is not peace, but the undermining and sabotage of the United States.

The questions of peace, disarmament, nuclear weapons testing and related matters are the gravest issues confronting the United States today. It is vital that the Congress be informed whether, and to what extent, concealed agents of a foreign power are attempting to influence the decisions which must be made on these questions—and to influence the decisions so they will serve not the interests of the United States but a foreign power dedicated to the destruction of freedom everywhere.

The subject of this inquiry is to determine the extent of Communist infiltration in peace organizations, particularly in the Metropolitan New York area and with special reference to the women strike for peace—and also to determine the degree to which Communists have responded to the previously quoted directives that they engage in such activity. Such information, as the resolution authorizing these hearings indicates, is relevant to certain legislative proposals now pending before the committee.

The committee wishes to emphasize these points before the hearings begin: The fact that Communists are active in peace agitation does not mean that everyone who agitates for peace is a Communist or fellow traveler.

The fact that Communists have created and infiltrated peace organizations does not mean that all peace groups are Communist or that all members of them, or even a majority of them, are Communists, Communist sympathizers, or fellow travelers.

As I stated in the opening of these remarks, the cry for peace is universal. There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of many people who are today agitating and calling for peace, even though we may have reason to doubt the wisdom of some of the actions and statements made by these people.

The subject and legislative purpose of these hearings are set forth in a resolution adopted by the committee on August 2, 1962. That resolution reads as follows:

"*Be it resolved*, That hearings by the Committee on Un-American Activities, or a subcommittee thereof, be held in Washington, D.C., or at such other place or places as the chairman may determine, on such date or dates as the chairman may designate, relating to Communist conspiratorial techniques and propaganda used in implementing Soviet and U.S. Communist Party directives within the United States, with special reference to the so-called united front tactics of the Communist Party, and the Communist Party tactics of infiltration of non-Communist organizations; the legislative purpose being to determine the need for amendment of the Internal Security Act of 1950, so as to make its provisions applicable to persons engaged in such activities, and for the additional legislative purpose of obtaining information designed to aid the committee and Congress in determining whether the Internal Security Act of 1950 should be amended in a manner to make unlawful membership in the Communist Party of the United States, as proposed in H.R. 9944, referred to this committee on the 30th day of January 1962: Be it further

"*Resolved*, That any subcommittee appointed pursuant to this resolution be authorized to hear any other matter within the jurisdiction of the committee."

The order for appointment of this subcommittee, for the record, reads as follows:

November 9, 1962.

To Francis J. McNamara,
Director, Committee on Un-American Activities.

Pursuant to the provisions of the law and the rules of this committee, I hereby appoint a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, consisting of Hon. Clyde Doyle as chairman, and Hon. William M. Tuck and Hon. Donald C. Bruce as associate members to conduct a hearing in Washington, D.C., Tuesday, December 11, 1962, at 10 a.m., on subjects under investigation by the committee and take such testimony on said day or succeeding days, as it may deem necessary.

Please make this action a matter of committee record.

If any member indicates his inability to serve, please notify me.

Given under my hand this 9th day of November 1962.

Francis E. Walter,
Chairman,
Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote "no" on H.R. 249, not with any thought that it will be defeated and with no personal aspersions intended, but to express my opposition, first, to the failure of this House to define properly and in meaningful terms the scope of the committee's authority; second, to the deficiencies in the procedures of this committee to which attention has been repeatedly called; and third, to the increase in the committee's budget while many of the other committee budgets are either being held constant or cut.

I support the right—indeed the duty—of this Body to conduct investigations for legislative purposes in this area which involves the very survival of the Nation. I would support the transfer of this function to the Judiciary Committee under a redefined statement of authority and have so voted this day on procedural questions as to try to accomplish this purpose. I am sorry that House Resolution 69 was not brought to the floor by the Rules Committee so that Members could express themselves on this aspect of the problem.

I twice in the Oregon Legislation voted to kill proposals to establish committees with general and undefined investigatory power. I feel now as I did then, that the rights of the individual must be protected in this country of ours. My vote is thus not a vote in favor of un-Americanism but rather a vote in favor of orderly American constitutional procedures in this very critical and controversial area.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore supported appropriations for the House Un-American Activities Committee because I believed that as long as it was a standing committee of this House it should receive appropriations with which to function.

I have also indicated my strong belief that this committee could better operate as a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee. I have made that claim without impugning the motives or opinions of any one who has served on the House Un-American Activities Committee.

I still believe that its jurisdiction should be transferred to the House Judiciary Committee. If the resolution to accomplish that purpose would have come to the floor, I would have voted for it. The Rules Committee having refused to report that resolution to the House, we will have no opportunity to vote thereon.

I am going to vote against this appropriation today, not because I have changed my mind in any way but so as to register a protest against those who have insinuated and inferred that "Communists and their buddies" are seeking to destroy the committee by transferring its jurisdiction to the Judiciary Committee.

Although not a member of the Judiciary Committee, I resent the implication that that committee would not do its duty if this jurisdiction were transferred to it, more than that I resent the implication that those of us who seek to effect the transfer are one whit less patriotic or less pro-American or less anti-Communist than any other Member of this House.

I think the best way to register my protest is to vote against this appropriation.

SERVICE ON THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES IS NO SINECURE

Mr. TUCK. Mr, Speaker, I rise in favor of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Maryland. Many years ago the Committee on Un-American Activities, by resolution, abolished the practice of conducting one-man subcommittee hearings. A number of years later this action was incorporated into the rules of the House. Hearings are now conducted by subcommittees composed of three members with at least one appointed from the minority party, and with the right to function with a quorum of two members present.

The added work that the three-man subcommittee rule imposes upon the small number of members of this committee, is more than compensated for by the public confidence that such a procedure inspires in the quality and character of the work performed. With a membership of only nine, the appointment of standing subcommittees is impracticable, so each member is required to spread himself very thin, in order that there be proper representation at the numerous hearings held during a session of Congress. The enormity of the work required is indicated by the fact that actual hearing sessions vary from 25 to 50 in number over the period of a year.

Diligent attention is required of the members to the study of results of preliminary investigations in areas concerning which the committee believes that Congress should be informed and remedial legislation appears desirable. Some of such investigations do not get beyond a preliminary stage. In those instances in which preliminary investigations mature into hearings, committee members must inform themselves regarding the subject of the hearing, consider the need and adequacy of legislation dealing with the subject of inquiry, and study with discrimination remedial legislative proposals.

I was pleased to learn of my appointment to a subcommittee which took me to California during the Easter recess of the last session. I anticipated that there would be some time afforded for relaxation from my arduous duties in Washington. The Members generally may be surprised, as was I, that our subcommittee was in the Federal Building at 8 o'clock each morning, where, except for the noon hour, we remained until 6 o'clock every afternoon, for the purpose of hearing witnesses. There were also a number of night sessions. I returned to Washington utterly exhausted, but satisfied in the assurance that this was another instance of extremely productive results.

I have been impressed with the dedication and ability of the members of the committee and its staff. The chairman is a lawyer of national repute and one who has no peer among the very able and distinguished Members of this body. He exercises control over and strictly supervises the activities of the staff and he enjoys the full confidence and loyalty of the staff, consequently, the committee and the staff operate as a team.

I think the committee and Congress is fortunate in having a professional staff of extended experience in the field of this committee and one which has demonstrated its restraint and sound judgment in the handling of many sensitive and difficult problems facing the committee.

You will be interested to know that the director of the committee with his B.A. from St. John's University and his M.A. from Niagara University, has had a long and distinguished record in the military service, as major in military intelligence, and is the recipient of the Army, Navy, and Air Force Medal by the Republic of China for meritorious service in the northern Burma campaign, as well as having served in important posts as editor and research analyst with favorably recognized publications; the general counsel of the committee, with an M.A. degree in constitutional and international law at Princeton University, an LL.B. degree at the University of Virginia, and an honorary doctor of laws degree from Roanoke College, has served the Government as U.S. attorney for the western district of Virginia, for a period of 15 years, acting chief of counsel during the defense phase of the trial of Tojo and others before the International Tribunal in Japan, and counsel for this committee for almost 14 years.

I do not believe there is a better equipped investigative staff to be found than that of this committee. Three of the six investigators have been with the committee for more than 15 years and are experts in their field, one of whom had served with the FBI and one with the U.S. Secret Service.

It was said by the friends of Grover Cleveland that he was loved because of the enemies he made. The diligent work of the members and the staff of this committee likewise has earned the love of countless numbers of people for the enemies that they have made.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, as we discuss today the appropriations requests of the House Un-American Activities Committee, I want to lend my full and unqualified support to this committee and the appropriation which it has requested.

It has been pointed out that the appropriation is large. That may be so, but the price of freedom is not cheap. And I consider the work of this committee to be among the most important of the functions of the Congress.

Year after year we see the committee attacked, we see those who would see it abolished, but this in my opinion would be a serious mistake.

The expressed purpose of world communism is that we be enslaved. There are no limits that they will not go to, there are no devious means that they will not attempt to meet this goal. This Nation has never faced more perilous times—both within and without our great Nation.

We seek to ward off armed aggressors with the force of arms, assembling the most powerful war machine for defense that the world has ever seen. And the Congress has sought and is seeking to keep this Nation militarily strong.

But there is the threat from within which is just as serious. That is of complacency on the one hand and subversion on the other.

We cannot afford either. And perhaps this is the great boon that this committee has given to this Nation, that it has helped to awaken our people to the threat which communism poses, that here in this great land of ours there are those forces at work which would crumble this Nation from within.

And so I believe that this is the task of the House Un-American Activities Committee, to continue to alert America to the threat which godless communism poses from within our own land by those who unwittingly and also those who deliberately support the force of communism. This committee has also brought to light other problems of equal import, organizations which if allowed to flourish without the light of truth being focused upon them, would ultimately lead to possible deterioration of this land of ours.

I want to add my vigorous support of the committee, not only for the funds which it needs to carry on its work, but my full support in all facets of the Congress to allow them to carry on their work.

This Nation needs such a committee. We will not crumble from within so long as our people are informed, but a duped nation can become the victims of such insidious ideologies of communism just as so many lands and countless millions of humans have fallen before its onslaught.

I believe America needs the House Un-American Activities Committee, I commend it for its work, and support fully their request for funds to carry on this needed and vital work.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, it should shock the conscience of every patriotic Member of this body to see this determined effort being made by the handful of our colleagues to abolish or weaken the effectiveness of the Un-American Activities Committee. In my humble judgment this committee is performing one of the most valuable services not only to the Congress but to the entire Nation.

I was amazed to hear the argument of one of the opponents of this committee when he based his opposition upon the cost of the operation of the committee and further that its activities "assaulted our civil liberties."

May I respectfully remind the gentleman from New York that freedom and its preservation are always costly matters. While he is speaking in terms of dollars and cents may I remind him of the fact that many of our American sons and daughters did not complain about paying the supreme cost during prior wars in order to preserve our way of life.

As to his argument that the activities of this committee "assaulted our civil liberties," I have no sympathy for those who would hide behind the fifth amendment or some constitutional guarantees in order to continue membership in some organization which has as its avowed if not published purpose the destruction of our freedom and the enslavement of our citizens. Let me say to him and those who would complain about having their civil liberties assaulted by the Un-American Activities Committee that they can easily escape the questioning eye of that committee by disassociating themselves with those organizations and groups who sympathize with or embrace the Communist philosophy of government.

Mr. Speaker, those who now seek to abolish or weaken this committee are the same ones who always seem to take the lead in the parade of bleeding hearts in defense of those who hide behind the protection of our constitutional guarantees when charged with attempts to overthrow the Government of the Nation it founded.

Fortunately for America, Mr. Speaker, their voices are loud today but their number is small. I am proud to give my wholehearted support to the Un-American Activities Committee, which is so ably led by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania.

Although I would not question the sincerity of those attacking this patriotic committee they must face up to the reality that they are without question aiding the Communists and their sympathizers. May it never be said that we as a legislative body would do anything to stymie any effort to expose and combat those elements seeking to subvert and undermine our democratic way of life.

Mr. GILL. I am happy to join with 19 other Members of the House in a vote expressing a protest and concern over the functions and procedures of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Many other Members of the House who, in the final analysis, voted for the appropriation, share my distaste for the reputation the committee has gathered over the years.

One thing should be made clear: I believe the Congress has a right to investigate matters related to the internal security of the Nation. It has the right to legislate on these matters so it certainly has the right to inform itself. I, along with many others, would be in favor of transferring the functions of the Un-American Activities Committee to the Committee on the Judiciary, with the hope that the Judiciary Committee would exercise its powers in a far more judicious and less sensational manner. I understand that the chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee himself favored this solution until very recently.

However, today we were not given a chance to vote on this issue. The floor managers of the funding resolution would not recognize any motion which could put this issue before the House. Nor would they allow any motion which would merely reduce the appropriation for the committee, currently among the highest in the House. It was apparently their desire to force an all-or-nothing vote.

The obvious result is that those who voted against the total appropriation can now be attacked by partisans of the committee as soft on communism or as somehow being unpatriotic. This I understand and expect, but I have faith that the people of Hawaii are smart enough to see the motives behind any such idiotic attacks.

A free democratic society is not protected or developed by adopting any part of the methods of the Soviet police state. The right of confrontation of accusers, of cross-examination, of security against vilification by innuendo are part of the lifeblood of our free society; destroy them and you destroy America. I hope the Committee on Un-American Activities will, in this coming session, take these truths to heart.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in voting against an increase in appropriations for the Committee on Un-American Activities today, I wish to again make it clear, as I did 2 years ago, that I do not question the existence of a congressional committee to conduct investigations of internal security matters and Communist activity. These are proper areas of congressional concern, and the Congress should not deny itself the power to conduct inquiries relevant to proposed legislation. However, such inquiries demand the highest degree of responsibility and objectivity. When a committee of the Congress abuses its power and exceeds its authority, it is our duty to bring it to account. The long history of notoriety and controversy surrounding this committee is well known to all.

Today's vote is not, to my mind, the ideal method of dealing with the problem of the committee's activities; it would be preferable to transfer the committee to the Committee on the Judiciary, as in the Senate. This is a proposal which Committee Chairman WALTER himself supported in 1955. But the Rules Committee yesterday declined to permit the House to vote on this question. Instead, we are presented with a "yes" or "no" choice—to approve or to reject the request for increased appropriations of $360,000. Therefore, in order to express my strong reservations about the committee, my only alternative is to oppose its appropriations. This I do.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it has long been my conviction that the legislative process would be better served if jurisdiction over the criminal statutes now assigned by the rules of the House of Representatives to the House Committee on Un-American Activities were transferred to the House Committee on the Judiciary. The Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over all other criminal statutes contained in the U.S. Criminal Code. There is no logic in a number of congressional committees having responsibility for separate parts of the code.

The Judiciary Committee has a tradition of fairplay. A subcommittee concerned with the statutes in question would have the review of the full committee, the members of which are all lawyers conversant with the principles of due process.

Consistent with this view, I introduced some weeks ago into Congress a resolution, House Resolution 1140, to transfer jurisdiction over these statutes to the House Judiciary Committee.

If this resolution had been reported by the Rules Committee and adopted by the Congress, it would, of course, mean that the Committee on Un-American Activities would have been abolished as a separate standing committee, and the jurisdiction that it now has over several criminal statutes taken over by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. This is the structural arrangement in the Senate where Internal Security is a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I testified before the Rules Committee in support of my resolution. I asked that the House be given the chance to vote on it. I regret that by a vote of 12 to 1 the Rules Committee declined to give us that opportunity. As I pointed out to the members of the Rules Committee in my testimony, the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], as recently as 1960, was in favor of transferring the functions of the House Un-American Activities Committee to the Committee on the Judiciary.

In my testimony I further stated that I did not favor an attack upon the appropriations of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Such a tactic is misdirected. It serves no useful purpose and accomplishes nothing. To deny the committee funds to pay for stationery, clerk help and other housekeeping matters in no way changes the committee's basic jurisdiction or mandate. The committee still will have jurisdiction over several important criminal statutes, including the Internal Security Act of 1950 and the Subversive Activities Control Act. In fact there is nothing in the Rules of the House of which I am aware that prevents a standing committee from raising money from the outside to finance its activities. Therefore, until we reorganize the basic structure by the means I have proposed we will not solve this problem. I will continue to support a resolution of transfer, but for the reasons which I have given I shall vote against an attempt to deny the committee the appropriations authorized for it by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Rules Committee voted 12 to 1 for the continuance of the Un-American Activities Committee, I believe that it is necessary for the committee to have adequate funds to carry on its functions.

At this particular time, it seems to me that it is important to maintain the investigatory powers of Congress so far as subversive activities are concerned. As long as we are engaged in a cold war, basically the battle of the ideologies, it is necessary to keep an effective means of informing Congress on the activities of our enemy.

A move to abolish the committee or limit its activities has been branded as part of the Communist plot. I do not see it as a plot and I also see no purpose to be served by transferring the powers of the committee to the Judiciary Committee. It is a matter of determining what is the most effective manner of carrying on the battle against totalitarian ideology.

The greatest criticism against the committee has been its purported action in violation of specific constitutional rights. I do not consider the movement to support the committee with adequate funds an endorsement of any action to abuse the civil liberties of individuals.

So again I say that since it is the judgment of the Rules Committee to continue the Un-American Activities Committee, then it should be implemented with funds to make its work effective.

Mr. FRASER. Mr Speaker, I vote "No" today to express my concern about both the philosophy from which this committee springs and its operation. I regret that my disappointment in the House Un-American Activities Committee should first be expressed for the record by a vote against the appropriations for that committee. I would have preferred an opportunity to vote in favor of the proposed rules change heard yesterday by the Rules Committee. Under this change the House Un-American Activities Committee would in effect have become a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, just as is now provided in the Senate. This opportunity being denied by adverse action of the Rules Committee, I would have chosen next to be permitted to vote for an amendment to the resolution now pending which would have given more direction to the use of the money being authorized. This opportunity too was denied.

A secure America is not just an America strong in arms and united with its allies against Communist imperialism. A secure America needs also to build its defenses against those who either knowingly or unknowingly would cut down and restrict our freedoms here at home. Our defenses must be positive ones. They must reject the notion that due process can be too cumbersome, or that freedom of thought is only permissible to the extent acceptable to our neighbors.

We have passed laws which seek to deal with communism at home. Whether these laws are wise or not, once a law is passed the role of enforcement under the separation of powers doctrine falls to the executive and judicial branches. The House Un-American Activities Committee may properly review these laws, consider others, and review enforcement procedures.

My objection is not to this role but to the further activities in which this committee seems to be engaged; namely, that of exposure.

Our U.S. Supreme Court has said that mere exposure is not a proper role of Congress and I agree. If citizens are guilty of a crime they should be prosecuted If not, they should be left alone.

No matter how well intentioned Government or any of its agencies may be, the oppressive power which it can exert over our citizens is far too great to be left unrestrained. The damage which can be done to the free expression of ideas by a committee operating as this one has far outweighs, in my opinion, the good which it may do. Law enforcement should be left to the highly trained enforcement officials in our Government who must bring their charges before the courts—and freedom of thought and expression should be left to our people.

One of the most powerful forces for our survival is the exercise of the right of free expression. In closed societies such as the Soviet Union, the expression of ideas which are in opposition to Government policy is discouraged or prohibited. Thus that Government denies itself the criticism which may set erroneous policies right, or expose improper or even unintended exercise of authority.

Here in America we traditionally have debated alternatives freely, and have subjected the views of Government to searching criticism and analysis. In recent years, however, with the external threat of communism looming so large, there has been an increasing tendency to avoid discussion of policy alternatives which may not follow the hard line. Whenever freedom of expression is impaired, to that extent we endanger the security of our country. Policies of our Government which are detrimental to our safety or welfare may continue uncorrected because those who might offer constructive alternatives are silenced by the fear of expressing unpopular ideas. In my judgment the House Un-American Activities Committee in some of its work contributes to that fear, and is therefore detrimental to our national interest.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this resolution which provides funds for the operation of the House Un-American Activities Committee. I cannot emphasize too strongly the vital role which this committee has played in America's fight against communistic infiltration. Its work is necessary and vital.

Fighting communism at home is as important as opposing its threats from beyond our shores.

Some Congressmen and a few organizations have attacked the committee on the ground that it has engaged in smear campaigns and has invaded constitutional rights of persons investigated. Such a position is difficult for me to understand. The American Bar Association, for example, commented on this point, saying it was impressed with the fairness with which hearings before the committee have been conducted.

We must recognize communism as a fight of truth versus falsehood, of freedom versus bondage, and of Christian belief versus atheism.

We must recognize it as a force seeking to degrade the dignity of man, rob him of his individualism, and deprive him of his God-given right to justice and the pursuit of happiness.

About 2 years ago, I purchased, at my own expense, a copy of the film "Operation Abolition," showing Communist-inspired rioting in San Francisco before the committee in 1960. Before it was finally worn out, this film was shown nearly 200 times in western North Carolina to church, civic, social, and veteran organizations. Reaction to the film was almost 100 percent favorable.

I intend to continue to seize every opportunity to speak out and act against communism. I believe this to be the duty of every American.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I join with those voting "No" on House Resolution 249, and I associate myself with most of their remarks as to the reasons for this action—admittedly an unsatisfactory method of expressing our views.

I do not believe that public exposure before the Committee on Un-American Activities—with the consequent inescapable implication that certain individuals and organizations are un-American—should be used as a punishment for ideas.

I do not believe that ideas of any sort are ever destroyed or weakened by punishment. This can be accomplished only by the power of better ideas.

I believe America is weakened if we place our primary reliance for security upon the suppression of ideas by force or coercion, including the ideas of communism.

In the struggle for a peaceful, free, and democratic world, which is America's primary goal, victory can only be won by the aggressive expression of superior ideas backed to the hilt by programs aimed at carrying out those ideas.

The committee's purposes and methods, in my opinion, have reflected in certain instances a contrary philosophy which is of limited value within this country and which is of positive harm to our goals when applied to the vast developing areas of the world—the major battlefield for freedom and democracy today.

In that battlefield no victories are won by declaiming that a philosophy or a program is un-American, but only by demonstrating that there is an American philosophy or program which is far better.

I fully support the Committee on Un-American Activities insofar as it investigates and recommends legislation for control of subversive activities. At the same time I am acutely sensitive to the constitutional protections of the Bill of Rights involving the free expression of thought and opinion.

My vote is intended to reflect these views.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, those who express concern about the Committee on Un-American Activities of this House often seem to be insisting that it is undemocratic and unconscionable for a democracy to post guards against its subversion. The great responsibility of service on the committee carries with it a willingness to endure a succession of unwarranted attacks on joint and individual integrity—and a determination to persist in the assigned task in spite of these perverse sallies.

It is to the eternal credit of the committee members that they have borne the onslaughts with firm resolve, and the Nation is in their debt. Where better than among the representatives of the people, duly elected, should there be an active concern for the persistent threat of subversion, and an instrumentality to assist in its exposure?

As we prepare to vote our conviction as to the continuing need for the committee, Mr. Speaker, we might recall the significant service it has rendered in spotlighting laxity in the enforcement of personnel security procedures within highly sensitive agencies of Government concerned with the national defense. I should like to recall to the notice of the House the committee's investigation of disgraceful and dangerous security looseness in the secret National Security Agency and read into the RECORD the following editorial which appeared on August 15, 1962, in the Richmond (Va.) News Leader:

INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL SECURITY

> Those who persistently maintain that the House Committee on Un-American Activities is misdirected sound and fury should gage their outrage by the report issued Monday. This document cites 22 distinct corrective actions taken by the National Security Administration following the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigation into the defection to Russia of the homosexual security risks Bernon F. Mitchell and William Martin. NSA has since cooperated fully in tightening its lax security procedures; but if the House Committee on Un-American Activities had not existed, or had been abolished before it began its 13-month investigation, the Nation's most critical and most secret agency of defense would still be wide open to Communist penetration.
>
> The Mitchell-Martin story was an ugly one. Both men worked as mathematicians in the cryptology section of NSA. Both were hired and given access to top secret information before security checks had been completed. Both were eventually given clearance despite Mitchell's admission of sexual aberrations and Martin's association with Communist party members, even after becoming an NSA employee. On August 5, 1960, the two disappeared, apparently with top-secret information about NSA activities; on September 6 they turned up at a Moscow press conference.
>
> The National Security Agency is so sensitively secret and so vital to the country's defense that no outsiders can describe its activities. Not even the Civil Service Commission, which regularly audits all Government jobs, is allowed to know what NSA employees do. Yet the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigation discovered that the Agency had made a regular practice of hiring employees before security checks were completed—ever since the Korean war had given the pretext of an emergency. One of the major revisions of NSA policy was the correction of this incredible practice.
>
> Under another strange policy, the NSA placed almost complete reliance on checking security clearances through lie detector tests, without coordinating information received from the FBI and other agencies. The lie detector or polygraph, useful as it is, charts only chemical and psychological reactions. An innocent but nervous subject comes off badly; a guilty, calm subject may get through without suspicion. J. Edgar Hoover has warned many times that the polygraph can give no more than hints, even to an operator experienced at reading the graphs. Yet the NSA allowed security clearances to be given on the strength of a junior officer's interpretation of the polygraph.
>
> The irregularities in hiring extended to the NSA's director of personnel himself. House Committee on Un-American Activities investigators, working with the FBI, turned up falsifications in the personnel director's background file; the director, who of course had complete access to his own file, then attempted to thwart the committee by forging a form with the correct information and substituting it for incorrect statements. This man has been fired for his forgery.
>
> Since the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigation, NSA security has been tightened in all fields. Greater emphasis is put on pyschological and medical investigations of prospective employees. Guards and watchmen have been increased. The clearances of all employees have been reviewed, and 26 known homosexuals have been dropped from the rolls.
>
> Both the Secretary of Defense and the Director of NSA have been active in the housecleaning, but it was the House Committee on Un-American Activities that devoted more than 2,000 hours to the investigation. This effort has resulted not only in the practical cleanup of the present mess, but in a bill now about halfway through Congress which will forestall a loosening of security practices. The men who are hired to guard a special trust for the country must submit to greater tests of loyalty. Were it not for the House Committee on Un-American Activities we would have no way of knowing whether these tests were being applied or not.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY].

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to vote against this resolution because I am again drawn to the conclusion that the committee in question frequently has gone beyond its proper scope of authority and in so doing has trespassed upon fundamental rights of individual citizens secured by the Constitution itself.

I am sure that all of us conceive it to be the responsibility and the duty of every American to defend the United States from enemies which seek our destruction. But I submit that it is no less the responsibility or the duty of every American, and especially those of us who serve in this body, to protect against encroachment upon our individual freedoms and to preserve the sanctity of the civil rights for which so many millions of Americans have given their lives.

I resent very deeply, Mr. Speaker, the implication that it is something less than respectable to question whether a congressional committee has operated in such a way as to trespass upon the rights which are guaranteed to every citizen.

Even more bitterly do I resent the suggestion that only Communists or Communist sympathizers seek a review of the activities of the committee in question.

The plain fact of the matter is that the Bill of Rights and the rest of our Constitution can be emasculated or lost by our own action or inaction, just as they can be destroyed by an alien adversary.

It seems to me that the preservation of these rights, Mr. Speaker, depends upon our ability to recognize that they are subjected to internal as well as external pressures, and upon our willingness to curb abuses of Government power wherever such abuses are found to exist.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and in behalf of the minority members of that committee, I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Subcommittee and the full Committee on House Administration—as well as the ranking minority member—for the committee's action in voting this authorization of committee funds. Some remarks have been made here today regarding alleged violation of the rights of witnesses and of citizens by the committee. I direct the attention of the House simply to the statement made by the Special Committee on Communist Strategy, Tactics, and Objectives of the American Bar Association, about a decade ago, in which they emphasize the finding that the committee operates with fairness, that the witnesses called to testify before the committee are treated fairly and properly in all respects; and that they also feel satisfied that each witness is accorded fullest protection so far as constitutional or other legal rights are involved.

Since the time of that bar association statement these safeguards and protections have been enhanced by the strengthening of the rules of the committee itself, a committee, by the way, which was the first one to inaugurate and to adopt rules of this type.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the views of the chairman of this committee and the ranking majority member who is here today representing him in his absence, and my colleagues on the committee, in supporting this resolution.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the resolution before us today is authored by the distinguished chairman of this standing, regular committee of the House, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. FRANCIS WALTER. I know every Member of the House joins me in expressing regret that he is not able yet to be here on the floor with us, but I am pleased to tell you that he is on the improve and we are all hoping for his speedy return. Meantime, I have the responsibility for doing, as acting chairman on this occasion, what he would so ably be doing if he were here today. I know you will bear with me.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], who read his paper criticizing the committee and opposing this appropriation today, also read substantially that same paper in toto a few days ago before the House Administration Committee. He was the only Member who appeared before the House Administration Committee in opposition to our appropriation request. The House subcommittee voted unanimously for our appropriation and so did the full Administration Committee. I think this House is perfectly familiar with these specious arguments and I wish to state that some of the alleged facts he again read to the House a few minutes ago are mistaken on his part, and are not accurate.

I wish to say only this, that this committee is not going to take much time of the House today to reply to his repetitious statements. The House is familiar with them already over a term of years. However, because it might occur that some of the new Members of this great body have not yet heard of any justification for our committee's annual appropriation, I will state it as follows below. First, on behalf of my distinguished chairman and all our members of the committee of nine, I wish to thank the House Administration Committee for its favorable, unanimous report to this House on House Resolution 249 which is before you today.

And whereas the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], a few minutes ago, called attention of the House to the fact that yesterday the House Rules Committee had voted against the Roosevelt resolution to abolish our committee and transfer its duties to the House Judiciary Committee, I think this House should be informed by me that the announced vote, supporting the work of this committee, on the Roosevelt resolution was 12 to 1 against the same. Therefore, I wish now to thank the House Rules Committee for its almost unanimous expression of renewed confidence and respect for the work of more than 20 years of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Inasmuch as this is the largest appropriation the committee has requested, I believe that, in fairness to the Members of this House who are being asked to approve it, I should explain why the committee has asked for this sum.

Some of you may wonder why the committee today needs more than double the amount of money it operated on years ago—in the 80th Congress, for example, when it expended only $300,000 for the 2 years.

The principal factors involved in the committee's increased operating costs are the following:

First. An increase of well over 100 percent in congressional staff personnel pay since 1945. To illustrate: A congressional employee who earned $7,000 in 1945—even if he has never received a promotion or personal raise in pay during all the years—today earns $15,349.65.

Inasmuch as about six-sevenths of the committee's expenditures are for salaries, it is obvious that by far the largest single element in the committee's increased operating needs is the general pay raises granted all congressional employees over the years.

Second. The Committee on Un-American Activities, unlike most other committees, is an investigating committee. This means not only that it must employ full-time investigators, but that it must pay their investigative expenses as well as their salaries. It now has six investigators, by the way, two of them ex-FBI agents and one a former agent of the Secret Service.

Here, too, costs have risen considerably. The per diem allowance for traveling congressional employees was once $7. Then it went to $9. Now it is $12. The mileage allowance has gone up similarly, from 9 to 12 cents per mile.

These facts, combined with the fact that investigators generally have to spend more time in the field than in years past, mean that the committee's investigative costs—even though it has fewer investigators than formerly—are now much higher than before.

Why must our investigators spend more time in the field? Primarily because the Communist Party has gone successively deeper and deeper underground since the days of the 80th Congress.

There was a time when hundreds, even thousands, of known Communists operated more or less above ground in numerous fields. Those days are gone—I hope forever. But the more dangerous secret Communists are still with us in significant numbers, the danger they pose is far from gone, it is very real—and with each passing day it becomes harder and harder to ferret them out. Longer and more intense investigative effort must be made for the committee's hearings. This is another reason its costs have gone up.

Third. Over the years, the committee has given some salary increases to its higher bracket personnel, the purpose being to obtain—and retain—qualified professional staff members in more important positions. This, however, has been a relatively minor factor.

Fourth. The number of staff employees, over the years, have been increased from 40 to 50. This has been brought about by the increased workload of the committee. Let me give you an example of this.

Unlike other committees, the Committee on Un-American Activities is charged with retaining its files from year to year. They are not turned over to the House. In its 25 years of operation, it has accumulated a mass—and a wealth—of data of communism, Communists, and party and front operations in this country. Filing and indexing this material is a tremendous job—and one that must be done if the data is to have any value.

This work and the work of preparing information based on this data for Members of Congress, and for the committee's investigative staff occupies the full time of over 20 percent of the committee's employees. This is an expense that no other committee in the House—or the Senate—has.

How important is this data? In Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947, the so-called loyalty order, President Truman directed that the names of all applicants for Federal employment be checked against these files of the committee. This was continued during the administration of President Eisenhower and is still being done today in the administration of President Kennedy. These files are used by the FBI, the Civil Service Commission, and various other security agencies. Representatives of such executive agencies made more than 2,000 visits to the committee last year for this purpose.

And what about the Members of Congress?

During the 5-year period, 1958–62, the number of requests for information from Members of Congress handled by the committee's files and reference section almost doubled—and here are some figures on the last 3 years:

In 1960, the committee received 2,200 requests for information from Members, an increase of 27 percent over the previous year.

In 1961, the committee received 3,200 requests from Members, an increase of 45 percent over 1960.

In 1962, the committee received 3,800 requests from Members, an increase of 19 percent over 1961.

In 1960, the committee prepared 1,945 reports for Members of Congress in response to requests received; in 1961, 2,500 reports; in 1962, 3,747 reports—an increase of 50 percent over the previous year.

Mr. Speaker, that is a lot of reports. And that is what I have in mind when I say that the committee's workload has increased.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that the facts I have cited are sufficient to justify the committee's appropriation request and the action of our fine colleagues of the Administration Committee in approving it.

This request for the $360,000 for our annual expenses comes to you with the unanimous approval by the expressed vote of all of the members of the committee.

I wish also to say that on inquiring of my distinguished chairman [Mr. WALTER] as to what his wish was about a yea-and-nay vote on final passage, he sent word to me that if he were on the floor he would think it would be very unfortunate not to have a yea-and-nay vote on final passage of this resolution. So I am notifying the House now that on final passage of this resolution, on behalf of my chairman and with the unanimous approval of my committee, I am going to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. If the gentleman will yield, will the gentleman answer these questions: The gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] stated that the committee had pilloried the Women Strike for Peace organization in the action of the chairman at the hearings. Is it not true that one Mrs. Lyla Hoffman, of Great Neck, Long Island, said she had been a member of the Communist Party 5 years previously, but refused to say whether or not she was a member now?

Mr. DOYLE. That is correct. Some of the women we subpenaed to come before those hearings reportedly had Communist Party membership or affiliation and pled the fifth amendment which was their constitutional privilege so to do. We expected these women to do that but because the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN], who was not present at the hearings, by the way, just now insinuated that these hearings were unfair and unjust and therefore without worthy foundation or justification. I will include in the closing of my remarks today the text of the opening statement which I made as subcommittee chairman on December 11, 1962, before we questioned any witnesses. The hearings we held were almost exclusively devoted to the fact of infiltration of this movement in and about the city of New York from which the gentleman emanates. My opening statement at the hearings will, I believe, clearly show that we did not imply or indicate that all the women, or most of the women in this movement for peace, were Communist affiliated, or subversive. His insinuation that the hearings were conducted for the purpose of lessening or weakening the movement for world peace is, of course, ridiculous on its face.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Is it not a fact that Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, the president of this organization, openly welcomes Fascists, Communists, and Nazis into this group?

Mr. DOYLE. In the closing moments of the hearings, she said she would welcome Communists into her group even though they were known Communists but we did not charge or infer that Mrs. Wilson was herself a Communist. I wish to make that argument crystal clear. I think I told her that to her face during the hearings and publicly, but I also stated that I thought her willingness to welcome known Communists into the leadership of the Women for Peace organization resulted in a disservice to this movement. Mrs. Wilson is not from New York, but is a resident of Washington, D.C., and she made it clear in her testimony that she did not claim to have any control over these groups in the New York area.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. That is correct.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROOSEVELT) there were—ayes 167, noes 22.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 386, nays 20, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—386

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Clausen
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Glenn
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Miller, Calif.
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Rains
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
St. George
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—20

Ashley
Brown, Calif.
Diggs
Dingell
Duncan
Edwards
Farbstein
Fraser
Gill
Gonzalez
Green, Oreg.
Kastenmeier
Multer
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ryan, N.Y.
Staebler

NOT VOTING—29

Barrett
Blatnik
Bow
Brademas
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Celler
Fallon
Gavin
Hawkins
Healey
Hébert
Hemphill
Jensen
Kee
Macdonald
Meader
Michel
Morse
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Powell
Rostenkowski
Sheppard
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Walter
Wyman

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Jensen.
Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Wyman.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois, with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Michel.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, again the House of Representatives has expressed its overwhelming approval of the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I was delighted to give it my support because I think this committee has alerted the American people to subversion in the United States.

Opponents of this committee have stated that reputations of American citizens have been besmirched. I have never seen a list of these injured parties, although in almost 11 years of service in the House of Representatives I have waited for these names.

It is interesting to note, and I am proud to state, that not one Republican Member of this House opposed appropriation of necessary funds to the Committee on Un-American Activities, today.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 74 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by H. Res. 73 of the Eighty-eighth Congress incurred by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $150,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistance, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all meetings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 1, following "That" insert "effective January 3, 1963".

Line 4, strike out "$150,000" and insert "$60,000".

Line 13, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"SEC. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 227 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1963, in carrying out its duties during the Eighty-eighth Congress, the Committee on Ways and Means is authorized to incur such expenses (not in excess of $25,000) as it deems advisable. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 4, strike out "$25,000" and insert "$12,500".

Line 9, insert the following new paragraph:

"SEC. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the resolutions considered today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THIS WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the rest of the week, if he can tell us, because I have had a number of inquiries on my side, as I am sure he has had on his side, as to what we may expect.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, we have finished the legislative business of the week. There will be no legislative program tomorrow. There is a possibility we may have a message from the White House, but I know of no other matter that might require the presence of Members.

Mr. Speaker, it will be the purpose tomorrow to ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn over until Monday.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

ARE WE CONDONING PIRACY

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, how much are our actions influenced by what Russia thinks?

Recently the United States has condoned piracy on the high seas, apparently because this piracy was sanctioned by Russia.

On February 17 an act of piracy was committed against a Venezuelan ship, the *Anzoateguy*. On the same day Russia praised the act of piracy, calling it:

> Another brilliant page to the heroic struggle. The banner of liberty has waved in the Caribbean Sea and the Atlantic Ocean.

Aside from firing across the bow of the pirate ship we did nothing. Only the naive would question that we could have captured the ship if we had desired.

In January 1961 a murderous assault was committed on the Portuguese ship *Santa Maria*. Members of the crew were murdered, and although American warships could easily have captured the ship, they were not allowed to do so apparently because Russia was loudly crying that this action of piracy was right because Russia was against Portugal.

Both of these actions clearly were acts of piracy, a crime so heinous that it is one of the few crimes specifically mentioned in our Constitution. The Congress at an early date authorized the President to instruct the commanders of our armed vessels to subdue, seize, take, and send into any port of the United States, any vessel or boat, the crew whereof shall be armed and which shall have attempted or committed a piratical aggression.

The warships of the world were not limited to merely seizing those who committed piratical acts against ships owned by their country, for a very early Supreme Court ruling stated:

> Pirates may, without doubt, be lawfully captured on the ocean by the public ships of every nation, for they are, in truth, the common enemies of all mankind.

The courts of the world also ruled that the definition of piracy need not depend on the motive of private gain. Under international law the warships of the United States or any nation have the right to seize ships held by pirates, bring them into port and try those guilty of piracy.

The Geneva Sea Conference, which was ratified by our Senate, stated:

> All states shall cooperate to the fullest possible extent in the repression of piracy on the high seas.

The refusal of our Government to capture the pirates of the Portuguese ship *Santa Maria* is in large part responsible for the bitterness which exists against us in Portugal today. This is particularly sad because Portugal has been our

friend since the Colonies first sought freedom from England.

Undoubtedly American ships could have seized the crews who committed the acts of piracy on both of these ships; but the pirates claimed they were Communist and Russia jumped to their defense. We should keep in mind that being Communist does not allow people to commit piracy with legal immunity. America must do what is right regardless of whether or not the wrongdoers are Communist.

I recently heard the remark: "It is a shame that Captain Kidd was born two centuries ago—he could have claimed he was a Communist and been given a haven instead of being hanged."

The United States must do what is right and not condone wrong just because the Communists try to force us.

MEXICAN FARM LABOR

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 78, which authorizes the existing arrangement between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, whereby Mexican nationals legally are brought to this country as a supplemental farm labor supply, will expire this year.

I have introduced H.R. 1836 to extend the program in its present form for 2 years.

I know of no subject on which there is more misunderstanding and misinformation. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "Grapes of Wrath Rot in the Sun," by Victor Riesel, which appeared in the Los Angeles Times of October 16, 1962. It seems to me to answer the charge that our farmers do not need the Mexican labor, and I commend it to the reading of every Member of Congress:

GRAPES OF WRATH ROT IN THE SUN

(By Victor Riesel)

MODESTO.—Grapes of wrath is the only crop being harvested the year round in this valley and for hundreds of miles south. Word of the farmers' revolt in the Midwest has stirred the growers, the fruit and vegetable ranchers in California.

I heard over in San Francisco that there was talk here in the lush San Joaquin Valley—among the operators of the fields which are the food factories, the vegetable baskets of the land—talk of revolt and letting the stuff rot.

If this revolt develops among the growers who sink their hearts and money into the ground, your food shopping bill at home will skyrocket.

Remembering well the days I covered farm and ranchers' and growers' revolts—the spilled milk, the rotting vegetables and melons and beans and lettuce—and aware that the growers here are avidly watching the National Farmers Organization revolt 1,500 miles east, I drove into the valley.

Let me tell you about Modesto. Small cities such as this one some 110 miles east of San Francisco will swing into the news if the fruit and vegetable growers make good their private angry warnings. If labor can strike, so can they, they say. Modesto is the county seat of Stanislaus County, in one of the most sprawling, fertile, productive valleys in the land. When I arrived there was peak harvesting of tomatoes.

The growers had been short 12,000 workers for more than a week. The losses can't be calculated. Some of the fruit which should have been harvested that week was finally picked—but a week too late. Much of it was overripe. One grower alone had $2,300 worth of tomatoes rejected by the cannery in a single day after he was able to start picking. The fruit was spoiled. Fewer tomatoes will reach far-off markets. The fewer the fruit, the higher the prices in the big cities.

Pickers are scarce for many reasons in the tomato fields, as well as in the more difficult asparagus and melon fields. Stanislaus County, for instance, needs 5,000 to 6,000 pickers for peaches early in the season. At the height of the season the growers need 11,000 men. Then, at the end virtually no hands are needed.

Mexican labor is eager to work. But the law says that there must be no U.S. workers available before the Mexicans—braceros—can come in. The U.S. workers can take their pick of picking. They wait and see where the work is less backbreaking.

So you can have the crisis of fruit suddenly ripening in the field. The crop must be picked or it rots. But many of the domestics are in one part of a county waiting for a peach crop while a melon crop is near ruin.

Then your sentiment all depends on where you sit. If you are a farmworker you just don't want to do "stoop labor." You don't want to go out into the higher paying melon fields in 110° heat picking melons and slinging them into a heavy bag over your aching shoulders. So you wait for the $1.10-an-hour peach-picking harvest.

But if you're a grower and your investment is out in that sun-baked field and a year's income may melt in that sun, you want help immediately. And you don't want to wait for the bureaucratic farmworkers referral offices or the other official agencies to decide at the last minute whether you can have Mexican help.

If you're a grower you're ready to pay—and I was startled at how much. I have just gone over wage costs in some fields. Mexican melon pickers, willing to work in the sun, have earned from $20 to $30 a day, while U.S. pickers have waited for the lower paying though less brutal peach crop, giving them $10 a day.

I have checked and rechecked payroll records on a melon ranch—and found that at the height of the season some packing shed workers have earned as much as $600 a week. Women in other shed operations have taken home over $200 a week. This happens during a period of 15 weeks. Some average $4,000 for that period. Others take $6,500. Then the crop runs out and they do get unemployment relief ranging up to $55 a week.

These are the steady workers. They lay off from the second week in October to late April. They start then in El Centro. They work the crop there and then swing onto a circuit—from El Centro to Yuma, Ariz., and on to the San Joaquin Valley in this general area.

The growers say they're ready to pay. But they want workers. They say that they are forced to take any itinerants who come along, though they may not be farmworkers, but want a few days pay and then drift on.

They report that in a batch of workers sent them not so long ago, just 1 man out of 1,798 domestic workers worked more than 4 weeks. All the others quit in a short time. In Salinas, America's vegetable basket, during one harvest season, only 63 out of 1,193 U.S. workers completed a job for which they were hired.

Small wonder one grower told me: "You folks in the big cities better take notice. One of these days the vegetable basket will be empty. We can strike, too. The unions do it. The farmers do it. We will, too."

SHALL THIS UNION OF STATES BE PRESERVED?

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Bonner Fellers, chairman of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, sent me a copy of a speech by the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill before the Missouri House of Representatives in Jefferson City on March 27, 1946. Believing Mr. Pettengill's remarks to be more pertinent now than they were 17 years ago, I insert them in the RECORD. One cannot help but state the conclusion that we have traveled a long way down the road cited by Mr. Pettengill.

SHALL THIS UNION OF STATES BE PRESERVED?

Missouri's share of the Federal debt is twice the assessed value of all your taxable property. Missouri has used its blood and treasure to save the United States from foreign foes. Will Missouri now show an equal resolution to save itself from being swallowed up by the Federal Government?

On our steady progress toward the centralization at Washington of both political, financial, and economic power over the lives of men, I ask this question: Between where we are now and where Hitler took the German people, at what point do you propose to stop?

It is very clear that we are moving away from "an indissoluble Union of indestructible States" toward a consolidated bureaucracy—a Europeanized America.

The first great breach in the dike of the American Constitution was the adoption of the 16th amendment authorizing the taxation of incomes without limit. The Federal Government, in time of peace, should have no more absolute power over your property than it has over your life or liberty. Many States have constitutional limits upon the power to tax and the power to go into debt. The Federal Government has none. But without such a restriction, then, as Governor Lehman of New York said, "The States may be deprived of the means of financing themselves and their local governments. They would become vassal States and as units of government, would disappear."

The second great breach in the dike was the Supreme Court decision in the second AAA case giving the general welfare clause, for the first time in judicial history, an interpretation which Thomas Jefferson held would remove the essential landmark dividing the Nation from the States. It held that Congress can spend money for purposes not specifically granted in the Constitution.

A prime purpose of the Constitution was to place limits on governmental power. But we now have vested in the Federal Government the unlimited power to tax and the unlimited power to appropriate. As a result, the Federal Government taxes away from Missouri the wealth, created by its citizens, and then by gift, loan, subsidy, and grants in aid, feeds Missouri money—less the political brokerage—back to Missouri. This makes Missouri and her officials suppliants to Federal power for the right to use the wealth which they create. Missouri and all other States now live by Federal grace and not by ancient right.

The third great breach in the dike came with the fantastic folly that the Federal Government can "create purchasing power," or as stated by Mr. Roosevelt, that it should "provide customers for business," by oiling up its printing press. This idea was taken straight from Mussolini and Hitler. With it goes the excuse that debt is of no importance because "we owe it to ourselves."

This has given the green light to the Rake's progress of easy money, the soft way out of difficulty. The degrading effect of this immoral doctrine upon the character of the American citizen is manifest on every hand. It is making America a nation of moochers and panhandlers. It invites to the Nation's Capital vast pressure groups which carry on a sort of civil war against each other for this corrupting flood of unearned dollar bills.

This is the moral cancer at the political heart of the Republic. It is destroying the unity of the Nation and the fraternal association of its people. It has led to 16 consecutive years of "charging it on the cuff," with no end in sight, and any end proposed by such men as Senator HARRY BYRD is bitterly opposed. It is leading to inflation and the dilution, if not the destruction, of the savings of the people. It is taking from their hands the power over the purse, the strongest weapon freemen have ever devised to prevent government from destroying them. It is substituting the gravy train for the American eagle as our national symbol.

It should be plain to all but rakes and thieves that the Federal Government cannot create wealth, cannot create purchasing power in any honest use of words. If the Government taxes Peter to pay Paul, it simply forces the transfer of wealth from one to the other; it does not create new wealth or enrich the Nation by a dime. The same is true when it sells its bonds to Peter to give the money to Paul. It is equally true when it prints money or sells its bonds to commercial banks. This also transfers wealth by diluting the value of every dollar earned by honest toil and saved by homely thrift.

It is as dishonest as pouring water into milk. Having taken value out of good dollars, as thieving kings once clipped the edges off gold coins, the Federal Government, through OPA is now trying as desperately to give value to its watered money in order to conceal its fiscal crimes, as when men were guillotined for refusing to give up wheat and wine for the diluted paper currency of the Government of France when it began to issue counterfeit money to pay its bills.

This process not only strengthens the Executive and weakens Congress by making it possible (for awhile) to carry on vast socialistic programs without resort to taxation and the brake on spending which taxation always exerts, but it is a sword in the vitals of the States of the Union.

This is so because States and cities are forbidden to print or coin money to pay their debts. They cannot make the money markets their creatures nor depreciate interest rates at their caprice. When States, counties, cities, and towns undertake to borrow money, they have to pay interest rates established in a free market, and must satisfy the lender that the loan is sound. To pay interest and principal of debt, States and municipalities have to get the cash the hard but honest way—by taxing the people. This puts some brake on their borrowings, some resistance to socializing the business of their taxpayers. You see this force at work in every municipal ownership election.

The Federal Government, however, is under none of these restrictions. It can force interest rates down, borrow huge funds cheaply, pay its obligations of interest and principal by converting more of its promises into Federal Reserve notes, or by devaluing its gold and silver hoards—"clipping the coins" to pay its bills—or by outright greenbacks.

The Federal Government has a printing press; the States do not. This easy money route promotes the growth of Federal power and subtracts from State and local self-government, which we thought for centuries to be necessary to prevent the return of Caesars, or dictators.

It is high time to recall the words of the great British statesman, William Pitt: "No civilization * * * can be accepted as secure in which expenditure is greater than revenue." It is imperative that the Octopus on the Potomac be made to balance its budget.

There must be no Missouri compromise with the principles for which our fathers died.

SAMUEL B. PETTENGILL.

GRAFTON, VT.

IMPORTATION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ALREADY IN SURPLUS

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today proposed legislation which I feel is of great importance to the future of agriculture in the United States. That future at the moment is clouded with the uncertainties of decreasing markets, uncertain prices, surpluses, subsidies, and Government control. This bill deals with but a part of the agricultural situation, a part that is sometimes overlooked but that nevertheless must be dealt with if we ever hope to arrive at a lasting solution to the overall problems facing American agriculture. The particular situation to which I refer is that of the importation of agricultural commodities which are already in surplus.

It has always been a source of amazement to me that we explain our surpluses strictly in terms of the farmer. That misunderstood man in overalls has been maligned again and again as the cause of our surpluses, simply because he became the best farmer in the history of mankind. But we must look deeper for the total reason for our surpluses.

We are presently importing, and have been for a number of years, several agricultural commodities, already in surplus, in such large quantities that these imports are, in effect, being placed in storage. The taxpayer pays the storage costs, prices are edged higher through support payments, the resultant higher prices attract further imports, and the American farmer is left literally holding the feedbag, watching his market disappear into the oversea sunset. It should be obvious that we must reexamine our position on imports.

My colleagues will recall that I have noted on other occasions a number of specific crops where our imports far exceeded our surpluses. For instance, in a 10-year period we imported twice as much barley as our surplus grew during the same period. We imported over four times as much oats in that same 10 years as our surplus grew. Rye is another example. Meat products have experienced similar evidence of injury to American producers because of excessive imports.

Permit me to state at this point that I am not against all imports of agricultural products. Nor do I feel that imports alone are the only and complete solution to the agricultural problem. But I do think that it is unreasonable to propose or request that American farmers curtail their production of certain commodities which are in surplus, and at the same time make no effort to at least control the imports which have played such a large part in creating many of the surpluses.

We gathered in this House today to consider a supplemental appropriations bill, which was most essential under the circumstances. There are many reasons why we had to consider it at this time. One reason, while not a major one, was that Government purchases and stocks of dairy products were much higher than anticipated. This alerts us to problems on the import scene that have come about in recent months, and in particular, a real problem for the future of the dairy industry.

While this Government buys our surplus dairy products, increased shipments of cream arrive at our ports from overseas. The National Milk Producers Federation, in its February 21, 1963, news bulletin, notes that "continuing imports of foreign cream as of February 2 totaled some 500,000 pounds since January 1, according to a midmonth report by the Bureau of Customs." The same bulletin reports that 2 million additional pounds are reported en route to eastern ports.

This can only serve to further aggravate the whole agricultural scene. In fact, it could result in our being asked to appropriate additional funds to purchase dairy products under existing laws.

The bill I have introduced today, however, provides that the President should call for an investigation by the U.S. Tariff Commission in such cases as these when any agricultural commodity which is in surplus is being imported. It does not order anyone to do anything. It does not close the door on imports. But it does make possible a determination of the facts regarding imports of such commodities, and will provide a solid basis on which realistic approaches and decisions can be made.

I respectfully urge the prompt consideration of this bill.

IMPACTED AREA ASSISTANCE

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may

extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to extend the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874 for 2 years. It is my sincere hope that the Congress will act favorably on this legislation early in the session and thus avoid the chaotic situation we faced 2 years ago.

In the 1st session of the 87th Congress, we allowed these laws to expire because there were hopes of passing a general education bill which would include impacted area assistance. But, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, general education did not pass—we only succeeded in delaying and postponing the issue of impacted area aid until the closing hours of the session.

We imposed considerable hardship upon communities dependent on Federal funds. Local budget planning was extremely difficult. In many small towns, education constitutes a sizable portion of the budget. If Federal funds were not forthcoming, the tax rate would have to be raised. Not knowing whether they would receive Federal funds, they obviously could not estimate expenditures or tax rates for the coming year.

Mr. Speaker, this year we must avoid such a situation. Local communities look to the Congress for prompt, responsible action. The question of impacted area aid should be considered on its own merits and not tied to an omnibus education bill.

The need for Public Laws 874 and 815 is well established. Across the Nation, some 4,065 educational agencies are eligible for operation and maintenance aid, some 217 for construction assistance. To the 12th Congressional District of Massachusetts, for example, this aid totals about $1.5 million.

Recently I have received many letters from superintendents of schools, school boards, and interested citizens urging my support for early extension of Public Laws 815 and 874.

Harvard H. Broadbent, superintendent:

> The Barnstable School Committee adopted a resolution requesting that you support an early extension of Public Laws 874 and 815 in their present form.

Sandwich School Commission:

> Request immediate consideration and passage of renewal of Public Laws 874 and 815 in their present form.

John J. Rolfe, Wareham superintendent:

> Support the continuance of section B of Public Law 874. In its present form Wareham receives $35,000 each year under section B.

Albert F. Hunt, superintendent:

> Bridgewater School Committee favor extension of Public Laws 874 and 815 in their present form.

William Ripley, Jr., superintendent:

> We are particularly interested in continuing the B section of Public Laws 874 and 815. During the past 4 years Cohasset has received an average of $13,220.37 per year under Public Law 874. The loss of this money would mean approximately $1 per thousand on the tax rate on real estate.

F. Edward Nicolas, superintendent:

> To the town of Plymouth in dollars, it means a loss of $22,000 which is computed as a budget figure for 1963–64. * * * Urgently request you to support an early extension of Public Laws 874 and 815 in their present form.

Everett L. Handy, superintendent:

> I am writing to ask your continued support of Public Laws 874 and 815 in their present form. During the past several years Duxbury has benefited considerably by payments under Public Law 874 and with this money has been able to extend a number of areas of the school program which it would have been difficult to do had this money not been available. Although Duxbury does not qualify under Public Law 815 in my judgment there are many communities so located that the assistance of this law is most deserving.

Sydney G. Pierce, superintendent, Eastham-Orleans-Wellfleet regional school:

> Urge you to support an early extension of Public Laws 874 and 815.

Donald Fisher, superintendent, West Bridgewater:

> Aware of the great burden our larger school budget places on the local property taxpayers we recognize the Federal allocation of funds and the State reimbursement money have aided greatly in giving our children worthwhile educational program.

Leonard G. Palopoli, assistant superintendent:

> The school authorities of Abington will be most grateful for any efforts which you may exert in behalf of favoring the continuance of all the provisions of Public Laws 874 and 815.

Wilfred H. Graves, superintendent, Bourne:

> I sincerely hope that I may have a great deal of help from you * * * to initiate early consideration of renewal of these programs. If this drags out, I am afraid we can expect a long hard pull, that may extend well through the summer.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat for emphasis, the need for impacted area legislation is well established—local schools expect responsible, early consideration from the Congress—we cannot let Public Laws 815 and 874 expire—the question should be considered on its own merits—I urge the Congress to act expeditiously on this legislation.

UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND: ANALYSIS CONTINUED

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in my continuing investigation into the workings—may I say the amazing workings—of the United Nations Special Fund, I have come across a United Nations declaration that points out candidly that this Fund is a foreign aid program designed to strengthen nations.

Now, strengthening nations may be all well and good. Particularly, in view of the 40-percent contribution which the United States makes to the Special Fund's finances, it may be good for the American taxpayers if friends of the United States are strengthened.

But, can there be any possible sane reason for America's overwrought taxpayers subsidizing the building up of nations committed to the burying of the free Western civilization?

I commend the following article, provided by Mr. Philip Deane, Director of the U.N. Information Center here in Washington, to the attention of my colleagues, and I wish to point out two particular statements within it:

First. In the eighth paragraph Mr. Deane tells us that the Special Fund is not "charity," saying:

> The country that receives nearly always gives more than it receives.

Mr. Deane might just as easily have pointed out that the United States always gives far more than it receives. That is not hard when you are receiving nothing. However, he does not note that Poland, Yugoslavia, and Cuba have contributed to the Special Fund far less than they have received from the Fund. That must be some sort of charity.

It appears that the United Nations by the use of fuzzy argument is deliberately attempting to mislead the American taxpayers who are footing most of the bill.

Second. May I direct your attention now to the ninth paragraph of the accompanying U.N. statement. There we are told that the United States pays only 17 cents for every dollar's worth of Special Fund project. That, of course, depends upon the amount of contribution to the project made by the receiving nation. That rate varies from project to project.

As I have pointed out before, the value to the United States of these local contributions is limited by currency-convertibility restrictions imposed by the benefiting nations—especially Communist nations who benefit. They provide that almost none of their funds may be spent in the United States or for U.S. equipment or experts.

Finally, I ask the Members of this House to note the title of the U.N. statement: "United Nations Special Fund—A No-Frills, Low-Cost Approach to Self-Help for Underdeveloped Countries."

This tells us that it is not a "frill" to delve into the mating habits of the desert locust and not a "frill" to provide for nuclear research in Communist Yugolslavia. These cannot be frills because the U.N. Special Fund says they are not. Did anybody ask the American taxpayers?

This title tells us, for instance, that Communist Poland and Yugoslavia are underdeveloped because the U.N. Special Fund says they are—not because the American taxpayer says they are.

Again, this title tells us that the Special Fund is a low cost arrangement.

Well, certainly it is low cost for the Communist bloc which makes a token contribution and never increases it as I have shown this House. Certainly it is low cost for the U.N. which has no money of its own to spend anyhow. Certainly it is low cost for the Red nations of Cuba, Poland, and Yugoslavia which are getting back dollars for every nickel they contribute to the Special Fund.

Just as certainly, this Special Fund is not low cost to the American taxpayer, who is footing 40 percent of the Special Fund bill and who has generously increased his contributions to the Fund 300 percent in 5 years while the U.S.S.R. has not increased contributions at all.

It becomes obvious that we Americans are finding out that there is far more to this U.N. Special Fund iceberg than is evident above the surface of the United Nations propaganda.

It is time we got the shivers about this thing and got busy chipping away the frosty excesses of a foreign aid program paid for chiefly by Americans—who already are paying for their own aid to places they at least can decide whether or not to aid.

United Nations Special Fund: A No-Frills, Low-Cost Approach to Self-Help for Underdeveloped Countries

1. Help, sometimes, is no help. A gift, a loan or an investment in a developing country might be largely wasted if that country does not have trained people to put to work the help they get. Even if there are trained people, they will not make the best use of the help they receive if they don't know what resources their country has, what can be developed and what cannot; white elephants and castles in Spain can waste a lot of money. Moreover, unless a developing country can show it has resources ripe for development, that country will not attract investment; businessmen—local as well as international—don't launch into the unknown with their shareholders' money.

2. This vital preinvestment work—producing technical and managerial skills, proving resources, stimulating investment—is the main business of the United Nations Special Fund.

3. The Special Fund runs surveys that reveal what wealth exists in a nation's land, water, minerals, oil, forests.

4. The Special Fund helps set up programing units of experts who can put first things first on the priority lists of developing countries.

5. The Special Fund helps set up schools for administrators, managers, technical experts, foremen and ordinary craftsmen even.

6. The Special Fund helps with teachers' colleges because without high school graduates, no country can beat poverty.

7. All this is essential preinvestment work. Its cost, like seed money, is little. It yields rich and indispensable harvests.

8. The Special Fund is not charity. The country that receives nearly always gives more than it receives—to the project on its own soil and to projects in other less fortunate lands. Further, the Special Fund mobilizes additional resources from European and other industrialized countries, some of whose contributions are substantial.

9. As a result, for every dollar's worth of project completed with Special Fund participation, the United States pays only 17 cents. Other forms of economic aid often cost the United States a full hundred cents to the dollar. The contribution of the United States to the Special Fund's 246 projects thus far approved will reach $84 million.[1] The total cost of these projects is $496 million [1] and their yield is incalculable.

10. Every Special Fund operation is a telling lesson in the no-nonsense, no-frills, self-help approach to economic development.

11. The Special Fund is welcome wherever it works.

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Siler] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I notice that one of the great departments of our Federal Government, Health, Education, and Welfare, has allotted a sum of $250,000 to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] for aiding him in trying to solve the problem of juvenile delinquency. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] is pastor of a large Baptist Church in New York City and part of the allotted fund is to be paid to his own church as rent for the basement of the church building that will be used as a site for this work, a total of $17,000 being earmarked for such rent.

Now as an active Baptist myself, I know how zealously and jealously we Baptists always try to guard against any breach whatsoever in the wall of separation between church and state. If the Powell church had been a Catholic Church, instead of a Baptist Church, we Baptists and many others of similar conviction would have been up in arms because of this use of public tax money indirectly for a sectarian purpose. We would have decried the use of sectarian property for governmental functions, especially at what appears to be a very lavish outlay of rental consideration. And I certainly think we would have been amply justified in our criticism of this kind of public tax money and of this manner of governmental use of a specific church building. If these things might have been considered out of place in relation to a Catholic Church, then they are equally out of place in relation to a Baptist Church. I think we should be fair, unprejudiced, and always quick to condemn in our very own circle that which we might readily condemn if it involved another circle down the street from us. Therefore, I would like to put myself on record as a stringent and uncompromising critic of the use of this public tax money through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for rent of a Baptist Church basement at $17,000, both because of the public tax money involved and the governmental function to be pursued in the church mentioned. Doubtless there are 1,000 suitable places in New York City that are neither sectarian nor of any religious relationship whatever which might have been used for the money and purpose involved in this instance. Why not avoid the very appearance of evil? Shades of Roger Williams, the original Baptist leader in America, let us have a completely free church or churches in a completely free state—not a tax-subsidized or tax-sustained church in some kind of sectarian state here in our country.

CUBA

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the news today carries a story that a top Communist in Cuba, Raul Castro, admits only Russian help keeps the Cubans alive. Thus, the Communist government in Cuba becomes one of the few countries in the world in which there has been food rationing, and now clothing rationing has been added to their problems. All of which indicates that the pressures which have been applied to the Communist government of Cuba are having some desired effects from the U.S. standpoint.

There are some who continue to engage in what I call the numbers game, how many Russians and Chinese in Cuba; or who continue to engage in a game of having intelligence information which is better than that of the United States about what is going on with respect to the Communist movements in Cuba or other places around the world. I have two observations to make for people who are still interested in the past or determining exactly Russian actions in Cuba. One is that we have enough congressional investigations going on now—one man or otherwise—to satisfy the most partisan and the most meticulous on those questions.

The second observation is, as our President has said, the danger is not in whether there is one soldier or not in Communist Cuba—the danger is the fact that communism exists in Cuba and it is the base for subversion in the entire hemisphere, therefore all of our policies must be directed to the eradication of that Communist government and that cancer. With this, all of us can agree.

The time has come for us to take those additional actions which would hasten that day of deterioration and final eradication of the Communist government in Cuba. It is heartening, Mr. Speaker, to know that the Cuban problem will be on the agenda of the next conference of the American governments that will take place at Costa Rica.

It is also encouraging, Mr. Speaker, to know that the Organization of American States continues its keen awareness of the Communist offensive in the Western Hemisphere. By resolution of the eighth meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs held at Punta del Este, Uruguay, in January 1962, a special consultative committee on security was created. This advisory body, made up of experts, was deemed necessary to advise member governments which might require and request assistance in the common goal of fighting the subversive action of international communism and preserving democracy in the Americas.

That committee has made several reports and important recommendations for the consideration of the American governments. In light of the coming meeting, and because of their very nature, these recommendations are important. In its initial general report of 1962, the special consultative committee on security recommended as follows:

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations set forth below are the recommendations that the committee, in this first stage of its work, has considered pertinent with respect to resolution 112(c) of the eighth meeting of consultation of ministers of foreign affairs. The first recommendations are restricted to the measures that the American states should take to counteract the subversive action of international communism; the second, to other aspects of the problem contemplated in Resolution II of Punta del Este.

A. MEASURES TO COUNTERACT SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

First. According to resolution II of the eighth meeting of consultation, the committee is to submit to the Council of the Organization in this report any general recommendations it considers pertinent in this initial stage of its work regarding measures that should be taken with respect to the subversive action of international communism. To that end, the committee carefully examined the efforts that have been made in the past to combat and to eradicate from this hemisphere subversive activities directed, assisted, or instigated by extracontinental powers, designed to replace our democratic institutions with totalitarian ideologies and forms of government.

Second. This almost uninterrupted struggle against subversive action has now entered its third decade. When the activities of the Axis agents were involved, the system of security against subversion functioned satisfactorily and gave satisfactory results. The first three meetings of consultation recommended the various kinds of internal measures that each state should take to prevent and punish espionage, sabotage, propaganda, and the other subversive activities, and those that should be taken to insure the degree of international cooperation required for the effective operation of the system. The earnestness with which the governments adopted measures and cooperated with each other made it possible to check Nazi-Fascist subversive action in the Western Hemisphere effectively.

3. Unfortunately, the situation has been, and continues to be, entirely different in the matter of the fight against the subversive action of the international Communist movement. It cannot be denied that not only have the results obtained in World War II not been obtained in this matter, but the Sino-Soviet powers have been able to carry on their offensive largely unimpeded in several countries, and a beachhead has been established in American territory, which constitutes a very grave threat to the security of the hemisphere. This development of the Communist offensive is contrary to the objectives and decisions that have appeared in resolutions adopted by the Inter-American Conferences and Meetings of Consultation since 1948. For purposes of the recommendations stated below, the committee deems it advisable to pause here in order to quote the pertinent sections of the abovementioned resolutions.

4. When the problem of the preservation and defense of democracy against the threat of subversive action by international communism was presented for the first time at the Conference of Bogotá (1948), the American republics resolved:

1. To reaffirm their decision to maintain and further an effective social and economic policy for the purpose of raising the standard of living of their peoples; and their conviction that only under a system founded upon a guarantee of the essential freedoms and rights of the individual is it possible to attain this goal.

2. To condemn the methods of every system tending to suppress political and civil rights and liberties, and in particular the action of international communism or any other totalitarian doctrine.

3. To adopt, within their respective territories and in accordance with their respective constitutional provisions, the measures necessary to eradicate and prevent activities, directed, assisted, or instigated by foreign governments, organizations, or individuals tending to overthrow their institutions by violence, to foment disorder in their domestic political life, or to disturb, by means of pressure, subversive propaganda, threats, or by any other means, the free and sovereign right of their peoples to govern themselves in accordance with their democratic aspirations.

4. To proceed with a full exchange of information concerning any of the aforementioned activities that are carried on within their respective jurisdictions.

5. The Fourth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs (Washington, 1951), convoked specifically because "the growing threat of international Communist aggression has demonstrated the urgent necessity that the free nations of the world determine the most effective methods for preserving their freedom and independence," and "the need for adopting measures to insure the economic, political, and military defense of this hemisphere is urgent and of common interest to the American Republics," resolved:

1. To recommend to the Governments of the American States:

(a) That, mindful of their unity of purpose and taking account of the contents of Resolution VI of the Second Meeting of Consultation in Havana and Resolution XXXII of the Ninth International Conference of American States in Bogotá, each American Republic examine its respective laws and regulations and adopt such changes as it may consider necessary to assure that the subversive activities of the agents of international communism, directed against any of them, may be adequately prevented and punished;

(b) That, in accordance with their respective constitutional provisions, they enact measures necessary to regulate in the countries of America transit across international boundaries of those foreigners who there is reason to expect will attempt to carry out subversive acts against the defense of the American Continent; and

(c) That, in the application of this resolution, they bear in mind the necessity of guaranteeing and defending by the most efficacious means the rights of the human person as well as their firm determination to preserve and defend the basic democratic institutions of the peoples of the American Republics.

For the purpose of facilitating the fulfillment of the objectives of this resolution, it was recommended that the Pan American Union prepare technical studies on certain aspects of subversive action. In accordance with the recommendation, the Department of Legal Affairs prepared a report on "Strengthening of Internal Security," which was submitted to the governments and published in 1953.

6. In the "Declaration of Solidarity for the Preservation of the Political Integrity of the American States Against the Intervention of International Communism," the Tenth Inter-American Conference (Caracas, 1954), again insisted on the need to adopt and carry out measures to counteract the subversive activities of the international Communist movement, recommending that the American governments, without prejudice to such other measures as they might consider desirable, should give special attention to the following steps for the purpose of counteracting such activities within their respective jurisdictions:

(a) Measures to require disclosure of the identity, activities, and sources of funds of those who are spreading propaganda of the international Communist movement or who travel in the interests of that movement, and of those who act as its agents or in its behalf; and

(b) The exchange of information among governments to assist in fulfilling the purpose of the resolution adopted by the inter-American conferences and meetings of ministers of foreign affairs regarding international communism.

7. In view of the foregoing, the committee has not considered it necessary, in this initial stage of its work, to examine the measures intended to counteract subversive activities. It considers that, at least for the moment, it has the vast experience acquired through the measures adopted during World War II. However, the committee does consider it desirable—and an unavoidable duty—owing to the nature and scope of its terms of reference, to point out to the Council of the Organization the urgent need for each and every one of the American governments to give the greatest possible application to the measures that have been adopted since 1948 by the Inter-American Conferences and Meetings of Consultation. As stated above, in the fight against the subversive action of international communism, the American governments in general have not, unfortunately, demonstrated the same zeal and earnestness that they manifested during World War II in fighting Nazi-Fascist subversive action, and perhaps this is one of the reasons for the degree of development of Sino-Soviet and Castro activities in these past few years.

8. In connection with the foregoing, it should be noted that, in Resolution VIII, the Fourth Meeting of Consultation (1951) explicitly stated:

Since the said subversive action recognizes no boundaries, the present situation requires, in addition to adequate internal measures, a high degree of international cooperation among the American Republics, looking to the eradication of any threat of subversive activity which may endanger democracy and the free way of life in the American Republics.

It is obvious, therefore, that owing to the methods employed by international communism, the lack of cooperation of one State can render inoperative the measures adopted by a contiguous State; and when several States fail to cooperate, the system for defense against subversion as a whole becomes ineffective. The interdependence of the measures to counteract subversive action is such that if any government fails to apply them, the system is weakened and its entire effectiveness is undermined. This is the impression one receives from surveying the American scene over the past few years.

9. Along the same line of thought, the committee would also like to recommend that, in adopting and applying internal

---

[1] These figures were true as of several months ago; they should now read $98 million and $589 million.

measures, the governments act with the necessary vigor which is required to combat subversive action. In making this recommendation, the committee has kept in mind especially two fundamental considerations: the first is that the agents of international communism, as the fourth meeting of consultation stated, are attempting to destroy the democratic institutions, "utilizing for this purpose the exploitation and the abuse of these selfsame democratic liberties"; and secondly, that the measures adopted by the competent authorities to counteract the subversive action, whatever its nature and scope, are not, by any means, inconsistent with the internal and international obligation of the state to respect human rights and fundamental liberties.

10. In connection with this second consideration, the committee wishes to add that the subversive action of international communism presupposes the performance of acts directed, assisted, or instigated by foreign powers or governments, and that therefore, they constitute grave acts against the public order and the security of the state, especially when the agent carrying out the subversive action is a national or citizen of that state. Under the laws of all the countries of the world, and the international instruments governing the matter, the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental liberties is subject to the limitations and restrictions that the state is expressly authorized to impose for reasons of internal security or other reasons that are considered vital to the welfare of the nation. It can be easily understood, therefore, what a legal and political mistake it would be to tolerate subversive activity or fail to combat it adequately, out of fear that human rights and fundamental liberties would not be respected.

11. The above recommendations and considerations, therefore, are completely consistent with the aim, already expressed in Resolution VIII repeatedly quoted, that in applying the measures referred to, the states should bear in mind "the necessity of guaranteeing and defending by the most efficacious means the rights of the human person as well as their firm determination to preserve and defend the basic democratic institutions of the peoples of the American Republics." On this point, the above-mentioned Pan American Union report states that in its conclusions care was taken to guard against the possibility that such ways and means be used to obstruct or suppress genuinely democratic expressions of opinion, activities, or political aspirations, completely foreign to international communism." The same legitimate concern appears again in Resolution I4(c) of the Eighth Meeting of Consultation as one of the basic political principles set forth in that resolution:

"The repudiation of repressive measures which, under the pretext of isolating or combating communism, may facilitate the appearance or strengthening of reactionary doctrines and methods which attempt to repress ideas of social progress and to confuse truly progressive and democratic labor organizations and cultural and political movements with Communist subversion.

"B. Vigilance for the Purpose of Warning Against Acts of Aggression, Subversion, or Other Dangers to Peace and Security, and Self-Defense."

In establishing this Committee, the Eighth Meeting of Consultation resolved:

1. To request the Council of the Organization of American States to maintain all necessary vigilance, for the purpose of warning against any acts of aggression, subversion, or other dangers to peace and security, or the preparation of such acts, resulting from the continued intervention of Sino-Soviet powers in this hemisphere and to make recommendations to the governments of the member states with regard thereto.

In the preamble to Resolution II, it is stated "it is advisable, therefore, to make available to the Council of the Organization of American States a body of an advisory nature * * *. In this connection, the committee takes the libery of offering its technical services to the Council for the purposes outlined in the paragraph cited above. To this effect, the committee also takes the liberty of submitting to the Council for consideration its recommendation that the member States be invited to furnish the Council with any information that they may exchange between themselves, pursuant to the resolutions mentioned above, as well as any evidence they obtain regarding Communist deception that can be added to the evidence contained in this report. This information would be examined by the committee from the purely technical standpoint, in accordance with whatever directives the Council might issue to it, in order that general studies and pertinent recommendations might be submitted to the Council for consideration.

The Committee makes this recommendation having in mind the fact that Communist deception and techniques vary constantly, and that only by studying them in a determined, continuous, and comparative manner can conclusions be reached and suggestions made that would be of great utility in more effectively combating communism. In all this, the committee is fully aware that it is the governments and peoples of America who have the right, capacity, and interest to counteract the subversive action of the international Communist movement.

The eighth meeting of consultation also resolved:

"3. To urge the member states to take those steps that they may consider appropriate for their individual or collective self-defense, and to cooperate, as may be necessary or desirable, to strengthen their capacity to counteract threats or acts of aggression, subversion, or other dangers to peace and security resulting from the continued intervention in this hemisphere of Sino-Soviet powers, in accordance with the obligations established in treaties and agreements such as the Charter of the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance."

In view of the nature and scope of this paragraph of Resolution II, the committee considers that it would be highly desirable for the General Secretariat to prepare a study of the background of the exercise of individual and collective self-defense, especially with reference to the threats and acts referred to in the said paragraph.

The committee also deems that it would be very useful to the general objectives of Resolution II if the General Secretariat would issue a new, up-to-date edition of the report on "Strengthening of Internal Security," published in 1953.

MANUEL CAMPOS JIMÉNEZ,
Chairman of the Committee.
JULIO CÉSAR DOIG SÁNCHEZ,
Vice Chairman of the Committee.
FRANCISCO MARCELO RAMÍREZ.
THOMAS D. WHITE.
JOAQUIM CANUTO MENDES DE ALMEIDA.
JULIO CÉSAR VADORA ROZIER.
JOAQUÍN ZALDIVAR.
APRIL 30, 1962.

Mr. Speaker, in a recent additional report, the committee has made other recommendations to the American Governments. Among these are:

First. The effective control of travel to Cuba, including both national and international procedures.

Second. Exchange of information between governments on known Communist subversive agents and persons who travel to Cuba.

Third. Plan to counteract, weaken, or cancel out Communist propaganda carried on through any medium.

Fourth. Enact measures which might control the transfer of funds for subversive purposes. Also to exercise strict control over national procedures used by Communists to obtain funds.

Fifth. Improving the intelligence services of each country to coordinate and carry out effective action against Communist subversion.

Sixth. Establish real and effective collaboration of those agencies in each country charged with action against Communist subversion.

Seventh. Transmit all information on subversive activities to the central committee.

These and other stringent measures which have been recommended are only the forerunner of the joint action which can and must be taken by the members of the Organization of American States to meet the Communist threat in all of Latin America and to help bring about the elimination of the Communist base in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, as I have maintained for several years, the American states must take all cooperative action, military, economic, and ideological to deal with the menace of communism in the Western Hemisphere, and particularly the problem of Cuba. As our President has stated, the existence of a Communist government in Cuba is incompatible with the inter-American system and all our policies are directed toward its elimination.

I would hope, as we all do, that effective joint action of the American countries will be successful in meeting the threat of Communist subversion in Latin America and in eliminating the Communist government in Cuba. However, in the final analysis, as I have repeatedly maintained for several years, the existence of a Communist government in Cuba is a direct threat to the peace and security of the United States and failing all else, the United States must, in its own security interests, take whatever action necessary, military or economic, to eradicate that government.

FREIGHT RATES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide a means by which freight rates established under that section for the U.S. Government may be set aside if they are unjustly discriminatory or unduly prejudicial.

Contrary to common belief, Mr. Speaker, there are two sets of rules in public ratemaking.

The rules for private industry are set forth in the Interstate Commerce Act and various other transportation statutes and regulations. These rules require shippers to govern themselves in such a way as to insure equality for all in regard to transport rates and services.

The rules for the Federal Government are set forth in section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, which states clearly that rates on Government traffic are exempt from Government regulation.

The paradox is clear. The Government, which is the largest shipper in the world, is charged by law with the responsibility of maintaining fair and impartial freight charges. However, this largest shipper easily avoids the controls and restrictions with which all other shippers must comply by legally obtaining unregulated rates concessions under section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act. Even more ironic—and dangerous—is the fact that there is presently no procedure by which an interested party can question the fairness of these unregulated rates, nor does ICC have authority to determine whether they are discriminatory.

It is to this point that my bill is directed. It does not seek to abolish section 22 but simply to establish a procedure which will assure that rates, fares, and charges under this section are fair. It does this by prohibiting any Federal agency from quoting or tendering a section 22 rate to the U.S. Government which subjects any particular locality, port, port district, gateway, region, district, or territory to any unjust discrimination or any undue or unreasonable prejudice or disadvantage. Agencies or departments of the Federal Government would be required to file any rate which they intend to accept under section 22 with the ICC at least 15 days before such rate is accepted and the Commission would receive complaints and hold hearings to determine whether such rates are discriminatory or prejudicial. Under the bill, if a rate was found to be discriminatory, the Commission would then issue such order or orders as might be necessary to remove the unreasonable preference or advantage.

Before directing attention to the Government's present use of section 22, I would like to review briefly the history of this section. It is most interesting and is also relevant to the legislative proposal under discussion.

Section 22 was incorporated in a bill enacted in 1887, popularly known today as the Interstate Commerce Act, the purpose of which was to bring order out of the freight-rate chaos which existed at that time.

In the early years of rail transportation, Federal assistance was given to various railroad companies in the form of land grants amounting to over 140 million acres—an area equal in size to all of Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and nearly half of Ohio. At that time the land was valued at approximately $130 million. In return for the railroad grants the Government received compensation in the form of reduced transportation charges on mail, troops, and Government property as required by the land-grants acts.

However, there were many rail lines which were not the beneficiaries of land grants from the Federal Government. These lines were under a competitive disability as far as movement of Government traffic was concerned. The act of 1887 recognized this and section 22 was added to bring about equalization of land-grant and nonland-grant railroads by exempting all carriers from the regulated freight rate controls which the act established, insofar as Government traffic was concerned.

In the years that followed, military and nonmilitary traffic moved over the land-grant railroads at substantial savings to the Government. Nonland-grant railroads that wished to compete for this traffic equalized their rates through section 22. It was not until 1945 that Congress finally relieved the land-grant railroads from any further obligation to transport persons and property for the military at reduced rates. However, section 22 was allowed to remain in the act in its original form and it became the only mechanism through which the Government, without any control at all, could receive lower rates than those available to commercial shippers. It is not surprising that it quickly became a competitive weapon among regulated carriers.

Since 1945 the use of section 22 to secure reduced rates on Government freight has grown to astronomical proportions and the consequences have been correspondingly serious. The filing of section 22 rates with the Defense Traffic Management Service alone grew to such proportions that in June of 1962 the agency announced that it was proposing the use of computers for handling these quotations due to the receipt of over 10,000 new section 22 rates per week.

By 1962 the situation had become so critical that Rupert Murphy, Interstate Commerce Commission Chairman, stated to the Senate Commerce Committee:

> A large percentage of the traffic transported for the Government now moves at reduced rates under section 22 which are not available to the commercial shipper. This preferential treatment has a strong tendency to increase the cost of transportation services to commercial users who, when their rates become too high, resort to private carriage. Such diversion of traffic to private carriage is obviously detrimental to the maintenance of a sound common carrier system. Moreover, the preferential treatment accorded the various levels of government is, in our view, inconsistent with the national transportation policy which has among its objectives to foster sound economic conditions in transportation.

What kind of situations did Chairman Murphy have in mind when he repeatedly referred to "preferential treatment detrimental to the maintenance of a sound carrier system"?

Perhaps the answer can best be illustrated by citing three examples. One involves a recent price quotation on surplus corn by the Department of Agriculture on a special delivered basis to 12 Southeastern States. The basis was the Chicago cash price plus 25 cents regardless of the point of destination. Obviously these quotations completely disregarded the costs of transportation in excess of 25 cents a bushel. If the Department of Agriculture used the published commercial rates, the differential was paid by the Department and ultimately by the taxpayer. If reduced rates were offered by a carrier under section 22, as appears likely, then the differential was either absorbed by the carrier or passed on to private shippers in the form of higher charges.

A second example occurred several years ago in June when carriers quoted the Government a $1.50 rate per hundred pounds to move shirts from Anderson, S.C., to Memphis, Tenn. The following March the rate was cut to $1.10 in May to 90 cents, in June to 80 cents, and in July to 75 cents. In 13 months the rate was cut in half while the commercial rate stood higher than the initial rate.

This is the same kind of destructive practice which was involved in the movement of aluminum pigs from a point in Texas to Hammond, Ind. In May the railroads established a commercial rate of $16.24 per ton. The General Services Administration had a sizable shipment about a year later, so to match the public barge rate of $12.71 a ton, the railroads quoted a section 22 rate of $12.71 or $3.53 per ton less than their published commercial rate. The water carriers then quoted $12.45 a ton or 26 cents per ton less than their published rate. In less than 2 years each mode of transportation made four further reductions and when the railroads finally reduced their rate to $9.45 a ton, the bargelines refused to be a party to a further reduction and consequently abandoned the tonnage to the railroads.

The third situation presented itself recently and involved the movement of tanks from Centerline, Mich., to a port of embarkation for shipment abroad. The published commercial rates from Centerline to Newport News—792 miles—were $1.37 per hundredweight, and to Toledo—50 miles—52 cents. The carrier, which I believe was the New York Central, offered a section 22 rate from Centerline to Newport News of 50 cents but offered no comparative section 22 rate to Toledo or any other available port and none was requested by the Defense traffic people.

Obviously, if anything in the nature of a comparable section 22 rate had been offered to Toledo or any other port less distant from point of origin than Newport News, the result would have been reduced freight charges to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, if all of the preferences and discriminations implicit in the use of section 22 were to be eliminated, it would be necessary to repeal the section outright. By definition, section 22 makes it possible for the Federal Government to accept freight rates and charges which are preferential to those available to private industry under section 15. From the standpoint of national security and in certain other respects, I believe the position of the Federal Government to be different in character from that of private commercial shippers and that therefore there is legitimate reason for retaining section 22. But I emphatically suggest that the use of this section should be legitimate and I would suggest further that history has demonstrated that this can never be achieved so long as the determination is left to the very governmental agencies that seek reduced rates, with no recourse to any impartial regulatory agency.

In essence my bill does nothing more than provide a day in court for those who claim that rates made available to the Federal Government under section 22 discriminate against one locality in favor of another. It would not eliminate the preference which this section offers to the Government but it would put a halt to one form of discrimination which is disruptive of our entire transportation system and which clearly represents an added and unconscionable charge to the taxpayer.

It is true that the ICC takes the position that it is not precluded from "prescribing" reasonable, maximum section 22 rates. It is equally true, however, that a prescription from the Commission has never been nor ever will be effective enough to deter a carrier or Government agency from using section 22 as they wish regardless of the consequences to private shippers, the national transportation system, or for that matter, themselves. Only a court decision can enforce the ICC recommendations and since any and all section 22 rate quotations are automatically within the law, the courts cannot very well hand down a decision against a defendant when there has been no violation. Such is the incongruity of section 22. It is a law against the law and yet exempt from all laws.

Finally, I want to point out that the provisions of the bill would not apply if the President or the head of any agency or department certifies in writing to the Commission that the disclosure of information with respect to section 22 rates would endanger the national security.

Mr. Speaker, the weakened condition of our national transportation system is a matter of grave concern to all of us. It is plain that a major contributing factor of ever-growing proportions is the failure of carriers to offer—and failure of the Government to insist upon—comparative section 22 rates. No budgetary purpose is served by this practice—quite the contrary—and we know from experience that it only promotes ruinous competition which inhibits modernization of equipment and otherwise helps to destroy the common carrier system.

For the Government to have played this ignominious role as long as it has is little short of a national disgrace. We cannot allow congressional inaction to further the destructive process.

Mr. Speaker, I ask prompt committee consideration of the bill I have offered and urge its support by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

URGENT NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES OF GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, particularly disturbing are the reports that no conclusive photographs of Soviet intermediate range ballistic missiles in Cuba were made available to the President until the task of aerial reconnaissance was transferred from CIA to the Air Force. In its March 4 issue published this week, Newsweek magazine states that Presidential Security Adviser McGeorge Bundy transferred responsibility for these flights from CIA to the Strategic Air Command. Newsweek then states that the very first flight thereafter produced the evidence that triggered the face-down crisis of last October. Mr. Speaker, the implication clearly exists that CIA may have been the stopgap which accounted for the timelag of some 2 weeks in which the Russians almost completed their missile installation.

In addition, the Central Intelligence Agency has also caught the public eye with the recent statements of former Director Allen Dulles. In his remarks, Mr. Dulles said that the Kremlin had raised the art of espionage to an unprecedented height, and for that reason CIA should be exempt from any continuing congressional scrutiny. In short, Mr. Dulles argues, CIA should be left alone to continue its unparalleled role as the Nation's No. 1 untouchable Government agency.

It may be argued that the secretiveness of the CIA precludes the possibility of its successes coming to light; that its nature does not allow its ratio of success versus failure to be known. However, responsible Americans have begun to view the CIA differently. The Hoover Commission recommended that a congressional committee be set up to oversee the CIA. I have introduced legislation to establish such a committee—House Joint Resolution 211. And just last week, two of the Nation's leading newspapers, the Washington Post and the Evening Star, both editorially voiced their concern over the supersecret agency and, under unanimous consent, I include those editorials in the Record at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Feb. 20, 1963]

Congress and the CIA

As a former director of the organization, Allen Dulles writes with authority in his article declaring that there should be no further congressional curbs on the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. This supersecret enterprise, of course, embraces some of our Government's most delicate and most dangerous operations, and it therefore bears vitally on the security of the Nation. That is why Mr. Dulles argues that it must be exempted from controls normally exercised by either the House or the Senate, or both working together in the form of a joint committee. As he has put it, "we are faced by an antagonist [the Kremlin] that has raised the art of espionage to an unprecedented height," and in such circumstances there is need to put a bridle on the American inclination "to talk too much about matters that should be classified."

These matters, according to Mr. Dulles, most certainly include the CIA's operations, which could be greatly hampered—and perhaps washed out altogether—if subjected to constant congressional gossip, scrutiny, and badgering of a sort that could let out all the secrets. This strikes us as a solid point, but Democratic Senator Morse, of Oregon, has firm views to the contrary. He believes that the CIA exercises police-state powers that should be taken away from it forthwith, and he intends to speak at length on the issue in the next week or so. The event will be awaited with interest, especially in view of the Senator's formidable capacity to speak at length. Meanwhile, it must be hoped that there will be no politicking in this exceedingly sensitive area.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 20, 1963]

Checking Intelligence

The opinion of Allen Dulles, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, that there is no need for more controls on this country's intelligence effort, carries a great deal of weight, because of his personal integrity and his long professional experience.

Nevertheless, his exhaustive and capable discussion of the work of the CIA, in the Encyclopedia Britannica, will not eliminate anxiety about the role of the Agency. It is true that the CIA operates under the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State, and that its work is under the scrutiny of the President's Board of Consultants on Foreign Intelligence Activities which meets several times a year, and that its appropriations pass through the Budget Bureau and the congressional Appropriations Committees. None of these devices provides a day-to-day check on operations and all of them together have not been sufficient to prevent CIA operations at cross-purposes with those of persons supposed to be carrying out American policy abroad.

There have been instances in Egypt, in southeast Asia, in South America, and even in Europe, in which such conflicts have been exhibited. Ambassadors have been hindered and embarrassed by the spooks who have been attached in times past to their Embassies but who have operated almost entirely outside their direction.

Nor is it completely reassuring to say that CIA agents never get involved in policy. The decision to seek information by clandestine means often is, in itself, a policy decision. The failures of intelligence gathering operations sometimes shape policy itself, in wholly unplanned ways. The U-2 episode in the Soviet Union is only the most dramatic illustration of the impact of intelligence activities on policy. And even where the primary intelligence mission is successful—diplomatic risks and costs are involved that may be disproportionate to the intelligence gain.

The congressional watchdog committee recommended by the Hoover Commission was decisively rejected by Congress in 1956 and it may not be the answer now. The other checks enumerated by Mr. Dulles, are not the whole answer, either. The President and members of his Cabinet can give only infrequent and crisis attention to the task. The Budget Bureau can give fund allocation close scrutiny but it is hardly in position to criticize actual field operations, or even to criticize appropriations when its experts turn out to be former CIA officials. The appropriation procedures of Congress afford no administrative control of day-to-day enterprises.

No objective person could read Mr. Dulles' formidable defense of the CIA without acquiring the conviction that the organization is of the greatest importance to the country's survival. Many will be convinced that it is so important that it cannot be left to carry out espionage, subversion and information functions all over the world without more continuous direction from the very highest level of the Government apparatus.

Mr. Speaker, truth does exist in Mr. Dulles' statement that the Kremlin is an accomplished antagonist. An agency charged with the operations such as those conducted by the CIA is vital to the security and tactics of America if we are to be successful in the cold war. However, the advantages of the CIA being exempt from continuing scrutiny of a permanent joint congressional committee are far outweighed by the disadvantages.

What happens, for example, when any Government bureau is allowed to go unchecked? The lack of congressional review results in inefficiency, needless and many times wasteful expenditures, as well as the pursuit of policies which may be completely contrary to national goals. If the principle of congressional review were not extended to every U.S. Government agency think of the uncoordinated duplication and damage which would result to this Nation. Consider as well the benefits which have accrued to America by a free press questioning the unclassified actions of the U.S. Government.

It is for the benefit of the Nation that Congress does police Government agencies. Where else but in the Congress, with legislative and appropriation review, can the entire spread of the U.S. Government be better coordinated and evaluated. And where else but in the Congress can the will of the American people be more directly interpreted?

Although CIA is subjected to some review each year when its budget is examined annually by the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress, such review can only provide hindsight—not daily checks or recommendations as they might be needed.

Mr. Dulles fears that congressional review of the CIA would produce security leaks and thereby destroy the effectiveness of the agency. If this were true, why is classified material now made available to congressional leaders by the President? Members of Congress are regularly given highly sensitive intelligence data pertaining to foreign affairs and defense matters, and the Nation's security is not jeopardized in the least. On the contrary, this Nation's well-being is enhanced when executive sessions are held by the congressional committees having jurisdiction in the military and international fields.

And Congress can keep a secret. When the United States was developing the atomic bomb during the closing days of World War II, it was felt that the Congress was entitled to know about the project. A top secret briefing was held on February 18, 1944, and seven congressional leaders of both Houses were advised of U.S. efforts in the nuclear field. Two of those distinguished leaders are still serving this Nation as Members of this House.

One year later, on February of 1945, five more congressional leaders were briefed on the development of atomic weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no better kept secret.

The evidence of recent months shows that the CIA might not be the instrument it was designed to be. The U-2 incident of the Eisenhower administration caused serious implications in our foreign policy. The Bay of Pigs fiasco as well as the collection of intelligence data surrounding Cuba suggests there may well be some serious kinks in our intelligence system.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the Central Intelligence Agency is once again involved in a new controversy respecting our foreign operations. How do we know the operations of this agency? What evidence is there to show that the agency's personnel is not delinquent in effecting a smooth transmission of vital intelligence data? And what proof have we that this agency, which in many respects has the power to preempt foreign policy, is not actually exercising this power through practices which are contradictory to the established policy objectives of this Government?

Mr. Speaker, in these days when the Nation is engaged in a struggle for its very survival, Americans and particularly the Congress, would do well to ask some searching questions about this supersecret organization. Such questions could be answered in the review provided by the Joint Committee as proposed in my bill, House Joint Resolution 211.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Florida on the excellent job he has done in exposing some of the situation that has been going on down in Cuba and for bringing out the information about the fact missiles were not discovered until after the CIA was taken off the particular project.

Could the gentleman tell me from whence the information came that there were 42 medium or intermediate range missiles in Cuba?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Actually, I think these reports were made by the Defense Department to the State Department.

Mr. STINSON. Is it not true that this information originally came from Khrushchev that there were 42 missiles, because we have no checks that might possibly be gathered in Cuba while CIA was in charge of the project?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think we do have some reports from the exile groups that first started out checking the missiles. As to the exact number, I am not sure where the first reports came from, but it is my impression they have been verified in statements by our own Government.

Mr. STINSON. To my knowledge, and perhaps the gentleman can amplify this a little bit, there never has been any actual identification that there were 42 missiles brought into Cuba. We have not seen them. We do not know that there were 42 brought into Cuba.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That could well be. We will not know the true story until we have on-site inspection.

Mr. STINSON. This information that 42 were there was actually received from Mr. Khrushchev, who has proven to be extremely unreliable in relaying information to the United States.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I appreciate the point that the gentleman makes, but I think too we have had some verification from our own intelligence sources, including some of the exile groups. They have forwarded many of those reports. I have received some. I have turned these over to our Government agencies for checkout. It is a problem that cannot possibly be solved until we have some on-site inspection.

OVERCROWDED RAIL COACHES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to call to the attention of the Members of the House an omission in the Interstate Commerce Act relative to the transportation of passengers on railroad coaches in interstate commerce. This matter was brought to my attention indirectly as a result of an experience I personally encountered at 30th Street Station in Philadelphia on the evening of February 24, 1963. On that occasion a train operated by the Pennsylvania Railroad between New York and Washington stopped as scheduled in Philadelphia. The train consisted of some 13 railway coaches in addition to a diner, and so forth. When the train stopped the crew notified the several hundred passengers waiting to board the train at 30th Street Station that no seats were available and my personal investigation indicated to me that this condition prevailed from the time the train departed from New York. As a result of this announcement there was a mad rush of several hundred passengers and great danger of serious personal injury, particularly to many older passengers was created. No effort was made by the crew of this particular train to limit the number of passengers boarding the coaches and I personally observed several coaches that were so crowded that no one could move in the aisles. A very dangerous hazard was thereby permitted to exist by the railroad. I have in the past personally sympathized with the plight of the railroads, recognizing as I do the problems confronting them. I now think, however, that a great deal of their problems are of their own doing and that the service for passengers between Washington and New York is a good illustration of the failure of railroad management. I have personally observed the deterioration of this service during my 5 years in the Congress.

I find the coaches are many times unkempt, the service often is discourteous, and the equipment used by the railroads is generally of ancient vintage. The passengers who boarded this particular train in Philadelphia were charged a fare for a seat by the railroad and then were herded like a bunch of cattle into overcrowded coaches and forced to stand for approximately 2 hours. The management of the railroad with the knowledge that no seats were available from the time the train left New York made no provisions for any additional sections on this train and made no announcement to the passengers awaiting the train in Philadelphia of the unavailability of seats. Recognizing the dangers inherent with the overcrowding of railroad coaches, I contacted a representative of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the purpose of determining what regulation covered the number of passengers riding in railroad coaches in interstate commerce. I was informed that the Interstate Commerce Commission had no authority under the law to issue any such regulation. As of now, therefore, the railroads have the perfect right to carry as many standees in a railroad coach as they wish without regard to the safety of the passengers. The railroads, particularly the Pennsylvania, have been doing this for some time. I am convinced that the safety and welfare of the citizens of this country demand that some limitation be placed upon the number of passengers riding in these railroad coaches and I have, therefore, prepared and have today introduced a bill granting the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to provide by regulation such limitation. It is my sincere hope that this legislation will pass and that the Interstate Commerce Commission will be authorized and will in fact enact regulation limiting the number of passengers who will be permitted to stand while traveling on any railroad coach while that coach is in interstate commerce. I urge the Members of the House to support this legislation. Unless something is done to remedy these conditions that are now existing we may have in the near future, because of this overcrowding, a serious loss of life. The responsibility for regulation properly belongs with the Interstate Commerce Commission and this Congress should give such authority to this Commission. I sincerely hope, therefore, that the Members will support this bill.

MARINES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] introduced a bill, H.R. 4222, to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to request the assignment of U.S. Marines to assist in law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

I want to take this occasion to commend the distinguished gentleman from Texas for having offered the bill, and I assure him I support his bill 100 percent.

Never in the history of the Marine Corps has there been a greater need for the services of the marines than there is in the city of Washington today. Never before has there been an opportunity for so few—he asks in his bill for two companies of marines—to do so much good for so many people.

My prayerful hope is that the marines will soon land in the District of Columbia and have the situation well in hand.

We all know that at this time it is unsafe for people to be on the streets of Washington at night. Every kind of crime known to man is being committed here in the District. It is unsafe for high school groups to come and visit the Nation's Capital. Men and women are being mugged, stabbed, assaulted, and raped within the shadow of the dome of the Capitol. There is no place on earth where human life is more in danger after the sun goes down than in Washington, D.C. The marines, in my opinion, are overdue. I believe that two companies of marines can do a good job.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Texas, the author of the bill.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman has had to say. It is needless to assure him of the concern of the representatives of the board of trade in Washington about this matter, a story on which appeared in one of the local papers the other day, regarding their feeling about the economic effect of such a situation. Certainly it is going to have an economic effect. As the gentleman has pointed out, some communities in our country do not want their high school and college boys and girls to come here, for fear that something unfortunate will happen to them.

The situation is a disgrace. I should like to ask the gentleman if he would agree, if our Government officials find it necessary or desirable to send troops to other places to enforce the law of this land, why should they not be willing to send them to a Federal territory to protect the people here?

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman is eminently correct. I would say that conditions are no worse in Vietnam today than they are in certain areas of Washington, D.C. I am sure the gentleman read the story recently of two busloads of school kids who came down from Massachusetts and, lo and behold, someone stole one of the buses. How much worse can conditions get?

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope the gentleman's bill becomes law.

DECISIONS BY SUPREME COURT SOMETIMES FRUSTRATING

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr.. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, is there any way to predict the actions of the Supreme Court? Obviously, it is not governed by the well established legal principle of "stare decisis." In the case of *Roth* v. *United States* (354 U.S. 476), the Supreme Court held "obscenity is not within the area of constitutionally protected speech or press" and may therefore be regulated by the States.

Nevertheless, on February 18, 1963, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of Bantam Books, Inc., et al. against Joseph A. Sullivan, et al., found the activities of the Rhode Island Commission To Encourage Morality in Youth to be in violation of the Constitution of the United States. The commission sought to remove from public sale publications tending to the corruption of youth. By its action, the Court frustrated an attempt by a State of this Union to combat the problems of juvenile delinquency.

While I recognize and endorse the primary responsibility of the family for encouraging morality among our youth and for guidance in the choice of literature that youth should read, it is inconceivable to me that, in an allegedly intelligent society, we can expect the family to exercise this primary responsibility and then at the same time allow society to engulf our children with trashy literature when they leave the portals of home.

Unless such groups as the commission created by Rhode Island are permitted to encourage good works and to condemn bad ones, then we as a government and as a society are working in opposition to the home and the training we expect to be given there. We cannot expect our youth to feel that the home is giving them proper instruction when at the same time society seems to say that anything goes.

Freedom of speech is a liberty which I cherish and for which I will stand second to no man in defending. But the Supreme Court has laid the basis here for a subsequent approval of the conduct of a man who stands up in a crowded theater and yells "Fire." This decision is deserving of more than passing notice. The trend indicated portends consequences which should cause all parents who love and hope for the best in their children to shudder.

Mr. Speaker, this decision will do incalculable harm to those patriotic and concerned groups, such as the one in Richland County in my district, which are conscientiously trying to cope with a serious juvenile problem. Instead of encouraging juvenile decency by preventing the sale, distribution, or display of indecent and obscene publications to youths under 18 years of age, the Court has in effect told our States and local communities to stop all preventive measures and start building bigger jails.

It is high time for the Supreme Court to return to its intended role of giving legal continuity and stability to our laws rather than disrupting all judicial processes and public spirited efforts by vacillating back and forth with the will and caprice of every sociologist.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps which would provide useful employment and training for unemployed young men and women age 16 through 21.

Such a program would be established for the purpose of performing needed conservation and natural resources work under the supervision of both Federal and State conservation agencies.

There are similarities between the Youth Conservation Corps and the Civilian Conservation Corps that existed during the 1930's. As the Civilian Conservation Corps succeeded in providing opportunities for our youth three decades ago, I am confident the proposed Youth Conservation Corps can fulfill successfully a similar need in the 1960's.

My congressional district, which comprises all of Luzerne County, Pa., suffers from historic structural unemployment due to the depressed conditions of our heretofore prosperous No. 1 major industry—anthracite coal. Such a situation as exists in my district only serves to aggravate the prospects for employment of the youth in my area because employers will naturally hire the heads of households to sustain families rather than hire the younger persons. At the present time there are some 20,000 men out of work in my district. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is readily apparent that the youth of my district find it most difficult in obtaining gainful employment there due to conditions of many years duration. That is one of the reasons why I feel such a program as the YCC would be a great benefit to our young people, not only from my experience and observation over the years as a Representative of Pennsylvania's 11th District, but from discussions I have had with other Members of this body having such employment problems in their districts.

It should also be pointed out that our youth have the further problem of not being able to find jobs because employers are reluctant to hire them if they have not completed their military obligation and, moreover, they have the added problem of finding employers reluctant to go to the expense of training them, only to subsequently lose them to the military services.

The establishment of Youth Conservation Corps would permit the utilization of our young people to work on certified projects of great value to the local communities under the supervision of local organizations such as educational and welfare groups and committees, urban redevelopment committees and boards, many of whom have performed truly outstanding jobs for the betterment of their immediate localities.

I have introduced a bill for the redevelopment of the Susquehanna River basin throughout the States of Pennsylvania, New York, and Maryland. A 6-year survey was begun last year by the Army Corps of Engineers for this purpose. The establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps would be ideal in carrying out many of the features of the Susquehanna River redevelopment program, such as assisting in the revival of the once-prosperous lumber industry, the construction of recreational centers to encourage tourism which in itself would be a great boon in providing jobs for our unemployed. Tourism as an industry has been neglected in my area of Pennsylvania where it has immense potential in greatly improving the economy of the region.

So that the principal provisions of the bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps might be made readily available, the following is a summary of the bill I introduced today and I would like to include it as part of my remarks and have it inserted at this point in the RECORD:

Principal Provisions of the Youth Employment Act of 1963

This legislation contains two titles—the first establishes a Youth Conservation Corps, the second a local area youth employment program. Both programs are designed to provide useful employment and training to unemployed young men and women 16 through 21 years of age. Authorized appropriations for the program are included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1964. The legislation carries the full endorsement of the White House and the Bureau of the Budget.

TITLE I—YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

1. A Youth Conservation Corps (YCC) is established to perform needed conservation and natural resource work under the supervision of Federal and State conservation agencies.

2. The YCC will be located within the Department of Labor. The Director of the YCC (appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate) will perform such functions as prescribed by the Secretary of Labor. The Secretary of Labor will consult with the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare regarding the operation of the YCC. A National Advisory Council (appointed by the Secretary of Labor) will advise on the operation of the YCC.

3. Enrollment in the YCC will be open to young men 16 through 21 years of age. Minimum enrollment period will be 6 months with a maximum enrollment of 2 years. Enrollees will receive $60 per month in wages and receive board, lodging, clothing, tools and equipment, medical care, and other necessities. It provides for a YCC not to exceed 15,000 enrollees during the first fiscal year of its operations; the size of the YCC for the succeeding 4 years will be determined by Congress through appropriations but may not exceed 60,000 at any one time. No specific termination date is included in the legislation.

4. Technical training and other educational skills will be provided after work periods through arrangements made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and local educational authorities.

5. An allotment formula provides that 50 percent of the enrollees are to be selected from the States on the basis of population figures and 50 percent allocated in such manner as determined by the Secretary of Labor, with special preference given to areas of substantial unemployment. Selection of enrollees will be made by the respective State employment services.

6. Two-thirds of the YCC will work on lands of the national forests, national parks, and other Federal conservation agencies. One-third of the YCC will be available for work on State forests and parks on a 50–50 matching basis.

7. Congress is authorized to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of title I.

TITLE II—LOCAL AREA YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

1. Through the use of 50–50 matching grants, local public or private nonprofit agencies will be permitted to pay the wages of youngsters for useful full-time or part-time work not currently being performed by regular employees.

2. Unemployed young men and women 16 through 21 years of age will be eligible for jobs under the program.

3. The program is designed to depend on local initiative. Local groups, such as educators, welfare and employment service officials, and private agencies will formulate a local employment program proposal. This program proposal will be submitted to the Secretary of Labor for approval. A National Advisory Council (appointed by the Secretary) will advise the Secretary on the approval of such specific programs and on the operation of the program in general.

4. In order to be approved, the local programs must increase the employability of the enrollees or enable student enrollees to resume or maintain school attendance, permit a public undertaking or service that would not otherwise be provided, and not result in the displacement of regular workers, etc. Testing, counseling, job development, and job referral services will be provided for every enrollee.

5. Local employment opportunities would include jobs in schools, hospitals, libraries, welfare agencies, courts, children's homes, etc., in public programs relating to park improvement, playgrounds, etc., and in private community activities such as the Visiting Nurses Association, Boy Scouts, etc.

6. The legislation authorizes the Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to support a program not to exceed 50,000 enrollees at any one time during the first fiscal year and thereafter such numbers as Congress may maintain through appropriations. Authority for this program terminates on June 30, 1966.

(NOTE.—The provisions of the Youth Employment Act, should not be confused with the National Service Corps—the so-called domestic peace corps. The purpose of the Youth Employment Act is to establish programs that can begin to cope with the problem of youth unemployment while also making a significant contribution to the conservation of natural resources and the achievement of general public needs. Enrollees will be unemployed young men and women, many of them school dropouts, who join to obtain job training and experience. The National Service Corps will be a vehicle for those public-spirited persons already possessing considerable training and skills to contribute their time and talent in the service of less fortunate members of society.)

NEED FOR COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, last week I learned from a statement made by our able Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, G. Mennen Williams, that the U.S. Government was supporting the right of Angolans to self-determination and that its attitude had been clearly demonstrated at the United Nations. It was not surprising. Our championship of self-determination rights is of long standing. It is known throughout the world, both the free world and the slave world.

Hence, Mr. Williams stated what we all espouse. He also gave correct interpretation to President Kennedy's views. Addressing the United Nations General Assembly on September 25, 1961, President Kennedy put himself unequivocally behind the universal application of the principle of self-determination. He said:

> Let us debate colonialism in full and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscites in every corner of the globe.

However, the State Department does not follow it "in every corner of the globe." It does not apply the principle of self-determination to Russia—the only colonial empire left on the globe. The question why has been recently answered in a lucid manner by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan]. In the keynote address delivered at the Political Forum of American Friends of Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, Inc., in New York, on February 9, 1963, he subjected to penetrating criticism the State Department's double standard in dealing with the captive nations problem in various corners of the globe. I wish to include the keynote address with my remarks.

I also wish to dwell for a few moments on the peculiar reason for the State Department's opposition to the application of the self-determination principle to Russia. As stated in Mr. Dean Rusk's well known letter of 1½ years ago to the distinguished chairman of the House Rules Committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith], the State Department would not apply such a principle, for example, to the Ukraine, Armenia, and Georgia because they were considered as "parts of historical Russia."

Mr. Speaker, I could not subscribe to this policy because it, first, utterly contradicts our fervent desire, so succinctly expressed by President Kennedy in his United Nations address, that the tide of self-determination does not stop before submerging the Communist empire after it already has cleansed Asia and Africa. Second, such policy is distasteful to every American because it shows the State Department using a double standard also in this case.

It was between 1792 and 1795 that Russia annexed a part of what today is known as the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. Subsequently, however, she lost a large segment of her acquisitions to Poland between the two world wars and again to Germany in the last war. Galicia and the Carpatho-Ukraine never belonged to Russia before 1944–45. Nevertheless, the State Department does not exclude either Galicia or the Carpatho-Ukraine from its concept of a "historical Russia."

The northern portion of Armenia was annexed to Russia in 1828, while her southern portion did not come under Russian sovereignty until 1878. Moreover, Armenia became independent in 1918 and managed to stay independent until 1921.

Georgia's annexation to Russia was accomplished by a unilaterial imperial proclamation in 1801. The Georgians responded with passive resistance and frequent open clashes, always drowned in blood and followed by deportations and less and less freedom. Like Armenia, Georgia proclaimed her independence in 1918 and lost it under tremendous odds in 1921.

These are relatively brief and often interrupted periods of Russian supremacy in the Ukraine, Armenia, and Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, is this not a double standard the State Department is employing to assess Russia's historical rights to their colonies? I do not condone Russia's colonial rule over some 100 million non-Russians in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, is it not high time that Congress take a hard look at the State Department's pro-Russian—I am not saying pro-Communist—policy, and at its obstinate refusal to implement the noble principles that are embodied in Public Law 86–90? And who could do it better than a Committee on Captive Nations, the establishment of which I again proposed in House Resolution 14? I am proud that the resolution has received so much gratifying support on both aisles of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I hereby urge the distinguished chairman of the House Rules Committee to report favorably House Resolution 14.

The New York address of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan] follows:

U.S. Policy Toward the Captive Nations

(Address of Hon. Michael A. Feighan, U.S. Representative, 20th District of Ohio, at political forum of American Friends of Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, Inc., New York, N.Y., February 9, 1963)

Mr. Moderator, distinguished members of the panel, and friends, the great challenge of our times is the new colonialism, the new imperialism of Moscow. This challenge poses a clear and present danger to representative self-government, to individual liberty, to the basic freedoms cherished by all mankind and to a peaceful world in which justice, charity, tolerance, and brotherhood govern the relations between nations. For the ideology which motivates the new imperialism holds that all civilizations must be purged of the past and be transformed into colonies subservient to the materialistic will of Soviet Russia. And those, past and present, who man this drive to world empire, leave no doubts about their fanatical dedication to those objectives.

Hence in the vortex of American foreign policy are the captive nations. They are the victims of the new imperialism, the new colonialism of Moscow. What we do or fail to do in restoring to them their rightful place in the community of civilized nations is the surest test of our intentions and the honest measure of our dedication to the cause of peace with justice.

Yet we do not have a uniform and clearly defined policy toward the captive nations. This vital area of our foreign policy is beset by dangerous contradictions, prejudice, and self-defeating doctrines. The extent of this disarray at the vortex of our foreign policy is observed best by an examination of the term "captive nation" and its application to our Nation's commitments.

If we turn to the Congress of the United States for such a definition we find an official expression of directness and clarity in Public Law 86–90, the Captive Nations Week law. That law identifies the captive nations by name, not only the so-called satellites and Baltic States, but the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union—including several whose names have been purged from the great book of history by the Russian imperialists and one that has been partitioned by the Muscovites into five so-called Soviet republics. Also one finds in that law the names of the Asian nations whose national integrity has been subverted by the Red banner of modern day Russian imperialism, and those three nations which have been partitioned by Communist aggression and Red army occupation. But equally important to the findings of that Federal statute is its identification of Russian communism as the despoiler of national independence and master of the techniques of national servitude. Finally, Public Law 86–90 finds that the aspirations of the people in the captive nations for freedom and national independence constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of our best hopes for a just peace.

I believe, therefore, it is proper to conclude Congress is not responsible for the dangerous contradictions and prejudices which attend our Government's approach to the central issue of captive nations versus imperial Russian communism. Truth and objective fact on this central issue, established by the 2-year official inquiry of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression of the 83d Congress, guided the language and intent of Public Law 86–90. It is worth noting in this connection that the validity of the voluminous reports, basic findings, conclusions and recommendations of that select committee remain unchallenged to this day. As is known, the Moscow propaganda organs reacted violently to the work of that select committee, but Russian governments, whether under the czars or the commissars, have always worked in the shadows where truth is a stranger and objective fact is an unwelcome lamp.

Under our Constitution, Congress does not set our foreign policy anymore than it has authority to execute it. That authority and the responsibility which accompanies it rests with the President and he is free to select those whom he wishes to share either or both with him. Congress can exercise regulatory authority where public funds are involved in the execution of foreign policy, in matters of foreign trade, and the Senate must ratify treaties with foreign powers. Congress reserves the exclusive right to declare war, which invariably results from a failure of foreign policy, yet has very little real authority over its formulation or execution. Nevertheless, Congress, as the voice of the people, possesses ways and means to exercise an influence on foreign policy—not the least of which are the "sense of Congress" resolutions such as were passed on the Berlin crisis, the Cuban crisis, the Middle East crisis and on the captive nations. So we must look elsewhere for the source of the dangerous contradictions and prejudices which attend our policy toward imperial Russian communism.

The most obvious place to turn next is to Secreatry of State Dean Rusk because his greatest claim to fame in this critical policy area arises from an ill-conceived letter bearing his name and addressed to the chairman of the House Rules Committee in connection with a pending resolution to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations. That letter expressed opposition to the establishment of such a House committee and defended the legitimacy of Russian colonialism in Ukraine, Georgia, and Armenia on the grounds those nations were traditional parts of the Soviet Union. While stating that our Government has consistently upheld the

right of subjugated people in the Soviet Empire to national independence, governments of their own choosing and to human rights and freedom, Rusk then restricts these rights to formerly independent nations.

The tragic comedy of the Rusk letter is that it exposes a profound official ignorance of the fact that Ukraine, Georgia, and Armenia all were independent nations in the wake of World War I and that their independence was subverted in the first wave of imperial Russian communism. He then compounds his comedy of errors by claiming that our Government's support for the right of formerly independent nations is weakened by any action which confuses the rights of formerly independent peoples or nations with the status of areas such as the Ukraine, Armenia, or Georgia because this would put us in the position of seeming to advocate the dismemberment of a historic state. Such tortured reasoning as this is common to Russian thinking and mythology, particularly when the political principle of self-determination must be abused and perverted to defend modern day Russian colonialism. Moreover, it parallels the irrational thinking found in the "Lenin-Stalin Solution to the National Question"[1] which, by the way, the ideological organs of Moscow are now using to argue their case for a permanent partition of Germany and the strangulation of Berlin.[2] The greatest fantasies of history are those based solely upon "Russian truths" which crawl out from the shadows of despotism where, as is well known, truth is a stranger and objective fact an unwelcome lamp.

In a spirit of fair play, I suggest all the blame for this tragic comedy of errors does not rest solely on Secretary Rusk. He is not generally regarded as an authority on Russian colonialism or the supporting tactics of imperial communism. Moreover, experience in recent years has taught us that Secretaries of State are seldom masters of the Department over which they serve and more often than not the entrenched bureaucracy are in sure, if subtle, command of policy.

Now we turn to the Department of State, to that entrenched bureaucracy of Russian experts, who, somewhat like Ole Man River, just keep rolling along their erroneous course despite changes in national administrations and growing protests of an aroused electorate. There we find concentrated the disciples of a mythical doctrine—Russia the Sacred Cow—an untouchable Russia whose ruthless imperialism they now find to be exercising a mellowing influence on the highly civilized non-Russian nations imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain. Unmindful of the fact that imperial Russian power has posed a constant threat to Europe, the Near and Middle East, and Asia for many centuries they defend the divine right of empire claimed by an unbroken line of imperial ambitions centered in the Kremlin.

That same group in the State Department produced the doctrine of nonpredetermination toward the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union which haunted the Eisenhower adminstration. In brief, that doctrine holds that if the unbridled right of self-determination was extended to the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union this would result in a prejudgment on the political future of the Eurasian land mass now under control of Moscow. The implied admission is clear. The non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union would choose the course of national independence which would mean the end of imperial Russian power. Rights to national independence, to self-government, to basic human rights and freedom are thus withheld from millions of peoples inhabiting that darkened area of the world. Like the current ideological elite of the Kremlin, who defend the Lenin-Stalin theories on self-determination through K. Ivanov in the Communist Party organ Pravda,[3] the Russian experts in our State Department sap the lifeblood of self-determination by forbidding its application to the heartland of the Russian empire.

Such massive discrimination against some submerged nations held in colonial bondage by Moscow does severe damage to the honesty of our intentions with regard to imperialism and colonialism. We have demonstrated our support for national independence movements in south and southeast Asia, in the Middle East, and in Africa, despite what it cost us in our relations with some of our NATO allies. But we have demonstrated an unwillingness to support national independence movements which would reduce the power of aggression held by those who would destroy us. It is little wonder that so-called neutralism has become popular and profitable in recent years or that the concept of a European third force now threatens the stability of our NATO shield. Principles must be applied to all without fear or favor if they are to be regarded as the hallmark of American foreign policy.

Let me make it clear that I am not engaging in a blanket charge against all the area desks and divisions of the Department of State. I am speaking about the entrenched bureaucracy of Russian experts in the Department who backstopped the Rusk letter, who authored the doctrine of nonpredetermination, and whose thinking is allied with the "Lenin-Stalin Solution to the National Question." There are many within the Department who reject policy based upon Russian myths and who are informed of the facts on Russia, the Russians, and their empire. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, for example, is informed on the facts about the formerly independent status of Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and the other non-Russian nations forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union. He made this clear in a United Nations debate on colonialism when he reviewed the history of Soviet Russian imperialism, charging the Russians with subverting the national independence of those nations, among many others. This defense of historical truth by Ambassador Stevenson, took place in the United Nations a short while before Secretary Rusk assumed the indefensible position as protector of Russian colonialism in his letter to the House Rules Committee. This episode underscores what I mean by the dangerous contradictions and prejudice which logjam the vortex of American foreign policy.

Let us now turn our examination of this vital issue to the constitutional source of American foreign policy—the President of the United States. The public statements, addresses, published papers, and public commitments of President Kennedy serve as the basis for this examination. Here the record is clear, devoid of contradictions and limitations on governing principles, and deeply rooted in our American political heritage. In his address before the General Assembly of the United Nations on September 25, 1961, President Kennedy analyzed the new colonialism of Moscow and called for the unfettered, universal application to the principle of self-determination in these words:

"But colonialism in its harshest forms is not only the exploitation of new nations by old, of dark skins by light—or the subjugation of the poor by the rich. My Nation was once a colony, and we know what colonialism means; the exploitation and subjugation of the weak by the powerful, of the many by the few, of the governed who have given no consent to be governed, whatever their continent, their class, or their color.

"And that is why there is no ignoring the fact that the tide of self-determination has not reached the Communist empire, where a population far larger than that officially termed 'dependent' lives under governments installed by foreign troops instead of free institutions, under a system which knows only one party and one belief, which suppresses free debate and free elections and free newspapers and free books and free trade unions, and which builds a wall to keep truth a stranger and its own citizens prisoners. Let us debate colonialism in full and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscites in every corner of the globe."

In an address at Buffalo, N.Y., on September 14, 1962, before a Pulaski Day observance, President Kennedy called out for an active policy toward the captive nations. He said:

"What policies can we pursue to encourage what Thomas Jefferson called the disease of liberty? It is not enough to make speeches about liberations. Our Government must pursue an active policy which holds out the promise of freedom behind the Iron Curtain."

Those who hide behind the fear of nuclear war or use the so-called nuclear stalemate argument to kill political action in the cause of peace with freedom will find no comfort in this commitment by President Kennedy. And those who are informed on the realities of the Russian problem must redouble their efforts to bring about the implementation of policies calculated to encourage the "disease of liberty" behind the Iron Curtain. For the nurtured seeds of liberty bring forth the sturdy trees of national independence. The time is long overdue for a full-scale political confrontation with Russian imperialism. Here the prospects of escalation into world peace with freedom are practically unlimited. Alternative choices now open to us, including political inaction, could well railroad us to defeat—with or without a nuclear war.

But a few weeks ago, in his state of the Union message, President Kennedy again displayed his keen perception of the growing political storm within the empire of Moscow when he observed:

"The disarray of the Communist empire has been heightened by two other formidable forces. One is the historical force of nationalism—and the yearning of all men to be free. The other is the gross inefficiency of their economies. For a closed society is not open to ideas of progress—and a police state finds that it cannot command the grain to grow."

Basic to the Berlin crisis is the issue of unfettered application of the political principle of self-determination. And the crisis of Berlin is tied irrevocably to the broader issue of captive nations because it cannot be separated from the larger question of a free, united, and democratic Germany. President Kennedy announced our policy on that issue as follows:

"The U.S. Government continues to believe that there will be no real solution to the German problem, nor any real tranquility in central Europe, until the German people are reunited in peace and freedom on the basis of the universally recognized principle of self-determination."[4]

The dangerous conflict between the policies of President Kennedy and those expressed by Secretary Rusk in his letter to the House Rules Committee heralds the need for immediate and far-reaching changes to bring State Department policies with regard to self-determination, the rights of nations, colonialism, and imperialism in line with those annunciated by the President. If the entrenched bureaucracy of Russian experts in the State Department are allowed to work their will against the policies of the President of the United States, representative self-government in the United States is doomed. Meanwhile, we will continue to suffer the pains of national frustration and economic dissipation until that "Gordian knot" on our political ideals is severed.

---

[1] See Lenin-Stalin, "Solution to the National Question," Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow.

[2] See "The German Demand for Self-Determination," German Information Center, New York, N.Y.

[3] See Pravda, Dec. 20, 1961, issue, article by K. Ivanov, pp. 4–5.

[4] See President Kennedy's reply to the Russian Aide Memoire on Berlin and Germany, July 17, 1961.

It is fair to say that so long as these dangerous contradictions and prejudices continue to logjam the vortex of American foreign policy we may not claim a policy toward the captive nations. And all the rest of our foreign policy which of necessity must take its direction and strength from the vortex is immeasurably weakened.

What is needed if we are to win our goal of peace with freedom is a new horizon of ideals to which the foreign policies of our Government can be firmly attached and against which we can make reliable evaluation on the rate of our progress. President Kennedy has made a strong start in illuminating a horizon of ideals, based upon our American political heritage and toward which he endeavors to move the future of the world. But we cannot accomplish this monumental task alone. And his efforts are retarded by the old frontiers of reaction and discrimination within our Government which as I have indicated, continue to exist and to exert an unhealthy influence on our attitude toward the captive nations.

The old frontiers of prejudice and discrimination toward the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union still existing in the Department of State are no less a formidable barrier to peace than is the Berlin wall. In some respects those old frontiers are more formidable. It is quite reasonable to conclude that had our foreign policy been free of those prejudices during World War II we would not have the problem of captive nations today—at least not its present magnitude. But we can be sure the Berlin wall will not come down so long as the old frontiers of a Russian beachhead on our policies remain in force. We can hardly expect to accomplish in Berlin, surrounded as it is by the Red army, what we have failed to accomplish within our own Government, free as it is to take corrective actions.

It is not difficult, in the light of this examination of the forces and counterforces at work in the crucial area of American policy toward imperial Russia, to understand the hidden barriers erected against establishment of a House Committee on Captive Nations. A special congressional committee by nature is a probative body, it seeks the views of all who want to be heard on great public issues, it works in the open marketplace of public opinion and it delights in the techniques of sifting fact from fiction. The public spotlight of Congress is harsh on those who function best in the shadows of special privilege, but is kind to those who work openly to serve the common good and the safety of their fellow Americans. This explains the fervor in support of such a committee by those who know the realities of Communist imperialism by personal experience and the lack of such fervor by those who man the barriers of opposition.

The stalemate which now applies to this public issue must be broken. Involved is the question whether the new horizon of ideals opened up by President Kennedy shall prevail as our policy toward the captive nations or whether the old frontiersmen entrenched in the State Department shall continue to buck the rising tide of self-determination in the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union.

I am confident you share with me a determination to help build the new horizon of ideals to guide us to our goal of peace with freedom.

FORESTRY RESEARCH NEEDED

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, for many reasons we must make a more efficient and beneficial use of our forests and forest lands. Our population expansion demands greater productivity from the forests. Likewise, that same population expansion, together with the fact that more leisure time is available to our people, brings more outdoor activity into the great forested areas. Of course, our Federal Government is a great landlord and should be a good housekeeper; but what is more, our Federal Government should be a leader in the field of forest resource management.

My congressional district, the western district of Montana, contains one of the largest national forest reserves in the Nation. Therefore, it is proper that within that district research be sponsored and fostered. Mr. Speaker, today I am presenting to my colleagues here on the floor the same program that I have urged upon the Committee on Appropriations.

FORESTRY RESEARCH PROPOSALS FOR MONTANA, FISCAL YEAR 1964

This proposal outlines the need for strengthening forestry research at Bozeman and Missoula, Mont., in the following amounts:

Laboratory construction, Missoula	$400, 000
Accelerated research programs:	
Forest engineering, Bozeman	100, 000
Forest fire research, Missoula	250, 000
Forest products utilization, Missoula	50, 000
Total	800, 000

RESEARCH LABORATORY CONSTRUCTION

Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Missoula: This laboratory, which is needed now and should not be delayed, would house four important forestry research programs: First, silviculture and management of larch and spruce forest types; second, wood utilization aimed at broadening marketability of lumber and other products; third, improved methods of wildlife habitat management, especially big-game ranges; and fourth, forest recreation. The structure would be built on a site provided by Montana State University on the campus adjacent to the proposed new State forestry school. Forest Service research scientists presently working on these projects are now housed in very crowded rooms in the Missoula post office where no laboratory facilities exist.

RESEARCH PROGRAM EXPANSION

Forestry research projects underway at Bozeman and Missoula, Mont., are not being financed at the levels needed to keep on top of the many problems requiring research for their solution and necessary to the proper management and utilization of timber resources. The increase would represent reasonable progress toward the 10-year program needs developed by the Forest Service and strongly supported by forestry and forest products interests in Montana and other Western States.

FOREST ENGINEERING RESEARCH

A forest engineering research project by the Forest Service is underway at Bozeman on a very small scale to improve methods for harvesting timber from steep, erodable mountain slopes. Initial studies of improved engineering systems, such as transporting pulpwood from mountain to mill in chipped form through pipelines, show promise. What is needed now, is an accelerated attack that will lead to low unit harvesting costs and methods to lessen the impact of logging on soil and watershed values. Some steep, erodable areas cannot be logged at all under conventional methods because costs of logging roads would be high and damaging also to the watersheds. We need to open up more of our forests to profitable timber harvest but must first find a practical way of doing it economically and at the same time safeguarding the watersheds from damage by logging. Proposed additional appropriation: $100,000.

FOREST FIRE RESEARCH

Forest fires continue to require huge annual expenditures for control in the United States and particularly in the mountainous West. Some of the best opportunities to reduce the firefighting bill, which runs over $100 million annually, lie in research such as is underway at the Missoula Forest Fire Laboratory. A much stronger attack will result in early dividends on this research investment. Research should be stepped up on Project Skyfire to prevent lightning-caused fires which are among the most costly fires to control because they often occur in large numbers and in roadless areas. We also need new methods of fire detection as by infrared airborne devices, improvement of chemical fire retardants to make aerial attack more effective, and fire ignition and rate-of-spread studies to increase intelligence on which firefighting is based. These and related studies would require an additional $250,000.

FOREST PRODUCTS UTILIZATION RESEARCH

The timber industry has been suffering from many problems including loss of markets to substitute materials. There is a great need for research on problems peculiar to our forest products industries in Montana and adjacent States that will result in product improvement and diversification that would extend and improve markets for wood products. This Forest Service project would work with and be a field arm of the Forest Products Laboratory of the Forest Service at Madison, Wis. Such research would include development and evaluation of improved seasoning practices to produce a more stable product; research to improve production of plywood through greater plant efficiency; methods of handling, seasoning, and preserving poles and other round products; development of new uses for wood; and improvement of practices in the use of wood in structures, leading to longer life and greater acceptance. Amount needed is $50,000.

U.S. AID TO POLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORRIS). Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] for 30 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, many times the American people become very much bewildered when they read articles written by authors who express their own private views as though they were the last word in authority on their subject matter. This has been true over the past several years with regard to U.S. aid to Yugoslavia and Poland.

In the spring of 1962 I made a special trip to Poland for the Foreign Affairs Committee for the purpose of studying our foreign aid program in that country since 1957. Upon returning I wrote a report on my findings. It was published as House Document No. 1968, 87th Congress, 2d session, titled "Special Study Mission to Poland and Austria."

For those who are still in doubt as to whether or not we should continue foreign aid to Poland, I recommend both my report and the following article which appeared in the New Yorker magazine February 9, 1963:

LETTER FROM WARSAW

(By Joseph Wechsberg)

From the window of my room in the Hotel Europejski, I can see Victory Square, where military men of one nationality or another have been parading for centuries. "Particularly famous were the reviews of the guards by Napoleon I during his stay in Warsaw," says a folder that I picked up in the lobby. Along the sides of the square, one can see something of Warsaw's past and something of its future. On the north is the immense unfinished Warsaw opera house (hammering starts at half past 6 in the morning), and on the west stands a fragment of the colonnade of the 18th-century Saxon Palace, which was demolished during the Second World War. Under the colonnade is the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. The first morning I was here, I happened to be looking out of my window just before 10 o'clock, and I saw four military trucks pull up in the square. A company of soldiers and a brass band poured out and lined up in front of the tomb. Exactly at 10, several limousines arrived, a large wreath materialized, and a guest of honor, flanked by Polish officials, strode solemnly toward the colonnade. The guest, I learned later, was the newly accredited Ethiopian Ambassador. The band played his national anthem, and then, after a bit of marching that incorporated something very like the goosestep, it played the "Warszawianka," a stirring revolutionary hymn written during the Polish uprising of 1830, or 1863, or some other year—nobody I've spoken to seems to know which. Finally, the diplomats disappeared into their limousines and the soldiers into their trucks, and the tomb was left with only the customary guard on each side. On the second morning, the same thing happened, only this time the guest of honor was a dignitary of the United Arab Republic.

On the third morning, it happened again, and I hurried down into the square for a closer view. When I got there, I asked a man who the guest of honor was, but he didn't know; probably somebody from Ruanda or Burundi, he said, and added pleasantly that Africans were always coming and going these days. After the ceremony, I walked over to the colonnade, and inside it I saw six black marble plates engraved with the names of all the battles that Polish soldiers had taken part in, officially or unofficially, over the last quarter of a century. The list went from Madrid and Guadalajara, in 1937, to Berlin and Warsaw, in 1945, and included Britain, Tobruk, Arnhem, and many others, but perhaps the most impressive was Partyzantka—the long and desperate struggle of the Polish partisans against the Nazis. As I stood there, a class of 7- and 8-year-old boys and girls arrived, with their teacher. The children formed a semicircle around the tomb and stared in awe at the two guards while the teacher spoke in a low voice about the soldier who was buried there. The children listened gravely and in complete silence. Though it does not appear in the curriculum, patriotism is the most important subject taught in any Polish school.

Patriotism is, indeed, one of the unquestioned facts of Polish political life. There aren't many others. In this Communist state, very few people are Communists. Of 30 million Poles, slightly more than a million have joined the party, but even of these the vast majority are far from being doctrinaire Marxists. To all kinds of doctrinaire politicians, East and West, Poland presents an untidy lot of paradoxes. It is not a police state, for instance, and no one is afraid to criticize the government, but it is not a free country, either; occasionally—and, it would seem, capriciously—certain people are called in by the police and advised not to see such-and-such a visiting westerner.

Moreover, though most Poles dislike communism—and I've heard it said that 95 percent of them, which obviously would include a good many party members, dislike it—they don't seem to fancy our style of capitalism. On the whole, they would probably prefer a form of democratic socialism, like Sweden's. Actually, the people maintain some sort of loyalty to a regime that they basically have little use for—largely because the regime stands for peace and for Polish independence. There is plenty of evidence in everyday life that the Poles are a people who can't be pushed around—many citizens are arrested for resisting the police in matters that have nothing to do with politics—and they would certainly fight for their territory and their independence. When the Poles start worrying about their territory and their independence, the threat they have in mind is Germany. One Pole, in the course of telling me about his country's attitude toward the rest of the world, said, "We foolish Poles love France with a hopeless, unrequited love. We admire America for its civilization and technical progress. We feel superior to the Russians. But we are suspicious of the Germans, and even a little afraid of them." Most Poles make no distinction between East and West Germans, though the regime does. The other day, I fell into conversation with an official of the Polish United Workers (that is, Communist) Party in a coffeehouse, where he and his wife were having a glass of punch, and when he tried to explain to me that one must differentiate between good (East) and bad (West) Germans, his wife expressed disagreement. "East or West, it's just the same," she said with feeling. "A German is a German."

Poles are still seriously concerned about the future of the "returned territories"—the land on the eastern side of the Oder-Neisse line, which Germany had annexed piecemeal over the years and which was tentatively put under Polish administration at the Potsdam Conference, pending the signing of a German peace treaty. The United States, and the West generally, does not yet officially recognize Poland's claim to the territories, and there are elements in West Germany that reject it altogether, but the countries behind the Iron Curtain have all accepted it. The issue is an important one, and the regime keeps it alive, because on this point it has public support (something that the regime needs from time to time) and also because the dispute stirs up anti-American feeling (something that the regime doesn't seem to mind). "We know the Germans better than you Americans do," I was assured a couple of days ago by a Pole who is not a party member. "If you don't want to support German revanchism, why don't you recognize the Oder-Neisse boundary line?" Few Poles spend much time lamenting the fate of the East Germans, and the building of the Berlin wall created little excitement in Warsaw, except among some housewives, who stormed the stores, as their mothers and grandmothers had also done in uncertain times, to lay in sugar, flour, and salt. The general opinion is that the wall may have prevented an explosion—that it probably solved more problems than it raised. "After all," a Pole said, "those people in East Berlin had 16 years to go to the nearest subway station and get out. It's hard to feel much sympathy for them."

In any case, Germans from both West and East come here, some of them on business and others as tourists, and, considering how many Poles were killed by the Nazis, they seem to be treated politely. Naturally enough, the Germans have had a lingering influence in Poland. Everybody in Warsaw, as in Prague and Bucharest and Sofia and Budapest, has spoken at least a little German ever since the occupation, and officials from the various satellite countries often converse in German, though they are supposed to use Russian. Indeed, German has become the lingua franca of the once occupied countries—"the People's Democratic Latin," I heard one Pole call it. And the black Mercedes 220, a product of West Germany, is very much in evidence, for it seems to be the favorite car of the Communist Party and the security police.

The two most powerful men in Poland are Wladyslaw Gomulka, the first secretary of the Communist Party, and Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, who heads the country's Catholic Church. In certain ways, many of the supporters of each man have at least a sneaking respect for the other. The non-Communists generally admit that Gomulka is a Polish patriot, and even that, for a Communist, he is quite tolerant. He is probably doing all he can, they say, in a country that is wedged between Russia and Germany. In October of 1956, when Gomulka, who had just become first secretary after 5 years in jail on a charge of Titoism, defied the Russians by addressing the Hungarian freedom fighters as "our brothers," he was positively admired here, and even non-Communist intellectuals had high hopes for his regime. Now, I should think, the most that can be said is that he is neither liked nor feared. As for the cardinal, the Communists admit that he is a realist. Between them, the cardinal and the first secretary have managed to keep Poland alive and going. In a way, each is faced with the same problem: how to make his faith more attractive to the younger generation. The cardinal, in his baroque palace, and Gomulka, in his simple paneled office in the central committee building, are both working to make their organizations intellectually interesting, and the methods of both are questioned by many of their own followers.

The Polish Constitution of 1952 proclaims the separation of church and state, and adds that the question of religion is "the private affair of each citizen." At present, church and state may be separate, yet they are very much aware of each other, and are watching each other and waiting. The regime harasses the church, but with kid gloves. Last June, for instance, on the holiday of Corpus Christi, when a hundred and fifty thousand of the faithful (12 percent of Warsaw's population) came out to follow the Blessed Sacrament from St. John's Cathedral to St. Ann's Church, where the cardinal spoke, the state authorities did not try to suppress the procession. Instead, they took two rather waspish measures. First, they forbade the use of loudspeakers during the cardinal's sermon (the cardinal got around this by speaking into a microphone that was tied to his crosier while priests spread among the crowd carrying small receiving sets), and, second, they put on a bicycle race, which, as it happened, meant closing off two of the three bridges across the River Vistula, which bisects Warsaw, thus forcing many Catholics to make long detours to reach the cathedral. The church, for its part, is not actively fighting the regime. The cardinal and other priests speak out against materialism and atheism, to be sure, but there was no violent reaction among Catholics in the autumn of 1961, when Gomulka's regime, which had decided in the friendly days of 1956 to permit religious instruction in the schools, decided to stop it again. "It makes little difference to us," a man said. "I'm sending my children to catechism classes in our church. I don't think the regime will stop those classes. It doesn't want serious trouble."

Neither the Catholics nor the atheists can be quite happy about the present situation. A few months ago, the Polish Association of Atheists and Freethinkers held its second congress, and afterward a prominent member wrote in the magazine Argumenty, "It is obvious that the traditional form of the religious cult continues to predominate among the broad masses of our society." The churches of Poland are still crowded every Sunday, and it is no secret that even some party officials show up at mass. ("Why are the trolleys so crowded on Sunday mornings?" a Warsaw joke goes. "Because they're full of party people who have left the Mercedes at home and are on their way to another part of town to attend mass.") But the composition of the crowds in the churches has changed. During the Stalinist era, when priests were constantly being jailed, going to church was an act of political protest, and many young people went to church as a way of defying the regime. Now the Government doesn't interfere openly with church going, and most young people don't go any more. On the whole, they feel that both the church and the state have failed them. "Poland has three religions," a thoughtful man told me the other day. "Catholicism, communism, and a third one." He added that the third one is hard to define; all one can say is that it is against communism and against Catholicism, though it may borrow elements from each. For many people, it is something called "social liberalism"; for others, it is a mixture of Marxist economics and democratic politics, with an overlay of undogmatic religious faith; and for still others, who appear to have become overwhelmed by the complexities of modern thought, it is "the meaning of truth." A young poet I met one night had perhaps the most haunting description of this new religion; he called it Sehnsucht—the German word for "desire."

If these various hints, trends, and yearnings amount to a third religion, Poland has a fourth. Before the war, there were 3 million Jews in the country. Now no one knows exactly how many there are; estimates run from 25,000 to 50,000. Some Polish Jews no longer practice Judaism, and a number have changed their names and attempted to pass as Gentiles, for although the regime officially condemns anti-Semitism, anti-Semitic feeling exists in Poland, even among loyal party members. Warsaw, which used to have dozens of synagogues, now has just one. It escaped destruction by the Germans because the members of the congregation hastily converted it into a stable. It is in an old Jewish slum district near the center of town, and to reach it one has to walk past tenement houses and a couple of lots where ruins are overgrown with weeds. Finally, in a depressing courtyard, one sees the synagogue—a gray, dark building with broken windowpanes and a dilapidated facade. It is a melancholy sight from the outside, but inside one finds all the essentials—the curtain with Hebrew signs, and the Torah, and the voices of men praying. The day I visited the synagogue, most of the worshippers were old and weary looking, but there were two or three in their twenties, and these had the hard, tough faces that are so often to be seen in Eastern Europe—the faces of young people whose early years were spent in concentration camps. A gray-haired man with a scholar's face, who wore a new trenchcoat and spoke excellent German, told me that this synagogue had been built in the latter half of the 19th century by a family called Nosik, and had been known as the Nosik Synagogue. "Nowadays, we often have trouble finding 10 men for a minyan," he said. "That little man over there lived for 45 years in Birobidzhan, the Jewish Republic in Russia. The man next to him is the only one of us who has been in Warsaw the whole time." He was silent for a moment. "You know what it means when I say that he has been here the whole time? He lived through the invasion in 1939, the insurrection in the ghetto in 1943, and the 63 days of the Warsaw uprising the following year. The other day, he told me he cannot believe now that it all really happened."

These Jews could probably leave Poland if they wanted to, and many Jews have left. Poland is the only Communist country that permits large-scale emigration. Every week, people set out for Israel, Canada, Australia, or the United States. Last year, America's quota for Polish immigrants, which, at 6,488, is the fourth largest—after Great Britain's, Germany's, and Ireland's—was completely filled, and at the start of this year there was a long waiting list. The Polish authorities create no major difficulties for emigrants. There is some overpopulation on the farms and some underemployment in the towns, and the only Poles who are refused passports are men who have recently finished their military service and are subject to recall; technicians and highly skilled workers; and a small category of people whose applications are turned down "for reasons of state." Many emigrants leave to join members of their families who emigrated in the old days or escaped during the war. Some are young couples with children, and quite a few of these come into Warsaw from the farm and get straight on a plane for America. Each emigrant is permitted to take along only his personal effects and the equivalent of $5 in cash. A few of those who go to America come back after a year or two, usually complaining that they could not stand the climate; the real reason is probably that they had trouble with the American branch of the family or that they expected too much. Many Poles, especially in the rural regions, think of America as a land of easy, unlimited opportunity. A considerable number of Poles travel to the West as tourists, and, surprisingly, almost all of them return. Back when Poland was still living in its dreary Stalinist epoch, 60 members of a group of 100 Poles visiting Stockholm defected; that would not happen today. Tourism, incidentally, works both ways. Last year, nearly 10,000 Americans, many of whom had been born in Poland, came here for a visit. And there was another category of American travelers—old men and women who were returning to their native villages to die.

In other ways, too, Poland is more closely attached to the United States than one might expect a Communist country to be. For one thing, English has become the most popular Western language in Poland. It is taught—as an optional course, naturally—in high schools and colleges, and in addition 7,000 adults study it at a school in Warsaw run by Polish Methodists. For another thing, more than 500 Poles visit the library of the American Embassy every month, to study up on some aspect of American life or literature. Ever since 1957, the Embassy has been conducting an exchange-of-persons program, and it has expanded steadily; recently a number of professors, technicians, and sportsmen have gone to the States, and so have the Ministers of Foreign Trade and Agriculture. American exhibitions attract considerable attention here. About a year ago, the collection of Edward Steichen's photographs called "The Family of Man" was shown in six Polish cities, and, from all that I hear, large and voluble crowds went to see it. Last summer, a "Plastics U.S.A." exhibition was on view in the main exhibition hall of Warsaw's Palace of Culture and Science; the biggest drawing cards were a Corvette sports car and an experimental Firebird II, both with plastic bodies.

People who follow such matters can always tell the exact temperature of official Polish feelings toward the United States simply by reading the Government-controlled Polish press—drawing conclusions both from what the papers say and from what they don't say. Those feelings can fluctuate drastically. At the time of our atmospheric nuclear tests, for instance, and during our blockade of Cuba, the Polish regime, like all the other Communist governments, looked upon us with a very chilly eye. On other occasions, the attitude has been more cordial—especially when economics has been involved. Over the past 5 years, the United States has signed five separate agreements with Poland, providing, in toto, for the sale (on credit) and shipment to Poland of $486 million worth of surplus agricultural commodities, nonstrategic equipment and materials, and medical supplies. (Some of the foodstuffs were distributed by CARE, which has a program for aiding children in summer camps; widows with children; old people; war invalids; and persons whose income is less than $20 a month.)

In the spring of 1962, a special congressional study group, headed by Representative HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR., of Delaware, visited Poland and concluded that "these commodities reach the people in need [and] persons in Poland benefiting from them are aware of their American origin." So far so good, many of the aid program's supporters in both countries felt. On June 6, however, the U.S. Senate voted to deny aid to "any country known to be dominated by Communists or Marxists." The Poles were furious. Six days later, the Senate voted to permit the shipment of surplus agricultural commodities to Poland and Yugoslavia, after all. Half a year has passed, but the Poles are still somewhat baffled by the double turnabout.

Many aspects of the Polish economy appear rather hazy, but one thing is certain: the people have enough to eat. American aid is one explanation, but there is another, which is probably more important, and that is that 87 percent of the farmland is under private ownership. There are 5,300 "state farms," occupying 12 percent of the farmland, and 1,600 collective farms, occupying 1 percent. After Gomulka came to power, the Government permitted farmers to break up about 8,000 collective farms, on the reasonable ground that they were producing relatively little food. To some extent, the collectives have been replaced by "agricultural circles"—cooperatives, more or less, for which the Government subsidizes the purchase of fertilizers and tractors, and markets some of the produce as well. So far, about 20 percent of the owners of private farms have chosen—and there is a choice—to join these circles. In any case, Poland seems to prove that private ownership of the land still works best. In neighboring East Germany and Czechoslovakia, whose farms are almost completely collectivized, there are serious food shortages, and the Soviet Union, of course, has severe agricultural problems. But in Poland, rice, flour, sugar, and even meat are plentiful and cheap. There are occasional snarls in the distribution of fresh fruit and vegetables, but there is no rationing.

At any of the expensive restaurants in Warsaw, the customer is handed a large, tempting menu, and, as in all Communist countries, the menu tells him exactly how much of every dish he is going to get. In the dining room of the Grand Hotel, for instance, he can have 132 grams of pike in aspic, or 102 grams of egg, with smoked salmon, or 180 grams of borsch with small pastries, and he can even have a slice of lemon—a great luxury—weighing exactly 20 grams. When I had dinner there, I found the roast chicken à la polonaise (310 grams) very good, and I also enjoyed the conversation of my waiter, a white-haired man with exquisite manners, who told me about the wonderful dishes, like sautéd goose stomachs, that he used to serve to Paderewski in the old days, when no one counted the grams.

In the state-managed delicatessens, I have seen many imports—Swiss chocolates, French pâté, Maxwell House instant coffee, and plenty of pineapple from Cuba. Warsaw's latest shopping sensation is the state-run Super-Sam ("sam" is the Polish word for "oneself," and "Super-Sam," translated roughly, means "super-self-service"), where delighted shoppers, carrying metal baskets, make their way past pyramids of Russian canned fish and large refrigerators packed with bottle milk and American-style cold cuts. Prices are controlled, but they tend to creep upward; sometimes the authorities will decide, for instance, that what was formerly classed as "ordinary" butter is now "quality" butter, and the price tag is revised accordingly. "Socialist inflation" is the popular term for the process. Not far from the Super-Sam is the Polna free market, to which, in the appropriate seasons, farmers come at dawn in their horse-drawn carts loaded high with produce and fresh fruit. Price controls are fairly dim at the Polna. A Polish economist has said that the country "is in a transitional stage, part way between the old-fashioned peasant market and a modern food-distribution system," but at the moment it would be truer to say that the old system and the new exist side by side, and in the old-fashioned peasant market the capitalistic law of supply and demand still regulates the price.

If Poland's agriculture is getting along quite well, so is its industry. The annual increase in industrial production is officially said to be 10 percent, and even skeptics concede that it is at least 8 percent. The country has a brandnew copper industry and an excellent aluminum plant (built with Russian help), and is intensively exploiting the second largest sulfur deposits on earth. The Poles have been exporting as much as they can—coal and rolling stock to the Soviet Union, machine tools to Japan and Italy, bicycles and ham to the United States, and bacon, ham, and eggs to England and West Germany. All the same, Poland has a chronic foreign-trade deficit, which in 1961 amounted to $180 million, and, like some other countries, it looks with trepidation on the Common Market, which threatens to reduce drastically Polish trade with the six.

At the official rate of exchange, 4 Polish zlotys are worth $1. Tourists, however, get Zl24 for a dollar, and Polish citizens get Zl72. (Approximately $2 million a year is paid to Poles who once lived in the United States by the Veterans and Social Security Administrations, the Civil Service Commission, and the Railroad Retirement Board, and a good many Poles receive dollars from American relatives.) The black-market rate is even higher—between Zl80 and Zl90 to the dollar. The best customers for black-market dollars are farmers (who love to keep a few greenbacks under their mattresses, the way French farmers used to keep gold coins), people hopefully saving up for a trip to Paris, and shady operators who buy such goods as perfume and watches in the West and sell them here at exorbitant prices. The average Polish wage is Zl400 a week. In the state-owned stores, a pair of good shoes costs Zl800, a sports jacket Zl1,000, a shirt Zl500. Word may get around that a state store suddenly has a supply of Italian ties for Zl35 apiece, and everybody will rush over and buy a few, because such ties cost four times that in the small private-initiative stores clustered around the Palace of Culture. (The Poles call the section "Our Rue de la Paix.")

The consumer passion runs high in Poland, and Warsaw has its crop of status seekers eager to keep up with the Michalskis, who have a white telephone, spend their weekends in the country, and last spring reached the pinnacle by making a 3-week trip to London, Paris, and Rome. Even in the Polish villages, once hives of illiteracy and poverty, there have been many changes. TV antennas can be seen on quite a few roofs, and the people talk about—and some even have—refrigerators and washing machines. Nevertheless, there is a widespread feeling here that the standard of living is improving too slowly, and everywhere in Poland one hears complaints about how hard it is to find certain things—notably, apartments and cars.

Eighty-five percent of all the buildings in Warsaw were destroyed during the war, and other towns and villages fared just as badly. Although the Poles are rebuilding at an impressive rate—apartment houses with a total of more than 72,000 rooms went up in Poland during the first half of last year—they are still a long way from catching up. The state is doing most of the building, and it provides apartments at very low rentals, but in order to get one a family has to meet a large number of requirements, having to do with such things as wages, number of children, and health, and besides, there is always a long waiting list. Just about the only alternative is to get an apartment in a cooperative. A man I know has made a downpayment of Zl18,000 on a one-room apartment priced at Zl75,000. He will have to wait 2 years to move in, and then he will pay Zl250 a month, which includes mortgage payments and upkeep. He considers himself lucky.

In Poland, architects and town planners are among the elite, and the country could use more of them. At present, there are 4,200 architects, 1,600 of whom work in Warsaw. These have all but finished their task of reconstructing the historic parts of the city, and they have definitely given up monumental building in the Stalinist style, so today most of them are concentrating on new apartment houses. This means coping with shortages of materials, a lack of skilled labor, and other problems—among them, the problem of density. "Warsaw is not as bad as Manhattan, but it is getting close," an architect who recently spent 6 months in the United States said the other day. The building program makes no provision for one-family houses here in the city, and the architects do the best they can with large buildings. "I believe our new apartment houses look a good deal better than the ones that were put up before 1956," my architect friend said. "We are trying to build a little as the Italians and the Dutch do, with large windows and sunny balconies. But we can't do everything we want. We lack the proper window frames. We lack," he shrugged, and added, "I always find these things hard to explain to Americans. You people can do anything." Polish architects feel that there is "great social value" in the appearance of a city. They do not design the kind of depressingly uniform, blocklike structures that one sees in Kiev and Prague, in Dresden and Bucharest. Warsaw's new houses have bright colors and pleasant individual touches. Besides apartment houses, the city urgently needs schools and hospitals, and ambitious plans are being drawn up for a new public library, a new railroad station, and two more bridges across the Vistula. Architects are also discussing what to build in the "wild west"—a large, desolate area near the Palace of Culture and Science, that monument to Stalinist pomposity at its worst. Some optimists look forward to the day when the palace will be surrounded—and hidden—by skyscrapers. Another thing that the architects are discussing is whether the 14th century Royal Castle, which was blown up by the Nazis and is still a heap of ruins, should be rebuilt exactly as it was. Some of them say that the expense would be frightful and that a great many useful buildings could be put up for that amount of money. Others reply that something must be put into the large hole and that the historic character of the city would be destroyed if a modern building was put up there. "Knowing my fellow citizens, I expect the Royal Castle to be rebuilt exactly as it was, at enormous expense," one architect has told me.

The Poles want gadgets, clothes, and houses, but when it comes to private vehicles they are downright avaricious. In Poland, a car is more than a means of transportation or a symbol of Western comfort; it is a nationwide obsession. Everybody wants a car, and many people put in years of saving for one. There are now only 800,000 motorcycles in Poland and only 200,000 automobiles, yet during the rush hour it is dangerous to cross a city street. A folder distributed by LOT, the Polish airline, says, "In Warsaw, vehicles do not stop at bus and tram stops or at pedestrian crossings; they only slow down." Poland has its own hierarchy of motor vehicles. At the bottom is the Polish-made Junak motorcycle, which costs Zl7,000 or between 15 and 20 weeks' wages. Next comes a motor scooter, made in Russia or Poland, that looks almost like a Lambretta and costs Zl17,000, or close to a year's wages. By the time a man owns one of these, he has begun to dream of a Syrena (Mermaid), a hard-knocking, two-cylinder Polish automobile that costs Zl72,000. So many people want a Syrena that a prospective customer generally has to wait 6 months for delivery. From the Syrena, one ascends to a Czech Skoda (Zl90,000), a Polish Warszawa (Zl120,000), a Volkswagen (Zl160,000), and finally a Mercedes 220 (Zl300,000). The question is, who can afford to pay so much money for a car? Plenty of people, I'm told—film stars, prominent writers and architects, engineers with more than one job, professors who serve as consultants to industry, medical specialists who combine unlucrative public practices with lucrative private ones, people who own private-initiative stores, and a few big lawyers.

Poland has long been an extremely litigious country, and in prewar times the lawyer and the factory owner were usually the richest men in town. In Communist countries, of course, the legal profession is looked down upon, and a few of the lawyers who used to make a good living by keeping people out of jail now have one foot in jail themselves.

In Poland, lawyers are organized in cooperatives, and the cooperatives assign individual cases to them. A law passed last year specified the fees that lawyers were permitted to demand, and the fees were very low. As it works out, however, some clients see fit to reimburse their lawyers more lavishly than the law specifies. Last week, I dropped into a Warsaw courtroom where a criminal case was being tried, and I noticed that the defense lawyer wore an elegant Italian-style suit (Italian, not British, fashions are now the sine qua non of the fastidious Warsawian), while the public prosecutor—a feared man in Poland—and the judge wore shabby suits of undistinguished cut which could only have come from the state-run Central Department Store. After the trial, the defense lawyer drove off in a Warszawa car. The prosecutor boarded a crowded trolley and rode home for half a zloty. The defense lawyer may have had his worries, though; many prosperous lawyers are now being investigated for alleged tax frauds or black-market operations, and some have been tried and convicted.

Last year, there were over a million court cases in Poland—1 for every 30 inhabitants, including children—and another half million cases were settled out of court. A good many of the lawsuits apparently stemmed from fights after country weddings and other rural celebrations. (Though the government's Central Statistical Office is reticent about the matter, Poles take pride in being one of the hardest-drinking nations in the world.) Many peasants have money saved up, and if they get into trouble, they are able to pay their lawyers generously. About 10 percent of the court cases have to do with theft, and 40 percent deal with "economic crimes against the state"—an area in which there are so many laws, decrees, and special regulations that some lawyers handle only cases involving the textile industry, others only building-trade cases, and so on. (The builder of a house has about 1,200 laws to cope with.) Some of the best-publicized crimes against the state are "crimes of negligence." The manager of a state enterprise is personally responsible for what his employees do or fail to do; if a factory worker illegally takes something home with him, for instance, not only the worker but the manager is liable to arrest. A manager may also be arrested if his workers don't fulfill "the plan"—something that often happens, because workers are likely to be saving their strength for a second, and private job. (A comparable thing occurs in Western Europe, where masons, bricklayers, and plumbers frequently earn more from a weekend of freelancing than they do from a week's work at their regular jobs.) Recently, the director of a Polish state enterprise was arrested for paying a special bonus to his men to make them work harder and finish a job on time. Many able men avoid managerial jobs here, and it is not hard to see why.

Intellectually and artistically, Poland is certainly the liveliest country in Eastern Europe—perhaps in all of Europe. Practically everything of a cultural nature that is done or not done here is the subject of controversy. The opera house now being built in Victory Square is an example; though it is only about half completed, it has already cost half a billion zlotys, and, to judge from what one hears on the streets and in the cafes, that is a lot more than most Poles think should be spent on an opera house. Poles will gladly spend millions on the restoration of anything connected with Frédéric Chopin or their 19th-century poet Adam Mickiwicz, not to mention John III Sobieski and the other great Polish kings, but they have never been much interested in opera, and today the younger generation considers it somewhat passé. Still, opera does have its adherents, and one of them, as I discovered when I went to take a look at the partly finished building, is Dr. Arnold Szyfman, an 80-year-old impresario, who ran Warsaw's famous Teatr Polski for 40 years, and who is now in charge of rebuilding the opera house.

Warsaw's old opera house—the Teatr Wielki, or Great Theater, which was built in 1832—was destroyed, except for its facade, during the Second World War. In 1950, the Polish Government decided to rebuild it, and though the design was contributed by an architect named Bogdan Pniewski, the true hero of the reconstruction, and the target of much criticism as well, has been Dr. Szyfman. The actual work of reconstruction started in 1956, and is expected to be finished by 1964. When Dr. Szyfman took me on a guided tour of his domain, the place was so crowded with workmen that if I had been on my own I couldn't have got much of an idea of what it would be like, but as the doctor talked I could almost visualize it on opening night.

The auditorium, Dr. Szyfman told me, will have only two thousand seats; he thinks that that is the best size for an auditorium, and also that Warsaw probably could not fill a bigger one. But everything else in the house will be, to use Dr. Szyfman's favorite word, enormous. Certainly the various stages—the main stage, the side stages, the back stage, and a circular, revolving stage—are to be large by any standard. The layout of stages, Dr. Szyfman thinks, will permit a production of "Boris Godunov" in which all its nine sets can be prepared before the beginning of the performance—a feat that no other opera house on earth has ever achieved. But the real sensations, I soon found out, are hidden ones. They include a large orchestra rehearsal room under the auditorium, another one under the stage, and a rehearsal auditorium—almost a small opera house in itself—on the fifth floor. "Instead of rehearsing on the main stage and using 50 or 60 technicians, we will rehearse up there on the fifth floor and do the same job with 8 or 10 men," Dr. Szyfman said proudly. "The savings will be enormous. We will also have a rehearsal room for the chorus, and four rehearsal rooms—two big and two small—for the ballet. The main stage will be used only for the performance—a revolutionary innovation. We're going to have a museum of the theater here, too, and a hostel for singers and dancers in an adjoining building. I don't think there's anything quite like this opera house in the world."

At this thought, Dr. Szyfman took a deep breath. Then he said, "Opera has a great history in this city. In the old days, all the world-famous artists came here. Chaliapin stopped off at least once a year. Since the last war, there has been a decline. We've been performing on a makeshift basis in the Palace of Culture and Science, and we've had too many management changes. During the 1961 season, we had only 14 weeks in the repertory, and the performances were mediocre. But at the end of that season, the prominent conductor Bogdan Wodiczko was appointed director of the Warsaw Opera, and since then things have been perking up. It's been a real renaissance. Wodiczko has conducted Stravinsky's 'Perséphone' and 'Oedipus Rex,' and we've had fine productions of Gluck's 'Iphigénie en Aulide,' Honegger's 'Judith,' and a stage version of Debussy's cantata 'L'Enfant Prodigue.' No Wagner, though."

Before I left, Dr. Szyfman showed me the dressing rooms, which had recently been completed, and the ones for soloists were the largest, brightest, and most elegant I have ever seen. "The Warsaw opera house has 10 bathrooms for its soloists, each situated between 2 dressing rooms," Dr. Szyfman said. "No other opera house in the world can make such a claim. It took the present regime in Poland to authorize such a project. It's enormous." He paused, and then said, "I hope I'll be around for the opening."

I spent the other evening with a Polish friend and a visiting Russian girl. We were sitting in a coffeehouse called Pod Gwiazdami (Under the Stars), which is situated on top of a skyscraper, and below us we could see Warsaw's streets, bright with fluorescent light. The girl described herself vaguely as "a student from an institute that is like your MIT," but we didn't talk much about technology, because she was so excited about Warsaw. She had been here a week, and had seen some avant-garde plays, heard some acid criticism of the government, looked at books about expressionism and cubism, and danced the twist. She was going to go back to Moscow the next morning, she said, but she would never, never forget this trip. I'm sure she meant it.

One doesn't have to come from a Communist country to be stimulated by Warsaw. It is one of the most talkative cities in the world. I heard Poles talking in such clubs as the SARP (the Association of Polish Architects) and the ZAIKS (the Society of Authors, Composers, and Publishers), and, most notably, in the coffeehouses, which are crowded day and night, and which make the coffeehouses of Vienna (where the coffeehouse originated) seem dull. Conversation is practiced as an art here, and the joys of discussion are deeply appreciated. People talk politics at fever pitch, but with surprising tolerance. One recent evening, I dined with five men—a party member, a revisionist, a poet who is fed up with Gomulka, a practicing Catholic, and a "straight Westerner." We argued widely and constantly but never nastily. A lot of vodka flowed, but its only effect was to make my companions talk even faster.

There are also as many bookstores in Warsaw as there are banks in Zurich. New books are issued in paper covers, as in France, and they cost no more than two packs of cigarettes. Consequently, even first novels may sell 10,000 copies in a few days, and sales of 50,000 are far from uncommon. The annual bookfair at the Palace of Culture and Science attracts as many people as a major soccer game. And the Poles not only read; they write. Writing poetry is the great national pastime, and there are probably more poets per square mile here than anywhere else in the world. Many American and Western European films are shown here, though American films seem to arrive years late. (The big show in town right now is "It Happened in Rome.") The Polish film industry is quite lively, though it suffered a great loss 2 years ago when the immensely gifted Andrzej Munk—whose films "The Blue Cross" and "Eroica" presented bitter views of the occupation and the Warsaw uprising—was killed in an accident. Warsaw's 16 legitimate theaters show a cross section of the best plays of both the East and the West. In the last few months, plays by Brecht, Sartre, Sagan, Dürrenmatt, and Max Frisch have been presented, along with a couple of Polish plays, a new Soviet play ("The Dragon," by Evgeny Schwarz), and an old American play ("Harvey").

This is one Communist city where members of "the milieu"—as the artistic world is known—are important, influential, and close to the heart and the pulse of the nation. The milieu even exercises a definite attraction on snobbish party members—an attraction that does not work both ways. "In Prague and Budapest, the intellectuals would be delighted to have the party hierarchy join their circle," a Polish writer who had just visited those cities told me, "but we want as little to do with our hierarchy as possible. Some of my friends in Czechoslovakia and Hungary long to come here and breathe the exhilarating air of intellectual freedom, so they can know they are still alive, but they can't get passports.

Obviously, the Communists there are afraid we would corrupt their artists, and we probably would. Poor creatures—they kept me up all night answering their questions about new French paintings, Swiss plays, and American films. It was pathetic. The poorest Pole is a rich Westerner compared to a Czech or a Hungarian—or a Russian, for that matter. We like to see people from the West here. We don't have the defensive arrogance that the Russians display toward foreigners. Our mission is to be a cultural bridge between East and West—to bring Western ideas and Western culture to the East."

For all their exuberance, Polish artists do have to proceed with care, for their position is full of ambiguities and dangers, small and large. A typical ambiguity appears in the case of a painter I have met. He does some realistic drawing and a great deal of abstract painting. The state-run museums buy his drawings, but don't bother to show them. They show his paintings—on loan from the artist—but don't dare to buy them. The reason is that abstract painting, which is much more popular than realism here, is still officially taboo; a museum director may very well get away with showing an abstraction, but he might lose his job for buying one. Polish literary men face comparable problems. A writer who too clearly criticizes the regime probably won't be thrown out of his apartment or lose his job, but he will have difficulty getting published. The state publishing house, unlike its counterparts in other Communist countries, does not seem to work hand in glove with the censors of the ministry of culture or of the central committee; it sometimes takes a bold chance with a book, and sometimes the book in question is banned. Pressure to increase conformity is always there. "We Poles rejoice in what freedom we have," one writer told me, perhaps summing up not only the state of the intellectuals but that of the nation as a whole. "However, we never know what's coming next. We can't take anything for granted, and, believe me, we don't."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan (at the request of Mr. NEDZI) on account of illness.

Mr. HEALEY (at the request of Mr. KEOGH), for Wednesday, February 27, 1963, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BECKER, for 2 hours, on Monday, March 4, 1963.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. CAHILL, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. McDOWELL (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ), for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ), for 60 minutes, on February 28, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BECKER and to include a speech.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEROUNIAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GLENN.

Mr. HORAN.

Mr. SIBAL in two instances.

Mr. FINDLEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McDOWELL.

Mr. PIKE.

Mr. BURKE.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

476. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480 agreements concluded during January 1963, pursuant to Public Law 85-128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

477. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Street Readjustment Act of the District of Columbia so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close all or part of a street, road, highway, or alley in accordance with the requirements of an approved redevelopment or urban renewal plan, without regard to the notice provisions of such act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

478. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to increase the partial pay of educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia who are on leave of absence for educational improvement, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

479. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes', approved February 4, 1925"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

480. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes', approved May 1, 1906, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

481. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

482. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

483. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize certain expenses in the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

484. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in expansion of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

485. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of unnecessary deterioration of unused rubber tracks for Army combat vehicles; to the Committee on Government Operations.

486. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of a publication entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1961, Privately Owned"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

487. A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a report that the Atomic Energy Commission took no affirmative actions under the authority of Public Law 85-804 during the calendar year ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 85-804; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on investigation and study of aircraft noise problems (Rept. No. 36). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 146. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 84; with amendment (Rept. No. 37). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 100. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; with amendment (Rept. No. 38). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 35. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary under Public Law 86-272; with amendment (Rept. No. 39). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 226. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; with amendment (Rept. No. 40). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 239. Resolution to provide funds for the expense of studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 38; with amendment (Rept. No. 41). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 204. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 153, with amendment (Rept. No. 42). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 202. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 142; with amendment (Rept. No. 43). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 243. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 55; with amendment (Rept. No. 44). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 80. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by rule XI(8) incurred by the Committee on Government Operations: with amendment (Rept. No. 45). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 165. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on House Administration; with amendment (Rept. No. 46). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 135. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 79; with amendment (Rept. No. 47). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 30. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 29; with amendment (Rept. No. 48). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 152. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 151; with amendment (Rept. No. 49). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 236. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 56; with amendment (Rept. No. 50). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 237. Resolution to provide for the further expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 56; with amendment (Rept. No. 51). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 177. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 143; with amendment (Rept. No. 52). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 222. Resolution to provide funds for the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 13; with amendment (Rept. No. 53). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 249. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; with amendment (Rept. No. 54). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 74. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 73; with amendment (Rept. No. 55). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 227. Resolution to provide funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means; with amendment (Rept. No. 56). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 4298. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to assure that rates, fares, and charges established under that section for the United States Government are free from undue prejudice and preference; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 4299. A bill providing that certain privately owned irrigable lands in the Milk River project in Montana shall be deemed to be excess lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4300. A bill to amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4301. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 4302. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to limit the number of standees on railroad cars; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 4303. A bill to amend section 102(a) of title 28 of the United States Code to transfer certain counties from the northern division to the southern division of the eastern district of Michigan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4304. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4305. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1959 to provide a 1-year moratorium on Federal Housing Administration insured and certain other guaranteed and insured mortgages, with the Federal Government assuming the mortgage payments (both principal and interest) and certain other mortgage costs, for mortgagors in areas of substantial unemployment who are unemployed and unable to make such payments through no fault of their own, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4306. A bill to prohibit advertising in commerce of articles produced in any foreign country unless the advertisement clearly states that fact; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4307. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4308. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4309. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GILL:

H.R. 4310. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of cost-of-living allowances received by certain caretakers and clerks employed by the National Guard outside the continental United States, or in Alaska; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 4311. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4312. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4313. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4314. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 4315. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 4316. A bill to amend sections 1231, 272, and 631 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to iron ore royalties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4317. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to retirement fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4318. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize the retirement of employees after 30 years of service without reduction in annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 4319. A bill to permit persons who suffered damage to their lands or other private property by reason of flooding along the Arroyo Colorado and North Floodway in October of 1958 due to the diversion of flood waters of the Rio Grande to file claims under the act of August 27, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 4320. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the restriction on the period during which an application for a determination of disability is granted full retroactivity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 4321. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 4322. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to utilize

volunteers for active police duty; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 4323. A bill to amend the act of May 18, 1956, in order to provide for payment for rights-of-way used for the Ainsworth unit, Missouri River Basin project, being constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 4324. A bill to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery on or near the Cumberland River in the eastern part of the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4325. A bill to set a definite limit on the number of employees supervised by a foreman of mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4326. A bill to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof prohibiting the certification, as bargaining representative of persons employed as guards, of a labor organization which admits to membership, or is affiliated with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 4327. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, to extend for 2 years the provisions thereof which would otherwise expire; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4328. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 20-percent across-the-board benefit increase, to reduce from 72 to 70 the age at which deductions cease to be made from benefits on account of outside earnings, and to provide that the Federal Government shall contribute one-third of the additional cost of such changes (reducing the additional contributions required of workers and employers accordingly); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4329. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHITENER (by request):

H.R. 4330. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 4331. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the northeastern water and related land resources compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 4332. A bill to amend section 560 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of special pension to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor awarded such medal for actions not involving conflict with an enemy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 4333. A bill to authorize the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia to discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 4334. A bill to require each person hired by a Member of the House of Representatives to perform compensated services in the District of Columbia and the district represented by the Member; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 4335. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to transfer the counties of Genesee and Shiawassee in the State of Michigan from the northern division to the southern division of the eastern judicial district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4336. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4337. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 4338. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel and transportation allowances for travel performed under orders that are canceled, revoked, or modified, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 4339. A bill to increase from $600 to $750 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4340. A bill to provide for fair representation of all areas of the United States in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4341. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 4342. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4343. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions (including the exemptions for dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness) to $1,000 for 1963 and succeeding year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4344. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which old-age and other monthly insurance benefits shall be payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4345. A billl relating to the distribution of the Year Book of Agriculture; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4346. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 4347. A bill to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to new construction or alteration of veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 4348. A bill to provide for the relocation and reestablishment of the members of the Papago Indian Tribe inhabiting the village of Sil Murk, which adjoins the Gila Bend Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 292. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. Con. Res. 102. Concurrent resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT:

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Res. 265. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Res. 266. Resolution authorizing investigation of effects of foreign trade on American economy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GLENN:

H. Res. 267. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 268. Resolution to amend clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that committee reports include an estimate of the cost of bills, as reported to the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. Res. 269. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. Res. 270. Resolution to amend rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to permit Members to introduce jointly public bills, memorials, and resolutions; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 4349. A bill for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 4350. A bill for the relief of Reeder Motor Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 4351. A bill for the relief of Marietta C. Bibeau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 4352. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Filomena Daria Mannarella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 4353. A bill for the relief of Asher Dzialoschynski, his wife, Lilly Ida Dzialoschynski, and their minor son, Jeschua Dan Dzialoschynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 4354. A bill for the relief of Bianca Viola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4355. A bill for the relief of Muriel Agatha Gauntlett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 4356. A bill to provide transportation for molten sulfur in an amount not to exceed 100,000 long tons in the vessel SS *Etude* and SS *Pochteca* from U.S. ports on the gulf coast to other points in the United States along the gulf coast and the eastern seaboard until December 31, 1963; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 4357. A bill for the relief of Robert Wilkes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 4358. A bill for the relief of Jacob Attias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4359. A bill for the relief of Estela Colobong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4360. A bill for the relief of Stojan Pavesic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 4361. A bill for the relief of the estate of Paul F. Ridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 4362. A bill for the relief of Ie Liang Pouw, his mother, Tenglan Ong Pouw, his wife, Bie In Ijiang Pouw, and his minor children, Jennee Pouw and Sien Wie Pouw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 4363. A bill for the relief of Dr. Wei-Tsung Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 4364. A bill to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer for the use of Oregon State University; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 4365. A bill for the relief of Henryk Lazowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 4366. A bill for the relief of Domenico De Marco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 4367. A bill for the relief of Estena Adella Grant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4368. A bill for the relief of Rose Babaian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4369. A bill for the relief of Nicholaus Iatridis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4370. A bill for the relief of Demitrios Karonis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 4371. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sofia Mazzella di Regnella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 4372. A bill for the relief of Miss Najiba Antone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4373. A bill for the relief of Hugo Beretvas, his wife, Veronica Beretvas, and their minor son, Andrew Beretvas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 4374. A bill to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 4375. A bill to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 4376. A bill to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 4377. A bill to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

56. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Doris M. Hyde, secretary, Catholic Evidence Guild of New York, New York, N.Y., relative to the position of the President's educational aid program insofar as it pertains to elementary and secondary schools is discriminatory against those who choose to exercise their constitutional rights in practicing their religion and in the education of their children in private schools, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Day With Their Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTIS G. PIKE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a praiseworthy program developed a year ago by the Suffolk County, Long Island, N.Y., Boy Scout organization, whereby the hardest working Eagle Scout in the county was rewarded with a trip to Washington to spend a day with his Congressman. This was an extension of their town and county scouts in government program to the Federal level, and so far as I know is the first Boy Scout group in the country to develop this program.

It was such an enjoyable and rewarding experience for the young man, Eagle Scout John Weiner, of Huntington, N.Y., and for me, that when I was asked again this year whether I would be willing to take another Eagle Scout under my wing for a day, I looked forward with the greatest of pleasure to his arrival. Two Eagle Scouts, James Boardman, of Aquebogue, N.Y., and Ernest Trubig, of Lindenhurst, N.Y., arrived on February 19 for a day with their respective Representatives.

Into a single day we crowded visits to the Smithsonian, the FBI, the Supreme Court, the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, luncheon at the Capitol, and a tour of the House and Senate.

Along the way we squeezed in a quick briefing on how our laws are made, and let our Eagle Scouts absorb as much as they could of the flavor of the Nation's Capital.

Although the boys only expected to have 1 day, their plane was grounded that night and they had to remain in Washington another 24 hours. Their host, Mr. Harry Jones, of the national Boy Scout organization, was able to take them to the luncheon for Astronaut John Glenn given by the Washington Board of Trade, and to the assignment of his famous space capsule to the Smithsonian Institution, and to meet President Kennedy and the President of Venezuela. I think I can safely say that Eagle Scouts James Boardman and Ernest Trubig have had an unforgettable experience, and one that should be made available to the most distinguished Eagle Scout in each congressional district in the years to come.

The concept of a day in Washington with their Congressman for outstanding Eagle Scouts is one I shall continue to foster, and it has already caught the imagination of the national Boy Scout organization. I hope its worth and possibilities will so impress my colleagues in the House that they will want to make similar arrangements with the Boy Scout organization back home, and in 1964 guide an outstanding Eagle Scout through the mazes of the National Government just as the two Members representing Suffolk County, Long Island, N.Y., had the privilege of doing last week.

A Quality Stabilization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON W. GLENN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, independent retailers in all fields are being relentlessly liquidated by monopoly producing price cutting known as customer-bait pricing.

There are a number of reasons for the decline of independent retailing. But I think the inability of the small storekeeper to sell, at a fair profit, the famous brand-name products which are his bread and butter, must come at, or near, the top of these reasons.

The quality stabilization bill which I introduce today will not cure customer-bait pricing, but its enactment most assuredly will help curb it.

The quality stabilization bill reflects free enterprise at its enlightened best. It enables the manufacturers, if they wish, to guard the reputation of their brand names. It would restore fair, yet competitive, pricing to the marketplace, and would cost neither the Government nor the consumer a single penny.

Government Takeover in Grain Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, to understand more fully why the USDA's Commodity Credit Corporation needs still more money beyond its present $14.5 billion fund, I present here statistics showing the degree to which Uncle Sam has taken over feed grain merchandising in recent years.

Twenty-five years ago, the entire feed grain carryover of the United States was owned privately—on farms, in country elevators or terminal markets.

Today—an alltime high—88.5 percent of feed grain carryover is handled by Uncle Sam.

Here is the shocking story of Government takeover of what historically has been a private enterprise activity. It naturally follows that, as Government assumes greater responsibility for grain merchandising, more cash is needed.

The attached table shows the total feed grain stocks over the past 25 years, the stocks owned by CCC and other stocks. Feed grain stocks are counted, in this case, as of October 1 for corn and sorghum and as of July 1 for oats and barley:

Total feed grains carryover at the beginning of marketing year

Year beginning—	Government stocks [1]	Other stocks	Total	Government stocks as a percentage of total
	Million tons	*Million tons*	*Million tons*	*Percentage*
1937	(2)	3.8	3.8	0
1938	1.3	13.0	14.3	9.1
1939	7.2	13.5	20.7	34.8
1940	13.2	9.6	22.8	57.9
1941	11.3	11.8	23.1	48.9
1942	5.5	13.0	18.5	29.7
1943	.4	17.4	17.8	2.2
1944	.2	11.4	11.6	1.7
1945	.3	14.6	14.9	2.0
1946	(2)	10.9	10.9	0
1947	.3	13.5	13.8	2.2
1948	(2)	7.8	7.8	0
1949	15.3	15.1	30.4	50.3
1950	20.9	9.6	30.5	68.5
1951	14.8	13.8	28.6	51.7
1952	9.0	11.1	20.1	44.8
1953	16.6	10.4	27.0	61.5
1954	22.6	9.1	31.7	71.3
1955	29.7	9.4	39.1	76.0
1956	34.7	8.5	43.2	80.3
1957	40.8	8.0	48.8	83.6
1958	49.7	9.3	59.0	84.2
1959	58.0	9.5	67.5	85.9
1960	65.7	8.9	74.6	88.1
1961 [3]	74.7	10.0	84.7	88.2
1962 [4]	60.5	10.5	71.0	88.5

[1] Owned by CCC and old crop grain under loan.
[2] Less than 50,000 bushels.
[3] Preliminary.
[4] Source: FDS–196.

Source: Grain and feed statistics through 1961, Statistical Bulletin No. 159, revised June 1962.

Full Military Honors for 11 Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, today a group burial service with full military honors for 11 young Americans who died in the crash of a B–25 bomber during World War II in New Guinea was held at the Arlington National Cemetery. Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish services were conducted in the Fort Myer chapel and the services then moved to the gravesite at section 34, Arlington National Cemetery. The three chaplains officiating were Lt. Col. Harry P. Henderson, U.S. Air Force, Protestant; Capt. Thomas J. Moran, U.S. Air Force, Catholic; and Capt. Ervin Preis, U.S. Army, Jewish.

Taking part in the ceremony were: A one-platoon honor escort from the 1st Battle Group, 3d Infantry—The Old Guard—Fort Myer, Va.; music by the U.S. Army Band; two caissons drawn by horses; three volleys by seven-man firing party; the playing of "Taps" by bugler.

The names of men are as follows: Sgt. Jack E. Beals, West Hollywood, Fla.; S. Sgt. Marvin Culbreth, Dearing, Ga.; Sgt. Harold B. Davis, Zanesville, Ohio; Lt. Angelo C. Dellisante, Corning, N.Y.; Sgt. Charlie L. Fann, Murfreesboro, Tenn.; Lt. Walter R. Gerry, East Providence, R.I.; Sgt. Raymond F. Greene, Norwood, Mass.; Cpl. Edward R. Howard, Hingham, Mass.; Capt. Rudolph W. Johnson, Jr., Muskegon, Mich.; Sgt. Milton S. Miller, Bridgeport, Conn.; and Capt. Lamar S. Russell, Goldhill, N.C.

Members of the families who attended are: Mrs. Mildred E. Thomas, mother of Jack E. Beals; Mr. Elbert D. Culbreth, brother of Marvin E. Culbreth; John B. Davis, father of Harold B. Davis; Philip B. Dellisante, brother of Angelo C. Dellisante; Mr. Houston Fann, father of Charlie L. Fann; Walter R. Gerry, father of Walter R. Gerry; Maude R. Greene, mother of Raymond F. Greene; Carol Robinson, sister of Edward R. Howard; Rudolph W. Johnson, Sr., father of Rudolph W. Johnson, Jr.; Minna B. Miller, sister of Milton S. Miller; and Beulah S. Russell, mother of Lamar S. Russell.

Also in attendance were: Mr. and Mrs. Richard Greene of Norwood, Mass., and Mr. Leslie Greene of Racine, Wis.

These brave young Americans gave their full measure of devotion to our country. Their remains are in two caskets buried in the same grave. Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish boys who died together that this Nation of ours might live. One headstone bearing the name of each young man will mark the final resting place in the Arlington National Cemetery. No words of mine could adequately send out the message or lesson to our countrymen that has been laid down by these fine young Americans. I know the entire Nation mourns their loss.

The 15th Anniversary of the Communist Takeover of Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABNER W. SIBAL
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, February 24th was the 15th anniversary of the Communist takeover of Czechoslovakia. The wretchedness of life under the Red regime needs no particular review at this time. It is well known, and Czechoslovakia is not alone among the nations of the world who suffer life under communism. She is but one of a tragic list of oppressed nations, all of which stand as cruel illustrations of the harshness, moral bankruptcy, and utter inability of the Communist system to meet the economic or spiritual needs of mankind.

An example of the complete callousness of the Red regime in Prague is its current practice of extorting American dollars from American citizens who have relatives in Czechoslovakia. This is a practice which Members of Congress should know about and which, in my opinion, our Government should stop.

Because of the economic misery in Czechoslovakia, American relatives are anxious to send gift packages of American goods to their close of kin. The Communists are making this impossible, however, by placing an astronomical duty on new goods and an almost prohibitive duty on used clothing.

The purpose is to extort dollars out of Americans. If Americans wish to help their needy relatives and friends, they must send dollars with which Czechoslovakian citizens can buy Czechoslovakian goods, if and when available, in a government store called Tuzex.

Through this process, the Red regime accumulates dollars which it uses to spread anti-American propaganda and to promote subversion in Latin America and elsewhere in the world.

Our balance-of-payments problems are so severe that we restrict the amount of goods our own citizens can bring back duty free. It is folly, Mr. Speaker, to tolerate this open leak of dollars, which not only further weakens the international position of the dollar, but directly fills the coffers of our enemies. Let us put a stop to this either by sending the direct transfer of American dollars to the Communist regimes or by insisting that gift packages of American goods be allowed to go directly to needy citizens of those countries.

The Berlin Wall Is a Barrier to the Exchange of Ideas, Trade, and People—And the Exclusion of American Poultry From the Common Market Is a Violation of the Principle of Free Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the exclusion of American poultry products from the Common Market is no less a violation of the principle of free trade than the Berlin wall.

I include herewith for the information of my colleagues an editorial from the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal of February 25, and a recent press release of mine on this subject:

DELMARVA BIRDS NEED TO TRAVEL

A major tenet of the European Common Market has been that agriculture in the six nations needs tariff protection if it is to reach its full potential for feeding Western Europe. One of the imports saddled with a stiff duty is poultry. Delmarva broiler growers are therefore unhappy.

After a conference that U.S. Representative McDOWELL and Congressmen from other poultry States had with the President, word came that Mr. Kennedy would see that an American complaint was lodged with the Common Market's Council of Ministers in Brussels.

Negotiations on matters of this kind are important to the Common Market as well as to U.S. agriculture. Those European countries have a stake in trade with the United

States. They cannot hope to be so self-sufficient in all important commodities and manufactures that they can risk raising unnecessary barriers against any single import.

Certainly the broiler industry in the Delmarva Peninsula must protest any new action that puts more of a squeeze on profits. Growers cannot well stand the kind of prices—as low as 16 cents a pound live weight—that have been afflicting the industry for a long time here.

In this country, of course, there is the internal trouble of overproduction. You'd think the huge American market would insure profits for the American poultry industry, with all the promotional means at its disposal. But the overproduction in chickens is a hard fact. While it continues, the export of poultry is critically important.

We'll say this for the Delmarva poultry industry: It has taken a stanch position against U.S. artificial controls of production. Since tariffs are another kind of artificial control, there is a genuine consistency in the present effort for lowered Common Market tariffs on poultry.

It is not as if European poultrymen can really compete with Delmarva growers. Mr. McDowell has told of taking a good look at the kind of birds raised in Europe. They weren't much to look at, running loose around the farmer's yard, the way they used to do in Delaware. On the table they just couldn't compare with a Sussex County bird that goes 3 pounds at 8 or 9 weeks of age.

The point is that Europeans would learn to eat more poultry if they could buy better quality birds.

The farm-raised Senator Boggs has also voiced concern about the Common Market's poultry tariffs. What does Senator Williams think about it? As another farm-bred delegate in Washington, as a feed dealer in Millsboro, he has often fought a good fight for the Delmarva poultry industry especially when it comes to purchases by the U.S. Government for the Armed Forces.

Monday, February 18, 1963, Washington, D.C.—Congressman Harris B. McDowell, Jr., Democrat, of Delaware, in a meeting with President Kennedy at the White House today expressed great concern with the Common Market restrictions designed to exclude U.S. poultry, including Delmarva poultry, from the European market.

Congressman McDowell told President Kennedy that: "Any curtailment of our poultry export markets because of trade restrictions imposed by the Common Market will certainly have undesirable effects on the Delaware poultry industry and the Delaware economy in general."

Congressman McDowell told President Kennedy: "While our trade representatives now appearing before the European Economic Commission in Brussels are trying to make a case for our poultry industry, our position in this matter should be forcefully set forth so as to insure reasonable access for our agricultural products to the European Common Market area."

Congressman McDowell's complete statement follows: "Since August 1962, when nation members of the European Economic Community implemented its common agricultural policy, I have observed with serious concern the effect of this policy on certain U.S. agricultural exports. Our poultry and wheat flour exports have been adversely affected and there will be important impacts therefrom as to our feed grain and rice exports.

"Of immediate concern to me which I emphasized in a meeting with President Kennedy this morning is the restrictive effects of this policy as it relates to the export of Delaware poultry products.

"A new array of import charges and tariffs, applicable only to imports from nonmembers of the Common Market have clearly been unfavorable to the U.S. poultry industry. In West Germany, our major poultry market, the new import charges, even omitting any charges between the invoice and gate price which might be levied, amounts to more than 30 percent ad valorem, as compared with a previous duty of 15.9 percent. Other restrictive policies, including the gate or minimum price arrangements have been equally onerous.

"I explained to President Kennedy that the export market is a valuable market for Delaware and for Delmarva broilers. This export market has been developed despite numerous barriers against U.S. poultry such as import bans, often under the disguise of sanitary or disease control measures, and the restricting of dollars for the purpose of buying U.S. poultry. However, it was my feeling that aggressive promotion by the U.S. poultry industry, and the fact that U.S. poultry is of superior quality, attractively packaged and available at prices often below that of domestic poultry, has made possible a growing export market for the United States.

"In 1955, U.S. exports of poultry meat amounted to only 28 million pounds; this has grown to over 135 million pounds in 1962. Any curtailment of our poultry export markets because of trade restrictions imposed by the Common Market will certainly have undesirable effects on the Delaware poultry industry and the Delaware economy in general.

"While our trade representatives now appearing before the European Economic Commission in Brussels are trying to make a case for our poultry industry, I urged President Kennedy today to have our position in this matter forcefully set forth so as to insure reasonable access for our agricultural products to the European Common Market area.

"The obvious effect of these Common Market restrictions is to exclude U.S. agricultural exports and to preempt unto the Common Market countries themselves as much of the market as they choose despite the competitive position of our products or the uneconomic nature of their domestic production.

"The Common Market, by these proposals, intends to exclude competition and create a captive market rather than expand trade. Through the combination of actions which restrict our current poultry exports, I view this matter as the bellwether which may symbolize other actions by the EEC in the agricultural field.

"The Berlin wall symbolizes the barrier which exists today and which prevents the exchange of free ideas, free trade, and the movement of freemen; a tariff wall among free nations endangers the spirit of Western unity which we have encouraged as the goal of the Common Market. The issue involved here is one of principle and a reasonable and fair solution must be reached promptly if our relationship with the Common Market is to grow and flourish."

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, February 16 was the 45th anniversary of the founding of the independent Republic of Lithuania. This heroic people was first formed into a nation 710 years ago. In the long history of Lithuania, the succession of tyrants from both East and West which she has endured has only fanned her desire for liberty. Oppression and brutality have been their almost daily companions. So has their love of freedom and their readiness to die in its defense. Lithuania stands as an inspiring example to all of us who are charged with leading the fight for freedom. It is fitting that we salute her and give her our assurances that we have not forgotten.

Dispelling Some Fog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my own remarks in the Congressional Record, I am pleased to include an article written by my colleague, the Honorable Jack Westland, of Washington State's Second District.

We who represent districts in which the American softwood lumber industry is sick and in real trouble are trying to help prevent the demise of that industry.

For one thing we seek a quota on imports from Canada. By quota we mean a 6-percent limit based on the total imports of 1960–61 and 1962. It should be pointed out that Canada now imposes a tariff averaging 10 percent on any lumber imported into Canada from the United States.

We do not mind sharing our good market but not to the extent of killing off our producers.

The article follows:

DISPELLING SOME FOG

(By Hon. Jack Westland, of Washington)

After his death, Argus' eyes were transferred to the peacock's tail and his name was given to the Pacific Northwest's magazine of news, comment, opinion, and occasional mythology.

It isn't difficult to find each in the stimulating January 25 issue, including a bit of mythology on page 1 headlined "Sound Lumber Industry Explodes Myth of Woe, Chaos."

The unidentified author of the article should ask for a bonus from Argus Publisher Thomas H. Meadowcroft, who is also listed as a director of MacMillan, Bloedal, & Powell River, Ltd., one of Canada's largest timber producers.

The Argus said, among other things, that "lumber industry profits in 1962 have risen sharply, and are exceeded by only 1 year in the past 6." Well, now I find that the latest figures from the quarterly reports of the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission show that corporate net profits as a percentage of sales after income taxes in the lumber and wood products industry amounted to 2.1 percent in 1962. The comparable figure for all manufacturing industries was about 4.6 percent.

Profits in the lumber industry in 1961 were 2 percent, in 1960 they were 1.7 percent, in 1959 were 4.1 percent, in 1958 ran 3.1 percent and in 1957 were 2.3 percent. To suggest that there were sharp increases in profits for the timber industry in 1962 or that it was a good profit year is not supported by the facts.

Also, the Argus reflects considerable confusion concerning the composition of the lumbermen's economic survival committee, which was formed under the leadership of the Dwyer Lumber Co., and the Simpson Timber Co.—not Georgia-Pacific Corp., mentioned in the article.

Contrary to the Argus statement, no petitioners before the U.S. Tariff Commission withdrew their names from the petition. Several lumber industry associations which were included on the mailing list of the lumbermen's economic survival committee clarified their relationship with the committee in a statement before the Commission.

Every major association representing softwood producers in the United States appeared and testified before the Tariff Commission. This included the Southern Pine Association. The Argus article erroneously said that the Southern Pine Association was "conspicuous by its absence."

According to the article, "The Portland-based lumber associations, representing only 1.5 percent of U.S. sawmills but financially dominating the National Lumber Manufacturers Association through the weight of its [sic] production and its dues, succeeded in getting National's money at the tariff hearing to support the lumbermen's economic survival committee." It is true that the Western Pine Association and the West Coast Lumbermen's Association have their offices in Portland, Oreg. What the article failed to indicate is that these two associations represent mills in every lumber-producing State west of the Mississippi River, and whose members account for at least 60 percent of all production of softwood lumber in the western region of the United States.

Contrary to the impression created by the Argus, the National Association of Home Builders did not appear before the Tariff Commission. It did file a statement with the Commission several weeks after the hearings ended, thereby avoiding interrogation on the assertions made in the statement. The article also suggested that the distributors of lumber in America appeared in force before the Commission in opposition to the domestic lumber producers' position. Nothing could be further from the truth.

A small group of lumber wholesalers from the New York-New England area did appear, but concentrated its testimony on lumber consumed in the United States which moves by water. The vast majority of wholesalers in the United States did not express their views at the Tariff hearings, except as they coincided with the views of the manufacturers.

The Argus said "Prices in December were higher than at any time in the past 3 years." Let's look at the facts. The wholesale price index for lumber, reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, shows that the price index for 1962 on softwood was 95.5, while the preliminary December figure reached only 95.1. This compares to the 1958 index of 96.6, the 1959 index of 105, a 1960 index of 98.6 and a 1961 index of 93.5.

The most significant indication of whether or not domestic producers of lumber could supply all domestic softwood lumber needs is the fact that in 1959 domestic manufacturers of lumber produced 30.5 billion board feet of softwood lumber. In 1961 the United States used 30 billion board feet of softwood lumber and in 1962 used 30.9 billion board feet. It is only fair to assume that the mills producing lumber in 1959 could have supplied all the domestic needs for lumber in 1960, 1961, and 1962, without Canadian importation of softwood lumber into the United States. Consequently, the Argus statement, "We need natural resources and Canada needs manufacturers. Our lumber industry and lumber users need heavy Canadian supply if conservation plans are to work," is not supported by the evidence.

I want to point out that in 1962 consumption of softwood lumber in the United States increased by approximately 850 million board feet. Canadian shipments of softwood lumber into the United States captured 680 million board feet of this increase, or 80 percent.

How has waterborne shipments of lumber from British Columbia hurt west coast lumbermen? In 1952, 82.59 percent of the timber shipped to the U.S. Atlantic coast came from Oregon, California, and Washington, while 17.41 percent came from British Columbia. During 1962, shipments from the west coast amounted to about 38 percent compared to 62 percent for British Columbia. The British Columbia percentage was up from 57 percent in 1961.

The increase in British Columbia waterborne shipments between 1952 and 1962 was 629 million board feet, and means a gain to British Columbia over the 10-year period of 6,290 direct lumber industry jobs. This constitutes the direct employment opportunity loss to the Pacific Northwest. If you add service and community employment, British Columbia gains in the U.S. east coast market means a lost opportunity for 15,735 jobs and income equivalent of a city of more than 60,000 persons.

Canadian lumber can be shipped in foreign bottoms at a much cheaper rate than lumber from Washington State. This is one of the reasons British Columbia has captured so much of our east coast market. To help remedy the situation, I have introduced H.R. 3124 which would amend the Jones Act to allow shipments between the west coast and the east coast in foreign-flag ships if the industry can show it is losing a substantial portion of its business to foreign competitors because of the difference in shipping costs between foreign and American ships.

I believe that all the American lumberman asks is a chance to compete on an equal basis. I think my bill would help give him this opportunity.

Even though I disagree with the Argus in this instance I defend its right to publish the article even though the publisher's father-in-law and brother-in-law are also listed as directors of MacMillan, Bloedel & Powell River Ltd. a $300 million a year Canadian lumber concern. But I would suggest changing the masthead from the Argus to the Cyclops. One eye in focus might be more effective than 100 out of focus.

This Nation Under God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 27, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday evening, February 21, 1963, I had the good fortune to attend a meeting held in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School to discuss the issue of the Supreme Court decision of June 24, 1962, barring prayer in the New York State schools.

The speaker at that particular meeting was our colleague, the Honorable Henry C. Schadeberg, of Wisconsin. The title of his address "This Nation Under God."

I sat during the course of Mr. Schadeberg's address completely enthralled and greatly informed. It was the finest talk I have ever heard on this subject.

Believing that every Member should have the opportunity of at least reading this address, I am taking the liberty of inserting it herewith in the Congressional Record:

THIS NATION UNDER GOD

It was just last week that our Nation paused briefly to pay tribute to one of its greatest leaders and 16th President, Abraham Lincoln. It was just a short distance from where we are meeting tonight that this loved and honored man delivered a short memorial known as the Gettysburg Address. It has become one of humanity's greatest utterances, not merely because it was brief and simple in style but because each phrase portrays a truth that is lasting and significant. From this immortal speech, which lasted but a brief 2 minutes, I quote from the last few lines:

"It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us; that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave their last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain." (End of quote.) And what, ladies and gentlemen, was the task to which Mr. Lincoln insisted they were to dedicate themselves? It was this, and I now use his closing words, "That this Nation, under God," not merely a nation of men believing only in themselves or in some material ideal, but that "this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people; by the people; for the people shall not perish from the earth."

When Mr. Lincoln said, "This Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom," he was not trying to be rhetorical. It was not a religious gesture (a tipping of his hat, so to speak) to Almighty God. He illustrated quite clearly his belief in the origin and meaning of life—namely that it was conceived by God and that, to find fulfillment, life must be lived under God.

He was saying to the people he so deeply loved and who had borne so heavy a burden that life is not meaningless; that the universe is not like a ship without a rudder, left to move aimlessly over the sea, but that there is a divinity that shapes our ends, roughhew them how we will. In these immortal words Lincoln reveals that he had a deep and abiding knowledge and understanding of truth.

Lincoln lived in a period of history in which communications and transportation were rather primitive compared to the communications and transportation of our day. In his day Lincoln, living in Springfield, Ill., approximately 1,000 miles from Washington, said, "This Nation cannot survive half slave and half free." Today we live in a community of nations in which our most remote enemy is closer to us in time and in terms of transportation and communication than Washington was from Springfield, Ill., in Lincoln's day and it is as true of our community of nations as it was then of the sovereign States of this Nation, that "this community of nations cannot survive half slave and half free."

It is no secret to you, I am sure, that we are today engaged in a worldwide struggle which will decide the destiny of civilization for the next thousand years. We are at war, sometimes hot (though we prefer not to call it war), and sometimes cold, meaning simply that there is no military action, but it is war, nonetheless. We are engaged in a war to decide whether the people of the world shall be free, as certainly is the intention of God, the Creator, or whether they shall be enslaved to some degree under a Marxist, atheist philosophy that translated into political expression is what is variously called the welfare state or the Socialist state or the Communist state.

Every political decision made in Washington by the President; every decision made by State Department; by the Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate; and nearly every decision handed down by the Supreme Court of our land, either directly or indirectly, and if indirectly, very seldom remotely, is related to the basic issue before us. All people of the world who love freedom—which means all but the selfish few who seek the prestige of personal power—have an intense interest, if not understanding, in the decisions that are made.

It was Thomas Payne in 1776 who said, "These are times which try men's souls." Nothing could better describe the times in which we live in 1963 and in which our children will be forced to mature in the next few decades and in which many of us will be living out our sunset years. These days—these years—this decade is indeed a time that "tries men's souls." It is because we are in a very present period of decision-making, of worldwide importance; being forced to deal politically with men representing governments, not of the will of the people, but forced upon them by brute power—men who have no sense of right or wrong, who have no basis for moral judgment—men who live by the law of the jungle, kill or be killed—that it is imperative that we as a nation understand our privileged position among nations; that we understand our responsibilities as spokesman for the free world.

As a people of a nation whose economic and social and political life historically has reflected the philosophical position that God is the Creator of all things and all life, it is imperative that we understand three things:

(1) It is imperative that we understand that man's peculiar relationship to his Creator as the one creation in all of God's marvelous creations—made in God's image—sets man apart from the rest of the animal world and gives to man certain unquestionable rights. This is clearly stated in the Declaration of Independence. "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights."

These rights referred to in the Declaration of Independence are not just social or political conveniences granted to us by the State. They are neither a favor nor a mutually arrived at contract. They are basic premises upon which men accept the authority of government. And they are arrived at not as a result of discussion or barter, but as a result of faith in a God who is Creator.

I insist that there is a lot of nonsense today about rights. In speaking to people throughout the Nation I come across some who say that faith in God has nothing to do with our rights; that there were among certain of our early political forefathers those who had no faith in God. With this I disagree. The truth is that while some of our early forefathers may not have accepted the theological position of a particular denomination of the church or of an ecclesiastical order, they were definitely convinced and convicted in their faith in Almighty God.

Our rights as a people of a free nation come to us even as science comes to us, in what I call a theological frame. It is our peculiar relationship to God as a creature, created, if you will, in His image—and incidentally it is a spiritual relationship, because God is a spirit and being created in His image, we are spiritual creatures—which endows us with unalienable, intangible, irrevocable rights. Unless we believe we are created by God and thus endowed by God with rights, our rights become a mere social utility, or a political commodity to be given to us or taken from us at the whim and passion of those who happen to control the state.

We of the Judeo-Christian tradition believe in the cherished doctrine of the sanctity and sacredness of personality, simply because we are God's creation.

Several years ago I drove from Wisconsin to Colorado. I came through a community in which I saw a rather poorly written sign posted along the side of the street where considerable trash and debris had been dumped. This sign read, "No more trespassing allowed." The owner of the property had had his fill. He could stand no more. He saw the results of those who had run roughshod over his property.

When the philosophers of the 16th and 17th centuries expressed the concept of rights as that given by God, and not by man, they were not discovering a new truth. They were simply restating the truth of Scripture; namely, that because man is a child of God, no one dare trespass on human personality without trespassing on God. I am of the firm conviction that in these trying days in which we are engaged in a worldwide war for keeps with atheistic communism, it is high time we as a nation put a sign to be read by all throughout the world, "No more trespassing on human personality." The sign must also be clearly visible to all in America for it is useless to try to save freedom throughout the world if by default or indifference or ignorance or misdirected tolerance we should lose it here, for we are as yet the home base of freedom for all.

I know of no more confusing and dangerous detour we could take than that of imposing upon this Nation, and especially upon this Nation's schools, a legalistic demand which emanates from a purely legalistic interpretation of our Constitution, that the mention of the name of God and the right to pray in public or outside of the church shall be denied our people. Criminals and gangsters are sometimes set free because of some legalistic interpretation of a law or a ruling. To free such men, clearly and unquestionably guilty of committing crime, may defy all sense of justice and run counter to all the intent of those who framed the law and all who abide by it but because it is legal it becomes an established fact. What I am trying to say is that just because an act is legal it becomes an established fact. What I am trying to say is that just because an act is legal it does not make that act moral or desirable. This is the danger of creating a world community under law devoid of basic moral foundations to undergird that law.

Now this is in a sense what is happening to our freedom.

Because there has developed in the past few decades among some who would be leaders of our Nation an assumption that constitutional government is out of date and cannot meet the needs of our society, catapulted overnight into a space age which demands answers today for tomorrow's questions, we hear rather strange and frightening suggestions being spread among us falsely as irrefutable fact. Suggestions, such as:

(a) Our Constitution is outmoded because it was written for an agrarian age, or

(b) Our Constitution is not adequate to meet the challenge of the sixties.

This kind of talk indicates a growing tendency to repudiate the influence of God in human affairs and to replace it by human knowledge of the physical sciences which we are told is the key to all progress.

We are witnessing before our very eyes, and it is so brash in its efforts we will not believe what we see, a coldly calculated attempt to destroy the importance and effectiveness of one of history's greatest documents of freedom—the Constitution of the United States. Over the years the basic intent of our Constitution is being: (1) circumvented out of authority by Executive order; (2) legislated out of authority by the legislative branches of our Government; interpreted out of authority by the judicial branch—our Supreme Court. The late ruling by the Supreme Court on the issue of prayer in the public schools of New York is but one of many examples. The decision could have been conveniently delayed because so many important matters are pending before the Court. Though legally, and perhaps technically, correct the decision was most unfortunate coming as it did in this time when we are so bitterly engaged in this worldwide struggle for the minds of man. Freedom is on the scaffold. It is most important that careless and itc[illegible]ngers, no matter how nobly guided by high ideal, not be allowed to trip the trap to bring freedom to an untimely death.

I return you to my initial statement that it is imperative for our survival that we understand man's peculiar relationship to his Creator as God's crowning creation, that gives the individual his unquestionable or unalienable rights.

Second, it is imperative that we as a people of this free Nation under God understand clearly that with these rights we have received from God we have also a moral responsibility. It is precisely because God created us in His image to be free—to be individuals with free choice—that no man dare live carelessly or indifferently. No man has a moral right to squander his life with impunity, for if he toys with his freedom, then he may very well lose it. Our freedom does not exempt us from life. He who claims a right, must also accept his responsibility to destiny. There are many in our day who jump at the idea of possessing these rights, but who are not willing to accept responsibility commensurate with these rights.

One reason freedom finds itself today in its present plight is that we have developed in our Nation a philosophy which is certainly foreign to us and would have been extremely repulsive to our forefathers—that is that there is no such thing as individual responsibility. We have come to a period in history in which we are evading our individual responsibility by placing the blame for all our difficulties on the collection group, either as the community, society as a whole, or government. So, we look for government to provide us with all the answers to our difficulties.

Before his death in 1910, William Graham Sumner, while serving as professor of political and social science at Yale, edited an almanac entitled "The Forgotten Man's Almanac." In it appears this statement:

"The social and political philosophy which has been spread abroad has nourished a doctrine that if a man wants anything which he has not got it is the fault of somebody else who ought to be found and compelled to give it to him."

To many people today, and this certainly is true for those in our Federal Government agencies, no one person is ever at fault. The guilt is society's and therefore nobody's. All blame can be traced to our economic system, or to bad plumbing, or to a defective school system, or to an inadequate home situation, or to unemployment, or to bad teeth, or to greedy businessmen, or to crooked labor leaders, or what have you. So the Government must spend and spend, ever taking more from your paycheck and mine and charging the rest off to our children, in order to provide more and more things for people because the individual is never to blame for any of his problems.

We have come to a period in our history—tragic as it is—in which we assume that individuals are more to be pitied than to be challenged or blamed. Whenever a man

finds himself in trouble, it is because he is a victim of poverty or bad companions or of a traumatic experience at birth or the sinister powers of the unconscious over which he has no control. Our solution is to forgive all, make it impossible for him to fail, and thus impossible for him to learn by experience, and then to pour his neighbors' wealth into his coffers so he can continue to involve himself in more trouble. Our philosophy seems to be that since we cannot really know all the factors that enter into a man's life, no one should ever be blamed for anything.

You see this is all tied up with our basic faith in God and our willingness or unwillingness to accept the premise that He created us in His image. By our failure or unwillingness to make the individual responsible for his own destiny and by our insistence that impersonal government shall assume these responsibilities, we are saying, in effect, that man far from being created in the image of God is nothing more significant than tumble weed blown helplessly about by every wind or influence. If we continue on our present course that exiles us as individuals from responsibilities, the future holds nothing for us but a collectivism that will drag all men down to a common level—a level below which we, as children of God, believe is reserved not for man, created in the image of God, but for the animal of the field.

We are not puppets of fate or victims of vast impersonal forces beyond human control. The politician in office, who many times cannot adequately handle his own affairs is certainly not in a better position to give adequate answers to problems of the people—problems that vary in the different segments of our society and physical geography. We as individuals are endowed with the creative freedom of God, our Maker. We are free to take a hand in determining our own destiny—whether for good or evil.

I like the words of the poet who wrote these simple lines which summarize so clearly this thought:

Life is a jig saw puzzle
  Its pieces are jagged and torn.
We piece it together with weeping
  'till sometimes it's faded and worn.

A bright bit of sunset we fashion
  A home where wee children wait;
Where flowers are blooming and twinning
  And love meets with love at the gate.

Some pieces are drab, unenticing.
  How gladly we fling them away.
But there's a place for each fragment
  And the picture is needing the gray.

No extra pieces are given,
  The rose and the gray interlace
And lovely the picture presented
  When each finds its proper place.

Sometimes there's a storm on the ocean
  And the ships are all wearied with gale.
But storms have their beauty completed
  When met with firm courage and sail.

Life is a jig saw puzzle
  Cut by the Master's hand
And each little turn and each corner
  Is a part of the love He has planned.

So please put it together with patience
  Why should we whimper or wail?
If we blindly mix up the pattern
  Should we blame the Lord if we fail?

It is imperative that we understand that with the acceptance of unalienable rights we must also accept moral responsibility.

And, third, it is imperative that we understand that it is immoral to surrender basic freedoms and fundamental rights. If God has clothed us with dignity—created us in His own image—set us in the world with the ability and with an innate will to grapple with life's problems, then, to abdicate or to transfer these freedoms and rights to the group or to government is immoral. It is in a sense to forfeit the soul.

There are those in our day in high places and low who are so presumptuous as to assume for themselves the rights God has given to each individual man. They play at being God, but because they have neither God's wisdom nor insight, they in time bring only misery and failure. This is the threat of the totalitarian state. This is the threat in the earliest form of the socialist state or the welfare state. Once man relinquishes his individual God-given rights and responsibilities to government for any reason at all, he is on the road to abdicating his heritage as the crowning creature of God's creation—he is on the road to allowing himself, as the mere cattle in the field, to be fed and milked.

Many in our Nation seem to think that the totalitarian state is something for Europe or Asia or South America—that we here in the United States have some kind of a natural immunity to it—no matter what we do or fail to do or what course we take. There is, however, only one thing that stands between us and a totalitarian government and that is the concept of the meaning of life under God, of which I have been speaking. This is why it is so very important that we as a free people do not allow to go by unnoticed or unchallenged the vicious, howbe-it, well-meaning attempts, under the guise of protecting the rights of a small minority, to take from the vast majority the right to instill in society at every level, the basic concept of God as Creator and Giver of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. This is why it is so important that we do not allow ourselves as free people to fall victim to those who believe that men and the physical sciences have all the answers to our problems. If we lose our grasp on the concept of God as Creator; of man possessing dignity and unalienable rights; of individual responsibility for his own destiny—if we are willing to try to substitute some synthetic creation of government for the fundamental rights of man or to insist that government assume what are our individual responsibilities we shall surely lose our freedom. The time has come for us to obey the command given to the Galatians, "Stand up and be ye separate, thus saith the Lord."

It is a fact worth pondering as we study history that when men of evil design contemplated and succeeded in enslaving a people, faith in God and the church were the first and bitterest points of attack and that in the struggle to remain free the main resistance to totalitarian evil came not from the universities, the centers of science, not from corporations, the centers of profit, not from trade unions, dealing solely with the material aspects of society, but from the churches, the centers of faith, and more directly from men of faith themselves. Faith and freedom are inseparable. They are codefendants. Destroy faith in God and you destroy freedom as we know it. Destroy freedom and you destroy the faith in God out of which we have our concept of the dignity of man.

I opened my remarks with words from Lincoln and I close my remarks with a paraphrase of the last sentence of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. It is my fervent prayer that, "This Nation under God"—and I hasten to add "this world under God"—"shall have a new birth of freedom for unless we do, government of the people, by the people, and for the people will perish from the earth."

SENATE

Thursday, February 28, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Emory Stevens Bucke, D.D., book editor of the Methodist Church, Nashville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

O God of love and power, we pray that Thy spirit may be in us. May men of all nations and stations be bound together in Thy family of man.

Grant Thy blessing on those who seek it, and make our wills sturdy enough to do Thy will. Give us grace enough to be humble, and help us to admit and correct our own errors before we seek to correct the errors of our brothers.

Lead us, Heavenly Father, that we may follow Thy way and know Thy truth. This we pray for life.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 25, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CIVIL RIGHTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 75)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the President has transmitted to the Congress today a message relating to civil rights. I am informed the message has been read in the House of Representatives. I therefore ask unanimous consent that its reading in the Senate be waived, and that the message be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 79. An act to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H.R. 780. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers in the case of decedents dying after December 31, 1947;

H.R. 1597. An act relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents;

H.R. 1839. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States;

H.R. 2053. An act to provide for the temporary suspension of the duty on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers;

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman;

H.R. 2513. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 79. An act to require authorization for certain appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 780. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers in the case of decedents dying after December 31, 1947;

H.R. 1597. An act relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents;

H.R. 1839. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of wild animals and wild birds which are intended for exhibition in the United States;

H.R. 2053. An act to provide for the temporary suspension of the duty on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers;

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her hubsand on the same basis as a single woman;

H.R. 2513. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CURTIS, on behalf of Mr. MCCLELLAN, the Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Philip N. Brownstein, of Maryland, to be Federal Housing Commissioner.

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Roland R. Renne, of Montana, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture; and

Roland R. Renne, of Montana, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. ROBERTSON subsequently said: Mr. President, last Tuesday the Banking and Currency Committee considered the nomination of Philip N. Brownstein to be Federal Housing Commissioner. The committee approved the nomination without objection, and it has been reported today. I ask unanimous consent that a biography of Mr. Brownstein and copies of the letters which the committee received in support of the nomination be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the biography and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Philip N. Brownstein, whom the President announced today he intended to appoint as Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, has had long experience in Government and housing.

Mr. Brownstein, who is presently Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration, was born February 14, 1917, at Ober, Ind. He attended high school at Knox, Ind., and George Washington University. He began his Government career with the Federal Housing Administration in 1934. During his early years with FHA he attended law classes at Columbus University in Washington, D.C. He received his LL.B. degree in law in 1940 and his LL.M. degree in 1941. He was admitted to the District of Columbia bar in 1940. In 1944 he entered the U.S. Marine Corps and served until 1946. From the Marine Corps he entered the Veterans' Administration and began a 17-year record of increasing managerial responsibility in the Veterans' Administration.

After service as Assistant Chief of the Loans and Claims Division and Chief of the Claims and Liquidation Division, he was appointed in 1954 to the position of Assistant Director for Loan Policy and Management of the Loan Guaranty Service. In March of 1958 he was named Director of the Loan Guaranty Service, in full charge of the program which has insured 7 million home loans to veterans.

As Chief Benefits Director, a position he has held since March 15, 1961, Mr. Brownstein is in charge of the entire VA benefits program, including claims service with its compensation, and pension departments, the rehabilitation program for disabled veterans, the vocational training and education program that has already furnished schooling or training to more than 10 million veterans, and the loan guaranty program. Mr. Brownstein holds the highest honor the Veterans' Administration can bestow, the Exceptional Service Award.

Mr. Brownstein and his wife, Esther, make their home at 620 Sheridan Street, Hyattsville, Md. Their son, Michael, is now a student at Columbia University in New York.

UNITED STATES SAVINGS &
LOAN LEAGUE,
Chicago, Ill., January 23, 1963.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: As president of the United States Savings and Loan League, representing almost 5,000 members and over 95 percent of the assets of the savings and loan business, I want you to know that we wholeheartedly endorse the appointment of Philip N. Brownstein to be Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

The Nation's savings and loan associations have an active interest in the national housing industry, and we feel that Mr. Brownstein is eminently qualified to take on the duties and responsibilities of FHA Commissioner. His long, loyal, and able service in the field of housing makes him the ideal choice to continue his service to the public, the Federal housing agencies, and the housing industry in its entirety.

I would appreciate it if you would see fit to make this a part of the hearings on Mr. Brownstein's nomination.

Sincerely,

F. B. YEILDING, Jr.,
President.

MORTGAGE BANKERS
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1963.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: It is my understanding that the nomination of Philip N. Brownstein to be Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration is before your committee for consideration.

May I say that the Mortgage Bankers Association of America supports Mr. Brownstein's appointment without qualification and with enthusiasm. We know from many years' experience that Mr. Brownstein is admirably qualified for this position, and we are confident that he will administer the affairs of this great agency with competence.

It is our hope that because of the urgent business now before FHA, hearings on Mr. Brownstein's nomination can be scheduled by the committee without delay, and I would request that this letter be placed in the record in support of his appointment as Commissioner.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL E. NEEL,
General Counsel.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1963.

Hon. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROBERTSON: I have known Philip N. Brownstein over the years and know him to be an extremely capable man. I am delighted to hear of his nomination as FHA Commissioner and I am sure the committee will act favorably.

Best regards.

Sincerely,

DANTE B. FASCELL,
Member of Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

GUAM

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Manuel F. L. Guerrero, of Guam, to be Governor of Guam for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be considered en bloc, with the exception of the nomination of Brig. Gen. Paul Leonard Kleiver.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations referred to will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

THE AIR FORCE, THE ARMY, THE NAVY, AND THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations the Senate has confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

RANKING OF SENATOR STENNIS ON COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the remainder of the 88th Congress the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] be listed, following the chairman, as the ranking majority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF A SATURN V GROUND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT TEST FACILITY AT MARSHALL SPACE FLIGHT CENTER, HUNTSVILLE, ALA.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the construction of a Saturn V ground support equipment test facility at the Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON EXPANSION OF CITY OF COCOA, FLA., WATER PLANT

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the expansion of the city of Cocoa, Fla., water plant to provide adequate water supply for the manned lunar landing program area at Merritt Island, Fla.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON TITLE I AGREEMENTS UNDER AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements con[illegible]ded during January 1963 under the Agricu[illegible]ural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "STATISTICS OF ELECTRIC UTILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1961, PRIVATELY OWNED"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a publication entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1961, Privately Owned" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain expenses in the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Street Readjustment Act of the District of Columbia so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close all or part of a street, road, highway, or alley in accordance with the requirements of an approved redevelopment or urban renewal plan, without regard to the notice provisions of such act, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the partial pay of educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia who are on leave of absence for educational improvement, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote safe driving and eliminate the reckless and irresponsible driver from the streets and highways of the District of Columbia by providing that any person operating a motor vehicle within the District while apparently under the influence of intoxicating liquor shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of certain of his body substances to determine the alcoholic content of his blood, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the regulation of the business of selling securities in the District of Columbia and for the licensing of persons engaged therein, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to utilize volunteers for active police duty (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

U.S. Participation in International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Audit Report on St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Department of Commerce, calendar year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Unnecessary Deterioration of Unused Rubber Tracks for Army Combat Vehicles

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of unnecessary deterioration of unused rubber tracks for Army combat vehicles, dated February 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Programing, Delivery, and Utilization of Selected Missile System Equipment Delivered to European Countries Under Military Assistance Program

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on the review of the programing, delivery, and utilization of selected missile system equipment delivered to European countries under the military assistance program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Unnecessary Planned Procurement of Generators by Department of the Army

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of unnecessary planned procurement of generators by the Department of the Army, dated February 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Contracts To Facilitate the National Defense

A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that the Commission had taken no affirmative actions under authority of the act to make contracts to facilitate the national defense, during the calendar year ended December 31, 1962; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Audit of National Fund for Medical Education

A letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of that fund, for the year ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Financial Statement of Boys' Clubs of America

A letter from the president and national director, Boys' Clubs of America, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audited financial statement of that organization, for the year 1962 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1963

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in expansion of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. Johnston and Mr. Carlson members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to direct the Bureau of Land Management to withhold any adjustments in domestic livestock grazing fees prior to the holding of the requested congressional hearings in the affected State

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has proposed to raise livestock grazing fees on Bureau of Land Management lands; and

"Whereas the economy of many communities and counties in the State of Colorado is dependent upon the grazing of domestic livestock on the Federal lands; and

"Whereas from studies conducted by universities and State and national agencies it has been determined that the average rate of return to stockmen is substantially less than that allowed regulated industries, so that any increase in fees would cause many livestock operations dependent on Federal range lands to become unprofitable or marginal; and

"Whereas use of the Federal range held for grazing purposes results in the production of a major raw material resource of these lands; and

"Whereas the tax base of many areas in Colorado and other Western States is dependent upon and affected by the permanency, security and value of grazing rights: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 44th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That this general assembly hereby petitions the Members of the Congress of the United States to direct the Bureau of Land Management to withhold any adjustments in domestic livestock grazing fees prior to the holding of the industry-requested congressional hearings in Colorado and in each of the affected States; and be it further

"Resolved, If after these requested congressional hearings have been held in Colorado and other Western States and if it is determined that an adjustment in grazing fees is justified and necessary then such an adjustment be based only on the presently used livestock price index formula; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Members of Congress from the State of Colorado, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Secretary of the Interior.

"John D. Vanderhoof,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"Donald H. Henderson,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
"Robert L. Knous,
"President of the Senate.
"Mildred H. Cresswell,
"Secretary of the Senate."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to the ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, proposed by the Congress of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors

"Whereas the 87th Congress of the United States of America has adopted Senate Joint Resolution 29 (two-thirds of each House concurring therein) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in the following words, to wit:

"'JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO THE QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTORS

"'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"'Article —

"'Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

"'Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.', and

"Whereas said proposed amendment will be valid as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, a majority of all the members elected to each house of said legislature voting in favor thereof, That the proposed amendment be and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Governor of the State of California to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"Glenn M. Anderson,
"President of the Senate.
"Jesse M. Unruh,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"Attest: "Frank M. Jordan,
"Secretary of State.
"Walter C. Stutler,
"Assistant Secretary of State."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to the ratification of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States proposed by the Congress of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors

"Whereas the 87th Congress of the United States of America has adopted Senate Joint Resolution 29 (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in the following words, to wit:

"'JOINT RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO THE QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTORS

"'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"'Article —

"'Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

"'Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.', and

"Whereas said proposed amendment will be valid as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly, a majority of all the members elected to each house of said legislature voting in favor thereof, That the proposed amendment be and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Governor of the State of California to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States.

"Jesse M. Unruh,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"Glenn M. Anderson,
"President of the Senate.
"Attest:
"Frank M. Jordan,
"Secretary of State.
"Walter C. Stutler,
"Assistant Secretary of State."

A resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Resolution 67

"Resolution relative to respectfully requesting and memorializing the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity to support the people of Guam in their efforts to require an end to the highly discriminatory dual wage system practiced in this territory

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

"Whereas the dual wage system practiced among the Federal employees residing on Guam is discriminatory on its face in that one's wage rate and perquisites depend not on skill and experience but on place of origin, the locally hired employees receiving both a much lower wage and much fewer privileges than the equivalent off-island hire doing exactly the same work and having the same responsibilities; and

"Whereas the Governor of Guam, including both the executive and legislative branches thereof, has done all within its power to bring this highly unfair and inequitable system to the attention of the Department of Defense and the Civil Service Commission with the ultimate goal of abolishing this colonial vestige of Guam's former status as a dependency of the Naval Department, but little has been so far accomplished toward this end; and

"Whereas the legislature is advised that the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity is vested with the authority to end discrimination in the defense activities of the United States Government, and it would therefore have a legitimate interest in discriminatory wage practices in the defense activities on Guam; now therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Seventh Guam Legislature does hereby on behalf of the people of Guam respectfully request and memorialize the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity to support the people of Guam in their efforts to put an end to the discriminatory dual wage system, thereby permitting all the citizen employees of the Federal Civil Service on Guam to be treated equally in their wages; and be it further

"Resolved, That the speaker certify to and the legislative secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Secretary of Interior, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Chairman, President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, Washington 25, D.C., and to the Governor of Guam.

"Duly adopted on the 26th day of January 1963.

"A. B. Won Pat,
"Speaker.
"V. B. Bamba,
"Legislative Secretary."

A resolution adopted by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association, Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation to establish an Administrative Conference of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the Belen, N. Mex., Chamber of Commerce, favoring the establishment of a memorial library in Belen to honor the late Senator Dennis Chavez; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PROPOSED REVISION OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT OF 1952—RESOLUTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Haddassah, Women's Zionist Organization of America, has adopted a resolution pertaining to the current proposals to revise the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed following my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

American Affairs Resolution Adopted at Midwinter Conference, New York, N.Y., February 1963, on Immigration

Whereas the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, often referred to as the McCarran-Walter Act, provides for a national origins quota system which places discriminatory limitation on immigration from many countries; and

Whereas under the foregoing immigration law the needs of refugees are not met, thereby necessitating special legislation to meet each emergency as it arises: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, assembled in midwinter conference, urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for reforms to eliminate the discriminatory practices of the national origins quota system, and to include permanent provisions for the allocation of quotas for refugees.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 20. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 11).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments:

S. Res. 14. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations (Rept. No. 10); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments:

S. Res. 15. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters pertaining to public and private housing (Rept. No. 12); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 9)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred House Joint Resolution 284, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal 1963, I wish to report the joint resolution at this time favorably, and to state for any Senators who may be interested, that there are Thermo-Fax copies of the committee report now available for anyone who may request one, because we hope to take up the measure in the shortest possible time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The report will be received and printed, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS RELATING TO THE HISTORY OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 99), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document a compilation of materials relating to the history of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, in connection with its fiftieth anniversary (1913–1963); and that there be printed for the use of that committee one thousand additional copies of such document.

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL FOR 88TH CONGRESS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 101); which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Eighty-eighth Congress, that said Rules and Manual shall be printed as a Senate document, and that one thousand six hundred and fifty additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which one thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, two hundred copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining four hundred and fifty copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

HELEN M. JOHNSON—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 102); which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Helen M. Johnson, widow of Curtis E. Johnson, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to ten and one-half months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

SON RANKINS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 103) to pay a gratuity to Son Rankins, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Son Rankins, widower of Ella M. Rankins, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 919. A bill for the relief of Flora and William Bisof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Moss, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Scott, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Tower, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Clark, Mr. Humphrey, and Mr. Fong):

S. 920. A bill to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may, if it finds that the public interest, convenience or necessity may be served, issue authorizations, but not licenses, for alien amateur radio operators to operate their amateur radio stations in the United States, its possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico provided there is in effect a bilateral agreement between the United States and the alien's government for such operation by U.S. amateurs on a reciprocal basis; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Goldwater when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 921. A bill to amend section 22 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773, 7 U.S.C. 624), to require the Secretary of Agriculture to include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act; and

S. 922. A bill to establish in the Department of Agriculture an office for two additional Assistant Secretaries, one of whose prime responsibility shall be forest resources and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 923. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended (48 Stat. 1246, 12 U.S.C. 1701), to require the use of domestically grade-marked lumber and wood products in the construction of housing federally financed and/or federally insured, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 924. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 925. A bill to amend section 203(b)(6) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to limit the application of the exemptions provided therein, and for other purposes; and

S. 926. A bill to repeal section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relating to the water-carrier bulk commodity exemption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

S. 927. A bill to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title; and

S. 928. A bill to amend section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide that owners of vessels requisitioned by the United States shall be accorded preference toward reacquiring these vessels when they can be released by the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 929. A bill for the relief of Maggiorina Magnante; and

S. 930. A bill for the relief of William Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER (for himself and Mr. Hickenlooper):

S. 931. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay fair value for improvements located on the railroad rights-of-way owned by bona fide lessees or permittees; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 932. A bill relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 933. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes; and

S. 934. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to utilize volunteers for active police duty; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself, Mr. Johnston, Mr. McClellan, and Mr. Hruska):

S. 935. A bill to protect the constitutional rights of certain individuals who are mentally ill, to provide for their care, treatment, and hospitalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ervin when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 936. A bill to provide transportation for molten sulfur in an amount not to exceed 100,000 long tons in the vessels S.S. *Etude* and S.S. *Pochteca* from U.S. ports on the gulf coast to other points in the United States along the gulf coast and the eastern seaboard until December 31, 1963; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 937. A bill to amend the act of August 16, 1957 (71 Stat. 372), authorizing the construction of the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 938. A bill relating to the provision of facilities and services for the accommodation of visitors in the national parks, monuments, and reservations, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to guaranty the obligations of concessioners incurred for such purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 939. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Charles Edward Cunningham; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 940. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward V. Amason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Muskie):

S. 941. A bill to amend section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my distinguished colleagues, Senators Talmadge, Muskie, and Pastore, in the introduction of legislation designed to tighten a loophole in the Tariff Act of 1930 which allows large imports of so-called waterproof cloth.

Section 301 of the Tariff Act permits the duty free importation of goods containing not more than 50 percent of foreign materials on a value basis, from the insular possessions of the United States. Loopholes in this provision have had an adverse effect on many of our domestic industries.

I understand that under present procedures, large quantities of Italian-produced woolen fabrics are being imported into the Virgin Islands. There the goods are given an inexpensive waterproofing treatment before being shipped to the United States where they enter duty free. In many instances the resulting fabric is used in the manufacture of skirts and trousers so that the waterproofing is of little or no value and is, in such cases, merely a device to enable the importers to take advantage of the duty free provisions of section 301.

The Department of Commerce has published figures which indicate that a total of more than 6 million square yards of these waterproofed cloths was imported during the first 7 months of 1962. This amounted to nearly 20 percent of the regular woven fabric imports during this same period. The waterproofing operations employ very few people and do little to add to the economy of the Virgin Islands. However, the loss of duty to the U.S. Treasury resulting from this procedure was more than $4 million during the first 7 months of last year.

The legislation that we are introducing today will put an end to this artificial practice and will help to eliminate at least one of the problems being faced by our domestic woolen textile manufacturers. Massachusetts is the leading wool manufacturing State in the Nation and its economy is therefore especially vulnerable to these increasing import pressures from foreign manufacturers. I am particularly hopeful that this legislation will provide some relief for these people.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Church, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Douglas, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Morse, Mr. Bible, and Mr. Burdick):

S. 942. A bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to give effect to the operation of the provisions of that section applicable to certain railroad consolidations and mergers until December 31, 1964, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the desk for 10 days.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kefauver when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 943. A bill to provide for denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement, for review of passport denials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Lausche when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. Morse, Mr. Gruening, Mr. McGee, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Javits, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Mechem, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Engle):

S. 944. A bill to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. Humphrey):

S. 945. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to extend its application to contracts for the maintenance of Federal installations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 946. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes;

S. 947. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals settled by the United States-Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, and for other purposes;

S. 948. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 949. A bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act, as amended (63 Stat. 734–736); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bills which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 950. A bill for the relief of Dr. Dunet Francois Belancourt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself and Mr. Symington):

S. 951. A bill for the relief of Dr. William M. Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 952. A bill for the relief of Joo Yon Ohm Cederberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 953. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 954. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for reform of personal and corporate income tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 955. A bill to amend the antitrust laws to prohibit certain activities of labor organizations in restraint of trade and commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tower when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 956. A bill providing a program of financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Case when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JORDAN of Idaho:

S. 957. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 958. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that only lumber and other wood products which have been produced in the United States may be used in construction or rehabilitation covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jordan of Idaho when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH (by request):

S. 959. A bill to amend section 104(b)(3) of title 23, United States Code, relating to the apportionment of funds for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Randolph when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 960. A bill to establish the Joint Committee on Defense and Space Contracts, and for other purposes; and

S. 961. A bill to require public disclosure of certain information concerning the award of contracts entered into by the Armed Forces and by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Case when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JORDAN of Idaho:

S. 962. A bill to amend section 22 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773; 7 U.S.C. 624), to require the Secretary of Agriculture to include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jordan of Idaho when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6-percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. Beall, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Holland, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Miller, Mr. Case, Mr. Fong, Mr. Clark, Mr. Moss, Mr. Symington, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Allott, and Mr. Curtis):

S.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Goldwater when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOWER:

S.J. Res. 52. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of Agriculture to submit proposals to the Congress for the gradual termination of unnecessary Federal controls on farming; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to establish the Joint Committee on Foreign Trade; to the Committee on Finance.

S.J. Res. 54. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; and

S.J. Res. 55. Joint resolution to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tower when he introduced the above joint resolutions, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JORDAN of Idaho:

S.J. Res. 56. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6-percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jordan of Idaho when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE PURPOSE OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IS VICTORY OVER COMMUNISM

Mr. TOWER submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) to express the sense of Congress that the purpose of U.S. foreign policy is victory over communism, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Tower, which appears under a separate heading.)

OBSERVANCE OF SIGNING OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. RIBICOFF submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) favoring observance on July 4 of each year by the ringing of bells throughout the United States, of the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Ribicoff, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

CONTINUANCE OF AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MAKE CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 98) continuing the authority of the Committee on Government Operations through March 31, 1963, to make certain investigations which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appears under a separate heading.)

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS RELATING TO THE HISTORY OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 99) to print as a Senate document, with additional copies, a compilation of materials relating to the history of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Robertson, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

INVESTIGATION OF GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH PRIVATE BUSINESS

Mr. TOWER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 100) to provide for an investigation of Government competition with private business, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Tower, which appears under a separate heading.)

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL FOR 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 101) authorizing the revision and printing of the Senate Manual for the use of the 88th Congress, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

HELEN M. JOHNSON

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 102) to pay a gratuity to Helen M. Johnson, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

SON RANKINS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 103) to pay a gratuity to Son Rankins, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AMENDMENT OF SECTIONS 303 AND 310 OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill, on behalf of myself and other Senators, which will amend the Communications Act of 1934 and allow the Federal Communications Commission to authorize amateur radio operators from other countries visiting in this country to operate their amateur gear while in this country. It would be not a license, but merely a permit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 920) to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may, if it finds that the public interest, convenience or necessity may be served, issue authorizations, but not licenses, for alien amateur radio operators to operate their amateur radio stations in the United States, its possessions and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico provided there is in effect a bilateral agreement between the United States and the alien's government for such operation by U.S. amateurs on a reciprocal basis, introduced by Mr. Goldwater (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Moss, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Scott, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Tower, Mr. Yarborough, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Clark, Mr. Humphrey, and Mr. Fong), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

IMPORTS OF CANADIAN LUMBER

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last fall the Senate Commerce Committee held a series of hearings in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Alaska, in regard to the lumber situation as it directly relates to imports of lumber from Canada and their effect on the U.S. market and U.S. lumber producers. As a result of the hearings, several actions were taken by the President of the United States and by certain Government agencies; but the principal objective was to attempt—on petition by the lumber interests—to have the Tariff Commission establish a temporary quota or at least an increase in the tariff on Canadian lumber entering the United States and its markets, particularly the eastern market.

Over a period of many weeks the Tariff Commission held numerous hearings and heard many witnesses. Recently the Tariff Commission finally ruled. It denied that the President or various governmental groups had a right to take action in connection with that tariff.

The Senate Commerce Committee has had ready for many days, following the hearings, certain bills, for introduction, in lieu of the desired action by the Tariff Commission. The bills cover many of the facets of this very serious problem.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators who held the long hearings which culminated in the preparation of these bills, I introduce them at this time, for appropriate reference.

Let me say that I believe that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] is about to introduce some other bills which relate to this matter. Those of us who sponsor the bills I am introducing at this time wish to join the Senator from Idaho in his efforts, and we hope he will join us in ours. The bills I am introducing are

the result of the committee's hearings and consideration. I believe it well that both those of us who sponsor these bills and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] proceed at this time to call attention in this way to this very serious problem. I assure him that the members of the Commerce Committee are wholeheartedly with him. Some of the bills may involve duplication; but, if so, we shall work out that situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, in connection with my introduction of these bills, an editorial from the Seattle Times of February 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills and joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorial will be printed in the Record.

The bills and joint resolution, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 921. A bill to amend section 22 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773, 7 U.S.C. 624), to require the Secretary of Agriculture to include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act; and

S. 922. A bill to establish in the Department of Agriculture an office for two additional Assistant Secretaries, one of whose prime responsibilities shall be forest resources, and for other purposes.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 923. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended (48 Stat. 1246, 12 U.S.C. 1701), to require the use of domestically grade-marked lumber and wood products in the construction of housing federally financed and/or federally insured, and for other purposes.

To the Committee on Finance:

S. 924. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin; and

S.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6-percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber.

To the Committee on Commerce:

S. 925. A bill to amend section 203(b)(6) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to limit the application of the exemptions provided therein, and for other purposes; and

S. 926. A bill to repeal section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relating to the water-carrier bulk commodity exemption, and for other purposes.

The editorial presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

OTHER MEANS TO LUMBER RELIEF

West coast lumbermen have lost their battle for mandatory quotas on Canadian lumber imports. But at least the rejection of the American lumbermen's plea by the Tariff Commission was not unexpected.

The challenge now is to seek relief for the hard-pressed lumber industry in other directions.

What we said in these columns last October 1 is more than ever applicable today. The Times said then of the case before the Tariff Commission:

"It would be a mistake either to count upon a favorable decision or to assume that if the decision is favorable, efforts on other governmental fronts to ease lumber's plight can be relaxed.

"The pressure must be maintained both in Congress and on the executive branch."

The Tariff Commission heard that factors other than American trade policy are responsible for the decline of the softwood lumber industry in the West.

Industry officials have been saying all along that domestic laws and regulations imposed by their own Government are among the key factors.

These include the Jones Act requirement that American west coast lumbermen who ship their products to the Atlantic market by sea must use costly American ships while the Canadians can invade the same market in less-costly foreign vessels.

The unfavorable Tariff Commission decision increases the responsibility of President Kennedy to take meaningful action on the lumber aid program he promulgated with great fanfare last July.

We would hope that the President is eager to refute the cynics who viewed his lumber aid program as an election year gesture.

One facet of the Kennedy program consists of efforts to convince the Canadians that they should impose a voluntary quota on their lumber exports to this country. The surplus of marketable lumber caused by the October 12 windstorm has created speculation that the Canadians might now be interested in a voluntary quota as a means of self-protection.

Certainly the administration should seek further Canadian-American talks on the lumber import problem at the earliest possible date.

And new efforts should be made in Congress to solidify and strengthen the lumber bloc that was created in the 1962 congressional session. This union of western and southern Congressmen can be effective both as a legislative team and as a means of influencing the White House and the executive departments.

It should be kept in mind that the lost case before the Tariff Commission was but one of a number of approaches to the problem of lost lumber markets in the East.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am introducing, by request of the Nation's subsidized steamship lines, two bills which were before the Committee on Commerce during the 87th Congress, were reported favorably by the committee and passed by the Senate, but too late in the session for final action by the House.

One bill would permit U.S. owners of vessels built with construction subsidy to secure Government war-risk insurance coverage in the same amounts available to foreign owners of comparable vessels built in foreign yards without subsidy. Present law is unduly restrictive in such respect, U.S. ship operators contend.

The other bill would give owners of U.S.-flag vessels requisitioned for use by the Government in time of war or emergency priority toward reacquiring their vessels when the Government no longer has need of them. The many new vessels being put into service now by U.S. operators generally are built to serve the needs of particular trade routes. The owners believe, therefore, that the interests of our country's shipping and commerce would be best served by having the vessels in the hands of operators serving the particular routes for which the vessels were designed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

S. 927. A bill to amend title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to remove certain limitations with respect to war-risk insurance issued under the provisions of such title; and

S. 928. A bill to amend section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide that owners of vesels requisitioned by the United States shall be accorded preference toward reacquiring these vessels when they can be released by the Government, and for other purposes.

PROTECTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the leadership which President Kennedy showed in his message to Congress several days ago concerning the administration's program for the mentally ill was most gratifying. There is much to recommend his bold action in this neglected area. However, there is another facet of the problem not mentioned by the President that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has been considering for some years. This study concentrated on the constitutional rights of the mentally ill rather than their treatment as such.

The subcommittee's preliminary investigation has now been completed; and during the last session I offered a bill, S. 3261, to protect the rights of the mentally ill in the District of Columbia. Although the measure would apply only to commitment procedures for St. Elizabeths Hospital here in Washington; I should hope that, if adopted, it would serve as a model for the States. Unfortunately, hearings on the measure were not completed, and no action was taken on the bill due to other pressing business of the Senate.

Today I am introducing what is essentially the same bill because I feel that the need for legislation to protect the rights of the mentally ill grows increasingly important as increasingly large numbers of persons are afflicted with emotional illnesses.

The National Institute of Mental Health annually reports increases in mental hospital admissions; and, according to medical prognosticators, the mounting stresses of our modern society portend even greater increases in the future. This forewarning is applicable to every American household.

Mental illness does not choose its victims by social class, religious affiliation, or racial origin. In that respect, it is the same as any physical ailment. It differs in that it often renders one incapable of rational judgment and of conforming of the discipline patterns of society. This difference has been reason enough to physically separate the mentally ill from society; but this difference should not be reason enough for society to separate them from fundamental ideals of justice and from their inalienable rights as citizens.

Fortunately our society has been experiencing a revolution in attitude respecting the mentally ill. This revolution, for the most part, has been brought about by the great advances made in medical science. This success has offered us the promise that one day we shall consider emotional illnesses and cures for them with the same regard as the physical illnesses.

Just as we are in a period of revolution respecting medical treatment of mental illnesses, we are likewise experiencing a revolution respecting the social status of the mentally ill. For too many years they were treated as creatures to be feared because of the lack of understanding of their malady. Knowledge of the mind is providing us with this understanding, and the fear is being removed.

Unfortunately, but understandably, the old fears were reflected in the laws governing the mentally ill. They were shut away in institutions similar to our penal institutions. Prevailing attitudes caused them to be treated as criminals in most respects. They were picked up by arresting officers, transported in a paddy wagon used for criminals, charged with mental illness, retained in jail, then committed to an institution. Once inside the institution, ostensibly for treatment, they were immediately deprived of most of their rights—often locked up, straitjacket, regimented, and silenced. When cured, they were paroled, then released and had to apply to the courts in order to regain their legal rights.

Upon being institutionalized, it was generally assumed that the individual was incapable of caring for himself and even less so of handling his property and other affairs. Consequently, individuals were automatically divested of their rights respecting their property and were considered total incompetents. We know now that the variety of mental illnesses requires less rigid standards in order to achieve fair and just administration of the laws that may be necessary to assure protection of their property.

It is now necessary to reform our commitment laws to reflect our new understanding of the nature of mental illness. The fact of mental illness should not reduce our responsibility to see that every individual's rights are fully protected according to the intent and spirit of our Constitution.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleagues, Senators JOHNSTON, McCLELLAN, and HRUSKA, I introduce for appropriate reference this bill to bring the mental illness laws of the District of Columbia in line with modern scientific and legal knowledge in order to better protect the constitutional rights of the individuals involved.

During the subcommittee's hearings in 1961, a wealth of valuable information and recommendations were received. It was on the basis of these recommendations and others obtained from various organizations that this bill is drafted.

I would hope that with the passage of any new legislation, Congress will expressly repeal those sections of the Code that would no longer apply to our commitment procedures, and collect and carry over with this legislation the remaining consistent provisions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill, an analysis of it, and a comparison of it with titles 21 and 32, the pertinent titles of the District of Columbia Code, reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, analysis, and comparison will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 935) to protect the constitutional rights of certain individuals who are mentally ill, to provide for their care, treatment, and hospitalization, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ERVIN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHORT TITLE

This Act may be cited as the "Hospitalization of the Mentally Ill Act".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "mental illness" means any psychosis or other disease which substantially impairs the mental health of an individual (but shall not include epilepsy, alcoholism, drug addition, or mental deficiency);

(2) the term "mentally ill individual" means any individual who has a mental illness;

(3) the term "physician" means an individual licensed under the laws of the District of Columbia to practice medicine;

(4) the term "private hospital" means any nongovernmental hospital or institution, or part thereof, in the District of Columbia, equipped to provide inpatient care and treatment for any individual suffering from a physical or mental illness;

(5) the term "public hospital" means any hospital or institution, or part thereof, in the District of Columbia, owned and operated by the Government of the United States or of the District of Columbia, equipped to provide inpatient care and treatment for any individual suffering from a physical or mental illness; and

(7) the term "administrator" means an individual in charge of a public or private hospital or his delegate.

VOLUNTARY HOSPITALIZATION

SEC. 3. (a) Any individual who has a mental illness, or who has symptoms of a mental illness, may apply to any public or private hospital in the District of Columbia for admission to such hospital as a voluntary patient for the purposes of observation, diagnosis, or care and treatment of such illness. The administrator of a private hospital may, and the administrator of a public hospital shall, upon the request of any such individual twenty-one years of age or over (or in the case of any individual under twenty-one years of age, upon a request made by his spouse, parent, or legal guardian), admit such individual as a voluntary patient to such hospital for observation, diagnosis, or care and treatment of such illness in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

(b) Any voluntary patient admitted to any hospital pursuant to this section shall, if he is twenty-one years of age or over, be entitled at any time to obtain his release from such hospital by filing a written request with the administrator thereof. The administrator shall, within a period of forty-eight hours after the receipt of any such request (unless such period shall expire on a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday, then not later than noon of the next succeeding day which is not a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday), release the voluntary patient making such request. In the case of any voluntary patient under the age of twenty-one years, the administrator shall immediately release such patient upon the written request of his spouse, parent, or legal guardian. The administrator may release any voluntary patient hospitalized pursuant to this section whenever he determines that such patient has recovered or that his continued hospitalization is no longer beneficial or advisable.

EMERGENCY HOSPITALIZATION

SEC. 4. (a) Any duly accredited officer or agent of the Department of Public Health of the District of Columbia, or any officer authorized to make arrests in the District of Columbia, who has reason to believe that an individual is mentally ill and, because of such illness, is likely to injure himself or others if he is allowed to remain at liberty may, without a warrant, take such individual into custody, transport him to a public or private hospital, and make application for his admission thereto for purposes of emergency observation and treatment. Such application shall reveal the circumstances under which the individual was taken into custody and the reasons therefor.

(b) Subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, the administrator of any private hospital may, and the administrator of any public hospital shall, admit and detain for purposes of emergency observation and treatment any individual with respect to whom such application is made, if such application is accompanied by a certificate of a physician on duty at such hospital stating that he has examined the individual and is of the opinion that he has symptoms of a mental illness and, because of such illness, is likely to injure himself or others unless he is immediately hospitalized. Not later than twenty-four hours after the admission pursuant to this section of any individual to a hospital, the administrator of such hospital shall serve notice of such admission, by registered mail, to the spouse, parent, or legal guardian of such individual and to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

(c) No individual admitted to any hospital for emergency observation and treatment under subsection (b) of this section shall be detained in such hospital for a period in excess of twenty-four hours from the time of his admission unless the administrator of such hospital has, within such twenty-four hour period (unless such period shall expire on a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday, then not later than noon of the next succeeding day which is not a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday), filed a written petition with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for an order authorizing the continued hospitalization of such individual for emergency observation and treatment.

(d) The court shall, within a period of twenty-four hours after the receipt by it of such petition (unless such period shall expire on a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday, then not later than noon of the next succeeding day which is not a Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday) either order the hospitalization of such individual for emergency observation and treatment for a period of not to exceed ninety-six hours from the time such order is entered, or order his immediate release. In making its determination, the court shall consider the testimony of the agent or officer who made the application under subsection (b) of this section requesting the hospitalization of such individual, and the certificate of the examining physician which accompanied it.

(e) The administrator of any hospital in which an individual is hospitalized for emergency observation and treatment under a court order entered pursuant to subsection (d) of this section shall, within forty-eight hours after such order is entered, have such individual examined by a physician. If the physician, after his examination, certifies that in his opinion the individual is not mentally ill to the extent that he is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty, the individual shall be immediately released. The administrator shall, within forty-eight hours after such examination has been completed, send a copy of the results thereof by registered mail to the spouse, parents, attorney, legal guardian, or other nearest known adult relative of the individual examined.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the administrator of any hospital in which an individual is hospitalized for emergency observation and treatment under this section may, if judicial proceedings for his hospitalization have been commenced under section 5 of this Act, detain such individual therein during the course of such proceedings.

HOSPITALIZATION UPON COURT ORDER

SEC. 5. (a) Proceedings for the judicial hospitalization of any individual in the District of Columbia may be commenced by the filing of a petition with the United States District Court for the District of Columbia by his spouse, parent, or legal guardian, by any physician, duly accredited officer or agent of the Department of Public Health, or by any officer authorized to make arrest in the District of Columbia. Such petition shall be accompanied (1) by a certificate of a physician stating that he has examined the individual and is of the opinion that such individual is mentally ill, and because of such illness, is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty, or (2) by a sworn written statement by the petitioner that (A) the petitioner has good reason to believe that such individual is mentally ill and, because of such illness, is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty, and (B) that such individual has refused to submit to examination by a physician.

(b) Within three days after the receipt by it of any petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, the court shall (1) send a copy of such petition by registered mail to the individual with respect to whom it was filed, and (2) appoint two qualified physicians who shall, within seven days after their appointment, examine, independently of each other, the mental condition of such individual. The examinations may be conducted at a hospital or other medical facility, at the home of the individual to be examined, or at any other place designated by the court. Each such physician shall, on the basis of his examination, report to the court his determinations and findings as to the mental condition of the individual examined and his need for custody, care, or treatment in a hospital.

(c) If the reports of the designated physicians are both to the effect that the individual examined is not mentally ill to the extent that he is likely to injure himself or others if he is allowed to remain at liberty, the court shall immediately terminate the proceeding and dismiss the petition. If either of such reports is to the effect that such individual is mentally ill to the extent that he is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty, the court shall fix a date (which shall not be less than five days nor more than fifteen days after the date such reports are filed) for a hearing on the petition, and shall give notice of such hearing to such individual and to his attorney, legal guardian, spouse, parent, or other nearest known adult relative.

(d) Any hearing held pursuant to a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section shall be conducted in as informal a manner as may be consistent with orderly procedure and in a physical setting not likely to have a harmful effect on the mental health of the individual named in such petition. In conducting such hearing, the court shall receive all relevant and material evidence which may be offered and shall not be bound by the rules of evidence. Any individual with respect to whom a hearing is held under this section shall be entitled, in his discretion, to be present at such hearing, to testify, and to present and cross-examine witnesses, but in no event shall any such hearing be concluded without the judge who is conducting such hearing first having personally observed such individual.

(e) Any individual with respect to whom a hearing is held under this section shall be represented by counsel at such hearing, and if he fails or refuses to obtain counsel, the court shall appoint counsel to represent him. Any counsel so appointed shall be awarded compensation by the court for his services in an amount determined by the court to be fair and reasonable. Such compensation shall be charged against the estate or property of the individual for whom such counsel was appointed, or against any unobligated funds of the Department of Public Health, as the court in its discretion may direct. The court shall, at the request of any counsel appointed to represent an individual in any hearing held pursuant to a petition filed under subsection (a) of this section, grant a recess in such hearing (but not for more than five days) to give such counsel an opportunity to prepare his case.

(f) If, upon completion of the hearing and consideration of the record, the court finds that such individual is mentally ill to the extent that he is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty, it shall order his hospitalization for an indeterminate period. However, if the court finds that such individual is not mentally ill to the extent that he is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty, it shall order his immediate release.

PERIODIC EXAMINATION AND RELEASE

SEC. 6. (a) Any patient hospitalized pursuant to a court order obtained under section 5 of this Act, or his attorney, legal guardian, spouse, parent, or other nearest adult relative, shall be entitled, within three months after such order and not more frequently than every six months thereafter, to request, in writing, the administrator of the hospital in which he is hospitalized, to have a current examination of his mental condition made by one or more physicians. If the request is timely it shall be granted. The patient shall be entitled, at his own expense, to have any duly qualified physician participate in such examination. In the case of any such patient who is indigent, the Department of Public Health shall, upon the written request of such patient, assist him in obtaining a duly qualified physician to participate in such examination in the patient's behalf. Any such physician so obtained shall be compensated for his services out of any funds available to such department in an amount determined by it to be fair and reasonable. If the administrator, after considering the reports of the physicians conducting such examination, determines that the patient is no longer mentally ill to the extent that he is a danger to himself or others, he shall order the immediate release of the patient. However, if the administrator, after considering such reports, determines that such patient continues to be mentally ill to the extent that he is dangerous to himself or others, but one or more of the physicians participating in such examination reports that the patient is not mentally ill to the extent that he is dangerous to himself or others, the patient may petition the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for an order directing his release. Such petition shall be accompanied by the reports of the physicians who conducted the examination of the patient.

(b) In considering such petition, the court shall consider the testimony of the physicians who participated in the examination of such patient, and the reports of such physicians accompanying the petition. After considering such testimony and reports, the court shall either (1) reject the petition and order the continued hospitalization of the patient for an indeterminate period, or (2) order the administrator to immediately release such patient.

(c) The administrator of a public or private hospital shall as often as practicable, but not less often than every six months, examine or cause to be examined each patient admitted to any such hospital pursuant to section 5 of this Act and if he determines on the basis of such examination that the conditions which justified the involuntary hospitalization of such patient no longer exist, the administrator shall immediately release such patient.

RIGHT TO COMMUNICATION AND VISITATION—EXERCISE OF CERTAIN RIGHTS

SEC. 7. (a) Each patient hospitalized in a public or private hospital pursuant to this Act shall be entitled (1) to communicate by sealed mail or otherwise with any individual or official agency inside or outside the hospital, and (2) to receive uncensored mail from his attorney or personal physician. All other incoming mail or communications may be read before being delivered to the patient, if the administrator believes such action is necessary for the medical welfare of the patient who is the intended recipient. However, any mail or other communication which is not delivered to the patient for whom it is intended shall be immediately returned to the sender.

(b) Each patient hospitalized in any public hospital for a mental illness, shall, during his hospitalization, be entitled to medical and psychiatric care and treatment. Within five days after the end of each calendar month the administrator of each public hospital shall submit to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia a report giving a detailed account of the type of medical and psychiatric care and treatment which, during such month, has been provided by such hospital to each patient hospitalized therein for a mental illness.

(c) No mechanical restraint shall be applied to any patient hospitalized in any public or private hospital for a mental illness unless the use of restraint is prescribed by a physician, and if so prescribed, such restraint shall be removed whenever the condition justifying its use no longer exists. Any use of a mechanical restraint, together with the reasons therefor, shall be made a part of the medical record of the patient. The Administrator shall make written quarterly reports to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their delegate of each use of a mechanical restraint, the reason for such use and the duration thereof.

(d) No patient hospitalized pursuant to this Act shall, by reason of such hospitalization, be denied the right to dispose of property, execute instruments, make purchases, enter into contractual relationships, and vote, unless such patient has been adjudicated incompetent by a court of competent jurisdiction and has not been restored to legal capacity. If the Administrator of the public or private hospital in which any such patient is hospitalized is of the opinion that such patient is unable to exercise any of the aforementioned rights, the Administrator shall immediately notify the patient's attorney, legal guardian, spouse, parents, or other nearest known adult relative of that fact.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES

SEC. 8. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require the admission of any individual to any Veterans' Administration or military hospital facility unless such individual is otherwise eligible for care and treatment in such facility.

UNWARRANTED HOSPITALIZATION OR DENIAL OF RIGHTS—PENALTIES

SEC. 9. Any individual who willfully causes or conspires with or assists another to cause (1) the unwarranted hospitalization of any individual under this Act, or (2) the denial to any individual of any right accorded to him under this Act, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000 or imprisonment not exceeding three years, or both.

MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 10. Any Act or part of an Act which is inconsistent with any provision of this Act shall, to the extent of the inconsistency, cease to apply on and after the date of enactment of this Act.

The analysis and comparison presented by Mr. ERVIN are as follows:

ANALYSIS OF S. 3261

Analysis of the bill to protect the constitutional rights of certain individuals who are mentally ill, to provide for their care, treatment, and hospitalization, and for other purposes.

This bill brings up to date the District of Columbia statutes dealing with the hospitalization of the mentally ill in the areas of admission to the hospital, patient examination and release procedures and enumeration of personal rights of the patient.

Section 1 is the title for this proposal.

Section 2 defines some of the terms used in this act. The principal definition in this section is of the term "mental illness." The object of the definition is to correlate the legal meaning and the precise medical condition of the patient.

Section 3 provides that a private hospital may, and a public hospital must, admit any individual, over 21 years of age, who applies for observation, diagnosis, or care and treatment for a mental illness. It further provides that any individual who has voluntarily applied for admission should be released within 48 hours after submitting a written request for same.

This is a significant improvement over the existing procedure for admitting voluntary patients, in that it eliminates the cumbersome conditions that unduly restrain the categories of persons accepted for hospitalization. Some of these conditions are: sufficient mental competency to make an application; certification and approval of application by the Department of Public Health; a guarantee that the hospital will be reimbursed for cost of care; residential requirements and the ever-present threat of revocation of certification by the Department of Public Health.

Section 4 (a) and (b) permits an authorized arresting officer to seize any individual believed to be mentally ill to the extent that he may cause injury to himself or others, and to transport him to a public or private hospital for observation and treatment. Such admissions must be accompanied by the officer's statement of circumstances and reasons for the seizure; a certificate from the admitting physician stating that an immediate examination has been made and that the patient needs hospitalization to prevent injury to himself or others. Notice of admission is required to be by registered mail to the nearest relative within 24 hours of the hospitalization.

Section 4 (c) and (d) spells out the conditions and the time regulation by which a hospital may detain an individual for emergency observation. It specifies that within 24 hours of admission the Administrator must file a petition with the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia for an order authorizing the continued hospitalization of the individual. Following receipt of the petition, the court, within 24 hours, is required to reply with an order of detainment for not more than 96 hours or an order for immediate release.

Section 4 (e) and (f) concerns the disposition of the individual following the court order of detainment. Requires medical examination within 48 hours of the court order for detainment. If found not to be mentally ill he is released immediately. If found to be mentally ill, the patient's nearest relative, guardians, etc., must be notified within 48 hours. Continued detention of the individual may be effected only if proceedings for judicial hospitalization are initiated.

Section 5 deals with procedures for hospitalization upon court order which may be commenced by the filing of a petition by: the spouse, parent, legal guardian, any physician, officer or agent of the Department of Public Health, or officer authorized to make arrest. The petition must be accompanied by physician's certificate of examination and by petitioner's sworn written statement that the individual is mentally ill and likely to injure himself or others if released and that he has refused examination by a physician.

Section 5 (b) and (c) requires the court to send, within 3 days, a copy of the petition to the individual concerned and appoint two physicians to examine independently of each other the mental condition of the individual at a court approved site. Each physician is required to report to the court the findings of his examination. If each report shows the individual not to be dangerous to himself or others, the court must terminate proceedings. If, however, either report indicates the individual is dangerous, the court shall fix a date, within 5 to 15 days of the report, for a hearing. It provides also for notice to the appropriate individuals.

Section 5 (d), (e) and (f) outlines the conduct of the hearings. It provides for: (1) a proper setting for the hearings; (2) permits the court to receive evidence; (3) permits the individual to be present at hearings to testify, to present and cross-examine witnesses; (4) requires the judge to personally observe the individual; (5) requires representation by counsel and directs the court, upon findings, to order hospitalization for an indeterminate period or order release of the individual in accordance with the findings in the proceedings.

Section 6 (a), (b), and (c): This section entitles the patient to request a mental examination within 3 months after the order and each 6 months thereafter with his personal physician participating in the examination. If the reports of the physicians are favorable, the Administrator, after considering each report, shall order the release of the patient. If any of the reports indicate the continued existence of the illness, but one or more indicates the illness no longer exists, the patient may file a petition in District Court for his release based on the favorable report of the examination. The court may reject the petition and order the continued hospitalization of the patient, or order the Administrator to immediately release such patient.

The Administrator shall examine each patient not less often than every 6 months and when it is determined that the patient is no longer ill, he may order his release.

Section 7 enumerates for the first time in the District of Columbia law, the personal rights of the patient.

Section 7(a) entitles the patient to communicate, by sealed mail, with individuals and officials and to receive uncensored mail from his attorney and physician. All other mail is subject to the scrutiny of the Administrator. However, any mail that is forbidden the patient, must be returned immediately to the sender.

Section 7(b) entitles the patient to adequate medical and psychiatric care and treatment, and requires that a record be kept of the type of medical and psychiatric care and treatment administered. These records are to be filed monthly with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Section 7(c) forbids the use of mechanical restraints except as prescribed by a physician, whose reasons therefore shall be made a part of the patient's medical record to be forwarded quarterly to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Section 7(d) gives the patient the right to dispose of property, execute instruments, make purchases, enter into contractual relationships, and vote, unless the patient has been adjudged by a court to be incompetent.

Section 8 exempts application of this act to admissions of individuals, unless otherwise eligible, to Veterans' Administration or military hospitals.

Section 9 provides for fine and imprisonment of any individual who willfully causes or assists in an unwarranted hospitalization of another individual.

Section 10 provides that any inconsistency of present laws with the provisions of this act no longer applies after enactment of this act.

COMPARISON OF PROPOSED BILL WITH TITLES 21 AND 32 OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

I. COMMITMENT PROCEDURES *A. Voluntary*	
SEC. 3(a). The Administrator of a public hospital must, and of a private hospital may, admit patient for observation on his request. For individual under 21 years of age, the request must be made by spouse, parents or guardian.	D.C.C. 32–412: There must be written application by a patient competent to make such application. If person is under 21, the application must be made by parent, legal guardian, or legal representative. (1948 act.) D.C.C. 32–417b: Superintendent of St. Elizabeths may at his discretion admit such a person for a period not exceeding 30 days (1949).
SEC. 3(b). Voluntary patient must be released within 48 hours of filing written request. If individual is under 21, such request must be made by spouse, parent, or legal guardian, and release is immediate. Administrator may also release when he considers hospitalization no longer necessary.	D.C.C. 32–413, 32–417b: A voluntary patient must be released within three days after filing written application with Administrator. (If under 21, application by parent, legal guardian, or legal representative.) However, if during this period a petition for commitment is filed or if the Board of Public Welfare files such a petition or writ de lunatico inquirendo accompanied by notice from the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital that the patient is of unsound mind and should not be allowed to remain at liberty, he may be detained until final judgment by the court. The notice and petition from the Board of Public Welfare shall be referred to the Commission on Public Health and shall be sufficient to start proceedings before the Commission (1948).
B. Involuntary 1. Emergency	
SEC. 4(a). Arrest without warrant may be made by agent of Department of Public Health or any officer authorized to make arrests in the District of Columbia if he believes the person likely to injure himself or others. Arresting officer must transport to the hospital and make application for admission of patient, stating circumstances of custody. SEC. 4(b). Physician on duty at time of application has to certify that he thinks the person is likely to injure himself or others if not immediately hospitalized. Within 24 hours of admission notice must be given by registered mail to spouse, parent, or legal guardian.	D.C.C. 21–326: Any officer in the District of Columbia can arrest without warrant any person in a public place that he believes to be of unsound mind. Arresting officer must immediately file an affidavit with police that he believes that the individual is incapable of taking care of himself and that he will jeopardize the public peace or render the commission of crime probable. The police have the duty to notify a responsible person or the spouse of the individual about the detention (1904). D.C.C. 21–327: Provides for arrest without warrant at other than public places of indigent persons alleged to be of unsound mind or of any insane person with dangerous or homicidal tendencies. Two District of Columbia residents must file affidavits with the police saying that the individual is incapable of managing his own affairs, jeopardizes the public peace and makes commission of crime probable. Two physicians must also examine the person and certify him to be insane or of unsound mind (1904).
SEC. 4(c). To detain more than 24 hours a petition must be filed during this period with the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. SEC. 4(d). Within 24 hours of receiving this petition, the court must either order the person's release or order a period not exceeding 96 hours for emergency detention and observation. SEC. 4(e). Within 48 hours of the court order, the individual must be examined by a physician. If the physician certifies that the patient is likely to injure himself or others, the administrator must within 48 hours of this send notice by registered mail to the patient's spouse, attorney, legal guardian, or nearest relative. SEC. 4(f). If commitment procedures have been initiated, the hospital can detain until hearings take place as under section 5.	D.C.C. 21–332 permits such persons to be discharged upon bond payable to the United States with condition to restrain and take care of patient not charged with a breach of peace until the patient is restored to sanity (1936). D.C.C. 21–310: Provides for starting commitment procedures or applying for a writ de lunatico inquirendo by the person making the arrest as above, or by parent, spouse, brother, sister, committee, officer of hospital or Board of Public Welfare. Petition is to be filed with the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia (1948). D.C.C. 21–311: After petition as in 21–310 alleging dangerous tendencies is filed, the court may order detention for a 30-day observation period. He must be given an examination within 5 days of admittance to St. Elizabeths Hospital. Persons arrested as provided in 21–326 and 21–327 shall be detained at Gallinger Municipal Hospital until the petition is filed as provided in 21–310. Petition must be filed within 48 hours of original arrest; otherwise individual must be discharged. On basis of petition, the court may order detention for a period not exceeding 30 days. (Compare with D.C.C. 32–417 below.) If a petition for commitment or a writ de lunatico is filed with the equity court, it shall be referred to the Commission for report and recommendation within a period not exceeding 7 days; but this time can be extended if the court finds it necessary. In its hearings on the individual's sanity, the Commission shall listen to the alleged insane and other competent witnesses. The individual has the right to counsel during these hearings. If the Commission finds him not sane, it shall apply to the court for a hearing. The Commission is responsible for giving written notice of the hearing to the individual at least 5 days before the hearing. Such notice is also to be sent to the applicant or spouse or nearest relative if applicant is not spouse or relative. Right to jury and counsel will be discussed below (1938, amended 1948). D.C.C. 21–315: If alleged insane is then found to be insane, the judge may commit him as he believes is in the best interests of the public and of the insane person (1939).
B. Involuntary—Continued	
2. Hospitalization on court order SEC. 5(a) For confinement there is still the requirement that the person be likely to injure himself or others. The Petition must be filed with the U.S. District Court for the District of of Columbia by the spouse, parent, guardian, officer of the Department of Public Health or authorized arresting officer. The petition must be acompanied (1) by the certificate of the physician that the individual is dangerous or (2) by a written statement by the petitioner that he believes such person likely to injure himself or others and that the patient has refused to submit to examination by a physician.	D.C.C. 21–310: Petitions are filed as discussed above. D.C.C. 21–311: Hearings are held by the Commission in accordance with this section as discussed above. D.C.C. 21–312: A copy of the report and recommendation of the Commission is to be served on the alleged insane, his guardian or attorney with notice that he has 5 days to demand a jury trial (see VII below). If jury trial is demanded, trial is calendered for hearing not more than 10 days after demand (1939).
SEC. 5(b). Within three days after receipt of this petition the court shall send a copy to the person by registered mail. The court shall also appoint two physicians who then examine the person within seven days and report their findings to the court. SEC. 5(c). If both physicians report the person not likely to injure himself or others, the petition is to be dismissed. If one report states he is dangerous, the court shall set a date for the hearing 5–15 days after the filing of the reports. Notice shall be given to the individual, his attorney, guardian, spouse, parent, or nearest known relative. SEC. 5(d). The hearings are to be held in a setting not likely to be adverse to the patient's mental health. The court shall not be bound by rules of evidence. The individual is permitted to be present, testify, present and cross-examine witnesses. The judge must observe the individual before the conclusion of the hearings. SEC. 5(e). Right to counsel. (See below section VIII.) SEC. 5(f). If after the hearing the court finds the person likely to injure himself or others, he shall be committed for an indeterminate period. Otherwise he shall be immediately released.	D.C.C. 21–314: If there is no demand for jury trial, sanity is determined by the judge and the judge may commit according to D.C.C. 21–315 (1939). D.C.C. 21–316: Recommendations of the Commission (see D.C.C. 21–312 above) must be unanimous by the three members sitting. If they cannot agree, a report is filed with the court, and a hearing is held for judicial determination of sanity. Recommendations must be in the form of either (1) advice to dismiss petition; (2) further temporary confinement; or (3) confinement with recommendations as to payment of expenses according to results of investigations of patient's background (1939). D.C.C. 32–417: (Compare with 21–326 and 21–327 above.) Provides for commitment by specially designated commissioners of the U.S. District Court after a hearing with testimony of two witnesses that person is of unsound mind and two physicians, one of whom is skilled in diagnosis of mental disorders. The doctors must certify that the person is of unsound mind and should be restrained for his own safety and for the preservation of the peace. Such confinement shall not exceed 30 days. The head of the agency where the person is apprehended must notify the person's spouse or near relative if the address is known (1939). D.C.C. 32–417a: If an immediate hearing as in 32–417 cannot be had, the person can be detained for 72 hours pending the hearing. Upon certification of the superintendent that it would be unsafe to hold the hearing elsewhere, such hearing shall be at St. Elizabeths Hospital (1949).

COMPARISON OF PROPOSED BILL WITH TITLES 21 AND 32 OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE

B. Involuntary—**Continued**

	D.C.C. 32–417d: If the superintendent of St. Elizabeths finds the person to be of sound mind, he shall immediately release him. If he finds him to be of unsound mind, he shall return the patient to his State or relatives if practicable. Provides for judicial determination of sanity and appointment of committee for patient upon application of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or any interested party (1949, amended 1953).
II. PERIODIC EXAMINATION AND RELEASE SEC. 6(a). Patient is entitled upon his, his sponsor's, attorney's, and nearest adult relative's written request to have an examination of the patient's mental condition by a physician within 3 months after the order of hospitalization and as frequently as every 6 months thereafter. The patient may in addition have his own physician participate in the examination. If the patient is indigent, the Department of Public Health, after written request for it, shall assist in obtaining and shall pay the fee for this extra physician. If on the basis of the physician's report the administrator no longer believes the patient dangerous, he shall order the patient immediately released. If the administrator still believes the patient dangerous, but one of the physicians' reports is to the effect that he is no longer dangerous, the patient may petition the U.S. district court for his release. The petition shall be accompanied by the reports of the physicians. SEC. 6(b). The court shall consider the testimony and reports of the examining physicians. The court shall then order either the continued hospitalization or release of the patient. SEC. 6(c). The administrator of the hospital shall see that the patient has an examination at least every 6 months. If from these reports he believes the patient no longer dangerous, he shall order his immediate release.	D.C.C. 21–325: Provides that none of these statutes shall deprive the alleged insane person of existing remedies for release or proof of sanity (1939). D.C.C. 21–320: Provides procedure for restoring to the status of sound mind a person paroled or released from the hospital. There are no provisions corresponding exactly to those of the proposed act (1939).
III. RIGHTS TO COMMUNICATIONS AND VISITATION *Exercise of certain rights* SEC. 7(a). Entitles each patient to (1) communicate by sealed mail with any individual or official agency, and (2) to receive uncensored mail from his attorney or physician. SEC. 7(b). Entitles each patient to medical and psychiatric treatment. Each month a report of treatment shall be submitted to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. SEC. 7(c). Allows the use of mechanical restraints only when prescribed by a physician. Any use of mechanical restraint must be described in quarterly reports to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. SEC. 7(d). Entitles each patient to dispose of property, execute instruments, make purchases, contract, and vote unless patient has been adjudicated incompetent by the court and has not been restored to legal capacity. If the hospital administrator believes the patient incapable of exercising these rights, he shall notify the patient's attorney, guardian, spouse, parents, or nearest known adult relative.	No specific provisions defining rights. Processes for commitment are interwoven with those for filing writ de lunatico inquirendo, leaving the situation extremely unclear.
IV. VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES SEC. 8. Provides that nothing in this act shall be construed to require the admission of any individual to any VA or military hospital facility unless such individual is otherwise eligible for care and treatment in such facility.	D.C.C. 21–315: The judge may commit to a Veterans' Administration facility if the administration files a certificate with the Commission stating that he is eligible for admittance. D.C.C. 21–316: Provides for recommendation of the Commission to the court on the basis of the certificate from the Veterans' Administration (1939).
V. UNWARRANTED HOSPITALIZATION OR DENIAL OF RIGHTS—PENALTIES SEC. 9. Provides a penalty of up to $5,000 and/or 3 years imprisonment for any person willfully causing or conspiring to cause the unwarranted hospitalization or denial of any right to any individual under this act.	D.C.C. 21–324: Provides a penalty not exceeding $500 and/or 3 years' imprisonment for knowingly submitting false petition or affidavit (1939).
VI. MISCELLANEOUS SEC. 10. Provides that any act or part of any act which is inconsistent with any provision of this act shall, to the extent of the inconsistency cease to apply on and after the date of enactment of this act.	No specific comparable provision found.
VII. RIGHT TO JURY TRIAL No specific mention of jury trial is made. Therefore, sections 21–311, 21–312, and 21–313 of the D.C. Code continue in effect.	D.C.C. 21–311: If demand for jury trial is made, the hospital superintendent shall see that the patient has the opportunity to appear at the hearings either personally or by attorney. However, if the superintendent certifies that it would be unsafe or prejudicial to the patient's health, the patient's presence shall not be required (1938). D.C.C. 21–312: The alleged insane person, his guardian ad litem, or his attorney has 5 days after the receipt of the Commission's report to demand a jury trial (1939). D.C.C. 21–313: Provides for the jurors to be impaneled from those in attendance upon U.S. District Courts for the District of Columbia (1939).
VIII. RIGHT TO COUNSEL SEC. 5. (e) In hearings on judicial hospitalization the alleged insane shall be represented by counsel. If the individual does not obtain counsel, the court shall appoint counsel for him. Provides for granting of recess in hearings not to exceed 5 days to allow appointed counsel to prepare his case. Counsel is to be compensated out of the individual's estate or out of the unobligated funds of the Board of Public Welfare, at the court's discretion.	D.C.C. 21–308: The court has the power to appoint an attorney or guardian ad litem who will be compensated out of the alleged insane person's estate or out of the funds of the Commission, as the court directs. This applies to hearings before the Commission as well as before the court (1938, amended 1939, 1948, 1949). D.C.C. 21–311: Makes the same provision for counsel as above in D.C. 21–308 (1938). D.C.C. 21–312: If commitment is sought wholly or in part at public expense and the person is not represented by counsel of his own choice, he shall be represented by the Corporation's counsel (1939).

A BILL TO AMEND THE TWIN BUTTES RESERVOIR ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the Twin Buttes Reservoir, near San Angelo, Tex.

Mr. President, this bill will amend the act authorizing the construction of the Twin Buttes Reservoir near San Angelo, Tex., in respect to the recreational facilities to be built there. Under this amendment, the Secretary of Interior is authorized to acquire lands and construct public recreational facilities at the reservoir at a cost not in excess of $1,700,000, the cost to be shared with the San Angelo Water Supply Corp. I am pleased to join with the distinguished Representative from the 21st Congressional District of Texas in sponsoring this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 937) to amend the act of August 16, 1957 (71 Stat. 372), authorizing the construction of the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MORATORIUM ON RAILROAD MERGERS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and Senators MANSFIELD, HUMPHREY, METCALF, CHURCH, YARBOROUGH, DOUGLAS, MCCARTHY, and MORSE, a bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to give full force and effect to the operation of the provisions of that section applicable to certain railroad consolidation and mergers until December 31, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to point out that the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], is unable to be here at this moment. He has no objection to the introduction of the bill, of course. He wanted to be heard on the matter of reference to committee.

I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Tennessee would have any objection to having his bill lie on the desk until the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] can be present at a later time and make his statement on reference?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 1 week so that other Senators who may wish to do so may cosponsor it, and to give the Senator from Illinois an opportunity to discuss the matter of reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The bill seeks a limited moratorium on major rail merger decisions so that the Congress, the administration, and the Interstate Commerce Commission can have the necessary time to continue their investigations and studies into the impact of this proposed concentration in the rail industry, and can have the opportunity to consider new legislation establishing the degree to which competition and economic balance should be preserved in the railroad industry. In addition, it is my intention that this bill would give further time for a more intensive investigation into what I believe to be the demonstrated inability of the Interstate Commerce Commission to render adequate legislative judgments with respect to these great social and economic issues.

What I propose is an amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act, and the same language which was approved by a majority of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee last year, except that it extends the moratorium period to December 31, 1964. Very briefly, the bill would provide for a temporary prohibition of rail merger approvals by the Interstate Commerce Commission involving any railroad with total assets of more than $200 million and which was not in involuntary bankruptcy, where such merger would substantially lessen competition or tend toward monopoly, except where the merger is necessary and essential to the maintenance of adequate railroad transportation facilities.

Thus, under this bill smaller railroads would not be denied the opportunity to merge into stronger, more competitive systems, and any railroad would be permitted to merge if the merger met the tests of section 7 of the Clayton Act. Furthermore, any road in bankruptcy reorganization could merge without delay under the bill.

Mr. President, this is a reasonable bill. It permits the strengthening of smaller roads whose efficiencies may be improved by combining; it takes care of those railroads in dire financial trouble; and it prevents our moving ahead too rapidly on the larger monopolistic mergers before we find out where we are going.

Now, why do we need this legislation? What is happening with respect to this field of regulation which demands immediate congressional inquiry and a halt to the present proposed restructuring of our rail plant?

In the first place, over 75 percent of the assets of the American railroads are involved in merger transactions of one kind or another. As you know, Mr. President, the roads are permitted under present law to come in voluntarily with their own merger plans for approval by the Commission—there is no positive governmental planning, as such. Instead of merging the smaller railroads into the existing competitive trunklines, and thereby strengthening our rail network into balanced competitive systems, the industry has presented the Commission with a series of monopolistic plans which combine the profitable and wealthy roads and ignore the weak and unhealthy ones, and in particular, reduce to a shadow rail competition in vital industrial and agricultural areas of the country. The admitted purpose of these monopolistic plans is to scrap facilities, lay off workers, abandon and eliminate trackage, reduce schedules, and in general contract our rail network to a point which may seriously endanger our economic growth.

By way of example, I need only mention the proposed New York Central-Pennsylvania merger which will create a multibillion-dollar rail empire controlling over half the rail traffic in the East, and interlocked with major industrial and investment companies to the extent that competition among shippers may be seriously affected. For those of my colleagues who come from the great Northwest, I point out that the proposed amalgamation of the Northern Pacific, the Great Northern, and the Burlington, whose legal right to merge without specific congressional approval has been challenged, will create virtually a one railroad territory and the destruction of thousands of miles of track and millions of dollars of facilities and services.

To my colleagues in the South, I direct their attention to the proposed Atlantic Coast Line-Louisville & Nashville-Seaboard combination eliminating a choice in rail service through much of the Southeast, and also to the possibility of an Illinois Central-Gulf, Mobile & Ohio merger which would seriously reduce rail competition in Mississippi and Alabama. Finally, in the West and Southwest, the attempts by the Southern Pacific to control the Western Pacific and to enlarge its system to include the Union Pacific and the Rock Island could result in substantial competitive detriment to the Atchison, Topeka & Sante Fe.

I wish to emphasize that none of these big roads mentioned above are in any serious financial difficulty as the railroad industry public relations people would have us believe. The roads which are in precarious positions are the lesser-size lines serving areas of declining growth, such as the New Haven and other New England roads, the Erie-Lackawanna, the Lehigh Valley, the Milwaukee, the Chicago & North Western, and certain southwest roads, and it is these roads which have been ignored by the industry plans. Thus the cry of financial insecurity as justification for present merger proposals is not supported by the directions in which the industry has chosen to aline new systems. The industry pattern is to merge the strong with the strong, create monopolies, shrink capacity, and squeeze out increased profits, leaving the poorer roads to their own demise and loss of service to the communities affected.

This is negative business thinking, and it is dangerous to a growing country. It is a type of planning which is not in the public interest. It is a long step in the direction of concentration of private, economic, social, and political power. It is inimical to our basic concepts of competitive enterprise and business freedom. But most important of all, if these industry plans are allowed to be consummated, there will be no turning back to try it a better way. The pattern and policy of surface transportation for the future will be irrevocably determined by the type of reorganization presently contemplated by the rail industry. That pattern is monopoly, and that policy is railroad dominance to the detriment of other modes of transportation. It is time now for Congress to alert itself to what is going on in this vital area of the economy.

Mr. President, I would not be so alarmed at these rail merger issues if I thought that the body delegated to make the vital decisions—the Interstate Commerce Commission—was adequately empowered and sufficiently knowledgeable to effectuate a reorganization of the Nation's railroads.

However, the hearings before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am chairman, made it shockingly clear to me that the Commission lacks necessary planning initiative to cope with the present situation, and has done virtually nothing to inform itself, independent of the claims of the rail industry, concerning facts and issues involved in these vast cases.

It has admitted that it has made no studies or investigation as to who control and influence the policy of railroads or how the roads are interrelated by stock interests or board representation.

It has only recently begun a study of traffic flow in order to determine the effects of traffic diversion at interchange points and what routes and areas can support rail competition.

It has no objective reports as to the degree of intermodal competition along major routes. It does not know whether increased railroad size through merger will bring serious diseconomies which will have to be offset by undue contraction of rail plants. It has made no investigation of the poverty myth being propounded by the railroad industry.

Its own staff has criticized present methods and patterns of the Commission's testing of public interest criteria.

It has yet to complete a staff study into merger problems, and it has made no suggestions, or indicated any directions, in connection with what mergers might be acceptable in the public record.

Instead, the Commission has chosen to make these vital legislative decisions affecting our economy and our lives based only on such judicial testimony as may come before it, relying upon what adversary testing of the evidence there may be under restrictive rules of procedure.

Although bulky in support of the proposed mergers, these case records appear virtually devoid of any adequate testing of applicants' positions, primarily because the litigants with the real capacity to challenge the facts—the major railroads—choose not to oppose—because of their own merger plans—or raise only limited opposition with the hope of obtaining certain protective conditions of questionable merit. The burden of testing applicants' cases has been thus left to certain public interest groups and labor representatives who have not the money or expertise to set the record straight.

Only in two extraordinary situations has the Commission ordered its own experts into a case, and such participation thus far has been insubstantial. The Department of Justice has been forceful on briefs, but except in one case, virtually silent during the development of crucial testimony. Only recently has the Commission recognized the need for independent challenge on behalf of the public interest, and it has asked for funds to set up a special staff to appear in major transportation merger cases. It has asked $65,000, an amount so infinitesimal to afford adequate challenge to the million-dollar legal presentations of applicants, as to make the whole idea of Commission participation virtually worthless.

However, despite these gross inadequacies of testing the public interest criteria, the Commission continues to allow its major cases to be closed, and examiners' decisions to be rendered. One such case, the Chesapeake & Ohio's control of the Baltimore & Ohio, has even reached the stage of full Commission approval. Nevertheless, in that case, the first major rail merger decision of the Commission, the dissenting opinion of Commissioner William Tucker, joined in by Commissioner Charles Webb, laid open for public inspection the critical situation which exists in the Commission.

Recognizing that these rail merger decisions, "irrespective of their nature, predetermine to a great degree the future of the American railroad system", the Tucker-Webb dissent began by striking at the heart of the Commission's incapacity to render proper decisions in the public interest—a matter which could end in reversible error in the courts, and certainly should be of immediate alarm to Congress. It states:

> There can be little argument, however, concerning the general nature of the expert testimony upon which the finding of consistency with the public interest is grounded. That evidence consists essentially of impressive post hoc rationalizations prepared by a corps of engineers, economists, accountants, and traffic and financial experts employed or retained to justify a prior managerial decision. Neither the examiner nor any interested party to the proceeding, public or private, was endowed with the peculiar knowledge and the ample resources required to challenge evidence of this character. The question thus arises as to whether the necessary findings could have been made if the general public had been represented by members of the Commission's staff and by consultants retained by the Commission. We shall never know the answer to that question because the Commission's role in this proceeding has been passive from beginning to end.

It aggressively criticizes the majority's intention to determine this Chesapeake & Ohio-Baltimore & Ohio case, piecemeal, when the merger is being generally represented as a part of a "package" of three eastern mergers which includes approval of the highly controversial Pennsylvania-New York Central amalgamation. On this point, the dissent stated:

> If the Commission is going to open the gates on all eastern merger applications so each successive one becomes one of the basic reasons for requiring approval of the next, and realistically, I can see no other course of action from the decision in this case, we may end up as the creators of another Frankenstein's monster far more ruinous than its fictional counterpart.

The dissent then attacks the majority's decision that this control transaction is necessary to alleviate a deteriorating financial condition of the Baltimore & Ohio on the ground that whatever financial downturn existed for this road in 1961—a particularly bad year for most eastern roads—has been offset by the fact that the Baltimore & Ohio has reported that it is operating in the black for 1962 and forecasts even greater improvement ahead, as a result of its new programs directed toward reducing costs, improving service, and modernizing its operations.

However, one of the most vivid challenges to the majority's handling of the evidence in the Chesapeake & Ohio-Baltimore & Ohio case came with respect to the allegation that Chesapeake & Ohio's control would rehabilitate the Baltimore & Ohio. Recognizing that controlled railroads had been used in the past as sources of profits from stock manipulations, and "left to sink into bankruptcy," the dissent stated:

> An inordinate reliance has been placed by the majority throughout this report on the self-interest of the Chesapeake & Ohio in rehabilitating the Baltimore & Ohio if control is approved. Notwithstanding the particular issues and facts presented in the instant application, which reveal the glaring lack of a single solid commitment by Chesapeake & Ohio to render specific aid to Baltimore & Ohio and the economic impracticability of Chesapeake & Ohio's assistance in the modernization programs, the self-interest assertions of a controlling railroad do not stand the test of our experience.

The dissent then went on to expose the apparent neglect on the part of the majority to recognize the crucial effect of traffic diversion which this control transaction would have on the New York Central, the Norfolk & Western and other roads, if allowed to go forward at this time, and particularly how the setting up of this diversion would lead the Commission into a state of entrapment in deciding other eastern mergers whose applicants would cite the Chesapeake & Ohio–Baltimore & Ohio diversion as justification for their own mergers. It stated that the majority's conclusion that no undue amount of traffic would be diverted was "a groping, meaningless generalization," and that such an important subsidiary finding by the majority would not "withstand the

effects of close judicial scrutiny." It went on to warn the Commission, and in fact all of us in government who are concerned with this issue, that "the decision to isolate this case from others is going to haunt this Commission for many days to come." It continued as follows:

> If even 10 percent of the Central's traffic is diverted by the approval of this application and it is not allowed to merge, the Central will collapse. The catastrophic disaster which would befall New England, New York, and the smaller railroads dependent on the Central for traffic could then only be alleviated by Government ownership of, or subsidies to, the Central. A possibility of either of these courses would obviously militate against disapproval of the Pennsylvania Railroad-Central merger, which I am sure the majority, as much as I, does not want to prejudge at this time. Unfortunately, under the case-by-case method we have no way of knowing at this moment if this transaction will create undesirable results to the eastern transportation system. Trapped into approving all three cases one by one, this Commission may be placed in the hapless position of robbing Peter to pay Paul not once but thrice.

Mr. President, this has been only a brief description of the crisis which I see in the Commission's handling of these merger issues. A majority of the members of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee has recently approved a detailed report on these and many other vital evidences of the dangers which the present movement toward rail concentration will work on our national transportation system. That report should be printed within the next 10 days. I sincerely urge every Member of Congress to read it in detail, and then to consider the issues which it raises in connection with the future rail transportation policy and growth in your own State and constituency.

This bill must be passed this session, and soon. Time is running out. The Commission has ignored the warnings of knowledgeable Members of Congress to stop its rapid case-by-case processing of merger applications, and take on a role of leadership and investigation into these matters. But this bill alone is not enough. Permanent antitrust and public interest criteria must be invoked, and Congress should move toward a thorough investigation of the financial conditions of the railroads and the means short of merger which can be employed to keep these roads balanced and healthy in every region of the country. Likewise, the problem of passenger transportation should be explored. I am presently considering these avenues of legislation with a view toward introducing some new bills in this regard at a later date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The bill (S. 942) to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to give effect to the operation of the provisions of that section applicable to certain railroad consolidations and mergers until December 31, 1964, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and ordered to lie on the desk.

PASSPORT LEGISLATION—DENIAL OF PASSPORTS TO SUPPORTERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT, ETC.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement; for review of passport denials; and for other purposes.

I wish to call attention to the very unsatisfactory situation which exists with respect to the passport law of the United States. I do so because the subject is important and urgent.

The present situation is full of confusion and, in my opinion, danger.

It is necessary to review some history in order to judge the problem which faces the Congress. The passport statute now on the books was enacted in 1856. Conditions then were, of course, very different from conditions now. During most of the history of our country, a passport was not required upon entering the country or leaving it.

During the later part of World War I, for military reasons, the law was changed to require a passport for entry or exit from the United States. World War II again necessitated such a requirement and, under legislation which still exists, Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy have continued the requirement that a passport is necessary for entry or exit by making determinations that a "national emergency" continues.

Existing passport laws are quite brief and many questions of interpretation and policy have arisen. Some of these questions have been settled by the courts but others remain in doubt. During World War II and following, the Department of State claimed that it had complete discretion in the issuance of passports. That is, it claimed the right to decide which American citizens might travel abroad and where they might be allowed to go.

This claim of complete discretion was narrowed down by the courts in several cases but there began to arise charges and denials that the discretionary authority claimed by the Department of State was from time to time abused. In fact, in 1957, the Committee on Foreign Relations held several hearings to look into some of these charges of abuse of discretion.

Mr. President, this already confused legal situation on passports was thrown into turmoil in 1958. On June 16, 1958, in the case of Kent against Dulles, the Supreme Court held that the Department of State could not, in the absence of express statutory authorization, without a passport on the ground that an applicant refused to sign a non-Communist affidavit. The Court in that same case indicated that under existing statutes, a passport may be denied if the applicant is not a citizen, or is engaging in criminal conduct, or is a member of a Communist organization under a final order to register issued by the Subversive Activities Control Board.

As soon as the Supreme Court decision in Kent against Dulles was handed down, President Eisenhower sent a bill to the Congress which would have, in effect, enacted into law the Department of State passport regulations as they existed before the Supreme Court decision. President Eisenhower stated at that time that every day that passed without the legislation which he proposed left the country in great peril. At about the same time other bills, based on the opposite philosophy of passport policy, were also introduced. They would have prohibited the denial of passports, or the imposition of geographical restrictions on travel of Americans abroad, except in time of war. A bill representing a middle ground—comprehensively advising passport law and laying down specific and narrow grounds for denying passports—was introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT.

On September 8, 1959, the House passed H.R. 9069 which dealt only with the questions of denying passports to supporters of communism and of general geographical restrictions on travel. The House bill left the rest of passport legislation untouched.

The Committee on Foreign Relations had been active in the passport field even prior to the Supreme Court decision of 1958. The committee held hearings on passport legislation in 1957, in 1958, and in 1959. In 1960, a number of executive meetings were held by the committee to discuss passport bills. Some members of the committee supported each of the three main approaches to the problem which I have just described. It was obvious that it was going to be difficult to work out an agreed committee bill.

Incidentally, Mr. President, among others who testified before the committee were representatives of the Communist Party, of the Daily Worker, and of Americans for Democratic Action.

With the change of administrations in January of 1961, the committee decided that the subject of passport policy should continue to have a high priority. The committee decided, however, that a reasonable delay, until the new administration could review the subject of passport legislation and submit a bill or policy statement, would be appropriate.

Since January 1961, the chairman of the committee has informally and formally requested the administration to expedite its consideration of passport legislation. It seems to me that a reasonable time has now passed. The administration should come forward with its proposals on passport law.

Mr. President, in the absence of congressional action on passport law, the present confusion is dangerous. It may be that from a theoretical legal point of view, the Department of State can continue to claim whatever discretion to deny passports may be left after the Supreme Court decision. There would seem to be quite a broad area for the denial of passports which has not been tested in the courts. The Department of State has not, however, chosen to test its discretion further. It has issued passports to many persons who previously would have been unable to sign non-Communist affidavits and who, on that ground, before the Supreme Court decision, would have been denied passports.

There is no doubt that many hard-core Communist Party members are now able to travel abroad on U.S. passports. Can anyone seriously doubt but that these people intend to do harm? Let me quote Secretary of State Rusk when he appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee in 1961 in support of the President's foreign aid program:

> While economic penetration by aid and trade are new weapons in the Communist arsenal, the old weapons of force in all its manifestations not only continue to exist, but are daily visible. In Cuba, for example, what appeared to be a people's revolution against oppression has been stolen from the people and has become an instrument of oppression. In Laos, cadres of outsiders, hardened invaders masquerading as local revolutionaries, have been attempting to dominate the country. In Vietnam invaders from the north are waging a campaign of terror and assassination to capture the country.
>
> Elsewhere, both on the borders of the Communist bloc and half a world away, Communist agitators, infiltrators, and guerrillas are at work or moving into chosen positions. Within the bloc itself, there remain huge nuclear capability and expanding delivery systems as well as formidable conventional forces.

Mr. President, as I heard these words of the Secretary of State, my thoughts turned to the chaotic situation pertaining to passports. Because the law is unclear, Communist subversives or agitators may freely move back and forth across our borders. The facts as to the extent of harm which they may be doing have not yet been brought out by the appropriate congressional committees.

Mr. President, a Council of the Organization of American States, Pan American Union, in a report made February 20, this year, recognized the seriousness of unrestrained international travel by those engaged in promoting communism. On page 17 of its report, the Council said:

> It is clear that Cuba is being used as a base for training in communism and its spread in America.
>
> That activity of international communism, and particularly on the part of the Cuban Government, is greatly facilitated by the lack of suitable measures, and of cooperation among the American countries, to check the constant and heavy stream of travelers to and from Cuba. The importance of this problem makes it necessary to devote a special section to it.
>
> The nations that maintain normal and friendly relations recognize that it is desirable and even necessary to facilitate travel by their nationals across their borders as a means of strengthening cultural and economic ties, becoming better known, and becoming qualified and ready to support one another in the solution of their problems.
>
> For this reason the documents necessary for crossing international borders have become less in number, the period of validity of entry and departure permits has been extended, procedures for obtaining passports and other travel documents have been simplified, the obligation to secure visas has been removed, the securing of foreign exchange has been facilitated, and so on.
>
> These facilities are used by communism so that its agents may circulate freely and in this way introduce propaganda and move the money needed in planning, encouraging and carrying on subversion. It has already been pointed out in this connection that it is of public knowledge that many individuals of antinational and communistic tendencies travel to Cuba for various reasons connected with subversion. Cuba is also utilized as the point of departure for trips to the Communist countries of Europe or Asia for the same reasons.

Mr. President, it is time for the Congress to get down to work. This situation must be studied. The dangers involved must be carefully appraised. The constitutional questions must be gone into thoroughly.

I do not say that I have any easy answers on passport legislation. There are many troublesome questions of fact and policy. However, it seems to me long past time for the Congress to grasp these questions and to come to a decision so that this loophole in our security may be closed.

To provide a basis for this action, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement; for review of passport denials; and for other purposes.

I strongly urge, Mr. President, that the Committee on Foreign Relations address itself to this problem as a matter of urgent priority.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the table until 1 week from today. If other Members of the Senate would like to join with me in sponsorship of the bill I specifically request that they do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table, as requested, and the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 943) to provide for denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement, for review of passport denials, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—DENIAL OF PASSPORTS TO SUPPORTERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the international Communist movement of which the Communist Party of the United States of America is an integral part, seeks everywhere to thwart United States policy, to influence foreign governments and peoples against the United States, and by every means, including force and violence, to weaken the United States and ultimately to bring it under Communist domination; that the activities of the international Communist movement constitute a clear, present, and continuing danger to the security of the United States, and seriously impair the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States; that travel by couriers and agents is a major and essential means by which the international Communist movement is promoted and directed; that a United States passport requests other countries not only to permit the holder to pass freely and safely but also to give all lawful aid and protection to the holder and thereby facilitates the travel of such holder to and in foreign countries; and that in view of the history of the use of United States passports by supporters of the international Communist movement to further the purposes of that movement, the issuance of a passport to, or the possession of a passport by, persons described in section 2 is inimical to the security and to the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States and therefore passports should not be issued to or held by such persons.

SEC. 2. (a) In accordance with the findings in section 1, the Secretary of State is authorized to refuse to issue a passport, or to revoke a passport already issued, to any person as to whom it is determined on substantial grounds that he knowingly engages in activities for the purpose of furthering the international Communist movement, unless such person demonstrates to the Secretary, by clear and convincing evidence, that his activities abroad would not further the purposes of such movement.

(b) The Secretary shall consider as evidence of activities in furtherance of the international Communist movement, within the meaning of subsection (a)—

(i) present membership in the Communist Party or former membership terminated under circumstances which reasonably warrant the conclusion that the person continues to act knowingly in furtherance of the interests and under the discipline of the Communist Party;

(ii) activities under circumstances which reasonably warrant the conclusion that a person, regardless of the formal state of his affiliation with the Communist Party, is knowingly acting under the discipline of the Communist Party, or as a result of the direction, domination, or control exercised over him by the international Communist movement;

(iii) other facts which reasonably warrant the conclusion that the person is going or staying abroad to conduct activities for the purpose of furthering the interests of the international Communist movement.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of State may require, as a prerequisite to the issuance, renewal, or extension of a pasaport that the applicant subscribe to and submit a written statement duly verified by his oath or affirmation as to whether he is or has been within ten years prior to filing his application a member of the Communist Party.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this title shall continue in effect until the termination of the national emergency established by Presidential Proclamation Numbered 2914, December 16, 1950 (64 Stat. A 454).

TITLE II—PROCEDURE FOR PASSPORT DENIAL AND REVIEW THEREOF

SEC. 5. Upon application therefor, duly completed, and upon compliance with any requirement under the provisions of section 3 of title I of this Act, a passport shall be issued to any person qualified under section 4076 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (22 U.S.C. 212), or the applicant shall be informed in writing of a denial thereof, within ninety days after the receipt of such application. If a passport is denied, revoked, or restricted for any reason other than noncitizenship or geographic restrictions of general applicability, the passport applicant or holder shall be informed in writing of the reason, as specifically as is consistent with considerations of national security and foreign relations, and of the right to a hearing before the Passport Hearing Board in accordance with the provisions of this title. Notice of the denial or revocation of a passport under the terms of title I of this Act shall specify the paragraph or paragraphs of section 2(b) of title I on the basis of which the passport is denied or revoked.

SEC. 6. There shall be established within the Department of State a Passport Hearing Board consisting of three officers of the Department to be designated by the Secretary of State. This Board shall have jurisdiction in all cases wherein a hearing is requested in writing within thirty days after notification of the denial, revocation, or restriction of a passport, for any reason other than noncitizenship or geographical restrictions of general applicability. The Board shall hold a hearing within ninety days after the receipt of the request unless such time limit is extended at the request of the party. The officers who present the case of the Department of State to the Board shall not otherwise participate in the deliberations or recommendations of the Board.

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary shall establish and make public rules which shall accord to the individual in proceedings before the Board the following rights:

(1) To appear in person and to be represented by counsel;

(2) To testify in his own behalf, present witnesses, and offer other evidence;

(3) To cross-examine witnesses appearing against him at any hearing at which he or his counsel is present and to examine all other evidence which is made a part of the open record;

(4) To examine a copy of the transcript of the open proceedings or to be furnished a copy upon request.

(b) In order to protect information, sources of information, and investigative methods, disclosure of which would have a substantially adverse effect upon the national security or the conduct of foreign relations, the Board may at any time consider oral or documentary evidence without making such evidence part of the open record. Prior to completion of its proceedings, the Board shall furnish to the individual a résumé of any such evidence, and shall certify that it is a fair résumé. The Board shall take into consideration the individual's inability to challenge information of which he has not been advised in full or in detail or to attack the credibility of sources which have not been disclosed to him.

SEC. 8. Within sixty days after completion of its proceedings, the Board shall make written findings, conclusions, and recommendations, which shall be transmitted with the entire record to the Secretary of State who shall make the final administrative determination. If the recommendation of the Board is adverse to the individual, a copy of the recommendation and of the findings and conclusions which are based upon the open record or upon the résumé of any evidence not made part of the open record, shall be furnished the individual, who may within twenty days following the receipt thereof submit to the Secretary written objections thereto. The Secretary shall base his determination upon the entire record submitted to him by the Board, including all findings and conclusions, and upon any objections submitted by the individual. In appropriate cases, the Secretary may remand a case to the Board for further proceedings. In the event he takes action adverse to the individual, the Secretary shall make appropriate written findings and conclusions.

SEC. 9. The United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to review any final determination of the Secretary of State under section 8 of this Act to determine whether there has been compliance with the provisions of this Act and of any regulations issued thereunder. In any such proceedings the court shall have power to determine whether any findings which are stated to be based upon the open record are supported by substantial evidence contained in that record, or, in the case of a résumé of evidence which was not made part of the open record in conformity with section 7(b) of this Act, are supported by the résumé of such evidence, duly certified by the Board under said section 7(b).

SEC. 10. The provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended (5 U.S.C., ch. 19), shall not apply to proceedings under this title.

TITLE III—REGULATIONS

SEC. 11. The Secretary of State is authorized to prescribe regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

TITLE IV—SEPARABILITY

SEC. 12. If any provision of this Act is held invalid, the remaining provisions shall not be affected.

TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 13. This Act shall take effect immediately upon its enactment.

A MONUMENT TO MEXICAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the city of Washington is beautiful for many reasons. One of them is the plethora of beautiful statues, many of them being gifts from foreign countries.

Mr. President, I am privileged to introduce once again on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], and my colleague from California [Mr. ENGLE], a bill to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico.

This bill was approved during previous Congresses by both the Department of State and the Bureau of the Budget. On September 5, 1961, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations favorably reported this measure, and soon thereafter it passed the Senate. The House failed to act upon it.

I have been informed that the Mexican Government would be pleased to accept a statue of our great President Abraham Lincoln. This is especially fitting because of the high regard in which Lincoln is held by the Mexican people and because of Lincoln's crucial support of Benito Juarez, the outstanding Mexican patriot.

Senators will recall, Mr. President, that in the spring of 1864 Napoleon III, of France, was preparing to establish a Mexican empire under Archduke Maximilian, of Austria. The struggling young Mexican Republic faced an uncertain future. Yet, in that hour of crisis, disregarding European hostility, Lincoln and his Secretary of State, William Seward, provided encouragement and, later, active support for the brave new Government of Mexico.

The Mexican Minister to the United States in gratitude proclaimed:

> Our common interest, political as well as commercial, will give us a common continental policy which no European nation would dare disregard.

It is fitting, then, that we present Mexico with a statue of Lincoln, to remind ourselves, as well as the Mexican people, of the common ideals of the two statesmen, Lincoln and Juarez, and of the continuing Mexican-United States bonds of history, geography, commerce, and love of freedom.

As I stated when I introduced this bill in 1960:

> Today, we share with Mexico a great deal more than our 1,935 miles of a common border. We have entered upon a new era of mutual cooperation and respect. The visit of President Eisenhower to Mexico and the official visit of Mexico's distinguished President, Lopez-Mateos, to the United States are indicative of this era. The forms of our cooperation may take many guises. It may involve a joint commission to wipe out a destructive hoof-and-mouth disease or any other hindrance which distresses both peoples. It may take the form of that unique and enduring monument to Mexican-United States cooperation, the mighty Falcon Dam, constructed and built by the two governments on the Rio Grande, 75 miles downstream from Laredo. Or it may take the form of a cultural exchange program. But whatever the nature of cooperation between our two countries, we labor toward a common goal: To advance the cause of peace with honor among all peoples of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations be printed at this point in my remarks and that the text of the bill be set forth in full in the RECORD, and that the bill be held at the desk until tomorrow before being printed in the event that any others of my colleagues desire to join in sponsoring it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie at the desk, as requested, and the bill and excerpt will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 944) to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of State is authorized and requested to procure a statue of Lincoln to commemorate appropriately the independence of Mexico, and present the same, on behalf of the people of the United States, to the people of Mexico. Such monument shall be prepared only after the design, plans, and specifications therefor have been submitted to and approved by the Commission on Fine Arts.

SEC. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, including payment of the cost of such statue, the design and construction of a suitable pedestal therefor, transportation, including insurance, erection of the statue in Mexico, and traveling expenses of persons delegated by the Secretary of State to present such statue, on behalf of the people of the United States, to the people of Mexico.

The excerpt from the report presented by Mr. KUCHEL is as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill authorizes the Secretary of State with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts to procure a statute of Lincoln for presentation to Mexico. The cost involved in S. 653 is estimated by the Department of State at $150,000, which include expenses of transportation, insurance, predestal, erection, and of the presentation itself. If a copy of an existing statue of Lincoln can be procured, the cost will be lower.

BACKGROUND

In 1960, Mexico celebrated its 150th anniversary as well as the 100th anniversary of the triumph of Benito Juarez. These occasions were commemorated with appropriate ceremonies in which the United States took part.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, in August 1960, considered a bill (S. 2627) which was similar to S. 653 but took no final action. On January 30, 1961, Senator Kuchel for himself and Senators Chavez, Engle, Goldwater, Gruening, Javits, Morse, and Yarborough, introduced S. 653, which was considered by the committee in open and executive sessions on July 31, August 9 and 29. On September 1, the committee voted to report S. 653 favorably to the Senate with amendments. These amendments merely strike out references to the two anniversaries that took place in 1960 since their celebration is now at an end.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Although the ceremonies are over, the Committee on Foreign Relations recommends enactment of S. 653 as a gesture of friendship and good will for the Mexican people. It was the consensus of the committee, moreover, that the U.S. Embassy in Mexico should explore with appropriate officials of the Mexican Government the possibility of providing an attractive setting for the statute. It was felt that the gift would have greater meaning for, and bring more enjoyment to, the Mexican people if a way could be found to make a park around it.

The Department of State has no objection to enactment of S. 653. Its comments on the bill state that "if the Congress should enact such a bill * * * the Government of Mexico would graciously accept a statue of Lincoln."

A statue of Lincoln is considered to be most appropriate because the memory of Lincoln is cherished by the Mexican people for his sympathetic concern for them during the period that Mexico was struggling to regain its independence from European domination. The committee, therefore, recommends S. 653 to the Senate for favorable action.

EXTENSION OF THE DAVIS-BACON ACT TO MAINTENANCE WORK

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and the assistant majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], a bill to extend the Davis-Bacon Act to include contracts for work performed on Federal public works and buildings.

Mr. President, in 1931, a historic act authored by a Republican Senator from Pennsylvania, James Davis, and a Republican Representative from New York, Robert Bacon, was adopted by Congress and signed into law by President Hoover. In passing the Davis-Bacon Act, Congress wisely determined that when Federal tax dollars were being used for construction, the wages paid for a particular type of labor must be those prevailing in the locality for work on projects of a similar character. The purpose in passing this law was to prevent cheap labor from geing imported into an area and thus undercutting the going wages in the local labor market. Effective administration of this act has meant more job opportunities for both local workers and local contractors.

I have long worked for the extension and improvement of the Davis-Bacon Act. In 1956, as a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works, I helped attain the adoption of an amendment which applied the Davis-Bacon principle to the construction authorized under the multibillion-dollar 41,000-mile interstate highway program. In urging that amendment almost 8 years ago, I noted what the application of the prevailing wage law would mean to the people of California and all other States, as follows:

> Our local working people will be given the statutory assurance by the Congress that, in working on a public construction job, they would have the same level of income or salary which they would have if they are working in similar enterprises in that locality. It also means that the local contractor who had local people working for him would not be subject to the hazard that some contractor from another part of the country might underbid him on the basis that he could import cheap labor into that area and could underbid the local contractor, and depress the local economy.

In the last Congress, my counterpart, the assistant majority leader [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I offered an amendment to the administration's Urban Mass Transportation Act, S. 3126, which would apply the Davis-Bacon principle to that program. This amendment was agreed to by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and is section 11(a) of the new bill (S. 6) in this Congress.

We also coauthored another Davis-Bacon amendment, S. 1360, which we originally introduced on March 15, 1961, and which we have reintroduced on January 23, 1963, as S. 450 in this Congress. Our measure would amend the Davis-Bacon Act to require the Secretary of Labor to take into account in his determination of the prevailing wage the contractor payments to various types of health, welfare, unemployment, retirement, and apprenticeship funds. The great growth of these funds was unforeseen three decades ago when the original legislation was framed. With 70 percent of the workers in the construction industry now covered by negotiated agreements which provide for some welfare and pension benefits such a revision is long overdue. California has had such a provision in the State prevailing wage law since 1959. If we are to bring the Davis-Bacon Act into conformity with the practices of modern labor-management relations, it is now time for Congress to act.

Additional revision, however, is also sorely needed. The Davis-Bacon concept should be extended to the maintenance contracts—such as those dealing with the replacement, modification, reconstruction, and demolition of a structure or project—which are made after the original construction has been completed. At this time on military and other Federal installations in my own State and throughout America we have the strange zig-zag pattern where prevailing wages—and thus protection for local contractors and local workers—are honored during the construction phase but ignored when maintenance work—including replacement, modification, reconstruction or demolition—occurs. Whole crews of out-of-State workers are brought in to perform such work below prevailing local wages while our local contractors and workers are literally standing outside the fence looking in. This is not fairplay.

The Federal Government should not condone that which is not fair play and should not through inaction encourage such substandard working conditions. Interestingly enough, in California, if it is a State public works project, alteration, demolition, or repair work as well as construction has been covered since the "little" Davis-Bacon Act was adopted by the California Legislature in 1937. The State act has worked successfully and has had the support of contractors and workers in the areas involved. I hope that this Congress will amend the Davis-Bacon Act in the two ways that have been indicated. Such revision is long overdue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the resolution in favor of extending the Davis-Bacon Act to include maintenance work on Federal projects, which was adopted by the 41st Convention of the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California in San Francisco on July 24–27, 1962, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as well as the text of the bill to which I have alluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 945) to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to extend its application to contracts for the maintenance of Federal installations, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the Act entitled "An Act relating to the rate of wages for laborers and mechanics employed on public buildings of the United States and the District of Columbia by contractors and subcontractors, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1961, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–6), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. A contract for maintenance work on a public building or public work, including the replacement, modification, reconstruction, and demolition thereof, shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to be a contract for the construction, alteration, and/or repair thereof."

The resolution presented by Mr. KUCHEL is as follows:

RESOLUTION ON GOVERNMENT MAINTENANCE WORK

(Resolution adopted at 41st convention of State Building and Construction Trades Council of California, San Francisco, July 24–27, 1962)

Whereas the Federal Government has adopted a policy of placing much of the maintenance work on Government installations out for competitive bids; and

Whereas such work does not fall under the scope of the Davis-Bacon Act and the prevailing wage rate is not applicable; and

Whereas under these conditions nonunion employers very often are successful in

securing this work at a wage rate detrimental to our members and organization; and

Whereas organization of such work on Government installations is not easily accomplished; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this 41st convention of the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California endorse inclusion under the Davis-Bacon Act all construction maintenance work, i.e.: alteration, repair, replacement, modification, reconstruction, and demolition on Government installations to be let for competitive bids; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers and executive board members contact the Senators and Congressmen of our State to secure a sponsor to introduce such legislation in the coming legislative session; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the building and construction trades department of the AFL–CIO requesting their aid and cooperation in securing this legislation.

TO AMEND THE FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926—title 22, United States Code, sections 292–300—to permit continuation of the program for the acquisition, maintenance, and operations of real property required abroad by diplomatic, consular, and other activities of the United States operating in foreign countries.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of State dated February 1, 1963, to the Vice President in regard to it and a table showing authorizations and appropriations for the Foreign Service building program.

I might add that this is substantially the same bill as H.R. 11880 which passed the Senate last year but was not finally enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 946) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U.S.C. 295), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) In addition to amounts authorized before the date of enactment of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State—

"(1) for acquisition, by purchase or construction (including acquisition of leaseholds) of sites and buildings in foreign countries under this Act, and for major alterations of buildings acquired under this Act, the following sums—

"(A) for use in Africa, not to exceed $8,400,000, of which not to exceed $3,600,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(B) for use in the American Republics, not to exceed $6,100,000, of which not to exceed $4,100,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(C) for use in Europe, not to exceed $7,650,000, of which not to exceed $2,440,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(D) for use in the Far East, not to exceed $2,900,000, of which not to exceed $2,200,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(E) for use in the Near East, not to exceed $2,800,000, of which not to exceed $2,100,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(F) for facilities for the United States Information Agency, not to exceed $1,850,000, of which not to exceed $760,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964, and

"(G) for facilities for agricultural and defense attaché housing, not to exceed $800,000, of which not to exceed $400,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(2) such additional sums as may be necessary to carry out the other purposes of this Act.

Sums appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall remain available until expended. To the maximum extent feasible, expenditures under this Act shall be made out of foreign currencies owned by or owed to the United States."

SEC. 2(a). Section 2 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926 (22 U.S.C. 293), is repealed.

(b) The first section of such Act (22 U.S.C. 292) is amended—

(1) by striking out ", subject to the direction of the commission hereinafter established,";

(2) by striking out "under such terms and conditions as in the judgment of the commission may best protect the interests of the United States,";

(3) by striking out ", to the extent deemed advisable by the commission,"; and

(4) by striking out ", which buildings shall be appropriately designated by the commission, and the space in which shall be allotted by the Secretary of State under the direction of the commission" and inserting a period and the following: "The space in such buildings shall be allotted by the Secretary of State".

(c) Section 3 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 294) is amended—

(1) by striking out ", subject to the direction of the commission," and "in the judgment of the commission,"; and

(2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "and without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (31 U.S.C. 529)".

(d) Section 4 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 295) is amended by striking out ", subject to the direction of the commission,".

(e) Section 9 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 300) is amended—

(1) by striking out "with the concurrence of the Foreign Service Buildings Commission,"; and

(2) by striking out ", as in the judgment of the Commission may best serve the Government's interest".

(f) Section 1(c) of Reorganization Plan Numbered II of May 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1432), is repealed.

(g) All references to the Foreign Service Buildings Commission, originally established by the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, in all laws of the United States are hereby repealed.

The letter and table presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT are as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1963.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Department encloses, and recommends for your consideration, proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926 (22 U.S.C. 292–300), to permit continuation of the program for the acquisition, maintenance, and operations of real property required abroad by diplomatic, consular, and other activities of the United States operating in foreign countries.

Authorizations of appropriations to implement the provisions of the Foreign Service Buildings Act from 1926 to date amount to $251,625,000, of which $235 million has been authorized in the last 15 years. The appropriations request for the buildings program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, aggregates $27 million and is dependent upon enactment of the proposed legislation.

Thus far the Department of State has acquired under its Foreign Service buildings program office buildings, residences, and staff housing which are valued far in excess of their cost of approximately $200 million. The Department has developed a 2-year program to meet its most urgent needs, especially in Africa and Asia, which contemplates an expenditure in the period from July 1, 1963, through June 30, 1965, of an estimated $30,500,000, exclusive of normal operating expenses, for which we are asking continuing authority.

Acquisition of real properties under the Foreign Service Buildings Act has been financed largely in the past by U.S. Treasury holdings of foreign currencies generated through lendlease, surplus property and other agreements. However, many of the Department's most urgent and compelling buildings needs are now in countries where credits or local currencies are not held by the United States in sufficient amounts. U.S. dollars must be expended in those areas. In view of the high concentration of local currency holdings of the U.S. Treasury in a relatively few countries, and the recurring need in areas in which local currency holdings do not exist, the proposed legislation does not specify a definite amount to be used solely to acquire local currencies or credits. However, under regulations of the U.S. Treasury, the Foreign Service buildings program is required to utilize foreign credits and currencies owed to or owned by the United States before it can acquire needed foreign exchange from any other source.

During the 87th Congress, the House Foreign Affairs Committee reported favorably H.R. 11880 to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926. This bill was passed by the House and also by the Senate but with several amendments. No final action was taken by the Congress prior to adjournment. The enclosed draft bill includes all the provisions of H.R. 11880 as passed by the House, with certain modifications in limitations which the Department considers essential.

The Department of State has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the administration's program, to the presentation of the draft bill for the consideration of the Congress.

A letter similar to this is being sent to the Speaker of the House.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

(Enclosures: (1) copy of draft bill; (2) copy of Department of State "Authorization and Appropriations for the Foreign Buildings Program".)

Authorizations and appropriations for the foreign buildings program, since the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926

[Thousands of dollars]

Public law	Authorizations [1]		Appropriations [1]			Unappropriated balance
	Minimum use of U.S. Treasury foreign currency	U.S. dollars	Fiscal year	For purchase of U.S. Treasury foreign currency	For U.S. dollar obligations	
186, 69th Cong., May 7, 1926		$10,000				
			1926		$435	$9,565
			1927		700	8,865
			1928		1,300	7,565
			1929		2,700	4,865
			1930		1,700	3,165
			1931		2,000	1,165
			1934		1,165	0
145, 74th Cong., June 15, 1935		300				300
260, 74th Cong., Aug. 12, 1935		1,325				1,625
			1935		1,625	0
543, 75th Cong., May 25, 1938		5,000				5,000
			1940		750	4,250
			1941		300	3,950
			1942		450	3,500
			1943		275	3,225
			1944		144	3,081
			1945		220	2,861
			1946		1,000	1,861
			1947		1,000	861
547, 79th Cong., July 25, 1946	$110,000	15,000				125,861
			1948	$50,000	1,500	74,361
			1949	35,000		39,361
			1950	13,000		26,361
			1951	2,950		23,411
			1952	7,500		15,911
399, 82d Cong., June 19, 1952	90,000					105,911
			1953	6,500		99,411
			1954	[2] 3,316		96,095
			1955	[3] 3,000	1,000	92,095
			1956	7,500	1,000	83,595
			1957	14,000	5,000	64,595
			1958	15,000	3,500	46,095
			1959	15,000	3,000	28,095
			1960	16,739	633	10,723
			1961	10,495	228	None
86-723, Sept. 8, 1960		10,000				10,000
			1962	9,100	900	None
87-843, Oct. 18, 1962	7,000	3,000	1963	7,000	3,000	None
88——, ——, 1963 [4]	36,000	18,000				54,000
			[4] 1964	[4] 19,000	[4] 8,000	27,000
Total	243,000	62,625		235,100	43,525	27,000

[1] Data are exact, since both authorizations and appropriations have been enacted in even thousands of dollars.

[2] Transferred from "Government in occupied areas" pursuant to Public Law 83-207.

[3] Of this amount, $1,000,000 was transferred from "Government in occupied areas" pursuant to Public Law 83-663.

[4] The 1964 appropriation is dependent upon the enactment of authorizing legislation, expected to be introduced early in the 88th Cong. in the amount shown.

[5] Estimated.

TO AMEND THE INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals settled by the United States-Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with a letter from Edward D. Re, Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, of recent date, and also the Commission's section-by-section analysis of the bill which were sent to the Vice President in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 947) to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals settled by the United States-Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (f) of section 4, title I, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) No remuneration on account of services rendered on behalf of any claimant in connection with any claim filed with the Commission under this title shall exceed 10 per centum of the total amount paid pursuant to any award certified under the provisions of this title, on account of such claim. Any agreement to the contrary shall be unlawful and void. Whoever, in the United States or elsewhere, demands or receives, on account of services so rendered, any remuneration in excess of the maximum permitted by this section, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than twelve months, or both."

(2) Section 6, title I, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(b) The Commission shall complete its affairs in connection with the settlement of United States-Polish claims arising under the Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, not later than March 31, 1966."

(3) Subsection (b) of section 7, title I, is amended by inserting "(1)" after the subsection letter, and adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"(2) The Secretary of the Treasury shall deduct from each payment into the Polish Claims Fund created pursuant to section 8, 5 per centum thereof as reimbursement to the Government of the United States for the expenses incurred by the Commission and by the Treasury Department in the administration of this title. The amount so deducted shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts."

(4) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c), section 7, title I, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) If any person to whom any payment is to be made pursuant to this title is deceased or is under a legal disability, payment shall be made to his legal representative, except that if any payment to be made is not over $1,000 and there is no qualified executor or administrator, payment may be made to the person or persons found by the Comptroller General to be entitled thereto, without the necessity of compliance with the requirements of law with respect to the administration of estates."

(5) Section (c) of section 8, title I, is amended by inserting the phrase "paragraph (1) of" after the phrase "pursuant to" and before the words "subsection (b)".

(6) Section 8, title I, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(e) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed out of the sums covered into the Polish Claims Fund, to make payments on account of awards certified by the Commission pursuant to this title with respect to claims included within the terms of the Polish Claims Agreement of 1960 as follows and in the following order of priority:

"(1) Payment in the amount of $1,000 or in the principal amount of the award, whichever is less;

"(2) Thereafter, payments from time to time on account of the unpaid principal balance of each remaining award which shall bear to such unpaid principal balance the same proportion as the total amount in the Polish Claims Fund available for distribution at the time such payments are made bears to the aggregate unpaid principal balance of all such awards; and

"(3) Thereafter, payments from time to time on account of the unpaid balance of each award of interest which shall bear to such unpaid balance of interest, the same proportion as the total amount in the Polish Claims Fund available for distribution at the time such payments are made bears to the aggregate unpaid balance of interest of all such awards."

(7) Section 302, title III, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsections:

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer the unobligated balance in the Italian Claims Fund into the War Claims Fund created under section 13 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended.

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall cover into each of the Bulgarian, Hungarian, and Rumanian Claims Funds, such sums as may be paid by the Government of the respective country pursuant to the terms of any claims settlement agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of such country."

(8) Section 303, title III, is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (2), and by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and immediately thereafter, the word, "and".

(9) Section 303, title III, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) pay effective compensation for the nationalization, compulsory liquidation, or other taking of property of nationals of the United States in Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, between August 9, 1955, and the effective date of the claims agreement between the respective country and the United States."

(10) Section 306, title III, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(b) within thirty days after enactment of this subsection or the enactment of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for payment of administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title, whichever date is later, the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register the time when and the limit of time within which claims may be filed under paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title, which limit shall not be more than six months after such publication."

(11) Section 310, title III, is amended by adding at the end of subsection (a) thereof the following paragraph:

"(6) Whenever the Commission is authorized to settle claims by the enactment of paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title with respect to Rumania, or by the execution of a claims settlement agreement with Bulgaria or Hungary, no further payments shall be authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury on account of awards certified by the Commission pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of section 303 of the Bulgarian, Hungarian or Rumanian Claims Funds, as the case may be, until payments on accounts of awards certified pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 303 with respect to such Fund have been authorized in equal proportion to payments previously authorized on existing awards certified pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 303."

(12) Section 316, title III, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(b) The Commission shall complete its affairs in connection with the settlement of claims pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title not later than eighteen months following the date of enactment of such paragraph, or following the enactment of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for payment of administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title, whichever date is later."

The letter and section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT are as follows:

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT
COMMISSION OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted herewith in behalf of the executive branch for the consideration of the 88th Congress is the draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals settled by the United States-Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, and for other purposes."

On July 16, 1960, the Governments of the United States and the Polish People's Republic entered into an en bloc settlement of claims of nationals of the United States against Poland for the nationalization or other taking by Poland of property and rights or interests therein; the deprivation of use or enjoyment of property; and debts of nationalized enterprises. The Polish Government agreed to pay to the U.S. Government an aggregate of $40 million in 20 equal annual installments. Three such installments have been paid to the U.S. Treasury.

A total of 9,873 applications have been received to date, some having been received after the close of the filing date, March 31, 1962. It is anticipated, of course, that the number of valid claims will be considerably less. Nevertheless, all claims filed with the Commission, whether valid or invalid, must be examined and decided by formal opinions.

The Commission started work on the Polish claims program on September 1, 1960, pursuant to title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, which established the procedures for the administration of such a claims program by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. Title I, however, makes no provision with respect to limiting the time within which the Commission must bring about the timely and orderly completion of the Polish claims program.

As indicated, 9,873 claims have been filed. In relation to programs previously administered by the Commission this one is more than six times the size of the Yugoslav program, equal to the size of the title III program, and more than twice the size of the title IV program. Four years were allowed for the completion of each of those programs. Accordingly, the Commission proposes that the period for processing claims against Poland be no greater than 4 years from the last day for filing claims.

Eight other proposals are contained in the draft measure:

(a) A proposal to relieve the Commission of the burden of determining attorneys' fees and to make title I consistent with the attorney fee provisions of titles III and IV of the International Claims Settlement Act.

(b) A proposal to relieve the Treasury Department of extensive administrative burdens in deducting the Commission's administrative expenses from the fund instead of from each award by the Commission.

(c) A proposal to transfer the unobligated balances in the Italian Claims Fund to the War Claims Fund.

The following proposals are designed to provide for the implementation of the United States-Rumanian Claims Settlement Agreement of March 30, 1960.

(d) A proposal to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to cover the payments by governments with which the U.S. Government concludes en bloc claims settlement agreements into the respective claims fund.

(e) A proposal to provide for a new category of claims against the Rumanian Claims Fund.

(f) A proposal requiring the Commission to publish notice of the program in the Federal Register.

(g) A proposal providing for equitable payments on awards.

(h) A proposal providing for the orderly completion of the Rumanian program.

The items covered in the draft proposal will involve little, if any, cost. In any event, the cost of effectuating any of the proposals would be borne by the claims fund concerned and not the U.S. Government.

The Commission cannot proceed in the orderly administration of the Polish and Rumanian claims programs unless the items pertaining to them are enacted. With respect to the remaining items, these are considered good administrative housekeeping which should not be left at loose ends. Moreover, it is important that this legislation be enacted promptly because installment payments of $2 million each have been made by the Government of Poland on January 11, 1961, January 10, 1962, and January 10, 1963. On July 1, 1960, the Government of Rumania made its first installment payment of $500,000 under the terms of the agreement of March 30, 1960. Subsequent installment payments of the same amount were made on July 1, 1961, and July 1, 1962.

For these reasons the Commission urges early and favorable action on the proposed bill.

Accompanying the draft bill is a section-by-section analysis of its provisions.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the presentation of this proposal for consideration by the Congress and its enactment would be consistent with the administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD D. RE,
Chairman.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED BY THE FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION IN BEHALF OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Paragraph 1: (The enacting clause unnumbered.)

Section 4(f) of title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, presently provides for a limitation on attorney's fees of 10 percent of any payment on an award made by the Commission, but it also provides machinery authorizing the Commission to set the amount of such fee within the 10 percent limitation. Further provision is made for deduction by the Secretary of the Treasury of the amount of the fee and for payment directly to the attorney.

Because of the additional administrative burdens imposed upon the Commission and the Treasury Department through such procedures the attorney fee provisions have been considerably simplified in legislation enacted subsequent to title I of the act, namely, titles III and IV. The latter two titles provide simply that such fees shall not exceed 10 percent of any payment made on an award by the Commission, and leaves the settlement thereof to attorney and client.

Paragraph 1 of the proposed bill is designed to repeal present section 4(f) of the title I, and to substitute therefor the attorney fee provisions contained in section 414 of title IV of the act.

Paragraph 2: While title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, made provision for the initiation of claims programs such as that contemplated under the Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, and authorized the Commission to set a claims filing period, it did not make provision for establishing the time limit within which the Commission should wind up its affairs in completing the program.

Accordingly, the Commission, having received nearly 10,000 claims during the filing period, recommends in the measure that the windup date be set 4 years from the last day for filing claims. The date thus recommended is March 31, 1966.

Paragraph 3: The various claims funds administered by the Commission have all been charged with financing the administrative expenses of the Commission. Section 7(b) of title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, presently provides for the deduction of 5 percent of any payment made on an award for this purpose. Legislation enacted subsequent to title I, i.e., titles III and IV, instead provides for a direct deduction of 5 percent from the respective funds for this purpose. This latter method lifts an extensive administrative burden from the Treasury Department.

It is recommended, therefore, that the cumbersome procedure of section 7(b) be repealed and provisions comparable to those of title IV be substituted.

Paragraph 4: Section 7(c)(1) of title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, presently provides that payment of awards be made only to the persons entitled thereto except in cases involving legal disability or death. Where the award does not exceed $500, requirements with respect to the appointment of a qualified executor or administrator may be waived and payment made to the person or persons found by the Comptroller General to be entitled thereto.

This proposal raises the limit from an award not in excess of $500 to any payment not in excess of $1,000. This will provide for a more orderly and efficient disposal of claims falling within the provision of the act. A similar change was made regarding claims under title IV of the act against the Government of Czechoslovakia.

Paragraph 5: This proposal involves technical changes in the language of subsection C of section 8 of the act which would retain the present payment procedures with respect to claims against the Yugoslav Claims Fund in the event future prorated payments are made. This is accomplished by including a reference to paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 8, under this amendment.

Paragraph 6: This new subsection authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to make payments on account of awards certified by the Commission with respect to claims included within the terms of the Polish Claims Agreement of 1960, and provides payment in the order of priority as follows: (1) payment in the amount of $1,000 or in the principal amount of the award, whichever is less; (2) thereafter payments on a prorated basis on account of the unpaid principal balance of each remaining award. This proration will be made on the basis of the total amount remaining in the Polish Claims Fund and available for distribution after initial payments have been made; (3) payments on account of the unpaid balance of each award of interest under the same proration provisions.

Under these provisions it is possible for claimants having awards less than $1,000 to receive payment in full, excluding awards of interest. Claimants who receive awards in principal amounts over $1,000 would receive additional payments on a prorated basis.

Paragraph 7: New subsection (b), section 302, title III, of the act would provide for the ultimate abolition of the Italian Claims Fund, the Italian claims program having been completed, and provide for the transfer of the unobligated balance in the fund ($1,088,623.53), into the War Claims Fund. The rationale for this proposal is that after World War II the Italian Government paid to the U.S. Government the sum of $5 million under the Lombardo agreement, August 14, 1947, in settlement of property damage claims not covered under the peace treaty. No reverter clause was included in the agreement.

Under the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, among other things provision was made to compensate members of our Armed Forces who were detained as prisoners of war. These benefits were paid out of the War Claims Fund, comprised of blocked and vested German and Japanese assets.

Commission records disclose that approximately 20,000 members of our Armed Forces were detained in or by Italy, and who received prisoner of war compensation at an average of $1,500 each. Thus, roughly, $30 million of German and Japanese assets were utilized to compensate prisoners of Italy. Accordingly, it is recommended that such balances as remain in the Italian Claims Fund be utilized to reimburse, in some measure, the War Claims Fund.

Upon completion of the claims program against the Government of Rumania on August 9, 1959, the Commission had issued 498 awards in the aggregate of $84,729,291 including interest, against a fund in the amount of about $22 million. On March 30, 1960, the Governments of the United States and the Rumanian People's Republic executed an en bloc settlement of these claims of U.S. nationals upon the provisions that Rumania pay to the United States an additional $2.5 million in five equal annual installments.

Inasmuch as the statute now provides that the Rumanian fund shall be comprised only of sums blocked, vested, and transferred by the Attorney General, the additional sums paid by Rumania cannot be covered into the Fund. New subsection (c) provides the vehicle for accomplishing this purpose.

Paragraphs 8 and 9: Paragraph 8 involves technical changes in the language of section 303, title III of the act to permit the addition of a new paragraph "(4)" as contained in the amendment under paragraph 9. The proposal under paragraph 9 makes provision for disposition of a small number of claims against Rumania, included within the agreement of March 30, 1960, which have arisen since August 9, 1955, as well as any additional similar claims which may be included within agreements the United States may make in the future with Bulgaria and Hungary. Negotiations are currently underway with Bulgaria.

Paragraph 10: This proposal requires the normal publication of the claims filing period in the Federal Register.

Paragraph 11: This proposal revamps the award payment provisions with respect to claims against Rumania or by the execution of a future claims settlement agreement with Bulgaria or Hungary in order to insure that new awardees will not obtain a pecuniary advantage over previous awardees. Awardees under the Rumanian program have received approximately 35 cents on the dollar in payments on their awards. This proposal would limit payments on new awards to a like extent, and then permit the residual balance to be distributed proportionately among all awardees.

Paragraph 12: This proposal requires the Commission to wind up its affairs in the Rumanian claims program within a period of 18 months.

TO AMEND THE FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1946, AS AMENDED

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Department of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record at this point, together with the letter from Assistant Secretary of State Frederick Dutton, dated February 18, 1963, to the Vice President, and also the Department of State's explanation of the bill and the cost estimates of the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and explanation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 948) to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1963".

Sec. 2. Section 571 (a) and (c) of such Act are hereby amended as follows:

(a) Section 571(a) is amended by changing the final period to a colon and adding "*Provided,* That in individual cases when personally approved by the Secretary further extension may be made."

(b) Section 571(c) is amended by inserting in the first sentence following the word "terms" the phrase "of paragraph (b)" and deleting the second sentence.

Sec. 3. Section 625 of such Act is amended by substituting in the first sentence the words "the same numerical" for the words "a given"; by substituting the words "fifty-two calendar weeks or more, shall, at the beginning of the next pay period" for the words "nine months or more, shall, on the first day of each fiscal year"; and by substituting in the second sentence the words "a Foreign Service officer or a Reserve" for the words "any such".

Sec. 4. (a) Section 911 of such Act is amended by adding a comma and the phrase "including prepayment on a commuted basis" after the word "pay" in the introductory sentence.

(b) Section 911(1) of such Act is amended by inserting after the word "Secretary" the phrase "authorizing annual leave at their home upon reassignment to the United States after service abroad or".

(c) Section 911(2) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) the travel expenses of members of the family of an officer or employee of the Service when proceeding to or returning from his post on duty; accompanying him on authorized travel to his home on annual leave when he is reassigned to the United States or on authorized home leave; accompanying him for representational purposes on authorized travel within the country of his assignment or, at the discretion of the Secretary, outside the country of his assignment; or otherwise traveling in accordance with authority granted pursuant to the terms of this or any other Act;"

(d) Section 911(8) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(8) the cost of preparing and transporting to their former homes, or to such other place in the United States as may be determined to be the appropriate place, or to a place not more distant than their former homes, for interment the remains of an officer or employee of the Service who is a citizen of the United States and of the members of his family who may die while the officer or employee is in the Service."

Sec. 5. Section 921(d) of such Act is deleted, restated in a new section 914, and a new heading thereto is added as follows:

"USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED OR LEASED VEHICLES

"Sec. 914. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of the Act of July 16, 1914, as amended (5 U.S.C. 78) the Secretary may authorize any principal officer to approve the use of Government-owned or leased vehicles located at his post for transportation of United States Government employees and their dependents when public transportation is unsafe or not available."

Sec. 6. A new section 1051 and part F under title X of such Act are hereby added as follows:

"PART F—CLAIMS

"Sec. 1051. The Secretary may, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, settle and pay claims arising after date of enactment of this section against the United States Government for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to his service of any officer or employee of the Service in a sum not to exceed $6,500 for a single claim, or replace property in kind: *Provided,* That a claim may be allowed under this section only if: (i) the officer or employee of the Service establishes that insurance was not obtainable at reasonable cost or was unobtainable at reasonable cost or was unobtainable for the risk from which the damage or loss resulted; (ii) it is presented in writing within two years after the damage or loss occurs; (iii) it did not occur at quarters occupied by the claimant within the fifty States or the District of Columbia that were not assigned to him or otherwise provided in kind by the United States; and (iv) such loss or damage occurs without fault or negligence on the part of the claimant or member of his family. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a settlement of a claim pursuant to this section shall be final and conclusive."

Sec. 7. A new section 1081 and part I under title X of such Act are hereby added as follows:

"PART I—GRANTS TO SCHOOLS

"Sec. 1081. Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary is authorized to make grants of funds in lieu of or as supplementary to education allowances, for assistance in the establishment, construction, expansion, maintenance, and operation of schools outside the United States, whenever he determines such grant of funds is necessary in order to provide suitable education for children of employees stationed in a foreign area."

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. Fulbright are as follows:

Department of State,
Washington, D.C., February 18, 1963.
Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate.

Dear Mr. Vice President: We are enclosing herewith draft amendments to the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, that the Department of State considers urgently needed for the improvement of the administration of the Foreign Service. In substance, these proposed amendments would:

1. Modify provisions limiting the period officers or employees of the Service may be assigned for duty in any Government agency (including the Department of State) or in any international organization, international commission, or international body. At the present time such assignment is limited to periods of 4 years which may under special circumstances be extended by the Secretary for a period of not more than 4 additional years. The proposed amendment will authorize the Secretary to make further extensions of such assignments on an individual case basis (sec. 571(a)).

Change by making more restrictive the provisions with respect to the payment of salary differentials to Foreign Service personnel assignment to duty in the United States (sec. 571(c)).

2. Simplify payroll procedures by making the effective date of within-class salary increases for Foreign Service officers and Reserve officers at the start of a pay period and equalize their application by making them effective after 52 weeks in class rather than at the beginning of each fiscal year (sec. 625).

3. Grant the Secretary authority to simplify existing procedures incident to Foreign Service travel:

(a) Permitting payment or prepayment of travel expenses on commuted basis (sec. 911).

(b) Providing authority for the travel of officers and employees of the Service and their families for annual leave in connection with rotation assignments to the United States after service abroad (sec. 911(1)(2)).

(c) Providing authority to enable members of the families of officers and employees of the Service to accompany officers or employees for representational purposes within the country of their assignment or at the Secretary's discretion, outside the country of their assignment (sec. 911(2)).

(d) Providing authority to transport the remains of officers or employees of the Service and members of their families to appropriate places of interment anywhere in the United States (sec. 911(8)).

4. Increase the Secretary's authority to use Government-owned and leased vehicles for transportation of Government employees and their dependents abroad when public transportation is unsafe or not available (sec. 914).

5. Simplify procedures to permit quick settlement and payment by the Secretary of legitimate property loss claims incident to service abroad when they do not exceed $6,500 (sec. 1051).

6. Provide the Secretary with authority to grant funds in lieu of or supplementary to educational allowances for the purpose of making available educational services for children of Government employees stationed in foreign areas whenever he determines such a grant of funds to be necessary (sec. 1081).

These proposals provide authority in the administrative field, which we believe are essential for more effective administration of the Foreign Service.

It is hoped that they may be given early consideration during the current session of Congress and that they may receive your support.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection, from the standpoint of the administration's program, to the presentation of the draft legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,
Frederick G. Dutton,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Estimated cost of proposed Foreign Service Act amendments

Item 1: Broadening provisions relating to length of assignments in the United States (sec. 571(a)), first year cost__ 0

COMMENT

There will be no additional cost to retain employees for longer periods in the United States.

Item 2: Change in provisions relating to U.S. salary differentials (sec. 571(c)), first year cost____________________ (—$41,000)

COMMENT

The reduction in the area of applicability of the U.S. salary differential under this proposal would result in a saving in the amount of $41,000.

Item 3: Change in provision relating to within-class increases for Foreign Service officers and Reserve officers (sec. 625), first year cost__ $80,000

COMMENT

Most officers are promoted during the months of February, March, or April. Thus they would receive their first within-class increase 3 or 4 months sooner under this proposal than they do under present legislation. The cost of this provision can be estimated by multiplying the average number of officers promoted by one-third of the average within-class increase. This amounts to $80,000. Changing the date from July 1 to the beginning of a pay period will reduce administrative costs.

Item 4: Commuted travel plan (sec. 911), first year cost______________________ 0

COMMENT

There will be no additional costs in connection with this plan, the purpose of which is to permit an eventual substantial reduction in administrative costs.

Item 5. Substitution of annual leave for home leave prior to home assignment (secs. 911 (1) and (2)), first year cost_ 0

COMMENT

This section would not result in any increase in costs and would result in a saving to the Government by virtue of the earlier entrance on duty of personnel assigned to Washington after a tour of duty abroad.

Item 6: Travel expenses for members of families in connection with representation (secs. 911(2)), first year cost______________________ $40,000

COMMENT

Cost of travel for members of family to accompany officers and employees on official travel for representational purposes is estimated at $40,000.

Item 7: Shipment of remains to place other than official residence (sec. 911(8)), first year cost____________ $1,200

COMMENT

The increased cost of shipping the remains of officers and employees and members of their families to the family burial place is estimated to be $1,200.

Item 8: Use of Government-owned or leased vehicles (sec. 914), first year cost________________________________ 0

COMMENT

The proposal authorizes increased use of existing vehicles so the only cost would be a minor increase in fuel expenses which is not possible to estimate.

Item 9: Settlement of employee claims for property damage abroad (sec. 1051), first year cost________________ 0

COMMENT

Between June 1950 and June 1961, 266 claims, averaging $1,804, were settled by private laws at a total cost of $479,994. The average annual cost for claims settled during this period was $43,636. It is not anticipated that there wil be any increase in this amount.

Item 10: Grants to schools (sec. 1081), first year cost____________ $150,000

COMMENT

A preliminary estimate indicates that grants might be made to 10 schools averaging $15,000 each.

Total estimated cost______________	$271,200
Savings_____________________________	41,000
Net cost__________________	230,200

Part H—Assignment of Foreign Service Personnel

ASSIGNMENT TO ANY GOVERNMENT AGENCY OR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Existing legislation

Sec. 571. (a) Any officer or employee of the Service may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be assigned or detailed for duty in any Government agency, or in any international organization, international commission, or international body, such an assignment or combination of assignments to be for a period of not more than four years, except that under special circumstances the Secretary may extend this four-year period for not more than four additional years[.]

(c) If the basic minimum salary of the position to which an officer or employee of the Service is assigned pursuant to the terms of this section is higher than the salary such officer or employee is entitled to receive as an officer or employee of the Service, such officer or employee shall, during the period such difference in salary exists, receive the salary and allowances of the position in which he is serving in lieu of his salary and allowances as an officer or employee of the Service. Any salary paid under the provisions of this section shall be the salary on the basis of which computations and payments shall be made in accordance with the provisions of title VIII. [No officer or employee of the Service who, subsequent to the date of enactment of the Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1960, is assigned to, or who, after June 30, 1961, occupies a position in the Department that is designated as a Foreign Service Officer position, shall be entitled to receive a salary differential under the provisions of this paragraph.]

Proposed legislation

Sec. 571. (a) Any officer or employee of the Service may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be assigned or detailed for duty in any Government agency, or in any international organization, international commission, or international body, such an assignment or combination of assignments to be for a period of not more than four years, except that under special circumstances the Secretary may extend this four-year period for not more than four additional years: *Provided*, That in individual cases when personally approved by the Secretary further extension may be made.

(c) If the basic minimum salary of the position to which an officer or employee of the Service is assigned pursuant to the terms of paragraph (b) of this section is higher than the salary such officer or employee is entitled to receive as an officer or employee of the Service, such officer or employee shall, during the period such difference in salary exists, receive the salary and allowances of the position in which he is serving in lieu of his salary and allowances as an officer or employee of the Service. Any salary paid under the provisions of this section shall be the salary on the basis of which computations and payments shall be made in accordance with the provisions of title VIII.

Section 571(a) is amended to broaden the provisions which limit the period that the Secretary may assign or detail an officer or employee of the Service for duty in any Government agency or in any international organization, international commission, or international body, so that in individual cases the Secretary may extend such assignments for periods beyond 8 years.

It is proposed to repeal the provisions of section 571(c) with respect to payment of differentials except in cases of appointment by the President. The provisions of existing section 571(c) relating to payment of salary differentials after June 30, 1961, resulted from changes made by the Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1960. The Department sought at the time of enactment of those amendments to eliminate the requirement that an officer or employee of the Service assigned or detailed to duty with any Government agency (including the Department of State) receive the difference, if any, between his salary as an officer or employee of the Service and the basic minimum salary of the position to which he was assigned. It was pointed out that there was no longer any justification for this so-called Washington salary differential for officers of the Service assigned to positions in the Department since the integration of the Department and Foreign Service had made the interchange of officers between oversea and Washington asignments a normal procedure. Accordingly, since Washington is, in effect, a post of duty similar to any post abroad the payment of a salary differential was not believed justified.

The Department believes that all officers of the Foreign Service should be treated alike and that no Washington salary differential should be paid to any officer assigned to a position in the United States. By policy determination the Secretary can designate any and all positions in the Department that are occupied by officers and employees of the Foreign Service as Foreign Service officer positions thus eliminating the possibility of the payment of differentials to such persons who are assigned by him to the Department. Secretarial and clerical positions could not justifiably be designated as Foreign Service officer positions, nor could the Secretary designate positions in other agencies, missions, international organizations, international commissions, or other international bodies as Foreign Service officer positions in order to eliminate salary differentials when officers and employees of the Service are assigned to such positions.

The only exceptions to the provision eliminating all salary differentials would be in cases when Foreign Service officers and employees are appointed by the President alone or by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as described in section 571(b). Such officers would receive the salary of the position to which appointed by the President or their Foreign Service officer salary, whichever is greater.

WITHIN-CLASS SALARY INCREASES OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS AND RESERVE OFFICERS

Existing legislation

Sec. 625. Any Foreign Service officer or any Reserve officer, whose services meet the standards required for the efficient conduct of the work of the Service and who shall have been in [a given] class for a continuous period of [nine months or more, shall, on the first day of each fiscal year], receive an increase in salary to the next higher rate for the class in which he is serving. Without regard to any other law, the Secretary is authorized to grant to [any such] officer additional increases in salary, within the salary range established for the class in which he is serving, based upon especially meritorious service.

WITHIN-CLASS SALARY INCREASES OF FOREIGN

Existing legislation—Continued

Proposed legislation

Sec. 625. Any Foreign Service officer or any Reserve officer, whose services meet the standards required for the efficient conduct of the work of the Service and who shall have been in the same numerical class for a continuous period of fifty-two calendar weeks or more, shall, at the beginning of the next pay period, receive an increase in salary to the next higher rate for the class in which he is serving. Without regard to any other law, the Secretary is authorized to grant to a Foreign Service officer or a Reserve officer additional increases in salary, within the salary range established for the class in which he is serving, based upon especially meritorious service.

SERVICE OFFICERS AND RESERVE OFFICERS

Proposed legislation—Continued

The purposes of the proposed amendments to section 625 are: (1) to simplify the payroll procedures for processing within-class increases for Foreign Service officers and Foreign Service Reserve officers by making such increases effective at the beginning of a pay period; (2) to equalize the application of such increases by making them effective immediately following the expiration of a specified period in class rather than on July 1 of each year; (3) to permit the use of service in the same numerical class either as an FSR or an FSO toward an increase in the class in which the officer is serving at the time the increase would be due; and (4) to clarify the language relating to increases for meritorious services.

When within-class increases are made effective on July 1 of each year, a pay period is nearly always split, unnecessarily complicating the payroll operation. Under present law, when an officer is promoted to a higher class in October of a given year, he would not have 9 months in class by the following July 1 and would therefore not be eligible until July 1 of the second year following class promotion. By providing for increases after a specified period of 52 calendar weeks, each officer serves the same length of time in class before his first within-class increase. For example: an officer was promoted to FSO–4, on October 8, 1962; under the present system he would not be eligible for within-class increase on July 1, 1963, but would receive a within-class increase on July 1, 1964; under the proposed system he would receive the within-class increase on October 14, 1963.

Under present interpretation, service as an FSR is not credited toward a within-class increase in an FSO class. This has resulted in unjustified delay for an FSR when later appointed as an FSO. Substitution of the phrase "a Foreign Service officer or a Reserve" for the word "such" in existing language is a technical clarification that relates the granting of meritorious service increases directly with Foreign Service officers and Foreign Service Reserve officers. This change eliminates the unintended implication in the present language that such increases relate to those officers who have been in class for a specified period of time.

PART B—TRAVEL AND RELATED EXPENSES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Existing legislation

Sec. 911. The Secretary may, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, pay—

Proposed legislation

Sec. 911. The Secretary may, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, pay, including prepayment on a commuted basis—

The purpose of the proposed amendment of the first sentence of section 911 to add the phrase "including prepayment on a commuted basis" is to grant the Secretary authority to simplify existing procedures incident to Foreign Service travel. Present laws and related regulations pertaining to the travel of personnel and the transportation of their effects do not allow the adoption of simplified procedures which would result in lower costs to administer the Foreign Service travel and transportation system.

To achieve its goal of streamlining administrative operations, the Department must thoroughly revamp its present travel system to eliminate the excessive number of obligating, vouchering and auditing actions generated by Foreign Service travel. The man-hours spent in providing travel assistance to employees, obtaining and evaluating bids for packing and shipping services, issuing Government bills of lading, supervising shipments being sent and received, collecting from employees for excess weights shipped and settling claims represent undue effort and expense which can be curtailed sharply or, in some cases, eliminated by adoption of the commuted travel program.

Approval of the required legislation would permit the Department to prepay on a commuted basis, all costs in connection with fares and shipments of unaccompanied air and surface baggage, as well as household effects, thus overcoming the prohibition on advance of public moneys contained in 31 U.S.C. 529. The cost of each trip would be computed in advance and a single voucher would be processed to effect payment to the traveler prior to the commencement of the journey. Provision would be made for a supplemental payment to cover unusual circumstances such as strikes and acts of God affecting travel beyond the control of the traveler. The traveler would be responsible for making arrangements for his personal travel and for the transportation of his effects, in accordance with pertinent laws and regulations concerning the use of American-flag carriers, American airlines, and other American companies.

The isolated location of many Foreign Service posts, inadequate packing and transportation facilities in some areas of the world, as well as other factors having a direct bearing on a worldwide program of this kind, will cause implementation of the commuted travel plan to proceed slowly. It is estimated that, because of abrupt and unannounced changes in tariffs, unstable rates of exchange and other variables, this plan would not be usable for 20 percent of the transfer cases involving Foreign Service personnel. On the other hand, it is quite possible that it would be valid for the other 80 percent of transfer cases and the potential savings in terms of reduced paperwork would be sizable. These savings, which are not definitive and must be projected over a period of several years, could result in a cumulative reduction in costs to the Government. The initial effort would concentrate on those areas where costs can be established and verified readily.

Approval of legislation permitting establishment of a commuted travel program for Foreign Service travel would result in more effective utilization of available manpower and simplified transportation management.

Existing legislation

Sec. 911.

(1) the travel expenses of officers and employees of the Service, including expenses incurred while traveling pursuant to orders issued by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of section 933 with regard to the granting of home leave;

Proposed legislation

Sec. 911.

(1) the travel expenses of officers and employees of the Service, including expenses incurred while traveling pursuant to orders issued by the Secretary authorizing annual leave at their homes upon reassignment to the United States after service abroad or in accordance with the provisions of section 933 with regard to the granting of home leave;

The purpose of this amendment is to permit travel to a place of residence in the United States for annual leave when an officer or employee is to be assigned to duty in the United States following duty abroad. Current authority provides for transportation to a place of residence, under such circumstances, only for home leave.

At present an officer or employee is granted home leave after a foreign assignment and before an assignment in the United States if he has completed 18 to 36 months, depending upon his post of assignment, continuous service abroad. Such leave is not necessary from the viewpoint of acquainting the officer or employee with circumstances in his own country to make him a better representative abroad. His assignment in the United States will accomplish that purpose. It is the Department's belief, however, that an employee is entitled to earned home leave after a tour of duty at certain hardship posts and that he should be given an opportunity for such leave before entering on duty for a departmental assignment. On the other hand, an officer or employee who has not served at a hardship post may upon return to the United States need a shorter period of leave in order to refresh himself and his family and to attend to private affairs (putting children in college, visiting aged parents, settling estates, etc.) before taking on a Washington assignment. For such purposes a relatively brief period of annual leave will normally be granted personnel returning from nonhardship posts.

It is therefore proposed that transportation for visits to the home leave address following a foreign assignment and before entering upon a U.S. assignment be paid for by the Government, but that the period of leave be shortened by allowing only annual leave for those on transfer to the United States from posts where living and working conditions have not imposed any particular hardship. Annual leave would be charged for the officer or employee's absence from the time he would have arrived had he made a direct journey from his post to Washington or from the time he arrives at his home leave address which ever is sooner until the time he actually arrives in Washington. However, he will be entitled to actual or constructive travel costs and to per diem for the time that would have been spent in travel status on direct travel to his home leave address. Home leave upon return to the United States for assignment in the Department will normally be granted only after an officer or employee has completed a tour of duty at a post which has been designated a hardship post for rest and recuperation purposes.

Existing legislation

Sec. 911.

(2) the travel expenses of members of the family of an officer or employee of the Service when proceeding to or returning from his post of duty; accompanying him on authorized home leave; or otherwise traveling in accordance with authority granted pursuant to the terms of this or any other Act;

Proposed legislation

Sec. 911.

(2) the travel expenses of members of the family of an officer or employee of the Service when proceeding to or returning from his post of duty; accompanying him on authorized travel to his home on annual leave when he is reassigned to the United States or on authorized home leave; accompanying him for representational purposes on authorized travel within the country of his assignment or, at the discretion of the Secretary, outside the country of his assignment; of otherwise traveling in accordance with authority granted pursuant to the terms of this or any other Act;

Section 911(2) is being amended with respect to travel on annual leave when an officer is reassigned to the United States to conform with the proposed amendment in section 911(1). Further, a new provision is being added to section 911(2) to authorize dependents of Foreign Service officers and employees to accompany them for representational purposes on authorized travel within the country of their assignment or at the discretion of the Secretary outside the country of their assignment.

Experience has shown that representation is frequently conducted more successfully by a man-and-wife team than by an officer alone, and in the case of single or widowed officers, when accompanied by a sister or other adult relative who normally acts as hostess. This has become increasingly significant with the improving status of women in societies throughout the world. In the past, when members of an officer's family have accompanied him on official trips the representational benefit to the United States has frequently been pronounced. The Department does not believe officers should be required to bear this additional expense when the travel of members of family is in the public interest.

Existing legislation

Sec. 911.

(8) [the cost of preparing and transporting to their former homes in the continental United States or to a place not more distant, the remains of an officer or employee of the Service who is a citizen of the United States and of the members of his family who may die abroad or while in travel status:]

Proposed legislation

Sec. 911.

(8) the cost of preparing and transporting to their former homes, or to such other place in the United States as may be determined to be the appropriate place or to a place not more distant than their former homes, for interment the remains of an officer or employee of the Service who is a citizen of the

Existing legislation—Continued	*Proposed legislation*—Continued
	United States and of the members of his family who may die while the officer or employee is in the Service.

The current provision relating to the transportation of remains of officers and employees of the Service and members of their families is limited to transportation to their former homes or to a place not more distant. Experience has shown that the family burial plot and the place of residence is not always the same. When the cost of the shipment of the remains to such a place is in excess of the cost of shipment to the former home, the difference in cost cannot be paid by the Government. The proposed amendment would permit in appropriate cases the transportation of such remains at Government expense to former homes or to any other place considered appropriate, such as a family burial plot or national cemetery anywhere in the United States.

The proposed amendment will also correct an inconsistency in existing authority relating to the transportation of remains of employees and members of their families. When an employee or dependent dies abroad or while in travel status, the remains, the family, and their effects are transported to their place of residence in the United States; if an employee or dependent dies while in the United States but not in travel status, the family and effects may be transported but not the remains. This amendment will make it possible to transport the remains of employees or dependents who die while in the Service, wherever stationed, to an appropriate place of interment anywhere in the United States.

PART B—TRAVEL AND RELATED EXPENSES

Existing legislation	*Proposed legislation*
See part C, section 921(d).	Use of Government-owned or leased vehicles SEC. 914. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of the Act of July 16, 1914, as amended (5 U.S.C. 78) the Secretary may authorize any principal officer to approve the use of Government-owned or leased vehicles located at his post for transportation of United States Government employees and their dependents when public transportation is unsafe or not available.

The basic langauge in new section 914 is being taken from existing section 921(d) which is being deleted because reference to use of Government-owned vehicles for the transportation of employees or dependents does not belong under the heading "Commissary services." The existing provisions in this section make it possible for the Secretary to authorize any principal officer to approve the use of Government-owned vehicles located at his post for the transportation of U.S. Government employees who are American citizens and their dependents to and from recreation facilities when public transportation is unsafe or is not available.

The provision authorizing the use of Government-owned transportation to and from recreational facilities has been a useful one but there are many instances over and beyond this need where, in the interest of the safety of the adult and minor dependents of Foreign Service personnel, Government transportation must be used. In many of the newly opened posts in Africa, in certain Asian posts and in the curtain countries, public transportation facilities, if they exist, cannot be considered a safe means of travel for women and children. In fact, in some areas it is not considered safe for an unescorted woman to drive herself or her children on the public thoroughfares, whatever may be the purpose of the travel. Further, in these difficult areas there are certain social functions which for representational purposes our officers and employees and their wives must attend. In many instances, in addition to the absence of safe public transportation privately owned vehicles cannot be left unattended on the streets.

Moreover, in some Foreign Service posts where adequate schools exist for providing elementary and secondary educational services for dependents of U.S. Government employees public transportation facilities to and from such schools are not available or are inadequate.

Government-owned vehicles are available at all posts abroad. They are not necessarily in use constantly for official transportation yet they must be maintained and held in readiness for such use. The principal officer at a post where transportation facilities are unavailable or unsafe should be able to use, in his discretion, facilities that are available to him for whatever purpose they may be needed to provide transportation for employees and their dependents. It is for this reason that the Department seeks the broader authority provided in the new section 914. This section also has been changed to authorize the use of leased vehicles as well as Government-owned ones since there are posts where it is more economical for the Department to lease a few vehicles on a part-time basis rather than to purchase and maintain a full quota of Government-owned vehicles.

PART C—COMMISSARY SERVICE

Existing legislation	*Proposed legislation*
SEC. 921. [(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 5 of the Act of July 16, 1914, as amended (5 U.S.C. 78) the Secretary may authorize any principal officer to approve the use of Government-owned vehicles located at his post for transportation of United States Government employees who are American citizens, and their dependents, to and from recreation facilities when public transportation is unsafe or is not available.]	

Section 921(d) is repealed since this section has been revised and restated as new section 914.

Existing legislation	*Proposed legislation*
No existing legislation.	Part F—Claims Sec. 1051. The Secretary may, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, settle and pay claims arising after date of enactment of this section against the United States Government for damage to, or loss of, personal property incident to his service of any officer or employee of the Service in a sum not to exceed $6,500 for a single claim, or replace property in kind: *Provided*, That a claim may be allowed under this section only if: (i) the officer or employee of the Service establishes that insurance was not obtainable at reasonable cost or was unobtainable for the risk from which the damage or loss resulted; (ii) it is presented in writing within two years after the damage or loss occurs; (iii) it did not occur at quarters occupied by the claimant within the fifty States or the District of Columbia that were not assigned to him or otherwise provided in kind by the United States; and (iv) such loss or damage occurs without fault or negligence on the part of the claimant or member of his family. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a settlement of a claim pursuant to this section shall be final and conclusive.

The purpose of this amendment is to simplify the procedure for reimbursing, within limits, Foreign Service personnel who suffer property loss incident to service abroad.

The lack of political stability in a number of areas of the world where Foreign Service personnel are stationed, and the incidence of civil disturbance, riot, arson and sundry threats to the property of such personnel have made it certain that the U.S. Government will be presented from year to year with legitimate claims.

Past experience indicates that hasty evacuation of a post in the face of hostilities leads almost inevitably to personal property losses. When Seoul was evacuated in 1950, 24 hours ahead of its takeover by the advancing North Korean Army, American Embassy personnel were evacuated by plane and saved only what they wore and what they could put into one suitcase.

At the present time the Department's Foreign Service Claim Board, operating under administrative regulations, considers claims for noninsurable losses incurred by Foreign Service employees as a result of emergency conditions and recommends approved cases to the Congress for settlement under private bills. For losses sustained since the evacuation of personnel from Seoul, Korea, in June 1950, 15 claims have been approved by the Claim Board, 11 of which have been settled under four separate private laws approved by the 83d, 85th and 86th Congresses. Four of the fifteen cases were recommended to the 2d session, 87th Congress, for reimbursement. No action was taken on these claims prior to adjournment of that session of the Congress.

The proposed amendment would provide a permanent vehicle for the quick settlement of legitimate claims, thus enabling personnel who have suffered losses to replace them, at least in part.

This proposal would be similar to authority presently vested in the Secretary to settle tort claims abroad involving State Department operations.

Existing legislation	*Proposed legislation*
No existing legislation.	Part I—Grants to Schools SEC. 1081. Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary is authorized to make grants of funds in lieu of or as supplementary to education allowances, for assistance in the establishment, construction, expansion, maintenance, and operation of schools outside the United States, whenever he determines such grant of funds is necessary in order to provide suitable education for children of employees stationed in a foreign area.

The Department is requesting the authority contained in new section 1081 because over and above existing general authority for aid to education abroad, the Secretary needs to be able to supplement the existing channels of assistance to schools in those instances where none of the existing statutory authorities enable him to insure adequate education for the children of Government employees abroad.

There is existing legislative authority for several types of aid to education abroad. First, two useful and far-reaching programs, but ones that are not designed to meet the needs of children of Government employees abroad, are those which provide demonstration centers in foreign countries to display American educational techniques primarily for the benefit of the local population. The programs are under the direction, respectively, of State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Relations and of AID. Although in some few instances these programs provide benefits to children of Government employees abroad when no more suitable arrangement can be made, the use for such purposes is extremely limited.

Legislative authority exists for two kinds of aid to schools attended primarily by dependents of Government employees. These, however, are primarily of benefit to the dependents of military and AID personnel. One is the military dependents' school system which is concentrated in areas where troops are stationed. The other is the new authority in section 636 (c) and (d) of the AID legislation which authorizes assistance to schools for dependents of Government employees in areas where the AID program is operating.

A third major kind of assistance in education is that provided in 1955 through which educational allowances may be granted to parents to defray the costs of obtaining an adequate education for their children. Valuable as this program is, it is not the complete answer. It is dependent upon the existence of adequate educational facilities and the willingness of local educators and the officials of the host government to cooperate. Where no adequate facilities exist or where there is opposition to the participation of the dependents of U.S. Government employees in existing systems, educational needs can be met best by capital grants.

With the requested new authority in the Foreign Service Act, the Secretary will be able to supplement the existing channels of assistance to schools in those instances, as in Iron Curtain countries, where none of the existing statutory authorities can meet the need.

The Secretary of State needs authority to supplement existing educational facilities or to provide new ones where they are not available through the grant of funds over and above existing legislative authority which cannot meet the needs for educational services to dependent children in certain areas. This amendment will provide stopgap legislation to be used only on a very limited basis until total legislation can be developed on aid for education for dependents of employees of all civilian agencies overseas.

TO AMEND THE UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended by Public Law 341, 81st Congress, October 10, 1949, to grant the President wider discretion in the assignment of top level personnel of the U.S. mission to the United Nations, including their rank and status as ambassadors or ministers, and to give the U.S. representative discretion to assign these top representatives to the various organs of the United Nations in accordance with workload and other considerations; to authorize the President to appoint a U.S. representative to the European office of the United Nations and other international organizations; and to authorize payment of a housing allowance to certain officers assigned to the U.S. mission to the United Nations.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of State dated February 12, 1963, to the Vice President in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 949) to amend the United Nations Participation Act, as amended (63 Stat. 734–736), introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsections (a), (b), and (d) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended by Public Law 341, Eighty-first Congress, October 10, 1949, are hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a representative of the United States to the United Nations who shall have the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and shall hold office at the pleasure of the President. Such representative shall represent the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations and may serve ex officio as representative of the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations other than specialized agencies of the United Nations, and shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations as the President may, from time to time direct.

"(b) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint additional persons with appropriate titles, rank, and status to represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations and in such organs, commissions, or other bodies as may be created by the United Nations with respect to nuclear energy or disarmament (control and limitation of armament). Such persons shall serve at the pleasure of the President and subject to the direction of the representative of the United States to the United Nations. They shall, at the direction of the representative of the United States to the United Nations, represent the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations, including the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council, and perform such other functions as the representative of the United States is authorized to perform in connection with the participation of the United States in the United Nations. Any deputy representative or any other officer holding office at the time the provisions of this Act, as amended, become effective shall not be required to be reappointed by reason of the enactment of this Act, as amended.

"(d) the President may also appoint from time to time such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in organs and agencies of the United Nations. The President may, without the advice and consent of the Senate, designate any officer of the United States to act without additional compensation as the representative of the United States in either the Economic and Social Council or the Trusteeship Council (1) at any specified session thereof where the position is vacant or in the absence or disability of the regular representative or (2) in connection with a specified subject matter at any specified session of either such Council in lieu of the regular representative. The President may designate any officer of the Department of State, whose appointment is subject to confirmation by the Senate, to act, without additional compensation, for temporary periods as the representative of the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations in the absence or disability of the representatives provided for under section 2 (a) and (b) or in lieu of such representatives in connection with a specified subject matter."

Sec. 2. Section 2 of such Act is hereby further amended by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) to be subsections (f) and (g) respectively; and by adding after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a Representative of the United States to the European Office of the United Nations with appropriate rank and status who shall serve at the pleasure of the President and subject to the direction of the Secretary of State. Such person shall, at the direction of the Secretary of State, represent the United States at the European Office of the United Nations, and perform such other functions there in connection with the participation of the United States in International Organizations as the Secretary of State may, from time to time, direct."

Sec. 3. Such Act is hereby amended by inserting after section 8 the following new section:

"Sec. 9. The President may, under such regulations as he shall prescribe and notwithstanding the provisions of sections 1765 and 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (5 U.S.C. 75; 31 U.S.C. 529), grant certain officers having important representation responsibilities as determined by the Representative of the United States to the United Nations, an allowance adequate to defray the additional housing costs necessitated by such representational responsibilities during the period such officer is assigned for duty in the continental United States as a member of the United States Mission to the United Nations."

The letter presented by Mr. Fulbright is as follows:

February 12, 1963.

Dear Mr. Vice President: I submit herewith a proposed draft amendment to the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended by Public Law 341, 81st Congress, October 10, 1949, to grant the President wider discretion in the assignment of top level personnel of the U.S. mission to the United Nations, including their rank and status as ambassadors or ministers, and to give the U.S. representatives discretion to assign these top representatives to the various organs of the United Nations in accordance with workload and other considerations; to authorize the President to appoint a U.S. representative to the European Office of the United Nations and other international organizations; and to authorize payment of a housing allowance to certain officers assigned to the U.S. mission to the United Nations.

The United Nations Participation Act now authorizes a representative and a deputy representative of the United States at the United Nations, both of whom shall have the rank and status of Envoy Extraordinary and Ambassador Plenipotentiary. In addition, another deputy representative to the Security Council is authorized and the President also may appoint, from time to time, such other persons as he may deem necessary to represent the United States in the agencies of the United Nations including the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council.

Ambassador Stevenson has found this to be unnecessarily rigid and it is proposed that the provisions specifying the number and the role of the deputies and their diplomatic titles be deleted. In lieu thereof, the proposed amendment would authorize the President to appoint such additional persons with appropriate title, rank, and status as he deems necessary to represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations. In addition, these officers would, at the direction of the U.S. representative to the United Nations, represent the United States in any organ, commission, or other body of the United Nations including the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council and perform such other functions as the U.S. representative is authorized to perform.

These changes will permit the U.S. representative to organize his staff and assign their duties as he deems necessary to accomplish his mission effectively. In the case of the two deputy representatives, Ambassador Stevenson has in mind that they should be alter-egos of the U.S. representative and available to represent the United States in any way in which he himself is able to do so. Although the proposed amendment gives the U.S. representative greater flexibility in determining assignments, it remains appropriate for an individual who was to be appointed, for example, to spend most of his time on the Economic and Social Council, to be appointed as representative to that Council, and that the Senate in advising and consenting on his appointment would consider primarily his ability and qualifications to fulfill those duties. This, however, would be on the understanding that if the U.S. representative to the United Nations found it desirable to utilize him temporarily as representative to one of the other organs, he would be in a position to do so.

The amendment also provides that persons who would represent the United States in the principal organs of the United Nations, including bodies that may be created by the United Nations with respect to nuclear energy or disarmament would be appointed subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. Persons appointed to represent the United States in other organs, commissions, and bodies of the United Nations would not require the advice and consent of the Senate.

It is not intended that enactment of this amendment would necessitate the reappointment of any person holding office at the time of its enactment.

The United States maintains a mission to the European office of the United Nations and other international organizations at Geneva. Geneva has become increasingly important as the site of many international conferences and organizations, and the responsibilities of our mission there have increased commensurately. Therefore, it is proposed in this amendment that the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall be authorized to appoint a representative of the United States to the European office of the United Nations with appropriate rank and status who shall serve at the pleasure of the President and subject to the direction of the Secretary of State. In addition to representing the United States at the European office of the United Nations, such person shall perform such other functions in connection with the participation of the United States in international organizations as the Secretary of State may direct.

The proposed amendment to provide a housing allowance for officers of the U.S. mission in New York is to remove the anomaly resulting from the location in the United States of the United Nations. The functions performed by the officers are identical to those performed by officers in similar positions in our Foreign Service missions abroad. However, the quarters allowances authorized by law to our representatives to foreign countries and to international organizations whose headquarters are located outside the United States are not paid to members of the U.S. mission to the United Nations.

The United States, as the host nation, can expect and must respond to the many opportunities for the effective social intercourse of representational activities. Foreign delegations look upon the U.S. mission to the United Nations as bearing a special responsibility in this area, and they expect to be invited to the homes of the members of the mission. Officers assigned to the U.S. mission are expected to maintain private living quarters in the vicinity of the United Nations in order to discharge their representational responsibilities more effectively for the convenience, and in the interest, of the Government. These representational duties are for the most part discharged outside office hours, this being an obligation not imposed on other Federal Government officers stationed in New York.

The expansion of the United Nations to the present total of 110 countries has greatly increased our responsibilities as host government. The problem of making known our Government's policies and determining the policies of the other governments has become of paramount importance. One of the most effective means of doing this is at small social gatherings; but in the past our contacts with other delegates have tended to be largely limited to public meetings, to corridor encounters and hasty restaurant luncheons. It is my firm belief that the personal type of representation, which is least expensive in the long run, brings about a greater understanding between our officers and their colleagues. It allows for creation of a family interest and an exchange of divergent views in the relaxed surroundings of a private American home, which make a pleasant and sympathetic atmosphere for diplomacy. Such entertainment creates good will and does not leave the impression that we are only concerned with immediate and pressing problems in the United Nations. Unfortunately, most of our officers assigned to the mission in New York have not generally been able to carry out their duties in such atmosphere. The reason is that they would be subjected to considerable personal expense in maintaining quarters adequate for such representational purposes.

A major portion of the representational functions in the past have been held in public places, with the exception of those held in Ambassador Stevenson's apartment at the Waldorf. His quarters are, as you know, rented by the Government. Although he is able to bring together the mission's officers and delegates of the foreign missions at representational functions at his suite, it is not the same as these officers entertaining their counterparts in their own homes. A very limited number of our officers, using their personal funds, have been financially able to consider this problem of representation in renting adequate apartments in Manhattan. On the other hand, most of our officers have not been able to assume this added expense and either rent small apartments in Manhattan of inadequate size for representation activities, or have found it necessary to live in the suburbs where such activities are very difficult. For this reason, some of the effectiveness of these officers is lost to the mission. They themelves are placed at a disadvantage with respect to their opposite numbers in other delegations who are receiving rental allowances and the other additional compensations usually enjoyed by diplomats serving abroad.

There is need for a new allowance to defray the added costs which certain officers of the U.S. mission are forced to incur if they are to obtain and maintain housing that is adequate for the proper discharge of their representational duties. The amount of this allowance would represent the difference between cost of adequate representational housing and the cost of housing which an officer concerned would have if he had no representational responsibilities. We intend to limit eligibility to those officers having more than usual representational responsibilities, and the total cost for their housing allowances would be approximately $60,000 per annum.

The submission of this proposed legislation has been approved by the Bureau of Budget as being consistent with the administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

Dean Rusk.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask for its appropriate reference a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

This bill would authorize, but not make mandatory, the assignment of class I bases among dairy farmers within a Federal milk marketing order in a manner reflecting the actual utilization of fluid milk within the given market. The essential purpose of this proposal is to authorize the producers within a marketing order to receive payment for their class I fluid milk in line with their actual base and a surplus price for production in excess of their base.

Under the present Federal order program unfortunately there is an incentive to the producer to continue expansion of his production because he is rewarded through a blend price for milk production which goes into manufacturing uses. Thus surplus milk from the Federal order markets floods the manufacturing markets and eventually results in substantial surplus accumulation under the support program.

I realize that this proposal leaves substantially unanswered one of the difficult problems regarding this class I base plan, namely a means of orderly sale or transfer of bases from one producer to another. Hearings on this and related proposals will be necessary to develop sound answer to this problem. It is possible that such a plan could operate for 1 or 2 years before we find the best manner in which to provide for such transfers or sales. I am hopeful that all concerned with the future well-being of the dairy producer will contribute to perfecting this proposal during the hearings in order that Congress can enact sound legislation before the close of the present session.

The bill which I introduce today is essentially the proposal suggested by the National Milk Producers Federation, which proposal has received the endorsement of the Michigan Milk Producers Association.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks a copy of the resolution adopted by the Michigan Milk Producers Association, the text of the bill, a memorandum explaining the bill, and comments which I made on this subject at the annual meeting of the Michigan Allied Dairy Association in Detroit on February 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, resolution, memorandum, and comments will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 953) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Hart, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end of section 8(c)(5) the following new subparagraph (H):

"(H) Allocating, or providing a method for allocating, to each producer under a marketing order a percentage of total sales, as defined in the order, in any one or more use classifications higher than the lowest priced use classification which percentage shall be determined by relating total deliveries of milk accounted for under the order made by each such producer during a representative period, as determined in the order, to such total sales during such representative period, due allowance being made, in the provisions of the order, for abnormal conditions, hardship cases, and new producers, including new producers thereafter entering the market. Such allocations may be adjusted from time to time, or new allocations may be made, by amending the order. The provisions of this subparagraph may be applied notwithstanding subparagraphs 8c(5)(B) and 8c(5)(G). Regulations and order provisions under this subparagraph shall be applied equitably among producers and among handlers and may provide for the effective application of such allocations to such sales made by any handler. All of the remedies available to handlers under section 8c(15) shall be available to producers for the purposes of this subsection. Order provisions under this subparagraph shall not become effective in any marketing order unless separately approved by producers in the same manner provided for the approval of marketing orders. Disapproval of order provisions under this subparagraph shall not be considered disapproval of the order or of other terms of the order. Order provisions under this subparagraph may be terminated by separate vote in the same manner provided for the termination of marketing orders. In the case of marketing orders calling for individual handler pools under subparagraph 8c(5)(B)(i), the allocations provided for herein may be applied to each handler and to the producers delivering milk to such handler."

The resolution, memorandum, and comments presented by Mr. Hart, are as follows:

Resolution Adopted by Michigan Milk Producers Association

GOVERNMENT FARM PROGRAMS

(a) National milk production quotas administered by the Federal Government provide no assurance of any improvement in dairy farmers' net income. They would be regid and inflexible and would deprive dairy farmers of any voice in their administration or interpretation to meet local conditions. We, therefore, oppose national production quotas.

(b) We believe dairy farmers' net income can best be protected by continuation of the present price support program providing for not less than 75 percent of parity. We direct our association to vigorously support retention of this program as provided by the Agricultural Act of 1949.

(c) We favor amending the Agricultural Marketing Act to permit the use of transferable class I bases administered under the Federal milk order program. We believe that such class I base programs should be made effective only after separate producer referendum.

Sincerely yours,

Glenn Lake,
President.

Dairymen's Class I Base Plan

The proposed legislation further amends the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended. This bill in no way changes the presently authorized provisions of Federal milk marketing orders, nor does it change the statute as applied to other commodities.

The bill authorizes, but does not require, the assignment of bases reflecting an allocation of fluid-milk utilization among dairy farmers supplying any given market under a Federal order.

The purpose of the bill is to make it possible for a fluid-milk producer, upon his own option, to deliver his allocation of the market's requirements (plus necessary reserve) and to receive a price for such deliveries closely related to the class I price.

Under present methods of pooling returns among farmers, each dairy farmer receives an average or blend price for all his milk deliveries with no distinction made between the part representing fluid-milk sales at the class I price and the part representing surplus milk at the manufacturing milk price. Under this system the actions of any dairy farmer to balance his production with market requirements for class I fluid milk are thwarted by the fact that his production is only a very minor part of the total market purchases and the loss of his production in total would not affect the market statistics.

This bill would not increase consumer prices for milk. It would encourage reduction of the national milk surplus, and thus serve to reduce the cost of supporting prices paid dairy farmers. Of greatest significance, however, the provisions of this bill would permit a dairy farmer to sell fluid milk at a price closely related to the class I price without forcing him to take an average price because other dairy farmers increased production or continued to market surplus milk.

Base plans which have been used under Federal orders are intended only to effect a leveling of production on a seasonal basis over a single year period. Such bases are established on production history alone, usually for a short period (few months), and are not related to market requirements. To the extent that the total of such bases exceeds market requirements, as is often the case, base prices paid become average prices and are subject to the same objections as market blend prices. This bill is intended to relate the total of bases to the market's requirements—production leveling would be a resultant byproduct, not the primary objective.

The dairymen's class I base plan provides opportunity for a new method for distributing the money in the producer pool as defined in a particular order to the producers eligible to receive payment from that pool under the terms of that order. The amount of money in the producer pool of any order is determined by the specific terms of that order as to class prices, pool plant qualification, producer definition, and use allocation—not by producer base rules.

Any base established entitles the holder of such base to a pro rata share of class I sales upon which he can rely and to which he can adjust his individual production. Such base becomes an approximate limit upon the amount of milk for which the producer can expect to receive a price above the surplus price. It is, however, a limit upon that portion of his production on which he may receive the higher price—it is not a limit upon his total production. The effect upon production of such a program would be to eliminate the incentive which blend pricing affords by offering the blend or average price for additional milk which has only a surplus value. The blend price exerts a direct effect upon the supply of milk. This is the price the producer receives for any and all deliveries. This plan is designed to change such an effect. It is intended to reflect to producers the class prices which the market returns as the value for the various uses of milk. The producer would then make production decisions based on two different prices—free of the effects of actions which other producers may take. It is designed to let supply and demand work, without the obscuring effects of blend pricing.

In some markets milk supplies in relation to fluid milk requirements are in better balance than in other markets. This bill makes the adoption of the base plan permissive on an individual market order basis. Adoption of a base plan may necessitate a review of the interpretation of the pricing standards under the act, and place a different emphasis upon other terms of the act.

1. What are the objectives of this plan?

The principal objectives are to (1) eliminate the basic defect of blend pricing which returns to milk producers a price higher than the manufacturing milk price for deliveries in excess of the requirements for fluid milk products, (2) permit individual producers to produce in line with market requirements for fluid milk products without having their prices reduced by present surplus or increased production of other producers, (3) provide individual producers an opportunity to increase net income, and (4) reduce the national dairy surplus and the cost to taxpayers of the dairy support price program.

2. Is this plan production control?

No. It does not limit any producer to any maximum quantity of milk he is allowed to produce or sell. It does not place any physical limitations on the number of cows he may keep. It does not limit in any way any factor of production or sale of milk. It allows producers in a given market, at their own option, to receive a price for base milk related to the class I price, and a lower price related to manufacturing milk value for any milk in excess of base sold, instead of a single blended price for all milk.

3. How can this plan be expected to reduce the dairy surplus?

Reduction of the national dairy surplus is one of the principal objectives of the dairymen's class I base plan. The plan can be expected to accomplish this in a number of ways:

(a) By reducing the incentive to produce surplus milk under the Federal order program. Approximately half of the milk produced in the country is marketed under Federal milk orders. Under some of these orders there is now a high degree of surplus. Under others there is only a moderate amount. Under still others there is no surplus. The base plan would allow each market to establish surplus reducing incentive in line with the degree of surplus existing in each respective market—be it a lot or a little. Several Federal order markets now have a surplus of 10–25 percent or more and have blended prices of $4 per hundredweight or more and a surplus class price of approximately $3. The base plan would discourage production of surplus by reducing the price paid for surplus production from $4 or more per hundredweight to about $3.

(b) By relieving producers of the pressure they are now under to continually produce more milk, hence, more surplus, as the only available means of maintaining the size of their milk checks to keep up with increasing production costs. The single blend price system we have now penalizes a producer who might try to keep production in line with his share of the class I market. The penalty is in the form of a lower blended price caused by the increased surplus production of other producers. His only recourse is to engage in a surplus production race with his neighbor. The base plan, by treating each producer as an individual relative to his production and his market, frees each producer from this penalty and the incentive to produce unneeded surplus milk. The result should be a reduction in surplus.

(c) By using the order to build into the market price structure incentives to adjust supply in line with class I demand. This is done by a number of interrelated factors, all of which aim in the general direction of supply-demand balance. Such incentives should operate toward a reduction of the Nation's dairy surplus.

4. What effect will base plans have on the cost of the national dairy support program?

Since the dairymen's class I base plan provides voluntary incentives to reduce production, it should reduce the surplus and in this way should reduce the cost of the support program. Such plan should result in reduced expenditures by the Congress.

5. What will this plan cost to administer?

The Federal order administrator's offices are set up and functioning. Many of them are already administering seasonal base plans. Administration of Federal milk orders has been competent and efficient since its inception. It is supported by the industry at no cost to the taxpayer as will be this program.

6. How does this plan avoid being a trade barrier?

First we must clarify the term "trade barrier." On the production side of the dairy industry the class I price for milk in any given milk market is never high enough to permit dairy farmers in every other part of the country to compete. This is because milk's natural characteristics result in high cost of transportation, thereby giving a natural advantage to dairy farmers nearby a given market. This is why class I prices decrease with distance from the market center and why class I prices vary among markets.

Reflection of natural characteristics of production and marketing through geographic variations in milk prices does not constitute a trade barrier. The dairymen's class I base plan is not a trade barrier. Only if a base plan in a particular order contained features which kept out milk from other supply areas to preserve an artificially high class I price or an artificially low surplus price would it be a trade barrier within the meaning of section 8c(5)(G) of the act, and such an effect is not intended.

7. Does the plan require any changes in language or interpretation of class I pricing standards of the act (sec. 8c18)?

Language—no; interpretation—yes. The pricing standards are as follows:

"The prices which it is declared to be the policy of Congress to establish * * * shall reflect the price of feeds, the available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk or its products in the marketing area to which the contemplated marketing agreement, order, or amendment relates, insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk, and be in the public interest (and) thereafter, as the Secretary finds necessary on account of changed circumstances, he shall, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, make adjustments in such prices."

The dairymen's class I base plan is designed to improve the application of supply-demand pricing now provided in the act. The phrase "other economic conditions" in the present standard makes it sufficiently broad to be properly applied to the base plan without change in language.

Certain changes in interpretation of the present standard from its past application to single blend pricing would be necessary. For example, the pricing standard has been interpreted to require automatic supply-demand adjusters in class I pricing formulas. The base plans provide incentives and opportunities to individual dairy farmers which are designed to improve upon this application of supply-demand pricing. For this reason, if a base plan is introduced, the necessity of retaining the supply-demand factor in the orders present class I price formula needs to be reevaluated.

With the task of obtaining a supply-demand balance in the order given over to some extent to the base plan, the general level of the class I price can reflect other objectives such as an equitable income goal for producers, changes in production costs, and costs of available alternative supplies of milk from other supply areas all of which may properly be considered encompassed in the phrase in the present pricing standard, "* * * other economic conditions * * *."

The various incentives among producers set in motion by a base plan particularly with respect to the market's milk supply, necessitate reinterpretation of the class I pricing standards of the act because supply-demand forces under the order will be influenced in a different manner than under present operations. For this reason they must be taken into account in a proper determination of what the class I price should be in conjunction with a base plan.

8. Does the plan require any changes in pricing milk used for manufacturing under Federal orders?

No. Under the plan milk marketed in excess of fluid milk requirements will be priced on the same basis as under the current orders. The lowest use class price must be at a level at which milk will be accepted for processing, and in line with nationwide values of manufactured dairy products. This class price in Federal orders now reflects national competitive forces affecting the supply of milk of dairy farmers delivered to manufacturing plants not regulated by Federal orders and the consumer demand for dairy products (butter, cheese, ice cream, evaporated milk, etc.) including the level of the price-support program. To the extent that the base plan becomes an inducement to producers to market less excess milk, thereby reducing the national dairy surplus, there might be some impact on prices in the manufacturing milk market. This in turn automatically would be reflected in the surplus class price under orders. This effect would be indirect. No amendments to surplus class price formulas should be required as a result of the base plan.

9. What effect would this plan have on the dairy price-support level?

In orders where the plan is adopted bases will be related to market requirements for fluid milk products, and the undesirable effects of blend pricing eliminated. The result should be a closer alinement of market supplies with market requirements. The plan does not provide for positive reduction in total supplies; but with closer adjustment to market requirements on a market-by-market basis, the pressure to reduce support prices will be relieved.

10. How would bases be applied?

There are a number of details involved in applying the necessary individual producer bases required by the plan.

There are a number of different ways that bases could be applied. One way would be to establish for each producer under an order a base expressed in pounds per day or per pooling period. These bases would be predicated upon deliveries during a prior representative period, adjusted to reflect the total fluid milk utilization of milk allocated to producers, plus a reasonable necessary reserve. These bases then could be projected 1 year in advance from a specified beginning date, which would be the first day of a given month. Then each month the Market Administrator would compute, as separate totals, all base milk and all milk in excess of base delivered to handlers by all producers under the order. He would first assign milk used in the lowest class to excess milk, and compute a blend price for base milk consisting of the weighted average class use value of the remaining milk in the pool. Each producer would be entitled to this base price for his base milk, and the lower class price for any excess.

Another way would be to have the plan optional in the sense that producers under

a given order who so wished could apply for bases for their share of class I only, without other producers being required to have bases. Those who applied would have the market's class I milk assigned to their base first, and milk in the lowest price class assigned to their excess first. They would then be entitled to the class I price for base milk and only the lowest class price for their excess. For producers who did not apply for bases a single blended price would be computed from the remaining class uses of milk remaining unassigned to base or excess.

For orders where the plan is applied by requiring all producers to have a base, the bill allows for the inclusion within base of a reserve above actual sales of fluid milk products to cover the day-to-day and weekend variations in sales. This is expressed as a percentage above monthly average of sales. The percentage of reserve considered necessary is variously estimated among markets at between 10 and 25 percent of actual sales in the month of lowest production seasonally. The reserve milk is actually used for manufacturing in the lowest price for lack of a market in a higher priced class. The price for base milk where reserves are thus included in base will reflect some milk at the manufacturing price class ranging from the defined percentage of reserve in the shortest production month to higher proportions in the flush season to the extent of the seasonal range in the particular market.

The pooling procedure must also allow for the eventuality of all producers together delivering less base milk than the volume of class I sales, but with some individual producers delivering some excess.

11. What is the base period?

The representative period for determining bases should be a period preceding the date that the plan, ending as close to the start of the plan as possible. It may include all or portions of more than 1 year. Each market need not have the same base period years nor the same length of period. Factors which should guide the Secretary in his selection of the period for a given market should include local customs regarding any current base plan, desires of producers affected, past trends in market supply, abnormal conditions, shifts in supply sources, availability of data, etc. The computations necessarily require time which can be provided only by some lag between the base period and the time of application of bases.

12. How are bases determined and changed?

The bill provides for making due allowance for abnormal conditions and hardship cases.

These terms are meant to apply to the base period. If a producer's total deliveries in the base period were low due to an abnormal condition, he might be entitled to an adjustment in his base to offset the effect of the abnormal condition.

The allocation concept also includes the opportunity to adjust all bases periodically in line with changes in sales of the products on which the initial base allocations were made.

Another way that a given plan might allow all bases to be changed periodically (such as annually) would be the use of a 2-, 3-, 4-, or 5-year moving or rolling average base according to deliveries or a new base every year in the case of a 1-year base plan. In this way a producer's increase, or decrease, in deliveries each year would have an effect on his next year's base to the extent of 100 percent, 50 percent, 33⅓ percent, 25 percent, or 20 percent of the change depending on whether the base period is 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 years long. If this type of automatic adjustment were allowed, it would also be necessary to refigure every year the percentage of total market deliveries to normal supply requirements and apply this percentage to prevent automatic base adjustment from getting the sum total of the market's bases out of line with normal supply requirements.

Another way that an individual producer could change the size of his base would be to obtain part or all of the base of another producer. (See more detailed explanation of this under "To what extent would bases be transferred.")

In summary the bill would provide for bases to be changed in a number of ways depending on the circumstances of individual producers and market conditions, with considerable flexibility allowed on each market to provide for changes to best meet its needs.

13. How does a new producer obtain a base?

The bill specifies that the sales allocation (base) must make "due allowance" for "new producers including new producers thereafter entering a market." This means that the plan must provide some means for new producers to obtain a base. This is one of the safeguards provided which would prevent any base plan under this bill from becoming a trade barrier. The particular procedure or basis for granting bases to new producers would depend on the particular local market situation, as developed in the required hearing. A number of different methods of accommodating new producers could be used, and should be allowed consideration, such as:

1. A small percentage of the total market's base to be set aside out of which new producers could be granted bases according to some prescribed performance rules.

2. A new producer to be allowed average market value (or some specified percentage thereof) for a period equal to the base period, after which he is given a base according to his deliveries.

3. New producers allowed to earn a base according to deliveries but required to take the excess price while earning a base.

4. New producers allowed to obtain bases from other producers.

14. To what extent would bases be transferable among producers?

The bill specifies no particular degree of transferability. All past experience with any type of base plan, for whatever purpose, and whether privately operated or under Government auspices, indicates a need for some degree of transferability. The tighter the base in terms of limitation of opportunity for adjustments, the greater the need for freedom of transferability and vice versa.

This is for the purpose of preventing a tight base plan from freezing producers to their production at some point in time in such a way that they are hampered from making future shifts in resource allocation to improve efficiency.

There is a need for limiting transfer of base to milk producers to avoid the abuse of their being acquired and hoarded for coercive purposes by anybody, particularly persons who are not milk producers.

On this detail of a base plan, as in any other described above, there is need for flexibility among orders.

15. To what extent would bases be transferable among markets?

Base allocations are claims upon the class I returns from a market to the producer milk delivered in that market. Ownership of a base on a particular market is of on value unless the holder delivers milk to that market. Individual producer bases are determined by deliveries of such producer during a predetermined representative period. The terms of each of the individual orders could recognize deliveries of producers transferring between markets.

16. In what way would a base plan affect intermarket movements of milk?

Base plans are not intended to encourage either more or less intermarket movements of milk. Intermarket class prices relationships, rules for pool participation and type of pool are the features of orders, along with the natural characteristics of milk production and marketing, which determine intermarket movements of milk. Since base plans are to be applied only to the producer milk under an order, any inshipments of other milk would not be affected by the base plan. Shifts of producers from one market to another would be affected by whatever rules the base plan provided for allowing new producers in a given order to obtain base, as explained in the answer to the question concerning transferability of bases.

17. Does the plan provide any maximum or minimum on individual bases?

No. The average size of producers varies among Federal order markets from less than 500 pounds of milk per day in some areas of highly diversified farming to more than 13,000 pounds per day in other markets where dairying is characterized by a few large feedlot type of milking herds. Because of these wide variations in production conditions, any base ceiling to be prescribed by the law would have to be so high as to be meaningless or else it would work a hardship and discriminate against the normal pattern of family farms in some areas. If any performance standard with respect to base sizes is needed, it could be considered in the hearing for a base plan for a given market.

18. What effect would this plan have on other farm crops or livestock products?

The effect of this plan on other farm crops or livestock products would be limited to the release of production resources from dairying to the extent that dairymen adjusted production to meet market requirements.

19. How will this plan affect producer-handlers?

To the extent that acquisition of base becomes another requisite in expansion of operations as a producer, producers could turn to the exempt status of producer-handlers to facilitate expansion. This may become one more reason for eliminating producer-handler exemptions or, at least, limiting the size of producer-handlers' operations to which exemptions may apply.

20. What would be the effect of this plan on producers of manufacturing grade milk?

The plan's purpose is to eliminate the payment of any part of the money derived from class I sales for surplus milk delivered by order producers in excess of market requirements. In effect, it says to manufacturing milk producers, "You may still have to compete with producers under Federal orders, but you have the assurance that those producers will be receiving the manufacturing price for their surplus milk."

21. What effect can the plan be expected to have on negotiated marketwide premiums?

If the surplus in a market is reduced the incentive for premium prices may be lessened.

22. Can the plan work satisfactorily in one market without being in effect in all other markets?

Yes, but producers who adopt this program and reduce production to meet market requirements may require some assurance, by way of order provisions, that the results of their efforts will not be undermined or eroded by contrary actions of other handlers or groups of producers outside the program.

23. What advantage does this plan have over national dairy supply management proposals involving allotments, bases or quotas?

Base plans as features of Federal orders would have the advantage of being tailored much more closely to local market conditions and customs. Great variation exists among markets in the degree of surplus, all the way from some which have no surplus above normal reserve requirements to some with as much as 40 percent of such surplus. It would be most difficult if not impossible to fit any single national adjustment program to the varying conditions which exist among markets. The base plan has the further advantage of being introduced on a market-by-market basis with much better chance of approval by local referendum.

24. What would be the effect of this plan on fluid markets which are not regulated under Federal or State controls?

1. The rules for the movement of milk from plants in unregulated areas are established under other order provisions, allocation, pool plant qualification, etc. The base plan would place no added burden on such movement.

2. For producers in currently unregulated markets who wished to become producers in an order market having a base plan, the acquisition of a base by purchase or performance would be a requisite.

3. All markets, regulated or not, feel the effects of national surpluses. To the extent that the plan removes some of the pressure for increased production, all markets will benefit.

The dairy surplus problem is still with us and it appears that dairy legislation will receive considerable attention during this session of Congress. I'm sure you are all aware that the cost of dairy price support through purchase of surplus dairy products has almost doubled the past 2 years. Program expenditures are running over $500 million and there is little prospect of these costs declining unless some action is taken to reduce milk supplies. This is a situation which demands attention and the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture has indicated dairy legislation will be the subject of early hearings.

I realize it will not be easy to develop new dairy legislation which will meet the immediate problems of reducing surpluses and at the same time be acceptable to all of the diverse interests of the dairy industry. Dairying is one of the most extensive commodity interests in U.S. agriculture and in many ways one of the most complex. There are major differences in the way manufactured dairy products and fluid milk are marketed and on the fluid milk side there is a separate market for almost every major city or metropolitan center. Each of these fluid-milk markets has its own supply-demand and pricing characteristics. Yet at the same time, what happens in each of these markets affects our national surplus situation and in turn, every other market. The challenge is to find an approach which will alleviate our national surplus problems and at the same time meet the needs of the various individual markets.

A year ago the administration proposed a national allotment program to reduce dairy surpluses and improve dairy farm income. This proposal received little support from the dairy industry and was rejected by Congress. Hearings were held on this proposal in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, giving dairy organizations opportunity to suggest alternative programs for meeting the surplus problem. But at that time few constructive suggestions were made.

I am pleased to note that the situation appears to be changing somewhat. A number of dairy organizations have indicated they will propose program changes this year. I expect there will be differences of opinion between these organizations on the approach to be taken. But the willingness of these groups to make constructive proposals at least indicates an awareness that something must be done to reduce the surpluses that jeopardize the continued existence of the dairy price support program.

What are the principles of a sound dairy program?

1. The program should contribute to a reduction of excessive supplies of dairy products which threaten the entire dairy industry—including fluid markets, and create huge price support costs.

2. The program should protect the income of dairy farmers.

3. The program should not increase consumers milk prices.

4. The program should not involve direct Government controls over individual producers' cow numbers or output of dairy products.

5. The program should reduce Federal expenditures for dairy price-support programs.

6. The program should allow flexibility, expansion of production by efficient producers, and not constitute barriers to trade or prohibit entry of new producers.

The present dairy program clearly does not meet the first and fifth principles. The present Federal order program was not designed as an income protection program. When, however, it was combined with a price-support program for manufactured products it becomes almost impossible for all concerned. First, the payments of a blend price in excess of the value of the surplus milk results in a built-in expansion in the fluid markets, encouraging them to produce milk which goes into manufacturing uses. Thus, surplus milk from the Federal order markets floods the manufacturing markets and eventually results in substantial surplus accumulation under the support program. Moreover, the present Federal order program requires that a producer maintain his relative market share in order to maintain his absolute fluid milk base. This provides another incentive to increase output.

I have agreed to sponsor the class I base plan for Federal milk marketing orders developed by the National Milk Producers Federation. I believe this approach of seeking to reduce the incentive to produce surplus milk in fluid milk markets is a step in the right direction. Some Federal order markets have twice as much surplus as can be justified for meeting their fluid milk requirements. These surpluses not only depress prices in their immediate markets, but add to the surpluses acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

But I don't believe bases in Federal orders alone will be adequate to solve the problem. Producers in Federal order markets are not going to reduce the marketings enough under this type of base plan to cut CCC purchases of butter in half. At best we might expect this plan to curtail expansion on the part of the producers under Federal orders who produce only 50 percent of our total milk production. Some way must be found to reduce total milk supplies at least 3 or 4 percent if we are to avoid adding to the almost 400 million pounds of butter already in CCC inventory.

The dairy industry must be realistic in facing its responsibilities if dairy price supports are to be continued. Other commodity groups have had to adjust their marketings downward as a condition of price support as surpluses warranted and program expenditures increased. An increasingly urban Congress will not continue to sanction large budget expenditures to support an industry which does not assume this responsibility. Nor will other farm groups who have adjusted, assist in maintaining dairy price supports if dairy producers are not willing to assume a like degree of restraint.

The President has proposed in his agricultural message that the possibilities of a voluntary dairy adjustment program be explored. In view of the satisfactory experience with this voluntary program on feed grains this approach would appear to have some promise. I am hopeful that the dairy producer organizations will give this suggestion constructive thought and that it will be possible to find an acceptable way of reducing our surplus of dairy products.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 104(b)(3) OF TITLE 23, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, at the request of the Under Secretary of Commerce, a bill to amend section 104(b)(3) of title 23, United States Code, relating to the apportionment of funds for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas.

In this connection, I request that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate by the Under Secretary of Commerce be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 959) to amend section 104(b)(3) of title 23, United States Code, relating to the apportionment of funds for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1963.

The Honorable PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department of Commerce has prepared and submits herewith as a part of its legislative program for the 88th Congress, 1st session, a draft of a proposed bill "To amend section 104(b)(3) of title 23, United States Code, relating to the apportionment of funds for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas."

Section 104(b)(3) of title 23, United States Code, provides for the apportionment among the States of funds authorized for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas in the following manner:

"In the ratio which the population in municipalities and other urban places, of five thousand or more, in each State bears to the total population in municipalities and other urban placcs of five thousand or more in all the States as shown by the latest available Federal census. For the purpose of this paragraph, Connecticut and Vermont towns shall be considered municipalities regardless of their incorporated status."

The foregoing provision of law was originally enacted as section 4(c) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838). At the time of its enactment it was understood that its purpose was to place Connecticut and Vermont on an equal basis with other States in the apportionment of urban funds. The term "town" in the New England States usually refers to a political subdivision of a State which may contain incorporated or unincorporated places which are urban in character. As used by the Bureau of the Census for the 1940 Federal census, "urban population" did not include population of unincorporated areas unless those areas met certain population-density standards. At the time of the 1944 Act it was indicated that much of the population of these towns was urban in fact although population density standards adopted by Census had not been met. However, the Bureau of the Census has since revised the definition of "urban population" to include as nearly as possible the population of all places which have urban characteristics regardless of their incorporated or unincorporated status.

Under 23 U.S.C. section 104(b)(3) as presently worded, the population of each town in Connecticut and Vermont with 5,000 or more inhabitants is included in the population data used as the basis for apportioning Federal-aid urban highway funds and, in addition, is included as appropriate in the rural population data upon which apportionment of Federal-aid secondary funds is based.

The report by the Comptroller General to the Congress of the United States dated August 15, 1962, entitled "Review of Apportionments of Federal-aid Highway Funds, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce for Fiscal Years 1956–63" pointed out that:

"In the apportionment of Federal-aid urban highway funds for the fiscal year 1963, the duplication in the population counts resulted in Connecticut's receiving about $810,000 more and Vermont about $73,000 more than would have been received if the population had been considered in these two States in the same manner as in all other States. These amounts represent 18.2 and 22.6 percent, respectively, of the Federal-aid urban highway funds apportioned to the two States for fiscal year 1963."

The report included the following recommendation to the Congress:

"In view of the changed Bureau of the Census definition of urban population, which appears to place the States of Connecticut and Vermont on an equal basis with all other States, we recommend that the Congress consider amending section 104(b)(3) of title 23, United States Code, to eliminate or otherwise modify the special provision applicable to these two States in the apportionment of Federal-aid urban highway funds. The Bureau of Public Roads agrees that this matter should be brought to the attention of the Congress."

Under these circumstances and particularly in view of the fact that distinctions once used by the Bureau of the Census and originally forming the basis for this provision have been revised as described, it is recommended that the last sentence of provision quoted above be deleted. The enclosed draft bill would carry out this recommendation, and its enactment would remove the preference to Connecticut and Vermont towns thus affording a more equitable basis for the apportionment of Federal-aid urban funds.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there would be no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD GUDEMAN,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

S. 959

A bill to amend section 104(b)(3) of title 33, United States Code, relating to the apportionment of funds for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary asytems within urban areas

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (3) of section 104(b) of title 23, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) For extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas:

"In the ratio which the population in municipalities and other urban places of five thousand or more in each State bears to the total population in municipalities and other urban places of five thousand or more in all the States as shown by the latest available Federal census."

PRESENTATION OF AIR FORCE MEDAL TO MAJ. GEN. BENJAMIN D. FOULOIS, RETIRED

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, today, on behalf of a number of cosponsors and myself, I am introducing a joint resolution to authorize the presentation of an Air Force medal of recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired.

The beginning of General Foulois' extraordinary and distinguished aviation career was literally one and the same with that of U.S. military aviation. Enlisting in the Army in 1898, he was an 18-year-old private in the Spanish-American War, was later commissioned, and then transferred to the aviation section of the Army Signal Corps in 1908, where he obtained the distinction of being placed in charge of the first airplane owned and used by the Army.

The general's earliest flying training consisted of 54 minutes of impromptu instruction from Wilbur Wright in 1909, followed by a solo flight at Fort Sam Houston in 1910, when he recalls logging four "firsts":

> It was my first solo flight, takeoff, landing, and crackup.

The accident knocked the airplane's tail off, but he was flying again a week later, this time accompanying his efforts with what could be called a correspondence course from the Wrights.

While mastering flying techniques, then Lieutenant Foulois designed more that 20 mechanical improvements, all of which were built into later Army aircraft. One of his most important inventions was the seatbelt.

As Captain Foulois, he commanded the first Aero Squadron during the Punitive Expedition into Mexico in 1915, then served as Chief of the Air Services of the American Expeditionary Forces in France during World War I, and climaxed his military career as Chief of the Army Air Corps, retiring December 1935.

It is not strange that General Foulois was the man the Army chose to take charge of its budding Air Corps. While taking a Signal Corps course in 1907, he wrote what was the first military article about airplanes, a thesis on the "Tactical and Strategic Value of Aerodynamic Flying Machines". His sources were Jules Verne, the Bible, and Army Field Service Regulations.

The general's dedication to aviation has not lessened during his years of retirement, and today at a young 84 years, his hobby is telling high school groups throughout the country about the earliest days of the Air Force.

I ask that this joint resolution lay on the table so that other Senators may join in this legislation to provide suitable recognition to an outstanding American who has dedicated so many years of his life toward furthering the development of military aviation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Arizona.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 51) to authorize the presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Major General Benjamin D. Foulois, retired, introduced by Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

LET FREEDOM REALLY RING

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on July 4, 1776, the Liberty Bell, tolling in Philadelphia, proclaimed the independence of the Thirteen Colonies from British rule. That infant Nation endured; indeed, in 187 years, it has become the leader in man's good fight against tyranny and oppression.

In earlier days, the anniversary of our birth of freedom was actively observed by young and old. While our Nation was growing, while her people were new immigrants, they had fresh memories of tyranny. They were intensely aware that they had something to celebrate on the Fourth of July. It was an occasion to remember and observe.

Lately, unfortunately, this same spirit seems lacking. True, a national holiday is proclaimed; true, speeches are made; but the Fourth of July is not the same.

That is why the idea advanced by two citizens of Connecticut—Eric Hatch of Warren and Eric Sloane of Litchfield—appealed to me so much. They have suggested that on July 4 each year, all church bells, all bells in Government buildings, and all carillon bells in colleges and universities ring for 4 minutes in every part of the land. Radio stations would also broadcast the sound of bells for 2 minutes, followed by a reading from the Declaration of Independence.

The bells would ring at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, eastern daylight time, to remind all citizens that this was the precise moment when the liberty bell tolled in Philadelphia 187 years ago, proclaiming to all who heard it that a new nation had been born. Would it not be invigorating for democracy now if, for 4 minutes on our great national holiday each year, the attention of every American was directed to that moment of our country's birth? As they are reminded by a great chorus of bells of the principles of freedom on which the Nation was founded, perhaps they will rededicate themselves to preserving those principles—not only here at home, but also throughout the world.

To encourage this, Mr. President, I today submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution calling for the ringing of bells throughout the United States each year on the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be permitted to lie on the desk for 10 days so that any of my colleagues who wish to do so may join as cosponsors. I also ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks, together with an article from This Week magazine for February 17, 1963, entitled "Make Freedom Really Ring." The editors of This Week are to be congratulated for their interest in this proposal.

We all owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Hatch and Mr. Sloane; they have reminded us of a duty shirked and given us the opportunity to do something constructive about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested, and the resolution and article will be printed in the Record.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas the tolling of the Liberty Bell at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., at 2 o'clock in the afternoon of the 4th day of July, 1776, proclaimed the signing of the Declaration of Independence; and

Whereas the adoption of this historic document marked the birth of our country as a free and independent nation; and

Whereas it is fitting that the anniversary of this great event should be appropriately observed in each year at the same moment throughout the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby (1) declares that the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence should be observed each year by the ringing of bells throughout the United States at the hour of 2 o'clock, eastern daylight time, in the afternoon of the 4th day of July, and (2) calls upon civic and other community leaders to take appropriate steps to encourage public participation in such observance.

The article presented by Mr. Ribicoff is as follows:

Make Freedom Really Ring

This is the story of two This Week readers and an idea which we believe can sweep the country, stir a new wave of patriotic feeling and turn this Fourth of July into the most inspiring celebration in our Nation's history. We are sure all This Week readers will be interested in it. Here is the idea:

On July 4, 1963, and each year thereafter, all church bells, all bells in Government buildings, and all carillon bells in colleges and universities will ring for 4 minutes in every part of the country. Every radio station will broadcast the sound of bells for 2 minutes, followed by a reading from the Declaration of Independence.

The idea's proponents are a pair of Connecticut Yankees with a lifelong interest in the American heritage—Eric Hatch, a distinguished writer, many of whose stories have appeared in This Week, and Eric Sloane, a meteorologist, artist and writer who is an expert on early American barns, covered bridges and tools.

HEARTBEAT OF THE NATION

Since it is fitting that the Nation's birthday be celebrated where it began, Hatch and Sloane suggest that a special ceremony be televised from Philadelphia, in front of the Liberty Bell in Independence Hall, and that across the Nation the bells ring out at this same moment.

As the great chorus of bells swells across the land, it will be heard by families at home, on the lakeshore, in the mountains, wherever Americans gather on the Fourth. The sound will come as a thrilling reminder of what the Fourth of July stands for, challenging each of us to remember the heroic resolve formed by the men who pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor 187 years ago.

July of 1776 saw the Declaration of Independence, democracy's greatest manifesto, approved by the Continental Congress. Delegate John Adams went to his Philadelphia boardinghouse and penned a letter to his wife Abigail, in Massachusetts:

"I am apt to believe," he wrote of the great event in which he had taken part, "that it will be celebrated by succeeding generations as the great anniversary festival. It ought to be commemorated as the day of deliverance by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty. It ought to be solemnized with pomp and parade, with shows, games, sports, guns, bells, bonfires, and illuminations from one end of this continent to the other, from this time forward forevermore."

Perhaps a little of the noble grandeur that John Adams felt has been dulled in our hearts by the passage of time. The Fourth of July has evolved into more of a summer holiday than a patriotic festival and games and sports have taken over perhaps a little too much of the stage. The "illuminations," or fireworks, were a dominant Fourth of July sound for decades, but have largely disappeared. The bells, which John Adams also mentions, Sloane and Hatch now propose reviving as a uniting feature of the whole day—much like the national observance of two minutes of silence at 11 a.m. on Veterans Day.

SPIRIT OF THE FIRST FOURTH

Adams wrote of an independent celebration "from one end of this continent to the other," at a time when the newborn Republic scarcely penetrated beyond the Appalachian Mountains, when the whole West was a wilderness whose title was in the hands of Britain and Spain. Alaska belonged to Russia, and Hawaii had not even been discovered. Today, the grandeur of the Independence Day he envisioned should certainly be remembered.

What can you do to help bring about a truly reverent and patriotic Fourth?

Writers Sloane and Hatch appointed themselves a committee. They obtained the endorsement of Gov. John N. Dempsey and Senator Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut. Here's how you can get the project started in your community:

1. Write to or call on your State and city officials. Show them this article—ask them to sponsor the observance. Then organize a committee of volunteers who share your enthusiasm, and go out after community support. Contact groups that would be especially interested.

2. Make a survey of the bells in your town—the church bell, the bell on the county courthouse, the college chapel bell, the firehouse bell—how many more are there? Find out who rings them and who gives the order to ring them and sign them up for July 4. Does your community have an ordinance against bellringing? It can surely be waived for a special observance like this one, but be sure your town officials have handled the necessary technicalities well in advance of Independence Day.

3. Write letters—and get friends to write—to your local newspapers, radio and TV stations. Ask editors to give their support on the editorial pages. Give them all the information they need, both to take part in a national ceremony and to publicize the program in advance.

LET US HEAR YOUR IDEAS

If you need assistance in organizing your committee, Mr. Sloane and Mr. Hatch are anxious to help. Write "Let Freedom Ring," Box 4140, Grand Central Station, New York 17, N.Y. We'll share your questions and ideas in future progress reports.

In the pealing of the bells across the land, we will have, every year, on our Nation's birthday, a fitting reminder of the exalted words and heroic decision that founded America.

INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution for which I request immediate consideration. This has been cleared with the acting minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 98) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the investigative authorizations provided by S. Res. 250 of the Eighty-seventh Congress are hereby continued through March 31, 1963, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been happy to call up the resolution at this time, at the request of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, although I should like to state that, to the best of my knowledge, insofar as this committee and other committees are concerned, even though the expiration date is today, these committees and other committees would be allowed to continue their work, and action taken subsequently on this matter would be retroactive. However, I am glad to have this action taken today, because of the importance of the investigative work of the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana. Of course, we have been proceeding in the expectation that the committee would be adequately and fully organized, although—because of delays for which the majority leader certainly is not responsible—we have not been able to do so. Therefore, I appreciate his courtesy in submitting the resolution today, so that the committee's work may proceed without interruption.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, for whom all of us have an extremely high regard. I am just as happy as he is that this matter has been attended to, so there will be no question as to the continuing authority of the committee.

NAVAJO ROADS IN UTAH—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which would authorize the construction of an important and much needed road, and bridge, from Bluff, Utah, to Mexican Water, Ariz., traversing approximately 30 miles within the Navajo Indian Reservation. The amendment is being submitted by me, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss]. The amendment is offered to S. 95, which authorizes construction of certain high-

ways on the Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations in the Four Corners area, which I have the privilege of cosponsoring with Senator Goldwater. S. 95 amends the act of April 19, 1950, relating to the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Tribes of Indians.

As introduced, S. 95 adds an additional 709 miles of principally north-south roads on the two reservations in Utah, Arizona, New Mexico and Colorado, broken down as follows: Arizona, 459 miles; New Mexico, 200 miles; Utah, 39 miles; and Colorado, 11 miles. Routes 1 and 3 in the area have gone a long way toward providing the Four Corners area with east-west routes, but we need adequate highways to allow north-south travel.

The 30-mile stretch of highway proposed in my amendment would connect Utah State Highway 47 just west of Bluff, Utah, with Navajo Route 1 at Mexican Water, Ariz., thus completing one of the major north-south highways of the Southwest, directly crossing the Navajo Reservation. It also provides for construction of a bridge and approaches to span the San Juan River near Bluff, Utah.

The area south of Bluff is a seriously neglected area on the Navajo Reservation. It has the barrier of the San Juan River on the north for a distance east and west of approximately 60 miles to a bridge crossing. Many additional miles must be traveled over sand trails to get in and out of the area. There are many Navajo families in this isolated spot trying to eke out an existence. Giving these Utah Navajos highway access to schools and possible work opportunities, as well as medical and welfare assistance, is in perfect accord with the original intent of the act of April 19, 1950. It will also aid in fulfilling Utah's legal obligation to educate the Navajos of the Utah area south of the San Juan River.

Utah's attorney general has ruled that San Juan County must provide equal opportunities for schooling to the Navajo people residing in the county. He has also ruled that they must administer the welfare program equally to these people, who have a great need for the program. San Juan County has taken this responsibility seriously. It is fulfilling this obligation very well throughout the county, with the exception of the Navajo people in the area described above. The road proposed in my amendment would do more than anything else to facilitate the carrying out of this program.

Until 1960 the Bluff Elementary School did not have a single Indian student. Then a Navajo girl, who had attended Government schools, enrolled, and the word got around that the Navajo children were welcome there. Today half the enrollment of the school is Navajo, and it is estimated that the school's enrollment would triple if there were a means of getting all of the Indian children in the area into school. Mrs. Merial Goforth, a teacher at the Bluff Elementary School, describes her Navajo students as "bright, clean-cut youngsters, who want to learn and, in some instances, are setting the pace for the white children." These children, she points out, have the advantage of living at home while attending a public school. This way the family is kept intact while the children are integrated into our society. The community of Blanding has fully supported the integration of its Indian children into school and community affairs.

As one small, but touching and important, example of the need for the bridge and route south, I am advised that one of the Navajo families who lives on the mesa just across the river sends their son to the school at Bluff. Each day the father fords the San Juan with his son on horseback. During the extreme cold recently, they crossed on the ice. During the thaw that followed and breaking up of ice, he missed school. He will miss more school this spring during runoff, when the river is too deep. Looking to the immediate future, we want this young man in school, and all of his brothers and sisters and cousins, too. We want them to be educationally equipped to live in the world into which they are slowly moving. These Navajo young people cannot wait indefinitely for us to build bridges and highways. They are growing up right now.

With the increased emphasis that is being placed on scenic development in southeastern Utah, tourism is another factor that must be considered in connection with this important, north-south road link. As I have already pointed out, it would complete the most direct scenic highway from Utah through the Navajo Reservation to southern Arizona, west Texas, and Mexico, thus opening up new recreational horizons as well as new economic possibilities for the entire area. It would provide a major interconnecting highway between the existing national parks and monuments of southeastern Utah and northeastern Arizona, and would provide close access for the planned development at Canyonlands and possible future park development of Poncho House Ruins in Utah.

The tourist industry is becoming a vital factor in the economic rehabilitation programs being administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. With this important road link across their reservation, the Navajos could benefit greatly from the new emphasis on scenic development in southeastern Utah. Visitors en route to the parks and monuments would have the added advantage of seeing these colorful Indian lands.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senate will adopt my amendment to S. 95 to include in the bill this additional vitally needed road.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendments were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE REPORT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Economic Committee be granted an extension of time from March 1, 1963, to March 15, 1963, to file a report of its findings and recommendations with respect to the Economic Report of the President, as required by section 5(b) (3) of Public Law 304, 79th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, Senate bill 622, pertaining to personnel policies on the federally owned Alaska Railroad, was introduced on January 31 and was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. An identical bill, S. 2593, was introduced in the last Congress, was referred to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and hearings were held on that identical bill by that committee.

Under the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from further consideration of S. 6222 and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], be added to the sponsors of S. 2, the water resources research bill,

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Boggs], I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate bill 108, the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be included as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I would like at this time to ask unanimous consent to have my name added as a cosponsor of S. 424, for the relief of Mr. Venson Chu and his family, introduced by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], and I ask that my name appear on the bill on its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill, S. 580, the name of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] may be listed as a cosponsor of S. 650, to create the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, which 17 other Senators and I introduced on February 4; and I ask unanimous consent that his name may be added at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add the name of the senior Senator from Vermont, to the sponsors of the land and water conservation bill, S. 859, and that his name be included in the list on the bill at the next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when there is a second printing of S. 880, the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963, that the names of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] appear as cosponsors of the bill. The Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Michigan expressed the desire to be cosponsors at the time the bill was introduced but through an error their names were omitted on the original printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators Hartke and Jackson be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 900) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by me on February 22, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of February 4 and 14, 1963:

S. 666. A bill to further secure and protect the rights of citizens to vote in Federal elections: Mr. Allott, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Beall, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Miller, Mr. Morton, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Saltonstall, and Mr. Scott.

Authority of February 18, 1963:

S. 829. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through establishment of acreage allotments: Mr. Allott, Mr. Clark, Mr. Engle, Mr. Ervin, Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, Mr. Long of Missouri, and Mr. Mansfield.

Authority of February 19, 1963:

S. 855. A bill to provide for more effective utilization of certain Federal grants by encouraging better coordinated local review of State and local applications for such grants: Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Mundt, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

Authority of February 20, 1963:

S. 865. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Academy of Foreign Affairs, and for other purposes: Mr. Bayh, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Clark, Mr. Engle, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McGee, Mr. Moss, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Yarborough.

Authority of February 21, 1963:

S. 894. A bill to provide for Federal assistance on a combination grant and loan basis in order to improve patient care in public and other nonprofit hospitals and nursing homes through the modernization or replacement of those institutions which are structurally or functionally obsolete; and for other purposes: Mr. Pell.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 387, RELATING TO USE OF UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE METHODS OF PACKAGING OR LABELING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] is the chairman, as we all well know, of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] has designated me to preside over hearings to be held on S. 387, a bill introduced to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit restraints of trade carried into effect through the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, I wish to give notice of the schedule of the forthcoming hearings in connection with this bill. Hearings are scheduled for March 6 and 7; March 12 and 13; and March 19, 20, 21, and 22. Should there be a need to modify the schedule, prompt notice will be given.

Mr. President, it is the desire of the subcommittee to have testimony offered by all persons concerned and interested in S. 387. I would ask that any person who desires to testify notify my office.

The bill was introduced by me on January 21, in association with other Senators. At that time, through inadvertence, the name of the distinguished present occupant of the chair (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair) was omitted from the list of cosponsors. As Secretary of HEW, and earlier as Governor of Connecticut, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] has given leadership in efforts to insure consumer protection. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] may be added as a sponsor of S. 387.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 859

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I announce for the information of the Senate that hearings have been scheduled by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on S. 859, a bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, on March 7.

The hearing will begin at 10 a.m. in room 3110, New Senate Office Building. People wishing to testify should contact the committee.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ray H. Hemenway, of Minnesota, to be U.S. Marshal, district of Minnesota—recess appointment.

James A. Carr, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1968, vice Edward J. Donovan—term expired.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, March 7, 1963, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Address by Secretary of Commerce, Hon. Luther H. Hodges, at 61st annual convention of American Road Builders' Association, February 25, 1963, Chicago, Ill. Also, speech by himself at opening session of A.R.B.A. convention.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

Address by Representative Frank Thompson, Jr., of New Jersey, delivered at the University of Illinois on February 26, 1963, dealing with medical care for the aged.

EDITORIAL TRIBUTE TO SENATOR WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the other day an editorial in the Washington Post described one of the many good works of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams]. In this case, it concerned the Senator's personal efforts, with the help of a few others, to fix up a few hazard-ridden, dilapidated shacks near Mount Vernon, to postpone the imminent eviction of three destitute families who had no other place to go.

Let me say that this humble act of service is typical of the Senator from New Jersey, who is as modest as he is able. Pete Williams is not much for talk, but in his own quiet way he does a great deal to benefit the people of his State and the Nation. There is no more able and respected and capable Member of this body.

His act the other day dramatizes his deep interest in the welfare of all Americans, including the poor and inarticulate, who all too frequently are overlooked in this affluent society of ours. This simple act of human concern comes from a man who has worked with his heart as well as his head to do something to improve the lot of this country's migratory workers, to give our cities better transportation, and to preserve and extend the parks and open spaces in our communities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this highly deserved editorial tribute to Senator Williams be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 25, 1963]

Senator Williams' Example

Senator Harrison Williams' Good Samaritan venture in the downtrodden community of Gum Springs, near Mount Vernon, brought a hearty response from many different groups. The spectacle of a U.S. Senator laboring with a half-dozen coworkers to save three destitute families from eviction because of the fire hazards in their ramshackle homes proved to have an inspirational quality. It set in motion forces that may well carry far beyond the stopgap improvements which these volunteers were able to make on George Washington's birthday.

The Senator's example came at an opportune moment. Events of the last few weeks have demonstrated that thousands of Washingtonians are bursting with energy and grasping for straws of adventure. Many of them have taken to the trails and highways on foot in seemingly passionate gestures to test their fitness and to break away from the routine of their lives. How much more exciting and useful their ventures might be if they turned their footsteps and their energies to the slums instead of the trails.

Washington is at once afflicted with a curse of idleness and with mountains of work to be done to make its dark corners more habitable. Of course, volunteer crews could not replace insanitary hovels with the model low-cost housing that is so urgently needed, but they could render an immense service by cleaning up yards, removing fire hazards and rat nests, repairing and painting old homes, planting grass and flowers, lifting up spirits, and cultivating a new sense of cooperation and of community pride. This newspaper suggests, with all seriousness, that the armies of hikers who are taking to the trail divert at least part of their energies into the type of community service that Senator Williams has popularized at Gum Springs.

Organization of any large-scale efforts will be necessary, and this is where President Kennedy's proposed Domestic Service Corps comes into the picture. But cleanup squads and flower-planting task forces could be organized on a neighborhood basis, with experts and other volunteers drawn from all parts of the city. With a genuinely cooperative effort in the spirit of the Williams demonstration, the physical blight of this city could be amazingly transformed, with corresponding amelioration of its moral and psychological blight.

RESOLUTION OF NORTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE MAKING SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL AN HONORARY CITIZEN OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. Jordan] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record a resolution of the Legislature of North Carolina making Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of North Carolina. I also ask consent to have printed in the Record the accompanying document.

There being no objection, the resolution and the document were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To All Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:

I, Thad Eure, secretary of state of the State of North Carolina, do hereby certify the following and hereto attached (four sheets) to be a true copy of Resolution 11, general assembly of 1963, a joint resolution honoring the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill, K.G., the original of which is now on file and a matter of record in this office.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal.

Done in office, at Raleigh, this 21st day of February in the year of our Lord 1963.

Thad Eure,
Secretary of State.

Resolution 11

Joint resolution honoring the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill, K.G.

Whereas the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill, K.G., distinguished and illustrious son of an American mother and an English father, writer and maker of history, eloquent champion of the free world, still lives among us in the flesh, symbolizing those attributes of honor, loyalty, courage, and magnanimity, which have been cherished for generations by the English-speaking peoples; and

Whereas due to fortuitous circumstance and his own will to greatness, he stood in the breach and through his eloquent pen and tongue rallied the democracies of the world to stand with him and hurl back the threat of dictators who would have crucified humanity and suppressed the love of freedom wherever it existed; and

Whereas Sir Winston is close to the heartbeat of Americans who admire this Englishman's love of fairplay and decency, as well as his stubborn courage where the liberties of freemen are concerned; and

Whereas North Carolinians whose history goes back to England and to Magna Carta honor and revere this son of freedom who has attained immortality while he yet lives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

Section 1. That the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill, K.G., is the most eloquent champion of liberty not only throughout the English-speaking world, but among all free nations and free peoples; that his superb leadership in civilization's darkest hour helped to save mankind from the tyranny of dictators; and that he continues to symbolize in his life the great attributes of integrity and honor that are the basis of our civilization.

Sec. 2. That the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill, K.G., is hereby declared to be an honorary citizen of North Carolina.

Sec. 3. That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of the respective journals of the house and senate, and that a duly certified copy be forwarded through proper channels to the British Ambassador in Washington with the request that it be transmitted to the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill, K.G., together with the good wishes of the General Assembly of North Carolina for many more years of health, happiness, and service to mankind.

Sec. 4. That this resolution shall become effective upon its adoption.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified, this the 21st day of February 1963.

Clarence Stone,
President of the Senate.
H. Clifton Blue,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Examined and found correct.
George R. Uzzell.
(For committee.)

DR. ELLEN WINSTON, U.S. COMMISSIONER OF WELFARE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, recently, Dr. Ellen Winston, of North Carolina, was appointed U.S. Commissioner of Welfare.

For many years, Dr. Ellen Winston has served her native State of North Carolina with distinction, building up within our State one of the finest welfare departments in the Nation. In recognition of her achievement, she has now been called upon by the Federal Government to organize and direct a welfare administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dr. Winston brings to her new post the competence, the skill, and the sound judgment that will set our long-needed welfare administration on a steady and progressive course. She understands the problem of chronic dependency which has developed in our country despite our general prosperity. She knows how to attack this problem constructively by getting at the root causes. She will give wise and practical leadership to the Nation in developing welfare programs that are genuine investments in human resources, rather than mere systems for maintaining the poor in their poverty.

A welfare administration directed by Dr. Winston will not only help us to find better answers to the problem of poverty in the midst of plenty; it will also help us to improve the services needed by people in all income brackets, particularly children and the aged. To Mrs. Winston, welfare means more than financial aid to the needy; it means providing the facilities and services that prevent an individual from becoming lost in the increasingly mechanized and impersonal milieu of modern society. North Carolina's loss of a great lady and a wise welfare commissioner is the Nation's gain.

In order that others may know more about Dr. Winston and her achievements, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the following items:

First. A biographical sketch of Dr. Winston, prepared by the North Carolina Department of Public Welfare;

Second. An article by Mrs. Bernadette W. Hoyle, information officer, North Carolina Department of Public Welfare, entitled: "Dr. Winston Reviews 18 Years in Public Welfare";

Third. A statement made by Dr. Winston at her swearing-in ceremonies on January 28, 1963;

Fourth. A feature article from the January 27, 1963, edition of the Sunday Sun, Baltimore, Md., entitled: "New U.S. Welfare Chief—Iron-Beneath-Velvet Southerner Seeks To Halt Dependency Before It Gets Started"; and

Fifth. Editorials from several North Carolina newspapers concerning Dr. Winston; they are as follows: "A Woman of Vision Goes to HEW," Twin City Sentinel, Winston-Salem, December 21, 1962; "Tar Heels Will Be Proud," Sanford Herald, Sanford, December 21, 1962; "A Quality Appointment That Honors North Carolina," Kinston Daily Free Press, December 20, 1962; "Tar Heel Tapped for Post," the Wilmington Star, Wilmington, December 21, 1962; "Fine Ladies to Washington," Lexington Dispatch, Lexington, December 21, 1962; "Deserved Promotion," Hickory Daily

Record, Hickory, December 20, 1962; "Dr. Winston Qualified To Realine National Welfare," High Point Enterprise, High Point, December 20, 1962; "Dr. Winston Can Contribute Much," Greenville Reflector, Greenville, December 21, 1962; and "Dr. Winston Takes a New Job," Durham Herald, Durham, December 21, 1962.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch, statement, articles, and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF DR. ELLEN WINSTON

Dr. Ellen Winston has served as commissioner of public welfare for the State of North Carolina for the past 18 years. She was named to that post in 1944 after 4 years as head of the department of sociology and economics at Meredith College, Raleigh, N.C.

During this period of long service to her home State, Dr. Winston worked extensively with both National and State social welfare agencies and has achieved wide recognition for her contribution to the public welfare field.

After early teaching experience she served as social economist and technical editor for various Federal agencies from 1934 to 1940. She was a member of the technical committee on long-range work and relief policies for the National Resources Planning Board, 1940–43.

Author of numerous books and articles in the fields of sociology and social welfare, Dr. Winston did extensive research in these fields for the National Economic and Social Planning Association, the Carnegie Corp. of New York, and the Federal Government.

A native of North Carolina, Dr. Winston was born in Bryson City, in the western part of the State. She received her early education in North Carolina public schools and was graduated from Converse College, Spartanburg, S.C. In 1930, she received a Ph. D. in sociology from the University of Chicago. Honorary doctoral degrees have been awarded to Dr. Winston by the Women's College of North Carolina, Converse College, and the University of North Carolina.

Among the State and National posts she has held are: President, American Public Welfare Association, 1957–59; member of the Fact-Finding Committee for the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth and the National Committee for the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth; member of the Slum Clearance Advisory Committee of the U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency, 1951–54; member of the Board of Directors of the Council on Social Work Education, 1958–60; cochairman, Income Maintenance and Public Assistance, Fifth International Congress of Gerontology, 1960; member of the U.S. Committee of the International Conference of Social Work, 1960; member of the ad hoc Committee on Welfare appointed by HEW Secretary Abraham Ribicoff in 1961. She served on the 12-member National Council on Child Welfare established by the Congress in 1958, and was a member of the Federal-State Committee on Aging, 1957–60.

For the past 10 years she has been a member of the executive committee of the National Council of State Welfare Administrators; since 1956 has served as chairman of the North Carolina Governor's Coordinating Committee on Aging; and since 1959 has been a member of the Governor's Committee on Migrant Labor.

She is presently a member of the board of directors of the Child Welfare League of America, Inc., and chairman of the league's ad hoc committee on public agency relationships. In 1962 she was appointed to a 2-year term on the Advisory Committee on Problems of the American Community (Brookings Institution) and to membership on the Advisory Committee on Housing for Senior Citizens of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. She is chairman of the division on social welfare manpower for the 1963 National Conference on Social Welfare.

Dr. Winston is the wife of Dr. Sanford R. Winston, author and lecturer and head of the department of sociology and anthropology at North Carolina State College.

DR. WINSTON REVIEWS 18 YEARS IN PUBLIC WELFARE

(By Bernadette W. Hoyle)

Dr. Ellen Winston, who took the oath of office as the first U.S. Commissioner of Welfare on January 28, left North Carolina after 18½ years as State commissioner of public welfare.

In reviewing the North Carolina program during her administration, which began on June 1, 1944, it is interesting to note that public welfare legislation enacted by the Congress in 1962 is a reiteration of the North Carolina emphasis on preventive, protective, and rehabilitative services for many years. Shortly after her tenure of office in Raleigh began, Dr. Winston delivered a speech titled "Prevention: The Final Test of Public Welfare." Only in the past year has this emphasis been adopted through legislation at the national level.

An expanded program of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled has been in progress during Dr. Winston's nearly two decades as administrator of the North Carolina program. Provision for payment of hospitalization of recipients and the medically indigent has been added to the program.

In discussing additions to the North Carolina program during her term of office, Dr. Winston points with pride to community services, which has a staff member who works with local communities and organizations to further the utilization of available community resources. Two projects of the North Carolina Federation of Women's Clubs were initiated by Dr. Winston. These are the Children's Clothing Closet, through which local clubs secure clothes for children such as layettes, school clothing, graduation dresses and other items for which tax funds are not available. The help-a-home project collects furniture and household articles which are given to needy families to help lift their level of living. "The women's clubs have in many ways been interested in and supported the public welfare program," stated Dr. Winston. "Working with these clubs has also been an excellent means of interpreting the program to the people of our State."

She pointed out the good relationship with the State bar association. "We have worked with this association for many years on legal aid service for the legally indigent—persons who need legal advice but cannot pay for it. County bar associations have set up county committees which work with county departments of public welfare."

She added, "We have several programs which we have been pushing for a number of years. One of these is a program through which we provide special assistance to aid to dependent children to help them go on for further training or education. Each year county departments of public welfare help a number of bright boys and girls obtain scholarships, as well as summer jobs, and often a community group is contacted to help supplement the scholarships awarded these young people."

The aid to dependent children policy has been revised so that a child with a part-time job may use the money he earns for present educational purposes or save it for his future education. "This was made possible by a reinterpretation of Federal law," stated Dr. Winston. "We took advantage of it because of the incentive it offered to young people. Another facet of this emphasis is that it is one way to break the cycle of dependency. The young people become self-supporting, take care of their families and their parents, pay taxes, and so forth."

The program of day care for preschool age children of working mothers has been built during Dr. Winston's administration. "We have stressed the importance of standards for these facilities," she stated, "and we license over 350 day care facilities. At present we have set up day care projects in two counties with Federal money to demonstrate how counties can help families become self-sufficient or prevent the need for assistance by having children cared for during the day while their mothers work. These demonstration projects establish a program, so that we will have had experience with policies and procedures in order to know the best way to proceed on a statewide basis when Federal funds become available in 1963." When Dr. Winston became State commissioner one person on the State office staff handled this program as an extra job in addition to other regular duties. At present there are three full-time staff members in day care and three more will be added in the near future.

In the program of foster boarding home care for children there has been considerable expansion. The State board of public welfare licenses all foster boarding homes for children. "We require a semiannual report on each child in order to know that there is continuing supervision of the children and planning for them as their needs change. North Carolina was one of about 15 States that took immediate advantage in 1961 of legislation that under special circumstances permitted payment for care of children in foster boarding homes with AFDC funds," she said.

In the program of adoption there has been great expansion in the past 18 years. During Dr. Winston's first year in office, 309 adoptions were completed. In the year 1961–62, 2,111 adoptions were completed. The majority of the adoptions in the State are handled by county departments of public welfare, and all adoptions are registered with the papers filed for safekeeping in the State board of public welfare.

A program developed during Dr. Winston's administration is that of licensing of all agencies which solicit funds for charitable purposes. "We have a law as strong as that in any State for licensing these agencies," she stated. Because licensing protects both the agencies and the citizens from fraudulent solicitations, there is good cooperation in the administration of the policies.

"Here in North Carolina we have placed much emphasis on nonfinancial services in public welfare," stated Dr. Winston. "We believe that a broad program of social services should be available to all people who seek them, regardless of their economic status. North Carolina has a population of 4½ million people. During the past year some type of public welfare service was given to 600,000 men, women, and children, that is, 1 out of every 8 persons in the State. Over half of these services were nonfinancial. They included adoptions, planning for the care of aged relatives, work permits for minors, and other services."

One of the most significant programs is that of homemaker service through public welfare. At present 15 counties employ 45 homemakers who go into homes to help families raise their level of living. They teach low income families how to use money wisely, they teach young mothers without training in elementary housekeeping how to care for their children, how to cook and how to clean house. The program began with demonstration projects in a few counties, which built the foundation for a statewide program that has received national recognition.

"We have a large program of services to the aging," added Dr. Winston. "We first became concerned over old people in rural counties who should not be living alone, who were not sick, yet needed a protective program of domiciliary care. Now we have over 500 licensed facilities for the aged and infirm. About 300 of these are family care homes, licensed for two to five persons. These homes are much like the homes of a generation ago where there were one or more aged relatives in a family. They keep aged persons in a home atmosphere when they do not desire or cannot for some reason remain in their own homes, yet can remain in their own communities near their churches and friends and lifelong ties. In essence this program is not too different from the foster boarding home program for children. At present over 6,000 persons in North Carolina live in licensed facilities for the aged and infirm."

Increasingly the public welfare program in North Carolina has stressed services to older people in their own homes in order to make it possible for them to remain there. Homemaker service has been the answer in many cases, where a homemaker may visit a number of homes for several hours a week and help with the necessary chores. "Now we have a new policy which makes it possible for us to pay for an attendant, where it is necessary for the person to have care for a longer period of time than is practical in the use of homemaker service. We have a long list of possibilities, so that we may have a particular service available at the time when a person needs it," added Dr. Winston. "In order to have a comprehensive public welfare program, there must be a wide range and variety of social services and policies available to meet different types of needs and the changing needs of the same individual."

The inspection of jails has long been a responsibility of public welfare in North Carolina. "We also approve plans for new jails and renovations and we are proud of our progress in this area. We are always concerned over the health and safety of people. We are interested in keeping mental patients and children out of jails. Actually for the entire State we have fewer children in jails in a year than many States have in one county in that period of time," said Dr. Winston. "Public welfare has to be concerned about people who need some kind of special protection as these are the most vulnerable persons in our society.

"To promote the exchange of ideas and keep open the lines of communication between the public welfare program and the citizens of the State, there are a number of advisory committees from special interest groups such as heads of child caring institutions, day care operators, juvenile judges, medical advisory committee, and other areas of interest in which public welfare plays a major role in helping people," added Dr. Winston.

"The concern for helping people, whether their need is financial or nonfinancial, has been the primary focus of public welfare in North Carolina," she declared. "With the enactment of new Federal legislation in 1962, it will be possible to continue this emphasis with the implementation of broader policies and more effective procedures."

STATEMENT BY DR. ELLEN WINSTON AT SWEARING-IN CEREMONIES IN WASHINGTON, JANUARY 28, 1963

This day, January 28, 1963, is of great significance to all who are interested in or have any direct connection with the social welfare field. The Secretary's decision to establish a new Welfare Administration to encompass the major welfare responsibilities of the Federal Government offers a tremendous challenge, a tremendous opportunity. By this action the role of public welfare in the total economy, the place of social services in our complex society, have been dramatically emphasized.

This new Welfare Administration will require close cooperation among its constituent units, while they carry out their own special responsibilities. It should lead to increasingly closer working relationships in Federal-State-county welfare programs, between welfare and other governmental services for people, between public and private social welfare agencies, and between public welfare and a host of community organizations.

Goals for this new Welfare Administration, dedicated as it is to preventive and rehabilitative services, must be clearly defined and stated again and again. Success in their attainment will be measured by the opportunities given to children to rise above the handicaps of deprivation and neglect, to the disabled fully to utilize their capabilities, to the ill to receive needed treatment, to the aged in all walks of life to live without fear or loneliness, to families to obtain needed help and guidance in resolving a wide range of special problems, to untold numbers to be spared dire poverty and personal disaster through effective preventive measures. Such services can only be rendered where the people are and so welfare's responsibility stretches to every city, town, and open area of our Nation. We know, too, that it is not just what is done but how it is done so that welfare services truly promote human dignity and independence and self-respect.

In working toward these ends, to improve and strengthen the broad pattern of welfare services, I pledge you that I shall do my best.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Jan. 27, 1963]

NEW U.S. WELFARE CHIEF—IRON-BENEATH-VELVET SOUTHERNER SEEKS TO HALT DEPENDENCY BEFORE IT GETS STARTED

(By Cherrill Anson)

When Ellen Winston is sworn in tomorrow afternoon as head of the newly created Federal Welfare Administration, official Washington will acquire a choice example of that celebrated feminine subspecies, the iron-beneath-the-velvet southerner.

Dr. Winston, a slight, 59-year-old North Carolinian, has served her State as commissioner of the board of public welfare for the past 18 years. During that time she has fought determinedly and successfully to give North Carolina a progressive welfare program which attempts to stop dependency before it starts, tries to get people off the welfare rolls and back onto their own feet, and stresses a variety of nonfinancial services rather than cash handouts.

The identical emphasis on prevention, rehabilitation and protection was written into Public Law 87–543, the set of amendments which represents the most important changes in the public welfare provisions of the Social Security Act in that act's history.

"I have approved a bill," President Kennedy commented after signing the legislation in July, "which makes possible the most far-reaching revision of our public welfare program since it was enacted in 1935."

TERMED OUTSTANDING

The assembling of all welfare functions in one administration was the recommendation of a task force appointed by the President before his inauguration. The head of this task force and the guiding intelligence behind the new welfare amendments was Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Legislation.

Mr. Cohen, who has known Dr. Winston for 20 years, calls her "the country's outstanding State welfare administrator." Her salary will be $20,000 a year.

The new administration, which will become the sixth major operating agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was formed by HEW Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze by bringing together three activities formerly under the jurisdiction of the Social Security Administration: the Children's Bureau, the Bureau of Family Services, and the Cuban refugee program. To these he added the special staff on aging and the juvenile delinquency and youth development staff.

These five activities embrace the principal Federal-State programs of the Department which through services, research, and grants are directed to the interests of older persons, families, children, and youth.

FIRST MAJOR REALINEMENT

The establishment of the administration marks the first major realinement of welfare functions since HEW came into being in 1953. Mrs. Winston's appointment is considered the culmination of a trend toward reappraisal and reorientation which was hinted at in a group of welfare amendments passed in 1956. These put emphasis on services rather than money and on the strengthening of family life. But, according to Cohen, they were permissive and offered little in the way of financial encouragements to the States.

The new legislation, on the other hand, offers considerable financial rewards to States which are willing to spend some of their own money to become eligible for Federal cost-sharing. Starting in September, States which appropriated $25,000 for certain welfare services or for the cost of training staff members could count on an additional $75,000 in Federal funds.

These new laws and certain administrative actions in the same spirit which were taken by ex-Secretary Ribicoff in 1961 and 1962 will involve the expenditure in the fiscal year 1962–63 of nearly $300 million in addition to the amounts authorized by earlier law. During this period, Federal payments to States under public assistance programs to which the Federal Government makes grants will reach $2,600 million. This money will benefit some 7 million persons.

OUNCE OF PREVENTION

The idea behind the new welfare measures is that by spending more now, we will eventually spend less. Cohen does not look for a cut in the welfare bill, but he is hopeful that the new emphasis on prevention and rehabilitation will head off an increase. "Our population is growing at the rate of 30 million every 10 years," he explains, "and we find ourselves forced to run faster just to stay in the same place."

Mrs. Winston's concern with services which would prevent dependency was expressed as long ago as 1945, shortly after she took office in her own State. "We recognize the fact," she said then, "that it is cheaper not only in terms of well-being but also in terms of actual money to prevent ills rather than to try to remedy them after they have been allowed to develop. In public welfare as in health an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. It is far better to prevent than to have to try to rehabilitate. The preventive approach requires more service, more effective leadership, and harder work than the traditional approach to the public welfare program. At the same time it is a far more challenging approach."

An excellent example of the preventive approach is the program of day care for the children of working mothers.

LIVING LEVELS RAISED

When Dr. Winston took over as State commissioner there were 18 licensed day-care facilities in North Carolina. Now there are 350, and demonstration projects involving use of Federal funds have been set up in 2 counties. (The 1962 legislation called for $5 million in the fiscal year 1962–63 and $10 million in succeeding fiscal years to be earmarked for the encouragement of day care under State child welfare service plans.)

Because of the availability of day care, a young North Carolina woman was able to get a stenographic job which enables her to support herself and her two small children, although she cannot afford to pay for their supervision during working hours. This family never went on the relief rolls.

Another aggressive program which Dr. Winston started was the use of homemakers to help recipients of relief raise their level of living by showing them how to manage their homes and their funds better. These homemakers are resourceful, mature women who visit seven or eight families a week, working closely with the county welfare department caseworkers.

They teach AFDC (aid to families with dependent children) recipients to stretch their grants over the month, demonstrate the use of surplus foods, instruct them in sewing and mending, help them to make simple home repairs, and encourage and aid them to improve their personal appearance.

A homemaker may show a mother how to make a vase out of a bleach bottle or bring a group together for instruction. By contributing her own set of plastic dishes and helping the hostess to bake a few cookies, she may turn the instruction session into a party. "One of the problems of destitute people is that they are isolated," Dr. Winston explains. "In working with public assistance families it is important to push up from the bottom. You must give them goals they can reach."

MORE FOSTER HOMES

A childless woman with a great feeling for children, Dr. Winston found in 1944 that North Carolina had fewer than 100 licensed foster boarding homes for children. These homes provide individual motherly care for children who would otherwise be institutionalized or left to grow up in improper environments. Today there are 1,500 such homes which care for 2,700 children in a given month.

The adoptive program, under Dr. Winston's guidance, has undergone a similar expansion. During her first year as commissioner, there were 309 adoptions. Last year, 2,111 were completed.

For both children and the aged, her goal has been to have available a whole series of possibilities. Some elderly people have been enabled to stay in their own homes by the services of a homemaker or attendant; others have been placed in licensed boarding homes. The majority of these are small facilities caring for two to five persons in a noninstitutional atmosphere. Such special care homes keep elderly people in their own communities, near their lifelong ties.

Dr. Winston has been particularly successful in marshaling community support. Under her encouragement, the State bar association has come forth with aid for the legally indigent. The Federated Women's Clubs help to furnish homes of families living on welfare grants and contribute layettes and graduation dresses. Other community groups help with scholarships for bright youngsters.

Since without education one welfare generation breeds another, Dr. Winston has pushed a program to encourage AFDC recipients, whose grants stop when they become 18, to go on for special training after high school. Scholarships and summer jobs help. Recently North Carolina revised its AFDC policies to allow a child to save some of the proceeds of a part-time job for future educational needs without having the family's grant diminished. This change was made possible by a reinterpretation of Federal law.

"This is the way you break the cycle of dependency," Dr. Winston says. "They go on from here to supporting their families, helping younger sisters and brothers, and paying taxes."

In addition to initiating strong programs, Dr. Winston has seen that these programs and their positive results have been brought to the attention of North Carolina's taxpaying public. These taxpayers are spread over a primarily rural State divided into 100 counties which stretch horizontally more than 500 miles, from the Atlantic coast through the Great Smoky Mountains.

MANY SUCCESS STORIES

A series of articles titled "For the People," written by the board's public information officer and appearing in more than 50 small weekly papers, is devoted to spelling out the details of the welfare programs and relating success stories about recipients of public assistance.

Among these stories are those of a child who was born a spastic and now supports herself as a beautician; a girl who is attending nursing school on a scholarship; a young woman who is a member of the Peace Corps; and another who became the first child from her rural elementary school ever to go to college.

In a centrally located county which has six high schools, three of the six valedictorians in the recent graduating classes came from families which had been assisted through aid to families with dependent children.

Among the young men who were once the recipients of AFDC are the principal of a county school, a sheriff, a minister, and a business man who was named Young Man of the Year in his community.

NONFINANCIAL HELP

Then there was the mother with three small children to support. Although she had finished high school, the only work she could find was as a domestic. A caseworker got her a scholarship at the local junior college, which she attended at night after working all day. There was no 4-year college in town. When she had finished the 2-year curriculum at the junior college, a sister-in-law offered to care for her children so that she could finish her studies at an out-of-town college which offered her a work scholarship. This fall, at the age of 32, she drew her first paycheck as a primary schoolteacher and became a taxpayer instead of a tax taker.

Dr. Winston has always emphasized welfare services which do not involve the giving of money, and she is proud of the fact that of the 600,000 people helped last year, half were extended counseling or other nonfinancial services. Nevertheless, North Carolina's welfare budget (including Federal funds) has grown during her service from $7 million to $70 million. (Seventy million dollars for North Carolina's 4,500,000 residents is proportionately almost the same as Maryland's expenditure of $50 million for 3,100,000 inhabitants.)

In a State in which per capita income is less than 70 percent of the national average, the money has not come easily. The history of Dr. Winston's relations with the North Carolina General Assembly is a stormy one. Her quest for the State money needed to call forth matching Federal funds has led, time and time again, to clashes with legislators.

Most of the time she has gotten what she wanted. One gallant legislator attributes this to a combination of southern womanly graces and brains. Another observer describes the Winston technique less elegantly but not unchivalrously as "flapping her eyes around and politely submerging those men with facts."

"She has had differences with practically everybody in the house and senate," a State representative reports, "but she is still liked and respected."

Dr. Winston has been described as a past master at championing public welfare programs. To those who suggested that most of the illegitimate children in North Carolina were getting help from public welfare, Dr. Winston pointed out that only 9 percent of these children were receiving public assistance. Furthermore, she noted, the proportion of families with illegitimate children in the caseloads of county departments of public welfare had dropped from 20 percent to 16 percent.

CITES LONG-RANGE COST

To others who insisted that some women were turning out illegitimate babies almost as a business, she answered that it was ridiculous to assume that $10 a month would constitute an incentive to a woman to continue to have illegitimate children.

Cutting off aid to illegitimate children, she said, might effect a sharp reduction in immediate expenditures, but there would be a staggering long-range cost in terms of expenditure for crime, juvenile delinquency, and medical costs if these children were allowed to grow up in squalor.

On the topic of welfare "chiseling," Dr. Winston has said that "a common complaint against public welfare is fraud; yet, in terms of income tax evasions, racketeers who defraud the Government of billions of dollars each year, and deception in the day-to-day business world, this problem is indeed minor."

Critics of aid to families with dependent children have been informed that the average person in a North Carolina AFDC household, considering all sources of money, must manage on one-quarter of the average per capita income for the State. Typically, she points out, a family receives such assistance for only 2 years before finding other means of support.

WIFE OF AN EDUCATOR

Dr. Winston was born in Bryson City, a small town in the western mountains of North Carolina. Her father, Stanley Warren Black, was a lawyer and a southerner. Her mother was from Illinois. In consequence, the commissioner says, she finds herself endowed with "two sets of colloquialisms midwestern and southern."

She received her early education in public schools and was graduated from Converse College in Spartanburg, S.C. In 1930 she received a Ph. D. in sociology from the University of Chicago.

She went on to teach and to serve as social economist and technical editor for Federal agencies from 1934 to 1940. At the time she was named State commissioner, she had served for 4 years as head of the department of sociology and economics at Meredith College in Raleigh, the State capital.

The wife of Dr. Sanford R. Winston, head of the department of sociology and anthropology at North Carolina State College, the commissioner has written numerous books and articles in the fields of sociology and social welfare and has done extensive research in these areas.

Dr. Winston has been president of the American Public Welfare Association, one of 12 members of the National Council on Child Welfare established by Congress in 1958, and a member of the Federal-State Committee on Aging. She also served on a special advisory committee whose recommendations were incorporated in the Kennedy administration's welfare legislation.

BUILT-IN INCENTIVES

That legislation, designed to remedy the deficiencies of laws passed over a quarter of a century ago, has built-in incentives for self-care and self-support and is "by far the most useful we have ever had," Dr. Winston

says. "It offers opportunities to give help which is constructive, not palliative."

In addition to the provisions for day-care expenditures, stepped-up aid to States for training enough skilled personnel to reduce caseloads to reasonable levels, and liberalized payments for the needy aged, the blind, and the disabled, it allows for protective payments to be made to a competent party if a child's parent is found to make unwise use of welfare grants. It makes possible the use of public assistance funds to maintain a child in a foster care home if its own environment is completely unsuitable.

Another change is designed to assist the States in encouraging the conservation of existing work skills and the development of new ones. Federal financial participation is authorized in State expenditures for aid to families with dependent children made in the form of payment for work performed by the child's parent or other relative. States which wish to take advantage of Federal money in these work or don't eat programs must provide facilities for training or retraining in preparation for regular employment.

HER VIEW OF NEW JOB

Another change recognizes family neediness when both parents are in the home and deprivation to a child results from a parent's incapacity or unemployment. Previously only one parent was included in aid to families with dependent children.

The provision for children of unemployed parents was enacted in 1961 as a 14-month temporary measure. It was extended for 5 years by Public Law 87–543. Before this a father could desert his family and see them taken care of, but could not lose his job, stick with them, and have them receive the same benefits.

Dr. Winston assumes her new position as the States are just beginning to participate in the new welfare program. Fourteen States, for instance, are extending aid to deprived children of the unemployed. Another 14 are taking advantage of Federal sharing in expenditures for foster care.

The Commissioner can be expected to give the Welfare Administration the same firm, able, and imaginative leadership for which she is known in North Carolina and to run the same sort of "tight office." "I am exchanging 100 counties for 54 jurisdictions," she says, "and the general assembly for Congress."

[From the Twin City Sentinel, Dec. 21, 1962]

A WOMAN OF VISION GOES TO HEW

Last February, Dr. Ellen Winston, State commissioner of public welfare in North Carolina, appeared before a congressional committee to speak for the American Public Welfare Association in support of the administration's proposed welfare changes. According to reports, she handled the complicated subject knowledgeably and in language the nonsociologist Congressmen could understand.

A short time later, Chester Davis, writing in the Journal and Sentinel of the State's welfare program, called Dr. Winston a thorough-going pro. She had not always been personally popular in and around the Capitol, he wrote, largely, perhaps, for her enthusiasm for keeping welfare free from political entanglements. But, he went on, her associates respected her as a crack administrator and a woman of vision who retains her sense of the practical.

Thus, while the announcement of Dr. Winston's appointment as the Federal Government's first Welfare Commissioner came as more or less of a surprise, her appointment is not itself surprising.

The Welfare Administration is a new division in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, bringing under one head a number of bureaus and functions that heretofore have operated under other departmental supervision. Furthermore, revisions in the welfare program made by the last Congress both enlarge the Federal stake in public welfare and put new emphasis on the rehabilitative and preventive services.

What better qualifications could Secretary Celebrezze have asked for in the new administrator of this program than precisely those with which Dr. Winston is endowed? Someone who is on record as knowing, supporting, and being able to interpret the new program of public welfare—a crack administrator, a person of vision who retains a sense of the practical, indeed, a person with enthusiasm for keeping welfare free from political entanglements.

Dr. Winston had been nationally recognized long before this; Secretary Celebrezze has simply translated that recognition into service at a higher level. North Carolina is nevertheless newly honored by her new honor, and we wish her well in the wider responsibilities to which she has been called.

[From the Sanford (N.C.) Herald, Dec. 21, 1962]

TAR HEELS WILL BE PROUD

Dr. Ellen Black Winston, 18 years the State's welfare commissioner, has been appointed U.S. Welfare Commissioner. She will have the responsibility of putting into effect a new reorganizational move that places welfare on an equal basis with health and education in the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In this important assignment she will join a few other notable Tar Heels in Washington. Dr. Winston is quite an addition and hers is a real assignment.

Tar Heels are of many schools of thought on our State welfare administration. Party affiliation has little to do with it. There are Democrats and Republicans who soundly cuss the welfare and others who realize its farflung and varied services. However, all who have had any dealing with Dr. Winston realize that here is an administrator who is truly competent, who knows and understands her field of work. Legislators who have heard her testify at committee hearings come away with admiration for the way she can field the answers, quote the statistics and information she has at her fingertips.

Regardless of whether everyone agrees with all welfare policies, North Carolinians can be proud to have such a woman as Ellen Winston in Washington. She is a graduate of Converse College, a liberal arts college, has a knack for statistics, holds a Ph. D. from the University of Chicago in sociology. She worked for many Government bureaus and agencies in Washington prior to World War II. She has also headed the department of sociology at Meredith College where her students can testify she was a stimulating and brilliant teacher.

In the new Federal set up she will direct the Bureau of Family Services, the Children's Bureau, and Cuban refugee program. Special staffs on aging, juvenile delinquency, and youth development which presently report to Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze will report directly to Dr. Winston.

The position pays $20,000 a year as contrasted to the $12,000 Dr. Winston was paid by North Carolina, but the magnitude of the task would frighten a lesser official. We predict that Dr. Winston will greet the new assignment with the enthusiasm and verve North Carolinians have come to expect from her.

The agency Dr. Winston heads will mark the first major realinement of Federal welfare agencies since the Federal welfare program was enacted in 1934. As North Carolina commissioner, Dr. Winston has heard her share of complaints of too much Federal regulation in this field. She already knows the Federal program is under fire. Here is an unparalleled opportunity to do something about removing opportunity of abuse in the Federal program. The eyes of the Nation will be upon her and her decisions.

[From the Kinston (N.C.) Daily Free Press, Dec. 20, 1962]

A QUALITY APPOINTMENT THAT HONORS NORTH CAROLINA

Appointment of Dr. Ellen Winston of Raleigh, commissioner of public welfare in North Carolina for the past 18 years, to a new post as Federal Commissioner of Welfare, comes as an honor to North Carolina as well as the appointee.

Dr. Winston will get a year's leave of absence to take the post, which has been created by a reorganization of the Federal Welfare Administration. Her salary will be $20,000 a year, compared with her present post, which pays $12,000. R. Eugene Brown, assistant welfare commissioner, will become acting commissioner and director of the State Department of Public Welfare.

The new Federal agency which Dr. Winston will direct will comprise the Children's Bureau of Family Services. It also will include Cuban relief, the special staff on the aging, as well as the juvenile delinquency and youth development staff. These five agencies make up the principal Federal-State programs operated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It constitutes a $3 billion per annum program.

Dr. Winston is peculiarly fitted for her new post after 18 years of experience with the administration of North Carolina's public welfare program. She has been closely associated with the details of the matching services programs and knows where there is need for improvement and flexibility. North Carolina will miss her services, but it is good that the Federal agency can have the benefit of her long and valuable experience.

Congratulations to HEW Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze on his selection and to Dr. Winston on the honor and responsibility that have come to her.

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) Star, Dec. 21, 1962]

TAR HEEL TAPPED FOR POST

The Kennedy administration has tapped another North Carolinian for service with the Federal Government, with the announcement that Dr. Ellen Winston, State welfare commissioner, will head a new Federal agency.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is shifting the major welfare functions of social security to the new unit, in a move to strengthen both programs. It is the agency which Dr. Winston will take over as administrator. It is an agency handling welfare for children, the aging, and the needy.

A spokesman for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare said that social security and welfare had become too big and too diverse to be handled by a single administration. The split apparently is being made with a minimum of extra personnel and cost.

It is not surprising that social security and welfare have grown to larger proportions. In fact, it is to be expected that such would happen. Thus, it is well that steps are being taken now to strengthen the two programs by changing the administrative procedures and dividing the duties.

North Carolina has reason to be proud that our own Dr. Ellen Winston was chosen for this new and important post in the Federal Government. Dr. Winston not only is well known throughout North Carolina in welfare work, but also is nationally prominent for her work in juvenile delinquency and child welfare.

She is certainly eminently suited and qualified for the new post. This is evident, of course, by the fact that she was chosen for the job, doubtless from a field which included many well-qualified persons.

We feel sure she will establish an outstanding record of service, and one in which all Tar Heels can take pride.

[From the Lexington (N.C.) Dispatch, Dec. 21, 1962]

Fine Ladies to Washington

As the Mona Lisa, the world's most treasured painting, arrived in Washington on Wednesday it was announced there that another fine lady is coming to the Nation's Capital to help administer one of the most important Government programs.

Dr. Ellen Winston, who has served as North Carolina State commissioner of welfare for the past 18 years, will become National Commissioner of Public Welfare. This is a new post established by Congress in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the new Commissioner will receive a salary of $20,000. And she'll be worth it.

Another fine lady, Mrs. W. T. Bost, was the State's first commissioner of welfare, and did a great job as did her successor who is now stepping higher. Mrs. Bost was the wife of that ace of North Carolina newspaperman, Tom Bost. Dr. Winston's husband, Sanford, is a professor at State College.

The great lady from Paris is an honored visitor. Dr. Winston will remain as a national asset.

[From the Hickory (N.C.) Daily Record, Dec. 20, 1962]

Deserved Promotion

The selection of Dr. Ellen Winston, head of the North Carolina State Welfare Commission for the past 18 years, to have charge of the Nation's reorganized $3 billion welfare program, is a deserved promotion.

We doubt if there is another person anywhere in the United States, who has a better record of capability in this field than Dr. Winston. We congratulate Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze on his excellent choice for the important assignment.

It will be the job of Dr. Winston to bring together all of the Department's major welfare programs in the new setup effective January 28.

R. Eugene Brown, this State's assistant welfare commissioner, will be named acting commissioner by Governor Sanford, and North Carolina Welfare Board Chairman Howard Manning has announced that Dr. Winston has been granted a 1-year leave of absence to take the Federal post.

Dr. Winston is recognized as one of the outstanding State welfare administrators in the country.

The reorganization which she will now undertake, is the first major realinement of U.S. welfare functions since the Department was established in 1953, and will make the Welfare Administration the sixth major operating agency of the Department.

Secretary Celebrezze said the new agency reflects the magnitude and importance to the Nation of the new welfare amendments, which President Kennedy called the most far-reaching revision of our public welfare program since it was enacted in 1935.

Dr. Winston is author of numerous books and articles for the National Economic and Social Planning Association, the Carnegie Corp., and the Federal Government. She is 59 and was born in Bryson City, N.C. She was graduated from Converse College in Spartanburg, S.C., and received a Ph. D. in sociology from the University of Chicago.

[From the High Point (N.C.) Enterprise, Dec. 20, 1962]

Dr. Winston Qualified To Realine National Welfare

Auspiciously does the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare launch its own Welfare Administration by calling Dr. Ellen Winston, who has directed ably North Carolina's welfare program these past 18 years, to head that significant new operation.

Emphasis of this new division underscores the Kennedy administration's objective of making certain that services to children, families and the aged will be built into the Nation's relief programs. The Social Security Administration is being stripped of its Children's Bureau as well as the Bureau of Family Services, which hitherto has operated all federally supported relief programs.

Indeed, gathering of those bureaus, together with the Cuban refugee program, the special staff on aging and juvenile delinquency and youth development creates such a complexity of five welfare agencies as only one of Dr. Winston's broad understanding, executive capability and tireless energy could superintend.

The development is described by Washington officials as the first major realinement of welfare functions since the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was set up a decade ago. HEW Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze says it reflects magnitude and importance of the new welfare amendments approved earlier this year by Congress.

President Kennedy, who has called it the most far-reaching revision of our public welfare program since it was enacted in 1935, has chosen well a director. Dr. Winston, despite criticisms leveled at handling of an almost impossible task, has done a great work in the difficult development of a welfare agency which, for efficiency, ranks with the best of the Nation.

The administration, of course, is patently clearing the decks of Social Security to make way for medical care if and when that next objective is loaded upon social security. The procedure is something that is wholesome irrespective of when and how the following development occurs, for Dr. Winston can be counted upon to make her significant new Welfare Administration a creditable contribution to the national well-being.

[From the Greenville (N.C.) Reflector, Dec. 21, 1962]

Dr. Winston Can Contribute Much

Dr. Ellen Winston's appointment as head of the new Welfare Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is a compliment to her ability and the program she has formulated and administered as head of North Carolina's department of welfare.

During the 18 years Dr. Winston has directed the activities of the welfare department of the State, she has moved the program steadily in the direction of preventive and rehabilitation measures rather than merely assisting in the care of persons in unfortunate circumstances. The State program has broadened far beyond the care status to assure that youngsters in particular will be able to make their own way economically in their later years.

By placing emphasis on helping families help themselves, the program in North Carolina has meant a great deal more to the State than would have been the case if emphasis has been on merely providing financial assistance to indigent citizens.

The leadership Dr. Winston has given the program in the State will stand the Federal program in good stead as she goes to the new post in Washington. The experience she has gained in emphasizing preventive and rehabilitation programs in North Carolina may well be reflected in the new administrative agency under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. If that supposition proves correct, it will bring about important constructive changes in Federal policies toward the entire welfare program.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Herald, Dec. 21, 1962]

Dr. Winston Takes a New Job

Dr. Ellen Winston's appointment to head the Federal welfare program in the reorganization of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is a deserved tribute to a remarkably able lady and a merited compliment to North Carolina's welfare program.

No person engaged in public welfare work is more thoroughly familiar with Federal welfare legislation than is Dr. Winston. Not only does she know in detail what has been enacted and how it is applied and have that knowledge readily available for explanation, but she also keeps alert to every development on the welfare legislative front.

As important as such knowledge is in the administration of the welfare program, it is not Dr. Winston's only strong point. She is not only knowledgeable but she is also imaginative in applying the public welfare principle to human needs. Thus she will bring to her new work the knowledge of the welfare program and policy, and she is well equipped to give creative leadership in the field of public welfare at the national level.

In her new job, Dr. Winston will be in charge of the various welfare programs, such as old age assistance, medical aid to the aged, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the totally and permanently disabled in the Bureau of Family Services; the Children's Bureau, which administers the Federal programs of child welfare and maternal and child health, and services to crippled children; the Cuban refugee program; and the Federal programs on aging, juvenile delinquency, and youth development.

North Carolina may well mingle regret with pride in Dr. Winston's new appointment. She has administered a difficult program well, and her leadership is in no little part responsible for the good public welfare program the State has. Since Dr. Winston has been given a leave of absence and her assistant has been named acting commissioner, the natural expectation would be that she will return to her post as head of the welfare program in North Carolina. The prevalent view, however, is that her move to Washington is more or less permanent. Her ability and experience forecast continued service and perhaps promotion in the National Government.

FEDERAL DEBT CEILING

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the interest that will be paid on the national debt in the current fiscal year will be more than twice the total expenditures of the Government when I was first elected to the House in 1932. Deficit spending in a big way was started with the passage by the House of a so-called relief and recovery bill of $8,400 million. Only nine Members of the House, including myself, voted against that bill. In speaking against that bill, I predicted

that if Congress embarked upon a spending program of that magnitude, we would live to see a national debt of $50 billion and that such a debt would not only involve backbreaking taxes but be a grossly unfair mortgage upon the opportunities of generations yet unborn.

Next Monday, I will have completed 30 years of service in the Congress—14 on the House side, and 16 on the Senate side. In the life of any nation that is a brief span, but in that span I have seen our national debt rise from $19,487,002,444 in 1932 to $307 billion. The permanent limitation as of July 1, 1963, upon the size of the debt is $285 billion but the temporary ceiling is $308 billion. We know now, of course, that it is not possible for the debt to go back to $285 billion because it is now over $300 billion and instead of being decreased it will, between now and next June 30, be measurably increased. The administration, not knowing exactly what the deficit will be for the current fiscal year, wishes to be on the safe side by having the Congress authorize a temporary debt limit of $308 billion. And, if we authorize all of the proposed spending schemes and then add a $10 billion tax cut, the next jump in the debt ceiling will have to be in the neighborhood of $320 billion.

At an appropriate time, I intend to discuss the danger not only to a stable dollar, but likewise to our Democratic institutions of a deliberate policy of a deficit financing and at that time indicate the grave necessity of curtailing the spending program which has been presented to us which will necessitate a debt limit of $320 billion and a still larger debt limit in the succeeding year. In the meantime, I wish to call attention to a thoughtful article on increasing the debt ceiling, from the Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, February 27, entitled "Administration Braces for Real Battle Over Increasing Federal Debt Ceiling." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that article may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Raising the Roof—Administration Braces for Real Battle Over Increasing Federal Debt Ceiling

(By Henry Gemmill)

Washington.—How far the management of U.S. finances may be veering from ordinary logic—anyone's logic, liberal or conservative—can perhaps be indicated by this fact:

Never has any administration approached Congress for the frequent ritual of elevating the Federal debt ceiling with so much nervousness, so little confidence, as Mr. Kennedy's team exhibits at this moment.

The White House finds it wildly illogical for the Capitol to show signs of balking. Congress votes the appropriations; Congress legislates the tax rates; when the fruit of these is deficits, how can Congress decline to recognize by law the inevitability of an upsurge in Federal borrowings?

Influential conservatives on the Hill agree this complaint has some validity. "Trying to stop the debt rise by holding down the legal ceiling seems about like trying to stop an elevator by grabbing the indicator arrow," remarks one of them. Yet he does emphatically intend to attempt it—and in powerful company—as a last resort against what he considers madly illogical grand designs for deficit spending.

So the debt ceiling question, from whichever side it is examined, seems to have its roots in irrationality. Yet, after years of stirring up little more than political noise, it is rather suddenly emerging as an issue which henceforward may have to be taken seriously. Though Mr. Kennedy may well get the debt roof raised to his specifications this year, he must return to the fray in 1964.

The rise of this issue is, of course, propelled by the historic rise of the debt, yet one must glance also at the history of the debt ceiling itself, which is by no means identical.

A WARTIME INNOVATION

Though congressional authority to control Federal indebtedness stems from the Constitution, for more than a century legislators created no ceilings but instead voted carefully specified obligations for particular purposes. Two World Wars sired the ceilings; in 1917 general-purpose borrowing was authorized but specific limits were set on the amount of bonds, certificates, notes, and bills issued; in 1941 the permitted levels were lumped under an all-inclusive maximum.

There could be no great argument over lifting this higher and higher during World War II, and in early postwar years the ceiling seemed academic because actual debt was left drifting billions below. During that relaxed time Harry Truman could have slipped through Congress legislation abolishing the ceiling or making it infinitely elastic, some Treasury officials believe, and they could kick him for not doing it. By the time Dwight Eisenhower took charge the debt was piling high enough to make the ceiling sticky—not so much because of congressional obstinancy as because of his conservative fiscal commitments. Embarrassed by having to jack up the ceiling in 1954, Ike's administration actually encouraged two reductions, then found itself heading again to new heights. And Mr. Kennedy continued this course.

So, though it may seem longer, the economy bloc in Congress has been hitching its crusade to the debt ceiling issue for less than a decade. And most of that time many have thought they were conducting mere mock battles—little dramas useful perhaps in keeping alive the dream of black ink, but certain of failure. Not until last year—and it came as a surprise and a shock—did the administration almost suffer defeat. An $8 billion ceiling boost squeaked through the House by only 210 votes to 192; it got through the Senate Finance Committee with a one-vote margin.

It would be unsophisticated to suppose that conservatives could block a ceiling rise this year simply by converting 10 Members of the House who voted for last year's boost. The election has filled many seats in Congress with new men; nobody knows for sure how their votes will split. More importantly, a fair share of the votes traditionally cast against ceiling hikes has come from Congressmen who are not economizers, who back nearly every spending bill that comes along. These flexible fellows vote against cranking up the ceiling only to balance their record with constituents, and will perhaps continue to do so only if confident their votes won't pile up into a majority. "Our greatest risk is that these gentlemen will miscalculate," says one administration expert.

REASONS FOR FEAR

Nevertheless, the administration has reasons to fear even fiercer opposition this year.

Before Congress now is the Kennedy tax-cut program; in combination with his spending budget it has alerted the public to prolonged planned deficits—and so far the populace doesn't seem to like it. By the end of this session, to be sure, Congress will have rewritten the tax measure and at least altered much of the tax reform which contributes to the mood of aversion; by then it is possible the public will be eager for tax cuts—deficits and all. But the debt ceiling issue will not wait until then.

On the contrary, the administration insists it must have one round of legislation passed before April; hearings before the Ways and Means Committee begin today. And then it must trot back for a second hike—a big one—before July. This seems an open invitation for Congress to pour all its current disgruntlement onto the debt ceiling issue.

In detail, the picture grows sharper. Congress passed last year's ceiling increase in precise conformity with a Presidential budget forecasting that the current fiscal year ending June 30 would end up in balance, with no net rise in debt. The calculation was that the ceiling needed to be lifted to $308 billion just to meet a midwinter seasonal peak; in line with this Congress voted the boost but provided that the ceiling should drop to $305 billion in April, and back to $300 billion on June 25.

Now, however, the administration is forced to base its first ceiling plea to the new Congress on a flat contradiction of last year's logic. Its current case is that the roof must be lifted to $308 billion for the remainder of the fiscal year, because its own budget forecast turned out to be nonsense, because the Government has slipped into a multibillion-dollar deficit not just seasonally but for sure.

And while they are voting on that, Congressmen will have in mind that by June they'll be voting on a far fancier hike. Naturally enough, tacticians of any administration would be unwilling to let the matter rest on such uneasy ground.

"What would happen if we simply refused to raise this ceiling on the Federal debt?" a senior Senator once inquired in committee session.

"The first thing we'd do is stop your paycheck, Senator," roared the Secretary of the Treasury.

A SPECTACULAR DRAMA

That short story dates back to Eisenhower days, but the question has gained pertinence and Kennedy men still respond in the same spirit. The consequences of a debt ceiling crackdown are described as disasters, vivid enough to scare most any Congressman—or citizen.

A spectacular drama of the near-future can be—and is—written around the following set of assumptions:

Mr. Kennedy asks Congress to lift the ceiling for the fiscal year beginning July 1, to a figure in the neighborhood of $320 billion.

Congress wrangles right through June and passes no ceiling legislation whatever; thus the legal debt roof drops to its "permanent" level, $285 billion.

Outstanding debt, which has been riding along well above $300 billion, stands clearly in excess of the legal maximum.

Now let the cameras roll.

The first and hasty action of Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon is to dispatch telegrams frantically requesting a halt to savings bonds sales. Thousands of telegrams, not just to banks and other places of public sale but also to all the employers who run payroll deduction plans. Mr. Dillon's lawyers have told him that any bonds that slip through after June are not Government obligations at all; they are his personal debt.

Next the weekly rollover of short-term Treasury bills is stopped. No replacements can be issued for around $2 billion of outstanding bills coming in for repayment each week. These alone are enough to suck up within 3 weeks the $5 billion or so which the Treasury usually keeps in cash. Governmental pockets are empty.

CAN'T MEET PAYROLLS

By this time the Government begins missing payments on its missiles and other purchases. It can't meet its payrolls, nor if it fires Federal workers can it give them severance pay due. Such checkwriting, which normally runs around $2 billion a week, can be done belatedly and in a trickle from any tax revenues that come in. But no payment priorities based on hardship or necessity can be set up; legal opinion holds that bills must be paid in chronological order of presentation.

Worse yet, the Treasury begins missing interest payments on existing debt, and fails to redeem bonds that mature. Securities markets fall into turmoil which makes all past panics look pale. Foreigners launch the great run on U.S. gold, and the dollar is done for.

At this point the official script ends, but one is left with the feeling that the Congressmen don't get reelected.

Though it's a lively drama, its chief defect is that it could only happen in real life by accident. Accidents can happen; Mr. Kennedy himself flew off to Mexico last year without signing a bill boosting the ceiling; for most of 1 day the U.S. debt stood at an illegal level. (It was a Sunday, no harm done). But the fact of the matter is that conservative congressional leaders have no slightest intention of establishing a ceiling lower than outstanding debt.

The strategy they outline is entirely different. They would aim to set a ceiling high enough to avoid pushing the Government into any sudden crisis of bankruptcy—but low enough so that within a few months the administration would have to cut back some of its deficit spending, hopefully in an orderly and selective fashion. Measured in money, their objective would be to cut the ceiling below administration desires not by a magnitude of $35 billion, as in the sensational script, but by whatever smaller sum seemed safe and feasible—$1 billion, $2 billion, perhaps a bit more.

If that were the game, argue administration men, it would produce results precisely the opposite of what the congressional economy bloc desires. The Kennedy government could not—or at least would not—cut back its spending but instead would do what the Eisenhower government did when squeezed by the debt ceiling several times during the fifties. It would resort to costly gimmickry.

One gimmick employed in Eisenhower's time of pinch was to have the Federal National Mortgage Association sell directly to the public some of its own notes, which technically do not count as part of the national debt, instead of drawing funds from the Treasury. Another trick was to have the Commodity Credit Corporation raise more of its money for agricultural price-support loans by selling to the public certificates of interest, similarly outside the legal debt, instead of pulling money from the Treasury. These agencies had to offer investors a slightly higher return than would have been required through normal Treasury borrowing; by one calculation the Government ended up paying an extra $18 million in interest.

COULD DUMP MORTGAGES

Besides repeating the old tricks, the Government could try plenty of new ones. Officials suggest, for instance, that the Veterans' Administration could raise some money by dumping its foreclosed mortgages on the market—but only at discount prices, and at the risk of drying up investment money needed to sustain private construction.

Leaders of the congressional economy bloc are aware the Government could and probably would seek this escape from a ceiling squeeze; they agree that it would promote no true economy. But some of them do have an answer: "We'll just wait for the next round of ceiling legislation—and then we will nail 'em."

This double-dose technique could conceivably be applied by Congress rapidly, since the administration must seek its two ceiling boosts before July. Tactics are still fluid, however; economy leaders could aim at just one squeeze this year, and wait till 1964 for the second. At any rate, the theory is that if the administration responded to a first tight ceiling with no more than gimmicks, the legislators could insist upon an official commitment on spending cuts before setting the next ceiling. Failing to get it, they could try making the second squeeze tight enough to exhaust the possibilities of gimmickry and still force a reduction in expenditures.

Suppose—and it is a large supposition—Congress did eventually shove the administration into real spending slashes. Would legislators find themselves much happier over the outcome than officials downtown? Very likely not.

ABDICATION OF POWER

The cutbacks would be chosen by the administration, not by Congress. Legislators who have raised "merry Ned" over past administration refusals to spend appropriated money—uproar over the B–70 bomber is the classic case—could silently choke on resentment as their pet projects were maimed or buried. In the attempt to assert control over the executive branch, legislators would find they had in practice abdicated much of their present power.

It is obvious enough that a Congress really set on curbing spending could devise a half-dozen better ways of doing it. But Congress is not devising them, nor likely soon to do so. If an argument can be made for converting the debt ceiling issue from a talking point into a sharp tool of economy, it must rest on this: Risky and awkward though it may be, it is conveniently at hand.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am very glad to have been present and to hear the presentation of the distinguished Senator from Virginia. I understand that in the past 2 years the Congress has lifted the debt ceiling three times. It is obvious that the next request will be that the debt ceiling be raised to $320 billion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct, if we adopt all the proposed spending schemes. But in the near future I shall make a speech in which I shall indicate that we need not adopt some of the proposed spending schemes, and the ceiling may not have to be increased to that point.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recall the statement made by the colleague of the Senator from Virginia that our present national debt embraces the value of all buildings, equipment, and land within the United States. With that situation we are confronted with a proposal to enter upon a spending program and a tax-reduction program that would make mandatory the authorization of a debt limitation of $320 billion. I suggest that such action would lead us toward economic suicide.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am sure my distinguished colleague is correct.

SECRETARY DILLON DENIES CONGRESSMAN POWELL'S STATEMENT CONCERNING THE VALUE OF COUNTERPART FUNDS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on February 20, 1963, in a press conference a Member of Congress whom I have been asked to refer to as a "friend of the Kennedy administration" while defending his expenditures of counterpart funds quoted Secretary Dillon as follows:

> The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, told Congressman JEFFERY COHELAN, of California, when asked, what would happen to counterpart funds now that the House had stopped the use of them. He said the only thing there is to do is to put a match to them.

I was confident that the Secretary had made no such statement, and I was concerned that anyone would suggest that any responsible official—especially the Secretary of the Treasury—could ever have spoken so lightly concerning the value of these foreign currencies which belong to the American taxpayers.

To clarify this point, I wired Secretary Dillon on February 22 asking for a denial or an explanation.

I have just received a reply from the Secretary in which he emphatically denies that he ever made any such statement. Secretary Dillon said:

> On the contrary I consider that counterpart funds belonging to the United States require the same prudent management and careful handling as any other moneys of the Government.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that both my telegram of February 22 and the Secretary's reply of February 26 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram and reply were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 22, 1963.

Hon. DOUGLAS DILLON,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.:

In Congressman POWELL's press conference of the 20th he quoted you as having told him that counterpart funds were valueless and his direct quote was quote we might as well put a match to them end of quote. I would appreciate either an emphatic denial that you made such a statement or an explanation.

JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senator.

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1963.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: In answer to your telegram about the remark attributed to me on counterpart funds, let me assure you that I have no recollection of any such conversation referring to counterpart funds, or their value, or having said that we might as well put a match to them. On the contrary, I consider that counterpart funds belonging to the United States require the same prudent management and careful handling as any other moneys of the Government.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I join Secretary Dillon in emphasizing that these foreign currencies—counterpart funds—do belong to the taxpayers of the United States, and I am sure that most Members of Congress recognize this point.

I am not criticizing official trips by Members of Congress when such visits to foreign countries are connected with their official duties. Such trips properly conducted can be constructive and of considerable benefit both to the Congress and to the American people.

In making these trips most Members of Congress recognize that they are in effect goodwill ambassadors of our Government and that the foreign currencies or dollars used to defray the expenses of their trips are taxpayers' money and should be accounted for accordingly.

It was never intended that these taxpayers' funds be used to finance a tour of the nightclubs of Europe.

However, as an example of the loose manner in which the State Department has made these foreign currencies, which belong to the American taxpayers, available to this friend of the administration, I will insert the cablegram sent by the State Department last summer to our embassies in connection with the trip then being planned.

Since a claim had been made by this individual that he had done only what other Members of Congress had been doing, I checked with the State Department to verify the accuracy of this cablegram, and I also asked that I be furnished with copies of any other similar cablegrams that had been sent for other Members of Congress. I said I would include all of them in the RECORD at this point. None were furnished.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the cablegram sent last summer by the State Department.

There being no objection, the cablegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Congressman ADAM C. POWELL, chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, accompanied by Mrs. Tamara J. Wall and Miss Corrine Huff, staff members, traveling Western Europe accordance following itinerary:
>
> August 8 sailing *Queen Mary* arriving Southampton, August 13; Paris, August 16; Venice, August 20; Rome, August 23; Athens, August 27; Delphi, August 30; sailing *Leonardo de Vinci*, September 15 from Gibraltar. Arrival times and flights forwarded when firm.
>
> Provisions handbook congressional travel apply. Codel and party authorized use local currencies 19FT561 funds. Meet assist appoint control officers.
>
> Request one single and one double with bath as follows: London-Cumberland Marbel Arch Hotel; Paris Hotel San Regis; Venice Royal Denieli; Rome (1) Excelsior (2) Flora (3) Victoria which ever has special embassy rates; Athens beachhouse at Astir Hotel Delphi new government hotel name unknown. Confirm Department soonest.
>
> London, request three tickets August 14 and 15, best shows playing, except Broadway plays.
>
> Paris-Codel desires use U.S. Army car and chauffeur. Reserve three for first show and dinner best table Lido August 16.
>
> Southampton-Codel requests be met at *Queen Mary* Cherbourg with $100 U.S. equivalent in local currencies for each member party.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Other equally serious questions which have been raised concerning the tax delinquencies of this individual as well as the propriety of certain loans, guaranteed mortgages, and outright grants of Government money which have been made to companies with which he is associated, are all discussed more fully in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 5 and February 20.

Before concluding I want to commend the Members of the House for the steps which they proposed last Tuesday as a start toward correcting this situation.

Congress cannot afford to let any Member conduct himself in a manner which will cast a reflection upon the entire Congress; nor can Congress sit back and allow the administration to open the doors of the Federal Treasury to a favored Member of Congress who may hold a key position in regard to their legislative program or who may be in a position to control an important block of votes in the general election.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Because He Is a Negro?" published in the New York Times, issue of February 23, in which comment is made on the subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BECAUSE HE IS A NEGRO?

After a soul-searching self-inquiry into why in the world he should be under criticism, Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., has come up with the complete answer: It is "unequivocally" because he is a Negro.

Nobody would be objecting to his long, outrageous record as a congressional absentee; no one would have noticed his nightclubbing junkets to Europe; the presence of his wife on the congressional payroll at over $13,000 while resident in Puerto Rico, would have been ignored, as would POWELL's own desertion of responsibility as a House committee chairman in the midst of important hearings. All these possible explanations for displeasure by his colleagues and other critics including ourselves have no validity, Mr. POWELL states. His only mistake is that he is not white.

It is not unexpected that Mr. POWELL has chosen such a convenient and demagogic refuge. An appeal to race and the drumming up of charges of bigotry have long been his political stock in trade. The fact is that a Negro in high office usually—rightly or wrongly—receives favored treatment, and is nearly exempt from criticism, in the press and elsewhere, unless his faults are so obvious that silence becomes intolerable. There is a general and laudable desire to see a Negro succeed when he has attained a position of public trust. Criticism is avoided for the very reason that it might be mistaken for prejudice. Now Mr. POWELL has again raised the racial issue in a desperate gesture of self-defense.

He is not alone in being criticized for junketing around the world on flimsy missions at the taxpayer's expense. He is not unique in being criticized for having a member of the family on the payroll—although it must be admitted that such employees usually have the good grace to stay on the mainland, at least.

His philosophy of "everybody else is doing it, why shouldn't I?" is, we suppose, a commonplace reaction of the most commonplace of politicians. It is disappointing, however, to see POWELL—a spiritual as well as a political leader—not setting a better example. The tragedy of the long Powell career in office is that he, unusually gifted with intelligence, talent and personality, has chosen to be equal with the least conscientious in Congress rather than the most.

So, to vindicate himself and not be accused of running out under attack, POWELL said he has changed his mind and will not retire but instead will seek another term.

This is really bad news, for New York and for Congress.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF "STAR-SPANGLED BANNER"

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, next year will mark the 150th anniversary of the composition of "The Star-Spangled Banner." The occasion of its composition, at the height of the British attempt to invade Baltimore City by sailing up the bay and overwhelming the defenses at Fort McHenry, gives to this anniversary a special significance for citizens of the Free State.

The Metropolitan Civic Association of Baltimore is taking the lead in arranging for appropriate activities in Maryland. This organization has adopted a resolution calling upon the President to appoint a special national commission to arrange for a nationwide celebration marking this 150th anniversary.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Whereas 1964 will mark the passage of 150 years since Francis Scott Key saw our flag flying over Fort McHenry "in the dawn's early light" on September 14, 1814, and then penned the immortal "Star-Spangled Banner": Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the President be requested to appoint a special national commission to begin formulating and arranging for a nationwide "Star-Spangled Banner" celebration in 1964 so that all citizens may point with pride to Francis Scott Key's unique contribution to the Nation, as exemplified by our national anthem and its 150th anniversary.

SENATOR DOUGLAS FIGHTS FOR PUBLIC

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished Mr. Irving Dilliard, a very fine correspondent, has written a remarkable tribute to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] on his several endeavors in the public interest. I ask unanimous consent that the tribute be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOUGLAS STUBBORNLY FIGHTS FOR PUBLIC

(By Irving Dilliard)

CHICAGO.—Thank to his persistence, two of Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS' bills to benefit the rank and file of the American people stand a greatly improved chance of passage in the new Congress. One is to require lending agencies to tell borrowers the annual rate of interest on loans. The other is to preserve a modest portion of the Lake Michigan sand dunes as a national park.

Both bills are outstandingly meritorious. Up to now both have been blocked by strong commercial interests which either profit (as in the case of the money lenders) or stand to profit (as in the case of those who are hungry to despoil the dunes area) through their opposition.

The "little people" are fortunate to have a champion so unrelenting in his devotion to their welfare as is Senator Douglas, of Illinois. For this is the third Congress in which he has introduced his truth-in-lending bill. For 6 years he has refused to take rejection for an answer.

Ample testimony has been heard. Witnesses have stated under oath that grossly exorbitant interest rates are packed into many loans.

FOR HOW LONG?

A borrower in financial need, perhaps dire extremity, goes to a money lender. The lender says the rate is 6 percent. That does not sound too high and the loan goes through. But it would sound a lot higher if the lender was required by law to say that this 6 percent was not 6 percent a year but 6 percent a month and then quoted the higher annual rate.

Some greedy lenders often charge all the traffic will bear. Some regularly get 42 percent while more unscrupulous lenders have run the annual rate to 100 percent and even higher.

After having milked countless adults, some credit extenders are now going to work on teenagers. They say that this credit can be had for "pennies a week." What they do not say that these "pennies a week" charges can run as high as 80 percent of the most of the article bought.

Last year the honest interest bill was defeated in a Senate Banking Subcommittee by vote of 5 to 4. The rejecting majority consisted of one Democrat (Robertson, of Virginia) and four Republicans (Capehart, of Indiana; Bush, of Connecticut; Bennett, of Utah; and Beall, of Maryland). Capehart and Bush were not reelected and so they cannot again oppose the bill. Nor is it likely that their two successors will take the side of the gougers.

RECREATION NEEDS

The other Douglas bill that has aroused the exploiters is so sound that it is hard to see how the opposition is bold enough to declare itself. Our population is now 187 million. Soon it will be 200 million. With the rise in population goes the need for more recreational areas—particularly adjacent to large metropolitan centers.

Yet certain industrial interests seem to have determined on destroying the heart of the Indiana duneland shore. They reckoned without considering Mrs. James H. Buell, who 11 years ago formed a save-the-dunes council which in turn enlisted Senator Douglas's support.

In the short time that he has been in office, President Kennedy has taken strong stands before Congress for preserving a part of the dunes shore and for the truth-in-lending legislation. On the latter he said, "Excessive and untimely use of credit arising out of ignorance of its true cost is harmful both to the stability of the economy and to the welfare of the public."

The exploiters have had their way on these issues long enough. Let's pass both Douglas bills so President Kennedy can sign them for the people's benefit.

A REPORT ON COMMUNISM IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA AS TOLD TO AMERICANS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Sunday was the 15th anniversary of the day the Communists took over Czechoslovakia. This dark event in modern history brought the tragic death of the great Czechoslovak patriot, Jan Masaryk, and the tragic death of a free nation which was born among Czechoslovak exiles living in the United States during World War I.

In bitter observance of this anniversary, the Czechoslovak National Council of America has prepared a statement on life today in their homeland. It is a revealing picture of life in a Communist country, a Soviet satellite. It contains a proposal which we, as Members of the Senate and the Congress of the United States, might well consider. More than anything else, it reminds us of the great love which the Czechoslovak people bore for their free nation and their longing to rid themselves of their Communist overlords and enjoy the light of freedom once again.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Report on Communism in Czechoslovakia as Told to Americans

Fifteen years ago, on February 24, 1948, Communists took over Czechoslovakia with Soviet assistance, under the personal supervision of Moscow's hatchetman Valerian Zorin, the recent troublemaker at the United Nations. At first, the Communists made an effort to bluff the free world into believing that the seizure had been an act of a free people. Now that pretense is no longer necessary, the Communists brazenly describe how they plotted the overthrow of the democratic government and how much they depended on Soviet help.

What communism has meant to the people of Czechoslovakia and how much it has changed their lives is borne out in thousands of letters received by American relatives. The Czechoslovak National Council of America, an organization of Americans of Czechoslovak descent, with headquarters in Chicago and branches in a number of cities, has made a study of personal mail from Czechoslovakia and on the basis of this information concludes that Christmas 1962 in Czechoslovakia was the worst since 1945, the first postwar Christmas when the country was left bare by the Nazis.

In their letters, Czechoslovak citizens complain: "If one is not young enough and strong enough to queue up for hours from very early morning for a ration of 4 ounces of butter and 1 pound of margarine, there is nothing left within a few hours. Electricity is shut off early. Prague streets are dark. Trains are unheated. There is a fuel shortage. In the mining town of Kladno near Prague, people stood in line for 20 pounds of coal, which they had to carry home in sacks, when and if they got any. Water pipes are frozen, but former plumbers are not allowed to take house calls and repair the damage; instead, people must wait until a government agency assigns a workman to the job. Since industry, farms, business, and professions have all been expropriated without compensation by the government and are government owned and operated, government agencies alone decide what should be done, by whom, for whom, and when, if at all. Consequently, the average citizen waits for weeks for the repair of pipes, furnace, roof, or crumbling wall. Should he wish to repair it himself, he is not given the material with which to do it, not even a bag of cement.

Service to customers is also very poor as there is no business competition and personal initiative. One waits for weeks, even for months, for a suit to be cleaned and shoes to be resoled. The quality of goods is far inferior to what it used to be. Despite the fact that every ablebodied—and not so ablebodied—man and woman is hard at work, there is a scarcity of almost everything and the prices of consumer goods are very high.

The reason for this is Red Czechoslovakia's foreign policy: acting as a spearhead for the Soviet Union, the Prague regime gives considerable economic aid to the underdeveloped and neutralist countries the Soviets are trying to woo to their side. This is why the Prague regime has been supplying Castro with food, considerable technical aid, and arms. In return, Czechoslovakia has received some unwanted Cuban sugar, for Czechoslovakia herself has always been a heavy exporter of beet sugar.

Most of all, people lament the loss of freedom in their letters to American friends: "There is work for everyone, but that is all we have. Nothing is as it used to be. We have only our memories." Families with young children are afraid to attend church in their hometown because their son and daughter would be barred from a higher school of learning and from a better job. The letters reflect the weariness, apathy, and despair of the writer.

American relatives are anxious to send gift packages of American goods to their close of kin. It would be simple for a daughter to send a warm sweater to her mother in Czechoslovakia who writes: "My room is unheated and it is so cold that I stay in bed and cry myself to sleep. A wool sweater is not to be had and a cotton sweater isn't worth anything." The Communists have made it impossible, however, for Americans to send gift packages by placing in 1961 an astronomical duty on new goods and an almost prohibitive duty of 50 crowns on a kilo of used clothing (approximately $7 for 2.2 pounds; hourly wage of average office worker is 6 crowns; of farmworker as little as 12 crowns a day).

The Red regime has a definite purpose in mind: to squeeze dollars out of Americans. If Americans wish to help their needy Czechoslovak relatives, they must send dollars to the Red regime with which Czechoslovak citizens can then buy Czechoslovak goods, if and when available, in a government store called Tuzex.

The Red regime then has dollars for anti-American propaganda and Communist subversion in Latin America and elsewhere in the world. In view of these facts, it is hard to understand why our Government is so careful to observe strictly all the niceties and why it has not restricted the Red government monopoly which bars American goods. After all, we are in a strong position for we have the dollars. We could insist, for instance, on gift packages of American goods (limited in size and value) if we continue to send dollars (unlimited, so far) and to travel to Czechoslovakia with unlimited spending money. In order to curtail the flow of American dollars abroad, the United States limits its citizens on how much they can bring back into this country duty free and exacts other limitations on its citizens as well. Why not set up reciprocity regulations or limitations when dealing with the Reds?

So far, Americans of Czechoslovakia have been asking this question in vain.

A $12 BILLION DEFICIT WILL NOT PROMOTE GROWTH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there is nothing in the country's long experience with deficits to suggest that the administration's proposed $12 billion deficit will significantly stimulate economic growth or even forestall a recession.

In our $550 billion economy, even the $12 billion deficit programed by the administration will be swamped by the impact of private economic forces.

In the past 32 years, this Nation has become thoroughly experienced in Federal deficits. Deficits have been a continuous way of life for our National Government almost throughout this period.

These deficits have been so immense that the national debt has exploded twentyfold since 1930: from $16 billion to over $300 billion.

But except in World War II when deficits were astronomical, there is no evidence that continuous deficits have promoted economic growth. The evidence is all to the contrary.

The biggest growth in peacetime Federal debt, for example, was in the decade of the thirties and in the period since 1957. The thirties period was characterized by disastrous economic stagnation and record unemployment coinciding with 10 years of such heavy deficits that they would be equivalent to $20 billion annually today.

From 1957 to date, Federal deficits have averaged a heavy $6 billion per year. And yet, economic growth has been the slow-moving despair of current economists during this very period.

Advocates of the deficit route point to the impressive economic progress in Europe during the past decade to support the deficit stimulus theory.

The economic situation in European countries during the past 10 years is so vastly different from ours—particularly in terms of demand—that the comparison is not a valid one.

But even here what does the record show? The industrial star of Europe, West Germany, enjoyed a mammoth 92-percent growth in industrial production in the 8 years between 1953 and 1961—most recent years for which figures are available—compared to 20 percent in this country; but its deficit averaged one-tenth of 1 percent of gross national product during this period compared to an average deficit of four-tenths of 1 percent of gross national product in the United States of America. In terms of gross national product, Germany had one-fourth the deficit and four times the growth of this country.

JESSE LEE WARD, SR.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, at its organizational meeting on February 27, 1963, the Committee on Rules and Administration took official cognizance of the death last November of Jesse Lee Ward, Sr., who for many years, both individually and through his commercial reporting firm, rendered competent and valuable service to the committee in connection with its legislative hearings. It is my understanding that Mr. Ward demonstrated the same type of personal concern and interest in the quality of service he supplied to other Senate committees, making apparent his dedication to the highest principles of his profession. Moreover, in many instances his working relationships with Members of the Senate over a long period of years developed into close personal friendships—a point emphasized at the meeting by none other than the dean of the Senate, the Honorable Carl Hayden.

Mr. President, in view of his contribution to our work and the esteem in which he was held, at the direction of the Committee on Rules and Administration I ask unanimous consent to insert a short biographical statement of Mr. Ward at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Jesse Lee Ward

Jesse Lee Ward was born on a farm near Enterprise, Miss., August 23, 1886, the son of Horace R. and Semele M. Ward. Working on the farm until his late teens, he then went for a brief time to Mississippi A. & M. College, but left to find work to support himself. He then became a telegrapher for a period of time, during which time he studied shorthand and court reporting techniques. He worked as a substitute court reporter until a vacancy occurred in the circuit court at Meridian, Miss., where he began his life's work as a shorthand reporter.

He served under Judge W. W. Venable as a court reporter until the judge ran for Congress, being elected to the 64th Congress in 1916. When Judge Venable came to Washington to assume his congressional duties, he brought with him his court reporter as secretary, which position Mr. Ward held for the two terms Judge Venable served in Congress.

During the period of time Mr. Ward was secretary, he became familiar with the official committee reporters of the House, and when his work as secretary was terminated, he commenced reporting House and Senate committees as a free lance reporter. During the late twenties he also served as campaign manager and secretary for the late Senator Pat Harrison, of Mississippi, but returned to his first love, stenographic reporting, just prior to the depression in 1929, and continued reporting or directing his company of reporters, formed by a partnership with another secretary-reporter, Alfred C. Paul, until the time of his death November 3, 1962.

He was a Mason, a member of the bar of Mississippi, a member of the Civitan Club, deacon in the Calvary Baptist Church, and an active supporter of many charitable enterprises.

Throughout his life he maintained a firm insistence on accuracy, honesty, courtesy, and devotion to the ethics of the shorthand reporting profession, and this heritage he leaves behind him with many who worked with him to become masters of their, and his, profession.

THE INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY—IS THERE A SCANDAL?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, yesterday's Washington Daily News carried a most disturbing story by Seth Kantor concerning the Inter-American Highway entitled: "Dream Highway a Nightmare" with a subhead: "$227 Million for a 3,142-Mile Inter-American Jolting." The article indicates that the highway on which the United States has spent so many millions is anything but a success. To whatever extent its allegations are substantiable, it constitutes a shocking indictment.

Last January, as a member of a subcommittee of the Public Works Committee of the Senate, under the chairmanship of our able colleague from West Virginia, Jennings Randolph, he and I went to Central America on an inspection tour of the highway. Our report on the progress of the Inter-American Highway made to the Senate and presented to the Public Works Committee by its then chairman, the late Senator Dennis Chavez, expressed our concern at "the lack of any signs along the Inter-American Highway indicating that the construction of the highway was a joint undertaking, of which the United States has paid two-thirds of the cost besides providing expert engineering and other services without which the highway could not have advanced to its present status." That, according to the article by Seth Kantor has not yet been remedied, although we were promised it would be.

Our report to the Senate continued:

> No adequate explanation was given as to why such markings have not been installed. This is more than a matter of pride. It seems to the members of the subcommittee that such markers would serve as constant daily reminders to the users of these highways of the interest of the people of the United States of America in the economic betterment of the people of the Central American countries.

The subcommittee, composed of Senator Randolph and me, were likewise distressed to know that with the exception of Salvador the one-third cost contribution which the six Central American Republics were supposed to pay under the law establishing the joint financial responsibilities for the Inter-American Highway, Public Law 77–375 were largely derived from various types of foreign aid funds. In other words they are paying us with our own money. They included loans from the World Bank, from AID, from the Development Loan Fund, from the Export-Import Bank, and from the Inter-American Development Bank, and they totaled $153,355,780. The specific items of aid are found on pages 63 to 70 inclusive of our report.

Another matter which should give the Congress concern is that the cost estimates given it by the responsible officials of the Bureau of Public Roads seem never to have been accurate. The article refers to this, and our committee report likewise quoted the specific testimony of government officials indicating that the highway could be completed for the sums then appropriated. Yet the Congress is still being asked to contribute more millions to complete the highway.

I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee's comments on this aspect of the question, as well as the article by Mr. Seth Kantor and the tables showing how money from our foreign aid program has been substituted for the required contributions of these Central American countries, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. I am further distressed that plans seem to be underway to have the United States, after the completion of this highway, provide, in substantial part, funds for its maintenance.

We do not permit our own States, under our Federal aid highway program, to use Federal funds for the maintenance of these highways. It seems fantastic that we should extend this generosity abroad when we deny it to ourselves at home. It would seem to me unthinkable that, after we have spent some 15 years in association with the highway agencies of these six Central American countries, demonstrating to them our presumed skills and know-how in highway construction, we should not have been able to inculcate upon them the ability and know-how thereafter to maintain these roads. I think this is a very serious matter and deserves the attention of the Congress.

EXHIBIT 1

DREAM HIGHWAY'S A NIGHTMARE—$227 MILLION FOR A 3,142-MILE INTER-AMERICAN JOLTING

(By Seth Kantor)

The United States has pumped more than $227 million and 33 years of engineering and construction into a crazy quilt of laziness, mistakes, landslides and floods, known as the Inter-American Highway.

Laid out from Panama to Laredo, Tex., the 3,142-mile road formally will open in May. Just back from a bone-rattling ride on it, the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads' chief expert on the highway described parts of it this way to the Washington Daily News today: "discouraging as hell."

WORSE

Spending 4 January and February weeks riding the highway that pierces six Central American nations and Mexico, the bureau's expert, Deputy Director of Engineering and Operations A. F. Ghiglione, said "sections of the highway are worse than they were 3 years ago." He said:

"Road directors don't make repairs, I traveled through water-filled ditches that have crawled across the road like giant lizards. They could have been stopped by peon labor, but weren't.

"Stuff is going on down there that would make a highway engineer sick at his stomach."

Mr. Ghiglione isn't a squeamish man. He spent 25 years in Alaska—10 of them as the Territory's commissioner of roads—fighting ice and snow. Chiefly, two things turned his stomach, he will tell Commerce Department bosses in a report he's preparing on his trip:

"I asked the public roads ministers of the Central American states to ride with me in my standard sedan. Some hadn't been on the highway—hadn't even looked at it—in more than a year."

"In one 95-mile stretch, in northern Guatemala, jostling ruts and bumps were covered by dust so thick that it was like riding on flour. We ate our own car's dust, through closed windows."

MONEY

For this, the United States has spent $227 million since 1930. Thirteen years ago, Congress was asked to approve $64 million "for completion of the highway." It did, with sighs of relief.

Since then, Congress has allotted four more whopping sums, totaling $16.9 million "for completion of the highway."

The American Automobile Association, just completing test rides of the highway, agrees with the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads' expert: "It's nowhere near complete." The AAA is fearful the highway's grand opening in May will bring out many vacationing families this year, looking for a romantic excursion from Texas to Panama. Said Mr. Ghiglione:

"The road is passable. But that's all. For little children and the elderly, it's tortuous in places. I wouldn't recommend it, except for the adventurous."

Bureau of Public Roads estimates are that the span of long-standing trouble "may be ready in 4 to 6 years," in a realistic appraisal.

Mexico is no problem, everyone seems to agree. Mexico had started its own section of the road before the official route was agreed on, 30 years ago. Mexico has not used U.S. funds and the Mexican section is considered in good driving shape.

THE REST

That leaves 1,555 miles of the highway running bumpety-bump down through Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Panama. A report being prepared by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads for "The Grand Opening" shows 515 of those miles—a third of the Central American span—in a state of neglect or in need of completion.

Another report is being prepared by a Texan, behind scenes in Congress, which will show the Inter-American Highway has been in the hands of various incompetents for years.

Since 1930, when the Hoover administration first started dropping U.S. taxpayer dollars into it, the highway in the six Central American countries has been like a bag developing holes faster than patches.

The six little countries have paid $63 million toward the grand opening in May.

Representative JIM WRIGHT, Democrat, of Texas, will report to colleagues on the House Public Works Committee that the public roads ministers of Latin American nations should "be relieved" of control of the highway.

OAS PLAN

Based on firsthand travels over the road, he will suggest next month that "a responsible body should be created to maintain the highway." He will urge an Inter-American Highway Authority be established, under the Organization of American States, to:

"Keep the road from falling apart in places, as it has been."

"Establish a means of repair revenue, such as taxes from gasoline stations along the route and franchised motels and restaurants."

Representative WRIGHT also is disturbed about "lack of salesmanship by the United States." In 22 years, since heavy construction began in earnest on the highway, there hasn't been so much as one sign put up to show "the road is an example of teamwork among the Americas."

The United States has been putting up most of the money, but Representative WRIGHT has discovered "most people down there don't realize we've had a thing in the world to do with their road."

Where the United States has been "most lax," Mr. Ghiglione said, is in not enforcing original agreements with the six nations.

WALLPAPER

"Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala originally agreed in writing that U.S. construction aid would be held up at any time that they didn't maintain the road as it was built.

"Well, you could paper the walls with their agreements, for all the paper is worth. We now have wised up. Last October, Congress appropriated another $32 million to help bring the highway to a reasonable conclusion. This time, the money won't get into their hands unless we see them taking care of the highway."

The two biggest blights on the dream that was first envisioned by Pan American delegates as a railroad, in 1884, are in:

Costa Rica, where rock slides make an obstacle course out of one 133-mile stretch.

Guatemala, where the first 95 miles south of Mexico turn to gumbo in the 5-month-long rainy season and a haze of dusty ruts the rest of the year.

Honduras and El Salvador have the fewest problems. But combined, their stretch of highway is shorter than any of the other four countries where the big problems are.

COMMENTS—LOAN AND GRANT PROGRAMS AND ESTIMATES OF COST

The subcommittee has noted the report made recently on Latin American policies by a committee of which the senior Senator from Arkansas was chairman, and having as its members the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, and Senators HRUSKA, BIBLE, and SMITH of Maine. It is noted with special interest that paragraph in the the report, which our majority leader asked to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 2, page 2077, and which reads as follows:

"We must face up to the enormous duplication of sources of help for Latin America which already exist. These are not yet used in any integrated pattern. We can ill afford to waste either the funds or the talents that are involved in this duplication. Moreover, it is likely that more sources of aid will continue to be piled on top of existing sources and, beyond great cost, there will be such cumbersomeness, confusion, rivalry, and redtape that effective followthrough under the Alliance for Progress will become next to impossible."

This astute observation is especially true with respect to aid for the construction of highways in Central America. The record indicates that, in addition to funds appropriated directly by the Congress for the Inter-American Highway ($138,703,000), various grants and loans have been made by various lending agencies for the total highway program in Central America since 1955.

A breakdown of these loans appears at the end of these comments.

The statute under which the Inter-American Highway was authorized provides with respect to matching the following:

"Not to exceed one-third of the appropriation authorized for each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the country or countries in which such funds may be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity to bear. The remainder of such authorized appropriations shall be available for expenditure only when matched to the extent required by this section by the country in which such expenditure may be made (23 U.S.C. 213(a))."

Thus the intent of the statute was that the United States of America would pay no more than two-thirds of the cost of the Inter-American Highway and the Central American country involved would pay one-third of the cost.

The subcommittee is concerned at the extent to which loans granted by the Export-Import Bank have been used to meet the matching requirements of the statute. At the time the funds authorized for this project were increased in 1955, in response to a question by Senator Kerr as to whether there was a "satisfactory basis to assure us that the affected countries will be ready to put up their one-third of the cost," Mr. Henry F. Holland, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, replied:

"Senator, we have conferred with each of the governments affected and each is delighted to accelerate its own contribution to carry out this program."

Yet, Mr. Holland, in his prepared text, inserted into the record, indicated that only Guatemala and Costa Rica required loans and that the remainder of the countries involved were able and willing to put up their shares of the costs of completing the Inter-American Highway.

However, the record indicates that all the nations involved, with the exception of El Salvador, have borrowed either from the World Bank or the Export-Import Bank to meet their matching shares. The program has thus become one in which the United States has granted to the nations involved (other than El Salvador) two-thirds of the cost of building this highway and has lent to them, other than El Salvador, the remaining one-third.

The concept of self-help involved in this project, therefore, has been diminished by the availability of loans from the United States and the World Bank to enable these nations (other than El Salvador) to meet their shares of the costs. To the extent that payment for the cost of constructing the highway has been deferred, the burden in the future of repaying both the loan and current maintenance costs will be the greater. The danger is that needed maintenance costs will be deferred—since they bear no due date—and the roads will be permitted to deteriorate to the point where there will be a need for high reconstruction expenditures.

COST ESTIMATES

The subcommittee hopes that estimates presented to it by the Bureau of Public Roads as to the amounts needed to complete the Inter-American Highway will be more accurate than those presented in the past.

The subcommittee reminds the Bureau of Public Roads that when it appeared before the committee in 1955 requesting an additional authorization of $25,730,000 to complete the Inter-American Highway, assurances were given at that time the highway could be completed with such a sum. The following colloquy took place at that time:

Senator GORE. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to inquire either of Mr. Curtiss (Commissioner of Public Roads) or Mr. Turner (Assistant to the Commissioner of Public Roads), as to the reliability, in their opinion, of the cost estimates?

"Mr. CURTISS. We think they are reliable, and that the work can be done for that amount.

"Senator GORE. Did you arrive at the recommended amount through detailed study or is it a so-called educated guess?

"Mr. CURTISS. Mr. Turner was in charge of the work of making the estimates. I think it was a careful estimate.

"Senator GORE. Do you say so, Mr. Turner?

"Mr. TURNER. Yes."

However, in 1957, the Bureau of Public Roads was before the Congress again requesting an additional authorization of $10 million and admitting that its previous estimates had been incorrect. Such increased authorization was voted by the Congress.

Now we are told that a request for the authorization of an additional $32 million will be made to the Congress, again for the purpose of completing the construction of the Inter-American Highway.

Thus, the Bureau's estimate in 1955 that the expenditure of the sum of $25,730,000 would complete the Inter-American Highway turns out to be incorrect by $42 million—an error of close to 200 percent. No one now can say what the reaction of the Congress would have been in 1955 if it had been told that it would take $67,730,000 to complete the highway rather than $25,730,000. Congress is entitled, if it is to legislate intelligently, to more accurate estimates than have hitherto been furnished it with respect to this program.

Loans made by the various lending and grant agencies for road construction to the Central American Republics

The World Bank	$64,100,000
AID (Foreign Assistance Act)	21,055,780
Development Loan Fund	24,900,000
Export-Import Bank	40,800,000
Inter-American Development	2,500,000
Total	153,355,780

Aid under the Foreign Assistance Act to Guatemala for highway construction

REPUBLIC OF GUATEMALA

Fiscal year 1955:	
Pacific slope	$3,675,000
Seminar	1,100
Fiscal year 1956:	
Pacific slope	1,700,000
Atlantic Highway	3,205,000
Quetzaltenango-Retalhulen	950,000
Pacific slope, east and west sections	1,206,000
Fiscal year 1957:	
Atlantic Highway	6,043,000
Pacific slope	1,700,000
Project access roads	700,000
Fiscal year 1958: Project access roads	675,000
Fiscal year 1959	None
Fiscal year 1960: Bridge construction—reobligation	204,000
Fiscal year 1961	None
Total	20,059,100

Current credit and loans extended to Guatemala by the Export-Import Bank for use on completing construction of Inter-American Highway

REPUBLIC OF GUATEMALA

Credits authorized		Undisbursed balance	Status of loans			Interest	Repayment terms
Date	Amount		Disbursed	Repaid	Outstanding		
						Percent	
Dec. 16, 1960	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	----------	----------	----------	5¼	24 semiannual payments beginning July 31, 1964.

Statement of loans made by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (the World Bank)

GUATEMALA—ROADS

Fiscal year report	Year made	Maturities	Interest rate including commission	Original principal amount	Partial cancellation	Effective loans sold or agreed to be sold	
						Total sales	Portion matured
			Percent				
June 30, 1957	July 29, 1955	1959–70	4⅝	$18,200,000	----------	$576,000	----------
June 30, 1958	do	1959–70	4⅝	18,200,000	----------	576,000	----------
June 30, 1959	do	1959–70	4⅝	18,200,000	----------	576,000	$576,000
June 30, 1960	do	1959–70	4⅝	18,200,000	----------	576,000	576,000
June 30, 1961	do	1959–70	4⅝	18,200,000	----------	576,000	576,000

	Principal repayments to Bank	Effective loans held by banks	Principal amount disbursed
June 30, 1957		$17,624,000	----------
June 30, 1958	----------	17,624,000	----------
June 30, 1959	----------	17,624,000	$17,618,443
June 30, 1960	$1,192,000	16,432,000	17,963,303
June 30, 1961	2,440,000	15,184,000	18,199,066

No loans have been made to Guatemala under the following lending programs: International Development Association, Inter-American Development Bank, and Development Loan Fund.

Aid to the Republic of El Salvador for road construction under Foreign Assistance Act

Fiscal years 1955 through 1958	(1)
Fiscal year 1959: Highway training	$6,000
Fiscal years 1960–61	(1)

[1] No grants.

No loans were made under the following programs: Development Loan Fund, International Development Association, Inter-American Development Bank, and the Export-Import Bank.

Statement of loans made by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (the World Bank)

EL SALVADOR—ROADS

Fiscal year report	Year made	Maturities	Interest rate including commission	Original principal amount	Partial cancellation	Effective loans sold or agreed to be sold	
						Total sales	Portion matured
			Percent				
June 30, 1957	1955	1959–66	4½	$11,100,000		$250,000	
June 30, 1958	1955	1959–66	4½	11,100,000			
June 30, 1959	1955	1959–66	4½	11,100,000		250,000	$250,000
June 30, 1960	1955	1959–66	4½	11,100,000		250,000	250,000
June 30, 1961	1955	1959–66	4½	11,100,000		250,000	250,000
June 30, 1959	Jan. 7, 1959	1963–74	5¾	5,000,000			
June 30, 1960	do	1963–74	5¾	5,000,000		300,000	
June 30, 1961	do	1963–74	5¾	5,000,000		300,000	

	Principal repayments to Bank	Effective loans held by banks	Principal amount disbursed
1957		$10,850,000	
1958		10,850,000	
1959	$334,000	10,516,000	$10,692,467
1960	1,542,000	9,308,000	10,829,006
1961	2,804,000	8,046,000	11,042,218
1960		4,700,000	380,998
1961		4,700,000	1,405,677

Loan to Republic of Honduras for road construction under International Development Association

Date: May 12, 1961.

Amount: $9,000,000.

Period: 50 years.

No interest.

Amortization after 10 years; 1 percent for 10 years, 3 percent for 30 years.

Repayable in foreign currency.

Aid under the Foreign Assistance Act program to the Republic of Honduras for highway construction

REPUBLIC OF HONDURAS

Fiscal year 1955: Consultation on highways	$9,600
Fiscal year 1956: Consultation on highways	39,076
Fiscal year 1957: Consultation on highways	32,000
Fiscal year 1958: Consultation on highways	$37,000
Fiscal year 1959: Consultation on highways	47,000
Fiscal year 1960: Consultation on highways	29,000
Fiscal year 1961: Equipment and management operation	71,000
Total	264,676

Loan from the Development Loan Fund to Republic of Honduras for road constructions

REPUBLIC OF HONDURAS

Made in fiscal year 1958.

Amount approved: $5,000,000.

Paid back $440,661.

Repaid $25,000.

Interest 3.717 percent.

Repaid in lempiras.

Loan from Inter-American Development Bank to Republic of Honduras for road constructions

REPUBLIC OF HONDURAS

Project: Roads.

Date of loan: May 12, 1961.

Amount: $2,500,000, of which $500,000 is a grant and $2,000,000 is loan. Up to $750,000 for local costs.

Repayable in 2 years, at an interest rate of 4 percent.

Repayment of principal in Honduras currency (lempiras) and payment of the interest will be made in dollars.

Repayment begins 4⅓ years from date of contract.

Statement of loans made by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (the World Bank)

HONDURAS ROADS

Fiscal year report	Year made	Maturities	Interest rate including commission	Original principal amount	Partial cancellation	Effective loans sold or agreed to be sold	
						Total sales	Portion matured
			Percent				
June 30, 1957	Dec. 22, 1955	1955–64	1½	$4,200,000		$872,000	$483,000
June 30, 1958	do	1955–64	1½	4,200,000		872,000	483,000
June 30, 1959	do	1955–64	1½	4,200,000		872,000	802,000
June 30, 1960	do	1955–64	1½	4,200,000		872,000	872,000
June 30, 1961	do	1955–64	1½	4,200,000		872,000	872,000
June 30, 1957							
June 30, 1958	May 9, 1958	1961–78	5⅜	5,500,000			
June 30, 1959	do	1961–78	5⅜	5,500,000		200,000	
June 30, 1960	do	1961–78	5⅜	5,500,000		299,000	
June 30, 1961	do	1961–78	5⅜	5,500,000		299,000	97,000

	Principal repayments to Bank	Effective loans held by banks	Principal amount disbursed
June 30, 1957		$3,328,000	
June 30, 1958			
June 30, 1959	$185,000	3,143,000	$3,750,392
June 30, 1960	643,000	2,685,000	3,968,063
June 30, 1961	1,195,000	2,133,000	4,140,549
June 30, 1957			
June 30, 1958			
June 30, 1959		5,201,000	422,214
June 30, 1960		5,201,000	2,356,041
June 30, 1961		5,201,000	4,064,606

Current credit and loans extended to Honduras by the Export-Import Bank for use on Inter-American Highway construction

REPUBLIC OF HONDURAS

Credits authorised		Undisbursed balance	Status of loans			Interest	Repayment terms
Date	Amount		Disbursed	Repaid	Outstanding		
Jan. 17, 1957	$1,810,000	$510,000	$1,300,000	$110,000.99	$1,189,999.01	Percent 5¾	30 semiannual payments beginning Feb. 1, 1960, except advances in excess of $1,100,000 payable 30 semiannual payments beinning Aug. 1, 1962.

Loans made to Nicaragua for highway construction by the various lending agencies of the U.S. Government

NICARAGUA

Development Loan Fund	([1])
Inter-American Development Bank	([1])
Aid under the Foreign Assistance Act:	
1956: Public roads	$17,644
1957: Transportation, highways	14,000
1958: Transportation, highways	5,000
1959: Transportation, highways	$7,000
1960: Transportation, highways	6,000
1961: Transportation, highways	5,000
Total	54,644
Export-Import Bank: Dec. 12, 1956—Loan, 5¾ percent interest. Repayable 30 semiannual payments beginning Aug. 1, 1959. Purpose, construction of Inter-American Highway	$2,000,000

The World Bank—International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. (See attached sheet for breakdown.)

[1] No loans.

Statement of loans made by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (the World Bank)

NICARAGUA—ROADS

Fiscal year report	Year made	Maturities	Interest rate including commission	Original principal amount	Partial cancellation	Effective loans sold or agreed to be sold	
						Total sales	Portion matured
			Percent				
June 30, 1957	June 7, 1951	1954–61	4⅛	$3,500,000		$29,000	$29,000
June 30, 1958	do	1954–61	4⅛	3,500,000		29,000	29,000
June 30, 1959	do	1954–61	4⅛	3,500,000		29,000	29,000
June 30, 1960	do	1954–61	4⅛	3,500,000		29,000	29,000
June 30, 1961	do	1954–61	4⅛	3,500,000		29,000	29,000
June 30, 1957	Sept. 4, 1953	1957–63	4¾	3,500,000			
June 30, 1958	do	1957–63	4¾	3,500,000			
June 30, 1959	do	1957–63	4¾	3,500,000			
June 30, 1960	do	1957–63	4¾	3,500,000			
June 30, 1961	do	1957–63	4¾	3,500,000			

	Principal repayments to bank	Effective loans held by banks	Principal amount disbursed
June 30, 1957	$1,213,000	$2,258,000	
June 30, 1958	1,680,000	1,791,000	
June 30, 1959	2,167,000	1,304,000	$3,500,000
June 30, 1960	2,673,000	798,000	3,500,000
June 30, 1961	3,200,000	271,000	3,500,000
June 30, 1957	214,000	3,286,600	
June 30, 1958	657,000	2,843,000	
June 30, 1959	1,121,000	2,379,000	3,417,942
June 30, 1960	1,606,000	1,894,000	3,500,000
June 30, 1961	2,116,000	1,384,000	3,500,000

Current credit and loans extended to Nicaragua by the Export-Import Bank for use on construction of Inter-American Highway

REPUBLIC OF NICARAGUA

Credits authorized		Undisbursed balance	Status of loans			Interest	Repayment terms
Date	Amount		Disbursed	Repaid	Outstanding		
Dec. 12, 1956	$2,000,000	$245,509.36	$1,754,490.64	$113,342	$1,641,148.64	Percent 5¾	30 semiannual payments beginning Aug. 1, 1959.

Aid under the Foreign Assistance Act to the Republic of Costa Rica for highway construction

REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA

Fiscal year 1955: Highway planning, construction, and maintenance improvement project	$2,400
Fiscal year 1956: Highway improvement project	27,960
Fiscal year 1957: Highway improvement project (training personnel)	$14,000
Fiscal year 1958	None
Fiscal year 1959: Ministry of Public Works—highway planning	7,000
Fiscal year 1960: Ministry of Public Works—highway planning	5,000
Fiscal year 1961: Ministry of Public Works—highway planning	$5,000
Total	61,360

Under the Development Loan Fund, Inter-American Development Bank, and World Bank, no loans were authorized for road construction.

Current credit and loans extended to Costa Rica for use on Inter-American Highway construction by the Export-Import Bank

REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA

Credits authorized		Undisbursed balance	Status of loans			Interest
Date	Amount		Disbursed	Repaid	Outstanding	
						Percent
Nov. 3, 1955	[1] $14,540,000	$2,964,977.51	$11,575,022.49	$2,671,342.00	$8,903,680.49	4½
Apr. 22, 1942	[2] 7,000,000		6,985,000.00	2,552,062.61	4,432,937.39	3½
Apr. 15, 1960	[3] 3,000,000	3,000,000.00	None	None	None	5¾

[1] The above loan or balance of $9,540,000 is repayable in 30 semiannual payments beginning May 1, 1957.

[2] This loan of $7,000,000 was for materials and services for the Inter-American Highway, repayable in 80 quarterly payments beginning Jan. 1, 1951 ($15,000 of it not used).

[3] This loan is repayable in 30 semiannual payments beginning Sept. 1, 1962.

Statement of loans made by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (the World Bank)

PANAMA—ROADS

Fiscal year report	Year made	Maturities	Interest rate including commission	Original principal amount	Partial cancellation	Effective loans sold or agreed to be sold	
						Total sales	Portion matured
			Percent				
June 30, 1957	July 12, 1955	1959–64	4¼	$5,900,000		$1,700,000	
June 30, 1958	do	1959–64	4¼	5,900,000		1,700,000	
June 30, 1959	do	1959–64	4¼	5,900,000			
June 30, 1959, Panama repaid 3 loans				7,390,000	$542,574	1,700,000	$1,700,000
June 30, 1960	July 12, 1955			7,390, 00	542,574	1,700,000	1,700,000
June 30, 1961	do		4¼	7,390,000	542,574	1,700,000	1,700,000
Do	Aug. 19, 1960	1964–75	5¾	7,200,000		457,000	
Repaid 3 loans				7,390,000	542,574	1,700,000	1,700,000
Total				14,590,000	542,574	2,157,000	1,700,000

	Principal repayments to Bank	Effective loans held by banks	Principal amount disbursed
June 30, 1957		$4,200,000	
June 30, 1958		4,200,000	
June 30, 1959	$5,147,426		$6,847,426
June 30, 1960	5,147,426		6,847,426
June 30, 1961	5,147,426		6,847,426
Do		6,743,000	

Aid under the Foreign Assistance Act to the Republic of Panama for highway construction

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

Fiscal year 1955	None
Fiscal year 1956	None
Fiscal year 1957	None
Fiscal year 1958	None
Fiscal year 1959	None
Fiscal year 1960:	
Training and operating of heavy equipment	$75,000
Fiscal year 1960—Continued	
Reobligation—training and operating of heavy equipment	$103,000
Fiscal year 1961:	
Training and operation of heavy equipment	117,000
Construction of farm-to-market roads	$315,000
Total	610,000

No loans were made to Panama from the Development Loan Fund or the Inter-American Development Bank for highway construction.

Current credit and loans extended to Panama by the Export-Import Bank for use on construction of Inter-American Highway

REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

Credits authorized		Undisbursed balance	Status of loans			Interest	Repayment terms
Date	Amount		Disbursed	Repaid	Outstanding		
						Percent	
June 14, 1957	$12,850,000	$6,749,579	$6,100,421		$6,100,421	5¼	60 quarterly payments beginning July 31, 1962.

ADMINISTRATION'S TAX PROGRAM

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, for many months now I have had a suspicion that there existed along the reaches of the New Frontier a very serious and fundamental misunderstanding of the American enterprise system and the Nation's economy. If I ever had any doubts about this, they have certainly been laid to rest by recent developments in connection with the administration's program for tax reduction and tax reform. I doubt if there ever has been so much confusion over a plan for changing the tax system than exists today over the program sent up by President Kennedy. And, Mr. President, we have only the Chief Executive himself to blame for this confusion. Frankly, I no longer know what to think about the official attitude of our Government—and I doubt if the American people know what to think about it.

Consider what we were told, Mr. President, when the administration's tax program was submitted to the Congress just 1 month ago. As I remember it, the President in his special message said it was needed to promote economic growth, to provide more employment, and to put our unused production capacity to work. He spoke in terms of long-term improvement of the economy and said,

> My recommendation for early revision of our tax structure is not motivated by any threat of imminent recession.

Now, those words were spoken at a time when it appeared that the administration's tax program would encounter

little difficulty in the Congress. I am sure everyone remembers the support which at that time was coming from all areas in general acceptance of the premise that the Federal tax system had become burdensome and needed to be revised. Organized labor as well as business groups appeared to be closing ranks behind the President's request, and there was no great need for the administration to engage in pressure tactics and propaganda broadsides to press its point.

But now all that has changed. Strong public opposition has arisen to the whole idea of slashing taxes without a corresponding reduction in Government spending. Strong opposition has arisen to the whole idea of deliberately planned deficits and continued fiscal irresponsibility on the part of the Federal Government. In addition to this, great differences of opinion have arisen over how and where taxes should be reduced.

So what happens? Now we find the President speaking darkly about a recession and saying that if it comes those who oppose his tax program must bear the responsibility. Less than 5 weeks after the President told us that his tax recommendations were not motivated by any threat of imminent recession, he tells the American Bankers Association that, if there is no tax reduction, the country will be struck with its fifth postwar recession in the not-too-distant future. And after insisting that any tax reduction must be accompanied by tax reform in his message to Congress, the President tells the bankers that he is willing to scrap his reform proposals to get a $10 billion tax cut.

Mr. President, what goes on with this administration? Are we expected to believe that the economic situation has changed so radically since January 24, when the special tax message came up to us, that the Nation is now threatened with recession? Are we to believe that the need for consumer purchasing power, which so bemuses the New Frontier as a means for spurring the economy, has increased in that period? If so, the administration is trying to sell a phony package. Only 2 days ago the Wall Street Journal reported that in a time of record spending, public savings have risen an amazing 20 percent since 1960. In the period since 1957, they have increased 41 percent.

And let me list here the conclusions the Journal draws from these phenomenal figures. It says:

> The large savings supply forms a money cushion in public hands if a recession occurs.
>
> It provides fuel for still greater spending in the months ahead and, possibly, for renewed inflation.
>
> It suggests consumer demand, for the time being, is lagging behind ability to buy and casts doubt on the degree to which a tax cut can spur consumer spending.
>
> It exerts downward pressure on interest rates.

Mr. President, if there is a fifth postwar recession in the not-too-distant future, it will not be for lack of consumer purchasing power; it will be for lack of confidence in the administration's handling of fiscal affairs.

The President, in his talk to the bankers, challenged the critics of his program to put forward a solution of their own. Most of those critics have been putting forward a solution—and a sound solution—ever since talk of an administration-sponsored tax reduction program first began. And that solution is to reduce Government spending, not increase it, in concert with a program designed to lower taxes which have the effect of depressing capital investment.

It is more than obvious that when the President asks for alternate solutions, he wants only those that fit his preconceived formula of what will help the American economy. His trouble is that he will not entertain the idea that his whole formula is faulty. He is wedded to the idea that the way to solve the unemployment problem is to increase consumer purchasing power through both tax reduction and Government spending. He holds the economically naive belief that this will increase demand and guarantee the full utilization of America's presently unused production capacity. If this is a valid belief, then why is there so much consumer purchasing power presently residing in the time deposits at the banks, in savings bonds, in short-term Government securities, in savings and loan shares, in postal savings? If the need is for more purchasing power why has there been an extraordinary, record pileup of savings of 20 percent since 1960 against only a 3-percent increase in consumer credit?

And even if there was a need for increased consumer purchasing power—which there obviously is not—the filling of this need would not guarantee the full utilization of the Nation's production capacity. It is not enough merely to say that some of this capacity is unused because demand is lacking and that by increasing consumer purchasing power the necessary demand will be provided.

Let us take an example. When the New Frontiersmen speak of unused plant capacity in the United States, the steel industry is often cited as a case in point. Figures are produced to show that the steel industry is operating at only 60 percent of capacity. Then it is argued that if the steel industry produced at 90 percent of capacity the gross national product would increase and more people would be employed. The argument rests on a belief that if people had more money to spend they would spend a lot of it for products in which steel is used. This, in turn, would supposedly increase the demand for steel and bring about capacity or near-capacity production in American mills.

The trouble with this argument is that it overlooks the fact that steel-producing capacity is of many varieties, and some of that capacity is for a kind of steel that is no longer wanted. A large part of the 40 percent unused steelmaking capacity will never be used again, no matter how much consumer purchasing power is expanded.

If things were as simple as the President and his economic advisers would like us to think, why was it that the steel industry spent a billion dollars last year to increase capacity? Why did not the steelmakers merely use some of the 40 percent of idle capacity the administration talks about?

The reason is easy to understand. An industry operating at only 60 percent of its total capacity had a need for a different kind of production capacity. It needed a new capacity to produce this sheet steel so that it could compete better with the producers of other kinds of materials, such as plastics and aluminum. In short, it had to increase capacity for reasons of advancing technology and in recognition of the fact that a great deal of its existing, but unused, capacity would not fill the bill.

If demand stemming from consumer purchasing power was the answer to unused capacity in the steel mills, it would be difficult to understand why 1962 was not a capacity year for steel. Just consider the automobile industry, perhaps the largest single user of steel in America, and consider the fact that 1962 was one of the biggest years the automakers ever enjoyed. General Motors, for example, had the biggest year of any corporation in American history. Steel demand also was high in the fields of construction, highways, industrial plants, housing, schools, and military hardware.

Mr. President, the need today is not for utilization of old and obsolete plant capacity, but for the building of new kinds of plant capacity. There is need for the kind of tax reduction that will increase the capital investment needed to build this kind of capacity. There is need, too, for greater research and development and for more retraining of manpower for new tasks. I do not care how much this administration increases consumer purchasing power; it will not put unemployed coal miners back to work. It is about time the President begins to realize that our present problems are not the kind that lend themselves to easy answers such as deficit spending combined with tax reduction.

In closing, Mr. President, let me take note of the President's complaint that his tax program has become the target of "heated, partisan, exasperated, and rash assaults." I believe these assaults are fully justified and stem from a better understanding of how the American economy works than is presently held at the White House or in the Treasury Department. They are based on a distrust of printing-press money and overwhelming deficits. They are based on justified fear of ruinous inflation and further aggravation of our adverse balance of international payments.

In short, they are a nationwide protest against the New Frontier's policy of deliberately planned deficits, fiscal irresponsibility, and distrust of the enterprise system.

RATIFICATION BY THE STATES OF ALASKA AND OHIO OF THE PROPOSED POLL TAX AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. HOLLAND. At this time, Mr. President, I am happy to announce that two more States have ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment which the 87th Congress submitted to them last year. They are the States of Alaska and Ohio.

The Alaskan Senate took affirmative action on February 1, by a vote of 19 to 0 and the Alaskan House on February 11, by a vote of 27 to 8; thus completing the necessary action for ratification by that splendid new State.

According to an Associated Press dispatch appearing in this morning's Washington Post, the Senate of the Ohio Legislature unanimously approved ratification of the amendment yesterday. I have since been notified by our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], that the Ohio House overwhelmingly approved the amendment on February 6 by a vote of 119 to 3, and the Senate's unanimous action of yesterday, 31 to 0, completes ratification by that great State.

This brings to 13 the number of States which have thus far ratified the amendment, the others being California, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, and West Virginia. There are several other State legislatures presently considering ratification of the anti-poll-tax amendment where it has been approved in one of the two houses and is now pending before the other.

Mr. President, I am delighted to express my deepest appreciation to my distinguished colleagues from Alaska, Senators Bartlett and Gruening, and from Ohio, Senators Lausche and Young, all of whom cosponsored and supported the measure to passage last year and who lent their effective assistance this year in bringing the matter to the attention of the legislatures of their States.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As a cosponsor of the joint resolution resulting in the submission of this proposed constitutional amendment to the States, I wish to commend the Senator from Florida for the leadership he is taking in bringing the matter of the importance of ratification of the proposed amendment to the attention of the legislatures of the various States, and in keeping Members of the Senate and Congress in general informed as to the progress the amendment is making.

I wish to have the Senator know that I am hopeful that the Legislature of Tennessee, which is now in session, will before it adjourns approve the resolution embodying the amendment, which I hope will be the 24th amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the kind remarks of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. No one has been more devoted in pressing this matter than he has. I hope that he will be successful in his very sincere efforts in his own State. No one would be happier than the Senator from Florida to hear about the successful culmination of his efforts.

Mr. KEFAUVER. We hope to have good news for the Senator soon.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, as the Senator from Florida knows, I supported the joint resolution when it was before the Senate. After it was passed by Congress, I contacted the Governor of Ohio, the majority leaders in the senate and the house in the State, and the minority leaders in the Ohio Legislature. The gratitude which the Senator from Florida is expressing today should go to these men, namely, the Governor of Ohio, and the leaders of both the majority and the minority in both Houses, because it was they who did the work which led to so expeditious approval by the State of Ohio of this important matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. I express again my appreciation to the Senator from Ohio. I believe that he is overmodest. His own efforts counted very heavily in the ratification by the State of Ohio of the proposed amendment. I appreciate his placing this information in the Record, because it shows again that this effort is a bipartisan effort.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Gov. James A. Rhodes is a Republican. The Republicans are the majority party in both houses of the Ohio Legislature, and the Democrats are in the minority.

Mr. HOLLAND. Again, that shows that we are proceeding in a bipartisan way in this matter.

Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Florida on the progress which the anti-poll-tax amendment to the Constitution is making. I congratulate him upon his leadership and enterprise in presenting this important issue to the Nation.

The people of Alaska are extremely grateful to Senator Holland for his important part in assisting them to secure statehood, for without his assistance Alaska might not have become a State and would not have been able to cast a vote to ratify this amendment. Thus virtue brings its own reward.

The senior Senator from Florida was one of the Senate leaders in helping us to achieve statehood in the days when the achievement of statehood did not look too promising. With not too much prospect of success, his help was particularly valuable, for he came from a region in which relatively few of the Members of Congress favored statehood. Therefore, his support was perhaps more important than that of almost any other Member of this body.

I am very happy to pay him this tribute and to express on behalf of myself and the people of Alaska our deep appreciation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I assure the distinguished Senator from Alaska that I deeply appreciate his comments. It is a source of pleasure and pride to the Senator from Florida to recall always that he was one of the many Senators who strongly sponsored the admission of Alaska to statehood. I like to think that the vote which has just been cast by the Legislature of Alaska indicates a rather strong justification of the hopes and the strong convictions which so many Senators had that Alaska would live up very fully to the responsibilities of statehood.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is interesting to note that the resolution which was adopted by the Alaska Legislature, to which the senior Senator from Florida has referred, was Senate Joint Resolution 1. It was introduced by the State affairs committee. As the Senator has already noted, the resolution was approved unanimously by the Alaska Senate. I only wish the same had been true in the house, notwithstanding the fact that the vote in the house was overwhelmingly in favor of the resolution.

I, too, am happy that the Alaska Legislature has acted so promptly and affirmatively. I join with my colleague from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] in commending the senior Senator from Florida for making it possible for the Legislature of Alaska, the Legislature of Ohio, and the legislatures of other States in the Union to act upon this amendment. I hope it will soon become the 24th amendment to the Constitution of the United States. I also commend the Senator from Florida for his bold leadership in this endeavor.

Thinking back to another time, I also wish to join with my colleague from Alaska in expressing gratitude and admiration to the Senator from Florida for his wonderful leadership in the cause of Alaska statehood.

Mr. HOLLAND. I express my very deep appreciation to the Senator from Alaska. It is always a pleasure for me to remember that, along with some 76 other Senators, it was possible for us to submit the resolution. I think we are all entitled to equal credit in that respect.

So far as statehood for Alaska is concerned, a great many of us were working in that cause. I was happy to be among those who were in the ranks.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, while I fully appreciate the sincerity of the Senator from Florida and the efforts which he made not only to pass this constitutional amendment through the Senate, but to have it ratified by the States, as a matter of information I should like to inquire what States, if any, of the 11 States of the Confederacy have ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry to say that as of this date there have been none. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] has just advised us that both Houses of the Tennessee Legislature, which is now in session, have had presented to them resolutions of ratification, and that he is hopeful of their passage.

As I have already stated to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the Governor of Florida will recommend to the April session of the Florida Legislature that it, too, ratify the amendment; and the two Senators from Florida are doing everything in their power, including the making of personal appearances, to secure that ratification. Further than that, the Senator from Florida has no information at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Florida. If I may be permitted to continue, while I voted for the adoption of the constitutional amendment, I felt that it was inferior to legislation to eliminate the poll tax, because it will be necessary to have three-fourths of the States ratify it; therefore, the failure of 13 States to ratify will mean that the amendment will not go into effect.

I am disappointed that none of the 11 States of the Old Confederacy have ratified the amendment as yet. I expressed my doubt at the time whether many of them would. I think this has been the strongest objection against the method of a constitutional amendment. I only hope that we may get ratification from the Southern States as well as from the Northern and Western States.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the apprehension of the Senator from Illinois. I think I should add that while I have no information about what the great State of Texas may do about ratification, I have been advised by one of the Senators from Texas that the present Governor of Texas, Governor Connally, has recommended to the legislature of that State that it abolish the State poll tax for all purposes. I think that is one of the results we may attribute, in part at least, to the submission of the amendment last year.

I am sure the Senator from Illinois knows that the Senators from Florida are working in every way they know how to bring about the ratification of the amendment, not only in their own State, but elsewhere, as well. I hope that the Senator from Illinois will continue his efforts in that direction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Illinois, I think, was the first State to ratify the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct. Illinois was the first State to ratify the amendment. I was happy to name the two Senators from Illinois in my first comments on this subject, shortly after the convening of the 88th Congress. I was happy to pay my respects and express my compliments and appreciation to both Senators from Illinois, who, I understand, actively worked for the ratification of the amendment by their State.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S MESSAGE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I warmly applaud the President's message on civil rights, which was submitted to Congress today.

Although there are some notable omissions, this is the President's strongest message on civil rights to date. I welcome and applaud it. His eloquent words will have to be matched by determined leadership if any of his legislative proposals, and others which are needed, are to see the light of day. A major opportunity to lay the groundwork for meaningful civil rights legislation was forfeited by yielding to the filibusterers last month. But I am certainly ready to join in whatever bipartisan efforts are now needed to make significant progress in this field.

SECONDARY MATERIAL INDUSTRIES

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on March 15, representatives of an important, but little recognized industry will meet in New York City to celebrate their 50th anniversary.

The National Association of Secondary Material Industries represents a vast industry that is comprised of generators, processors, and consumers of metals, paper stock, textiles, rubber and plastic scrap. In all, this industry represents an annual volume of approximately $5 billion. It provides vital raw materials to practically every segment of the American economy. And, perhaps of greatest importance of all to the American people, the activities of this industry provide raw materials that assure the manufacture of quality and yet economically priced end products. To many this industry has meant the difference between "have" and "have not."

Perhaps many will best remember this industry, and the association that represents it, for their industrial contributions in World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. "Scrap" was literally a household word, and it was this industry, through its farflung collection system and its processing plants, that brought the needed raw materials for our defense effort to the marketplace.

This industry had a great wartime record. Moreover, it has achieved an equally impressive peacetime place in our economy. Its metals segment markets almost as much copper scrap as that mined in this country, and similar statistics can be cited in the use of other metals. In paper stock it accounts for almost a third of the raw material used by the consuming mills. The industry's importance in the textile, rubber, and plastic fields also is most startling.

There is yet another significant—and unique—attribute to recognize. Here is a conservation industry in the truest form. Here are enterprising businessmen who throughout our 50 States process the industrial, office, and household materials for reuse in our economic cycle. The actually perpetuate this cycle and, in so doing, play a mighty role in keeping our forests and other resources of limited supply from dangerous depletion.

The story of the National Association of Secondary Material Industries is a fine American story, since many of this association's member companies have transcended three generations. From humble beginnings they have become vital cogs in our industrial economy and leaders in our communities.

Thus, on this occasion of the 50th anniversary of the National Association of Secondary Material Industries, we should proudly pay tribute to an industry that has given real meaning to an age-old adage: "Waste Not—Want Not."

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HICKENLOOPER

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a little more than a year ago, J. C. Moore, editor of the Winterset Madisonian, wrote a highly complimentary and much deserved article about my colleague, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper]. In view of my colleague's reelection to the Senate, last fall, for a fourth term, I think it most appropriate that the article by Mr. Moore be printed in the Record; and I so request.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hickenlooper for President

(By J. C. Moore)

Well, why not? Barry Goldwater says that there should be more than three names available. Barry is working and willing but is too much on the conservative side to carry a presidential election. Nixon says that if elected he will serve 4 years as Governor of California. Rockefeller says that his first consideration is to be elected Governor of New York. So we submit Hick as a compromise middle of the road candidate for the Presidency.

Last year at the Republican National Convention, Hickenlooper, the chairman of the delegation, was given a courtesy vote by the delegates. At the next convention, to be held in 1964, we'd like to see the Iowa delegation instructed for Iowa's leading Senator. We served with Hick in the Iowa Legislature, we have visited with him in the statehouse in Des Moines while he was Governor. We have called on him a couple of times in Washington, D.C., and we have never met a man who was more qualified to serve as a leader in the United States.

After serving in World War I as an artillery officer, he then graduated with a B.S. degree at Ames after which he acquired a degree in law at the University of Iowa. After serving two terms in the Iowa House of Representatives, he served two terms as Lieutenant Governor until he was elected Governor in 1942. Since then he has been elected three times to the United States Senate. No other Iowan has such a record, and only two Republican Members of the Senate outrank him in length of service.

In the Senate he was the first Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, of which he is still the first ranking member. He is the second ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, and third ranking on the Agricultural Committee. He is also on the Committee of Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

While in the Senate he served on the Committees for Rules and Administration and Expenditures of the Executive Department, was a member of the Smith-Mundt committee, has represented our country at Vienna at the International Atomic Energy Agency, was a Senate consultant at the Atomic Ban Conference in Geneva and is a Senate consultant on the Inter-American Development Bank.

Besides these major committee assignments he has served on committees to investigate oversea information programs, disarmament, foreign aid and foreign policy study. In 1958 President Eisenhower appointed him as U.S. Representative to the United Nations General Assembly.

Recently he was accorded the highest honor that he could receive from his fellow Republican Senators in Washington when he was elected as chairman of the Republican Senate policy committee.

At present he is a candidate for his fourth term in the Senate. We assume that he will be elected without too much trouble. Iowans (Democrat or Republican) are too smart to throw away such a wealth of experience, such seniority and such old fashioned American integrity as they have in Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper.

Now back to the Presidency again. No State ever went down the drain supporting a favorite son. HICKENLOOPER because of his service to the State and Nation deserves the honor. If nominated and elected President then there would be a vacancy in the U.S. Senate for some other deserving Iowan. If nominated and then defeated by Kennedy, he would still have 4 years of his term yet to serve in the Senate and the party would be in an excellent position for the 1963 campaign.

Of course we are going to do our utmost in the forthcoming campaign to send HICK back to the Senate, but at the same time we are going to work on the Presidential angle too. This trial balloon, if it can be called that, is completely unsolicited, unauthorized, and for all we know unwanted, but we think our reasoning is sound.

RELEASE OF OUTDATED PUBLIC PRESTIGE POLLS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the release of certain outdated public prestige polls is an additional example of the mismanagement of the news. Later on, I may have more to say about this matter; but at this time I call attention to the fact that the 2-year timelag in making these polls available to the public makes it possible for us to learn only at this time, for the most part, about what happened during the past administration; and I point out that the 2-year lag seems to have an obvious purpose, in that the public will be free to learn on October 22 or 23, 1964—several weeks before the next presidential election—of the status of American prestige and executive prestige on what I suppose is a purely coincidental date—October 22, 1962. At that time the actions of this Government received the united support of the people and the bipartisan support of all Members of Congress, representing both political parties, and there can be no question whatever that our prestige and our standing were then at a very high point.

I see no particular reason for the release of the polls for political purposes 2 weeks before the 1964 election, although the polls might just as well be released at the present time.

Moreover, the 1-year lag in making available some of these polls to less than one-tenth of the Members of Congress, under a seal of secrecy, and not making them available to the Congress generally or to the people also means that information furnished at that time in secret will itself be outdated; and, as I have said, the 2-year lag prevents any consideration of polls which may have occurred between the first week of November 1962 and the first week of November 1964. In other words, the public is to be excluded from the knowledge of what was contained in these so-called prestige polls, not only in the past, but also in the future. Anything that happens tomorrow or next month or next year will automatically be barred by the 2-year lag, because it imposes a virtual curtain on the greater part of the information; and the 1-year lag means that anything that happens after the first of November 1963 cannot then be made public to the country, although it will be released to certain selected Members of Congress, and will perhaps in one way or another find its way to public attention in a manner less gratifying than if it had been given openly to the press.

Mr. President, I deplore this type of news management. The proper thing to do would be to release at least the substance of such prestige polls—which I am convinced can be done without either compromising the sources or imperiling the national security, both of which phrases are used to conceal things the public is entitled to know. The excuses are flimsy and will not hold water.

ELDERLY HIT HARDEST BY TAX CUT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on February 15, 1963, the Treasury Department released a fact sheet showing that of the 18 million Americans 65 years old and over, 14½ million, or 80 percent, have such low incomes that they pay no Federal income tax now.

This means that four out of every five old persons could not possibly receive any benefit from an income tax cut. Since the overwhelming majority of the 20 percent of oldsters who do pay income taxes pay very little, the benefit would in aggregate be very small, indeed.

On the other hand, many of these older people are debtors. Interest is a heavy cost to them. The rising interest rates, which seem to be the certain companion of the income tax cut, will come out of their already pitifully inadequate incomes.

Indeed, both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board told the Joint Economic Committee this month that the economic stimulation flowing from the tax cut would be accompanied by rising interest rates.

Since these two men are the most powerful of the Nation's money managers, and since their policy decisions largely determine the course of interest rates, climbing interest costs seem sure if the tax cut is passed.

Even more sure and cruel, rising prices—another companion of any Federal deficit stimulation of the economy—would diminish what these older people buy with their modest incomes.

TAX CUT CANNOT INCREASE TAX REVENUES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Monday the President of the United States spoke at a meeting of the American Bankers Association in Washington. At that time he said that in a short time his tax reduction program would result in increased tax revenues.

I vigorously disagree with the President on that point on the basis of the testimony of witnesses before the Joint Economic Committee, including the Council of Economic Advisers, the Secretaries of the Treasury, Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, and a number of economists who favor the tax cut. Their testimony indicates the contrary.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have written to the President of the United States on this issue be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Last June, in your superb speech at the Yale University commencement, you called for an economic debate. In the spirit of that challenge, and because I disagree so strongly with an assertion you recently made that is of central importance in the whole controversy over the tax cut, I write you this letter.

In your speech to the American Bankers Association Monday you said that if the full tax reduction program which you have recommended this year is enacted, it will "in a short time, result in increased tax revenues."

As a Senator who sat through virtually every minute of hearings held by the Joint Economic Committee this year and listened to the testimony of the strongest administration supporters of your tax program, your statement that tax revenues will increase following your recommended tax cut seems to me to be wholly unjustified.

The total, long-term effect of the tax cut on eventual revenues is determined by how much the tax cut, which initially reduces revenues, later may restore some of those lost revenues or even increase revenues by the stimulation it may bring to the economy.

To my knowledge, there is no evidence in the testimony of any witness before the Joint Economic Committee that the tax cut would actually increase revenues. I remind you that the witnesses included your Council of Economic Advisers, the Secretaries of the Treasury, Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, and a number of economists who enthusiastically favored the tax cut.

As a matter of fact, none of the witnesses called before the committee opposed the tax cut.

But even among these tax cut supporters, the general consensus was as follows:

1. A tax cut would increase the gross national product 2 to 2½ times. A $10 billion tax cut was expected to increase the GNP by $20 to $25 billion depending on monetary policy. A restraining monetary policy was expected to reduce the stimulating effect of tax reduction. The threefold increase in the gross national product suggested by the Council of Economic Advisers (after the hearings) was the highest multiplier suggested by any witness.

2. Most of the economists who testified on the share of the increase in the GNP which would be picked up by the Federal Government in revenues estimate that it would be about one-sixth. This is close to the relationship between Federal revenues and GNP. The Council of Economic Advisers took the extremely optimistic assumption that 30 percent of the GNP increase might flow to the Federal Government in increased revenues.

3. With a multiplier of two, a tax cut of $10 billion, the one-sixth relationship between Government revenues and increased GNP, would mean an increase in the GNP of $20 billion and with a one-sixth recovery of tax revenues, $3⅓ billion would be regained of the $10 billion tax cut—for a net loss of $6⅔ billion.

If the most favorable assumptions for the tax cut made by any witnesses are applied—that the stimulation is three and the Federal Government increases its revenue by 30 percent—with a $10 billion tax cut, the GNP would be increased to $30 billion. Federal revenues would be 30 percent of this or $9 billion. Result: with a $10 billion tax cut the loss would be $1 billion. That seems to be the minimum revenue loss on assumptions that are most favorable to tax reduction.

You cite the 1954 tax cut as an example of a tax reduction which resulted in increased tax revenues. This is a post hoc, ergo propter hoc argument. As such, it doesn't stand up. All kinds of factors were at work to stimulate the economy and therefore increase revenues in 1955 through 1957, including especially a pent-up investment demand and a strong consumer demand for automobiles.

There is not a shred of evidence that the tax cut per se stimulated the economy sufficiently to actually cause a net increase in revenues. One could just as well argue that it was not the tax cut but a very sharp reduction in Government spending in 1954 that reduced the deficit and gave the business community the kind of confidence it needed to invest in and stimulate the economy.

A tax reduction may be wise or unwise. It may or may not significantly stimulate the economy and reduce unemployment. But on the basis of the testimony by the Nation's top advocates of a tax cut before the Congressional Joint Economic Committee: it will not increase Federal tax revenues; it will not help balance the budget; it will not reduce the national debt.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The impact of the President's tax proposal on various income groups was dramatically shown in a table submitted to the Joint Economic Committee by Dr. Leon Keyserling. This table eloquently dramatizes the regressive effect of the proposed tax cut. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President's proposed tax structure in 1965 compared with present structure (1962), at various tax levels for married couple with 2 children

(1) Taxable income level	(2) Present tax [1]	(3) Present income after tax	(4) Proposed tax [2]	(5) Proposed income after tax	(6) Percent tax reduction	(7) Percent increase in after-tax income	(8) Percent tax to income: Present	(8) Percent tax to income: Proposed
$3,000	$60	$2,940	0	$3,000	100.0	2.0	2.0	0
$5,000	420	4,580	$280	4,720	33.3	3.1	8.4	5.6
$7,500	877	6,623	663	6,837	24.4	3.2	11.7	8.8
$10,000	1,372	8,628	1,068	8,932	22.2	3.5	13.7	30.7
$15,000	2,486	12,514	2,076	12,924	16.5	3.3	16.6	13.8
$25,000	5,318	19,682	4,605	20,395	13.4	3.6	21.3	18.4
$35,000	9,037	25,963	7,814	27,186	13.5	4.7	25.8	22.3
$50,000	15,976	34,024	13,837	36,163	13.4	6.3	32.0	27.7
$100,000	44,724	55,276	38,542	61,458	13.8	11.2	44.7	38.5
$200,000	115,224	84,776	95,072	104,928	17.5	23.8	57.6	47.5

[1] Assuming 10 percent deduction for taxes, interest, contributions, medical, etc.

[2] Assuming President's proposal, as revised by Dillon's testimony, of $400 minimum deduction for married couple and $100 for each child; 10 percent for incomes between $6,000 and $10,000; $1,000 flat deduction between $10,000 and $20,000; and 5-percent deduction for $20,000 and up.

NOTE.—Actual slight deviations from these workable assumptions would not in the slightest change the general import of the analysis.

U.S. BASES IN SPAIN—LET US NOT BE BLACKMAILED

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, several Members of the Senate, including our able and distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, have raised a warning flag that in the negotiations pending for the continuation of our bases in Spain—if it seems in our national interest to continue them—the U.S. representatives conducting these negotiations should be careful to avoid being high-pressured into increasing the very generous largesse we have been giving Spain and its dictator, Francisco Franco, for a decade. The Washington Post, in an editorial which I inserted in the RECORD 2 weeks ago, even sounded a note warning of possibly impending blackmail.

It is well to keep this issue before the American public. U.S. administrations have been altogether too soft in their dealings with foreign nations in connection with our aid program and particularly so with dictators.

Pertinent is an editorial from a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Castles in Spain," which likewise urges that we should not again yield to extortion. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTLES IN SPAIN

Some of the most flagrant abuses of foreign aid were in Spain. As usual they were caused by the military, not the economic side of the aid program. In return for the eagerly sought—or dearly bought—American bases in Spain, huge dollar sums were simply handed over to the Madrid Government to spend as it pleased. No wonder Spain has demanded more of the same, now that the base agreement is up for renewal.

But the bargaining terms have changed.

In the earlier postwar years, any military man in Washington who studied the economic and political reports out of Madrid would turn pale. They read as if the whole Spanish house of cards was about to collapse, and the obvious sequel would be communism. Well into the late 1950's the same panic reaction continued in Washington. Withdraw American support, funneled through the bases program, and what looked to the military like the safest bastion in Europe might go over to the enemy.

These fears were exaggerated. But the American response, which was to give Madrid far too much of what it imperiously demanded, simply confirmed the confidence of Spanish officials who thought they had the United States over a barrel.

Now Spain is easing its more extreme economic rigidity and groping its way into the modern period. It is still deep in economic trouble but the likelihood of Communist takeover and the exaggerated fear of it have been eased. And Washington, now gives the impression of really wanting to avoid a giveaway and being willing to negotiate rigorously. It is shopping elsewhere in the Mediterranean for Polaris bases, and everywhere withdrawing its vulnerable and obsolete land missiles.

The United States need not yield to extortion this time.

Mr. GRUENING. Recently Members of Congress have been recipients of a Spanish Newsletter, obviously a fairly recent propaganda development, since it is only in its second volume. No. 2 of that volume, dated February 1, carries a commentary entitled "New Pact on U.S. Bases Sought." A careful reading of it would indicate that the above-voiced fears are not without some foundation.

The article points to "the need for adaptation to present realities in a world which has undergone rapid radical changes of all kinds." Could this mean more money from Uncle Sam? On the other hand, it might mean that fashions in weaponry had so changed that the air bases were no longer necessary in Spain—or at least not at an increased price.

I ask unanimous consent that the extract from the Spanish Newsletter, entitled "New Pact on U.S. Bases Sought," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW PACT ON U.S. BASES SOUGHT

Under 10-year defense agreements between Spain and the United States signed in 1953, joint Spanish-American military bases have been established on Spanish soil. The agreements provided for automatic extensions of two successive 5-year periods, unless either government notifies the other it wants to cancel the pact. Spain has notified the United States that it wants to revise the agreements, which expire this year, and to renegotiate new terms for the naval base at Rota, near Cadiz, and joint use of the three major air bases. Here is a statement by a Spanish foreign office spokesman on the reason for his country's action:

Three events of international politics have coincided, but although the coincidence is unrelated in timing or intention, it has confused news media and may mislead public opinion. The three events are the expiration after 10 years of the Spanish-American agreements of 1953, the crisis in the European Common Market about Great Britain's application for membership, and the satisfactory evolution and intensification of Spanish-French relations made evident by the presence in Madrid of French Minister of Interior Frey and by the announcement of other important visits by members of the French Government.

Negotiations for renewal of the Spanish-American agreements were foreseen in the agreements. In conformity with article 5 of the defense agreements, Spanish Foreign Minister Castiella in a letter sent January 14 to U.S. Ambassador Woodward in Madrid officially announced his intention to invoke the renewal procedure. The decision derives from the need, in a true spirit of friendship and cooperation, for adaptation to present realities in a world which has undergone rapid radical changes of all kinds.

The need to preserve the spirit of the agreements while giving their content required revision, as well as to profit from experience in carrying out the agreements, made the Spanish Government believe its decision will serve, through discussion leading to knowledge of respective viewpoints, to find a formula adequate to common objectives, thereby intensifying and strengthening the excellent relations between the two countries. * * *

CONFERENCE IN GENEVA TO HELP BACKWARD NATIONS ILL TIMED—REPORT OF OBSERVER

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I was honored by being appointed by the Vice President to serve along with my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] as an observer for the Senate of the United States at the recent United Nations Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, on the application of science and technology to help backward nations.

As I reported to the Senate recently, we were disappointed, disillusioned, and disgusted that this Conference was arranged and convened before proper planning and preliminary hearings were held within all the backward nations, and intelligent cooperation shown in selecting a few delegates from each nation. Frankly, I considered it a terrible waste of taxpayers' money to hold this Conference before briefing sessions had been held in every backward country and intelligent delegates carefully selected.

However, although my stay in Geneva was a waste of time, I believe that if the criticisms I have to report will be accepted by officials of the State Department and corrected in the future, our time and effort spent there as observers will not have been completely in vain. It is in this sense that I speak again today.

May I say at the outset that I hold Dr. Walsh McDermott, chairman of the U.S. delegation, in high admiration for his industry and for his valiant efforts to salvage something from this Conference. He is a man of intense enthusiasm and great industry. I feel that he did his best to conceal his disappointment at the failure of the Conference to make any real accomplishment and in the failure of many backward and emerging nations to have even one delegate at the Conference. With the assistance of Ambassador Jonathan B. Bingham and Ambassador Roger W. Tubby, both very able Americans, he did an outstanding job under extremely difficult circumstances. Dr. McDermott has recently been appointed as a consultant with the Agency for International Development, and I am sure that he will prove to be an effective—in fact, an outstanding—public servant.

It was most unfortunate that officials of the State Department promoted, or even permitted, this Conference to be held without adequate planning and preparation. It was a shameful waste of the time and talent of the more than 100 delegates from the United States. Of course much to the disappointment of our State Department officials many underdeveloped nations sent no delegates whatever. They should have anticipated this.

It is a good thing that the Vice President appointed two observers from the U.S. Senate to attend this Conference. It did not take us long to observe that the cart was hitched before the horse; that there was a lack of preliminary planning; that American taxpayers' money was thrown away on a futile conference.

The more developed nations of the world had large delegations present. The main purpose of this so-called Conference was to help the underdeveloped, emerging nations of the world. For the most part, the delegates of backward nations did not have the background and knowledge to enable them to cope with and to understand the extremely technical nature of the material presented by the delegations from the more scientifically advanced nations. It was evident that AID and State Department officials had failed to brief the nationals of these countries in their respective countries, to have motion pictures shown to groups there, and to assist in selecting a few delegates from each country. The attendance from the emerging nations was very disappointing. Many did not send even one delegate. The delegates from those nations which did were obviously uninterested or unable to understand the technical content of the multiplicity of speeches delivered.

Mr. President, I am informed that the Agency for International Development spent almost $400,000 for the expenses of our delegation alone. That was in addition to the $2 million authorized by the United Nations from its regular budget to which the United States contributes over 32 percent. Frankly, it was a complete waste of taxpayers' money. In all candor may I state that the emerging nations of the world are not yet ready for this type of conference. A great deal of background work must be done in their countries if conferences of this sort are to be successful in the future.

A State Department spokesman reported that 237 scientists and technicians submitted papers. Very likely, that many speeches or more were made throughout the 16 days of the United Nations Conference on the Application of Science and Technology to help backward nations. Practically the entire cost of this so-called Conference was paid directly or indirectly by our taxpayers. This was most unfortunate.

Scientists and physicists of the United Kingdom, Soviet Union, and the United States may have understood the technical papers prepared by their fellow scientists, but it was a fantastic idea on the part of some State Department and AID publicity men to believe that representatives of Nigeria, Sierra Leone, and emerging nations could understand and carry back to their countries the information given in a multiplicity of papers read or speeches made. State Department officials should make no such claim.

Let us not fool the American people. Does any State Department bureaucrat have the effrontery to claim that Nigeria and other African nations sent delegates first class at the sole expense of that new nation, recipient of millions of dollars of foreign assistance money from the United States? The same situation is true regarding other backward nations.

The excuse for holding this Confere[illegible]was to help backward nations by giving their delegates scientific and technological information of which they had no knowledge.

It evidently never occurred to State Department officials that U.S. officials in AID, the Peace Corps, the Foreign Service, and so forth, are running all over the place in every country in Africa, Asia, and South America. Before similar conferences are held, these Americans who are already in these countries could do the proper preliminary work and enlist the cooperation of intelligent men and women of those countries. Local conferences could be held for the benefit of 200 or 300 nationals of each nation, with our technicians stationed there acting as advisers. Educational films could be shown as well as understandable scientific and technical literature illustrating the advances made in these fields by the United States and other more scientifically advanced nations of the world.

After a complete briefing and after thoroughly discussing the very complex subjects involved—after doing the necessary spadework—there could then be a selected group of people from each country, interested in the problems, sent to regional conferences within a few hundred miles' distance, and within the same area, instead of to a European city. Some delegations at Geneva from the emerging nations were composed for the most part of relatives of the rulers and political leaders of these nations. They seemed more interested in the parties and receptions than they were in the Conference itself, according to my observation and information.

Let me make it crystal clear that I do not advocate hiring any more bureaucrats to do the planning and work I have suggested. I am positive that American officials presently working abroad in our foreign assistance program and in various agencies can handle this additional duty without any difficulty whatever. If backward nations are to send competent delegations to international conferences, their delegates should be somewhat informed ahead of time. There is much preliminary work that should be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, may I have an additional 2 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I express the hope that high officials in the State Department will curb and prevent this sort of thing in the future and stop this waste of hundreds of thousands of dollars. The millions of poverty-ridden people in the many new nations of the world are far more in need of instruction on improved methods of agriculture, on how to bring water to their villages, on how to build highways, on how to perform a multitude of vitally needed functions, than they are in sending delegates to hear speeches about computers, airplanes, pure science, and

other subjects beyond their comprehension.

This conference, precisely as stated by a congressional colleague in attendance as an observer, was often undermanned scientifically and technologically and unable to cope with the vast amounts of material presented to the conference. He further stated:

> Unfortunately these nations were overwhelmed by the massive delegations from the larger countries.

The net result was that members of the United Kingdom, Soviet Union, and U.S. delegations rose and read papers possibly of interest to their fellow members only. Yet a tremendous expenditure was incurred to bring delegates from the new underdeveloped African nations and from various countries of Asia and Latin America. These delegates came first class. Our taxpayers, who have been sweating and paying too much for foreign assistance, really paid for this extravaganza. It was shameful that eminent American scientists and physicists were given economy class tickets for this conference. More shameful that they were taken from important work in our country to spend a week or more attending this so-called conference.

Two U.S. Senators appointed as observers to render a public service were given economy class tickets. When we disembarked, some delegates were met as they emerged from the first-class section of the plane. If local officials wondered how it came that two U.S. Senators on a mission for their country were traveling economy class, that did not embarrass either of us, I am sure.

I am sorry that the time of the American delegates—many of whom were involved at home in very important work—was wasted along with hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money because of a decision of some bureaucrats in the State Department. In the future such incompetence must not be permitted.

Mr. President, it is my feeling that the Senate of the United States should continue to be represented at international meetings of this kind. Perhaps by the presence of our observers we can prevent a recurrence of what happened at Geneva earlier this month.

I attended every conference morning and afternoon throughout the 4 days I was in Geneva, and my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] did likewise. We did no sightseeing. We avoided the parties and receptions held each evening, but according to hearsay, delegates from backward nations—not conspicuous in attendance at conference sessions—attended these receptions and parties. I was invited to five receptions and banquets but did not attend even one.

I also again wish to express my high regard for Dr. McDermott and the other American delegates who gave of their time untiringly and unselfishly in the interests of their country. I am sorry that so much of their time was wasted. It must have been a frustrating experience for most of them.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, we have often heard the comparison made between talk and action. We have often heard the term of "paying lipservice" to a principle or objective but taking no action.

Recently the Emergency Planning Director issued a report with respect to the residual oil import situation that may have given courage to New Englanders that the present policy of the administration discriminating against them on this was admittedly unjustified.

The report of the Emergency Planning Director is dangerous if it only gets the hopes of New Englanders up falsely—only to be let down by the President failing to do anything about the matter.

Until the President takes the action in the matter that is long overdue—an action which he pressed his predecessor on when he was a Senator from Massachusetts—until he acts, the report of the Emergency Planning Director is nothing more than the well-worn technique of merely "paying lipservice," of only talking but doing nothing about the situation.

It was in this spirit that I wrote the President of the United States day before yesterday—on February 26, 1963—urging him to do what he had urged his predecessor to do. I ask unanimous consent that my letter of that date to the President be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1963.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Earlier this month I wrote you urging you to keep your commitment to the workers at the Kittery-Portsmouth Naval Shipyard to issue an executive order equalizing their pay rates with that of the Boston Naval Shipyard.

This time I want to urge you to do what you urged your predecessor in the White House to do. As a Senator from Massachusetts, you joined with your New England colleagues in petitions to President Eisenhower to remove the restrictions on residual oil imports. You urged not only a relaxation but a complete termination of the quotas which were ordered by the Eisenhower administration 4 years ago.

In this connection I invite your attention to an excellent article by Donald R. Larrabee in the February 20, 1963, issue of the Bangor Daily News. It is good reading.

Sincerely yours,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senator.

MANAGEMENT OF NEWS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I have just returned from a visit to my home State of Hawaii where I was able to meet with many of my constituents. On more than a few occasions I was asked about the policy of managing the news being practiced by the White House and the executive branch of our Government.

There is growing concern and criticism that the practice of managing news is injurious to our national welfare and seriously undermines the freedom of the press.

The people are rightfully dismayed by the calculated manner in which news is manipulated by the executive branch. They are wondering aloud whether the information passed on through controlled channels is the truth and nothing but the truth—or whether it is carefully "managed" to tell only what the administration wants, even if it means tailoring the news to only the partial truth, or even less. The press and the public insist that the administration practice candor and forthrightness in handling the news.

No less an authority in newspapering than Arthur Krock, the distinguished columnist of the New York Times, has accused President Kennedy of managing the news with what he calls a cynicism, a boldness, and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history. This sharp accusation comes from a Pultizer-Prize-winning newsman who for 21 years was chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times and more recently a Times Washington columnist. Mr. Krock has documented his charges in an article he has written for the March issue of Fortune magazine.

Just as the complaints against the administration's manipulation of news are mounting throughout the country, we find in Hawaii a vigorous critic in the editorial columns of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin. This is not the first time that this courageous newspaper has assailed the mishandling of news by this administration, and I predict that it will not be the last—so long as the White House, the Department of Defense, and other agencies pursue their practice of managing the news, without regard to the right of the people to know the truth about their Government.

A most timely and meritorious editorial on this subject was published in the Star-Bulletin on Tuesday, February 19.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Feb. 19, 1963]

A RATHER SOUR SITUATION

Many quotations would fit the occasion. Best of all, perhaps, is one from Longfellow:

"Pride goeth forth on horseback, grand and gray,
But cometh back on foot, and begs the way."

There was arrogance, too—("the boast of arrogance soon turns to shame")—and not a little ignorance:

"Blind and naked ignorance
Delivers brawling judgments, unashamed,
On all things all day long."

The references are to the Kennedy administration's handling of news of the Cuban crisis.

"We," said Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Relations, "managed the news. We used the news as a weapon. A government has an inherent right to lie."

These aren't Mr. Sylvester's exact words, but they are a faithful paraphrase of what he said and meant. He meant that at a critical time such as that existing during the

Cuban crisis a government, as the representative of the people, has a right to twist the truth if this will aid its survival.

Conceded. If the government, in order to deceive the enemy on a critical issue, finds it unavoidably necessary to deceive its own people as well, truth becomes a casualty. But a government in a democratic country ought to have the wisdom to know that no stone should be left unturned, once the crisis is over, to repair the damage, for damage will surely have been done to the people's confidence in their government.

Instead of so doing, Mr. Sylvester—and Mr. Sylvester in this regard is Mr. Kennedy; Mr. Sylvester doesn't talk on such weighty matters without the boss' approval and prior authorization—was not only unmoved by protests but boastful.

His attitude was, it was necessary. So what of it? What's all the fuss about?

We concede that under the circumstances then obtaining it was necessary. But it was outrageous for Mr. Sylvester or anyone else to brush off inquiries and protests as though he and the administration big shots had a patent on what was good for the country.

Now their chickens are coming home to roost. Gone is the pride of yesterday (We Americans "ought to be rather pleased with ourselves this Christmas," said President Kennedy December 17), and if Mr. Sylvester is saying anything louder than a mumble about managing the news it is impossible to hear it.

The reason is that, though the Kennedy administration is terribly anxious to have the country believe what it now says of the situation in Cuba, too many people remember Mr. Sylvester's smug declaration about the Government's right to lie when it thinks necessary.

The administration is sweating even more because the same critics who were saying the right things last fall while the administration was denying them—the administration was later proved to have been wrong—are again criticizing the administration and the administration is denying.

Since Senator KEATING was right in August and September, and the administration was wrong, who is more likely to be believed now, especially in view of Mr. Sylvester's defense of lying?

We give you three guesses. First two don't count.

FEDERAL JUDGE R. E. THOMASON, OF EL PASO, FORMER CONGRESSMAN, HONORED AS HUMANITARIAN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, among the many fine public officials who have served both the Nation and my home State of Texas, none has shown a greater devotion to public duty and the public interest and welfare than U.S. District Judge R. Ewing Thomason, of El Paso.

Like many other great Texans, including Sam Rayburn, Davy Crockett, Sam Houston, and Jesse Jones, R. Ewing Thomason was born in Tennessee. He was brought to Texas by his parents at an early age. He served as speaker of the Texas House of Representatives, like Speaker Sam Rayburn before him, and was an impressive candidate for the governorship of Texas, losing mainly because of geography, he being then from El Paso, in the far western corner of the State.

When I went to El Paso as a young lawyer in 1927, R. E. Thomason was the newly elected mayor. His law office was in the building in which my office was located. His encouragement and kindness meant so much to me that later I asked him to sponsor my admission to the U.S. Supreme Court, which he did.

R. E. Thomason served with distinction for nine consecutive terms in the House of Representatives of the United States and as an able member of the Committee on Armed Services all during World War II, was a strong and able advocate of measures which helped bring about victory in World War II.

On July 31, 1947, Judge Thomason resigned from the Congress, on being appointed U.S. district judge for the western district of Texas. He serves there now with fidelity and distinction, with a kindness and humanity and humility not always found in lifetime-appointed judges.

Judge Ewing Thomason has recently been paid a rare tribute in El Paso. The new R. E. Thomason General Hospital at El Paso has been named in his honor, in tribute to his broad humanitarianism and kindness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print at this point in the RECORD the dedicatory speech by Ellis O. Mayfield, past president of the El Paso Bar Association, delivered on February 16, 1963, at the hospital dedication, and the two articles from the El Paso Times of February 17, 1963, entitled "New General Hospital Dedicated as Memorial to Judge Thomason" and "Happy End of an Era: New Thomason Hospital To Be Open Sunday."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE DEDICATION OF R. E. THOMASON GENERAL HOSPITAL, FEBRUARY 16, 1963, ELLIS O. MAYFIELD, PAST PRESIDENT, EL PASO BAR ASSOCIATION, AND PAST PRESIDENT, EL PASO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Judge Thomason, Mrs. Thomason, Dr. Holcomb, distinguished guests and fellow Thomasonites, with all sincerity, to be asked to speak on this occasion is the greatest privilege ever extended to me—and I am truly honored.

While the exact occasion is a relatively new idea—the fact that R. E. Thomason would someday be honored by El Paso in some manner has been an accepted fact for almost 40 years.

Now, there has always been a question as to whether history makes the man or whether man makes the history—but I suspect that in the case of Robert Ewing Thomason it is a mixture of both, for it seems that wherever he has stood—whether as the mayor of his city—the speaker of the Texas Legislature—a national figure in the Congress of the United States—or as a leader in his profession, both at the bar and on the bench—history has been written. Moreover, your presence here today on this occasion attests to the fact that, in each case, he has stood the test of greatness—and the honor which was his has reflected to the great benefit of the people of this community, of this State, and of this Nation. While within his record of service are recorded the passing of some of the great moments of history, yet (and I admit I may be prejudiced) it seems to me that his service at the bar of justice must be, to a man of his qualities, his greatest source of satisfaction. For in that great, solemn courtroom this man sits as a living symbol of the fundamental guarantee of our Nation of laws that all who stand before him—both the great and the small—will receive equal justice under the law. There—in great dignity—is tested the rights of the individual against the welfare of the Nation and all who have witnessed this—have experienced a great source of satisfaction and a renewed confidence in the American way of life. There, then, is the personification of the law of this land—applying its concepts to human beings—in each case a different soul to which a separate set of facts necessarily applies and the balance which has been achieved between governmental and human rights is, I am sure, the fruition of a lifetime of public service by Robert Ewing Thomason.

Thus, over the years, the people of this community have wondered how we might best honor and remember our friend. His die has been cast and, in wonder, we remark: "How large is the mold."

From the beginning of recorded time, people have sought to perpetuate the record of greatness of their leaders—the early primitive stone pictures and carvings—the colossal pyramids—the Greek statues—faces perpetuated in rock on the sides of mountains—bronze castings in the public square. Which of these would be appropriate to this occasion?

It seems to me that any symbol should truly reflect the spirit of that which is symbolized—and while granite and bronze alone may perpetuate the physical features of the person—the genius of our friend is his inner warmth and friendship for his fellowman. He is the unique leader who can lead without turning his back on those who follow in his steps.

Therefore, there could be no more fitting tribute to this great man than the dedication to his name and to his service of this living memorial—a house of hope and mercy which exists but for one purpose—to help mankind.

This great hospital, then, the citizens of El Paso here dedicate to the everlasting honor of Robert Ewing Thomason.

[From the El Paso Times, Feb. 17, 1963]

NEW GENERAL HOSPITAL DEDICATED AS MEMORIAL TO JUDGE THOMASON

(By Ramon Villalobos)

El Paso's ultramodern $6.2 million R. E. Thomason General Hospital, described as one of the finest if not the best of is size in the United States, was officially dedicated Saturday "as a fitting memorial to a man who has dedicated his life to the service of his city, State, and National Government."

The brief ceremonies were held at the entrance of the imposing structure and before a large gathering of personal friends of the U.S. district judge, and city, State, and military authorities.

From the opening dedicatory prayer by the Reverend B. M. G. Williams, who also delivered the invocation at the ground-breaking ceremonies, to the last speaker, the honors and praise were paid to Judge Thomason, the people of El Paso, and particularly to the hospital's Women's Auxiliary and El Paso County Medical Association.

Dr. Dysart E. Holcomb, chairman of the board of managers of El Paso Hospital district, who served as master of ceremonies, praised the combined efforts of the many persons, public officials, and the newspapers, for their contribution to the successful realization of the modernistic hospital.

In his dedicatory speech Attorney Ellis O. Mayfield, in a tribute to Judge Thomason, said, "We are here today to honor our friend and we all know it."

"Now there has always been a question as to whether history makes the man or whether the man makes history—but I suspect that in the case of Robert Ewing Thomason it is a mixture of both, for it seems that wherever he has stood—whether as the mayor of his city, speaker of the Texas Legislature, a national figure in the Congress of the United

States, or as a leader in his profession, both at the bar and on the bench—history has been written.

"Moreover, our presence here today on this occasion attests to the fact that in each case he stood the test of greatness—and the honor which was his has reflected to the great benefit of the people of this community."

Mayfield said there could be no more fitting tribute to this "great man" than the dedication to his name and to the service of this hospital.

"This great hospital, then, the citizens of El Paso here dedicate to the everlasting honor of Robert Ewing Thomason," he said.

Taking the speaker's rostrum, Judge Thomason told those present, "This is the greatest honor that has ever come to me.

"I regret I do not have the words to adequately express my appreciation for the honor you do me and my family in the naming of this hospital. * * * I have tried, to be a good citizen but no man deserves extra praise or recognition for that. I thank all of you gentlemen for your very kind and generous remarks."

Judge Thomason then went on to congratulate the hospital board, the commissioner's court, and the medical society, and all who had a part in making the hospital possible. He also paid special tribute to the doctors, nurses, and the hospital's women's auxiliary who have given of their services freely and without hope of reward to the charity cases in the hospital and who will continue to do so in the new building.

"To them I extend the thanks of a grateful community," Judge Thomason said.

"My hope and prayer today is that this magnificent and modern hospital will live and prosper throughout the years to come—to bless, comfort, and heal the sick and suffering of El Paso and the Southwest."

Dr. W. R. Gaddis, president of El Paso County Medical Society, said that his group was proud to have been coagitator for construction of the hospital which, he said, "symbolizes the desire of man to care for the needs of his neighbor."

"It should be noted that medical care of all people has come to its present exalted status as a voluntary contribution of the practitioners and researchers in medicine, not the result of legislation.

"We owe no fealty to the higher-ups for this hospital, it is the will of the people," he said.

Dr. Gaddis then congratulated the people of El Paso and pledged El Paso County Medical Society's aid to the unfortunate sick to the best of "our ability."

"We join the people of El Paso in giving this accolade to our great outstanding public-spirited citizen, Judge R. E. Thomason, as a fitting tribute to his life of public service," he said.

County Judge Glenn Woodard, another speaker at the ceremonies commended the work of the hospital board whose members worked without compensation for more than 3 years.

"To them we owe our most sincere gratitude," the judge said.

He also praised Judge Thomason and said the naming of the hospital was a dedication to a man who has spent most of his life for the betterment of the people.

After the ceremonies, guests, which included representatives of all the local hospitals, and United States and Mexican military authorities, were taken on a special guided tour of the hospital.

[From the El Paso Times, Feb. 17, 1963]

HAPPY END OF AN ERA—NEW THOMASON HOSPITAL TO BE OPEN SUNDAY

(By Barbara Funkhouser)

The new R. E. Thomason General Hospital will be open for public inspection between 10 a.m. and 6 p.m. Sunday and every taxpayer in El Paso County should go see what he bought.

When all the bills are paid it will have cost the $6.2 million available which includes $3.7 million from the issuance of bonds approved by El Paso taxpayers and $2.5 million in Federal Hill-Burton funds contributed by every taxpayer in the United States.

Expenses are approximately $5.2 million for construction by R. E. McKee General Contractors, Inc., $346,000 to Garland & Hillis Architects, $450,000 for furnishings and supplies and the remainder for land acquisition.

These are the figures but the new hospital represents more than money. It represents a decade of crusading by those cognizant even then of the desperate conditions in the old hospital which will be vacated March 1 and razed immediately. It represents a year's work in creation of El Paso Hospital District, 2 years on the drawing board, and 2 years in construction.

GENEROUS TAXPAYERS

It represents the generosity of taxpayers toward the indigent residents of El Paso County in need of medical attention, and their interest in raising health standards of the community.

It represents the blood, sweat, and tears of those who have laughed and wept and continued to work toward building the finest hospital in the Southwest.

The new Thomason General Hospital is a fine building. It is sleek and modern in appearance, colorful yet restful in its furnishings, and fully equipped.

The project has had its stormy moments. The psychiatrists did not like fourth-floor plans and will continue to use Gilbert Annex. There was not enough money for the proposed chronic-care unit so the would-be psychiatric floor may be used for this purpose. The dentists didn't like the furnishings of the dental suite so these were changed. Furnishings and equipment had to be bid twice to stay within the funds available and, finally, some of the floors had deflected too much but the building has been declared safe and some floor area has been leveled.

However, through all of this there has not been a hint of corruption, graft, dishonesty, insincerity, or inability connected with the project—a large and public project.

It is perhaps unfortunate that those attending Sunday's open house cannot first tour the old building of narrow halls, inadequate lighting and heating, almost no plumbing, rattletrap equipment, and crowded wards.

The new building is vastly different. The main entrance off Alameda Avenue is approached around the memorial fountain given by Judge and Mrs. R. E. Thomason as an indication of their interest in the hospital.

Doors lead into the lobby area, open in the front with a large information booth to the left behind which is an attractive row of cubicles and offices composing the admitting department.

The southwest corner of this floor, behind admitting, is devoted to business offices, medical records, the library and other facilities surrounding a small courtyard.

The southeast corner is the outpatient department designed to accommodate 60,000 patients per year; the eye, ear, nose, and throat and neuropsychiatric treatment departments and occupational and physical therapy facilities.

Between these two sections of the first floor is the seating area of the lobby, gift shop, first floor pharmacy, chapel, classrooms and offices, and the glass walls through which hospital visitors may overlook the large inner courtyard complete with sprays of water, evergreen plantings and a live oak tree.

The east half of the first floor is perhaps the most important part of the hospital. On the west end are the entrances for hospital employees and doctors and the emergency entrance through which probably 25,000 emergency patients will move in the remainder of this year.

Three large operating rooms and six large treatment rooms make up the emergency department which is adjacent to the recovery and intensive care units of two isolation rooms and a large ward accommodating at least 10 beds and a nurses' station.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT

Next to recovery is surgery, with six major operating rooms. Then comes a row of urology examination and treatment rooms adjacent to the radiology department of four major X-ray rooms completely equipped with almost everything available in this field.

Finally, in the northeast corner is the extensive laboratory.

The arrangement of this half of the first floor is a point of pride with the designers because, unlike most other hospitals, they have achieved what appears to be the logical sequence of emergency, intensive care, recovery, surgery, X-ray, and laboratories.

Also leading from this floor are the glass-enclosed walkways to Gilbert Annex and the tuberculosis annex.

While this will be the busiest public door, the key to the operation of the entire hospital is the basement or ground floor below.

Here is the nerve center for the pneumatic tube-conveyor and trayveyor systems by which supplies and drugs will be moved to every area of the hospital after ordered, cleaned, sterilized, packaged or whatever is needed.

COLORFUL CAFETERIA

Here, too, on the east side is the kitchen and cafeteria equipped to accommodate thousands of persons. Colorful tables and chairs are arranged to overlook the large inner courtyard. It will be a pleasant place to eat and the food at Thomason General Hospital is excellent even in the old building.

On the west side is an unfinished area which one day will become a large dining room and to the west is the auditorium where students or other persons may view surgical procedures by closed circuit TV or hold meetings.

There is much more on this floor which would be of primary interest to mechanically minded persons or those interested in systems in the name of efficiency. It is also connected by tunnels through which food, supplies and equipment will be moved to the annexes.

But taking one of several swift elevators upward, the second floor is the administrative area plus some of the air control equipment.

Here are the offices of the administrator, personnel director, director of nursing and her assistant; bedrooms for doctors and technicians while on call but not busy in the hospital, various other staff facilities and the hospital board conference room.

Above this floor are the five floors composing the patient room tower. Here are 250 new beds, 50 on each floor divided into single, double, and 4-bed rooms.

Each room includes at least one floor-to-ceiling window with colorful blue and green drapes and a bathroom with dressing table and large mirror, lavatory, commode, shower and communication system to the nurses' station.

PRIVACY PREVAILS

Each bed may be separated off for privacy by drawing a yellow curtain and each has a pillow speaker through which the patient may speak directly to the nurses' station and receive an answer, turn on the radio and, if he can pay for it, turn on the television set.

The theory behind the pillow speaker is that it will save many unnecessary trips by the nurse into the patient room and nurses are in short supply at Thomason.

In the center core area of each floor is the central nurses' station, classrooms, preparation and storage rooms, offices, public restrooms, and a host of other facilities. Dayrooms are at each end.

The third floor is for obstetrics, nurseries, and maternity nursing. Here will be born approximately 100 babies each month and for a change, it is hoped that each will have his own crib and there will be enough incubators to house the premature infants.

In normal operation, this floor is designed for 34 adult beds and 46 bassinets and another of those nice "gizmos" to be found in the new Thomason is the speaker system between the corridor and nursery so that the proud parent and nurse need not lipread or shout through the plate glass separations.

The fourth floor, designed as the neuropsychiatric nursing unit, will be used when needed as a chronic care unit or a regular nursing floor. The only differences between this and other tower floors are the windows have security screens and elevator lobby areas and exits can be locked.

The pediatrics department will be on the fifth floor which is designed for use, more or less, in sections whereby beds and rooms not occupied by children can, if necessary, be used for adult medical-surgical patients.

Sixth and seventh floors are regular medical-surgical nursing units.

As a building, the new Thomason General Hospital will be the finest county hospital anywhere. It is a physical plant capable of fulfilling the dream of a community health center.

It is a tribute to the man for whom it is named. It is a monument to those who have been responsible for its construction. It is a decent place in which to work for those who serve humanity. It is a place you and I can go for emergency treatment.

It requires several hours to tour the entire hospital, but the open house Sunday provides an opportunity to see whatever part of it is desired.

SPENDING AND TAXATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in a period of our history not too long ago, referred to by some as the thwarted thirties, there were those who proclaimed that the way out of a depression would be to spend and spend, and tax and tax. Now, currently, in the not so roaring sixties, there is a new school of thought that the way to get the country moving again is to spend and spend, but not to tax and tax. Indeed, these are times that try men's souls—and their pocketbooks.

Mr. President, Mr. J. S. Seidman, of a prominent firm of New York City certified public accountants, has written a very thought provoking article entitled "How Do We Sober Up Our Intaxicated Nation?" In order that members of the Congress and others may have an opportunity to read the article by Mr. Seidman, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW DO WE SOBER UP OUR INTAXICATED NATION?

(By J. S. Seidman)

In the thwarted thirties, the administration in office proclaimed that the way out of a depression is to spend and spend, and tax and tax.

In these not so soaring sixties, the administration in office says that the way to get the country moving again is to spend and spend, but not tax and tax.

What was said when the Nation was struggling to be born is just as applicable today: These are the times that try men's souls—and their pocketbooks.

It's natural for everyone to want a tax cut. It's natural for everyone to want a Government handout of one sort or another. What's unnatural is not to face up to the fact that we can't have it both ways without ultimately falling on our face.

Hence, this clarion call to restraint and sobriety. Let's all look at both sides of the ledger. To me, here are the answers that emerge:

1. To have a tax cut unmatched by an expenditure cut is to endanger the economy, not improve it. We don't get stronger by depleting the Treasury. If budget deficits were the way out, we should now be enjoying economic paradise, since we have had sizable deficits in 25 of the last 31 years. But we know from history what happens to nations that persist in living beyond their means.

2. Spending more than we take in does put more dollars into the economy. But that is not the equivalent of more purchasing power, or more purchases. A deep-rooted anxiety, reaching out to the entire Western World, is not about the quantity of our dollars, but their quality. Quantity without quality places in jeopardy the savings bonds, life insurance policies, bank balances, and pension benefits of our own people. Adding deficit on deficit may get the country moving again—but in the wrong direction.

3. The road to tax reduction is in expenditure reduction. Expenditure reduction requires determination and forthrightness by each of us. Lipservice and pious resolutions won't do it. Every one of us must recognize that expenditure reduction may curb or eliminate advantages that some of us, or certain groups, areas, or parties now unwarrantedly enjoy.

4. The President properly put it to the Nation when, at his inauguration, he said it is time for the people to ask: "What can we do for the Government?" There are many things we can do if we are serious about having our economy advance. For one, we must stop calling for, or condoning, the spending of money that we don't have.

5. We must realize that today's promises become tomorrow's taxes. We must therefore turn a deaf ear to rosy pictures of lavish welfare programs, and other spending that we just can't afford.

6. We must recognize that nothing impoverishes us, as a nation, more than to pay out a dollar without getting a dollar's worth in return. Featherbedding, or sloughing off of any sort, comes at a high cost to all of us.

7. We must therefore instill or restore in ourselves an interest in work, a pride in work, a sense of responsibility about work. We must stop trying to get the most and give the least. Otherwise our economy and our jobs are imperiled.

8. By the same token, we must insist that our elected representatives scrutinize every public program or activity, and measure it by dollar's worth in results and efficient administration. The same rigid analysis, support, and yardsticks must be applied to public expenditures, as is expected of business in its expenditures.

9. Furthermore, priority must be assigned to the different expenditure requests by Government, to permit postponements or eliminations as need be.

10. We must not only welcome, but also insist upon, tax reform. We must get rid of punitive and outmoded tax laws. In the process we must correct the excessive reliance on the income tax. We must bring to whatever income tax we do have, simplicity, equity, certainty, and administrability. More important, we must get away from the present situation under which taxes, rather than commonsense or good judgment, run our personal and business lives. The cost to the Nation in time and moral fabric consumed by taxes, instead of production, is too great.

These 10 commandments may keep us off the shoals of intaxication. Otherwise, we will stagger more with taxes that stagger less.

WILLIAM C. DOHERTY, AMBASSADOR TO JAMAICA

Mr. BREWSTER. It is with great pride that I report to you that a distinguished American, Mr. William C. Doherty, of Bethesda, Md., has established himself as one of our most effective ambassadors.

When President Kennedy announced his selection of Mr. Doherty as our first Ambassador to Jamaica, I think every Member of this body was confident that the choice was both brilliant and inspired.

In his capacity as president of the National Association of Letter Carriers for 21 years, Mr. Doherty became an acknowledged expert in the international labor movement. He was one of the most stalwart and articulate advocates of freedom and the democratic process in the labor world.

It gives me great pleasure to state at this time that Mr. Doherty is obviously living up to our expectations as a diplomat in a very difficult post. The current issue of Newday, the monthly magazine of the West Indies, published in Jamaica, carries a glowing tribute to Ambassador Doherty. I ask unanimous consent to have this tribute printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAILMAN MAKING GOOD

He arrived on Grace Line's *Santa Rosa* November 24. Even before he presented his credentials to the Governor General 2 days later at King's House, William C. Doherty, 60, first U.S. Ambassador to Jamaica, was winning friends and influencing Jamaicans in typical Dale Carnegie fashion.

Early December he met Prime Minister Bustamante and some of his Cabinet in the Prime Minister's office. A keyhole listener reported: "They all got along like old buddies." Underscoring his earlier endorsement, Bustamante's later said: "I like Mr. Doherty. He speaks the same language that I and my Government speak." Bustamante's language is pro-Jamacian development, pro-Commonwealth, pro-American, pro-West, in that order.

Doherty's stout, well-tailored figure has since become familiar to thousands of Common Joes; no longer does anyone need to point him out to them; his common touch is paying off in rapidly mounting popularity.

His revelation that he once edited the house magazine of the National Letter Carriers Association (from whose presidency he resigned to accept the ambassadorship) has made him one with the Jamaican press boys. When the afternoon tabloid Star misinterpreted that portion of his speech to the American Men's Club in which he quite correctly said the stability of Jamaica's Government was due in large measure to the English traditions inherited by a first-rate civil service, he generously accepted a reporter's assurance that it was a genuine mistake.

Wherever he has spoken, he has struck the same warm, inspiring note: Jamaica is a wonderful, hospitable little island on the threshold of great achievement as an independent nation, which the U.S. Government stands ready to assist in every possible way.

His concern for Jamaica's No. 1 problem, unemployment, is as deep and sincere as that of the country's leaders. Says he: "There is no shortcut solution to unemployment in any country. I think Jamaica is following the right course toward a long-term solution."

First ever. Christmas week he pulled a big surprise on the embassy staff: an all-staff party at the embassy residence on Long Lane, S.A. For the native members, it was the first such party ever; it left them glowing.

To the same venue week later he invited members of both sides of Parliament and leaders from other sections of the Jamaican community to view the now-famous film in which President Kennedy, interviewed by a top team of three TV men, gives gloves-off answers to questions on America's domestic and foreign policy on a wide range of subjects, and straightens the record on the gigantic role his country plays in bolstering or stabilizing weak economies and keeping world peace.

Quicker than he probably thought or hoped he would, the ex-mailman from the United States has earned in Jamaica a new name which signifies acceptance: "Ambassador Bill."

U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE IN JAPAN: A SMALL OFFICE DOES A BIG JOB

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, recently I visited Japan as an observer, for the Senate Commerce Committee, at the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission meeting in Tokyo. While there I visited the Far East office of the U.S. Travel Service of the Department of Commerce. This visit produced two firsts: I was the first Member of the Senate to inspect this office; and this office was the first U.S. Travel Service office I have had the pleasure of visiting. My visit was pleasant and informative. I am extremely impressed with the efficient and effective job that has been done in the promotion of travel to the United States of America—both by this office in Tokyo and by the Travel Service generally.

The Travel Service office in Tokyo is a small one. It is located in the heart of the Tokyo business district. It is handsomely decorated and well equipped. There are only four employees—two local travel specialists, a general services clerk, and an American director. The director is Mr. Martin B. Pray who, in a short period of time, has done an excellent job.

The office maintains a reference library of pamphlets and materials describing tourist facilities and commercial opportunities for each of our 50 States. In the Alaska files I found over 75 pamphlets describing the attractions of our 49th State. The library is in constant use both by Japanese businessmen and by Japanese tourists planning their vacations.

The office maintains up-to-date mailing lists of each and every travel agency in Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and the Philippines. Mailings on travel developments in the United States are made twice a month to this list.

Although this travel office has not been open long, I understand that more and more Japanese travel agencies are making use of its facilities. In the month of January alone, representatives of 53 travel agencies, 61 booking offices and 239 tourists visited this U.S. Travel Service office. This, of course, does not include the many mail and telephone inquiries that the office receives.

Senators may not be aware that last year 17,972 Japanese visitors toured the United States. These figures do not include the many students and Government officials who also visited our country from Japan in 1962. This is indeed an impressive number when we consider that Japan currently maintains relatively strict currency exchange controls. It is my understanding that the International Monetary Fund has suggested to the Japanese Government that these controls be relaxed in the future and it is possible that within the next 18 months there will be such a relaxation. This would undoubtedly result in a large increase of Japanese travel to the United States. I was told that one major travel agent in Tokyo has predicted that relaxed currency controls would mean, for example, that as many as 10,000 honeymooners a year would visit Hawaii alone.

Not only has travel from Japan increased since the opening of the Tokyo U.S. Travel Service office but there has been a corresponding increase in travel to the United States of America from the other areas of the Orient served by the Tokyo office. A total of 8,869 Philippine visitors visited the United States last year, an increase of 20 percent over the year before. The number of U.S. visitors from Hong Kong likewise increased by 27 percent.

These travel service offices which have been established overseas to encourage foreign visitors to come to America are anxious to receive the publications and advice of travel and convention bureaus within our own cities and States. I urge the State and local travel bureaus to take full advantage of the publicity and promotion skills available to them at the U.S. Travel Service offices throughout the world.

While I was visiting the office I was pleased to speak to several reporters Mr. Pray had called together. I told them of the tourist attractions of my State of Alaska. As a result, articles outlining the attractions of Alaska appeared in many of the local Japanese papers; articles which would never have been printed without the existence of the U.S. Travel Service. These articles are but a small part of the services rendered by the Tokyo office. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a representative article entitled "Alaska Eagerly Seeking More Tourists," taken from the Shipping and Trade News, Saturday, February 9, 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point. This article was written by an outstanding and responsible newsman, Mr. Peter T. Sum.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA EAGERLY SEEKING MORE TOURISTS—SENATOR LENDS HAND IN TOURISM PROMOTION

(By Peter T. Sum)

One portion of the United States, the name of which often exists, it seems, in dreams only, is offering a new aspect in tourist attractions.

The largest State in the United States, the 49th in the Union currently has in this country its own ambassador of goodwill.

The ambassador is Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, a "more than 50-year resident" of Alaska and a Democrat lawmaker on the floor of the Senate since 1959.

Senator BARTLETT's presence in this country, officially speaking, is in connection with the International Fisheries talks currently being conducted in Tokyo among the Governments of the United States, Canada, and Japan.

Senator BARTLETT is an adviser to the U.S. delegation to the talks.

The Senator, however, managed to take time out from his principal work yesterday to do some promotion for his home State.

He called on the Far East regional office of the U.S. Travel Service (USTS) where he conferred briefly with Martin B. Pray, regional director, USTS, on how to get more foreign tourists to Alaska.

While at the USTS office, Senator BARTLETT also met Jack Moss, Japan sales manager, Northwest Orient Airlines, and Bill Glaza, NWA's PR-manager.

The Senator later was introduced to members of Tokyo's English-language Press by Pray.

In what was described as an informal chit-chat in the spacious reception office of USTS, the U.S. lawmaker said that while there were increases in the flow of American tourists to his State within the past few years, the outcome was still far from satisfactory in the State government's view.

He said that the State was now earnestly trying to promote tourism through the good offices of its board of tourism under the directorship of Morris Ford.

"The State is pursuing a very active campaign (for the promotion of tourism) though small in scale at the moment," the Senator expressed.

He said that funds for the campaign came from Government appropriations.

Geographically speaking, the Senator thought that the State he represented offered a new aspect in tourist travel.

"We have the wilderness," declared the Senator pointing out that the largest State in the Union had a population of only a quarter of a million.

He said that any visitor arriving at Anchorage, the main gateway to the State of Alaska, needed only a few minutes' time by car in order to be with the wilderness.

"We also have the few glaciers in the world that are accessible by road," the Senator from Alaska said.

He thought that visitors from the Far East, Japanese in particular, would enjoy touring Alaska where recently the weather was warmer and more pleasant than Tokyo.

The Senator pointed out that the State had one drawback in its attempt to have more visitors.

He said, "We have no passenger steamship services. What we had were contributed by the Canadians."

The Canadians suspended the services some time in 1954 after which, Senator BARTLETT said his government introduced a ferry service system for the conveyance of people between the other States of the Union and Alaska.

Communications and hotel facilities within the 49th State were up to date, however.

Senator Bartlett disclosed that Alaska alone has six regional airlines with the Consolidated Airlines well known for its package-tour services.

"The airline even packages your (fishing) catch and sends it home for you," contributed Pray.

The USTS executive thought that "for 5 years to come Alaska and Hawaii will be the two most popular destinations for Far East tourists."

Asked why he had thought so, the American travel promoter attached to the Department of Commerce replied that he had based his thoughts on two factors.

Proximity of Alaska and Hawaii.

Both Alaska and Hawaii offer the greatest variety of things to do.

However, statistics thus far showed that there had been far too few passengers landing at Alaska than other U.S. States.

Things might look better for Alaska, however, what with Pray already coining the sales slogan:

"Hawaii—presold package; Alaska—tomorrow's discovery."

And, with Northwest Orient Airlines saying that it takes only 6½ hours' nonstop scheduled flying time between Haneda Airport and Anchorage.

Thus, in a way, Alaska is not only a name in dream after all. For it is still nearer to Tokyo than traveling by train (for the time being) from this city to Osaka.

REVISION OF NASA PATENT WAIVER REGULATIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, recently one of our most distinguished Representatives, Mrs. Edith Green of Oregon, joined a group of Representatives and Senators who are vigorously opposing the revision of NASA patent waiver regulations. Her statement of January 28, 1963, was so forceful and enlightening that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Mrs. Green of Oregon

At the outset I want to pay tribute to the role of the National Space and Aeronautics Administration and also to its capable leadership whose efforts have garnered the attention and admiration of the American people and their allies. I have had occasion from time to time to contact James Webb, the NASA Administrator, and his staff, and have found them helpful and knowledgeable at all times.

Therefore, in the context that there can be disagreement among friends, let me aline myself with my distinguished colleagues, Senator Gruening and Representatives Holifield and Ryan on the matter before you today—a proposed change in the NASA patent waiver regulations.

It is my view that in cases where the National Aeronautics and Space Administration sponsors and pays for research and development in fields within its statutory jurisdiction, the ensuing inventions and discoveries should be the property of the Federal Government for the benefit of the general public and not for the benefit of only a particular contractor involved.

Inventions resulting from Government contracts are the products of expenditures of public funds. These inventions are developed for a public purpose and are a means to a Government purpose, assigned by statute as refined by regulations, and take on a public character thereby. The public, the American taxpayers, has therefore paid for the invention.

The admirable and fruitful technological research conducted and financed by the Federal Government, including NASA, a constituent agency, represents a vast national resource—a resource in my view that is a counterpart to the great public domain lands of our West of the 19th century.

This, I believe, is the position of the Atomic Energy Commission. This, I suggest, should be the position of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

At this point I shall quote from a Department of Justice report signed by the then Attorney General, Tom Clark, and issued in 1947, I believe:

"Where patentable inventions are made in the course of performing a Government-financed contract for research and development, the public interest requires that all rights to such inventions be assigned to the Government and not left to the private ownership of the contractor. Public control will assure free and equal availability of the inventions to American industry and science; will eliminate any competitive advantage to the contractor chosen to perform the research work; will avoid undue concentration of economic power in the hands of a few large corporations; will tend to increase and diversify available research facilities within the United States to the advantage of the Government and of the national economy; and will thus strengthen our American system of free, competitive enterprise."

My recollection is that the Justice Department during the administration of General Eisenhower in effect reiterated this policy.

The policy as laid down by the Atomic Energy Commission, and endorsed by the Justice Department, it seems to me, has avoided this very hazard—the one of granting of special privileges and the establishment of preferred positions by contractors.

The Mitchell subcommittee of the House Science and Astronautics Committee reported in March of 1960, during a review of proposed patent revisions, the solicited views of Prof. Seymour Melman of Columbia University.

Professor Melman made this valid observation based on a study he had prepared for the Senate Subcommittee on Patents: "It was found that where knowledge is treated—where the production of knowledge is treated as an end in itself, the pace of inquiry moved the more rapidly, as against criteria which see the production of new knowledge from the vantage point of a special section or group or agency in society."

That doughty Frenchman, Clemenceau, once said that war is too important to be left to the generals. I suggest that the patent system is too valuable an apparatus to be left to its friends.

Now it is natural to raise the point—and it has been raised by my colleagues in the House—"you think it's something immoral in an inventor retaining the fruits of his labor—the system under which we became the greatest industrial country in the world?"

Well, Byron R. White, now an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, replied in this fashion when Deputy Attorney General: "The individual inventor doesn't enjoy the patent rights himself in any case and they go, instead, to his employing company, which, in the situation we are describing, is the Government contractor. And, of course, the present patent system of NASA, which some are now trying to change, was established by Congress itself in the 1958 Space Act.

It seems to me the proposed waiver regulations are objectionable on a number of scores, one of which I shall mention. The initial statement of the waiver policy, which, I believe, is section 1245.103, appears to suggest that waiver, rather than Government retention as contained in title 42, United States Code, section 2457(f), is to be the rule rather than the exception. The statute requires a determination that the waiver serve the interests of the United States—Government title generally is the result of Government-financed inventions. But the proposed regulations change places emphasis on the prompt working of inventions and assumes that such prompt working will ordinarily be fostered by the private retention of exclusive rights in the inventions concerned.

The core of the NASA patent matter is section 305 of the 1958 Space Act. It requires the Federal Government to take title to NASA contractor inventions unless the Administrator determines the interests of the United States require waiving such title. Now on two occasions since passage of the 1958 act, there have been two attempts to change this provision by means of legislation. This legislation did not pass. I think that this very hearing raises the question of whether an attempt is being made to accomplish by regulations that which in legislation form failed to secure congressional approval.

I suggest that advocates of a change in patent section 305 return to the committees of the Congress for a fair and open hearing on the merits and demerits of their proposed patent change.

This seems to be a proper and equitable means of settling the matter which is of the utmost importance for the economic well-being of the American people.

AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL POLICY—SPEECH BY R. K. DOERK, INTERNATIONAL HARVESTER CO., MADISON, WIS.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the February 1963 newsletter distributed to the vocational agriculture teachers of my State, there appeared portions of a speech by Mr. R. K. Doerk, of the International Harvester Co., which was delivered at a luncheon during a convention attended by many Oregon agriculture teachers.

During the course of his remarks, Mr. Doerk pointed out many important facts which are sometimes lost sight of in debate upon agricultural policy. I think it is important to stress as he did that:

> Financially, agriculture is also America's largest single industry. The value of the farm plant—$206 billion—exceeds the plant value of any other industry in this country. And gross total farm income—$40 billion annually—exceeds the income of any other industry on the American scene. By contrast, the gross income of the farm equipment industry last year was close to $2 billion, or about 5 cents per dollar of gross farm income; and it will probably be nearly the same for 1962.

It is important, too, Mr. President, for us to recall the fact that although our food supply is coming from fewer farms now as compared to the past it does not diminish the importance of our farms for the people who operate them. Actually, Mr. Doerk points out, the importance of our farm production is best gaged by the need for farm products which in turn is a function of the number of customers our farmers serve.

So, too, is Mr. Doerk's reminder that the people in agriculture in our country

are the largest single gainfully employed group in our national economy. It will be helpful to us, in my judgment, in the days ahead as we consider legislation which affects either directly or indirectly American agriculture that we remind ourselves of these points which Mr. Doerk has developed so concisely. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that his article be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Is Agriculture Important?

No one acquainted with the facts questions the great importance of American agriculture to the well-being of our Nation. With the assignment of providing the daily needs of food and fiber for more than 168 million people, agriculture must be recognized as the most important business in our country. American agriculture has no competitor, and any possible foreign competition is not foreseeable for the future. Each morning there are 6,000 more youngsters to feed on the basis of the present birthrate, and what that figure will be in 1975 or 1980 is anybody's guess. So, American agriculture's market here at home is assured, and it is growing daily.

The fact that our food supply is coming from fewer farms now as compared to the past doesn't diminish the importance of our farms or the people who operate them. Actually their importance is gaged by the need for farm products which in effect is the number of customers they must accommodate: and on this basis the importance of our farms increases daily. This, of course, is based only on our peacetime requirements of farm products and does not reflect the greatly increased load which would be placed on our farms in the event of an emergency.

Also, even though the number of farms has declined and is still continuing to decline at a lesser rate than in the past, the need for manpower in agriculture is continually increasing due to the constant growth of the agricultural service professions and industries. This includes all the specialists in animal and crop sciences, those going into farm products processing and marketing fields, and those entering the farm equipment and farm supplies business and occupations. This means that, rather than shrinking manpowerwise, American agriculture is constantly growing. This statement is borne out by the fact that of the 68 million people employed in the United States, 40 percent or 27 million are at work in the nine major areas of modern agriculture of which farming is one area. The people in agriculture are the largest single gainfully employed group in our national economy.

Financially, agriculture is also America's largest single industry. The value of the farm plant—$206 billion—exceeds the plant value of any other industry in this country. And gross total farm income—$40 billion annually—exceeds the income of any other industry on the American scene. By contrast, the gross income of the farm equipment industry last year was close to $2 billion, or about 5 cents per dollar of gross farm income; and it will probably be nearly the same for 1962.

We must recall that 95 percent of all American farms are family owned and operated enterprises. This certainly speaks well for the success of the free enterprise system in our economy. If there were no money to be made in farming, independent operators, which is what our farmers really are, would obviously not be in farming. The results also reflect favorably on the efficiency of the family-type farm because each American farmer now feeds himself and 26 others, which is phenomenal efficiency as compared to farming efficiency in other lands. In comparing our farming with Russia's farming for example, according to recently released figures, our farmers, even on a curtailed production basis, produce 60 percent more farm produce on 40 percent less cropland than Russia. This is done by only 8 percent of our population as contrasted with 40 percent of the Soviet population engaged in agriculture. Moreover, I am sure we will all admit that the total production potential of American agriculture has never really been tested. A former top official of the U.S. Government recently stated that, if we would really farm the Mississippi Valley intensively, we could feed the population of the world now and in the foreseeable future. Such potential production of farm products certainly weighs heavily in our favor as a power in relationship with the rest of the world.

So, to put it in a nutshell, the importance and value of American agriculture—(1) as a source of essential products for us and others, (2) as a factor in our overall economy, (3) as a factor of the free enterprise system, and (4) as a bulwark of strength in the free world—can be characterized as a giant of preponderant strength which no amount of doom and gloom philosophy can overcome. It is a very much alive, vital, vibrant force. So, why not conserve it and foster it, and use it to the greatest value of the American people and the peoples of the free world?

MEANING OF EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET TO AMERICAN FARMERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on a related point, I wish to direct the attention of Senators to the lead article in the January 1963 issue of the Farm Journal, entitled "Wake Up or Be Walled Out," which appeared under the byline of Mr. Claude W. Gifford, economics editor of that publication.

There are those who would not agree with Mr. Gifford's analysis but, in my judgment, he has touched upon one aspect of our policy toward the Common Market which deserves our attention since it reflects the view of a growing number of farmers in the United States. Certainly, for every Senator whose State lists agriculture among its major industries, the tariff walls being erected against agricultural products, particularly wheat, seed grains, poultry, rice, tobacco, fruits, and vegetables are a matter for concern and careful evaluation. In view of the thought-provoking character of this article and the editorial relating to it which appears in the same issue, I ask unanimous consent that both be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Wake Up or Be Walled Out

(By Claude W. Gifford)

"You Americans had your chance. When you could have pressured the European Common Market to keep its doors open to American farm products, you did very little. Now the trade doors are closing in Europe—and farmers in the United States are going to get hurt."

That is how one of Europe's largest grain importers sums up the meaning of the European Common Market (EEC) for U.S. farmers.

This importer reflects the private opinion of many important Europeans whom I interviewed recently in a 3-week tour of the Common Market countries—the second such trip that I have made for Farm Journal in the last 2 years.

My latest mission: Find out whether Great Britain (England, Wales, Scotland, and North Ireland) is going to enter the Common Market. And size up what this and other late developments in the Common Market mean to U.S. farmers.

What I have to report from this survey made in the capitals of five European countries is not good news for American farmers—as things now stand. The consensus is that unless the United States wakes up soon and fights harder for its trade in Europe:

We'll see a shrinking market for U.S. farm goods in the part of the world where we ship two-thirds of the farm exports that we sell for dollars;

Our international monetary exchange balance, already in trouble, will suffer—since farm products account for $1 out of $4 of our exports;

Common Market countries will also be hurt in the long run.

The trouble is this: Western Europe is building one big tariff wall around the outside of the Common Market. Meantime, they're tearing down the tariff walls between the countries inside (Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg). They'll trade freely with one another—but buy less from the outside.

They seem more determined than ever to build an abnormally high tariff wall around the outside to keep out certain farm goods, including ours.

For us, it means that it will be harder to vault farm stuff over the wall—particularly wheat, feed grains, poultry, rice, tobacco, and fruits and vegetables. We suspected this when we printed an article last February entitled "You'll Pay for the Common Market." It looks even more likely now. And the harm doesn't stop there.

Great Britain is loosening her age-old ties with the Commonwealth and is rushing headlong into the Common Market—after centuries of standing aloof from continental Europe. Now her government is working hard to find a way to join what is intended to be a United States of Europe.

Great Britain feels that she can't stand idly by and be shut out of the rich industrial market at her front door while European nations trade freely with each other. Already the EEC economy is humming while Great Britain does little more than tread water. And unless Great Britain joins the Common Market, she will have less and less "say" about how European political matters will be decided in the future.

When Great Britain joins, this will make the Common Market an economic giant with even more people than in the United States. It will be by far the world's biggest importer of raw materials and export trader. And it will slide the world's largest single food importer—Great Britain—behind that same high Common Market tariff wall.

The countries slated for the Common Market import more than half of the world's exports of corn, butter, barley, wool, vegetable oil and fats, cheese and meat; and just under half the world's exports of eggs and tobacco.

These same countries now buy 52 percent of our U.S. exports of feed grain, 43 percent of our poultry exports, 37 percent of our oversea sales of wheat and flour, and 28 percent of our tobacco exports, all for dollars, all of which will be hurt.

As this happens, it seems that every country affected—except the United States—is fighting tooth and nail for the interest of its farmers, and is yelling bloody murder.

I was in London during the historymaking meeting of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers. They were probably presiding over the breakup of the historic British Commonwealth. The Prime Ministers from one Commonwealth country after another took turns pounding the table demanding that their farmers be protected when Great Britain enters the Common Market.

The Commonwealth representatives explained how they now ship most of their farm stuff into Great Britain at lower tariff rates than other countries must pay (including the United States). They are deathly afraid that their trade preferences will be shut off when Great Britain joins the Common Market.

"Duties on our goods would shoot up, and the European countries behind the tariff wall would then have first call on the big British food market," one of the representatives told me.

"We are fighting for our very lives," says New Zealand's Prime Minister K. J. Holyoake, himself a farmer. "We sell 91 percent of our exported butter and 94 percent of our cheese and mutton exports to Great Britain." New Zealand has 9 million acres in pasture, and the land is little suited for other use. Their economy depends on cows and sheep. And 60 percent of all their nation's exports go to the protected market in Great Britain.

Australia is also up in arms. "A third of our trade with Great Britain would be seriously affected (wheat, beef, lamb, butter, and sugar) and another third (canned and dried fruits) would be grievously disrupted," says Australia's Deputy Prime Minister J. McEwen.

U.S. farmers need to be just as concerned. We supply nearly one-half of Great Britain's feed grain imports, more than half of her lard imports, and about one-sixth of her wheat imports.

We also have a stake in the big food exports that New Zealand, Australia, and Canada send to Great Britain. If the British outlet is closed down to them, these exports from the Commonwealth countries—mainly dairy products, mutton, beef, and fruit—will come banging on our door to get in. They've got to go somewhere.

The Commonwealth countries are asking that they be guaranteed a quota of imports into the expanded Common Market—based on what they have been selling to Great Britain. "This may be the best solution for us, too," says a U.S. official. "It would be better to have these Commonwealth exports going into the Common Market than to have them pounding on our door or competing with us in markets around the world."

Nor do our troubles stop there. I called on Karl Skytte, Minister of Agriculture for Denmark. "What will Denmark do if Great Britain joins the Common Market?" I asked.

"We will press to get in immediately," he said, explaining why: Denmark is an agricultural nation, and a good one. She not only takes care of her own food needs, but exports two-thirds of her output—mostly livestock and poultry products. She has tripled her poultry meat production in the last 5 years, and expects to produce substantially more of this and other products in the future. Four-fifths of this goes to Great Britain and the six continental Common Market countries.

Naturally, she wants behind the tariff wall; it doesn't pay to be on the outside if you want to sell food to Western Europe.

Norway also will surely press for membership when Great Britain joins. "These two countries, Denmark and Norway, probably will be accepted with little fuss or trouble," says Dr. Sicco L. Mansholt, vice president of the Common Market, and head of its agricultural affairs. Ireland probably will be taken in, too.

That, then, is the last-minute picture I brought back of what the entry of Great Britain means to U.S. farmers.

The second important part of the picture is this: There is a determined drive within the Common Market to (1) build that outside wall unreasonably high; and to (2) set abnormally high price supports on their farm production.

"This is fraught with danger for us—unless we do something about it, and soon," says one of our trade specialists.

Two years ago, I found that the Common Market was at least talking a good game of keeping its doors open to American farm products. But when the chips were down this summer—as they set their first common tariff rates for that outside wall—Common Market officials hiked several farm tariffs. And they were high before as an aftermath of recovery from World War II.

Here's what happened late this summer: They shoved up tariffs on our broilers so that the rates in West Germany, our biggest outlet, jumped from 4.8 cents a pound to 13 cents on 30-cent birds. They hiked fruit tariffs in the six by 36 percent. They pushed up duties on grain and flour—in the Netherlands the duty on flour shot up from $13 a ton to $40. And tobacco tariffs that averaged 19 percent of value in 1958 are now 28 percent.

Another important test is at what level the Common Market will place farm price supports. They are moving toward one common price level across all countries for each farm commodity supported. They'll complete this by 1970, or earlier, and if they follow the present trend they'll push these support levels higher than the present average in the six.

Why does this matter to us? Simply because (1) high supports over there mean high tariffs raised against us, and (2) more farm production over there, with less need of our imports.

Why is the Common Market going in this direction? People there say it is because they have a "small farm" problem—more than half of the farms in the six countries are 12 acres or less in size. Naturally, farm income is low.

A loud and influential cry has gone up for what appears to be an easy solution: Clamp down on food imports; raise the tariff wall; push up farm price supports; and raise more themselves.

They propose to do it with a "variable duty"—which will always be slightly more than the difference between the fluctuating world price of farm goods outside the wall, and the support price inside the wall. That way, nothing can come in at less than the effective support level.

"But this is a Frankenstein that will hurt them in the long run," says one of our officials on the scene. He explains that high supports will simply bring more retaliation from the rest of the world. It will raise food prices inside the Common Market, which in turn will raise wages, since negotiations there are based directly on the cost of living.

Higher wages will raise the cost of Common Market industrial goods and make it harder for them to export. And these countries must rely on heavy industrial exports to stay prosperous.

Moreover, higher farm supports won't help Europe's small farms much—their volume is too small to benefit greatly.

Abnormally high price supports are shadowed by the specter of overinflated land values; overmechanization that can't replace itself profitably; Government controls that will interfere with healthy adjustments of their small farms; high tax costs; and depressed prices when surpluses spill over at home and on world markets.

In short, thinking Europeans admit that the Common Market's best future does not lie in high price supports to protect an inefficient agriculture—an agriculture whose efficiency U.S. farmers can beat with one hand tied behind them.

The Common Market's future lies in its industrial efficiency, which can now match the best in the world, including ours.

"What the Common Market really needs is an overall program to reverse centuries of political, social, family, and legal customs that have led to smaller and smaller farm holdings," says one official.

Top Common Market technicians see this, but they are bucking a strong tide at home.

The economic fact of life is that the European mind is still trade restrictionist. And the political fact of life is that the European farm population that is affected by these agricultural policies is abnormally high—as high as 30 percent of the total population in some countries, compared with 9 percent here. And most of these European farms are small.

These numerous, small farmers are politically potent—even more powerful than their numbers suggest.

This is exactly why many European government officials privately hope that the United States will wake up—before it's too late—and use its vast prestige, power, and leadership to help lead the Common Market into a more reasonable farm trade program.

Some people, especially in our State Department, say that we have been putting on the pressure. After all Secretaries Benson and Freeman have both gone to Europe to talk to the Europeans about their tariffs. We have competent professional people representing our viewpoint in Brussels, the Common Market capital. In many ways, we've made our views known.

But what has been noticeably lacking, a well known and highly placed European told me, "is a consistent, day-after-day, strong, unrelenting pressure built on a studied policy that would convince the Europeans that the United States means business."

A case in point: The 18-month Geneva conference on GATT tariff negotiations was closed this year before we got satisfactory terms from the Common Market on farm matters. President Kennedy signed the document consenting to end the conference. This tipped off the astute Europeans that our Government—at the top level—wasn't as serious as we'd been talking.

A second case in point: Only after the German poultry duty skyrocketed did President Kennedy write a letter to Chancellor Adenauer protesting the move. This kind of "we're serious" pressure should have come before, not after, the duty was hiked. The letter coming as it did after the deed had been done, caught the Germans by surprise, embarrassed them, made them angry—and so far the duty hasn't been changed.

A third case in point: Our State Department is calling most of the shots in Common Market negotiations—and the State Department is so engulfed in political considerations in Europe that U.S. farm considerations are buried.

If we're going to save the day in Europe, say those close to the scene, we need a yell to go up—and a purpose to set in—in Congress, at the State Department, and at the White House; places where these have been most noticeably lacking up to now.

WILL WE FIGHT FOR U.S. FARMERS?

It's not surprising that American farmers, busy with their daily affairs, have been largely oblivious of a threat to their livelihood that now looms in Europe. That's why we shout in page 24 of this issue: "Wake Up or Be Walled Out." Walled out of a large share of your foreign market for wheat, feed grains, poultry, rice, tobacco, and some fruit and vegetables. Not only do you need to wake up, but our Government needs to, and it's up to you to do the arousing. Your Senators and Congressmen happen to be at home right now.

Farm Journal thinks this important enough that twice within the year we have sent our economics editor to Europe to see how the Common Market is shaping up. Claude Gifford's article gives you the straight dope.

What's happened, in a nutshell, is that countries which once warred with one another are now forming a Western European Club designed to advance trade with each other, promote peace in Europe and raise their standard of living. They are abolishing tariffs against each other; later they hope to achieve actual political federation.

We've applauded all this. It's good for our friends, the Western Europeans, and it could be good for us. If Europe prospers she can be an even better customer of ours. And she can put a powerful block in the path of communism. The danger is that in their understandable zeal to help themselves they may pay scant regard to the damage they do the rest of the world—including us. They appear headed toward raising the highest tariff wall against us seen in modern times. "The Six"—France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Italy and Luxembourg—are currently indicating that they may be pretty tough about it.

At which point, to use that old Missouri expression, this gives us every right to rise and say: "Now just a darned minute!"

We've had a good deal of regard for other countries in our trade relations—too much sometimes. The very word "trade" indicates a two-way deal. We've traded concessions at the GATT meetings (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade). We've refrained from dumping our farm surpluses. Even in our vast giveaways we've been careful not to harm farmers of other countries. We've taken in a lot of foreign food, even when it hurt. Last year, according to USDA, we exported $5 billion worth, of which only $3½ billion was sold for a full cash price. We imported $4 billion worth, and more than half of that was in products that compete with ours. The figure does not include noncompetitive agricultural stuff such as coffee, tea and rubber.

What can we do about it? Well, any farmer who ever got into a tough dicker knows that you don't start out with threats. You try to sell, persuade and show the other fellow that the trade would be to his advantage. (In this case it actually would be. High tariffs over there would mean high food prices, higher wages and hence a poorer competitive position for the industrial goods Europe wants to export.) But it's also essential in a dicker to have a good bargaining position and let the other fellow know that you certainly intend to use it. He respects you for it.

Secretary Freeman did some of this in Paris the other day when he reminded the Europeans that the last Congress passed a law "which directs the President to take all appropriate steps * * * including retaliation if necessary." What he meant was that Europe can't sell industrial stuff here if we can't sell farm stuff there. This game can work two ways if, unhappily, that should be the way Western Europe wants it.

The question now is whether the President, the State Department and—most of all—Congress, will fight for American farmers the way every other nation fights for its farmers.

We've been pretty wishy-washy so far, but it's not too late if farmers get aroused enough. That's why we say "Wake up!"—and wake your Government up.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN MALLORY RULE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post contains an editorial which I consider to be an unanswerable argument against any change in the Mallory rule. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NULLIFYING THE LAW

It is a misfortune that the House and Senate District Committees chose to meet in secret on Monday to consider modification of the Mallory rule. One result of the secrecy is that only garbled and unverifiable versions of what took place are available. It is reported that there is agreement among law enforcement officials and the District Commissioners that the Mallory rule should be changed. But the character of the change on which they have agreed has not been disclosed.

Let us look at what it is they propose to change. There is a law in the District of Columbia—and State laws similar to it exist everywhere else in the United States—declaring that when the police arrest someone they must take them before a judicial officer "without unnecessary delay." If such laws did not exist, policemen would themselves be the judges of their own arrests and could hold suspects in police stations for as long as they pleased.

Now, the Mallory rule is nothing more than a rule of evidence laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States holding that a confession obtained in violation of this District law may not be introduced in a Federal prosecution. The aim is simply to require the police to obey the law they are supposed to enforce and to prevent a situation in which the rights of a defendant may be violated.

Congress cannot substantially alter the Mallory rule without effectively nullifying its own earlier enactment. To nullify the Mallory rule, in short, is to invite the police to ignore an act of Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also wish to emphasize that I shall strenuously oppose any change whatsoever in the Mallory rule. The Mallory rule constitutes a protection of a basic freedom in this Republic and I do not intend, under the pressure of a police department, to support any modification of it whatsoever.

I look upon the Mallory rule unanimously established by the Supreme Court as a vital protection of the American people against the ever-present danger of police abuses.

One of the reasons for our forefathers' insurrection against the British Crown was the police-state methods that the so-called law enforcement officers of the British Crown came to apply in highly tyrannical fashion.

As one who has worked for years in surveying of law-enforcement practices in the United States, I warn again that police departments must always be subjected to constant vigilance. We have learned over and over again in the history of our country that unchecked practices exercised by police departments result in the loss of personal, individual freedom.

There is no reason at all why anyone arrested for crime should not be taken forthwith to a committing magistrate for commitment or for freedom from commitment.

All the Supreme Court ruled in the Mallory case was that free Americans are entitled to be taken before a committing magistrate by arresting officers without delay.

In my judgment it would be a serious mistake in this session of Congress to seek to change the Mallory rule in any way whatsoever.

I congratulate the Washington Post for what I consider to be the unanswerable editorial published in this morning's paper.

While I am on the subject of law enforcement problems in the District of Columbia, let me also make clear that I shall strenuously oppose any attempt in the District of Columbia to authorize arrests for investigation or other unjustified purposes.

This, too, smacks of political tyranny. As I said earlier this year, it is clearly unconstitutional and the time is long past for the District Commissioners of the District of Columbia to follow and not flout the Constitution of the United States.

RECONSTRUCTION OF FEDERAL TAX SYSTEM

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the subject of Federal taxation is presently before Congress, and the best information available from well-established sources is necessary to our proper consideration of all current proposals.

Tax Foundation, Inc., is an independent, nonpartisan, nonprofit organization engaged in research and study in the field of government at all levels—Federal, State, and local.

Within the past few weeks the foundation has published a study entitled "Reconstructing the Federal Tax System—A Guide to the Issues." I am privileged to have received both the original and a condensation of this study.

In order that other Members of Congress and the public may have the benefit of this study, I ask unanimous consent to have the condensation published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECONSTRUCTING THE FEDERAL TAX SYSTEM—A GUIDE TO THE ISSUES

The present period is probably unique in the history of Federal taxation. There have been few times when the deficiencies of the Federal tax system have been as vigorously discussed. Seldom have hopes for tax reduction run as high. Never has the discussion of tax changes ranged over so many aspects of tax and fiscal policy.

While there is widespread agreement that substantial changes need to be made in the Federal tax system, there are important differences of opinion as to the measures that should be undertaken to improve it. To many the problem is simply one of reducing rates. Others would seek merely to make certain revisions or reforms in the present methods of taxing individual incomes. Still others believe that a basic overhaul of the entire system and the adoption of new forms of Federal taxation are needed.

NEED FOR TAX REVISION

The need for tax revision is compelling. The present tax structure is in large part a legacy of the depression of the 1930's and of World War II. Since then economic conditions have changed profoundly, and the objectives of public policy have been modified. Yet there has been little adaptation of the tax system. Some of the major developments in the past three decades which have not yet been reflected in tax laws may be summarized:

1. The economy has moved from deep depression and yet retains tax provisions adopted, not necessarily wisely, to meet depression emergencies.

2. Drastic increases in tax rates, reductions in exemptions, and other elements enacted to pay for a big war remain in effect 17 years after the end of fighting.

3. Inflation has gradually increased the burden of taxes, but more so for some people than for others; these burden increases and shifts have not yet been considered explicitly as part of tax legislation.

4. State and local taxes have gone up.

5. Defense cost remains heavy. The tax system was not designed to meet such apparently endless strains. There is small margin for meeting the added revenue needs which would grow out of a serious, but not inconceivable, turn for the worse in foreign relations.

6. The continuation of an adverse balance of payments calls for attention in Federal tax policy.

7. The desire to speed economic growth, coupled with the inevitability of tax burdens which will greatly influence growth, make up a relatively new and compelling reason for modernizing Federal taxes.

Aside from the changes in economic conditions and policy objectives which make the need for tax revision compelling, there are some overall characteristics of the Federal tax system which in themselves should be critically examined.

1. The system imposes heavy burdens. The Federal tax bill in 1963, including social insurance and highway user taxes, will amount to over $100 billion, or about one-fifth of net national product.

2. The laws and regulations, especially those taxing incomes, estate, and gifts, have become increasingly complex.

3. Yields are unstable over the cycle and rise automatically with, but at a more rapid rate than, national income.

4. The revenue system exerts a stabilizing effect on the economy but one which slows down economic expansion before full employment is reached. The major taxes, those on income, bear relatively heavily upon income which would be saved and thereby become available for investment. The tax system favors some types of investment over others, with results which may well hurt, rather than benefit, the national interest.

5. The total Federal tax burden is progressive, sharply so in the income ranges over about $10,000; the highest rates do actually apply.

6. Special provisions have unequal effects on taxpayers in about the same circumstances. Some of the results are sometimes unfair.

CRITERIA FOR TAX REVISION

Most complaints about the tax system could be removed to a large degree by reduction in tax rates. A rate cut would reduce total burdens. It would also make the special provisions, the so-called loopholes, of less practical importance. The most effective tax reform possible would be achieved by reducing tax rates.

In judging proposals for tax change, several basic principles should be considered as guides:

1. The system should bring at least enough revenue to pay expenses, except in periods of recession, without burdening business so heavily as to keep the economy below full employment. Over the long run the budget should at least be kept in balance.

2. The total tax burden ought to be distributed to meet generally accepted concepts of fairness. To do so, it will tax equally those who are similarly situated. It will vary the burdens on those whose conditions differ; the differences in tax will be related reasonably—not arbitrarily, capriciously, or maliciously—to circumstances which occasion the differences in burden.

3. The tax laws should be devised to keep at a minimum obstacles to the efficient operation of the economy.

4. Tax changes ought to seek to reduce the costs of administration and compliance.

5. Tax provisions which are least likely to impede economic growth may well be preferred.

6. Finally, as indicated previously, the changes which will do most to help achieve most objectives are cuts in high tax rates.

THE INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

Differences of opinion are extensive as to the character and extent of the changes in the individual income tax which would best serve the public interest. Proposed changes in the individual income tax include revising the rate and bracket structure singly or in combination with broadening or narrowing the tax base.

The rate and bracket structure can be examined from two main points of view: equity and economic effects. On both grounds there is good reason for substantial revision. The present rate structure was never justified by a reasoned calculation of the relative tax burdens at different income levels needed to meet the most widely accepted standards of equity. As with rates, there is no clearly accepted basis for arriving at a more or less ideal bracket structure. Some guides are available, however.

Steeply progressive rates cannot be justified on grounds of equity or their economic effects on the whole country. High tax rates influence the pattern of personal investment; the allocation of capital can hardly be as productive as if investment decisions were governed by economic factors alone. From a revenue standpoint, drastic cuts in the most extreme rates would cost little revenue, and substantial moderation throughout the whole progressive rate structure would involve surprisingly little revenue loss.

Growth of national income will enlarge the tax base, but the size of the base will also depend upon what Congress says shall be included. Some of the hardest choices of tax revision will be between broadening the tax base to get bigger rate reduction and meeting special needs in ways that narrow the tax base and thereby restrict the opportunities for rate reduction. Among the issues involved in considerations of modifying the tax base are: the treatment of fully excluded forms of income (social insurance benefits, the retirement income credit, imputed income, unrealized gains and losses, and income in kind); interest from State and local bonds; capital gains and losses—the difficulty of distinguishing capital gains and losses from income; issues involved in taxing the income element of capital gains; personal deductions; personal exemptions; and tax credits.

The tax base is broad in part because the personal exemption has remained fixed in dollar terms for 15 years. Many observers believe, however, that in some respects the base is too narrow. Various types of receipts are excluded from gross income; payments representing certain uses of income are deductible. Almost every exclusion and deduction is criticized on one ground or another; and each is defended. Any change should take account of the circumstances which led to the adoption of the practice and also to the commitments and adjustments which taxpayers have made over the years.

THE CORPORATION INCOME TAX

One of the most important facts about the tax on corporation earnings—the distribution of its burden—is unknown. There is uncertainty about the extent to which the tax rests finally on stockholders, or is shifted to consumers in the prices of products, or is somehow passed backward to workers or other suppliers of factors of production. This uncertainty seems to add to the tax's political appeal because few people are aware of what they may be paying.

The economic effects of the tax are also uncertain. Even when the general characteristics seem reasonably clear, their quantitative significance cannot be determined with any high degree of confidence.

The corporation tax consists of a normal tax of 30 percent on all net income plus a surtax of 22 percent on income over $25,000. Although the normal tax was scheduled to fall to 25 percent in 1954, the reduction has been postponed every year, most recently in 1962. The 52-percent rate is four times as high as in the 1920's, three times as high as in the 1930's, and significantly above the World War II rate.

The seriousness of the need for rate reduction depends partly upon what is done with the tax credit at the stockholder level. Some general rate reduction will have high priority among measures for tax revision. A reduction in the normal tax, unlike a cut in surtax, would aid all profitable corporations, but would be relatively favorable to small corporations. It would reduce the marginal tax rate that bears upon the decisionmaking of most corporations.

When tax revision is considered, dozens of problems will arise in connection with the corporate tax base—the provisions for loss carryovers, tax depreciation policy, the treatment of depletion, and provisions for travel, entertainment, and related expenses.

Some time will be required to appraise the workings of the 7-percent investment credit provided by the Revenue Act of 1962, and to compare it with other alternatives. It adds more complexities, affects some companies and types of investment more than others, and in general adds to the unwelcome combination which makes tax, rather than more basic productivity, considerations influential in investment decisions.

Many more problems involving the corporation income tax warrant congressional attention. Most are technical. Most are of significant importance to only a relatively small percentage of businesses in any one year.

In considering revision in the corporation income tax, some very fundamental issues are at stake:

1. This country has the heaviest, or almost the heaviest, of the world's taxes on corporate profits distributed to stockholders.

2. Everyone's economic interest is served by conditions which enable businesses to operate efficiently and which require them to compete vigorously.

3. The interjection of tax considerations into business decisionmaking will to some extent distort decisions—and produce results which on fundamental economic grounds are not best but which become best for the company when the tax effects are taken into account.

4. Taxes on business make difficult the acquisition of capital to use in producing larger output and producing with greater efficiency.

5. As choices about tax change are made, they should take account of the fact that taxes which add to business costs will make the balance-of-payments problem more difficult while tax changes which cut business costs will aid in competing abroad.

CONSUMPTION TAXES

Most national governments rely considerably more heavily upon consumption-based taxes than does the U.S. Federal Government.

Taxes on income are taxes governed by the value of contributions to society; taxes based on expenditure are levies governed by what a person withdraws or uses up from the stream of production. There are no clear grounds for saying which basis is to be preferred.

Traditional types of consumption taxes do not lend themselves to progression. Nevertheless, exemptions (such as food and housing) and rate differentials on various commodities may be used to get a distribution of the burden with some rough adjustment to popular concepts of "ability to pay."

Proposals for change in the present U.S. system are numerous. They include: (1) the scrapping of the selective excise system (generally except for the liquor, tobacco, highway user, and miscellaneous regulatory taxes) and its replacement with a fairly general manufacturers' excise tax applied at a uniform rate, supplemented by provision for a tax on services; (2) a Federal retail sales tax, integrated with sales tax systems of the States; and (3) a comprehensive expenditure tax. These proposals can be examined on the basis of size and stability of their revenue yield, costs of administration and compliance, equity, Federal-State fiscal relations, the tax-consciousness they create on the part of the taxpayer, and their effects on individual saving and longrun economic growth.

ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES

Consideration of both reduction in rates of the estate and gift taxes and a widening of brackets will belong in a program of broad tax revision. The present rates are those enacted during World War II. At the upper levels, they appear excessive. The steepness of the rise—to 30 percent at $100,000—seems sharper than is appropriate for a tax on capital. If rates were cut and brackets widened, reduction of the opportunities for avoidance would perhaps have greater chance of success. The problems are complex, and the chances which would best serve the public interest can be defined only after extensive study.

PAYROLL TAXES

Payroll taxes are a large and growing part of the total Federal tax bill. They include taxes for old-age and survivors insurance to which disability insurance was added in 1957; for Federal unemployment insurance; and for retirement and unemployment benefits of railroad employees.

The distribution of the total tax burden, the economic effects of the tax system, the problems and opportunities of tax revision, all require careful and explicit consideration of present and prospective payroll taxes.

These levies unquestionably use up tax-paying capacity. They do so for transfer payments, not for the purchase of services to meet public needs. The ability of an economy—and of a social system—to finance transfers is limited, though the boundaries of the limits are not clear. The payroll taxes now on the books leave no doubt that workers and employers face increasing burdens.

TAX CHANGES AND THE BUDGETARY AND ECONOMIC OUTLOOK

In attempts to reconstruct the Federal tax system, serious consideration should be given to the relationship of tax changes to the budgetary and economic outlook.

Most observers agree that tax reduction which is not matched by expenditure reduction can provide a temporary stimulus for an economy which has idle productive capacity. The shot-in-the-arm effects to be gained, however, can scarcely justify permanent tax reduction accompanied by large and persisting budgetary deficits.

What is needed for the longer run is substantial tax reduction based on the kind of tax changes which will reduce the existing depressants on capital accumulation, incentive, and efficiency and thus help the market operate with greater freedom from tax considerations. Such carefully devised tax changes would contribute to responsible budgetary policy. They are not, however, a substitute for wisdom in restraining expenditures.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN FEDERAL DEBT CEILING

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, a bill is now pending in the House of Representatives to continue the statutory limit on Federal debt at $308 billion through June 30, 1963.

It has been indicated in the President's budget message that another request to increase the limit again will be made before June 30.

An interesting article on this general subject, written by Henry Gemmill, appeared in the Wall Street Journal of February 27, 1963. I ask unanimous consent to have this article published in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAISING THE ROOF—ADMINISTRATION BRACES FOR REAL BATTLE OVER INCREASING FEDERAL DEBT CEILING

(By Henry Gemmill)

WASHINGTON.—How far the management of U.S. finances may be veering from ordinary logic—anyone's logic, liberal or conservative—can perhaps be indicated by this fact:

Never has any administration approached Congress for the frequent ritual of elevating the Federal debt ceiling with so much nervousness, so little confidence, as Mr. Kennedy's team exhibits at this moment.

The White House finds it wildly illogical for the Capitol to show signs of balking. Congress votes the appropriations; Congress legislates the tax rates; when the fruit of these is deficits, how can Congress decline to recognize by law the inevitability of an upsurge in Federal borrowings?

Influential conservatives on the Hill agree this complaint has some validity. "Trying to stop the debt rise by holding down the legal ceiling seems about like trying to stop an elevator by grabbing the indicator arrow," remarks one of them. Yet he does emphatically intend to attempt it—and in powerful company—as a last resort against what he considers madly illogical grand designs for deficit spending.

So the debt ceiling question, from whichever side it is examined, seems to have its roots in irrationality. Yet, after years of stirring up little more than political noise, it is rather suddenly emerging as an issue which henceforward may have to be taken seriously. Though Mr. Kennedy may well get the debt roof raised to his specifications this year, he must return to the fray in 1964.

The rise of this issue is, of course, propelled by the historic rise of the debt, yet one must glance also at the history of the debt ceiling itself, which is by no means identical.

A WARTIME INNOVATION

Though congressional authority to control Federal indebtedness stems from the Constitution, for more than a century legislators created no ceilings but instead voted carefully specified obligations for particular purposes. Two world wars sired the ceilings; in 1917 general-purpose borrowing was authorized but specific limits were set on the amount of bonds, certificates, notes and bills issued; in 1941 the permitted levels were lumped under an all-inclusive maximum.

There could be no great argument over lifting this higher and higher during World War II, and in early postwar years the ceiling seemed academic because actual debt was left drifting billions below. During that relaxed time Harry Truman could have slipped through Congress legislation abolishing the ceilings or making it infinitely elastic, some Treasury officials believe, and they could kick him for not doing it. By the time Dwight Eisenhower took charge the debt was piling high enough to make the ceiling sticky—not so much because of congressional obstinancy as because of his conservative fiscal commitments. Embarrassed by having to jack up the ceiling in 1954, Ike's administration actually encouraged two deductions, then found itself heading again to new heights. And Mr. Kennedy continued this course.

So, though it may seem longer, the economy bloc in Congress has been hitching its crusade to the debt ceiling issue for less than a decade. And most of that time many have thought they were conducting mere mock battles—little dramas useful perhaps in keeping alive the dream of black ink, but certain of failure. Not until last year—and it came as a surprise and a shock—did the administration almost suffer defeat. An $8 billion ceiling boost squeaked through the House by only 210 votes to 192; it got through the Senate Finance Committee with a 1-vote margin.

It would be unsophisticated to suppose that conservatives could block a ceiling rise this year simply by converting 10 Members of the House who voted for last year's boost. The election has filled many seats in Congress with new men; nobody knows for sure how their votes will split. More importantly, a fair share of the votes traditionally cast against ceiling hikes has come from Congressmen who are not economizers, who back nearly every spending bill that comes along. These flexible fellows vote against cranking up the ceiling only to balance their record with constituents, and will perhaps continue to do so only if confident their votes won't pile up into a majority. "Our greatest risk is that these gentlemen will miscalculate," says one administration expert.

REASONS FOR FEAR

Nevertheless, the administration has reasons to fear even fiercer opposition this year.

Before Congress now is the Kennedy tax-cut program; in combination with his spending budget it has alerted the public to prolonged planned deficits—and so far the populace doesn't seem to like it. By the end of this session, to be sure, Congress will have rewritten the tax measure and at least altered much of the tax reform which contributes to the mood of aversion; by then it is possible the public will be eager for tax cuts—deficits and all. But the debt ceiling issue will not wait until then.

On the contrary, the administration insists it must have one round of legislation passed before April; hearings before the Ways and Means Committee begin today. And then it must trot back for a second hike—a big one—before July. This seems an open invitation for Congress to pour all its current disgruntlement onto the debt ceiling issue.

In detail, the picture grows sharper. Congress passed last year's ceiling increase in precise conformity with a Presidential budget forecasting that the current fiscal year ending June 30 would end up in balance, with no net rise in debt. The calculation was that the ceiling needed to be lifted to $308 billion just to meet a midwinter seasonal peak; in line with this Congress voted the boost but provided that the ceiling should drop to $305 billion in April, and back to $300 billion on June 25.

Now, however, the administration is forced to base its first ceiling plea to the new Congress on a flat contradiction of last year's logic. Its current case is that the roof must be lifted to $308 billion for the remainder of the fiscal year, because its own budget forecast turned out to be nonsense, because the Government has slipped into a multibillion-dollar deficit not just seasonally but for sure.

And while they are voting on that, Congressmen will have in mind that by June they'll be voting on a far fancier hike. Naturally enough, tacticians of any administration would be unwilling to let the matter rest on such uneasy ground.

"What would happen if we simply refused to raise this ceiling on the Federal debt?" a senior Senator once inquired in committee session.

"The first thing we'd do is stop your paycheck, Senator," roared the Secretary of the Treasury.

A SPECTACULAR DRAMA

That short story dates back to Eisenhower days, but the question has gained pertinence and Kennedy men still respond in the same spirit. The consequences of a debt ceiling crackdown are described as disasters, vivid enough to scare most any Congressman—or citizen.

A spectacular drama of the near future can be—and is—written around the following set of assumptions:

Mr. Kennedy asks Congress to lift the ceiling for the fiscal year beginning July 1, to a figure in the neighborhood of $320 billion.

Congress wrangles right through June and passes no ceiling legislation whatever; thus the legal debt roof drops to its permanent level, $285 billion.

Outstanding debt, which has been riding along well above $300 billion, stands clearly in excess of the legal maximum.

Now let the cameras roll.

The first and hasty action of Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon is to dispatch telegrams frantically requesting a halt to savings bonds sales. Thousands of telegrams, not just to banks and other places of public sale but also to all the employers who run payroll deduction plans. Mr. Dillon's lawyers have told him that any bonds that slip through after June are not Government obigations at all; they are his personal debt.

Next the weekly rollover of short-term Treasury bills is stopped. No replacements can be issued for around $2 billion of outstanding bills coming in for repayment each week. These alone are enough to suck up within 3 weeks the $5 billion or so which the Treasury usually keeps in cash. Governmental pockets are empty.

CAN'T MEET PAYROLLS

By this time the Government begins missing payments on its missiles and other purchases. It can't meet its payrolls, nor if it fires Federal workers can it give them severance pay due. Such checkwriting, which normally runs around $2 billion a week, can be done belatedly and in a trickle from any tax revenues that come in. But no payment priorities based on hardship or necessity can be set up; legal opinion holds that bills must be paid in chronological order of presentation.

Worse yet, the Treasury begins missing interest payments on existing debt, and fails to redeem bonds that mature. Securities markets fall into turmoil which makes all past panics look pale. Foreigners launch the great run on U.S. gold, and the dollar is done for.

At this point the official script ends, but one is left with the feeling that the Congressmen don't get reelected.

Though it's a lively drama, its chief defect is that it could only happen in real life by accident. Accidents can happen; Mr. Kennedy himself flew off to Mexico last year without signing a bill boosting the ceiling; for most of 1 day the U.S. debt stood at an illegal level. (It was a Sunday, no harm done.) But the fact of the matter is that conservative congressional leaders have no slightest intention of establishing a ceiling lower than outstanding debt.

The strategy they outline is entirely different. They would aim to set a ceiling high enough to avoid pushing the Government into any sudden crisis of bankruptcy—but low enough so that within a few months the administration would have to cut back some of its deficit spending, hopefully in an orderly and selective fashion. Measured in money, their objective would be to cut the ceiling below administration desires not by a magnitude of $35 billion, as in the sensational script, but by whatever smaller sum seemed safe and feasible—$1 billion, $2 billion, perhaps a bit more.

If that were the game, argue administration men, it would produce results precisely the opposite of what the congressional economy bloc desires. The Kennedy government could not—or at least would not—cut back its spending but instead would do what the Eisenhower government did when squeezed by the debt ceiling several times during the fifties. It would resort to costly gimmickry.

One gimmick employed in Eisenhowers time of pinch was to have the Federal National Mortgage Association sell directly to the public some of its own notes, which technically do not count as part of the national debt, instead of drawing funds from the Treasury. Another trick was to have the Commodity Credit Corporation raise more of its money for agricultural price-support loans by selling to the public certificates of interest, similarly outside the legal debt, instead of pulling money from the Treasury. These agencies had to offer investors a slightly higher return than would have been required through normal Treasury borrowing; by one calculation the Government ended up paying an extra $18 million in interest.

COULD DUMP MORTGAGES

Besides repeating the old tricks, the Government could try plenty of new ones. Officials suggest, for instance, that the Veterans' Administration could raise some money by dumping its foreclosed mortgages on the market—but only at discount prices, and at the risk of drying up investment money needed to sustain private construction.

Leaders of the congressional economy bloc are aware the Government could and probably would seek this escape from a ceiling squeeze; they agree that it would promote no true economy. But some of them do have an answer: "We'll just wait for the next round of ceiling legislation—and then we will nail 'em."

This double-dose technique could conceivably be applied by Congress rapidly, since the administration must seek its two ceiling boosts before July. Tactics are still fluid, however; economy leaders could aim at just one squeeze this year, and wait till 1964 for the second. At any rate, the theory is that if the administration responded to a first tight ceiling with no more than gimmicks, the legislators could insist upon an official commitment on spending cuts before setting the next ceiling. Failing to get it, they could try making the second squeeze tight enough to exhaust the possibilities of gimmickry and still force a reduction in expenditures.

Suppose—and it is a large supposition—Congress did eventually shove the administration into real spending slashes. Would legislators find themselves much happier over the outcome than officials downtown? Very likely not.

ABDICATION OF POWER

The cutbacks would be chosen by the administration, not by Congress. Legislators who have raised "merry Ned" over past administration refusals to spend appropriated money—uproar over the B–70 bomber is the classic case—could silently choke on resentment as their pet projects were maimed or buried. In the attempt to assert control over the executive branch, legislators would find they had in practice abdicated much of their present power.

It is obvious enough that a Congress really set on curbing spending could devise a half-dozen better ways of doing it. But Congress is not devising them, nor likely soon to do so. If an argument can be made for converting the debt ceiling issue from a talking point into a sharp tool of economy, it must rest on this: Risky and awkward though it may be, it is conveniently at hand.

BULGARIA—85TH ANNIVERSARY OF LIBERATION FROM THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, March 3 marks the 85th anniversary of the liberation of Bulgaria from the rule of the Ottoman Empire.

Today, we wish we could rejoice in the freedom of the Bulgarian people. But we cannot. Today, the brave Bulgarian people suffer under another tyranny. At the end of the Second World War the freedom of Bulgaria was smothered under a complete police state imposed by the Soviet Army.

But it is clear that the will to resist lives strongly in the hearts of all Bulgarians. They are an ancient people with a long history of struggle for freedom and independence. Today, reports emanate from Bulgaria that despite the repressions of the state, the people of Bulgaria continue to look to the West for ideas and inspiration.

It is proper that we join today with Americans of Bulgarian background in pledging that one day Bulgaria shall be free once again, and that the Bulgarian people will once again join the Western democratic nations as people of an independent nation.

KALEWALA DAY, FEBRUARY 28, FINNISH HOLIDAY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, every nation develops out of its history and its language an epic which embodies the virtues and the values and the high principles which have borne that nation through history and led it to greatness.

The national epic of Finland is the Kalewala, and the Finnish people rightfully take pride in this classic work for it reflects the character and the personality of the Finnish nation and its people. There are recorded the heroic deeds of the legendary and historical figures in the long and glorious history of the Finnish people.

For centuries these songs and verses were handed down from generation to generation by oral means. But then they were collected and set down in writing and on February 28, 1835, the first fairly complete collection of verses was published in Finland—the Kalewala.

Mr. President, ever since that happy day, February 28 has been celebrated by Finns throughout the world as a national holiday. We in Michigan have been fortunate that many Finnish people chose our State when they came to the United States. Michigan's history and institutions show clearly the strength, independence, and courage of these people and their descendants.

I join my Finnish friends today in celebrating the 128th anniversary of the publication of Kalewala.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—FEBRUARY 24

Mr. HART. Mr. President, 45 years ago the ancient nation of Estonia gained its independence, established a democratic form of government and thrived in peace until the Second World War.

Today, Estonia does not exist as an independent nation. She has been brutally incorporated against her will into the Soviet empire. All attempts to preserve the Estonian heritage are suppressed by agents of the Kremlin.

However, today the spirit of the Estonian people remains strong. Hope and determination lives strongly in the hearts of the Estonian people that one day Estonia will again be free and independent.

It is fitting that we here once again express the continuing regard of America for the aspirations of the Estonian people, and that we join with all persons of Estonian background in renewing our pledge that all shall be done to assure that Estonia will one day walk in freedom.

PUBLIC SERVICE BY RADIO STATIONS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am confident that there are many radio stations throughout the country that accept their responsibility, under their license, "to be of public service." There are some that take this pledge with a sense of positive dedication far beyond legal requirement. This is the case with station WAQE whose facilities are located in my home county in Maryland.

Mr. Charles S. Gerber, station manager of WAQE, has chosen Howard Cottage at the Maryland Training School for Boys as the station's community public service project for 1963.

Every Monday night, the staff and management of WAQE, on a voluntary basis, visits with the boys at Howard Cottage.

WAQE hopes to bring to public attention the fine work that Maryland Training School is doing and the desperate need for private citizens to take an interest in these boys, who have been judged juvenile delinquents.

The need for help is not only while they are at the training school, but after their period of training has been served. To help arouse public interest, a series of programs, presenting Maryland Training School will be broadcast beginning January 26, through June 29. These programs will be heard at 12:30 p.m., every Saturday.

Today in Maryland, one out of every five boys comes in contact with the police. Therefore, it is imperative that the citizenry of our State become alerted to the problems and how each individual can play a part in helping to stamp out juvenile delinquency and to help the delinquent. By working with the boys, it is hoped that the staff of WAQE will be more qualified to perform the public service so desperately needed to help these boys.

In addition to the Monday night visits, plans are being made to take the boys bowling, to sports events and other special entertainment.

It is with great pride that I rise today to bring this fine example of public service to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate.

SIOUX FALLS EDITOR SUPPORTS PRESIDENT'S CUBA POLICY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, at a time when some Americans appear to be urging the President to follow an extreme policy in Cuba that might involve us unnecessarily in a war, it is encouraging to note a thoughtful editorial in the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Argus-Leader supporting the wise policy of restraint now being pursued by the President.

There are those who would shoot first and learn the facts later. The President has very wisely resisted such temptations.

I commend to my colleagues an editorial from the Argus-Leader of Saturday, February 23, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENSIBLE RESPONSE BY THE PRESIDENT

President John K. Kennedy has issued shoot-if-necessary orders against any plane or other sorties from Red Cuba.

This followed the news that two Mig fighter planes from Cuba fired rockets in a flight over a U.S. shrimpboat in the Florida Straits earlier this week.

The President refrained, pending further information, from pinning any blame on the Soviet Government for the attack on the *Ala*. The small craft and its two crewmen were not hit.

"These planes came from Cuba and flew under a Cuban flag and, therefore, unless the Soviet Union should claim they were flying them, we would hold the Cubans responsible," the President said.

The President said that he had given orders "to insure that action will be taken against any vessel or aircraft which executes an attack against a vessel or aircraft of the United States over international waters in the Caribbean."

The President declined to proclaim a policy of hot pursuit, as advocated by some Members of Congress. Under this policy, attacking planes or ships would be pursued back to their Cuban bases if necessary to destroy them.

Details of the United States reaction might well wait, the President said, until it is seen whether the attack on the shrimpboat was an isolated incident, the result of a pilot's decision, or was the deliberate decision by the Cuban Government which forecasts other attacks.

Meantime, it looks like the Russians are heeding the President's warnings and American public opinion, in their move to take some more of their troops out of Cuba. Patience is indicated in this situation, rather than a trigger-happy response.

We think President Kennedy has taken a sensible course. He has the responsibility.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD yesterday's Washington Post report of a recent Gallup poll demonstrating the overwhelming opposition of the American people to sending our Armed Forces into war with Cuba under present circumstances.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPOSITION TO INVASION OF CUBA RISES IN UNITED STATES

PRINCETON, N.J., February 26.—Although they see Premier Fidel Castro's Cuba as a serious threat to world peace, the American people at this point are opposed to a U.S. invasion of the island.

Americans, in fact, are slightly less invasion-minded about Cuba today than they were last fall before President Kennedy's decision to blockade the Communist outpost in the Caribbean.

Some persons point out, moreover, that the results of the quarantine action are a factor in their current belief that the Cuba dilemma can be solved without a hot war.

With the controversy over Cuba continuing, the public was asked a question last put to them shortly before the blockade decision last October:

"Some people say that the United States should send our Armed Forces into Cuba to help overthrow Castro. Do you agree or disagree?"

The vote today and last fall:

	Percent
Today:	
Agree	20
Disagree	64
No opinion	16
October 1962:	
Agree	24
Disagree	63
No opinion	13

To further determine just how real a danger the people feel Cuba constitutes today, the public was then asked:

"Do you think the Cuba situation is a serious threat to world peace at this time, or not?"

The vote:	Percent
Yes, is	59
No, is not	31
No opinion	10

Despite the partisan controversy involved in the overall Cuba question, virtually identical majorities of Republicans, Democrats and Independents indicate their opposition to a U.S. invasion of Cuba at this time.

On the question of Cuba as a threat to world peace, however, Republican voters display more concern than either Democrats or Independents.

The vote on this question by party preferences:

	Percent
Republicans:	
Yes, is	65
No, is not	27
No opinion	8
Democrats:	
Yes, is	59
No, is not	31
No opinion	10
Independents:	
Yes, is	57
No, is not	35
No opinion	8

NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING IN AMERICAN LIFE—ADDRESS BY PALMER HOYT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by Mr. Palmer Hoyt to the Advertising Federation of America and the Advertising Association of the West. His subject was "Newspaper Advertising in American Life," and the address was delivered on February 6, 1963. In the address, Mr. Hoyt, the editor of the Denver Post, pointed out very graphically the relationship between advertising and the free news media in this country, and showed how important the free press is to this country. His address is an extremely thoughtful and analytical one, and I recommend it very much to all Senators.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING IN AMERICAN LIFE

Mr. Chairman and distinguished guests, without shocking the eggheads and egg peddlers too much, I would today like to stress a simple truth.

That truth is this: The much maligned institution of American advertising is really a solid cornerstone of our freedom.

An abundant flow of advertising has a special relationship to our free way of life for two very important reasons:

First, and I believe foremost, it is the financial warranty of free electronic communication, and it is the guarantee of our free press.

Second, advertising is an active partner in our burgeoning economy and a vital component of our free enterprise system, without which system we could not enjoy freedom as we know it.

But even if advertising did not have a special economic role as the mover of goods and services, the fact that advertising is the basic guarantee of a free press would make it worthy of our protection and preservation.

I do not, of course, mean to argue that all advertising is beyond reproach, but I do defend it overall as a necessity because of its essential relations to a free press.

As you are aware, by the term "free press", I mean a press that is not controlled by government, party, or faction. This type of independent press has been emphasized as a necessity by our greatest political thinkers from the earliest days of our country.

This principle is guaranteed by the first amendment to the Constitution, which says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

The first amendment is in itself a remarkable document. Particularly is the phrase "or abridging the freedom of the press" a strong and exact statement.

It is hard to imagine a free people without a free press. It is hard to imagine because it simply could not be.

Thomas Jefferson recognized the vital importance of newspapers when he said in a letter to Col. Edward Carrington on January 16, 1787: "The basis of our Government being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left for me to decide whether we should have a Government without newspapers, or the newspapers without government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

To this distinguished audience my remarks up to this point may sound like copybook maxims.

On the subject of maxims and of hearing from a speaker only what you expect to hear, I recall a speech by James Conzelman, one of the all-time greats of American football, later a fine coach, and now a distinguished advertising man.

Several years ago, I introduced Jim to a Rotary Club audience in Denver, most of them older and serious minded. I might say that James Conzelman, in addition to being a great athlete, was also a fine actor. Jim sat beside me at the head table and did a pretty fair job of looking dumb so that he could score a touchdown with his opening remarks.

When I introduced him, I said, "Jim was a great football player and a great coach, but whether or not he can make a speech, I wouldn't know."

Jim rose to his feet, ran his fingers through his shock of white hair and to an audience prepared for the worst, started as follows:

"You men are rich. I can see that. But let me tell you. Money isn't everything. Money won't buy you friends. Money won't buy you love. Money won't buy you position."

At this point, Jim paused. His audience by now was sure they were going to listen to a real do-gooder. Boredom was on every face.

And then Jim Conzelman, after a long pause, said: "Of course, I was talking about Confederate money."

Like Jim Conzelman and his audience, I know you men are rich. If not in money, then in wisdom and experience. So I want to urge that I am not talking about Confederate money.

The late, great Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes often observed that it was more than passing strange that so many brilliant minds overlook the obvious. In the chance that the Justice may have been right, I am here stressing the obvious. The obvious that brilliant minds sometimes overlook.

No. 1: It is obvious the continuation of a free press is vital to our continuation as a free nation. We must have a source independent of government, party, and faction, to provide people with the information they need to guide those governments, parties, and factions.

No. 2: It is obvious that the press can only remain free, and keep us free, if it is not subsidized by any special interest.

No. 3: It is obvious that advertising has an all-important role in guaranteeing this free and unsubsidized press. Advertising keeps the press financially strong with income from a number of sources, so that no one source becomes dominant. And often we forget that advertising is in itself genuine news of business and industry. As economic news, it is a vital attraction to gain the readership that keeps papers alive.

No. 4: It is obvious that there are only three ways to finance a newspaper, a very expensive product: (1) Sale of the product, which we call circulation; (2) sale of advertising; (3) direct subsidy, from somewhere.

The history of the American press shows that newspapers depending on circulation income alone can't succeed. The relatively brief life of PM is a good example. PM was born in response to a charge that advertisers exercise an undue influence on the news columns and editorial opinions. So PM did not accept advertising.

But PM failed to make its point. It built up its own prejudices and was far less objective than most newspapers operating on the basis of both advertising and circulation support. And it just couldn't get enough income from circulation alone to stay in business.

Only through a combination of circulation and advertising revenues can newspapers operate and remain truly free. Only truly free newspapers can take an independent view of government. And only free newspapers can provide the people with objective news.

Let me digress to say again that I do not maintain that all newspapers are perfect, that all advertising is exceptional, that news is never slanted, or that advertising is never misleading. Of course there are imperfections but not, I truly believe, so great as to cast in doubt the general principles about which we are talking.

The general principle of a press maintained as an independent force in our society by a combination of advertising and circulation revenue actually antedates our free Government by somewhat more than 50 years.

The tradition of the free press dates back at least to 1737 when the John Peter Zenger trial established the legal protections under which newspapers can criticize political leaders or movements without facing charges of seditious libel.

Other basic protections for a free press were developing throughout the colonial era. So the press was actually a fairly well-grown midwife attending the birth of the Constitution in 1787 and the formalization of our present style of Government on March 4, 1789.

On through the years the free press and free Government developed together into the special relationship we have today. And repeatedly the courts have reemphasized the vital necessity to our way of life of keeping newspapers strong and independent.

There are today, as there have always been, a number of important criticisms of this special status of the press. I would like to note briefly some of these challenges, and since several of them are bromides, perhaps we can put them back in their bottles, at least temporarily.

First, there is the charge that our press is not free.

Answer: We do have a free press in the United States, the freest in the world.

Our press is as free as the men who operate it want it to be. Can you imagine any news story or opinion, decency considered, that couldn't, or wouldn't be published in the United States somewhere in the range of publications between the Daily Worker and the John Birch Society? Maybe you can imagine this, but I can't.

Second, there is a charge that big advertisers control the newspapers.

Answer: As one who has operated at policy level at three newspapers, I have yet to know of a single advertiser saying, "Kill it or else," to any news story or editorial. As a matter of fact, it has been my experience that big advertisers take far too little interest in the news of the day, or the comment thereon.

Actually, the greater number of advertisers a paper has the less chance there is of any one being able to rule the press, as the critics would have it.

Third, there is another bromide that big business and big government are in conspiracy to throttle news sources and cover up vital facts.

Answer: There are men, I'm sure, in both big business and big government, who would like to do just that. But so far, there is nothing so hidden but that a few good city editors and reporters cannot uncover it, if they really go to work.

Recently, an able reporter, Clark Mollenhoff, wrote a book called "Washington Cover Up," about official attempts at concealment. I would, generally speaking, accept the facts presented in the book but point out that this type of coverup has gone on ever since George Washington moved to this great Capital on the Potomac.

But I would also like to say that as long as there are reporters like Mollenhoff, we are still free.

The free press does face many dangerous threats—rising costs; unwise mergers; a destructive pattern of unionism; and insensitive management.

But advertiser domination is not one of these threats, in fact, advertising support enables the free press to meet the real threats. In 1962, advertisers spent $12 billion in all media not only as a sales and promotion fund for our gross national product, but also as the basic support of our free communications system.

We can gain some understanding of where we would be without this by noting the economic and social impact of newspaper

strikes. As I speak here the great cities of New York and Cleveland are without newspapers, their people without a great deal of vital information that they need.

Does it matter? Yes, it matters. For example, it matters economically. As only one example, it is estimated by the Federal Reserve Board that department store sales in Newark, with newspapers, are running 10 percent better than the corresponding figures in neighboring New York City. And in the suburban metropolitan area where the press is flourishing, department store sales figures are 18 percent better than in the big city.

There is no total price tab on the economic loss this lack of newspapers means in New York, but we know that the 116-day strike in Minneapolis and St. Paul cost that area $58 million in lost consumer spending.

And it matters more than in economics. Lack of newspapers also represents a great social loss. Think of the hundreds of different categories of information that only a newspaper provides—local news in detail; classified advertisments that do everything from selling the home to bringing back the lost dog: theater, movie, sports, and book news that guides recreation—indeed the list is endless and need not be belabored.

I would like to quote James S. Fish, vice president and director of advertising of General Mills at the end of the recent strike in Minneapolis. Mr. Fish, "Apparently nothing is able to replace fully the daily newspapers. Not just as a disseminator of news and the carrier of advertising, but as a dynamic force in the well-being of our community."

If you want to use a Madison Avenue term and talk about impact, what is the real impact of newspapers?

There is no regular, continuous impact in the world like the impact of 59 million newspapers hitting the streets of America every weekday.

Or of 48 million Sunday newspapers banging on front porches the country over every Sunday morning.

Or of 23 million copies of weekly newspapers that keep their reads up to date on home affairs. This is real grassroots impact.

When I was younger and a little more naive than now, I used to advocate making the guaranteed free flow of news between nations a part of all treaties made by the United States.

I still believe that such a course would help bring peace to this troubled world; because the truthful, unprejudiced news of the day is a powerful prophylactic.

For example, there are many views of what is or will be happening in Russia.

Will there be a revolution against imperial communistic tyranny?

I would say there will be no revolution in our sense of the word.

But as the Russian people become more informed, there will be changes. In other words, Russia will change in exact ratio to the flow of factual news to and in Russia.

Because the greatest enemy that communism has or can have, is the free flow of information, and the greatest ally that any kind of totalitarianism has is to have news as its servile handmaiden.

And free flowing news implies abundant advertising.

In summary then, I hope I have suggested at least some of the reasons why advertising is much more than a nonessential source of materialism. That's the image some of its detractors try to create.

Instead, advertising has a vital role in our way of life—as the necessary news of goods and services which lubricates our whole economic system. And, even more importantly, as the basic revenue source which allows a wide range of electronic communication and an independent press.

These are truths that need to be looked at again—they are the obvious facts which are often overlooked—they are not in the words of Jim Conzelman, "Confederate money."

If these truths be copybook maxims, let me paraphrase Patrick Henry and urge you to make the most of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further morning business, morning business is concluded.

SAFEGUARDS TO BE OBSERVED IN DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, for many months I have been disturbed over the apparent attitude of our Government in reference to disarmament. Today I want to talk about that subject in some detail. My remarks relate to Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, submitted by me, which can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 20, 1963, page 2604, column 3.

The information that caused me to submit this resolution, and which is embodied in what I will say today, comes from public sources that were published in 1962 or before. My remarks are not related to any information imparted to a senatorial committee, because I have had no opportunity to receive such information.

I have submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 21 to provide a bare minimum of congressional guidance to our negotiators now meeting with the Soviets to discuss arms control and disarmament. This guidance is not only necessary, but also mandatory, in view of the growing concern of the American people in this vital and complex subject.

This concern has been aroused by several developments in recent weeks:

First. A statement by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara in which he expresses the belief that we can deal more realistically with the Soviet Union if that nation were soon to develop an invulnerable second-strike missile force.

Second. Acceptance of this position by the State Department in a speech by an arms control adviser at Ann Arbor, Mich.

Third. A study released by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency which states, in effect, that the United States should consider seriously dropping its demand for on-the-spot inspection to insure compliance with any arms control or disarmament agreements.

Coincident with these developments has been an extremely grave new pronouncement of Soviet policy from Moscow—little read and little understood.

This publication is called Voyennaya Strategiya, which I understand is interpreted to mean "military strategy." It was prepared under the direction of Marshal Sokolorsky, by 14 Soviet generals, and published last year. For the first time since 1926 the Soviet Union has formally changed its strategic concept. The new strategy, as explained in the Soviet document, involves total war, total destruction, and total nuclear annihilation. Of course, this is their ultimate strategy and cannot succeed unless or until the Soviet Union acquires the kind of nuclear superiority over the free world which the United States now holds over the Communists.

As I said, these developments are in themselves grave and leave with us serious implications. Perhaps the most serious of all implications is the possibility that these statements and developments can or will be misinterpreted at home, among our allies or, most importantly, by a potential enemy.

That this new approach of American policy is subject to misinterpretation is conceded by Mr. McNamara himself in his now-famous interview with Stewart Alsop in the Saturday Evening Post of December 1, 1962.

I would like to quote in full at this point the paragraph from the interview which has caused so much concern. That they are important to the subject at hand can best be demonstrated by the words themselves. In that interview, Mr. McNamara was asked if it were not wise to assume that the time will come when the other side would have a sure second-strike capability. His response:

> Yes, and that raises an interesting point. I believe myself that a counterforce strategy is most likely to apply in circumstances in which both sides have the capability of surviving a first strike and retaliating selectively. This is a highly unpredictable business, of course. But today, following a surprise attack on us, we would still have the power to respond with overwhelming force, and they would not then have the capability of a further strike. In this situation, given the highly irrational act of an attempted first strike against us, such a strike seems most likely to take the form of an all-out attack on both military targets and population centers. This is why a nuclear exchange confined to military targets seems more possible, not less, when both sides have a sure second-strike capability. Then you might have a more stable "balance of terror." This may seem a rather subtle point, but from where I'm sitting it seems a point worth thinking about.

As Secretary McNamara says, this does, indeed, seem to be a subtle point, and it most certainly is a point worth careful examination. It is obviously open to interpretation, and it has been variously interpreted by various people. One obvious connotation was placed on this "subtle" point by the State Department. In a speech on December 19, just a few weeks after the McNamara interview appeared in print, Robert E. Matteson, an adviser to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—a branch of the State Department—gave what must be considered the official departmental view of the McNamara interview.

I might point out here that all such speeches are carefully screened by the Department and cannot be made without highest possible clearance from the Department.

In his speech, Mr. Matteson had this to say:

> It is even possible as Secretary McNamara intimated in the Alsop interview in the Saturday Evening Post that it would be a good thing if the Soviets were to achieve soon an invulnerable second-strike capability. My own feeling is that it might enhance the prospects of an early arms control-disarmament agreement.

If this is the official view of a high-ranking State Department official, what then can the American people think?

Following by less than a month came a report from the Woods Hole Summer

Study, sponsored by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, on the problems of verification and response. This comparatively new study was released a short time ago. It was written by a group of scientific and legal experts who gathered at Woods Hole, Mass., last summer to discuss the many facets of the problem.

They come to the conclusion that inspection is not really the answer but emphasize, rather, what they term "verification." They even admit in their study that complete verification is not possible nor, they say, is it desirable in some instances. They draw the rather unique conclusion that some violations of disarmament agreements could go by unnoticed and not change the situation very radically.

Again, this study is subject to interpretation. It contains many sophisticated subtleties which may escape the average person here and abroad. One interpretation, that placed upon the study by the press, is that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has abandoned or is in the process of abandoning the requirement of on-the-spot inspection as a prerequisite for any arms control or disarmament agreement.

This interpretation is that inspection can be replaced by verification. As any knowledgeable nuclear physicist will tell one, there is no little box, whether black, white, pink, or orange, that can possibly give adequate verification of the kind of violation about which we are most concerned. The Soviets know that we have an enormous stockpile of nuclear weapons. We know that they have a large stockpile of such weapons—between us, enough to destroy all life on this planet.

The problem is not so much one of nuclear weapons or nuclear explosions as such, but is rather that of delivery vehicles. No matter how many little boxes were spread over the face of the earth there would be no method of detecting the production in either the United States or the Soviet Union of the vehicles with which to deposit nuclear terror anywhere in the world.

There has been a proposal at Geneva that a so-called neutral inspection team be created with the right of entry into both the Soviet Union and the United States. This cannot be considered seriously by either party. In a struggle between slavery and freedom there can be no real neutrals. I do not think for a moment that the American people can or should trust their security, their future and their freedom in the hands of so-called neutrals like Nkrumah or Sukarno.

Because not only American freedom but civilization itself is at stake in these perilous times, we cannot afford any hint or tinge of uncertainty in the American position on disarmament and arms control. We cannot permit an interpretation of official statements which might in the future cause a potential enemy—or even one of our friends—to make that one awful mistake which would plunge the world inevitably on its course of complete and terrible destruction.

For this reason and because of the uncertainties which have been created in the minds of many persons—both here and in foreign lands—I have drafted a concurrent resolution. This resolution has three principles:

First. All arms control or disarmament agreements will provide for full and free inspection, and Members of the Congress of the United States shall be included on the inspection teams.

Second. The President will keep the appropriate congressional committee chairman advised at all times of any measures he may take which would affect the arms ratio between East and West.

Third. There shall be no informal or tacit arrangements between heads of state. All agreements with respect to arms control and disarmament will be in treaty form, subject to the constitutional right of the American people, speaking through the U.S. Senate, to approve or reject.

I believe that all of us are concerned about the workability of any treaty on arms control or disarmament, whether it involves a ban of nuclear testing or a destruction of germ warfare facilities. There is only one way in which this kind of arrangement can function properly and that is through a thoroughly grounded confidence on the part of each party that he knows all there is to know about the arms production and delivery capability of the other.

Each party must be confident that, when he lays down his arms, when he abandons any weapon or weapons system, he is not opening himself to utter ruin and chaos because of some unseen or unheralded weapons development on the other side.

Only through constant and complete inspection can this confidence be gained.

In this connection, it would be wise, I feel, that Members of each House of Congress be included on any team created to carry out inspection. Members of the Armed Services Committees or the Joint Atomic Energy Committee would, I think, be best fitted for this assignment.

May I say here that there are veteran members of these committees, and perhaps other committees, who have served in that capacity through several administrations. They are experts in these matters.

At a time when public pronouncements have become suspect due to the manipulation of news, the confidence of the Congress and the American people can be maintained only through complete and objective reporting. Such reporting can best be done by the people's representatives in the legislative branch working as observers on inspection teams.

As to the second point in the operative part of my resolution, I feel it is most essential that the President be advised of Congress' desire that no unilateral measures be taken by the President in his capacity as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces or otherwise that might alter the existing arms ratio between the United States and its allies on the one side and the Soviet Union and its allies on the other. For this reason, the resolution provides that the President, prior to taking such measures, shall advise the appropriate congressional committee chairmen of any steps he contemplates with respect to the size, composition, and disposition of the Armed Forces and particularly their weapons systems.

I bring up the third point in this resolution—Senate ratification of any agreement—for two reasons:

First. The all too frequent references in current documents to such matters as "tacit arrangements" and "informal agreements" in referring to potential arms control and disarmament proposals.

Second. A matter such as this is of such vital importance to the world that it must be clearly understood that not only our Executive but also the representatives of all our people support any disarmament program. Only through a formally approved treaty can such an assurance be given to the world.

We have seen, during the course of recent history, that informal arrangements, regardless of how seriously taken they may be, cannot long endure. As you recall, there was an informal arrangement not too long ago in which the Soviet Union and the United States agreed to ban further nuclear testing. At will, the Soviets violated that arrangement. They did so knowing that our anguished outcry would impress nobody since no treaty was involved.

These informal or tacit arrangements just cannot work.

It is also my feeling that the American people and the people of the world would rest much easier if they knew that any arms control program or disarmament arrangements had the full force and being of international law, solidly supported by all institutions of government. Only through this kind of assurance can we hope to gain and expand the kind of confidence in such an instrument which is inherently necessary for it to bear fruit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, which is already at the desk, be held until Monday of next week for additional cosponsors. I wish to express my gratitude to the many Senators who have already expressed their willingness to cosponsor this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. I request unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks an article by Charles Burton Marshall, member of the State Department's policy planning staff from 1950 to 1953 and presently a research associate of the Washington Center for Foreign Policy Research of the Johns Hopkins University. Mr. Marshall clarifies the meaning of some of the jargon being bandied about in the discussion of arms control and disarmament, and he points up some of the obstacles to meaningful arrangements in this area.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New Republic, Nov. 24, 1962]

HIDE AND SEEK—SOME DOUR THOUGHTS ON INSPECTION

(By Charles Burton Marshall)

Some key terms relevant to arms control and disarmament—a field of endeavor overburdened with ambiguities—have been mauled about by Government spokesmen, news analysts and editorial writers since the onset of our troubles over missiles in Cuba. I feel prompted to offer, on behalf of rigor, some simple definitions. I begin with the generic term, "verification."

One kind of verification can be carried out without the acquiescence or cooperation of the Government subject to check. Certain information is explicit in, or inferable from, open sources within the country, from covert operations within or over the domain concerned, and from observations from adjacent territory. An appropriate term for this kind of verification is "monitoring."

A second kind of verification requires grant of access by a government whose actions or capabilities are assessed. The operations divide into two classes.

One sort of access is that conceded by a government for a specific limited occasion. Outside authority is permitted to enter an area to confirm that the inviting government has done what it claims to have done (e.g., dismantled a missile pad). The visitors have no warrant to ferret out unreported matters. In effect the government is host, the outside authority is guest. An appropriate term here is "authentication."

A contrasting sort of access is exercised when a government vests an outside authority with power not merely to check matters admitted by the subject government but also and essentially to determine, within limits of relevance, what may have been left undone or done covertly. The correct term here is inspection. Such is its sense in official parlance generally—in banking, postal operations, military outfits, and so on. An inspector comes around, welcome or not, with warrant to poke and to raise issues—not merely to nod through a prearranged checklist.

The general concept, verification, is what was alluded to in Chairman Khrushchev's offer to take his missiles out of Cuba—concurred in at once by President Kennedy, subject to a proviso for continuing U.S. monitoring in an interim. U.S. spokesmen immediately began calling the prospective operation inspection. But by any feat of imagination, the essential attributes of inspection were lacking. Nevertheless U.S. officials, having espoused inspection through drudging years of talks on test bans and arms limitation, appeared anxious to nudge arangements toward at least nominal or symbolic conformity to this standard. With equal alertness to record and precedent, the Soviets set out to attribute an invitational and pro forma character to whatever, if anything, had been agreed to.

For an outsider, an analysis of the ensuing exercise in tactical diplomacy revolving around these opposed themes is highly difficult—much like trying to comprehend a merry-go-round by glimpsing it in motion through a fence crack, or a score of counterpoint by hearing gust-borne sounds of a distant orchestra. Who and what prompted U Thant to the pilgrimage that resulted in establishing a U.N. absence in Havana? On the basis of what estimates did the U.S.S.R. propose and did the United States hasten to accept the impeccably humanitarian International Committee of the Red Cross as a verifying agent on matters of war technology outside its familiarity? Were Castro's dissents at the instance, by leave, or in defiance of Moscow? Perhaps the explanations of these and many other mysteries will never be known.

One matter seems fairly evident, however: Both sides have been doing their cagey utmost to avoid precedents and to minimize compromising basic positions on verification. As an augury for the 18-nation disarmament conference scheduled to resume soon in Geneva, this maneuvering is probably much more significant than the fervent pieties about disarmament exchanged between Chairman Khrushchev and President Kennedy at the peak of the crisis.

Here, at risk of elaborating what is evident, I want to emphasize that the main parties to negotiation at Geneva are the governing groups in the United States and the U.S.S.R. Their views do not necessarily coincide—and in some aspects are not at all likely to coincide—with the views found in literature on arms control. This literature is written by psychiatrists and sociologists intent upon resolving policy conflicts by dismissing them as aberrant, by physicists disposed to evaluate an adversary government's aims from sentimentalities uttered over cocktails at a Pugwash meeting, by psychologists seeking clues to the weapons riddle by analyzing chitchat of train attendants and of concierges met during a Russian tour, and by various other sorts of imaginative but nonresponsible authors.

The governing groups in the United States and the U.S.S.R. are aware of the chances for calamity. A shared desire to get armaments under control may be assumed without arguing, for on any other premise the negotiations consist of subterfuge and fall beyond rational analysis. Arms control and disarmament, however, are not absolute and discrete aims. They overlap and interact with a great range of other considerations. The rub is—or at least has been up to now—with respect to these other matters.

A bargain, if and when arrived at, must be a political one, in the broadest sense. Each party is under constraint to insure terms which will preserve the order of values basic to its polity. As a test of their providence, the terms must have convincing marks of being provident—convincing to constituents and allies whose concurrence is necessary as a condition to giving the terms effect. While still in position to give or to withhold consent, each party is constrained to seek terms consistent with other purposes reflecting its relevant order of values.

This gets close to the heart of the inspection issue. Each side—with reason—attributes to the other ultimate desires and preferences incompatible with its own. Each side—again with cause—suspects that the other, given opportunity, would bring its more remote desires and preferences into its pattern of immediate actions. This reciprocal anxiety is nothing to puzzle about. Authentic spokesmen for the U.S.S.R. articulate international goals entirely incompatible with the U.S. order of values. Spokesmen on our side articulate world goals which could be realized only after a frustration of the U.S.S.R. amounting to historic defeat. That the articulated goals of both parties may lie beyond reach is beside the point. Each side makes plain enough what preferences it would establish as purposes of policy if it could.

In analyzing the interplay between inspection and the basic conflict of purposes, it is important to recognize that individuals may accept, draw upon and apply orders of values prevalent within their culture even while ignoring or renouncing beliefs underlying them. One may act on monotheistic postulates while professing agnosticism. In this respect, hopes for a detente between the United States and the U.S.S.R. founded on Khrushchev's indifference or even cynicism—often alleged but never demonstrated—regarding Marxist-Leninist tenets are probably like fantasies that a Borgia pope, because inconstant on finer points of practice, might have been flexible on matters in controversy with Luther.

NATURAL LAW AND INSPECTED TRUTH

The mode of thought underlying the U.S. approach, whether or not recognized and acknowledged, rests on ideas of natural law. A unified creation, with a pattern of right reason inherent, is postulated. Good is identified with it. Principles are held as reflections of this good. What opposes good is ascribed to aberrant free will. Interests are seen as colored with such aberrant imperfections associated with misguided free will. Principles thus transcend interests. Social good inheres in upholding principles impartially. The concept of authority—which is to say, power to bind in conscience—is based on devotion to principles unswayed by interests, impartially applied. Facts are items of information developed impartially by authority and are an objective basis on which to apply principles. Such are the justifying, if not always reigning, concepts in state life.

In the U.S. view, an inspectorate in connection with arms control comprises institutional arrangements for projecting onto the world scene, and especially onto the U.S.S.R., a fact-finding function based on the conception of authority described above. It must be above interests, impartial in endeavor—its authority acknowledged, permitted scope, facilitated in operations, submitted to without cavil or hindrance. Its existence and functions, thus serving as both a substantive and symbolic substitute for trust between the great adversaries, would gradually evolve a basis for confidence. It would serve to assemble and to verify facts to bolster assurance or to confirm doubt. In extremity—that is, in event of the need to abrogate an agreement in face of unacceptable violations by others—the system would provide warrant and vindication. In sum, the U.S. plan for a disarming or disarmed world is congenial to the U.S. view of legitimacy.

The U.S.S.R. view is different. The U.S.S.R. asserts a total claim on the future, based on its dialectic concepts of history. An essential aspect of this claim is that history progresses by inherent momentum toward a final perfection perceivable only through Communist doctrine. Concepts of legitimacy are derived from the law of history which ordains eventual universal triumph for Communist interests and purposes. All other interests and purposes are deemed deviant and devoid of legitimacy. The ruling Communist Party is considered sole interpreter and custodian of legitimacy. Bearers of party authority are constrained not to concede legitimacy to any authority beyond their control.

INTRUSION AND INSPECTION

No thread, I contend, has been more consistent in Communist conduct than this sensitivity to making any concessions to external authority—manifested in the World War II period by the Soviet's obduracy against the scheduling by the Western allies of chain bombing out of Russian airfields, stiffness over timing of lend-lease convoys, and impingements on UNRRA operations. The instances often cited as countervailing turn out to be unconvincing under examination. Russia's acceptance of inspection in post World War II occupation agreements, for example, pertained to domains not yet brought to heel. Soviet agreement to inspection in Antartica involved no Communist area. Communist accession to inspection in North Korea under armistice terms has proved nugatory in real effect. According to a notion persistent within the so-called disarmament community, the U.S.S.R. did once offer concessions on inspection in test-ban discussions. But should we construe a martini recipe as an offer of a drink?

An index to this attitude is the Soviet practice of linking inspection with the term intrusion. All too often, Americans echo the linkage, using "intrusive inspection" for inspection proper and "nonintrusive inspection" for monitoring. A standard definition of intrusion is "forcing of oneself into a place without right of welcome, the act wrongfully entering onto property of another." Inspection is defined in lexicons as "the act of examining officially"—and officially means "with authority, with sanction." "Intrusive inspection" is a contradiction in terms and "nonintrusive inspection" a tautology. Both expressions should be banned from U.S. discourse.

Soviet willingness to invite in an authenticating agency on occasion is quite conceivable but has no bearing on submitting to inspection. The U.S.S.R. persistently says inspection is out—a stand consistent with Communist dogma. In face of this, it is difficult to explain lingering U.S. hopes that the U.S.S.R. really does not mean it, and that obduracy can some day be overcome by adjusting details. The United States may indeed exaggerate the efficacy of inspection. In this connection, the notion that inspection has a potential for guiding the U.S.S.R. toward becoming an open society may be laid aside as inherently too marginal and speculative for serious consideration. The point of inquiry is whether inspection could do the job for which designed. I am not in a position to state definitive views. I can only raise questions.

One question pertains to inspection as a way of insuring compliance with any agreement. For the moment, and for argument, formal acceptance of inspection terms by the U.S.S.R. and other Communist regimes may be assumed. But formal acceptance does not necessarily mean cooperation. The Korean armistice pattern might well be repeated—continuous frustration, postponement, avoidance, and administered ambiguity. The level and quality of information afforded might well be less than attainable through monitoring—that is, verification by means available to the United States irrespective of Soviet cooperation. The international inspectorate would probably provide small, if any, assurance of compliance.

A second question concerns the qualities of an international inspectorate. To gain necessary respect and credit even under favorable conditions, such an inspectorate would have to have high motivation and technical competence. Yet presumably an inspectorate would have to draw heavily on people from uncommitted countries. Most of these countries are—and will remain for a long time—short on technicians. They will need to keep their best men at home.

Third, a question is in order concerning the integrity of findings by an international inspectorate. U.S. expectations are based on the assumptions that everyone can divorce truth from its consequences. The United States envisages an international inspectorate disciplined and constrained to rigorous, exacting attitudes toward empirical data, irrespective of preconceptions and preferences. Yet the United States doubts the detachment of Communists in an inspectorate; in the event neutrals may prove equally self-interested.

U.S. expectations overlook a disposition, basic in the cultures of many of the neutralist countries, to view magisterial functions as intended not so much to forward the triumph of good over evil as to keep contention between them from getting out of hand. This calls for temporizing, mitigating, hoping always to work out arrangements to save something all around, but in a pinch favoring concessions to the more intransigent. F. S. C. Northrop's "Philosophical Anthropology and Practical Politics" reflects good insights into this attitude.

I recall an illustrative instance. Representing the Government of the United States at an International Red Cross Conference during 1952 I was forced to the limit of my patience in trying both to avoid a donnybrook and to preserve national prestige in the face of outrageous attacks from Chinese Communist delegates. At intermission, a delegate from a leading neutralist country, after praising me for reasonable forbearance, added, "These men are mad dogs. You should have let them have their way"—a non sequitur to me but obviously plausible to him.

To expect unequivocal findings by an international inspectorate which has neutrals in the swing position—especially with respect to crucial considerations likely to precipitate renewed competition on armament—is probably too much. Should the United States ever find itself constrained to abrogate a disarmament treaty, it would probably have to do so, and to face consequences, on its own sole sovereign discretion—without any international certificate.

It could be—who can say for sure?—that inspection would not raise the level of technical surety over that achievable by monitoring. Some experts say this. Perhaps also the United States has not realistically appraised factors of feasibility in regard to plans for an inspectorate. These negative considerations, however valid, do not dispose of the matter. It is necessary also to take account of the political acceptability of an agreement within the United States—an aspect bearing on the juridic character of an agreement.

So systematic and far reaching a venture as a formal agreement on arms control and disarmament should be an act of state of a most solemn character—to be undertaken only on a basis of firm and demonstrated concurrence between the executive and the coordinate political branch. It should commit the nation beyond the term of the administration launching it, with a status above party contention. It should contract other parties to obligations equally durable and deep. A treaty seems appropriate, even indispensable, as an instrument for any such formal agreement.

In this perspective, limits, difficulties, and doubts regarding inspection recede to academic import. Questions of confidence and dependability are not merely technical. They never were. They might conceivably have become so if at some juncture relationships between the United States and the Communist imperium had turned onto a basically better course. Then armaments might conceivably have been tethered without all the paraphernalia of inspection. But this hypothesis is based on fantastic rather than realistic imagination. Whatever the theoretical possibilities under dreamed up conditions, one now must take account of the autumn missile crisis. I have heard hopeful speculations regarding its effect, as if fellowship might grow out of a shared crisis, as if wrestling a bear to the brink were a mutually endearing experience. I am skeptical. I see little in recent events to nourish the mystique of trust. An uninspected arms control compact seems out for the calculable future. The outlook is dour—indefinite impasse on formal terms, with abatement of the problems restricted to unilateral steps and to informal and tacit agreements, with or without more such crises as the one over Cuba.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Nebraska not only for submitting the resolution itself, but also for the statesmanlike method of the presentation he has adopted, and on the very progressive and constructive thoughts which he has given in his speech. I wish the Senate to know that I, among others, fully support the principles and the details of the Senator's concurrent resolution.

It adds to our deliberations a needed safeguard of realism and reason, and would provide a deterrent against the sort of ill-conceived and dangerous suggestions currently being espoused by some of our Federal agencies charged with the conduct of our affairs in world councils. I share the Senator's concern that there appears to be a pellmell rush to weaken this Nation's historic position as the champion and protector of the weaker nations in this free world.

On September 19, 1961, when the House passed the original legislation establishing the disarmament agency, I took the floor of the other body, of which at that time I was a Member, and said, among other things:

> We have just seen the Soviet Communists explode their 13th nuclear blast with testing renewed by their own unilateral action. Free countries have been threatened with annihilation by Soviet rockets. Mr. Khrushchev has said that our grandchildren would exist only under Communist rule. We have tried for years to obtain an agreement on nuclear disarmament and each meeting has been deliberately stalled and broken up by the Soviet Communists. From a handful of fanatics in 1916, international communism now tyrannizes over one-third of the population of the world and it continues to grow not by the force of argument and principle, but by force of arms and terror.

We should remind ourselves of the warnings given to the Congress by the eminent nuclear scientist Dr. Edward Teller. Although discussing the dangers to our strength which would result from a test ban, he pointed out that a test ban might strike a fatal blow to our defense of the free world through NATO, while at the same time building the free world's enemies. Certainly his warning that test bans, or for that matter, disarmament, would not restrain the Communist government of Red China, and might be considered a slap to France, is an acute observation. Recent events suggest the bold truth of that analysis. Dr. Teller, we may recall, drew a parallel of present conditions with our abandonment of Czechoslovakia at Munich which history shows was a major factor which brought on World War II, and he concludes that had the Munich Pact also banned fighter planes and radar the inevitable consequence would have been the fall of Great Britain. There is reason in his view to suggest that the Soviets even now are seeking to maneuver this Nation into another Munich. I share the concern of the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska and others in the light of the recent developments that we tend to blind ourselves to the true ideology of the Communists, seeking to interpret their actions within the framework of our own principles and beliefs. We ignore their statements, such as those made by Lenin and often repeated:

> To continue an undeclared war or to launch an open war no casus belli is needed, only fresh breath and favorable circumstances.

The war itself has been decreed by Communist history and was declared by Marx once and for all in 1848 when he wrote:

> The Communists scorn to conceal their aims, the forcible overthrow of all existing conditions, a world to win.

Their philosophy contends that:

> In this war, although armistices and temporary agreements are necessary, the essence of any agreement is that it is temporary, not that it is an agreement. The struggle may have to be continued by other means for a shorter or longer period. But war itself is only the continuance of the politics of peace, and peace the continuance of the politics of war, by other means.

This, I repeat, was the credo of Lenin. It has not changed. We must understand it. We must remind ourselves continuously that "negotiate" and "agree" have different meanings for them and for us. To them lulls cannot conceivably or decently be preliminaries to all-out peace as we understand it, nor are specific "hot spots" really separate except in the sense that they have been separated out for strategic or tactical convenience from the general context of struggle. Every negotiation, every issue, even every day's session as we have seen in the apparent fruitless 5-year negotiations in Geneva are regarded primarily as a move in an irreconcilable conflict. Khrushchev himself has reiterated this, the very same credo, as recently as 1959 when, before the Foreign Ministers Conference in Albania, he is reported to have said:

> They say [meaning the United States] that with the U.S.S.R. you must negotiate in the following fashion concession for concession. But that is a huckster's approach. We do not have any concessions to make, because our proposals have not been made for bartering. [Their] proposals do not contain a single element for negotiation. They are not based on a desire to find a correct solution.

It is thus obvious that Khrushchev's solution remains the same as that stated by Marx:

> The forcible overthrow of all existing conditions—a world to win.

We too must recognize that we have a world to win, but for a different purpose—to advance the cause of freedom of all mankind. It is in this light that many of us are concerned that our present path is following the ivory tower thinking that recently characterized a group of study papers produced for certain Democratic Members of the House and published under the title of "The Liberal Papers." I should like to read into the RECORD a portion of "The Liberal Papers" which suggest the actual time table of unilateral concessions, many of these concerning disarmament.

Although suggested as purely hypothetical, this timetable nevertheless brightly illuminates the sort of over reliance on Communist good will against which the resolutions of the senior Senator from Nebraska seeks to guard. Here is the timetable of unilateral concessions as suggested by "The Liberal Papers." This, I may say for the benefit of Members of the Senate, is a hypothetical timetable, one which could occur in any year, depending upon when the particular agency desired to begin to put it into effect.

> April 1: We announce that, as of May 1, we intend to make public all medical information we have been gathering concerning man in space; reciprocation invited from all nations; nature of general policy indicated (A–1).
>
> May 1: We announce that, as of May 15, all discriminatory trade and travel restrictions with respect to Communist China will be lifted, and we will entertain diplomatic exchange; reciprocation in kind is invited and general policy stated (B–1).
>
> (A–1 reciprocated by Russia and most other countries.)
>
> May 20: We announce a unilateral test ban that will be continued indefinitely and invite reciprocal announcement from Russia, England, and France (C–1); we also announce that we are making technicians and professionals in various fields of specialization available to the U.N. for work in the Congo and other areas; reciprocation from other "have" nations invited and general policy again stressed (D–1).
>
> (B–1 not reciprocated by Communist China.)
>
> June 1: We announce that at the next convening of the General Assembly of the U.N. (June 20) we will move the seating of Communist China; we again indicate our willingness to entertain diplomatic exchange and the general nature of our policy (B–2).
>
> (C–1 reciprocated by Russia, England, and France; D–1 reciprocated by England, France, and others, but not Russia.)
>
> June 15: We announced, as of July 15, one of our oversea bases in Japan will be publicly denuclearized, and we invite U.N. and Russian inspection; reciprocation is invited but left open ended, and our general policy is again stressed (E–2).
>
> (On June 16 bombardment of Quemoy and Matsu increases abruptly and invasion preparations are observed; U.S. naval power concentrates and firm warnings about what our policy does and does not imply are given; Russia makes nuclear threat; on June 20 we nevertheless move seating of China in U.N.; one invasion attempt is repulsed [but no counterattack on Chinese mainland occurs]; Russo-Chinese conferences are followed by Chinese delegation seated in U.N.; Quemoy-Matsu hostilities peter out; D–1 reciprocated by Russia.)
>
> August 1: We announce that, as of the next September, student exchanges will be offered in proportion to the populations of the countries involved; reciprocation is invited generally (A–2). We announce that, as of August 20, the DEW line (early warning system) will be made bidirectional (warning of our flights toward Russia as well as vice versa), and we invite the Soviets to "plug in" (Note: I am told this is technically feasible; it emphasizes our reliance on second-strike rather than first-strike strategy; if we have no intention of suprise attack, there is no reason why this shouldn't be done); reciprocation in kind invited (C–2).
>
> Russia announces that, as of September 1, its armed forces in East Germany will be reduced by one-third and reciprocation in form of denuclearization of West Germany invited; we interpret this as indirect reciprocation of E–2; an envoy from Peiping arrives in Washington for talks.)
>
> August 15: We announce that, with agreements from some of the major mass media, beginning September 1, material on contemporary world affairs prepared by Russian sources may appear on Sundays in special newspaper sections and certain TV and radio programs without censure; reciprocation in kind invited (D–2).
>
> (We announce that, as of September 1, NATO forces are being reduced in West Germany but that no denuclearizing is contemplated at this time; East Germany announces relaxation of transit regulations between West Germany and West Berlin; B–1 reciprocated by Communist China.)
>
> September 1: We announce that, of January 1, we will be prepared to have all launchings of flights into outer space supervised by a new agency of the U.N. which we propose be established (A–3).
>
> (Russia announces an expanded program of inviting scholars and scientists for advanced study in Soviet institutes [which we intepret as indirect reciprocation for A–2]; Communist China invites joint teams of Russian and American scientists to Peiping for conferences on technical problems; C–2 and D–2 still not reciprocated by Russia.)
>
> September 15: We announce that, as of October 15, the islands of Quemoy and Matsu will be publicly demilitarized and turned over to proper authorities from the mainland, and clear statements about the unchanged status of Taiwan are made (B–3); we announce that surpluses of several grain crops will be made available at adjusted prices to countries needing them during the winter (D–3); reciprocations left open ended.
>
> (Russia proposes that, beginning January 1, the conquest of space be made a joint human enterprise on the model of the International Geophysical Year (IGY) and invites international cooperation through the U.N. (we interpret this as reciprocated for A–3); C–2 and D–2 still not reciprocated by Russia; Nehru urges that she do so.)
>
> November 20: We announce that, as of the next meeting of the U.N. (December 1), we will move the substitution of Communist China for Nationalist China on the Security Council—reciprocation in the form of recognition of Taiwan as a sovereign country with representation in the General Assembly requested (B–4); we announce that, as of February 1, we will open this country unilaterally to inspection and monitoring by authorized U.N. teams, as further evidence that we have no intention of surprise attack—reciprocation in kind is invited from all countries (C–4).
>
> (The demilitarization and evacuation of Quemoy and Matsu accomplished without major incident (Chiang Kai-shek's threats of retaliation countered by large nonmilitary spending program in Taiwan); Russia has reciprocated, in part, on C–2, but not D–2; under strong urging from Great Britain, plans for full-scale disarmament negotiations under U.N. auspices are being prepared.)

Mr. President, what do we actually have? This is a theoretical timetable, prepared by prominent Democratic Members of the other body. We have here the U.S. program for general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, published as Department of State Publication No. 7277. Obviously, I shall not read the entire document. I shall, however, read some of the general principles which are set forth in it.

The general principle is complete disarmament. I read from page 3, as follows:

> The disbanding of all national armed forces and the prohibition of their reestablishment in any form whatsoever other than those required to preserve internal order and for contributions to a United Nations peace force.

That is one of the methods by which this program would be accomplished. Next:

> The elimination from national arsenals of all armaments, including all weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery, other than those required for a United Nations peace force and for maintaining internal order.
>
> The institution of effective means for the enforcement of international agreements, for the settlement of disputes, and for the maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.
>
> The establishment and effective operation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations to insure compliance at all times with all disarmament obligations.

Mr. President, I suggest that there is no series of proposals which, if they should be adopted at this time and with the situation as it exists in the world today, would more adversely or sharply affect the security and safety of this country.

Certainly every Member of this body would like to see the great burden of our existing weapons reduced. However, in the present day and age and in the dangerous situation in which we find ourselves, I share the concern of the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] that this is a field in which all people of the free world are justifiably interested; that it is of paramount importance to all people in this country; and that the impact of any agreement in the field of disarmament is so intense that any such agreement should be entered into only after joint review and agreement on the wisdom of such a course by both the executive branch and by the representatives of the people, as expressed through the membership of the U.S. Senate.

Again, I express appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Colorado for his important contribution to the discussion of a problem which I am sure worries every thoughful American.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Nebraska both upon his resolution and upon his excellent statement in support of it.

Also, I believe my distinguished colleague from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] has performed a real service for the Senate in pointing out the muddleheadedness and the muddleheaded type of thinking which seems to be going on, even in Congress, with respect to some of the fundamental issues which affect this country.

I am happy to support the concurrent resolution on arms control and disarmament, submitted by the junior Senator from Nebraska. I endorse particularly that part of the resolution calling upon the President of the United States to report to the appropriate congressional committees "any and all steps taken by him which would tend to alter existing ratios of weapons and their effectiveness between this Nation and its allies, and the Soviet bloc of nations."

Recent alterations in our defense posture underscore the importance of this proviso.

All of us recall, I am sure, Khrushchev's demand, made at the height of last October's Cuban missile crisis, that the United States dismantle its intermediate range ballistic missile sites in Turkey, as a quid pro quo for dismantling the Soviet missile sites in Cuba. Such a demand struck a few responsive chords in this country, we will further recall, for only 2 days earlier a distinguished pundit suggested such a swap as a way out of the crisis. But thankfully our President rejected the proposal out of hand.

What happened subsequently? The administration announced in January, less than 3 months after Khrushchev agreed to withdraw his missiles from Cuba, that the United States would dismantle its missile sites, not only in Turkey, but also in Italy as well. That the announcement came as a surprise was indicated by the complaint of the Italian Government that it was not consulted prior to the decision. Why the sudden change in American policy? "Weapons modernization," it was explained. The Jupiters have become obsolescent and are, therefore, no longer effective, we are told. The Polaris submarine—which, incidentally, is more and more asked to assume the burden of solving all of America's problems—will patrol the Mediterranean. Of course, a minor difficulty concerning where those Polaris submarines will be based has cropped up, but this should not hinder the dismantling of our Jupiter sites in Turkey and Italy. As a result, meanwhile, it appears that we are soon to be confronted with—if you will excuse the slogan, Mr. President—a "missile gap" on the southern flank of the NATO area, at least for a while.

Forgive me, Mr. President, for being facetious; but as an interested layman observing some of our recent diplomatic and defense moves, I cannot resist some sarcasm. Certainly there is little evidence here of the long-range planning of which this administration, with its bevy of blue-ribboned task forces, boasts. But that is not my main point. Why, Mr. President, was the Congress not consulted before this decision was announced? I am sure that my good friends who serve devotedly and conscientiously on the Armed Services Committee and its Special Preparedness Subcommittee would have expressed keen interest in this initiative. Certainly it was of more than passing interest to the distinguished chairmen of these two panels. Yet, to my knowledge, Mr. President, these Senators and their counterparts at the other end of this building were not informed of the decision to dismantle these sites, prior to its announcement, nor was their advice solicited.

This is a matter of grave concern to me, Mr. President, for we are talking about an act that, in the words of the concurrent resolution under discussion, "would tend to alter existing ratios of weapons and their effectiveness." This I believe to be true, regardless of the reason for the decision, whether it be weapons modernization or a gesture aimed at Khrushchev and the amorphous body called world opinion, to demonstrate for the *n*th time how reasonable and peace-loving we are.

Perhaps I would not be so much concerned if this decision were an isolated event. But when considering other alterations in our defense posture that have been announced in recent weeks, I become worried. Let us take the Skybolt incident, Mr. President. We are told that the manned bomber has become passé, despite expert opinion to the contrary from the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and his colleagues in the Pentagon. We are told that cost-effectiveness studies run in the Department of Defense have shown that further development of this missile would be unnecessarily wasteful.

Perhaps the Secretary of Defense is correct. But when, in the aftermath of the October missile crisis, with its uncertain denouement, we see, first, the junking of Skybolt, and then the announcement of the dismantling of our missile sites in southern Europe, I become puzzled. Are these decisions being taken for the technical reasons cited by the administration; or are they perhaps measures to persuade Khrushchev of our good will and fervent desire for peace? I do not know, Mr. President; I merely raise these questions.

In this connection, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Arizona recently dealt with this matter in some brief remarks on the floor of the Senate. He asked:

> What goes on here? First—

He said—

> we hear about the dismantling of missile bases in Turkey and Italy. Next we read that plans are afoot to reduce our troop strength in Europe by some 40,000 men. Then we are told about the gradual deactivation of the 850 B–47 bombers in American combat units.

Other alterations in our defense posture questioned by the Senator are:

> B–58 supersonic medium bombers, production halted; RS–70 bombers, development halted; the Dyna-Soar manned spacecraft bomber system, development funds cut back; B–47 bombers, scheduled for deactivation; B–52 bombers, out of production, no new bombers either scheduled or planned.

The purpose of my remarks, Mr. President, is to endorse the concurrent resolution under discussion here, and to raise questions about some recent alterations in our defense posture that seem to me to have an effect upon the balance of military power. Perhaps there are good reasons for these moves. Perhaps, on the other hand, they could, in light of the wishful thinking evidenced in some quarters of the executive branch, unwittingly jeopardize this Nation's security. The point I want to make in raising my questions today is the need for close and continuous liaison, consultation, and genuine exchange of views and ideas on these vital matters between the executive and legislative branches. This the resolution seeks to bring about; and, for this reason, it deserves the support of all Senators. Mr. President, I urge adoption of this resolution.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator very much for his important contribution.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, with the free world's eyes focused on the arms buildup in Cuba, political developments in Canada, and the French veto of Britain's entry into the European Common Market, as well as the continuing war in Vietnam, it is my concern that the United States-Soviet negotiations on nuclear testing will proceed without receiving warranted attention. It is not my purpose to here argue the number of onsite inspections that are necessary to insure compliance with any test-ban treaty. But it does appear to me to be a bit odd that in 1958, leading experts, including those from the Soviet Union, agreed that 21 manned inspection stations in the U.S.S.R. were necessary; yet today the Soviet is offering two to three onsite inspections. Surprisingly enough, the United States is now demanding only seven. My surprise at these developments is compounded, especially when I hear that there are many hundreds of seismic events in the Russian landmass each year, any one of which, I am told, could be the result of a nuclear explosion.

Has our technology advanced to such an extent that unmanned seismic stations can keep a test-ban honest? I do not know. But I do know that Mr. William C. Foster, the director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said on January 14:

> There is no way at present to distinguish certain natural underground occurrences from nuclear explosions.

Mr. Arthur Dean, Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the conference of the 18-nation Committee on Disarmament, said on the same day:

> No one, including the Soviet Union, has been able to demonstrate scientifically that natural underground events like earthquakes can be consistently differentiated from man-made nuclear explosions.

So, Mr. President, here are two spokesmen for the administration who contend that scientific surveillance in the art is not sufficiently advanced to be able to detect all nuclear explosions.

Lewis L. Strauss, the former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, is concerned over our reaching, with the Soviets, a compromise that will endanger our national security, as is Dr. Edward Teller, one of the Nation's foremost nuclear experts. It is difficult for me, Mr. President, to understand how the administration could recommend entering into an honor-system type of agreement with a country that within the past 6 months deliberately lied to our Chief Executive concerning the arms buildup in Cuba. The Soviet world and much of the free world must retire, in the evening, wondering what type of schizophrenic agreement the administration will enter into.

Of course, we are all for peace. We are all for the avoidance of nuclear war. But an agreement which would allow the Soviet to violate its very principles would not only disappoint our peaceful desires; it would also undermine the very existence of our country. The 1961 Russian violation of the test moratorium should be ever present in our mind. Assuming that, for once, the Russians were sincere, which is hard to believe, what of the Chinese? Has their activity in the field of nuclear research been taken into consideration? Reports are persistent that they have the potential to create an atomic explosion this year.

Mr. President, it is my hope that satisfactory agreement on nuclear testing can be reached; but it must be more than an agreement just for the sake of agreement. Since the termination of World War II, time after time we have been reminded that the Russian leadership cannot be trusted, either in the field of nuclear testing or in the field of the conventional type of strategic maneuvering. Based upon information supplied by experts, it is difficult for me to believe that the Soviets can be relied upon to carry out the terms of an agreement, when such an agreement is based upon an honor-system type of understanding. On January 28, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, addressed himself to the matter of a nuclear test ban; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Governor Rockefeller be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER

In light of the long record of broken promises and other bitterly disillusioning experiences with the Soviet Union, including the Soviet's violation of more than 50 international agreements, I am deeply concerned by two recent developments:

First, President Kennedy's announcement of the U.S. suspension of underground testing of nuclear devices; and

Second, the apparent weakening of our requirements for a nuclear test ban treaty.

In connection with the cessation of underground testing, experience should have taught the administration that unilateral suspension of testing in advance of negotiations not only does not improve the atmosphere but on the contrary removes any incentive for agreement on the part of the Soviets.

This was proved in the fall of 1961 when the Soviets resumed nuclear testing after a voluntary test ban had been in effect for nearly 3 years, during which we had been fruitlessly negotiating to achieve a permanent test ban.

While the United States was observing this test ban, the Soviets had been preparing a test series for at least a year, thus making it possible for them to achieve major progress in nuclear weapons development in relation to the United States.

While a truly effective test ban treaty with adequate inspection is desirable, I think it is imperative that our new voluntary test ban not be extended through any protracted negotiations. We must remember that the Soviet Union broke the last moratorium only 4 weeks after solemnly assuring us that it would never be the first to do so.

As to the second problem; namely, the weakening of the U.S. position on a test ban treaty, I have three basic concerns with respect to developments since the advent of the Kennedy administration:

First, that the United States has given up the concept of manned inspection stations on Soviet territory altogether;

Second, that the administration has accepted unmanned stations in spite of statement by responsible administration officials casting doubt on their effectiveness; and

Third, that the administration has progressively reduced the number of onsite inspections we demand from 20 a year to 8 to 10 a year.

My reasons for these concerns are as follows:

With respect to manned inspection stations:

1. The 1958 Geneva Conference of Technical Experts, including the Soviets, agreed on a worldwide system of 170 to 180 manned inspection stations, of which 21 were supposed to be located on Soviet territory. The Soviets have now entirely withdrawn their agreement to a system of manned control posts on Soviet territory, and the present administration has accepted this.

2. At the time that the inspection system was supposed to be based on manned stations, the United States insisted on 20 onsite inspections a year as the minimum number required for safety against evasion.

3. When the Kennedy administration came into office, it still insisted on 19 manned inspection stations within the Soviet Union, and from 12 to 20 onsite inspections a year. Only last March 4, William C. Foster, Director of the U.S. Agency for Arms Control and Disarmament, said that these inspection requirements, if anything, might have to be increased in the national interest.

As to unmanned inspection stations:

1. This concept was first advanced in 1959 by the Berkner Panel, which estimated that unmanned stations should be located 170 kilometers apart to be effective, which would mean that 200 such stations would be required to cover the seismic area of the Soviet Union and 600 would be necessary to cover the entire Soviet Union.

2. Only last night, on the "Meet the Press" program, Secretary of State Dean Rusk revealed the ineffectiveness of U.S. unmanned testing devices in these words: "The Soviets claim that they have instruments which are fully effective in scrutinizing tests; if they have them, we don't have them."

But in the latest exchange of secret letters between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev, as released by Khrushchev, the Soviet Premier was talking of only three unmanned inspection stations, in the Soviet seismic area only (in contrast with the Berkner Panel recommendation of 200), and only 2 or 3 on-the-spot inspections a year, while President Kennedy in his letter to Mr. Khrushchev expressed the feeling that the Soviet proposal on inspection stations "does not go far enough" and the number of on-the-spot inspections should be 8 or 10 a year (in contrast with the 12 to 20 the Kennedy administration previously demanded).

This apparently is the current basis of negotiations.

Concerned Americans must therefore ask the following questions:

1. Why is it that, 3 months after the demonstration of Soviet duplicity in installing missiles in Cuba, we are again instituting an unpoliced moratorium on nuclear testing?

2. What gave us the confidence, 2 months after the demonstration of Soviet duplicity in Cuba, to reduce inspection requirements which were still considered basic a year ago?

3. If there is new scientific evidence warranting our reduction of inspection requirements, why has the American public not been told about it?

4. What incentive do the Soviets have to accept any American proposal, or to behave responsibly, if as a result of their intransigence they receive evermore favorable U.S. offers?

5. Is it wise to engage in bilateral, secret negotiations with the Soviets at a time when we are asserting the indivisibility of the Atlantic NATO alliance, and on issues which basically affect the security of our allies?

The American people are entitled to answers to these questions before irrevocable decisions are made which may seriously prejudice the future security of the United States and the whole free world.

All in all, it seems to me that in this critical area the administration is trending toward a Cuba-type inspection plan. One of these is dangerously more than enough.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. Neuberger in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. In the headlines of today's issues of the two leading Washington newspapers, I think we see a very dramatic demonstration of what the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Utah fear.

The headline in this morning's Washington Post reads as follows: "K Warns United States on Cuba: Invasion Means H-War."

The following article states the details of how Mr. K spells that out.

In the face of that blast, I think it ironic that we find in this afternoon's Washington Star the following headline: "United States Drafting New A-Test Treaty—Changes Ease Requirements for Inspection."

Khrushchev rattles the saber—perhaps with no real connection between the two; but ironically, in terms of the time relationship, we move backward another step in our attempts to obtain inspection and control by means of any nuclear test ban, to which subject the Senator from Nebraska has addressed himself.

I suppose we cannot blame the people of the world for coming to believe that the more Khrushchev shouts, the faster we shall step back. We have already come to the point where we say we are going to be satisfied with seven inspections; and now, apparently, there is to be offered a new treaty which would take us closer to the time and the situation in which we might say we would be satisfied with no inspections. Madam President, I think this most ironic.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Utah.

Mr. HART. Madam President, I listened with attention to the remarks of Senators following the interesting remarks of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis]. I was struck by the comment made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], who read two headlines from today's issues of the two principal Washington newspapers, the first of which announced again that Khrushchev would view very dimly any military action on our part to invade Cuba; and then the Senator from Utah pointed out that this afternoon's Washington Star states that we are drafting a new test ban treaty, and the Senator from Utah read the headline: "United States Drafting New A-Test Treaty—Changes Ease Requirements for Inspection."

I believe the Senator from Utah was conscious of the concern to which I now address myself, and he may well have so indicated on the record. But I wish to make very sure that there is no reader of the Congressional Record, here or elsewhere in the world, who would be able, as a result of this afternoon's session, to stand up and say that there is an opinion in the Senate that would support the proposition that when Khrushchev barks, we back down. I ask the Senator from Utah if he does not agree that that would be a most unfortunate implication.

Mr. BENNETT. I think it is unfortunate that those two events happened as they did, but one would not need to read the Congressional Record. We merely have to read the headlines in the two newspapers to which I have referred.

I make the point, too, that apparently there has been no response from the President or his advisers to Khrushchev's saber rattling, indicating that we were going to let him get away with it. So the combination of events leaves us in a very weak position. I am sure that neither the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] nor I desire the world to get the impression that we are backing all the way down. But, unfortunately, in the juxtaposition of those two events, that impression can well be created.

Mr. HART. Would the Senator from Utah be happier if the President of the United States should announce that we are going to invade Cuba? Is anything short of that course backing down?

Mr. BENNETT. That is the kind of question with which the Senator from Utah was faced during his campaign for reelection last year. But the Senator from Utah would be greatly heartened if the President of the United States would today, in the face of the kind of blustering which we have witnessed, take the same kind of firm position that he took on October 22. He has left the American people wondering how far Khrushchev can go before we announce a firm program. That firm program need not be a direct invasion of Cuba. It could well be a reimposition of the blockade or some satisfactory substitute.

Mr. HART. Is the Senator from Utah satisfied that a blockade at the present juncture would be legal under international law? Or should we not concern ourselves with that question?

Mr. BENNETT. The American people are eagerly looking for the day when the President will take some kind of step which would indicate his firm determination not to let Khrushchev continue to press us in Cuba. I am not presuming to say what that course should be. I do not think it is the responsibility of the minority to decide what it should be or when it should happen. I am merely expressing the feeling that I get from the people back home. Those people were happy last October when the President took a firm stand. They are now greatly disturbed to see that there is no followup in the face of the kind of blustering we have had from Khrushchev.

Mr. HART. Madam President, I am grateful to the Senator from Texas for permitting me, in a sense, to intrude. I should like to conclude by making clear my own reaction to those two headlines. As an American and as a Member privileged to serve in this body I am proud of my country and the fact that it continues to seek that which actually is the common aspiration of all mankind—to achieve an adequate resolution of the A-test question. This effort in my mind demonstrates no weakness at all. It demonstrates a sensitivity and a recognition of our obligation as a power possessed of an instrument that can incinerate mankind.

If we are not working toward a solution of the problem 24 hours a day, then I would say that we are wrong on everything.

I share with the Senator from Utah the conviction that Cuba represents a constant irritant. I know how the people at home feel. I know the expression about which he is speaking. I am not sure that the kind of discussion that sometimes goes on here does not do us all a disservice because it inclines us to miss the real threat in Cuba at the moment. The real threat is not whether there are 10,000 or 15,000 Russian troops, good, bad, or indifferent, frontline or rearline troops. I cannot believe that troops in those numbers represent a threat to our physical integrity or survival. There is an ultimate problem, yes. But the immediate problem is not to get lost in the swamp of debating how many troops are there or whether a gravel pit or a cement block that was or was not bulldozed last night was rebuilt today. The problem is to recognize that Cuba is a center of subversive activity in our own hemisphere and at our own back door. It is the instruction given to the young Venezuelans and the Chileans in Havana that disturbs me to an infinitely greater degree than what amounts, in total numbers, to a division of troops, but not organized as a division.

Second, we are likely to be diverted from a recognition of the fact that we must become hardheaded about aid to Latin America. We should make sure that conditions are attached to the grants we make which will reverse the conditions, political and economic, which give rise in all Latin America to the great potential of a takeover similar to the one we see in Cuba.

Having intruded to raise some questions, I desired to make clear my own feeling at the moment.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, I, too, appreciate the patience of our friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower]. The question that concerns the Senator from Utah is not the question of gravel pits or a nose count of Russians. It is the direction in which the situation is proceeding. The Senator from Utah greatly fears that, as far as the position of the United States vis-a-vis the Russian power in Cuba is concerned, it is weakening rather than strengthening. That is the point that concerns me.

I hope that someday the administration will come forth with a program which will reverse that trend so that all Americans may feel that we are making progress against the kind of thing that appeared in the headlines of this morning's newspaper: "K. Warns United States on Cuba—Invasion Means H-War."

Mr. HART. I do not believe I shall ever see the formula developed which will enable us to write Khrushchev's speeches.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, may I again thank my friend the Senator from Texas for the opportunity of the present interchange.

A COMPREHENSIVE, CONSERVATIVE PROGRAM FOR CONGRESS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a legislative package consisting of eight bills and resolutions designed to offer a comprehensive, conservative program for this session.

These bills are substantially the same as those which I introduced in the last Congress. Altogether they make up a comprehensive, conservative legislative program. While I do not anticipate action on this program in the present Congress, I believe the time is drawing near when the American people shall have had their fill of New Deal, Fair Deal, and New Frontier paternalism, and therefore will send to Congress a conservative majority. When that time comes, legislation of this type will be given full consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary of my bills and resolutions be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). The bills and resolutions will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the Record as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The bills, joint resolutions, concurrent resolution, and resolution, introduced and submitted by Mr. Tower, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

To the Committee on Finance:

S. 954. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for reform of personal and corporate income tax rates, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to establish the Joint Committee on Foreign Trade.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S.J. Res. 52. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of Agriculture to submit proposals to the Congress for the gradual termination of unnecessary Federal controls on farming.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 955. A bill to amend the antitrust laws to prohibit certain activities of labor organizations in restraint of trade and commerce, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 54. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the balancing of the budget; and

S.J. Res. 55. Joint resolution to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) submitted by Mr. Tower, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the foreign policy of the United States appears to omit the possibility of complete and clear-cut victory over Communist imperialism; and

Whereas this is a policy which places human survival above human dignity, which fears random manifestations of opinion more than it nurtures the hope of freedom; and

Whereas the Congress has not consented, nor can it consent to such a policy; and

Whereas the mission of the United States must be to secure victory over tyranny, the end of man's enslavement of man, and the ultimate impotence of all concentrations of power which may now or hereafter threaten the peace of the world and the freedom of its peoples; and

Whereas this purpose should be enunciated in such a way that whatever enemies we face cannot mistake it, so that the people we represent may determine their own support, and so that the enslaved peoples of the earth may find hope for a future in which their freedom, and the whole cause of freedom, is not sacrificed for safety but instead is consecrated as the central cause of our time and all times: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the purpose of the United States in its relations with other nations of the world should be—

(1) victory over Communist tyranny;

(2) to oppose by all effective means the growth of any power dedicated to aggression or the denial of freedom to its own or any other peoples;

(3) to oppose communism's worldwide efforts to subvert nations and peoples by the most effective means available;

(4) to support for all nations submitted to Soviet, Communist Chinese, or other Communist control since 1939, the right of free choice of government, after proper preparation and under appropriate electoral supervision;

(5) to press by all diplomatic means for the withdrawal of Soviet, Communist Chinese, or other Communist forces, both uniformed and covert, from all areas entered by them since 1939;

(6) to reduce Communist war machines, and the economies which support them, to levels at which they can no longer threaten the peace of the world;

(7) to fully arm, both in material and morally, ourselves for these tasks;

(8) to support and fully defend those whose freedom is threatened;

(9) to support and assist those whose aspirations for freedom are challenged by internal or external forces whose ultimate path would lead to tyranny;

(10) to counsel and assist those who, untried in freedom, are tempted by the promise of rapid growth to embrace coercive economic systems, that they may be preserved instead on the path of the only proven progress to freedom—that of individual dedication, dignity, initiative, and responsibility in a free capitalistic economy;

(11) to enjoin all nations to a course of full commitment to self-determination; to discourage attitudes of benevolent neutrality which, when men are not free, debase all men, weaken all freedom, and work not for peace but for the advantage of aggressors; and

(12) to remind a world often fearfully unsure, that peace in our time depends not upon the concessions of free nations but upon their determination and upon the enemy's assessment of that determination, that life itself is no more dear than the conditions of that life, and that freedom is the only tolerable human condition for the people of these United States and for a world at peace.

The resolution (S. Res. 100) submitted by Mr. Tower, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study for the purpose of determining—

(1) the extent to which departments and agencies of the Government are engaged in the production or furnishing of goods and services which can be supplied by private enterprise;

(2) the extent to which necessity or the national security require that such goods and services be produced or furnished by departments or agencies of the Government; and

(3) the means and methods by which the function of producing or furnishing such goods and services may be transferred at the earliest practicable time and to the greatest practicable extent to private competitive enterprise within the United States.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $125,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The summary presented by Mr. Tower is as follows:

The package includes measures in the following fields:

1. A balanced Federal budget: This is a proposed constitutional amendment making a balanced Federal budget mandatory except in case of war or other grave national emergency.

2. Taxes: A bill identical with H.R. 265 introduced in the House of Representatives by Representatives Herlong, of Florida, and Baker, of Tennessee. This is a comprehensive proposal calling for across-the-board reductions in tax scales, both individual and business. In addition it includes new depreciation provisions applied to new acquisition of business plant and equipment. This measure would make statutory provision for tax-free transfer of capital by individuals, but not by corporations, from one investment to another within a taxable year when the investments have been held at least 6 months. Finally, the bill would establish a new formula for setting tax rates on estates and gifts with a top rate of 47 percent.

3. Foreign trade: A resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Trade to exercise congressional oversight of all foreign trade programs.

4. Government competition with private business: This is a resolution authorizing a Senate Committee on Government Operations to make a full and complete study to determine the extent of Government competition with private enterprise, and to determine means and methods by which such functions can be transferred to private enterprise.

5. Foreign policy: A resolution expressing "the sense of Congress" that the purpose of the U.S. foreign policy is: (1) Victory over communism; (2) to oppose by all effective means the growth of any power dedicated to aggression or the denial of freedom to its own or to any other people; (3) to oppose and end communism's worldwide efforts to subvert nations and people; and (4) to support and secure the right of free choice of government for all nations submitted to Communist control since 1939.

6. A resolution to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of Federal laws on State laws: The resolution would provide that no future act of Congress would be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to preempt State laws on the same subject matter, unless Congress expresses such intent.

7. Labor antitrust law: The purpose here is to prohibit certain types of union activity intended to lessen competition or to establish monopolies in the marketplace for products or commodities. For example, efforts by the unions to prevent the installation of preglazed windows or factory-painted kitchen cabinets. It has no application whatsoever to the supply or price of labor.

8. Agriculture: This is a resolution to gradually move the Government out of the field of farm controls. Within a period of 6 years the level of price supports would be gradually reduced while increasing acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

NEED FOR VIGOROUS PROSECUTION OF COMMUNISTS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, last year, I made a speech in the Senate calling for more vigorous prosecution of Communists by the Justice Department. I am even more convinced now than I was then that more intensified prosecution is necessary.

Aside from their activities in the political and military fields, Communists continue to subvert and to do violence to other institutions and aspects of American life. Recent events in my own hometown of Wichita Falls, Tex., provide a dramatic and sorry example. Let me tell the story from the beginning.

In the summer of 1960, a committee of the board of directors of the Civic Playhouse of Wichita Falls, a little theater group of which I was a member, met in my home and interviewed Mary Lee Maxine, whom we subsequently employed, with her husband, Willis Henry Maxine, on a full-time basis to direct and manage the Civic Playhouse.

As professional employees of the playhouse, they performed the functions of stage direction, set construction, business management, and general supervision of the theatrical activities of the playhouse. In this connection, they also engaged in some theatrical work at Sheppard Air Force Base, but were subsequently barred from the base as security risks.

It was learned by a local attorney, Mr. John Mogan, a former FBI agent, that the Maxines were Communists. On learning this from reliable sources, Mr. Mogan, together with his wife—both active members of the playhouse organization—made this information known to the board of directors of the Civic Playhouse in April of 1961, and they were discharged.

In February 1962, a $106,000 slander and defamation of character suit was brought by Willis and Mary Maxine of Wichita Falls, Tex., against Frank G. Logan and John and Barbara Mogan charging that the defendants publicly called the Maxines Communists. Logan was subsequently dismissed as a defendant in the case.

According to the Wichita Falls Times of September 11, 1962, testimony began the previous day in the $106,000 slander suit of the Maxines against John and Barbara Mogan. It was indicated that the Maxines were former employees of the Civic Playhouse and the defendants were members of the playhouse board of directors in April 1961. The Maxines were asking $75,000 exemplary damages, $6,000 actual damages and $25,000 punitive damages.

In September 1962, Mrs. Maxine took the stand and testified. Mrs. Maxine admitted attending Communist-front schools but denied knowing the schools were on the national subversive list at the time she was attending them. She denied being a Communist although she admitted she had been asked to join the Communist Party—CP—at one time in New York but had refused.

Willis Maxine took the stand and stated that he had never, to his knowledge, met a Communist although he admitted he had met some who seemed to think socialism would be a "great way to run America."

The September 13, 1962, issue of the Wichita Falls Times quoted Willis Maxine as stating:

> I was not a Communist * * * and I have never distributed the Daily Worker.

Willis Maxine testified, in his slander suit against the Mogans, for nearly 2 hours and admitted he had associated in the past with persons in the Minneapolis, Minn., area who allegedly were members of the Communist Party in the United States. The newspaper reported that Maxine emphatically denied membership in this Communist organization. The newspapers revealed that the Maxines contended in their suit they were discharged as employees of the Wichita Falls Civic Playhouse because of the reports to the playhouse board of directors by the Mogans that they were Communists.

The September 24, 1962, issue of the Wichita Falls Times revealed that a self-admitted former member of the Communist Party had identified Mr. Maxine as "a hard-working member of the Communist Party, one highly trusted by Communist officials, and one who would be considered a 'revolutionist'."

Mrs. Ruth Gordienko, of Minneapolis, Minn., testified on the witness stand in the slander suit and repeatedly contradicted earlier testimony of Willis Maxine. She identified Willis Maxine as the "distributor of the Communist Daily Worker newspapers in the Minneapolis area." Mrs. Gordienko related her personal relationship with Maxine during the years 1952 and 1953, a relationship which allegedly carried the two into several meetings and social functions with top-ranking members of the Communist Party in the United States. She testified:

> Max [the name she used in referring to Maxine] was a member of the Communist Party. I saw him at several of the meetings and he told me he was a Communist. In fact at one time he told me how much he hated stoolpigeons, spies, and persons who worked undercover for the FBI and informed on Communist activities. He said if the Communist Party ever asked him to spy on persons to help the party, he would be glad to do it.

Mrs. Gordienko stated that she was working during the above period as an informant for the FBI. She claimed to have been a member of the Communist Party in Minneapolis in 1948 and 1949 and continued her membership after moving to Winnipeg, Canada. While in Canada, she broke with the party and thereafter worked for the FBI until 1954. When asked whether she knew if Maxine was still a member of the Communist Party, she replied:

> I don't know if he is still a member but he definitely was a member the last time I heard. I understand he did remain in the party.

Mrs. Gordienko's testimony took place on September 14, 1962.

The Wichita Falls Record News of September 15, 1962, reported that the plaintiffs appeared stunned by the defense move of calling Mrs. Gordienko as a witness and when court resumed following the noon recess, George Schatzki, Dallas attorney for the Maxines, filed motions for a mistrial and a continuance, both of which were overruled.

The Wichita Falls Times of September 17, 1962, revealed that the $106,000 slander libel trial of Maxine and his wife against the Mogans ended abruptly on September 17, 1962, when the plaintiffs' motion for dismissal of the suit was granted.

Before moving to Texas in 1960, Willis Maxine was engaged in Communist Party youth work in the Minneapolis area. It was understood that he was to take an active part in organizing a Communist Party youth group in the Minneapolis area which would function along singing or dramatic lines. The original plans did not materialize and it was shortly thereafter that Maxine and his wife moved to Wichita Falls, Tex.

In July 1959, Maxine attended the annual picnic of the Minnesota Freedom of the Press Committee—MFOPC—held at Hastings, Minn. The principal speaker was George Morris, labor editor of the Communist weekly newspaper, "The Worker." The MFOPC was organized in 1952 for the purpose of continually agitating against closing Communist Party offices, arrest of Communist Party leaders and to fight any measures that would stop circulation of the Worker.

On May 2, 1960, Maxine attended a May Day celebration in Minneapolis which was sponsored by the Communist Party. Sam Davis, acting secretary of

the Minnesota-Dakotas district of the Communist Party, delivered the principal address.

While living in Minneapolis, Maxine was a frequent visitor to the residence of Sam Davis and worked with him in connection with Communist Party activities.

In June 1957, Maxine attended a "smelt fry" sponsored by a Communist Party club which was held in Glenwood Park, Minn.

In October 1957, Maxine attended the opening of the North Star Book Shop in Minneapolis at which Hy Lumer, national educational director, CPUSA, was the main speaker.

In December 1955, Maxine attended a "welcome home" party for Martin Mackie, district organizer of the Minnesota district of the Communist Party. Maxine also attended a New Year's Eve party at the residence of Martin Mackie on January 1, 1956.

In May 1956, Maxine attended a May day rally sponsored by the Freedom of the Press Committee, a Communist group, at which the featured speaker was Sam Kushner, labor leader of the Illinois edition of the Worker.

In January 1955, Maxine was observed in St. Paul, Minn., delivering handbills relating to the 31st birthday of the Worker.

In connection with Mary Lee Maxine, nee Mott, she was also associated with Sam Davis with respect to assisting her husband in Communist Party youth activities in Minneapolis area.

Mr. President, these things I have related, along with other unimpeachable information which I have received, produces convincing evidence that Willis Henry Maxine is a dangerous Communist of revolutionary inclinations who is prepared to follow the bidding of Moscow in the conduct of subversive activities, including espionage.

Many good and well-intentioned people—some very conservative and avidly anti-Communist—came to the defense of the Maxines when they were charged with being Communists. If I had not been familiar with the circumstances I may have defended them myself. It seemed highly unlikely that people simply engaged in little theater work should be Communists. Indeed, Mr. President, I was partially responsible for hiring these people and I think my record against communism is well known. It never occurred to me that Communists would seek to subvert an organization that functioned to produce amateur theatricals. This has been a tremendous embarrassment to these good people who defended the Maxines. The intrusion of Communists into my hometown has divided a community. It has placed the existence of a fine cultural organization, the Civic Playhouse—the only outlet for local theatrical talent in my community—in jeopardy. The organization has declined in membership. It is in financial straits. I am hopeful that the people of Wichita Falls will not allow the Communists to secure even such an apparently minor victory by destroying a worthwhile community institution. Now more than ever before they should rally to its support.

The Mogans—public spirited citizens—have incurred heavy legal fees as a result of the Maxines litigation. The Maxines, as late as yesterday were still living in Wichita Falls, still at large, spreading dissension and imposing themselves on innocent people.

What has happened in Wichita Falls is just one example of how Communist Party members can be a destructive force in this country. It is another example that gives the lie to the arguments raised by some that the existence of the Communist Party, because it is small in number, constitutes no threat to the peace and security of our country.

Again, Mr. President, I implore the Justice Department to initiate a program of vigorous rooting out and prosecution of Communists in the United States.

BENEFITS FOR COLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] in cosponsoring the bill to provide benefits for cold war veterans. I represent a well-deserved step in the direction of recognition for those American servicemen who are serving in areas of cold-war danger throughout the world. Although we are certainly not engaged in a worldwide hot war today, there is equally no doubt that Americans are being killed around the globe, but particularly in South Vietnam, in the course of conflicts which are essentially activities of warfare. In increasing insurance and other benefits, this bill provides for a wider recognition of the service these men are giving their country today.

Mr. President, I would, however, like to make the point that this bill would appear to apply only to areas or parts of the world that are designated as "areas of hostility." Personally, I would be inclined to think that in some branches of the service, such as SAC or Polaris submarine duty, the nature of the service is so much a part of the cold war and the dangers faced are so exceptional that some provision should be made for these men even though they may not be technically in an "area of hostility." I would certainly hope that in further consideration of the bill, this matter would also be considered and possibly some amendments adopted.

GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS TODAY: DOES THE REALITY CONFORM TO THE MYTH?—ADDRESS BY CLARK M. CLIFFORD

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made recently at Washington University by one of the university's distinguished alumni, one of the Nation's most prominent citizens, Clark M. Clifford.

Mr. Clifford, who served so ably as Counsel to President Truman, who has helped in many other governmental capacities, and who understands the Government as well as anyone I know, in or out of Government, has devoted his very logical mind to an analysis of big government, big business, and big labor, resulting in this fine and thoughtful speech which in my opinion merits the attention of the Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS TODAY: DOES THE REALITY CONFORM TO THE MYTH?

(Address by Clark M. Clifford to the Washington University assembly on the occasion of Founders Week, celebrating the 110th anniversary of Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.)

It is with a sense of deep satisfaction and gratification that I return to my alma mater on the occasion of her 110th anniversary. I pay homage to those who have gone before who have brought her to her present high estate, and to those present here who shall carry on her sacred traditions and cherish her honor and renown.

During World War II and the tense years which have followed, Americans have come to understand how prophetic was Winston Churchill's comment that the West was faced with "long-drawn trials of vigilance and exertion." Our trials indeed have been long drawn. They have seemed in fact almost interminable, as crisis has followed crisis in unending and unrelieved succession.

We find ourselves committed to a titantic struggle with communism, nonetheless mortal because both sides seek to avoid resolving the issue by resort to mutual cremation. We are confronted by nations and ideologies committed to imperialism, constantly probing for weaknesses, constantly encroaching, seeking every means to expand their control over the world's human and material resources.

Even though we are preoccupied with foreign relations and our national defense, more and more thoughtful people have come to recognize that the outcome of this struggle will ultimately depend to a great extent upon our economic strength. For the foreseeable future, our economy must sustain the burden of an armament budget exceeding $50 billion a year. It must provide employment for a labor force growing in size, skill, and expectation. It must support a technology which will produce not only superior weapons but also commercial products which are competitive with those of foreign countries with lower cost labor.

Thus we are entering a period when our economic system will be subjected to its greatest strain. Because I believe so deeply in our free enterprise system, I consider its preservation a vital part of the victory we must win in our contest with communism. Yet I know that if we cannot find the means to make that system equal to our Nation's needs, the American people will change the system.

So we must do more than compete with communism. We must win with our techniques, not with theirs, or the victory will be hollow indeed. We must rely on the efforts of free men, working together to solve their problems. And in no area does that joint effort confront more challenging problems than in the relationship between government and business.

THE BUSINESS VIEW OF GOVERNMENT

To understand fully that relationship, we must consider some myths which surround it. No aspect of our society today is the subject of more superstition, oversimplification, or sloganizing. While those in government and those in business are almost equally guilty, let us first consider the beliefs of businessmen about government; how they regard it; what they expect of it.

There is today in the American business community a classical orthodoxy, accepted by many, which includes a familiar litany on government. It runs something like this:

"Government is at best a nuisance; at worst a menace.

"At best it is a nuisance because it is operated by bureaucrats, a class congenitally dense, arrogant, slow, meddling, ignorant, and composed of men who have never met a payroll.

"It is a nuisance because it is expensive, returning little for its cost; a luxury because many of its activities, if necessary at all, could be conducted better and more cheaply by business.

"At worst, government is a menace because of its natural tendency to regulate for the sake of regulating. It is staffed by ambitious men full of impractical, socialistic ideas, bent upon obtaining more and more power.

"Most damning of all, it is antibusiness, and thus opposed to the free enterprise system—foundation of the American way of life."

The essence of this antagonistic view of government is most often expressed as a resentment of government interference in business affairs. It assumes that the dominant aspect of the relationship is the initiative of government, aggressively thrusting itself into the world of business. It is interpreted as unilateral and unprovoked aggression.

Our analysis would be incomplete if we failed to note that many businessmen think they detect the transition of government from nuisance to menace simultaneously with a change from a Republican to a Democratic administration. It is particularly a Democratic administration which is expected to be antibusiness, with the least understanding of business problems, and inclined to the wildest of Socialist experiments. Since we have just completed 2 years of a Democratic administration, let us consider the extent to which the reality of government conforms to this myth.

MYTH VERSUS REALITY

The major legislative undertaking to date by the Kennedy administration was the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, designed primarily to equip the Government to secure the reduction of foreign tariffs and the removal of quantitative restrictions which inhibit the sale of American goods abroad.

It would be difficult to conceive of any endeavor more essential to the future health of American business. Already more than 8 percent of our total output of manufactured and semimanufactured goods is sold abroad. Twelve percent of our total agricultural production is exported, so that 1 out of every 6 acres is producing for oversea consumers. In the case of many industries, the dependence on foreign markets is even more pronounced. As examples, over half of our production of locomotives and a third of all construction, mining, and oilfield machinery and equipment are sold abroad.

For most major industries in the United States the development of foreign markets represents the best hope for substantial increases in production and employment. Rising personal incomes and higher standards of living all over the world are creating an explosion of demand for consumer goods similar to the one we have experienced in this country since World War II.

* * * * *

A second major task which confronted the Government during the last 2 years was establishing a communications satellite system, involving the basic question of whether this system should be owned and operated by the Government or by private industry.

The Kennedy administration, against violent opposition, proposed and vigorously supported ownership of the satellite system by a private corporation. It is to be subject to the normal regulation of a public utility, and the Government is to provide the facilities for launching the satellite on a reimbursable basis.

* * * * *

The third major way in which the present administration demonstrated its attitude toward business was in a series of proposals for changes in the tax laws and related changes in tax regulations.

In 1962 the administration liberalized the rules concerning depreciation and secured legislation providing substantial tax credits for business expenditures for new equipment. It is estimated that these measures are saving business over $2 billion a year in taxes, and significantly increasing the net return on capital investment.

Last month President Kennedy proposed more sweeping changes in the tax laws, calling for a "top-to-bottom reduction in personal and corporate income taxes in 1963—for reducing the tax burden on private income and the tax deterrents to private initiative that have for too long held economic activity in check." In his economic report, the President continued: "Only when we have removed the heavy drag our fiscal system now exerts on personal and business purchasing power and on the financial incentives for greater risk taking and personal effort can we expect to restore the high levels of employment and high rate of growth that we took for granted in the first decade after the war."

I suggest that it would be difficult to express a more concise summary of the view which the business community has advanced since World War II, regarding the effect of high levels of taxation on business and economic growth.

* * * * *

These are examples of a 2-year pattern of major governmental actions which I submit is at complete variance with the orthodox view of government. Is this departure from the expected norm the result of the fact that our country has again produced in a time of crisis a great President, unusually perceptive in dealing with the Nation's problems? Is it the result of the unusual competence and perspicacity of the members of his administration? I believe this is part of the answer, but I suggest that the difference between myth and reality is deeper and more significant.

THE NEW INTERDEPENDENCE

I believe that the relationship between government and business has undergone such changes that the orthodox business view of government is now archaic and inadequate. It does not do justice to, nor is it worthy of, the scientific, financial and managerial brilliance of the American business community.

One hundred and ten years ago, when our university was founded, the scope of governmental activity and the effect of governmental action were still very limited. At the same time, the scope and effect of a decision by any single business enterprise were also strictly limited. Ours was still a nation of small farms, of small towns, of small industries, of self-sufficiency, of great numbers of sources of almost every product the consumer used.

It should hardly be necessary even to comment on how changed is the world in which we live today. It is true that government has a greater role in the affairs of business, but this is the result not of aggression, but of necessity, arising out of the complex interdependence of modern society.

The orthodox business ideology on the relationship of government and business sees the growing role of government as a trend to be reversed. I submit that the trend is inevitable and irreversible, and a political or propaganda program to get the Government out of business is foredoomed to fail. Its goal is as hopeless of achievement as would be a decision by politicians to end the Government's dependence on business for the accomplishment of critical national objectives. The two are permanently wedded in a partnership of necessity.

THE RESPONSE OF BUSINESS

If, as evidence of the past 2 years suggests, government is displaying a responsible and constructive concern for the problems of business; if it is consciously pursuing policies designed to enlarge business opportunities and insure business growth, what response is our society justified in expecting from business?

We ask primarily that the cobwebs of past folklore be brushed away; that the cliches be buried, once and for all, in order that we may solve the problems of our common survival. We fear that "like the army which plans the next war with the weapons of the last," business is today "in danger of facing its future armed only with the slogans of its past." [1]

An appropriate beginning to a more constructive relationship between government and business would be to explore the area of agreement on revision of our tax laws. It is an appropriate place to start because taxation is the governmental activity which exerts the broadest effect upon business decisions and business prospects.

Is the subject of taxes one about which government and business are doomed to disagree? One might assume that the President's current tax proposals would sweep away at a single stroke much of the suspicion and antagonism of business toward government, but apparently some in the business community are not so easily persuaded.

How much evidence of good faith does business require of government before it will join in a common effort to reach an agreed objective? Wise revision of our tax laws can be accomplished only with the constructive advice and counsel of the business community, offered in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, trust and forbearance. No proposals for broad changes in our tax laws could be made which would not include controversial elements, but differences over details must not be permitted to prevent our achieving the agreed objective.

I recognize that some businessmen oppose tax reduction if it results in a larger national deficit. But since we apparently face a deficit, regardless of the decision on tax revision, this is essentially a question of the level of Government spending. It is a problem which, at least for the time being, must be dealt with separately because of the traditional organization of the Congress. Expenditures are determined in the appropriation process, handled by entirely different committees than those which write the tax laws. It is the appropriation committees to whom business should present its proposals for reducing spending.

AREAS OF CHALLENGE

I hope that I do not leave the impression that the barriers to a constructive relationship have been erected entirely by business, for this is not the case. Government, too, must contribute reason and effort to remove antagonism and friction, particularly that engendered by government's role as a regulator of business activity.

The need for a better relationship between government and business is nowhere more

---

[1] This warning was originally addressed to labor. Joseph A. Beirne, "New Horizons for American Labor" (Washington, D.C., 1962), p. 16.

urgent than between regulated businesses and the regulatory commissions. An indispensable element of such improvement is for government to encourage a more open and frank exchange of views between industry and these agencies. We must also reconsider the traditional exclusion of the regulatory commissions from the formulation of proposed national policies by the executive branch of Government. The commissions must be exposed to ideas, to expertise, to experience, for wise policy cannot be made in a vacuum. There is no reason that consultation with either the regulated industry or other Government departments should compromise in any way the independence which Congress has sought to confer upon the regulatory commissions.

The more sweeping and significant regulatory power of the Government is that which touches all business, restraining certain types of conduct by any business enterprise. The primary area of such regulation is that established by our antitrust laws.

As our economy becomes more complex, there is increasing conflict between business and the agencies responsible for antitrust enforcement and trade regulation. Many have become convinced that our present antitrust laws are outmoded and inconsistent.

This legislation was the product of a different age. The Sherman Antitrust Act was passed in 1890, for a nation of 63 million people, producing annually goods and services worth less than 14 billion of today's dollars. This is a total national product that is less than the sales of the General Motors Corp. last year.

The original act was broadly designed to protect competition and forbid monopoly. Experience under the Sherman Act led to the Clayton Act of 1914, which was intended to prevent monopoly in its incipiency by preventing practices which might lead to an end to competition.

These laws are basically consistent in purpose, however unfortunate may have been their application in a particular case. But beginning with some provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936, we began a system of government regulation wholly inconsistent with the belief in competition.

Why then have not these conflicting provisions been reconciled? Why has not this whole body of law been rationalized and modernized? Because, unfortunately, there exists in government a hard core subscribing to an orthodoxy no less rigorous than that of business; and the antitrust laws constitute its bible. This orthodoxy is not really antimonopoly so much as it is antibigness.

There is an urgent need for recognition of the chaotic state of our present laws, and for a willingness to reconsider the purposes and methods of antitrust policy.

I believe that the President of the United States could render an invaluable contribution toward removing a major area of antagonism and misunderstanding between Government and business if he would appoint a broadly constituted commission to study the antitrust laws and recommend to the Congress new standards of antitrust policy designed to meet the radically different problems of the mid-20th century.

GOVERNMENT, INDUSTRY, AND LABOR

Another major source of antagonism between government and business is government's role in labor-management relations. Business has traditionally resented the intrusion of Government into this field, and more recently labor has become almost as sensitive to it. The time has now come when both industry and labor must seriously consider the changes in our society which have radically altered the impact of labor-management decisions.

Government is concerned both with labor peace, and with the broader question of the effect of wage and price decisions on the economy. Its activities, therefore, involve efforts, first, to secure a settlement of disputes without work stoppages which would seriously damage the Nation; and second, to influence the terms of such a settlement so that they are in accord with broad economic policy objectives. These two types of governmental intervention raise entirely different problems.

Secretary of Labor Wirtz has rightly concluded that "public tolerance for strikes is diminishing rapidly." He further stated: "It is more frequently true now, than it used to be, that a shutdown will hurt the public badly before it hurts one party to it or the other enough that someone has to cry 'uncle'." [2]

A far-sighted labor leader predicts: "If it becomes impossible to seal off an area of dispute, then government must exercise its sovereignty in the interest of the whole." [3]

Under existing laws, after the parties have bargained without settlement, after the dispute has been mediated without success, after a strike has been enjoined while tempers cool and the facts of the dispute are determined and aired—if after all this, no settlement has been reached—we have no means to prevent a strike or lockout.

What would be our response to a strike by a single union that would stop all rail or truck or air transportation overnight? How long could we last before we faced acute shortages of food and fuel and raw materials? Before plants closed down? Before all construction stopped? Do we not need a new law to give the President a wider range of alternatives in dealing with critical labor disputes that affect our welfare and security? Have we not reached the point where, if all else fails to resolve such disputes, one of the weapons available must be binding arbitration of the issues?

Industry and labor could still insure primary reliance on the private decisionmaking process. They can do so by a more imaginative effort to prevent their problems from reaching the stage that necessitates governmental intervention.

Entirely different issues are presented by the Government's concern over the broader effects upon the Nation's economy of wage and price decisions in basic industries. This issue may arise in labor-management disputes over wages, or in management decisions on prices.

Government must not lose sight of the fact that we have no standards other than opinion as to what wage and price policies best serve the Nation's economic interests. These are matters on which capable men differ widely, and on which we now have no means to arrive at even a definitive consensus, much less ultimate truth. I submit that for this reason the intervention of the Government to affect decisions on wages and prices, and not the fact of settlement, must remain for the foreseeable future a matter of persuasion only, and not of compulsion.

But to reject compulsion should not preclude an interest by government in the negotiation between management and labor over wages. Neither should it preclude an interest by government in price decisions in basic industries.

There is a need for government, business, and labor to create a mechanism for consultation in an effort to reach a consensus on wage and price policies in a calm atmosphere rather than one of crisis. The impact of such decisions on our own economy, and perhaps more urgently, on our ability to compete in world markets, is constantly enlarging the common interest in this area.

THE BASIS FOR COOPERATION

There is every reason to believe that businessmen and public officials can find a meeting ground of mutual purpose. In their contacts, both the government official and the businessman will usually find the other to be a man of integrity and dedication. But more than this, each will find a high percentage of extremely competent individuals in both government and business—with no greater proportion of political hacks than of corporate nephews and cousins.

THE FINAL TEST

In all our efforts to overcome the attitudes and antagonisms of the past, and to forge new, more constructive relationships between government and business, we must recognize that our success or failure would matter very little, were these but petty arguments among ourselves, affecting only the transient efficiency of our economy. Even their setting in a time of economic and military competition with other nations imparts to our problems no cosmic significance. We have given them meaning because of the rules we have imposed upon ourselves, because of the standards by which we choose to judge success.

We have dedicated this Nation not only to being prosperous and powerful, but to being free. We have chosen a democratic society, seeking first the blessings of liberty. We have committed ourselves to the belief that the common good can be achieved without resort to dictation by government.

Our real challenge is whether such a society can, through voluntary restraint and reason, reconcile private and public interests without resort to the harsh restrictions and compulsions of an alien ideology.

Our argument with communism is not over the organization of the means of production, but over the worth and dignity of man. We would have him unfettered, to create, to experiment, to improvise—certain that only thus will we realize the full measure of our potential.

It is this contest the world watches. It is this contest which we can win, but only as free men working together to demonstrate to all mankind that this Nation, so conceived and so dedicated, can indeed endure.

FLORIDA YANKEE SPARKS QUIET LATIN REVOLUTION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by James Russell, business editor of the Miami Herald. This article clearly demonstrates the fallacy of the arguments of those who claim that the economic rehabilitation of Latin America is a hopeless cause.

Furthermore, it clearly demonstrates the great good which can be accomplished in this field by individual initiative and private enterprise. These American virtues which helped to build this country and make it strong are not passé, contrary to much that we hear on the subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Feb. 10, 1963]

BATTLING INFLATION TO CREATE HOMES—FLORIDA YANKEE SPARKS QUIET LATIN REVOLUTION

(By James Russell)

The slow-moving Alliance for Progress might learn a lesson from a virtually unheralded U.S. advisory program that, in less than 5 years, has changed the spending and saving habits of thousands of people in Chile.

---

[2] Address before the National Academy of Arbitrators, Chicago, Ill., Feb. 1, 1963.

[3] Joseph A. Beirne, "New Horizons for American Labor" (Washington, D.C., 1962), p. 17.

But more than that, it has helped arrest one of the wildest inflations in the Western Hemisphere and has made homeowners of Latin Americans who previously had little or no hope of ever owning the place they lived in.

No U.S. Government bureaucrat engineered this feat. Practically the whole program is the brainchild and the achievement of an outspoken Miami Beach savings and loan executive who takes a curious delight in pursuing ambitious projects that pay him nothing more than standard Government consultants' fees.

The Yankee sparkplug of Chile's new savings and loan system is Arthur Courshon, 41, a World War II bomber pilot who is chairman of the board of directors of Washington Federal Savings & Loan Association.

This impressive title would suggest that Courshon spends all his working hours in the big cushioned chair of his paneled office on Miami Beach or in a board room conferring about lofty economic matters.

Instead, much of his time is spent touring Latin American countries, writing voluminous reports for congressional committees, and serving on such unlikely boards as the Sam Rayburn Foundation and the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission—to which President Kennedy recently named him.

But Courshon's pet project is the Chilean savings and loan system. He started it in 1958, acting as technical adviser to the U.S. Operations Mission in Santiago.

What he found on his first trip to Chile would have discouraged many a man, however noble his purpose.

"Chile was still in the grip of a runaway inflation," Courshon wrote in a report to a Senate subcommittee. "It destroyed any incentive on the part of the people to save in Chilean currency and destroyed any business incentive to make long-term loans for housing or any other purpose."

The average interest rate then, on a 1-year loan, was 17 percent a year, of which 11 percent was aimed at covering the erosion of the currency by inflation. Houses just weren't being built. Nobody could borrow money on a long-term basis.

Courshon, working with Chileans, devised a plan that tied dividend rates on savings and interest rates on home loans to an inflationary index, much in the way some unions in the United States have escalator clauses in wage contracts.

This provided the incentive needed to make Chileans put money in savings accounts, which, in turn, built up a supply of mortgage money for home loans. The plan actually worked—and worked well.

Since its start from scratch less than 5 years ago, 22 savings and loan associations have sprung up in Chile. Last year they loaned out more than $10 million that financed more than 3,100 homes. Some mortgage loans were made for 20 years and interest rates ran around 6 percent—which is what they are in the United States.

It is not the wealthy class that is doing most of the borrowing. The average borrower and home buyer earns less than $200 a month. Through the savings program and other measures, Chile's rampant inflation has slowed to a more respectable level.

Direction of the program was done on the spot by a Washington Federal executive, Mario Schram, who next month will complete a 2-year stay in the South American Republic. Courshon still shuttles back and forth between Miami and Chile keeping tabs on the project. He also brings Chileans to Miami to train them in U.S. savings and loan techniques. Six of them are doing that very thing here this week.

The program has been no easy task. Courshon had to overcome a traditional Latin mañana (wait until tomorrow) attitude as well as an inflation problem.

He used a method that many an American businessman in Latin America is reluctant to follow for fear of ruffling the Latins' feelings. Courshon is direct, determined, and doesn't mind sacrificing a little tact and diplomacy to get action.

When a Chilean savings and loan official suggested that Chile not be called an underdeveloped country in a Courshon report to Washington, he stood his ground.

"That's a word they understand in Washington," he explained. "If I substituted something else, it might serve the cause of diplomacy, but it wouldn't get my point across to the people who have the authority."

Having proved by deeds that privately financed homeownership is feasible in Chile, Courshon now is urging similar programs for other nations the United States is helping.

His latest comprehensive report to a congressional committee, this one to Senator JOHN SPARKMAN's Subcommittee on Housing, asks for creation of an International Home Loan Bank that would help create savings and loan firms in other underdeveloped countries of the world.

GOOD CITIZENSHIP GOLD MEDAL AWARDED TO DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a member of the Sons of the American Revolution, I am much pleased to announce to the Senate that this year the Philadelphia-Continental Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution awarded to the Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, the annual gold Good Citizenship Medal.

I am sure every Member of the Senate will share my pleasure in making this announcement, because I think there is no question about the fact that the Chaplain is truly beloved by all Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter to Dr. Harris from Earl M. Richards, president of the Philadelphia-Continental Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution, dated November 28, 1962, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

It is this letter that announces the plan that the Philadelphia-Continental Chapter is to make the award of the gold Good Citizenship Medal to Reverend Harris.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement of the citation from the chapter setting forth the reasons for selecting Dr. Harris as the recipient of the award, dated February 23, 1963.

There being no objection, the letter and citation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA-CONTINENTAL CHAPTER,
SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
Philadelphia, Pa., November 28, 1962.

DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS,
Chaplain, U.S. Senate, The Westchester, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. HARRIS: As you probably know, the Sons of the American Revolution is composed of men whose forefathers fought and died to make our country free. Our chapter, the Philadelphia-Continental Chapter, is located at the spot where the Declaration of Independence was signed, the Constitution was written, the first Capital of the United States—Philadelphia.

The outstanding event of the year of our chapter is our Washington's Birthday luncheon. On this occasion it has been our privilege to have as our guest speaker an American citizen who has rendered an outstanding service to our country in protecting the liberty so dearly won by our forefathers. At this time we present the speaker with our gold Good Citizenship Medal.

This medal has been presented to President Hoover, General Bradley, and General Patton, Admiral Byrd, and Admiral Halsey, to mention only a few.

For our luncheon scheduled for Saturday, February 23, our chapter has instructed me, as the newly elected president, to ask you to be that speaker and, in turn, to present you with the medal.

If you can arrange to be with us we would appreciate it if you would advise us promptly so that we can make the appropriate preparations.

Sincerely yours,

EARL M. RICHARDS,
President.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
February 23, 1963.

DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS,
Chaplain of the Senate of the United States:

Under authority granted me by the board of management of the Philadelphia-Continental Chapter of the American Revolution, it is my privilege to present to you our highest award, our gold Good Citizenship Medal. We do this in recognition of the following:

1. Your outstanding service for 18 years as the spiritual leader of one of the most distinguished legislative bodies in the world—the Senate of the United States of America.

2. Your leadership and participation in furthering the word of God.

3. Your prominence as a lecturer and an author as exemplified by the four volumes of prayers published as an official document of the Senate and by your syndicated newspaper column "Spires of the Spirit."

4. Your deeds that brought international recognition such as when President Eisenhower chose you as his special representative at the inauguration of Syngman Rhee in Korea and as when the three leading political parties in Great Britain gave a luncheon in your honor at the House of Commons.

5. "Your significant utterances on freedom" for which you have been accorded the unusual honor of six awards from the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge.

6. Your immeasurable contributions and untiring efforts toward furthering the principles upon which our Nation was founded. Your deeds and actions are outstanding examples of the objectives of this society, which is dedicated to the purpose of perpetuating and inspiring the active practice and demonstration of those ideals and principles which influenced and guided the founders of this Republic and upon which the future of our Nation depends.

With this Good Citizenship Medal we bestow upon you our admiration and esteem and through it we express tangibly our regard for the outstanding quality of your citizenship.

EARL M. RICHARDS,
President, Philadelphia-Continental Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution.

REPORTS OF ACQUIRING BY FRENCH GOVERNMENT OF U.S. OBLIGATIONS PAYABLE IN GOLD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, several days ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an inquiry I had sent to Treasury Secretary Dillon concerning reports that the French Government was acquiring

U.S. obligations for which it could demand payment in gold.

I have now received a reply from Secretary Dillon, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the article by Charles Coombs, of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, to which Mr. Dillon's letter makes reference.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1963.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WAYNE: In answer to the questions in your letter of February 14, in which you refer to news reports of increasing French holdings of U.S. Government securities and of French efforts to encourage demands on our gold reserves, I am happy to give you the facts.

As a consequence of French balance of payments surpluses in recent years, French reserves have risen to $3,744 million, of which $2,626 million is in gold and $1,118 million in foreign exchange, mostly in dollars. In turn, as is the case with virtually all foreign governmental and central bank holdings of dollars, the French holdings are almost entirely invested in short-term Treasury securities. These U.S. Government obligations give foreign governments both the liquidity they need for their reserves and some earnings in the form of interest.

These French holdings of dollar claims can be converted into gold for legitimate monetary purposes, as can those of other governments and central banks. This readiness of the U.S. Government to back its international obligations with gold, which has long been established policy and has been reaffirmed without qualification by President Kennedy, is the basis for the position of the dollar as the leading reserve currency of the international financial mechanism.

This special position of the dollar has been recognized by the major countries of the free world, and they have shown themselves ready and willing to help maintain the soundness of the gold-exchange system of international payments. France, like the other major countries, has played a full and responsible part in making this system work. Despite rumors and reports, every indication we have had is that the French will continue to do so.

In 1962, it should be noted, the French balance-of-payments surplus was about $1.3 billion. With these funds, France made debt prepayments to the U.S. Government totaling $470 million, converted $460 million into gold, and added $205 million to foreign exchange reserves. The remainder was used largely to prepay outstanding indebtedness to Canada and the World Bank.

At the time of the most recent French debt prepayment to the United States last December, in the amount of about $117 million, I noted our appreciation for that action and stated my view that France was again demonstrating acceptance of its responsibilities as a creditor country and further evidencing the spirit of international financial cooperation among the major nations of the free world which is contributing so much to the strengthening of the free world's international financial system. That statement is equally as valid today.

While the basic problem posed by the accumulation of claims on our gold stock in the hands of foreigners cannot be fully resolved until our balance of payments is freed from the persistent deficits of the past few years, the U.S. Government, in cooperation with the governments and central banks of other nations having convertible currencies, has put into effect a number of arrangements to deal with the effects of short-term flows of capital, any speculative disruptions in the market, or other events that might possibly lead to sudden calls on our gold stock. I believe you will find that these arrangements, which have been discussed in the enclosed article by Mr. Coombs of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, constitute an impressive bulwark to defend the dollar, as well as other currencies.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

[From Federal Reserve Bulletin, September 1962]

TREASURY AND FEDERAL RESERVE FOREIGN EXCHANGE OPERATIONS

(NOTE.—This joint interim report reflects the Treasury-Federal Reserve policy of making available additional information on foreign exchange operations from time to time. The Federal Reserve Bank of New York acts as agent for both the Treasury and the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System in the conduct of foreign exchange operations. This report was prepared by Charles A. Coombs, vice president in charge of the foreign department of the New York Reserve Bank. It covers the period March 1961–August 1962.)

The resumption of foreign exchange operations by the U.S. Treasury in March 1961 and by the Federal Reserve System in February 1962 has been part of a cooperative effort by Treasuries and central banks on both sides of the Atlantic to create a first line of defense against disorderly speculation in the foreign exchange markets. Recognizing that the dollar is the cornerstone of the entire international currency system, this cooperative effort has mainly taken the form of arrangements between the United States and other leading industrial countries adapted to the special needs of the countries involved. Continuous, close consultation among all of the Treasuries and central banks concerned has avoided any conflicts of policy or operations within the group as a whole.

BACKGROUND TO OPERATIONS

Under fair weather conditions, speculation can and does play a highly useful role in the foreign exchange market by helping to correct temporary deviations of spot and forward rates from the levels appropriate to underlying payment trends. Thus a decline in the spot or forward rate of one currency resulting from a temporary market imbalance may stimulate new demand for that currency by alert traders expecting a rebound in the rates.

On the other hand, when the exchange markets become seriously unsettled by political or economic uncertainties, normally beneficial speculation may quickly become transformed into a perverse, and sometimes even sinister, force. The latter type of speculation may be motivated, on the one hand, either by a natural desire to protect capital values or, on the other hand, by the prospect of a quick capital gain. In such periods of market anxiety, abrupt declines in the spot or forward rate for a given currency may take on a grossly exaggerated significance, the exchange market may become a prey of purely imaginary fears, and selling or buying pressures on the exchanges may quickly acquire cumulative force. Even minor speculative squalls may have disturbing effects upon the normal flow of trade and payments, while very severe attacks have on occasion forced governments into unwanted changes of currency parities.

Official foreign intervention in markets: Although foreign central banks have for many years intervened in their foreign exchange markets to protect their currencies against speculative disturbances, the United States had refrained from such operations from the end of World War II until early 1961. This difference of approach goes back to the Bretton Woods Agreements. Under the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund, member countries agreed to establish par values for their currencies in terms of gold or the U.S. dollar and to limit fluctuations in their exchange rates to no more than 1 percent above or below the par value. In many cases, foreign countries have fulfilled their obligation to the International Monetary Fund by purchasing or selling U.S. dollars against their own currencies in order to keeep their exchange rates from rising above the "ceiling" or falling below the "floor." Foreign central banks may also operate in the exchange markets between the margins, and many central banks do so to prevent sharp movements in the rates. As the exchange rate moves upward (or downward) a country may buy (or sell) dollars against its currency to slow the rate movement, or even to halt it completely at some point within the official margins. Such purchases and sales, by ironing out sharp fluctuations in rates, help to maintain orderly conditions in the exchange markets, thereby facilitate the flow of trade and payments and contribute materially to the maintenance of confidence in currencies.

Foreign official intervention on the exchanges is generally conducted through purchases and sale of U.S. dollars, the principal reserve currency. Such exchange intervention results in changes in official holdings of dollars, increasing them when the demand for the foreign currency is strong and reducing them when demand is weak. Most major countries hold only a part of their reserves in dollars—sometimes a very small part; the rest are held mainly in gold. If exchange intervention is undertaken on a large scale, such countries may acquire more dollars than they wish to hold; if so, they will convert their excess dollars into gold. Conversely they may have to sell gold to acquire the dollars necessary for support operations.

Role of dollar convertibility into gold: The willingness of foreign central banks to acquire and hold dollars as part of their reserves depends on the assured convertibility of such dollars into gold at a fixed price. As part of the Bretton Woods system, this assurance is provided by the United States, which undertakes to maintain a fixed par value for the dollar by standing ready to buy or sell gold against dollars at a fixed price of $35 per ounce in whatever amounts may be requested by foreign monetary authorities. This system of defining and maintaining the parity of the dollar in terms of gold, while the parities of other currencies are maintained by buying and selling dollars, has greatly encouraged the development of an international gold exchange standard. Under this system the United States serves as banker for the dollar exchange reserves, now more than $11 billion, of 82 countries throughout the world.

As banker for the international currency system, the role of the United States until recent years has been largely passive. Although foreign central banks resisted declines in their currency rates toward their floors, they had no obligation or incentive to resist similar declines in the dollar against their own currencies. As the dollar came under pressure from time to time in world exchange markets, the dollar rate therefore tended to slip to the floor. At this point foreign central banks would then fulfill their obligation to take the surplus supply of dollars off the market. If they wished, they would then convert part or all of these dollars into gold.

Currency crisis of 1960: This passive stance by the United States, in which both the rates for the dollar against foreign currencies and the accumulation of dollar reserves by foreign central banks were left entirely to market forces, and to the unilateral decisions of foreign monetary authorities, gave rise to no serious problems for many years after the war. By 1960, however, successive U.S. balance-of-payments deficits had brought about both heavy gold losses and sizable increases in our dollar liabilities to foreigners. At this point, the dollar became subject to rumors of impending changes in U.S. international financial policy, with widespread doubts developing abroad as to whether the U.S. Government could and would maintain the $35 price for gold.

The resultant wave of speculation against the dollar was effectively stemmed in early 1961 by a Presidential pledge to maintain the gold price, to make our entire gold reserve available to defend the dollar, and, if necessary, to draw upon the IMF as a supplementary source of reserves. Most fundamental of all, of course, was announcement of action to correct the balance-of-payments deficit, and this program has subsequently shown gradual but solid results.

Effects of revaluation of mark and guilder: Meanwhile, the recovery of confidence in the dollar remained vulnerable to sudden shocks, and these were not long in coming. On the weekend of March 4, 1961, the German Government announced the upward revaluation of the mark by 5 percent. Shortly after that the Netherlands Government announced a similar change in the guilder parity.

However, effective these moves may ultimately prove to be as a contribution to international balance of payments equilibrium, their immediate effect was a shattering blow to market confidence in the system of fixed currency parities. All major currencies immediately became labeled as candidates for either revaluation or devaluation, and an unparalleled flood of speculative funds swept across the exchanges.

Speculation on a revaluation of the Swiss franc became particularly intense, with the result that more than $300 million flowed into that country in 4 days. Most of the dollars acquired by the Swiss National Bank and other continental financial centers were the counterpart of a major speculative attack on sterling, with the Bank of England suffering heavy reserve losses.

At this critical juncture, the central bank governors attending the monthly meeting of the Bank for International Settlements in Basle announced that their central banks were cooperating in the exchange markets. The scale of this cooperation in credits to the Bank of England reached a total of more than $900 million and played a vital role in providing a breathing space during which more fundamental measures could be taken by the British Government.

TREASURY INTERVENTION IN THE MARKET

Although the dollar emerged relatively unscathed from the first speculative attacks, the massive reshuffling of foreign-owned funds resulted in heavy accumulations of dollars by certain foreign central banks, with the possible consequence of sizable drains upon U.S. gold reserves. Anticipations of a second revaluation of the German mark generated a continuing heavy flow of funds to Frankfurt, with the result that the dollar reserves of the German Federal Bank rose to $4.1 billion by March 31 as compared with its gold reserves of $3.2 billion.

Operations in German marks: The disruptive effect of such speculation on the normal flow of German trade and payments was reflected in a scramble by non-Germans with contractual liabilities in marks to anticipate their requirements. Meanwhile German residents sought to hedge against contracts payable to them in dollars or other foreign currencies. The forward exchange market could hardly cope with such an abrupt swing in expectations, with the result that the premium on the forward mark or, viewed the other way, the discount on the forward dollar, rose to nearly 4 percent. At that exaggerated level it tended to reinforce expectations of a further revaluation of the mark.

The limited availability of forward cover, even at such expensive rates, diverted commercial hedging demands into foreign purchases of spot marks to cover future mark contracts and German borrowing of dollars, both in New York and in the Euro-dollar market, as a hedge against dollar receivables. The resultant shift of the leads and lags in commercial payments against the dollar and in favor of the mark created a potentially dangerous situation. This situation became the subject of conversations on Friday, March 10, 1961, among officials of the German Federal Bank, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, and U.S. Treasury. There emerged the decision to undertake on the following Monday, March 13, forward sales of marks in the New York market by the New York Federal Reserve Bank as agent of the U.S. Treasury, with the dual objective of providing an ample supply of forward marks as an alternative to anticipatory purchases of spot marks by foreigners and dollar borrowing by Germans, and in the process, of driving down the forward premium on the mark as closely as possible to the 1 percent level.

These forward sales of marks by the U.S. Treasury were undertaken under a parallel arrangement, generously suggested by the German Federal Bank, which agreed to supply the U.S. Treasury with marks (should they be needed), at the time the contracts matured, at the same rate as that at which the marks had been sold by the U.S. Treasury. In effect, the U.S. Treasury's forward commitments were entirely protected against any risk of loss. Forward operations undertaken under this arrangement were later supplemented by forward sales by the U.S. Treasury on the basis of $100 million equivalent of German marks obtained by the United States under the $587 million German debt repayment in April 1961.

Table 1 illustrates the scope and pattern of the Treasury's forward mark operations. From March 13 to the end of the month, the Treasury forcefully resisted the speculative inflow to Germany by selling over $118 million equivalent of marks for delivery in 3 months. Market demand for forward marks then gradually declined, perhaps partly owing to the reassuring effect of official operations on so sizable a scale. But by mid-June the outstanding forward mark commitments of the U.S. Treasury had risen to $340 million.

TABLE 1.—*Treasury forward operations in German marks, March–December 1961*

[Dollar equivalent, in millions]

Month	Future commitments (beginning of month)	New sales (during month)	Maturing contracts not renewed (during month)	Future commitments (end of month)	Premium on 3-month forward mark (percent per annum, end of month)
March	----------	118.7	----------	118.7	1.47
April	118.7	104.4	----------	223.1	1.59
May	223.1	78.4	----------	301.5	1.39
June	301.5	52.8	−86.5	267.8	2.21
July	267.8	32.9	−98.1	202.6	1.45
August	202.6	12.7	−89.3	126.0	1.02
September	126.0	.3	−76.6	49.7	.88
October	49.7	----------	−35.5	14.2	.76
November	14.2	----------	−14.0	.2	.80
December	.2	----------	−.2	----------	1.04

As the first of the forward contracts began to mature, the tide turned and the spot dollar rate gradually rose off the floor to which it had been pinned for many months. The improvement in the spot dollar rate was attributable in part to a market demand for dollars required to pay the U.S. Treasury for the forward mark purchases previously contracted for. Coordinated intervention by the German Federal Bank and the U.S. Treasury in the spot mark market also helped to strengthen the dollar rate.

With the crisis of confidence more or less weathered, it seemed desirable to allow the forward premium on the mark to rise somewhat, thereby increasing the cost of forward cover and further dampening commercial hedging demand. As a consequence, the Treasury's outstanding balance of the forward mark commitments declined rapidly after mid-June as the daily rate of new sales fell far below maturing contracts. In September, in a market also strongly influenced by the Berlin crisis, forward sales were discontinued entirely as a normal flow of forward marks from private sources reappeared. By early December the Treasury's forward mark commitments had been fully liquidated.

By thus offsetting a large-scale flow of speculative funds that proved to be reversible within 9 months, the U.S. Treasury operations in forward marks clearly helped both the United States and Germany. The short-term capital outflow from the United States was held down, and the U.S. payments deficit thereby reduced, while the German Federal Bank could restrain its dollar accumulations from becoming too large and also prevent the German money market from being flooded with a heavy volume of liquid funds. More generally, the forward mark operation apparently calmed a badly shaken exchange market, which needed time and the assurance of intergovernmental cooperation to recover confidence.

As previously mentioned, the U.S. Treasury had acquired, in April 1961, $100 million in marks as part of a German Government debt payment totaling $587 million. While about half of this mark balance was used to settle forward contracts maturing in the fall of 1961, the remainder was converted into dollars in September to make final payment to the U.S. lending agencies concerned.

The experience with the forward mark operation had proved sufficiently encouraging, however, to suggest that the U.S. Treasury might usefully acquire moderate amounts of spot marks when that currency temporarily weakened late in 1961. These mark acquisitions by the U.S. Treasury reached a total of approximately $55 million equivalent and have been employed in several operations during the first half of 1962 to support the dollar rate during periods of temporary pressure. These operations have not only proved useful in producing the desired firming of the dollar rate but have also proved reversible. Later strengthening of the dollar rate has permitted replenishment of earlier drafts on the Treasury's mark balances.

Operations in Swiss francs: The second major exchange operation initiated by the U.S. Treasury during 1961 was in forward

Swiss francs. The March 1961 revaluations of the German mark and Dutch guilder resulted in a burst of speculation on a similar revaluation of the Swiss franc and a heavy flow of short-term speculative funds to Switzerland. This influx created a serious problem of excessive liquidity on the Swiss money market while also raising the dollar exchange reserves of the Swiss National Bank far above traditional levels.

These dollar acquisitions by the Swiss National Bank could have been converted immediately into gold by purchases from the U.S. Treasury. But in the interests of international financial cooperation, the Swiss National Bank refrained from effecting such conversions in order to loan back to the Bank of England a large proportion of the dollar inflow to Switzerland.

There was in near prospect, however, the likelihood of a massive British Government drawing from the International Monetary Fund which would result in a liquidation of the short-term credits received by the Bank of England from the Swiss National Bank and other European central banks. Accordingly, the Swiss National Bank seemed likely to convert large amounts of surplus dollar holdings into gold unless some means could be found to stimulate an outflow of private funds from Switzerland.

The basic obstacle to such an outflow of private funds from Switzerland came from the lingering fears and hopes of many private individuals that the Swiss franc would somehow or other provide a safer haven than other currencies against a wide range of political, military, and financial risks. But it had become quite clear to both Swiss and U.S. central bank officials that the hot money inflow into Switzerland was disguising a significant deterioration in the basic balance of payments of Switzerland and that, when some recovery of confidence in currency parities reappeared, a cessation of this hot money inflow would result in a strengthening of the dollar against the Swiss franc and in drains on the gold and dollar reserves of the Swiss National Bank. Thus, the piling up of hot money in Swiss commercial banks was essentially a temporary, reversible phenomenon that might properly be dealt with by compensatory action by the two central banks concerned.

After extensive discussions among officials of the U.S. Treasury, the New York Federal Reserve Bank, and the Swiss National Bank, it appeared that a useful start could be made in offsetting such temporary inflows of hot money by providing adequate incentives to the reexport of private investment funds from Switzerland on a hedged, or covered, basis. Partly because of speculative fears or hopes of a revaluation of the Swiss franc, the premium on the forward Swiss franc had risen to roughly 1¾ percent at which levels it was prohibitively costly to cover short-term placements in New York, London, or other financial markets abroad.

Consequently, in July 1961 the U.S. Treasury agreed to supply through the agency of the Swiss National Bank forward Swiss francs to the market at rates sufficiently attractive to induce the Swiss commercial banks and other short-term investors to move funds into the dollar market. These forward operations were begun in a limited, experimental fashion on the basis of relatively small Swiss franc balances previously acquired by the U.S. Treasury.

With the emergence of the Berlin crisis in August 1961, however, the problem was complicated by a renewed flow of hot money to Switzerland, and the Treasury accordingly enlarged the scope of its forward operations. To provide a broader base for such operations, the Swiss National Bank agreed to provide a sizable line of credit in Swiss francs to the U.S. Treasury which could be drawn upon by issuance of 3-month certificates of indebtedness carrying a rate of 1¼ percent and denominated in Swiss francs. As the Treasury's forward commitments rose rapidly, it availed itself of its drawing rights to the extent of 200 million Swiss francs ($46 million equivalent) in October 1961. By the end of November the Treasury's forward sales had reached $152.5 million equivalent, which meant a roughly corresponding reduction in the dollar reserves of the Swiss National Bank and in Swiss gold purchases from the U.S. Treasury.

During December the Treasury's forward commitments declined somewhat ($15 million of maturing contracts were paid off by the Treasury rather than renewed). This happened largely because Swiss commercial banks wanted to increase their franc assets for yearend window dressing. New contracts of $9 million equivalent were undertaken at the end of January 1962. And in January and February all contracts were rolled over at maturity, so that by the end of February the Treasury's outstanding forward franc market commitments amounted to $146.5 million equivalent.

In February 1962 the Swiss franc began to weaken, as had been expected with Switzerland's large current-account deficit and the tapering off of the short-term capital inflow. In these circumstances, the Swiss National Bank had to supply dollars to the market and, by the end of May, the New York Federal Reserve Bank as agent of the U.S. Treasury had sold $139 million to the Swiss National Bank.

If the U.S. Treasury had elected to meet these dollar requirements of the Swiss National Bank by accepting Swiss francs in payment, the resultant increase in the Treasury's franc balances would have been adequate to liquidate nearly all of the forward Swiss franc market contracts outstanding. But a rapid liquidation of these forward contracts would have tended to recreate too much liquidity on the Swiss money market. Accordingly, the Swiss National Bank suggested that the U.S. Treasury might accept gold rather than Swiss francs in payment of part of the Swiss dollar requirements. Swiss gold sales to the U.S. Treasury amounted to $74 million. The remaining $65 million required by the Swiss were paid for in Swiss francs.

The Swiss franc balances were gradually used to liquidate $55 million of maturing forward contracts, which by the end of May 1961 were less than $91.5 million equivalent outstanding. The $46 million certificates of indebtedness issued to the Swiss National Bank in the autumn of 1961 were also fully liquidated, as the Treasury found its forward position could be sustained on a smaller cash reserve. In effect, the program of forward sales of Swiss francs, initiated by the U.S. Treasury in July 1961, proved to be a self-liquidating operation, as the swing developing in the Swiss payments position would have permitted nearly complete liquidation of the forward operation within a matter of 10 months. And the forward operations helped both the United States and Switzerland by damping U.S. gold losses from speculative money movements while relieving the Swiss market of too much liquidity.

Unfortunately the pendulum began to swing back. During the latter part of May 1962, capital funds again flowed to Switzerland in response to speculation caused by the Canadian devaluation and by the subsequent sharp decline of the New York stock market. But meanwhile, the financial resources and market techniques available to the U.S. Government had been strongly reinforced by the entrance of the Federal Reserve System into the foreign exchange field. As subsequently outlined, a coordinated program involving the U.S. Treasury, the Federal Reserve System, and the Swiss National Bank succeeded in minimizing the impact of potentially dangerous speculative pressures.

Operations in Netherlands guilders: After the revaluation of the Netherlands guilder on March 7, 1961, the premium on the 3-month forward guilder rose to well over 2 percent and remained there until the end of April. The premium encouraged a further inflow of short-term funds into the Netherlands and deterred any covered outflow.

In this context, early in May the United States and Netherlands authorities discussed whether the United States should intervene in the forward guilder market to reduce the guilder premium to levels more consistent with interest rates on dollar and guilder investments. These discussions between the United States and Netherlands authorities produced their first tangible results in July, when the Netherlands Bank, whose dollar reserves were to be depleted by a large British IMF guilder drawing (for conversion into dollars) in August, agreed to sell spot guilders to the United States and to provide for U.S. investment of these guilders in Dutch Treasury bills. It was agreed that it would be useful for the Treasury to acquire modest guilder balances for possible use in exchange operations in the future. Accordingly, the Netherlands Bank sold $15 million equivalent of guilders to the U.S. Treasury during September.

As expectations of another revaluation of the guilder withered away, the forward guilder premium declined to more normal levels. But toward the end of 1961, rumors questioning the stability of exchange parities and the beginning of continental commercial bank repatriations of funds for yearend window-dressing operations induced a renewed rise in both spot and forward guilder rates. By December 20 the premium on the 3-month forward guilder was again over 2 percent (though moving erratically) and was clearly out of line with comparative interest rates.

Although the premium declined somewhat after the turn of the year, the U.S. Treasury concluded that it might usefully test the market by a small offering of forward guilders which might succeed in nudging the rate down to a more normal level. After further negotiations it was agreed that the Netherlands Bank would sell forward guilders in the market for the Treasury's account.

The sales were first made in January 1962 and reached $20.8 million equivalent by early February. As the availability of forward cover stimulated Netherlands investment demand for short-term placements in New York and other financial markets, the spot guilder rate weakened to about par and, in the process, enabled the U.S. Treasury to acquire more spot guilders from the Netherlands Bank against dollars.

The forward operations were terminated on February 13 as the Netherlands money market had become less liquid, and the U.S. Treasury later liquidated each contract at maturity. The remaining guilder balances of the U.S. Treasury were used to intervene occasionally in the market to slow down a strong rise of the guilder spot rate during the spring months as a result of a tightening of liquidity in the Netherlands financial market. Also a sizable foreign exchange inflow was expected as a result of the Philips Lamp stock issue.

Operations in Italian lire: A continuing surplus in Italy's balance of payments has made the Italian lira one of the strongest continental currencies. From mid-April 1961 until the present the lira has usually remained at its upper limit against the dollar.

In these circumstances, in late 1961 discussions began on the possibility of U.S. Treasury operations in the lira market. In January 1962 it was agreed that the Treasury would take over a substantial block of forward lire contracts from the Italian foreign exchange office and that the Bank of Italy would simultaneously extend to the Treasury a $150 million line of credit in lire to support such spot as well as forward operations in lire as might appear desirable.

The Treasury made the first drawing on this line of credit on January 26, 1962, when it issued a 3-month certificate of indebtedness for the equivalent of $25 million in lire. It made a second drawing of $50 million in March, and a third drawing of $75 million in August.

Both spot and forward operations by the U.S. Treasury in lire are continuing and have lessened the accumulation of dollar reserves during the recent seasonal inflows to Italy.

BEGINNING OF FEDERAL RESERVE OPERATIONS

While the exchange operations undertaken by the Treasury with the limited resources of its Stabilization Fund had yielded encouraging results, Federal Reserve officials—with the full concurrence of the Treasury—considered whether it might not also be desirable to reactivate Federal Reserve exchange operations. After many months' study, the Federal Open Market Committee on February 13, 1962, authorized open market transactions in foreign currencies.[1]

Currencies involved: Under this authorization, the special manager of the open market account for foreign currency operations received committee approval to inaugurate operations by purchasing from the stabilization fund at market rates the following foreign currencies in order to open accounts with the central banks responsible for these currencies and develop procedures for future operations (table 2).

TABLE 2.—*Federal Reserve purchases of foreign currencies from the U.S. Treasury*

Currency	Dollar equivalent (in millions)
German marks	32.0
Swiss francs	.5
Netherlands guilders	.5
Italian lire	.5

Accounts had previously been opened, and maintained for some years with more or less nominal balances, with the central banks of Canada, Great Britain, and France.

With the authorization of the Committee, the special manager proceeded to negotiate a series of reciprocal credit, or swap, facilities with seven foreign central banks and with the Bank for International Settlements. The amounts and dates of these swap arrangements are shown in table 3.

TABLE 3.—*Federal Reserve reciprocal currency agreements*

Other party to agreement	Amount (in millions of dollars)	Term (in months)	Date (of original agreement)
			1962
Bank of France	50	3	Mar. 1
Bank of England	50	3	May 31
Netherlands Bank	50	3	June 14
National Bank of Belgium	50	6	June 20
Bank of Canada	250	3	[1]June 26
Bank for International Settlements [2]	100	3	July 16
Swiss National Bank	100	3	July 16
German Federal Bank	50	3	Aug. 2
Total for all banks	700		

[1] Announced on Sunday, June 25.

[2] In Swiss francs.

Mechanics of swap arrangements: The details of the swap arrangements varied somewhat from agreement to agreement, reflecting differing institutional arrangements and operational procedures among the central banks. However, certain general principles ran throughout all of the agreements. They may be summarized as follows:

1. A swap constitutes a reciprocal credit facility under which a central bank agrees to exchange on request its own currency for the currency of the other party up to a maximum amount over a limited period of time, such as 3 months or 6 months.
2. If such a standby swap between the Federal Reserve and the Bank of England, for example, were to be drawn upon by the Federal Reserve, the Federal Reserve would credit the dollar account of the Bank of England with $50 million at a rate of, say, $2.80 to the pound while obtaining in exchange a credit on the books of the Bank of England of about £18 million. Both parties would agree to reverse the transaction on a specified date, say, within 3 months, at the same rate of exchange, thus providing each with forward cover against the remote risk of a devaluation of either currency.
3. The foreign currency obtained by each party as a result of such cross credits to each other's accounts would, unless disbursed in exchange operations, be invested in a time deposit or other investment instrument, earning an identical rate of interest of, say, 2 percent and subject to call on 2 days' notice.
4. After consultation with the other, each party would be free to draw upon the foreign currency acquired under the swap to conduct spot transactions or meet forward exchange obligations.
5. Each swap arrangement is renewable upon agreement of both parties.

Use of swaps: Use of these various swap arrangements has followed a varied pattern. The $250 million swap with the Bank of Canada was immediately drawn upon through a cross-crediting of Canadian and U.S. dollars as part of a Canadian stabilization program. The Canadian Government also received financial assistance from the International Monetary Fund, the Export-Import Bank, and the Bank of England.

In the swaps with the Bank of France, the Bank of England, and the National Bank of Belgium, in amounts of $50 million each, the standby facility was immediately drawn upon by the Federal Reserve in order to test communications, investment procedures, and other operational arrangements. In both the French and British swaps, no occasion has arisen for either party to use the proceeds of the swap in exchange operations. Consequently, after one renewal on June 1, the swap with the Bank of France was liquidated in advance of maturity on August 2 and placed on a standby basis. The swap with the Bank of England, which matured on August 30, was similarly placed on a standby basis.

The swaps of $100 million each with the Swiss National Bank and the Bank for International Settlements were negotiated as standby facilities but with anticipation of an early necessity for their use to mop up a speculative flow of hot money to Switzerland in June and early July of 1962. Similarly, a standby swap with the Netherlands Bank has been actively utilized to mop up temporary flows of funds to the Netherlands. Finally, the $50 million swap with the German Federal Bank was negotiated as a standby facility and no drawings have been effected to date.

Swiss francs: As previously noted, the standby swap arrangements of $100 million each negotiated in mid-July by the Federal Reserve with the Swiss National Bank and the Bank for International Settlements anticipated an early drawing on these swaps to mop up surplus dollars taken in by the Swiss National Bank. Under these swap arrangements, the Federal Reserve drew, during July and August, $60 million of Swiss francs under its swap arrangement with the Bank for International Settlements and $50 million equivalent in Swiss francs under the swap with the Swiss National Bank. The total proceeds of $110 million in Swiss francs were immediately employed to buy back an equivalent amount of dollars on the books of the Swiss National Bank.

During the same period, the U.S. Treasury enlarged somewhat its forward operations in Swiss francs and thereby absorbed an additional amount of dollars held by the Swiss National Bank. As a result of these operations, the dollar holdings of the Swiss National Bank were substantially reduced, and the Bank purchased no more than $50 million of gold from the United States during a period of intense speculation following the June decline in the New York and other stock exchanges.

Federal Reserve drawings under the Swiss franc swaps also indirectly served to absorb excess liquidity on the Swiss money market since the Swiss francs supplied under the swap by the Bank for International Settlements came from deposits of Swiss commercial banks. The Swiss National Bank similarly absorbed Swiss francs from the market by various forward operations involving investments by Swiss commercial banks in U.S. Treasury bills on a covered basis. Subsequently, the speculative fever subsided, the dollar strengthened significantly against the Swiss franc, and the Federal Reserve has already begun to acquire Swiss franc balances in anticipation of an eventual liquidation of the drawing under these two swaps.

Netherlands guilders and Belgian francs: Similarly, a heavy influx of funds into the Netherlands following the stock market declines in June was absorbed by drawings upon the Federal Reserve swap with the Netherlands Bank, combined with a resumption of Treasury forward operations in Dutch guilders. Sizable foreign payments for certain special purposes by the Netherlands have since reduced the dollar holdings of the Netherlands Bank and thereby enabled the Federal Reserve to completely repay drawings under the swap, which has now reverted to a standby facility.

Here again, U.S. Government exchange operations have succeeded in dealing with what proved to be a reversible flow of funds and, as a result, the Netherlands Bank refrained entirely from purchases of gold from the United States during this difficult period. Intervention on a small scale in Belgian francs by drafts upon the swap with the National Bank of Belgium has served a similar purpose, with subsequent repurchases of Belgian francs by the Federal Reserve as the dollar strengthened.

Canadian dollars: The $250 million Federal Reserve swap with the Bank of Canada on June 25, 1962, played an important role in a broad program of international financial cooperation designed to reinforce the Canadian Government's efforts to defend the Canadian dollar. Between January 1 and June 25, about $900 million, or 44 percent of Canada's gold and dollar reserves of $2,056 million were swept away by a mounting balance-of-payments deficit which threatened to force the Canadian dollar off its newly established parity. If this had happened, it would have been an extremely serious setback, not only to Canada but to the entire international financial system of fixed parities, and might easily have touched off a worldwide burst of speculation against other currencies, including the U.S. dollar.

In this atmosphere of emergency, a combined program of $1,050 million was put together within 4 days. This included a $300 million Canadian drawing upon the Fund, a $250 million swap between the Federal Reserve and the Bank of Canada, a $100 million credit to the Bank of Canada from the Bank of England, and a $400 million standby credit to the Canadian Government by the Export-Import Bank. Announcement of financial assistance on this massive scale coupled with a Canadian Government announcement of fiscal and other measures of restraint, immediately broke the speculative wave. Between June 25 and the end of August, Canada recovered more than $500 million of its earlier reserve losses. Once again, the potentialities of central bank and intergovernmental financial cooperation in defending currency parities against essentially reversible flows of speculative funds was demonstrated.

---

[1] The text of the authorization appears in the Appendix, pp. 1150–1153.

The great bulk of the exchange operations undertaken by the Federal Reserve for its own account have involved transactions directly with foreign central banks, rather than in the exchange market. The foreign central banks have continued their policy of active direct participation in the market, and their activity has been supplemented from time to time by appropriate Treasury operations. The Federal Reserve has not thus far undertaken any forward operations in the exchange markets for its own account. Spot operations in support of the dollar in the markets have so far been limited to moderate sales of German marks, sometimes accompanied by similar sales of marks by the Treasury. These transactions have proved fully reversible, with both the Federal Reserve and Treasury subsequently replenishing their mark holdings as the dollar strengthened.

COORDINATION OF TREASURY AND FEDERAL RESERVE EXCHANGE OPERATIONS

Treasury and Federal Reserve exchange operations are continuously coordinated by frequent telephone communications each day between Treasury and Federal Reserve officials concerned with market operations. At 2:30 p.m. each day the foreign exchange trading desk in the Foreign Department of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York provides a full and detailed report over a Treasury and Federal Reserve telephone conference circuit, of exchange rates, market conditions, and operations undertaken during the day by both the Federal Reserve and the Treasury stabilization fund. The very fact that the special manager of the system account is an officer of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York which also conducts exchange operations on behalf of the Treasury eliminates, insofar as is humanly possible, any risk of an inadvertent clash of operations by the two agencies and greatly facilitates the task of insuring a coordination of both Federal Reserve and Treasury operations with the foreign central banks concerned.

With both agencies pursuing identical policy objectives and employing a single instrument of operations, it has proved possible during recent months to carry out an effective meshing of Federal Reserve and Treasury operations in several European currencies.

APPENDIX

AUTHORIZATION REGARDING OPEN MARKET TRANSACTIONS IN FOREIGN CURRENCIES

Pursuant to section 12A of the Federal Reserve Act and in accordance with section 214.5 of regulation N (as amended) of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Open Market Committee takes the following action governing open market operations incident to the opening and maintenance by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York (hereafter sometimes referred to as the New York bank) of accounts with foreign central banks.

I. ROLE OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF NEW YORK

The New York bank shall execute all transactions pursuant to this authorization (hereafter sometimes referred to as transactions in foreign currencies) for the System open market account, as defined in the regulation of the Federal Open Market Committee.

II. BASIC PURPOSES OF OPERATIONS

The basic purposes of System operations in and holdings of foreign currencies are:

(1) To help safeguard the value of the dollar in international exchange markets;

(2) To aid in making the existing system of international payments more efficient and in avoiding disorderly conditions in exchange markets;

(3) To further monetary cooperation with central banks of other countries maintaining convertible currencies, with the International Monetary Fund, and with other international payments institutions;

(4) Together with these banks and institutions, to help moderate temporary imbalances in international payments that may adversely affect monetary reserve positions; and

(5) In the long run, to make possible growth in the liquid assets available to international money markets in accordance with the needs of an expanding world economy.

III. SPECIFIC AIMS OF OPERATIONS

Within the basic purposes set forth in section II, the transactions shall be conducted with a view to the following specific aims:

(1) To offset or compensate, when appropriate, the effects on U.S. gold reserves or dollar liabilities of those fluctuations in the international flow of payments to or from the United States that are deemed to reflect temporary disequilibrating forces or transitional market unsettlement;

(2) To temper and smooth out abrupt changes in spot exchange rates and moderate forward premiums and discounts judged to be disequilibrating;

(3) To supplement international exchange arrangements such as those made through the International Monetary Fund; and

(4) In the long run, to provide a means whereby reciprocal holdings of foreign currencies may contribute to meeting needs for international liquidity as required in terms of an expanding world economy.

IV. ARRANGEMENTS WITH FOREIGN CENTRAL BANKS

In making operating arrangements with foreign central banks on System holdings of foreign currencies, the New York bank shall not commit itself to maintain any specific balance, unless authorized by the Federal Open Market Committee.

The bank shall instruct foreign central banks regarding the investment of such holdings in excess of minimum working balances in accordance with section 14(e) of the Federal Reserve Act.

The bank shall consult with foreign central banks on coordination of exchange operations.

Any agreements or understandings concerning the administration of the accounts maintained by the New York bank with the central banks designed by the Board of Governors under section 214.5 of regulation N (as amended) are to be referred for review and approval to the Committee, subject to the provision of section VIII., paragraph 1, below.

V. AUTHORIZED CURRENCIES

The New York bank is authorized to conduct transactions for System account in such currencies and within the limits that the Federal Open Market Committee may from time to time specify.

VI. METHODS OF ACQUIRING AND SELLING FOREIGN CURRENCIES

The New York bank is authorized to purchase and sell foreign currencies in the form of cable transfers through spot or forward transactions on the open market at home and abroad, including transactions with the stabilization fund of the Secretary of the Treasury established by section 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 and with foreign monetary authorities.

Unless the bank is otherwise authorized, all transactions shall be at prevailing market rates.

VII. PARTICIPATION OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

All Federal Reserve banks shall participate in the foreign currency operations for System account in accordance with paragraph 3G(1) of the Board of Governors' statement of procedure with respect to foreign relationships of Federal Reserve banks dated January 1, 1944.

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

The Federal Open Market Committee authorizes a subcommittee consisting of the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Committee and the Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors (or in the absence of the Chairman or of the Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors the members of the Board designated by the Chairman as alternates, and in the absence of the Vice Chairman of the Committee his alternate) to give instructions to the special manager, within the guidelines issued by the Committee, in cases in which it is necessary to reach a decision on operations before the Committee can be consulted.

All actions authorized under the preceding paragraph shall be promptly reported to the Committee.

The Committee authorizes the Chairman, and in his absence the Vice Chairman of the Committee, and in the absence of both, the Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors:

(1) With the approval of the Committee, to enter into any needed agreement or understanding with the Secretary of the Treasury about the division of responsibility for foreign currency operations between the System and the Secretary;

(2) To keep the Secretary of the Treasury fully advised concerning System foreign currency operations, and to consult with the Secretary on such policy matters as may relate to the Secretary's responsibilities;

(3) From time to time, to transmit appropriate reports and information to the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems.

IX. SPECIAL MANAGER OF SYSTEM OPEN MARKET ACCOUNT

A special manager of the open market account for foreign currency operations shall be selected in accordance with the established procedures of the Federal Open Market Committee for the selection of the manager of the System open market account.

The special manager shall direct that all transactions in foreign currencies and the amounts of all holdings in each authorized foreign currency be reported daily to designated staff officials of the Committee, and shall regularly consult with the designated staff officials of the Committee on current tendencies in the flow of international payments and on current developments in foreign exchange markets.

The special manager and the designated staff officials of the Committee shall arrange for the prompt transmittal to the Committee of all statistical and other information relating to the transactions in and the amounts of holdings of foreign currencies for review by the Committee as to conformity with its instructions.

The special manager shall include in his reports to the Committee a statement of bank balances and investments payable in foreign currencies, a statement of net profit or loss on transactions to date, and a summary of outstanding unmatured contracts in foreign currencies.

X. TRANSMITTAL OF INFORMATION TO TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The staff officials of the Federal Open Market Committee shall transmit all pertinent information on System foreign currency transactions to designated officials of the Treasury Department.

XI. AMENDMENT OF AUTHORIZATION

The Federal Open Market Committee may at any time amend or rescind this authorization.

MEDICAL COVERAGE FOR THE AGED—RESOLUTION OF WASHINGTON COUNTY POMONA GRANGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Washington County Pomona Grange of my State on the subject "Medical Coverage for the Aged."

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL COVERAGE FOR THE AGED

Whereas the problem of medical care for the aged is becoming more and more serious to the aged and to society as a whole; and

Whereas nearly all public opinion polls show that the public generally favors broadening the social security program to include medical care for the aged within the social security program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Washington County Pomona Grange No. 2 reiterate and strengthen its support for a prepaid medical coverage program to be included in the social security program.

Approved by Washington County Pomona Grange No. 2 in regular session this 23d day of January 1963.

HENRY HENRICKSON,
Master, Washington County Pomona.
KATHLEEN SIMMONS,
Secretary, Washington County Pomona.

WANTED: A BUSINESS ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS—ADDRESS BY PETER R. NEHEMKIS, JR.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an address by Peter R. Nehemkis, Jr., of the Whirlpool Corp., on the subject "Wanted: A Business Alliance for Progress."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANTED: A BUSINESS ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(Address by Peter R. Nehemkis, Jr., Whirlpool Corp., before the 13th Annual Conference on the Caribbean, School of Inter-American Studies, University of Florida, December 7, 1962)

Dean Page, Professor Wilgus, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, turning points in history are usually marked by the professional historian long after the event. This 13th Conference on the Caribbean meets when the pages of history are still wet with printer's ink.

The School of Inter-American Studies is to be congratulated for having selected Venezuela as the focus of attention for this annual meeting of distinguished scholars, government officials, and men of business. Venezuela is a microcosm for all of the burning issues of Latin America. But it is something more. Venezuela is the beacon light of hope for democracy in Latin America. If the lights go out in Venezuela, one of the richest prizes in the Western Hemisphere will have been won by the Castristas.

Tonight, our dialog concerns a crisis in the confidence of capitalism in Latin America. In the Western Hemisphere all roads once led to Havana. We, too, begin at Havana.

U.S. private investment in Latin America has been one of the major casualties of the Cuban revolution. With no more formality than a TV harangue, Dr. Castro successfully wiped out $1 billion of American investments in the Pearl of the Antilles. Expropriation hangs like a sword of Damocles over the remaining $8 billion of U.S. investment scattered throughout the southern continent.

The meaning of Dr. Castro's deepening shadow is apparent from these simple figures. In 1957, the flow of U.S. direct investment to Latin America was over $1.5 billion. In the second quarter of 1962, it was precisely zero. Not only has investment in Latin America been arrested, but some companies are bringing their capital home. What this implies, in a word, is that U.S. business has lost confidence in Latin America.

The cessation in U.S. investment means that Secretary of the Treasury Dillon is shy some 30 percent of his $1 billion Punta del Este commitment. Of this amount, $300 million was to be provided through U.S. private investment. Now if only a shortage of $300 million were involved, this would be small change to the U.S. Government. Belatedly, however, the Washington policymakers have come to the realization that, without a continued flow of new U.S. private capital, the Alliance for Progress is a stick of dynamite without a percussion cap.

Some in the business community believe the loss of confidence in Latin America results largely from shrinking profit margins. Superficially, the statistics appear to support this contention. In 1960, the average return on investments in Latin America (after U.S. taxes on remittances) was 9.2 percent—just about the same average return as the 9.1 percent from the United States. In short, by staying home, without incurring any risks or losses from currency devaluation, you could, statistically speaking, do just as well as in Latin America. On the other hand, the after-tax return from investments in the European Common Market was almost 14 percent. The more than $7½ billion of U.S. direct investment which had moved into West Europe by the end of 1961 is clear evidence of the magnetic attraction of the European Common Market.

These statistics, however, tell only part of the story; perhaps not even the most significant part at that. It is Latin America's political instability—more than any other element in the investment equation—which has sapped investment confidence.

Political instability in Latin America is endemic. Oue hundred and fifty years after the breakup of the Spanish and Portuguese empires representative government is still an elusive aspiration. Democratic constitutional trappings and parliamentary edifices are largely theatrical stage props, "Potemkin Villages." Latin America has a three-beat political rhythm: dictatorship, revolution, dictatorship. In the service of truth let it also be said that, if democracy is conspicuous by its absence in Latin America, the Colossus of the North is not without some blame. U.S. history of support for the status quo has scarcely been consistent with the democratic cause.

Contemporary events in South America's major countries are profiles of political instability. Since the resignation of Jânio Quadros from the Presidency there has been for all practical purposes no functioning government in Brazil. One of Brazil's best-known economists, Dr. Celso Furtado, characterizes Brazil as in a prerevolutionary state. If and when the Northeast explodes, Cuba will seem like a firecracker.

In Argentina, the seizure of power by the military under a thinly disguised civilian regime completed the economic and political bankruptcy of the nation begun by Perón. A civil war between clashing generals was narrowly averted. Like Banquo's ghost the Peronistas continue to haunt the stage. Nor has the end of this unhappy chapter been reached.

The military coup in Peru ripped the props from under the Alliance for Progress. The junta functions in a political vacuum; provides a surface calm; and allows business as usual to flourish.

Venezuela is Dr. Castro's primary target. After his abject humiliation at the hands of the Russians, Dr. Castro must destroy Betancourt in order to redeem himself as Latin America's No. 1 revolutionary. If by its disruptive tactics the extreme left can succeed in creating a situation of anarchy which will force the Venezuelan military to take over, the Communists are poised in the wings prepared to take eventual control.

Still in prospect elsewhere on the continent are additional golpes de estado to preserve the status quo by politicians who wear the uniform of generals. Or Nasser-like seizures of power by younger officers who want social reforms under a directed democracy.

In the coming election in Chile for the first time in the Western Hemisphere we may witness a democratically elected President who represents the Marxist alternative.

From the Rio Grande to the Tierra del Fuego where Argentina like a pointing finger reaches into the Atlantic waters rushing to join the Pacific, the continent is wracked by political violence, if not outright anarchy.

In one of the great tragic dramas of our time an entire continent is hemorrhaging from its internal economic and political wounds. For at least another generation, Latin America is bound to undergo a vast convulsion.

This is the context in which U.S. investments will have to be made, if they are made at all.

Since many American companies have managed to get along for a good number of years in this environment of political turbulence, Why at this late date, it may be asked, are they beginning to close up shop? Companies with long experience in Latin America are not leaving. A United Fruit in Central America or an Anaconda Copper in Chile might wish that it could take its cash and come home. But they can't. For all practical purposes they are frozen into their investments. Others have no intention of departing. Who is pulling out? Mainly the newcomers to Latin America.

Paradoxically, investors from other countries do not appear to share the adverse reaction of U.S. capital to Latin America. Japanese businessmen are swarming over the hemisphere in search of deals. The West German Krupp empire finds Brazil's chaos and Argentina's political and economic bankruptcy promising soil for the future. Swedish, Italian, and French firms continue to probe for profitable investment opportunities.

The explanation for this continuing interest as against the American withdrawal lies, I suspect, in an emotional predisposition toward Latin America, and in long experience with foreign investments. Neither political instability nor the absence of certainty seems to worry the non-American entrepreneur. Moreover, he appears to have a greater capacity for environmental adaptation. In a word, the non-American investor has the knack of being able to live in the mouth of an active volcano.

Practical and dramatic solutions to the current crisis in capital require joint action by U.S. business and the U.S. Government. It cannot be solved by Government or business acting alone. Our inability to resolve this painful dilemma paralyzes effective action.

In part, the difficulty in reaching a rapport with the governmental administration is of our own doing—or, more precisely, our lack of doing. How often and when has the story been told of what U.S. business really looks like in Latin America?

Whatever may have been its historic shortcomings, U.S. business now in Latin America is not exploitive leech, the insensitive tool of Yankee imperialism, which the Castro-Communist propaganda would have the Latin American masses believe.

With its powerful thrust for expanding consumer markets, U.S. business now in Latin America is, in its own right, a revolutionary force. U.S. business is, in fact, the salesman for the revolution of rising demands. The hot dreams in the heads of Latin America's urban slum dwellers and middle groups are not stimulated by Karl Marx' "Das Kapital," but by the shop windows bulging with refrigerators, ranges, TV and radio sets. Indeed, American business makes Khrushchev look like a piker. History will record as one of the consummate ironies of our time that the grave digger of the feudal societies was the American business presence in Latin America.

Nevertheless, myths die hard. The image of a buccaneering, greedy, socially atrophied American business lingers on. In numerous layers of Washington officialdom there is little or no knowledge of the socially constructive and creative role being played by many U.S. companies in Latin America—Creole Petroleum Co.; Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Kaiser Industries; Deltec Corp.; International Basic Economy Corp., to mention but a few. Scarcely a handful of the Members of Congress have any knowledge of what a score of U.S. companies have accomplished to identify themselves genuinely with the aspirations of the people of Latin America—for instance: The Chase Manhattan Bank with its development of a cattle industry in Panama; or the Whirlpool Corporation, through its sponsorship of a Technical Institute at Medellin, Colombia, for the training of high school graduates in the disciplines of middle management.

There is no patent medicine which is guaranteed overnight to bring the business and governmental communities into an effective, working relationship. If joint action is not feasible, why can't that sector of the business community, which is concerned over the plight of Latin America, act on its own? Why not business Alianza para el Progreso?

If American business is prepared to "roll its own" Alliance, there must be cleared away some of the underbrush which contributes to misunderstanding. As a first step, we should jettison the notion that there are no profits to be made in Latin America. There are, and will continue to be, profitable business opportunities in a number of Latin American countries. For it must be remembered that the fallacy of the statistical average lies in its concealment of the profitable individual investment.

American business can take advantage of these profitable opportunities if it will forgo the will-o'-the-wisp pursuit of political stability as a condition to doing business. Political stability presupposes a static society. Latin America is a volatile, diverse, and changing society. It is a society powered by three revolutions all moving at the same time: an industrial revolution; an agrarian revolution; and a social revolution. In Latin America, the 20th century is in headlong collision with the 13th.

As a second step, we might tear a page out of the book of our international competitors. How do they do it? The answer is: An ability to adapt. Actually, in adapting to a revolutionary environment little more is required from U.S. business than that it do those things in Latin America which are accepted as a matter of course here at home: support of education; training of nationals for responsible supervisory and managerial positions; sharing of profits; bona fide collective bargaining; opening up stockownership to the people of the country. In short, to do those things which encourage a better standard of living and a better distribution of income, if for no other reason than the inability to sell to a poorhouse. We should be willing to share the benefits of our own enlightenment not through motives of paternalism, but for the same reasons which prevail here at home: it makes good sense.

As a third step, the upper reaches of management in the United States must recognize that effective environmental adaptation requires some changes in mental attitudes on the part of some of the local managers in Latin America. Honorary membership in the Jockey Club ought not to transform an ordinarily decent American, with all of the instincts for democracy, into a Spanish grandee. Nor does it seem necessary in the exchange of the social amenities for the good American to adopt the obsolete social and political philosophies of the oligarchy.

Latin America—as does the United States—has a mixed, private, and governmental economy, only more of it. Latin America intends to keep it that way. Latin Americans do not look with favor on the U.S. business representative who seeks to impose on his operation in Latin America a doctrinaire brand of U.S. capitalism which has long ceased to exist in the United States except as a myth invoked at the annual trade association banquets. While Adam Smith may be a saint before whom North American businessmen sentimentally genuflect, it is downright silly to attempt to include him in the already heavy roster of Latin America's celestial hierarchy.

At a time when the winds of nationalism are reaching gale proportions in some parts of Latin America, U.S. business needs a strong anchor to the windward. The wholly-owned subsidiary does not provide the requisite security. Probably no other aspect of U.S. business is more irritating to the scab of nationalism than the totality of control of the wholly-owned subsidiary. Nor is the irritant confined solely to Latin America's intellectuals and bureaucracy: it is shared by Latin America's businessmen. What Latin Americans resent—and not without justification—is the U.S. manager who can't make decisions without first obtaining the approval of his home office. From any point of view this bespeaks a boy sent to do a man's job. From the peculiarly Latin American view it smacks of economic colonialism.

In passing, it might be noted that this is not an idiosyncrasy of Latin Americans. The Canadians have expressed their version of "Yanqui-go-home" by their sensitivity to Canadian subsidiaries of American firms. Among the European Common Market countries the French, for instance, take exception to the wholly owned U.S. company. Both the French governmental administration and the French business community believe that basic economic decisions laid down, say, in New York or Detroit may be inimical to the national investment objectives attained through joint government-industry planning.

In short, effective environmental adaptation requires that U.S. business become a Colombian, an Argentinian, a Brazilian company instead of being a foreign appendage of its American parent.

The key to successful environmental adaptation is the instinct for what makes other people tick. One of the truly great illusions of the American mind is the assumption that other people—meaning the natives—will react to our policies in the same way as we would react, if we stood in their bare feet. We might spare ourselves a good deal of frustration if we first took a look at the feet and then shaped our policies accordingly.

Successful adaptation necessitates abandonment of the American compulsion to play missionary to the world. It is a delusion to believe that there is a magic pill which will convert Latin America's shockingly mismanaged societies into neat replicas of the United States of America. Or that the inherited Spanish passion for individualism and the dispersive nature of the Spanish character (unique in the Western World) can be transformed into the American obsession for collective action. Or that there will soon be a change in the fatal Spanish characteristic of producing the perfect blueprint which is never put into operation. Latin Americans sometimes mock themselves with an old Spanish proverb (which, incidentally, illuminates why the Alliance for Progress has experienced difficulty in getting off the ground). It goes: Se obedece pero no se cumple. We obey but we do not fulfill.

If U.S. business can stand a bit of mental house cleaning so, too, can Latin American business. If I am critical of Latin America's capitalista, it is, however, in the spirit of a friend who asks his colleagues to look again at the hands of the clock: they are now perilously close to midnight. Time is running out for all of us—the Alliance for Progress; Latin America's business elite; our own business leadership.

The trouble with the Latin American capitalist is that he is a hundred years behind the times. Too many Latin American capitalists retain the mental baggage of an itinerant peddler: buy and sell quickly; always have your luggage packed for a fast getaway. He looks upon investment as a treasure to be plundered instead of an expectation to be nurtured. He has yet to recognize that the return on an investment must be reasonable; that profits must be plowed back into the business and not siphoned off for safekeeping abroad. If it is to be employed usefully, capital can't be put into idle land because ownership of land is a status symbol or a hedge against inflation. He has yet to understand that payment of taxes to the state is not a form of feudal tribute—tributo and tributario, it might be recalled, are the Spanish equivalent for taxes and taxpayer. As a footnote, I should add that, throughout Latin America the very idea of handing over tax moneys to government functionaries who would steal it, is a grim jest, peculiar to the Yankee sense of humor.

The Latin American capitalist is not sufficiently aware that the real security base of capitalism rests on the people's identification with and confidence in the capitalist system. Identification results from jobs, good wages. But this is not enough. More important is the feeling of confidence. Confidence exists when the workers themselves believe that the patrón—their own boss—is himself associated with social progress.

There is no future for Latin American capitalism if, in the eyes of the people, it is linked with a closed, feudal, aristocratic society.

If Latin American capitalism is to be accepted, if it is to prosper, if it is to play a creative role in the development of the hemisphere, it must become the champion of an expanding and egalitarian society.

It would be a gross distortion of reality—a caricature—if the impression were left that all Latin American capitalists were part of a feudal backwash. Eugenio Mendozo and Gustavo Vollmer in Venezuela; the Klabin and Byington families in Brazil; Luis Echavarria in Colombia; Eugenio Heiremans in Chile; Francisco de Solo in El Salvador—these businessmen with others like themselves throughout the continent are members of that select company of men who are part of the mainstream of a 20th century capitalism.

One thing which the existing crisis in capital should make abundantly clear is that there is no holy writ which says U.S. capital must go to Latin America. The plain truth of the matter is that U.S. investment capital doesn't need Latin America.

The American economy still exerts the first claim on the competitive demands for the investment dollar. Most American companies are more deeply committed to supplying capital funds for product development and improvement, or in being associated with the glamour of a shot to the moon, than with the discovery of investment opportunities in Latin America.

Lenin's celebrated dictum—now a universal article of Communist faith—that finance-capital must invest in the underdeveloped lands because it has no other place to go simply doesn't hold water. The European Common Market—as was previously noted—has attracted almost as much new U.S. investment since the midfifties as our entire existing investment in Latin America. Today, to paraphrase from the "Communist Manifesto," a specter is haunting communism—the specter of the European Common Market.

If Latin America really wants American private capital, its own private capital has to stand up and be counted. It is immoral for Latin America's businessmen to expect U.S. business to assume the risks which they themselves are unwilling to take.

Latin America is not as capital poor as it would have us believe. There is now probably as much or more private Latin American capital squirreled away in New York, Paris, London, and Zurich as the Alliance for Progress proposes to export over the entire decade. Until this refugee capital is repatriated, we are just whistling in our teeth about a decade of development in Latin America.

In some major Latin American countries expatriated private capital may have exceeded the total amount of U.S. foreign aid. Nor can this vacuum conceivably be filled by foreign aid when it is recalled that many of the Latin American countries have sustained losses from the decline in commodity prices which are two to three times as great as the amounts supplied through public moneys from the United States.

In recent months, some prominent U.S. and Latin American leaders have sought to dismiss the problem of flight capital or have defended its incidence. Dr. Felipe Herrera, president of the Inter-American Development Bank, believes that focusing attention on fugitive capital "harms the standing of the hemisphere abroad."

Do Latin America's leaders believe that it is politically realistic for the President of the United States to continue to ask his fellow citizens to help Latin America when Latin Americans themselves have so little confidence in their own countries?

Do Latin America's leaders believe that it is politically realistic to expect the Congress to continue to appropriate tax moneys for the benefit of Latin America when Latin Americans act like strangers in their own lands?

The vast majority of the American people are weary with the whole business of foreign aid. Nevertheless, Latin America holds a unique place in their affections. The American people will support their government's efforts to assist Latin America with greater generosity than for any of the other poor lands of the world.

One guaranteed way by which to make Americans indifferent to Latin America's fate is for Latin America's leaders to tell us that the migration of capital is a mere peccadillo which we ought not to take seriously.

Private capitalism as a competing system with the state capitalism of the Soviet Union (for that is essentially what Soviet communism is) can't take itself for granted, least of all in a transitional society. In Latin America, especially, private capitalism has to justify itself, for it is on trial. It has to provide tangible evidence that it can produce more at lower prices and that its cumulative impact is good for the country and for the people.

Ask any baker's dozen of ordinary Latin Americans whom you might encounter on the streets of Mexico City, Lima, São Paulo, Buenos Aires, or any of the other urban conglomerations in Latin America, what they think of the capitalist system in their country. The answer will be a loud and resounding Bronx raspberry. The reason is not hard to find: Latin American capitalism simply hasn't delivered for the masses. And the propaganda of the extreme left never lets up in driving home this fact.

A classic illustration of the point is the Mexican industrialization. A mixed bag of public and private investment, it has by all odds been spectacular. Between 1945 and 1957, Mexico doubled its gross national product. No other Latin American country during the same period was able to achieve that record. In this same period per capita production increased 44 percent. In the United States it was 6.5 percent.

Yet with this remarkable rate of growth the Mexican people are not any better off than they were 15 years ago. A report of the U.S. Department of Commerce states: "There appears to have been a considerable increase in the real per capita income since 1939. However, most of the increase was in the form of commercial and industrial profits, and large sectors of the population apparently derived little if any benefit from the enlarged national product."

The Mexican economist, Manuel Germán Parra, finds a greater inequality in the distribution of income in 1955 than in 1940. He comments that, ironically after 45 years of struggle for social justice by the Mexican Revolution, the distribution of income in Mexico is so lopsided as to make the most conservative British or U.S. capitalist blush.

In the Mexico of Don Adolfo López Mateos is a far cry from the Mexico of Don Porfirio Díaz (when it was "the mother of foreigners and the stepmother of Mexicans"), there is, nevertheless, a deadly parallel. Don Porfirio's cientificos (that brilliant group of young lawyers and economists who worshipped at the shrine of Progress and ruled as benevolent despots) have been replaced after 20 years of industrialization by revolucionarios adinerados—rich revolutionaries—who have siphoned off the lion's share of the increase in national income. Qué revolucion. Qué adelanto. Some revolution. Some progress.

Since that fateful evening in late October when President Kennedy informed the world of America's determination to counter the Soviet missile thrust into the Western Hemisphere, there has been discernible in Latin America a new climate, a different ambiente.

American diplomacy had exerted itself—decisively and massively. Latin America was eager to follow—and it did. Overnight, as it were, the turgid atmosphere full of recriminations and bickerings, which had hung over the continent, has been replaced by a clear sky.

Dr. Castro is discredited as a social revolutionary. Today, he is revealed as a paranoiac incendiary—an exporter of terror and destruction. His erstwhile admirers are disenchanted by the confirmation of Cuba's status as a Soviet lackey. After almost $1 billion in economic aid from the Soviet bloc, Cuba is a failure as a Communist showcase.

New opportunities beckon for American diplomacy and for American business. May not this be the beginning of a new dawn for U.S. investments in Latin America? May not this be the decisive hour for U.S. business leadership to lead? Are not the tides right for the launching of a Business Alliance for Progress?

The embryonic Central American Common Market offers an unparalleled opportunity for U.S. business leadership to make a spectacular contribution to modernization. It can do this by organizing a series of mixed private and governmental ventures to supply capital and consumer goods for a potentially viable regional economy. West European, Canadian, United States, Japanese, and Central American capital (both private and governmental) could be mobilized.

Perhaps the most significant and far-reaching contribution—for both the immediate Common Market undertaking and for the future of U.S. investments throughout Latin America—would be for the coventurers to propose to and negotiate with the Central American Common Market Authority a charter of the rights, duties, and obligations of the investors and of the respective governments.

The charter could spell out, among other things, that this international consortium did not intend to preserve its investment over the indefinite future; and that its financial stake could be bought out by local investors or governmental bodies. It could be made crystal clear that the whole sweep of the idea was to light the fuse, to help detonate an explosion of economic growth—and then get out.

What is good for the Central American Common Market can also be good for the larger Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA). Latin America's best hope for economic progress lies in the early development of these two regional markets.

In a world divided into enormous trading blocs, unless Latin America's fragmented economies are regionally integrated, they are doomed to permanent stagnation.

It cannot be emphasized too often that for its own psychological sake and for its own political future, Latin America must think and act as a continent. A century and a half of Balkanization is enough.

Latin America's forced-draft industrialization has of necessity created artificial, hothouse industries. They are sustained by their ability to exact high prices for their products. Their underpinning depends upon protective tariffs and other import restrictions.

Regional integration now offers the unique opportunity for industrial rationalization.

Regional integration can provide the elbowroom for North American, European, and Japanese technology, distribution, and consumer financing to accelerate economic growth. This can be accomplished initially by reorganizing and consolidating those existing enterprises whose technology is largely obsolete, whose materials handling is costly and wasteful, and whose business efficiency leaves much to be desired.

The experience of the United States common market and the emergent European Common Market is that the small unit cannot compete effectively. Big consumer markets require big businesses with strong engineering, manufacturing, and financial resources.

The sweep of history may bypass LAFTA if it fritters away a decade on conventional tariff jockeying to the neglect of regional consolidation and merger of industries; and if it fails to supply imaginatively conceived regional mechanisms to support economic integration.

I venture to suggest that there may never again be present a more propitious moment for the LAFTA countries to reevaluate whether its regional structure may not be too unwieldy. And whether initially a more simplified series of regional groupings would not be more manageable for trade and political administration.

Latin America is at an historic moment of truth: unless its governing and business elite heeds Macauley's injunction to reform if you would preserve, they might just as well sign their own death warrants. For,

comes the revolution, there will be precious few of this class who will hold a safe-conduct pass.

A democratic capitalism, which is part of the mainstream of the 20th century, can strike a lethal blow at Latin America's real enemy: the people's lack of hope and the bitter despair which consumes their hearts.

A 20th century democratic capitalism can offer to the people of Latin America something much better than the Marxist alternative: a stake in the future under freedom.

Which will it be?

If a revitalized Alliance for Progress and the hemisphere's enlightened business leaders will now act with reassuring swiftness, it could be the beginning of a new era in the New World.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION—HIGHER EDUCATION AS A NATIONAL RESOURCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Dr. Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education, has recently brought to my attention the publication of that organization entitled "Higher Education as a National Resource."

The American Council on Education, which was founded in 1918, is a council of educational organizations and institutions whose purpose is to advance education and educational methods through comprehensive voluntary and cooperative action on the part of American educational associations, organizations, and institutions. The officials and directors of the organizations are drawn from our great higher education institutions, both private and public, from every section of the country. As an Oregonian I am particularly proud of the fact that Dr. Richard H. Sullivan, president of Reed College in Portland, Oreg., serves as a member of the board of directors.

The American Council on Education has in the past given most valuable advice and counsel to the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare concerning its various proposals, particularly those relating to higher education which have been brought before the subcommittee.

In the weeks ahead, as we consider the National Education Improvement Act of 1963 (S. 580), I know I speak for the members of my subcommittee when I say that we shall welcome the testimony of this great educational organization.

Although as I have indicated, the American Council on Education is primarily concerned with the problems of higher education, I was most pleased to find contained in its recommendations one paragraph which states:

> The council recognizes the need also to strengthen elementary and secondary education and believes that the Federal Government has significant responsibilities on those levels. The American Council on Education, however, represents higher education. Our proposals are concerned accordingly with the need to strengthen colleges and universities.

It would be helpful, in my judgment, for Senators to have readily available the recommendations of the American Council on Education, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that the brief statement to which I have referred be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHER EDUCATION AS A NATIONAL RESOURCE

American higher education is a priceless asset fundamental to the national purpose. It cannot be spoken of simply in terms of the value of buildings and equipment, the total number of persons served, the teachers involved, or the research performed. The Nation's colleges and junior colleges, universities, research institutes, and professional schools are all of these things, but something more. Broadly conceived, higher education constitutes a precious national resource essential to the achievement of great national goals and to the achievement of worthy aspirations of individual citizens. It is a resource also in the sense that, given favorable conditions, it is as capable of self-renewal as is a properly conserved forest.

As students, young men and women look to colleges and universities to help them fulfill their aspirations. Parents look to these institutions to help them realize the ambitions they have for their children. More significantly, the American people look to colleges and universities for a continuing supply of increasingly capable citizens. They expect institutions of higher education—especially universities and their associated professional schools—to explore new fields of knowledge and to apply this knowledge to the problems of business and industry, human development, and government.

Nor is it the American people alone who place a high value on their institutions of higher education. The governments and peoples of emerging nations are turning more and more for advice and assistance to our colleges and universities. There can be little doubt that American higher education must help meet the expectations not just of the Nation, but of the world as well.

Like any other resource, colleges and universities must be used wisely lest they be exploited and their values diminished. Thus far, American higher education has served without substantial impairment of its teaching and research functions. But as we approach the 1970's, it is quite clear that colleges and universities will be subject to pressures that could weaken their usefulness as national resources. To prevent such a possibility, and to develop further higher education's strength as a resource for the future, action must be taken now. Appropriate action involves individual citizens and private philanthropy, but it also involves local, State, and National governments.

The heaviest pressure on our colleges and universities—and one certain to increase—is the steadily rising number of persons who want to enter college. Not only are there vastly more individuals in the college-age group, but also more of them find it necessary and desirable to get a higher education.

Opening enrollment for the current academic year (4,175,000 in fall of 1962) shows a 17-percent increase over 1960, the start of the present decade. By 1965, it is estimated that the figure will have increased 46 percent over 1960. An opening enrollment of almost 7 million is projected for 1970—an increase of 94 percent over 1960.[1] To meet this situation, institutions of higher education, even with the most effective use of the staff and plant they now have, must enlarge their faculties and expand classroom and student housing facilities.

In addition, though more difficult to measure, the pressure of new knowledge on colleges and universities requires new and expensive research facilities and equipment. Our Nation cannot afford to let its institutions fall behind in the search for new and better knowledge. To move ahead, we must expand and strengthen graduate education, including postdoctoral study, for the purpose of advancing knowledge of all kinds as well as for advancing learning on all levels. Throughout our educational system, in brief, we shall have to do a bigger and a better job. Achieving this objective will be costly; falling short of it will be even costlier.

The American Council on Education believes that the problems confronting higher education transcend State and local concerns, and thus have become an urgent national concern. We believe that, to maintain and develop higher education as a national resource, the Federal Government must supplement other sources of support. The Federal Government should do this, not to aid higher education, but to meet a national obligation to conserve and strengthen a national resource.

The council therefore proposes a broad program of Federal action to help expand and improve American higher education.

Although American higher education is unified in purpose, it is varied in its forms. We can think of it as a single entity when visualizing the impact of enrollment increases and sensing the obligation this places upon colleges and universities. But this concept of unity blurs the variety and complexity which must be considered in formulating a viable program. Such a program should meet the needs of institutions ranging in complexity from small colleges to large universities comprising many divisions and professional schools, in size from a few hundred students to many thousands, and in control from private to public.

The council believes it is well within the capacity of the American people, acting through their elected Representatives in Congress and in response to leadership from the President, to implement a program of adequate support for higher education as a national resource.

This assertion, we are aware, proposes the use of Federal funds for private institutions as an integral part of the American system of higher education. This is nothing new, however, in either principle or practice. Historically, the Congress and the Federal Government have drawn no line of demarcation between public and private institutions of higher education when utilizing them in the national interest. The Federal Government has repeatedly called upon both public and private institutions to perform research and to serve as training centers for military officers. The Federal Government has provided grants to both public and private institutions for construction of research facilities. The Federal Government has granted funds to both public and private institutions for graduate education under the National Defense Education Act. In these and other ways, ample precedent exists for a program designed to develop both public and private institutions of higher education as a vital national resource.

For more than a 100 years the United States has supported and taken pride in a dual system of higher education which affords our youth the freedom to choose how and where they are to pursue their advanced learning. The American Council on Education believes in the soundness of this educational tradition and urges the American people, through their Federal Government, to support and develop it to meet the Nation's growing needs.

---

[1] The conservative estimates of the U.S. Office of Education reflect the general increase in population aged 18–21, and assume that the present ratio of 38 college students per hundred in the 18–21 age group will rise to 48 per hundred by 1970. The increase in enrollment is not a temporary bulge, but a more permanent increase which will require even greater expansion in the 1970–80 decade. The 18–21 age group in 1980 (already born and approaching kindergarten) will be approximately 3 million larger than the equivalent group in 1970.

The proposals here set forth were recommended by the American Council's Commission on Federal Relations, and approved by the council's board of directors. By its nature, higher education is diverse and comprises institutions of many different traditions and views. As may be expected there are individual differences of opinion. Nevertheless, our recommendations represent a thoughtful consensus of representatives of all segments of American higher education. They take into account the views of the council's 1,000 member institutions and 175 member organizations.

The council recognizes the need also to strengthen elementary and secondary education and believes that the Federal Government has significant responsibilities on those levels. The American Council on Education, however, represents higher education. Our proposals are concerned accordingly with the need to strengthen colleges and universities.

THE PROPOSALS

I. Physical Facilities

The Federal Government should take appropriate steps to assist colleges and universities in the construction of physical facilities for instruction, research, and student housing.

Instructional facilities: The council believes the need justifies a commitment by the Federal Government averaging $1 billion annually for a program of matching grants and low-interest loans for construction of academic facilities in both public and private institutions.[2]

Classrooms, laboratories, and libraries are essential to any soundly conceived academic program. The institution which overcrowds these facilities or tries to make do with obsolete facilities risks serious impairment of the quality of its academic program.

Research facilities: Federal agencies which support research in colleges and universities should be authorized and encouraged to provide appropriate support for construction of the physical facilities and for acquisition of the equipment required for such research. Additional appropriations should be provided as needed for these purposes.

Student housing: The basic legislative authorization of $300 million annually for the college housing loan program runs until 1965. The Government is urged to make full use of its authority to make college housing loans and, if the demand for loans should exceed available funds, to seek additional lending authority.

II. Faculty

The Federal Government should expand programs that will help to increase the supply of college teachers and improve the quality of instruction and research in colleges and universities.

Supply of college teachers: Two principal sources of Federal support for individuals enrolled in graduate programs which would qualify them for college teaching are the National Science Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The programs of these agencies are restricted for the most part to the natural sciences. Moreover, they are directed primarily to research and only incidentally to college teaching. The NSF and NASA fellowship programs should be expanded as the number of qualified candidates increases. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that expansion of these programs does not necessarily insure that the participants will go into college teaching rather than research

The quality of college education also depends on an adequate supply of well-prepared teachers in disciplines other than the sciences, for example, in English, history, political science, and economics. The Federal Government should support expansion of graduate education in such a way as to redress the present imbalance in favor of science, and to encourage the preparation of college teachers in many, instead of few, fields of learning.

The only Federal program specifically intended to increase the supply of college teachers in fields other than science is that authorized in title IV of the National Defense Education Act, supplemented by the National Defense Education Act, title VI, scholarships to prepare researchers and teachers in modern foreign languages not commonly taught in the United States. To make the National Defense Education Act a more effective instrument for adding to the supply of college teachers, it should be amended as follows:

1. Increase the total number of fellowships available under the National Defense Education Act from 1,500 to 5,000, distributed in these categories:

(a) Up to 2,000 in the existing new or expanded category.

(b) Up to 2,000 in programs of graduate instruction in institutions which can make a major contribution toward meeting the pressing need for college teachers.

(c) Up to 1,000 1-year awards for college teachers who are within a year of completing the requirements for the doctorate.

2. Provide each institution a flat grant of $3,000 a year for each graduate student enrolled under the National Defense Education Act fellowship program with the stipulation that the institution waive all tuition and other fees, other than room and board, normally required of graduate students.

Improvement of quality of instruction: A prime factor in the improvement of academic instruction obviously is the improvement of faculty competence. In the scientific field, Federal programs presently afford faculty members opportunities for postdoctoral research as well as for carrying out research projects on their own campuses. Similar benefits to teachers in fields other than the natural sciences should be provided through amendments to the National Defense Education Act.

New legislation to support the operation of college and university libraries would also reinforce faculty research and scholarship. In many scholarly disciplines the library is a major research facility, comparable in importance to the laboratory.

The program suggested above for 1,000 1-year National Defense Education Act fellowships for college teachers within a year of completing the doctorate would add to the supply of fully qualified college teachers and, because it is directed to persons already in college teaching, would improve the competence of these persons.

In addition, the National Defense Education Act institutes in modern foreign language should be extended to college teachers of modern language without any distinction between teachers from public and private institutions. These modern language institutes should be authorized to include the teaching of English.

Finally, there should be increased use of existing legislative authority for exchanges of faculty members with foreign countries and for grants to actual and prospective college teachers to study abroad. The council believes that Federal agencies administering these programs should consult with the academic community in developing fresh approaches that will win support for needed and substantial increases in appropriations for international educational exchanges.

III. Students

There is need for appropriate Federal action to lower the financial barriers to higher education for qualified students.

The predicted enrollment increase of 2.8 million students between 1962–63 and 1970–71 places a high priority on the need for academic facilities and college teachers. Realization that enrollments will rise by one-fourth between 1962 and 1965 alone emphasizes the urgency of this need. Without adequate facilities and qualified teachers, our colleges and universities will have to resort to expedients detrimental to educational quality. Thus the council believes first priority should go to Federal programs designed to assure the coming generation of college students of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries in which to leran, and qualified persons to each them.

All evidence indicates that charges to students for tuition, fees, and room and board in both public and private institutions are continuing to rise sharply. This upward trend in costs has forced the student, his family, and the institution to plan more realistically the share of the cost that should be borne by grant assistance, loans, and student employment. But dangers lie ahead, since a study of trends also indicates that scholarships and institutional loan funds, even when augmented by Federal loan funds available under the National Defense Education Act, are not keeping pace either with the increase in number of students or with the upward cost trend. Furthermore, while the loan program of the National Defense Education Act has helped many families in the middle-income brackets, qualified students from the very low income levels are finding it more and more difficult to finance a college education.[3]

With National Defense Education Act assistance, State programs of testing and counseling, with special emphasis on early identification of talented students, have either been initiated or expanded. But it is not enough to identify the talented student who comes from a low-income family unless some hope of grant assistance can be offered by the time he must make the decision to go to college. In short, if equality of educational opportunity is to be more than an abstract slogan, the Federal Government must help colleges and universities provide grant assistance as well as loan assistance to able but needy students.

Student loans: The ceiling of $250,000 on Federal contributions to any one institutional loan fund should be removed so that institutions may request funds in proportion to the predictable demand for them. The National Defense Education Act student loan program should be made a permanent program, with the Federal capital contributions granted to the institutions as permanent revolving loan funds. From time to time additional appropriations should then be made

---

[2] The magnitude of what the Federal commitment should be is suggested by the projections of facilities needs published by the U.S. Office of Education in 1962 as ch. 11 of "Economics of Higher Education." These projections show an average annual cost of construction for needed facilities of $2.21 billion in the years between 1961 and 1975. Average annual expenditures for construction are now approximately $1.25 billion. This rate can be sustained only if all present and anticipated sources of institutional financing of facilities are fully utilized.

Another estimate of the probable magnitude of the required Federal commitments is found in the results of a November 1960 survey of council membership. Reports from 582 institutions, representing about half of total student enrollment at that time, indicated that, over a 5-year period, they would expect to request a total of $2.9 billion under a program of grants and loans. Of this amount, it was anticipated that about $2.1 billion, or 72 percent, would be for grants, and $800 million, or 28 percent, would be for loans.

[3] The statements in this paragraph are based on "Financial Aid to the Undergraduate: Issues and Implication," by Elmer D. West, to be published by the American Council on Education.

for grants to institutions to reimburse them for the portion of loans forgiven for recipients who entered teaching, to meet the needs resulting from increasing enrollments, and to establish loan funds for instiutions new to the program.

As a matter of equity to student borrowers, the 50 percent "forgiveness" of loans should be extended to all teaching, including college teaching in recognized public and private, nonprofit institutions of education.

Student grant assistance: With due regard to the priority needs for a Federal program of assistance for construction of academic facilities and for expansion of the National Defense Education Act fellowship program for training college teachers, a new Federal program of 4-year undergraduate scholarships should be provided to supplement the National Defense Education Act student loan program. This scholarship or grant assistance program should have as its primary objective the seeking out and assisting of students of academic promise and great financial need.

International student exchanges: In the Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, Congress recognized the need to increase the number of undergraduate and graduate student exchanges with foreign countries and to provide special services to foreign students enrolled in American colleges and universities. Congress should appropriate adequate funds to support these programs realistically if international exchanges of students are to be extended effectively to emerging nations, and if the foreign student is to obtain maximum benefit from study in an American institution.

IV. Other proposals and considerations

The focus of Federal action to sustain and develop American higher education as a national resource must be on programs to assist institutions to meet the demand for better higher education for an increasing number of students. Thus the construction of academic facilities and the recruitment and preparation of qualified college teachers must have first priority for the academic community, and should have first priority in the thinking of Congress and the Executive. The need for more student financial assistance holds a second priority.

The council will continue to support other proposals for Federal action in the field of higher education. The list below is by no means inclusive, but among the proposals for which the council intends to provide appropriate support are these:

Federal assistance for construction of teaching facilities in medicine, dentistry, and other health professions.

Payment of full costs of federally sponsored research.

Equitable reimbursement to colleges and universities for expenses incurred in providing facilities and instruction for ROTC units.

Federal assistance to programs for college-level technician education.

Extension of the urban renewal program with annual authorizations sufficient to maintain benefits to the colleges and universities at least at current levels.

Amendments to the National Defense Education Act (a) to authorize preparation of persons to teach English as a second language, (b) to permit institutions and agencies undertaking National Defense Education Act-supported research to publish the results of such research, and (c) to authorize guidance institutes for training college student personnel workers.

Implementation of international agreements providing for tariff-free importation of books and scientific equipment.

Appropriations for Federal educational programs commensurate with the known demands for such programs. Particular emphasis will be placed on adequate appropriations for the salaries and expenses of the Office of Education, for the program of the National Defense Education Act, for the National Science Foundation, for grants in support of educational television, and for international educational exchanges.

In the interest of providing better coordination and focus for Federal programs in support of education, the American Council on Education believes there should be appropriate revision of Federal organization and administration to strengthen the U.S. Office of Education, and to bring the U.S. Commissioner of Education into a closer relationship with the President.

In addition the council is convinced that the Federal Government has an immediate responsibility to assess all of its present relationships with higher education and to take such steps as may be necessary to make these relationships more conducive to the long-term strengthening of the Nation's educational resources. In such an endeavor the council pledges its full cooperation and assistance.

The Urgent Need for Decision

On December 15, 1962, President Logan Wilson of the American Council wrote the President of the United States:

"The crisis long predicted in the capacity of our institutions to meet the demands upon them is no longer something in the future. It is now."

It takes time to enact new Federal legislation and then to get it into effective operation. It also takes time to plan and then to build new buildings, and to complete the graduate education of a college teacher. Prompt action in the 1st session of the 88th Congress might result in a few new instructional buildings ready for use in the middle of the academic year 1963–64 and many more ready for use at the beginning of the 1964–65 academic year. The full effect, however, of a new Federal program for construction of academic facilites would not be felt until 1965–66 and beyond.

Similarly, assuming that Congress acts promptly in its 1963 session, expanded graduate programs for training college teachers would not make a significant difference in the supply of college teachers until 1965 and after.

The crisis cannot be averted, but it can be met without resorting to hastily devised "crash" programs. The decision lies both with Congress and with the President and his advisers. The American Council on Education is convinced that it speaks not only for organized higher education but for a much broader American consensus when it asserts that the opportunity for quality education beyond the high school should be widened and deepened through Federal action. With wise and effective Federal assistance, higher education can be maintained as an important national resource for generations to come.

RESOLUTION BY McNARY POOL PORTS ASSOCIATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have appear in the RECORD a resolution sent to me by the McNary Pool Ports Association of Walla Walla, Wash., expressing its opposition to the proposed user tax on fuel used by inland waterways carriers.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the McNary Pool Ports Association is comprised of the ports of Benton, Kennewick, Pasco and Walla Walla, all located in the State of Washington and the port of Umatilla located in the State of Oregon; and

Whereas the association represents port districts having an area of approximately 6,627 square miles, including some of the most productive agricultural and industrial land in the Pacific Northwest, having an assessed valuation in excess of $213,435,004; and

Whereas the above-mentioned port districts are charged with the responsibility of the development of the overall transportation complex in their respective districts; and

Whereas in excess of 1 million tons annually have passed the McNary lock and dam and upon completion of the Lower Snake River Dams, including Ice Harbor, Lower Monumental, Little Goose and Lower Granite, will increase very substantially; and

Whereas this development will aid the shipper and consumer of the McNary Pool area and beyond due to a very large dependence upon inland waterways transportation; and

Whereas the President of the United States on April 5, 1962, sent to Congress contained in his transportation message a recommendation for a user tax of 2 cents a gallon on all fuel used by inland waterways carriers; and

Whereas this proposal contains dangers readily recognized by all who are familiar with waterways transportation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the McNary Pool Ports Association and the port districts belonging thereto, both individually and collectively, That this association is unalterably opposed to the enactment of any user charge proposal on our inland waterways; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Northwest congressional delegation and other appropriate Government agencies.

RESOLUTION BY FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution from the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Portland Aerie No. 4, Portland, Oreg., received from Chester E. Capon.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas many areas of the world are confronted with the threat of domination by those whose policies are repugnant to the principles long cherished by a democratic society; and

Whereas it is vital that means of communication be established throughout the free world whereby all people would be better informed and educated and thus be given an opportunity not only to guide their own destiny, but be better able to cope with the moral, religious, economic and political problems of an ever changing universe; and

Whereas the United States of America has an abundance of technical equipment such as television receivers, television signal repeaters and electrical generators, some of which it is believed should be made immediately available without charge to any country desiring the same for the purpose of the dissemination of information and education consistent with the precepts of a democratic society; and

Whereas the Fraternal Order of Eagles subscribes to the democratic principles of truth, justice, liberty and equality and seeks every opportunity to promote those programs and to adopt those principles designed for the social betterment of man: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Portland Aerie No. 4, requests that the United States of America proceed with all reasonable vigor to seek the establishment of free educational television within the boundaries of those countries desiring or requesting the same for the purpose or purposes indicated herein; and be it further

Resolved, That President J. F. Kennedy, Senators Wayne L. Morse and M. B. Neuberger, and Representative Edith Green, be forwarded a copy of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the appropriate office of the Grand Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, with a request that every other aerie within its jurisdiction support this resolution.

Attest:

CHESTER E. CAPON,
Secretary.

CIA PROBLEMS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an item from the Insider's Newsletter, dealing with some of our CIA problems, about which I shall speak at some length next week.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAY CIA AGENTS IN CONTACT WITH DE GAULLE'S FOES—U.S. EMBASSY FROWNS ON MEETINGS WITH FORMER OAS LEADERS

NEW YORK, February 18.—Agents of the United States, presumably of the Central Intelligence Agency, have resumed contact with former OAS leaders since President De Gaulle's bid for French supremacy in Europe, the Insider's Newsletter reported today.

American Embassy officials in Paris are, according to the Newsletter, disturbed over U.S. agents' meetings with the Georges Bidault-Jacques Soustelle group which advocates a pro-Atlantic alternative to De Gaulle, whom they say will eventually hand France and Western Europe to the Communists.

Diplomats say the U.S. agents have met the anti-De Gaullists frequently during the past month in Central Europe where the former backers of the French underground move around constantly with the aid of forged passports.

The Embassy officials deplore, the Newsletter says, what they call another example of hamhandedness on the part of the cloak-and-dagger men who "see politics purely in terms of whom you can get to throw out the guy you don't get along with."

They emphasize that the last thing the U.S. Government wants to do is to be shown intriguing with people who have no backing in France except from a mixed bag of fascists, cashiered army officers, and gunmen.

ADDRESS BY CLARK R. MOLLENHOFF

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently the Editorial Association of the State of Oregon made a very wise decision. It invited one of our most able correspondents, Clark Mollenhoff, to go to Oregon and address the national convention of the Editorial Association. It is a memorial lecture that is given each year known as the Eric W. Allen memorial lecture.

Eric Allen was for many years the distinguished dean of the Oregon School of Journalism. I need not tell the Senate that any lecture given by Mr. Mollenhoff deserves reading and deserves being made of historical record.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mollenhoff's lecture of February 15, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERIC W. ALLEN MEMORIAL LECTURE

(By Clark R. Mollenhoff, Washington bureau, Cowles Publications, February 15, 1963)

Much has changed in the newspaper world in the 50 years since Eric W. Allen founded the department of journalism at the University of Oregon. Reporters and editors are better educated than in the period of even 25 or 30 years ago. There has been a specialization on many of our larger newspapers that is regarded by some observers as a tremendous step in giving the public a better understanding of such fields as education, science, and labor. Certainly, most local newspaper staffs are better equipped today to report and analyze the activities of local and State government than they were in 1912. Much credit for this progress belongs to men like Eric Allen.

However, there is real reason for asking if the newspapers are keeping pace with the national and international problems that confront our society. These problems involve both bigness and complexity. They are best illustrated by a simple reference to the tremendous increase in Federal responsibilities and Federal expenditures.

In 1912, Federal expenditures were less than $1 billion—$689,881,000 to be exact. Recently, President Kennedy has proposed a budget of $98.8 billion, and it could easily soar over the $100 billion mark. More than $50 billion of the Federal spending will be for defense. This means it will be spent behind a heavy curtain of military security that will prevent the press and the public from examining many of the decisions of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

There can be little doubt, we have reached the point where it is impossible for any newspaper reporter, or any group of reporters, to engage in a comprehensive analysis of government spending. The size of the spending is staggering. The complexity of the laws and regulations is overwhelming. The powers assumed by the executive branch are almost unbounded.

Yet, somehow, we must manage to examine and criticize this mammoth Federal Government if we are to carry out our assignment in the American democracy. Somehow, we must find the means to expose corruption or favoritism even if it involves areas where the Defense Department may seek to use false claims of military security for a shield. Somehow, we must oppose the arbitrary and arrogant use of authority within the huge bureaucratic agencies. Somehow, we must keep all channels of information open unless the real military security of our Nation is at stake. And even in those areas where genuine military security can be claimed, we must assure ourselves that the Congress has provided an effective check on the use of arbitrary power by the executive branch.

Bound up in these press responsibilities is the most vital issue of our time: Can the United States fight effectively in the long-range cold war, and also continue to function as a real democracy?

The newspapers of the United States must carry a heavy responsibility, if not the major responsibility, in the determination of how that question will be answered in the next 10 to 20 years ahead of us. Newspaper editors and reporters must be able to understand the problem of obtaining information from Government. They must know all the avenues for obtaining information, and must recognize when those avenues are being barricaded. They must recognize when a false claim of military security is used to cover up matters that are simply embarrassing to the executive branch.

It is not enough for our editorial pages to shout "freedom of information" or "news management" with a fervor. It can be relatively easy to deplore the news managers on a well-publicized Federal case where others have led the way. However, it is more important that you be able to do your own analysis of Government operations to expose the unjustified secrecy that slips into Government agencies under many different guises.

Many journalism schools and many professional newspaper organizations are doing a laudable job of trying to promote a greater interest in depth knowledge of Government information problems. However, the effort is still far from successful.

It is unfortunate that deep splits have developed in the ranks of the working newsmen that tend to hurt the entire cause. One group tends to scoff at the resolutions passed by freedom of information committees as being ineffective. This group may point to an enthusiastic resolution supporter who does not follow through in his daily operations. There is the claim that all that is needed is good reporting to break through any of the information barriers.

Such feuding tends to weaken the newspapers on an issue upon which they should be united. There is no doubt that good aggressive reporters and editors can do a great deal to break through news barriers. However, when the problem becomes national in scope, there is also the need for strong and unified support from other newspapers and from professional organizations. It is seldom that one reporter or one newspaper can break through a secrecy wall on the national level if there is not general newspaper support. It is even more difficult if there is active opposition from well-known but poorly informed national columnists.

Fortunately, most of the columnists are reasonably well informed on this issue, but some are not. One well-known columnist screamed about "news management" but a short time later supported a total arbitrary secrecy in a claim of "executive privilege."

How could he complain that an administration was engaged in news management by putting out favorable press releases, and then defend that administration for arbitrarily barring Congress from investigating behind the self-serving declarations in the news releases. Some might contend that the man was forsaking journalistic principles to promote the things he felt were expedient.

He was not dishonest. It was worse than that. He simply does not know Government operations. He writes the big picture, second-guessing the President, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State on all types of broad policy issues. Yet, I know from considerable personal experience that he is unfamiliar with the detailed little pictures that are necessary if one is to draw sweeping conclusions on the so-called big picture.

This columnist had no understanding of the laws, regulations, or court decisions involved in the problem of executive privilege. Secrecy was wrong one week because it interfered with a story he was pursuing. Broader secrecy was acceptable the next week because it seemed to bar information from a Senator he did not like.

Over a period of years, I believe that the activities of our journalism schools and our professional newspaper organizations can do a lot to eradicate or minimize such misleading commentary.

As far as the overall information picture is concerned, I do not want to be an alarmist. However, I do want to express concern over a number of actions in the Kennedy administration that deal with the information policy. Some are mere extensions of the Eisenhower administration's policies, and some seem to carry the New Frontier stamp.

I do not believe we are faced with public officials who want to interfere with the rights of a free press or the proper operations of our democracy. However, this does not mean that I believe we can count on the good intentions or the self-serving statements of any administration. The President and others charged with the responsibility for military defense can easily rationalize steps to bar the press or Congress from embarrassing information. The political aspirations of nearly every high official in the executive branch tend to make it easy to justify press releases that give an overly optimistic picture of how well Government is being administered.

The men heading our Government may have the best interests of the press at heart, but it is cause for concern when Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester starts to talk of an inherent right to lie about defense matters. This is particularly troublesome when it is accompanied by a directive which makes it necessary for all civilian and military officials at the Pentagon to report all conversations with reporters before the close of business each day.

Take such pronouncements in context with other developments in recent years, and it is apparent why newsmen should be giving more serious study to the laws and practices on Government information. Just review some examples:

When an Air Force navigator was crippled for life in a bomber crash, the Air Force denied him Government records he needed to press a damage claim.

When a Government investigator displeased his superiors with a report on misuse of U.S. foreign aid to Cambodia, the State Department refused him access to his own personnel records which, he claimed, would show he was railroaded out of his job.

The Defense Department refused to allow a Senate committee to question Defense censors on their official actions.

The State Department refused Congress access to records containing evidence of fraud in foreign-aid spending in Laos and Peru.

The Atomic Energy Commission and the Budget used an arbitrary secrecy ruling to hide a conflict of interest which made a multimillion-dollar power contract illegal.

A State Department official refused to give the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a copy of a controversial foreign relations planning paper.

High State Department officials accused a foreign government representative of bribery, but refused to produce documents or testimony to support the charge.

Even a Government agency, the General Accounting Office, was denied access to official Navy, Air Force, and State Department records despite a specific law giving GAO such right of access.

These are not examples of what might happen in the United States under an all-powerful authoritarian executive branch of Government. These are only a few of the cases demonstrating what has happened in the American Democracy in recent years under an arbitrary claim of a right to unlimited secrecy.

This unlimited secrecy has been promoted under the term executive privilege. Through a simple self-serving declaration that the public interest is involved, officials of the executive branch have pulled down the broad secrecy curtain. The public, the press, the Congress and even the courts are barred from records of testimony from Government officials or records of official acts.

President Eisenhower claimed his administration could bar Congress and the GAO from any records or testimony containing advice of high level officials.

President Kennedy has taken the Eisenhower thesis and extended it to declaring that he will not allow the questioning of subordinate officials of our career service on their official acts.

Executive branch officials admit there is hardly a paper of importance in any Executive agency that does not include the opinions, conclusions or recommendations to qualify for an executive privilege secrecy stamp.

The result is a doctrine that disregards the law, flies in the face of court decisions, scoffs at the right of the public to be informed and arrogantly rejects the processes of Congress.

In its simplest form, it is a proclamation that the executive branch cannot be challenged in its invocation of total secrecy. It strips away, or diminishes, the constitutional right of the Congress to investigate the administration of laws.

Neither the Eisenhower administration nor the Kennedy administration has used the ultimate power inherent in the executive priviledge doctrine. Total application of this doctrine would create a public uproar for it would be executive tyranny. Both administrations have made much information available that might have been hidden by executive privilege, and in some cases information was revealed that was against the political interests of the administration in power. However, in many of these cases, the executive branch officials had no real choice for there was already enough information in the public domain to make a coverup impractical.

It would have been poor politics for the Kennedy administration to have tried to use executive privilege to pull down the secrecy curtain on the Billie Sol Estes case. When the McClellan committee started its investigation of Estes in April there had already been an exposure of large segments of the Estes case by a Texas newspaper and by Texas attorney general Will Wilson.

Use of executive privilege at that point would have meant political disaster for Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman. Pulling down a secrecy curtain in the fact of strong evidence of fraud would have been similar to claiming the fifth amendment. Freeman couldn't afford secrecy in the face of evidence indicating fraud or favoritism. The Kennedy administration couldn't afford to face a charge of coverup on the first major scandal problem.

The Kennedy administration opened the records for Chairman McCLELLAN, and for a House subcommittee headed by Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina. Investigative reports were made available to the press and to the Senate and House investigators. High-level officials testified on their opinions, conclusions, and recommendations in the cotton allotment decisions that favored Billie Sol Estes, and on the decisions that resulted in Estes being named to the National Cotton Advisory Board.

Low-level officials testified in detail on their dealings with Estes. Nothing was withheld, the administration claimed.

The open Government policy in the Estes case was a complete reversal of form for the Kennedy administration. Less than 2 months earlier, President Kennedy had given his approval to a Defense Department decision to refuse to allow a Senate armed service subcommittee to question Defense censors on their official actions.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara used the secrecy of executive privilege to block the Stennis subcommittee from questioning the censors on specific changes in speeches of high ranking military officers.

On February 8, 1962, President Kennedy wrote to McNamara:

"I have concluded that it would be contrary to the public interest to make available any information which would enable the subcommittee to identify and hold accountable any individual with respect to any particular speech that he has reviewed.

"I therefore direct you, and all personnel under the jurisdiction of your department, not to give any testimony or produce any documents which would disclose any such information."

President Kennedy did not contend that the national security of the country might be jeopardized in the questioning of the censors. He did not contend that defense or state secrets of a highly classified nature might be involved. This would have been ludicrous.

So, the President simply gave his view that it was "in the public interest" and the secrecy of executive privilege was claimed.

It was politically practical to assert a claim of unlimited secrecy in the censors' hearings, because Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, was the major opposition. Senator THURMOND held a position on racial and economic matters which had little national appeal, and he was regarded as a symbol of extreme right-wing thinking. It was Senator THURMOND who contended that the Pentagon and State Department censors were watering down the speeches of generals and admirals, and were in essence pursuing a no-win philosophy. The Defense and State Departments denied the allegation, and the Armed Services Subcommittee, under Chairman JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, was established to do a full investigation of the controversial blue penciling.

The Defense Department made copies of the public speeches available, and McNamara and others testified on the general policy under which censors operated. However, the important question was how the policies were interpreted and applied by the actual censors. That question was never answered, because the claim of executive privilege was used to avoid pinpointing of responsibility for specific actions.

This was not a wild and free-swinging investigation under an irresponsible chairman. This was not a committee operating outside of its jurisdiction, and engaging in abusive treatment of witnesses. It was a properly authorized subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee; it was operating within its jurisdiction, asking for Government records and asking questions that were pertinent to the inquiry.

McNamara declared that the Congress would have to content itself with his self-serving declaration—his high-level handouts—and would be prevented from going behind his assertions. Amazingly, the editorial cheers for McNamara were deafening. He was cheered because he was defying Senator THURMOND.

The question of whether Senator THURMOND was right or wrong in his conclusions on the censors was not important. He had the right to be wrong, as long as he conducted himself in a proper manner, and asked pertinent questions in a legitimate investigation. He had fully as much right to ask questions as any member of the press, and he had a right to expect answers that were truthful.

The press should examine its performance in this case as it considers that information policies that were adopted later by McNamara and Sylvester. The press forgot principles for the moment in the interest of kicking a Senator who held an unpopular view. The press also forgot its own long-time self interest.

McNamara was arbitrary, he was defiant of the power of Congress, and he was crowned a hero. Was it any wonder that he and

Sylvester were confident in seeking the maximum in their more recent news managing ventures in connection with the Cuban affair? Was it any wonder Pentagon officials and the White House believed it was possible to adopt the Sylvester directive to control press contacts at the Pentagon?

Pentagon reporters have characterized the Sylvester directive on press contacts as a "Gestapo" tactic. They comment that they feel the Sylvester directive, if implemented, will have the potential for shutting off legitimate dissent on policy matters that have nothing to do with national security. Even if the order is not fully implemented, it is felt it will be a club over the heads of military and civilian personnel. It is a formal order, and can be used as a basis for disciplinary action at the times when the McNamara team wants to use it to curb dissent.

Defense Secretary McNamara may want to run the Defense Department in the best and most efficient manner. We can credit him with wanting to achieve the maximum military strength for the minimum expenditure. We can assume that he believes his policies are in the best interests of the Nation. However, the same thing could have been said for most of our past Secretaries of Defense and their military chiefs.

The present administration did not accept the Eisenhower administration's assessment of its achievements. In fact, President Kennedy and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were sharply critical of the defense policies of President Eisenhower. Since assuming office, they have stressed that the Eisenhower administration policies resulted in what they believed to be serious military weaknesses. They have assured us that Defense Secretary McNamara and General Taylor have been working feverishly and have repaired many of the weaknesses in our defense armor.

The men who are now leading our Nation did not want us to accept the self-serving declarations of the Eisenhower administration on our defense posture. Now they contend that what they found demonstrated the former policies were wrong.

Are we now to assume that we have finally found that infallible team composed of men who will instinctively know what is best for us? Are we to assume that McNamara, only 2 years in the job, can produce the right answers on complex problems of defense without the benefit of dissent or public debate?

The press should be insistent that the Sylvester directive is wiped off the books. The effectiveness of the press in opposing the directive will depend upon its persistence. While it has been encouraging to see the Nation's press genuinely irritated over the Sylvester order and the attitudes that surround it, it is doubtful that this fury will continue.

If there is sharp and continued criticism, I have no doubt the Sylvester order will eventually be modified or withdrawn.

However, if the Nation's newspapers follow a characteristic pattern, the fury will soon give way to a few mild protests, and these will in turn give way to a whimpering acceptance of the chains. The short attention span of many newspapers will mean that the Sylvester directive will be forgotten, and the high-level handout collecting that goes with it will become an accepted part of the Washington news-gathering picture.

The press has an obligation to rip the Sylvester directive apart at every opportunity, not only because it is bad, but because it can become the pattern for further similar directives if it survives.

Past history should pretty well demonstrate that the executive branch does not do a good job of investigating itself. This is particularly true of the Military Establishment. It was the Congress that revealed the scandals involving Gen. Benny Meyers. It was the Congress that pulled loose the scandals involving Harry (the Hat) Lev and the New York procurement office. It was the Congress that produced the "Chamber of Horrors" on military buying practices generally. It was the Congress that revealed the details of the classic military corruption and mismanagement in the construction of an airstrip at Fort Lee, Va.

These scandals were actually being hidden or disregarded by the Pentagon until the Congress stepped in and forced aggressive action. Our thinking on future problems should be keyed to these documented studies of the past.

We should remember that the Symington Armed Services Subcommittee has demonstrated that several billions of dollars were wasted in the stockpiling of strategic and critical material. A vast curtain of secrecy covered the stockpile purchasing and the political letters and questionable decisions that went into the creation of that $9 billion stockpile.

By now the lesson should be clear. Government secrecy has been used to hide corruption, mismanagement, and arbitrary abuse of power.

However, we must accept some secrecy as necessary to cover some military matters and some diplomatic negotiations. (Also, some secrecy is provided by law, such as in the income tax field.)

Our job is to see that the secrecy is limited to the areas clearly defined by laws and regulations. Even in the areas of military security and diplomatic negotiations there must be an avenue for review by proper committees of Congress and by the General Accounting Office.

Today we have four basic information problem areas:

1. The common news management in which an administration releases information that is most favorable to its activities, and makes it difficult to obtain contrary facts.

2. Such special directives as the Sylvester order of October 27, 1962, to control all press contacts at the Pentagon.

3. The misuse of military security classifications to cover up mistakes of judgment, malfeasance, and incompetence on the part of an incumbent administration.

4. The arbitrary and unlimited secrecy claim inherent in the executive privilege doctrine as stated by President Eisenhower and carried on by President Kennedy.

Of all these problems, I am least concerned about simple news management as it is usually defined. Usually this term refers to the timing and wording of Government press releases to put the best foot forward for the incumbent administration. I am concerned only when the administration insists we accept these self-serving declarations, and then refuses to allow us to go behind them.

I am most gravely concerned about the executive privilege doctrine. This doctrine is a naked claim to unlimited secrecy on the whim of the executive branch. It has been used to bar the press, the public, the Congress and the General Accounting Office from examining Government business. It has been used to hide scandals and mismanagement in our regulatory agencies, in the foreign aid program and in the Defense Department.

There is one thing that every citizen can do, and that every newspaper should do, in opposing the Washington coverup:

Give full support to Congress in asserting its right to investigate Government activities and Government spending.

I am not advocating that you should agree with the conclusions that any or all committees of Congress may reach in an investigation. I do suggest that you support the full right of Congress to call for documents and testimony in properly authorized investigations of Government activities.

The executive branch of the Government has grown more powerful year after year, and it seems unlikely that this power will be cut. It may be that a powerful Executive is needed in dealing with the problems of the cold war.

However, I do not believe that many of us would suggest that this great power that is lodged in the President and his official family should go unchecked. If that power is unchecked then we will have lost one of the most important aspects of our form of government—the checks and balances.

The Congress represents the only effective check on the executive branch. All legislative power resides in the Congress, and this means the power to pass laws, to investigate to see how the laws are being administered, and to investigate to determine if new laws are needed.

Every curtailment of the right of Congress to investigate is a curtailment of the right of the press to learn about the operations of Government. This is a curtailment of the public's right to know.

Congress may have its scoundrels, its scandals, and its abuses. But it is well to remember that Congress is a bipartisan body. It has within it the representatives of every shade of political thinking in our society from extreme liberal to extreme conservative. This diversity of thought is the strength of our Congress, and it is the real strength of our system of government. It is our only protection against the arbitrary and unauthorized use of power by the powerful executive branch that exists today.

In the last few weeks, I have read all of the earlier Eric Allen memorial lectures. They covered a wide range of interests, as diverse as were the interests of the men who gave them. However, it did seem to me that through them all ran one dominant theme—one basic belief:

Freedom of the press exists only to provide for reporting and commentary on public affairs. We are true to our profession only as we work to provide the light that makes the democratic process more effective.

It cannot be emphasized too often that our basic responsibility is governmental affairs. It was encouraging to see that all of your past Eric Allen speakers were in agreement on this point. In one way or another, each of them sought to demonstrate that the comics, gossip columns, fashions, sports and the puzzles—necessary as they may be in making mass appeal—are not the press activities the framers of our Constitution had in mind in guaranteeing a free press.

I believe Eric Allen would have found something of value in each of those earlier lectures, and I am sure he would have found the compiled lectures carried an inspiration greater than any single one.

We need a full measure of inspiration, as well as perspiration, to handle our responsibilities in these days of $100 billion budgets. We need a persistent devotion to our tasks if we are to understand and control the high cost of government secrecy at the city, county, State, or Federal level.

The future of democracy is contingent upon whether we can subordinate political partisanship and petty differences for basic principles. This is the least we can do to honor the memory of men like Eric Allen.

NATIONAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1963—POSITION OF NEA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the National Education Association Division of Federal Relations provides a most interesting and informative report to its membership through a publication entitled "Washington Outlook on Education."

The February 1, 1963, issue is devoted to the National Education Improvement Act of 1963, which I had the honor to introduce as S. 580.

Since this brief statement contains not only an excellent summary of the bill but, in addition, the official position of the NEA as voiced by Dr. William G. Carr, executive secretary of the NEA, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HILL GETS NATIONAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT

President Kennedy on January 29 called for a comprehensive program to help overcome shortcomings in American education. The 24-point program was wrapped up in a single bill (S. 580) (Morse, Democrat, of Oregon) providing Federal aid to education from the elementary through the postgraduate level. Companion bills were introduced in the House by Representative Powell, Democrat, of New York; Perkins, Democrat, of Kentucky; Green, Democrat, of Oregon; Roosevelt, Democrat, of California; and Sickles, Democrat, of Maryland.

PSYCHOLOGY OF THE COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH

Mr. Kennedy told Congress that he is not the first but "I hope to be the last" President to call the Nation's attention to its needless shortcomings on education. Outlining his 24-point program in a special message to Congress, the President explained the single-bill approach, saying:

"To enable the full range of educational needs to be considered as a whole, I am transmitting to the Congress with this message a single, comprehensive education bill—the National Education Improvement Act of 1963. For education cannot easily or wisely be divided into separate parts. Each part is linked to the other. The colleges depend on the work of the schools; the schools depend on the colleges for teachers; vocational and technical education is not separate from general education. This bill recalls the posture of Jefferson: 'Nobody can doubt my zeal for the general instruction of the people. I never have proposed a sacrifice of the primary to the ultimate grade of instruction. Let us keep our eye steadily on the whole system.'

"In order that its full relation to economic growth, to the new age of science, to the national security, and to human and institutional freedom may be analyzed in proper persepective, this bill should be considered as a whole, as a combination of elements designed to solve problems that have no single solution.

"This is not a partisan measure—and it neither includes nor rejects all of the features which have long been sought by the various educational groups and organizations. It is instead an attempt to launch a prudent and balanced program drawing upon the efforts of many past Congresses and the proposals of many Members of both Houses and both political parties. It is solely an educational program, without trying to solve all other difficult domestic problems. It is clearly realistic in terms of its cost—and it is clearly essential to the growth and security of this country."

THE NATIONAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1963

The bill carries—with some notable concessions—nearly every education request Kennedy has made since taking office. The legislation would help pay for new classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and shops; provide higher pay for better training for teachers; and open new sources of funds for college students.

Unofficially, its total cost over 4 years would be about $5 billion. The comprehensive program calls for new obligational authority of $1.2 billion and actual spending of $143.6 million—above present levels—in the 1964 fiscal year.

The program was tailored to meet some of the congressional obligations that have "dogged" school aid proposals from both Democratic and Republican Presidents. President Kennedy made it clear that he regarded Congress as duty bound to face and solve the religious dispute as well as others facing the school aid proposals. The President emphasized:

"We can no longer afford the luxury of endless debate over all the complicated and sensitive questions raised by each new proposal on Federal participation in education. To be sure, these are all hard problems—but this Nation has not come to its present position of leadership by avoiding hard problems. We are at a point in history when we must face and resolve these problems."

A summary of the major proposals in the National Education Improvement Act follows:

Student loans: Raise the ceiling of $90 million on annual Federal appropriations for college student loans to $135 million and eliminate the yearly ceiling of $250,000 on loans to students at any one institution.

Loan insurance: Supplement direct college student loans by insuring commercial loans to students who could not meet the criteria for direct Federal help. Insured loans would be limited to $2,000 a year.

Work study: Appropriate $22.5 million to pay half of the wages for student campus employment of an educational character of up to 15 hours per week.

Fellowship: Increase the National Defense Education Act graduate fellowship program from 1,500 to 10,000 annually for the next 3 fiscal years, plus 2,000 additional summer session fellowships. These fellowships now pay from $2,000 to $2,400 a year.

Construction: Authorize $1 billion over 3 years of Federal loans to public and private colleges for the building of acedemic facilities.

Junior colleges: Appropriate $50 million for fiscal 1964 and such sums as are necessary for two succeeding years for grants to states to construct community junior colleges.

College libraries: Appropriate $40 million for the first year of a 3-year program to help colleges and universities build libraries and acquire books. Construction grants would be on a 50-50 matching basis, with Federal funds going for only 25 percent of book and material costs.

Graduate schools: Appropriate $40 million to start a similar grant program to expand graduate schools.

Languages: Extend for 2 years existing laws aiding public and private institutions of higher learning in the study of foreign languages with an increase in funds from $8 million annually to $13 million for fiscal 1964.

Teacher institutes: Expand authority for teacher institutes financed by the Office of Education to admit teachers of English, humanities, social sciences, and library personnel; increase funds from $14.5 million to $37.5 million.

Specialized training: Finance, with an initial appropriation of $7.5 million, a 3-year program to help train teachers for the mentally retarded and other handicapped children, of gifted, or culturally deprived children, and of adult literacy.

Teacher preparation programs: Project grants to colleges and universities to strengthen departments and programs which prepare elementary and secondary school teachers. Emphasis will be on subject matter courses, $7.5 million for fiscal year 1964 and necessary sums for next 2 years. Public and private nonprofit education institutions eligible.

Vocational education: Expand such programs to meet the needs of individuals in all age groups for training in occupations where they can find employment in today's diverse labor markets. By increasing Federal expenditures from $50 million to $73 million for the 1964 fiscal year, and necessary sums for each of the succeeding 4 years.

Extension, adult courses: Provide $14 million for grants to States to expand university extension courses in land-grant colleges and State universities and to provide classes for illiterate adults in public schools.

STRENGTHENING PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

In the area of elementary-secondary school aid, the President recommended instead of a general aid approach that could at best create a small wave in a huge ocean, our efforts should be selective and stimulative, encouraging the States to redouble their efforts under a plan that would phase out Federal aid over a 4-year period.

The President recommended strengthening elementary and secondary education by:

Selective and urgent improvement of public elementary and secondary education: 4-year $1.5 billion program of Federal grants to States for teacher salary improvement; i.e., increasing maximum salaries, raising low starting salaries, raising low average salaries in economically disadvantaged districts; support for critical classroom construction needs such as overcrowding, fire and health hazards; support for special projects to improve educational quality particularly in disadvantaged rural and urban areas. Appropriation would be authorized so as to phase out Federal support by the end of program. Public schools only.

Acquisition of science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction equipment (amendments to title III of the National Defense Education Act): Extends for 2 years title III of the National Defense Education Act for purchase of equipment needed in science, math, and modern foreign language instruction in elementary and secondary schools. Grants to public schools—loans to private nonprofit schools as in present law.

Guidance, counselling and testing (amendments to title V of the National Defense Education Act): Extends counselling and guidance title of the National Defense Education Act for 2 years and increases authorization from $15 million to $17.5 million for fiscal year 1964 and succeeding years. Authorizes testing program for all seventh- and eighth-grade students. Public schools only, except for testing in private nonprofit schools.

Federally affected areas (amendments to Public Law 815 and Public Law 874): Extends all expiring provisions for 4 years; no modifications in payment formulas for first year, with some reduction in the formulas beginning the second year and standardization of the eligibility conditions at 5 percent in the third year; and inclusion of the District of Columbia. Public schools only as in present law.

NEA REACTION

Commenting upon President Kennedy's comprehensive program outlined in his special message on education, Dr. William G. Carr, NEA executive secretary, stated:

"The association welcomes this clear and courageous reaffirmation of the President's concern for education, hails the comprehensive aspects of the program, and is encouraged by the proposals to strengthen American education at the points of most urgent national need. The association will seek the widest possible civic and professional cooperation to secure the enactment of the program as a whole."

Analysis of new obligation authority and expenditures

[In thousands of dollars]

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

	1962 enacted		1963 estimated		1964 estimated	
	New obligation authority	Expenditures	New obligation authority	Expenditures	New obligation authority	Expenditures
National Defense Education Act:						
Elementary and secondary	72,750	53,644	72,750	54,600	72,750	61,350
Higher education	103,407	96,794	118,700	114,800	118,650	118,650
Other aids to education	34,470	30,900	38,000	34,000	38,220	36,000
Total	210,627	181,358	229,450	203,400	229,620	216,000
Federally affected areas:						
Operation	217,000	226,419	282,322	260,000	320,670	297,901
Construction	61,942	56,490	63,686	59,945	61,784	63,042
Total	308,942	282,909	346,008	319,945	382,454	360,943
College aid (other than NDEA):						
Land-grant college:						
Morrill	2,550	2,550	2,550	2,550	2,550	2,550
Bankhead-Jones	8,194	8,194	11,950	11,950	11,950	11,950
Total	10,744	10,744	14,500	14,500	14,500	14,500
Vocational education:						
Smith-Hughes Act	7,161	7,147	7,161	7,161	7,161	7,161
George-Barden Act	33,672	33,032	34,716	33,800	34,756	34,100
Total	40,833	40,179	41,877	49,061	41,917	41,261
Handicapped teaching:						
Mentally retarded	1,000	916	1,000	997	1,000	997
Deaf	1,575	32	1,500	1,502	(1)	1,500
Total	2,575	948	2,500	2,499	1,000	2,497
Other educational programs:						
Cooperative research	5,000	3,697	6,985	5,740	17,000	11,670
Foreign language training and area studies					2,500	1,600
Library services	7,500	8,197	7,500	7,625	7,500	7,500
Educational research (foreign currency program)		6	400	17	800	685
Total	12,500	11,900	14,885	13,382	27,800	21,455
Salaries and expenses, Office of Education	11,594	11,158	12,899	12,435	16,261	15,574
New educational program (proposed legislation)					1,215,170	143,600
Total, Office of Education	597,815	539,196	662,119	607,122	1,928,722	815,830

OTHER GOVERNMENT UNITS

	1962 enacted		1963 estimated		1964 estimated	
	New obligation authority	Expenditures	New obligation authority	Expenditures	New obligation authority	Expenditures
National Science Foundation	263,041	182,689	322,488	238,000	589,000	343,000
Educational television			2,000	1,000	7,000	4,200
Juvenile delinquency and youth offenses	8,200	1,386	5,810	7,139	13,200	8,431
School milk program			109,997	97,497	102,000	102,000
School lunch program	170,000	169,112	169,993	169,493	182,000	182,000
Educational exchange:						
Mutual educational and cultural exchange	26,999	26,925	41,947	34,000	56,420	42,000
International educational exchange (foreign currency program)	7,400	11,450	(2)	13,000	(2)	10,000
Center for cultural interchange (East-West)	3,300	6,617	8,340	8,000	5,690	6,500
Total, educational exchange	37,699	44,992	50,287	55,000	62,110	58,500
Vocational Rehabilitation, Office of:						
Grants to States	64,450	63,330	72,940	71,754	88,700	86,650
Research and training	20,250	18,875	25,500	24,776	36,830	35,250
Research and training (foreign currency)	1,372	282	2,000	1,310	3,000	2,128
Salaries and expenses	2,325	2,227	2,480	2,456	2,905	2,869
Total, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation	88,397	84,714	102,920	100,296	131,435	126,897
Peace Corps	30,000	11,409	58,550	47,000	108,000	80,000
Surplus property	862	840	891	856	950	937

[1] Legislation expires, included in proposed new legislation.

[2] New obligational authority for 1963–64 included in mutual educational and cultural exchange program expenditures to continue until present funds exhausted.

A BALANCED BUDGET FOR THE U.S. POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, as recently as October 8 of this past year, I called to the attention of the Senate certain facts upon which I concluded that, following the enactment of the postal rate and pay bill of 1962, the Post Office Department would have a balanced budget by 1965.

Members of this body will recall that in setting forth these data last October, I explained in detail the adjustments which would achieve a balanced postal budget within 3 years. I still believe this possible. Certainly, as the costs of operating our great Postal Establishment reach $5 billion on an annual basis, we should take every precaution to assure the people who foot this bill that they shall have maximum, efficient service at the lowest possible cost. I, for one, hope we shall be able to provide such service for many years to come within the framework of an appropriation of this size. I need not remind this body that the cost of our entire Federal Government just 30 years ago was only $5 billion per year.

In reviewing the President's budget for 1964, the first full year in which our recent postal rate hikes will be in effect, I find that the postal deficit has been pared to $104 million.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that there was pending an increase in the fourth class rates, which are regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, not by Congress, which would amount to approximately $100 million, which would balance the budget. Furthermore, the President in his message states:

> Additional net revenues are expected to reduce this revenue deficiency in later years as successive stages of the postal rate increases enacted in 1962 become effective.

This, in my opinion, is full verification of the statement I made to the U.S. Senate on October 8, 1962.

As responsible legislators, we owe the American people the responsibility of taking whatever steps are necessary to achieve a balance in our $5 billion postal operation and at the same time improve the service to the people. Certainly, it is my intention that the committee in the near future will undertake studies dealing with postal costs, improvement of mail classification, and the greater use of machinery, for the purpose of achieving this kind of balance. As I have said many times before, our U.S. postal service should be the best in the world—not the most expensive. I firmly believe that we can achieve this balance without detriment to our loyal postal employees.

Any businesslike approach to the problem of this enormous cost should provide ways and means for our employees to cope with the growing volume of mail through more modern methods and equipment and gain for themselves greater rewards in the matter of postal pay and benefits. The key to this, of course, is "productivity."

In his budget message, the President supported this goal as follows, and I quote:

> Furthermore, we shall maintain pressure on each department and agency to improve its productivity and efficiency. Through improved management techniques, installation of modern equipment, and better coordination of agency programs, important productivity gains have already been realized, and further advances will be forthcoming. I mean to insure that in each of the various Federal programs, objectives are achieved at the lowest possible cost.

It seems to me that the executive and legislative branches working in harmony on this can realize economy goals that will keep the postal service within the reach of all the people.

THE PROBLEMS OF THE SOFTWOOD LUMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, when I took my oath of office as U.S. Senator last August, one of the first requests I made of my office staff was for a complete study of what had been done to alleviate the growing problems of the

softwood lumber industry in my State of Idaho, the whole Pacific Northwest, and throughout the country. Most of these problems over the past 2 years are a direct result of the fact that Canadian softwood lumber has been imported into this country in sufficient quantities to cause hardship on our own producers. It is significant I think when, by the end of 1962, 17 percent of our total domestic consumption of softwood lumber was Canadian. Throughout the country, but particularly in the Northwest and in my State of Idaho, mills are closing and putting people out of work because the market that was formerly available to them is now being taken over more and more by the Canadians.

The Canadian producers have certain definite advantages over our domestic producers. Among them are: First, the devaluation of the Canadian dollar; second, the Canadian Government's practice of allotting timber concessions without competitive bidding at low stumpage rates; third, lower wages; fourth, less costly and restrictive forest practices, such as setting minimum road standards and low slash disposal rates; fifth, high tariff rates on U.S. lumber shipped to Canada; and sixth, low charter rates for coastwise and intercoastal shipping.

These create a combination of circumstances favoring the Canadian producers against which our domestic producers cannot compete.

For many months Members of Congress have been concerned over this problem of Canadian imports, but until now most of us have preferred to see what relief could be given the American lumber industry by various Government agencies, without resorting to legislation. Many avenues have been tried.

When appeals were initially made to the Federal Government, its first reaction was to recommend a study. Finally, an Intergovernmental Committee was established by the Departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, and Interior last spring to make recommendations for action. So far, no definite recommendations have been forthcoming from this committee. Last spring the Senate Commerce Committee also held hearings on the problems of the American lumber industry. These hearings included field hearings at which hundreds of lumber-based communities had an opportunity to express their viewpoints. But no major legislation resulted from these hearings.

After other meetings had been held, the next big hurdle which the lumber industry had to cross was that of the U.S. Tariff Commission. At the President's request, after he had expressed great concern for the American lumber industry and had handed down his six-point program, the lumber industry took its case to the Tariff Commission. But, despite the President's expressed concern, and in the face of the facts and figures presented to the Commission by the industry during public hearings on the matter last fall, the Tariff Commission on February 14 sent to the President a report that would deny our lumbermen necessary and needed import relief.

Mr. President, I want to make it clear at this point that I do not intend to be partisan in my remarks today. Here in the Senate the States most concerned with the forest products industry are represented by both Democrats and Republicans.

I will be the first to say that this problem of Canadian imports is one which we must try to solve jointly, as representatives of our various States and not as members of either major political party. This problem transcends party labels.

Furthermore, I do not think that we can sit back and let the Tariff Commission's decision be the end of the matter. This Congress, this Government, this administration, can and should act positively to help the fourth largest industry in this country—the lumber industry—in alleviating one of its major problems.

Mr. President, the February 14 decision of the Tariff Commission was a historic one in two respects: First, it is the largest case ever considered by the Tariff Commission in terms of dollars involved in an industry and employees concerned, and second, this decision was the first rendered by the Tariff Commission under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The Commission did acknowledge the validity of the major portion of the lumber industry's claim for relief, but refused to grant relief by referring to the requirements of the Trade Expansion Act which say that the petitioner must prove injury resulting in major part from trade agreement concessions.

I wish to reiterate that point: The Tariff Commission ruled in agreement with the lumber industry that the increased Canadian imports, for various reasons, are making the American lumber industry suffer. But the Tariff Commission maintained that these increased imports were not due "in major part" to prior tariff concessions, thereby ruling out the Commission's right to help the industry through the Trade Expansion Act.

However, I believe that the Tariff Commission's report may have been worth more to the lumber industry than they at this moment realize. The Commission's report made this statement:

> The Commission observes further that while international commitments may deter Congress from legislating in conflict therewith, these commitments do not prevent Congress from so legislating. Congress may, if it so elects, legislate in conflict with any international commitments.

I therefore feel that the Tariff Commission has passed the responsibility to Congress, and I feel that it is our duty to pick it up and to assume the burden for correcting some of the disadvantages under which the U.S. lumber industry is forced to operate and over which it has no control.

The lumber industry—this country's fourth largest industry and one of the top three in Idaho—has worked hard in its appeal to the Government for help in solving the problems created by the inequitable import situation. The industry has even gone so far as to make many practical recommendations and to offer several sound solutions both to Congress and the executive agencies. Believe me, this industry has not merely been sitting back, asking for a Government handout. Its people have been working diligently and hard to put the lumber industry back on its feet. I believe the time has come for Congress to lend them a helping hand in their fight.

Today, I wish to introduce a package of measures which, if enacted, will do much to help the lumber industry. These measures are essentially the same as some which have just recently been introduced into the House of Representatives by various Members of Congress from both parties.

First, I propose the imposition of an import quota of 6 percent, based on the average quarterly domestic softwood consumption in the United States during the calendar years 1960, 1961, and 1962.

Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a Senate joint resolution to that effect, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 56) requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6-percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber, introduced by Mr. JORDAN, of Idaho, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Whereas on the 12th of October 1962, a disastrous windstorm caused excessive damage to the forests of the Pacific Northwest; and
>
> Whereas an estimated eleven billion six hundred million board feet of timber was blown down which, if not harvested within the next two years, may result in serious insect damage; and
>
> Whereas this timber must be harvested in order to prevent a greater loss of our country's major renewable natural resource; and
>
> Whereas lumber producers in the Northeast, the Southwest, the Midwest, the Southeast, and the Northwest will be adversely affected by the marketing of an additional two billion board feet of lumber over the next three years from the downed timber; and
>
> Whereas many factors adversely affecting the competitive position of the American lumber producer cannot be solved without Government assistance and cooperation: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the President is hereby requested to impose an emergency temporary quota of 6 per centum on the import of softwood lumber for the period of three years. This emergency quota to be determined on the basis of 6 per centum of the average quarterly domestic softwood consumption in the United States during the calendar years 1960, 1961, and 1962.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, this joint resolution is a bit broader than a similar one introduced in the House of Representatives. In addition, it takes into account that the lumber industry throughout the whole country, not just the lumber industry of the Pacific Northwest, will be hurt by the marketing of an additional 2 billion board feet of lumber over the next 3 years as a result of the harvesting of the timber downed by windstorm in the Northwest on October 12, 1962.

Second, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 957) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin, introduced by Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That subdivision (J) of section 304(a)(3) of the Tariff Act of 1930, amended (19 U.S.C. 1304 (a)(3)(J)), is amended to read as follows:
>
> "(J)(1) Such article is of a class or kind with respect to which the Secretary of the Treasury has given notice by publication in the weekly Treasury Decisions within two years after July 1, 1937, that articles of such class or kind were imported in substantial quantities during the five-year period immediately preceding January 1, 1937, and were not required during such period to be marked to indicate their origin: *Provided*, That this subdivision shall not apply after June 1, 1963, to sawed lumber and wood products.
>
> "(2) No trade agreement or other international agreement heretofore or hereafter entered into by the United States shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with the requirements of this section."

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, people in Idaho have been worrying about the situation of the lumber industry in our State for over 2 years. In January 1961 the State Legislature of Idaho passed a joint memorial urging the President and the Congress to take some action to alleviate the problems of the lumber industry.

All segments of our economy in Idaho are vitally concerned about this situation. The businessmen have been, and still are, quite concerned. Last fall, during the months of October and November, I received various letters and resolutions from chambers of commerce throughout the State, particularly in the north, relative to the problem of Canadian imports of softwood lumber. On November 19 the board of directors of the Idaho State Chamber of Commerce unanimously approved a resolution calling upon the President of the United States "to impose fair quotas on Canadian lumber imports and to take whatever action is necessary to insure the survival of the American lumber industry by removing every impediment which makes it impossible for the American lumber industry to compete on an equal basis with other countries."

Just a few weeks ago, because the lumber situation has not been eased but, in fact, has grown worse since 1961, the Idaho State Legislature again passed a joint memorial, House Joint Memorial 1, calling upon Congress and the President to establish controls to regulate the flow of foreign lumber by a quota system and that such lumber be marked to show the country of origin. These first two pieces of proposed legislation which I have today introduced implement this joint memorial of the State legislature.

In addition to the joint memorial passed by the Idaho State Legislature, the Legislatures of Colorado, Montana, and Washington have approved joint memorials calling upon Congress and the President to impose limitations on the import of Canadian softwood lumber; and the Legislatures of Oregon, Texas, and Arizona have similar memorials under consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Memorial 1 of the Idaho Legislature be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, House Joint Memorial 1 of the Idaho Legislature was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

> *To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled and to the Honorable Secretary of the Treasury of the United States:*
>
> We, your memorialists, the members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 37th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:
>
> Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States, and
>
> Whereas there is a need to cope with the large volume of blowdown timber on the Pacific coast and to increase the cut from overmature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes, and
>
> Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries, and
>
> Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canada, due to advantages such as (1) depreciated currency; (2) low stumpage rates; (3) noncompetitive bidding; (4) less costly and restrictive forest practices; (5) lower wage rates; (6) high tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada; (7) low charter rates for coastwise and intercoastal shipping; (8) a cooperative government; and
>
> Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States, and
>
> Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities, and
>
> Whereas there is no longer any justification by reason of a trade agreement between Canada and the United States for exempting Canadian lumber from the requirement that all foreign imports be marked, and
>
> Whereas without foreign imports being marked it is difficult to be certain that the executive orders requiring the use of domestic lumber in certain installations will be obeyed: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the house of representatives and the senate concurring)*, That the Congress, the President, and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of America, be respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show ~~the~~ country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes, and deterioration of communities; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President, Vice President, and Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.
>
> PETE T. CENARRUSA,
> *Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
> W. A. DREVLOW,
> *President of the Senate.*

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, there has also been introduced into the Idaho Legislature a proposed National Products Preference Act. This bill would require that a preference be given to domestic forest products in any State-supported construction when the price quoted for the same is not more than 20 percent in excess of the lowest bid or price.

These actions by the Idaho State Legislature clearly indicate the statewide concern in Idaho with the problems of our lumber industry.

Since February 1, several resolutions have come into my office from the lumber workers of Idaho themselves. So far, a total of 2,300 lumber workers in my State have signed the resolutions which I have received. These men are perhaps more vitally concerned than any other group. This is affecting their bread and butter—their very livelihood.

Their resolutions ask this:

> That the Congress and President of the United States of America be respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin.

Incidentally, one lumber company in my State of Idaho feels so strongly about the necessity of marking lumber with its country of origin that it has voluntarily taken the lead in this practice and at this time is so marking its lumber.

Last year, another avenue which the lumber industry tried for relief was asking for assistance under section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act. The Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture at one point informed the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that, in his opinion, lumber, or actually trees, is an agriculture commodity. But later the Secretary of Agriculture said that section 22 of the act could not be applied for relief of the lumber industry. Also, the Department of Justice has informally advised lumber officials that

they do not look with favor upon this plea. So it appears that we must again resort to legislation to have trees included as an agriculture commodity.

The third measure I introduce today for appropriate reference would amend section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act so that the Secretary of Agriculture can include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act, enabling the lumber industry to get protection from competition from foreign imports. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 962) to amend section 22 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773; 7 U.S.C. 624), to require the Secretary of Agriculture to include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act introduced by Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That section 22 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773; 7 U.S.C. 624), is hereby amended by adding to the end of subsection (a) the following language: "For purposes of this section, 'agricultural commodity or products thereof' shall be deemed to include lumber and wood products."

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, in connection with the bill requiring that lumber be marked with the country of origin, I introduce for appropriate reference a fourth bill, requiring that only lumber and other wood products which have been manufactured in the United States may be used in construction or rehabilitation covered by FHA-insured mortgages.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 958) to amend the National Housing Act to provide that only lumber and other wood products which have been produced in the United States may be used in construction or rehabilitation covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages, introduced by Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That title V of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:
>
> "SEC. 517. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no mortgage or loan shall be insured by the Commissioner under any provision of this Act after the date of the enactment of this section unless he receives satisfactory assurances that all lumber and other wood products used in the construction or rehabilitation of the structure covered by the mortgage or loan will have been produced (and processed) in the United States; except that the Commissioner may, under rules and regulations promulgated by him, permit the use in any such construction or rehabilitation of lumber or other wood products which were produced (or processed) in a foreign country if he determines that neither the species of tree yielding the wood involved nor any species of tree yielding wood which is equivalent for the intended purpose is grown in the United States."

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that all four measures and the resolution be held at the desk for 1 week, for additional sponsors. Senators of both parties have indicated to me their desire to cosponsor these bills with me, to do their part to help bolster a declining American lumber industry.

Something must be done to correct some of the disadvantages under which the U.S. lumber industry ~~has~~ been forced to operate in recent years. I believe that these bills offer a fair and reasonable solution to some of the problems confronting the lumber industry over which it has no control, and I am hopeful that they will receive speedy consideration. People all over the country, directly or remotely connected with the lumber industry, from the lumberworkers and the millowners to the storekeepers who serve them and the consumers who buy wood products, are now looking to the Congress for action.

Mr. President, I assure the Senate that I am willing to cooperate with all persons who are interested in the plight of the softwood lumber industry in the United States. If other bills of a similar nature are introduced, I hope we shall work together to achieve the enactment of constructive legislation which will relieve this basic industry of some of the troubles which beset it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bills and joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] on the excellence of his maiden speech on the floor of the Senate and on the proposals which he is advancing here today in behalf of the lumber industry which is, as all of us know, so depressed economically. I am happy to join the Senator from Idaho in support of the resolutions which he is offering today with the hope they will be promptly considered and approved by the Congress so that the lumber industry can look forward to the future with hope.

Mr. President, all of us from lumber-producing States are deeply disturbed at the long-range effects of the decision of February 14 which was handed down by the U.S. Tariff Commission in the case brought before it by the softwood lumber industry. This is the first decision handed down by the Commission since the Trade Agreements Act of 1962—which I voted against—and it very dramatically points up the ineffectiveness of the so-called protective feature of this act for American industries. The Tariff Commission in effect ruled that though the Canadian lumber imports have risen significantly and the domestic lumber industry has suffered greatly, the increased imports cannot be directly related to a prior tariff concession, which is required by the 1962 act. Thus, while the Commission recognizes that a great industry is being economically depressed, small business operations made inoperative, and the breadwinners of families forced on to the unemployment rolls this Commission is unable under existing law to take any action to assist these American taxpayers and citizens. All the Tariff Commission can recommend is for the small businessman engaged in lumbering to go bankrupt or to close down his mill and for the man unemployed by such action all they can offer is the right to draw unemployment compensation. This, Mr. President, is not the American way or the American dream.

Mr. President, I hate to say "I told you so" but last September 21 in a speech on this Senate floor, I predicted that the Trade Agreements Act of 1962, which we at that time had just enacted, would not meet the needs of our various agriculture industries.

Consequently, I reluctantly voted against the act although I favored the objective of expanded international trade toward which it moved without the necessary safeguards for American industry, especially the agricultural and natural resources sectors of it.

In fact, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 15, page 20347, I stated:

> I wish I could believe that the bill which the Senate passed this week, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, contains provisions which will provide for protective measures for this great segment of our agriculture industry. I fear that it does not. I fear that agriculture and my great area of our Nation may be in for some increasingly difficult times because of the action of the Senate.

Mr. President, my fears have been increased by the decision of February 14 by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. President, as we look back down the road where we have been we can see that we do not have on the books the needed protective provisions of law in this area. When we have an industry such as the lumber industry where mills are closing and people are being unemployed because the market is being taken over by imports from another country, I think it is time we in the legislative halls take another look at where we have been and decide where we are going if we are going to legislate so that American industry can look to the future with hope for success. The first decision of the Tariff Commission brought before it under the provisions of the act of 1962 points up very dramatically that the Tariff Commission has virtually ceased to exist as an effective agency to which any suffering domestic industry or its employees can turn for relief. Therefore, in order to restore effectiveness to the Tariff Commission and to offer to American industry and the working men and women of this country, some semblance of hope for their economic future, this Congress should take the action proposed in the legislation which my colleague from Idaho has introduced here today. While these proposals are not the complete answer to the problem they are certainly an affirmative step in the direction of guaranteeing the right of American industries to survive and provide jobs for American citizens.

Mr. President, may I remind the Senate once again of a statement made by President Kennedy in Salem, Oreg., on September 7, 1960, in which he said to a timber-based community:

> It is time for a fresh and imaginative program to resolve the problem of our Nation's timber industry and in 1961 we are going to put such a program into action.

This was an excellent statement of intention. Unfortunately the implementation of it has been most unrewarding. It is now 1963—almost 2½ years since that statement was made and yet no definitive action has been taken which will bring economic relief to the timber industry. In fact, the only action taken through the Trade Agreements Act has added to the plight of the industry.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the Senate and the administration to support the proposals which are advanced here today so that we can resolve the problem of our Nation's timber industry and bring a ray of hope to the economic future of the men and women who depend on the success of this industry for their livelihood.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which provides a program of financial assistance to the States, for the construction of public community colleges. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and an analysis of the bill be printed in the Record, following my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for 5 days, so that additional Senators may sponsor the bill if they so desire.

Mr. President, many factors point to the continued growth of these unique educational institutions. The time is rapidly approaching when community colleges should become as general in our country as central high schools. The growing need for skilled technical and professional workers means that we must extend our range of general education beyond the high school and must carry it into at least 2 years of college.

During the 1950's there was a 58-percent increase in the number of skilled technical and professional workers. In the 1960's, the indications are that this tremendous growth will spurt even higher as the pressures of automation and other technological progress make their impact on our employment situation.

Higher education is no longer a luxury. Parents throughout the country recognize that unless their youngsters are equipped with adequate education, they will be among the job leftouts who seek the good jobs, but find they are not qualified for them.

In addition, the complexity of public problems which every citizen must face makes it essential that the young people of today become alert and informed adults capable of understanding and participating in the resolution of the great issues of tomorrow.

Throughout the Nation there have been encouraging signs that the value of community colleges is being recognized. Several States have made audits of their higher education facilities and have measured them against the steadily increasing pressure of demand for college training. In evaluating these studies, numerous States have come to the conclusion that the community colleges offer tremendous advantages in meeting present and anticipated needs.

The community college is indeed a community institution. Within its facilities there is the capability for meeting a wide range of needs in the community, and to do so economically.

The community colleges provide a 2-year terminal program for students not going on to a 4-year college course, a transfer program for those who do wish to complete a college training program of 4 or more years, technical training for those who desire to enter skilled vocational and subprofessional careers, and continuing education for adults who want to further their education while working.

On the fiscal side, they are economical to establish and they are economical to attend. Community colleges do not include expensive dormitory and eating facilities, and, therefore, do not require the tremendous sums involved in such structures. Student expenses are usually low, because, for the most part, junior colleges are within commuting distance, and thus make it possible for students to live at home and, if need be, to work part time in their own communities.

In New Jersey, these community colleges have received a great impetus through the enactment of legislation to assist counties in establishing colleges. The very presence of these colleges within sight of high school students who are thinking about their future is bound to make the difference between having many qualified youngsters go on to college or having them write "the end" to their education at the high school exit doors.

In the past session of Congress, one of the most bitter disappointments was the defeat of higher education legislation. At first, all of us were encouraged when the House passed a bill by a vote of 319 to 79, and later the Senate passed a similar bill by a vote of 69 to 17. Then the bills went to conference, and finally the conferees found a way to work out an agreement on the proposed legislation. But a majority of the House of Representatives voted to recommit the measure, and it died.

My proposal for Federal aid to community colleges was a part of the Senate-passed bill, and was included in the conference recommendation. In fact, there was no opposition to this program, either in committee or on the floor of the House or on the floor of the Senate. The disagreements about provisions of the higher education legislation dealt with other parts of the program. It is clear that we need such legislation.

My bill, which is in the form passed last year by the Senate, would provide a 5-year program of matching grants to public colleges, with $50 million a year indicated as the Federal share. The administration's omnibus education bill adopts my bill for a 3-year period.

The demand for the development of facilities for adequate training grows stronger each year. In our State of New Jersey, for example, the high schools will graduate over 15,000 more seniors 4 years from now than they did last June, and the percentage of seniors who want to go to college has been steadily rising. It is estimated that by 1966, 40 percent will want to go on.

Numerous States, including my own, have been export States in the higher education field, sending forth each year numerous boys and girls who must look elsewhere for college opportunities. The program which I offer in this bill will help thousands of youngsters obtain a higher education. This will be useful to them and useful to the Nation, for unless we realize the fullest potential of our young people, we shall not be able to realize the fullest potential of our Nation's most important resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the Record, and the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The bill (S. 956) providing a program of financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges, introduced by Mr. Case, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Emergency Public Community College Construction Act of 1963."

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

Sec. 2. The Congress recognizes that the Nation faces a severe shortage of college facilities for the training of qualified young men and women. It also acknowledges the steady growth in need for semiprofessional and technical workers who require more preparation than high school, but less than four years of college.

It is therefore the purpose of this Act to assist in—

(1) supplying the greatly increasing need for college training facilities, and

(2) solving the problem of increasing costs for such training,

by providing a five-year emergency program of financial assistance to the States in constructing public community college facilities in such locations as will make such facilities accessible to the homes of as many individuals as may be possible.

AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

Sec. 3. For the purpose of this Act there is authorized to be appropriated $50,000,000 for each of the five successive fiscal years be-

ginning with the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1963.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES AND FEDERAL SHARE

Sec. 4. (a) The sums appropriated pursuant to section 3 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the income per person and the number of high school graduates of the respective States. Such allotments shall be made as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated pursuant to section 3 for such year as the product of—

(A) the number of high school graduates of the State, and

(B) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under subsection (c))

bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

(b) The allotment to any State under this section for any fiscal year shall be available until the end of the succeeding fiscal year for payment to it of the amounts certified, not later than the end of the fiscal year for which the allotment was made, by the State agency as the Federal share of the cost of constructing public community college facilities under the State plan approved pursuant to section 6.

(c) For purposes of this Act—

(1) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per person for the State by the income per person for all the States (not including Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75, (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam shall be .75, and (iii) the allotment ratio of any State shall be .50 for any fiscal year if the Commissioner finds that the cost of school construction in such State exceeds the median of such costs in all the States by a factor of 2 or more as determined by him on the basis of an index of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the States as determined for such fiscal year under section 15(6) of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 645), or, in the Commissioner's discretion, on the basis of such index and such other statistics and data as the Commissioner shall deem adequate and appropriate; and

(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner as soon as possible after enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, on the basis of the average of the incomes per person of the States and of all the States for the three most recent consecutive calendar years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

MATCHING REQUIREMENT

Sec. 5. Payment of the full Federal allotment to a State shall be contingent upon the matching of Federal funds by State or local funds, or both, as follows: Each State shall match the Federal allotment by an amount equal to the product of (1) the number of high school graduates in the State and (2) the difference between the national base and the Federal allotment to the State per high school graduate of the State: *Provided,* That in no case shall the State matching payment be more than twice the Federal allotment. To the extent that a State's matching payment falls short of the matching requirement, its Federal allotment shall be proportionately reduced.

STATE PLANS

Sec. 6. (a) Any State desiring to accept the benefits of this Act shall submit a State plan for carrying out the purpose of this Act. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

(1) designates the State agency responsible for administering the plan throughout the State;

(2) contains satisfactory evidence that such State agency will have authority to carry out such plan in conformity with this Act;

(3) provides fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement and accounting for Federal funds under this Act and to assure proper applicaton of non-Federal funds used in connection therewith;

(4) provides for the establishment of standards, in accordance with the purpose of this Act, for locating, planning, and constructing public community college facilities;

(5) provides for affording to every applicant, whose application for funds for a construction project under the State plan is denied, an opportunity for a hearing before the State agency; and

(6) provides that the State agency will make such reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this Act, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(c) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, finds that—

(1) the State plan submitted by such agency and approved under this section has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a); or

(2) in the administration of such plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner shall withhold further payments under section 7 to the State or withhold further payments for any project designated by the Commissioner as being directly affected by such failure, as the Commissioner may determine to be appropriate under the circumstances, until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply, or if compliance is impossible, until the State repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal moneys which have been diverted or improperly expended; except that the foregoing provisions of this subsection shall not apply to payment of any amount already reserved under section 7(a) with respect to any public community college facilities project not directly affected by such failure. After notice as provided in this subsection to any State, the Commissioner may suspend the making of further reservations of funds under section 7(a) for projects in such State pending the making of the findings under this subsection.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

Sec. 7. (a) Upon a certification by a State agency—

(1) listing a public community college facilities project (or projects) approved by it during a fiscal year under a State plan approved under section 6; and

(2) setting forth the estimated cost of each such project, the amount of the Federal share of such cost, and such further description of such project as may be required by the Commissioner in order to carry out the provisions of this act,

the Commissioner shall reserve, subject to the requirements of section 5, an amount equal to such Federal share of such cost out of the State's allotment for such fiscal year. Payment of such amount shall be made by the Commissioner to the State, upon request of the State agency, through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, at such time or times and in such installments (in advance of the incurring of cost or otherwise) as the Commissioner may determine. Such payments shall be used exclusively to meet the cost of construction of the project (or projects) for which such amount has been reserved. The Commissioner shall change any amount so reserved upon request of the State agency and receipt of an amended certification from such agency, but only to the extent such change is not inconsistent with the other provisions of this act.

(b) If any project with respect to which payments have been made under this section is terminated or abandoned or not completed within such reasonable period as may be determined in accordance with the regulations of the Commissioner, the State which certified such project shall be liable to repay to the United States, for deposit in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts, the amount of such payments or such lesser amounts as the Commissioner deems reasonable under the circumstances.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 8. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

Sec. 9. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under this Act, such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive unless substantially contrary to the weight of the evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

LABOR STANDARDS

Sec. 10. (a) The Commissioner shall not reserve any amount for a grant under this Act except upon adequate assurance that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction assisted by such grant will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C.

276a—276a-5), and will receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times the basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a) of this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

(c) The Commissioner may waive the application of subsection (a) in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction assisted by such grant, voluntarily donate their services for the purpose of lowering the cost of construction.

METHOD OF PAYMENT

SEC. 11. Payments under this Act may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the cost of administering the provisions of this Act.

FEDERAL CONTROL NOT AUTHORIZED

SEC. 13. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as authorizing a department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or condition with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 14. As used in this Act—

(1) the term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(2) The term "public community college" means an educational institution, or branch thereof, in a State, which (1) is under public supervision and control, (2) is organized and administered principally to offer educational programs, of not more than two years' duration, beyond the high school level, (3) has as one of its major purposes the provision of a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree upon the student's transfer to an institution of higher education, and (4) if a branch of an institution offering four or more years of higher education, is located in a community different from that in which its parent institution is located.

(3) The terms "construct", "constructing", and "construction" include the preparation of drawings and specifications for public community college facilities, erecting, building, acquiring, and expanding public community college facilities, and the inspection and supervision of the construction of such facilities.

(4) The term "public community college facilities" means classrooms and related facilities, initial equipment, machinery, utilities, and land (including interests in land and land improvements) necessary or appropriate for the purposes of a public community college, but shall not include athletic stadiums or structures or facilities intended primarily for the purpose of athletic exhibitions, contests, or games or other events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

(5) The term "high school graduate" means a person who has received formal recognition (by diploma, certificate, or similar means) from an approved school for successful completion of four years of education beyond the first eight years of schoolwork, or for demonstration of equivalent achievement. For the purposes of this Act the number of high school graduates shall be limited to the number who graduated in the most recent school year for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The interpretation of the definition of "high school graduate" shall fall within the authority of the Commissioner.

(6) The term "national base" means with respect to any fiscal year, an amount equal to three times the quotient of (A) the amount appropriated for such year under the authorization in section 3, divided by (B) the number of high school graduates.

(7) The term "State agency" means the agency designated by a State in its State plan in accordance with section 6(1).

(8) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

The analysis presented by Mr. CASE is as follows:

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF S. 956 BY SENATOR CLIFFORD P. CASE

Section 1: The bill provides a program of financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges.

Section 2: Congress recognizes that the Nation faces a severe shortage of college facilities for the training of qualified young men and women. It also acknowledges the steady growth in need for semiprofessional and technical workers who require more preparation than high school, but less than 4 years of college.

Defines the purpose of the act to assist in (1) supplying the greatly increasing need for college training facilities, and (2) solving the problem of increasing costs for such training, by providing a 5-year emergency program of financial assistance to the States in constructing public community college facilities in such locations as will make such facilities accessible to the homes of as many individuals as may be possible.

Section 3: Authorizes appropriation of $50 million for each of the 5 successive fiscal years beginning on July 1, 1963.

Section 4: Outlines the method for apportionment of funds among the States. Consideration will be given under this formula to the income per person in the State and the number of high school graduates of the respective States.

Section 5: Requires that each State shall add to the Federal allotment an amount equal to the product of the number of high school graduates and the difference between the national base and the Federal allotment to the State for high school graduates of the State.

Section 6: Requires that any participating State submit a plan to the Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for carrying out the purposes of the act. The Commissioner may not fully disapprove any State plan or modification thereof without first affording the State agency reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing. The Commissioner may withhold payments if he finds the State has not been in compliance with the provisions of this act, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency.

Section 7: Payments shall be made by the Commissioner of Education to the State through the Department of the Treasury, and subject to the audit of the General Accounting Office.

Section 8: The Commissioner is authorized to delegate to any officer of the Office of Education any of his functions under the act except the making of regulations.

Section 9: If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under this act, such State may appeal to the U.S. court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part.

Section 10: Labor standards: Applies provisions of Davis-Bacon Act to any construction under this act.

Section 11: Defines method of payment.

Section 12: Authorizes administrative appropriations.

Section 13: Prohibition against Federal control: Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as authorizing a department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or condition with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

Section 14: Defines the terms used in the act.

POLITICS, INFLUENCE, AND GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the President's new budget recommends the expenditure of more than $60 billion for national defense and space activities. This means that more than half of all the Federal Government's expenditures in the coming fiscal year would be earmarked for these two important activities, and indications are that these amounts will tend to increase even further in the next few years.

Some of these expenditures involve individual contracts running into millions and millions, even billions, of dollars. In the 1962 campaign they were the subject of much political attention by various candidates and the President himself. I shall cite several examples.

Government defense contracts are big business. In the past fiscal year, the Defense Department awarded more than $28 billion in contracts. Approximately 35 percent of these were on the basis of competitive bidding.

The remaining 65 percent—almost two-thirds of the total—were made in the category of negotiated contracts. With such huge sums involved and with decisions made in the private way in which negotiated contracts are developed, it is more important than ever that the national interest be the sole criterion in awarding Government contracts; that we get a dollar's worth for each dollar spent. The scale of space and defense commitments calls for unusual measures to safeguard the integrity of the contract award system, to make sure that awards are made on the basis of merit—and that politics, influence, or any other extraneous interest is ruled out.

These contracts are of such substantial amounts, as many Senators well know, that in some cases success or failure in winning a particular contract may well mean making or breaking a particular firm. They have heavy impact on the welfare of hundreds of thousands of people—employees, management, and

stockholders. They affect vitally the interest of entire communities and, indeed, the interests of many States, including my own.

The Defense Department's official policy is plain:

> Our first and paramount objective is to acquire weapons and materiel which fully meet our qualitative, quantitative and delivery requirements—at the lowest overall cost. To this end we must stress full and free competition, with equal opportunity to all interested qualified suppliers, and we must continuously seek to minimize sole-source procurements for end items, major subsystems, spare parts and supplies. Whenever our specifications are sufficiently precise, we must obtain competition through formal advertised bidding procedures as required by law.

The Defense Department policy is eminently clear. Anything less than this is contrary to the national interest and is obviously unfair to the honest bidders who put their faith in their own ability and efficiency, in the confidence that the decision will be made only on the merits, without any interference or string pulling through political channels.

But recent actions and statements in high official circles—indeed, in the highest—raise doubts as to whether what actually goes on conforms with official policy.

A major project in the scientific world is the so-called Mohole project, to drill a hole in the bottom of the sea, as a part of a great geological project, being undertaken by the National Science Foundation, to pierce the earth's crust and sample its hot interior. This has been termed "man's greatest geological project," and the 5-year contract is estimated to cost $43,600,000. Brown & Root, Inc., of Houston, Tex., was awarded this plum, despite the fact that one NSF panel rated this firm third best in a field of three, and another NSF panel rated four firms as better qualified.

Initial progress reports on this project indicate an eventual cost of $70 to $85 million—almost double the original estimate—and that the contractors are behind schedule.

A similar topside reversal of evaluation panels is apparently involved in a major Defense Department aircraft contract award, part of which is to be performed in Fort Worth, Tex. The Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee began hearings on the award this week.

The final decision in either or both these cases may have been completely sound. But under present limited disclosure practices, it is impossible for the public to judge.

A full disclosure of all relevant facts would benefit everybody. An informed public opinion would exert irresistible weight in support of decisions which are soundly based, and against those which are not. It would reduce to a minimum improper pressures on Government officials. It would restore public confidence in the integrity of Government.

I have been deeply concerned by statements during the 1962 political campaign, as well as recurring press reports, which tend to confirm this feeling that politics, influence, and other extraneous considerations are involved in the selection of contractors. Unfortunately, the President himself, in several statements he made in the heat of last fall's campaign, has done nothing to dispel this concern.

Appearing in West Virginia, the President, in urging the reelection of a Congressman, said that four times as much defense money was being spent in West Virginia as in 1960. In a subsequent speech in Pennsylvania, in behalf of a candidate for Governor, the President said:

> In fact, military prime-contract awards to Pennsylvania for fiscal year 1962 were nearly 50 percent higher than they were in 1960—and this is the kind of progress and collaboration which Dick Dilworth (nominee for Governor of Pennsylvania) can continue as Governor.

The next day, again the President said:

> Working with Governor Lawrence since 1960, we have increased by 50 percent the number of prime defense contracts that come to Pennsylvania—job retraining, cleaning our rivers, area redevelopment, increasing our food supplies for those on relief—all these measures which can be brought about with a progressive, Democratic Governor. So I am hopeful that you are going to elect in this State Dick Dilworth.

These statements were made in the heat of a campaign; but such statements by candidates and party leaders have lowered the standard for campaigning to the point that from Massachusetts, on the Atlantic, to Washington, on the Pacific, the cry, "I can do more," has been made respectable.

What specifically can we do to provide better protection for the integrity of our contracting system? I propose legislation to carry out a three-point program based on my experience on the Armed Services, Space, and Appropriations Committees.

First. Require that a record be maintained, open to public inspection, of all ex parte communications, whether written or oral, in regard to a defense or space contract by anyone, including Members of Congress or the executive branch, other than the bidder.

Second. Require full, complete, and prompt public disclosure of the basis on which a negotiated contract award is made, except for information classified for security provisions, or where forbidden by existing law.

Third. Establish a special joint House-Senate committee authorized to review defense and space contract awards, with primary attention to negotiated contracts. This watchdog committee would consist of a Democrat and a Republican appointed from each of the following committees: the Senate and the House Armed Services Committees, the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees, the Senate and the House Government Operations Committees, and the Senate and the House Space Committees.

This joint committee would have its own continuing staff, as well as assistance from the General Accounting Office. I would suggest that the chairman of the committee be a Republican, during a Democratic administration, and a Democrat, during a Republican administration.

Timely disclosure is important for several reasons. From the point of view of the Government, if there has been an error or favoritism in an award, it can be corrected before funds are committed or before work for which the Government is obligated to pay has been started. From the point of view of both the Government and the contractors who lost out, review after the point of no return, as it were, has been reached may be helpful for the future, but does nothing to right the immediate wrong. In short, disclosure at the time when the selection is made makes it possible to do something about it, if the facts so warrant.

On the matter of full disclosure, some progress has been made. As a result of my discussions with the Defense Department, the Department has amended its regulations on armed services procurement so as to provide that the contracting officer shall give written notice to the unsuccessful offerers, relaying such information as the number of prospective competitors solicited, the number of proposals received, the items, quantities, and unit prices of each award, and, in general terms, the reason why the offerer's proposal was not accepted. This moves in the direction I have urged, but it still does not include the key information necessary in order to permit the public to evaluate the decisionmaking process in the selection of the successful contractor. The complete and prompt disclosure which I have urged would let the public know who had a hand in the contract award and what cards he played in that hand.

One immediate benefit, I am confident, would be that Members of Congress and the executive branch would be in a better position to resist pressures from contractors who seek political help in obtaining contract awards. Their argument that they need this help because a competitor is receiving the same sort of under-the-table assistance from his Government friends is difficult, if not impossible, to answer in the present situation. The knowledge that any outside intercession would become publicly known would serve as a warning, and, I believe, would be the strongest possible deterrent to those who would seek improper intervention.

I recognize that some of these proposals sound revolutionary, even utopian, and depart from customary procedures; but the size of our Federal budget—now approaching a hundred billion dollars a year—makes unusual steps necessary. Doubt and suspicion have no place in Government contracts, and this applies most emphatically to our defense program. Full disclosure and active surveillance are the best safeguards against them.

The only consideration in selecting a contract recipient should be what makes sense for the program itself. If improper interference with the contracting system adds even $1 to the cost of our expensive space and defense programs, it is waste; and we may be sure that if it adds a dollar, it will probably add a great deal more than that in the lifetime of a negotiated contract. This is everybody's problem.

The public business, particularly that involving billions and billions of dollars, for a virtual handful of firms, should be transacted in the open. There is no room for back-door approaches or hidden influences in the selection of contract awards. Morally bad in any situation, it is intolerable when it affects our vital interest. The people do not want political spoils—Democratic or Republican—diminishing our national security.

Mr. President, I now introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills which embody the proposals I have described. I ask unanimous consent that the text of both bills be printed at this point in the RECORD; and I also request that the bills be held at the desk for 5 days, for additional sponsors. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following the text of the bills, an article on this subject which was published in the Chicago Daily News.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and article will be printed in the RECORD, and the bills will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The bills, introduced by Mr. CASE, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 960. A bill to establish the Joint Committee on Defense and Space Contracts, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Defense and Space Contract Review Act".

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE AND SPACE CONTRACTS

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a Joint Committee on Defense and Space Contracts (hereinafter referred to as the "Joint Committee") which shall be composed of eight Members of the Senate and eight Members of the House of Representatives, selected as follows:

(1) Two members of the Joint Committee shall be members of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate, and two members of the Joint Committee shall be members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives;

(2) Two members of the Joint Committee shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and two members of the Joint Committee shall be members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

(3) Two members of the Joint Committee shall be members of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, and two members of the Joint Committee shall be members of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(4) Two members of the Joint Committee shall be members of the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate, and two members of the Joint Committee shall be members of the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives.

(b) Members of the Joint Committee selected from each such standing committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be designated by the chairman of that standing committee and shall include one member thereof who is a member of the majority party of the House of the Congress of which he is a Member, and one member of such standing committee who is a member of the minority party of the House of the Congress of which he is a Member.

(c) The Joint Committee shall select a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members at the beginning of each Congress. The Vice Chairman shall act in place of the Chairman in the absence of the Chairman. The Chairmanship shall alternate between the Senate and the House of Representatives with each Congress. The Chairman shall be chosen by the Members from the House which is entitled to the Chairmanship, and the Vice Chairman shall be chosen from the House other than that of the Chairman by the Members from that House. No member of the Joint Committee may serve as Chairman if he is a member of the political party of which the President of the United States is a member. No member of the Joint Committee may serve as Vice Chairman if he is a member of the political party of which the Chairman is a member.

(d) Vacancies in the membership of the Joint Committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the Joint Committee, and shall be filled in the same manner in which original appointments thereto are made.

INVESTIGATIVE DUTIES

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Joint Committee to conduct a continuing study and investigation of all major contracts entered into for the procurement of property or services by the Department of Defense (including the military departments thereof and the armed forces administered thereby), the Department of the Treasury or the Coast Guard for or on behalf of the Coast Guard, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Particular attention shall be given to such contracts entered into by negotiation. Such study and investigation shall be conducted for the purpose of ascertaining as to each such contract—

(1) the facts and circumstances leading to the formation of that contract;

(2) the basis upon which award of that contract was made; and

(3) the considerations which were determinative in the selection of the contractor to whom that contract was awarded.

(b) On or before January 31 of each year, the Joint Committee shall transmit to the Senate and to the House of Representatives a report which shall—

(1) state the results of its studies and investigations during the preceding calendar year;

(2) describe fully the facts and circumstances of any such contract award which the Joint Committee considers to have been made contrary or without due regard to the interest of the Government in procuring property and services of maximum utility upon the most advantageous terms available; and

(3) include such recommendations for legislative or other measures which the Joint Committee may deem necessary or advisable to improve in the public interest practices and procedures of departments, agencies, and armed forces of the Government in the procurement of property and services.

(c) Each department, agency, and armed force referred to in subsection (a) shall—

(1) keep the Joint Committee fully and currently informed as to the policies, practices, and procedures of that department, agency, or armed force with respect to the procurement of property and services; and

(2) furnish to the Joint Committee any information requested by the Chairman thereof as to such policies, practices, and procedures, or with respect to action taken by that department, agency, or armed force relative to the formation of any major contract or proposed major contract.

(d) As used in this section, the term "major contract" means any contract under which the United States, or one or more of the departments, agencies, or armed forces thereof, may be obligated to expend or pay $500,000 or more.

LEGISLATIVE DUTIES

SEC. 4. (a) All bills, resolutions, and other measures in the Senate or the House of Representatives relating primarily to the procurement of property or services by any of the departments, agencies, or armed forces referred to in section 3(a) of this Act shall be referred to the Joint Committee.

(b) The members of the Joint Committee who are Members of the Senate shall from time to time report to the Senate, and the members of the Joint Committee who are Members of the House of Representatives shall from time to time report to the House, by bill or otherwise, their recommendations with respect to matters within the jurisdiction of their respective Houses which are referred to the Joint Committee or otherwise within the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee.

POWERS

SEC. 5. (a) In carrying out its duties under this Act, the Joint Committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings or investigations, to sit and act within or outside the United States at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The Joint Committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary. Except as otherwise specifically provided by this Act, no measure or recommendation shall be reported from the Joint Committee unless a majority of the committee assent.

(b) Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the Chairman of the Joint Committee or by any member designated by him or by the Joint Committee, and may be served by such person or persons as may be designated by such Chairman or member. The Chairman of the Joint Committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

STAFF AND ASSISTANCE

SEC. 6. (a) The Joint Committee may appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and staff employees as it deems necessary and advisable.

(b) The Joint Committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the General Accounting Office and of any department, agency, or armed force of the United States, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise, with the consent of the head of such office, department, agency, or armed force. With the consent of any standing, select, or special committee of either House of the Congress, or any subcommittee thereof, the Joint Committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such committee or subcommittee whenever the Chairman of the Joint Committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

EXPENSES

SEC. 7. (a) The expenses of the Joint Committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from funds appropriated for the Joint Committee, upon vouchers approved by the chairman. The cost of stenographic service to report public hearings shall not be in excess of the amounts prescribed by law for reporting the hearings of standing committees of the Senate. The cost of stenographic service to report executive hearings shall be fixed at an equitable rate by the Joint Committee.

(b) Members of the Joint Committee, and its employees and consultants, while traveling on official business for the Joint Committee within or outside the United States, may receive either the per diem allowance authorized to be paid to Members of the Congress or its employees, or their actual and necessary expenses provided an itemized statement of such expenses is attached to the voucher.

CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

SEC. 8. (a) The Joint Committee may classify information originating within the committee, in accordance with standards used generally by the executive branch of the Government for classifying defense information.

(b) Upon request made by the Chairman of the Joint Committee, the eligibility of any employee or consultant of the Joint Committee for access to defense information shall be determined in the same manner in which such determination is made with respect to employees within the executive branch of the Government. Any employee or consultant of the Joint Committee who has been so determined to be eligible to have access to defense information of any classification shall be entitled to have access to such information of that classification to the extent required for the performance of his duly assigned duties as an employee or consultant of the Joint Committee as certified by the Chairman of the Joint Committee.

RECORDS

SEC. 9. (a) The Joint Committee shall keep a complete record of all committee actions, including a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

(b) All committee records, data, charts, and files shall be the property of the Joint Committee and shall be kept in the offices of the Joint Committee or such other places as the Joint Committee may direct under such security safeguards as the Joint Committee shall determine to be required in the interest of the national defense and security.

S. 961. A bill to require public disclosure of certain information concerning the award of contracts entered into by the Armed Forces and by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code (relating to procurement generally), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 2315. Public disclosure of certain contract information

"(a) There shall be established—

"(1) within the Department of Defense a contract information file in which there shall be deposited forthwith each contract communication received by that Department, any military department thereof, or any armed force administered thereby with regard to each proposed major contract of any such department or armed force;

"(2) within the Department of the Treasury a contract information file in which there shall be deposited forthwith each contract communication received by that Department or by the Coast Guard with regard to each proposed major contract of the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy; and

"(3) within the National Aeronautics and Space Administration a contract information file in which there shall be deposited forthwith each contract communication received by that agency with regard to each proposed major contract of that agency.

"(b) Whenever any major contract is awarded by or on behalf of a department or agency named in subsection (a) or any armed force administered thereby, there shall be forthwith prepared and deposited in the contract information file of that department or agency a contract information memorandum which shall contain a full, complete, and accurate statement of (1) the facts and circumstances leading to the formation of that contract, (2) the basis upon which award of that contract was made, and (3) the considerations which were determinative in the selection of the contractor to whom that contract was awarded.

"(c) All communications and memorandums deposited in the contract information file of any such department or agency shall be available for public inspection within such department or agency during all regular business hours, and shall be arranged, classified and indexed in such manner as to facilitate rapid inspection of all communications and memorandums which relate to each proposed contract or contract. All communications and memorandums deposited in the file shall be retained therein for not less than three years. The head of the department or agency concerned may excise from any contract communication or contract information memorandum to be placed in the contract information file of that department or agency any portion of the contents of that communication or memorandum if he determines that publication thereof would result in the public disclosure of (1) information theretofore duly classified for reasons of national security as information which may not be publicly disclosed, or (2) information the public disclosure of which is specifically forbidden by any Act of the Congress. Authority to excise any portion of any such communication or memorandum may not be delegated by the head of any department or agency to any other individual. The head of the department or agency concerned shall promulgate appropriate regulations to carry into effect the requirements of this section. All regulations promulgated under this section shall be published in the Federal Register.

"(d) In this section the term—

"(1) 'Contract communication', with respect to any proposed major contract, means the original copy of any written communication, and a written memorandum which identifies by name and official or business affiliation the maker and contains a full, complete, and accurate statement of the substance and purport of any oral communication, received by the department or agency concerned, or by any officer or employee thereof, relating in any way to any proposed major contract award, except that such term does not include any communication receive from a potential contractor under that proposed contract or from a contractor representative of any such potential contractor.

"(2) 'Major contract' means any purchase of property or services and any contract or agreement for the procurement of property or services which may result in the expenditure or payment of $500,000 or more by one or more of the departments, agencies, and armed forces referred to in subsection (a).

"(3) 'Proposed major contract' means any proposed or contemplated purchase, contract, or agreement, and any commitment or declaration of intention, which, if entered into or carried into effect, would result in the formation of a major contract.

"(4) 'Potential contractor', with respect to any proposed major contract, means any individual, and any corporation, partnership, or other business entity, who has submitted or who has been invited by advertisement or otherwise to submit to the department, agency, or armed force concerned a bid for that proposed major contract, or who has entered into any discussion with the department, agency, or armed force concerned in contemplation of entering into that proposed major contract by negotiation.

"(5) 'Contractor representative', with respect to any proposed major contract, means any officer or partner of any corporation, partnership, or other business entity which is a potential contractor under that proposed major contract, and any individual who is a regularly employed sales or technical representative of any potential contractor under that proposed major contract. Such term does not include (A) any officer, employee, or agent of the United States or any department, agency, or armed force thereof, (B) any Member of or Delegate to the Congress, or (C) any individual who is an officer or employee of the Congress or any agency within the legislative branch of the Government, either House of the Congress, any committee of the Congress or either House thereof, any subcommittee of any such committee, or any Member of or Delegate to the Congress."

(b) The sectional analysis of chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"2315. Public disclosure of certain contract information."

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code (relating to public officers and employees), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1916. Default of obligation to disclose contract information

"Whoever, being an officer, employee or person acting for or on behalf of the United States or any department or agency thereof who has any obligation under section 2315 of title 10, United States Code, or any regulation duly promulgated thereunder, to file, record, prepare, preserve, transmit, maintain, or grant access to any contract communication or contract information memorandum or to cause any such communication or memorandum to be filed, recorded, prepared, preserved, transmitted, maintained, or made available for public inspection, by any act or omission fails to fulfill that obligation with intent to prevent, evade, delay, or obstruct the prompt public disclosure of (1) the identity or affiliation of the maker of any such contract communication or full, complete, and accurate information concerning the contents, substance, or purport of that communication or any part thereof, or (2) full, complete, and accurate information concerning any fact, circumstance, or consideration required by subsection (b) of section 2315 of title 10 of the United States Code to be stated in any contract information memorandum, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both."

(b) The sectional analysis of chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"1916. Default of obligation to disclose contract information."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the fourth month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

The article presented by Mr. Case is as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News,
Nov. 17, 1961]

Defense Pressure a One-Way Road—Nobody Leads Fight To Reduce Spending

(By James McCartney)

Washington.—Political pressures on the defense program flow in a relentless tide—one way.

There, in a nutshell, lies the problem.

Congressmen and Senators seek defense contracts and installations for their districts or States, striving to keep employment high.

Defense contractors, understandably, seek all of the defense business they can engender and get.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force seek, in great sincerity, larger military budgets, better weapons systems.

Frequently these three great forces, with immense resources to influence spending policies as well as public opinion, operate in concert.

But * * *.

There is no lobby for lower defense spending—no lobby actively seeking to hold the $50-billion-a-year defense machine in check.

Former President Eisenhower described the problem as saying that pressures for defense spending—from each of the three primary sources—were "all in one direction."

Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell L. Gilpatric, who is fully aware of the dangers, agrees.

"In effect," says Gilpatric, "the burden of containing the pressures rests on the civilian Secretaries of the Defense Department and on the President."

But few applaud if their answer to a spending request is "No."

The stakes in this game are high.

Mr. Eisenhower warned that "unwarranted influence" by the "military-industrial complex" could "endanger our liberties or democratic processes."

"The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist," he said.

Gilpatric says this was the most significant message Mr. Eisenhower ever delivered to the American people, and wonders only why he waited until 3 days before he left office to deliver it.

"It's a very great risk," Gilpatric adds. "But I think our system is capable of dealing with it."

Gilpatric, a former Wall Street lawyer with a Phi Beta Kappa key from Yale, believes that only a strong executive in the White House, backed by an informed public opinion that understands the nature of the pressures, can adequately do battle.

He also believes that the pressures are inevitable in a democracy in which defense industries operate in the private sector.

But he does not believe that the pressures are sinister—although he can recall exceptions—and he does not believe that they have gotten out of control.

"Pressures on the other side—opposing spending—are more generalized," he says.

"They come from the President, the budget people, the Treasury Department and sometimes, generally, from the business and financial community."

"But," he adds, "this never translates into much support."

"The question," says Gilpatric, "is whether the counterbalancing forces, particularly the civilian Secretaries of the Defense Department, are strong enough."

"It all depends on the quality of the people."

Have we had strong enough men—do we have them now?

It is difficult to answer with certainty.

Today's civilian leaders have loosened up the defense purse strings to the extent of $6 billion this year to strengthen the Armed Forces generally and to prepare for the Berlin crisis.

But they are finding that even this sum has not satisfied many military leaders.

The three military services have reportedly requested an additional $11 billion in defense spending in next year's budget.

This would mean a defense budget of upward of $60 billion—which Gilpatric says "is out of the question." President Kennedy has said, however, that he will ask for at least some additional defense funds next year.

Stories of political influence in the Defense Department are a dime a dozen in Washington.

All a reporter has to do is talk with almost any contractor who has lost out on a contract—and there are usually several losers for every winner. Proving their charges—usually passed out on a confidential, not for attribution basis—is something else.

There are documented cases where contracts have changed hands after political pressure was exerted—but none in which the Defense Department will admit that pressure was the reason for the switch.

A midlevel official at the Pentagon says: "Political and economic pressures play at least some role in the awarding of almost every major contract. We don't live in a vacuum."

Members of a Senate-House subcommittee on defense procurement, headed by Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, believe that the doors to the Pentagon are wide open to pressure because 60 percent of all defense contracts are awarded without competition.

Says Ray Ward, a procurement expert on the subcommittee's staff, "When a contract is negotiated, without competition, no one on the outside can tell what factors may have influenced the contract award."

To this Senator Douglas adds, "the negotiated contract opens the door to all kinds of political abuses, to pressures from contractors, from local communities, from the military services, as well as to parochial pressures placed on Members of Congress from communities."

Defense Department officials insist, however, that there are so many checks and balances in the contract awarding system that the exercise of "influence" is nearly impossible.

Perhaps the most agonizing aspect of the entire struggle between opposing forces is that no one can be sure—least of all a civilian outsider—precisely what is necessary to guarantee national survival.

No one quarrels with need for a strong defense program in a world in which the Nation's survival is threatened.

But some want to spend more. Others believe we have already gone too far in building an economy which depends so strongly on military expenditures.

The simple and yet incredibly complex equation—how much defense equals adequate protection—is under constant review by the administration.

On a recent CBS–TV program, Mr. Eisenhower summed up his feelings about overall problems posed by the existence of the military-industrial complex.

He mentioned each of the principal kinds of pressure—those from manufacturers, the military and from Congress.

"Now this brings together," he said, " a tremendous economic unit producing for one thing * * *

"The thing we must do," he said, "is to use our commonsense * * * not to give way to these pressures * * * except as we need to.

"I'm not saying there is anything venal here. I'm just saying it's a natural influence that is created by this enormous munitions industry and by all of the people that are pushing in that direction.

"And this means that it takes strong men to stand against it if it goes too far."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT'S TAX PROPOSAL

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], our distinguished colleague and nationally known economist, has written a debate in support of the President's tax proposal.

The portion of the debate which appeared in the Washington Post on February 24 is the most succinct argument for the layman that I have read. I especially appreciate its ability to cut through the involved presentations that I have read and studied in other publications.

For instance, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] writes:

> To put it simply, tax cuts would increase monetary purchasing power which in turn would put idle men to work on idle machines producing goods which would otherwise not be produced.

I agree with the Senator that the tax reforms are as important as the tax cuts, although, as a true political realist, the Senator from Illinois realizes that the compound package may not be palatable to the Senate and so he suggests an alternate proposal if, as he says, "the reforms are junked."

A table which illustrates the multiplier effect was a part of the original article but was deleted from the Post article probably for space purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the article and table be printed following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and table were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Congress and the public should support President Kennedy's proposals for tax cuts and tax revisions because they would stimulate the economy and make our tax system more equitable.

At the present time 5.8 percent of the labor force is fully unemployed. Unemployment has exceeded 5 percent in every month except one since 1957. It has averaged almost 6 percent for the past 5 years. When the full-time unemployment effect of those who work only part-time is taken into account, unemployment is now at least 7 percent.

This is an intolerable situation.

In addition, our idle industrial resources amount to about 17 percent of capacity. Our sluggish rate of economic growth is considerably below our potential.

Furthermore, in periods of recovery or economic upswing, the present tax system tends to take a larger and larger share of the marginal increase in our economic growth. The tax structure prevents us from reaching full employment or the full use of our human and productive resources.

Therefore, the time to act has come.

MULTIPLIER EFFECT

To put the problem in economic terms, there is not enough purchasing power in the economy to buy the goods and services which our labor force and industry can produce at the prices charged.

There are at least two general ways to attack this problem. One of them, and perhaps the preferable one, is to reduce the prices charged to the level of monetary purchasing power. This could be done by an all-out attack on monopoly, semimonopoly, and administered prices, and the structural defects that prevent competition.

The second way to attack the problem is to increase the monetary purchasing power in the economy to the level of the prices that are charged. This is what a tax cut would do.

To put it simply, tax cuts would increase monetary purchasing power which in turn would put idle men to work on idle machines producing goods which would otherwise not be produced.

But the amount of purchasing power released would not merely be the size of the tax cut. It would be, in fact, from three to four times more than the tax cut. This effect can be called the "multiplier effect" which is the shorthand term for describing the increases in both consumption and investment arising from a tax cut to individuals.

The best estimates presented to the Joint Economic Committee are that an $8 billion personal tax cut would increase the gross national product by from $24 to $32 billion more than it would otherwise be.

In turn, the additional funds generated in the economy would themselves be taxed—at the new lower levels—and ultimately about one-fifth of the total increase in the gross national product would be returned to the Treasury.

Thus, an $8 billion tax cut with a multiplier of three to four times would increase the gross national product by $24 to $32 billion. Taxes at 20 percent would bring in added revenues of from $4.8 to $6.4 billion. The net cost of an $8 billion cut would be only from $1.6 to $3.2 billion.

An increase of these magnitudes in the gross national product would produce about 2 million new jobs.

The importance of the "multiplier" effect cannot be exaggerated and is the key to understanding how a tax cut would stimulate the economy.

CUTS NOT INFLATIONARY

All kinds of objections are raised against a tax cut. Here I will answer only the more general ones.

It is charged that tax cuts would be inflationary. With almost 6 percent full-time unemployment and 17 percent of our industrial capacity idle, such a charge is nonsense. At full employment, pumping monetary purchasing power into the economy would merely bid up prices. But at a time of excessive plant capacity and unemployment, added monetary purchasing power can put idle men to work on idle machines without appreciable price rise.

It is argued that we should not cut taxes until the cut is matched by a reduction in expenditures. Frankly, this policy would bring disaster. There are places where the budget can and should be cut. Because of the power of special-interest groups, it will not be cut where it probably should be cut.

But if we were to try to balance the budget by cutting essential functions by $10 to $12 billion, this would have a reverse multiplier effect. The gross national product would be reduced by from $30 to $40 billion. But this expenditure cut would not bring a balanced budget. The deficit would increase by from $6 to $8 billion just from the drop in personal and corporate incomes which would be caused by the initial $10 billion cut in expenditures.

Under the depressed conditions that would be created, Budget Director Kermit Gordon estimated that it would take a cut of about $20 billion in Federal expenditures to bring a balanced budget next year. I agree with the general magnitude of his estimates. Such a cut would bring with it an intolerable rate of unemployment and depression conditions. It would be self-defeating and would bring chaos and catastrophe in its wake.

The tax reforms in the President's program are as important as the tax cuts, both to stimulate the economy and for equity reasons.

If the reforms are junked, I would favor the substitution of a program to increase the personal exemptions from say $600 to $800, or to cut taxes on the first $1,000 and $2,000 of income to a much greater degree than the President's program would do.

Otherwise, the proposed rate cuts, without the revisions, would lack both equity and adequate economic stimulus.

Table I.—*Net cost of $8,000,000,000 tax cut with multiplier effect of 3 to 4 times*

[Dollars in billions]

Tax cut	Multiplier	Increase in GNP	Average tax rate	New taxes collected (4×3)	Net cost (1−5)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
			Percent		
$8	3	$24	20	$4.8	$3.2
$8	4	32	20	6.4	1.6

THE AL SARENA STEAL—AFTER 8 YEARS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as we meet here today, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hearing testimony on very important proposed legislation which would affect the present and future generations of our country. It has to do with conservation of some of our remaining wilderness. One of the main threats to the preservation of beautiful areas in many parts of the United States is a result of a flaw in our mining laws which allows mining in wilderness areas. I am reminded of a situation in my State which has not been corrected, even though attention was first called to it during the senatorial campaign in 1954, of my late husband. I call it the Al Sarena steal. I should like to report to the Senate on that question after 8 years of watching developments in that area.

On February 15, 1954, the then Secretary of the Interior granted patents to 475 acres of the Rogue River National Forest to Al Sarena Mines, Inc.

A joint hearing was held by the House Government Operations Committee and the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and, thereafter, they issued a report.

In these 8 long years, certainly there has been ample opportunity for those who obtained patent to proceed to mine. They got a free, clear, unencumbered title to the entire 475 acres they sought.

Not once since 1954 has there been the slightest evidence of mining claim development or mining activity. Not one cupful of ore has been processed.

Nor can it be still argued that the so-called miners lacked an opportunity or the financial resources to proceed to mine.

During the last 8 years over 6½ million board feet of timber, with a value in excess of $100,000, have been mined in the form of "green gold." Under our tax laws, the so-called miners could get a capital gains tax treatment on their timber. If they are in the lower tax bracket of 20 percent this means but a 10-percent tax and in no event a tax of more than 25 percent.

Since the claim cost them only $2,375—or $5 per acre—the profit opportunity is quite clear.

Without a patent the Al Sarena group could have gone on to explore, develop—yes, and even mine—their claims. But without a patent they could not reap the value from the timber.

The minority reports at the time made the point that—

> If the claimants' objectives were to secure timber, they could have purchased 20 to 25 times as much timber for the money that was merely invested in the claims and in the pilot mill.
>
> The charge that the claims were filed originally as a subterfuge for securing timber is not supported by any evidence and, in fact, is insupportable.

Mr. President, history has its own way of leading the truth out into the light.

Al Sarena could not be defended in 1954. It cannot be defended today. Al Sarena stands etched for all time as a monumental fraud perpetrated on the people of the United States by inept people in positions of public trust—people unwilling to see the facts as they stood and blind as to their duty to the public interest.

MANAGED NEWS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we hear a great deal of talk about managed news. As a Democrat and as a supporter of President Kennedy's program, it is not unfair to say that any charges of excesses or mistakes made by the administration are equally matched by the editorial comments of the overwhelmingly Republican press of the country.

Yesterday I was asked to answer a series of questions by the magazine U.S. News & World Report. On the whole I think that is a good magazine and any remarks I wish to make now should not be taken as a general criticism of it.

However, the questions I was asked to answer must either have been drafted by someone in a partisan moment or by the Republican National Committee.

In fact, they are not unlike the congressional polls we see from time to time where a Republican Congressman asks a loaded question such as, "Would you be in favor of cutting $5 billion of waste from the President's budget" and where he reports replies in the order of 99 percent "yes" and 1 percent "undecided."

In order that my Democratic colleagues may be forewarned, I want to put the proposed questions from the U.S. News & World Report in the RECORD. There is no reason for me to comment further on them for even a cursory or hasty reading will show, I think, that they are really loaded questions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the questions which I was asked to answer and which I refused to answer be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the questions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Why is President Kennedy, as a Democrat, able to exert so little influence over a House and Senate that have majorities heavily Democratic?
2. White House messages and ideas go to Congress and seem to disappear. As far as anyone can see they generate no response out in the country. Why?
3. Has the President failed to get into tune with the mood of the country?
4. Is there a feeling that the President's plans do not command wide support among the voters?
5. Is there distrust of the White House advisers who generate ideas and write messages?
6. Has the President, himself, lacked some element of leadership—an ability to create confidence and attract loyalty?
7. Or: Are many Members of Congress simply wary about the political future and willing to trust their own political judgment more than that of the President?

WERE DUNES JOBS FIGURES PADDED?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the irreplaceable Indiana Dunes may be destroyed by a proposed Burns Ditch Harbor and a Bethlehem Steel plant if certain interests have their way. The principal justification advanced by those who would destroy one of the Midwest's finest gifts of nature is the claim that 60,000 to 100,000 new jobs would be created.

An extraordinary letter bearing directly on these claims from the Bethlehem Steel Co., to Governor Welsh has been obtained by Chicago's American and was discussed in an article which appeared in that paper on February 26. I have now obtained a copy of this letter. It is remarkable in showing that the claims which were made of the alleged new jobs which would be created were simply not founded on fact.

This American article in part points out that the letter specifically states that—

First, 200 to 250 supervisory employees will be moved to the Indiana plant from Bethlehem plants outside Indiana; second, by 1965 there would be employed a maximum of only 2,100 to 2,300 employees; not 10,000 or 20,000 as sometimes claimed; third, if—and there is absolutely no commitment on this—a basic steel mill is ever put in, there will be employed only a maximum total of 8,000 to 10,000 employees; and fourth, Bethlehem will make no commitment on when or whether it actually will put in an integrated steel mill.

The figures given for maximum production employment in the indefinite future of only 8,000 to 10,000 workers, some of which will be imported, contrast markedly with the claims being made that 100,000 jobs will result from the destruction of the Indiana dunes. It takes more than naive optimism to think one production worker will support 10–12 service employees.

This letter also contains unusual and even ominous statements with respect to the question of whether organized labor is to be welcomed at the proposed Bethlehem plant. I will leave to the reader of the American article and the letter any interpretation as to the meaning of Bethlehem's comments on this question, but when it is recalled that some of the chief port promoters are also leaders of right-to-work forces, this letter becomes very significant.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter, dated February 18, 1963, which was apparently released to the press about a week ago, be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks along with the article discussing the disclosures made by this letter and their significance which was written by C. Owsley Shepherd and which appeared in Chicago's American on February 26, 1963.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BETHLEHEM STEEL CO., INC.,
Bethlehem, Pa., February 18, 1963.

Hon. MATTHEW E. WELSH,
Governor of Indiana,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR GOVERNOR WELSH: From time to time during the past several years we have written to you concerning our plans for the development of our plant site in the industrial district adjacent to the Burns Waterway Public Harbor tract. On December 3, 1962, Bethlehem Steel Co. announced that it had commenced construction of a new steel mill at this location. You have received a description of this project which, in general terms, will consist of three finishing mills to be constructed over a period of 3 years at an estimated cost of $250 million. This new plant of ours has been given the name Burns Harbor Plant.

Our currently authorized program consists of the first three steps of a long range six-step plan for the development of this site. The sixth step will be the construction of facilities which will make the Burns Harbor Plant a fully integrated steel mill. For the sake of clarity we will hereinafter refer to the current project, the first three finishing mills, as the 1962 program.

You have asked a number of specific questions concerning the 1962 program. Many of the answers require estimated figures. We believe the figures contained in several of the following answers to be conservative and as accurate as is practicable at the present time.

(a) The 1962 program will require the employment of building trades employees approximately as follows:

Number of employees:	*Estimated monthly payroll*
Sept. 1, 1963: 400 to 500	$270,000
Sept. 1, 1964: 2,500 to 3,000	1,650,000
Sept. 1, 1965: 400 to 500	270,000

(b) We assume, but do not know, that our contractors will employ union building trades labor.

(c) We assume that our contractors will, to the extent practicable, give preference to local building trades labor.

(d) The first production employees will be employed about October 1, 1964.

(e) The employment figures for production employees will be approximately as follows:

Number of employees:	*Estimated monthly payroll*
Dec. 1, 1964: 600 to 650	$387,500
July 1, 1965: 1,700 to 1,800	1,085,000
Dec. 1, 1965: 2,100 to 2,300	1,364,000

(f) We have no way of knowing whether our production employees will elect to be represented by a union.

(g) The nature of any labor agreement we may have will have a bearing on whether the local labor supply, where qualified, will be given preference.

(h) We anticipate that some supervisory employees, numbering 200 to 250 for the 1962 program, will be moved to the Burns Harbor plant from other Bethlehem plants located outside the State of Indiana.

(i) It is obvious that we cannot now predict, with any degree of accuracy, when we will reach step VI, which will be the fully integrated steel mill. We hope that steps IV and V, which consist of further refinements of steps I to III and additions to finishing mill capacity, will be completed during the period 1966–72.

(j) When step VI is completed the production force at the Burns Harbor plant should be in the range of 8,000 to 10,000 employees. Our very long-range plan contemplates a Burns Harbor plant with an annual capacity of 10 million tons. It is too early to judge how many employees will be required if and when this ultimate objective is reached.

Although you did not ask for it, I think it would be appropriate here to restate the Bethlehem position with respect to a public harbor at this location. Because the State has worked so long for an adequate public harbor and because the great majority of the citizens of the State want such a harbor, we have supported and will continue to support your efforts to construct the Burns Waterway Public Harbor. It is true, however, that neither our 1962 program nor our long-range plan of development is dependent upon the construction of a public harbor at the Burns Waterway location. If your efforts to construct the public harbor are successful we will contribute toward its cost and make use of its facilities in the manner provided in our July 25, 1962, agreement with the State and the Indiana Port Commission. If a public harbor is not in being or under construction at the time when we will need harbor facilities, we necessarily will have to construct a private harbor by ourselves or in cooperation with other private interests. Within 2 years we will be moving very large quantities of semifinished steel to our Burns Harbor plant from plants in the East. If harbor facilities were available in 1965, a substantial portion of this semifinished tonnage could move into the plant, and a smaller quantity of finished products could move out of the plant, by water transport. We could make good use

of a harbor in 1965 and we must have one when we reach step VI of our development program. We sincerely hope that the State of Indiana can have its public harbor at Burns Waterway, but until such a harbor is assured beyond reasonable doubt we must, in our forward planning, assume that our Burns Harbor plant will be served by a private harbor.

Very truly yours,
B. D. BROEKER,
Secretary.

[From the Chicago American]

STEEL FIRMS GIVE DATA—POLITICIANS PADDED DUNES JOB FIGURES

(By C. Owsley Shepherd)

Bethlehem Steel Co., in a letter to Gov. Matthew E. Welsh, of Indiana, has dispelled any hope that construction of a public harbor at Burns Ditch would create jobs for from 60,000 to 100,000 Hoosiers, Chicago's American has learned.

Secretary B. D. Broeker of the steel firm said that when and "if" a fully integrated mill is built to turn out raw steel and finished products, the production force would range from 8,000 to 10,000 employees.

Such a long-range plan is not even contemplated before 1972, the letter states.

NEARLY 2,300 JOBS BY 1965

Meanwhile, Bethlehem is preparing to construct a steel rolling and finishing mill on its Burns Ditch site which Broeker says would employ from 400 to 500 workers this year; 2,500 to 3,000 next year, and 400 to 500 in 1965.

When the mill is complete, he continues, the number of production employees is expected to reach a peak of 2,100 to 2,300 late in 1965.

Midwest Steel, which would share the benefits of a harbor built at taxpayers' expense, has a finishing mill in operation which engages 1,100 employees. It never has committed itself to build an integrated plant.

These official employment figures are in sharp contrast to the estimates made public by Indiana politicians.

Lt. Gov. Richard O. Ristine has said the port and steel mills would open up 100,000 new jobs, while Governor Welsh has trimmed his prediction to 60,000 positions.

He says he bases this estimate on the steel mills employing 35,000 persons and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce calculation that every 100 new manufacturing jobs produce 65 additional nonmanufacturing openings.

Joseph Germano, director of district 31, United Steelworkers of America, contends news mills at Burns Ditch would create no new jobs, but merely result in the rehiring and relocation of steelworkers forced out of jobs in other northern Indiana plants.

NONUNION FACTOR

Germano says that the steel industry has been operating at only 70 percent of capacity for several years, and that the construction of new plants does not create either more orders or more jobs.

Although Governor Welsh campaigned for office as a friend of organized labor, the Bethlehem letter explores the possibilities of the company's hiring nonunion workers. It says, in part:

"We have no way of knowing whether our production employees will elect to be represented by a union.

"The nature of any labor agreement we may have will have a bearing on whether the local labor supply, where qualified, will be given preference."

IMPORT STEEL AIDS

In addition to this implied threat to import labor is the direct statement that:

"We anticipate that some supervisory employees, numbering 200 to 250 for the 1962 program (this embraces the first 3 years of the overall project), will be moved to the Burns Harbor plant from other Bethlehem plants located outside the State of Indiana."

The steel interests are seeking $25.5 million in Federal funds for dredging and construction of outer breakwaters and $38 million from Indiana State tax money for port facilities. The two companies would put up $4.5 million, and the harbor would be 90 percent or more for their benefit.

The question of Federal participation now is stalled in Washington in the Bureau of the Budget, which is analyzing a favorable recommendation by the Corps of Army Engineers.

SENATE CHANGES PLAN

In an effort to get an immediate start on the harbor, Governor Welsh has proposed doubling the State's 3-cent cigarette tax so that Indiana can go ahead with what was to have been the Federal end of the project.

But in Indianapolis yesterday, the senate passed, 47 to 0, and sent to the House a radically revised plan for financing these preliminary stages.

Instead of the State spending $25.5 million for the outer breakwaters in lieu of Federal aid, private industry would be authorized to advance the funds and operate through the port toll free until their investment is returned with interest.

SENATOR JOHN A. CARROLL'S MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO CIVIL LIBERTIES AS A MEMBER OF THE U.S. SENATE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, John A. Carroll of Colorado was one of the finest men who ever served in this body. His record was one of honor and usefulness and was marked by great courage in defense of principles in which he deeply believed.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief monograph entitled "Carroll's Contribution in the Senate in the Field of Civil Liberties," written by Miss Helene C. Monberg, a writer for a number of newspapers in the West, be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the monograph was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARROLL'S MAJOR CONTRIBUTION IN THE SENATE IN THE FIELD OF CIVIL LIBERTIES

WASHINGTON.—Senator John A. Carroll's major legislative accomplishment during his 6 years of service in the Senate was in the field of civil liberties and constitutional rights, according to veteran Capitol Hill observers.

He played a decisive role in the battle in the Senate in 1958 to preserve the independence of the courts.

For 5 years Carroll, a Colorado Democrat and a liberal, served on the Senate Judiciary Committee heavily weighted in favor of southern and midwestern conservatives The Colorado Senator fought a rearguard battle, first in committee, then on the Senate floor, against legislation which, to a civil libertarian such as Carroll, appeared to be an encroachment on an individual's constitutional rights and an assault on the independence of the judiciary by the U.S. Congress.

His most important battles were defensive. He used the procedural rules in the Senate and tactics of delay to stop Senate approval of what he considered to be unwise anticourt legislation. But he also fought in the Senate Judiciary Committee in favor of extension of civil rights to all Americans, particularly the right of Negroes to register and vote in the South.

Carroll's major legacy in the field of constitutional rights and separation of the powers of government came in 1958. During that year he was instrumental in stopping several bills whose purpose was to curb the powers of the U.S. Supreme Court and to nullify several of its unpopular decisions.

COURT UNDER ATTACK

As Walter F. Murphy, a political science professor at Princeton University, points out in his book, "Congress and the Court," published in 1962, the U.S. Supreme Court has been under attack intermittently throughout American history after it has rendered decisions unpopular with either liberals or conservatives. The present decade has been an era of attack on the High Court because a number of its recent decisions have displeased conservatives, particularly the southerners.

After Earl Warren, of California, became Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1953, the Court began to hand down a series of decisions which had the most profound effect on particularly sensitive areas of American society. Most of these decisions were rendered by the Court in the years 1954–57. The first was the unanimous decision written by Warren and announced on May 17, 1954, ruling racial segregation unconstitutional in the public school systems in 21 States and the District of Columbia which operated segregated schools. The Court thus outlawed the separate but equal doctrine that it had enunciated in 1896. During the period 1954–57 the Court handed down important decisions in such vital areas as race relations, loyalty security programs, conduct of congressional investigations, admission to the bar, and prosecution of subversives.

Many of these Court decisions sorely troubled certain Members of Congress. "Stirred sometimes by resentment against judicial policymaking, sometimes by pressures from interest groups and newspapers whose goals had been thwarted by the Court, sometimes by fear of the effects of the Court's decisions on national security or racial peace, and sometimes by a combination of these causes, many Congressmen supported proposals to reverse various facets of judge-made policies and even to curb the Court's basic authority, in the mid and late 1950's," Murphy stated.

The showdown on such anticourt legislation came in Congress in 1958.

COURT CURB BILLS

The battle in the Senate revolved around several key measures.

One was a comprehensive bill by former Senator William E. Jenner, Republican, of Indiana, to strip from the U.S. Supreme Court appellate power in five categories of cases. A brief hearing was held on the Jenner bill in the Internal Security Subcommittee on August 7, 1957. On February 3, 1958, an attempt was made to push it through the parent Judiciary Committee. Senator Thomas Hennings, Democrat of Missouri, fought the attempt and it failed on a 6-to-6 tie vote. Carroll, who had been appointed to the committee only 4 days earlier, argued at length against committee action on the bill without more complete hearings. He cast the decisive vote to keep the bill from being reported pending further hearings. As a result, lengthy hearings were held on the bill during March and April of 1958.

The Jenner bill was too far reaching to be approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee. So it was extensively modified in committee by a series of amendments proposed by Senator John Marshall Butler, Republican, of Maryland. As the bill was reported to the Senate on May 15, 1958, it barred the Supreme Court from reviewing State bar admission rules, the only restriction on appellate jurisdiction carried over from the original Jenner bill. It also modified or nullified several recent Supreme Court rulings by legalizing State sedition laws, spelling out the legislative intent of certain provisions of the 1940 antisedition Smith Act, and stating that the two Houses of Congress would be the judge of their own congressional committee investigations.

Carroll was one of a minority of six committee members who voted against the Butler amendments to modify the Jenner bill, and he was one of a minority of five who voted against the modified Jenner-Butler bill when the committee voted 10 to 5 to report it as amended on April 30, 1958. After this vote, Carroll made a motion to refer the bill back to subcommittee for further hearings, but his motion was tabled by a vote of 10 to 5.

A minority report on the new Jenner-Butler bill signed by four committee members including Carroll pointed out that much new language had been added to the highly complex measure since hearings had been held on the original Jenner bill, so additional hearings should be held to determine the impact of the new provisions. The minority report was critical of each provision of the Jenner-Butler bill, and the four signers, Carroll, Hennings, Senators Estes Kefauver, Democrat of Tennessee, and Alexander Wiley, Republican of Wisconsin, stated they opposed the entire bill.

ANTISEDITION BILL

The next anticourt bill which cleared the Senate Judiciary Committee on August 1, 1958, was a measure (S. 654) to permit States to pass antisedition laws, thereby nullifying a 1956 Supreme Court ruling. In that decision the Supreme Court had held that under the 1940 antisedition Smith Act the Federal Government had, by implication, preempted exclusive jurisdiction in the field of sedition. The ruling held invalid provisions of a Pennsylvania sedition act punishing attempted subversion of the Federal Government within the State.

Carroll was 1 of 4 committee members to vote against S. 654. Carroll noted that no hearings had been held on the measure in the 85th Congress. "This is not responsible legislative procedure," he stated. Emphasizing that sedition is a national problem, he added, "If enacted, this bill would revitalize approximately 42 State statutes directed against overthrow of the Federal Government." The State laws were widely diverse, both in their substantive and procedural provisions, and "some have provisions plainly at variance with the Federal legislation (i.e., the Smith Act). Others are vague and lack basic procedural safeguards. Many contain provisions which raise sharp constitutional questions. Yet this bill (S. 654) would in one swoop revitalize all these measures. The problem of subversion against the Government of the United States is a national rather than a local problem. All these factors emphasize the need for a uniform national standard and an integrated centralized program in combating subversion," Carroll stated.

FEDERAL PREEMPTION DOCTRINE

The third bill which cleared the Senate Judiciary Committee, on August 5, 1958, with one dissent, was the so-called preemption bill (S. 337). It was of far-reaching importance to the courts. It provided that no Federal law precluded the enactment and enforcement of a State statute on the same subject unless the Federal statute expressly preempted a certain area or the State law was irreconcilably in conflict with the Federal law. The doctrine of Federal preemption is based on a provision of article 6 of the U.S. Constitution making Federal law the supreme law of the land, and it had been broadly interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court to apply by implication or inference. S. 337 barred use of the doctrine of Federal preemption by implication.

Carroll was the lone dissenter to S. 337 in the Senate Judiciary Committee. He filed a minority report on S. 337 on August 11, 1958, in which he stated why he opposed the bill. "It is being used as a device to whip the Supreme Court for decisions with which some Members of this body (i.e., the Senate) disagree even though those decisions relate only incidentally or not at all to the constitutional doctrine of preemption * * *. If the proponents of this bill are correct in assuming that the Supreme Court has failed in its task of interpreting the will of Congress—an assumption often repeated and little demonstrated—they still have not made a case for this type of 'shotgun' legislation. They are like doctors who, having concluded the patient needs an operation, proceed to perform it with a rusty meat ax," Carroll stated.

THE MALLORY RULE

The final key anticourt bill cleared the Senate Judiciary Committee on August 8, 1958. This was a House-passed bill known as the "Mallory rule bill." The Supreme Court had ruled on June 24, 1957, that a confession obtained by the Washington, D.C., police from Andrew Mallory, a criminal assault suspect, after his arrest but before his arraignment could not be used in Federal court as evidence because there had been illegal and unnecessary delay (about 21 hours) between the time that Mallory was arrested and the time when he was arraigned. The court ruled that since Mallory's confession was made during a period of illegal detention, it could not be used as evidence in Federal court.

As the Mallory rule bill had passed the House on July 2, 1958, it provided that otherwise valid confessions should not be barred as evidence solely because of delay in arraignment.

As the bill was reported out of the Senate committee it was amended to insert the word "reasonable" before the word "delay." The addition of the word "reasonable" materially changed the effect of the legislation.

The Mallory rule bill was referred to the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code, of which Carroll was a member, and this subcommittee held hearings on the Mallory rule bill in July of 1958.

Carroll expressed grave doubts about the bill during these hearings. He conceded that the State and local police now have and perhaps should have a lesser degree of accountability in arresting a man because they are not required to establish probable cause in making an arrest. But Federal law enforcement officers may only arrest for probable cause because they are required to operate under the fourth amendment to the Constitution which protects citizens against unreasonable search and seizure, he pointed out.

Although Carroll was willing to modify the Mallory ruling as it applied to common-law crimes handled by the local police in Washington, D.C., he demurred against a broader modification. "We forget we are opening the door to Federal police in all States of the Union to give them a power that they have never had before in American history," Carroll stated at the hearings. "Shall we permit the Federal police * * * to utilize the interim period between arrest and arraignment to elicit information from a witness to be used against him before arraignment? That has never been permissible under Federal law * * * I want to take a long look at such legislation before we place the stamp of approval upon a Federal police practice of such far-reaching importance," Carroll stated. Legislation modifying the Mallory rule might aid law enforcement officers in their work, Carroll said, but it might also "open the door to abuses in another area" affecting the individual's civil rights vis-a-vis the Federal Government.

LIBERALS GIRD FOR BATTLE

Senate liberals were appalled at the prospect that so much anticourt legislation was being reported to the Senate during the final weeks of the 85th Congress. They decided to put up a last-ditch battle against these bills. In his book, "Congress and the Court," Murphy detailed how the Senate liberals girded for battle, as follows:

"The procourt faction (in the Senate) was also coalescing. Paul Douglas, of Illinois; Thomas Hennings, of Missouri; Frank Church, of Idaho; William Proxmire, of Wisconsin; John Carroll, of Colorado; Jacob Javits, of New York; Joseph Clark, of Pennsylvania; Wayne Morse, of Oregon, and Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota, formed the core of this group, with perhaps another dozen Senators strongly sympathetic. Liberal leadership was divided among three men, Carroll, Hennings, and Humphrey. Hennings, and more particularly, Carroll, assumed responsibility for keeping the group united around a minimum plan of action, while HUMPHREY was to maintain liaison with the majority leader.

"Choice of leadership of a Senate faction is an informal affair, more a matter of gravitation than official election. But in this instance, at least, the selection had been quite rational, however informal. HUMPHREY, as a close personal friend of LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, was the obvious man to work with the (Senate) majority leader. Both he and Hennings were accepted and established members of the Senate's inner club; and, although Carroll was only serving his freshman term, he had already managed to impress his liberal colleagues, as well as the majority leader, without having yet alienated the older conservatives. By pressing for a change in Senate rules to curb filibustering and by opposing the jury trial amendment to the 1957 Civil Rights Act, Carroll immediately established a reputation as a fighting liberal.

"Carroll and Hennings were on the Judiciary Committee, where they had been able to watch much of the enemy's battle plan develop," to pass the anticourt bills, "and Hennings was also secretary of the Democratic Policy Committee, a vantage point from which he could try to block floor consideration of the court bills," Murphy stated

CARROLL CALLS STRATEGY MEETINGS

"In the second week of August, Carroll began calling the (liberal procourt) group together for occasional strategy conferences. These meetings were held in the basement of the Old Senate Office Building, and PAUL DOUGLAS commented that the liberals were beginning to look like the Christians in the catacombs. At one of these gatherings some 15 Senators showed up, but usually only 5 or 6 were present. Yet, no matter how small or large the conclave, it was obvious that the liberals—like the anticourt faction—were divided in their degree of opposition to the court bills as well as in their ideas of how best to cope with the legislative situation. They could agree on only the most general and obvious plan of battle," Murphy related.

The liberals worked out a plan of strategy at these meetings. According to Murphy's account, "the first liberal tactic would be to charge haste and panic, and to plead for postponement until the next session. The second tactic agreed upon tied in with the first; to talk at great length on the floor, to be ready to talk at greater length, and then to press for motions to table or to recommit rather than allow a vote on final passage. When their quasi-filibuster was going on, the liberals could approach the majority leader and caution him not to bring up more court bills lest the Senate never adjourn. If all of this failed, they agreed to resort to dentistry, and by amendment, to try to pull some of the teeth of the anticourt measures," Murphy stated.

The procourt group also had some powerful allies. The Attorney General was certain to prevail on then President Eisenhower to veto most of the anticourt bills, and he had so stated. LYNDON JOHNSON, the then Senate majority leader, had grave doubts about the anticourt measures, particularly from the aspect of their upsetting the balance of power among the three branches of Government, and JOHNSON quietly determined to use his great legislative skill to shelve most of these measures.

LIBERALS THROW DOWN GAUNTLET

Murphy said that the procourt group decided to make their first concentrated public move about 2 weeks before the end of the congressional session. Murphy's account is as follows: "On the 12th of August, the liberals put their opposition to the court bills in writing. Hubert Humphrey personally delivered a letter to Johnson signed by himself and nine other Senators, Paul Douglas, John Carroll, Wayne Morse, Joseph Clark, Thomas Hennings, Pat McNamara, Richard Neuberger, William Proxmire, and John Kennedy."

Their letter stated: "We are deeply concerned that, in the last-minute rush to adjourn, one or more decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court may be overruled by hasty legislation enacted without adequate consideration. A great debate on the recent decisions of the Supreme Court has much to recommend it, but we do not believe that the last days of the Congress are the appropriate time for such a debate. We urge you to announce this great debate for the next session of Congress rather than bring up legislation to reverse isolated decisions in this last stage of the Congress," the liberals stated.

To try to placate the anticourt group pressing for action on the court bills, JOHNSON decided to bring up the least controversial of the anticourt measures, the House-passed Mallory rule bill. It passed the Senate on August 19, 1958, by a vote of 65 to 12, after the Senate agreed to a committee amendment by a 41 to 39 rollcall vote which added the word "reasonable" before the word "delay." The liberals supported the committee amendment, but split on the bill's passage. Carroll supported both. Carroll was also named a conferee to the Senate-House conference committee to compromise differences in the two versions of the bill.

JENNER-BUTLER BILL DOWN DRAIN

The following day, on August 20, 1958, Jenner sought to add the Jenner-Butler bill as a rider to a minor court bill. But the Jenner-Butler bill went down the drain when Hennings' motion to table or kill it was agreed to 49 to 41. All of the liberals including Carroll coalesced behind the Hennings motion, and they were jubilant with the demise of the Jenner-Butler bill.

But their jubilation was short lived. The anticourt group regrouped behind an amendment by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, to add the text of a House-passed bill similar to S. 337 banning Federal preemption by implication to S. 654, the Senate bill permitting States to enact laws barring subversive activities. A motion by Hennings to table the McClellan amendment was rejected 46 to 39 on August 20, 1958, although all of the liberals voted for the Hennings motion and the Eisenhower administration supported it.

The procourt group sought final passage of the amended S. 654 immediately. Carroll sought to make a motion to recommit the bill to the Senate Judiciary Committee, thereby killing it for the session. Johnson decided to postpone a showdown on the bill until the next day. He asked Carroll to yield the floor to him to adjourn the Senate until noon of August 21. Carroll did so, with the understanding that he would be able to make his motion to recommit the bill when it was again taken up in the Senate.

CARROLL RECOMMITAL MOTION

Frantic lobbying went on nearly all day on August 21, 1958, as both the procourt and anticourt groups sought to swing undecided Senators to their side. Early in the afternoon, according to Murphy's account, JOHNSON'S tally indicated that Carroll's motion would be defeated by a vote of 42–40 if it were brought up at that time. Johnson played for more time, primarily to try to get several Senators who might favor the anticourt bill to stay off the Senate floor and withhold their vote.

Murphy's account of this tense period in the Senate, just prior to a major test on curbing the powers of the U.S. Supreme Court, read as follows: "Carroll waited for word from JOHNSON when to take up his recommittal motion again. He expected it at 1 p.m., but JOHNSON sent him a message to hold a while longer. A little after 2 p.m., when Carroll was eating lunch, the AFL–CIO called his office to tell him that they thought they had swung the necessary votes to carry his motion. Carroll checked with JOHNSON, but the majority leader was not sure. It was not until just before 5 p.m., that JOHNSON was willing to go ahead. When the clerk began calling the roll on Carroll's motion to recommit the anticourt bill, the majority leader was nervously pacing around the Senate chamber. He knew the vote was going to be close, and to add to the drama and suspense, Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican of Utah, was off the floor when his name was called.

"While the voting was going on, Bennett had come onto the floor and was counting the roll. After the pairs were announced and the last name ticked off, the count stood at 40–40. * * * The clerk read Bennett's name again. In a steady voice the Senator from Utah called out 'Aye'," Murphy related.

Carroll's motion had carried by 1 vote, 41 to 40, thereby killing the major anticourt bill on its key test in the Senate, on August 21, 1958. Carroll was toasted as the hero of the procourt group that August night. Neuberger paid the ultimate compliment to Carroll after the vote. The Oregonian told the Coloradan that if he never did another thing in the Senate, he had earned his place in history that night.

MALLORY RULE BILL SHELVED

The final anticourt bill still alive at that point was the Mallory rule bill, which was in conference committee. The five Senate conferees, of whom Carroll was one, and the five House conferees spent 2 days haggling over the addition of the word "reasonable" to the House-passed bill.

Finally, on August 23, 1958, just on the eve of adjournment, the joint Senate-House conference agreed to a bill which was different from both the House version and the Senate version, but was much closer to the House version. As reported by the conference committee, the bill provided that reasonable delay in arraignment would not, of itself, invalidate a confession obtained during such a delay; that no confession or statement would be admissible unless, prior to interrogation, the suspect had been advised of his right to silence and warned that anything he said might be used in evidence; and, finally, that "such delay is to be considered as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions." Chairman Emanuel Celler, Democrat, of New York, of the House Judiciary Committee, Carroll, and Wiley refused, as conferees, to sign the conference report.

Carroll told Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, who has a keen interest in Washington, D.C., as a long-time member of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, that the procourt conferees had lost their battle on the Mallory rule bill in conference. A fighting liberal of the last-ditch variety who is one of the Senate's champion filibusterers, MORSE suggested to Carroll that they organize a group of liberal Senators to filibuster the conference report to death. Carroll agreed, and the two Senators recruited several others, including DOUGLAS, and went into the marble room off the Senate floor to rest up, thereby gathering strength for their potential filibuster. All of the Members of the Senate were dog tired, it was the eve of adjournment, and this mere threat to filibuster was a trump card.

As the long hours of adjournment night dragged on, a member of the JAVITS staff pointed out to Carroll that under the rules of the Senate a point of order might be successfully raised and sustained against the conference report because Senate rules forbid the insertion of new matter in a conference report. If a point of order were sustained, the conference report would be recommitted to conference, which would bury it for the session, as the Senate was at the point of adjournment.

Carroll checked out the point-of-order proposal with the Senate parliamentarian and also with the then Vice President Richard M. Nixon, to be sure that it would be sustained. Nixon took the matter under advisement, then told Carroll that he would sustain the point of order if Carroll made it. Faced with the prospect of a potential filibuster and Carroll's raising a point of order against the conference report on the Mallory rule bill, the Senate Democratic policy committee threw in the towel on the last anticourt bill still before the Senate.

When the conference report was brought up as the last matter of business in the 85th Congress, Carroll and MORSE read into the RECORD statements made in the meetings of the conference committee to prove that new matter had been added to the bill in conference.

Carroll then made his point of order, and JOHNSON "asked for a ruling from the Chair," Murphy related. "At 10 minutes past 4 a.m. in the morning the Vice President played his role properly by sustaining Carroll's motion. The Senate adjourned at 4:11 a.m. Sunday, August 24. The attack on the Warren Court which had come in with a thunderclap went out with a sham battle over a point of order," Murphy stated.

Carroll had made a great contribution to the cause of preserving the independence of the judiciary and to the preservation of constitutional liberties as the Senate adjourned early that Sunday morning. Within a period of 3 days he had successfully killed two anticourt bills, one on a motion to recommit and another on a point of order. The back of the congressional drive to curb the U.S. Supreme Court had been broken by Carroll's and Hennings' procedural motions. It never built up steam again.

Douglas, the leading liberal in the Senate, called Carroll "the real hero" of the battle to preserve the jurisdiction of the U.S. Supreme Court and to preserve constitutional rights.

Clark Foreman, director of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, praised Carroll's work on the Mallory rule legislation, first by watering down the bill in committee and then by shelving it in the Senate. The civil liberties committee regarded the bill as "a very serious attempt to weaken constitutional guarantees of the fourth amendment," Foreman said.

CARROLL ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Throughout his 6-year Senate career, Carroll was always active in the perennial drive to liberalize Senate rules to improve the chances for enactment of civil rights bills in the Senate and in the recent drive to extend Federal protection to Negroes who want to vote in the South, but who are presently disenfranchised in many areas because of State laws and local custom.

It became apparent as soon as Carroll joined Senator Gordon Allott, Republican, of Colorado, in the Senate in 1957 that these Colorado Senators were both more civil rights minded than the old Colorado Senate team of former Senator Ed C. Johnson, Democrat, of Colorado, and the late Senator Eugene D. Millikin, Republican, of Colorado.

In 1957 Carroll and Allott voted against a motion by Lyndon B. Johnson, Democrat, of Texas, then the Senate Democratic leader, to table, or kill, a motion by Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Democrat, of New Mexico, to adopt new Senate rules to ease the method of limiting Senate debate, and thereby improve the chances for passage of civil rights legislation. Johnson's motion was agreed to 55 to 38 on January 4, 1957, but the Colorado Senators set a new pattern in both voting against it.

Also in 1957 Carroll and Allott lined up with a bipartisan coalition of moderates and liberals from the North and West to oppose a point of order raised by Senator Richard B. Russell, Democrat, of Georgia, against a move to refer a House-passed civil rights bill directly to the Senate, thereby bypassing the Senate Judiciary Committee. Russell's point of order was rejected by a vote of 45 to 39, on June 20, 1957.

In voting against the Russell point of order, Carroll said at the time: "I have been fighting for civil rights and civil liberties for a long time, for about 25 years. I am tired of watching civil rights bills blocked by legislative committees in Congress. No civil rights bill has ever passed the Senate. It always has been tied up by committee. After the House passed the civil rights bill with an overwhelming majority, and the Senate Judiciary Committee sat on a civil rights bill for 5½ months without reporting a measure, it just seemed to me there was nothing to do but remove the roadblock of the Senate Judiciary Committee and place the House bill on the Senate Calendar for Senate debate."

THE 1957 CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

As the civil rights bill passed the House on June 18, 1957, it created a six-member Civil Rights Commission to investigate deprivations of the right to vote and ordered it to report its findings to the President within 2 years. It authorized the President to name an additional Assistant Attorney General to head a new civil rights division in the Justice Department. It authorized the Attorney General to seek injunctions in Federal courts in the name of the U.S. Government against any person who has "engaged or is about to engage" in acts which would deprive a citizen of his voting rights or other civil rights. It granted Federal courts jurisdiction over such civil rights cases "without regard to whether the party aggrieved shall have exhausted" State administrative or judicial remedies. Finally, the House-passed bill made it unlawful for a private individual to interfere or attempt to interfere with a citizen's right to vote.

Carroll was one of a small band of liberal Democrats in the Senate who fought in vain to keep the House bill intact.

This group literally lived civil rights legislation night and day during the month-long debate in the Senate. Both as a civil libertarian and as an attorney, Carroll was fascinated with the subject. He pored over law books and sought out cases from the American Law Division of the Library of Congress to bolster his arguments. He deplored the lack of figures on voting statistics and he sought data from the Department of Justice on voting infringements in the South. He distributed from his office a book based on a series of articles which had appeared in a national magazine relative to the South's decision to oppose the 1954 Supreme Court school desegregation decision.

The first critical test in the Senate was on an amendment by Senator Anderson and Senator George D. Aiken, Republican of Vermont, which eliminated a key provision in part III of the House bill permitting the Attorney General to institute civil action for preventive relief in civil rights cases. The Anderson-Aiken amendment had the effect of limiting the bill to the enforcement of voting rights only. The amendment was agreed to by a vote of 52 to 38 on July 24, 1957, in the Senate, with both Colorado Senators voting against it.

Carroll strongly opposed the amendment because it prevented the Attorney General from seeking an injunction in Federal court to enforce school integration and other civil rights. He told the Senate there were many infringements on the civil rights of minorities throughout the country which could be rectified only by keeping intact part III of the House-passed bill.

"I represent 150,000 Spanish-speaking citizens in Colorado," Carroll told the Senate. "I am not afraid to have the Attorney General assert their constitutional rights in the Federal court of Colorado as the need arises," Carroll said.

JURY-TRIAL AMENDMENT

Carroll fought even more strongly against the key jury-trial amendment which was finally added to the bill in the Senate. After many changes in final form this amendment guaranteed jury trials in all cases of criminal contempt, not only those arising out of the civil rights bill, and it provided for uniform methods of selecting Federal court juries. The jury-trial amendment finally was agreed to in the Senate by a vote of 51 to 42 on August 2, 1957. Carroll was one of only nine Democrats who voted against it.

The amendment was bitterly fought by this little band of Senate liberals including Carroll, by many top legal experts, and by pro-civil-rights groups for many reasons. These reasons included its far-reaching effect on Federal statutory law, the likelihood that the jury-trial amendment would delay action on voting rights violations and the likelihood that southern juries would not convict defendants in civil rights cases.

Carroll denounced the amendment on the Senate floor. He told the Senate, "It is not a question of whether we are going to protect the right of trial by jury. That is sheer nonsense. Never in the history of the Nation has such a right been granted in this type of case." He proposed a three-judge court to determine a criminal contempt case arising out of a voting rights violation as an alternative to the jury-trial amendment, but his proposal never got anywhere.

The badly outnumbered Senate liberals lost the battle but those who voted against the jury-trial amendment were heroes in the eyes of the pro-civil-rights group. In addition to Carroll, they were Douglas, Humphrey, McNamara, Hennings, Morse, Neuberger, Clark, and Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat of Missouri.

As the bill finally cleared Congress, it established a commission to investigate allegations of voting rights violations and set up a new civil rights division in the Department of Justice. It empowered the Attorney General to seek an injunction when an individual's voting rights were in jeopardy, and it empowered Federal district courts to take jurisdiction over such cases. It entitled a defendant in any major criminal contempt case involving voting rights or other rights to a jury trial, and it gave Negroes the right to serve on juries in Federal cases tried in the South.

The 1957 civil rights bill was not all that Carroll wanted or fought for. But he said, "It is not all we desire, but I believe it represents a step forward. We have established a beachhead, I believe that at least we are on the trail of civil rights legislation. We must move forward and never relax our efforts until we have provided genuine protection of civil rights" to all Americans, as civil rights are "the heritage of every American."

In 1959 the Senate moved a step closer to an effective curb on filibusters. Once again Anderson made a motion to consider the adoption of more liberal Senate rules, and once again Johnson successfully tabled Anderson's motion by a vote of 60 to 36 on January 9, 1959. Carroll and Allott voted against the Johnson motion. The liberals, including Carroll, then got behind a proposal by Douglas to limit Senate debate by the affirmative vote of 50 Senators 15 days after 16 Senators filed a cloture motion. Douglas' proposal was rejected 67 to 28 on January 12, 1959.

A slight modification was made in 1959 in the Senate cloture rule for the first time in 10 years when Johnson and Senate Republican leader Everett M. Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois, offered a proposal to limit Senate debate by a two-thirds vote of the Senators voting, instead of two-thirds (then 66) of the total Senate membership. The Johnson-Dirksen resolution was adopted 72 to 22 on January 12, 1959, with the support of both Colorado Senators. The vote indicated that the Senate as a whole had permanently shifted away from its traditional do-nothing position on civil rights.

CARROLL FORMULA

By now Carroll was up to his eyebrows in civil rights legislation, both as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee and as a member of its Constitutional Rights Subcommittee. He fought in subcommittee for all legislative proposals to extend civil rights, but he also was intent on getting some type of bill through committee and to the Senate floor for debate. In July 1959, he presented what he called "the Carroll formula," which he defined as an attempt to bring "a barebones bill" to the Senate floor from committee with the hope that some meat on the bones of the bill could be added by amendment on the Senate floor.

The bill which was approved by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee on July 15, 1959, fit the "Carroll formula." It extended the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years and required that election officials must preserve voting records for 3 years and make them available for inspection by Federal law enforcement officers. Carroll called the bill "a skeleton," but he was optimistic that it could clear the Senate Judiciary Committee despite the opposition of the southern members.

The key provision of civil rights measures under study by the subcommittee was scrapped on June 17. At that time the subcommittee voted 5 to 3 to remove from the measure under study a provision which would have empowered the Attorney General to initiate civil rights suits to safeguard all civil rights, not merely voting rights which had been covered in the 1957 Civil Rights Act. Carroll was one of the three subcommittee members to vote against omission of the key provision.

But even with this omission, the 1959 civil rights bill failed to clear the Senate Judiciary Committee. In order to keep the Civil Rights Commission alive, a rider had to be added to an appropriation bill in the closing days of the 1959 session. Carroll supported the rider.

THE 1960 CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

When it became apparent that the liberals on the Senate Judiciary Committee could not muster the votes to report out even a skeleton bill, Johnson on February 15, 1960, called up a minor House-passed bill and invited Senators to offer civil rights amendments to it. This precipitated a southern filibuster. The liberals resumed their strategy meetings and had to stand duty on the Senate floor throughout the filibuster. Carroll was one of those to stand duty.

Finally, on March 8, 1960, a bipartisan group of 31 liberal and moderate Senators, including both Coloradans, offered a petition to limit debate, despite leadership opposition. Two days later, on March 10, 1960, Douglas and Javits made a motion to limit debate and thereby choke off the filibuster. It was rejected by a vote of 53 to 42, both Colorado Senators voting for it.

The House on March 24 passed a civil rights bill, and the Senate immediately adopted a motion by Johnson referring the House-passed bill to the Senate Judiciary Committee with instructions to the committee to report the bill back to the Senate no later than midnight of March 29, 1960. There was feverish activity in the committee. It held hearings on March 28–29, and it reported out an amended bill to the Senate on March 29. The Senate took up the bill on March 30, 1960, on a motion by Johnson agreed to by a vote of 71 to 17.

REFEREE CONTROVERSY

As the bill had passed the House, it provided for court-appointed referees to help Negroes register and vote when the court found that a pattern of discrimination existed. The bill also made a crime the obstruction of court orders to carry out school desegration. And it required the preservation of court records.

In committee Carroll offered an amendment to give courts the authority to waive the requirement that a Negro must prove to the referee that he was refused registration by a State official. His amendment was rejected by a vote of 10 to 4, on March 29, 1960.

Kefauver offered an amendment that was agreed to on March 29 by a 7 to 6 vote in the Senate Judiciary Committee. It struck out language in the bill insuring that a Negro's appearance before a voting referee would be ex parte (without cross examination by opponents). The Kefauver amendment also added a provision that hearings would be held in a public office, that the referee must give the local registrar 2 days' written notice of the time and place of the hearing, and that the registrar or his counsel might appear and make a transcript of the proceedings.

Carroll voted for the Kefauver amendment in committee, but he later had misgivings about it. Although the purpose of the Kefauver amendment was said to be to avoid a star chamber proceedings, opponents claimed it would have the effect of intimidating southern Negroes from seeking their voting franchise.

So on April 1, 1960, Carroll offered on the Senate floor a substitute for the Kefauver amendment. Carroll's amendment was agreed to by a vote of 69 to 22. It restored the House language requiring that the hearing before the referee be held ex parte, and it allowed the court to set the time and place of the hearing. It was a key amendment to the House-passed civil rights bill, and one of only two accepted on the Senate floor. Carroll was also cosponsor of the other amendment which was offered by Dirksen and agreed to by the Senate on April 7, 1960, on a 79 to 12 rollcall vote; it provided if a Negro's application to register were challenged, the court could allow him to vote provided that he "shall be qualified to vote under State law." There were varying interpretations of the effect of the Dirksen-Carroll amendment. Carroll claimed it would circumvent delay, and that it would be unlikely that proceedings would be brought to test a Negro's registration application until after the election.

VENUE AMENDMENT

Carroll also offered an amendment to the civil rights bill considered by the Senate prior to action on the House-approved bill. His amendment, agreed to by the Senate by voice vote on March 14, 1960, amended a provision making bombing a church or school a Federal crime by providing that the offender could be prosecuted either in the Federal judicial district in which the crime was committed or in which he was held in custody before fleeing. The purpose of the amendment was to provide for orderly judicial procedure in conformity with the Constitution.

One of Carroll's Senate floor amendments was tabled or killed on a rollcall vote of 62 to 32 on April 6, 1960. It provided that the court could have discretion to waive the requirement that a Negro seeking a voting certificate under the referee plan must prove that he had tried to register with State officials and had been refused even after a pattern of discrimination had been found by the court.

As the bill passed the Senate on April 8, 1960, by a vote of 71 to 18, and as it finally cleared Congress on April 21, this second civil rights bill since 1875 provided that obstruction of all Federal court orders was a crime. It outlawed all bombings and bomb threats, required preservation of voting records and provided for court registration of Negroes.

Carroll and Allott voted for the 1960 civil rights bill as the only alternative to no legislation at all, but Carroll predicted, "even with a voting procedure provided for in the bill, it will take 20 or 25 years before it will come into full fruition."

The 1960 civil rights battle indicated that although Carroll was a liberal in good standing in the Senate on the question of civil rights, he was not an extremist. "I'm a realist as well as a civil rights advocate," he stated. He, therefore, became a kind of "bridge" between the southerners on the Senate Judiciary Committee and his liberal allies who did not serve on the committee.

Following the national political conventions on September 1, 1960, Carroll joined with Democratic Presidential Nominee John F. Kennedy and 22 other Democratic Senators to pledge action in the next Congress on legislation in all fields of civil rights "to assure an American his full constitutional rights and to make equal opportunity a living reality for all Americans."

KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

The high hopes of the liberals for speedy action on civil rights in 1961 did not materialize, however, primarily because the closeness of the 1960 election indicated that Mr. Kennedy would have to take measured steps in this field to keep his party intact.

At the beginning of the 87th Congress in 1961 Carroll favored proposals advanced by liberals to shut off debate in the Senate either by a simple majority after reasonable debate, as Clark advocated, or by a vote of three-fifths of the Senators present and voting, as proposed by Anderson.

Both Colorado Senators voted against a motion by the new Senate majority leader, Mike Mansfield, Democrat, of Montana, and Dirksen to refer Anderson's proposal to the Senate Rules Committee for study. The Mansfield-Dirksen motion was agreed to, however, by a 50-to-46 vote on January 11, 1961. Carroll commented at the time that the action put "old King Filibuster back in the saddle in the Senate," thereby dooming any civil rights legislation for 1961.

One measured advance on the civil rights front was made by the Senate on March 27, 1962, when it approved a constitutional amendment barring the imposition of a poll tax and its payment as a qualification for voting in Federal elections and primaries. The resolution was approved by a vote of 77 to 16, with both Carroll and Allott voting for it.

But the administration-backed bill to require that anyone with a sixth-grade education must be passed in a literacy test for voting in Federal elections went down the drain on May 14, 1962, when Mansfield and Dirksen were unable to limit debate on the measure. Their motion to limit debate was rejected by a vote of 52 to 42. Carroll voted for it. Carroll was appalled at some of the technical and complicated literacy tests given Negroes in the South when the tests were under study before the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee in March and April 1962. "In my State," Carroll noted at the literacy test hearings, "if only 100 people were denied the right to vote, why there would be sort of a political revolution."

WIRETAPPING

Carroll's final major contribution to the civil rights battle in the Senate, from a civil libertarian point of view, was his successful battle to keep a wiretapping bill from being reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee until it was too late to permit enactment of wiretapping legislation in the 87th Congress.

The Kennedy administration wants Congress to enact legislation to permit legalized, controlled wiretapping by Federal law enforcement officers and the right to use information thus obtained in court in certain cases involving national security, organized crime, and certain serious crimes. It also would authorize State wiretapping and use of evidence thus obtained in court in a limited category of crimes, under Federal regulation.

Wiretapping is done by local police and by State and Federal enforcement officers although the status of information obtained through wiretapping to be used as evidence is very much clouded by conflicting court decisions and by conflicts in Federal and State laws. The central issue in wiretapping is how to balance the need for better tools for law enforcement in these days of high-speed communications as against the individual citizen's right to privacy and personal liberty.

Carroll recognizes that legislation is needed in the field of wiretapping, but he is sorely troubled as to how this is to be accomplished. At hearings held on the subject in May 1961, before the Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee, Carroll stated, "I recognize there is a need for change under the present law and the present Supreme Court decisions. The real question is, How far do we go? I recognize that in the State of New York they have different problems than we have in Colorado. * * * I know in my own State when the FBI moves in to help we get cooperation from the local police, from the law enforcement officials, and sometimes even from the phone company. This might not strictly conform to the law. There is a vacuum here, and in operating our system of government, we just can't deal in a vacuum," he stated.

CONTRA TO CONSTITUTION?

Carroll is greatly concerned about the constitutional question posed by new legislation to legalize wiretapping. "It is one thing to keep track of what the criminal is doing, but I think it is quite another thing to put wiretapping in the same category as search and seizure in the fourth amendment—to make wiretapping evidence admissible in court. Once we extend the concept of interception and divulgence and the admissibility of evidence by wiretap, isn't the next step the electronic device, the bugging, the spike in the wall, the microphone planted along the windowpane? How far are we going to permit this invasion of privacy?" he wondered aloud in committee.

Carroll is particularly sensitive about this general subject because when he was district attorney of Denver (1937–41) he prosecuted a case[1] in which a microphone was planted in a grandfather clock in the executive chambers of the Governor. Carroll tried the case under a 300-year-old common law crime of eavesdropping. The defendants were found guilty and the Colorado Supreme Court upheld the conviction and the lawyers responsible for the bugging were disbarred. On the basis of this famed case, Carroll states, "Colorado takes a very dim view of wiretapping."

Carroll held out for the most exhaustive type of study on this subject before Congress takes final action on a wiretapping bill. But as no other member of the subcommittee showed such marked concern about assuring that it would not encroach on constitutional guarantees and as Carroll will round out his Senate career in January 1963, informed observers believe that a fairly comprehensive wiretapping bill will pass in the next Congress.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a noteworthy development of recent years has been that Members of Congress have been meeting with parliamentarians from the NATO countries, from Canada and Mexico, from Latin America, and from the British Commonwealth as well as from other parliamentary bodies around the world.

Of these interparliamentary bodies the oldest is the Interparliamentary Union, whose origin dates back to 1889. The Union, which now has some 65 member countries, brings together parliamentarians representing different ideologies and countries for the objective study of political, economic, social, juridical and cultural problems of international significance. For this purpose, two important sessions are held each year. They function as a grand forum where the tribunes of the people from every continent and country can exchange views on all international problems suitable for settlement by legislative action. They also serve as a center for the comparative study and development of parliamentary institutions so as to improve their operations and enhance their prestige.

At its 51st Conference last October in Brasilia the Interparliamentary Union showed once again its independence and vitality. This was demonstrated both by the high quality of its debates and by the resolutions which were adopted appealing to the great powers for peace, calling for the reestablishment of freely functioning parliaments in all countries, supporting the role of international trade in promoting balanced economic and social progress in developing countries, and setting forth methods and prerequisites for general disarmament.

The meeting of the IPU in Brasilia last fall coincided with the sudden emergence of the Cuban crisis and added much tension and drama to its debates. Delegates of the United States—six Senators and six Representatives—participated actively in all these debates. Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON served as chairman of the U.S. delegation and was its eloquent spokesman in the general debate on the Cuban crisis and on the subject of arms control.

Other Senators who served ably and with credit were the Senator from Hawaii, Mr. Long; the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. Thurmond; the Senator from Georgia, Mr. Talmadge; the Senator from Texas, Mr. Yarborough; and the former Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Murphy. I also had the honor of serving as a member of the Senate delegation.

Members of the House of Representatives who served, with great distinction, were Representative W. Robert Poage, of Texas; Representative Paul C. Jones, of Missouri; Representative Dale Alford, of Arkansas; Representative Phil Weaver, of Nebraska; Representative Thomas N. Downing, of Virginia; and Representative Lucien N. Nedzi, of Michigan.

The vigorous defense by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] of the President's Cuban policy was received with warm applause by all the delegates except those of the Soviet bloc. I have been informed, Mr. President, by other members of our delegation to the conference at Brasilia that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], was our star performer there, and that he brilliantly arose to the occasion during the emergency at a crucial moment.

Upon their arrival in Brazil the delegates of the United States to the Union Conference received a very instructive and informative briefing on economic and political conditions in that country from our able Ambassador, Lincoln Gordon, and his staff. After the Conference, Ambassador Gordon sent a telegram to our delegation which I would like to read to the Senate. He said:

> I want the delegation to know that I have followed the deliberations in Brasilia with great interest and appreciation. I am most impressed with the dedication exhibited not only in faithful attendance, but in serious deliberation and exercise of leadership in Interparliamentary Union activities. It causes considerable satisfaction, though certainly no surprise, to receive numerous reports of the good will and support your delegation has gained for the United States of America as a nation and as leader in mankind's constant efforts to maintain peace, retain his freedom, and improve his lot.

Mr. President, I want to offer my sincere congratulations to the Senator from Virginia for his distinguished leadership of the congressional delegation to the IPU meeting in Brasilia last October. I am sure that I speak for the entire Senate in congratulating the junior Senator from Virginia for his successful guidance and his inspiring leadership of the U.S. delegation, as well as all the other members of the delegation whose performance at Brasilia won so many compliments there. The full text of their speeches and of the resolutions that were adopted by the Conference will be found in the forthcoming report of our delegation to the 51st Conference of the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. President, in the rush of news concerning the Cuban crisis last October, the news of the achievements and accomplishments of this delegation, headed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], was crowded out of the more conspicuous channels of news media in the United States; and I believe the full impact of their efforts and activities there has not been fully realized, and should certainly be further publicized, in addition to our extending congratulations for their achievements.

There was introduced at that Conference of the Interparliamentary Union during the Cuban crisis a resolution which was presented by the Yugoslav delegation concerning the Cuban crisis. It certainly was not leaning in our favor. In fact, it was critical of our position.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution as originally introduced by the Yugoslav delegation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION 51ST INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, BRASILIA, OCTOBER 24–NOVEMBER 1, 1962

DRAFT RESOLUTION PRESENTED BY THE YUGOSLAV DELEGATION

The 51st Interparliamentary Conference,

Deeply disturbed by the sudden increase in international tension and by the dangerous consequences which the blockade of Cuba entails for world peace;

Convinced that it should be possible to settle all international disputes without resort to force through direct negotiations between the parties concerned or through the procedures provided for this purpose in the Charter of the United Nations;

---

[1] *People* v. *Ellis* (101 Colorado Reports 101; 70 pp. 2d 346).

Convinced that all possibilities of an equitable agreement on existing problems in the Caribbean region have not yet been exhausted;

Appeals urgently to the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union to avoid any action which might lead to catastrophe and a general conflict for the peoples of the world;

Invites the United Nations to take urgently, in the spirit of the charter, all appropriate measures which would contribute to the maintenance of peace and the settlement of the present dispute.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, due to the skillful operations, diligence, great earnestness, and sincerity of our delegation attending the Conference, that resolution was amended—drastically amended—in such a manner as to totally defeat its original purpose.

Under the circumstances this was a worthy achievement indeed.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD I be permitted to insert a draft of the revised resolution as passed by the Interparliamentary Union.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, 51ST INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, BRASILIA, OCTOBER 24–NOVEMBER 1, 1962

DRAFT RESOLUTION PRESENTED BY THE YUGOSLAV DELEGATION

The 51st Interparliamentary Conference, deeply disturbed by the sudden increase in international tension and by the dangerous consequences which the recent events in Cuba and the Indo-Chinese border entail for world peace;

Convinced that it should be possible to settle all international disputes without resort to force through direct negotiations between the parties concerned or through the procedures provided for this purpose in the Charter of the United Nations;

Convinced that all possibilities of an equitable agreement on existing problems have not yet been exhausted;

Appeals urgently to the Governments concerned to avoid any action which might lead to catastrophe and a general conflict for the peoples of the world;

Invites the United Nations to take urgently, in the spirit of the charter, all appropriate measures which would contribute to the maintenance of peace and the settlement of the present dispute.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as further reflecting the activities of the chairman, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], as well as our other esteemed and valuable members of the delegation, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD at this point a copy of the remarks made by Senator ROBERTSON at the Conference on October 30, 1962.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

METHODS AND PREREQUISITES FOR GENERAL DISARMAMENT: MEASURES FOR LESSENING INTERNATIONAL TENSION

(Speech by Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the U.S. delegation to the 51st Interparliamentary Union Conference, Brasilia, October 30, 1962)

In an age characterized by strife and discord, when many feel that we are suspended between two worlds—the one dead, the other not yet capable of being born—the delegation of the United States of America points with pardonable pride to the record of our country in behalf of peace.

We have participated in two World Wars, both of which have been defensive wars for the preservation of personal freedom and a democratic way of life. In neither of those wars in which we were victorious, did we ask for the territory of any nation or for booty. On the contrary, at the end of World War II, we were so distressed over the misery and suffering that had resulted from that conflict that we promptly proceeded to aid in the rehabilitation, first of our Allies, later of those who had fought against us, and still later, of needy nations elsewhere in the world. In that undertaking, we have expended more than one hundred billion dollars. Never before in recorded history has any nation ever poured out its wealth in such a prodigal manner for the cause of the future peace of the world.

In addition to that program of rehabilitation on a worldwide basis, we have repeatedly, first at the United Nations in New York, and later at Geneva, Switzerland, made proposals for world peace which have been vetoed by the Soviet Union. Today we stand on that record. Today we still hope that a nuclear war that would destroy civilization as we have known it, can be avoided.

Ever since the end of the last World War, as evidenced by our joining in sponsorship of the United Nations, we have been, and still are, ready to support a program of arms control based upon full and adequate measures of inspection. The objectives of such a program must be the maintenance of the security of all free nations and the preservation of their honor, dignity, and self-respect. Concessions inconsistent with these objectives will never be acceptable to us. On the contrary, we hope all free nations of the world will join with us in reaffirming the traditional attitude of our country expressed by Patrick Henry of Virginia. Prior to the Declaration of Independence in 1776, he said:

"Is peace so sweet or life so dear as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God."

Mr. STENNIS. Further, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the additional remarks made by the chairman of the delegation, Senator ROBERTSON, also be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, CHAIRMAN, U.S. DELEGATION TO THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. President, on behalf of my entire delegation, I want to express our appreciation to our Brazilian hosts for the cordial hospitality with which we have been received here and for the excellent arrangements which have been made for this Conference. It is a particular pleasure to be meeting in this magnificent new city of Brasilia which surely ranks as one of the modern wonders of the world.

I would like also to compliment the Secretary General on his annual report which meets the high standards we have come to expect. It is in every way a first-rate document.

I had hoped to talk today about some of the responsibilities and opportunities we have as legislators to strengthen representative political institutions. But the attention of all of us has been diverted by the gravest threat of nuclear war since the Communist invasion of the free Republic of Korea more than a decade ago.

Now, as then, it is international communism, founded in deceit and backed by ruthless power, which is responsible.

Two elements have been added, so that in the present crisis we are dealing with a threat of a new magnitude and a new dimension. Technology has rapidly given the world more awful weapons. And these weapons have now been introduced into a part of the world which had hitherto been spared their presence.

This lends a new urgency to that topic of our agenda which deals with disarmament. Yet at the same time, it casts something of an aura of unreality over the millions of words which have been said on the subject. A large number of those words unfortunately have been untruthful and deceptive. The representatives of international communism have been talking peace and preparing for war.

It is significant that there is no Cuban delegation among us today. There is no Cuban parliament. It will be recalled that when Mr. Castro was embattled in the Sierra Maestra, he promised his people free elections. But once he came to power, it was a different story. Elections, he said, were not necessary. The will of the Cuban people and the spirit of their revolution, he said at one of his mass meetings, could be amply expressed without elections, through public assemblies such as he was then addressing. In any event, he added, popular support of him and his revolution was such that there was really nothing to have an election about.

Mr. Castro was well aware, of course, that a freely elected Congress would no doubt hinder his already well-advanced plans to deliver his long-suffering country into the hands of the international Communist movement.

That delivery has long since been completed, and Mr. Castro has publicly boasted of it.

So long as this was all, it was a tragedy for the Cuban people and a cause of concern to all free nations, especially in the Western Hemisphere, but it was not a threat to world peace.

But international communism was not content with enslaving the Cuban people. No. It wanted also to use their island as a base for furthering its aggressive intentions against the remaining free nations of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States.

While the spokesmen for international communism repeatedly proclaimed their purely defensive intentions, they were in fact hurriedly installing a capacity to deliver nuclear warheads to the north as far as Canada and to the south as far as Brazil. There is no doubt about this. My Government has incontrovertible proof. This is why the President of my country, as he himself explained so eloquently and forthrightly Monday night, has taken the measures of which we are all aware.

Now, we hear it said, Mr. President, that what the Soviet Union is doing in Cuba is no different from what the United States is doing in Turkey and in other free countries on the periphery of the Soviet bloc. This is silly. Let me, at this point read the pertinent portions of a couple of paragraphs from the President's speech of Monday night:

"For many years, both the Soviet Union and the United States have deployed strategic nuclear weapons with great care, never upsetting the precarious status quo which ensured that these weapons not be used in the absence of some vital challenge. Our own strategic missiles have never been transferred to the territory of any other nation under a cloak of secrecy and deception."

When, referring to the buildup in Cuba the President said,

"But this secret, swift and extraordinary buildup of Communist missiles—in an area well known to have a special and historical relationship to the United States and the nations of the Western Hemisphere, in violation of Soviet assurances, and in defiance of American and hemispheric policy—this sudden clandestine decision to station strategic weapons for the first time outside of Soviet soil, is a deliberately provocative and unjustified change in the status quo which cannot be accepted by this country, if our courage and our commitments are ever to be trusted again by either friend or foe."

No, Mr. President, if a parallel exists at all, it is not between Cuba and Turkey but between Cuba and a member of the Warsaw Pact, for example Poland whose representative we heard earlier. If the Government of Poland were to undergo a change, and if Western nuclear missiles were to be installed on Polish territory, that would represent a change in the deployment of such weapons comparable to what has occurred in Cuba. It would, I think, be a provocative change, and it would obviously heighten world tensions.

But this is a far cry from what the United States and its allies have done in Turkey, which was never an ally of the Soviet Union, but which on the contrary is an ally—and a stanch one—of the United States. Furthermore, when Western missiles were installed in Turkey, and also in Italy, it was publicly announced as a decision taken by the North Atlantic Council.

Mr. President, let us hear no more of these fatuous comparisons which do not compare but serve only to confuse.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me make these final points, briefly and clearly:

First, the United States has no quarrel with the people of Cuba. It has, on the contrary, the deepest sympathy for the agonies through which they are passing, and it looks forward to the day when they will once again take their rightful place in the family of free nations.

Second, the United States had no quarrel with the present Government of Cuba until it became clear beyond peradventure that this Government was betraying the promises of reform which bore it to power. Let it be recalled that when Mr. Castro first came to power in 1959, he was offered the hand of friendship and economic aid by the United States.

Third, the United States intends not only to protect its own vital interests but also to honor its international commitments, one of which is the commitment of hemispheric defense contained in the Rio Treaty of 1947. Only yesterday the action of the United States was approved by 19 nations of this hemisphere including Brazil.

Fourth, and finally—and let there be no mistake about this—the people of the United States and their elected representatives are united on this question.

There is no division among us, regardless of political party affiliation. Nor should there be any division among free nations.

Peace is not divisible. With respect to the present crisis in Cuba, or wherever a new threat to world peace may subsequently be presented, it is our earnest hope that all freedom loving nations will courageously stand together in defense of the fundamental principles of human rights.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DEATH OF JUDGE FRANK PICARD

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in the last few minutes I learned of the death in Michigan today of a Michigan citizen who over many years has contributed effectively to the strength and vitality of our community. I refer to the Honorable Frank Picard, who some years ago retired from the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan after many years of effective service there.

Frank Picard first came to attention in Michigan as a baseball player. He reflected in his baseball career those attributes which later distinguished him as a trial lawyer, as a devoted Democrat, but a wholly responsible partisan. Additionally, and as suggestive of the uniqueness of the man, he and his brothers were celebrated high wire performers. Finally, even in the robe of a Federal judge, Frank Picard never lost that spark and quality which set him apart from most of us.

I have long known Judge Picard, but the day I was permitted to assume responsibility as U.S. attorney for eastern Michigan I came to know him more intimately. I should not want at this late moment to suggest that he was a Government judge. He was anything but that. As a matter of fact, I think everybody who went to court before him felt that he was the other fellow's judge. The truth of it is that he was his own judge, subject to his own conscience, which was a brilliantly perceptive one.

Judge Picard was honored by our party many years ago by its nomination of him to be a candidate for the U.S. Senate. Had he been successful in that campaign, there would be many Senators on the floor at this moment who would be expressing, as I now do, sorrow at news of his death.

There is no corner of life in Michigan that did not, at one time or another, feel the influence of this remarkable man. I can only add that I have hope his family will understand that, while he will be missed, his imprint on Michigan will never be forgotten so long as those books which record history are available.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 1, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 28, 1963:

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORPORATION

The following-named persons to be incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corporation:

Leo D. Welch, of New York.
Joseph V. Charyk, of California.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, February 28, 1963:

GOVERNOR OF GUAM

Manuel F. L. Guerrero, of Guam, to be Governor of Guam for a term of 4 years.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade indicated:

To be major generals

Robert E. Cushman, Jr.
Richard G. Weede
Leonard F. Chapman, Jr.

To be brigadier generals

John C. Miller, Jr.
Louis B. Robertshaw
Rathvon McC. Tompkins
John H. Masters

U.S. NAVY

Rear Adm. Kleber S. Masterson, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Weapons in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to grade indicated:

LINE

To be rear admirals

Edwin S. Miller
Bernard M. Strean
Francis J. Blouin
Arthur R. Gralla
John J. Hyland
Henry L. Miller
John M. Lee
Robert E. McC. Ward
Rhodam Y. McElroy, Jr.
John O. Miner
Theodore A. Torgerson
Edward A. Ruckner
Odale D. Waters, Jr.
Harry L. Reiter, Jr.
Joseph C. Wylie, Jr.
Earl R. Eastwold
William A. Stuart
George R. Luker
William H. Groverman, Jr.
George W. Pressey
Francis E. Nuessle
Robert B. Moore
Magruder H. Tuttle
Harold G. Bowen, Jr.
Edgar H. Batcheller
William A. Brockett
Levering Smith
Edward J. Fahy

MEDICAL CORPS

To be rear admirals

Harold J. Cokley
Robert B. Brown

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

To be rear admiral

Lewis C. Coxe

DENTAL CORPS

To be rear admiral

Frank M. Kyes

Rear Adm. George C. Towner, U.S. Navy, to have the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, the following-named officer, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Ephraim P. Holmes, U.S. Navy.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for appointment in the Air Force Reserve, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of chapter 35 and section 8373, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Donald J. Campbell, AO726745, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Joseph J. Lingle, AO395663, Air Force Reserve.

Col. James H. McPartlin, AO438109, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Roger W. Smith, AO291671, Air Force Reserve.

Col. John A. Lang, Jr., AO569020, Air Force Reserve.

Col. Charles E. Heidingefelder, Jr., AO500072, Air Force Reserve.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of chapter 835, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. James C. Jensen, 1042A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Von R. Shores, 1236A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Sam Maddux, Jr., 1561A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Glen R. Birchard, 1623A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William K. Martin, 1697A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Henry Viccellio, 1728A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen John K. Hester, 1870A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Charles M. Eisenhart, 1957A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. George B. Dany, 1061A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Chester W. Cecil. 1298A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John W. Carpenter III, 1647A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James B. Knapp, 1668A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Jack G. Merrell, 1687A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Marvin L. McNickle, 1721A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Arthur C. Agan, Jr., 1759A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Horace M. Wade, 1872A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Austin J. Russell, 1980A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert H. Warren, 1987A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Theodore R. Milton, 2026A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. James W. Wilson, 1711A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John K. Cullen, 19068A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force, medical), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Kenneth R. Powell, 1614A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Loren G. McCollom, 1632A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William S. Radar, 1636A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Kinney, 1661A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard D. Curtin, 1666A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas B. Whitehouse, 1677A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Milton B. Adams, 1712A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Frederic C. Gray, 1729A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William E. Elder, 1772A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edgar W. Hampton, 1805A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert R. Rowland, 1806A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James B. Tipton, 1854A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. William W. Veal, 1902A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Tarleton H. Watkins, 1910A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Eugene B. LeBailly, 1920A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles R. Bond, Jr., 1937A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gilbert L. Meyers, 1958A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem II, 2025A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Rollen H. Anthis, 2053A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph A. Cunningham, 2054A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Horace A. Hanes, 2060A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John B. McPherson, 2068A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Carroll W. McColpin, 3514A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Oran O. Price, 3563A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas K. McGehee, 3809A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gerald F. Keeling, 3827A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Fred J. Ascani, 4036A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gordon T. Gould, Jr., 4040A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John B. Henry, Jr., 4129A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert W. Burns, 4142A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John W. O'Neill, 4155A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard O. Hunziker, 4164A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Earl C. Hedlund, 4170A (colonel, Regular Air Force, U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Arthur G. Salisbury, 4224A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Winton R. Close, 4343A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jamie Gough, 4511A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James C. Sherrill, 4910A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Abe J. Beck, 5831A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gordon M. Graham, 7761A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips, 8981A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Alonzo A. Towner, 19158A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth E. Pletcher, 19136A (colonel, Regular Air Force, Medical), U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Robert S. Brua, 19063A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Brig. Gen. Theodore C. Bedwell, Jr., 19101A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Brig. Gen. Robert F. Worden, 1510A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edward G. Lansdale, 2534A, (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Reginald J. Clizbe, 2004A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert N. Smith, 3783A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. George S. Brown, 4090A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John C. Meyer, 4496A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jack J. Catton, 4719A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Kinney, 1661A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Richard D. Curtin, 1666A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James B. Tipton, 1854A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Eugene B. LeBailly, 1920A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles R. Bond, Jr., 1937A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Alvan C. Gillem II, 2025A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Rollen H. Anthis, 2053A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph A. Cunningham, 2054A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas K. McGehee, 3809A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John B. Henry, Jr., 4129A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Force.

Brig. Gen. Earl C. Hedlund, 4710A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jamie Gough, 4511A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

Brig. Gen. J. Francis Taylor, Jr., 1583A (colonel, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Col. William F. Cook, 19117A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Emmett M. Tally, Jr., 1312A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John L. McCoy, 1705A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Eugene L. Strickland, 1856A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert L. Delashaw, 1913A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard S. Abbey, 1992A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Robert W. Strong, Jr., 2010A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Roy W. Nelson, Jr., 2016A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Glenn A. Kent, 3701A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John L. Zoeckler, 3724A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Woodrow P. Swancutt, 3729A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Wendell E. Carter, 3848A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Howard A. Davis, 3860A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Thomas G. Corbin, 4097A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William B. Martensen, 4113A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Fratis L. Duff, 19188A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Joseph S. Bleymaier, 3883A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Andrew J. Evans, Jr., 4072A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William A. Tope, 4287A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Harrison R. Thyng, 4414A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Olbert F. Lassiter, 4445A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard A. Yudkin, 4480A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Timothy F. O'Keefe, 4608A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Richard C. Neeley, 4609A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William H. Brandon, 4712A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Delmar L. Crowson, 4954A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Anthony T. Shtogren, 4956A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William C. Lindley, 4976A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Lawrence S. Lightner, 5219A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Archie A. Hoffman, 19222A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Clarence J. Galligan, 4772A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John L. Martin, Jr., 7556A, Regular Air Force.

Col. William D. Dunham, 8097A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Lawrence F. Tanberg, 8286A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Royal N. Baker, 8315A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Jewell C. Maxwell, 8393A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Chesley G. Peterson, 9383A, Regular Air Force.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright, O18129, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Ben Harrell, O19276, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Alfred Dodd Starbird, O18961, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

The Army National Guard of the United States officer named herein for promotion as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be brigadier general

Francis Stevens Greenlief, O1291268, Infantry.

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Albert Watson II, O18105, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Harvey Herman Fischer, O18832, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Samuel Leslie Myers, O17180, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grades as follows:

To be general

Lt. Gen. John Knight Waters, O18481, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Theodore John Conway, O19015, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Charles Granville Dodge, O18072, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3072, 3306, and 3307:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. George Robinson Mather, O18696, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Alfred Dodd Starbird, O18961, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Jonas Ely, O18974, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, O19187, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ben Harrell, O19276, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Alden Kingsland Sibley, O18964, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Alvin Charles Welling, O18983, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. David Warren Gray, O18988, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Hilliard Polk, O19028, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Frederick Robert Zierath, O19211, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Beehler Bunker, O19402, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Berton Everett Spivy, Jr., O19479, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert George MacDonnell, O19361, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Austin Wortham Betts, O19373, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Hutcheson Craig, O19526, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

To be major general, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Howard William Doan, O20057, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Col. Harry Jarvis Engel, O39840, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Henry Schuldt Murphey, O19338, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Floyd Lawrence Wergeland, O19599, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, secs. 593(a) and 3384.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. William Joseph Hixson, Jr., O302021.

Brig. Gen. Michael Bernard Kauffman, O364438.

Brig. Gen. Ernest Louis Massad O302186.

Brig. Gen. Raymond Forrest McNally, Jr., O294487.

Brig. Gen. John Chester Monning, O337254,

Brig. Gen. de Lesseps Story Morrison, O302989.

Brig. Gen. Robert Fulton Sikes, O291193.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Bodley Booker, Jr., O376560, Infantry.

Col. John Lewis Boros, O405754, Transportation Corps.

Col. Carl Leslie Burk, O410902, Infantry.

Col. Prentiss Courson, O1173570, Artillery.

Col. Rowland Falconer Kirks, O337691, civil affairs.

Col. William Percival Levine, O1055895, Artillery.

Col. John Francis Linehan, Jr., O1313261, Infantry.

Col. William Francis McGonagle, O325282, Artillery.

Col. Robert Roy Owen, O468688, Infantry.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Claude Feemster Clayton, O322985.

Brig. Gen. Benjamin Franklin Merritt, O244836.

Brig. Gen. Cecil Lee Simmons, O360399.

To be brigadier generals

Col. David Combs Baum, O534933, Infantry.

Col. Robert Stickney Dale, O378584, Artillery.

Col. Charles Watts Fernald, O1287851, Infantry.

Col. Donald Nielsen Moore, O372591, Armor.

Col. Paul Joseph Mozzicato, O371323, Artillery.

Col. Louie Charles Wadsworth, O260016, Armor.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. George Oliver Pearson, O253334.

To be brigadier general

Col. Marshall Edgar Bush, O298635, Infantry.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Raymond L. Abbott to be captain, and ending Robert L. Woodward to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 11, 1963.

The nominations beginning Gene W. Oehlman to be major, and ending David D. Thomssen to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 18, 1963.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Alfred Dodd Starbird to be lieutenant general, and ending Lloyd H. Yoshina to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 15, 1963.

The nominations beginning Harold R. Aaron to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Eddi Z. Zyko to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 25, 1963.

IN THE NAVY AND THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Robert A. Campbell to be colonel in the Marine Corps, and ending Ronald M. Zobenica to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 5, 1963.

The nominations beginning Asher D. Abelon to be ensign in the Navy, and ending Walter F. Hudiburg, Jr., to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 19, 1963.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Jacob Pressman, Temple Beth Am, Los Angeles, Calif., offered the following prayer:

O God in Heaven: Look down upon Thy world, so marvelously wrought at the dawn of time for man's delight—so torn and tormented now by ancient grudges and newborn fears.

Look at this land, so fertile and broad, and yet so far from domestic tranquillity and fraternal love.

Look at this historic Chamber, echoing with patriots' dreams from less complicated times, now charged with awesome choices bearing on lives, not here alone, but everywhere on this earth and beyond this earth; not for this day alone, but for generations still to come.

Look at Thy children assembled here to fulfill the sacred trust placed in their hands by hopeful citizens, while human frailty, great temptations, and bitter disappointments whittle down the idealism and zest of younger days.

Look within us all, created in Thine image, and tell us quietly if we have polished or tarnished that image.

Look at Thy world, and pity us, O Lord; and teach us what to say and what to do to rise above ourselves and the demands of today to take the long, historic view—to bring peace and tranquillity, love and justice, beauty and order into our lives—what to say and do this very day, so that when it ends each of us will be able to examine himself honestly, face Thee unashamed, and sleep the sleep of innocence that comes to those who, while imperfect, have listened for Thy voice, and done their very best. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

OPENING PRAYER DELIVERED BY RABBI JACOB PRESSMAN

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and privilege for me to announce that the opening prayer of today's session was delivered by my dear friend and constituent, Rabbi Jacob Pressman, of Temple Beth Am in Los Angeles.

Rabbi Pressman is truly a model of what is generally considered the ideal religious leader. His heartfelt concern for his fellow man is well evidenced through the excellence of his service not only to members of his congregation but to the community as a whole.

His leadership and devotion have justifiably earned him the respect, admiration, and affection of all who know him.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Economic Committee be granted an extension of time from March 1, 1963, to March 15, 1963, to file a report of its findings and recommendations with respect to the Economic Report of the President, as required by section 5(b)(3) of Public Law 304, 79th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, in recent times this has been a kind of customary procedure, pretty much necessitated by the circumstances under which the joint committee operates?

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. HALLECK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ILLINOIS EDITORS VISIT PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 14, 20 Illinois newspaper publishers and editors were luncheon guests of President Kennedy at the White House. One of these distinguished journalists was the Honorable Robert L. Kern, publisher of the News-Democrat, of Belleville, Ill., in my congressional district.

I am certain my colleagues in the House will enjoy Mr. Kern's observations made during his White House visit.

Accordingly, I include Mr. Kern's article which appeared in the News-Democrat Tuesday, February 19, 1963:

LUNCHING WITH THE PRESIDENT

(By Robert L. Kern)

"About your visit with the President, write what you wish without reservation, but do not attribute any statement directly to him." In substantially these words, Presidential Press Secretary Pierre Salinger ticked off the ground rules for 20 Illinois newsmen who came to Washington at President John F. Kennedy's request, to be his guests at luncheon on Valentine's Day.

Like the rest, this journalist's invitation came in the form of a telegram a few days prior to February 14. It read: "It would be useful to me to have an exchange of views with you on State, regional, and National problems. Therefore I would be most pleased to have you as my guest at luncheon Thursday, February 14th at 1 p.m. (Enter the northwest gate on Pennsylvania Avenue). I hope it will be possible for you to attend. It would be appreciated if you would kindly reply to Press Secretary Pierre Salinger. (Signed) John F. Kennedy."

The reply goes out quick, short and affirmative.

THROUGH THE GATE

So here you are in the Nation's Capital at a few minutes past noon on the 14th, approaching the small gatehouse on Pennsylvania Avenue where uniformed officers monitor all traffic to the front door of the White House.

The iron gate is closed, and since the day is overcast and chilly, the three guards are inside where it's more comfortable. You enter the cubicle and hand over the telegraphed invitation. An officer scans a typewritten list posted on the wall, searching for your name. For a moment yours doesn't seem to be there, but a second guard peers toward the list and stabs his finger at the right place. Good—you're on the list.

With a courteous gesture you are waved ahead toward the curving sidewalk that terminates at the famous north portico about a quarter of a block away. This is the front porch where Presidents step out to greet certain visiting heads of state and personages of lofty prominence in world affairs.

The winter has been pretty rough in Washington and the White House lawn looks ravaged and dead, much like yours at home. There are a number of pigeons waddling about on the dried grass, looking too fat to fly. Several gray squirrels, too, and one pure white, like the breed found in the city park over in Olney. Contrasted with the pigeons they look miserably skinny. Wonder how come?

WHERE YOU'LL SIT

A friendly butler meets you at the door with such an air of respectful consideration that you begin to feel important. You enter the great marble entrance hall where one attendant takes your coat and hat while another leads you across the room to a side table. Something resembling a game board reposes on the table. But this is not parcheesi. It is a diagram or plan of the table for today's luncheon and the seating arrangement will be determined here by the drawing of numbers from a silver bowl. Mr. Kennedy will occupy the center seat along one long side of the table. Mr. Salinger will be directly opposite him in the middle of the other long side. Disposition of the guests is left to chance.

You select a card from the bowl, and turn it over. No. 19. You will be facing the President from across the table, four chairs to Mr. Salinger's left. Not bad.

WHAT YOU SEE

This formality concluded you are conducted into the Red Room. Here you learn that while you are an early bird, two others are earlier. The Red Room gets its name from the color of its silk damask walls. The shade is richly brilliant but not overpowering owing to the great number of huge paintings that adorn the walls. All are portraits of past presidents, and the full-length canvas of Thomas Jefferson over the marble mantel looks 10 feet high. The magnificent pieces of furniture are large, antique, and perfectly maintained. The elegant patina on desk and tables speaks of a little wax and a lot of elbow grease. There are also two settees and several fine upholstered chairs, almost too beautiful to use.

An expanse of tall windows across the room reveals a vista of several acres of lawn, which you anticipate will be green in time for the traditional egg-rolling debacle at Easter. It is gray today.

SECLUDED SWING

Peering upward to your left you catch a view of the south porch where Harry Truman installed his mezzanine. He got the devil for that from some architectural purists who deplored his taste. Republicans, no doubt.

You stand high above the ground and until now you missed the tiny secluded patio nestled against the building directly beneath the window. Thick shrubbery affords an effective screen and there are several rather large trees, too. The day is not pleasant, and the place is unoccupied. You note an old-fashioned rope swing dangling from a high tree branch. It is a stout child's swing of the practical, old-fashioned kind, and you have an idea who swings there sometimes.

By the time you turn around guests have begun flocking in. They stand around in small groups engaging in small talk. Drinks are passed around on a silver tray: Bourbon, Scotch, cocktails, sherry, tomato juice.

Almost precisely at 1 o'clock the President enters the room confident and smiling. He moves from person to person shaking hands and exchanging greetings. He stands erect, handsome and fit in a medium gray business suit. He seems completely relaxed and at ease. Thank goodness that bad back is improving. Sore backs can be hell. Someone mentions a rocking chair and there is unanimous agreement that rocking chairs make bum backs feel better.

FAVORITE PORTRAIT

The President shows keen interest in the portraits on the walls. Some are historic gems. His first choice, it seems, is for a more recently acquired portrait of Woodrow Wilson painted in France while the World War I President was attending sessions of the Versailles Conferences.

After a short time the President moves toward the state dining room, and the double doors swing open. The large room is as sumptuous as a Hollywood set, but in elegant good taste. A long table, perhaps 25 or more feet in length extends down the center of the room, its mahogany top gleaming. It seems 6 or 7 feet wide with both ends semicircular. As expected, the President takes his place at the center of the long side, facing the door, with his back to the immense marble fireplace.

The guests quickly settle into their high-backed gold-upholstered chairs without confusion. Gilt-edged placecards, with names of individuals hand engraved, are at each plate beside menus typed in script on embellished parchment bearing the Presidential seal.

Plates are the whitest of white porcelain, gold bordered, with small blue stars and the Presidential crest in the center. Knives, forks and spoons are in gold finish, of antique design, with the knife handles of gleaming mother-of-pearl.

TEMPTATION DEFIED

There are individual gold ashtrays at each place. What a souvenir. This fleeting thought, supplanted by the vision of No. 19 tearing down Pennsylvania Avenue with the Secret Service in hot pursuit, shatters the dream. You settle thankfully for a book of matches, completely white, lettered simply in gold: "The President's House."

Six waiters start serving with the circumspect, swift efficiency gleaned through long service. They offer you a portion of Maryland surprise, which turns out to be individual pieces of fish dipped in batter and baked. This is followed by roast sirloin of beef (in thin slices), Yorkshire pudding (instead of bread), braised endives, puree of broccoli and a red Burgundy wine; Chateau neuf-du-Pape La Bernardine 1957. The windup consists of tarte aux poires normande, a light baked dessert, and coffee.

The cigar humidor is passed and you pluck a Corona Corona in what appears to be the 35-cent size. Flame will not sully yours. It will be another souvenir to go with the white matchbook.

But the more sophisticated newsmen light up, and so does the President. His cigar, however, is lighter in shade and smaller in size. Before the party breaks up he will have consumed two, rekindling each several times because of frequent neglect.

PRESIDENTIAL TALENTS

With removal of the last plate the President clears the deck and gets down to business. Questions from the visitors begin to flow on every subject in the news today touching on national and international crises. The President listens attentively, then replies in detail.

As he goes on you settle back to witness the most brilliant display of skillful fielding it probably ever will be your pleasure to see.

The President is wonderfully articulate, never groping for a word. His mastery over the art of lucid communication must be one of the better blessings of good Irish ancestry.

What astonishes you most is the fantastic store of pertinent facts and figures he is able to summon up instantly on every conceivable phase of Federal Government as it touches his job.

The Illinoisans often preface their questions with openers like "Folks in our area would like to know," or "people out in the Illinois wonder about." The questions themselves actually aren't so unusual as to be earthshaking. What the questioners try to do is open the blinds a bit to let in a little more light.

SPELLS OUT ANSWERS

Somebody asks about whether it makes sense to cut taxes while the country is going to sink deeper and deeper into debt. The President answers, showing his great concern for the Nation's overall economy. Can the Nation afford to pay farmers more to produce less? What's making General de Gaulle kick over the traces? What about the current political hubbub over Cuba? Is our position in Berlin better today than a year ago? Would you care to comment on rumors that Presidential brother-in-law Sargent Shriver is interested in running for Governor in Illinois?

Each question draws a frank informative reply. The questions are not new. They have been asked before. And they have been answered by the President or his spokesmen, and the replies have been faithfully and fully recorded in the press and over the airwaves.

But this time it is different, somehow. This time the answers come direct from the top, bearing an aura of authority they never had before. You sense that you are in the presence of a true leader—keen, strong, great.

It is 3 o'clock and time to leave. The President rises and reluctantly his guests follow suit. They have been having a ball. But their host has a televised press conference scheduled in less than an hour—an appearance before the Nation during which he again must be at his best, replying to every conceivable query with sound logic, cold facts and good humor. What frightful responsibilities are these that must be borne by the leader of the world's greatest nation.

In some quarters it is a thankless unappreciated effort. Not everybody loves Jack Kennedy. You pray that Someone up there does. A President needs all that kind of help he can get.

SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on the 26th day of February 1963, the Honorable Frank G. Clement, Governor of the State of Tennessee, affixed his signature to Senate Joint Resolution No. 20, acts of 1963, of the Tennessee General Assembly, making Sir Winston Churchill, resident of London, England, an honorary citizen of the State of Tennessee, United States of America.

The resolution reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:

I, Joe C. Carr, Secretary of State of the State of Tennessee, do hereby certify that the annexed is a true copy of Senate Joint Resolution 20, acts of 1963, the original of which is now on file, and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my official signature and by order of the Governor affixed the Great Seal of the State of Tennessee at the Department in the city of Nashville, this 27th day of February A.D. 1963.

JOE C. CARR,
Secretary of State.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 20

Resolution to make Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of Tennessee

Whereas a resolution has been introduced in the Congress of the United States to confer honorary citizenship upon Sir Winston Churchill, of England, subject to the legal requisite that he be first and also an honorary citizen of a State of the Union comprising the United States of America; and

The mother of Sir Winston having been a Virginian; and

His services while Prime Minister of Great Britain being of inestimable value not only to all English-speaking peoples but to the whole free world; and

Since never in its glorious history has England brought forth a son so well equipped by force of character and an unusual combination of powerful abilities to lead and direct his nation and assist its Allies in the gravest crisis that has as yet imperiled them; and

Whereas his voice and pen have left a legacy enhancing the literature of our mother tongue with passages that stir and lift the spirit as none other of his time, and with never-to-be-forgotten thoughts that

illumine like a beacon the dark turmoil of life; and

As multitudes throughout this country and along its farflung battlelines—in homes that had given husbands, fathers, sons to war, and in fields and foxholes, and on the ensanguined seas—have heard that memorable voice and fed upon his high-hearted courage, valor, sympathy; and

Since none more than he has contributed to that greatest of all victories, the sign of which he kept always before us in that night of time before the dawn; and

Since God has spared him still to remain among us into the 89th year of his immortal life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 83d General Assembly of the State of Tennessee (the House of Representatives concurring), That Sir Winston Churchill, resident of London, England, hereby be made an honorary citizen of the State of Tennessee, United States of America.

Adopted February 19, 1963.

JAMES L. BOMAR,
Specker of the Senate.
WILLIAM L. BARRY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, February 26, 1963.

FRANK G. CLEMENT,
Governor.

Mr. Speaker, Tennessee is the first State to be recorded in the Journal of the House conferring honorary State citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill. We are all aware of this great man's service to not only his nation but to the cause of freedom, human dignity, and constitutional government throughout the world and I will not reiterate this history here.

In addition, Sir Winston, whose mother was a native Virginian, has close personal ties with our great United States of America.

For some time efforts have been underway to confer upon Sir Winston honorary citizenship of the United States of America. I am informed that the Department of Justice has found no legal reasons as to why this cannot be done, that Sir Winston would cherish and esteem such an act and that Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER of the House Judiciary Committee has introduced a new bill granting honorary citizenship to Sir Winston.

The State of Tennessee has given clear proof that our people support this act of high regard for Sir Winston and I therefore urge the support of my distinguished colleagues in making this great man an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we have no legislative business, as I advised the House yesterday, for the balance of this week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day.

Tuesday is undetermined—Baltimore primary.

Wednesday: House Resolution 228—A resolution to provide funds for investigations and studies, Banking and Currency Committee.

Thursday and the balance of the week: House Resolution 254—A resolution to provide funds for investigations and studies, Education and Labor Committee.

This, of course, is subject to the usual reservation that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the House there are at least two important measures, and perhaps three, that may be reported from legislative committees. Of course, I do not want to anticipate the action of the committees or of the Committee on Rules, but I would like to advise that probably the week after next we will have at least three major proposals from three of the committees.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LET'S TAKE A GOOD LOOK

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the time is near when we shall consider the foreign aid authorization bill. It is no secret that this bill will raise more questions this year than it has raised in the past. Its reception will depend upon the character of its presentation by the executive branch. If there is a willingness to admit errors and to change faulty procedures and policies, the legislation may win reasonable support. On the other hand, if the executive branch attempts to gloss over the defects and treats the problem as if we were in 1948 instead of 1963 the program will be in serious trouble indeed.

President Kennedy, early this year, appointed a committee to review the foreign aid program and to make recommendations. Gen. Lucius D. Clay was named chairman of the committee and the other members are distinguished gentlemen, indeed. This committee has the opportunity to save the good portions of the foreign aid program by recognizing its problems and treating them in a forthright manner.

Unfortunately, dispassionate review has not characterized Foreign Aid Study Committees in the past. As the distinguished political commentator, Peter Edson, points out this will be the fourth time in the last 10 years that the Government has gone through what he calls "this same aid reform exercise." He goes on to say:

> U.S. and free world security was the theme of the Mutual Security Administration which administered foreign aid at the end of the Truman administration. This is what it will apparently be once again if the Clay idea prevails.
>
> When the Eisenhower administration came to town, it recruited a lot of big business executives to survey foreign aid. The result was that MSA was changed into the more businesslike Foreign Operations Administration.
>
> Then former President Herbert Hoover's Commission on Reorganization of Government surveyed foreign economic operations in 1955. FOA was changed to International Cooperation Administration. President Eisenhower then appointed another commission under Gen. William H. Draper to survey foreign aid again in 1959. It is reminiscent of the Clay committee.

If the committee merely goes through the motions of rubber stamping the aid program, it might as well have never been born. I have set forth my views in a letter which I wrote to General Clay on January 28, 1963, and I append this letter herewith.

JANUARY 28, 1963.

Gen. LUCIUS D. CLAY,
Chairman of the Committee To Strengthen the Security of the Free World, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL CLAY: I was interested to learn that President Kennedy had named a committee to review and make recommendations concerning our program of foreign assistance and that you had agreed to be Chairman of this committee.

As a Member of Congress serving on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, I read of the formation of your committee with mixed feelings.

First of all, there is a history of independent committees in the past. In many cases, they have been appointed to support existing programs and have done so without substantial qualification or criticism.

Secondly, the atmosphere under which your committee was appointed led to the description in the Wall Street Journal of its formation as "a hurry-up move to disarm congressional opponents of foreign aid."

I am not an opponent of foreign aid, in fact I have always voted for foreign aid bills, but I have seen enough of the operation of these programs to know that their continuance will not be furthered by an uncritical approach. Their failures and shortcomings have gradually filtered into the public consciousness and the necessary popular support will not continue unless substantial steps are taken to assure the public that these programs are properly staffed and adequately administered.

Thirdly, since people who have had a responsibility in its past operation have been selected to do the vitally important preparatory work for the committee, one could conclude that yours might very well constitute an exercise in self-examination—which is self-defeating.

In the areas of self-help, of fiscal reform, of increased contributions by allies whom we have restored to viability, in the propping up of oppressive regimes and in the support of pro-Communist governments, there are questions which must be examined and properly settled if foreign aid is not to dwindle and expire.

The committee can perform a useful function if it causes our administrative agencies to recognize that problems do exist and that change is essential if public and congressional support is to be continued.

You have served our country in an outstanding manner in the past in war and in peace and you have a great opportunity to strengthen the necessary elements of our program of foreign assistance by a dispassionate and empirical examination by your committee.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

General Clay responded to my letter on February 7, 1963, as follows:

COMMITTEE TO STRENGTHEN THE
SECURITY OF THE FREE WORLD,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1963.

Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: I am most appreciative of your letter of January 28. I want to assure you that our committee has spent hours in cross-examination and is determined to form its own conclusions and recommendations.

From what I have seen and heard from its members, they are keenly aware of the need for a critical approach.

I shall call you when our work has progressed somewhat further to ask for the opportunity to let you know what we are thinking.

Sincerely yours,

LUCIUS D. CLAY.

For the sake of the valuable portions of the foreign aid program, I sincerely hope that General Clay's assurance that the committee members are aware of the need for a critical approach will be demonstrated by their actions.

Otherwise, the future of the foreign aid program is dubious, to say the least.

Let us take a good look.

SPECIAL ORDER FOR 2 HOURS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT TO DISCUSS RECORD OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR IN 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have just received permission to address the House on a special order on next Wednesday for 2 hours. The purpose of this request is to enable the majority members of the Committee on Education and Labor to present to the House what we believe to be the factual record of the Committee on Education and Labor in the 87th Congress and to answer certain allegations which have been made on the floor of the House concerning the record of that committee.

I would also like to say we will allot a good portion of the second hour of this special order to any Members of the minority who wish to discuss the matter with us at that time.

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am again today introducing a bill which would prohibit campaign contributions from crossing State lines—campaign contributions to influence elections for the National House, the U.S. Senate, the Presidency, and presidential electors.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason under the sun for money to be poured from one State during political campaigns into another. Members of Congress are supposed to be the representatives of a particular State. The sovereign people of each State elect their own representatives to represent them. Under no circumstances should they be influenced by money gotten together in some smoke-filled hotel room in Chicago, Detroit, London, England, or even Caracas, Venezuela.

Pressure groups with tremendous campaign funds are on the march. They are determined to control the Congress. Much progress is being made in that direction with huge campaign treasuries.

This Congress must take some action to restore the confidence of the American people. The prestige of Congress is at an alltime low with nepotism, counterpart hayrides, and irresponsible shenanigans by some Members in the nightclubs of London and Paris. This is doing more damage to the cause of representative government in the United States than Communist subversion.

Campaigns for Federal office are largely campaigns of who can raise the most money. We hear reports of $100,000 being spent in races for the House of Representatives, and $1 million in Senate races. This makes a mockery of real democracy as much of this money often comes from pressure groups a thousand or more miles away and sometimes even abroad. If Federal public office is open to only the highest bidder, then indeed we have fallen upon evil days, and this Republic cannot long endure.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it is too late. This Congress can and must take positive action to restore the prestige of this great institution. The cause of freedom everywhere rides on the outcome of our own integrity, our prestige, and our principles and ideals.

RIDE HERD ON AWARD OF ALL NEGOTIATED CONTRACTS

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will, if enacted, establish a joint congressional committee to ride herd on the award of all negotiated contracts. This committee will include Republican and Democrat members from the Appropriations, Armed Services, Government Operations, and Space Committees of both the House and Senate and will be 100 percent bipartisan in nature; compel complete public disclosure of the reason for awarding a negotiated contract, except where such information is classified; require that a public record be kept of all persons other than the bidder who have communications with the Government about negotiated contracts. This would include Members of Congress and the executive branch.

Some of my proposals may sound revolutionary, but the awesome size of our budget makes unusual steps necessary. The current budget calls for spending over $60 billion for space and defense and 80 percent of all defense contracts are negotiated or sole source without open competition. The Secretary of Defense is on record as stating we must continuously seek to minimize sole source procurements.

I think it is time the Congress took hold of the reins of all this spending and helped the Secretary achieve his goal. This is what I have been doing for 18 months in a lengthy study, and this is what my legislation is designed to do.

GOP NUCLEAR TEST PANEL RELEASES SECOND REPORT

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Republican House conference committee on nuclear testing has prepared a summary of arguments pro and con regarding the wisdom of entering into any test ban agreement with the Soviet Union at this time. Assistance in preparing the compilation was obtained from such diverse organizations as the American Security Council and the Committee on Sane Nuclear Policy. Most of the arguments

pro and con listed in the report were contained in nine "expert's papers" submitted to the committee during the past 3 weeks by nationally known scientific and geopolitical experts.

The committee objective in its second report is to provide a fair statement of the issues as a guide for widespread and informed public discussion of the question of nuclear test bans in general. In its first report, the committee called on all Members of Congress to assume responsibility for encouraging such a public discussion, declaring "vital questions of U.S. national security are involved and Americans have a right to make their voices heard." It also called upon the Kennedy administration to declassify and disseminate seismic detection and other data pertinent to overall examination of the test ban issue.

The nuclear testing committee will continue to examine evidence before it and issue reports from time to time on the progress of the Geneva test ban negotiations.

These reports will be fair, but the constant retreats and concessions by Disarmament Administration Chief William C. Foster at the negotiating table must be expected to become the subject of the committee's very critical comment.

The second report is as follows:

SECOND REPORT TO THE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE BY ITS COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR TESTING

In its first report your commitee described the prime U.S. objective of national survival as in direct conflict with communism's goal of worldwide domination. We expressed the valued judgment that a superior U.S. nuclear weapons arsenal capable of instant and deadly retaliation is required to deter the Communists from initiating nuclear war to gain their objective quickly.

From this background the first report began examining whether the proposition of a nuclear test ban treaty could reduce the world's risks inherent in present conditions without creating new or different risks which would leave matters in a state worse than before.

Because Communists cannot be trusted to keep their treaty commitments the first report specified certain minimum safeguards which must be contained in any nuclear test ban treaty. These are: (1) reasonable machinery to detect possible violations; (2) reasonable opportunity to inspect to determine if cheating has occurred; and, (3) consequences not fatal to the victim if either cheating or surprise abrogation occurs.

The basis of present test ban negotiation between the United States, U.S.S.R. and United Kingdom were examined by the first report, found wanting in these safeguards, and demand was made upon the administration to upgrade the U.S. negotiating position. So far, this has not been done. On the contrary, more concessions to Soviet demands have been announced.

Demand also was made for declassification and dissemination of all seismic and other data required for informed public discussion of the test ban question. The basis for this demand was that the security and future of the Nation is concerned and, therefore, the people have a right to be informed and make their voices heard.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has scheduled public hearings early in March at which administration officials will testify concerning seismic detection. Whether this will amount to "a quick peek under the clean side of the rug" or forthright disclosures of limitations as well as capabilities in seismic detection remeains to be seen.

On the general question of whether any test ban treaty at all at the present time is in the national interest, the first report recommended Members of Congress of both parties assume responsibility to encourage widespread public discussion. It so recommended because test ban negotiations have dragged on for 5 listless years during which the Soviets twice have gained substantial advantages by surprise resumption of testing.

If Americans decide a treaty is in the national interest, it will facilitate achieving one. If they decide otherwise, it will facilitate breaking off negotiations. Informed, widespread public discussion is required to reach a decision.

As a guide for leading public discussion your committee promised to Members of Congress a summary of the arguments for and against a test ban treaty. It is set forth below. In compiling these arguments, your committee gratefully acknowledges the assistance and cooperation of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Committee on Sane Nuclear Policy, the American Security Council, and the nine scientific and geopolitical experts who submitted expert's papers to your committee.

In evaluating test ban "pro" and "con" positions it must be kept in mind they pertain not to the inadequate and dangerous range of treaty terms now under negotiation, but to a hypothetical "enforceable" treaty—that is, one under terms of which cheating is less likely to occur than compliance. If such a treaty is achieveable it must be assumed the Soviet Union agrees to it because it finds it in its own national interest to do so. The reasonableness of such an assumption is not here examined. But respecting it, two relevant questions should be in mind while evaluating the "pro" and "con" arguments: (1) In what respects do Soviet national interests in this subject differ from our own?; (2) under what circumstances, if at all, does Marxist-Leninist dogma permit Communist leaders voluntarily to forgo a means of achieving worldwide domination?

The compilation of "pro" and "con" positions follow:

I

Test ban treaty will slow the proliferation of nuclear weapons to other countries

Pro: Eleven nations in addition to those already possessing nuclear weapons (United States, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and France) have the necessary economic base, industrial capacity, and skilled manpower to launch at least a primitive program for nuclear weapons "in the near future," according to a recent study by Christopher Hohenemser. Among them are China, East Germany, and West Germany. The spread of nuclear weapons to any additional nations multiplies the chances of accidental war, tends to undermine existing military strategies, and increases the number of parties that must be satisfied before workable arms control agreements can be reached. Nuclear testing is necessary before a nation can produce these weapons without outside assistance. While a test ban would not automatically prevent other nations from testing, the provision that additional governments should adhere to the agreement gives the original parties an opportunity to exert pressure at least on their own allies.

Con: The magnitude of present difficulties between the United States and France illustrates the naivete of any belief that one nation can handle another which is determined to achieve nuclear weapons. Red China amply has demonstrated its absolute refusal to be handled by the U.S.S.R. Attempts by the United States to handle its European allies by exerting pressure on them could strain NATO to the breaking point. The only practical way to control the danger of accidental war is to prevent the proliferation of nuclear warhead delivery systems. If a nuclear power is forced to develop its own characteristic national delivery system, then a mischiefmaking attacker may be identified and the attacked nation need not respond on the assumption general war has been initiated. This discrimination cannot be made from the explosion of a warhead—it can be made very quickly from the characteristics of the delivery vehicle which carried it. Similar reasoning applies to matters of military strategies and achieving arms control agreements.

II

Test ban treaty will slow down the development of nuclear weapons

Pro: According to Disarmament Administrator William C. Foster: "Without a treaty and with continued unlimited testing on both sides, there would be further increases by both in the efficiency of weapons at the higher yield end of the scale. Our advantage in small-weight, high-yield weapons would most probably diminish. Both sides would enhance their knowledge of weapons effects. In the field of tactical weapons, the Soviets would eventually be able to match our more diversified and numerous arsenal. Overall, the trend would be toward equality between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

"With a treaty, improvements in yield-to-weight ratios would come more slowly through laboratory work alone. The U.S. advantage in smaller weapons would persist over a longer time. Some weapons effects phenomena would remain unsettled or undiscovered by both sides. The development of antimissile systems would be slowed down on both sides. Our tactical weapon superiority would persist longer. In general, our present nuclear advantages would last for a considerably longer period."

Con: There is no real assurance the United States has superiority in usable tactical weapons and Mr. Foster does not claim it for high-yield weapons. The Soviets have announced solution of the missile defense problem. Thus a test ban runs the risk of freezing U.S. technology in a position of inferiority. As the potential defender against an aggressor's first strike, U.S. national security can be based only on superiority in weaponry, particularly in anti-ICBM defense, which has not been achieved and can only be achieved by further coordinated development of both antimissile warheads and rockets to carry them.

If, as Mr. Foster argues, the United States presently has weapons superiority, then it exists because U.S. laboratories are able to win over U.S.S.R. laboratories in open competition. Mr. Foster's statement that under conditions of nontesting "our present nuclear advantages would last for a considerably longer period" implies that Soviet laboratories would move faster than our own under a test ban. Thus inevitably at some time the United States will become "second best." What happens then?

III

Test ban treaty will "open up" Soviet society and establish an invaluable precedent

Pro: A test ban which includes provision for some detection machinery and onsite inspection in the Soviet Union has potential significance for progress in other areas of arms control and disarmament and for future relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R. It would give both sides experience with inspection and permit us to appraise their cooperation, and, in the light of that appraisal, to estimate the cooperation which might be forthcoming in the verification of more significant agreements. It might also serve to "open" the Soviet Union to some extent and to help diminish the Soviets' fear that effective control is another name for espionage. It could lead to the development of a basis for confidence in other agreements.

Con: It is idle to think that a small number of stations and inspections on Soviet soil will have any significant impact upon the structure or attitudes of Soviet society. Certainly what the U.S.S.R. now seems to have in mind is considerably less than the United States originally had envisaged—and too little to accomplish this purpose. What is more, if the United States, in the interest of pious hopes now accepts a diluted, token version of international inspection to save face as it enters upon a treaty, the precedent which it will set will not be at all valuable, but highly dangerous and prejudicial to free world security in the future. Further, freezing present seismic detection technology into treaty terms will kill off development of detection devices which could be the future basis of a treaty in which genuine confidence could be placed.

IV

Test ban treaty will eliminate additional fallout

Pro: A test ban treaty should lead to the elimination of whatever danger exists from fallout from United States and U.S.S.R. nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere.

Con: Only a treaty banning atmospheric testing is required to accomplish this end.

The United States stands ready to enter such a treaty, but the U.S.S.R. refuses—until it agrees, fallout from testing is the inevitable price for avoiding fallout from war.

V

Test ban treaty will create international good feeling and promote arms control and disarmament

Pro: In democratic countries, one of the main factors producing a sense of helplessness on the part of citizens has been the magnitude of the arms race. To people throughout the world who have passively observed the years of deadlock in disarmament negotiations a nuclear test ban agreement would restore a measure of confidence in the ability of governments to solve the complex problems of the nuclear-missile age. This confidence, once established, will facilitate the achievement of broader arms control and disarmament agreements. The test ban treaty is the significant first step toward resolution of nations' differences without war.

Con: Conclusion of a treaty in the near future almost certainly would lead to a popular overestimation of its political benefits and an underestimation of the strategic-military dangers which might lurk within it. It would likely generate euphoric pressures for speedy progress on disarmament schemes involving control arrangements which fall below the threshold of reliability required by national and international security interests. Western nations have learned to their regret that in a world divided by profound political ideological differences the manufacture of artificial good will can be productive of the most unwholesome consequences. Communists will enter no agreement which does not give them a net advantage in their unremitting campaign to destroy the non-Communist world.

VI

Test ban treaty risk from surprise abrogation is small

Pro: Secret preparations and surprise abrogation by the Soviets after a few years might leave us as much as 18 months behind in our readiness to test. However, we can and will avoid this by a national policy to maintain readiness to test and to provide the funds necessary for this and for the incentive program necessary to keep competent scientists at work in the laboratories. This will minimize any possibility of a long Soviet headstart if the treaty breaks down.

Con: This is dangerously wishful thinking. There simply are no incentives our society can offer which will cause our creative scientists to stay with a dead end program. The Soviet society can arbitrarily assign its most creative minds to secret nuclear research and stimulate them with the reminder that article 49–o of the Soviet Constitution authorizes abrogation of any international agreement or treaty at any time unilaterally. The Soviets would gain a long lead, lengthened further by delays inherent in a democracy's decisionmaking machinery for test resumption.

VII

Test ban risk from possible cheating is small

Pro: Many important nuclear weapons principles can be studied with explosions of less than 3 kilotons and larger ones can be muffled by favorable underground formations or artificial decoupling. Such explosions may go undetected by the test ban treaty detection machinery.

However, such clandestine underground testing would be unsatisfactory for learning the kind of things which might change the military balance against us. According to Disarmament Administrator William C. Foster, little improvement in yield-to-weight ratios can be expected and pure fusion weapons would not be a great advantage to us because primarily they constitute only a cheaper substitute for weapons already in our stockpile. Moreover, testing in natural formations which muffle explosions is risky because it may produce a detectable surface depression, while artificial decoupling is time consuming and expensive.

Con: As stated by Mr. Foster, pure fusion weapons could be developed by clandestine underground testing below detectable yields. This would give the Soviets overwhelming nuclear superiority in both tactical weapons and antimissile warheads which can be used safely over their own country because they do not produce fallout. Yielding effective antimissile capability to the Soviets would nullify our retaliatory capacity and drastically change the military balance against us. The same is true with respect to fallout-free tactical weapons.

Additionally, unless and until we achieve fallout-free tactical pure fusion weapons, we do not possess weapons which are feasible and effective to use for the defense of our NATO and other allies against invasion of their homelands. Abandoning development of such weapons, when its drastic self-defense implications are realized, will surely place unbearable strain on the NATO alliance.

VIII

Miscellaneous arguments against test ban

The committee found the following additional arguments against a test ban treaty at the present time among the expert's papers which were not subject to classification under the preceding "Pro" and "Con" headings:

1. Defense Secretary McNamara recently testified to Congress that the Soviet Union is engaged on a large scale "hardening" program for its missile bases. This can only be met by U.S. retaliatory weapons of much greater yield than we now possess. We must test and achieve them, otherwise our retaliatory capacity will be too weak to deter the Kremlin.

2. Nuclear weaponry is a new science. So far it has produced weapons which are incapable of discrimination in their deadly effects. The field of weapons development ahead is toward discrimination in both yield and effects. Although war, if it should ever come, can never be made humane, it can be made considerably less inhumane if refinement of nuclear weapons is allowed to proceed.

3. Should cheating under a treaty be really known to occur, but not be provable according to treaty terms, resultant tensions and apprehensions would create conditions more unstable and dangerous than the absence of any treaty at all.

4. Nuclear technology is here to stay. No treaty can foresee or limit future technological developments in nuclear physics. They cannot be frozen through the legal device of a treaty any more successfully than were earlier attempts to outlaw the science of medicine by dictatorial fiat. Nuclear technology is wedded to delivery systems and to defense systems. These stand at an early point on the development curve. No nation can afford for long to observe inhibitions on its national security interests, therefore no test ban treaty can be expected long to survive.

5. The operators of any system of detection or inspection will tend to become dominated by one or the other parties to the treaty, or just plain sloppy in their work, so the achievement of an enforceable treaty is no more than a dangerous illusion.

6. As a general proposition no treaty will cause the Soviets to do what they would not do in the absence of a treaty. The history of treaties entered into with the Soviet Union demonstrates that they bind, inhibit, or deter only the non-Soviet signatories. The Soviets, therefore, want and will sign a test ban treaty only if they calculate that it will give them a net advantage in their unremitting campaign to destroy the non-Communist world.

CRAIG HOSMER,
Chairman.
LESLIE C. ARENDS.
WILLIAM E. MILLER.
MELVIN R. LAIRD.
CHARLES E. GOODELL.

Ex officio:
CHARLES A. HALLECK.
JOHN W. BYRNES.
GERALD R. FORD.

OPERATION OF UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter and a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my continuing investigation into the operations of the United Nations Special Fund, which we find is providing aid to Communist nations at the expense of the American taxpayer, I have requested the unanimous consent of the House to have published at this point in the RECORD a detailed table.

This table will provide ready reference for my colleagues about a number of projects undertaken by the Special Fund, and others approved, but not yet started.

The facts in this table are taken from a U.N. Special Fund publication of December 1962, which received only limited distribution. The table lists the projects of the Fund by country or territory, the date of approval by the Governing Council of the Fund, the executing agency of the U.N., the total cost of the project and the Special Fund contribution to that cost.

The above mentioned follows:

Status of individual projects approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund: May 1959–May 1962, as of Oct. 31, 1962

[NOTE.—Throughout this annex, the figures under "Special fund contribution" indicate gross project costs, i.e., including the recipient Governments' cash contributions to the project budgets]

Project by country or territory	Approved by Governing Council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Costs of individual projects (U.S. dollar equivalents)			Plan of operation signed (date)	Authorization to commence execution (date)
				Total	Special fund contribution	Estimated Government counterpart contribution		
AFGHANISTAN								
Land and water survey and agricultural station	December 1959	FAO	3 5	$1,996,400	$1,404,000	$594,400	June 29, 1960	Aug. 15, 1960
ARGENTINA								
Electric power survey [1]	May 1959	IBRD	½	337,500	287,500	50,000	Sept. 14, 1959	[1] Sept. 14 1959
Management development and training of supervisory and skilled personnel.	December 1959	ILO	5	1,723,500	1,132,500	591,000	Oct. 11, 1960	Oct. 18, 1960
Transport study [2]	May 1960	IBRD	1½	1,045,000	520,000	525,000	Sept. 30, 1960	[1] Oct. 5, 1960
Petroleum Institute	December 1960	UNESCO	5	5,113,100	1,110,100	4,003,000	Aug. 23, 1962	
Study of nutritional diseases and deficiencies in cattle	do	FAO	5	1,009,800	661,200	348,600	Feb. 7, 1962	Feb. 16, 1962
Forestry and Watershed Management Training Institute, Buenos Aires.	May 1961	FAO	5	1,155,100	599,100	556,000	Apr. 12, 1962	Apr. 13, 1962
Study of land reclamation of the Viedma Valley	May 1962	FAO	4	1,385,600	761,600	624,000		
BOLIVIA								
Precolonization survey	December 1959	FAO	2–3	429,500	312,500	117,000	Oct. 25, 1960	
Agricultural training	do	FAO	3	489,000	375,000	114,000	Aug. 16, 1960	Aug. 23, 1960
Pilot Mineral Survey of the Cordillera and Altiplano	May 1961	UN	4	1,607,000	922,000	685,000	Oct. 30, 1961	Nov. 14, 1961
BRAZIL								
San Francisco River Basin survey	December 1959	FAO	5	2,021,000	[3] 1,533,500	487,500	Oct. 7, 1960	Oct. 12, 1960
National Forestry School, Vicosa	May 1961	FAO	5½	2,241,100	1,265,100	976,000	Dec. 29, 1961	Feb. 13, 1962
Survey of rock salt deposits	January 1962	UN	2½	945,100	595,100	350,000	Aug. 21, 1962	Aug. 29, 1962
Survey of hydroelectric resources in Minas Gerais	do	IBRD	3	1,295,000	735,000	560,000	Oct. 23, 1962	Oct. 26, 1962
BURMA								
Survey of lead and zinc mining and smelting	May 1961	UN	2	823,400	590,400	233,000	Nov. 3, 1961	Nov. 3, 1961
Mineral and ground-water survey	January 1962	UN	4	3,382,600	1,068,600	2,314,000		
Expansion of meteorological and hydrological services	do	WMO	3	1,126,600	525,600	601,000		
Forest Research Institute	May 1962	FAO	4	2,697,800	954,800	1,743,000		
Mu River irrigation survey	do	UN	3	1,504,400	1,054,400	450,000		
CAMBODIA								
Center for technical staff training and productivity, Phnom Penh.	January 1962	ILO	4	2,038,500	947,500	1,091,000		
CAMEROON								
Secondary School Teacher Training Institute, Yaoundé.	May 1961	UNESCO	6	2,692,800	1,174,800	1,518,000	Nov. 2, 1961	Nov. 2, 1961
CEYLON								
Establishment of a small industry service institute, Velona.	January 1962	ILO	5	2,263,300	942,300	1,321,000	May 23, 1962	June 20, 1962
CHILE								
Hydrometeorological stations	December 1959	WMO	4½	1,815,650	633,500	1,182,150	May 27, 1960	June 13, 1960
Mineral exploration	do	UN	2½	1,719,000	1,080,500	638,500	June 24, 1960	Aug. 3, 1960
Institute for the Development of Forest Resources and Industries.	December 1960	FAO	4	2,168,800	1,268,800	900,000	Aug. 2, 1961	Aug. 30, 1961
Faculty of Engineering, University of Concepcion	do	UNESCO	3	1,478,600	1,043,000	435,600	Nov. 7, 1961	Nov. 8, 1961
Instructor and Foreman Training Center, Santiago	May 1961	ILO	5	1,805,100	1,140,100	665,000		
Fisheries Development Institute	January 1962	FAO	5	4,408,700	1,448,700	2,960,000		
Institute of Occupational Health and Air Pollution Research, Santiago.	May 1962	WHO	5	1,215,000	404,000	811,000		
CHINA								
Hydraulic development project [3]	December 1959	UN	1	520,075	342,000	178,075	Sept. 20, 1960	[2] Oct. 17, 1960
Telecommunication and Electronics Training and Research Center.	May 1960	ITU	3	566,100	296,100	270,000	Mar. 7, 1961	Apr. 18, 1961
Auto technician and instructor training, Taipei	May 1962	ILO	4	1,204,700	695,700	509,000		
COLOMBIA								
National Vocational Training Service (SENA)	December 1959	ILO	4	1,726,500	561,500	1,165,000	Sept. 1, 1960	Sept. 13, 1960
Soil survey	do	FAO	3	690,050	401,500	288,550	do	Oct. 27, 1960
Institute for Technological Research	December 1960	UN	4	1,071,700	558,700	513,000	June 28, 1961	July 6, 1961
Training of engineers, Industrial University of Santander.	do	UNESCO	4	4,008,700	1,509,700	2,499,000	Nov. 30, 1961	Dec. 8, 1961
Agricultural training and research, Cauca Valley	May 1961	FAO	4	1,565,700	931,700	634,000	Oct. 20, 1961	Oct. 23, 1961
Institute for Training and Research in Agricultural Marketing, Bogotá.	May 1962	FAO	4	1,817,900	807,900	1,010,000		
National Vocational Training Service (SENA)	do	ILO	4	1,955,300	793,300	1,162,000		
Survey of the Cauca Valley coal deposits	do	IBRD	¾	336,500	216,500	120,000		
CONGO (BRAZZAVILLE)								
Secondary School Teacher Training Institute, Brazzaville.	January 1962	UNESCO	6	2,960,200	1,185,200	1,775,000	Oct. 31, 1962	
Survey of the water resources of the Niari Valley	May 1962	FAO	3	778,700	631,700	147,000		
CUBA								
Central Agricultural Experimental Station, Santiago de las Vegas.	May 1961	FAO	5	3,035,600	1,157,600	1,878,000		

See footnotes at end of table.

Status of individual projects approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund: May 1959–May 1962, as of Oct. 31, 1962—Con.

NOTE.—Throughout this annex, the figures under "Special fund contribution" indicate gross project costs, i.e., including the recipient Governments' cash contributions to the project budgets]

Project by country or territory	Approved by Governing Council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Costs of individual projects (U.S. dollar equivalents)			Plan of operation signed (date)	Authorization to commence execution (date)
				Total	Special fund contribution	Estimated Government counterpart contribution		
CYPRUS								
Agricultural Research Institute, Nicosia	May 1961	FAO	5	$1,944,000	$787,100	$1,156,900	Feb. 23, 1962	Apr. 2, 1962
Survey of ground-water mineral resources	May 1962	UN	5	2,935,000	1,340,000	1,595,000	------	
ECUADOR								
Fisheries Institute	December 1959	FAO	4	1,307,000	693,000	614,000	June 2, 1960	Nov. 4, 1960
Hydrometeorological stations	do	WMO	4	1,204,300	423,500	780,800	June 27, 1960	July 27, 1960
Precolonization survey	do	FAO	2	289,500	168,000	121,500	Aug. 26, 1960	Nov. 22, 1960
National Polytechnic School, Quito	May 1961	UNESCO	5	3,021,400	1,321,400	1,700,000	Jan. 5, 1962	Mar. 1, 1962
Faculty of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine, Quito.	May 1962	FAO	5	2,540,800	1,240,800	1,300,000	------	
Survey of hydrological resources of Manabi Province	do	UN	2	740,600	487,600	253,000	Oct. 5, 1962	Oct. 19, 1962
EL SALVADOR								
Groundwater resources survey	May 1960	FAO	2	910,800	348,300	562,500	Apr. 4, 1961	Apr. 17, 1961
ETHIOPIA								
Awash River Basin development survey	do	FAO	3	1,257,100	930,100	327,000	Feb. 7, 1961	Feb. 21, 1961
School for Veterinary Assistants	December 1960	FAO	5	722,700	432,700	290,000	------	
FEDERATION OF MALAYA								
Productivity Center	do	ILO	5	805,400	525,400	280,000	Dec. 20, 1961	Feb. 27, 1962
Telecommunications Training Center, Kuala Lumpur	May 1961	ITU	5	3,327,600	896,100	2,431,500	Dec. 23, 1961	Feb. 24, 1962
GHANA								
Volta River flood plain survey	May 1959	FAO	3	540,000	385,000	155,000	Dec. 9, 1959	Jan. 8, 1960
Institute of Public Administration, Accra	May 1961	UN	5	1,845,700	523,700	1,322,000	July 18, 1961	July 27, 1961
Land and water surveys in the upper and northern regions.	January 1962	FAO	3	1,181,700	806,700	375,000	Sept. 28, 1962	Oct. 24, 1962
GREECE								
Ground-water development	May 1959	FAO	3	408,000	298,000	110,000	Dec. 3, 1959	Feb. 3, 1960
Economic survey of the western Peloponnesus	December 1960	FAO	2	942,600	503,600	439,000	May 23, 1961	July 11, 1961
Preinvestment survey of selected forest areas	May 1962	FAO	3	1,077,200	394,200	683,000	------	
GUATEMALA								
Survey of hydraulic resources for electrification and irrigation.	December 1960	IBRD	2	883,500	633,500	250,000	July 28, 1961	Aug. 31, 1961
GUINEA								
General development survey [4]	May 1959	UN	1	425,000	425,000	------	Jan. 7, 1960	[4] Feb. 25, 1960
HAITI								
Animal husbandry demonstration project, Plaine des Cayes.	May 1961	FAO	3	588,800	338,800	250,000	June 6, 1962	June 15, 1962
Land and water surveys in the Gonaives Plain and the Northwest Department.	January 1962	FAO	3	1,136,100	665,800	470,300	------	
HONDURAS								
Survey of pine forests	May 1961	FAO	3	1,002,300	422,300	580,000	Dec. 11, 1961	Jan. 23, 1962
INDIA								
Industrial Instructors Training Institute	May 1959	ILO	3	3,173,500	1,033,500	2,140,000	Feb. 26, 1960	Apr. 4, 1960
Regional Labour Institute	December 1959	ILO	3	1,544,546	381,500	1,163,046	Oct. 6, 1960	Dec. 28, 1960
Mechanical Engineering Research Institute	do	UNESCO	3	1,666,200	725,000	941,200	Jan. 15, 1960	Feb. 16, 1960
Power Engineering Research Institute	do	UNESCO	3	4,698,700	1,981,500	2,717,200	do	Mar. 4, 1960
Public Health Engineering Research Institute	May 1960	WHO	4	4,115,000	525,000	3,590,000	May 16, 1961	May 18, 1961
Fisheries Training Institute	do	FAO	3	1,340,300	610,300	730,000	May 28, 1962	July 17, 1962
Mining research station	do	ILO	5	1,535,900	695,900	840,000	Dec. 20, 1960	Jan. 16, 1961
Potential hydropower sites survey	do	UN	3	7,361,400	2,361,400	5,000,000	June 4, 1962	June 29, 1962
Water supply resonces of Greater Calcutta survey	do	WHO	2	480,000	324,100	155,900	Sept. 17, 1962	
Central scientific instruments organization	December 1960	UNESCO	3	3,135,500	935,500	2,200,000	Sept. 1, 1962	Oct. 5, 1962
Cavitation Research Center	do	UN	3	574,100	364,100	210,000	Oct. 16, 1962	
National aeronautical research laboratory	do	ICAO	5	8,239,700	1,439,700	6,800,000	June 29, 1961	July 17, 1961
Vocational training scheme for industrial trades including a central instructors training institute in Kanpur.	do	ILO	4	2,740,100	1,050,100	1,690,000	June 7, 1961	Aug. 18, 1961
Central Instructor Training Institute, Madras	May 1961	ILO	3	2,302,000	612,000	1,690,000	Oct. 17, 1961	Jan. 5, 1962
Institute for Petroleum Exploration	do	UN	3	1,834,000	790,300	1,043,700	June 18, 1962	July 30, 1962
National Institute for Training in Industrial Engineering, Bombay	January 1962	ILO	5	2,289,000	669,000	1,620,000	------	
Central Instructor Training Institute, Hyderabad	do	ILO	3	2,302,000	612,000	1,690,000	------	
Rajasthan Sheep and Wool Institute	do	FAO	5	5,016,000	744,000	4,272,000	Oct. 4, 1962	Oct. 26, 1962
Central Instructor Training Institute, Ludhiana	May 1962	ILO	3	2,353,100	663,100	1,690,000	------	
INDONESIA								
Building Materials Research Laboratory	May 1960	UN	6	1,245,400	550,900	964,500	May 24, 1961	Nov. 17, 1961
Statistical Research and Development Center, Djakarta	January 1962	UN	5	2,236,400	997,400	1,239,000	Apr. 28, 1962	July 23, 1962
IRAN								
Teheran Polytechnic	December 1959	UNESCO	5	2,582,500	1,432,500	1,150,000	Jan. 31, 1960	Mar. 10, 1960
Soil fertility survey	May 1960	FAO	5	1,613,100	545,100	1,068,000	Nov. 7, 1960	Jan. 3, 1961
Geological Survey Institute	December 1960	UN	5	3,566,300	1,566,300	2,000,000	Jan. 16, 1961	Apr. 27, 1961

See footnotes at end of table.

Status of individual projects approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund: May 1959–May 1962, as of Oct. 31, 1962—Con.

[NOTE.—Throughout this annex, the figures under "Special fund contribution" indicate gross project costs, i.e., including the recipient Governments' cash contributions to the project budgets]

Project by country or territory	Approved by Governing Council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Costs of individual projects (U.S. dollar equivalents)			Plan of operation signed (date)	Authorization to commence execution (date)
				Total	Special fund contribution	Estimated Government counterpart contribution		
IRAN—continued								
Animal Health Institute	December 1960	FAO	5	$1,413,500	$873,500	$540,000	Apr. 29, 1962	Aug. 27, 1962
Vocational Instructor and Foreman Training Center	May 1961	ILO	4	1,737,400	762,400	975,000	Jan. 31, 1962	Apr. 10, 1962
Forestry and Range Institute and Forest Ranger School, Karaj.	May 1962	FAO	6	2,479,900	979,900	1,500,000	------	
IRAQ								
Technical Training Institute	May 1960	UNESCO	5	4,834,500	934,500	3,900,000	Feb. 8, 1961	Feb. 16, 1961
Animal Health Institute	December 1960	FAO	5	1,321,700	493,700	828,000	Feb. 19, 1962	May 17, 1962
Management Development and Supervisor Training Center, Baghdad.	May 1961	ILO	5	1,027,100	604,100	423,000	Sept. 28, 1961	Oct. 19, 1961
Conservation and development of the lesser Zab Basin	January 1962	FAO	5	1,337,800	837,800	500,000	------	
Telecommunication Training Center, Baghdad	do	ITU	5	2,974,700	909,700	2,065,000	------	
ISRAEL								
Watershed management	May 1959	FAO	5	725,000	375,000	350,000	Dec. 29, 1959	Feb. 7, 1960
Meteorological Institute	December 1959	WMO	4	798,513	319,500	479,013	Apr. 19, 1960	Apr. 21, 1960
Experimental coastal groundwater collectors	May 1960	FAO	2½	1,429,000	341,800	1,087,200	Sept. 5, 1960	Sept. 6, 1960
Training centers for vocational instructors, technicians and foremen.	December 1960	ILO	5	2,196,400	816,400	1,380,000	Sept. 4, 1961	Sept. 22, 1961
Ceramic and Silicate Industries Laboratories, Haifa	May 1961	UN	3	665,100	301,200	363,900	Dec. 22, 1961	Jan. 3, 1962
Underground water storage study	May 1962	FAO	3	2,173,300	489,300	1,684,000		
IVORY COAST								
Secondary Schoolteacher Training Institute, Abidjan	May 1961	UNESCO	6	3,150,400	1,034,800	2,115,600	Nov. 2, 1961	Dec. 1, 1961
JAPAN								
International Institute of Seismology and Earthquake Engineering.	January 1962	UNESCO	5	1,676,800	702,500	974,300	Oct. 31, 1962	
JORDAN								
Groundwater survey of the Azraq Area	May 1961	UN	3	1,228,800	811,300	417,500	Nov. 2, 1961	Nov. 13, 1961
LAOS								
Technical training	May 1960	UNESCO	5	1,338,900	583,900	755,000	Dec. 14, 1961	Feb. 15, 1962
LEBANON								
Technical Training Institute	do	UNESCO	5	2,473,800	723,800	1,750,000	Nov. 8, 1960	Dec. 29, 1960
Animal Health Institute	December 1960	FAO	5	1,066,200	598,200	468,000	Feb. 9, 1962	May 17, 1962
Forestry education, training, and research	January 1962	FAO	5	2,260,700	844,700	1,416,000	------	
Flight Safety Center, Beirut	May 1962	ICAO	5	4,421,700	2,288,700	2,133,000	------	
Ground-water survey	do	UN	5	1,966,600	816,600	1,150,000	------	
LIBERIA								
Agricultural training and research	December 1960	FAO	6	1,756,900	1,006,900	750,000	Sept. 18, 1961	Oct. 25, 1961
LIBYA								
College of Advanced Technology	December 1959	UNESCO	5	3,063,950	1,116,000	1,947,950	Sept. 16, 1960	Oct. 3, 1960
Radio and Telecommunications School	December 1960	ITU	5	1,183,600	523,600	660,000	July 5, 1961	July 14, 1961
MALI								
Secondary Schoolteacher Training Institute, Bamako	January 1962	UNESCO	6	3,668,900	1,019,900	2,649,000	Oct. 17, 1962	
Improvement and expansion of rice cultivation	May 1962	FAO	5	1,463,000	1,013,000	450,000	Oct. 31, 1962	
MEXICO								
National forestry inventory	May 1960	FAO	4	1,461,900	417,900	1,044,000	Apr. 27, 1961	May 4, 1961
Civil Aviation School	December 1960	ICAO	5	2,201,600	844,600	1,357,000	June 30, 1961	July 3, 1961
Survey of metallic mineral deposits	January 1962	UN	3	2,746,600	896,600	1,850,000	July 6, 1962	July 18, 1962
National Center for Technical Teacher Training, Mexico City.	May 1962	UNESCO	5	1,698,600	915,600	783,000	------	
MOROCCO								
Engineering School	May 1960	UNESCO	5	2,751,500	751,500	2,000,000	Oct. 8, 1960	Dec. 1, 1960
Rif region development survey	do	FAO	2	1,882,800	702,800	1,180,000	Nov. 1, 1960	Jan. 2, 1961
Civil Aviation School	December 1960	ICAO	5	1,772,200	624,200	1,148,000	June 29, 1961	July 28, 1961
Institute for Instructor Training for Leather and Textile Workers.	January 1962	ILO	4	2,472,800	934,800	1,538,000	Oct. 11, 1962	
Secondary School teacher Training Institutes, Rabat	May 1962	UNESCO	5	2,743,900	884,900	1,859,000	------	
NEPAL								
Hydroelectric development of the Karnali River	May 1961	UN	3	1,199,400	974,400	225,000	Jan. 16, 1962	Feb. 7, 1962
NETHERLANDS: SURINAM								
Mineral survey	May 1960	IBRD	2	1,462,000	770,000	692,000	Oct. 19, 1960	Oct. 21, 1960
NICARAGUA								
Survey of agricultural and forest resources	May 1962	FAO	4	1,290,900	851,900	439,000	------	
NIGERIA								
Niger River Dam survey [4]	December 1959	IBRD	1	2,425,000	735,000	1,690,000	Mar. 7, 1960	Mar. 10, 1960
Federal Higher Teacher Training College	December 1960	UNESCO	5	2,852,200	1,052,200	1,800,000	Feb. 15, 1962	Mar. 29, 1962
Soil and water resources survey of the Sokoto Valley	May 1961	FAO	4	2,272,300	1,552,300	720,000	Feb. 23, 1962	Mar. 30, 1962
Vocational training program	do	ILO	4	1,507,500	1,002,600	504,900	------	
Fisheries survey in the Western Region	do	FAO	4	829,000	564,000	265,000	------	
Secondary School Teacher Training College, Northern Region	January 1962	UNESCO	5	3,730,200	930,200	2,800,000	------	
Forestry faculty, University College, Ibadan	May 1962	FAO	6	1,551,800	876,800	675,000	------	

See footnotes at end of table.

Status of individual projects approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund: May 1959–May 1962, as of Oct. 31, 1962—Con.

[NOTE.—Throughout this annex, the figures under "Special fund contribution" indicate gross project costs, i.e., including the recipient Governments' cash contributions to the project budgets]

Project by country or territory	Approved by Governing Council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Costs of individual projects (U.S. dollar equivalents)			Plan of operation signed (date)	Authorization to commence execution (date)
				Total	Special fund contribution	Estimated Government counterpart contribution		
NIGERIA—continued								
Secondary School Teacher Training College, Eastern Region.	May 1962	UNESCO	5	$3,688,500	$1,055,500	$2,633,000	--------	
PAKISTAN								
Mineral survey	December 1959	UN	3	1,933,000	1,643,000	290,000	Sept. 22, 1960	Oct. 31, 1960
Soil survey	do	FAO	4	2,729,950	754,500	1,975,450	Dec. 8, 1960	Jan. 17, 1961
Management Development, Supervisory, and Instructor Training Center East Pakistan.	May 1960	ILO	5	2,239,000	1,039,000	1,200,000	Sept. 7, 1960	Sept. 22, 1960
Training of engineering and other technical personnel	do	UNESCO	5	3,424,400	2,294,400	1,130,000	Nov. 12, 1960	Feb. 10, 1961
Hydrological survey in East Pakistan	December 1960	FAO	5	3,845,700	1,645,700	2,200,000	Nov. 18, 1961	Dec. 4, 1961
National forestry research and training program	May 1961	FAO	5	4,589,800	1,061,800	3,528,000		
Polytechnic Institute, Chittagong	January 1962	UNESCO	5	3,512,500	856,500	2,656,000	--------	
Manpower planning	do	ILO	5	868,100	695,100	173,000	--------	
Management development and industrial training scheme for West Pakistan.	May 1962	ILO	4	2,656,000	1,494,000	1,162,000	--------	
PARAGUAY								
Technical Standards Institute	do	UN	5	908,900	543,900	365,000	--------	
PERU								
Marine Resources Research Institute	December 1959	FAO	4	1,766,500	790,500	976,000	Apr. 21, 1960	June 2, 1960
Precolonization survey	do	FAO	2	426,689	219,000	207,689	Feb. 13, 1961	Mar. 1, 1961
Vocational Instructors Training Institute	do	ILO	4	734,066	514,500	219,566	Nov. 25, 1960	Dec. 22, 1960
Hydrometeorological services	May 1960	WMO	4	1,862,300	788,300	1,074,000	Jan. 5, 1961	Jan. 16, 1961
Institute of Agricultural Engineering, National School of Agriculture.	December 1960	FAO	5	985,500	633,500	352,000	Sept. 28, 1961	Oct. 2, 1961
Resources surveys in central Peru (Peru Via)	May 1961	IBRD	4	2,507,000	1,277,000	1,230,000	--------	
Veterinary Institute for Tropical and High Altitude Research.	January 1962	FAO	4	2,247,900	902,900	1,345,000	--------	
Irrigation of the Pampas de Olmos	do	FAO	3	1,752,700	785,700	967,000	--------	
Forestry research and training	May 1962	FAO	5	1,289,800	751,800	538,000	--------	
PHILIPPINES								
Telecommunications Training Institute	May 1961	ITU	5	1,631,300	968,600	662,700	June 5, 1962	June 13, 1962
Dairy Training and Research Institute	January 1962	FAO	5	1,699,000	756,000	943,000	Sept. 19, 1962	Oct. 16, 1962
Institute of Applied Geology, Manila	do	UN	5	1,403,000	704,000	699,000	July 6, 1962	July 11, 1962
POLAND								
Training Center for Supervisory Personnel in Industry.	May 1959	ILO	3	3,517,000	817,000	2,500,000	Feb. 1, 1960	Mar. 7, 1960
Research and extension services for food production, processing, and utilization.	January 1962	FAO	4	4,651,500	1,020,500	3,631,000	--------	
REPUBLIC OF KOREA								
Tidal land reclamation survey	December 1960	FAO	3	1,022,000	586,200	435,800	Sept. 12, 1961	Sept. 28, 1961
Agricultural survey and demonstration in selected watersheds.	May 1961	FAO	5	936,100	563,100	373,000	Oct. 5, 1961	Nov. 14, 1961
Productivity Center, Seoul	January 1962	ILO	5	1,608,500	778,500	830,000	Aug. 15, 1962	Aug. 16, 1962
Telecommunications Training Center, Seoul	May 1962	ITU	5	2,291,600	1,288,600	1,003,000	Oct. 1, 1962	
REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM								
Mineral survey	December 1959	UN	3	421,400	268,500	152,900	Dec. 14, 1960	Jan. 24, 1961
SAUDI ARABIA								
Land and water surveys in the Wadi Jizan	December 1960	FAO	2	1,512,100	431,600	1,080,500	Oct. 24, 1961	Nov. 27, 1961
Higher Institute of Technology, Riyadh	May 1961	UNESCO	5	3,002,500	965,500	2,037,000	Aug. 28, 1962	
Pilot Experimental Farm and Agricultural Center	May 1962	FAO	5	1,371,600	680,600	691,000	--------	
SENEGAL								
Instructor and Foreman Training Center	May 1961	ILO	4	1,625,500	486,600	1,138,900	Feb. 14, 1962	Mar. 28, 1962
Secondary School Teacher Training Institute, Dakar	January 1962	UNESCO	6	3,179,700	1,144,700	2,035,000	Oct. 5, 1962	
Rural vocational training program	do	ILO	4	2,680,200	1,408,200	1,272,000	--------	
SOMALIA								
Agricultural and water surveys	December 1960	FAO	4	1,218,800	928,800	290,000	Sept. 30, 1961	Nov. 3, 1961
Iron ore survey	January 1962	UN	4	874,300	594,300	280,000	--------	
SUDAN								
Animal Health Institute	December 1960	FAO	4	459,900	264,900	195,000	Mar. 31, 1962	May 17, 1962
Hides, skins and leather: Development and training project.	do	FAO	4	868,600	521,000	347,600	May 3, 1961	June 14, 1961
Forestry Research and Education Center, Khartoum	May 1961	FAO	5	1,222,600	832,600	390,000	Dec. 19, 1961	Dec. 21, 1961
Land water use survey of Kordofan Province	do	FAO	6	1,389,900	889,900	500,000	Oct. 10, 1961	Nov. 20, 1961
Secondary Schoolteacher Training Institute, Khartoum.	do	UNESCO	5	3,015,400	1,074,400	1,941,000	Dec. 31, 1961	Jan. 12, 1962
Post and Telegraph Training Center, Khartoum	January 1962	ITU	5	1,936,900	486,900	1,450,000	--------	
Electric power survey	May 1962	IBRD	1	141,200	115,200	26,000	--------	
Land and water use and resources survey in the Jebel Marra area.	do	FAO	4	3,056,100	1,136,100	1,920,000	Sept. 23, 1962	
SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC								
Ground-water resources survey	December 1959	FAO	3	1,045,500	507,000	538,500	Sept. 29, 1960	Dec. 28, 1960
Food processing project	December 1960	FAO	5	896,300	568,300	328,000	Apr. 30, 1961	May 16, 1961
Damascus Agricultural Research Station	January 1962	FAO	5	1,243,200	663,200	580,000	--------	
Higher Polytechnic Institute, Damascus	May 1962	UNESCO	5	3,611,300	1,121,300	2,490,000	--------	
Planning the integrated agricultural development of the Ghab region.	do	FAO	4	1,457,500	766,500	691,000	--------	

See footnotes at end of table.

Status of individual projects approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund: May 1959–May 1962, as of Oct. 31, 1962—Con.

[NOTE.—Throughout this annex, the figures under "Special fund contribution" indicate gross project costs, i.e., including the recipient Governments' cash contributions to the project budgets]

Project by country or territory	Approved by Governing Council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Costs of individual projects (U.S. dollar equivalents)			Plan of operation signed (date)	Authorization to commence execution (date)
				Total	Special fund contribution	Estimated Government counterpart contribution		
THAILAND								
Siltation study of Bangkok Port	May 1959	IBRD	3½	$1,365,000	$1,015,000	$350,000	July 10, 1961	July 24, 1961
Civil Aviation Training Center	May 1960	ICAO	5	3,027,400	1,339,600	1,687,800	Apr. 10, 1961	Apr. 18, 1961
Productivity Center, Bangkok	May 1961	ILO	5	779,900	567,300	212,600	Jan. 18, 1962	Feb. 14, 1962
Technical Institute, Thonburi	do	UNESCO	5	3,035,700	1,081,700	1,954,000	--------	
Research and Training Center for rice protection	January 1962	FAO	5	1,124,300	606,300	518,000	July 20, 1962	Sept. 8, 1962
Expansion of Meteorological Services	do	WMO	3	581,300	330,300	251,000	--------	
TURKEY								
Middle East Technical University	May 1959	UNESCO	4	9,831,287	1,664,000	8,167,287	Dec. 14, 1959	Jan. 30, 1960
Antalya region development	May 1960	FAO	3	832,600	359,600	473,000	Oct. 21, 1960	Feb. 7, 1961
Poplar Institute	January 1962	FAO	4	1,919,600	644,600	1,275,000	May 2, 1962	June 27, 1962
UGANDA								
Aerial geophysical survey	May 1960	UN	1	453,500	313,500	140,000	Nov. 30, 1960	Dec. 15, 1960
Kampala Technical Institute	January 1962	UNESCO	6	5,112,500	1,159,500	3,953,000	--------	
UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC								
Drainage of irrigated land	May 1959	FAO	3	1,365,000	365,000	1,000,000	Dec. 27, 1960	Feb. 21, 1961
Soil survey from aerial photographs	do	FAO	4	827,500	327,500	500,000	Mar. 10, 1960	May 24, 1960
Civil Aviation Training School	May 1960	ICAO	5	1,860,500	1,063,400	797,100	Apr. 17, 1961	May 18, 1961
Cotton Research Laboratory	December 1960	FAO	4	1,465,300	687,300	778,000	Dec. 26, 1961	May 31, 1962
Animal Health Institute	do	FAO	4	1,005,000	668,000	337,000	Aug. 8, 1962	Oct. 4, 1962
Vocational Instructor Training Institute	do	ILO	4	1,447,100	888,100	559,000	Aug. 20, 1961	Oct. 5, 1961
National Institute of Standards	May 1961	UNESCO	5	4,973,700	973,700	4,000,000	--------	
Central Agricultural Pesticides Laboratory, Cairo	do	FAO	4	986,000	616,000	370,000	May 5, 1962	Sept. 12, 1962
Establishment of an Institute of Small Industries, Kubba.	January 1962	ILO	4	1,298,600	600,600	698,000	--------	
Mansoura Institute for Higher Education	May 1962	UNESCO	5	4,870,400	1,756,400	3,114,000	--------	
TOGO								
Land and water use survey	May 1960	FAO	3	963,000	700,000	263,000	Dec. 23, 1960	Jan. 11, 1961
Survey of groundwater and mineral resources	January 1962	UN	3	1,793,500	1,273,500	520,000	Aug. 21, 1962	Sept. 4, 1962
TUNISIA								
Agricultural Research, central Tunisia	May 1960	FAO	5	2,457,200	897,200	1,560,000	Sept. 13, 1960	Sept. 23, 1960
Civil Aviation School	December 1960	ICAO	5	1,787,500	640,500	1,147,000	Sept. 19, 1961	Sept. 27, 1961
Research and training on irrigation with saline water	January 1962	UNESCO	5	1,817,800	971,800	846,000	--------	
Vocational Training and Productivity Institute, Radés.	do	ILO	5	2,644,700	1,018,700	1,626,000	--------	
UNITED KINGDOM: BRITISH GUIANA								
Siltation study, Georgetown Harbour	December 1959	IBRD	2	421,500	278,000	143,500	Apr. 8, 1960	Apr. 15, 1960
Soil survey	May 1960	FAO	3	879,000	491,000	388,000	Nov. 9, 1960	Dec. 8, 1960
Survey of Canje Reservoir scheme	May 1961	FAO	1½	605,600	352,600	253,000	Dec. 30, 1961	Jan. 11, 1962
Aerial geophysical survey	January 1962	UN	3	1,340,800	640,800	700,000	June 14, 1962	June 14, 1962
UNITED KINGDOM: COLONY OF NORTH BORNEO								
Surveys of the Labuk Valley	December 1960	UN	3	1,559,900	769,900	790,000	Aug. 11, 1961	Aug. 30, 1961
UNITED KINGDOM: FEDERATION OF RHODESIA AND NYASALAND								
Multipurpose survey of the Kafue River Basin	May 1961	FAO	4	1,375,100	786,100	589,000	Feb. 23, 1962	May 16, 1962
Lake Fariba Fisheries Research Institute	January 1962	FAO	4	1,107,200	555,200	552,000	--------	
UNITED KINGDOM: KENYA								
Training of engineers for East Africa	May 1962	UNESCO	5	1,756,600	832,600	924,000	--------	
The Kenya Polytechnic, Nairobi	do	UNESCO	6	2,308,100	1,428,100	880,000	--------	
Survey of the irrigation potential of the Lower Tana River Basin.	do	FAO	3	1,297,100	974,100	323,000	--------	
UNITED KINGDOM: MALTA								
Polytechnic Institute	May 1960	UNESCO	5	1,501,200	601,200	900,000	Mar. 22, 1961	May 9, 1961
UPPER VOLTA								
Agricultural Training Center, Bobo-Dioulasso	May 1962	FAO	5	1,840,900	1,040,900	800,000	--------	
URUGUAY								
Vocational Instructor Training Institute, Montevideo	January 1962	ILO	4	1,585,200	874,200	711,000	--------	
VENEZUELA								
Agricultural survey of selected watersheds in the northwest.	December 1960	FAO	3	1,778,700	778,700	1,000,000	June 30, 1962	Aug. 13, 1962
National Polytechnic Institute	January 1962	UNESCO	5	4,899,700	1,254,700	3,645,000	--------	
School of Industrial Engineering, Central University, Caracas.	May 1962	UNESCO	5	4,753,300	1,038,300	3,715,000	--------	
YUGOSLAVIA								
Training of vocational instructors	May 1959	ILO	4	7,511,500	1,044,000	6,467,500	Dec. 31, 1959	Jan. 21, 1960
Pilot land reclamation project	December 1960	FAO	4	3,932,100	1,037,100	2,895,000	May 19, 1962	May 22, 1962
Nuclear research and training in agriculture	May 1962	IAEA	3	1,752,400	546,400	1,206,000	--------	

See footnotes at end of table.

Status of individual projects approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund: May 1959–May 1962, as of Oct. 31, 1962—Con.

[NOTE.—Throughout this annex, the figures under "Special fund contribution" indicate gross project costs, i.e., including the recipient Governments' cash contributions to the project budgets]

Project by country or territory	Approved by Governing Council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Costs of individual projects (U.S. dollar equivalents)			Plan of operation signed (date)	Authorization to commence execution (date)
				Total	Special fund contribution	Estimated Government counterpart contribution		
REGIONAL: THE AMERICAS								
Industrial Research Institute [6]	May 1959	UN	5	$2,238,000	[7] $2,238,000		May 10, 1960	May 10, 1960
Engineering faculty, University of the West Indies [8]	December 1959	UNESCO	5	3,426,940	904,000	$2,522,940	Aug. 25, 1960	Aug. 30, 1960
Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences [9]	December 1960	FAO	5	8,212,000	4,001,000	4,211,000		
Latin American Development Institute [10]	January 1962	UN	5	4,188,500	3,068,500	1,120,000	June 8, 1962	June 18, 1962
Study for development of telecommunications in Central America [11]	May 1962	IBRD	1	895,000	770,000	125,000		
REGIONAL: ASIA AND THE FAR EAST								
Mekong tributary survey [12]	December 1959	UN	4	1,793,700	1,469,000	324,700	May 4, 1960	(13)
Hydrographic survey of the lower Mekong [12]	December 1960	UN	2	667,000	347,000	320,000	May 31, 1961	July 24, 1961
Laos and Thailand: Survey of minerals and mineral processing industries	May 1961	UN	2	569,300	424,300	145,000	Oct. 20, 1961	(14)
Cambodia and Republic of Vietnam: Mekong River delta model study.	do	UNESCO	3	758,800	642,800	116,000	May 2, 1962	May 25, 1962
INTERREGIONAL								
Desert locust [15]	December 1959	FAO	6	3,866,000	[16] 3,866,000		Apr. 9, 1960 [17]	June 8, 1960
Total				497,017,716	210,254,900	286,792,816		

[1] Project completed in June 1960.

[2] Project completed in February 1962.

[3] "Special fund contribution" includes, in addition to cash payments by the Government for local costs, a cash counterpart contribution equivalent to $405,000.

[4] Project concluded in March 1961.

[5] Project completed in April 1961.

[6] Participants: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua.

[7] Cash counterpart contributions by the participating governments totaling the equivalent of $1,300,000 included under "Special fund contribution."

[8] Participants: Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, and the United Kingdom on behalf of British Guiana and its non-self-governing territories in the Caribbean.

[9] Participants: All member countries of the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences.

[10] Requesting Governments: Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Venezuela.

[11] Participants: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama.

[12] Participants: Cambodia, Laos, Republic of Vietnam, and Thailand.

[13] Laos and Thailand, July 14, 1960, Cambodia, Dec. 8, 1960, and Republic of Vietnam, June 14, 1961.

[14] Thailand, Nov. 3, 1961, and Laos, Sept. 21, 1962.

[15] Participants: Cameroon, Chad, Ethiopia, France and the French Community, Ghana, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, Yemen, and the United Kingdom for and on behalf of Aden Colony and Protectorate, British Trusteeship Territory of the Cameroons, Gambia, Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda, and the Gulf States.

[16] Cash counterpart contributions by the participating governments totaling the equivalent of $1,390,850 included under "Special fund contribution."

[17] Operations limited to those countries whose governments have completed their initial obligations.

NEW RESIDUAL OIL IMPORT QUOTA ALLOCATIONS

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, this morning I delivered a letter to the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, requesting the Department withhold publication of new residual oil import quota allocations until the projected schedules have been reviewed by key interested Members of the House of Representatives.

In view of the statements made on this floor by many of my colleagues, expressing concern over the increase in the quotas for foreign residual oil, I believe they will be interested in the request I have made to the Secretary of the Interior.

FEBRUARY 27, 1963.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Since it is customary, I believe, for your office to announce a month in advance the oil import allocations for the year beginning April 1, it is likely that such an announcement is now in preparation.

It would logically be assumed that, because of the disastrous economic losses incurred by coal mining and oil producing regions as a consequence of the present high levels of oil imports, a reduction in shipments of foreign oil to this country will be ordered for the year beginning April 1. Since conditions of high unemployment in this country have not thus far been taken into consideration in the administration of the oil import control program, however, there does exist the grave possibility that those charged with the responsibility of setting the quota limitations will permit incoming oil shipments to be increased rather than reduced. For this reason I urgently request that you postpone any action on the new schedule until it is discussed with Members of Congress whose constituencies are affected.

As representative of lignite mining communities whose very existences are imperiled by the waves of foreign residual oil inundating the Nation's fuel markets, and as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I would, of course, appreciate an opportunity to preview the projections and to discuss them with designated authorities in your office. Because, however, you may prefer to limit further the number of those so favored, I would suggest that the matter could be handled satisfactorily by the chairmen and senior ranking members of these committees: Interior and Insular Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means.

Obviously, the senior members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee are familiar with the impact of foreign oil on the domestic fuel industries. Foreign Affairs members are in better position to ascertain to what extent commitments might have been made to President Betancourt of Venezuela during his visit to Washington last week. Members of the Ways and Means Committee are cognizant of the promises made to Congress on limiting oil imports from the time that the national security amendment to the Trade Agreements Act was first adopted.

I am confident that my colleagues here named would make an objective analysis of the proposed new import schedules and could, with more than a fair degree of accuracy, indicate to your office the probable reactions on the part of the House should the revised schedule again prove to be as offensive to the American economy as in the past year.

I shall appreciate your notifying all interested parties that the publication of new imports schedules will be delayed as long as is necessary for adjustments that will be in keeping with the will of Congress and the welfare of the United States.

Copies of this letter are being sent to Members of the House indicated above, and I shall ask that a copy of my letter to you be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Sincerely,

HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,
Member of Congress.

MR. KHRUSHCHEV AND CUBA

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the lead story in the Washington Star last night, and I assume all of the Associated Press papers across the Nation, told a most interesting story and one which should send cold chills down the spine of most Americans.

It told of a big political speech made by Mr. Khrushchev in his one-party election campaign. He said the Soviet Union "would come to the aid of its friends" should the West launch any attack on Cuba or Red China.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the first real proof we have had that Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy consider Cuba as Soviet territory. It is the first real proof we have had that the President has abandoned "our friends"—the free people of Cuba to the Communist dictatorship.

This brings the American people face to face with facts. Where do we stand? Have we actually abandoned the principles of freedom? Have we completely abandoned the Monroe Doctrine? Has this administration turned its back on the men who gave their lives in every war this Nation has fought to make the world or at least the Western Hemisphere safe for democracy?

When Mr. Khrushchev says he will go to the aid of his friends in Cuba is he referring to anyone other than Castro and a few of his hierarchy? What about the Cuban people? We fought one war to free them; do we now stand by and watch them ground under the slave heel of the Kremlin?

The American people want some answers. They want some facts and they want them now. Just what deals has this administration made and who has been traded off to whom?

THE NEW YORK NEWSPAPER STRIKE

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the New York newspaper strike long since ceased serving any useful purpose. No one has benefited; everyone has been irreparably hurt.

The chief damage has been done to the public. The public has been deeply prejudiced by this strike. And, for that reason the Federal Government should have moved on this long ago. The former Secretary of Labor, Mr. Goldberg, established a precedent of intervention in crisis strikes. He went up to New York during the Metropolitan Opera strike and forced the parties together. And yet it is argued now that the Federal Government cannot intervene in a local strike.

I do not know of a strike that has more serious overtones and undertones than does this one. The news blackout means that Government is operating in camera. It is the process of daily public scrutiny that keeps governments acting honestly and in the public interest. The public right to know is one of the most important rights ingrained in any democracy. It is important because governments will not long remain free and honest in the absence of a public press.

In my view Government and governmental processes have abandoned the public in this case.

Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Robert G. Spivack, a distinguished newspaperman, published three articles on the subject of the New York newspaper strike. They are well worth reading, and I am taking the liberty of inserting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

THE LONELY METROPOLIS

Lively, lovely, exciting New York—Baghdad-on-the-Hudson—is today a mute, paralyzed, crippled city. She is like a helpless creature, unexpectedly stricken dumb and deaf. Dazed and staring vacantly, she is obviously in distress and yet so powerless to summon help.

People still rush about, the subways are crowded, the lights blink on Broadway. There are a handful of tradition-breakers who snatch a Philadelphia or Newark paper, or one of the half-dozen makeshift dailies, hastily patched together. The early morning gazers still stand outside the NBC studios watching the Today show. There are the curious in Pennsylvania station who pick up a clipboard to which has been clamped the latest UPI copy.

Superficially not much is different—until you start to talk to New Yorkers. Then you realize that nothing is the same and the full impact of what has happened starts to become apparent.

A great sadness has descended on the city, such as marked the passing of a beloved friend like, if you remember, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Are the newspapers missed? Has television filled the news gap?

I have never seen the big town or its inhabitants so glazed or so lonely or reacting so inadequately. At one moment it is as if some nerve gas has quietly seeped over the city and asphyxiated its residents. At other times you get the feeling that Manhattan Island has been set adrift from the mainland and silently floated out to sea.

The New Yorker feels cut off from America and the visitor from Washington is earnestly questioned about the outside world. There is probably no other American city where this would be quite so true, where the newspapers play such a vital role. The New York press is the heart of the big town through which its lifeblood flows. Without its papers the city is half-dead.

The printers' strike has been a catastrophe and it was unnecessary from the outset.

I say this as a union man.

I am a member of the American Newspaper Guild, have been for most of my adult life. There have been numerous strikes which, I felt, were justified. I intend to remain a member of the guild.

But I have taken no loyalty oath to Mr. Bert Powers of the ITU. Nor do I feel obliged to remain silent when a union leader makes a fool of himself.

Mr. Powers and a small clique in the New York locals of the ITU are primarily responsible for the strike. He may wrap himself in a mantle of rectitude. But Mr. Powers is no hero to organized labor, nor to the unorganized layman.

There is not a union leader in New York with whom I have spoken who has had a good word to say for the course Mr. Powers has charted. But they do their grumbling in silence or within "the club." This is unfortunate, because a word from a responsible union leader would carry weight.

What has happened, though, is that many who grew up in the thirties find themselves entrapped by their own rhetoric. There must always be labor unity. The boss, or in this case the publishers, must always be wrong.

This is one time when neither slogan is adequate. With all the publishers' shortcomings and all the rigidity of other years, most union leaders in New York say privately that Powers' bargaining methods and demands were outrageous, that no publisher in this economically distressed industry could acquiesce and no paper could continue to publish in the manner to which New Yorkers have grown accustomed.

Perhaps Powers' greatest error has been that he has demonstrated such poor generalship. He left no room to maneuver. He provided no escape hatches for either the publishers or the ITU. He took a desperate gamble in December when, before the Christmas advertising was over, he decided to strike. It was a massive miscalculation.

When it did not pay off, when the nonstruck papers also shut down, a mature labor leader would have left other courses of action open for himself. In all his grandiose planning, Mr. Powers overlooked this elementary fact of all warfare, whether it is political or military or labor. Instead he boxed himself in and thus far has not figured a way out.

WHO HAS BEEN HURT BY THE NEWSPAPER STRIKE?

New Yorkers are a special breed and, as a result, they are often misunderstood by those who live in other parts of the country.

To a visitor New York is an exciting town, but its people are strange. They hardly ever smile. Some seem fierce and withdrawn. Others act as if their mission in life is just to separate you and your cash. Frequently New Yorkers seem to look down on the outlander, regarding him as uncultured, uninformed, and a hick.

That, in part at least, is the background of the well-known comment, "New York is a nice place to visit but I wouldn't want to live there."

As one who came east from Ohio and grew to know and love New York, I believe this picture is a distortion. It is worth considering, though, why New Yorkers are different.

There are 8 million people from divergent backgrounds. If one does not wish to become involved with anyone else's interests and problems, the easiest way is to be withdrawn. The tendency for each man to become an island unto himself is not hard to understand. It is a protective defense against invasion of privacy.

Sometimes it is overdone. Some New Yorkers are so withdrawn they do not know their neighbor's name. Others do not start the day by saying, "Good morning." This is sad. It is one more reason why every New Yorker ought to be required to visit west of the Hudson, at least before he can be considered well educated.

But as their substitute for traveling, New Yorkers turn almost instinctively to the newspapers. As a result the city has been compelled to develop the best newspapers in the country; their readers are critical and demanding.

There are other towns with one good newspaper. But New Yorkers support seven of which at least six possess unusual qualities. Half the city's inhabitants read at least one newspaper daily. These reading habits have developed over the years. The morning newspaper is as important to start the day as that first cup of coffee.

So when Mr. Bert Powers of the International Typographical Union pulled what has turned out to be his disastrous printers' strike, the first victim was the newspaper reader. Shutting down the New York press was like ripping a delicate fabric. In this case the unseen damage done is not likely to be easily or quickly repaired.

Perhaps that is why for over 80 years the ITU has not gone on strike in New York. The union's earlier leaders were no less tough than Mr. Powers. They may have been wiser. In any event they were part of the newspaper tradition and the city's social structure.

If you have not lived in New York it may be difficult to understand the unique role that the press plays. But everyone can understand the economic damage of the strike. It has virtually bankrupted the Newspaper Guild and many individual newspapermen. But it has also vitally affected others.

The small businessman who advertises in the big papers hoping to get someone to his shop or to get orders by mail has been acutely injured. He cannot afford the more costly advertising on radio or television, which is also too fleeting. He has no facilities for compiling direct mail lists and anyhow that cannot be done overnight.

The big department stores have also been damaged. Hardly anyone knows what they have to offer. Book publishers and authors have been cruelly affected. A man spends a year writing a book. If it came out during the strike, who would know it? It is not reviewed in any New York newspaper.

For the theaters and movie houses the winter has been bleak. There is a cheaply printed yellow sheet of what's playing called the "emergency list," available in the hotels. But if you do not live in a hotel, what then?

But those who have been most seriously injured of all are those who are out of work. The city's vast army of jobless do not know where to turn. Shall an unemployed man first travel to Brooklyn, or to Queens? Is there something opening in the garment center? Does a law firm need a young typist? For the unemployed page 1 is the page that lists job opportunities.

There are vast areas from one end of the big city to another. It's expensive to get around at 30 cents a round trip on the subway if you do not know which spots to hit first. If you try to telephone, you soon discover that others are doing the same. The line is always busy.

It's ironic that those who are already spiritually wounded and so badly demoralized by unemployment should now find themselves further injured by a strike nobody wanted.

Losers All

One day, of course, the strike ends in a compromise. The combatants feel a bit foolish, like two old friends who have been in a brawl. The victims try to pull themselves together. Everybody hopes it won't happen again.

If the newspaper strike in New York had been an ordinary strike, let us say of bus drivers, or coal miners, or building maintenance workers, life would go on after the settlement pretty much as before the conflict. This Nation has survived many strikes and the damage is usually not permanent.

Certainly these are times when workers, through their unions, must strike.

But the newspaper strike was entirely different and the lessons to be drawn from it are different. It is difficult to figure out what, if anything, has been gained by the strike. There is no problem about figuring out what has been lost.

First there was the tearing of the social fabric of New York. The newspaper readers were the innocent bystanders in a fight that basically did not concern them. Then there was the loss of income for the newspaper employees, the publishers, and the advertisers.

Estimates vary, but probably $40 to $50 million was lost, some of it never to be regained. Then there were unmeasurable losses. How do you figure how badly hurt New York's unemployed were by their inability to obtain a daily listing of job opportunities?

Aside from all this is the damage done to the New York press at a crucial point, when the very survival of certain publications is jeopardized.

As everyone knows, newspaper publishing has been an economically sick industry. But at a time when responsible unions and publishers should be engaging in a joint effort to see what might be done to nurture it back to health, some hotheads in the New York locals of, the International Typographical Union decided to start a brawl.

This strike was comparable to kicking the patient out of bed, using a meat ax on his medicine chest, pounding him senseless, and then asking why he does not get up and do his job.

If the newspapers are to regain their strength and if the printers' union is to regain its prestige, then it is important to think about where we go from here. Some changes in union leadership would probably be salutary. But for now let's examine the broader issues.

Even though the New York printers' chief bungled it and scarcely bothered to make a public case, there is something that has worried the ITU for many years. It is a matter of legitimate concern: How automation will affect the printers' craft. There is no doubt that the newspapers will eventually automate. To survive they must modernize.

But if that is what really underlay this explosion, then it was the ITU's job to start working with the publishers to see how modernization could take place without dislodging those now working and how to make the transition with a minimum of joblessness.

In fairness to the union, it must be acknowledged that this will not be easy, nor the negotiations simple. Other industries have not set a very good example and other unions have also been asleep on the job. But to adopt a head-in-the-sand approach helps neither unions nor publishers.

Next we should consider future relations between the unions. The New York strike has virtually bankrupted the Newspaper Guild, which has mortgaged itself for what is probably the normal lifetime of its present membership. On the other hand, the ITU is building up a national strike fund estimated at somewhere from $17,500,000 to $20 million.

If the ITU expects future cooperation, then the least it could do would be to repay the Newspaper Guild and the other newspaper unions all the funds that they laid out in strike benefits. Unfortunately no one will be in a position to reimburse the employees for what they lost in pay or the employers for their loss in revenue.

But even more important, there must be a complete reexamination of how a newspaper strike can be called. So long as there is not one big newspaper union but a conglomeration of small unions, then no strike should be called until there is substantial agreement among the rank-and-file as well as the leaders on whether there is to be a strike.

The least that ought to come out of this strike is a greater degree of union democracy. No one, newspapermen least of all, wants to be part of a union of sheep.

GOVERNMENT COPYRIGHT PRACTICES NEED INVESTIGATION

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress I introduced a resolution that would authorize an investigation into the practices of Government copyrights.

That this issue remains a current problem is evidenced by the exchange of letters I am appending for the consideration of my colleagues:

Mr. Abram Chayes' Letter to Professor Charles Foster Regarding Government Copyrights

Department of State,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1963.

Mr. Charles R. Foster,
Assistant Professor of Political Science, DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind.

Dear Professor Foster: I have been asked by the Secretary to reply to your letter of January 24, 1963, questioning the permissibility of publication by Beacon Press, Inc., of a selection of his official statements and speeches in a book entitled "Winds of Freedom." You also express the view that the publication may be a violation of the Copyright Act.

The Department of State authorized Beacon Press to undertake this publication in order to obtain a more widespread public awareness of the foreign policy positions of the U.S. Government than would normally be available through use of the Government Printing Office. Beacon Press was, and is, able to bring to bear its machinery for promotion and publicity to achieve this end. It undertook this project in a spirit of public service with no intention of recovering more than its costs. Moreover, the Department of State itself has sought no profit from the agreement, nor will the Secretary or Mr. Lindley receive any royalties or other compensation from the publication of the book.

Beacon Press has informally assured the Department that its procurement of a copyright on the book was a regrettable inadvertence, and that it is taking steps to remedy the situation. In any event, the Department has reason to conclude that at least the format of the material may be copyrighted, whatever else may not be. However, the provisions of the Department's arrangements with Beacon Press make it very clear that the material is available to other publishers on the same terms as it has been made available to Beacon Press.

You may feel certain that access to those materials through official channels of the Government is still open to you and all other Americans. Indeed, it is our hope that publication of the book will stir enough interest so that many other Americans will be led to avail themselves of this and related material through those channels.

Sincerely yours,

Abram Chayes,
The Legal Adviser.

Mr. Charles Foster's Letter in Reply

February 15, 1963.

Mr. Abram Chayes,
The Legal Adviser, Department of State,
Washington 25, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chayes: I greatly appreciate your letter of February 5, but I find myself puzzled about a number of points you mention with regard to the private publication and copyrighting of Secretary Rusk's official speeches in an officially prepared book entitled "The Winds of Freedom."

You state that "The Department of State authorized Beacon Press" to publish the book in question. By what statutory authority does the Department have the right to do this? So far as I know no such authority exists in law. Indeed the only statute relating to private publication of official documents, the Copyright Act, expressly forbids copyrighting of such material. Section 8 of this law states: "No copyright shall subsist in any publication of the U.S. Government, or any reprint, in whole or in part thereof" (17 U.S.C. 8).

Moreover, according to an official statement by the Copyright Office, "Any work produced by a Government employee within the scope of his employment is not copyrightable, even though produced by a private publisher" (Report of the Register of Copyrights to the House Committee on the Judiciary, 87th Cong., 1st sess., 1961, p. 131).

It will interest you to know that in opposing extension of copyrights, Deputy Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach, recently defined copyrights as "forms of monopolies" which should be restricted "from the viewpoint of the public."

You state that private publication was authorized by the State Department "in order to obtain a more widespread public awareness of the foreign policy positions of the U.S. Government." I fail to see how this can possibly be attained through the means authorized by your agency.

As you know, the book in question is being privately sold, under authorization of the State Department, at $4.95 a copy. However, I understand that the same material, if issued by the Government Printing Office, as it should have been, could be made available to the public at about 60 cents a copy.

I note that advertisements promoting the private sale of the book refer to it as "indispensable for understanding the position of the Kennedy administration on intricate world problems and for its perceptive, carefully articulated analysis of the nature of the world struggle." If it is indeed so indispensable it should be available to my students—as well as to everyone else—at the low prices charged by the Government Printing Office for official publications, not at the high prices private publishers charge for commercial works.

You state that private publication of Secretary Rusk's speeches was motivated by "public service." I fail to see what public service is rendered when a compilation of official documents is furnished to a preferred publisher for copyrighted publication at $4.95 a copy when it could have been made accessible to the public, without copyright restrictions, at 60 cents a copy.

You state that private publication of the book was "authorized * * * in order to obtain a more widespread public awareness of the foreign policy positions of the U.S. Government than would normally be available through use of the Government Printing Office." In view of what you imply in this regard permit me to call your attention to the following:

(a) The Government Printing Office was established by Congress and is supported by the taxpayer for the very purpose the State Department has disregarded—printing and distribution of official publications appropriately and inexpensively.

(b) It is a matter of record—and, I might add, considerable pride—that some publications of the Office have achieved circulations of several hundreds of thousands via purchase at low cost by the public in general.

(c) The resources of the Federal Government for promotion and publicity are far, far greater than those of any private publisher.

(d) In publicizing the publications of the Government Printing Office, the Superintendent of Documents distributes millions of promotional circulars every year. Incidentally, Government Printing Office publications are frequently the subject of publicity and reviews in leading newspapers and magazines.

You state that copyrighting of the work is due to "regrettable inadvertence." I fully agree that use of this restrictive device is "regrettable" but I find it difficult to believe that the Department did not know that it is quite customary for all private published material to be copyrighted. Nor can I persuade myself that the Department was unaware that publications of the Government Printing Office cannot be copyrighted.

Prior to joining the State Department's staff Mr. Ernest Lindley, Special Assistant to Secretary Rusk and editor of the book in question, was a prolific author of works published under copyright arrangements. As he must know, such arrangements are a basic requisite of all private publishing.

Moreover, I find "inadvertence" a very inadequate explanation in that it is common knowledge that other copyrighting of official material has been the subject of a great deal of attention in the press in the past few years. For specifics, permit me to call your attention to the criticisms set forth in last year's Congressional Record as follows: July 18, 1962, page A5501, daily Record; October 11, 1962, pages A7590 and A7611, daily Record; also in volume 108, part 12, pages 16050–16052; volume 108, part 13, pages 17648–17649; volume 108, part 15, pages 20592–20593; and volume 108, part 17, page 22659.

It will interest you to know that "inadvertence" has been the explanation proffered when other glaring instances of copyrighting of official material have come to light. For details about one of the most important recent instances I refer you to a New York Times article of January 5, 1962, entitled "Copyright Erred on Kennedy Book."

You state that "at least the format of the material may be copyrighted, whatever else may not be." According to the Copyright Act and the Copyright Office the format in and of itself cannot be copyrighted. What can be copyrighted is genuine creativity and originality by a private individual. If there is any genuine creativity and originality in the book in question it is in the editing done by Mr. Lindley in his official capacity as Special Assistant to Secretary Rusk, but such work is not copyrightable because, as the Copyright Office has stated, "Any work produced by a Government employee within the scope of his employment is not copyrightable."

Incidentally, I understand that it is no secret in Washington that Mr. Lindley, a former Newsweek correspondent, is one of the State Department's ablest ghostwriters. I daresay that at least some of the speeches he wrote for Secretary Rusk are included in the book Mr. Lindley edited for the State Department as part of his official duties. I do not, of course, mean to imply any criticism of official ghostwriting; it's an unavoidable necessity in modern government. Secretary Rusk wouldn't have had much time for fulfilling his duties as the head of the State Department if he had to take time off to write all of the speeches appearing in the copyrighted book ascribed to his authorship.

You suggest that although the Secretary's speeches have been published under private copyright at $4.95 a copy the official press releases in which they originally appeared are accessible to the public "through official channels of the Government"—meaning, I suppose, that every citizen is free to deprive himself of the right to obtain all of the speeches in conveniently compiled, indexed, and printed form unless he is willing to pay $4.95 to a private publisher because the State Department has found it expedient to extend preferential treatment to that publisher instead of complying with the obligation of a Government agency to furnish the public with the full benefit of official work and official material through the proper official channels.

It will interest you to know that I originally became acquainted with the existence of "Winds of Freedom" when it was called to my attention by a friend. Despite the fact that its publication by Beacon Press was supposed to be a means of making it available to the public, it was not until the other day that I was finally able to obtain a copy. My previous efforts to locate the work in several cities, including Washington, D.C., were fruitless. Moreover, although Beacon Press is the publishing house of the Unitarian denomination I have not found the book accessible, for examination or purchase, at any of the Unitarian churches I have visited.

Since, as the ads of the book state, it is "indispensable for understanding the position of the Kennedy administration on intricate world problems and for its perceptive, carefully articulated analysis of the nature of the world struggle", I take it that the State Department and its affiliated agencies have purchased many copies for official distribution. As a taxpayer I should like to know how many such copies have been paid for through public funds.

In conclusion, permit me to emphasize that although I hold Secretary Rusk in highest esteem, I feel I should speak up frankly and freely in this connection.

Sincerely yours,

Charles R. Foster,
Assistant Professor of Political Science,
DePauw University.

CIVIL RIGHTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 75)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

"Our Constitution is colorblind," wrote Mr. Justice Harlan before the turn of the century, "and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens." But the practices of the country do not always conform to the principles of the Constitution. And this message is intended to examine how far we have come in achieving first-class citizenship for all citizens regardless of color, how far we have yet to go, and what further tasks remain to be carried out—by the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government, as well as by State and local governments and private citizens and organizations.

One hundred years ago the Emancipation Proclamation was signed by a President who believed in the equal worth and opportunity of every human being. That proclamation was only a first step—a step which its author unhappily did not live to follow up, a step which some of its critics dismissed as an action which "frees the slave but ignores the Negro." Through these long 100 years, while slavery has vanished, progress for the Negro has been too often blocked and delayed. Equality before the law has not always meant equal treatment and opportunity. And the harmful, wasteful and wrongful results of racial discrimination and segregation still appear in virtually every aspect of national life, in virtually every part of the Nation.

The Negro baby born in America today, regardless of the section or State in which he is born, has about one-half as much chance of completing high school as a white baby born in the same place on the same day; one-third as much chance of completing college; one-third as much chance of becoming a professional man; twice as much chance of becoming unemployed; about one-seventh as much chance of earning $10,000 per year; a life expectancy which is 7 years less; and the prospects of earning only half as much.

No American who believes in the basic truth that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," can fully excuse, explain, or defend the picture these statistics portray. Race discrimination hampers our economic growth by preventing the maximum development and utilization of our manpower. It hampers our world leadership by contradicting at home the message we preach abroad. It mars the atmosphere of a united and classless society in which this Nation rose to greatness. It increases the costs of public welfare, crime, delinquency, and disorder. Above all, it is wrong.

Therefore, let it be clear, in our own hearts and minds, that it is not merely because of the cold war, and not merely because of the economic waste of discrimination, that we are committed to achieving true equality of opportunity. The basic reason is because it is right.

The cruel disease of discrimination knows no sectional or State boundaries. The continuing attack on this problem must be equally broad. It must be both private and public—it must be conducted at National, State, and local levels—and it must include both legislative and executive action.

In the last 2 years, more progress has been made in securing the civil rights of all Americans than in any comparable period in our history. Progress has been made—through executive action, litigation, persuasion, and private initiative—in achieving and protecting equality of opportunity in education, voting, transportation, employment, housing, government, and the enjoyment of public accommodations.

But pride in our progress must not give way to relaxation of our effort. Nor does progress in the executive branch enable the legislative branch to escape its own obligations. On the contrary, it is in the light of this nationwide progress, and in the belief that Congress will wish once again to meet its responsibilities in this matter, that I stress in the following agenda of existing and prospective action important legislative as well as administrative measures.

I. THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The right to vote in a free American election is the most powerful and precious right in the world—and it must not be denied on the grounds of race or color. It is a potent key to achieving other rights of citizenship. For American history, both recent and past, clearly reveals that the power of the ballot has enabled those who achieve it to win other achievements as well, to gain a full voice in the affairs of their State and Nation, and to see their interests represented in the governmental bodies which affect their future. In a free society, those with the power to govern are necessarily responsive to those with the right to vote.

In enacting the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts, Congress provided the Department of Justice with basic tools for protecting the right to vote—and this administration has not hesitated to use those tools. Legal action is brought only after voluntary efforts fail—and, in scores of instances, local officials, at the request of the Department of Justice, have voluntarily made voting records available or abandoned discriminatory registration, discriminatory voting practices or segregated balloting. Where voluntary local compliance has not been forthcoming, the Department of Justice has approximately quadrupled the previous level of its legal effort—investigating coercion, inspecting records, initiating lawsuits, enjoining intimidation, and taking whatever followup action is necessary to forbid further interference or discrimination. As a result, thousands of Negro citizens are registering and voting for the first time—many of them in counties where no Negro had ever voted before. The Department of Justice will continue to take whatever action is required to secure the right to vote for all Americans.

Experience has shown, however, that these highly useful acts of the 85th and 86th Congresses suffer from two major defects. One is the usual long and difficult delay which occurs between the filing of a lawsuit and its ultimate conclusion. In one recent case, for example, 19 months elapsed between the filing of the suit and the judgment of the court. In another, an action brought in July 1961 has not yet come to trial. The legal maxim "justice delayed is justice denied" is dramatically applicable in these cases.

Too often those who attempt to assert their constitutional rights are intimidated. Prospective registrants are fired. Registration workers are arrested. In some instances, churches in which registration meetings are held have been burned. In one case where Negro tenant farmers chose to exercise their right to vote, it was necessary for the Justice Department to seek injunctions to halt their eviction and for the Department of Agriculture to help feed them from surplus stocks. Under these circumstances, continued delay in the granting of the franchise, particularly in counties where there is mass racial disfranchisement, permits the intent of the Congress to be openly flouted.

Federal executive action in such cases, no matter how speedy and how drastic, can never fully correct such abuses of power. It is necessary instead to free the forces of our democratic system within these areas by promptly insuring the franchise to all citizens, making it possible for their elected officials to be truly responsive to all their constituents.

The second and somewhat overlapping gap in these statutes is their failure to deal specifically with the most common forms of abuse of discretion on the part of local election officials who do not treat all applicants uniformly.

Objections were raised last year to the proposed literacy test bill, which attempted to speed up the enforcement of the right to vote by removing one important area of discretion from registration officials who used that discretion to exclude Negroes. Preventing that bill from coming to a vote did not make any less real the prevalence in many counties of the use of literacy and other voter qualification tests to discriminate against prospective Negro voters, contrary to the requirements of the 14th and 15th amendments, and adding to the delays and difficulties encountered in securing the franchise for those denied it.

An indication of the magnitude of the overall problem, as well as the need for speedy action, is a recent five-State survey disclosing over 200 counties in which fewer than 15 percent of the Negroes of voting age are registered to vote. This cannot continue. I am, therefore, recommending legislation to deal with this problem of judicial delay and administrative abuse in four ways:

First, to provide for interim relief while voting suits are proceeding through the courts in areas of demonstrated need, temporary Federal voting referees should be appointed to determine the qualifications of applicants for registration and voting during the pendency of a lawsuit in any county in which fewer than 15 percent of the eligible number of persons of any race claimed to be discriminated against are registered to vote. Existing Federal law provides for the appointment of voting referees to receive and act upon applications for voting registration upon a court finding that a pattern or practice of discrimination exists. But to prevent a successful case from becoming an empty victory, insofar as the particular election is concerned, the proposed legislation would provide that, within these prescribed limits, temporary voting referees would be appointed to serve from the inception to the conclusion of the Federal voting suit, applying, however, only State law and State regulations. As officers of the court, their decisions would be subject to court scrutiny and review.

Second, voting suits brought under the Federal civil rights statutes should be accorded expedited treatment in the Federal courts, just as in many State courts election suits are given preference on the dockets on the sensible premise that, unless the right to vote can be exercised at a specific election, it is, to the extent of that election, lost forever.

Third, the law should specifically prohibit the application of different tests, standards, practices, or procedures for different applicants seeking to register and vote in Federal elections. Under present law, the courts can ultimately deal with the various forms of racial discrimination practiced by local registrars. But the task of litigation, and the time consumed in preparation and proof, should be lightened in every possible fashion. No one can rightfully contend that any voting registrar should be permitted to deny the vote to any qualified citizen, anywhere in this country,

through discriminatory administration of qualifying tests, or upon the basis of minor errors in filling out a complicated form which seeks only information. Yet the Civil Rights Commission, and the cases brought by the Department of Justice, have compiled one discouraging example after another of obstacles placed in the path of Negroes seeking to register to vote at the same time that other applicants experience no difficulty whatsoever. Qualified Negroes, including those with college degrees, have been denied registration for their inability to give a reasonable interpretation of the Constitution. They have been required to complete their applications with unreasonable precision, or to secure registered voters to vouch for their identity, or to defer to white persons who want to register ahead of them, or they are otherwise subjected to exasperating delays. Yet uniformity of treatment is required by the dictates of both the Constitution and fairplay—and this proposed statute, therefore, seeks to spell out that principle to ease the difficulties and delays of litigation. Limiting the proposal to voting qualifications in elections for Federal offices alone will clearly eliminate any constitutional conflict.

Fourth, completion of the sixth grade should, with respect to Federal elections, constitute a presumption that the applicant is literate. Literacy tests pose especially difficult problems in determining voter qualification. The essentially subjective judgment involved in each individual case, and the difficulty of challenging that judgment, have made literacy tests one of the cruelest and most abused of all voter qualification tests. The incidence of such abuse can be eliminated, or at least drastically curtailed, by the proposed legislation providing that proof of completion of the sixth grade constitutes a presumption that the applicant is literate.

Finally, the 87th Congress, after 20 years of effort, passed and referred to the States for ratification a constitutional amendment to prohibit the levying of poll taxes as a condition to voting. Already 13 States have ratified the proposed amendment and in 3 more 1 body of the legislature has acted. I urge every State legislature to take prompt action on this matter and to outlaw the poll tax—which has too long been an outmoded and arbitrary bar to voting participation by minority groups and others—as the 24th amendment to the Constitution. This measure received bipartisan sponsorship and endorsement in the Congress—and I shall continue to work with Governors and legislative leaders of both parties in securing adoption of the anti-poll-tax amendment.

II. EDUCATION

Nearly 9 years have elapsed since the Supreme Court ruled that State laws requiring or permitting segregated schools violate the Constitution. That decision represented both good law and good judgment—it was both legally and morally right. Since that time it has become increasingly clear that neither violence nor legalistic evasions will be tolerated as a means of thwarting court-ordered desegregation, that closed schools are not an answer, and that responsible communities are able to handle the desegregation process in a calm and sensible manner. This is as it should be, for, as I stated to the Nation at the time of the Mississippi violence last September:

"Our Nation is founded on the principle that observance of the law is the eternal safeguard of liberty, and defiance of the law is the surest road to tyranny. The law which we obey includes the final rulings of the courts, as well as the enactments of our legislative bodies. Even among law-abiding men, few laws are universally loved—but they are uniformly respected and not resisted.

"Americans are free to disagree with the law but not to disobey it. For in a government of laws and not of men, no man, however prominent or powerful, and no mob, however unruly or boisterous, is entitled to defy a court of law. If this country should ever reach the point where any man or group of men,, by force or threat of force, could long defy the commands of our courts and our Constitution, then no law would stand free from doubt, no judge would be sure of his writ, and no citizen would be safe from his neighbors."

The shameful violence which accompanied but did not prevent the end of segregation at the University of Mississippi was an exception. State-supported universities in Georgia and South Carolina met this test in recent years with calm and maturity, as did the State-supported universities of Virginia, North Carolina, Florida, Texas, Louisiana, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Kentucky in earlier years. In addition, progress toward the desegregation of education at all levels has made other notable and peaceful strides, including the following forward moves in the last 2 years alone:

Desegregation plans have been put into effect peacefully in the public schools of Atlanta, Dallas, New Orleans, Memphis, and elsewhere, with over 60 school districts desegregated last year—frequently with the help of Federal persuasion and consultation, and in every case without incident or disorder.

Teacher training institutes financed under the National Defense Education Act are no longer held in colleges which refuse to accept students without regard to race, and this has resulted in a number of institutions opening their doors to Negro applicants voluntarily.

The same is now true of Institutes conducted by the National Science Foundation.

Beginning in September of this year, under the aid to impacted area school program, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will initiate a program of providing onbase facilities so that children living on military installations will no longer be required to attend segregated schools at Federal expense. These children should not be victimized by segregation merely because their fathers chose to serve in the Armed Forces and were assigned to an area where schools are operated on a segregated basis.

In addition, the Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have succeeded in obtaining voluntary desegregation in many other districts receiving impacted area school assistance; and, representing the Federal interest, have filed lawsuits to end segregation in a number of other districts.

The Department of Justice has also intervened to seek the opening of public schools in the case of Prince Edward County, Va., the only county in the Nation where there are no public schools, and where a bitter effort to thwart court decrees requiring desegregation has caused nearly 1,500 out of 1,800 school-age Negro children to go without any education for more than 3 years.

In these and other areas within its jurisdiction, the executive branch will continue its efforts to fulfill the constitutional objective of an equal, nonsegregated, educational opportunity for all children.

Despite these efforts, however, progress toward primary and secondary school desegregation has still been too slow, often painfully so. Those children who are being denied their constitutional rights are suffering a loss which can never be regained, and which will leave scars which can never be fully healed. I have in the past expressed my belief that the full authority of the Federal Government should be placed behind the achievement of school desegregation, in accordance with the command of the Constitution. One obvious area of Federal action is to help facilitate the transition to desegregation in those areas which are conforming or wish to conform their practices to the law.

Many of these communities lack the resources necessary to eliminate segregation in their public schools while at the same time assuring that educational standards will be maintained and improved. The problem has been compounded by the fact that the climate of mistrust in many communities has left many school officials with no qualified source to turn to for information and advice.

There is a need for technical assistance by the Office of Education to assist local communities in preparing and carrying out desegregation plans, including the supplying of information on means which have been employed to desegregate other schools successfully. There is also need for financial assistance to enable those communities which desire and need such assistance to employ specialized personnel to cope with problems occasioned by desegregation and to train school personnel to facilitate the transition to desegregation. While some facilities for providing this kind of assistance are presently available in the Office of Education, they are not adequate to the task.

I recommend, therefore, a program of Federal technical and financial assistance to aid school districts in the process of desegregation in compliance with the Constitution.

Finally, it is obvious that the unconstitutional and outmoded concept of "separate but equal" does not belong in the Federal statute books. This is particularly true with respect to higher education, where peaceful desegregation has been underway in practically every State for some time. I repeat, therefore, this administration's recommendation of last year that this phrase be eliminated from the Morrill Land Grant College Act.

III. EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF THE COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The Commission on Civil Rights, established by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, has been in operation for more than 5 years and is scheduled to expire on November 30, 1963. During this time it has fulfilled its statutory mandate by investigating deprivations of the right to vote and denials of equal protection of the laws in education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice. The Commission's reports and recommendations have provided the basis for remedial action by both Congress and the executive branch.

There are, of course, many areas of denials of rights yet to be fully investigated. But the Commission is now in a position to provide even more useful service to the Nation. As more communities evidence a willingness to face frankly their problems of racial discrimination, there is an increasing need for expert guidance and assistance in devising workable programs for civil rights progress. Agencies of State and local government, industry, labor, and community organizations, when faced with problems of segregation and racial tensions, all can benefit from information about how these problems have been solved in the past. The opportunity to seek an experienced and sympathetic forum on a voluntary basis can often open channels of communication between contending parties and help bring about the conditions necessary for orderly progress. And the use of public hearings—to contribute to public knowledge of the requirements of the Constitution and national policy—can create in these communities the atmosphere of understanding which is indispensable to peaceful and permanent solution to racial problems.

The Federal Civil Rights Commission has the experience and capability to make a significant contribution toward achieving these objectives. It has advised the executive branch not only about desirable policy changes but about the administrative techniques needed to make these changes effective. If, however, the Commission is to perform these additional services effectively, changes in its authorizing statute are necessary and it should be placed on a more stable and more permanent basis. A proposal that the Commission be made a permanent body would be a pessimistic prediction that our problems will never be solved. On the other hand, to let the experience and knowledge gathered by the Commission go to waste, by allowing it to expire, or by extending its life only for another 2 years with no change in responsibility, would ignore the very real contribution this agency can make toward meeting our racial problems. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress authorize the Civil Rights Commission to serve as a national civil rights clearinghouse providing information, advice, and technical assistance to any requesting agency, private or public; that in order to fulfill these new responsibilities, the Commisison be authorized to concentrate its activities upon those problems within the scope of its statute which most need attention; and that the life of the Commission be extended for a term of at least 4 more years.

IV. EMPLOYMENT

Racial discrimination in employment is especially injurious both to its victims and to the national economy. It results in a great waste of human resources and creates serious community problems. It is, moreover, inconsistent with the democratic principle that no man should be denied employment commensurate with his abilities because of his race or creed or ancestry.

The President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, reconstituted by Executive order in early 1961, has, under the leadership of the Vice President, taken significant steps to eliminate racial discrimination by those who do business with the Government. Hundreds of companies, covering 17 million jobs, have agreed to stringent nondiscriminatory provisions now standard in all Government contracts. One hundred and four industrial concerns, including most of the Nation's major employers, have in addition signed agreements calling for an affirmative attack on discrimination in employment; and 117 labor unions, representing about 85 percent of the membership of the AFL–CIO, have signed similar agreements with the Committee. Comprehensive compliance machinery has been instituted to enforce these agreements. The Committee has received over 1,300 complaints in 2 years, more than in the entire 7½ years of the Committee's prior existence, and has achieved corrective action on 72 percent of the cases handled—a heartening and unprecedented record. Significant results have been achieved in placing Negroes with contractors who previously employed whites only—and in the elevation of Negroes to a far higher proportion of professional, technical and supervisory jobs. Let me repeat my assurances that these provisions in Government contracts and the voluntary nondiscrimination agreements will be carefully monitored and strictly enforced.

In addition, the Federal Government, as an employer, has continued to pursue a policy of nondiscrimination in its employment and promotion programs. Negro high school and college graduates are now being intensively sought out and recruited. A policy of not distinguishing on grounds of race is not limited to the appointment of distinguished Negroes—although they have in fact been appointed to a record number of high policymaking, judicial, and administrative posts. There has also been a significant increase in the number of Negroes employed in the middle and upper grades of the career Federal service. In jobs paying $4,500 to $10,000 annually, for example, there was an increase of 26 percent in the number of Negroes during the year ending June 30, 1962, over three times the rate of increase for all employees in those grades during the year. Career civil servants will continue to be employed and promoted on the basis of merit, and not color, in every agency of the Federal Government, including all regional and local offices.

This Government has also adopted a new executive policy with respect to the organization of its employees. As part of this policy, only those Federal employee labor organizations that do not discriminate on grounds of race or color will be recognized.

Outside of Government employment, the National Labor Relations Board is now considering cases involving charges of racial discrimination against a number of union locals. I have directed the Department of Justice to participate in these cases and to urge the National Labor Relations Board to take appropriate action against racial discrimination in unions. It is my hope that administrative action and litigation will make unnecessary the enactment of legislation with respect to union discrimination.

V. PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

No act is more contrary to the spirit of our democracy and Constitution—or more rightfully resented by a Negro citizen who seeks only equal treatment—than the barring of that citizen from restaurants, hotels, theaters, recreational areas, and other public accommodations and facilities.

Wherever possible, this administration has dealt sternly with such acts. In 1961, the Justice Department and the Interstate Commerce Commission successfully took action to bring an end to discrimination in rail and bus facilities. In 1962, the 15 airports still maintaining segregated facilities were persuaded to change their practices, 13 voluntarily and 2 others after the Department of Justice brought legal action. As a result of these steps, systematic segregation in interstate transportation has virtually ceased to exist. No doubt isolated instances of discrimination in transportation terminals, restaurants, restrooms, and other facilities will continue to crop up, but any such discrimination will be dealt with promptly.

In addition, restaurants and public facilities in buildings leased by the Federal Government have been opened up to all Federal employees in areas where previously they had been segregated. The General Services Administration no longer contracts for the lease of space in office buildings unless such facilities are available to all Federal employees without regard to race. This move has taken place without fanfare and practically without incident; and full equality of facilities will continue to be made available to all Federal employees in every State.

National parks, forests and other recreation areas, and the District of Columbia Stadium, are open to all without regard to race. Meetings sponsored by the Federal Government or addressed by Federal appointees are held in hotels and halls which do not practice discrimination or segregation. The Department of Justice has asked the Supreme Court to reverse the convictions of Negroes arrested for seeking to use public accommodations; and took action both through the courts and the use of Federal marshals to protect those who were testing the desegregation of transportation facilities.

In these and other ways, the Federal Government will continue to encourage and support action by State and local communities, and by private entrepreneurs, to assure all members of the public equal access to all public accommodations. A country with a "color blind" Constitution, and with no castes or classes among its citizens, cannot afford to do less.

VI. OTHER USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

The basic standard of nondiscrimination, which I earlier stated has now been applied by the executive branch to every area of its activity—affects other programs not listed above:

Although President Truman ordered the armed services of this country desegregated in 1948, it was necessary in 1962 to bar segregation formally and specifically in the Army and Air Force Reserves and in the training of all civil defense workers.

A new Executive order on housing, as unanimously recommended by the Civil Rights Commission in 1959, prohibits discrimination in the sale, lease, or use of housing owned or constructed in the future by the Federal Government or guaranteed under the FHA, VA, and Farmers Home Administration program. With regard to existing property owned or financed through the Federal Government, the departments and agencies are directed to take every appropriate action to promote the termination of discriminatory practices that may exist. A President's Committee on Equal Housing Opportunity was created by the order to implement its provisions.

A Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces has been established to investigate and make recommendations regarding the treatment of minority groups, with special emphasis on off-base problems.

The U.S. Coast Guard Academy now has Negro students for the first time in its 87 years of existence.

The Department of Justice has increased its prosecution of police brutality cases, many of them in Northern States, and is assisting State and local police departments in meeting this problem.

State employee merit systems operating programs financed with Federal funds are now prohibited from discriminating on the basis of race or color.

The Justice Department is challenging the constitutionality of the separate but equal provisions which permit hospitals constructed with Federal funds to discriminate racially in the location of patients and the acceptance of doctors.

In short, the executive branch of the Federal Government, under this administration and in all of its activities, now stands squarely behind the principle of equal opportunity, without segregation or discrimination, in the employment of Federal funds, facilities, and personnel. All officials at every level are charged with the responsibility of implementing this principle and a formal interdepartmental action group, under White House chairmanship, oversees this effort and follows through on each directive. For the first time, the full force of Federal executive authority is being exerted in the battle against race discrimination.

CONCLUSION

The various steps which have been undertaken or which are proposed in this message do not constitute a final answer to the problems of race discrimination in this country. They do constitute a list of priorities—steps which can be taken by the executive branch and measures which can be enacted by the 88th Congress. Other measures directed toward these same goals will be favorably commented on and supported, as they have in the past—and they will be signed, if enacted into law.

In addition, it is my hope that this message will lend encouragement to those State and local governments—and to private organizations, corporations, and individuals—who share my concern over the gap between our precepts and our practices. This is an effort in which every individual who asks what he can do for his country should be able and willing to take part. It is important, for example, for private citizens and local governments to support the State Department's effort to end the discriminatory treatment suffered by too many foreign diplomats, students, and visitors to this country. But it is not enough to treat those from other lands with equality and dignity—the same treatment must be afforded to every American citizen.

The program outlined in this message should not provide the occasion for sectional bitterness. No State or section of this Nation can pretend a self-righteous role, for every area has its own civil rights problems.

Nor should the basic elements of this program be imperiled by partisanship. The proposals put forth are consistent with the platforms of both parties and with the positions of their leaders. Inevitably there will be disagreement about means and strategy. But I would hope that on issues of constitutional rights and freedom, as in matters affecting our national security, there is a fundamental unity among us that will survive partisan debate over particular issues.

The centennial of the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation is an occasion for celebration, for a sober assessment of our failures, and for rededication to the goals of freedom. Surely there could be no more meaningful observance of the centennial than the enactment of effective civil rights legislation and the continuation of effective executive action.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 28, 1693.*

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the body of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the level attained by a democratic civilization is revealed in important part by the state of those rights which protect the citizenry from oppressive action.

Many of our civil rights were wrung from past governments by our ancestors.

Mr. Speaker, precious indeed is the American right to vote. This is the wellspring of opportunity in our society. Yet, as long as any American is denied the right to vote because of race or color, our civilization will not attain full development.

The President's message on civil rights, received today by the Congress, sets forth several practical proposals in this important area and in other areas of civil rights.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be pointed out at this time, that the many Executive actions taken in the last 2 years in the area of civil rights have been important contributions. I applaud the President for his many Executive achievements. No other administration in our times has a comparable record in this important area.

CIVIL RIGHTS OR CIVIL WRONGS

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the body of the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe the constitutional rights of all Americans should be guaranteed and protected. I am afraid, however, that the question of civil rights has become such a political football that what is developing is a set of civil wrongs practiced on the majority in the zeal to win the votes of minorities. We cannot guarantee civil rights to minorities by riding roughshod over the Constitution, by setting race against race, by throwing States rights out the window, and dispensing with all traditions of a system under which all people of every race, color and creed have made greater advances than in any other country in the world.

There are none who will deny the Negro has suffered abuses. There are none so base as to deplore the excesses which have occurred, but why is it so necessary for the Kennedy administration in trying to prove its every point to downgrade the United States? Nowhere in the President's message does he recognize the progress the Negro has made in America. He does not point out how far we have moved ahead in opening up new educational opportunities, new employment opportunities. He ignores the many fine neighborhoods everywhere in this Nation where people of many races who have the initiative and the willingness to sacrifice and build have created beautiful homes and enjoy the best of living conditions. This is not to say we should not constantly strive to do better, to maintain a national climate which affords greater opportunity for all our people.

We will not create this climate, we will not really help the Negro through force, through the use of Federal troops, through thought control, through court edicts. The Negro can only suffer setbacks in the progress he is steadily making if we continue to make a political football of civil rights. Unless we protect the civil rights of all Americans, not just the minorities, we cannot guarantee the civil rights of any group.

Just for a moment let us consider some aspects the President conveniently overlooks. There is a constant cry for more Federal jobs for Negroes. Yet, what are the facts? The latest available figures I have been able to secure are from the Department of Labor, Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. This report shows Negroes in the Federal service make up 13 percent of the total working force. The Post Office Department had 15 percent, Veterans' Administration, 19 percent, and General Services Administration, 16 percent. Negroes represent about 10 percent of the population of the United States. Certainly no one can claim they are being discriminated against in Federal employment, where we find competent Negroes in jobs at every level of government.

The South has been made the whipping boy of the civil rights question and completely ignored are the great strides made in the improvement of the lot of the Negro in the South. Those liberals who scream loudest for integration and complete civil rights in the South will have no part of it in the North. Minor racial incidents in the South are banner headlines in newspapers throughout the world, but there is a strange silence over major race riots in Chicago, New York, and here in Washington, D.C., on last Thanksgiving Day. And what of the segregation practices of many of the labor unions who will deny acceptance of the Negro in their organization, but will demand that all the rest of society accept him?

Negro leaders, too, must alter their thinking if they truly believe in the cause of improving conditions for their race. In the millions of words in the newspapers, magazines and over radio and TV, calling for more civil rights for the Negro, greater opportunity for the Negro, better homes for the Negro, rare it is indeed for any prominent Negro leader to remind his fellows that with rights there is also responsibility. There must be some effort on the part of people to help themselves. People cannot move ahead by absolving themselves of all responsibility for every irresponsible action by claiming that all Negro lawlessness is caused by lack of job opportunity, lack of recreational facilities, lack of good homes. Granted that environment is a contributing cause to delinquency in many cases among all races, there are too many crimes committed by Negroes from good homes with good opportunities to make this a blanket excuse for every delinquent and criminal belonging to a minority.

We cannot call it civil rights when the President issues Executive orders, which in my opinion are unconstitutional, taking away the rights of the owners of private property by making it illegal for them to rent or sell to persons of their own choice in a free market.

Mr. Speaker, the best way we can help the Negro and all minority groups is for all of us to pull together to return this Nation to constitutional limited Government so that the people at the State and local level can settle many of the problems we now face. I am still of the firm belief that the good that is in the hearts and minds of most Americans will furnish the prescription for justice for all people if friends and neighbors can attack their problems without Federal interference and agitation by those who, for political gain or other reasons, find it advantageous to stir up unrest and racial tensions. Patience, courage, goodwill, a belief in the American dream and the ideals which inspired the founding of this great Nation will solve the problems for the minorities. Political pressure, the subverting of the Constitution in order to build a political dynasty, the appeal to racism in the mad quest for power can only slow the progress which is already being made in behalf of minorities.

While we are on the subject of civil rights, how about the civil rights of the millions of workers of this country who are being deprived of their rights by ruthless and autocratic labor leaders? How about the civil rights of the people of Cleveland and New York who have been denied their newspapers for months because of the action of a small group of labor leaders? How about the civil rights of hundreds of thousands of workers who were thrown off their jobs and other countless thousands of our citizens whose rights were ignored by the reckless action of the recent dock workers' strike? If we believe in civil rights, let us be for civil rights all the way. As a part of these remarks I would like to include editorials by David Lawrence in the U.S. News & World Report:

Anarchy

(By David Lawrence)

Moral decay in our political system is responsible for the anarchy that prevails today in labor-management relations.

We prate about civil rights. We send Federal troops to coerce a State university to admit a student. We file suits in the courts to make sure that certain citizens are not denied voting rights. But we shut our eyes when the whole governmental system is used to blackmail an employer into accepting the exorbitant demands of labor unions.

The longshoremen's strike was settled by Government intervention, but can it be said that "free" collective bargaining characterized the settlement?

The newspaper strikes in Cleveland and New York have been frowned upon by public opinion in both cities and in the Nation wherever the facts have been revealed. But the right of a dictator in one union—backed by other unions—to hold out until some of the employers are tottering on the edge of bankruptcy has not been challenged in the courts. No "inherent" powers are invoked by the Attorney General to sustain an employer's civil right—the opportunity to survive.

Isn't there a civil right which says that no citizen can conspire with another to destroy a man's business?

Isn't there a civil right which says that nobody can conspire with someone else to prevent another citizen from crossing a picket line either to take a job or to buy goods from a company involved in a strike?

Isn't there a civil right which says that a union having a bare majority of the employees in a bargaining unit has no right to represent other citizens who refuse to join such a union?

Isn't there a civil right which says that a man cannot be forced to accept the tenets of any church or organization or political party? So why must he be fired from his job because he will not join a union?

Isn't there a civil right which says that a citizen who is physically threatened or attacked in a labor dispute may obtain redress?

Yet, writing in the January 21 issue of this magazine, J. Mack Swigert, of Cincinnati, Ohio, one of the foremost authorities on labor law in the country, says:

"Labor-violence cases, when presented in police court, are customarily continued until the strike is over and then dismissed. The reluctance of many courts to issue and to enforce injunctions against unions is well known to lawyers.

"Police assigned to strike duty often look the other way when union violence occurs. Even the FBI is reluctant to intervene in labor disputes. Many States have statutes forbidding or limiting the use of State highway police in such disputes. A tendency to lean in the direction of the union when the question is a close one is observed throughout almost the entire hierarchy of public officials.

"Favorable treatment of unions is particularly marked in the case of State and Federal administrative officials and employees who deal directly with labor problems.

"State departments of labor, workmen's compensation commissions, unemployment commissions, industrial commissions, mediation boards, and labor boards are almost uniformly staffed with union members or former union officials or persons otherwise closely associated with and sympathetic to the union movement. This is true even

though these agencies are charged with the protection of all workers, including the great majority who are nonunion.

"Similarly, the U.S. Department of Labor, the National Labor Relations Board, and, to a considerable extent, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, as well as other agencies dealing with labor problems, are staffed largely with union members or sympathizers.

"Since the advent of the Kennedy administration, the National Labor Relations Board has openly moved in a direction very helpful to organized labor.

"The unions now have a clear majority of union sympathizers on the Board.

"During the past 2 years, under the leadership of the new Chairman of the Board, numerous precedents have been overruled and discarded, and the labor law has been substantially changed without legislation.

"Largely because of public sympathy and effective political action, unions not only benefit from favorable legislation, but also are singled out for special and favorable treatment from courts, arbitrators, law officers, and other public officials.

"As politicians make laws and enforce them, this idea that unions can influence the direction of thousands or even millions of votes leads politicians who want to keep their jobs or advance in their profession to bend in the union direction when a union issue is before them."

How can we shut our eyes to the true meaning of this indictment? On these issues, we seem to have experienced a moral deterioration as we drift into a state of anarchy in the national economy.

A BILL TO CREATE A JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today submitted a bill to create a Joint Committee on the Budget. We have discussed the possibility of such a joint committee in the past, but we have not acted. The time has come, however, when we can no longer ignore the pressing need for the greater cooperation and efficiency that would result from the work of such a group.

A Joint Committee on the Budget would consider the President's messages on the state of the Union and Economic Report, would inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of our Government, and would report its findings to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees with recommendations that would expedite the handling of appropriations requests.

Thus far this session we have received a request from the President for appropriations in the next fiscal year in the amount of more than $98 billion, the largest peacetime budget ever submitted. While we attempt to analyze this budget request, we must also consider the possible effects of proposed tax cuts and reforms. The Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate must each wade through volumes of information, often duplicating activities, and resulting in needless delays.

Last year's budget message predicted a surplus of $500 million by the reasoning that revenues would exceed expenditures. It is now conceded that when June rolls around we will have a deficit of at least $8 or $9 billion. This represents an error in judgment comparable to 10 percent of the total expenditures of the Government for the year. This clearly indicates the need for further checking, evaluation, examination, and closer cooperation between the two Houses of Congress.

With the complexities and size of modern-day budgets, the American people expect and should get the most efficient evaluations and considerations possible when we appropriate their money.

A Joint Committee on the Budget would greatly improve the surveillance over the expenditures of public funds and would be a positive step toward the elimination of extravagance, waste, and needless or excessive appropriations.

We need harmony and cooperation between the respective Appropriations Committees of the two Houses of Congress. This bill would provide a climate conducive to such cooperation. It is only reasonable that we all will benefit when the two groups work together, get the same information, to enable them to more intelligently evaluate the many requests before them.

We already have a precedent for such a joint committee. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has been in operation for a number of years and has demonstrated how much efficiency can be effected through cooperation.

These same efficiencies can be effected in the area of the budget, and I respectfully urge the adoption of this measure to bring such a joint committee into being.

BULGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 3d, it will have been 83 years since the Bulgarian people received their independence from the imperial Russian Government and the Ottoman Empire; ending a 500-year struggle.

Bulgarian liberation followed the self-sacrificing struggle led by such patriots as George Rakovski, Vasil Levski, and Christo Botev and was preceded by a national uprising which won the sympathy of the world.

The liberation of Bulgaria was followed by the election of a freely elected national assembly which adopted the Tirnovo Constitution, one of the great liberal doctrines of all times.

Ignored by the present Communist regime, the constitution has always been the rallying point for democratic forces opposing communism in Bulgaria.

The Bulgarian people, Mr. Speaker, have remarkably demonstrated what can be done in a free country.

September 8, 1944 was a sad day for freedom loving people throughout the world. Bulgaria was invaded by Russian armies and the Bulgarian democratic government coalition of the National Agrarian Union and the democratic party was overthrown. A Communist controlled government was established and Bulgaria became another satellite to Communist Russia.

The story since that time has been the usual tragic one. We can only hope as we reflect upon the misery that ensnarls Communist Bulgaria today, that the great and unconquerable will that the Bulgarian people have demonstrated in the past will reassert itself, and freedom will again encompass the country.

CUBAN CAVES

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the presence of a Soviet bloc satellite 90 miles off our shores is sufficient cause for alarm from the standpoint of its possible use as a base for subversion. Given the attitudes of Fidel Castro and his Communist friends, it would be improvident to think otherwise. By the same token, we cannot overlook the possibility of Castro's Soviet and Chinese Communist allies using Cuba for similar purposes.

However, the presence of intermediate range missiles capable of delivering either a nuclear or chemical attack upon the United States would pose an even graver problem for this Nation—one requiring steel nerves and costly countermeasures.

FORTY-SIX MISSILES IN CUBA?

The U.S. News & World Report of February 4, 1963, has an item on page 38 entitled "Eyewitness: '46 Medium-Range Missiles Still on the Island.'" According to this item, the Soviets originally sent 88 medium-range missiles to Cuba, of which only 42 were withdrawn last fall. The complete item is as follows:

An authoritative source who has just left Cuba reported this:

My people counted 88 medium-range Soviet missiles in Cuba, of which only 42 were taken out, by Russian count. That leaves 46 missiles still on the island.

There are 10,000 Russian troops and 12,000 non-Russian Communists in "international brigades."

Why did the United States stop its pressure after the week of confrontation over missiles?

On the Saturday night before the agreement with Russia, October 27, 1962, there was panic in the upper circles of the Castro government.

Officials were running for cover. They were quietly asking diplomats for asylum, trying to get into embassies. They were trying to get places for themselves and families on ships leaving Havana.

Now that the United States has permitted Castro to demobilize, morale has gone back up. My judgment is that the winners of the showdown in October were the Russians and Castro, and that the loser was the United States.

The average Cuban now says, "I hate the Communists, but I also hate the United States." His hatred is for being let down twice, in the invasion at the Bay of Pigs, and last October.

The economy and administration of Cuba are a catastrophe. Housing projects are falling apart. There are no new shoes. But the police state and the Communist military forces make an uprising from the inside impossible.

I have no knowledge as to the accuracy of the above item. However, if there are in fact 46 missiles left in Cuba, they have to be somewhere. Caves are the most likely storage area, barring the possibility of a form of camouflage not yet detectable by our current air surveillance techniques.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE REPORT

So far as I know, little information has been published recently about the size and number of caves in Cuba. On February 7, 1963, I asked the Legislative Reference Service to search the Library of Congress for references to Cuban caves. On February 19, 1963, I received the following reply:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1963.

To: HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND.
From: Natural Resources Division.
Subject: Number and sizes of the caves in Cuba.

Response is made to your inquiry of February 7, 1963 relative to caves in Cuba.

Inquiry was made of the Geological Survey concerning caves in Cuba. The Survey indicated it had no specific knowledge as to the number and sizes of the caves. However, they reported that Dr. Charles Park, Jr., Dean, Earth Sciences, University of Stanford, Stanford, Calif., might have information, since he carried out a limestone study in Cuba.

A search was made of material available in the Library of Congress. This search did not reveal any recently published material indicating the number and sizes of the caves in Cuba. However, materials are available which discuss various aspects of caves found in Cuba. The source of listed articles in Spanish is the "Handbook of Latin American Studies," volumes 14–24, 1948–62. The following pertinent materials are enclosed:

"A Guide to the Cave of Bellamar," E. Guiteras. A travelog of the cave is presented.

"Caves in World History," National Speleological Society; Bulletin No. 5, October 1943, page 11. Caves in Cuba and locations.

Eigenmann, Carl H. "Cave Vertebrates of America." Washington, D.C., 1909, pages 188–201. References to caves in Cuba.

"The Idol of the Cave," M. R. Harrington. Natural history, vol. 60, No. 7. September 1951, pages 313–318, 335. Account of exploration of a cave at La Patana Cabo Maisi Cuba.

"La Espeleologia en Cuba," JNAE/R. Junio 1960, pages 39–103. Summary of cave explorations. Greater portion devoted to role of caves and of speleology in the recent revolution.

"La Caverna del sol," Antonio Munez Jimenez. INRA, 2:3, Marzo 1961, pages 58–67. Pictographs from the Cueva de Garcia Robion in Havana province—location is secret—military installation.

In addition you may wish to refer at some later date to the following magazine articles which is currently in the bindery and consequently not immediately available.

"El archiepelago de las," Cavernas. INR, 1:5, Mayo 1960, pages 46–55. Discusses painted pictographs on the roof of the Cueva de la Isla, Punta del Este, Isla de Pinos; also Cueva de Ramos in Punta de Caguanos, north of las Villas.

The following is a listing of articles reportedly relating to caves in Cuba but which are not a part of the permanent collections of the Library of Congress.

Alvarez Conde, Jose:

Las cavernas funerarias de Cayo. "La Agriada." Habana, 1952, 34 pages. Account of discovery of burial caves off north coast of Cuba.

"Fomento: nuevo centro de hallazgos arqueologicos indigenas." Tremestre, volume 3, No. 2. Abril-Junio, pages 209–226. Cave burial in central Cuba.

"Revision indo-arqueologica de la provincia de Las Villas." Habana, Junta Nacional de Arqueologia y Etnologia, 1961, 175 pages. Detailed summary of the sites and excavations in Las Villas Province, municipality. Includes hitherto unpublished work by the author.

Herrera Fritot, Rene and Manuel Rivero de la Calle. "La cueva funeraria de Carbonera, Matanzas." Contribucion de la sociedad Espeleologica de Cuba al Decimo Congreso Nacional de Historia. Habana, 1954, 45 pages. Excavations of a Ciboney cave on the north coast of Cuba in 1950.

"Rivera de la Calle," Manuel and Antonio Nunez Jimenez. Excursiones arqueologicas a Camaguey (Santa Clara), Cuba. Universidad Central de las Villas. Departmentos de Investigaciones Antropologicas e Investigaciones Geograficas, 1958, 62 pages. Visit to a cave in Cerro de Tubaquey and to a village site in the Lomas de Guaney both in north central Cuba.

ERNEST PAPPAJOHN.

As may be seen from the foregoing, there are a number of references to Cuban caves in the Library of Congress material. In addition, I have written to Dr. Charles Park, Jr., dean of earth sciences, University of Stanford, asking him for any information he may have available on this subject.

One of the references I found very interesting in the Library of Congress compendium was a booklet entitled "Guide to the Cave of Bellamar" by Senor Eusebio Guiteras, published in 1863. This cave is located 1 mile from the Bridge of Ballen on the San Juan River near Mantanzas Bay.

Senor Guiteras describes one portion of the cave called the Galleries of the Fountains as being "2,400 feet long." It runs from "west to east, the greatest depth is 360 feet, the ground is dry, and the temperature is 80° F."

Unfortunately, the overall dimensions of the vault are not given. He goes on to say, "In principal places there are fixed lights; good paths have been opened, bridges thrown over and steps placed wherever the passage required it."

Although few measurements are given in the booklet, an unmistakable impression of hugeness is given. For example, the first hall in the cave is called the Gothic Temple. There are several others having names equally suggesting spaciousness.

Another very interesting reference to caves in Cuba appears in a book, "Cave Vertebrates of America," by Prof. Carl H. Eigenmann, professor of zoology, Indiana University. It was published in June 1909 by the Carnegie Institute of Washington, D.C. On page 189 of this work there is a diagram of the Cave of the Insurrectos, which looks rather large indeed. On page 192 Professor Eigenmann describes the Caves of Cañas in these terms:

> The caves about Cañas differ from those of the Carboneira and Alacranes. They are cistern-shaped sink-holes rather than caves in the ordinary sense of the word, but on account of the absence of soil there are no funnel-like depressions on the surface to indicate their presence. There is absolutely no general surface indication that one is in a cave country in traveling through it, and it is not until standing at the very brink of one that the presence of a cave may be suspected.

The magazine, INRA, of March 1961 has an article on "The Cave of the Sun," on page 59 with illustrations. These illustrations show possible storage for large weapons of war.

The letter I received from the Legislative Reference Service indicated that the U.S. Geological Survey has little or no information concerning caves in Cuba. The Geological Survey is a fine service and this fact in no way reflects discredit upon it.

In retrospect, it seems obvious we should have collected information concerning Cuban caves. For over 50 years prior to the Castro takeover, we had the freedom to acquire this information.

All of this suggests that our information-gathering programs in the past have sometimes lacked selectivity and impetus.

WHAT INFORMATION IS NEEDED?

Knowing what information to gather is a difficult problem. I am sure this Government has improved its information-gathering techniques since World War II. However, can anyone ever be certain as to just what will be needed in the future. I found an illustrative example of this problem in Col. Maurice Buckmaster's book "They Fought Alone." It is an example drawn from British experience at the outset of World War II. Colonel Buckmaster was charged with forming a secret British service called SOE with the mission of sabotaging French factories. The following passages show how difficult it is to foresee information needs:

> On reflection, it seemed to me that the best thing I could do was to try and remember what I could about French factories which I had visited when I was working, during 1932 to 1936, for the Ford Co. of France. My information might be out of date, but at least it was information. I drew a pile of typing paper toward me.
>
> Day after day, for 3 weeks, I dredged my brain for knowledge, noting down every conceivable thing I could about the potential, the staff and the layout of French industry. In spite of my hard work, however, I could not conceal from myself the haphazard and incomplete nature of my notes. There was no system, save a vague geographical ordering from north to south. If only there were an alphabetical list.
>
> "The 'Bottin'," I said, aloud. "Of course, the 'Bottin'." It was exactly what I had been looking for—an alphabetic thesaurus of French industry and commerce, department by department, from A to Z. It only remained to get hold of a copy. I telephoned confidently to my chief.
>
> "I'd like a copy of the 'Bottin'," I told him.
>
> "You are our 'Bottin'," I was reminded.
>
> "Somebody must have one."
>
> "That may be; I haven't managed to get hold of it."
>
> "Do I have your authority to try and get a copy?" I demanded.
>
> "Certainly, but it won't do you any good."
>
> I got through to my colonel in the intelligence corps.
>
> "Bottin? Haven't got one in the place, old boy," he announced cheerfully.
>
> "Do you mean to say that in the whole length and breadth of military intelligence there's no copy of the 'Bottin'?"
>
> "If there is, I haven't seen it," the colonel said, putting down the receiver.
>
> I thought of getting through to De Gaulle's people, but my earlier experiences of them, together with my instructions not to do anything to upset them, dissuaded me. I tried the booksellers: nothing. With some hesitation I rang through to General Templer's office. I explained my difficulty in procuring a copy of the "Bottin" and was given another extension in the war office where it was thought they might help me.
>
> "Colonel Denvers here."
>
> "Oh, this is Major Buckmaster, French section of SOE."
>
> "Of what?"
>
> I explained roughly the nature of SOE insofar as I knew it myself and then said: "I need a copy of the 'Bottin' very badly if I'm to get on with my work."
>
> "Who told you that we had a copy?"
>
> "General Templer suggested I ring you."
>
> "We're not allowed to release any of our secret material."
>
> "Why should the 'Bottin' be secret material? The Germans have got as many copies of it as they want. What's the point of keeping material from your own side that's freely available to the enemy?"
>
> "Look, old man, that's not my worry."
>
> "Well, it is my worry. Your name was given me and I really would be most grateful if you could help me."
>
> "My instructions are not to let my copy of the 'Bottin' out of my sight."
>
> "You have got a copy then?"
>
> "Possibly, possibly."
>
> "Well, sir, can I come round to your office and use it there? It would still be in your sight."
>
> "M'm, that's a thought."
>
> I went round to the war office and managed to present myself to Colonel Denvers.
>
> "I can't have you working actually in the room with me, Buckmaster," he told me. "I've put you in the little office my secretary uses for keeping her coat."
>
> "Thank you very much, sir," I replied. He showed me into the fawn partitioned office. It was quite bare except for a desk and a chair, but on the desk was a copy of the 'Bottin.' I sat down and began to go through it; to my delight I discovered, as I had hoped, a preface to each chapter which detailed the industries of the département with which it dealt. The first which really interested me was the Timken ball bearing factory, Quai Aulagnier, Asnieres, Seine. I happened to know that particular factory well.
>
> Each day I returned to the colonel's secretary's cloakroom in order to pursue my researches, comparing them with the notes I had already made and adding new details of which the names of various manufacturers and factories reminded me. After I had been working in this manner for some weeks, undisturbed either by inquiries from my commanding officer or liaison activities from other members of the SOE organization, I chanced to meet a man I knew who had something to do with the War Office library.
>
> "Are you working here now?" he demanded.
>
> "I have to," I complained, and went on to tell him about the "Bottin."
>
> "What do you mean you can't take it out of the building?"
>
> "I gather it's the only copy in the place."
>
> "Come along with me." I followed him to a large and dusty storeroom which was piled high with various out-of-date handbooks and French guides. Under the windowsill was a stack of "Bottins." "Help yourself," he suggested.
>
> I helped myself.
>
> That was the end of the only work I ever did in the War Office. I thanked Colonel Denvers for his kindness, informed him deferentially where he might replenish his slender stock of "Bottins" and repaired to Baker Street. As usual, things seemed pretty quiet there. In spite of my industrious tabulation, I was still unable fully to understand what SOE was all about or when it was going to start doing whatever it was supposed to do. Patiently, I continued my study of the "Bottin"; I had reached "P" by now.

During last fall's Cuban crisis the administration released aerial photographs of missile sites. These photographs set a praiseworthy precedent of releasing information to the American public during a crisis.

It is possible that photography of known cave entrances may exist. If available, these photographs might show any recent unusual use of such cave entrances.

If such photography exists, I suggest it would be appropriate for the administration to release it now. The precedent has been set and no one can deny the situation continues to disturb many thoughtful Americans.

Finally, if there are any private persons residing in this country who possess information on Cuban caves, I ask that they send it to the Library of Congress. Tourists, campers, cave explorers, and businessmen who spent time in Cuba may have information of this type. They should send it to:

Dr. Hugh Ellsbree, Director, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Washington 25, D.C.

A SELF-DEFEATING SUGAR POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not consume all the time allotted to me, but in an extension of remarks I will discuss at great length the unfortunate situation in which we find ourselves at the present time because of the 1962 amendments to the Sugar Act which I am sure all the Members will recall, and which resulted in the members of my committee being vilified and abused as never before in my memory during my 28 years of service here.

Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks, as our sugar situation has steadily deteriorated, there have been numerous suggestions from every quarter of the sugar community that I, as chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, take some stand on this matter. This I have thus far refused to do because it seemed to me that those officials charged with the responsibility of administering this inept parody of a sugar law had a hard enough job on their hands without those of us who had opposed its global quotas and premium recapture theories from the very first standing on the sidelines shouting "I told you so."

Now, however, it is apparent that the Department of Agriculture has lost control of the situation—that sugar prices are out of hand, and that the existing law provides no mechanism which will permit the Department of Agriculture to regain effective control of sugar prices. In fairness to the forgotten man of the 1962 Sugar Act—the American consumer—I think it is time for some plain speaking.

In New York day before yesterday the spot price of raw sugar was 6.90 cents per pound. This is 0.15 cent per pound more than 2 weeks ago; it is 0.31 cent per pound higher than it was 2 months ago; and it is 0.50 cent per pound more than refiners had to pay for raw sugar on July 13, 1962, when the Sugar Act now in effect was signed by the President. It is the highest price that American refiners have been forced to pay for raw sugar since 1924.

Speculators, apparently, do not think that, under the circumstances, this price is too high, for Tuesday, in New York on the coffee and sugar exchange, the price of futures in domestic sugar for September delivery closed at 6.90 cents per pound.

If the price of sugar should continue at the latest announced wholesale price for the remainder of 1963—and there is no assurance that it will not go higher—American consumers will pay at least $110 million more for their sugar in 1963 than they paid in 1962.

What has happened? Why do we find ourselves in this situation? The answer is relatively simple. On July 13, 1962, when the President signed the sugar law under which we are now operating, we chose to cancel the sugar insurance policy which for 30 years had assured American consumers of ample sugar supplies at a stable and reasonable price. With the enactment of that legislation we chose, figuratively and literally, to stop paying the premium on our sugar supply-price insurance and to take our chances on the world market.

When that legislation became law, the world market price of sugar was approximately 2.86 cents per pound and the proponents of the "no premium," "global quota" policy that is written into our new law apparently assumed it was going to stay forever at that low level.

On Tuesday, however, the price of world sugar was 6.2 cents per pound, f.o.b. Caribbean ports. This is 0.3 cent per pound above the New York price, when freight and import duty amounting to about 1 cent per pound are added. This means that when present shipping commitments are fulfilled, the only way for the United States to obtain additional supplies of sugar is for our price to follow the world price upward. I have no idea how far it may go.

TO PROTECT THE WELFARE OF CONSUMERS OF SUGAR

The title of the Sugar Act describes its basic purposes:

> To regulate commerce among the several States, with the territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of sugar and of those engaged in the domestic sugar producing industry; to promote the export trade of the United States; and for other purposes.

It has become painfully apparent that the Sugar Act, as it was revised last summer, and as the Committee on Agriculture warned might be the case, is no longer capable of carrying out one of its most basic objectives—"to protect the welfare of consumers of sugar." The upward surge in sugar prices is not yet fully reflected in the 5-pound bag the housewife buys at the local market. But the commercial and industrial users of sugar, who use about two-thirds of all we consume and who must fit the price of sugar into the price of their own end products, are understandably alarmed.

Their alarm is even greater, Mr. Speaker, when they realize that we have canceled our sugar price insurance, that the Department of Agriculture has lost control over U.S. sugar prices, that the present law gives it no tools with which to reestablish that control, and that from now on, as long as this sugar policy remains on the books, U.S. consumers will be at the mercy of world prices whenever those world prices go above the U.S. price level.

This is exactly the situation which the Committee on Agriculture warned against last summer when it refused to accept the administration's global quota proposal and reported to the House a bill continuing the sugar price and supply insurance which had operated so well for some 30 years.

OUR SUGAR INSURANCE POLICY

Let me be specific about what I am referring to when I discuss the insurance features of our sugar program. It is not a matter of conjecture or theory, but is written into the act itself. Section 202(d) of the Sugar Act reads:

> (d) Whenever in any year any foreign country with a quota or proration thereof of more than ten thousand short tons, raw value, fails to fill such quota or proration by more than 10 per centum and at any time during such year the world price of sugar exceeds the domestic price, the quota or proration thereof for such country for subsequent years shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount by which such country failed to fill its quota or proration thereof, unless the Secretary finds that such failure was due to crop disaster or force majeure or finds that such reduction would be contrary to the objectives of this Act. Any reduction hereunder shall be prorated in the same manner as deficits are prorated under section 204.

In plain language, this says to sugar suppliers who are enjoying the benefits of the U.S. market that they must continue to make their regular quota shipments, at our price, during periods when the world market price is higher than the U.S. price, or they will forthwith lose that part of their quota which they do not fill. This is the insurance contract for which we have been paying the premium and which we have canceled by the premium recapture provision of the 1962 amendment.

As early as June 6, 1960, in reporting out a temporary extension of the Sugar Act, the Committee on Agriculture pointed to this basic insurance feature of our Sugar Act and warned against the "penny wise but pound foolish" policy of trying to get our foreign sugar supplies at a somewhat cheaper price on an unregulated and undependable world market.

Because of the then uncertain situation in Cuba, the 1960 bill merely extended the existing provisions of the Sugar Act for 1 year without change. The committee felt, however, that the Cuban situation might require a complete reappraisal of our sugar program and, in order that Members of Congress and the public generally might have the information on which to reach a sound judgment, it devoted 39 pages of the committee report on the bill to a detailed history and analysis of the Sugar Act and related matters.

The report pointed out and documented the supply and price insurance features for which we had been paying the premium under our Sugar Act. With respect to price it said:

> An outstanding feature of the U.S. sugar program is the price stability it has brought to our domestic sugar market. Although there are fluctuations, they are within a rather narrow range—reducing uncertainties and inventory problems for consumers. Industrial users of sugar are not compelled to carry excessive sugar stocks as a hedge against a sudden large price rise, nor do they fear that the value of the working stocks they have on hand will suddenly shrink. Similarly, the American housewife can reach for sugar on her grocer's shelf with confidence not only that it will be there but also that the cost will continue to be a negligible item in the family food budget. Both the industrial user and the housewife know that the price of sugar in the United States is not only stable, but it is also reasonable by any fair standard of measurement.
>
> This has not always been the case, as is demonstrated by table 5, which shows the retail price of refined sugar from 1913 until shortly after the effective date of the 1937 Sugar Act. In June 1920, sugar reached a price of 26.7 cents per pound, and the whole period 1913–20 was marked by steady increases in sugar prices, combined with violent fluctuations. Fluctuations continued during the 1920's with a generally descending trend in prices but with prices for the first 7 years substantially above a reasonable level, as compared to the general price structure and the price of other foods. It will be noted also that even in the depression years of the early 1930's, sugar prices did not respond downward along with all other prices and the price of sugar was relatively high compared both to the general price level and consumer income.

Since the enactment of the 1937 Sugar Act, the report pointed out, the price of sugar in the United States remained remarkably stable. Although it increased gradually from 1949 to 1959, the rate of increase was far less than that of other foods and of prices in general, and had been remarkably free from periodic fluctuation. Related to the price of all foods, the report pointed out, sugar was 4.82 cents per pound in 1939 and only 4.17 cents per pound in 1959. Related to disposable personal income in the United States, sugar was 4.57 cents per pound in 1938 and was only 2.48 cents per pound in 1959—the lowest relative price of any country in the world. It quoted a study by the United Nations showing that the retail price of sugar in the United States was nearly 5 cents per pound below the median price in 121 nations around the globe.

STABILITY OF SUPPLIES

With respect to the effect of our insurance policy on supply, the report pointed out that our insurance premium had guaranteed an adequate supply of sugar, at our own price, during three specific periods when the world price of sugar was above the U.S. price.

The first of these three periods was the 6 years during and immediately following World War II, during all of which time we obtained our foreign supplies at less than the world price, and in the full amount required. During 14 months of the Korean war the world price was above our price but our offshore sugar supplies continued to come into the United States without interruption, at our domestic price, although the world price at one time was 1.85 cents per pound above the U.S. price. Again, during 6 months of the Suez crisis we received an uninterrupted flow of sugar at our price, although the world price was higher and in April 1957, was 1.34 cents per pound above the U.S. price.

In view of this stability of price and supply which we had obtained under the program of statutory foreign quotas embodied in the Sugar Act and involving, at times, the payment of a quota premium, the committee contrasted and warned against the risk of depending for our foreign sugar supplies on an uncertain and volatile world market. With respect to the world market, the committee report of June 6, 1960, said:

> The very use of the terms "world price" and "world market" are a misleading use of words. Only about 12 percent of the world's sugar production is traded on the misnamed "world market." This is essentially unwanted sugar and the trading in this small part of the world's sugar supply cannot and does not establish a true world price or reflect the actual value of sugar. However, because of the very character of this so-called world market, it is an extremely volatile market reacting violently to international tensions or to changes in supply and demand. The assumption, therefore, that the United States could buy its sugar cheaper on the world market than it is obtaining it under the Sugar Act is not necessarily valid. Not only would American consumers be the victims of the wild price fluctuations and supply uncertainties of the world sugar market, but that market might very well be higher than the existing American price under our quota system.

With respect to the quota premium—the price we pay for our sugar insurance—the report said:

> The difference between the so-called world price and the U.S. price has on occasions been called the quota premium, or more popularly, the subsidy in our sugar program. This approach is carried even further to say that the amount of protection or subsidy involved in the American sugar program is the amount of the difference in the two prices, multiplied by the amount of sugar purchased. This is an exaggerated statement of the protection afforded by the Sugar Act and is such an oversimplification of a basically complicated economic situation as to be misleading. It is obvious that the amount of quota premium or subsidy, if one exists, is not the difference between the U.S. price and the so-called world price with the Sugar Act in effect, it is the difference between the price received by supplying areas for their sugar now and the price they would receive if we had no sugar program.

In May 1962 the committee issued and gave wide distribution to a document called "History and Operations of the U.S. Sugar Program," in which it updated and slightly revised, for the information of the Congress and the general public, the material which had appeared in the 1960 committee report.

Again, the committee warned against abandoning the price and supply assurance provided by the statutory quotas of the Sugar Act for the dangers and uncertainties which it felt were inseparable from a program based upon a global quota at world market prices.

HOW STATUTORY QUOTA SYSTEM WORKED

Why did our statutory quota system work and how did it provide us with price and supply insurance? The answer is very simple. The United States offers the largest and most stable sugar market in the world. Ordinarily the price of sugar in the United States, established and controlled under the provisions of our Sugar Act, is somewhat above the so-called world price. Year in and year out, whether our price is above or below the world market, it offers sugar producers a certain market for a specific quantity of sugar at a stable and assured price.

Sugar is a long-term crop. It takes from 18 months to 3 years between the planting of the cane and the harvesting of the sugar. It is an expensive crop to produce. Clearly it is to the economic advantage of a sugar producer to know at the time he plants his cane where he will be able to sell his sugar and approximately how much he will receive for it, rather than to take his chances on an uncertain and unknown world market. In order to maintain his right to ship into this stable U.S. market, he will continue his regular quota shipments to us at our price even at times when the world market price may be substantially higher than the price he will receive in New York. It is simply sound long-range economics for him to do so and it is also sound long-range economics for the U.S. consumers of sugar to have this kind of price and supply insurance.

The first indication that the executive branch of the Government might be succumbing to the momentarily attractive but basically unsound idea of obtaining our foreign sugar supplies on an open world market came in an article in the New York Times in August 1961 quoting an unnamed person at the State Department to the effect that when the Sugar Act was extended, serious consideration should be given to abandoning the system of foreign country quotas and obtaining our sugar from foreign sources on the basis of a "global quota" and without payment of the so-called quota premium.

Casual inquiry at the State Department failed to turn up the author of any such statement and brought, instead, denial on the part of several officials that such a proposal was under consideration.

Notwithstanding these denials, members of the Committee on Agriculture, well aware of the value to U.S. consumers of the insurance we had been purchasing with our quota premium, were disturbed by the newspaper story. So that there could be no misunderstanding of the committee's position on this matter, the committee unanimously adopted on September 7, 1961, the following resolution, which was transmitted to the Secretaries of Agriculture and State:

> Whereas it has come to the attention of this committee that certain officials in the executive branch of the Government are reported to favor the adoption of a "global quota" system for the importation of sugar into the United States; and
>
> Whereas the existing system under which specific import quotas are established by law has for many years operated effectively to protect domestic sugar production, assure consumers of ample sugar supplies at fair and stable prices, and to promote the export trade of the United States: Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved*, That this committee would regard with extreme disfavor any action or statement by any representative of the United States at the conference in Geneva, Switzerland, on the International Sugar Agreement which would commit the United States or imply, either directly or indirectly, any commitment on the part of the United States to adopt any system of sugar importation other than fixed statutory quotas as have heretofore operated so effectively under the Sugar Act of 1948 and previous laws.

Having delivered itself of this pronouncement with respect to global quotas and having, so it assumed, made it quite clear to the executive branch that if there were any inclinations in this direction they had better be abandoned, the committee sat back with some complacency to wait the recommendations of the executive branch, in connection with the upcoming revision and extension of the Sugar Act, as to how the foreign country quotas should be allocated.

GLOBAL QUOTAS EMERGE

Apparently, however, the advocates of the global quota theory did not read the committee's resolution for they continued their activities and succeeded in having written into the President's budget message of January 18, 1962, the following statement:

> The Sugar Act expires on June 30, 1962. Legislation will be proposed extending it with substantial revisions to bring this program into line with the greatly changed world sugar situation. Under this legislation the difference between the domestic and world price of sugar, which is currently received by foreign suppliers of sugar, will be retained by the United States to the extent permitted by existing international agreements, with an estimated increase in 1963 budget receipts of $180 million.

Although the President did not mention global quotas but only recapture of the quota premium, the two are inseparable. A country quota is of no value, either to the supplying country or to the United States, if there is no incentive to fulfill that quota by steady shipments of sugar into our market in foul weather as well as in fair. Recapture of the so-called quota premium would have removed this incentive. It would cancel the insurance.

On February 15, 1962, the Director of the Department of Agriculture's Sugar Division, in a major speech before the Sugar Club of New York, disclosed the details of the proposed global quota and premium recapture scheme. The members of the Committee on Agriculture and the whole sugar community of the United States were shocked, not so much by the proposal itself, as by the flimsy arguments which were advanced in its support.

This plan, it was said, would provide greater flexibility of supply and greater assurance of price, when the speaker well knew that the world sugar market is one of the most undependable markets in the world.

With Cuba out of the supply picture, it was said, there was no other country to which we could turn with assurance for our 3 million tons of foreign sugar—in spite of the fact that in the crop year 1961–62 Western Hemisphere countries outside of Cuba and the United States produced 11,749,000 tons of sugar and one country alone, Brazil, more than 4 million tons.

Premium recapture and global quotas, it was stated, would give us greater assurance of supplies, although the sugar would have to be procured from the very same countries which might expect country quotas, and at a price offering no incentive to ship to the United States instead of to some other country.

It implied that American consumers would be saved the quota premiums which were really "foreign relief expenditures by American consumers" although there was nothing in the proposal which would reduce the price of sugar to American consumers by even $1 of the premium recapture and there was the great danger—as we have now discovered—that the scheme might prove extremely costly to consumers.

Before the 1st session of the 87th Congress adjourned in the fall of 1961, I had announced that, in order to give the Congress ample time to consider new sugar legislation before the expiration of the existing law on June 30, 1962, the Committee on Agriculture would begin hearings on sugar legislation as soon as possible after the convening of the 2d session of the 87th Congress in January 1962. In furtherance of this objective, I asked both the Department of Agriculture and the domestic sugar industry to have their recommendations ready for the committee before the convening of the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

The Department agreed to have its recommendations in our hands by December 1, 1961, then postponed the date to the end of December, then told us they would have their recommendations to us by the time Congress convened, but when that time arrived indefinitely postponed the submission of their recommendations on sugar.

The speech of the Director of the Sugar Branch in New York on February 15, 1962, at least served to explain the long delay by the Department in submitting its recommendations. It was apparent from that speech that a struggle had been going on within the administration between the proponents of the premium recapture, global quota theory and those who wanted to retain the basic insurance features of our then existing sugar law, and that the global quota advocates had won out.

PRESSURE FOR GLOBAL QUOTAS

Thereafter, while the committee waited impatiently for recommendations from the Department of Agriculture, there followed a long series of meetings between representatives of the Department of Agriculture and of the Department of State, and representatives of the domestic sugar industry—both producers and consumers. The basic purpose of these meetings was to try to persuade the domestic sugar industry to back the global quota, premium recapture theory to which the administration had by that time apparently committed itself. In spite of all the inducements which could be held out by the Government spokesmen, the industry representatives refused to lend their support to a proposal which they considered to be essentially unsound.

Finally, about May 1, when there was still no recommendation forthcoming from the Department of Agriculture with respect to sugar, I announced that hearings on sugar legislation would start on May 15, whether the recommendations of the Department had been received or not.

Faced with this deadline, the Department finally submitted its recommendations on May 14. The Department's recommendations were that the existing foreign country quotas, with the exception of the Philippines and Cuba, should be continued at the low level provided in the old law but that even these quotas should be eliminated over a period of 5 years by applying an import fee at the cumulative rate of 20 percent per year on the difference between the world market and the U.S. price for raw sugar. Thus, at the end of 5 years all of these quotas, including that for Cuba, would be rendered completely ineffective because sugar would be purchased under them only at world market prices, giving the United States no preference in the exports of such country. The Philippine premium was not to be reduced because this is protected by treaty.

The Cuban quota would have been continued at its existing level of somewhat more than 3 million tons except for a reduction of about 600,000 tons which was allocated to domestic producers. As long as Cuba remained in Communist hands, the Cuban quota would have been withdrawn and put on a global quota basis with recapture of the entire difference between the world market price and the U.S. price.

This meant, in effect, that as long as diplomatic relations with Cuba remained as they were, the approximately 2.6 million tons of sugar allocated to Cuba would be bought on the world market at world market prices. This would be accomplished by issuing import permits within the limitation of the global quota but collecting on each pound of sugar an import fee established by the Department of Agriculture as the difference between the world market price and the domestic price for raw sugar.

Under this proposal there would be no more inducement for a foreign sugar producer to sell his sugar to the United States than to any other country in the world. It was a proposal which might operate successfully during periods of sugar surplus, when the world market price was seriously depressed, but which placed our sugar supplies at the mercy of world markets and speculators in periods when, for any reason, the world price of sugar was above the U.S. price.

It abandoned completely the principles of price and supply insurance which the Sugar Act had established and which had operated so beneficially for almost 30 years.

EXPERTS OPPOSE GLOBAL QUOTA

In the subsequent hearings on the proposed legislation, every sugar expert who appeared before the committee warned of the dangers inherent in this proposed policy. At the conclusion of the hearings, the first action taken by the committee in executive session was to vote unanimously to reject the global quota, premium recapture proposal and to continue the price and supply insurance embodied in statutory country quotas regulating our foreign sugar supplies.

Accordingly, this committee reported a bill reducing the Cuban quota to 1.5 million tons and assigning larger quotas to the domestic beet and cane areas, to the Philippines, and to other sugar producing countries, chiefly in the Western Hemisphere, which assured the committee that they were able and willing to provide sugar under our quota system regardless of the level of world prices. The Cuban quota was withheld from that country as long as we are not in diplomatic relations and was assigned on a year-by-year basis to other Western Hemisphere countries able to provide the sugar.

In protection of American sugar consumers, and in order to maintain price stability regardless of the level of world prices, sugar shipped to the United States under both the permanent and temporary quotas would be paid for at the U.S. price, regardless of the level of world prices.

The House approved the bill as reported by the committee. The Senate, on the other hand, swallowed the global quota proposal hook, line, and sinker, and adopted a bill exactly as recommended by the administration. In conference, the House was forced to accept a compromise with which it thoroughly disagreed, which it felt to be dangerous and unworkable, in order to have any sugar act at all. Due to the administration's delay in submitting its recommendations, the old law was within 2 days of expiring at the time the conference was held and it was unthinkable that we should be without any sugar act, for the domestic sugar industry cannot exist without it.

THE COMPROMISE BILL

The compromise bill adopted most of the permanent foreign country quotas established in the House bill but provided that the so-called quota premium should be recaptured at the cumulative rate of 10 percent per year, rendering these quotas valueless at the end of 10 years, and provided further that the quota withheld from Cuba, established in the conference bill at 1,635,000 tons, should be obtained from any supplier with full recapture of the so-called quota premium, in other words on the world market and at the world market price.

As Members of the House will recall, even before this hybrid bill became law, the administration realized part of the unwisdom of its position and got the Senate to add on to a House bill relating to honeybees a provision restoring 150,000 tons of the country quotas which had been provided in the House bill and deleted in the conference.

The evil of the premium recapture and the global quota remained, however, and we are now beginning to reap the harvest of this ill-advised action.

No sooner had the 1962 Sugar Act been signed by the President on July 13—marking the entry of the United States into the world sugar market for approximately 600,000 tons—than world sugar prices started an upward spiral which has continued virtually without interruption since that time.

The following table shows for the period beginning January 1, 1962, the weekly average spot price of raw sugar on the domestic market and the world market, the weekly average wholesale price of refined sugar in the northeast area of the United States, and the monthly average retail price of refined sugar. In order to compare the world price of raw sugar with the domestic price, it is necessary to add to the world price approximately 1 cent per pound for transportation, insurance, handling, and tariff duty, and then to add to this figure the amount of the import fee established by the Department of Agriculture. This fee was originally set at 2.4 cents per pound.

1962 average weekly and monthly spot prices for domestic and world raw sugar, and wholesale refined sugar in Northeast; average monthly U.S. retail prices for refined sugar

[Cents per pound]

Week ending—	Raw sugar		Refined sugar	
	Domestic spot price	World spot price	Wholesale Northeast	Retail United States
1962				
Jan. 6	6.45	2.43	9.30	
13	6.45	2.43	9.30	
20	6.46	2.30	9.30	
27	6.46	2.16	9.50	
Month of January	6.45	2.30	9.37	11.62
Feb. 3	6.40	2.14	9.50	
10	6.40	2.32	9.50	
17	6.36	2.34	9.50	
24	6.35	2.38	9.50	
Month of February	6.37	2.36	9.50	11.70
Mar. 3	6.37	2.53	9.50	
10	6.40	2.64	9.50	
17	6.42	2.62	9.50	
24	6.45	2.65	9.50	
31	6.45	2.74	9.50	
Month of March	6.43	2.65	9.50	11.68
Apr. 7	6.45	2.78	9.60	
14	6.47	2.70	9.60	
21	6.44	2.69	9.60	
28	6.39	2.60	9.60	
Month of April	6.43	2.69	9.60	11.64
May 5	6.38	2.51	9.60	
12	6.42	2.58	9.60	
19	6.42	2.68	9.60	
26	6.46	2.64	9.60	
Month of May	6.43	2.60	9.60	11.64
June 2	6.49	2.60	9.60	
9	6.50	2.54	9.60	
16	6.47	2.64	9.60	
23	6.43	2.66	9.60	
30	6.38	2.70	9.60	
Month of June	6.45	2.63	9.60	11.68
July 7	6.37	2.84	9.60	
14	6.40	2.86	9.60	
21	6.40	2.96	9.60	
28	6.36	2.97	9.60	
Month of July	6.39	2.92	9.60	11.72
1962—Continued				
Aug. 4	6.44	3.03	9.60	
11	6.48	3.11	9.60	
18	6.56	3.27	9.60	
25	6.60	3.35	9.60	
Month of August	6.54	3.24	9.62	11.72
Sept. 1	6.59	3.35	9.70	
8	6.40	3.35	9.70	
15	6.35	3.17	9.70	
22	6.45	3.08	9.70	
29	6.50	3.17	9.70	
Month of September	6.43	3.18	9.70	11.76
Oct. 6	6.52	3.19	9.70	
13	6.54	3.19	9.70	
20	6.53	3.20	9.70	
27	6.53	3.42	9.70	
Month of October	6.52	3.28	9.70	11.76
Nov. 3	6.41	3.49	9.70	
10	6.40	3.50	9.70	
17	6.44	3.55	9.70	
24	6.45	3.72	9.70	
Month of November	6.44	3.65	9.70	11.78
Dec. 1	6.50	3.82	9.70	
8	6.50	4.05	9.70	
15	6.53	4.22	9.70	
22	6.55	4.34	9.70	
29	6.60	4.72	9.83	
Month of December	6.54	4.29	9.72	11.76
1963				
Jan. 4	6.62	4.85	9.90	
11	6.69	5.20	9.90	
18	6.72	5.43	10.02	
25	6.72	5.66	10.05	
Feb. 1	6.72	5.80	10.05	
8	6.72	5.99	10.05	
15	6.77	6.05	10.05	
22	6.82	6.05	10.06	

Source: New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange spot prices for raw sugar, No. 7 contract domestic and No. 8 contract for world price. Trade sources for wholesale refined prices and U.S. Department of Labor for retail price.

As will be noted from the table, at the time the bill became law and the Department of Agriculture announced its global quota and established an import fee of 2.4 cents per pound, the world spot price was 2.86 cents per pound and the domestic price was 6.40 cents per pound. Adding to the world price the 1 cent charge for transportation and duty and the 2.4 cents charge for the import fee, brought the world price up to 6.26 cents per pound, New York basis. This gave foreign suppliers an incentive of 0.14 cent per pound to sell on our market and made, for the moment, a workable program.

OPERATIONS UNDER THE NEW LAW

Under the procedure used by the Department of Agriculture, having announced the quantity to be permitted entry under the global quota, it accepted advance commitments from foreign suppliers for delivery prior to a specified date and required that these commitments be accompanied by a binder of 0.5 cent per pound—this amount to be forfeited if the sugar was not imported into the United States within the specified time limit.

Under the import fee of 2.4 cents per pound, the Department succeeded in obtaining commitments for the full quantity of approximately 600,000 tons of sugar in the global quota for the balance of the calendar year 1962.

It is to be remembered, however, this commitment to ship to the United States does not include any commitment as to the price at which the sugar will be sold in the United States. As will be noted from the table, the world price continued to advance, particularly late in the year as predictions of a short Cuban sugar crop and of unfavorable growing conditions affecting beet sugar production in Europe and both beet and cane sugar in the United States, indicated an even shorter world supply situation in 1963 than had been assumed at the time of our hearing. The sharp increase in the world price—from 2.86 in the week ending July 14 to 4.72 in the week ending December 29—was, therefore, reflected by a smaller but substantial increase in the U.S. price—from 6.40 in the week ending July 14 to 6.60 in the week ending January 29.

By the time in late November when the Department of Agriculture had to announce its intentions with respect to total consumption figures and quotas for 1963, it was apparent that the import fee of 2.4 cents per pound which had been set for 1962 represented far more than the difference between world prices and desirable U.S. prices, and would not result in any sugar being shipped to the United States under the global quota. In the late November announcement, therefore, the Department of Agriculture set the proposed import fee for 1963 at 1.8 cents per pound.

In the 2 weeks that intervened between the time of this preliminary announcement and the issuance of the official quota proclamation with respect to 1963 on December 7, 1962, it became apparent that the 1.8 cents import fee was also too high and would not bring in the global quota sugar we required. Therefore, in the official announcement of December 7, 1962, the import fee on global quota sugar for 1963 was established at 1.4 cents per pound. At the same time, the Department announced a global quota of 750,000 tons for the first 5 months of 1963.

In spite of the Department's optimistic estimates, by mid-January 1963 it had succeeded in obtaining commitments for only 115,000 tons of the 750,000 tons of global quota sugar we will require during the first 5 months of 1963, and U.S. consumers were faced with an actual sugar shortage if the situation remained unchanged.

Accordingly, on January 23 the Department eliminated altogether the premium recapture it had so strongly advocated and reduced the import fee to zero. World sugar could now be shipped into the United States without the payment of any import fee.

NO ASSURANCE OF PRICE

The significant things about this action, Mr. Speaker, are: First, that instead of the optimistic predictions of the great amounts of money which would be collected by sugar import fees and might be used in foreign aid programs, the Department had collected from mid-July to mid-January a total of only $39.5 million and they had done this at a cost to American consumers of more than $17 million in the last 5 months of 1962; second, and of even greater significance is that in reducing the import fee to zero, the United States had played its last free card in the game to stabilize U.S. sugar prices.

From this point on, there is little, if anything, that the Department of Agriculture can do under the existing law to maintain a stable level of sugar prices in the United States. From this point on, our prices are tied irrevocably to the world market price; and in order to obtain sugar supplies we will have to pay whatever fantastic price may be commanded on the world market.

On January 31 the Department of Agriculture added 350,000 tons to the global quota for delivery prior to September 30—at the full domestic price and without the imposition of any import fee. It has obtained commitments for all of this 1.1 million tons of global quota sugar, and this fact is being pointed to with great glee by some advocates of the global quota, premium recapture theory as proof that this system is working.

What they neglect to point out, Mr. Speaker, is first, these commitments were obtained only after the premium recapture idea was abandoned and we agreed to pay foreign suppliers the full U.S. premium price; second, the commitments to deliver sugar contain no assurance whatever as to price.

Similar commitments were obtained in July 1962 with respect to global quota deliveries during the balance of that year, but this did not prevent the New York price from going up from 6.35 in the week ending September 15 to 6.60 in the week ending December 29. Likewise, the commitments now made with respect to 1963 will not prevent foreign suppliers from selling this sugar in New York for the highest possible price they can get for it.

Third, these commitments do not even assure us that the sugar will be shipped to the United States. The suppliers have put up a binder of 0.5 cent per pound to assure delivery, but this is the only assurance we have. If, by any chance, we should succeed in keeping the U.S. price of sugar more than 0.5 cent per pound below the world market price, it would clearly be to the advantage of the foreign sugar suppliers to sell their sugar elsewhere and forfeit the binder they have put up with the United States.

WHO GETS THE BENEFITS?

During the hearings and the debate on this sugar bill last summer, the fallacious argument was made that the payment of our insurance premium on foreign sugar was a form of foreign aid, that there was no assurance this premium payment was reaching the workers in the canefields and the small sugar planters but that, in fact, it might be benefiting only the large mills and exporters. It should have been clear to anyone that there was far more chance of benefit to small cane producers and the workers in the fields from a steady, guaranteed price and market such as is afforded under the statutory country quota system than from a world market at the depressed price level where these same persons assumed we would be able to buy sugar permanently, and where the price has to stay in order for the premium recapture scheme to work.

It would be interesting to hear now from those whose hearts bled so copiously for the canefield worker, who they think is getting the profits from this uncontrolled increase in sugar prices. They can be assured that none of this price increase is going to the worker in the canefield, probably very little of it to the small cane grower, and in many instances not even to the foreign millowner and producer of raw sugar. Instead, much of the tremendous profit being reaped from these high sugar prices is going to traders and speculators and downright gamblers.

Activity on the New York sugar futures market has increased tenfold since the 1962 Sugar Act became law. Prior to that, under our stabilized country quota system, there was very little need for hedging by legitimate sugar interests and almost no profit to be had in speculation. Since the enactment of that law trading in sugar futures has mushroomed and much of it is downright gambling speculation.

Just as an example of what has occurred, I asked a Government expert in futures market operations to calculate the paper profits which would have been made by a speculator who bought one sugar future contract on the New York market at the time the 1962 Sugar Act was passed and then pyramided this speculative holding each time the price went up sufficiently for him to buy a new contract. The answer is interesting. If a speculator had invested $400 in a world sugar contract for future delivery during the week ending July 14, 1962, and then had pyramided his holdings as I have indicated, he would now have a profit of $185,000 on an investment of $400.

NO INSURANCE FOR THE FUTURE

Unlike some of those whose voices have been heard most stridently on this subject, Mr. Speaker, I do not claim to be a sugar expert. I am not predicting that before this year is out we may be forced to pay as much as 8 or 9 cents a pound for raw sugar, with a corresponding increase in the price of the refined product. I am not predicting that when 1964 rolls around and new sugar quotas come into effect the quota areas, both foreign and domestic—in the light of this year's experience—may withhold or slow down deliveries under quota in order to help push the price upward—for it must be remembered that quota holders as well as speculators on the world market benefit from higher prices. I am not predicting that in 1964 the Soviet bloc will acquire enough of the so-called world market of sugar to drive the price up and then feed its cheaply acquired holdings back into the market at high prices for hard currency, although there is some suspicion in sugar circles that this is going on now.

I do not predict that these things will happen, Mr. Speaker. I merely point out—and I hope the House will consider this most seriously—that in abandoning our statutory quota policy we have canceled our sugar insurance and under the global quota, premium recapture theory of the new law, these things can happen and there is little or nothing we can do to prevent it.

Mr. Speaker, I have said many times on the floor of this House that sugar is one of the most complex and highly involved subjects with which Congress had to deal. It is, therefore, a subject on which it is easy for pseudoexperts, wild-haired theorists, and voluble commentators to make their voices heard, and to sound convincing. I apologize to the House for taking this much of its time to discuss this subject but I consider this matter to be of such great importance to every sugar consumer in the United States that the House has a right to a full explanation of the situation and to know where I, and I believe the whole Committee on Agriculture, stand on this matter. In my own defense for taking this much of your time may I point out that I have discussed only one aspect of this complicated subject of sugar—the responsibility to protect U.S. consumers both as to supplies and prices. May I point out some of the things I have not discussed.

I have not, for example, discussed the importance of a workable and effective sugar act to our domestic sugar producing industry, to the beet sugar producers of continental United States, to the cane producers of Louisiana and Florida, and to the sugar producers and, in fact, the whole economic well-being of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands and to the domestic beet processors and cane refiners.

I have not discussed the importance of a fair and equitable sugar program to our export trade although the promotion of that export trade is one of the basic objectives of the sugar act. In the fiscal year 1961, exports from the United States to countries holding statutory quotas under the 1962 Sugar Act, not counting India and the Netherlands, were valued at over $3.3 billion, of which $420 million were agricultural exports. The dollars we spend for sugar come directly back to us for exports from the United States. I am not discussing at this time the effect it might have on those exports if those who advocated the premium recapture theory were able to force those sugar exporting countries to sell their sugar to us at a loss on a depressed world market, instead of at the fair and equitable level of the U.S. market.

I am not discussing the possibilities, on the erratic world market we are helping to create, for the Soviet bloc to obtain Cuban sugar under cheap barter contracts and build up its hard currency holdings by selling this at high prices into the world market.

I am not discussing the bewildering and discouraging effect on our good neighbors to the south of a sugar policy admittedly designed to force them to sell us their sugar supplies at ruinously low prices, when at the same time we are making loud protestations of our concern for their economic well-being; when at the very time we were destroying the stability of the sugar market we were promoting an international conference to stabilize by quotas and other devices the price of coffee. The goal of stabilized commodity prices was sufficiently important to them that they stated in the charter of Punta del Este that one of the charter's primary purposes was:

> To find a quick and lasting solution to the grave problem created by excessive price fluctuations in the basic exports of Latin American countries on which their prosperity so heavily depends.

The people of the sugar producing countries of Latin America find it hard to understand, as I do, why we would sign such a pledge, and then, less than a year later, flagrantly and openly violate it by adopting a system of sugar procurement which, far from "finding a solution to the grave problem of excessive price fluctuations in the basic exports of Latin America," instead insured greater price fluctuations than existed before we signed it. It would be hard to conceive of legislation which is better designed to lose friends and alienate people.

Although I have taken much time of the House, Mr. Speaker, there are a great many important aspects of this sugar matter which I have not discussed.

WE SHOULD RENEW OUR INSURANCE POLICY

Now, you may well ask, What are we going to do about it?

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we should renew our insurance policy. We should return again to a system of statutory country quotas established by Congress, pay the premium that is necessary to assure us of supply and price stability, and strictly enforce that provision of the law which summarily withdraws from any country permanently any part of its quota which it fails to fill because of more attractive prices on the world market. I assure you that if it were ever necessary to take action under this provision of the law, there would be no dearth of other suppliers ready and able to take over that obligation. And I assure you that this system will work, as it has for 30 years, to guarantee U.S. consumers adequate sugar supplies at reasonable and stable prices.

What will we do about Cuba?

I think that we should continue a statutory quota of approximately 1.5 million tons held in reserve for Cuba until such time as the Communist regime is overthrown and that island again returns to the family of free nations. Until such time, of course, Cuba would get none of this quota. Instead, it should be allotted by Congress on a temporary year-to-year basis to other sugar-producing countries able and willing to supply our needs.

I admit, Mr. Speaker, that there may be some tendency on the part of countries receiving these temporary allocations to consider them of a permanent character, but I believe that this possibility has been grossly exaggerated by the proponents of the ruinous global quota, premium recapture theory. Our friends to the south are reasonable and intelligent. They would know that the very law which temporarily divides the Cuban quota among them provides, by its own terms, that the quota will be returned to Cuba when it returns to the family of free nations. They would know when they accepted the temporary Cuban allotment that it is likely to be withdrawn at any time and only in the most reckless disregard of reality would they make plans on the assumption that this would be a permanent quota.

The very fact that the Cuban quota would be reallocated among other countries by Congress on a year-to-year basis would be a constant reminder of its temporary character. This would also, in my opinion, be the best possible way to assure that, to the greatest extent possible, our purchases of sugar at the U.S. price from these supplying countries is reciprocated by their purchase of our products. The present Sugar Act contains a provision giving some preferences in global quota purchases to those countries agreeing to purchase U.S. agricultural commodities. Admittedly, this is a cumbersome and difficult provision to administer. It would be much more effective, in my opinion, if countries temporarily filling a part of the Cuban quota knew that the allotment of that quota was to be reviewed each year by Congress and that in making new allotments, their purchase of our agricultural commodities would be taken into consideration.

Those opposed to handling the temporary allocation of the Cuban quota in this manner have contended that it would be unfair to the countries receiving a portion of that Cuban quota to give them a definite temporary allotment because this would cause them to increase sugar production and construct facilities to fill an allotment which might be withdrawn at any time, to their great financial loss. Those who make this argument overlook three rather important facts: First, the quantity of sugar involved is no larger, in fact is exactly the same, as the quantity to be acquired under the global purchase program and would come from substantially the same countries; second, there is already in existence in the Western Hemisphere outside of the United States and Cuba sugar production amounting to 11.5 million tons per year, out of which we would take, both with our permanent and temporary quotas, a total of only approximately 3 million tons; third, the temporary allotments of the Cuban quota would not be made to countries who did not, at that time, have in operation sufficient sugar-producing capacity to meet the allotment—thus no new facilities or additional cane fields would be required.

These were the essential provisions of the House bill, Mr. Speaker. The Committee of Agriculture devoted weeks of study to the preparation of that bill. The House passed the bill by an overwhelming majority. Looking back at it now, there was not much wrong with that bill.

It is unfortunate that in conference we were forced to make ruinous compromises with a bill which had been considered by a committee in the other body only a few days and where even that short time had not been devoted to the study of sugar, but in large part to questioning the motives of the witnesses who appeared before the committee.

Am I going to introduce such a bill tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker, I am not.

Never in my memory of 28 years as a Member of Congress and a member of the House Committee on Agriculture has my committee, its members, or myself, been subjected to the kind of pressure, abuse, and downright vilification as we were during that period when, in our knowledge of and experience with the Sugar Act, we were trying to enact a bill which would protect the consumers of the United States against exactly the kind of price increase they are now faced with, and at the same time be a measure of friendship and helpfulness to our friendly neighbors in this hemisphere.

I do not want to dwell on this, Mr. Speaker, and I hold no personal animosity but I have no intention of putting my committee or myself through this kind of an ordeal again. I have no intention of subjecting them again to the barrage of propaganda, criticism, slanted newspaper articles, cartoons, and pressure that they went through last summer.

I will introduce a bill and call it up promptly in my committee when, and only when, those who got us into this mess indicate clearly that they now see the error of their ways and are willing to cooperate with the Committee on Agriculture in writing a new Sugar Act that will restore our statutory obligations, reinstate our sugar price and supply insurance, and give the fullest possible protection to the forgotten man of our present law—the U.S. consumer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Who does the gentleman mean by "they"?

Mr. COOLEY. The proponents of global quotas in the administration. That is, with the help of the U.S. Senate.

The gentleman will recall our bill came out of committee without serious opposition. It passed this House with very little opposition, if any. There was opposition to one provision affecting the Dominican Republic. But our bill passed the House and everybody was pleased with the sugar program it established. All segments of the industry, foreign and domestic, were satisfied.

It went over to the Senate, and we were forced to make concessions because the law was expiring. We had assurances we would have $180 million. That has not been true. We have cut off all of the recapture possibilities. We are not recapturing anything, and it is costing the American consumers at the rate of $110 million in higher prices in 1963.

Mr. GROSS. Has the State Department played any part in this?

Mr. COOLEY. I am certain the State Department has. I am certain that many other departments of the Government have played a part in it.

We made this concession in the conference. The gentleman will recall that those who opposed the House bill concluded overnight they had made a mistake. So we had a little honey-bee bill in the Senate. They put amendments on the honey-bee bill and picked up another 150,000 tons and made it on a country-to-country allocation.

Mr. Speaker, I advocate a return to the old sugar law which operated so well for so long, almost 30 years. During all of that time we had fair prices and stable supplies. Now we are at the mercy of a world market that can be manipulated by the Soviets cooperating with Cuba. We are, therefore, at the mercy of a world market, which is going to result in injury to the American producers and the American consumers. There is no telling what it will cost in the end.

I am not going to start anything. I am not going to introduce any bill unless those who got us into this mess come to us and ask us to correct the errors that have been made. We should go back to the former program that has operated so well over the years.

I do not want to bore you with a long discussion, but I do have the facts and figures here, and they will appear in the RECORD tomorrow morning.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand the gentleman is advocating the principle that is enunciated in the Jones Act that we had for about 30 years?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. The law has been operating for 25 or 30 years. We had country-by-country quotas. Our committee sat over there and allocated 9,700,000 tons of sugar, every pound of it. We did not leave it to anybody's discretion, but we were forced in conference to go to this global quota proposition that will not work and cannot work.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As I understand it, the gentleman's committee did go ahead and try to work out a program that would fit into the law at that time?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The bill went to the Senate and through the pressure that was put on what your committee had adopted, the bill was changed in the final analysis?

Mr. COOLEY.. That is right.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The question of the allocation of quotas to other countries was involved. The other departments were taken out of the law, which has resulted in an increased cost of sugar to the consumers of the United States of approximately $110 million?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman believes that the proper approach would be to return to the law that has worked so well for 30 years?

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly do.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Under the present bill what assurance do the cane and beet producers have as to stability?

Mr. COOLEY. The domestic cane and beet producers have their quotas. But the consumers have no assurance or insurance. They are dependent on a market here that might go on up. You do not know what is going to happen.

The Soviet Union and Cuba can if they choose, manipulate the world market and we will be at their mercy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for calling this situation to the attention of the Members of the House and ask him again if I heard correctly that an individual, a speculator, could have taken $400 and pyramided or parlayed it into $185,000?

Mr. COOLEY. One hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars, since last July.

Mr. GROSS. Since last July?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, sir. These figures I have had checked and double-checked by the best advised people in Washington in the administrative branch of the Government, so I am quite certain that they are correct.

Mr. GROSS. And this could have been done on the basis of the legislation passed by Congress in the last session?

Mr. COOLEY. It was done on the basis of the world price of sugar, which our legislation has helped to skyrocket.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman has no connection with this situation so I do not mean to propound a question to him. But I would call the attention of the House, since he mentioned coffee a little while ago, that there is pending in the other body, a coffee agreement for ratification, since it is in the nature of a treaty, that I hope will be thoroughly scrutinized by Members of the other body and by the Members of the House before it is ratified. Personally I have serious doubts about this coffee agreement for I understand it will result in substantially increased prices for coffee to American consumers.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows that the sugar program operated so well and so satisfactorily that the ordinary housewife was not even aware of the fact that we had a sugar program. Over the years this program had operated at a net profit to the Treasury of more than $450 million, not counting import duties of as much as $37 million a year. We had ample supplies. Why in the world anybody would want to disturb a program that had operated as well as that I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. There had to be some changes in the sugar program in view of the fact that we had been obtaining a very substantial amount of sugar from Cuba; but this did not make it necessary for Congress to enact legislation that would open the door to what has happened.

Mr. COOLEY. I know. We could have gotten that sugar, we could have replaced the Cuban sugar by buying it from other sources of supply.

Mr. GROSS. Without changing the law?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. We took away the Cuban quota. Then under the law we could have allocated that quota to other countries, and I was interested in giving it to the friendly countries in the Western Hemisphere. We tried our best to do that.

KAISER FOUNDATION MEDICAL CARE PROGRAM—THE NATION'S LARGEST PREPAID DIRECT SERVICE MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, over the past two decades I have watched a private enterprise pattern for providing medical care take shape and grow in my part of the Nation. In 1943, when I first came here as a Member of the 78th Congress, this pattern was one industry's solution to providing medical care for its own workmen in badly overcrowded wartime communities. This industrial program has evolved into the largest voluntary medical care plan of its kind in our Nation—a plan now serving a diverse membership larger than the populations of each of 13 of our 50 States.

I am speaking of the Kaiser Foundation medical care program. Undoubtedly the name is a familiar one. It is receiving more and more favorable attention, both here and abroad, as more and more responsible individuals concern themselves with the problems of organizing and financing medical care, and closely study all types of existing solutions.

Recently I talked at length with the leaders of this program and then observed how it functions in a visit to its newest medical center at Panorama City in southern California's San Fernando Valley. I was so favorably impressed with its fundamental principles, with the cooperative accomplishments of businessmen and independent groups of physicians, and with their mutual philosophy for a private enterprise approach to the problems of providing medical care, that I wish to present this report on its activities.

Six major organizations share the primary responsibility for conducting this program. They are Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, four independent groups of physicians—the Permanente medical groups—and Kaiser Foundation Hospitals.

THE KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN'S MEMBERSHIP

The health plan is the Nation's largest prepaid direct service medical and hospital care plan, with more than 940,000 members in the Pacific States and Hawaii. Voluntary subscribers may enroll themselves and their dependents either through groups or on an individual family basis. Among its group subscribers are retail clerks, longshoremen and warehousemen, culinary workers, faculty and staff members of educational institutions on all levels of learning, public utilities employees, personnel of Federal, State, and local governments, and employees from a wide variety of industries.

Federal employees and their dependents comprise the largest group with approximately 180,000 members, or nearly 20 percent of the total enrollment. No other group, including Kaiser employees and their dependents, make up more than 5 percent of the total.

The health plan contracts with all subscribers to arrange necessary hospital and professional care on a prepaid basis for themselves and their families. To carry out this commitment, it then contracts with Kaiser Foundation Hospitals for hospital facilities and services, and with one of four independent medical groups for professional services. There is one medical group for each of the program's four autonomous service regions which include the San Francisco Bay area, Metropolitan Los Angeles, and Fontana, the island of Oahu in Hawaii, and the two-State metropolitan area of Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, Wash.

Here are the program's resources for serving these 940,000 health plan members. The four cooperating medical groups have a total complement of more than 900 physicians representing general practice and all the major specialties of medicine. There are 12 Kaiser Foundation hospitals with a total complement of about 2,200 licensed beds; all 12 are self-supporting, nonprofit community hospitals also serving other doctors and patients in surrounding areas. The medical groups operate about 36 medical office locations. And together, the six organizations have a total nonphysician personnel force of nearly 7,000 men and women including nurses, pharmacists, technicians, administrative personnel, service and maintenance people, and a wide variety of others.

To express these figures another way, for each 10,000 health plan members the program has close to 10 physicians and about 75 people in paramedical and service capacities; and at current cost levels, each 10,000 members require a capital investment of about $1 million in hospital and medical facilities and equipment.

THE PROGRAM'S OBJECTIVE IN PROVIDING MEDICAL CARE

The contracts between the health plan and the medical groups and the hospital organization link these organizations together in pursuing one objective: to provide the public with a comprehensive, high quality medical and hospital care plan on a nonsubsidized and self-sustaining basis, at costs which the average family can afford.

When I visited the program's newest medical center at Panorama City and met with its southern California region's medical and lay management, I wanted to determine their success in reaching this objective. One of the things which interested me was the scope of services that health plan members purchase with their monthly dues.

I was told that each of the program's four regions offers a selection of plans for group enrollment and one plan for individual enrollment. Unlike plans offered by other programs, the scope of services never varies. The only differences are in the monthly dues and benefits, which are based on local medical economics.

Here is the illustration of the benefits which an employed subscriber and his family receive under one group enrollment plan available in the southern California region:

Unlimited visits to doctors in their offices without supplemental charge; all necessary surgery without supplemental charge, 125 cost-free days of hospitalization per year, with the remaining 240 days at half-rates; special duty nursing in the hospital, if medically required, without charge; all necessary laboratory work, X-rays and physical therapy without supplemental charge; blood on a replacement basis; eye examinations without supplemental charge; doctors' home calls, day or night, at $5 per call; prenatal and maternity care through the baby's birth for a supplemental charge of $100, after 10 months of membership; polio benefits; and free ambulance service. In addition, members are protected by a maximum of $1,000 in indemnity coverage for accidental injury or emergency illness occuring outside the health plan service area. Under this particular group plan, the subscriber pays $24.85 per month for himself, his wife and his dependents. An individual subscriber in this group would pay $8.85 for himself, or $17.70 for himself and his wife.

As Time magazine concluded last September 14 in an article on the Kaiser Foundation medical care program:

> And for their money subscribers get more complete protection than is available from most other forms of U.S. medical insurance In most of the United States, Blue Cross pays only hospital bills and Blue Shield pays only surgeons' fees and some doctors' bills; HIP (the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York), runner-up to Kaiser as the Nation's biggest prepaid care plan, does not cover hospital bills. Kaiser covers almost everything.

THE PROGRAM IS BASED ON FIVE PRINCIPLES

The participating organizations follow five guiding principles in organizing this comprehensive medical care plan: prepayment, group practice, voluntary enrollment, integrated hospital and medical facilities, and preventive medicine.

Prepayment is generally accepted as the only way by which people of moderate means can pay the increasing costs of modern medical care. Prepayment allows individual families to budget for medical care and also spreads the cost of each member's treatment over a large number of persons.

This prepayment principle is found among all voluntary health insurance programs. However, there is one basic difference between direct service prepayment plans—such as Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound, and Group Health Association here in Washington—and the fee-for-service plans such as Blue Cross and Blue Shield. The latter plans collect subscribers' prepayments and then pay claims on the traditional basis of a fee for each service rendered. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, instead of paying providers of services on the traditional fee-for-service basis, employs an entirely different economic approach to remunerating its contracting hospital and medical organizations.

The health plan collects subscribers' prepayments and then uses these revenues to pay Kaiser Foundation Hospitals and the medical group for providing all necessary hospital and professional services. The medical groups are paid a negotiated amount for each health plan member per month as a regular and stable income, rather than payment on the fee-for-service basis. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals receives its remuneration through a cost reimbursement agreement with the health plan, with contractual payments covering operating costs, amortization of facilities and a modest earnings provision. In this arrangement, both the medical groups and the hospitals share one sound and stable planning base: the health plan's prepaid membership population.

Prepayment coupled this way with direct service actually reverses the traditional economics of medicine. The well health plan member becomes an asset to the participating medical group; the sick member becomes a liability until he regains his health. For physicians associated with this program, the only economical medical care is good medical care.

The next principle is group practice, which again is not unique within the Kaiser Foundation medical-care program. This method of medical organization has long been employed by many of the Nation's leading clinics and medical centers associated with educational and charitable institutions. Under this organization, each doctor in the group practices in the field of medicine in which he has been trained.

The physicians themselves control all professional care, with no lay or corporate interference with their services to, and relationships with, their patients.

Each health plan member is encouraged to choose a personal family physician from among the group's general practitioners or internists. This personally chosen physician directs all phases of the member's medical care, ordering X-rays, and laboratory tests, prescribing medications, and therapy, and referring to other specialists within the group whenever examinations and consultations appear necessary.

The medical groups' pooling and sharing of all income from health plan members and from private and industrial patients creates economic unity within the group, rather than individual economic rivalry.

In the Kaiser Foundation medical-care program, the four cooperating medical groups provide the four cornerstones on which the entire program is built. The medical groups' professional leaders are directly responsible for measuring and controlling the quality of medical care for health plan members, and for maintaining and striving to improve this essential factor of quality.

I talked at considerable length with leaders of the southern California medical group on this point of quality. Their feelings are that quality of care is best ascertained and controlled by key well-trained physicians working with other members of the medical group in the actual care of patients. Their staffs are organized by services or departments such as internal medicine, surgery, and pediatrics. Each chief of service has the responsibility of constantly reviewing and supervising the medical care practiced by his staff members. Together with keymen on his staff, he establishes a standard of care and then sees that this standard is maintained.

Physicians within the group select new staff members on the basis of training, experience, professional standing, a warm and personal attitude toward patients, and the personal ability to work cooperatively. Both a new staff member and his work are regularly reviewed by the chief of that particular service. Once each year the individual members of all services are discussed formally by their chiefs of service, their medical directors and the medical group's board of directors. After 3 years of such observation, the physicians who meet the medical group's standards are admitted as partners. In this way, group practice effects a potent control on quality.

The third principle—voluntary enrollment—means that each health plan subscriber belongs to the plan by choice. At the beginning of each new contract period, each subscriber has an opportunity to continue membership or choose another plan.

Another aspect of this principle is the concept of dual choice, which was developed and introduced by the Kaiser Foundation Health Plan. It means the health plan does not accept new members through captive groups. Any contracting group such as a labor union, a health and welfare fund or a Government health benefits program must offer its members a choice between the Kaiser Foundation Health Plan and at least one significantly different prepayment program such as an indemnity or service plan. The health plan actually refuses enrollment requests if the interested group does not plan to make arrangements for offering its members a choice of programs.

As I mentioned earlier, there are approximately 180,000 Federal employees and their dependents enrolled in the health plan through the Federal employees' health benefit program. Each of approximately 60,000 Federal employees who enrolled as the health plan subscriber exercised his choice among a number of different plans, including two nationwide programs. I was impressed to learn that among all the programs available to Federal employees, the Kaiser program is the most popular choice in two of its four geographic regions and the second choice in its remaining two regions.

Leaders of this program also point out another aspect of this principle of voluntary enrollment and dual choice: It gives the consumer an opportunity to exercise his opinions, influentially.

Dual choice—or multiple choice—means competition, and competition encourages improvement. By selecting from competing plans and approaches, the consumers of medical care exercise their influence on the direction of future developments and their judgment as to which types of plans and developments best meet consumer needs.

The fourth principle is that of well-planned, integrated facilities. The program's medical and lay leaders believe that doctors and their patients need to have a central medical center with modern hospital and outpatient facilities and, as needed, outlying satellite medical offices from which patients are referred to this main center.

This principle is readily apparent at the new Kaiser Foundation Hospital and Medical Center which I visited at Panorama City, Calif. This 10-story facility opened last September. Its first three floors, which are rectangular in shape, contain doctors' offices and all the supporting diagnostic services such as laboratory and X-ray. The top seven floors, which are shaped like a pair of binoculars with twin circular wings connected by a vertical column for elevators and other services, contain a hospital with 146 licensed beds and surgery and maternity facilities.

Some 60,000 health plan members in the surrounding San Fernando Valley identify their medical needs with this one central location. Patients are not forced to waste time traveling from one specialist's office location to that of another, or from a doctor's office to an outside laboratory. Doctors caring for critically ill hospitalized patients can attend their outpatients and still remain within close proximity to the hospital room.

And there are advantages in economy, too. When a large group of doctors and a large hospital share the same diagnostic facilities and equipment, there is no need to duplicate these costly items at various locations.

The fifth principle, preventive medical care, is the effort to safeguard health. As I mentioned earlier, prepayment and direct service together reverse the traditional economics of medicine. The doctors and hospitals depend on the total health plan membership for their incomes and not primarily on people who are ill. Thus, the natural desires of physicians and hospital administrators to contribute toward maintaining good health is reinforced by an economic incentive. And with prepayment greatly reducing the economic barriers, health plan members are easily encouraged to obtain diagnosis and treatment early—before a condition becomes severe and more costly, more dangerous and more tragic.

The intriguing thing about these five principles is that none of them were preconceived by the program's founders. Each one arose from practical experiences in solving medical care problems in a series of situations.

THE FIVE PRINCIPLES EVOLVED OVER 30 YEARS

The first such situation goes back 30 years when a young surgeon named Dr. Sidney R. Garfield organized an industrial medical-care program for workers building the Los Angeles Aqueduct across the southern California desert. His medical group began their program on the traditional fee-for-service basis, but soon discovered they needed a more stable and adequate method for financing it.

The contractors joined them in persuading insurance carriers to drop fees-for-service in favor of prepayment at a monthly rate of $1.50 for each employee. This new financial arrangement was such a success that the doctors soon were able to expand the plan to prepaid medical coverage for nonindustrial illness and injuries.

Similar programs later were organized first for Kaiser employees constructing Grand Coulee Dam in 1938 and then for 90,000 warworkers at Kaiser's west coast shipyards and steel mills during World War II. Again these programs proved themselves self-sustaining and financially sound.

Immediately after the war, former war workers and a number of labor unions asked Henry J. Kaiser and the cooperating physicians to open this kind of program to the general public. They decided to accept this new challenge and in 1945 opened health plan enrollment to groups and individuals on a voluntary basis. Then the plan had only about 10,000 members. By the end of 1962, membership stood at 940,000. Within a year, this figure may reach 1 million.

As Henry J. Kaiser told the 83d Congress House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during its consideration of national health legislation:

> The principles of the health plan have been tested under all sorts of conditions—in wartime and in peacetime; through depression, recession and prosperity; in all sorts of locations—in deserts, in remote rural areas, in suburbs and in large cities; in areas with only a small number of members and in other areas with tens of thousands of members; with scattered groups and concentrated groups.

PHYSICIANS CONTROL QUALITY OF PATIENT CARE

Actually, I was even more impressed with the program's built-in controls on quality of care than I was with its size or its guiding principles.

While describing the principle of group practice, I mentioned how the cooperating medical groups establish their standard of quality. For maintaining and improving upon this standard, the medical leaders say the development of the individual physician is the major factor. Leaders of the Permanente medical groups say they believe the most important benefit they offer their staff physicians is the opportunity to develop professionally in a manner usually available only in centers for medical education.

Within this program, these opportunities are available both on an informal and formal basis. Informally there are opportunities for physicians to discuss cases with colleagues, to confer with specialists from other services within the group, and to obtain aid or advice from medical education centers in the area, if necesary.

On a formal basis, the four medical groups and Kaiser Foundation Hospitals sponsor continuing programs in education and research, in the interest of better patient care. Doctors in the major hospitals at San Francisco, Oakland, Los Angeles, and Portland, Oreg., direct and participate in intern or residency programs which are approved by the American Medical Association's Council on Medical Education and Hospitals. A number of physicians from the medical groups hold academic appointments at nearby medical schools and universities such as Stanford, University of California, UCLA, and USC. In addition, the doctors in each hospital organize a number of regularly scheduled medical conferences, teaching sessions and symposia, all of which are also open to attendance by any physician in the community. Any physician on the staff of a Kaiser Foundation hospital may also apply for funds for a clinical research project. Each such application is reviewed by the research committees of the medical groups and Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, which decide whether funds should be made available by the hospital organization.

These activities in education and research, together with the Kaiser Foundation School of Nursing, the Kaiser Foundation Research Institute, and Kaiser Foundation Hospitals' charitable care, constitute the program's community service endeavors. Last year Kaiser Foundation Hospitals expended more than $1.5 million to support these pursuits and in addition, the research institute received a total of another $1.5 million in Federal grants for research involving basic sciences related to medicine.

Another significant aspect of quality control in this program is that the medical groups' practices are hospital based. All major Kaiser Foundation hospitals which have been open for the required year are accredited by the joint commission on hospital accreditation, representing the American Hospital Association, the American Medical Association, and the American College of Surgeons. This means the hospitals have voluntarily invited inspection by the commission and have been found to meet its standards for approval. The medical groups believe these standards are important, and their chiefs of services cooperate closely with the hospital administrations in maintaining accreditation requirements.

THE ENTIRE PROGRAM IS SELF-SUSTAINING

Another impressive fact is that this entire program is economically self-sustaining.

Looking back 21 years, Mr. Henry J. Kaiser recalls that when he sought the first bank loan to build hospital facilities for his wartime shipyard workers, the bankers told him they "wouldn't loan a dime on a hospital, because hospitals are such money losers." He personally had to guarantee the first hospital construction loan of $250,000.

Last June, 20 years later, Kaiser Foundation Hospitals completed negotiations for a $35 million loan from four private financial institutions. This amount refinanced all long-term financial obligations and provided $16.5 million for development of additional facilities. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan was the only guarantor.

THE PROGRAM'S LEADERS ARE SENSITIVE TO COVERAGE GAPS

Despite these successes—in terms of comprehensive coverage and membership growth, construction and financing of new facilities, and organizing quality medical care services—the program's leaders point out a number of problems that still need solution.

Health plan membership is closed in some areas because the program's facilities cannot keep pace with the demand for enrollment. Both physicians and lay management are sensitive to gaps in health plan coverage and are studying ways to fill them.

Significant work is being done in southern California between the medical group and the Retail Clerks Welfare Fund, on a cooperative and demonstrative basis, to determine how best to integrate psychiatric care into the scope of services to health plan members. In Portland, Oreg., limited coverage is now provided for inpatient psychiatric care. Also in Portland, under very recent arrangements, prepayment by health plan members covers a substantial portion of their outpatient drug bills.

In assessing the importance of the Kaiser Foundation medical care program in answering the health care needs of the public, one fact is clearly outstanding: On a private enterprise basis, dedicated physicians and farsighted businessmen are pooling their talents in efficiently organizing the complex resources of modern medical care to serve a population now greater in number than the populations of each of 13 States in our Nation.

Edgar F. Kaiser, president of Kaiser Foundation Hospitals and Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, says this about the program:

> Among all the activities which my father has organized and stimulated, the one he views with greatest pride is the Kaiser Foundation medical care program. The program's antecedents began because we had a need we could not fill. Doctors, nurses, and other members of the health professions responded by joining with us to form a relationship from which has evolved our present-day program. Together with independent groups of dedicated physicians for whom there is no substitute, this program answers expressed health care needs of the public in the true spirit of the free enterprise system, under which the financing and organization of medical care may be met by diverse approaches.

A RECORD VOTE ON ALL SPENDING BILLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, this week the House considered its first appropriation bill. This was House Joint Resolution 284, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. The amount of taxpayers' money involved was $503 million.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say first that when it came to the vote on final passage of the resolution, I asked, and the House sustained my request, for the vote to be taken by "yeas" and "nays". I sought this record vote in line with the firm belief that there should be a record of how all Members vote on all appropriations bills. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that in the balance of this session, the House will support me in trying to get record votes on all spending bills.

If this can be done, Mr. Speaker, then an analysis can be made of individual voting. Such an analysis would show the Members who consistently vote for larger appropriations and then, quite inconsistently, vote against such legislation as an increase in the national debt ceiling. Certainly if Members help to create an increase in the national debt, in all honesty they should be willing to vote for an increase in the legal limit. The record should be such as to allow the press to point up such inconsistencies.

This year, with the first planned deficit budget of an administration that I can recall, with an administration proposal calling for greatly increased expenditures, and with a proposed loss of revenue through a cut in taxation, priority, of course, will have to be given by the President to legislation that will raise the national debt ceiling.

As for me, Mr. Speaker, I voted last year against an increase in the debt ceiling to $308 billion, just as I did before that. According to Treasury estimates, the national debt stands at about $302 billion. Furthermore, under the present law, the debt ceiling will drop to $305 billion on "April Fool's Day," then in turn to $300 billion on June 25, and to $285 billion on July 1.

The administration has known all along that we were facing this situation. The President could have called for a curb in spending in order not to bring about this present emergency and thereby avoided the need to continue the $308 billion limit. I see no way to exert pressure for economy other than to refuse to go along, and instead to vote down the bill to authorize the debt ceiling increase.

Mr. Speaker, some people say we do not need any debt ceiling. Such individuals completely overlook the fact that at the moment there is authorization under back-door spending programs for the agencies of Government to borrow from the Treasury and spend without any appropriation legislation a total of about $28 billion. The only assurance Congress has that Government agencies will not borrow all this money and spend it without coming to Congress is the legal debt ceiling, and I for one see no method of bringing about fiscal control or responsible economic policies other than to maintain a debt ceiling.

To return, however, to the subject of the $503 million supplemental appropriation, during consideration of this resolution, I inquired as to how much of this $508 million impairment in the Commodity Credit Corporation funds was due to shipment of surplus commodities to Communist Poland and Communist Yugoslavia. I could not get a precise answer, but I was informed that since the program began in 1954, around $900 million worth of commodities have been supplied to Yugoslavia under the Public Law 480 program, and some $590 million worth of commodities under this law have been supplied to Poland.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the huge deficit of the Federal Government and the reason for the administration's request for an increase in the debt ceiling is substantially the result of a policy of aiding and feeding the Communists. Those who embrace the very philosophy of the international conspiracy to destroy our freedoms are the ones who have been aided. These deficits have been making communism succeed. These deficit dollars have been going to a nation that has loaned money to Cuba and helped Castro build a Communist beachhead in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the start, I expect to try to obtain a record vote on every appropriations bill that comes up in this session. Then, I hope someone will analyze this record and find out who are the Members of Congress who are supporting the vast expenditures which are creating our huge debt and futhermore, Mr. Speaker, I hope the analysis will show the Members who vote the dollars that go to help the slave world try to destroy the free world. It is about time that the American people be given the facts. Let the record show just which Members of the House are the ones who are responsible for the vast public debt and what the money is spent for. It is time someone did some fingerpointing. Too many spending bills have been by voice votes with no showing as to how individuals vote on these measures.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, at long last the President today sent a message to Congress recomending some legislation and outlining prospective Executive action in the field of civil rights. In the preamble to this message the President says that his administration has done more in the field of civil rights than any other administration in our Nation's history.

Since I am the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has had responsibility in this field for many years, I am forced to take issue with that statement and to say that there is no unanimity concerning that claim by the President.

I would like to remind the House that in the last term of the Eisenhower administration, in 1957 and in 1960, far-reaching civil rights legislation was passed. I am sure that those who are without prejudice will admit that that legislation is the most effective legislation in the field of civil rights since the days of the Carpetbaggers.

In addition, during President Eisenhower's term in office the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunities was given its principal impetus. Furthermore, the beginning of real, effective school desegregation occurred in the Eisenhower administration following the 1954 Supreme Court decision.

In addition, the action to eliminate discrimination in transportation first became effective in the Eisenhower administration.

I am sure that those of you who were in the armed services within the last two decades know that desegregation in the Armed Forces occurred during the Truman administration. And I am also sure that those of you who were in Washington from 1950 to 1960 know that in the Nation's Capital desegregation had its first effective help in the Eisenhower administration.

As a matter of fact, more effective civil rights legislation was enacted in the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration than has been enacted in all the years since the death of that great President, Abraham Lincoln.

In large part, the President now recommends legislation much like, but not nearly as broad in scope, the civil rights legislation which was introduced by a score or more of the minority Members of the House on the 31st day of January of this year.

I particularly note in section 1 of the President's message that the right to vote is discussed at some length, but there is a singular omission in that section of his message to the Congress. Of course, every qualified American should have the right to vote, and he should be able to freely exercise it, without discrimination, in accordance with the laws of the State in which he resides; but of equal importance, if not of greater importance, is the right of every citizen to have his vote properly counted or to prevent citizens who are not qualified to vote for one reason or another, even by death, from having such votes counted.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to news story after news story in the press and on the air concerning illegal voting and the illegal counting of votes in elections in recent years in Philadelphia, in Chicago, in Detroit, and in certain political subdivisions in Texas.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida, one of the able members of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record, and for the purpose of the Record, and I think the gentleman will confirm it, I should say that it was 2 years ago that the Committee on the Judiciary in considering the extension of the Civil Rights Commission voted out by a very substantial majority the specific provision to which the gentleman is now referring that has been omitted from the administration's proposal, and that is that the right not only of a person to vote but to have that vote counted should be within the jurisdiction of the Civil Rights Commission to investigate and make recommendations on, adding that as a subject matter within its jurisdiction. I am sure the gentleman recalls that.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I do recall it, and I am very happy to say that the gentleman from Florida wrote the original proposal that was submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary and he made a successful fight to have that proposal in the bill which we considered. It is regrettable that it was not enacted into law.

Mr. CRAMER. The reason for my offering such an amendment arises from the fact that, by appointment of the Speaker, I, for two sessions now have served—at that time one session—on the special Subcommittee on Campaign Expenditures and Elections; and I came to the very definite conclusion that the major shenanigan in voting in America is that votes cast often are not properly counted or are not counted at all.

Numerous instances that have been documented, including events during the last presidential election, I think clearly show that. The objective of this amendment was to make sure that the right of the citizen to have his vote counted, which is of equal importance with the right of the vote itself, be preserved.

I am sure the gentleman is also familiar with the fact that the majority turned handsprings, speaking procedurally, to keep that amendment which was voted out of the committee from ever being considered on the floor of this House in that the other body, to avoid that amendment, to avoid a vote on it on the floor of the House, put its own extension of the Commission bill as a rider on a totally unrelated appropriation bill for the Justice Department and sent it over and made the House accept it without the right-to-have-the-votes-counted amendment which affects all people, including the majority as well as the minority. That was certainly a backhanded way of preventing the House of Representatives from voting on what I think is one of the crucial questions in connection with the right to vote, to have the vote counted of both the majority and all minorities. Does not the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the comments of the gentleman from Florida. It is regettable, indeed, that that provision is not now the law of the land. Before we leave that subject, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about public images, I do not know what can give us a blacker and a darker image in the eyes of the people of the rest of the world that are struggling so hard for the elective franchise than to hear it charged in responsible publications and news media of every kind that votes are being illegally cast in this great country and that some votes that are properly cast are being either not counted or illegally counted.

Now I yield to my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. Derounian].

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio is making a contribution to truth in his statement today. I would like to ask the gentleman, since the President is taking all the credit for all civil rights advances: Was it not during the Truman administration that Mr. Ralph Bunche was offered a position in the administration, but he refused it

because he said Negroes were not comfortable in living quarters in Washington, D.C.?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I do have a recollection that that statement was made.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Is it not true under President Eisenhower's administration, hotels and restaurants were desegregated in the District of Columbia by Executive order?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes, of course; 3 or 4 years ago, I attended a dinner at the Willard Hotel to which were invited some of the leading business and political leaders, including Negroes, of this country. One of the leaders of the majority in the other body spoke and said there has been more progress made in desegregation in the District of Columbia in the last half decade than in all the history of the District theretofore. I was about to give the name and the date, but that detail is unnecessary.

I should like to say, that Ohio has no voter qualifications which seek to prevent or which do prevent people from voting, who meet the residence qualification. Any person 21 years of age, and under no legal restraint and who has lived within the State for 1 year and within the political subdivision for 40 days may vote. We have had no election scandals in Ohio for more than a third of a century when that able, effective, and courageous secretary of state, Clarence J. Brown was in, large part, responsible for indictments and trials and convictions for violation of the election laws in my State.

I am further disturbed by the failure of the President to make recommendations to end conditions which exist in discrimination in employment by those who have authority in the labor movement in America. While the right to vote and to help select people to represent one is of great importance, the opportunity to get a job and earn one's bread by the sweat of one's brow is even more important and more basic than the right to help select public officers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland who has been so active—so constructively active and interested in this subject.

Mr. MATHIAS. I think the gentleman is touching upon one of the most significant failures in the civil rights message. Certainly, if one holds in one hand a copy of the message and in the other hand a copy of the Democratic platform of 1960, what has been sent to the Congress today can be viewed only as a retreat. It is an ironic fact that the Washington Post and Times Herald for today has a story on the front page which is headlined "Race Barrier Still a Factor in Jobs Here." This news story appears the very day that a Presidential message comes to the Congress which has repudiated the many repeated promises made on this subject and which offers neither help nor hope for relief in this important area of discrimination in employment. In contrast to the weakness of the President's message in proposing measures to safeguard equality of opportunity for employment, the bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and by other Republican members of the Judiciary Committee would make a real contribution.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the gentleman from Maryland has made that comment. I can with good grace say to the House that the civil rights bill which the gentleman from Maryland introduced contains a section which would remedy the thing that is so distasteful to so many.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York who also has been so interested and active in the field of civil rights.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank my distinguished friend, the ranking minority member of our committee, for yielding to me. He has shown great leadership in proposing a comprehensive meaningful civil rights bill which I and others were privileged to cosponsor with him on January 31.

I suppose we have embarrassed the administration somewhat, because I am happy to see that some parts of the bill which a group of us on the minority side of the Judiciary Committee proposed have been included in the President's message that was sent to the House today. Although I am gratified to that extent, I am disappointed and amazed that the President would send up such a thin proposal and ask the Congress to act only on that proposal.

This is a retreat; and is in effect an invitation to legislative catastrophe in the civil rights area. I cannot help noting at the same time that the message is accompanied by a good deal of propaganda. I wonder if poor Abe Lincoln is not turning in his grave a little bit as I read this sentence in the President's message:

> In the last 2 years more progress has been made in securing civil rights for Americans than in any comparable period of our history.

That is quite a statement, and I would have thought that the drafters of that statement would have thought twice before putting it in, because at the end of the message the President asks that there be no partisan consideration, that there be no disagreement, and that we just accept this meager proposal as it stands.

I take note also that it was under the Eisenhower administration that the lead was taken in ending segregation practices and discrimination in interstate transportation, land and air; yet that credit is magnanimously assumed by Mr. Kennedy. The Eisenhower administration also took the lead in ending desegregation for the District of Columbia.

So I think that we on the minority side owe it to the public and owe it to ourselves as members of the minority to call for an accounting on statements of this kind.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with my colleague from New York, and that is the reason why earlier today I asked for this 30-minute special order that we might discuss the matter. From a hurried reading of the message, it appears to fall far short of the Democratic platform on the subject, adopted at the convention in which the President was nominated. On the other hand, the bill which the gentleman from New York had so much part in preparing carries forward, in substance, the Republican platform.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. The Democratic platform of 1960 specifically states that the Civil Rights Commission should be made a permanent commission, yet the proposal sent to us today in this message calls for only a 4-year extension.

Mr. McCULLOCH. The gentleman's bill likewise provides for a permanent commission. A permanent commission in this field is needed.

Mr. LINDSAY. And with proper subpena powers.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes.

Mr. LINDSAY. One reason we know this is important is that contrary to what is stated in the President's message, the problem of civil rights in securing for all citizens equal opportunity under the law is a continuing one which is not going to be solved in 4 years; it will not be solved in 24 years. In order to have a proper Civil Rights Commission examining into the problems, it must be permanent. We are going to have continuing difficulty in securing truly qualified men to serve on such a commission on a temporary year-to-year basis.

The 1960 Democratic platform also calls for providing governmental authority to institute a civil action in a Federal court.

This proposal is not even mentioned in the message. Our bill, the bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] contains this provision in the field of education, which is the most critical area.

A third area where the Democratic platform is breached by this message is in the area of employment practices. A Federal FEPC was promised in the platform. No mention of it was made in the message.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Would not the gentleman agree that the denial of the opportunity to earn a living by reason of race or color is one of the most troublesome and inexcusable discriminations with which we are faced?

Mr. LINDSAY. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. McCULLOCH. It is basic?

Mr. LINDSAY. It is basic. It should be pointed out that the bill the gentleman offered to the Congress contains a provision setting up a Federal commission on a permanent basis that has power to make surveys, and to bring cases in this area involving discrimination in connection with Government contracts, in the great complex where the Government cooperates with private industry and universities to forward the defense of America. This is the area we propose to do something about.

May I say that I have no intention of being partisan on this issue, and I hope we will not force ourselves into a partisan angle, but it is difficult to remain silent in view of statements made in this message.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I interrupt the gentleman from New York to say in view of the fact some 80 or 90 new Federal judges have been appointed, the court calendars in most of the Federal district courts should be kept current.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio for his many contributions throughout the years to the solution of the problems in the field of civil rights.

I note on page 6 of the message of the President these words:

> Beginning in September of this year, under the aid-to-impacted-area school program, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will initiate a program of providing on-base facilities so that children living on military installations will no longer be required to attend segregated schools at Federal expense.

My question to the gentleman from Ohio is this: There is nothing in the bill which the gentleman and other Republican Members introduced that would perpetuate school segregation by building integrated schools on military installations?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Of course not. I am happy that question has been asked, in view of the language in the President's message.

Mr. SHRIVER. Would not such a plan result in actually rewarding local school districts for noncompliance with our Constitution?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes, it would. I think those who joined in introducing the bill of the minority, would have no part in such proposals.

Mr. SHRIVER. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is very much against this proposition?

Mr. McCULLOCH. That is my understanding.

Mr. SHRIVER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to most sincerely commend the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] as well as the gentlemen who have participated with him in this discussion of the merits of the civil rights legislation introduced by many of us last month, and the lack of merit in the President's message given to the Congress today.

In noting the superficial nature of the proposals contained in the Presidential message, the thought occurs to the gentleman from Minnesota that there must be some understanding between powerful congressional Members of the President's party and the drafters of this message; how else does one account for the serious deficiencies and oversights in the legislation requested by the White House? For example, there is nothing in the Presidential message calling for added legislative tools to eliminate discrimination in employment opportunities.

I cannot let this day go by without suggesting that considerations of political expediency, and the plans going forward for the 1964 campaign, have been more evident in the content of this message than the expected sincere desire to advance the cause of civil rights in America.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

At this point I would like to comment upon a statement that was made by my colleague from New York who said that he hoped legislation in this field would not take on partisan political attributes. I, too, hope that there is no partisanship in the consideration of this legislation either in committee or on the floor of the House or in the other body.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am pleased to yield to my good friend from Iowa [Mr. Bromwell].

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, let me join my colleagues here in congratulating the gentleman from Ohio in his anticipation of sound civil rights legislation over a month ago in the introduction of a sound civil rights bill.

Apropos the most recent remark of the gentleman about partisan political considerations I, too, am in hopes that partisanship can be avoided and that a sound bill will be enacted very swiftly. Here is a situation where all that is needed is a minority of the majority to put good civil rights legislation on the books. I think the expression has been made abundantly in this session from this side of the aisle, that the only thing that is needed for some decent legislation is cooperation from the other side. I would, however, like to make one statement, which I cannot forbear making—I made it substantially a month ago when the civil rights bills were introduced from this side of the aisle—and it is brought to mind by the reference to the poll tax amendment in the message we received today. I think that it cannot be pointed out too often to the people of the United States, or too vigorously, that the poll tax amendment is a glittering political fraud, that no one has so far voted because of its adoption after a full 40 minutes of debate in this House, that no one has yet voted; 13 States have ratified and we have some 25 to go and when they get done, it is still a question whether anybody will vote, because it applies only to Federal elections and Federal officers, who are on the same ballot with State officials, to vote for which poll taxes have to be paid. I think we should deemphasize the poll tax amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] has expired.

CUBA SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of the Congress, I have refrained from taking the time of the Members of this House until today. I would have hoped that the occasion of my first remarks could have been one of less urgency and of less danger to this Nation than the increasingly critical problem of Cuba.

As many Members of the House, I have been anxiously hoping that the administration would, after weighing all of the various alternatives, assume the advantage we seemingly held some months ago and have since lost, by stepping forward in a capacity of leadership, and, with the cooperation of the other nations in this hemisphere to the greatest extent possible, by undertaking a positive course of action aimed at preventing the strengthening of the Castro regime, stopping the further spread of communism from Cuba to other nations of this hemisphere, and hopefully accelerating the eventual elimination of communism from Cuba. Regrettably, this has not happened.

Personally, as serious as these questions may be, I have been less concerned of late with debating the exact number of missiles or Communist troops remaining in Cuba, or the often obscure distinction between offensive and defensive weapons, or even the exact meaning of a so-called bipartisan foreign policy, than with the very real danger which Cuba represents to this hemisphere as a training ground and stepping off point for Communist guerrillas, saboteurs, and infiltrators. Certainly, recent developments in Brazil dramatize this problem. We cannot tolerate four or five South Vietnams in this hemisphere.

I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues some shocking facts concerning the dramatically increased trade between Cuba and Communist-bloc nations, particularly Red China, and to point out that much of this cargo, which serves to strengthen the Castro regime in Cuba and to assist Cuba in its subversive activities, is being moved through our own Panama Canal.

The 1962 annual report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Company states on page 6:

> The volume of cargo moving through the canal to Red China in 1962 totaled 877,000 long tons, for an increase of 600 percent, and movements to Russia totaled 344,000 long tons, for an increase of 48 percent.

While this is shocking to me, it apparently is not of great concern to the administration, in that the president of the Panama Canal Company, and, incidentally, the Company is a corporate agency and instrumentality of the Government of the United States, stated in

his 1962 letter to the stockholder—the stockholder being the Honorable Cyrus Vance, Secretary of the Army:

> It is gratifying to report that a record volume of traffic moved through the Panama Canal last year, reflecting the canal's expanding role of world oceanborne commerce.

I, for one, do not consider an increase of 600 percent in cargo movements to Red China through the Panama Canal gratifying. The report points out that sugar movements from Cuba accounted for a major portion of the increased combined tonnage to Red China and Russia through the canal. The report goes on to say:

> Thus, cargo movements during 1962 marked another year in the continued phenomenal growth in world traffic since World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I am writing today to the President of the United States, expressing my concern and asking a series of four questions regarding the advisability of the United States extending the recently announced policy of denying the use of U.S. ports to ships trading with Cuba to include the ports at either end of the Panama Canal. I wish to insert my letter to the President in the Record at this point:

> FEBRUARY 28, 1963.
>
> THE PRESIDENT,
> *The White House,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am deeply concerned by the dramatically increased cargo movements through the Panama Canal to Red China during 1962 as reported in the 1962 Annual Report of the Panama Canal Company. Certainly the restrictions which the United States has imposed on trade with Cuba represent an attempt by this country to weaken the Castro regime. This obviously is and must be our goal. In that the increased trade between Communist-bloc nations and Cuba is defeating this goal, it seems obvious that serious consideration should be given to the possibility of a move by the United States to deny the use of the Panama Canal to all ships carrying cargo into and out of Communist Cuba.
>
> In the event that existing treaties and international agreements prevent such action, it would further seem feasible that this Nation give immediate consideration to the possibility of a revision of the treaties and international agreements involved to adapt them to the cold war being fought in this hemisphere in 1963.
>
> The danger of the establishment of a Communist dictatorship on the continent of South America which is posed by the continued exportation of communism from Cuba to the continent is serious. Today the Panama Canal could serve as an effective tool in preventing the strengthening of the Castro regime and the further spread of communism to the continent. At the point where a Communist dictatorship is established on the continent of South America, control of the Panama Canal will cease in large measure to be an effective tool in preventing the further spread of communism.
>
> For your consideration and response, I am attaching a series of four questions which are of grave concern to me. I will look forward to your early reply.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> DONALD RUMSFELD,
> *Member of Congress.*
>
> ---
>
> QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
>
> 1. Would existing U.S. treaties and/or international agreements permit a move by the United States to deny the use of the Panama Canal to ships carrying cargo into and out of Cuba?
>
> 2. What are the restrictions contained in the recent administration statement limiting the use of "American ports" under certain circumstances by certain vessels?
>
> 3. Could the facilities, whether they be called harbors, ports, or entrances at both ends of the Panama Canal be considered American ports for the purposes of international agreements, treaties, and the recently established policy referred to above?
>
> 4. Since the rise of the Castro regime in Cuba, the United States has taken various steps to weaken that regime including restrictions on trade between this country and Communist Cuba. To offset the desired harmful effects on the Cuban economy as the result of these U.S. actions, the Communist bloc nations, particularly Red China, have substantially increased their trading activities with Cuba. In view of these facts and in view of the events in the past 5 months, would it not be appropriate for this Nation to impose a restriction on the use of the Panama Canal by any ships carrying cargo to or from Cuba?

Problems are not solved by pretending that they do not exist. Certainly the continued delay in commencing a coordinated hemispheric action will reduce our chances for success in stemming the tide of world communism. Once the Communists have established a firm beachhead on the continent of South America, we will have lost the advantage which our control of the Panama Canal today represents and with it the opportunity to prevent the continued spread of communism throughout this hemisphere. Today, the Panama Canal can be an effective tool against communism; tomorrow, it may not.

To my knowledge, this question was first raised in two articles appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times during the past week. For the benefit of those who share my concern, I wish to insert the following articles from the Chicago Sun-Times in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks: A syndicated column by Milburn P. Akers, of Friday, February 22, an editorial advocating that this Nation deny the use of the Panama Canal to all ships carrying cargo into and out of Communist Cuba, of February 22. The syndicated column of Milburn P. Akers which I understand has been distributed for publication in the Chicago Sun-Times on March 1, also deals with this problem and I intend to insert it in the Record as soon as copies are available.

I wish to point out that our policy of denying the use of U.S. ports, or even a step to deny the use of the Panama Canal to Communist vessels engaged in trade with Cuba, will not solve the problem, in that a major portion of these cargoes move on vessels flying non-Communist flags.

Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting an invasion of Cuba; I am not suggesting a full blockade of Cuba; I am not rattling sabers; rather, I am urging the administration to take cognizance of this dramatically increased Communist trade through the Panama Canal. I am requesting and urging that the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives conduct an investigation as to the advisability of a move by the United States to deny the use of the Panama Canal to all ships carrying cargo into and out of Cuba. If under existing treaties and international agreements this cannot be accomplished, and I fully appreciate that there are obstacles including treaties with both Panama and Great Britain, I am asking that consideration be given to prompt revision of these treaties or agreements to adapt them to cope with the cold war we are fighting in this hemisphere in 1963. Certainly if such course of action is deemed advisable, the necessary changes could be accomplished. If at the conclusion of these studies it is the decision of the House to express to the President the sense of the House that these or similar steps be taken, I strongly urge that every effort be made to encourage the cooperation of the other nations of this hemisphere through the Organization of American States.

I wish also to include at the conclusion of my remarks pages 4, 5, and 6 from the 1962 Panama Canal annual report of the board of directors:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 22, 1963]

(By Milburn P. Akers)

Total isolation of Fidel Castro's Cuba by the remaining Western Hemisphere nations has been proposed by President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela.

This step, effectively enforced, would help. But it isn't enough. Cuba should be isolated by the entire free world. So long as the Castro regime remains in power, Cuba's potential for mischief, or worse, remains.

The United States risked atomic war to force Soviet Russia to withdraw its missiles. It is now treading on risky ground in efforts to bring about the removal of remaining Soviet troops. Even after these troops are removed, as they probably will be shortly, Cuba under Castro remains as a threat—a threat not so much to the United States, which if need be, can overrun Cuba at will, but to Latin America generally.

Cuba is being used as a training ground for saboteurs, guerrillas and other varieties of Communist troublemakers from various Latin American nations. If that is permitted to continue, the United States, sooner or later, will be fighting many dirty, little wars in Latin America as it is now doing in South Vietnam. Twelve thousand American soldiers and much equipment are now employed in South Vietnam in the effort to eradicate relatively small bands of Viet Congs, that nation's equivalent of Communist guerrillas. The United States is spending a minimum of $500 million annually in this effort alone.

Do we want to do the same thing in half a dozen or more Latin American nations?

Ridding Cuba of Soviet missiles and troops isn't enough. Castro and the Communist regime on that island are the real culprits. The missiles and troops wouldn't have been in Cuba except for Castro and his regime. They were brought into Cuba surreptitiously in the first place. They can be returned in the same manner so long as Cuba has a Communist government.

Neither the Kennedy administration nor most of its Republican opposition is taking or advocating those steps, short of invasion, which would eradicate the infection at its source. Total isolation of Cuba by the free world might do the job.

Total isolation would mean that no citizen of the free world would be permitted to travel to Cuba; that no person, company, or cartel would engage in any kind of traffic whatsoever with Cuba.

Various nations whose own security is totally dependent upon the atomic capability of the United States hesitated or refused to ban commerce with Cuba previously. Even the United States hasn't sought to plug all Cuban supply sources in this country. The Kennedy administration acted courageously and effectively in forcing Soviet Russia to remove its missiles. Otherwise its course insofar as Cuba is concerned has been one of timidity, expediency and sheer bubbleheadedness.

So long as the United States itself fails to follow policies resulting in an effective total ban on all commerce and travel with Cuba by American citizens and American companies, other free world countries cannot be expected to do so.

Once the United States has instituted such policies most others in the Western Hemisphere can be expected to follow suit. Once the Western Hemisphere has demonstrated it is taking effective steps to rid Cuba of its Communist regime other nations in the free world may do likewise.

It becomes increasingly apparent that the Communist planners, having a foothold in Cuba, intend to use it as a training ground for hordes of guerrillas and saboteurs who will turn many Latin American nations into South Vietnams. Our experience in South Vietnam demonstrates the difficulties such guerrilla bands can create as well as the cost, both in lives and in money, in efforts to rid a nation of them.

It was good to rid Cuba of Soviet missiles. It will be good to rid Cuba of Soviet troops. It will be even better to rid Cuba of Castro and his Communist regime. Without them, there could have been neither Soviet missiles nor troops. With them, we are constantly confronted with a possible return. And with them, we are confronted with the possibility of many dirty, little wars throughout Latin America.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 26, 1963]

TAKE OFF THE GLOVES

Sixty-two Americans have been killed in the abortive fighting in Vietnam. The latest to die is a U.S. Army machinegunner who was killed when two Army helicopters were downed by ground fire while they were carrying out a medical evacuation mission 100 miles east of Saigon.

To check this mounting casualty list an order has been given to allow our troops to open fire first, "in some cases." The criterion is that the American soldier must pick for a target a "positively identified" guerrilla.

This is a specious order. It is inconceivable that a trained Army machinegunner, sitting exposed and naked to ground fire in the open door of a helicopter, would wait to be fired upon before he opened fire. If he did not immediately rake any enemy area where he detected movement before he was fired upon he would not be worthy of the training he had received. Death is as final to a soldier in a political action as it is in a formally declared war.

The relaxing of the "rules of engagement" (State Department terminology for as yet undeclared warfare) does have a major significance, however.

We have now declared war in Vietnam. Our troops can fire as soon as they identify armed guerrillas as the target. This is war; pure and simple. The line has been drawn in the dust with the heavy toe of a military boot. If you see the enemy—shoot to kill.

There has been an overabundance of political falderal and shilly-shallying in Vietnam and other areas. We are not at war, but our troops have been shooting at an "enemy." We are not at war, but the survivors of those killed in action in Vietnam have been accorded full survivor's benefits consistent with those awarded during a formal conflict.

Now we must buckle down to the difficult and onerous task of driving the enemy—and there is only one enemy, communism—out of southeast Asia.

As a matter of cold fact, it is high time we take off our velvet gloves and stop worrying about offending Russia. The Russian troops in Cuba must go, whether they go in response to a formal protest from our State Department (and no such protest has yet been lodged, so far as anyone knows) or whether they go because we threaten to drive them out.

In Cuba the Red cancer grows. Now Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, normally a careful and precise man in his public utterances of import, says that four Americans died in invasion aircraft during the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

It is not known, yet, whether these four men were members of our military forces. The management of news about Cuba has been shocking and calloused beyond recall. It does not matter a great deal—they were Americans and Senator DIRKSEN takes proper umbrage in protesting the remark of Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, that the Bay of Pigs affair is "spilled milk."

Cuba must be isolated and removed as a mounting platform for armed subversion of Latin America. As Milburn P. Akers, editor of the Sun-Times, noted in his column Friday: "Communist planners, having a foothold in Cuba, intend to use it as a training ground for hordes of guerrillas and saboteurs who will turn many Latin American countries into South Vietnam."

We must not only blockade Cuba—we must also deny the use of the Panama Canal to all ships carrying cargo into and out of Communist Cuba.

Let there be an end to this defeatist philosophy of fearing to offend Russia. When Russia is confronted with the harsh fact that the game is up—as they were confronted in Cuba on October 22—they follow the only course open to them if they hope to survive; they back down.

There will be some who will call this course of confrontation jingoism. There are always those who choose to believe a bully can be won over with soft talk and sweet reason.

Jingoism is an outdated word. A better name is self-preservation.

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY REPORT

Subject: Annual report of Board of Directors.
Letter to stockholder:

It is very gratifying to report that a record volume of traffic moved through the Panama Canal last year reflecting the canal's expanding role in the steady growth of world oceanborne commerce. The average time spent by ships in Canal Zone waters during transit was reduced to 15.5 hours, compared with 16.5 hours per transit in 1961. This 1 hour reduction in transit time represents a savings of approximately $1 million to our customers.

Waterway improvements progressed on schedule during 1962, and the final contract in the channel widening program will be awarded within the next year.

For the 11th successive year since its reorganization (July 1, 1951), the Panama Canal financed within its resources, and without cost to the taxpayer, all of its operational and capital requirements.

The capital program required expenditures of $16.1 million during the fiscal year. This was the second highest annual expenditure of this nature since the reorganization. The largest single item of capital expenditure was $5.9 million toward widening of the Empire Reach within Gaillard Cut. In the 5 years through fiscal year 1962, a total of $22.8 million has been expended for the channel improvement program and additional expenditures necessary to complete this program will approximate $20.9 million. Other major expenditures in 1962 included $2.3 million on the quarters replacement program, $1.3 million for an additional electric generating plant, $0.6 million on the central air-conditioning plant, and $0.5 million on the new locks towing locomotives.

The funds provided through operations, net revenue, depreciation, etc., were not sufficient to finance capital expenditures and it became necessary to draw down cash reserves to the extent of $1.7 million.

Tolls revenue was at an alltime high of $58.3 million, for transiting 11,340 ships over 300 tons. Comparatively figures for 1961 were $55.2 million and 11,054 ships. The average cost to the shipper per cargo ton was 74.9 cents (excludes vessels transiting in ballast or measured on displacement basis), as compared to 74.8 cents for the previous year. The tolls rate remains unchanged at 90 cents per laden ton under Panama Canal measurement.

On June 29, 1962, the SS *Ancon* was transferred to the U.S. Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, on a nonreimbursable basis, for ultimate transfer to the State of Maine. Consequently, the equity of the U.S. Government in the Company was reduced some $2 million.

Special emphasis has been given to equality of treatment of all employees. Several programs have been initiated to improve communications with our Spanish-speaking employees as well as our neighbors in the Republic of Panama.

(By order of the Board of Directors.)

ROBERT J. FLEMING, Jr.,
President.

CANAL TRAFFIC

Demands for Panama Canal services established new high records for the year. Oceangoing transits increased by 2.6 percent, cargo tonnage by 6 percent, and tolls income by 5.8 percent over the previous record year of 1961. The flags of some 38 nations of the world were represented by the 11,149 commercial transits. Ranked in the order of their transit volume were the flags of the United States, Norway, Great Britain, Germany, and Liberia. Russian ships in trade with Cuba made 12 transits. The average tonnage of transiting commercial vessels increased by 3 percent. The number of large ships with beams of 80 feet and over increased by 6 percent.

Of the 67,525,000 long tons of commercial cargo that passed through the waterway, 96.5 percent originated in or was destined to one of the nations of North, South, or Central America. Some 22,189,000 long tons of U.S. exports, 17,669,000 tons of U.S. imports, and 5,562,000 tons of cargo moving in the U.S. intercoastal trade passed through the canal.

The flow of cargo to the Far East continued to dominate canal traffic growth as it has for the past 3 years. Commercial cargo movements increased 3,855,000 long tons over last year, of which 3,321,000 long tons was increased flow to the Far East. Cargo movements to Japan alone increased 2,700,000 tons. Japan's industrial boom has been reflected in canal traffic. The beginning of the current expansion phase occurred in 1959 when 7,973,000 long tons of cargo passed through the canal to Japan. This year 16,504,000 long tons moved to Japan. Some slowing in the rapid rate of growth in cargo movements to Japan occurred in late fiscal year 1962. Showing a very impressive percentage increase for the year was the volume of cargo moving to Red China and Russia. Cargo movements to Red China totaled 877,000 long tons for an increase of 600 percent and movements to Russia totaled 344,000 long tons for an increase of 48 percent. Sugar movements from Cuba accounted for the vast majority of this combined tonnage. In the return flow of cargo, Red China and Russia shipped 52,000 tons of cargo to Cuba.

Thus cargo movements during 1962 marked another year in the continued phenomenal growth that has occurred in canal traffic since World War II. During this 16-year period, commercial cargo movements have

increased 212 percent, an annual average increase of 7.5 percent. Only 1958 failed to surpass the previous year in total tonnage movements.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. I would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois on his first speech in the House of Representatives and for his very fine and astute analysis of problems of such importance as this.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank my colleague.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Illinois in the very excellent presentation he has made to the House today and also to suggest that each and every suggestion and warning and advice that can emanate from this House which may help in the solution of the very tense international situation primarily in the area of Cuba is a contribution to the Nation. This important message that we have had today from the gentleman from Illinois is along that line and contributes to that end. He has made a suggestion which provides a forceful and yet a nonbelligerent method of helping to resolve this difficult problem. I compliment the gentleman on the research and study that has evidently gone into the preparation of his remarks. I am confident that the Executive will want to take very careful note of the suggestions and recommendations that have been made. Also, Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman in the presentation which was given to the House today.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank my colleague.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois, my colleague.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman for his remarks here this afternoon. The gentleman is my neighbor to the north and it is certainly a pleasure to see him deliver his maiden speech today in the fine manner that he did and to see him get into the general swim of debate in the House of Representatives. His constituents have every reason to be proud of their Congressman for his maiden speech here today. I am familiar with the Sun-Times recommendation regarding denial of the Panama Canal to ships hauling goods to Communist-dominated Cuba. The gentleman from Illinois is wise in urging the proposal be adopted as part of our policy toward Cuba. This is a sound proposal. I should like to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois on his opening remarks when he said he was not so much concerned about the number of troops or types of weapons in Cuba, but whether or not the very presence of Soviet Communists in Cuba is serving as a base for exporting communism to the entire South American Continent. This is really the heart of the Cuban issue and I hope the gentleman will agree that this is the concept in which President Kennedy is today viewing the entire Cuban situation. He has stated repeatedly that the presence of Communists in Cuba constitutes a menace to this country and this entire hemisphere in that Cuba serves as a base for exporting communism to the rest of the South American Continent.

I believe that the suggestion made by the gentleman today certainly is one that should be given careful consideration as a step toward an overall effort to narrow the ability of the Communists to fortify Cuba economically so they can continue exporting communism to South America. Once we succeed in isolating Cuba economically, I believe we can start looking confidently toward the day when we can eradicate the Communists from Cuba. It has been my judgment for some time that sooner or later the Communists will fall from the weight of their own oppression—not only in Cuba but all over the world. No system has had as dismal a record of failure as the Communist system. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to congratulate my neighbor to the north of my congressional district, for the significant contribution he has made here today in his maiden speech and certainly, for calling our attention to the excellent editorial which appeared in the Sun-Times. Even though the gentleman and I are of different political parties and beliefs, I am certain I can state with confidence, Mr. RUMSFELD's constituents can be proud of his initial contribution today.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank my colleague.

ROGERS CHARGES THAT WEATHER NOT THE REASON FOR CIA MISSILE PHOTO LAG

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, weather conditions can hardly be the reason why the CIA, according to reports, was unable to produce photos of Russian missiles in Cuba and the Air Force did. From published reports, it appears that the very first Strategic Air Command overflight of Cuba produced the photographs which showed the extent of Russian missiles in Cuba was sufficient for the President to act.

I have compared the weather reports for Cuba during the period September 5 through October 14—the period during which CIA was allegedly conducting aerial intelligence reconnaissance over Cuba. Cloudy to rainy weather prevailed on the days CIA overflights were reportedly conducted. As confirmed by the Department of Defense, aerial reconnaissance of Cuba was performed by the Air Force during the early morning hours of October 14. This is the important point—weather conditions on that morning were generally as cloudy and difficult as those under which the CIA had been operating for the previous 5 weeks. And as the President stated in his speech on October 22 when he came before the Nation to expose the Soviet threat in Cuba, his decision was based on receiving the first preliminary hard missile information the morning of October 16.

Just what is the reason?

In any case, the Congress has a right to review the operations of the CIA. Such review should be conducted by Members of both the House and the Senate in a joint watchdog committee as I have proposed. I urge all Members of Congress to get behind the movement to form this permanent joint watchdog committee for the security of this Nation.

ELLIS ISLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as Ellis Island is in the 19th Congressional District which I have the honor to represent, I feel a special interest in the problem of its disposition. Let me recall that it has been more than 7 years since the historic old facility was abandoned, 7 years in which the island has been idle and has been allowed to gradually decay.

Now, there is no need to argue at length for the special importance of this piece of property. Ellis Island is not ordinary real estate to be sold to the highest bidder. Yet unless Congress takes action, the General Services Administration will once again throw the island open to competitive bidding and we may indeed see a commercial project replace the historic buildings.

We are fortunate that there are citizens in our community sufficiently alarmed by this prospect to have organized and to have worked for an alternative. A group of our most distinguished educators has, in the past 2 years, elaborated a detailed, concrete, and practical plan that would convert the existing buildings on Ellis Island into a first-rate new liberal arts college. Their plan would accomplish a double goal; it would preserve all the existing buildings and at the same time it would put them to practical use by meeting the urgent and growing need for more educational facilities.

I think we who have been concerned about the disposition of this property owe much to the educators who have taken the trouble to create an imaginative plan for its use. There are virtues to their proposal which seem to me to be superior to any that have been offered in the 7 years since the island's abandonment. I would like to suggest a few.

In the first place, their proposal helps to meet an immediate and pressing need. We are all, I think, growing aware of the problems that face us in the present shortage of college facilities. The next few years will see an acute crisis. With a facility readily adaptable and crying for use, it would be disgraceful not to seize this opportunity.

Second, the new college has the virtue of putting the historic site to a use which I find most appropriate. Ellis Island once stood for opportunity for millions. Formal higher education has never been so crucial; it has never been so important in opening up opportunity. We cannot handicap our youth by failing to give them the educational chances they need and deserve. But this means we must be alive to every new possibility.

Again, I am much impressed by the public support the proposal has received, so evident in newspaper editorials like the New York Times, the Journal American, the Washington Post, and others. I think it is a most important consideration that the alternative we choose for Ellis Island's future be one that is in the interest of and has the support of the public. We remember the outcry in the past against commercial sale. It was justified. Ellis Island is a monument to a very special and important part of our historical experience. The new college at Ellis Island would preserve the old buildings as a living and fitting memorial to the past.

Because of her special location in the great harbor, thousands of visitors pass Ellis Island daily. Set beside the Statue of Liberty, the symbolic value of the new institution is most important. We must not allow this opportunity to pass. Let us make a farsighted decision. Housing projects, hospitals, and the like are worthy endeavors. But they can be usefully built elsewhere. Let us provide on Ellis Island a new institution that will belong to the Nation, an institution that we will be proud to point to as we pass it in the harbor. Let us preserve the old buildings and put them to appropriate use.

In short, let us back the efforts of the distinguished citizens who want to create a great new liberal arts college on that site. They have worked unselfishly toward that end for a long time. Let us share their vision and help make a new and exciting reality of Ellis Island, one in which we may all partake and one in which we may all take pride.

Toward this end I am today introducing legislation authorizing the Administrator of the General Services Administration to dispose of Ellis Island to the Ellis Island for Higher Education, Inc., of New York for educational purposes.

ONE GENERAL EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATION FOR EACH FISCAL YEAR

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Skubitz] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a resolution that would provide that the Congress place an annual expenditure limitation on every spending account in the Federal budget. This is a companion resolution to one that was introduced in the Senate on January 24, 1963, by Senator Byrd of Virginia and Senator Williams of Delaware.

There is nothing new about this resolution. Similar ones have been introduced at each session for at least a dozen years, and all of them have ended up in the pigeonholes of unfinished business.

It is my sober judgment that this resolution transcends in importance all other business that will come before the 88th Congress. It is not pleasant to think about, but we now stand with our backs against the fiscal wall. It should now be obvious to even a child that if this Nation is to escape national bankruptcy and runaway inflation, it is going to be necessary for the Congress to regain control of expenditures. This administration, like the three that have preceded, has shown no signs that it intends to embrace fiscal sanity. It has been completely taken in by the political heresy of bug-eyed and long-haired university professors who have been bamboozling the young with the Keynesian theory that the more we spend and waste the more prosperous we shall become. This theory has long since landed on the seashore of exploded delusions, and the sooner we abandon it the better.

It is not necessary here to tell any Member of this House that unless we place an annual limitation against all expenditure authorizations, including current appropriations, unexpended balances and countless other loopholes that invite public waste, that chaos is inevitable. You have all been to school and know it as well as I do.

To delay any longer effective expenditure control amounts to no more than ignoring a grave responsibility of Government that should have been discharged a dozen years ago.

EQUAL RIGHTS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Record a communication which I have received from a member of my constituency, and an outstanding leader in the field of labor, Mr. L. Joseph Overton, vice president, Negro American Labor Council:

February 22, 1963.

Congressman Adam Clayton Powell,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Adam: This letter may be a little late coming during a time when you may be under the deepest criticism. I sincerely hope that you realize the position you are in is one which has been and will always be criticized throughout history. You are the chairman of one of the greatest committees in the history of our Nation. The top two domestic issues of our Nation are labor and education. The only persons in this position who would not draw criticism would be the ones not doing anything. And an individual not doing anything, and not drawing criticism would mean the same thing—nothing.

Since those who recognize the importance and significance of the operations of your committee know that your job is one which the world would recognize and feel that in lieu of all criticism, the job which has been done by your committee and under your supervision since you have been chairman is one to be hailed by our Nation because of your closeness and understanding of the people for which this committee was established in the Halls of Congress some 80 years ago, has again created the same conflict and condemnation for which came about in the Halls of Congress and the Nation in these ancient years.

It is regrettable that after 100 years since the Emancipation Proclamation, you have to suffer today the pressures and condemnations of that era, but, since the committee of which you are chairman did not complete the work on behalf of the people, the job of creating equal opportunities in employment and education for all American people, the job must be done.

I feel for you in the condemnations and criticisms which are now being launched against you. However, I do believe that your decision to remain in Congress and to continue your struggle to place before the American people the way of a true democracy was the right one and by doing so the future would undoubtedly vindicate your action and position in all of these matters which are now being criticized.

With the above thoughts in mind, I would like to express my personal feeling which I believe is shared by many of the black people of America, and certainly by all of those with whom I am and have been associated. We pledge our fullest support and confidence in your efforts to eradicate all injustices in discrimination in the fields of labor and education that may now exist in our Nation.

Sincerely and fraternally yours,
L. Joseph Overton.

ACCIDENT RATES IN COAL MINES

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in 1962, 289 men were killed in accidents in the U.S. bituminous coal, lignite, and anthracite mines. These fatalities occurred at a frequency rate of 1.20 per million man-hours of exposure, the same as last year which was the second worst year since World War II.

At least 95 percent of all injuries and fatalities in coal mines are preventable and only occur because of the failure of all concerned to apply the knowledge they possess and have not used.

In an analysis of coal mine roof, face, and rib fall fatalities by size of mine and district the Bureau of Mines shows 47 men were killed in title I mines—those employing 14 or less underground—against 66 killed in title II mines—those employing 15 men or more underground. Nearly half such deaths occurred in the so-called small mines in spite of the fact that they produce less than 14 percent of the coal.

Mr. Speaker, I took an active part in the fight to pass Public Law 552 the original Mine Safety Act. At that time I was opposed to the amendment which refused Federal inspectors the power to shut down a mine working less than 15 men underground when an imminent danger was found. I am still opposed to it. I believe that every man who goes down into a hole in the ground is entitled to all the protection the operator, the State, and the Federal Government can give him. I think that every State inspector and every Federal inspector should have that power. I know that men seeking a job are not wholly free. They must work for a living.

They cannot remain idle and must accept offered employment even if it means they are taking their lives in their hands when they do so. They must take care of their wives and children and they do even if it means taking a chance in an unventilated, untimbered, gassy and dusty hole in the ground.

I hope and trust that the 88th Congress will undo the wrong done to the mineworkers of America and provide them with the full protection of Public Law 552, the Federal mine safety bill.

A Bill To Amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as To Provide Further for the Prevention of Accidents in Coal Mines

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 552, Eighty-second Congress, entitled "An Act to amend Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to provide for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines", approved July 16, 1952, chapter 877, 66 Stat. 692, 30 U.S.C. 471, be amended by striking out section 201(b) thereof.

THE SUBCONTRACTOR'S RIGHT TO SUE THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a major reform needed in the Government's procurement process is to accord to subcontractors the right to recover directly from the Government payment due for labor or material furnished to the prime contractor in prosecution of a Government contract. I have introduced H.R. 4390 to accomplish that reform.

A prime contractor may demand from the Government the payment due under his Government contract, and institute a suit in case of nonpayment. However, although the Government is the beneficiary of the services rendered or supplies furnished under the subcontract, there is no procedure by which the claim of the subcontractor can be presented against the United States except as a claim of the prime contractor. The reason is said to be that there is no contract, express or implied, between the subcontractor and the Government.

Presently, the subcontractor may resort to private litigation in a court of law against the prime contractor for payment due under the subcontract, but a small subcontractor can neither afford the high cost of the usually protracted litigation nor the interminable delays involved. Small contractors are, thus, often forced to submit to offers of settlement which are, in many instances, ruinous. Additionally, the fact that a subcontractor is unable to count on prompt payment by his prime contractor constitutes a definite handicap to the subcontractor and his ability to obtain financing.

This constitutes a clear injustice to the subcontractor and a hardship which, in my opinion, should not be imposed upon him, especially at a time when, due to the increasing complexity and sophistication of military weaponry, it is becoming more and more difficult for small business to obtain a fair share of Government business as prime contractors.

It behooves the Government to deal with the small subcontractor in this matter on the same basis as it deals with the prime contractor, especially since the Government controls subcontracts by requiring the prime contractor to include in the contract certain clauses before it will approve a subcontract. These clauses contain general conditions to the effect that the subcontractor should perform his work in accordance with the provisions of the prime contract, that the Government may inspect, and reject the subcontractor's work, and that the obligations of the subcontractor and prime contractor toward each other should be equivalent to the obligations between the Government and the prime contractor. These clauses grant the Government authority over the subcontractor without assuming corresponding responsibility.

Not only is the Government denying the unpaid subcontractor direct access to the courts for the benefits it is receiving, but it also prohibits its contracting officers to consent to a subcontract containing a clause conferring upon the subcontractor the right to resort to the Government's own administrative procedures—Armed Services Procurement Regulation 3-903.5.

This is an intolerable situation both from the point of view of the small contractor as well as that of the Government. The bill I have introduced will remedy this injustice, in that it will establish privity between the subcontractor and the Government which is now required to enable him to obtain payment for services rendered or supplies furnished to the Government under a subcontract entered into with a prime contractor.

This is a needed amendment and I urge that early action be taken on H.R. 4390 by the Congress.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS MUST BE LARGER

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, 1963 is a year of decision.

We must decide this year whether we want this Nation to remain strong in the 1970's and the long future, or whether we will slip downward through inaction and neglect of the greatest natural resource America possesses—the youth of this Nation.

We all know the familiar figures: 1 million more 16-year-olds this year than last year, as a result of the postwar baby boom; unemployment among youths 2½ times the national average. We are all familiar with the social pattern: rising idleness, frustration, juvenile delinquency, crime—all sapping the national strength.

The principle of the Youth Conservation Corps is the most thrilling development since the establishment of the Peace Corps. It is not the most important bill in Congress. I think education is far and away the most important. But youth employment comes a close second.

We have heard a lot of talk about fiscal responsibility. I think this Nation would be highly irresponsible fiscally if we sat on our hands and failed to act to save what could be a lost generation. The fiscally responsible thing to do is to invest a small amount in a program which will pay rich dividends in a stronger America, as our young people develop a sense of responsibility, new skills, and help enrich the value of our vast resources and learn the great lessons of service to their home communities.

Let me turn the focus for a minute on West Virginia, and illustrate why this program is so badly needed. In West Virginia, we first experienced the shock of losing young people right after the Korean conflict. West Virginia paid a bonus to its Korean war veterans, and 44.3 percent of the bonus checks went to out-of-State addresses—thus indicating that the cream of our young work force was leaving the State in the 1950's because they found superior economic opportunities elsewhere.

What is the situation today? The strength of West Virginia's future rests on the shoulders of our young people between the ages of 16 and 21. These young people will not only supply our future leadership, but they will in large part determine the economic future of West Virginia. I am sure everyone is aware that West Virginia has in a sense become a laboratory to determine whether the American economic system can flourish. A lot of local programs have lifted communities up by the bootstraps. For example, in the city of Logan, the Woman's Club won a nationwide award from the General Federation of Woman's Clubs by reason of communitywide effort to bring in a new industry, to provide new employment and recreation opportunities, to lift the face of this largest coal-producing county in the Nation. In 1963, West Virginia's centennial year, this kind of spirited grassroots activity is going on all over the State. The Area Redevelopment Administration, the accelerated public works program and efforts to channel more Federal contracts into West Virginia have generated an economic upturn. We are starting to move in West Virginia.

Now comes this surge of thousands of young people thrown onto the labor market, and here is the crisis which the Youth Employment Act can and must meet. There has been a lot of talk about school dropouts. Between 1960 and 1962, the Office of Education reports that nationwide, the rate of high school graduates rose from 68.5 to 69.7 percent. Nationwide, the dropout rate is still too high, but it did decline in the last 2 years. But while the dropout rate was declining in the Nation, it was rising in the State of West Virginia. During the same period, high school graduates in West Virginia declined from 62.1 percent in 1960 to 59.9 percent in 1962. This means that not only is our dropout rate in West Virginia going in the wrong direction, but in 1962 it was almost 10 percent above the national average.

The national dropout percentage for 1962 was 30.2 percent. For West Virginia, it was 40.1 percent.

In the face of these serious developments, we are taking action in West Virginia. In 1962, the State legislature appropriated $70,000 for a pilot study and experiment in one county—Mercer—in the southern area of the State where there is a high percentage and also a high ratio of school dropouts. The study took 149 school dropouts in Mercer County, and made participation in the program compulsory. An instructional program during the summer months was aimed at preparing the boys for practical jobs. This morning I talked with the State Superintendent of Schools, Rex Smith, about the results of the pilot study. He said that of the 149 enrolled, 114 completed the course. Of the 35 that did not complete the course, some were employed, entered military service, or moved out of the State. Of the 114, 12 returned to school, 9 entered military service, 14 were employed, and 79 were still unemployed at the time the survey was completed last fall.

Superintendent of Schools Smith told me that West Virginia is now applying the experience in this one-county pilot study in other areas of the State. Gov. W. W. Barron reported on Monday of this week that the West Virginia dropout rate is now leveling off, and for the first 3 months of the current school term the rate is considerably lower than the dropout average in recent years. Incidentally, Superintendent of Schools Smith enthusiastically endorsed the principle of the Youth Employment Act and said it would be a step in the right direction.

Recently, the Secretary of Labor reported a very ominous figure: in West Virginia, unemployment of male youths between 16 and 21 in April 1960 was 19.4 percent. The national average in this age bracket is only 10.8 percent.

Unemployment of this age group is two and a half times the national average, as has been pointed out; but in West Virginia, it is nearly four and a half times the national average. Only one State has a higher unemployment rate for young people—Alaska—and, of course, there are special circumstances in Alaska during the winter season, among the Eskimos, and in certain areas of that State.

In the next 4 years, 95,000 to 100,000 young people lacking the benefit of a specialized skill will be entering the labor market in our State, or else migrating to other States because they cannot find work. More positive measures must be taken immediately to provide a reasonable training program for young people in order to help these young people acquire some constructive work experience.

The State of West Virginia has experimented in many programs which have provided some measure of the success of the type of approach used in the Youth Employment Act. The State spent $50,000 in rehabilitating 95 delinquent boys at a State-operated forestry-conservation camp near Davis, W. Va. In the 2-year period involved these young men accomplished some $200,000 worth of constructive conservation work. It would have cost more than $50,000 if these youngsters had been confined or maintained in idleness. Yet the major dividend is the healthful, purposeful outdoor life provided and the skills learned in the rehabilitation process.

One important point here is that voluntary opportunities for this type of healthful outdoor work are not available to those unemployed youths who are not delinquent—or who may be potential delinquents in the near future.

The Youth Employment Act would offer our young people hope for the future and would give them a chance to perform useful activities which would benefit both themselves and their State. The Federal land in West Virginia totals 950,000 acres, and State-owned land 220,000 acres. We have 19 State parks, 9 State forests, and 12 hunting areas. This morning I talked with State director of national resources, Dr. Warden Lane, and he told me:

> I would give anything to get some young people working in these areas.

And Dr. Lane added that he could use all we could get for him. Dr. Lane enthusiastically endorsed the principle of the bill.

Title I is a very appealing part of the bill, since we have the tremendously successful experience of the Civilian Conservation Corps to build on. But the amounts are pitifully small. I can see the force of the argument that we should not bring in too many youngsters to exceed accommodations. But 15,000 is barely enough to slow down a few forest fires, let alone carry out some of the more constructive conservation programs. Surely, we cannot expect 15,000 to contribute much toward solving the youth unemployment problem of our Nation. Take West Virginia, for example. Under title I, I am informed that 225 young men might be eligible for our State. You have heard the conditions which confront us; yet a 15,000-man program would mean only 4 boys per county in West Virginia. I cannot understand the timidity which would dictate that kind of total. This is worse than competing for a college scholarship to get a slot in the Youth Conservation Corps, if they figure on those kind of totals. Furthermore, the ultimate limit or ceiling of 60,000 is fantastically low. The CCC was nearly ten times that size at a time when the country's population was much smaller. Our own Department of National Resources annually employs 300 young men between the ages of 17 and 20 in our State parks. The Federal program would seem very small in comparison to what the State is already doing.

Under title II, the local area youth employment program, the numbers provided for are a little larger, but still too small for the problem. There is another suggestion which I have for title II. In section 206, provision is made for the Federal Government to pay up to 50 percent of the costs. This means additional matching funds which just simply are not available. The States and localities are just about matched to death financially already. Along came the accelerated public works program and we are squeezed some more and some communities could not even put up 25 percent in very depressed areas.

Now I recognize that any larger Federal contribution under title II would result in fewer young people being able to take advantage of the total program, but I think some of the very hard-hit areas should receive a larger percentage of Federal contribution. Perhaps for the first year of the program, the Federal Government could provide the seed money at 100 percent of the contribution to get the program off the ground, and thereafter the type of formula used by the Public Works Acceleration Act could be employed; that is, a sliding scale between 50 and 75 percent on the basis of a formula including unemployment rate and median family income in the area.

If such provisions were not included in title II, I am afraid that those areas and communities in the Nation which need help the most and can least afford to put up the matching funds will end up not fully participating in the program.

To summarize, I believe this is a great program in principle, but it must be bolder in its approach. It must be larger in scope, and should give attention to the serious financial crisis of the areas it is designed to help.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. Morton (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for March 4, 5, and 6, 1963, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Pelly, for 10 minutes today.

Mr. McCulloch, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Rumsfeld, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Holifield, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Roosevelt, for 2 hours, on Wednesday next.

Mr. Rogers of Florida, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Taft (at the request of Mr. Bell), for 5 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. Farbstein (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 15 minutes, today and to

revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Alger, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday next.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Snyder.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Bell) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Curtis.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gibbons) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Natcher.

Mr. Patten.

Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Udall and to include certain tables.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON CIVIL RIGHTS DISCUSSION

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who took part in the discussion on civil rights be granted permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 4, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

488. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the review of the programing, delivery, and utilization of selected missile system equipment delivered to European countries under the military assistance program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

489. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the sixth report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment by the Office of Civil Defense, Department of Defense, for the quarter ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

490. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 62d quarterly report on export control covering the 4th quarter, 1962, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

491. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of unnecessary planned procurement of generators by the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

492. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

493. A letter from the president, Boys' Clubs of America, transmitting an audited financial statement of Boys' Clubs of America for the year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 988, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

494. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense, of the U.S. Coast Guard for the calendar year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 85–804; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

495. A letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, transmitting a report of an audit of the National Fund for Medical Education for the year ended December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 685, 86th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

496. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report relating to positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

497. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report relating to refugee operations during the fifth 6-month period ending December 31, 1962, and reporting that refugee operations were conducted in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Lebanon, countries in which the Department of State has determined that refugee situations exist, pursuant to Public Law 87–510; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4378. A bill to prohibit interstate contributions in connection with congressional primaries and elections and with elections for electors of the President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 4379. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education, including junior colleges and technical institutes, in financing the contruction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4380. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatchers or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4381. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4382. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to authorize the President, during periods of acute unemployment, to provide that all individuals otherwise eligible may retire with full benefits thereunder at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4383. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 4384. A bill to amend section 9(b)(S) of the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit labor organizations representing guards to be admitted to certain affiliations of labor organizations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 4385. A bill to donate to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, White Earth Indian Reservation, some submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservation involved; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4386. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4387. A bill to provide that employees whose basic compensation is fixed and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, shall be paid on a weekly basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 4388. A bill to amend title I and XVI of the Social Security Act to permit a State to establish or designate a separate agency to administer the portion of its State plan relating to medical assistance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 4389. A bill relating to the tariff classification of woven fabrics in chief value of wool and in part of braid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4390. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 4391. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 4392. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize the provision of contracting and procurement assistance to business concerns otherwise qualifying therefor, even though they are not independently owned and operated, if they are located in depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4393. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to prohibit any State or political subdivision from imposing a lien against an individual's property as a condition of aid or assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4394. A bill to govern the harvesting of Indian timber; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4395. A bill to amend section 3574 of title 39, relating to nightwork compensation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4396. A bill to increase night differential to 15 percent; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4397. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to change the computation of annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4398. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase the survivor annuity from 55 to 75 percent of the principal annuity in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4399. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 4400. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain farm vehicles from the highway use tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 4401. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 4402. A bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4403. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Alaska among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement sysems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 4404. A bill to authorize waiver of indebtedness growing out of erroneous payments by the Armed Forces to military personnel or their dependents, to bar recovery of these payments if recovery action is not initiated within 6 years of payment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4405. A bill to increase rates of death compensation payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4406. A bill to make permanent the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4407. A bill to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to priority of assignments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4408. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H.R. 4409. A bill to insure the awarding of defense contracts on a basis of merit through requiring a public record of ex parte communications with respect to such contracts, requiring disclosure of the reasons for awarding of such contracts, and establishing a congressional committee to oversee negotiated contracts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 4410. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4411. A bill to prohibit the Postmaster General from intentionally issuing defective stamps; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 4412. A bill to provide uniformity in determinations of disability made by departments and agencies of the United States by requiring the use of the standard schedule for rating disabilities prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN (by request):

H.R. 4413. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 4414. A bill to provide for the establishment of Fort Toulouse as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4415. A bill to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 4416. A bill to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.J. Res. 293. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Flaming Gorge Dam, Utah, and the recreation area contiguous to such lake in the States of Wyoming and Utah, as "O'Mahoney Lake and Recreation Area"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 294. Joint resolution amending section 201(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.J. Res. 295. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appropriations shall not exceed revenues of the United States, except in time of war or national emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution providing for one general expenditure authorization act for each fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 271. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. Res. 272. Resolution to amend rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WATSON:

H. Res. 273. Resolution to amend rule XVIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that certain information be contained in committee reports accompanying general appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LIBONATI: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona: House Memorial No. 1, of the Arizona House of Representatives, adopted February 8, 1963, urging the Congress of the United States to authorize the immediate cessation of printing of all $1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to article V thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4417. A bill for the relief of Bryan Simpson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4418. A bill for the relief of Louise Knibbs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4419. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services Administration to dispose of Ellis Island for educational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4420. A bill for the relief of Laura Do Nascimento; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4421. A bill for the relief of Manuel Pires-Mestre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4422. A bill to waive the statute of limitations in a certain case; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Young Citizens in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, this year the week of March 2 through 9 has been set aside as National 4-H Club Week and once again it is a pleasure to salute these clubs which are dedicated to the development of multiple programs serving many varying needs. The 4-H Club work does indeed belong to the people and rightfully inspires a reaffirmation of our faith in our country when we realize the vital part such organizations play in preparing our youth of today for their mature responsibilities of tomorrow.

The phenomenal growth of the system of 4-H Clubs, initiated in the early years of this century, is due to a dynamic program of education functioning through our State land-grant colleges and universities in cooperation with the Federal Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture. In addition to this leadership at the national level, the State extension services provide helpful direction as do the more than 307,750 unpaid volunteer local leaders who are assisted by about 114,960 older club boys and girls designated as junior leaders. Working together also for the betterment of the 4-H movement are two nongovernment organizations, the National 4-H Club Foundation and the National 4-H Service Committee.

Ample proof of the effectiveness and wisdom in providing Federal funds to assist in conducting 4-H Club work is found in the fact that, since 1914, when Federal legislation was passed for this purpose, nearly 22,830,400 different young people have participated in this "learn by doing" program.

The widespread changes in agricultural technology have created new 4-H needs and these needs are being met squarely by these young people who now have a breakdown of 51 percent from farm homes; 29 percent from rural nonfarm homes; and 20 percent from urban localities. Present-day challenges make it neither possible nor desirable for all farm youth to stay on farms and accordingly, rural members and others are trained to become well-rounded citizens equipped to earn and serve in many fields. The number of projects available to 4-H'ers range from about 25 in some States to approximately 100 in others and constitute an incredibly diversified group of programs which have had and will continue to have far-reaching benefits individually and collectively at every level.

In view of today's urgent need for worldwide understanding between the people of all nations, it is indeed gratifying that the National 4-H Club Foundation conducts an international people-to-people program through its International Farm Youth Exchange and its Peace Corps projects. Each year, approximately 115 U.S. delegates from the Youth Exchange are sent abroad to contribute to the social and economic growth and expansion of some 65 countries. In like manner, the same number of young people are brought to this country under this program designed to promote an exchange of ideas, aims, and purposes.

More and more it becomes evident that our Nation, and indeed the world, needs youth organizations such as the 4-H Clubs, because, if the United States is to lead the free world down the road to a lasting peace, our youth must be adequately prepared to meet the challenges which tomorrow holds.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it is a pleasure as well as a privilege to salute this outstanding organization which has well earned worldwide commendation for past achievements and I am sure has the best wishes of all of us for continuing successes in its many fine and worthwhile endeavors.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on Tuesday last, Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, JR., of New Jersey, debated the medicare issue with Dr. Annis of the American Medical Association. Congressman THOMPSON's speech is so lucid and persuasive that it should be made available to all Members of the Congress.

In his speech, the Congressman quotes a brief poem concerning a disease, the symptoms of which we have seen in congressional lobbies all too often. It goes as follows:

If you make a diagnosis
Of the medical psychosis
That is now identifiable as AMA disease,
You would find that hypertension
Is induced by any mention
Of a method whereby patients could afford their doctor's fees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR., DEMOCRAT, OF NEW JERSEY, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Students and faculty of the University of Illinois, ladies and gentlemen—it is a pleasure and an honor for me to be here tonight. It is a pleasure because I will be talking about one of the most significant and humane pieces of social legislation in the Nation's history. It is an honor because I can defend and advocate this great measure to you.

I am talking about the proposal—introduced in the Congress again this year—to provide our elderly with adequate insurance under social security against unmanageable hospital costs.

My opponent this evening is not only a speaker trained to smooth perfection since college debating days, he is also a doctor. And as such, I thought he might appreciate this little poem which appeared in the Reporter magazine several years back. It goes like this:

"If you make a diagnosis
Of the medical psychosis
That is now identifiable as AMA disease,
You would find that hypertension
Is induced by any mention
Of a method whereby patients could afford their doctors' fees."

Of course, we are not talking about doctors' fees this evening. We are talking about hospital costs. We are talking about our aged population, which is a low-income group with extra-high health needs and inadequate means of paying for care. We are talking about a measure which proposes to do something about this sorry situation.

The tart little poem I cited does serve a purpose. In a crisp manner it isolates the major source of opposition to this much-needed social legislation.

That opposition comes from the doctors' trade union—the American Medical Association. It is the only group with a professional speaker-president touring the country criticizing this measure. The workers of the Nation, who pay into social security, are not up in arms against this program—they are for it. The workers' employers have not seen fit to mount such a campaign of obstructionism, nor the hospitals, nor the insurance industry.

And so I am glad that it is the AMA which is representing the negative side in this debate.

It has been less than 2 years since Dr. Annis assumed his first official position in the AMA. But in that time as chairman of the speakers' bureau and now as president-elect he has spoken widely and too often irresponsibly on the subject of health insurance for the aged.

I think it is now high time to have a close look at some of the charges being leveled by Dr. Annis this evening and in the recent past.

The first problem to consider is why there has been such concerted effort in the last several years by the Kennedy administration, concerned Congressmen, and private citizens to provide the aged with social security hospital insurance. Are the aged a low-income group? Do they have high health costs? Are they having trouble meeting these costs?

According to Dr. Annis the answer is "No" once, "No" twice, and "No" again. In a speech last month to the Economic Club of Detroit, Dr. Annis had this to say about the financial status of the aged:

"Turn to your own University of Michigan. Its recent survey committee reported that great majorities and great numbers of our senior citizens are well able to provide for themselves. Think among those of your own membership and the members of the community beyond the age of 65 who are still among the sultans of industry."

Now I submit that a person with a cash income of $20 a week is hardly a sultan of anything. Twenty dollars a week equals $1,000 a year and that, my friends, is the annual cash income of more than half the 17½ million elderly citizens of this affluent society.

That figure is the latest estimate of the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

But let us look at the University of Michigan report which led Dr. Annis to the extraordinary conclusion that our aged possess the luxuries of sultans.

The report found (and I quote): "Not only do older spending units have substantially lower incomes than younger ones, but low incomes are commonly temporary among young families and permanent among the aged."

Dr. Annis, who has eight children, has tried to confuse the issue by saying 90 percent of his family has income of less than $500.

He knows perfectly well that in the over-65 age group three-quarters of all families consist of two persons. And the median income for them in 1960 was $2,530.

Do the aged have extra high health costs? A year ago Dr. Annis told the Senate Special Committee on Aging that "most of our senior citizens are healthy and require little medical attention."

Not according to the U.S. national health survey.

The survey shows that 9 out of 10 aged can expect to be hospitalized at least once during their retirement, 2 out of 3 aged at least twice and 1 out of 3 at least 3 times.

Moreover the aged can expect their hospital stays to be at least twice as long as those of younger people and their bills to be twice as large. An elderly person will get an average bill of $700 for his hospital stay. For those 300,000 aged who annually must spend more than 30 days in hospitals, the average bill will be in excess of $1,000.

These expenses have zoomed all out of proportion with the income of the aged since Social Security was passed in the 1930's. In the decade of the fifties alone, medical costs went up by 36 percent and hospitalization rose by 65 percent. Where hospital costs were $9 a day in 1946, they are now around $35 a day.

These figures have spiralled for a number of reasons. In part, because all prices have risen; in part because hospitals are catching up with prevailing wage levels. But mostly it is because of the tremendous strides made in curative medicine, much of it due to Government-financed research. Of this we are very proud.

We are proud enough to want our aged to share in these new benefits. At the moment, too many of them cannot. The increased expense of medicine has caused a major breach in the economic protection we seek to provide to the elderly. A nation which cherishes the values of independence and self-reliance, and which has undertaken to maintain these values through a far-reaching system of social insurance, can hardly afford to leave this breach unclosed.

But just as Dr. Annis doesn't believe the aged are a low-income group, just as he doesn't believe they have higher than average medical expenses, so doesn't he believe they have any trouble meeting their bills.

In his statement to the Senate Special Aging Committee, Dr. Annis said all but the completely indigent can provide for their own health care needs through voluntary insurance plans.

Would that were the case. The said fact is that half the aged who must pay an average hospital bill of $700 have their savings wiped out. They must then beg from relatives or borrow from banks at high rates because they are poor credit risks. In about one case out of five, they must go to public welfare or charity agencies for help.

The Massachusetts General Hospital reported in 1961 that one-third of its annual deficit is accounted for by unpaid bills of the aged.

Hearings of the Senate Special Aging Committee—held around the country—are full of tragic tales that might enlighten Dr. Annis to the true plight of the elderly.

But does Dr. Annis really think our aged can adequately meet their health bills? Does Dr. Annis consider it sufficient that 4 out of 10 older families have either no liquid assets or less than $200 in such assets?

I doubt it, because I do not think Dr. Annis considers doctors that much different from other people who have retired. Why then did medical economics—a magazine for which Dr. Annis has served as editor-at-large—recently offer this piece of retirement advice to physicians: Do not set your financial sights far below the $200,000 nest-egg needed for old-age security or you will be in trouble. I ask the doctor if there isn't a notable difference between $200,000 and $200?

Dr. Annis believes the aged can be neatly split into two groups—those who are so indigent they need a handout and those so wealthy they can afford any size medical bill.

The former are well provided for, according to Dr. Annis, by State welfare agencies and Kerr-Mills programs.

The latter find what little assistance they need in the high-premium, small benefit private health insurance that is available to the aged. Let us look at these suppositions.

The Kerr-Mills Act—passed in 1960—has two parts. The first is an increase in a 10-year-old program of Federal support of medical care for recipients of old-age assistance—usually referred to as OAA. The second part is a new Federal-State program of medical assistance for the aged—known as MAA. MAA was meant to provide relief for a whole new segment of the aged, who can be described as "medically needy."

These are persons whose income and resources are too high to qualify them for OAA public assistance but still too low to meet the costs of medical care.

It is obvious that MAA was meant as a specialized supplement to hard-pressed and flagging State welfare programs. It is thus absurdly misleading for Dr. Annis to state (and I quote) "That under the terms of the Kerr-Mills law any State can set up any provision to provide any and all total medical care for its senior citizens."

Kerr-Mills has not even been able to do the much smaller task assigned to it: To date only 25 States and 3 territories have enacted Kerr-Mills programs and of these only 3 or 4 States can be said to have comprehensive plans. Most States simply do not have the funds to match Federal grants. Thus half the States have no programs and 21 other States have totally inadequate ones.

The inequities of the Kerr-Mills system are appalling. In November three States received 70 percent of the Federal matching funds. The three States—New York, California, and Massachusetts—had 63 percent of all recipients, made 72 percent of the payments, although they had only 22 percent of the Nation's aged population.

Among the poorer States struggling to create the illusion of adequate Kerr-Mills programs we find such things as the following: Eligibility limited to individuals with annual incomes of less than $1,200 or $1,500. Hospital care limited to 6 days per admission in one State, 10 days per year in another and in several States care is provided only in life endangering or sight endangering cases.

What is perhaps most disappointing of all is the gradually emerging fact that the States are not using MAA to help a new group of the aged—the medically needy. Instead they are switching former recipients of OAA to MAA. Thus the States benefit because of the larger Federal payments in the latter program. As of September 75,987 former OAA recipients had been switched to MAA plans. In Massachusetts, the welfare director estimated he has saved $15 million by such transfers.

Furthermore, Kerr-Mills is proving to be—in the words of the New York Times—"An administrative monstrosity." This is no wonder. There are 25 different programs—one for each State. There is the need for annual appropriation of funds by each State and the Federal Government. And most of all there is the means test. To check out an applicant for MAA, to shuffle through all his records, to quiz his relatives, to completely strip away his dignity costs about $40 a person each time and some persons must be tested more than once.

It is no wonder that Tennessee is spending more on red tape than on MAA benefits; it is no wonder that in 1961 the cost of administering the MAA program in Kentucky was 124 percent of the amount paid for medical expenses and it is no wonder that it costs Oregon 38 cents for every $1 of benefits.

And is it any wonder that the other 25 States are hesitant to adopt Kerr-Mills?

Dr. Annis used to say that all our States—including his own, Florida—would shortly have MAA programs. He has had to change his tune. In recent speeches, he has been claiming that those States which don't have MAA programs don't need them—including Florida.

Which States don't need these programs? Rich ones that have them like New York, California, and Massachusetts or lower income States which don't have MAA like Mississippi, North Carolina, and Florida? The rich States already had adequate programs before MAA: the poor States still don't.

Let us take Dr. Annis' Florida for example. In testimony before the Senate Special Aging Committee, the doctor said, "Florida is presently implementing the aim and objective of the Kerr-Mills law, namely to provide medical and/or surgical care when necessary to any of our senior citizens."

Now I submit that it is difficult to be too bountiful to any and all your senior citizens when Florida has the most strict residence requirement permitted by Federal law.

A person who has not lived in Florida at least 5 years cannot expect any help through the Old-Age Assistance program—this from a State that gains so much from being a retirement center. A University of Florida economist told the Senate committee that retirement income provides Florida the same kind of expenditures as tourism: It is money in a sense that comes in from outside. Apparently Florida is happy to have its economy bolstered by retired people spending money there but it stacks its welfare against them.

There is more to be said about the Florida OOA program. Only 11 percent of the State's aged receive OOA, even though a very large proportion of the elderly couples there have less than $2,500 a year income and a majority of widows have less than $1,000.

These are the conditions that lead Dr. Annis to tell us that Florida doesn't need a Kerr-Mills MAA program, much less anything else.

Dr. Annis' other supposition is that all the aged who are not indigent can afford private insurance policies which provide adequate coverage. Can they afford these policies and are they adequate?

A little over half the aged have private insurance now. Dr. Annis says that 80 to 90 percent will have it by 1970. Beside the fact that those presently covered have inadequate policies for the most part, the projected growth figures of Dr. Annis are preposterous. They are even higher than those of the insurance industry.

The doctor knows that the aged who have not been signed up in the 5-year crash program to extend coverage to the elderly are the highest cost risks and those least able to pay for insurance.

Half of those with insurance now have Blue Cross, and Blue Cross says it cannot afford to sell any more to the aged at present prices. Blue Cross premiums have already gone up 83 percent in the last 12 years.

The State of Washington provides a grim example of what Blue Cross is presently offering the aged. There, a couple can get health insurance for $27.50 a month—or $334 a year. This huge sum doesn't include Blue Shield.

And this huge sum doesn't cover preexisting conditions; or hernia, cardiac, vascular, cancerous or tumorous conditions until after 12 months of coverage. Thankfully, most Blue Cross plans for the aged cost less even if they don't offer more. The average around the country for an elderly couple is $144 a year.

The private insurance companies are doing little better. The much heralded noncancellable plans for the aged usually have a safety catch. The Connecticut Plan, for example, has annual and lifetime maximums, which makes the noncancellable face dubious indeed. Furthermore, there is a $100 deductible, 20 percent coinsurance, the cost of excluded medical items and for this package a couple would be asked to pay $408 a year and up.

Paid-up-at-age-65 plans aren't much help either. Couples nearing retirement can't afford them and the benefits offered are meaningless to younger people, because the amount of insurance bought might be worthless in 20 years upon retirement if hospital charges go up 500 percent as they have in the past 20 years.

This situation is not the fault of the insurance companies. There is simply no way for profitmaking organizations with small numbers of policyholders relative to the social security system to cover the aged without charging extravagant fees.

If private insurance would concentrate on covering those under 65 who are, as a whole, good risks and offering supplementary coverage to the aged, there would be more than enough business. Life insurance has had its greatest growth since social security was enacted. The same will be true of health insurance, once hospital coverage for the aged is added to social security.

The social security approach has the support of a majority of Americans. Poll after poll shows it. The approach has recently been copied by Republicans in the Senate. It has received endorsement from such solid

Republicans as Marian Folson, former Secretary of HEW under Eisenhower and from Ike's special advisor Arthur Larson. Conservative-oriented magazines, including Life, Time, and Business Week, have plunked for it. And just last week in a letter to the Senate Special Aging Committee, the Saturday Evening Post joined the growing list of endorsers.

What are these substantial people and organizations endorsing? They are backing a program which would provide 90 days of hospital care, 180 days of care in a skilled nursing home, 240 home health visits and diagnostic services rendered by the outpatient departments of hospitals.

They are backing a program that would cover nearly 100 percent of those over 65.

They are endorsing a program that would be financed by a one-fourth of 1 percent increase in the social security payroll tax.

They are endorsing a program that will cost the highest paid eligible worker $17.16 a year and the average-paid worker $12 a year. Put those figures next to the $144, the $408 annual cost of private plans.

The social security mechanism can handle the aged's hospital insurance needs at reasonable rates because of the number in the system and because the system is so efficiently run. Administrative costs run at about 3 percent of every dollar handled compared with the 50 percent and up costs of private and Kerr-Mills programs.

Social security health insurance is not intended to cover everything, as Dr. Annis has often said. There is, for example, a $90 deductible, there are time limits—though liberal—for any one illness and there are no funds for doctors' bills or drugs. These conservative aspects of the program are, to my mind, as important as the liberal ones.

Congress is charged by the Constitution to "promote the general welfare," not "provide for it." This plan, like social security itself, is a floor program on which people can build to meet their own standards through additional savings and supplemental insurance.

This program has singled out hospital costs because these are the least budgetable, most catastrophic health costs confronting the aged. By insuring the elderly against the financial ravages of serious illness, we remove the haunting fear that they will suddenly be turned from self-sufficient citizens into applicants for alms. In short, we add a sense of security, a measure of dignity and a new dimension of happiness to their retirement years.

But it would be more accurate to say they do this for themselves.

For the essential characteristic—the real genius—of the social security mechanism, is that every American can pay during his working years for benefits after he retires. As the Supreme Court has said, social security allows every man to earn a retirement unmarred by economic dependency. It has become one of his unalienable rights.

These features of the system have never particularly impressed Dr. Annis or the AMA. They are opposing this health insurance plan with many of the same arguments and much of the same phraseology they originally displayed in opposing social security, in opposing Blue Cross and in opposing benefit programs for Government employees.

Dr. Annis' charges, implications and innuendos against the program are too numerous to answer in full. But his major attacks should not go unanswered.

He has sought to undermine confidence in the whole social security system by claiming the Supreme Court has ruled it isn't insurance. The Court has done just the opposite. Dr. Annis always fails to mention that he refers to the opinion of an Eisenhower Solicitor General arguing in the case, Fleming versus Nestor.

The Court's ruling in that case reads as follows:

"The social security system may be accurately described as a form of social insurance, enacted pursuant to Congress' power to spend money in aid of the general welfare."

Dr. Annis has further sought to undermine confidence in social security by suggesting that it is financially unsound. In Detroit he pointed out that the system is presently unfunded by $330 billion and concluded with what sounded suspiciously like a call for repeal of social security. He said, "the day is coming when we are going to have to take a second look at this system."

Dr. Annis has twisted a known and obvious fact when he discloses that social security does not maintain the reserve that an insurance company with the same liability would have to maintain. To build such a reserve would be unnecessary and foolish, for unlike an insurance company the Government does not have to reckon on going out of business.

The financing of social security is too long a story to go into here, but the method of financing has been studied again and again by distinguished experts and each time—most recently in 1959—it has been given a clean bill of health.

Dr. Annis has sought to instill the fear of Government control of medicine. He knows the legislation in question specifically forbids Government control of any kind over the practice of medicine. He knows that the accrediting and admitting procedures for hospitals were written into the bill at the urging of the American Hospital Association. He knows that Government has no control over those procedures. He knows that 38,000 of the 50,000 physicians he charges will be controlled by the Government are actually interns and residents on salary at the hospitals.

Dr. Annis has sought to instill the fear that patients will lose their freedom of choice. He knows that this measure is only a means of paying the bills. Patients will choose their doctors, follow their advice and go to the hospitals of their choice as they always have in the past. It is Kerr-Mills that takes away a patient's freedom. For under this act, he can be assigned to any welfare or county hospital that the State chooses.

Dr. Annis has sought to stir up class antagonism by raising the specter of a hoard of rich people benefiting from this program. I ask what rich people? Three-tenths of 1 percent of those over 65 have incomes of $50,000 or more and only 3 percent have incomes of $10,000 or more.

To ferret out the wealthy would require a degrading means test that would weigh just as degradingly on the other 97 percent of the aged. And as we have learned from Kerr-Mills experience, a means test would cost more to operate than it would save for the program by excluding the wealthy. The rich are already doing pretty well by the Government. In the top tax bracket, 91 percent of medical expenses can be written off as tax deductions.

And finally Dr. Annis invariably raises the specter of socialism. This program is socialistic, he says, and is only an entering wedge to very broad Government health insurance.

Except for the aged, our population is well taken care of by private health insurance. This program is meant to meet a particular need and it is a complete program. In itself, the program has nothing to do with socialism. It provides for insurance, not care; the Government does not own the hospitals which do provide care nor does it employ the doctors who prescribe care.

I have always considered this accusation the most revealing of the AMA's true feelings. It shows what they are really concerned about * * * not the condition of the aged but the slim chance that in some future time someone might want to socialize the AMA. Thus they obstruct a good and needed program because of a bad and unfounded fear.

And they have the gall to attribute their selfish motivation to those of us who back social security health insurance for the elderly. Well, they are wrong. We have not the slightest interest in the bogus issue of socializing medicine. But we are vitally committed to providing adequate health insurance to the aged as a matter of right and not on the basis of indigence. We believe that as many people as possible should be spared the degrading need for public assistance. The American Medical Association thinks that a means test and public assistance should be acceptable to everyone. This is our difference.

Thank you.

An Address of Congressman Horace R. Kornegay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Horace Kornegay, made a timely and thought-provoking address at a dinner sponsored by the Wake County Young Democratic Club honoring Democratic members of the North Carolina General Assembly, which I was permitted to attend. The address was delivered on the eve of the convening of the 1963 Legislature in North Carolina's new State House at Raleigh.

Because of the challenge to all lawmakers contained in this address, I recommend it to all Members of this body.

The address follows:

Talk Before the 1963 Democratic Legislative Dinner, Wake County YDC, Raleigh, N.C., February 5, 1963, by the Honorable Horace R. Kornegay

It is a distinct pleasure and privilege to be here with you tonight as guest of the Wake County Young Democratic Club at this 1963 legislative dinner honoring the 147-man Democratic delegation in the 1963 General Assembly of North Carolina.

To the returning veterans this occasion is a great and genial homecoming. To those of you who are serving in the State legislature for the first time, let me say that I have a warm fellow feeling for you. For as you have journeyed to Raleigh for your first term, it was just 2 years ago that I journeyed up to Washington, in cold and sleet and snow, to embark upon a similar experience in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Now being an ancient veteran of one 2-year term in the Congress, however, I look back on those days with a mixture of relief and nostalgia—relief that I survived them intact, and nostalgia because being a freshman carried certain concessions and courtesies. You weren't supposed to know anything, so allowances were made for you. After that first term, however, these amenities cease. It's like being the "lap baby" for 2 years and suddenly being thrust into the role of the "knee baby" where you have to fend for yourselves in the cold world.

I am sure that your veteran colleagues in the general assembly will patiently lead you newcomers into the right corridors, the right customs, and the established procedures, and that you will emerge from this session experienced solons—that fine old word which derives from the name of an Athenian lawgiver of the sixth century, B.C., and which means a "wise man, a skilled legislator" in present day usage.

I know of no greater accolade I would rather earn than to be considered a skilled legislator. The science of law giving is an exact one, and the path to its accomplishment is a thorny one, strewn with the bleached bones of many good men who have tried and failed.

To be a legislator is to wear two hats, for even as you are a legislator, you are also a representative. In this dule role, therefore, you are to participate in an important, exciting, and unique experience—that of being an integral part in the functioning of a representative government—the very essence of democracy at work.

There are certain fundamental principles recognized in our system of representative government, and one is that a government derives its just power from the consent of the governed. Thus the legislative powers of our great State of North Carolina are delegated to it by the people, and this becomes an operative principle in the institution of representation. The best form of self-government is representative government, whereby those who make the public laws are chosen periodically by the people and remain accountable to them, and whereby the people have the final and very effective means of making their representatives accountable to them, and that is by giving them the hatchet at the next election, if they do not believe they have been well represented.

Thus when we speak of government by the consent of the governed, we mean that this consent is achieved by the indirect participation of the people in the very process of the formulation of the law. At the very minimum, the people are called on to think through the issues of legislation and arrive at their own conclusion on them and communicate to their duly elected representatives.

So you are going to be hearing from the people—make no mistake about that. And if you think the people speak with one clear, clarion call, as with one voice, the veterans in the general assembly here can emphatically tell you that it just ain't so. You are here by the grace of God and the Democratic Party to represent your constituency. But here again is a jolting thought—the party does not always speak a clarion, unfractured call. We're all a family of good and true Democrats here tonight. But if we all had exactly the same thoughts and the identical philosophy of government, down to the most minute detail, we would be little more than rubberstamps and the label would inevitably become greater than the man and greater than the laws the man is here to make.

So now we must conclude that you successful candidates to the general assembly actually wear three hats—the hat of the legislator, the hat of the representative, and the hat of the party you represent. It sounds like one big happy family, but the veterans among you know that it isn't always the coziest of togetherness with all those hats on the hatrack.

We often hear—what is good for this or good for that is good for the country.

What is good for the country, for its economic well-being, for its international stature, for its internal welfare, security, and defense is a question so thought provoking and so nearly imponderable that its solution cannot automatically be equated with one group, one area, one district, one thought pattern. Just as here in our great State of North Carolina, the larger good of the whole State transcends the consideration of what is good for one county or one senatorial district. It is a larger canvas and requires a lot of brushes to paint properly.

By the same token, the larger good of the Democratic Party paramounts any group or individual preferences. This is no time to complain of wounded feelings or hurt pride, but it is the time for all Democrats to follow the example of Philip of Macedonia, by forming a phalanx welded together in a common mission of dedicated service to the people of North Carolina. Let unity be our password and victory our cause.

What I would like to leave with you tonight is the thought that as good Democrats we owe allegiance to our great party, as representatives we owe allegiance to our constituency, as lawgivers we owe allegiance to the very best that is in ourselves to do for our people, our State, and for its government, whose greatness lies in the fact that it is a government of laws and not of men.

And if these considerations do not always mesh together in a perfect whole, with a single objective, if there are dissident opinions, and times of confusion as to what is right in the final essence, let us draw upon the wisdom of that great statesman of England, Edmund Burke, in the year 1774:

"Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinions high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasure, his satisfactions, to theirs—and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own.

"But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure, no, nor from the law and the Constitution. They are a trust from providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

This session of the North Carolina General Assembly which begins tomorrow is a very significant session. As we enter upon our tercentenary year commemorating the issuance of the Carolina Charter, we look back at our first 300 years and see the unbelievable progress we have attained albeit through unbelievable hardships. We look ahead to the next 300, veiled in the mists of the future.

You, whom we honor here tonight, are the recipients of a noble legacy—built and acquired by the generations of dedicated and future looking Democratic legislators who have preceded you in these positions of great trust. From their legislative pens came the laws which made North Carolina the envy of many and gained her the respect of all of her sister States. Her accomplishments are legion, and point particularly to our vast and well balanced highway system; the enormous growth of our industry; our humane and ever increasing concern for the mentally ill and handicapped; and by all means, our herculean efforts in the field of public education for which tremendous credit should go to our farsighted and courageous Governor, Terry Sanford. Yes, you, the 1963 General Assembly, are inheriting a great tradition of statesmanship which was nurtured with a passion for progress and a zealous striving for excellence.

That is your challenge and we are confident that you will acquit yourselves well in the carrying out of these heavy responsibilities. For what you do here in the next few months will have great meaning for the future of North Carolina.

I have not yet had opportunity to learn what the beautiful new State House contains in the way of inspiring inscriptions. But in the chamber of the House of Representatives in Washington there is only one quotation, as such, and this is a plaster plaque inscribed with a quotation from Daniel Webster directly over the Speaker's rostrum, which reads as follows:

"Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

These stirring words are often a great comfort to me, as well as a challenge, and may they also be to you in your consideration of the land of the old North State and what is best for her, now and in the future.

It goes without saying that the North Carolina delegation in the U.S. Congress is eager to be of assistance in every appropriate way to you who serve our State in the legislative halls in Raleigh. There are many areas of Federal-State cooperation where we can labor together for the good of the country and the State. I hope we will have the freest communication and exchange of ideas on these matters of vital interest to all of us.

And now I thank you for the privilege of being with you tonight and I wish for you a productive and highly successful general assembly for this 300th year in North Carolina.

Legislative Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have just issued a report to my constituents in the Second Congressional District of Arizona on a legislative questionnaire which I distributed recently, results of which have now been tabulated. I believe this indication of opinion in my district may be of considerable interest to our colleagues.

The report follows:

THE PEOPLE SPEAK: A REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF SOUTHERN ARIZONA ON CONGRESSMAN UDALL'S 1963 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

This is a report on a very successful and encouraging experiment. Just before Congress convened, I prepared and mailed a 22-question legislative questionnaire. The response has been most encouraging and rewarding. This is my report on the returns.

About 11,000 questionnaires were distributed, nearly all of them in the Second Congressional District, although a few were mailed in from Districts 1 and 3 and are included in the tabulations. Out of 11,000 mailed, 2,547, or 23 percent, were returned—a somewhat greater return than other Congressmen have experienced with similar questionnaires.

We are sometimes led to believe that Arizonans are apathetic on public issues; I now have clear evidence this is not true. Many who received the questionnaire not only have replied but enclosed thoughtful letters or additional comments. I have read all of these letters and found much to think about. Arizonans apparently want to be consulted in this way. All of 96 percent thought the questionnaire a good idea—and one enthusiastic reader urged me to sponsor a law requiring every Representative to poll his registered voters once a year.

The complete results are tabulated below. In summary form the results show:

Strong support for continued membership in the United Nations, 80 percent.

Substantial support for foreign aid as a tool in the cold war struggle against communism, 60 percent.

Solid support for six new Kennedy programs—the Peace Corps, 78 percent; Domestic Peace Corps, 57 percent; Alliance for Progress, 78.5 percent; Youth Conservation Corps, 73 percent; medicare, 54 percent; and the wilderness system, 73 percent.

Opposition to farm subsidies, 66 percent; a World War I pension, 73 percent; Federal aid for teachers' salaries, 55 percent; Federal aid for private and parochial schools, 76.7 percent; and a Department of Urban Affairs, 47.5 percent.

Support for present or increased expenditures in all 11 categories of spending, but by relatively narrow margins in the case of military assistance, 57.7 percent, and veterans' benefits, 53.8 percent.

HOW THE QUESTIONNAIRE WAS DISTRIBUTED

I wish I could have distributed this questionnaire to every voter in my district. Staff and financial considerations made this impossible. Many people have asked how the distribution was handled. Here is the answer:

The initial mailing went to my regular mailing list, made up of businessmen, schoolteachers, clergymen, the rosters of many civic organizations, and innumerable people who have asked to receive my newsletters. I have taken pains to see that this list is representative of my district as a whole, not just members of my own party. From time to time, including a special "Christmas present" offer last December, I have publicly invited constituents to request inclusion on my mailing list.

When the initial mailing was made I issued a news release informing newspapers, radio, and television stations that interested persons could obtain copies of the questionnaire by writing my Washington office. Approximately 2,000 additional questionnaires were distributed as a result of this announcement.

While the tabulation has now been completed, I want to renew my invitation to all interested constituents to send me their names for inclusion on my mailing list. This will enable them to receive my regular newsletters and such future questionnaires as I may find it possible to issue.

WAS THIS A SCIENTIFIC POLL?

During the period when questionnaires were being received here, the Arizona Republic in Phoenix kindly offered to reprint it in its columns. I was delighted to give my consent to this proposal. Also, the Tucson Daily Citizen covered a few of the same subjects in a questionnaire which it drafted. I commend the editors of both papers for stimulating interest in the issues of 1963, and their published findings have been noted.

Since the results below differ rather markedly from some of the results received by the Republic and Citizen (while others are markedly similar), many will ask: just how scientific and how accurate were the three polls? Of course, the answer is that none of the three was based on scientifically selected samples of the public, and I specifically make no such claim for mine.

The only citizens whose opinions were counted were those who took the time to reply; all of us are grateful for this interest, and I think it of tremendous significance that so many felt strongly enough to complete one or more of the three questionnaires.

While many of these questionnaires were sent in by people who voted against me and generally do not agree with my stand on issues, I think it should be recognized that those who agree with a polling organization are, generally speaking, more inclined to participate in such a mail survey than those who disagree with the organization. This principle would likely apply in a general way to all three polls.

This tendency is reflected in my mail. Several people clipped the two newspaper polls and sent them to me, saying, "I want you, not the Arizona Republic, to have my opinion," etc. Conversely, one lady sent back my questionnaire, remarking, "I am a Republican, and I don't want you to have my opinions." I think both these attitudes are unfortunate, but they illustrate the general tendency I have described.

In weighing the accuracy of the opinion sample obtained in my own survey, I am comforted by two factors:

The voter registration in my district is 68 percent Democratic as against a combined total of 32 percent for Republicans and independents. Of those returning my questionnaire, 68.7 percent identified themselves as Democrats, 31.3 percent as Republicans or independents.

After the results were tabulated, I checked them against recent Gallup poll findings of national opinion on a few selected issues. Here are the comparisons:

MEMBERSHIP IN UNITED NATIONS

	Stay in	Get out	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Gallup poll, Feb. 18, 1962	90	5	5
Udall questionnaire	80	18	2

DOMESTIC PEACE CORPS

	Approve	Disapprove	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Gallup poll, Nov. 22, 1962	62	22	16
Udall questionnaire	57	31	12

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Gallup poll, April 13, 1962	79	16	5
Udall questionnaire	73	22.6	4.5

FOREIGN AID

Gallup poll, July 3, 1962	58	30	12
Udall questionnaire	60	(*)	(*)

*Other choices not comparable.

WHAT IS THE VALUE OF SUCH A POLL?

Dr. George Gallup, founder and director of the Gallup poll, places little value on surveys such as I have just conducted. He said recently that "the 20 percent who may reply do not really represent a cross section of the electorate" and that they tend to be the better educated people higher up on the economic ladder. He recalled the famous Literary Digest debacle of 1936 when that magazine predicted the election of Alf Landon to the Presidency; on that occasion, he said, the fault lay in polling too heavily in the upper economic groups. Of Congressmen who make surveys such as mine, he said, "If they set out to misinform themselves, they couldn't do a better job of it."

What, then, is the value of such a survey as this? I think there are several things to be said for it:

(1) Opinions thus expressed give a Congressman a broader sweep of constituent thinking than he is likely to receive in his regular mail.

(2) Studying individual responses can be quite revealing. For example, if the Alliance for Progress receives substantial support from both those who oppose foreign aid and those who support it (which happened to be the case), the Alliance may be regarded as enjoying broad support among the electorate.

(3) Such a survey gives people an opportunity, not just to pull a lever and vote for a candidate, but to register their views on legislative matters. In this survey a great many of the 2,500 respondents expressed their thoughts to their Congressman for the very first time.

In the end, of course, a Congressman is expected to acquaint himself more thoroughly than can any constituent with the merits of legislative proposals. We elect Congressmen on the basis of their education, experience, and judgment—and we expect them to use that judgment in deciding public questions. As your Congressman, I don't intend to take an opinion poll every time I have to make a decision. However, I value your opinions, and I want to do the best job I can to represent you in the Congress. I believe this questionnaire will help me do this.

To all of you who participated in this survey, and especially to the volunteers who helped me tabulate the returns, I want to express my deep gratitude.

Following are the results, expressed in percentages:

After each question please check the answer which is closest to your view.

(1) United Nations: Should the United States stay in or get out of the United Nations? Stay in, 80 percent; get out, 18 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.

(2) Red China: Do you favor or oppose admission of Red China to the United Nations? Favor, 20 percent; oppose, 74 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

(3) Peace Corps: Do you favor or oppose the Peace Corps? Favor, 78.5 percent; oppose, 13.7 percent; no opinion, 7.8 percent.

(4) Domestic Peace Corps: Would you favor or oppose a domestic Peace Corps whose volunteer members would perform similar functions in our own country? Favor, 57 percent; oppose, 31 percent; no opinion, 12 percent.

(5) Fallout shelters: Would you favor or oppose Federal assistance for an expanded program to build public and private fallout shelters? Favor, 31.2 percent; oppose, 56.8 percent; no opinion, 12 percent.

(6) Foreign aid: Which of the following statements comes closest to expressing your opinion of foreign aid?

You can't buy friends; foreign aid is a total waste of money and the whole program should be ended at once, 17.8 percent.

Foreign aid is OK for our military allies and countries which support us in the United Nations, but neutral or uncommitted nations shouldn't get help, 22.2 percent.

Foreign aid is a tool in the cold war struggle against communism; it should be used wherever the President and Congress think it will contribute to our national security and strengthen the free world, 60 percent.

(7) Alliance for Progress: One part of our foreign aid program is the Alliance for Progress, a 10-year program to help Latin American countries head off communism by improving living standards and broadening democratic government. In general, do you favor or oppose the Alliance for Progress? Favor, 78.5 percent; oppose, 15.5 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

(8) Kennedy support: In general, do you believe Congress should give greater, less, or about the same support as it gave last year to President Kennedy's program? Greater, 46.4 percent; less, 13.4 percent; about the same, 30.2 percent.

(9) Medicare: President Kennedy has asked for a "medicare" bill which would pay a part of hospital bills for persons over 65. No doctor bills would be covered. The plan would be financed by a $1 per month increase in employees' social security deductions and a similar increase in contributions of employers. In general, would you favor or oppose a plan of this kind? Favor, 54 percent; oppose, 40 percent; no opinion, 6 percent.

(10) Aid to education: (a) Do you favor or oppose increased Federal aid to the States for elementary and high school construction? Favor, 56.2 percent; oppose, 40.2 percent; no opinion, 3.6 percent. (b) Do you favor or oppose increased Federal aid to the States for teachers' salaries? Favor, 38.1 percent; oppose, 55 percent; no opinion, 6.9 percent. (c) If Congress decides to increase Federal financial aid to public elementary and high schools, would you favor or oppose giving similar Federal aid to private and parochial schools? Favor, 18.8 percent; oppose, 76.7 percent; no opinion, 4.5 percent.

(11) Urban affairs: In 1962 President Kennedy asked Congress to authorize a new Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. Proponents point out that the new Department would add no new Government functions but would bring together related functions now scattered in various agencies for more effective handling of this Nation's mounting urban problems. Opponents argue that establishing the new Department would further concentrate power in Washington and threaten cities with Federal domination. Would you favor or oppose establishment of this new Department? Favor, 39.5 percent; oppose, 47.5 percent; no opinion, 13 percent.

(12) Youth Conservation Corps: It has been proposed that Congress establish a Youth Conservation Corps (somewhat similar to the CCC's of the 1930's) providing a 3-year program of public service employment and training for young men and women 16 to 22. Would you favor or oppose such a program? Favor, 73 percent; oppose, 22.5 percent; no opinion, 4.5 percent.

(13) Wilderness system: The wilderness bill would set aside about 15 million acres of forest lands already owned by the Federal Government (including about 600,000 acres in Arizona) to be preserved in its natural state as a national wilderness system. Opponents urge multiple use of Federal forest lands and contend that mining, timber, and cattle industries would be damaged by this legislation. Proponents say existing commercial uses would continue and assert we have a duty to set aside at least this 1 percent of our Nation's land area for future generations to enjoy. Do you favor or oppose the wilderness bill? Favor, 73 percent; oppose, 22.5 percent; no opinion, 4.5 percent.

(14) Farm subsidies: Generally speaking, which of these courses do you believe Federal farm legislation should take (choose one): Continue present programs for basic commodities (wheat, tobacco, rice, cotton) under which price supports and mandatory acreage allotments are provided if approved by two-thirds of farmers voting in referendum, 20.7 percent. Discontinue price supports and acreage allotments for basic crops, substituting a voluntary system of land retirement payments for farmers who wish to participate, 13.3 percent. Abolish all Federal controls, acreage allotments, and price supports for basic crops, letting the agriculture industry operate under free market conditions with the Government's role restricted to soil conservation, research, extension work, etc., 66 percent.

(15) World War I pension: A bill before Congress proposes to grant most veterans of World War I a pension of $102 per month regardless of need or disability, provided the veteran served 90 days in the Armed Forces. The pension is estimated to cost $11 billion. Do you favor or oppose this pension? Favor, 16.4 percent; oppose, 73 percent; no opinion, 10.6 percent.

(16) Income taxes: If income tax rates are cut by Congress, should the main reductions go to individuals with low incomes, 30 percent; all individual taxpayers in both high and low brackets, 25 percent; both corporations and individual taxpayers, 45 percent.

(17) Federal budget: This fiscal year Federal tax collections seem likely to fall short of Federal expenditures by about $7.8 billion. (a) If expenditures could be reduced to balance the budget, would you favor this course, or would you favor the deficit as a means of stimulating the economy? Balanced budget, 60 percent; deficit to stimulate economy, 32 percent; no opinion, 8 percent. (b) If expenditures cannot be reduced sufficiently to balance the budget, would you favor an increase in your taxes of 4 to 5 percent to avoid a deficit? Favor, 31.1 percent; oppose, 60 percent; no opinion, 8.9 percent.

(18) Federal spending: In general, should Congress spend more, less, or about the same as last year for these programs:

Fiscal 1963 expenditures	Program	Spend more	Spend less	About same
Billions				
$52.7	National security	17.0	28.0	55.0
2.4	Space programs	25.5	30.0	44.5
5.4	Veterans' benefits	12.3	46.2	41.5
1.3	Reclamation, parks, forests and reclamation.	30.0	18.0	52.0
1.3	Military assistance to allies for mutual defense.	9.0	42.3	48.7
1.0	Development loans and grants to new and underdeveloped countries.	18.0	39.0	43.0
.4	Supporting assistance to protect U.S. security interests abroad.	20.7	26.8	52.5
.5	Alliance for Progress	25.3	27.0	47.7
1.3	Federal aid to education.	38.4	32.0	29.6
1.9	Medical research, aid for hospital construction, welfare.	40.2	21.1	38.7
2.8	Aid to aged, blind, dependent children.	40.7	13.7	45.7

(19) The economy: Generally speaking, do you think you and your family are better off, or worse off, financially than you were 5 years ago? Better, 45.5 percent; worse, 18.8 percent; about the same, 35.7 percent.

(20) Television: As our children grow up today they are exposed to almost constant advertising for beer, wine, and cigarettes on radio and television. Many parents believe such advertising cannot help but shape psychological attitudes of children toward use of these products. Would you favor or oppose legislation to prohibit such commercials before 8 p.m. local time? Favor, 55.6 percent; oppose, 34 percent; no opinion, 10.4 percent.

(21) Party identification: Do you consider yourself a Democrat, 68.7 percent; Republican, 17.7 percent; independent, 13.6 percent.

(22) Questionnaires: Do you think questionnaires like this one are a good idea? Yes, 96 percent; no, 2 percent; no opinion, 2 percent.

Extension of Impacted-Areas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I intend to introduce legislation to extend for 4 years the Federal aid to education bill for impacted areas. Massachusetts has received over $38 million in payments from the Federal grant to its school systems under the Impacted Area Act.

I have personally observed the significant assistance to schools in my congressional district resulting from Federal payments under the impacted-area law. The money received in cash benefits to the people of the Seventh Congressional District has amounted to approximately $2½ million. This in no small measure aided in keeping the local taxes from climbing higher than they are now. It seems clear to me that there is no logical reason why the Federal Government should not continue to reimburse local communities for taxes lost to municipalities from tax-free Federal installations.

Many of the provisions of the impacted-areas law will expire on June 30 of this year. This law must be extended if our school districts are to continue to provide necessary school services to schoolchildren residing in areas heavily impacted by Government employees. Action on my bill should be taken promptly so that school administrators may know what funds are available to them in planning their budget for the coming year. Without the assurance of Federal aid these school officials cannot make firm commitments for expenditures after June 1963.

Bulgarian Liberation Day, March 3, 1878

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Bulgarians were masters of a mighty kingdom in the Balkans during the late Middle Ages, and formed a formidable force which was a decisive factor in that region's affairs. But early in the 15th century their kingdom was overrun by the Ottoman Turks and they lost their independence. Thenceforth for some 400 years these sturdy and rugged people lived under Ottoman sultans without losing sight of their objective and without relinquishing their right to freedom and national independence. In 1878 they at last attained their goal at the conclusion of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78. The peace treaty signed on March 3 of 1878 guaranteed Bulgaria's independence.

That historic event of 85 years ago became a national holiday for the Bulgarian people, ushering in a new era in their modern history. Since then, however, their history has been compounded of happiness with misfortune, joy with tragedy. They were dragged into the First World War and fought on the side of the defeated powers. If in this they were unfortunate, they were even less fortunate in the last war. Much against their wishes, they were drawn into that war and again they fought on the side of the losers. In the end they were saddled with a Communist government and placed behind the Iron Curtain.

Today they are separated and sealed off from the free world. For all practical purposes Bulgaria is part of the Soviet Union and its people are pawns in the hands of their Bolshevik bosses. For almost two decades these proud and gallant fighters of southeastern Europe have been suffering under the unrelenting yoke of Communist tyranny. But these brave fighters for freedom have not forgotten the momentous event of 85 years ago, their liberation day. Though they are not free to celebrate it in their homeland, here we observe it, and I gladly join my friends among the Bulgarian-Americans on this 85th anniversary of that historic event, Bulgarian Liberation Day.

Building an Urban America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. ~~Mr. Sp~~eaker, U.S. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, spoke on Monday, February 25, 1963, on urban housing before 500 delegates of the 32d National Housing Conference, in Washington, D.C.

I was present when Senator WILLIAMS delivered his address on the problems and goals in the vital field of housing and found his speech enlightening and impressive. I request that the contents be placed into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The speech follows:

BUILDING AN URBAN AMERICA

Since you all know that this is not expected to be what we call a housing year, I think this might be a good time to step back to take a broader look at some of the things going on in the development of an urban America.

You know, whenever I dip into the literature on urban living, I am always struck by the fact that fashions change in our attitudes here almost as often as they do in the field of dress designing.

One day we hear that our cities are doomed to a fate of creeping chaos and decay, that our monolithic suburbs will spread like amebae until they cover the face of the earth.

But as soon as enough people begin to agree, those elusive members of the urban establishment—always alert to new opinion-molding opportunities—begin to herald the dawn of a new and glorious urban age.

After all, isn't the Manhattan skyline breathtaking to behold? Doesn't Kalamazoo have a permanent pedestrian mall? We know that the city of Rochester has Victor Gruen and his specially designed downtown shopping center.

And isn't it true, as the always provocative Mr. Moses has written, that all the "little identical suburban boxes of average people represent a measure of success unheard of by hundreds of millions on other continents?"

If I may be pardoned a simple-minded observation on this running debate between our urban bears and our urban bulls, it seems clear that we have come quite a long way in building a better society for our citizens. And it seems equally clear that we have quite a way left to go before we achieve the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family—to say nothing of achieving communities that are both beautiful and just.

I think we can fairly say that there has been much expansiveness, physical improvement and prosperity in our urban endeavors—but almost no grandeur, no recognition that our surroundings are the outward reflection of our inner self-esteem.

The real question, however, is not how well or poorly we have done.

The question is where we are going.

THE GAPS AND THE GOAL

There are several ways of approaching this question. For one thing, we can try to measure the gap between what needs to be done and our present rate of progress.

In the field of housing, we know we are building about 1.4 million units a year, which must be stepped up to 2 million a year if we are to meet the needs of the 10 million new households that will be formed by 1970, and if we are to handle the additional influx of farm families into the urban areas, compensate for the houses that will be demolished, and eliminate the million and a half totally dilapidated and unredeemable housing units in the country.

In transportation, we know that we have about 70 million registered vehicles on the road today in the United States. In just 15 short years, this number is expected to rise to well over 115 million. Obviously we have a need for the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System.

Since outdoor recreation demand for Federal land and water resources alone will double by 1970, we must expand our park and recreation facilities, with the help of the open-space program for urban areas and the President's new land and water conservation fund.

Our transit is deteriorating at the very time traffic congestion is becoming increasingly intolerable, and the magnitude of the problem certainly calls for the all-out effort that the administration's $500 million transit bill would trigger.

We have far more acres of slumland than we have cleared under the urban renewal program. We have far more ill-housed low-income families than we are providing homes for under the public housing and other moderate income housing programs. In fact, right here in Washington, there is a waiting list of about 4,000 for public housing at the present time. Yet only 29,000 units have been put under construction throughout the entire country since passage of the 1961 Housing Act.

And so it goes down the list.

But while we have to keep measuring the needs and present performance, and while we have to formulate legislative goals to fill the gap, pass the bills, administer the programs, clear the land, pour the concrete, and build the buildings, this is not enough.

At some point we have to step back and look at our work, what it all adds up to, where it is all leading us.

We need to because our individual efforts are not ends unto themselves. Building highways is not an end. Nor is clearing a slum, building a home, or acquiring a park.

They are all means to an end—the enjoyment of a better, more just, and fuller life by all the people who live and work in our urban communities.

If we are to achieve that goal, we must look beyond our immediate interests and broaden our horizons.

Above all, we must begin facing the hard issues involved in building a better urban America.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

And the hardest issue of all is the problem of racial and minority group discrimination. It permeates almost all our urban development activities.

The suburbs have become the pure white collars around central cities, which are rapidly becoming vast ghettos for Negroes and other outcast minority groups.

This overriding social problem compels us to ask ourselves: How many L.P.A.'s have presided over projects in our cities the purpose of which was more Negro removal than urban renewal?

How many times has the problem of discrimination rather than the goal of decent housing in a suitable environment led to the construction of stacks of high-rise public housing projects, concentrating thousands upon thousands of low-income and problem-ridden families in a wholly unnatural and isolated environment?

How many of our public transit systems are in trouble today because upper income breadwinners have fled to faraway suburbs and would rather endure the agony of traffic congestion in the privacy of their cars than ride with the lower class in a public conveyance?

RELOCATION

Another hard issue is the question of relocation. You really have to get out and talk to the people who have been caught in the maelstrom of massive change in our cities to appreciate the enormous impact forced relocation can have on these people, especially the elderly.

In the last few months I had an opportunity to do just that during the hearings we held around the country on the relocation problems of the elderly.

As a matter of fact, just last Friday I went down to a shanty town in Fairfax County in Virginia on what you might call a voluntary domestic peace corps mission to see if we could help fix up the shacks at least temporarily so that these Negro families would not have to be evicted immediately with no place else to go, because of violations of the building and health codes.

During our hearings on the west coast we talked to a 74-year-old man who was living in one of those 50-cent-a-night hotels in a skid row area, scheduled to be cleared by an urban renewal project.

We asked him where he would go when the hotel was torn down, and he replied, matter-of-factly, that he'd "go back under the bridge."

The thing that became clear to me from these hearings is that we really don't know very much about the people we are displacing through various Government actions. We don't know what the people are like, what their special needs may be, what their ties to the neighborhood are, and so forth.

As a result, the efforts we do make in relocation are often poorly geared to the needs of these people.

They don't take into account the fact that the forced relocation of these people can be a traumatic experience, especially for the elderly and people living in ethnic neighborhoods where the social ties are particularly strong.

As a matter of fact, I am forced to say that in far too many instances where relocation assistance is required, the officials do not treat the task of relocating people into decent housing in a suitable environment as a primary and positive objective of enlightened public policy. On the contrary, too many officials regard it as a plain nuisance, another cumbersome task to be dispensed with as quickly and painlessly as possible.

Needless to say, we have also been exceedingly remiss at the Federal level.

Because of the patchwork quality of our Federal laws, we have produced grossly inequitable situations where a family displaced by an urban renewal project gets a payment for moving expenses, advisory assistance and the assurance of safe, decent, and sanitary housing, while a family across the street, displaced by a public housing project or a Federal office building might get nothing but a kick in the pants.

For that reason, I intend to introduce legislation shortly to achieve uniformity in our relocation policies in the Federal programs that displace families.

PLANNING AND WORKABLE PROGRAMS

Next we come to the question of workable programs and comprehensive planning—and how we all worship at the altar of these two principles.

But who does not know of instances where communities have gotten Federal aid to hire an outside consultant to come in with his standard master plan—suitable for all purposes and all occasions—so that the community can then qualify for other Federal assistance?

Who does not know of instances when communities lying right in the path of explosive urban growth have seized upon comprehensive planning as a way of rationalizing the status quo, instead of as a way to honestly meet the problems of urban growth?

How many times has that most sacred of all forms of planning—regional planning—consisted of pasting together all the separate local plans on one big new regional map?

And how many housing and redevelopment agencies have fussed and fumed over the delays of their individual projects because the workable program requirements have not been met—requirements which must be met if individual housing or renewal projects are to have any real meaning and lasting value to the community?

And how many workable programs are themselves hollow documents, offered with a wink and accepted with a grimace for the sake of getting the project under way?

My point is simply that it is very easy to go through the form and motion in planning and developing workable programs without really facing up to the host of difficult issues floating like icebergs just beneath the surface.

URBAN LAND POLICY

Another very important area in which we have done almost nothing is the development of rational and effective urban land use policies.

Our metropolitan areas are exploding outward at a fantastic rate, wasting land in the most profligate way, compounding our transportation problems, driving costs for essential public facilities and services up to unnecessarily high levels, and pushing the open space of our countryside farther and farther away from more and more people.

The bold new world has become almost an endless maze of curvilinear streets and split-level houses, until no man is an entity, but merely a cipher in a vast environment.

Is it any wonder that people seem so apathetic about what goes on around them?

I personally believe there are two values that are extremely important to us all as individuals.

One is a sense of identity with the community.

While this sense of identity still exists in some of our more prosperous and insular suburban communities, there are vast stretches in our metropolitan areas, especially in the gray areas, where a person might just as well say: "I live in town X which lies somewhere between towns Y and Z and you can tell when you get there if you look closely enough for the city limits sign that's located in the empty lot with all the billboards in it, right across the street from the gas station."

THE OTHER VALUE IS THE FREEDOM OF CHOICE

We tend to forget that the one great advantage to the organization of society into cities is choice—the choice of jobs that it offers, the choice of friends, the choice of shops, the choice of theaters, restaurants, cultural events, housing, sports, recreation. In short, the choice of diversity.

While the technological developments of transportation, the telephone, television and so forth, have expanded the range of our living and working environment without too much sacrifice in the freedom of choice, it seems clear to me that there are limits to this expansion, and always will be. When we go beyond these limits, we gravely restrict this freedom of choice.

There are a whole host of forces at work which are propelling our living environment out over the landscape, forces over which we, as individuals, do not have very much control.

For example, in my own State two-thirds of the vacant land within a 50-mile radius of New York City is zoned for single-family homes on half-acre lots or larger. Half of the land is zoned for 1-acre lots or larger.

This illustration is typical of just one of the many forces that are contributing to the chaotic dispersal of the urban environment.

Despite this, we have yet to develop at any level of Government effective urban land use policies which would guide and shape the pattern of growth so as to preserve the maximum amount of choice for the maximum number of people.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE

I could go on to the problems we face in bringing the polluters of our air and our water to task, the problems we face in controlling those who are desecrating the face of our cities with atrocious architecture and other works of appalling ugliness, from roadside slums to overhead utility lines. We could talk about how we are going to get anything more than lip service on the question of achieving coordination and cooperation among the innumerable political jurisdictions of our metropolitan areas in matters affecting the region as a whole.

These are just some of the issues we need to bring out into the open and look at squarely.

It was for that reason I wrote President Kennedy last December to urge that he hold a White House conference on urban problems—which has never before been held, despite the fact that two-thirds of the Nation's population is vitally affected by these problems. In fact, not since 1931 has there been a Presidential conference on the subject of housing, which is a major component of every community's environment.

Incidentally, I am delighted to see the leadership that the national housing conference has taken in urging such a conference.

My greatest hope is that a White House conference would help rally public concern for the problems of urban development so that we may hope for the day when we can say of this country's urban areas what Samuel Johnson said long ago of his city: "When a man is tired of London, he is tired of life."

Public Service in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks of Anthony J. Celebrezze, distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, at a dinner held February 22, 1963, at the Woman's National Democratic Club.

Secretary Celebrezze has brought to Washington with him an outstanding record of public service and interest in Government. He has been characterized throughout his governmental service by not only efficiency but also by humanity.

His comments at that time are particularly appropriate to the vast problems in which the United States finds itself today. The remarks of Secretary Celebrezze appropriately reflect the need for a Government which not only is interested in economy but which is concerned with the intelligent and humane solutions of the multitude of problems facing our people today.

The address follows:

PUBLIC SERVICE IN GOVERNMENT

(Remarks by Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, at the dinner of the Woman's National Democratic Club, Washington, D.C., Friday, February 22, 1963)

I am pleased to note that this is a bipartisan occasion—the 231st anniversary of George Washington's birth. The Republicans customarily gather on Lincoln's Birthday, and we Democrats pay faithful annual tribute to the genius of Jefferson and Jackson. But Washington was a unique figure in American political annals. First in so many things, he bears the unusual distinction of being the first—and also the last—President to be elected outside the party system.

Politics was very much alive, of course, even under Washington's administration, and the two-party system that marks the structure of American politics was already in the making. It was in Washington's first term that Jefferson and Madison took their famous botanical expedition through the Northern States and planted the seeds of the great national party that is parent to our own. Since then, throughout the years, men and democracy have been tested by our politics, and time has proved the system worthy.

Some 80 years ago, the great English historian, James Bryce, comparing American politicians with their counterparts in Europe, described two categories of politicians—those of the "inner circle" and those of the "outer circle." What he found remarkable in America was that the membership of both the inner and outer circles was relatively larger here and, therefore, more representative than in most European states. Whereas in Europe the "inner circle"—the people who devoted their full time to politics—was made up of only a small number of individuals, usually men of independent means and aristocratic background, in America the profession of politics attracted thousands of people from all walks of life. And, more importantly, the American "outer circle"—in which he placed all who work for the party without pay and without seeking office—he found came nearer to including the whole country here than it did in England.

This is not the usual conception of the ins and outs in politics, but it is a refreshing one, and it is a mark of American democracy that we have reason to be proud of.

Politics has a special meaning for Americans. Some call it the science of government. Others, more poetically, call it the art of freedom. Pragmatists like to call it the art of the possible. But whatever you call it—by fair name or foul—it comes down finally to the act of responding individually to the obligations of self-government. And whether one counts oneself a member of the inner circle or the outer circle, every American is, or should be, a politician. Over the age of 21, everyone should be an active politician, letting his voice be heard at least through his vote.

I have found also that there are plenty of active politicians under the age of 21. I have been surprised and gratified by the number of letters I have been getting from schoolchildren. I like to get these letters. They don't tell me how to run the Department. They ask me what I do.

And from these younger citizens I sometimes get a pretty good idea of what's being taught in the schools around the country. I can say, for example, with a fair degree of accuracy, that during the past 6 weeks a lot of ninth graders have been studying the Cabinet, and I'm sure that a lot of class reports have been given on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This is as it should be, and I am glad that in this country schoolchildren can feel free to ask a member of the Cabinet just what it is that he does. I make a special effort to answer these letters because I feel a special obligation to these youngsters who will become the responsible politicians of tomorrow.

I am glad, too, that they care about the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In spite of our rather long and specific title, there is widespread misconception about what we do and how we do it. A lot of people don't realize, for example, that nearly 90 percent of the Department's appropriations are passed on to the States, educational and scientific institutions, and hospitals and individuals in the form of grants—for public assistance, for medical research, for aid to education, for water pollution control, and a host of other projects in which State, local, Federal, and nongovernmental energies and resources are combined to promote the general welfare.

Because the work of our Department directly affects the lives of so many millions of people in so many different ways, any single impression of HEW is bound to be colored as much by what is opinion as by what is fact.

One of my staff members tells about his 5-year-old daughter who asked him what his job was. He found it somewhat difficult to put this into 5-year-old terms, but he went on at some length about how the Department looks after all the people in the country—how we try to keep people from getting sick, how we try to protect the food they eat and the medicine they take, how we try to see that everyone has enough to eat, how we want to make sure that everyone has a chance to go to school. The child was visibly impressed. A few days later the father overheard his daughter telling another child, "My daddy's better than your daddy—he takes care of everybody, just like God."

Unfortunately, like the 5-year-old, too many grownups share that mistaken impression. At one extreme are the anti-Federal forces who oppose all national programs in health, education, and welfare. Their view is that we have gone too far in the caretaking role. At the other extreme are the absolute paternalists who think we are not fatherly enough.

Both extremes, I think, have a narrow, cramped view of the needs and problems of our society. One clings to an ideal that may have been possible in a simpler, bygone age—the belief that each of us can stand entirely alone. But today, in a world that is changed by fantastic advances in science and technology, such a belief is as obsolete as the Pony Express.

The "let-the-Government-do-everything" school is equally shortsighted. Its followers show too little faith in the ability of man to adapt to new conditions, to meet new challenges. In their rush to take care of all his material needs, they forget his most basic need for self-respect and self-reliance and would rob him of the great happiness—the intense personal satisfaction—that comes from independence, growth, and achievement.

Neither approach would benefit society. With one we would flounder; with the other we would grow flabby. But between the two there is a path that will lead to social progress—a way that would sacrifice neither security nor independence—a way that would enhance both the dignity of the individual and the strength of the Nation.

And it is this path that the Kennedy administration is following.

In public welfare, for example our goal is to provide opportunities for independence to all who need them. For youth and adults who are handicapped by lack of education, by physical or mental disabilities, by social and economic pressures beyond their control, the dole is being exchanged for a bootstrap, so that they can help themselves.

We are also examining the causes of dependency and are looking for ways to cure or prevent them. Disease and poverty, ignorance and idleness are social ills that—like cancer—will respond to treatment if caught in time.

Our experiences over the past quarter of a century have amply demonstrated the soundness of the social security approach to establishing a floor of economic independence for people beyond their working years. When this independence is threatened by the high cost of hospital and related health care—as it is today—we feel it is time to add another plank to social security, to give people the means of insuring themselves against the pauperism that can quickly result from the heavy expenses of illness in the later years of life. This would not intrude upon individual freedom and dignity. Instead, it would make them possible.

The inadequacies of education, at a time when we are confronted with increasing demands for a more broadly and more highly educated population, have brought us face to face with a national crisis of major proportions.

Here, while respecting the prerogative of the States and local communities to control the education of our youth, we have proposed Federal assistance to selected areas of need where it is most appropriate and where it can be most useful.

We can no longer ignore the need for emergency classroom construction and aid to teachers' salaries in the public schools, for revitalized vocational education programs, for broadened opportunities in higher education, for expanded college facilities, for improving the quality of teaching, for meeting the special needs of handicapped children, and for expanded opportunities for adult education. These are among the nationwide needs which the Federal Government can properly help to meet. Indeed, it will be failing in its responsibility if it does not come forward to meet them.

And there are still other national problems that are waiting solution. There is mental retardation which needlessly blights the lives of millions of Americans. There is the problem of accidents which are the leading cause of death for young people up to the age of 35. There are the costly and debilitating problems of alcoholism and drug addiction which strike alike at rich and poor and have too long been shrouded with mystery and misunderstanding. There is the matter of air pollution and the harmful effects of manmade chemicals on man himself and his environment.

These are problems which George Washington and Jefferson and Madison and Hamilton could scarcely foresee. Yet they saw the need for a national government that would be strong enough to withstand the strain which accompanies any real progress—a government which would be strong enough to protect the whole body of the people—one that would be able to promote the general welfare without threat to individual freedom.

To be sure, the National Government cannot do these things alone. Nor was it ever intended that it should. We are a pluralistic society, a government of, by, and for the people, and all of us share in the responsibility of keeping our Nation free and strong.

But the stimulus for social progress must rise from each one of us as responsible individuals. It must come from our public conscience. It must respond to public needs. It must pull together our multiple resources and convert them into action.

The big job ahead is a job for all of us—every individual, every level of government, labor, management, professional organizations, welfare and civic groups, the technicians, and the man on the street.

Most basically, it is a job for politics—for the inner circle and the outer circle—because nothing at all will happen if we sit still.

We can't afford to sit still, and we don't intend to sit still. The past, for all its grandeur, is behind us. The present—tomorrow—will slip into the past. From the past and the present we must mold the future. We are responsible for its shape, its condition, and the promises that it holds for all mankind.

It is the job of politics to anticipate the future, to seek out opportunities for progress and to propel the Nation forward.

It is the job of politics to resolve the differences that divide and tend to immobilize us.

It is the job of politics to convert ideas into energy and energy into action, so that progress is possible and the future can be secure.

Politics, in turn, is led by parties, each of which has chosen a different path to the future.

Today, we know where we are going, and, with your help and the help of millions of others throughout the country, we will get there. We have purpose, we have energy, we have leadership.

These are three of the essential elements of progress, but there is still a fourth, and that is action.

When we can galvanize our forces into action, only then can we say that we, as a party, and we, as politicians, and as citizens have fulfilled our responsibilities to the Nation—and to ourselves.

I am confident that we will not be found remiss.

An Evaluation of the Common Market and American Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, our very able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] recently wrote an article on "New York, The Common Market, and World Trade," for the February 1963 issue of County Government, a journal of opinion and discussion on matters affecting New York State. Mr. DEROUNIAN's remarks, based upon his close study and hard work during the discussion of the Trade Expansion Act of the last Congress, well deserve the close attention of all of those interested in this important matter. To share these ideas with the Congress and the country, I am placing the gentleman's article, "New York, The

Common Market and World Trade," in the RECORD at this point.

NEW YORK, THE COMMON MARKET, AND WORLD TRADE

(By STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN)

Despite the fact that I have great respect for Luther H. Hodges, our present U.S. Secretary of Commerce, I feel that it is incumbent upon me to answer in a somewhat critical manner the article written by him in the December issue of this magazine. While Mr. Hodges took an extremely optimistic view of the European Economic Community (popularly known as the Common Market)—and I wish he could be proven right in his optimism—I feel that his views resembled those of a man in an ivory tower. Everything is not rosy with the Common Market as far as the United States is concerned.

First let me touch on our trading situation with Europe prior to the evolution of the Common Market and during this period of transition. (One must keep in mind that the entire Common Market scheme of trade restrictions has not yet been fully implemented.) Although tariffs have always been an obstacle to U.S. manufacturers attempting to create markets in the countries of Europe, they were by no means the greatest hurdle they had to overcome. Restrictions other than tariffs, so-called administrative restrictions, have for a long time retarded the growth of U.S. markets abroad. I make direct reference to restrictions such as the horsepower use tax in France, the restrictions against the importation of coal into Great Britain, the ban against the importation of watch parts into Switzerland and prohibitions against the importation of dairy products into the Scandinavan countries.

Although our negotiators have in many instances been successful in bargaining down prohibitive tariffs against U.S. products, at the same time they have devoted little or no time toward administrative restrictions. In essence this has meant that while our U.S. representatives to trade negotiations have been able to obtain more equitable tariff rates on U.S. products, in many cases these reduced rates have offered little incentive to our domestic producers as other restrictions still prohibited anything resembling a freer flow of trade.

Since the formation of the Common Market there has been little indication that the member nations in combination will tend to take any positive action with respect to prohibitive administrative restrictions. From all indications their only intent is to create common trade barriers and to lower these trade barriers only for those products which they desperately need. Moreover, there is little guarantee that once Common Market sources for these needed products are developed that even these beneficial rates will not be raised. From all indications their goal is as self-sufficient a Europe as is possible. In the opinion of many, the Common Market has at least the potential of becoming one of the most restrictive trade cartels in modern times. What one must understand about the Common Market is that for those within its walls such an arrangement can be most beneficial. Member nations under the Common Market will tear down traditional trade barriers. They will promote both the free flow of labor and capital throughout its member nations. On the other hand, in joining together they are at the same time raising a common wall against the rest of the free world.

This is not to say that we cannot make some inroads through this wall, but at what expense? For example, prior to the formation of the Common Market the bulk of our automobile exports were shipped to Germany and to the Benelux countries where there was a tariff of 18 percent. The Common Market initially proposed an external tariff of 29 percent. As a result of further concessions on our part, this initial tariff was reduced to 22 percent. However, U.S. automobile exporters, as a result of the formation of the Common Market, are faced with a higher rate of duty than was heretofore applicable to the bulk of their exports despite our bargaining efforts and additional concessions.

The case of automobiles is not an isolated one. When the full effect of the Common Market's external tariff wall is realized, other U.S. products will have to find their way into Europe under higher tariffs than those presently enjoyed. This averaging of the tariff rates of member nations, in many cases, will close present markets and open no new ones.

Our negotiators have bargained away U.S. rates to a point where there are only four major trading nations in the free world that have rates lower than our own. The Common Market rates when they are fully implemented will, on the average, be considerably higher than ours. Based on weighted averages, only West Germany, Sweden, Switzerland, and Denmark have lower average industrial tariffs. West Germany is already a member of the Common Market so in reality under Common Market averaging this leaves only three nations with rates lower than ours. Moreover, there is talk that even these three nations may become members of the Common Market in the future. Where does this leave us? To answer my own question, this leaves us with very little to bargain with. To lower Common Market external tariff rates back to pre-Common Market levels we will have to lower our rates even further. This will open no new markets, only preserve old ones. At this point it becomes questionable whether our domestic industries can stand the increased competition at home that such action is bound to bring, for it goes without saying that in almost all cases we will have to give additional concessions via lower rates on European goods coming into the United States of America.

Agricultural products are another area of grave concern. The Common Market has proposed a system of variable import fees. These fees will slide up and down, thereby tending to keep the prices of imported agricultural products somewhat above the prices of corresponding Common Market agricultural products. This is meant to encourage the European farmer (including the inefficient farmer) to produce more—with the end objective a self-sufficient Europe.

The implementation of these variable import fees by the Common Market could cost us millions of dollars in the near future, particularly in the product areas of food grains, poultry, eggs, fresh fruit, and vegetables. In the long run, as the Common Market becomes self-sufficient and the European farmer more and more efficient we might well find ourselves pitted against Europe in cutthroat competition for other world markets. In a time when we have large farm surpluses, agricultural price supports and other costly Government subsidies to agriculture, such action presents a real threat and a triple threat at that—to the farmer, the consumer, and the taxpayer. Moreover, it is not too difficult to imagine what this will do to our present unfavorable balance of payments, which is out of balance in great part because of the tremendous expense of maintaining oversea military installations and the foreign aid program—activities which directly and indirectly are of great benefit to our European neighbors.

To summarize, so far I have attempted to show that restrictions other than tariffs present a serious threat to U.S. industry marketing, or hoping to market, abroad. A threat, I might add, to which this administration gives little voice or understanding. Those of us who worked on drafting the final trade bill understood the problem. That is why the bill as it became law contained a section that gives the President expressed power to act against nations or groupings of nations that make use of discriminatory import restrictions.

Also I have discussed the threatened hardships of the averaging method of arriving at uniform external tariffs by the Common Market. It appears that little is to be done about this right away. It has been stated that it will be 1964 before any new trade negotiations will be entered into. Our last round of trade negotiations took approximately 18 months. Using this past experience as a measuring rod, it will be late 1965 or 1966 before any new agreements with the Common Market or our other trading partners would become effective. By this time Europe may be self-sufficient in many areas of production and we will be shut out of much-needed markets.

As if this ought to be enough of a concern, it is only half of our problem. Remove all trade barriers and in many product areas the U.S. manufacturer still could not compete in foreign markets. Here at home we are in, and for the past several years have been in, a period of inflation and increased national debt. Inflation raises domestic prices, stimulates imports, reduces exports and employment, and reduces our gold reserves. A growing national debt shakes business confidence—businessmen are less likely to speculate in times of uncertainty. A growing national debt requires additional debt monetization, which takes money out of circulation that could well be used for consumption and business investment. Our present debt of roughly $300 billion includes interest on that debt of about $9.5 billion. Debt management is rapidly becoming an overpowering problem spurred by the inherent threat of increased inflation.

Furthermore, our present tax structure does not offer the proper incentives for modernization and expansion of American plants and equipment. Granted, within the last year depreciation, schedules have been somewhat liberalized and the 7-percent investment credit was instituted. These, however, are not the kind of sweeping reforms that are so desperately needed. At most they are only mild attempts by the New Frontier to appeal to business.

The Federal budget should be brought into balance. This is not something which can be put off for some indefinite future time. Even the Kennedy administration has given credence to the concept of a balanced budget. However, and this is where we have a parting of the way, they maintain that the budget should be balanced over the cycle and not fiscal year by fiscal year. Even conceding the concept of a balanced budget over a cycle, unless the cycle is to run into infinity there has not been, and will be no balancing. Over the past 33 years we have experienced 27 deficits (current fiscal 1963 included). While our too few surpluses of the past have only been slight or marginal, our deficits have been deep and alarming. In this current fiscal year we are faced with an expected budget deficit of almost $8 billion. It will be much larger if there is a tax cut without an accompanying cut in Federal spending. Nonessential, nondefense spending should be cut, and there is even some indication that defense spending could be trimmed without seriously threatening our national defense or space projects. The 100,000 and some employees that the Kennedy administration has added to the Federal payrolls should be cut. Federal budgets which are more nearly in balance would help to reduce our national debt and debt-management problem, and curb the threat of more inflation. Secondly, they would go far toward reinstating the confidence that

both domestic business and foreign interests seem to lack in our somewhat shaky economy.

The yearly productivity gains of domestic industry should be used primarily to reduce prices, and not to increase wages. Between 1953 and 1960 wages in the United States rose by 31 percent while productivity rose by only 15 percent. In comparison with other industrial nations of the free world, our ratio of wage increases to productivity gains is most unfavorable. Productivity gains used to reduce the price of goods would tend to stimulate consumption and employment, increase exports, and in the end increase the real wages and income of all.

In conclusion, it is incumbent that the Kennedy administration toughen up its foreign trade policy. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which those of us on the Ways and Means Committee worked closely on, has the potential of becoming a fine and rewarding trade program. However, standing alone it is only a paper document. The act needs to be implemented by men who understand its purposes. It needs the force and enthusiasm of a persuasive and aggressive administration. Beyond this, we need trade negotiators who will "bring home the bacon" by protecting American interests.

Concurrently, we need greater domestic economic stability. More specifically, we need balanced budgets, more incentives for the business community to invest and expand, productivity gains which reduce prices—bringing about more competitive prices for American goods in foreign markets.

During its first 2 years in office this administration has shown little understanding of our problems—domestic and foreign. We need positive action not indecision coupled with empty promises. We need an administration that concerns itself with our immediate and foreseeable problems and is not off chasing rainbows.

Red Gamble Held Gain for West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the following Associated Press article has been brought to my attention by a constituent, and I feel it should be a matter of interest to this House:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier Journal, Feb. 24, 1963]

RED GAMBLE HELD A GAIN FOR WEST

WICHITA, FALLS, TEX., February 23.—Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON said Saturday night that Russia has lost its gamble to extend the Communist empire into the Western Hemisphere.

JOHNSON said in a speech to a dinner audience that the year 1962 is likely to be pinpointed "as one of the decisive turning points in the cold war and of the whole long struggle between freedom and tyranny."

He continued: "First, after 15 years of containment, the Russian Communists gambled desperately in an attempt to extend their armed empire across the oceans to the Western Hemisphere. They gambled greatly—and they lost."

LEADERSHIP DEFIED

"Second, after that failure, the Russian Communists turned back to an empire in which—for the first time since communism came into existence—they found their own leadership and control defied and challenged by the Chinese Communists. And the whole myth of Communist unity exploded."

JOHNSON said that when the Soviets moved missiles into Cuba they found themselves facing the hard reality of an America ready, an America prepared, an America resolute.

"In the face of that preparedness and resolve, the forces of communism backed away.

"But there is one vital point which I believe needs to be brought home. The American strength which Khrushchev faced in Cuba—the strength which has held the line against aggression through all these years of the cold war—is not solely the strength of arms and planes and missiles and bombs."

SOLIDARITY CITED

"The greater strength which has carried us through these years of peril is the strength of this country's political system—the system of which all of us are part and to which each of us adds or subtracts strength and solidarity."

JOHNSON said the country needs to recognize that partisanship is not "the end-all and be-all of citizenship."

"In our national history, there are no heroes who made their names as partisans," he said. "The only men remembered—the only men worth remembering—have always been those who have placed the country above party and principle above partisanship. We shall have lost the keystone from the arch of our national strength if ever our values are otherwise."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is obvious that the Vice President has miscalculated when he makes the statement that Russia has gambled in the Western Hemisphere and lost. Khrushchev declared to all the world after he had withdrawn 42 missiles from Cuba that they had scored a major victory in Cuba and since we know that it is basic Communist strategy to take three steps forward and one or two steps back in their advancing—it would certainly seem that in view of the no-invasion guarantee which it is reported Mr. Khrushchev received, it can hardly be said that the Russians lost in this hemisphere.

Second. The Vice President is quoted as saying that 1962 is likely to be pinpointed as one of the decisive turning points of the cold war, and I will ask in which direction, and in whose favor? Is there anything to indicate that the Communists have had any reversals of any significance?

Third. The phrase "after 15 years of containment, the Russian Communists" is an insult to the intelligence of the American people. It certainly is tragic that the Vice President of the United States should feel that communism has been contained during the last 15 years. A call to the Library of Congress today indicates that 15 years ago approximately 330 million people lived under communism and today approximately 1,059 million are living behind the Iron Curtain or in the satellite countries. Can this be construed as containment?

Fourth. The Vice President seems to take comfort, as do many, in some supposed cleavage between the Chinese Communists and the Russian Communists. I quite frankly cannot take much comfort in any disagreement as to methods and do not feel that a disagreement in methods can in any way indicate a break in Communist objectives. It has been repeatedly indicated by both of the Communist empires that it should be understood that they would stand together and they both look forward to the day when they will joyfully shovel the last spadeful of dirt on the grave of capitalism.

The Chinese Communists and the Russiar. Communists may scrabble over methods, but they are both unswervingly and unrelentlessly committed to the same objective, world conquest and world domination.

Secretary of Commerce, Hon. Luther H. Hodges, Calls for Development of an Adequate Nationwide Transportation System in Speech Before American Road Builders' Association—Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat of West Virginia, Addresses 61st Annual Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the 61st annual convention of the American Road Builders' Association, a national organization devoted to the advocacy of adequate highway and airport programs, has just concluded its sessions in Chicago, Ill.

The meeting this year was of particular interest because it was held in conjunction with the construction equipment and exposition road show which, I am told, was the largest industrial exhibit in the world. Without question, it was of tremendous significance. The exhibits covered an area equivalent to that of 13 football fields. It was attended by more than 100,000 people including some 7,000 foreign visitors.

Aside from its impressive size the show was meaningful in that it clearly illustrated the great strides which have been made in the technology of equipment design. The increased productivity of modern machines accounts for a very important part in keeping the unit costs of highway construction at a low level.

The problems and progress of the highway program were discussed from many different approaches during the meeting of the ARBA.

The highway legislative situation was ably presented by my good friend and former House colleague, the distinguished chairman of the House Subcommittee on Roads, the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, and by the energetic ranking minority member of that subcommittee, the Honorable WILLIAM C. CRAMER.

It was inspiring to hear from such outstanding leaders as John C. Mackie, the Michigan State highway commissioner who is the 1963 president of the

American Association of Highways Officials; Ralph R. Bartelsmeyer, who has recently completed a distinguished term of service as chief engineer of the Illinois Division of Highways, and W. A. Bugge, the noted director of highways of the State of Washington.

I gained an insight on the thinking of the highway industry from W. K. Cox, who is the president of the Construction Industrial Manufacturers Association and vice president of the Caterpillar Tractor Co., and from Maj. Gen. Louis W. Prentiss, the capable executive vice president of the American Road Builders' Association.

A high spot of the convention, the annual road builders' luncheon, was addressed by the Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Luther H. Hodges.

I was particularly happy to be present to see the annual American Road Builders' Association Award presented to Nello L. Teer, Jr., president of the Nello L. Teer Co. of Durham, N.C., a firm which is among the world's leaders in highway construction. I was most pleased that the founder of that outstanding company, Nello L. Teer, Sr., was also present, as was the Federal Highway Administrator, Rex M. Whitton, and many other distinguished leaders representing both government and industry.

Secretary Hodges delivered an outstanding speech which contained a message which should be read by every Member of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Hodges' speech at the 61st annual meeting of the American Road Builders' Association be printed in the Congressional Record.

Also, Mr. President, I request that there be printed at the conclusion of Secretary Hodges' address my own remarks delivered at the opening session of the convention.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges Prepared for Delivery at a Luncheon of the American Road Builders' Association, Palmer House Hotel, Chicago, Monday, February 25, 1963

When Nello Teer asked me to come to Chicago for the American Road Builders' Association convention, he suggested as a topic, "Trends Threatening To Curtail Motor Vehicle Use and Highway Development."

The Department of Commerce, however, is responsible for promoting the health of the Nation's entire transportation system and not just its roads. Since there are trends threatening the development of our whole transportation system, I think it would be properly responsive to your subject to talk with you as transportation men and not just as roadbuilders.

We do not have to look far to discover why the Federal Government is concerned with transportation. The industry makes a huge contribution to the national economy. It is estimated that the cost of passenger and freight transportation, including the private automobile, presently is more than $100 billion a year, or nearly one-fifth of our gross national product. It is further estimated that this cost will rise above $150 billion before 1980.

The influence of the transportation industry, however, goes far beyond these dollar figures. It affects the cost of every item we produce, and thus is vital to our country's economic growth at home and abroad.

The Federal Government estimated that it will spend nearly $5 billion in transport-oriented operations in fiscal 1964. At the Department of Commerce better than 85 percent of the funds we will administer in fiscal 1964 are for transportation. This includes more than $3 billion in the highway trust fund, but even out of the Department's general fund we spend nearly half for transportation, mainly maritime subsidies.

Yet, despite the fact that the public is spending more for transportation facilities and equipment than ever before in history, transportation is not serving—let me repeat, not serving—as well as it should or as well as it could.

Millions of dollars in business are lost in central city districts because of traffic congestion.

Common carriers, which are the backbone of our transportation system and vital to the welfare of small business, specially, are getting less and less of the total intercity freight shipments.

In spite of increasing subsidies, our merchant marine's share of world shipping is declining at a time when we are trying to expand our oversea commerce.

And, finally, many of our railroads, airlines and trucking firms are operating at losses, or with profits that are unhealthily small.

The present state of affairs has been some time in the making. An abundance of studies in the past have pointed to the problems of transportation, but not until last year was an effort made to present a comprehensive program for the functioning of the transportation complex as an efficient whole.

Until now attention has been concentrated on strengthening a particular mode of transport, generally for sound historical reasons. The past decade, for example, has seen an intensification of highway construction. I don't mean in any way to deprecate this activity—our need for better roads has been and still is great. We still have much to do to build a highway network adequate to our domestic commerce and defense requirements.

As I mentioned before we shall spend well over $3 billion for highways in fiscal 1964. Much of this money will go toward completion of the 41,000-mile National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. More than 14,000 miles are now open to traffic and construction is underway on another 4,300. Roadbuilding in 1962 involved about 10,000 individual firms. Highway construction costs, exclusive of engineering and rights-of-way, involved an estimated $5.6 billion. We have tightened our audit and investigations program to insure that the most efficient and honest use of funds is made. This is a story in itself.

We are continuing our safety and research projects. We have to go no further than last year's record 41,000 traffic fatalities to find the reason why we are so concerned with safety.

Within the last year or so, two specific organizations have been set up to improve Government's role in traffic safety—one is the Bureau of Public Roads Office of Highway Safety, the other is the Interdepartmental Highway Safety Board under the chairmanship of the Secretary of Commerce. These two groups plus participating members offer scientific, technical and educational aid to groups in and out of Government to promote traffic safety.

We have established a Federal drivers' register, which keeps track of all drivers whose licenses have been suspended for drunken driving or involvement in fatal accidents. States participate voluntarily in this program, and to date only four States have not taken part. Two of these holdouts are expected to participate in the very near future. We also have a program with the States to promote uniformity in signs, signals, and markings to end accident-causing confusion.

We have further expanded educational and training services to States, and have programs to stimulate and coordinate traffic research.

We are proud of our accomplishments in these areas, but we must also face the problems arising in integrating highways into the overall transportation complex. It is fortunate that we can see them and hopefully act on them now—not later when solutions would be much harder to effect.

Perhaps the most immediate and vexing problem facing us is urban transportation. Traffic snarls result in millions of dollars in lost business and time, not to mention frayed tempers and raw nerves.

The difficulty in finding a solution, it seems to me, has been that in pursuing their parochial interests, the various factions have failed to state the problem—and the problem is how to move goods and passengers in the fastest, most economical, and most comfortable manner that is acceptable to the user, the customer so to speak.

We must not only make the best possible use of each mode of transportation, but find the best combinations of modes—we need, in short, an integrated, rather than a fragmented approach. This may call for some thinking of the national interest, rather than local or modal concerns.

The problems of urban transportation are going to grow rather than diminish with time. The population of the United States will soar to 214 million by 1970. One hundred and fifty million of these will be concentrated in urban areas.

An important step toward an integrated approach to these problems was taken in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962.

First, the act allows a State to use Federal-aid secondary funds on extensions of the system that pass through urban areas. This permits increased flexibility of financing arrangements and promotes improvements in such areas, particularly those having important feeder routes on the secondary system.

Second, the act requires assurance from the State highway department that relocation advisory assistance will be provided for the relocation of families displaced by acquisition or clearance of rights-of-way for any Federal-aid highway.

The loss of taxable property for a freeway right-of-way creates real problems for city officials. We are actively promoting the use of air space over freeways, and have adopted procedures and standards which would permit States and cities to utilize space above and below freeways to build parking facilities, apartments, stores, public buildings, and even parks and playgrounds.

Third, and most important, the Secretary of Commerce is directed to cooperate with the States in the development of long-range highway plans and programs coordinated with plans for improving other affected forms of transportation. This provision will encourage transportation planning and improve the quality of urban planning generally. It will not delay the current Federal-aid highway program. Urban areas of 50,000 or more must have plans in process by July 1, 1965, to be eligible for Federal participation in costs of projects.

At last, I think we have made a move toward curing the illness rather than treating the symptoms.

Urban congestion is acute and, therefore, has occupied much of our immediate attention, but other problems are shaping up, and our hope is that together we can attend to these before they become too serious.

We expect to have ready for submission to Congress within 60 days the Department of

Commerce recommendations for possible changes in the present weight and size limitations for vehicles using the Interstate System.

Here again the task is not easy. While physical characteristics of highways, such as width of lanes, the ability to withstand heavy axle weights, and other criteria are important, we must also evaluate weights and sizes in terms of the economics of truck transportation. We must provide the combination that will result in the most efficient and effective standards for highway vehicles.

The need to evaluate the effectiveness of alternative methods and standards must be extended throughout our transportation system. The interlocking nature of urban planning, highways, and truck sizes carries on through railroads, waterways, and air transport. The parts must mesh if the machine is to run properly.

For this reason the administration has formulated a basic transportation policy. Briefly what President Kennedy has called for is greater reliance on competition and less on regulation, consistent policies of taxation and user charges, increased research for equipment and systems.

Much of the weakness in transportation today can be traced to the existing Federal regulatory policies. As the President said, in his transportation message to Congress last year, "A chaotic patchwork of inconsistent and often obsolete legislation and regulation has evolved from a history of specific actions addressed to specific problems of specific industries at specific times. This patchwork does not fully reflect either the dramatic changes in technology or the parallel change in the structure of competition."

The unequal application of present regulatory laws impedes competition and leads to a host of inconsistencies.

Coal, petroleum, grain, and other bulk commodities move by barge over inland waterways completely without regulation, but the same commodities moving by rail or common carrier truck are completely regulated.

Hauling buttermilk is exempt from regulation, but the same truck hauling chocolate milk over the same route between the same points is regulated. Powdered milk is exempt but condensed milk is not. And there are many other such inconsistencies.

There is in the legislative machinery right now a most important bill. It would assure all carriers the right to ship containers and vehicles on other carriers at rates available to noncarrier shippers.

The object, of course, is to encourage coordination among the various agencies of transportation, to assure shippers better and cheaper service. One result would be to stimulate the growing piggy-back technique, which eliminates much of the cost and time loss of repeated loadings and unloadings.

Another purpose is to further the growth of containerization, which promises to cut transportation costs considerably and is one of the exciting developments in the field.

A trend appears to be developing to standardize containers in sizes of 4 by 8, 8 by 8, 8 by 10, and 8 by 20. If these do become standard sizes we must give consideration to how these can be effectively moved by all modes of transportation. It would affect the trucking industry, for example, because piggyback trailers are really nothing but containers.

Developing these new techniques, however, depends to a large extent on allowing all carriers equal rights to use them rather than regulating some and penalizing others.

Inequities persist, too, in our policies toward taxes and user charges.

For example, the Federal Government now spends about $500 million a year on the airways system and this expenditure continues to grow. Yet, airlines pay only a small portion of this public cost in the form of user charges. Passengers pay a 5-percent user charge on their tickets, and there is no tax on air freight. A 2-cent-per-gallon charge is levied on the fuel for reciprocal engine airplanes, but there is no fuel tax for the big, fast, efficient jets.

The public has invested more than $2 billion in the inland waterways system and continues to spend at the rate of about $70 million a year. Yet, inland waterway operators pay no user charge for this publicly provided facility.

I am happy to say that the highway trust fund which supplies all of the Federal-aid highway funds for construction is set up to allocate construction costs as nearly as possible in relation to user benefits. Revenues from the fund are derived from motor fuel taxes, rubber taxes, use taxes for heavy vehicles, and taxes on new trucks, buses, and trailers.

Our aim is to bring costs in a similar fashion more into line with user benefits in other segments of industry. We hope to establish equity in terms of taxes and regulation and allow free enterprise as free a rein as possible. For it is through competition we feel we can best get the lowest possible shipper costs and the most effective service.

Competition gives us more than efficiency for a static situation. It sharpens our awareness for the pressures of change. It requires that we not only keep up with a rapidly moving world, but that we anticipate and precipitate change in the constant desire to forge ahead.

It is important that we move with purpose—blind change for its own sake is inadequate. Only through the various forms of well reasoned research can planned change be accomplished in a way that will produce the kind of transportation system that will be responsive to the economic and social requirements of the future.

In his transportation message, President Kennedy said, "To understand the increasingly complex transportation problems of the future, to identify the relationships of social, economic, administrative, and technical factors involved, to translate scientific knowledge into transportation engineering practice, to weigh the merits of alternative systems, and to formulate new, improved, and consistent policies—we need information that can evolve only from a vigorous, continuous, and coordinated programs of research. Yet, in the field of transportation where we have many unfulfilled opportunities, research has been fragmented, unsteady, inadequate in scope and balance."

In the long view, I don't think we can commit ourselves too firmly to any mode of transportation, to any process of manufacture, to the use of any material, or engineering procedure. Research is pointing to new high strength, low cost, durable materials, new sources of power, new types of vehicles. The jet airplane is fairly new on the scene, and investigations are underway for commercial aircraft to fly at three times the speed of sound. A nuclear-powered merchant ship is operational, and a hydrofoil ship has been built. A variety of surface effect vehicles are in the experimental stage. And who is to say that something will not follow that sounds incredible now?

The President said, "Taking advantage of new techniques that would provide convenience and efficiency, we must consider the impact of different forms of transportation investment on economic development; we must combine and integrate systems to take advantage of the maximum benefits of each mode of travel; we must consider the Nation's transportation network as an articulated and closely linked system rather than an uncoordinated set of independent entities."

The Department of Commerce has been given the job of developing a comprehensive transportation research program for the Government for later consideration by the Congress.

Our Commerce Department's Census Bureau is undertaking a survey of all transportation to fill in the gaps of present knowledge, especially with respect to private trucking.

Our Bureau of Public Roads has been using research for many years to aid it in planning and building the world's finest intercity network of highways. It is now reemphasizing its work and has undertaken the complex job of evaluating the relation of highway planning to mass transportation by rail or express bus, and to city planning.

I cannot stress too much the importance of accomplishing these goals. Transportation is tightly tied to public policy. Transportation is the catalyst that makes our economy work. It affects economic growth, it is a determining factor in the price of every commodity we produce, consume, and export. It is a vital cog in our defense machinery. An inefficient transportation system can render inefficient every vital aspect of our country's life.

We've made a start on a long, continuing, complex, and difficult job. It is going to take the best techniques and cooperation of Government and private enterprise to put and keep our transportation program at the high level our country requires.

But I feel that Government is facing up to the overall problems of our transportation industry with more realism than it has in the past. With your help we will build an industry that is responsive to our Nation's growth needs, economically and socially.

Keep up your good work and thank you for letting me be with you today.

Address by Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat, of West Virginia, Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Roads, U.S. Senate Committee on Public Works, at Afternoon Session of Annual Convention of American Road Builders' Association, Chicago, Ill., February 25, 1963

On several occasions during the past 4 years I have been invited to address national conventions of the American Road Builders' Association, contractor groups, and affiliated State units of ARBA. For the most part, I have spoken on subjects such as the role of the citizen in public affairs and the relations of the businessman and his Government.

I intend to speak here more specifically of problems in the area of concern of the roadbuilders and of the highway planners and administrators.

First, however, I should say that in the Senate, and especially in our Public Works Committee, we have felt in a keen official and a deep personal way the losses of Senators Dennis Chavez of New Mexico and Robert Kerr of Oklahoma in recent weeks. They were policymakers and leaders of action in highway matters in the Congress. Our new chairman, the capable Senator Pat McNamara, of Michigan, and others will carry on. None of us is indispensable, but our success and the progress we seek to effectuate by our decisions and actions will be all the more assured by our drawing on the experiences we acquired while serving under the expert leadership of our predecessors.

There has been a minimum of partisanship on the Public Works Committee and on the Public Roads Subcommittee. Senator John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, is the ranking Republican member and brings to his duties a commendable diligence. In this respect, I acknowledge and commend the productivity of the Subcommittee on Public Roads during the 86th and 87th Congresses under the chairmanship of Senator McNamara. It was a privilege to have served with him, Senator Cooper, and other colleagues on that subcommittee. I am sure we will continue to labor cooperatively.

Concerning the important question of coordinate but separate branches of our Government—especially as relate to administration of public roads matters—I have some positive opinions. Between the legislators and the administrators in the public roads agencies of the executive branches of both State and Federal Governments there should be mutual understanding, mutual respect, and helpful liaison in the public interest.

Those in the executive establishment responsible for public roads administration receive from the legislative branch outlines of policy in the broadest possible terms.

I stress the word "broad" in speaking of most legislative policy declarations and authorizations passed on to the executive. This is as it should be. The legislative branch must not straitjacket the executive branch. By and large, I do not believe there is straitjacketing in any substantial degree.

But it does seem that occasionally there are some legislators in the State assemblies or in the Federal Congress who exceed the bounds of what I consider to be propriety on the one hand and constitutional requirements on the other hand. I refer to those members of legislative bodies who seem neither to respect nor to subscribe to the concept of coordinate but separate branches of government. I believe there are legislators and staffs of legislative bodies who abuse the relationship between the executive and legislative authority—especially in the area of public roads. This condition is deplored.

A legislator does not have a right to seek to administer the law or laws which stem from legislative action. That is a usurpation of power because administration is a duty reserved for the executive branch by constitutional provision and in statutes brought into being under the Constitution.

Furthermore, I believe a legislator or a legislative body or a legislative committee staff should not seek and should not attempt to take over law enforcement authority which is specifically a responsibility of the executive branch. Yet, this sometimes happens. And, I assure you, I believe a legislator or any group of legislators or any legislative body or any legislative committee staff should not infringe on the judicial branch by seeking to be prosecutor, judge, and jury. But, unfortunately, this, too, sometimes occurs.

There are also instances wherein some among our fellow citizens expect—even demand—that their legislative representatives shall transgress on the authority reserved by the Constitution or specific statutes for the executive branch or for the judiciary.

Citizens who have complaints against administration should first direct their objections to the executive. They should not complain to the legislative representatives or committees unless and until they are prepared to suggest and support valid, reasonable, and responsible changes in existing law—or to recommend new statutes relating to conditions and circumstances apparently not covered by law.

If citizens have complaints to lodge against the legality of an administrative action and they cannot bring about correction within the structure of the executive branch where responsibility reposes, the proper course for those citizens to follow is to seek appropriate judicial review and/or action.

It is the responsibility of citizens as well as legislators, executives and administrators, and jurists to keep their actions within the framework of our constitutional system of coordinate but separate branches of the Government. Nowhere does this seem to be more necessary than in public roads matters.

In spite of some distracting influences there has been much substantial progress in the implementation of the public roads program authorized by the Highway Act of 1956. And there has been sound progressiveness in the American Road Builders' Association, too, since 1956. That was the year during which the knowledgeable and efficient executive vice president of this association, Maj. Gen. Louis W. Prentiss, became head of the organization's administrative staff. I share a view ably expressed recently that much of the current prominence which the association holds in the highway world is attributable to his conscientious leadership. And General Prentiss' deputy, Burton F. Miller, has contributed effectively to the American Road Builders' Association leadership effort. His was a significant article for our magazine recently on the subject "Teamwork in Constructive Progress." I share his comment that technological advancements in the highway field are speeding highway planning, construction, and maintenance and are creating better, more efficient roads for a traveling America.

There are, of course, capable and dedicated administrators, planners, researchers, and engineers in the Bureau of Public Roads of the U.S. Department of Commerce. It is pleasant to have their cooperation and a privilege to cooperate with them.

I believe citizens can agree that in view of the high capital investment required for construction of the Interstate and Defense Highway System and the substantial maintenance charges which devolve on the States, our highways in that system necessarily must be designed for a long service life. In fact, Bureau of Public Roads analysts have estimated a service life of 80 to 100 years for Interstate System grading, 35 years for surfacing, and 65 to 75 years for structures. It seems to me that where evidence accumulates that the estimated traffic for 1975 approaches a breakover point, it would be wise to provide now for either the additional lanes required to take care of traffic needs projected beyond the 1975 period or at least make those provisions necessary to assure that the structures being included in highway projects will continue to have useful lifespans. It certainly would be tragic to permit structures to become obsolete early in their life because of insufficient rights-of-way, lack of control of access, or because of other reasons.

I understand that what actually has happened in some instances is that new sections of highways which have only recently been completed, and which were designed on the basis of the estimated 1975 traffic load, already are carrying traffic equal to that which had been anticipated to develop no sooner than 1975. Based on these experiences, steps should be taken to assure that sections of highways now being constructed will continue to be of optimum use beyond 1975.

The importance of the longevity of the highways is apparent to the most casual observer. Consequently, there is much interest in obtaining assurances of quality construction. And this interest is displayed not only by State and Federal highway officials but, also, by State legislative committees, by committees of the Congress, and by the public at large.

This concern generates demands that each stage of construction be subjected to thorough and expert inspection.

From a technicial standpoint, the informed consensus seems to be that inspection procedures and nondestructive testing have improved and will continue to improve with more emphasis on measuring devices utilizing radioisotopes and various applications in the field of electronics and sonics. The technical tools are available now to measure construction performance with micrometer exactness. There is no real doubt that technological advances in this field will enhance the building of better highways at lower costs to the taxpayers.

I share the view that it must be accepted as fact and as a practical consideration that highways cannot be constructed under degrees of exactness comparable to laboratory control. Indeed, there must be leeway allowed in order to meet working conditions actually encountered in field operations. This should be clear, even to the layman. But there should be no lessening of quality, nor lowering of standards. Perhaps the correct approach would be the placing of more reliability on field decisions and allowing greater acceptance of reasonable variations from the technical specifications.

Unless procedures permit prompt and firm decisions by field engineers, it is conceivable—even probable—that the highway program would be bogged in greater degree under a maze of indecision and the proverbial redtape. This consequence would prove to be extremely costly for the taxpayers.

Insofar as inspections are concerned, there would appear to be a demand for and an ability to perform them precisely and with prompt results. But in informed circles I hear two dominant questions. They are:

1. What tolerances can be permitted in the various construction operations without loss of quality in the finished product?

2. What inspections are necessary and desirable to make certain that the work has been accomplished within the required tolerances?

In spite of the fact that the State, as the instrumentality contracting for the highways, bears the primary inspection responsibility, we hear numerous demands that the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads must conduct extensive physical inspections of every Federal-aid project—and especially the Interstate System projects—to make certain that full value is received for every Federal-aid dollar allocated and expended.

If the Bureau of Public Roads inspects in the interest of every Federal dollar involved and if the State checks on behalf of every State dollar, it would appear that there would be costly duplicate inspections at every stage of construction. There are few if any instances in which duplication of effort is not wasteful. In the matter of the types of inspections under discussion, duplications patently result in many excessive and mostly unnecessary delays and much confusion. This reflects in the high costs to the taxpayers and extra expense imposed on the contractor.

For more than 40 years highways have been built successfully within the framework of the Federal-State partnership—and this certainly should continue.

I reemphasize a point about which I have consulted with segments of the highway industry. It is this:

If we are to achieve throughout the United States the acceleration of the roadbuilding program called for by our transportation and economic needs, we must reinstate at every level a vigorous Federal-State-industry partnership and the sense of mutual trust that such a relationship implies.

By and large, the partners are working well together, notwithstanding some disrupting influences.

There is need for Federal cooperation with the agencies of the States. This does not necessitate duplications, and it certainly does not imply and should not countenance undue and unnecessary Federal controls.

I have the positive feeling that the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, headed by Federal Highway Administrator Rex Whitton—who had long experience as a State administrator and understands the State point of view—really has no designs on a so-called takeover. In fact, under Administrator Whitton, it is my belief that the Bureau is exerting leadership to strengthen the partnership concept.

One of the most promising developments in this area is the formation of a task force

within the Research and Development Division of the Bureau of Public Roads to work with the State highway departments and with industry to explore the whole problem of permissible tolerances and inspection procedures.

The consensus of informed persons, as I interpret it, is that the approach being followed is based on the fact that the testing of samples taken at random provides data which can be plotted on a curve, and an analysis of which determines whether or not a given standard of quality has been met. I would be inclined to the more lenient interpretation that in using this approach it does not follow that a job is categorized as a failure because a few samples may fall below the lower limit of specified tolerances. Shouldn't the whole curve be considered?

Early completion of the work of the task force in the Bureau's Research and Development Division is a matter of urgency. Acceptance by the States of recommended tolerances to be brought forth likewise is an urgent matter.

I am informed that planning and construction delays have reached proportions in many areas which are costly not only to the taxpayers but also are threatening the stability of the contracting industry.

Highway contractors should find acceptance of workable tolerances to be of significance to their work and beneficial to their operations.

Experts assure me that new inspection and testing techniques, coupled with engineering judgment of high order, will promote decisions on the spot, so to speak, and will thus eliminate many costly delays, as well as speed the process of approving estimates for payment.

Close cooperation between State and Federal authorities and between government and industry is, of course, essential to success through these approaches.

I am gratified that the American Road Builders' Association has a committee at work to provide industry participation in and support for this project undergoing study by the Bureau's research and development task force.

The interest of our Public Works Committee in the matter of new materials and new uses of materials, new equipment and new methods employed in construction has been demonstrated by the activities during the past year in connection with the compiling of seven committee prints dealing with the subject of new materials, new design methods, etc., in public works construction. One of the outstanding presentations which the committee received was prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads, in cooperation with others. It has shown very clearly and concisely the high degree of technical refinement that is being employed in highways construction in this country. It is my hope that we can expand this study by conferences with representatives of industry and that eventually we can publish a composite report which will point up specific areas where additional research may be helpful in improving public works structures.

In summary, I emphasize the belief that important contributions can be made—indeed, must be made—to three vitally necessary goals, namely:

1. Maintenance of a Federal-aid highway program—and I underscore the fact that it must be an aid program—conducted by the States, rather than one which would be a Federal highway program with aid to the States unfortunately deemphasized.

2. Improved and duplication-free inspection which would have the positive result of strengthening public confidence in the integrity of the highway program.

3. Elimination of project and construction delays costly both to the taxpayers and to the contractors.

It is my hope that this year will be one during which the administrators can devote their efforts to administering—the engineers to engineering—the roadbuilders to building—the paving contractors to paving—and the highway and safety researchers to their important investigations and development.

I trust there will be a minimum of requirement on the time of those in the public road agencies and those in the private sector of road construction for response to legislative inquiries and legislative hearings.

In the absence of objection—to use legislative parlance—I will close, as I did the last ARBA convention I had the privilege of addressing, with these admonitions and assurances:

There is an overriding requirement that there will be full recognition of the fact that this Nation's road construction needs are among our most urgent domestic problems. But these needs can be had and will be fulfilled—and the blight of accounts of alleged and/or actual wrongdoing will be overcome—if we unite to promote a harmonious Federal-State-industry partnership. I call for a partnership for progress—one guided by men to match our times.

SENATE

Friday, March 1, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace, Thou hast taught us that in quietness and in confidence shall be our strength. On this day of world prayer, when around the earth the incense of intercession arises from the agonized needs of Thy children, we, too, in this Chamber of governance, would climb the world's great altar stairs which slope through darkness up to Thee, the giver of all good.

We lift up our prayer for Thy endowment of spiritual might upon the godly women of all the churches in this our Capital City, who are reverently bowing this very hour at an altar set up in this white-domed shrine of each patriot's devotion, asking for Thy healing grace as the only balm in Gilead for the ills of this sundered and wounded world.

On this appointed day we would join the hosts under all skies in the mystery of united prayer by which more things are wrought than this world dreams of. We do not ask for Thy bestowal upon us of any material thing. We but ask that Thou wouldst make us men and women of pure hearts, purged from the mire of moral failure, free from the lure of selfish advantage, and of the prejudice which blinds our inner eyes and warps our judgment.

So above all, in turmoils without and within, day by day we would find—

A little place of mystic grace,
  Of self and sin swept bare,
Where we may look upon Thy face,
  And talk to Thee in prayer.

In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 28, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Export Control

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, covering the quarter ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Use of Civil Aeronautics Board Records and Testimony of Board Personnel Regarding Aircraft Accidents

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Financial Condition and Fiscal Operations of Highway Trust Fund

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the financial condition and fiscal operations of the highway trust fund, dated June 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Report on Review of Manpower Utilization in the Maintenance of Facilities and Operation of Utilities at Selected Military Installations in Japan

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of manpower utilization in the maintenance of facilities and operation of utilities at selected military installations in Japan, Department of Defense, dated February 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Extraordinary Contractual Actions To Facilitate the National Defense, U.S. Coast Guard

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense, U.S. Coast Guard, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Research and Training Activities Under Manpower Development and Training Act

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research and training activities under the Manpower Development and Training Act, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"House Joint Memorial 10

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas, in its act of June 30, 1906, the Congress of the United States recognized that nontaxpaying national forests situate within the States created an imbalance within those States and within the counties in which such forests were situate, and by said act authorized payment to said States and counties of 25 percent of the receipts from sales of timber in such national forests in lieu of taxes on said forest lands and the timber thereon; and

"Whereas although it appeared to be the intent of the Congress that such payments in lieu of taxes were to be computed on the gross receipts, as aforesaid, nevertheless the quantitative payments to the said States, and especially to the State of Idaho and to the counties situate therein, have become smaller in relation to the gross receipts from sale of timber from said national forests because of increasing deductions from said gross amounts; and

"Whereas, it has been estimated that, because of increasing deductions from said gross payments the counties of the State of Idaho have been receiving as little as 8 percent of said gross receipts; and

"Whereas it would require, because of present deductions which have been made since the original enactment of the act of Congress of June 30, 1906, payment to the State of Idaho for the counties therein of 65 percent of the receipts from the sale of timber severed from forest lands to realize the amount of 25 percent as originally contemplated by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as will authorize the payment to the States wherein are situate national forests an amount of 65 percent of the gross receipts from the sale of timber in such forests, or such other percentage of said receipts, as will assure such States of receiving an amount equivalent to the intent of the Congress in enacting the act of June 30, 1906; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States.

"Passed the house on the 9th day of February 1963.

"Pete T. Cenarrusa,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate on the 18th day of February 1963.

"W. E. Drevlow,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"Robert H. Remaklus,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Memorial 7

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"Resolved by the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" ' "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

" 'Sec. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission'; and be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"Passed the house on the 7th day of February 1963.

"Pete T. Cenarrusa,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate on the 19th day of February 1963.

"W. E. Drevlow,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"Robert H. Remaklus,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Memorial 1

"Memorial urging the Congress of the United States to authorize the immediate cessation of printing of all one dollar silver certificates which do not bear the inscription 'In God We Trust'

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas Public Law 140, enacted by the 84th Congress, and approved by the President of the United States on July 11, 1955, provided that all U.S. currency shall bear the inscription 'In God We Trust,' the intent of the U.S. Congress is clear and this law is hereby quoted below:

" '*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That at such time as new dies for the printing of currency are adopted in connection with the current program of the Treasury Department to increase the capacity of presses utilized by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the dies shall bear, at such place or places thereon as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine to be appropriate, the inscription "In God We Trust", and thereafter this inscription shall appear on all U.S. currency and coins.

" 'Approved July 11, 1955.'

"Whereas 8 years have elapsed since the enactment of this law by the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas as recently as the fiscal year 1962, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing delivered 193,960,000 silver certificates, series 1935 G, without the inscription; and

"Whereas it appears that the use of currency without the inscription 'In God We Trust,' gives aid and comfort to those nations which pursue the atheistic Communist ideology:

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays that the Congress of the United States authorize the appropriate officials and agencies of the Federal Government to order the cessation of printing of all $1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription 'In God We Trust.'

"Adopted by the house on February 8, 1963.

"Approved by the Governor, February 8, 1963.

"Filed in the office of the secretary of state, February 8, 1963."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate a concurrent resolution adopted by the State Legislature of South Dakota urging that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall recognize the full protection which licensed South Dakota public grain warehousemen provide for the owners of grain in storage, and urging the abandonment of any proposed action by the Commodity Credit Corporation to duplicate such protection. I request that the resolution and the letter of transmittal be made a part of the Record, and referred to the appropriate committees.

There being no objection, the letter and concurrent resolution were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

State of South Dakota,
Senate Chamber,
Pierre, S. Dak., February 25, 1963.

Hon. Karl E. Mundt,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I have the honor to transmit herewith Senate Concurrent Resolution 1 which has been adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, convened in its 38th regular session at Pierre, S. Dak.

Your favorable consideration of the purpose and intent of this concurrent resolution will be greatly appreciated by the citizens of South Dakota.

Respectfully,

Niels P. Jensen,
Secretary of the Senate.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

Concurrent resolution urging that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall recognize the full protection which licensed South Dakota public grain warehousemen provide for the owners of grain in storage, and urging the abandonment of any proposed action by said Commodity Credit Corporation to duplicate such protection

Whereas the licensed public grain warehousemen of South Dakota do provide a surety bond to the State of South Dakota for the full market value of all grain that they hold in storage, either for private individuals or for the Commodity Credit Corporation, in contrast to many other States where warehouse laws do not afford this safeguard; and

Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation has publicly announced its intention to seek a blanket bond or legal liability insurance policy covering all warehouses in the United States by whom Government grains are held in store; and

Whereas the need which Commodity Credit Corporation may feel to secure adequate protection arises solely from absence or insufficiency of statutory safeguards elsewhere than in the State of South Dakota; and

Whereas the Commodity Credit Corporation proposes to arbitrarily distribute the cost of such blanket bond or legal liability coverage under some plan which has not yet been determined, to which extent they would inflict a cost upon South Dakota warehousemen for duplicating a protection which has always been required by South Dakota law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the 38th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring), That the action under study by the Commodity Credit Corporation would be in conflict with the regulatory controls already wisely established in this State and administered by the Public Utilities Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota hereby memorializes the Commodity Credit Corporation to abandon any action which serves to duplicate the safeguards which they now already have provided to them; and be it further

Resolved, That the assessment of any costs which Commodity Credit Corporation might incur, to warehousemen licensed under the South Dakota public grain warehouse law, would be imposing an unfair and unnecessary burden upon them; and be it finally

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and to the Members of the Congress of the United States elected from the State of South Dakota.

Adopted by the senate January 28, 1963.

Concurred in by the house of representatives February 20, 1963.

Nils A. Boe,
Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

Niels P. Jensen,
Secretary of the Senate.

Paul E. Brown,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

Attest:

W. J. Matson,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate a concurrent resolution adopted by the State Legislature of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States, relative to providing incentive payments by the Federal Government for domestic gold producers.

In presenting the concurrent resolution, Mr. President, I call attention to the bill, S. 824, which I have introduced and in which my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] has joined as a cosponsor.

Mr. President, I request that the resolution and the letter of transmittal be made a part of the Record. I also request that a copy of S. 824 also be printed in the Record immediately following the text of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the letter and concurrent resolution were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the concurrent resolution, letter and bill were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State of South Dakota,
Senate Chamber,
Pierre, S. Dak., February 25, 1963.

Hon. Karl E. Mundt,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I have the honor to transmit herewith Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, which has been adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, convened in its 38th regular session at Pierre, S. Dak.

Your favorable consideration of the purpose and intent of this concurrent resolution will be greatly appreciated by the citizens of South Dakota.

Respectfully,

Niels P. Jensen,
Secretary of the Senate.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to providing incentive payments by the Federal Government for domestic gold producers

Whereas domestic gold producers have been obligated to sell their product to the Federal Government at the established price of $35 an ounce since 1934; and

Whereas constantly increasing inflationary costs of mining and milling this precious metal have resulted in closing down the properties of virtually all of the gold producers in the United States; and

Whereas production of gold from domestic sources has remained in the range of 1½ million ounces contrasting to 6 million ounces in 1940 while current industrial use of gold in this country amounts to 3 million ounces per annum; and

Whereas our dwindling national gold reserve is a matter of grave concern to our citizens; and

Whereas it is in the national interest to increase our domestic gold production: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 38th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the members of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota respectfully request the Congress of the United States to provide incentive payments to assure domestic gold producers a fair economic return on their properties with the objective of increasing gold production in the United States. Such incentive payments would enable gold mines currently operating to survive under current high levels of cost, would aid in reopening closed mines and likewise provide a stimulus for exploration and development of new gold properties. Such incentive payments are essential to prevent complete destruction of our domestic gold mining industry; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

Adopted by the senate February 13, 1963.

Concurred in by the house of representatives February 21, 1963.

Nils A. Boe,
Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.

Attest:

Niels P. Jensen,
Secretary of the Senate.

Paul E. Brown,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

Attest:

W. J. Matson,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

S. 824

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the percentage depletion allowance for gold produced in the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 613(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to percentage depletion) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", except that in the case of gold mines, such allowance shall not exceed 65 percent of the taxpayer's taxable income from the property (computed without allowance for depletion)".

Sec. 2. Section 613(b)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to mines and other natural deposits entitled to 23-percent rate of percentage depletion) is amended by inserting "gold," after "columbium,".

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.)

RESOLUTION OF ARIZONA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, relating to the withdrawal from circulation all $1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription "In God We Trust."

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Memorial Urging the Congress of the United States To Authorize the Immediate Withdrawal From Circulation All $1 Silver Certificates Which Do Not Bear the Inscription "In God We Trust"

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

Whereas Public Law 140, enacted by the 84th Congress and approved by the President of the United States on July 11, 1955, provided that all U.S. currency shall bear the inscription "In God We Trust." The intent of the U.S. Congress is clear and this law is hereby quoted below:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That at such times as new dies for the printing of currency are adopted in connection with the current program of the Treasury Department to increase the capacity of presses utilized by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the dies shall bear, at such place or places thereon as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine to be appropriate, the inscription 'In God We Trust', and thereafter this inscription shall appear on all U.S. currency and coins.

"Approved July 11, 1955."

Whereas 8 years have elapsed since the enactment of this law by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas as recently as the fiscal year 1962, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing delivered 193,960,000 silver certificates, series 1935G, without the inscription; and

Whereas it appears that the use of currency without the inscription, "In God We Trust", gives aid and comfort to those nations which pursue the atheistic Communist ideology.

Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona prays:

That the Congress of the United States authorize the appropriate officials and agencies of the Federal Government to order the cessation of printing and immediate withdrawal from circulation of all $1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription "In God We Trust."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 345. A bill to provide for the approval of a payment in lieu of taxes to be made for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu (Rept. No. 13).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment:

S. 812. A bill to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America (Rept. No. 14).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments:

S. 13. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark. (Rept. No. 15).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, with amendments:

S. Res. 74. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to make a study of matters pertaining to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. Res. 95. Resolution to provide funds for additional staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. Res. 22. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to examine, investigate, and study matters pertaining to migratory labor; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 963. A bill for the relief of Constantina (Mihas) Michia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 964. A bill for the relief of Michele Tunzi and his wife, Carmina, and their minor children; and

S. 965. A bill for the relief of Amalia Seresly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 966. A bill for the relief of Yukio Iseri; and

S. 967. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio A. Moure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 968. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in expansion of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 969. A bill to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crewmembers and their dependents, and for other purposes;

S. 970. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services; and

S. 971. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to arm his employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 972. A bill for the relief of Jesus Te Torrado-Espana; and

S. 973. A bill for the relief of Manuel Gil-Carrasco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 974. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 975. A bill to provide for the satisfaction of claims arising out of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks by Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. Moss):

S. 976. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to permanently set aside certain lands in Utah as an addition to the Navajo Indian Reservation, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1963; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 977. A bill for the relief of Henry Kaufusi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Kennedy):

S. 978. A bill to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself and Mr. Hruska):

S. 979. A bill to amend section 332 of title 28, United States Code, in order to provide for the inclusion of a district judge or judges on the judicial council of each circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. Prouty):

S. 980. A bill to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the District of Vermont at Montpelier and St. Johnsbury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. Burdick, and Mr. Humphrey):

S. 981. A bill to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to assist in the provision of housing for domestic farm labor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Williams of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATORS DWORSHAK, CHAVEZ, AND KERR

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 104) providing for memorial addresses on the late Senators Dworshak, Chavez, and Kerr, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Mansfield, which appears under a separate heading.)

MEDICAL CARE FOR CERTAIN RETIRED COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY PERSONNEL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Acting Secretary of Commerce, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crew members and their dependents, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce and an enclosed statement of purpose and need for the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 969) to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crew members and their dependents, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. Magnuson are as follows:

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There are attached four copies of a proposed bill to provide medical care for certain Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crew members and their dependents and for other purposes.

There are also attached four copies of a statement of purpose and need for the proposed bill.

The proposed bill is not being submitted to the Speaker of the House for introduction as a similar bill, H.R. 74, is pending before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed bill to the Congress from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

C. D. Martin, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

Statement of Purpose and Need for Proposed Legislation To Provide Medical Care for Certain Coast and Geodetic Survey Retired Ships' Officers and Crewmembers and Their Dependents and for Other Purposes

The attached legislation would provide permanent authority for treatment at Public Health Service facilities of retired vessel employees and their dependents of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. This authority was inadvertently repealed by section 5 of Public Law 86–415, approved April 8, 1960, 74 Stat. 34, but has been continued on a year to year basis by language in the Public Health Service appropriation acts. The bill would also provide for an eventual transition to coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, rather than under the Public Health Service Act, for retired vessel employees and for the dependents of all vessel employees, active or retired.

For many years ships' officers and crewmembers of Coast and Geodetic Survey vessels when on active duty have been authorized to receive medical care at PHS facilities on the same basis as other seamen employed on American vessels. In 1939, retired ships' officers and crewmembers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and dependents of retired or active officers and crewmembers were also authorized to receive such care. In 1960, in amending the Public Health Service Act to provide parity of treatment for members of the uniformed services (which do not include the vessel employees covered by this proposal), the Congress inadvertently repealed the authority to provide medical care to retired vessel employees and to the dependents of such retired employees, while leaving unchanged the authority to provide medical care to vessel employees on active duty and their dependents (sec. 5(d) of Public Law 86–415).

Present vessel employees were hired and have served for a period of years with the understanding that they and their dependents would receive Public Health Service medical care during active service and after retirement. Elimination of this service for those now retired would be a severe hardship and is inconsistent with the administration's concern in regard to adequate medical care to the aged.

Discontinuance of the service to the dependents of those now employed similarly would be an obvious breach of a moral obligation. Moreover it would undoubtedly result in the loss of some highly qualified personnel. To keep faith with these employees, the Department recommends it be made clear that Public Health Service care will continue to be provided to all vessel employees now on active duty or retired, and their dependents.

We believe, however, that for those entering on service in the future, medical care after retirement, and for dependents at all times, should be provided on the same basis as those benefits are provided for Federal employees generally, that is, under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959.

The attached legislation would accomplish this purpose by providing in effect that a vessel employee who entered on duty before July 1, 1963, would be eligible to receive care at PHS facilities after retirement and his dependents would be eligible for such care at any time. Employees entering on duty after that date would receive medical care after retirement, and for their dependents, under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959.

The legislation would also amend section 326(c) of the Public Health Service Act to make clear that the Public Health Service is to supply for the Coast and Geodetic Survey not only care for the sick and disabled but also ancillary services such as medical examinations for purposes of appointment, retirement, and the like. This would be accomplished by extending to the Coast and Geodetic Survey existing authority for the Coast Guard to receive such services. The amendment to section 326(c) also would extend to Public Health Service officers assigned to Coast and Geodetic Survey vessels the authority to render medical aid to crews of fishing vessels now vested in Public Health Service officers assigned to Coast Guard vessels.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO UTILIZE CERTAIN FUNDS FOR SPECIAL METEOROLOGICAL SERVICES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Under Secretary of Commerce, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce and an enclosed statement of purpose and need for the proposed legislation be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 970) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. Magnuson are as follows:

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., February 13, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services, and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Edward Gudeman,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

Statement of Purpose and Need

The Weather Bureau has often been requested by various State and local governments to provide or undertake special meteorological investigations, tests, and services which the personnel and facilities of the Weather Bureau are specially capable of carrying out. It has become increasingly difficult for the Weather Bureau to perform such functions, which ordinarily cannot be effectively undertaken by any other organizations, because of the lack of adequate statutory authorization to utilize funds for these purposes which the requesting public agency would be willing to provide. The purpose of this proposed legislation is to enable the Weather Bureau to accept and use funds provided by State and local governments for special services required by them which cannot be financed from available Weather Bureau resources. The proposed legislation provides that if work or services requested have no value to the public at large, the Secretary of Commerce must require reimbursement for the total direct and indirect costs before undertaking such work or services. Moreover, the Secretary of Commerce could not undertake work or services having no public value unless they cannot be obtained from private firms or individuals with special competence.

Some instances in which the authorization herein proposed could be utilized for the benefit of local needs are as follows:

1. The State of California is embarking on a large-scale water resources program (headed by its department of water resources) for which it requires a large increase in precipitation stations, in reporting, in maintenance and inspection of stations, and in processing of data. The Weather Bureau's responsibility is national, with its available funds actually insufficient to cover the local needs of California. The State is willing to pay for the increase required to meet its needs. The necessary funds cannot be accepted and utilized by the Bureau unless the proposed legislation is enacted.

2. In 1955 the Kansas Water Resources Factfinding and Research Committee recommended to the Governor and legislature a "cooperative program with the U.S. Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Geological Survey, U.S. Weather Bureau, and U.S. Soil Conservation Service for comprehensive research in hydrology of small watersheds, requiring detailed data on all aspects of the water cycle and effects of man's operation.

Estimated State funds $150,000 per year for 20 years, to be matched by Federal funds." But of the four Federal agencies mentioned, only the Weather Bureau cannot now accept and utilize the State funds.

3. Many thousands of communities on lesser tributaries and in headwater areas suffer devastating flash floods. With the support of the Weather Bureau's national main stem and tributary flood forecasting system and its developing radar network, these communities could be warned effectively in many cases after establishment of special local observational and reporting networks and communications, development of localized forecast and warning procedures, and eduactional liaison in planning actions based on warnings. The costs may average only a few thousand dollars per community per year. There are thousands of such communities, and the Bureau is able to serve only a token few with its available funds. The job could be done wherever the community felt it was sufficiently needed to pay for it—if the Bureau could accept and use funds made available by the community.

4. Fire-Weather Service of the Weather Bureau is another service which operates on a cost-sharing basis in many instances, and which is handicapped in its operation by lack of adequate legislative authority. The Service provides day-to-day forecasts and advices during the fire season and issues detailed localized operational forecasts for going fires. The Bureau is subject to a heavy demand from forest protection agencies for an expansion of this service to new areas. In most cases it is unable to provide the needed assistance. Enactment of the proposed legislation would greatly facilitate arrangements to provide additional badly needed services of this nature where Federal funds are not available but State or local governments are willing to help.

5. Agricultural weather services, particularly those requiring highly localized and detailed forecasts and special instrumentation, would be greatly benefited by enactment of the proposed legislation. This type of service cannot be adequately handled through the general forecast service and as a rule it is of direct benefit to a relatively small segment of the population. Accordingly, such services are often arranged on a cost-sharing basis where the recipients of the service assume a share of the costs involved. The Horticultural Protection Service which operates in Florida, California, Washington, Oregon, and a few other States is a good example of a specialized weather service that often uses cost-sharing procedures. Under present law the cooperating agency is limited to furnishing such items as communication expenses and office quarters while the full salary of the employee limits the number of points where such service can be provided since the major expense must continue to be handled by the Federal Government. The Bureau has had many requests from all parts of the country for more agricultural weather service of the above-mentioned type. Although cost-sharing is one good way of furnishing more service of this kind, the Bureau is seriously handicapped by the present inability to utilize funds which the localities would be willing to furnish.

6. The Weather Bureau has, in the past few years, received several requests for special observations and assistance in the field of air pollution. Two specific examples of recent origin are the request from the Los Angeles County Air Pollution Control District for the reinstitution of intermediate upper air soundings at Santa Monica, Calif., and the request from the San Diego County Air Pollution District for additional wind installations and additional upper air soundings in the vicinity of San Diego. There have been other similar requests in the past. The Bureau has generally met such requests either by declining on the basis of inadequate funds or, where consultation work and a minimum of observations would suffice, arranging for support through other agencies such as the Public Health Service or the Atomic Energy Commission. In light of the increased interest in air pollution, it can be expected that the number of these requests will increase, particularly for specialized observational data such as low-level radiosondes and additional wind measurements. The Bureau will be unable to accommodate most of these requests unless it can accept reimbursement.

On December 22, 1955, the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy recommended: "Continued cooperation with States and municipalities should be encouraged. Such cooperation serves to supplement the basic data programs of the Federal Government in fields in which there is substantial joint interest. State and local participation contributes to the fundamental programs for interpretation, analysis, and research which are primarily national in character and extend beyond the interests of any single geographical area. Federal matching of State financial support for data programs on a 50–50 basis has been mutually satisfactory and should continue to be a sound basis for such cooperation. * * * Authorization for cooperative participation should be provided if necessary authorization is lacking."

The Bureau cannot provide the cooperation proposed unless legislation is enacted authorizing it to utilize State funds.

Harvey O. Banks, director of water resources, State of California, in supporting legislation such as here proposed, said:

"In many areas, there is need to supplement the basic information now gathered in order that more detailed evaluation may be made of the nature and occurrence of water supplies. California is most vitally interested in the most efficient and complete control and utilization of its water resources to meet the needs of all beneficial uses.

"Therefore, it is the recommendation of the State of California that legislation be enacted by the Congress which would permit agreements permitting cooperative financing between the Weather Bureau and non-Federal agencies under which the trained personnel of the Weather Bureau might be assigned to these cooperative endeavors to obtain and develop information and to make analyses thereof, in addition to that gathered under the Bureau's present basic responsibilities. If this legislation is enacted, we expect to take advantage of it, by entering into such a cooperative agreement at an early date."

AUTHORIZATION FOR ADMINISTRATOR OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY TO ARM HIS EMPLOYEES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to arm his employees, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 971) to authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to arm his employees, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft bill "To authorize the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to arm his employees, and for other purposes."

This proposal is part of our legislative program for 1963 and its enactment by the Congress is recommended. The bill would authorize the Administrator to purchase and furnish firearms to employees of the Agency as necessary for the protection of public property under his jurisdiction, custody or control, or the execution of responsibilities vested in him by law.

It is the opinion of this Agency, and one shared by other agencies, that the head of an agency of the Federal Government has implied authority to arm his employees for the protection of Federal property. (See S. Rept. 1858 and H. Rept. 2087 accompanying H.R. 11700, 85th Congress.) Accordingly, at those facilities for which we must provide guard service, and for which the normal protective services of the General Services Administration are not available, the Agency has provided arms to the guards. In one instance, the arming of the guards has been preceded by securing from local jurisdictions their designation as "special policemen." This has been done as a precautionary measure to prevent any conflict with local authorities. However, such a designation cannot always be obtained and because of the potential hazards involved in the carrying of firearms, we believe it prudent to obtain express legislative authority. This would place beyond dispute the legal status of our employees in the event of an incident.

In addition to the normal peacetime requirements for property protection, the recent international crisis demonstrated some of the very urgent protection problems which this Agency will face in a national emergency when all of its resources must be directed to maintaining an air defense and air strike capability. The continuity of service of the hundreds of air navigation facilities and other installations which this Agency operates then becomes a matter of critical importance. To assure protection of these facilities, we anticipate arming a limited number of employees at each installation during an emergency. The legislation which we propose would also eliminate any doubt as to the authority of those employees to bear arms.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection from the standpoint of administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely,

N. E. HALABY,
Administrator.

CONSTRUCTION OF A DOWNTOWN HELIPORT FOR WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize the construction and operation of a downtown heliport for Washington, D.C.

Helicopter transportation is no longer a novel idea or a mere vision in the eyes of planners. Successful operations are

being conducted in American and foreign cities, serving local and international air transportation needs. Washington, as the capital of the free world, must build to meet the needs of its users of air transportation. A public heliport would serve this purpose.

The Nation's capital city should not lag behind other major metropolitan areas, such as New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, in providing fast and efficient transportation for those who desire it between downtown business areas and jet airports, required to be located more miles away from cities than terminals for conventional aircraft.

With the opening of Dulles International Airport, a new era in air transportation has begun for the Washington area. No longer is it possible for passengers to travel 15 or 20 minutes to National Airport and board a plane to almost any destination. Most long-haul flights, including both arriving and departing jet and conventional aircraft, will be utilizing either Dulles or Friendship terminals. These airports are located between 27 and 34 miles from the District, a greater distance than jet airports presently serving New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Helicopter transportation will provide the service sought by many air travelers who prefer speedier travel to and from jet airports, thereby effectively taking advantage of the timesaving features made possible through the development of jet air transportation.

Forecasters tell us that air transportation in the Washington, D.C., area will increase greatly during the next 5 years. The Bureau of National Capital Airports, Federal Aviation Agency, predicts that Dulles Airport alone should be handling 4,088,000 passengers in 1967 compared to an estimated 1,035,000 passengers in 1963.

My bill would leave to the discretion of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency the downtown Washington location, which would be in close proximity to the business section and easily accessible to Federal offices.

It is essential that the prestige of the Nation's Capital be maintained as a leader in the air transportation field and as a forward-looking and progressive city supplying the finest in air services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 974) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia," introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO SATISFY SCRIP CLAIMS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the satisfaction of claims arising out of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights. This legislation has been submitted by the Secretary of the Interior and has as its principal purpose closing the books by 1970 on 462 unredeemed old "blank checks" for 16,522 acres of public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

I ask unanimous consent that a departmental press release which embodies all of the points suggested by the Department in their letter transmitting the proposed legislation, and the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and press release will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 975) to provide for the satisfaction of claims arising out of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, except for military bounty land warrants, all claims and holdings recorded under the Act of August 5, 1955 (69 Stat. 534, 535), which are not satisfied in one of the ways hereafter set forth, shall become null and void on January 1, 1970, or at the termination of any transaction initiated pursuant to this Act, whichever is later.

SEC. 2. Prior to July 1, 1966, holders of claims recorded under the Act of August 5, 1955, may apply to the Secretary of the Interior to have conveyed to them, in satisfaction of their claims, such lands as they may, in their applications, designate. The Secretary shall thereafter convey the selected lands if he finds them to be proper, under existing law, for such disposition, and if the claim upon which an application is based is determined to be valid.

SEC. 3. Prior to January 1, 1967, the Secretary shall classify lands which he finds can properly be sold at public sale under the Small Tract Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 682 a–e) or other public sale laws as suitable for selection in satisfaction of claims recorded under the Act of August 5, 1955. Holders of recorded claims may apply for reasonably compact areas of land so classified, and, upon his determination that the claim upon which application is based is valid, the Secretary shall convey such lands to the applicant.

SEC. 4. Prior to January 1, 1968, the Secretary shall, by registered mail or certified mail send to the address of record of each person having an unsatisfied claim, offer in satisfaction of such claim lands which in the opinion of the Secretary shall have a fair market value per acre not less than the average price received for lands sold under the Small Tract Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 682 a–e) during the three years prior to the date of the appraisal of the offered lands. Upon the acceptance of the offer, the Secretary shall convey the lands to the claimant, if he determines that the claim is valid.

SEC. 5. Prior to January 1, 1970, any person who has a claim recorded pursuant to the Act of August 5, 1955, by written notice to the Secretary of the Interior, or any officer of the Department of the Interior to whom authority to receive such notice may be delegated, may elect to receive cash instead of public land in satisfaction of his claim, at a rate per acre equal to the average value of the lands offered by the Secretary under section 4 of this Act. Upon a determination that the claim is valid, the Secretary or his delegate shall certify the claim to the Secretary of the Treasury who is authorized and directed to pay the claim out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Acceptance of the money shall constitute a full and complete satisfaction of the claim or holding for which the money is paid. No agent or attorney acting on behalf of another to procure a payment under this Act shall demand, accept, or receive more than 10 per centum of the payment made, and any agreement to the contrary shall be null and void.

The press release presented by Mr. BIBLE is as follows:

INTERIOR SEEKS LAW TO SATISFY LAND "SCRIP" CLAIMS BY 1970

The Department of the Interior has asked Congress to enact legislation that will permit the Government to close its books by 1970 on 462 unredeemed old "blank checks" for 16,522 acres of public lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management.

Under the proposed bill, holders of land scrip—I O U's issued by the Government against public lands for various reasons—would have to make their selections by 1970 or forfeit their claims.

From 1776 until as late as 1922, the Government, from time to time, issued public land warrants, or scrip, to satisfy a wide variety of claims and obligations to individual citizens. The acreage entitlement was specified, with the location to be chosen by the holder. It was a handy way of paying off Government debts during the years when the United States had easier access to land than to money.

But the scrip problem has plagued Federal administrators for many decades. The situation has become unsatisfactory because of changing times, lost records, and unforeseen practices.

Until August of 1957, no one had any sure way of knowing how many valid and unsatisfied scrip claims on the public lands were still outstanding.

A law passed by Congress on August 5, 1955, required scripholders to record their claims within 2 years or forever hold their peace. When the deadline came and passed, it finally became possible to ascertain the maximum amount of land the United States still owes the holders of these I O U's.

Congress dealt with a part of the remaining problem in July 1962 when it passed a law providing for the final settlement of claims on scrip issued for military bounty purposes. This measure authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to buy up remaining military bounty land warrants at $1.25 per acre, and imposes a 1-year deadline for warrant holders after receipt of the Secretary's offer.

Military bounty land warrants were the most numerous and best known form of scrip, issued to veterans of American wars and skirmishes fought prior to March 3, 1855. One recipient of a 120-acre scrip certificate was former Capt. Abraham Lincoln of the Illinois militia, for his service during the Black Hawk War.

There were numerous other varieties of scrip, based on about 10 major acts of Congress and about 30 minor ones.

There was, for example, Gerard scrip—issued as partial reimbursement to the three children of Joseph Gerard, who died in service as a messenger to the hostile Indians of the old Northwest Territory; Sioux Half-Breed scrip, issued to Sioux Indians of mixed blood in exchange for lands set apart for them under a treaty signed in 1830; Choctaw scrip, with a similar background. Other forms of scrip were issued to compensate landowners for early Government survey errors which, when corrected, led to partial loss of their properties.

The bill now proposed by the Department of the Interior is aimed at finishing the job by settling claims for the other remaining kinds of scrip within a limited period. Eleven varieties have been identified among those still outstanding.

Holders of scrip must be able to show valid title through inheritance or purchase before it can be honored by the Government. Still, other problems have arisen in the transfer of scrip to land.

Some scripholders, for example, in recent years attempted to take some highly valuable public properties in exchange for long-unredeemed warrants—public beaches in California, offshore properties in the Gulf of Mexico and in the Pacific, and valuable timber stands. Some effort was made to set up a lively traffic in scrip sales, at substantial sums, based on the asserted value of such lands.

Activities like these led Congress to pass the so-called Recordation Act of 1955. Now that it is known how many claims must be considered for a definite number of acres, the Department and the Bureau of Land Management are seeking a fair way to clear the books at last—before the passage of time can create further difficulties for purchasers and Government alike.

Under the proposed bill, scripholders could continue to apply for land of their own choosing until June 30, 1966, and the land could be secured if it were classified by the Secretary of the Interior as proper for selection.

After July 1, 1966, scripholders of record would be permitted to apply only for lands that are first declared proper by the Secretary for scrip location.

Before January 1, 1968, every remaining scripholder of record would be offered a specific tract of land by the Secretary, equal in acreage to the amount of his claim. Procedures are specified in the proposed bill to insure that the offers would be of a reasonable value.

If scripholders should prefer money instead of land, they could elect to do so, at fair market value of the equivalent offer by the Secretary. All applications, either for land or for money, would have to be submitted before January 1, 1970.

If the bill passes, a long and colorful era in American history will end, and so will a bothersome problem in governmental housekeeping and business practices.

The following is a list of the kind, number and acreage of scrip recorded which would be affected by this proposal:

Kind of scrip	Approximate acreage recorded	Number of pieces of scrip recorded
Valentine certificate	2,119	65
Soldier's additional rights	5,563	275
Forest lieu selection rights	6,252	61
Sioux half-breed certificates	560	7
Wyandotte certificates	250	7
Porterfield warrants	436	11
Isaac Crow	80	1
Railroad lieu selection rights	542	18
Merritt W. Blair selection right	80	1
Gerard certificates	440	11
McKee certificates	200	5
Total	16,522	462

MEDICAL CARE FOR SELF-EMPLOYED SEAMEN

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator Bartlett, Senator Jackson, Senator Kennedy, and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel.

This bill is needed to correct inequities which resulted from a ruling in 1954 of the General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. For 20 years or more prior to this ruling in 1954, self-employed seamen or those who had financial interest in the vessels on which they served as seamen had been entitled to medical care at facilities of the U.S. Public Health Service. This medical care was given to all persons working on board these vessels irrespective of whether they were working for themselves as owners or part owners of vessels or whether they were employees working for others just as long as they were employed in "the care, preservation, or navigation of any vessel, or in the service, on board, of those engaged in such care, preservation, or navigation."

In May 1954, the General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued an opinion stating that the term "employed" would thereafter be interpreted in the narrow sense to mean only those persons working for someone else in an employer-employee relationship. This interpretation had the effect of denying medical care to the thousands of self-employed seamen all over the country, particularly in the fishing industry. It had the effect of dividing the crews on these vessels into two parts: one consisting of those who had no ownership in a vessel and who were eligible for medical care at facilities of the Public Health Service, and the other consisting of those who had an interest in the vessel no matter how small and who were excluded from receiving medical care at Public Health Service facilities. This situation should be corrected as soon as possible.

Legislation similar to that now introduced was passed by the Senate in the 87th Congress but failed of favorable consideration in the House. This failure was to a large extent attributable to the views of the Bureau of the Budget on one small aspect. The version today is designed to eliminate that objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 978) to provide medical care for certain persons engaged on board a vessel in the care, preservation, or navigation of such vessel, introduced by Mr. Magnuson (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

HOUSING FOR MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators Burdick and Humphrey, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to housing for migratory labor. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 981) to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to assist in the provision of housing for domestic farm labor, introduced by Mr. Williams of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. Williams of New Jersey is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., DEMOCRAT, OF NEW JERSEY, UPON INTRODUCTION OF MIGRATORY LABOR HOUSING BILL

The problems faced by the migratory farm citizens of this Nation are many, complex, perennial, and when encountered firsthand, disheartening. Of this panoply of problems, none is more pressing or persistent than the inadequacy of the housing in which our migratory citizens and their families live. Inadequate housing destroys the incentive for qualified workers to enter agricultural employment; adequate housing, on the other hand, attracts those already working in agriculture to areas where they are needed. Thus, adequate farm labor housing is essential to insure a sufficiently large farm labor force and insure the efficient allocation of this labor force to seasonal farm jobs—two factors that are indispensable to the efficient operation of our Nation's farm economy.

In addition to the obvious hazards and degradation that ramshackle housing imposes upon its occupants, this housing is a major source of the serious health problems that afflict our migratory farm citizens. Their interstate movement, moreover, endangers the health of the residents of communities in which these laborers work and through which they pass.

Although our Nation's farmers are aware of the seriousness of this housing problem, and in many instances have made outstanding efforts to remedy it, too often the farmer is unable to obtain funds needed to construct new housing or to renovate existing housing. The financial squeeze is particularly acute in the case of the small or marginal farmer—frequently, the farmer with the worst housing facilities. Thus, the key to any amelioration of the migratory farmworker housing problem is a program that will lessen the financial difficulties that prohibit or prevent the establishment of housing for our Nation's farm laborers and their families.

There are three basic reasons why financial assistance is required to make adequate migratory farmworker housing a reality in our Nation.

First, commercial money is not readily available for building or rehabilitating migratory farmworker housing because of the high investment risk resulting from the fact that the economic usefulness of such housing is generally limited to the short duration of the harvest season. The practical consequences of this situation are that the farmer must make expenditures for housing from his profits, or mortgage his entire farm enterprise to finance a relatively minor part of his farming operation. Neither action can be regarded as a sound business transaction, particularly in view of the expense of such housing.

Second, the emergence of more stringent State housing and sanitation codes is producing greater needs for new or rehabilitated farmworker housing. Many States are moving in this direction, and still others have begun more vigorous enforcement of existing codes. This situation means, of course, that without adequate Federal assistance the already difficult financing problems can be expected to grow worse in the near future.

Third, the farmworker himself, when he does manage to acquire title to property, seldom has sufficient financial resources to take the next steps toward homeownership; consequently, those dwellings which the migratory farmworker manages to acquire are frequently ramshackle, patchwork shacks that constitute health hazards to their occupants and to the community in which they are located.

The absence of Federal legislation designed to meet the housing needs of our domestic farmworker is another factor that accounts for the lack of adequate farm labor housing. The existing low-rent housing provisions are geared to the metropolitan-urban complex and cannot accommodate the low-paid migratory worker who is constantly on the move or who lives in rural areas.

In recognition that the farm labor housing problem is national in scope, I send to the desk a bill to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to develop and operate a program utilizing direct loans, loan insurance, loan-grant combinations for minor repairs, and financial assistance for low-rent housing so as to assist in providing adequate housing for this Nation's domestic farm laborers and their families. This bill will make a major contribution toward establishing domestic farm labor housing that is adequate to meet the minimum needs and standards for shelter, sanitation, durability, and human dignity that every citizen needs and deserves.

Mr. MONRONEY subsequently said:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill introduced earlier today by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] relating to housing for migratory labor, may lie on the desk until March 8, 1963, for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WARTIME BENEFITS FOR PEACETIME VETERANS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of S. 836 (a bill to authorize wartime benefits under certain circumstances for peacetime veterans) the following names be added as cosponsors: Senators Allott, Beall, Boggs, Carlson, Case, Curtis, Dominick, Fong, Hickenlooper, Hruska, Javits, Jordan of Idaho, Keating, Miller, Mundt, Pearson, Prouty, Scott, Simpson, Tower, and Young of North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, also at the request of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], I invite any other Senator who would care to cosponsor S. 836 to contact Senator Saltonstall's office.

PRESENTATION TO PEOPLE OF MEXICO OF A MONUMENT COMMEMORATING THEIR INDEPENDENCE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 28, 1963, the name of Mr. Long of Missouri was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 944) to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Kuchel (for himself and other Senators) on February 28, 1963.

NOTICE OF POSTPONEMENT OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CARL E. McGOWAN, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, this is to announce that the hearing scheduled for Tuesday, March 5, 1963, on the nomination of Carl E. McGowan, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge, District of Columbia circuit, has been postponed until further date.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Article entitled "Today's Liberals: Better Called 20th Century Tories," by Senator Karl E. Mundt, published in Critique, Penn State University magazine, January issue, related to the meaning of the term "Liberal."

NATIONAL WEIGHTS AND MEASURES WEEK

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, for the sixth consecutive year the National Conference on Weights and Measures is sponsoring a "National Weights and Measures Week." We in Massachusetts are proud that Mr. J. Ellis Bowen, city sealer of Newton, Mass., is serving as chairman of the education committee of the conference, and that he and his committee colleagues have the responsibility for this undertaking.

National Weights and Measures Week, which begins today, March 1, and continues through March 7, will be a timely reminder to Americans of the important role that accurate weights and measures play in our daily lives. Industry, business, agriculture, and, in fact, every field of endeavor, depend heavily upon the accuracy of such determinations.

In these difficult times, with all the pressures on us, it is easy to lose sight of the vital importance of such basic governmental services as weights and measures enforcement. But it is fair to say that our complex civilization could not exist without them.

Weights and measures enforcement is performed at national, State, and local levels. All work together in close harmony, with personnel numbering only some 3,000 officers. At the national level is the National Bureau of Standards, which is the custodian of our national standards of weights and measures and is the calibrating authority for State standards. The Bureau is also constantly occupied in a teaching and technological advisory capacity to the lower governmental levels. State-operated offices of weights and measures direct statewide administrative and enforcement activities. At the local level, county and municipal offices of weights and measures carry out strictly local enforcement.

Some laws, and the enforcement thereof, touch the average person only occasionally, if at all. But as John Quincy Adams said in his report on weights and measures, made to the Senate in 1821, when he was Secretary of State:

> Weights and measures may be ranked among the necessaries of life to every individual of human society. They enter into the economic arrangements and daily concerns of every family.

Historically in America weights and measures are of sufficient importance that the Constitution specifically delegates to Congress the authority to "coin money, regulate the value thereof, and fix the standard of weights and measures."

It is not accidental that these two powers were mentioned together, for while money is a medium of exchange, what a purchaser receives is of equal importance to what he pays therefore, for to receive short weight or short measure is the equivalent of receiving counterfeit money in change.

Today, proper weights-and-measures administration constitutes a sound governmental investment. It confers a two-sided benefit, protecting the seller as well as the buyer. I have been assured by Mr. Bowen that at least half of the mistakes in weighing and measuring that are uncovered throughout the United States each year are against the interests of the owner of the weighing or measuring device. In discovering such mistakes, protection is provided the honest businessman or merchant against loss of just profit by means of a faulty device.

America's weights and measures officers inspect and either approve or reject all commercially used weighing and measuring devices. These range from large-capacity railroad and vehicle scales to the delicate prescription balances and tiny weights used by hospital pharmacies and drugstores, the accuracy of which can spell the difference between death and life itself. Also involved are the scales of the butcher, the grocer, and the baker; scales used for counting piecework for wage purposes; fuel-oil measuring meters and gasoline-dispensing pump meters; yardsticks; and taximeters. All of these are definitely related to the cost of living of every family; and usually neither the merchant nor the customer is aware of any inaccuracy of devices or in packaging and labeling operations, unless such is discovered by an inspector of weights and measures during his inspections.

Mr. President, it is my conviction that America is indebted to these dedicated officers. National Weights and Measures Week is a good time to suggest that our weights and measures service, at all levels, is deserving of the commendation of the Senate and of our fellow citizens.

Mr. President, I am very happy that a fellow citizen of mine in Newton, Mass., is serving as chairman of the education committee of the national conference.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that it is the intention of the leadership to call up for debate and consideration House Joint Resolution 284, Calendar No. 10, the agricultural supplemental appropriation bill for the Commodity Credit Corporation, on Monday next.

I also wish to announce that Senate bill 20, the outdoor recreation bill, is on the calendar, and will also be considered shortly.

APPLICATION OF SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS TO MILITARY PROBLEMS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I believe we can all agree that science is wonderful. But I seriously doubt if it is wonderful enough to justify a policy of unilateral disarmament by the United States. Perhaps I am a skeptic, but I find it very difficult to put my complete faith in so-called scientific developments which fit in so neatly with Communist objectives and which arise so conveniently when Soviet intransigence at Geneva seems to call for another concession on the part of the United States.

In this morning's newspapers, we read that Mr. Jacob D. Beam, Assistant Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, has stated that the concessions being made at Geneva are not concessions to the Soviet Union but rather are concessions to scientific progress. In other words, scientific progress has taken another leap now that the United States is getting ready to present a new draft treaty for a nuclear test ban at Geneva. Presumably this scientific progress will encourage our negotiators to drop our previous requirement that international observers be placed at national seismic stations that would monitor a test ban and excuse another downward revision of the number of on-site inspections required on Russian soil. Presumably, this so-called scientific progress will allow us to give the Soviets just about anything they demand.

On this basis, Mr. President, are we to conclude that the Russians are not keeping pace with our scientific progress? I have not read anywhere that scientific progress has led the Soviets to ease their position at Geneva. It is true that they have made a tongue-in-cheek offer to accept two or three on-site inspections, and, of course, that is like saying they will accept none. This is not an offer made in good faith; it is a cynical attempt to see how far the United States will go in its headlong drive toward accommodation.

Why is it that all the scientific progress is on the side of American concessions? Why is it that our scientific computations in the Pentagon tell us that manned bombers are no longer necessary; that the Skybolt is no good; that we no longer need missile bases in Turkey and Italy; that perhaps surface ships are as good as submarines for carrying the Polaris missile?

Another point I should like to raise is whether the world at large is fully apprised of this scientific progress? I certainly am not one to dwell on the surpassing value of world opinion, but I do recognize the fact that it will do the United States no good if the entire world views our concessions at Geneva and our jettisoning of the manned bomber and the Skybolt as signs of weakness. In other words, can we be sure that the rest of the world understands the marvels of this scientific progress and the wide vistas it opens to us alone for disarmament moves? Or will it interpret our actions as frantic moves to pacify an enemy which has sworn to bury us?

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, science is wonderful and I am as thankful as anyone else for the great benefits which it has given to mankind. But I also recognize the fact that the application of scientific progress to military problems is subject to human error and open to wide disagreement and debate. This is particularly true when such application so conveniently fits a pattern of unilateral disarmament in a dangerous world.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD J. MEEMAN

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on February 25, several hundred persons—just a small percentage of his admirers in this country and abroad—gathered in Memphis to pay tribute to one of the greatest newspapermen of our time, Mr. Edward J. Meeman, editor emeritus of the Memphis Press-Scimitar.

The occasion was a dinner at which Mr. Meeman received the National Human Relations Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. The principal speeches were made by Edmund Orgill, former mayor of Memphis, who presented the award to Mr. Meeman and Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges.

Mr. Orgill traced the fabulous career of this wonderful man, who framed the motto, "The newspaper working alone can do much, but citizens working with their newspaper can do anything"—and believed in it and lived by it every day, and still does.

Secretary Hodges paid deserved tribute not only to Mr. Meeman for his dedicated service to Memphis and the Midsouth, but also to the people of Memphis for their very substantial progress in the crucial area of better human relations.

In his response after receiving the Human Relations Award, Mr. Meeman was truly in character: he was appreciative of his recognition of his past services, but he was already pointing out that there was still work to be done.

> Our task now—

He said—

> is to widen the opportunities for employment for our Negro citizens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mr. Orgill, Mr. Meeman, and Secretary Hodges be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY EDMUND ORGILL

In 1931, Edward J. Meeman, came to live amongst us—and we are blessed that he did.

He came to Memphis as the editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar. He had started his newspaper career at the age of 18 as cub reporter for the Evansville (Ind.) Press. His work impressed his bosses, and in 1921, he was sent to Knoxville to start, and to edit a new paper, the Knoxville News.

Under his guidance the News flourished and bought out its competitor. It became the News-Sentinel and the city's leading newspaper, which it is today.

In Knoxville, the Great Smoky Mountains National Park was among this man's visions. He and his paper supported every move for the establishment of this national park. They were successful and the whole Nation is happier for it. Meeman is now chairman of the board of the National Committee on State Parks, he is vice president of the American Planning and Civic Association and he has just been appointed the conservation editor of the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

In Knoxville, Ed Meeman fought for the establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority. When he came to Memphis, he carried on the fight for TVA power, and low electric rates. He and his star reporter, Null Adams, went into the towns of northeast Mississippi and west Tennessee preaching TVA's advantages.

After TVA power was secured for Corinth and Tupelo, the Press-Scimitar went after it for Memphis. It published a series of articles under the heading "The Tale of Two Cities," in which the electric rates of Tupelo and Memphis were compared. There was built up a popular demand, and the local politicians in power "took the ball" and in 1934 Memphians voted overwhelmingly to become a TVA city. Ladies and gentlemen, what a great contribution this was to the Memphis area.

There have been many more great achievements by this great editor. I will mention just a few of them. When he came to Memphis we had an old, crumbling, mismanaged, rat-infested city hospital. As a result of a Press-Scimitar crusade, this was replaced in 1935 by the modern John Gaston teaching hospital.

In the middle thirties, Ed Meeman returned from a European trip deeply impressed by the Black Forest of Germany. He thought that Memphis should have something like it. He and his associates started looking. One day they discovered in the northwest corner of this county, the forest along the Chickasaw Bluffs, and in the adjacent Mississippi River lowlands. Meeman cried, "This is it," and jumped up and down with joy. (This information comes from the man who was with him.)

He persuaded the Federal Government to buy 12,000 acres. This was later transferred to the State of Tennessee, and is now our Shelby Forest. It is the most visited of Tennessee's State parks and probably Ed Meeman's greatest love. His home and his Forest Farm adjoin Shelby Forest. His writings make constant reference to the birds and flowers and trees and animals and to the many joys of nature. (Incidentally, the flowers on the tables will be delivered to Forest Farm and it is our hope that they will be replanted and serve as a reminder to our honoree of this happy occasion.)

Through 32 years in Memphis, Ed Meeman has pleaded—and fought for—more democratic government with greater citizen participation.

His vigor and vigilance, imparted to his reporters, helped see to it that local government in the years of machine rule, was honest, if not democratic.

And, democracy began to come alive in 1948 with the election that year.

Citizens have overcome their fear and now speak out on public issues.

With Press-Scimitar support, we have gotten permanent registration, voting machines and other election reforms.

We have an effective city-county planning commission. City employees are protected to a degree by civil service. Reassessment of all real property is underway by qualified experts. Many other improvements in local government have been accomplished and still more are under discussion.

Ed Meeman has stimulated an interest in international affairs. It was at his home in November 1946, that a small group met with Clarence Streit, author of "Union Now" and editor of the magazine, Freedom and Union, and pledged themselves to work for a Federal Union of the self-governing peoples. (We are delighted that Mr. Streit is with us tonight.)

Out of this meeting the Atlantic Union Committee was born. Its efforts resulted in the Atlantic Convention in Paris last January, and the increasingly strong movement towards economic and political unity of NATO and the free world.

Meeman's interest in world trade resulted in his appointment to the Regional Export Expansion Council by Secretary Hodges.

Any one of these achievements would make a man's life worthwhile—a success. When we consider them together, we all must agree that Ed Meeman justly deserves the honor that is his tonight.

We are sorry that Mr. Jack Howard could not be with us tonight. We want him to know of the accomplishments of the Memphis Press-Scimitar and its editor emeritus and his conservation editor. We hoped to let him know what we think of Ed Meeman.

We wanted also to tell him that Memphis likes Charlie Schneider. We are glad to have him back with us.

Again we wanted to express thanks for the support which both the Press-Scimitar and the Commercial Appeal give to all worthwhile civic causes. They both fulfill the role of good citizens.

But it is the National Human Relations Award that Ed Meeman is receiving. Therefore, it is fitting that we know and recognize his strong efforts through the years towards a better understanding between men—between labor and management—and between members of different religious faiths (hence his interest in the National Conference of Christians and Jews). He believes that men should be judged by their character and not by the color of their skin. He and his paper have been big factors in the good race relations which we enjoy in Memphis. Mr. Secretary, Mr. Streit—we want you and other visitors to know that many leading white and Negro citizens are working together to maintain and improve these relations.

But the best thing of all was emphasized by one of the editors of the Commercial Appeal. This man said to me last Thursday. "I have always liked and respected Ed Meeman—he is so interested in the people who work under him."

And how true this is. I expect that he has personally helped more young men up the ladder of success than any other editor in America.

And so, Ed Meeman, my friend—our friend—I present to you on behalf of the National Conference of Christians and Jews—this National Human Relations Award.

RESPONSE BY EDWARD J. MEEMAN

This award means much to me, because I see it not as an honor given to one individual, but as an honor given to principles in which a great many people believe, principles which have brought us together this evening in this assemblage.

What are those principles? That Jews, Catholics and Protestants each find in faiths which are not their own, so much more which they hold in common with the other faiths than they find differences. We all believe in one good God, the same God, and that it is His will that all His children should live together as brothers, sharing harmoniously in the good earth He gave us.

We may have different theological reasons for being good and doing good, but our differences as to what is good are minor. At least there is a vast area of common agreement on what good needs to be accomplished. When the men and women of the three faiths join hands to accomplish this good, they find joyous fellowship, brotherhood, and unity of spirit. Each reflects credit on his own faith by the fruits he shows in his contribution to such community action.

Memphis has had many examples of fine accomplishment when men and women, each inspired by the teachings of his own faith, have joined hands with those of other faiths to make our community an ever better place of abode. Most recent have been the changes in race relations, for which the time had come, which were brought about in Memphis peaceably and without violence, by men and women of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths, all working together to practice the principles of each of those faiths. This accomplishment has made our community a happier place for those who live here, and brought us the generous envy of other American cities, and the admiration of the world.

GOOD FOR ONE—GOOD FOR ALL

It is my faith, which has been proved to my satisfaction in both observation and experience, that what is good for one is good for all, and that what is good for all is good for each. Conflict is only in the erring human mind, not in reality. The solution of any problem, mathematical or human, always lies right alongside the problem. We can always find the solution if we will lay aside self-interest and prejudice, and discuss it in the spirit that our religious faith has taught us, whatever that faith is. We need to ask not "Who is right?" but "What is right?" and if we look for the answer in enlightened discussion, reinforced by mediation and prayer, we will find the answer. The answer will be found to be good for all concerned, and we will wonder why we did not see this solution in the first place, it will seem so obvious when it is found.

RECALLS AN ILLUSTRATION

When we have that spirit, every problem will become an opportunity. I recall an illustration of this truth. When the New Deal, during the depression, issued a brochure saying that the South was the Nation's No. 1 problem, the editors of the seven Scripps-Howard newspapers which are published in the South met in Memphis to consider the brochure. Not in the spirit of criticizing the New Deal's pronouncement, but in order to strike a positive note, we editors issued our own pronouncement, declaring that the South was "the Nation's No. 1 opportunity." And so it proved, when the success of the Tennessee Valley Authority created a vast new market for the goods of northern manufacturers.

THE NEXT PHASE IN RACE RELATIONS

We have come to the next phase in race relations in Memphis.

We have already accomplished more difficult tasks. We have desegregated buses, schools, libraries, and the art gallery, a university, parks and playgrounds, restaurants; what is now our task is less of a break with our traditions. Therefore it is easier. Our task now is to widen the opportunities for employment for our Negro citizens. It is to find more and better jobs for the men and women who constitute more than one-third of our population, jobs in both public and private employment. Everyone is now agreed that Negroes should have the opportunity to obtain an education as good as that which is available to whites. Having been prepared to hold good jobs by this training, they should not be shut out from the opportunity to get them.

The great pioneer of Negro opportunity, Booker T. Washington, told the story of sailors from a wrecked ship, marooned in open lifeboats, who were dying of thirst. They had failed to see that they had drifted from the open sea to the estuary of the great Amazon River, and that the water around their boat was now fresh water. All they had to do was to let down their buckets where they were. He told this story to show his fellow Negroes, just emerged from slavery into personal freedom, that there was opportunity for progress all around them, if they but had the gumption to see it and use it. "Let down your buckets where you are," he told them.

This story has a moral, not only for Negroes then and now, but it has a moral for white people now. Let us let down our buckets where we are. All around us is a great pool of competent, educated, trained Negro labor. Let us dip into it and use it fully. If we use it, the South will have a great increase of prosperity. There should not be Negro jobs and white jobs but a job for the one best qualified to hold it. Many Negroes now dependent and a drag on the economy, will become self-supporting. Those just getting along will have increased income and become better customers.

JOB GAINED DOESN'T MEAN JOB LOST

Let white labor not make the mistake of thinking that a job gained by a Negro is a job lost by a white man. The good God has not given us the kind of universe in which the good of one man is at the expense of another. When we open wider the doors of opportunity to Negroes we shall have such an improvement in our economy that more jobs will be available to white men also.

Why are so many nations clamoring to get into the European Common Market? Because it is a wide, free trade area with a high standard of living.

When we upgrade a large portion of our population, the South will raise its standard of living, improve the labor supply, become an area with greater attractions to industry and distributive commerce, and provide a greater prosperity for all of us who live here, and the peace of mind that comes from friendship and cooperation between the races.

BROTHERHOOD COMMANDED BY RELIGIONS

Brotherhood is commanded by the teachings of the religions to which all of us in this room adhere. Thus we know it is right. It would be a lawless universe if that which was right was not also practical. Hate, prejudice, fear, and division are negative, and they are shown by their fruits to be impractical. Brotherhood is practical.

I thank you, Edmund, for this award, and I thank everyone in this room, and those they may represent for their part in it.

I look forward to working with you for these things in which we believe.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE LUTHER HODGES

It is a pleasure to join with you tonight in thanking Edward Meeman for his many outstanding contributions to the cause of human brotherhood.

You have already heard many things about his constructive leadership as editor of the Press Scimitar and about his dedicated community service activities which have contributed so much to the social and economic progress of this Midsouth region and to the very substantial progress you have made here in Memphis in the crucial area of better human relations.

I want to compliment the people of Memphis for the highly constructive approach they have taken on this difficult problem of race relations.

You have demonstrated how much can be accomplished in a relatively short time when responsible leaders of both races work together in good faith to serve the best interests of all of the citizens of the community.

As a southerner, I congratulate you on the honorable beginning you have made toward meaningful brotherhood in a highly sensitive area of human relations.

Tennessee has enjoyed progressive leadership in many areas of national policy in the past.

An example is Mr. Meeman's strong, lifelong commitment to the cause of freer trade among the nations of the world—a cause which, I feel is closely related to our national goal of an expanding international brotherhood of free men.

Mr. Meeman was one of the most vigorous supporters of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962—that bold new instrument of the liberal trade philosophy of another great Tennessean, Cordell Hull, who fashioned the first reciprocal trade act in 1934.

He is also a valued member of the Memphis Regional Export Expansion Council, which is helping the Department of Commerce in its national effort to expand the sale of U.S. products abroad.

I am looking forward to meeting with him and with the other members of this export council at breakfast tomorrow to discuss ways of putting more steam behind this vital effort.

It is essential that we increase our exports from the Midsouth and from every other part of our Nation.

We must sell more abroad to strengthen our domestic economic growth.

But most importantly, we must increase our export earnings to offset the continuing deficit in our balance of international payments—which is serious indeed.

Since 1957 our total payments to other countries have exceeded our receipts by several billions of dollars a year.

In 1960 we were running in the red in our international accounts to the tune of nearly $4 billion a year.

The result has been a heavy drain of our gold reserves and a massive build-up of dollar claims on our gold by foreign banks, individuals, and governments.

In 2 years, through a variety of measures, we have cut this annual deficit nearly in half—to $2.2 billion in 1962.

But this reduced deficit is still much too much—so far as I am concerned, $2.2 billion too much.

To maintain our financial position in the world—and maintain our position of political leadership in the free world—we must bring our international accounts into balance.

Our balance-of-payments deficits result largely from our country's heavy moral commitment to the ideal of a world brotherhood of freedom, prosperity, and peace—an ideal implicit in our great Judaic-Christian religious heritage.

Over the years we have continued to enjoy a substantial surplus of exports over imports in our merchandise trade with other nations.

But these export earnings have been more than offset by our oversea military expenditures to help safeguard freedom, by our foreign aid expenditures, and by our U.S. private investment in the economic development of other countries.

The only practical solution is to increase our exports.

If our exports were at least 10-percent larger than they are, we would go a long way toward eliminating the present annual deficit in our international accounts.

But the required $2 billion or more increase in our exports will not be achieved easily.

Competition in world markets is getting keener.

And there has been a slowdown in the rate of economic growth in Europe, our largest regional market, so there is a slackening of European demand for imports from the United States, and we have the uncertainty caused by General de Gaulle's outbursts.

Last year our sales abroad totaled nearly $21 billion—up about $1 billion from 1961.

Nevertheless, there is plenty of room for improvement in our export performance.

The United States exports only about 4 percent of its total production of goods.

Yet our chief world trade competitors, the six countries of the European Economic Community—the Common Market countries—export 12 percent of their total production.

More American companies must get into the export field, and all of our exporters must work on these export markets as aggressively and as imaginatively as they sell in our domestic market.

The great thrust of this export expansion drive must come from private business and private initiative, but the Department of Commerce stands ready to do everything it can to help U.S. companies enter the export market and succeed in that market.

The Trade Expansion Act, adopted overwhelmingly by the Congress, is designed to open broader markets for U.S. goods, both in Western Europe and in the other countries of the world that account for about two-thirds of our total exports.

But it can do much more than this; it can help to bind the free nations closer together through expanding mutually profitable, international trade.

I have always believed that trade among friendly nations promotes greater understanding and strong ties of mutual interest among the peoples of these nations.

I feel this even more strongly today when trade and understanding are vital to our efforts to create a prosperous dynamic, international economic community.

Such a community is essential.

We must have an international community which recognizes both the value and dignity of the individual and the constructive power of individual enterprise.

I am certain we cannot find lasting peace and prosperity in a world which throws up barriers to enterprise in trade or investment.

We cannot create a strong community of interests if nations or regional blocs become self-centered and adopt policies of "beggar thy neighbor."

I am confident, therefore, that, despite such incidents as General de Gaulle's recent dash of cold water on the prospects for an outward-looking European Economic Community, the postwar trend toward more liberal trade policies in the world will continue.

History requires that Europe look beyond its borders and join with the United States in shaping a viable, prosperous world community of free peoples.

This trend toward closer cooperation and more meaningful brotherhood in the world must be matched by a keener awareness of our responsibilities to our fellow men at home.

That great southerner, my fellow North Carolinian, Clarence H. Poe, pointed out more than 50 years ago that "the prosperity of every man depends upon the prosperity of the average man."

"Every man whose earning power is below par," he said, "is a burden on the community; he drags down the whole level of life, and every other man in the community is poorer by reason of his inefficiency, whether he be white man or Negro."

This wise observation is as pertinent today as it was when it was made in 1910.

It reminds us that what is done to the least of these, our brethren, is a matter of concern to all of us—as practical men as well as humanitarians.

Let me cite a few examples of how these shortfalls in earning power and economic opportunity affect our communities, our national economy, and even our capacity to compete in markets of the world.

More than 4 million of our fellow Americans are currently unemployed for a variety of reasons.

A prime reason is our slow rate of economic growth and the underutilization of our industrial capacity.

But there are other causes of unemployment that are just as serious, and some of them may be even more difficult to remedy.

Last year, young people under 25 accounted for more than one-third of our total unemployment, although they represent only one-fifth of our total labor force.

Many of these young people are being frustrated by the slow growth in the number of available jobs.

But many thousands of them are looking for work without success because they lack adequate education and marketable skills.

Hundreds of thousands of young men and women drop out of school each year before they finish high school.

It is estimated that there will be 7½ million such dropouts during the current decade.

Yet surveys show that the unemployment rate for young people who fail to complete their high school training is twice the rate for high school graduates.

In our present labor force, more than 3 million workers have not even completed the fifth grade.

And among unskilled laborers the rate of unemployment is more than twice the rate for the labor force as a whole.

The shortfall in earning power among Negro workers is especially large—due both to inadequate education and to the pressures which tend to confine nonwhites to unskilled and low-skilled occupations.

On the average, nearly a million nonwhite workers were without jobs last year.

And, again, the rate of unemployment for nonwhite workers was more than twice that for white workers.

Together, these figures describe a serious unemployment problem which will not readily yield to our efforts to step up our national rate of economic growth.

If we achieve our national goal of a full employment economy, civilian employment will rise from about 67 million to more than 80 million in 1970.

But there will be no increase at all in jobs for unskilled laborers, as we continue to mechanize and automate.

Stepping up production and our rate of growth will not provide jobs for those who lack useful skills or for those who are barred by custom or prejudice from employment for which they may be fitted.

Instead of benefiting as a Nation from the energies and innate abilities of these potential workers, we will have to bear the social and economic costs of their idleness, their frustration, and in many cases their bitterness and hostility to their communities and everyone around them.

To avoid this social alienation and this waste of valuable human resources, we must step up our efforts to improve our educational system and, equally important, to strengthen the motivations for self improvement.

This is a challenge to all of us, as private individuals, as businessmen, as public officials, as people who care about their fellow men and women.

Our economy falls short of its potential when earning power and consumer buying power are inadequate to maintain a higher rate of growth.

The development of our human resources is, thus, a matter of concern to each of us.

And in view of our domestic and international responsibilities and our world competition, it is a matter of pressing national interest.

Our most urgent domestic economic business is, of course, the need to lighten the heavy Federal tax burden which is depressing our rate of economic growth.

The President's tax program includes reductions of corporate income taxes to provide both incentive and the means for greater business investment to create additional jobs.

This will help to bring down the rate of unemployment by creating new jobs for those whose unemployment is due, not to lack of marketable skills, but to inadequate consumer demand.

Further lowering of our jobless rate will depend heavily upon our ability to upgrade our present labor force and to do a better job of preparing the more than 1 million new workers entering the labor force each year.

To do this, we must improve our public schools and stimulate our students to develop their abilities to the fullest.

We must expand our community junior colleges and our special facilities for vocational and technical training.

We must also expand our senior colleges and universities.

Our ablest young people also must be better prepared to deal with the complex problems of this technological age.

And we must strive unceasingly to remove those barriers in every industry and every community which deny Americans the opportunity to obtain the best educations and the best jobs of which they are capable.

To further these efforts, the President has proposed a comprehensive program of Federal assistance for education and vocational training.

This program emphasizes the special areas of need—the expansion of our community college programs, for example, and the improvement of teacher training and teaching research, the expansion of vocational education, the improvement of our public libraries, and the expansion of our adult education and adult literacy programs.

But the greatest responsibility for doing all of these things falls upon our States and our local communities.

The development of our human resources is a matter of national concern, but the obligation to see that this development takes place rests upon each of us in his capacity as a citizen of a community and a State, as well as a citizen of these United States.

This challenge to us as southerners is especially great.

We live in a region that has enormous natural and human resources.

But we are not realizing the full benefits of these resources for ourselves or for the Nation.

We have made great economic progress in the South in the last few decades.

This is reflected in the rapid increase in southern per capita incomes.

Since 1929, when it was only half the national average, per capita income in the South has increased by almost 400 percent.

This compares with a 200-percent increase for the Nation as a whole.

But we cannot let this dramatic progress blind us to the fact that per capita income in the South is still only 75 percent of the national average.

Today, our national economy is operating at about $35 billion below capacity.

Our consumer demand and investment demand are this much below what is necessary for full utilization of our available manpower and productive facilities.

Yet, if per capita income in the South were raised to the level of the rest of the Nation, this would generate enough additional spending and investment to restore this country to full employment.

The whole country suffers when any part lags in the development of its natural resources, in the education of its youth, or in the earning power of its people.

The South has made substantial progress in its agriculture.

The region, you know, has more cropland than all of the rest of the Nation.

But we are still hampered by generations of inadequate conservation which permitted the depletion of our soils.

Southern farmers have had to pay, more than half of the Nation's fertilizer bill to overcome these deficiencies, and they have had to do it out of about one quarter of our total national farm income.

The South has about three quarters of the Nation's commercial forest land, and we have made striking progress in developing this great resource.

But we have to overcome generations of chronic overcutting and inadequate fire protection and restocking which reduced our total timber stand to less than one-third of the national total.

Southern industrial progress in recent years has been a source of justifiable pride for us all.

The trend of modern technology is running in the South's direction—emphasizing wood pulp, petrochemicals, petroleum, and other southern products as basic industrial raw materials.

The South has all of the Nation's reserves of natural sulfur and bauxite.

It has 65 percent of the Nation's petroleum; 75 percent of its natural gas, phosphate, and titanium; half of the Nation's clay and coal; and it ranks very high in the rare-earth metals that are so important in this space age.

Yet, value added per worker in manufacturing in the South lags behind the value added per worker in the Nation as a whole.

And this shows up in the comparable lag in incomes of southern families headed by a year-round, full-time worker.

This lag underscores the vital importance of improving the education and technical skills of our people—to raise their productivity and their earning power, and consequently the level of per capita income in the South.

We have made great progress in our public schools.

But we can and we must do more.

We have further to go than other parts of the country to lift the educational level of our people to the standards imposed by a modern technological society.

The latest census figures show that the median number of years of schooling completed by southerners is a full year below the national average and more than 2 years below the level of the Western States.

Our school expenditures are only 71 percent of the national average—$265 per pupil, compared with $375 for the Nation as a whole.

We must invest more in education to overcome our deficiencies in classroom space, in teachers' salaries, and in teaching equipment—to improve the quality as well as the quantity of our educational effort.

We also must be concerned about the quality of the employment opportunities we make available to the young people we educate at such great cost.

I want to be very frank about this last point:

We cannot continue to waste the talents of our Negro citizens if we ever hope to raise the South to its full economic potential.

We cannot afford to employ in menial jobs educated Negro men and women who are qualified for better jobs.

We cannot let the talents of a Negro engineer be wasted in sweeping floors, in sorting mail, or in digging ditches.

We cannot use trained stenographers as maids.

We cannot make trained electricians rake yards, or use as construction laborers men who have the training to be draftsmen.

One of the reasons our per capita income is so low is the widespread underemployment of Negroes in our labor force.

Less than half of our Negro families are headed by persons with full-time, year-round jobs.

Too many Negro men and women are confined to jobs which produce little for themselves or for those who employ them—to jobs which in other parts of the country have been eliminated by machines, with a resulting rise in the average productivity and average incomes of the people in those areas.

The right to seek a job in keeping with one's ability—and have a reasonable prospect of finding such a job—is fundamental to my concept of freedom and equality of opportunity in a free enterprise economy and a free society.

For the South, this matter of better job opportunities for our Negro citizens is an economic necessity, as well as a duty imposed by our sense of fairness and right.

With constructive local leadership such as you have been showing here in Memphis and with growing public awareness of the importance of developing our region's human resources to the fullest, we can make great progress in this area of better job opportunities in the next few years.

The South has a great opportunity to demonstrate to the Nation and to the world both its capacity for orderly change and the extent of its faith in its future.

Those of us who know the South and love the South and its people cannot doubt that this region has a great destiny to lead both in our national economic growth and in the development of a deeper understanding of the meaning of practical human brotherhood.

Challenging opportunities produce growth, and I am confident that the South has only begun its growth to greatness in our time.

Thank you, and my best wishes to you all.

PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], spoke in detail and with great care on the problems involved in our disarmament negotiations and in support of his resolution designed to give the U.S. Senate a voice in the acceptance or rejection of any tentative agreement which might be reached.

A number of our colleagues on this side of the aisle joined in this discussion supporting the need for passage of this resolution. Lest we be accused of partisanship I call to your attention the excellent and documented letter appearing under the name of our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut. In this letter which I call to the attention of all Members, a detailed list is set forth of the continuing series of concessions which the United States has recently granted in our disarmament and nuclear test-ban negotiations without a single concession on the side of the Soviets.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter appearing in the Washington Post for March 1, 1963, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dodd and the Test Ban

I would like to comment on your editorial of February 22 which misrepresented my position in several respects.

I have never stated or implied anything so preposterous as that this administration or its predecessor would deliberately imperil the security of the United States. I do contend that the test-ban policy pursued in good faith by both administrations has already cost us our nuclear superiority over the Soviets, and will gravely imperil our security unless soon revised.

My assumptions are these: Such peace as we have is based upon our nuclear parity with Russia; if the Soviets continue nuclear tests, and we do not, they will develop weapons so superior to ours that they can confront us with a choice between surrender or annihilation; the safeguards in our current test-ban proposal are so inadequate that the Soviets can continue testing in secret, after they have disarmed us through the signing of a treaty.

It is demonstrable that in 4 years of negotiations, the Soviets have whittled down our detection and inspection provisions to the point where they are only one-tenth as effective as those in our original proposal. And the whittling goes on.

We once demanded the right to inspect all seismic disturbances of a significant size, i.e., several hundred per year; we then dropped to 20, and then to 12, and then to 8, and then to 7, and now to 5.

We once insisted on 600 monitoring stations, then 180, and now 80.

We once insisted that monitoring stations be manned by nonnationals of the country involved. We now accept the principle that these stations may be manned by nationals, which means that the Russians are to be the judges of whether or not they themselves are cheating.

We once excluded from the treaty, tests so small that they could not possibly be detected. We now include these undetectable shots.

We once proposed a control body on which no nation had the power of veto. We now give the Communist bloc the veto power.

We have made all of these retreats despite the testimony last September of our Disarmament Director, William Foster, that there has been no improvement in our verification capability.

Continued nuclear testing is essential to the perfection of the antimissile missile and to the development of the neutron bomb. The nation which first perfects either of these weapons will decisively overturn the balance of power. The kind of testing involved here is underground testing of small yields, which is precisely the kind most easily hidden. Under the provisions of this treaty, our chance of detecting sneak tests is 1 in 1,000. I am not willing to stake the survival of this country on such a gamble.

The question, then, recurs: Is it possible that any administration would negotiate a treaty as dangerous as I contend this one to be?

The Washington Post answers "No" and its answer seems to be based more on an act of faith than on an examination of fact. As a Senator it is my duty to assume that such a mistake is possible; and the history of all major nations in the 20th century is replete with mistakes of similar magnitude.

There is one supreme question which the Senate must ask about any nuclear test-ban treaty: Does it provide reasonable protection against cheating by the Soviets? If it does not it is worthless, worse than worthless, because it could lead to our national destruction. In my judgment, the present proposal of the United States does not meet that test. And so I am against it.

Thomas J. Dodd,
Senator from Connecticut.

Washington.

THE LATIN AMERICAN SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most encouraging success stories of the Alliance for Progress is the school lunch program now reaching more than 8 million Latin American children. This is a part of the U.S. food-for-peace program, which it was my privilege to direct during 1961 and 1962.

My successor in this program, Mr. Richard Reuter, expects that within a year, the United States will be assisting in the feeding of 1 out of 3 of Latin America's schoolchildren. This program not only provides a constructive outlet for American agricultural surpluses, but it contributes both to the health of the schoolchildren and to their education.

I know of no other single overseas U.S. aid effort which has had such spectacular results as our school lunch programs.

The current issue of Time magazine—March 1, 1963—carries a special news note on this food-for-peace effort, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Alianza: Feeding the Children

Despite all the discouraging news about the lagging Alliance for Progress, the United States could find a lift last week in the record of one relatively modest but highly successful program. In 1954, the United States started shipping surplus food stocks to Latin America for use in a free school-lunch program. So far, under the food-for-peace program, the United States has sent thousands of tons of surplus flour, cornmeal, edible oils, cheese, beans and powdered milk. Distributed by private relief agencies and local officials, the food will help feed 8,300,000 children this year, or 25 percent of Latin America's school-age population. Another 5,400,000 babies and pregnant women get at least one square meal a day.

In Washington, food-for-peace officials have coined a name for the project—Alianza para los Niños, meaning Alliance for Children. The food is credited with helping to double Peru's rural school attendance since the program began; school absenteeism in Bolivia has dropped from 38 to 2 percent, and students now make sure to be on time since latecomers go to the end of the lunch line. Each day in Mexico, more than 1 million schoolchildren receive the donated food. "The lunch is the only reason a lot of parents send their children to school," says Djalma Maranhão, mayor of Natal in Brazil's impoverished northeast. In Brazil alone, some 3 billion glasses of milk a year are distributed in 25,000 public schools. At the end of a 3-month period, reports one Brazilian teacher, most of her pupils gained at least 5 pounds. With plenty of surplus food where this came from, Food-for-Peace Director Richard W. Reuter expects that within a year the United States will be helping to feed one-third of Latin America's schoolchildren.

BULGARIAN LIBERATION DAY AND COMMUNIST TAKEOVER OF BULGARIA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, 85 years ago, on March 3, 1878, the Bulgarian people were liberated from the yoke of the Ottoman Turks. That day, coming at the end of the bloody Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78, marked the culmination of the struggle for their national independence which the Bulgars had been carrying on for some 400 years. During all that time they were held down by their powerful oppressors, and hard as they tried to shake off the foreign yoke, they were unable to do this by themselves alone. Finally, when the Russians came to their aid by declaring war against the Turks in April of 1877, their independence was assured. Their success was guaranteed in the peace treaty signed on the historic day of which we take notice today.

Since then fate has not been kind to the Bulgarian people. During the First World War their leaders made the grievous mistake of allying themselves with the Central Powers—with Germany and Austria—and when these powers were defeated, Bulgaria shared their fate of suffering the inevitable consequences. But the Bulgarian people, inured to hardship and adversities, took these in their stride. When World War II came, they once more were fated—forced one might say—to be drawn into fight on the German side. But before the end of the war the Bulgarians succeeded in extricating themselves from the Nazi-Fascist anti-democratic camp. At first it seemed that with their liberation from Nazi-Facist domination, they could look forward to living in freedom in their homeland. But the evil-minded men in the Kremlin had another design. They decided to capture Bulgaria, force the people of that country into their own camp, and cut them off from the free world, thus robbing them of their freedom and independence before they even had a chance to enjoy it.

This Soviet design was carried out with mechanical precision. At first the British and the United States Governments had been totally unaware of this design, but beginning in September 1944, it became evident that any government installed in Bulgaria had to be subservient to Soviet authorities there. Thenceforth Russian functionaries, with the aid of local Communists, succeeded in eliminating all independent and democratic groups opposing their design. It is true that the last, and perhaps the stoutest opponent of communism in the country, the late Nikolai Petkov, was not put to death until September 1947, but actually Bulgaria had fallen a victim of Soviet aggression even before the end of the last war, and since then has been a mere Soviet satellite. Its liberty-loving and courageous people are prisoners in their homeland, behind the Soviet-imposed Iron Curtain. On this 85th anniversary of their liberation day, we hope and pray for their deliverance from Soviet totalitarian tyranny.

TRAINING HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS FOR SPECIFIC SKILLS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, school and government officials as well as employers all over the country

will be watching with keen interest the new experimental programs recently inaugurated under the Manpower Development and Training Act whereby young people, many of them high school dropouts, are to be trained for specific skills that are in demand.

Educators are becoming increasingly plagued by the large and increasing number of dropouts among high school students. City and other government officials are increasingly vexed with a growing pool of untrained, hence unemployable, youth. Yet at the same time many employers are unable to fill job vacancies they have because there are no available trained persons on the local labor market.

The new manpower development and training projects centering on youth stand to help toward solutions to each of these problems.

An editorial appearing in the February 19 edition of the Kansas City Star says the programs make sense. I agree, as I believe would most, if not all of our colleagues in Congress. Because the problems are of such general current concern in all parts of the country, I ask unanimous consent that this Star editorial, "Another Approach to Job Retraining," be printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Another Approach to Job Retraining

In Kansas City the job retraining program is well underway as a combined effort of the Federal and State Governments and the school district. Motorcar mechanics and welding classes are in progress. Another welding class is scheduled for April and classes in stenography and typing will begin in March. One of the welding students is expected to drop out. Recently he took a test and did well enough on the welding questions to be offered a job for $2.85 an hour.

Last week a new (experimental) program under the Manpower Development and Training Act was outlined. It will put the emphasis on youth. In New Haven, Conn., 100 to 200 young persons—including high school dropouts—will be trained for specific jobs in laboratory technique, industrial drafting and industrial X-ray uses.

A similar program is being considered for Kansas City in which potential employers would be asked to waive high school graduation requirements. The New Haven project would appear to go a step further by bringing the employers in on the actual training.

Certainly this is a positive approach to school dropouts and the chronic unemployment problem of unskilled youth. Training for skills that are in demand make sense—not only for mature adults who have been hit by automation, but for young persons who have no job specialties at all.

AWARD TO SENATOR WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. YARBORCUGH. Mr. President, last Saturday in Kansas City, the National Council for the Spanish Speaking honored our colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey, for the leadership he has given to legislation affecting migrant farmworkers.

This award, the first Father Raymond A. McGowan Award, was presented to our colleague by a distinguished Texan, the Most Reverend Robert E. Lucey, archbishop of San Antonio, who cited the junior Senator from New Jersey as "a champion of social justice and the American way of life."

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Archbishop Lucey on presenting this award, as well as an interesting speech by Rev. Theodore E. McCarrick, president of the National Council for the Spanish Speaking on "The Contribution of the Latin American People to the United States," be printed in the Record.

I also ask unanimous consent that a sketch of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] by the Reverend John A. Wagner, executive secretary of the National Council for the Spanish Speaking, and the program, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Excerpts From Address by His Excellency Most Rev. Robert E. Lucey, S.T.D., Archbishop of San Antonio, for Presentation of First Annual Father Raymond A. McGowan Award of the National Catholic Council for the Spanish Speaking to the Honorable Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Senator From New Jersey

One of my earliest recollections of Raymond McGowan in our student days was this: A debate was going on in the United States between Father John A. Ryan, a professor in the Catholic University, Washington, D.C., and Morris Hillquit, an economist. The debate had to do with problems of capital and labor, specifically with socialism. It appeared monthly in a publication known as Everybody's Magazine. Often I saw the latest issue of the magazine sticking out of Ray McGowan's cassock pocket as we walked in camarata formation to the university. Fifty years ago he was deeply interested in the problems of men who labored for a living.

As a matter of fact, Raymond McGowan was sensitive to all the problems of humanity, spiritual and temporal. He was concerned with the poverty of the masses in many parts of the world. He knew that there was a close connection between the economic order and the field of international relations. He was saddened to behold that greed of gain and lust for power might lead to armed conflict. Europe at that time was seething with unrest. There was rioting in the streets of Rome. Then in 1914 World War I erupted with all its bloodshed and tragedy.

Father McGowan founded the Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems at a time when many of our citizens knew little or nothing about good social organization. The gospel which Father McGowan preached about social justice and social charity was not popular always and everywhere but he never ceased to proclaim the rights and obligations of both capital and labor. If he denounced the oppression and exploitation of working men and women, he also recognized that there is a natural right to private property and that a bankrupt employer is no help to employees. He recognized with the great Pope Leo XIII that capital needs labor and labor needs capital.

In 1926, between two world wars, Father McGowan organized the Catholic Association for International Peace in the city of Chicago. He was aware that most of our citizens knew precious little about international relations. This was true of Catholics generally even though they had at their disposal a papal peace program beginning with the magnificent "Message to the Belligerant Nations" published by Pope Benedict XV on August 1, 1917. In that message a League of Nations and compulsory arbitration of disputes were advocated. The pontiff went so far as to say that sanctions should be imposed on any nation that refused to submit a dispute to an international court of justice or would decline to accept the award of the court.

These were the principles for peace proclaimed by Father McGowan in his speeches and writings. Isolationists didn't like those principles but he preached them courageously. With his brilliant mind he saw clearly that our own beloved Nation was a danger to the peace of the world. We had not learned then to play our proper role in the family of nations. Many Americans believed sincerely that isolation and neutrality would alone keep us out of war. Our Government and our people did not seem to realize that neutrality in the face of crime is itself a crime. We encouraged tyrants and despots to attempt unprovoked aggression by assuring them beforehand that we would be neutral; that we would not fight to defend justice everywhere. And, when justice is not defended by the strong, it falls. This was the gospel of peace, justice, arbitration, and conciliation that Father McGowan preached for 40 years. He wanted our great country to take her rightful place in the world community and vision, his courage, and his devotion to humanity have been vindicated in today's United Nations.

During World War II growers were permitted to import some Mexican nationals to harvest our crops of food and fiber. After the war their numbers increased so that up to a few years ago as many as almost half a million braceros were employed in agriculture under Public Law 78. Wages, hours of labor, and conditions of employment for citizen migrants had been bad enough but with the importation of braceros a situation which had been deseparate became unspeakable.

About 4 years ago a man strode into this scene who is a champion of social justice and the American way of life. He is not fearful, he is not apprehensive. He believes that every American should enjoy the blessings of justice, liberty, and equal opportunity. The courageous man of whom I speak is our honored guest this evening: Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr., of New Jersey.

It is not difficult to speak well of liberty and justice because they are popular throughout the world. To pay lipservice to these natural rights involves no hardship, but to make them effective is not always easy. Arrayed against them are hatred and greed. These are controlled with difficulty; they do violence to natural rights and this is the heart of the matter. The little people, the weak, the defenseless are made in the image of God regardless of their color, their hunger, their poverty, and this is what Senator Williams has recognized in the migrant agricultural worker—he is a human being, a creature of supreme dignity and surpassing destiny. In the Senator's book of life the migrant is a man.

You all know the legislative program of our distinguished guest: A decent education for the migrants; housing that will protect them from the elements; day care for children; a national advisory council which will analyze the problems of migrancy and give necessary information to the President, the Congress, and the general public; health care; better employment service; crew leader registration; control of child labor; and fairer wages.

Neither this legislation nor the Constitution of the United States gives migrant farmworkers natural rights—"They are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights." Senator Williams proclaims, defends, and makes effective the rights that were bestowed by Almighty God.

Father McGowan spent 40 years fighting for the rights of man. It is peculiarly appropriate that the Reverend Raymond A. McGowan Award should be bestowed first on a courageous champion of human rights: The Honorable Harrison A. Williams, Jr., a Senator of the United States.

The Contribution of the Latin American People to the United States

(An address by Rev. Theodore E. McCarrick, president of the National Council for the Spanish Speaking, given at the testimonial dinner honoring U.S. Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr., of New Jersey, at the presentation of the first annual Father Raymond A. McGowan Award, February 23, 1963, Hilton Inn, Kansas City, Mo.)

This evening as we are gathered together at what we trust is the first instance of a tradition in the life of the National Council for the Spanish Speaking in the United States, I am very conscious that we gather to do a threefold honor. Certainly we are here to honor one of the modern champions of the dignity of man and the rights of labor, the distinguished Senator Harrison Williams, of New Jersey. It is surely an added tribute to his zeal and interest in this important field of social welfare that he has taken time from a busy session of Congress to be here with us in person this evening. In an equal manner, through the very title of this award, we seek to do honor here to the memory and to the life work of an extraordinary priest of God.

Some men make their mark in life because they fall in love with great ideas, others because they fall greatly in love with people. Father Raymond McGowan was the more unusual because he fell in love with both. Early in his life he became aware of the troubles and yet also of the tremendous opportunities presented to the church and the Nation by the Spanish-speaking community in the United States. He fell in love with their openness, their hearty friendliness, their deeply Catholic faith. His contacts with them throughout the land gave him a people to love. The national council was his great idea.

It is eminently fitting that this organization, which came into being largely through his foresight and his efforts, should have this opportunity to honor his memory in the annual Father Raymond McGowan Award.

Yet, there is another tribute to which I rise this evening, another honor to be paid, another debt of gratitude to be satisfied to the small extent that it is mentioned here on this occasion. I speak of the debt of gratitude that this Nation already owes to the millions of Spanish-speaking peoples who have made and are making a mighty contribution to the life and strength of this Nation.

In our zeal—and this zeal is commendable indeed—to secure for those of Spanish speaking and Latin background the rights that are truly theirs as children of God and participants in the national life of a great democracy, we must not overlook the fact that not only should this farflung community be the object of our interest and concern, but that it has already earned its place as the recipient of our gratitude and in a most substantial way.

I should like to speak very briefly this evening of three contributions which the Spanish speaking have made or are presently making in the United States.

No one of us is so far removed from our history books that we do not recall how eminent a place in the chronicle of explorations and discoveries is occupied by those who came to these States under the Spanish flag. Columbus himself, the great admiral of the ocean seas, carried the colors of Spain to the New World. It was a Gomez sailing for Spain, who perhaps even before Verrazono sailed into the great harbor of New York. In 1570 a mission bearing the name of Segura existed near the very banks of the Potomac. Who can forget the foolhardy daring of Ponce de Leon, the thrilling story of De Soto crossing the Mississippi, of Coronado pushing into the Colorado Territory, of Cabeza de Vaca who walked from the Texas coast to the shores of the Pacific.

And they have left their mark on the charts and maps of America. Names which sing in lilting Castellano, which testify to their deep faith and their sense of the mystery of Providence. From San Agustin to the sprawling modern metropolis of Our Lady Queen of the Angels, from the city of St. Anthony to the city of St. Francis, the map of America bears witness to their coming and their faith. But this is only one of the major contributions of the Spanish speaking to this land.

The second area of contribution of the Spanish-speaking community in the United States is economic. The scientific American economist has not even yet fully explored and delinated the contribution that immigrant and migrant groups have made to the wealth and productivity of the Nation. How many industries have been maintained, how many resources have been able to be developed, how many essential community services have been dependent on the newcomer and his entrance into the labor market, his contribution to the economic forces of the section to which he comes. New York and the great population centers of the East have good reason to be mindful of the economic value of the tremendous Puerto Rican immigration of the past score of years. The great arc of the Southwestern States of this Nation, from California into the valley of the Rio Grande, would be economically handicapped to a disastrous degree if the economic support in both supply and demand were not forthcoming from the millions of Spanish speaking and their descendants who make their homes in this region. Who can deny that the sudden growth of Cuban and other Latin-American populations in southern Florida has made a tremendous impact on the economic life of that section of the country. Throughout the length and breadth of the Nation, migrant workers of the Spanish-speaking community have provided a necessary support to many industries and thus have reason to be proud of their part in the building up of the wealth of the Nation.

Finally, the Spanish speaking have brought to this country and to its culture a new focus which is specifically different in many important features and which is—of all the moments in our history—never more needed than now. To an American society, which prides itself on its pluralism but is constantly exhibiting the trend to the monolithic, they have brought their own ways of doing things, their own ways of thinking about things, and a deeply spiritual sense of values which transforms the ordinary things of life. To an American society which tends to be characterized by the lonely crowd, they have brought their sense of family and values that do not depend on material things. This is perhaps the greatest contribution that they can make today, and one for which the Nation has reason to be grateful.

As president of the National Council for the Spanish Speaking, I pledge all our constant, our—please God—increasing efforts to serve the community of the Spanish speaking in the United States: to make their real contribution to this Nation better known and better understood, to strive for the removal of the obstancles which may stand in their way of playing a fuller part in the life of this Nation, and to work for that day when mutual understanding and cooperation will build for the future greatness of the United States a union of the best parts of two cultures, a harmony in nature and in grace, a wholly integral family and community, like wisdom in the Old Testament: One in unity and in beauty, yet surrounded with variety.

The Honorable Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Senator From New Jersey

The National Council for the Spanish Speaking is honored to present the first Rev. Raymond A. McGowan Award to the Honorable Harrison A. Williams, Jr., U.S. Senator from New Jersey. In him domestic farmworkers throughout the United States have found a champion on the national level through his chairmanship of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor called for by the Senate Resolution 267 and agreed to by the 86th Congress on March 24, 1960. He has made practically all the problems associated with migratory workers known to the public.

Without public understanding we cannot hope for progress. The Senate subcommittee, through public hearings, field trips, personal visits and extensive studies and analyses, has given to the citizens of the United States the understanding needed for corrective action.

Because of the efforts spearheaded by Senator Williams the 87th Congress considered more bills pertaining to migratory farmworkers than any of its predecessors. A complete legislative program has been prepared by the Senate subcommittee for the 88th Congress. Specifically, this legislative program includes measures to provide decent housing and sanitation facilities, day care centers for migrant children, improved educational opportunities for the migrant and his family, modification of existing child labor laws, national labor relations coverage, improvement of employment service for migrants, minimum wage, and a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor.

In our judgment, our choice of Senator Williams for the reception of the first award is justified by the Senator's own words taken from a statement prepared for floor delivery when the migrant bills are to be introduced. "It is often ascertained that prosperous society tends to forget its poor and Congress will not concern itself with a group lacking a political voice, especially the migrant citizen whose very mobility costs him his vote. This myth has been exploded. People from all walks of life have expressed their concern for the migrant citizen and his family. A first step has been taken. We must take many more steps, however, if social justice is to become a reality for the many millions who go through life with the burdens of second-class citizenship."

I know that the thousands and thousands of Spanish speaking found in the domestic migrant stream will cheer our presentation of the Father McGowan Award to Senator Harrison Williams.

Rev. John A. Wagner,
Executive Secretary.

Program

"Star-Spangled Banner."

Invocation: Most Rev. Charles H. Helmsing, D.D., bishop of Kansas City-St. Joseph.

Dinner

Toastmaster: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Arthur M. Tighe, M. SS. W., chairman of the arrangements committee.

Welcome: Most Rev. Charles H. Helmsing, DD.

Remarks: Hon. H. Roe Bartle, mayor of Kansas City, Mo.

Guest Speaker: "The Contribution of the Latin American People to the United States," Rev. Theodore E. McCarrick, president of the National Council for the Spanish Speaking.

Tribute to Father Raymond A. McGowan and presentation of the award: Most Rev. Robert E. Lucey, S.T.D., archbishop of San Antonio, executive chairman of the bishops' committee for the Spanish speaking.

Response: Hon. Harrison A. Williams, U.S. Senator from New Jersey, chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor.

Appreciation: Rev. John A. Wagner, executive secretary, National Council for the Spanish Speaking.

Benediction: Most Rev. Edward J. Hunkeler, D.D., LL.D., archibishop of Kansas City in Kansas.

PLIGHT OF DOMESTIC SOFTWOOD LUMBER INDUSTRY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am concerned about the attitude demonstrated by our Government toward an industry which is so important to my State of Texas. I first want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the junior Senator from Idaho, in his clear statement in regard to a need for an immediate and temporary emergency quota on the importation of softwood lumber. However, there were several other matters I would like to call to the attention of the Senate that may be productive in providing parity for our domestic softwood lumber industry on U.S. markets.

Texas has been one of the leading lumber-producing States since the turn of the century. More than one-tenth of the State's manufacturing establishments are wood-using plants. They account for nearly 5 percent of the value of all products made in the State. The output of the wood-using plants is worth more than one-half billion dollars per year. In terms of human beings, something that is far more important to me, nearly 10 percent of the people employed in manufacturing in Texas work in forest industry plants. Many others supplement their income with part-time work in the woods, harvesting the timber crop, or in mills that make trees into some of the thousands of wood articles used every day.

About 9 percent of the total Texas industrial payroll is paid by the forest-dependent industries. This $138 million income of the forest industry workers finds it way into every part of the State's economy. Barber shops, gasoline service stations, grocery stores, sporting goods shops, movie theaters—all share in the bounty of the forests in Texas.

Some of the best managed woodlands and finest growing pines in the United States are found in east Texas. Lone Star State timberlands grow wood for over 1,000 mills and factories that make a large variety of wood products. Although we Texans are accused of overstatements from time to time, it is true that a single Texas tree farm is almost as big as the entire State of Rhode Island. Texas forests and the industries they support provide full-time jobs for 43,000 persons and, more important, trees are a renewable resource—they grow. In Texas, timberlands today are growing wood faster than it is being used. I am sure that my good conservation friends will be delighted with this single fact.

Small ownerships prevail in the forest land ownership pattern in east Texas. Nearly two-thirds of the privately owned commercial forest is in holdings under 500 acres each. Farmers own more than 21 percent of the commercial forest lands of east Texas. Forest industries own about 27 percent and other private investors own approximately 45 percent. The governments—Federal, State, and local—own or control less than 7 percent of the total commercial forest land in Texas. However, the Federal Government is the largest governmental owner, with 736,400 acres, mostly in national forests.

The standing sawtimber in east Texas commercial forests measures over 27 billion board feet. As most of my colleagues know, a board foot is represented by a piece of wood 1 foot square by 1 inch thick and when a Texan refers to saw timber, he means a tree 9 inches or over in diameter, breast height. This is enough lumber for a five-room house for every family in the State of Texas plus the schools and churches that they might need. Southern pine accounts for 63.4 percent of this total inventory.

We can reach back into our early days in Texas for the roots of our present lumber industry. Records indicate that one of Texas' earliest sawmills was operating in 1819. By 1869 it ranked 24th among the States with lumber production of approximately 107 million board feet. By 1956, it stood 11th in lumber production—supplying 3.1 percent of the total national production.

Texas forest lands certified as tree farms in the American tree farm system exceed by more than 300 square miles the entire area of the State of Connecticut. For my urban friends, a tree farm is a privately owned taxpaying forest area whose owner has been publicly recognized by his State forest industries committee for doing an outstanding job in protecting and managing his woodlands for the continuing growth of forest crops for commercial purposes.

Mr. President, I give all of this background of the forest industry activity in my home State of Texas to demonstrate the importance to me of the great problems confronting our American softwood lumber industry. I am very concerned when the U.S. Tariff Commission decides that for a very technical legal reason, the fourth largest employer of manufacturing labor in the United States is without recourse under our Trade Agreements Act to mounting imports that are in fact causing serious injury to it.

I am personally convinced that we are going to have to face up to the proposition that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, as presently worded, affords no protection from imports for domestic industry and—because the criteria for granting relief to workers deprived of employment by imports is the same as that for industries—large segments of our work force are going to be without a forum to which they can take their problems and expect a reasonable opportunity for relief.

Even more significant, I believe, is the action taken by the administration in its tax proposals which affect this basic American industry. In the face of all the difficulties confronting the American domestic lumber industry, this administration has seen fit to recommend that the tax system applicable to timber for 20 years—a system under which conservation and sound forest management practices have reached their zenith by all worldwide standards—this administration has called for a repeal of the timber capital gains provision first written into the Tax Code in 1944. Mr. President, I consider this to be the height of absurdity. I was delighted to see the junior Senator from Oregon call to the attention of the Senate the provisions in the tax bill recommended by Secretary Dillon as they relate to the forest industry. She performed a great service in pointing out the importance of this single most important provision in the Tax Code in terms of the sound forest industry in these United States. Prior to the enactment of section 631 of the present Tax Code, the tax laws were such that there was an incentive on the part of landowners to cut their timber and not invest in the cost of replanting and forest management extending over the life of a new forest, which can be from 20 to 80 years depending upon which part of the country the trees are growing. Since 1944 there has been a real incentive for tree owners to bear the long-term expense of forest management which has sustained the highest growth of forest lands in the entire world.

Yet, another provision of this administration's tax proposal seems ludicrous when consideration is given to the domestic lumber industry's problem. That is the recommendation that a flat ceiling be placed on deductions permitted to the average taxpayer for interest payments out of income. It takes very little imagination to recognize the inducement for single family housing ownership that is found in the present Tax Code which permits individual taxpayers to deduct from taxable income the cost-of-interest payments on home mortgages. It seems to me the quickest way to encourage rental housing and to discourage home ownership is to limit this interest deduction as is proposed in the administration's tax package. How do I relate this to the lumber industry?

To my associates who are familiar with the lumber industry's economic health, the answer is clear that in large measure it depends upon single family housing starts. In the average single family house approximately 10,000 board feet of lumber are utilized; in rental housing that average drops to below 7,000 board feet per unit. Consequently, the encouragement of rental housing and the discouragement of a single family ownership has a direct and immediate impact upon the lumber industry and its economic health.

Now, Mr. President, I want to make specific reference to a bill that I think the Senate can act on with considerable haste. I am referring to S. 957, introduced yesterday by the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan].

The U.S. Tariff Commission in the softwood lumber industry case opened the door for legislative action by the Congress by stating:

> The withdrawal of the country-of-origin marking requirement cannot be regarded as a trade agreement concession within the meaning of section 301(b) of the Trade Expansion Act.

It also stated:

> Concurrently, country-of-origin marking would involve little expenses in addition to that already incurred in complying with the grade-marking requirements instituted in 1960 by the Federal Housing Administration.

Finally, it stated:

> It is clear that its restoration (that is, the restoration of the requirement for country-of-origin marking) in recent years would not likely have contributed to a reduction in the level of imports of softwood lumber. On the basis of evidence obtained by the Commission, its restoration might well have had a contrary affect.

What this series of quotations suggests, Mr. President, is that a requirement that all lumber entering the United States be marked as to the country of origin would not be considered a violation of a prior trade concession which would involve us in GATT problems. In fact, the Tariff Commission is saying that to require that lumber entering the United States from abroad be marked as to the country of origin would not be a burden to any foreign producers at all. I am very much convinced that such a marking—now required for every other product entering the United States that I am aware of—would be of immeasurable help to our domestic softwood lumber industry. It could then promote its products in U.S. markets as being domestically manufactured.

Finally, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Idaho introduced a bill (S. 958) requiring the use of domestically manufactured lumber in all FHA-insured construction. His reason for introducing this bill is that much, if not all, of the lumber being imported into the United States comes in, either ungraded or grade marked in the foreign country by agencies over which the United States has only the minimum amount of jurisdiction. That lumber is competing with our own domestic lumber which is grade marked within the United States by agencies regulated very closely by the American Lumber Standards Committee. Because of the volume of lumber going into FHA insured housing these days, I am confident that in spite of the best intentions the FHA is unable to honestly certify that all Canadian lumber being utilized is, in fact, on grade. As a matter of sound administration, it is my recommendation to the Senate that the Congress require that all FHA housing utilize lumber which bears a grade mark from an agency that has inspected the lumber within the continental United States and has graded the lumber as to its quality.

I hope the Senate will act as quickly as it can on this proposal.

ST. LOUIS, RIVER TOWN

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch calls attention to the tremendous part that low-cost water freight transportation has played in the economic development of the St. Louis area.

The past and future of this great city are inseparably linked with the mighty Mississippi and Missouri Rivers which flow by her boundaries.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point this clear and constructive editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 25, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

St. Louis, River Town

A million and a half tons of petroleum products annually go out of the Greater St. Louis industrial complex by water. A quarter of a million tons of iron ore mined in Peru and Venezuela come upriver by barge from New Orleans, along with 165,000 tons of scrap iron from Minneapolis, for the steel mills and 440,000 tons of finished steel and tinplate move in and out. Of the $200 million worth of grain moving out, a large and increasing part goes by way of the Mississippi River, much of it to be reloaded into ocean-going vessels for export to Holland, Germany, France, England, Japan, India, and Latin American countries. Ten million tons of coal move out, nearly half of it by water.

These figures indicate only part of what it means to St. Louis that it is a major center of the Nation for water as well as for rail, truck, pipeline, and air transportation of freight. Water transport is a major mainstay of heavy industries here. Its low cost strengthens their competitive position and enlarges their market area—in coal, for example, 42 percent of the delivered cost nationally consists of transportation charges.

What the river means to St. Louis is presently a matter of more than usual concern because of proposals by the Kennedy administration to deregulate most of the traffic of the railroads, which would enable them to cut rates to destructively low levels and possibly drive their competitors from the inland waterways.

So it is a pertinent time to take stock of what low-cost water-freight transportation means to the industrial life and development of our area as part of an integrated transport system.

Many of us whose lives are directly affected by it are little if any aware of the teeming traffic of our waterfront—the quantities of superphosphate barged in from Florida, sulfur from Texas and Louisiana, fluorspar from Mexico, refined sugar from Louisiana, raw sugar from Mexico and the Philippines, barbed wire from Japan, semifinished steel from Belgium, Japan, and Germany; the large and growing traffic outbound in chemicals, one of our major industries; the tinplate for our can factories, another principal enterprise.

St. Louis is headquarters of two of the largest common-carrier bargelines in the country, Mississippi Valley and Federal, each carrying freight over some 4,000 miles of waterways—with regular service to Minneapolis, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Omaha, New Orleans, Chattanooga, Mobile, Birmingham, Fort Myers, Brownsville, and other ports. Here is situated the largest builder of towboats in the United States, the St. Louis Shipbuilding & Steel Co.

Water transport has not only provided low-cost freight hauling on its own account but has also through its competition been the most effective single means of obtaining favorable freight rates. It is credited with reducing rail rates on coal from St. Louis by some 25 percent. It has been a large factor in the success of the Granite City Steel Co., now the 14th largest steel producer in the Nation, enabling it to compete as far away as Baton Rouge with steel mills at Birmingham, several hundred miles closer to the market—and bringing down rail rates on the haul by nearly a third.

The asset of low-cost water transportation affects our future as vitally as it has affected our present, if not more so. This is best demonstrated in coal and steel.

Southern Illinois across the river from St. Louis contains what is said to be the largest known deposit of low-cost steam coal east of the Rocky Mountains. Until fairly recent years the railroads enjoyed a virtual monopoly on coal haulage and transportation costs were high. Many mines in the area were forced to close. Coal mining was almost defunct when water transport revived a measure of activity. Today an estimated 65 percent of the coal mined there goes out by water.

But the area looks to still further waterway development to realize the potentials of its coal resources by means of the proposed Kaskaskia River and Big Muddy Creek navigation channels and associated projects.

This development would be linked with the large iron ore deposit discovered in recent years 70 miles southwest of St. Louis at Pea Ridge, near Sullivan, which the St. Joseph Lead Co. and the Bethlehem Steel Corp. are jointly preparing to develop.

The proximity of these deposits to enormous coal reserves for use in manufacture into steel creates a remarkably rich opportunity for both eastern Missouri and southern Illinois to reap an industrial development which could be very large indeed—and its realization depends on low-cost water transportation.

St. Louis is not only a river town, it is a two-river town.

It was founded because it was on the Mississippi and near the Missouri.

Because it was a river town, it became the Gateway to the West, as our magnificent arch in the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial on the riverfront will signify.

It thrived until around the turn of the century on the river trade.

But though St. Louis may have lost some consciousness of the linkage of its destiny with the "Meeting of the Waters," celebrated in Carl Milles' memorable statuary, the link has continued and has become more important to us than ever before.

A single towboat now pushes barges containing more cargo than could have been carried by all the steamboats that once lined our waterfront for 20 blocks.

St. Louis and the industrial complex around it in two States reap an indispensable advantage from the Mississippi, mightier today than ever. It is essential to our future progress to protect that advantage from impairment, and to utilize and extend it.

SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE ASKS ASSISTANCE FOR GOLD MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in my remarks to the Senate on Monday, I called attention to the critical situation in South Dakota which confronts our gold producers. One of America's most valuable industries has fallen on unhappy days and most of the gold mines in this country have been forced to close in recent years. To help remedy this situation, my senior colleague from South Dakota and I have introduced S. 824, which would increase the depletion allowance for gold produced in the United States.

Today I received a copy of Concurrent Resolution 4, adopted on February 21 by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, which memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide incentive payments by the Federal Government for domestic gold producers. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to providing incentive payments by the Federal Government for domestic gold producers

(Introduced by committee on State affairs and public institutions)

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

Whereas domestic gold producers have been obligated to sell their product to the Federal Government at the established price of $35 an ounce since 1934; and

Whereas constantly increasing inflationary costs of mining and milling this precious metal have resulted in closing down the properties of virtually all of the gold producers in the United States; and

Whereas production of gold from domestic sources has remained in the range of 1½ million ounces contrasting to 6 million ounces in 1940 while current industrial use of gold in this country amounts to 3 million ounces per annum; and

Whereas our dwindling national gold reserve is a matter of grave concern to our citizens; and

Whereas it is in the national interest to increase our domestic gold production: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 38th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the members of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota respectfully request the Congress of the United States to provide incentive payments to assure domestic gold producers a fair economic return on their properties with the objective of increasing gold production in the United States. Such incentive payments would enable gold mines currently operating to survive under current high levels of cost, would aid in reopening closed mines and likewise provide a stimulus for exploration and development of new gold properties. Such incentive payments are essential to prevent complete destruction of our domestic gold mining industry; be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

Adopted by the senate February 13, 1963.

Concurred in by the house of representatives February 21, 1963.

Paul E. Brown,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
Attest:
W. J. Matson,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.
Nils A. Boe,
Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.
Attest:
Niels P. Jensen,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, to consider the new nominations sent to the Senate by the President of the United States.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

John Harold Fanning, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board;

Dr. Francis Keppel, of Massachusetts, to be Commissioner of Education;

Daniel Patrick Moynihan, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor;

Howard G. Gamser, of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board;

David Frost, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service;

George C. Trevorrow, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review; and

Joseph C. Robinson, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees the clerks will state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roland R. Renne, of Montana, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roland R. Renne, of Montana, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip N. Brownstein, of Maryland, to be Federal Housing Commissioner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the president be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

TRIBUTE TO ROLAND R. RENNE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before returning to legislative session, I should like to make a few comments on the nomination of a distinguished citizen of my State, Dr. Roland R. Renne, the president of Montana State College. It has been my privilege to know Dr. Renne for approximately 32 years, which comprises practically the entire span of his period of service at Montana State College. He has been an outstanding professor at that institution which, incidentally, is one of the truly great institutions of our country. He has been the president of Montana State College for the past 19 years. He is a man of great integrity and ability. We of Montana are extremely proud that this outstanding citizen of our State has been given this recognition.

We know that he will do a good job. We know that he will be a credit to his State and to the Nation; and no one can expect more of any man.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I join my distinguished colleague, the majority leader, in paying tribute to a distinguished Montanan, whose nomination to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture the Senate has confirmed. He will bring to the Department of Agriculture a vast amount of experience and information necessary to the execution of the duties of that important position. He has already been an outstanding educator in the State of Montana, as the senior Senator from Montana has described. He has been a researcher and an author. He has published books on agricultural economics, and published the most important text on the government of the State of Montana. He is now on leave of absence from Montana State College. His career has contributed to building up that institution into one of the great land-grant colleges of the country.

I am proud to have been able to support the confirmation of his nomination; and I am especially proud because he is an old and valued friend, as well as an outstanding Montana citizen.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the agreement which has been reached, I should like to invite the attention of Senators to the fact that at 12:30, Senators will begin the delivery of eulogies for our late departed colleagues. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to suggest the absence of a quorum and to have the call of the roll terminated at 12:30.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 12:30 having arrived, under the previous order, the order for the quorum call is rescinded; and the Senator from Montana is recognized.

HELEN M. JOHNSON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of order of business No. 7 on the calendar, Senate Resolution 102.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 102) to pay a gratuity to Helen M. Johnson.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Helen M. Johnson, widow of Curtis E. Johnson, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to 10½ months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

SON RANKINS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 8, Senate Resolution 103.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 103) to pay a gratuity to Son Rankins.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Son Rankins, widower of Ella M. Rankins, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

REVISION AND PRINTING OF SENATE MANUAL FOR 88TH CONGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 9, Senate Resolution 101.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 101) authorizing the revision and printing of the Senate Manual for the use of the 88th Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Eighty-eighth Congress, that said Rules and Manual shall be printed as a Senate document, and that one thousand six hundred and fifty additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which one thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, two hundred copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining four hundred and fifty copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES RELATING TO LATE SENATORS DWORSHAK, OF IDAHO, CHAVEZ, OF NEW MEXICO, AND KERR, OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution (S. Res. 104) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, in accordance with notice given on February 25, the legislative business of the Senate be now suspended in order that memorial addresses may be delivered, respectively, on the lives, characters, and public service of the late Senators Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho, Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico, and Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR DWORSHAK, OF IDAHO

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, Idaho has been represented in the Halls of Congress by several outstanding people, and one of the most illustrious was the late Senator Henry C. Dworshak. Except for a short period of time in 1949, he served the State of Idaho as a Member of the House of Representatives or as a Senator, from January 3, 1939, until his death on July 23, 1962.

Our State of Idaho was admitted to the Union over 72 years ago, on July 3, 1890. For almost one-third of that time—for 23 years—Henry Dworshak was one of the State's most able representatives in the Congress of the United States.

Before Senator Dworshak became interested in politics, he had been quite active in civic affairs in Idaho. At one time he served as governor of the Idaho-Utah district of Rotary International, being installed at convention in Nice, France, in June 1937. He was a 33d degree Scottish Rite Mason and Shriner, and a member of the Elks and the Odd Fellows.

During the First World War, Henry Dworshak served overseas as a sergeant in the 4th Antiaircraft Machine Gun Battalion in 1918 and 1919. For many years thereafter he was quite active in the American Legion, serving as the Idaho commander in 1932. He never lost his interest in veterans' affairs and was a Member of Congress who could always be counted on to see that the veterans of this country received proper benefits and treatment. At various times he was on the boards of visitors of the Naval Academy, the Military Academy, and the Air Force Academy.

Professionally, he was a newspaperman. From 1909 until 1918, when he entered the Army, he worked at the printing trade. After his tenure of service in the Armed Forces, for 4 years—1920 to 1924—he was manager of a printers' supply business. Then, in 1924, he became editor and publisher of the Burley Bulletin in Burley, Idaho. This position he held for 20 years, until 1944 when he sold the paper. In 1931, Henry Dworshak was president of the Idaho Editorial Association.

As has often been said about newspapermen, Senator Dworshak had printer's ink in his blood, and he was never too far removed from the newspaper world. He was an avid reader of all newspapers, sometimes spending hours going over them. By his side in the Senate Office Building was his ever-present typewriter, and it was not at all unusual to see him sitting there, putting his thoughts on paper by typing rapidly away with four fingers. He used to have a pet saying, and I quote: "You give me the leads and I will furnish the news." All one has to do to appreciate his ability as a writer is to look over his old correspondence files. They are filled with clear, concise, and interesting letters dictated by Henry Dworshak.

He was a vigorous man and a trim man who, with his thatch of white hair, really looked the part of a U.S. Senator. He had a keen sense of humor, and it was often difficult to tell whether he was being serious or was kidding. It was only the twinkle in his eye which usually gave him away.

Senator Dworshak was a member of three powerful committees here in the Senate at the time of his death—Appropriations, Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, he sat on five subcommittees—Army Civil Functions, which handles development of rivers and harbors and flood control problems; Agriculture, which handles farm and forest appropriations; Defense, which reviews expenditures for the Pentagon and Armed Services; Interior, which deals

with such problems as Indian affairs, fish and game problems, irrigation, public lands, parks and territories; and the State, Justice and Judiciary Subcommittee, which handles the FBI, State Department, and Federal court funds.

Many times two or more of these subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee would be meeting at the same time in separate rooms. But Senator Dworshak had an exceptionally good record of attendance at these meetings. Oftentimes he would go from one meeting to another, rationing his time on a clockwork basis. He was a vigorous man whose schedule would often make a much younger man gasp for breath.

He was always considered a stanch supporter of and member of the economy forces here in the Senate. He operated under the idea that the taxpayer should get the most for every tax dollar he had sent to Washington; and, through his work on the Appropriations Committee, he worked tirelessly to cut waste, unnecessary government spending, and duplication and inefficiency in the Federal Government.

Senator Dworshak was ranking minority member on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. There he did a great deal of good for Idaho by his work in respect to Indian affairs, land management, reclamation, fish and wildlife, geological surveys, the Bonneville Power Administration, and national parks. Idaho is 65.1 percent federally owned, and a Member of the Senate from Idaho cannot be placed on a better committee than Interior as far as his State is concerned.

He was particularly interested in Indian affairs and the progress of the Indians in Idaho. He felt that Indian affairs should rely quite heavily on the tribal councils, and he wanted to keep the management of Indian affairs as far away from Washington as possible.

Through his diligent work on the Interior Committee, Senator Dworshak accomplished many things for the State of Idaho—reclamation projects, dams, and so forth. He served on two subcommittees of Interior—the Public Lands, and the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Subcommittees.

From 1957 until his death he served as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which supervises operations of the Atomic Energy Commission. He was very helpful in getting the AEC National Reactor Testing Station situated at Idaho Falls and Arco, Idaho, through his work on this Joint Committee. He also served on two subcommittees of this Joint Committee—the Legislation Subcommittee and the Raw Materials Subcommittee. This brought the total subcommittees on which he served to nine.

All of his committee assignments put him in close touch with legislation affecting nearly every facet of the lumbering, mining, and farm industries so important to our State.

Senator Dworshak was very active in securing more access roads for forest harvest and recreational use. He worked for adequate tariffs to protect the domestic mining industry and for a good highway program emphasizing farm-to-market roads. He got through Congress many bills to reclaim desert lands through irrigation. Henry Dworshak was quite an exponent of the full development of flood control, power, and irrigation uses of streams and rivers which flow through Idaho and the Northwest.

He was also a member of the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission.

In addition to all the committee and subcommittee meetings he attended, he was just as diligent in his attendance on the Senate floor. For his many years here in the Senate he had better than a 97-percent attendance record for all rollcall votes. During the 1st session of the 87th Congress and up until the time of his death during the 2d session, he had 100-percent attendance on rollcalls. There are not many of us who can match that record.

I commented earlier that Henry Dworshak was a man with a fine sense of humor and that sometimes the only way one could tell whether or not he was kidding was by the twinkle in his eye. I have heard of one time, however, when everyone close by knew he was quite serious. For some reason, neither he nor any member of his staff heard the bells for a rollcall vote. And, had not a photographer in the office at the time told him of the vote, he inadvertently would have missed it. That day it seems the late Senator Dworshak became very agitated and disturbed—and there was no doubt in his staff's minds that he was quite serious. Henry Dworshak certainly did take his attendance here in the Senate with a great deal of seriousness.

But despite his many meetings and conferences and the diligence and seriousness with which he tended to his Senate business, Henry Dworshak always had a kind word for his colleagues and the many employees in the office buildings who were his friends. There are many people here on the Hill who feel his absence besides those who worked directly with him and for him. At times there may have been a gruffness about him, but this was just to cover up the innate gentleness of the man.

Also, he always had time to help individuals with their separate problems. Many people from Idaho appealed to him over the years for help on many things, and he always saw to it that he gave them whatever help he could through his contact with the Government agencies and bureaus.

One outstanding case where Senator Dworshak virtually changed the entire life of an individual was brought to my attention just this week. A young man came into the office to meet me, and I quickly learned that several years ago Senator Dworshak had gone out of his way to help this young man with his problems.

This young man had been a native of China and a citizen of Spain, and had been born in Shanghai, China. He had first entered this country in 1948 as a seaman, but had departed again with his ship. Later, in 1949, he came into the port of New York as a seaman and became ill enough to be hospitalized in New York. While he was hospitalized, he was advised to make an application for adjustment of his status under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. However, not knowing all the provisions of the law, when he got out of the hospital, he went to Idaho where his two sisters lived. In all good faith, he entered Idaho State College, feeling sure that his application would be approved. This was not the case. His application was returned to him by the Immigration and Naturalization Service as unaccepted because he had not arrived in the United States prior to April 1948, as required by the act. Consequently, the Immigration Service had no other course to follow than to start deportation proceedings.

At this point this young man's case was brought to Senator Dworshak's attention and, because of the very strong recommendations concerning the young man's intelligence and ability, his earnestness of purpose, and good character and dependability, Senator Dworshak introduced a private bill for his relief. This bill provided him with permanent residence in the United States.

But that was only the beginning. This private bill received an adverse report from the Department of Justice. Therefore, Senator Dworshak took it upon himself to make several personal appearances before the proper committees in behalf of this young man. In the end, despite the obstacles involved, this private bill was finally passed by the Congress and approved by the President, giving this young man his citizenship.

Soon thereafter this new citizen graduated from Idaho State College with high honors, went on to get his master's degree, and later served for 6½ years as a commissioned officer in the Air Force Reserve and as an intelligence officer in the Regular Air Force. Ten years after the enactment of this private law, this young man, who speaks six languages fluently, is an outstanding citizen of these United States. He is now executive vice president of a college which trains electronic technicians and has some 1,000 students enrolled at this time.

I think this one instance is a good example of Senator Dworshak's great humanity and goes far to show what this country might have lost had Henry Dworshak not been a Member of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, today I have not mentioned any personal contact of mine with Henry Dworshak. I would simply like to say this—and I do not think there is a higher tribute that can be paid to any man by any other man—he was my friend.

Mr. President, the people of Idaho loved Henry Dworshak for his fine qualities. I join with them and with my colleagues in the Senate in paying my deepest sympathy to his wife and the members of his family on this occasion.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, when our late colleague, Senator Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho, was removed most suddenly from our midst, an outpouring of sympathy for his family came from people of all walks of life. The concern for the State's loss in the death of this good man was manifold and widespread.

One unquestioned theme found in all of these expressions of sympathy was that HENRY C. DWORSHAK was a person of great sincerity, character, and dedication; that he was one whose warm, outgoing personality had created and kept for him the friendship of thousands of people. I can think of no warmer tribute.

This was the hallmark of his service, that in the increasingly complicated society of today, and in a position subject always to the arrows of criticism, he kept his friendships intact down through the years. Even those people who disagreed with his political creed found that their friendship and respect for him never faltered.

This, I think was HENRY DWORSHAK's rule for dealing with people: be candid, be sincere—a rule, written in all our halls of learning, spoken from every rostrum—but few have practiced it with the same fidelity as he. Even though the Senator had many accomplishments to his credit, they pale beside this memory of an honest man.

I knew Senator DWORSHAK only slightly when I first came to the Senate in 1957 as the youngest member. In the forefront of those colleagues who were anxious to help me and to make my reception a warm and gratifying one was HENRY DWORSHAK. Even though he sat on the opposite side of the aisle for his nearly 24 years of dedicated public service to the people of Idaho, Senator DWORSHAK gave me much kindly advice. I shall always remain indebted to him.

HENRY DWORSHAK was such a forthright man; dedicated to the public service, ready to fight for his ideals, impatient of pretense, and unswerving in his course. Such was the habit of this man, directly a product of a pioneer western culture which sent him back to Washington for four terms as a Member of the House of Representatives and three terms as Senator. HENRY DWORSHAK looked like a westerner; he looked like a Senator. He was, as the Twin Falls Times-News said, "the big Idahoan." Big of stature, big of heart, Senator DWORSHAK was truly a man of the West. He spoke the language of the Main Street businessman, understood the problems of the homesteader, appreciated the rough humor of the logger. His own views were solidly grounded in a conservatism that often cast him in the role of opposition to much of the legislation offered by four administrations under which he served. After Eisenhower became President, a friend once wrote to him, pointing out that he had long been a member of the opposition during the years of Democratic administration, and, now that a Republican administration had arrived, he might be more charitable to its President who "looked ahead." Senator DWORSHAK wrote back: "If I did look back, it would be in order to look forward."

Regardless of how one viewed his political philosophy, Senator DWORSHAK was honored and respected by his fellow Idahoans. Nearly everyone in Idaho counted Senator DWORSHAK as a "personal friend," commented the Emmett Messenger-Index. His perserverance in the pursuit of his goals and his fairness to everyone were characteristics of this man of Idaho.

He was "never one to seek the limelight," said the Caldwell News-Tribune, "he was one of the hardest workers in the Senate; he was active in committee work as well as on the floor and still had time to listen to a constituent or a representative of a Government department before making his decision."

HENRY C. DWORSHAK—the big Idahoan—a man with the courage of his convictions. A gentleman we shall long remember. If we serve our constituencies as well as he, democracy will ever flourish.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I served with Senator DWORSHAK when he was a Member of the House. I had the privilege of serving with him here in the Senate. I very much appreciate and subscribe to the eloquent statement made by the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] on behalf of the late Senator DWORSHAK.

As a Member of the House, I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining, and finally chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In each one of those capacities I had occasion to work with Senator DWORSHAK when he was a Member of the House, and also when he was a Member of the Senate, and I can subscribe wholeheartedly to all that has been said on his behalf by the senior Senator from Idaho.

He was a hard worker. He diligently represented the interests of his State. He had an intense interest in the mining industry, which over the years we tried to save and which over the years we have seen slowly decline into almost complete oblivion as a national industry, not only in my State, but also in Idaho and throughout the Far West.

In addition, he had a great interest in the development of the water resources of the Far West, and he worked for his State in the development of water resources within his State.

I recall appearing in Idaho for hearings at the time the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] was Governor of the State. Some of those projects were in the interest of the State of Idaho, and we were encouraged by Senator DWORSHAK. I am happy to join in these tributes to him, and I concur wholeheartedly in what the Senator from Idaho has said, that as long as we have men of that kind of diligence and that kind of devotion, and that kind of adherence to the fundamental principles of our country, whether they are on our side of the aisle or on the other side of the aisle, this Nation will be better off.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on January 3, 1939, nearly a quarter century ago, I was sworn in as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. I was in a new place, and had not yet had the opportunity to become acquainted with the rest of that body, but on that occasion, which I shall always remember, I was looking in particular for one Representative.

The late Senator Hugh Butler, of Nebraska, had told me to be on the lookout for the new Congressman from Idaho, Mr. HENRY DWORSHAK. The late Senator Butler was very active in Rotary International, and so was our distinguished colleague whose memory we honor today. HENRY DWORSHAK had served as Governor of the Idaho-Utah District of Rotary International. He had been installed as such at the convention in Nice, France, in June, 1937. Many of my fellow Rotarians who had served as Governor of Rotary or who had attended national conventions either knew HENRY DWORSHAK or knew of him. HENRY's broad outlook, his intense patriotism and his dedication to the principles in which he believed had made him a very much admired man. I met him on that day.

Through all the years that followed, it was my privilege to have the friendship of HENRY DWORSHAK. The friendship of HENRY DWORSHAK was not a fair weather friendship. If HENRY had a fault, it was that he believed so deeply in the sound principles that he embraced that he burned inside when those principles were violated. It put a strain on his heart and at times it was necessary to urge him to take it easy and to slow down, but everyone who came in contact with HENRY DWORSHAK could honestly say: There was a man of courage; there was a man who represented stability. HENRY was an individual to whom yes meant yes and no meant no. Reliability and dependability were his creed. Honesty and integrity were rigidly adhered to. Loyalty and devotion were part of his makeup, and sham and meanness and untruths found no place in the life of HENRY DWORSHAK.

His first speech in Congress as a freshman Member of the 76th Congress began with these words:

> Mr. Chairman, the wholehearted support accorded the national defense measure last week in this House indicates that no trace of partisanship was permitted to influence Members in their desire to provide adequate preparedness for our Nation. Such expenditures and policies are predicated upon the theory that, instead of being Republicans or Democrats we are Americans with a single objective of preserving peace.

In these days, when thoughtful people are concerned about the fiscal plight of our Government, we remember Senator DWORSHAK with gratitude. He was an aggressive champion of Government economy. He was thorough, hard-working, and effective as a member of the Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate. One of his early votes, in 1939, was against an authorization for an additional $100 million for an artificial work program which was not bringing about real recovery.

His patriotism is attested to by his record in support of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives and his support of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate.

HENRY DWORSHAK was an example of what I like to refer to as the American dream coming true in the life of a man. He was born in Duluth, Minn., on August 29, 1894. There he went to the public schools. His background taught him the necessity of hard work. It was in his home city that he learned the printing trade and entered newspaper work.

In the First World War he left his printing press, laid down the tools of his trade and served with distinction in the Armed Forces of his country. He was a part of the American Expeditionary Forces that brought victory to the country and its allies. He served as a sergeant in the 4th Antiaircraft Machinegun Battalion.

HENRY DWORSHAK, upon being discharged from the service, returned to Duluth and managed a printers' supply business. In 1924 he adopted his beloved Idaho as his home and he became editor and publisher of the Burley Bulletin of Burley, Idaho.

HENRY's force of character, his dedication and his hard work, took him to a place of prominence in his chosen field. In 1931 he was elected president of the Idaho Editorial Association. In 1932 he was Idaho Commander of the American Legion. He served his community and State in many capacities and, as I have mentioned, was district governor of Rotary International for Idaho-Utah shortly before his election to Congress.

His affiliations were many, his friends were legion, and he commanded the highest respect from all who came in contact with him.

HENRY DWORSHAK possessed true humility. He embraced a faith that recognized the Great Architect of the Universe as the one in charge of the lives of men and nations. He entered that Eternal City, not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, on the 23d day of July, 1962.

Mrs. Curtis joins me in extending to Mrs. Dworshak and to her fine family our most sincere sympathy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the sudden death of our friend and colleague, Senator DWORSHAK, was a grievous loss to the Senate and to me personally. We had been good friends for many years. We were neighbors in the Northwest and I was fortunate to be his colleague in both the House and the Senate.

Senator DWORSHAK was a determined champion of his ideals and fought fiercely for what he regarded to be in the best interests of the people of his State and of the Nation. The Senate may not have always agreed with him, but it never questioned his personal dedication, his integrity, and sincerity.

The voters of Idaho chose Senator DWORSHAK to represent them on six different occasions, three times as a U.S. Representative and three times as their spokesman in the U.S. Senate.

During his 16 years in the Senate, he rose to the position of ranking minority member of the important Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. From this vantage point, he wielded considerable influence on measures dealing with the West in general, and with his State in particular.

In addition to this assignment, he also held a position on the Appropriations Committee where he could project his philosophy to a national constituency.

Senator DWORSHAK was a man of humble origins and he rose to great heights of public achievement. But he never lost his basic simplicity. He conducted his Senate work out of the public spotlight and with little fanfare.

I had the opportunity to get to know Senator DWORSHAK well because of our mutual interests in developing the Rocky Mountain Northwest. I often found him to be a valuable ally in this endeavor, particularly as affecting certain public power projects. Shortly before his death, I had an opportunity to travel with him to Latin America on behalf of the Appropriations Committee. He worked indefatigably on that trip, revealing his great concern for the public purse and the public interest not only at home, but in our farflung activities abroad.

Mr. President, Senator DWORSHAK was an honest, sincere and dedicated public servant. I shall miss him. Mrs. Mansfield and I wish to extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Dworshak and her family in their time of sorrow.

HENRY DWORSHAK was a good man.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, at the beginning of the 76th Congress, I stood in the well of the House of Representatives, together with the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], to take the oath of office as a Member of Congress. At my side on that day was another freshman Congressman, from Idaho, HENRY DWORSHAK. Our work in the House of Representatives marked the beginning of a warm and lasting friendship which I shall forever cherish.

We not only served together in the House, but, for some time, we shared adjoining suites in the House Office Building. Many a night, after the day's work was done, HENRY and I would sit together, pondering the problems with which we were faced, comparing notes, trying to fit ourselves into the role in which the fortunes had cast us. There, in those quiet times, I came to know him well—and to appreciate those qualities which served to make him a man to remember, a name to honor, and a model to follow.

How do we describe a man like HENRY DWORSHAK? What words can we comb from the language which we speak which will paint the picture of his character? Only two that I can summon up seem to fit. These words are "rugged honesty."

One never had to worry about HENRY DWORSHAK's intentions or plans. There was never a doubt about his motives. He could not be devious. He could not stoop to chicanery. He could only say what he thought and felt—and he did it face to face.

HENRY and I came to Congress during troubled times, and all his service to our country was in those days when the world was caught in a cauldron of hate, fear, and turmoil. There were never any easy answers. Some of them were heartbreaking, but HENRY DWORSHAK always aproached his duty like a good soldier. It was not always possible to say, "This is the answer" or "That is the answer." There was no clear blueprint to follow. Nevertheless, we could always be sure that when HENRY DWORSHAK made a decision, cast a vote, or wrote an opinion, he did it after an abundant search of his conscience, making sure that he did not violate any of the high principles for which he stood.

During our service in the Senate we served together on many Senate committees. He and I were companion members of special committees, assigned to untangle some of the most unpleasant problems ever to face the Senate.

For example, we worked together during the harrowing times of the Army-McCarthy hearings. There was at times considerable hurly-burly in the hearings. Participants in the hearings were vigorously persistent in their contentions. Sometimes the atmosphere was supercharged, tension was high and there were heated exchanges. During those times, HENRY sat quietly, patiently, and unharried. Once he had made up his mind, he was vigorous and forceful in his presentations. He was an example for all Members and witnesses. His work was judicious and without rancor, and serving with him was a genuine pleasure.

HENRY DWORSHAK served on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate. He was anxious to help preserve the natural resources of the West, to develop other resources which would benefit the Nation, and to expand the opportunities for his people. His State of Idaho, and my native State of South Dakota had many of the same problems. We always felt that we had a kind and understanding friend in HENRY DWORSHAK when problems relating to the preservation of our natural assets were before Congress. The mountains that he loved, the waterways that he explored, the parks and treelands that he helped save, will stand as his monument before God and man in the years ahead.

HENRY DWORSHAK and I served on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, where HENRY was always one of the most thorough and meticulous members. He firmly believed in trying to operate this Government within a balanced budget whenever possible. He disliked waste, overindulgence, carelessness, or squandering in the handling of public funds. He thought the Government had the right and duty to demand full return for money spent.

He made a full study of budget requests, even to the point of traveling abroad to see for himself whether there was a need for the money which was requested, or to determine whether the policies which were being followed were safeguarding the welfare of our Nation.

For HENRY DWORSHAK loved his country, and he loved serving that country. He believed in the freedom of man, the freedom of enterprise, the freedom of expression, and the freedom to grow. Like William Cowper, he believed that:

> Freedom has a thousand charms to show,
> that slaves, however contented, never know.

HENRY DWORSHAK opposed efforts to change the basic concepts of our Government, and he worked, to the last hours of his life, in an effort to keep this country strong and free.

A short time ago, I heard the "Freedom Pledge" of the American Heritage Foundation recited. As I listened to it, knowing that I would soon be speaking in eulogy of Senator HENRY DWORSHAK, I thought how well the following words bespoke his own philosophy:

> I am an American. A free American.
> Free to speak—without fear
> Free to worship God in my own way
> Free to stand for what I think right
> Free to oppose what I believe wrong
> Free to choose those who govern my country
> This heritage of freedom I pledge to uphold
> For myself and all mankind.

Those words could well have been written by Henry Dworshak himself, for they set out the things in which he deeply believed.

I want to offer the deepest expressions of sympathy of Mrs. Mundt and myself to Mrs. Dworshak and to her four fine sons. All of us who knew the late Senator from Idaho, remember him with affection. We shall cherish that memory, as we know his family will cherish it. They can be comforted in the knowledge that they have shared with those of us in this body—and with all the citizens of our Nation—the life and work of one of the finest and most noble men ever to come out of the West.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, one of my close friends, although we sat on opposite sides of the aisle, was Senator Henry Dworshak, of Idaho. For many years we worked together in efforts to improve and promote the natural resources of our country.

Senator Dworshak was particularly interested in the fish resources of the Pacific Northwest and worked effectively to the end that this great resource would be preserved. The construction of dams across the great rivers in that area affected the spawning grounds of a variety of fish and he was always on hand to offer suggestions as how best to protect them.

As I said, Senator Dworshak was always very sympathetic to resource development while sitting with me on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works. He was particularly active in promoting the Bruce's Eddy project on the banks of a fork of the Salmon River in his home State of Idaho. It will be recalled that some opposition to this project arose from the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

Senator Dworshak was one of the prime movers in suggesting and authoring proposing legislation to make possible extensive surveys and planning for this project. He wished to insure that it would not impair the salmon runs which are so important to that section of the country.

After his death last year I made strenuous efforts to have the Bruce's Eddy project named for my good friend, the former Senator from Idaho. I think it would have been a most fitting monument, and I still believe that it should bear his name.

In 1960, Senator Dworshak and I, as well as other members of the Subcommittee on Public Works, made a boat tour down the Mississippi to inspect the various installations and public works projects along the river. We started at Memphis and ended our trip in New Orleans for a 2 days' stay, where we attended meetings with representatives of the Lower Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association.

I believe that I knew Senator Dworshak as well as any other Member of the Senate, and counted him as among my closest friends. His and my interests were much the same, and they transcended the fact that we came from widely separated areas of the country. His loss was a great one not only to the State of Idaho, the Pacific Northwest, and the country as a whole, but to me, as well. I hope that I may continue to carry on this work in which he was so interested.

I extend to his wife and family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it is easy for me to understand why the people of Idaho chose Henry Dworshak to represent them, first in the House for 8 years, then in the Senate for 15. Henry was more than a representative; he was the living symbol and personification of the people of his State.

Idaho is a big State filled with small towns. Burley, on the eastern edge of the great irrigated middle empire, is such a small town. For 20 years before he came to Congress, Henry Dworshak was the editor and publisher of the Burley Bulletin. In that period, he became both the mirror of his community and the repository of its hopes, fears, and secrets. A man who lives with such a responsibility is either loved and trusted or hated and endured. That the people of Burley took Henry to their hearts when he came from far-off Minnesota as a young man, there is no doubt. That he was trusted, first in Burley, then in the State, and finally in the intermountain region, was demonstrated by the ever-widening circle in which he became the ambassador and voice of his hometown. First, he became Idaho's State commander of the American Legion, and then district governor of Rotary International for both Idaho and Utah.

I met him first while he held that high office in Rotary, and I was filling a lesser responsibility in the Salt Lake club. I was very much impressed by his down-to-earth effectiveness; and I was thrilled to meet him again when I came to Congress, where he had preceded me by a dozen years.

Before I came to Congress, I had been doing business in Idaho for nearly 30 years. Therefore, I feel that I know the people of Idaho, and therefore know why they sent Henry here in the first place. All of us who have worked with Henry know why they kept him here so long. Rural Idaho and Henry Dworshak were well matched in background, in philosophy, in character, and in devotion to our traditional principles of government.

There are so many forces that play on men in Congress that too frequently many of us give way and change, and not always for the better. In the important ability to mirror and represent his people, Henry did not change.

Life is not easy in a town like Burley. People have to work hard both for a living and for the thing we call success. Henry matched that characteristic here in the Senate. He never stopped working. He was always ready to do more than his share of the unglamorous, tiresome daily jobs that kept the stream of legislation moving. The people of Idaho are not the kind who look for easy answers to their problems. They hope to solve them by the wise application of trusted truth. In these, too, Henry was their counterpart. He built his congressional career on the same time-tested principles on which he ran his Burley newspaper—courage to live by the simple virtues, public and private, that cannot be faked in a small town where everyone knows everyone else, courage to speak the truth as he saw it, plus a wisdom which reflected a sound scale of human values.

Henry did not speak often on the Senate floor; but when he did, frequently it was with a rush of words like the breaking of a dam—words which released his pent-up anguish and impatience with ideas and programs that he thought unworthy of this great body. If he suspected that anything like that might be happening, he could be roused to strong denunciations, always followed by periods of deep self-criticism which reflected his natural self-effacing modesty; but never did he abandon his faith in the rightness of his position.

It was a sad day for the Senate when Henry's voice was stilled. It was also a sad day for all the people who live in little towns like Burley, Idaho, no matter in what State those towns may be located.

Today, there is a tide of power running against people from little towns and there is a strongly voiced demand for increased power for those who live in great metropolitan centers. We must not seek to satisfy this demand by silencing the spokesmen for scattered millions in the hinterlands. Both groups are Americans, and both must be well represented here. For all these reasons, the passing of a man such as Henry Dworshak is a tragic loss, not only to the people of Idaho and to his family, but also to the little people in the little towns everywhere in America. God grant that there will be others like him who will work and speak with courage, as he did within these hallowed halls.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words about Henry Dworshak, whom I regarded as one of the finest men ever to serve in the Senate during the few years I was privileged to serve with him.

I met him in the organization known as Rotary International, long before either of us thought of coming to Washington, D.C. He loved the ideals of Rotary, and found it a body of expression for both his own life and his actions.

I came to the House of Representatives in 1941, and found Henry already there. He was helpful to me as a newcomer in the House of Representatives, and was kind and courteous at all times. We had many problems on which we worked together; and I found him then—as I always did—courteous, decent, and helpful.

Subsequently, we served on the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. His attitude toward the expenditure of public funds is well known to Senators. He had strong convictions on the need to be careful with the budget of the United States and the expenditures of this country. I always found him a very fine person with whom I could deal.

Later, we both came to the U.S. Senate; and here he was assigned to the Interior Committee, on which I have served during all the years I have been here. Toward the end, he became the ranking Republican member of that committee. Then I had a new test to apply to the things he did. There were daily conferences to be held and joint actions to be taken. I found how fair and how undemanding a person he could be.

Subsequently, he was appointed to a committee on which I served for a good many years—the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. One of the members of the committee said:

> You are going to have some tough times, because Henry will oppose all the programs which you may want to sponsor.

We took particular pains to make sure that the able Senator from Idaho was made familiar with all the projects, particularly the ones to which he might have had objection. It was interesting to me to watch the expression of his views. Every day that he was on the Joint Committee and was called upon to cast votes, I think that in voting on the majority of the proposals which came before that committee he acted with probably better tolerance than did most of the rest of us who served on the committee. I was proud to be associated with him in that endeavor.

Mr. President, I can testify to the fact that there was no proposal brought before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy which involved the security of the United States and its welfare in the family of nations on which Henry Dworshak did not vote as a true patriot with the finest interests of the country at heart.

Therefore, Mr. President, Mrs. Anderson and I extend to Mrs. Dworshak our sympathy and our love, as we praise the character of Senator Dworshak, who exemplified the fine traits that a Member of the U.S. Senate should have.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying brief tribute to the memory of Henry Dworshak. I was a Member of the House of Representatives when Henry entered the House. I came to know him early. I came to know him as a courageous man of deep convictions, and one who could always be depended upon to stand by his convictions.

Later I came to the Senate, and not too long thereafter Henry also came to the Senate. In the Senate Henry displayed the same strength of conviction and character.

He served his constituency well. It was a sad day when his voice was stilled in behalf of his constituency and the principles for which he stood.

Mrs. Sparkman and I extend our sympathy to Mrs. Dworshak and members of the family.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, one of the best opportunities to judge the worth of a fellow Senator is to serve with him on committee assignments—especially on those assignments where issues are of a highly controversial nature. It is during this time that judicious decisions, even temperment, and balanced judgment are needed and appreciated.

I had the privilege of serving with the late Senator from Idaho, Henry Dworshak, on two different Senate committees. We served together on the Government Operations Committee from 1951 through 1954. Also, as Senators will remember, we both served on the committee that conducted the famous Army-McCarthy hearings in 1954. His calmness during stormy sessions and his ability to sift the kernel of fact out a barrage of charges and countercharges were valued assets to the committee.

He was always a hard-working Member. He was prompt and thorough. He had a keen insight into legislation and rendered his decisions after careful and thoughtful study and preparation.

During the time he served on the Government Operations Committee, we had a number of historic hearings, at which difficult decisions were hammered out. Henry Dworshak never shirked his responsibilities. He served with a quiet determination in an effort to arrive at the truth.

We also served together on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. Here he exercised caution and care, and showed concern for the welfare of the taxpayer. He was interested in maintaining fiscal responsibility in this Government. He was careful and precise in his inquiries in an effort to make sure that for every dollar spent, the Government got a dollar's worth of services or goods in return.

One of the last great labors in which the late Senator from Idaho and I were jointly engaged was a special study trip through Latin America in late 1961. We served on the State, Justice, and Judiciary Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. I had the honor to serve as chairman of our group, which consisted of the majority leader, Hon. Mike Mansfield, and Senators Margaret Chase Smith, Alan Bible, Roman Hruska, and Henry Dworshak. We traveled through 7 Latin American countries, covering 14,000 miles during the 19 days we were on the trip, examining our foreign aid programs, the Alliance for Progress and other international programs. Every day we worked long hours in our search for information.

I believe that the report which we made to the Congress, following our investigations and research, has been valuable as a guide to our oversea operations in the Latin American countries. Our committee tried to do a good and careful job. We worked as a team—a bipartisan team—and Henry Dworshak, in the tradition and pattern he followed during his long years of service, undertook his share of the assignment, always contributing a positive and practical viewpoint on the problems we had before us.

He was an honest man—straightforward in his dealings with others. He knew no other way to operate in the Senate than in a down-to-earth, practical manner.

He served with a conscience. He did not shirk his assignments. He believed, with Thomas Paine, that:

> Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom, must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it.

He always dealt with issues and did not engage in personalities. In debate he fought hard for the things in which he believed—and whether he lost, or whether he won, he was gracious and kindly to his opponents.

Henry Dworshak has left this body, but the imprint of his character will remain and the impact of his work will be felt for long years ahead.

Mrs. McClellan and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Dworshak and members of the family.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senate lost a valuable Member with the death of Henry Dworshak. The Appropriations Committee particularly will miss him, for he was a vigorous advocate of economy. He attacked waste and misuse of funds at every opportunity, and was a strong opponent of back-door spending that would bypass the normal appropriations procedure.

Senator Dworshak labored unremittingly for a balanced budget and for the curtailment of swollen bureaucratic payrolls. He was a hard and earnest worker and a man of sterling character.

He was a newspaperman of distinction and ability, leaving this work in his youth to volunteer for service in World War I, and returning to the newspaper business after the war as editor and publisher of the Burley, Idaho, Bulletin. which he continued to operate until 1944.

Henry Dworshak's first congressional service was in the House of Representatives, which he entered in 1938. He then came to the Senate in 1946 and, with a brief interruption in service, remained here until his death.

All of us will miss Henry Dworshak, a distinguished conservative and an admirable gentleman.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the longer one is a Member of this body the more he becomes aware of the bond of fraternalism which exists in an area that could, because of its very makeup, be a setting for dissension and acrimony. The pervasive warmth of that bond is always present, yet it becomes even more pronounced during those times of tragedy when death removes a colleague from our ranks.

Henry Dworshak, of Idaho, one of the three great Senators who have passed to their reward recently, and whom today we eulogize, was a stalwart defender of the highest traditions of this great body. Significantly, he, as did the other Senators whom we shall eulogize, had a humble beginning. He plodded industriously to scale the ladder of success, and if there is any validity to the term "a self-made man," the appellation would fit him whose memory we honor today.

Henry Dworshak was a journeyman printer as a young man and rose to become editor of one of Idaho's prominent weeklies. He served in the House of

Representatives prior to entering the U.S. Senate in 1947. It was my pleasure to serve with Senator DWORSHAK on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and we shared many interests common to Senators from the western region of the United States. HENRY DWORSHAK was a hard-working legislator, ever mindful of his responsibilities to the people of Idaho yet equally cognizant of his responsibilities to the Nation as a whole. He was a fine Senator in the fullest sense of the word.

In conclusion, I point out that the Senate has benefited immeasurably from the presence in this Chamber of Senator HENRY DWORSHAK. He has left the mortal scene, yet he has left an imprint on this body which will not be eroded with the passage of time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, HENRY DWORSHAK was a real, true conservative in the finest meaning of that word. I had the pleasure of serving with him on various committees, but especially on the Appropriations Committee and on several subcommittees of that committee. I found him always interested in economy, always willing to express his views on how we could save money here, there, and elsewhere. Many times he had to regret the fact that others would not go along with him in saving money where he wanted to save it, but I found him to be perfectly willing to look forward and take a position for new expenditures which were manifestly needed as our country and its people progressed.

I respected him very greatly indeed. In the work for veterans, on the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, I found him always taking particular interest in their welfare.

In talking with him at one time, I think he told me he had been commander of the American Legion for his fine State, the State of Idaho. At any rate, he showed great concern and interest in the welfare of veterans who needed help from their country and for their dependents.

There is not much I can add to the many tributes that have been properly paid to this fine American. I merely wanted the RECORD to show that I regarded him as one of our finest Americans, a patriot in the fullest tradition of that word, and that we shall ever miss him.

We in Florida were happy that Senator DWORSHAK and Mrs. Dworshak found occasion to come to our State for such infrequent vacations as the work of the Senate would permit. We found him always popular in the areas where he stayed; he always had kindly words about the people he met there. I want to assure Mrs. Dworshak and the children that no one who has gone to our State from the Senate was more genuinely admired than was HENRY DWORSHAK.

Mrs. Holland wishes to join me in offering at this time this meed of our sympathy, respect, and affection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in 1947, when I came to the Senate for a 2-year term, I met the Senator from Idaho, HENRY DWORSHAK. He also came to the Senate that year for his first term. Throughout the years as we served together, I came to know him better and better. I agree with those who have spoken today, that he had strength of character, courage, and convictions.

Even in disagreement, as occurs often in this body, we knew his great sense of humor and his tolerance.

I considered him a friend. His death was a loss to this body, to his State, and to our Nation. I, too, join in expressing to Mrs. Dworshak and to his family the sympathy which I know all of us feel.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it was my pleasure to serve in the U.S. Senate with the late Senator HENRY DWORSHAK, of Idaho. I served with him on two committees, the Appropriations and Interior and Insular Affairs Committees. There, in the close contact of legislative examination and discussion, I had the opportunity to observe the day-to-day actions and interest of this notable Republican. His hard work, his unerring frankness, his keen concern for legislative integrity as he saw it, all provide a warm background for our personal remembrances of the late Senator from Idaho, for, in agreement or in disagreement, HENRY DWORSHAK wanted to keep his friends.

During his more than 20 years of service to Idaho and America, he labored for fiscal and administrative integrity in the Federal Government's complex operations. This belief that Government should serve the individual, and not itself, was best illustrated by his untiring efforts on the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

HENRY DWORSHAK's legislative endeavors were also marked by his special and unique competence and interest in natural resources, especially in mining and in the public lands of the West.

I was fortunate to have served on the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs while my esteemed colleague was the ranking minority member of that committee. I think he would consider his successful efforts in that committee to realize the construction of the Palisades Dam on the South Fork of the Snake River in Idaho as perhaps his greatest personal triumph for the people of his State. I am glad to recall that I supported him in that endeavor.

For a word I wish to touch on Senator DWORSHAK's other dedicated service as spokesman for the people of Idaho. He worked to establish the Arco Atomic Reactor Testing Plant, which stands in vivid contrast to the mines and lumbering industry in Idaho, and will open up a new era of techonology for the State. As a former newspaperman and editor, Senator DWORSHAK was responsive to the requests and problems of his constituents. Yet he maintained a constant and vigilant interest in national and international affairs.

His courage was unique, and it typified the rugged character of Western America. His distinguished appearance matched that of the rugged mountains of his native Idaho. He looked like a Senator, and a Senator he was.

Mr. President, I join my colleagues in expressing my very real sorrow in the passing of the late HENRY DWORSHAK, a Senator from Idaho. Yet I am sure we know that the warmth of the Senate's affection here in Washington for our late colleague and our respect and esteem for him will never equal the esteem, and now the regret in his untimely passing, felt by the people of the State which he served so long and with such never-ending devotion.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, it was my good fortune during most of my years of service in the Senate to serve on a committee with the late Senator DWORSHAK. No man was ever held in higher esteem than he was, or was more respected; or whose opinion was valued more than his. We liked him for his good, strong, rugged, honest qualities, which were always in evidence without any pretense whatsoever. He was fair and conscientious in his consideration of public matters.

I know that on the Appropriations Committee very frequently we would say, "Well, let us see what HENRY has to say." We always knew that he was a student of the problems of that committee, always honest and sincere, and nonpolitical in his thinking and in his presentation of matters under our consideration. He was an unusually valuable member of that committee, whose work is never completed and is ever increasing.

I saw in him not only the qualities of a man that one would want for a friend—and I am honored to have been his friend—but also the qualities that one wants to see in anyone who can be considered a real American, with all the qualities of patriotism, not for show, but from a sense of sincerity, the qualities one looks for in a good neighbor, the qualities one would look for in a man who was a true servant of the people.

I believe he set as high an all around standard for these fine qualities as anyone I have ever know in public life.

I know that on our committee there was and still is a very strong feeling that we miss him, and miss his work. At the same time we feel that his contribution to our country does continue to live. In that way he is still with us and will continue to be with us and with this Nation for many decades, and we will continue to feel the strength of his character and the contributions he made to the Nation in both public and private life.

Mrs. Stennis and I have been close neighbors of Senator DWORSHAK and Mrs. Dworshak. Mrs. Stennis joins me in the expression of these sentiments of friendship and feelings of great respect and esteem for him and his memory, and for Mrs. Dworshak and their fine family.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I feel a special loss in the passing of Senator DWORSHAK because of my long and pleasant association with him in the Congress.

We served together in the House of Representatives before coming to this body. In the Senate, we worked together on the Committee on Appropriations. He was always courteous and thoughtful toward me and other members of the committee, regardless of party. Moreover, he always did his homework and

did it well; he was one of the best informed members on whatever subject might be before the committee.

Some years ago I had the privilege of visiting Moscow with him. I found him to be a delightful traveling companion.

The Nation has lost a dedicated public servant who will be missed by many.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to have served with HENRY C. DWORSHAK in both House and Senate for a great many years was a rewarding experience.

As soldiers in World War I we had the kinship and the fellowship which comes from wearing the uniform in the same war.

As a newsman, editor, and a publisher, HENRY DWORSHAK had a sharp capacity for accurately appraising men and events.

His leadership in Rotary International and his election as the State commander of the American Legion for the Department of Idaho both proclaim a deep gregarious instinct which was the basis for his love for people.

His long years in the great open West gave him that expansive spirit which actually reflected the great outdoors.

All this compounded in him a deep conviction and a sense of fidelity to his country which expressed itself in the deep earnest, thundrous speeches which were like the rolling thunder coming down from the sacred mountain top. It was the voice of the patriot speaking from the depth of his soul for a land he truly loved.

But in him also was a rare gentility and a sense of humor which was as refreshing as a morning breeze perfumed by the thousand-year-old cedars of his State. To see his huge frame roll with appreciative laughter on hearing the recital of a whimsical anecdote or a humorous incident was truly an energizing tonic to a tired spirit.

For more than a score of years he served the Republic in House and Senate with vigor, with diligence and ability. And truly it could be spoken of him as was spoken in an ancient day:

> Thou good and faithful servant, enter unto the joy of thy Lord.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, back when I was a daily nationally syndicated columnist I expressed myself in print in newspapers throughout the Nation about Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK. On July 10, 1953, my column was devoted completely to my appraisal and opinion of him.

I am thankful that I publicly acclaimed my respect and admiration for him while he was alive. Ten years later and after he has passed away, I wish to repeat those words that I wrote by reading that column today—or in the 10 years that followed that column my admiration and respect for him grew even greater and deeper.

DWORSHAK OF IDAHO A HARD-WORKING SENATOR

(By Senator MARGARET C. SMITH)

WASHINGTON.—Right across the hall from my office in the Senate Office Building is the office of one of the hardest working and most conscientious Members of the U.S. Senate—Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK, of Idaho. I have worked with him more than most Members of the Senate, as we are members of the same committees. We are both on the Appropriations Committee and the Government Operations Committee. My third committee is the Armed Services Committee, while his third is the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. He is also a member of the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee of which I am chairman.

Several times I have met the Senator in the hall in the evening as we both left our offices after working much later than those in most of the other offices. If we run into each other leaving for the day as early as 7 or 8 o'clock in the evening, we joke good-natured sarcasm and ask each other if we are working half days.

DEVOTED TO DUTY

I don't believe that there is any Senator more devoted to the duty of his committee work than Senator DWORSHAK. He always faithfully attends the meeting of my Reorganization Subcommittee and does a very effective job. But he is that way about all of the committees and subcommittees on which he serves. Indicative of the seriousness with which he takes his committee and subcommittee work is the fact that one month he attended more than 60 committee and subcommittee hearings and meetings.

We have more than just our committee and subcommittee work in common. Both of us have consistently been rated as economy champions in the Senate—both of us have been in the newspaper business—both of us have been members of the military forces—both of us started our service in Congress in the House of Representatives in the 76th Congress. Senator DWORSHAK has been elected to the Senate twice and appointed to the Senate once. We both come up for reelection to the Senate next year.

He takes his duty of attendance at Senate sessions just as seriously as the committee work. The record proves this conclusively, as it shows that during the 82nd Congress he has the best record of the Senators for attendance at roll call votes. The then Senate majority leader praised his attendance record by observing that the Senate would complete its work and adjourn much sooner if all Senators were as cooperative and faithful as Mr. DWORSHAK.

ON POLICY GROUP

There is another Senate Committee of which he and I are both members. It is the Republican Policy Committee which sets the Republican policy in the Senate. It is headed by able Senator William Knowland of California, who succeeded Senator Robert Taft in the post of chairman. If the people of Idaho could attend the meetings of this committee, they would surely swell with pride at the forceful and intelligent contribution that Senator DWORSHAK makes to the work of this all-important Republican committee in the Senate.

All in all, there is no harder or more conscientious Senator than HENRY DWORSHAK. Whatever the Senate accomplishes, it is because of faithful public servants like him who refuse to work by the clock. Their only interest is in making this a better country for all of us.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, it is difficult to believe that 7 months have passed since these Senate halls saw the happy hurrying of HENRY DWORSHAK. His pleasant smile seemed always a headlight of friendliness as his mighty figure moved about at a pace which seemed to find the day all too short—and finally found life all too brief.

HENRY DWORSHAK was termed a conservative. His Idaho neighbors endorsed his spirit of caution and his colleagues of our Senate Appropriations Committee respected his sincerity. He stood his ground—and lost no friends.

Newsman, journalist, editor and publisher, soldier, and statesman, his life was one of discipline and dedication. Through the dragging days of last July no Senator was more faithful in attendance than he. Within the week of his passing, here on the floor of the Senate by his presence and his words, he declared his readiness at any sacrifice and at any hour to stay here to consummate the Senate's business.

Here in the morning hour of the very day of his passing, his response to a live quorum call was further proof of his constancy.

Those were days that continue to take their toll of our membership.

Because HENRY DWORSHAK's life was that of a man who hearkened to their meaning, I would like to borrow some phrases from our Chaplain's prayer of that Monday, July 23, 1962.

> We live too much in the shallowness and shabbiness about us and in the rush and clash of busy hours, too often we forget the heavenly vision that lifts our eyes to far horizons.
>
> Whatever this new day may hold for us as it commandeers our strength of mind and body and heart, send us forth girded by Thy might, until by patience, persistence, and enduring courage we become sufficient for the tasks we must accomplish.

Beside the life of HENRY DWORSHAK his Creator has written "Task accomplished."

And we add our prayer: "May he rest in peace."

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the passing of our late and beloved colleague, Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK, is a grievous loss. HENRY was one of the few Senators left of the old truly conservative school of thought. He believed in this with all his heart and he practiced daily what he preached. He was an honorable, dedicated, and valuable public servant.

I came to know HENRY DWORSHAK very well through our many years of service together on the Senate Appropriations Committee. The more you knew of HENRY DWORSHAK, the more you admired and respected him. He had a deep sense of loyalty and dedication to our system of Government and all it stood for.

HENRY was a tremendously hard worker. He went about his duties in such a serious way that he sometimes appeared to be stern and harsh. Actually, at heart HENRY DWORSHAK was a very kind and friendly person. He would not have intentionally harmed anyone if he could help it. He was a rugged individualist so typical of the great statesmen of old who made possible this great Nation.

HENRY DWORSHAK served the Nation well in many capacities from the battlefields of World War I to State commander of the American Legion, as a Member of the House of Representatives and as a Member of the U.S. Senate. He left his mark on much of the better legislation that was enacted during his service in the Congress of the United States. He was a highly respected

Member of the Senate and a friend I will long remember.

In attending his funeral services at Arlington Cemetery, I could not help thinking how fitting it was that a man of his dedication to our Nation and its ideals should have a final resting place in this beautiful cemetery dedicated to our great heroes and the preservation of our country.

May I extend to Mrs. Dworshak and all the family my most sincere sympathy.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, in honoring the lamented Senator from Idaho today, I join in paying tribute to a colleague, but also to a Senator from a neighboring State who was my friend. We did not always agree, but there was never any doubt where Senator Dworshak stood on issues before the country. There was never any question as to his integrity and his devotion to America. He was the ranking minority member on the Interior Committee where we served together. He was faithful in attendance and was forthright in his defense of our western resources and contribution to development of our neighboring States.

His record as a distinguished and valued citizen of Idaho and his devoted service in both Houses of the Congress of the United States leaves a void that will take long to fill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I considered Henry Dworshak a warm friend. Above all, I knew him as an untiring and selfless worker in the cause of his honest and strong convictions on what would serve best our Nation. It was always a fine sight to see Henry rise from his seat to take up the cudgels for a cause. When he was through, no Senator and no spectator could ever doubt where Henry Dworshak stood and what he believed. While we could hardly have disagreed more on a number of issues, I cannot imagine having disagreed with a nicer or finer person.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the Nation lost a fine public servant with the passing of our late distinguihsed colleague, Senator Henry Dworshak, of Idaho. Outstanding among his excellent qualities were his sincerity, his integrity, his dedication to hard work, and his capacity for far-ranging friendship.

I had the pleasure of serving with Henry Dworshak, first in the House of Representatives, and then in the Senate. He preceded me by 4 years in the House. When I was elected to my first term in the House—that was to the 78th Congress—I soon became closely acquainted with Henry Dworshak, and he was of immeasurable help to me in my freshman days. He was always thorough in his work, and one could accept his advice as one would accept the advice of an acknowledged expert in the field. We served together during the 78th and 79th Congresses, before he left to take his seat in the Senate.

Again, in entering the Senate, I followed Henry Dworshak by about 4 years. We served together in the Senate through numerous Congresses—from January 1953 until his death in the fall of 1962. The years of association were rich for me. It was my pleasure to cosponsor numerous bills with Senator Dworshak. On most matters we saw eye to eye.

Henry Dworshak's service in the Senate was marked by his particular interest in the field of natural resources. As the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, he was an authority on matters of water, land, mineral, and forest resources. I was especially impressed by Henry Dworshak's consistent advocacy of close cooperation between the States and the Federal Government in planning and developing needed projects.

Henry Dworshak's capacity to make friends resulted from his warm personality, his humility, and his sincere interest in the problems of others. He was loved and respected by all—regardless of political affiliation. Everyone knew Henry Dworshak as a fair and honorable gentleman in all his dealings.

Henry Dworshak's passing was a personal loss to me. It was a loss to this body, to his State, and to his Nation which he so dearly loved.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Henry Dworshak and I served together on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate for over 10 years. We sat beside each other. We became friends and discussed committee problems together. I found him to be frank and outspoken, with a sound, practical knowledge of the questions that face us in our Government. He was not partisan in his point of view. He was objective and made his judgments realistically in the way he felt to be most helpful to his country and to the section of the country which was involved. He was absolutely sincere in doing what he considered to be the right thing under the circumstances. He fought hard in behalf of the interests of his State of Idaho. There was his home. There he raised his family, and there were his friends.

He always expressed his beliefs vigorously and sometimes with a feeling of exasperation, but that was his way. With all his forcefulness of expression, he was considerate of the feelings of others. He was good natured, thoughtful, friendly, and always fair. He was conscientious in his attendance at hearings of the Appropriations Committee and his questions were always pertinent. Altogether he had a firm philosophy of government and he fought vigorously to uphold it.

After the war, Senator Dworshak and I were among those on the Appropriations Committee who went to Europe to study the conditions there as they involved our aid to those countries in a military and economic way. He was opposed to spending the taxpayers' money in ways that he believed were not in the best interests of our Nation's security. He believed that our resources should be spent as far as possible in building up our own country, though he realized the necessity of cooperating in rebuilding the free nations of the world which had suffered from the calamities of war and revolution.

Henry Dworshak and his good wife were friends of Mrs. Saltonstall and myself. We enjoyed their company on many occasions and always knew we would be received in a friendly, sociable way that made for greater happiness and greater comradeship in the busy life that surrounds us here in Washington. He was proud of his family and of the life and activities of his sons in the war and after.

Henry Dworshak was a good citizen in war and in peace and a patriotic public official in the fullest sense of the word. I miss him as a colleague who sat close by me on the Senate floor. I miss him as a fellow member of the Appropriations Committee whose judgment I respected. I miss him as a friend.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on this day we engaged in one of the saddest rites which our body enacts. The U.S. Senate has set aside this day for those of us who wish to speak to the memory of our late brother in this body, Henry C. Dworshak.

In this day when cynicism too often surrounds the individuals who see public service as one of the highest forms of service to mankind, the life of Henry Dworshak was a challenge to all of us. He was completely aware during the last few years of his life that he had certain physical disabilities wihch should have been cared for, and which indicated the need for a slowing down of the personal load which he carried as ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and as a member of the Appropriations Committee. Notwithstanding this, he continued to give the same zeal, devotion, and attention to his work, which he had done as a younger man, when he would not have been limited by the physical disabilities which took him later. His work and his devotion to public service were a direct, contributing factor to his decease. All men should know that here was in fact a man who was a public servant to his own detriment and to the great loss of his own family.

In a more personal vein, Henry Dworshak was probably the closest friend I have ever had in the U.S. Senate. No death could have shocked me more, nor left a greater void in my daily responsibilities here. I found that when Henry opened up his great heart to you, his friendship was as wide and encompassing as anyone could ever wish or ask. It was a gift he bestowed—and we the recipients appreciated it.

Both Mrs. Allott and I want to extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Dworshak and their four sons and hope that his contributions to our country and the warmth of his friendships in the Senate will help to diminish by some small amount the loss of this wonderful person.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it was my privilege to serve 8 years in the House of Representatives and 12 years in the U.S. Senate with Henry Dworshak.

During these many years we were closely associated in sponsoring and working for legislation in the interest of the people of the West and the Midwest. We became close personal friends.

Henry Dworshak was truly a rugged individualist, a conservative and a man

with great character. Once his mind was made up on an issue or a piece of legislation, you never need question where he stood.

He was a kindly man and I know personally of many instances of his generosity to individuals and to institutions. He was a man of courage that typifies the great West. All of these qualities are needed in the U.S. Senate and we miss him greatly.

Mrs. Carlson and I extend to Mrs. Dworshak and the family our sincerest and deepest sympathy.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, all of us are saddened by the passing of a respected and capable gentleman whose service to the State of Idaho was long and faithful. Henry C. Dworshak was a diligent and forthright addition to this body whose dedication to the public interest brought credit to himself and to his native State.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, it was my privilege to serve with Henry Dworshak in the 76th through 79th Congresses. Later, from 1960 until his death, we were colleagues in the U.S. Senate.

Though we were occasionally alined on opposite sides of issues brought before this group, the late Senator from Idaho was at all times straightforward and reasonable in debate and willingly gave careful attention to the views of those who differed with him.

Senator Dworshak was an influential and highly respected member of the minority as his responsible committee assignments will attest. We shall miss his robust and hearty personality as well as his steadfast efforts in projects designed to benefit citizens of Idaho and of the United States.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I knew Henry Dworshak as colleague and friend, both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. His service and devotion to his home State of Idaho, and to the Nation as a whole, place him firmly and well in history, and in the hearts of those who knew and worked with him. His conception of his role as a U.S. Senator was in the very finest tradition, and he filled that role with unique distinction. Neither political partisanship nor possibiilty of personal gain swayed him from the path of principle as he saw it. And though his efforts and action certainly bore the mark of a statesman, I believe that he himself would wish to be remembered as a U.S. Senator who represented his people well.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I was not privileged to know the late Senator Dworshak as a close colleague. We did not serve on any committees together and our legislative interests were not similar.

During my years in the Senate, however, I had an opportunity to observe his hard work and firm commitment to those causes in which he believed so deeply. I pay tribute, today, to his memory and to his record as a Senator who stood up for his point of view without flinching and without fear of opposition.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today we pause to pay a heartfelt and richly merited tribute of remembrance to our departed friend and colleague, the distinguished and able son and servant of the great State of Idaho, Henry Dworshak. Since his election to this body in 1946, Henry Dworshak contributed the full measure of his outstanding gifts to the advancement of his State and Nation toward an ever richer fulfillment of freedom and security. He was a man who gave stature and dignity to every office he held during his long an eminent career. We who were privileged to call him friend, and to work at his side, were ever impressed by the integrity of character and the depth of understanding he brought to the duties and responsibilities entrusted to him. Even those who might find themselves in disagreement with him could not but admire the sincerity of his convictions and the vigor with which he expressed and defended them. As we deeply valued Henry Dworshak as a friend, so, too, we esteemed him as a man who lent distinction to this body in which we proudly serve.

His beloved State mourns a son. His Nation salutes him for his contribution to the better, fuller national life toward which he worked so zealously. His friends turn to his family in this sorrowful hour and share with them the grief of a loss so deeply, so personally felt by each of us privileged to know the warmth of Henry Dworshak's friendship.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, today we honor the memory of the late Henry C. Dworshak and express our profound appreciation for the opportunity to be associated with him.

Senator Dworshak was an unusual man. Trained in the newspaper craft, he was not content merely to observe events and to write about them. He insisted on doing something about them. That is why he left his desk as editor and publisher of the Burley Bulletin to run for the House of Representatives in 1938.

His service in the House and later here in the Senate were marked by the newsman's inquisitiveness. He seldom accepted statements at their face value. He wanted to know who, what, where, why, and how much.

I will long be in Henry Dworshak's debt for his kindly advice and assistance to me on the Appropriations Committee. His thorough knowledge and general competence in this field were of great help on many occasions.

It was my pleasure to visit several Latin American countries in 1961 in company with Senator Dworshak. I was particularly impressed with his intimate knowledge of the mining operations we observed in some of the countries we visited and with Senator Dworshak's keen awareness of his responsibility to the mining industries of the section he represented in the Senate.

Senator Dworshak served Idaho and the Nation with a devotion and purpose which all of us might well seek to emulate. And yet despite his strongly held convictions and his fierce fights for that in which he believed, he never lost the essential quality of dignity which he wore like a bright jewel.

We shall miss Senator Dworshak. Too few of his kind of men are in the public service.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, Henry Dworshak was my good friend. He was, in a real sense, an ideal against which one could not hesitate to measure his own worth.

Politically, he was a conservative. And, because he had espoused the cause of conservatism, adherents to that philosophy increased in number and respect for it was increased among those who take issue with it.

Others of my colleagues in this eulogy to Henry Dworshak will mention specific accomplishments of his career. They are many, they are important and they shall endure. But, from the time of our first acquaintance, I was struck most forcefully by his personification of those qualities possessed by great and good men.

Physically, Henry Dworshak was a big man. Looking at him, one was immediately reminded of the grandeur of the mountains which surround his home in Idaho. To know this man, was to recall the gentleness of the beautiful valleys among those mountains—equally an important part of that magnificent sector of this great country.

This combination of great mountains and beautiful valleys is the West. So, also, this combination of physical strength and gentle nature merge to form magnificent men.

But, there were yet other fine qualities which Henry Dworshak possessed in great measure. He, as much as any man I ever knew represented a personal geography of the State he so ably represented:

He possessed the freshness of pure mountain air.

His was the swift pace of a cold, clear mountain stream.

His humor was a chipmunk on the lofty crags and buttercups in a high meadow.

Ardor for his causes, tempered by good judgment, was as the evergreen relieved by warm golden aspen at late fall in the high Rockies.

One can stand alone in the silence of high mountains, gentle valleys, vibrant wildlife, and become irresistibly an humble man.

Henry Dworshak was all of that, too.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, Henry Dworshak will always live in our memories as one of the stalwarts of the U.S. Senate. His rugged features, his square jaw, his snow-white hair, his broad shoulders, and massive stature marked him as a man of iron will. I always had the feeling that the pioneers who conquered the West must have resembled him in appearance.

In the case of Henry Dworshak, these physical characteristics were not deceptive for he was endowed with a moral courage and an unflinching devotion to his ideals that won and held the respect of all who knew him. He was a man who took with deep seriousness the responsibilities of his high office. He loved his country with a passion and feared for its welfare with an anxiety that left its marks upon him and shortened his years.

He believed in what he believed with all his heart and he fought for it with all his might.

No more dedicated man ever served in the U.S. Senate.

We sorrow with his loved ones in his passing, but we share with them the solace that he was one of that band of noblemen who have given of themselves unstintingly and have truly passed to their reward.

> Why pity them? Full well they lived
> Their God-appointed plan, died joyously,
> And left a golden memory! Pray who
> Could ask a fairer rate for them, or me.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, we who knew our able and esteemed colleague from Idaho, HENRY DWORSHAK, regarded him with utmost respect and warmest affection. The shock of his sudden and untimely passing last year saddens us still. It was all the more sorrowful because his robust appearance and his vigorous manner gave outward promise of far longer tenure on this mortal planet. A mighty oak had fallen, leaving a gaping void in the tall timber.

When I first met HENRY DWORSHAK less than 3 years ago, I was impressed by his physical stature, his magnificent white hair and his handsome visage. To me, he looked every inch a Senator.

As I subsequently learned through working with him on the Senate Interior Committee and in the Senate Chamber, he was every inch a Senator.

Able, hard working, diligent, dedicated, sincere, straightforward, HENRY DWORSHAK brought honor to this body, honor to his State, and honor to his country.

His rugged appearance and sturdy independence were characteristic of the pioneer people who settled in the West from whence he came. And so, it is easy to understand that, in any struggle for what he believed right, he was a man of dogged determination and unswerving tenacity. An exponent of conservative thinking, he had a prudent man's high regard for fiscal soundness in government, a reasonable man's zeal for steady progress, and a conservative man's faith in the people to govern themselves in States and local areas and a corresponding horror of overcentralized Government in Washington.

We often drove together to our Washington homes at the close of a long day in the Senate, and in our conversations I soon discovered his booming voice belied his warm and compassionate spirit and his kindly and considerate manner.

I am sure I echo the sentiments of every Member of the Senate and of the many employees of the Senate when I say we miss him sorely.

At this sad time, there are no words adequate to assuage his dear one's sense of loss. But I do hope they may derive some measure of comfort to know that we honor and esteem in the highest his memory.

My wife Ellyn and I convey our deepest sympathy to his wife and family in their bereavement.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the late Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK first applied his voice to the problems of his State and Nation through the pages of his newspaper, the Burley Bulletin. In 1944 he came to Congress where he served ably until his death.

Senator DWORSHAK and I frequently disagreed on the issues debated in this body, but I could not disagree with the devotion he displayed to duty and country. He put his very real talents to the job of representing his State and serving his country as he thought the job should be done, with all the energy at his command.

Mr. President, it is indeed a sad fact of life that the laws of God and nature make these eulogies necessary. But I am proud to have had the privilege of serving with the three Senators we honor today and I am confident that their record in the eyes of historians of the future shall reflect the utmost honor and credit upon the United States of America and the U.S. Senate.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Idaho, HENRY DWORSHAK, is no longer with us. He was a beloved and respected Member of our body. His loss will be felt by his friends in the Senate for a long time to come.

Senator DWORSHAK was a Member of the Senate for many years, having come first to this body in 1946. Over the years his interest, his knowledge of the problems of the development and conservation of our natural resources came to be known and respected by all. As ranking minority member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the Senator made a substantial contribution to the cause of intelligent use of the resources of our Nation.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, with the passing last year of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, Mr. DWORSHAK, the people of the State of Idaho lost the services of a courageous, capable, sound, and devoted public servant. Senator DWORSHAK was a man who possessed all the basic qualities which are so vital in winning and holding the respect and confidence of his fellow man. He was a man of great intellect, wisdom, judgment, industry, integrity, sincerity, and courage. Because of these qualities, the people of Idaho elected him to the House of Representatives four times and also to a seat in the U.S. Senate on four occasions.

Of all the qualities I have mentioned in describing our deceased colleague, there is one upon which we must place a premium in our country today, especially for public servants. That quality is courage. Winston Churchill has well said that "courage is rightly esteemed the first of all human qualities, because it is the quality which guarantees all others."

HENRY DWORSHAK demonstrated this priceless quality on many occasions in performing his duties as a Congressman and Senator. He had the courage to oppose the demands of special interest groups, when their demands were not in the public interest or in the best interest of the preservation of freedom—which to me runs parallel to the public interest. He fought to correct the corrupt practices of big union bosses in the interest of the working people, realizing the power of the union bosses to work their will in election contests. He fought to preserve freedom when conformity appeared to be the order of the day. He promoted programs and ideas to help our farmers be more competitive and prosperous, but jealously guarded their freedoms in doing so. He stood up for the Constitution and the rights of the States as against usurpation of power and the centralization of government in Washington. He spoke up against deficit financing and in his voting record he hewed to the line in favoring fiscal sanity and a balanced budget.

HENRY DWORSHAK defended our great free enterprise system against the rising tide of socialism, and he supported bold, firm foreign policy proposals designed to win the cold war which the forces of world communism have forced on us. And, he advocated a program of national defense which would insure a supremacy of military power and full readiness to cope with the aggressive intentions of any enemy power.

I count it a high privilege to have been able to serve in this great body with the distinguished Senator from Idaho, and I join my colleagues in extending my deepest sympathy to the people of Idaho and the members of the Dworshak family in the incalculable loss they have incurred by his passing.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the West lost a good friend in the sudden passing last summer of HENRY DWORSHAK. I served with him for 3½ years on the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and I found him at all times thoroughly dedicated to the development of the West and its natural resources in the way he felt was in the best interests of the people.

We did not always agree what was in the best interests—we had many lively discussions on the merits of various proposals and measure—but I never doubted that Senator DWORSHAK always acted with honest conviction, and with unquestionable integrity. He was industrious, high principled, and eminently fair.

His length of service in the Congress—from 1939, when he first came to the House—on through 8 years there and almost 16 years in the Senate, indicate the high regard in which he was held by the people of Idaho. He won and held their confidence and respect, and his death was a great loss to them.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in paying deserved tribute to the late Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK, of Idaho. It was my privilege to know him for some years before I joined him as a colleague in the Senate. Our friendship developed during our mutual service in this body and his death was a great personal blow to me as well as a loss to the people of his State and the Nation.

There was no more dedicated Member of the U.S. Senate than HENRY DWORSHAK. I know of the long hours that he spent in the hearings and executive sessions of the Appropriations Committee. No one was more tireless in his devotion to duty or more conscientious in the discharge of his responsibilities as a Member of this body.

It was my privilege to visit Idaho with him on several occasions. I traveled throughout the State with him in 1959 and 1960. I know from firsthand the very high place that he had in the hearts of the people of Idaho.

I take this occasion to extend to Mrs. Dworshak and her wonderful family my deepest sympathy. We shall all miss him.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, no man who worked with and knew HENRY DWORSHAK could have anything but the highest respect and regard for him.

HENRY DWORSHAK came from a rugged part of our country, and he was a rugged individualist. He always lived by the highest principles and he believed strongly in individual and governmental integrity. He was deeply devoted to the conviction that individuals and groups of individuals should make every effort humany possible to solve their own problems rather than to turn to the Federal Government for help and oftentimes what turned out to be expensive assistance.

In his long years of public service in the House and the Senate HENRY DWORSHAK brought to the Halls of the Congress the true spirit of the West. As a newspaperman and as a public servant he believed in hard work, and he proved time and again that honest labor and unwavering conviction are among the best qualities man can possess.

In many respects Senator DWORSHAK was a quiet man, but when he spoke everyone listened and respected his views. In the legislative body no higher tribute can be paid to a man.

I know that Idaho will miss him, and I know that the Senate and the Nation will miss him and all of the unselfish work he did so willingly and so effectively.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it is impossible to express adequately the sense of loss which all of his colleagues in the Senate feel on the death of HENRY DWORSHAK.

My acquaintance with Senator DWORSHAK began in 1945 when I first came to the House of Representatives. From the beginning I was attracted to him particularly as a warm human being, and our friendship was a very close one for all of these years.

Senator DWORSHAK was a highly respected Member of this body. His colleagues especially knew and admired his diligence and his comprehension of the problems affecting the Nation and, particularly, his own great Northwest. Most of all, they knew and loved him as a man.

Mrs. Case joins me in expressing to Mrs. Dworshak and all the members of their family our deepest and most affectionate sympathy.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to our late colleague, Senator HENRY CLARENCE DWORSHAK, of Idaho.

When HENRY DWORSHAK came to the Senate in 1947, he brought with him the experience of four terms in the House of Representatives as well as two decades as editor and publisher of the Burley Bulletin in his home State.

He also brought to this body his high ideals and an unparalleled pride in our country.

Senator DWORSHAK was a rugged individualist, in every good sense of the word. He was respected and admired as much as anyone in the Senate.

We will miss him deeply, as a close friend and a devoted public servant.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I am privileged to join in the justly deserved tributes to the late Senator from Idaho, HENRY CLARENCE DWORSHAK, who served his State and Nation with dedication and distinction.

The Senate has lost an outstanding Member, and it is fitting that we honor his memory in eulogies here where he had so many friends and where his service for many years was so well known to all of us.

All who knew our late colleague valued his friendship and respected his devotion to duty. It was a great pleasure for me to serve with him in the Senate. I deeply regret his passing, and shall miss his presence.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, it is a sad occasion when we rise in this Chamber and undertake to express our feelings upon the passing of one of our colleagues. Words mean little to me, for I find them inadequate to define my feelings.

I believe this more so in speaking of a man like HENRY DWORSHAK. Here was a man of character, a man of honesty, of tolerance, and of patience. He was a rugged son of the West who was a dedicated public servant not only during his illustrious career in the Senate, but also in the years when he served with distinction in the other body.

HENRY DWORSHAK was a great American. He was an American in the old tradition, a man who was solid on the inside. He was a man of great integrity. You would not find HENRY DWORSHAK cutting fancy political capers on the floor of the Senate in an effort to win either publicity or acclaim. He was a man of principle and high ideals.

He was a great Senator and one who made many great contributions to the welfare of his country, both in the active military service of the Nation and in the Halls of Congress. Death laid a heavy hand upon the Senate when he was taken from us. Believing as I do that there are eternal rewards for men of honor and decency who live justly and show tolerance and forbearance, I have no doubts as to where HENRY DWORSHAK will spend eternity.

It is always difficult to fill the void left by a man of great character, and HENRY DWORSHAK had character. He was an easy man to know and love. One could communicate with HENRY DWORSHAK. Perhaps that was because his earliest training was in communications. He entered newspaper work and later became editor and publisher of the Burley, Idaho, Bulletin in his hometown.

His philosophy was grounded on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and he recognized the Senate of the United States as the forum of States. No public act of his ever demeaned the Senate or diminished the high purpose of the Founding Fathers that in this Chamber the representatives of proud States were entitled to the fullest of freedom to voice the hopes, the aspirations and the desires of those who sent them here.

He was a champion of sound federalism, with the National Government confined to its proper functions. HENRY DWORSHAK was a practical man. He was not beset by illusions. He was a genial man whose friendship was warm and whose compassion was deep. He was a man of dignity and simplicity, and when he spoke you knew there was something worthwhile to be said.

He was a man of courage and action, and when there was something to be done, he acted promptly and forthrightly. I felt a great sense of personal loss in the passing of HENRY DWORSHAK, and I share the grief of his family in the loss of a loving father and husband. I understand the grief of the people of Idaho who are deprived of his wise counsel and devoted service.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in expressing my sympathies over the sad and untimely death of a good friend, Senator HENRY DWORSHAK.

His loss was not a family sorrow alone for it was felt by his colleagues here in the Senate and the citizens of Idaho.

By training and experience HENRY DWORSHAK was well prepared for the giant task of representing the West that he knew and loved so well.

Mr. President, I extend my deepest sympathies to the family of Senator DWORSHAK, and I want to express a special regret of the State of Nevada at the loss of a stalwart son of its neighboring State.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, as a freshman Senator, I found myself assigned to the Interior Committee, where our late beloved Senator HENRY DWORSHAK was the ranking Republican member. Senator DWORSHAK quickly took me under his wing and provided me with the warmhearted, friendly, and helpful guidance which he always offered to new Republican members of the committee. I can say that his kindness meant a great deal in enabling me to adapt myself to my new surroundings.

HENRY DWORSHAK was a great fighter. Sometimes one hears it said that younger men are needed in the Senate to engage in debate and to fight hard over principles. However, that is not entirely true. Among the older members of the Senate, there was none who fought harder for his principles and who really enjoyed a battle on the Senate floor more than did Senator DWORSHAK. In this, he will continue to be an inspiration to me and to all younger Members who had the privilege of serving with him.

Mrs. Miller joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Dworshak and the rest of the family. We shall remember HENRY in our prayers.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this speech is a most unhappy occasion for me. The people of Idaho and the Nation were saddened on July 23, 1962, by the sudden death of Senator HENRY DWORSHAK.

I had known Senator DWORSHAK for many years. It is true that although we sat on the opposite sides of the political aisle, and we disagreed on many policies and issues, I always had the greatest respect for his integrity and energy as a legislator on the national scene.

Henry Dworshak was a kind man, a dedicated man. He was the type of man that you could always count on for a helping hand. He had an extraordinary way of dealing with people. He always looked and acted the part of a distinguished Senator. He had a friendly, humble, homey manner; yet he was always dignified, courteous, and always businesslike.

During his lifetime, Senator Dworshak was a printer, a sergeant in a machinegun battalion in World War I, a newspaper editor, and a legislator. Before coming to the U.S. Senate, he served four terms in the House of Representatives. After the people of Idaho elevated him to the U.S. Senate he served in this great body for 14 years. During the 22 years that he served in the House and Senate, he remained a devoted public servant. He voted his conscience and his duty, as he saw it, for the American people.

During his tenure of 22 years he was on many important committees and was the sponsor of legislation of national importance. He was a member of the House and later the Senate Appropriations Committees, where he gained a vast knowledge and understanding of all the operations of the Government. His particular interest was in the field of natural resources. He worked closely with those agencies which manage our water, land, mineral, and forest resources. He was ranking minority member of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee at the time of his death. He always advocated close cooperation between the States and the Federal Government in planning and developing new projects.

To his good wife, and to his four sons, I would like to say that I miss him in the Senate; however, I would like to add, that a grateful Nation shares in their great loss.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I am sure the members of the Dworshak family would desire that at this time I express their appreciation for the thoughtful statements which have been made by the late Senator's colleagues and friends.

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR CHAVEZ, OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I rise today to honor in words a man whose deeds speak far more eloquently of his dedicated service over four decades to his Nation and his State—our late colleague, Senator Dennis Chavez, a man whom I knew very well. We had associated ourselves in public affairs for some 40 years. We had campaigned together back and forth across New Mexico for 30 years. We had been colleagues in the Senate for 14 years. I can speak of him with authority, with conviction, and with deep respect.

When Senator Chavez died last November 18, former President Harry S. Truman observed that he was "a good public servant, and that's about the highest thing you can say about a man."

Another measure of our colleague's devotion to the public's cause was the way in which thousands of his friends, the humble and the high, paid their final respects to Dennis Chavez when he was laid to rest in his native soil of New Mexico.

Dennis Chavez came from a family whose roots lay deep in that soil. His ancestors were Spanish and more than 300 years ago first settled in New Mexico on land granted by Philip II of Spain.

He was born on April 8, 1888, at Los Chavez, not far from Albuquerque, into an impoverished household, the oldest of eight children. He went to work as a youngster to help put bread on the family table. When his formal education had to be laid aside in order to help his family, he began the process of self-education through extensive reading, a process which continued to the very day of his death. It was years later before he was able to obtain a law degree from Georgetown University. Dennis Chavez was 32 before he was able to hang out his lawyer's shingle in Albuquerque.

In 1920, Dennis Chavez was elected to the State legislature, where he sponsored a bill to provide free textbooks to schoolchildren, a recognition of his own love for learning. He began his service in Congress in 1931 when he was elected to the House of Representatives. He came to the Senate in 1935 and served here continuously until his death.

Mr. President, in a time when this Nation is increasingly concerned about conditions in Latin America, Dennis Chavez was one of the best of good neighbors. Perhaps that was due to his Spanish origins; perhaps it was due to the fact that New Mexico shares a common border with the northernmost of the Latin American nations. One of his landmark efforts to more closely link the United States with its hemispheric neighbors is the Pan American Highway. He strongly supported the construction of that road, and diligently sought to have the project completed. Although many difficulties remain along that road, his intentions were of the finest.

When the Ambassador of Mexico presented Senator Chavez with that country's highest medal in 1961, our colleague observed that the award "was the culmination of years of effort to better relations with our vital neighbors to the south."

Mr. President, most of us in this Chamber know of the struggle Senator Chavez had with his health over the last 10 years of his life. A number of years ago a large part of his stomach was removed to arrest cancer. But he remained with us, effectively working for the causes he believed in. Toward the end, he underwent prolonged treatment for cancer of the throat. It became necessary for him to master the technique of speaking through a special tracheal tube. But with persistent courage that was typical of this man, he learned to use it. Although he was confined to the National Institutes of Health, Senator Chavez announced that he would attend the opening of the second session of the last Congress. And attend he did—despite a snowstorm—and we gave him a warm welcome when he appeared on the floor.

It is one of those circumstances of fate that on this day when we pay homage to Dennis Chavez, he is also to be honored by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States for his service in behalf of the military strength of this country. Had he lived, Dennis Chavez would have personally received the honor of Minuteman of 1963, but that award, which will be made tonight, regrettably will be posthumous.

As chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator Chavez was an untiring advocate and architect in the construction of a stronger free world. The citation which will accompany the award reads in part:

> Few men have shouldered the burden of deciding the preparedness course of this Nation, and have done so with wisdom, dedication, and resultant effectiveness as has Senator Chavez. The degree of our Nation's strength has been subject to his judgments. We are convinced history will demonstrate that to Senator Chavez is due a goodly portion of the security every American shares today.

I only wish that Senator Chavez were still here to hear those words. But I am sure, Mr. President, that he would have accepted them with characteristic modesty, for while he had achieved a degree of eminence in legislative affairs which few men do, he never lost the close touch with the people.

I well recall the evening in Albuquerque when many of Dennis Chavez' friends gathered to commemorate his 25th anniversary of service in the Senate of the United States. On that occasion it was observed of our colleague:

> He succeeded where other native sons of New Mexico have failed. He stood four-square to every wind that blew. He has faced life with courage and fortitude. He has never lost the common touch. He has never forgotten old friends and loyalties. He has never allowed politics to interfere with the dictates of his conscience. He is an illustrious son of New Mexico.

Mr. President, Senator Chavez was the devoted friend of groups in this country who sometimes found themselves without an articulate spokesman. In a memorable statement of his fundamental faith in democracy he once declared:

> It matters little if the Congress appropriates hundreds of millions of dollars to check the erosion of the soil if we permit the erosion of our civil liberties, free institutions, and the untrammeled pursuit of truth.

Dennis Chavez, who had delivered groceries in a horse-drawn wagon to help his family, was witness to an amazing transformation of his State and helped to engineer that change. Works to control the ravages of flood, impoundments and canals to bring water to parched lands, military bases vital to the defense of freedom, highways to link rapidly growing centers of population: these are some of the markers Dennis Chavez left along the route he traveled.

It can be said that the story of Dennis Chavez is another chapter in the continuing story of America. It is a story worth the telling to the generations that succeed him.

To Mrs. Chavez and the other members of the family of Senator Chavez, Mrs. Anderson and I extend our affection as we today express our reverence for his memory and our appreciation for the life he led and the contributions he made to the welfare of the people of the land he loved.

Mr. President, at the time of the illness of Senator Chavez, the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] took on the great burden of handling the military appropriation bill. I yield the floor to him for his kindness to my colleague.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the kindness of the senior Senator from New Mexico in yielding the floor to me at this time.

Senator Chavez rendered to the Senate, to his home State, and the United States long and valuable service; and in his death, I felt a keen personal loss.

He became a Member of the House of Representatives in 1931 and a Senator in 1935. During these three decades the Congress has met many crises—the depression, World War II, Korea, the atomic age. Senator Chavez contributed much to the Nation in all of these years.

Senator Chavez brought to his service in the Senate a culture and courtesy for which aristocratic Spaniards have been known throughout the world, an intimate knowledge of the great Southwest, a zeal for the perpetuity of democratic institutions, and a capacity for friendship which endeared him to his colleagues.

It was a real pleasure for me to serve with him on the Senate Appropriations Committee for nearly 14 years, and especially to have been a member of the very important Subcommittee on Defense, of which in recent years he was the distinguished chairman.

Although the parents and grandparents of Senator Chavez were all Republicans, he became a Democrat by conviction. All his life he was a stanch supporter of the doctrine of States' rights. One of the great-uncles of Senator Chavez was a colonel in the Confederate Army, and a picture of General Lee and his officers occupied a place of honor in Senator Chavez' office. Because of his connections with our region, he had the particular affection of those of us who come from the Southern States.

Senator Chavez was a genuine and friendly man and truly democratic in his personal contacts with everyone. We miss him.

Mr. MECHEM. Mr. President, it is with deep conviction that I rise on behalf of the people of New Mexico and myself to express our respects and pay tribute to Senator Dennis Chavez.

It is good for us to pause, as we now do, to view with new perspective the recent past, for it is difficult to see a man such as Senator Chavez, while still with us, for what he really was.

He was the very epitome of the "American dream."

Born in a dignified but poor farm family which did not speak the English language, he raised himself by sheer exercise of will to become one of the most influential and able figures in the United States.

What other nation can produce such a self-made man?

What other form of government encourages and rewards such a climb?

Senator Chavez endeared himself to hundreds of thousands of New Mexicans—who felt great affection and trust—simply because he was a symbol of hope, a shining example for his fellow man.

He walked among the mightly, but he never forgot his humble roots, deep in the soil of the sunshine area of this Nation.

He was never too busy with urgent national problems to stop and give a hand to the downtrodden and friendless.

He fought all of his life for individual equality, for the equal opportunity our Constitution promises Americans of every race and creed. He knew—as we all must learn sooner or later—that only eternal and unflagging effort can make this goal come true.

This is why New Mexicans loved Dennis Chavez and returned him for more than a quarter of a century to a seat in this body.

They knew him as a faithful friend.

They knew him as a man with courage—a tough fighter.

And they knew him as a man with the human touch—a man with an open mind and a warm heart.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, one of the joys of Senator Chavez was his close and continuing friendship with the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the minority whip. I now yield to him.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the sad news of the passing of the late Dennis Chavez came to me last November when I was in West Berlin as an American delegate to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference. West Berlin represents man's struggle for freedom. In a very real sense, the life of the late, respected Dennis Chavez also represented, in all its many facets, a successful struggle for freedom and for equality of opportunity in our own beloved America.

Humble product of our common soil, this gallant Christian man attained a pinnacle of responsibility in the U.S. Senate. It was he who guided through the Senate its enormous and crucial pieces of legislation designed to strengthen our country, its security, and its role of leader in the cause of freemen everywhere.

The Nation has lost the services of a great American. New Mexico has lost a distinguished son who fought the good fight, and did so successfully, for Americans of all races and creeds, and he was sustained in his fight by the proud and noble blood of Spain. His family had lost a loving and devoted husband and father; and we who were honored to know him and work with him have lost a beloved friend.

Like my colleagues in the Senate, I cherish the memory of Dennis Chavez, lawyer and statesman, great leader, loyal and devoted, possessed of an unbounded courage which carried him through all manner of crises and pain, and which sustained him to the very end.

I served under Dennis Chavez on the Senate Committee on Public Works. If I may say so, I came to know him intimately. I remember the great public works projects which came from his committee, on their way to the White House, to become law. They were fashioned under his leadership. The good of the country was his guide. I remember all the compassion and all the sympathy which he brought, side by side, with his legislative responsibilities and power. Rich or poor, great or small, all stood equal before him and his committee. Equal treatment under law for all our people, the high American gift of liberty, and our resolute duty to maintain it, formed the basis of his official life. And as simply a human being, with his family and with his legion of friends, sweetness, generosity, and a sense of unselfish devotion and of faith ever guided him. I know, Mr. President, for a year ago, with pride, I took with me to my State of California his faith, freely and publicly given in a fashion which may well be unique in the political history of our Republic.

I treasure fond recollections of the years I spent with him here in the Senate.

With my wife, I send once again to the Chavez family, son and daughters, and particularly to his dear widow, our never-ending condolences. Dennis Chavez will live in our memory, as he will live eternally in the minds of his family and in the minds of all his many, many friends in the Senate, in his native State, and across the great breadth of America.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, many times I have heard our late colleague, Senator Chavez, speak of his affection and genuine friendship for the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] and I now yield to him.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senate has been most unfortunate to lose the services of Senator Dennis Chavez of New Mexico. I served beside him for many, many years on the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I knew him to be a public servant who was devoted to serving the people of his State and the country as a whole.

Senator Chavez was one of the first men of Spanish extraction to come to Washington in the service of his country. He was beloved by his constituents, as can easily be seen by his long term of service in the Senate.

Senator Chavez had a most difficult assignment on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services. Well over 50 percent of all funds appropriated each year by the Congress during the last 10 years were handled by him.

Mr. President, let me add that as chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, he did noble work in authorizing the funds for important projects in order to assist in protecting and preserving our water and land resources. I served as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, whereas his committee authorized the projects; and it was my business to see to it that the funds necessary in order to make them effective were appropriated. Therefore, we were very close, and on many occasions discussed many of these projects. I know the Senate has lost a great leader in that respect.

I was truly saddened when I was informed of his death while I was traveling in the jungles of Africa, last year. I regret his passing; and I extend my deep sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I want to join my colleagues in a brief tribute to our late colleague, DENNIS CHAVEZ of New Mexico.

Before I came to Congress, I became familiar with his name. I came to know him personally when I entered Congress. He had moved from the House of Representatives to the Senate.

Shortly after coming to the Senate, I was named to the Committee on Public Works and had the privilege of serving under the chairmanship of Senator CHAVEZ. He was a wonderful chairman whom all members of the committee, Democrats and Republicans alike, respected. All the members enjoyed working on the committee under his guidance. It was also my privilege to serve under the chairmanship of Senator CHAVEZ on the Senate Office Building Commission.

I have had the pleasure of campaigning across the State of New Mexico with DENNIS CHAVEZ. I greatly enjoyed the experience of riding with him and having him point out the historic home site of his family through many generations. Many historic sites were pointed out as we went from place to place, and many interesting stories of his own campaign experiences were related.

DENNIS CHAVEZ was a serious and hardworking public servant. He was dedicated to his work, devoted to his family, and intensely loyal to his country. I am glad to have enjoyed his friendship.

Mrs. Sparkman and I extend our sympathy to Mrs. Chavez and the other members of the family.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not know what I can add to the eloquent tributes that have already been paid to our late departed colleague, DENNIS N. CHAVEZ. But I wish to express the sadness I feel at his passing.

Senator CHAVEZ and I served and worked together on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. I also served with him for a period of time, during my early days in the Senate, on the Public Works Committee. It was a rewarding experience to serve on a committee with him. He exercised caution and care, and approached his duties with sincere dedication to the welfare of the people of the United States and of the people of the State of New Mexico, whom he loved.

We in the Senate will long remember the years of service he rendered to the Nation as chairman of the Public Works Committee. Throughout this great country, projects initiated by the Public Works Committee under his leadership stand as monuments to his achievements and to the contributions he made to the welfare and progress of our Nation. Many such projects in Arkansas will serve to remind the people of my State of his important contributions to its growth and development.

He was a man of sympathy and understanding, and he was a man of courage, who continued over a period of years to discharge his duties here with distinction while enduring much pain and suffering. Many weaker men would have given up the effort and quit in such circumstances of disadvantage. But not Senator CHAVEZ. He fought on unwaveringly with a manifestation of fortitude, strength, and devotion to duty seldom matched and unexcelled, and which we might all do well to emulate.

Mrs. McClellan and I both express our deepest grief and heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Chavez and the family.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate was deeply saddened by the death of Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ. This quiet and kindly man served in this body for nearly 30 years with distinction to himself, to his beloved State of New Mexico, and to our country. During those years, he made a great many friends and set an example for unassuming and unpretentious public service.

I pay homage to our late colleague, whose ancestors came to this country, not decades, but centuries ago. He was truly, and in the best sense a descendent of the real first families of our country.

Senator CHAVEZ was close to his people. He was close because he remained one of them even as he rose to high office. He knew their problems. When only 13 years old, he had to leave school to contribute to the support of his seven brothers and sisters. He later worked as a newsboy and delivery boy. But he continued to study at night and later passed a special college entrance examination. With personal determination and the encouragement of his wife, he went on to earn a law degree and begin his career in politics.

Because of his Spanish-American background, Senator CHAVEZ was intimately aware of the problems facing minorities in this country. His history of public service was one of constant support of his people and other minority groups. In fact, he first gained national prominence because of his leadership in support of a permanent Fair Trades Employment Commission to combat job discrimination.

Another area of special interest was that of national defense. As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense Funds, he championed a strong military posture during the critical early years of the cold war. Both in this position, and as chairman of the important Public Works Committee, Senator CHAVEZ left his mark on the Nation.

Yet valuable as his contributions were in these fields, his ultimate reputation will rest on his unflagging fight for human freedom and human decency. His finest hour came on this floor when he protested in simple, yet eloquent, terms against an atmosphere which he termed would have "quietly shackled the growth of men's minds." Prefacing this remark, he said:

> I should like to be remembered as the man who raised a voice * * * at a time in the history of this body when we seem bent upon placing limitations on the freedom of the individual.

I am sure that Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ would have been proud to know that a grateful Nation and constituency have accorded him this honor after death.

Mr. President, in spite of the late date of these remarks, I want to express again to Mrs. Chavez and her family, and to the people of New Mexico, the profound sympathies of Mrs. Mansfield and myself.

May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, many Senators are admired. The late Senator CHAVEZ was not only admired, but also actually loved. I was among those who appreciated and loved him.

For almost the entire time I have been in the Senate I had the privilege of serving on a committee with him. First, I served with him on the Committee on Public Works, of which he was chairman. Later I served on the Appropriations Committee, at a time when he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

In the brief time available to me I wish to speak of him primarily as an individual, and to laud him for his human qualities.

I think first of his unfailing kindness. He was a man of great human appreciation. He was truly a great humanitarian. Simple in his manners, sincere in his friendliness, he did not wear those qualities on some days and leave them at home on others. He had them with him at all times.

As has already been said, his name as a legislator, will forever be linked with major forward-looking and constructive legislation having to do with many subjects. I mention only a few. First, the public works program of our Nation has felt the impact of his great strength. He worked on it year in and year out. Second, our defenses and the national security of our Nation have been greatly strengthened by his attention and his unfailing effort.

Mr. President, Senator CHAVEZ sat almost within reach of me for the past 15 years. I know that he was a man of great courage, both political and physical.

He was also a man of great gratitude. Many years ago I had an older brother who lived in New Mexico. In their early days my brother and Senator CHAVEZ were friends. When I came to the Senate, Senator CHAVEZ put his arm around me and said, "Welcome." And he really meant it. For years he went out of his way in efforts to help me or to befriend me. He encouraged me as well as others in our committee work, where he gave unfailing attention to matters that might concern me. It is one of the happy thoughts of my life that I really tried to reciprocate.

I was with Senator CHAVEZ for a week in his home State during one of his campaigns. I spoke with him in the daytime and at night. I then had an opportunity to see the real warmth of heart, the gratitude and the love exhibited there for his own people, with whom he had lived, for whom he had worked so long, and to whom he felt so dedicated. That feeling of interest, appreciation, and friendship was fortunately reciprocated by those people a thousandfold.

I wish to extend to Mrs. Chavez, who is a great friend of humanity, my feeling of utmost appreciation for her in her own character and personality. She has been a favorite of Mrs. Stennis and myself for many years.

Mrs. Stennis joins with me in this short but strongly felt tribute to a man who had a great record and a great soul. I bow with the rest of my colleagues in appreciation of his great life and work. We miss him, but we continue to love him.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly about our late colleague Senator CHAVEZ, this fine man, this gentleman, this good friend whom we lost a few months ago. I speak not so much of the great work which he did—though I watched him with admiration as he did it—but more of his personal qualities.

As one who sat next to him in the Committee on Public Works for a long time, I saw his great interest and effective action in the development of our country in all those fields in which public works mean so much in developing our great Nation. He served our country loyally in that capacity. He served it greatly in the husbanding of the defense of our Nation. But it is of his personal qualities that I must speak.

First, I speak with reference to his intense interest in Latin America. Along with him, and after him, I had some small interest in the Inter-American Highway and in those nations which, as he believed intensely, that highway would enable to develop to much greater heights of independence, of security for their people, and of advanced living standards. We talked of that field many times. His compassion toward those weaker Latin American neighbors I shall always remember.

When I made several visits to that area, I found that he was beloved in that area as few Americans probably ever have been beloved there. It is my feeling that somehow and in some way, when the highway is completed—as it will shortly be—we should find an opportunity, in conjunction with our friendly neighbors who are so greatly affected by that highway, to memorialize Senactor CHAVEZ' great interest and effective participation in moving ahead with that development.

The second thing I wish to speak about is his friendship, his comradely qualities, on trips when we were together. I remember one trip we took to the Columbia Basin and to Alaska. I believe his distinguished colleague [Mr. ANDERSON] was there with another committee at the same time, and we happened to see each other briefly. I recall that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who has just spoken, was a member of Senator CHAVEZ' committee, and went with us on the trip I mentioned.

Not only was he intensely interested in all public works going on there—and that was at a time when Alaska was a territory, and there was perhaps even more interest then than now in providing the public works required to gain greater stature—but also he knew the background of each project, wherever we went, in a way which was amazing to me. I found the people there very grateful for his continuing interest in their development.

Again it is about a personal thing I wish to speak. When we were ready to come home—we were living at the officers club on Elmendorf Air Force Base—he told me he had to find a way to bring some flowers to Mrs. Chavez. He left us that morning and later showed up at the plane with a great paper package of the flowers of Alaska, much bigger than similar flowers in this more southern latitude. He brought sweet peas and pansies. We kidded him all the way home, and it took 18 hours on the plane, for we came by way of Rapid City. He made sure that those flowers stayed moist and were in as nearly perfect condition as possible when he delivered them to his good wife, whom he loved so dearly.

I think I shall always remember him best for that indication of the deep affection and undying love which he felt for his wife and family.

Mrs. Holland and I will always grieve because of his passing; and we want his widow and children and the other members of his family to know that they have our deep and affectionate sympathy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the late Senator CHAVEZ had many, many friends in Tennessee, and I am proud that I could count myself among them.

When DENNIS first came to Washington, he worked as a clerk in the same Senate office as one of my fellow Tennesseans, Pride Tomlinson, who later became a justice of the Tennessee Supreme Court. We talked very frequently of his relationships with Justice Tomlinson and many mutual friends in Tennessee.

Senator CHAVEZ was also admired by many in my State because of his concern with resource development in the Tennessee Valley. As chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, he conducted many hearings on the annual budget for the Tennessee Valley Authority. He was always fair and just.

It was a great privilege for me to serve with him on the Appropriations Committee. He was never too busy to talk with any younger Member of the Senate or the House about any problem, and always was willing to help them if he possibly could.

In the passing of Senator CHAVEZ, the Nation has lost a genuine humanitarian, a very effective Member of Congress, and a great statesman. We have all lost a wonderful friend.

Mrs. Kefauver and I extend our deepest sympathies to Mrs. Chavez and to all members of his family.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I had the opportunity to serve under the late Senator CHAVEZ on the Committee on Public Works for a number of years, and I admired and respected him.

I do not think it is necessary for me to dwell upon his work as a member of and chairman of that committee, or upon the service he rendered our country as chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations. Yet the country should know that his work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations contributed greatly to the defense and security of our Nation.

As a member of the Committee on Public Works, I know that his leadership had much to do with the development of our Interstate Highway System, and the growth of the Federal-State system. As the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has truly said, it was his initiative and his persistent support which has made possible the Inter-American Highway.

There were many things which made all of us respect and love DENNIS CHAVEZ. It always seemed to me that among his many unusual qualities three were joined—his dignity, his simplicity, and his courage.

Early in my service in the Senate I had occasion to visit his home city of Albuquerque, N. Mex., in 1947. There I found him exactly the same in his own city, among his own people, as we knew him in the Senate. He was loved and respected by the people of his State, by those who had known him throughout the years.

His dignity and simplicity were always evident in the Senate. His dignity led him to express his pride in his ancestry—the fact that his family was among the first of those who lived as the new Americans upon this continent. Yet always he spoke the greater pride that he was an American and a citizen of the United States.

We also admired his dignity and his courage in those latter days when all of us knew of his illness. Again and again he came to the Senate and to the committees, and until the very last he was engaged in the work of the Senate.

He had great dignity, great simplicity, and great courage. We have noted these same characteristics, in the members of his family, in Mrs. Chavez and his children. I shall always remember DENNIS CHAVEZ as a friend, and for his qualities of courage and dignity.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, DENNIS CHAVEZ, one of the three great Senators who have recently passed to their reward, and who today we eulogize, was a stalwart defender of the highest traditions of this great body. Significantly, he, as did the others, had a humble beginning. He plodded industriously to scale the ladder of success, and if there is any validity to the term "a self-made man," the appellation would fit him whose memory we honor today.

DENNIS CHAVEZ was truly a man of the people. His unswerving devotion to the cause of his constituents was a testimony to his depth of feeling and understanding. He was a fierce fighter for the underdog, and his more than a quarter of a century in the U.S. Senate is studded with instances where he did battle for those he felt needed his voice, his courage, and his implacable dedication to justice.

The people of New Mexico loved DENNIS CHAVEZ. DENNIS CHAVEZ loved the people whom he served. The Senate has benefited immeasurably from the presence in this Chamber of Senator DENNIS

CHAVEZ. He has left the mortal scene; yet he has left an imprint on this body which will not be eroded with the passage of time.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, all the Nation does, and should, feel the loss of the late distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico, DENNIS CHAVEZ. My acquaintance with this man began long ago, when I first came to the Senate. DENNIS CHAVEZ befriended me when we served together on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and we remained close throughout the years. Working with him in committee and in the Senate afforded me an opportunity to know him well, and witness firsthand his distinguished service to his State and Nation, his unfailing courteousness and kindness to every person he met.

His great mark was the quiet, easygoing manner in which he went about his work in the Senate. Never loud or boisterous in his endeavors, he won support for himself and his causes through the power of sincerity of purpose and friendship.

As chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, DENNIS CHAVEZ was endlessly helpful in passing authorizations for projects vital to South Carolina's development. There is hardly a county in my State that has not benefited from legislation he fostered as chairman of the Public Works Committee.

Extremely dedicated to public service, even his painful illness did not stop him from attending to his business in the Senate. He was loyal and sincere, and lived and died a friend of the people.

At all times he was trying to do something that would make life easier for the people of this Nation. Long will he be remembered and loved by all who were fortunate enough to have known and worked with him.

Mrs. Johnston and I feel the loss of DENNIS CHAVEZ, and we sympathize with Mrs. Chavez and his family in the loss of this great family man, for he was, in the true sense of the word, very close to his family and thought of them on every occasion. For that reason we all must admire him.

At this time our sympathy is extended to Mrs. Chavez in the loss of her fine husband.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, while the Senate was in adjournment, death came to one of our most beloved and honored colleagues, a man whose memory will shine brightly and enduringly in the minds of Americans everywhere. I know of no Senator who was held in greater affection than DENNIS CHAVEZ.

Indeed, Mr. President, I am sure that each of us feels keenly and in a deep personal sense the absence of our late colleague, Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico. It can truly be said of him that he lived with an abiding faith in the democratic process which he zealously guarded. By doing so, he provided a ringing affirmation of our way of life in this age of challenge. He said in 1960, in answer to critics when a subcommittee of which he was chairman recommended the appropriation of $1 billion more for defense than President Eisenhower had requested, "There can be no price tag on freedom."

A sense of dedication to his office and the people he represented illuminated his nearly 28 years of fruitful service in the U.S. Senate and his almost 4 years of service in the U.S. House of Representatives.

To us who knew him well DENNIS CHAVEZ was a generous, warm, and understanding, gentle man. Above all, he was a fighter for the causes in which he believed. Possibly because of his own Spanish heritage, and certainly because he knew the needs of our neighbors to the south, he was one of the earliest supporters of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's good neighbor policy. More recently he was one of the great champions of President Kennedy's Alliance for Progress.

Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ in many respects was a very predictable man. He was always with the underdog. He was for the little fellows whether they were struggling farmers fighting debts, drought, and low farm prices; underprivileged and forgotten American Indians; or workingmen seeking to better their lot and provide a more secure future for their children. At all times he was the champion of the poor and the humble, a fervent advocate of our Nation's defense, a protector of our national resources, and a voice for the oppressed.

Though a most lovable and friendly man, he was a resolute and unyielding battler from his early manhood to the time of his death for the principles and causes in which he believed. He served his country well.

He exemplified the spirit of individual courage and conviction, which, unfortunately, is more and more becoming absent in American life. As he took his position in the front line of combat for his cause, he never looked behind to count the supporting troops. He cared not if there were many or there were none, but moved forward in the just belief of the rightness of his cause.

About 30 years ago I first served with him in the House of Representatives. I was Representative at large from Ohio, and he was then a very well-known Representative from New Mexico. I became acquainted with him at that time.

Upon being elected to the Senate in 1958, I requested that I be appointed to serve on the Committee on Public Works, of which he was chairman. I knew within a few weeks, when we began holding hearings, that DENNIS CHAVEZ was a great chairman of that vital committee. I considered myself fortunate in serving with him and in being associated with him. No one served under him; we served in association with him.

He was good to me, and I followed the advice that he gave me. I was glad as a member of that committee to follow the leadership of DENNIS CHAVEZ. It will always be a happy personal recollection of mine that some time later I was permitted to accompany him on a study mission of all the Central American countries. It was a thrilling experience to see the affection and love with which the leaders of these proud Latin American countries greeted him, particularly for the part he played in their receiving the great public works projects and public roads that were built in part through the generosity of the people of the United States. I hope that some appropriate plaques will be placed there by the governing officials of Nicaragua, Guatemala, and the other Central American countries.

Our Nation will miss Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ. He was my close personal friend. I feel a deep personal loss at his passing. He was, as I said, a great, good man, and he will be remembered by all of us who served with him or knew him.

Quite frequently, even now, from my seat in the Chamber I look over to the desk that he occupied. I still expect to see him sitting there. I feel a twinge of sadness because he is no longer with us.

To his lovely wife, Ymelda, to his two beautiful and extremely talented daughters, Mrs. George Dixon and Mrs. Jorge Tristani, and to his son, Dennis Chavez, Jr., we express our deepest sympathy. Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ was one of the noblest men ever to be sent from the great West to serve his country in the House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ was my trusted personal friend. He aided me in my efforts to come to the Senate. I shall miss him and I do miss him. He is a friend of the State of Texas. He was a friend to the people. He was regarded as "their Senator" by the nearly 1½ million Spanish-speaking people of Texas. He was called El Paso's third Senator. As chairman of the Public Works Committee and third ranking Senator on the Appropriations Committee, he proved that he was a friend to all the navigation and reclamation progress of Texas. But in a wider field, Senator CHAVEZ was a broadminded friend of all Americans, of all people. He was a Senator, not for New Mexico alone, but for all Americans.

The Albuquerque Journal, on November 19, 1962, stated about Senator CHAVEZ:

> But overall, Senator CHAVEZ will be remembered as the true friend and defender of the poor man. He never wavered in his long senatorial career of more than 27 years in battling for legislation that benefited the people who needed help.
>
> Senator CHAVEZ knew well what was poverty. He was born in poverty, but of rugged, honest, and humble stock. His strong and persevering character was molded early in life when he strove valiantly for an education. He won that uphill contest as since he has won other battles, politics or otherwise, in which he became engaged.
>
> He was tenacious and never compromising in fighting for what he thought was right. As any man in public office, he had his political foes. But never did such political differences prod the Senator into other than ethical conduct.
>
> As the Senator's career extended into the years his seniority enabled him to wield great influence on powerful committees which went far toward giving New Mexico its rightful share of appropriations covering many types of governmental projects, including military and defense installations.
>
> In the field of racial and cultural relations the Senator was always a dominant and effective figure on the side of tolerance.
>
> The Senator's long and heroic fight for life, while enduring great suffering after he had been stricken with cancer, followed the pattern of his whole career in never yielding without a fight to the finish.
>
> We could sum up Senator CHAVEZ' outstanding characteristics with this: He had the human touch.
>
> The Senator's passing is a distinct and distressing loss to his family, and the State and his country.
>
> Our sincere condolences to the Chavez family in their time of great sorrow.

Mr. President, this editorial, a sincere and stirring tribute to a great man, expresses my view. May the memory of this great life console the loving family he leaves behind.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article from the Albuquerque Journal entitled "A Fighter, Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ Battled to Top Post," describing something of the life of this distinguished leader.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FIGHTER, SENATOR DENNIS CHAVEZ BATTLED TO TOP POST

(By Wayne S. Scott)

He was a fighter, the lad who was born 74 years ago in a poor adobe home in Los Chavez and was baptized DENNIS CHAVEZ. He fought his way out of the poverty of his early days, battled his way to one of the most powerful posts in the U.S. Senate, kept on fighting to better the conditions of those who had not been able to work their own way above poverty.

He was uncompromising in his beliefs—even to the point of giving up a needed job rather than deliver groceries to strikebreakers. He early broke from his father's political party because he didn't think it had the interests of the common man at heart—but was not adverse in later years to withholding support from the nominee of his own party. He was beloved by thousands of his fellow New Mexicans—and hated by almost as many.

His political fights were savage—but he won most of them. He twice fought, and licked, that dreaded ailment, cancer. Death was due at last to a heart attack.

CHAVEZ served 27 years in the Senate, becoming one of its most colorful and powerful figures. He was fourth in seniority in the entire Chamber, and held the powerful chairmanships of the Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

He will be remembered chiefly for his Senate service. But before that he was a U.S. Representative and served in the State legislature. He was an attorney, had been an engineer, newspaper editor, deputy game warden, and grocery store employee.

Senator CHAVEZ was born April 8, 1888, in a small adobe house in the village of Los Chavez, north of Belen in Valencia County. The land on which the house stood had been granted to his direct ancestors by King Phillip II of Spain in 1597. His parents, David Chavez and Paz Sanchez de Chavez, were members of families which had lived in the community for generations.

His boyhood was typical of that of a rural New Mexico boy of that time. The family spoke only Spanish. Young DENNIS worked long hours in the fields, tending the crops that were to furnish the family's food and watching the cattle and sheep on the pastures.

In 1895, the family moved to Barelas—that part of present-day Albuquerque just east of the Barelas Bridge.

The move was made to give the children better educational opportunities. Young DENNIS attended a Presbyterian mission school which then stood at Second and Trumbull SW. He later attended the old third-ward school.

But the family's finances, which had never been good, became even worse. Young CHAVEZ was forced to quit school when in the seventh grade, to aid his father in supporting the family. There were eight children.

His first job was as a delivery boy for Charles Conroy, at the Highland Grocery Store. Work hours were 6 a.m. to 7 p.m. daily—11 p.m. on Saturdays.

During this time CHAVEZ pursued his education by the aid of books from the public library.

His grocery career ended abruptly when he was 18. He was instructed by his employer to deliver groceries to a group of strike breakers. He refused. He was promptly fired.

It was about this time he made his decision to join the Democratic Party. His father had been a Republican, a peace justice and GOP precinct chairman at Los Chavez before moving to Albuquerque. He was Republican chairman of precinct 5 after moving here.

The Senator used to recall he "had many a hot word with my father" over politics. The younger CHAVEZ hated the so-called patron system—which set up landowners as virtually omnipotent people in their communities. They owned the land and houses and—in effect—the people themselves. Most were Republicans.

A DEMOCRAT

So when the younger CHAVEZ turned to politics himself, in 1916, he entered through the Democratic Party.

Meanwhile, about the time he was fired from his grocery job, CHAVEZ made the acquaintance of Jim Gladding, a young engineer who had just moved to Albuquerque. Under Gladding's guidance, he studied engineering at night and qualified as a surveyor. When Gladding became city engineer of Albuquerque, in 1906, CHAVEZ became his assistant. As such, he aided in designing and supervising construction of the old part of the present city hall and 33 miles of sewage system. He later worked for the territorial engineer, Jim French, and built the first highway in Rio Arriba County, between Espanola and Abiquiu.

In 1911 he married Imelda Espinosa, a member of another longtime and prominent New Mexico family.

For the next few years, CHAVEZ worked at a variety of occupations. He edited a Belen newspaper—until he wrote an editorial which did not match the owner's views. He was fired again. He then worked for the territorial engineer, operated a construction firm in Albuquerque in partnership with the late Rafael Garcia, became an assistant State game warden in 1917.

In 1916 he had his first political fight—and lost. He became Democratic nominee for Bernalillo County clerk and attempted to unseat the incumbent, Don Nestor Montoya. The latter, an experienced orator and public official, president of the New Mexico Press Association, and member of the then-dominant Republican Party, won easily.

In 1917 came a big chance for young CHAVEZ to continue upward. The late Senator A. A. Jones, Democrat, offered him the post of assistant clerk of the U.S. Senate. He jumped at the chance—mainly because he could continue his education in night school. In 1920 he graduated from the law school of Georgetown University and returned to Albuquerque to practice law. Two years later he was joined in that practice by his brother, David Chavez, Jr., now a justice of the State supreme court. He was elected to the State legislature in 1920, where he sponsored a bill to provide free textbooks for schoolchildren.

In 1930 he won election to the U.S. House of Representatives, defeating the incumbent, Albert G. Simms, Republican. During his first term in the House he unsuccessfully fought for a public works bill, but successfully sponsored a bill granting a moratorium on construction assessments of reclamation districts. During his second term, he successfully sponsored a measure which allowed longtime settlers on lands to which Indians had title to keep the lands, with the Indians receiving payment.

HEADED THE PARTY

CHAVEZ became Democratic national committeeman for New Mexico in 1933.

The next year, he opposed the incumbent, Republican Bronson Cutting, for the U.S. Senate. Cutting was declared the winner. CHAVEZ filed a contest with the Senate. This was pending when Cutting was killed in an airplane crash. The late Clyde Tingley, then Governor, appointed CHAVEZ to the vacancy. He was elected in 1936—defeating the powerful Miguel A. Otero, Jr., of Santa Fe, Republican. He was reelected in 1940, 1946, 1952 and 1958. Every election was a tough fight.

In 1940, he was opposed for the Democratic nomination by the late John J. Dempsey, former Congressman and former Governor. CHAVEZ won by about 3,000 votes. But recounts demanded by Dempsey went on for weeks, without changing the results. The 1946 primary was a repeat. CHAVEZ defeated Dempsey by about 10,000 votes in this contest—but was opposed by Republican Patrick J. Hurley in the general election. Hurley tried again in 1952 to wrest the Senate seat from CHAVEZ, and when the incumbent was declared the winner, filed a contest of the election with the Senate itself. This dragged on until March 1954, when the Senate confirmed CHAVEZ winner.

PLANNED NEW CAMPAIGN

His renomination and reelection in 1958 was relatively easy. He had announced, about a year ago, he would seek reelection in 1964. He repeated this intention in an interview during his last visit to Albuquerque, shortly before the general election.

The Senator always kept a close watch on the political pulse of New Mexico—and frequently tried to influence the course of its elections. He had frequent "breaks" with leaders of his own party.

In 1942, CHAVEZ backed his friend, Bryan G. Johnson, in the latter's unsuccessful attempt for the Democratic nomination for Governor. Dempsey won the nomination. Clyde Tingley—who had appointed CHAVEZ to the Senate originally—was among those who fought Johnson in this primary.

He carried on open feuds with John E. Miles and Thomas J. Mabry, during their terms as Governors. When Miles was defeated, in 1950, for a return to the Governor's office, there were many rumors CHAVEZ had given support to the winner, Republican Edwin L. Mechem.

DOUBTS REMOVED

There is no doubt as to the Senator's role in the defeats of Gov. John F. Simms in 1956 and Gov. John Burroughs in 1958, by Mechem. Dennis Chavez, Jr., son of the Senator, in a recent campaign talk in New Mexico said his father had withheld support from Simms and Burroughs in their bids for reelection because he had not liked their administrations.

In 1948, CHAVEZ had his first serious bout with disease. He became quite ill with cancer of the stomach and had about two-thirds of his stomach removed in an operation at St. Joseph's Hospital.

He suffered cancer of the throat about 2 years ago He came to Albuquerque for treatment, had an operation and in Washington took cobalt treatments. Between hospital stays, he continued to actively work in the Senate and on its committees. His death was attributed to a heart attack.

CHAVEZ received many honors during his long career. Among them, and its bestowal was ranked by the Senator as one of the top events of his life, was the Order of the Aztec Eagle, First Class, the top award of Mexico. It was presented by Mexican Ambassador Antonio Carrillo Flores in September, 1961.

TOPPED EFFORTS

"For me it was the culmination of years of effort to better relations with our vital neighbors to the south," CHAVEZ himself said.

Toward the end of his life, he looked backward in a series of articles for the Journal. He made this comment:

"It was the early years, the hard years of growing up in a poor country, that made the difference. They were years rich in human warmth. They taught me a knowledge of New Mexico, her people and problems, that has enabled me to serve effectively through more than 30 years in high office.

"I like to think I've repaid New Mexico in some small measure for the favors she did me as a child."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the tributes paid to the late Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ today are appropriate and well deserved. I have never known a senior Senator of this body to be more generous and more helpful to a very junior Member than Senator CHAVEZ was with me as a new Member of this body. Senator CHAVEZ, then chairman of the Public Works Committee, made me chairman of the Public Roads Subcommittee. It would have been easy for him to exercise the power of chairman, to take the leadership in the enactment of the superhighway program. Instead, he referred it to the subcommittee.

As chairman of the full committee, he accorded to me the full support and the full confidence of which he was capable—and this was powerful. This program ultimately came to enactment and is now the largest public works program in the history of the world.

Not only did Senator CHAVEZ demonstrate generosity and comradeship to me, but this was the pattern of his conduct toward all members of the Committee on Public Works. A man possessed of great ability, enormous capacity for loyalty, and devotion to friendship, DENNIS CHAVEZ also possessed an unusual degree of moral, political, and physical courage. Many of his colleagues recall his appearance on the floor of the Senate after many months of suffering and travail, rigors which might have discouraged men of lesser faith and courage. He rose in the Senate and spoke representing the people of New Mexico. I thrilled at this demonstration, a demonstration of indomitable spirit.

DENNIS CHAVEZ loved life, and he loved it to its fullest. He loved his friends and his family, and they in turn loved him in full measure.

To his wife, who was ever constant and ever loving, and to his children, I extend sympathy and condolénce, but also I extend to them congratulations for having been the wife and the children of a great husband and father.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, when Senator CHAVEZ died last November, the State of New Mexico lost a devoted servant, and the Nation lost a steadfast defender of human rights.

DENNIS CHAVEZ was born to poverty in New Mexico. He was truly and in every sense of the word a self-made man. He made himself what he was—a great, strong American. He was the first American of Spanish origin to serve in the Congress of the United States. He served 2 years in the House of Representatives and 27 years, until his death, in the U.S. Senate.

He was loved by Spanish-speaking people all over the world, especially in this country, and particularly in California, where there are 1,750,000 Spanish-Americans who live in Los Angeles and in other areas of the State.

He was an authentic hero to the Mexican people, in every sense of the word. He gave them hope, he gave them encouragement, and he gave them dedication. For more than three decades, Senator CHAVEZ dedicated himself to the needs of the underprivileged and those who are discriminated against.

He was a quiet, soft-spoken man; but when our civil liberties were threatened, he could speak with great eloquence and vigor. Senator CHAVEZ will long be remembered for a statement he made on the floor of the Senate in 1950. It has been alluded to before. It appears in the tribute to Senator CHAVEZ in the House, some weeks ago. Our distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] referred to that statement. He did not read all of it. I should like to read into the RECORD the entire statement of Senator CHAVEZ:

> I should like to be remembered as the man who raised a voice—and I devoutly hope not a voice in the wilderness—at a time in the history of this body when we seem bent upon placing limitations on the freedom of the individual. I would consider all the legislation which I have supported meaningless if I were to sit idly by, silent, during a period which may go down in history as an era when we permitted the curtailment of our liberties, a period when we quietly shackled the growth of men's minds.

That is one of the greatest and most eloquent statements ever made on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Some time ago the late beloved Robert Frost said that he thought the people should be more patriotic than partisan. Senator CHAVEZ was a good example of this philosophy. As chairman of the Committee on Public Works and of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, he held a position of great influence and power in the Senate. However, he did not use that advantage for selfish political or sectional purposes. His country always came first.

DENNIS CHAVEZ served his State and his Nation with distinction. His colleagues will never cease to miss him on the floor of the Senate. The people of New Mexico will never forget him. As a personal friend, I will never forget him.

I am proud today to join with Senators who are paying tribute to a man whom we loved and respected, the tribute to the service he rendered to his country.

Lou and I extend our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy to the wonderful members of his family, who are in the gallery today, most especially to the wonderful lady, Mrs. Chavez, who stood by him all the years of his life and during his public service.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, we who knew Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ in his late years as a Member of the Senate knew him primarily as a man dedicated to the Senate and particularly to the work of the committees on which he served. We knew him as one who was ever ready to help the other Members of the Senate, especially those of us who were new in this body.

At the time of his death, it was noted by commentators that few Members of Congress were more closely identified with the States which they represent than was Senator CHAVEZ, of New Mexico. Born at Los Chavez, Valencia County, N. Mex., he was of Spanish ancestry and became a spokesman in Washington not only for his State but also for Spanish-speaking Americans in the United States, in Puerto Rico, and in the countries of Latin America.

As a Senator, he was a quiet and efficient workman, and served long and skillfully as a legislative and political technician. He was more than a technician.

It is my opinion that Senator CHAVEZ will be best and longest remembered, at least in public life, for two public positions which he took during the course of his long Senate career. One of these in political terms might be described as a popular one, in the sense that it might be charged that it might have gained him votes. The other position was, at the time, a most unpopular one, with respect to public attitudes of the time.

Senator CHAVEZ was the first sponsor of fair employment practices legislation during World War II. This was the popular position.

He was among the first to issue a clear warning 13 years ago of the dangers to America in unjustified charges regarding disloyalty and security.

His battle for fair employment practices legislation was unsuccessful, so far as obtaining the passage of specific legislation was concerned, although his effort came very close to success. This early effort brought the issue to the front, and the demonstration of support provided a base upon which modern civil rights legislation has been developed.

The second great public position for which he should be remembered was, at the time, for him and for every man in public life a most unpopular and dangerous one.

In a speech delivered on the floor of the Senate on May 12, 1950, Senator CHAVEZ warned against the dangers of demagoguery in America.

That was a time when there had been raised in this country voices of discord and voices of misunderstanding and mistrust. It was a time when voices of accusation and suspicion were heard in many quarters. It was a time when truth—which should be honored and guarded—had been redesigned and contracted by some; it was a time when many were called upon to prove in the marketplace whether truth was more effective than falsehood; a time when doubts, which should be isolated, guarded against, and contained had been expanded; a time when words, which should be cherished instruments of communication and repositories of meaning and thought, had been misapplied and misused; a time of confusion, agitation, and appeals to the emotions. All of them had been developed in their full force and flow. It was a time when patriotism, which should be the badge and shield of honor, was being forged into a weapon to be used against all who might disagree with one. It was a time when unwarranted and unjustified appeals to religion, to support a political position, were being used to serve ignoble aims and objectives. In that speech, Senator CHAVEZ stated the simple fact, "My ancestors brought the cross to this hemisphere"; and he denounced those who, as he stated, were "using this cross as a club." That was a time when betrayal, the greatest natural fault which could be charged against a fellow man, was freely charged; and it was a time when treason—the last word which should be used against a good man—was readily on the tongues of many.

Under those circumstances, DENNIS CHAVEZ stood and spoke for all America and for the dignity and value of every man. That action, together with his actions in the area of fair employment practices, indicated, in my judgment, in broad strokes the real measure of the character and the contributions of DENNIS CHAVEZ to the U.S. Senate and to the United States.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, with a heavy heart at the loss of our beloved colleague, DENNIS CHAVEZ, I wish to join in the tributes to him and to his great service both as a public servant and as a citizen.

Much has been said and much will be said about his public service in the 32 years—nearly one-third of a century—during which he served in the Congress, 28 of them in the Senate. Those services, numerous and important, deserve permanent chronicling for which a trained historian, a qualified biographer, could find no better subject. I have no doubt that this recording will be made.

I can think of no better project for the University of New Mexico than to turn some of its political scientists to work on such an assignment, for no man from New Mexico ever served as long in the Congress as did DENNIS CHAVEZ, and few men from any State have served so long through a period of such great change and such import in the history of our Nation and in the history of the world.

Occupying—as Senator CHAVEZ did in the latter years of his life—the extremely important positions of chairman of the Public Works Committee and chairman of perhaps the most important subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, that dealing with the Department of Defense, it would be inevitable that he would contribute importantly to national policy. He did contribute importantly to our internal economy, through the multitude of public works and highways, river and harbor developments, public buildings, and power dams—all these great contributions to our national economy and growth which recently have received the appellation of infrastructure. No less important were the tremendous achievements, for which he was in a large measure responsible, in strengthening the defenses of our Nation by providing adequate appropriations, and thus not only preserving our own liberties, but also striking telling blows, in behalf of all mankind, for both the nations that are free and want to remain free, and also those whose people were emerging from colonialism or were seeking to escape totalitarianism and wished to be free.

It is probable that few men had so great an opportunity to serve effectively in the national interests, both at home and abroad, as did DENNIS CHAVEZ; and he served effectively. The results of his attitudes and actions will be indelibly inscribed in the history of our country's growth, progress, and strength.

Others will develop fully, I have no doubt, these aspects of DENNIS CHAVEZ' illustrious career. As I said, I hope his public service, as well as his fruitful and happy private life, from its humble origins, will be made the subject of a book-length biography.

What I would like to stress, however, are the outstanding traits which I think above all distinguished DENNIS CHAVEZ among his fellow men. Those traits were his personal kindliness, his warm human sympathy, his friendliness, and his helpfulness. They were inevitably part of his love of his fellow men, his feeling for the common man, his sympathy for the underprivileged, the poor, the needy, the sick, the disadvantaged, the victims of any kind of discrimination. In his early days he had experienced poverty and want, and he could understand the problems of those who had similarly undergone the experiences and trials of humble surroundings.

His kindliness was, of course, notable to his colleagues, and particularly to those newcomers to the Senate who needed the cooperation, friendly assistance, and guidance of those who, like DENNIS CHAVEZ, had both the experience and the position and power to be helpful.

I, myself, recall most gratefully some of these experiences. I wish to recall, in the first place, DENNIS CHAVEZ's great help to the cause of statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii. It could scarcely be otherwise with one so deeply imbued with basic American principles, especially the most basic American principle—that of Government by consent of the governed. He was old enough to remember when New Mexico was a territory; and both his personal recollections and his knowledge of American history made crystal clear to him that the disadvantageous status of being a territory was not one that could permanently be consistent with the basic aspirations and professions of America. So he vigorously supported statehood for Alaska and Hawaii—in which, I may say, the other Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] was also a tremendous force, having led the fight on more than one occasion, and also in seeing it through to a successful conclusion. Indeed, DENNIS CHAVEZ supported every worthy cause, every cause that made life better and nobler for his fellow men.

I recall another episode for which we Alaskans must be and are grateful. In Alaska we have a unique episode related to the Matanuska Valley, which was the scene of a project in 1935 initiated with the imagination characteristic of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. When I first saw him at Hyde Park, in September 1934, just prior to my appointment as the first Director of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions of the Department of the Interior, President Roosevelt reviewed the conditions and needs of our outlying areas over whose Federal relations this newly created Federal agency would have jurisdiction. In regard to Alaska, he said:

> Alaska needs more people and we should also do what we can to stimulate agriculture there.

He recommended that the following spring a thousand people be moved from our stricken agricultural areas, victims of the dust bowl droughts and other natural calamities, and be given a chance to start life anew on "the last frontier."

One of the problems which these settlers faced was that of developing their farm economy. They did so by starting a dairy industry. They were encouraged to do that when, 5 years after their settlement in the Matanuska Valley, in 1935, defense belatedly came to Alaska, and Fort Richardson and Elmendorf Field, Army and Air Force installations, respectively, were established near Anchorage. It was then that encouragement was given to the farmers to develop their dairy herds and supply the military, furnishing not only a market and a livelihood for the settlers, but helping to develop the economy of Alaska and getting the military to use healthful locally produced dairy products.

Our congressional delegation, my colleague BOB BARTLETT, and I, however, found that for some reason or other the quartermaster department of the military preferred to import reconstituted milk from the other States, which, upon investigation, proved to be grade C milk with a high bacterial content. An effort to change this by buying locally produced fresh milk met with firm opposition from the military purchasing authorities. My colleague and I appeared before the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of which Senator CHAVEZ was the chairman. He was presiding on that occasion. After we had testified, his attention was called to a pertinent aspect of this issue, which was that the officers on the bases were furnished with grade A fresh milk but the rank and file received the reconstituted grade C milk with the high bacterial content. That was enough for Dennis Chavez. He promptly espoused the cause which we were supporting and provided that in the subcommittee's report, the Army and Air Force were ordered to give the GI's precisely the same treatment that the officers were getting.

I think this example is illustrative, and there are many others which could be cited, of Dennis Chavez' great feeling not merely for the rank and file, but for equality—political, social, and economic—of all Americans.

One aspect of Dennis Chavez' life was unique in the Senate. Being of Spanish origin and of Mexican descent during the period of Mexican independence, he naturally had warm feelings for our neighbors to the south. He represented the people of that culture in the Southwest with a warmth and understanding which did much to improve and strengthen our relations with our southern neighbor.

I recall what a magnificant contribution he made during the first meeting of the Interparliamentary Union with Mexico two years ago, at Guadalajara. He could and did speak as a representative of both the Anglo-Saxon and Hispanic cultures, and his democratic ways, kindliness, and knowledge of our neighbor's ways contributed greatly to the success of this important new undertaking, which was designed to strengthen the bonds of our two neighboring Republics. In this respect, as in many others, his place cannot be filled.

And so, we shall miss him—but say to his family, in offering our deep, heartfelt condolences, that he has left them a legacy of which all of them, and his children's children, and their children, through the coming generations may always be proud.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise to add my few words to those that have already been expressed. I knew Senator Chavez well enough to admire him as a leader. He was a fine and honorable man who exemplified courage and an inspiring concern for his fellow men.

I did not know Senator Chavez as long or as well as I would have liked. But I knew him well enough to admire him as a brave and fine man who exemplified the practice of courage. He was a fighter for what he thought was right, and a crusader for civil liberties. He worked hard and successfully for the welfare of his native State and was its great benefactor.

He combined the fire and spirit of his distinguished forebears with a very real concern for his fellow man.

To my mind, he demonstrated triumph of spirit over body. I extend my condolances to his family who, indeed, can and should be very proud of him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, after the adjournment of the 87th Congress every Member of the Senate was shocked when the news came that one of the most lovable and best loved Members of this body was summoned on the final rollcall to that vast confraternity in the domain of eternal rest.

When I first met Dennis Chavez in the 73d Congress in 1933—which as you will note is 30 years ago—I was deeply impressed by the fact that a somewhat weatherbeaten Spanish-speaking citizen from distant New Mexico should be among the lawmakers of the Nation. This was, perhaps, hard testimony to the fact that I was not a very well traveled citizen in those days.

He intrigued me immensely and I made it a special point to cultivate his friendship. That friendship soon ripened into an affection which continued to grow with the years and continued without interruption through our long association in both the House and the Senate.

It must have been a rugged and determined spirit which brought him across country to the Nation's Capital, which carried him through a law school course, which brought him to the U.S. Senate as a clerk, which took him back to New Mexico to establish a law practice, which impelled him to successfully seek a place in the legislature of his State, which later made him successful in his first bid for a seat in the House of Representatives and which finally brought him to the U.S. Senate, where he served for more than a quarter of a century. Few members of this body had so varied, so successful, and so influential a career.

His contributions to the Nation in the field of national defense and public works were notable indeed and what comfort and pride his family can find in that record.

I have said before that to me he was an amazing person. Consider for a moment the long affliction which kept him in the hospital; his determined struggle to survive and continue in the public service; his long handicap for expression and how frustrating it must have been on many an occasion when the spirit cried for expression but the physical instrument for expression could not respond. Seldom will one see such tenacity for life and for the purpose of carrying on the work which he began when his congressional career was first established.

I have said of him on many occasions that he was one of the most colorful people I ever knew. This one can quickly define from the variety of his service, his great popularity in Spanish-speaking lands where he engendered good will for his own country; his campaigns in a bilingual State—all these made him a truly colorful person.

I said he was so deeply beloved. It was that spirit of helpfulness which was always evident in him and one of his great attributes that endeared him to his colleagues. I for one must confess a deep debt of gratitude to him for the generous way in which he dealt with a number of measures in which I had an abiding interest.

Today in reverent tribute I salute his service and his spirit. That service was long and devoted. The spirit was humble and helpful and he shall always be enshrined in our remembrance. So across the months since the eternal finger touched him into eternal sleep, let me say "buenas noches," gentle friend.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to serve on the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense during the time that Senator Dennis Chavez was the chairman of that subcommittee.

I saw him in action. No Senator was ever more dedicated to his duties and to his country's defense and national security than Dennis Chavez in his untiring efforts as chairman of that subcommittee.

Several years ago when a move was made to unseat Senator Chavez because of alleged irregularities in a New Mexico election, I was one of five Republican Senators voting against unseating him. I did not see how we could single out Senator Chavez when in the very same election New Mexico had given a majority to President Eisenhower and elected a Republican Governor.

I have spoken of how the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, even though he was a Democrat, offered campaign contributions to me in 1954 and 1960 and desired that I be reelected.

I know that Senator Chavez felt that way too. It is not important that he felt that way about me—the importance is that he was not controlled by narrow political partisanship. I am sure that had I asked him for a letter of endorsement of my candidacy for reelection in 1960 he would have unhesitatingly given it to me even though we were of opposite political parties.

For he did that very thing in 1962 for the Republican assistant leader in the Senate—the senior Senator from California. This was an act of considerable political courage—and act of political statesmanship.

But it was typical of Dennis Chavez.

Political courage was one of the many outstanding traits of Senator Chavez. He had it in abundance. One of the many times that he demonstrated that courage was back in 1950 when our Nation was plagued with a mental sickness in which neighbor began to distrust neighbor—in which name-calling became the vogue of the day—in which the Senate was debased with unrestrained vilification and character assassination—when there was a silence of fear that almost completely paralyzed the Senate—and when heretofore leaders became mental mutes afraid to speak their minds lest they commit political suicide.

It was back in those fear-ridden days of 1950 that Dennis Chavez risked political suicide and with extraordinary political courage declared his moral conscience against the tactics that had gripped the Senate.

If Dennis Chavez is remembered by historians for any one act above all other acts on his part, I am confident that it will be this.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, one of my first friends, as a new Senator in these Halls, was the gracious Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico. His was a chivalry of true Spanish origin with the humility of a man who loved America as he cherished his own State as the Land of Enchantment, where out of his earliest responsibilities he fashioned his own opportunities.

Out of his own memories of difficult days, it was the character of Dennis Chavez to befriend the friendless. Out of

his own boyhood experience of insecurity, he demanded that his land be secure and strong. Out of a preeminence in statesmanship earned and proved in this Senate, he was understanding and generous to the newcomer.

Dennis Chavez could be restrained on this floor with the eloquence of a man who did his homework and knew whereof he spoke. Dennis Chavez could be eloquent on this floor with the indignation of a man who hated chicanery and pretense.

And my friend from New Mexico could be courteous to my friends—and to my family as he was and would be to yours—and leave them all with the lovely impress that our Senate must, indeed, be a courtly place, for men like Dennis Chavez made it so.

There was a pleasure in serving here with him. There is a sadness since these Halls will know him no more. May he rest in peace.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, one of the first Members I met when I came to the U.S. Senate in 1950 was Dennis Chavez. I shall never forget his first statement to me. He said, "You and I represent States from the great West and Southwest and I am sure we will be working together."

One of the real joys of working with the Senator was the fact that he knew and understood the problems of that area and the people.

We were associated in many public works programs for the conservation of water for beneficial uses, in an area where water is so important.

One of Dennis' outstanding characteristics was his kindness and his friendliness. He always had a kind word and a friendly greeting for everyone. His many years of service in the U.S. Senate had endeared him to everyone he came in contact with. I miss him very much. The Senate just does not seem the same without him.

Mrs. Carlson joins me in extending our sincerest and deepest sympathy to Mrs. Chavez and the family.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, it was with a feeling of deep personal loss that I received the news of the death of Senator Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico.

My long and pleasant association with Senator Chavez dates back to January 1955 when I first entered the Senate and had the good fortune to be assigned to the Committee on Public Works, of which he was the chairman.

It was my privilege to serve with Senator Chavez on that committee for almost 8 years—until his death on November 18, 1962. Senator Chavez always treated me with unfailing courtesy and consideration and with eminent fairness. He was my good friend.

Senator Chavez was a great and distinguished American. His many battles on behalf of the underprivileged and the unfortunate earned him the title of "Champion of the Underdog."

He served the people of his beloved New Mexico and of the United States for many years with great devotion. It is a tribute to the wisdom of the people of New Mexico that they early recognized his great potential for public service, first electing him to the Senate in 1936, confirming his earlier appointment to this body by the Governor. They then proceeded to reelect Senator Chavez four times. At the time of his death, he was serving his fifth term.

As chairman of the Public Works Committee and as chairman of the Military Affairs Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, he made many great and lasting contributions to the physical development and the national security of his country.

The knowledge of these achievements, plus the high regard in which he was held by his colleagues of the Senate, will, I hope, be of some comfort to his bereaved family to whom I extend my most sincere condolences.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Dennis Chavez was first elected to Congress in 1931. He became a Member of the Senate in 1935 and served as a faithful Senator from New Mexico until his death in 1962. I came to know Senator Chavez from our service together on the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. For a number of years he served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and I was the senior minority member of the same committee. So we sat beside each other. We discussed the questions that were important to our country's security. We respected each other's opinion and thus became good friends. Senator Chavez' decisions on questions that involved the security of our country were always without partisanship. We differed at times—not on a partisan basis—but on what we believed to be in the best interest of the military services of our country. These differences, always without partisanship, brought us closer together in our work.

Senator Chavez was always insistent on making it possible for men who were intelligent, energetic, and hard-working to make a career of the military service which would be of value to our country and at the same time a career of which such men could be proud and in which they would be happy to serve. Hospitals, housing, proper pay for services rendered were thus matters on which he stressed and exercised the full weight of his position as chairman of our subcommittee.

In his efforts to improve the military services and thus the security of our country, he gave the best of his experience, his knowledge, and his zeal, but at the same time he never forgot to help, in ways that the Federal Government could help, the people of his own State of New Mexico. He fought to get better roads and to build up the conservation resources of his State. He never forgot the Indians who were resident in the State of New Mexico.

Many times we argued pleasantly over whose ancestors came first to our country—his, who came to our country through Mexico, or mine, who came to New England at Plymouth and Salem and elsewhere. We never did reach a conclusion, but we enjoyed our discussions.

On the floor of the Senate, he stood up for what he believed, and on military questions as they came from our committee he backed forcefully the decisions reached by the committee.

Senator Chavez and his wife and family were very close to each other. It was a happy sight to see them together.

His friendly presence on the Appropriations Committee, his wise judgment on its decisions, and his pleasant personality on the Senate floor will be missed by every Senator no matter what his partisan faith. And I personally have lost a colleague whom I came to respect and with whom I became friends.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I pay tribute, today, to the memory of Senator Chavez, whose courage and attention to his responsibilities even in the depths of a painful illness will always be an inspiration to those of us who were privileged to be his colleagues.

Senator Chavez, though he spent many years in Washington and rose to a place of high responsibility and national prestige in the Senate, never forgot his State or the citizens who elected him. His record as a Representative and a Senator stands as a monument to a responsive and responsible career in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Dennis Chavez was a friend and a colorful figure in the Senate. His Spanish-American heritage lent a piquancy to his important position in the Senate over so many years. His success in great office made him one of the shining symbols of what a man can do in our Nation when given the opportunity; and his physical and moral courage in the face of terrible pain and adversity cloaked his figure with the mantle of human greatness.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, a western Senator who left his mark upon this body was the late Dennis Chavez. Senator Chavez represented the blend of cultures and backgrounds that gave variety and distinction to the settlement of the West. His is also the story of attaining cherished goals through hard work and determination. And when he had reached his goal, when he saw success in his efforts for advancement he did not choose to rest on his laurels. He worked hard for the people of his State and Nation.

The extent of his devotion to duty was easily observed by those of us in this body who saw him at his desk and in this Chamber even after he was cruelly attacked by the illness that ultimately caused his death. Lesser men would have given up, would have retired to their sickbeds. But Dennis Chavez continued his lifelong habit of hard work. His was an example for everyone's benefit and his determination should give courage to those who would hesitate in the face of formidable obstacles or retreat in the face of pain and suffering.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as Members of the U.S. Senate, we share a deep and common sense of loss in the passing of our distinguished colleague and esteemed friend, Dennis Chavez. Although it is a shared loss, this does not lighten the burden of sorrow for any who proudly and affectionately claimed Dennis Chavez within the circle of their friendship. In his long and eminent career of public service, this outstanding

American gentleman brought the highest qualities of dedication, of intellect, of energy, and of leadership to the tasks and responsibilities which his fellow citizens entrusted to him. He was a fighter in spirit, in mind, in body—ever prepared to commit his full self to both the defense and the achievement of the ideals, the principles, the convictions which he found in his heart.

Valiant in his long and grievous illness, his spirit unyielding in the daily battle against pain, Dennis Chavez died as he had lived, a man of singular and indomitable courage. Our deepest expression of sorrow and sympathy goes today to his beloved family, to the people of the great State of New Mexico whom he served so well, and to the Nation he ennobled by his life and his work.

To me the friendship of Dennis Chavez was ever a valued personal treasure, and so too, will his memory remain the precious, inspiring legacy that friend leaves to friend.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is well that we take this time to voice our tributes to the memory of Senator Chavez. It is a time for quiet and solemn reflection. It is a time to repledge our efforts to carry on with the heritage which Dennis Chavez left.

He was a proud man. He was proud of his noble ancestry. He was proud of the State of New Mexico where he was born 24 years before it became a State and he was proud of the Senate of the United States which he first served as a clerk while working for his law degree at Georgetown University.

He was proud of the Senate, both as an institution and proud of us, his colleagues. I was privileged to serve under his chairmanship of the Public Works Committee. No chairman could have been more fair or more considerate of the rights of the committee members, whether they towered in seniority or were the most recent of newcomers.

I well recall his describing the Public Works Committee and its role.

"We are builders," he said. "We are building America, harnessing its rivers, developing its resources, making it a greater Nation."

He insisted that partisan politics play no part in the consideration of a project before his committee. It either had merit or it did not. He had a discerning eye for projects which lacked merit.

The true character of Dennis Chavez is best illustrated, I think, by the last several months of his life. Although he had been in failing health for some time, he never sought sympathy. Instead, he always endeavored to have a word of cheer and encouragement for others.

It was my great and good fortune to have had him as a friend.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Senator Dennis Chavez served 27 years in the Senate. In these 27 years no man in the Senate was more loved or respected than he was. He worked long and hard. He worked with intelligence and devotion, with honor and integrity, for his Nation and his State.

Senator Chavez was chairman for many years of the Public Works Committee. His work and that of his committee make a fitting memorial to this beloved man. There is no State in our Nation in which evidence of his wisdom and foresight cannot be seen—embodied in our great dams, our highways and our public buildings.

Of Spanish-American origin himself, he was deeply sympathetic to the injustices which are done to the racial and religious minority groups of our Nation. Time and time again he used the authority of his office to see that right was done to individual citizens who had been unfairly treated by the officials of our Nation. He was, I know, greatly loved by the people of New Mexico. He was no less loved by the Members of the Senate.

In the last months of his life in spite of intense pain and discomfort, he continued to served his State, his Senate and his country. His presence among us last year was a moving example of high courage and selfless devotion.

His loss is a heavy burden for us. His death is a great personal loss to me.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the first committee assignment that I received upon entering my duties in the Senate in 1959 was membership on the Committee on Public Works. Dennis Chavez was chairman of that committee at that time.

He was one of the first friends I made in the Senate, and I have profited greatly from his good counsel.

Senator Chavez occupied in his capacity as chairman of the Committee on Public Works a position of prestige—and of great power. His grasp of his job and his wise conduct of the affairs of his committee were qualities to provoke admiration from an observer such as one becomes as he enters the Senate.

One other quality which I remember in Senator Chavez endeared him to many of his colleagues. While on the floor of the Senate, I have seen him, perhaps more frequently than most other Members, spontaneously offer his congratulations to a Senator who had made an important point in a speech.

In this way alone, he constantly offered encouragement to his colleagues. Any new Senator needs such kindness. And Senators could have only great appreciation for the author of such welcome gestures.

For a long time, Senator Chavez was afflicted with an illness which would have caused lesser men to despair. But the lived with it, fought it, and as was characteristic of his fortitude, conquered it.

I am glad that the opportunity presented itself for me to have known and worked with this fine man.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, with the death of the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, the Senate lost one of the kindliest men that ever graced these halls.

Dennis Chavez was interested in people. He liked people. The heat of the battle never prompted him to do or say an unkind thing.

Senator Chavez was first and always an American. He was proud of his nationality background but his devotion to this country was the important thing in his life. He shared the American dream and he wanted all of our citizens to have an opportunity under it.

Senator Chavez had grit. He would hang on when others might give up. His successful struggle with serious illness will be an encouragement to everyone and no doubt will even add to medical knowledge.

I endorse all of the fine things that are being said today concerning our late friend. I wish to extend to Mrs. Chavez and to all the family the sincere sympathy of Mrs. Curtis and myself.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, we in the Senate who worked with Dennis Chavez are better Senators as a result of our associations with him. Without him, we are without a very warm friend and a true patriot who put the good of his country above all else.

Dennis Chavez loved people and people loved him. He was a great believer in democracy and government with a heart that responded to the needs of the people and the demands of the times.

The U.S. Senate was very much a part of Dennis Chavez and his life, and he had a unique career in this body. He came to Washington and to the Senate as a clerk as just a boy, and he was a part of the life of the Senate and the Federal Government during the most crucial periods of our Nation's history.

I often called on Senator Chavez for advice and counsel. He was always understanding, and above all, reasonable and fair. I know that the other Members of the Senate also looked to him for guidance, and I am sure they found in him the same qualities.

Senator Chavez looked upon the vast Southwest as the new frontier of the United States. He worked most effectively to develop the tremendous resources of that region, because he believed, and rightly so, that what was good for the Southwest—or for any other area for that matter—was good for America.

For many years to come, we will see the work Senator Chavez did in the field of resources development bear fruit in the form of a growing, stronger economy.

Even in ill health, Dennis Chavez always put his country first, and he gave to his country all that was in him.

We have sustained a great loss, but we are a better Nation as a result of what Senator Chavez contributed to us.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, my first acquaintance with Dennis Chavez was when I entered the Senate and was assigned to the Committee on Public Works, of which he was chairman. I served under him for a period of years and came to regard him with a deep and abiding affection.

Senator Chavez could be fiery and vehement when battling for his State or for the causes in which he believed, but he was friendly, helpful, and warmhearted with all of his colleagues, and especially kind to those who were his juniors and to the attachés and others who served under him.

His long, intrepid fight against ill health and his constant triumph over physical weakness to perform the duties and discharge the responsibilities of his great office sets a high mark of courage that few of us can ever hope to attain.

Deeply religious, devoted to his family, loyal to his friends, he leaves a warm spot in the hearts of every one of us who knew him.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, it was a real pleasure to serve as a member of the Committee on Public Works under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez.

When I came to the Senate, he had already established a reputation for his interest in development of our public resources and in the first Americans, the American Indians.

The map of the United States is dotted with monuments to his effective interest in water resource development, reclamation, and irrigation.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, this body lost a great Member with the passing of Dennis Chavez. We will miss him very much. He was a very active member, a hard worker. Much legislation now in existence bears his stamp.

Dennis Chavez preceded me in the Senate by some years. In fact, when I first became a Member, he was one of the stalwart leaders. He was of a warm, friendly nature, and was always glad to be of help to new Members. I leaned heavily on his always available helpful advice. Dennis Chavez' presence in this Chamber dates back to 1918, when he became a clerk in the Senate while studying law at Georgetown University. He served as a clerk in the Senate for some 2 or 3 years. Upon graduation, he returned to his native State of New Mexico, which elected him to the House of Representatives in 1931. There he served during the 72d and 73d Congresses, and then came to the Senate. From 1935 through 1962, Dennis Chavez served in the Senate with distinction. I am sure that all of us were particularly impressed with his effectiveness in committee work. He studied each issue carefully, and was always well informed on the matters which came before his committees. It was in committee work that he was outstanding. In my dealings with Dennis Chavez, I found him to be a fair and just man. He was always willing to cooperate with others in anything he believed was for the good of the Nation.

Senator Chavez knew the problems of the Nation, and particularly those of special interest to his State. He deeply believed in our system of government. Though we were of different political parties, I never found this to be any kind of a barrier to his cooperation with me in matters which were of special interest to me.

People like Dennis Chavez are "the salt of the earth." When we consider that first and foremost he was an American, it makes us proud to call ourselves Americans.

Dennis Chavez has gone, but his work and his memory will live forever.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the departure from this official body and this earthly life of Senator Dennis Chavez creates a void in the hearts of those who knew him that will not easily be filled.

Dennis Chavez was a quiet and gentle man, whose activities as a Senator were devoted not to the mere winning of plaudits of the press and galleries, but to serving the people of his beloved State of New Mexico, the American West, and the United States.

It was my privilege first to know Dennis Chavez when I came to Washington as a new Member in the 73d Congress, and in the subsequent 30 years our association deepened to cherished friendship.

During the past 4 years, as a member of the Senate Committee on Public Works, I served under the chairmanship of Dennis Chavez, where I observed at close range the work of equity and justice which he brought to that post. In a sense, every colleague was a member of his constituency, for every Senator at some time pressed the claims of his State on Dennis Chavez. Though these needs could not always be filled to the satisfaction of the individual request, I doubt that a single Member could deny that he invariably received a responsive and sympathetic hearing from Senator Chavez.

Though a lifelong and loyal Democrat throughout his career, the late Senator from New Mexico never lost sight of Aristotle's dictum that:

> Those who think that all virtue is to be found in their own party principles push matters to extremes; they do not consider that disproportion destroys a state.

Dennis Chavez held always to this sense of proportion, and his wise and reasoned counsel will not soon be forgotten by those who served with him.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President. I should like to join my colleagues today in honoring the memory of Dennis Chavez, whose sudden passing last November saddened all of us. He was a most remarkable man, indeed, another of a long line of Members of Congress whose careers add proof that America is a land of opportunity for those willing to grasp the opportunity and work hard.

Dennis Chavez made no secret of the fact that he enjoyed being a Senator—he reveled in it—not because of any prestige that might attach to the post, but because it gave him a chance to help his native land. He made it plain that his country had been good to him, and he dedicated his long tenure in public office to repaying America in fullest measure.

During the last session of Congress, despite his newly acquired physical impediment, he refused to be deterred from his senatorial duties. We all admired his faithful attendance to the tasks of his office during what must have been very trying and uncomfortable days for him.

I came to know Dennis Chavez through my membership on the Public Works Committee, of which he was chairman. How proud he was of the work of that committee. He regarded it as a most constructive committee, for it deals with protecting human lives and safeguarding property from floods and other natural disasters; expediting navigation and transportation; developing America's natural resources; preserving our Nation's shorelines; building post offices and other Federal buildings; improving highways and harbors; harnessing the energy of waterpower; creating recreational areas for our people. These were actions which gave him tremendous satisfaction, as well they might.

Through his Public Works Committee work and his long tenure as chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and through extensive travel, he came to know America very well. He had a retentive mind for people, places, and things. And he had a long memory for acts of friendship toward him. This was impressed upon me by a personal experience.

In the course of a defense inspection tour soon after Congress adjourned in 1959, he stopped over in Hawaii, aboard a Matson liner. To greet my chairman and extend a welcome to the islands, I journeyed out to his ship before it anchored. He never forgot the incident, often recalling it to me. I think he would have a good chuckle to know how close to seasickness I became in the process.

Dennis Chavez was a firm friend of Hawaii, a fact he demonstrated on many occasions in his capacity as Senator by voting for statehood and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and as chairman of the Public Works Committee. He was familiar with the extensive defense installations in Hawaii and he took great pains to make sure our forces in Hawaii were strong and ready—that America's defense outpost in the mid-Pacific would be equal to any emergency.

He recognized the value of public works projects in the economic development of all the States and of the protection of lives and property, and he took the lead in promoting these essential measures.

I recall he was especially sympathetic to the need for protection of Hilo, Hawaii, after the devastating tidal wave of 1960. With his active support, construction of a breakwater was approved by Congress.

So as I pay personal tribute to the man whom I came to know and admire in the Senate, I also pay honor to him in behalf of all the people of Hawaii who are the beneficiaries of his steadfast support and assistance.

Every State in the Union has benefited from his service in the Senate. Everywhere there are enduring memorials to his constructive leadership and his deep and abiding interest in the necessary and orderly development of needed public works. The very strong military shield that protects America today shows his handiwork. His good works, indeed, live on.

To Mrs. Chavez and other members of his family, my wife Ellyn and I extend our heartfelt condolences on their loss, a loss shared by all of us.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Senator Dennis Chavez was my chairman on the Senate Public Works Committee, and in his passing I feel a great sense of personal loss. Although he was ill much of the time during which I served on the committee, he had a magnificent courage which lifted him above and beyond his physical infirmities.

He came to the Senate in 1935, from the House of Representatives, and for almost 30 years he dedicated himself to people of his State and of the country. He has left behind many proofs of his generosity, aid, and comprehension, and his name belongs in the annals of important Americans of our time.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it is with a deep sense of sorrow that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Senator from New Mexico, DENNIS CHAVEZ.

His untimely death was a great loss, one which was felt by his friends in the Senate, his native State, and indeed the Nation as well.

DENNIS CHAVEZ, who entered the practice of law in 1920 in Albuquerque when New Mexico was still a young, new State of the Union, dedicated his life to duty and service. His long record in the U.S. Senate, punctuated by many outstanding accomplishments, shows that he devotedly pursued his ideal to the end.

The late Senator from New Mexico was especially preeminent in the conservation and development of our natural resources and in the maintenance of a mighty Military Establishment. It also is to his credit that he was a stanch defender of the rules and traditions of the Senate.

We shall all miss DENNIS CHAVEZ, but we shall always remember him as a true and loyal servant of the Nation and the people he represented.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it was a sad day for the Senate and for the country when DENNIS CHAVEZ was called home.

This kind and genial man, warm and generous friend, devoted husband and indulgent father, fair and manly opponent, incorruptible and courageous public servant, was a martyr to duty, to the people's cause, and to the service of his country.

We saw DENNIS CHAVEZ, as the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, laboring indefatigably for the development of America's waterways and her great natural resources with which God has so blessed our land. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services of the Senate Appropriations Committee, he bore the heavy burden and labored incessantly for the building and maintenance of the strength and effectiveness of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marines, to keep America strong that we might keep America free.

It was as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, including the period of some several years when DENNIS CHAVEZ was chairman of the subcommittee, that I was privileged to work closest with him and to see his noble heart, his love and compassion for his fellow man, and his deep sympathy and concern for all who suffer.

A few months ago I was privileged to witness the Ambassador from Mexico confer upon DENNIS the highest honor that his country confers upon any citizen of another country. The ceremony of conferral was held at the clinical center of the National Institutes of Health where the battle is being waged against the dread diseases, the cripplers and killers of mankind. As I sat there, moved by the occasion and humbly proud to see so richly deserved an honor bestowed upon my friend, I could not but think how fitting it was that the ceremony should be held at the National Institutes of Health that DENNIS had done so much to bring into being and to which he had made so many fine contributions. I was reminded of the words of the ancient Greek philosopher when he declared, "One cannot get closer to God than by bringing health to one's fellow man."

The example of DENNIS CHAVEZ' life is a light to lead us to higher and nobler paths. It is a part of every life he touched while on this earth and it will be transmitted from heart to heart, from soul to soul, until the last mortal shall put on immortality.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to join with other Members of the Senate in a well-deserved tribute to our beloved departed friend, DENNIS CHAVEZ.

"DENNIE" CHAVEZ, by which name he will always be remembered by his friends—was a truly wonderful person. He rose from a humble beginning to become a great statesman of our country. His contributions to important legislation over the many years that he served in the U.S. Senate are many. He was a most effective Senator, an untiring worker, and one of the most courageous men I ever knew. He never once thought of giving up, no matter how rough the going was.

DENNIE CHAVEZ will probably be remembered most for his great interest and concern for the poor and less privileged not only in his own State but throughout this Nation and, for that matter, our entire hemisphere.

DENNIE was a wonderful friend and a great statesman. We miss him here greatly. We in the Senate grieve with his beloved family in this great loss.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, when a man who is rendering magnificent service to his State and country passes from the scene of public life, it is indeed a sad occasion.

While I did not have the privilege of serving on any committee with DENNIS CHAVEZ, I grew to know him from my associations with him on the floor of the Senate and in our respective official duties. He was a man who inspired friendship and confidence, always willing to give the benefit of his long experience and background in government to a colleague.

I respected his views and benefited from his counsel.

DENNIS CHAVEZ was a great champion of the West and a man who could look ahead to the needs of future generations of his own State and of the Nation. My sympathies go out to all those who knew him and particularly his family with whom we join in a profound sense of loss on this occasion.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in the U.S. Senate in paying tribute to the memory of a distinguished former Member of this body who served his State and Nation with distinction and dedication for more than three decades. DENNIS CHAVEZ was a devoted servant of his people, and they rewarded him for his dedication to duty by returning him to the U.S. Senate on five occasions.

Mr. President, it is an amazing feat just to be able to win the confidence of the people of a great and sovereign State. To be able to hold that confidence for such a long period of time, however, is indeed a rare distinction, as all the Members of this body can well appreciate. This can only signify public belief in one's character, ability, and unselfish devotion to the people.

I had the pleasure of serving as a member of the Public Works Committee under Senator CHAVEZ when I first came to the Senate in 1955. I found him to be a fine gentleman who presided over his committee with competence, impartiality, and dignity. He rendered many valuable services to his Nation as a member and as chairman of this important committee, and also as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense Expenditures. I particularly remember his capable work on the great interstate highway program which was approved in the Congress under his leadership and that of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

To the people of New Mexico and the members of the Chavez family I again extend my sincere and deep sympathy on the passing of this distinguished and able public servant.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I pay tribute to the late Senator from New Mexico, DENNIS CHAVEZ.

We were all proud to be his friends, and it was my privilege to work with him on the many programs in which we shared an interest.

His youth in New Mexico endowed Senator CHAVEZ with a great knowledge of the land, and during his years in the Senate he devoted much energy to the development of our precious natural resources.

He was also an expert on military matters, and brought a keen mind to the complex problems of preparedness and defense.

Senator CHAVEZ was a tireless worker in behalf of the American Indian, and he made many permanent contributions to the betterment of our hemispheric relations.

It was my pleasure to serve with him on two committees, and he was unfailingly gracious and wise with respect to the problems of my State.

In many ways, we will miss his presence in the Senate for years to come.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, one is always hard put to express his opinion and sentiments when the subject is a friend and colleague over a period of many years. It will be impossible for me in a few short minutes to say the things that I feel in my heart about a very dear personal friend and one of the truly courageous public figures of our time, the late Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ.

I am one of the few Members of this body who was here when DENNIS CHAVEZ took the oath of office as a Senator of the United States. Over a period of years, we worked in many instances on the same committees and I came to know him intimately.

He was the toughest man physically I have ever known. He sustained and recovered from several major operations that would have taken all of the heart out of a lesser man, but DENNIS CHAVEZ was a great fighter. He fought the most terrible of diseases with the same courage and determination with which he always supported his political beliefs. He had courage in any field to back up his convictions. No man, no single group of men, no mighty combination or groups could shake him in his beliefs or frighten him into yielding a conviction.

We have many self-proclaimed liberals in this day. DENNIS CHAVEZ was a true liberal and he was proud of his philosophy. He was a liberal in the finest traditions of the political meaning of that word. He was a liberal in the tradition of La Follette, Borah, and Norris. He fought for the common man, the little man, the underprivileged in our society. He stood for equality of opportunity for all Americans and he supported with everything he had the great liberal traditions upon which our Republic is founded and our precious way of life rests.

DENNIS CHAVEZ was a genuine Senate type. He had not served here long before he became a Senate man through and through. He was jealous of the prerogatives of the Senate and he had a fierce pride and faith in the Senate as an institution. He understood the roll that the Senate and individual Senators are supposed to play in our scheme of government. I do not know of a higher compliment that I could pay any man who ever served in this body.

It is said that he was born in an adobe hut and of poor parents. The story of DENNIS CHAVEZ is a story in the greatest American tradition. The record DENNIS CHAVEZ accumulated and the battles he fought during his long years in public life will be long remembered and often discussed, not only by his beloved people of New Mexico, but by all others in this Nation who, though humble born, aspire to success and yearn for the opportunity to serve and possess the character with which to do it well.

Several years ago I traveled through some of the public forests and other public lands of New Mexico with Senator CHAVEZ. We visited a number of small communities largely populated by Americans of Spanish descent. The faith and pride of these people was clearly reflected on their countenances as they sought an opportunity to touch him if they could not shake his hand. His entire career bears proof that the faith and confidence of his people was justified in every respect. He never let them down.

I have never known a man who had a more complete faith in the basic American system of government than did DENNIS CHAVEZ. All of us will miss him here in the Senate, and I will miss him as my friend and confidant, and most especially the inspiration I derived from his courage every time I saw him.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to join briefly with my colleagues in the Senate in paying tribute to the memory of DENNIS CHAVEZ. He had made his mark in this body, as a Senator and statesman of the first rank, before I came to know him. It was in the closing days of his life that he set before us the example of courage and stamina that for me will be an indelible memory. I will remember this man as he stood in the Senate, mortally ill, refusing to yield in spirit to the final colloquy to which he was being called by the failing flesh, persevering in his duty while an ounce of strength remained. I will always remember DENNIS CHAVEZ as the personification of a courage to which every man should aspire, and which every man who knew him may come closer to matching, when his own time of need arrives, by recalling the burning will which kept DENNIS CHAVEZ on his feet, on the floor of the Senate, so long as the call to duty could be heard.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, when I first came onto the Senate Public Works Committee, of which the late Senator CHAVEZ was chairman, I was warmly received by the Senator and was made to feel very much at home. He loved the committee, and he had a deep affection for all of its members. We were, he said, on a committee which had no purpose other than to be constructive, to authorize projects which would make the United States a greater country, and its people happier and more productive.

The Senator had great courage, and he will always be an inspiration to those of us who knew that he was fighting a physical affliction which would have caused many a strong-willed person to lose hope and to despair. But Senator CHAVEZ never despaired. We will miss him. Mrs. Miller and I extend to Mrs. Chavez and the family our deepest sympathy over their great loss.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my sense of deep personal loss in the death last November of Senator CHAVEZ.

Senator CHAVEZ in his more than three score years of service in this body, established an enviable record of service to his State, the Nation, and to the Americas.

He was in all a great builder. As chairman of the full Committee on Public Works, he guided the world's largest construction program during the many years of his chairmanship. In this work it was his duty to program and plan the many facets of our public works development in water resources, navigation, road and highway construction, and even to our public buildings.

Aided by devoted and enthusiastic committee members, Senator CHAVEZ gave leadership and direction to this mammoth program and saw that proper emphasis was placed on not just one—but all—of the areas where the strengthening of our Nation was needed in this field of resource development. Each section received its rightful share of attention and development according to its needs. The sad plight of highway systems was corrected by the well planned and programed interstate highway program.

Vital needs of the newer States of the West, which Senator CHAVEZ knew and understood so well, were likewise provided new agricultural opportunities through irrigation projects built by the Army Engineers.

But the Senator's interest in building was not alone in physical buildings, as important as they were. He built opportunity for the underprivileged throughout all the States. He was a pioneer in the fight for civil rights and for opportunities for those who otherwise would have been passed by. His attention and work for the improvement of racial relations will long stand as a monument to his love for all Americans. He wanted all to have fair and equal opportunities.

In the field of our inter-American relations, Senator CHAVEZ was likewise active. As the first Senator of Spanish-American origin, he was able to communicate our ideas and ideals to our Latin American neighbors. This way he helped improve the solidarity of relationships with both North and South America.

We who knew him well knew of the warm personal friendship that he extended to his colleagues. As a new Member I early learned of his solicitude for our success in the Senate and found him always ready and willing to assist us in our problems connected with our service on our committees or to our States.

The people of New Mexico can be proud of the service he rendered, not only for them, but for all the Nation.

To his wife who was a true companion through all of his public and private life and to his children I extend for myself and for Mrs. Monroney our deep sympathy and condolence for the loss of a devoted public servant.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, DENNIS CHAVEZ was at home on the old frontier and the New Frontier. The Nation owes him a great debt. This warmhearted New Mexican dedicated his life to serving his country. His service on the Public Works Committee of the Senate was long and dedicated. Through the efforts of this great American, three great rivers of the country are being tamed and harnessed, and the people who live in their valleys protected. This is a service for which Senator CHAVEZ was rarely, if ever, truly recognized. Quietly, effectively and with great dedication DENNIS CHAVEZ also served tirelessly and devotedly as head of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. Hardly a decision was made in the momentous years of war and cold war without his hard work, deep research, and solemn advice. Atomic warfare, conventional warfare, manned bombers, deadly missiles, Polaris, machines, men, ships—all these were his to check, to examine, to probe, to worry and brood over.

Yet, DENNIS CHAVEZ, a man who had served in the Senate for four decades, had time to be concerned with the welfare of his own constituents and with the problems of his colleagues. His heart was big and warm. His efforts were for all of us. It was our good fortune to have had him with us. We shall miss him greatly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am among the many who will miss Senator Dennis Chavez, as a friend, a legislator and as a wise American. He was truly a great man.

Senator Chavez was a native son of New Mexico and was the oldest of eight children. He served his State ably as a member of the State legislature and was next elected to the U.S. House of Representatives, where he served from 1931, until his appointment to the U.S. Senate in 1935, where he served until his death in 1962.

Dennis Chavez had served 9 years in the Senate before I was appointed to the Senate. I became closely associated with him on many legislative matters and found in him a faithful friend. Our friendship grew for each other through the years and I considered myself a member of his family.

Senator Chavez served for many years on the Appropriations Committee and I will always treasure the years that I was able to work with him on appropriation matters. He was a great organizer, armed with the tools of logic. He served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

I could write volumes on the good work which Dennis Chavez did as a member of the Public Works Committee of the Senate. He served ably as chairman of this committee for a number of years. He did outstanding work in authorizing the funds for important projects in order to assist in protecting and preserving our water and land resources.

It is true that during a number of years Dennis Chavez was in ill health. How he fought on, day after day, over unsurmountable odds, everyone had to admire. He was a tough fighter and continued to remain active almost until the time of his death.

When Senator Chavez died last November, former President Harry S. Truman observed that he was "a good public servant, and that's about the highest thing you can say about a man."

A note was sent to Mrs. Chavez by the President of the United States, when she accepted on behalf of her husband the Minuteman Award of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States. President Kennedy said:

> Tonight we honor him as the citizen who contributed most to national security—but we shall also long remember him as a great patriot—and a great American.

I extend my heartfelt sympathy to the Chavez family, son and daughters and particularly to his wife. In my mind Dennis Chavez will live on and his overall impact on posterity will be enormous.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the people of New Mexico, and indeed of our country, Republicans and Democrats, the rich and the poor, the high and the humble, I desire to express our thanks to Senators who participated in the expressions of tribute to our beloved Senator.

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR KERR OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the untimely death of Senator Robert S. Kerr ended a career of public service unequaled by any Oklahoman, a career that deeply affected the course of our Nation.

For Senator Kerr's great energy, intellect and human qualities combined to mark him with the genius of leadership. His life was one of distinguished service, not only for his State, but for the Nation as well.

This Senate, this Government, and the people of this Nation will for years to come feel the loss of this buoyant, resourceful, dynamic individual who loved the Senate, its duties, its opportunities, and its responsibilities.

Senator Kerr's monumental achievements in his many fields of endeavor were matched by his amazing capacity for friendship, his unbounded faith in his fellow man and in his abiding and all-encompassing faith in God. His life exemplifies the great American story of attaining nearly impossible goals through hard work.

His dynamic and confident approach to challenging projects and new concepts sparked the drive in hundreds of friends, who were willing to follow his tested leadership in many fields. Those who were associated with Senator Kerr in any project followed his lead, knowing that his careful study and evaluation would bring success. He brought this quality to all the many fields where he directed his energy. Whether it was a drive to finance a university, to build hospitals, to promote new scientific institutions, or whether it was in a daring and novel project for the conservation of water resources, in social legislation, or in private business, his carefully thought-out plans and means of achieving his goals inspired others to join in his crusades.

For his basic formula for success was not only in having unbounded confidence in himself, but in transmitting that enthusiasm and loyalty to others. This enthusiasm made molehills out of obstacles that to some might seem mountains. This zest filled the contest with adventure as though it were an athletic event. It was fun for Bob Kerr, and those who loyally followed him shared in the fun.

His aims and activities reached across all vital realms of human experience in our time. Born in a log cabin on what was truly a frontier, he strove always in the vanguard, maintaining a newness and freshness of thought. His imagination and his vision seemed boundless. In science, in social welfare, in resources development, in strengthening our national security and in enlarging our economy, he forsook outmoded concepts to seize with youthful enthusiasm the rationale of new ideas and new approaches. "'Tis not too late to seek a newer world," Senator Kerr sometimes remarked, quoting from Lord Tennyson's "Ulysses."

Robert S. Kerr was born in a place where the world was new. His parents had come to Indian territory in a covered wagon and had established a small farm on land rented from the Indians. In that rustic pioneer setting, 11 years before Oklahoma was granted statehood, Robert S. Kerr was born. In his early years, his love and respect for God's good earth were nourished in the toil of making things grow that a family might live. One learns to love and respect the order of the seasons, the rich earth, the pure blue water, the value of the forest, and the beauty of the sky when life itself depends upon the harmony one achieves with such an environment.

The son of a scholarly but self-taught father, Robert S. Kerr diligently sought the benefits of a formal education under most difficult circumstances. Like many another pioneer boy before him, he walked many miles to and from a small schoolhouse, and he lived on the edge of destitution as a student at what was then the small beginning of what is now a great educational institution known as Oklahoma Baptist University. Unable to afford the full college course, the future Senator interrupted his studies at the age of 17 to become a teacher in a one-room school. When World War I came, he enlisted in the Army and saw duty in France as a field artillery lieutenant. Later, he gained much of his knowledge of the law during an apprenticeship in the office of one of the great early-day Oklahoma attorneys. He worked his way through courses at East Central State College in Ada, Okla., and at the University of Oklahoma. He sold magazines door to door. He also established a small produce business, buying the fruits and vegetables from the farmers in his home community and selling them at distant cities.

But Bob Kerr's real education came after the end of his formal education. Everything he did, everything he read, all that he saw were a part of the learning that lifted him to a wide range of understanding of myriad subjects and made him an able master of most of them.

Without realizing the transition that was taking place, his colleagues in the Senate and his people in Oklahoma saw this vast understanding of the Government's most complicated activities translated into national leadership. This leadership was acknowledged in the last session of the Senate.

For it was his ability, his understanding of the subjects, his command of earthy debate in explaining complicated measures, that enabled Senator Kerr to dominate the scene. These measures ranged from space communications to the President's 1962 trade bill, from medical care to a nationwide program to conserve our water resources, from tax revision to improvement in social security legislation.

Always an outstanding debater in scholastic competition, Senator Kerr's natural leadership abilities first came to statewide attention when at the age of 28 he was elected State commander of the American Legion. This was while he was still a struggling lawyer in a small city. His first ventures in oil came soon

after, however, and a few years later he was the principal organizer of one of the greatest industrial organizations ever founded in Oklahoma.

In 1925, Robert S. Kerr met, wooed, and won the hand of Grayce Breene, the talented daughter of a pioneer Oklahoma oil drilling contractor. The late Senator often described himself as a "wife-made man." His family always came first with Robert S. Kerr. Their three boys and one girl have now established families of their own, and the love and affection that Oklahomans had for Robert S. Kerr was reflected in an outpouring of sympathy for these fine citizens when he passed away.

Robert S. Kerr's work in civic affairs and as a lay leader of his church brought him recognition rapidly after he moved from his home community in Pontotoc County to Oklahoma City in 1931. His father had taught him the principles of Thomas Jefferson, and he rose quickly as a leader of the Democratic Party in his State, being elected national committeeman in 1940. Two years later, he became the first native Oklahoman to be elected Governor. Four years of splendid management of State affairs followed. During that period, Oklahoma was able to retire an indebtedness of $44 million, and when Robert S. Kerr left the Governor's office a surplus of more than $40 million existed in the State treasury.

During Senator Kerr's term as Governor, devastating floods occurred in Oklahoma to compound economic difficulties which had been set in motion a decade earlier by drought and depression. When he came to the U.S. Senate in 1949, the first bill he introduced was to create the Arkansas, White, and Red River Study Commission. This resulted in a completely coordinated plan for the development of the soil and water resources of the area, which Robert S. Kerr envisioned as the heartland of a fabulous new empire. But Robert S. Kerr's knowledge of the forces of nature and their effects upon our country's economy and security benefited vast regions of the United States far removed from the rural, agricultural community from which he came. The basin-wide study concept adopted with the passage of his first bill has now set a pattern being followed in many parts of the Nation.

Bob Kerr believed that the Nation's final greatness depended upon the conservation of its water resources. From the beginning of his public career, it became his principal goal. Certainly, he was interested in water for Oklahoma, an area which he loved and knew best. But from his understanding of area problems came a devotion to solving the Nation's problem of providing a certain and dependable supply of good water for the generations to come.

His unmatched knowledge in this field was recognized as he rose to lead the Senate in planning water resource development.

Much of the landmark legislation bears Senator Kerr's name and attests to his success in the passage of most of the major bills in this field.

Robert S. Kerr authored a bill to liberalize the benefits of soil conservation projects designed for upstream flood prevention. This legislation now provides water for irrigation, municipal water supply, and other benefits in needy sections of many States.

Senator Kerr was the author of the Tennessee Valley Authority self-financing bill, which at a moment of crisis for that great conservation and development system in the South gave the TVA an opportunity for new growth and stability.

He was a coauthor of the Pollution Control Act, which provides grants-in-aid to cities as an incentive to adequately treat sewage, prevent pollution of our streams, and provide policing powers to the Public Health Service. Always in search of new methods and new solutions, he secured in this bill a provision for research into better techniques for treating the critical problem of keeping our water clean.

Millions of Americans living in Northern and Eastern States will enjoy the benefits resulting from the compromise legislation which Senator Kerr worked out permitting the construction of the Niagara power development project. Opposite opinions had practically stalemated this development when Senator Kerr intervened. He also assisted in working out the legislation for the St. Lawrence Seaway, for the Delaware River Compact, and the Colorado storage project.

Robert S. Kerr was chairman of the Select Committee on National Water Resources, which, after an exhaustive nationwide survey, established principles which now have become the cornerstone policies of water resources development throughout the Nation. To hasten action upon these vital conservation projects, Robert S. Kerr, through indomitable insistence and persuasion, secured a liberalized policy making recreation part of the justification for reservoir building and providing for storage in Federal reservoirs for low-flow regulation to improve what he liked to call water quality management. This expression, "water quality management," was his method of accentuating the positive, rather than relying upon the negative term of antipollution control.

A résumé of Senator Kerr's legislative activity in the final 2 years of his life embraces an amazing spectrum. His accomplishments in the fields of foreign trade and tax legislation are wellknown, and to recite them here is unnecessary. His strong support and aid in the working out of our interstate highway program is likewise a matter known to us all. Another monument arising from his diligence in the Finance Committee is the Kerr-Mills bill, which now provides medical care for many of our aged citizens who deserve it most.

Robert S. Kerr was a charitable man. The Kerr-Mills bill is but one of many, many legislative enactments relating to social security and the welfare of our less fortunate citizens which had his meaningful support. Not so well known, perhaps, were the activities of a charitable nature which occupied many of his hours when he was not on the floor of the Senate or in the confines of the committee rooms. Many of these activities focused on Senator Kerr's beloved Baptist Church. He had served as president of the Baptist General Convention of Oklahoma and as vice president of the Southern Baptist Convention. For several years before his death he had been president of the Baptist Foundation of Oklahoma.

In the book of Malachi it is written:

> Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in mine house, and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it.

Intimates of Senator Kerr know that he went far beyond this biblical admonition, providing not only one tithe, but much more to support the charities and good works that he believed in. No one, I am sure, will ever be able to document accurately the extent of his giving, for his talent in this field he carefully and humbly hid from public view.

No one knows how many hundreds of young men there are—now outstanding business, professional, and technical leaders—who received help from Bob Kerr when they needed it most. His door was always open to youth who were seeking—as Bob Kerr once sought—an opportunity to work their way up. In his own business, in his gifts and support to young men starting out in new fields or professions, his help was there in countless cases.

Sometimes it was substantial aid in the face of financial disaster for a new family. Sometimes it was a new start in life or a stake in a business that he believed would prosper through the qualities of those he helped.

Being a friend in time of need brought him a substantial part of the satisfaction he had in his own success—it enabled him to help others to be successful, too.

His gifts to educational institutions and organizations will be of much benefit to deserving youth long after all of us here today have joined him in the course of mortal man.

Robert S. Kerr recognized the inevitability of change, and profoundly expected most changes to be constantly for the better. His work as chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences was rooted in the philosophy that mankind is fast discarding the shackles of fear, the fear of the unknown. "Faith," he said, "smashes the shackles of fear, frees us from its imprisonment, replaces its paralysis with unlimited power."

In taking the lead in the bipartisan effort to accelerate our Nation's program for the development of outer space for peaceful purposes, he once explained his position in terms of his faith in God, in our country, in our free institutions, in ourselves. "Reinforced and fortified by faith," he said, "we can live safely and happily amid the astonishing realities of today and face the fabulous predictables of tomorrow. We can also anticipate the astounding unpredictables of the unknown depths of space with unshakable serenity."

Time—as well as space—had to be conquered. And with his unusual ability to get things moving, Senator KERR applied his drive to this vast and complicated field. It was his ability to understand industrial methods in big projects that gave him the experience to move rapidly into this field of space exploration with a well organized program for mobilizing the Nation's best talents into the new effort in space.

We could not buy time, and Senator KERR was dedicated to establishing this Nation's preeminence in this vast new field. He considered the Russian effort a challenge to the supremacy of democracy, and acted accordingly. We were out to win.

President Kennedy once described Senator KERR as "the man with the long view." That simple encomium fits.

All of us recall how his mind sometimes overflowed with poetry or song, erupting as a fountain of wit to ease the strife and turmoil of debate. Senator KERR had many favorite passages from scripture and many verses and sayings of his own that seasoned and enriched the lives of all who came in contact with him. In serious moments, his stately passages or quotations gave dignity and meaning to the subject at hand. Or if the occasion demanded, he could frolic with words and phrases to lighten the burdens of debate or discussion.

Whether in debate on the floor of the Senate, or in a farm meeting in the hills of Oklahoma, BOB KERR always had at his command a story in point to sharpen his explanation of his position or to puncture the argument of an opponent. He loved to use his vast store of anecdotes—many native to Oklahoma—not as a gag to get a laugh, but to make understandable a philosophy or a point he was anxious to have thoroughly understood. It was also this facility for weaving humor into serious discussions to clarify his meaning that made him one of the Senate's most sought after speakers on platforms and in forums throughout the country.

It was his humor that made friends of those who once discounted his ability. It was his humor that added a mellowness to a drive that would otherwise have been suspect of seeking too much power. It was his humor that helped sustain him in the long hours that he worked.

He loved his work, but above all he loved the Senate—its Members and the body itself—as one of the world's greatest institutions. I am sure that if he had been required to make a choice between his vast business enterprises and his seat in the Senate, he would have chosen the Senate; for no man loved his work here more than the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

No one quotation can epitomize this man. His philosophy was expressed in many voices. His unique mind held in constant readiness these expressions that reflected his philosophy.

Yes, in a moment of challenge he would say:

Come, my friends,
Tis not too late to seek a newer world.
Push off, and sitting well in order smite
The sounding furrows; for my purpose holds
To sail beyond the sunset, and the baths
Of all the Western stars, until I die.
It may be that the gulfs will wash us down;
It may be we shall touch the Happy Isles,
And see that great Achilles, whom we knew.
Though much is taken, much abides; and though
We are not now that strength which in old days
Moved earth and heaven; that which we are, we are;
One equal temper of heroic hearts,
Made weak by time and fate, but strong in will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.

Yes, ROBERT S. KERR enjoyed the gift that enabled him to translate the vibrant spirit of his personality through the use of timeless and borrowed phrases of "Ulysses" and many another stalwart figure from the past. He was, however, more than a Ulysses of his day, for his heroic heart was tempered by his love for mankind. One of his favorite Biblical quotations came from the 13th chapter of St. John. He would interrupt a fiery argument, when tempers seemed about out of hand, to remind that Jesus said:

> A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another.

This was ROBERT S. KERR, a loving and heroic heart, strong in will. He strove, he sought, he found, and until the end of his life he did not yield.

All Oklahoma expresses great sorrow in mourning the loss of her distinguished son and great sympathy for the honored family he left behind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the prayer given by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, at the funeral services, and various editorial comments from newspaper publications in the State of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the prayer and editorial comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYER OFFERED AT THE FUNERAL OF SENATOR KERR, BY DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS, CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE, JANUARY 4, 1963

Our Father God, as we come to this solemn hour a sentence from Thy book is ringing in our ears: "Know ye that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel." Fallen? Yes, that is the poor, blundering verdict of tear-dimmed eyes and of broken spirits, shadowed today by the somber sadness of farewell.

We bow in this sanctuary he loved, vividly conscious of the empty place at which our surprised eyes are staring, staring stunned, bewildered, and strangely moved. For there is a vacant place against the sky of our national life, a vacant place against the sky of our friendship, of this church, of this city, of this State, and of the worldwide enterprises of the Kingdom of God.

One loved by his friends, trusted by his colleagues, honored by his church, has gone down—"As when a giant cedar, green with boughs, goes down with a great shout upon the hills and leaves a lonesome place against the sky. Thou knowest that is the first thing we see. For a while it seems the only thing we see. Our eyes are glued upon that vacant place against the sky. With a poignant sense of tragic loss we are gazing today with altered eyes upon an altered world and our lonely and wondering hearts are crying out in those ancient words of startled surprise, "My Father, my Father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof."

Upon our waiting hearts as we gather in this hallowed shrine, where his hungry heart listened to the proclamation of the word of God, where he entered into the fellowship of the sweet communion, the solemn vows, and the church's hymns of love and praise, may there fall upon us the mantle of a double portion of the enabling spirit of the Master he loved and served.

We come this day, with a background of Christian living and serving, which for dedicated time and strength, and substance, strikes dumb any poor faltering word of estimate or appreciation we might try to bring.

Like thy servant Moses he wished not that his countenance shone—but it did. Not with any external halo of boastful profession, but with the glow of an inner radiance. Diligent in business, yet he instinctively turned from a subtle secularism which so often, alas, in these days of crass materialism dims life's altar light. His holiness was not a claim but a climate which, while frank and open and truthful, had no place for meanness or duplicity. His was never a cloistered piety, for while only a ministering doctor saw him die, we saw him live in the glory of public service.

Here in this State of which from pioneer days he was a rugged builder, he dreamed his dreams and saw his visions of the city of God hovering over this expanding land.

We are conscious today that in his record is an epic of achievement which stands as a prophetic beacon of hope for the youth of America. Here it was by force of character and ability he climbed the steep ladder of business success and won the recognition of strong men. He belonged to this age of amazing expansion, with its perennial tearing down and building up of titanic energy and of gigantic plans. This was his field of service. His prayer was not for an easy place.

That prayer of thy servant, Carl Sandburg, expresses the very spirit of his sacrificial service: "Lay me on an anvil, O God, let me lift and loosen old foundations, let me be the great nail holding a skyscraper through blue nights into white stars."

We are grateful today that with a sense of his stewardship through his church he touched the world with his prayers and his gifts. Thus, he was a statesman of the kingdom of God, a custodian of God's purposes, a trustee of the great commission.

He was intense when mind and strength and time were to be focused upon the thing to be done but he kept the heart and bubbling enthusiasm of a child.

Thus we gratefully bring the record of one who was not a conformist, who spoke for himself and for those who sent him as their spokesman, who consecrated his ability and his love of country and his massive strength across toiling years to help build an America which under God is the torch of the world.

And so no parting here, even though unheralded and poignant, can hush the song our confident spirits raise,

"Jesus I live to Thee
The loveliest and best
My life in Thee—Thy life in me
In Thy blest love I rest.

Jesus I die to Thee
Whenever death shall come
To die in Thee is life to me
In my eternal home."

Lord bring us all to that homeland of Thy eternal love.

In the name of the loving redeemer, we pray. Amen.

[From the Daily Oklahoman, Oklahoma City, Okla., Jan. 2, 1963]

ROBERT S. KERR

A giant has fallen. Oklahoma's ablest and most honored native son was struck down yesterday. He was in the prime of his power and at the pinnacle of his career, a statesman and a patriot. He was the champion defender and developer of his native Oklahoma. No other man had fought so hard and achieved so much in raising Oklahoma to a high place in the eyes of the world.

His ability, energy, and keenness of intellect challenged the admiration of his friends and the fear of his opponents. In his death, Oklahoma suffered a crippling wound. The Nation itself and the whole world in which our country moves will suffer changes unknown.

Seldom has one man so dominated the course and future of his beloved State. In the death of Senator KERR, the State of Oklahoma has been shaken to its foundations. A host of friends and uncounted numbers of his opponents will deplore his untimely death.

Always he was a friend to the poor, a generous giver who shared his wealth unstintingly in a myriad of benefactions.

Now is no time to count or evaluate the extent of the disaster which has fallen upon the country and his cherished Oklahoma.

Where is the leader who can take his place?

[From the Oklahoma City Times, Jan. 2, 1963]

OKLAHOMA'S GREAT SON

What Oklahoman will ever forget the chill that struck the heart Tuesday as he heard the shattering news that Senator ROBERT KERR had died?

Even though the tidings 2 weeks before that the 66-year-old senior Senator had suffered a heart attack had spread premonitions throughout the State, Oklahomans had been reassured by the drive and hardiness of KERR into believing he would recover.

But it was not to be.

And a relaxed Oklahoma, its thoughts on the Orange Bowl game at Miami, saw the future of the State suddenly shiver in uncertainty.

At a time like this one remembers the qualities of the deceased—Senator KERR's single mindedness for Oklahoma, his vision, his fine mind, his wit. But because of his superb ability to get things done, these qualities were so intermingled with accomplishment after accomplishment that even in the hour of his death one cannot separate the personal qualities from the achievements and the plans for the future. Nor does one need to.

So even as we remember the past we can reflect in sadness upon an untimely death that came with so much the Senator had planned as yet unaccomplished. The Senator who loved Oklahoma so much and did so much for his State would understand.

The loss is not ours alone. The ramifications of this death go far beyond our borders—into Congress, the Kennedy administration's plans, our space effort, public works, conservation, oil legislation, finance. The title of a Saturday Evening Post article on Senator KERR which came out by coincidence just this week, "The Uncrowned King of the Senate," describes the impact this loss will have in national affairs.

Oklahoma mourns with the grieving family of this man, one of her great sons of all time.

But even in this hour of sorrow we must realize what Senator KERR, tireless worker for the Oklahoma of tomorrow, would want above all. That would be for Oklahoma, without despair, to press on to make come true that glorious future toward which he did so much to blaze a splendid pathway.

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune, Jan. 2, 1963]

BOB KERR

You could write a lot of trite editorial sentences about the death of Senator ROBERT S. KERR.

You could say that his loss will be keenly felt in the Senate. You can say that it is a great blow to Oklahoma. These things are true.

You could also point out that he grew as his jobs grew. But maybe that's in reverse. That's what you might say about any one of a number of American Presidents who were plunged into a place of great power with only modest equipment, and who suddenly began to measure up to their responsibilities. BOB KERR could have been just a garden variety Senator. But he became the most powerful man in that body because he first demonstrated his capacity to handle great responsibilities.

He was a driving man. But he drove no one as hard as himself. He peddled magazines to put himself through college. He studied law while he taught school. He set out to become a millionaire and became a multimillionaire. He never completely satisfied his thirst for wealth, and, with his partner, Dean McGee, never ceased making purchases and expansions. But along about 1940 he decided he was financially fixed for life, so he roared into politics like a tornado.

As a politician BOB KERR lost only one major battle, his drive for the presidential nomination. Yet you can't say that he started out as a statesman. There was a lot left to be desired in his 4 years as Governor of Oklahoma. But he was learning. As he grew more sure-footed he began to spend less time playing politics as though it were a poker game and more time trying to figure out what was sound.

He didn't hit his stride until after he gave up his White House hopes. Then he relaxed. He began to appear occasionally on the unpopular side of issues. His colleagues, who had regarded him as a church-basement orator, long on platitudes and Biblical quotations, began to listen to him. They discovered that there was a lot more to BOB KERR than homilies and billingsgate. He was formidable in debate because he did his homework. He was powerful in committee because he arrived stuffed with information.

BOB KERR's love affair with Oklahoma caused wry smiles and some resentment. But someone had to love Oklahoma. BOB KERR chafed at the stagnation brought about by unwise farming, lack of soil conservation, and high transportation costs. His conviction that this could be reversed by the proper employment of land, wood, and water became his credo and he backed it by heavy investments in pasture and coal land in eastern Oklahoma, an area that had been on the skids for 40 years.

BOB KERR, fortunately, lived long enough so that much of his work cannot be undone. The Arkansas River development program is now far enough along so that completion is assured. Oklahoma's potential will be realized many years earlier than it would have been without BOB KERR.

But we will miss him, just the same. He was a locomotive. He was ruthless and he was human. He was acquisitive and he was generous. He was partisan and he was also patriotic. He was a complex and amazing man.

[From Vinita (Okla.) Daily Journal, Jan. 3, 1963]

JOURNALLY SPEAKING

(By O. B. Campbell)

Many facets of American life will feel the loss of Senator ROBERT S. KERR for he figured in so many phases of activity in Oklahoma and the Nation.

All these activities added together emphasize the demands made upon his time and his services.

Anyone who has not followed closely the work of a U.S. Senator or Congressman cannot realize the hours and hours of work spent in trying to properly carry out the duties of the office. Their hours are long, often far into the night to become informed on legislation that is being considered by the legislative bodies. Constant trips to and from their States, public appearances, stacks of mail, campaigns, committee meetings, and hundreds of other demands add more and more burdens to their already loaded shoulders.

It is no wonder that these services eventually become more than the body can bear. But, being the type of public servants that they are, they continue to carry on while the demands never let up.

Senator KERR, a great Oklahoma leader, joins the ranks of those who have fallen in the service of their country.

[From the Seminole (Okla.) Producer, Jan. 2, 1963]

BOB KERR'S DEATH A BLOW TO OKLAHOMA

(By Milt Phillips)

Senator KERR's death is a serious blow to Oklahoma. His philosophy of government may not have coincided with the philosophy of every reader of this column. Whether it did or did not, none can sincerely say the Senator's influence was not one of the most important factors in bringing numerous industrial developments to Oklahoma. The faith expressed in Oklahoma by Senator KERR and his business associates—the influence he exerted because of his seniority and exceptional ability in the Congress—his constant alertness for governmental and industrial payrolls for his State—all of these added up to one of the State's greatest potentials for economic growth.

* * * * *

Oklahoma not only lost one of the most brilliant men ever to serve in Congress from Oklahoma, it lost the most influential man ever to sit in Congress from this State.

[From the McAlester (Okla.) News Capital, Jan. 2, 1963]

THE LOSS OF SENATOR KERR

The death of Oklahoma's Senator ROBERT S. KERR is a loss to his State and his Nation. His importance is shown by the fact that the future of President Kennedy's legislative program has been put in doubt and there well may have been a cloud drawn over Oklahoma water projects by his death.

Loss of "the most powerful man in Congress" also shifts responsibility for many important Oklahoma programs to his colleague, Senator MIKE MONRONEY.

Senator KERR was a fighter and a cooperator in Congress and at the same time had a tremendous sense of humor when the occasion justified it. It is being said he is the Congressman President Kennedy will miss most during the coming session.

As Senator HUMPHREY said of Oklahoma's senior Senator, it is hard to describe the characteristics of a man who was as accomplished as Senator KERR.

Oklahoma will miss his leadership in the front ranks of its continuous fight for progress.

[From the Purcell (Okla.) Register, Jan. 3, 1963]

STATE MOURNS DEATH OF KERR

BOB KERR is dead. Oklahoma people have lost their most faithful, most effective, and most beloved public servant.

Senator KERR was a native son, a typical Oklahoman. Born of a rugged pioneer family, he grew up under primitive conditions, conditions that called for hard work and total perseverance. Commencing with an innate ambition, he planned his career in business, profession, and politics just like an architect would design a building or like an artist would paint a picture or a sculptor would carve an image of a great face. He worked consistently and methodically on every operation, every lawsuit and every project and that coordinated system of labor brought him success in every field of endeavor.

It is well the editor of this newspaper remembers a description of BOB KERR given him by the late judge of the district court in Purcell, W. G. Long. Judge Long described BOB KERR as a lawyer having the best analytical mind of any attorney who had ever appeared in his court, and some of the greatest lawyers in Oklahoma appeared in Judge Long's court.

Senator KERR is stricken down just as he reached the heights of popularity, strength, and outstanding accomplishments in the field of national service. Oklahoma has lost its most faithful friend.

Senator ROBERT S. KERR will go down in the history of this State as Oklahoma's most famous citizen.

[From the Edmond (Okla.) Booster, Jan. 3, 1963]

SPEAKING FRANKLY

The death of Senator ROBERT S. KERR this week is being mourned by thousands of Oklahomans and countless other thousands throughout the United States.

Eulogies of this man are being spread over every newspaper in the country, but they all cannot help but fall short in accurately depicting the influence wielded on the lives of so many others by his outstanding personality. And the effect of so many of his decisions will be felt for many, many years to come.

Few individuals in the history of our country have had the opportunity to serve their country and their fellow man in such positions of responsibility as did Senator KERR. He sought and accepted these opportunities with a fervor few men could muster.

Wisdom, courage and humility are three traits of character seldom found in one individual, but KERR had more than his share of each.

* * * * *

Statesmen of Senator KERR's stature are hard to come by, and there are none that could begin to compare with him on the Oklahoma horizon. The realization of this fact is one of the reasons Democrats and Republicans alike are saddened by his loss.

No man—including the great Will Rogers—has ever contributed so much to the State of Oklahoma as has ROBERT S. KERR.

[From the Shawnee (Okla.) News-Star, Jan. 3, 1963]

SOME HUMAN WARMTH HAS GONE, TOO

By now little has been left unsaid or unprinted concerning Oklahoma's Senator ROBERT S. KERR. His untimely death Tuesday morning occasioned an immediate flood of praise and flattering appraisals of his life which had reached towering achievements in many fields. Most of the printed tributes came from men of high stature themselves, who were in position to know the great qualities that had brought him success.

"A giant has fallen," "the uncrowned king of the Senate," "a bit of Oklahoma died New Year's Day along with Senator BOB," "a great industrialist and oil executive," "Oklahoma's greatest asset," "OBU's most generous benefactor," were but a few of the ways by which such men appraised Oklahoma's senior Senator, perhaps the title he cherished most. In this role he was able to bring to bear the kind of influence that was fruitful to his native State to which few men have been more fiercely devoted.

The writer is not presuming to be numbered among the great personages who have so unstintingly praised Senator KERR, or will. Rather we choose to evaluate him as a man who one just instinctively likes because of the human warmth that he couldn't have concealed had he chosen. Those little lines that were etched around his eyes because of the happy smiles or more hearty laughs with which he cloaked his visage must have been no small reason for the great affection which he evoked among his fellow beings. Certainly they worked such magic on us, upon occasions when we were around him, mostly on the basis of press meetings. Even though we were not always in accord with the issues to which Senator BOB brought his vast resources of support, we were never naive enough to believe that only we knew all of the answers—and we felt that the Senator was really at heart a conservative and very, very good for the Oklahoma which we also wished to see progress.

We will always cherish a letter from Senator KERR which he took the time to write in longhand in appreciation of something we had said about him that he liked. "God bless you, Beachy," was his closing sentence, and we felt the warmth of a great man then, as now.

And we feel that God has blessed us more because of Senator KERR's request.

[From the Lawton (Okla.) Morning Press, Jan. 3, 1963]

STATE MOURNS LOSS OF LEADER

The people of Oklahoma today mourn the loss of their greatest statesman and leader, ROBERT S. KERR.

His untimely death on New Year's Day leaves a void which cannot be filled, Senator KERR was without peer in many walks of life. He was without doubt Oklahoma's greatest native son, who rose from lowly beginnings to become one of the outstanding leaders of his time in both State and Nation.

A man of strong character, untiring energy, and keen intellect, he had the drive and the ability to forge to the top in statecraft and business in a constructive way. He was instrumental, almost singlehandedly at times, in lifting his beloved State of Oklahoma to greater heights, morally, spiritually, and industrially. He was a man of vision who could see the potential of his fellow man and his State, and work constructively to achieve results. Not the least of BOB KERR's attributes was his devotion to his God and his church. He was a deeply religious man and practiced his religion.

Senator KERR gave all he had to his State. He has often said "when I can no longer be of service to the people of Oklahoma I do not care to serve in the Senate." On recent visits to the State, friends have felt that the Senator was pushing himself too hard. But he never let up. He continued working for Oklahoma to the very end.

BOB KERR was loved by many, hated by few. There is no one in Oklahoma who can take his place. His sudden and tragic death is Oklahoma's and the Nation's loss.

[From the Altus (Okla.) Times Democrat]

A GREAT LOSS AND A CHALLENGE

Senator ROBERT S. KERR had been described as Oklahoma's greatest living asset.

This great and good citizen is dead at the peak of his power and influence in the Nation's Capital. The end followed 2 weeks of enforced rest, which came too late because BOB KERR would never stop working for the people of Oklahoma.

Senator KERR was in this area a few days before he entered the hospital. He was very, very tired, but he would not slow down and he never complained. His life was dedicated to the service of the people of his native State.

It is doubtful that any man in history will leave his personal imprint so deeply etched on a State as ROBERT S. KERR has on Oklahoma. It is to be found everywhere—religious institutions, hospitals, schools, charities, highways, parks, vast reservoirs of water that will bless and sustain us for years, job-providing industries located in Oklahoma, and through his efforts, agricultural and other developments in a hundred ways that have never been publicized.

Oklahomans have known for a long, long time that BOB KERR truly was an amazing man. The writer was with him for most of a full day immediately following the close of the last session of Congress. It is a miracle that he lived through those grueling months. The Senator said he had slept most of 2 days after the adjournment of Congress. And if he was weary, he hardly showed it. He acted like a young man starting on a new job. There was work to be done and he would not quit.

We spent a part of a day with him in the middle of November. He held a press conference in Tulsa at a convention of an international journalistic society. Searching questions came from a hundred reporters and magazine writers and the comment from all was that the senior Senator from Oklahoma was a most remarkable man. Senator KERR's spirits were high and he appeared to be refreshed and stimulated by the hour-long questioning.

Senator KERR frequently was a controversial individual, but he was respected. To some he seemed to be gruff at times, but he was kind, generous, and warmhearted. He was beloved and will be honored by future generations of Oklahomans for doing so much to make this State a better place to live.

Oklahoma will miss Senator ROBERT S. KERR. His family, his personal staff, and his immediate associates know all of us grieve with them. Oklahoma faces a new challenge. We don't have BOB KERR. His great works were not all completed. We now must unite to finish his program and in a way that will honor his memory. We never again can rest on our oars and say, "BOB KERR will take care of us."

[From the Nowata Daily Star, Jan. 2, 1963]

It is to be hoped the outstanding fight conducted by Senator ROBERT S. KERR to defeat President Kennedy's socialist medicare plan will not have been in vain.

And it is to be hoped President Kennedy can't take any comfort in the knowledge that Senator KERR's death has removed a stumbling block to his socialistic legislation that would slowly but surely enslave the American people.

Senator KERR in making his all-out fight to defeat a plan that would eventually lead to a dictatorial Federal Government probably got the message across to a lot of Americans. That message was: the strength of this Nation is the freedom of each individual.

Speaking in Nowata December 6, 1961, Senator KERR told Scottish Rite Masons and their guests:

"The strength of the Nation provides the environment in which free men live and raise families, build churches and institutions so that when they move on they leave with the knowledge they have not been unfaithful to the great heritage imposed upon them."

* * * * *

Sure, Oklahoma and the Nation have lost a great citizen and public servant. But what he believed in and fought for are the same great principles which guide the vast majority of American citizens. It is only when we permit false leaders to dazzle us with tinsel that we get into trouble.

The great program of utilizing Oklahoma's vast resources to create a stronger economy was a well-known goal of Senator KERR's. The cost of better utilizing these resources wil be repaid the Federal Treasury many times over by the taxes generated by new jobs and new business.

Senator KERR had an interesting life of service. Certainly man can have no greater blessing.

[From the Oklahoma Courier, Jan. 4, 1963]

SENATOR KERR

Senator ROBERT KERR was unquestionably the strongest political personality in Oklahoma. His death deprives the State of the single most important element in its promising future. The immense growth that is expected in the coming decade, industrially and in population, was based primarily upon the position and influence of ROBERT S. KERR.

Now, Oklahoma must face the present and immediate future without its ablest champion.

In a time and in a part of the United States where politicians are held in even less esteem than is usual, the commanding intelligence and the quick-strided leadership of the late Senator made substantial contributions toward bettering the politician's image. And, the politician in the temporal realm is our most important personage. It is little less than tragic he is not recognized and treated as such.

Senator KERR, of course, had political foes and during his lifetime undoubtedly made some bitter enemies. Whether friend or foe is a matter of no importance to him or to anyone else anymore. All that matters is that we all alike beg Almighty God to be good to one of our chief political leaders and most famous citizens.

[From the Oklahoma City, (Okla.) Advertiser, Jan. 10, 1963]

ROBERT S. KERR

So much has been written of Senator ROBERT S. KERR since his sudden death New Year's morning one wonders what is left to be said? And yet his interests were so varied, drama so crowded his life, the story is all but endless; and for years to come parents and grandparents will be regaling children with tales of this man, who, as Dr. Waldo Stephens said in his always fine Sunday morning program on KWTV, was truly unlike anyone else.

I am sure many of us inside the church last Friday afternoon must have thought, with pricks of conscience, of those others, equally devoted and faithful, lining the streets, in the cold rain outside. For this man began his political career as the spokesman for humble men and women and, despite his millions, he never lost contact with them. In these early days Senator KERR won his battles for election against the bitter opposition of many "at the top," who became supporters much later, when the senior Senator's place was too firm for upsetting.

All walks of life were, of course, represented both inside and outside the church and neither city nor State has seen such an outpouring of saddened humanity to honor a public servant. Whatever the disappointments along the way, in the final moments people seem to remember.

To the gentle, healing organ music the church filled and came to epoch moments. The first, it seemed to me, was when MIKE and Ellen MONRONEY walked slowly down the center aisle, followed by the delegation from Congress; men we knew from newspaper headlines and TV, many of them from the far corners of the country, come to honor our fellow citizen. Some there were who may not have always agreed with Senator KERR but all had come to pay a last tribute to a man they honored and respected.

The second emotion-packed moment came when former Mayor Allen Street, his own face showing the strain, led President John F. Kennedy, Vice President and Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, and Governor and Mrs. J. Howard Edmondson to their first row seats, just across from the space which Mrs. Robert S. Kerr and the family next quietly filed in to take.

The minister's reading of the First Psalm, of course, had more than the usual meaning:

"Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly. But his delight is in the law of the Lord. And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper."

When the service was over a fine drizzle had begun to fall again and as I walked back to the office other scriptural words came to me, these from Ecclesiastes.

"To every thing there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven. A time to be born, and a time to die; a time to plant and a time to pluck up that which is planted."

The heritage of a life such as Senator Kerr's is rich beyond computation, alike to family and the State and Nation he served. It is a small matter that not everyone agreed with all he said, with all his votes. He served faithfully to the end.

Senator KERR was blessed in many ways. Dr. Stephens said Sunday morning that his ability to accumulate this world's goods came from his pioneer spirit, the ability to apply this same spirit in the world of science, air and space, the facility to bridge the in-between gaps.

And certainly Senator KERR was blessed in the manner of his going, in his time to die. A man at the very pinnacle of his fame, the flush of success warm on his brow, trusted confidant of his country's great, no lingering illness, no weeks or years of empty idleness removed from the fray he loved.

How well, I wonder, will we learn the lessons in such a life. Certain it is we cannot all amass such fortunes—even on promise to share in many good works as he did. But perhaps we can learn better our lessons of determined loyalty to principles he held dear, causes for which he labored and on which the well-being of today's world may well hang.

EXCERPTS FROM EDITORIALS IN OKLAHOMA NEWSPAPERS

Pryor Daily Times: "Senator KERR never hid the fact that he was in Washington to obtain all of the political plums possible for his home State. He regarded that as his first duty and succeeded at it at the same time his role as a national political power reached lofty heights. His loss to Oklahoma is immeasurable. The Kerr shoes are big and will be difficult to fill."

Muskogee Phoenix: "The people of this State were shocked Tuesday morning just before the Oklahoma-Alabama football game when the TV audience was told that there would be an interruption for a special bulletin—and then in a moment the announcer said: 'It has just been announced that Senator KERR has died.' A great shock it is indeed. Oklahoma has lost her greatest citizen and probably the most powerful man the State has produced in its 55 years of existence."

RECALL MEDICARE FIGHT

Nowata Star: "It is to be hoped the outstanding fight by Senator ROBERT S. KERR to defeat President Kennedy's socialist medicare plan will not have been in vain. Senator KERR in making his all-out fight to defeat a plan that would eventually lead to a dictatorial Federal Government, probably got the message across to a lot of Americans. That message was: The strength of this Nation is the freedom of each individual."

Norman Transcript: "While his public service career spanned a period of only 20 years, his tireless energy, strength of purpose and dedication to the causes in which be believed enabled him to write a record that will stand for a long time in Oklahoma."

The Duncan Banner: "Oklahoma faces a new challenge. We don't have BOB KERR. His great works were not all completed and we now must unite to finish his program. In that way, we will honor his memory. We never again can rest on our oars and say: 'BOB KERR will take care of it.'"

Daily Ardmoreite, Ardmore: "KERR's big dream was to make Oklahoma an industrial State and he lived to see the start of that dream, with many new industries coming to the State. Starting out life in a log cabin, KERR's life is an example that anyone can be successful in America and he rose from those humble beginnings to become an oil millionaire and a key figure in the Senate."

McAlester News-Capital: "His importance is shown by the fact that the future of President Kennedy's legislative program has been put in doubt, and there well may have been a cloud drawn over Oklahoma water projects by his death. Senator KERR's death also shifts responsibility for many important Oklahoma programs to his colleague, Senator MIKE MONRONEY."

The Ada Evening News: "Mrs. ROBERT S. KERR, sons, daughter, and grandchildren are suffering heart pains they have never known before.

"Their distinguished husband, father, and grandfather has been cut down at the peak of his influence in home, in church, in business, in State and National and world affairs.

"But, friends, we here in Ada, the men and women who grew up with our BOB, those who were here before he grew to acknowledged greatness and those who have grown up in later years but have known of his multiple activities, also are heartbroken. We know we have lost a dear friend, one who cannot be replaced, and thus there will always be a void in our hearts."

The Pawhuska Journal: "Many, many tributes will be paid to Senator BOB KERR in the press and elsewhere this week. Many of them will be eloquent and impressive.

"There is little we can say about Senator KERR other than a rather all-inclusive statement that has been heard here often the past 2 days: 'We sure will miss "Ole BOB."'"

The Anadarko Daily News: "The death of Senator ROBERT S. KERR put a heavy damper upon the start of a new year.

"Few if any communities had not felt the personal touch of service from the senior Senator. Few if any communities were not looking to great expansion in the future by the development of eastern and central Oklahoma River navigation. Our State's industrial climate was being adjusted to accommodate the almost unlimited space program that was being guided by Senator KERR.

"It will take all of the political cooperation that can be developed within the Democratic Party of Oklahoma to hold the advance which has been made. And this cooperation must come at a time when the Democratic Party has lost its most determined leader."

The Cushing Daily Citizen: "'There were giants on the earth in those days.'—Genesis 6: 4.

"Historians of the future, and not necessarily the distant future, will record that ROBERT S. KERR was a giant in those days in which he lived to manhood and carved out a career of achievement. His strides were long and his workloads stupendous.

"If Will Rogers was Oklahoma's most loved citizen, then KERR was its most powerful. Some say that Senator KERR though himself indestructible. That I would deny.

"He only thought himself expendable. He was so deeply concerned with aims and goals, with the work he hoped to do for the world in which he lived, that it never occurred to him to spare himself."

The Woods County Enterprise: "Oklahoma suffered two great losses New Year's day. However, the State will recover from Sooner's Orange Bowl loss by Alabama much sooner than it will from the death of Senator ROBERT S. KERR."

The Sapulpa Daily Herald: "Ask 10 persons what they think the death of Senator BOB KERR will mean to Oklahoma and most likely all will express an opinion of doubt as to the State's future in the space age from the standpoint of new industries.

"There is no denying the fact that many of the space-age people were opening up facilities in Oklahoma for the principal reason that they wanted to be counted among the constituency of Senator KERR.

"As to the Arkansas River development, it must be assumed the Government has too great an investment in the project to abandon it at this late date. And too, Senator MIKE MONRONEY is one of the ranking Members of the Senate and he now will swing an even greater stick for Oklahoma and the many projects now in the hopper.

"But for the most part Oklahoma surely will be able to grow industrially despite the severe loss created by KERR's death. The Oklahoma congressional delegation, now led by MONRONEY, has worked as a team and the show will continue in the future as it has in the past."

[From the Oklahoma Union Farmer, February 1963]

The Oklahoma Farmers Union and all rural Oklahoma lost a great friend and stanch ally New Year's day in Washington when death came to ROBERT SAMUEL KERR, Oklahoma senior Senator.

While he climbed to heights found by few in American finance and politics, Kerr never moved, spiritually, far from the Pontotoc County farm where he first saw light 66 years ago. Always he found renewed strength in close comradeship with those who tilled the soil of the Sooner State. His hopes were theirs; his interest theirs, too; and his ambitions ran hand in hand with those of Oklahoma farm families.

Since the middle 1940's when KERR served as Oklahoma's first native-born governor, the jovial giant of Oklahoma politics and finance was a frequent and willing speaker at OFU conventions. Many times he dropped pressing engagements in private and public affairs and came winging halfway across the Nation in his own aircraft because he wanted to be with us.

* * * * *

While he dwarfed even the late Gov. E. W. Marland in accumulation of a personal fortune * * * and unlike him retained it * * * money was never the supreme thing with Senator KERR. "I was just as happy when I didn't have a dollar," he said and we believe he meant it.

In the list of things that count, KERR's religion and his friends stood far above material possessions. It was a simple religion and he was a stanch soldier in the Baptist faith; but he granted a wide and protective tolerance to those of all other beliefs.

KERR bridged the gap between the log cabin and space-age generation Americans. Yet he was at home in both. He was almost the last of American statesmen who could boast of a log cabin beginning. Few in American politics have died at the apex of power where he stood at the moment he was stricken.

His was a unique character. Yet in it were many of the qualities of Lincoln, more than a bit of Senator George Norris, and a lot of both the first and second Roosevelts. We think he and Newt Gresham would have found great comradeship, too.

[From the Oklahoma Rural News, publication of the Oklahoma Association of Electric Cooperatives, Feb. 1, 1963]

SENATOR ROBERT S. KERR

The late Senator KERR's battles for rural electrification have been classic rounds which will long be remembered in the Halls of Congress.

"My own background has given me a devoted interest in rural electrification," he says in Land, Wood, and Water. "I have seen the rural electric cooperative bring a revolution to the farms in just one generation.

"When I was a young man, few farmers could get electricity. Private utility companies could not, or would not string lines to isolated farms. So we read by kerosene lamps and milked the cows by hand."

Thus impressed he bucked the powerful Senate Appropriations Committee while yet only a freshman Senator and won his battle.

Southwestern Power Administration sought a continuing fund to give it greater flexibility in the sale and purchase of power. If its bill failed in Congress SPA officials feared it would be "thrown back into the arms of the private utilities whose affection they doubted and whose prices they feared."

In this situation Senator Kerr took the floor to tell the Senate he hoped its action would not leave the rural electrics in a fix similar to the tall awkward country boy who was brought into a doctor's office in the foothills of the Ozarks by a stern-visaged oldster who said, "Doc, I want you to fix up my son-in-law.'

"'What's his trouble?' asked the doctor.

"'Oh, I shot him in the laig yestiddy and lamed him up a mite.'

"'Shame on you,' said the doctor, 'for shooting your own son-in-law.'

"Which brought this brisk rejoinder, 'well, you see, he wairn't my son-in-law 'til I shot him.'"

With this story the Senator made his point: that without his amendment, rural cooperatives and municipalities could be headed for a shotgun wedding with the utilities, which was exactly what they did not want.

Battling for public power projects and cheaper electricity for rural folks seemed to come naturally to him. Through it all he retained the mark of a really great man—the ability to laugh even at himself. Relating his clash with the director of the New York State Power Authority over hydroelectric power development of Niagara Falls, Senator KERR says:

"After the two of us had blown off enough steam to operate a small generating facility, we finally agreed to proceed * * * to find an acceptable formula to permit the great project to go forward."

He was winner in the historic controversy over financing the Tennessee Valley Authority as well as of many others. Of them he says,

"Out of all these and the numerous other legislative battles and debates, a constructive power policy has been and will be hammered out of Congress. The goal must be to develop our natural resources to have the greatest value to the most people."

His fight for rural electricity alone entrenched him firmly and everlastingly in the hearts of rural people throughout the Nation.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, I rise today with a sense of pride, but also with a sense of inadequacy, to pay tribute to Oklahoma's first native-son Governor and late senior U.S. Senator. No other man surpassed ROBERT S. KERR in service to our State.

My active career in politics began with his first campaign for the Senate in 1948. He had completed a successful term as wartime Governor of Oklahoma. I went to his office in Oklahoma City and volunteered my services, and a group of us recently discharged from military service in World War II organized students in some 20 colleges in the State for his Senate campaign.

My impression of him then was to remain always. Here was a man not only with vision, unlimited energy, and an almost fierce dedication, but also a man with a unique understanding of people and a sincere concern for their well-being.

In 1948, he was elected to his first term and so began one of the Senate's most successful and productive careers. Such effectiveness did not come without sacrifice. He realized better than anyone that it took hard work to achieve success, and his road to it was never an easy one. He was always willing to work, and one could always count on him working just a little bit longer and harder than his toughest competitor. As Senator KERR once said:

> I came here to do a certain job for Oklahoma. It is a big program. It takes a long time. I can't figure any other way to get it done—except to work.

Of all his outstanding qualities, and he had many, I believe this untiring dedication to the realization of a job well done was most significant. Couple this with his ability to see beyond today's horizon—to see the possibilities of tomorrow and make them probabilities today—and we have the blueprint of a man who succeeded in business, in industry, and in agriculture; served his State and country well; and was a leader in his church.

Being a son of the soil, born in a log cabin, he had a keen awareness of the importance of conservation, development, and full utilization of our natural resources.

Years before others, he saw the Arkansas River as a vast navigation channel from the Mississippi River across the entire State of Arkansas and deep into Oklahoma. To many, such vision appeared in earlier years to be pure folly. To the untrained eye the Arkansas River looked like a vast sandbed with too little water for navigation—a scar on the face of our State caused by our own careless, thoughtless, and wasteful use.

But to Senator KERR it was no folly. It was a challenge to restore one of the country's greatest rivers to its original condition and uses, and in the process open the heart of the Nation to industrial development and production.

When he campaigned across the State preaching such plans and possibilities, his opponent often belittled them by suggesting it would be far more practical to pave the Arkansas. But today this dream, this often-called folly, is close to completion and stands as a monument to his foresight and, more particularly, his untiring effort.

As the Members of the Senate know, this ability to serve your State, this effectiveness, does not come overnight or easily, but only through years of service and a constant dedication to the job to be done.

In later years, the effects of this great Oklahoman's service not only crossed the borders of States, but spanned the oceans as well. In the last session alone, his contributions in the fields of space and world trade stand as mute testimony to this fact. To his wife and family—Mrs. Edmondson joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy.

Words alone neither can nor need be adequate today to pay tribute to Oklahoma's native son. His deeds are his monument, as lasting as the land, wood, water—and finally space—to which he dedicated his life.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, BOB KERR has gone; a mighty oak has fallen. A void has been left in the U.S. Senate, hard to fill.

In the passing of this economic, political, and religious leader, the U.S. Senate, the people of Oklahoma, and the people of the Nation have suffered a great loss. For the past 14 years, it has been my privilege to serve with him in the Senate and to claim him as a personal friend. I felt about him as did Maj. Thomas Howie, of Virginia, who said of the heroic courage of the men of the 116th Infantry whom he led in its historic landing on Omaha Beach in World War II:

> I am both humble before God and proud before my fellow men that America produces the breed of men I have had the privilege to go into action with.

History will record how Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, exemplified the philosophy of Woodrow Wilson, who said: "It is the primary duty of a leader to lead his own generation and not the next." Today, I ask the privilege of merely paying tribute to Senator KERR as a man and a Christian gentleman. BOB KERR had a capacity for friendship and we in the Senate loved him. He achieved success without conceit, accumulated wealth without arrogance, and power without ruthlessness—a self-made man who gave to God all credit for what he was. He was a man of character whose faith in God never wavered; a man of courage who flinched before no foe—either on the battlefield in World War I or in any subsequent political arena. He was taken from us while still in the full possession of a vigorous and elastic mind. But his was the philosophy of Robert Louis Stevenson, who said:

> And does not life go down with a better grace foaming in full body over a precipice than miserably straggling to an end in sandy deltas?

We shall miss him, but we give assurance to his relatives and constituents who loved him that we loved him too and that love will keep his memory green. We must not be too sad over the passing of one who "kept the faith," because:

> When the great and good depart,
> What is it more than this—
> That man, who is from God sent forth,
> Doth yet again to God return?
> Such ebb and flow must ever be
> Then wherefore should we mourn?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we were all shocked by the sudden death of Senator ROBERT KERR. BOB KERR was an immensely talented and versatile man. Rising from humble beginnings, he parlayed these talents into success in a number of fields. Not the least of these was in the legislative field, where he gave full expression to his manifold abilities.

As a member of three important committees, as an orator, as a skilled debater, as a Senator who defended the interests of his constituents, and as one who did his homework thoroughly, he had few if any peers. The rest of us had grown so accustomed to his personal competence that it is hard to imagine the U.S. Senate without BOB KERR. He was a giant of a man, not only physically, but in the sense that he filled the Senate with his presence.

BOB KERR's unexpected death was a tragic one. His loss has been felt in the Senate, in Oklahoma, and in the Nation. But those who mourn his passing can find consolation in the achievements of his life and of his career in the Senate. He played a key role in the passage of countless measures—some controversial and some universally acclaimed. It is fitting that his greatest legislative contribution came in the last of his 15 sessions in Congress. Senator KERR's efforts in behalf of the historic Trade Expansion Act of 1962 were of inestimable value in gaining almost unanimous acceptance of the measure in the Senate. The overwhelming success of the act in this body may be properly considered the crowning achievement of his legislative career. He was, in my opinion, the ablest of the able.

Both in and out of the Senate, BOB KERR had a lively sense of humor which complemented his dedication to hard work. And he was a deeply religious man who took a lifelong interest in the activities of his church. For these and his many other qualities, he will be sorely missed.

BOB KERR was a great American, a great Senator, and a great Democrat. Last, but certainly not least, he was a great Oklahoman.

I wish to take this opportunity to extend once again the heartfelt sympathies of Mrs. Mansfield and myself to Mrs. Kerr and her family and to the people of Oklahoma.

BOB KERR was an outstanding Senator who has made his mark on this body and whose good works will be his enduring monument.

As the majority leader of this body, no one will miss him more.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it is with a deep sense of personal loss that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great American—Senator ROBERT KERR. It is most appropriate to use the word "great" in describing BOB KERR, for I am sure all will agree that he was in the truest sense of the word a great citizen, a great Senator, a great Oklahoman, and a great American. As a measure of his stature and greatness, we have only to look to the void created in this body by his death. He served with us here in this body for 14 years with great distinction, devotion and dedication. In those years of service and close associations, he endeared himself to the high respect, confidence and personal esteem of all of us, and of all America.

I have lost a personal friend, and the State of Arkansas has lost a true friend and a wonderful neighbor to whom it will always be indebted. There has always been a community of interest between my own State of Arkansas and the great State of Oklahoma. Because of these common interests, I often had the privilege of working closely with Senator KERR in furthering the progress and development of our respective States. Perhaps the outstanding example of this and of the results that have been obtained through cooperative efforts between Senator KERR and the Arkansas congressional delegation is the Arkansas River basin development program which means so much to both Oklahoma and Arkansas. The people of Arkansas will never forget, and will always be grateful for, the tremendous contribution which BOB KERR made in bringing this project to fruition. Generations yet unborn will benefit from the prosperity which this program will bring to the Arkansas River Valley.

BOB KERR was the kind of man who is so greatly needed in our country today. His kind of man has been rare in all periods of history. He was a living example of what can be accomplished by hard work and individual initiative in this great country of ours. Young people of today would do well to study his life, for there is no finer example of the opportunities presented to the individual by the free enterprise system of the United States than the life of BOB KERR. His activities in both private and public life were a succession of accomplishments that represent perhaps the best illustration possible of the American success story.

Throughout our service here together, my respect and admiration for him grew ever greater with the passing of years. He was possessed of marked ability, industry, and courage. No Member of this body had greater wisdom or influence in legislative affairs, or a more striking and impressive personality. He was a Senator's Senator. He was a deeply Christian man. He could be gentle, but he could also act with the strength and toughness of a man who knows no fear. He stamped the print of his personality on the course of events in this body as few men have done.

The people of Oklahoma, I am sure, loved and respected him for what he was, a remarkable and dedicated public servant, whose services to his State and his Nation were of the very highest order.

BOB KERR will be greatly missed by all of us, and by all Americans. When we consider the stature of the man, we realize that anything we might say about him would be an understatement. I find words, mere words, truly are inadequate to express the emotions and sentiments that well up in my heart on this occasion. It is difficult for me to realize that he is gone.

Mrs. McClellan joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Kerr and members of the family. We share their deep sorrow and their great loss.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, it is with deep sorrow that I recall the tragic death of my beloved friend and colleague, ROBERT S. KERR. His untimely passing marks the end of the long, distinguished career of one of the century's greatest champions of democracy.

Serving and working side by side with BOB was indeed one of the most rewarding and fulfilling experiences of my life. I never met a man who did not respect him. Driven by an indefatigable determination to pursue and fulfill all his dreams, he set his goals high. His interests encompassed many fields and in his lifetime he served as a schoolteacher, lawyer, soldier, rancher, oilman, industrialist, financier, statesman, humanitarian, author, orator, and churchman.

Born in a log cabin in the blackjack country of Pontotoc 13 years before Oklahoma became a State, BOB KERR found no task too big or too overpowering for him. He was one of the last true pioneers of America, and in keeping with that spirit he touched the lives of thousands of people. Always he retained his deep faith and inherent understanding and compassion for all people, his inspiration coming from spiritual truth and an intense love of his country and fellow men.

One of the leading national churchmen of the Baptist Church, BOB was a deeply religious man. He was one of the most dedicated men I have ever known, and strove against overwhelming odds to attain his ideals.

He lived and worked under the slogan "Land, wood, and water." Despite his fantastic success, he never lost sight of these three things, and became America's first and foremost developer of natural resources and soil conservation both in Oklahoma and all over the United States.

Having a thirst for factual knowledge, a fondness for research, and an analytical mind, BOB KERR acquired a foresight for predicting the future problems of this Nation. With these talents he became a founder and champion of the space efforts in this country.

Loyal to his beloved State, he earned the title of "Mr. Oklahoma." BOB was also well known and loved in South Carolina, having visited my State on several occasions in an official capacity. As chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Natural Water Resources he conducted hearings in Columbia and Charleston. He was guest speaker at a meeting of the South Carolina Press Association and just this past year spoke in Columbia at a Democratic Party rally. A great orator, BOB touched the hearts of the people of South Carolina with his sincere words.

His endless deeds and toil for his fellow men and his devotion to public service and to making America a better place can never be erased. Long will this Nation mourn the death of BOB KERR, and never will there be a man big enough to follow in his footsteps. May his spirit and memory ever be a shining light and lasting inspiration for all generations.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to observe at the beginning that the Members of this body who served the longest with Senator KERR are the ones who have been more inclined to remain in the Chamber during all of the memorial service. I know that all Senators who can be here are present. I observe in the Chamber the Vice President, who was one of Senator KERR's great friends. Everyone is giving the utmost attention. That within itself is an unspoken tribute to this truly great man whom we knew and loved so well.

At the expense of some repetition, I desire to make a few remarks about this big, friendly, magnanimous man who did so much for his country in the relatively short time he was a Member of the Senate.

I pass on to the youth of this country, especially those who are interested in public life, a point which Senator KERR made with me when he told me of a conversation he once had with his father, who was a trusted and respected county official in Oklahoma. Senator KERR one day walked into the office of his father, who was clerk of the court, and said, "I want to be the Governor of Oklahoma."

His father said:

> Fine, son. Keep your eye on that goal, and you will get there. But first establish yourself in some kind of business or profession, so that you will have something substantial besides the salary of your office on which to fall back, and thus be able greatly to increase your opportunity for service.

BOB did that, and in a great way. I think it is mighty good advice for young men, and we want more of them to become interested in entering public life, to bear such advice in mind, and thus to build an economic foundation on which to broaden their opportunities in public life.

Senator KERR was also a man of great faith—not only faith in God, but faith in mankind, as well. He always attended our breakfast gatherings. Shortly before our last meeting in October of last year, at the end of a hard session, particularly hard for him, I remarked to him one day that he appeared to be rather fagged out. I said, "BOB, the last meeting we will have will be next Wednesday morning. We must end the year on a great note of faith. I want you to lead."

He said, "I will be there."

He gave us one of the finest talks on practical spirituality, the practical side of spiritual values, that we had ever heard. So valuable were his remarks that I asked him for his notes that he had made hurriedly the night before—I understood it was about midnight—and had a photostatic copy made of them. I treasure them not only as a guide to this great man's thinking, but also for the value they have to me in a personal way.

Mr. President, I have heard it said that one of the former Vice Presidents said to a Member of this body that in order to be a great Senator, it was more important to have courage than to have brains. I believe that to be true. BOB KERR had both.

Mr. President, I wish to have printed in the RECORD one of the greatest funeral services I have ever heard. It was delivered at our friend's funeral by his pastor, the Reverend Mr. Herschel H. Hobbs, of the First Baptist Church of Oklahoma City, Okla. Those of us who heard that great man pay that wonderful tribute to BOB KERR knew that Rev. Mr. Hobbs was talking about the same man we had known.

Before I ask unanimous consent to have the entire sermon printed in the RECORD, I wish to read "A Prayer for My Pastor," which, as Rev. Mr. Hobbs said, ROBERT KERR published many years ago. This is what our late friend wrote:

> Our Father, let me be a pillar of strength to help hold him up and not a thorn in his flesh to sap his strength, nor a burden on his back to pull him down.
>
> Let me support him without striving to possess him.
>
> Let me lift his hands without placing shackles around them.
>
> Let me give him help that he may devote more time in working for the salvation of others and less time in gratifying my vanity.
>
> Let me work for him as the pastor of all the members and not compel him to spend precious time in bragging on me.
>
> Let me be unselfish in what I do for him and not selfish in demanding that he do more for me.
>
> Let me strive to serve him and the church much and be happy as he serves me less and the church and others more.

Mr. President, as his pastor said, I believe BOB KERR's prayer was answered a thousandfold. It was characteristic of him. He was always doing for others and he was always thinking of others.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the entire sermon delivered by the Reverend Mr. Hobbs.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EULOGY FOR SENATOR ROBERT S. KERR, BY REV. MR. HERSCHEL H. HOBBS, PASTOR, FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH, OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

(SCRIPTURE: PSALM 1:1–3)

We are gathered today, the great and the lowly, to honor the memory of a great man who was a friend to both. We would not disturb the memories which fill your hearts and minds. Rather we would leave them to each of you as precious treasures to be enjoyed in the secrecy of your own life. But we would seek to voice for all a tribute regarding one who lived wonderfully and wrought greatly among us.

President James A. Garfield said, "I mean to make myself a man, and if I succeed in that, I shall succeed in everything."

ROBERT S. KERR was a man in the highest sense of that word. Before he made his first dollar, or his fame had spread beyond the bounds of Pontotoc County, Okla., he was a man. He possessed a character endowed with the possibility for greatness. His was a character ingrained with qualities of righteousness received at the hands of a pioneer mother and father. More than once he was heard to say, "My old daddy was the greatest man I ever knew."

And though he was destined to rise to the dizzy heights of economic and governmental power, he brought to those heights these principles of righteousness which were the very warp and woof of his being. He was always a man.

He was a man of vision. ROBERT S. KERR was a walking commentary on the words of Robert Browning.

"Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his
grasp
Else what's a heaven for?"

There is a vast difference between a visionary man and a man of vision. Our friend was the latter. He dreamed great dreams, and then turned them into realities. To whatever task he set his hand, he did so not merely with a view of things as they were but what they could become. Thus he saw vast economic empires where none existed before. He envisioned cargo-bearing streams and life-giving water amidst vast prairies and rolling hills, derricks in the ocean, homes for orphaned children, seats of learning for youth, and sustenance for the aged.

No one man could achieve in one lifetime the visions which ever beckoned him on. But he blazed trails, pointed the way, and challenged others to pursue the goals to whose achievements he gave his last ounce of energy and devotion.

ROBERT S. KERR was a man of wisdom. His ready wit was exceeded only by his sober judgment. When he spoke he did so in utterances based upon facts. When he lifted his voice others listened, convinced not by the flow of his oratory but by the soundness of his reason. His encyclopedic mind amazed both friend and foe. He was always ready to listen to the counsel of others. And he was never too busy to give wise counsel when sought. Almost infinite was his patience as he sought to lead others to see and understand that which was so clearly comprehended by him. For he was blessed with a mind which readily could sift the wheat of decision from the chaff of details.

ROBERT S. KERR was a man of courage. His life was a moving drama of the American dream. Born in a log cabin to poor but righteous, hardworking parents, he rose to sit in the councils of the mighty. His slogan of "Land, wood, and water" was a dramatic testimony to the basic origin of his courage and stamina. In his journey across the years he encountered many obstacles, but none so great as to cause him to dip his colors. Often in times of difficulty in a given enteprise when the courage of others seemed to fail, one heartening challenge from the Senator brought others back to face resolutely the problem and to win the victory.

Our friend possessed not only physical but moral courage. Men might criticize his program but never his principles. He never sacrificed personal convictions on the altar of questionable conduct. And he will ever remain a monument of a man in the world but not of it.

ROBERT S. KERR was a man of faith. He had an unshakable faith in God and in God's word. On his desk was always seen a much used Bible. Often when he was alone his secretary would find him reading from its pages as he filled his soul with its precepts and power. Or he was reading and expounding its message to a friend. On one occasion he is reported to have read Psalm 91:7 to one whose courage had failed. "A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee." "Do you believe it?" asked the Senator. "Do you really believe it? Then quit worrying, and live by it." He ever fortified his advice by his example.

Because he had faith in God he had faith in men. His life was that of a thousand because he entrusted vast enterprises to others. He gave absolute loyalty to those about him, and received the same in return.

No task was too great or too small for him to undertake for a friend. Many years ago this speaker asked him to leave his many duties in Washington to travel to San Francisco, at his own expense, to address a group of pastors. He agreed, saying, "A wish from my pastor is a command performance. I'll be there."

ROBERT S. KERR gave much and expected little in return. Many years ago he published what he called "A Prayer for My Pastor."

"Our Father, let me be a pillar of strength to help hold him up and not a thorn in his flesh to sap his strength, nor a burden on his back to pull him down.

"Let me support him without striving to possess him.

"Let me lift his hands without placing shackles around them.

"Let me give him help that he may devote more time in working for the salvation of others and less time in gratifying my vanity.

"Let me work for him as the pastor of all the members and not compel him to spend precious time in bragging on me.

"Let me be unselfish in what I do for him and not selfish in demanding that he do more for me.

"Let me strive to serve him and the church much and be happy as he serves me less and the church and others more."

And God answered his prayer a thousandfold.

But most wonderful of all was ROBERT S. KERR's simple, childlike faith in Jesus Christ as his personal Saviour. In this hour it matters not how much wealth one accumulated. Or how much fame adheres to one's name. But one thing matters. What did you do with Jesus who is called the Christ? BOB KERR trusted in Christ in life. He has found Him trustworthy in death.

For years the Senator carried an engagement pad in his pocket. Its many entries bespoke the stature and the stress of the life that he lived. But always at the head of each page were written these words:

"Be near me when my feet
Are slipping over the brink;
For I am nearer home today,
Nearer, perhaps, than now I think."

These were prophetic words. For in a moment of quiet serenity he slipped away to be with the Lord. And even before the news media carried the word of his going to a shocked Nation, he heard the glad, triumphant words of the Saviour whom he loved and served. "Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

Many trees grow in the forest and are cut down, the only evidence of their going being the stumps which they leave. But once in a great while a mighty oak falls. And falling, it leaves a vacancy against the sky.

ROBERT S. KERR was such an oak. Who will take his place? Alas! None will take it. For he received it not by appointment, but through achievement. What one mighty man began, many must continue. And doing so, we shall realize for him that he did not live, nor did he die, in vain.

God help us to make it so.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I find it difficult to express the feeling of personal loss I suffered when I was informed of the death of Senator ROBERT S. KERR. It is more difficult to express the loss that the entire Nation sustained in his passing.

I had the privilege of working with Senator KERR for many years on conserving, preserving, and developing the natural resources of our country. He and I both took a deep, fervent, and abiding interest in waterway and river valley development.

I am glad to to be able to say that his interest extended not only to his own State of Oklahoma, but also to all the other areas of our great Nation. However, it is only natural that his primary interest would lie in the development of his native State and its river valleys. He and I worked jointly on these developments: the Gillham Reservoir, in Arkansas; the Millwood Reservoir, also in Arkansas; and the Broken Bow and Pine Creek Reservoirs, in Oklahoma; as well as many other projects designed to aid the development of the Arkansas and Red River Valley and the development of the Nation as a whole.

In the earlier days we were among the first to express an interest in the Ferrell's Bridge Reservoir, in Texas, which is on a tributary of the Red River, and in the large and promising McGee's Bend project, also in Texas, on a tributary of the Red River.

Our interest was joint, and it was lasting. He and I considered, and I still consider, that the development of the Arkansas and Red Rivers to their full potential should be a concern of the utmost importance to the Nation as a whole.

Of these worthy projects, only the Ferrell's Bridge Reservoir, in Texas, has been completed. I expect to carry on Senator KERR's ideal; and I express the hope that my future efforts will result in the completion of those projects, in which he was so vitally interested.

In 1960, Senator KERR published his now well-known and widely respected volume entitled: "Land, Wood, and Water." I am pleased and proud to be mentioned in its pages. I am indeed fortunate in having an autographed copy of it on my desk.

Senator KERR's inscription to me on the flyleaf is very complimentary. It contains such words as "greatest," "most able," and "generous." I am sincere when I say that if I could now return those compliments to him, they would prove far, far insufficient to describe the man.

I am sure the first paragraph of the preface to "Land, Wood, and Water" contains a large measure of Senator KERR's personal philosophy. That paragraph reads as follows:

> Ever since I was a boy on the frontier, the wonders of nature have awed and inspired me. My father cultivated this taste, coining the rhythmic phrase of "Land, Wood, and Water." As he often told me, these were his objectives when he set out to find a home in the old Indian territory. There on the farm he chopped out of a wilderness, I could plainly see the basis of our existence. As I grew to manhood with broader horizons, I realized that the trio of natural wealth is the foundation of all prosperity and essential to a better way of life everywhere.

While living, Senator KERR did everything in his power to make stronger that foundation of all prosperity.

I close by saying that I count myself most fortunate to have been a friend of Senator KERR, and to have been able to aid him in some small degree in carrying out his life's work.

I am deeply grieved at his passing, and I extend to his wife and family my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I first had the privilege of knowing our late friend, Governor and Senator Bob Kerr, when both of us were serving as Governors—he as the Governor of Oklahoma, and I as Governor of my native State, Florida. The last 2 years of my term—1943 and 1944—overlapped the first 2 years of his; and I had the chance to get in close touch with him when we met in the Southern Governors' Conference meetings or at national defense conferences. It was my pleasure—and I have a good deal of pride in remembering it—to nominate him to be chairman of the Southern Governors' Conference when I was leaving the office of Governor, in 1944; and he was named to serve in that capacity. I believe he served in it 2 years.

He used to say to me—I am sure the remark was facetious, but, nevertheless, I appreciated it—that he thought my helping him to be named to that particular position launched him beyond the borders of the State of Oklahoma. That statement was typical of his generosity, for it would have been impossible to have contained him within the bounds of Oklahoma.

When he came to the Senate, we served together on the Public Works Committee, and also on the Appropriations Committee, in connection with matters relating to public works, because he served there as ex officio member of the Public Works Subcommittee when it was dealing with matters relating to public works. He was always on hand at those meetings, as my distinguished friend, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], the able chairman of that particular subcommittee will recall.

I can remember now what happened late one evening last year when we were having a conference with the conferees from the other body in the old Supreme Court Chamber when Senator Kerr was a conferee for the Senate on the public works appropriation bill. I shall never forget the delightful way that he wangled some particularly desirable things, from his standpoint and those of his constituency in Oklahoma, from the conferees from the other body.

On the Space Committee I had the pleasure of serving under his chairmanship for 2 years. I take this opportunity to say that I have never heard any greater illustration of knowledge of a complex subject matter than he showed in cross-examining leading executives from some of the communications firms of the country when we were holding hearings on the Telstar bill last year.

Insofar as my State is concerned, he honored us frequently with his presence at Canaveral and elsewhere. He conducted a meeting of his Select Committee on Water Resources in Jacksonville, at which time our people paid him the acclaim that was due him.

He used to come down fishing on the St. Johns River with a friend of his and mine, Capt. Noah Tillman, who operates a fishing houseboat which he has named *Noah's Ark*, and out of which Senator Kerr seemed to draw particular pleasure. He used to like to talk about the good times he had down there fishing.

He was a very human person, liking things of the type that I mentioned, especially in the way of being out in the wide out-of-doors with friends.

Last fall he came down and spoke as the honored guest at the University of Florida annual Blue Key meeting at the homecoming game. Though I frequently heard him on the floor of the Senate when his sarcasm almost baffled description, I have never heard him to better advantage than I heard him that night when he felt that the preliminary portions of the program, trespassed upon his time after he had come down the long distance to Florida to deliver a speech to us. He wound up with everybody in that huge crowd of about 1,500 leading citizens from all over our State loving everything that he said and everything that he stood for.

In closing, I wish that the Record could preserve the feeling of sorrow, solemnity, and absolute devastation that prevailed when we heard that Senator Kerr had unexpectedly passed away on January 1 of this year. Many of us were at Miami for the Orange Bowl game. The President of the United States was flying from West Palm Beach to Miami to be our distinguished and honored guest at that game. When the news came through the air of the death of Bob Kerr, the whole affair was turned into a channel which is almost indescribable in any words that I might utter. When the President came into the little tent which had been set up for him so that he might be received by a group of friends, there was on his face the mark of a terrible sorrow that had struck him a few minutes before. The same is true of Senator Mansfield and of all others who were present.

I do not believe I would be going too far to say that Senator Kerr's death at that particular time may have had some effect on the result or outcome of that game. Without by any means discrediting the fine performance by the football team from the University of Alabama—and it was an outstanding performance—I am sure that every man on the Oklahoma team that day felt a sense of distinct personal loss and sorrow, and it must have had some effect upon what he did that day.

That indicated the kind of man Senator Kerr was. He left his mark upon all who knew him and many who did not know him. He will be long remembered as a personage who had a character distinct and different from that of anyone else, which marked him as a man among men, and one whom, of course, we shall always miss greatly in the Senate.

Mrs. Holland and I join in expressing our deep sympathy to Mrs. Kerr and the children. I am sure that the words of all who speak here today will make them understand how deeply their beloved one will be missed by all of us and by a grateful nation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Oklahoma, and the Nation, suffered a great loss by the death of Bob Kerr. He belonged in that unusually small group of men who seem to be born to lead and he used this God-given ability well. Monuments to his contributions to this Nation exist in the form of far-reaching programs touching the daily lives of every American—from conservation of our natural resources to exploring the frontiers of space. Perhaps the fact that he was born and raised on the frontier helped form his deep and abiding faith in the future of America. He watched Oklahoma grow from a raw, untamed territory to one of the most dynamic and progressive States in the Union. Much of this progress was due to his own efforts growing from confidence in the great potential of his State and our Nation. He had courage and enthusiasm. He had judgment and perspective. He had humor. He had loyalty. And he had tremendous drive and ability.

Few men have, in real life, lived the American success story. Bob Kerr was one of them. Born in a log cabin, he was a self-made man who, through hard work, ability, and initiative, became the head of a great industry and more important, one of the most able Senators ever to serve in this body. His was a remarkable career, but he was a remarkable man. Throughout his life Bob Kerr never forgot the source of his wisdom and strength. He was a faithful and devoted leader in the Baptist church and I know that his fellow Baptists will sorely miss him.

He had certain precepts for living and he stuck by them.

For his church, he tithed. And for his beliefs he indulged in neither alcohol nor tobacco.

He was a strong believer in self-discipline.

His talents as a legislative craftsman are legendary. Whenever he brought a bill to the Senate floor for action every other Senator knew that the Senator from Oklahoma had done his homework. He knew the answers to any questions raised in debate on his bills. Bob Kerr mastered the intricacies of legislation dealing with subjects all the way from taxes to space. He knew his business, and all other Senators knew that he knew it. We are all familiar with his great ability in debate. I think that a good bit of his well-deserved reputation as a debater, was due to his thorough knowledge of legislative business coming before the Senate.

The people of Arkansas lost a great and true friend at Bob Kerr's passing. The Arkansas delegation worked closely with him on many projects of mutual interest. The Arkansas River navigation and Red River programs on which he worked so tirelessly will be only two of the more important monuments in our area to his efforts. His work on this project is typical of his foresight on conservation matters. He took the long range view—the view that it was incumbent on us to protect the Nation's natural resources for generations to come. Our children and our children's children will owe a great debt to Bob Kerr for his efforts in protecting their heritage.

It is sometimes hard for us to understand why—for lack of a tiny part—a great whole can disintegrate.

How often we wonder at the fall of a giant jet for lack of a bit of metal in a crucial spot. And now we have wondered at a big man's falling for the nonfunctioning of a small but vital part.

Bob Kerr did not have great seniority in the Senate but his vital interest in the processes and his deep convictions on many points led to his having influence far beyond that to be expected from one of his tenure.

His mark on our times is indelible and it is our loss, the Senate's loss, the country's loss, that he could not have had a longer span among us. He paid me the honor of coming to my State last fall to speak in my behalf. He was my friend and I miss him.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, it is not often that the U.S. Senate and the Nation suffers such a grievous loss as it has in the passing of Robert Kerr. He was an unusually talented and effective public servant.

Bob Kerr had so many fine qualities. He was the truest friend anyone could have. Even though tremendously busy he always found time to help others. Mr. President, Bob Kerr spent much of his time in the U.S. Senate helping other Senators. If he thought a Senator had a worthy cause he would leave no stone unturned to help him, but if he thought his cause was not worthy he was frank to tell him so.

Among Bob Kerr's many talents were his quick wit, his great intellect, and his ready grasp of any subject he chose to debate on the Senate floor. Few Senators ever successfully sponsored as much important legislation as he—legislation of the kind that was not only beneficial to his beloved State of Oklahoma but also to the entire Nation.

One of the memories of Bob Kerr that I will always cherish is the opportunity that I had to serve with him on the Select Committee of National Water Resources. Every one of us in this Chamber is aware of his dedication to the development of the resources of this country, and no Member of Congress ever went to Bob Kerr and asked his help with a worthy project that he did not receive it. I remember very well that the first hearing the select committee held was at Bismarck in my State of North Dakota, and at that meeting Bor Kerr seemed to take as much interest in what my people had to say as if the hearing had been held in his own State of Oklahoma.

In the years that I had the privilege of serving in the Senate with Bob Kerr, notwithstanding the fact that he probably had a reputation as being partisan, I can never recall a time when he was not anxious to help the Members on this side of the aisle as well as those on his side. Bob Kerr was a big man. He was bigger than politics; he was bigger than a region. I have never known another man who had the vision and the courage and the complete faith in the future of this country that could compare with his. As an example of his vision, he one time said:

> No region in the country, possibly in the world, is better stocked with fuels—oil, natural gas, and coal. Only 10 percent of the potential hydroelectric power has been developed. The mineral treasures are almost endless. The forests are being restocked in mammoth proportions, and this is what will make this the greatest country under the sun, its resources of which the people are the greatest.

Every 1 of the 50 States of this great country lost a friend in the homegoing of Bob Kerr. It will be a long time until he can be replaced with a man of vision such as he possessed. His State is filled with monuments to his vision. Almost every river in this State has reservoirs that testify to his efforts. The soil conservation program of his State stands as an example for all of us to follow.

As a member of the select committee, I came to know why he was considered the leader in the field of developing natural resources.

In addition to his efforts in the resources field, no man ever stood on the floor of this Senate who was more qualified in taxes and finances than Bob Kerr. The most difficult pieces of legislation in this complicated field were made to appear simple by the ability of Bob Kerr to provide a complete analysis of how they would work and what their effect would be.

> Many trees grow in the forest and are cut down, the only evidence of their going being the stumps which they leave. But once in a great while a mighty oak falls. And falling, it leaves a vacancy against the sky.

The U.S. Senate sorely misses Bob Kerr—one of the great intellectual giants of our time—a man of many talents who made good use of all of them.

Bob Kerr's greatest contribution was to his church. He spent much of his time and energy in serving his church and gave liberally of his earnings. He was a true Christian.

In Bob Kerr's passing I have lost one of the best friends I ever had. May I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kerr and all of his wonderful family.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I suppose there were few people in the Senate who felt as deeply as I did the loss of the great man from Oklahoma.

I think of him, first of all, as a great neighbor. While he was Governor of Oklahoma, there were many items he wished to have disposed of in connection with the agriculture of that State. Time after time he came to the Department of Agriculture, where I was then associated, and presented the problems to me.

He had under consideration at one time a piece of land which he wanted for one of the agricultural colleges. He finally found a way to acquire it. But there was no putting him off until that was worked out.

He had at another time a program for agricultural price supports which he thought could be handled in a businesslike fashion. He prevailed upon me, as Secretary of Agriculture, to accept the program for purchase, and he said, "Leave it to me from there on out. I will see that you do not have to buy anything." And, true enough, I did not. The program worked exceptionally well because it was sponsored by an individual who had rare business judgment.

I point out that he remembered things of that nature.

In 1948, when he and I both were candidates for the U.S. Senate, he was very busy with the campaign in his own State. I appealed to him to come to my State and to make one or two speeches for me. He finally asked me to set a date. I set a date. He said, "You will have to give me a little while to think it over. I will call you later this afternoon." He called me later in the afternoon and he said, "I'll be there. A little change is required in what I have to do, but I'll be there."

He stopped first at Roswell, where he had a sister living, and made a talk there. Then he flew to Clovis, N. Mex., where there were assembled a great group of people interested in him because of his philanthropies. There he made a fine talk. Then he came to my home city of Albuquerque, where he made a perfectly wonderful talk for me that evening.

Afterwards I learned that in order to do this he had had to cancel his own rally in the city of Tulsa, one of the largest cities in his State. What he had to do did not compare with what he wanted to do for those people whom he regarded as friends.

He was also a great businessman. We have thorough knowledge of that in my home State of New Mexico. Many companies became interested in the development of uranium, but when Senator Kerr put his mind to it great changes took place in the development that he pioneered. Some $16 million was spent by the Kerr-McGee Co. in the development of a great mill. Of far greater interest, probably, to the people of this Nation, is the fact that out of the processes developed in that mill the cost of yellow cake—of uranium put away in processed form—came down substantially. As a matter of fact, the costs in his mill were approximately half of what they were in certain antiquated mills throughout the country, which previously had been supplying the product.

I have many times thought that it would be interesting to calculate the millions upon millions of dollars which his enterprise and genius brought to the American people because of what he did in the development of that one industry alone.

I regarded him as a great Senator. We have all watched the things that he could do.

He and I were assigned, at the beginning of our first terms, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In that committee he began to express his great interest in reclamation, in the use of water and in the conservation of water.

Some time after that he called me one day and told me that I was going to Oklahoma City for a meeting of the Arkansas, Red, and White River group. I tried to assure him that I had made no commitment of any kind to go. He assured me that I had. We checked every piece of paper that we could find in my office. There was no single evidence of any kind that I had ever agreed to go.

Nonetheless, I went. I was on his plane that afternoon, because he was determined that I should be there and because of what he was trying to do to make sure that a great development took place.

I made no contribution, except to hold up my hand at the meeting and to say that I was willing to support Senator KERR in everything he had to propose for the development of the water of his State and the conservation of it for use in the future.

There was an Indian problem of great complexity which we considered. That happened to be in the State of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who is now in the Chamber. We had a great deal of trouble with it. Members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were trying hard to solve it. We were unsuccessful in reaching any formula which seemed to promise any reasonable solution.

Finally the chairman of the committee said to Senator KERR, "Why don't you go out and see if you can bring the contending groups together?" A short time later he reported that an agreement had been reached.

Mr. President, I have no way of knowing how long the Congress would have wrangled over it. I have no way of knowing how long the committee would have debated it. I know it did not take Senator KERR long to dispose of it.

Subsequently, there was introduced in this body a resolution for a water resources survey. I was extremely happy to suggest to the leadership that the Senator from Oklahoma be asked to take charge of it. We had many discussions before he finally agreed, because he had calls on his time. As the Senator from North Dakota pointed out, the results showed why he had been selected for these important duties.

Everywhere he went he met the people of the State he was visiting and had them understand that ultimately the greatest thing that could happen to the Nation would be the development of these water resources. He left the States with the support of the people for water resource conservation and for the things which the water conservation proposal was trying to accomplish. It was not just in the State of North Dakota or the State of Oklahoma; it was everywhere he went that the Senator from Oklahoma had taken the time to acquaint himself with the problems there and what ought to be done about them.

Finally, I would say he was a great friend. Many, many times those of us who knew him well would carry our problems to him.

Sometime last fall I had a period in which I was not feeling particularly well. While in the Finance Committee I went to answer a telephone call. When I came back the Senator from Oklahoma asked me what was the matter. I told him it was a call from my doctor telling me I had no business being in a committee meeting. The Senator from Oklahoma said, "You are going to leave right now." He accompanied me to the door and to the hall and said, "I am going to see that you go home." I went home. He knew that the votes were desperately close on some of the issues he was interested in. He knew I was going to vote with him. But he was more interested in my trying to conserve my health than he was in having enacted legislation with which he was concerned.

So I say he was a good neighbor, a great businessman, a great Senator, and a great man. We will not see many like him in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the late Senator ROBERT S. KERR was a man among men. I believe he was the quickest witted man I have ever known. He could match wits with the keenest of men in depth of intellect, in quickness of perception, in mirth, in sarcasm, in pathos. He had a capacity for friendship that could survive the keenest rivalry, the strongest of contention.

Early after my coming to the Senate the bonds of friendship were established between Senator KERR and me. These survived mutuality of interest and contention in legislative issues.

One of the keenest debaters that I have ever known, indeed, I believe one of the great debaters this Chamber has ever enjoyed, one crossed swords with BOB KERR with the greatest of trepidation.

I am sure he would think it quite appropriate, even in a eulogy, to recall one bit of mirth which illustrates how difficult it was upon occasion to "get the better of him," so to speak.

Last year, during the debate on the tax bill, the late Senator KERR and I had a particularly vigorous exchange over a considerable period of time on the floor of the Senate. When that debate was concluded, the New York Times requested that Senator KERR and I go to the President's room in order that our photograph might be taken. Mr. President, you can imagine with what alacrity both of us responded. I did not notice, and I am sure he did not notice, that the photographer had posed us with a portrate of George Washington hanging on the wall between us.

It was rather startling, the next morning, to see on the front page of the New York Times a two column picture of Senator KERR and me, with the Father of our Country looking seemingly down upon us, big as life.

One of my secretaries called attention to the fact that if one examined the portrait of George Washington carefully, he could see there was a different expression on his face. I found this amusing. I obtained a copy of the picture and sent it to Senator KERR with this note: "Dear BOB: I give you with my compliments a picture of two eminent statesmen who seem to be under the surveillance of the Father of our Country. I hope you will not mind my suggesting that if you examine the portrait closely, George seems to be smiling at me and glowering at you."

Right back came a messenger with this note: "Dear ALBERT: I thank you for the picture and I agree as to the eminence of the statesmen shown therein, but I suggest you take another and a closer look at George. Can't you tell the difference between smiling and laughing?"

He was a man capable of love—magnanimous love—of his fellow man; a man capable of compassion in the smallest of things, comprehension and dreams of the greatest of events—truly a man among men. To illustrate the quality of being a man among men, let me call attention to one item to which the distinguished and able junior Senator from Oklahoma has already made brief reference.

He referred to the TVA self-financing act. For many years this great publicly owned utility system had been a matter of political contention annually. For 20 years I had regarded as my primary duty, as a Representative and as a Senator, as did the senior Senator from Kentucky for many a year, the obtaining of sufficient appropriations for the TVA to meet the growing demands of the great area which it serves.

Doing that which he was equipped to do better than any man who lived within the valley, Senator KERR brought to enactment the TVA self-financing bill. No longer is TVA a matter of political contention on the floor of either House of Congress. When the people it serves now require more electricity, the TVA in a businesslike way determines the need for additional generating capacity, locates it in a businesslike way, and sells bonds to raise the revenue in a businesslike way; and now the people are secure in the confidence that this utility system is removed from political contention and will be permitted to thrive and to serve a thriving people.

I said Senator KERR was capable of compassion and faith. He and I enjoyed a mutuality of love of the soil and of cattle. Upon occasion we would walk together upon the green turf. Upon occasion he would speak of his faith in God, his religious convictions, which were deep and profound. Possessed of great talents, great courage, great perception, great vision, his faith was the simple faith of a God-fearing mother and father who had given him parenthood.

To his loving wife, to his three stalwart sons, and to his loving and charming daughter, all of whom I know and call my friends, I extend the deepest sympathy and yet congratulations, because this father and this husband was one of the greatest Senators who has graced this body.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the death of Senator ROBERT S. KERR came as a shock to those of us who knew him well.

He was a man of many interests, a man of great strength, a man of great vitality. Senator KERR was a man who, in my judgment, lived in the great tradition of the empire builders of America, a man who dealt with the physical and material structure of America.

Those who served with him on the Finance Committee know that he had respect for finance as something necessary and useful. However, his real goal and delight was to make and build things. He was concerned with cattle and with the land. He was concerned with rivers and with the minerals of his own State, and with the resources of this Nation.

He did not hesitate to penetrate to the very bowels of the earth in order to develop things which might be useful to man; nor did he shy away from exploration in space when that became a challenge to America and a challenge to him.

He was a man of vision. He was not a visionary. His dreams were not idle but, instead, lead to planning on almost every occasion.

He was much respected in the Senate. Those who did not know him well, particularly some columnists and commentators, suggested that this respect in the Senate was based more on fear than on affection and real understanding. This was a misrepresentation of the character of Senator KERR and of the attitude toward him of many Members of the Senate.

His basic strength was one which was based on loyalty and affection and respect for this intelligence, and on respect for his great effectiveness in the Senate.

There were those who said that he was a compromiser. He would have been the first to admit it. However, his compromises were not compromises with principle, but, rather, with the realities of the day or the realities of history.

He was a genuine realist in the best sense of that word. Indeed, he preferred some progress and some advance to a kind of perpetuation or a perfection of an issue without any achievement.

It was sometimes charged that he was harsh in debate. In a sense, I suppose, sometimes he was. However, that was primarily, I believe, because he was in a hurry on most of the issues. Even so, Mr. President, there was a kind of evenhandedness in his harshness. He welcomed all adversaries into battle and treated all of them as though, being Members of the Senate, they were the equal of anyone else and should be prepared for the contest. He believed that every man was to be trusted until he had proved to be untrustworthy; that every man was to be accepted unless he had somehow betrayed his trust.

He was basically, in the real meaning of the word, an optimist. I do not mean that in the sense of one who foolishly or falsely believes that the world necessarily is getting better and better every day, but of one who sincerely believes that when men band together as individuals and exert a great force and exercise their fair judgment and direct their energies to both old and new problems, they can bring about some improvement. This is genuine optimism, which is based, fundamentally, upon the religious virtue of hope.

Senator KERR had a deep respect for the Senate and for its traditions. Through his actions in the Senate and outside the Senate he was a positive force for the building and strengthening of America.

All of us who served with him in the Senate have reason to be grateful for having had occasion to be here with him, and have cause to express our grief and regret at his passing; but at the same time to say to his family, his wife, and his children, that they, too, are honored in the service which he has given to the Senate and to America.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during time of war we honor those Americans who give their lives for their country on the field of battle. We honor such men, and justly so. Today we have come together to honor three Members of the U.S. Senate who have passed way. But I think it is entirely fitting and proper that we consider the death of Senator CHAVEZ, Senator KERR, and Senator DWORSHAK as representing the ultimate sacrifice these outstanding Americans have made for their country.

As every colleague in this Chamber well knows, the task of fulfilling the responsibilities of a U.S. Senator with fidelity and devotion demands a total commitment of time and energy. The Senators we honor today certainly made such a commitment. I am quite confident that their unrelenting expenditure of themselves in the service of their country and their States will stand as their supreme sacrifice.

At the time of his passing, the senior Senator from New Mexico, Mr. CHAVEZ, was the fourth-ranking Senator in terms of seniority. Only the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] served for a longer period of years.

I know that other Senators have already commented upon the details of Senator CHAVEZ's career. I wish to emphasize only the highlights. The citizens of his State gave him their stamp of approval no less than seven times by electing him twice to the House of Representatives and five times to the Senate. This constitutes the highest degree of approval from those persons best qualified to pass judgment.

During his long years of service among us, the Senator from New Mexico rose to two positions of great importance in this body: Chairman of the Committee on Public Works and chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Defense. Both these duties carried great pressures and responsibilities but the Senator from New Mexico executed his duties with wisdom, justice, and efficiency. The words of praise that we speak today will endure for the ages; they will be read by historians and students of government. But the true monuments to the Senator from New Mexico will be the strength of this Nation's defenses that he always sought; and the dams, irrigation systems, and harbors that protect our people from destruction and create areas of profitable farming from the arid deserts. Protecting our Nation, saving lives, and creating life are accomplishments that will perpetually do honor to the Senator from New Mexico.

I know his colleagues also share the greatest admiration and respect for the tremendous courage displayed by the Senator from New Mexico during the last years of his life. His tenacious determination to continue his service despite the gravest illness will never be forgotten.

The Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. KERR, was suddenly taken from us at the peak of his career. Every Member of this body was deeply shocked and dismayed at his sudden passing. Truly the Senator from Oklahoma could have looked ahead to many years of the same productive, courageous, and resourceful life that characterized his amazing career.

Each Member of the Senate knows the importance of the late Senator from Oklahoma in the operations of this body. As chairman of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee he took the lead in implementing President Kennedy's pledge to the American people that the United States would be second to no other nation in the quest for outer space. As ranking Democrat on the Committee on Finance he was the principal leader in writing the President's tax proposals into law. As ranking Democrat on the Committee on Public Works he carried on the responsibilities of the chairman during the absence of the late Senator from New Mexico. The magnitude of these responsibilities only assume their true proportions when one realizes the humble origins of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Born on September 11, 1896, in the Indian Territory of Oklahoma, the Senator from Oklahoma first viewed the world from the windows of a log cabin. Is there another American of this generation who rose to comparable heights of personal fortune, political success, or national power? I know of no other such American.

He was always a persuasive and faithful advocate for the interests of his State. He was a true and dedicated member of his party. He was honored with the respect of his colleagues in the Senate as few other Senators are. We have lost a great Senator and a great American.

Likewise, the late Senator from Idaho, Mr. DWORSHAK, was a faithful representative of his State and his party. While the Senator from Minnesota differed with the late Senator from Idaho on many issues of public policy, he always did so with the greatest respect and admiration for his honesty, courage, and dedication to the principles of government in which he believed. As a respected member of the Committees on Appropriations, Interior and Insular Affairs, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the late Senator from Idaho exhibited the greatest concern for the natural resources of this country. His knowledge and wisdom in such areas will be sorely missed by members of both Republican and Democratic Parties in the Senate.

This Nation has truly sustained a great loss with the passing of Senator CHAVEZ, Senator KERR, and Senator DWORSHAK. The Senator from Minnesota wishes to convey his personal sympathy to the families of these great Americans who are present with us today.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I do not believe I can add very much to the words of my colleagues. I can say that I miss Senator KERR very much, and I shall miss him in the days that lie ahead. Somehow his abilities, personality, and his great powers at times held the Senate, and held each one of us enthralled. He had a tremendous capacity for work, a powerful intellect, and a great power of exposition. These and other qualities made him one of the most powerful leaders that the Senate—indeed, the country—has known.

I felt something unusual in his leadership. He had unquestionably, the type of leadership which because of the very power of his intellect and his force could bring people along with his views.

But I thought also he had that type of leadership which drew people to him. It was hard to be against Bob Kerr because of his human qualities. I saw this quality on the floor of the Senate, and in the committees on which I served with him. His human qualities, humor, persuasion, friendship impelled one to want to be with him.

I saw this quality, as it related to members of the staff of the committees and the men and women who served with him in his office. They were most faithful to him and loved him, because he gave them his loyalty and confidence.

I found in him the human quality of kindness and sympathy; and as others have said, a willingness to help another Member, even though his problem was far from those of his own State.

His wit and his irony could be devastating, but he was very human. I shall never forget one day, sitting in his office, talking with him, when he showed me pictures of his family, and a picture of his father and mother. In talking of them, tears came to his eyes. I was not surprised. Yet, with all his great force, power, and strength, it was an illustration of his pathos and simplicity.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the death of the senior Senator from Oklahoma, Robert S. Kerr, is a grievous loss. His was the fabled success story that is so much a part of the living dream of America, the story which sets our country apart from all others. He knew war as a young soldier knows it, troubled peace as a statesman knows it, democracy as one who rose from log cabin to Governor's chair to Senate Chamber knows it, hard work as one who achieved stature in the business world from a standing start knows it.

His loss is not only to Oklahoma, the State he loved and served so well. He was a true friend to my State of Texas, for he was, above all, a man of great intellect and outstanding accomplishment, a man who had vision and the ability to turn vision into reality.

All the Southwest, the vast land that is the wide-open door to future generations of a growing Nation, will miss this strong man and will be forever indebted to him for his interest in bringing water to a thirsty earth, new commerce to an inland haven.

His memory will be kept fresh for generations by his achievements not only for Oklahoma, but in all the Nation. He invigorated his own party, the Democratic Party, in the days of its defeat in the 1950's, with his sharp wit and his great speaking ability. I heard him stir audiences in Dallas, Amarillo, Sweetwater, and other places in my home State of Texas in the first half of the decade of the fifty's, at a time when members of his own party were so dispirited that some of the leaders did not want to accept speaking invitations there.

I was with him at the Hayden dinner in Arizona, in 1961, and returned with him on the long, sad trip to Bonham, Tex., for the final rites for our dear friend, the great Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn. On that plane trip, I heard him speak of his faith, which was as strong as that of the early settlers of America. He had a deep religious faith.

Senator Kerr was a broad-gaged man. In reading the accounts of his life, which were published in many of the newspapers following his death, I saw references to the fact that he used his great position of power to try, perhaps, to control the votes of other Senators. I do not think that was true. That was not my own experience. I differed as sharply with him on subjects such as the communications satellite bill as I ever have with any other Member of the Senate.

Last fall, during the long, tiring days of September and the first half of October, days which I think placed on Senator Kerr the great burden which was ultimately to take his life, he worked unstintingly.

Texas was concerned about many water projects. I went to Senator Kerr and asked him to give his help on project after project. He placed every single one in the bill. There was not the slightest discrimination, not the slightest hesitancy, not the slightest bit of pettiness in him. He was a broad-gaged man. The fact that I disagreed with him on other major proposed legislation made not one whit of difference in the Committee on Public Works. He considered every project on its merits and decided whether it was sound. That was the kind of broad-gaged man he was.

All of us in this body will miss him. My area of the country will miss him. Our two States of Oklahoma and Texas have a similar outlook about most matters. There are areas in the western portions of our States which are lands of little water. It is that area about which Mr. Justice Holmes said in one Supreme Court decision, "Water is more than an amenity, it is a treasure." It is that part of the country that esteems land and water, and the things that grow on the land and in the water; forests or crops plants by man, where the cattle industry is highly prized, where people think of the elemental things—the minerals in the ground, the crops that grow on it, and the natural things which abound in the earth. It was in that environment that Senator Kerr gained his stature as a statesman.

Mr. President, I have read many articles about Senator Kerr since he passed away; but of all those I have read, both from my own State and from Oklahoma and other States, the one which I thought was best and that I liked the best was the one entitled, "President, Other Leaders Pay Tribute to Kerr," published in the Tulsa Daily World of Wednesday, January 2, 1963. Perhaps it has already been placed in the Record; but since I think it was the best of the many articles I read, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Tulsa Daily World, Jan. 2, 1963]

President, Other Leaders Pay Tribute to Kerr

Many called Senator Robert S. Kerr, Democrat, of Oklahoma, the uncrowned king of the Senate and his sudden death Tuesday in Washington brought an outpouring of sorrowing comment from President John F. Kennedy and the Nation's leaders.

The President learned of Kerr's death from a heart ailment while flying by helicopter from Palm Beach to Miami for the Orange Bowl football game.

"He possessed a unique combination of talents, which joined with his deep devotion to his State and Nation, brought him to a high place in American public life," said the President.

"His legislative accomplishments were exceptional. In the last 2 years alone, almost every major bill enacted bore the mark of his untiring leadership and skill: the space program, the trade bill, the tax bill of 1962, the improvements in social welfare and in national resources development. He will be greatly missed when the Senate opens next week and even more so in the months ahead."

Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, long a personal friend of Kerr, said Kerr "had the strength of the pioneers of old and daring of the pioneers of today and he gave both to his country in full measure."

He said he had never known a more effective legislator and that "America has lost one of our great resources."

"He was a man of brilliance and great ability," said Senator Harry F. Byrd, Democrat, of Virginia, for whom Kerr often acted as the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee.

"He will be mourned by his political foes as well as his allies because both admired him," said John Bailey, chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Oklahoma's Governor-elect Henry Bellmon, from his home at Billings, said "Few men in our history have reached the pinnacle of power attained by Senator Kerr and no man has had a more profound effect on his native State.

"Generations unborn will pay homage to his great vision and to his tireless efforts in behalf of Oklahoma."

"It is the most severe loss that Oklahoma has suffered among its public figures since statehood," said House Majority Leader Carl Albert, a fellow Oklahoman. "He is absolutely irreplaceable."

Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Democrat, of New Mexico, said Kerr's death was a great loss to the Nation.

"He was a great developer of property and did a lot for the uranium industry in New Mexico."

Senator Mike Monroney, called his colleague's death an "irreplaceable loss" to the Nation.

"Senator Kerr's death takes away from the service of the Nation at this critical time a man whose ability, energy and dedication to public service had won him preeminence of leadership in the Senate," Monroney said.

Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat, of West Virginia, said Kerr "possessed a keen mind and a strong will."

Bailey termed Kerr "one of the great Senators of his era in history."

U.S. Representative Ed Edmondson, of Muskogee said "I think in the loss of Senator Kerr, Oklahoma, suffered its greatest loss in our generation. We lost a great leader in the field of statecraft, in the field of industry and in the spiritual life of our State and country. And his loss is irreparable for Oklahoma.

"I think the project closest to his heart was probably the Arkansas River Basin program. In his memory, I expect to introduce in the next session of Congress, legislation to name the Arkansas River navigation system the Robert S. Kerr Seaway, and I feel it will have unanimous support in both the House and the Senate."

Representative John Jarman, Democrat, of Oklahoma, said Oklahoma's congressional delegation has "lost a great leader."

"Senator Kerr literally gave his life and his talents to his church and State," said Representative Victor Wickersham, Democrat, Oklahoma.

"Oklahoma has lost her most valuable asset," said Representative Tom Steed, Democrat, of Oklahoma. "There has never been or ever will be anyone like him in public service."

Oklahoma Gov. J. Howard Edmondson, already mentioned as a possible successor to Kerr, brushed away tears after he was informed of Kerr's death while attending the Orange Bowl football game in Miami, Fla.

"His death is a great loss to the country and especially to Oklahoma."

Gov. Buford Ellington, of Tennessee, a personal as well as political friend, said he was deeply grieved.

He said the loss would be felt "by the entire country, to which he devoted so many years of service."

State Democratic Chairman Gene McGill, of Oklahoma, said: "It's a great loss to Oklahoma, the Nation, the Democratic Party and to me, for he was a very good friend."

Former Oklahoma Gov. Raymond Gary, who had feuded privately with Kerr during last year's campaign and indicated he would run against him in 1966, said: "I have always admired Senator Kerr because of his ability, courage, and untiring efforts he would put forth to make a success of whatever he undertook to do."

Dean McGee, Kerr's partner in the oil business, said "He was not only a great man, he was a great gentleman along with it."

B. Hayden Crawford, Tulsa attorney who ran against Kerr in 1960, said "This is a great loss to the State of Oklahoma. I extend my deep sympathy to his family and associates."

Senator John Stennis, Democrat, of Mississippi, who served with Kerr on the Senate Space Committee, called Kerr's death a personal loss as well as a loss to the Senate said "I certainly am grieved." He was "one of our great leaders and one of the most versatile men I have ever known and a fine gentleman."

Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield, of Wyoming, called Kerr's death "a tragic, unexpected loss that will be felt most keenly in the Senate, in Oklahoma, and in the Nation."

Senator Frank Carlson, of Kansas, said Kerr's death cost this Nation "one of its greatest citizens and the Senate one of its ablest Members."

The Kansas Republican, at home in Concordia for the New Year's holiday, said "Senator Kerr's death is a tremendous loss to the Midwest and the Nation."

Former Gov. Roy J. Turner said the loss of Senator Kerr "can't be anything but tragic."

Turner, who ran against Kerr for the Democratic nomination for the Senate in 1954, said: "It's a real tragic thing to have happened. I don't know what else I can say about it."

Senator Herman E. Talmadge, Democrat, of Georgia, said the death "is a great tragedy for our country."

Talmadge said he served with Kerr the past 4 years on the Senate Finance Committee and "he had the most incisive, retentive mind that I have ever known.

"He was an extremely hard worker, being well prepared on all bills and all issues," Talmadge continued.

"When he made up his mind as to what was best for our country, no amount of pressure from any source could deter him from his convictions. As a warm personal friend I deeply mourn his passing."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the longer one is a Member of this body, the more he becomes aware of the bond of fraternalism which exists in an area that could, because of its very makeup, be a setting for dissention and acrimony. The pervasive warmth of that bond is always present, yet it becomes even more pronounced during those times of tragedy when death removes a colleague from our ranks.

Robert Kerr, of Oklahoma, one of the three great Senators who has passed to their reward recently, and whom today we eulogize, was a stalwart defender of the highest traditions of this great body. Significantly, he, as did the others, had a humble beginning.

Although I never had the privilege of serving on a Senate committee with Bob Kerr, I did enjoy the pleasure of his warm friendship. I recall vividly an occasion a few years back—it was a campaign year for me, in fact—when I asked Bob Kerr to come to Nevada to address the Democratic State convention. He agreed with his usual heartiness, and delivered a speech that set the tone for one of the liveliest conventions in my State's history. A man of limitless ability, he also possessed the oratorical skill to drive home his points with the clarity of a bell and the punch of a jackhammer. In the passing of Bob Kerr, the Nation lost an able servant and the Senate has been deprived of one of its most colorful personalities.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is a small three-letter word which describes every dimension of Robert S. Kerr, his philosophy and his career. All those who knew him know that word is "big."

Bob Kerr was a big man physically, and in his leonine head there hummed the wheels of a tremendous intellect.

His heart was as big as his body; and it was a diversified heart. It was big in the courage to meet conflict or to deal with danger, and it was big in compassion to deal with those he encountered along the road of life who had suffered the vicissitudes of fortune—the humble and the broken.

He thought in big terms. His plans for his private life were big, and they brought a financial success that was one of the notable contributions to the history of the opportunities which are afforded by our form of government.

His plans for his beloved Oklahoma and for our Nation were big enough to encompass the whole horizon.

Bob Kerr did nothing halfway. He was big in his affection for his family and for those who were fortunate enough to enjoy the priceless boon of his friendship. Only those know how big was his capacity for friendship.

Candor compels me to say, Mr. President, that he could be big in the retribution he showered upon any who happened to incur his wrath, either on the political hustings or in this forum where we are today.

Bob Kerr and I became fast friends within a few days after his services here commenced, and I have never enjoyed a sweeter or more satisfying friendship. We seemed to understand each other completely.

There were a few, rare occasions when we disagreed on some matters; but he knew what I was thinking, without discussing it; and I knew the conclusions and the processes which led him to his positions; and we did not even have to discuss them. We understood each other completely.

Bob Kerr was a big man in the U.S. Senate. A log cabin may have been the place of his birth, but he was born to be a big leader of men.

He enjoyed conflict, either in committee or here on the floor of the Senate; and he enjoyed it and dealt with it in a big way.

Bob Kerr was proud of the U.S. Senate; and no one guarded it more jealously, to assure that the Senate would not be demeaned or that there would be no diminution of the big place which the Founding Fathers intended to have the Senate play in our scheme of government, when they hammered out the Constitution in Philadelphia in 1787.

Mr. President, the passing of such a figure naturally creates a big void in this body. Bob Kerr's fine mind will be sorely missed in the days ahead.

I mourn the loss of a personal friend and a comrade at arms in many legislative struggles. For me, the Senate will never be exactly the same without Bob Kerr. Sometimes I feel almost as if some part of myself is missing, when I look across to where he sat in this Chamber and do not get the look of reassurance that sustained me so many times.

One of my most prized possessions is a letter written in his own hand, on the back of a piece of gaily colored Christmas wrapping paper—a letter which he wrote to me from the hospital, about 2 days before he passed away. The letter was written in answer to a little note I had written him.

Mr. President, I regret that I cannot comfort his family. But I cannot, because I feel so bereaved that I cannot comfort myself. I can say to them—and I say it also to the thousands of people in this country, from horny-handed sons of toil to masters of finance and business, all of whom trusted and loved and followed Bob Kerr—that I deeply grieve with them at the passing of this big American.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, so many fine things have been written and said about Senator Robert Kerr that it would be presumptuous of me to try to add anything. However, I do want to say that it was my privilege to have served with him and to have become well acquainted with him. He was helpful to me, as a new Member of the Senate, on a number of occasions; and he was always warm and cordial. One of his great loves was for the Aberdeen Angus strain of livestock; and when he learned that I had a bronze model of a Hereford bull on my desk, he was quick to make sure that I had a Black Angus model to stand beside it.

Bob Kerr was a tireless and effective worker for the State he represented. Indeed, it was his great love for work, and for battle, too, that weakened his magnificent constitution during the last session of Congress to such an extent that Oklahoma lost one of her greatest citizens. We will miss him. Mrs. Miller and I extend our most profound sympathy to Mrs. Kerr and the family.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Robert S. Kerr, affectionately known to his colleagues as "Bob," was one of the most amazing men I have ever known and certainly one of the most unselfish and spectacular Members to ever grace the U.S. Senate.

From the log cabin where he was born to his last mortal moments in the hospital where he passed to eternal rest here in the Nation's Capital, in which he had served with such distinction, his life was in the frontier tradition and epitomized the essence of America—a free land where opportunity was open to all and where there were no limits to the goals which an individual could achieve.

His career in public service as a member of the legislature and as Governor of his own State and as a U.S. Senator was in itself a major achievement for any man, and what he accomplished for his State and his country constitutes a great and epic story.

But with all these accomplishments there was also his vast operations in the field of livestock farming, land reclamation, with improved techniques and his contribution toward the productivity of American agriculture.

His achievements, however, do not stop there. He became, in fact, one of the great leaders in the petroleum and gas industry and his efforts were of such dimensions as to set him apart as one of the outstanding men of this generation.

But Bob Kerr was never so busy that he did not have time for his God. Friends who knew him best can testify to his deep and unremitting devotion to his church. He exemplified in the highest degree those four precious words in the preamble to the Constitution of the American Legion, which recite "For God and country." It was not merely his benefactions in sharing with the Lord but his work in advancing the Christian cause. Not only did he pray for the advancement of the Lord's kingdom, but he did something about it.

Was there a secret weapon in Bob Kerr's life which made his accomplishments possible? There was. In fact, there were two. One was his unfaltering faith and the other his amazing capacity for doing his homework well. Every Senator can testify to Bob Kerr's skill and ability in handling the most abstruse and complicated legislation on the Senate floor.

He was a great and happy warrior who fought in the great causes of his time and fell in battle at a moment when his skill, his ability, and capacity were and are so sorely needed by this Republic.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to serve on the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences when the late Robert S. Kerr was chairman of that committee. Although I was not the ranking minority member of the committee during that time, Chairman Kerr treated me as though I was.

This may have stemmed from the fact that the ranking minority member was also the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on the Judiciary and consequently with such heavy official duties did not have the time to take from them for the Space Committee that I would have.

Whether it was this factor or not, this much is certain and true. No other committee chairman ever extended to me the consideration that Senator Kerr did.

This, of course, would prejudice me very much in his favor. It might well have prompted greater tolerance on my part toward him when we differed so very basically on some issues like the 27½-percent oil depletion allowance that he so stoutly defended and I have sought for years to pare down.

But I know that it was not that. I know that it was because Bob Kerr had two deep-seated characteristics which made him the dynamic, effective power that he was in the Senate—characteristics for which I admire him so much.

In the first place, he was a fighter for what he believed in and for his State of Oklahoma and his constituency. He pulled no punches and no one ever had to guess where he stood. There was nothing ambivalent about him—and because he refused to play the role of expedient political ambivalence, he made many bitter enemies. Perhaps that, in itself, was his most impressive hallmark of leadership.

In the second place, he was not a man motivated by narrow political partisanship. As a Democrat, he did not automatically view all Republicans as enemies. Nor did he permit his economic views control his attitude toward those of his colleagues who held opposite views.

Of this I had very personal knowledge. In 1954 when I was first running for reelection, oil millionaries sent money into Maine in an attempt to defeat me. One reason they did was because of my opposition to the 27½-percent depletion allowance—on which Senator Kerr was their champion defender.

In spite of this and even though I am a Republican, Senator Kerr came to me and said that though we disagreed on many issues and were of opposing political parties, he wanted to see me returned to, and remain in, the U.S. Senate because I did not hesitate to speak my mind. In doing so, he offered to contribute to my campaign funds. I thanked him but declined to accept any contribution from him.

And I continued my opposition to the oil depletion allowance for the next 6 years—and still do.

When I was running for my third term in 1960, Senator Kerr came to me and said that he did not like what members of his own Democratic Party were attempting to do to me—that whatever I needed to finance my campaign he would be happy to provide himself. Again I thanked him but declined to accept any contribution from him.

My opposition to matters dear to him—such as the oil depletion allowance—made no difference to him. My being a Republican made no difference to him.

I am certain that many other persons witnessed this trait in him. But individuals are of no importance and significance. What is important is that rare trait of a person being able to disagree and yet remain a friend—that rare trait of not judging individuals in terms of narrow partisanship or political prejudice.

Robert S. Kerr had that rare trait in abundance. His death is a great loss to me in the Senate. It is a loss of strength to me. But more important is that it is a loss of strength to the entire U.S. Senate and to our country. It is irreplaceable.

I am sure that no one knows this better than President Kennedy. For Robert S. Kerr opposed President Kennedy on issues in the Senate and beat him—and yet it was Robert S. Kerr that the President looked to for legislative victories on many matters and on which Robert S. Kerr delivered magnificently.

Here again was his rare trait of not permitting deep differences on some issues to prevent him from friendship and performance for the President of the United States.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the year 1963 was new—and suddenly it was old. Senator Robert S. Kerr had passed away.

Something is gone from this Senate, something of the challenge, something of the fervor of debate and the firmness of argument. There is gone from us that dramatic moment when Bob Kerr would slowly rise to his full height and slowly raise his voice to its full power in the heat and heart of his cause.

All this is missing because Bob Kerr is not here; all too suddenly gone from our midst.

I stood at his interment with those who heard the words of his neighbors; neighbors who had known his growth from log cabin limitations to the majesty of a majestic business empire; neighbors who knew him as the good neighbor and God-fearing man.

I would here borrow from my words addressed to his dear ones at that moment.

Bob Kerr gave character and courage to his every role in public life with a gift to sharpen with wit and to soften with human warmth the discussions out of which democracy works its destiny.

It was a privilege to be his colleague, it was a pleasure to share some of his purposes, and it was even delightful, at times, when one differed with him, for he was always an inspiration and invitation to outspoken Americanism.

Bob Kerr's memory will long live in the Halls of the Senate and I am sure it will be an enduring pride in those he loved so deeply.

May a country's appreciation be of comfort to them in their loss as each of us adds his own humble sentiments of sorrow and sense of loss.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in Robert Kerr many of us in the Senate met a powerful figure, physically and intellectually. When we were on opposite sides of an issue, he was a formidable adversary, but when we were on the same side, he was an equally formidable ally. New York State owes him a great debt of gratitude for his role as architect of the Niagara power project. Robert Moses and I had discussed plans to invite Bob Kerr to tour the Niagara power project later this year; and with Senator Kerr's approval, we were going to have a "Robert Kerr Day" in which the Niagara community would participate. We in New York regret that Bob Kerr did not live to have a firsthand look at that project in operation, as he would have been proud of the role he played in having it developed.

Robert Kerr was indeed one of the alltime giants of the Senate.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, none of us who served with Senator Kerr will soon forget his forceful presence in this body. His intelligence, wit, perception, and determination brought him to a unique position as one of the giants of the Senate.

Today I pay tribute to his memory as a man who understood other men, a Senator who grasped the potential of this institution, and a citizen who did not hesitate to battle for those values he held dear. All of us have much to learn from his example.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Nation and the U.S. Senate lost one of its great leaders in the death of Robert Kerr. Bob, as he was affectionately known by all of us, was a man of great ability and great courage. He was truly an optimist and a man of vision. To him the sun always seemed to shine through the clouds. He was a big man and he made big plans for his personal life for his State and for his Nation.

There was nothing small about Bob Kerr. He had an abiding faith in his God and his Creator. Never at any time did he hesitate to confess this faith. He was an active Christian layman and his work in the church and the Sunday school will continue to bear fruit for decades to come.

Bob Kerr owed much to Oklahoma and the great West and he never forgot to keep that in mind when considering problems of the Midwest.

It was my privilege to have been closely associated with him in working for the best interests of our States and Nation. We were very close friends and his death was a personal loss to me.

It was my privilege to introduce him at a meeting in Wichita, Kans., just a few days before he left for Washington where he was stricken. This was one of his last great public meetings. His subject was soil and water conservation—a field in which he was recognized as our greatest conservationist. The soil and water conservation projects that he sponsored in Oklahoma and the Nation will stand as living monuments to his service.

Bob Kerr was devoted to his family, and Mrs. Carlson and I want to extend our sincerest and deepest sympathy to Mrs. Kerr and the family.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, with very great pride I called the late Robert Samuel Kerr, senior Senator from Oklahoma, a dear friend. And with very great sorrow, my wife and I express to his family our heartfelt condolences on their tragic loss.

Bob's passing, however, was far more than a personal one for those who called him husband and father. Oklahoma lost a preeminent Senator. And the Nation, particularly the Senate of the United States, lost one of its great citizens and Senators. I never ceased to marvel at Bob Kerr's intellectual capacity. He was a truly brilliant person—greater than most and as great as any. Fully armed in every Senate debate, there was no more powerful adversary ever to sit in this chamber, skillful, colorful, and persuasive.

The late Senator Kerr was an imposing example of the American success story. From humble beginnings, he became one of the most successful businessmen in the Nation. But he devoted himself, in what was far more important, to his family, his church, and his Nation, in a tireless and unselfish fashion. He loved his family, his dear wife and his children. I remember the moving eulogies uttered to his memory in his church in Oklahoma City, where the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and many of us from the Congress, gathered to mourn his passing. There were plain people in attendance at those final ceremonies. They came to share the sorrow of all who knew him, rich and poor, high and low, in the sudden conclusion of his span of life.

Bob Kerr was my friend. I am most proud that I may say that. But my relations with him were not unique. For his friendship with his fellow man, in and out of the Senate, was a constantly enlarging and happy circle, and those who take part today in these eulogies, share a common pride that the circle included all of them.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the death of Robert S. Kerr has deprived the Senate of the United States of one of its most vibrant personalities. Bob Kerr's strong character was felt in this chamber even though he might have sat quietly at his desk, an observer, rather than a participant in the debate.

This Chamber will always remain a little empty without him. It was not just his size, or his booming voice or his hearty manner which made him so vital.

It was his forthright devotion to his service here for the people of Oklahoma—a service he regarded as a dedicated trust.

It was my good fortune to have served with Senator Kerr on the Public Works Committee and later on the Appropriations Committee of which he was an ex officio member. We had our differences but just about as often the issues found us on the same side. No one could have a more capable opponent—or a more loyal ally.

Bob Kerr placed loyalty at the top of his list of virtues. He worked diligently at the notion that loyalty runs two ways.

Though he may have appeared somewhat bluff and direct, particularly here in this arena of debate in which he reveled, all of us who were proud to count him a friend know that he was gentle, tolerant and considerate. Few of us here have not profited by some sound and sage advice from Senator Kerr.

I well recall an appearance by Bob Kerr on the television program, "Meet the Press." Perhaps my recollection of the words is inexact but they may well form the proper epitaph for Robert S. Kerr. He was asked about his lack of support of the President on a specific national issue. I shall never forget his reply. It was:

> I love the President of the United States, but I love the people of Oklahoma more.

In this way did he express pithily his devotion to the people of his State and his deep belief in the concept of truly representative government.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the first week of this year brought a severe and unexpected shock to each of us and to America with the knowledge of the passing of the late Senator Robert S. Kerr.

Senator Kerr was the kind of man who does not often pass our way. Even in such a body of individualists as this, the force of his presence and personality laid special claim to one's attention.

None was more formidable in debate, giving no quarter and asking none. And there are few, if any, Members who joined in debate with Bob Kerr who did not feel the imprint of his agile mind and the occasional bite of his acid wit.

But, though Senator Kerr was perhaps more widely noted for his skill as a debater, his greatest services were rendered as a mediator and conciliator of what to others would seem to be irreconcilable positions. Nowhere was this more evident than in the demonstration of his leadership as conference chairman of the omnibus public works bill in the 87th Congress. Out of an apparently hopeless deadlock between the two bodies in the late hours of the 87th Congress, Senator Kerr brought forth a measure that won support on both sides of Capitol Hill.

Though it is a grievous loss to those of us who were his colleagues and friends, to the State of Oklahoma, and to the Nation to have Bob Kerr taken at the peak of his powers and prowess, we may truly say that no one lived more fully during the time allotted him. His tremendous zest for life seemed almost to assume the proportions of a force of nature.

This quality of Bob Kerr may be best expressed, I believe, by reference to a line written by the philosopher, William James, to his sister on the occasion of his purchasing a summer home. He exclaimed with joy that it had "14 doors and they all open outward." Such was the world of Bob Kerr—and open universe with many doors, all opening out.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, Bob Kerr was a fighter, and I like fighters.

In legislative battles the side that had the help of Bob Kerr was happy. If he was on the opposing side it often caused alarm.

Much will be said today about the success story of our late departed friend.

He went to the top in his profession, in business, in politics, as a citizen and in his church. I wish to associate myself with all of the laudatory things that are said about him today.

I wish to extend to Mrs. Kerr and to all the family the sincere sympathy of Mrs. Curtis and myself.

Shortly after Senator KERR's death the Omaha World Herald published an editorial entitled "Without Mr. KERR." It appeared in their paper on January 3, 1963. I think that editorial should be preserved in these records and I include it as a part of these remarks:

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Jan. 3, 1963]

WITHOUT MR. KERR

Last summer, as the final legislative battles of the 87th Congress were shaping up, this newspaper observed that Senator ROBERT KERR, of Oklahoma, was probably the most influential legislator in Washington and that his influence usually served the public interest.

Mr. KERR, who died Tuesday, was a self-made man who delivered strongly in the American enterprise system. He never saw reason to apologize for his wealth or his success. Yet he was a broad-gaged man whose interests went beyond business. They encompassed the world and America's place in it.

To him, perhaps more than to any other man, was due the credit for curbing the excesses of the administration's welfare legislation. Without his informed and persuasive opposition, the President's medical care plan might very well have become law.

But Mr. KERR was not merely a naysayer and an obstructionist. He believed that there is a degree of Federal responsibility for medical care for the aged, and he had tried to meet it—successfully in the opinion of many—by coauthoring the Kerr-Mills Act.

Senator KERR was No. 2 man, behind Chairman HARRY BYRD, on the taxwriting Senate Finance Committee, and he saw eye to eye with Mr. BYRD on many issues. As chairman of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, he unquestionably was the leading congressional figure in space matters.

Thus by position, by knowledge, and by force of character, he quite likely was the Senate's most substantial man. His death Tuesday is not only a grievous loss to the country but it can alter the balance between legislative and executive power.

This self-made man was a fierce champion of the integrity and independence of Congress at a time when President Kennedy, like most Presidents before him, was trying to expand the power of the White House.

At a time when leadership in Congress had become relatively weak, ROBERT KERR was strong.

The Oklahoma Senator rose to prominence with relative suddenness after years in which he had been a minor figure. Americans will hope that some other Senator may come out of obscurity similarly to replace him. For with Senator KERR gone the Congress is weaker, and so is the voice of moderation.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it is customary at times such as this to comment on the lives and work of those Members of this great body who are no longer with us. The great tragedy to me is that our departed colleagues cannot be in this Chamber today to hear our expressions of admiration and affection which all too often go unsaid during their lifetimes.

The U.S. Senate is sometimes referred to as the "most exclusive club in Washington." In the sense that I cannot think of any other body of only 100 members representing over 188 million people, perhaps this is so. And being a comparatively small body and working closely together it is inevitable that we form strong bonds of friendship and respect for the positions which we have sworn to carry out.

The great English poet, John Donne, wrote that "any man's death diminishes me" and when death takes a respected Senator and great statesman the loss to mankind is much more than just this.

The new year, as we all know, opened on a very sad note. The untimely death of Senator ROBERT S. KERR was a shock and source of grief to all of us. I can think of no other man who possessed such vitality or who enjoyed living as did BOB KERR. It is still hard to believe that his figure will no longer be seen entering the Chamber doors or his resonant and articulate voice heard on the Senate floor.

But more than just an admired and respected colleague, BOB KERR was a true and devoted friend whose death came as a great personal loss to me. His advice and assistance were always welcomed because I knew they were based on sound judgment and unfailing loyalty. I do not think that anyone can quite fill his shoes for I know of no man who possesses as many outstanding and unique qualities as he did.

Senator KERR was also well known for his unlimited capacity for hard work and his brilliant and incisive mind which enabled him to grasp and comprehend the most difficult problems in every area of legislation.

I am reminded of an incident last year which occurred following a Finance Committee meeting where we were struggling with a particularly complex and complicated piece of legislation. While walking out of the committee room after what seemed a trying and interminable session, another colleague on the commitee came up to me and said:

> You know, GEORGE, one Senator tends to evaluate things in terms of acres and you have to be explained things according to tourists or oranges, but BOB KERR is the only man I know who can understand everything in terms of anything.

I will not attempt to go into Senator KERR's extensive personal, business, or public accomplishments as I know my Senate colleagues have and shall continue to do this much more eloquently than I.

In closing, I recall that when BOB KERR ran for the Senate in 1948 he adopted the campaign slogan "Land, Wood, and Water," which turned from a political catchword into his credo for championing the needs and interests of his fellow Oklahomans. When he became chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, he added the word "space" to his slogan. Since it has been said that man is immortal as long as his name or his works are remembered by the living, I would like to suggest that today Senator ROBERT KERR's slogan be further enlarged to "Land, Wood, Water, Space, and Immortality."

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President—

> The tumult and the shouting dies,
> The captains and the kings depart.

Thus, Mr. President, wrote Rudyard Kipling in 1897.

Thus could Rudyard Kipling have written today on the passing of ROBERT S. KERR, late Senator from Oklahoma.

BOB KERR was a big man, with a big voice—with big abilities commensurate with his big ideas. He was a man with great power, great prestige, and great presence.

Perhaps no man in recent times was more able in the Senate to make his presence felt, and to accomplish more in the way of legislation in which he believed than was BOB KERR. He possessed an extraordinary breadth of knowledge, and a tremendous capacity to translate that knowledge into action.

Certainly he shouted; surely he was in the midst of tumult. And no man was, in recent times, more effective in the use of his talents.

BOB KERR was no king. For kings are not born in log cabins. But, BOB KERR was a leader.

I served on the Committee on Public Works with BOB KERR for the first 4 years of my present term in the Senate. I can assure every Senator that each of the moments in our committee sessions was no more dull than every minute which held BOB KERR on the floor of the Senate.

We shall not soon see again a legislator so effective in the manner of Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to a Senator who was a great and distinguished Member of this body.

Although I have only been a Member of the Senate for a short while, my acquaintance with Senator KERR dates back to the time he came to Montana in the campaign of 1948. His charm and ability captivated the Montanans who heard him, and he had substantial support for the nomination for President from the Montana Democratic delegation to the Democratic National Convention. BOB KERR's name is still a legend in the areas where he spoke in Montana and the grief at his untimely death was real and moving.

Since coming to Congress, and especially since I came to the Senate 2 years ago, I had the privilege of working with Senator KERR in one of his favorite fields, conservation and development of America's water resources.

Senator KERR was one of the first legislators that I have had the opportunity to observe. He had an intuition about legislation that was only matched by the incomparable Speaker Rayburn. He used his great abilities and his skill in the public interest for the advancement of a legislative legacy that will be a memorial to him for many years ahead.

It was a distinction to have worked with Senator KERR, it was a pleasure to observe him at work, I am honored to have had the opportunity to serve with him. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, running through every word and every thought uttered on this solemn occasion by the friends and colleagues of ROBERT KERR is the same basic theme. The force and power of his personality impressed itself upon each one of us as it did on any group or any assembly in which he served through his long and crowded career. He was a man of strong convictions with a lightning mind and a rapier-like tongue to express them. In debate he was almost invincible so that a stranger in the gallery or a new colleague whose acquaintance with him had been brief would consider him almost cruel in the ruthless way that he riddled his opponents' arguments, lashing them with powerful eloquence. Yet, as we came to know him we found a warm and affectionate friend who had not one ounce of venom or bitterness in his heart. He reveled in a battle of wits. Yet, he spoke without anger.

In the first years of my Senate service, I served with him on the Committee on Public Works. I well remember one occasion as we were sitting about the table waiting for a quorum to assemble when one Member mentioned a departed colleague and expressed regret that his last contact with his friend had been in the heat of Senate debate. BOB KERR leaned back in his chair and recited these words:

> These clumsy feet, still in the mire,
> Go crushing blossoms without end;
> These hard, well-meaning hands we thrust
> Among the heartstrings of a friend.
>
> The ill-timed truth we might have kept
> Who knows how sharp it pierced and stung!
> The word we had not sense to say—
> Who knows how grandly it had rung!

It impressed me so much that I asked him to send me a copy of the quotation which I have always kept. It told me much of the warm affection which he had for all his friends and which I am thankful I enjoyed through the years, both on the Public Works Committee and later with him on the Committee on Finance.

He fell suddenly at the height of his power in the Senate and at a time when he was most needed. Yet, in that there is one consolation. He will always live among us in all his strength and power. There can never be a memory of fading faculties and slackening strength that comes with age. We unite with his loved ones in mourning him today, but we can say in the words of the poet who wrote of "An Athlete Dying Young":

> Now you will not swell the rout
> Of lads that wore their honors out,
> Runners whom renown outran
> And the name died before the man.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, when historians of the future look back on this era, they will see throughout our land the indelible footprints of a relatively small band of giants who towered over their fellow men in ability, in leadership, in patriotism, and in devotion to duty.

Because of these men, our Nation has continued to grow and prosper.

Because of these men, we have preserved our treasured heritage and have enriched it for the benefit of future generations.

Yes, Mr. President, giants have left their unmistakable marks on this, our present age, and among their number was the late ROBERT S. KERR, who was our esteemed colleague from Oklahoma.

Senator KERR was truly a giant in every possible manner—in the scope of his interests, in the magnitude of his philanthropies, in the plenitude of his knowledge, and in the extent of his devotion to the welfare of the Nation he loved so well.

With Senator KERR's death, we in this body have lost a memorable friend; the citizens of his State and our Nation have lost a powerful, a dynamic, and a devoted public servant.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it is always a sad occasion when this body sets aside a day for eulogies for departed colleagues. The three men we remember today were all from the West and exemplified those virtues which developed the West and have made it the region of the future. They had courage to face new challenges, determination to overcome all obstacles, and a vision of a better life for those who would follow them.

The late Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. KERR, was a dynamic example of the American dream. He had the distinction, now a political rarity, of being born in a log cabin. His origins were humble, but his ambitions proud. He was a living example of the dictum that success comes to those who are willing to work for it.

Senator KERR worked long and hard for the people of his State, his region, and Nation. I had the good fortune to serve with him on the Select Committee on Water Resources. That committee spent many hours considering what is and will be for many years one of our Nation's most perplexing problems—the development of water resources to match our population and economic growth. No one worked harder, no one was more concerned that the people of our Nation should not be deprived of the necessity of adequate water than was Senator ROBERT KERR. And this singular devotion to the cause at hand could as easily have been applied to a myriad of other projects to which he devoted his efforts. Mr. President, ROBERT KERR was a man who could get things done; he will be sorely missed in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, last year the Senate was in a state of perpetual mourning as, one by one, five of our colleagues fell victim to the grim reaper. It was a terrible toll, and sorrow was heaped upon sorrow. Among those whose loss we grieve is the late senior Senator from Oklahoma, my friend BOB KERR.

He was a giant of a man, who possessed a mentality to match. He had a capacity to grasp the most complex problems, to cut through the mass and the maze of irrelevancy to get to the heart of a matter and to manage difficult legislation in committee, on this floor, and in conference.

One could not be long in his presence without sensing the force of his strong personality. He had a natural proclivity for leadership, and he never was one to shirk his leadership responsibility.

Since coming to the Senate in August 1959, I had the opportunity to serve on the Public Works Committee with BOB KERR and to observe him in action. We worked particularly closely on the Subcommittee on Flood Control-Rivers and Harbors last year, where he demonstrated over and over again his ability to accomplish the impossible. He confounded the pessimists who predicted there would be no omnibus public works bill enacted before adjournment last fall. As a consequence, many essential projects all over America are one step nearer realization.

BOB KERR was a Senator who had an enormous capacity for hard work. He made certain he did his homework, so that in legislative skirmishes he proved always to be both a worthy protagonist and a worthy antagonist. We all knew that, if we challenged him, we had better be prepared to defend our point of view. Nowhere did he show his mettle more clearly than in the debates last year on the tax bill and on medicare for the aged.

BOB KERR possessed a great competitive spirit. When he undertook a task, he determined to be successful, to win the struggle.

During his lifetime, he won the economic struggle from poverty to plenty. He won the political struggle to high office in the U.S. Congress. His notable business and public careers attest to his ability to win.

But there is one battle all of us must lose some day. That BOB KERR should have lost this ultimate struggle for the breath of life in his very prime saddens us all. We in the Senate are the poorer for the loss of his rare skills and his informed guidance.

To his beloved wife and family, Ellyn and I extend our heartfelt condolences. May the Almighty comfort you in your bereavement.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, it is impossible for the friends and colleagues of Senator KERR to find words to adequately describe how much he meant to us and the extent to which the Nation will miss him.

The story of BOB KERR's life is the story of America. Through hard work, ingenuity, and determination he started from meager beginnings and worked his way to the highest peaks.

Many men have done this, but few demonstrated the wide range of abilities that BOB KERR possessed. A keen businessman, a skillful legislator, a respected leader—all apply to BOB KERR. But he was more than these things, too. He was a warm, understanding human being who enjoyed working with and for people. This quality showed through all that Senator KERR did, and it enabled him to accomplish what all men dream of and what few men realize.

Regardless of what the contest was, BOB KERR was the kind of man everybody wanted on their side. When he undertook a job he went all the way, and he knew exactly where he was going and how to get there.

As for myself, the highest tribute I can pay to BOB KERR is the fact that I called on no one for advice and counsel more than I did Senator KERR. I deeply respected his wisdom, his knowledge, and his understanding.

We know that we must go on without Bob Kerr, but only time will make us realize how much we miss him.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in paying deserved tribute to the late, great Senator from Oklahoma, Robert S. Kerr. There is no need for my detailing his great accomplishments in serving the people of his State and the people of his country.

Before I came to the Senate, I developed a great respect for Bob Kerr. During my years of service with him in this body, this respect continued to grow and along with it, a very real personal friendship. Although we sat on different sides of the aisle and often disagreed, I still never lost my respect for his judgment or the position that he took. I am bold enough to say that he in turn respected my judgment as being sincere even though at variance with his own point of view.

I rarely saw Bob Kerr except in connection with our legislative duties. Nevertheless, one of the most enriching experiences of my life was our friendship developed here in the Capitol, on the floor of the Senate, in committee, in conference. To me our friendship was one of those extra values of legislative service which I shall always treasure.

Bob Kerr was a warm, sympathetic man. He had charm, he had humor and he had great intellectual capacity. His penetrating mind could get to the heart of the problem without being lost in peripheral details. His contributions to his State which he loved and served so well and his country which he loved and served so well are too many to enumerate here. His untimely death was a real loss to Oklahoma, the country, and the Senate of the United States.

I join with my colleagues in extending to Mrs. Kerr and all members of the family, my deepest sympathy.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is my sad purpose today, Mr. President, to speak of the loss of three Senators and three friends. The Senate will not be the same place without Henry Dworshak, Bob Kerr, and Dennis Chavez. All Senators will take their passing as both a personal and national loss.

The senior Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Kerr, served in the Senate for close to 15 years. During this period he served the people of his State with attention, intelligence, and devotion. No State has ever had better representation in this body than that received by Oklahoma from the late Senator. In recent years the Senator's leadership and clear ability elevated him to a position of great importance in this body as ranking member of both Finance and Public Works Committees and as chairman of the Space Committee. Robert Kerr was in a position to serve his Nation as also his State. He served his Nation well.

No better illustration may be given of his ability and skill than that offered by his leadership of the controversial tax bill in the last session of the Congress.

Mr. President, the President of the United States, the Nation, this Senate and especially the people of Oklahoma have reason to mourn the passing of Robert Kerr.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, knowing Bob Kerr was an adventure like a first trip into new country. Viewed from afar, his life's landscape could seem almost overwhelming in its size and ruggedness, but to those who were privileged to watch him at close range, this ruggedness was broken up by much that had sweet and kindly beauty. Though most people associate him with wealth, oil and power, he believed that his greatest contribution was measured in the title of a book he wrote—"Land, Wood, and Water," which was inscribed on the gold clasp he wore around his tie.

Essentially, Bob Kerr's life was built upon a foundation of great simplicity reflected in the fundamentalism of his religion. At the same time, he was a man of great versatility, and striking contrasts. He had a deep loyalty to whatever and whomever he loved, including his family, Oklahoma, and oil, but he found keen delight in all-out combat with those who challenged these loyalties. He could be a generous and effective ally, as well as a resourceful foe.

He had a great facility in the use of words. They came easily to him, and he could use them with great skill—to tell a story, to sell an idea, to charm or entertain an audience, to pray, to plead, or as weapons with which to strike an opponent down.

Bob Kerr was a strong man, prodigal with his energy and strength. When we adjourned last year, all of us would have said his reserves of energy, like those of the oil of Oklahoma, were inexhaustible. Looking back now, we realize that he never spared himself and therefore can understand why he fell suddenly.

Toward the end of his career, the newsmen began to call him "the uncrowned king of the Senate," as though he loved power for its own sake. To me, this is a sad misjudgment. I feel instead he acted always to increase his capacity to serve the causes that he loved.

The Senate is poorer for his passing.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the sudden passing of our colleague—Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma—came as a great shock to all of us.

We lost not only a good friend, but an excellent Senator, as well. He will be sorely missed by his family, his country, his State, and the Senate, where he had served since 1949.

I had the pleasure of working closely with Senator Kerr during the past 8 years as we served together on the Senate Public Works Committee.

I quickly developed a great respect for his ability and his integrity, and I valued his friendship very highly.

Bob Kerr was a powerful advocate of what he thought was right.

The contributions he made to the fields of conservation and public works, and to the legislative records of this body, will be his lasting monuments.

There is no one among us who was more dedicated to the preservation and proper utilization of our Nation's vast natural resources.

The work that Senator Kerr did in the field of water resources, for example, will be long remembered and will pay vast dividends in the years ahead.

Our greatest tribute to Bob Kerr, I believe, would be to carry on the programs and policies which he started.

To his family, at this time, I would like to extend my sincere condolences.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it was my privilege to serve both on the Senate Public Works Committee and on the Select Committee on National Water Resources with Senator Robert S. Kerr, and I came to respect both his great mind and his great heart.

All of us would like to think that during our tenure in the U.S. Senate we became experts in at least one, and perhaps two or three fields. But Bob Kerr managed to become an expert in everything he touched.

I am sure it is safe to say that he handled as many major bills on the Senate floor in these past few years as any other Member, and he was well versed in the subject matter of each. I can see him now, standing at his Senate desk, every muscle at attention as he waited to parry and turn aside with wit and eloquence every objection to the measure at issue—ready to answer from the great depths of his knowledge every question raised against it. He was a commanding figure and one we in the Senate shall not soon forget.

I personally will never forget his many kindnesses to me—the times he helped me with legislation or projects in which I was interested. He was a good friend—and it is hard to believe that this great heart has been stilled. The Senate will never be quite the same without Bob Kerr.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I consider it a distinct honor to have known Robert S. Kerr and to have served with him in the Senate of the United States and on the Senate Finance Committee.

I am deeply saddened by his passing.

In many respects, Bob Kerr was one of the most remarkable men I ever knew. He was gifted with the quickest mind—the most inquisitive and retentive mind—that I ever saw in action on the floor of the Senate, in the committee room, or anywhere else.

Anyone who ever met him in debate can attest to the fact that as a forceful defender or advocate of a cause, Senator Kerr was without peer.

Why? Because he made it his business to know what he was talking about. Because he always spoke with the authority of one who has done his homework. Because the Senator from Oklahoma asked no quarter and gave none.

When Bob Kerr spoke, all men listened, sometimes perhaps with disagreement, but always with respect. He commanded a memory I have yet to see matched. Nothing escaped this man.

Depending upon what the occasion called for, Bob Kerr could bring to bear a great wit or a great solemnity, a sweet tongue or a biting attack. But he did not rely on oratory alone to win his battles. Always it was supported by an irrefutable statement of facts and an intelligent grasp of every aspect and implication of the subject at hand.

Bob Kerr was one of the great men of this country. The Nation and the Senate will sorely miss him.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, it was my good fortune to have been assigned to the Finance Committee when I came to this body. This meant working with many great men. None was greater, none was friendlier to a young country boy from Indiana than that big Oklahoma country boy, Bob Kerr.

I have visited on Senator Kerr's vast ranch on the land he loved so much. Together we shared the vista in Oklahoma, viewing the cattle and enjoying the fresh air. We often talked about Senator Kerr's love of the land and the things he tried to do to protect the future of the country.

Others have spoken eloquently about Senator Kerr's devotion to our beloved country, about the contribution he made to our space program, of his great work in taxation and finance. Although the day-to-day official contact we had was in the field of finance and taxation, I prefer to think of Senator Kerr as the great conservationist—the one who worried, fretted, and acted to save our wood, water, and soil.

Senator Kerr was at his best when he talked about these things and when he was doing something about them. I remember when he flew out to a meeting of the Wabash Valley Association at my behest to talk about these things. I remember when we would visit about them. His concern was deep and unselfish. His labors were long and successful.

If America's water resources are developed to the fullest, if our streams and woods are protected, if flooding can be controlled, Bob Kerr's living memorial will have been established beyond anything we can say here or build from rock and steel.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues who have spoken words of tribute to our late departed colleague and friend, Bob Kerr.

I first came to know Bob Kerr before either he or I came to the Senate of the United States. In fact, I first knew him when he was Governor of Oklahoma. I shall never forget the great and rallying keynote address that he delivered at the Democratic National Convention.

I recognized him from the first as a man of great energy and tremendous ability.

When Bob Kerr first came to the Senate he was assigned to a committee on which I was serving, the Public Works Committee, of which he later became chairman. I also served with him on the Senate Office Building Commission. I learned to admire greatly his ability in handling legislation and in getting quickly to the point. He had a masterful way of bringing persons of divergent views together and in getting out of committees beneficial legislation and in getting problems satisfactorily solved.

I have had the privilege of campaigning with Bob Kerr in his beloved State of Oklahoma. His energy, his knowledge of facts and figures pertaining to his State, his grasp of the situation under all conditions to me were always impressive. On several different occasions Bob Kerr has come to Alabama and spoken at various meetings, political and otherwise. He was a favorite of Alabama audiences.

Bob Kerr had a perception that was beyond that of most people. I recall one instance when a group of us were being briefed on the vast operations of TVA. It was probably the first visit of Bob Kerr to that area. He was impressed with the man who did the briefing. Without knowing what his job was, he said to him:

> Young man, I don't know what you are doing at the present time, but I would like very much to have you work with me.

It happened that the young redheaded man was "Red" Wagner, who was then serving as general manager of the TVA and is today the Chairman of the TVA Board.

Bob Kerr was a fine Senator, a great and loyal churchman, a devoted family man and a wonderful friend.

Mrs. Sparkman and I extend our sympathies to Mrs. Kerr and to her children and other members of Bob Kerr's family.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the untimely passing of our colleague Bob Kerr removed from the Senate one of the most skilled legislators of our time.

Bob Kerr was a self-made man. He was fearless and forceful. There was no limit to his capacity for taking on large responsibilities. These qualities which he had in abundance won for him the admiration and respect of even his sharpest critics. He had a powerful intellect and a great gift of expression—and it was always an unforgettable experience to see him in action on the floor of the Senate or at work in his committees. It was for his colleagues also a rewarding experience because we learned a great deal from him about the art of legislation. We will miss him very much.

It is to the enormous advantage of his State and country that Bob Kerr turned his talents into the public service. As chairman of the Senate Space Committee and of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee, and as second in command in the Finance Committee—Bob Kerr was in a position to make a significant contribution to the Nation. And he did.

From humble beginnings Senator Kerr reached great heights in the business world as well as in the political world. I believe that this was largely because he never lost the common touch. He served the people well—with courage and devotion to the end. His death has left a great vacuum in the Democratic Party and in the U.S. Senate.

I join with my colleagues in expressing deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, all of us were profoundly shocked when we learned of the sudden and tragic passing of Senator Robert S. Kerr. This distressing news reached us as the new year was beginning, but the impact of this event will be felt for many years to come.

The untimely death of this great statesman was not only a loss to the State of Oklahoma, to the Senate, and to his friends, but it is my firm conviction that the people of the United States also lost the services of one of their finest public servants. Few men in public life possess his qualities of leadership. The story of his life exemplifies what our Nation has to offer to citizens if they have the will and determination to carry out their ambitions.

It was my privilege to work closely with Senator Kerr in my capacity as a member of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee and the Senate Public Works Committee. We spoke frequently and often exchanged ideas relative to the space program. He was always considerate, and he could always be approached with confidence. I shall miss his friendship and guidance. He was always very good to me personally.

The Nation could ill afford to lose the services of this outstanding American. We, his friends, will always remember him. His memory, his deeds, and his contributions to our Government are a part of the history of our Nation.

He was a vastly popular, extremely influential man who served the people of his State with a dedication and devotion. No doubt it was this same energy which lifted him from humble beginnings in a log cabin in the Indian territory, which later became the great State of Oklahoma, to a position of wealth and respect. Had Senator Kerr been content with the security that comes from having achieved great success in business and acquired almost limitless financial resources, he probably could have rested on that and still have been highly regarded. However, of course, he did not. He was a man of outstanding intellectual attainments. He devoted the remaining years of his life to public service, first as Governor of his State and then as a U.S. Senator.

I shall miss Senator Kerr as a friend and as a colleague, and there are thousands of others who will miss him too. The Senate in particular will miss his refreshing candor, his determination, and his guiding hand.

Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in extending to Mrs. Kerr and her family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the sudden and untimely passing of Senator Robert S. Kerr has shocked and saddened us all. To his family, it has brought a sorrow that will ease with time—but never cease.

Among his friends and colleagues, it has left an emptiness that will be filled with memories—but never a replacement.

Throughout the length and breadth of the America he cherished in heart and served in life, there has been a loss that can never be regained, but there will forever remain the indelible mark of a devoted man that nothing short of the infinity of eternity can erase.

Many knew Bob Kerr much closer—and for many more years than it was my honored privilege to know him. But this is not the gage that measures my personal feelings about him—feelings which I am certain are shared with all my fellow Missourians. He had close ancestral ties with Missouri through his father, William Samuel Kerr, who was born in Bakersfield, Ozark County, Mo. On many occasions he had mentioned this to me and told me of his feeling of close interest for my State.

He was also our neighbor, not only in geography, but in philosophy as well. He always demonstrated clearly the interest and concern of a good and faithful neighbor.

As a man, he rose from the most humble of beginnings to vast material gains, but never lost sight of the truth that nothing is accomplished without the assistance of our Creator.

As a public servant and official, he achieved the highest success and power, but always used it in keeping with the solemn obligation of trust that it imposes.

Because of the success and power he earned, many refer to him as a "king," yet it is clear from the example of Bob Kerr's life that for him there was truly only one king, God himself.

So while each of us misses the wonderful blessing of a daily association with such a trusted and loyal colleague as Robert S. Kerr, great American and good man, we can be thankful for the worthy example that his life and his service sets for us all.

Many will recall that his favorite hymn was the wonderful and simple "Shall We Gather at the River," and know that he is now gathered at the greatest of rivers, the goal toward which his life and works were always directed.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that five editorials from Missouri newspapers, which are typical of the many appearing in newspapers, throughout my State, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press Jan. 2, 1963]

A Friend Has Gone

Although they didn't have much to say about it, Democrats of this congressional district backed U.S. Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, for the party's nomination for President in 1952. The Senator died yesterday.

Ellis Cook, of Maryville, and DeWitt Campbell, of North Kansas City, were the delegates of this northwest Missouri district at the Chicago convention that year. They were uninstructed. Adlai Stevenson seemed to be the front runner, but they came out at the start for Senator Kerr. Mr. Stevenson went on to win the nomination—but nothing else.

Only a little more than 2 months ago, Senator Kerr in the waning days of the 1962 election campaign came into this Sixth District to make a speech for Congressman William R. Hull and U.S. Senator Edward V. Long. He spoke at a fundraising dinner at North Kansas City.

It was a typical Kerr speech. He was a man of powerful voice and an orator of the old school, one given to tying in Biblical quotations to make political points. For example the Biblical verb "smite" fit often into the woof and warp of his political blasts at the opposition.

Oklahoma and the United States have lost a colorful lawmaker in the death of Senator Kerr. He was a man who made friends and who made enemies—of equal ardor—because he was a man who was not to be bluffed. The Senator always stood his ground.

It is good to have men like that in the Senate.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Jan. 2, 1963]

Senator Robert S. Kerr

The unexpected death of U.S. Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, has deprived Congress and the Nation of a Capitol Hill powerhouse, a very human and picturesque figure on the Washington scene, a fine Senator.

His growth from log cabin beginnings to become a multimillionaire oil and mining tycoon was more than the usual American success story. And his rise to become the "uncrowned king" of the Senate had little to do with business acumen.

Mr. Kerr used a keen mind, a prodigious talent for homework, a native skill for slashing debate to become the most sought after—and sometimes feared—Senator on the Hill.

He was friend and foe of the New Frontier. The President courted him whenever possible.

Mr. Kerr was credited with being the biggest single factor in clobbering Mr. Kennedy's pet medicare program, yet the White House turned to the Senator for help in the battle for the administration's tax and trade bills.

No one in Congress knew as much about America's water resources, or the urgent need to conserve them, than Senator Kerr. He came to St. Louis a few months ago and spoke in behalf of the successful bond drive to clean up our rivers. Mr. Kerr was also a resolute champion of highways. He coauthorized the Kerr-Mills law to help needy aged with medical and health problems.

A man of homespun wit, that could develop a rapier thrust or a withering sarcasm, Senator Kerr was respected in Congress almost as much as among his Oklahoma constituents, for whom he stood first and last. He was a devout churchman, a leading Baptist in his State.

Bob Kerr left his mark on much legislation he was significantly instrumental in passing, laws that will long serve his country. His loss will be deeply felt among the major Senate committees in which he served.

His passing deprives the Nation of a signally able public servant.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Jan. 3, 1963]

Changes in the Senate

The death of Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, will have a profound effect on the work of the Senate and on its relations with the White House. Senator Kerr had become known as the most powerful man in the upper body, and though he opposed the administration on certain issues, he was a mainstay of President Kennedy on others.

The Senator, who headed Kerr-McGee Oil Industries, Inc., a $200 million oil, chemicals, and uranium concern, led the fight last year against Mr. Kennedy's program of medical care financed through social security, but he was in the forefront of the battle for the President's trade expansion program. He upheld the 27½-percent depletion allowance, of vital importance to extractive industries, but the administration had hoped for his assistance in putting over a tax reduction program this year.

Although Senator Kerr was a witty orator and a skilled debater, he exercised much of his power behind the scenes. He had a keen grasp of the inner workings of the governmental machine. A major source of his power was his ability to control pork-barrel projects through his chairmanship of a Public Works Subcommittee. He was a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and of the Senate Finance Committee, and was chairman of the increasingly important Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee.

There will be important changes in the Senate other than those caused by Senator Kerr's death. The defeat of Senators Wiley and Capehart has, for example, left two openings on the Foreign Relations Committee. The stature of the replacements chosen by the Republican Senators will measure the importance the party attaches to the conduct of a sound foreign policy, particularly with respect to bipartisanship.

A new factor in the Senate will be the presence of 30-year-old Edward Kennedy, of Massachusetts, who will occupy a unique position because one of his brothers is President, and another is Attorney General. The new Senator has been described by the President as the best politician in the family, and he is confirming this judgment by deliberately choosing assignments that will keep him out of the limelight.

The Senate faces a heavy workload in the coming 2 years, and the factors noted here will influence the legislative product. By how much, time will tell.

[From the Warrensburg (Va.) Daily Star-Journal, Jan. 4, 1963]

Impact of Kerr Death

No one can say with precision just what effect Senator Robert S. Kerr's death will have on the administration's legislative program in Congress. There is no doubt that White House measures will have tougher sledding without the powerful Oklahoman's strength and legislative skill behind them.

Administration leaders thus have particular reason to mourn Senator Kerr's passing. Others, of whatever political complexion, may regret the departure of one who acted boldly and resourcefully in behalf of strong convictions.

During the past year or so it had often been remarked that Senator Kerr had become the most powerful man in the Senate. In a sense, he filled the power vacuum created when Lyndon B. Johnson left the Senate to become Vice President. Though he jumped on the Kennedy bandwagon with notable tardiness in 1960, he quickly became the President's right-hand man in the Senate. It was he whose support was principally instrumental in administration successes with trade, tax, and other legislation.

Now the White House must find another man, or men, to take up the slack in leadership. Particularly, a man must be found to manage administration tax proposals and maneuver them through the Senate. Senator Kerr's shoes will be hard to fill.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Jan. 4, 1963]

Power Vacuum in Senate

Calling him "the Senate's single most powerful Member," Washington officials and correspondents are speculating on how the death of Senator Robert S. Kerr will affect the Kennedy program in the upcoming session of Congress.

The power vacuum Senator Kerr leaves is the one he stepped into 2 years ago. Up until then, he had spent 12 years in the Senate building up seniority, acquiring influence, but not exercising active leadership, which was held pretty firmly in the strong political hands of Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson.

With Senator Johnson moving up to the Vice Presidency, Mike Mansfield was supposed to take both his title and his place but, somehow, couldn't manage to fill his shoes. That gave Senator Kerr his opportunity.

In the absence of a strong liberal or strong conservative who could exercise effective control of the Senate, the Oklahoman, hardly classified as either, simply took it over.

As was to be expected under these circumstances, Senator Kerr used it for moderation. He supported those parts of the Kennedy program which he approved, but opposed those he didn't. Frequently, he would trade with the President, making concessions to the administration in exchange for some he wanted as a Senator.

That, particularly, is why Washington is trying to estimate how the Kennedy legislative program will fare in the absence of Senator Kerr, who could give it the strongest support or the strongest opposition of any Member of the Senate.

Initially, objective observers feel that it could help Mr. Kennedy with his medicare proposal, which Senator Kerr—coauthor of the Kerr-Mills plan—opposed, but hurt him with his tax-cut program, which the Senator favored. On these measures, however, the final decision may well come in the House. The House would probably spike both.

In the Senate, itself, the effect will be determined by who now steps into the power vacuum which Senator Kerr filled the last 2 years. It is a tribute to his great service to the Congress and to the country that both are left wondering who can fill his place.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in the passing of Senator Kerr, the Senate lost one of its most forceful personalities and the Democratic Party one of its most vigorous adherents.

Senator Kerr fought hard for the things he believed in; he was an able advocate and, as many in this body learned to their sorrow, a formidable adversary in debate. As a fellow Democrat, I was grateful for his effectiveness in this regard for he could rally support for common causes. One of the best speeches I ever heard was the keynote address he gave at the Democratic National Convention in 1944.

Many of my fellow Tennesseans knew him as one of the principal architects of the self-financing act for the Tennessee Valley Authority, under which TVA may issue bonds for the needed expansion of its power production facilities.

Senator Kerr was one of the most important figures on the American political scene in modern times, and history will not soon forget him.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in expressing my deep sense of loss at the passing of Senator Kerr, and my conviction that the Senate, the Nation, and the State of Oklahoma have suffered a truly great loss. During my brief service here, I have learned that there are few men who could so completely win the hearts, friendship, and loyalty which Bob Kerr won in his long and honorable Senate service. He was a strong man, yet a kind man, and he had the deepest sense of humility. He was a man who had strong convictions and the courage to fight for his beliefs, but all of his struggles were devoid of bitterness or rancor.

In his personal life Senator Kerr was a devoted family man, and one deeply moved by charity and the spirit of religion. He was a natural leader of men, a man of both character and moral strength, and big enough to consider the views of other men because of his dedication to justice, democracy, and the perpetuation of this great body.

I had the privilege of serving with him during the period that he was chairman of the Senate Space Committee. I know of his deep commitment that this Nation be preeminent in space and science. I know of his devotion to education and the development of the resources of this country for the use of its citizens. Some have said that he is a man who had everything and with this I would agree; but he had the humanity to care about the aged and the sick, about the less privileged, and the economically distressed.

Many bills which have passed this body to become law, bear his indelible signature. He has given much to this Nation, and we as a people are thankful for his having been here to serve and to leave his mark on present and future generations.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of a great American who has been recognized by many as one of the most distinguished and effective public servants ever produced by the great State of Oklahoma. Senator Robert Kerr earned an enviable reputation as a man who turned his every endeavor into success, whether it be in the business world, in the Governor's chair, in the U.S. Senate, or as a lay leader in the Baptist church. His meteoric rise from his humble beginnings in a log cabin to a position of strong leadership and powerful influence in the councils of government and also his almost unmatched success as a businessman present a ringing testimony to the great and vast opportunities which our form of government and our free enterprise system offer to all Americans. Bob Kerr proved that a man who is willing to work hard and face all the challenges of life can meet with eminent success in America. I must admit, however, that Bob Kerr possessed many more valuable traits which contributed considerably to this success, including, of course, his warm and friendly personality, his integrity, his vast store of knowledge and intelligence, and his dedication to his State and Nation.

I had the pleasure of serving with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma on the Public Works Committee, and I value my associations with him while serving on that committee and while working with him on many legislative matters in the Senate.

The State of Oklahoma and the people of this country have lost the services of a valuable and dedicated public servant, and I join my colleagues in extending my deepest sympathy to the people of Oklahoma and all the members of the Kerr family.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as we all know, the Senate and the Nation have suffered a grave loss in the sudden passing of Senator Robert Kerr; and I have lost a dear friend.

Bob Kerr was one of the most brilliant men ever to serve in the U.S. Senate. His great mental capacity was only matched by his boundless physical drive, in behalf of those things he believed to be necessary and right.

To him the most complex problems seemed simple, and the most herculean tasks possible.

Senator Kerr was one of the most successful and industrious businessmen ever to serve in the legislative branch of our Government. Nevertheless, he maintained a close and affectionate relationship with all the people of his State.

He was an expert in the field of conservation. His observations on that subject have been permanently recorded in a book of such quality that it is now widely used as a textbook in the colleges of Missouri.

Bob was an outstanding Biblical scholar, whose impressive knowledge substantiated his own great faith as well as that of others.

His rare oratory and his unforgettable humor will always be remembered by those who knew him.

With this abundance of talents, it is as though we have lost many men.

To his gracious wife and fine children Mrs. Symington and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, it is with profound humility that I add my voice to those of my colleagues in lament and praise for Senator Robert Samuel Kerr. He will always be remembered as a pillar of strength and power in this body. But there were many other attributes to the man which will always make him memorable and his example one to respect. Colorful in speech and dress, forceful in oratory, the late Senator Kerr was never one to allow himself or his interests to be submerged in the anonymity of government. And this, it seems to me, is the great lesson of his career to us all, as it was the source of his great influence in this body. The record of his life reads like a lexicon of the history of his State. Born in what was then Indian Territory, he grew up in that lusty area, won from her his education and his well-being, saw her come to statehood and became her Governor. And when he came to Congress, he was always first to say that Oklahoma's interests were his interests and that his interests were Oklahoma's. Robert Kerr had his critics, but the lesson he left for us, it seems to me, was that he persisted in being his own colorful, independent self. The result was that we in the Senate always had a fresh burst of Oklahoma sunlight to illuminate our way, and we shall always be the richer for having had it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to Bob Kerr, late a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, and a man who honored me with his friendship. The Members of this body who knew Senator Kerr are aware that he was a man who stood apart in many ways. He was a giant among us, physically, mentally, and in the mark he left by his generalship here of legislation of far-reaching significance. He was the kind of man of whom legends are made. Indeed, he was a living legend while yet among us—which can be said of few men, and never of little men. The legends will grow and flourish, for the basic stuff was there, and Bob Kerr will enter into the folklore of our politics, as one of the rare ones of whom stories are told and memories cherished. The tribute we pay today is but the beginning for Bob Kerr. We may be as confident that he will live in the history of the Senate as we can be confident that he has now found communion with the one Master whom Bob Kerr recognized and served in all he did on earth.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I, along with the entire Nation, was shocked to hear the news, last December, that Bob Kerr, of Oklahoma, had died suddenly.

I have enjoyed my close working relationship with Senator Kerr, and it is much too difficult to crowd into this short tribute all the accomplishments which were his during the time he served in the U.S. Senate. While he had done so much, I truly felt that his star was just beginning to shine much brighter on the horizon had he been able to remain with us, to continue the work which he had so nobly advanced.

Senator Kerr was born in a log cabin. He was a native son of the State of Oklahoma. He was a devout member of the Baptist church. He had served as president of the Baptist General Convention of Oklahoma and as vice president of the Southern Baptist Convention. For several years before his death he had been president of the Baptist Foundation of Oklahoma. He struggled hard to get his formal education and came from a poor family. He was a great debater and became an expert on every subject he handled in the U.S. Senate.

Bob Kerr served with honor and distinction on many committees in the Senate and his first love was the utilization of our natural resources.

I worked very closely with Bob Kerr on the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, which he so ably chaired. One could not help but be amazed at the confidence which he always demonstrated on many of the seemingly impossible tasks which he handled. Were it not for his bipartisan effort for the use of outer space for peaceful purposes, our Nation today, would, indeed, be lagging far behind in this field. He was determined to make our country first. The speed with which he got our space program underway was most encouraging and had it not been for his background in business and politics, I feel that this would never had been accomplished.

I had looked forward to working with Senator Kerr during the 88th Congress. We needed him and were counting on him.

I join with my colleagues in expressing my deep sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the affection and respect for the great contribution of our former associate, Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, extended far beyond the limits of his home State. This has been said to the Senate many times. Another example of this respect is indicated by the resolution of the City Commission of the City of El Dorado, Kans., which I submit here for inclusion in the Record relating to the designation of the lake at Ponca City, Okla., on the Arkansas River as Lake Robert S. Kerr.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it resolved by the governing body of the city of El Dorado, Kans., That in recognition of the commendable public services of the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, of the State of Oklahoma, not only to the people of his State, but to the people of the State of Kansas, and in particular to the Arkansas Basin Development Association in Kansas, and as partial recognition for his efforts and contributions to the public good, that it be recommended to the proper authorities, that the lake to be created on the Arkansas River east of Ponca City, Okla., be entitled and called Lake Robert S. Kerr.

Passed and approved this 5th day of February 1963.

Paul F. Martens,
Mayor.
V. Eugene Payer,
Commissioner.
Virgil K. Godding,
Commissioner.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the words spoken today here on the floor in tribute to Senator Kerr make a lasting record of his love for Senators and of their love for him.

I consider it a great honor to have been privileged to serve 12 years as his junior colleague—the most happy relationship a man could possibly have.

His passing leaves a deep void in the State of Oklahoma, where his leadership was so effectively known.

All Oklahoma, and particularly myself and Mrs. Monroney, deeply sympathize with Mrs. Kerr and the wonderful family in this loss.

NATIONAL DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, compelling evidence is piling up of the need for full public disclosure of the basis on which national defense contracts are being awarded. Yesterday the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] made a statement highly critical of the President for remarks made last year during the course of the campaign which confirmed that politics, influence, and other extraneous considerations governed the selection of top Government contractors. I ask unanimous consent that an article appearing in the Washington Post on March 1 setting forth some of the comments of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Case Asks Arms Contract Publicity Rule

(By Laurence Stern)

A top Republican liberal in the Senate called yesterday for broad public disclosure action to insure that political favoritism is kept out of the Pentagon's $60-billion-a-year spending program.

Senator Clifford Case, Republican, of New Jersey, further said that President Kennedy during last year's election personally confirmed that politics, influence, and other extraneous considerations govern selection of top Government contractors.

Case spoke as a Senate investigations subcommittee headed by Senator John L. McClellan, Democrat, of Arkansas, continued its closed inquiry into possible favoritism in the award of a $6.5 billion TFX tactical fighter aircraft contract to the General Dynamics Corp.

And on another front, the award of the TFX contract was defended yesterday by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara as a tremendous step forward that would save at least $1 billion in research and development costs.

CONGRESS TAKES INTEREST

It was the controversial fighter contract that created a flareup of congressional interest in the perennial issue of favoritism in Government contract awards.

Case cited the TFX award and the Mohole project of the National Science Foundation, designed to provide greater knowledge about the earth's interior, as cases in which top administration officials reversed the recommendations of expert panels in awarding contracts.

He criticized the President for having lowered campaigning standards by saying that Democrats could get more Government contracts for their States than Republicans. Case's home State of New Jersey lost 17 percent of its prime Government contracts since the Kennedy administration took over, a recent Defense Department study disclosed.

THREE-POINT PROGRAM

The New Jersey Republican proposed a three-point program which he said would protect the integrity of the contract system:

Require that records be maintained, open to public inspection, of all written and oral communications (except by the bidder) on defense or space contracts, including those from Members of Congress. This is intended to prevent back-door wirepulling in behalf of contractors.

Require full, complete, and prompt public disclosure of the basis on which noncompetitive negotiated contract awards are made. Nearly two-thirds of all Pentagon contracts, he noted, are negotiated.

Create a joint House-Senate committee as a watchdog over all defense and space contract awards. He suggested that it be headed by a Republican during Democratic administrations and by a Democrat when a Republican is in the White House.

INTRODUCED IN HOUSE

Companion legislation was introduced yesterday in the House by Representative Earl Wilson, Republican, of Indiana, who charged that "influence, politics, manifestations of good will and other pressures are being used to channel defense contracts to favored manufacturers at all levels."

Protested Wilson: "Wining and dining of middle-grade civil servants in both skyrocketing the cost of defense procurement and disrupting efficiency of the military. * * *"

At the McClellan committee hearings, meanwhile, investigating Senators pursued the question of why Defense Secretary McNamara ignored the unanimous recommendations of four evaluation boards and awarded the fighter contract to General Dynamics. The military boards, representing all the services affected by the fighter project, picked Boeing Aircraft.

The closed-door testimony was released to the press after being sanitized by Pentagon officials, who were instructed by McClellan to remove only classified information.

COST CLAIMS DOUBTED

McNamara awarded the controversial contract to General Dynamics last November despite findings by military professionals that the Boeing airplane was superior in range, bomb-carrying capacity, radar evasion, and other military advantages. An Air Force review board also found that Boeing could produce the plane for $100 million less than General Dynamics.

One of the factors that reportedly weighed in McNamara's reversal of the evaluation boards was doubts among his civilian analysts of Boeing's cost claims.

At his press briefing yesterday the Secretary, without referring to any individual company, mentioned during the discussion of the TXF project the "serious underestimates of program costs * * * that have plagued us in the past."

McNamara pointed out that in 10 or 15 major weapons systems he has examined recently "no one of them had an actual cost less than 300 percent of the original estimate and several of them had final costs that were approximately 1,000 percent of the original estimate."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I call attention to unclassified testimony which was received by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, showing Air Force evaluation of the operational characteristics and cost comparisons between the Boeing and General Dynamics TFX fighter aircraft proposals. I ask unanimous consent that this unclassified comparison be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the comparison was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Operational comparison of 2 TFX proposals, General Dynamics versus Boeing, as evaluated by U.S. Air Force

[Only subcommittee selected items are shown]

	General Dynamics	Boeing
Contractor's proposal (millions) [1]	$5,455.5	$5,364.2.
Air Force program estimate (millions)	$7,083.2	$6,983.0.
Air Force program estimate adjusted figure (millions)	$5,803.0	$5,387.5.
Ferry range (nautical miles)	X	X plus 1,100 miles.
Reaction time at minus 65° F. (minutes)	2 times X	X.
Landing distance over 50-foot obstacle (feet)	X plus 590 feet	X.
Deceleration device	Dive brakes and spoilers	Thrust reverser.
Air Force estimate of Navy weight (pounds)	X plus 2,208 pounds	X.
Air Force estimate of Navy mission A (loiter time in hours)	X	X plus 30 minutes.
Air Force estimate of Navy mission B (loiter time in minutes)	X	6½ times X.
Aircraft carrier spotting [2]	X plus 5	X.
Avoidance of foreign object damage	Deflectors	High scoops.
Area intercept mission (radius in nautical miles) [1]	X	X plus 177 miles.
Ordnance carrying capability (pounds of demolition bombs):		
Wings out	X	X plus 69 percent.
Wings in	X	X plus 11 percent.
Contractor's proposed ordnance loading: [1]		
Nuclear bombs	X	X plus 50 percent.
Air-to-ground missile	X	Do.
Demolition bomb	X	X plus 105 percent.
Cluster dispenser	X	X plus 180 percent.
Fire bomb	X	X plus 250 percent.
Land mine	X	X plus 70 percent.
Rocket launcher	X	X plus 44 percent.
Air-to-air missile	X	X plus 100 percent.

[1] Contractor data.

[2] Navy evaluation.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, who is also the chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], stated yesterday that the Pentagon's civilian hierarchy overruled four times the recommendations of military evaluation boards for acceptance of the Boeing proposal as being a cheaper and far superior design.

I suggest that this testimony being received by the subcommittee reveals that the Air Force estimated the Boeing program would cost $100 million less than the one offered by General Dynamics.

The Air Force further stated that with certain adjustments in both programs, the Boeing program would cost over $400 million less. At the same time the comparison which I have had printed in the Record reveals that the Boeing model was estimated by the Air Force to have a ferry range 1,100 nautical miles greater, 177 nautical miles of greater radius for interception, capability of landing at a distance of 590 feet less, and a much greater ordnance carrying capacity than the General Dynamics model.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Cecil Holland, appearing in the February 27 issue of the Washington Evening Star, and another article by the same writer appearing in the February 28 issue of the Washington Evening Star, on the subject of the investigation of the TFX contract, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 27, 1963]

TFX Hearing Witness Defends Boeing Design

(By Cecil Holland)

An aeronautics expert has told Senate investigators he does not consider that the Boeing Aircraft Co. was overoptimistic in its design of a fighter aircraft with numerous advantages over one for which the Defense Department has contracted.

The testimony was given by John Stack, a former official of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, before the Senate Investigations Subcommittee in its inquiry into the award of the TFX fighter aircraft contract.

Mr. Stack, vice president of Republic Aviation Corp., is known as the father of the new type plane designed for use by both the Air Force and Navy.

TRANSCRIPT RELEASED

He testified before the subcommittee in a closed session yesterday and a heavily censored transcript of what he said was released today.

The transcript revealed that the Boeing Co., which lost out to General Dynamics Corp. in the bid for the contract, was held by the Pentagon's top civilian officials as being too optimistic in its proposal.

The transcript showed to Air Force Secretary Zuckert made this point in a memorandum justifying the action of the civilian officials, including Secretary of Defense McNamara, in overruling recommendations of four military evaluation boards in favor of the Boeing design.

MEMORANDUM QUOTED

An excerpt from Mr. Zuckert's justification said:

"There are additional examples of exceptional optimism in the Boeing proposal—the apparent belief that thrust reversers can be developed without major problems and engineering changes; the view that the variable swept wing can be quite easily applied to the use of the TFX concept; the use of titanium instructural members; the unique design of the propulsion installation.

"These examples suggest, if our experience is any guide, that much redesign and testing would be necessary, contrary to the reduced engineering estimates and costs indicated in the Boeing proposals."

The Boeing design was estimated at $100 million less costly than General Dynamics and far superior in several features.

TO TOTAL $6.5 BILLION

The contract is expected eventually to total $6.5 billion and the subcommittee is undertaking to determine if there was any favoritism in awarding the award. Secretary McNamara, Mr. Zuckert, and Navy Secretary Korth, who overruled the military experts, will be called as witnesses later in the investigation.

Committee Counsel Jerome Adlerman questioned Mr. Stack about some of the advantages indicated in the Boeing design and asked if he considered the Seattle-based company was overoptimistic in its proposals.

"Why, no," Mr. Stack replied.

Among advantages of the Boeing design indicated by Mr. Adlerman's questions were a lighter aircraft, a range of 1,000 to 1,100 miles greater and an ability to land on a field 600 feet shorter. Mr. Stack agreed that these and other features would make a plane more desirable.

The witness testified that from his knowledge while in Government service Boeing started design work on the TFX type of aircraft in 1959 and that General Dynamics began its work about a year later.

FEATURES DEFENDED

He also said that use of titanium would not detract from the aircraft and expressed confidence that competent engineers would be able to work into the aircraft the thrust reversers (for slowing the plane down for landings, for example) and the variable swept wing. Without the variable wing, the witness said, there would not be a TFX plane.

He also said the Boeing design of locating airscoops or intakes on the upper surfaces of the fuselage would seem to be better than General Dynamics design placing them under wings. He explained that there would be a hazard of drawing in pebbles and stones with the intakes under the wings when the aircraft was taking off from turfed or unpaved landing fields.

The witness also said the Boeing design offered more area for attaching weapons.

"It would make your head swim when you see how much stuff they are going to have in this * * *," Mr. Stack said. "It will look like a porcupine."

OTHER WITNESSES CALLED

The investigation continued today, still behind closed doors, with a number of military officers and staff investigators as the witnesses.

The inquiry began yesterday with Chairman McClellan detailing how the Pentagon's civilian hierarchy overruled four times the recommendations of military evaluation boards for a cheaper and far superior design.

While Boeing lost out on the airplane contract, the biggest since World War II, it scored yesterday in landing one for the development and production of 11 Saturn 1–C first-stage boosters for a spacecraft which it is hoped will carry a crew of astronauts to the moon in this decade.

The contract totals $418.8 million.

While the hearings are closed because of security considerations, the subcommittee has ordered censored transcripts of the testimony released to the press.

At yesterday's opening hearing, Senator McClellan said an evaluation group known as the Source Selection Board recommended the Boeing design four times between January and November 1962.

STILL 2 YEARS OFF

First test flights of the plane, designed for use by both the Air Force and Navy, may be as much as 2 years away, Mr. Stack said. "I think we could have had an outstanding airplane flying today if those concerned with the project had moved faster," he added.

Mr. Stack helped develop the idea of the all-purpose "wonder plane" while stationed at the Langley Research Center in Virginia.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 28, 1963]

Probers Seek Date Pentagon Ruled on TFX

(By Cecil Holland)

Senate investigators of the TFX fighter plane controversy want to know exactly when the Pentagon's civilian bosses decided to award the procurement plum to General Dynamics Corp. of Fort Worth, Tex.

The matter came up during the Senate investigation's questioning of two Air Force colonels in a closed hearing yesterday. The testimony, heavily censored, was made public today.

Secretary of Defense McNamara, Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert, and Navy Secretary Korth overruled unanimous recommendations of military experts favoring the Boeing Aircraft Co. of Seattle, Wash., and gave the contract to General Dynamics. The program is expected eventually to total $6.5 billion.

TWO COLONELS HEARD

Col. Charles E. Gayle, program director for the project, and Col. Roy A. Jaynes of Air Force headquarters testified, the transcript showed, that Mr. Zuckert was briefed on the fourth and final rival proposals last November 9.

Subsequently, Colonel Jaynes said, Secretary Zuckert requested on November 14 a history of the rival proposals and supporting documents. The officer said he understood the Secretary wanted the material for use in making a decision.

However, Senator Mundt, Republican, of South Dakota, said, "We have reason to believe the decision was made before November 13 or 14." He did not elaborate, and Senator Curtis, Republican, of Nebraska, suggested that the Secretary may have requested the material to back up a decision already reached by the Pentagon civilian leaders.

The award to General Dynamics was announced on November 24.

SECRETARIES TO TESTIFY

Mr. McNamara and the two service secretaries will be called as witnesses later in the investigation.

It was brought out during the questioning of the two colonels that it was unusual for the civilian secretaries to overrule the unanimous recommendations of the military boards and other high-ranking officers who recommended Boeing as the producer of the plane. Both said they were unaware of any other incidents of this kind.

"I want to find that out," Chairman McClellan said. "I think it is important * * * if this is a most unusual thing, that a weapons system or procurement problem like this would be processed as much as it is, and have such apparent unanimity among those who are presumed to know most about weapons and how to use them, and their judgment is overruled."

The committee was told yesterday that the civilian defense officials ordered an unusual course before making the award.

COMPETITORS ASSISTED

After the third rejection of the board's recommendation of Boeing as the producer of the multipurpose aircraft for use by both the Navy and Air Force, Colonel Gayle told the subcommittee, the officials ordered an evaluation team to give the major competitors every assistance in reworking their designs.

Colonel Gayle said this was the first time as far as he knew that such instructions had been issued. Colonel Gayle also was recalled as a witness.

The colonel also testified that during the months while the award was pending, he took the position that the successive rejections of the board's recommendations by the civilian officials and their orders to rework the designs brought the two companies closer together in their proposals and made it harder to reach a decision.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I also call attention to a report in the press that Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara considered doubts of the Pentagon's civilian analysts of Boeing's cost claims in his reversal of the Military Evaluation Board recommendations. However, I wish to point out that I am not concerned about the Boeing estimates. I am concerned about the Air Force estimates which I have previously inserted in the Record. I suggest that if there was any concern on the part of the Secretary of Defense, it should be couched in the light of the Air Force estimates rather than the estimates of the unnamed civilian analysts in the Pentagon.

I shall not prejudge the hearing, but I do suggest that if public confidence in the integrity of our defense contracting system is to be maintained, there must be much less secrecy surrounding the system. Coupled with the news management policy of the administration, its cynical hinting that Democrats can get more contracts for their districts than Republicans, and the fact that about two-thirds of Pentagon contracts are negotiated on a noncompetitive basis, I think the publics' right to know how its money is being spent in this area is vital. Furthermore, I trust that the claim of executive privilege, which seems to be increasingly put to use in denying facts to investigating committees of the legislative branch, will not be interposed in the defense contract award area.

In that connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks a copy of the address by Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, one of the Nation's leading reporters, who is affiliated with the Washington Bureau of the Cowles Publications.

The address was delivered at the University of Oregon on February 15, 1963. Mr. Mollenhoff is the author of the book "Washington Cover-Up," and the address which I have requested to be printed in the Record gives an excellent description of the way in which executive privilege can be whimsically interposed between the executive branch and the public, which has the right to know how its affairs are being conducted by those in whom it has placed its trust.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Washington Cover-Up

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

Much has changed in the newspaper world in the 50 years since Eric W. Allen founded the department of journalism at the University of Oregon. Reporters and editors are better educated than in the period of even 25 or 30 years ago. There has been a specialization on many of our larger newspapers that is regarded by some observers as a tremendous step in giving the public a better understanding of such fields as education, science, and labor. Certainly, most local newspaper staffs are better equipped today to report and analyze the activities of local and State governments than they were in 1912. Much credit for this progress belongs to men like Eric Allen.

However, there is real reason for asking if the newspapers are keeping pace with the national and international problems that confront our society. These problems involve both bigness and complexity. They are best illustrated by a simple reference to the tremendous increase in Federal responsibilities and Federal expenditures.

In 1912, Federal expenditures were less than $1 billion—$689,881,000 to be exact. Recently, President Kennedy has proposed a budget of $98.8 billion, and it could easily soar over the $100 billion mark. More than $50 billion of the Federal spending will be for defense. This means it will be spent behind a heavy curtain of military security that will prevent the press and the public from examining many of the decisions of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

There can be little doubt, we have reached the point where it is impossible for any newspaper reporter, or any group of reporters, to engage in a comprehensive analysis of Government spending. The size of the spending is staggering. The complexity of the laws and regulations is overwhelming. The powers assumed by the executive branch are almost unbounded.

Yet, somehow we must manage to examine and criticize this mammoth Federal Government if we are to carry out our assignment in the American democracy. Somehow, we must find the means to expose corruption or favoritism even if it involves areas where the Defense Department may seek to use false claims of military security for a shield. Somehow, we must oppose the arbitrary and arrogant use of authority within the huge bureaucratic agencies. Somehow, we must keep all channels of information open unless the real military security of our Nation is at stake. And even in those areas where genuine military security can be claimed, we must assure ourselves that the Congress has provided an effective check on the use of arbitrary power by the executive branch.

Bound up in these press responsibilities is the most vital issue of our time: Can the United States fight effectively in the long range cold war, and also continue to function as a real democracy?

The newspapers of the United States must carry a heavy responsibility, if not the major responsibility, in the determination of how that question will be answered in the next 10 or 20 years ahead of us. Newspaper editors and reporters must be able to understand the problem of obtaining information from Government. They must know all the avenues for obtaining information, and must recognize when those avenues are being barricaded. They must recognize when a false claim of military security is used to cover up matters that are simply embarrassing to the executive branch.

It is not enough for our editorial pages to shout freedom of information or news management with a fervor. It can be relatively easy to deplore the news managers on a well-publicized Federal case where others have led the way. However, it is more important that you be able to do your own analysis of Government operations to expose the unjustified secrecy that slips into Government agencies under many different guises.

Many journalism schools and many professional newspaper organizations are doing a laudable job of trying to promote a greater interest in depth knowledge of Government information problems. However, the effort is still far from successful.

It is unfortunate that deep splits have developed in the ranks of the working newsmen that tend to hurt the entire cause. One group tends to scoff at the resolutions passed by freedom of information committees as being ineffective. This group may point to an enthusiastic resolution supporter who does not follow through in his daily operations. There is the claim that all that is needed is good reporting to break through any of the information barriers.

Such feuding tends to weaken the newspapers on an issue upon which they should be united. There is no doubt that good aggressive reporters and editors can do a great deal to break through news barriers. However, when the problem becomes national in scope, there is also the need for strong and unified support from other newspapers and from professional organizations. It is seldom that one reporter or one newspaper can break through a secrecy wall on the national level if there is not general newspaper support. It is even more difficult if there is active opposition from well-known but poorly informed national columnists.

Fortunately, most of the columnists are reasonably well informed on this issue, but some are not. One well-known columnist screamed about news management but a short time later supported a total arbitrary secrecy in a claim of Executive privilege.

How could he complain that an administration was engaged in news management by putting out favorable press releases, and then defend that administration for arbitrarily barring Congress from investigating behind the self-serving declarations in the news releases. Some might contend that the man was forsaking journalistic principles to promote the things he felt were expedient.

He was not dishonest. It was worse than that. He simply does not know Government operations. He writes the big picture, second-guessing the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State on all types of broad policy issues. Yet, I know from considerable personal experience that he is unfamiliar with the detailed little pictures that are necessary if one is to draw sweeping conclusions on the so-called big picture.

This columnist had no understanding of the laws, regulations, or court decisions involved in the problem of Executive privilege. Secrecy was wrong one week because it interfered with a story he was pursuing. Broader secrecy was acceptable the next week because it seemed to bar information from a Senator he did not like.

Over a period of years, I believe that the activities of our journalism schools and our professional newspaper organizations can do a lot to eradicate or minimize such misleading commentary.

As far as the overall information picture is concerned, I do not want to be an alarmist. However, I do want to express concern over a number of actions in the Kennedy administration that deal with the information policy. Some are mere extensions of the Eisenhower administration's policies, and some seem to carry the New Frontier stamp.

I do not believe we are faced with public officials who want to interfere with the rights of a free press or the proper operations of our democracy. However, this does not mean that I believe we can count on the good intentions or the self-serving statements of any administration. The President and others charged with the responsibility for military defense can easily rationalize steps to bar the press or Congress from embarrassing information. The political aspirations of nearly every high official in the executive branch tend to make it easy to justify press releases that give an overly optimistic picture of how well Government is being administered.

The men heading our Government may have the best interests of the press at heart, but it is cause for concern when Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester starts to talk of "an inherent right to lie" about defense matters. This is particularly troublesome when it is accompanied by a directive which makes it necessary for all civilian and military officials at the Pentagon to report all conversations with reporters before the close of business each day.

Take such pronouncements in context with other developments in recent years, and it is apparent why newsmen should be giving more serious study to the laws and practices on Government information. Just review some examples:

When an Air Force navigator was crippled for life in a bomber crash, the Air Force denied him Government records he needed to press a damage claim.

When a Government investigator displeased his superiors with a report on misuse of U.S. foreign aid to Cambodia, the State Department refused him access to his own personnel records which, he claimed, would show he was railroaded out of his job.

The Defense Department refused to allow a Senate committee to question Defense censors on their official actions.

The State Department refused Congress access to records containing evidence of fraud in foreign aid spending in Laos and Peru.

The Atomic Energy Commission and the Budget used an arbitrary secrecy ruling to hide a conflict of interest which made a multimillion-dollar power contract illegal.

A State Department official refused to give the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a copy of a controversial foreign relations planning paper.

High State Department officials accused a foreign government representative of bribery, but refused to produce documents or testimony to support the charge.

Even a Government agency, the General Accounting Office, was denied access to official Navy, Air Force, and State Department records despite a specific law giving GAO such right of access.

These are not examples of what might happen in the United States under an all-powerful authoritarian executive branch of Government. These are only a few of the cases demonstrating what has happened in the American democracy in recent years under an arbitrary claim of a right to unlimited secrecy.

This unlimited secrecy has been promoted under the term "Executive privilege." Through a simple self-serving declaration that the public interest is involved, officials of the executive branch have pulled down the broad secrecy curtain. The public, the press, the Congress, and even the courts are barred from records of testimony from Government officials or records of official acts.

President Eisenhower claimed his administration could bar Congress and the GAO from any records or testimony containing advice of high level officials.

President Kennedy has taken the Eisenhower thesis and extended it to declaring that he will not allow the questioning of "subordinate officials of our career service" on their official acts.

Executive branch officials admit there is hardly a paper of importance in any executive agency that does not include the opinions, conclusions, or recommendations to qualify for an "Executive privilege" secrecy stamp.

The result is a doctrine that disregards the law, flies in the face of court decisions, scoffs at the right of the public to be informed and arrogantly rejects the processes of Congress.

In its simplest form, it is a proclamation that the executive branch cannot be challenged in its invocation of total secrecy. It strips away, or diminishes, the constitutional right of the Congress to investigate the administration of laws.

Neither the Eisenhower administration nor the Kennedy administration has used the ultimate power inherent in the "Executive privilege" doctrine. Total application of this doctrine would create a public uproar for it would be executive tyranny. Both administrations have made much information available that might have been hidden by Executive privilege, and in some cases information was revealed that was against the political interests of the administration in power. However, in many of these cases, the executive branch officials had no real choice for there was already enough information in the public domain to make a coverup impractical.

It would have been poor politics for the Kennedy administration to have tried to use Executive privilege to pull down the secrecy curtain on the Billie Sol Estes case. When the McClellan committee started its investigation of Estes in April there had already been an exposure of large segments of the Estes case by a Texas newspaper and by Texas Attorney General Will Wilson.

Use of Executive privilege at that point would have meant political disaster for Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman. Pulling down a secrecy curtain in the face of strong evidence of fraud would have been similar to claiming the fifth amendment. Freeman couldn't afford secrecy in the face of evidence indicating fraud or favoritism. The Kennedy administration couldn't afford to face a charge of cover-up on the first major scandal problem.

The Kennedy administration opened the records for Chairman McClellan, and for a House subcommittee headed by Representative L. H. Fountain, Democrat, of North Carolina. Investigative reports were made available to the press and to the Senate and House investigators. High level officials testified on their opinions, conclusions, and recommendations in the cotton allotment decisions that favored Billie Sol Estes, and on the decisions that resulted in Estes being named to the National Cotton Advisory Board.

Low level officials testified in detail on their dealings with Estes. Nothing was withheld, the administration claimed.

The open Government policy in the Estes case was a complete reversal of form for the Kennedy administration. Less than 2 months earlier, President Kennedy had given his approval to a Defense Department decision to refuse to allow a Senate Armed Service subcommittee to question Defense censors on their official actions.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara used the secrecy of Executive privilege to block the Stennis subcommittee from questioning the censors on specific changes in speeches of high ranking military officers.

On February 8, 1962, President Kennedy wrote to McNamara:

"I have concluded that it would be contrary to the public interest to make available any information which would enable the subcommittee to identify and hold accountable any individual with respect to any particular speech that he has reviewed.

"I therefore direct you, and all personnel under the jurisdiction of your Department, not to give any testimony or produce any documents which would disclose any such information."

President Kennedy did not contend that the national security of the country might be jeopardized in the questioning of the censors. He did not contend that Defense or State secrets of a highly classified nature might be involved. This would have been ludicrous.

So, the President simply gave his view that it was in the public interest and the secrecy of executive privilege was claimed.

It was politically practical to assert a claim of unlimited secrecy in the censors hearings because Senator STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, was the major opposition. Senator THURMOND held a position on racial and economic matters which had little national appeal, and he was regarded as a symbol of extreme rightwing thinking. It was Senator THURMOND who contended that the Pentagon and State Department censors were watering down the speeches of generals and admirals, and were in essence pursuing a no-win philosophy. The Defense and State Departments denied the allegation, and the Armed Services Subcommittee, under Chairman JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, was established to do a full investigation of the controversial blue penciling.

The Defense Department made copies of the public speeches available, and McNamara and others testified on the general policy under which censors operated. However, the important question was how the policies were interpreted and applied by the actual censors. That question was never answered because the claim of executive privilege was used to avoid pinpointing of responsibility for specific actions.

This was not a wild and free-swinging investigation under an irresponsible chairman. This was not a committee operating outside of its jurisdiction, and engaging in abusive treatment of witnesses. It was a properly authorized subcommittee of the Senate Armed Service Committee, it was operating within its jurisdiction, asking for Government records and asking questions that were pertinent to the inquiry.

McNamara declared that the Congress would have to content itself with his self-serving declaration—his high-level handouts—and would be prevented from going behind his assertions. Amazingly, the editorial cheers for McNamara were deafening. He was cheered because he was defying Senator THURMOND.

The question of whether Senator THURMOND was right or wrong in his conclusions on the censors was not important. He had the right to be wrong, as long as he conducted himself in a proper manner, and asked pertinent questions in a legitimate investigation. He had fully as much right to ask questions as any member of the press, and he had a right to expect answers that were truthful.

The press should examine its performance in this case as it considers information policies that were adopted later by McNamara and Sylvester. The press forgot principles for the moment in the interest of kicking a Senator who held an unpopular view. The press also forgot its own longtime self-interest.

McNamara was arbitrary, he was defiant of the power of Congress, and he was crowned a hero. Was it any wonder that he and Sylvester were confident in seeking the maximum in their more recent news managing ventures in connection with the Cuban affair? Was it any wonder Pentagon officials and the White House believed it was possible to adopt the Sylvester directive to control press contacts at the Pentagon?

Pentagon reporters have characterized the Sylvester directive on press contacts as a "Gestapo" tactic. They comment that they feel the Sylvester directive, if implemented, will have the potential for shutting off legitimate dissent on policy matters that have nothing to do with national security. Even if the order is not fully implemented, it is felt it will be a club over the heads of military and civilian personnel. It is a formal order, and can be used as a basis for disciplinary action at the times when the McNamara team wants to use it to curb dissent.

Defense Secretary McNamara may want to run the Defense Department in the best and most efficient manner. We can credit him with wanting to achieve the maximum military strength for the minimum expenditure. We can assume that he believes his policies are in the best interest of the Nation. However, the same thing could have been said for most of our past Secretaries of Defense and their military chiefs.

The present administration did not accept the Eisenhower administration's assessment of its achievements. In fact, President Kennedy and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the present Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were sharply critical of the defense policies of President Eisenhower. Since assuming office, they have stressed that the Eisenhower administration policies resulted in what they believed to be serious military weaknesses. They have assured us that Defense Secretary McNamara and General Taylor have been working feverishly and have repaired many of the weaknesses in our defense armor.

The men who are now leading our Nation did not want us to accept the self-serving declarations of the Eisenhower administration on our defense posture. Now they contend that what they found demonstrated the former policies were wrong.

Are we now to assume that we have finally found that infallible team composed of men who will instinctively know what is best for us? Are we to assume that McNamara, only 2 years in the job, can produce the right answers on complex problems of defense without the benefit of dissent or public debate?

The press should be insistent that the Sylvester directive is wiped off the books. The effectiveness of the press in opposing the directive will depend upon its persistence. While it has been encouraging to see the Nation's press genuinely irritated over the Sylvester order and the attitudes that surround it, it is doubtful that this fury will continue.

If there is sharp and continued criticism, I have no doubt the Sylvester order will eventually be modified or withdrawn.

However, if the Nation's newspapers follow a characteristic pattern, the fury will soon give way to a few mild protests, and these will in turn give way to a whimpering acceptance of the chains. The short attention span of many newspapers will mean that the Sylvester directive will be forgotten, and the high-level handout collecting that goes with it will become an accepted part of the Washington newsgathering picture.

The press has an obligation to rip the Sylvester directive apart at every opportunity, not only because it is bad, but because it can become the pattern for further similar directives if it survives.

Past history should pretty well demonstrate that the executive branch does not do a good job of investigating itself. This is particularly true of the Military Establishment. It was the Congress that revealed the scandals involving Gen. Benny Meyers. It was the Congress that pulled loose the scandals involving Harry (the Hat) Lev and the New York procurement office. It was the Congress that produced the "chamber of horrors" on military buying practices generally. It was the Congress that revealed the details of the classic military corruption and mismanagement, in the construction of an airstrip at Fort Lee, Va.

These scandals were actually being hidden or disregarded by the Pentagon until the Congress stepped in and forced aggressive action. Our thinking on future problems should be keyed to these documented studies of the past.

We should remember that the Symington Armed Services Subcommittee has demonstrated that several billions of dollars were wasted in the stockpiling of strategic and critical material. A vast curtain of secrecy covered the stockpile purchasing and the political letters and questionable decisions that went into the creation of that $9 billion stockpile.

By now the lesson should be clear. Government secrecy has been used to hide corruption, mismanagement, and arbitrary abuse of power.

However, we must accept some secrecy as necessary to cover some military matters and some diplomatic negotiations. (Also, some secrecy is provided by law, such as in the income tax field.)

Our job is to see that the secrecy is limited to the areas clearly defined by laws and regulations. Even in the areas of military security and diplomatic negotiations there must be an avenue for review by proper committees of Congress and by the General Accounting Office.

Today we have four basic information problem areas:

1. The common news management in which an administration releases information that is most favorable to its activities, and makes it difficult to obtain contrary facts.

2. Such special directives as the Sylvester order of October 27, 1962, to control all press contacts at the Pentagon.

3. The misuse of military security classifications to cover up mistakes of judgment, malfeasance, and incompetence on the part of an incumbent administration.

4. The arbitrary and unlimited secrecy claim inherent in the Executive privilege doctrine as stated by President Eisenhower and carried on by President Kennedy.

Of all these problems, I am least concerned about simple news management as it is usually defined. Usually this term refers to the timing and wording of Government press releases to put the best foot forward for the incumbent administration. I am concerned only when the administration insists we accept these self-serving declarations, and then refuses to allow us to go behind them.

I am most gravely concerned about the Executive privilege doctrine. This doctrine is a naked claim to unlimited secrecy on the whim of the executive branch. It has been used to bar the press, the public, the Congress, and the General Accounting Office from examining Government business. It has been used to hide scandals and mismanagement in our regulatory agencies, in the foreign aid program, and in the Defense Department.

There is one thing that every citizen can do, and that every newspaper should do, in opposing the Washington coverup.

Give full support to Congress in asserting its right to investigate Government activities and Government spending.

I am not advocating that you should agree with the conclusions that any or all committees of Congress may reach in an investigation. I do suggest that you support the full right of Congress to call for documents and testimony in properly authorized investigations of Government activities.

The executive branch of the Government has grown more powerful year after year, and it seems unlikely that this power will

be cut. It may be that a powerful executive is needed in dealing with the problems of the cold war.

However, I do not believe that many of us would suggest that this great power that is lodged in the President and his official family should go unchecked. If that power is unchecked then we will have lost one of the most important aspects of our form of government—the checks and balances.

The Congress represents the only effective check on the executive branch. All legislative power resides in the Congress, and this means the power to pass laws, to investigate to see how the laws are being administered, and to investigate to determine if new laws are needed.

Every curtailment of the right of Congress to investigate is a curtailment of the right of the press to learn about the operations of Government. This is a curtailment of the public's right to know.

Congress may have its scoundrels, its scandals, and its abuses. But it is well to remember that Congress is a bipartisan body. It has within it the representatives of every shade of political thinking in our society from extreme liberal to extreme conservative. This diversity of thought is the strength of our Congress, and it is the real strength of our system of government. It is our only protection against the arbitrary and unauthorized use of power by the powerful executive branch that exists today.

In the last few weeks, I have read all of the earlier Eric Allen memorial lectures. They covered a wide range of interests, as diverse as were the interests of the men who gave them. However, it did seem to me that through them all ran one dominant theme—one basic belief:

Freedom of the press exists only to provide for reporting and commentary on public affairs. We are true to our profession only as we work to provide the light that makes the democratic process more effective.

It cannot be emphasized too often that our basic responsibility is governmental affairs. It was encouraging to see that all of your past Eric Allen speakers were in agreement on this point. In one way or another, each of them sought to demonstrate that the comics, gossip columns, fashions, sports, and puzzles—necessary as they may be in making mass appeal—are not the press activities the framers of our Constitution had in mind in guaranteeing a free press.

I believe Eric Allen would have found something of value in each of those earlier lectures, and I am sure he would have found the compiled lectures carried an inspiration greater than any single one.

We need a full measure of inspiration, as well as perspiration, to handle our responsibilities in these days of $100 billion budgets. We need a persistent devotion to our tasks if we are to understand and control the high cost of Government secrecy at the city, county, State, or Federal level.

The future of democracy is contingent upon whether we can subordinate political partisanship and petty differences for basic principles. This is the least we can do to honor the memory of men like Eric Allen.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the three deceased Senators, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Monday, March 4.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 4, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 1, 1963:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

To be senior assistant surgeons

Eugene A. Arnold, Jr.
Jo Anne F. Holzman
Joseph T. English

To be assistant surgeons

David L. Child
John R. Furman
Allan L. Brakensiek
Robert K. Heide
George A. Reich

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Raymond E. Goepfrich
Richard D. Lowe
Terrance W. Baker

To be assistant dental surgeons

Richard P. Frank
Richard F. Rappl
Robert F. Williams
Sheppard M. Levine
Charles A. Borgman
Paul J. Carr
James C. Dunkel
John A. Matis
Jack L. Cox
Paul J. Heins
Bruce R. Thorburn
Louis S. Vodzak
William S. Driscoll
Stephen J. Christensen
Joseph Schwartz
Fred D. Greenblatt
Robert H. Dumbaugh

To be assistant sanitary engineer

Vincent P. Barnaba

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

Donald S. Baker
Robert L. Thoem
Joseph R. Tynsky

To be senior assistant sanitarian

William P. Wollschlager

To be assistant sanitarian

Edwin J. Heidig

To be senior assistant veterinary officers

Arnold P. Kaufmann
Melvin J. Worth, Jr.
Donald D. Smith

To be assistant veterinary officers

Albert S. Ricker
John G. Orthoefer
Larry T. Grubbs

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Ersie F. Palmer, Birmingham, Ala., in place of J. R. Moncus, retired.

Erskine W. Bonds, Docena, Ala., in place of J. A. Hyde, transferred.

Thomas P. Weeks, Moundville, Ala., in place of M. E. Sims, transferred.

ALASKA

Marshall C. Higginbotham, Aniak, Alaska, in place of I. A. Begin, resigned.

Mildred J. Sanford, Tok, Alaska, in place of L. F. Trafton, resigned.

ARIZONA

Marion L. Massey, Jr., Claypool, Ariz., in place of J. S. Raymond, retired.

R. Odie Shipp, Miami, Ariz., in place of H. P. Williams, retired.

ARKANSAS

Eliot T. Bush, Arkinda, Ark., in place of Deedy Newsome, retired.

Marvin J. Wilber, Maysville, Ark., in place of Clara Evans, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Floyd H. Erickson, Ahwahnee, Calif., in place of G. H. Crooks, retired.

Joy L. Fansler, Big Pine, Calif., in place of E. D. Willson, retired.

Carl W. Fischer, Jr., Camarillo, Calif., in place of C. B. Schmill, removed.

Clayton F. Malling, El Cerrito, Calif., in place of L. W. McNeil, retired.

Nathaniel R. Evans, Fortuna, Calif., in place of C. L. Batten, retired.

Frances M. Reed, Glen Ellen, Calif., in place of G. A. Rock, retired.

Jack J. Snyder, Harbor City, Calif., in place of A. E. Collins, deceased.

John F. Bushell, Oakland, Calif., in place of K. E. Francis, deceased.

Nancy C. Avery, Pacoima, Calif., in place of L. M. Friedman, retired.

COLORADO

Harley O. Mullins, Aurora, Colo. Office established July 2, 1962.

Elmer D. Vagher, Bristol, Colo., in place of H. L. Elmore, resigned.

Claude T. Cecil, Gill, Colo., in place of Clarence Townley, retired.

Phyllis M. Jenkins, Gilman, Colo., in place of L. M. Heyer, resigned.

Goldie L. Simpson, Monument, Colo., in place of W. W. Carrothers, resigned.

Frank A. Batman, Jr., Pierce, Colo., in place of E. F. Huitt, retired.

Fredda H. Mizner, Pine, Colo. Office reestablished July 22, 1961.

Vernon L. Morris, Ramah, Colo., in place of William Kloster, retired.

Archie N. Hain, Wellington, Colo., in place of A. L. Carlson, transferred.

CONNECTICUT

B. Woodruff Clark, Litchfield, Conn., in place of S. A. Beckwith, retired.

John H. Murphy, New Canaan, Conn., in place of F. B. Leslie, retired.

Eugene D. Lynch, New Milford, Conn., in place of J. J. Berger, resigned.

Donald T. Hogan, Plymouth, Conn., in place of M. E. Ryan, retired.

Stanley L. Zaprzalka, Seymour, Conn., in place of A. H. Forst, retired.

Carl J. Gniadek, Southport, Conn., in place of E. J. Speer, retired.

Matthew J. Monahan, Thomaston, Conn., in place of M. T. Doyle, retired.

Louis P. Gage, Washington Depot, Conn., in place of J. F. Connerty, retired.

John J. Slattery, Waterbury, Conn., in place of W. J. Phelan, retired.

GEORGIA

Fred A. Kimler, Damascus, Ga., in place of J. A. Webb, retired.

Clifton H. Conner, Gainesville, Ga., in place of H. R. Tucker, Sr., retired.

Rothwell A. McCaskill, Sparta, Ga., in place of H. H. Berry, retired.

ILLINOIS

Eugene J. Tafel, Algonquin, Ill., in place of M. W. Struwing, removed.

Ralph E. Haffenden, Belvidere, Ill., in place of P. I. O'Brien, retired.

Carl H. Vaughn, Kinderhook, Ill., in place of M. E. McCarl, retired.

C. Kenneth Sizemore, Paris, Ill., in place of Grady O'Hair, deceased.

Vincent E. Stephenson, Pittsfield, Ill., in place of A. B. Caughlan, retired.

Owen A. Reimer, Roscoe, Ill., in place of V. M. Wallace, retired.

Curtis J. German, Rossville, Ill., in place of Joseph Brown, deceased.

Thomas A. Wood, Wheaton, Ill., in place of C. E. Carlson, retired.

Harold G. Minor, Windsor, Ill., in place of D. M. Wallace, resigned.

IOWA

Kenneth A. Madigan, Council Bluffs, Iowa, in place of J. C. Jenson, resigned.

Vernon M. Hill, Davis City, Iowa, in place of C. L. Evans, transferred.

Helen A. Bellmann, Durango, Iowa, in place of Elizabeth Grimme, retired.

Leon L. Wilson, Nevada, Iowa, in place of C. S. Price, retired.

Rex V. Ritz, Selma, Iowa, in place of W. W. Fulton, retired.

KANSAS

Henry L. Smith, Abilene, Kans., in place of R. M. Hill, retired.

Donald I. Beamgard, Atwood, Kans., in place of Sophia Kesselring, retired.

Joseph B. Nick, Basehor, Kans., in place of J. D. Grisham, retired.

Virgil W. McCune, Benton, Kans., in place of M. P. Hill, transferred.

Francis R. Gorman, Chapman, Kans., in place of C. W. Taylor, resigned.

Fred A. Riggs, Cottonwood Falls, Kans., in place of R. D. Bennett, retired.

Myrl H. Kliesen, Dodge City, Kans., in place of C. V. Houlton, retired.

Harold D. Brown, Eureka, Kans., in place of R. L. Marlin, resigned.

Clarence E. Zarnowski, Halstead, Kans., in place of E. H. Malleis, retired.

Lawrence V. Ferrell, Independence, Kans., in place of Benjamin Taylor, retired.

Donald E. Plank, Iuka, Kans., in place of B. M. Dillon, retired.

E. Maxine Nelson, Lenora, Kans., in place of R. A. Fuller, retired.

Mabel B. Hoss, Ness City, Kans., in place of J. E. Clouston, retired.

Daryl M. Ford, Valley Falls, Kans., in place of Clayton Wyatt, retired.

KENTUCKY

David S. Miranda, Ashland, Ky., in place of H. D. Shanklin, retired.

M. Alleen Hall, Betsy Layne, Ky., in place of A. M. Boyd, retired.

Henry M. Fannin, Ezel, Ky., in place of Roy Murphy, retired.

Joseph L. Thomas, Glendale, Ky., in place of L. M. Stuart, retired.

Bremer Ehrler, Louisville, Ky., in place of J. D. Scholtz, retired.

James H. Hicks, New Haven, Ky., in place of C. R. Johnson, resigned.

Mary R. McCormack, Sparta, Ky., in place of E. K. Riley, retired.

LOUISIANA

Rowland C. Regan, Egan, La., in place of F. E. Richey, retired.

Lloyd E. Chachere, Eunice, La., in place of Rene Tate, retired.

Phillip A. Hanks, Greensburg, La., in place of E. M. Barbier, retired.

William E. Scott, Lake Providence, La., in place of T. G. Biggs, retired.

Chester L. Guidry, Morse, La., in place of DeLuke Thibodeaux, retired.

Cecile B. Cheramie, Paradis, La., in place of F. C. Bertrand, retired.

Marvin E. Schauf, Saint Joseph, La., in place of J. A. Schuchs, deceased.

MAINE

Sidney W. Bessey, Buckfield, Maine, in place of G. C. Thurlow, retired.

Samuel A. Saunders, Calais, Maine, in place of N. F. Townsend, deceased.

Ervin D. McCluskey, Jr., Freeport, Maine, in place of E. H. Stowell, retired.

Erma M. Small, Monson, Maine, in place of H. E. Johnson, deceased.

MARYLAND

Eugene G. Bujac, Bowie, Md., in place of J. M. Porter, resigned.

Ora H. King, Clarksburg, Md., in place of J. M. Hess, resigned.

Henry J. Mundell, North Beach, Md., in place of M. G. Van Edsinga, retired.

W. Conway Beall, Upper Marlboro, Md., in place of E. V. Dorsey, transferred.

M. Ilene Trotter, Waldorf, Md., in place of W. L. Ryon, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Edward F. O'Leary, Holliston, Mass., in place of W. P. O'Grady, retired.

Marion O. Lantagne, Linwood, Mass., in place of G. V. Brady, retired.

William A. Latraverse, Northbridge, Mass., in place of C. E. Dion, retired.

George E. Owens, Jr., Wayland, Mass., in place of T. E. Hynes, retired.

MICHIGAN

Donald G. Bachman, Sr., Ann Arbor, Mich., in place of O. J. Koch, deceased.

Florence W. Letvenow, Atlantic Mine, Mich., L. M. Pyykkonen, retired.

Stennette E. Walsworth, Augusta, Mich., in place of J. B. Woodrow, Jr., transferred.

Robert E. Mohr, Clinton, Mich., in place of R. F. Richardson, transferred.

James M. Mahoney, Decatur, Mich., in place of H. H. Creagan, removed.

William H. Schwartz, Flint, Mich., in place of W. O. Kelly, resigned.

John W. Kelly, Manistique, Mich., in place of F. M. Gierke, Sr., retired.

Leo E. Osterberg, Pleasant Lake, Mich. Office established October 2, 1961.

John H. Brule, Watervliet, Mich., in place of J. R. Crumb, retired.

MINNESOTA

William J. Pattinson, Currie, Minn., in place of H. I. Gervais, retired.

Audrey A. Johnson, Esko, Minn., in place of C. M. Mattinen, retired.

Earl W. Dressen, Green Isle, Minn., in place of J. C. Myers, retired.

Virgil R. Buffington, Kenyon, Minn., in place of J. S. Cole, deceased.

Walter A. Dietz, Mapleton, Minn., in place of W. B. Lievan, retired.

Loren L. Marsden, St. James, Minn., in place of C. J. Strom, resigned.

Chester L. Stimpert, Sleepy Eye, Minn., in place of A. D. Bertrand, retired.

Gordon W. Friesen, Solway, Minn., in place of M. S. Dalby, transferred.

Dellin F. Segar, Wells, Minn., in place of W. P. Horan, retired.

Clarence B. Minyard, Lexington, Miss., in place of A. R. Alexander, retired.

MISSOURI

Albert D. Teter, Callao, Mo., in place of W. P. Clarkson, deceased.

Lewis D. Baldwin, Collins, Mo., in place of D. C. Selvidge, deceased.

Charles A. Reed, Concordia, Mo., in place of E. E. Sagehorn, retired.

Johnnie Moyer, Jr., Corder, Mo., in place of W. M. Riley, deceased.

John W. Volker, Craig, Mo., in place of C. M. Randall, retired.

Kenneth W. Alexander, Greentop, Mo., in place of J. H. Goeke, transferred.

William B. Bales, St. Peters, Mo., in place of A. B. Iffrig, retired.

Clyde E. Maxwell, Thompson, Mo., in place of D. A. Meyer, retired.

James M. Crighton, Willard, Mo., in place of B. L. McLin, retired.

MONTANA

Jean M. Hanson, Simms, Mont., in place of E. N. Skinner, retired.

George A. Henderson, West Glacier, Mont., in place of H. P. Gibb, retired.

NEBRASKA

Blaine T. Larsen, Beaver Crossing, Nebr., in place of P. C. Geis, transferred.

Wilfred L. Kozisek, Bruno, Nebr., in place of E. L. Spatz, retired.

Carl C. Larson, Edgar, Nebr., in place of C. A. Scism, retired.

Elgar R. Dempcy, Eustis, Nebr., in place of A. R. Montgomery, transferred.

Mary E. Hartigan, Inman, Nebr., in place of J. M. McMahan, deceased.

Frederick G. King, Lynch, Nebr., in place of N. L. Nelson, deceased.

John P. Munnelly, Omaha, Nebr., in place of Walter Korisko, resigned.

W. Edward Chamberlain, Rushville, Nebr., in place of H. J. Mayes, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Ernest F. Rossi, Jr., Milford, N.H., in place of J. J. Kirby, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Vincent T. Fagan, Jackson, N.J., in place of F. A. Asay, retired.

H. Pearl Hinshaw, Long Valley, N.J., in place of Clarence Frone, retired.

Herbert J. Jackson, North Bergen, N.J., in place of J. V. Zoppel, not commissioned; overage.

NEW YORK

Daniel F. Mulvana, Bombay, N.Y., in place of Frank Crowley, deceased.

John J. Frazer, Earlton, N.Y., in place of H. G. Haines, retired.

Floyd A. Jones, Marathon, N.Y., in place of C. L. Kelley, retired.

Edna K. Baldassare, Tomkins Cove, N.Y., in place of J. M. James, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

L. Hubert Collins, Brunswick, N.C., in place of Redden Gaskin, retired.

Patricia S. Fipps, Clarendon, N.C., in place of M. H. Pittman, retired.

Josephine D. Riggs, Cove City, N.C., in place of H. R. Heath, retired.

Giles F. Bryson, Marble, N.C., in place of B. H. Mintz, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Richard D. Grieve, Buffalo, N. Dak., in place of J. U. Pavlik, deceased.

Chester C. Cowee, Crosby, N. Dak., in place of M. J. Wallin, removed.

Robert E. Fischer, Hague, N. Dak., in place of K. E. Fischer, retired.

Clements H. Weigum, Hazen, N. Dak., in place of Ronald Keeley, deceased.

Margaret L. Keenan, Portal, N. Dak., in place of N. L. Talmo, retired.

OHIO

Louise E. Hoover, Bascom, Ohio, in place of J. H. Glick, deceased.

Mabel M. Bendetta, Malvern, Ohio, in place of H. H. Hart, retired.

Russell E. Yackee, Martin, Ohio, in place of A. C. Witt, retired.

Paul L. Casci, Middleport, Ohio, in place of J. W. Waddell, retired.

Harold A. Schonhardt, Venice, Ohio, in place of Jane Neuscheler, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Don A. Neumeyer, Council Hill, Okla., in place of H. H. Swadley, retired.

Jack E. Clement, Fairfax, Okla., in place of J. J. Quarles, Jr., retired.

Youvon W. Martin, McAlester, Okla., in place of H. S. Howard, retired.

Paul D. Sockey, Red Oak, Okla., in place of W. L. Smith, transferred.

OREGON

Orval R. Layton, Lakeview, Oreg., in place of F. R. Peat, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Harry D. Hess, Bangor, Pa., in place of A. R. Cramer, retired.

Donald M. Crouch, Butler, Pa., in place of P. R. Paux, retired.

Carolyn F. Singley, Cashtown, Pa., in place of I. G. Ridinger, retired.

Ernest W. Parsons, Pen Argyl, Pa., in place of R. W. Mosteller, retired.

Stanley T. Wagner, Penns Creek, Pa., in place of J. C. Showers, retired.

Russell G. Kratzer, Richfield, Pa., in place of O. G. Leitzel, deceased.

Russell S. Powell, Jr., Riegelsville, Pa., in place of R. S. Powell, Sr., deceased.

Ethel E. Murphy, Rossville, Pa., in place of M. E. Spangler, resigned.

Kenneth A. Harrison, St. Thomas, Pa., in place of J. M. Martin, retired.

Barbra M. Wissinger, Salix, Pa., in place of B. F. Wissinger, deceased.

Joseph Kosik, Townville, Pa., in place of L. D. Kingsley, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Sixto G. Mercado, Isabela, P.R., in place of Luis Domenech, deceased.

RHODE ISLAND

Pasquale D. Prisella, Wakefield, R.I., in place of E. W. Belknap, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

David B. Brockman, Greer, S.C., in place of W. B. Smith, retired.

John W. Rogers, Pelzer, S.C., in place of Sue Scott, retired.

William D. Russell, Ware Shoals, S.C., in place of E. M. Wharton, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

William C. Feather, Marty, S.D., in place of M. E. Becking, retired.

Wanda M. Humiston, Oelrichs, S. Dak., in place of Marie Logue, removed.

Virgil C. Guderian, Waubay, S. Dak., in place of Marion Paterson, retired.

TENNESSEE

Raymond B. Cox., Cottage Grove, Tenn., in place of D. F. Ross, transferred.

Harvey G. Fitzgerald, Humboldt, Tenn., in place of E. H. Gibson, retired.

Robert E. Harris, Kingston Springs, Tenn., in place of Wilton Rust, transferred.

Roscoe M. Hill, Luttrell, Tenn., in place of J. C. Davis, retired.

R. Frank Cunningham, Obion, Tenn., in place of H. B. Fox, deceased.

James H. Armstrong, Rogersville, Tenn., in place of G. B. Kyle, retired.

John L. Norris, Jr., Tiptonville, Tenn., in place of P. W. Campbell, retired.

Jeff J. Blanks, Jr., Trezevant, Tenn., in place of J. B. Goodwin, retired.

TEXAS

Thomas H. Journeay, Angleton, Tex., in place of J. A. Armstrong, resigned.

Erwin O. Dallmeyer, Burton, Tex., in place of L. W. Fisher, retired.

Thava H. Brown, Canutillo, Tex., in place of E. L. Jackson, resigned.

Graham M. Phillips, Cranfills Gap, Tex., in place of O. J. Bronstad, deceased.

Alma J. Littleton, Dryden, Tex., in place of B. R. Farley, retired.

James J. Kaster, El Paso, Tex., in place of C. T. Boyce, retired.

Anna L. Franklin, Fort Hancock, Tex., in place of M. E. Franklin, retired.

Frank A. Yeager, Galveston, Tex., in place of R. A. Stewart, retired.

James W. McMillan, Kingsville, Tex., in place of P. D. Cauley, Sr., retired.

Harold I. Line, O'Donnell, Tex., in place of Hal Singleton III, transferred.

Milton H. Elliott, Shallowater, Tex., in place of A. J. Evans, transferred.

Charlene Westbrook, Talco, Tex., in place of G. L. Barber, retired.

Bertha L. Delz, Texon, Tex., in place of B. F. Irby, transferred.

VERMONT

Robert W. Swann, Roxbury, Vt., in place of F. B. Tilden, deceased.

VIRGINIA

John H. Glass, Dewitt, Va., in place of L. R. Bolte, retired.

Gary H. Helms, Stafford, Va., in place of V. M. Dent, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Fletcher E. Andrews, Proctor, W. Va., in place of V. M. Dunham, retired.

WISCONSIN

Clarence G. Buss, Belmont, Wis., in place of P. R. Sornberger, retired.

Keith E. Anderson, Eleva, Wis., in place of B. E. Sands, retired.

Gordon H. Mollers, Glenwood City, Wis., in place of H. E. Lauber, resigned.

Frederick W. Pagel, Watertow, Wis., in place of R. W. Lueck, Jr., resigned.

John F. Graham, Whitewater, Wis., in place of R. J. Chamberlain, retired.

ALABAMA

Ida L. Colgrove, Boligee, Ala., in place of B. M. Means, deceased.

ALASKA

J. Raymond Roady, Ketchikan, Alaska, in place of P. N. Ripley, retired.

ARIZONA

Merle W. Heap, St. Johns, Ariz., in place of J. A. Brown, deceased.

ARKANSAS

James G. Ramey, Everton, Ark., in place of D. A. Trammell, deceased.

Kathryn R. Richards, Gamaliel, Ark., in place of E. E. Maynard, retired.

Maxine R. Edmondson, Gentry, Ark., in place of E. E. Epperson, transferred.

Herbert Miller, Jr., Junction City, Ark., in place of J. A. Fairly, deceased.

John A. Graves, Siloam Springs, Ark., in place of J. E. Trahin, retired.

Erwin B. Medart, West Fork, Ark., in place of E. R. Robinson, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

E. Vernon Putnam, Arbuckle, Calif., in place of I. M. Griffin, retired.

Joe R. Edde, Five Points, Calif., in place of N. J. Marshall, resigned.

Robert M. Lee, Freedom, Calif., in place of M. C. Tierney, deceased.

Ralph E. Lozano, Greenville, Calif., in place of F. M. Taylor, deceased.

Louis L. Brunnemer, Los Molinos, Calif., in place of C. T. Gadwood, retired.

COLORADO

William J. Smith, Craig, Colo., in place of E. E. Sullivan, retired.

Laurence Montano, Leadville, Colo., in place of C. A. Fitzsimmons, removed.

Clara W. Dennison, Hesperus, Colo., in place of Ethel Dunn, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Warren A. Holbrook, Amston, Conn., in place of S. G. Turshen, deceased.

Philip V. Rokosa, Bristol, Conn., in place of H. C. Polhill, retired.

Ruth C. Soracchi, Columbia, Conn., in place of L. W. Beck, retired.

Charles N. Doane, Jr., Essex, Conn., in place of P. D. Guptill, deceased.

Arline M. Fife, Falls Village, Conn., in place of B. S. Reymers, resigned.

Merle E. Phelps, Staffordville, Conn., in place of Benjamin Phelps, retired.

Leopold A. Szczygiel, Uncasville, Conn., in place of M. P. Geary, retired.

FLORIDA

William C. Hurston, Laurel Hill, Fla., in place of J. L. Adams, resigned.

IDAHO

Oscar H. Egbert, Heyburn, Idaho, in place of G. F. Bixler, retired.

ILLINOIS

Clemit T. Peifer, Beecher City, Ill., in place of V. U. Barr, retired.

Marvin H. Stewart, Brighton, Ill., in place of A. A. Moehle, retired.

Orville E. Van Brocklin, Caledonia, Ill., in place of M. A. Ralston, retired.

Lee Bush, Cambria, Ill., in place of Edmond Lovel, retired.

Maynard R. Koltz, Capron, Ill., in place of M. M. Boyd, removed.

Marvin C. McCulley, Chatham, Ill., in place of L. W. Tice, retired.

James T. Bobbit, Dalton City, Ill., in place of G. A. Morrison, retired.

Mabel J. Atkins, Dawson, Ill., in place of C. B. Stanton, deceased.

Joel F. Parker, Divernon, Ill., in place of J. W. Rettberg, retired.

George C. Cavanaugh, Gillespie, Ill., in place of H. R. Ganey, retired.

Russell W. Martin, Hanover, Ill., in place of A. E. Young, deceased.

Haven W. Hammond, Martinsville, Ill., in place of Clem Wiser, retired.

Betty J. Jones, Mound City, Ill., in place of C. A. Stout, deceased.

Leroy M. Smith, McHenry, Ill., in place of E. R. McGee, retired.

Donald W. Ferris, Marshall, Ill., in place of Leroy McNary, retired.

Henry W. Roehrkasse, Red Bud, Ill., in place of A. H. Brandt, retired.

Cornelius L. DiPiotti, Taylorville, Ill., in place of S. W. Hershey, deceased.

Eldon R. Bristow, Waynesville, Ill., in place of A. E. Swan, retired.

James T. Shinnebarger, Williamsville, Ill., in place of G. T. Hobkirk, retired.

Ruth P. Spraggins, Yale, Ill., in place of R. J. M. Howard, transferred.

IOWA

Leonard R. Brasel, Dow City, Iowa, in place of B. L. Bremser, transferred.

Florence K. Hamilton, Riverside, Iowa, in place of J. R. Shebek, retired.

Irvin F. Husmann, Scotch Grove, Iowa, in place of E. F. Plueger, transferred.

KANSAS

Herbert P. Franz, Goessel, Kans., in place of Mary Warkentin, retired.

Raleigh J. May, Haven, Kans., in place of W. M. Stoffer, transferred.

Robert W. Foster, Sterling, Kans., in place of F. H. Chesky, retired.

KENTUCKY

Newell M. Hargett, Maysville, Ky., in place of N. M. Hargett, removed.

James E. Morris, Neon, Ky., in place of J. M. Caudill, resigned.

Charles M. Crawford, Olive Hill, Ky., in place of W. H. Roe, removed.

MAINE

William E. Comer, Bangor, Maine, in place of J. S. Dinsmore, retired.

Keith G. Robinson, Pembroke, Maine, in place of S. A. Gillis, retired.

Edward E. Scribner, Stratton, Maine, in place of H. T. Ricker, retired.

MARYLAND

Joseph E. Kenney, Frostburg, Md., in place of M. J. Byrnes, retired.

Virginia M. Goode, Marbury, Md., in place of L. S. Henderson, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Francis J. Mooney, Andover, Mass., in place of S. A. Boland, retired.

Howard M. Hayden, Athol, Mass., in place of Richard Mullen, retired.

John F. Keefe, Dracut, Mass. Office established February 3, 1962.

MICHIGAN

Allen J. Dahl, Iron River, Mich., in place of P. J. Nora, retired.

Leslie C. Willer, Marion, Mich., in place of C. E. Rawson, transferred.

MINNESOTA

Marvin G. Loeck, Balaton, Minn., in place of T. H. Lohrke, retired.

M. Wallace Post, Cottonwood, Minn., in place of E. M. Kolhei, deceased.

Fred M. Colwell, Morton, Minn., in place of R. R. Keefe, retired.

Eugenie A. Wollum, Porter, Minn., in place of B. W. Meyers, retired.

Bertrand H. Strandlund, Stacy, Minn., in place of L. E. Hewson, removed.

MISSISSIPPI

James H. Simpson, Winona, Miss., in place of C. M. Jaco, retired.

MISSOURI

Griffith E. Benson, Chillicothe, Mo., in place of J. D. Stewart, retired.

Walter E. Bamman, Jacksonville, Mo., in place of H. R. McDaniel, retired.

George E. Bennett, Purdy, Mo., in place of F. W. Aderhold, retired.

Herbert L. Coggin, Republic, Mo., in place of H. L. Wells, retired.

Barclay T. Cortelyou, Troy, Mo., in place of T. W. Withrow, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

George A. Clement, Chester, N.H., in place of R. N. Ray, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Claude R. Poyer, Belvidere, N.J., in place of N. H. Deshler, retired.

Helen M. Emley, Creamridge, N.J., in place of L. G. Wygant, deceased.

William F. Martin, Elmer, N.J., in place of L. L. Bignell, retired.

Ida E. Smith, Goshen, N.J., in place of H. C. Shaw, deceased.

Emma M. Stout, Island Heights, N.J., in place of E. V. Sharp, retired.

Stewart J. Hyland, Lakehurst, N.J., in place of H. J. Fuccile, removed.

Rita M. Kosminsky, Liberty Corner, N.J., in place of E. J. Burnett, retired.

Joseph W. McCauley, Millburn, N.J., in place of H. F. Jacobus, deceased.

Frank W. Howell III, Newton, N.J., in place of M. N. Strader, retired.

Ralph J. Caneva, Park Ridge, N.J., in place of J. J. McNally, retired.

Oscar N. Benson, Rumson, N.J., in place of P. G. Peterson, retired.

John B. Porter, Runnemede, N.J., in place of F. R. Barker, retired.

Frank A. Maressa, Stratford, N.J., in place of E. B. Carr, retired.

Lawrence H. Friedman, Teaneck, N.J., in place of J. F. Carroll, removed.

John R. Latourette, White House Station, N.J., in place of W. W. Lance, retired.

NEW YORK

Erma B. Tenney, Alexander, N.Y., in place of E. R. Harrington, retired.

John J. Biondolillo, Avon, N.Y., in place of J. L. Light, deceased.

Edward K. Sutryk, Bradford, N.Y., in place of F. R. Schuh, retired.

Michael Pokitko, Burt, N.Y., in place of C. W. Rentschler, retired.

Richard J. Lobdell, Canton, N.Y., in place of E. R. Wood, retired.

Edwin J. Faber, Caroga Lake, N.Y., in place of Burton Yates, retired.

Oreina L. Lavoie, Champlain, N.Y., in place of E. A. Coonan, deceased.

John M. Edwards, Chester, N.Y., in place of J. J. Diffily, deceased.

Alan R. Mann, Cobleskill, N.Y., in place of L. R. Mann, retired.

Henrietta B. VanDerheyden, Coeymans, N.Y., in place of G. C. Hazelton, retired.

Marcella J. Lee, Crown Point, N.Y., in place of C. S. Kloos, deceased.

Donald J. Fitzpatrick, Dannemora, N.Y., in place of Jacob Tolosky, retired.

Jams A. Mulholland, Delmar, N.Y., in place of A. I. Ryan, retired.

Thomas J. Dolan, Dover Plains, N.Y., in place of K. C. Lasher, removed.

Christene S. Myers, Eldred, N.Y., in place of E. C. Stevens, retired.

Mae S. Cohen, Fallsburgh, N.Y., in place of Sam Rosenberg, resigned.

Marie M. Olds, Freeville, N.Y., in place of W. F. Moore, retired.

John L. Kress, Jr., Galway, N.Y., in place of J. T. Hunter, retired.

Helen S. Victor, Grand Gorge, N.Y., in place of A. V. Joslyn, retired.

William E. Vaughn, Greenville, N.Y., in place of W. P. Stevens, retired.

Raymond E. Skinner, Greenwood Lake, N.Y., in place of I. J. Posten, retired.

Rodney N. Lockwood, Hinsdale, N.Y., in place of E. S. Baxter, deceased.

Jean T. Klemann, Honeoye, N.Y., in place of Pauline Clement, deceased.

Martin J. Harr, Jr., Indian Lake, N.Y., in place of J. F. Farrell, retired.

Clarmarie S. Kenerson, Jacksonville, N.Y., in place of M. C. Baker, deceased.

Raymond W. Gould, Jamestown, N.Y., in place of O. K. Palm, deceased.

Lawrence J. Daley, Kanona, N.Y., in place of D. K. Griesa, resigned.

George L. Longyear, La Fayette, N.Y., in place of I. B. Locke, retired.

Alton E. Briscoe, Laurens, N.Y., in place of M. D. Taylor, deceased.

Jean V. McQueen, Little Genesee, N.Y., in place of P. D. Kuhn, resigned.

Guy E. Hobbs, Jr., Manlius, N.Y., in place of W. C. Farnham, retired.

Mary V. Quigley, Mottville, N.Y., in place of J. F. Quigley, retired.

Benjamin N. Ketcham, Mountainville, N.Y., in place of B. S. Ketcham, retired.

Donald E. Van Vliet, Niverville, N.Y., in place of G. L. Crausway, retired.

Grant D. Morrison, Northville, N.Y., in place of P. H. Griffing, retired.

Arthur C. Jacobia, Old Chatham, N.Y., in place of A. M. Tobin, deceased.

Shirley A. McNally, Olmstedville, N.Y., in place of E. C. Sullivan, retired.

Francis P. Secor, Otego, N.Y., in place of R. A. Southard, declined.

Joseph J. Farrell, Paul Smiths, N.Y., in place of R. J. Longtin, retired.

Nathan R. Walker, Phelps, N.Y., in place of J. F. Cudebec, retired.

George R. Low, Pine Bush, N.Y., in place of G. H. Stanton, retired.

Joseph Espinar, Plattekill, N.Y., in place of P. K. Fleming, retired.

Karl E. Putnam, Prattsburg, N.Y., in place of G. L. Patch, retired.

Michael L. Odak, Red Hook, N.Y., in place of J. S. Hobbs, deceased.

Donald M. Slocum, Richfield Springs, N.Y., in place of R. J. Conklin, deceased.

Raymond R. MacDonald, Rock Tavern, N.Y., in place of Winifred Fisher, retired.

Albert G. Evans, Saratoga Springs, N.Y., in place of J. T. Bryant, deceased.

Helen H. Kirker, Seneca Castle, N.Y., in place of M. P. Leadley, deceased.

Margaret B. Belmont, Sidney Center, N.Y., in place of D. L. Hoy, removed.

Maurie G. Flanigan, Slingerlands, N.Y., in place of W. P. Degenaar, retired.

Frank H. Doyle, Jr., Stuyvesant, N.Y., in place of F. H. Doyle, deceased.

Arthur H. Withall, Ulster Park, N.Y., in place of C. H. Schoonmaker, retired.

Robert A. Nussbaum, West Hurley, N.Y., in place of L. E. Joyce, retired.

Irene I. Carson, York, N.Y., in place of V. A. Spring, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

J. Preston Andrews, Jr., Bahama, N.C., in place of M. W. Harris, retired.

Henderson W. Haire, Garner, N.C., in place of J. G. Penny, retired.

Edward K. Leggett, Hobgood, N.C., in place of R. R. Wyatt, retired.

Helen H. Huggins, Laurel Hill, N.C., in place of M. H. Calhoun, retired.

Louis E. Bottiglier, Lillington, N.C., in place of M. D. Lanier, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ronald E. Monson, Edinburg, N. Dak., in place of W. D. Flaten, retired.

William L. Arenstein, Washburn, N. Dak., in place of H. C. Nelson, retired.

OHIO

Kenneth W. Gerber, Kidron, Ohio, in place of H. R. Sprunger, deceased.

Frances M. Adams, Ludlow Falls, Ohio, in place of J. R. Gallagher, deceased.

John W. Sharick, Nankin, Ohio, in place of R. E. Funk, transferred.

Ruth E. Kenny, Paris, Ohio, in place of E. F. Kintner, retired.

Josephine E. Pittenger, Pavonia, Ohio, in place of A. W. Pittenger, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Guy E. Warren, Norman, Okla., in place of M. L. Autrey, retired.

Eura V. Furr, Stringtown, Okla., in place of T. J. Winters, Jr., resigned.

Buster T. Robb, Sulphur, Okla., in place of G. E. Snethen, retired.

OREGON

Joseph L. Dall, Nyssa, Oreg., in place of L. W. Lewis, deceased.

Bernice M. Ladd, Tualatin, Oreg., in place of C. W. Adams, retired.

Laura A. Wassenmiller, Tygh Valley, Oreg., in place of D. B. Ritchie, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Robert I. Grove, Alexandria, Pa., in place of R. N. Lankard, resigned.

Charles H. Heffner, Arendtsville, Pa., in place of W. A. Raffensperger, retired.

Bernard F. Cooney, Jr., Austin, Pa., in place of M. G. Collins, retired.

Robert E. Dibble, Cedars, Pa., in place of Isadore Sacks, deceased.

Joseph W. Kudasik, Jr., Central City, Pa., in place of J. W. Kudasik, retired.

Derry A. Miller, Clearville, Pa., in place of Marshall Troutman, retired.

John A. Reph, Jr., Danielsville, Pa., in place of E. M. Reph, retired.

Edward L. Thomas, Drifton, Pa., in place of N. E. Breslin, retired.

Edward P. O'Connell, Eagleville, Pa., in place of M. E. Honsberger, retired.

Dorothy R. Karpyn, Egypt, Pa., in place of E. A. Breinig, retired.

John W. Richard, Elysburg, Pa., in place of S. L. Hower, removed.

George T. Steinberger, Fairfield, Pa., in place of J. W. Beach, resigned.

Charles W. Pentz, Gettysburg, Pa., in place of L. E. Oyler, deceased.

John H. Reynolds, Grove City, Pa., in place of G. C. Bower, deceased.

James J. McLaughlin, Holmes, Pa., in place of N. G. Landenberger, retired.

Blanche G. Smyers, Hopewell, Pa., in place of E. T. Smith, retired.

Oscar W. Laucks, Hummelstown, Pa., in place of L. W. Fisler, retired.

Carl F. Englehart, Hunlock Creek, Pa., in place of S. C. Croop, deceased.

A. Thomas Carty, Lafayette Hill, Pa., in place of H. G. Mack, retired.

Michael J. Clark, Lansdowne, Pa., in place of E. S. Husband, Jr., deceased.

Merle C. Bamat, Lanse, Pa., in place of Adolph Johnson, retired.

Stephen W. Ochs, Lucinda, Pa., in place of F. G. Neuland, retired.

W. Deen Lauver, McAlisterville, Pa., in place of L. I. Leister, retired.

Thomas F. Doyle, Marion Center, Pa., in place of R. M. Dodson, retired.

George M. Guswiler, Mechanicsburg, Pa., in place of G. C. Dietz, transferred.

Jay F. Pollock, Mount Union, Pa., in place of R. E. Bell, retired.

Luther D. Clewell, Nazareth, Pa., in place of J. U. Fetherolf, retired.

Robert A. Feinour, New Tripoli, Pa., in place of F. D. Weiss, retired.

Roy C. Brey, Red Hill, Pa., in place of E. T. Thomas, deceased.

Dean A. Risch, Sarver, Pa., in place of F. I. Risch, deceased.

Walter S. Morrison, Jr., Transfer, Pa., in place of R. D. Heile, retired.

James F. Acker, Venango, Pa., in place of George Acker, retired.

Glen E. Cluck, Waynesboro, Pa., in place of C. L. Johnston, retired.

Thomas W. McIntyre, West Chester, Pa., in place of J. F. Sullivan, deceased.

Agnes K. Timko, Windber, Pa., in place of C. W. Baumgardner, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

J. Lawton Harper, Estill, S.C., in place of C. W. Ellis, retired.

TENNESSEE

William A. Roberts, Newport, Tenn., in place of H. C. Mantooth, retired.

TEXAS

James Q. Pennington, Bluegrove, Tex., in place of R. O. Childs, removed.

Oscar R. Hawkins, Crawford, Tex., in place of R. B. Miller, transferred.

Burton L. Kirtley, Jr., Graham, Tex., in place of W. E. Simpson, removed.

James H. Jones, Jarrell, Tex., in place of M. C. Watkins, retired.

Bobby L. Raspberry, Keller, Tex., in place of Alex Jones, retired.

Junius P. Ray, Llano, Tex., in place of A. P. Box, retired.

Hiram C. Hughes, Munday, Tex., in place of F. L. Haymes, retired.

Clarence E. Garrett, Pittsburg, Tex., in place of G. H. Holman, resigned.

Mary L. Rutherford, Putnam, Tex., in place of E. C. Waddell, retired.

Elmo W. Ullrich, Randolph Air Force Base, Tex., in place of F. A. Benedict, retired.

UTAH

Don A. Mayhew, Duchesne, Utah, in place of W. H. Case, retired.

Harry J. Bigelow, Kamas, Utah, in place of R. F. Lambert, Jr., retired.

Bryce R. Jensen, Roy, Utah, in place of E. M. Russell, retired.

VERMONT

Helen A. Howrigan, Fairfield, Vt., in place of E. J. Howrigan, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Alfred P. Tirelis, Alberta, Va., in place of E. R. Johnson, deceased.

Robert J. Sturgis, Belle Haven, Va., in place of E. L. Willis, retired.

Doran W. Fary, Deltaville, Va., in place of J. H. Norton, removed.

Hume P. Doyle, McKenney, Va., in place of D. M. Cliborne, deceased.

John G. Mizell, Richmond, Va., in place of J. F. Bates, deceased.

Charles M. Mastin, Spotsylvania, Va., in place of M. M. Blaydes, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Lila E. Cahill, Kittitas, Wash., in place of F. W. Cahill, deceased.

Donald F. McLennan, Sedro Woolley, Wash., in place of W. R. Allhands, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Maynard W. Weaver, Arthurdale, W. Va., in place of R. R. Vanaman, removed.

Robert F. Wilson, Decota, W. Va., in place of M. I. Jackson, resigned.

Kenneth L. Taylor, Hopemont, W. Va., in place of Herman Taylor, retired.

Dennis P. Stanley, Superior, W. Va., in place of S. L. Sinnett, retired.

Ross White, Weston, W. Va., in place of S. M. McWhorter, retired.

Benjamin F. Lowe, Jr., Yolyn, W. Va., in place of Geraldine Chambers, removed.

WISCONSIN

John W. Crimi, Brookfield, Wis., in place of W. G. McCoy, transferred.

Max H. Bergen, Chetek, Wis., in place of P. H. Moe, transferred.

Cleo N. DeLaura, Menomonee Falls, Wis., in place of M. M. Minten, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 1, 1963:

Department of Agriculture

Roland R. Renne, of Montana, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Roland R. Renne, of Montana, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Federal Housing Administration

Philip N. Brownstein, of Maryland, to be Federal Housing Commissioner.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Liberalism in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 1, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the fact that the so-called liberals of our political life in this country have been usurping the real meaning of that term is beginning to get through to the American people. They are realizing, as the Europeans have for many years, that the end result of the phony liberal proposals will destroy freedom instead of extending and protecting it. More Americans are speaking out on this bold theft of a word and the twisting of it to mean something it never was meant to mean. The most articulate argument I have read thus far is one made by our brilliant colleague, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. This appears in the Penn State University magazine Critique January issue. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"TODAY'S LIBERALS," BETTER CALLED 20th CENTURY TORIES

(By Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota)

"All down the ages the fight of the true liberals has been to take power from the executive and give it to the legislative branch. Now the so-called liberals want to give more power to the executive."—Former Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Democrat of Montana.

Nobody familiar with the political history of this Republic during the past three decades can deny that Burt Wheeler, of Montana, is rightfully one of the great fighting liberals of this era. It is likewise pertinent that Wheeler's liberalism was demonstrated on the floor of the U.S. Senate and in his public career rather than in the safe, serene atmosphere of a college classroom or the impersonal and untested philippics of a book. Senator Wheeler expressed his convictions in public debate with a consistent courage that made him an effective advocate willing to wager his reputation and political future on the logic and wisdom of his viewpoints.

As a consequence, when former Senator Wheeler speaks of today's "liberalism" and the curious and irrational projects which its present day disciples advocate, he speaks as an authority on what comprises genuine liberalism in public life and what principles and concepts give validity to the term liberal as a political philosophy. Thus, he serves the Nation well when he bluntly calls attention that our latter-day "liberals" have deserted the traditional liberal crusade and have, strangely enough, associated themselves with power drives similar to those of the Tories of early America.

It is my conviction that those who inaccurately describe themselves as liberals today, while persistently advocating policies and programs promoting authoritarian government in the United States, might be described more accurately as the 20th century Tories.

Somewhere along the line these Tories have lost confidence in the American people and have, by some curious form of self-delusionment, convinced themselves that only the Federal politicians are motivated by a high sense of ethics; only the Federal politicians can be trusted to do what is right; and only the Federal politicians can understand and provide what the people need and want. Thus, these misnamed and misdirected liberals, Tories, in fact, continue to chip away at the power, the rights, and the free choice of the people while transferring to bigtime politicians in Washington the authority to determine the people's destiny. This does not imply that these self-proclaimed but thoroughly deluded liberals are evil men. It definitely does mean, however, that they would substitute for a government devoted to promoting the general welfare one imbued with the paternalistic concepts of ancient times and Tory governments. The function of such government would be to provide for the general welfare rather than to promote the conditions through which the people can advance themselves in accordance with their desires, deserts, and abilities. They have lost sight of, or propose to destroy, the careful distinction between the responsibility of the Federal Government to provide for the common defense and the responsibility of the Central Government only to promote the general welfare as it is set out so clearly and meticulously in the preamble to our Constitution: "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Our wise and prudent constitutional forefathers used the English language carefully and thoughtfully. They evaluated and weighed every word before it was enshrined in our great charter of freedom. It was with specific purpose and prudent forethought that they drew the distinction between the terms "promote" and "provide" * * * it was not by accident that they did not connect the phrases dealing with the common defense and the general welfare by the conjunction "and" * * * they deliberately emphasized their conception of the vast difference between the Federal responsibilities for the common defense and the promoting of the general welfare. The programs and projects which our modern liberals espouse would eliminate that difference and shift to the Federal state the same responsibilities and authority for the general welfare that are rightly exercised by it in protecting the common defense and maintaining the national security.

By placing their primary confidence and trust in the bigtime politicians, instead of in the people our Government was designed to serve—not control—these illegitimate liberals would receive a golden age of toryism when the king, the Federal Government, "could do no wrong." It would seem that Hitler and Mussolini, Stalin and Khrushchev should have disproved that naive assumption during the lifetimes of most of those hiding the desire for increased political power behind a mask of liberal concepts and phrases which either they do not understand or refuse to implement.

During the past 25 or 30 years, the growing influence of those I prefer to designate as "20th century Tories" instead of identifying them as "liberal," to which they claim, but repudiate by their actions, while embracing with their adjectives, has made an important, and in the main, unfortunate impact upon our national destiny. During this era, we have been following a global drift toward the overcentralization of government and the glorification of the central politician over the rights and privileges of the individual citizen.

Some 24 years ago when I first came to Congress, an oldtimer told me that a good political axiom for reelection was to remember that "economic conditions determine political decisions." He recommended that a candidate identify himself and/or his party with every upswing of economic conditions, with full employment, good profits, and happy living conditions. A great many voters, he argued, vote for the candidates whom they believe to be associated with their economic well-being. I believe there was some truth to his observations and, perhaps, his formula for victory still has a validity. During the intervening years, however, many new issues have come into play and new political alinements, the influence of big city political machines, labor organizations, ethnic groups, and other developments have tended to blunt the truism that "economic conditions determine political decisions."

Today we confront a comparatively new political axiom which has unquestioned validity and which all Americans should recognize when deciding their personal preference for either a steadily expanding power for the Federal Government, which means personal power for politicians, elected or appointed to Federal positions, or for a return to the concepts of keeping the Federal Government subject to the desires and controls of the voting citizens. This latter-day axiom is the converse of the earlier axiom. It now is stated, "political decisions determine economic conditions." Federal taxes are now so high that any alteration has a vital impact on business; inflation has gained so much headway that adding any further increase could destroy the base of many successful economic enterprises; new and mighty regulatory agencies and commissions in Washington hold life or death power over many economic activities. Even the sharp verbal expression of Federal displeasure drove the steel industry into ignominious and discredited defeat.

We live in an era of big government with big powers. We are witnessing a shift toward an authoritarian American state in which big politicians hold the whip and in which "who you know" in Government circles seems likely to replace "what you know." As yet, this consolidated central state is neither Socialist nor Communist nor Fascist in nature. But, neither is there anything remotely liberal about its nature or its design. It is big time politics in action, and regardless of which "ism" it eventually embraces or which embraces it, it would be a careless student of history who could not envision the possibility that our basic American concepts of private ownership, reward of merit, self-determination, and effective control of the politicians by the people are being threatened.

This switch of emphasis and the glorification and exaltation of the Federal politician at the expense of the private citizen is a deplorable change. It is the more deplorable because it has been promoted by a sustained drive for concentrated political power led by self-designated liberals who have practiced a semantic sham unprecedented in political history. The one notable exception must be those masters of doubletalk, the Russian Communists, whose standard stock in trade is to talk of "democracy" when they mean "dictatorship," to talk of "coexistence" when they mean "capitulation" and to talk of the "peoples' rights" when they mean the "politicians' privileges." It is a sham because it espouses the same type of proposals for expanding political controls over the people as advocated by the reactionaries, the tories, and the royalists of a century or two ago.

The true, tried, and tested liberal of history and of today is the private citizen or public official who advocates the maintenance or extension of individual liberties free alike from the power and the encroachments of an economic or political monopoly. It is the danger, and the presence, of a political monopoly and of programs moving toward that ugly goal which is the blind spot in the thinking of our latter-day liberals who are so busy looking at the problems of our times that they fail to see the even greater perils created by their proposals for solution.

Analyzed from the political standpoint of the predominant political performance of the members of each major party, one must conclude that the Republican Party, by supporting the concept that the size of Government should be reduced rather than expanded is far more identified with the great American liberal ideal than is the Democratic Party. And the always ready and willing handmaiden of the Democratic Party, Americans for Democratic Action, is no more liberal in concept or progressive in action than a Scotsman playing poker in an Edinburgh club.

Our American dream has evolved from the idealistic concept that proper ethics, sound morals, good judgment, prudent economy, and wise decisions are not the exclusive monopoly of those holding public positions of power and authority in Washington. It is an ideal our current pretenders to the liberal label seem entirely unable to comprehend or to accept. While the Republican Party has excelled its major adversary in clinging to this liberal ideal which has had its greatest fruition on American soil and which has provided more happiness for more people and greater individual liberties than man has attained in any other era or area of human history, it must be admitted that among Republicans, also, there are some who have succumbed to the seductive concept that the people must be pushed around by their political officials rather than have them retain the power and push the politicians toward the goals which they desire.

It is not, however, the purpose of this discourse to identify basic Republicanism with true liberalism nor to stigmatize all Democrats as people seeking personal and political power after the manner of Tories. Rather, it is my purpose to point up the forensic fakery involved in trying to identify a candidate, a party, or a cause involved in seeking more power over more people through Central Government, with any realistic, accurate, honest, or historic relationship with liberalism unless the relationship is to show how these linguistic liberals differ so sharply and so deeply from the programs and philosophies of such recognized liberals as Jefferson, Wilson, and Wheeler.

One of the great responsibilities of any administration in this country is to protect and wisely use what we usually term "the American system." To me, the American system means that system which seeks to provide a maximum of opportunity and freedom for our individual citizens. It is no more abstruse nor complicated than that. It is a system which manifests confidence in its people, and it is a system which has produced results unequaled and unexcelled by any other, any place, any time.

Those who would change our American system so as to place the basic responsibility for progress in the hands of Federal politicians instead of with the local citizens and governments are turning back the clock of history. Just as there is nothing liberal about such drives for increased political power in concentrated hands, there is also nothing new or novel in their proposals.

If one were to accept the pratings of the current crop of self-appointed liberals as providing courses of action and programs of progress which are, in fact, liberal in nature, one would logically be forced to the conclusion that the greatest liberals of current history are such advocates of concentrated power as Khrushchev, Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, Salazar, and Castro. Each of these promised the more abundant life, better schooling, better health, better economic opportunities, and greater well-being to their people. Each sought to provide them by reducing the areas of self-determination and free choice enjoyed by the private citizen and by expanding the areas of control and power enjoyed by the politicans in the capital cities of their lands. Each failed to achieve the degrees of well-being and human happiness enjoyed by the peoples of free countries where even the right to err in judgment is an inherent part of any system which provides unlimited rights to succeed and to aspire. To those who argue that it is not our system which has made America so outstanding but rather something else—our temperature, our resources, our good fortune, or our great complex population—it should be pointed out that West Germany has employed this system with spectacular success and even such formerly backward countries as the Philippines and Japan are making it work.

How, then, can one recognize an actual liberal in the great American tradition and in conformity with the true meaning of the term as shaped by the flow of human history everywhere? Obviously, not by accepting the unsupported boast of an ambitious politician who proclaims, "I am a liberal" much as Louis XIV boasted, "L'etat c'est moi". A real liberal must be tested by his actions, by his programs, by his goals, and by his methods just as we test the veracity and worth of any sloganeer or propagandist who hopes to persuade us by his rhetoric rather than his reason. The wisdom of Emerson is as sound now as it was when he wrote his immortal observation that what you do speaks so loudly that no one can hear what you say.

Let us apply that what-you-do test to today's misleading or misled liberals rather than limiting ourselves to an artless acceptance of their what-you-say pronouncements. There is available for each of us a test which every intelligent and thoughtful citizen should use to decide whether any public proposal or public personality is in fact liberal in conception and nature. We need not become involved in a battle of semantics or in a controversy over terminology. Simply stated, a man or a program is appropriately described as liberal if identified with circumscribing excessive power over the people from any source whether it be concentrated economic, political, or hereditary power. On the other hand, if any man or program is identified with expanding and increasing the power of politicians or economic tycoons over the average citizen, that smacks of reactionism, Toryism, and has no place anywhere in the dictionary of valid liberalism.

This yardstick of good government, this do-it-yourself test of whether a political party, an individual citizen, or a proposed change is in fact liberal in nature, can be employed by applying the following tests to any given circumstance:

(1) Does the proposal expand individual freedom or does it expand the power and authority of the central state?

(2) Does the proposal give a greater choice to the greatest number or does it give greater decisions to be made by a steadily decreasing number of politicians at the top?

(3) Does it enlarge the powers and opportunities of all individual citizens to determine their own destiny or does it give greater power and additional opportunity to politicians at the Federal level to determine the destiny of all citizens?

After examining a public proposal or a suggested reform; after analyzing the speeches, votes, and positions of a politician or a public figure; after studying the recommendations of an organization, a political party, or a reform group, and after asking the foregoing questions and relating your honest answers to the steps which have been advocated, you will know whether what it proposed is actually liberal, or reactionary, and paternalistic in conception. With the clarification of its character, one can still be for or against a proposal or consider it wise or unwise, but it will be assured that no literate and prudent citizen will be found supporting an issue or a cause on the pretext that it is liberal when in fact it is demonstrably a step backward toward the eras of the overpowering central state.

Since 1776, the march of human freedom in this Republic has been in the direction of expanding and protecting the rights of self-determination by each individual citizen. We have been happily moving toward a more effective implementation of the goals set out in our Declaration of Independence and in the Preamble to our Constitution. We have been endeavoring to extend the vote to all our citizens; to correct imbalances of political power between urban and rural areas; to reform our electoral college system so that every citizen shall have the right to exercise equitable authority through the vote he casts for a President.

But, the ebb tide of freedom is in motion in our country. It is imperative that we seriously question ourselves as to whether, in our impatience to get things done and to bring about improvements, we may be destroying a system of checks and balances which has helped shape the basic formula by which in less than 200 years, we have developed a system so successful that no other country has remotely approximated it. Not only have we provided more happiness and more opportunity for more people than the world has ever seen but we are today also contributing to the support of over 80 less fortunate—or perhaps less prudent—countries in the world.

We have done all this under a constitutional charter of freedom which provides for the most liberal government in the world, one in which the wishes, the desires, and the ideals of the people can predominate. The light of human liberty burns brightest when the will of man is given free rein—uncontrollable by the politicians of his time and place. Let us not reduce that light of liberty to a mere smudgepot of low-level security by casting aside our traditions in reckless pursuit of illusionary goals that require a subjugation of the individual to achieve the false promises of any form of authoritative or totalitarian government. Let us examine each new proposal with an analytic test rather than accepting or rejecting it because of a political label or the mistaken notion that because it is noble in objective it must be liberal in nature.

All Americans are challenged these days—but the greatest challenge is to the real American liberal of 1962. If he is true to the liberal traditions of the past, the liberal heritage which is his as an American, he can not embrace concepts of collectivism or of centralized controls which would have been as much anathema to Thomas Jefferson as they are to the real constitutional libertarians of today.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 4, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 3: 16: *That He would grant you to be strengthened with might by His spirit in the inner man.*

Almighty God, during this Lenten season may we become richer in the culture of our souls and stronger in gaining the mastery over every insurgent impulse, every inordinate desire, and every self-indulgent habit.

May we daily cultivate a more intimate and radiant fellowship with the spirit of the lowly Man of Galilee who went about doing good and who called upon His followers to share their strength with the weak, their sympathy with the sorrowing, their substance with the poor, and to give their hearts to God.

Inspire us to live among our fellow men as messengers of helpfulness whose minds and hearts are impervious to the spirit of self-seeking and self-glory but who are defining and interpreting life in terms of its usefulness and its value in contributing to the building of Thy kingdom and the blessedness of all mankind.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 28, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 6, of February 27, 1963, on House Joint Resolution 249, I am recorded as being absent. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF LABOR DEPARTMENT

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note that it was just 50 years ago that President Taft signed into law the bill creating a new Department of Labor.

Thereby the concern of America for its working men and women was evidenced and in the ensuing years of expanding industrialization the wisdom of having the Government interest itself in workers and working conditions has been fully demonstrated.

Under free labor and a free system of enterprise, and under also our great Constitution and Bill of Rights, this Nation has been producing 35 percent of the world's goods through the organized effort of only 6 percent of the world's population.

This achievement has been possible because of our system of economic freedom and the wage and profit incentives under it during the past half century.

I want to express my appreciation of the Department of Labor and extend this tribute to the workers of America who look to this Department to oversee their interests and basic rights.

DISARMAMENT AGENCY DEPUTY'S STATEMENT IS BLUEPRINT FOR SELF-MUTILATION

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Adrian S. Fisher, Deputy Administrator of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, speaks for himself, William G. Foster, the Agency's Administrator, and for the President. His statement today on the administration's test ban position in answer to Senator Dodd's recent speech is shocking and tragic.

Mr. Fisher has at last revealed the Kennedy administration's blueprint for an American strategy of gradual nuclear self-mutilation.

Fisher's claim that "the strategic military balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. could not be altered in any major way" by clandestine Soviet test cheating flies in the face of repeated statements to the contrary by several U.S. experts in the actual making of nuclear weapons.

More than that, however, it completely undercuts any reason for U.S. demands for an adequate control system in any test ban treaty. Why should such machinery to detect and verify cheating be included in a treaty if the contention is correct that no significant progress could be made while the Soviets test clandestinely and we test not at all? The administration's position, therefore, must now be that detection and inspection machinery need no longer be insisted upon.

Fisher's words must be a great aid and comfort to the Kremlin. They signal it to sit tight while the Americans cave in on the test ban talks. He has ratified the long-suspected fact that bargaining and negotiation have been replaced by kowtow and concession on the U.S. side of the Geneva conference table.

I intend to issue a series of point-by-point exposures of the fatally dangerous Foster-Fisher fallacies. These gentlemen try to make some kind of meaningful distinction between surrender to Communist objectives on the installment plan and outright relinquishment of the world to Communist domination. There is no such distinction and I do not believe the American people can be sold the bill of goods that there is.

Also I am pressing my request that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy hold exhaustive hearings on nontechnical as well as technical factors involved in the test ban.

RESUMPTION OF PUBLICATION OF NEW YORK POST

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I pointed out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that in the city of New York there were seven newspapers which were not publishing; that of that number, three had voluntarily ceased publication in accordance with a publishers' agreement and were not under strike. I am delighted to report to the House that the publisher of the New York Post, Mrs. Dorothy Schiff, announced that she would start today to publish the New York Post again. I commend her and believe that this should help to resolve the present labor dispute.

JOINT WATCHDOG COMMITTEE TO OVERSEE CIA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the CIA is fast becoming the subject of many questions asked in the Congress and in this Nation. The intense interest of the American public in following the handling of the Cuban situation has claimed close attention to the details surrounding U.S. actions in Cuba. The questions are becoming more precise in nature every day. However, such questioning should be above partisan approach but valid questioning of the CIA and other intelligence operations of the U.S. Government is in order.

The major area of concern lies in determining just how far the CIA may have strayed from the intent of Congress; what powers and authority has the CIA acquired or not fulfilled since it was originally established by act of Congress in 1947?

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge the establishment of a joint watchdog committee composed of members of both political parties, from both the House and the Senate, to oversee the activities of the CIA as well as the other intelligence operations of the Government. I urge the Members of both the House and the Senate to join in the effort to establish this joint watchdog committee for the security of our Nation.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the recognition of the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Department of Labor in the executive department, I have noted an unfortunate failure to recognize the significance of the part played by the late William Howard Taft, 27th President of the United States, who on March 4, 1913, at the very close of his term as President signed the bill establishing the Department of Labor.

It was during the administration of William Howard Taft that important progress was made by the American Federation of Labor, which had more than 1,500,000 members in 1910 and which was composed largely of trade unionists who supported Taft and who resisted with him efforts to wreck the union movement threatened by the expansion of the radical International Workers of the World.

President Taft's role is frequently misinterpreted and often deliberately distorted. During his administration there was greater progress in the elimination of monopoly and restraints of trade than during any prior administration. He proposed and Congress passed the Mann-Elkins Act of 1910 enlarging the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission, established postal savings banks and the parcel post system, and authorized a National Health Bureau and Federal Children's Bureau. By Executive order he extended the merit system in the Postal Department and in the consular and diplomatic services.

On this day when the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Department of Labor is being celebrated, full recognition should be given to the man whose pen converted this dream into the permanent fabric of our Nation.

I am pleased to join with my esteemed colleague from Ohio, Congressman ROBERT A. TAFT, JR., in this timely recognition of the establishment of the Department of Labor, in connection with which his grandfather, the late William Howard Taft, played such a leading roll.

MEDICAL CARE

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I introduced a bill which would remove medical care beneficiaries from the welfare rolls of the individual States, H.R. 4388.

Among the recent messages from the White House to the Congress has been the President's message with regard to medical care. This raises again the entire question of medical care which can be provided in this country for all of our citizens regardless of their age or their financial condition. There are not many Americans who would contest the principle that we should all have available the kind of medical care which our doctors and our scientists have made possible. There is still, however, a considerable dispute as to the means by which this care should be provided particularly to those segments of the population who by reason of age and financial inability have difficulty in getting the kind of hospital treatment and the kind of medical treatment that they need.

Much has been done in this field already, and it is interesting to examine where we now stand with regard to medical care programs. We should also look into some of the suggestions of things that can be done to improve our current legislation on this subject. A program for medical assistance for the aged has been in operation in Maryland since June 1, 1961. This was made possible by the so-called Kerr-Mills bill which was passed by the 86th Congress and signed into law by President Eisenhower in 1960.

Like the other assistance programs in the State, the medical assistance for the aged program is under the supervision of the State department of public welfare and is administered by the county department of public welfare in 23 counties and by the Baltimore City Department of Public Welfare. The department of public welfare is responsible for certification of eligibility for this aid and reinvestigation and recertification are made annually if warranted by changes in the recipient's circumstances. Identifying the need for and arranging medical care, however, are the responsibility of the State department of health in accordance with the contract between the department of welfare and the department of health.

Under this program, in fiscal year 1962, 10,881 applications for medical aid were approved within the State of Maryland. In the first 6 months of fiscal year 1963—that is, from July 1 of 1962 through

December 31 of that year—there were 4,417 applications approved. Thus, you will see there is a considerable acceptance of medical aid under this program which has the substantial approval of the medical profession and of the public officials of the State of Maryland. There are, however, improvements that could be made. One of the objections to the Kerr-Mills plan as it is now administered is that applicants must apply to the State welfare department. Many people feel that there is a certain stigma to making applications for welfare aid. This objection has some basis in fact because those who receive medical aid through the welfare department may not otherwise be needful of welfare assistance.

I have, therefore, introduced into the House of Representatives H.R. 4388, a bill which will change the Kerr-Mills law permitting individual States to select the agency to be responsible for medical assistance for the aged. This will be to every State's advantage and I believe that it will simplify efforts to provide comprehensive and continuous care to all of our citizens who need it. Through changes such as this, the Kerr-Mills medical program can be improved to meet the demands of the American people for the best medical care for all of our citizens.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago a man who had climbed up the ramp, his lifeless limbs encased in irons, and leaning on the arm of his eldest son James, was inaugurated as President of the United States. Before him was a Bible that for 300 years had been in the Roosevelt family, a source of strength for many generations. That Bible was open to a page in the book of Corinthians with the counsel of the ages—faith, hope, and charity.

The counsel of the Bible, counsel that had given strength to peoples in many troublesome periods of the world, was the reliance of Franklin Delano Roosevelt as President of the United States.

I remember so well those years. Nobody had any money. Few had food sufficient for the nourishment of their families. The banks had failed. There were no jobs. The savings of people had been wiped out. There seemed no hope. Day after day, week after week, month after month, American people went through the wilderness of hopelessness, strengthened only by the admonition of Franklin Delano Roosevelt to have faith and courage and to go ahead with faith and with courage—and then day would break—and the march in the wilderness would be ended.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt if any man in the history of the world gave as much to a suffering people as Franklin Delano Roosevelt did through his example of courage, and faith that out of the darkness of every night there comes the dawn of a new day.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the House appreciates the fact that the distinguished gentleman has taken this time to commemorate the occasion 30 years ago when Franklin Delano Roosevelt was inaugurated as President of the United States. And with his inauguration a new era of hope and a new era of opportunity was inaugurated also for the American people.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I remember one evening when I was in the city hall in Chicago and the word came of the passing of President Roosevelt. As I left the city hall, scrubwomen were in tears. As I came into the streets of Chicago, men and women and children were crying—so deeply had the image of Franklin Delano Roosevelt reached into the hearts and minds of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I will make this observation. In one of the Chicago papers yesterday, there was a photograph of President Roosevelt on the occasion of his inauguration. By his side in that photograph was James, his eldest son. I am happy, Mr. Speaker, that James, his eldest son, is a Member of this body and that he is carrying on in the pattern and in the spirit of his father.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy that in my very humble way, I am seeking to carry on in the pattern of the man I, with all my countrymen, looked to for spiritual as well as material strength when ours was a stricken Nation with no hope save in Franklin Delano Roosevelt, counseling us to faith and courage as we marched out of the wilderness.

I was born in the same year of 1882. He was 51 when he was inaugurated President. I was approaching my 51st birthday. I am still here—I do not know for how long, but as long as I am here I shall try to go on in my humble way in the years ahead inspired in the doing of the work of each passing day by one who inspired me then, and now to all is an inspiration of immortality.

Yes, in the darkness of the night—no hope. And I know, because people would come to me who had everything wiped out, who did not know how they could go on; and then Franklin Delano Roosevelt would speak to the Nation and overnight courage came, and faith, and a suffering people marched out of the wilderness. How they did it I do not know, if the measure of their power to survive and to conquer overwhelming odds of adversity was material. But they did it by the inspiration of a great soul, one of the great souls in the history of our world.

And, Mr. Speaker, may I touch on one other matter mentioned on the opened page of the 300-year-old family Bible lying before Franklin Delano Roosevelt on his inaugural 30 years ago today—charity. Faith, hope, charity, these three: but the greatest of these is charity.

Preceding the Presidency of Franklin Delano Roosevelt was the Presidency of Mr. Hoover. In those days of the great depression when our people were entrapped in the wilderness of despair, Mr. Hoover was blamed for very much that had happened. It always seems that when one gets caught in a time of collapse he is blamed for everything, even though the collapse had come from a chain of preceding events not of his immediate making. Mr. Speaker, I think we all are happy that today in the evening of his life ex-President Hoover is respected and beloved by all his fellow citizens. And I know that no one would wish me more to say this than Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that as in each succeeding generation we go through the many problems of our Nation, and as we argue, sometimes bitterly in the intensity of varying convictions, that as time goes on and makes evaluation of what we in each generation have done, that there will be a reflection in that evaluation of that charity that Franklin Delano Roosevelt had in mind when he had before him at his inauguration this page from the 300-year-old family Bible: Faith, hope, charity, these three: but the greatest of these is charity.

And so let us give to all our fellow Americans full credit for sincerity. All seek to serve God, country, and mankind. And when time has passed let history be equally charitable and say that the Franklin Delano Roosevelts and the Herbert Hoovers and all were great Americans, that they had at heart the interests of their people and of mankind. The differences that divide in days of great crises are best forgotten and erased from memory. Ours cannot remain a great nation, the bulwark of freedom, if there are not always differences of opinion, honestly presented, honestly fought out, with a mutuality of respect that is part and parcel of our American heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I was humbly grateful when you asked me to make these remarks. I have been speaking from the heart and not from a manuscript, not even from any mental notes to guide the continuity. I am speaking, as one who went through those frightful years of the depression leaning upon a great spirit, lifted with my countrymen to the heights of the physically impossible by the presence of a great soul, inaugurated 30 years ago today as President of the United States.

MARCH 4—AN ANNIVERSARY DAY

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois for taking this time to commemorate the 30th anniversary of the inauguration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt for his first term as President.

March 4, 1933, is surely one day in our Nation's history that will long be remembered. Thirty years ago today, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was inaugurated President of the United States. Most of us can still vividly remember the depths of despair into which the Nation had fallen in that fourth year of the great depression. It can be truly said that FDR's first important act was his inaugural address. The eloquent words he spoke that day, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," helped to restore the Nation's confidence in itself. The lack of that national self-confidence was undoubtedly the most dangerous aspect of those black days. President Roosevelt was able to transmit that personal courage, which had enabled him to conquer his own physical handicap, into the inspiration which restored the courage of a whole people.

Many of our senior colleagues began their service in this House on a March 4 in the past. Four of our fellow Members are today celebrating anniversaries of decades of service to their country:

Clarence Cannon, the esteemed chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who entered the House 40 years ago today after a distinguished career as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives; and Emanuel Celler, the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, also began his service in this House 40 years ago. His fight against monopoly and for the protection of civil liberties and civil rights has gained him a well-earned place in the history of the fight for equal treatment for all.

On the same day 30 years ago when Franklin Roosevelt delivered that eloquent inaugural address, three of our distinguished senior colleagues entered upon their long careers of service in the national House of Representatives.

William M. Colmer, the ranking Democratic member of the House Rules Committee who has a long record of dedicated service on that most important Committee; and Thomas J. O'Brien, my beloved fellow member of the Ways and Means Committee to whom I have often turned for counsel and advice in order to benefit from his many years of experience.

Francis E. Walter, the revered chairman of the Democratic conference and one whose skill and fairness as chairman of the Committee of the Whole House has been recognized and appreciated by Members on both sides of the aisle.

Today we also celebrate the anniversaries of distinguished service, though not of even decades, of three others of our fellow members.

Joseph W. Martin, Jr., our distinguished former Speaker and earnest advocate of his party's cause who has won the admiration and affection of Members of this House on both sides of the aisle, who entered this House 38 years ago today; and Wright Patman, the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee whose spirited devotion to the interests of the less-favored has been an inspiration to us all, who entered this House 34 years ago.

Howard W. Smith, the astute and able chairman of the Rules Committee, known to us all affectionately as Judge Smith, who has always treated every Member with consideration and fairness in fulfilling his responsibilities for the managing of the House's business, who entered this House 32 years ago today.

These constitute the total membership of the House who were sworn into office on a 4th of March. In 1933, the 20th amendment to the U.S. Constitution was ratified which changed the starting dates of Presidential and congressional terms to January 3.

Two other of the distinguished senior Members of this body have a record of service prior to 1933, but they were elected in the middle of congressional terms to fill vacant seats:

Carl Vinson, who has served longer in this body than any other living Member, is the House's preeminent expert on national defense matters. I look forward to November 3, 1964, when we can congratulate the dean of this House on 50 years of loyal and distinguished service to his country as a Member of this body.

John W. McCormack, our esteemed Speaker, will celebrate 35 years of continuous service in this body on November 6 of this year. Before his election as Speaker of the House of Representatives, John W. McCormack had an unequaled record of service to his party and country in his position as Democratic leader under Speaker Rayburn and as the architect of many of the important measures passed in the last 35 years to strengthen the Nation's defenses and to protect the welfare of its citizens.

I know I speak for every Member of this House in congratulating these 10 men on their long records of service and in expressing the wish of us all that they be with us for many more years so that we may have the continued benefit of their mature judgment and great wisdom.

SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 78)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read; and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, I transmit herewith a report on the projects and progress of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the period of January 1 through June 30, 1962. This is the seventh of these reports since the passage of the legislation establishing that agency.

This report covers a period of acceleration in the national space program and reveals the significant role of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in that progress. Congressional support and interagency cooperation have contributed substantially to this record of space and aeronautics performance.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *March 4, 1963.*

SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 79)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read; and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the 17th semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period July 1 through December 31, 1962.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *March 4, 1963.*

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS HAVING SERVICE-INCURRED DISABILITY OF DEAFNESS OF BOTH EARS

The Clerk called the first bill (H.R. 199) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

STATUTORY AWARD FOR APHONIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 214) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

LEWIS DESCHLER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 274) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the House of Representatives hereby tenders its thanks and appreciation to Lewis Deschler, whose 35th anniversary as its Parliamentarian occurred on January 1, 1963, in recognition of his dedication to this House, his wise and impartial advice to the Speaker and Members, and his exceptional contribution to the operation of its rules.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the spontaneous response of the Members of the House on this resolution makes it almost anticlimatic for anyone to make a speech. But I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying a few words.

Mr. Speaker, this is a high privilege that I now have. It is with great pride that I offer this resolution in my name. But, Mr. Speaker, as much as I would cherish the honor, this resolution is not just offered on my own behalf alone. It is offered on behalf of the great and distinguished Speaker of the House; it is offered on behalf of the great and distinguished minority leader; it is offered on behalf of the entire leadership on both sides of the aisle. More important, it is offered indeed, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House of Representatives and all its Members.

Yesterday was Lew Deschler's birthday. This year also marks his 36th year of service as Parliamentarian of the House. In honoring this great American on this occasion the House does honor to itself.

Lewis Deschler was born in Chillicothe, Ohio, on March 3, 1905, the son of Joseph Anthony and Lilian Louise—Lewis—Deschler, who are still residing in Chillicothe.

Mr. Deschler began his higher education at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, where he was a student from 1922 to 1925. During these years at Miami, he played tackle on the varsity football squad and engaged in other extracurricular activities. In 1925, he came to Washington, D.C., where he completed his undergraduate work at George Washington University. In 1932 he received both the degrees of juris doctor and master of patent law from National University in Washington, and in 1947 he was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of laws from the same university. He took the examination for the District of Columbia bar in 1934 and received the highest score ever given on the exam to that date. He was admitted to the District of Columbia bar in the same year. On motion of Hatton Summers he became a member of the U.S. Supreme Court bar in December 1937.

On January 18, 1931, Mr. Deschler married Virginia A. Cole of Washington, D.C. They have two children: Lewis Deschler II, an attorney practicing in Boca Raton, Fla.; and Joan Mari—Mrs. William B. Eddy—who resides with her husband and two children in Bethesda, Md. Mr. Deschler has one brother, Kenneth Deschler, living in Secaucus, N.J.

Lewis Deschler's career on Capitol Hill began in December of 1925—69th Congress, 1st session—when he was appointed by Speaker Longworth to be messenger at the Speaker's table, U.S. House of Representatives. He performed the duties of the timekeeper. At that time there was no position at the Speaker's desk carrying the title of Parliamentarian. The functions of Parliamentarian were performed by the Clerk at the Speaker's table, a position which had been filled by Lehr Fess, of Ohio, since the 66th Congress, 2d session—1919. In 1927—69th Congress, 2d session—the title of the position was changed to Parliamentarian—44 Stat. 1150, Public Law 631, 69th Congress—and the position of Assistant Parliamentarian was created—House Resolution 365, January 31, 1927. Mr. Deschler became the first Assistant Parliamentarian of the House, effective February 1, 1927, and served in this capacity until January 1, 1928, when he succeeded Mr. Lehr Fess as Parliamentarian. He has served as Parliamentarian continuously since that date; thus, on January 1, 1963, he began his 36th year in that position and he is currently in his 38th year of service in the House. During this long career, Mr. Deschler has had the honor to serve under Speakers Longworth, Garner, Rainey, Byrns, Bankhead, Rayburn, Martin, and McCormack.

On many occasions over the past several years I have heard the beloved Speaker McCormack say, without equivocation and without qualification, that "Lew Deschler is the greatest Parliamentarian in the world." I believe that is a fact. Lew Deschler knows the rules of this House, the parliamentary procedure of this House as nobody else on earth ever knew them. The parliamentary language of this House, in every conceivable procedural situation, is as much a part of his vocabulary as the words he learned at his mother's knee. To the presiding officer either of the House or of the Committee of the Whole, his work has been indispensable. He never forgets, he never falters, he never fails.

But perfect practitioner that he is, Mr. Speaker, Lew Deschler is more than this. He is a philosopher and historian of parliamentary law. He knows and loves the rules of this House. He knows when and why they were developed. He knows their importance to the dignity and decorum of the House, which itself has been his life and his love. He knows the pitfalls that accompany departures from parliamentary procedure, pitfalls both to individual Members and to the prestige and to the role of the House itself.

Lew Deschler has combined this great knowledge of parliamentary law and parliamentary procedure and his long years of experience in this House with rare and innate qualities of judgment and insight. He has the ability to sense instinctively almost the important missions of each succeeding Congress. Though his job is entirely objective, he has a talent for sifting the legislative wheat from the chaff. He knows when a transitory victory in a legislative battle may cost the legislative war. He knows the value of timing in the legislative process.

Lew Deschler has served at the right hand of many great Speakers, all of whom I have previously named. Every one of them, and they have all been preeminent judges of men, has singled Lew out for the quality of his service to the House. In the language of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, Lew Deschler has earned the commendation of us all for his exceptional contribution to the operation of the rules of the House, for his wise and impartial advice to the Speaker and to Members of the House, and for the quality, and the dedication, and the importance of his service to this body.

I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding; I also thank him for myself and for all of the Members on my side of the aisle for his presentation of this resolution. Too often it has seemed to me that some of the good things that we can say about people who are with us are delayed too long.

I seldom deal in superlatives but agreeing with our able Speaker I want to say that Lew Deschler is the world's greatest Parliamentarian, and that I realize is taking in a lot of territory.

I never cease to be amazed at the length and breadth of his knowledge of the rules of the House of Representatives.

These rules, as we all know, have evolved out of decades of experience and are designed to protect the rights not only of the minority, but of the 435 individual Members of this body.

Obviously, without them, we never would get anything done around here.

Sometimes I think it is a miracle that we accomplish what we do even with the rules to keep us in line with proper procedure.

Certainly one of the reasons is because we have a Parliamentarian who, throughout his career, has shown a capacity for a completely fair application of those rules.

Through the years that I have known Lew Deschler ours has become one of the closest personal relationships, and never has it made the slightest bit of difference in that relationship, especially as it had to do with the business of this House, whether I was a member of the majority party or the minority party.

I say without equivocation that never have I known Lew Deschler's advice, his judgment or his decisions to be influenced by any partisan considerations whatsoever.

My admiration for him as a man goes far beyond my respect for Lew Deschler as an officer of the House. He has a deep understanding of his job that transcends its purely technical aspects.

In my years of service here I have known no other person more fiercely proud of the highest traditions of the House of Representatives, and no other who has been more careful or more determined to protect and maintain the prestige and standing of this body.

People reach the top in their chosen field only because of strong motivation. It is this complete dedication to our great institution that has made Lew Deschler the very best, and I wish him many, many more years of distinguished service to the Congress and his country.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his excellent statement. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I might say that the offering of this resolution and the remarks of various Members are a complete surprise to our distinguished friend. I might make the observation in connection with the surprise that when I recognized the gentleman from Oklahoma and he addressed me to offer a resolution, Lew Deschler turned to me and said, "Did you know about this?"

I said, "Yes; and you had better stay here because I am afraid there might be a point of order made. So you had better stay here." So it was a complete surprise to our dear and distinguished friend.

The gentleman from Oklahoma has covered the background of the years of dedicated service of Lew Deschler to this great body. My remarks will be made from another angle, about Lew Deschler the man. It is true that whenever I introduce Lew Deschler to anyone, particularly those from abroad, I always introduce him as the No. 1 Parliamentarian of the world, and that is true. But more than being a Parliamentarian he is a human being, he is a man possessed of nobility of character, with a fine, broad understanding outlook on life and a sweet and noble philosophy of life.

In addition, he is a man of wisdom, a man whose influence in the legislative affairs of our country for so many years has been tremendous, unseen possibly from the angle of the public but well known to each and every Member who has ever served in this great body.

As my dear friend from Indiana, the minority leader, so well said, Lew Deschler "is dedicated to the House of Representatives." He is loyal to the House as such. He is loyal to whoever might be the presiding officer of the House without regard to what the presiding officer's political party or affiliation might be. His views, his opinions, are sought not only by the Speakers that he has served with, and I might use the words under or in cooperation with, but also by all Members of the House, and his views and his opinions are profoundly respected.

My friends from Oklahoma and from Indiana, as I have said, have covered not only Lew Deschler personally but Lew Deschler's contribution as Parliamentarian. I like to look at him and to make my remarks from the angle of Lew Deschler the individual. He was here when I first came to Congress a little over 35 years ago. During my period of service there has developed between Lew Deschler and John McCormack a feeling of friendship which I shall always treasure.

One of the most ennobling influences of my life has been the fact that by reason of my service in this body I have been able to meet so many fine Members, men and women, possessed of beautiful minds, who, without regard to party, have been dedicated to the service of our country. Among all of them there is none who will forever as long as I live occupy a more treasured position in my mind than our dear friend Lew Deschler.

To Lew and to Mrs. Deschler, and to his parents and his other loved ones, I extend my hearty congratulations not only on his birthday anniversary of yesterday but on this anniversary today in his official position as Parliamentarian. May God continue to bless Lew for countless years to come in the service of our country and particularly in the service of this great body.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

I now yield to the majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Lew Deschler has set a high standard for ability, for tireless dedication, and for wise and honest counsel. As the minority leader has said, and as the distinguished Speaker of the House has said, he is unquestionably the greatest Parliamentarian in all of the world. Historians will never be able to trace the very far reaching influence of this man in helping the House of Representatives to pass well-conceived and well-thought-out legislation, and legislation able to pass the constitutional test. Every Member, as the Speaker of the House has just said, who has sat in this House at any time in the past 36 years will bear testimony that his influence has had a tremendous impact and that he has contributed far more than the world will ever know toward maintaining the dignity and the supremacy of this great body.

I think one of the great characteristics of this man, speaking of him as a man, as the distinguished Speaker just did, is that no one ever questions his impartiality. Everyone knows that when one of us has the privilege of presiding as chairman in the Committee of the Whole, or sometimes when the Speaker of the House designates one of us as Speaker pro tempore, we are constantly, so to speak, in the hands of the Parliamentarian. When someone makes a point of order or raises a parliamentary question or whatever the situation may be, we turn immediately to the Parliamentarian and he advises us. It has been my observation over the years regardless of whether we have had a Democrat or a Republican sitting in the Speaker's chair, and regardless who may have been presiding in Committee of the Whole, no one ever questions the fairness or objectivity of Lew Deschler. To my way of thinking, that has been one one of his very important contributions to this great body. Our distinguished Speaker has described Lew Deschler as the greatest Parliamentarian. I remember when another great Speaker, Mr. Rayburn, used to say he was, to quote, "A big brain man." I think that describes Lew very adequately. He is a big man in every sense of the word. He understands the bigness of this country and the challenges that this country faces. He understands the unique and magnificent role that the House of Representatives plays in carrying on the spirit and the strength of our democratic institutions in the United States of America.

So it is my great pleasure, number one—to express my profound gratitude to Lew Deschler for the great help he has given to me over the years both as a Member of this body and as one who has had some minor responsibility in the leadership—and that has been a personal matter and one for which I will be forever grateful; and number two—to say to him, I join with all your colleagues in wishing for you and your family a happy birthday chronologically and a happy birthday as an officer of this great body.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join our distinguished Speaker and the leaders on both sides in extending congratulations to our beloved and distinguished friend and Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler, and at the same time also to extend my felicitations to him on the occasion of his birthday yesterday.

I wish also to join others in expressing my appreciation for our distinguished majority leader's presenting the resolution today appropriately recognizing the life work of our Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler.

Apropos to what our distinguished majority whip has just said, I recall one occasion which I think would be appropriate to include in these remarks. Legislation was being considered in the House; one of the Members serving as the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole; some question was raised by a Member regarding a parliamentary matter; the Chairman of the Committee remarked that the Parliamentarian said it was so-and-so. It was a little out of the ordinary for a Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to say that for the Record, but it is so obvious, it was so true.

And I want to associate myself with the appropriate and splendid remarks that have been made here about my good friend who has always so willingly and gladly given counsel and advice.

Lew, we wish you the best for many, many more years of fine service, because you have meant so much to us as a group, to us as inudividuals, to me not only as a Member, but also as chairman of one of the great committees of this House; and I personally want to thank you for it.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas, and now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thornberry].

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to join others in paying this deserved tribute to Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian of this House. I recall more than fourteen years ago when I first came here, the distinguished gentleman whom I succeeded in the House and who now serves this Nation as Vice President, the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, gave me much valuable and good advice. One of the most valuable pieces of advice he ever gave me was:

> You get to know the Parliamentarian, Mr. Lewis Deschler. He is a wise man, he is a good man, he is nonpartisan, and he will always advise you not only as to the rules of the House, not only as to the proper procedure, but also as to the proper conduct of a Member of the House.

The two of them have been fast and good personal friends over the years.

I took advantage of that advice and as a result of the Vice President's wise judgment I have been afforded a personal and close friendship which means much to me and will always mean much to me. I expect Lew Deschler enjoyed, as much as any mortal man, the friendship and confidence of the immortal and beloved Sam Rayburn. I do not believe there was ever a day went by that Mr. Rayburn did not in some way or in other refer to Lew Deschler as his friend and confidant. Not only did Mr. Rayburn think of him as a big brain, but more important than that, as a big man with a big heart.

I think it is a great privilege for all of us who come to this House not only to know Lew Deschler as a valiant champion of the House and of the Members of the House, see him take pride in the House and do his best to see that the House maintains its prestige and place in this capital, but also to be afforded his friendship and advice. We can rejoice in the pardonable pride that his father and mother, his wife, Virginia, her parents, and their children have in him, not only because of today but particularly because of what he has meant to them, to his friends, and to this country. All the members of the family are in Washington today, or most of them are, to help celebrate this day with him.

And so, to Lew Deschler, go my congratulations, my thanks, and my best wishes.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, in my 37 or 38 years here I have had the good fortune and great privilege of meeting some of the finest men I have ever met in all my life or ever expect to meet. When I first came up to Washington it was with a Member of Congress with whom I was closely associated prior to that time, in fact, a relative. He said to me:

> Herbert, in getting around try to meet some smart people, try to meet people who have been around, people who amount to something.

I followed his advice, and as I met these people who were the leaders on the majority side at that time and on the minority side, I always heard them mention this fellow Deschler's name.

So I made it my business to get acquainted with Mr. Deschler.

Mr. Speaker, I can sincerely say that fortunate is the man who knows Lew Deschler.

Lew Deschler has helped more individual Members of this House and their staffs than any man I know of on this side of the Capitol, because if you are fortunate enough to get advice from Mr. Deschler, it is good advice. I have often heard the former Speaker of this House, Mr. Rayburn, say, "When I am talking I am not learning anything." So I had the privilege many times of being in Mr. Deschler's company and of listening to him talk to other people. I learned something about the operations of this House and the things that had gone on in the past as well as his prediction of the things that would take place in the future.

It has been one of the great privileges in my life to know this fine Christian gentleman, and I am everlastingly grateful for having had the opportunity of this great association, this fine association, because he has meant so much to me. I am proud to call you, Lew, my friend.

I hope you spend many, many more happy birthdays and continue to render to the Members of this House impartially, in the future as you have in the past, the wonderful service you have given the House of Representatives, the Congress, and this Nation.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

It is now with pleasure that I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a very great pleasure to me to get up and wish Lew Deschler a happy birthday at this time.

I suppose I go back as far as anyone, so far as Lew Deschler is concerned. When I first came down here with my husband there were a lot of greenhorns around, just as there are today who did not know anything about parliamentary law. So they asked Lew Deschler if he would give them lessons. They would come to our house, Clarence Hancock, Bill Hess, Carroll Beedy, and others, of an evening. Lew certainly put them over the bumps. It was wonderful.

I must say at that time I was not very greatly interested in politics. Of course, I was interested in my husband's service in the House, but I did not expect to be down here myself. Even so I found it fascinating.

Mr. Deschler was a most wonderful teacher in addition to being a most delightful person to have around.

I do wish you, Lew, every joy in the world, and a lot more years. May I congratulate the House, Mr. Speaker, that we have had his services for so many, many years. Heaven bless you, my dear.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio, and I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, following my colleague from Ohio, may I say that I have probably known Lew Deschler longer than any other Member of this House, because I have known him since he was a lad of 13, back in 1918. I knew his father and his grandfather before him.

So, it has been a real pleasure to me to sit here today and listen to the tributes which have been paid to a wonderful man, Lew Deschler, by those who have served with him here in the House of Representatives.

As has already been said, Lew is a big man in many, many ways. He is a big man physically. Lew and I have had a little joke between us for a good many years—because Chillicothe is just up the tracks a piece from my hometown—about erecting a statue to Lew in Chillicothe. We have always said it should be of gold but have always insisted Lew should first go on a diet to hold down the cost of his statue.

But, Mr. Speaker, if you think Lew Deschler is a big man physically, you should have seen his grandfather, who would make Lew look like a little boy if he were standing beside him today. He too was a great American, as was Lew's father.

Mr. Speaker, Lew comes from the old stock. Chillicothe was the first capital of Ohio, as you all know, and from those hills that make up the background of the seal of the State of Ohio came the pioneers, who in turn have given Lew not only a strong constitution and great physical strength, but a strong character, a great moral strength, and unusual mental capacity, which has permitted him to become the renowned Parliamentarian that he has been described here today, but also a truly great man, which counts the most, after all.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of personal pleasure to join in this well-deserved tribute to our Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler.

Everything has been said so well that I will merely tell one story and then make one point. It happens that a number of years ago, some years after the late Speaker Rayburn had broken Henry Clay's record of service—that of longest service as Speaker of the House of Representatives—I happened to go into Speaker Rayburn's office when he and Lew were discussing some problem. Shortly thereafter Mr. Deschler left. The Speaker and I began to discuss a variety of matters. I said "Mr. Speaker, you probably know more about the rules of the House than anybody in the history of the House." The Speaker looked at me and said, "There is only one man around here who knows the rules of the House. He just left. Lew Deschler."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Speaker Rayburn meant exactly what he said and I expect he was telling the precise truth.

Mr. Speaker, there is one characteristic of Lew that has not been brought out today. He was surprised by this event. In fact, I think he learned only a few seconds ago that some members of his family were more aware of the coming event than he. One of the things you must recognize about him is that he probably views these proceedings with mixed emotions. He has had an enormous influence on the Members and the proceedings of this House for many decades and yet he is less well-known in the United States than many men of less importance here. That is entirely deliberate on his part. He has a real passion for anonymity. He wants to do things, and not talk about them.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure again to congratulate our fine Parliamentarian.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for those very pertinent and accurate observations.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have addressed the House on this subject today may revise and extend their remarks, and that all Members have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this resolution, and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject matter of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Lewis Deschler has functioned in the office of the Parliamentarian of the House for a period of 36 years. It is a fitting tribute that on this day the House by resolution pays tribute to his honorable and distinguished services in this capacity.

The office of Parliamentarian covers many important segments of the business of the House: the assignment of messages and resolutions to the committee properly having jurisdiction of the subject matter; the rulings on sundry motions, points of inquiry, and order made by the membership in the hearings on the floor at various stages during the progress of legislation.

Lewis Deschler has through the years established himself as a final authority in the specialized field. The importance of his rulings has guided the destiny of hundreds of pieces of legislation through the House of Representatives.

The many miscellaneous questions of parliamentary nature arising in committee or in conference between both Houses and settled through his good offices are matters of legislative history.

His high talents in this service have earned for him the respect of the membership and the appreciation of the leadership of the House of Representatives.

His constant application to the duties of his office together with a continuing study in research on questions pertinent to his specialization has given to him a national recognition as an expert authority in his field.

His intellectual and legalistic mastery of Jefferson's Manual and the ten thousand rulings on parliamentary questions decided in the highest parliamentary controlled body from its very beginning have marked him as a master in his chosen field of endeavor.

His valuable service to the Congress has been the controlling factor in keeping legislation within the constitutional limits prescribed by the Constitution of the United States.

His assistants, William P. Cochrane and William H. Brown, reflect the thorough training received under his tutelage. The old adage of the teacher and the efficiency of the pupil is no better demonstrated.

We, of the Illinois delegation, are proud of the important services rendered by our friend and distinguished public servant Lewis Deschler, and give public thanks to him for his many years of dedication to the American people.

May God bless him and his family with health and happiness, and to him many years of continued service in the House of Representatives.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the past two elections happily have brought a goodly number of new Members to the minority side of this body.

As a freshman in the 87th Congress, I can attest from personal experience the fair and helpful way in which Lew Deschler fulfills the office of Parliamentarian. As teacher, technician, and friend, he has been most helpful.

I know from contacts with other new Members that this same fine standard has been applied to all.

Our very best wishes to Mr. Deschler on this anniversary.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of Congress, I have had occasion to call on our Parliamentarian, Mr. Lew Deschler, for assistance and advice. I have found him to be most cordial and helpful, and I am most appreciative of his service and knowledge. It is a pleasure to join in the ceremony congratulating Lew Deschler on the occasion of his birthday.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, there is little I can add to what has been so eloquently and so justifiably said about the distinguished service of our Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler. I join in what has been said about this truly able and truly fine official of the House. But I, and only I can testify to the personal respect and great affection I have for him. Even as I attempt to do so I cannot find the words adequately to express what is in my mind and heart.

That Lew has sat at the Speaker's table since 1925 and has been our Parliamentarian since 1928, under eight Speakers, both Republican and Democrat, itself attests to the quality of his service and the quality of the man himself. As Parliamentarian he may be said to be the chief legal adviser of our Speaker and whomever may occupy the chair as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole. Not infrequently the Chair is obliged to make an immediate ruling on an extremely difficult question, but Lew is there to advise the Chair instantly as to exactly what the precedents are on such an issue. That there should be an absence of appeals from the Chair's rulings bespeaks the soundness and the fairness of the advice the Chair receives from Lew.

There is considerably more involved in connection with the position of Parliamentarian than advising the Chair during the course of proceedings on the floor. That the legislative program is handled so expeditiously on the floor from day to day is due to the thorough preparations made for the business of the day by the Parliamentarian. Frankly, I am sometimes amazed how he seems to anticipate the unexpected, and I think this is because he is familiar with every aspect of every bill that is called up.

Lew is now serving his 36th year as our Parliamentarian. I congratulate him. On this occasion we Members of the House might appropriately congratulate ourselves in having such a man as Lew Deschler in the service of the House. Without him the House will not be the same, and we sincerely hope he will be our Parliamentarian for many, many more years.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to be included with those who are praising Lew Deschler on his birthday today. Anyone who has observed Capitol Hill over the last 30 years can testify to his great contribution to the legislative process. Both in character and ability he has made a record which has impressed everyone who has had occasion to come in contact with him. His fairness in the discharge of his duties as Parliamentarian is universally acknowledged. Not many persons have the talent of being able to make vital decisions on the spur of the moment without question or criticism. But Lew has this talent and that is one of the reasons why he will be recorded as the greatest Parliamentarian in the history of the House of Representatives.

As a friend and admirer I extend my greetings and best wishes on this occasion.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join in this tribute to our distinguished Parliamentarian. I soon learned after my arrival in the House that Lewis Deschler is all that our great Speaker and majority and minority leaders have said. He is not only a walking encyclopedia of the rules and procedures of the House, but a patient and lucid teacher, ever willing to share his knowledge with the Members. The House indeed has been fortunate to have had the benefit of his invaluable service during the past 35 years. I want to add my voice in wishing continued success and happiness to Lewis Deschler and his family.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, though mine has been a relatively short stay in Washington, it has witnessed and continues to realize the importance and expertness of Lewis Deschler, our House Parliamentarian. In a very real sense, his service in such capacity, of which this august body has been the fortunate recipient since 1928, has helped to sustain and vindicate the axiom that ours is a government of laws, not men. Serving as the parliamentary alter ego of the Speaker, and for that matter, of the entire membership, Lewis Deschler has cleared the well-known tight congressional procedural path time and time again in a way characterized as impartial, decisive, and quiet. His response to inquiries as to procedural stratagems and as to rights and privileges of Members has been particularly invaluable to my congressional brethren as well as myself. Indeed, this great body has been and continues to be the better for its selection some 35 years ago of the outstanding ability and parliamentary wisdom of Lewis Deschler.

I congratulate Lew on his recent birthday anniversary, and, moreover, on the occasion of his 36th year of service as House Parliamentarian. His has been a long and productive service; may the House of Representatives continue to enjoy his wise and nonpartisan counsel for many years to come. May Heaven bless Lew Deschler, and may he continue to privilege this great Chamber with his presence.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am more than delighted that our majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, offered the resolution affording the House of Representatives the opportunity to extend its thanks and appreciation to Lewis Deschler, our Parliamentarian, who is now serving in his 36th year in this important capacity. Others have spoken of Lew Deschler as "the greatest parliamentarian in the world," of Lew Deschler "the man," of his great contributions to all of us as individual Members; and I would like to join with my colleagues in all of these expressions of recognition, appreciation, and high confidence in Lew Deschler, our friend.

More than this, I would also like to record for history the tremendous assistance Lew Deschler through the years has rendered to the professional staffs of the committees of the House of Representatives. As assistant counsel to the Education and Labor Committee in the 82d Congress, I learned that Lew Deschler was always available and often was called upon for opinions on parliamentary questions arising within the committees of the House, as well as to give advice regarding the rules and procedures for presenting committee legislation for floor action.

While I am confident that every Member of the House of Representatives who has ever served with Lew Deschler recognizes his outstanding contributions to the leadership of the House and the Members individually, I know that each staff member who has ever called on the Parliamentarian likewise could testify that his advice and assistance have been invaluable in the work of the Congress in the committees.

It is a great pleasure and privilege to join in saluting Lew Deschler for all of his many contributions. I extend to him my best wishes for many, many years of continued service in this most important position of service to our Nation.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution tendering the thanks and appreciation of the House of Representatives to Lewis Deschler for his faithful service as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives for the past 35 years is a very fitting tribute to a great American.

Lewis Deschler is not only the greatest Parliamentarian of our times, but he has endeared himself to all Members of the House. In addition to his many splendid qualifications as Parliamentarian, he has those personal attributes which make people admire and respect him.

It has been a real privilege for me to have been associated with Lewis Deschler throughout my service in the Congress, and I wish him the best of everything in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I am privileged today to extend my sincere congratulations to Lew Deschler on the occasion of his 35th anniversary as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives.

This is a very great achievement and one I am sure that Lew is proud to claim. His devotion to his duties, to our Speaker and to the membership of this House is reflected in his modesty, but we all know he is, without a doubt, the greatest authority on parliamentary law in the United States today.

Above and beyond this acknowledged ability, Lew is a very human and understanding man. He is a humanitarian and is never too busy to lend a helping hand when requested to do so.

Mr. Speaker, we are most fortunate to have had Mr. Deschler with us over the past 35 years and I hope the good Lord will watch over him and guide him for many more years to come.

Lew, we will always need your wisdom and your valuable assistance. Again please accept my heartiest congratulations on this very important occasion in your fabulous life on Capitol Hill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the pleasantest associations I have enjoyed during my long service in the House has been with our able and distinguished Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler, who has now entered upon his 36th year of service in this vitally important office. Not only has this been a delightful association, he is one of my closest and dearest friends in this body.

During my terms as Speaker in the 80th and 83d Congresses, he sat at my right hand. As any Speaker, of either party would testify, if any employee of the House is an indispensable man, it is Lew Deschler. His knowledge of the rules, precedents, and procedures of the House is profound and instantaneous. During my terms as Speaker, his services were of inestimable value. It would be impossible to exaggerate the value of his services to the Speaker and to the House.

There is no more dedicated and faithful public servant in our Government than Lew Deschler. He loves this House. He is a stalwart defender of its privileges, its rules and its dignity. He has earned the everlasting admiration, esteem, and respect of the entire membership of this body for his great ability, his knowledge, and his devotion to duty.

I hope he will continue in robust health so that he may serve the House for many years to come.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join our distinguished Speaker and the majority and minority leaders in extending my congratulations and best wishes to our well beloved and dedicated Parliamentarian, Lew Deschler. At the same time I want to wish him a very happy birthday.

I am pleased to be able to join my colleagues in expressing appreciation for the counsel and advice which I have received from him over the years. I can recall numberless occasions when his assistance proved invaluable.

It is a great privilege for all of us who come to the House of Representatives to meet and know Lew Deschler. He has proven to be a great champion of this legislative body and a symbol of reverence for its traditions.

Moreover, I want to associate myself with the remarks which have been made here about Lew. These tributes are sincerely meant and keenly deserved.

We wish you, Lew, many more years of fine service in behalf of the House of Representatives, and our Nation.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a brief word of congratulations to Lew Deschler in marking the 35th anniversary of his service as House Parliamentarian.

Without question, the ability of the House to act responsibly and progressively on legislation and in fulfilling its obligations to the many diverse and geographically disparate constituencies from which its members come depend upon the rules which it adopts and follows as a legislative body. The preservation of order, decency and regularity is of the greatest importance to our democracy.

No better statement of the purpose of the rules can be found than that set forth in Jefferson's Manual, which is in the hands of all House members in an edition which is prepared and revised regularly under the careful supervision of Lew Deschler. As Lew has noted, the rules under which the House operates today are perhaps the most finely adjusted, scientifically balanced and highly technical rules of any parliamentary body in the world.

We often hear criticism and complaint about rules when they seem to be invoked to prevent haste. Yet rules are established and maintained primarily to protect the rights of minorities, while permitting the majority to work its will.

In the course of daily events, the House and its Speaker and its members must rely constantly on the word and judgment of a man who is fully familiar with this body of rules, and it is in his knowledge and experience that the solution is found for steady and regular progress, without constant wrangling and captious argument.

This is an important and sensitive role, and it is one that Lew Deschler has discharged faithfully and well over many years, earning the praise and warm regard of the House.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I venture to add a new Member's word of appreciation to the eloquent and fully merited tributes which have been paid here today to the distinguished Parliamentarian of the House, Mr. Lewis Deschler.

Many a new Member has learned early in his service here that at least a modest working knowledge of the rules and procedures of the House is essential to his comprehension of the lawmaking process and his appropriate role in it. He is heartened to find that he is not without willing assistance in this effort at self-education.

Mr. Deschler is affable, patient and, above all, rich in knowledge of form and precedent. One realizes quickly that 35 years of service have not dulled his enthusiasm for his work, or his pride in the responsibilities assigned him.

Every Member of the House, I am sure, is secure in the recognition that Mr. Deschler's counsel is available to all, and is given conscientiously, impartially and wisely.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, it is truly gratifying to praise the accomplishments of a selfless man. It doubles that satisfaction when the man who deserves and gets that praise is my friend. I add my voice to that of many others when I give just recognition to the more than 35 years of understanding service rendered to the House of Representatives by Lew Deschler.

Before I speak for anyone else, I first speak for myself. When I was new here, Lew personally helped me to avoid legislative mistakes. He increases my efficiency as the Representative of the people who send me here.

What Lew Deschler does for me, he does for every Member of the House who seeks his counsel.

This same patience and sagacity lubricate the parliamentary wheels of the full legislative body. As the years accumulate, as the influence of legislation enacted here increases around the world, as emerging nations struggle to form parliamentary systems of their own and emulate one already functioning, who but the probing historians of future years can fathom the impact this one quiet, knowledgeable man may have had on the history of his fellow men?

To paraphrase a verse from a New Testament parable, "Well done, thou good and faithful public servant."

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege to join in this well-deserved tribute to our distinguished Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler. His vast knowledge, unbelievable memory and alert mind have won him top recognition in his chosen field and every Member of the House will attest to the fair and impartial manner in which this outstanding capability is exercised. His ready smile is sincere and warm. His huge frame commands attention upon first meeting, but association soon demonstrates he possesses a heart and spirit of equal size.

Lew Deschler has seen history made during some of the most stirring periods of our Nation. His role, though great, has been little known, largely due to his quiet and unassuming manner, but those who have glimpsed him in action know how effective are his rapid fire responses as he counsels and advises. The tribute of the Speaker gives special validity to this attribute. It is my hope that Lew Deschler will continue to discharge his important service to our Nation for years to come. We congratulate him on his birthday and extend every good wish.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in all the words they have uttered in praise of our able Parliamentarian Lew Deschler. Lew was on the job when I came to Congress almost a quarter of a century ago, and I learned quickly to seek his counsel and advice, all of which proved to be good. Lew Deschler possesses that sixth sense, to see the right, and to live right during every minute of the day.

I could go on for hours, Mr. Speaker, expounding my high esteem of this great and good man, but it is simply not possible to gild the rose, neither is it possible to say anything that would add to the love and high esteem that all have who know well, my friend, Lew Deschler.

I only wish for you, Lew, many more years of service to the Members of Congress and to our beloved Nation, which you have served so well for over one-third of a century.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in a legislative body like the House of Representatives with 435 Representatives of such widely different areas and interests, the daily functioning of the House in a smooth and orderly way is a continuing tribute to its Parliamentarian.

However, on the occasion of Lew Deschler's 35th anniversary in that post, it is fitting to pay special and explicit tribute to the service he has rendered to the House and, with exemplary impartiality, to all its Members. The rules of the House are both numerous and technical. There are more than 11,000 rulings that constitute precedents for the conduct of House business. In these circumstances, the sureness with which Lew Deschler makes his judgments, represents ample evidence of his immense accumulation of knowledge and of his dedication to his work.

I should like to join many of my colleagues in congratulating our distinguished Parliamentarian on his anniversary and his birthday. I hope his highly valued service will continue so that I shall have many occasions in the future on which to renew these congratulations.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of well-deserved tribute paid to one of the best friends the House of Representatives has, Lewis Deschler. For more than 35 years he has displayed his genius as a parliamentarian. His guidance is accompanied always by wit and courtesy, and his warm good nature has endeared him to us all. Without subtracting from Lew Deschler's own outstanding talents, and with perhaps more truth than modesty, I would like to point out that he exemplifies the sort of character we from Ohio think of as typically Buckeye. In addition to having had the original good sense of being born in our great State, Lew comes from Chillicothe. As a freshman that won my heart immediately, since the Minshalls were politically active in Chillicothe for almost a century. All in all, it is hard to fault Lew Deschler, a man of enormous talent, graciousness, and dedication. Ohio is proud of him and the U.S. House of Representatives is deeply in his debt.

Mr. ALBERT. Now, Mr. Speaker, to conclude these remarks I would like leave of the House to read a letter:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 2, 1963.

Hon. LEWIS DESCHLER,
Parliamentarian, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LEW: I have learned from the Speaker that on Monday you will be honored by the Members of the House of Representatives for your long record of service to the Congress. In your parliamentary capacity over 36 years, you have played a unique and vital role in the life and work of the House of Representatives. I had an opportunity myself as a Member of Congress to know of your wise and effective influence.

With warmest best wishes.

Cordially,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the resolution was unanimously agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Communications of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

TRUTH-IN-LENDING ACT

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced the Truth-in-Lending Act. This bill, which is sponsored in the other body by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS and other Senators, requires simply that there shall be a full written disclosure of charges for credit when credit is extended to consumers.

Installment buying is a major part of our economy. Since the end of World War II consumer credit has increased more than eightfold from less than $6 billion in 1945 to more than $55 billion. Although credit buying is a large segment of consumer buying, it is often impossible for the consumer to know exactly the price he pays for an item bought on credit.

Dr. Theodore O. Yntema, vice president in charge of finance, Ford Motor Co., in testimony during the 1961 Senate hearings on automobile financing stated:

> The variety and complexity of finance and insurance arrangements and the charges for them are such as almost to defy comprehension. It is impossible for the average buyer to appraise the rates for the finance and insurance services offered, as compared with alternatives available elsewhere.

In an article written by the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO it is pointed out:

> Easy credit and the ruthless imposition of consumer debt upon the unwary have led to frightful abuse and sometimes to tragic consequence. Because of the ignorance regarding the true costs of money, lives have been needlessly scarred or even wrecked. Unless excesses are halted, the entire American business community may be discredited.

The truth-in-lending proposal spells out the disclosures, including the total amount to be financed, the amounts to be credited as downpayment and/or trade-in, which are to be made by merchants and lenders when they extend consumer credit. The information will enable the consumer to know how much is added by credit to the cost of things he buys. This legislation will aid almost every American. Economists estimate that almost every family uses some form of consumer credit at some time, and on the whole Americans spend 13 cents out of every dollar they earn for repayment of installment loans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this legislation will be acted upon favorably during this session.

TAX PROGRAM

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the Members of the House informed on the facts in connection with the President's tax proposals upon which the Ways and Means Committee is presently holding hearings, I would like to include as a part of my remarks the testimony of one of the best informed witnesses to appear on the tax question. He is Mr. Roswell Magill, of New York City, and the statement he presented to the committee this morning will appear at the end of these remarks.

I would like to emphasize that President Kennedy's tax program is contradictory to its announced objectives in four basic ways. First, the investment capital incentive is penalized because consumer purchasing power is overly stressed; second, the structural reforms defeat rate cuts; third, the timing is bad, there being no immediate stimulus as intended; and, fourth, the budget is further imbalanced through lack of expenditure control.

The testimony contained a six-point constructive tax recommendation with which I am in agreement:

First. Substantial rate reductions should be made in the individual income tax. It would be a good idea to spread these over several years.

Second. To moderate the revenue loss in individual rate reductions, the opening rate on the new scale might be set at 16 percent instead of 14 percent. This one step would eliminate the need for revenue-raising reforms and keep the total tax reduction within the level set by the President.

Third. The corporation tax rate needs to be lowered quickly, if the reduction is to have the desired effects. The simplest way to do this is to permit the Korean rate increase on corporations from 47 to 52 percent to expire on June 30, as scheduled.

Fourth. Structural reforms need not be undertaken in this bill but should be treated in a separate measure. In any case, only true reforms that would improve the structure should be considered, and not revenue-raising measures such as the reduction of allowable deductions by 5 percent of gross income, the repeal of the dividend credit, and the proposed new levy on unrealized capital gains, levied at death or transfer by gift.

Fifth. For the long run, we should work toward a top rate on the individual income tax of 50 percent. Similarly, for the long run, a much lower level of taxation of business would be desirable. To make this possible, the Congress should consider alternate business or transaction taxes in the future to provide substitute revenues and relieve the burden of taxation on profits.

Sixth. Finally, Federal expenditures should be rigorously held at least to the fiscal 1963 level, preferably to a lower level so as to insure that the budget will actually reach a balance in the near future when the good effects of the tax reduction program begin to appear.

Finally, a basic fallacy in the President's proposal, the longstanding policy on percentage depletion, is not reexamined in terms of whether the percentage allowance is too large or whether the policy is good. Admittedly the percentage depletion provisions have been effective in achieving their objectives over the past 35 years. Nevertheless, the proposal is that the basis for calculating depletion be changed in a way that would restrict severely the very activities that percentage depletion is designed to encourage.

In this constructive criticism of the President's tax proposals and the positive program offered, we have the basis for the discussion of a workable tax cut and reform program if the administration sincerely wants tax cuts and reform instead of just a political issue.

STATEMENT TO THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BY ROSWELL MAGILL, MARCH 4, 1963

The President's special message to Congress on January 24, 1963, is specifically addressed to two topics—tax reduction and tax reform. The recommendations in the message all have to do with the income tax. In general, the tax reform proposals are devised to recoup some of the revenue that would be lost if the tax reduction proposals were adopted.

The message was preceded by a number of speeches by the Secretary of the Treasury, and by the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, emphasizing that the current Federal tax structure impedes economic growth. The prescription to cure that malady was said to be a substantial reduction in taxes on business and on the upper income brackets to stimulate investment incentives and unleash venture capital. The income tax was described as a drag on the economy.

These statements, with one notable exception, repeated in substance what the business community has said for years. The business community has emphasized that the weakness of the Federal tax structure lies primarily in the fact that the U.S. Treasury is almost wholly dependent for tax revenue upon the income tax; that a reduction in the steeply progressive income-tax rates, coupled with the substitution of another form of tax to produce some of the revenue now produced by the income tax would be highly desirable.

The reforms proposed in the special message are all income tax reforms. In general, they are devised to produce additional revenue from taxpayers in the middle and upper brackets. The Secretary of the Treasury has urged in substance that the two parts of the program should be adopted together; that the price of tax reduction is the adoption of the reforms, that if the reforms, or some of them, are not adopted, then the tax reduction program must be modified, at the expense of taxpayers in the middle and the upper brackets.

1. Will the administration's tax proposals achieve these objectives? It is unfortunate, however, that the tax package proposed by the administration is not well designed in the judgment of many of us to accomplish the objectives of removing barriers to business growth. The tax reduction and tax reform proposals appear to be contradictory. They contain conflicts both in purposes and ideas which tend to neutralize each other and thus to cancel out the good effects we seek. May I refer specifically to four of these conflicts.

2. The first contradiction is in the economic thrust of the entire program. The tax reductions proposed by themselves would be a constructive reform in our present income tax. The new scale of rates suggested for individuals—14 to 65 percent—represents an across-the-board reduction ranging from about 28 percent at the lowest income bracket to something over 20 percent at the highest and averaging about 23 percent. Such a reduction in rates has long been advocated by all who believe a lower tax burden is imperative.

Moreover, this proposal would be an excellent first step toward a long-range permanent income tax scale. Ultimately the top rate of the individual income tax should be brought down to 50 percent on the principle that a taxpayer's interest in earning a dollar of additional income should at least equal the Government's.

The administration has coupled these rate reductions with a series of revenue-raising measures labeled "tax reforms" which completely transform the proposed tax cuts. The tax liabilities are reduced by 40 percent at the lowest bracket, by 29 percent in the $3,000-to-$5,000 income bracket, and by only 9 percent in the $50,000-and-over bracket. Minimizing tax reductions in the middle and upper income brackets while concentrating the tax relief in the lowest brackets, is justified by the proponents on the theory that what the economy needs is more consumer spending. While the President and Dr. Heller recognize the need to expand investment opportunities, the tax relief proposed is overbalanced in favor of more consumption spending.

Similarly, the proposal to lower the corporation tax is a first step in what I believe should be a most important long-range goal, namely to lower the level of business taxation. Profit margins would be increased and more earnings freed for business expansion. Lowering the corporate tax rate would be a fundamental step toward stimulating larger capital investment and furthering job opportunities and economic growth. But of the total $10 billion reduction in tax liabilities in these proposals, less than one-fourth applies to corporations.

Moreover, the proposed rate reduction is coupled with a proposal to speed up corporation tax payments and 5 years will elapse before corporation tax payments are lower by the full extent of the 5 percentage point tax cut. The 5-percent cut in the corporate rate would still leave the corporation tax substantially higher than in the pre-Korean war years.

Less than a year ago, Secretary Dillon, arguing for the investment credit before the

Senate Finance Committee, said: "Some critics of the investment credit have suggested that we should approach the problem of increasing investment through tax changes by giving first priority to measures designed to add to consumer demand. We cannot be content merely with the level of capital formation that will result from response to increased consumer demand. The American economy now is in much need of modernization of its capital equipment which, in the technological environment of the 1960's, requires an increase in the ratio of capital to output. One of the important means of achieving a higher rate of economic growth lies precisely in increasing this ratio, and a direct approach to investment incentives is needed to accomplish this." Apparently, although the diagnosis remains unchanged, the remedy prescribed has now been reversed and the emphasis placed on increased consumer spending.

This confusion in the economic purposes of the tax program can give investors and businessmen, both large and small, little confidence in the administration's stated intentions to remove the barriers to investment.

3. Structural reforms versus revenue needs: A second conflict of aims is evident in the approach to reform of the tax structure. We can all agree that the tax system needs to be reconstructed in the interests of equity, simplicity, and better balance. The Federal tax structure for many years has placed too great a reliance on the income tax. Further, the system is tremendously and I believe needlessly complex. In recent years, many accusations have been leveled against it on the grounds of equity. Granted that structural reforms are needed, do the administration's proposals represent a good way to go about it? In my judgment, they do not.

Certainly, the proposed change in the taxation of capital gains to include in income a smaller percentage of long-term gains is a step in the right direction since it will serve the main purpose of encouraging investment. The same endorsement can be given to the proposals to limit the surtax exemptions of affiliated corporate groups and at the same time repeal the tax on consolidated returns. Some of the proposed changes in definitions of capital gains are desirable to offset abuses which have arisen in attempts to bring ordinary income under capital gains treatment. Some are not so desirable. For example, I question whether the change in the treatment of timber sales is a move in the right direction. A crop of timber requires many years for development. It is subject to many natural hazards. Congress adopted section 631 in the code after careful study to serve public interests; in this case to tax timber sales in a way which would encourage wise forest management. The provisions seem to have served their purpose well. What assurance do we have that the adoption of the proposed substitute treatment would achieve an equally good result?

The major base broadening and equity provisions, so-called, are not reforms at all but, as the Secretary admitted in his testimony to this committee, merely revenue-raising measures, attempts to recover some of the revenue lost through tax reductions. They strike with particular inequity at the middle and upper income brackets and wash out a substantial part of the tax relief granted by rate reductions.

When the Congress sets out to change the tax structure in the interests of equity and simplicity, it will certainly want to examine each of the deductions in order to arrive at the best possible policy decisions. But the proposed reduction in deductions by an amount equaling 5 percent of the taxpayer's gross income does not attack these deductions as loopholes or inequities; it leaves them in the structure without reference to whether they are good or bad. The so-called 5-percent floor under deductions is proposed simply to produce $2.3 billion of additional revenue by denying in part deductions many of which have been in the income tax law for 50 years and which have long been recognized as fair and reasonable.

Similarly, the proposed tax on gains accrued at time of gift or death is a straightforward revenue-raising measure, involving in this instance a further problem of constitutionality. The proposed repeal of the dividend credit and exclusion moves in exactly the opposite direction from the policy carefully and determined by the Congress to be correct, namely that there should be some relief, however minimal, for the double taxation of dividend income.

The longstanding policy on percentage depletion is not reexamined in terms of whether the percentage allowance is too large or whether the policy is good. Admittedly the percentage depletion provisions have been effective in achieving their objectives over the past 35 years. Nevertheless, the proposal is that the basis for calculating depletion be changed in a way that would restrict severely the very activities that percentage depletion is designed to encourage.

In sum, these structural reforms would steepen the progression of the individual income tax, add a new layer of complex restrictions and requirements on top of existing complexities, free some groups of taxpayers from any tax, and limit tax relief in the middle and higher income brackets. Such measures cannot be termed "reforms" of the tax structure. They work against what should be our objectives for improving the system.

4. The third conflict is between short-term and long-run goals. In presenting his program, the President stressed the need to make long-range tax changes which will get the economy off the plateau on which it has rested for the past 5 years. To this end, he is willing to gamble increased deficits in the next few years to achieve more rapid economic growth and a balanced budget later. But the timing of the program is such that it cannot fully achieve either the stimulating or the capital expansion effects which are claimed for it.

If stimulation of the economy through more consumer spending is desired (and we must remember that only 6 months ago Dr. Heller was preaching the need for an immediate massive tax reduction not tied to any reforms), then what stimulation can we expect from rate reductions for individuals which will total only $2.7 billion in 1963? Will these sufficiently offset the $2 billion increase in social security taxes this year? Will they offset the expected rise of $1.5 billion in State and local taxes this year? Will they offset the rise in State income taxes which will be the natural consequence of changes in the Federal tax base and Federal taxable income next year?

In the case of corporations, the effect of the acceleration of payments is to increase corporate tax payments in fiscal 1964 and fiscal 1965. Not until fiscal 1966 will corporate tax payments decrease and then by only $1 billion, less than 5 percent of corporate tax payments; and not until 1969 will the benefits from the five-point reduction leave $2½ billion with corporations for expansion purposes.

Revenue reasons may dictate that tax reduction of the kind proposed should be spaced out over several years. But there must be some substantial effects immediately if we wish to start the economy moving at a more rapid pace. The result of phasing out the tax changes in this combination program will produce only a very modest increase in consumer purchasing power this year and next. It will produce practically no stimulus to increased savings, to investment incentives and to capital expansion for several years to come.

5. Will this program help balance the budget? Finally a conflict arises in the great gamble that increased deficits for the next few years will generate much larger revenues some years later. Why do we pay taxes at all? The obvious answer is that we pay taxes in order to meet Government expenditures. Tax revenues have not been high enough in recent years to keep up with rapidly increasing spending. Can we hope that the present program will change that situation?

Government expenditures have been rising rapidly year after year. This year's budget is $6.5 billion higher than last year's, and that in turn was $6.3 billion higher than the year before. Now an increase of $4.5 billion is proposed for 1964. The deficits for the 4 fiscal years 1961 to 1964 will total over $30 billion. In each year the requests for new obligational authority have exceeded expenditures. In the 1964 budget, new obligational authority exceeds proposed expenditures by $9 billion. These are built-in increases for future spending.

In addition, the President has sent the Congress a whole series of messages suggesting new programs, all with modest beginnings but requiring heavier outlays in the future. While the President has stated that attempts are being made to hold down nonmilitary spending, what confidence can we have in a future budget balance unless expenditures are brought under better control than heretofore? If the budget continues to rise at the rate that it has in recent years, will even these tax cuts, assuming that they have all the stimulting effects with which the administration endows them, succeed in generating sufficient revenues to catch up with the budget? It seems unlikely.

The only assurance we can have that the increased deficits due to the adoption of this tax program would ever be wiped out, would be a strong effort to bring expenditures under control. A first step would be to hold expenditures at the current year's (1963) level, and preferably at some lower level. This should be coupled with determined and vigorous action to reverse the trend of rising Federal expenditures and establish a stronger relationship between taxing and spending.

Secretary Dillon has argued that without the structural reforms the deficit would be too large. In that case it would be better to discard the reforms and make more modest cuts in taxes. In this connection it is well to observe that even a small change in the opening rate—applicable to 85 percent of all taxable income—would make unnecessary the adoption of the proposed revenue-raising reforms. For example, a scale ranging from 15 percent or 16 percent to 65 percent would produce between $2 and $4 billion more revenue than the 14 percent to 65 percent scale proposed, and would probably be just as effective in increasing investment incentives.

To summarize: There is a great need for a substantial income tax reduction both for individuals and for corporations. In view of the current and prospective deficits, it is probably wise to spread reductions over several years and accompany them by substantial cuts in expenditures. The goals sought by the President are important and ones which we can all endorse. We regret that it is unlikely that the tax package proposed by the administration will achieve these goals because it is a mixture of contradictory and often conflicting recommendations. The economic goal seems to be a stimulus to consumption spending whereas the need is to encourage greater investment. The program is a mixture of reductions and reforms, but the latter are principally revenue-raising measures which erode the purpose of free investment capital and would not improve the structure of the income tax. The timing of the proposals is a conflict between short- and long-term aims, with insufficient emphasis on what should be the primary goal, greater productivity and more jobs. Finally, the deliberate choice of larger deficits for the next few years is too risky when not coupled with better restraint and control over spending. It does not instill confidence that budget balance will result within the foreseeable future.

6. What kind of a program is needed?

I am convinced that major and permanent tax cuts at this time would be desirable. Several elements in the President's program move taxes in directions which in my opinion are sound. Others are not geared to the main goal of stepping up the flow of venture capital to productive enterprise.

The President has urged his critics to submit recommendations of their own. My recommendation to this committee is that it modify the President's program along the following lines:

(a) Substantial rate reductions should be made in the individual income tax. It would be a good idea to spread these over several years.

(b) To moderate the revenue loss in individual rate reductions, the opening rate on the new scale might be set at 16 percent instead of 14 percent. This one step would eliminate the need for revenue-raising reforms and keep the total tax reduction within the level set by the President.

(c) The corporation tax rate needs to be lowered quickly, if the reduction is to have the desired effects. The simplest way to do this is to permit the Korean rate increase on corporations from 47 percent to 52 percent to expire on June 30 as scheduled.

(b) Structural reforms need not be undertaken in this bill but should be treated in a separate measure. In any case, only true reforms that would improve the structure should be considered, and not revenue-raising measures such as the reduction of allowable deductions by 5 percent of gross income, the repeal of the dividend credit, and the proposed new levy on unrealized capital gains, levied at death or transfer by gift.

(e) For the long run, we should work toward a top rate on the individual income tax of 50 percent. Similarly, for the long run, a much lower level of taxation of business would be desirable. To make this possible, the Congress should consider alternate business or transaction taxes in the future to provide substitute revenues and relieve the burden of taxation on profits.

(f) Finally, Federal expenditures should be rigorously held at least to the fiscal 1963 level, preferably to a lower level so as to insure that the budget will actually reach a balance in the near future when the good effects of the tax reduction program begin to appear.

These tax changes would have the virtue of concentrating on the primary goal, to step up business and jobs. They should be accompanied by expenditure reductions and controls to minimize the risks of inflation and a further weakening of the dollar which a continued series of unbalanced budgets might otherwise entail. Such a program of expenditure control and tax reduction would have a strong stimulative effect on investment incentives and on corporate expansion programs. Tax burdens on individuals would be lowered substantially to encourage more consumer spending. The program would considerably lighten the tax burden on the vast majority of taxpayers in the lower income brackets. Further it would insure the accumulation of savings to permit greater investment, business growth, and more jobs.

We are in reasonable agreement with the administration on the aims and purposes of tax rate reduction. Our disagreement centers on the question whether the so-called reforms proposed by the President and the Secretary will not defeat the main purposes on which we are agreed. In such a case, the part of wisdom would seem to be to push forward on the tax rate reduction program, to give the economy needed stimulation; and to subject the so-called reforms to further study.

The Nation simply cannot afford the archaic tax system that now saddles its people and its productive facilities. This committee's task is a formidable one, but I hope it will be able to seize this great opportunity for fundamental change and make a lasting contribution to America's future strength.

IDAHO TERRITORIAL CENTENNIAL

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, Idahoans today celebrate their State's territorial centennial. The establishment of the Idaho Territory on March 4, 1863, came during tumultuous times, for our Nation was still in the midst of civil conflict.

The name "Idaho" is a derivation of the Indian word, "Ee-da-how," which means "Light on the Mountain." The country was first seen by white men when Lewis and Clark crossed the Continental Divide from what is now Montana and came down the Clearwater River through north-central Idaho. This identical historic route can now be traveled on the new Lewis and Clark Highway which crosses the midsection of the State through the Bitteroot Mountain Range to Lewiston.

Fur trappers and traders followed in the early 1800's. Many of the names of lakes, streams, and towns reflect the influence of early French-Canadian trappers and missionaries.

Gold, first discovered at Pierce, Idaho, in the fall of 1860, brought the next influx of white men. The discovery of this important metal greatly influenced the creation of the Idaho Territory when it became apparent that the stampede for gold would sufficiently change the distribution of population and threaten the control of the Washington Territorial legislature.

Idaho's central primitive area, penetrated by the Salmon River and its tributaries, remains today as formidable as it was when Lewis and Clark skirted its vertical canyons on their way west. The explorers heeded the Indians advice against attempting to navigate the Salmon, known as the River of No Return. The mighty Snake River, another important waterway, has carved the deepest gorge in North America, which you well know as Hells Canyon.

Throughout the year, Idahoans will celebrate this momentous occasion in the State's history. Displays, pageants, balls, and other programs will remind the people of their rich heritage. At Caldwell, Idaho, for instance, the citizens are planning to run a stagecoach from that progressive city to what remains of the once flourishing mining town of Silver City. Last Saturday at Boise, Idaho's colors of blue, silver, and gold were used for the centennial ball sponsored by the Sons and Daughters of Idaho Pioneers. In our State capitol, a group of Idaho oldtime fiddlers serenaded the legislators with an old-fashioned hoedown.

Events such as these will be presented in many fashions in communities, both large and small, throughout the Gem State. I wish to extend a cordial invitation to my fellow colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives to visit Idaho in 1963 and become a part of our territorial centennial celebration.

IDAHO TERRITORIAL CENTENNIAL

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, March 3 marks an important date in Idaho history books. It was on March 3 exactly 100 years ago that President Abraham Lincoln approved the Organic Act to establish and govern the Idaho Territory.

The act created a princely domain covering 325,000 square miles which was carved out of the Washington, Dakota, and Nebraska territories. It encompassed the area now approximately occupied by Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming and exceeded in area the present State of Texas by over 60,000 square miles.

The name, Idaho which freely translated means "Gem of the Mountains" or literally translated, "Behold, the sun coming down the mountain," was selected in preference to all other suggested names by U.S. Senator Henry Wilson of Massachusetts, who later became the Vice President of this great Nation.

During the past hundred years Idaho has had an illustrious and fascinating history. Today it is the home of the world famous Idaho potato but produces equally as good beef cattle, wheat, and many other products of the soil.

Idaho primarily is an agricultural State, on the threshold of industrial development and is a sportsman's paradise. The State has a great number of beautiful crystal clear streams and rivers which are well known the world over as outstanding fishing haunts, including Silver Creek. This creek has been described as the best fly fishing stream in America. Then there is the Salmon River which produces great numbers of salmon and steelhead to the fresh water angler annually and the Snake River which is famous as a trout stream throughout the West.

In addition, the lakes of northern Idaho are famous for their large trout. The State also has some of the finest hunting grounds in the continental United States with elk, moose, mountain sheep and goats, bear, and deer among the wild game that is hunted in the mountains of Idaho.

The snows of the fall turn a hiker's paradise into beautiful ski slopes with probably Sun Valley the best known of the ski areas in the State and the Nation as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent this great State that has so many natural beauties—the majestic mountains, crystal clear streams, wild game, fighting fish—and some of the finest people found anywhere in the world. Most of them are the descendants of pioneers who helped to carve the State from the territory that was created 100 years ago. As a result of their pioneering heritage, they retain their independence, their self-reliance and their friendliness.

I am sure that Americans everywhere would enjoy spending a few weeks in Idaho, but this year when all Idaho will be celebrating its territorial centennial there will be a special welcome to all visitors. I join with Idahoans everywhere in saying, "Come to Idaho, the Gem of the Mountains, partake of our hunting and fishing, our hospitality and help us celebrate our territorial centennial."

U.N. AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING FOR CUBA

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues, are well acquainted with the term "pilot" project. We seem to be getting news of a good many pilot projects these days.

The Kennedy's Federal service corps for youth is a going thing under a pilot organization without any congressional authorization.

Many spending proposals are squeezed through this Congress as small experimental or pilot plans, only to balloon to gigantic proportions in later years.

And the United Nations is active in pilot projects, also. A number of these are in Communist nations both under and outside of the much-lamented Special Fund.

It is a United Nations pilot project in a Red nation which brings me before the House today.

An airplane pilot project.

Gentlemen, it is with deep regret and dismay that I inform the House that the taxpayers of America, through their subsidization of the United Nations, are scheduled to pay to teach Communist Cubans to learn to fly airplanes. Indeed, we already have paid, so that Cubans and Yugoslavs could learn about aircraft operations and maintenance.

In a small project, probably designed to get a U.N. boot in the door, the United Nations through its International Civil Aviation Organization has programed a $17,280 grant to Castro Cuba that not only could send 12 Cuban officials to flying school, but also could instruct them in meteorology, air traffic control, and maintenance of radios, aircraft, and engines.

Just as in its plan to give agricultural aid to Cuba, the United Nations once again is working in direct opposition to whatever foreign policy we should have in the United States, and against the best interests of the Latin American Republics. Yet, it is only with the continued massive financial support of the American taxpayers that the United Nations is able to remain solvent. Here again is that 40 percent we contribute to the Special Fund.

Under the proposed U.N. project the Cuban officials would be trained at the Mexico City Training Center of the International Civil Aviation Organization. That school—which came under Special Fund support in July 1961—trained some 300 students from Latin America in the 1961–62 period.

It teaches meteorology, air traffic control, radio, aircraft and engine maintenance, and flight operations. The aircraft used in training are the Piper Apache, Cessna 172, DC–3 and Hiller helicopter.

May I point out to this House that as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am well aware of the uses of these aircraft in military operations, and it matters not to their military effectiveness whether the pilots and mechanics and air controllers were trained on planes configured for civilian operations. The Piper, Cessna and Hiller models are light aircraft that can be used for battlefield transport, for observation and for artillery fire direction, as our advisers in South Vietnam have so well proved. The old-faithful DC–3, of course, can and has done dozens of military jobs in past years including cargo and troop transport operations and the dropping of paratroops.

Need I point out to this House that just a few weeks ago two airplanes from Cuba fired upon an unarmed American shrimp boat?

Can there be any question but that training of Castro Cubans in flying operations does benefit Cuba in a military sense?

Who will say that a Cuban trained in air traffic control, in interpretation and prediction of the weather, in aircraft engine repair, or in radio maintenance will not be a valuable addition as a trooper and as an instructor in Fidel Castro's Red armed force, which if it never attacks the United States is already—today—attacking in a bits-and-pieces assault, the nations of Latin America?

The United Nations has seen fit to help Castro do this.

The Latin American nations have not yet protested, perhaps due to our faulting leadership.

The American taxpayers are to help pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, this cannot be allowed to continue. This still is a small program. But the principle is intolerable to Americans. We will not, we must not, pay to train our enemies.

In the period 1961–62 this same program was operated on a smaller scale by the United Nations. Training of six Cubans was programed at that time. Luckily for the United States only a small portion of the granted money was spent, and the U.S. State Department feels that few, if any, Cubans already have benefited from the program.

But we may not be so lucky in the 1963–64 period. Castro is not stupid enough to turn down a chance to train key young men in aircraft techniques that lend themselves well to his guerrilla operations in Latin America—and all for free.

The U.S.S.R., as we know, runs Cuba. Russia must be getting a big kick out of the things communism is getting Americans to pay for, under the United Nations.

I also find that Communist Yugoslavia—which seems to get continuing preferential treatment from the U.N., and from our own State Department, was provided under the ICAO program in 1961–62 three aircraft maintenance instructors and one pilot instructor.

What these U.N. instructors did in Yugoslavia is revealed by this quotation from the 1962 annual report of the ICAO to the U.N. General Assembly:

> They spent 2 months in Yugoslavia early in the year to assist in setting up maintenance procedures for the aircraft of Soviet manufacture operated by the national airline and in the selection of personnel to undergo further rtaining in the U.S.S.R. * * *"

Now, I ask my colleagues, does that sound like the State Department's goal—wooing Yugoslavia away from Russian communism—is being served by this "second foreign policy" of ours administered by the United Nations?

It seems decidedly not.

And once again the name of Ghana crops up as that leftist leaning nation comes in for more U.N. aid at the expense of American taxpayers. That nation received in 1961 two air traffic service experts from ICAO. Ghana also was favored with helpers from the U.N. in the fields of "airworthiness procedures," and teletype maintenance.

Yugoslavia also came in for additional aid in the form of fellowships that enable students to train in civil air law, meteorology, airport engineering, radar, airworthiness, airport design, airline accounting, airport management, civil aviation administration, radio engineering and telecommunications. Some of this training by the U.N. was conducted in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, American taxpayers do not object to the general goals of the International Civil Aviation Organization. We are glad to help our sister republics in this hemisphere in development of air technicians—to the extent that our deficit budget will permit.

But this hemisphere has isolated Cuba.

Cuba has admitted an ideology alien to this free hemisphere.

American taxpayers are under no obligation to help the bearded and loudmouthed Cuban dictator and his boss from the U.S.S.R. who keeps reminding us that the Communist aim is to bury us.

Many of the Members of this House have risen here to attack the Special Fund of the United Nations. Now we must turn our vigilance to the entire United Nations program. For this "pilot" project in Cuba is partly under the Special Fund and partly under the United Nations' Expanded Program of Technical Assistance.

Unfortunately, this is not the only case of United Nations aid to Red Cuba. My

continuing investigation of this sorry situation has brought to light other instances of aid about which I will advise the House as final documentation of the programs is gathered.

Distribution of ICAO expenditures under the expanded program by regions and states

[In U.S. dollars]

	1961	1960	1959
Africa:			
Congo	8,000	....	....
Ethiopia	98,336	106,379	84,103
Ghana	1,973	....	....
Guinea	3,608	14,847	9,125
Liberia	11,865	2,841	....
Mali	6,942	....	....
Morocco	21,272	23,357	6,432
Senegal	11,200	....	....
Sudan	....	....	7
Tanganyika	3,980	....	....
Togo	19,863	....	....
Tunisia	22,464	24,734	36,451
Subtotal	209,503	172,158	136,118
Asia and the Far East:			
Burma	2,350	1,900	11,095
Cambodia	16,181	19,740	18,550
China (Taiwan)	....	....	9,111
India	36,960	27,176	52,087
Indonesia	120,266	111,629	115,020
Japan	3,534	8,546	7,564
Korea, Republic of	....	4,600	9,705
Nepal	9,143	....	....
Pakistan	....	2,049	22,014
Philippines	19,118	37,637	49,271
Thailand	....	43,607	32,870
Subtotal	207,552	256,884	327,287
Europe:			
Greece	....	25,998	44,961
Yugoslavia	11,065	15,221	4,600
Subtotal	11,065	41,219	49,561
Latin America:			
Argentina	16,831	16,867	16,387
Bolivia	15,049	9,428	4,476
Brazil	4,000	....	....
British Honduras	342	2,220	2,352
Chile	20,092	6,392	....
Colombia	....	7,200	7,732
Costa Rica	18,108	600	4,800
Cuba	1,152	3,250	5,038
Dominican Republic	....	....	1,200
Ecuador	15,107	13,115	16,237
El Salvador	17,009	15,586	10,851
Guatemala	30,151	41,689	48,936
Haiti	17,512	12,399	....
Honduras	28,239	3,517	6,302
Nicaragua	360	3,000	2,972
Panama	6,653	....	5,600
Paraguay	33,776	31,974	38,115
Peru	41,912	36,967	34,154
Venezuela	3,581	13,907	7,858
West Indies Federation	1,604	....	....
Central America Air Navigation Services Corp	5,615	20,599	11,999
Regional Latin America (Training Centre, Mexico City)	60,426	90,471	73,894
Subtotal	337,519	329,181	298,933
Middle East:			
Afghanistan	102,006	65,600	87,672
Iran	111,718	117,448	118,998
Iraq	64,498	52,171	32,207
Israel	2,228	14,734	34,743
Jordan	34,887	25,871	3,121
Lebanon	56,211	48,849	75,308
Saudi Arabia	47,461	19,724	13,012
Syrian Arab Republic	50,159	49,722	48,663
United Arab Republic	38,476	47,376	48,864
Seminars on Forecasting	35,346	....	....
Regional projects:			
Firefighting	14,645	....	....
Flight safety	43,945	28,520	43,422
Frequency	26,522	9,724	16,181
Teletype maintenance	21,649	8,007	....
Subtotal	649,751	487,746	522,191
Total for projects	1,415,390	1,287,188	1,334,090
Administrative costs	197,535	184,122	179,064
Exchange losses	....	12,447	15,583
Grand total	1,612,925	1,483,757	1,528,737

SIXTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN ROADBUILDERS' CONVENTION

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, during the last week in February the American Roadbuilders' Association held its 61st annual convention at the Palmer House Hotel in Chicago, Ill. One of the main speakers at the convention was the Honorable WILLIAM C. CRAMER, who is the ranking minority member of both the Subcommittee on Roads and the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program.

Congressman CRAMER's remarks were informative and challenging, and I was particularly interested in his comments concerning toll traps on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. I am informed that at the present time the Illinois State Toll Highway Commission is seeking to direct Interstate Route 80 through collection gates on 8 miles of toll road near Chicago.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include here the full text of Congressman CRAMER's speech for the benefit of my colleagues who share my interest in the Federal-aid highway program.

The speech follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM C. CRAMER AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ROAD BUILDERS' ASSOCIATION AT CHICAGO, ILL.

Two years ago, at the beginning of the 87th Congress, the problems confronting the highway program were grave, difficult, and, in some cases, highly controversial. The problems were largely financial. It had become obvious that the receipts of the highway trust fund would not be sufficient to continue the Federal-aid highway program on an orderly basis under existing and anticipated authorizations. Furthermore, the latest estimates of the cost of completing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways made it clear that additional Federal funds would have to be provided in order to complete the Interstate System as originally planned.

In a fine display of bipartisan effort, which has become traditional in Federal-aid highway legislation, the 87th Congress enacted the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1961 and 1962, which provided solutions to most of the financial problems, continued the highway program on an orderly basis, and added certain modifications and revisions to the Federal-aid highway laws.

Fortunately, the 88th Congress is not confronted with these difficult and controversial financial problems. It is still too early in the first session of this Congress to make a detailed analysis of the proposed legislation which will be considered. But it is a certainty that many bills affecting the Federal-aid highway program will be introduced, considered, and possibly enacted by the 88th Congress.

Today, I want to discuss three matters which certainly will be considered by the 88th Congress and which I believe are of the greatest importance. First, the geometric standards for the construction of interstate highways. Second, the extent to which toll roads—toll traps—are being inserted into the supposedly toll-free Interstate Highway System. Third, the occurrence of fraud, dishonesty, and incompetence in the highway program.

When the Interstate Highway program was started in 1956, we visualized a complete nationwide system of highways, adequate to accommodate the traffic anticipated for years in the future. Too often, in the past, had highways become congested and overloaded shortly after their construction simply because the volume of traffic which would use the highway had been badly underestimated. Determined to avoid this, the Congress required that the Interstate System be constructed to standards adequate to accommodate the types and volumes of traffic forecast for the year 1975. At the time this provision of law was enacted, in 1956, it seemed that this 19-year anticipated use period was a reasonable, perhaps even a generous provision.

However, the Bureau of Public Roads has interpreted this as a limiting factor on the design of interstate highways. The law has been interpreted to mean that interstate funds can be expended to build a highway which will accommodate traffic forecast for 1975, but cannot be expended for additional lanes and other facilities to handle the additional traffic which is expected to develop in later years. In other words, the traffic volume forecast in 1963 for 1975, a spread of 12 years, is used for interstate highway design purposes, even though it may be known that the traffic which will develop by 1980, a spread of 17 years, will require a larger facility.

It is generally accepted that fairly accurate traffic forecasts can be made for approximately 20 years in the future. Such forecasts are frequently used as the basis for designing primary and secondary highways. However, on interstate highways, the design is based on traffic forecasts for the year 1975—now only 12 years away. The Interstate and Defense Highway System, which was supposed to be of unquestioned adequacy, is being designed on the basis of less advanced traffic forecasts than many of our less important highways.

This can lead to very undesirable and uneconomical results. Suppose that traffic forecasts as of 1963 indicate that a four-lane highway will handle the traffic anticipated for 1975, but that a six-lane highway will be needed by 1980. Obviously, the economical thing to do is to build four lanes now, but make provision for two additional lanes in the future. Rights of way adequate to accommodate six lanes should be purchased. Interchanges, bridges and separation structures, and drainage facilities should be constructed to six lanes, or so designed and constructed that they can be easily and economically widened in the future.

However, as the present law has been interpreted, Federal-aid interstate highway funds cannot be used to provide for these future needs. And, in many cases, the States lack the necessary funds to pay the additional cost. The result is that some interstate highways may be built with the knowledge that within a very short time expensive and uneconomical projects will have to be undertaken to expand the facility and the adequacy of the project for future use is limited to 12 years, a period that decreases as each year passes between now and 1975.

This problem was not critical in 1956. At the present time, 1963, it has become quite critical. And as time goes on, it will be more and more serious. As the law is now interpreted, in 1972 interstate highways will be designed to accommodate traffic forecast for only 3 years in the future.

It seems obvious that something should be done to solve this problem but quite frankly, I am not sure just what the solution is. One proposed answer is to simply change the law to require interstate highways to be designed to accommodate traffic forecast for 20 years after the date of construction. However, this deceptively simple solution has some very troublesome aspects. Many miles of Interstate highways have been already built to 1975 standards, and most of this mileage is in States which have advanced the program most diligently. To amend the law now so as to permit the construction of interstate highways to higher standards would be to penalize the more advanced States, and give inequitable benefits to those States which have lagged. Providing additional funds to assist the advanced States to improve the earlier interstate highways would create difficult financial problems.

Whatever may be the best solution, it is essential that the Congress take early action. We are now only 10 years away from the end of the program, and every day that goes by makes the problem more serious.

Secondly, since 1921, Federal law has required that all highways constructed with the aid of Federal funds be free of tolls of all kinds with certain exceptions in the case of toll bridges and tunnels. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, which provided for construction of the Interstate System with Federal funds paying 90 percent of its cost, authorized the Secretary of Commerce to approve, as part of the Interstate System, toll roads which meet the geometric and construction standards adopted for that system. This provision was designed to avoid the economic waste that could result if toll-free highways were constructed to duplicate the service provided by toll roads. I believe this provision has been distorted and abused.

Since 1956, more than 2,200 miles of toll roads in 17 States have been approved as parts of the Interstate System. Some other States are even now constructing or contemplating the construction of additional toll road sections of the Interstate System, which were not planned as toll roads in 1956.

In my opinion, the legislative history indicates that the Congress intended the provisions of the 1956 act to apply only to toll roads then in operation, under construction or authorized, and not to authorize the future substitution of newly conceived toll roads for toll free highways on the Interstate System. The unrestrained placing of unjustified toll traps on the Interstate System is not, in my opinion, either in the public interest nor in accord with the intent of the Congress.

Let us examine the effects of inserting toll sections into the generally toll-free Interstate System.

I mentioned that more than 2,200 miles of toll roads have been approved as part of the Interstate System, most of them planned or in existence when the 1956 act was passed. This is a little more than 5 percent of the total 41,000 mile system. However, these 2,200 miles obviously have been placed in the most heavily traveled traffic corridors, and thus affect a much greater percentage of Interstate System traffic. And, although Federal funds do not participate in the cost of constructing toll roads, Federal funds do participate in the cost of constructing the highways which funnel interstate highway traffic into these facilities, and when this is the planned purpose, they become toll traps.

Now, we are concerned with future toll traps. Now the costs of toll road travel to the individual motorist becomes relevant in considering these new toll traps. Obviously, he must pay twice: once in highway user taxes, and once in tolls. But what does this mean in cold, hard dollars? The Bureau of Public Roads has calculated that the cost per mile of operating a fairly typical 4-door sedan is about 10 cents per mile, of which State and Federal highway user taxes comprise about 1.17 cents. These taxes are paid whether the motorist is traveling on a toll road or a toll-free highway. Toll charges on the major toll roads range from about 1.09 cents per mile on the Pennsylvania East-West Turnpike, to 2.25 cents per mile on the West Virginia Turnpike. The latter, incidentally, is scheduled for future integration into the Interstate System. For the average motorist driving, let's say, 100 miles, these figures mean this: On a toll-free highway, the motorist will pay $1.17 in highway user taxes. On the Pennsylvania East-West Turnpike he will pay the same $1.17 plus $1.09 in tolls—a total of $2.26 for the same distance. On the West Virginia Turnpike he will pay $1.17 in highway user taxes plus $2.25 in tolls, or a total of $3.42, or nearly three times as much as on a toll-free highway, for a 100-mile trip.

Let us view this from a different standpoint. As you know, the Federal tax on gasoline is 4 cents per gallon, while the average State tax is about 6 cents per gallon—a total of roughly 10 cents per gallon. The toll charge on the Pennsylvania East-West Turnpike, the lowest on any major toll road in the country, is equivalent to an additional gasoline tax of approximately 16 cents per gallon, computed on the basis of a typical passenger car traveling 15 miles per gallon of gasoline. On the West Virginia Turnpike, to be integrated into the interstate system after juggling the interstate routes to accomplish this, the toll charge is equivalent to an additional gasoline tax of about 33.7 cents per gallon for the same type of vehicle.

Now, how about the relevant comparative cost of constructing toll roads as compared to free roads. Ordinarily toll facilities are financed through the issuance of revenue bonds. Of all methods of financing highway construction, revenue bonds for toll facilities are the most expensive. The Chesapeake Bay bridge-tunnel facility near Norfolk, Va., will cost about $139 million to build. But the users of this toll facility will have to pay an added $345 million in interest and financing costs—a total of $484 million for a facility which will be constructed for less than one-third that amount. In my own State of Florida, a proposed extension of the Sunshine State Parkway will cost $76.4 million to build. But financing costs bring the total bill to $169.5 million.

I fail to see any real justification for assuming such exorbitant additional costs for toll traps that could be financed as free roads on the Interstate System, after all, in 1960, the States certified to the Congress that they could finish the system as free roads if Congress provided the money—which Congress did. Federal funds are thus available to pay 90 percent of the cost of toll-free Interstate Highways.

It has been stated by some as a justification for toll traps that Federal funds are not apportioned rapidly enough to permit the early construction of badly needed Interstate Highway facilities, and in order to provide a highway now rather than several years in the future, toll revenue financing is necessary. This is not very convincing. Many States, faced with a shortage of highway funds, have constructed toll-free highways with the proceeds of general obligation anticipation of revenue bonds at a much lower cost than would have resulted from revenue-bond-financed toll roads. This anticipated financing is provided for under section 122 of title 23 of the U.S. Code. These bonds are paid for out of future funds due and anticipated. The Bureau of Public Roads has published figures concerning the bond financing programs of five States which issued both revenue bonds and general or limited obligation bonds for highway purposes. These figures show that savings of from 65 to 78 percent of financing costs were realized when general or limited obligation bonds were issued rather than revenue bonds.

Perhaps even more important than cost to the public and to the individual motorist is the effect of toll roads on the construction of other highways in the area. Highway officials are reluctant to construct highways which might divert traffic from a toll road and thus reduce its revenues and often overemphasize feeder roads serving toll roads, giving them priority treatment and neglecting other needed highways. The Bureau of Public Roads has adopted the official policy that it will not permit Federal-aid interstate funds to participate in the construction of a highway which will compete with and thus jeopardize the financial security of a toll road.

In my own State of Florida, the State road department has agreed to defer needed highway improvements even in the Cape Canaveral area in order to channel traffic into the Sunshine State Parkway. It announced that its official policy was to construct and improve all roads in the State:

"Except when the construction of any competing highway, or the improvement of any existing highway paralleling any portion of the existing parkway or of the aforesaid extension, in the same traffic corridor, would reduce the driving time or improve the convenience to such an extent that through traffic which might otherwise use the parkway or the aforesaid extension would be substantially diverted therefrom."

One additional aspect of this matter must be mentioned. Federal funds cannot participate in the cost of toll roads. However, they can and are used in the cost of constructing highways which funnel traffic into toll roads. This has led to the insertion of far too many toll traps into our supposedly toll-free Federal-aid Interstate Highway System. For just one example, the New England section of the New York State Thruway is 11.5 miles long, and the southerly 2.6 miles and northerly 5.3 miles were constructed with Federal-aid funds. The middle section, 3.6 miles long, was financed with other funds, and a tollgate is on this section. It is said that Federal participation in the northerly and southerly sections of this facility was legal, because the tollgate can be bypassed by use of local roads. However, to a motorist not familiar with the area, the New England section of the New York State Thruway is a single 11.5-mile facility, he travels its entire length and pays a toll—despite the fact that more than two-thirds of the length of the highway was financed with Federal-aid funds, and highways financed with Federal-aid funds are supposed to be free of tolls of all kinds.

In my opinion, this purposeful insertion of new toll traps not planned by 1956 is a distortion of the plain meaning of the 1956 law, and was not the intent of the Congress. I have introduced a bill (H.R. 3494) which would prohibit future toll facility construction on the Interstate System unless there is an affirmative finding by the Secretary of Commerce that it is in the public interest to build a toll rather than toll-free facility and to make this decision subject to congressional review. I feel strongly that this is important and urgently needed legislation, and intend to press for early congressional action.

Lastly, some comments on the distasteful subject of fraud, dishonesty and incompetence in the highway program. I assume that you are familiar with the shocking disclosures which have been made by the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, of which I am the ranking minority member.

So far the subcommittee has held public hearings with respect to practices in five States: Oklahoma, Florida, New Mexico, Massachusetts, and West Virginia. It was found that certain serious deficiencies and irregularities existed or had occurred in all of these States.

The findings, which were established by conclusive proof, included examples of these: Deplorable failure to meet construction

specifications; little or no testing, inspections, or supervision; actual falsification of test reports and samples; conflicts of interest on the part of highway department officials; payments of cash and other things of value by highway contractors to State employees who were responsible for inspecting and supervising the contractors' work; improvements on rights-of-way which had been purchased with public funds and had to be removed to permit highway construction being turned over to contractors, who sold them at huge windfall profits; payments of greatly excessive amounts for highway rights-of-way through pure incompetency of appraisers; and criminal conspiracy between State employees, appraisers, and attorneys resulting in payment of clearly inflated prices for right-of-way and sizable illicit profits by the conspirators.

We don't like to admit that these things occur. We have confidence in our highway program and highway officials, and most of us are proud of the part we may have played in building the finest highway system in the world. We comfort ourselves with the belief and knowledge that irregularities and dishonesty occur in only a small percentage of the cases, and that the vast majority of people involved in the highway program are honest, competent, dedicated persons. Even though this is true, and I am convinced that it is true, the fact remains that dishonesty and incompetency do exist and cannot be condoned or tolerated.

Every person involved in the highway program—highway officials, contractors, material suppliers, engineers, attorneys, appraisers, and the rest—must not only be personally honest, but must do everything possible to assure that his associates are doing their job honestly and properly. I am afraid that in too many places it is being said, "The irregularities disclosed in those other States are shameful—but can't happen here." But the fact of the matter is that it can and very possibly has happened here.

A friend of mine put his finger on the problem, I think, when he observed, "It's hard to be suspicious of a friend." It is hard to be suspicious of people that you have known, liked and worked with for a long time. But the cases of dishonesty and incompetency revealed in congressional hearings occurred largely because honest, competent people assumed that everybody else was equally honest and competent, and therefore did not review the work of their subordinates or associates carefully or critically. They accepted everything at face value, and thus created the opportunity for fraud.

I am not suggesting that we establish a spy system, where nobody trusts anybody. I am saying that we should not take everything for granted. We should not blindly accept a statement or certification that a job has been done. We must make some inquiry or examination to assure that the job has actually been done and done properly. This is the only way that we can minimize the opportunity for fraud and incompetency, and have some assurance that dishonesty will be promptly detected and punished.

All of us know that much has been done already to tighten procedures and minimize the opportunity for fraud. But it is not sufficient that we simply take action in that direction and stop. We must make the public aware of the fact that such action has been taken, and that the program, fairly clean in the past, will be more so in the future.

I have heard it said many times that the banking industry is not threatened or attacked simply because a cashier embezzles money or a bank official absconds with the day's deposits. I think that this is true because the American public is satisfied that the banking industry has established proper safeguards, and that thievery occurs in only rare, isolated instances. In other words, the banking industry has convinced the people that it has done everything it can to protect its patrons.

The highway people must do the same. We complain that frauds make the headlines, while accomplishments are never considered newsworthy. Unfortunately, this seems to be one of the facts of life, and there is not much we can do about it. However, if we can convince the public that we have taken vigorous, affirmative action to eliminate fraud and incompetency, and are doing everything humanly possible to protect public funds, I believe the black headlines will be viewed with proper perspective. The public will be satisfied that cases of fraud and incompetency are the rare exception rather than the rule in the highway program.

It was partially for this reason that last session of Congress, and again this session, I introduced a bill (H.R. 2557) to strengthen and revise the Federal criminal laws relating to the Federal-aid highway program.

Briefly speaking, my bill would do the following:

1. It would prohibit donations to political parties or political candidates by individuals or firms contracting with the States on Federal-aid highway projects. Existing Federal law, enacted in 1940, contains such a prohibition with respect to Federal contracts. My bill would simply extend this to Federal-aid highway contracts which are generally State rather than Federal contracts, although Federal funds may bear from 50 to 95 percent of their cost.

2. My bill would prohibit reprehensible practices which we know have occurred with disturbing frequency: the practice of highway contractors giving money and other things of value to the highway department personnel responsible for inspecting or supervising the contractors' work, and the directly related practice of performing work or furnishing materials and equipment, or permitting the performance of work or furnishing materials or equipment other than as provided in the contract or applicable plans and specifications.

3. The bill contains provisions directed toward conflicts of interest. It would prohibit persons performing services for the highway departments (including highway department employees) from having a financial or other personal interest in Federal-aid highway contracts with respect to which they have performed such services. It would also require such persons to publicly disclose any interest they might have in any real property required for Federal-aid highway projects on which they worked or had an official responsibility.

4. The bill would revise and strengthen the existing law having to do with false statements and certifications concerning Federal-aid highway projects, by extending its terms to cover real property transactions.

The need for enactment of legislation covering these matters has become obvious, and I intend to press for early congressional action.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Feb. 27, 1963]

CONGRESSMAN OPPOSES TOLL ROAD ADDITION

CRAMER CITES BURDEN ON MOTORISTS

(By Hal Foust)

Additions to the Nation's tollways, such as those planned in Illinois, were denounced yesterday by Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, ranking minority member of the congressional Subcommittee on Roads.

In a speech before the American Road Builders Association Convention in the Palmer House, CRAMER declared that it was the intention of Congress in its 1956 enactment of the 41,000-mile interstate program to incorporate the then existing 2,200 miles of tollways but not to accept any further mileage.

SEEK LEGISLATIVE AID

The Illinois Toll Commission is seeking legislative aid to extend its East-West route 95 miles from Aurora to Fulton at a cost of $105 million. The commission also is seeking to put the Hammond-Rock Island (I–80) expressway, a quarter-of-a-billion-dollar freeway, through its collection gates on 8 miles of tollway in southern Cook County.

"The cost of travel to the individual motorist is relevant in considering new toll traps," CRAMER said. "The Federal Bureau of Public Roads estimates that the cost per mile for a typical family car is 10 cents, including 1.17 cents in Federal and State license fees and gasoline excises. These taxes apply whether the travel is on a toll road or a free road.

"Toll charges range from 1.09 cents per mile on the Pennsylvania Turnpike to 2.25 cents on the West Virginia Turnpike. In Pennsylvania, on the cheapest tollway in America, the motorist is paying the equivalent of an additional 16 cents a gallon. In West Virginia, the toll is the equivalent of an additional 33.7 cents a gallon."

BONDS MOST EXPENSIVE

On the Tri-State tollway bypassing Chicago, the toll is $1.80 for 77 miles, which is the equivalent of an additional 35 cents a gallon tax for a car making 15 miles per gallon.

"Of all methods of financing highway construction," the Congressman continued, "revenue bonds for toll construction are the most expensive.

"The Illinois Toll Commission expects to collect $1.7 billion revenue from its users before the retirement of the $441 million in revenue bonds used to build the existing 187-mile system."

AFFECTS OTHER ROADS

"Perhaps even more important than cost to the public and to the individual motorist," CRAMER said, "is the effect of toll roads on construction of other highways in the area. Highway officials are reluctant to build freeways that will take traffic from tollways."

This reluctance on the part of Indiana is perpetuating a gap of 30 miles near Michigan City in the otherwise completed Chicago-Detroit freeway.

When Illinois adopted its tollway program, plans were postponed or canceled for modernizing Skokie Road as a freeway; an interstate route from Chicago through the Fox Lake and Lake Geneva region was killed; and a belt route around Chicago was removed from the Federal program.

COMMUNIST MILITARY PENETRATION OF THIS HEMISPHERE

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those Republicans who remain convinced that our resolution to deal firmly with Communist military penetration of this hemisphere is not and must not be based on political considerations. The great majority of Americans are for running Communists out of Cuba whether Republicans or Democrats.

Secretary of State Rusk says he is for it too, at least he gives the impression he is for it by saying that it continues to be America's policy that "Castro must go." But it is about time we had some action, Mr. Speaker. Informed sources among the military are deeply disturbed. So is the general public, and rightfully so.

I have repeatedly sought the use of force if needed to end Communist control of Cuba. This I have done regardless of the political complexion of the administration involved. On July 5, 1960, as chairman of the Committee on Internal Security of the National Association of Attorneys General of the United States, I submitted a report to the association at San Francisco, Calif., specifically urging the use of armed force if necessary "to prevent the construction of missile launching bases, landing fields, or Russian submarine bases 90 miles off the American coast." This was almost 3 years ago.

The report in which this recommendation was made is an extremely interesting document. It addressed itself to the acuteness of the problem of how to meet communism's challenge to our internal security, made substantially more difficult by the unnecessary language of a number of decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court.

This report which continues to be of current interest and pressing importance was as follows:

Report of the Committee on Internal Security to the National Association of Attorneys General, San Francisco, Calif., July 5, 1960

In June 1957 the National Association of Attorneys General authorized the creation of a committee on internal security and instructed the committee "to confer immediately with interested Federal agencies and other national groups, including the American Bar Association, with a view to preparation of legislation for introduction at the current session of Congress designed to reaffirm and reactivate Federal and State internal security controls; and further authorized the committee, with the approval of the executive committee, to appear before Congress in support of its recommendations."

In June 1958, at the 52d annual conference, the National Association of Attorneys General resolved as follows:

"*Be it resolved by the 52d annual meeting of the National Association of Attorneys General, meeting in Chicago, Ill., on June 11, 1958,* That the president is authorized to continue a committee on internal security and that the committee is authorized to communicate to the proper congressional committees the support and approval of the association for legislation to accomplish the following purposes:

"1. Reestablish the rights of States to enforce their subversive control laws by, in effect, amending the Smith Act to declare that it does not occupy the field to the exclusion of the States.

"2. Redefine the offense of teaching and advocating the overthrow of the Government to indicate that the immediate probable effect of such action is immaterial, and further to provide that whenever intent to cause the overthrow is proved that the offense is established.

"3. To define the term 'organize' in the Smith Act to include the continuing organization and recruiting of members for subversive organizations and the formation or expansion of either new or existing units of subversive organizations."

At the time of the 1958 meeting a number of measures designed to effect the specific recommendations of your committee were pending in Congress. In February 1959 the American Bar Association through its house of delegates by an overwhelming vote adopted similar recommendations. On April 21, 1959, the chairman of the committee on internal security testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Internal Security, in support of these recommendations. A copy of this testimony was appended to the report of this committee submitted in May 1959 in New Orleans, La. As was then reported to this association:

"The legislative recommendations are simple. They are specific. They affirm congressional intention. They neither limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court nor do anything more than plug loopholes in existing internal security laws shown (to exist) by judicial decision. The need for State factfinding investigation complementary to the work of Federal committees is reflected in the position of the Department of Justice and Federal authorities, desirous of continued cooperation between the States and the Federal Government in this field. Transcripts of sworn testimony are a useful adjunct to the work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which for all its splendid record has but a limited number of agents with a great many other things to do than deal with subversion and is without power to take testimony under oath, which is required for adequate survey of subversive activities.

"Your committee feels that in no respect does any of the legislation which has been recommended sanction abuse of process, interference with academic freedom, discrimination against teachers, undue interference with private rights, nor the pernicious practice of exposure for the sake of partisan political advantage. Contrariwise, it is believed that the power to investigate in fields in which there is power to legislate is vital to the manifest need to keep abreast of Communist and other subversive activity within the several States as a sensible precautionary measure in which the States and the Federal Government should work together. In addition to redefinition of the word organize and permission to the States to prohibit subversive activity by State law, it is felt that intentional criminal advocacy of overthrow of the Government of the United States or of any State by force and violence should be prohibited whether or not the advocacy at the time of utterance incites to the commission of an overt act. Lacking such an amendment, the Smith Act is now largely ineffective and opportunity is afforded for Communist indoctrination by intentional subversive advocacy within and without educational institutions across the land."

At the present time Congress has before it a number of measures designed to carry out these recommendations. In varying language all of the objectives have been favorably reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee and some have passed either the House or the Senate but not both. A very considerable Senate committee disposition to recommend and enact legislation authorizing the enforcement of State statutes prescribing criminal penalties for subversive activities (S. 294, 86th Cong., 1st sess.) lost considerable pressure for enactment in June 1959 with the Supreme Court decision in *Uphaus* v. *Wyman*, 360 U.S. 72, 3 L. Ed. 2d 1090, 79 S. Ct. 1040, which was erroneously believed by many persons to have revitalized State sedition laws. While this decision was of considerable helpfulness in permitting State legislatures to investigate subversive activity within their States (including subversion directed toward the United States insofar as the same infringed upon the security and safety of the State) it reaffirmed the holding of *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* v. *Steve Nelson*, 350 U.S. 497, 100 L. Ed. 640, 76 S. Ct. 477, to the effect that State sedition laws were superseded by the Federal Smith Act to the extent the State laws attempted to make it a crime within the State to seek the overthrow of the Federal government by force, violence or other unlawful means.[1]

In addition to the foregoing measures, an omnibus bill offered by Senators Dodd and Keating (S. 2652, 86th Cong., 2d. sess.) was reported from the Internal Security Subcommittee on September 7, 1959, and favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee on June 30, 1960. It is now pending before the Senate.

Your committee would be something less than candid if it did not report that in this election year the prospects for enactment of this legislation are not bright. It is hoped that in the postelection period it will be possible for Congress to adopt the recommendations of this association in the field of internal security, which are relatively simple, urgently needed, and should not become embroiled in partisan political conflict.

At the 1959 meeting your committee was authorized in addition to keeping the association advised of the progress of the foregoing recommendations for congressional legislation, to note such other matters relating to internal security as may be of interest or concern to the National Association of Attorneys General. It is difficult to define the periphery of "matters of interest or concern to this association in respect to internal security." It disturbs many of us that Congress has not reacted with more alacrity to the tremendous limitation of State power and authority implicit in the decision in *Commonwealth* v. *Nelson*, 350 U.S. 497, 100 L. ed. 640, 76 S. Ct. 477 Congress, particularly in the House of Representatives, being very directly reflective of public sentiment, thus demonstrates more than ever the apathy, indifference, and lack of understanding that besets America in this field. Without doubt, eclipsing all other nonpolitical issues either domestic or international, the paramount problem of this time is whether communism and capitalism can live in one world in peaceful coexistence or are destined to clash in the death throes of hydrogen warfare. Tactical maneuvering by the Communists has warmed the cold war as this report is written, to a point where it is seriously urged that the United States maintain a 24-airborne, hydrogen and atomic bomb equipped air alert against the possibility of surprise Communist attack. Khrushchev's treatment of the President of the United States at the recent attempted Summit conference has beyond question materially increased world tensions but is of value in revealing the real Communist attitude toward this Nation.

It is impossible to assess the problem of internal security without regard to these international factors. This is for the reason that communism is international in scope and purpose and seeks the destruction of all free nations everywhere in the world by force and violence if other means fail. This objective with regard to the United States has never been clearer than in the propaganda of hatred toward the United States that is daily taught the youth of the Soviet Union and its satellites and by devious means is spread among the youth of other lands to inflame them against the American imperialists and warmongers. That such propaganda efforts can be successful has been proven last month in Japan. That it continues unabated is reported daily at intelligence levels within the U.S. Department of State, particularly in reference to Latin America and Mexico.

---

[1] A fundamental weakness of such a holding being, of course, that Communist conspiracy to destroy our system is not aimed at any particular government, either State or Federal, but at capitalist free America.

How much of the same pernicious propaganda is being distributed to young and old in this country is hard to know. The number of Communist-front groups and organizations infiltrated by Communists is reported by Federal committees to be substantial, each having its particular segment of the Communist mission reflecting the Communist Party line of the moment. How far such propaganda separately or cumulatively may contribute to persuade otherwise loyal American citizens to renounce that loyalty and to become agents for the Communist Party and agents for communism generally is impossible to assess. It is indisputable, however, that as this report is written there has been a recent noticeable resurgency of Communist activity both open and secret throughout the entire United States. That this was predictable was stated by your chairman when president of this association in Sun Valley in June 1957. The suggestion from sources that should know better that Communist activity in this country is some kind of lawful political activity privileged from surveillance by reason of the first amendment has noticeably emboldened and broadened written and spoken activity on the part of Communists throughout the United States.

We should all be grateful that the U.S. Supreme Court in *Barenblatt* v. *United States*, 260 U.S. 109 (June 1959), with reference to the Communist Party has now said that those who would claim that it was "just an ordinary political party from the standpoint of national security, is to ask this Court to blind itself to world affairs which have determined the whole course of our national policy since the close of World War II—and to the vast burdens which these conditions have entailed for the entire Nation."

Your committee believes that there is even more pressing present need to keep abreast of Communist activities throughout the Nation than existed 10 years ago. We are distressed by the apathy, the complacency, the indifference, and even the blindness of too many comfortably situated Americans who hear Khrushchev in Austria claim that the Communist Party line has eliminated force and violence but remain uneasily aware that throughout history every Communist leader since Karl Marx has said that war between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Your committee is strongly of the view that the internal security of each State would be materially improved by procedures designed to enable each State government to be kept advised of the nature and extent of the operations of Communists in that State. For such purposes the use of the subpena power through legislative investigation is indispensable. In this view the committee is aware of the fact that Communist Party members have not carried cards for more than a decade. It also knows that many of the so-called intelligentsia who knowingly and intentionally work for and in behalf of the Communist Party and Communist-front organizations have never assayed membership for reasons obvious. Your committee continues to be of the abiding conviction that every Communist in the United States is a potential security risk and that State and Federal policy should not fail to take due cognizance of this fact.

The relationship of the foregoing to the internal security of each State is clear. In this time no attorney general on behalf of any State can disregard within his State, Communist operations whatever they may be. As attorneys and members of the bar sworn to uphold the Constitution of State and Nation, it is our fundamental moral and legal responsibility to exert every lawful means to keep apprised of the machinations of those who would destroy our Constitution, our system, and our way of life.

Your committee recognizes that no amount of fixed doctrine nor Maginot-line-type of education can vest us with that vitality necessary to meet and defeat the challenge of communism without war. We also recognize that this challenge must be met and defeated without war or there will be little left in the world but chaos and destruction. Therefore, with confidence in the capacity of an intelligent and informed free citizenry to fashion a better panacea for tomorrow's citizens than can be offered by communism, and with confidence that the day will soon come when the courts will affirm in indisputably decisive language the principle that those who claim the priceless benefits of American citizenship and the protection of its laws owe to their State and Nation both moral and legal responsibility to answer relevant questioning relating to the security of our people, your committee reports that the internal security of the Nation is under continuing Communist stress which is being partially met by active State and Federal countermeasures. It is felt that a much larger complementary role in this struggle might be effectively waged by State agencies, and to the extent that each member of this association in his State can assist in this direction, he is respectfully urged to do so.

Most Americans are concerned by the developments in Cuba as well as in other less easily recognized locations in this hemisphere indicating intentional aggressive Communist penetration of what has always been heretofore considered a place of primary concern and control of the United States. It is shocking to see American properties and American citizens and companies pushed around and discriminated against by the Castro government while we stand by and just watch. Economic sanctions in such circumstances are not enough if this country or its citizens are to have any self-respect left. Nothing is perhaps accomplished by descriptive adjectives, but your committee is beginning to wonder whether the world thinks we are afraid to stand up for what we believe in.

To put off dealing firmly with a situation of outright Soviet military aid to the Castro government in Cuba is to mortgage the future day when a much worse problem is presented with Panama. In terms of the internal security of the United States—not solely of the State of Florida—it is simply intolerable that we should permit the construction of missile launching bases, landing fields, or Russian submarine bases 90 miles off the American coast even if it takes force to prevent it. The same principle applies to the unlawful thefts and discriminations by the Castro government against Americans in Cuba. The impetus to this new aggression is undeniable. How can any American be safe in any Caribbean travel if this Nation will not protect him against outlawry?

For many years the unpleasant moment which is now upon us has been foreseeably predictable from American policies which have deferred the day of reckoning by continued appeasement of Communist aggression.

Just as surely as this Nation misled Britain and France into believing that they might with our sanction use force to defend their interests against Nasser's taking of the Suez Canal, and misled the Hungarian people into believing we would help if they would rise up and rid themselves of communism's yoke, it is a certainty that we would use force to prevent the taking over of the Panama Canal should the Panamanian Government become too friendly with the Soviet Union, accept its aid and military supplies as Egypt has done, and attempt to seize it.

We should meet the Cuban aggression now. Latin America and the entire Caribbean are watching.

The conclusion is inescapable that the United States must be ready to risk war to keep hostile Communist military establishments out of this hemisphere. The heavy logistical burden of maintaining effective military defensive action in Indochina and other places in the Far East is not present with respect to operations in this hemisphere. Those who claim that if we can arm bases in Turkey the Communists have the right to do so in Cuba, are intellectually dishonest, for the mission, objective, and spiritual dedication of the American people as well as American policy is neither imperialist nor aggressive toward any other nation in the world, whereas Soviet communism aims at unlawful world domination and individual slavery by aggression and violence all over the world.

Neither in terms of international law nor in the field of propaganda is there merit to any charge that by acting to prevent such military preparations by a foreign enemy power in this hemisphere, we are imperialists. As Americans the United States seeks nothing other than a world in which freedom and equal justice under law will stand some reasonable assurance of continuing in peace. Such a position, properly explained to the peoples of the world, is all the moral sanction we need. If the Communists can get away with what is going on in Cuba in plain view, we stand (and deserve) to lose not only the respect but in all probability the support, of a great majority of the countries of Latin America.

No thorough contemporary assessment of our internal security in this time should fail to appraise the intrinsic will of the American people to fight to preserve the American way of life. Such an appraisal does not lend to optimism for the future safety of this Nation. The dedication and purpose with which many Communists approach the problems of the education and orientation of youth, application of their work, elimination of wasted time, and indoctrination in young and old of a single-mindedness of purpose toward a Communist world, is a caution for all of us in our opulence. While we should not endeavor to indoctrinate our youth with the same virus of hatred with which the youth of the Soviet Union and other countries are being infected toward this Nation as a germ warfarer and imperialist aggressor, nevertheless, it is of the first order of importance that the generation now being trained by us should be fully and completely aware of the nature, purposes and objectives of international Communism in relation to those of American constitutional government. Anything short of this is to send our younger generation into the world ill prepared to wage the struggle for the minds of mankind that reaches from the Congo to Oslo. It is not enough only to offer these explanations to our own youth. In the schools of the friendly nations of this world we must send our qualified representatives to tell the truth concerning the United States and its role as protector of freedom and individual liberty.

No State in this Union has internal security if the United States itself is insecure.

At this moment Communist enemy forces are actively at work aiding existing hostile nations and seeking to further encourage other younger nations now frenzied with nationalism by propagandizing them that America, like John Bull of old, is against their nationalism, and that the West seeks to prevent their independence.

Unilateral Western talks on disarmament are bound to be ineffective, as have been those spheres of United Nations activity that have required concurrence of the Soviet bloc. We can never disarm as long as the Soviet does not also do so. We can never safely disarm without contemporaneous full and complete inspection. The world is not going to obtain such a commitment from Communists. In the meantime, the race toward the neutron bomb, the satellite mirror, and the military conquest of space goes on at the expense of the soundness of our fiscal structure.

For the immediate present there is little doubt that defense requires continued sorely needed U.S. billions even at the price of more deficit and a correspondingly weaker dollar, but one has only to project such a situation continued over the next two decades to arrive at the conclusion that short of that time some way must be found to stop it or the economic structure of the United States will be ruined—itself a Communist objective.

If millions upon millions of young men and women now growing up throughout the world continue to be indoctrinated with communism's philosophy of the use of unlawful force, of class struggle, of hatred, of the justification for subversion in the name of a Communist world, of the justness of atheism and alleged soundness of the material concept of the explanation and derivation of the universe, it means only one thing for us within our lifetime—aggressive war upon this country. This is because young adults trained in this manner from earliest adolescence in their willingness to destroy us will exceed even the banzai of the Kamikaze pilot in World War II who was sure he was on his way to Japanese heaven. These, with the many now in their forties in Japan and in Germany who also hate this Nation in the memory of the destruction heaped upon theirs in World War II, make the projection almost a dismal certainty.

Some say that the only way the people of this country will awake to the need for authorization of powerful and effective governmental action to combat further Communist aggression is an attack upon us. The price of this would be the infinite horrors of atomic destruction, for we would certainly retaliate. Short of the shock of an attack, some method must be found to jar Americans from their complacency and inspire them to authorize their legislatures and the Congress to firmly take those steps in our behalf that must be taken to make certain that not one additional inch of the earth's surface nor one additional citizen of the world's population, adult or juvenile, is added to the Soviet Communist bloc.

Along with such a governmental policy, if Americans traveling abroad conclusively demonstrate by word and deed that we are for peace, freedom, and justice for all, and that communism means individual slavery, we are bound to succeed, for ours is the more attractive package.

Only a blind man would disregard the situation now existing. Internal security in our States is inadequate. We should not delude ourselves to the contrary. Internal security is literally dependent on the external security of the United States itself.

We have implicit confidence that just as communism is atheistic and denies the existence of God, so are we and our allies essentially law-abiding, God-fearing men and women. If Divine Providence and the omnipotence of Almighty God are to be made manifest upon this earth in our time it must mean that in this struggle we will win. Faith alone, however, is not enough. Strength in meeting any public challenge to American authority is indispensable.

As attorneys general let us as one firmly reject any governmental policy, State or Federal, that includes further appeasement or equivocation in dealing with Communist aggression. In firmness reflecting our genuine concern for the peace and security of the world will be found the only sure road to an honorable peace which will result from aggressors' unwillingness to face the showdown if we stand firm. The hour is late but not too late.

If we continue to show an incredulous world that we are unwilling to fight to preserve our freedom or that of our allies, the balance of world power will swing to the Soviet Union. Should this happen, we predict that whether resulting from ultimatum or secretly in the night, The United States will suffer a major and terrible attack—an avoidable catastrophe if we have the courage now to stand firmly for freedom.

Your committee respectfully recommends that the committee on internal security be continued, instructed, and authorized to keep the association advised of the progress of the association's recommendations for legislation in the field of internal security and of such other matters relating to internal security as may in the opinion of the committee, be of interest or concern to the National Association of Attorneys General. The chairman has been authorized to prepare and deliver to the resolutions committee a resolution to this effect.

Respectfully submitted.

LOUIS C. WYMAN,
Chairman,
Committee on Internal Security.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the concepts expressed in this report will soon become an integral part of American policy.

HOW REDS USE PANAMA CANAL

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday on the floor of the House, I revealed that during 1962 there had been a 600-percent increase in cargo movements through the Panama Canal to Red China as reported in the annual report of the Panama Canal Company. At that time, I indicated that I had written the President of the United States urging prompt consideration of the advisability of denying the use of the Panama Canal to all vessels trading with Cuba. At that time, I further urged a study of this question by the House of Representatives. Today I rise to report that I am introducing a House resolution which it is hoped will provide the impetus to bring about such a study by the appropriate committee of the House.

The resolution is as follows:

> *Resolved,* That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President of the United States should take such steps as may be necessary to deny the use of the Panama Canal to all vessels engaged in trade with Cuba.

Since the rise of Castro, there has been, to my knowledge, little or no consideration of the possibility of denying the use of the Panama Canal to ships trading with Cuba. In view of the above report that during 1962 there was a 600-percent increase in cargo movements through the canal to Red China and a 48-percent increase to Russia, and in view of the fact that CIA Chief John A. McCone, in his February 19 statement to the House Foreign Affairs Committee emphasized the increasingly serious problem of subversion spreading from Cuba to South America and stated that at least 1,000 to 1,500 South Americans went to Cuba in 1962 for sabotage and guerrilla training, with more going this year, I consider such a study necessary—without delay.

Our goal must be to weaken the Castro regime, to prevent the spread of communism from Cuba to the continent of South America, and, hopefully, to bring about the eventual downfall of the Castro dictatorship. I do not suggest that I am an expert on Cuban or South American affairs. However, from a study of a map of this hemisphere, it seems logical to predict that once the Communists have established a firm position on the continent of South America, we will have lost in large part the advantage which our control of the Panama Canal today represents as a method of preventing the strengthening of communism in this hemisphere. Today the Panama Canal can be an effective tool against communism: tomorrow it may not.

The situation today represents a major danger to all of the American nations. Its solution will require the United States to assume and maintain a capacity of leadership, with the cooperation of the Organization of American States and the United Nations to the extent possible. This is not, in my opinion, saber rattling. A leadership vacuum exists, and we must fill it.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are obstacles to restricting the use of the Panama Canal. We have treaties with Panama—the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Convention of 1903—and with Great Britain—the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901—to mention two. However, if, after study, it is considered desirable to deny the use of the canal to vessels trading with Cuba, there are ways to do it. If it is impossible under existing agreements, these agreements can be revised, as they have been before. We can ask the cooperation of the Organization of American States. We can consider extending our right to deny the use of U.S. ports to include those ports at either end of the canal. We can consider the possibility of liberally interpreting these treaties of the early 1900's to permit such action in view of the cold war of 1963.

Regrettably, we have lost much of the advantage we held some months ago. To wait further could result, within a matter of months, in having communism firmly established on the continent of South America. We cannot afford four or five South Vietnams in this hemisphere. I urge prompt consideration of this resolution in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a column from the Chicago Sun-Times of March 1, discussing Communist trade through the canal, and an editorial from the Chicago's American of February 25, concerning the recent OAS report urging the individual member nations to invoke the 1948 Rio Treaty for their mutual defense against Communist Cuba. I also refer the

Members of the House to the recent testimony of CIA Chief John McCone, before the Foreign Affairs Committee for a discussion of the seriousness of tne problem of Communist subversion in South America:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Chicago's American, Feb. 25, 1963]

WARNING TO THE OAS

A report just made public by the Organization of American States soberly warns that individual member nations can no longer defend themselves adequately against the threat of Communist Cuba, and urges them to invoke the 1948 Rio treaty for mutual defense.

The report was submitted by a special 7-man study group and is "advisory," meaning that it doesn't have official OAS approval. Getting it adopted will involve many a wrangle, since some of its recommendations—for instance, breaking off all hemisphere relations with the Castro government—are still regarded as controversial by some member states. But the United States and other governments aware of the danger should press hard for approval; there isn't much time to spare.

What has been revealed of the report is restrained and factual, and does not indulge in nightmares. It points out that Castro and the Soviets have developed in Cuba a "political-military apparatus" which is expressly designed to get around the haphazard security measures now in force. Against the Communists' highly engineered techniques of subversion and agitation, the hemisphere's defenses aren't much beyond what they were in 1948, and are simply not adequate for the job.

One sorely needed element, the report said, is coordination of intelligence and counterespionage work among the hemisphere's free nations. Without that, they won't have the means to plan and carry out joint action. The report also called for organizing, equipping, and training security forces of the American republics to counter subversion and guerilla activity directed from Cuba.

This does not mean that the United States should rely wholly on cooperative action against Cuba. As Defense Secretary McNamara said last week in testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, it is United States policy to eliminate Castrosim and communism from Cuba, and that's a job that will have to be handled principally by this country.

But the United States cannot police the rest of the hemisphere against subversion and guerrilla attacks. That will be up to the governments involved—and they'd better get together fast on ways to do it.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Mar. 1, 1963]

HOW REDS USE PANAMA CANAL

(By Milburn P. Akers)

Red China and Soviet Russia are making very good use of the Panama Canal in efforts to bulwark Fidel Castro's regime in Cuba.

The 1962 report of the board of directors of the Panama Canal Co. contains, on page 6, the following statement:

"Showing a very impressive percentage increase for the year (1962) was the volume of cargo moving to Red China and Russia. Cargo movements to Red China totaled 877,000 long tons for an increase of 600 percent and movements to Russia totaled 344,000 long tons for an increase of 48 percent. Sugar movements from Cuba accounted for the vast majority of this combined tonnage. In the return flow of cargo, Red China and Russia shipped 52,000 tons of cargo to Cuba."

Undoubtedly, Nikita Khrushchev, Mao Tse-tung and Castro fully appreciate the use of this American-built and American-operated facility which helps them to carry out their Caribbean designs without the necessity for the long and expensive sea voyage around South America. The fact that the Panama Canal Co., which operates the canal for its owners, the taxpayers of the United States, spent $16,100,000 to improve the canal in 1962 probably causes them to rejoice also.

Ships which transit the canal are required to pay for its use. Such payments are, no doubt, a bit of a load on the Cuban economy. But now that the traffic has been called to Washington's attention efforts will no doubt be made to remit the tolls on these shipments. Such action would be in line with the solicitous manner in which U.S. policy in respect to Castro's Cuba is currently conducted.

Why the United States should permit use of its facilitiels to undermine its position in the Caribbean is difficult to comprehend.

The statement that we are obligated by treaty and international law to permit transit of the canal by the ships of all nations is not a sufficient answer.

The United States doesn't recognize Red China. Treaties and international laws and practices which may be binding upon the United States insofar as other nations are concerned are not applicable to Red China. The United States has broken diplomatic relations with Cuba. There may be a technical distinction between nonrecognition and the current status of United States-Cuban relations. That point is moot. If, however, the United States has the right to deny use of American ports to foreign ships engaged in the Cuban traffic, a right it has asserted, it can find ample legal grounds on which to deny use of the Panama Canal and its facilities, including the harbors, to the ships engaged in this particular traffic.

The ships engaged in the Sino-Soviet-Cuban traffic fly many flags. Those three Communist countries have relatively small merchant marines. Much of the traffic is carried in Greek, British, Norwegian, Lebanese, Japanese, Polish and Yugoslav bottoms. These also should be forbidden use of the canal's facilities for this particular traffic.

If the American Government doesn't intend to employ every economic tool it has to bring about Castro's downfall it shouldn't announce such policies; halfway measures, such as it now engages in, are worse than none at all.

Since the ending of World War II Panama Canal traffic has increased 212 percent. In 1962 canal shipments between Red China and Cuba increased 600 percent over 1961. This huge increase gives some measure of the use to which this American-built, American-operated facility is being employed to thwart American policy in respect to Castro's Cuba.

The United States stopped buying Cuban sugar for the sole purpose of wrecking that island's economy and, in so doing, bringing about Castro's downfall. To prevent that downfall, Red China and Soviet Russia have been taking huge amounts of Cuban sugar in barter deals. As noted in the 1962 report of the Panama Canal Co., sugar shipments from Cuba to Red China and Soviet Russia "accounted for the vast majority of this (increase) combined tonnage."

This is but another example of the fact that the United States, as a consequence of inept policies and implementation, does more to defeat itself than all the Communist nations combined.

RESOLUTION TO PREVENT U.S. CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS FROM BEING USED FOR ASSISTANCE TO CUBA

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, I have today submitted a resolution to the Congress to prevent U.S. contributions to the United Nations from being used for assistance to Cuba. The resolution provides that if the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance or the United Nations Special Fund hereafter provides any assistance, directly or indirectly, to Cuba, then the maximum U.S. contribution which may be made to that program or Fund, as the case may be, for the next calendar year shall be reduced by the amount spent by such program or Fund in providing such assistance to Cuba.

The recent decision by the U.N. Directorate to extend $1,157,600 from the United Nations Special Fund for a 5-year project intended to diversify Cuban agriculture reveals the need for such a joint congressional resolution. U.S. officials strongly opposed the project, which was first considered in May, 1961, when it came up again before the Special Fund several weeks ago. It was argued that the likelihood of success for such a project was considerably less than when the project was first approved because of the increasing chaos, in fact the utter disorganization, of Cuban agriculture caused by Castro's follies. It was pointed out that some of Cuba's best agricultural experts had fled the country, that food production was in trouble, in short, that Castro's dictatorial hand and his inept policies were reflected throughout the agricultural sector. Foreign agents—Soviet agricultural experts—were replacing native technicians. And yet, the Special Fund was not convinced by these arguments. The old contention that the extension of assistance must be decided on the basis of project feasibility alone—and that political considerations must play no part—was once again dragged out in support of the United Nations action. But do not these facts—the disorganization of Cuban agriculture, the inept agricultural policies of the Castro government, the presence of large numbers of Soviet agents—challenge the feasibility of the United Nations scheme?

Furthermore, Castro has not been noted for his cooperation with the United Nations in the past. He blocked the recent United States-Soviet negotiations on the crisis caused by the Soviet military buildup in Cuba at every point. He refused to allow United Nations inspectors on Cuban soil to verify the removal of Soviet offensive weapons. When Secretary General U Thant attempted to mediate in the crisis, Castro adamantly denied him every point. He alleged that Soviet bombers belonged to Cuba and could not be withdrawn without his consent. In short, Castro has failed to cooperate with the United Nations in political settlements in the past. Why should he now be granted Special Fund assistance? What guarantee is there that once United Nations experts arrive, Castro will aid their efforts? What about the Soviet agricultural experts? Will they and the U.N. technicians work hand in hand? The answers to these questions are vital to the feasibility of the project. The question marks are surely numerous enough to have made the Directorate think twice and then a third time before extending assistance to Castro.

Granted, these questions also involve political considerations, but political considerations of a sort which must be taken into account, I contend, in deciding upon any United Nations activity. The Special Fund criteria for determining what projects may be approved deny inclusion of political considerations. But what is meant by political considerations—the attempt of any one government or group of governments to influence a decision on the basis of its own, or their own, self-interest rather than in terms of the usefulness of the project to the country concerned and its chances for success? In the case of U.N. assistance to Cuba there are political considerations of a different sort—political considerations which touch upon not the relations of individual states with Cuba, but the relationship of international organizations, the Organization of American States, and the United Nations itself.

In the eyes of all Latin America, Castro is an outlaw in the Western Hemisphere who is trying to subvert democratic governments throughout the hemisphere. The OAS declared him persona non grata in the inter-American system when the foreign ministers voted to expel Cuba from the Organization of American States at the Punta del Este Conference in January 1962. Currently the OAS has undertaken a thorough study of the means by which Castro is attempting to infiltrate Latin America and spread the gospel of communism. All Castro's actions—repression within Cuba, subversion without—contravene the cooperative and collective security bases of the Organization of American States. Castro is a threat to the hemisphere, a barrier to the cooperative efforts of the inter-American community, and an outlaw in the inter-American security system. Does he deserve international assistance? Can such assistance be justified in view of Castro's unlawful actions in the Western Hemisphere?

The same political considerations arise with regard to the United Nations itself. Castro's oppressive policies within Cuba—the execution of political prisoners, the forcing of thousands of citizens into exile, the denial of individual freedoms—make a mockery of United Nations efforts in the field of human rights. How can the world organization on the one hand spend years formulating basic codes of human rights in order to improve the condition of man throughout the world and on the other hand lend its assistance to a government which is flagrantly flouting basic individual freedoms? Furthermore, the chief purpose of the United Nations is preservation of peace and security; it was established as a collective security organization explicitly dedicated to deterring aggression. Yet, on this score, too, Castro is guilty. He allowed Cuba to become an open Soviet military base; he turned his island into a bridgehead of covert Soviet penetration in the Western Hemisphere. How can the United Nations extend assistance to a government which is subverting the basic purposes of the world organization, which is dedicated not to maintaining international peace and security but to deterring international peace and security?

Even more basic than these questions insofar as the U.S. Congress is concerned is the relationship between the United States and the United Nations, for it is in this area that the Congress can make itself heard. If the United Nations will not listen to the dictates of reason and justice, if it will not exert some sense of discrimination between a foolish and a wise course of action, if it will not accept its responsibility as an organization dedicated to the collective security of the world and the betterment of man's lot, the U.S. Congress can do nothing. It can only point out insufficiencies; it can only hope that wiser counsels will prevail in the future.

But as one of the branches of government engaged in the formulation of U.S. foreign policy, Congress has the right, and the duty, to make its will felt in the area of relations between the United States and the United Nations. It is in this spirit that the resolution to prevent U.S. contributions to the United Nations from being used for assistance to Cuba was placed before the Congress. It is from a sense of responsibility for the foreign policy of the United States that the Congress is suggesting the President reduce future U.S. contributions to the U.N. or its agencies, in the event such contributions will be used for assistance to Cuba.

Paul Hoffmann, the Managing Director of the Special Fund and an American himself, it is true, has promised that no U.S. funds will be used on the Cuban project and that no U.S. technicians will be sent to Cuba. But this does not get at the root of the problem. For one thing, the substantial U.S. contribution to the Special Fund—$28 million for 1963—will release other funds that can then be diverted to the Cuban project. Furthermore, Mr. Hoffmann's promise does not resolve future difficulties, future instances in which the United Nations may allocate assistance to Cuba. The problem is rather that the action of the U.N. Directorate in authorizing the agricultural assistance project for Cuba was in direct contravention of U.S. foreign policy toward Cuba. The United States, along with the rest of the Western Hemisphere, has declared itself the enemy of the Castro government. We are dedicated to weakening Castro's economic and political position in order to open the way for the establishment of a democratic government in Cuba. We have been attempting to put the economic squeeze on Castro—through the withdrawal of sugar quotas, the elimination of trade. We have urged our friends to do the same. The United Nations action, designed to improve Castro's agricultural sector, if successful, would strengthen rather than weaken Castro's position and is therefore in direct opposition to the avowed policy of the United States toward Cuba. If the United States succumbs quietly to the United Nations position, we are letting the United Nations make our foreign policy for us—and a foreign policy which, in this case, is far different from that which we have time and again stated we are pursuing with regard to Cuba. The U.S. Congress cannot allow the United Nations to take over the function of formulating U.S. foreign policy.

We feel too that it was impolitic of the United Nations to overlook the fact that the United States is contributing over 40 percent of the total contributions to the Special Fund for the year 1963, some $28 million. While it may be true that the basis of the United Nations is the equality of member states as reflected in the one-state one-vote General Assembly, only too often the equality factor is overemphasized and it is forgotten that the great powers were given a preferred position in the world organization. The permanent member veto in the Security Council acknowledged that the powers had a special responsibility and that therefore they ought to have a special privilege in the United Nations. Should not some form of recognition be given to the fact that the United States is contributing over 40 percent of the Special Fund's resources, over 32 percent of the U.N. regular budget, and a major portion of the Congo operations? The United States has poured considerable financial resources into the United Nations. It has bailed the United Nations out of financial trouble. Just last summer the U.S. Congress authorized the President to purchase up to one-half of the total issue of U.N. bonds to finance peacekeeping operations. Should the United Nations not have listened a little more carefully to U.S. objections concerning assistance to Cuba?

The United States cannot support, cannot be asked to contribute financial resources, to a project which subverts its own foreign policy. The United Nations is dependent on U.S. contributions. It could not continue to exist if U.S. funds were withdrawn. May the Cuban assistance controversy be a lesson to the United Nations that it cannot ignore the basic foreign policy position of one of its chief contributing members. The resolution before you, if adopted, would insure that U.S. money will never be used by the United Nations to subvert U.S. foreign policy in Cuba. It would assure that our foreign policy toward Cuba will continue to be formulated in Washington and not at the United Nations in New York.

Contributions to the U.N. Special Fund are not based on a schedule of assessments; they are entirely voluntary. Each year governments pledge their contributions to the Special Fund for the current year at a U.N. conference convened for this purpose. Thus, the loss of voting sanctions of article 19 of the charter, which pertain only to assessed contributions, do not apply to Special Fund contributions.

The following statistics setting forth the amount of U.S. contributions to the Special Fund, as well as pledges by Soviet Russia and its satellites substantiate the

dependence of the United Nations upon U.S. contributions:

(1) Expenditures of U.N. Special Fund through 1962

(Thousands)

1959	$37,368
1960	59,715
1961	36,189
1962	81,454
Total	214,726

(2) U.S. contribution to Special Fund through 1962

(Thousands)

1959	$10,325
1960	15,842
1961	19,525
1962	25,341
Total	71,033

(3) Percent of U.S. contribution to fund in relation to expenditures through 1962

1959	27.63
1960	26.53
1961	53.95
1962	31.11

(4) Soviet Union and satellite pledges through 1962

A. PLEDGES (IN U.S. DOLLARS)

	1959	1960	1961	1962
Albania			2,000	2,000
Bulgaria		14,706	14,706	17,647
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Cuba				25,000
Czechoslovakia	69,444	69,444	69,444	69,444
Hungary	42,608	42,608	42,608	42,608
Poland	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000
Rumania	16,667	16,667	16,667	16,667
Soviet Union	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000
Yugoslavia	150,000	175,000	192,000	220,000

B. PERCENT OF PLEDGE IN RELATION TO EXPENDITURES

	1959	1960	1961	1962
Albania			0.006	0.002
Bulgaria		0.02	.04	.02
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	0.13	.08	.14	.06
Cuba				.03
Czechoslovakia	.18	.12	.19	.09
Hungary	.11	.07	.12	.05
Poland	.33	.21	.35	.15
Rumania	.04	.03	.05	.02
Soviet Union	2.68	1.67	2.76	1.23
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	.33	.21	.35	.15
Yugoslavia	.40	.29	.53	.27

NOTE.—Cuba and Yugoslavia have been included as members of the Soviet bloc.

WE NEED TO CONSERVE THE WILD ANIMALS OF THE WORLD BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a House concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of State, should take all necessary steps to convene an international conference to begin a worldwide cooperative effort to conserve wild animals.

Such an effort is most urgently needed. A world conference can provide the basis for decisive measures to save many of the world's most famous animals which are now threatened with extinction.

MANY ANIMALS ARE THREATENED WITH EXTINCTION

In these days the words "critical" and "desperate" are used so often and so casually that we become inured to them and often fail to accept their full meaning. But I assure the Members that these words should be given their full weight when they are used to describe the plight of many species of wild animals in the world today. Man has already ignobly succeeded in exterminating about 200 species of birds and animals, among them beautiful, useful and once plentiful creatures. The common phrase, "dead as a dodo," serves as a continual reminder of one species wiped out by man. Now we recklessly threaten nearly 250 species with the same fate. These almost condemned creatures include some of the most spectacular and successful animals evolved during millions of years. Yet if we continue our present course, they may be gone forever in a decade or less. And none of the scientific and technological prowess of which we are justly proud will suffice to recreate any of them.

The American bald eagle, the emblem of our Nation, may exist only metallically on our coins one day. Its numbers are dangerously reduced.

A partial rollcall of immediately threatened species includes the California condor, the polar bear, the woodland caribou, the trumpeter swan, and the sandhill and whooping cranes in the United States, the giant tortoise, the Arabian oryx, the Ceylon elephant, the Kashmir stag, all species of wild chinchilla, the Angolan giraffe, and several types of rhinoceros. An experienced game warden in East Africa has warned that unless something is done promptly, the great migratory herds of antelopes, rhinos and elephants, among others, will be doomed in a decade or less. This is a terrible prospect which demands our attention.

THE SLAUGHTER IS FREQUENTLY SENSELESS

The reasons for the prospective extermination of many of these animals are so trivial and ridiculous that they reveal the depths of man's thoughtlessness and capacity for injustice. The Arabian oryx, a member of the antelope family, is being gunned down from cars because some Arabs believe that by killing an oryx they will obtain the animal's legendary courage and virility. The rhinoceros is being hunted and killed so that the horn can be cut off and ground into powder for sale in parts of Asia where the myth persists that it is an aphrodisiac. The desire for the tails of wildebeests and giraffes so that they might be sold for several dollars as fly swatters has led to the destruction of countless of these animals. Fashion fads that have required animals' skins or feathers have decimated wildlife populations. Much of the destruction of wildlife is deliberate and so highly organized that even fabulous abundance will not by itself prevent a species from soon being snuffed out.

Ironically, but perhaps logically, the threat to wildlife is most acute in Africa, the continent we traditionally associate in our minds with the most marvelous variety and wealth of animal life. A century ago, reports from Africa told of huge herds of antelope and zebra and an amazing profusion of elephants, hippos, and rhino. Although nowadays the picture is still of large herds, surveys indicate that all these animals are greatly reduced in numbers. In parts of the continent where they once lived, some of these animals are nonexistent outside zoos, preserves, and farms.

The reasons for this downtrend are easy to find. Newspaper reports and other accounts describe an annual slaughter that the less prolific species cannot stand much longer.

MUCH OF THE DESTRUCTION IS DELIBERATE KILLING

Much of the killing is to provide ivory, horn, skins, pelts, and other animal products for export. A quite large number of animals can be killed legally to meet the demand for animal products. In Kenya, for example, between 1955 and 1960 the yearly legal sales were 1,400 pounds of horn and 73,000 pounds of ivory. Thus the desire for a supposed sexual stimulant, for chessmen and billiard balls and other products that could be met within legal bounds required the death of 175 to 200 rhino and 1,000 elephants annually.

But this legal killing amounts to only a fraction of the total destruction of African wild animals. Poachers take a truly terrible toll every year in a business which is, as the eminent biologist, Sir Julian Huxley, reported after an African survey, "profitable, highly organized, extremely cruel, and quite ruthless." This widespread illegal killing is also very wasteful in the short run. In the long run, it will be disastrous ecologically and economically.

Most of the demand for the products of African wild animals originates in the United States and in Western Europe. It reflects trends, fads, and vagaries in fashion. After several prominent ladies of fashion appeared in leopard skin coats recently, a demand for leopard skins far in excess of the supply from legal sources suddenly materialized. Immediately, a motely crew of white entrepreneurs descended upon the African bush in search of fast profits. The leopard, which is not scarce but is reduced below the balance of nature in several areas, was reduced still further. British Overseas Airways installed a weekly flight from Uganda to London to transport leopard skins.

POACHING IS RAMPANT

The white entrepreneurs find that there are few law enforcement officers to hinder illegal killing of the desired animals. Typically, this type of white hunter hunts nothing more than an African or Asian middle man who in turn easily finds natives willing to poach for a paltry share of the profits. The African poacher runs no great risk anyway for he is hard to catch and when caught faces very little real punishment. The authorities tend toward the view that he is doing what comes naturally. If they try to impose punishment at all, fines are virtually impossible since few natives have any money. A jail sentence is usually prized as a sort of paid vacation in which the government provides the food and lodging which are constantly struggled for in the bush.

So the native goes gladly about his poaching, with hair-raising cruelty. Wire loop snares are spread widely around the landscape, particularly at gaps in thorny barriers set up by the poachers. Wire of sufficient strength to hold even an elephant is cheap and readily available. One end is attached to a tree or log. Zebras, wildebeests, antelopes, rhinos, and elephants are caught by the leg in these devices and suffer intense pain as their struggling causes the wire to cut deeply into their flesh. They die slowly in agony. The poachers visit the snares only infrequently, so as not to be troubled by arriving while the animals still live.

Arrows smeared with a poison that acts so slowly that the animal is subjected to long suffering are also much in favor among the poachers. Another weapon frequently used is the muzzleloading gun, of which there are reportedly more than 100,000 in the hands of natives of Kenya and Northern Rhodesia alone. These firearms, loaded with whatever miscellaneous hardware lies at hand, are fired into herds, maiming and wounding many animals. In some cases the wounded creatures may be more easily tracked and killed but often they die unnoticed in the bush.

Another poachers' device is the pitfall covered with branches and studded with pointed stakes. A lingering death awaits the animals falling into these pits, for they are seldom killed outright.

THE KILLING IS EXTREMELY WASTEFUL

Sometimes the animals are used for meat which is shipped to nearby African towns by "bicycle boys." More often, only the horns, tusks, skins or other wanted parts are removed and the remains left to rot. Frequently, the animal blindly killed is not the one whose parts are currently in vogue and it is merely left where it fell. The illegal exports start their journey to America or Europe by devious paths to the coast where a tramp steamer waits, by long overland routes to nations from which they may be exported without hindrance and by air.

High profits for the poaching master are the rule in this grisly trade. For example, the native poacher in East Africa will probably get about 7 to 10 shilllings—98 cents to $1.40—per pound for rhino horn which sells on the open market for 90 shillings—$12.60. Much of the difference is pocketed by the white entrepreneur, some of whom have boasted of earnings of $50,000 a year in their callously destructive undertaking.

KILLING FOR SPORT AND FOOD

Wildlife is also being killed deliberately and haphazardly for sport, food, and in attempts to wipe out animal-borne diseases and to protect crops and domestic animals. Although there is some poaching, most of the killing for these purposes is legal, a fact that often is an illustration of the weakness of the game laws.

There are still some "slaughter safaris," but most countries have bag limits that are respected by hunters. Sportsmen are also frequently interested in conservation. And there are an increasing number of safaris that do their shooting with cameras only.

Usually the killing for food is ruinously wasteful. The lechwe antelope, which is killed for meat, has been subjected to mass hunts by men and dogs in which thousands were speared to death at once, including young and pregnant females. As a result, of course, its numbers were reduced sharply and rapidly so that there are less than one-eighth as many as there were 30 years ago.

MANY ANIMALS ARE BEING KILLED BY FIRE

Innumerable wild animals have been killed in Africa in campaigns against the sleeping sickness, but with little success in eliminating the scourge. Since the hides and meat from these animals are not used, this program entails the loss of very large potential incomes.

In Africa, another significant cause of destruction of animals and their habitats is fire. Aside from many blazes stemming from natural causes and human carelessness, others are set purposely for spectacles or as a means of driving game to a place where it may be killed. Wardens suspect that a number of fires in national parks have been planned to force animals out of the protective surroundings into death-dealing traps.

WILDLIFE HABITATS ARE BEING DESTROYED

In addition to the deliberate killing that occurs, as I have described, particularly in Africa but also elsewhere in the world, there is the usually inadvertent destruction of wildlife through man's changes in the environment.

These changes occur very obviously in the construction of roads and the establishment of towns and industries. The impounding of large bodies of water by dams and hydroelectric projects on one hand and the drainage of wetlands and marshes on the other will harm the wildlife of those areas.

Another major source of damage to wildlife is water pollution, not only of inland water but of the seas. Discharges of urban sewage, of toxic wastes from factories and of petroleum on the high seas take their toll of birds and water animals.

Attempts to divert marginal land to uses to which it is not well suited also injures wildlife with little or no compensating benefit. Marginal bushland converted for grazing of cattle in Africa has produced far less needed protein than could have been obtained by well-managed game ranching. Before being used for grazing the land provided a great variety of plants. To match this, there was a differentiation of herbivores to make use of all the vegetable resources. But when put into use for cattle grazing, the land was stripped and it deteriorated rapidly.

MISAPPLIED SCIENCE AID EXOTIC ANIMALS HARM HABITATS

The application of scientific knowledge to the benefit of one animal can bring an unprecedented increase in its numbers with consequent harm to the habitat and other animals. Improved veterinary practices have allowed a large expansion in the herds of scrubby cattle that the Masai tribe of East Africa use as money and measures of prestige. The result is large areas that are in bad shape from overgrazing and unable to support the wildlife that had lived there.

The harm to native animals and their environment that can result from the introduction of a highly successful exotic animal is notorious, with the depredations of the outlandish rabbit in Australia being perhaps the most familiar example. Unfortunately, animals are being moved about in the world today with little thought about the damaging results to native animals.

It is not my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to assign blame for these tragedies but only to describe the problem as it exists. We cannot feel complacent in this country, for there is much we have failed to do to perfect our own conservation program, though our resources are sufficient to the task. It may be recalled, too, that the flightless, penguin-like Great Auk once populated our Atlantic coast in large numbers. After several centuries of indiscriminate clubbing, the last one was killed in 1844. We still appear bent on destroying other species by failure to practice conservation. But we have also shown in our rescues of the bison and the pronghorn antelope that it is possible to reverse an animal's downslide to obliteration and give it a new lease on life.

PRIVATE GROUPS ARE WORKING TO CONSERVE WORLD WILDLIFE

The picture I have presented is dark indeed. It would be blacker still if it were not for the efforts of several organizations which are already attempting to promote conservation of wild animals throughout the world.

The International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources—IUCN—is the foremost among these. It was formed in 1948 under the sponsorship of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization — UNESCO. The IUCN, with headquarters in Morges, Switzerland, is now an independent organization but it still works closely with UNESCO and the United Nation's Food and Agriculture Organization. It has as members the governments off Belgium, Cambodia, Dahomey, Denmark, West Germany, Ivory Coast, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaya, Monaco, Morocco, the Netherlands, Sudan, Switzerland, Thailand, Venezuela, and South Vietnam and more than 240 organizations throughout the world.

The IUCN has held several general assemblies of its members—the latest in June 1960 at Warsaw. An eighth general assembly is scheduled to be held from September 12 to 20, 1963, in Nairobi, Kenya. It will focus particularly on problems in Africa.

The IUCN has established a professional staff to collect and distribute information on preservation of wildlife. Its Survival Service Commission strives to catalog and preserve threatened

species. Its studies have been the basis for action to save wild animals native to the Middle East and Southern Asia and have led to the foundation of a group to preserve the remarkable animals of the Galapagos Islands. With aid from UNESCO, the IUCN has made country-by-country reviews of the status of nature protection in many parts of the world.

AFRICA HAS BEEN SINGLED OUT FOR SPECIAL ATTENTION

As a result of a decision at Warsaw that the most critical threat to wildlife was in Africa, the IUCN has undertaken a three-stage African special project to attempt to deal with the problem. This project, which is being carried out in cooperation with other international and national organizations, is aimed at convincing African leaders and public opinion of the need and value of nature conservation. In addition, assistance is being given through the exchange of scientific and technical information. The threatened animals are initially the subject of particular attention.

A conference at Arusha, Tanganyika, in September 1961, brought together leading figures in the new African states and African, European, and American scientists and administrators. FAO, which was represented at the conference, announced its concern with the status of African wildlife and its intention to support conservation measures. Two wildlife experts, who are being paid by the FAO, have been hired to provide professional services and advice on wildlife problems.

As another part of the African special project, Sir Julian Huxley investigated the status of African wildlife for UNESCO in 1960 and wrote a report that has provided some of the valuable information I have presented to the House today. Dr. F. F. Darling, vice president and director of research for the Conservation Foundation also made an exploratory survey of 14 African countries.

But the IUCN and other existing agencies are not capable of meeting the problem without greater aid. The IUCN has only a small budget, reportedly amounting to about $90,000. No large, wealthy nation except West Germany belongs. To contrast resources with the need, the World Wildlife Fund—International—estimates that $1.5 million a year is needed to save the most seriously threatened animals and that a realistic worldwide wildlife conservation program would cost at least $3 million.

The WWF—International—is a sponsoring organization of national groups which exist in the United States, England, and the Netherlands and are being established in Germany, France, and Switzerland. Among the projects to which the WWF has contributed were: the establishment of the Charles Darwin Research Foundation to preserve the giant tortoise, the penguin, the flightless cormorant, the flamingo, and the fur seal; an expedition to take into captivity a breeding stock of the Arabian oryx; purchase of part of the famous Marismas at the mouth of the Guadalquivir in Spain to save the most important marshland wilderness in Europe and the return of 28 Hawaiian geese, bred by the Wildfowl Trust in England, to a national park on Maui Island from which they disappeared some years ago.

The WWF has been aided by Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, and by Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, but its efforts still fall short of meeting the need.

There are other groups making contributions to the work to promote conservation, among them the Conservation Foundation mentioned previously; the African Wildlife Leadership Foundation, which raises funds to train Africans in conservation; the United States Agency for International Development which is aiding in the establishment of a school of wildlife management in Tanganyika; the Interior Department, which is working on a program for wildlife management in Africa; and the new Canadian Wildlife Foundation, which should extend measures to conserve wildlife in North America.

In addition, the Fulbright program has provided a number of scientists to work abroad in the fields of conservation and wildlife management.

THE HUMAN INTEREST IN SAVING OUR WILDLIFE

Why, it may be asked, should we worry about saving all these wild animals?

Part of the answer, surely, is that there are inherent, sentimental and esthetic values in doing so. The different world we will have when the last lions or rhinos are to be found in zoos or when a youngster must ask "What was a lion, daddy?" is evident. The inherent value of preserving animals that have caught and held man's attention from time immemorial hardly requires advocacy. There is a spectator value in the threatened wildlife that is altogether incomparable and irreplacable. Many of these beasts are as beautiful as anything ever upon this earth and contemplation of that beauty cannot help but affect and uplift human sentiments.

"To see large animals going about their natural business in their own natural way, assured and unafraid, is one of the most exciting and moving experiences in the world, comparable with the sight of a noble building or the hearing of a great symphony or mass," Sir Julian Huxley once wrote.

This by itself argues strongly in favor of vigorous conservation measures. But in addition, there are very practical reasons for conserving the wildlife of the world.

Wildlife is a valuable subject of study to establish important scientific principles. Some of the areas of Africa contain climax communities which represent the highest development of the prehuman ecological system.

THE ECONOMIC VALUE IN SAVING OUR WILDLIFE

More practical still is the economic potential of wildlife under proper conservation. Wildlife can and should be a significant factor in the economic growth of the developing nations. By properly managed game ranching, wildlife can provide more much-needed meat than is being obtained from the reckless, indiscriminate slaughter now being practiced. And because of the differentiations of type among wildlife to prefectly fit the environment, game ranching can in many cases provide more meat than could be obtained from turning the land over to the grazing of domestic stock or to agriculture. The crop of domestic livestock, mostly cattle, in East Africa grassland is slightly more than 30,000 pounds per square mile. On savannah it sinks to under 16,000 pounds. But for wild game on savannah the figure is between 66,000 and 90,000 pounds. On African land which will support one cow on 30 acres, game can yield 4 pounds of meat per acre for every 3 pounds from cattle, experts estimate. This yield from game could be increased if modest sums were invested to improve the habitat, by opening new water holes, for example. Moreover, game ranching protects the environment whereas the grazing of cattle on much of the land now occupied by wildlife leads to its rapid deterioration. The advantages of depending upon game ranching is also very great in areas where use of cattle or other domestic animals is barred by the presence of diseases and pests. In South Africa, game ranching is already an important supplement to income derived from domestic animals on many farms.

Not only does game ranching produce meat, but also the hides and other animal parts which are so much in demand in the Western World and elsewhere. By management to assure that the animal sources of these products are not soon killed off and by subjecting the trade to controls, the developing nations can assure themselves and the world a continuing and perhaps increasing source of revenue.

WILDLIFE WILL BRING TOURIST INCOME TO DEVELOPING NATIONS

Tourism generated by the presence of extraordinary wildlife can also be a source of revenue for nations that preserve their animals. Already expenditures by tourists comprise the second largest source of revenue in Kenya, amounting to some $22 million. Through the construction of better roads and accommodations and by developing national parks replete with films, guides, lectures, information bureaus in the manner of many of our parks and natural attractions income from tourism can be increased further. The Treetops facility in Kenya where visitors can spend a night in a tree shelter with the certainty of seeing a variety of wild animals going their way unaware of human presence has become very popular. Continued urbanization and industrialization of the United States and Europe will enhance the attraction of such settings in Africa and other developing nations if wildlife is conserved. But the developing nations lack the means to avail themselves of this opportunity without aid for that purpose.

A WORLD CONFERENCE CAN MARSHAL THE COMPREHENSIVE MEASURES NEEDED TO SAVE THE WORLD'S WILDLIFE

Many of the threatened animals are native to areas of Latin America, Asia, and Africa. It may, therefore, be asked why we in the United States and in this Congress need to concern ourselves with their fate.

I would reply that each species, wherever it may live, belongs to all mankind. When the stock of life is diminished by the senseless slaughter now going on, all of us lose something very real and irreplaceable. We have an interest in preventing the squandering of the animal riches of the world and in avoiding the day when man and his domestic animals alone occupy the globe.

The United States is also seeking to promote the development of many of the nations which possess the greatest wild animal resources. By helping them to see the value of conserving these resources and by aiding them to begin their conservation programs we can, at small cost, make a considerable contribution to their growth, their ability to fulfill the rising expectations of their people and their capacities to remain independent parts of the free world.

The participation of the governments of the world is needed since they control conservation programs within their borders, regulate imports and exports, and can provide the funds that are required to reap the benefits of conservation. Action to control imports of wild animal products can be of great assistance to nations attempting to prevent the outrages of poachers. With vast areas and few wardens this presents tremendous enforcement problems otherwise. Import bans or limitations would strike at the poachers' incentive to crime and put new difficulties in their way. For import restrictions to be effective, they must be imposed by all importing countries. It would be of little value to prevent the fashionable ladies of America from having leopard-skin coats, for example, while their counterparts in England or Germany continued to buy them apace.

Since bilateral negotiations would necessarily be protracted and cumbersome, an international conference seems the best way of focusing attention on the problem and getting the world started toward more general, more effective action by governments and private groups to save the world's wildlife. The nations represented at the conference could hammer out an agreement on a total program, set out the responsibilities of each nation, make provision for new studies in areas where information is lacking and decide, at least tentatively, how the program will be financed. It is possible that the wildlife conference might be held in conjunction with the World Food Congress of the Freedom From Hunger Campaign of the FAO in Washington June 4 to 18, 1963.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 107 follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of State, should take all necessary steps to convene an international conference within one year after the adoption of this concurrent resolution for the purpose of initiating cooperative action to further conservation of wild animals on a worldwide basis.

SEC. 2. The following countries should be invited to participate in the conference:

(1) Those countries (hereinafter referred to as the "consuming countries") whose demand for furs, skins, pelts, tusks, feathers, and other parts of wild animals, or whose citizens, by hunting wild game, cause a diminution of species of wild animals, and which include, but are not limited to, the members of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; and

(2) Those countries (hereinafter referred to as the "producing countries") in which the major wild animal habitats exist and which include, but are not limited to, countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

SEC. 3. The conference should consider the following cooperative actions:

(1) Legislative or administrative action by consuming countries curtailing or banning imports of commodities the chief value of which is derived from wild animals; and

(2) Assistance by consuming countries to producing countries, either unilaterally or multilaterally through the United Nations or other international agencies, to establish training schools for wildlife and conservation specialists, to establish conservation departments in the producing countries, or otherwise to assist desired world conservation programs; and

(3) Joint study by producing and consuming countries to determine how wildlife conservation and management can increase tourist revenues for producing countries; and

(4) Assistance by the United States to the producing countries through use of local currency accruing to the United States under the food-for-peace program to further the objectives stated in paragraphs (2) and (3) of this section; and

(5) Any other action to promote wild animal conservation.

DEVELOPED NATIONS CAN AID IN ELIMINATING POACHING AND IN TRAINING CONSERVATIONISTS

Some of the specific steps proposed in House Concurrent Resolution 107 could go far toward meeting major specific parts of the problem. Many leaders in the developing nations see the need to conserve their wildlife resources but lack the means to act decisively. Subsection 1 of section 3 proposes a way of aiding developing nations in eliminating the devastating poaching now going on, by controlling imports of the skins and other products of threatened animals.

Another great deficiency in meeting the threat to wildlife is the great shortage of specialists in wildlife management and conservation in the developing nations. There are so many demands on the limited supply of highly trained persons and so strong an impulse among the educated to forsake the bush for the city, that aid particularly to train game managers, conservationists and ecologist is very much needed. A college to train game wardens is to be established in Tanganyika but it is only a small beginning. The need is large. There are fewer than 30 wardens for 355,000 square miles in Tanganyika. In Kenya, for instance, there are only 22 for 200,000 square miles. The central agencies concerned with conservation are embroyonic. House Concurrent Resolution 107 proposes that the conference consider means by which the developed countries that import wild animal products can aid the developing nations to establish training schools and conservation departments.

Relatively small outlays to bring Africans, Asians, and Latin Americans to this country for training in wildlife management and to supplement efforts to set up conservation colleges in the developing countries could pay big dividends. The resolution suggests a means by which some of this could be financed, through use of local currency accruing to the United States under the food-for-peace program.

It is clear, as I pointed out earlier, that the nations fortunate enough to have marvelous stocks of wild animals can derive considerable tourism income from them. But to make the most of this possibility they will have to make some improvements in roads, tourist accommodations, information services and other preparations. To avoid ill-conceived projects and waste, careful studies of the economics of each proposal will be requisite. Joint study by the developed nations, whose citizen will comprise the bulk of the tourists, and the developing nations offers the best approach to the situation. This is proposed in subsection 3 of section 3 of House Concurrent Resolution 107.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Congress will take note of the desperate plight of the many magnificent animals of which I have spoken and of the demands of reason and morality that the current rush toward extermination be stopped. I hope it will promptly pass House Concurrent Resolution 107.

DIALOG ON THE PROBLEMS OF THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I assure you I do not intend to take for myself all the time allotted to me but shall make my remarks as brief as possible. Before I begin my prepared remarks, entitled "Dialog on the Economy of the United States," as requested by President Kennedy last June in his speech at Yale, bearing on the question of tax reduction and tax reforms, I should like to make two things clear:

First, I shall finish my statement and then I shall be glad to yield to anyone on the floor.

Second, my remarks, while they may include political implications in that I shall refer to certain political statements made in the past and apply them to the present, it is not my intention to make a partisan speech.

I want especially to call to the attention of the Members of the House that only yesterday again I read in the newspaper some remarks made by our Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, a man for whom I have the highest respect and admiration not only as a statesman but as a politician. I do so because it seems that when we Republicans stand up and fight for our beliefs and our principles and point up what we believe to be the errors, mistakes and bungling, if you will, of the Executive of this country, we are immediately accused of political motives by

members of the Democrat Party as did the Democrats when I spoke a couple of weeks ago on the economy of the country. But the Democrats very rarely go back to their own remarks of just a couple of years ago when President Eisenhower was the Executive of this Nation, when they sniped at him continuously for 8 long years, even to the point at which many of the remarks, such as those on the missile gap, were very dangerous. Recall also, Democrat criticism of the matter of U.S. prestige in the world, again a very dangerous political attack. This continued from one end of the land to the other, day in and day out, and we had to accept it as being the political rights of the Democrat Party.

Mr. Speaker, I shall read this statement as rapidly as I can.

Mr. Speaker, I shall address myself for a few minutes to the problems of our sagging economy and the changing moods and methods of this administration with reference thereto.

Then, I invite my colleagues to join in the discussion because this is a matter of extreme importance to our country. What I say will not be of a partisan nature and cannot be so construed.

Let us start with the period in which Mr. Kennedy, then a U.S. Senator, was a candidate for the Presidency.

In reply to a question by the Scripps-Howard newspapers October 3, 1960, Mr. Kennedy said:

> It is extremely important that the United States maintain, to the extent that it is possible, a balanced budget. The only true reasons justifying an unbalanced budget would be a great national emergency—and serious unemployment.

Now, it should be noted here that, first, we now face no great national emergency; and, second, any unemployment is too much, but the unbalanced budgets of the last few years have not decreased it. Actually, unemployment has gone up a little while the unbalance of our budgets on the red ink side has gone up and up, during the first 2 years of this administration and in the budget before us now.

The facts are: To my knowledge, President Kennedy has not sent to this Congress a single idea designed to balance the budget, but that, on the contrary, he continues to send us programs that will cost increasingly fantastic amounts of money, and planned deficits.

Then, the President made his famous Yale University commencement address in June 1962, in which he called for a dialog on the problems by this time besetting the American economy.

Two months later, in August, he told a nationwide television audience why he would not propose a tax cut at that time.

But now we have the administration's tax-cut, tax-reform program before us in the Congress. President Kennedy sent it up here with the flat warning that he must have an all-or-nothing package of tax cuts and tax reforms.

The President's fiscal spokesman, Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon, testified before the House Ways and Means Committee, in answer to a question by Mr. Brynes of Wisconsin, that unless the tax-cut, tax-reform proposal was adopted in a package, he would recommend a Presidential veto.

Subsequently, the President began to hear from Members of the House and from the people. He found they didn't agree with these screwball economics such as a tax cut, by borrowing $12 billion; followed by tax reforms to take it back, and adding to the national debt, and increased inflation.

So, on February 25 last, the President told the American Bankers Association he would be satisfied with a tax cut alone. He already had estimated officially that the entire package as originally requested would result in a deficit of nearly $12 billion. Without the so-called tax reforms where would the deficit go?

Where, in fact, has the idea of a balanced budget gone in the mind of the President if, in reality, he ever did have such an idea?

Now, let us go back to another speech Mr. Kennedy made at Rockford, Ill., on October 24, 1960. He said:

> Members of the House of Representatives have great responsibility placed upon them by the Constitution. They are the representatives of the people. Therefore, the power to tax, to appropriate money, other great powers, are vested in Members of the House.

If the President believes in this constitutional power, why then has he so aggressively interfered with the affairs of Congress?

I refer to his personal intercession in stacking the Rules Committee of the House in the 87th and 88th Congresses in order to get what he called a committee that would be responsive to his legislative requests.

Why has he interfered at the start of this session to load the Finance Committee of the other body with people responsive to his wishes?

I ask the President to study his statements in the light of subsequent attempts by him to pressure the Members of the House into adopting his tax package under threat of a recession.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the President's statement at Rockford, Ill. We, as Members of the House, are the representatives of the people. We do have great responsibility. We do have the power to tax and appropriate money.

In my opinion, it is high time we made the truth of the statement very clear. We do represent the people.

And, in my opinion, the people are sick and tired of high taxes, deficits, and inflation brought about by gimmick programs to which the President is so persistently devoted.

In my opinion, the people I represent are sick and tired of their Government continuing to bleed them, to finance all kinds of fantastic schemes, continuing, meantime, to operate at a deficit with an ever-increasing national debt leading to higher inflation and inevitably to bankruptcy.

The dialog Mr. Kennedy asked for is on in a big way.

Many divergent views are expressed in various ways. But, the basic theme of it all, is, that what we need to get the country going, as President Kennedy has phrased it, is to cut the expenses of government before we cut its revenue.

Every housewife, every worker, every businessman knows that to keep his financial head above water, he must do that very thing, so he asks very logically: "Why should not my Government do that, too?"

Now, the President finds himself and his administration in an embarrassing position for which he would like to shift the blame to Congress—to Members of the House especially.

Nobody objects to paying his fair share of taxes. But, the people wonder, Mr. Speaker, why their Government should continue to go further in debt—a debt on which the interest alone, some $10½ billion, takes second highest position in the budget.

"When, if ever," they ask, "can we begin to get rid of this debt and interest payment if we cannot begin now when our Nation enjoys its highest national product, greatest national income and most people employed?"

That's a good question. And, the only answer to it is that we can never begin to attack the debt until the responsible leaders of the administration learn basic economics.

The very proposal of the President's tax-cut, tax-reform program violates basic economics. Surely, the administration knows it. And, yet, the leaders of the President's party have been told from the White House that this program must pass or Mr. Kennedy's chances for reelection will not be so bright.

In any event, the President's pronouncement that he must have a tax cut and tax reform bill or the country would be plunged into a recession was the appeal of a frantic man.

He recognized insurmountable opposition to his program, not only in the Congress, but among the people—opposition coming from just about every segment of the population, as is pointed out in U.S. News & World Report which lists these groups as a few: churches, charity groups, homeowners, homebuilders, elderly people, stockholders—17 million—employee groups.

Other new tax ideas to which there is objection include: tighter rules on stock options, capital gains taxes on estates and gifts, limits on casualty-loss deductions, speedup in payment of taxes by large companies.

The President's frantic state of mind overcame his judgment to the point at which he actually shook the economic foundations with his forecast of a recession. For him to so predict is to undermine the confidence of investors et al on whose confidence rests the economic future.

If this was an attempt to blackmail the Congress into passing his tax reduction bill by shifting the blame for any recession that might occur to Capitol Hill, the President is resorting to ruthless interference with the congressional responsibility he so aptly recognized in his Rockford, Ill., speech in October 1960.

The opposition I have recounted came when the people began to understand some of the provisions of the administration plan, which are as follows:

ADMINISTRATION TAX PROPOSALS

I. Reductions

(a) Personal: Income tax would be reduced from present 20-percent to 91-percent range to a 14-percent to 65-percent range over a 3-year period.

(b) Corporate: Normal tax would be reduced from 30 percent to 22 percent on $25,000 or less. Surtax on income of more than $25,000 goes up in 1963 from present 22 percent to 30 percent; would be reduced in 1964 to 28 percent and 1965 to 25 percent. Net effect: Good tax break for small companies immediately; a 5-percent reduction for larger firms after 3 years.

II. Reforms (the major proposals concerning which there is the most controversy)

(a) Deductions (personal):

1. Itemized deductions: Only itemized deductions (taxes, interest, contributions, medical expenses) in excess of 5 percent of adjusted gross income deductible. Present law: All such items deductible.
2. Casualty losses: Only casualty losses (fire, flood, theft, etc.) in excess of 4 percent of adjusted gross income deductible.
3. Dividend credit: Eliminated.
4. Dividend exemption: $50 dividend exemption eliminated.
5. Sick pay credit: Eliminated.

(b) Other changes:

1. Estate gift: Capital gains tax on appreciation of property at time of decedent's death or at time of gift.
2. Stock options: Increased value of stock between time option is made and exercised would be taxed as regular income. For example: If one is given an option to buy stock valued at $100 and 6 months later exercises that option, and the market price of the stock has climbed to $150, the added $50 would be taxed at regular income.
3. Disability pensions: Now not taxed; would be.
4. Government pensions: State, local, or Federal now not taxed; would be.
5. Acceleration: Corporations with tax liability of $100,000 or more required to speed up payments so that by 1965 they would be on current basis.
6. Group insurance: Employer contributions to group insurance programs to be considered as employee income and would be taxable as such.

The President expressed surprise at the opposition. I wondered, as do many others, where the President got such ideas.

The Chairman of Mr. Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, Mr. Walter Heller, came before the Joint Committee on Economic Affairs to defend the plan. He gave at least a part of the answer to where such ideas come from. Mr. Heller said it was remarkable that the "basic puritan ethic of the American people" would overcome their desire for a tax cut.

Well, let us compare what one great American, Benjamin Franklin, said about this subject, with what Mr. Heller said, as published in the U.S. News & World Report, a compilation of their comparative views:

BEN FRANKLIN ON DEBT

Sayings of Benjamin Franklin, as published in "Poor Richard's Almanack" about 1750, had a lot to do with forming Americans' early ideas on borrowing money and having debts. Some of Franklin's teachings:

"He that goes a borrowing goes a sorrowing."

"If you'd be wealthy, think of saving, more than of getting. The Indies have not made Spain rich, because her Outgoes equal her Incomes."

"Beware of little Expenses: a small Leak will sink a great Ship."

"'Tis against some Men's Principle to pay Interest, and seems against others' Interest to pay the Principal."

"Rather go to bed supperless than run in debt for a breakfast."

"The second Vice is Lying; the first is running in Debt."

"Spare and have is better than spend and crave."

"Pay what you owe, and you'll know what is your own."

"He that buys by the penny, maintains not only himself, but other people."

"Frugality: Make no expense but to do good to others or yourself; that is, waste nothing."

"It is hard for an empty sack to stand upright."

AND THE NEW WAY OF LOOKING AT DEBT

Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers:

"I think it is quite remarkable that the basic puritan ethic of the American people should be such that they want to deny themselves tax reductions because of (a) their fears of deficits, and the additions to the national debt; and (b) because they do not understand that their spending, in effect, makes this contribution to the national growth and full employment."

"This economy is running well short of its potential. The tax cuts can generate higher output, higher employment, higher incomes; can, in effect, broaden the base for taxes so that any increase in the deficit is really a downpayment on a stronger economy and on future surpluses when this economy comes back to something approximating full employment."

"It isn't a choice between no tax cut and a balanced budget on the one hand, and a tax cut and a deficit on the other. It is a choice between a deficit of weakness which comes from sliding along below full employment, and a deficit of strength, or a deficit of transition, which comes from cutting taxes, leaving more money in the hands of private individuals, and invigorating the economy. And I think that business itself, as you can see, has come more and more to this point of view."

In reading these opposition views, one must wonder which one has been proved by history to be right. Ben Franklin or Walter Heller? This is an easy one to answer. Certainly the puritan ethic expressed by Franklin has been the rock of our Nation and its economy. The Heller concept is simply the Keynesian theory of economics that proved near fatal in England, and during our depression years.

I would suggest to President Kennedy that he fire his battery of pseudoeconomists and allow them to return to the ivory towers at Harvard, and so forth. Among these I include America's leading advocate of democratic socialism, Arthur Schlesinger, and Walter Heller, the President's chief economic adviser, whose advice the West German Government rejected in 1951, and, by so doing, went on to create the healthiest economy in Europe.

You know, we do not have to spend a dime of the taxpayers' money to build rockets to send these advisers into orbit. I am convinced they are up there already. I hope the President personally is not as confused about this situation as his ever-changing mood and direction would indicate.

But, whatever the reason may be, there can be no doubt that he has lost his way; that he needs an experienced guide. The Members of this House can be that guide.

The President should simply reduce nonessential spending and then present to the Congress a comprehensive tax reform bill along the lines of H.R. 266, the Herlong-Baker bill. This bill provides for tax reduction on a graduated scale over a 5-year period and covers both corporate and personal income taxes. This would release the additional money needed for more rapid plant expansion, retooling, and increased research. It would further put additional money in the consumer's hands for increasing the purchasing power of the American public. The stimulus from this increased economic activity would create more jobs and make up for lost revenues from increased taxable incomes.

Another great contribution the President could make to getting the country going is a publicly expressed change in attitude toward business—a change from the scare tactics he employed in the steel price controversy. His performance then did as much harm to the Nation's economy as anything else in the Nation's history.

During the campaign of 1962, I stated time and time again that I favored tax cuts. They are necessary not only for the well-being of our people directly by permitting them to keep more of their earnings, but for the good of the economy by providing business expansion and jobs for more people.

But, I made the stipulation that I would not vote tax reduction without a like reduction in spending. I said then and repeat now, that my political and economic philosophy will not permit me to absorb the theory of borrowing money to pay for tax reduction. I believe this theory to be screwball economics and economic suicide.

My constituents are under no illusion as to where I stand, believe me. I have informed them regularly since the President's message on tax reduction and tax reforms.

Now, does it seem strange to you, that I, as one Member of this House, have not received a single letter advocating or supporting tax reduction under the President's plan?

On the contrary, I have received considerable mail, from individuals and business, opposing the President's proposal of planned deficits.

I am sure many Members must recall that during the past several years I have referred to deficit financing and backdoor spending as immoral. It has been my position in the past and will remain so.

The policy now advocated by President Kennedy is that of the social planners, the sponsors of the planned economy, the regimenters of the American people, the advocates of purchasing things now to be paid for by our grandchildren and great-great grandchildren. Is this not immoral? Is this not the kind of immorality and real danger that is revolting to the American people?

I want to quote an article that appeared in the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) News entitled: "Aroused Populace Can Halt Administration's Plunge Into Financial Disaster":

> From events of the past few months, it has become frighteningly clear—

The article reads—

> that President Kennedy * * * no longer believes in the philosophy that progress and prosperity for our Nation can be achieved through the sound principles of a balanced budget. * * * Instead, he has surrendered to the Keynesian philosophy that real prosperity can only be achieved by spending what we do not have for things we do not truly need in the hope this reckless spending binge will produce an artificial kind of prosperity that will keep us afloat in a sea of red ink. * * * It is time more Americans wake up to what is going to happen to their country if we don't get some sanity back in Washington.

Well, I am sure the Fort Lauderdale News is aware by now that the American people have awakened to the real danger, and want none of it.

In the statement by Mr. Heller, he said and I quote:

> I think it is quite remarkable that the basic puritan ethic of the American people should be such that they want to deny themselves tax reduction because of, etc.

This statement by Mr. Heller, in itself, shows a great lack of understanding of the American people. He just does not know and admits it, that the American people are far smarter than he is.

Abraham Lincoln said, many years ago:

> You can fool all of the people some of the time; you can fool some of the people all of the time; but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

The American people are not fooled this time. They are making themselves heard in revolt, and this appears to be surprising to Mr. Heller and his Keynesian followers.

Perhaps it is these economic dreamers who have advised the President to send up the program which he said at Yale would, with the help of Congress, get the country moving.

These included farm controls, aid to depressed areas, medicare, youth employment, manpower retraining, and discretionary Presidential power for public works spending.

It takes a great stretch of the imagination to place any of these in the get-the-country-moving category. For the most part, they have little or nothing to do with the economy, except that they all cost a lot of taxpayers' money.

Whatever else may be said for the President's unsuccessful farm bill, its purpose was to regiment the farmer into producing less, not to stimulate more production.

Regardless of the pros and cons of medicare on other grounds, not even its proponents could very well claim it was a growth additive.

Aid to depressed areas, unemployed youth manpower retraining, public works—all of these are by definition tranquilizers, designed at most to soothe sore spots. They can no more be expected to stimulate growth than did similar programs in the thirties, when all the considerable efforts of Government, year after year, were unable to significantly alleviate mass unemployment, much less lift the economy out of the mire of depression.

Thus it would appear that the help the President sought from Congress—and much of it he got—has not started the country moving.

The answer, in my opinion, lies in a forthright statement by President Kennedy, that he is going to reduce nonessential spending and restore fiscal responsibility to the Federal Government. If he would then reduce his requests for spending, then and only then, should Congress consider tax reduction.

The proper procedure for the Congress to follow, in my opinion, is as follows:

First. Act on all appropriation bills first with a sharp eye toward elimination of nonessential appropriations.

Second. If sufficient cuts are made to more than balance the budget, apply the black ink balance to tax reduction and the national debt.

Speaking for the people of my district now and as I have for many years, I say that we must stop foisting all of these social gimmicks on the people; stop being the tool of the pressure groups.

We must act on behalf of the great majority of the American people who look to us to conduct the affairs of their Government in a sound and sensible way.

Let us put aside the thought of political expediency or who will win the next election.

Let us respond to the puritan ethic of the American people and base our judgment on what is right and what is moral.

Let us assure the American people that principles are the foundation of good and only on this basis will we decide the issues.

For the good of my country, I want to see my President make good. But I will never concede that he is God, or speaks with a God-like voice, no matter how many threats he makes or what terrible retribution he seeks to invoke.

And, finally, let me say this. The task of, and responsibility for, cutting public expenditures is not limited to the Federal Government.

It is just as important to State and local governments. The people are sick and tired of outlandish government spending, no matter at what level it may be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so that nobody can conceivably get the idea that I am against lower taxes, I want to make it clear that since I have been in the House I have advocated less spending and less taxes. This is no new position for me.

For instance, it startles me when I realize that our factories, stores, mines, utilities and all other corporations, on an average, must operate the first 190 days of the year—more than half the year—to make enough money to pay their taxes.

As Henry J. Taylor, the learned writer, says:

> Surely one definition of socialism is the line beyond which a government gets more than the owners. We've crossed that line, even excluding State, county and community taxes on corporations.

Mr. Taylor further points out that Hitler took only 44 percent of profits; that Mussolini took 40 percent, and that they were, as he says, "pikers compared to Washington's 52 percent bite."

So let there be no question about where I stand. Taxes are too high and they have got to come down.

Taxpayers are already forking over $2.2 billion more this year in social security taxes. There are 47 State legislatures meeting this year. Preliminary budget estimates indicate they will seek at least $2.5 billion in additional State taxes.

Many State tax systems are based on the same deductions, allowances, as is that of the Federal Government. President Kennedy reforms which would cut deductions would be incorporated into these State laws, thus raising State taxes. Thirty-three States are studying ways of increasing taxes at present.

As Mark Twain said, maybe we are lucky we are not getting as much government as we are paying for. But paying we certainly are, and a tax cut may be a frustrating, illusory thing.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I would be happy to yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] on this very excellent and well-prepared speech. I want particularly to ask the gentleman, since he brought Benjamin Franklin into this discussion and since I also read the remarks in U.S. News & World Report which the gentleman quoted—does not the gentleman feel that perhaps if we went back to the original concept of government which prevailed in the days of Benjamin Franklin when the Congress legislated and the executive carried out the legislation, we might be a little better off than we are today since we too are guilty in this respect?

Mr. BECKER. I am in wholehearted agreement with the statement of my colleague, the distinguished gentlewoman from New York. That is exactly what we must do. I think we are hearing more and more about that every day, for we, through the years, have permitted the executive branch of Government and I might say the judicial branch of Government to usurp the power and authority of the Congress. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentlewoman, and that is what I mean here. We must reassume our responsibilities as one of the three equal branches of the Federal Government.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman; I quite agree with him.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman on his very fine economics discourse. I should like to ask the gentleman if he can point to any one recommendation of the administration that he considers an aid to private industry.

Mr. BECKER. That is what I tried to get at in my remarks; in going over President Kennedy's recommendations, both last year and so far this year, I can find absolutely nothing that would add to the growth of what we call the gross national product upon which income and employment depend and upon which revenues of the Government depend. There is really nothing in here. I would like to see some concrete ideas to get the country moving; that is, legislation in that direction.

Mr. YOUNGER. I think the gentleman also can find many instances of harassment of private industry.

Mr. BECKER. I think one of the ways in which President Kennedy could get the country moving, one of the greatest contributions he could make is to get government off the backs of the people and of business and let them operate as business people; do not restrict or confine them so that business does not know whether it is going or coming, and does not know on what day it is going to get hit over the head by threats or through regulation. I think that if we would free our business people, our enterprise system that has made this one of the greatest nations in the world and has put it where it is today, conditions would improve. The Government did not make our country. It provided the rules under which we could live. But it was business, the free people of this Nation, working under laws, that made this the greatest Nation on earth. We could do that again. I think if President Kennedy adopted this idea and moved forward with the idea of reestablishing the moral principles of our government, he would really get this country moving. And I would love to see him do it.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, does not the gentleman feel that it is impossible to put all of the unemployed to work in the Peace Corps foreign and the Peace Corps domestic, and by increasing the payrolls of the Federal Government?

The Government simply cannot absorb all of the unemployed, as they are attempting to do.

Mr. BECKER. As I said in my statement these are all gimmicks they are using to take the minds of the people off their many problems. I mentioned earlier that the President promised this year to make a greater utilization of the employees of the Federal Government so that we could have less people on the payroll. Then, a couple of days later, he asks us for appropriations to put 37,000 more people on the Federal payroll. These are some of the inconsistencies that I am talking about, that tend to destroy us.

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman on a splendid statement. I have a constituency which is very much addicted to letter writing. I, like the gentleman from New York, have yet to receive one letter from a person in my district urging me to support the President's tax program.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate my colleague's saying that because I have had the same expression from many other Members. Mr. Speaker, may I add this: I appreciate the complimentary things that have been said about my statement. I am not a writer of speeches, believe me. All I have done today is to try to get off my mind and off my chest those things which I believe I am for and those which I am against.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from New York, the distinguished gentleman who has just spoken, for the excellent statement he has made.

He made reference to the Keynesian philosophy of government. It did not come as any surprise to the gentleman when the other day the President said it did not make any difference whether we had any kind of tax reform just so long as he got his tax cut. It seems that at the other end of the avenue his advisers who believe in this Keynesian philosophy that we can spend ourselves into prosperity have been speaking with tongue in cheek when they said that we might have some tax reform but so long as they get money out of the Federal Treasury they can go on spending and spending and electing and electing.

I join with the gentleman in the remarks he has made.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the President recommend another record budget of about $99 billion, but with lower taxes promised to all. The budget, proposed in a time of prosperity, seeks to meet unemployment problems by massive Federal spending, the same method used unsuccessfully during the New Deal in a time of depression.

It seems to me that such a proposal is the height of fiscal irresponsibility. With a promise of a tax cut and an increased budget there can be only one result, and that is an unbalanced budget and a higher Federal debt.

The President's proposals are based on the premise that joyous taxpayers will join the Government in spending more, creating new economic activity to end unemployment and at the same time produce more tax revenues to wipe out the record deficit.

The value of the dollar meanwhile is supposed to hold steady, contrary to past experience in periods of big Federal deficits.

In looking at the rosy forecasts for increased Federal revenues, some of us keep recalling that Federal spending has climbed much faster than income during the past 2 years. And chief relief for the unemployed has been to put them on the rapidly expanding Federal payroll.

The administration anticipates big cuts in spending for farm programs and international finance with lesser cuts in housing and veterans affairs. There is little reason to look for reduction in any of these areas. In addition, there is evidence that the cost of present and proposed domestic programs has been seriously underestimated.

In all probability, we can look forward to an increase in deficit spending and a higher Federal debt if the administration's budgetary proposals are followed. In the face of an increased deficit, the President has offered a tax cut which will add further to the already soaring Federal debt.

Chief interest is centered in the administration proposal to place a 5-percent floor on tax reductions for such things as interest on home mortgages, contributions to church and charities, and so forth.

The average tax cut for a family of four with an income of $5,000 is estimated at $58 by 1965.

Congressional tax experts say the 5-percent floor will reduce the average itemized deductions by between 20 and 30 percent. This includes other changes allowing smaller deductions for medical expenses and casualty losses.

Under present law the standard deduction is equal to 10 percent of the adjusted gross income—with a ceiling of $1,000—or a deduction by itemization. The proposed 5-percent floor would appear to reward those who use the standard deduction and penalize those who itemize—which falls most heavily on the middle income group.

At the same time it would seem to discriminate against the homeowner paying local and State taxes and contributing to his church, charity, or school. It would reward the person who does not own his home, does not pay local or State taxes, and does not contribute to charity.

The whole question of tax reduction while increasing Federal spending involves a grandiose gamble. The President is putting everything on the line in the hope that the increased expenditures and tax reduction will result in spectacular economic growth. There is no guarantee that his proposals will work now, when they have failed in the past. If the economy fails to realize such spectacular growth, then tax rates will have to be increased to prereduction levels.

The citizens of South Dakota are deeply concerned about the President's proposals. Many of them have

expressed their views to me. I would like to cite some of the comments which my constituents have expressed in recent letters. They are representative of many additional letters being received:

> Hon. Ben Reifel,
> *House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*
>
> Dear Mr. Reifel: I am extremely concerned about the Treasury Department's recent recommendation to Congress for changes in our Federal income tax laws.
>
> An inducement to keep good teachers in any community is that fact that under their limited income, and under present legislation, it is possible to purchase a home on a monthly purchase plan. The fact that these folks can presently deduct all of certain expenses in computing the net for tax purposes is surely a positive factor. Home mortgage interest and real estate tax deductions were approved as an inducement for growth of homeownership; this inducement, it seems to me, is as important today as ever before.
>
> Thank you.
>
> Very sincerely yours,
>
> Clair T. Blikre.

> Hon. Ben Reifel,
> *U.S. Congressman from South Dakota,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> Honorable Sir: It appears to me that our congressional representatives should represent their constituents, but there are times when the constituents are misled by governmental propaganda, and at such times, the representation should be a matter of protection of the constituent.
>
> If there was ever a time when the unthinking citizen needed protection, it's now. A tax cut is, of course, popular, but if it entails greater debt, and eventual federalization of our country, I feel that our representatives should save the public from its own ignorance and folly.
>
> Please use your influence and vote to defeat any and all political schemes to perpetuate an all-powerful Central Government.
>
> No one ever successfully spent himself rich. How can Democrats justify their stand? We must return the government to the people.
>
> Respectfully yours,
>
> L. J. Pankow.

> Hon. Ben Reifel,
> *Congressman from South Dakota.*
>
> Dear Mr. Reifel: We had a livestock meeting here last night with some of the commission men and packer buyers and one of the topics discussed was income tax crackdown for business people.
>
> There is no question that it is hurting the cattle market. It has probably been abused, but the net result will be less tax money. These farmers are very disturbed about the whole deal, and many seem to think that we will simply raise the U.S. debt.
>
> I personally think that a big tax cut would make more activities for all business and perhaps make more people employed, but how can it help as long as big labor leaders step in and raise more wages. The administration is antagonistic to business anyway.
>
> You must remember when F.D.R. came in 1933 until 1941 with the same kind of gang in power, unemployment was higher in 1941. All farm products were down. We sold hogs for 4 to 5 cents in 1940 and 1941 and the only reason prices came up was the war.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Jim Biggar.

> Hon. Ben Reifel,
> *U.S. Representative,*
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> My Dear Mr. Reifel: A lot of voters in South Dakota are becoming irate over Federal spending and what it is costing us. From the information we get, the proposed tax cut is a mere pittance compared to what could be done.
>
> We—I believe I speak for many South Dakotans—are awestruck over the method that is proposed to allow for tax reduction. The beatnicks have a phrase for it—"snow job."
>
> In my opinion, it is time that careful legislators band together, tighten controls on spending at home and abroad, making sure we get our dollar's worth; exert pressure on the committee responsible for tax laws that irrigate the bank accounts of most Americans who are literally living from hand to mouth.
>
> The February issue of Nation's Business states that government spending will take 31 percent of the gross national product in 1963 as opposed to 10 percent in 1940 and 24.8 percent in 1955. Perhaps the sages on Capitol Hill know where we are heading and have ceased to listen to the still small voice of the taxpayer and voter who are fearful of a ruptured bubble.
>
> Respectfully yours,
>
> J. E. Swallum.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe we all realize that the public is losing confidence in the present administration—

Because of the double failure, for example, that we have had down in Cuba.

Because this administration has allowed the wall to be erected in Berlin.

Because we have had a continuing program of giving aid to the Communist bloc countries.

Because of the fantastic budget proposals that have been made.

Because of the unrealistic tax reduction and reform proposals.

Because of helping form a coalition government with the Communists in Laos.

Because business failures are the highest since 1935.

Because mortgage foreclosures are extremely high.

Because of having alienated the Canadians, the British, the French, the Portuguese, and probably some others.

However, I find it extremely difficult to understand what would motivate the administration to use tactics that may well start a recession in this country. It is quite possible that a recession can be induced when a person in high office starts referring to a recession as being likely if certain legislation is not passed.

The people have gone along with the deficit-spending fiscal irresponsibility of the administration for the past couple of years. Now they are demanding that we return to a sound financial position.

My mail also has been overwhelmingly in favor of not going along with the fiscally irresponsible program of the administration.

Mr. BECKER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I agree with what he says. I am sure his constituents feel exactly that way.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I should like to compliment the gentleman from New York on his most important presentation, and to make note of the fact that it is especially appropriate on this 30th anniversary of the inauguration of former President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Our late President became noted for his deficit financing, but during his years in the White House I do not recall a single peacetime year in which he failed at least to give lipservice to the objective of a balanced budget.

Mr. BECKER. The most significant part of it is that it started off with the idea that we would probably reach a balanced budget by this method in 1967 or 1968, but now they have even pushed this by the board and it may not be until 1975. Who is going to carry the load along the way?

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. I wish to thank the gentleman from New York for taking the time to discuss the importance of a sound national budget.

I am sure the gentleman would be pleased to know that obviously the general public does not buy, as a sound proposal, the so-called planned deficit approach. I reach this conclusion judging from the many comments included in the many letters I receive. I think the gentleman should know that actually some folks are amused, feeling the tax proposal is ridiculous.

A quote from one letter reveals this fact very well—here is the quote:

> Dear Congressman: Could you get President Kennedy to write my banker. You see I am planning a deficit in my budget and I am having trouble making the dumb cluck understand.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. BECKER. I am glad to have a little levity in this, but the gentleman is perfectly right.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I desire to associate myself with a particular remark of the gentleman in which the gentleman points out that probably all unemployment is too much unemployment, but obviously our experience for many years now is that you do not lick an unemployment problem with a deficit spending program. The present program of the administration tries, as I see it, first, to increase the spending and then reduce the taxes. I suppose they intend to make up the difference by borrowing.

Mr. Speaker, it also has been my observation that a debtor is not in a very healthy financial situation and I do not think it is proper ever to consider a debt as an asset. Nevertheless, this administration seems to so consider it.

Mr. Speaker, a debt—the national debt in the size to which it has grown, represents to my mind the failure of our generation to meet the demands of our time. Practically all of the present national debt, Mr. Speaker, was created by our generation—permitted to grow by our generation, and it measures the extent to which our generation has failed to meet the requirements of our time and, yet, we see fit to cast that burden upon the future. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the future will have need of all of its own resources to meet all of its own needs without bearing our burdens as well. Consequently, I do not see how we can avoid the very elemental economic principle that you cannot spend and have, and that the way to get this economy of ours on a sound basis again would be to reduce Government spending, to balance the budget and to undertake an orderly process for the reduction of the national debt.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. BECKER. I certainly would agree with what the gentleman has said. This is getting into the immorality of what we are doing. It seems in recent years the pseudoliberals—and I call them pseudoliberals because that is all they are—they want to spend my money but not theirs, to do all the fancy things that they want, but that they do not want to pay for themselves. I would like to see them spend their money to do some of these things, which they could very well do because their funds are unlimited. But they are in such a hurry to do everything now and to remake the world now. It took God all these years to create the world and mankind as we know it today, but they want to do this today, tomorrow and yesterday. But they do not care whether my grandchildren and my great-grandchildren are going to be able to build a sidewalk or whether they are going to have a bankrupt nation. They do not care about that. I say if they want these things now, let those people who propose to do the spending bring in an additional tax bill and place that tax bill before the people and be honest about it and say, "This project is going to cost $5 billion, therefore, we are going to increase taxes so much." To me—this would be the moral way to handle the situation.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that your chief objection is that this is a planned spending deficit?

Mr. BECKER. No, sir. I am against deficit spending except when it happens as a result of a national emergency or an uncontrolled recession or depression.

I am against deficit spending. I have voted against it through the years.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. How would you go about getting from under the deficit?

Mr. BECKER. I think I detailed that in my lengthy dissertation on the economy.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What part of the appropriations would you cut out?

Mr. BECKER. Oh, I would cut out a lot of foreign aid. I would cut out a lot of agriculture. I would cut out this $5 billion for Federal aid to education. I would cut out a lot of things the people do not want and which they could get along better without.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Would you do without subsidies to airlines?

Mr. BECKER. If we are going to get into this matter of cutting expenditures to meet revenues I could detail where you could cut out billions of dollars from the budget, at least $10 billion, without getting into the matter of subsidies to airlines.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further, what the gentleman is talking about is the budget.

Mr. BECKER. That is right.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And the tax bill.

Mr. BECKER. That is right.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And the gentleman is objecting because they do not come out even.

Mr. BECKER. No, that is not it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is not that the extent of your argument?

Mr. BECKER. That is only part of it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do you not realize that after the depression of 1929 we have been engaging in deficit spending almost every year since then, including the Eisenhower years when we had more than $32 billion in deficit?

Mr. BECKER. No, you did not. In the Eisenhower years it was $30 billion.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Only $30 billion.

Mr. BECKER. And that was too much.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And that was not planned, was it?

Mr. BECKER. During that time there were two recessions that caused a great part of that deficit. The gentleman will remember that in 1954 we balanced the budget with a Republican-controlled Congress, and reduced taxes. We did that under a Republican Congress. Under a Republican Congress and Republican President in 1954 we balanced the budget and we reduced taxes nearly $7.5 billion. I would think that was quite an accomplishment.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman is talking about the slump of 1955.

Mr. BECKER. I believe it was after that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman is talking about the slump of 1955.

Mr. BECKER. I believe it was after that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman admitted to two depressions in the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. BECKER. Not depressions. The gentleman referred to the Hoover depression. I would like to have him define what he means by a Hoover depression.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The Hoover depression came when the Republicans manipulated the market.

Mr. BECKER. Republicans?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. When they threw the farmer and the working man completely out of employment.

Mr. BECKER. Just a minute. I wonder if Joe Kennedy should not bear some of the responsibility? Nobody made more money in the stock market in 1929 than Joe Kennedy. That is where he made many millions. He also manipulated the stock market. Was he a Republican?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Was it not the Republicans who set up the RFC to help out the railroads and the banks?

Mr. BECKER. When was it that was set up?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In 1930.

Mr. BECKER. Certainly it was neither 1928 or 1929.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It came about at a time when every bank and railroad was in trouble and the man Hoover appointed at the head of it was Mr. Dawes, "Hell-and-Maria" Dawes, Vice President under "Keep Cool With Coolidge."

Then what did he do? The first $90 million he lent was to his own bank in Chicago. He resigned and went home, as did every other Republican who had the ability to get close to the RFC, the railroads, and the banks. That was when the Federal spending got started, under the Republicans in 1930, 1931, and 1932.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman will concede that whoever started it, it has kept going ahead.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Eisenhower followed that philosophy.

Mr. BECKER. He did not. At no time did he follow that philosophy.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The Republicans had a $32 billion deficit from the time he went in 1953.

Mr. BECKER. Again the gentleman is wrong. In the first place, the gentleman will remember we were in the Korean war in 1953 and there was a big deficit that year.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. Is it not true that every President for the last 50 years in running as a candidate for the Presidency has sold the people on the idea, or told the people that he was going to have and submit to the Congress a balanced budget?

Mr. BECKER. I agree with the gentleman, yes.

Mr. HALEY. And it has not been done, has it?

Mr. BECKER. It has not been done, no.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, in reference to the remarks made by the gentleman from Colorado, I would like to point out to the gentleman that the Democrats had control of the Congress 6 of the 8 years that President Eisenhower was in office, and that the Republicans have had control of only two sessions of Congress since 1930. I do not think a Republican in Congress or any Government employee can be blamed for the deficit spending program that this country has embarked upon since.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman referred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and said it was created by Mr. Hoover. What kind of Congress did we have in 1931? It was a Democratic Congress elected in 1931. It was not a Republican Congress. If the gentleman wants to argue about the matter, let us look at the record. There was not one recommendation made by Hoover to stave off the depression that the Democratic majority passed in the Congresses of 1931 and 1932. The record is abundantly clear on recommendations made by President Hoover at that time. This is an exercise in futility, if we are going to try to discuss what happened in 1928 and 1930. I am trying to discuss what we ought to do today. We should get down to business today. We should balance the budget by having sane, sound programs, and reducing the national debt, then reducing taxes, but not come in here with some gimmicks involving a deficit that nobody can point to with one ounce of reason that it will work.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I am sure the gentleman knows that in the election of 1930, and certainly in the election of 1928, with the Hoover landslide, you got a Republican Congress with him?

Mr. BECKER. That was for 2 years. The gentleman said in 1930.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is what I said. We had the election in 1930.

Mr. BECKER. Right.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. And the Republicans had a majority.

Mr. BECKER. No.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. After the election and before the Congress came along on March 4, 1931, and there were vacancies, the Republicans failed in the special elections, and it was possible for the Democrats to take over. I think that is the history of it. If you do not believe what I am talking about, go talk to JOE MARTIN.

Mr. BECKER. I do not think it makes a particle of difference what happened in 1930. I think we should keep the discussion on what we are going to do now, what we have to build on. Because I made a mistake last year or 5 years ago, does the gentleman not think I should correct it now?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. If the gentleman has a contribution to make that is appropriate to the discussion at hand, I will yield to him. But if we are going back, it is a great waste of time, and I do not think we should burden the Members with it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The contribution I would like to make at this time is to ask the gentleman, How does he propose to take care of automation and unemployment and not carry on as we have since World War II?

Mr. BECKER. Let me ask the gentleman this question, How did business provide jobs for the American people over the last 150 years? Did the Government provide the means for that? It did not. It provided a confidence in the minds and hearts of the American people. We should move forward and provide opportunities for the people. That is how we get along. Automation? Labor and business will take care of automation if we do not get in between them. I think I have yielded now enough to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I want to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. BECKER. I do not believe it will contribute anything to what we are trying to do here. In this present budget I have indicated $10 billion that you can cut. If you want to give a tax cut after that, all right.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman in this respect: It is not where we have been. It is, Where are we going now?

I say this, and I think every Member of this Congress knows it: You can cut the budget which has been submitted to this Congress by 20 percent, and you will not interrupt any essential function of Government, if we will get the Government out of the people's hair and let them get back to doing the things that have made this country a great Nation—individual initiative, private enterprise—and we will not have the Congress messing into these things about which it does not know anything. The people will take care of them.

Mr. BECKER. I must say that I am in wholehearted agreement with my colleague on the other side of the aisle, and I would only hope and pray that our leadership and our Government would get down to this basis. That is what I am trying to bring out today.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from New York for the light which he has shed on this subject today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to hear my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER], comment on this item that has been been bothering me a little bit:

The President, when he submitted his message to us, told this House, if we approved his tax program and the budget which gives us a deficit of nearly $12 billion on the one hand and a big tax cut on the other, it would "strengthen every segment of the American economy and bring us closer to every basic objective of American economic policy." A tax cut and a deficit at the same time, according to the President, is designed to strengthen every segment of the American economy. My point is this: I wonder if we have discovered some new economic law under which we can operate the Federal Government? If we have discovered some new economic law, I wonder if the Members of the House who have indicated they might support this type program would not be good enough to write to their respective Governors, because we have a lot of State legislatures now in session. They are stumbling around in the dark. In Utah, for example, they are figuring out ways now to solve their school problems by raising taxes so they can balance the budget. In Utah we are working under some archaic economic principles if the President is correct. I wish someone could shed some light on this matter so we could cut our taxes and increase our spending program at the same time and maintain a balanced budget. Perhaps the New Frontiersmen have discovered a new economic law and they ought to share it with us all.

In his special tax message, President Kennedy told the Congress:

> The chief problem confronting our economy in 1963 is its unrealized potential—slow growth, underinvestment, unused capacity and persistent unemployment. The result is lagging wage, salary, and profit income, smaller take-home pay, insufficient productivity gains, inadequate Federal revenues, and persistent budget deficits.

The President was correct in every respect. These are difficult problems, the solution of which will try the best minds in the country. Since that time I have been baffled by the solution which the President and some of his fellow Harvardites have proposed. To cure two of the ills he itemized—"inadequate Federal revenues and persistent budget deficits." He asks us to deliberately plan a $12 billion deficit and at the same time deliberately cut Federal revenues.

The Congress and the Nation are being told by the "wagonmaster" of the New Frontier that this great big budget coupled with a great big deficit and backstopped with a great big tax cut is good for the country.

Mr. Speaker, if it is true that the economic problems facing our great Nation, are shared on a somewhat lesser degree by our States, counties, and towns, why will not the President share his magic with the Governors, commissioners, and mayors who, all across this broad land are stumbling in the darkness, laboring under false impressions, and trying their best to make old fashioned concepts, like the myth from our Puritan past, work; and I refer to the myth that government revenues should equal government expenditures.

If the President has no doubt that increased spending, decreased revenues, and pyramiding debt are the answer to the economic ills at the Federal level, why doesn't he urge that all of the 50 States cut their taxes, go into debt, and spend 12 percent more this year than they anticipate taking into their treasuries? I believe the States have a role to play in the Republic, and they ought to do their share of tax cutting, overspending, and debt building. Furthermore, we ought to get our 3,072 counties to help out too. If they would all overspend their budgets 12 percent and cut their taxes in one fell swoop, I imagine the rate of recovery would stagger even the President and Mr. Heller.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all the Members of this House who intend to support this sort of White House hocus-pocus to immediately write their Governors, county commissioners, and mayors and urge them to do their part to help the President get the country moving again.

The plain truth of the matter is, that this sort of economic logic would not work for you, nor for me. It would not work either for the States, the counties, and the cities and I, for one, do not believe it will work for the Federal Government.

With the adoption of his tax recommendations the President expressly promises:

First:

> Total output and economic growth will be stepped up by an amount several times as great as the tax cut itself. Total income will rise—billions of dollars more will be earned each year in profits and wages.

Second:

> Unemployment will be reduced, economic prospects of our depressed areas will improve, those presently employed will have greater job security.

Third:

> Price stability can be maintained * * * with increased profits after tax there should be less pressure to raise prices. * * * Inflationary expectations have ended * * * the balanced approach that the Treasury has followed in its management of the public debt can be relied upon to prevent any inflationary push.

These blessings are promised if we will but adopt the largest budget ever, build in a good healthy deficit and then cut taxes.

Many Members of Congress would buy a tax cut if we could knock $10 to $15 billion off the budget. But we have been advised that the program won't work if we try to balance the budget by cutting expenditures. Mr. Kennedy said in his very proposal to cut the taxes:

> It would be a grave mistake to require that any tax reduction today be offset by a corresponding cut in expenditures.

We may well wish that we could solve all of our problems, that we could feed, clothe and house the poor, provide for the Nation's defense, and educate our children with this little effort. We cannot, except by effort, work, and sacrifice, accomplish these goals and we know it.

I challenge the administration with all of its economic experts to prove the soundness of their logic. Can the gentleman from New York further enlighten us?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I think I can shed some light on it.

Mr. BECKER. Just a moment.

Mr. BURTON. I think that is my point. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman asked me the question, and let me say this to the gentlemen: This is the very nub of what I am talking about. If we would get down to cases here in the Federal Government, reduce all of this spending and get out of local affairs such as urban affairs and this mass transportation business, and let the localities do it, we would cut our Federal spending by $10 billion. Then by doing this we could cut Federal taxes and let the people in the States and the various localities handle their own money and spend it on what they need in those areas. This is what I have been getting at.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if my friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers], thinks that to borrow and spend is going to increase the national income, and whether it has increased the national income? What does the gentleman propose? Is this what the gentleman is proposing—that we would borrow the money and increase the national income? I would like to know.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I will yield to the gentleman to answer the question.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Of course, I do not want to get into the economics that the gentleman from Utah talked about and that the gentleman from Iowa is now asking the question about. There has been a change in the economics of this country beginning in 1930 when the Republicans dipped into the till to save the banks, the railroads, and whatnot. Now, in 1933 when President Roosevelt came in he opened the barrel wide open. He opened it to whom? The farmers represented by the gentleman from Iowa. And they have had their hands in the till ever since and he has not gotten them out of it. At the same time we created, or there was created in 1933 the Home Owners Loan Corporation. Now we have a Federal Housing Administration. Does the gentleman from Iowa propose that we should do away with that altogether? And at the same time we set up the——

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I want to answer the question of the gentleman from Utah and the statement of the gentleman from Iowa. They asked the questions.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Pilcher). The gentleman from New York [Mr. Becker] refuses to yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, but I have not yet finished.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to permit the gentleman to go back to 1902 in order to answer a question just asked.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I think you should know that there has been a change in the economic conditions in the last 30 years.

Mr. BECKER. That is the gentleman's idea. That does not mean that we have to like the change or that we have to live with it. Maybe we want to correct it now.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. How are you going to meet the problem? Are you going to kick the farmers of Iowa out the window and refuse to give them anything?

Mr. BECKER. I am not referring to the farmers of Iowa alone, but we could cut this farm program by several billion dollars instead of pyramiding its cost every year.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Are you going to withdraw the insurance that has been given to every homeowner that has built a home, until we have 60 percent homeownership now in this country? Are you going to do away with that program?

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York refuses to yield further.

Mr. BECKER. If the gentleman wants to offer a detailed program, I suggest he put in the Record. I refuse to yield further at this time.

Mr. Speaker, there are billions—$10, $15, $20 billion, by which this budget can be cut. It should be cut now. Irrespective of what was done 30 years ago or 50 years ago, my children should not be blamed for my mistakes, or for the mistakes of my grandfather or father. If we can correct these mistakes, it is our moral duty to do it now and not follow what was done yesterday or last year or 20 years ago. Now we have the golden opportunity to carry out our own responsibility. The Members of Congress must have some idea of what the people are thinking back home, across this land. That is evident I believe to the President and his economic advisers today, because they really backed up on their proposals for tax reform. But they are threatening a recession if a tax reduction is not voted, in attempt to blackmail the Congress, if we do not pass such a tax reduction bill. They do not know which way to run now. I think we should guide them in the right direction. That is our responsibility.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one quick observation?

Mr. BECKER. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers] that we got the old triple A in 1933. It came from a Democratic Congress. That is where the law was born and that is where the subsidy to the farmers was born.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this observation, coming from a bourbon State, that it seems to me that "spending yourself into prosperity" seems to be analogous to "drinking yourself sober."

Mr. BECKER. I think that is about right.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in behalf of the

statement of the gentleman from New York and comment on his remarks. A farmer from Nebraska very much appreciates his position. If the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers] were a farmer and had to operate a farm under the control program that this administration tried to pass last year, he would realize that Federal control of the food supply would cause many additional grave problems.

If the Congress had passed that bill it would affect 40 percent of the economy of the United States. Even though the farmers are about 10 percent of the population, the industries relating to farming would bring the total up to almost 40 percent of the economy. If we had allowed that bill to pass and an all-powerful Federal Government could have had control of 40 percent of the economy, it would be but a short step to take over all the rest of the economy. At that time whatever man was Secretary of Agriculture trying to run American farms by the seat of his pants down here at a desk in Washington would not understand the problems of the farmer.

For instance, it would be hard for some to understand why a 4-plow tractor will pull only one plow on different farms.

Federally controlling the food supply in the United States would put the American farmer in the same position farmers are in today in Russia and China.

I plead for the support of the gentleman from Colorado with 50 or 100 or 200 Democrats on that side, to gradually get the Government out of production and marketing. We ask you at the same time to gradually get the Government out of the rest of the economy so free enterprise can take over and do a better job of operating the economy of this country.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I will not yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. Does the gentleman have a question or a statement?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am sure we all share the gentleman's great concern about fiscal responsibility. I try to join the gentleman in trying to save some money for the taxpayers. I wonder if the gentleman will be good enough to put down on paper at the end of his remarks for all of us to study how he proposes to save this $20 billion. He might find a great deal of support if he did that, I am quite sure. I should like the gentleman to give us all the facts, breaking it down specifically, on where he proposes to save $20 billion in this budget. I assure the gentleman I will be looking at the Record tomorrow and I will be very eager to see how he is going to do that. He will get a great deal of support if his program is workable.

Mr. BECKER. In the first place, I must interrupt to say that I did not say $20 billion, I specifically named $10 billion. I said this would probably grow, if we went deep enough, to $15 or $20 billion; I do not know. But $10 billion has been the figure. With just the few items I have mentioned it went beyond $10 billion.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will we find that in the Record tomorrow?

Mr. BECKER. I have got it in the Record already. I mentioned $4 billion in the foreign aid program. We can take $4 billion out of agriculture.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will the gentleman be good enough to break down that $4 billion? We are asking for only $3.8 billion this year in the whole foreign aid program. I would like the gentleman to break this down and show us specifically where he would make the cuts. Then maybe he would find a great deal of support.

Mr. BECKER. I will be very happy to have the gentleman's support, but I will bet right now he will not vote against one appropriation this year, the President is going to bring up here. He will not vote against it whether it has cuts in it or not. We on this side want to give you the opportunity to make cuts. If the gentleman from Chicago will refer to the remarks by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Snyder] he will find a detailed list of reductions that can be made in the budget this year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to correct the gentleman to make the record clear. They are not asking for $3.8 billion, it is $4.9 billion.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But I would like to have a breakdown.

Mr. BECKER. I have not yielded to the gentleman.

The gentleman made a grievous error like Democrats will do of only $1 billion. That may be peanuts in his book, but in my book even $1,000 is a great deal of money.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If you break the figures down, we may support you.

Mr. BECKER. I doubt that very seriously despite the fact I know the gentleman might be sincere in making the statement.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Try us; let us have the figures and see what the difference is.

Mr. BECKER. May I say to the gentleman, let me refer to his record last year. How many of our amendments on the foreign aid bill did you vote for last year?—not one.

Mr. PUCINSKI. On the contrary, the record will show I voted for every single amendment made by the committee headed by Congressman Passman. We trimmed that foreign aid bill way down last year and the year before and the year before that.

Mr. BECKER. I am talking about the amendments made on the floor here.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Amendments written on your knees—ill-conceived and ill-thought out? I went with the committee and I think the majority of the Members of this Congress went with the committee. We trimmed it, if my memory serves me right in this House, I believe, almost $1 billion.

Mr. BECKER. How did the gentleman vote on the farm bill last year?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Sir?

Mr. BECKER. How did the gentleman vote on the farm bill last year?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I believe we supported the committee on that too.

Mr. BECKER. Yes, you are right.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Of course, we did.

Mr. BECKER. That is all. I do not yield further.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. I think we have gotten far off the track of the central theme of the presentation of the gentleman from New York which, I am sure, all will agree was a very excellent one. One factor which might be pointed up at this time was the strange character of this planned deficit, so-called tax cut incentive which the administration is talking about. I think we might properly consider the proposed tax cut actually a bit of hokus pokus because, so long as we continue to spend, the Government is going to exact its pound of flesh from the taxpayer whether it be in the form of direct taxes or in the form or indirect taxation, namely, inflation. What we need to be concerned with here is the level of spending and I thank the gentleman from New York for so eloquently presenting this theme to us.

Mr. BECKER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from New York on his thoughtful presentation. I would like to inquire of him: Under the proposed tax reforms, is it not less advantageous for a person to make contributions, to pay property taxes, or to pay interest on a mortgage? I have reference to my understanding of the so-called 5-percent floor under deductions. Will this not result in reducing the amount of interest and property taxes and charitable contributions that a taxpayer can take as a deduction?

Mr. BECKER. Of course; in other words, if a taxpayer has, we will say, taxes to pay or interest on his mortgages or charitable contributions, let us assume that these total $1,000. Now, if 5 percent of his gross income is $500, he then loses $500 worth of the deductions that he is getting today of $1,000. That is my understanding of it and it is why every property owners organization in this country took off after this. Certainly, if we are going to knock the props out from underneath all our homebuilding institutions, this is a good way to do it.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I thank the gentleman from New York for clarifying this situation. This was my understanding of it too. As a country lawyer, I have made out a great many tax returns for small property owners, and it seems to me this is going to discourage charitable contributions and home ownership. I understood from some of the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado that he took great pride in the fact that his administration is in favor of home ownership.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I do not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman refuses to yield at this time. I have yielded to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Continuing my remarks, the point I am trying to make is: this administration has submitted a proposal, this 5-percent floor, which will reduce the amount of interest paid on a mortgage which can be deducted. Also the amount of property taxes deductible would be limited. This will discourage private ownership of homes.

Mr. BECKER. I think the answer to that is simple. The President and his advisers, at least the President, has backed away from this tax reform proposal that they sent up; and I am sure the reason they backed away from it is that if we are going to disallow the interest paid on mortgages and the amount of money paid in taxes it certainly will injure the homebuilding industry of this country.

Secondly, such a policy means we would be breaking faith with the millions of people who bought their homes and who have been paying interest and taxes because they are allowed deductions. We would break faith with them if we turn around and say we are going to allow you only that part above 5 percent of your gross income, perhaps cut in half the deduction you are now getting. This is not good faith. I do not think we are in any position to break faith with these people, and I do not think we should attempt to destroy our economy by putting hundreds of thousands of homeowners in this position. I think we should have a floor on spending, a floor on deficits.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the administration will no longer press for the so-called reform that puts a 5-percent floor on deductions?

Mr. BECKER. If the gentleman is asking me for an opinion I can only give you my own. I think the President's own statement indicates that, for he said he would accept tax reduction without tax reform. But let us not think that perhaps later on if we pass a tax reduction bill this year that there will not be tax reform next year or in the near future.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Another factor that enters it besides interest payments and taxes is the matter of contributions to churches, schools, and charities. Is it not true that this 5-percent floor will discourage that type of contribution?

Mr. BECKER. That is quite correct. Included is a person's contribution to church, to any form of charity that is deductible. That is included in this so-called reform proposal. It would mean a floor of 5 percent of a person's gross income.

Mr. CLEVELAND. This proposal discourages contribution to churches and charities. This discourages homeownership because of the treatment of interest paid on mortgages and taxes. Is this not part of a continuing attempt to do all things for the people by the Federal Government in Washington? Is this not an attempt to discourage local individual and private efforts to do important things at home?

Mr. BECKER. All we have to do is to look back over incidents that have happened in the last 30 years to see how this socialistic philosophy of government has been developing and growing. I do not know whether it was planned. Actually I do not know what was planned by this tax reform suggestion, but if they want to ruin the economy of this country all they have to do is to pass this thing.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. I just want to call the attention of the gentleman from New York to this: In the 5-percent floor under allowable deductions it is my understanding that various religious organizations, churches and so forth, have a method of tithing 10 percent of a person's earnings.

I have some of these people in my congressional district. Ten percent of all their earnings they give to the church.

So the gentleman from Colorado, who seems many times here to be anxious and zealous in protecting civil rights, I would suggest he also ought to be just about as zealous in protecting the religious rights of some of the people, because, after all, it boils down to civil rights also.

Mr. BECKER. I think the gentleman is quite right.

I want to say something to the gentleman from Colorado. He and I have been friends for years on this floor and off the floor. So there is no misunderstanding about that. I may possibly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman. That is a promise.

Mr. BECKER. No, I said "may" not "shall." I may change my mind.

May I say to the gentleman that during the course of this discussion I thought I was quite liberal earlier in yielding constantly to the gentleman from Colorado. I do not think I restricted the gentleman at all. But finally I came to the conclusion that he was attempting to utilize my entire time and the time others might want to use. That is the reason I found it necessary to refuse further to yield. We are coming down to the point where we will be belaboring our colleagues if we continue along this line. I did not take this discussion far afield. We cannot afford the immoral act of borrowing $12 billion to give a tax reduction to the people. It is unprincipled, it is immoral. I do not think it is at all fair to put on generations to come a tax reduction now for things we have and perhaps they never will have.

I said we could reduce this budget by $10 billion. Possibly you may build it up to $15 billion or $20 billion. Someone has suggested that. From the looks of the present budget, we could cut out $5 billion for Federal aid, and a few other things. You can easily balance this budget and forget about a tax reduction. I think the American people would be the happiest people in the world if we came in now at this session of Congress with a balanced budget. We can cut appropriations. Let us not vote a tax reduction which would increase the deficit next year. Then we will have tax reforms, putting more on their backs.

Now, briefly, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do not know how reasonable I shall be in face of the many statements made by the gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. BECKER. Is the gentleman going to attempt to answer all these questions?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will give me time, I will.

Mr. BECKER. I do not know that I want to stand here that long.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As to the farm program, the gentleman says he is against that.

Mr. BECKER. Does the gentleman want to know something?

The Farm Bureau in New York State endorsed me for reelection and I have voted against every farm bill to come up in the House of Representatives. I have no farm in my district.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman from New York would propose as part of the $10 billion reduction to take that money now allocated to the farmers; is that right?

Mr. BECKER. No; not all at one time. You could take $4 billion or $5 billion right away.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is about all they get.

Mr. BECKER. I heard the gentleman say the other day it would be about $8 billion this year including the surplus and crop supports.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Be that as it may——

Mr. BECKER. Let us not quibble about billions.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Each billion is important.

Mr. BECKER. I know.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Each billion is important even as to you and I.

But the question that I propounded and the thing that I want to know is this: Since we have had a changed economic condition that started in the 1930's and since we have had a tremendous buildup in deficits each year since then, what is the solution when just recently the Republicans on the other side of the aisle were jumping on the President because he had not done anything about unemployment and stated that unemployment was up almost to 6 percent.

Now, the President in his message that he sent up here is apprehensive that we may get into another depression. The question I would like to ask the gentleman is this: Would the gentleman just as soon we go into a depression and not have any deficit spending?

Mr. BECKER. I would like to say this to the gentleman: The gentleman says right now that the President is apprehensive that we might go into another depression, or recession. Is that what the gentleman just said?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BECKER. The President is apprehensive. Did the gentleman read and hear the President's state of the Union message in January? The President spoke in the most beautiful and superlative terms about the economic condition of the country, both domestic and international, in terms most superlative and beautiful that I have heard in my life. I could not imagine that the President would be apprehensive over a recession in the offing. He said this in the event he does not get his tax reduction bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The statement about the large number of unemployed, uttered by some people on the other side——

Mr. BECKER. I did not hear that, so I do not know where it came from.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does not the gentleman know that unemployment is increasing and if we do not here in the Congress see that those who are unemployed or those who want to work get work, we will be in extreme difficulties?

Mr. BECKER. You bet your life I do. That is the reason I am prescribing the program which I have proposed today; to get the country off the back of business so business can expand and employ people. As the gentleman knows, in the thirties the Government tried this same scheme that is before us now. We started with 11 million unemployed in 1933 and in 1939 we still had 10 million unemployed. Only God knows that World War II absorbed the unemployment of that depression. So all of these synthetic operations of the Government will never end unemployment. Only business will do that. Get the Government off the back of business and I am sure business will solve the greater part of these problems.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEERMANN. With reference to this discussion about unemployment, there are 1 million more people employed in the last 2 years. As I recall, about 235,000 or approximately 25 percent of these were put on the Federal payroll for all of the taxpayers to pay their salaries.

I would like to go back to this 1933 discussion for a moment, when the national debt was $22 billion, and when the Department of Agriculture had 23,000 employees helping farmers. Now, in 1963 the national debt is $303 billion, or $305 billion, and there are almost 100,000 employees in the Department of Agriculture. In 1964 it is planned, along with the planned deficit spending of $12 billion, to have a total of 121,000 employees in the Department of Agriculture to help fewer farmers. In other words, there will be more and more Government employees to help the Department in this administration in a planned program of attrition against farmers.

I think back to last year when the Democrats in this House of Representatives turned down an amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] which prescribed that there should not be more employees in the Department of Agriculture than there are farmers.

So, it looks to me, that as the debt goes up there are less people on farms to help pay the taxes, and more Government employees to help increase the taxload.

One place we can cut and cut fast is the uneconomical advisory personnel in the Department of Agriculture hired to sell the farmers a planned economy program.

As one of my constituents said the other day in a letter—and I received almost 2,500 letters last week in response to my last newsletter; not a questionnaire, a newsletter—stating that this administration has taken us closer and closer to a democratic socialistic republic. I go for the democracy and I go for the representative republic. But I cannot go for these schemes that will eventually break our country as they will hamstring our private economy and individual initiative and put us into that kind of government which was never intended by the original founders of this country.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to conclude on this note. Along with many other people I am extremely worried because of this theoretical tax reduction program and planned deficit. Certainly no one, by the wildest stretch of the imagination, can put his finger on any evidence that this program will succeed, because it is purely theoretical. However, we do know that the tax reform program, as I said before, was something that certainly had to fail, because they would have to break faith with the people who were assured in previous years that they would be permitted to make a deduction for interest paid on mortgages, and for taxes paid; particularly those two items. They must have known that they would be putting the homebuilding business out of business, and would be hurting industry and labor, and would be creating more unemployment than anyone could possibly imagine. But what worries me about these theorists and these planners who are offering this program is that in the budget of 1962 there was estimated a surplus of $500 million. Now the President has said that business has been on the move and that everything was going well. Those were his words; everything was increasing—gross national product, and so forth. Yet, what happened? Those who advised the President were off in their estimate to the point where we had a deficit of $8 billion. For the 1963 budget they told us that the estimated surplus would be $1.5 billion. In the President's state of the Union message in January, he told us in what wonderful condition the country was; how well we were doing under his administration; but we are now running a deficit of about $8.8 billion this year instead of a surplus of $1.5 billion.

That means that for this year their estimates will have been wrong by $10.3 billion. That is for 1 year. For 2 years, it would mean a mistake of $18 billion that they had made in their estimates of income. If they can make that much of a mistake in 2 years in their estimate of income—and they say that for the 1964 budget they plan a $12 billion deficit—can anyone assure that I am wrong in thinking that they might very well make the same mistake for the 1964 budget that they did for the 1962 and 1963 budgets, and that our deficit for 1964 may run some $20 billion or more, instead of $12 billion?

That is what worries me and that is the reason why I think we should try to cut these appropriations down to a point where we can pay our expenses out of a real estimate of revenue. I think the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means will be able to tell more about this than can Walter Heller down at the White House.

Mr. Speaker, that concludes my statement. I have tried to express my idea on this subject. I can only hope and pray that Members of the House will get down to business this session and cut appropriations, and reduce the burden on the people and then, if there is something left over, reduce taxes.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, with considerable fanfare, a committee of the other body has been investigating the source selection by the Department of Defense of the General Dynamics and Grumman aircraft companies for the development and construction of the TFX fighter plane. Much publicity has attended this investigation. The publicity has tended to present in general a one-sided interpretation of that contract award. It has omitted many extremely important and valid considerations which well could have led to the decision which the Department of Defense, in the exercise of its very best judgment, made.

I have not desired to enter into any public controversy over this matter. Heretofore, I have refrained from doing so. Since it was a closed issue, already determined on the basis of the many complicated factors involved, there seemed to me utterly no point in following the course against which Kipling enjoined when he spoke of those who "Peck out, dissect, and extrude to the mind the flaccid tissues of long dead issues, offensive to God and mankind, like vultures over an ox that the Army has left behind."

Yet the continued daily repetition of partial quotes and one-sided comments in the newspapers emanating from this somewhat overpublicized inquiry make it necessary for me today to take the floor for the purpose of balancing the public record with information which heretofore has been given practically no acknowledgment or publicity.

I do this not to provoke an argument nor to extenuate the already overextenuated discussion. I do it rather to protect the reputations of a very excellent firm in my own district, of another honored firm in the State of New York, and of a number of very fine public officials from the wholly unwarranted suspicions which this prolonged second guessing and the veiled and undocumented public charges accompanying it may have cast upon them.

The loser in this contract competition was the Boeing Co. of Seattle and Wichita. Somewhat curiously, the committee in the other body has undertaken to inquire as to why the Department of Defense would consider granting a contract to other firms when Boeing was interested in it. The Boeing Co. has been given numerous contracts for many defense and space programs. It has better than a billion dollar backlog of these orders today. It has never occurred to anyone, of course, to investigate the reasons on any of those numerous occasions when Boeing has been awarded lucrative contracts. The odd assumption behind the investigation in the other body seems to be that Boeing receives contracts solely on "merit", but a competitor could only win by some undisclosed chicanery.

One week ago today, the Boeing Co. was awarded a $418,820,967 contract, described as the largest ever awarded in the U.S. space program, to produce 11 boosters for the Saturn V moon shots. Nobody has suggested that this should be investigated.

The award to build the TFX was granted after long and tight competition and after prolonged and careful consideration to the General Dynamics Co. of Fort Worth in association with the Grumman Co. of New York. Since the statements emanating from the hearing in the other body have included only remarks which would tend to favor Boeing or to be detrimental to the General Dynamics-Grumman submission, I think in the interest of a more balanced record and a fairer public exposure of the factors and elements involved in that decision, it is incumbent upon someone to list publicly some of the extremely valid factual considerations upon which the decision of the Department of Defense may well have been based.

VALID CONSIDERATIONS

Therefore, I shall list here a few of the impelling reasons which may have weighed the scales in favor of awarding this particular TFX contract to General Dynamics and Grumman rather than to Boeing.

EXPERIENCE IN SUPERSONIC AIRCRAFT

First of all, the Government had every reason to be interested in the contractor's proven experience in developing and producing a manned supersonic aircraft. Since the TFX is to be a supersonic plane, capable of flying more than twice the speed of sound, this would surely seem to be an important criterion. General Dynamics has produced supersonic manned military aircraft. Boeing has not.

In the B–58, built at this same Fort Worth plant, General Dynamics and the Air Force achieved the greatest advance in the state of the art which has been achieved in modern times. This is the free world's only supersonic bomber. It holds six world speed records previously held by Soviet aircraft. Boeing, by contrast, has been producing the B–52 which is subsonic, slower in fact than the commercial aircraft in common use throughout the country.

The B–58 accomplished a greater incremental increase in speed over the Boeing-built B–52 than the B–52 accomplished over the aircraft originally built and flown by the Wright brothers.

EXPERIENCE IN NAVAL AIRCRAFT

Second. Since the TFX is to be a biservice aircraft, for common use by both the Air Force and the Navy, it is only natural to assume that the Government would be deeply interested in the contractor's experience in meeting the sometimes difficult requirements of Naval Air Operations.

In designing and building this biservice fighter, General Dynamics wisely formed a team in association with the Grumman Aircraft Corp. This company, whose talents are melded with those of the General Dynamics firm in this program, has built more naval aircraft than any other firm in the United States. Quite probably, at least half the total number of take-offs and landings ever made from the U.S. aircraft carriers have been made in Grumman-built aircraft.

Boeing, by contrast, has not been dealing with the Navy in the meeting of these exacting requirements.

Boeing has not had a naval aircraft production program in 30 years unless we were to count an experimental design of which only two models were ever built.

TOP PRIORITY

In the third place, because of the vital importance of this particular program and the necessity that it be given top priority by the firm undertaking its construction, it naturally would be important to the Government that its production source be in a position to devote its full and undivided attention to this individual program. The General Dynamics plant at Fort Worth, with its proven engineering and manpower team and its well equipped 4,000 feet long assembly plant, was in a position to give real priority to the TFX program since the B–58 program in which it had been engaged was finished.

Boeing, on the other hand, has so many programs going that its engineering skills and talents must be divided among them all.

Boeing right now has a backlog of defense and space orders that run to a total volume of several billions of dollars. Boeing had proposed to do the TFX designing and development work in Seattle, the actual production work in Wichita. Even the Wichita plant, relatively less busy, has been engaged in doing extensive repair and modification work costing the Government many millions of dollars on the failing wings of B–52 aircraft which it earlier built.

DESIGN COMMONALITY

Fourth, and probably most important of all, was the central question of design commonality in the slightly differing versions of this craft to be used by the Air Force and the Navy. The basic purpose of the plan was to design and build one airplane which could serve both services. Probably the most significant factor was the question of which design had the greater percentage of common and interchangeable parts.

Fundamentally, it was a question of whether we were to have one airplane or two airplanes. Secretary McNamara was deeply committed to the concept of one basic model with the highest possible degree of commonality. He believes truly great financial savings will thus be effected in the long run.

In this all-important criterion, the General Dynamics-Grumman design is reliably accounted to have been clearly and demonstrably superior.

GOVERNMENT INTEREST

In the fifth place, it surely is desirable from the standpoint of our Government to keep our defense production arsenal functioning. It is not healthy to give all the work to one firm and reduce the Government to a dependence upon one company. Obviously, the purposes of the United States are served when both Boeing and General Dynamics and the other top aircraft production firms are holding together the trained and proven management teams which have been developed at such cost over the years to our Government.

Single-source procurement is potentially dangerous. When we have only big-company producing in a given field, the Government itself suffers. A few years ago, the Bendix Co. was the only producing concern making aircraft brakes. That company went out on strike and many aircraft were temporarily decommissioned. The same thing has happened in the field of radar altimeters. It serves the public purpose to keep a number of good companies in active production.

In the absence of a substantial contract of this type, the General Dynamics team at Fort Worth was faced with dismemberment. Having produced the B–24, the B–36, and the B–58, its talents and equipment would have lain idle and wasted if it had not received this or a similar contract. Our Government has an enormous investment in the physical properties of that plant. It also has a far greater financial investment, and one incapable of calculation, in the 20 years of aircraft design and manufacturing which have resulted in the development there of a smoothly functioning team of management, engineering, and machine skills.

Employment at the Fort Worth plant had gone from a peak of 27,000 during the B–36 program to a level of only 8,000 at the time the TFX contract was awarded.

Without this contract to hold the team together, it inevitably would have declined sharply and drastically below that

point. A team whose members are scattered to the four winds is no longer a team. It was not in the interest of our Government to allow this to happen. Had it been allowed, our Nation's defense structure would have lost a very valuable national asset.

AIRCRAFT CARRIERS

In the sixth place, since naval aircraft carriers contain limited space, an extremely important consideration is the question of how many aircraft of a given design can be placed on a single carrier. Our number of aircraft carriers is limited. Therefore our total naval air striking power is limited by the number of combat aircraft which can be carried aboard each such vessel.

Since the committee in the other body has seen fit to make certain inquiries into certain selected characteristics of design, I suggest that in the interest of a complete record they should want to inquire into the question of which of the competing designs would have better served this extremely important purpose of allowing the maximum number of aircraft on each individual carrier. Unless I am completely misinformed, the General Dynamics design was considerably superior in this vital aspect.

UNINTERRUPTED PRODUCTION

Finally, it is only logical to assume that due to the urgent need for this new plane in adequate numbers as soon as possible, the Defense Department would be deeply interested in assurances of uninterrupted production at the plant where the plane is built. At the time the contract was awarded, the General Dynamics firm had just signed a 3-year labor contract with the organization representing its employees, thus guaranteeing at least 3 years of labor peace and top production unhindered by strikes and walkouts or work stoppages.

The same could not be said for Boeing, where management and labor still were in dispute and the possibility of work-stoppages or discordant strife still unremoved.

These are not all of the considerations, I am sure, which went into the decision by our Defense Department in the awarding of this important contract. But surely any fairminded person would have to admit that they are indeed considerations of the greatest importance. No doubt there were other things, and perhaps many other things, which had to be taken into consideration.

Yet since much of the publicity from the hearings in the other body has tended to leave the extremely erroneous impression that there were no proper reasons at all for awarding this contract to the General Dynamics-Grumman group, I thought it very much worthwhile and in fact essential in the interest of objectivity that the above facts be publicly disclosed.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I believe the gentleman from Texas is making a very, very significant statement here today, and I am very grateful to him for bringing to the attention of the House these pertinent facts on this particular contract. I want to congratulate him for the effort he has exerted in assembling the material and arguments on this very important development. I would like to associate myself with his remarks, because it appears to be obvious that there has been an effort to develop something sinister in the awarding of this contract. I do not follow that on the basis of the information the gentleman is presenting to the House. It appears that the Defense Department was perfectly correct and proper in its decision. I congratulate the gentleman for calling our attention to these very pertinent facts.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman from Illinois and appreciate his comments.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. PIKE. I, too, would like to join with the gentleman from Illinois in congratulating the gentleman from Texas. It is a rough job for any of us to follow the eloquent and articulate gentleman from Texas. He and I have shared in the past the kind of disappointment which comes when a major defense contractor in his district fails to get something, or something happens to one of them. In the case of the gentleman from Texas a B–58 bomber was phased out, and it certainly was essential to his district, and in my own case it was an F–105 fighter which was phased out. It was also essential to my district. We were keenly disappointed. In either case we questioned the judgment which had been made.

I think it is all right to question a judgment which is made by the Department of Defense in these cases from time to time, but I would like to add to what the gentleman from Illinois just said; some have gone a little farther than just questioning judgment in this TFX matter; they have gone to questioning motives. One sees in publications coming out all over the country in connection with this program that something is wrong with the motives for awarding this contract to the General Dynamics and Grumman team, and I think that there is a real danger that we might bog down so much on the question of the motives of the people who are working on this thing there will be delay and confusion in this essential program, and there is no room for any delay and confusion whatsoever. We certainly have had enough delay and confusion.

This is not like the phasing out of the B–58 in the past. That was a controversial matter. It is not like the phasing out of the F–105 in the past. That was a controversial matter. It is not like the B–70 program which is a controversial matter today. But it is universally agreed that this TFX program must be done. This is a program which every segment of the industry and of the military and the Department of Defense agrees must be done and it should be done as fast as possible. This is a plane we need and it is a plane we have got to build without delay.

I do not in any sense blame the disappointed people who did not get this contract, for questioning the judgment of those who put it where they did, but I want to join with the gentleman in a few of the specifics in this thing. It was not just a question of adding one or two planes to a carrier, it was a question of adding five planes to a carrier; and I submit that the five planes which are added to a carrier in this Grumman-General Dynamics—or respecting the gentleman from Texas, General Dynamics-Grumman proposal—might be the differences between yes and no in any given mission.

I would like to say further that in questioning the judgment used or utilized by the Department of Defense in the awarding of this contract, the judgment goes just a little bit deeper than the business of comparing what one company says it can do with what another company says it can do.

There has to be a complete credibility in the proposals which are made by any company in any defense contract. Our country has had entirely too much experience with defense contractors who say they can do such and such and so and so. Then time after time after time we have found that the programs which have been presented, when they are fulfilled, when they are completed, have cost 300 percent of what the original proposal said it would cost.

With General Dynamics and Grumman the Defense Department knows they have corporations which can and will produce what they say they can and will produce, and they will do it within the time frame they say they will do it in—if Congress will let them.

I want to associate myself completely with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas. I am proud of him for having taken this time for this very important purpose today. I think it is time we quit haggling about judgment and devote our time, energies, and resources in speeding the design and the manufacture of this aircraft which we need so badly.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman. I think he is thoroughly and completely correct.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. I concur with the gentleman we need this very, very valuable TFX, sometimes known as the LBJ aircraft. I can understand the gentleman's elation also in getting this contract in his district. I am somewhat familiar with the TFX and the fact that the TFX was originally conceived in the Boeing Co. in my particular congressional district.

I would like to point out a few misconceptions here about the proposed designs of the Boeing aircraft and the General Dynamics aircraft. We certainly need the TFX aircraft, but we should procure this aircraft at the lowest possible price to the American taxpayer.

Mr. WRIGHT. May I inquire, Is the gentleman leading to a question?

Mr. STINSON. Yes, I am leading up to a question.

There are good indications in the hearings that have been held by the Senate that there is a savings of between $100 million and $400 million by taking the Boeing design.

Also, I might point out that the bomb load capacity of the Boeing is much higher. There is also a design feature of the General Dynamics model that would indicate that this aircraft might suck up gravel from runways.

Reference has been made to the point that the airplane is smaller, the General Dynamics airplane is smaller, but the Boeing aircraft is somewhat lighter in weight when adapted to Navy use. This is a very important factor on aircraft carriers; namely, that the weight should be kept down to the lowest possible level. Also, the Boeing design requires about a 600-foot shorter runway to take off than does the General Dynamics design.

As far as priority is concerned, the Boeing Co. has ample people to design and build this particular aircraft, because of the phasing out of the B–52 program. The military people involved in this particular problem are all in favor of the Boeing design rather than the General Dynamics design.

I should also like to point out that the Boeing Co. has had a marvelous reputation of living up to its commitments with the military and the American Government.

I also point out that the General Dynamics Corp. in the last year has been involved in a financial problem, but I am not in any way being derogatory with regard to that company, because all companies can have financial problems. But it would appear, therefore, that the Boeing Co. has a capability at least as good as that of General Dynamics as far as fulfilling the production of this aircraft is concerned.

So for these reasons, I think, and would not the gentleman agree, that perhaps some of the criticism of the awarding of this contract is justified, and that there might just be a very small amount of political influence involved in awarding this particular contract to the General Dynamics Co.?

Mr. WRIGHT. Let me take these questions up point by point, if I may, and then I will gladly yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price].

The first point that is made seems to rely on the presumption that a cost figure as estimated by an aircraft company is the final and totally reliable figure as to exactly how much such a program will end up costing the Government. This simply is not true.

I think sad and checkered experience teaches us that this is at best an estimate only. I would refer the gentleman to the Bomarc program as an illustration that even a fine aircraft producing company like the Boeing Co. can be not only wrong, but considerably wrong, in the amount that it initially estimates to be the final cost of producing its commodity. In the Bomarc program not only has the cost far exceeded the initial cost estimate upon which the Defense Department relied. I think it also can be said without any overstatement that the performance has considerably fallen below that which the designers initially felt it could do.

Therefore, the Secretary of Defense and his Defense Department advisers have to ask this question: Can the company actually produce a plane by this design which actually and in truth will do those things the company believes and says it will do? Numerous times companies have submitted designs and with the submittals claimed probably in good faith that the plane or manufacture of that particular design would do certain things, and then those commodities will not do those things. This is the reason I say that the Secretary of Defense had every reason to weigh in the balance the question of which of these companies has actually been over this specific road and which of them is better able actually to know on the basis of its own demonstrated experience that it can design a plane of this particular type that will do what it says it will do. This is why the General Dynamics experience in producing the supersonic B–58 and the Grumman experience in producing naval aircraft would have been, in my judgment, valid considerations.

Second, the Defense Department must ask of each company: can it actually perform this mission for the cost estimates? The Defense Department officials, joined by the heads of the Navy and the Air Force, concluded that the cost estimate submitted by the Boeing Co. in this particular instance was unrealistically low; that it did not take into account many of the cost factors involved in producing a supersonic plane and particularly a new design of this type.

POLITICS?

Insofar as the matter of politics is concerned, that charge has been somewhat surreptitiously made before. I am glad the gentleman from Washington has brought it out in the open. Let me be perfectly frank with the gentleman from Washington.

Dark hints have been heavily leaked to the press that some mysterious and undisclosed political influence must have been responsible for the Defense Department's decision to award this contract to the General Dynamics-Grumman team. This goes back to the original assumption and prejudgment that Boeing just cannot be beat unless something sinister is at play.

Well, let us just briefly discuss the question of supposed political influence. For my own part, I do not believe that anyone is capable of persuading Secretary McNamara beyond his own best judgment. I should know, because I have tried it, and have been unsuccessful in the attempt. In 1961, after Congress had authorized and appropriated $525 million for the continued production of manned bombers, I requested and gained an audience with Secretary McNamara at which I did my very best to persuade him to take the money and continue bomber production. To make a long story short, I fanned out.

As for supposed political influence, in the awarding of the TFX contract, that depends entirely on what is meant by "political influence." Webster defines "politics" as "the science and art of government." In that sense, anything said or done concerning this Government program could be called political. I know of no other person in a public office who has been any more deeply interested in this particular matter than I have been during the past 18 months. It meant the difference between employment or unemployment for thousands of my constituents whose interests I am charged with serving.

Let me be completely frank. During the course of last year, I talked about this subject with everybody whom I could get to listen. Believing that good and adequate reasons existed for giving every fair and just consideration to the General Dynamics submission, I made it my business to try to persuade people to this point of view. I am not ashamed of that. I considered it my duty. There is nothing sinister about it. I made no secret of the fact. I talked with both military and civilian officials. I tried to be as persuasive as I knew how to be. That does not in my judgment amount to undesirable political influence. The same sort of thing was being attempted on the other side. If you choose to call this "political influence," then I did my best to engage in it and I am not the least bit ashamed of having done so. It was truthful and open and wholly honorable.

But I had absolutely no illusions whatever that I could ever have prevailed upon our military leaders or our defense officials to grant such an award to the firm in my hometown unless that firm had come up with a truly superb design and this is exactly what it did. Any argument I might have been able to make as an admitted Fort Worth partisan would have been utterly unavailing had it not been for the truly magnificent record of performance which the General Dynamics plant at that city and the Grumman plant have to their credit.

Let me further make it amply clear that any reasoning I used in this connection was of the type embraced in five of the seven reasons listed earlier in these remarks. At the time, of course, I had no specific knowledge as to the points of technical design comparisons. Every point of logic I made or attempted to make with any civilian or military official was addressed to the question of what would be best for the United States, and that only.

I emphatically did not employ anything which could be remotely described as pressure. For that matter, I would have had no pressure to apply. I expressly did not promise any reciprocal favor in return for the granting of this award to General Dynamics and Grumman. I am unaware of any favor which would have been at my disposal to grant even had I been so inclined.

Perhaps more to the point, I expressly did not threaten any type of reprisal in event the decision should have been other than what I wished. Most expressly, I did not threaten anyone in our Defense Establishment with a congressional investigation if their decision should go against my wishes. That is what I would call political pressure.

That is what I would call undesirable or unhealthy political influence. Perhaps we might inquire as to whether anyone is employing pressure of this type. I employed none, nor to my knowledge could any such threat or attempted reprisal have been made by any other person interested in the awarding of this contract to General Dynamics and Grumman.

Of course, I talked with people about this contract award. I talked with many people. Perhaps it would not be inappropriate to ask whether the Senators from the State of Washington are prepared to deny that they ever talked with anyone in our Defense Establishment in behalf of the Boeing Co. Specifically, I ask if the Senator from Washington, Senator Jackson, is prepared to deny that his office directly initiated at least seven separate contacts with top officials in Boeing's behalf prior to the awarding of this contract?

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I see that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Wright] needs no assistance in this matter. However, I rose originally to compliment him on his statement before any questions were directed to him because I think what he said needed to be said somewhere in an official area.

There were not only two proposals submitted for the TFX; these were the two that had final consideration. I think every major aircraft producer in the country submitted proposals and one of the last to be eliminated was one that was very close to my area. But I do not recall that any of these others who lost in this competition requested any congressional investigation. They accepted it in the competitive spirit that private enterprise is founded upon.

I have followed the TFX very closely because of my interest in research and development and all the information I have on it indicates that the idea for this plane did not originate with any aircraft producer or manufacturer. As the gentleman mentioned a few minutes ago it originated within the military services and specifically within the Department of Defense. They requested the aircraft manufacturers of the country to submit proposals on this type of aircraft. It has been under study for 1 or 2 years at the least and it has had thorough and considered study.

I am glad the gentleman from Texas has taken the time to indicate his concern that any time a contract is let there must be a congressional investigation to follow. When there is wrongdoing that has been indicated or charged, then I suppose we should have an investigation and possibly even in this case we may welcome it so that the air may be cleared. But I am disturbed over the fact that when a contract is lost the manufacturer should seek a congressional investigation, because I think this is the last place in the world, the floor of this Congress, where we should start handing out contracts for Government procurement. We have our job in a legislative way but we are not the administrative or executive arm of the Government. We do have recourse in the event of abuses in this area and we should follow them.

I think the gentleman also has very well answered the question directed to him by the gentleman on the other side who has been querying him, but I rose, particularly, not to give the gentleman any help because, as I stated, he is well able to take care of himself, but to express my congratulations to him on bringing this into an official arena so that some sense of balance may be attained on this particular problem. I have been disturbed over congressional investigations and all that we have been reading about concerns the investigation being held, but we have never had the other side of the story.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman for taking the floor this afternoon to express his views on the subject.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am very grateful to the gentleman and would like to express my appreciation of his comments in that regard.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. As one who comes from a district which never had an airplane factory, which never produced a plane of any kind, and which probably will not, a district which does not adjoin anybody's district in which planes are being produced, and which has no financial interest in this matter one way or the other, other than as citizens of the United States all have an interest in it, I wonder if the gentleman would not clarify, in country language which I can understand, some of the conversations which have passed between him and the gentleman from Washington. To be specific, is it not a fact that there has never been a bid made on the production of this plane?

Mr. WRIGHT. It is a fact that no bid has been made in the sense of any company's saying:

> We will undertake to produce this total package for you as you request for X number of dollars and guarantee that it will not cost any more than that.

Mr. POAGE. That is what we country boys are talking about. When we talk about building a tank or stock pond we are talking about getting just what was described and about somebody's delivering just what he said he would deliver for what he said it would cost and at the time he said he would complete it. The Boeing Co. has not guaranteed to deliver this plane, has it? Nor to do so for a definite price? Nor to guarantee that it will do what they say they think it will do?

Mr. WRIGHT. To be completely fair, I think the Boeing Co. has proposed that they believe they could build the plane for X number of dollars. This could be more accurately described as an "estimate," however, than as of a "bid."

Mr. POAGE. Suppose I gave a proposal that I believe I could build this plane for about half of what Boeing says they can build it for, and I am so ignorant that maybe I believe I could do that, because there is a lot of money involved in it, and I believe maybe I could do it for half that amount. Do you think the other body ought to conduct some kind of investigation to find out what went on in the Pentagon, to find out why they did not accept my proposal?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think the gentleman's point is very well taken.

Mr. POAGE. I never have failed on any of my proposals, have I? I have never made any.

Mr. WRIGHT. Certainly not to my knowledge.

Mr. POAGE. I am talking about making airplanes. I never have suggested I could build an airplane for less and then found that the Government must pay about 300 percent more than I estimated.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am certain the gentleman has never done anything remotely like that.

Mr. POAGE. There have been aircraft companies which have done it.

Mr. WRIGHT. There have, indeed.

Mr. POAGE. I never have made a proposal to these departments that I could shoot missiles from one plane to another and bring them down, have I?

Mr. WRIGHT. I am quite certain the gentleman has not.

Mr. POAGE. There have been people who have?

Mr. WRIGHT. There have been. And often those programs have cost considerably more than originally estimated. Also the performance of such missiles has often been less than originally held out.

Mr. POAGE. We are still doing little more than throwing rocks to bring those planes down, is that not right?

Mr. WRIGHT. I think that may be about what it amounts to.

Mr. POAGE. Could it be that some of the same people who have been so certain as to what they could do in the past, now come with a similar certainty and tell the Department of Defense with absolute certainty what they can do and how much it will cost? If so, has their statement been taken as an absolute fact? That is what I have read in the newspapers.

Mr. WRIGHT. Apparently some of the members of the committee in the other body have accepted at face value these statements without thus far giving the Secretary of Defense or any of those who advise him the opportunity of even explaining why they arrived at the decision they did.

Mr. POAGE. That is right; and the newspapers have pretty well dipped up most of the mud in Puget Sound and thrown it on the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. WRIGHT. This is why I felt called upon to rise this afternoon, certainly not to condemn the Boeing Co. nor to degrade or disparage that company. It is a fine organization. It has built some very fine aircraft for our Nation in its time of need. But it seemed necessary for someone simply to balance the record with some of these facts which unfortunately have not been made available to public inspection through the media of the investigation and the press releases that have come out of that investigation in the other body.

Mr. POAGE. Now to give those of us who are not experts on this thing a little better understanding, has the so-called low bidder offered to post any bond that they could produce this plane for even twice what they have said they could produce it? Have they even said that they would do what they outlined in their proposal?

Mr. WRIGHT. So far as I am aware, and I believe this is correct, no bond has been posted nor has any ironclad guarantee been made that the final, ultimate cost would be that which was presented in the proposal. I might say in passing that it is not customary for aircraft manufacturing firms to make such bonds or to underwrite such guarantees because so many unaccounted—or unaccountable things can arise in the manufacture of an entirely new aircraft. But this simply highlights the fact that the Department of Defense is going to have to be free to judge in its own best reason whether or not a cost submittal is truly a realistic cost submittal. An estimate, of course, certainly may be far removed from the final, ultimate cost to the taxpayer. The Secretary has to award these contracts on the basis of his very best judgment, not solely on the basis of what a company guesses or represents that it could do.

Mr. POAGE. But the newspaper articles that you have read, or at least all those I have read, have indicated that the findings of a committee of the other body were to the effect that certain people could and would deliver certain results for certain money. And I believe our colleague, the gentleman from Washington, just said they would do it for $100 million less. But he has not offered to post any bonds, nor are those in whose behalf he pleads about to make any firm commitment. They have just expressed an optimistic hope that they could do the things suggested in their outline. Is it not a fact that that is the function of the Department of Defense, to pass upon these proposals and to determine whether they are within the bounds of reason and whether there is a reasonable expectation that they could and would be carried out for the amounts suggested? Is it not the duty of the Department to weed out all obviously overoptimistic proposals?—and particularly is it not the duty of the Department to avoid a repetition of overoptimism from sources which have shown their lack of realism in the past?

Mr. WRIGHT. Precisely, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. POAGE. And is that not just what the Department of Defense and the Department of the Air Force and the Department of the Navy did do?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is exactly what they did, and I am glad the gentleman has helped to make this clear.

Now let me move from this point briefly to cover one or two of the other points that have been touched upon, but not thoroughly elaborated in this discussion. First, on the question of who originated this concept of the TFX plane, it is correct, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price] said that the concept originated within the Department of Defense. This plane is to be built for the two services. It is Secretary McNamara's baby. It is his brainchild. It is going to be his window piece to demonstrate that effective unification of the services can be achieved. I think in truth, we must say that a lot of people in the uniformed services, the career military personnel in the various branches, met this idea with something less than overwhelming enthusiasm. It is only natural that those who make their livings by career military services identify themselves with the perpetuation and ascendency of their own particular branches of the service. Therefore, it is only natural, I think, that these career military people or at least many of them, identify themselves with a separateness of their particular branch and with as complete autonomy as can possibly be achieved within that branch. That is what we were trying to get around when we created the Department of Defense in the first place. Some of the ideas that have been expressed, pretending shock and outrage that some of the military people might have wanted the Boeing Co. to build the plane, seem to overlook the fact that the Secretary of Defense is charged with the responsibility of making these decisions.

The notion that this idea for a TFX program originated with Boeing is inaccurate. It is like some of the other thoughts that have been expressed through the papers in this regard. Boeing is a fine aircraft company, but it did not originate the TFX concept.

One presumptive exposé written by a columnist who must have relied on utterly incorrect advice, asserted that the variable-sweep wing, a key to the TFX design, was originally invented and developed by Boeing. This is just not true. This feature, so vital to the TFX design, was, in fact, developed some years ago by Grumman, the General Dynamics partner. Grumman, in fact, built and flew a plane embodying this revolutionary design feature. The Boeing Co. has never done so.

Certain other representations carried in the newspapers during the last several days have similarly tended to distort the truth of what actually happened with respect to the Defense Department's decision. News stories have made reference to three so-called reversals or overrulings of military advisers by civilian chiefs. The three occasions to which they refer could hardly be described as reversals. They were occasions in which the designs of both companies were officially held to be insufficient, the specific deficiencies pointed out to each, both required to attempt specific improvement, and additional time allowed to both companies to come up with better designs for this revolutionary new concept in aircraft.

This could hardly be called a reversal of military advice. Some of the professional military people may indeed have said, in effect, that if you take either of these designs at this particular time, we would recommend the Boeing design. But clearly it was a decision properly within the purview of the Secretary of Defense to determine whether or not either design adequately met the rugged, difficult, and rigorously exacting standards set out by the two services. On three occasions, neither of them did.

On at least one of those occasions, it is clear that the granting of additional time to both contractors to perfect and improve their designs would have worked to the advantage of Boeing. Boeing initially had built its design around a new G.E. engine. But this particular engine on which G.E. then was experimenting could not be produced in time to meet the desired production schedule for the TFX. Therefore, Boeing was given the opportunity to go back and redesign its proposed project around the Pratt & Whitney engine.

In any event, the decision to require improvements in design on the part of both competitors clearly has resulted in a better final production. I believe that neither Boeing nor General Dynamics would seriously assert that its originally submitted design was anywhere near as good as the ones they both finally were able to develop as a result of the long competition.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield again to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. I thank the gentleman.

I would remind the Members that the Boeing Co. has always lived up to its commitments and that is as much assurance as is necessary that these airplanes would be produced at the price given.

I think there is no question but that the two companies are equal. The Boeing Co. on numerous occasions has shown its potentiality in building the finest aircraft in the world.

Here is the next thing I would like to point out: Reference was made to the fact that somebody on this side of the aisle was trying to put some pressure on the military or on the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman will withhold at that point, I made or meant or implied no indication that anyone on that side of the aisle had done this. I am not aware of anything that anyone on that side of the aisle had done in that regard. My remarks were addressed to the other side of the Capitol, not the other side of the aisle. I simply wondered aloud whether a gentleman in the other body was prepared to make a specific statement.

Mr. STINSON. I misunderstood the gentleman.

The next point I wanted to mention is this: No one on this side of the aisle has to my knowledge tried to put any pressure at all on the Department of Defense or the military to see to it that this contract would be awarded to the Boeing Co. May I say that it is a Democrat who is conducting the hearings on this particular matter and not a Republican.

I would also like to point out that the Boeing Co. was almost a year ahead of the General Dynamics Co. in submitting the first design for this aircraft. So the Boeing Co. was much in the vanguard as far as submitting a design for this aircraft is concerned.

Going back to the political aspect, we on this side of the aisle would only argue that the aircraft be awarded to the lowest bidder so that the taxpayers will get the most for their money. If the awards are not going to be made to the lowest bidders, what basis are we going to use? Is Mr. McNamara more capable of designing an aircraft than engineers of the Boeing Co. or people in the Air Force who have been working with aircraft similar to this?

I would like to make a proposal to make this a fair program. Perhaps we should have the General Dynamics Co. and the Boeing Co. both build a prototype of their particular design. Then we could have a competitive program to see which is the better aircraft. I believe we would end up by saving the taxpayers a lot of money and would get the best possible aircraft for the Air Force and Navy.

Mr. WRIGHT. I cannot yield further at this point.

What the gentleman proposes is so completely contrary to established procedure, and so completely contrary to the contract that has already been determined and awarded that I cannot entertain a suggestion of that kind to be seriously made on the floor of the House. I would merely remind the gentleman of two or three points. Some years ago, after the modification of the B–36 program, when there was a need in the Air Force for a new long-range bomber to get there and back, there was competition between a number of companies. Among those companies were the General Dynamics Corp. and the Boeing Co. The General Dynamics Corp. proposed to make a supersonic plane similar to the B–36. The Boeing Co. came up with a proposal which is the B–52. It was awarded on that basis to the Boeing Co. Nobody suggested that the decision ought to be investigated; nobody suggested something crooked had taken place, or something sinister. Nobody suggested that this contract which had gone to Boeing should be taken back and divided up to see if we could not have one built down at Fort Worth and one at Wichita. Nobody suggested any of those things.

It followed its normal procedure.

More fundamental that any of this, however, are three rather basic principles in this regard which concern us all.

The first relates to the proper employment of congressional committees in such a matter. The second relates to our longstanding American tradition of civilian control over the military. The third concerns whether attempts at necessary military unification are to be forever frustrated.

PROPRIETY OF CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

In regard to the first, permit me to say that I have great respect for the committees of the Congress. That respect certainly extends to the committees of the other body. It extends to the gentlemen who comprise those committees.

It would be unfortunate indeed if a great investigating committee which has done such notable and outstanding work in the past should degenerate in the public mind to a body attempting to exercise its power to influence the selection of contracts as between competing firms.

It would be hurtful to the Congress if the impression should be gained that members of our executive branch or our Military Establishment were to be subject to attempted personal harassment, embarrassment, or recrimination whenever their decisions in regard to the awarding of contracts might run at cross purposes with the personal wishes of certain ranking members of congressional investigating committees.

Surely it would be a flagrant misuse of the congressional investigating power if the word were to get around among public officials charged with the awarding of contracts that, unless they want to be called on the carpet and attacked in the public press, they had better play ball with firms represented by members of certain congressional committees.

In this particular instance, it has caused more than a few raised eyebrows when the highly touted star witness, on whose presumed objectivity the committee's case apparently rests, turns out to be the vice president of a firm which was itself interested in this contract. Certainly I do not question this gentleman's integrity nor that of the Senator from Boeing's home State at whose request this unusual inquiry was launched and who had authored so many of the questions in the hearing. I am sure they both are honorable men.

But as one who is interested in the reputation of our congressional investigating committees, I simply say that we should exercise greater care to make sure that they are truly objective, that they more fully and fairly develop both sides. Our entire system of congressional investigations loses prestige and respect when one of our committees leaves the impression that it has first drawn its conclusions and then gone out in search of whatever it can find to substantiate those prejudgments.

I think it would be extremely dangerous if the impression were to be gained that one munitions manufacturer, now doing work on the Saturn program, the Minuteman program, the Bomarc program, the Dyna-Soar program, the B–52 program, the KC–135 program, and others, had become so powerful that it could cause a congressional investigation whenever it does not get everything it wants, exactly when the company wants it.

When questioning in a congressional hearing is directed along a one-sided line to adduce a predetermined result, magnifying one side of a question and ignoring the other, it unfortunately tends to lead to the above impressions.

Mr. Speaker, I do not disparage Boeing. It is a fine organization, and builds fine airplanes. But I do want to say it is not the only organization in this country capable of building airplanes.

I do want to emphasize that it would be extremely dangerous were we to get into a situation where the Government is reduced to dependency upon any one company. We have tried that in other lines of endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to know something about a situation in which two companies are being maintained for the purpose of producing helicopters, the Bell Co. and a company on the west coast. Although the Bell Co. sometimes does come in with lower bids for the production of these items, the Department of the Army has held for some years that it is in the long-range best interest of the Government to see to it that there are at least two and not just one in the business with their tools and their machine shops going, with their skilled management and manpower teams working together. This is another thing that cannot be evaluated simply on the question of who says he thinks he can build it cheaper than someone else.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I would be glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from New York.

Mr. PIKE. I would like to comment on two things said by the gentleman from Washington, I believe.

First. On the question of the Boeing design having been a year in advance. The fact of the matter is that, so far as in advance is concerned, the design was based on a powerplant that did not exist. When the fear developed that this particular aircraft might have to be built with this powerplant they had to admit they could not build it with that particular powerplant because there was not any such powerplant and they themselves had to change to a different powerplant.

Second. On the question of the lowest bidder, it sounds good—and I have sat on the Armed Services Committee not too long, but I have sat there long enough to vote against the expenditure of an awful lot of money that other people who talk about reducing taxes vote for all the time, but you cannot put out a contract like this on a simple contract basis to the lowest bidder. I submit to the gentleman if they did say to Boeing "Will you give us a contract price on which you agree to build these aircraft without any renegotiation clauses in it, without any right to come back to the Government for more money if you get in trouble?" I submit to the gentleman either that the price would not have been what the price Boeing submitted was, or that Boeing would not have submitted any price whatsoever.

Mr. WRIGHT. As a matter of fact, it has been reliably stated that, on the basis of price estimates alone, both the Boeing estimate and that submitted by the General Dynamics-Grumman team, were less than the amount the program had been estimated actually to cost by the Air Force. So, in that regard, the Air Force in its best judgment felt that the estimates submitted by both of them were too low. They felt that neither one of them actually could be expected to perform the total contract on the amount of money that they individually said and thought that they could.

In the end the civilian heads of our Defense Establishment simply had to exercise their very best judgment. And this leads me to a matter of fundamental public policy.

CIVILIAN CONTROL OVER MILITARY

My concern in this regard lies in the protection of the great American tradition of the preeminence of civilian over military authority. A few of the quotations attributed to those who seem displeased over this contract award decision seem to bring into question the right of civilian heads of our Defense Establishment to make the final decisions. They seem to be founded upon a presumption that the Secretary of Defense and his Service Secretaries are supposed to perform only a meaningless ceremonial function and leave all the decisions to the men in uniform.

If this were the policy, there would be no need for a man of the capabilities of Robert S. McNamara in that crucial position. If he is not to perform the ultimate decisionmaking function, then indeed there is no need for a Secretary of Defense at all. Either the civilian heads of our Defense Department are to have the authority that goes with their enormous responsibilities, or they will be of utterly no value.

I am perfectly willing to concede that the average colonel in the Air Force probably knowns more about the physical job of flying an airplane than Secretary McNamara knows. But I certainly think we all would have to agree that Secretary McNamara knows infinitely more about the tools, techniques, technicalities, and requirements of manufacturing and producing than any career military personnel in the country. With so great a share of the national budget devoted to military procurement, his great experience in this particular field no doubt was a primary consideration behind his selection for this responsible post.

Above and beyond the personalities involved, however, lies the more fundamental question of just who is going to run this country—the military or the civilian. Many of our forefathers came from nations in Europe where, by bitter personal experience, they had learned the dangers adherent in governments dominated by an all-powerful military clique whose judgment was presumed to be infallible and whose edicts had become incontestable. They wanted no repetition of that sad situation on these shores.

Nor do the American people want to see developed here the kind of volatile and unstable situation in which military juntas have controlled and dominated certain governments in the Caribbean area of this hemisphere. That would be anathema to our country, contradictory of our most basic beliefs and completely contrary to our truest traditions.

The history of the United States contains many recitals of the principle that the civil authority of our Government must exercise the final judgment. Often this has been done over strenuous objections of the military. In reviewing the history of such decisions, we are inclined to say "Thank God!" Very often have subsequent events proven that civilian authorities were right and the military wrong.

The first repeating rifle for example was purchased for the Union Army by Abraham Lincoln over the vigorous objections of the Army Ordnance. This Spencer rifle was the decisive turning point in many subsequent engagements.

Under the same strenuous military opposition, Lincoln bought the Gatling gun which could fire 2,500 rounds a minute. The Army stubbornly refused to use it. Eight of them were left behind by General Custer when he went to Little Big Horn.

It was under the stubborn objections of the career Navy officers Lincoln ordered the *Monitor*. The result of that decision is history.

The Army General Staff was bent upon crucifying Billy Mitchell until the Congress intervened.

History is full of such illustrations. Today our Secretary of Defense and the civilian heads of our Defense Establishment confront enormous responsibilities in which the exercising of their very best judgment could indeed be crucial to our survival.

It would be a long step backward and not forward if Congressmen were to leave the impression that it expected the responsible civilian officials of this Government to abdicate their responsibilities to the hands of the military, or to be bound in all things by the advice of colonels or even generals.

SUCCESS OF UNIFICATION

In this particular instance, a further and final question of impelling importance arises. This concerns the repeated and continuing frustrations which have been encountered by those who attempt to bring about practical implementations of the Unification Act.

Secretary McNamara has vigorously prosecuted numerous efforts to create efficiency and desirable unification in matters of supply and program management. He has been attacked and criticized on many such attempts.

The TFX program is probably the outstanding case in point. The Secretary is trying to protect tax dollars. He believes that the basic concept of one plane for both services can ultimately save our Government upward of $1 billion in this one program alone.

The crucial question in the TFX award was whether or not the Secretary was to be permitted to carry forward this program to the greatest degree possible. His essential requirement was that of the highest degree of commonality in the design. The General Dynamics-Grumman design more adequately embodied this feature.

I, for one, believe that Secretary McNamara deserves to be encouraged and supported and upheld in his determination to bring about the most desirable ends of military unification.

And so, this aircraft represents not only a revolutionary design but a revolutionary concept in military unification. We need these aircraft. We need them at the earliest possible date. The program is vital to our security. Let's curtail the second-guessing and Monday morning quarterbacking and get on with the job of building the planes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prolong this much further, but there is one further thing I would like to say and then I shall yield the floor, having done that. That is this. I do earnestly regret that it ever became necessary for me to take the floor of the House to discuss a matter of this type. I did it reluctantly. It became necessary, however, because of the totally and completely one-sided publicity which had been accorded to the inquiry in the other body. It became necessary because no publicity whatever had been given to these matters which I regard to be strong and impelling reasons why the Secretary of Defense in his own good judgment may have selected the Grumman-General Dynamics team. I do not know that those were the reasons. I know that some of them were among his reasons. But I do believe that he is an honorable man, that he is an honest man. I believe that the Secretaries of the Air Force and of the Navy are honorable and honest men. I believe them to be capable men. I believe them to be doing their earnest best to promote the defense of this country for the lowest consistent cost.

I believe that in the exercise of their own good judgment, as charged by their responsibilities in this matter, they did their best to do that very thing. Nobody certainly can say that they have not. I am convinced that they have.

I say let us stop the quibbling, let us stop the quarreling, let us stop the "Monday morning quarterbacking", let us stop all this second-guessing. Let us stop trying to poke holes in other people and charging them vaguely with some sinister activity. Let us get on with the job of building these airplanes. We need them. We need them desperately. We need them in numbers as soon as we can get them. Let us join forces, unite, be both good winners and good losers in this business.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to yield further at this particular time to anyone. My allotted time has just about expired. I would not want to end this discussion on a note of controversy. What I am trying to say at this particular time is not controversial in this sense. What I am trying to say is that every American from whatever State has a stake in our defense effort. Let us be good winners and good losers and stop calling one another names. What I am trying to say is all the companies ought to be willing to be as good losers as they are winners, that they ought not to try to harass or embarrass our public officials when those public officials do not happen to go along with their particular private wishes. When a decision has been made, let us close ranks and get to building and move forward together.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LABOR DEPARTMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Taft] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this special order today to assure that the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Department of Labor does not pass unnoticed in this body and from this side of the aisle.

The concern of America for the welfare of our people as workers and members of organized labor groups has found voice in the many great steps led by the Department to the betterment of conditions and enjoyment of our economy and better life by laboring men and women over the years.

In the increasingly complex times in which we live its functions have been many. Two of grave importance have been the strengthening of the free collective bargaining process and the safeguarding of the rights, opportunities, and privileges of all who labor.

To these ends, as with all its duly assigned duties and missions, we join in wishing the Department well.

In connection with the anniversary of the Department there was published in the Washington Post on Sunday, March 3, 1963, an article by Mr. Morton Mintz, as follows:

> ### Labor Department Is 50 Years Old, and It Took a Taft To Start It
>
> (By Morton Mintz)
>
> Although the Government had been in labor since 1884, when it established a Bureau of Labor in the Interior Department, it didn't give birth to a fullfledged department until March 4, 1913.
>
> The 29-year gestation period ended when President William Howard Taft, on his last day in office, signed the law bringing the Department of Labor into the world—a world in which the workingman, the workingwoman, and the working child needed all the help they could get.
>
> Monday is the 50th anniversary of the Department. The anniversary will be observed with regional banquets and conferences in 16 cities.
>
> The Washington banquet, which will follow other special events during the day, will be held Monday night at the Sheraton-Park. President Kennedy, Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz, three former Secretaries—Frances Perkins, James P. Mitchell, and Justice Arthur J. Goldberg—and leaders of industry, the AFL–CIO, and the three branches of Government are among those scheduled to attend.
>
> ### TO IMPROVE CONDITIONS
>
> The law that created the Department said its purpose was "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment."
>
> Today few would question that the law's purpose reflected compelling needs.
>
> A 1913 Government report, for example, said that almost 30 percent of the Nation's steelworkers were on a 7-day week, that some worked 18 to 24 hours without letup, and that 2 out of 5 worked 72 or more hours a week.
>
> The report said that 42 percent were earning less than 18 cents an hour, with a weekly potential maximum of $12.50. From their pay deductions were made for such things as ice water, disablement funds, medical fees, rent for company houses, and identification badges.
>
> Owning almost everything in towns where many workers lived, employers could charge what they wished for rent, transportation, and even food.
>
> In the 1st decade of the 20th century there were few laws governing safety, health, sanitary conditions, or child labor. Sick leave, paid vacations, and other fringe benefits were virtually unknown.
>
> A common laborer toiled 50 hours a week for an average of $11—and a child may have worked beside him under dangerous conditions. Illness or old age could cut off his income.
>
> More than 40 percent of his take-home pay went for food, beverages, and tobacco—compared with about 25 percent today. A suit of clothes took 75 hours' work—compared with 20 hours today.
>
> To the Department's 10th Secretary the task today is "equal in magnitude" to the challenges of 1913.
>
> In an anniversary statement, Wirtz said that the Department "carries much of the responsibility for a major decision we must face as a people: Can we make our economy a human as well as a technical success?"
>
> The Secretary said that we have today "an economy so forward and aggressive in its technical ability that it has outstripped the skills of millions of persons, deprived itself of that many consumers, and come to an impasse of demand.
>
> "As framer of the manpower policies of this Nation, the Department of Labor must keep pace with the scientific advancements that offer promise of man's fulfillment.
>
> "We have the responsibility of developing those programs which will safeguard the person who may, as an individual, be adversely affected by a technological development which greatly benefits the community as a whole.
>
> "We are going to have to review our seniority, our job-right systems, our employment security programs, and our retirement programs in order to find ways of insuring man's rights despite his displacement by a machine."
>
> Of the four units that comprised the Department when it was born, only the Bureau of Labor Statistics remains in it. Within the last quarter century the Bureau of Immigration was transferred to the Justice Department and the Children's Bureau to what is now the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Mediation and Conciliation Service has become an independent agency.
>
> But changing times have brought changing needs, and the Department's activities and responsibilities are now of a scope that could not have been imagined 50 years ago.
>
> ### EMPLOYMENT SERVICE
>
> They include career counseling for women, reemployment help to veterans, the U.S. Employment Service, training in labor subjects for about a thousand foreign visitors annually, apprenticeship and training programs, publication of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (a new edition will list about 40,000), studies of the chronically unemployed, thousands of investigations to assure compliance with the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, help in retraining jobless workers (an estimated 400,000 in the next 3 years) and enforcement of fair labor standards.
>
> "During its first half century of service to the United States," Wirtz said, "the concern of the Department of Labor can be expressed in one word: People. Human welfare remains its interest."

AMERICAN LABOR

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in further recognition of the Department of Labor's 50th anniversary, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Members of the House the heartening and thoughtful expression of Mr. Rick Lampella, of Waukegan, Ill., a loyal friend. Mr. Lampella is a carpenter, an active union leader representing Local 48 of the Carpenters & Joiners of America on the Lake County Branch of COPE, an effective Republican precinct committeeman and Republican candidate for alderman in Waukegan. Rick Lampella's words are as follows:

> We are the hands and heart of labor. Our hands are the hands that helped make America strong. They may be the grime studded hands of a steelworker, perhaps the hands of a machinist, or the calloused hands of a carpenter, but always the hands of a free, dedicated American. These hands will never know the tyrant's sword as long as we are allowed to exercise free choice in a system of free enterprise. A system where men sit down together to negotiate their differences of opinion and to come away with an amicable solution. In times of crises, our hands will lay down the implements of our peaceful labor and will take up the armaments of defense.
>
> Our peace and prosperity has not been cheap, rather it has been wrought by the sweat of the brow. No power shall ever take it from us. We are strong for we are free. We are labor.
>
> Though our hands may be coarse and strong, yet our hearts flow with admiration and humble thanks to those who made our heritage so great. Our hearts swell with pride of accomplishment when we see mighty towering buildings, each one a monument to the men who built it. Our hearts never cease to wonder at new and intricate implements our fellowmen in the technological field devise for us in industry.
>
> Above all our hearts flow with gratitude to the Maker for the blessings He has so copiously bestowed upon us as free laboring men. As time goes on, our hands will remain firm, our hearts sure, for our faith is in our Creator who gave this great Nation as a citadel of strength so that all men who crave freedom might look to it and be encouraged in their pursuit. Today we are strong. Today we are free. Today we are the grateful American labor.

MILITARY MANPOWER UTILIZATION: TESTIMONY BEFORE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the opportunity to testify before the Armed Services Committee of

the House of Representatives on the highly important subject of proper manpower utilization. I believe that this is an area in which we must give careful study and plan intelligently in order to avoid wasteful duplication of efforts and to provide for our country a secure defense. I am placing my testimony of this morning in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

MANPOWER UTILIZATION

(Testimony of Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, Monday, March 4, 1963)

I appreciate very much the courtesy this committee has extended to me to testify at this time on one of the most important subjects which faces our society today: proper manpower utilization.

I know of no one piece of legislation which has a greater impact upon the subject of manpower utilization than the Draft Act which is again before your committee for extension.

It is almost unbelievable that the President in his message to the Congress on Youth on February 14, 1963, failed to mention, let alone, discuss the question of the draft as it bears on this youth problem. There is no single force which causes more disruption in the education, training, employment, and personal lives of our youth today, which the President's message points up, than the draft law.

It becomes imperative to know whether the penalties that our society pays as a result of this disruption are penalties we must pay in order to provide for the defense of our country. A great burden is placed upon this committee to fully understand the effects of this disruption and weigh them against the benefits. Certainly the Congress needs this advice before it sets up more Federal programs which will interfere with the lives of our young people, as the President has proposed.

This committee will have under consideration this year another request which relates to the basic question of efficient manpower utilization. I refer to the request for increasing the pay scales in the Armed Forces so that the rapid and costly turnover of military manpower can be somewhat arrested. Surely, the high cost and military inefficiency involved in the rapid rate of turnover of trained manpower in the military suggests that this committee look carefully into all aspects of the policies of procurement, training, promotion, and retirement of the Armed Forces to determine where basic errors may exist so they may be corrected. I am satisfied that the most costly error exists in the basic manpower procurement policy which relies upon the draft instead of positive recruitment techniques. This is the matter this committee must delve into in great depth and not dismiss out of hand with a cursory review and set of hearings.

The third matter to which I wish to direct the attention of this committee is the Manpower Training Act of 1962 and the philosophy which underlies it. This act was the result of lengthy studies into the basic problems of employment and unemployment in our dynamic economy where technological advancement has been so fast we have coined a name for it, automation. There is no question that we must concentrate a great deal more than we have been on the subject of education, and training, both in preparing our people to enter the labor market and in adult education and retraining to keep their skills up to date after they have entered the labor market.

Probably the largest sums of money being spent in the field of training and retraining in our society today are spent by the Military Establishment. The Military Establishment runs the largest single vocational education systems in the world, most of them in direct competition with the civilian society for pupils, teachers, and facilities. These systems are largely uncoordinated with the civilian sector and therefore are redundant as well as unnecessary competition. The armed services make the complaint that they seem to be training people only to have them enticed away by the civilian sector. They attribute a substantial part of the costly turnover problem they are experiencing to this fact; the obvious deductions to which I have alluded to be drawn from this should not be lost sight of.

I have been before this committee on other occasions to discuss manpower utilization. As the chairman knows, I was one of a group who strongly opposed the concept of universal military training in 1951 and 1952, not on the basis of an ideological difference, but upon the concepts of efficiencies. I happen to agree quite strongly with the advocates of universal military training that whatever personnel our Military Establishment needs they must have. I pointed out during the debate on universal military training in the House that the military needs for manpower were primarily quality needs, not quantity needs, needs for skills rather than for numbers. Our technology has continued to advance since then to make that point which was valid in 1951–52 even more valid today. A second point I sought to make was that a high proportion of the skills the military needed had counterparts in the civilian economy. Again, as we have advanced rapidly technologically this point is even stronger today.

This second point suggests that we should be doing a careful job of coordinating the civilian skill needs with the military skill needs. This requires as a mere rudimentary beginning developing nomenclature and description of skills both in the civilian sector as well as the military sector. Very little has been done in this area by the military sector. The same has been true in the civilian sector. However, the Manpower Training Act of 1962 can correct this if it is properly implemented by updating, keeping up to date and anticipating the new skills coming into being in the Dictionary of Skills which the Department of Labor is required to maintain.

Once the military has some understanding of the skills it needs in relation to the skills in use and coming into use in the civilian sector then intelligent decisions can be made on specific points of where the civilian sector or the military sector is best suited to maintain and operate the institutions of learning to develop these skills. As we move forward here we will develop a new mix, with the emphasis much heavier on the civilian sector and lighter on the military sector than it is today.

In opposing universal military training it was suggested that the theory of the high school ROTC program which worked well in the 1920's and proved itself in World War II could be used to develop a more efficient and less costly system to procure the great bulk of the skills needed by a modern technologically developed Military Establishment, than the universal military training concept which required the military to move into the entire field of housing, feeding, maintaining as well as training and paying the young men.

Universal military training was rejected by the Congress, in its wisdom, after hearing testimony from many educators and persons knowledgeable in the field of manpower utilization. It is apparent that the policy decison the Congress made has been ignored by the Military Establishment abetted by those in powerful positions in the Congress who support the universal military training concept. The draft law now up for extension has been perverted from a system of satisfying the real manpower needs of the military establishment into an awkward and costly program of universal military training which does not result in a strong man-for-man defense.

I sometimes think that emotion rather than reason supports a continuation of this concept which so hampers our civilian society and provides such an inefficient procurement system for the military. The emotion is directed not to those of us who wish to discuss the problems of efficient manpower utilization but toward those who argue somewhat emotionally on their part that peacetime draft has no place in our free society. I do not wish to minimize the value that freedom has for us by eliminating it from the discussion but I do not believe it is necessary to make an appeal beyond one to efficiency to establish the case against the system of peacetime draft for military personnel procurement.

I want to get the discussion on the plane of what system is the best for our society. There is no question in my mind about the great penalty we are paying in the civilian sector in inferior education and training resulting from the disruption of the plans of our youth in entering the labor market and embarking upon their life's endeavor.

I also think there is no question that the peacetime draft has proved to be, as many of us suggested it would be, a costly, inefficient personnel procurement system which would result in an inferior defense for our society.

In these times of increasing needs of the military for high quality rather than quantity in personnel procurement, our basic emphasis should be on strong recruitment programs backed by a topnotch system of pay schedules, promotions, retirement and fringe benefits.

Gentlemen, in the early 1900's the Navy had recruitment officers at the gates of every Federal penitentiary. Largely as the result of the experiences in World War I and the wisdom of the Naval leaders of the day the personnel system was changed to one of recruitment of topflight enlistments and top caliber training with real career opportunities based upon a good promotion and retirement system. Granted the Navy has become a more technical service where unskilled and semiskilled personnel are in less demand, but so it is with all military services today, including the Army.

Adm. Ben Moreel pointed the way to proper procurement practices for post World War II in the personnel system he established for the Seabees in World War II, matching civilian skills with military needs and adapting these skills as the case required. I discussed this and other aspects of the problems of manpower utilization at some length in my testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee in 1959 when the Draft Act was last extended. I ask that this testimony which is just as appropriate today as it was then be made part of these hearings. I also call attention to and ask that it be made part of these hearings an article appearing in Newsweek, April 4, 1960, entitled "The Draft—Campus to Chaos." I placed this timely article which sought to develop the points I have discussed in the CONGRESSIOAL RECORD, volume 106, part 7, pages 8446–8447.

[From Newsweek, Apr. 4, 1960]

THE DRAFT—CAMPUS TO CHAOS

Is there any sense trying to plan a career? Is it worthwhile to look for a permanent job? Should I get married? These are

questions that tens of thousands of young men graduating from college must face up to now, as they bump squarely into four words "Uncle Sam needs you."

For most who graduate from high schools, there will be time to postpone the question of military service. But what about the young men of 21 and 22 who know the draft is coming soon. Will they be drafted? And how soon? How can they find out?

Or should they just enlist and get it over with? Or what about signing up for one of the Reserve programs? And if so, which one of a bewildering variety of alternatives should they choose?

At sometime, almost every American family will be touched by the draft—now in a state of terrible uncertainty and confusion. For the first full appraisal of the draft, and its effect on the Nation's youth, a team of Newsweek correspondents headed by General Editor Jack Iams talked to students, parents, draft boards, and public officials across the Nation. Following is the summing up—and the answers to all-important questions:

The conscientious father in Arlington, Va., was both hurt and disturbed when his college sophomore son spoke up: "Dad, do you realize you've got me locked in with this darned draft thing until I'm 35? The other guys are just kissing it off until they're 26; and then they'll be exempt."

"I told you to do what the draft board requires," said the father. "To apply for a student's deferment while you're in college. Keep your grades up. It's true that makes you liable until you're 35. But that's the law."

"It may be the law," said the sophomore, "but the other guys aren't bothering. They say it's the only way you can beat the draft."

Father, sure he was right, reached for the phone. But the woman clerk at his son's draft board shook him to his conscientious core. "Your son's right," she said. "We just aren't bothering with college deferments any more. It's mostly redtape and the boys aren't filing requests for deferment. They hardly ever get called until they're 23 and they're out of college by then, so why bother? But, of course, since your son did apply, he's liable until he's 35. Otherwise, the liability ends at 26."

That is one example of draft law confusion. Another, and a more common one, is provided by 23-year-old Robert Reed, who was graduated from Princeton in 1958 and is waiting patiently at his home in Chicago's suburban Lake Forest for his local draft board to tap him. "Ever since college, I thought it would be just a couple of months. Then as time went by I thought maybe they had forgotten all about me. Two months ago I had my physical. I guess I'll be called any time now. I've been waiting so long, it'll be a relief." But, relief or no, nearly 2 years of uncertainty will have gone out of young Reed's life, with 2 years of active duty and 4 years Reserve obligation still to come.

Or there is the Detroit office boy, high school graduate James Gentner, now 21. "In June of 1957 I volunteered for induction. They deferred me for 3 months. They were supposed to call me in October that year, but they haven't done it yet. They may call today, tomorrow, a year from now. They've got me hanging." And while he's hanging, young Gentner marks time in a "just for now" job.

Another, and less resigned attitude, is that of 22-year-old Tom Taylor, a recent University of California graduate currently looking for a job in San Francisco. "I don't want to be drafted. It seems to be a waste of time in terms of career and the little good it does. I want to go into advertising but I can't get a good job because of the Army thing. I just hope there'll be a draft cut."

THE ODDS ARE 99 TO 1

These are typical cases, chosen at random. They can be multiplied thousands of times with individual variation in any part of the Nation today.

Few, if any, of these uncertain and badgered young men—and there are an eligible million and a half of them now in the draft age bracket of 18½ to 26—are unwilling to serve their country if they are really needed. But many wonder how great that need is, particularly when they know that the draft is currently taking fewer than 100,000 men a year (an estimated 93,000 in fiscal 1961). No wonder the temptation is to play "roulette," to lie low, say nothing, and hope to reach the magic age of 26 before one's number comes up.

But "draft roulette" is a game that plays havoc with nerves and with self-respect. Also, the chances of winning are slim. Right now, the Pentagon insists that "virtually no nonfather who is otherwise eligible is currently escaping the draft." The word "virtually" is a slippery one, of course. But Pentagon officials say the odds are at least 99 to 1 against the roulette player.

But even those who gamble on waiting it out are weighted down by what many young men consider the heaviest burden imposed on them by the draft as it stands today: The near impossibility of going into a desirable job upon which a career can be built. Obviously, the great majority of employers are reluctant to hire young men for positions of any real responsibility when there is no telling just how soon they may be plucked for service. Conversely, many of the young men themselves would prefer to mark time in some run-of-the-mill job—working in a filling station or at a soda fountain—rather than embark on a serious working life that may be interrupted at any time.

A dean speaks: The way a majority of college students apparently feel is summed up by Amherst's Associate Dean John C. Estey, Jr., himself an Air Force veteran of Korea and student adviser on military obligations:

"In my experience in counseling some thousand students, I think I could characterize their reaction to the draft as one of uncertainty, inequity, and—I am extremely sorry to say—frustration and demoralization.

"They are uncertain when they will be called, if at all. They sense the inequity involved when they see friends with the money and inclination go on to graduate school, planning to stay deferred until age 26 when they will be freemen. They sense the inequity in the indefinite deferment of their friends who precipitate marriage and have a family, often with the sole purpose of avoiding the draft.

"If it is true that raw manpower is still needed in great numbers by the Armed Forces, this message does not get through to the college student. He does not see why he is needed. He reads about the competition with Russia in research, technology, engineering, economics, culture, and he wonders why his brains and training are not as valuable as his feet and back. Finally, he sees so many men being deferred for apparently flimsy reasons that he is bound to say, 'How shall I get out of it?', rather than 'How shall I serve?' "

Ways out: For those who frankly want "to get out of it" there are a number of more hopeful prospects than "roulette." Some are matters of chance; some aren't. Briefly, these are the main avenues to "freedom":

Rejection for failure to meet physical or mental standards.

Fatherhood. Actually, fathers are not exempt or even automatically deferred; but they are far enough down on the order of preference to give them what is tantamount to indefinite deferment.

Continuance of graduate schooling until age 26—providing that a high average is maintained. The fact that this requires money has caused critics of the present draft setup to cry "one law for the rich, one for the poor." Representative William H. Meyer, Vermont Democrat, has even compared the educational deferment to the Civil War practice of a draftee's hiring a substitute.

Pursuance of certain essential occupations, such as science, engineering, agriculture, and teaching. Decisions as to degree of essentiality are up to local draft boards.

The ministry, and study for the ministry. That is a flat exemption. It has raised problems, according to a California draft board official, with such sects as Jehovah's Witnesses, some of whose members claim to be ministers though they hold full-time jobs.

Hardship cases—again determined by local boards. About a million and a half are currently listed in this category.

To what extent any or all of these categories are being exploited by the unscrupulous draft dodger, nobody knows for sure. Draft board officials are generally convinced that the successful faker is rare, indeed, though the tendency these days is toward leniency, and as one put it: "We stretch a point not to create hardship."

But where the question of fatherhood is concerned, there is simply no way of knowing when a young man has cynically and deliberately got himself married and started a family strictly for draft avoidance. There are now 400,000 fathers who are as good as exempt. A recent Labor Department study estimates that 35 to 40 percent of the men reaching the age of 22–23 will have become fathers. Certainly many a parent must wonder uneasily if his son has made a hasty and perhaps foolish marriage, saddling himself with a family that he may not be able to support. One New Jersey father put it like this: "My kid, who is 22, swears that he wouldn't think of getting married except for old-fashioned romantic reasons. But in the same breath he talks about friends of his who have started families just to get out of service." And it is a standard gag among deferred students at the University of Southern California: "If your grades fall you'd better have a fertile girl on tap."

The job problem: If the normal course of marriage is upset by the draft, the normal path of starting on a career is even more seriously affected. The college graduate who wants a job as a steppingstone to better things is just out of luck, in a great many cases, as long as the draft hangs over him. It's true that if he is drafted out of a job, his employer by law must rehire him when he is free. But the fact is that most employers don't want to hire a 1–A in the first place.

Large companies with elaborate personnel systems are inclined to insist that draft imminence is no factor in their hiring policies. But a far more widespread attitude was bluntly put by the San Francisco Bank of America's vice president, Frank E. Young: "We usually wait until a young man has completed his draft requirements. If you take a man and put him through training and then let him go off for 2 years in the Army, we have to start him again from scratch and this isn't worthwhile."

Employment agencies are still more outspoken. An official of Detroit's Action Center put it: "Many employers express the stipulation that employees be 4–F or have completed military training. It is rather prevalent as a stipulation."

The fresh college graduates themselves say flatly there is almost no chance of getting a decent job—one that will lead anywhere—during the months of limbo between the bright day of graduation and the dark one when Uncle Sam's greetings arrive. What burns up the eligibles is that during this same period their friends who are rejected as unfit or who have become fathers are walking into the jobs of their choice and getting a long head start.

How vital? This disruption over the draft during what is, nominally anyway, the peacetime American way of life, raises a basic national question: What justification is there for continuing a law passed in a time of stress, namely 1940?

The very history of that law provides a partial answer. It was dropped at the beginning of 1947. It was renewed 15 months later, in 1948, when the Soviet aggression threat appeared clear and present. Even then the law's teeth were not really felt until the summer of 1950 and the outbreak of the Korean war. In September of that year, 50,000 were called up (compared with the presently monthly average of about 7,500).

The draft law has been renewed five times since then, most recently in February of last year for another 4-year stretch, until July 1, 1963. (It was no accident that Congress chose to set a nonelection year for the next bubbling up of the controversial issue.)

Baby crop: There was some opposition to renewal in Congress last time. There will almost certainly be more in 1963—barring some world upheaval—because that's when the postwar bumper baby crop will start crowding the registration lists. That means that the draft, purely in terms of providing the armed services with manpower, will be only a drop in the bucket. For that matter, it isn't much more than a drop in the bucket today, providing as it does less than 100,000 men annually to a total defense manpower of 2.5 million.

If that is so, why is the draft necessary even now?

Defense officials, led by Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, have plenty of answers, but they mostly boil down to this: If it weren't for the hot breath of the draft, volunteer enlistments would drop far below the point of sufficiency.

Assistant Secretary of Defense Charles C. Finucane, in charge of manpower and reserves, put it simply: "Even if we don't take many people in the draft, we need it for a proper flow of enlistments. The Armed Forces would dwindle if you removed that impetus. We would never have time in an emergency to rebuild a Selective Service System if it were dissipated. Selective Service is the machinery in being, a pillar of our ability to mobilize manpower in an emergency." It is a hard argument to answer. One answer may come from England; there conscription has been abolished as of the end of this year, on the ground that sufficient volunteers are available to meet Britain's military commitments—and provide more efficient forces. But skeptical American officials reply that results of the British experiment won't be known for another 2 years.

It should also be stated, on the side of the draft, that the civilian officials who carry out most of the actual, backbreaking work of administering the law do a first-class, thoughtful, considerate job ("a beautiful job," says Georgia Tech's Dean Fred Ajax)—and furthermore, the bulk of them do it without pay.

Nevertheless, the great problems of disruption, delay, uncertainty, confusion, and general demoralization, where the flower of the Nation's young manhood is concerned, are undeniably present, casting their shadows across a nation opposed since its birth to the militaristic tradition. What can be done about it?

Two presidential aspirants have ideas on the subject:

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey says: "I am not at all satisfied with the present law. One immediate step should be taken. Our whole program should be reviewed and revised by a special manpower commission of civilian members."

Senator Stuart Symington, the candidate most deeply immersed in defense problems, says: "A force made up of volunteer professional military personnel is more effective and less costly than one dependent upon involuntary draftees. If the current atmosphere of complacency were dissolved, and a military career made more respected and attractive, the draft could be eliminated."

Keep it: Vice President Richard Nixon, on the other hand, has never changed from the position he voiced in 1956, when he said there was no "easy way" to maintain defense, and the draft, however hard a way, was indispensable to national security.

The average youngster, for all his grumbling, knows full well that behind all the confusion and uncertainty of the draft, behind the rosy promises of service recruiting officers, behind the inequities and the skulduggery and the smart-guy stuff, there lies the simple, basic need of his country's welfare. His complaint is not: "Why should I serve?" It is: "Tell me when and how I should serve, and to the best of my ability." He doesn't want his time wasted—and his time, in the long run, is the Nation's time.

Statement of Hon. Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri, Before Senate Armed Services Committee, March 3, 1959

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before this committee on the very serious question of the extension of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

This act had a difficult birth and its life has been a strange one. If anyone doubts it let him ponder over its title. It is probably neither universal, military, nor training. It is theoretically a draft act, as it is popularly called.

I would like to review the legislative birth of this act from the time it received its undescriptive title if I had the time. Instead I will refer to the remarks I made on the floor of the House during various debates upon it. The first, volume 97, part 3, pages 3220–3222 and pages 3786–3787 of the Congressional Record; volume 98, part 2, pages 6174–1678; volume 101, part 5, pages 6497–6498; and stress the highlights.

Before doing this I would like to refer to the testimony I gave before the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor which reported out its version of the National Defense Education Act of the last Congress, an act which also does not live up to its title.

I quote: "Before Congress undertakes to extend the Federal Government's authority in the field of education it is essential that it thoroughly appraise the Federal Government's present role in this important area to determine whether its role is proper and conducive to the growth and stability of the educational system. Regrettably, this appraisal has not been made to any great extent to date. I am convinced that the greatest damage that is occurring in our educational system today stems from the role of the Federal Government during the past 8 years.

"Under the guise of a peacetime draft law the Military Establishment has effectively disrupted for the past 8 years the education and training of every youth in America. Even those who have not been drafted have had their plans disrupted by uncertainty. Those who have been drafted include potential teachers, engineers, scientists, and indeed any potential professional man or technician, who have had 2 to 3 years taken out of the most crucial periods of their education. Their time has been devoted to largely sitting on their hands in a military uniform. If the military utilizes the peacetime draft system for its intended purpose, i.e., acquiring the personnel needed to carry out its functions, it would be an entirely different matter. Unfortunately, the peacetime draft law is being used to carry out the specious, impractical, and rejected philosophy that 'every American boy should have military training.' I say rejected philosophy because the Congress rejected the Military Establishment's request for universal military training. It was rejected, in part, because the military could never define by curriculum or even in general terms what constituted military training. During the debates on the various bills, members of this Committee on Education and Labor raised the point that if the bill really was to be a training bill it should be referred to the Committee on Education rather than to the Committee on Armed Services. Members of your committee warned, and I joined in that warning, that UMT would badly damage our educational system. I charge that the peacetime draft has been perverted in its use to a quasi-universal training program and indeed it has badly damaged our educational system and is continuing to do so.

"The first step that should be taken by this committee is to examine into this charge to see if it is substantiated. If it is, then it should recommend to the Congress what steps must be taken to require the Military Establishment to carry out the intention of the peacetime draft law and not subvert it. Such positive action should bring positive results, to wit: (1) We would improve our educational system, particularly in the area of scientists and technicians; (2) we would improve our defense strength because we would be getting our men trained in military science back to the jobs they are trained for and away from education for which they are not trained; (3) we would save billions of dollars that are presently being wasted on inadequate training and usage of personnel.

"In the 1920's and 1930 the American Legion sponsored a universal military training bill that was based upon an extension of the high school ROTC program. It had proved quite effective in training men for wars like World War I and to some degree World War II. The basis of this plan was the proper utilization of the educational facilities already existing in the society, rather than an attempted duplication of these facilities in the military.

"The need in modern warfare for technical skills, as opposed to close-order military drill skills, indicates that we should be utilizing the educational facilities that exist in the society in the field of vocational education, instead of having the Military Establishment duplicate them at the cost of billions of dollars.

"We achieve at least three things by following a program based upon utilization of the educational plant already in existence, to wit: (1) We get better trained technicians; (2) we get these technicians at one-tenth the cost; (3) we work with rather than foul up the civilian educational system.

"Fortunately, this is not a matter of theory. It is a matter that was proved conclusively in World War II by the Seabee personnel procurement system. To illustrate, the Seabees needed bulldozer operators. They did not take 18-year-old boys with a couple of weeks boot training camp experience and send them for a few months to a bulldozer operating school set up by the Navy. Instead they offered enlistment opportunity with a suitable rating to the experienced bulldozer operators in the civilian society and accepted them even though they were fat and 40—if they really knew how to operate a bulldozer. The accomplishment of the Seabees in World War II is fabulous and resulted essentially from this personnel system.

"The Seabee formula was abandoned when the war was over. The Navy now operates a bulldozer operators school and takes young men, whether they want to be bulldozer operators or not, and sends them to this school for a few months. The results are obvious: (1) You don't have a very good bulldozer operator; (2) after the enlistment period is up the man involved may or may not take a civilian job operating a bulldozer * * * likely not * * * so the skill is lost * * * (the Reserve program has not been carried out successfully to retain these skills); (3) the cost to the Navy of running the school is considerable; (4) the talents of the naval personnel who run the school are taken away from the fields where they could be efficiently utilized."

Unfortunately the House Subcommittee on Education and Labor did not make the studies I recommended. No committee in the Congress or executive agency to my knowledge has made such studies. Yet the truth of my basic observations is borne out by our common experiences and requires some pretty strong evidence to rebut.

The reason I am before this committee in the Senate is because the House Armed Services Committee made no study into these important charges. In hearings covering a period of 4 days and lasting only 7 hours and 13 minutes according to the committee's own records the extension of this draft act was passed out unanimously by the committee. An examination of the hearings demonstrates that it received the most cursory type of study. Not one educator testified. Not one person in the field of technical training testified. The testimony was exclusively that of representatives of the armed services and various church and other groups who were concerned with the spiritual aspects of the draft law.

I am concerned with the efficacy of the draft law in providing the type of defense this country needs. Not so strangely the most efficacious measure to provide the strongest defense happens to be the least costly. A fat man never could fight with efficiency and a fat Military Establishment can't fight any better.

The speeches I referred to in my opening remarks give sufficient detail to follow up the points I shall now state. If this committee undertakes to make a real study of these points I should be happy to supply to your committee staff the many reference books and other materials I have accumulated on this subject, hoping that some day some committee or even executive commission would undertake this important study.

The points:

1. An enlistee is considerably more valuable than a draftee. Enlistees are obtained by making the military service as attractive as possible.

2. Draft laws are necessary if there are insufficient volunteers. Yet relying on the draft law to meet personnel needs tends to weaken the efforts to attract volunteers. It is like getting used to relying on a crutch.

Therefore, drafting as a basis for getting personnel should be abandoned just as soon as possible. Indeed, it should be abandoned on a trial basis—just as a crutch should be abandoned—to see if a system of attracting volunteers will not work. And to test different methods of attracting volunteers.

3. To defend our way of life without having the very defense we set up destroy our way of life we must rely on a small standing military force backed by Ready Reserves:

(a) To make a Reserve system work the regular Military Establishment must try to make it work. One good test of whether they have tried to make it work is whether they are in a position to testify in detail as to why it does not work. The testimony of the leaders of our Military Establishment over a period of years on the inadequacies of the Reserve and National Guard systems demonstrate beyond much doubt to one who looks a little beneath the surface that they have not tried to make either system work.

4. Modern warfare (even the World War II variety) requires 90-percent noncombatant skills and of these noncombatant skills an increasing proportion are technical skills:

(a) Most of these skills have their civilian counterparts and these civilian type skills are readily adaptable to their military counterparts.

(b) The civilian educational system, including the vocational, trade, industry, etc., schools, has the specialists in the field of education and training.

(c) The leaders of the Military Establishment are specialists in the field of military science. Military science is a different field from education and training.

Therefore, the 90-percent noncombatant skills needed by the Military Establishment should be taught through the civilian educational system. The 10-percent combatant skills should be taught by the Military Establishment.

Corollary: The 10 percent needed for combatant duties could undoubtedly be procured through volunteer enlistment, particularly if the bright uniforms, medals, honors and veterans' benefits were reserved for this group.

Corollary: The 90-percent noncombatant skills could be procured through voluntary enlistment inasmuch as the men would be moved by the greatest incentive there is to be employed in skills they know and like.

5. A–1 physical specimens are not needed for noncombatant skills. A one-legged man can be a stock clerk. A midget an airplane mechanic. Only one thing seems to serve as a check on utilization of personnel with physical limitations: The cost of veterans' benefits. But if veterans' benefits are reserved for combatants this problem is eliminated.

6. Military law and discipline is required for combat and those who might be in combat. It is not the best or most efficacious system for utilizing noncombatant skills.

The Code of Military Justice of World War II evolved from centuries of battle experience was found to be inadequate when applied to the 90-percent noncombatant personnel. Without appreciating the fact that the error lay in trying to apply a system of discipline and law in an area where it was inappropriate we junked this time-tested code for a watered-down code which is no longer effective for combatant activity and doesn't do very well in the noncombatant area.

We should take a new look at the code for military justice. Set it up for combatant activities and combatants and withdraw it from noncombatant activities.

In other words, there is no sense in putting a military uniform on a Pentagon clerk. In fact, we cut down on the ability to recruit good clerks by subjecting them to military law.

7. A thorough job analysis of the technical skills needed by the Military Establishment should be done. At the same time an inventory of the civilian counterpart skills should be taken. Match the two groups to determine what may be lacking and set up an incentive system to encourage the training and the enlistment for training through the civilian educational system in those areas where there are skill shortages. Have a Reserve system set up geared to receive these skills to keep them from becoming rusty and to keep them up to date with the needs of the military. Have a stepped-up civilian-type law during war or emergency to deal with absenteeism and malingering and I believe we will have a strong defense system.

Gentlemen, these are the points that have not been studied. I am satisfied a study of them would give a sensible answer to what some have looked upon as insoluble problems of how we are to have defense in modern warfare and sustain its cost, how we are to preserve and strengthen the education system that will continue our advance in science and technology and yet have the manpower necessary to man the defenses, how to defend our way of life without destroying it, or setting it aside for the nonce, saying we will reset it up after the emergency.

The committee has several months to study this serious matter. I pray that you take the time to make this study.

EXERCISE IN FUTILITY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Harsha] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the State Department's foreign policy with Latin America is an exercise in futility and I have called upon the State Department to explain to the American people why it would even entertain the thought of granting a $1.5 billion loan, or any sum, to Brazil, or any other country, to develop a trade program between that country and Russia.

A delegation from Brazil was scheduled to visit the United States today for the purpose of negotiating a $1.5 billion loan from the United States to help develop long-term trade between Russia and Brazil; however, the visit has been delayed.

During these days when we are so concerned with Communist expansion in the Western Hemisphere; when our national leaders state publicly that the United States will not tolerate Communist expansion into Latin America; when the administration is calling for $11 billion of the taxpayers' money to help Latin America combat communism; why in the name of commonsense would the State Department even consider any such loan.

This dramatically demonstrates the futility of our foreign policy.

We spend billions on our defense to combat communism; we spend billions to help other nations combat communism; this Government is sacrificing American lives in Vietnam to combat communism; yet, our State Department apparently does not realize that the expansion of Russian trade, a very effective cold war weapon, will enhance the spread of communism and completely nullify the advantage, if any, of making these vast expenditures of money and American lives.

I think the American people are entitled to an explanation. I think the American taxpayer should be aware of the muddled philosophy of those in the State Department who advocate such a policy, and I think we should be told just who such persons are and why they would even entertain such a meeting.

This situation affects not only our security and fight versus communism, but also our own deficit financing and balance-of-payments problem.

BEWARE OF DANGEROUS CURVES ON PAPER

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in recent months there has been a deluge of statistics emanating from the Soviet Union which, if taken at face value, seem to indicate that Russia is really on the move in almost every area of activity. The latest of these statistics show that during 1961 the number of telephones in the Soviet Union increased by 19 percent—the most rapid percentage increase made by any major nation. On this basis, the United States increased 4.1 percent for the year. Considering only these raw percentage figures, some people might try to make us think the United States is falling sadly behind. But, we should all know this is ridiculous.

The current issue of Public Utilities Fortnightly effectively "bells the cat" on the use of percentage increase to try to compare growth. It points out that when you start with nothing—or nearly nothing—it does not take much to show a phenomenal rise percentagewise in almost anything.

Let us not lose sight of the fact that the United States still has over half the telephones in the entire world. We have 42 phones per 100 population as compared with about 2 per 100 population in Russia. Even though we have 21 times more telephones for each 100 Americans, the real important point is that this is being accomplished by American enterprise and private initiative rather than some heavyhanded bureaucracy as in the Soviet Union. History will bear out the fact that our free enterprise type of economy has been the most productive in the course of civilization in supplying the needs of the people and contributing to their well-being.

Trying to use Soviet percentage increase statistics for comparisons with the United States reminds me of the well-known line about the billiard game in Gilbert and Sullivan's "The Mikado"—playing with a cloth untrue, a twisted cue, and elliptical billiard balls. The author of the statement in Public Utilities Fortnightly warns, "Don't rely too much on curves." I might add that to use such percentage figures is actually throwing a curve and we had better beware.

I agree wholeheartedly with the thought of the author that all of us should keep the proper perspective when some individuals try to tell us—after a pilgramage to Moscow—the Soviets are going to overtake us in the electric energy field.

Mr. Speaker, this interesting statement in Public Utilities Fortnightly would be so useful for all of us to keep in mind when we hear any individual try to use such scare statistics about the Soviet Union in an attempt to play down or minimize the outstanding accomplishments of our free enterprise system. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I insert it in the Congressional Record at this point with the suggestion that each of my colleagues read it and remember it well:

Beware of Dangerous Curves on Paper

Did you know that as of January 1, 1962, the number of telephones in the Soviet Union had increased 19 percent over 1961? This was by far the greatest, most rapid increase shown of any major country in the world (meaning those with more than a half million telephones). The runnerup for statistical honors in the percentage increase race was Japan, whose total number of phones in 1962 was 14.8 over 1961.

Compared on this same basis, the United States makes a pretty sorry showing, indeed—only 4.1 percent—the third worst record for percentage increase of 25 other major countries. Only Brazil (with 2.3 percent) and South Africa (with 3.5 percent) show smaller increases percentagewise. There is no telling what an imaginative statistician might do if he were let loose with such short-range comparisons and plenty of curve charting paper.

Our only point in bringing up this silly comparison—and it is silly, admittedly—is to point out that when you start from nothing, or nearly nothing, it does not take much to show a phenomenal rise percentagewise. The really significant fact is that well over half the telephones in the entire world (150 million) are right here in the United States (77.4 million). And whereas there are about 42 telephones for every 100 persons in this country, there are only a little over 2 phones for every 100 persons in Soviet Russia.

We would do well to bear such sane figures in mind the next time some sensation-seeking Government official tries to get us all hot and bothered about the great progress Russia is making in electrification. Fears that the Reds will overtake us at the bus bar are freely thrown around the pages of the Congressional Record. But the hard fact is that Uncle Sam now has around 200 million kilowatts capacity (as against about 75 million for Russia) and produces three times as many kilowatt-hours for a much smaller population. The moral is: Don't rely too much on curves for tomorrow unless there is some real meat in the sandwich for today.

STATEMENT OF REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Republican members of the House Appropriations Committee conducted a press conference this morning at which I outlined our plans and hopes for sizable and meaningful reductions in the budget for the 1964 fiscal year.

I wish to include my statement with my remarks, but first, let me relate the background of this effort.

Immediately upon receipt of the President's budget message, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen], who is the ranking Republican member of the House Appropriations Committee, called together the minority members of the committee.

We met to discuss the budget and share our views on how it might be possible to hold Federal spending within bounds. The problem, quite frankly, was as staggering as the size of the proposed spending, itself.

The gentleman from Iowa, Congressman Jensen, therefore, appointed a subcommittee of six men, of which I am the chairman, to conduct a detailed, line-by-line survey of the budget and make firm recommendations as to where savings could be made. Our subcommittee soon became known as a task force, and it is under that title that we made our statement to the press today.

After several weeks of careful analysis, with the expert help of Mr. Maurice H. Stans, and others, we believe that a budget reduction of from $10 to $15 billion can be achieved.

Other members of the task force are the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ostertag], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pillion].

Following is the text of our statement to the press today:

Statement of Representative Frank T. Bow, of Ohio, Chairman, Special Task Force of Republican Members of House Appropriations Committee

The President's budget for the fiscal year 1964 has been before the Congress for nearly 7 weeks. During this period the Republican members of the Appropriations Committee have been carefully analyzing the voluminous documentation of the staggering budget request for $108 billion in new spending authority and $99 billion in actual expenditures for next year.

We have obtained expert assistance in our analysis of this budget, in the person of Mr. Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Budget from 1958 to 1961. His services as an adviser have been of inestimable value to us. In addition, we have consulted with dozens of other persons in various walks of life who are familiar with various aspects of Government spending.

We have concluded from this study that it is not only feasible, but urgent in the national interest, to reduce substantially the President's budget request. Our preliminary conclusion is that new spending authority can be reduced by a magnitude of from $10 to $15 billion. A reduction in appropriations of such magnitude would result in an expenditure reduction of from $4 to $6 billion in 1964 and of $6 to $9 billion in subsequent years.

The Republican members of House Appropriations are prepared to submit detailed amendments to the budget to achieve this objective. We believe that if such reductions are not achieved, the chances of congressional approval of a tax cut at this session will be almost nil. The American people have become deeply alarmed at the prospect of continued heavy deficit financing in a time of high national output. While everyone desperately desires tax reduction,

the American people do not want this to be at the expense of their children in the form of a steadily mounting, staggering national debt. We are conscious of the fact that many of our colleagues in the majority party are equally concerned, and we will welcome their assistance as this program develops.

To understand the magnitude of the fiscal 1964 budget proposals, let us look at the record.

Prior to the submission of this budget, the largest expenditure in our Nation's history was in fiscal 1945 when we spent $98 billion to end World War II. The fiscal 1964 budget proposes the expenditure of nearly $99 billion, an alltime high, with no shooting war in progress and no recession to fight.

The expenditures proposed in this budget are almost exactly three times as great as those of postwar fiscal 1948.

The expenditures proposed in this budget will be $22.3 billion higher than in fiscal 1960, the last full Eisenhower year. This is an increase of almost 30 percent.

These proposed increases in expenditures are reflected in all departments of the Government if the budget is adopted:

Defense expenditures will be up $9.7 billion since fiscal 1960.

Space expenditures will rise $3.8 billion in the same period.

All other expenditures will be up $7.5 billion over fiscal 1960.

The Federal payroll will have added 215,000 people since 1960, in addition to 220,000 in the armed services.

Perhaps an even more serious implication for the future is found in the new spending authority (which is the form of congressional appropriations) requested in the fiscal 1964 budget. These new "obligational authority" requests are a forecast of expenditure levels for future years.

New spending authority requested in fiscal 1964 is $108 billion, a fantastic $27.2 billion or 34 percent higher than for the last Eisenhower budget, just 2 years ago.

These increases in "new obligational authority," which are nearly $10 billion higher than proposed 1964 expenditures, are woven into the entire fabric of Government, and would irrevocably be reflected in fiscal 1965 budget expenditures of well over $100 billion.

In concluding that a $10 to $15 billion cut in new spending authorizations could be made, we applied the following basic principles:

1. Limitation of personnel additions in 1964 to requirements of nondeferrable workload increases such as may be caused by recent new legislation, or for law enforcement or protection of property, or high priority objectives.
2. Absorption by all agencies of the half year payroll increases effective January 1, 1964, even though this necessitates personnel attrition or other expense economies; this was stipulated in the pay legislation.
3. Postponement of a considerable portion of new nonemergency construction, both civil and military; and some stretchout of previously authorized capital outlays.
4. A moratorium on initiation of new programs not essential for the national welfare or security.
5. Conscious reappraisal of continuing programs and services, with a view to reducing those of low priority and leveling out temporarily those (like research) which have enlarged substantially in recent years.

Applying these principles could not be said to produce an austere budget. The result of taking all the reductions indicated would still be a 1964 expenditure level equal in the aggregate to that of 1963, for the budget as a whole. Only by holding the dimensions of spending to a fixed level for a few years, while annual revenues grow, will it be possible to bring about a balanced budget again.

With all the budgetary growth the past few years, it is inconceivable that the reductions contemplated would harm the economy or the security or the welfare of the Nation. All real needs of the Nation can be met without attempting to satisfy everybody's demands on the Federal Treasury.

CUTS IN FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Snyder] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] earlier today has asked for some examples of places where spending can be cut. May I suggest that potential spending in any of the fields hereinafter listed are examples of past spending which might well bear scrutiny to see if any of these appear in the projected budget submitted to this Congress.

This list does not include losses incurred by the Federal Government due to its business activities in some fields wherein the Government is in direct competition with private enterprise.

First. A grant totaling $65,000 in Polish zlotys given for agriculture research—U.S. Department of Agriculture, daily summary, July 5, 1962.

Second. An item of $9,483,000 for redevelopment of an Oklahoma lake as a tourist center given under the administration's area redevelopment program.

Third. An untold amount to construct a solar-powered ship to win friends and influence people along the rivers of Surinam—House Foreign Operations Subcommittee Report No. 2436, part 1, September 19, 1962.

Fourth. One thousand 23-inch television sets ordered for use in community education programs in underdeveloped oversea areas were ordered at a cost of $400,000 for areas where there was no electrical power supply—House Foreign Operations Subcommittee Report No. 2436, part 1, September 19, 1962.

Fifth. Studies by the National Institutes of Health provided for:

Indian caste cohesiveness and personality development	$7,820
Empirical tests of a theory of interpersonal behavior	17,250
Alcohol used in a changing Navaho community	1,996
Juvenile delinquency in Japanese-American population	50,180
Studies of silent thinking	26,565
Behavior and physiological concommitants of dreaming	20,700
The social role of aging wild ungulate	8,205
The ontogeny of English phrase structure	2,100
A stereotactic atlas of the beagle brain	9,775
Blood groups genetics of Southampton Island Eskimos	11,500
Oral health of Icelandic peoples	14,030
Investigation of information contained in echoes	13,837
Studies of disease in a giant snail	20,092
Role of behavior of frontal monkeys	$15,998
Student culture and intellectual development	43,613
Travel of synthetic detergents with percolating water	20,991
Emergent leadership among the New Guinea Tolai	1,251
Mental age, IQ, sex, and divergent thinking	2,227
The establishment and maintenance of a monkey colony	13,816
A suicidal referral demonstration	100,215
Red tuna and yellow fat disease in the cat	19,965
Premarriage counseling	14,403
The skilled clinicians assessment of personality	94,587
Social space as bicommunication	21,616
Longitudinal growth studies on anamolies of the head	23,712
Appointment breaking in a pediatric clinic	18,000
Initiation and support of a colony of baboons	61,985

Senator Paul H. Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, Congressional Record, volume 108, part 11, page 14286.

Sixth. The National Science Foundation, an independent agency of the Federal Government, has provided a total grant of $78,000 to conduct turtle studies to find out what makes them tick.

Seventh. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration awarded a $80,700 1-year contract for research on dolphin talk to try to establish communications between dolphins and mankind—announcement made September 16, 1962.

Eighth. A grant of $1¼ million was given for a 6-year study of the affectional relationship of an infant monkey and its mother—hearings, part 2, page 238.

Ninth. Ten thousand dollars was given for a tour of the U.S. defense plants by a Communist Polish official—brought over from Poland under educational and cultural exchange program by State Department in 1962.

Tenth. Air-conditioned Cadillacs eligible under aid program—hearings, part 2, page 414.

Eleventh. Plant explorers sent on a 30-month trip to the Kingdom of Nepal to look for specimens—particularly for those that are especially ornamental—Department of Agriculture announcement, September 17, 1962.

Twelfth. Foreign aid funds used in Kenya, Africa, for purchase of extra wives for government officials—hearings, part 2, page 289; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1962, House committee.

Thirteenth. Splendid new sports stadium built in an African country with primitive roads to get to it—statement by Eugene R. Black, World Bank President, September 18, 1962.

Fourteenth. A strikingly modern air terminal building constructed for a few planes while fertile land is left without irrigation in an African country—statement by Eugene R. Black, World Bank President, September 18, 1962.

Fifteenth. Chester Bowles, President Kennedy's roving Ambassador, spent $600,000 on an 18-day jaunt around the world meeting ambassadors and their wives—hearings, part 2, page 60.

Sixteenth. U.S. Government is lending $27 million to Ghana to build the Volta River Dam in addition to other loans. In questioning Secretary of State Dean Rusk during hearings, Representative Joseph Montoya, Democrat, of New Mexico, asked:

> Looking at the commitment on this loan in retrospect, what do you have to say in view of the fact that it has been disclosed there is in Ghana a school for the training of Communists—that was disclosed in the papers a few days ago, for the purpose of infiltrating into the different countries in Africa.
>
> Secretary Rusk. I would not think that in itself would be grounds for not proceeding. There are other relationships between Ghana and Western countries in the military, educational, and technical assistance fields which we believe will serve in the longer run to be a very heavy counterbalance to the type of influence you just mentioned. We were playing also for the long-range political stakes in that country besides the economic stakes (hearings, pt. 2, p. 77); hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Seventeenth. Many Latin American countries have taken their dollars and have bought U.S. gold. Argentina, for instance, insisted on gold for dollars and in 1961 bought over $150 million worth despite the fact that the United States was paying interest on the dollars. Many other countries are doing the same thing so that our deficit in the balance of payments and our gold reserves are at a dangerous level—hearings, part 2, page 122.

Eighteenth. An FHA aid, fired for gambling, is rehired by the Alliance for Progress and sent to Caracas, Venezuela, at a salary of $17,030 per year—hearings, part 2, page 131.

Nineteenth. Greek Government appealed to its wheatgrowers to curb the growing of wheat to spur U.S. aid and then suggested the acreage be placed in cotton, competing with U.S. cotton—hearings, part 2, page 161.

Twentieth. Of the 24 countries sending delegates to the so-called neutral Belgrade Conference in September 1961, 23 are receiving U.S. economic assistance and 13, military assistance in fiscal year 1962. In fiscal year 1963, economic assistance is programed for 22 countries and military assistance for 13. Section 112 of last year's Appropriation Act stated:

> It is the sense of Congress that in the administration of these funds great attention and consideration should be given to those nations which share the view of the United States of the world crises.

Those words were almost exactly the same as those used by President Kennedy when he signed the authorization bill. Among the nations at that conference were Cuba, Ghana, Yugoslavia, Guinea, and Indonesia—hearings, part 2, page 206; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Twenty-first. No feasibility or engineering studies completed on many projects for foreign aid running into millions of dollars, yet not the smallest American flood control or drainage project would be authorized a penny until such plans and costs were completed—hearings, part 2, page 230.

Twenty-second. Many foreign aid plans initiated by the United States, not by the recipient countries—hearings, part 2, page 237.

Twenty-third. Because of commitments made for foreign aid projects, Congress is losing control of aid program amounting to billions of dollars—hearings, part 2, page 264.

Twenty-fourth. Foreign funds spent to build superhighways in countries where there are few, if any, automobiles—hearings, part 2, page 288.

Twenty-fifth. A luxury yacht replete with air conditioning and gold wallpaper furnished a millionaire Emperor at the cost of $3.1 million. Yacht called a training ship—hearings, part 2, page 329.

Twenty-sixth. Funds spent for troughs for camels—hearings, part 2, page 289.

Twenty-seventh. Funds spent for suits for Greek undertakers—hearings, part 2, page 289.

Twenty-eighth. Agreement between Morocco and the United States gives Morocco the U.S. bases worth millions of dollars by the end of 1963. One base now occupied by Russian personnel and Russian Mig planes. Yet we are substituting an aid program which according to the Under Secretary of State for African Affairs "would be judged like every other country"—hearings, part 2, pages 313 and 314; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Twenty-ninth. Teachers, claimed to be in short supply in the United States, are all over the world in the Peace Corps and in AID, some of them in the same buildings—hearings, part 2, pages 320 and 321.

Thirtieth. Southern Rhodesia has an agriculture school with 9 to 11 pupils as part of aid program and yet has 5 professors, more buildings than they can use, and everything else for a large school—hearings, part 2, page 326.

Thirty-first. Countries buying jet planes in Africa with aid money without proper facilities or business. Ghana has its own airline, all standing dead at the airport—hearings, part 2, page 327.

Thirty-second. In Liberia, independent since 1847, where there is a great deal of poverty and misery, a $10 million palace is being built for the President despite the fact that the present palace practically equals the U.S. White House. Through fiscal year 1962, Liberia has received over $40 million in foreign aid and around $250 million for development loans—hearings, part 2, page 360.

Thirty-third. Three hundred and thirty thousand dollars spent for Libyan textbooks, refused by Libya because of its sensitiveness over American technicians editing them from French into Libyan texts—hearings, part 2, pages 398 and 444.

Thirty-fourth. Peace Corps made demands on air transport industry in letter to U.S. international carriers from Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver, stating:

> You are hereby instructed to file a tariff for Peace Corps personnel at 35 percent below economy class fares—hearings, part 2, page 459.

Thirty-fifth. Contingency funds transferred for aid to countries. Even British possessions are considered for aid programs—hearings, part 2, page 468, hearings; foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Thirty-sixth. Household furnishings and other items under highway projects in Cameroon with average contract to technicians at $30,000 each, at an average salary of $12,000—hearings, part 2, pages 540.

Thirty-seventh. Ten million dollars loan to textile mill in Sudan; $500,000 for textile mill in Ethiopia while our textile mills are suffering—hearings, part 2, page 701.

Thirty-eighth. New project for a survey of water supply system for the city of Libreville at cost of $150,000 made without congressional approval—hearings, part 2, page 708.

Thirty-ninth. Increased funds for Kenya, a British possession, home of the Mau Mau, to $3.2 million for fiscal year 1962—hearings, part 2, page 789.

Fortieth. No control can be exercised over the $9 million of aid funds for Libya—hearings, part 2, page 837.

Forty-first. Two and one-half million dollars in aid for Mali with a very large element in the Government taking an anti-Western stand. Mali became independent in September 1960. It has 4.5 million people—hearings, part 2, page 845.

Forty-second. Nigeria, gaining independence October 1, 1960, from Great Britain, received a grant aid of $20.5 million for 1962 in addition to U.S. loan commitments of $225 million. Among projects is a TV educational program at a cost of $343,000 for 1963 although Nigeria has only two TV stations and very few TV sets. Population is 36 million—hearings, part 2, pages 875 through 891.

Forty-third. For helping tourism in Tunisia there is an estimated obligation of $167,000 for fiscal 1963. Communist bloc countries have extended over $46 million in aid tied in with technical assistance and/or sale of capital goods—hearings, part 2, pages 951–952; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Forty-fourth. One hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars for project for airline training for Tanganyika—hearings, part 2, page 975.

Forty-fifth. Two hundred thousand dollars allocated for a translation center in the African regional region together with an additional $139,000 for translation services to translate African technical publications into French—hearings, part 2, page 982.

Forty-sixth. Cambodia given enough rifles so that each man had two rifles apiece—hearings, part 1, page 493.

Forty-seventh. Peace Corps has contract of $59,000 with Institute for the Study of Man and another contract for experiment in international living for training of Peace Corps members—hearings, part 1, page 727.

Forty-eighth. Peace Corps men assigned as evaluators of other Peace

Corps men at an estimated cost of $1 million—hearings, part 1, page 733.

Forty-ninth. Ten physical education directors assigned to Ivory Coast by Peace Corps—hearings, part 1, page 735.

Fiftieth. Peace Corps sent man, wife, and nine children to Philippines at a one-way cost of $13,190. The man's salary is $10,190. He is former executive secretary to the Newspaper Guild of Greater Boston and a Harvard graduate—hearings, pages 782, 783, 840, and 841.

Fifty-first. AID agency requested information from Library of Congress to compile and supply information to ascertain nations which have or have not received aid from the United States in order to answer questions by House Committee on Foreign Operations Appropriations—hearings, part 3, part 253; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

Fifty-second. In Lebanon, at the stock breeding farm furnished by U.S. funds, there were nine stalls to each bull. Lebanon is one of the wealthiest countries in that area—hearings, part 3, page 278.

Fifty-third. Cyprus, which received $679,000 in aid in 1962 from the United States bought up $2 million of our gold at the end of 1961—hearings, part 3, page 375.

Fifty-fourth. India, which has received a total amount of about $4 billion in U.S. aid is now negotiating to buy a Russian Mig aircraft plant—hearings, part 3, page 383.

Fifty-fifth. Iran, in the last quarter of 1961, purchased $16.1 million of U.S. gold, yet that country is under the mutual security program for $54.4 million exclusive of military aid—hearings, part 3, page 433.

Fifty-sixth. Iraq, which has, through fiscal year 1962, received a total of $67.5 million in U.S. aid, bought a total of $29.8 million of U.S. gold in 1960—hearings, part 3, page 467.

Fifty-seventh. Request for $225 million for Pakistan, for projects on which there are no commitments, has been programed for 1963—hearings, part 3, page 499.

Fifty-eighth. Cambodia, to whom we gave $24 million in fiscal 1961, turned around and bought $12 million worth of U.S. gold—hearings, part 3, page 556.

Fifty-ninth. Indonesia, to whom the United States gaves $44 million in aid in the last half of 1960, bought up $24.9 million of U.S. gold in 1960—hearings, part 3, page 607.

Sixtieth. Cambodian Highway, paid for by the United States, to cost—hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee—$15 million, was so badly planned and built that it resulted in a cost of $32 million and now must be further repaired at an additional cost of $2.7 million—hearings, part 3, page 636.

Sixty-first. Vietnam, where our marines and other defense forces are fighting and dying, taxes U.S. goods received in that country as gifts. These are distributed in part to private businesses which sell them at a profit—hearings, part 3, page 684.

Sixty-second. Other nations with a system of taxing U.S. aid and selling it for a profit similar to Vietnam's are Cameroon, Guinea, Kenya, Morocco, Senegal, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, Yugoslavia, Bolivia, Cambodia, Korea, Thailand, Greece, India, Israel, Pakistan, and Turkey—hearings, part 3, page 693.

Sixty-third. In Taiwan, Nationalist China, a sawmill was built in the mountains with U.S. aid; then it was learned it would not saw the type of logs produced there—hearings, part 4, page 714.

Sixty-fourth. AID is spending $120,000 for an orientation course for employees going overseas, together with their wives and adult dependents—hearings, part 3, page 744.

Sixty-fifth. Fraudulent invoices from Laos for generators and sawmill equipment of $207,500 were paid by the United States when actual cost was $44,000. No recovery was made of the money expended. Laos also bought $1.9 million of U.S. gold while taking $24 million in aid for 1961—hearings, part 3, page 775.

Sixty-sixth. Four hundred and fifty-eight thousand dollars granted by the United States to bring Japanese labor leaders to this country—hearings, part 3, page 811; hearings, foreign operations appropriations for 1963, House committee.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Congress long interested in American labor, it gives me pleasure to stand here today and say to the Department of Labor, on the occasion of its 50th anniversary—well done.

For labor, for Congress, indeed for all Americans, this is truly a golden occasion not only in time, but in terms of achievement. Congress passed the bill which created a separate Department of Labor half a century ago, on March 4, 1913. President Taft signed the bill and the one Department of the President's Cabinet which has as its sole concern people became a fact.

Working together, the legislative and executive branches of this Government have examined, been deeply concerned with, and worked hard to improve the welfare of the working force of America—those 70 million men and women who form the backbone of this country.

It is appropriate, therefore, to turn back the clock for a moment, and recall what working conditions were in 1913. I do not mean remember personally, mind you, I am having a 50th birthday myself this month. But perhaps that, too is symbolic. I am proud that labor has always been my own special concern. But we all know, of course, that working conditions were far different in 1913 than they are today. Long hours of toil, wages not far above the subsistence level of living, unsafe, unhealthy sweatshops, child labor, little security—such, frequently, were the conditions of labor only 50 years ago. Weariness and fear were the daily companions of many a workingman—or the child that may have toiled beside him.

What has happened since, through the joint efforts of the Congress and the Department of Labor, and with the cooperation of both labor leaders and management, has been a continuing record of betterment for our working people. Child labor and immigration were among the major problems solved in the beginnings of the Labor Department. Social security, fair labor standards, minimum wage and hour specifications, unemployment insurance—these are only some of the benefits which have given Americans a better way of life.

Through two World Wars, the Department of Labor helped marshal a labor force ready to meet the production needs of the Nation. The National Employment Service helped in solving the problems of the depression period of the early 1930's. The Women's Bureau sought, and continues to work on, the status of women as a contributory factor in the economy, as more women than ever before are entering the ranks of labor. The Bureau of Labor Statistics furnishes us with data on the cost of living, family budgets, employment, and the occupational outlook—facts we must have at our fingertips in reviewing and anticipating trends in the economy of the Nation.

It has been a tremendously changing 50 years. It is gratifying to look at the working man and woman today and say, for the most part: their life is good. Both the Labor Department and Congress are to a large extent responsible for this march of human progress. It was not too long ago that unions were secret societies whose members had their names blacklisted by industry. Today, employees may negotiate freely.

But our problems are not all solved. The rush of automation in our new technology is setting a pace which the Labor Department and the Congress must equal and even anticipate, if the needs of the man and woman on the job are to be served. It is not an easy task.

The Manpower Development and Training Act which the Congress passed last summer is undertaking to train 400,000 persons in the next 3 years. The Area Redevelopment Act has translated into terms of action the concern for parts of the country where technological change must itself sponsor other changes. Fifty years ago we were just moving out of the horse-and-buggy age. Today, we are talking about why we cannot live on Venus. In such terms, we realize that although America has come a long way from the plantation life and industrial towns of colonial days, this country is still just laid out in the rough.

We are not going to forget the working people in all these changes. The Department of Labor and the Congress will see to that. People cannot be ignored merely because machines are also more numerous. We faced other problems in the past. We will continue to do the same, in the same spirit, in the future.

It is often said that good things come in small packages. The Labor Department is the smallest branch of the President's Cabinet. But for tens of millions, it has certainly been a good thing. I have been proud to work with it and for it in its high goal of achieving the best for every man. In 50 years, we have come a long, long way.

SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN COMPACT

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my bill to establish a Susquehanna River Basin compact between the States of Pennsylvania, New York, and Maryland.

Last year I requested that a comprehensive survey and report on the water and related resources of the Susquehanna River Basin be undertaken, and this survey, which will take some 6 years to complete, is now underway by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my proposed measure is to create a regional agency by intergovernmental compact for the planning, conservation, utilization, development, management, and control of the water and other natural resources of the entire Susquehanna River Basin.

The establishment of such a compact would also provide for the improvement of navigation, reduction of flood damage, reduction and control of surface subsidence, regulation of water quality, control of pollution, development of water supply, fish and wildlife habitat, hydroelectric energy and public recreational facilities.

Some 15 million people at present live and work in the region of the Susquehanna River Basin and its environs which covers a geographic area in excess of 27,500 square miles, and the government, employment, industry, and economic development of the entire region and the health, safety, and general welfare of its population are and will continue to be vitally affected by the use, conservation, management, and control of the water and related resources of the Susquehanna River Basin.

Demands upon the waters and related resources of the basin are expected to mount rapidly because of the anticipated increase in the population of the region projected to reach 23 million by 1980 and 33 million by the year 2010, and because of the anticipated increase in industrial growth projected to double by 1980.

Mr. Speaker, the public interest requires that facilities must be ready and operative when needed to avoid the catastrophe of such things as unexpected floods or prolonged drought such as we experienced last summer.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress will adopt this measure at an early date so the organization of this vital compact can be undertaken.

PLACING THE CUBAN CRISIS IN PERSPECTIVE WITH RESPECT TO U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, we here on the floor of the House of Representatives and the Senate have been asked to partake of a smorgasbord of innuendo, misshapen facts, false alarms and all kinds of advice regarding foreign policy, particularly in respect to the Cuban situation.

On the right hand, we hear advice recommending that we should send forth a military expedition to unseat the regime of Fidel Castro. On the left hand, we hear advice that we should effect a reconciliation with the leftist Castro regime because it was driven leftward only because some unidentified capitalistic interests wished to do in the Cuban revolution in the first place. Both brands of advice seem unpalatable to me.

In the late 1930's and the early 1940's, the America First movement displayed its fare of disunion and distrust. Now apparently we have in our midst the "America last" critics. According to these critics, General de Gaulle is right, Chancellor Adenauer is right, Canadian Prime Minister Diefenbaker is right, every propertied Cuban emigree is right and every rumor ground from the plush, expense-account bar in Miami is right. According to these critics, President Kennedy is wrong, the entire intelligence-gathering apparatus of the U.S. Government is wrong and Defense Secretary McNamara is wrong.

It is human nature for fallible human beings to second-guess other human beings, particularly a President of the United States. President Kennedy sits today in the world's loneliest job in America, a welter of hair-raising problems—the thrust of Soviet imperialism, a nuclear arms race that threatens to destroy the world as we know it and maybe a few others.

President Kennedy not long ago replied with this stanza of poetry to his critics and at this point I quote it with approval:

> Bullfight critics ranked in rows
> Crowd the enormous plaza full
> But only one is there who knows
> And he's the man who fights the bull.

I recall with a shudder the numbers game of the unsavory McCarthyite past. The numbers game in new dress today revolves around Soviet facilities and men stationed in Cuba.

The numbers game is, of course, not new. Shakespeare has the following passage in Othello during a debate between the Duke of Venice and his council regarding the size of the enemy Turkish fleet.

> Duke. There is no composition in these news that gives them credit.
>
> First Senator. Indeed, they are disproportioned. My letters say a hundred and seven galleys.
>
> Duke. And mine, a hundred and forty.
>
> Second Senator. And mine, two hundred.

Now in place of the Turkish fleet we are talking as I said earlier, about the Soviet presence in Cuba.

It would seem to me that any fair-minded critic would say that the recent extraordinary 2½-hour briefing of news correspondents by Defense Secretary McNamara and President Kennedy have placed the Cuban crisis in proper perspective.

The President is not saying that the United States is content to have alien military forces stationed in Cuba. The President, as I understand him, is saying that the nature of the Soviet presence is not of a nature to justify resort to military means at this time to expel it.

Mr. McNamara, the Defense Secretary, as I read the transcript of that press conference of his I mentioned earlier, has stated that the United States has the will and the means to discover in swift fashion potential use of defensive weapons in Cuba for offensive purposes.

We should, of course, look askance at the positioning of Soviet arms in Cuba. We should desire and work for their removal. We should encourage the establishment of a truly democratic administration in Cuba—but not the return to entrenched power and privilege of the Cuban counterparts, now in Florida, of the French Bourbons who in a statesman's cogent words: "Forgot nothing, forgave nothing."

Once again Cuba is an example of how we react with a military fixation to a problem whose largest element perhaps is nonmilitary in character. President Kennedy has stated this danger as being one of Cuba as a base for subversion in the Americas. He has also stated that time is short in which to bring about the social and economic reforms necessary to forestall brutish, totalitarian revolution in the developing countries of the Americas.

An essential fact is that frustration about Cuba is not new. Cuba has troubled us for some 150 years. This in itself should indicate that some quick solution is not available.

And that leads me to a collateral comment. There exists a myth that the Monroe Doctrine is some magic key to resolving difficulties. In the first place, Messrs. Monroe and Adams did not conceive of their policy as "doctrine"—the word was not employed until 1895 during Cleveland's second administration when Secretary of State Olney employed the

term. Nor did Messrs. Monroe and Adams ever speak of "enforcing" it—if it was enforced, it was enforced only by courtesy of the British Navy. Both recognized it could be enforced only in cooperation with another European nation—in this case, as I said, the British fleet.

In recent years the Monroe Doctrine has in fact been mutualized under the aegis of the Organization of American States which provides for consultation in any possible application of the policy.

I would also like to point out another historic parallel which has in the past gotten us in trouble—the use of the U.S. mainland as a base for operations for filibustering against Cuba and other nations. This began with such adventurers as Aaron Burr.

I think that Secretary of State Dean Rusk is to be commended for not playing politics with diplomacy. Diplomacy should not be conducted by means of Fourth of July oration papers.

Once again, there is no miracle tablet to cure our frustration in Cuba and in other troubled spots. There is the danger, too, of smaller nations or their self-appointed representatives playing one great power against another in frenzies of an excess.

President Kennedy has said that the Cuban problem must be dealt with as part of the larger worldwide issues. We should exercise the wisdom that the President has suggested and that he himself exercises. In an age of nuclear destruction, the charade of military might in the form of orations and saber rattling is indeed unforgiveable and holds the most profound consequences.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce an editorial on the Cuban situation that appeared in the February 28, 1963, issue of the Portland, Oreg., Journal and a column by Art Buchwald that appeared in the March 3, 1963, editions of the Washington Post.

Political War Over Cuba

When President Eisenhower was in office, and particularly during the 1960 campaign, the Journal criticized leading Democrats for partisan attacks on foreign policy of a kind that were damaging to this country.

Now it seems to us that some Republicans are guilty of the same thing over Cuba.

Cuba rightly is a foreign policy issue. Communist control of a country 90 miles from our shores is a serious matter. The presence of 17,000 Soviet troops and heavy supplies of Soviet military equipment is not to be taken lightly.

But the nature of the threat from Cuba ought to be kept clearly in mind. We see no possibility of an overt attack from Cuba on this country. We accept the proof offered by the Defense Department from its surveillance that Cuba does not possess missiles of the range needed to strike this country.

The chief value to Castro of Russian troops and materiel is to guard the Castro administration from an internal uprising by Cubans themselves or to defend against attack from abroad.

But the main thing we have to fear from Cuba is its use as a base for Communist revolution in the rest of Latin America. If Cuba is to remain a political issue, that ought to be the focal point of discussion.

The recent visit to Washington of Venezuelan President Romulo Betancourt is a reminder of this aspect of the Cuban threat. Betancourt is convinced that Communist terrorism in his country is fomented and supported from Cuba.

If the Reds should succeed in destroying the moderate kind of government Betancourt has been trying to establish in Venezuela, after years of misrule by rightist dictatorship, then their threat to the rest of Latin America will have been multiplied. Communist control of Venezuela would be many times more dangerous than Communist control of Cuba. U.S. policy toward Latin America has to be a lot more comprehensive than simply getting the Russians out of Cuba.

Soviet Premier Khrushchev has promised to withdraw thousands more of Soviet troops from Cuba. Nobody knows for certain that he means it. But there ought to be a moratorium on debate over this particular point until we see whether he fulfills his promise.

Some of the critics of our Cuba policy are not clear on what ought to be done. Few of them recommend that we invade the island. They simply say that we ought to do something.

Lots of things are being done. Time will be required to see whether they will accomplish the goal short of all-out nuclear war that nobody wants.

Meanwhile it helps to keep things in perspective if we remember that blame for Castro's rule can be widely shared. The bearded dictator came to power during the Eisenhower administration. He consolidated his position after Kennedy became President.

Everybody concedes that the Bay of Pigs invasion attempt was badly bungled. Nobody knows whether it would have led to Castro's overthrow even if it had been well planned and executed.

We think the debate on Cuba ought to be carried on more responsibly than it has been in recent weeks.

Getting the News Is Always a Battle

(By Art Buchwald)

There has been a lot of talk about news management in the Government these days, but if you go through history you can find that every presidential administration tried to manage the press in one way or another. We found an old transcript the other day of a press briefing between Abraham Lincoln's press secretary and White House reporters, which shows that even in those days attempts were made to bottle up vital news of interest to the public.

Here are excerpts from it:

Question. Mr. Nicolay, yesterday the President gave a speech at Gettysburg, and he started it out by saying, "Four score and 7 years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation." Sir, would you mind telling us the names of the fathers he was referring to?

Secretary. I'm sorry, gentlemen. I can't reveal the names at this time.

Question. The Saturday Evening Post, which is published in Philadelphia, said he was referring to Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin.

Secretary. That's just conjecture. The President is not responsible for everything written by his friends.

Question. The President said yesterday in the same speech that the country was engaged in a great Civil War, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure. He didn't say how he intended to win the war. Does this mean he has a no-win policy?

Secretary. The President in his speech was only concerned with the Battle of Gettysburg, which incidentally we won. The Department of War will give you full details on other battles.

Question. The Department refuses to give us any information. We don't know how many troops were used at Gettysburg, who commanded them, or how many casualties there were. All we were given were some lousy photos of Confederate gun emplacements. How can we be sure the Confederates still don't have artillery hidden in the hills around Gettysburg?

Secretary. We have constant surveillance of the hills. To the best of our knowledge all southern artillery pieces have been removed.

Question. What about Confederate troops? There are an estimated 17,000 in the area.

Secretary. We have the South's promise they will be removed in due course.

Question. Mr. Secretary, why didn't Mrs. Lincoln go with the President to Gettysburg?

Secretary. Mrs. Lincoln feels that her place is at home with her children. But she did send a telegram.

Question. In talking about the government of the people, for the people, and by the people, did the President have any particular group in mind?

Secretary. Not to my knowledge, gentlemen. But I'll check it out just to make sure.

Question. Mr. Secretary, the President in his speech yesterday indicated he intended to manage the news.

Secretary. How did he do that?

Question. He said in the same speech, "The world will little note nor long remember what was said here." It seems to me in this phrase he was intimidating the newspapermen who were there.

Secretary. I don't think you have to interpret the speech in that manner. The President's remarks, written on an envelope, were off the cuff, and he felt there was no reason to be quoted. An official version of his speech will be made available to the press in due time, as soon as the President has a chance to go over it again.

SOCIAL SECURITY SEEKS OUT ELIGIBLES UNAWARE OF BENEFITS

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] may extend her remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the "big heart" project of the Social Security Administration was publicized by Jerry Kluttz, Federal news reporter for the Washington Post, in the two articles appearing in the March 3 and 4, 1963, issues of that newspaper. It is always pleasing to read of private and public efforts that go beyond the bounds of duty. And it is particularly pleasing to read about these efforts of the social security agency which provides a margin of assistance to millions of low-income Americans. These articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 3, 1963]

Social Security Seeks Out Eligibles Unaware of Benefits

(By Jerry Kluttz)

A couple of weeks ago, on a chilly night, a vagrant crawled into a large trash can in downtown Baltimore and fell asleep.

The next morning, the man, who appeared in his 70's, was awakened when he was tossed into a 30-foot refuse pit.

A mechanical shovel was about to pick him up along with a pile of junk and throw him into the city incinerator when a truckdriver saw the elderly man struggling in the debris and rescued him.

Benard McKinley Jackson was taken before municipal court on a vagrancy charge. He said he had no money, no home, no job; and he asked to be placed where he could be looked after for awhile. The judge cooperated by sentencing him to 90 days in city jail.

But Jackson was better off than he had thought and his near tragic experience was a blessing in disguise. His story came to the attention of an employee in the sprawling headquarters of HEW's old-age and survivors insurance in the Woodlawn section of Baltimore.

The employee wondered if the vagrant was eligible for social security benefits. It took him only a matter of minutes to get a preliminary answer from OASI's stable of IBM electronic machines, the largest single number in operation anywhere.

The machines spit out 313,134 names of Jacksons, the 17th most popular surname in OASI's file of 140 million names. There were hundreds of Bernard Jacksons, but the robot revealed that only one Bernard McKinley Jackson was insured and eligible for benefits—and wasn't being paid them.

OASI investigators quickly confirmed that the penniless wanderer was the Bernard McKinley Jackson in their files. A claims expert visited Jackson in jail to explain that he should have been paid benefits for the past 9 years—since he became 65—if he had only applied for them.

Jackson signed the claim and he will receive $520 in back benefits, the maximum he's entitled to under the law, and $40 a month for the remainder of his life.

Unusual case? Not really. OASI has what is officially known as a leads program but which is also referred to as a "big heart" project to seek out aging persons who are eligible for social security benefits and to make payments to them.

Social security benefits are being paid monthly to 17 million men, women, and children and its rolls are growing at a rate of nearly a million annually. You'd think that anyone who pays into OASI's insurance fund would apply for benefits the minute he qualifies for them. But this isn't necessarily so.

To launch its "big heart" project, a few buttons were punched on the electronic machines and they served up the names of 1,156,000 insured persons who were over 65 and who had filed no claims for benefits.

A cross-section of 350,000 names were selected and they were sent to OASI's district offices which serve sections covered by the original addresses of the missing insured, many of them dating back 26 years when social security started.

As a result, more than 100,000 persons, many destitute like Jackson, are being paid benefits they had overlooked. OASI employees were unable to locate 191,086 of the 350,000 and the remainder weren't eligible for one reason or another.

OASI then took another batch of 240,000 names, persons it described as "less obviously insured," and sent them to its field offices along with what few clues it had on their possible whereabouts.

This program is in process now, and up to a few days ago agency employees set in motion machinery to pay benefits to 17,311 additional persons who were no doubt delighted with their windfalls.

The high degree of automation at OASI makes possible the "big heart" program. The machines may be cold and calculating but they also provide material for the human touch which an agency like social security can't afford to lose.

The machines, for example, keep Victor Christgau, OASI Director, supplied with the names and addresses of each person on the rolls who reaches age 100 and also the birthdays of the 412 recipients of social security who are more than 100 years of age. Christgau sends each of them happy birthday greetings. Incidentally, a dozen of the century oldsters are still actively employed.

OASI EMPLOYEES HAVE HIGH PRODUCTIVITY RATING

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Employees of HEW's old age and survivors insurance are cocky, confident and proud. They have good reason for their reassuring attitude.

They have one of the best work records in or out of Government. The President has publicly commended them on their efficiency. Administrative costs take only 2 cents of each dollar spent by OASI, a low figure. Employee turnover is lower than the average in either HEW or the entire Government.

Employee productivity is rising steadily, an estimated 5 percent this 1963 fiscal year and a gain of 2.8 percent is contemplated in fiscal year 1964. If production had continued at the 1962 level, about 2,900 additional employees and $18.5 million in new funds would be required to operate the world's largest insurance system.

OASI pioneered the use of electronic data processing machines and its own experts helped to develop some of the most advanced and sophisticated IBM machines at its headquarters in the Woodlawn section on the outskirts of Baltimore.

Someone guessed it would take a million Federal employees to handle OASI's chores if there were no electronic machines to work their magic round the clock. Could be. Consider this: One machine can produce more work than 500,000 employees with desk calculators.

More than 18 million persons are paid monthly benefits and an average of 300,000 new claims for benefits are received each month. About 75 million persons work under social security and contribute to the OASI fund each year and 280 million earning reports, supplied by their employers, are recorded on their individual accounts.

The latter makes OASI the world's largest bookkeeper but it has no books to keep. The records are kept on tape and microfilm. The names and social security numbers of more than 140 million persons are maintained on 2,000 magazines of microfilm that can be stored in a single room.

The agency handles its duties with a 35,000-man staff of whom 10,000 are at its Baltimore headquarters, moved from Washington during World War II, and a goodly number of them commute from the Washington area.

OASI employees have no job worries. The agency has never had a layoff and its people are well aware that social security has overwhelming public and political support and is here to stay. Despite the giant machines that gobble up the work, the staff has had to be increased gradually to make effective the more liberal amendments voted to the social security law.

The employees are confident that one of these days, or years, Congress will give it another major task—to manage the proposed medicare program for the aged through social security.

If and when that happens, the headquarters building, the fifth largest in Government, would need to build another wing to house an estimated 3,000 new employees to manage it.

OASI has perhaps the most extensive program of preventive medicine for its 10,000 headquarters employees than any agency in Government. Dr. Leon Kochman heads a 31-man staff of doctors, nurses and technicians.

Physical exams are given every 3 years to employees under 40, every other year for those between 40 and 55, and annually for those over 55. Electrocardiograms are available to those 45 and older. A number of cases of cancer, tuberculosis and other diseases have been detected in their early stages by the tests. The employees are referred to their private physicians for treatment.

Chest X-rays, hearing tests and inoculations, for small fees, also are available to employees. The health office also keeps its own blood reservoir for the use of any employee and his family. The health office goes further and checks cafeteria employees who handle food even though they aren't employed by OASI but OASI employees are protected by this activity.

Only emergency treatment is administered by Dr. Kochman and his staff. Ailing employees must be treated by their private physicians who, Kochman stressed, have accepted the OASI program.

Perhaps one of the secrets of the splendid productivity record of OASI employees is the fact that they have a large voice in setting what is regarded as reasonable standards, or guidelines, for their work. Cardpunchers and other mechanical groups are given two 10-minute breaks daily, one in the morning and the other in the afternoon.

Sixty percent of OASI's employees are G-girls and women hold many of the key posts in the agency. Civil service's federal service entrance examination is most used by OASI which takes about 25 percent of all persons hired from the register. More than 5,000 employees have been hired from the FSEE during the past 2 years.

GABRIEL RICHARD, PRIEST, POLITICIAN, AND PATRIOT

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, 140 years ago today marked the beginning of congressional service of Gabriel Richard, priest, politician, and patriot. He was elected as the Territorial Delegate to the 18th Congress of the United States from the Territory of Michigan. His term was to commence on March 4, 1823.

Representing the territorial wilderness of the Midwest, he had a wide and far vision for its future development. His prime interest was in the education of the people in the areas which he served and, as a priest, in ministering to their spiritual needs. These two objectives he performed with zeal and vigor.

His personage and his attributes have been highly respected, not only by the persons with whom he was in constant contact during his lifetime, but the tributes to his memory have followed down throughout the years to this date.

I would like to take this opportunity to bring out some facts on the life and priestly, political, and patriotic accomplishments of Father Gabriel Richard, a well-known individual in the annals of Michigan history.

GABRIEL RICHARD, PRIEST, POLITICIAN, AND PATRIOT

The city of Detroit has dedicated two public elementary schools in the name of Gabriel Richard. In 1936 Detroit created the Gabriel Richard Park overlooking the Detroit River at Belle Isle Bridge. In that park stands a statue of Father Richard paid for by popular subscription. In large measure these tributes to Gabriel Richard are due to the effort commenced almost 30 years ago by Msgr. Edward J. Hickey to bring to light the achievements of this remarkable son of France and pioneer citizen of early Detroit. By a ceremony held on June 7, 1948, a distinguished group of Detroit citizens celebrated the sesquicentennial of Father Richard's arrival in Detroit. It is appropriate that with the passing of the years another tribute be paid now to the memory of the only Catholic priest who served in the Congress of the United States.

Gabriel Richard was born on October 15, 1769, at La Ville de Saintes, France. He was the son of Francis Richard, a civil servant, and Genevieve Boussuet Richard. He was educated at the College of Saintes and the Sulpician seminaries at Augers and Issay. He was ordained a Sulpician priest on October 15, 1791, and remained to teach mathematics at Issay where he was associated with Benedict Joseph Flaget and Louis Du Bourg, both of whom later became Catholic bishops in the United States. He fled France during the Revolution, and arrived in Baltimore, Md., on June 24, 1792. It had been intended by the superior-general of his order that he serve at St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore, but his services were not needed at the small seminary, and he was assigned by Bishop John Carroll to work as a missionary among the French and Indians at Prairie du Rocher, Kaskaskia, and Cahokia. In the 6 years he spent in the Illinois country his zeal and courage were tested by frontier hardships, lack of companionship, the impiety of the Indians, the furmen, and the settlers, and the danger of roving tribesmen. No missionary ever had a more difficult assignment. From the time of the departure of the Jesuits from the district a hundred years before, the French inhabitants of Illinois had been without pastoral care. Their intemperance and low morals had been a constant concern of Bishop Carroll's. Father Richard's outstanding success in this missionary venture led Bishop Carroll to appoint him to the pastorate of the Church of St. Anne in Detroit, and later to the vicariate of the entire territory of Michigan.

As vicar general Father Richard became an institution in the territory, a man of austere life, an eloquent preacher even in English, a reformer of commonsense, and a picturesque figure of sepulchral bearing marked by a livid scar, the result of a wound inflicted by a revolutionary mob as he made his escape from France. He ministered to the Indians of the whole area of Sault Saint Marie, Mackinac, Arbre Croche, Georgian Bay, and other fur posts. He compromised their difficulties, held French traders in check, and fought the evils of liquor. We shall say more later about his outstanding efforts in education.

In 1805 when Detroit was burned out he led relief work, and conducted services in a tent until he had rebuilt his church. In 1809 he obtained from Baltimore a printing press and a printer. On August 31, 1809, he published the first newspaper to appear in Detroit, the Essai du Michigan ou Observateur Impartial. Before the War of 1812 stopped his publishing activities, he had edited and published a children's spelling book, several devotional books, a volume of selections from the French poets, a Bible for Indians, and the laws of Michigan.

In addition to importing books and an organ from France, he imported carding machines, spinning wheels, and looms in an effort to stimulate local industry. He was a favorite among his own people and with the territorial officials as well. In 1807 he was asked by the governor of the territory and other officials to preach to them in English. Accordingly, on Sunday afternoons he met with his Protestant friends and preached to them of Christianity's truths.

Father Richard was a thoroughgoing American. During the War of 1812 he refused an oath to the King of England and was held by General Brock as a prisoner of war at Fort Malden near Sandwich until his release was demanded by Tecumseh. He is reputed to have prevented a massacre of prisoners through his influence with the Indians. On his return to Detroit he engaged in relief work among the destitute who had been impoverished by military and Indian raids.

The University of Michigan was established in 1817 by an act of the territorial Governor and judges dated August 26. Drawn up by Judge Augustus Brevoort Woodward, the law provided that 13 professorships, or courses, should be taught. The first, that of universal science, was to be taught by the president of the university. The Governor chose as president the Reverend John Monteith, a young Princeton graduate who had come to Detroit as a minister. He was also to teach six additional courses.

The Reverend Gabriel Richard was appointed to the second position in the university by the Governor. Father Richard was to teach 6 of the 13 courses. One of his courses was formidably described as "ennoeica, or intellectual sciences, embracing all the epistemiim, or sciences relative to the minds of animals, to the human mind, to spiritual existences to the Deity, and to religion, the didactor, or professor of which shall be vice president of the institution."

Education was one of Father Richard's deepest interests. He opened a school in 1804 which was to prepare boys for entrance into the seminary in Baltimore. Classes were held in his rectory on St. Anne Street until the fire of 1805 completely destroyed the town.

Undiscouraged, Father Richard trained three young women as teachers and opened another school in 1806. In 1807 he established still another at Spring Hill, about 2 miles outside the town. To provide equipment for his schools, he purchased in the East electrical apparatus, looms, a printing press, and surveying instruments. Father Richard so impressed President Thomas Jefferson with his plans for training Indian children at the Spring Hill School that for several years he received a grant from the Government of the United States to assist in their education for life in the civilized community.

In 1808, petitioning the Governor and judges for funds, Father Richard reported that he had two English schools in Detroit, and, in addition, four primary schools for boys and two for girls at Spring Hill, the Grand Marrais, and at the River Huron. His years of effort and experience in promoting education in Michigan eminently qualified Father Richard for a position on the faculty of the new university.

The university envisioned by Judge Woodward was to be more than an institution of higher learning. The act provided that it should have power to operate "colleges, academies, schools, libraries, museums, atheneums, botanic gardens, laboratories, and other useful literary and scientific institutions—in, among, and throughout the various counties, cities, towns, townships, and other geographical divisions of Michigan." The university was to be supported by tax moneys.

Since at the time there were no students prepared to enter upon advanced studies, the founders of the university now organized a primary school and a classical academy in Detroit and erected a building to house them.

The Presbyterian minister and the Catholic priest cooperated cordially in managing the affairs of the new university. That they were friends whom differences of religious belief could not divide is shown by entries in the Reverend Monteith's diary. After calling on Father Richard, who was ill, the minister wrote "I think he loves to have me visit him." Another entry records the gift of a book from the priest; one of the books found in Reverend Monteith's collection bears the inscription on the flyleaf, "un present de M. G. Richard." It is one of the first books printed in Detroit, and it was printed on Father Richard's press.

On April 30, 1821, the territorial legislature passed an act which provided that the university should be governed by 21 trustees. Both Rev. John Monteith and Reverend Richard were made members of this board. The former left Detroit later in the year, but Father Richard served as a trustee until his death.

The University of Michigan today is the successor of the dream of Monteith and Richard in 1817. Its founding act designed an institution which was nonsectarian and supported by public funds, a public agency benefiting the people of Michigan. The University of Michigan has always been guided by the educational ideals which were loyally supported by its two clergymen founders.

Is it so surprising, then, that this man, beloved by many, should be elected the Territorial Delegate to the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States? He entered the contest in order to serve better the interests of all the citizens of Michigan in their task of opening the West. It is also believed that he regarded the salary that he would receive as a means toward meeting the cost of the completion of construction of St. Anne's. Some of his own parishioners organized against him to vote for his opponent, John Biddle, brother of Nicholas Biddle, head of the Bank of the United States. Yet with the support of the majority of both his parishioners and nonparishioners he won the election to the 18th Congress. When he took his seat it was contested by John Biddle, but the House Committee on Elections upheld Father Richard.

His travels as a missionary had convinced Father Richard that there would be no westward progress of the United States unless roads were built through the wilderness. Therefore as a Delegate in the House he presented many petitions relating to lands and roads. One was for the construction of a road from Fort Meigs to Detroit, another for a post road from Mt. Clemens to Fultonville, another for roads through Detroit. His greatest service was his petition that a road be constructed from Detroit to Chicago, the great highway that today begins at Michigan Avenue in Detroit and ends at Michigan Avenue in Chicago.

In his January 28, 1825, speech to the House on his bill he foresaw the future greatness of his country:

"Everybody knows that the contemplated road is of the greatest importance, not only to the Territory of Michigan, but also to the general Government; and the consequence is, that it ought to be done immediately. This road will connect the East of the Union with the West. The grand Canal of New York will be completed next July. When the said Canal is finished, we consider Detroit in contact with New York. Last fall, I was on Lake St. Clair, on board a vessel built during the preceding winter, with a movable keel, ready and calculated to go down, through Lake Erie and the whole of the Canal, to land at the battery in New York.

"In relation to our military operations, the utility of a road across the peninsula of Michigan, from Detroit to Chicago, is obvious. This road will afford a facility to transport munitions of war, provisions, and troops, to Chicago, Green Bay, Prairie du Chien, and St. Peter's River, et cetera. When our upper lakes are frozen, an easy communication will be constantly kept open, in sleighs, on the snow. Everybody knows that, during the last war, for want of a proper road across the Black Swamp, our Government incurred an expenditure of $10 or $12 million, which would have been avoided by having a good road, made in due time. Make this road now, when you have the full sovereignty over the territory of Michigan, before it becomes an independent State, and you may easily anticipate how beneficial this road will be to your finances. There are more than 17 million acres of, generally, good and fertile land, in Michigan proper (without speaking of the 94 million acres in the Northwest Territory.) Without a road to go to those lands, they have no value.

"We are credibly informed, that, on our inland seas, I mean Lakes Erie, St. Clair, Huron, and Michigan, no less than 150 vessels are plying up and down, on board of which whole families do come, sometimes, with their wagons, horses, sheep, and milk cows; land in Detroit, ready to go in search of good land, to settle on it, and having their money ready to give to the receiver of the land office. No road to go into that immense wilderness. What a disappointment. During about 12 months, last elapsed, more than $100,000 have been actually paid into the hands of the receivers of public moneys, in the territory of Michigan, for land purchased. How much more would have been paid, if the proposed road had been made. We can learn from the commissioner of the general land office, that about 10 surveyors have been employed in surveying public lands in the interior of Michigan territory, between Detroit and Chicago, during last winter. These lands will soon be advertised to be sold. If there is no road to come to them, who will purchase them? But let this road be made; let it be determined by this House that it shall be made; then you will have purchasers enough: They will come as a torrent from the Eastern States. It cannot be questioned that the land along the intended road will sell for 200 or 300 percent more than it would if there were no such road; and so, in nearly the same proportion, the adjacent lands will be increased in price. If you ask me what will this road cost? I beg leave to answer, it will cost nothing to the Government. I might say it will cost less than nothing. The half of the land along the road only, will, after the road is made, or determined to be made, sell for a great deal more than the whole would, without the road. What an immense profit for your Treasury you can derive from the sale of this immense wilderness, which remains entirely unprofitable, if you have no road to come at it. This road is, therefore, to be beneficial to your finances, and your military operations, and to all parts of the Union, as well as to Michigan itself; as it will afford all kinds of encouragement to the citizens of the Eastern States, who wish to emigrate to the beautiful and fertile lands of the West."

The bill (H.R. 204) which he introduced was passed by the 18th Congress, and it was signed into law by the President on the last day of the second session of that Congress, March 3, 1825, the day that Father Richard's political career ended. He was defeated for reelection by not more than 70 votes.

From 1825 until his death in 1832 he continued as Vicar-General of the Territory. He died of cholera on September 13. He had contracted the disease while trying to relieve the suffering of the sick during the plague of that year. He was buried in his beloved St. Anne's Church in Detroit.

"His death was a public calamity," said a contemporary. His body lay in state in the church which he had built. Members of the 1st Regiment of Michigan Militia returned to pay their respects to their chaplain. As the good shepherd lays down his life for his sheep, so had he served his God, his people, and his country.

RATE ADJUSTMENT OF BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am today releasing a recent letter I received from Charles F. Luce, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, in reply to my letter of last January 28 concerning the need for an increase in the electric power rates charged by the BPA.

I am delighted to learn from Mr. Luce that he is committed to restoring BPA to the sound financial basis on which the agency was operated prior to 1957. It is gratifying to know that BPA plans to complete a general review of rates during the summer and fall of 1963 instead of waiting for the need of the statutory 5-year review period which comes late in 1964. Mr. Luce's decision to act this year is in accord with the recommendation I made to him last January.

Mr. Luce has indicated in his letter that BPA realizes that a rate increase may be required for the period 1964–69. This realization will be welcomed warmly by the taxpayers provided that the increase is sufficient to eliminate the drain which the BPA currently inflicts on taxpayers' funds. It occurs to me that Mr. Luce might consider seriously the possibility of increasing BPA rates where possible prior to December of 1964.

The suggestion was made by Mr. Luce that any BPA rate increase will depend in large part on congressional action on the proposed Federal transmission line between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest and on enactment of the so-called regional preference legislation. I hesitate to predict at this time how Congress will act on these two proposals, but I know Mr. Luce will agree that both pieces of legislation are quite controversial. It would be better, as I see it, for Mr. Luce to proceed to a determination as to BPA rates solely on the basis of the present situation rather than to wait indefinitely while Congress considers the course of action it will take on either or both of these two particularly controversial proposals.

I am somewhat disturbed by Mr. Luce's attempt to confuse the issue, in his letter to me, by equating BPA's interest rate with "the average cost of money to the U.S. Government." The data to which he refers cover the average interest rate paid on all marketable short-term and long-term Treasury securities. If Mr. Luce had chosen what I regard as the more honest approach, he would have equated the BPA interest rate with the interest rates on long-term Treasury bonds. He would have found, according to the Treasury Bulletin for January of 1963, that the interest rate for such bonds has varied from 2.55 percent in 1954 to 4.08 percent in 1959. The average interest rate in 1962 was 3.95 percent.

Mr. Luce extended himself to some extent by reminding me that the colloquy in the Senate on August 9, 1937, between Senator Ellender and Senator Steiwer—81 Congressional Record 8524—"clearly indicates that it was the understanding and intent of the Senate that rates be based upon generating capacity, and that if the full capacity was not sold the amortization period be extended rather than increasing the rates."

While this may be true, the colloquy to which Mr. Luce refers revolved around the question of whether there would be a sufficient market for BPA power and whether the quantity of power purchased would be enough to repay Federal costs. My reading of the remarks in the Senate that day do not lead me to conclude that the Senate intended then—nor does it intend now—to provide an artificial means of maintaining Bonneville's low power rates. I think Mr. Luce is eminently wise in avoiding use of an argument based on this colloquy in order to suggest a rate reduction for BPA or a delay in increasing Bonneville's rates.

I am most gratified that Mr. Luce has accepted my suggestion to study present Bonneville rates with the intention of increasing the rates in the near future to levels which reflect more accurately the costs which should be borne by BPA customers rather than by the taxpayers of the country as a whole. In my view the situation is serious enough to warrant immediate initiation of this rate study. Any delay, even into late summer or early fall of this year, can only make matters worse for BPA.

The text of Mr. Luce's letter of February 8, 1963, is attached.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Bonneville Power Administration,
Portland, Oreg., February 8, 1963.

Hon. John P. Saylor,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Saylor: Thank you for your letter of January 28 concerning the possible need for an increase in Bonneville Power Administration rates.

We are committed to a program of putting Bonneville back on a solid financial basis, as it was until 1957. To the extent this requires an increase in our rates, that is what we will propose to the Federal Power Commission. In fact, 2 months ago we told our customers that we intend to complete a general review of BPA's rates in the summer and fall of 1963 and (as your letter recommends) not wait until the end of the present 5-year rate period which comes in December 1964. A month ago I publicly stated our intentions in this regard in an address before a meeting of the Allied Daily Newspaper Association of the State of Washington.

Although, because of surpluses accumulated prior to 1957, Bonneville is still cumulatively $20 million ahead of schedule in meeting its obligations to the Treasury; we realize that a rate increase may be required for the rate period 1964–69.

The amount of any BPA rate increase will depend in large part upon the reception which Congress gives our Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie program. An integral part of this program is the enactment of legislation defining our primary market area, as recently introduced in the House by Congresswoman Hansen and Congressman Westland. If the Congress this spring approves the program we have proposed, it should not be necessary to raise BPA rates enough to hurt electric consumers in our region. We estimate that our intertie program would net BPA between $6 million and $15 million per year.

Your letter refers to the House Public Works Appropriations hearings for 1962 in which we submitted data which showed BPA recent deficits would have been much greater had we been paying interest at 4 percent instead of 2½ percent. For those same hearings we also submitted data which showed that from 1939 through 1960 the average cost of money to the U.S. Government was only 2¼ percent and that Bonneville has been paying an interest rate higher than the average cost of money to the Government.

Your letter also refers to the Bonneville Project Act which requires amortization of projects over a reasonable period of time. The act also states that rates shall be set "upon the basis of the application of such rate schedules to the capacity of the electric facilities." At the time the act was passed in the Senate an amendment was offered to require amortization in 50 years, but this amendment was defeated. Further, the colloquy between Senators Ellender and Steiwer (81 Congressional Record 8524) clearly indicates that it was the understanding and intent of the Senate that rates be based upon generating capacity, and that if the full capacity was not sold the amortization period be extended rather than increasing the rates. If we were to adopt the liberal approach to ratemaking permitted by the Bonneville Act, BPA would be considering a rate reduction instead of a rate increase, for in every deficit year unsold capacity has exceeded the amount of the deficit.

Over the years we have taken a more conservative approach to the problems of Bonneville rates and payout than the act itself contemplated.

We appreciate your keen interest in our fiscal problems. I hope that in the near future I will have an opportunity to discuss them further with you personally.

Sincerely yours,

Charles F. Luce,
Administrator.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Wednesday, that the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Pilcher). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce a revision in the program. It was previously announced that the resolution—House Resolution 228—would come up on Wednesday and the resolution—House Resolution 254—on Thursday. I take this time to advise after consulting with the minority leader and the chairman of the Committee on House Administration that if the resolution—House Resolution 228—which is a resolution to provide funds for investigation and studies by the Committee on Banking and Currency is finished expeditiously on Wednesday, then the resolution—House Resolution 254—which is a resolution to provide funds fo. investigations and studies for the Committee on Education and Labor might be called up also on Wednesday.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Auchincloss (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for the week of March 4, 1963, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Wright, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. Fogarty (at the request of Mr. Ryan of Michigan), for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Boggs (at the request of Mr. Ryan of Michigan), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, March 6, 1963, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Toll.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Findley) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Utt.

Mr. Berry.

Mr. Alger.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Ryan of Michigan) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Gilbert in two instances.

Mr. Moorhead.

Mr. Powell in two instances.

Mr. Morris.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 6, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

498. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the seventh annual report on the financial condition and fiscal operations of the highway trust fund, pursuant to the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (H. Doc. No. 76); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

499. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

500. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the first report on operations under title I and part A of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–415); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

501. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of improvident disposals of crane shovels and unnecessary procurement of outboard motors under a modernization program of the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

502. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of manpower utilization in the maintenance of facilities and operation of utilities at selected military installations in Japan; to the Committee on Government Operations.

503. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

504. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1171), and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

505. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

506. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a draft

of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

507. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the report of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with respect to certain civilian positions established pursuant to section 1581, title 10, United States Code, during calendar year 1962, pursuant to section 1582, title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

508. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

509. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of the costs to the Government for storage of petroleum in new commercial facilities under Department of Defense negotiated contracts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

510. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the manned aircraft nuclear propulsion program of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

511. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a supplemental report and certification of economic justification on the Crystal Dam, reservoir, and powerplant, which comprise a segment of the Curecanti Unit, Colorado River storage project, in Colorado (H. Doc. No. 77); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 4423. A bill permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 4424. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Prairie National Park, in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 4425. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4426. A bill to authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 4427. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 4428. A bill to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated program in oceanography, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4429. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4430. A bill to amend title 35 of the United States Code to permit a written declaration to be accepted in lieu of an oath, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER (by request):

H.R. 4431. A bill to amend section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4432. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON (by request):

H.R. 4433. A bill to provide for the adjustment of the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over land in the several States used for Federal purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 4434. A bill to strengthen democratic processes within labor organizations respecting the calling of strikes, to protect union members against unjustifiable pay losses from strikes, to protect employers from needless production interruptions arising out of strikes contrary to the wishes of union members, to minimize industrial strife interfering with the flow of commerce, and to promote the growth of the Nation's economy through reducing economic waste by providing for an impartial secret strike vote; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4435. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4436. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act to prohibit discrimination in any respect whatsoever on account of race, creed, or color in hospital facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4437. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4438. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow under retirement age may continue to receive mother's insurance benefits (but at a reduced rate) even though none of the children of her deceased husband are any longer entitled to child's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 4439. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4440. A bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 4441. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit, for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4442. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GILL:

H.R. 4443. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H.R. 4444. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 4445. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4446. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that payments for jury duty shall be disregarded in the computation of income for purposes of payment of pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 4447. A bill to provide a new basis for determining the amount of money made available to a State for schools and roads by the Secretary of Agriculture in the case of sales of certain forest products from national forests located within such State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4448. A bill to amend the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act so as to establish an additional fund for fishery research programs and fisheries rehabilitation and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4449. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4450. A bill to amend section 1034 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that where the taxpayer or his spouse has attained the age of 65 no gain on the sale or exchange of the taxpayer's home will be taxed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAIRD (by request):

H.R. 4451. A bill to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4452. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949, as amended, to implement the purposes for which surplus personal property may be donated; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 4453. A bill authorizing a monetary contribution for the flood control accomplishments of the multiple-purpose developments to be constructed on the Yuba River by the Yuba County Water Agency of Marysville, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACDONALD (by request):

H.R. 4454. A bill to extend the benefits of the Panama Canal Construction Service Annuity Act of May 29, 1944, to certain additional civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 4455. A bill to amend section 172 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers to elect to use net operating losses only as carryovers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4456. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to change certain dates prescribed for making declarations and installment payments of estimated income tax by individuals so that such payments will be due at regular 3-month intervals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 4457. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to terminate the existing authority to suspend the marking requirement with respect to sawed lumber and timber, certain poles of wood, and bundles of shingles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 4458. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide, in the case of a widow who has attained age 65, that gross income does not include gain from the sale or exchange of her residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 4459. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4460. A bill to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4461. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, to provide for the payment of expenses of counsel assigned to indigent defendants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4462. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4463. A bill to prohibit the reproduction and reissuance of postage stamps found to be defective; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 4464. A bill to amend section 114 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to state the policy of Congress with respect to reimbursement for certain highways on the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 4465. A bill to require the national referendum on wheat to be held prior to May 15, 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Texas:

H. R. 4466. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict veterans, and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 4467. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to increase from 6½ to 6¾ percent the deduction from the basic salaries of employees generally for retirement; and to set 60 as the mandatory retirement age for certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4468. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 4469. A bill to amend the prevailing wage section of the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended; and related sections of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; and the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4470. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4471. A bill to amend section 8(b) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 4472. A bill to exempt from compulsory coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program self-employed individuals who hold certain religious beliefs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 4473. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a presumption of service connection in the case of heart disease becoming disabling within 3 years after discharge; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 4474. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 4475. A bill to establish a National Service Corps to provide opportunities for dedicated American citizens; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 4476. A bill to provide for holding terms of the U.S. District Court for the District of Vermont at Montpelier and St. Johnsbury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 4477. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4478. A bill to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of Kentucky; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 4479. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of California of certain mineral rights reserved to the United States in certain real property in California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 4480. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4481. A bill to establish a research laboratory at which programs of research and study shall be conducted to develop new and improved industrial uses for dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4482. A bill to prescribe a national policy with respect to the encouragement of invention by inventors and their employees, and thereby contribute to the advancement of the Nation's welfare, by providing for the administration in the public interest of the property rights to inventions resulting from research or development which is financed at least in part through the expenditure of public funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 4483. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to increase from 6½ to 7½ percent the deduction from the basic salary of such employees for retirement; and to set 60 years as the mandatory retirement age for such employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 4484. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through the establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 4485. A bill to guarantee electric consumers on the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 4486. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4487. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4488. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to require approval by the Secretary of the Interior of highway projects before they can be constructed; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 4489. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide additional deductions and exemptions for the expenses of medical care of persons 65 years of age and over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 4490. A bill permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division. Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4491. A bill to establish in the Department of the Interior a Gold Procurement and Sales Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4492. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 4493. A bill to extend for 4 additional years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.J. Res. 296. Joint resolution to create a regional agency by intergovernmental compact for the planning, conservation, utilization, development, management, and control of the water and related natural resources of the Susquehanna River Basin, for the improvement of navigation, reduction of flood damage, reduction and control of surface subsidence, regulation of water quality, control of pollution, development of water supply, hydroelectric energy, fish and wildlife habitat, and public recreational facilities, and other purposes, and defining the functions, powers, and duties of such agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.J. Res. 297. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

H.J. Res. 298. Joint resolution to provide that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.J. Res. 299. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.J. Res. 300. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to each State the exclusive power to apportion membership of its legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 301. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.J. Res. 302. Joint resolution to prevent U.S. contributions to United Nations programs from being used for assistance to Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.J. Res. 304. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution relating to Panama Canal Sovereignty-treaty interpretations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to initiate action to the adoption of a United Nations' resolution calling for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the convening by the Secretary of the Interior of an international conference to initiate cooperative action to further conservation of wild animals on a worldwide basis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. Res. 275. Resolution favoring enactment by States of compulsory school attendance laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. Res. 276. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RUMSFELD:

H. Res. 277. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the use of the Panama Canal by vessels engaged in trade with Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H. Res. 278. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to providing incentive payments by the Federal Government for domestic gold producers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON: Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to supporting basic changes in Federal reclamation laws to make it possible for reclamation development to meet the needs of today; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McINTIRE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine proposing the abolition of futures trading of potatoes on the New York Mercantile Exchange; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to the creation of a Department of Fisheries and Oceanography; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the immediate cessation of printing of all $1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to local airline service to cities in California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give early consideration to the authorization and construction of the Challis project, Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to extending sincere appreciation and aloha to the Congress and the Department of the Interior for its continuing interest in these fairest of all islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that land of the State of Indiana within 25 miles of Lake Michigan shall not be ceded or surrendered to the United States of America or any other sovereign power whose intentions do not coincide with the best interests of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging adoption and enactment of appropriate measures to relieve the financial burdens presently borne by States and local governments as a result of numerous interstate residential changes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to rejecting the report from the Office of Emergency Planning regarding the relaxation of import control on foreign residual oil, and also to aid the domestic coal and oil industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to proposing abolition of futures trading of potatoes on the New York Mercantile Exchange; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to providing incentive payments by the Federal Government for domestic gold producers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to assuring that the funding requirements for the Pacific Northwest regional water pollution laboratory at Corvallis, Ore., receive adequate attention in the preparation of the budget for 1965; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 4494. A bill for the relief of Karbis Balta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 4495. A bill for the relief of Osvaldo Severo and Cortese Severo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H.R. 4496. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Matsis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4497. A bill for the relief of Ruben A. Nepomuceno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4498. A bill for the relief of Miss Evelina Persello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4499. A bill for the relief of Dr. Angelos A. Kambouris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINNEGAN:

H.R. 4500. A bill for the relief of Melina Camello Agustin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 4501. A bill for the relief of Anthony F. Bernardo and Ambrose A. Cerrito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4502. A bill for the relief of Arturo Longobardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4503. A bill for the relief of Luigi Giuseppe Luraschi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 4504. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Picardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSH (by request):

H.R. 4505. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to entertain, hear, and determine a motion for a new trial on the claim of Robert Alexander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H.R. 4506. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephina C. Aquino Heindel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4507. A bill for the relief of Angeliki Devaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 4508. A bill for the relief of Francesco Todaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 4509. A bill for the relief of Guy Fleming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4510. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luisa L. Burkes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

57. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Petition of William A. O'Dea and 33 others to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

58. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Mrs. Selby Love and other citizens of the Third Congressional District of Kentucky to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

59. Also, petition of Thomas N. Golden and other citizens of the Third Congressional District of Kentucky to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

60. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Peter Poulson and others, Grand Avenue Junior High School, Bellmore, Long Island, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that the electoral college be nullified by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and that it be replaced with a system utilizing the popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

Monday, March 4, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Alfred O. Fuerbringer, D.D., president, Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., offered the following prayer:

In the name of God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Amen.

Eternal and almighty God, creator and preserver of the universe and all that it contains, ruler of all the peoples of the earth: Since Thou hast given us this good land for our heritage and dwelling place, we humbly ask Thee to guide us so that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favors and glad to do Thy will. Forgive, we implore Thee, our many shortcomings as individuals and as a nation. Purify our hearts to see and love the truth. Help us to overcome our inclination to selfishness and the prejudices which hinder the welfare of our fellow men.

Bless our land with sound learning, honorable industry, useful arts, and good manners. Save us from violence, discord, and strife. Keep us from pride, arrogance, and every evil way. Preserve our liberties and prosper our endeavors to fashion and keep as one united people the multitudes who claim this country as their own.

Endue with the spirit of wisdom all those to whom we have, in Thy name, entrusted the privilege and the responsibility of government, that they may plan and do what is right, and that justice and peace may be preserved throughout our land. Help us to observe Thy ways and to show forth Thy praise to all the nations of the earth. Teach us to be sincere in our dealings with our allies and our opponents, and incline the hearts of men everywhere to mutual confidence and to a genuine desire for equity and peace.

To Thy especial care we commend all those who are in suffering or want, who are deprived of their rights or their freedom, or who are in any kind of danger. Sustain them with Thy power, and deliver them by Thy might.

In the days of prosperity, fill our hearts with gratitude; and in time of trouble, do not let us lose our confidence in Thee and Thy sure help. All of this we ask through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 1, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 78)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, I transmit herewith a report on the projects and progress of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the period of January 1 through June 30, 1962. This is the seventh of these reports since the passage of the legislation establishing that agency.

This report covers a period of acceleration in the national space program and reveals the significant role of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in that progress. Congressional support and interagency cooperation have contributed substantially to this record of space and aeronautics performance.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *March 4, 1963.*

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES CARRIED ON UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480, 83D CONGRESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 79)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the seventeenth semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the period July 1 through December 31, 1962.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *March 4, 1963.*

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John Harold Fanning, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring December 16, 1967.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. Francis Keppel, of Massachusetts, to be Commissioner of Education.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

LABOR DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Daniel Patrick Moynihan, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Howard G. Gamser, of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1966.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George C. Trevorrow, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for the remainder of the term expiring July 15, 1965.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all the nominations which have been confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon, Thursday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSIDERATION ON THURSDAY OF OUTDOOR RECREATION BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to state that, at the request of a Senator, Senate bill 20, to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes, will not be taken up today, but will be taken up Thursday next.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report of Office of Civil Defense on Property Acquisitions of Emergency Supplies and Equipment

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Civil Defense on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment, for the quarter ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Extension of Provisions of Section 3 of Public Law 87-346, Relating to Dual Rate Contracts

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Payment of Certain Relocation Costs in the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report on Improvident Disposals of Crane Shovels and Unnecessary Procurement of Outboard Motors Under a Modernization Program of the Department of the Army

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on improvident disposals of crane shovels and unnecessary procurement of outboard motors under a modernization program of the Department of the Army, dated February 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Supplemental Report and Certification of Economic Justification on the Crystal Dam, Reservoir, and Powerplant, Colorado

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental report and certification of economic justification on the Crystal Dam, Reservoir, and powerplant, which comprise a segment of the Curecenti unit, Colorado River storage project, Colorado (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment of Section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as Amended (43 U.S.C. 1171)

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1171), and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report of Bureau of Land Management on Negotiated Contracts Made for the Disposal of Materials

A letter from the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Bureau on negotiated contracts made for the disposal of materials, for the period September 25 through December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report of National Aeronautics and Space Administration on Certain Civilian Positions

A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on certain civilian positions in that Administration, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Appropriations for Atomic Energy Commission

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Resolution 15

"Whereas the expanding economy and growing population of these United States make ever increasing demands upon available water resources and require vast quantities of water of high quality; and

"Whereas it has been recognized that a greatly expanded program of research, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the prevention and control of water pollution is necessary to keep pace with the need of providing adequate supplies of water of high quality; and

"Whereas the scope and magnitude of water quality research problems vary widely from region to region so that the best means of coping with these problems is to conduct research at a regional level; and

"Whereas research on water pollution control directed to the specific problems in the State of Washington is very necessary, and many aspects of Washington's economy are dependent upon sound development of the State's water resources, and if economic growth is to proceed within the State it is necessary to have a much greater understanding of how to cope with the many emerging problems of water pollution; and

"Whereas provision has been made under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for the construction of a Pacific Northwest regional field laboratory and research facility at Corvallis, Oreg., to assist in the solution of the many complex problems which affect water resources in the Pacific Northwest: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States do include in the President's budget for fiscal year 1964, adequate funds to initiate research on an advance basis during fiscal year 1964, and that the President of the United States do encourage and the Congress assure that the funding requirements for the Pacific Northwest regional water pollution laboratory at Corvallis, Oreg., receive adequate attention in the preparation of the budget and in the appropriation processes for 1965; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to Senator MAGNUSON, Senator JACKSON, and to each member of the Washington delegation in the House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"WARD BOWDEN,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Joint Resolution Proposing Abolition of Futures Trading of Potatoes on the New York Mercantile Exchange by the Congress of the United States of America

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 101st legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress may regulate commerce among the several States; and

"Whereas potatoes are now traded in futures contracts on the New York Mercantile Exchange, 6 Harrison Street, New York City, N.Y.; and

"Whereas the price at which future contracts are bought and sold has a direct and immediate effect on cash prices received by producers for potatoes in Maine and all other areas producing potatoes for market; and

"Whereas futures prices reflect the effects of manipulation and unlimited speculation to the detriment of producers of potatoes; and

"Whereas futures trading of potatoes obstructs all attempts of Maine potato producers to market their product in an orderly fashion; and

"Whereas futures trading of potatoes encourages overproduction in Maine and all other producing areas with resulting disastrously low prices for the producer; and

"Whereas experience has proven that futures trading can be carried on without detrimental and depressing effect on price only in the case of those commodities which can be stored for extensive periods of time either within the areas of production or the areas of marketing and distribution; and

"Whereas Irish potatoes are a perishable commodity that do not lend themselves to extended periods of storage, especially following preparation for market; and

"Whereas Irish potatoes historically are one of the most volatile commodities in terms of price range and in degree of sensitivity to myriad market factors, including total volume produced, anticipated production, available supply on track and in the marketplaces, as well as many others; and

"Whereas many areas of production have vehemently registered their opposition to the continued trading of Irish potato futures, either with or without the supervision of the Commodity Exchange Authority of the USDA, and producers in Maine, by mail ballot, have voted overwhelmingly in favor of abolishing futures trading in Maine potatoes; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has already established a precedent for the action to be proposed by this resolution in the instance of another perishable commodity, namely onions, leaving potatoes as the only perishable commodity now being traded on the futures market: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, your memorialists, recommend that the Congress enact legislation abolishing futures trading in Irish potatoes upon the New York Mercantile Exchange or upon any commodity exchange; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of State, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state, by mail, to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress, to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

"HARVEY R. PEASE,
"*Clerk.*
"CHESTER T. WINSLOW,
"*Secretary.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 9

"Joint resolution relating to the creation of a Department of Fisheries and Oceanography

"Whereas the fisheries of the United States occupy an ever increasing importance to the general well-being of the Nation; and

"Whereas the power of States to adequately protect and enhance the value of fisheries is clearly limited by the nature of our constitutional system; and

"Whereas foreign nationals have created competitive pressures which may only be met on a national scale; and

"Whereas the past lack of interest of Federal authorities in fisheries problems has resulted in a drop of American fisheries production from second to fifth in the world market, and a complete lack of aid and protection for American fishermen; and

"Whereas fisheries provide a source of livelihood for hundreds of thousands of Americans citizens deserving of constant Federal attention to the maintenance and improvement of the industry; and

"Whereas a cabinet level Department of Fisheries and Oceanography containing a research and management section, an economic development section, and an international section is necessary to deal with the scope and magnitude of the problems involved; and

"Whereas Gov. William A. Egan has already requested the President of the United States to make every effort toward establishing such a cabinet position: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of Alaska joins with Governor Egan in respectfully urging the President of the United States to establish a Department of Fisheries and Oceanography at an early date; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; and the members of the Alaska Delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the Senate February 5, 1963.

"FRANK PERATROVICH,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"EVELYN K. STEVENSON,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"Passed by the House, February 18, 1963.

"BRUCE KENDALL,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"PATRICIA R. SLACK,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*

"[SEAL] WILLIAM A. EGAN,
"*Governor of Alaska.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"House Resolution 39

"Whereas to resolve acute problems of civic administration, law enforcement and general health and welfare inflicted on large urban communities throughout the United States by a widespread and increasing influx of inhabitants from less densely populated regions of the Nation, the large urban communities have been compelled to accept and sustain severe financial burdens; and

"Whereas the difficulties inherent in such multitudinous residential changes from State to State are plainly national in area, scope and dimension; and

"Whereas the States and local governments obliged to provide for new residents are, apart from the failure of their resources, reluctant to expand the tax burden borne by their residents from a fear of assuming a position of economic disadvantage as compared with neighboring States; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has the power to check deteriorating welfare conditions of national scope by use of the resources of the Nation: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois*, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to adopt and enact appropriate measures to relieve the financial burdens presently borne by States and local governments as a result of numerous interstate residential changes; and that suitable copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and each Member of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives from Illinois.

"Adopted by the House, February 27, 1963.

"JOHN W. LEWIS, Jr.,
"*Speaker, House of Representatives.*
"FREDERIC B. SELIKE,
"*Clerk, House of Representatives.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 8

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 37th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas in cooperation with the local interests, the Bureau of Reclamation has undertaken a study of the development of the Challis project in Custer County for the purpose of providing supplemental and additional irrigation of lands, the control of floods, the preservation of fish and wildlife, and the creation of additional recreational opportunities; and

"Whereas the proposed Challis project is an upstream storage project which will provide additional late-season water, will augment the existing livestock and grazing utilization of the area, and will stabilize and influence the general economic development and contribute to the further growth of the local area of the State and of the Nation; and

"Whereas the Challis project includes upstream storage development which will minimize or eliminate the existing possibilities of flood damages to the great benefit of the existing community and surrounding area; and

"Whereas, the Challis project investigational studies have indicated the proposed plan of development is economically and financially feasible and is desired by the local interests for the further development and economic growth of Custer County and of the State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho*, That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to give early consideration to the authorization and construction of the Challis project, Idaho; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the United States.

"Adopted by the senate on the 19th day of February 1963.

"W. E. DREVLOW,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Adopted by the house of representatives on the 21st day of February 1963.

"PETE T. CENARRUSA,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Attest:

"ARTHUR WLSON,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

The petition of A. W. Lafferty, of Washington, D.C., relating to the O and C Land Grant Acts of April 10 1869, and May 4, 1870; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is not only an integral part of New Hampshire's economy, but it is also closely linked with the history of shipbuilding in the United States.

That the Portsmouth Navy Yard be kept operating at full force is of utmost importance to the safety and security of this Nation. Since coming to Washington, I have been bending all efforts in this direction, and will continue to work for full employment at the Portsmouth Yard.

The honorable House of Representatives of the New Hampshire General Court has passed a resolution calling on the State's congressional delegation to "use their utmost endeavors to the end that the Portsmouth Navy Yard be kept in operation at full force, not only to supply our country with the needed submarines but to insure full-time employment for our citizens."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be entered in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

RESOLUTIONS IN RE PORTSMOUTH NAVY YARD

Whereas Portsmouth Navy Yard has been considered the top ranking navy yard since the days of wooden ships; and

Whereas it is of vast importance that this place be kept in operation particularly because it produces submarines which fire the Polaris missiles, an important part in our country's defense; and

Whereas many of its employees have been threatened with layoffs at the yard due to lack of work: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of New Hampshire requests that our delegation in Washington, D.C., U.S. Senators NORRIS COTTON and THOMAS J. MCINTYRE and Congressmen JAMES C. CLEVELAND and LOUIS C. WYMAN, use their utmost endeavors to the end that the Portsmouth Navy Yard be kept in operation at full force, not only to supply our country with the needed submarines but to insure full-time employment for our citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to each of the above-named members of our congressional delegation.

STEWART LAMPREY,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
JOHN D. HACKETT,
Representative from Epping.
FRANCIS W. TOLMAN,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 816. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology (Rept. No. 16).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of January 1963. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, JANUARY 1963 AND DECEMBER 1962, AND PAY, DECEMBER AND NOVEMBER 1962

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for January 1963 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In January numbered—	In December numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In December was	In November was	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,477,937	2,486,628	−8,691	$1,337,052	$1,307,794	+$29,258
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,413,827	1,419,740	−5,913	789,232	735,455	+53,777
Department of Defense	1,064,110	1,066,888	−2,778	547,820	572,339	−24,519
Inside the United States	2,309,290	2,318,809	−9,519			
Outside the United States	168,647	167,819	+828			
Industrial employment	556,897	558,865	−1,968			
Foreign nationals	168,766	169,666	−900	28,865	28,639	+226

[1] Exclusive of foreign national shown in the last line of this summary.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1963, and comparison with December 1962, and pay for December 1962, and comparison with November 1962*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	January	December	Increase	Decrease	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	101,017	104,624		3,607	$49,809	[1] $51,038		$1,229
Commerce	29,890	29,701	189		18,737	19,318		581
Health, Education, and Welfare	77,521	77,750		229	39,428	40,646		1,218
Interior	61,595	61,882		287	33,000	[1] 33,891		891
Justice	31,902	31,813	89		20,335	21,393		1,058
Labor	8,883	8,836	47		5,095	5,006	$89	
Post Office	583,991	588,829		4,838	[2] 350,066	279,129	70,937	
State [3] [4]	41,214	41,101	113		20,565	21,468		903
Treasury	85,073	83,648	1,425		47,931	49,778		1,847
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	351	338	13		236	238		2
Bureau of the Budget	468	466	2		402	417		15
Council of Economic Advisers	50	66		16	44	44		
Executive Mansion and Grounds	73	79		6	41	46		5
National Aeronautics and Space Council	28	28			24	24		
National Security Council	45	39	6		31	34		3
Office of Emergency Planning	434	416	18		350	371		21
Office of Science and Technology	45	63		18	27	30		3
President's Commission on Campaign Costs						(5)		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1963, and comparison with December 1962, and pay for December 1962, and comparison with November 1962*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	January	December	Increase	Decrease	December	November	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	27	43		16	$21	$21		
American Battle Monuments Commission	389	392		3	81	80	$1	
Atomic Energy Commission	6,992	6,953	39		5,123	5,325		$202
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	607	602	5		387	408		21
Civil Aeronautics Board	832	830	2		614	642		28
Civil Service Commission	4,145	4,146		1	2,752	2,451	301	
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5			4	4		
Commission of Fine Arts	7	7			6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	85	98		13	52	59		7
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	281	277	4		198	191	7	
Farm Credit Administration	240	240			170	179		9
Federal Aviation Agency	45,256	45,273		17	30,470	31,885		1,415
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	6	6			4	4		
Federal Communications Commission	1,443	1,435	8		973	1,014		41
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,246	1,236	10		786	832		46
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,216	1,194	22		764	814		50
Federal Maritime Commission	211	198	13		145	146		1
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	391	390	1		339	348		9
Federal Power Commission	1,063	1,034	29		724	731		7
Federal Trade Commission	1,139	1,134	5		772	807		35
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	111	88	23		58	55	3	
General Accounting Office	4,585	4,614		29	2,927	3,070		143
General Services Administration	31,959	32,004		45	15,148	15,885		737
Government Printing Office	7,135	7,084	51		3,883	4,094		211
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,704	13,626	78		8,268	8,602		334
Indian Claims Commission	22	22			26	21	5	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,394	2,400		6	1,602	1,680		78
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	26,210	25,667	543		18,421	19,881		1,460
National Capital Housing Authority	414	418		4	184	195		11
National Capital Planning Commission	53	50	3		33	36		3
National Capital Transportation Agency	81	[1] 81			55	65		10
National Gallery of Art	323	324		1	136	145		9
National Labor Relations Board	2,004	2,056		52	1,359	1,410		51
National Mediation Board	133	138		5	116	128		12
National Science Foundation	884	854	30		673	620	53	
Panama Canal	15,634	14,905	729		4,993	5,188		195
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	43	47		4	30	33		3
Railroad Retirement Board	2,004	2,028		24	1,117	1,143		26
Renegotiation Board	207	206	1		166	181		15
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	158	155	3		99	114		15
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,409	1,405	4		946	972		26
Selective Service System	6,817	6,829		12	2,132	2,219		87
Small Business Administration	3,203	3,180	23		1,971	2,075		104
Smithsonian Institution	1,351	1,320	31		668	699		31
Soldiers' Home	1,056	1,059		3	352	379		27
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	[6] 49	49			44	46		2
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	26			21	22		1
Tariff Commission	266	270		4	196	203		7
Tax Court of the United States	154	154			119	120		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,608	18,025		417	10,130	10,823		693
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	113	106	7		82	112		30
U.S. Information Agency	11,517	11,444	73		4,969	5,317		348
Veterans' Administration	173,475	173,411	64		77,682	80,968		3,286
Virgin Islands Corporation	562	521	41		118	134		16
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,413,827	1,419,740	3,744	9,657	789,232	735,455	71,396	17,619
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			5,913				53,777	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,075	2,055	20		1,660	1,516	144	
Department of the Army	[7] 383,453	387,487		4,034	190,704	200,017		9,313
Department of the Navy	[7] 344,438	345,102		664	183,686	191,851		8,165
Department of the Air Force	306,347	306,886		539	159,139	165,990		6,851
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,017	2,074		57	1,011	1,065		54
Defense Communications Agency	478	290	188		165	178		13
Defense Intelligence Agency	306	285	21		191	201		10
Defense Supply Agency	[7] 23,427	21,149	2,278		10,094	10,350		256
Office of Civil Defense	1,032	1,026	6		867	864	3	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	40			31	34		3
Interdepartmental activities	20	18	2		17	15	2	
International military activities	58	57	1		39	38	1	
Armed Forces information and education activities	419	419			216	220		4
Total, Department of Defense	1,064,110	1,066,888	2,516	5,294	547,820	572,339	150	24,669
Net decrease, Department of Defense			2,778				24,519	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [8] [9]	2,477,937	2,486,628	6,260	14,951	1,337,052	1,307,794	71,546	42,288
Net change, including Department of Defense			8,691				29,258	

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

[2] Includes pay of temporary Christmas employees.

[3] January figure includes 16,401 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 16,460 in December and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The January figure includes 4,179 of these trust fund employees and the December figure includes 4,205.

[4] January figure includes 860 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 832 in December and their pay.

[5] Less than $500.

[6] Subject to revision.

[7] In January 2,044 employees and their functions were transferred to the Defense Supply Agency as follows: 1,899 from the Department of the Army and 145 from the Department of the Navy.

[8] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the **Central Intelligence Agency and the National** Security Agency.

[9] Includes employment by Federal agencies under the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87-658), as follows:

Agency	January	December	Change
Agriculture Department	4,897	7,854	−2,957
Interior Department	3,259	3,395	−136
Department of the Army	495	434	+61
Total	8,651	11,683	−3,032

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1963, and comparison with December 1962*

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	99,819	103,472		3,653
Commerce	29,254	29,067	187	
Health, Education, and Welfare	76,909	77,164		255
Interior	61,080	61,363		283
Justice	31,553	31,471	82	
Labor	8,786	8,751	35	
Post Office	582,539	587,369		4,830
State [1][2]	10,393	10,277	116	
Treasury	84,459	83,030	1,429	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	351	338	13	
Bureau of the Budget	468	466	2	
Council of Economic Advisers	50	66		16
Executive Mansion and Grounds	73	79		6
National Aeronautics and Space Council	28	28		
National Security Council	45	39	6	
Office of Emergency Planning	434	416	18	
Office of Science and Technology	45	63		18
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	27	43		16
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,959	6,922	37	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	607	602	5	
Civil Aeronautics Board	831	829	2	
Civil Service Commission	4,141	4,142		1
Civil War Centennial Commission	5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	7	7		
Commission on Civil Rights	85	98		13
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	281	277	4	
Farm Credit Administration	240	240		
Federal Aviation Agency	44,248	44,269		21
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	6	6		
Federal Communications Commission	1,441	1,433	8	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,244	1,234	10	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,216	1,194	22	
Federal Maritime Commission	211	198	13	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	391	390	1	
Federal Power Commission	1,063	1,034	29	
Federal Trade Commission	1,139	1,134	5	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	66	64	2	
General Accounting Office	4,498	4,529		31
General Services Administration	31,947	31,992		45
Government Printing Office	7,135	7,084	51	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,522	13,448	74	
Indian Claims Commission	22	22		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,394	2,400		6
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	26,198	25,654	544	
National Capital Housing Authority	414	418		4
National Capital Planning Commission	53	50	3	
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Capital Transportation Agency	81	[3] 81		
National Gallery of Art	323	324		1
National Labor Relations Board	1,970	2,022		52
National Mediation Board	133	138		5
National Science Foundation	871	841	30	
Panama Canal	153	80	73	
President's Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity	43	47		4
Railroad Retirement Board	2,004	2,028		24
Renegotiation Board	207	206	1	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	158	155	3	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,409	1,405	4	
Selective Service System	6,665	6,677		12
Small Business Administration	3,151	3,128	23	
Smithsonian Institution	1,339	1,306	33	
Soldiers' Home	1,056	1,059		3
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	[4] 49	49		
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	26		
Tariff Commission	266	270		4
Tax Court of the United States	154	154		
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,606	18,023		417
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	113	106	7	
U.S. Information Agency	3,215	3,177	38	
Veterans' Administration	172,462	172,406	56	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,350,140	1,356,894	2,966	9,720
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			6,754	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,014	1,994	20	
Department of the Army	[5] 331,293	335,256		3,963
Department of the Navy	[5] 320,086	320,903		817
Department of the Air Force	278,007	278,448		441
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,017	2,074		57
Defense Communications Agency	452	267	185	
Defense Intelligence Agency	306	285	21	
Defense Supply Agency	[5] 23,427	21,149	2,278	
Office of Civil Defense	1,032	1,026	6	
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	40		
Interdepartmental activities	19	17	2	
International military activities	38	37	1	
Armed Forces information and education activities	419	419		
Total, Department of Defense	959,150	961,915	2,513	5,278
Net decrease, Department of Defense			2,765	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,309,290	2,318,809	5,479	14,998
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			9,519	

---

[1] January figure includes 2,720 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,732 in December.

[2] January figure includes 588 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 575 in December.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

[4] Subject to revision.

[5] In January 2,044 employees and their functions were transferred to the Defense Supply Agency as follows: 1,899 from the Department of the Army and 145 from the Department of the Navy.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1963, and comparison with December 1962*

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,198	1,152	46	
Commerce	636	634	2	
Health, Education, and Welfare	612	586	26	
Interior	515	519		4
Justice	349	342	7	
Labor	97	85	12	
Post Office	1,452	1,460		8
State [1][2]	30,821	30,824		3
Treasury	614	618		4
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	382	385		3
Atomic Energy Commission	33	31	2	
Civil Aeronautics Board	1	1		
Civil Service Commission	4	4		
Federal Aviation Agency	1,008	1,004	4	
Federal Communications Commission	2	2		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	45	24	21	
General Accounting Office	87	85	2	
General Services Administration	12	12		
Housing and Home Finance Agency	182	178	4	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	12	13		1
National Labor Relations Board	34	34		
National Science Foundation	13	13		
Panama Canal	15,481	14,825	656	
Independent agencies—Continued				
Selective Service System	152	152		
Small Business Administration	52	52		
Smithsonian Institution	12	14		2
Tennessee Valley Authority	2	2		
U.S. Information Agency	8,302	8,267	35	
Veterans' Administration	1,013	1,005	8	
Virgin Islands Corporation	652	521	41	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	63,687	62,846	866	25
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			841	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	61	61		
Department of the Army	52,160	52,231		71
Department of the Navy	24,352	24,199	153	
Department of the Air Force	28,340	28,438		98
Defense Communications Agency	26	23	3	
Interdepartmental activities	1	1		
International military activities	20	20		
Total, Department of Defense	104,960	104,973	156	169
Net decrease, Department of Defense			13	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	168,647	167,819	1,022	194
Net increase, including Department of Defense			828	

---

[1] January figure includes 13,681 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 13,728 in December. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The January figure includes 4,179 of these trust fund employees and the December figure includes 4,205.

[2] January figure includes 272 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 257 in December.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and oustide the United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1963, and comparison with December 1962*

Department or agency	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,779	3,794		15
Commerce	5,404	5,581		177
Interior	8,490	8,475	15	
Post Office	252	248	4	
Treasury	5,184	5,134	50	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	250	247	3	
Federal Aviation Agency	2,938	2,960		22
General Services Administration	1,766	1,780		14
Government Printing Office	7,135	7,084	51	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	26,210	25,667	543	
Panama Canal	8,074	7,482	592	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	156	155	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	14,551	14,977		426
Virgin Islands Corporation	562	521	41	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	84,751	84,105	1,300	654
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			646	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 131,860	[2] 133,381		1,521
Outside the United States	[1] 4,275	[2] 4,298		23
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	197,509	198,082		573
Outside the United States	1,279	1,279		
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	134,064	134,540		476
Outside the United States	1,196	1,200		4
Defense Supply Agency:				
Inside the United States	1,963	1,980		17
Total, Department of Defense	472,146	474,760		2,614
Net decrease, Department of Defense			2,614	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	556,897	558,865	1,300	3,268
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			1,968	

---

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of January 1963 and comparison with December 1962*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	January	December	January	December	January	December	January	December
Canada	35	35					35	35
Crete	61	62					61	62
England	3,324	3,315			102	102	3,222	3,215
France	22,007	22,268	18,090	18,344	11	11	3,906	3,913
Germany	81,762	81,457	68,992	68,698	85	85	12,685	12,674
Greece	266	267					266	267
Greenland	174	174					174	174
Japan	51,979	52,878	18,553	18,921	14,225	14,366	19,201	19,591
Korea	6,207	6,204	6,207	6,204				
Morocco	2,357	2,410			786	785	1,571	1,625
Netherlands	54	55					54	55
Trinidad	540	541			540	541		
Total	168,766	169,666	111,842	112,167	15,749	15,888	41,175	41,611

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of January totaling 2,477,937 as compared with 2,486,628 in December. This was a net decrease of 8,691 including a net reduction of 3,032 in temporary employment under the Public Works Acceleration Program authorized by P.L. 87–658.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1963, which began July 1, 1962, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1962	2,510,950	14,455	
August	2,512,199	1,249	
September	2,485,324		26,875
October	2,482,982		2,342
November	2,498,312	15,330	
December	2,486,628		11,684
January 1963	2,477,937		8,691

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of January was 1,413,827, a decrease of 5,913 as compared with the December total of 1,419,740. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in January was 1,064,110, a decrease of 2,778 as compared with 1,066,888 in December.

Civilian agencies reporting larger decreases were Post Office Department with 4,838 and Agriculture Department with 3,607. Larger increases were reported by Treasury Department with 1,425, Panama Canal Company with 729, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration with 543. The decrease in Agriculture Department and increase in Treasury Department was largely seasonal.

In the Department of Defense decreases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Army with 4,034, Department of the Navy with 664, and the Department of the Air Force with 539. The largest increase was reported by the Defense Supply Agency with 2,278.

Inside the United States civilian employment decreased 9,519 and outside the United States civilian employment increased 828. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in January totaled 556,897, a decrease of 1,968.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,477,937 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 168,766 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during January who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in December was 169,666. A breakdown of this employment for January follows:

Foreign nationals, January 1693

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Canada	35			35
Crete	61			61
England	3,324		102	3,222
France	22,007	18,090	11	3,906
Germany	81,762	68,992	85	12,685
Greece	266			266
Greenland	174			174
Japan	51,979	18,553	14,225	19,201
Korea	6,207	6,207		
Morocco	2,357		786	1,571
Netherlands	54			54
Trinidad	540		540	
Total	168,766	111,842	15,749	41,175

FEDERAL PAYROLL

(There is a lag of a month between Federal employment and Federal payroll figures in order that actual expenditures may be reported. Payroll expenditure figures in the committee report this month are for December.)

Payroll expenditure figures in the executive branch during the first 6 months of the current fiscal year 1963 total $7.6 billion. These payroll expenditures for the first half of the fiscal year, July–December 1962, exclusive of $168 million of U.S. pay for foreign nationals not on the regular rolls, follow:

Month:	Payroll (in millions)
July	$1,222
August	1,282
September	1,147
October	1,317
November	1,308
December	1,337
Total	7,613

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. Simpson):

S. 982. A bill permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton Reclamation Project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGee when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 983. A bill to amend chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the use of contracting authority by officers and employees of the United States for purposes of duress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Lausche when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 984. A bill for the relief of Ling-Chuan Chiao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 985. A bill for the relief of the Boren Clay Products Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARSON (for himself and Mr. Carlson):

S. 986. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Prairie National Park, in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pearson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself Mr. Douglas, and Mr. Keating):

S. 987. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 988. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act so as to define more specifically certain of the benefits which may be provided under State programs of medical assistance for the aged established pursuant to such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 989. A bill to require the national referendum on wheat to be held prior to May 15, 1963; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 990. A bill to give financial assistance to the States for educational purposes by authorizing annual appropriations to each State equal to 1 percent of the Federal individual incomes taxes collected therein; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cotton when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 991. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States; and for other purposes; and

S. 992. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. Moss):

S. 993. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to make findings with respect to the amount of compensation to which certain individuals are entitled as reimbursement for damages sustained by them as a result of the cancellation of their grazing permits by the U.S. Air Force, and to provide for payments of amounts so determined to such individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 994. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

S. 995. A bill to amend the Street Readjustment Act of the District of Columbia so as to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close all or part of a street, road, highway, or alley in accordance with the requirements of an approved redevelopment or urban renewal plan, without regard to the notice provisions of such act, and for other purposes;

S. 996. A bill to increase the partial pay of educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia who are on leave of absence for educational improvement, and for other purposes;

S. 997. A bill to promote safe driving and eliminate the reckless and irresponsible driver from the streets and highways of the District of Columbia by providing that any person operating a motor vehicle within the District while apparently under the influence of intoxicating liquor shall be deemed to have given his consent to a chemical test of certain of his body substances to determine the alcoholic content of his blood, and for other purposes;

S. 998. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes";

S. 999. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925;

S. 1000. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md., and for other purposes;

S. 1001. A bill to provide for the regulation of the business of selling securities in the District of Columbia and for the licensing of persons engaged therein, and for other purposes; and

S. 1002. A bill to authorize certain expenses in the Government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1003. A bill for the relief of the Middlesex Concrete Products and Excavating Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1004. A bill to authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life, and for other purposes; and

S. 1005. A bill to amend paragraph (2) (G) of subsection 309(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by granting the Federal Communications Commission additional authority to grant special temporary authorizations for 60 days for certain nonbroadcast operations; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Engle, Mr. Kennedy, and Mr. Saltonstall):

S. 1006. A bill to amend the act of June 12, 1960, for the correction of inequities in the construction of fishing vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. Church, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Morse, and Mrs. Neuberger):

S. 1007. A bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. Clark):

S. 1008. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the delivery of Lincoln's immortal address at Gettysburg; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1009. A bill to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Neuberger when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1010. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT THE PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT—1,001 QUESTIONS ON HOW IT WORKS"

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government—1,001 Questions on How It Works," which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Humphrey, which appears under a separate heading.)

RIGHT OF PERSONS RESIDING ON FEDERALLY OWNED LANDS TO VOTE IN CERTAIN ELECTIONS

Mr. BEALL submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that persons residing on federally owned lands (other than military reservations) situated in any State should be extended the right to vote in elections conducted in such State for presidential and vice presidential electors and for Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States if such persons meet all the requirements for voting in such State except the requirement of residence, which requirement they are unable to meet solely because they reside on federally owned lands.

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AS A DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS ENTITLED "SUMMER EMPLOYMENT BY COLLEGE STUDENTS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—1961"

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 105) to print as a document a compilation of materials entitled "Summer Employment by College Students in the Federal Government—1961," which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Saltonstall, which appears under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT 117, 84TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. EASTLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 106); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed seven thousand additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 117, of the Eighty-fourth Congress, second session, entitled "The Communist Party of the United States of America, What It Is, How It Works—A Handbook for Americans", compiled by the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate.

DELIVERY OF WATER TO LANDS IN THIRD DIVISION, RIVERTON RECLAMATION PROJECT, WYOMING

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit the delivery of water by the Bureau of Reclamation to settlers in the third division on the Riverton reclamation project in Wyoming.

This project was initiated following World War II. It has promise of being a very beneficial and useful project, Mr. President, but unfortunately problems have been encountered that have delayed the execution of repayment contracts past the development period. My bill would give authority for water delivery in the division to farmers who want it. Without this authority no water can be released this year. I need not stress the need for a rapid decision on this matter. Mother Nature waits for no man, and today's wonderful weather is an indication that spring is almost here. The farmers in the third division have plans to make and those plans will hinge upon the availability of water from this project for this year's growing season.

Mr. President, I will not go into the problems that have beset this project except to say that they are problems which can be corrected. My bill would allow for water now while permanent solutions to these problems are being worked out. I might point out that at the direction of the Congress a Wyoming reclamation projects survey team was appointed by the Bureau of Reclamation to study this project and others in my State. This team, made up of highly qualified men, has just completed its study of the Riverton project and submitted a report and recomendations to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. President, I am confident that with the assistance of this valuable report and with the cooperation of the settlers, Bureau of Reclamation, affected State agencies and the Congress of the United States, we will be able to find permanent solutions to the problems of the third division. In the meantime, I would urge rapid consideration of the bill I introduce today so that the farmers on this project may start preparations for planting their crops.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 982) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming, introduced by Mr. McGee (for himself and Mr. Simpson), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROHIBITION OF USE OF CONTRACTING AUTHORITY BY OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES FOR PURPOSES OF DURESS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the use of contracting authority by officers and employees of the United States for purposes of duress.

Mr. President, the time has arrived when the Congress of the United States must define by law the power that may be used by Federal agencies and officials in coercing private industry and labor to adopt business practices, including labor-management relations, to suit the feelings of Federal officials.

Without special authority granted by the Congress, no Federal official or agency should be permitted to withhold or threaten to withhold any contract from the operator of a business on the grounds that such operator did not adopt labor-management practices responding to the individual will and wish of such Federal official. Manifestly a private enterprise which seeks a Government contract ought to be awarded such contract if it is the lowest responsible bidder and has fully complied with the requirements of law as distinguished from the requirements of the Federal official's individual fancies and feelings.

In the labor-management disputes involving the steel industry, General Dynamics Corp., North American Aviation, Inc., Ryan Aeronautical Co., Lockheed Aircraft Corp., and currently the Boeing Aircraft Corp., Federal officials threatened to withhold contracts from these employers unless, in the management of their respective business, they followed practices demanded by the Federal officials although such practices were not required by law.

These threats should not have been made. They had no authority in law. They constituted an usurpation of power; a vivid example of government by men and not by law. Newspapers and news magazines from coast to coast have carried numerous articles citing alleged threats and acts of coercion against firms holding important Government contracts.

Mr. President, I am certain that if the Congress were called upon to pass a law authorizing a governmental agency or official to order a settlement of a labor-management dispute in conformity with the views of the Federal agency or officer, such proposal would meet with vigorous opposition from both labor and management. The opposition would argue that labor as well as management should not be harnessed and straitjacketed in managing their own business.

Ours is a government of laws and not of men.

To me that precept means something. I only regret that it is not inscribed somewhere on the wall of the Senate Chamber. Let us quit invoking our whims and fancies, disregarding the requirements of law in the execution of our duties.

Motivated by their own wishes, Federal officials should not be allowed to force their judgments of what is right or wrong upon either business or labor management. When we permit that type of conduct we enter the dangerous field of requiring the people not to act in conformity with established law but in obedience to the changing wishes of changing men in changing administrations. It is wrong, should not be suffered, and is a threat to our democratic system of government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 983) to amend chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the use of contracting authority by officers and employees of the United States for purposes of duress, introduced by Mr. Lausche, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code (relating to Public Officers and Employees), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1916. Duress through use of contracting authority

"(a) Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States or any department or agency thereof—

"(1) with intent to coerce or induce any person to perform any act which such person has no obligation to perform, or to refrain from performing any act which such person may refrain from performing without default of any obligation; or

"(2) with intent to penalize any person for the performance of any act which such person was entitled to perform without default of any obligation, or for refusing to perform or for refraining from performing any act which such person had no obligation to perform,

withholds, attempts to withhold, or threatens to withhold from such person by any means any Government contract, or excludes, attempts to exclude, or threatens to exclude such person by any means from opportunity to enter into or to perform any Government contract, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'obligation', when used in relation to any person, means an obligation imposed upon such person by any statute of the United States, any rule or regulation duly prescribed or promulgated pursuant to any such statute, or any Government contract to which such person is a party or under which such person has assumed duties; and

"(2) the term 'Government contract' means any actual, proposed, or prospective contract entered into or which may be entered into by or on behalf of the United States or any department or agency thereof, and any actual, proposed, or prospective assignment, substitution of parties, or subcontract of any tier entered into or which may be entered into for or in connection with the performance of any such contract."

(b) The sectional analysis of that chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"1916. Duress through use of contracting authority,"

PRAIRIE NATIONAL PARK IN POTTAWATOMIE COUNTY, KANS.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing the establishment of a Prairie National Park in Pottawatomie County, Kans.

Expanding our National Park Service to include more features mirroring this country's natural offerings and its latent beauty was a basic part of a national policy concerning recreational resources.

As a Senator from Kansas, I am conscious that in the vast expanse of land in the heartland of this Nation, there are acres of natural prairie which, today, face extinction unless they are preserved.

I am in agreement with the program of the National Park Service, as previously stated, that we must do our utmost to preserve such latent natural areas as the midwestern prairie. We ask that the establishment of a Prairie National Park in Pottawatomie County be one of the priority projects of the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service. The establishment of a Prairie National **Park** will complement the national recreational development.

After full evaluation by a team from the National Park Service, it was found that Pottawatomie County offered not only the finest examples of true prairie, but also ideal wildlife habitat which would be conducive to the establishment of herds of buffalo, antelope, and deer, as well as providing propagation grounds for game birds such as the prairie chicken and quail.

Specifically, the park would be located in an area not to exceed 60,000 acres along the eastern shore of Tuttle Creek Reservoir.

The Prairie National Park bill has been drafted to provide the maximum in community and local participation to assure landowners in the affected area of full opportunity to help decide the boundaries within which the park would be established.

The bill provides for a seven member advisory commission which would give Pottawatomie County and the State of Kansas a voice in the deliberations and recommendations. Under the terms of the bill, the advisory commission would recommend to the Secretary of Interior where the park's boundaries would be established. This arrangement has met with the approval of the local people, the National Park Service, and the Department of the Interior.

I am advised meetings have been held with representatives of the affected landowners and it was determined that owners should be accommodated by early condemnation of their properties if negotiations for sale were not successful. This would prevent the landowner from being subjected to lingering and fruitless negotiations. Provision for this has been included in the bill.

Since the establishment of the Prairie National Park has been approved by the National Park Service, congressional endorsement would add another chapter to our park, monument, and historic site program and would fill a void in this system of natural showplaces by adding to our recreational system in the Nation and in Kansas.

I might point out, in closing, Mr. President, that Kansas is proud to have been selected as the site for a possible national park following a long and intensive study of numerous sites. We are indeed happy with the prospect of having the Prairie National Park as the first such national park, monument, or historic site in Kansas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this bill providing for the establishment of a Prairie National Park in Pottawatomie County, Kans., be printed in the Record at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 986) to authorize the establishment of the Prairie National Park, in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Pearson (for himself and Mr. Carlson), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in recognition of the influence of grasslands upon the progress and economic development of our country, and to preserve the scenic, scientific, and educational values of a representative portion of such lands for the inspiration and enjoyment of this and future generations, there is hereby authorized to be established, in the manner hereinafter provided, the Prairie National Park, in the State of Kansas, such park to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to designate such land and interests in land in townships 7, 8, and 9 south, range 7 east; townships 7, 8, and 9 south, range 8 east; and townships 8 and 9 south, range 9 east; sixth principal meridian, as he determines are necessary and desirable to preserve representative portions of the prairie grasslands and the native wildlife: *Provided*, That the area as designated shall not exceed sixty thousand acres.

(b) For the purpose of assisting the Secretary to designate a suitable boundary line for the Prairie National Park, there is hereby established an advisory commission to be composed of seven members as follows:

(1) the Chairman of the National Parks Advisory Board, who shall serve as chairman of the advisory commission;

(2) two members selected by the Secretary from among individuals recommended by the Board of County Commissioners of Pottawatomie County, Kans.;

(3) two members selected by the Secretary from among individuals recommended by the Governor of the State of Kansas; and

(4) two members selected by the Secretary.

Sec. 3. Within the area designated as the Prairie National Park pursuant to section 2 hereof, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to procure land and interests in land through purchase, exchange, donation or with donated funds.

When requested by the owner of property with respect to which the Secretary of the Interior has been unable to negotiate a voluntary sale, the Secretary, subject to the availability of funds, shall initiate action to file a declaration of taking on such property in accordance with section 258A of title 40, United States Code.

Administrative jurisdiction over the lands administered by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, above contour elevation 1,075 and which, under the authority of section 2 of this Act, are designated for inclusion in the park, is hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Interior without a transfer of funds. Such transfer of administrative jurisdiction shall not preclude continuation of flowage uses of the affected lands by the corps but shall preclude the development by the corps of access roads and such other development as would, in the judgment of the Secretary, defeat or impair the purposes of the park.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with the State of Kansas, and its political subdivisions, including Pottawatomie County, which will enhance or insure preservation of the park and promote use thereof in accordance with the purposes of this Act.

Sec. 5. When the Secretary of the Interior has designated a boundary for the Prairie National Park pursuant to section 2 of this Act and has determined that sufficient land and interests in land have been procured by the United States to provide an administrable unit within such boundary, he shall declare the establishment of the Prairie National Park by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. Following such establishment, and subject to the aforesaid acreage limitation, the Secretary may continue to acquire lands and interests in land for the park as authorized in this Act.

Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

UNFINISHED WAR-CLAIMS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, during the 87th Congress, a measure—Public Law 87-846—was enacted which resolved part of the long-outstanding problem of war claims settlement. In that legislation, Congress dealt among other things with the sale of seized properties, such as the General Aniline & Film Corp., which, as we note from today's newspaper accounts, will also happily be the subject of settlement in the courts as well. This is good news for a number of communities around the Nation, but particularly in Binghamton, N.Y., where a large Ansco plant is located.

However, I rise today to emphasize that, despite these long-awaited developments, a significant problem in the war claims area remains unresolved. I refer to two classes of claimants who as yet have received no measure of recognition for their claims: The first consists of refugees from Nazism and other tyrannies who became citizens of the United States after their property was seized. I offered an amendment to last year's bill to include such claimants, but the conferees rejected the amendment, at the same time offering hope that if funds remain after payment of other claimants, favorable action might ultimately be taken for these unfortunate citizens.

My colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], also introduced an amendment to deal with a second group of claimants: prisoners of war and internees who have personal injury claims. When this amendment was also rejected, Senator Douglas and I introduced S. 3796 to incorporate both provisions and pledged our continued efforts to have these measures enacted.

I am now sending to the desk on behalf of my colleagues, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], and myself a measure identical to S. 3796. I hope that action will not be delayed on this still unfinished war-claims legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 987) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses, introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself, Mr. Douglas, and Mr. Keating), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill designed to correct a deficiency in an earlier social security bill which I introduced in the present session of Congress. Briefly, the bill would expand the term of "prescription services" to include drugs prescribed by a dentist and such other persons authorized to prescribe drugs in addition to the physicians provided in the earlier bill. I send the bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 988) to amend title I of the Social Security Act so as to define more specifically certain of the benefits which may be provided under State programs of medical assistance for the aged established pursuant to such title, introduced by Mr. Humphrey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate referral, a bill which, upon enactment, will give financial assistance to the States and the District of Columbia for educational purposes by authorizing annual appropriations to each State and the District of Columbia equal to 1 percent of the Federal individual income taxes collected therein.

I feel strongly that this bill represents a direct and workable solution to a serious problem of national concern and I expect to address the Senate more fully on the advantages of the bill at a later date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 990) to give financial assistance to the States for educational purposes by authorizing annual appropriations to each State equal to 1 percent of the Federal individual income taxes collected therein, introduced by Mr. Cotton, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

APPOINTMENT OF DIRECTOR AND DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY FROM CIVILIAN LIFE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Acting Secretary of Commerce, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Acting Secretary, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1004) to authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill "To authorize appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life, and for other purposes" and four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

C. D. Martin, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of Commerce..

Statement of Purpose and Need

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the appointment of the Director and Deputy Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from civilian life.

Under existing law the Director and Deputy Director are required to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for terms of 4 years, from the active list of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey not below the rank of commander. (Section 1, act of June 4, 1920, 41 Stat. 825, as amended (33 U.S.C. 852), and section 8, act of January 19, 1942, 56 Stat. 8, as amended (33 U.S.C. 852b).)

In 1960 a Special Advisory Committee of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, chaired by Dr. Mervin J. Kelly, submitted to the Secretary of Commerce a comprehensive report entitled "The Role of the Department of Commerce in Science and Technology."

The Committee made two recommendations concerning the Survey which required legislative action. The first of these recommendations was that the act of August 6, 1947, 61 Stat. 787 (33 U.S.C. 883a, Public Law 373, 80th Congress), be amended to remove the geographical restrictions imposed on operations of the Survey. The act of April 5, 1960, 74 Stat. 16 (Public Law 86–409), enacted this recommendation into law.

The second recommendation was that "the positions of Director and Deputy Director be open to both civilians and officers, with the only restriction being that both positions not be filled simultaneously by either officers or civilians."

The proposed legislation would implement this recommendation of the Committee. In addition to opening these positions up to civilians as well as to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the bill would provide that the Director shall serve at the pleasure of the President, rather than for a term of 4 years. This change is in conformity with existing practice in the appointment of the heads of other important bureaus in the Department of Commerce, including the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, the Patent Office, the Bureau of the Census, the Maritime Administration, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Area Redevelopment Administration, and the U.S. Travel Service.

The bill would further provide that the Deputy Director shall be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce and shall serve at his pleasure, rather than be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. This change is in accord with common practice in filling positions at the deputy chief level in civilian

Government bureaus. In addition, it represents a return to the practice long followed prior to 1942. (See act of June 5, 1920, 41 Stat. 929.)

The proposed legislation would provide increased flexibility in appointment of the two top officials of the Coast and Geodetic Survey. It would greatly broaden the sources from which selections may be made for the two most important positions in the bureau. It would provide a better balance in the background, skills, and orientation of the officials responsible for directing the work of the bureau by providing for a team of commissioned officer and civilian scientific and engineering personnel. Finally, it would tend to strengthen the capacity of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to recruit and retain outstanding civilian professional and technical personnel for its important programs in oceanography, aeronautical charting, geodetic and geophysical survey work, and research in related fields, by providing improved career opportunities for civilians in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Appropriate provision has been made for the compensation of the Director and Deputy Director, when appointed from civilian life.

The recommendation of the Kelly Committee that both positions should not be filled simultaneously by either officers or civilians is provided in the form of a directive to the Secretary of Commerce to follow such a policy to the extent he deems appropriate. It is believed unwise arbitrarily to specify such a requirement since flexibility should be reserved under which the Secretary may make whatever selection may appear to be in the best interests of the Department under various circumstances, e.g., a period of national emergency, nonavailability of a well-qualified commissioned officer, nonavailability of a well-qualified individual from civilian life, and the like.

Various other minor changes of a technical or editorial nature are included in the bill.

Provision is made in the bill that it shall not be deemed to require reappointment or other change in the employment status of any person serving as Director or Deputy Director under an appointment made prior to the date of enactment of the bill.

AUTHORITY TO GRANT SPECIAL TEMPORARY AUTHORIZATIONS FOR 60 DAYS FOR CERTAIN NONBROADCAST OPERATIONS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Federal Communications Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend paragraph (2)(G) of subsection 309(c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by granting the Federal Communications Commission additional authority to grant special temporary authorizations for 60 days for certain nonbroadcast operations. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Acting Chairman of the Commission requesting the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1005) to amend section 309(c)(2)(G) of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the Federal Communications Commission to grant special temporary authorizations for periods of 60 days in certain cases, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1963.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program for the 88th Congress a proposal to amend section 309(c)(2)(G) of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the Federal Communications Commission to grant special temporary authorizations for periods of 60 days in certain cases (47 U.S.C. 309 (c)(2)(G)).

The Commission's draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We have now been advised by that Bureau that from the standpoint of the administration's program there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration. Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill and explanatory statement on this subject.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be most happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by the committee to which this proposal is referred.

Sincerely yours,

ROSEL H. HYDE,
Acting Chairman.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT TO PERMIT THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION TO GRANT SPECIAL TEMPORARY AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PERIODS OF 60 DAYS IN CERTAIN CASES (47 U.S.C. 309(c)(2)(G))

Paragraph (2)(G) of subsection (c) of section 309 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C. 309(c)(2)(G)), now exempts from the public notice and 30-day waiting period requirements of subsection 309(b) those applications for "a special temporary authorization for nonbroadcast operation not to exceed 30 days where no application for regular operation is contemplated to be filed or pending the filing of an application for such regular operation, or."

The Commission believes that this subsection should be amended to permit it to grant special temporary authorizations (STA) for 60 days in those cases where the application for the STA is filed pending the filing of an application for regular operation. We are not suggesting any changes in the 30-day limitation on those STA's in cases not contemplating a subsequent application for regular operation.

The purpose of paragraph (2)(G) of subsection 30(c) is to permit short-term radio operation in the nonbroadcast field without the delay of a 30-day waiting period (as provided in subsection 309(b)) after the issuance of public notice by the Commission of the acceptance for filing of such application. The Commission has found that this purpose is frustrated by the 30-day limitation on STA's in those cases where the short-term operation relates to a radio system for which an application for regular operation is filed later. In those cases, the provisions of subsection 309(b) are applicable and a 30-day waiting period is required before the Commission can act on the application for regular operation. As a result, there is a hiatus between the expiration of the STA and the Commission's grant of the application for regular operation. During the period of the hiatus, the applicant would be unlicensed and would, as a consequence, be unable to operate his radio. This defeats the purpose for which Congress made special provision for granting special temporary authorizations. Moreover, it does not appear that the Commission has authority to remedy this statutory defect by renewing the STA until it can grant the application for regular operation.

The Commission believes that this deficiency in the statutory scheme can be corrected by its proposed amendment. Therefore, we recommend that paragraph (2)(G) of subsection 300(c) be amended to give us this additional authority.

DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRICAL ENERGY GENERATED IN FEDERAL HYDROELECTRIC PLANTS IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, for myself and Senators CHURCH, JORDAN of Idaho, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, METCALF, MORSE, and NEUBERGER, a bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1007) to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the bill I have just sent to the desk is the same bill, with two minor changes, as S. 3153 passed by the Senate last year by a rollcall vote of 51 yeas to 36 nays. This bill is cosponsored by all the Senators from the Pacific Northwest. The two changes in the bill were suggested by Governor Hatfield of Oregon in a letter to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Last year the bill had administration support, and I am informed that it will have such support again this year.

This bill is needed to permit the Bonneville Power Administration to market surplus power outside the Pacific Northwest on an orderly basis, and to retain its sound financial position. All segments of the utility industry in the Northwest, public and private, have agreed on the need for the legislation. This year and last year the Northwest produced a total of 27½ billion kilowatt hours of secondary energy which had to be spilled over the dams and wasted.

In dollar terms this amounts to almost $52 million lost revenue to the Bonneville Power Administration. The Bonneville Power Administration needs these revenues to avoid a very substantial rate increase. It hardly wishes to raise its rates until every practicable step has been taken to market all the power that the dams will produce.

The Bonneville Power Administration has indicated that this bill is the keystone to a successful marketing program. Not only will sales of surplus Bonneville power strengthen its financial position

and produce revenues for the U.S. Treasury, but also they will prevent an inexcusable waste of energy that our Nation cannot afford. In addition, such sales will bring to consumers of neighboring regions large quantities of low-cost surplus Columbia River hydroelectricity.

The power supply of the Pacific Northwest is unique in the United States because it is virtually all—96 percent—hydro. The bill just sent to the desk applies only to hydroelectricity. The great Columbia River is the prime energy source for the Northwest. Because the natural flows of the Columbia have recorded a variation of about 1 to 25 between the low- and high-water years of record, the Columbia dams produce a large amount of seasonal power. This seasonal power, that cannot be relied upon the year around, and that ceases to exist in critical water years, cannot be sold as firm power. Only a relatively small amount of it can be sold in the Northwest until the Northwest develops large steam-electric generation. But there is already a market for large amounts of it in California and the Southwest, where large steam-electric plants already exist which can firm up surplus Northwest power.

This bill lays down sensible ground rules for the movement of bulk quantities of electric energy between the Northwest and other regions. It is broad enough to permit the advantages of increased efficiency and economy that can be achieved by strong regional interties—for example, sales of surplus energy and peaking capacity, diversity exchanges, and firming power.

But it would not permit regional interties to be used to the disadvantage of the utilities and the industries of the Northwest or of any region connected with the Northwest. If firm power were needed for local utilities or industries, such power could not be transported for use 1,000 or more miles away. Many of the industries now in the Northwest have invested millions of dollars in reliance upon a continued supply of Columbia River power.

Some confusion has arisen over the relationship of this bill to the construction of extra high voltage interties. This bill does not authorize the construction of such interties by Federal agencies. Such authority already exists. Bonneville Power Administration has legal authority to construct lines anywhere within economic transmission distance of the Columbia River plants. Proposals have also been made for the construction of a Northwest-California intertie by private utilities. Public agencies in both the Northwest and California are also known to be considering the construction of a large intertie between the two regions.

The numerous advantages of economy and efficiency in the use of our Nation's energy resources made possible by strong interregional connections make some form of Northwest-Southwest intertie inevitable. Within recent months, proposals have been received by the Bonneville Power Administration from six non-Federal utility groups for the construction of an interconnection between the Pacific Northwest and the Pacific Southwest. Regardless of who owns or operates the lines this bill is needed to provide the fullest orderly and economic movements of hydropower between the regions. With the passage of this bill, this sound national objective can be assured with great savings to electric consumers in both regions.

THE CLEAN AIR ACT

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in his health message to the Nation President Kennedy drew, in a few brief strokes, an indelible image of the terrible economic and human costs of air pollution.

> Economic damage from air pollution amounts to as much as $11 billion every year in the United States. Agricultural losses alone total $500 million a year. Crops are stunted or destroyed, livestock become ill, meat and milk production are reduced. In some 6,000 communities various amounts of smoke, smog, grime, or fumes reduce property values and—as dramatically shown in England last year—endanger life itself. Hospitals, department stores, office buildings, and hotels are all affected. Some cities suffer damages of up to $100 million a year. One of our larger cities has a daily average of 25,000 tons of airborne pollutants. My own home city of Boston experienced in 1960 a "black rain" of smoke, soot, oil or a mixture of all three.

It was in response to such evidence as this, that, on March 2, 1961, I introduced proposed legislation to establish a national air pollution abatement program, paralleling the newly successful Federal program for water pollution control. This measure, unfortunately, was not destined for success in the 87th Congress. But the intervening 2 years have witnessed both a dramatic expansion in technical knowledge of the enormity, complexity, and national character of the air pollution problem, and increased awareness, among public officials and ordinary citizens alike, of the profound need for remedial action.

During these 2 years, there have been major advances in the technology of air pollution control. In June of last year, for example, the Public Health Service completed the definitive study of motor vehicle air pollution which had been authorized by the farsighted provisions of the Schenck Act of 1960. This study revealed the ugly price which we are paying for the benefits of motor vehicle travel, identifying vehicular air pollution as the source of a broad spectrum of evils, from the decimation of crops and livestock to the aggravation and complication of human disease. Responding to the stimulus of this report and to the prodding of concerned Members of Congress, the Federal Division of Air Pollution Control, and States such as California, the automobile industry has made substantial progress in mitigating this hazard.

These 2 years have also brought insight into the particularly lethal role played by sulfur compounds in the air. Several recent studies have demonstrated that there exists a dramatic relationship between the levels of sulfur dioxide and sulfur trioxide in the air and the frequency and duration of the common cold and other respiratory ailments.

A series of studies carried out under the direction of Dr. F. Curtis Dohan, of the University of Pennsylvania, supported by funds from the Public Health Service, compared the frequency of colds among a group of industrial and office workers with levels of sulfates in the air of the cities where they worked.

Dr. Dohan found a striking relationship between airborne sulfate levels and the frequency with which workers were absent because of upper respiratory infections. The frequency of colds was apparently unrelated to levels of other pollutants and weather conditions. The study covered workers in eight cities in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana, and the pattern of colds closely paralleled the differing sulfate levels in the eight cities.

In another investigation, scientists at the Vanderbilt University School of Medicine and the Public Health Service reported a high statistical correlation between asthma attacks and levels of sulfur dioxide in Nashville, Tenn.

Dr. L. D. Zeidberg, of Vanderbilt, and Dr. Richard A. Prindle and Mr. Emanual Landau, of the Divison of Air Pollution, found that the asthma attack rate in Nashville closely followed the measurements taken of sulfur dioxide. They reported, in addition, that variations in temperature and humidity apparently were not related to the occurrence of asthma in the group of patients studied.

There is compelling evidence that air pollution is a contributing factor in a number of chronic respiratory diseases, including asthma, emphysema, bronchitis, and lung cancer. It now appears that sulfurous air may contribute also to our most common acute respiratory disease—the cold—which last year alone cost the Nation tens of millions of lost workdays. It should also be noted that sulfur dioxide and sulfate levels have been extremely high during several acute episodes of air pollution in this country and abroad in which many people have died.

We most do all we can to pursue and encourage further research on the sulfur air pollution problem.

The Division of Air Pollution of the Public Health Service informs me that sulfur compounds in air come from certain industrial operations, such as oil refining, ore roasting, and acid manufacture, as well as from the combustion of sulfur-containing fuels. When coal or oil containing sulfur is burned in factories, powerplants, or home furnaces, substantial amounts of sulfur di- and tri-oxide are released into the air. These gases and other solid compounds formed from them are commonly present in polluted urban air and are highly irritating to tissue in the respiratory tract.

In addition to their adverse effects on health, sulfur compounds in the air are known to cause corrosion of metal and other structural materials and to cause injury to vegetation.

While technical methods are available generally to prevent emissions of sulfur pollutants from industrial processes, satisfactory technology is not available for preventing such emissions from fuel combustion sources, chiefly industrial and commercial smokestacks and residential chimneys. What may be needed is more emphasis on removing sulfur from fuels before they are burned.

A report recently prepared for the Public Health Service by the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior reviewed present techniques for removing sulfur from fuel oil. One well-known method — hydrosulfurization — can extract as much as 90 percent of the sulfur from residual oils. Residual oils represent the residue remaining after gasoline and other lighter oils have been separated from crude oil. This residual is the source of much of the fuel oil burned by industry and for electric power generation in the United States.

Although current costs estimated for removing sulfur from fuels are significant, they might prove to be much lower if greater emphasis were placed on finding improved techniques. Moreover, when these costs are weighed against the health and economic damage caused by sulfur compounds in the air, the expense would seem more than justified.

While we have not yet developed adequate techniques for controlling the levels of sulfur compounds in the air, there are today technically sound, economically feasible, and effective procedures and devices for solving other major sources of air pollution. Yet we have failed to implement them.

On the local level, with a few notable exceptions, air pollution control has been an aspiration rather than a reality. As of last summer, only 106 local air pollution control agencies could boast a full-time staff and even these agencies served a bare 45 percent of the Nation's population. Moreover, virtually all the control agencies were hampered by insufficient funds.

On the State level, 35 States still lacked coherent air pollution programs while the remaining States had programs of greatly varying efficiency. In 1961, the median annual expenditure for air pollution control was approximately 10 cents per person, an inadequate sum by any relevant standard.

December 1962 produced two significant events which may yet prove to have been the much needed catalyst for transplanting public concern over air pollution into public action.

In early December we received news of a lethal smog descending upon the hapless city of London for the second time in a decade, disrupting the life of that great city, and leaving in its wake damaged property, disease and death. During the 4-day misery of the smog, 100 persons died and a thousand more were hospitalized. It would, of course, be quixotic to claim that what happened in London could not happen here. It is happening here.

Less than a week later, the attention of the Nation was sharply focused upon air pollution by the convening in Washington of a national conference on air pollution. For several days technical experts and public health officials testified to the immediate need for a vigorous national program to combat air pollution.

It was most gratifying, and, I believe, significant, that support for legislation such as I had proposed was forthcoming from such divergent sources as Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, President Eisenhower's Secretary of HEW, and the present president of the University of Oregon, and the American Medical Association. The American Medical Association has not, in the past, been characterized by the reckless espousal of Federal programing.

Following the conference, both the former Secretary of HEW, my esteemed colleague from Connecticut, and the present Secretary, Mr. Celebrezze, joined in supporting legislation embodying the principles contained in my earlier proposals. Finally, on February 7, President Kennedy, in his health message expressly endorsed such legislation.

During the early days of this session, I undertook to review and amend the provisions of my 1961 bill so that it might now reflect intervening advances in the science of air pollution control. To this end, I have worked closely with the distinguished chairman of the House Subcommittee on Health and Safety, Mr. ROBERTS, who has long been a champion of adequate Federal programing for air pollution abatement. The bill which I introduce today is substantially identical to legislation which he is introducing in the House.

This proposed legislation is designed, as was my earlier bill, to provide the Secretary of HEW the authority requested by President Kennedy in his health message:

> (a) To engage in a more intensive research program permitting full investigation of the causes, effects and control of air pollution;
>
> (b) To provide financial stimulation to States and local air pollution control agencies through project grants which will help them to initiate or improve their control programs;
>
> (c) To conduct studies on air pollution problems of interstate or nationwide significance; and
>
> (d) To take action to abate interstate air pollution, along the general lines of the existing water pollution control enforcement measures.

In addition, I am calling for a separate, intensified research effort directed toward the development of improved low cost techniques for extracting sulfur from fuels.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1009) to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EARNINGS LIMITATION UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, proposed legislation to amend the Social Security Act by removing the earnings limitation presently imposed on recipients. As is well known, no means test is required in order to become eligible for benefits under the Social Security Act. Each person who has contributed to the fund during his working years has a right to receive these benefits. However, a certain penalty is attached if the recipient continues to work after becoming eligible to receive payments. Beneficiaries under 72 years of age whose earnings consist of wages from self-employment income, forfeit their benefit payments in whole or in part if their income exceeds $1,200 a year. One of the most inequitable features of this regulation is the provision which exempts from this calculation all income from investments, annuities, and pensions. In fact, it is possible to earn an unlimited amount of money in dividends and interest, and still receive one's full social security benefits. Only the person who needs to work and earn wages to supplement his social security income is penalized.

It has been estimated that 17½ million citizens of this country are over 65 years of age. This year, the Congress will consider legislation to help these citizens meet their financial obligations on reduced incomes. Members of both parties, for example, have, during this session, offered bills to provide Federal assistance to these senior citizens for meeting medical expenses. It is my belief, however, that most Americans would prefer to help themselves rather than become dependent upon the community for support. Persons between 65 and 72 can make valuable contributions to the work force, and I believe that their initiative and independence should be encouraged, and their self-reliance commended.

Let us be realistic and recognize the fact that no person can live decently on $1,200 a year in the United States today. The income restriction provision of the law was first enacted in 1939, when the limitation was set at $180 a year. After numerous revisions, the figure $1,200 was reached in 1954. Although it is possible that at the time of enactment it represented a reasonable sum, it is indeed unduly frugal by our standards today.

Many would say that the only solution is an increase in social security payments, but I believe that most Americans, both recipients and taxpayers, would prefer to encourage retired persons to help themselves by earning supplemental income. The purpose of my bill is to give them that chance by removing the handicap which presently makes self-reliance impossible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1010) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PRINTING OF "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution to authorize a new printing of the document, "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?" I believe my colleagues will agree that this document is one of the

most informative and popular documents ever published by the Congress.

The author of this excellent introduction to American Government is the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas. There are few individuals more qualified and competent to prepare such a document. Its value has been amply demonstrated by the thousands of copies that have been distributed by every Member of Congress.

I recently discovered that the last printing of this document has been exhausted. Representative PATMAN submitted House Concurrent Resolution 85 on February 7, 1963, to authorize another printing of "Our American Government." This resolution provides, as does the resolution I introduce today, that each Member of Congress will receive 2,000 copies for distribution among interested constituents.

Mr. President, I hope both Houses of Congress will take prompt action on this concurrent resolution so that "Our American Government" will be returned to circulation as quickly as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That (a) with the permission of the copyright owner of the book "Our American Government—1001 Questions on How It Works," with answers by Wright Patman, published by Scholastic Magazines, Incorporated, there shall be printed as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?" In addition to the usual number there shall be printed two thousand copies for use and distribution by each Member of Congress.
>
> (b) As used in this concurrent resolution the term "Member of Congress" includes a Member of the Senate, a Member of the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS ENTITLED "SUMMER EMPLOYMENT OF COLLEGE STUDENTS BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—1961"

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution providing for the printing as a Senate document of information regarding the summer employment of college students in the Federal Government excluding clerical jobs.

The college interns I have had in my own office have been of high caliber and have performed useful tasks, in the course of which I am hopeful they have added significantly to their knowledge and understanding of the legislative process. I know that my colleagues here in the Senate have been equally pleased with the work of the interns who have assisted them. In many instances the experience on Capitol Hill has motivated students to enter Government service or has reinforced their previous intent to do so.

Just as we in the Congress have been making increased use of college students during their vacation periods in recent years, the executive departments have increased their programs. Yet very little information is available concerning which departments hire students for the summer and the size of the programs in existence. Inquiries to my office indicate that students desiring to benefit from a summer's work with the Federal Government—in many instances they contribute their services without charge to the Government—do not know how to go about it. Their college advisers frequently also lack sufficient information to guide them properly.

In view of the lack of readily available information on this important subject, about a year ago I requested the Library of Congress to survey the summer intern programs for undergraduate and graduate students being sponsored by the various executive departments. I was not certain whether legislation would be necessary or desirable in this field but I felt that such a study would be of assistance in indicating the kind of action which would prove most helpful.

A questionnaire was prepared and distributed to the various departments and agencies by the Library of Congress. Miss Helen Miller, of the Legislative Reference Service staff, was assigned to do this work and has done a thorough and effective job. A great deal of her time has been devoted to circularizing the various departments and agencies and in preparing a report based on the material received. Excellent cooperation was received from the various departments.

The response has proved most useful. The Civil Service Commission has expressed an interest in the findings and a representative of at least one department has told us that prior to this survey, his department had no accurate measure of the programs being undertaken within its own jurisdiction.

My examination of the report prepared by the Library of Congress convinces me that no legislation is necessary. Further dissemination of information regarding these programs would, however, in my opinion, be helpful in guiding students and in stimulating them to seek summer employment with the Federal Government. It is with this thought in mind that I am filing this resolution asking that a major portion of the report prepared by the Library of Congress be printed as a Senate document.

This material shows, by departments, the number of positions—excluding clerical jobs—likely to be available to summer students, by location and job description. The complete report provides the names of the universities from which the students who served as interns in the summer of 1961 came. It has not been thought necessary to include this information as part of the Senate document but it will be on file at the Library of Congress. In 1961, the summer for which the study was made, a total of 12,033 jobs were reported to the Library. Though final figures are not yet available, it has been estimated that more than 13,000 jobs will be filled by students in the summer of 1963.

With the Senate document in hand, a student and his college guidance officer can better determine the agency or office on which to concentrate in the search for a satisfactory position. Several university officials with whom the matter has been discussed have expressed the opinion that their task would be aided significantly by the publication of such a document.

I understand that the executive department is establishing a clearinghouse for these positions. As the procedure is described in the press, a student will apply to the office of his choice. If that office has filled the positions available there, the student's application will be transferred to an office where it is felt he might be useful. Publication of this document would assist the student in making a logical initial selection and should simplify the work involved on the part of the Government. I think it would increase the likelihood that students would receive assignments compatible with their interests and their skills.

I know we all feel that the continued success of our way of life requires that we recruit the best available people for Government service. I am hopeful that printing this report as a Senate document will represent a step in that direction. Since the season has arrived for students to begin making their inquiries regarding placement, I hope that expeditious attention will be given to this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 105) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That there shall be printed as a Senate document compilation of materials entitled "Summer Employment by College Students in the Federal Government—1961", prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; and there shall be printed six thousand two hundred additional copies of such Senate document for the use of the Members of the Senate.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President or the President pro tempore be authorized to sign, during the adjournment following today's session, the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN NEW PACKAGES OF IMPORTED ARTICLES TO BE MARKED SHOWING COUNTRY OF ORIGIN—AMENDMENT

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, last Thursday I introduced four measures to offer some relief for the American lumber industry in its fight against increased Canadian imports of softwood lumber into the United States. One of the bills I introduced at that time, S, 957, would amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate the country of origin. I later found out that on the same day, February 28, a House-passed bill, H.R. 2513, was referred to the Senate Finance Committee. H.R. 2513 would amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require certain new packages of imported articles to be marked to indicate the country of origin.

In keeping with my statement that I will continue to work for relief of the American lumber industry, I today submit an amendment to the House-passed bill, H.R. 2513. This amendment would require that lumber and wood products be included under the bill as items to be marked with the country of origin.

I am also sending a letter to the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] to the effect that I would like to have this amendment considered by his committee when H.R. 2513 is up for consideration.

I hope, in this way, to expedite the handling of one aspect of legislative relief for the American lumber industry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF ARMS CONTROL ACT — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be added as a cosponsor of S. 777, a bill to amend the Arms Control Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS ACT OF 1963—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 865) to provide for the establishment of the National Academy of Foreign Affairs, and for other purposes, the names of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] be added as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], I ask unanimous consent that upon the next printing of Senate Concurrent Resolution 23, introduced by him on February 25, providing for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Central Intelligence, that the names of Senators Bartlett and Gruening, of Alaska, be added as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of February 20, 1963, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and concurrent resolution:

S. 861. A bill to provide for the general welfare by assisting the States, through a program of grants-in-aid, to establish and operate special hospital facilities for the treatment and cure of narcotic addicts: Mr. Long of Missouri and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

S. 862. A bill to provide that, for purposes of certain studies, investigations, and demonstrations authorized with respect to mental illness under the Public Health Service Act, addiction to narcotics be considered as a mental illness: Mr. Long of Missouri and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

S. 863. A bill to amend chapter 402 of title 18, United States Code, to make the Federal Youth Corrections Act applicable to certain persons who violate the Federal narcotics statutes: Mr. Long of Missouri.

S. 864. A bill to enable the courts more effectively to deal with the problem of narcotic addition: Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

S. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control: Mr. Beall, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Fong, Mr. Goldwater, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Lausche, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Mechem, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

NOTICE OF MEETING OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, provides that the Joint Committee on Defense Production shall be composed of 10 members, 5 of them members of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and 5 of them members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. The law provides that these five members from each of the committees are to be appointed by the chairman of the respective committee, three from the majority and two from the minority party.

During the last session of Congress the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Defense Production were Senators Sparkman, Douglas, Capehart, Bennett, and myself.

Senators Sparkman, Douglas, Bennett, and I wish to continue as members. In addition, in accordance with section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, I have appointed Senator Tower as a member of the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

A meeting of the Joint Committee on Defense Production has been called for 10:30 a.m., Thursday, March 7, for the purpose of electing officers and adopting rules for this Congress. The meeting will be held in room S–126 of the Capitol.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I wish to announce a forthcoming hearing on the constitutional rights of the American Indian. The hearing is scheduled to begin at 10 a.m. on March 7, in room 457 of the Senate Office Building.

The subcommittee has been conducting a nationwide investigation on Indian rights since 1961. It appears from the hearings and investigations held in seven States and the District of Columbia that congressional clarification is needed to guarantee more fully Indian citizens their rights. Since a large number of tribal delegations will be in Washington during the week of March 4 to 8, the subcommittee feels it appropriate to schedule a hearing to receive the views of the tribal representatives, not heretofore represented in our study, who wish to be heard.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 537, TO CREATE A JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Committee on Government Operations will hold hearings on the bill, S. 537, proposing the creation of a Joint Committee on the Budget on March 19 and 20, 1963. This bill was introduced in the Senate on January 25, under the sponsorship of 77 Senators. Full details relative to its purpose and objectives are set forth in the Congressional Record at pages 1095 through 1101.

Outstanding experts on Federal fiscal problems will be invited to give the committee the benefit of their views and recommendations. Members of the Senate or the House of Representatives and others who may desire to be heard, or who wish to submit statements, relative to the proposed legislation should contact Mr. Walter L. Reynolds, the chief clerk of the committee, room 3304, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY ON DAIRY LEGISLATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR ELLENDER ON HIS RECENT TRIP TO AFRICA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to make two announcements. The first is that on March 18 the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will begin hearings on all proposed dairy legislation before it.

The second announcement I wish to make is that on next Thursday I will present to the Senate my report on my recent tour of Africa.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Statement on the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Department of Labor.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, 30 years ago a new President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, came into office. He was one of the great Presidents of our time. His contributions have been many, and the marks he left are visible even to this day.

Fifty years ago the Department of Labor came into being, under the auspices of a Republican President; and I am glad to note that anniversary today, and to commend the Department of Labor for its many fine activities through the years.

Thirty years ago, the Nation was in the midst of the great depression. It was the year in which a new President came into the White House and, with great determination and courage and with imagination and boldness in public policies, restored to the people of the United States hope in their system and in their future. One of his supporters in the election campaign which led to his election was a public-spirited Virginian.

In the same period, the same Virginian came into the Senate. From the outset, he was a man of independent views; but he understood the problems confronting the President and the Nation, and he did his part in seeing to it that those problems were faced in the Senate, and that appropriate remedies were devised.

Through the years, Mr. President, through the administrations of President Roosevelt, President Truman, and President Eisenhower, and into that of President Kennedy, the same Senator has continued to serve his State and the Nation. Sometimes he has agreed with Presidents, and sometimes he has not; but he has never failed to face the issues frankly, and to see to it, insofar as it lay within his power to do so, that the Senate faced them. That has been his hallmark.

It was 30 years ago to the day that Harry Byrd came to the Senate. He has seen this country grow under policies which he has espoused and also under policies with which he disagreed. He has not won all the battles, nor has he lost them all. But, either way, the Nation has gained because those battles were fought.

Nor are the battles over, Mr. President. The Senator from Virginia sits as chairman of the Finance Committee at a moment when great and complex social and economic issues, involving finance, are once again in the forefront of the Nation's concern. I do not look to the Senator from Virginia to agree with the President or to disagree on every issue. I look to the Senator from Virginia to bring to these issues his own, individual wisdom; and I look to him to see to it that these issues are faced by the Senate as a whole. Finally, I look to him—once the decisions are made by the whole Senate—to submerge his own views, to close ranks—whatever the outcome—as the great American that he is and has always been.

So, Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Virginia on his 30th anniversary in the Senate. I wish him many more battles and many more years of service in the Senate and to the Nation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to join in the statement of the majority leader concerning the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. I am indeed proud to be a Member of the Senate with him. All of us respect his views, and all of us consider him a friend. I value his friendship highly.

I hope he will have many more years of useful service, for there is no more patriotic citizen or more conscientious public servant than Harry Byrd.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, no Senator is held in higher esteem or greater respect than our friend the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, who today celebrates the 30th anniversary of his service in this legislative Chamber. I am honored to join with the able majority leader in saluting one who always has spoken out without hesitation, who has taken a position on all public questions, and who has followed the principles which have guided him down through the years.

I call Harry Byrd a friend. So do my Republican colleagues, and so do my Democratic colleagues. It is not at all a question of whether one agrees with another on issues as they come before us. It is simply a question of a Senator being able to stand, to speak his piece as he sees the light, to advocate that which to him appears to be right and just. The senior Senator from Virginia has always done just that. So I rise to express my own salute and best wishes to our colleague from Virginia, and to associate myself with the remarks of my friend from Montana.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with others in commending the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] on his 30 years of valuable and outstanding service to the U.S. Senate and our Nation.

Those of us who serve with him on the Finance Committee fully understand and value his patriotic devotion to our Nation and his dedication to the preservation of the fundamental principles laid down by our Nation's Founding Fathers.

In the New York Times on April 10, 1953, Arthur Krock commented on the "rare combination of integrity, ability, courage, and specialized knowledge of complex subjects" which have given Senator Byrd a unique place in the Senate and made him its strongest force on many great and controversial occasions.

Harry Byrd, since March 4, 1933, when he became a Member of the U.S. Senate, has been battling against deficit financing and for the "pay as you go" principle in Government. He is nationally known as "Mr. Economy" and "the watchdog of the Treasury."

We need more Harry Byrds in the U.S. Senate if we are to preserve the solvency of the U.S. Government and preserve for future generations the great heritage we have received.

He has held many positions of honor and trust in behalf of the citizens of the great Commonwealth of Virginia. He has not betrayed their trust. In fact, during many years of service, he has proven his fidelity to public service, his independence of mind and the courage of his convictions.

Much has been written about Senator Byrd's outstanding public service, but he also has rare personal qualities. He is soft spoken, he has great personal charm; he is friendly, and those of us who work with him hold him in great affection.

Henry Drummond, in his book entitled "The Greatest Thing in the World," mentions several virtues that are evident in a true gentleman.

The first is patience, and those of us who have had the opportunity of knowing and working with Harry Byrd know that he has unlimited patience.

In addition to patience, kindness is another virtue of a true gentleman. Generosity, humility, and sincerity are additional virtues and I am sure all my colleagues will agree with me that Harry Byrd has all these traits.

Courtesy is another requisite of a true gentleman. To this we add unselfishness. Good temper is another attribute, and certainly those of us who know Harry Byrd can honestly state he is not easily provoked to anger.

Personally, it is a great privilege for me to serve as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, of which he is chairman. On many occasions he has gone out of the way to be helpful to me. I am greatly indebted to him.

It is my sincere hope that he will continue to serve in this body for many years to come.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying respect to a man who 30 years ago first assumed his duties as a U.S. Senator. Unquestionably Harry Byrd will go down into history as one of the Senate greats. During his service he has done more to restore and maintain a degree of fiscal responsibility than has any other man in the Congress. The American people, not only from the State of Virginia but throughout the country, owe to this man a deep debt of gratitude for his tireless service as a public servant.

His integrity and his courageous stand for what he believes is right has made his name synonymous with honesty and efficiency in government. I know of no greater tribute to be paid to this man than to say that his State, our country, and we in Congress are all better men and women as the result of the example he has set.

Members of his personal staff as well as the members of the committee staff have asked that they be included in this tribute to a man whom they all admire and respect so highly.

As a member of the Senate Finance Committee, of which he is the chairman, and as one who has had the privilege of working with Senator Byrd for a number of years, I join Senators on both sides of the aisle not only in extending to him our best wishes but also in expressing the hope that he will be in the Senate for many years to come.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators in paying tribute today to the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who has just entered the Chamber.

I agree with everything that has been said about him. Although he and I disagree on many subjects, we have had a warm personal friendship. We have lived in the same area as neighbors for more than a quarter of a century. I feel that I am a friend of him and his family. I join in what our majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Montana, has said about him. I desire also to wish for him many more years of health and happiness.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, service in the Senate occasionally creates images of individuals who themselves become institutions. The service that Senator BYRD has rendered to the people of his State and to the United States during the past 30 years has made him an institution. The image which represents that institution has everything in it that the American people regard as fine, good, and sound. It is an image of personal responsibility, of the ideal American who manages his affairs well, lives within his income, and is always responsible in every decision that he makes affecting himself, his family and his country.

It is an image that draws solutions from sound, time-tested principles—that considers no gimmicks, no shortcuts, no imaginative solutions based on vague theories, but returns always to the principles which the experience of centuries has demonstrated.

We live in an age when many people are looking for shortcuts. Many of us are impatient with the consequences of our own mistakes. Many of us try to find solutions which are guaranteed against failure.

Senator BYRD represents the soundness and wisdom of faith in those principles which always produce the right solution. His is an image of fiscal responsibility, an image of thrift, an image of the wisdom of living within one's income.

It has been a privilege to me for the past 10 years to serve on the Finance Committee under his chairmanship, and I am proud of the number of times I have supported the principles he supports.

I think Senator HARRY BYRD has made a tremendous contribution to his country through his service in the Senate in the past 30 years. Like the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]—and, I am sure, every other Member of this body—I hope that his service may be continued. I am sure his service has benefited our country and will continue to benefit it, by reason of his courage, his vision, his wisdom, and his great devotion to the people he serves.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, one of the great delights which has come to me in my service in the Senate has been the association with Senator BYRD, of Virginia. While we have not agreed on all issues I hold him in the highest esteem.

If I were to speak to a class of students in political science and to advise that class what course it should follow, what principles it should adopt with respect to service to the country, I would say, "Emulate generally the example of HARRY BYRD, of Virginia." He is devoted to our country. He is devoted to the sound principles in Government. He thinks not only of the immediate but also the long-range impact of what happens in the Congress. He has been a bastion against the Congress of the United States running away from responsibility and following the star of political expediency.

It is very simple to take the easy course of spending the taxpayers' money, of being unconcerned about the future of the country, devoid of thought of the impact which fiscal policies may have in the future, but it is quite hard in the face of the tide to intermittently say, "No." HARRY BYRD has had the courage to say "No" when the political demands of the moment probably cried out for the word, "Yes."

I say to Senator BYRD, "I have been proud to serve with you. You have contributed much in keeping the brakes applied in stopping this vehicle of Government from running wildly to the bottom of the hill and destruction.

"I am proud to be with you today and proud to express these words of tribute to you."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am sure it will surprise no one if I make no unqualified endorsement of all the policies pursued by my dear friend, Senator BYRD, with whom I differ probably as often as I differ with anybody in this Chamber.

I rise especially to pay tribute to and offer congratulations to a friend—a warm friend and a very instructive friend.

I have had the privilege of differing with the Senator on issues which to me are very deep and profound, such as civil rights issues. At the same time, I have had the privilege of sitting at the Senator's desk and drawing tremendous stores of wisdom and enlightenment upon economic subjects, as to which, whether we agree or not, it has been tremendously illuminating to me to see his fine and informed mind in operation.

What too many people in the country may not know about HARRY BYRD is that he not only has stubborn conservative views about money, but also he does his homework.

Our friendship has been a great joy to me. I know enough about this body, whatever may be our differences, to know that those differences are essential to that tradition which makes America and makes for legislation in the greatest interest of our country.

So, with warmth and friendship, because our friendship is cemented in that holy of holies called the Senate gym, I rise to express my congratulations on three decades of service to my colleague, Senator BYRD.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it has been my pleasure to follow the political career of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia for more than two decades. I have had the great privilege of knowing him personally for some 12 to 15 years. I have had the further privilege of serving for more than 4 years on the Finance Committee, of which he is the distinguished chairman.

During all the time the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia has served in the U.S. Senate, our country has been confronted with tremendous and momentous issues of various kinds. The Senator from Virginia has been constant, dedicated, courageous, and forthright in all of his views throughout that period.

When I think of our distinguished Senator from Virginia I think of the great patriots his State has furnished our Nation. I think of Thomas Jefferson. I think of George Washington. I think of James Madison. I think of Robert E. Lee. I think of "Stonewall" Jackson. The Senator from Virginia has some of the characteristics and qualities of all of those immortal statesmen. If I were to summarize with one word the qualifications of the Senator from Virginia, I would say that he has courage.

Courage, Mr. President, is one of the most scarce commodities in the political arena of our country at the present time. The Senator from Virginia exercises courage. He does not let any combination of forces whatever in our country or in his State—the power of the executive branch, of the judicial branch, of the electorate, or anything else—deter him from acting on his convictions. The Nation admires him greatly for that characteristic. Even though some people may not agree with the political philosophy of the Senator from Virginia, all recognize his great characteristic of courage.

Then, too, he has courtesy, sound commonsense, and courtliness; he is gentlemanly in every respect. I am happy, indeed, to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in saluting what I think is one of the outstanding political services in our Nation, that of the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERTSON OF VIRGINIA

Mr. President, if I may, I would not wish to let this opportunity pass without pointing out the fact that the other Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has also served in the Congress for a period of 30 years. He has not served in the Senate during that period of time, but he rendered valuable service in the other body before he was made a Member of the Senate. He now serves as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate.

WILLIS ROBERTSON also has those rare qualities I have referred to as being possessed by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. He has them in tremendous abundance. It has been my privilege to have been intimately acquainted with the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. We not only worked together in the legislative halls, but we have had occasion to hunt and fish together, to visit in the fields, to visit with some of his friends, constituents, and neighbors of his native State. I know of no Member of the Senate who is more beloved and dedicated than is the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, Virginia and the country are fortunate, indeed, to have this pair of dedicated public servants. I salute our distinguished colleagues. I salute Virginia. I salute our Nation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to join my colleagues in the Senate in extending warmest congratulations to my friend and senior colleague from Virginia, HARRY FLOOD BYRD.

It was my happy privilege to commence my political career with Senator BYRD in January of 1916, when we both entered the Senate of Virginia. I served with him there in that capacity for 6 years. Incidentally, he and I served on the committee that laid out the highway system of Virginia. He and I were joint patrons of the bill that created the highway system of Virginia; and he was the chief architect of the Virginia plan to build that splendid 55,000-mile system of highways without one red cent of public debt.

I look back first upon the service of Senator BYRD in the State senate, and later his remarkable career as Governor. Incidentally, I had the privilege of serving in his cabinet when he was Governor. In my opinion the highway system of Virginia compares favorably with that of any other State in the Union. I reflect that we have no State debt by reason of that highway system, or by reason of anything else.

Then I think of the laws Senator BYRD sponsored. He is now looked upon as a conservative, but in 1925, when he was elected Governor of Virginia, he was a liberal and a progressive. He is still a Thomas Jefferson liberal. In an interview with James J. Kilpatrick, editor of the Richmond News-Leader, Senator BYRD described himself as one of the last of the old New Dealers. The Democratic platform of 1932, he has asserted, was an admirable platform, adding, "I'm still standing on it."

As I look back on his career, I cannot recall any Governor of Virginia whose services to his State have been more significant than have been those of HARRY BYRD as Governor of Virginia.

Mr. President, all of my colleagues, of course, are familiar with the wonderful contributions HARRY BYRD has made here in the Senate.

Senator BYRD remarked, with regard to the Chicago platform, that it called for a reduction in Federal spending, for a renewed dedication of States rights, and for stringent economy in Government. The first bill Senator BYRD voted for in this Chamber was drafted "To preserve the credit of the U.S. Government."

Economy in Government and reduction of unnecessary Federal spending have been Senator BYRD's watchwords in all his years of service here. While the chairmanship of other committees passes from one side of the aisle to the other with each change in party majority, Senator BYRD, by common consent, has kept the chairmanship of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures ever since the committee was established, at his instance.

Those who tend to judge a man altogether by his voting record have accused him of voting with the Republicans. He, in turn, has replied that, since his name begins with the initial "B," he votes first and the Republicans then vote with him.

On one occasion, however, Senator BYRD spoke out against his critics in this fashion:

> I want to tell you what kind of a Democrat I am. I am not a Republican, I will tell you that. I vote with them when they are right and against them when they are wrong, but I am not a Republican. The kind of Democrat I try earnestly to be is that kind of Democrat that two of the greatest Presidents of these United States were, both from Virginia, Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson. The kind of Democrat I try to be is the kind that Andrew Jackson was, who boasted that the proudest achievement of his administration was to pay off in toto the public debt. That is an opportunity that no one will ever have again. I am the kind of a Democrat that Grover Cleveland was, who said * * * it was the duty of the people to support the Government, and not the Government the people. The test of my vote in the Senate and my actions elsewhere, now, as they have been in the past, and as they will be in the future, is determined by what I believe to be best for my country.

That is the end of the quotation, but it is by no means the end of his concern for what is best for his country, best for his State, and best for his party.

Mr. President, I salute the senior Senator from Virginia on his 30th anniversary of service in this body, and I ask unanimous consent to have published at this point in the RECORD a fine tribute to Senator BYRD that was published last week in the Richmond News Leader.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Mar. 1, 1963]

BYRD REVIEWS TRAIL HE BLAZED IN SENATE

(By Carl Shires)

WASHINGTON, March 1.—HARRY FLOOD BYRD, the toughest rooster in Virginia's political aviary, looked back from his top-rung perch today at the 30 years that lie behind him as U.S. Senator from Virginia.

His look was a self-effacing one. There was no crow and no strut. If there was malice toward the proud young cocks whose tail feathers he'd plucked, it didn't show during an hour-long conversation in his office.

What he wanted stressed most in a story dealing with his 30th anniversary in the U.S. Senate was this:

"The people of Virginia have been mighty good to me; they've overlooked my errors; they've supported me when they thought I was right. They're the best."

LONGEST VIRGINIA TERM

Five times they've demonstrated to Senator BYRD's satisfaction that they're "the best." Five times they've voted him into the Senate seat he holds. That's the longest time ever for a U.S. Senator from Virginia.

Monday, March 4, that's the specific anniversary date for the Senator.

On that date, three decades, two wars and four Presidents ago, he was sworn into the Senate, there under appointment of Governor John Pollard. He'd gone to fill the vacancy that came with the resignation of Claude Swanson.

A President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was sworn in that day also. Roosevelt had picked Swanson as his Secretary of the Navy.

The new Senator from Virginia and the new President of the United States were friends. They'd known each other well while each was Governor of his State.

The friendship didn't last. Roosevelt had promised that Government expenses would be slashed 25 percent.

That's the kind of talk that impresses Senator BYRD. Promises weren't kept. Economy in Government didn't come with Roosevelt.

TRUMAN NEXT

Strike one President from the list of the Senator's favorite people.

Harry Truman was next; he'd once been Senator BYRD's Senate deskmate, but he wasn't strong on economy either.

Strike another President.

Eisenhower followed; promised surplus turned into a deficit. There went another.

And now there's Kennedy. Paraphrasing Senator BYRD, he wants to cut taxes and raise the national debt. And besides, he just recently tried to pack the Finance Committee, which the Senator heads, with a couple of members friendly to the Kennedy program.

STRIKE ANOTHER ONE

That obviously won't do; strike another.

"I've supported them all when there was an outside enemy," said BYRD, "Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman during World War II and Mr. Eisenhower during the Korean war. But it's been different on domestic matters.

"I think a Senator should represent his State, and I believe that Virginia still is among the most conservative States in the Union.

"And get this down, when I say conservative, it isn't a matter of money, it's a question of conserving the principles of government, the three-branch form of government, the executive, the judicial and the legislative."

CIVICS LESSON

He was off on a favorite topic. There was no trouble hearing him now. A voice that had been barely audible picked up in decibel output. His finger jabbed at the air; he took off his glasses, swiveled in his seat. He continued his lesson in basic civics:

"My greatest concern is the tremendous concentration of power in Washington. In 1776 there was born the greatest Nation the world has ever known. It did not grow great by public charity. It grew great by effort and sacrifices * * * the people ought to support the Government and not the Government the people."

He warmed still more; forefingers of both hands rent the air.

GREAT DEBTS

"And now we're having our cake and eating it too. We're passing on great debts to coming generations. It's your grandchildren and mine (he has eight) who will pay.

"Put it down that I'm completely hostile to the President's tax cut unless there's a reduction in expenditures."

One wouldn't dare not put it down.

That was the end of the Senator's easy articulation. For thereafter he was prodded into talk of self; he doesn't like to talk of self.

He'd talk of "Candy"—the sleeping cocker spaniel who lay nearby. She's 9 now, an age when dogs get uppity. She sleeps most of the time, refuses to walk in snow, and scratches on the door as a signal to a secretary when she wants to go tend to dog business.

WON'T SPEAK ILL

He declines to talk ill of his fellow Senators, though he's not certain that the caliber's so high as 30 years ago. "But," he wanted emphasized, "I've never known a man in the Senate who's done anything improper in a financial way."

Of his constituents, he thinks the caliber's about the same as it was when he first was elected to Winchester's city council in 1908. "They still write," he grinned, pointing to a desk stacked high with mail, "when they've got something to write about."

His most formidable opponent: That honor goes to Francis Pickens Miller, his liberal opposition in the 1952 Democratic primary. Mr. Miller draws the most formidable title because he was articulate, a good speaker, and waged quite a campaign. Miller turned some buckshot verbiage on the BYRD he sought to shoot down.

PLEASANT MEMORY

The Senator's memory this time obviously was a pleasant one. A formidable foe brought out a formidable array of Byrdmen. "I beat him by 90,000 votes," he chuckled, "the biggest majority I ever got."

Though a Democrat's never beaten him in Virginia, a Republican did once. That was after the term as councilman in Winchester.

"I thought I'd done a pretty good job and I didn't campaign very hard. He beat me." There's a memory block on that one; the Senator doesn't remember the Republican's name.

POLITICAL RETURN

He got back into politics after that sobering experience by running successfully for the State senate in 1915. Ten years later he ran for Governor on the "pay-as-you-go road" issue. He won decisively and it's been pay-as-you-go in theory if not always in full fact in Virginia since.

Senator BYRD will be 76 in June. Though his suit hangs loosely from weight lost in a bout with a virus this winter, he's regaining pounds. He's got a gimp-legged walk from an arthritic knee, but still takes a daily, early-morning, 1-hour, 3-mile hike and climbs to the top of a mountain every chance he gets.

He's got an apple redness to his cheek, a quickness in his moves, and a fiery twinkle in his eye. He lets his hair go off in byways of disarray.

BORN IN MARTINSBURG

His start nearly 76 years ago came in Martinsburg, W. Va. The Senator doesn't seem inordinately proud of his West Virginia birthplace. There are no constituents there. "I was born there because my mother went over to stay with some relatives for the occasion."

He remembers it was King Street in Martinsburg, and that WILLIS ROBERTSON (Virginia's other U.S. Senator) was born on the same street, 3 blocks away.

"WILLIS," reminds BYRD, with a little sideways grin, "is right much older than I am (exactly 2 weeks)."

DEFINES POLITICS

For a definition of the "organization" he heads in the Old Dominion's politics, the Senator likes the one offered a few years ago by John Battle. It goes roughly like this: "An association of friends for the benefit of the State."

And in reference to a recent observation that the organization was held together by a thread, he retorts: "It's a mighty stout one if it's a thread."

Will he run again in 1964?

That brings an incredulous look, a "golden silence" of response, as though it's a question so naively foolish it doesn't merit attention.

Old roosters don't tell ambitious young cocks everything they know.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I could not let this occasion pass without giving a small measure of testimony, to the best of my ability, to my sincere admiration for one of the greatest Americans, at least of this generation, in the Senate, Senator BYRD of Virginia.

When I first became a member of the Senate—not as many years ago as the time when Senator BYRD entered the Senate, but nevertheless a number of years ago—I was aware of his great reputation as a farsighted, stable defender and advocate of the sound American system of opportunity and freedom.

I had great respect for him, although I did not belong to the same political party. I had the rare privilege of being assigned to a committee of which he was a member at the time, and worked under his tutelage, in effect, in attempting to assault some problems that were then beginning to assert themselves so far as the financial and fiscal affairs of this country at that time were concerned. That was in 1945.

Not only was my already conceived great respect for him amplified and, in my opinion, justified, but it has increased with every year since that time.

I agree with the fine things that have been said about Senator HARRY BYRD by other Senators. I do not know that I can add anything to those eulogies, except that I believe it to be my conscientious duty to testify publicly to that agreement, and state my affirmation of those opinions because of that association with the Senator.

No one individual—at least in what we may call modern times, whatever "modern times" may mean—has contributed more to the maintenance of a consciousness of a great segment of the American people of the fact that there is a responsibility of the individual to his government and to himself and to his community, and that that responsibility is deeply entwined with fiscal honesty and fiscal responsibility and obligations, and with a keeping of the faith by the representatives of the American people, and with the people whom they represent, than has the senior Senator from Virginia.

I feel that the overwhelming majority of the American people believe that it is not possible to spend more than is taken in and survive economically under our system of government. I feel that a great majority of the American people believe that debts should be paid, that obligations must be met. I fully believe that the great majority of the American people believe, as statesmen of the past have said, that a public office is a public trust. I believe that HARRY BYRD not only believes in those great principles, and believes in them very deeply and vibrantly, but that he has fought with as great vigor as has any other man I have ever known. He sees those principles clearly and has defended them vigorously.

A few moments ago I came to the Capitol on the subway car with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I did not know at that time that this was the 30th anniversary of Senator HARRY BYRD's service in the Senate. Perhaps I should have looked it up, but I did not know of it until Senator ROBERTSON told me about it. I said, "I want to hasten to the floor so that I may in my own small way testify to my admiration and appreciation."

I also said to Senator ROBERTSON that throughout the history of the United States the great State of Virginia has contributed as much as, if not more than, any other State in the Union to the stability and founding of our great Nation under a new philosophy of the dignity of man. In my experience in the Senate the representatives of the State of Virginia in the Senate have upheld that record magnificently, in the tradition of the Founding Fathers and of those who followed after them, in the preservation of this country of ours and its stability.

I know of no one who dislikes the senior Senator from Virginia. I know of a great many people who would, in the fashion of termites, undermine the basic concept of this Government and change it from a representative type of government under responsibility of the people, into a government of concentration of bureaucracies in Washington and irresponsible financial policy, and those people fear him. I do not say they dislike him. They fear him, because he stands as a great rock against the incursions of some of those philosophies into our American system. He is one of the hopes for the preservation of the basic principles, and of the responsibility of the American individual and the answerability of the Government of the United States to the American people, rather than the answerability of the people to the Government.

As I said a moment ago, I shall not indulge in more expansive eulogies, although I would, if I had the capabilities, but others have done it much better than I can.

I conclude much as I began, by saying that HARRY BYRD has my congratulations, my thanks, and my appreciation for his 30 years of service in the Senate, for his service in his sovereign State as its Governor, and as a great private citizen of that State.

I have profited as much from his example, from his courage, and from his clarity of thought in my service here as I have from any other man with whom I have been associated. I wish him well. I wish him continued years of service to his State and his Nation and continued years of health and happiness. My appreciation goes to him for the opportunity of having been able to serve with him in this body.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I congratulate Senator BYRD, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the United States of America, upon his completion of 30 years' service in the Senate. Senator BYRD's public service in the Senate and in other political offices has been characterized by a devotion to fundamental principles, by fidelity to intellectual honesty and by a degree of political courage never surpassed in the annals of the Republic.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I esteem it a privilege to say a word for a very distinguished statesman, who held up his hand in this body 30 years ago in the same week in which I held up my hand at the other end of the Capitol and took the oath of office as a Member of Congress.

His name is a household word in the Commonwealth of Virginia, where he is universally regarded with respect and affection. That respect and affection go infinitely further. If one went into the area which we traditionally describe as the rockbound coast of New England, or to the sun-drenched valleys of California, or to the area where I live, where corn and hogs and soybeans are kings, or where greening wheat covers the landscape in the Plains States—everywhere, Mr. President, HARRY BYRD is held in high respect and affection.

Perhaps it seems strange to some, who think that about him there is a Machiavellian touch, or that he is the genius behind a machine that is dedicated to reaction and standpattism, that everywhere in this country there is a genuine respect and affection and admiration for the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia.

There are many reasons for it. I think I could assign two. The first is his fidelity to principle. That is a fine, mouth-filling term. How frequently and how easily we use it—devotion to fidelity and to principle. But the fact is that the great tradition of the Republic, which has been exemplified in the contributions of this great man, runs in his veins. It comes through other great Virginians of other days, beginning with George Washington and continuing with John Randolph, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, and James Monroe, whose names are constantly on the front pages long after they have gone to their eternal reward. But that is the tradition that flows in the veins of HARRY BYRD. He comes by it honestly. He has kept the faith and has kept the vigil in all of those days. It began with his service as a State senator; it continued when he was chief executive of his State; and it has continued for all the years during which he has graced the Senate of the United States. So we salute him for his fidelity to principle.

Second, we salute him on this occasion for his courage. I doubt whether anyone will deny that expediency, fear, and timidity are not unknown in the political domain. It was 120 years ago that Thomas Babington Macaulay made a speech in the House of Commons, in which he spoke of the self-interest of politicians sometimes urging them to think more of their own security and the security of their seats in Commons than of the security of the country. That kind of feeling has never blemished, has never touched, has never tarnished the thinking or the escutcheon of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia.

It is easy to follow the expedient course in times of controversy. Obviously, people like to perpetuate themselves in office—and I am not immune to that sentiment. But what a great thing it is to look back upon a long, unscarred, unblemished record of doing what conviction and fidelity to principle have always dictated.

In whimsical vein, I think of the time when Clancy was on his deathbed, and the good father came to shrive him and to administer unction. He said, "Clancy, do you accept God and renounce the devil?"

Clancy studied for a moment and then said, "Father, I do accept God; but as for renouncing the devil, I am in no position to make any enemies right now."

That is a sentiment which enters into the political domain. So I salute a man who has fidelity to principle, a man whose record is one of great and naked courage in the interest of this Republic. So long as this body is graced by men and women who will bring to it that kind of courage, that kind of fidelity, the record of this Republic will be sustained.

I salute you, Senator BYRD.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes which are being paid to our friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia. While we may disagree on many issues, the Senator from Virginia and the junior Senator from New York have at least one thing in common: Each of us has been an unsuccessful candidate for President of the United States on the Alfalfa ticket. I am proud of that connection with my friend from Virginia.

His friendship and good will toward the junior Senator from New York—as toward all Members of the Senate—have frequently been manifested. Differences of opinion never affect the friendship and unfailing courtesy of the senior Senator from Virginia toward all his colleagues.

The outstanding quality which has been referred to by the minority leader, is his devotion to his convictions. When he has reached a conviction on any problem, he adheres to it with tenacity, with firmness, and, frequently, with success.

I join in saluting the Senator from Virginia on the anniversary of the day 30 years ago when he first took the oath of office as a Senator of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, when students of American Government in the years ahead look back to March 4, 1963, review the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and study the many eulogies which have been rendered today in respect to and in honor of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, they will learn a great lesson about American Government. During our years of representative government we have learned to debate and discuss the great issues of the day. We have taught ourselves how to disagree on many of the great issues without being disagreeable. We have learned how to dissent without being disrespectful.

Many of the statements which have been made today concerning the distinguished Senator from Virginia have been in the vein of great respect for this gentleman, this outstanding public servant. At the same time, the individuals expressing these sentiments of friendship, affection, and respect have indicated that on some of the issues of the day and throughout Senator BYRD's many years of public service there has been honorable disagreement. I, for one, have disagreed with the Senator on such vital issues as fiscal and monetary policy, civil rights, and agricultural policy.

When I came to the Senate, like many other young men of that day, I knew the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who is my seatmate, as a strong conservative. I took issue with him. It is a matter of record that he also took issue with me, administered a political spanking, went on his way, and permitted me to become one of his friends.

The Senator from Virginia, as has been described today, is a true gentleman. He is a fine family man. We have visited many times. His name is known in the annals of American history, because the name BYRD is as much a part of American history as the American Revolution.

The senior Senator from Virginia is not only a student of government and economics; he is also a politician in the best sense of that word. He is a political leader and a political organizer, and he exercises political leadership when it is needed for what he believes to be the right.

The Senator from Virginia is an unquestioned patriot who is greatly admired and respected. His love of this country is second to that of no other citizen.

Previously I said the Senator from Virginia is a political conservative. We need in American politics those who can discuss the issues of the day from different points of view. Nothing would be more tragic to the American political scene than to have a monolithic political structure or political attitude. The only way in which we can discuss the important issues of fiscal policy, monetary policy, foreign policy, and domestic policy, and then come to a consensus and to some form of agreement which will gain the respect of the American people, is to have honest discussion of differences here in the legislative halls, in the Congress of the United States.

The Senator from Virginia takes his position; he mans the ramparts, and defends his position; and then he respects the decision of the majority.

I am very much pleased to be able to make this statement about him, although certainly it is not needed, because both his private life and his public life are so outstanding that tributes by his friends are not needed. The great qualities and the outstanding achievements of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia speak for themselves.

A few minutes ago the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] stated that Senator BYRD was elected as a New Dealer. I knew that he and I had much in common, and I am delighted to know that this point of common interest has been spread on the RECORD today. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, let me say in all seriousness that Senator BYRD's record is one of fairness and fearlessness. I have done my best to try to persuade him to take the point of views I hold. I have been disappointed to find that my powers of persuasion has not been more effective. [Laughter.] On occasion I have been saddened to learn that, despite whatever efforts I may have made and whatever eloquence I may have indulged in and whatever powers of persuasion I may have had, all of them have been for naught, insofar as persuasion of the Senator from Virginia has been concerned. However, Mr. President, let it be noted for the Record that there are occasions when the Senator from Virginia and I stand together and vote together. Those are happy occasions.

Mr. President, what is most meaningful to me is the friendship of this most distinguished gentleman, and also the fact that he has served his State and Nation for some 30 years in this great body, the U.S. Senate.

This is a most memorable day. Thirty years ago, Franklin Delano Roosevelt became President of the United States, and a new era came to America.

Thirty years ago, Harry Flood Byrd became a U.S. Senator from the State of Virginia, and a record of great public service in this body was then begun.

Fifty years ago saw the establishment of the Department of Labor.

Fifty years ago saw the inauguration of one of the greatest men ever to serve the United States of America or any other free people—Woodrow Wilson. I know the Senator from Virginia is one of the great admirers of Woodrow Wilson.

Let me say that my first introduction to politics was by means of a study of Woodrow Wilson—a study which was begun at the breakfast table in the Humphrey household, when my father, a Wilsonian Democrat, would speak to his sons about Woodrow Wilson. Never did a greater man serve a free people; and I am sure the Senator from Virginia will agree with me on this day, the 50th anniversary of the inauguration of Woodrow Wilson, as President, that the American Republic is much the better because of the distinguished service of that great American.

I am sure the Senator from Virginia will also agree with me that Virginia has given many great men to America; and let me state—because of his great modesty—that Harry Flood Byrd is one of them.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] on the occasion of the 30th anniversary the beginning of his service in this body.

He is a thoughtful gentleman. He is always appreciative of the point of view of others. He takes time to talk with and advise younger Senators.

While we may disagree on some subjects, such disagreement has always been in a friendly spirit. Indeed, Senator Byrd is one of the outstanding statesmen of our time.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues in honoring the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] as he begins today his 30th anniversary of service in the U.S. Senate. I deem it a high privilege and honor to have been able to serve in the Senate, for a little more than 8 years, with this distinguished Virginian, whom I rank among the greatest statesmen the State of Virginia, and this Nation, have produced. I realize, Mr. President, that in making this statement that I am ranking the Senator with America's top alltime statesmen, and this is my intention.

Senator Harry Flood Byrd is one of the most capable and most respected Senators ever to serve in this great body, and he has earned the accolades of his colleagues and millions across this country, despite the fact that he has refused to conform to the party line or any line except the dictates of the conscience of Harry Flood Byrd. I doubt seriously, Mr. President, if there have been many—if any—Senators who, when they announced their intention to retire, ever received more pleas from their colleagues, their fellow countrymen, and from their own States to offer for reelection and continue serving in the U.S. Senate. I recall well in 1958 how the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia was virtually drafted to run for reelection to the Senate by the Virginia Legislature and the Members of this body.

Since that time, when he was reelected by an overwhelming margin of victory, Senator Byrd has continued to serve with distinction, courage, and effectiveness the people of Virginia and the United States of America. He has won respect from friend and foe alike for the strong leadership he has exerted in this country for sound Government financing, as the chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and the Senate Finance Committee. He is also highly regarded for his long record of service as a ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, on which I have the honor to serve with him.

I take great pleasure, Mr. President, in paying tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia. I wish him many more years of capable and dedicated service to his State and Nation. I was most encouraged and pleased to read in U.S. News & World Report this morning that the Senator from Virginia is expected to seek reelection in 1964, as much as he deserves to enjoy a well-earned retirement from his long and illustrious record of public service, which dates back to 1915 when he was elected to the Virginia Senate. I urge that he offer for reelection and that if necessary, he again be publicly drafted to continue providing this country with his wise counsel on fiscal sanity and his effective service as a Member of the greatest deliberative body in the world.

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, recently there has appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Washington Star, and other newspapers, a series of articles entitled "Asia's Frontiers of Freedom." The articles, written by Richard Dudman, are based upon his journey of observation in the southeast Asian region. These articles constitute a job of first-rate and careful reporting on this region, in which we are deeply involved and about which we are inadequately informed. I commend these articles to the attention of the Senate. They are worth reading and studying in connection with our legislative responsibilities. I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 3, 1963]

ASIA'S FRONTIERS OF FREEDOM—U.S. POLICY: PLUSES, MINUSES, AND QUESTIONS—HARD GOING FOR YEARS INDICATED IN FIGHT TO ROLL BACK RED CHINESE

(By Richard Dudman)

(First of a series)

American policy along the rim of China can best be characterized as a holding operation.

It is really not a single policy, but a collection of different policies.

It supports the national leaders—mainly dictators—who say they are for us and against communism. It sometimes helps and sometimes ignores the leaders—also mainly dictators—who call themselves neutrals. It frowns on a third group of dictators, those who side with the Communists.

It guarantees the territory of Chiang Kai-shek, joins with China and the Soviet Union to support a neutral coalition government in Laos but hesitates to give similar assurances when Cambodia requests them. Is spurns altogether a request for diplomatic relations with Outer Mongolia.

The best that officials in Washington can do to give coherence to these varying and sometimes contradictory policies is to say that the United States is supporting and strengthening the "free nations" on China's periphery. They say that inconsistency is inevitable; different situations require different policies.

The aim, in short, is to contain Chinese expansionism, just as the overall postwar policy toward the Soviet Union has been to contain Russian expansionism.

(Some officials object to the term "containment" as being too negative. They say American policy is to "check and roll back" Communist expansion by both the Soviet Union and mainland China.)

A corollary is and has been that we will accept virtually any ally, no matter how repressive or unpopular, so long as he is reliably anti-Communist.

Popular revolts have overthrown two such leaders in recent years—Nuri Said in Iraq and Syngman Rhee, in South Korea, but supposed stability and anticommunism continue to be put before popularity and independence.

Under the Kennedy administration, as under the Eisenhower and Truman administrations, American policy with respect to China is essentially a negative, short-run course of reaction to Chinese initiatives, whether aggression or subversion.

American policy no longer looks for any early collapse of the Communist regime in China. "Only two people expect a collapse—Chiang and Joseph Alsop," runs a current quip that expresses the prevailing view.

Nor does current policy look toward a day when China may be brought into the community of nations and at least go through the motions of seeking world peace.

Positive aspects of American policy consist mainly in helping build the economies of the non-Communist nations bordering China and specifically in helping make India a beacon of hope that will outshine Communist China in Asian eyes.

How well is all this working? And if it does work, is it enough?

To answer these questions, the Post-Dispatch sent a reporter-photographer team on an 11-week tour of southeast Asia and India, to observe, ask questions, and take pictures.

Their conclusions are a number of plusses and minuses and some question marks. They add up to a bleak total—hard going in the next months and years, and no end in sight. Barring a major reappraisal of the American role in Asia, the greatest hope lies in Chinese blunders and misfortunes.

The worst of the present problems is Vietnam. American Armed Forces are actively engaged in the only current shooting war along China's border. They are advising, supporting, and occasionally fighting in a war against Communist-led insurgents trying to overthrow the government of an unpopular but anti-Communist dictator.

Too many blunders or misfortunes on the American and South Vietnamese side could bring a military disaster that would make the abortive Bay of Pigs in Cuba look like a beach party.

Some of the participants and observers in Vietnam maintain the standard view of cautious optimism. Public statements by officials along this line must be discounted, however. Techniques of psychological warfare call for attitudes of confidence and predictions of success, all calculated to create an air of victory and to discourage support for the enemy.

But others express an uneasy feeling that the operation in Vietnam may go the way of the operation in China in 1949, when Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist soldiers sold their American weapons to the Communists and lost China by default.

The U.S. part in the operation involves about 11,000 American troops. They are called advisers, but they are risking their lives alongside combat forces and sometimes take part in combat.

The war is costing the United States roughly $2 million a day—$1 million in military and economic aid to Vietnam and possibly another $1 million in American troops and the arms, trucks, planes, and supplies they are using directly.

Official casualties since January 1, 1961, now stand at 63 dead, including 24 killed in combat, and 90 wounded.

On a purely military level, the operation showed evidences of improvement in recent months. But it has just suffered a stunning setback.

The insurgent Vietcong (short for Vietnamese Communists), had seemed unwilling or unable to mount big offensives like those of a year ago. Moreover, although they still were capturing weapons from Government forces, the rate had slowed; a year ago Government forces were losing twice as many as the insurgents, whereas until recently the numbers had begun running about equal.

Then came the January 2 counterattack by 500 Vietcong in the rice paddies of the southern Mekong Delta. The attackers turned a routine troop-lift operation by the Government into a shambles, shooting down 5 helicopters, and killing 3 Americans and 65 Vietnamese.

Other major battles in the next few days increased the Vietnamese dead to 122 and resulted in the capture of hundreds of prisoners and sizable stocks of arms by the enemy.

Some officials in Washington sought to offset the losses by citing unconfirmed claims by the Government in Saigon that 101 Vietcong had been killed. The figure later was raised to 140. The Washington officials called the episode perhaps a standoff but certainly not a defeat. They said it differed from past enemy actions in that the Vietcong had not initiated the attack but had been forced into a defensive action.

Observers at the scene, however, know how unreliable are the Vietnamese reports of enemy casualties, a hodge-podge of accuracy, wishful thinking and speculation based on such things as blood spots on the ground. What bodies are found and counted as enemy dead are often those of innocent peasants mistaken for Vietcong or killed by accident.

The big battles last month gave new evidence that the fight for Vietnam will be long and difficult, that it must go on for at least another year before we can know whether the operation has even a reasonable chance of success—and that it may be lost entirely.

All involved in the campaign in Vietnam agree that it can be won only by a combination of military and political means. The American advisers say it, American diplomats say it and American aid officials say it. So do the three powerful figures that run the Vietnamese regime—President Ngo Dinh Diem; his brother and political counselor, Ngo Dinh Nhu; and Nhu's outspoken wife.

They are familiar with Mao Tse-tung's doctrine that a guerrilla army moves among the people like a fish swimming through water. The guerrilla depends on the support he gets from the peasants, whether through persuasion or coercion.

President Kennedy was expressing the same thought when, as a Senator in 1954, he said, "I am frankly of the belief that no amount of American military assistance in Indochina can conquer an enemy which is everywhere and at the same time nowhere, 'an enemy of the people' which has the sympathy and covert support of the people."

Breaking the Vietcong's hold on the peasants is the central problem in Vietnam. To solve it, the United States and the Diem regime have joined in a "strategic hamlet" program, in which a widening network of protected settlements is spreading slowly across the country.

Each strategic hamlet is surrounded by a fence of sharpened stakes or barbed wire. Often there are two fences and, between them, a moat filled with poisonous cactus or short spikes to pierce the feet of intruders.

The hamlets' threefold purpose is to protect the peasants from the Vietcong; to separate the Vietcong from its sources of food, weapons and recruits, and to instill loyalty and respect for the government.

American political and military advisers place great importance on the last feature. Their theory is the same as that of British Field Marshall Sir Gerald Templer in the campaign against Communist-led insurgents in Malaya in the 1950's: "This is a battle for the hearts and minds of men."

They want the armed villages to work in two directions in building a new relationship between the people and the government. They want the people to be organized into an effective loyal supporting force that will supply food, manpower and intelligence to the government, instead of to the enemy. They believe this can come about only if the government makes itself the friend and protector of the people and gives them a stake in its management and survival.

Officials of the Vietnamese Government express similar views, but their actions show that they consider the hamlet program a military device first of all and a political device only as a poor second.

A limited land reform program; an American-assisted project to help each family raise a pig; hamlet elections, in which there rarely is an opposition slate; occasional free medical service and agricultural advice from a traveling civic action team—such measures have not yet had important effect in swinging Vietnamese peasantry to the side of President Diem.

A peasant woman in the central highlands spoke for many others when she said: "I've been lucky this month. The Vietcong, didn't seize my rice and neither did the Vietnamese Army."

The truism seems to hold good that the peasant just wants to be let alone.

When the Vietcong, harassed by helicopter raids and rockets and napalm, begins stealing rice in an area, the peasants sometimes move out in a body and take refuge in a new fortified settlement provided by the government with American help and financing.

When the government steps up the draft or uproots families to force them to move into strategic villages, menfolk often disappear into the jungles and paddies to join the Vietcong.

A disturbing fact of the war thus far is that, at the best estimate, the number of armed Vietcong guerrillas remains at about 23,000, even though the government claims a weekly kill of around 500. Recruiting of new guerrillas inside South Vietnam seems to offset losses through casualties.

The tide will have turned when peasants begin stopping army convoys to warn them of an ambush ahead; when young men in large numbers, instead of mainly women and children and old persons, enter the relocation camps, voluntarily; when the women of a raided Vietcong village say, "They went that way," instead of replying with a blank look when asked where the guerrillas fled.

If the tide fails to turn, if the cautious optimism voiced by top officials fails to develop a solid basis, then what?

Some of the men actually engaged in the undeclared war do not share the view expressed by President Kennedy in his state of the Union address that "the spearpoint of aggression has been blunted in Vietnam." They are restless under the present restrictions and would like to see American forces in either full combat status or withdrawn altogether.

There can be no doubt of the firmness of the American commitment. Vice President Richard M. Nixon spoke for a Republican administration in 1953, at an earlier stage in the struggle for Vietnam, when the United States was trying to persuade the French to keep fighting.

"Under no circumstances could negotiations take place that would place people who want independence under bondage," Nixon said. "It is impossible to lay down arms until victory is completely won."

In similar words, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy stated the Kennedy administration's position a year ago in Saigon: "We are going to win in Vietnam. We will remain here until we do win."

Responsible officials have been frank and realistic in warning that the war would be long and bloody.

Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., Chief of Naval Operations, told a congressional committee a year ago: "I would not minimize the fact that we are going to lose helicopters and we will lose airplanes, and we will probably have people killed, Americans killed and wounded and perhaps captured. You cannot provide this type of assistance, which is absolutely essential, without some bloodletting."

But if the war sinks into a stalemate, possibly along the lines of the French experience in Algeria, it is questionable how long the effort would remain acceptable to the American people or to a President who likes to see foreign problems solved promptly, particularly if they carry political disadvantage at home.

No reappraisal of U.S. policy in Vietnam is in sight yet. Grave doubts are expressed by some American officials in Washington and in southeast Asia, but not by those who have real power in the Kennedy administration.

If the situation does eventually reach the point of thorough reappraisal, three other main courses are available:

1. Send in far more American troops and commit them fully to combat.

2. Withdraw support from Diem in hope that a more popular national leader will

emerge and lead the country in a successful independence.

3. Negotiate a settlement, possibly under the Geneva agreement of 1954, which provided for the military neutralization of Vietnam and its eventual reunification.

The first choice seems unlikely at present. Pentagon and State Department officials deny flatly a recent report that American authorities in Saigon have recommended that United States forces take over combat command in Vietnam.

The Defense Department, moreover, has long opposed the large-scale commitment of American combat forces in southeast Asia, except as a last resort. Military difficulties would be formidable. The possibility of triggering World War III would be enormously increased.

Finally, the spectacle of a white man's army fighting Asians in Asia would play into Communist hands by supporting the propaganda line that portrays the United States as an imperialist, neocolonial power that mistreats its own racial minorities at home and tries to subjugate dark-skinned peoples abroad.

Few Americans involved in the Vietnam operation consider Diem an ideal leader, but there is no one in sight who might become an ideal leader to replace him. If Diem should go, his most likely successor would be the army—a military dictatorship along the lines of that in South Korea.

As for negotiated settlements, they have never satisfied those who make American policy; they have been accepted only as a last resort. Korea was negotiated only to end a long and bloody war bogged down in hopeless stalemate. Laos was negotiated only after the humiliating military defeat of the American-backed rightists.

Reluctance to negotiate sometimes means that the United States has only a weak position by the time it reaches the conference table. Some believe that is the only possible eventual outcome of the fighting in Vietnam.

Vietnam and most of the other countries of southeast Asia emerged only recently as independent states in an area that has known little but foreign rule and bitter internal rivalries.

Japanese occupation in World War II spelled the end of colonial rule throughout southeast Asia. French Indochina was among the first of the colonial possessions to break up. Immediately after the Japanese surrender, Ho Chi Minh, heading the Vietminh, a Communist-led Vietnamese nationalist coalition, established a government and declared Vietnam independent.

That touched off the 9-year war with the French, which ended with the Geneva accords of 1954. The Vietminh seemed headed for a complete takeover of Indochina. Communist China, after first being cool to the Vietminh campaign, began supplying encouragement, support, and finally the training and guns that defeated the French at Dien Bien Phu.

With a Communist victory in sight, the Soviet Union moved to shut down the war, partly as leverage to prevent creation of a European Defense Community, partly out of fear of the "massive retaliation" policy of John Foster Dulles, and possibly also to maintain Soviet influence in the area instead of letting it go entirely to the Chinese.

Russia joined Britain and France in pressing for a compromise end of the fighting. As a result of negotiations at Geneva, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia were declared independent and were neutralized militarily. Vietnam was to be divided temporarily, pending national elections in 2 years for a unified government.

The Geneva settlement was signed by 14 nations, including Communist China, North Vietnam, France, and the two conference chairmen, Britain and the Soviet Union. It provided for the withdrawal of Viet Minh and French troops to their own sides of the 17th parallel. It prohibited the entry of additional troops or military equipment except for replacement of what was there already. Neither zone was to join any military alliance or permit any foreign bases on its territory.

Neither the United States nor South Vietnam would sign the accords. The American delegation merely took note of them and stated that the United States would "refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb them."

Both sides have violated the agreements. South Vietnam, with American encouragement, refused to discuss unification elections. North Vietnam has been encouraging and supporting the Vietcong insurgents in the south. U.S. troops and arms have been sent in far beyond the Geneva limits.

The Indian-Canadian-Polish control commission set up to police the agreements has found both sides in violation, although it said North Vietnam started the trouble. The commission's report criticized both parties' refusal to allow commission inspectors free movement.

Communist activity in Laos has been similar to that in South Vietnam. The insurgent Pathet Lao has received help, encouragement, and leadership from the Viet Minh in its efforts to take over the country. The main difference has been that there was no strong Laotian government willing and able to drive out the Communist influences and unify the country.

Until near the end of the Eisenhower administration, U.S. strategy in Laos was to try to make it an anti-Communist bastion, part of a containment line around China and a protection to the regimes in South Vietnam and Thailand.

There were signs of change just before Mr. Kennedy's inauguration. The Pentagon inspired newspaper stories that military intervention would be extremely difficult, that Laos was not worth fighting for, and that Prince Boun Oum, the rightest leader backed by the United States, had little popular support.

An abrupt change came when the rightist forces turned and ran from the Pathet Lao. President Kennedy's choice was complete military defeat, partition, or a neutralist coalition.

Acting out of necessity, the administration entered negotiations to neutralize Laos. Again the Soviet Union cooperated to help close down a civil war that had been virtually won by the Communists. Ironically, the United States now pins its hopes for peace and stability on a neutralist coalition headed by Prince Souvanna Phouma, whom the Central Intelligence Agency had helped oust twice in 5 years.

The result so far, somewhat better than had been expected, is actual partition of the country under a weak tripartite central government. Each faction has its own army and guards its own territory. The three factions have agreed to merge these forces and create a national police force, but the plan has not yet been carried out.

Government leaders in Thailand, like those in South Vietnam, regard the neutralization of Laos as a sellout by the United States.

They asked for help last May, when the fighting in Laos threatened to spill over into Thailand, and President Kennedy sent in 4,000 troops. Six months later, with the crisis past, the Thais asked privately that the troops be withdrawn. They departed last November but left behind their barracks and heavy equipment in readiness for a quick return if necessary.

Two other neutralist countries in the area, Cambodia and Burma, go their own ways, accepting aid from East and West. Their neutralism extends within the Communist bloc, too; they take aid from both China and Russia. They are more preoccupied with their own immediate problems than with some eventual threat of Chinese Communist expansion.

Off to the west, around the arc of China's southern border, the United States has embarked on another commitment that could surpass in cost and effort and lives the commitment in Vietnam. The United States is backing with arms and advice the new Indian determination to contest Chinese territorial claims in the high Himalayan border country.

Asians are watching these various American operations on their continent, as well as the continued backing of Chiang Kai-shek and his dreams of returning to the mainland; the encouragement of Japan's shift away from the extreme pacifism that followed the World War II defeat; the cold-shouldering of Outer Mongolia's overtures for diplomatic relations with the United States, and the adamant insistence on keeping China out of the United Nations.

America's future in Asia will depend partly on American techniques of using its aid and showing its strength. More importantly, it will depend on a correct reading of the Peking-Moscow split, China's motives in attacking India, China's capacity to survive as a nation, North Vietnam's role as a satellite of China or something more nearly approaching Yugoslavia, and the true nature of insurgent movements such as the Vietcong and the Pathet Lao.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 4, 1963]

Asia's Frontiers of Freedom—Communist-Led Vietcong Fighting on Shoestring With Homemade or Captured Guns—Modern Weapons From China Could Change Course of War, in Which 11,000 American Military Men Are Aiding the South Vietnamese

(By Richard Dudman)

(Second of a series)

An American B-26 combat plane shot down a few weeks ago in the Mekong Delta told much about the nature of the undeclared war in Vietnam.

Before American or Vietnamese troops could reach the scene, the insurgent Vietcong had stripped the plane clean of ammunition, radios, first-aid kits, even the clothes off the bodies of four dead American crew members. Most important, the guerrillas got eight 50-caliber machineguns.

From that day on American and Vietnamese intelligence and operations maps have carried small crosses, sometimes along the east coast of the Camau Peninsula, sometimes inland along the many canals through the rice paddies.

The moving crosses mark reports and rumors of where those eight lost guns have been sighted or are believed to be. They are supposed to have been camouflaged and mounted on sampans. Not one has been spotted for sure.

Helicopters must fly higher when they approach places marked with the crosses. Airborne Vietnamese troops give them a wide berth.

The eight captured machineguns are important because they are so much better than most other Vietcong weapons.

A gun of the same caliber, which Americans captured in the delta area, was a handmade weapon, constructed of a length of pipe, a carved teakwood stock and hand-forged firing parts, made to shoot captured shells one at a time.

Chinese automatic weapons are scarce. Mostly the Vietcong carry captured American carbines or rifles, firearms left over from the war with the French, or else one-shot weapons they have made for themselves.

An American helicopter returned recently from a flight over Vietcong territory with a steel crossbow arrow stuck in its fuselage.

One of the most effective antihelicopter weapons is simply a forest of 15-foot stakes planted in any open area where the helicopters are expected to land. These "rotor bumpers" force pilots to slow their landings to avoid damaging their rotors or impaling the thin bellies of their planes on the stakes.

When a ground force with an American adviser marched into upper Phu Yen Province north of Saigon to remove and burn thousands of the poles, Vietcong forces moved in at the other end of the area and began pulling them up and hiding them. As soon as the Government troops left, the guerrillas began replanting the helicopter trap.

The concern over the eight machineguns shows that, with little additional effort, China or North Vietnam could feed enough modern weapons into South Vietnam to change the whole course of the war.

The bloody Vietcong counterattack in the delta last month, in which 5 helicopters were shot down and 65 Vietnamese and 3 Americans were killed, gave further indication of what a few modern guns can do in enemy hands.

The Communist-led Vietcong is fighting on a shoestring. Some American officials speak of massive infiltration of North Vietnamese troops and weapons along the so-called Ho Chi Minh trail through Laos and even far south through Cambodia.

Other sources, well-informed Western officials, discount this infiltration and insist that the Vietcong now gets its new manpower and weapons mainly from inside South Vietnam. Part of the confusion on this point, says a Canadian observer, is that American intelligence on the subject comes mainly from Vietnamese sources, which often exaggerate.

American military experts in Cambodia and Laos say it would take 15 American divisions to seal off the wild, unmarked border between Vietnam and Cambodia. But they say there would be no need to do that, since there is only a little movement back and forth, nothing of military significance.

They deny entirely the Vietnamese claim that an extension of the Ho Chi Minh trail extends down through Cambodia. They assert that this would be needlessly difficult when the Vietcong has easier access through Laos.

It is true that the Vietcong gets much of its direction, many of its leaders and much of its propaganda encouragement from Hanoi, the capital of North Vietnam.

But the insurgents' continuing numerical strength, their material support and their vitality as a guerrilla army come mainly from the South Vietnamese peasantry. They obtain this support partly through terror, partly through ignorant fanaticism that believes charges of "American imperialism," partly through real grievances against the regime in Saigon and partly through the peasants' choice of what they see as the easiest path at the moment between two evil forces.

Guerrilla prisoners of war often say they were forced into the Vietcong by threats against themselves or their families. Some American officials conclude that the Vietcong relies exclusively on terror. But such statements can be self-serving; no prisoner is likely to say he joined the guerrillas because he thought they were on the right side.

It is a dangerous oversimplification to call the Vietcong merely a tool of international communism.

Propaganda statements out of Hanoi and Peking lead some to believe the Vietcong is nothing more than a tool of international communism. It is that, but it is also an expression of Vietnamese nationalism, drawing on indigenous sources for its strength.

The same can be said of Ho Chi Minh, president of Communist North Vietnam. He turned to communism after trying unsuccessfully at the Versailles conference to qualify Vietnam for Woodrow Wilson's principle of self-determination. After World War II, he turned first to the United States and Nationalist China for support for his independence movement.

Even now, he is above all else a Vietnamese nationalist. He maintains a degree of independence of Communist China and the Soviet Union, while siding with them and accepting their aid.

A minority view in the State Department holds that the United States is overlooking a good bet in not making some overture to Ho Chi Minh, some appeal to his Vietnamese nationalism that might override his ties to China and Russia.

In this view, he might be inclined to seek trade and eventually a truly neutral coalition with South Vietnam in hopes of building a strong nation that could be independent of China.

Current American policy, however, runs in the opposite direction and is devoted to wholehearted support of President Ngo Dinh Diem, regardless of his widely conceded shortcomings as a national leader.

The extent of American military involvement is an open secret. No official reports are given out on the number of men and weapons committed to the undeclared war. The secrecy stems from the fiction kept up by both East and West that they are abiding by the Geneva agreement of 1954, which prohibited additional troops or arms in the area.

The United States refused to sign the accords but promised to "refrain from the threat or use of force to disturb them." If it admitted publicly the extent of its aid to South Vietnam, it would be making a case for the Communists to charge violation.

Thus it was only unofficially that spokesmen disclosed that "about 11,000" American troops were in Vietnam. They did not make clear whether or not this figure includes the hundreds or thousands of troops on temporary duty from Okinawa or other American bases in the Far East.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara testified last week, however, that "there is now a total of more than 11,000 U.S. military personnel in Vietnam, providing training, airlift, communications, and advice to Vietnamese forces, and administering the military assistance program."

Officials explained afterward that the American forces are a temporary buildup, needed because the Communists had violated the limitations of the 1954 agreements, and would be withdrawn whenever the Communists withdrew.

No figure is being given out for the total cost of the operation. American military and economic aid to South Vietnam is running at about $1 million a day. How much it costs in addition to pay, feed, transport, supply the American forces is an unanswered question.

"It would be impossible to give a figure even ballparkwise," said a Pentagon spokesman.

The Pentagon approach is to point out that the troops in Vietnam would be getting their salaries, food, and other benefits somewhere else if they were not in Vietnam. By this reasoning, no military operation costs anything but transportation.

A reasonable estimate would be another $1 million a day, including additional operating costs and the sizable losses of planes and other equipment and expenditures of American ammunition.

Confusion also surrounds the precise role of the American forces in Vietnam. Officially they are nothing but "advisers," engage in no combat, shoot only when fired at, and fly armed planes only when accompanied by at least one Vietnamese.

Actually, they frequently are involved in combat. The never-shoot-first rule is broadly interpreted—"You can always say, 'There goes a burst'," explains a realistic American captain.

An official statement, posted at an American helicopter base, allows the same leeway:

"There is no change in the status of American advisers in Vietnam. They remain advisers, not combat troops. They are authorized by the President of the United States to return fire to protect themselves or other Americans when fired upon.

"This decision can only be made by the individual on the scene in light of the immediate and specific circumstances pertaining at a given moment."

The Arvin (short for Army of Vietnam) observer who is supposed to accompany the Americans in the new combat helicopters is often regarded as just so much surplus baggage. He is left behind if he is slow in appearing for a flight, or if Americans need all the seats.

American fliers often find the restrictions an annoyance and believe they are fully justified in blasting an entire village with rockets and machineguns if a man in black pants steps out of a shack and fires at a circling helicopter.

Here is the way an American officer discussed a mission in one of the new HU-18 armed helicopters:

"We took a couple of bursts of automatic weapon fire from a village and then small arms fire opened up from all over. We were ready to shoot back, but we had a general aboard who ordered us not to. He said, 'Don't shoot back—you might hit some innocent women and children'.

"Now, one way to look at it is that maybe 10 Vietcong were in the village and they were the ones doing the shooting and the rest of the villagers shouldn't have to suffer for it.

"But another way to look at it is that if those villagers are harboring 10 Vietcong they aren't really neutral. Besides, if the VC can fire at us without getting something back in return, it sets a bad precedent and makes them think they can get away with anything.

"We called for an air strike and some fixed-wing aircraft went in with rockets and napalm and really clobbered that village.

"The general was sore, of course. He wanted to know who ordered that air strike. We said we didn't know—it just came over the radio, might have been from the Arvin."

Operations from the air are not always so precise. Some fliers say they fire at any group of black-clad figures on the ground if they look suspicious and if a nod of approval can be obtained from an Arvin observer.

A common rule of thumb is that anyone in black pants who is running must be a Vietcong.

"They must be guilty or they wouldn't be running," explained an American officer. "Besides, President Diem has ordered them to stand still when they see a plane."

The disastrous helicopter ambush of January 2 gave new evidence of some basic shortcomings in the Vietnamese operation as a purely military exercise.

American military advisers charge repeatedly that Vietnamese soldiers are poor shots and lack aggressiveness.

"They're short on two ships—leadership and marksmanship," says an American captain, repeating one of the GI gags that sums up a widespread view.

According to a common complaint, Vietnamese soldiers hit the dirt at the first sound of gunfire, instead of advancing and returning the fire according to the antiguerrilla training they have been given.

The advisers also report repeated instances of arriving in helicopters at a "drop zone" with a second group of Vietnamese troops to find the first group busy cooking their lunch and preparing for a siesta instead of chasing the enemy.

"Sometimes I think these people are laughing up their sleeves at us," said a soldier who had seen such incidents. "Maybe we ought to charge them an amusement tax and get back at least part of what this is costing us."

Top officials take a more tolerant view. They point out that habits are hard to change and that the Vietnamese have been fighting one or another enemy for the last 20 years and cannot be expected to have the same sense of urgency as a soldier who has been assigned there for a year and wants to see a quick victory.

They recall the irritable complaints by Americans in World War II that British fighting men always stopped for tea.

Two new weapons, added to the war in the last year, were expected to turn the tide. Helicopters have permitted rapid envelopment of an enemy stronghold, and the tank-like M–113 amphibious personnel carrier, with aluminum armor plate and chain tread, has helped pursue the elusive Vietcong through the canals and rice paddies of the southern delta area.

But the new vehicles add further to the dependence of the Vietnamese army on modern carriers to fight a shadowy enemy who has only his gun and his bag of rice, who travels on foot, and who is willing to crouch for hours under water with leeches clinging to his body, breathing through a bamboo tube, so that he can live to fight again.

An American lieutenant colonel, back from a ground operation in which two companies of Vietnamese had chased a group of Vietcong through the jungle in a rainstorm, said afterward:

"This was only a sweep. You couldn't call it a clear-and-hold operation. We can't hold it, because there are no roads and these people depend on roads.

"Take away the jeeps and trucks and let them fight like the VC, and we could beat them a lot sooner."

The helicopters also were expected to work as a lever to give the American advisers a hand in the planning of operations against the Vietcong. The Americans had rarely been able to get a look at a plan before the mission began.

By providing the transportation, it was thought, the American officers would have something approaching a veto over the grandiose "sweeps" so often employed by the Vietnamese. These drives through Vietcong territory merely harass the enemy and do nothing toward extending the area under reliable government control.

But the expected leverage has not worked. The sweeps continue and the advisers still complain that their advice is often disregarded.

Official comments are more optimistic. After the wave of complaints last month about the Vietnamese army, Gen. Paul D. Harkins, the top U.S. commander in South Vietnam, said anyone who criticized the fighting qualities of the Vietnamese armed forces was "doing a disservice to the thousands of gallant and courageous men who are fighting in the defense of their country."

He said 10,000 South Vietnamese soldiers had been killed in action in the last year and that almost 30,000 dead Vietcong insurgents "attest to their courage."

Official estimates of the military operation are influenced by the needs of psychological warfare. An essential to victory is swinging the peasants to Diem's support. They will swing if they think he is winning. Hence, there is a policy of deliberate optimism.

Important visitors also are given a rosy view of the hamlet defenses by being taken to a few demonstration hamlets, where the peasants have been put through their emergency drill in front of so many visitors and cameras that they no longer want to work but sit around waiting for the gong to sound for the next drill.

In the last few months of 1962, the standard phrase for the war in Vietnam came to be "cautious optimism."

The rash of new mass attacks by the Vietcong has given more reason for caution and less reason for optimism. Victory, even in a purely military sence, is not yet in sight.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, February 5, 1963]

Asia's Frontiers of Freedom—U.S. Efforts in South Vietnam Weighted With Undemocratic, Unpopular Diem Family Rule—Washington Committed Not Only to President but to Clique, Including Brother and Brother's Wife, That Flouts Advice and Resists Change

(By Richard Dudman)

(Third of a series)

Success or failure of American policy in Vietnam depends heavily on the merits versus the shortcomings of President Ngo Dinh Diem and his family-controlled regime.

The United States helped him to power 8 years ago and now finds itself fully committed, with money, arms, and diplomacy, not only to Diem but also to his brother, his brother's wife, and his other relatives whom he has brought into the small ruling group.

Diem and his nepotarchy are anti-Communist, independent, patriotic, courageous, bright, and apparently quite sincere.

They are also undemocratic, self-righteous, unpopular, cunning, clannish, repressive and inclined to label anyone who criticizes them a Communist or a tool of the Communists.

Radio Hanoi is right when it refers to the "Diem clique," although the use of that phrase is said to have been enough to expel an American correspondent from the country.

The Communist mouthpiece in North Vietnam is wrong, however, when it calls the Diem regime a puppet of the United States.

Diem flouts American advice on military strategy and government policy. His sister-in-law, Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu, creates a disruptive major issue by prohibiting Americans and everybody else from dancing in South Vietnam and gibes at "that crazy freedom" in the United States.

The family resists American efforts to ease the dictatorial rule, broaden the base of the government and create a more popular and attractive image that will arouse enthusiasm and loyalty among the Vietnamese.

Some of the Americans on the scene wish the Communist charge were true and that Diem were a puppet, at least to the extent of taking American advice intended to strengthen his chances of survival.

Diem's aloofness from his people stems partly from his own introspective nature, partly from the fact that he and his family are Roman Catholics in a nation that is 90 percent Buddhist.

He has a good excuse not to risk mingling with his people like a Magsaysay in the Philippines, a Bourguiba in Tunisia or a Sihanouk in Cambodia. Army paratroopers revolted and surrounded the palace in an unsuccessful coup in 1960. Two air force pilots bombed the palace last February in an unsuccessful assassination attempt.

On South Vietnam's independence day last October 26, Diem reviewed a military parade from behind police barricades that kept the general public three blocks from the reviewing stand. No one could enter without security clearance and a special pass.

Later in the day, when he attended mass at the main downtown cathedral in Saigon, his security forces threw a similar cordon around that area.

Diem was asked in a recent interview why he avoided his people. He denied doing so. He said his advisers, on the contrary, reproached him for not being careful enough as he traveled through the country and mixed with his people.

One of his aids later supplied a map showing that Diem had gone on 62 major inspection tours, aside from public appearances in the Saigon area, and had visited 24 of South Vietnam's 40 provinces one or more times in the previous year.

On independence day, Diem said, the Government had received a tip that grenades might be thrown. As for the reviewing stand, there was not room for the general public without obstructing the view of the marine parade on the river, and then the navy would have protested.

"You can't satisfy everyone," he said.

Diem likes to recall that his struggle for an independent Vietnam began 30 years ago when he resigned as colonial minister of the interior after the French refused to give the legislative assembly real deliberative powers.

But now that he is in control, he is reluctant to permit much self-government. He appoints all the provincial governors, who have both civil functions and military commands. Provincial advisory councils are made up of elected village representatives, but at least half the local elections are rigged.

Rigging has been charged in national elections also, starting with the referendum in 1955, which made Diem chief of state in place of Emperor Bao Dai. The final count gave Diem an implausible 98.2 percent of the votes cast.

The government's leading non-Communist opponent, Phan Quang Dan, was elected to the national assembly in 1959 over government objections, but he was arrested afterward and the election was annulled. The charges were that he had campaigned too early and had made false promises.

Diem's supporters excuse his heavy reliance on his family on the grounds that the young country has few capable persons and that factional fights make it unsafe to trust outsiders.

A result, however, is that many of the educated persons of Saigon are openly hostile to the Diem regime and complain continually of fixed elections and graft by high officials.

Diem is reluctant to talk about the political prisoners held in his reeducation centers. The reason he gives is that too many others might consider the free room and board attractive and demand admittance.

When pressed, he said 8,000 to 9,000 members of dissident political sects were now being reeducated. Other sources, considered reliable, put the current figure at 15,000.

Diem has balked at making budgetary and currency reforms sought by the United States. A dispute over American accounting of foreign aid funds was left moot rather than settled when United States officials gained access to provincial offices where they could see where the money went and no longer needed formal control.

Military advisers are not yet satisfied with intelligence arrangements, but there have been some improvements. The number of competing intelligence organizations has been reduced from about seven to two or three. The advisers now sometimes can see captured documents promptly, but this is often because the Americans are present at the time.

Against American advice, Diem continues to push ahead with his more extreme measures for population control The United States has withdrawn funds from the "agrovilles," huge collective farms where peasants do forced labor reminiscent of the communes of Red China. American officials also have tried to shelve Operation Sunrise, in which Diem's government uprooted peasants from lands they had held for generations and put them in armed camps for the sake of security and surveillance.

Another disagreement is over the American requirement that aid funds be spent in the United States and that commodities be hauled in American ships.

Diem told the Post-Dispatch an exception should be made for South Vietnam, "so that the increase in aid can be a reality and not just theoretical."

His assistants supplied tables to show that metal products cost from 31 percent to 145 percent more if bought in the United States than if bought in Europe. They said freight charges were often two or three times as much if American ships were used.

Diem argues that Vietnam is at war and on the forefront of the fight against communism and should not be subject to the same rules as other nations receiving American aid.

American officials say the United States did waive the requirements for $12 million worth of spare parts up to December 1961. It stopped the practice to help reduce the American gold outflow.

They point out that the countries from which South Vietnam wants to buy products are also potential aid contributors and should be doing their part to help. They mention Japan and France particularly.

Instead of asking the United States to relax its rules, these officials say, South Vietnam should bring pressure on these other anti-Communist countries to extend grants or credits.

Officials note also that South Vietnam has some foreign exchange of its own and could earn more if it stimulated rice exports, instead of penalizing them as it now does under its multiple exchange rate system. They say it could earn $40 million a year by exporting rice.

For all his difficulties, Diem speaks as if things are going well with the campaign against the Communist-led Vietcong. He estimates that it will take 3 more years, at the present rate, to establish "complete security" in his country.

Diem's restraint and politeness contrast sharply with the outbursts of his sister-in-law, Mme. Ngo Dinh Nhu. Some Americans suspect it is by prearrangement that he speaks in conciliatory tones while she sounds off against American policies and institutions.

She has been promoting her ban on dancing with all the fervor of a Carry Nation, especially where Americans are involved.

Lecturing a U.S. Army audience in the swampy Mekong Delta, she said: "The Americans came here not for dancing but to help us, and they should share our austerity and our way of life. Here in Vietnam we dance only with death."

An experienced American observer believes she has begun to exhibit an almost pathological hostility and hatred for Americans.

Mme. Nhu told the Post-Dispatch she thought there would be no problem of American compliance with the morality law.

"For the minority who really prefer to abandon this front to go to prostitutes or to dance, we shall not miss them and will 'invite them out' of this country with pleasure," she said.

She created another controversial issue by pushing through the National Assembly her "code of the family," a law prohibiting divorce except by Presidential decree and making adultery a prison offense.

She says she meets the press only as a duty, but when duty calls she seems to enjoy lashing back at American criticisms. In a recent interview she said the American press was infiltrated with Communists and referred to "that crazy freedom in your country, where the press refuses any organization of self-correction."

Asked by the Post-Dispatch to explain what she meant by "that crazy freedom" in America, she said she referred to "freedom which hurts and harms, which goes loose and gets lost."

"I would not trust anything unless it had a careful and well-organized system of filtering and self-control, just to make sure that the liberty they want to enjoy is not exploited and turned against the great majority," she said. "I do not have the impression that there is any self-control organization in American information media, for example, to protect it against infiltration."

Mme. Nhu's feminist campaigns may sound trivial, and they arouse much criticism, but they appeal strongly to many Vietnamese women, who take her women's solidarity movement seriously. Criticism and ridicule come mainly from the men.

Some observers believe she already exerts powerful influence by using her women's organization as a political and intelligence network.

She denies she has any real power in the government, but then she goes on to tell anecdotes that prove she is a key figure.

When Laos was neutralized last year, the Diem government was displeased, but at American request refrained from saying so. But Mme. Nhu, in West Berlin at the time, told a press conference the Laotian compromise was a cowardly solution that prepared Laos for legal conquest by the Communists.

She said Diem complained about her remark, but she told him she could not be telephoning him every 5 minutes when she was halfway around the world.

"I said I would ask his advice when I was in this country if it was possible," she said. "But I don't know where he is every minute, and so far I have never asked."

On her return from Europe, she repeated and amplified her view that the United States compromise in Laos was a cowardly mistake.

When rumors connected her with a lottery racket in Saigon, she summoned the minister of the interior and told him to stop the rumors and the racket. He said he could not.

"I know that I am not behind this racket," she said she told him. "Inasmuch as you are permitting it to continue, I can believe only that you are behind it."

The intimidated official took prompt steps.

Another official told her he could not very well sew up people's mouths to stop them from spreading rumors connecting her with a shipping scandal.

"I ordered his security file checked 10 times a day, just to be sure it was not he that was behind the shipping scandal," she said. "He soon found he could stop the rumors."

She related also how she had urged Diem to make a public demand that the United States give South Vietnam a bigger radio transmitter so that his broadcasts would reach more of his people.

"But he said he couldn't bring public pressure on the United States—he didn't want to become a Sihanouk," she recalled.

If the Diem family hates anyone more than the Communists, it is Prince Norodom Sihanouk in neighboring Cambodia. The two countries have been feuding for hundreds of years.

In one of the arguments between Mme. Nhu and President Diem, she recalls telling him: "I'm not a child. I'm an adult. You're neither my father nor my husband."

Mme. Nhu's husband, Ngo Dinh Nhu, is Diem's youngest brother. They live in the palace, where Nhu has his office as political counselor to the President. He also operates an elite political party, the 70,000-member Can Lao, which serves as a secret espionage network for the Diem family.

Nhu is the chief theoretician of the campaign against the Vietcong. He led in adapting the strategic hamlet program to South Vietnam. He sees it as a cooperative system that can mobilize the forces of all the underdeveloped countries to raise standards of living and defeat Communist subversion throughout the world.

Nhu says he has to resist government pressure as well as Communist pressure as he tries to make the hamlet program effective.

"Government officials sometimes are afraid of prompt hamlet elections and a truly secret ballot," he told the Post-Dispatch. "They say a really free election might choose inexperienced persons or even a Communist.

"My answer always has been that we have to take that chance. Even if the wrong man is elected, the danger is limited to one hamlet. The advantages of free elections are nationwide."

American officials confirm that Nhu is one of the few in the Diem government who see the strategic hamlet program as a means of creating loyalty to the government rather than as primarily a control apparatus.

"This is a quiet revolution, but a very deep one," he said. "It aims at reversing the guerrilla warfare and subversion that is on the march throughout the world. To win, the government must have a sincere intention to develop democracy."

Nhu also has developed a military strategy which calls for beating the Communists at their own game. He believes that the United States and South Vietnam are both still limited to counterguerrilla warfare—dependent on heavy equipment and elaborate supply lines.

"My main personal effort is to push them to become pure guerrillas, to make them self-sufficient not only materially but also ideologically."

By adopting guerrilla tactics, Nhu believes the Americans and South Vietnamese can lead the Vietcong to concentrate their forces, abandon guerrilla warfare and become dependent on logistical support. They then will be vulnerable to attack by conventional forces.

There have been signs in the last few weeks that Nhu wants to abandon his behind-the-scenes role and become a political figure in his own right. He has begun making well-publicized speeches to classes for strategic hamlet cadres, and he had himself elected president of the Republican Youth Organization, in an unexpected maneuver that required three other candidates to withdraw hastily. Some observers think Diem may be preparing to retire as an elder statesman in favor of Nhu as president.

Two other brothers are also important in the regime. Ngo Dinh Can lives at Hue, up near the 17th parallel, where he controls central Vietnam through his own secret police organization. Ngo Dinh Thuc is archbishop of the new Roman Catholic cathedral in Hue.

Americans who deal with the Diem nepotarchy agree that it practices something approaching absolute rule. They disagree on what to do about this fact.

Efforts at urging reforms have been mainly unsuccessful. The line now appears to be: Don't press the government too hard, don't expect too much, remember that most governments in southeast Asia are dictatorships, and above all keep in mind that no satisfactory substitute is in sight.

A minority view holds that the Diem government faces greater stresses than other regimes in southeast Asia and cannot afford the luxury of dictatorship. This view looks with dismay at the political side of the struggle and questions whether it will be possible at all to win with Diem.

John Kenneth Galbraith, U.S. Ambassador to India, was not referring to Diem, nor was he speaking for the administration, when he wrote recently about dictatorship, but his comment applies in Vietnam:

"We must not excuse dictatorship on grounds of anticommunism or convenience or the absence of visible alternatives. This is one of the oldest habits, and is certainly the most myopic, of our foreign policy. Its price, as we have now painfully learned, is disaster magnified by postponement."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 6, 1963]

Asia's Frontiers of Freedom—Political Reaction a Problem in the Use of Dirty Tactics To Fight Vietcong Guerrillas—Military Advantage of Poisoning Crops, Fire Bombing Villages Weighed Against Opposition to Government Such Techniques Arouse

(By Richard Dudman)

(Fourth of a series)

Dirty-war tactics being used by the United States and its Vietnamese allies in Southeast Asia pose a dilemma for American policymakers.

The dilemma, clearly recognized but not yet resolved, is how to use the dirty tactics effectively without turning the Vietnamese people against their Government.

Take, for example, Operation Ranch Hand, a system of spraying the land with poison to kill plants that provide the Communist-led guerrillas with food and shelter.

Officials hope it can be effective in helping starve out and flush out the enemy Vietcong. Details are secret, but it is known that converted U.S. Air Force planes sweep across the countryside spraying poison from nozzles along their wings to destroy rice fields around insurgent strongholds and to strip the brush from roadsides where the enemy sometimes hides in ambush.

For technical reasons, the defoliant sprays have not worked very well yet. Correct mixtures and concentrations have not been learned. A plan to burn a path 1 mile wide along the Cambodian border, to keep the enemy from taking refuge in neutral territory, is still on the drawing board.

A troubling question is whether the use of poisonous sprays is a valid technique of warfare. That is, Will the military results be offset by political disadvantages, by resentment over the destruction of food?.

The same dilemma arises over the use of strafing, bombs, rockets, and napalm to destroy peasant villages where groundfire has indicated the presence of guerilla bands.

American flyers seek to justify these attacks by saying that villages deserve retaliation if they give shelter to the enemy. They say there can be no such thing as an innocent bystander in a war that depends ultimately on whether the peasants support the enemy or the Government.

Officials who are carrying on the counterinsurgency campaign give the more sophisticated argument that terror must be met with terror. They say the peasants must be taught that if they give in to the terror of the Vietcong, supplying food, recruits, and information, the punishment from the Government side will be even worse than the Vietcong can impose.

At the same time, this harsh tactic can be interpreted as proving that the fighting in Vietnam is a war by the Vietnamese Government, with American help, against the Vietnamese people.

Similarly, a strict system of population control, proposed by American officials and now being enforced on a pilot basis in Phu Yen Province, has some military justification but also some serious political drawbacks.

After the Post-Dispatch reported details of this plan last October, officials scrapped the original Agency for International Development booklet describing it, had it rewritten to take out objectionable passages, and considered giving the revised version a security classification to keep it from public knowledge.

The plan itself remains unchanged in its essentials. It calls for sweeping restrictions on the movement of persons, food and supplies in an effort to starve out the Viet Cong and separate it from its sources of food, supplies, information and recruits.

Features of the plan include fixed check points, where vehicles and persons are searched by armed inspectors; emergency check points to conduct surprise searches; elaborate accounting of all commodity shipments, and predawn searches of peasant huts or entire villages.

The original plan was published in a booklet titled "Control of Population and Material Movement" by E. H. Adkins Jr., a former Federal Bureau of Investigation agent who now is assigned by AID as public safety adviser to the Vietnamese Government. He adapted it from a system used by the British in suppressing Communist-led insurgents in Malaya in the 1940's and 1950's.

Adkins' outline of the control system aroused bitter disagreement among American officials. One called it insane and said it would only alienate the Vietnamese people.

Some complained that the plan called for police-state methods reminiscent of the Gestapo. They objected particularly to the statement that "arrests, wherever possible, should be made in the early hours of the morning to insure the element of surprise."

Another part of the plan said a check point should be equipped with two machine guns, two shotguns, two carbines and pistols. It said one man should always have a weapon at the ready when a vehicle was halted. The driver should be ordered to "stand facing the vehicle with his hands on the roof or side of the car" while an inspector searched "under the arms, the stomach, inside the thighs and the crotch." Persons halted in this way were to be searched first and questioned afterward.

Advantages and disadvantages of the Adkins plan were described in an introduction by Frank J. Walton, chief of the public safety division of the U.S. operations mission, the AID field office in Saigon.

He described the control of food, medicine, and clothing as a "vital factor in the war against subversion and guerrilla activities" and said such controls in Malaya "were a major factor in starving out, tracing, locating, and bringing to justice the insurgents."

Walton went on to say that the controls would be "extremely bothersome and time-consuming to good citizens." Therefore, he urged a public relations program to explain the need for the program and to tell how it would work. He said the Vietnamese authorities should be trained in "courteous, but firm, handling of the general public."

Officials who objected to passages in the book also found fault with the phrase "population control" and said the American part in the plan should be concealed. They also obtained oral assurances that inspectors would search travelers at gunpoint and force them to lean against the sides of their vehicles only in extreme cases.

AID officials persuaded the Vietnamese to adopt the plan by linking it to the counterinsurgency and strategic hamlet programs.

"The minute you say something is connected with counterinsurgency or strategic hamlets, they go for it right away," an official explained.

Other techniques that have been considered as part of the insurgency campaign are a portable one-man radar, portable heat-sensitive cells to detect hidden Viet Cong, and the use of police dogs to help track down the enemy.

The idea of using dogs was dropped after it was found each animal's canned horsemeat was costing $1.20 a day—three times the pay of a Vietnamese soldier.

Strategic hamlets are at the heart of the campaign against the insurgents. With American help, the Government is working to cover the country with a network of fenced settlements similar to the stockade of American colonial days or the kibbutzim in Israel.

Protection is one feature. An armed civil guard patrols the perimeter at night, and American radios are used if necessary to call for help from other hamlets or regional army units. Armed guards watch over the peasants when they go out to work their rice paddies.

Separation is another feature. Screened peasants are required to live inside the fence. Each family must keep a census book and will soon have to keep its own group photograph; if a member of the family is absent he is presumed to have run off to join or help the Vietcong.

As the hamlets spread across the country, so the theory goes, the Vietcong will be confined to poorer sections and forced to raid the hamlets to seize food and supplies. This is supposed to make the guerrillas the enemies of the people and frustrate their efforts to pose as the friends and saviors of the people.

There are technical difficulties in Vietnam that make it hard to apply the techniques pioneered by the British in Malaya.

In Malaya, the guerrillas were Chinese squatters, easy to distinguish from the Malayan population. In Vietnam, the guerrillas are Vietnamese and can vanish into the general population.

Finally, Malaya has a rubber economy and a food deficit. Starving out the enemy was a practical possibility. Vietnam, however, has a food surplus, and food is grown in most parts of the country. Living off the land is relatively easy for the Viet Cong.

Malaya has no common boundary with a Communist country, whereas cadres, weapons and supplies can be carried into South Vietnam from the north across wild unmarked boundaries, and on coastwise junks.

A more fundamental difficulty in Vietnam is a difference in point of view between the government of Ngo Dinh Diem and the top American advisers on counterinsurgency.

The Vietnamese Government tends to take a limited and mechanical view of the population living and building schools, clinics, and waterworks.

The Vietnamese Government races so fast to build spiked fences, set up new strategic hamlets and control more and more of the population that AID officials cannot keep up with the accompanying tasks of digging wells and providing schooling and medical help.

Americans and Vietnamese disagree also over some sort of amnesty program, opening the way for insurgents to defect and become loyal citizens. The Vietnamese regime tends toward the view that once an enemy always an enemy. It's reeducation centers are more like concentration camps than places for rehabilitation.

This problem involves around 300,000 South Vietnamese. Estimates of the number who are armed regulars range from 20,000 to 30,000. The others support the national liberation front, the Communist-led political apparatus in South Vietnam, to the extent that they are willing to take personal risks in its behalf.

It is this group from which the Vietcong draws its recruits and gets supplies of food, clothing, and intelligence.

As the military phase of the war progresses, there remains the political phase in which these 300,000 must be wooed back into the society.

There is reason to fear that the Diem regime may give no way out to these Vietnamese who have been coaxed or coerced into the insurgent movement. Even worse would be a fraudulent amnesty, persuading insurgents to give themselves up and then invoking harsh punishment and offering no chance of rehabilitation.

Another way of saying all this is that winning the military war is hard enough, but that even while winning the military war we could lose the political war.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch Feb. 7, 1963]

Asia's Frontiers of Freedom—U.S. Policymakers Having Trouble in Supporting Both Asian Allies and Neutralists—Current Efforts Satisfying Neither—SEATO Divisive, Ineffective Against Subversion—Has Pushed Some Nonalined Nations Toward Reds

(By Richard Dudman)

(Fifth of a series)

One of the American dilemmas in Southeast Asia is how to deal with the neutralists.

The problem is how to help the uncommitted neighbors of the countries whose governments have sided with the West against the Chinese-Soviet bloc—in short, how to aid the non-Communists without breaking faith with the anti-Communists.

The Kennedy administration indicates by its actions that it has not settled on a firm policy.

On the one hand, it actively seeks friendship with the neutrals. It helped add to their ranks, in fact, when it backed a neutralist compromise last year to end the civil war in Laos.

W. Averell Harriman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, said recently that the Kennedy administration had adopted a policy somewhat different from that of its predecessor.

Recalling that Burma, Cambodia, and Malaya had been successful in stemming Communist subversion in their countries, Harriman said the administration believed that it was "adequate for a government to be non-Communist (as distinct from anti-Communist) in order for the positive power of its nationalism to preserve its independence and resist subversion."

On the other hand, the administration has continued to support the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, one of the alliances the late John Foster Dulles devised to unite the pro-Western nations and set them apart from the neutrals, whose position he considered immoral.

SEATO has been ineffective against Communist subversion and, worse, has been a devisive force in southeast Asia. It has isolated its own members from the rest of Asia and has pushed some nonalined countries toward the Communist bloc.

The administration has given only a cool reception, moreover, to Cambodia's request for joint East-West protection of its neutrality and territorial integrity along the lines of the agreement covering Laos.

As usual in such cases, the current American policy satisfies no one. The neutrals believe they are receiving second-class treatment. Some of the Western-alined regimes, notably those in Vietnam and Thailand, believe that the United States is rewarding softness toward communism at the expense of the dedicated anti-Communists.

Neutralist sentiment is strong throughout southeast Asia, even in the countries now considered pro-Western. Its sources are centuries of civil war and conquest, generations of colonial rule, devastation, and Japanese occupation in World War II, and, above all, their proximity to China.

The aggressive expansionism of China is not just a Communist phenomenon; it dates back more than 1,000 years. Tribes from China's border regions overran southeast Asia repeatedly. Their decendants now populate much of Burma, Thailand, Laos, and Vietnam.

The rich rice bowl of the Indochinese peninsula always has been a powerful magnet attracting the rulers of China, with its chronic hunger.

Cambodians and Burmese like to point out that they have had little or no trouble with Communist China, whereas the countries that sided with the West, such as South Vietnam, Thailand, and Laos, when it was under its short-lived rightist regimes, had serious problems of Communist insurgency.

There is some basis for this assertion just now, although the Cambodians and Burmese have had to use harsh police measures to suppress their Communist undergrounds. Continued Communist insurgency in Burma was one reason given for a military coup last year that set up the present dictatorship under General Ne Win.

Burma claims an additional benefit from its neutralism. In 1960 Peking abruptly agreed to compromise its claim to a large part of northern Burma. It signed a border agreement, gave Burma an $84 million interest-free loan and promised to buy 350,000 tons of Burmese rice at a premium price.

It seemed not to matter that this conciliatory attitude by the Chinese turned out to be a prelude to tough action along China's frontier with India. Burma still considers the transaction to its advantage.

The Chinese attacks along the Himalayan border last October and November have not spelled out the same lesson to the neutralists of Southeast Asia that they did to the State Department. The American hope and expectation was that these neutralists would see the light and realize that coexistence is an illusion and that Chinese promises cannot be trusted.

Burmese and Cambodian leaders seem to conclude, on the contrary, that India's problem was in not being neutral enough. They profess also to see two sides to the India-China border dispute and to believe it could have been compromised in 1959 and should be compromised now.

A Burmese official recalled a conversation with a Communist-bloc diplomat about the China-India fighting.

"Who is in the right?" the Communist asked.

"I have read the claims by both sides and find them both convincing," the Burmese replied.

"Which did you read more recently?" the Communist asked.

"I read them both at the same time," said the Burmese.

A basic fact in southeast Asia is that most of the people and many of their governments do not regard Communist China as their overriding hazard. They do not share the belief of Chiang Kai-shek and the State Department that the aggressiveness and even the existence of the Communist regime are by far the worst threat to the area.

This fact accounts for the failure of SEATO as well as for the difficulties of American policy generally in southeast Asia.

Laos, the newest of the neutrals, has really never been anything else. American agreement to support a neutral coalition government merely marked the end of an abortive American effort to turn Laos into a bastion of anticommunism.

Through most of the Eisenhower administration, the State Department and the Central Intelligence Agency fought to prevent the very compromise solution that the United States now hopes will succeed.

They tried to block the Geneva accords of 1954, which left Laos a neutral buffer between Thailand and north Vietnam. Through American aid, they built up a huge rightist army intent on suppressing the insurgent Pathet Lao rather than integrating it into Laotian political life.

Twice in 5 years, American agents and dollars were used to help back rightist coups that overthrew neutralist coalitions headed by Prince Souvanna Phouma—the same man on whom the United States now bases its hope for an independent neutralist regime.

The upshot of these American efforts in Laos was to push Souvanna Phouma's neutralists into an alliance with the Pathet Lao and to bring about Soviet intervention in Laos, not as a case of clear-cut aggression but in response to an American-supported effort to overthrow a neutralist government there.

The end came when the huge army of the American-backed Gen. Phoumi Nosavan fled across the Mekong River into Thailand before a limited Pathet Lao attack at Nam Tha.

Considering that background, the new troika-style government with Souvanna Phouma as Premier and Defense Minister, is progressing somewhat better than had been expected. Prince Souphanouvong, the Red Prince, vice premier and minister of economic planning, is a nationalist as well as a Communist and pays at least lipservice to the objective of making the coalition work.

Phoumi Nosavan, as vice premier and minister of finance, ironically, has been the one to visit Moscow, Peiping and Hanoi, returning with promises of economic aid and an attitude described by an acquaintance as euphoric.

The major immediate problem is to unify the armed forces and end the present de facto partition of the country. The 3 factions have agreed to do this, by cutting back the 70,000 rightists, 19,000 Pathet Lao and 12,000 neutralists to 10,000 each. The agreement has yet to be carried out.

The Premier is beginning to achieve the power to move freely through the country. Freedom of movement, by government officials and a unified army, can enforce neutrality in a manner impossible for the three-nation International Control Commission formally charged with that task.

Several thousand Vietminh Communist troops from North Vietnam are said to remain in the country, but they are believed to be staying inactive rather than safeguarding infiltration routes through Laos to South Vietnam.

Cambodia enjoys internal security under a popular ruler, Prince Norodom Sihanouk. He mingles freely with his people and inspires enthusiastic patriotism, unlike the aloof President Ngo Dinh Diem in South Vietnam, Marshal Sarit Thanarat in Thailand and Gen. Ne Win in Burma.

Cambodia's big fear is invasion by Thailand and South Vietnam. They have been encroaching on Cambodian territory from time to time over the last five centuries, and their leaders have been threatening lately to divide Cambodia between them.

Sihanouk, for his part, upsets the State Department and his Asian neighbors by voicing his own version of the "better Red than dead" position. He says he would rather see Cambodia as a satellite of Communist China than to see it destroyed by Thailand or Vietnam.

Under these circumstances, Cambodia takes no sides in the war in Vietnam. It would, indeed, hate to see the country unified under any leadership, for fear the united armies would be turned against Cambodia.

Cambodia gets 40-percent American support for its 30,000-man army (compared to 200,000 regulars in South Vietnam and 8[illegible],000 in Thailand) and recently received 16 American fighter planes. It wants more military aid, either from the West or from the Communists, unless it can have some new political protection against its two neighbors.

Its formal proposal, circulated privately in early December, went to the other 13 nations that took part in the Laos conference. It calls for assurances rather than a guarantee, as Cambodia first proposed and omits the idea of another Geneva conference. It would require signers to send troops if necessary to protect Cambodia against invasion.

This goes considerably further than the Laos pact, which calls merely for consultation.

Communist China said it was prepared to sign immediately. The Soviet Union and France also approved the proposal. The United States, Britain and India so far have withheld substantive comment.

The State Department has been cool to the whole idea because of the strong objections of South Vietnam and Thailand, which insist that they fear aggression from Cambodia. The Department opposed a conference for fear it might be extended to a discussion of some neutralist solution for the war in Vietnam.

Meanwhile, Sihanouk continues to accept economic aid from the United States, the Soviet Union and Red China and to lead his palace volleyball team to victory over the Americans of the Military Assistance Advisory Group, a diplomatic corps team that is mainly Communist and the other groups that take part in his nonalined athletic league.

Watching a game recently, Sihanouk smiled as he noticed the Indian ambassador sitting on the sidelines with the Soviet ambassador on one side of him and the U.S. Ambassador, Philip D. Sprouse, on the other.

"Volleyball is good for friendship and good for health—a good combination," said the prince.

Relations with Cambodia have been impaired by a tendency of some American publications to ridicule the prince by charges in South Vietnam that Cambodia offers privileged sanctuary and an infiltration route for the insurgent Vietcong.

American military observers in Laos and Vietnam deny those charges.

Unlike Cambodia, which tries to be friendly with all the big powers, Burma gives the impression that it distrusts them all.

U.S. Ambassador John S. Everton has seen General Ne Win only three times since last March—when he presented his credentials, when Ne Win protested against a flight by an American plane, and when Everton introduced Senator Mike Mansfield on a visit to Burma.

The Burmese dictator seems to be keeping a tally of his diplomatic appointments with the United States, China, and the Soviet Union and holding them equal.

Burmese distrust of the United States results partly from 10 years of insurgent activity by units of Chiang Kai-shek's Chinese Nationalist Army. The forces were supplied from Formosa by planes flown by former U.S. Air Force pilots.

A captured Nationalist document said the insurgent group was to make trouble between Communist China and Burma with a view to bringing the United States into war against the Peking regime.

The Burmese put these pieces together and concluded that the United States could stop the raids if it wanted to. The Eisenhower administration eventually evacuated some of the Nationalist forces and withdrew American support for those remaining in Burma. After a new flareup, the Kennedy administration airlifted more of the Chinese Nationalist troops out of Burma in 1961.

That prompt action eased the situation, but resentment lingers. Last year Ne Win ordered the Ford and Asia Foundations and the Fulbright educational exchange program to get out of Burma.

The year-old dictatorship has stated its policy in a manifesto, "The Burmese Way to Socialism." The document says the regime will build a Socialist state using indigenous Burmese methods.

It firmly renounces parliamentary democracy which, it says, "has not only failed to serve our social development, but also, due to its very defects, weaknesses and loopholes, its abuses and the absence of a mature public opinion, lost sight of and deviated from the socialist aims."

Ne Win flies about the country continually on missions announced only later. He is working to build up the Burmese economy, partly by its own efforts and partly through economic aid from East and West. He is suppressing gambling and superstition and reforming the educational system to support socialist development.

He avoids contact with his people. When he plays golf, soldiers with machineguns surround the course.

In keeping with his disdain for parliamentary democracy, his government turned submachineguns on demonstrating students at Rangoon University last July. The controlled press said the students first were warned 3 times to disperse and then 15 were killed and 40 wounded.

Students told the Post-Dispatch there was no warning. They said 45 were killed and 100 were wounded.

The next morning, Ne Win's troops returned and dynamited the 34-year-old Student Union Building, cleared away the rubble and left the site vacant. An official statement said the institution had become a haven for underground leaders plotting overthrow of the government.

Ne Win, in one of his rare public speeches, blamed certain political organizations for the incident and promised to "meet sword with sword and spear with spear."

There had been some student resistance to plans to create a new single political party. A draft constitution had been published a few days earlier.

But the students said the point of their demonstration was merely to have the supper hour changed from 6 p.m to 4 p.m. and to obtain permission to stay out of their dormitories until 11 p.m., instead of 8 p.m.

A statement last November by U Sun Tun, dean of students of the university, indicated the intellectual atmosphere of the place under the Ne Win regime. He banned political discussions of any kind on the university campus "to keep the student body from falling prey to scheming politicians as in the past."

The dean said he had halted a discussion of the Berlin and Cuba situations in a meeting that was addressed by a leftist leader, since Burma's neutrality requires it to avoid taking sides in the cold war.

"We cannot allow our students to be biased one way or the other in controversial political issues and the best way to safeguard them from this danger is to ban political discussions on the university campus," he said.

[From the St. Louis Post Dispatch, Feb. 8, 1963]

Asia's Frontiers of Freedom—Political Use of Military Power Rather Than Combat Is Involved in Technique Being Tried by United States—Featured by Concentration of Armaments and Strategic Movement of Troops—Long-Term Program Needed for Self-Determination

(By Richard Dudman)

(Sixth of a series)

A field full of "mothballed" American military equipment in northern Thailand is a reminder that the 4,000 combat troops stationed there for 6 months last year could return on 15 hours' notice.

The field, outside the city of Korat, contains tanks, howitzers, armored cars, heavy trucks, and stocks of structural steel that can be assembled into military bridges.

Nearby are rows of simple but comfortable barracks, wooden floors and frames with screened sides, and thatched awnings that can be let down for protection against the driving monsoon rains. The wood is teak, which lasts a lifetime.

These items are part of the hardware for a new style of warfare being developed by the United States, a style that often involves no fighting, so it is hoped.

Southeast Asia is its chief laboratory, the testing ground for new techniques being devised to deal with the threats and blandishments, the political agitation, the subversion, and the guerrilla fighting that characterize the struggle between the Communist bloc and the American-led Western bloc.

For want of a better phrase, the new American techniques are sometimes lumped together by Washington policymakers as the political use of military power.

Some of the techniques are well known. The troop airlift from Hawaii to Thailand, in fact, was important mainly for its public aspect. It was intended to discourage the Communist-led Pathet Lao from taking over the rest of Laos, to reassure Thailand that the United States stood ready to protect it, and to show the world that the United States was determined that the Lao compromise of 1961 would stick and that the country would in fact become a neutralist buffer state.

The strategy seemed to work. The Pathet Lao advance stopped. The three Laotian princes resumed their stalled negotiations and reached an agreement on a coalition government.

Administration officials claim similar success for an earlier show of force in the same area. They say the Russians and the Chinese were willing to meet at Geneva in 1961 and negotiate for a neutralist coalition in Laos because U.S. Navy units had steam up in full preparation for military intervention.

Other politicomilitary techniques are less publicized.

Nothing is said publicly about the "White Star" teams said to have trained tribesmen in the mountains of Laos to fight the Pathet Lao, and to have undertaken other covert missions in other countries.

Their existence is well known in parts of southeast Asia—there was a brothel in Vientiane for a time called the Etoile Blanche—but their organization and functions are secret. It is not clear whether they work for the Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, or some other agency.

Army special forces units operate in the back country of South Vietnam, organizing mountain tribesmen into counterguerrilla units and working to win the sympathy of the civilian population by providing food, shelter, and medical treatment.

Other specialists work at developing poisonous plants with which to surround strategic hamlets and poisonous sprays to kill underbrush and food crops and deprive enemy guerrillas of hiding places and food supplies.

Still another special technique makes use of the mohlam, a Laotian improvised musical show. American propaganda specialists feed simple pro-Western themes to the mohlam troupes, at the same time keeping the spirit of the earthy folk art form.

A recent problem faced by these psychological warfare specialists was how to persuade the singers to drop a line that ridiculed the "Red Prince," Souphanouvong, questioning his virility in specific terms. Now that he is a member of the neutralist coalition supported by the United States, the line is considered objectionable.

One advantage of these techniques is economy. Conventional warfare, even if it could be effective against an elusive enemy who fights a war that is more political than military, would cost far more.

W. Averell Harriman, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, wrote recently that the decision to aid South Vietnam had the merits of not involving the deployment of American combat forces and not requiring the occupation of foreign territory by U.S. or other Western forces.

"Instead, the North Vietnamese could be engaged by the people of the Republic of

Vietnam, provided they were given technical assistance, training for the defense of their village areas, and increased mobility for their fighting forces," he wrote.

American military action in Laos, on the other hand, Harriman said, would have meant putting large U.S. and SEATO forces into that country, on the border of Communist China, "with unforeseeable consequences in the direction of a major world conflict."

He contended that it would have solved nothing to occupy merely that part of Laos that was in friendly hands.

Some other officials disagreed, believe a moderate-sized American force could have occupied the Lao plains and bottled up the Pathet Lao in the mountains by sealing off five narrow river valleys.

A convenient feature of such techniques, especially troop movements, is that they apply military power without raising the question of a declaration of war, a congressional prerogative under the Constitution.

In the case of sending troops to Thailand, the action had some color of advance congressional approval under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, which had been ratified by the Senate.

This SEATO treaty calls for consultation in case of a threat to the peace of the area, and appropriate action of the members unanimously charge aggression. The unanimity rule was in effect eliminated last year in an agreement between President Kennedy and Thai Premier Sarit Thanarat.

American forces made full use of their 6 months in Thailand to practice operations in rice paddies and jungles in dry and rainy seasons. Their practice marches crisscrossed the country. They subsisted on jungle fruits and parachuted combat rations.

Sometimes the claims of strategic success of such operations turn out to have been exaggerations.

A neutralist source in Laos told the Post-Dispatch the Pathet Lao forces stopped of their own accord last summer, rather than occupy the rest of the country including Vientiane. He said the leftist group did not want the responsibility of feeding the 138,000 inhabitants of the capital.

If that sounds disingenuous, there is more to the story. What the rightists had called a major advance led by 10 Chinese Communist and North Vietnamese battalions turned out to have been only a limited attack. When more facts became known, it appeared that the rightist army had run away and crossed into Thailand without a sign of pursuit.

Moreover, it was in the interests of the Soviet Union in both 1961 and 1962 to halt the fighting in Laos and rely instead on the possibility of an eventual political takeover. Increased fighting would have led to another Korean war. A Communist military victory would have increased Chinese influence in the area at the expense of Soviet influence.

Relations are not always easy with the countries where the United States must carry on this new political warfare. Thailand, for example, was anxious to have the American troops arrive when danger seemed imminent, but it began pressing for their withdrawal when the danger was past.

Thailand, furthermore, became so upset over some increases in military aid to Cambodia last fall that Thai officials began advocating what they called a "Thai-ist" policy that was never fully explained but seemed to hint at a swing toward neutralism.

Reliance on supposedly strongly anti-Communist regimes has had its hazards. In Iraq, a revolution overthrew the government of Nuri Said, and guns that had been supplied by American military aid were used to bombard his residence.

More recently, Pakistan showed its anger over American military aid to India by firing a propaganda barrage and signing a treaty with Communist China.

A fundamental difficulty with the new techniques of political warfare is simply that they are no more than techniques.

Used pragmatically, to combat a particular enemy that has ties with the Communists or to bolster a regime that professes friendship with the West and enmity toward communism, they may have satisfactory short-term effect.

But the future of the long-term struggle in southeast Asia involves historical trends and political forces that have little to do with day-to-day victories and defeats.

Self-determination is a major goal among southeast Asians. In seeking it, they can find much to oppose in both of the world's major power blocs. Communist promises sometimes blind them to communism's actual behavior as a new colonialism. When the West backs unpopular regimes, it recalls Western colonialism and dims current Western professions of freedom.

In South Vietnam, the United States is transplanting the techniques of population movement control that worked for the British, with much effort and a 12-year campaign, in suppressing Communist insurgency in Malaya. What is being overlooked is that victory was assured only when the British granted independence to the federation, thus robbing the Communists of their role as liberators.

Economic progress with an increased standard of living is another important goal among southeast Asians. Here again, Communist theory and Communist leaders promise much. Wherever American aid makes the rich richer, as it often has done in Laos and Vietnam, for example, it supports the Communists' case.

In Latin America, where people have similar overriding hopes, the Kennedy administration has come forth with the Alliance for Progress, which promises generous American help in a cooperative plan for social, political and economic progress and reform.

In southeast Asia, American officials sometimes argue that the threat of communism is too imminent to allow any 10-year plan like the Alliance.

But unless they hold out a positive program that offers hope and self-respect, the best of anti-Communist techniques can fail.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 10, 1963]

Asia's Frontiers of Freedom—Red China Versus Neutral India—Extreme Views of Chinese Aims in Border Fighting Now Seem Exaggerated—Neutralism Encouraged by U.S. Aid—Militant Indian Nationalism May Be Most Important Long-Term Result

(By Richard Dudman)

(Seventh of a series)

No one knows for sure what the Chinese Communists had in mind when they attacked India last fall.

Responsible Indians assumed at the time that they faced a major invasion. They said China was trying to seize the oilfields of Assam in the northeast, planning to humiliate India in the eyes of other Asians, or possibly starting to drive to cut India in two with a thrust all the way to Calcutta and the Bay of Bengal.

American officials also were prepared to believe the worst. Some added the suspicion that China wanted to drive a still deeper wedge between India and Pakistan and isolate Pakistan from the Western alliance.

Some of the Americans favored the elaborate speculation that China was arranging a calculated demonstration of the effectiveness of force to contrast with what it called Soviet softness in agreeing to remove its missiles and missile bases from Cuba.

Those appraisals were widely believed at the time. No independent check was possible. Indian restrictions prevented reporters or military observers from other countries from getting near the fighting.

The extreme estimates now seem to have been seriously overdrawn. The Chinese have halted and pulled back of their own accord. They have proposed negotiations that would leave the border situation much as it was 4 years ago when the shooting started along the Himalayan frontier.

Indian and American officials were not the best sources of unbiased analysis of the crisis. Both had good reason for deliberate or subconscious exaggeration.

The Indians, proud of their army and confident of their superiority over the Chinese, were profoundly embarrassed by the military defeats and by what they regarded as a stab in the back after years of Chinese lip service to the coexistence pact between the two countries.

A normally soft-spoken Indian official shook with anger as he said, "We will not tolerate this humiliation to our country. We will throw out the Chinese if it takes our last drop of blood."

To American officials, the Chinese attack was final proof of the folly of neutralism and the impossibility of doing business with the Communists. The bigger the invasion, it was thought, the better the lesson would stick.

More specifically, a full-scale Chinese invasion could persuade Indian to accept American military aid for the first time; at last get rid of Defense Minister V. K. Krishna Menon, the strongest anti-American voice in India, and possibly even modify its policy of nonalinement in the cold war.

A major invasion of India, moreover, might impress Pakistan with the danger of Chinese aggression and persuade that nation to overcome its fear and hatred of India and not raise objections to an American arms airlift to India.

An American official in Saigon may have had some of these points in mind when he talked with a reporter who had just been assigned to the China-India crisis.

"If you see any Chinese, tell them to keep on coming about 200 miles into India," he said.

It was hardly surprising that officials in New Delhi and Washington insisted that the fighting was far more than a border clash and that China was guilty of unprovoked aggression.

Other observers leaned toward a more prosaic explanation. As they saw it, China's objective was simply to maintain a right of way, to secure its hold on a strategic route from its province of Sinkiang into Tibet.

The current trouble spots are two remote areas where the mountains are the highest in the world and even the passes are 15,000 feet or more above sea level.

In both regions, it was neither the Indians nor the Chinese, but the British, who drew on a map the boundary line now in dispute.

One of the areas is northern Ladakh, in India's northwest, originally part of Tibet and still inhabited by people of Tibetan stock. A Sikh ruler conquered it more than 100 years ago and in turn was conquered by the British.

The frontier was not important until the British came. The area was valuable mainly as a trade route to and from China, and the border was where one side stopped collecting taxes and the other side started.

After the British took over, they joined with the Russians in establishing a boundary commission to fix the frontier and also the interests of the two parties. China was weak at the time, especially in its outlying territories of Sinkiang and Tibet, and was left out of the negoitations.

The Indians inherited what they assumed would remain an uninhabited zone so secure it would require no patrolling. The best route through it, after all, had five passes higher than 16,000 feet, and the highest, the Karakoram, was more than 18,000 feet.

But the Chinese achieved the supposedly impossible in 1956 and 1957 and built a road that soon was carrying tanks and guns and 10-ton military trucks into Tibet. The equipment helped China overrun Tibet in 1959. The highway is called the Aksai Chin Road, after the "white desert" that it crosses.

The Indians first learned of the new Chinese road through a map published in a Chinese newspaper. The Indian Government sent out a survey party in 1958, and the Chinese arrested 15 members of the party on charges of trespassing.

The other region in dispute is the northern part of Assam, in northeastern India. When the British moved into Assam in the 1850's, they were interested chiefly in the rich plain of the Brahmaputra River, not in the high mountains and dense jungles of the northern section. They paid subsidies to the hill tribes living there, peoples related to the Tibetans, on condition they would not raid the flatland Assam villages.

Britain saw a chance to draw a permanent boundary north of Assam when an earlier Chinese occupation of Tibet ended with the overthrow of the Manchu dynasty in 1911. The British and the Tibetans drew a line along the crest of a 20,000-foot range and called it the McMahon line. A Chinese envoy initialed the agreement, but his Government repudiated him. No Chinese Government has since recognized the legality of the McMahon line.

The British never occupied this northern territory. They forgot even to show the McMahon line on maps published by the Survey of India.

When the Indians inherited it, however, they began administering it as a closed territory, guarding the tribes against outside influence and trying to raise their living standards. The Chinese continued to claim the area but did nothing about it.

What brought the dispute to a head was India's belated realization that the Chinese had possession of northern Ladakh. The Indians began contesting the Chinese occupation by sending patrols into and building forts in the same area, approaching but not reaching the Aksai Chin Road.

In 1959, the Chinese stated formally their claim to the area in Ladakh and conceded that the disputed area in the northeast, south of the McMahon line, had not been occupied by the Chinese for some time. They offered to settle the border disagreement through negotiations.

This claim and concession, coming together as they did, were interpreted in India as an offer to give up the Chinese claims in the northeast if India would give up northern Ladakh.

India rejected the proposal and continued to press the Chinese in Ladakh. Last September the Chinese retaliated with strong attacks in both the northwest and northeast.

In Ladakh, the Chinese recaptured areas that the Indians had taken in the previous 3 years. In the northeast, technical disagreements over the precise location of the McMahon line made it difficult to say for sure whether the Chinese had pressed south of the unmarked frontier.

Later Chinese advances, in October, went well south of the McMahon line. The Chinese said the advance was retaliation against an Indian offensive intended to drive them back from positions they already had taken. India had, in fact, announced a new push. It is not clear whether the Chinese reacted to it or anticipated it.

In any event, if it was security of the Aksai Chin road that the Chinese wanted, that is what they have achieved, at least for the present. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru has offered repeatedly to negotiate if the Chinese will withdraw to their positions of last September 8.

That would put a cease-fire line at the point of farthest Indian advance in Ladakh, but it would mean India's giving up the portion around the Aksai Chin road. It would leave the northeast frontier area in India's hands.

Other results, possibly because most of the world considered the engagement a relatively minor border fracas, did not bear out most of the American expectations.

Neutrals of southeast Asia see both sides of the border dispute and are not inclined to put moral blame on the Chinese. This may be due partly to fear of China and partly to a dislike for India that is widespread in the area.

To the neutralists, the lesson, if anything, is that a nation can remain neutral and still receive help from the United States if coexistence breaks down and the Communists attack.

India has continued to hold firmly to its policy of nonalinement, even though Nehru did at last accept the resignation of his old friend Menon.

India did accept American military aid, but only reluctantly and with a minimum of publicity. Indian newspapers were instructed by telegram to publish only brief accounts of the airlift and to omit photographs.

They obeyed almost without exception but complained that Radio Moscow and Radio Peiping carried more news of the American military aid than appeared in the India press.

American arms, which arrived by airlift every 3 hours around the clock, disappeared behind a wall of Indian secrecy. United States and Indian crews unloaded from 20 to 24 tons of cargo from each plane, and trucks or Indian transport planes took the materiel away without further accountability.

One of the reasons Americans desired more publicity on the aid was to reassure Pakistan. The Pakistan press was complaining that the American arms would actually be used to strengthen India's position against Pakistan.

Pakistan's fear and hatred of India remains undiminished today.

In the longer term, China has brought about another result that could prove far more important than merely holding control of a road to Tibet.

The Chinese attack, whatever the rights and wrongs, aroused India to a pitch of militant nationalism unmatched in that nation's 15 years of independence.

At the time of the fighting, Indian students held almost daily demonstrations, marching, shouting slogans, giving blood, and often throwing rocks at the Chinese Embassy and burning effigies of Chou En-lai.

Indians of all classes now stop a visiting American on the street to condemn Chinese treachery and praise American friendship and help in time of need.

Indian businessmen sent out Christmas cards that were color photographs of flag-decked Indian tanks. On the inside, they said, "Season's greetings and all good wishes for a bright and prosperous New Year."

This new Indian unity and determination could be decisive in the continuing rivalry with China for influence among the developing nations of the continent.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 11, 1963]

Asia's Frontiers of Freedom—Bickering Between Nations Complicates Fight Against Reds in Southeastern Asia—Some of the Countries Hate Each Other More Than They Hate Communists—Even American Officials Find Themselves Taking Sides in Disputes

(By Richard Dudman)

(Eighth of a series)

A dispute over a centuries-old border temple has been a major public issue for the last few years in Cambodia and Thailand.

The controversy, legally concluded by the World Court last June but still rankling in both countries, is one of the many local quarrels that complicate the cold war.

Some of them, including the disagreement over the temple, are bigger public issues than the threat of Communist aggression in the countries involved.

These local disputes are not limited to any one part of the world, of course. India and Pakistan have fought bitterly in the past and are ready to fight again over the Kashmir. Hostilities between the Arab States and Israel plague the Middle East. Ecuador and Peru struggle over ownership of the headwaters of the Amazon.

In southeast Asia, the most serious current quarrels are between Cambodia and Thailand and between Cambodia and Vietnam.

The three countries are among the strong, expansionist states that developed on the southeast Asian peninsula about 1,000 years ago, after an earlier millennium in which tribes from the border regions of China had pushed southward and populated much of the area.

Burma invaded Thailand several times in a dispute that lasted four centuries and ended only with British colonization in the 1800's.

Thailand conquered several northern Malayan States, invaded the Khmer (Cambodian) empire and struggled with Vietnam for influence in Laos. The Vietnamese pushed southward and forced the Khmers out of Cochin China, now the southernmost part of Vietnam.

Colonialism brought a suspension of these regional rivalries. The pause lasted until World War II when Japanese occupation marked the end of colonialism in the area. Nationalism had been growing and the rivalries burst forth again after the nations gained independence.

Thailand, having grabbed two Cambodian provinces and part of Laos with Japanese help in World War II, was forced to give them back in 1947, but still wants them. Cambodia continues to claim Cochin China, which is inhabited by some 400,000 Cambodians.

Cambodian leaders charge that both Thailand and South Vietnam have designs on their country. They say, with apparent conviction, that they believe their two neighbors want to split Cambodia at the Mekong River and divide its territory between them.

Each of these nations is proud of a long and glorious history. Their politicians paint pictures of a golden age that was destroyed by colonialism.

It matters little that these histories have only a fragmentary basis, mainly the work of European scholars who removed jungle growth from ancient temples and cities and pieced together series of civilizations that were all but forgotten.

Recent discoveries reinforced dim recollections and the result was a strong sense of history that makes even minor border disputes become issues of national honor and prestige.

So it has been with the trouble over the temple of Preah Vihear. The holy place was founded in the 10th century, but it was neither well known nor particularly important until the Thai occupied it in 1953 and the Cambodians began issuing a series of protests.

Some Thai scoffed that it was not even Buddhist, but Brahman.

By the time the controversy was handed to the World Court in 1959 it had become a fighting matter. Thailand massed troops on the frontier and there was a demonstration in front of the Cambodian Embassy in Saigon.

Thailand stole a march by retaining as its counsel Philip C. Jessup, an international law expert who has held important State Department assignments. Cambodia responded, to the Thai chagrin, by retaining former Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

When Jessup later was named a judge of the World Court, some Thai thought they saw a dark plot. They thought the United States had decided to fix the case in Cambodia's favor in one move by taking away Thailand's lawyer and bribing him with an appointment to the Court.

The Thai, nevertheless, became confident they would win. On the day of their final argument, three elephants were seen walking together in Thailand and the sun broke through the clouds at The Hague. These were considered good omens.

When the Court found in favor of Cambodia, the news was a profound shock to Thailand. There were more riots in front of the Cambodian Embassy, encouraged or at least permitted by the Thai Government.

Hard feeling continued even after Thailand agreed reluctantly 3 weeks later to abide by the Court's decision. Officials in Bangkok speculated that Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia would not be able to visit the shrine from the Cambodian side, because the only access was up some broken steps on the face of a cliff. One of the steps was said to be 9 feet high.

There was speculation that Sihanouk would go to his temple by helicopter. There were Thai threats to shoot any Cambodians who dared set foot on Thai soil.

Sihanouk eventually visited the temple without serious incident, but the exchanges of threats continue.

One of the more colorful attacks on Cambodia was an editorial blast in a Bangkok newspaper. The paper recalled that several hundred years ago a Thai king had cut off the head (the highest, most sacred part of the body) of a Cambodian king and had used the blood to wash his feet (the lowest, most profane part of the body). The paper said the Thai were ready to do the same thing again.

For a time in 1960 the two countries had an agreement not to threaten or insult each other, but the truce broke down in a series of bitter exchanges that culminated in what the Cambodians considered an intolerable insult.

Sihanouk had stopped off in Tokyo and had been interviewed by the Japanese press. He was asked whether he was worried about Communist activities in Laos. He replied that he was not worried as much about the Communists as he was by the threats of Thailand and Vietnam against Cambodia.

Through a misunderstanding or poor translation, Marshal Sarit Thanarat, Thailand's premier, took the remark as a threat against Thailand.

He promptly issued a statement saying that "for Prince Sihanouk to threaten Thailand is like a pig threatening a lion.

Sihanouk suspended diplomatic relations.

When the United States blockaded Cuba and threatened invasion, many Thai concluded that meant it would be all right for Thailand to do the same to Cambodia.

Cambodia's relations with Vietnam have been just as bad. Both sides have charged repeatedly that the other side sent armed raiding parties across the border.

Newspapers of both countries carry frequent accounts of water buffalo rustlers slipping across the border and driving the cattle off to the other side.

The South Vietnamese have made the serious charge that Cambodian territory is being used as a sanctuary by Vietcong forces, as the Communist-led guerrillas flee from Vietnamese army attacks. They have charged also that North Vietnam sends arms and reinforcements through Cambodian territory into South Vietnam.

It is generally agreed that there are some minor incursions of the wild, unmarked border. But investigations of the border area have failed to disclose any Vietcong bases or organized infiltration traffic on Cambodian territory.

These bitter local controversies are facts of life in southeast Asia, as in other parts of the world. They raise the question of what responsibility the United States has for military assistance it gives countries in the area. Must the United States guarantee that Cambodia will not use its American arms to threaten Thailand and South Vietnam, or that Thailand and South Vietnam will not use their American arms against Cambodia?

A related question is how to keep American officials from taking sides in the disputes. Some of the diplomatic and aid officials are as vehement as the Asians with whom they work in denouncing the other Asians across the border.

Two old friends, one stationed in Saigon and the other in Phnom Penh, the capital of Cambodia, used to see eye to eye on most public issues. When they see each other now, they find themselves arguing continually about whether South Vietnam or Cambodia is in the right in the quarrels between them.

An obvious solution to this second question is to shift the Americans around more and more often to prevent them from developing "localities."

The first question is more difficult. The plain fact is that some of the countries in southeast Asia hate each other more than they hate the Communists.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 12, 1963]

Asia's Frontiers of Freedom—Trend Toward Nationalism in Japan; Pacifism Declining, Trade With Reds Increasing—Growing Unwillingness To Follow U.S. Lead in Policy of Containing China Is Expected To Result From Economic Pressures, National Pride

(By Richard Dudman)

(Ninth of a series)

A new nationalism is stirring in Japan. It shows itself in such diverse ways as a modest rebirth of militarism and plans for increased trade with Communist Russia and China.

The new tendency toward militarism is nothing spectacular yet. It is hardly comparable to the public interest in the military to be found in most Western countries.

What makes it significant is that it represents a sharp change from the extreme and emotional pacifism that swept the country after its defeat in World War II.

Japanese children now are beginning once more to play with guns. Most Japanese parents forbade such toys in the earlier postwar years.

Children swarmed to a military exhibition sponsored last year outside Tokyo by a Japanese newspaper. They climbed enthusiastically on American guns and tanks lent for the occasion, just as American children admire weapons at a military show in the United States.

The Government appears to encourage the trend. It sponsors a serial show on the Nippon educational television station, depicting the lives of soldiers in glorifying terms.

Applications for the Japanese military academy are up, running 25 for every acceptance. In previous years even the free bachelor's degree offered by the institution had not proved sufficient lure to outweigh the strong pacifist inclinations of most Japanese.

Kokushikan University in Tokyo, a conservative school, has reinstuted a feudalistic form of dueling called kendo, which was prohibited during the occupation.

The 45-year-old institution expects to increase its enrollment from the present 3,000 to 10,000 in the next 5 years. But it still is not comparable to the big universities of Japan, where Zengakuren, the leftist student federation, is a strong influence.

"We have no Zengakuren, no Communists, no pacifists—just patriots," a sociology professor said.

In practicing kendo, students face each other in pairs, armed with long bamboo sticks and wearing black plastic chest protectors, heavy gloves, baggy dark blue trousers, and helmets of heavy steel wire.

At the instructor's signal, the duelists begin howling in mock frenzy and whack each other with all their might. The beating of a drum halts each round and the instructor decides winners on points.

The sociology professor explained that the sport builds strength of muscle and character.

"We lost the war because you were too strong," he said.

The trend to militarism is limited mainly to children and young men. Middle aged and older men, as well as most women, seem to remain strongly pacifist.

Japan is building its own natural uranium reactor and could eventually produce its own atomic bombs. But any talk of bombs or plutonium, their raw material, is still as taboo as ever.

Strong pressure has developed for a revision of article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, which renounces war, but there is still strong resistance to any change in this provision.

Article 9, virtually dictated by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, says:

"Aspiring sincerely to an international peace based on justice and order, the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as a means of settling international disputes.

"In order to accomplish the aim of the preceding paragraph, land, sea, and air forces, as well as other war potential, will never be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized."

Japan has long since circumvented article 9. With the encouragement and help of the United States, it began rearming near the start of the Korean war. Japan called its new armed forces "self-defense forces," rather than an army, navy, and air force.

These now number 171,500 men in ground units, 32,000 in sea units, and 38,500 in air units. The 242,000 men operate nearly 1,000 tanks and motorized guns, 200 ships and 1,100 planes.

Proposed revision of article 9 is one of several possible constitutional changes being studied by a committee of experts named in 1957. The group has taken testimony from hundreds of witnesses and has presented 19 interim reports. Its final report is due sometime this year.

The movement for increased trade with Communist China finds support in the Japanese tradition of close relations with the mainland. In 1928, 26 percent of Japan's exports went to China. In 1961, the fraction was only 0.4 percent—an amount only one-tenth of Japan's trade with Formosa.

Trade grew for a few years starting in 1955 under a government-to-government trade agreement. But the Chinese denounced the agreement in 1958 after rightists tore down a Chinese flag, at a trade fair in Nagasaki.

Behind that incident was a dispute over whether Japan would permit the flag to fly as a right and thus take a step toward recognition of Communist China. The Chinese since then have generally insisted that improvements in trade relations be accompanied by improvements in political relations.

Other obstacles to a resumption of the trade with the mainland are the strong opposition of Chiang Kai-shek's government in Formosa and of the United States. Japanese leaders fear that both will retaliate if Japan disregards their objections.

New negotiations began last summer, when Premier Chou En-lai sent an emissary to speak with Kenzo Matsumura, an elder statesman of the ruling Liberal-Democratic Party. He is sometimes known as the Cyrus Eaton of Japan.

At Chou's invitation, Matsumura went to China for 2 weeks last September and came back with an enthusiastic report that China was prepared to trade salt, soybeans, corn, and iron ore for Japanese fertilizer, urgently needed to increase China's agricultural output.

Matsumura's understanding was that Japan could enter into expanded trade with China without becoming involved in any political conditions. Some Japanese told themselves such an arrangement would be acceptable to the United States. They had read into some congressional reports and some campaign statements by President Kennedy the unjustified conclusion that the United States was preparing to recognize Communist China and adopt a "two Chinas" policy.

Tatsunosuke Takasaki, former minister of trade and now chairman of the Dai-Nippon Fishery Association, thereupon went to work to organize a mission to China.

The steel and fertilizer industries were reluctant to support the move. Each had an eye on Washington and the fertilizer industry was fearful of a boycott by its big customers in Formosa and South Korea.

Takasaki talked target figures with the Chinese, leaving details and credit arrangements for later discussions. Steel and fertilizer representatives watched with interest and are said now to be swinging toward participation.

These talks have been entirely private, on the Japanese side. Eventually, however, they will require some sort of government blessing, since they involve the biggest Japanese industries.

Meanwhile, two other groups, the Japan-China Trade Promotion Association and the Japan International Trade Promotion Association, have signed a trade protocol in Peiping, calling for increased trade between the two countries.

Reflecting a leftist slant of the two Japanese organizations, the protocol recognized China's three political principles governing commerce—Japan must avoid enmity toward China, will take no part in the "U.S. plot" of creating "two Chinas," and will not impede the development of normal relations between the two countries.

These organizations are said to represent a number of smaller commercial firms that want trade with China and have no objections to political entanglements, as well as some dummy firms that actually are subsidiaries of large, well-known companies that dare not seek such trade openly.

Economic pressures are combining with an independent pride of country to lead Japan to take its own place in the affairs of Asia and the world. The outlook is for Japan to be gradually less willing to follow America's lead in its policy of isolating and containing Communist China.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Feb. 13, 1963]

Asia's Frontiers of Freedom—China Apparently in Upturn After Miscalculating Great Leap Forward in Its Economy—Much of American Wishful Thinking About Communist Chinese Found To Be Based on Myths—Wall of Ignorance Maintained by Both Countries

(By Richard Dudman)

(Last of a series)

Much American thinking about Communist China is based on myths repeated so often that they have been widely accepted as true.

These are:

That the Chinese are suffering from widespread starvation.

That Chinese industrialization failed because Communist organization, particularly in the communes, was ruthless and unpopular.

That dissatisfaction is so general that internal revolt is a very real possibility and could be touched off by an invasion from Formosa.

These beliefs, together with China's bitter split with the Soviet Union over strategy against the West, give basis for a feeling that the problem of China, distasteful as it is just now, will eventually solve itself.

A further easy assumption holds that when the Communist regime finally collapses the Chinese people will return with relief to their traditional friendship with the United States.

Information gathered by a Post-Dispatch reporter-photographer team touring the southern rim of China indicates that these widely held beliefs and expectations are false, a compound of exaggeration, wishful thinking, misinformation, and ignorance about what is going on in the biggest country in the world with its 700 million population.

The ignorance is due mainly to an artificial wall erected between the United States and China after the Chinese Communists gained control in 1949. Both countries work at keeping the wall nearly impenetrable. With few exceptions, both stand in the way of Americans who would like to visit the Chinese mainland.

Almost all American passports bear the printed prohibition: "This passport is not valid for travel to or in Communist-controlled portions of China, Korea, Vietnam, or to or in Albania."

The principal exceptions are for 34 news organizations that the State Department has judged to be qualified and six persons who have visited relatives held prisoner in China.

Edgar Snow, one of the few Americans to obtain a visa to enter Communist China, visited the country in 1960 and related his experiences in the book "The Other Side of the River," published last November. He said the State Department authorized the trip only after he became a correspondent for Look magazine, on the approved list. China, on the other hand, admitted him only as a writer and not as a news correspondent.

Barred from entering the country, an American investigator must resort to the data and analyses of the many China watchers operating in Hong Kong, Japan, Burma, India, and other countries around China's periphery. Some of these observers are working for the United States or other governments, some are supported by churches or other private institutions, some are self-supported through the sale of newsletters or intelligence reports.

Another source is the testimony of refugees who come out of China. Still another is the testimony of non-American businessmen, diplomats, and journalists who have traveled in China recently.

These sources must be considered in terms of their possible bias, and their information must be judged for plausibility and consistency.

What follows is a judgment on this basis of China's problems and prospects.

As for starvation, it does not exist on any large scale in China today. There is and always has been considerable hunger and some malnutrition. Imports of more than 10 million tons of grain from non-Communist countries in the last 2 years have been a heavy financial burden on the government. But the reports of mass starvation in recent years do not stand up as showing a repetition of the famines that have plagued China from time to time through the centuries.

One of the sources of starvation reports is Father Luis Ruiz, a Jesuit priest at the Portuguese colony of Macao, a peninsula and some islands on the China coast near Hong Kong. He greets several hundred refugees a month, feeding and housing those who cannot arrange to be smuggled to Hong Kong. He hears their stories and sees their hunger and judges that starvation in China is widespread.

He showed the Post-Dispatch team five farmers in their early twenties, who had arrived from China 6 days earlier. They were bright eyed, strong muscled, and huskily built.

"They were starving when they arrived," said Father Ruiz. "We fattened them up."

A British physician, after examining a group of 200 newly arrived refugees, observed that they were hungry from a 5-day walk to freedom but concluded: "These people are not suffering from malnutrition."

He explained that malnutrition has specific symptoms—swollen stomachs and ankles and loss of hair. He said he saw no such signs.

China's economic breakdown, which began in 1958, is more complicated than the simple explanation that the people are starving and resentful.

The trouble came after a first 5-year plan, 1953 through 1957, that American experts concede worked out rather well. Agricultural goals were modest, providing for a slight increase over population growth, and considerable progress was made in industrialization.

Suddenly, in 1957 and 1958, the Chinese stepped up the pace enormously in the "great leap forward." They set production goals that seemed astronomical and consolidated collective farms into rural communes of 3,000 to 4,000 persons. City communes engaged in such projects as building the famous backyard iron hearths, later dismantled and converted into larger and more practical blast furnaces.

American observers say the Chinese seemed to have gone mad, through a combination of national cockiness and an unrealistic ambition to overtake the Soviet Union and the United States as a great industrial power.

Some other observers think the scheme made sense in terms of China's needs and resources, notably its tremendous population, but foundered on two technical difficulties.

One was that the commune idea spread too fast for efficient organization. When it began in Honan Province, it caught public imagination as a quick jump to pure communism—from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs. It sounded like the ultimate welfare state. The communes spread like a flood through the country.

The other difficulty was statistical. Local bureaucrats exaggerated their production

figures to make a good showing against their high quotas. The cumulated errors resulted in the impossible 1958 harvest total announced as 375 million tons.

Believing its own figures, the Communist regime speeded up its industrialization program building new plants to be financed, it thought, out of surplus agricultural production. Farm acreage was cut back, in fact, to prevent anticipated overproduction.

The crash came late in 1960. The Chinese Government admitted the 1958 harvest had been overestimated and cut back the official total by one-third, to 250 million. Outside observers think the 1958 harvest was actually about 190 million to 200 million tons. That total still would have been the biggest harvest in Chinese history, but it was not enough to supply China's own needs, much less finance a construction boom.

Floods and droughts, combined with bad management based on bad statistics, caused poor harvests in 1959, 1960, and 1961.

The Government, in a drastic remedy, halted industrialization so suddenly that a foreign observer said the country looked like Pompeii after the eruption of Mount Vesuvius. Erection of buildings was halted at every stage of construction, as if by a blanket order from Peiping.

Industrial capacity was cut more than 90 percent, and 20 to 30 million persons were taken off industrial jobs and sent back to the farms. The rural communes were split into smaller units, and farmers were permitted to operate private plots once more.

Another step was to resume a national birth control program, interrupted when the "great leap forward" began and the theory was that the huge and growing population was China's single greatest resource.

Outside observers now estimate the 1962 harvest at around 200 million tons, about the 1957 level with allowance for the population increase since then. Grain purchases from the West are continuing.

Steel production was still dropping in 1962. From a peak of 18 million tons in 1960, it sank below 10 million tons. But these figures must be compared to the totals of 2,800,000 in 1955 and 5,300,000 in 1957.

Looking back at the economic difficulties, the trouble can be likened to the flight of an airplane. Managers of the economy overestimated its forward thrust, tried to climb too fast, and went into a stall.

As in aeronautics, an economy can come out of a stall without crashing if it has reached a sufficient altitude.

In China's case, the upturn seems to have occurred in time. The economy is making a gradual recovery. The big question now is whether China will try to resume the "great leap forward" and, if it does, whether it can do so with rational management. Technical publications have been preaching respect for honest statistics, suggesting that the Government has learned its lesson.

Estimates of morale inside China come largely from those who interview refugees. The significance of this testimony is not that the refugees are dissatisfied—that much is to be expected from those who are fleeing—but in two other comments frequently heard.

One is that they are proud of their country's new strength. They think they had to work too hard and had too little to eat, but younger refugees often credit the Communist regime with making China a powerful nation, able to command the fear and respect of the rest of the world and even stand off the armed might of the United States, in the Korean war. Even young Roman Catholic priests coming out of China have expressed pride in this new national strength.

The other significant refugee view is that the great majority, while ready to break with the Communist regime, has no desire to go to Formosa and come under the rule of Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Nationalists. Energetic recruiting campaigns by the Nationalists among the refugees in Hong Kong have had meager success.

The surge of refugees last May, when the Communists inexplicably lowered the bars for a month and let 60,000 cross into Hong Kong, proved to some China-watchers that the Government had lost control for a time. To others, the important fact was that the Communists could reimpose control without stirring mass violence among those who hoped to escape.

Internal collapse, at this point, seems out of the question. Some of the China-watchers, however, cling to the hope that Chiang can and will trigger a successful counterrevolution by undertaking a full-scale invasion.

"If the Nationalists could establish a bridgehead in Shanghai," said one of these China hands, not an American, "it would be a place where the Chinese could run to. This would require U.S. assistance, of course. The bridgehead would be a magnet for a stream of defectors. The regime eventually would fall."

This speculation leaves out of account a widespread propaganda-fostered hatred of Chiang and the United States. Chiang's threats of an invasion, together with small-scale landing attempts last summer, mean to many Chinese that the only alternative to Communist rule is a new dictatorship under Chiang.

In the eyes of China's leaders, the United States is an implacable enemy that pushed up to China's border in the Korean war and continues now to encourage Chiang in his dream of returning victoriously to the mainland. Some qualified Western observers in China have found this view widely held among the Chinese people.

If the People's Republic of China is here to stay, what of the future?

Historically, China is expansionist, and the rich rice-growing country of southeast Asia is a natural field for conquest. China's announced strategy is to encourage "wars of liberation" to overthrow the "bourgeois nationalist" regimes in the region.

But Red China's record of expansionism should not be exaggerated. China entered the Korean war only when American advances to the Yalu River threatened China's internal security and seemed on the point of proving to the rest of Asia that China could not save its one true satellite, North Korea, from extinction.

Along the Indian border, China has pursued strictly limited objectives, reestablishing its hold on disputed territory in the west and withdrawing voluntarily after administering a humiliating defeat to India in the east.

In Vietnam, it would be a simple matter for China to step up the scale of the guerrilla war against the South Vietnamese regime and its American support. So far, China has accepted a leisurely timetable, relying mainly on encouragement through propaganda blasts against the Diem government and the "American imperialists."

In the rest of southeast Asia, China has been practicing peaceful coexistence where it can, competing economically with the aid programs of the Soviet Union and the United States. The common American picture of Communist China as a threatening monster about to gobble up southeast Asia is not shared by most southeast Asians.

The bitter dispute between Communist China and the Soviet Union breaks the pattern of a monolithic Communist bloc following a consistent policy in southeast Asia, just as differences among Western powers had long since broken the pattern of a unified West building a wall of containment around Communist China.

American policy in southeast Asia is still centered on a constant threat of military action against Communist China by the American-backed nationalist forces on Formosa, followed, so it is hoped, by an internal breakdown. Other national regimes in the area are still judged mainly on the basis of their anticommunism rather than their acceptance at home as expressing the national self-interests of their own countries.

But the overriding aspirations of the peoples of southeast Asia is not the downfall of Communist China or even the promotion of democracy and free enterprise. Nor is it the downfall of Western imperialism, as the Communists would have them believe.

They aspire, instead, to their own self-determination, their own political and economic independence. Big power policies, whether by East or West, that neglect this basic fact must fail in the long run.

TRIBUTE TO VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to state to the Vice President that I am profoundly delighted, as I am sure every other Member of the Senate is, by his constantly being in attendance in presiding over the deliberations of this body. It has been a source of strength to me to see the Vice President here day after day, especially in view of the length of time he is assigning to this important task.

It gives a Senator comfort and strength to see the Vice President listening attentively to what is going on.

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have long believed that the Congress should provide a code of ethics for its Members and employees, and that the public good requires it. Accordingly, together with my colleague [Mr. KEATING], I have submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, to establish a Joint Committee on Ethics, which would develop and recommend such a comprehensive code for congressional adoption, and I have introduced S. 281, to make congressional communications with Federal regulatory agencies matters of public record.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 provides an interim code of ethics for the guidance of Members and employees during the period prior to the adoption of a comprehensive code. One of its requirements—which comes from the New York State Code—is that Members "having a financial interest, direct or indirect, having a value of $10,000 or more, in any activity which is subject to the jurisdiction of a regulatory agency" make a matter of public record the nature of such interest, by filing a statement with the Comptroller General.

Since Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 has not yet been agreed to, the Comptroller General does not have authority to receive and maintain such lists. However, in order to demonstrate my concern with the matter, I am now making a statement for the RECORD. As of this date, my holdings of the described nature are as follows:

As trustee of a family trust, I have an indirect interest in the following companies or their subsidiaries or affiliates; these are normal investments in publicly owned corporations, with no element of control alone or in combination with others: American & Foreign Securities Corp., Cities Service Corp., Criterion Insurance Co., Government Employees Corp., Government Employees Financial Corp., Government Employees Insurance Co., Government Employees Life Insurance Co., Sinclair Oil & Gas Co., South Carolina Electric & Gas Co., Southern Co., and Transamerica Corp. of Delaware.

UNITED NATIONS BONDS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it will be recalled that the matter of United Nations bonds was a hotly controverted issue in the Senate. Last September the Congress passed legislation by which the United States agreed to purchase the United Nations bonds on a matching basis—a formula which I am honored to say I had a part in drafting. Therefore, Mr. President, it is a matter of great satisfaction to me to be able to state that a recent United Nations report shows that so far a total of 58 nations have purchased or signified their intention to buy United Nations bonds, and that the total amount pledged or paid is now more than $137 million.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a United Nations press release listing the nations, the amounts, and the dates of the purchases of United Nations bonds, paid or pledged, to February 15, 1963.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED NATIONS BONDS

On February 14, India and the Netherlands purchased United Nations bonds to the value of U.S. $2 million and U.S. $1,333,000 respectively, bringing to $124,288,680 the total actual payments made for the purchase of such bonds.

India became the 40th country to buy United Nations bonds, while the Netherlands fulfilled its pledge of April 4, 1962, to buy $2,020,000 worth of bonds. The Netherlands had made an earlier purchase of $687,000 on October 19, 1962.

A total of 58 governments have either bought United Nations bonds or announced their intention to do so, and the total amount paid or pledged, including the matching increase by the United States, is $137,670,937. Details of these purchases and pledges are as follows:

Country	Amount in U.S. dollars	Date of purchase
Purchases:		
Afghanistan	25,000	Oct. 3, 1962
Australia	4,000,000	June 15, 1962
Burma	100,000	Nov. 30, 1962
Cameroon	9,569	Oct. 24, 1962
Canada	6,240,000	Oct. 8, 1962
Ceylon	25,000	Oct. 23, 1962
China	500,000	Dec. 17, 1962
Denmark	2,500,000	Mar. 23, 1962
Federal Republic of Germany	10,000,000	Oct. 15, 1962
Federation of Malaya	340,000	July 25, 1962
Finland	1,480,000	Mar. 8, 1962
Greece	10,000	Aug. 23, 1962
Honduras	10,000	Jan. 3, 1963
Iceland	80,000	Mar. 27, 1962
India	2,000,000	Feb. 14, 1963
Indonesia	200,000	Aug. 1, 1962
Ireland	300,000	June 13, 1962
Israel	200,000	May 1, 1962
Italy	8,960,000	May 2, 1962
Ivory Coast	60,000	Oct. 2, 1962
Jordan	25,000	July 6, 1962
Korea, Republic of	400,000	Dec. 7, 1962
Kuwait	1,000,000	July 18, 1962
Lebanon	8,271	Nov. 15, 1962
Luxembourg	100,000	Dec. 27, 1962
Purchases—Continued		
Morocco	280,000	Dec. 6, 1962
Netherlands	2,020,000	Oct. 19, 1962 Feb. 14, 1963
New Zealand	500,000	June 15, 1962
Nigeria	1,000,000	Dec. 18, 1962
Norway	1,800,000	Mar. 8, 1962
Sierra Leone	28,000	Sept. 24, 1962
Sudan	50,000	May 18, 1962
Sweden	5,800,000	May 18, 1962
Switzerland	1,900,000	Nov. 15, 1962
Thailand	160,000	Nov. 15, 1962
Togo	10,000	May 29, 1962
Tunisia	485,000	June 27, 1962
United Kingdom	12,000,000	Oct. 31, 1962
United States	59,672,840	Nov. 2, 1962 Dec. 21, 1962
Vietnam	10,000	July 11, 1962
Pledges:		
Austria	900,000	Mar. 19, 1962
Brazil	100,000	Aug. 10, 1962
Cambodia	5,000	May 14, 1962
Cyprus	26,175	Apr. 4, 1962
Ecuador	12,000	June 10, 1962
Ethiopia	200,000	Mar. 20, 1962
Ghana	100,000	July 20, 1962
Iran	500,000	Apr. 5, 1962
Iraq	100,000	Oct. 5, 1962
Japan	5,000,000	July 13, 1962
Liberia	200,000	Mar. 30, 1962
Mauritania	4,082	July 19, 1962
New Zealand	500,000	Apr. 27, 1962
Pakistan	500,000	Feb. 14, 9162
Panama	25,000	June 15, 1962
Philippines	750,000	Aug. 30, 1962
Turkey	100,000	Dec. 5, 1962
United Arab Republic	250,000	July 2, 1962
Venezuela	300,000	Apr. 13, 1962
Yugoslavia	200,000	June 8, 1962

(Yugoslavia handed over a check for $100,000 to the United Nations on January 2, 1963, but has yet to take receipt of the United Nations bond.)

FREE WORLD UNITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the prime architects of free world unity, who has done pioneer work in bringing Europe together into a strong economic partnership, is Jean Monnet, really the father of the European Common Market and the European Coal and Steel Community. On January 23, 1963, M. Monnet was presented the annual Freedom Award for outstanding service in the cause of freedom, at a Freedom House dinner in New York City. In his acceptance address M. Monnet emphasized the tremendous potential of the European Common Market in cooperation with the United States as a powerful force for peace and the common defense of the free world.

I consider it a great honor and privilege to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the acceptance address by M. Monnet, and the message from President Kennedy which was read by Under Secretary of State George W. Ball.

There being no objection, the letter and the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1962 FREEDOM AWARD TO JEAN MONNET

TEXT OF LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

DEAR MR. MONNET: I am delighted to join my friends at Freedom House in doing honor to your great achievements. You come at a moment of high importance, and you come as the exemplar of disinterested service to Europe and to the Atlantic world.

For centuries, emperors, kings, and dictators have sought to impose unity on Europe by force. For better or worse, they have failed. But under your inspiration, Europe has moved closer to unity in less than 20 years than it had done before in a thousand. You and your associates have built with the mortar of reason and the brick of economic and political interest. You are transforming Europe by the power of a constructive idea.

Ever since the war the reconstruction and the knitting together of Europe have been objectives of U.S. policy, for we have recognized with you that a strong Europe would be good not only for Europeans but for the world. America and a united Europe, working in full and effective partnership, can find solutions to those urgent problems that confront all mankind in this crucial time.

I have been happy, therefore, to read your statement of January 16 in which you call attention to the responsibility of Europe to share with the United States in the common defense of the West. I believe, with you, that Americans and Europeans must recognize that neither one nor the other is defending a particular country, but that the ensemble is defending a common civilization. The United States will be true to this conviction, and we trust that it will have the support of Europeans, too.

Your practical wisdom, your energy in persuasion, your tested courage, and your earned eminence in Europe are the reasons for this celebration in your honor. They are also a great resource for freedom, and I wish you many years of continued strength in your service to our cause.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

ADDRESS BY M. JEAN MONNET

Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, I am very honored to receive from the board of trustees of Freedom House the Freedom Award at your hands today.

That you are giving this award to a European is to me a proof of the deep community of mind and feeling that unite the people of Europe and North America.

I am convinced that this feeling is rooted in our common civilization, the essence of which is its tradition of freedom. This freedom truly is the main issue between the two ways of approaching life that compete for men's minds today.

So many people have written and spoken about liberty more thoroughly than I can that I want to limit myself to what seems to me the most important and urgent practical problem confronting the West and its traditions of freedom, the one that requires action from us today.

The worst enemies of freedom have been, and still are, the spirit of domination and its consequence, the threat of war.

While within our frontiers we have organized liberty and, by mutual consent, maintained the rule of law that largely eliminates the spirit of domination, internationally we are still maintaining peace by force.

Now we must go beyond national frontiers and create new forms of relationships between our countries.

The next step ahead of us must clearly be to complete the unity of Europe including Britain, and gradually develop a strong partnership of equals between the United States and Europe.

These are essential for the organization of peace in the world and the maintenance of freedom.

For, as we progress toward the unity of the West, we will create the conditions favoring a lasting peace between the West and the Soviet Union.

Naturally, the process of putting these great aims into practice involves great changes in the form of relationships now existing between our nations. This brings us up against difficulties.

I would like to talk of the one that looms largest over all at this moment.

It is more than important, it is essential that Britain should join our European Community under the same conditions as the present members.

The negotiations have been going on too long, but they can be rapidly concluded.

We must remember that on fundamental issues, as two World Wars have proved, Britain is part of Europe.

People in Britain and on the Continent must free their minds of the obsolete and static idea that Britain, because an island, is bound to be insular, that she does not belong to Europe and that her commercial policies and interests will keep her forever apart from the natural trend toward unity of Europe.

Entry into Europe would be good for Britain, for Europe, for the West and for world peace.

I still hope and believe, like most people in the six, that the negotiations on Britain's entry into Europe will succeed.

Those who had anything to do with European unity know from their own experience that the difficulties encountered at any moment do not matter so long as the objective is kept clearly in view.

The world has recently become aware of the success of European economic unity, and people everywhere see political unity emerging in Europe. But this sudden awareness has concealed the 12 years of work and often of serious trouble that lie behind the achievement.

When the treaty of the European Defense Community was rejected in 1954, most competent observers thought unity in Europe was dead and buried. And yet the progress we have made during the last 12 years shows that despite all the difficulties, we are on the way.

The countries of continental Europe—France, Germany, Italy, and Benelux—are uniting in a European Economic Community of nearly 200 million people.

Germany and France, which have struggled to dominate one another for centuries, are now coming together, accepting the fact that they have the same destiny. In the European Economic Community they are pursuing a common course which is gradually transforming their mutual relations and the outlook of their peoples. They have even been building recently the possibility of closer cooperation.

I have no doubt that France, from the start one of the promoters of the European unity, will follow this course in the future as in the past.

What are the simple reasons that made these changes happen?

It is because the countries of the European Community have agreed that their economic problems which, in the past, were national responsibilities, have now become common responsibilities and being common, unite them instead of dividing them.

It is because they have established common rules and common institutions that they can do the job.

It is because each of the steps they have taken one after the other, as circumstances allowed, have been designed to further the same objective.

The European Coal and Steel Community, which was at the beginning of all this enterprise, was not set up just to pool coal and steel, but as a first step on the way to European union.

The Common Market has not been created just to build a better system of exchanging goods, or to create a new power. We had, and have, as our objectives essentially the creation of a united Europe and the elimination between nations and their peoples of the spirit of domination that has brought the world close to destruction many times.

To produce such a change, it was essential to eliminate the feeling of discrimination between nations—the feeling that was the inevitable consequence of the many European wars.

To begin to unite Europe only 5 years after the war, it was vital that everyone should see that there were no more victors or vanquished, but only partners equal before the common law.

The institutions of the Common Market work in such a way that discrimination between European nations has now been ended.

The independent European Commission is the authority empowered to propose the economic policies of the Community. The national governments whose representatives sit in the Council of Ministers, decide on the common policies proposed by the Commission according to the rules and spirit of the Rome Treaty. In a widening field its decisions no longer require unanimity.

The attitudes of the people of Europe are rapidly changing. The peoples of these community countries, producers, farmers, labor and members of the professions, have become partners in change and are taking on the same community outlook. In fact, when you look at what's happening, these people are the same people as they have been for centuries but their attitudes today toward one another have changed, and this, in my opinion, is the process of civilization itself.

This process is taking us faster and farther than anyone would have dared to hope after the war.

Britain's request to enter European union is one sign.

Another is your President's speech of the last 4th of July, where he called for a partnership of equals between the United States of America and the European Community. You are now preparing to negotiate new trade links across the Atlantic which must serve the interests of the world as a whole.

Ever since the Marshall plan, and the Schuman plan, American support for European unity has never faltered.

I can testify from my own experience that this support has been invaluable in bringing European unity to the point where it is today. For once, the most powerful country in the world has helped others to unite instead of adopting the old principle of divide and rule.

But during all those years, the United States took her decisions alone. Now the partnership means a new form of relations.

Let me read to you what the Action Committee of the United States of Europe said on this matter in its joint declaration of June 26 last:

"The partnership between America and a united Europe must be a partnership of two separate but equally powerful entities, each bearing its share of common responsibilities in the world. This partnership is natural and inevitable because the peoples of Europe and America share the same civilization based on freedom and conduct their public life in accordance with common democratic principles."

I think this has implications for defense which, with the entry of Britain into the Common Market, is the main problem that looms over the great debate in the West.

We must recognize, in this nuclear age, that while making every effort to disarm, we must pursue and improve our common defense with all its political implications on both sides of the Atlantic.

Europe and America must both acknowledge that neither of us is defending a particular country, that we are all defending our common civilization.

You, in the United States, must realize that the claims of Europe to share common responsibility and authority for decisions on defense, including the nuclear weapons, is natural since any decision involves the very existence of the European peoples.

On the other hand, I think the Europeans must understand that the nuclear terror is indivisible and that they too must shoulder an adequate share of the common defense.

Today, however, the countries of the Atlantic Alliance have such divergent views of their immediate interests that a common approach to the problems has to be developed if agreement is to be achieved.

To achieve the partnership between Europe and America, we must create an increasingly common interest by acting in common on a growing number of questions. When sufficient points of common interest have been created, a degree of community in defense will be accepted that today appears utopian.

In my opinion, while progress on defense must be sought continuously, the field where results can be most promptly obtained is the economic one.

There are urgent problems which neither Europe nor America can settle alone. These are, to my mind, the monetary stability of the West, the organization of agriculture in an increasingly industrial world, help to the developing countries to speed their growth and, of course, the freeing of trade to be negotiated between yourselves and the Common Market.

I realize fully that economic partnership will not automatically lead to a partnership for defense. In Europe, too, the Common Market alone is not enough to create political union. But without the Common Market, political union would never have been raised as a practical issue. Similarly, the creation of the rules and institutions needed to build up the economic partnership between the United States and Europe will change the context for dealing with defense. It will then appear in a new light on both sides of the Atlantic.

The unity of Europe and its partnership with the United States will not only change the relationship between us, it will fundamentally change the relationship of the West with the Soviet Union.

As long as Russia believes the West can be divided, it will be tempted to upset the balance of power in its favor.

As we organize new forms of relationship between the Western nations, we will be showing ourselves, the Soviet Union, and the rest of the world, that as a result of the union of Europe and its partnership with the United States, the West cannot be divided.

The conditions will then exist for establishing the basis of lasting peace between the Soviet Union and ourselves.

I believe this development can come much faster than we imagine today. My hope is based on my experience of European unity. This experience has been that once people are convinced a new situation is inevitable, they adapt themselves to it spontaneously and by doing so, hasten the process itself.

This is the most hopeful road to the creation of peace today, and to the consolidation of freedom.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the independence of Estonia was celebrated on February 24, the 45th anniversary of this historic event in the life of the Estonian people. They proclaimed their Republic in 1918, after two centuries of Russian rule; but they enjoyed self-government for only two decades. In 1940, the Soviet Russian armies swept over the Baltic States, and brought the Republic to an end.

Communist repressive measures have ruthlessly put down all manifestations by the Estonian people of their hope for freedom and independence; but the flame of liberty still continues to burn high. The United States has steadfastly upheld the principle of self-determination, and will continue to press for the recognition of this basic right until all the captive peoples of Europe are freed from the oppressive rule of their Communist overlords. Our voices in commemoration of this anniversary of freedom will help to keep hope alive in the hearts of the Estonian people.

TRIBUTE TO BRIG. GEN. HERBERT D. VOGEL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am genuinely sorry to learn that Brig. Gen. Herbert D. Vogel, U.S. Army, retired, is leaving Tennessee, his adopted State for the past 9 years.

General Vogel served as Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority from 1954 until last summer, when he resigned, and was succeeded on the Board of Directors by the Honorable Frank Smith, a former Member of Congress from Mississippi.

As the appointee of an administration that was less than enthusiastic about the TVA, General Vogel at first was regarded with suspicion by many of those in the valley and in Washington who had worked to establish the TVA as the finest example of regional resource development in the world.

However, as often happens to those who are exposed directly to the things that make it great, General Vogel became one of the TVA's most outspoken champions. I recall that once a Texas physician wrote to complain that he did not want his tax money spent for such socialistic enterprises as TVA dams. General Vogel, who had spent much of his adult life in river and harbor development work for the Engineers, wrote back that the Government seemed to be spending more of the taxpayers' money to build dams in Texas than to build dams in the Tennessee Valley, and asked whether the doctor would like to "squawk" about that.

I should also like to remind the Senate that it was during General Vogel's tenure as TVA Chairman that identical bidding on TVA purchases of electrical equipment was exposed through the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monoply—a development quickly followed by the impaneling of a Federal grand jury at Philadelphia, and the indictment and conviction of a large number of individuals and corporations in the electrical equipment industry. The cooperation which General Vogel caused to be accorded by the TVA to our subcommittee was excellent and was fully in the public interest.

Both during his service as TVA Chairman and afterward, General Vogel took an active interest in the affairs of the community, Knoxville, and of the State in which he lived. Indeed, upon his departure from the TVA, he was sought as a candidate for election as Governor of Tennessee; but he declined to run.

According to news reports from Knoxville, General Vogel has closed the consulting engineer's office he had opened in Knoxville after leaving the TVA, and he and Mrs. Vogel plan to move to some place in the East. I wish them well, and I say again that Tennessee will miss them.

TRIBUTE TO MAJ. GEN. HAROLD K. JOHNSON, COMMANDANT OF THE COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE AND COMMANDING GENERAL OF FORT LEAVENWORTH

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Maj. Gen. Harold K. Johnson has endeared himself to the citizens of Leavenworth, Kans. As a gesture of appreciation, the chamber of commerce, Central Trades & Labor Union, and the National Federation of Federal Employees issued a resolution, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD together with names and editorial entitled "We Lose an Outstanding Citizen," published in the Leavenworth Times of February 1, 1963.

There being no objection, the resolution and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A JOINT RESOLUTION ISSUED BY AND FOR THE CITIZENS OF LEAVENWORTH, KANS., FEBRUARY 15, 1963

(To be read before the U.S. House of Representatives by the Honoroble WILLIAM H. AVERY, of Kansas, with his personal comments added)

Resolved, That it is with deep regret that the city of Leavenworth and its citizens have received the news that Maj. Gen. Harold K. Johnson will leave his command at Fort Leavenworth for a new assignment in Washington on February 25, 1963. Having witnessed General Johnson's exceptional ability at work, it should not have been unexpected to see him moved prior to a "normal" period of duty; nevertheless, the action was met with surprise mingled with regret.

The city of Leavenworth has seen many commanding generals at Fort Leavenworth. None have captured the esteem, respect, and downright admiration of the citizens of Leavenworth as General Johnson has. Several came close, but did not reach General Johnson's mark.

General Johnson's devotion of time and talent to what may be called civic affairs has been little short of amazing. No native civilian could have done more to promote the welfare of Leavenworth.

What we in Leavenworth think of General Johnson may best be summarized by the following editorial published in the Leavenworth Times February 1, 1963:

"WE LOSE AN OUTSTANDING CITIZEN

"The Leavenworth community will lose an outstanding citizen the last of this month when Maj. Gen. Harold K. Johnson, commandant of the Command and General Staff College and commanding general of Fort Leavenworth, leaves for a new assignment at the Pentagon.

"To say that General Johnson is populor is to use a trite expression but Webster's dictionary defines popular as a person having many friends, and certainly the general has a multitude of friends in both Leavenworth and Fort Leavenworth.

"In the city, he took an active part in civic and social affairs. He served on committees, both as member and chairman, for projects devoted to the welfare of the community. For this work he was given a man of the hour award by the chamber of commerce last year.

"At the fort he has been active in school and Boy Scout work and was awarded the Silver Beaver, one of scouting's top awards by the Kaw Council. Park College conferred an honorary doctor of education degree in recognition of his work in public relations.

"General Johnson had already established himself as a top military leader before his assignment to Fort Leavenworth and it didn't take long for people in this area to recognize his leadership in civic affairs. He has been in demand as a speaker in the Midwest because of his forceful presentations of world and military affairs in words that are easily understood.

"Because of his success in getting things done and securing cooperation within the combined community of the two Leavenworths, he leaves a tough mark to shoot at for his successor, Maj. Gen. Harry J. Lemley, Jr. Both generals will start their new assignments with best wishes for continued success by friends and coworkers here."

J. F. MITCHELL,
Mayor, City of Leavenworth.
IVAN J. MEYER,
President,
Leavenworth Chamber of Commerce.
IVAN MARSHALL,
President,
Central Trades & Labor Council.
MILTON H. STROH,
Public Relations Officer,
EDWARD F. LARKIN,
Public Relations Officer,
National Federation of Federal Employees, Local 49
(For Alfred E. Michael, President).

ALF M. LANDON'S COUNSEL ON CURRENT DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, many years have passed since Alf Landon carried the Republican Party's banner in its campaign for the Presidency. In the years since, Mr. Landon has demonstrated his wisdom and sound judgment as a spokesman on public issues and as a counsel to his fellow Kansans and to those in the highest places of Government. As with many men of character and wisdom, the years have brought increasing respect and admiration.

I ask unanimous consent at this time to have printed in the RECORD the recent address which Mr. Landon delivered to the Washington County Bar Association at Bartlesville, Okla., on February 28, 1963, in order that I might call to the attention of the Senate and to all of those who read this RECORD his sound counsel on current domestic and international affairs.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

(Address by Hon. Alf M. Landon)

I speak on international politics not as an expert steeped in classified information on foreign affairs.

I speak simply as one with some experience in politics, with a background of history, and close reading of world daily political events, viewing international politics as I would American politics.

It is obvious that economic problems and troubles in a country mold its foreign policies. Even in a rich and powerful country like these United States, the Secretary of Defense stresses the saving of billions of dollars that will be saved by abandoning bombers for missiles.

That decision involving life or death matters of our great country as a Nation of free people was made in the Pentagon by civilians over all the general staff, except Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the appointee for the President to head the general staff.

Of course, there are other factors involved than economic. I have previously spoken of

the tendency of generals to start the next war with the last war's weapons.

Nevertheless, I believe we can afford what engineers call a margin of safety in our calculations for military defense equipment. Certainly the Congress should give this decision by civilians a hard, thorough, and objective going over.

Just as there is political chaos prevailing today in international relations, so is there growing confusion in labor, business, and farming over our President's fiscal policies.

The Kennedy administration has called for a startling departure in fiscal policy. In a nutshell, this new policy is that taxes be substantially cut and expenditures substantially increased. This policy request comes after years of deficit spending and from an administration that has pledged itself to fighting the inflationary tendencies in our economy.

The question that we as citizens must ask is, What is behind this new policy call? It has been said that the practice of cutting taxes while increasing expenditures has been tried successfully in other countries. Yet what country has an economy as complex as that of the United States?

What complicated, stable economy has proportionately—

1. A National, State, and local debt the size of ours;
2. A tax load the size of ours—in 1961, National, State, and local taxes claimed 35 percent of our national income;
3. Defense and foreign aid commitments the size of ours; and
4. The freedom to act that is still possessed by our businessmen, bankers, and labor unions?

If the administration is experimenting rather than following an applicable precedent, as it would appear, it should say so. We Americans are not temperamentally opposed to experimentation.

Every President since Harding—including Kennedy—has tried one or more economic policies and failed to secure either economic stability or political calm or a debt reduction, or all three, for any length of time. We have fortunately survived these experiments so that we could experiment another day to try to improve our economic situation without losing our political freedoms. Yet the fact is that we are challenged to do just that in the Keynesian-Kennedy Government-financing policies.

One can sympathize with President Kennedy and appreciate his concern. The question is, Is this policy, if implemented, likely to achieve positive goals that will benefit the whole country? In other words—to avoid disastrous results for our country—I am only asking questions which must be asked and have yet not been answered satisfactorily by the administration.

1. Can the rise in the national debt and the presumed increase in private credit and spending (which should occur with increased Government expenditures and reduced taxes) be such that they will not lead to an inflationary spiral that would wipe out the tax savings and rob savings of tens of millions of Americans—especially those who could least afford the loss—a result that would favor the nimble speculator instead of the businessman, laborer, or farmer?

2. Will the new policy give us the low-skilled jobs in work areas where unemployment is so pressing or will it open up new high-skilled jobs which we already find difficult to fill?

3. Will it really ease the citizens' tax load at a time when every State and locality is desperately seeking more revenue and would gladly fill any tax void created by the Federal Government? In considering this question, one must keep in mind that the demands upon the States and localities have been increasing and that they will increase all the more if inflation is the result of new Federal policy.

4. Should inflation come, would it not ultimately pose the need to raise Federal taxes drastically to accommodate the needs of the Government for dollars to buy goods and services at inflated prices?

5. Can we persuade our sources of credit to cover what appears to be a substantial increase in the national debt as a result of the new policy, and if we can, would not this prevent the expansion of private credit at the rate anticipated by the administration?

6. Isn't it possible that the new policy would weaken our already touchy economic and political position with London, Bonn, Paris, Amsterdam, etc., which are now operating with conservative economic policies and have looked askance at the relatively mild deficit spending which we have engaged in during the past 5 years?

7. Will the new policy halt or increase the flow of gold, with which we are so much concerned?

The argument for the President's fiscal policy goes this way: The volume of business domestically and externally would be increased so much beyond tax cuts and increased Government spending that—assuming the supply and demand ratios were stable—the tax yield at reduced rates would keep the deficit down and the national debt manageable. For example, if the Government deficit ran—based on the present outlook—at $20 billion annually for the next 5 years—that would mean theoretically an increase in the national debt of $100 billion. If, however, business volume increased, thanks to these stimuli, at the rate of about 8 percent per annum, this would lead to an accumulated 5-year increase in the gross national income of $400 billion which, if taxed at 20 percent, would yield $80 billion extra in revenue and therefore leave only a new net debt of $20 billion. That could of course be easily managed. Moreover, at this rate, by the sixth year the annual tax yield should be such that a balanced budget could be achieved.

Pretty good, if it can be done—disastrous if it does not work.

Therefore, it is time to take stock of the past and the future.

The fiscal policies recommended to the Congress by President Kennedy are loosely based on the economic theories of the English Lord Keynes. Keynes asserted that the national economy could grow by pumping Government money into the economy on a deficit spending basis. He sold the idea to the New Deal and Mr. Roosevelt in 1933. It did not work here and has not been adopted by any other country. The Keynesians could only lamely say it did not work because Mr. Roosevelt did not spend enough money.

This same idea—Lord Keynes' idea—now seems to be at the base of President Kennedy's new fiscal policy—but with one great difference: Keynes did not call for tax cuts to accompany increased Government spending. Apparently the new Keynesians have figured out that the real reason for Mr. Roosevelt's failure was not just that he did not spend enough but that the deficit was not great enough for us to spend our way so far into debt that we would reach greater prosperity. They have persuaded Mr. Kennedy that this explanation is economic gospel, and their only criticism of him is that he is not planning to spend more money and create a bigger deficit.

It will take at least 3 years for the Keynesian-Kennedy fiscal policy to prove itself. In the meantime, there are many other factors that will affect national growth besides taxation and the volume of spending. There are Government policies to be initiated and established on agriculture, trade, and labor. A disruptive factor is the dispute over wages and hours. The limits Mr. Kennedy placed on hours and wages are rejected by the AFL-CIO and are now being set aside by the national administration. A rising tide of unemployment demands immediate and forthwith complete review by the Congress of all these factors in national growth to stimulate employment.

Then there is the international situation, which is now in greater flux because of France's refusal to let Britain join the Common Market.

There are the market demands. What will people and business do with their tax savings—if any really materialize? It must be evident that much will depend on the wisdom of business management. For illustration, if increased profits are used by railroads to improve their roadbeds and equipment, that, in turn, stimulates business. On the other hand, if increased profits are used for increased dividends to increase the price of stock on Wall Street, that will be inviting nationalization of railroads.

For sure, if business and employment do not grow, the administration will be forced to explain its failure not by admitting that the Keynesian-Kennedy fiscal theories were wrong, but that not enough money was spent and the deficit was not big enough.

President Kennedy might then ask Congress to spend more money, create a bigger deficit, and adopt more sweeping Government controls over business, labor, and farmers.

One can be sure that the leftwingers will try to foster a loss of public confidence in the capitalistic system—not in the Keynesian-Kennedy financial theories—despite the fact that communism's basic difficulty today is economics.

Whatever the decision of the Congress on the new fiscal policies of the President, it should have priority on the legislative calendar.

Uncertainty as to tax changes and inflation are a blight on business planning and markets. Merchants buying for the fall market are bound to take that into consideration.

In turn, that will affect employment in industry.

Therefore, the quicker that question of tax reduction and the changes in other taxation provisions are settled, the quicker business can plan for the next fiscal year starting July 1. That is also true of our industrial and agricultural planning for changes in foreign markets brought about by the EEC—commonly called the Common Market.

The free world has become so intermeshed that practically every economic decision America makes affects every free market in the world. That, in turn, affects their political and military policies.

It is not only a matter of logistics; it is also a matter of public uncertainty on what our new fiscal policy will be—and public psychology on inflation devaluing the dollar if it does not work. Our dollar is the corollary of the atom bomb in defense of the free world. The free world is as interested in keeping our dollar sound as in our atomic strength.

Yet not only economics but also politics shapes foreign relations. There is an atmosphere of intrigue—mystery, spies, and murder—clinging to the phrase "international politics."

International politics, however, is not just man-to-man combat, as in the spy movies, but a lethal contest that means life or death for millions. It is a contest that takes into account what we do and say at home, one that requires more restraint, moderation by the press, both political parties in discussing foreign affairs.

Yet this does not require that we as a nation or individuals not maneuver and comment on foreign policies. There is and must be maneuvering in foreign policies as there is in domestic policies.

As for maneuvering on foreign policies, I will not attempt to discuss that in terms of military hardware, combat troops, of positions of strength either for pagan tyrannical Communists or for popular democratic capitalistic governments with their proven record of contributing to the general good.

Neither will I attempt to reconcile the often puzzling declaration of President De Gaulle or Chancellor Adenauer of West Germany, Prime Minister Macmillan of England, and the other heads of European countries, or President Kennedy and Prime Minister Diefenbaker. I will simply say there is no principle involved between any of them similar to the one involved between Mao and Khrushchev.

It is apparent that China has won a victory over India. It appears that China's next step will be to attempt to consolidate some other Asian area under Communist domination.

Nehru said in a recent interview that Mao believes in a nuclear war and is thinking and planning that. He quotes Mao as saying, "What difference does 200 million lives make?" Mao himself has said that a country of 800 million people will have more left after a nuclear war than a country of 200 million people.

Hence there should not be a close and dependable alliance between China and Russia.

Furthermore, Chinese Communists are angry at the growing adoption of capitalistic production methods by occidental Communists. All that could mean if Khrushchev's present line is consistent—improving relations with European socialistic parties. In the latest news, Khrushchev is still harping on the economic collapse of decadent capitalistic states. But no responsive chord from Mao. A rising tide of nationalism is confounding communism in most countries.

Our foreign policy has been to defend the democratic governments of Europe—including England—and to build them up after two World Wars.

Having become economically strong, if Europe under the leadership of France now wants to decide its own policies and build its own defense weapons, I do not believe we can do much about it except be ready to cooperate at all times. We should help hold together in unity and strength the EEC. That organization has a better potential as a force for peace than SEATO, CENTRO, NATO, and the U.N. all put together.

It is obviously to the vital interests of West Germany to maintain close friendly relations with both France and the United States. That is true also for the United States of America. France is across the main supply lines to our troops in West Germany.

Then there is the crucial question of satisfactory trade agreements we must work out with the EEC.

The question of—After Adenauer and De Gaulle, what?—can be left for the future.

After all, we have done all we could to foster a United Europe, including England. Certainly a greater sharing and acceptance of the cost of defending the free world from Communist tyranny is long overdue by Europe, England, and other countries economically capable.

Berlin, Vietnam, and Cuba are where the evil intentions of the Soviet are now displayed. There is only one man in America that can put together for us the meaning of all these military and political situations and our answer to them. That man is the President of the United States. That does not mean that Members of the Congress—Republican or Democrat—should refuse to discuss foreign affairs. That is their obligation and duty to discuss them.

There is not a division between the two political parties on Cuba. Instead, there are two camps. While both agree with President Kennedy that Latin America is as critical as any area in the world today, they disagree on the steps that should be taken to meet the Russian-Cuba center of that critical area. Once again Cuba is the focus of world attention.

Of course our country and the democratic world is nervous because of the failure of intelligence in the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

Even more so when there has been no adequate explanation of how the Russian missile buildup in Cuba went on for months, to the point of Russian missiles staring down the streets of every Atlantic city to some 1,500 miles inland without alarming our President.

According to a very dramatic thriller semiofficial explanation, our President would not have known of that fateful massive installation if it had not been for a break in the clouds just prior to his October 22 address to the Nation. Yet, as early as May, Col. Robert S. Allen was writing in his column of the Russian missile buildup in Cuba. Senator KEATING, in September, was trying to arouse the administration to that danger.

Another reason for uneasiness is the administration's policy of not only managing—but suppressing—news threatening our military security. Of course, that went on in the preceding administration. We must rely, for adequate and proper press coverage of military events threatening our national security, on reporters who wear out their shoe leather instead of being satisfied with administrative news handouts.

The statement I most frequently hear is that America has no friends anywhere. I do not think that is so. The contradictions I have briefly mentioned are the contradictions inherent in democratic processes. Just as there are new weapons, new mass communication, new standards of living, maybe new worlds, we have a new kind of alliance—an alliance not for the perpetuation of a family on a throne, or for power, or for gold or trade.

The alliance of the Western World—NATO, OAS, SEATO are all based on the common bond of preservation and defense of democratic processes for all mankind against tyranny.

That is a connecting web that binds together the free world in the strength, characteristics, and ideals of the democratic processes. However strong that web, however dedicated a people are to their country's interest in that alliance, emergencies cannot be successfully met against a dominant dictator without a center of decision on diplomatic and military tactics.

By reason of our economic and military power, that place of decision has been forced on the President of the United States of America. There is a time for discussion and consultation. There is a time for instant decision, without talking things over. That's the way it will be for some time to come, providing there is clear direction and clear leadership.

In this contest with age-old tyranny, expressed in modern form by communism, we know the method of communism is to win by force and by fear. The volume and the variety of Communist lies are amazing. Forewarned is forearmed. Every Communist country in the world is ruled by a dictator. How fantastic to call them peoples democratic governments. Yet that is the Communist line. That line and the threat it represents must be met forthrightly to perpetuate the world democratic alliance.

That this is true is shown in a story on the installation of our President's Cuban quarantine last October. Our embassies the world over received the official explanation to be made to foreign diplomats.

One of our ambassadors started to make that explanation to a diplomatic caller. The veteran European ambassador was not interested. All he wanted to know was whether we were going through with it.

It is up to all Americans to show the world that we are going to stick to our policy regarding the imperialism of tyranny.

Our policy for 45 years has been to defend democratic processes in Europe at all cost against tyranny. That we will stick to. We have followed a similar policy in the Far East for over a decade. And that we will stick to. Can we do less for the Western Hemisphere—in Cuba—90 miles from our own coastline?

As I seee it, the administration is continuing its policy of last November of quarantining Castro.

This is a realistic policy if it isolates the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere. There is no easy answer in determining the steps that will have to be taken one by one in solving the Cuban question. That is why we need a national debate on its progress.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JEAN FELIX PICCARD

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would not want the Senate to fail to note the regrettable passing of one of the great scientists of America and the world—Dr. Jean Felix Piccard.

Professor emeritus of aeronautical engineering of the University of Minnesota, he was one of the great scientists of our time. A naturalized American citizen, he brought to this country excellence in stratospheric science, just as his famous brother brought excellence in oceanographic science.

The world can never have enough men of scientific and other genius such as Dr. Piccard represented. His loss was deeply felt throughout his adopted State of Minnesota, the Nation, and the world.

His talented wife, a distinguished scientist in her own right, and his family can feel a sense of deep pride in what this great man contributed throughout the 79 fruitful years of his life.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune, which summarizes his contributions, together with the biographical summary from "American Men of Science."

There being no objection, the article and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BALLOONIST JEAN PICCARD, 79, DIES ON BIRTHDAY

Dr. Jean Felix Piccard, internationally famous balloonist, died today on his 79th birthday.

Piccard, University of Minnesota professor emeritus of aeronautical engineering, was known for his stratospheric balloon flights and cosmic ray research.

He died at his home at 1445 East River Road at 2:30 a.m. He had had a heart condition for a number of years.

He was a member of the Piccard family of Basel, Switzerland, known for its scientific achievements. His twin brother, the late Auguste Piccard, was the first man to soar into the stratosphere and the first to plumb the ocean depths.

His nephew Jacques, Auguste's son, descended 37,800 feet to the bottom of the Pacific Ocean in 1960 in a bathyscaph, an underwater vessel used for exploring ocean depths.

WIFE HELPED

Mrs. Jean Piccard worked with her husband in many of his studies and experiments.

Mr. Piccard studied at the Swiss Institute of Technology, Zurich, where he earned his

doctor of science degree in 1909. He served as private assistant to Adolph von Baeyer at the University of Munich from 1910 until 1914.

After World War I, Mr. Piccard was associated with the University of Lausanne, where he remained 2 years. From 1916 until 1919 he was on leave in the United States to serve as associate professor at the University of Chicago, where he met his wife, the former Jeannette Ridlon.

He was a research associate at Massachusetts Institute of Technology from 1926 until 1929. In 1931 he became a U.S. citizen.

Two years later, in collaboration with Auguste, he designed a stratosphere gondola, built at Midland, Mich. In 1934 he became a research associate of the Bartol Research Foundation, Swarthmore, Pa. That year he made a stratospheric flight from Detroit, Mich., to study cosmic rays.

JOINS 'U'

Mr. Piccard joined the University of Minnesota faculty in 1936 as a lecturer in the department of aeronautical engineering and remained with the department until his retirement in 1952.

In a flight made in 1934 with his wife, Mr. Piccard soared to an altitude of 57,559 feet during a 5-hour flight. He had made his first flight, with Auguste, in 1913.

In 1937 he made a test flight to an altitude of 11,000 feet over Rochester, Minn., using a metal gondola and 100 rubber latex balloons.

His son, Donald, made a flight from the Minneapolis parade grounds in 1947 to test a new gas valve designed by Mr. Piccard.

Donald, a resident of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., was in the Twin Cities at the time of his father's death. He had competed in the St. Paul Winter Carnival balloon races Sunday.

ONE OF 100

In 1950 Mr. Piccard was named one of Minnesota's 100 living great men. Edward R. Murrow brought his television crews to Minneapolis in 1957 to interview Mr. Piccard on "Person-to-Person."

Besides his widow, Jeannette, and his son, Donald, survivors include sons John, Wilmington, Del., and Paul, Tallahassee, Fla.; a sister, Madame Paul Rambert, Lausanne, Switzerland, and a brother, Dr. Paul Piccard, a retired justice of the Swiss Supreme Court, Lucerne, Switzerland.

Services will be at 10 a.m. Wednesday at St. Paul's Church on the Hill, Summit and Saratoga Avenues, St. Paul.

The family prefers memorials to the University of Minnesota or to St. Paul's Episcopal Day School, 1524 Summit Avenue, St. Paul.

[From American Men of Science, 1961]

DR. JEAN FELIX PICCARD

Specialty: Aeronautical engineering; organic chemistry.

Born in Basel, Switzerland, January 28, 1884; naturalized American citizen; married 1919; three children.

Diplomate, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, 1907; doctor of natural sciences, 1909; honorary doctor of science degrees awarded by Jamestown College, 1956, Southern Illinois University, 1959. P.D. in organic chemistry in Munich, Germany, in 1914; Lausanne, 1914–16; assistant professor, University of Chicago, 1916–18, associate professor, 1918–19; professor at Lausanne, 1919–25; research instructor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; head, department of chemical services, Hercules Powder Co., 1929–32; stratosphere flying work, 1933–34; research associate, Bartol Research Foundation, 1934–36; special lecturer, aeronautical engineering, University of Minnesota, 1936–37; professor, 1937–52, emeritus professor, 1952 to date; civilian with U.S. Army Air Force, 1945.

Member of the following societies: American Chemical Society, American Meteorological Society, Society for Engineering Education, Aeronautics Association (awarded the certificate of merit, 1934), Geophysical Union, Institute of Aeronautical Sciences.

Principal areas of scientific research: Constitution and color of organic compounds; dissociation into free radicals of organic compounds as detected by color changes; Piccard effect; problems of aero engineering; design of plastic balloons.

COMMUNIST COUP IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 25, my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] spoke some well-chosen words concerning the plight of the people of Czechoslovakia under Communist rule. In connection with the 15th anniversary of the Communist coup d'etat in Czechoslovakia, he caused to be printed in the RECORD a report compiled by the Czechoslovak National Council of America. I received a copy of this report and was deeply moved by its account of the economic and other sufferings of the great Czechoslovak people. The report plainly reveals that the self-appointed Communist authorities in Prague have no compunctions about extracting the utmost from their own subjects while cynically taking advantage of their privations in order to extort needed foreign exchange from American citizens.

It was my intention to join my colleague at that time in order to pay homage to the living spirit of Czech democracy—a spirit personified in the life and works of that great Czech and that great European, Thomas G. Masaryk. The Masaryk tradition was ably sustained by his successor Edward Benes and other liberal Czech nationalists. It was trampled underfoot by an unprincipled Communist minority in the dark days of February 24–26, 1948.

Owing to my necessary absence from the Senate on official business, Mr. President, I could not then pay tribute to the Czechoslovak people. Nevertheless, I wish at this time to acquaint Senators with a report, entitled "The Communist Coup D'Etat in Czechoslovakia," which was prepared at my request by Mr. Moorhead Wright III, of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I asked for this report because in these troubled times it is instructive to have before us an example of the tactics employed by Communists in seizing power through so-called peaceful means. I suggest that the threatened governments of Latin America pay special attention to this report, because it should be borne in mind that the Czech coup took place even though all Red army troops had been withdrawn from Czech soil.

The Czech coup took place for a variety of reasons, including the strength of the national Communist Party, the fact that the government coalition was headed by a Communist, the widespread demoralization that followed Munich and the Nazi occupation, and the inability of the non-Communist majority to thwart the will of the disciplined Communists and fellow travelers. Not all of these facts are brought out in Mr. Wright's report because I did not ask him for a thorough analysis of the situation. Nevertheless, I wish to call Senators' attention to them now, because the overthrow of Czech democracy is a classic model for Communist seizure of power through "democratic" or "parliamentary" processes. In this connection I call particular attention to the dire consequences that flow from the control of a country's Ministry of the Interior—or the government agency that controls the police—by the Communists. The result is the almost inevitable loss of authority by the duly constituted government. The police, the armed forces, the government—these are the three prime targets of a Moscow-supported Communist insurrection. If any Latin American, African, or Asian government feels safe with its central police force in Communist hands, let it ponder the experience of Czechoslovakia and other East European countries.

Mr. President, the Czech coup was responsible in large measure for the fact that we awoke to the postwar Communist threat. It shared this effect with the Greek civil war and Soviet demands on Turkey. It steeled the West to resist Communist encroachments elsewhere. It was a major link in a chain of developments that led to the formation of NATO and to the creation of the hitherto unbroken solidarity of the West against Communist expansionism. How tragic that we had to learn this lesson at the expense of a small East European nation which had already suffered long years of totalitarian tyranny.

Free Czechoslovakia, Mr. President, shares our national spirit of industriousness and enterprise; it is imbued with the finest traditions of European humanism. It is pro-Western despite having ample reason for disillusionment with the West. In commemoration of the 15th anniversary of the extinguishment of freedom in Czechoslovakia, I ask unanimous consent that the abovementioned report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMUNIST COUP D'ETAT IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

The Communists were in a strong position in Czechoslovakia as early as 1945 when they gained a number of key ministries in the first postliberation cabinet. They controlled the Ministry of the Interior, which included the police; the Ministry of Agriculture, which was responsible for land reform and the distribution to peasants of land seized from Germans or collaborators; and the Ministries of Information and Education. The army and its leader, General Svoboda, came under Communist influence while undergoing training in the Soviet Union. The first Government was headed by the pro-Communist leader of the Social Democratic Party, Zdenek Fierlinger; after July 1946 the Prime Minister was Klement Gottwald, chairman of the Communist Party.

Although the Communists controlled the main power centers in the country, they continued to work within the limitations of popular front government. They sought to dominate the coalition by gaining control of the Social Democratic Party and by dividing and weakening the other parties. The Social Democrats declared their intention to remain independent, however, and in November 1947 the leftwing Fierlinger was replaced by the independent-minded Lausman as party chairman. In addition, it became increasingly evident that the Communists' electoral position was weakening; a public opinion poll conducted by the Minister of Information predicted that the party would not do well in the general election in May 1948. The Communists thus had to turn to extra-constitutional methods to complete their takeover of Czechoslovakia.

The end of democratic government was also hastened by the deepening rift between Russia and the West. Czechoslovakia's foreign policy was traditionally pro-Russian, but she had important economic ties with the West. Stalin could not tolerate this bridge between the two camps, and in July 1947 he forced the Czech Government to decline an invitation to attend Marshall plan talks in Paris.

There was a permanent political crisis in the country from the summer of 1947 to February 1948 when the coalition government split, as the Communists hoped it would. The issue which caused the break was the Minister of the Interior's dismissal of eight police commissioners in Prague and their replacement by Communists. Since these commissioners controlled the police's arms supply, this was an ominous indication of the Communists' intentions. The other cabinet members balked at this move and passed a majority resolution on February 12 demanding that the eight commissioners be reinstated. The Minister of the Interior refused to obey the resolution and was backed by the Communist Prime Minister Gottwald. On February 21 the ministers belonging to three of the four non-Communist parties resigned in protest; the Social Democrats, who had voted for the resolution on the police issue, now hesitated to join the other parties in the resignation gesture. President Benes pledged not to accept the ministers' resignation and called for continuation of Popular Front government with all parties represented in the cabinet.

The Communists moved swiftly to insure their victory in the crisis. They armed detachments of factory workers and paraded them through the streets of Prague; on February 22, Gottwald addressed Communist mass trade-union demonstrations. The Minister of the Interior charged the National Socialist Party with plotting an armed revolt against the state and used this as a pretext for police seizure of party headquarters; also, a warrant was issued against Ursiny, leader of the Slovak Democrats, on charges of high treason. The left wing of the Social Democrats revolted against the party's middle-of-the-road leadership, seized control of party headquarters, and reinstated the pro-Communist Feirlinger as party head. The Communists silenced party and independent newspapers by force. "Action committees" headed by Communists took control of government ministries, local government councils and other organizations.

President Benes' resistance to Communist pressures gradually weakened; he was isolated and ill, and he wanted to avoid civil war and a break with the Soviet Union, which he considered the main defense against a revived Germany. Finally, on February 25 he gave in to the Communists' demands, accepting the resignation of the 12 ministers and authorizing Gottwald to set up a Communist-dominated cabinet. One of the few anti-Communist ministers in this new cabinet was Jan Masaryk, who continued to be Foreign Minister. But on March 10 his body was found in a courtyard of the Foreign Ministry. In Hugh Seton-Watson's words, "The death of this great democrat, the last surviving male member of the family of the 'President-Liberator,' whose extraordinary charm and goodness had made him hundreds of devoted friends all over the world, especially in the Anglo-Saxon countries, brought home to the Czech people and to world opinion the horror of Czechoslovakia's tragedy."[1]

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 2 minutes in order to yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his very excellent statement on the lesson that is to be learned through the tragic experience of the Czechs and Slovaks having been taken over by the Communists.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator very much for his statement.

UKRAINIAN ARCHBISHOP SLIPYI FREED AFTER 18-YEAR SOVIET IMPRISONMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 17, Archbishop Josyf Slipyi celebrated his 71st birthday. It was the first time in 18 years that the spiritual leader of Ukrainian Eastern-Rite Catholics had celebrated his birthday as a free man. Released last Christmas by the Kremlin, Archbishop Slipyi has become an inspiring symbol of the resistance of the Ukrainian faithful to the repressive measures of the atheistic Soviet regime.

Archbishop Slipyi was a distinguished scholar and rector of the Theological Academy in Lvov before he became Archbishop of Lvov in 1939. He became the leader of Ukrainian Eastern-Rite Catholics in 1944 when the great Metropolitan Andrew Szeptycki died under mysterious circumstances. Archbishop Slipyi became metropolitan shortly after the Soviets reoccupied the Ukraine. With the Soviet Union at war, the regime did not want to alienate the people's feelings, so the traditional Russian persecution of Ukrainian Eastern-Rite Catholics, which had been especially virulent in 1915 during World War I, was not immediately renewed. But soon the Soviets began to exert pressures on the metropolitan. At first they sought to enlist the church's help in stamping out partisan resistance to Soviet occupation in the Ukraine, but Archbishop Slipyi did not give in to this demand. Then the Soviets tried to force him to renounce all ties with the Holy See in Rome and place his communicants under the jurisdiction of the Kremlin-dominated Russian Orthodox Church. This the metropolitan also refused to do. On April 11, 1945, he was arrested with four other Ukrainian bishops. Eleven months later he was secretly tried and sentenced to 8 years' hard labor on false charges of "traitorous activity and collaboration with the German occupation forces." None of the other bishops sentenced with him are still alive.

Although the details of his 18-year imprisonment are sketchy and often contradictory, it is apparent that the first 8 years of hard labor in a Siberian prison camp were the most arduous. The Soviets tortured him in a vain effort to make him embrace Russian orthodoxy. According to one report, he was confined with four Catholic priests in a small cell, where they said mass in secret using dried crusts of bread for the Host and using wine made from clandestinely fermented grapes and raisins. In 1954 he was allowed to return to Lvov, where he remained under house arrest without permission to exercise his priestly duties. He was tried and sentenced again, this time without any pretense of legality. At the time of his release in 1963 he was a servant in a Siberian old people's home.

It is extremely doubtful whether this gesture by the Kremlin presages an easing of religious persecution in the Soviet Union. Vatican officials view the archbishop's release as a simple act of personal respect by the Soviet Government for Pope John. The Vatican deserves the thanks of all freemen for whatever part its representatives may have played in arranging the archbishop's release. This act certainly offers a precedent for the release of other imprisoned religious leaders, such as Cardinal Mindszenty, who is a de facto prisoner in the American Legation at Budapest.

In the long run the release of Archbishop Slipyi should be viewed as a tactical shift rather than as a change in the Kremlin's basic attitude toward religion. It fits the general pattern of Khrushchev's substitution of relatively moderate methods of coercion for the brutal repressive measures which Stalin employed. The Communists may be learning gradually that religious faith thrives on persecution. In this context, Khrushchev's move can be interpreted as an act of enlightened self-interest, for as a living martyr, Archbishop Slipyi was a source of inspiration and courage for his flock.

While the release of Archbishop Slipyi is a joyful event, it does not in itself herald the return of religious freedom to the Soviet Union. There is strong evidence of increased efforts to curtail the practice of religion, which is one of the greatest threats to the totalitarian Communist regime. It is all the more urgent, therefore, that we strive unceasingly for the establishment of cultural autonomy—religious, educational, linguistic—in the Soviet Union. More than anything else, the "new Soviet man" of whom the Communists boast needs an inviolable bill of rights which emphasizes his freedom as an individual rather than his obligations as a cog in a machine. Unless such respect for basic human rights is introduced throughout the area under Soviet rule, Archbishop Slipyi's ordeal will have been in vain. His victory of faith and courage must guide us in this task.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain articles and press reports relating to Archbishop Slipyi's arrest be printed at this point in the Record.

---

[1] Hugh Seton-Watson, "The East European Revolution" (London: Methuen, 1950), p. 190.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 11, 1963]

Prelate Freed by Soviets Tells Pope of Torture

Vatican City, February 10.—The elderly head of Ukrainian Catholics told Pope John XXIII today how he survived 18 years of forced labor and horrible torture in Soviet prisons.

Msgr. Josyf Slipyi, who will be 71 next Sunday, met the Pope this morning for a lengthy audience.

Monsignor Slipyi, the metropolitan of Halyc and archbishop of Lvov, Soviet Ukraine, arrived in Rome last night and it was revealed that he had been released by the Russians last Christmas.

Monsignor Slipyi was first imprisoned April 11, 1945. He was one of 11 Ukrainian archbishops and bishops to be sentenced to various terms.

A number since have died—one by assassination—and Monsignor Slipyi is the first to be released.

A spokesman for the Ukrainian Pontifical College in Rome said that Monsignor Slipyi, head of Eastern rite Catholics in the Ukraine, "was horribly tortured and was forced to do hard labor in Siberia during his imprisonment."

The college spokesman said, "it is unlikely the metropolitan will discuss persecution in public because his every word could have a serious effect on thousands of people in the Ukraine."

Vatican sources said the archbishop's release "was not the result of an agreement between the Holy See and the Soviet Government, nor did the Holy See ask for it. There have been no negotiations on this matter."

The sources warned against believing Soviet persecution of the religious would be changed because of Monsignor Slipyi's release.

Pope John, during a cornerstone-laying ceremony for an Ambrosian seminary this morning, referred indirectly to Monsignor Slipyi's release.

"From the east of Europe there came yesterday evening a touching consolation, for which we thank the Lord," he said.

Monsignor Slipyi was charged with collaboration with the Germans at the time of his arrest. A booklet released by the Ukrainian college said this charge was based on the fact that his predecessor or Archbishop of Lvov had played host to German Army officers in the bishop's palace during the German occupation of the Ukraine.

It was not until 2 years later Moscow radio announced he had been sentenced to 8 years hard labor in Siberia. The Ukrainian college said he later was sentenced to two more terms of various lengths.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 13, 1963]

Vatican Got Reds To Free Archbishop

Vatican City, February 12.—The release of the imprisoned Archbishop of Lvov, Josyf Slipyi, from a Soviet forced-labor camp, was arranged under a Vatican ecumenical council program to ease points of friction between Roman Catholic and other churches, Vatican sources said today.

The release was engineered by the secretariat to promote Christian unity, which handles contacts with non-Catholic churches.

Monsignor Willebrands, member of the secretariat, brought the Ukrainian prelate back to Rome from Moscow by train after a visit there last week. On another mission to Moscow, last fall, the monsignor arranged for the presence in Rome of two observers of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Vatican sources said the success of Monsignor Willebrands' two missions have considerably improved relations between the Catholic and Russian Orthodox Churches. The 70-year-old archbishop, who had been a Soviet prisoner for 18 years, arrived in Rome last Saturday.

The plan for the archbishop's release was evolved during the Vatican council last fall. Giacomo Cardinal Testa, secretary of the congregation for oriental rites, met the two Russian Orthodox observers and asked for a good-will gesture toward Archbishop Slipyi.

[From Time magazine, Feb. 22, 1963]

Roman Catholicism: Kremlin Cooperation

Pope John XXIII, for all of his dislike for communism, is willing to be polite about it. Gone is the defiance that Pius XII used to hurl at the Kremlin; instead Rome makes such amicable gestures as inviting Russian Orthodox observers to the Vatican council. Last week the Pope produced in Rome a living gain from his policy of easing tensions: Ukrainian Archbishop Josyf Slipyi of Lvov, freed after 18 years of Soviet confinement.

The spiritual leader of the Ukraine's 2 million Byzantine-rite Catholics, tall, bearded Archbishop Slipyi, 71, is a Jesuit-trained theologian who was elevated to the episcopacy in 1939. Slipyi (pronounced slee-pay) protested a postwar Russian attempt to force Byzantine-rite Ukrainians into the Russian Orthodox Church, and in 1946 was imprisoned, charged with "political crimes during the German occupation." Confined to a tiny cell with four Catholic priests, he said mass in secret, using dried crusts of bread for hosts and wine made by letting grapes and raisins ferment in a glass. In 1953, his hard-labor sentence was reduced to house arrest in Lvov, but 2 years later, Slipyi was shipped to a Siberian old people's home, where he was put to work as a servant.

MEETING WITH TWO RUSSIANS

Slipyi's release is the diplomatic handiwork of two close Curia friends of Pope John—Augustin Cardinal Bea, chief of the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, and Gustavo Cardinal Testa, secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, which supervises Byzantine-rite Catholics. Late last November, Bea arranged a quiet meeting between Testa and the two Russian observers at the Vatican Council. Testa smoothly pointed out that the Pope had officially disavowed a protest prepared by a group of Ukrainian bishops at the council objecting to the presence of the Russians, tactfully brought up the subject of Archbishop Slipyi's long confinement. The Russians promised to do what they could, and last month notified Cardinal Bea that Slipyi would be freed. A fortnight ago, Bea's chief assistant, Dutch Msgr. Jan Willebrands, flew secretly to Moscow, escorted Slipyi by train to Vienna and then on to Rome. Slipyi had a personal audience with the Pope, has since been resting at the Byzantine-rite monastery of Grottaferrata, 15 miles southeast of Rome. He hopes eventually to return to Lvov.

ONLY THE BEGINNING

The Vatican regards Slipyi's release as only the beginning. "This was a simple act of personal respect by the Russian Government for Pope John," says one Vatican official. "It also gives us hope that other negotiations will work out." There is little doubt as to who would be the subjects of other negotiations: Hungary's Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, a political refugee in the U.S. legation at Budapest since the 1956 uprising, and Archbishop Josef Beran of Prague, who was seized by Czech Communists in 1950, has not been heard from since.

PROPOSED CHANGE OF NAME OF HUNGRY HORSE DAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there has been speculation in the newspapers of my State—and I am quite sure I know from where that speculation comes—concerning the changing of the name of the reservoir formed by Hungry Horse Dam, known as Hungry Horse Lake, to Truman Lake or Truman Reservoir.

Mr. President, I am a great admirer of former President Harry Truman. I know he did a great deal to bring about the consummation of the project known as Hungry Horse. However, I believe in States' rights, to a certain extent, and I must say that I would not be in favor of changing the name of Hungry Horse Lake to Truman Lake, or to any other designation, with one exception.

Some years ago my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] and I introduced a bill to change the name of the reservoir behind Hungry Horse Dam to Harry Kelly Lake. We did so because Harry Kelly, who was long and favorably known as Hungry Horse Harry, fought for and worked for the Hungry Horse project long before anybody else in the Flathead area. Many times his was the lone voice in the wilderness—and I make that as a literal statement.

However, we were not successful in our endeavor to change the name.

I feel that, as a matter of State pride, if the name of Hungry Horse Harry Kelly is not to be attached to the lake, the name Hungry Horse Lake ought to be retained.

I am in full accord with a St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial, which states in part:

> Hungry Horse is one of our favorites—

It is one of mine, also, I say incidentally—

> rich in flavor as a part of the Montana scene * * * in close harmony with the Old West of the Hungry Horse and the New West of hungry horsepower.

To that I say, "Amen."

Insofar as the dam is concerned, Mr. President, the present name should continue in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Great Falls Tribune of February 28, 1963, may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hungry Horse Dam It Is and So It Should Remain

We have admired former President Harry S. Truman. As President he supported and advanced water development projects in Montana and other Western States, but we are unalterably opposed to the proposal of congressional advocates to change the name of the reservoir formed by Hungry Horse Dam to Lake Truman.

This is included in a list of dams and reservoirs for which name changes are being sought to honor former Presidents and Senators. The effort to make the nauseous pill more palatable by splitting the name between reservoir and dam only compounds the felony and confuses one and all.

If a personal name were fitting for the Hungry Horse layout, none other would be so deserving of the honor as the late Harry J. Kelly, pioneer Montana newspaperman and longtime Kalispell weekly publisher. He was the first champion of Hungry Horse Dam—at a time when supporters were scarce and scoffers numerous. He began his crusade of editorials and speeches in support of the project in 1933 and continued it until 1944, when Congress approved the Bureau of Reclamation plans. He gained the nickname of "Hungry Horse Harry" and earned the title of "Father of Hungry Horse Dam."

It is not surprising that a few years ago a proposal to designate the reservoir Kelly Lake was supported by the Montana congressional delegation. We were not in favor of that despite Kelly's qualification for the honor.

A St. Louis Dispatch editorial hit the nail on the head when it said: "Hungry Horse is one of our favorites—rich in flavor as a part of the Montana scene * * * in close harmony with the Old West of the Hungry Horse and the New West of hungry horsepower."

There is a lot of interesting legend attached to the name Hungry Horse. We should cultivate and preserve it instead of trying to water it down.

FREE WORLD TRADE WITH CUBA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during the past 2 or 3 weeks, at various intervals, I have placed in the Record the names of free world ships engaging in Cuban trade. These names have been received on the basis of facts supplied by the Defense Department and the Maritime Administration, as well as other reliable sources of information. All the names have been placed in the Record, giving the flag under which the ships sail as well as the number of ships involved.

Mr. President, some ships are still engaging in trade with Cuba, and the number is greater than many people realize.

A dispatch to the Baltimore Sun, published in the February 19 issue of that paper, reported that eight ships flying flags of countries outside the Communist bloc were sighted by crewmen of the U.S.-flag freighter SS *Santo Cerro* during the 3 days that vessel was in a Cuban port, discharging its cargo of ransom medicines, drugs, and baby foods.

Three of the vessels reported seen by the crewmen were of British registry, three flew the Greek flag, one was Norwegian, and the other Yugoslavian. Together with the dozen or more additional freighters from Communist countries observed by the U.S. crewmen there were thus 20 or more ocean freighters in that Cuban port in the 3-day period cited. They represented a total freight carrying capacity which, if maintained with any degree of regularity, would go far toward taking care of a great proportion of Cuba's food and other requirements.

I ask unanimous consent that the Baltimore Sun article be printed in the Record in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Free-World Ships Seen in Havana—Eight Noticed During 3 Days Ransom Vessel Was There

Washington, February 18.—Eight free world ships were in Havana harbor during the 3 days the last ransom-bearing American-flag freighter, the SS *Santo Cerro*, was there, it was learned today.

This number in such a short period of time is considered significant, because the Kennedy administration pointed out that since only 15 free world ships had called at Cuba during the entire month of January, stringent regulations were not necessary against trading with Cuba.

Therefore, the administration's only restriction was to prevent vessels calling at Cuba since January 1 from loading U.S. Government-owned and financed cargo at U.S. ports, but not at foreign ports.

SEEN BY CREW

Seen by the crewmembers of the *Santo Cerro* from February 10 to February 13 were three British vessels, three Greek, one Norwegian, and one Yugoslav. In addition to these free world ships, they saw 10 Russian and several East German vessels. No mention of Poland was made.

The *Santo Cerro* carried the third shipload of ransom medical supplies, drugs, and baby foods demanded by Premier Fidel Castro in exchange for the 1,113 released Bay of Pigs prisoners.

The American-flag *Santo Cerro* loaded in Baltimore and sailed February 7. Her cargo brought up to $25 million the total sent to Cuba. The full ransom is $53 million.

The fourth ship is to be the German-flag *Priamos*, made available by the Standard Fruit Co. for loading at New Orleans beginning Thursday. The ship sails regularly from New Orleans.

NO REFUGEES EXPECTED

The *Priamos* is to load 2,300 tons valued at $1,100,000. She is not expected to bring back any refugees, the American Red Cross said, because she will head directly from Havana for Costa Rica to pick up bananas.

Like the *Santo Cerro*, the *Priamos* is a refrigerated vessel.

The 3,027-gross-ton German freighter will be the first of the four to load at a gulf port. The first—the SS *African Pilot*—took on her $11 million cargo at Port Everglades. The *Shirley Lykes* and the *Santo Cerro* loaded at Baltimore.

H.D.B.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have been placing the list in the Record from time to time, in the hope that the efforts of the President of the United States and of the State Department—to have the countries involved voluntarily prohibit their ships from moving in and out of Cuba, at the risk of losing their cargoes—can succeed, and so that the economic quarantine or shipping quarantine will be actually such.

On February 7, I published another list in the Congressional Record. In that list I mentioned the names of ships, and included in the list was that of a Swedish vessel, the *Cooranga*. Upon learning of this, the owner of the ship contacted the Ministry for Foreign Affairs at Stockholm and reported that the inclusion of the *Cooranga* in the list was incorrect, and asked rectification of that error. We have checked on that. Apparently the Maritime Commission, in the case of this one ship among many, listed it erroneously, and the following day I submitted a corrected list.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a letter to me, together with a list of the ships referred to.

There being no objection, the letter and list were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Royal Swedish Embassy,
Washington, February 13, 1963.

The Honorable Warren G. Magnuson,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator Magnuson: On page 2057 in the Congressional Record, of February 7, 1963, a list has been reproduced at your request on free world ship arrivals in Cuba, January 1–31, 1963. In this connection, may I draw your attention to the following:

Among the names of ships listed that of a Swedish vessel, the *Cooranga*, occurs. Upon learning this the owners of the ship in question contacted the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Stockholm, reporting that the inclusion of the *Cooranga* in the list was incorrect and requesting a rectification. On instructions from Stockholm, my Embassy contacted the U.S. authorities concerned, conveying to them the information received from the shipping line. They immediately confirmed that the listing was erroneous, and the following day issued a corrected list, a copy of which I enclose herewith for your ready reference.

Against the background of the above facts, I would very much appreciate if you could kindly have the Record corrected on this point.

Sincerely yours,

Gunnar Jarring,
Ambassador of Sweden.

Revised List of Free World Ship Arrivals in Cuba, January 1–31, 1963

NAME OF SHIP—FLAG OF REGISTRY

1. *Arlington Court* (British).
2. *Cannaregio* (Italian).
3. *Capetan Petros* (Greek).
4. *Gloria* (Greek).
5. *London Confidence* (tanker) (British).
6. *London Splendour* (tanker) (British).
7. *Meishun Maru* (Japanese).
8. *Mousse* (Lebanese).
9. *Overseas Pioneer* (tanker) (British).
10. *Pampas* (British).
11. *Perseus* (tanker) (Greek).
12. *Redestos* (Greek).

Note.—The *Cooranga* (Swedish) and the *Freedom First* (Panamanian) were carried on a previous listing as having called at Cuba between January 1–31, 1963. More complete information now available discloses these two ships did not call at Cuba during the period indicated.

(Prepared by Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.)

NOMINATION OF PHILIP N. BROWNSTEIN TO BE FEDERAL HOUSING COMMISSIONER

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement concerning the nomination of Philip N. Brownstein, of Maryland, to be Federal Housing Commissioner. This nomination was confirmed by the Senate on Friday last.

The nomination of this distinguished citizen has met with enthusiastic approval by Representatives in Congress, as well as by members of the financial community.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a number of letters from Members of Congress and others in tribute to Mr. Brownstein and in support of this excellent nomination.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

February 4, 1963.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I was pleased to learn of President Kennedy's recent nomination of Mr. Philip N. Brownstein for Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. Brownstein's experience in the housing field eminently qualifies him for this appointment, and I am happy to advise you of my support for his confirmation.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

George A. Smathers.

January 22, 1963.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Robertson: Your committee will soon be holding a hearing on the question of confirming Philip N. Brownstein, whom the President has nominated to be Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

I hope your committee will recommend Mr. Brownstein's confirmation.

In my judgment, no better choice could have been made. He is an outstanding civil servant, possesses both a keen mind and mature judgment, and his long experience with both the FHA and VA loan programs has eminently qualified him for the post.

Sincerely,

Albert Rains,
Chairman.

January 23, 1963.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator: I was very pleased to read of the pending appointment of Philip Brownstein as head of the Federal Housing Administration.

Mr. Brownstein has had a distinguished career in Government service and I believe is ably fitted for this position. He enjoys the confidence and respect of leaders in the housing industry and I believe his confirmation would meet with overwhelming approval.

This appears to be an excellent appointment of an outstanding public servant.

Very best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

William B. Widnall.

January 24, 1963.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: May I say a few words to you and your distinguished colleagues on behalf of Phil Brownstein whose confirmation as Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration is pending before you.

Not that I think Phil needs them, but it gives me great pleasure, based upon years of association with him, to give you my personal estimate of him. At all times, I have found him to be a man of excellent conduct and manners and a man of exceptional ability—also, he is a tremendous organizer and most levelheaded.

He will do an outstanding job for the good of the country and the agency as Commissioner of FHA. I hope you will confirm him.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am

Respectfully yours,

Albert Thomas.

February 11, 1963.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: Several weeks ago the appointment of Mr. P. N. Brownstein, now the Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration, to be the new Federal Housing Administration Commissioner, was made.

Mr. Brownstein has done an outstanding job as Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration and in that capacity he has been responsible for directing a variety of Veterans' Administration programs costing several billion dollars a year. As part of his responsibility he was charged with supervision and operation of all Veterans' Administration regional offices.

We regret very much losing Mr. Brownstein from the Veterans' Administration program but I did wish to express to you the belief you are getting a good man for the Federal Housing Administration. I believe that you will find him able and cooperative.

Sincerely,

Olin E. Teague,
Chairman.

January 22, 1963.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: I am taking the liberty of communicating with you in support of the nomination of Mr. Philip N. Brownstein as Federal Housing Commissioner.

I know Mr. Brownstein personally and can commend him to you as one who would creditably discharge any duties imposed upon him. His background and experience eminently qualify him for the position of Federal Housing Commissioner, and it is my hope that your committee will consider his nomination favorably.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Eugene J. Keogh.

January 15, 1963.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Robertson: As a former Commissioner of FHA I wish to express to you my great pleasure in learning that President Kennedy has appointed Philip N. Brownstein to be Commissioner of FHA subject to Senate confirmation.

During a good part of my 20-year tenure with FHA I was privileged to work closely with "Phil" on many matters arising from our efforts to coordinate the housing activities of FHA and VA.

On these occasions I was always greatly impressed with his good judgment and outstanding administrative ability.

I am sure that you will find in him the same high qualities that I have so long recognized.

Cordially,

Walter L. Greene,
Vice President.

January 22, 1963.

Senator A. Willis Robertson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Willis: A recent Richmond newspaper mentioned the possibility of Philip Brownstein being appointed as Federal Housing Commissioner.

I have been acquainted with Mr. Brownstein for a number of years and hold him in highest regard. His 25 years experience in this field and his other qualifications make him an excellent choice. Your support of him would be appreciated.

Sorry you cannot make the United States League reception Tuesday night.

Hope to see you before too long.

Sincerely,

Mark W. Saurs,
Executive Vice President.

January 22, 1963.

Hon. A. Willis Robertson,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Robertson: I would like to take this opportunity to convey to you my support for the President's nomination of Philip N. Brownstein to be the new Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

I have known Mr. Brownstein for many years and have found him to always be objective, understanding, and extremely capable. His many years of experience in the housing field eminently qualify him to be the FHA Commissioner, and I was delighted to learn of his appointment.

Naturally, I hope that your committee can quickly and favorably recommend his confirmation as Commissioner, and I wanted you to know that I have never heard anyone question Mr. Brownstein's ability to do this job as one of the top Government officials in the housing field.

Sincerely,

Henry A. Bubb,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

SELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point an article entitled "Are We Getting Our Share of the Best?" written by R. Smith Simpson, and published in the Foreign Service Journal for November 1962. The article relates to one of the most critical questions confronting our foreign service in the country. I commend it to the interest of all my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Are We Getting Our Share of the Best?

(By R. Smith Simpson)

The process of finding and selecting officers adequately equipped for our diplomatic service is a singularly exacting one keyed to highly selective criteria. It has been developed by trial and error over a number of years, subjected to numerous reappraisals, exposed to various essays of experimentation. One would be justified in expecting it would bring into the Foreign Service a flow of superbly qualified young men and women, the pick of their generation—young men and women fully aware of the importance of the calling to which they aspired and at least moderately well prepared for its opportunities and obligations of representing the United States abroad.

A year of service as a deputy examiner engaged in interviewing candidates and a round of colleges as a part of the Department's recruiting effort have persuaded me that accomplishment falls grievously short of the ideal. Of those candidates I examined a few were good, a rare one was outstanding, but the great majority were wholly unprepared for diplomatic work, and did not even have the slightest glimmer of what it was. Somehow they had acquired a feeling they might like the Foreign Service, or at any rate it would do no harm to give the examinations a whirl to see "what gives." They had no conception whatever that this is an exacting calling, involving not only considerable hazard and adventure but also a profound cultural awareness, knowledge of history and political science, some familiarity with the behavioral sciences and at least an elementary grounding in international law, international organization and diplomacy—in other words considerable intellectual preparation, if they are adequately to represent their country abroad.

My initial surprise was to find among the candidates an abysmal ignorance of so elementary a subject as the geography of the United States. Few could even place accurately the principal rivers: one with so descriptive a name as the Ohio was not infrequently identified as being "somewhere west of the Mississippi." Few could name the principal seaports, and, of course, any requirement demanding such detailed familiarity with this country as identifying the States comprising the Wheat Belt or the Corn Belt was completely beyond the average candidate's depth.

As to elementary economics and social data, most could only guess at the population, labor force, and gross national product of their country. Many did not know what constituted "gross national product." They had no clear idea as to the principal products of their country, nor as to its exports and imports. They could name a few of each, but had no notion of their relative importance and had given no thought to the role of imports in the American economy.

As with elementary geographic and economic aspects of the United States, so with historical, sociological, and cultural. Americans abroad are asked a great many questions about their country. How did the United States acquire the Panama Canal? What is its status now? Who started our war with Spain (or Mexico) and what came out of it? When did our labor movement start and where does it stand now? How does a Jimmy Hoffa get control of a powerful union? What were some of the reform movements in American history? What became of them?

A good half of our candidates could answer such questions with only the thinnest recital of facts; many could not discuss them at all. Some could not recall ever having heard of the Populist movement; few knew its connection with Woodrow Wilson's New Freedom. Asked if he knew anything about the progressive movement, one candidate replied, "Oh, yes, that was LaFollette's movement." To the question, "Where did LaFollette come from?" he could only reply vaguely, "Somewhere out west."

I would say that the proportion of candidates who could handle current events questions reasonably well was about 6 out of 10. Perhaps three or four could give fairly adequate definitions of the Truman Doctrine or the Eisenhower Doctrine, even state the composition and responsibilities of SEATO and CENTO. Most of them had never heard of ANZUS.

If we explored American foreign policy we encountered baffling deficiencies. Most of them knew the origin of the Monroe Doctrine and its general content, but beyond that their knowledge rapidly petered out. The tests the Doctrine has undergone, the various interpretations placed on it, its abuses were beyond them. Naturally, we rarely ventured to ask for a discussion of whether it is still in existence; although this is a question many of them will encounter and all of them should be expected to handle with some degree of information and intelligence.

The American abroad is asked about American culture as often as about our history, our politics and our policies. An Indian dinner guest may inquire: "America is very materialistic, I understand. Is that so? What has it contributed to cultural and spiritual progress?" No more than 1 candidate in 20 could provide a thoughtful, well-informed response to such a question. Even sadder to relate, they were equally blank on purely factual questions. Could the candidate give his Indian guests the names of five or six American painters and tell something of their work? The names of five composers? Of two or three philosophers? Of a few poets, novelists or essayists other than the contemporaries with whom the Indian was probably familiar?

The answers were halting and feeble. Many could not name a single painter, a single composer, a single philosopher, other than contemporary. Even in the literary field knowledge was surprisingly limited. Thought-provoking questions, requiring a certain amount of relating and synthesizing—"What has been Chicago's contribution to American literature?" for example—left them gaping and stumbling. We put simpler factual questions: What was the New England school of literature in the 19th century? We found college graduates native to New England itself who could not answer.

Most candidates showed some slight familiarity with 20th century writers. Asked to name some poets, they almost invariably led off with Robert Frost. Among novelists, they could produce the names of Hemingway and Faulkner, perhaps others. (One mentioned Tennessee Williams.) But under questioning this familiarity proved to be shallow; it did not survive much discussion.

Questions of a sociological nature asked us abroad and on which we should be able to throw intelligent light found candidates pitifully uninformed. Such questions concern the basis and nature of our society. They are problems people confront abroad. They raise doubts of our fitness for leadership. What are the causes of our sizable problem of juvenile delinquency? What are the causes of our high divorce rate? Why do we permit trashy pulp magazines to exist, to be exported? Why Hollywood? To what extent are our basic civil rights effective? Rare indeed was the candidate who could cope with such questions.

As to diplomacy itself, few of the candidates had any idea what it was. Nine out of ten had not even given any thought to it, it never having occurred to them to so much as look the word up in a dictionary, much less go to a library and read something about it, if only a biography or two. This was baffling indeed. I had expected to find far greater interest in a profession which candidates were considering as a career. I had expected, even, preparation, but as to this I found our universities deficient. One has to search far and wide for a course in diplomacy, particularly one in which its methods and techniques are discussed. Our universities appear to be hypnotized by the machinery and formulation of foreign policy: consideration of its execution is well-nigh nonexistent.

Indeed, one conclusion that emerges from such an experience as this is that American education is letting us down. An educational system that turns out graduates lacking the simplest geographical and sociological knowledge about their country is not an adequate educational system. Universities that graduate men and women with only a smattering of knowledge of their Nation's history, its governmental structure and political system, and its cultural evolution as well as of the international political system, do not merit the name of universities.

Unless the quality of our education is even more appalling than I think it is, a second conclusion must be that the State Department and the Foreign Service are no longer getting their share of the cream of college graduates.

One reason for this is that the Foreign Service is no longer the principal avenue for dedication to constructive work abroad. The spirit of service now has a score of outlets to two or three existing 30 years ago. Philanthropic and charitable organizations with oversea programs have multiplied, and broadened their activities. Three thousand American companies now operate outside the United States and offer all kinds of opportunities, including negotiation of agreements with foreign governments and the development of exchange, training and technical assistance programs, in a private diplomacy very similar in content to public.

The competition of the professions is more formidable than ever. Teaching now offers many opportunities for travel and cross-cultural adventure through scholarships and fellowships, exchange programs, foundation grants, positions in oversea branches. Law schools send moot court teams to college to demonstrate the practice of law and attract promising undergraduates. The physical sciences have taken on new glamour; there is a widespread feeling that our country's destiny lies in the hands of the scientists. Space technology has the adventuresome appeal that diplomacy had 30 years ago and the financial rewards are much greater.

The competition is not only from this extensive area of private and semipublic enterprise, but from other components of the Federal establishment. There are few departments and agencies not engaged in foreign affairs in some manner. They also have taken to offering summer employment as a means of stimulating interest. The military services offer many opportunities which parallel the Foreign Service, with fringe benefits our Service does not provide.

Impairing the competitive position of the Foreign Service is also the fact that in recent years it has become somewhat less of a foreign service than formerly. We can no longer offer the virtual certainty that a recruit will spend extended periods of his life abroad, with diversity of life, work, travel and adventure that this means. Since Wristonization, officers must expect to spend sizable periods of their careers right here at home.

The barrage of criticism directed at the Department and the Service has discouraged some applicants. I had candidate after candidate attest to this and query me about the criticism. It seems quite evident that we must be prepared to discuss criticism frankly, conceding deficiencies and mistakes where they exist, pointing convincingly to our achievements, although these may be quiet and unobtrusive, presenting clearly the difficulties and problems confronting the practice of diplomacy in this age.

For this complex of reasons, we are not now achieving the high level of quality the times require and which was envisioned by the various committees which, in the last 15 years, have examined the Foreign Service and made recommendations for its improvement. "Foreign policy," said the Wriston committee, "will be dynamic or inert, steadfast or aimless, in proportion to the character and unity of those who serve it."[1] Formal unit we have achieved, but character we have neglected.

In addition, since World War II, we have achieved the establishment of a broader base for recruitment. Our candidates now come from all parts of the country, all income levels, all social environments, all occupational backgrounds, all types of schools and almost every racial and national origin. But the Department has not correspondingly extended its effort at quality recruitment. It has followed the letter of the recommendation that the Nation's diplomatic service be more representative without recognizing the ancillary necessity of refining its competitive appeal to achieve a reservoir of suitable quality. It has not offered to college students or faculties a clear enough image of the Service and the kind of people it seeks. It has not set forth either the educational preparation needed nor, clearly and precisely enough, the personal qualifications, aptitudes and skills. It has engaged in a dragnet, come-one-come-all operation. If quality is to be combined with representativeness in our reservoir of talent, a greater effort—qualitative, in particular—is required.

To get across to our colleges, and even to our secondary schools, and the general public, a clearer image of our diplomatic service and the kind of people who can qualify is, I suggest, a fundamental responsibility of the department of foreign affairs in a democracy and it is going to take some doing. It requires, first, a clearer and deeper analysis of diplomacy. The content and techniques of our work rather than its situs abroad must now be emphasized. What is required is (1) a clearer concept among ourselves of what diplomacy is today—which is to say, the different types of diplomacy which the current environment exacts; (2) a clearer analysis of the competitive factors we are up against, including the interests of young people and why they have these interests, in order that our presentation may be sharply pitched to these interests; and (3) a more discriminating selection of the Foreign Service officers assigned to present the Service and its requirements to our educational system and the public, and the assignment of such officers for long enough periods to provide continuity of contact, experience and effort.

We must be quite clear and very determined about this. We can no longer afford the luxury of letting the Department and the Service be represented by officers who are not sufficiently seasoned and intellectually responsive to their audiences. Let me give an example or two of what I mean. Some high school teachers who had attended one of the Department's seminars complained to me afterward that the Department's presentation was incomplete and evasive. I pointed out that naturally there were matters that could not be placed on the top of a seminar table for public discussion. That was not the kind of thing the teachers had in mind, however. They were referring instead to such instances as the reply of a senior Foreign Service officer who, when asked what kind of informational program the United States had in the area under discussion, told the questioner he would have to get his answer from USIA. No one in the seminar felt that this was satisfactory or reassuring as to the Department's familiarity with, much less coordination of, our total diplomacy.

Another example is directly related to our recruiting effort. Representatives of the Department and of another Federal agency visited a certain eastern college for recruiting purposes. The other agency sent its deputy director; the Department's representative was a junior Foreign Service officer. Among the dozen or so students who showed up at the Department's meeting were the sons of a Foreign Service colleague. They described the Department's spokesman as timid, evasive, and inadequately informed on the current crises facing the United States. By contrast, the agency representative impressed the students as mature, frank, responsive, and well informed. No more than two or three students showed any further interest in the Foreign Service, but a dozen or so filled out applications to the other agency.

I would warn against any superficial or merely bureaucratic effort to improve our communication with the educational establishment and the general public. This is not something that can be handed out to officers as a kind of recruitment patter. It is not a matter of visiting more campuses or staying longer. What is needed is a clearer conceptualisation of diplomacy in the 20th century and this can come only from the minds of the officers themselves. We must take a more analytical—let us say a more scientific—interest in the overall nature of our policymaking and diplomatic functions, and the way in which these fit into the work of other departments, other agencies, private firms, universities. We must be willing to examine our work critically, pinpointing its deficiencies as well as its excellence, its failures as well its achievements, and ask ourselves why these deficiencies and failures occur. We must familiarize ourselves with the growing literature on foreign policy and operations and the wide range of sociological factors involved.

The Department on its side must be prepared to take steps to stimulate and make possible such an intellectual effort. This means, for one thing, that the Department and the Service must be staffed generously enough to provide time for intellectual, as contrasted with routine, day-to-day effort. Officers so hard pressed by daily demands that they can scarcely keep up with a good daily newspaper will not be able to measure up to what is required.

If this effort can be made, one consequence will be to bring us into closer relationships with our colleges and universities. The thinking of the faculties of our higher institutions of learning can help us in our search for clarification; we in turn have something to offer them. From this exchange will come a clearer understanding, on the campus and among ourselves, of the kind of work in which we are engaged and the kind of people we are seeking.

As the Wriston Committee said: "No segment of the Foreign Service machinery stands in more pressing need of modernization than its recruitment of junior officers." But no tinkering and tampering will produce this modernization. It must take place in the minds of men.

---

[1] Toward a Stronger Foreign Service. Report of the Secretary of State's Public Committee on Personnel, June 1954. Department of State Publication 5458. U.S. Government Printing Office.

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S MARKSMANSHIP IN MEXICO AND THE BIRD POPULATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a small news item in the Washington Evening Star last Monday caught my eye. It was a very sketchy report of a highly successful bird hunting excursion enjoyed by General Eisenhower in Mexico. According to the report, General Eisenhower killed 40 ducks and 35 other birds in a period of less than 3 hours last Saturday.

This is certainly a testimonal to General Eisenhower's keen marksmanship, but I shudder to think what the grand total would have been if he had made a full day of it. I do not know how many were in his party, but it is obvious that if their eyesight was as keen as the general's, the duck population has incurred a serious setback.

I do not believe that Arkansas duck hunters would necessarily be impressed with the general's markmanship. We have some mighty good hunters in Arkansas too, but they have little opportunity to test their skill under the same circumstances, since last season they were limited to only one mallard a day. Duck hunting has traditionally been excellent in Arkansas and it has in the past contributed a great deal to our economy by attracting thousands of out-of-State sportsmen. With a bag limit of only one mallard a day, however, there is not much incentive for someone to travel a considerable distance to merely watch the ducks fly over. If they could shoot all the ducks they wanted, I daresay that they could equal the general's record but, of course, there would not be any ducks at all the next year.

Two years ago the Congress authorized what is in effect a crash program to try to halt the decline in the duck population by speeding up the purchase of good breeding and nesting lands. This was a bipartisan program which encountered little, if any, opposition in the Congress. The question was not whether or not to authorize the conservation program but rather how fast to carry it out. Seven million dollars was appropriated by the Congress last year as the intitial increment in the purchase program and $12 million has been requested by the President for the next fiscal year. We have been working with our Canadian friends in an effort to improve the waterfowl situation at that end of the flyway. Neither the wetlands acquisition program nor the efforts to solve the breeding problem in Canada will accomplish much if the ducks and geese are all decimated at the wintering end of the flyway.

General Eisenhower's reputation as a marksman may have been improved by this recent hunt, but I fear that it does not lend much encouragement to our wildlife officials who are trying so hard to improve the waterfowl situation. I hope that all U.S. hunters visiting in Mexico do not follow the General's example.

I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EISENHOWER SHOOTS 75 BIRDS IN MEXICO

CULIACAN, MEXICO, February 25.—Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's marksmanship is still hot. And so is his appetite while on vacation at nearby Las Cruces.

The former President went duck hunting here and killed 40 ducks and 35 other birds in less than 3 hours Saturday. Then he rolled his own tacos, a sort of Mexican sandwich made of tortillas, and enjoyed chile con carne and enchiladas.

GOLD MEDAL FOR EDDIE CANTOR

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on Monday, February 18, 1963, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], introduced Senate Joint Resolution 47, which would authorize the President of the United States to express the high esteem and appreciation of the American people, and the issuance of a gold medal to Eddie Cantor.

The Senator from Florida has done this country a great service in calling to our attention the need for recognizing this outstanding humanitarian and entertainer, who not only has devoted his life to entertain Americans via radio, television, the motion picture, and stage, but also has given of his time to help in many worthy causes, the most notable of which is probably the March of Dimes, the 25th anniversary of which we celebrate this year.

Because it was the beloved Mr. Cantor who 25 years ago suggested to President Franklin D. Roosevelt the idea of every American interested in combating poliomyelitis to send 10 cents to the White House—the idea of a March of Dimes was created. It has stood the test of time—and because of it and through it, this dread disease today has virtually been stopped.

And even though the March of Dimes has virtually eradicated polio, the work of this great organization still goes on seeking cures, through research, of other crippling diseases.

Knowing that Mr. Cantor is a modest man, his recognition is symbolic of all Americans who have given so unselfishly and untiringly of their services to this great humanitarian effort.

The Senator from Florida has asked the Congress to act promptly and favorably on this resolution. I join with my distinguished colleague from Florida in this request, and particularly urge the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, to which this resolution was referred, to move with dispatch.

The junior Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] has assisted us all in putting this overall resolution in its proper perspective when he said that for the Congress to recognize Mr. Cantor through issuance of this gold medal, we are recognizing not only a fellow man who is a national figure, but a man who is a national asset.

FEDERAL AID TO CITIES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as a Member of a body directly concerned with the operations of the Federal Government I have many times heard the accusation that the Federal Government is a bureaucratic octopus continually seeking involvement in more and more areas of government.

I am convinced that the Federal Government is involved in a great many areas of concern primarily because there was a job to do and no one else would do it. It often appears that when there is a vacuum of responsibility the only level of government with the interest and ability to fill that vacuum is the Federal.

I for one would certainly be glad to see State and local units of government assume more responsibility. But I cannot believe that needed programs and services should be abandoned if no one at the local level will carry them out.

This problem is very well put in perspective in a recent editorial in a fine weekly newspaper in Wyoming, the Kemmerer Gazette. This editorial points out that the same people who are so vocal in condemning the Federal Government for moving into governmental vacuums are the same people who help create those vacuums by inaction at the local level.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Toward Federal Aid

It is hardly surprising that the State legislature flatly refused to give Wyoming cities and towns badly needed additional revenue. The State legislature, through the years, has never been particularly responsive to the needs of the citizens of Wyoming's rapidly growing municipalities.

The legislature's refusal to act was, however, extremely disappointing because it appeared as late as a week before adjournment that the cities and towns would get more revenue.

The sales tax measure (of which the towns would have gotten only one-fourth) passed the house of representatives by a substantial margin. The disappointment came when the senate defeated the measure by nearly a two to one majority.

Even if the lawmakers didn't like the sales tax, however, they could have passed any one of a number of alternative revenue-producing bills sponsored by the Wyoming Association of Municipalities. But they chose not to.

Thus, once again, the cities and towns get nothing.

There is one ironic, almost ridiculous, aspect about this situation. This comes in the fact that several of the most influential legislators like to speak long and loud in criticism of Federal aid.

By their act of denying cities and towns State revenue, the legislators are forcing the municipalities to seek aid from the Federal Government.

A good case in point is near at hand. A new bill has been introduced into the U.S. Congress which would appropriate $100 million to aid cities in eliminating combined sanitary and storm sewers.

Does this strike a familiar chord?

The town of Kemmerer has combination sanitary-storm sewers. The matter has been under discussion recently. The city council would like to separate the two sewer systems if money were available to do the job. Many other cities and towns, some of them in Wyoming, have the same problem.

The Federal Government is working on a solution to these problems. Our State government, through the lack of action by its legislature, has ignored these problems.

In the next few years, the Federal Government will move into many fields which were formerly considered the province of local government. One of the chief reasons for this will be the failure to solve problems by local government.

Wyoming's State legislature has boosted the cities and towns another step along the way to becoming dependent on the Federal Government.

PEACE CORPS TRAGEDY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I was informed yesterday that the bodies of two members of the Peace Corps were found in the wreckage of an airliner which crashed yesterday in the Philippines. The two were Phillip Maggard, of Buffalo, Wyo., and Nancy Ann Boyd, of Martinez, Calif.

There is little anyone can say or do to lessen the heartbreak of a tragedy like this one. These young people with their enthusiasm for life and their concern for their fellow man are gone. We can only say to their parents, their relatives and friends, that we too share your grief.

These deaths have illustrated a sad fact of human nature, that it is the bold, the daring, who pay the price for the advancement of mankind. Whether it be the pioneer extending the boundaries of civilization or the Peace Corpsman fighting the forces of want and suffering, it is those who live their convictions, who are not afraid to venture into unknown or dangerous fields who make the sacrifice for progress.

The Peace Corps is to me patriotism of the highest order. It is an endeavor that calls upon the very best in the human spirit and the very finest in the American traditions. These two young people exemplified the spirit of this Nation and the Peace Corps. We suffer because of their deaths; the world and the cause of freedom suffers a loss, yet at the same time the world is a better place because they were here.

Mr. President, the dedication of members of the Peace Corps is superbly illustrated by a statement made by Phillip Maggard in his application to join that group. Phillip, who hoped someday to be a minister, wrote:

> Since my ministry would be concerned mainly with attempts to help humanity, I feel the Peace Corps would provide a way of gaining experience that would make that attempt more feasible. And, having worked with the Peace Corps, I should hope to feel that I have left my area better than I had found it.

Phillip Maggard was 22 years old; he attended the University of the South at Sewanee, Tenn., and the University of Wyoming at Laramie. He entered Peace Corps training last June at San Jose State College in California and was a member of the Seventh Peace Corps contingent sent to the Philippines. At the time of his death he was teaching at a small village school in Liangu Bay, Agusan Province on the isle of Mindanao. His father, J. M. Maggard, is superintendent of schools in Buffalo, Wyo. Members of the family have long been friends of mine.

Mr. President, there are always many mundane details that attend tragedies such as this one and I am gratified to know that Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, has been able to send one of his assistants, Nathaniel Davis, to Buffalo to relieve the family of as much of this detail as is possible.

Mr. President, I should like to include the following statements from persons concerned with the Peace Corps in my remarks. Mr. Shriver said of Phillip and Nancy Ann that both were "outstanding volunteers performing valuable service to mankind. They could have devoted their lives to no more valuable effort. I extend my deepest sympathy to the parents and friends of these fine young people."

The superintendent of schools for Agusan Province said that these two were "outstanding Americans who were doing highly competent work, they will be missed greatly."

Ameito Mutuc, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, said:

> Nancy Ann Boyd and Phillip Maggard exemplified a new and dedicated breed of young Americans who are giving of their best to extend the variety and strength of the free way of life to the far corners of the earth. They consecrated their lives to the pursuit of peace and thus contributed to the important work of imparting peace and fostering good will and the democratic way of life which is the mission of the Peace Corps.

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, over the past few years there have been many carefully researched articles in the American press dealing with the increasing manifestations of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, and with the evidence that the Soviet officials are themselves deliberately fanning the flames.

Last June 28, I wrote to the Department of State in connection with this situation and I urged that some dramatic action be taken to make manifest our official displeasure over the persecution of religious minorities in the Soviet Union.

In a lengthy reply on July 11, 1962, Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton wrote, among other things, that it is "not possible to determine whether Soviet Jews are deliberately being singled out as Jews for a disproportionate amount of condemnation and victimization."

I must confess that I found it difficult to understand Mr. Dutton's uncertainty because it seemed to me at the time that there was overwhelming evidence that the Soviet Jews were, in fact, the victims of special persecution. In this connection, I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate an article which appeared in the London Observer for Sunday, January 13. This article, written by the Soviet expert, Edward Crankshaw, clearly points the finger at Prime Minister Khrushchev, himself, as the chief condoner, if not the chief instigator, of the persecution of the Soviet Jews.

Mr. President, in 1954, during the 83d Congress, I was a member of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression and Forced Incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. At that time, on September 22 and 23, 1954, we conducted hearings on the treatment of Jews by the Soviets. A report was published as a result of those hearings. I believe that the conclusions reached in the committee's study are worthy of reiteration, for the past 9 years have produced no evidence to indicate a contrary determination. The report stated:

> Indeed, the conclusion to which one is driven by the great mass of evidence presented to this committee is that the official and deliberate policy of communism was aimed directly at forced assimilation of the Jews as the preferred technique for exterminating the Jews as a people.
>
> The end result sought by the Communists stands revealed by the evidence, therefore, as being no different from the end result sought by the Nazis.

As the Observer article indicates, this continuing Soviet racism reveals not only to the world but also to the Soviet people that Communist deeds do not match Communist words.

This is a lesson that will stand us in good stead in all of our dealings with the Communists.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article from the London Sunday Observer be inserted into the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr K. Is Worried Over Jews

(By Edward Crankshaw)

The position of Jewry in the Soviet Union continues to worry Mr. Khrushchev—and the Jews.

According to a reliable report from Moscow, the much-publicized meeting on December 17 of writers, artists, and musicians with the highest Government leaders, including Mr. Khrushchev himself, was largely taken up with a bitter argument on and around anti-Semitism.

None of this was published in official versions of the speeches at that meeting because the Soviet Government has been advised by certain satellite leaders that the latest drive against Soviet Jewry—the arrest of rabbis and Jewish leaders on currency charges, the steady closing of synagogues—has been creating a poor impression in the outside world.

Mr. Khrushchev himself was uneasily half-defensive, half-aggressive. There was no more anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, he said, because "the nationalities question has been solved." There was only "individual anti-Semitism."

Nevertheless, it was better for Jews not to hold top positions in the Government because this only provoked popular resentment. He had already said all this to the leaders of Poland and Hungary in 1956, and in his view the revolt in those countries were largely due to the fact that there had been too many Jews in top Government posts.

CONSTERNATION

The occasion for these remarks seems to have been the attack by Mr. Ilychev on the composer, Shostakovich, for using Yevtushenko's poem about the Nazi massacre of the Kiev Jews at Babi Yar as the text for his new symphony. The remarks produced so much consternation that afterward Mr. Khrushchev was moved to go up to Ilya Ehrenburg, who had also been violently attacked by another speaker, and assure him that his words were not directed at him personally. "You must understand that as a professional politician I have to take things as I find them and warn against dangers."

These words do not ring quite true in view of the sustained attack, increasing all through 1962, on Jewish culture and Jewish religious observances. At least 10 important centers of Jewish population have had their synagogues closed down in recent months, making a total of at least 60 since 1959.

Over 60 percent of the published total of all those persons shot for "speculation" and similar activities have been Jews; and in some of the trials synagogues were described as the meeting place for "crooks and speculators."

PILLORIED BY PRESS

One of the most important closures was the Lvov synagogue on November 5 last year. Lvov, capital of the Western Ukraine, has been traditionally a great Jewish center, and even now there remain between 30,000 and 40,000 Jews. These now have no place of worship.

Their synagogue was closed after a series of articles in Lvov Pravda, the local party journal, had stigmatized it as a black-market center, and named various offenders; these were then tried and given heavy prison sentences.

Lvov Pravda subsequently published "demands" by Jewish workers that the synagogue should be closed, and it was.

Other synagogues closed last year were those at Sverdlovsk, with 40,000 Jews; Zhitomir, with 30,000; Kazan, with 25,000; Grozny, with 12,000; and many more.

In many places Jews meeting for prayer in private houses have been dispersed by the police and pilloried in the press.

For the first time in Soviet history, 1962 saw the banning of the manufacture of mazot, or unleavened bread, and the prohibition of parcels containing mazot from abroad.

The only Jewish religious seminary in the whole of Russia was immunized by the simple process of denying residential permits to 9 of its 15 students. "Individual anti-Semitism" seems to be running pretty high.

SUZANNE LABIN: JOAN OF ARC OF FREEDOM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a number of my colleagues have shared the pleasure with me of meeting with Madam Suzanne Labin, the remarkable Frenchwoman who has done so much in recent years to help focus the attention of the free world on the harsh realities of the cold war.

The late Forrest Davis, one of our distinguished American correspondents, described Madam Labin as "the most luminous and eloquent voice of the West against the terrible menace it faces." I, myself, have likened her to Joan of Arc, not only because she is a Frenchwoman and petite, but because of her dedication and her ability to inspire others and because the situation the free world faces in a sense resembles the crisis confronting the French nation when the Maid of Orleans called it to arms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record at this point an article entitled "Suzanne Labin: Joan of Arc of Freedom," by Eugene Lyons, who is nationally known to all of us as a senior editor of Reader's Digest and as an authority on communism.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the American Legion magazine,
December 1962]

Suzanne Labin: Joan of Arc of Freedom

(By Eugene Lyons)

Incensed by an anti-Communist book that was making a sensation in France, the Moscow paper Soviet Russia struck out at its author. "Is Suzanne Labin," it asked with heavyhanded irony, "an old maid wearing glasses, sour on the whole world, or a young girl who couldn't pass her school exams?"

Whether posed in ignorance or in malice, the question could hardly have been more grotesquely mistaken, and the Paris publishers exploited Moscow's blunder. In issuing a new edition of the book, "Liberté aux Liberticides" (Freedom for the Murderers of Freedom), they inserted a leaflet to set the comrades straight.

"Since the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. is inquiring about the author," it said, "we are pleased to comply." A picture of Suzanne Labin attested that she was strikingly good looking; a succinct biography attested that she was a seasoned scholar, held a string of academic degrees, and was happily married. This was in 1957. Since then, we may be sure, Soviet intelligence has caught up with the lady. The Communist press denounces her as the very embodiment of anti-Communist fury, but it no longer raises doubts about her looks or education.

In the intervening years, Suzanne Labin has emerged as the most dynamic, ubiquitous and effective opponent of communism in the free world. She is today as well known and as highly esteemed among dedicated anti-Communists in Asia, Latin America, and the United States, as she is in her native France and Europe. The shelf full of her books, pamphlets, and articles adds up to a hardheaded course on the theory and practice of political warfare. She accepts repeated threats of death that reach her by mail and by phone, as accolades from the enemy. The same applies to an attempt to kidnap her in New Delhi, when she escaped from a car that was taking her to the Soviet Embassy.

Senator THOMAS J. DODD has called Suzanne the Joan of Arc of freedom against communism, and he is not the only one. Because she is a Frenchwoman, petite, and a magnificient crusader, it was inevitable that she should be compared to the Maid of Orleans. The late Forrest Davis wrote, in addition, that she is the most luminous and eloquent voice of the West against the terrible menace it faces. Edmond Michelet, a former Minister of Justice, spoke of her as our magnificient, unique Suzanne Labin.

Certainly, political dynamite has rarely come in a smaller or more attractive package. A natural blonde with flashing eyes and a radiant smile, she ekes out 5 feet of height on high heels. In addressing large audiences around the world, she often has to stand on a box to get her head above the lectern. Somehow, the contrast between her feminine charm and her robust logic adds dimensions to the total impression. Whether in French, English, or Spanish, her eloquence is seasoned with Gallic wit.

Both her zeal and her energy seem inexhaustible. Consider her visit to the United States this summer:

She had traveled halfway around the globe, from her home in Paris to Seoul, Korea, to take part in an Extraordinary Congress of the Asian People's Anti-Communist League. The delegates and observers from some 30 countries regarded this tiny Westerner—the chief European correspondent of the league's official organ—as one of their very own. The principal achievement of the Congress was the adoption of Suzanne Labin's plan to create a permanent freedom center in Seoul—an Asian equivalent of the Freedom Academy project now bottled up in congressional committees in Washington.

The freedom center, which has the official support of the Korean and South Vietnam Governments, will "initiate and develop an integrated, operational science to educate and train anti-Communist leaders and cadres superior to Communist cold war professionals, and to develop a specific program designed to unmask and frustrate the false propaganda of the Communists and to propagate the gospels of freedom." The wording clearly bears the imprint of Mme. Labin's mind and style.

With this accomplished, she felt that there was work to do in America in connection with the mounting Red threats in southeast Asia. Therefore, instead of returning home directly, she went on to the United States. Her itinerary here included Los Angeles, San Francisco, Kansas City, St. Louis, Chicago, New York, Philadelphia, and Washington. Into about 5 weeks, she managed to pack 26 lectures (all but a few gratis), a dozen press conferences, 18 radio and television appearances, and uncounted consultations with individual anti-Communists and political leaders.

She wound up the tour by addressing 2 luncheons in Washington—1 tendered by Senator DODD and attended by 25 Senators, the other by Congressman WALTER H. JUDD, attended by 37 Representatives. Reluctantly, she declined other American invitations because she had to rush to Paris to supervise the filming of her documentary—"In Berlin, Freedom Is at Stake"—in time for the anniversary of the Berlin wall, and to prepare for a scheduled lecture tour in South America soon thereafter.

In New York, where we shared the platform at an anti-Communist seminar at the Commodore Hotel, Suzanne Labin explained the main purpose of her American trip to me. She was thoroughly alarmed by the intensive propaganda underway in the free world, and especially in the United States, against the government of Ngo Dinh Diem in South Vietnam.

"I wanted to warn anti-Communists in your country," she explained, "and as much of the public as I could reach, that the anti-Diem campaign is Communist inspired. It aims to discourage and if possible put an end to American support of the Saigon government in its life-and-death struggle against the Red guerrilla offensive."

This, indeed, was the message running through all her private and public talks while she was in our country. She recalled how similar propaganda against Chiang Kai-shek, in which the Mao Tse-tung forces were pictured as just agrarian reformers, helped bring about the fall of China. Always, she emphasized, when the Communists concentrate on conquering some country, the incumbent anti-Communist regime becomes the target of systematic attack in the free world. Now, she said, it was President Diem's turn.

In South Vietnam, the United States had decided to back the Saigon government against the Communist invasion. "This was too much for the numerous species of auxiliaries and dupes of the Kremlin," she wrote in the Washington World. "A case of true resistance to communism cannot be tolerated. Therefore, an immense campaign was launched through the powerful press of capitulation to decry and kill our ally of Saigon." Point by point, she then refuted the lies and half-truths about the Diem regime being spread by the Red propaganda apparatus—in print, on the air, through knowing allies and eager dupes.

In the last few years, Mme. Labin has made several extensive trips through South Vietnam, questioning its people, addressing meetings in towns and villages, checking anti-Diem allegations on the spot. Though the Government has its faults—to expect Western-style democracy in southeast Asia would be naive, she says—it has improved the lot of the people and was making exciting progress in agrarian reform until Communist terror slowed up the process.

The guerrilla offensive is not a popular revolt, as a portion of the Western press would have us believe, but "a prefabricated affair, teleguided from headquarters in Communist Hanoi and Peiping. We should never forget," Suzanne Labin told American audiences, "that more than a million persons have fled from North to South Vietnam. There would have been millions more had the borders not been closed in brutal violation of the Geneva agreement dividing Vietnam. You must see to it that the blunders the great democracies made in China, then in French Indochina, are not repeated in South Vietnam."

I had met Suzanne Labin briefly when she was in the United States in 1959. But I was able to observe her in full action for the first time in December 1960. It was a phenomenon not easily forgotten—a demonstration of what one dedicated and tireless woman, without money, without official support, despite the apathy of the press, could accomplish.

The occasion was the 3-day International Conference on Political Warfare, in Paris: the first global gathering of "activists" in the struggle against communism, above national and party line, ever staged. It was Suzanne Labin who had conceived and planned the enterprise; she who, almost singlehandedly and against heartbreaking odds, had mobilized the conclave.

Some 400 delegates showed up—trade union leaders, parliamentarians, writers, exile leaders from Communist-captive countries, and others—mostly as individuals, some as spokesmen for organizations. About three-quarters were French, of course, but the rest came from 15 other countries and included 10 Asians, 6 Africans, and a small American contingent. The whole spectrum of anti-Communist thinking and feeling, from right to left, was represented, in a search for common ground against the common enemy.

Like others before her, Suzanne Labin had learned the hard way that the rich seem indifferent to their own peril. Her efforts to raise money for the conference had netted only $2,400. Undismayed, she had proceeded with the project on that shoestring. She obtained a meeting hall, rent free, and managed to borrow tape recorders and crude simultaneous translation equipment. The delegates paid their own fares and expenses; in fact, on one occasion when the shoestring gave out, they raised the needed francs by passing the hat at the conference.

The first session, held in the NATO auditorium, was opened with an address by Paul-Henri Spaak, then Secretary General of NATO. Those who attended the sessions that followed, held in a cramped and shabby Paris hall, heard speeches by dozens of the world's most stalwart and knowledgeable anti-Communists. Among these were French leaders like Maurice Schumann; the Vice President of West Germany's Bundestag, Richard Jaeger; the Spanish philosopher, Salvador de Madariaga; a top official from South Vietnam; and Senators DODD and KENNETH KEATING.

Most of the pacticipants were unknown to each other, but all of them knew the gallant little Frenchwoman. She was the dominant figure throughout, the heart and soul of the gathering and, in terms of ideas, its brain as well. Her several appearances on the speaker's rostrum were inspirational and deadly serious, but always spiced with humor. In a keynote address she raised three slogans: (1) "Freemen of all nations, unite"; (2) "What is the use of filling our arms with weapons, if we let the enemy disarm our brains"; and (3) "Communism must kill freedom abroad, otherwise freedom will kill communism at home." These set the tone for much that followed.

Selections from the 3 days of oratory and argument appeared in book form a few months later, in French, under the title "Life or Death of the Free World." That, too, was made possible only by Mme. Labin's exertions in editing the vast materials and raising the modest financing for publication. The Italian delegates had been so impressed that they took the initiative in staging a second such world conference, in Rome, a year later. Again it brought together some 400 men and women from all over the world, and again Suzanne Labin played a major role. If her efforts to that end bear fruit, the most important of this series of worldwide consultations will be held in the United States.

What she envisages, ultimately, is a permanent worldwide organization not unlike the Asian People's Anti-Communist League in its own area. Slowly, painfully, that sort of global counterforce to communism may be taking shape. The fact that thus far it has received not the slightest encouragement or aid from the great democratic governments gives point to something I heard her say at the Hotel Commodore seminar:

"The most important thing to stop the spread of communism is not help for underdeveloped countries in the East but help for underdeveloped minds in the West."

Suzanne Andrée Devoyon was born in a slum district of Paris, one of four children

in a desperately poor family. Both parents were factory workers, but the father ceased to contribute early and the whole burden fell on the mother. Though she labored literally day and night, they often knew the bitter taste of hunger.

She was a blond doll, this Suzanne—only 2 feet high at the age of 6—but remarkably pretty and bright. Mother Devoyon was determined that her daughter get an education. Luckily, the girl easily won scholarships, though they came to little enough, and in due time she entered the Sorbonne.

She had been brought up in the revolutionary traditions of the French working class. Devoyon forebears took part in the Paris Commune of 1871, and her mother was active in the semianarchist French Union movement at the turn of the century. At an age when other girls were stuffing on romantic novels, Suzanne was chewing on Marx and Engels.

It was then the popular front period. On the campus, politics all but drowned out learning. Suzanne Devoyon threw herself into the student fight against pro-Fascist groups. From the first, however, she was repelled by the unfair and immoral tactics of the campus Communists and refused to join their organizations. In time, she found herself fighting both extremes.

One evening, Suzanne was cornered in a dark Sorbonne corridor by an excited "fascist" brigade bent on beating up its opponents. In the nick of time an "antifascist" squadron came to her rescue. The young man who headed the rescue party claimed the spoils of victory—he steered the tiny blonde to a cafe on Boulevard Saint-Michel and never let her go again. Edouard Labin was his name—tall, fair-haired and handsome, the son of a relatively well-to-do intellectual family, he was completing his studies in physics.

Edouard, at the time they met, had been a young Communist and had resigned in disgust. Their common dislike of the booming ideology helped the courtship, which led within a few months to a student marriage. They compared and solemnly discussed their political views down the line, and ended by renouncing Marxism. They joined a moderate non-Marxist faction of the Socialist Party (roughly equivalent to liberalism in Anglo-Saxon countries), to which they still adhere.

The young husband took his degree in science and went on to a successful career in electronics; in recent years he has specialized in automation. Suzanne, by the time she obtained her master's degree in chemistry and physiology at Sorbonne, decided that her real interests were in the social sciences. With Edouard's consent, she enrolled in the famous Ecole des Hautes Etudes Sociales et Internationales.

One of the professors, the famous historian Charles Seignobos, proposed that for her master's thesis she undertake a study in depth of living standards in leading countries, among these the Soviet Union. This, she has said, proved to be a turning point in her political and scholarly career. She had rejected communism for moral reasons, but went along with the widespread belief that the Soviet system, for all its faults, was bringing benefits to the Russian workers. Now, delving into the facts, she was soon disillusioned on this score.

After graduating with honors, she continued research on Soviet Russia. Her first two articles based on this work were promptly accepted and published by leading Paris magazines and led to a request for a book by a top publisher. Her course was set—she would be a political writer, with a searching, uninhibited book on Russia as the immediate goal.

But the war intervened. Edouard went into the army. Suzanne fled to Vichy as the Germans advanced. There her husband, having been demobilized, joined her before long. Together they worked in a resistance group which attained fame under the name "Reseau du Musée de l'Homme"—their underground services are mentioned in the two books about this period by André Weill Curiel. Edouard's skills in the electronics field were especially useful in procuring and setting up secret radio transmitters.

Because of treason within the group, however, the Labins soon had to flee for their lives. Pierre Laval himself signed the order for their interception and arrest. But they succeeded, after a series of close escapes, in reaching Spain and from there went on to Argentina. In all these flights, the Labins sacrificed their wardrobes and other belongings in order to rescue two trunkloads of Suzanne's research materials and manuscripts—the makings of her planned book.

They joined the Buenos Aires section of General de Gaulle's movement. Edouard established an electronics laboratory, one of the first in South America, and later also taught physics at the University of Buenos Aires. Suzanne wrote articles on literature and philosophy for La Nacion and other leading Latin American publications, and worked on her book. It was completed about the time the war ended—a profound, carefully documented, brutally realistic assessment of communism in practice.

The publishing house that had asked for the book was gone with the winds of war. Suzanne Labin sent the bulky manuscript to one prominent publisher after another, only to get it back. Nearly 30 publishers in France, England and the United States turned it down on the ground that her portrayal of Stalin and his system was too extreme, too emotional, in short "too anti-Soviet." She was discovering how deeply the illusions about communism had taken root in the West during the war years.

Meanwhile, the Labins had returned to Paris. There, in 1948, the book finally was published, under the title "Stalin the Terrible: A Panorama of Soviet Russia." In quick succession, translations appeared in Spanish, English, Italian, Portuguese, and Chinese; the London edition carried an enthusiastic preface by Arthur Koestler.

The book was widely hailed as a definitive work of scholarship and acute insight and, as was to be expected, drew fierce attacks from pro-Soviet quarters. In a foreword to the volume, the author defended the moral passion she had brought to the writing. In dealing with the monstrous truths about communism, she argued, she was under no moral obligation to conceal her sense of horror. "I claim," she wrote, "that I have studied communism with total objectivity and that this very objectivity leads me to a total condemnation. I am objective but not neutral."

The evolution of this woman's thought and attitudes thereafter, seems to me fascinating. Space limitations, however, allow only a summary statement. Suffice that her study of communism turned her to search for antidotes to its poisons, and gradually the scholar evolved into an anti-Communist activist, the analyst into a fervid crusader.

Her articles and lectures increasingly explored the nature of freedom, as well as its weaknesses, failures, and inhibitions in meeting the totalitarian challenge. She developed these ideas in a book first published in Paris in 1954 and 2 years later, under the title "The Secret of Democracy," in New York. Then, in 1957, came her book, "Freedom for the Murderers of Freedom." The question it raised was whether democracy is really compelled, by its principles, to commit suicide by guaranteeing freedom to those plotting to obliterate freedom. The answer was an incisive "No."

Madam Labin cut through the haze of sophisms and semantics to prove that democracies have not only the moral duty but the juridical right to suppress Communist and other totalitarian organizations. The conclusion was not new, but coming from a prominent liberal, it attracted immense attention and touched off passionate debate. The book won the French Liberty Award.

Embodied in this work was the author's civic code, a clear formulation in practical, legal terms of society's obligation to outlaw those committed to its enslavement. Since it threatened their most important advantage—their right to organize freely—the Communists were thoroughly alarmed by the civic code. The mouthpiece of their party, l'Humanité, attacked in fury and so did the Soviet press.

While she was attending a meeting of the Pen Club in Tokyo, Suzanne Labin received invitations from their governments to visit and lecture in South Vietnam and Taiwan (Formosa). This led to the first of four extensive tours of the Far East in as many years. She met all the anti-Communist leaders and, with a scholar's zeal, learned about the peoples and the problems in the area. By this time she is the Westerner best known and most admired by Asians seriously fighting the Communist plague.

Among the literary products of her deepening concern with Asia is the book which was published in America in 1959 as "The Anthill." It is a closeup and devastating account of life in Red China, based on systematic interviews with dozens of Chinese refugees in Hong Kong and Macao, carefully selected to provide a true cross section of the country's people.

When the Fourth French Republic fell and General de Gaulle came to power, June 1, 1958, a commission was set up to edit a new Constitution. Suzanne Labin saw in this an opportunity to put her civic code into law. She launched a remarkable campaign for that purpose and fought fiercely, often working 'round the clock, through friends on the commission and through the press. L'Humanité thundered against what it called the Mollet-Labin Civic Code and others railed against "the De Gaulle-Labin constitution." Telephone calls warned Suzanne Labin that she would be assassinated if she didn't desist. She didn't—and the campaign was successful.

Article IV of the new constitution guarantees the free functioning of all political parties—provided the goals and methods are democratic and they are not subservient to a foreign power. This was the substance of the Labin civic code. Unfortunately, De Gaulle, for reasons of his own, has as yet failed to apply this provision, but the continued existence of the French Communist Party is today clearly in violation of the constitution.

In her writings and speeches all over the world, during the last 5 or 6 years, Suzanne Labin's emphasis has been increasingly on the urgent need to engage in political-psychological warfare. While concentrating on military defenses, she points out, the free nations remain in effect unilaterally disarmed in the decisive nonmilitary areas. Endlessly she warns that our world is doomed to defeat by default, unless it finally develops political strategy and tactics on a scale for victory in the cold war.

This was the crucial warning she was eager to project in London in June 1959 when leading people from 15 member nations met to mark the 10th anniversary of NATO. The conference was opened with great pomp by Queen Elizabeth. As a member of the French delegation, Mme. Labin had herself designated to report on Soviet propaganda, though the subject was not on the original agenda.

She had come prepared for the assignment and worked feverishly on the completion of an ambitious, documented, and closely reasoned paper: "The Techniques of Soviet Propaganda." It not only disclosed the startling dimensions and vast diversity of the Red political offensive, but sketched a free world counteroffensive. Appeasement-minded elements which dominated the proceedings, having gotten wind of the nature of her contribution, tried by pressure and intrigue to silence her.

But she succeeded in reading her report into the record and it was generally acknowledged as the high point of the London meeting. More than that: with the help of an influential American participant, Gen. David Sarnoff, she proposed and forced the adoption of a resolution asking NATO to create special machinery for dealing with propaganda, subversion and other nonmilitary types of Communist aggression.

The resolution languishes in NATO files, ignored. But the effect of the Labin paper on world opinion has been considerable. Issued in pamphlet form by the U.S. Senate Committee on Internal Security, it has sold over 150,000 copies. This makes it, by a wide margin, the committee's alltime bestseller. Tens of thousands more copies were distributed by the "Committee of One Million," the American group opposing recognition of Red China. In expanded form, Mme. Labin also published it as a book, titled "Il Est Moins Cinq."

Her activities have been so multifarious that they cannot be recounted here in full. Let me just cite one episode typical of her dynamic response to events:

When the Hungarian people suddenly rose in revolt, she wrote at once a vibrant and now famous appeal for support of the Freedom Fighters. In days and sleepless nights on the telephone, she and her husband obtained hundreds of prominent signatures for the appeal. The literary paper Figaro was moved to provide her with secretaries and telephones, others volunteered help, and soon the list of signers grew to 3,500, among them virtually all the outstanding writers, artists and opinion leaders of France.

Whatever the challenge—Hungary, Cuba, Katanga, Red China, Vietnam—this diminutive blond has been in the forefront of enterprises to stem the tide of communism. Edouard Labin has worked with her, always in the background; though his income is moderate, he has footed the bills for most of her activities and travels.

In America, too, Suzanne Labin has become a familiar name to militant anti-Communists. During her first visit here, in 1959, she was asked for her impressions of the American people. Her answer: "They are what everybody abroad believes they are not: a highly cultivated people; and they are not what everybody abroad believes they are: an anti-Communist Nation." In her most recent visit she gladly revised the last part of that aphorism. The American people, she felt, were finally coming awake to the crowding menace of communism. If the awareness can be turned into world leadership on policy, she believes, communism can still be defeated.

What is needed, as Suzanne Labin sees it, is "a sacred union of all free men against communism," whatever their differences on other issues. The political struggle against the Moscow-Peiping axis and its worldwide apparatus of conflict must be given unquestioned priority. "Let us hear among us," she pleads, "the old cry of the besieged: Unite or perish."

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on Friday, March 1, 1963, the archdiocesan newspaper, the Catholic Review, printed a pastoral letter by His Excellency Lawrence J. Shehan, archbishop of Baltimore, on the question of racial discrimination.

This was a notable letter in that it eloquently presented the civil rights issue in its true moral and religious context.

Archbishop Shehan, who was formerly the bishop of the diocese of Bridgeport, Conn., outlined the concrete steps taken by the archdiocese of Baltimore to eliminate all vestiges of racial discrimination in the schools, hospitals and other facilities under its jurisdiction. But he pointed out that while agencies of the Government and of the church have accomplished a great deal in the field of civil rights, and should accomplish more, essentially, this is a problem for everyone; a problem that can be solved only by the application of justice and charity.

I believe that this statement by Archbishop Shehan should be widely read and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Archbishop Shehan on Racial Justice

Dearly beloved in Christ, in the month of November 1958, the bishops of this country at their annual meeting issued a statement entitled "Discrimination and the Christian Conscience." After noting the rather remarkable progress made by our Negro fellow citizens, particularly during and after the Second World War, toward such goals as political equality, fair educational and economic opportunities, good housing without exploitation, and a full chance for social advancement, the bishops went on to say that in more recent years "the issues have become confused, and the march toward justice and equality has been slowed, if not halted, in some areas. The transcendent moral issues have become obscured and possibly forgotten."

"The heart of the race question," they declared, "is moral and religious. It concerns the rights of man and our attitude toward our fellow man. If our attitude is governed by the great Christian law of love of neighbor and respect for his rights, then we can work out harmoniously the techniques for making legal, educational, economic, and social adjustments. But if our hearts are poisoned by hatred, or even by indifference toward the welfare and rights of our fellow man, then our Nation faces a grave internal crisis."

Among the signers of that document was my beloved predecessor, Archbishop Keough, who was then serving as chairman of the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. That the statement served as an expression of his personal conviction on the subject of racial discrimination, no one who knew him could doubt. Coming from a part of the country where such discrimination had never been a major issue, he at first found it difficult to realize the urgency of the problem here, in a State which lies midway between North and South, whose northern boundary has long symbolized the social barrier between two so diverse sections of this country. His gentle and charitable mind found it particularly hard to believe that some of his people would not be convinced and guided by the statement of principle issued by the bishops of this country as their official teaching on the subject of race relations.

Moreover, the illness which weighed so heavily upon the archbishop during the latter years of his tenure prevented him from coming to closer grips with the baffling racial problem and from issuing public directives on this subject to his priests and people. Events, however, which have occurred during the past 18 months have brought to me the conviction that I ought at this time to speak out in reverence for his memory and in fulfillment of my own duty of conscience.

A pastoral letter on this subject, moreover, seems particularly appropriate in this year when we are observing the centenary of the Proclamation of Emancipation issued by President Lincoln on Janutry 1, 1863. With that document, this country formally undertook to correct and undo the moral and social evil of slavery which had afflicted it from the beginning. The breaking of the shackles of bondage, however, was only the beginning of the process to which this country stood committed. The document by which our forefathers declared their political independence clearly stated the principle by which they justified their rebellion and guided their action in forming a new government: that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The struggle to give adequate expression to this principle has been long and arduous. There has been, however, real progress during the past century and—as noted by the American bishops—particularly during the last generation. Yet it is no exaggeration to say that in hardly any State of the Union has complete social, political, economic, and educational equality been established. In some States, the barest beginnings have only recently been made, under intense Federal pressure. Here in our own State, recent experience has shown that much—very much—remains to be done; that grave wrongs still need to be righted.

Nothing should be more evident to the fairminded citizen than the fact that the equality proclaimed by our Declaration of Independence, and the freedom described by it as "unalienable" requires, as a very minimum of justice, the right to equal accommodations, both on public property and within those enterprises licensed and protected by the State for the service of the general public. Yet our proposed State law of equal accommodations has thus far been emasculated by our State legislators. In our own See city, although there is a glaring public evidence of the failure to recognize the right of equal accommodation as properly belonging to the Negro, we are—for the present at least—without such an ordinance.

In this, the oldest and most venerable See in the United States, it should be particularly disconcerting to all of us to know that the recently invalidated equal accommodations ordinance failed to receive the support of some Catholic legislators who represent districts heavily Catholic in population. Does this mean that many of our own people have failed to recognize the serious duty of justice which flows from the basic equality of men of all races and all social conditions?

Such a failure is all the more regrettable since our Christian faith imposes upon us all a special duty of both justice and charity toward all men, no matter what may be their racial and social origin. By the very terms of Christian teaching, we believe that all men are God's special creatures, made to His image and likeness. We believe that the Son of God, Jesus Christ, the God-man, came into the world to save all men; that on the Cross of Calvary He shed His Blood to redeem all of us from our iniquity—all, without any exception. In our eyes as Christians, then, there is a fundamental bond that links us all together in the sight of God and in the order established by Him. We have an essential duty in justice to recognize and to respect equally the rights of all men.

As Catholics, we have an even higher and more sacred duty to all those who are "of

the household of the faith." In his Epistle to the Galatians (3: 28), St. Paul tells us: "You are all children of God through faith in Christ Jesus. For all you, who have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither slave nor freedman"—and today St. Paul would certainly have added: There is neither black nor white; neither brown nor yellow—"for you are all one in Christ. Therefore, you are no longer strangers and foreigners, but you are citizens with the saints and members of God's household. You are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets with Christ Jesus as the chief cornerstone. In Him, the whole structure is closely fitted together and grows into a temple holy unto God; in Him, too, you are being built together into a dwelling place for God in the Spirit" (Ephesians 2:19–22).

Nay more, according to the testimony of the same Apostle, by faith and by baptism we have been incorporated into the mystical body of Christ. For although Christ has given us different functions within His church, He has done this "for the building up of the Body of Christ," which is His church, of which Christ Himself is the Head; "for from Him the whole body derives its increase to the building up of itself in love" (Ephesians 4: 12).

Within this household of the faith, this temple holy to the Lord, this dwelling place of God in the Spirit, this mystical body of Christ, there can be no room for racial discrimination and the bitterness and rancor that inevitably grow out of it. In this year, when the minds and hearts of men are turning longingly and hopefully toward the goal of Christian unity, it is particularly important that justice and charity, without any discrimination or prejudice or antipathy, should shine brightly within the church of Christ. There is, we know—and there can be—only one center of Christian unity: Christ and His mystical body. But how can that body be recognized for what it is unless there is within it unity without division or dissension, and unless within and between its members there shine the justice and charity of Christ?

Within the time and space available to me in this letter, it is impossible to set forth in detail the extent and the nobility of the duty of justice and charity incumbent upon us as members of Christ's mystical body. Under the circumstances of today, however, it may be useful if I attempt to state briefly the minimum that is required of us as members of Christ's church in this archdiocese.

There is, I hope, no need to say that in our churches and in our parochial life generally there must be not only no racial segregation, but also no distinction of rank or place or treatment based upon racial difference: "* * * because we are members one of another. * * * Do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God in whom you were sealed for the day of redemption" (Ephesians 4: 25, 30). "For now the justice of God has been made manifest * * * through faith in Jesus Christ upon all who believe. For there is no distinction: as all have sinned and need the glory of God" (Romans 3: 21–23.

In our schools, both elementary, and secondary, the same general policy holds. As Catholic schools, they are meant primarily, although not exclusively, for Catholic students—for all Catholic students insofar as facilities can be made available—without racial or any other discrimination. This means that in the registration of students a common policy, approved by our Catholic School Board, must be followed in the case of all Catholic children living within the boundaries of every parish fortunate enough to have its own school. The same policy must govern all transfers from one school to another. Within the school, identical academic standards must apply to all students, and all must be treated with equal justice and charity.

In our diocesan organizations and institutions of charity, a sincere effort has been made over a period of years to eliminate discrimination and to effect true integration. Longstanding social and cultural patterns have at times made this process difficult. With the opening of the new St. Vincent's Home, we believe that the last traces of discrimination in this field will have disappeared.

It is some months now since all our Catholic hospitals gave formal approval and acceptance to the policies of nondiscrimination I specifically proposed. This means that they have agreed to admit and treat applicants for medical and surgical service without distinction in their outpatient departments; to follow the same procedure in admitting patients into the hospital, and in assigning beds to them; that there shall be no discrimination practiced in handling applications for membership on medical, surgical, and nursing staffs; that advancement within each staff will be governed only by ability, training, experience, and character; that a policy of integration and nondiscrimination is to be effective for all employees of the hospital.

In older and outmoded hospital plants, it has sometimes been difficult to eliminate some customs based on age-old prejudices and social patterns, but now that the last of our hospitals, is acquiring a modern building, we are confident that the final traces of segregation and discrimination will disappear.

Some of these policies have been in effect in each of these fields for a long time. We do not claim that any of them go beyond mere justice. I have spelled them out in some detail because of questions which have been raised from time to time.

The duty of justice and charity applies not only to our churches, our schools, our charitable organizations and institutions, and our hospitals, but also to all of us as individuals. It must guide us in our personal relationships—within our block, our neighborhood, our community; in our social and fraternal organizations; in the business we may conduct; in the labor unions to which we may belong; at work and at play; in all the circumstances of everyday life.

Particularly lamentable is the unreasonable and automatic panic, too often fanned by unscrupulous and disreputable real estate brokers and speculators, which accompanies the arrival of a Negro family in an area previously occupied by white families only. The flight that occurs not only unfairly prejudges the new neighbors, but it also works an economic hardship on departing property owners, destroys the community, undermines church life, and hits hard at substantial investments made in schools, rectories, convents, and recreational facilities, as well as in the actual places of worship.

Nor can we afford to overlook the crippling effect that division and dissension within our community have on our efforts to meet what is perhaps the most alarming problem of this and every other large city of the country—crime. This is not the place to go into the sources or causes of crime within our midst. Suffice it to say that no part or group of our people has a monopoly on those sources or causes. What should concern us is that the problem is so great as to call for the best minds and the combined, intense, and persistent efforts of the ablest leaders of all elements within the community. In saying this, we reflect in no way on the police force of either city or State. On the contrary, we have complete confidence in the integrity and ability of both the heads and the ranks of our police departments. But this problem is one that requires the continuing scrutiny and efforts of the community as a whole. It will not be met adequately if there is dissension, division, suspicion between the two chief racial groups of our citizens.

Even to enumerate our present duties and policies brings vividly to our minds our past defects. Those defects we frankly admit. With humility and regret, we Catholics must acknowledge that we have been all too slow in the correction of our shortcomings, although in the light of the experience of many of our forefathers, we should have been particularly sensitive to the unjust inequalities suffered by other groups. For this reason, we have a special obligation to place ourselves in the forefront of movements to remove the injustices and discriminations which still remain.

We are all aware of the present grave social problems which have had their origin in racial prejudices and tensions, and which are fed by longstanding racial antipathies. These problems cannot be suddenly solved or wiped out by wishful thinking or good intentions. They are community problems. They, therefore, cannot be successfully met by any one part of the community nor any one group, however, highminded and earnest. They call for the combined thought and planning and cooperation of all of us. They require patience and understanding and good will, and persistent effort on the part of everyone. They call for a sense of justice, above all, in that part of the community in which the evil had its origin, and a spirit of charity on both sides.

In their 1958 statement, the bishops of this country, while calling for concrete plans for the elimination of discrimination and the establishment of equal justice and opportunities, urged that such plans be based upon prudence—the virtue which inclines us to view problems in their proper perspective. The problems we inherit today, they noted, are rooted in decades, even centuries, of custom and cultural patterns. When we are confronted with complex and far-reaching evils, it is not a sign of weakness or timidity to weigh carefully the proposed remedies and reforms. Some changes are more necessary than others. Some may be easy to achieve; others may seem impossible at a given time. It is the mark of wisdom, rather than of weakness, to study problems fully and to form plans carefully. Prudence will indeed guard against the rashness which may endanger solid accomplishment, but prudence must never serve as an excuse for inaction or unnecessary gradualism, or as a reason for not holding a straight, steady course toward our goal of full justice.

In this letter, my dearly beloved people, I have spoken chiefly of our duties of justice, because they are so basic to our relations with our fellow men. During this season of Lent, it is well for us to ponder these duties and to reflect on our conduct to see whether our attitude and our acts measure up to what God requires of us. Lent, furthermore, is a season of repentance when, having seen clearly our shortcoming, we seek to bring about the needed reforms. But Lent is also a season when the church places constantly before us the mystery of our redemption, the mystery of that infinite love of God for us which seeks from us in return not only love for Himself, but also love for our fellow men. In that magnificent passage from the First Epistle to the Corinthians which formed the lesson of last Sunday's mass, St. Paul has shown us what our Christian love for each other must be: "Charity is patient, is kind, does not envy, is not pretentious * * * rejoices with the truth, bears all things, hopes all things, endures all things. * * * If I have not charity, I am nothing. I have become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." These words of the Apostle serve as a commentary to our Lord's saying: "By this shall all men know that you are My disciples, that you have love one for another" (John 13: 35).

In this era of the Second Vatican Council, Pope John has given us an example not only of the charity but also of the wisdom and courage which we here in the Archdiocese of Baltimore need for the solution of the problems of race prejudice and discrimination which we find within our civil community and also within our Catholic community, our own particular "household of the faith."

It has been due to the wisdom of our present Holy Father and his two great predecessors that the council presents to the world a true image of the unity and universality of the church as Christ must have meant it. In the hall of the council, men of all races and nations take their places in perfect equality—in the College of Cardinals in the ranks of archbishops and bishops, and of priest superiors of religious orders. All speak with equal freedom; all vote with equal force. To help us allay some of the prejudices which beset this country, it may be well to recall that some of the most effective voices within the council have been those of African archbishops and bishops who by birth stand much closer to the hills and plains and wilds of Africa than the Negroes in our midst.

The charity of Pope John has not only transfused the council, giving to it its unique pastoral spirit; it has also overcome many of the prejudices and antipathies of countless non-Catholic brethren, giving to them a new vision of the church. It has awakened in all of us new longings and new hopes for Christian unity. Such charity within ourselves could enable us to purge from ourselves whatever racial prejudices and antagonisms we may still retain, and could help us to give to our non-Catholic Negro brethren such a vision of Christ's church as might open for them the door to spiritual truth.

Finally, the courage with which Pope John in the face of so many difficulties and adverse predictions, called into being this council, which may well prove to be one of the great turning points of the church's history, should lead us to face our own problems full of Christian faith and confidence and fortitude. In that ecumenical spirit of Christian renewal which, in the words of Pope John, is meant to restore to the church the simple, pure lines of her pristine beauty, let us—priests and people of this archdiocese—face boldly and confidently the task that is before us, certain that with God's help we shall achieve in the church of this archdiocese a holy unity, free from all stain of prejudice and from every defect of division or discrimination.

Sincerely yours in Christ,

LAWRENCE J. SHEHAN,
Archbishop of Baltimore.

THREATENED NATIONALIZATION OF OIL INDUSTRY IN INDONESIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a recent news article in the Wall Street Journal reports that Indonesia has raised the threat of immediate nationalization of the oil industry in this country. The activity on the part of President Sukarno not only in his own domestic affairs but internationally as well should be carefully scrutinized by the administration in order to protect ourselves against another Cuba.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDONESIA WARNS FOREIGN-OWNED OIL FIRMS TO AGREE TO CONCESSIONS OR FACE SEIZURE

JAKARTA.—Indonesia has raised the threat of immediate nationalization in its deadlocked negotiations with the three foreign-owned oil companies over terms of a new concession agreement.

Chaerul Saleh, the island nation's Minister of Mining and Basic Industries, declared the Government doesn't intend to wait any longer to reach an accord. The sides already have spent more than 2 years debating royalties, a long-term plan for eventual Government ownership and, a new issue, restrictions on rupiahs (Indonesian money) earned on domestic sales.

The Government, Mr. Saleh stated, may take "necessary measures in accordance with the situation" unless a settlement is reached soon.

STAKES WOULD BE HIGH

To some officials here, the statement was a thinly veiled warning that Indonesia was considering a quick seizure of the oilfield facilities and refineries of the three foreign concerns: Caltex Pacific, jointly owned by Standard Oil Co. of California and Texaco, Inc.; Standard Vacuum Petroleum, owned by Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey) and Socony Mobil Oil Co. and Shell Indonesia, a unit of the Royal Dutch-Shell Group.

"It's a real threat," say one U.S. Embassy official. But he tempers his appraisal. "We can't really believe they really would take such a foolish action. After all, they need the revenue from oil sales and they're very conscious of what happened in Ceylon," he notes. The United States recently cut off all aid to Ceylon when it refused to make payment for nationalized oil properties to their U.S. owners.

The stakes in a conflict would be high. The United States in the fiscal year ending in June is extending about $71 million in economic assistance to Indonesia. And the three foreign oil companies earn Indonesia $300 million a year, returning the county about 40 percent of its foreign exchange credits.

At issue in the negotiations are oil concessions on the Indonesian island of Sumatra and in West Borneo originally granted by the Netherlands more than 30 years ago. Indonesia permitted the companies to continue their operations after the southeast Asian nation won its independence in 1949. But President Sukarno's leftward-leaning Government pressed for revisions in the concession terms.

Formal negotiations began early in 1960, but progress has been tediously slow. The Government tried to intensify pressure for an agreement by imposing a series of deadlines, but these with no apparent consequence. The latest deadline expired December 31.

Minister Salah now, however, has imposed a new deadline—buttressed with the threat of immediate nationalization—that could be crucial. He has indicated he will submit new draft contracts within a week. The companies then have 2 weeks to submit their final positions.

Some of the Government's previous demands were met earlier by the oil companies. The concerns separately agreed to give the Government a 60-percent share of their profit, instead of the 50-percent slice extended to the Dutch. In addition, the companies agreed to a long-term timetable for eventually turning over to the Government without compensation all their refineries, production facilities, and domestic marketing operations in Indonesia.

TERMS CALLED IMPOSSIBLE

But then, according to one U.S. oil executive, the Government suddenly submitted new proposals on February 2 that are "negative in attitude and bombastic in language." The terms, says another U.S. official, are "impossible to accept."

The Government's latest proposals insist the foreign companies bring in dollars and other foreign exchange to cover production costs in Indonesia, rather than utilize rupiahs earned from local sales of petroleum products. These rupiahs would be blocked in Indonesian bank accounts, subject to Government approval for repatriation.

The oil companies also are asked to waive any claims for compensation should their oil facilities be seized by the Government "in the interest of national security." The companies argue they have invested close to $1 billion in their oil properties in the past 20 years.

The foreign-owned concerns, nonetheless, are willing to turn over their facilities to the Government at some future date. By late last year, they say, they had agreed to relinquish their refineries within 20 years and their Indonesian marketing facilities within 5 years.

But even this agreement was rendered obsolete, they insist, by a later Indonesian demand. The Government wants ownership of the refineries within 10 years and of the domestic marketing facilities in 1 to 5 years.

Indonesia already is engaged in the oil business on a limited basis. Three state-owned companies currently produce about 50,000 barrels of crude oil a day. The three private concerns, by contrast, produce more than 400,000 barrels a day. Caltex Pacific's output is about 220,000 barrels. Standard Vacuum produces about 10,000 barrels and Shell Indonesia about 115,000 barrels a day.

AMERICAN AID TO INDONESIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in the Sunday issue of the Washington Post, Chalmers Roberts reports on a 10-day visit to Indonesia. This country of a hundred million people has received since 1949 a total of $665 million worth of American aid. It is also interesting to note that it has received approximately $665 million in economic aid from Communist bloc countries excluding a massive Soviet military aid. Because of its strategic geographical position in the South Pacific and because of the great interest the Soviet is showing in its present military buildup, it is my belief that all pertinent information on this area should be carefully scrutinized.

I ask unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Roberts be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICH INDONESIA IN DEEP TROUBLE ECONOMICALLY

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

DJAKARTA.—Indonesia is in economic trouble so deep that something probably is going to happen, and happen sooner rather than later.

This reporter has spent 10 days in Indonesia, chiefly in Java, where 65 million of the nation's estimated 100 million people live. Few lands are more lush or richer in natural resources. But Indonesia is more frustrating than most nations when it comes to trying to estimate where it is headed.

In talks with Indonesians, high and low, and with foreign observers of several nationalities, it is evident that economic conditions have greatly deteriorated in the past 6 months. Rice, the basic staple, is in short supply and prices have been rising erratically.

Copra, the coconut product, lies rotting or is burned because of price problems and disorganized transportation. Communists are alleged to be behind the burning of some sugarcane in the fields. People lack sugar and oils, and margarine has about disappeared. Indonesia is the world's No. 1 importer of rice, yet it is the world's fourth largest producer.

AN ELASTIC CURRENCY

The exchange rate of the Indonesian currency, the rupiah, reflects these economic troubles. The "official" rate is 45 to $1, the figure at which the United States must spend the rupiahs it receives in exchange for the food it sends here under Public Law 480. At the Hotel Indonesia, here in Djakarta, the nation's one first-rate hostelry, there is a 500 to $1 rate for food but room bills for foreigners must be paid in dollars or other hard currencies. The black market rupiah rate both here and in Singapore, however, has advanced in the past 6 months from 600 to $1 to about 1,300 to $1.

The result is too much money in circulation, too few goods for the rank and file to buy, inflated prices of rice in the free market (which is used to supplement the absolutely vital rice allowances supplied to Government and many other employees) and a vast amount of smuggling. It has been learned, for example, that half the Indonesian imports into nearby British Singapore are smuggled there from Sumatra or the islands off its coast.

Indonesia is still 80 percent agricultural and rural, only 20 percent industrialized, and few of the industries employ even 1,000 people. Yet industry as a whole is estimated to be running at only around 20 percent of capacity. This means less goods badly needed at home and less for exports to earn dollars to pay for badly needed imports. Smuggling, too, cuts deeply into foreign exchange earnings.

AID HAS BEEN MASSIVE

American aid to Indonesia since independence in 1949 has totaled around $665 million, of which about 45 percent has been in farm surplus items. Aid from all free world nations (of which Japanese reparations, credits and grants together slightly top the American total) has amounted to more than $1.5 billion, compared to an estimated $665 million in economic aid from the Communist bloc. This excludes the massive Soviet military aid.

The U.S.-built cement plant, Indonesia's biggest, is one of the few places now running at 100 percent capacity, and the United States is building a urea fertilizer plant. Each was financed by an Export-Import Bank loan and each will provide about one-third of the national need for its output. The World Bank won't do business here, so poor is Indonesia's credit rating and so shaky its economic structure.

With such a dismal picture so evident, one would expect an explosion of some sort. But Indonesians seem to have a low boiling point; the farmer somehow manages to eat and the city worker frequently resorts to graft and stealing.

A WEST IRIAN SEQUEL

The optimists here, both Indonesian and foreign, argue that these serious economic conditions are about to be faced. They say that the military rebellion against the government has now been liquidated and the issue of West Irian (West New Guinea) will be finally solved May 1 when that territory comes under Indonesian rule by way of the United Nations from the Dutch. Hence now is the time to tackle the economic problems.

Indonesian life, of course, is dominated by President Sukarno, as it has been since independence. He recently said that the time had come to concentrate on the economic problem and the cabinet is reported to have formulated "a basic strategic economic principle for surmounting present economic difficulties."

Critics contend that Indonesia's economic problems are self-made, though they concede that recent floods have added to the woe. Last summer's massive buildup (for a country such as this) for the projected attack on West Irian resulted in commandeering much of the transportation equipment, including the shipping, so vital in a nation of some 3,000 islands stretched across an area the width of the continental United States.

Incidentally, senior military officials have told me that some 30,000 men were within 2 or 3 days of D-day when the Dutch-Indonesian agreement was signed.

Now that some shipping, at least, is coming back to its normal commercial uses, there is an obvious need for a revaluation of the rupiah and a currency stabilization scheme on an international basis. The hopeful think this will happen; the pessimists do not think that Sukarno, whom they rate as an economic illiterate however high they regard his political prowess, will buckle down to the job and enforce the tough decisions, if, indeed, he makes them.

POSSIBLE RED MAJORITY

Such an economic situation, of course, is ready-made for the Communists. The PKI, the Communist Party of Indonesia, and its related labor organization, known as SOBSI, are very powerful. The party now claims 3.5 million members, up from an earlier 2 million claim.

No one knows how strong they really are, but one measure is the fact that a high official remarked to me that if elections were held today, the PKI would win an absolute majority. Some outside observers tend to think he could be right and not merely justifying the lack of elections. At any rate, Indonesia is still under martial law, though it is supposed to be lifted May 1.

Ten political parties are legal, but they operate in something of a vacuum since no election is in sight. Sukarno has talked vaguely of an election in 1963; other officials say perhaps in 1964, but the franker ones concede that date is illusory, too.

As long as Sukarno is alive—he is now 61—he probably will continue to be the boss. Officials here tend to throw up their hands when you ask what will happen if he disappears, but the general view is that the military would take over with a civilian figurehead.

Sukarno has built his guided democracy on what we might call the principle of consensus; that is, of getting all rival forces to agree. Since he can enforce a high degree of cooperation, Sukarno has made the Communists keep within bounds.

Of late, Sukarno has been talking a good deal about something he calls NASAKOM, an alphabet soup word meaning nationalism, religion, and communism. The third element used to be socialism; the change seems to reflect the growing power of the PKI. Sukarno's proclaimed aim is to run Indonesia on this three-legged stool principle.

The Communists' aim is to increase the strength of their leg and in due course to upset the stool in their direction. Currently, they are pressing for posts in Sukarno's inner cabinet, from which so far they have been excluded though they hold posts in the so-called outer cabinet.

The PKI is said to want the Finance and Information ministries, and the reason is obvious enough; to make more economic troubles and to control the already left-tinted public utterances of the Government and the press.

The PKI, incidentally, is officially oriented toward Peking in its ideological dispute with Moscow, but there appears to be no evidence of a split below the Politburo level. The rank and file party members are concentrating on exploiting the economic misery. Nor is there any sign that Peking is attempting to steer the PKI into military opposition to the Sukarno regime, a move which, now at least, probably would be as disastrous for the party as was the Stalin-ordered revolution here in the early post-World War II years.

The press in Indonesia is a disgrace by any democratic standard. News of the outside world is at a minimum and often is quite slanted. Newsprint is imported and publishers are under the government's heel. In this capital of Djakarta, with a population estimated at 3 million, the 15 papers have a combined circulation of 360,000, of which the five Communist or far left papers have about half the total.

The radio is state-owned. Television, which Indonesia can ill afford but which is a status symbol, has begun in Djakarta, where there are an estimated 10,000 imported TV sets.

This is not a land for dissent by any democratic standard. Dissent runs afoul of the Sukarno philosophy of government, which is based on the ancient village system of concensus and which therefore has wide public appeal.

Marxist terminology abounds. When Sukarno received an honorary degree February 2 at the University of Indonesia here, he was praised for having denounced "individualism, liberalism, capitalism, imperialism, feudalism, fascism as sources of exploitation of man by man." Communism was missing from the list. Any enemy of Indonesia will quickly be branded as an imperialist or neocolonialist or capitalist.

Some of this is explicable for reasons other than the power of the nations' Communist Party. As able American Ambassador Howard P. Jones, a man with 7 years' experience here, recently put it in a speech: "To the majority of Indonesians—in fact to most of the newly emerging peoples of the African and Asian world—the word 'capitalism' brings forth an immediate and vivid picture of foreign control of their economy and, not infrequently, of foreign exploitation and oppression."

The Dutch, who exploited the wealth of the Indies during 300 years of rule, are still unpopular although some Indonesians want enough of them to come back to help revitalize the largely Dutch-built farm and factory equipment. The Japanese, who occupied the country from 1942 to 1945, are looked upon as liberators from the Dutch.

Those who worry publicly about communism in Indonesia are accused of having a Communist phobia. The more democratic leaders will tell you, as foreign observers also do, that the PKI's power is balanced by the military, which is rated as highly anti-Communist.

Large numbers of army, navy and air force officers have been to the United States and the resulting friendship, from the sample I have had, is impressive. The same can be said for the several thousand students and technicians who have been sent to the United States.

Indonesians talk a lot about their poorness despite their great wealth of little-tapped resources, which include the biggest oil source in Asia, much rubber, copra, tin, and other items. In moments of frankness, they will say they have their hands out to both East and West—and that they expect to have their wants met.

The people, of course, are the greatest resource. They are not as aggressive as the Japanese nor as hard-working as the many Chinese among them, on whom they look with suspicion and often with envy despite the official Indonesian friendship with Red China. Yet Indonesians are industrious; they must be to survive, especially in Java, the most crowded major area in the world after Belgium.

They are not naturally very adept mechanically but they are trying, or at least the upper echelon is trying, to propel the nation into the 20th century industrial revolution. Sukarno has in motion, at least, a massive education program with three shifts in the schools. But the lacks are everywhere—trained teachers, buildings, books, paper. And it costs the university student far more to board than to study.

Indonesia's problem today quite obviously is to get its economic house in order. Perhaps the optimists are right and the necessary moves will now be made. But the pessimists are correct in demanding to see the evidence.

One would be more of an optimist, despite the nation's obvious shortcomings and the massive power of the Communists, if it were not for the lurking suspicion that Sukarno would prefer another foreign policy adventure. The row with Malaya over the British colonial possessions along the northern fringe of Borneo is the subject for another article.

Then, too, the Portuguese hold half of the island of Timor, an anachronism which Indonesians hint they will get around to in due course. To many, Sukarno is a permanent revolutionary who needs such foreign issues to keep his momentum.

In short, this is an attractive yet often baffling nation where many are seeking real progress but where the machinery of government "socialism" is clearly inadequate to the need. Indonesia's future is questionable, yet it is full of vital people who are trying to shed the colonial past with all its inhibitions in order to come to grips with the future.

FOREIGN POLICY SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as long as our foreign policy is conducted along the lines of an "experimental baker's school," I am sure that our allies and enemies alike will be completely confused as to exactly what our objectives are, both from a long-range standpoint and in the cold war. Political allegiance rather than foreign policy experience seems to be the key to the "confused frontier."

Constantine Brown in an article published in the Evening Star on Thursday, February 28, reports in shocking terms the reaction our allies throughout the free world and in particular Western Europe have to the foreign policy gyrations of the present administration.

I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Foreign Policy System of the United States—Europeans Feel That Too Many Cooks Are Involved in Decisions, Writer Says

(By Constantine Brown)

Rome.—The saying that too many cooks spoil the broth applies these days to diplomacy. Over the last 2 years this reporter has seen dozens of high and low American Government officials, legislators and mere friends of the administration roaming over Europe at the taxpayers' expense on various kinds of special diplomatic missions. They insist on seeing the highest in the land and then make special reports to the White House. It is probable that their impressions add to the confusion in Washington.

According to the Constitution, the President of the United States is alone responsible for the country's foreign policy; the Secretary of State is his executive officer. Until the advent of the New Frontier the various Presidents followed the Constitution and tradition. President Franklin Roosevelt was his own Secretary of State during his four terms, although the counsels of his right hand man, Harry Hopkins, did often prevail over those of Cordell Hull, particularly during the war. Mr. Hull was often belatedly informed about momentous decisions.

During John Foster Dulles' 6 years as President Eisenhower's Secretary of State, he was the real policymaker. The attempts of the President's brother, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, to influence foreign policies were successful only in regard to Latin America. There were no other "cooks" in the White House to spoil the international broth, since Harold Stassen's efforts to have a voice in African diplomacy and on disarmament were ignored. President Eisenhower relied completely on Mr. Dulles.

Now when President Kennedy speaks and apparently makes his own decisions they are suspected as being the result of advice from half a dozen theoreticians, mostly inexperienced in practical international affairs, who vie with each other to guide our destinies. This at least is the overall impression of responsible statesmen in Europe who watch American international gyrations with concern because they concern them directly.

The consensus in the principal European capitals is that Secretary of State Dean Rusk, given a real chance, could become "another Dulles." He possesses many of Mr. Dulles' qualities and is regarded as frank, understanding, and trustworthy. But as a high official put it to this reporter: "Mr. Rusk is uncertain of himself because he does not carry the necessary weight in Washington."

There are many other intimate advisers who are closer to the elbow and ears of President Kennedy than Mr. Rusk. In discussions with foreign ministers or heads of state Mr. Rusk makes no commitments—as Mr. Dulles so often did—because of fear that "the others" in the White House may disagree with his sound judgment and thus he may be overruled by Mr. Kennedy on advice of pedagogic counselors.

The bloopers made in recent months by the administration are blamed by European statesmen more on "too many cooks" in the White House than on the President himself and Mr. Rusk.

It is in reference to these cooks that well-informed General de Gaulle reportedly gave Mr. Kennedy the fatherly advice, "My dear young friend; always make your own decision," at the Elysee in 1961.

In Europe foreign policy decisions, good or bad, are made exclusively by those responsible for their acts. The special adviser system is unknown here.

Nobody will deny that General de Gaulle follows a policy line determined by himself. It is based on a thorough study of situations.

Like General de Gaulle, but to a somewhat lesser extent, Prime Minister Macmillan is also his own Secretary of State. Lord Home gives counsel more frequently than his French opposite number. Had the British Prime Minister consulted his Foreign Secretary before he made the mistake of losing his temper publicly when Britain's entry into the Common Market was blocked by General de Gaulle, his political position would not have been jeopardized.

Until the Spiegel affair rocked the Bonn government, Chancellor Adenauer was very much his own Secretary of State. Since then he has been wavering between his personal convictions and political expediency. But even so, the Germans, like the rest of the Europeans, have either none or a very small number of cooks preparing the international broth.

MANAGEMENT OF NEWS BY KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent to include in the body of the Record a news release issued by my office on February 27 concerning the management of news by the Kennedy administration. Along with this insertion, I would like to include an article by Constantine Brown from the Saturday, February 2, issue of the Evening Star which is most informative as to the present status of our prestige abroad.

There being no objection, the news release and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The management of the news has reached the point of ridiculousness. The USIA, after much prodding, has a scheme whereby it will release a handful of carefully selected polls designed to show that U.S. prestige was low at the end of the Eisenhower administration. These are the only polls released on the prestige of the United States. Two other polls of 2 years ago turned on the prestige of the Executive and the unfavorable attitudes of Castro.

This is not what the country has been asking for. If the news were not being carefully managed, these polls would have been accompanied by at least some evidence on the rise and fall of American prestige during the whole period of the past 2 years. Such release should certainly be made without the flimsy excuses that sources would be imperiled or security involved.

This administration is determined not to expose anything about how it was doing abroad and relies on a continual campaign to blame all its troubles on the Eisenhower administration. I do not see how any respected newsmaker could be content with "all we can tell you is how things happened before we got here." The policy of releasing news after 2 years means that about October 22, 1964, there will be a release geared to the total public bipartisan support of actions relating to Cuba around October 22, 1962. This combination of news management for political advantage helps the party in power but conceals from the American public the ups and downs of reactions to our foreign policy.

The Luster of U.S. Statesmanship—Some Fading Is Noted Among Europeans Who Find Our "Meddling" Distasteful

(By Constantine Brown)

Rome.—During the 1960 campaign candidate Kennedy and his aids complained that the American image had suffered much throughout the world through mishandling of international affairs by the Eisenhower administration. He promised, if elected, to restore American prestige. After a short upsurge, the American image is now at a low ebb with rank and file Europeans.

President Kennedy's inauguration speech, filled with electrifying words and promises of great things, plus his own youth and personality, charm and vigor, took Europe by storm. "Let both sides be united to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah—to 'undo the heavy burdens * * * (and) let the oppressed go free,' " were words of hope everywhere in the world. "Let every

other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house," were fair words of warning to Fidel Castro and Nikita Khrushchev.

But the words had hardly faded from memory when came the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion in Cuba. And while that pot was still boiling the Berlin wall was erected and the oppressed were locked behind it. Only stern protests came from Washington.

But the following year the world took heart when again the ringing, strong words of President Kennedy announced that the United States would take firm action if Mr. Khrushchev did not remove missiles and bombers from Cuba. But Cuba still remains a strong Soviet bastion in the American Hemisphere, a threat to every Latin American country and thus to the United States itself.

Crowding out the De Gaulle veto of Britain's entry into the Common Market and his refusal to join in NATO's nuclear arms force is the administration's fumbling recovery from the De Gaulle pronouncements. President Kennedy promised Polaris submarines in exchange for the removal of the Jupiter bases in Italy and Turkey. These subs eventually were to be manned by multinational crews. On second thought, it was realized that beyond the difficulty of handling crews speaking different languages, each Polaris sub needed five crews for rotation; that Polaris subs remained under water for 2 months at a time; and, that 5 years were needed to train the crews.

It was then proposed that the missiles be placed on surface ships, which several European navy men pointed out are as vulnerable as land-based missiles. At about that time it was reported in the European press that the Joint Congressional Atomic Energy Committee was bringing to the attention of the administration that the McMahon Act prohibited the United States giving atomic warheads to other countries. Perhaps this confusion results from what Secretary of State Rusk complains about: So many of the Presidential aids and friends in key policy planning roles send conflicting orders "from the President himself."

This reporter has recently heard complaints from a number of highly placed Europeans that while they appreciate America's help in getting them on their feet after the war, they do not appreciate the present tendency of Washington to meddle in their affairs. In fact, they now say that America needs their help for financial support to keep the dollar at the present rate of exchange.

There is a strong feeling here that our insistence that NATO nations increase their forces by at least another six or seven divisions is not based on actual military necessity but to procure the necessary weapons from the United States for gold. Germany already has pledged herself to purchase $750 million worth of ordnance in the United States during this and the next year. Italy has contracted for $125 million worth this year and an additional $350 million in the next few years.

While the direct inmixture of the United States into the quarrels of European states has been applauded by the governments in London, Rome, Brussels, and The Hague, the European press reflects the thinking of the people who find our "meddling" distasteful. Here in Italy politicians see that Washington is doing everything possible to help Prime Minister Fanfani remain in office. And our meddling will certainly be an issue in the April Italian elections. Most Italians do not want the Polaris missile submarines to have an Italian base and already cartoons are appearing showing Mr. Fanfani telling the people there "are no Polaris" while hiding them behind a screen.

The popularity of Americans in Europe is as high as ever, but the luster of American statemanship has faded.

KNOWLAND KEYNOTES CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN MEETING

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on February 23, former U.S. Senator William F. Knowland, now editor and publisher of the Oakland, Calif., Tribune, delivered the keynote address to the California Republican Assembly Dinner held in the Disneyland Hotel. His address merits the careful reading and consideration of all Republicans—whether domiciled in California or elsewhere in this Republic.

Bill Knowland, as we who served with him all know him, holds the rare distinction of being one of the few Republican Senators to have served both as a majority leader and as a minority leader of the U.S. Senate. He served his country well in both these capacities during the Eisenhower administration before Knowland voluntarily retired from the Senate.

Because of Bill Knowland's profound and intimate knowledge of Washington affairs and the political developments of our era his counsel to the California Republicans is especially important. So that all who are interested may read his remarks, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fellow Californians, since this Republican assembly was organized three decades ago we have gone through many political battles together. We have tasted both the champagne of victory and the vinegar of defeat.

In that time, by my reckoning, we have been on the winning side in 2 of 7 presidential elections, 5 of 8 gubernatorial campaigns, and 8 out of 10 contests for U.S. Senator. During this period of 30 years, the founders have aged from young men in our twenties or early thirties, to the middle fifties or early sixties.

To the young men and women who have since joined our ranks, I can assure you that the passing of these years has not dimmed our dedication to the cause of good government in California and in the Nation.

If history teaches anything, it is that men and women must be prepared to fight for principles even though victory may come not to them but to their successors.

Those who died on Bunker Hill, at Concord, and at Lexington were not present to share the thrill of the British surrender at Yorktown, nor did the victims of Pearl Harbor, Bataan, and Corregidor share the magnitude of the capitulation aboard the *Missouri*. But there were some who survived in each case to see defeat turn to victory.

So it has been in many a political campaign in our Nation. The 1856 defeat of John C. Fremont as the first Republican nominee for President laid the foundation for the election of Abraham Lincoln 4 years later.

Lincoln, himself, tasted defeat at the hands of Stephen A. Douglas for the office of U.S. Senator in 1858 only to, in turn, defeat Douglas for the Presidency in 1860.

We must always try to keep a proper perspective on the events of the moment. The tide of history moves and mere man does not always know what destiny may hold in store 2 or 4 years hence—nor does a political party or a nation.

I am vitally interested in the future of the Republican Party because I am concerned for the future of the United States. Our form of government cannot continue without an effective two-party system.

The Republican Party is the only mechanism available to give effective opposition to the present administration in 1964. We must pull the party together and not join in the prevalent pastime of tearing it apart.

There are millions of dedicated conservatives who belong to no organization other than the Republican or Democratic Parties. They are needed and have no intention of being liquidated from political activity.

Every time a conservative leader arises there is an attempted smear to tar him as a reactionary or a member of the Birch Society, regardless of the facts in the case. This is the "guilt by association" technique the liberals bitterly objected to during the investigations by Senator Joseph McCarthy. Now, some Republicans are emulating the liberal Democrats.

There are millions of dedicated liberals (some of the Jeffersonian tradition) who resent being blanketed in with the ADA or the more extreme left wing elements that operate in this country.

We need the dedicated conservatives and liberals who can find room for agreement in saving this Nation from having a bankrupt Federal Government which dominates our economy and submerges our State governments.

Republicans won a substantial victory in the First Congressional District on January 22. Don Clausen (who was Del Norte chairman of my first senatorial campaign in 1946) won a resounding victory with a margin of 14,000. He won in a district with a democratic registration lead of 14,000. He won in an area that had been represented by the late Democratic Congressman Clem Miller, since 1959.

This was the first congressional district election in the Nation since the general elections of last year and it has attracted widespread national attention. With qualified candidates and dedicated workers this pattern can be repeated in other areas of our State and Nation.

There is no reason for either Republican defeatism or complacency as a result of the November 6, 1962, elections. From a national point of view the election was spotty. Strong Republican trends were apparent in some areas whereas in nearby States the tide was running toward the Democrats.

Certainly we are realistic enough to recognize that the President is entitled to satisfaction in that his congressional majority, from a partisan Democratic point of view, improved in an off year election for the first time since 1934.

It is my judgment, however, that the 88th Congress will not be a rubberstamp for the President any more than the expired 87th Congress.

For this the country can be thankful. Article I of the Constitution gives all of the legislative power to Congress. If Congress is to remain a coordinate branch of the Government it must not become subordinate to any President—Republican or Democrat.

Party organization is important. We cannot wait until 1964 to organize for victory in the presidential election of that year. Now is the time to start. In every State the young men and women must be brought into positions of importance and responsibility. Without constant infusion of new blood, any political organization will wither on the vine.

I have a strong feeling that in 1964 the public will be looking for men with principles and party platforms that mean what they say. The party that can inspire the interest and dedicated support of the millions who stayed at home in 1962 can win the election of 1964.

As far as 1964 is concerned, the Democrats will renominate President Kennedy. The Republican Party has a number of potential candidates whose names immediately come to mind. In the next year others will move into national prominence. They may come from among the presently lesser-known Governors, Senators, Members of the House, or out of the business and professional life of the Nation.

In 1938 and 1939 a reading of the newspapers of those days would indicate that the next Republican presidential nominee of 1940 would be Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, or District Attorney Thomas E. Dewey. It was not until the nomination year of 1940 that Wendell Willkie loomed on the horizon as a formidable contender who took the nomination from the two "professionals."

At the present time the names (in alphabetical order) of those receiving most national attention are: Barry Goldwater, U.S. Senator from Arizona; Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of Oregon, reelected to second term; Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of New York, elected to second term; George Romney, Governor of Michigan; William F. Scranton, Governor of Pennsylvania, Member of House of Representatives 87th Congress.

In addition, there may well be a large number of "favorite son" candidates whose States will want to hold their votes intact until the picture clarifies.

The year 1964 may be one of those years that could result in the emergence of a "Dark Horse" as was the case of James A. Garfield, Member of Congress from Ohio, and Senator-elect who was chosen on the 36th ballot as a compromise between Grant, Blaine, and Sherman.

There were a number of very close elections in 1962, in Minnesota, Rhode Island, and South Dakota the final results were not known for several weeks after the election.

Republicans replaced Democrats as Governors in Colorado, Michigan, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Wyoming, and Rhode Island.

Democrats replaced Republicans in Hawaii, Iowa, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Mexico and Vermont. A little more effort could have changed the result in these and a number of other States that were carried by the Democrats.

Organization was important in 1962 and it will remain important in the elections of 1964.

It is time for the Nation to regroup so that the people will have a clear-cut choice and not be led by either leaders or parties down paths that violate their fundamental beliefs and principles.

It is my strong belief that the Republicans should make a major effort to carry the South in 1964 and thereafter. I strongly believe that we could carry Florida, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, Kentucky, and Texas in the southern area. There are several other possibilities as well.

The South, the Midwest, and the additional States we will win on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts would give the Republicans a majority in the electoral college. While we would intend to carry in 1964 both New York and California, the Southern States mentioned would permit us to win without either the first and second State in population.

Without the South, the Republicans cannot win unless they have New York and California or at least as a minimum, one of these States.

The Kennedy administration has struck out in the domestic ball game and in the international one as well. As a great Democrat, Al Smith, said: "Let's look at the record." In 1960 Candidate Kennedy said: "I believe in the balanced budget and the only conditions on which I would unbalance the budget would be if there were a grave national emergency or a serious recession."

In his state of the Union message, President Kennedy was optimistic about world conditions and also stated that "America has enjoyed 22 months of uninterrupted economic recovery." Yet President Kennedy presents a budget with a $10 billion deficit which may well reach $15 billion by the time of the nominating conventions next year.

When President Eisenhower left office in January of 1961 our historic close relations with our neighbor, Canada, were firm, our entente with France was cordial, and our understanding with Great Britain was friendly and clear.

In the last 60 days we disturbed our understandings with Great Britain by our unilateral termination of the Skybolt program; we have upset the friendly relations with France, our oldest ally since Lafayette and the Revolutionary War; and our lack of diplomacy has deeply shocked our good neighbor, Canada and plunged them into an election where "pulling the eagle's feathers" may turn out to be as popular as "twisting the lion's tail" was at one time in our own country.

The "whiz kids" have certainly established their amateur standing in foreign policy dealings with our friends.

Now let's look at our opponents: Last October we had apparently won a real victory in Cuba, Khrushchev was caught with his missiles showing. We had a united country, unanimity among our Latin American nations, full support of our Western Allies, and the power to gain a decisive settlement of the Cuban question. Let's look at the Cuban situation now compared to last October. Defeat was snatched by the "whiz kids" out of the jaws of victory.

1. We backed down on our demand for on-the-ground inspection of missile sites and potential missile hiding places.

2. We failed to board and examine the cargoes of Soviet ships with canvas-covered objects purporting to be missiles.

3. We failed to get Soviet agreement for the immediate withdrawal of all Soviet armed forces from Cuba. Four months later the administration throws the Nation a Kremlin sop that "some of these troops will be withdrawn." The American policy should be that every Soviet soldier be promptly removed from Cuba.

I refuse to accept the doctrine that we are helpless (short of armed conflict) to act in a decisive manner to get these Soviet troops out of Cuba. We could, in conjunction with the Organization of American States:

(a) Announce that if they were not all out by April 1, a tight naval and air blockade around Cuba would be instituted.

(b) The entire Organization of American States could notify the Soviet Union that diplomatic relations would be suspended as of that date and all Soviet embassies closed until the last Soviet soldier left Cuba.

I doubt the Soviet Union would want this to happen since Soviet embassies are centers of Soviet espionage and Communist propaganda in Latin America, as they are elsewhere in the world.

4. By the latter fatal oversight the Kennedy administration has for the first time in our history made the Monroe Doctrine a dead letter and has given tacit acquiescence to the establishment of a hostile Soviet base with approximately 20,000 troops just 90 miles from our shores.

For the first time in our history a responsible member of the administration has advocated "managed news" and enunciated the doctrine that it is proper on occasion to lie to the American people.

From now on during the remaining 20 months of this administration the public will be in doubt as to when they are being lied to and when they are being told the truth.

In his inaugural speech, the next Republican President on January 20, 1965, should make it clear that deceit will not be tolerated and the word of an administration official will be as good as his bond.

Only in this way can confidence be restored and a free people be assured they can make their decisions based on facts as they are and not as colored by officials assuming a papa-knows-best attitude.

This administration is striving to enlarge the executive power at the expense of the legislative power. It must be stopped in its tracks.

During the previous Congress the President compared Congress to Lazarus. If Congress dies, even temporarily, the Constitution dies with it. Congress is indeed no Lazarus and the President is no Saviour.

The time has come to take our stand in meaningful support of the Constitution.

1. We cannot permit an all powerful Federal Government that can overpower, submerge, and destroy the functions of our 50 State governments.

2. We cannot permit an all powerful Executive that can overshadow the legislative and judicial branches of our Government.

3. We cannot permit any world government to overpower, submerge, and destroy our constitutional form of government and the Bill of Rights of our people.

4. Excessive Government costs and taxes must be reduced to preserve the system of private enterprise. Among the essential steps is a drastic reduction in foreign aid where American enterprise is being taxed to provide an endless cornucopia to the socialist and neutralist nations of the world.

5. We must insist that the American people be protected from domination by big government, big business, or big labor. No man or no group of men must be allowed to have the power to strangle the economic life of our Nation, our State, or our community.

6. Civil rights must be respected but civil rights are far more extensive than racial rights alone. The right to own property and to dispose of it, to walk in safety on our streets to and from work, to have a job, to engage in a business or profession, are also civil rights entitled to the protection of government—National, State, and local.

Equality for the Negro will come when we stop treating him as a minority voting pressure group, to whom promises are often made and seldom kept—and we treat him as an individual American citizen who has the same rights, interests, and obligations of citizenship that the balance of our people have.

7. Education is and should remain the primary function of local and State government. We must resist the encroachment of the Federal Government in the field of education.

8. The constitutional separation of church and state does not require taking God out of government or out of our personal lives. Prayers were said in our Constitutional Convention and are said in our National and State legislative bodies. Prayers have been said in our inaugural ceremonies and the Bible is used for the Presidential oath.

At home we must not permit big government, big business, or big labor to so overshadow the individual that he loses his identity and becomes a mere statistic on an electric tape.

The individual must not willingly surrender nor have forcibly taken from him the control over his conscience and his power of decision in matters moral, economic, or political.

For this is what the American heritage is and what the American Revolution was about.

The real, deep, moving, powerful (yes, irresistible) strength of our Nation comes from the free and undominated convictions of men and women, old and young, rich and poor, native and foreign born, educated and unschooled, who have a deep faith in America and a belief in Almighty God.

PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES BY HAWAII HOUSING AUTHORITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the morning hour, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 345, which is Calendar No. 11, and which has been cleared by the minority and majority leaders.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 345) to provide for the approval of a payment in lieu of taxes to be made for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on passage of the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law or any contract or rule of law, the Public Housing Commissioner shall approve a payment in lieu of taxes to be made for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, in the amount of $24,167.78, by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement in explanation of the bill be placed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

S. 345 would require the Public Housing Commissioner to approve a payment in lieu of taxes in the amount of $24,167.78 made by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu, with respect to housing projects HA-1, HA-2, and HA-3 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959.

This payment was disallowed by the Public Housing Administration because it was made after the expiration of the time limit set for such payments in the annual contributions contract between the Hawaii Housing Authority and the Public Housing Authority. The contract provided that no voluntary payments in lieu of taxes may be made more than 1 year after the end of the fiscal year to which they apply. The payment which was disallowed was made on July 9, 1960, 9 days after the final permissible date, which, in this case, was June 30, 1960.

BACKGROUND

This restriction on voluntary payment in lieu of taxes was included in the contributions contracts with local agencies which have not contracted through cooperation agreements to make specific payments to their localities. The restriction was designed to prevent the excessive accumulation of potential expenditures, and to relate payments to the periods in which the city's services were rendered.

In opinion B-125637 (35 Comp. Gen. 345), dated December 7, 1955, the Comptroller General ruled that adherence to the time limit may not be waived by the Public Housing Agency. The summary of this decision stated:

"The establishment of time limitations for payments in lieu of taxes in annual contributions contracts between the Public Housing Administration and local housing authorities is a proper exercise of administrative discretion and the Public Housing Administration is proscribed from waiving such contract conditions to permit a local housing authority to make payments after the expiration of the limitation."

The Housing Act of 1956, section 408 (70 Stat. 1108), provided relief for 11 housing authorities affected by the above-cited ruling, and the Housing Act of 1961, section 907 (75 Stat. 191), provided relief for another. When the Housing Act of 1956 was before the Congress for consideration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency assured the appropriate committees that it would not support special legislation of this type in the future.

In two circulars dated May 17 and June 14, 1956, the Public Housing Administration called to the attention of all local housing authorities the Comptroller General's decision and warned them not to expect special legislative relief if in the future payments in lieu of taxes were not made within the time period specified in the contributions contract. The local housing authorities were advised either to amend their cooperation agreements with local towns to provide for mandatory payments, or to be careful not to exceed the time limit on any future voluntary payments.

The Administrator concluded that although the enactment of this legislation would be reflected in an additional contribution payment by the Federal Government "in view of the foregoing, we believe that it is a matter for Congress to determine whether relief should be granted under the circumstances of this case."

AGENCY COMMENTS

In a letter addressed to the chairman of the committee by the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, commenting on an identical bill, S. 2627, which was pending before the committee in the 87th Congress, the Administrator stated:

"The present case is * * * a matter of oversight, and one involving failure to make proper payment by only a few days. In his letter of January 3, 1961, requesting waiver of the contract provisions, the acting executive director of the Hawaii Housing Authority pointed out that 'the contract violations are technical, that they were not intended, and resulted from an oversight.' "

The comments of the Bureau of the Budget and the Comptroller General of the United States follow:

Executive Office of the President,
Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1963.

Hon. John L. McClellan,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This is in reply to your request for our views regarding the provisions of S. 345, to provide for the approval of a payment in lieu of taxes to be made for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu.

The bill would require the Public Housing Commissioner to approve the $24,167.78 payment in lieu of taxes made by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu with respect to housing projects HA-1, HA-2, and HA-3 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. The enactment of this legislation would be reflected in an additional contribution payment by the Public Housing Administration to the Hawaii Housing Authority.

The payment in question was disallowed by the Public Housing Administration because it was made 9 days after expiration of the time limit set for such payments in the annual contributions contracts between the Administration and the Hawaii Housing Authority. It appears that the violation in this case resulted from an oversight on the part of the Hawaii Housing Authority and is technical in nature. The Comptroller General has ruled, however, that adherence to the time limit may not be waived by that Administration.

If, despite the notice and warning by the Public Housing Administration to all local housing units concerning the exact situation covered by S. 345, your committee believes that relief should be granted, the Bureau of the Budget would not object to favorable action on the bill.

Sincerely yours,
Phillip S. Hughes,
Assistance Director for Legislative Reference.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN ARKANSAS TO CITY OF FAYETTEVILLE, ARK.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 13, Senate bill 13.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 13) to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "General Services" and insert "Veterans' Affairs"; on page 2, line 4, after the word "the", to strike out "fifty-sixth" and insert "fifth"; and in line 22, after the word "of", to strike out "General Services" and insert "Veterans' Affairs"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to section 2 of this Act, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the city of Fayetteville, Arkansas, for park and recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following described tract of land, which constitutes a portion of certain lands heretofore conveyed by such city to the United States without consideration, and which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States: A tract of land situated in the county of Washington, State of Arkansas, being part of the northeast quarter of section 9, township 16 north, range 30 west, of the fifth principal meridian, and being more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the northeast corner of section 9; thence south along the east line of said section 9, 660 feet to a point; thence west 165 feet to a point; thence south 100 feet to a point; thence west 733 feet to a point; thence north 350 feet to a point; thence west 435 feet to a point; thence north 410 feet to a point on the north line of section 9; thence east along the north line of said section 9, 1,333 feet to the point of beginning; and containing 19.382 acres, more or less.

Sec. 2. The land authorized to be conveyed by the first section of this Act shall be conveyed subject (1) to the condition that it shall be used for park and recreational purposes in a manner which, in the judgment of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, will not interfere with the care and treatment of patients in the Veterans' Administration hospital situated on lands adjacent to the land herein authorized to be conveyed, and (2) to the condition that in the event that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs determines, within twenty years after the date of execution of such conveyance, that the land so conveyed has been devoted to any use other than for park and recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest therein shall revert to and revest in the United States in its then existing condition, and (3) to the gas easement which was granted to the Arkansas Western Gas Company (for a period of fifty years) by the Department of the Army.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Arkansas."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Record a brief statement on the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 13, as introduced, would have authorized and directed the Administrator of General Services to convey the property covered by this measure to the city of Fayetteville by quitclaim deed, without compensation, and to be responsible for making any determination regarding the operation of a reverter in favor of the United States in the event the conditions of the conveyance were not met by the donee of the property. The bill also gives the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs general responsibility to insure that the operation of the property by the donee, for park and recreational purposes, would not interfere with the care and treatment of patients in the VA hospital located adjacent to the land authorized to be conveyed.

Inasmuch as the Veterans' Administration is the agency directly concerned, by virtue of its maintenance of a hospital adjacent to the property involved, the committee deems it more appropriate to lodge all responsibility imposed by this bill with that agency. The amendments, therefore, merely substitute the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as the transferring agency for the Administrator of General Services, as well as the administering agency, and make a correction in the description of the property.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the city of Fayetteville, Ark., for park and recreational purposes, all right, title, and interest of the United States in about 19 acres of surplus land, which constitutes part of a larger tract of land originally donated by the city of Fayetteville to the United States as a site for a veterans' hospital.

BACKGROUND

Except for the amendments noted above, S. 13 is identical to the amended version of S. 1412, 87th Congress, which the committee reported favorably on July 17, 1961 (S. Rept. 546, 87th Cong.), and the Senate passed on July 20, 1961. S. 1412 was referred to the House Committee on Government Operations on July 24, 1961, but no further action was taken on the measure.

The land proposed to be returned to the city of Fayetteville is a portion of an original tract containing about 82 acres, donated to the Federal Government by the city in 1932. It is reported that the city purchased the original tract at a cost of $66,250. The portion of the original tract of land covered by the subject bill was reported excess to the needs of the Veterans' Administration on September 7, 1955. It was transferred to the Department of the Army on November 20, 1956, and used by the Arkansas National Guard for outdoor training. On September 2, 1960, the Department of the Army declared the land excess to its needs and referred it to the General Services Administration for disposal as surplus property.

Under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the Administrator of General Services has authority to dispose of surplus realty to States and local governments at its fair market value, and if it is to be used for health, education, park or recreational purposes, a public benefit allowance may be made in the disposal of such property. Such conveyances shall be made at a price equal to 50 percent of the fair value of the property conveyed, based on the highest and best use of the property at the time it is offered for disposal. This authority may, however, be exercised by another agency which may have an interest in or be affected by the transfer when so designated by the GSA or by an act of Congress.

The city of Fayetteville sought to obtain this surplus property for use as a park, under the above provisions, but was unable to reconcile differences over the appraisal basis in subsequent negotiations with the General Services Administration, thus prompting the introduction of legislation to convey the property without consideration.

The city had independent appraisals made by three qualified local appraisers who valued the property at approximately $10,000, if it is to be used for public purposes, as proposed by the city. Applying the 50-percent formula to this appraisal, the city would be required to pay only about $5,000 for the land.

However, the GSA appraisal of the property was based on its highest and best use (residential) at $20,000, which meant that the city would be required to pay $10,000 under the public-benefit formula.

By letter of January 25, 1961, Senator J. W. Fulbright advised this committee that the General Services Administration was in the process of offering the land for sale to the general public and requested that such sale be postponed until further negotiations could take place between the city and the General Services Administration on a fair price for the land. Senator Fulbright also indicated his intention to introduce legislation to authorize conveyance of the property to the city without cost if further negotiations failed to result in an agreed price, since the property had been donated to the Government by the city.

In response to Senator Fulbright's letter, the committee requested the General Services Administration to postpone disposition of this property until a satisfactory adjustment could be made or, if this did not develop, until legislation providing for the conveyance of the property to the city of Fayetteville without compensation could be introduced and considered by the committee.

Additionally, members of the committee staff met with representatives from General Services Administration and Senator Fulbright's office in an effort to reach an agreement that would be satisfactory to the Administrator and to the city of Fayetteville. At that time the staff director, on behalf of the committee, requested the General Services Administration to seek a compromise on the appraisal value of this property so that the city of Fayettville might purchase the property at 50 percent of the fair market value, based on its use as a public park and not for residential purposes.

Subsequently, General Services Administration advised the committee, in a letter dated February 23, 1961, that it had requested its Dallas office to obtain another appraisal of the property in an effort to reconcile the aforementioned differentials in valuations. However, this reappraisal placed the value of the property at $21,000, or $1,000 more than the first appraisal by the General Services Administration, based on its use for residential purposes.

Thus the second evaluation by General Services Administration served only to widen the difference between the city and General Services Administration and prompted Hon. Guy E. Brown, mayor of Fayetteville, in a letter addressed to Senator John L. McClellan, chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, dated March 8, 1961, to comment as follows:

"The land in question was given to the Government several years ago by the city of Fayetteville, for the veterans' hospital. Since they did not use the land, it became surplus property. We thought that, in fairness to the city of Fayetteville, it should be given back to the city free of any charges.

"The General Services Administration office in Dallas called me the other day and stated that they had another appraisal made, and that the appraised value of the land was $21,000, $1,000 more than the first appraisal. This land is on a hillside, and there is a drop of 100 feet in the terrain from one side to the other. It can only be used for barbecue pits and picnic tables. Since we have no park in that part of town, we would like very much to have such a plot of ground for that purpose.

"We understand that we would receive the land for one-half of the appraised value, but we cannot see that it would be worth $10,500 to the city, for barbecue pits and picnic tables.

"The city of Fayetteville would be most grateful to you, and to Senator Fulbright and the other Senators, if you would introduce such legislation as would be necessary to give this land back to the city of Fayetteville."

In view of the failure of negotiations to achieve a satisfactory solution, Senator Fulbright then introduced S. 1412, which was designed to return the property to the city without cost, subject to the conditions set forth therein. As noted above this measure passed the Senate during the 87th Congress, but was not enacted by the House of Representatives. The measure was then reintroduced in this session in the form of S. 13 by Senators Fulbright and McClellan.

CONCLUSION

If the statutory provision relating to the conveyance of surplus property to States and local governments under the public-benefit formula is applied in this instance, the city of Fayetteville would be required to pay one-half of a market value predicated on the property's use for residential purposes when, in fact, the city intends to use the land for park and recreational purposes and, under the terms of the bill, as amended, the city will be required to so use the land.

The committee feels that it would be unfair to apply this formula to a city which originally donated a tract of land more than four times the size of the property in question to the Federal Government. In view of the fact that the city donated this land, and now seeks but a small, unimproved, surplus portion of its original grant for use as a public park, the committee feels that a compelling case is made for the return of this property to the city of Fayetteville without compensation.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE IN VOTING FOR UNIONIZATION OF EMPLOYEES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several days ago I sent a letter to the National Mediation Board, accompanied by a letter I received from a constituent in Ohio. This Ohio constituent, an employee of the United Air Lines, in his letter to me complained that in a ballot which was to be used in determining whether there shall be unionization of the employees, there was no separate space under which a worker could say, "No, I do not want to belong to a union." The ballot provided as follows:

1. Representation by the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.
2. Representation by the I.A.M.
3. Representation by any other organization.

There was no space on the ballot which would allow the employee to say, "I do not want to belong to a union."

I wrote to the Mediation Board and pointed out that there was not the ability to express a free choice on the ballot. The only way the employee could express a free choice clearly would be to write into the ballot, himself, "I do not want to belong to a union."

In reply to my letter there came this interesting information: That a suit has been filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia known as Civil Action No. 402–63, on February 12, 1963. The issue will be determined in that lawsuit. However, if it is determined adversely to the view of those who say, "We want a ballot that will give us a chance to vote 'No' with the same facility as we can vote 'Yes'" I am of the belief that matters of such importance as this should eventually have the cognizance of Congress so it can enact necessary legislation to provide that there shall be open and free elections, with an opportunity for all views to be given and equal facility for expression.

I yield the floor.

DEPUTY CHIEF OF ARMS CONTROL AGENCY ANSWERS TEST BAN CRITICS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, over the past several weeks some of us seem to have been engaged in an undeclared war concerning the desirability of a nuclear test ban. The intensity of the conflict has risen in direct proportion to reports coming out of Geneva and elsewhere as to the likelihood of an agreement between the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union. With every sign of progress, starting with the publication of the exchange of letters between President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev, we have heard a steady counterpoint of comment—usually unfavorable to a test ban—from a variety of sources.

One of the most exhaustive of these comments was delivered in the Senate Chamber recently by my good friend and colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut. I read the Senator's speech with great care while flying cross country immediately after my arrival in the United States from the 18-nation disarmament talks in Geneva. I attended these talks, which dealt with the nuclear test ban issue, at the special invitation of the President. It was an enlightening, if sobering, experience. Nothing that happened there, and nothing that I read in the speech of the Senator from Connecticut, diminished my conviction that a nuclear test ban is essential from the point of view of U.S. security—not essential for the sake of some do-gooding principle of world morality and human brotherhood—however important those concepts are—but essential from the point of view of our national safety and well-being.

In this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, there is a letter from Mr. Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, which sets forth admirably the arguments in favor of a nuclear test ban—a test ban on terms commensurate with U.S. security and national interest. It answers point by point the chief criticisms of the Senator from Connecticut. I commend it to the attention of Senators, and ask unanimous consent that the letter and an accompanying front page news article be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this week the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has scheduled some extremely important open hearings on matters relating to nuclear test detection capability. I shall be watching with great interest for reports on these hearings and on the remarks of the distinguished witnesses who are going to appear before the Committee.

I wish to announce in this connection that the Subcommittee on Disarmament, of which I am chairman, will hold hearings on the test-ban issue. Hearings will take place on Monday and Tuesday next week, March 11 and 12. To the extent possible, all sessions of the subcommittee will be open, and in any case all members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are cordially invited to attend. I can assure Senators that we will be going into both the technical and general policy aspects of a test ban, and no important consideration relative to United States policy is going to be swept under the rug.

In addition, I myself plan to take the floor tomorrow to present my own views and observations concerning the necessity of a nuclear test ban. The speech will explain in detail why I disagree with the view that a test ban is inimical to U.S. security. It will attempt to explain why I believe that a test ban containing adequate safeguards and backed up by the full panoply of rapidly advancing scientific and technical knowledge is definitely in the best interest of our country. I hope that all interested Senators will be present and will contribute their views to our thinking on this most important of world problems.

[Exhibit 1]

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1963]

A Communication

On March 1 your newspaper carried a letter from the senior Senator from Connecticut, Thomas J. Dodd, in which he gave reasons why he believed the present U.S. position in the nuclear test-ban negotiations was unsound. It is with great reluctance that I find myself having to express a disagreement with the Senator, a respected lawmaker and a distinguished public servant. But since it is the firm view of the national security advisers to the President that an effective test-ban treaty is in the national interest and that our position at the negotiations is eminently sound, a few comments should be made with respect to the U.S. position and the points raised in the Senator's letter, as well as in his recent speech in the Senate.

1. The Senator stated that the test-ban policy pursued by both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations "has already cost us our nuclear superiority over the Soviets." The actual situation is quite different. The United States has not lost its nuclear superiority over the U.S.S.R. The trend with unlimited testing, however, in the absence of an agreement will be toward equality in the major nuclear forces between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

2. A test-ban agreement would inhibit nonnuclear powers from obtaining a nuclear weapons capability. The national interest of the United States is served more by a policy of inhibiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons than by a policy of being indifferent to the number of countries that may develop nuclear weapons of their own. A test-ban agreement would not in itself be sufficient to prevent the spread of independend national nuclear capability, but it would be a definite step in the right direction. This question of nonproliferation is one that must be included in any total appraisal of the importance of a test-ban agreement to the United States.

3. The Senator states that if the Soviets continue testing in secret under an agreement and we do not test, "they can confront us with a choice between surrender or annihilation." This is not correct. It is true that if the U.S.S.R. were able to test small devices clandestinely underground for an indefinite period, they could make significant advances in the general field of small nuclear weapons. However, every analysis conducted by the executive branch in recent years has reached the conclusion that the strategic military balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. could not be altered in any major way by such developments. Furthermore, the risks of detection of a series of such tests would not be ignored by the U.S.S.R. One test would hardly be significant to a nation bent on attempting to gain a military advantage by testing secretly. Such a nation would more likely want to conduct a series of tests, and a series runs a much greater probability of detection than a single test. The risk of undetected cheating would be present under any treaty. The type of treaty prepared by the United States would provide deterrence against Soviet attempts at undetected cheating so that while such a risk must be recognized, on balance the security of the United States would be better served by taking this risk than taking the risk of continued unlimited testing with no agreement.

4. It is contended that the U.S. provisions for inspection and detection are only one-tenth as effective as those in our original proposals because the United States is now proposing fewer detection stations and fewer inspections. The monitoring system now proposed will have at least the same degree of deterrent effect as that contemplated 4

years ago. The original proposal of an internationally operated system of 180 control posts located in every geographic area of the world was made at a time when we had less knowledge about the detection and identification of underground events and was for a system designed to monitor the entire globe. On the basis of knowledge and experience of seismic events in the Soviet Union, we now know that the areas of interest can be monitored by a much smaller system which places primary reliance for the detection of events in the Soviet Union upon U.S. national systems located outside the Soviet Union. This is what we propose.

The original proposal would have required some 4 to 6 years to install and the international staff of technicians would have had to have been recruited and in many cases trained from scratch. Under the present proposal the United States would be relying on its own detection system which could begin operating immediately and which would be operated by United States and United Kingdom nationals who are already trained and skilled. This proposal would give the United States both maximum flexibility and maximum control of the detection system.

The previous proposal of the United States would have excluded from inspection underground events below a certain size—roughly, anything below a 20-kiloton explosion detonated in tuff, a relatively soft rock. And, at the same time, the United States would have agreed on a 3-year moratorium against conducting tests below this size. The present U.S. proposal would permit the United States to inspect, within the quota, for any underground event that had been detected and had not been positively identified as being an earthquake.

We also now know that the number of earthquakes in the U.S.S.R. is less by a factor of 2½ than we previously believed. This, coupled with our increased knowledge of earthquake identification, means that the number of unidentified underground events for which we might consider inspection, will be very substantially smaller than was assumed a few years ago. Furthermore, our knowledge in these areas is now based on actual observation whereas only a few years ago it was based in large part on uncertain estimates.

5. It is suggested that the United States now is willing to accept the principle that monitoring stations be manned by Russians and that Russians "are to be the judges of whether or not they themselves are cheating." Again, this is not a correct statement. The detection stations on which the United States would rely would be operated or supervised by the United States and United Kingdom and would be outside of the Soviet Union. No Soviet national would judge whether the Soviets are cheating. Automatic recording seismic stations inside the Soviet Union would play a supplementary role only; furthermore, the sealed recording devices which these would contain would be serviced and the records would be picked up by non-Soviet personnel.

6. It is said that we now propose to give the Communist bloc a veto power on the control body of the test-band organization. No veto on inspection has ever been proposed by the United States, and there is no consideration of proposing such a veto in the future.

7. It is stated that William Foster, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, testified in September that there had been no improvement in our verification capability. On the contrary, Mr. Foster testified in September concerning two significant developments which increased our verification capability. The first was a "better capability for long-distance detection of earth tremors caused by nuclear explosions or earthquakes." The second was that "an earlier estimate of the number of tremors from earthquakes in the Soviet Union which might be confused with tremors from nuclear explosions has been shown by actual observations and research to be several times too large. Since there are fewer actual earthquakes which produce tremors similar to those of an explosion, the number of onsite inspections needed to identify the cause of any observed tremors is less." (Hearings before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, Sept. 17, 1962, p. 6.)

8. The Senator believes that continued testing is essential to the perfection of the antimissile missile and to the development of the neutron bomb, and that the nation which first perfects either of these weapons will decisively overturn the balance of power. These contentions were refuted generally in points 1–3 above. Additionally, the perfection of the antimissile missile does not rest primarily on nuclear weapons testing. It rests on other kinds of activities. Even then, our military experts are of the view that the nation sending a missile to its target will always have the advantage over any foreseeable antimissile missile defense system. With respect to the neutron bomb, a weapon whose successful development is by no means assured no matter how many tests are made, the chief interest of the United States is to prevent the Soviet Union and other states from acquiring this kind of a weapon. These states are much more likely to be inhibited from developing and producing the neutron bomb under a test-ban agreement than under a situation of unlimited testing.

The United States will continue to persist in its negotiations with the Soviets to achieve an effective treaty. We do this because we firmly believe such an agreement is in the national interest of the United States.

Every person weighing the value and the risks of a test-ban agreement must face squarely the situation in which we reach no agreements and allow testing to go on, unlimited, and see the arms race continue to spiral upward. Those within both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations who have studied these questions and these alternatives thoroughly have concluded that every effort to bring the arms race under control, of which nuclear testing is a part, must be pursued diligently.

I would hope that this letter demonstrates that the kind of test-ban agreement now being negotiated by the United States is one that is in the national interest.

ADRIAN S. FISHER,
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

A-TEST BAN BID OF UNITED STATES DEFENDED—FISHER LEADS OFF FOR KENNEDY PRIOR TO POLICY SESSION

(By Laurence Stern)

The Kennedy administration jumped to the offensive yesterday against congressional critics who have been clamoring for a harder U.S. line in nuclear test-ban negotiations with the Soviet Union.

In the administration's first exchange of fire with Capitol Hill, Adrian S. Fisher, Deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, challenged as not correct recent criticisms of test-ban policy by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut.

DODD and other congressional critics in both parties have expressed alarm that reductions in American demands for onsite inspection will permit the Soviet Union to achieve nuclear superiority through secret bomb tests.

Such concessions, DODD argued, "have already cost us our nuclear superiority over the Soviets."

ISSUES REBUTTAL

Fisher yesterday issued a point-by-point rebuttal to this line of attack and argued instead that U.S. security can best be preserved with a test-ban treaty rather than in a no-holds-barred nuclear arms race.

In his letter to the Washington Post, Fisher replied to a letter from DODD published in this newspaper last Friday. Fisher's letter is printed in full in today's editions.

Yesterday's opening skirmish foreshadowed a showdown on test-ban policy between the administration and its critics on Capitol Hill later this week. The forum for the debate probably will be a Joint Atomic Energy Committee hearing on Project Vera, the program for refining our underground nuclear blast detection techniques.

DEFENDS REDUCTION

Fisher defended the administration's lowering of annual onsite inspection demands from a starting point of 20 to a current proposal of 7 on the grounds that our knowledge of Soviet earthquake activity levels is more precise than it was several years ago.

Original U.S. inspection demands, he pointed out, were based on a 250-percent overestimate of the number of earthquakes in the U.S.S.R.

"This, coupled with our increased knowledge of earthquake identification, means that the number of unidentified underground events for which we might consider inspection will be very substantially smaller than was assumed a few years ago," Fisher wrote.

Yesterday's letter coincided with the return to Washington of Disarmament Agency Director William C. Foster from the deadlocked test-ban negotiations in Geneva. He is expected to brief the President today on the talks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. SUDHIR GHOSH, MEMBER OF INDIAN PARLIAMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at this time I desire to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that we are privileged this afternoon to have as a distinguished visitor a fellow parliamentarian from the great nation of India. I call the attention of the Senate to the presence in this Chamber of Mr. Sudhir Ghosh, one of the most distinguished and able parliamentary leaders of the Parliament of India, a true friend of democracy and freedom, and a gentleman who enjoys the friendship of many Americans and many Members of this

body. Mr. Ghosh is a recognized leader in his country; a disciple of the late Mahatma Ghandi; a friend and adviser to Prime Minister Nehru. I wish to welcome him to the Senate.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to say I have had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Ghosh ever since 1952, when I first met him on a trip to India. I have had occasion to be with him on many occasions since then. I have found him to be an active, alert, devoted, patriotic Indian, and a very fine and dear friend of the West. He possesses much native ability. He was closely associated with the late Mahatma Ghandi, and was a student, or at least a disciple, of his. I think he still exhibits a great deal of the qualities which characterized Mr. Ghandi.

Several of us have just had the privilege of lunching together in the Foreign Relations Committee room, and we went over a good many of the questions which are of mutual concern and interest to both countries. I am delighted Mr. Ghosh is able to be here, and would welcome him every time he came.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad to join other Senators in welcoming a member of the House of the People, which is the elected house in India. I had the great honor and pleasure of knowing Mr. Ghosh in India. He is highly respected there. He is one of the strong leaders in the Congress Party and also in the House of the People. He has been here on several occasions. He has many friends among Members of this body and the other body of the Congress.

I concur in the statement that he is a great believer in and advocate of democratic institutions.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 10, House Joint Resolution 284.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this measure will be handled on the floor by the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who is now in the Chamber, will be present to make any replies that may be requested by other Senators who are also here, and to join in the handling of the joint resolution.

I have a brief statement to make in regard to the pending measure.

The Appropriations Committee has acted promptly in its consideration of the supplemental budget request of $508,172,000 for the Department of Agriculture. This amount is needed to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out its authorized programs for the balance of fiscal year 1963. In submitting the supplemental budget request—House Document No. 64—the President submitted an amendment to the 1964 budget request decreasing it by the same amount. In other words, the pending resolution, House Joint Resolution 284, deals solely with a shift in funding from the 1964 budget to providing these funds for fiscal 1963.

Over the years, Congress has enacted various laws under which the authorized borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation is to be used to finance costs incurred thereunder, subject to reimbursement appropriations. There is considerable misunderstanding with regard to the expenditures of the Commodity Credit Corporation versus the annual appropriations required to enable the Corporation to continue to carry out such authorized programs.

Today, we are dealing with just one aspect of the programs financed through the $14.5 billion borrowing authorization available to the Commodity Credit Corporation. This resolution (H.J. Res. 284) deals only with title I of Public Law 480, under which sales of agricultural commodities are made for foreign currencies pursuant to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, as amended. That, of course, is Public Law 480. The current legislative authorization for title I of Public Law 480 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements during the period beginning January 1, 1962, and ending December 31, 1964, which will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in a total amount not in excess of $4,500 million. This legislative authorization provides that sales agreements shall not be entered into during any calendar year of the authorization period which will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in amounts in excess of $2,500 million.

The various titles of Public Law 480 set the size of the programs for calendar year periods and the authorized reimbursement appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for costs incurred are usually made on a fiscal year basis.

The pending joint resolution is a supplemental item in this fiscal year.

The committee and the Congress have been dealing with these reimbursement appropriations for a number of years. I offer for the record a compilation of these legislative authorizations, and appropriation authority under which the Commodity Credit Corporation carries out these programs and is authorized to be reimbursed for the costs or the losses thereunder, and ask that it appear in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES, OR COSTS, TO THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAMS

Title I.—Sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies: Under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1701–1709), surplus agricultural commodities are sold for foreign currencies. Within certain limitations, these currencies may then be used by the U.S. Government for agricultural market development, purchase of strategic materials, military equipment, facilities and services for the common defense, payment of U.S. obligations, military housing, and other specified purposes.

Appropriation authority: Agricultural

The committee and the Congress

Public Law 480, title I (7 U.S.C. 1703): "(a) For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation * * * for commodities disposed of and cost incurred under titles I and II of this act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, etc. (b) Agreements shall not be entered into under this title during the period beginning January 1, 1962, and ending December 31, 1964, which will call for appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation in a total amount in excess of $4,500 million: *Provided*, That agreements shall not be entered into during any calendar year of such period which will call for appropriations to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation in amounts in excess of $2,500 million."

Title II.—Commodities disposed of for emergency famine relief to friendly peoples: Under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Public Law 480, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1703, 1721–1724), the Commodity Credit Corporation makes its surplus stocks of agricultural commodities available to the President for famine relief and other assistance to friendly nations and friendly people in meeting famine or other relief requirements and to pay ocean freight charges for the shipment of donated commodities.

Appropriation authority: Public Law 480, title II (7 U.S.C. 1723), July 10, 1954 (sec. 203): "Programs of assistance shall not be undertaken under this title during any calendar year beginning January 1, 1961, and ending December 31, 1964, which call for appropriation of more than $300 million to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for all costs incurred in connection with such programs." Public Law 480, title I (7 U.S.C. 1703(a)), July 10, 1954 (sec. 103a): "For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of and costs incurred under Titles I and II of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums."

Title IV—Long-term supply contracts: Under title IV of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (7 U.S.C. 1731–1736), the President is authorized to make agreements with friendly nations under which the United States would deliver surplus agricultural commodities over periods of up to 10 years and accept payment in dollars with interest over periods of up to 20 years.

Appropriation authority: Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act—Public Law 480, title IV, as amended by Public Law 86–341 (7 U.S.C. 1736), September 21, 1959: "In carrying out this title, the provisions of section 103(a) shall be applicable to the extent not inconsistent with this title."

BARTERED MATERIALS FOR SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

Under current policy, the Commodity Credit Corporation acquires strategic and other materials through barter of price-support commodities only for other Government agencies or for transfer to a supplemental United States stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. Transfers are valued at the lower of the domestic market price of the Commodity Credit Corporation's investment therein as of the date of transfer. The General Services Administration maintains the supplemental stockpile and transfers are made pursuant to their procedures.

Appropriation authority: Agricultural Act of 1956—Public Law 540, title II (70 Stat. 200) (7 U.S.C. 1856), May 28, 1956: "In order to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for materials transferred to the supplemental stockpile there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts equal to the value of any such materials so transferred. The value of any such material, for the purpose of this subsection, shall be the lower of the domestic market price or the Commodity Credit Corporation's investment therein as of the date of such transfer, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture."

INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

The International Wheat Agreement of 1962, originally signed by 25 importing and 10 exporting countries and to remain in force until July 1, 1965, encompasses all commercial trade in wheat and wheat flour between member countries. It established maximum and minimum prices at $2.02½ and $1.62½ a bushel, respectively, for the basic grade of wheat, Manitoba Northern at Fort William, Port Arthur, Canada, in terms of Canadian currency at the parity for the Canadian dollar determined for the purposes of the International Monetary Fund as at March 1, 1949. Importing countries undertake to purchase from participating exporting countries at prices within the prescribed price range, not less than a specified percentage of their total commercial imports.

Exporting countries undertake to make available to participating importing countries at prices within the price range, quantities of wheat sufficient to satisfy the commercial requirements of these countries.

Appropriation authority: Public Law 421 (7 U.S.C. 1641), October 27, 1949, as amended: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to make payments to the Commodity Credit Corporation of its estimated or actual net costs."

NATIONAL WOOL ACT

Under the National Wool Act, Commodity Credit Corporation is required to make incentive payments to eligible producers of wool and mohair on a percentage basis reflecting the amount required to bring the national average received by all producers up to the announced incentive level. The objective of this program is to encourage an annual domestic production of approximately 300 million pounds of shorn wool. The incentive level shall not exceed 110 percent of parity.

Appropriation authority: Public Law 690, title VII, National Wool Act (7 U.S.C. 1784), August 28, 1954:

"For the purpose of reimbursing the Commodity Credit Corporation for any expenditures made by it in connection with payments to producers under this title, there is hereby appropriated for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, an amount equal to the total of expenditures made by the Corporation during the preceding fiscal year and to any amounts expended in prior fiscal years not previously reimbursed: *Provided, however,* That such amounts appropriated for any fiscal year shall not exceed 70 per centum of the gross receipts from duties collected during the period January 1 to December 31, both inclusive, preceding the beginning of each such fiscal year on all articles subject to duty under schedule 11 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended."

Public Law 87–155, approved August 17, 1961, authorizes reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation for realized losses on price support and related programs. The new authority repealed sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 8, 1938, which provided for an appraisal by the Secretary of the Treasury of the assets and liabilities of the Corporation and authorized restoration of capital impairment or surplus payments to the Treasury based on such appraisal.

Appropriation authority: Public Law 87–155 (75 Stat. 391), August 17, 1961: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually for each fiscal year, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961 * * * an amount sufficient to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for its net realized loss incurred during such fiscal year, as reflected in the accounts and shown in its report of its financial condition as of the close of such fiscal year. Reimbursement of net realized loss shall be with appropriated funds * * * rather than through the cancellation of notes."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, so, today, we are simply dealing with a supplemental amount needed for the balance of this fiscal year to restore the capital structure and to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out all of its authorized program activities until June 30, 1963. Last year, the regular Agricultural Appropriation Act carried $832 million less for reimbursement appropriations than was requested in the President's budget. The pending resolution restores $508,172,000 of those reductions made for this year. All of these reimbursement appropriations will be dealt with again later in the session when the annual agricultural appropriation supply bill is under consideration in this body.

The Secretary of Agriculture testified before the committee that the borrowing authority of the Corporation was down to the perilously low level of $127 million. As recently as early January, when the President's budget message was submitted to the Congress, it was the belief of the Secretary of Agriculture and of officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation that sufficient funds would be available to enable the Corporation to carry out its programs for the balance of fiscal 1963. As indicated in the committee report, unanticipated changes have recently occurred in use of the borrowing authority. There has been an unusually heavy demand for loans on 1962 crop corn, a decrease in the receipts from feed grain sales, a larger volume of cotton loans, continuing demands for dairy product purchases and export payments, together with the continuing expenses and costs of Public Law 480, as well as payments to producers for acreage diversion agreements pursuant to the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962.

In conclusion, Mr. President, the reimbursement appropriation for $508,172,000 is entirely for expenses resulting from title I of Public Law 480 for sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies.

By advancing this amount from the 1964 budget request to the current fiscal year, the funds provided will enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out all of its authorized programs for the balance of fiscal year 1963; that is, through June 30 of this year.

In fact, the need for this particular supplemental amount did not arise because of price support and related programs carried on by the Commodity Credit Corporation under price support and related programs, but is due to the costs under Public Law 480. I want to make it amply clear that the deficiency in borrowing authority available to the Commodity Credit Corporation at this time does not arise from the feed grain program, the wheat program, or any other of its regular authorized program activities, but is occasioned by the expenses incident to carrying out Public Law 480.

That, Mr. President, is, of course, a foreign aid activity, rather than a strictly domestic agricultural activity.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate approve the pending resolution (H.J. Res. 284) as reported from the committee, without amendment.

I wish to call attention just briefly to the fact that the pending joint resolution, of course, has already been passed by the other body, and is here now for final consideration. If approved without amendment it would, as the Secretary believes and states, allow the Department of Agriculture to operate without further requests for supplemental funds to the conclusion of the present fiscal year, or until June 30, 1963.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I support the joint resolution which is now before the Senate. This is a policy which we have followed for years, right or wrong, that of obligating the Federal Government under certain contracts, and to reimburse it afterward. This bill happens to provide for the reimbursement of expenditures under Public Law 480. It concerns the selling of our surplus food to hungry people throughout the world for their currencies. Much of these currencies are then used locally to help those people. In fact, it is really a foreign aid program that we have here. The State Department has testified year after year that if it were not for this program they would have to ask for additional funds under their foreign aid program for exactly their kind of assistance.

I know of no program that has gained more friends for the United States than giving them our surplus food or selling it to them for their currency. On page 24 of the hearings is a table showing the amount of those funds from July 1, 1954, through December 31, 1962, and their use. The total of these funds amounted to $9,068,660,000, 7.1 percent was used for the common defense of the two countries, 18.3 percent was used for grants for economic development, 5.9 percent was used for loans to private enterprise, 45.7 percent was used for loans to these foreign governments, 23 percent was used for U.S. uses, such as the expenses of embassies and other uses we might have for these currencies.

If this money were not repaid to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Department of Agriculture would be in the position of having to foot the whole bill for one of our best foreign aid programs. I do not think we want to have those expenditures permanently charged to the farm program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the very clear statement made by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Uses of foreign currency as provided in title I, Public Law 480 agreements signed July 1, 1954, to Dec. 31, 1962 [1]

[Amounts are in thousand dollar equivalents at the deposit rate of exchange]

Country	Total amount in agreements (market value including oversea transportation)	104(c) Common defense	104(e) Grants for economic development	104(e) Loans to private enterprise	104(g) Loans to foreign governments	For U.S. uses [2]
Argentina	64,100			8,250	36,500	19,350
Austria	42,940				26,328	16,612
Bolivia	24,559			3,132	17,375	4,052
Brazil	386,420	2,000	34,400		285,247	64,773
Burma	51,370		8,134		32,525	10,711
Ceylon	30,800		5,280	5,465	12,720	7,335
Chile	71,900	100		850	56,330	14,620
China (Taiwan)	163,110	85,981		15,800	26,840	34,489
Colombia	70,890	80		11,270	41,180	18,360
Congo	18,750		16,875			1,875
Ecuador	13,190			1,273	8,785	3,132
Finland	46,535			3,615	25,634	17,286
France	35,775			7,824		27,951
Germany	1,200					1,200
Greece	109,300	5,040	7,470	9,171	53,450	34,169
Guinea	10,670			298	7,811	2,561
Iceland	13,930		198	567	10,119	3,046
India	2,428,306		788,175	165,262	1,164,933	309,936
Indonesia	314,025		25,312	21,086	213,497	54,130
Iran	50,971	5,763		3,253	27.803	14,152
Israel	291,069		32,589	46,891	172,899	38,690
Italy	152,900			6,250	100,500	46,150
Japan	150,800	700	600		108.850	40,650
Korea	342,860	290,583		5,891		46,386
Mexico	28,200			7,100	13,600	7,500
Morocco	21,870			2,130	14,273	5,467
Netherlands	275					275
Pakistan	1,065,920	79,366	556,841	51,740	276,432	101,541
Paraguay	13,200		3,420	1,170	6,000	2,610
Peru	37,280	100		3,762	22,723	10,695
Philippines	36,150	8,102	3,045	6,438	8,027	10,538
Poland	425,700					425,700
Portugal	7,100				3,400	3,700
Spain	505,630	9,910			253,480	242,240
Sudan	4,600		1,150	690	1,610	1,150
Syrian Arab Republic	37,200			6,550	22,750	7,900
Thailand	4,600				2,050	2,550
Tunisia	33,600		7,700	4,020	16,665	5,215
Turkey	386,065	97,750	2,340	42,011	115,000	128,964
United Arab Republic	782,940		25,731	77,504	554,047	125,658
United Kingdom	48,150					48,150
Uruguay	48,400			12,050	24,300	12,050
Vietnam	71,280	54,930		5,725		10,625
Yugoslavia	624,130		143,092		378,333	102,705
Total	[3] 9,068,660	640,405	1,662,352	537,038	4,142,016	2,086,849
Uses as percent of total	100.0	7.1	18.3	5.9	45.7	23.0

[1] Many agreements provide for the various currency uses in terms of percentages of the amounts of local currency accruing pursuant to sales made under each agreement. In such cases, amounts included in this table for each use are determined by applying the specified percentages to the total dollar amount provided in each agreement. Amounts shown are subject to adjustment when actual commodity purchases and currency allocations have been made.

[2] Fiscal year 1962 agreements provide that a specific amount of foreign currency proceeds may be used under various U.S. use categories, including currency uses which are limited to amounts as may be specified in appropriation acts. Included are uses specified under subsections 104 (a), (b), (f), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), (o), (p), (q), (r), (s) and sometimes (c) and (d), insofar as specified in agreements.

[3] Amounts shown in this column may differ from amounts on table 3, which reflect purchase authorization transactions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the 23 percent which is applied for U.S. uses is for such items as the building of embassies and legations, the buying of food for our personnel, military or otherwise, in the areas where the local currencies are available, and other similar purposes which are strictly U.S. expenditures for our own benefit.

The fact is that none of the these currencies for use in these countries can be used to support or carry on the normal, ordinary functions of the Commodity Credit Corporation, for its domestic operations intended to help agriculture in this Nation.

I think the case is clearly made by the committee report and also by the hearing record. But rather than to delve at this time into the numerous phases on which hearings will be held later on various items on which there have been losses, or where there will be need for repairment of capital, the Department of Agriculture has, instead, preferred—and for myself, I completely agree with that policy—for them to come to us on a single reimbursement item, a matter as to which there cannot be any doubt about our duty to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Corporation has simply carried out the foreign policy assistance program created by Congress and approved by the President, and has asked for this restoration of funds. When restored, this amount will enable the Commodity Credit Corporation, in its present judgment, to complete its full operations for the current fiscal year.

The other reimbursement appropriation items, which are of a similar nature, have to do with domestic operations, and will come before the committee for hearing in connection with the regular supply bill for the Department of Agriculture. At that time the wisdom or unwisdom of all of them may be gone into before the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses, and, of course, the wisdom or unwisdom of these programs may be gone into before the legislative committees which handle agricultural matters in the Senate and in the other body. But this joint resolution does not relate to such items.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this is an obligation which must obviously be discharged. It relates to operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation which are authorized by law. It is intended to replace money which was expended in earlier days and will repair the capital stock of the Corporation which has been impaired.

But this matter goes infinitely further, notwithstanding the fact that this item is an obligation and, as such, there is nothing offensive about it. I take this opportunity to say that as other appropriation bills, notably the regular supply bills, come before the Senate, there will be amendments and suggestions for reductions and adjustments. I think I ought to say that a request will be made for yea-and-nay votes on those proposals and upon the passage of those bills.

In the last few years we have done very little about having yea-and-nay votes on appropriation bills; but in view of the approaching tax bill and the importance of the reduction of expenditures as a hedge and an offset, I believe that a record must be made, and it should be so written and so made that all the world can see.

I thought I ought to interpose that thought at this particular time, because this is the first deficiency or supplemental supply measure to be considered at this session. In due course, the whole entourage of appropriation bills will come before the Senate, and we shall have some very specific recommendations to make at that time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement made by the distinguished minority leader, and it is a constructive statement. He has correctly stated the exact meaning and substance of this particular measure.

I shall welcome his approach to the later items which he mentions, because the Congress should be very careful in passing upon all of the items of expenditures of public funds, including those which are involved in the important activities of the Department of Agriculture.

However, I call the Senator's attention to the fact that we may be faced with situations in which the Department will simply be carrying out the purposes of the legislation which Congress has passed. In that case, although I have frequently been against such legislation, I would have to vote for the approval of items properly created under legislation which Congress has passed. In other words, when we are passing upon legislation, we are in one position; but after the legislation has been enacted and the money spent under it, we may be in an entirely different situation, as the Senator from Illinois well knows.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I recognize that whenever there is an obligation—and sometimes a moral obligation is involved—there is a duty to discharge it. But this situation affords an opportunity, also, to call attention to the fact that the new budget contains many items which call for completely new obligational authority, new functions, and new projects of one kind or another. I think we shall have one of them later in the week in connection with a recreation project. As I see it, these proposals envision the creation of bureaus for numerous purposes; and everyone knows how bureaus proliferate.

I remember when we first took $5 million out of the contingent fund to establish the Peace Corps. Now the Peace Corps, in the 1964 budget, calls for $108 million. It will be rather interesting to see what amount will be sought for the Peace Corps for fiscal 1965.

Also, I have read that there is an office downtown which is taking applications for the domestic Peace Corps. It has started probably with minor borrowing from the contingent fund; but in due course it will be before Congress; and then, like Topsy, it will grow, and who shall say the dimensions it will take before we get through?

There are quite a number of such proposals, which, of course, we shall have to examine with a rather hard, perspective eye.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. LAUSCHE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Edmondson in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had agreed to yield next to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; following which I shall gladly yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe Public Law 480 has been one of the most potent weapons that the United States has used in the cold war, which has been taking place during recent years. I, too, think the amount requested to supplement the amount available to the Commodity Credit Corporation is necessary. It is an obligation of Congress to provide that amount. However, I think we ought to make the record as clear as possible. I notice that the Secretary of Agriculture, in his communication to Members of Congress under date of February 28, states:

> CCC holdings of wheat and feed grains were 1,077,000 bushels less on February 15, 1963, than the peak quantities held in 1961, before the new program was effective.

That statement appears on the second page of the Secretary's communication.

The question I ask is, at what period of the year are peak quantities of feed grains held by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would have to say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that I would have to get the information elsewhere before I could answer his question fully. I am prepared to deal with any of the items which have to do with the operation of Public Law 480 in connection with this matter, but not in connection with matters which will come up in the general hearing on the agricultural supply bill. I understand that the date on which the Secretary based his statement was February 15, 1963.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not have before me the date of the beginning of the period to which his statement related—if that is what is sought by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that is what we should look into, because it is my impression that feed grains are taken over beginning in August and wheat a little earlier; and, naturally, if those holdings were obtained at about that time in 1961, it seems to me it would be more appropriate for the Secretary of Agriculture to compare the holdings of February 15, 1963, with those of February 15, 1962. Perhaps he did. I wish to make clear that he did not compare one period of 1963, reflecting the takeover from the 1961 crop, with the corresponding period of 1962 which would reflect the takeover from the 1960 crop. His failure to do so could make a difference of several hundred million bushels.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the point is a fair one. I call the attention of the distinguished Senator to the fact that, as an ex-officio member of the Appropriations Committee, he will of course be present at the hearings on the Department of Agriculture supply bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I suggest that at that time he clarify this question—not that I am unwilling to do so, but merely because I do not have the information as to the date of the beginning of the period to which the statement by the Secretary of Agriculture relates.

I fully agree with the Senator from Vermont that the same date and inventory facts for the various years should be used, in order to make a real comparison.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

In addition, I notice that apparently the Secretary takes credit for a reduction of a billion bushels in the supply of feed grains and wheat for the programs which have been in effect during the last 2 years. Does not the Senator from Florida understand that there has been a very large increase in the utilization of feed and in the exports of wheat during the last 2 years?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course that is correct. The authorized operations under Public Law 480, for example, have been increased very greatly; and it was the duty of the Secretary to increase them, because the law we passed directed him to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. So in arriving at the exact meaning of his statement, much more than is available as of now is involved.

Mr. AIKEN. I do have the information that during the last 2 years the exports of feed grains increased 268 million bushels over the level of the previous year—the figures for which the Secretary uses for comparison; and the utilization of feed grains for livestock feeding increased 300 million bushels—making a total of 568 million bushels of this reduction which was due entirely to increased exports and increased feeding in this country. Those figures do not take wheat into consideration. I note that the Secretary compares the amount of wheat on hand now with the amount on hand at the peak period in 1961. It is my recollection that the wheat program has been in effect only 1 year. Therefore, any reduction which took place between 1961 and 1962 should not be credited to a program which was not in existence at that time.

I raise these points merely because I cannot avoid feeling that the Department of Agriculture has grossly exaggerated the benefits of these two programs; and I feel that this point should be made clear for the record.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree with the distinguished Senator to this extent: I feel that the record should be made completely clear before we get through with this year's activities. I do not think it has much relationship to the presently pending bill; and I recall to the mind of the distinguished Senator that the two programs he has mentioned are not programs which I supported, and differences of opinion as to the wisdom of those programs are to be found on each side of the aisle.

What the Senator seeks—and I think he is entitled to the information, and I shall help in every way I can to obtain it—is a complete explanation of our present situation and a completely factual comparison or contrast, as the case may be, between the present situation and the situation at the appropriate times in the past which the Senator from Vermont has in mind.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure that when the main legislation comes up for renewal, the Senator from Florida and I will be found to be not very far apart. Perhaps I am a little unduly critical of some of these communications from the Department of Agriculture; but this cynicism, or whatever one may wish to call it, was prompted by recent releases relative to the dairy program—releases in

which, in an apparent attempt to make it appear that conditions got worse after Congress rejected the administration's request for compulsory dairy controls, they showed that purchases of dairy products in 1962 were greater than those in 1961. However, they were completely oblivious, or apparently they were oblivious, to the fact that in 1961 there were 3 months—January, February, and March—in which there were no accumulations whatever of butter and cheese in this country. Therefore, in that case they compared the purchases of butter and cheese for 12 months in 1 year with the purchases of those commodities during 9 months in the previous year.

I refer to these several instances and I make these statements in the hope that there may be some reformation by the Department of Agriculture, with the result that the reports and the releases will be issued in such a way that the average reader can obtain the correct picture by referring to page 1, rather than have to be expert enough to refer also to pages 16, 33, and other pages and study complicated tables, and thus figure out the truth, if he can. The truth is usually there, but it is not always readily discernible.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if I have noted anything in the course of watching the operations of both the present Secretary of Agriculture and his predecessor and earlier predecessors, I have never found any of them unwilling to provide the facts. I have never found a time when Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were not able to digest those facts and arrive at the correct conclusions, and I have never found a time when the Secretary of Agriculture was not able to defend himself when asked questions—sometimes questions by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, sometimes questions by other Senators on his side of the aisle, and sometimes questions by Senators on this side of the aisle.

We are dealing with an immense program which cannot be reviewed today here with any real justice to any part of the program.

So I think this matter should properly be reserved for later discussion, because it seems to me that the fact is—as has been well stated by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen]—that this particular item is unquestionably a just one on which we must proceed to repair the capital structure; and I hope we proceed speedily to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agreed to yield first to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche]. After yielding to him, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

I yield now to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, following the statement of the Senator from Vermont, I should like to add that when I served on the bench, my mental process was as follows: The witness would appear before the court. As the judge of the court, I swore in the witness. I did not relegate that duty to my clerk. The oath was as follows:

> You do solemnly swear that you will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

I felt that for the purpose of streamlining it would be enough to say, "You do solemnly swear to tell the truth." and leave out the words, "the whole truth and nothing but the truth." Upon analysis it became clear to me that the words "the whole truth" had significance. What one tells may be true, but because of what is omitted, what is told may become untrue.

I frequently find omissions which clearly indicate that what has been told is true, but the failure to tell the whole truth labeled as untrue that which was told.

I should like to obtain some information for purposes of clarification. Perhaps the Senator from Florida is not able to give me the information I desire. What I am saying also has a relationship to the thoughts raised by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken]. With regard to the expenditures of the Commodity Credit Corporation, I have figures showing that in 1962 reimbursement for net realized losses was $1,017,610,000, with reimbursement for a special milk program of $90 million, making a total of $1,107,610,000.

The amazing point is that the program will jump in 1963 to $2,373 million. The losses are $1,200 million more in 1963 than they were in 1962. Can the Senator from Florida explain why the losses have increased by that amount? Is it because more of the Commodity Credit Corporation's products have been sold at a loss?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Ohio, in complete good faith, is bringing into his question the item of reimbursement for net realized losses in various years of the Commodity Credit Corporation, growing out of all its regular operations. I invite his attention to the fact that the losses have varied. They have risen and fallen in various years.

I have before me a tabulation beginning in 1955 and coming through 1963, which means that the price support programs and other programs of the CCC, like everything else in agriculture, have fluctuated with weather conditions, crop conditions, and crop volume, with all the various things that happen to make agriculture always a speculative and not a certain operation.

The Senator will note that the appropriations to meet these losses have gone all the way from only $1,634,659 in 1956 to a total of $2,110,424,413 for 1960 and other varying amounts. So there is no real basis for expecting uniformity year after year in an agriculture program because it does not operate in that way.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my understanding that with the present activities, programs relating to surplus foods are resulting in a greater cost to the taxpayer than has been the case for several years past?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. That results primarily from the fact that the scope of the Public Law 480 program was very largely stepped up through the farm legislation enacted 2 years ago. We passed such legislation because we had found that the operation under Public Law 480 was very helpful in the foreign policy of our Nation. It was the joint judgment of the two Houses of Congress, by great majorities, that the best way to serve ourselves in the field of mutual assistance or foreign aid was to step up this particular aspect of the program. The distinguished Senator from Vermont has already touched on that subject—and I fully agree with him—by stating that the food program to which we refer has been found to be the most helpful part of the whole mutual assistance program.

I well remember—and I am sure the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] will remember also, because, as I recall, they served on the same conference committee on which the Senator from Florida served when Public Law 480 was set up—that there was a bipartisan approach.

For example, I remember that one of the distinguished authors of that program was our friend the late distinguished Senator from Kansas, Mr. Schoeppel.

Others came from the Democratic side of the aisle. There has always been a bipartisan effort to do something which would get rid of our surpluses, but get rid of them to excellent advantage in the building of more results for our country out of foreign aid and mutual assistance programs. The results have been better than any other part of the foreign aid program.

In 1961 we greatly enlarged the program. For that reason we are now beginning to see a largely increased reimbursement appropriation made each year to the Commodity Credit Corporation as required under an amendment which enlarged the authorization 2 years ago.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think the major reason for the increase of the funds in the agriculture bill is that in years gone by sizable sums were appropriated in the foreign aid program for food to go to foreign countries. Now practically all of that program is carried in the agriculture bill. Not much of it is now included in the foreign aid appropriations bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When did we insert the granting of food aid under Public Law 480 and take it out of the foreign aid bill? For my information, was that done recently?

Mr. HOLLAND. My recollection is that it was done in 1954.

My recollection is that the requirement that the sum be included in an appropriation bill rather than handled through the cancellation of notes was accomplished under a very worthwhile amendment offered, as I recall—and if I am in error the Senator can now correct me—by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams]. Before the adoption of the amendment these operations were handled on a paper basis. The CCC made notes to the Treasury. Of course, they were audited. Then the notes were canceled.

As I recall, under the amendment, offered by the Senator from Delaware it was required that for the information of the Congress and the people an actual appropriation be made so that annually, at least, the size of our operations in terms of costs to the United States in cash might be understood. Personally, I believe it was an excellent thing to do. As I recall, that amendment was later than 1954. Perhaps it was in 1957 or 1958 that that amendment was offered. Will the Senator from Delaware refresh my mind on that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not recall the exact year, but the Senator is correct. I was the author of an amendment which would require annual appropriations to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation. As the Senator has stated, it was done for the purpose of enabling Congress and the taxpayers to know the cost of the program.

Mr. HOLLAND. I correct the Record to say that that amendment was adopted in the act of March 20, 1954; which means it has been in operation now for 9 years.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recognize this is a fixed obligation we must honor. My query to the Senator from Florida relates to whether or not the discretionary action by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, in March of 1961, in lifting the price support on cotton from $3.24 to $3.42, contributed to the deficit.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the Senator is referring to the dairy prices.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct; to the dairy prices.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think that lift did play some part in the creation of a greater deficit for CCC in its regular price support operations. That had no relation to the presently pending measure or the fund which is to be covered thereby.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The raising of the support from $3.24 to $3.42 was made under the provision of law which gives the Secretary authority to raise the support "whenever the Secretary determines" that is necessary to insure an adequate supply of dairy products; is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The law has always simply laid down guidelines, but left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture the cash amount to be fixed as the basis of support year after year in the various commodities. That is the only practical way in which it can be done.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Our problem with respect to a dairy surplus has been aggravated; am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is probably correct in that understanding.

I say to the Senator that there is no action which the Secretary can take—in raising, or sustaining, or lowering price support levels—which is not reflected in the total operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That is a fact which I am sure the Congress recognized when it passed the original price support act and which it has recognized every time amendments or new acts have been passed. Certainly every decision based on the discretion of the Secretary in this very complex field does tend to affect in some way or other the operations of the CCC.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the present status of the cotton storage in the Commodity Credit Corporation? It has gone up rather extensively, has it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. It has gone up. The situation with reference to cotton is so disturbing that I understand the Secretary has made specific recommendations for legislation in that field. I also understand that those specific recommendations have not been received with uniform acclaim either in this body or in the other body. It is a highly complex and highly controversial subject, which I hope we shall not have to go into now, because it does not have direct relation to the subject matter of the pending measure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In 1961 the Secretary increased by 2 cents a pound the support on cotton, bringing it up to 32 cents. It is my understanding that that was done because it was thought there was not an adequate supply of cotton.

Did that discretionary judgment aggravate the problem we have with respect to surpluses of cotton?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Senators are not agreed on an answer. Neither are Members of the other body. Some think it aggravated the problem. Some think it was a justified action.

I say again to my friend, I am not anxious to ignore the problem. I certainly expect it to be presented to us in a very detailed way when there are appropriate hearings. Probably we shall be confronted with it both in the legislative committee and in the Committee on Appropriations.

But again I say, with all kindness, I do not think this is the time or the place to deal with that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely asked the questions because I cannot help but feel alarmed about the cost of this program and the recurrence of aggravated expense when assurances have been given that the costs would be lowered.

I will go along with the Senator from Florida on this measure, but I agree with what the Senator from Illinois said—that we had better take a good look at the program this year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I agree heartily with the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I expect to have to take two good looks at it—one in the Appropriations Committee, in which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] and I, though we happen to be on the two different sides of the aisle, nearly always are together on the question of supplying the needs of agriculture; and the other in the legislative committee, since the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] and I happen to be members of the Senate committee which deals with legislative problems affecting agriculture.

I surely expect that the cotton matter mentioned by the distinguished Senator, and many others, will be reviewed in both those committees before we conclude the present session of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] raised a question as to the dates used by the Secretary of Agriculture in comparing inventory holdings of wheat, corn, and certain other commodities.

I have figures which will show the inventories for January 1 for each of the past 3 years. In order that we may have a comparison of these inventories on comparable dates, I ask unanimous consent that the figures showing inventories of wheat, corn, and other feed grains, as well as dairy products, for January 1, 1961, 1962, and 1963, be printed in the Record at this point.

While these figures show inventories of both corn and wheat down in the past 2 years, they also show that the inventories of sorghum grains, butter, butter oil, cheese, and dried milk, to be substantially higher than they were when Secretary Freeman took office.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Commodity Credit Corporation inventories

Date	Corn (bushels)	Wheat (bushels)	Grain sorghum (bushels)	Butter (pounds)	Dried milk (pounds)	Cheese (pounds)	Butter oil (pounds)
Jan. 1, 1961	1,471,276,965	1,132,960,901	311,965,117	66,295,284	279,836,322		
Jan. 1, 1962	1,412,192,934	1,130,279,687	341,404,047	205,679,438	354,917,176	59,700,137	
Jan. 1, 1963	1,044,325,049	1,044,992,557	579,266,082	350,791,487	662,458,995	111,587,560	48,330,950

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I may say that I am glad to have those figures printed in the Record, and I would be glad to have printed any other figures which bear upon any problem Senators wish to have reflected in the debate. I hope, however, we will all remember that we are now dealing simply with an obligation we ourselves set up by the legislation which we passed, and we should now recognize that by passing the pending measure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate that point. I think it would be well to have figures for these inventories on comparable dates, rather than to have the Department compare a low point with a high point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think it will be helpful to have those figures in the Record.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Since I asked the question originally as to the peak holdings of feed grains by the Commodity Credit Corporation in 1961, I am advised that the date was October 1; which is the beginning of the feeding season and the beginning of the 1962 corn marketing year, also.

At that time—October 1, 1961—the Commodity Credit Corporation held 2,169,753,000 bushels of the four feed grains. On February 15, 1963, the Commodity Credit Corporation owned 1,374,517,000 bushels of feed grain, or 795,236,000 bushels less than held at the high point in 1961.

The Department records show that the increase in feeding and exports for the past 2 years amounted to 568 million bushels. If we deduct that from the 795,236,000 bushels, as a result of the program, it shows that the net reduction in holdings would be 227,236,000 bushels, which is quite a bit different from 1.1 billion bushels.

He undoubtedly had some answers for this, because they have some good pencils there. If they did not, they would not get everybody so confused as to what the actual figures are. But this is the pencil I used and I got this result. Really, for the $1½ billion spent on the feed grain programs—and I do not know what it was on the wheat program—we reduced the supply by 796 million bushels, which means it cost about $1.90 a bushel to reduce the supply to that extent.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad the Senator has mentioned these figures for the Record. It points out the fact that there is a complicated study in accounting and fixing of blame ahead of us, but it does not have to get into this consideration today.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. COOPER. Like many others in this body, I had the opportunity to vote for Public Law 480 when it was originally passed in 1954. As the distinguished Senator from Florida has said, it has enjoyed bipartisan support throughout the years. I believe it is one of the best programs of foreign aid that the United States uses. It is the best program for many countries and their people because it supplies their needs of food and fiber. Also, as the Senator again said, it is a program which only the United States can follow. It is one that the Communist countries cannot use except perhaps in a very, very small way. Yet, as the Senator from Florida has suggested, there is a certain contradiction—I am not sure whether he suggested this—between the agricultural program and Public Law 480 program, which is actually basically a foreign-aid program. On the one hand, the Department of Agriculture attempts to reduce surpluses. On the other, it helps subsidies in carrying out Public Law 480.

I see in the chair a distinguished Senator [Mr. McGovern] who was director of the program until he resigned to become a candidate. I am sure that the additional volumes of surplus food which were disposed of in the last 2 years were the result, to a large extent, of his efforts.

I should like to ask the Senator from Florida about this problem: He mentioned in his statement a few moments ago the cost of this program, which is over $1 billion a year. I believe many persons in this country, and certainly a great many of those who write on surplus problems, while they may know, do not at times make it clear that the $1½ billion which in the last year has been obligated is a chief part of the foreign-aid program. Would the Senator from Florida think it would be possible? As the Secretary of Agriculture each year presented his programs to the Congress, and, as the Senator so well knows he does, estimated the disappearance or use of feed grains, wheat, and other commodities—if we are going to have the Public Law 480 program, and I think we should—would it not be possible for him to place as one of the factors in his estimation of the disappearance of surpluses "x hundred million dollars, Public Law 480, which is an essential part of the foreign-aid program"? If that were done, I think there would be a clearer understanding in this country about the work of the Public Law 480 program and also about the cost of the agricultural program.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator has raised a good point. Two years ago our committee report stated it would be appropriate to show these food disappearances under foreign aid. The Secretary of Agriculture, while he showed all the facts from which one could figure it out for himself, is willing to show it in one figure and as foreign aid, but the President's budget advisers are not in agreement upon that. As I have been advised in the course of the hearings, there is disagreement between the two branches of the executive department as to the method of accounting for it as we wished and expressed the hope it would be, and which would have the furnishing of the information to the committee as the Senator from Kentucky pointed out.

I thoroughly agree with him. The public ought to know, year after year, just what our surpluses are and just what funds have been expended in foreign aid. I think we can make it clearer to the public and also relieve agriculture immediately from the burden of being charged with having that additional amount added to the total cost of the agricultural program.

I may say that no one has been more insistent than the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, throughout the years, that this policy be followed. Frankly, I am at a loss to know why the Bureau of the Budget is not willing to follow his request.

Mr. COOPER. I believe we ought to insist on it, because this is the only way accurately to describe the cost of the farm program, and also the cost of the Public Law 480 program as a part of foreign aid.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I share the opinion of the Senator from Kentucky. For years I have been trying to get action like that now proposed, under the Eisenhower administration and since then, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. We have an agricultural budget of about $7 billion, and all these items are listed as expenditures. Most people believe that the farmers get a subsidy check for it. There are involved nearly $600 million in loans for various agencies, which have a very good repayment record, and nearly $300 million of loans to the FHA, which also has a very good repayment record.

The school lunch program and several other programs are charged as expenditures of the Department of Agriculture. It is the feeling of many people that the farmers get a subsidy check for this. All this is a good example of parts of the foreign aid program which are charged to agriculture. Many people believe that it is charged as a subsidy to the farmers. I hope we can get this changed.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have strongly supported the insistent attitude of the Senator from North Dakota year after year, and that attitude is shared by the Senator from Kentucky. We should keep working for a change. I do not want it to appear that the essential facts are not supplied, because they are. I mean that in order to get at what is actually charged to agriculture and what is charged to foreign aid, one must take a pencil and figure here and there, not only in the Public Law 480 program, but in the international wheat program as well, and in various other places, in order to come up with the answer.

I have insisted year after year that we are entitled to have a plain, understandable answer on this matter so that we can reflect the actual size of the agricultural program, and what it is. It is big enough, but it is not as big as some people insist it is, particularly people who are critical because of misapprehension as to what the real size of it may be.

Mr. HUMPHREY rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I wish to join the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from North Dakota for their insistence that the analysis of the Department of Agriculture's budget be not only factual in terms of statistics, but also in terms of objectives and purposes for which these funds are committed. During my service on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I was as insistent about this matter as is the Senator from North Dakota. I consider the presentation of the Department of Agriculture's budget incomplete, inadequate, and, in a sense, inaccurate, when it comes to the proper interpretation of the use of the moneys which are provided to the Department of Agriculture.

Let us take, for example, the food stamp plan. While this is a program which was worked out within the Department of Agriculture and the Committees on Agriculture and Forestry of the two Houses of Congress, and falls within the jurisdiction of the Committees on Agriculture and Forestry, the food stamp plan is a relief program; it is an assistance program. It ought to be assigned by some notation within the Bureau of the Budget to a category called public assistance.

This undoubtedly would fall within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. If the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not wish to have this amount fixed in its budget, at least there ought to be a footnote or there ought to be a cross-reference in the budget as it comes from the President which notes that the food stamp program, the school milk program, the school lunch program, the assistance program for the needy through the use of surplus foods, and so forth, are items which belong to public welfare and public assistance.

The meat inspection program, for example, relates to health. The poultry inspection program relates to health. The international wheat program relates to foreign policy. I believe it is fair to point out that the export subsidy program relates to trade and foreign policy. The amounts can be tabulated under the Department of Agriculture, but there ought to be a cross-reference in the budget, as I have indicated.

If the executive branch of the Government is unwilling to do it, I believe we ought to adopt a resolution in Congress demanding that it be done. If we cannot get some help voluntarily from the Bureau of the Budget on this matter, then I believe we ought to direct that there be a clarification. The Department of Agriculture's budget today is not a reflection of the Department of Agriculture's programs insofar as price-support programs or marketing programs are concerned, relating to the farmer and his production and distribution problems.

I wish to join most vociferously and vigorously with the efforts which have been made today to have the budget show the facts. The facts are clear. What the facts relate to is another thing. The fact of the matter is that Public Law 480 is probably the most effective foreign economic aid program that we have. That program ought to be noted as a part of foreign assistance. It ought to be shown as a valuable part of our foreign aid and as a part of our foreign policy.

I call attention to the fact that the present Presiding Officer—Mr. McGovern in the chair—was the Director of the food-for-peace program in the new administration which came into office in 1961, and I submit that it is to the credit of the farmers of America, the Department of Agriculture, and the food-for-peace office, and to the credit of the producers on the farm, that we have Public Law 480 on the statute books.

We ought to look at it not as something that aids the farmers, but as something that helps people. The fact of the matter is that the farmers are but the producers of the food. We do not call the defense program aid for American industry, even though the defense program procurement is produced by some of our great industries. We call it defense, and properly so. We ought to call Public Law 480 a part of our foreign economic assistance program and a part of our international good will program. It ought to be tabulated in the budget to show what it is.

When the people in the Bureau of the Budget read the RECORD they will note there are Senators who have served here for many years who believe that the time is long overdue for the kind of clarification of the budget procedures which we have talked about here this afternoon. If we do not get it I will submit a resolution, and call upon my colleagues to back that resolution, ordering the Bureau of the Budget to print its report accurately in terms of what these figures represent.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I wish to call attention to the fact that the Senator from Minnesota has just pointed up a few of the complexities which exist in this whole bookkeeping process. We have been talking in this resolution simply about the operations under title I, under Public Law 480. We also have the famine relief operation under another title, and we also have the barter for strategic materials program under another act, which is completely apart from Public Law 480. There is institutional supply program, which does not come under public welfare.

This is a very complex bookkeeping operation. However, what is necessary can be done. I fully agree with the distinguished Senator that it should be done. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I desire to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota and the senior Senator from North Dakota and the senior Senator from Florida for clarifying the budget situation with reference to the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

I remember when the Senator from Minnesota served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He, along with the senior Senator from North Dakota and other Senators, pointed out that the vast segment of the so-called appropriations for the Department of Agriculture related to agriculture only in a very minor way, if in any degree whatever.

A few days ago, I requested the Department of Agriculture to break down the budget in this regard, because I have been interested in trying to devise and promote a farm program which would subsidize only farmers, instead of subsidizing railroads, subsidizing warehouses, subsidizing foreigners, and subsidizing every aspect of the American economy, all in the name of aiding farmers to improve their income.

I was indeed surprised when the Department of Agriculture submitted to me a breakdown of its proposed budget for the fiscal year 1964. The Department will request approximately $6,500 million. A study and analysis of that budget will show that only about $2 billion relates to agriculture and support prices. Even including the Rural Electrification Administration, which is a rural program, but not exclusively a farm program, the appropriation for agriculture still amounts to only about $3 billion, out of $6,500 million which is requested under the guise of a farm program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a breakdown and analysis of that budget.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. Department of Agriculture, budget expenditures, fiscal year 1964, estimated

PROGRAMS WHICH CLEARLY PROVIDE BENEFITS TO CONSUMERS, BUSINESSMEN, AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC

	Millions
Programs having foreign relations and defense aspects:	
Sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies	$1,282
Emergency famine relief to friendly peoples	246
International Wheat Agreement	72
Transfer of bartered materials to supplemental stockpile	62
Payments to Veterans' Administration and armed services under section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, for milk and other dairy products used in excess of normal requirements	40
Value of foreign currencies used by Defense Department for military housing, and long-term supply contracts	284
Defense food stockpiling	30
Total	2,016
Food distribution programs:	
Commodity purchases under the program for removal of surplus agricultural commodities	164
Pilot food stamp plan	51
School lunch program	182
Special milk program	102
Total	499
Investment in REA and FHA loans, which are subject to repayment:	
REA loans	259
FHA loans	189
Total	448
Long-range programs for the improvement of agricultural resources, including research, meat inspection, disease and pest control, education, market development and services, protection of soil and water resources, and forest and public land management:	
Forest Service	311
Agricultural Research Service	195
Soil Conservation Service	195
Extension Service	77
Cooperative State Experiment Station Service	40
Agricultural Marketing Service, Marketing Research & Service	43
Farmers Home Administration, salaries and expenses	39
Other, including FCS, FAS, CEA, FCIC, REA expenses, and staff offices	94
Total	994
Total	3,957

U.S. Department of Agriculture, budget expenditures, fiscal year 1964, estimated—Continued

OTHER PROGRAMS WHICH ARE PREDOMINANTLY FOR STABILIZATION OF FARM INCOME, BUT WHICH ALSO BENEFIT OTHERS

	Millions
Agricultural conservation program	$124
Conservation reserve program	294
Land-use adjustment program	27
CCC price support, supply, and related programs:	
CCC price support, supply and related programs	327
Less: Payments to Veterans' Administration and armed services under section 202 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, for milk and other dairy products used in excess of normal requirements	−40
Acreage diversion payments:	
Feed grains	227
Wheat	173
Price support payments:	
Feed grains	490
Wheat	91
National Wool Act program	106
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service expenses	115
Total	1,989
Sugar Act program	84
Total	2,608
Grand total	6,565

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I agree wholeheartedly with the view of the able Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] that it is high time that we not saddle every so-called expenditure on the face of the earth on the poor farmer's back and say it is a farmer's program, when it relates to health, public welfare, foreign aid, and every other aspect of the Federal Government, yet is submitted to Congress under the guise of a so-called farm bill.

Many of those programs are fine. I have supported a number of them. But we ought to charge them where they are supposed to be charged, and not make the American people think that we are appropriating billions of dollars for the benefit of the farmers of this country, for that is simply not true.

I thank the able Senator from Florida for yielding to me on this point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his able, constructive addition to the debate.

Mr. President, in order that the debate, before it terminates, may show the answer of the Secretary of Agriculture to the request of our committee for the breakdown of expenditures, which we have been talking about in the last few minutes, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter addressed to Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL from Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary, dated February 26, 1962, which is in reply to an inquiry about the item in the report on the appropriations for 1962, which has just been mentioned.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1962.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: The report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on the 1962 Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill requested that this Department consult with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget concerning a presentation in the next budget which would delineate more clearly, by programs, those that are chargeable to the farm program as distinguished from foreign assistance. It was also requested that the Department submit a report to the committee setting forth by items the regular programs of primary benefit to agriculture as well as foreign assistance items, with a breakdown of expenditures for each program.

These requests were considered intensively by both this Department and the Bureau of the Budget. The Department explored the purposes of its programs with the view of possibly classifying expenditures according to beneficiary. In this respect it was found that there was no objective way to clearly delineate between specific groups, such as farmers, businessmen, and consumers, since the benefits of the programs carried out are spread so widely among all segments of the economy. It was concluded that in the interest of a clearer public understanding of the Department's programs, a classification according to major purposes would be more feasible and appropriate.

The discussions with the Bureau of the Budget were therefore on the basis of classifying expenditures according to major purpose or function. In arriving at the classification for presentation to your committee of the programs carried out by the Department, it was the position of the Bureau of the Budget that such classification should be consistent with the treatment accorded the programs of the Department in the functional classification appearing in the President's budget. There is attached a statement showing the expenditures of the Department in fiscal years 1961 and estimated for 1962 and 1963 which reflects the functional classification appearing in the budget, and which provides a breakdown of the programs included in each group. Those programs constituting the food-for-peace effort under Public Law 480 are identified in the breakdown.

We will be glad to furnish any additional information the committee may want on this matter.

Sincerely yours,
ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Classification of expenditures by functions as reflected in the budget for the fiscal year 1963

[In millions]

	1961	Estimated, 1962	Estimated, 1963
International affairs and finance: Economic and financial assistance:			
Food-for-peace (Public Law 480, title II)	$199	$281	$300
Agriculture and agricultural resources:			
Farm income stabilization and food-for-peace:			
Price support, supply, and purchase programs:			
Present programs	1,331	2,497	2,516
Proposed legislation			−434
National Wool Act	61	67	70
Food-for-peace (Public Law 480, titles I and IV)	1,455	1,489	1,389
International Wheat Agreement	76	81	81
Transfer of bartered commodities to supplemental stockpile	201	225	250
Removal of surplus agricultural commodities	203	225	235
Conservation reserve	363	346	323
Sugar Act	72	82	87
Other	39	69	68
Subtotal	3,801	5,081	4,585
Financing rural electrification and rural telephones:			
Present programs	301	330	370
Proposed legislation			−136
Financing farm ownership and operation: Farmers Home Administration	353	158	198
Conservation of agricultural land and water resources:			
Soil Conservation Service (including watershed protection and Great Plains program)	146	164	181
Agricultural conservation program, CCC loan for ACP, and emergency conservation measures	251	256	257
Research and other agricultural services	324	352	380
Total	5,176	6,341	5,836
Natural resources: Forest resources:			
Forest Service:			
Payments to Klamath Indians	69		
Other	246	279	281
Total	315	279	281
Health, labor, and welfare: School lunch and special milk programs:			
Present programs	241	274	271
Proposed legislation			20
Total	241	274	291
Grand total	5,929	7,177	6,709

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, as one who served as director of the food-for-peace program during 1961 and 1962, I am especially interested in the legislation before us today.

Public Law 480, the legislative authority for the Nation's food-for-peace effort is one of the most important statutes ever enacted by the Congress.

Using our agricultural abundance to reduce hunger in the world is not only in our self-interest but is a tremendous humanitarian achievement.

The food-for-peace program (Public Law 480) stabilizes American farm incomes, reduces costly storages, stimulates our shipping industry, develops new commercial markets, improves the health and economy of other peoples, and promotes the cause of peace and freedom.

It is imperative that we recognize that while the cost of the program is chalked up to the budget of the Department of Agriculture, it is to a considerable extent an arm of our foreign economic aid program.

The supplemental appropriation which we are called upon to approve today is needed to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation resulting from our sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies under title I of Public Law 480.

The Commodity Credit Corporation plays an essential role in our entire farm economy and especially in the stabilization of farm prices.

It may be assumed by some persons that we are paying unreasonable prices for price supported commodities. The facts are that the American consumer is getting a remarkably good buy on farm commodities. Consumer food costs are $4 to $6 billion a year less than if farm prices had increased as much as prices in other parts of the economy during the past 8 years.

I ask unanimous consent that a paper prepared at my request by Walter W. Wilcox, senior specialist in agriculture of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress entitled "Consumer Savings Due to Decline in Farm Prices and Increased Government Cost of Farm Programs, 1953–54 to 1961–62," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSUMERS SAVINGS DUE TO DECLINE IN FARM PRICES AND INCREASED GOVERNMENT COST OF FARM PROGRAMS, 1953–54 TO 1961–62

Consumers' food costs are $4 to $6 billion a year less than if farm prices had increased as much as prices in other parts of the economy in the past 8 years. This amounts to a saving of $100 per family. These savings may be compared with an increase in Government farm price support costs of $0.7 billion in the 8-year period (or $2.4 billion if the cost of foreign assistance programs is added).

IF FARM PRICES HAD INCREASED AS MUCH AS MARKETING AND TRANSPORTATION CHARGES

The Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates civilian expenditures for domestic farm food products at $63 billion in 1961–62. If the farm prices of these domestically produced foods had increased as much between 1953–54 and 1961–62 as the marketing and transportation charges on the foods in the standard farm food market basket, or 17 percent,[1] civilian expenditures for these foods in 1961–62 would have been about $69 billion, or $6 billion higher than they were. This estimate assumes no change in marketing margins due to the higher farm prices.

IF FARM PRICES HAD INCREASED AS MUCH AS WHOLESALE PRICES OF NONFARM PRODUCTS

Wholesale prices of all commodities other than farm products and food increased 10.6 percent between 1953–54 and 1961–62. Had the farm prices of domestic food products increased by this percentage, rather than declining 6 percent as they actually did, consumers would have had to spend $4 billion more—or $67 billion—in 1961–62 for their domestically farm-produced foods. This again assumes no change in marketing margins.

IF FARM PRICES HAD INCREASED AS MUCH AS PRODUCTION EXPENSES

In the 8-year period 1953–54 to 1961–62, farm output increased 15 percent. The increased output was due to increased use of fertilizers, insecticides, weedkillers, improved seeds and breeding stock, and other improved practices. Prices paid by farmers for all purchased items, interest, taxes, and wage rates increased 9 percent in the 8 years. Taking into account the larger quantities of purchased materials and the higher prices, production expenses per unit of all farm output, including tobacco and fibers, increased 11.3 percent in the 8-year period. Had farmers balanced their supplies with market outlets, and had farm prices for food products increased by the same percentage as production expenses, civilian consumers would have had to spend $4.4 billion more than they did spend in 1961–62 for their farm-produced foods. Again, this does not allow for increased marketing margins resulting from percentage markups in the wholesale and retail markets.

IF FOOD PRICES HAD INCREASED AS MUCH AS OTHER ITEMS IN THE CONSUMERS PRICE INDEX

Still another comparison is possible. During this 8-year period, the cost of all items in the consumers price index other than food increased 12.9 percent. If farm prices of food products had increased by this percentage, without any change in marketing margins, civilian consumers would have had to pay $4.8 billion more annually for their domestically produced foods.

Because of the current organization of the economy and agriculture's rapid technical progress, civilian consumers are paying $4 to $6 billion less each year for food than they would be paying if farm prices had increased as much as production costs, or as much as prices in other sectors of the economy, where unused capacity and idle resources are greater today than in agriculture.

INCREASED COST OF FARM PROGRAMS LESS THAN CONSUMER SAVINGS

As compared with the above-estimated consumer savings, budget expenditures from appropriations for programs primarily for stabilization of farm incomes increased from an average of $1.9 billion per year in 1953–54 to $2.6 billion a year in 1961–62.[2] In addition to the cost of programs primarily for the stabilization of farm incomes, budget expenditures for foreign assistance programs or Public Law 480 programs, which began after 1954, averaged $1.7 billion per year in 1961–62.

Savings in retail food costs per family due to the decline in farm prices in the past 8 years while most prices were rising, average $100 a year as against increased farm program costs of $20 to $40 per family.

Details of the budget expenditures are as follows (million dollars)

	1953–54	1961–62
Acreage allotments and marketing quotas	27.0	70.0
Sugar Act program	64.6	75.1
Conservation reserve program	-------	348.0
CCC price support and related programs	1,582.7	1,691.0
Special milk program	-------	89.3
International Wheat Agreement	94.9	83.3
National Wool Act	-------	63.1
Sec. 32 removals	129.6	209.0
Subtotal	1,898.8	2,628.8
Foreign assistance:		
Public Law 480:		
Title I	-------	1,454.8
Title II	*37.2	220.3
Total	1,936.0	4,303.9

*Expenditures for famine relief prior to Public Law 480.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, unless there are other questions to be asked, I hope the Senate will pass the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before the vote on the passage of the joint resolution, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD summaries of certain programs under the Commodity Credit Corporation, together with the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the reimbursement of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the status of CCC borrowing.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF EFFECT OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS ON CCC COSTS (ASCS, FEBRUARY 28, 1963)

HIGHLIGHTS INDICATING SUCCESS IN CUTTING SURPLUSES AND REDUCING COSTS

1. CCC holdings of wheat and feed grains were 1.077 billion bushels less on February 15, 1963, than the peak quantities held in 1961 before the new program was effective, and total stocks at the end of 1963 marketing year will be 2,509 million bushels less than they would have been if the pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue.

2. The fact that the CCC does not now own the 1.077 billion bushels of grain it formerly owned is now saving the Government $770,000 each day in carrying charges—$280 million a year.

3. The 1964 budget includes $246 million less for carrying charges on these grains than was spent in fiscal year 1961, and $813 million—or $2.2 million a day—less than the annual rate that would have occurred by 1964 if the pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue.

These and other figures show that the new programs designed to eliminate the costly and unnecessary surpluses of wheat and feed grains, that had climbed to record levels in 1961, are working.

The Congress has given the CCC the responsibility to finance all Government price

---

[1] U.S. Department of Agriculture. Economic Research Service. Table 1. February 1963 (MTS–148).

[2] 87th Cong., 2d sess. House Department of Agriculture appropriations for 1963, hearings. Pt. 1. Table 5, "Budget expenditures from appropriations," pp. 243–245, and USDA Office of Budget and Finance.

support and commodity purchase programs through use of its own funds and a borrowing authorization limited to $14.5 billion. Each year the Corporation's realized losses are met by appropriations by the Congress for restoration of capital impairment. The amount of appropriations needed is determined by CCC's realized losses.

The realized losses of the CCC since 1960 are shown below:

Fiscal year	Realized loss (millions)	
	Amount	Change from preceding year
1961	[1] $2,067.0	+$454.9
1962	2,799.4	+732.4
1963 (estimated)	2,753.6	−45.8
1964 (estimated)	2,646.9	−106.7

[1] Does not include inventory revaluation loss of $1,268.5 million applicable to 1961 and prior years.

(1) Fiscal 1962 losses were higher than the previous year, primarily because of:

(a) an increased loss on commodity sales in the disposal of large quantities of corn and grain sorghums acquired from the 1960 and prior years' crops; such grain was acquired at a higher price in the 1950's than market prices in 1962. Obviously as the grain is moved out of surplus into consumption realized losses take place.

(b) increased loss on donations, due to the donation of more dairy products, wheat flour and corn meal, thus increasing benefits to millions of people at home and around the world by a more effective use of our agricultural abundance.

(c) acreage diversion payments to farmers as the immediate cost of launching supply adjustment programs enacted by the Congress—programs that by now have significantly reduced stocks of grain and the costs of both acquiring and carrying such stocks, while they have brought about substantial increase in farm income.

(2) Estimates indicate that realized losses for fiscal 1963 will be $45.8 million less than for the previous year, and that this encouraging trend will be stepped up in 1964 by an estimated decrease of $106.7 million below that for 1963.

(3) Stocks in CCC inventory in excess of needs for an adequate reserve have been substantially reduced—by a total of 1.077 billion bushels as compared with peak quantities on hand before programs for supply adjustment began to take effect. As a result, the 1964 budget estimates before the Congress show $245.6 million less for carrying charges on wheat and feed grains for the fiscal year 1964 than the actual cost in the fiscal year 1961. The fact that the CCC does not now own the 1.077 billion bushels of grain it formerly owned is now saving the Government $770,000 each day in carrying charges—$280 million a year.

(4) Cumulative savings of $480 million in carrying charges on feed grains and wheat from the record 1961 level have already resulted or are budgeted as a result of the decrease in CCC stcoks, as follows:

[In millions]

Fiscal year	Total carrying charges, feed grains and wheat	Savings from 1961 level
1961	$846	
1962	776	$70
1963 (budget estimate)	682	164
1964 (budget estimate)	600	246
Cumulative savings through June 30, 1964, from 1961 level		480

(5) If the new supply adjustment programs had not replaced the pre-1961 programs it is a conservative estimate that carryover stocks at the end of the marketing year for the 1963 crop would have amounted to 3.8 billion bushels of corn and grain sorghums and 1.6 billion bushels of wheat, and the annual carrying charges on these quantities would have amounted to at least $1.4 billion by 1964 as compared with the current estimate of $587 million for these three grains in the 1964 budget. The difference is equivalent to about $2.2 million per day.

(6) If pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue and stocks had built up as indicated through 1963, it is estimated that ultimate carrying costs to the CCC before disposal of the additional quantities added to stocks would have amounted to approximately $3.3 billion. This would result from the time which would elapse before these added stocks would be disposed of, based on the annual rate of disposition which occurred prior to 1961. This would be 10 to 12 years for feed grains and between 6 and 7 years for wheat.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE FOR REIMBURSEMENT TO COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FOR COSTS OF TITLE I, PUBLIC LAW 480

(Statement of Hon. Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, before the Senate Committee on Appropriations)

Mr. Chairman, I am here today not to request an increase in appropriations, but rather to ask for a shift in appropriations from fiscal year 1964 to fiscal year 1963. Your authorization of a supplemental appropriation of $58,172,000 to reimburse the CCC fo- unrecovered 1963 costs for title I, Public Law 480, will be accompanied by a reduction in our budget request for 1964 by that identical amount.

Congress has given the CCC the responsibility for financing all Government price support and commodity purchase programs through the use of its own funds and a borrowing authorization limited to $14.5 billion. Because the nature of CCC operations and expenditures are to a considerable extent unpredictable—due to factors such as weather, insect damage, domestic and import demand, trade psychology, and other intangibles—Congress has seen fit to authorize such borrowing and to make up for realized losses by later appropriations for restoration of capital impairment.

There are two circumstances that have brought about the present situation in which the CCC, required by law to carry out price support programs by purchases or loans for such commodities as wheat, cotton, dairy, and feed grains, is faced with resources now at the perilously low level of $127.6 million.

The first of these circumstances is the fact that the Appropriation Act for 1963 as approved by Congress last year did not include $831.6 million for reimbursement for past and estimated 1963 expenditures as requested in the 1963 budget.

The second is the combination of unpredictable factors that have resulted in: (1) heavier loans on cotton than expected, largely because mills have postponed buying in anticipation of lower prices; (2) heavier loans on corn than expected, largely because unusually favorable weather produced corn of such high quality that larger amounts went under loan earlier than anticipated; (3) lower sales from CCC stocks than were estimated a year ago.

Action is therefore necessary at this time to provide the CCC with enough operating capital to carry out the price support programs that are mandatory under law, along with its responsibilities for Public Law 480 operations, during the remainder of fiscal 1963. This action will have no effect on the total of the appropriations required for the 2 fiscal years of 1963 and 1964.

STATUS OF CCC BORROWING AUTHORITY

CURRENT SITUATION

The Congress appropriated $832 million less than the amounts requested in the 1963 budget to reimburse CCC for costs of the foreign assistance programs and for realized losses.

This left only a narrow operating margin for changes in the estimates which could result from weather conditions, farmer participation in programs, production abroad, timing of expenditures, and receipts, and other uncontrollable and unpredictable factors.

Available borrowing authority of CCC: With only a narrow operating margin, changes in timing of receipts and expenditures have occurred with the result that CCC's available borrowing authority has dropped to $149.6 million as of February 18, 1963. Section 4(i) of the CCC Charter Act (15 U.S.C. 714b(i)) prohibits the Corporation from exceeding its borrowing authority of $14.5 billion. The Corporation has used approximately $8 billion of the $14.5 billion borrowing authority in its investment in loans and inventory. The Corporation is required by law to use its borrowing authority to finance costs of the foreign assistance programs (Public Law 480, IWA, Bartered Materials for Supplemental Stockpile).

At the current rate of use, there is grave danger that the entire $14.5 billion of authorized borrowing authority will be exhausted by the end of February or early in March unless remedial action is taken promptly.

During this period, the Corporation is required by law to carry out certain mandatory programs which require use of sizable amounts of borrowing authority, such as cotton loans (averaging about $2.5 million per day in February), corn loans (averaging $9.6 million per day in February) and dairy purchases (averaging about $1.8 million per day in February). Under the 1963 feed grain and wheat stabilization programs, advance payments are authorized (averaging about $5 million per day).

STEPS TAKEN TO DATE

Payments to other Government agencies are being held in abeyance; for example, $15 million to AID for ocean transportation, and $20 million for loans to the ACP program for advance purchase of conservation materials and services.

Foreign assistance program funds have been shifted from the 4th to the 3d quarter for advance to CCC ($110 million).

Recovery of $93.1 million repayments from foreign currency loans was accelerated through special arrangements with the Treasury Department.

Daily reports from field offices are obtained and analyzed on borrowing authority used, cotton and corn loans and repayments, feed grain dispositions, purchases of dairy products, and advance feed grain and wheat payments.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Stop all payments and loans to producers under all price support and related programs. In addition, stop payments due and payable under contracts and firm commitments:

(a) To warehousemen.

(b) To rail and truck carriers.

(c) To processors and packaging firms.

(d) To vendors of dairy products.

(e) To U.S. exporters of wheat flour, cotton and cotton products.

(f) To U.S. exporters and U.S. ocean freight carriers for commodities shipped under Public Law 480 (food-for-peace program). Such action would result in a nationwide loss of confidence in the integrity of the U.S. Government to meet its financial obligations. It would disrupt all phases of the agricultural economy and incur the ill will of farmers and related industries throughout the Nation. It would set off a chain reaction which would be extremely damaging to farmers and people doing business with farmers, with resulting serious damaging effects upon the economy in general.

2. Use of section 32 funds: Section 32 currently finances payments for diversion or export of commodities, and has, in the past, procured commodities from CCC for distribution to domestic outlets. The 1964 budget estimates that in the fiscal year 1963, CCC will donate domestically approximately $300 million of surplus commodities and will make export payments of approximately $270 million. In order to lessen the impact upon CCC's borrowing authority, section 32 funds could be used to procure commodities from CCC for distribution to domestic outlets and to finance diversion payments and export payments.

If section 32 funds were used to the maximum extent permitted by available funds and existing authorities, it is possible that up to $250 million could be advanced to CCC, principally for commodities to be distributed to domestic outlets. In view of the provision in section 32 which limits the amount which can be devoted to any one commodity to 25 percent of available funds, not more than $150 million could be used for any one commodity; e.g., dairy products.

This large use of section 32 funds for commodities under CCC price-support programs has not been generally favored by members of the appropriation committees, by other Members of Congress and by officials of the Department of Agriculture and should therefore, be avoided, if possible.

3. Provide promptly a supplemental appropriation of $508 million as requested by the President. There is a budget amendment for 1964 to reduce the 1964 appropriation request by a like amount.

Such action would permit the continuation of CCC operations on a normal basis for the balance of this fiscal year consistent with current estimates.

CCC borrowing authority—Estimated major obligations and receipts

[In millions of dollars]

Item	February	March
Balance available or deficit (—), beginning of month	210	—31
REGULAR ACTIVITIES		
Obligations:		
Corn and cotton loans	170	53
Dairy purchases	62	60
Feed grain and wheat payments	131	105
Export payments	84	25
Storage, transportation and reseal payments	43	43
Other purchases, loans, interest	80	101
Total obligations	570	387
Receipts:		
Corn and wheat sales	179	325
Wheat and cotton repayments	80	107
Other sales, repayments, etc	26	57
Total receipts	285	489
Net obligations or receipts (—)	285	—102
SPECIAL ACTIVITIES (PUBLIC LAW 480, ETC.)		
Obligations	169	172
Receipts	[1] 213	17
Net obligations or receipts (*), special activities	*44	155
Balance available or deficit (—), end of month	—31	—84

[1] February includes $110,000,000 of reapportioned 4th quarter funds under the foreign assistance program and $93,100,000 loan repayments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the acting majority leader. I think it timely to say that, as I recall, not only is this the first appropriation measure of the session, but it is also the first measure of general importance which has been passed. I express the hope that there will be many others to follow soon, and that Congress may be able to adjourn at an early date, as soon as possible after July 31.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Whenever the Senator from Florida handles a measure as he has the appropriation bill today, he always acts with dispatch, efficiency, clarity, and with positive results.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished Senator from Florida mentioned the date of July 31. I think I should announce at this time that it is not the anticipation of the leadership to have the Senate take an Easter vacation this year because of the fact that we are at least 7 weeks behind in our schedule, and because committees are only now getting down to work. I think it behooves us to stay on the job and do the best we can to get legislation rolling, to the end that it may be possible for us to adjourn some time this year which, I am sure, will not be July 31, but because of the delay which has already been incurred, may well be in October or perhaps November.

Mr. HUMPHREY. O Senator. O Leader.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had not expected to have my hopes crushed at such an early date; but I cannot help approving the general position taken by the majority leader. We have an immense amount of work to do. While the purpose of my comment was to call attention to the fact that we have finally started to do it, I hope we may proceed much more expeditiously than we have in the recent past.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am happy that, almost 8 weeks after the convening of the 88th Congress, it has been possible, finally, for the Senate to consider a measure and pass it. I believe that the first bill passed this year had to do with a situation in the State of Hawaii. I am delighted that that bill, which was sponsored by Senator Fong and Senator Inouye, and reported by the Committee on Government Operations, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], has the honor of being the first bill to be passed by the Senate after almost 8 weeks of effort, of a sort.

I am especially happy that the first measure of major significance on a nationwide basis is the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) which was reported by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland], making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which was also passed today.

I compliment the Senator from Florida for the skillful, sound generalship he always shows in the consideration of a bill, and also the fact that in explaining a bill he proves to us conclusively that he does his homework and knows whereof he speaks.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my friend, the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAINTENANCE OF HIGHEST MEDICAL STANDARDS IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion and concern in certain departments of the Veterans' Administration relating to the medical and hospital care of veterans. Today I wish to address myself to these developments and to set at rest some of the worries and concerns of many Members of the Senate. I have received letters from Members of Congress, as well as from many veterans' representatives and organizations relating to the medical care program of the Veterans' Administration.

Throughout my service in the Senate, it has been my pleasure to devote attention to one of the most important obligations of the Nation: Providing the finest possible medical care for our wounded and ill ex-servicemen.

I should like today to mention some of the great medical challenges and opportunities which the Veterans' Administration faces.

A BRIEF VA MEDICAL HISTORY

First, however, a bit of historical perspective is necessary.

I will not recapitulate in detail the history of the Veterans' Administration medical program. I will only say this: This Nation today conducts the finest medical program in the world for those who defended it on the field of battle.

The program was not always thus. There was a time when Veterans' Administration medicine was the victim of an appalling combination of indifference, politics, the worst forms of bureaucracy, and professional mediocrity.

Then a great revolution occurred. It rightly bore the title, informally, of two of its great leaders, Dr. Paul Hawley and Dr. Paul Magnuson. After a time, however, that great reform movement itself ran into difficulties and was on the point of collapse. At that point—in 1951—a U.S. Senate subcommittee, of which I

was privileged to be chairman, stepped in and, observers said, saved the day.

That was 12 years ago. Since then, Veterans' Administration medicine has enjoyed outstanding esteem in the eyes of the medical world—and rightly so.

But times and circumstances change. Today, Veterans' Administration medicine confronts significant, albeit more subtle, challenges than in years gone by.

Fortunately, the outlook for those challenges to be successfully met is very bright.

FULL SUPPORT AT HIGHEST LEVEL

President John F. Kennedy and Administrator John S. Gleason are determined that Veterans' Administration medicine shall achieve new peaks of professional excellence.

The three great foundations of medicine—medical care, medical research, and medical education—are each being strengthened.

The key to Veterans' Administration's medical future lies, in considerable part, in the competent hands of the Nation's great medical schools. Today, 87 of the 170 Veterans' Administration facilities are affiliated with 77 medical schools. Some hospitals have multiple affiliation. In each of these hospitals, what are known as deans' committees help to assure the highest possible medical standards.

I cannot speak too strongly of the importance of this type of dynamic, high-level medical sponsorship and monitoring.

As a June 1960 report by a National Academy of Sciences Survey Committee stated on page 2:

> The total effectiveness of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration is undoubtedly more dependent on cooperation with the medical schools than on any other single factor. In the future, with an increase in the competition for professional personnel expected, this relationship will assume even greater importance.

NEED FOR HIGHER PAY

Meanwhile, the Congress, itself, as always, has a vital role to play. This particularly is the case in enabling the Veterans' Administration to compete successfully in the job marketplace, as I have indicated.

The 88th Congress must, in my view, enact additional Federal salary reform legislation. Only thereby can it enable the Veterans' Administration to recruit and keep the highest caliber of medical and paramedical personnel.

A Federal professional pay schedule should be adopted by Congress. If we are to maintain the technical, scientific, and medical personnel the Government requires for providing service to veterans, to the general public, and to the scientific institutes and medical institutes in this country, Congress must promptly act on the professional salary schedules needed to recruit and hold personnel of this kind.

On May 16, 1962, Administrator Gleason made a very strong and well-merited plea, before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, on behalf of an adequate system of compensation for Veterans' Administration medical personnel. Many of the observations which he made at that time might well be repeated today. Today the Veterans' Administration cannot effectively compete in the job market with other public and private sources. It has not been able to keep pace with compensation available elsewhere.

The greatest threat today to the medical and surgical programs of the Veterans' Administration is the failure of Congress to adjust the professional salary schedules so that trained and competent scientific personnel can be maintained on the job.

THE MENTAL ILLNESS AND REHABILITATION REVOLUTIONS

Yet, Mr. President, the Veterans' Administration medical program is subject to dynamic change. A great revolution in chemotherapy of tuberculosis has been followed and paralleled to some extent by a revolution in what is known as psychopharmacology. A magnificent opportunity to reduce mental illness confronts the Nation. This is subject, of course, to the proviso that we proceed with all due safeguards in the case of the many powerful new mind medications.

All the while, the Nation's veterans' population is itself subject to the factor of time and aging. More and more, the Veterans' Administration is confronted with the problems of the chronic illnesses and disability characteristic of advanced years.

The Veterans' Administration is beginning pioneering efforts in establishing restoration centers. The Veterans' Administration faces the great opportunity of not only adding years to lives, but also adding lives to years for our senior veterans. More and more, the concept of restoration must take hold. We should not be content until, if it is at all possible, we enable the senior, ill veteran to return to society.

APPREHENSION OVER TRANSFER OF AREA MEDICAL DIRECTORS

In view of all these significant challenges facing the Veterans' Administration, I was particularly concerned in recent days to note much apprehension—as I have already said—among experts as to one particular administrative move in the offing. I refer to the transfer to Washington of the Veterans' Administration area medical directors.

I shall not go now into this subject in detail, except to say that men of unimpeachable medical credentials have expressed to me deep concern over this relocation. Outstanding among those who view the move with deep misgivings is Dr. Paul Magnuson.

Every veteran and every veteran's family in the Nation owes Dr. Paul Magnuson a debt of gratitude for his reforms in the Veterans' Administration's Medical and Surgical Division. He made veterans medicine the finest medicine practiced today in America.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to join in the tribute to Dr. Magnuson. I know of no one in public life who has performed a more significant service than that which Dr. Magnuson has performed for our veterans. No words of praise are too strong for the services of this distinguished man to the Government, and particularly to veterans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from New York for his words of commendation of Dr. Magnuson, and also for his joining me in this expression of our appreciation and our respect for him. Of course, I may also include—as I have previously said—Dr. Hawley, Admiral Booth, and the other medical directors who have served the veterans of this country so faithfully.

I have discussed the issue of the relocation of certain area medical directors at high levels within the executive branch. I have been assured that the move will not impair the professional integrity of the Veterans' Administration medical service in any way, and that it will advance administrative efficiency.

I do not presume to render final judgment on the issue. In all frankness, I have strong doubts over the wisdom of moving Area Medical Directors away from the scene of their immediate responsibility. Inevitably, they will have to spend more time in travel to the field. Inevitably they will become more associated with the Washington scene than they will with the scene and the problems in the areas concerned.

DANGER OF INTERFERENCE WITH VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MEDICINE

What is more, I am distressed that the move was ordered from the Office of the Administrator, initially unknown to and over the head of the Veterans' Administration Medical Director. The latter was confronted with what amounted to an accomplished fact.

The able Veterans' Administration Medical Director has stated that he does not share this concern over the geographic relocation. I respect his judgment and that of the Administration. But I remind the Veterans' Administration that the Congress has expressed in unmistakable terms the position that the Veterans' Administration Medical Department shall be professionally independent. I have high regard for Mr. Gleason. He is doing a good job as Administrator, and I believe his staff is also doing a good job. But I have previously watched efforts to change the pattern of the Veterans' Administration medical care. I have seen attempts made to get it back into the old bureaucracy, subject to the pressures which come from many political sources. We are not going to let that happen again.

As I have said, in 1951 it was my privilege to step in and stop such a move. This afternoon, I repeat the warning that if there is any attempt to put Veterans' Administration medical and surgical programs under some form of political influence or administrative control that would violate medical standards and professional medical care, I will wage battle against whoever attempts to do it.

In the past, Dr. Magnuson recalls time after time when changes which were regarded as relatively innocuous have been part of a systematic pattern of interference with the professional independence of Veterans' Administration medicine. I repeat: I serve notice that I, for one, do not intend to be silent in the face of any such effort, now or in the future.

That is no threat. It is merely a statement of my concern in respect to the program. I have watched the program for the past 12 years. I have visited many of the veterans' hospitals. I shall do all I can to see that the existing high professional standards are maintained.

The Veterans' Administration's assurances over the situation cannot, however, be lightly dismissed.

At a December 3, 1962, meeting of the Veterans' Administration's Special Medical Advisory Group, Mr. Gleason stated the following noteworthy reasons for bringing the area medical directors to Washington:

> To improve communications between the field and the central office staff; to establish one point of contact in central office for each hospital director; to utilize the central office staff to provide technical program guidance and to advise hospital directors; to provide more uniform supervision and evaluation of field station operations, and to involve those with the most intimate knowledge of field operations (the area medical directors, themselves) in the development of top-level policies and plans.

Dr. William S. Middleton, the present Veterans' Administration Chief Medical Director, is a fine and able public servant. He has volunteered the belief, based on his experience in serving under three Administrators of Veterans' Affairs, that no Administrator has more stanchly supported the Department of Medicine and Surgery than Mr. Gleason. He has strengthened Veterans' Administration ties with deans' committees of the Nation's medical schools; he has insisted that Veterans' Administration hospitals be built near medical schools; he has supported the record appropriations for care and treatment of veterans patients, hospital construction, and medical research.

Mr. President, I concur in Dr. Middleton's opinion. Mr. Gleason is making a fine record as the Veterans' Administrator. I wish to support his efforts. But I want him to know that some of us are standing guard to see that nothing happens to weaken the independence and the professional competence of the medical section of the Veterans' Administration.

The geographic relocation, Mr. Middleton feels, in no way minimizes either the prerogatives or duties of the Area Medical Director or of the Chief Medical Director.

In summary, the move is regarded, at least by Veterans' Administration, as within the authority of the Administrator, and has been accepted by the Chief Medical Director, who has, as I have indicated, given assurances that it will in no way whatsoever detract from direct patient care.

I have gone into that question with considerable care. I have had a staff member of the Senate Subcommittee on Reorganization look into this situation carefully. My remarks today are the result of that study.

The Congress, however, is under no obligation to accept the relocation, particularly without further examination. I, for one, respectfully suggest that the Senate and House Appropriations Subcommittees with jurisdiction over the Veterans' Administration may wish to look into the merits and disadvantages of the geographic shift. In addition, perhaps our colleagues in the expert House Veterans' Affairs Committee may wish to explore the problem.

Certain people in Veterans' Administration were apparently planning to order the move as far back as 6 years ago. Yet, Mr. Gleason has only been in office 2 years. So, I do not want anyone in Veterans' Administration to get the idea that henceforth the Director of the Medical Department can again be circumvented and presented with an accomplished fact. Nor do I want them to get the idea that the Medical Advisory Committee can be told that a move is going to take place, instead of being consulted whether the idea of a move is sound.

The Medical Advisory Committee is supposed to give advice and not just act as a sounding board for decisions already taken.

In conclusion, I intend to give Veterans' Administration medical needs my close attention. I have ordered my staff on the subcommittee to keep a watchful eye over the program. As a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I am going to keep two watchful eyes on the program.

I may add, on this last point, that while Veterans' Administration has an outstanding record in many respects as regards interagency cooperation, we have found, in some areas—notably as regards drug communication—much to be desired.

So that this record will be complete and so that perspective will be maintained, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record a Washington Post editorial of February 3, 1963, as regards the relocation move.

I also would like to outline briefly the work performed by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee in 1951 as referred to in the above editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Veterans' Medicine

> That indefatigable watchdog of the Veterans' Administration, Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, is barking again. Experience has made it altogether plain that his warnings ought not to be ignored. Politicians and organized veterans' groups, he says, are making another grab for control of VA medicine.
>
> A dozen years ago Dr. Magnuson was fired from his position as director of medical affairs for the Veterans' Administration. The resulting commotion produced a Senate investigation by a subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator Hubert Humphrey which completely vindicated Dr. Magnuson and blamed the Veterans' Administrator of that time, Carl R. Gray, Jr., for developments which "could conceivably return the VA medical care program to the shambles which made it a national scandal in 1945."
>
> Dr. Magnuson had been fired because he objected vigorously to directives which would have brought the management of Veterans' Administration hospitals and medical facilities directly under the authority of the Administrator, bypassing the Director of Medical Affairs. Now, he asserts, incumbent VA Administrator John S. Gleason, Jr., has inaugurated a similar move, ordering VA regional medical directors to move their offices to Washington and report directly to a deputy VA medical director; and this has been done despite opposition by the retiring Medical Director.
>
> It is easy to understand why a Veterans' Administrator would like to centralize control over medical affairs under his own direct supervision. But there are serious dangers, as Dr. Magnuson has pointed out, in "interference with medical matters by the Administrator which may have a direct bearing on the care and treatment of patients and hospitals." It was precisely this kind of interference which Senator Humphrey's investigating subcommittee excoriated 12 years ago. Perhaps it had better have a fresh look at the situation. The Nation has an inescapable obligation to see to it that the medical care provided for veterans is of the highest professional caliber and wholly free from political overtones and influences.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The danger of collapse of medical reforms within the Veterans' Administration was the subject of an urgent study made in 1951 by a Special Subcommittee To Investigate Veterans' Administration Policies and Practices With Respect to Medical Care.

It was my privilege to serve as chairman of this subcommittee. Four other Members served on the subcommittee: the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and the then Senator Richard M. Nixon, of California.

The subcommittee heard direct testimony from Gen. Carl Gray, then Veterans' Administrator, and Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, who had served as Chief Medical Officer until January of that year. All in all, the subcommittee conducted 9 hearings, in February, March, and May 1951, with 25 witnesses. In addition, the subcommittee met in five other sessions at which operations were planned, testimony was analyzed, and recommendations were formulated.

On August 2, 1951, it was my pleasure to file the report of the subcommittee, as approved by the full committee. It appeared as Senate Report No. 610, 82d Congress, 1st session. The report was endorsed by leading medical experts throughout the Nation. It became, they said, a "benchmark" for the highest caliber medical policies in Veterans' Administration. The report itself stressed the role of the deans' committees.

It had reprinted—pages 4–6—the Veterans' Administration policy memorandum No. 2, dated January 30, 1946. That memorandum was entitled "Policy in Association of Veterans Hospitals With Medical Schools." Under it, it noted, each affiliated school of medicine organized a deans' committee, which assumed responsibility for the schools' functions in the program. The deans' committees usually consist of senior faculty members from all schools cooperating in each project, whether or not furnishing any of the attending or resident staff.

The report emphasized, in recommendation No. 1, page 41, that the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration must be the principal medical authority of the agency with primary authority to control, manage, and operate its medical and hospital program. It recommended that the Chief Medical Director be appointed by the President, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate—page 45—that the Special Medical Advisory Group be strengthened and be given every possible help.

The report emphasized—page 46—that the medical program on behalf of our Nation's veterans "must be kept dynamic and alert to the continuous scientific advances that are being made in hospital care."

It stressed that "affiliation of hospitals with the medical schools is the only way this can be successfully accomplished." It pointed out that the relationship must rest on mutual confidence and cooperation.

The underlying spirit and guidelines of the report merit, I believe, continued heed and respect.

There is no substitute for professional excellence in medicine and in all the healing arts.

LABOR DEPARTMENT—50 YEARS LATER

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, today we celebrate a significant milestone in the life of our Nation on this, the 50th anniversary of the Labor Department.

Dedicated to promoting the welfare of the wage earner in this country, to improving his working conditions, and to advancing his opportunities for profitable employment, the Department has advanced these goals with distinction.

It has been most instrumental in fostering the dignity of labor in a free society, and on the occasion of its 50th anniversary, I wish to offer my congratulations to the Department, as well as my deep appreciation for the role it has played in seeing to it that the price we pay for our industrial achievements is no longer measured in terms of human sacrifice.

From its small beginnings in 1913, the Department has met the challenges of changing times as the prime architect of our manpower policies in this country. Its able and dedicated Secretaries have helped the Department acquire a reputation for thoughtful and impartial devotion to integrity and objectivity among employers, unions, and the public in general.

Fifty years ago the workingman of this country was ill paid, ill housed, ill fed, and unprotected. Fringe benefits were almost nonexistent. There were few laws governing the safety and health of the workingman, or the child laborer. While prices were lower, the purchase of basic necessities took a far larger bite out of the workingman's pay than is now the case.

Today most of our children are protected against industrial exploitation. The sweatshops and yellow dog contracts are a thing of the past. Wages and working conditions have improved dramatically. Under the influence of many Federal laws, organized labor has risen from a position of ineffectual weakness to one of balanced power with management—a balance that is absolutely necessary to the achievement of the goal outlined by the first Secretary of Labor, "Industrial peace through progressively nearer realization of the highest ideals of industrial justice."

Yes, we have come a long way from the dark days of industrial life in the United States, and much credit must go to our present Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, and all his distinguished predecessors.

But as Secretary Wirtz has pointed out, the challenges facing labor-management relations today are at least "equal in magnitude" to the challenges of 1913. And a key question is, in his words: "Can we make our economy a human as well as a technical success?"

The fact is that, despite areas of affluence, mass poverty still exists in the United States today. Millions of people are still ill paid, ill housed, ill fed, and unprotected. While real wages have been increasing for everyone, the greatest gains are occurring at the upper end of the income scale, not the lower. In fact, the poor are even poorer today than they were years ago in terms of the percentage of the national income they are receiving. And the rate at which poverty is being eliminated has slowed down alarmingly since 1953, according to a recent eloquent article in the New Yorker by Dwight MacDonald.

High and persistent unemployment remains an unsolved problem of the greatest magnitude, and it is being increasingly aggravated by the accelerating rate of automation. We are not only faced with the problem of the millions of unskilled or poorly educated workers who cannot find jobs in the pages of want ads for engineers, scientists, and managerial executives that fill our papers every day, but we are also faced with the problem of people who, because of automation, suddenly find their skills obsolete. They may be ill suited or too old for retraining, or the job opportunities that are available may be far from the communities in which these people have planted deep roots.

In the face of these great challenges to the ability of labor-management relations in a free and democratic society, I have been increasingly disconcerted by the extent to which we, as a nation, seem to have forgotten the lessons of the past.

I have heard people so enraptured by the processes of automation that it seems they will not be satisfied until the last workingman is replaced by a machine. It seems to have escaped many people that the secret of our country's economic success has been the distribution of greater purchasing power in the hands of more and more working men and women, not fewer. Economic prosperity does not lie down the path of fewer jobs, more machines, and a wealthy elite to run them. Automation will indeed be a cruel triumph unless it leads to the creation of more new jobs than it displaces.

Increasingly we seem to hear cries for legislation designed to drastically upset the balance of power between labor and management that has slowly developed over the years, without realizing the implications of the proposed remedy.

Whenever a major, prolonged strike occurs, people begin demanding antistrike legislation and compulsory arbitration in order to protect what they consider the public interest.

Surely we need better mechanisms for dealing with major labor-management disputes, but keeping in mind the importance of a balance of power between labor and management in our kind of society, what power would organized labor have without the right to strike? And if we are to turn the question of wages and working conditions over to the Government or some designated third party, what possible reason would there be for not doing likewise for prices and profits? And then where would we be?

It seems to me that anyone truly interested in the preservation of the private enterprise system as we know it today would think long and hard before recommending such drastic remedies to the problem of major and prolonged strikes affecting the national interest.

The pressure to place labor under the jurisdiction of the antitrust laws also seems to me to be poorly thought out.

The purpose of the antitrust laws is to promote competition among the industries of the Nation to prevent monopoly control over the production and prices of the commodities we need. Aside from the fact that it is pretty difficult these days to find price competition in buying a car, gasoline, and other major commodities, we cannot forget that labor is not a commodity. We are not trying to promote the competition for jobs, or competition to see how little one union is willing to have its members paid.

But even assuming that unions have achieved too much power over the ability to determine wages and working conditions through the economic consequences of their right to strike, what evidence is there that the decentralization of union power would lessen the number of strikes or make labor more "responsible" or less "demanding"? It might, in fact, work just the other way around, for it is quite possible that union officers exercise a restraining influence on their members more often than the members exercise a restraining influence on the union officers.

One could go on to examine other proposals that have been made from time to time, which are based on the premise that "labor has grown too strong," but most of them seem designed to either plunge us back to the dark ages of industrial strife or involve the most dangerous degree of Federal intervention and control.

We have achieved, after years of strife and turmoil, a rough balance of power between labor and management in an atmosphere of freedom from government control.

It is not a perfect arrangement, and sometimes when bitter disputes develop, the public interest suffers very greatly. And at present our only real bulwark lies in the sense of responsibility and fairness on both sides.

But as I believe Winston Churchill once said in another context:

> Democracy is the worst form of government in the world—save all the rest.

Just so, one can argue that the present relationship between labor and management is the worst possible way to serve the interests of our Nation as a whole, but it beats any other system devised so far by mere human beings.

For the accomplishments we have achieved, let us be thankful on this 50th anniversary of the Labor Department, which deserves great credit for those accomplishments. At the same time, let us look for constructive ways to improve the equilibrium of labor-management relations in keeping with the traditions we value as a nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD news articles from the Washington Post and Washington Star, and an editorial commemorating the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Department of Labor.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1963]

LABOR'S 50 YEARS

As the country observes the 50th anniversary of the Labor Department today, there is a strong inclination to dwell upon the accomplishments of the last half century. The gains for labor have been enormous. When President Taft fixed his signature on the Labor Department bill, the 7-day week was still common, wages were low, child labor was prevalent, safety measures were meager, sick leave, paid vacations, and many other benefits were still dreams of the future. The occasion is likely to be meaningful, however, to the extent that it is used for assessment of the enormous problems still on the labor horizon.

Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz thoughtfully observed that, as his Department begins its second half century, "it carries much of the responsibility for a major decision we must face as a people: Can we make our economy a human as well as a technical success?" The task of the Department is very different from that of 1913, but in many respects it is more baffling and infinitely more complicated.

Today the country is keenly aware of the need for 4 million additional jobs. With all the advance in technology and productivity, the goal of full employment is still elusive. Workers are troubled by the consequences of automation; employers, by the consequences of featherbedding. As a nation, we have an appalling amount of idleness and underutilization of energy and skill. Yet, on the other hand, there are mountainous needs that remain unfilled and surplus capacity and production that are not put to constructive use.

If any simple solution of these maladjustments were at hand, it would doubtless have been applied long ago. In the absence of such a solution, the Labor Department will have a constant struggle to improve the lot of the workingman or, as Secretary Wirtz put it, to make change "the instrument for man's deliverance, instead of permitting it to become the instrument for his destruction."

Fortunately, it is now recognized that improved well-being for the rank and file is itself the goal, although there remains much controversy over how this can best be attained. One thing is certain: the problem will require continued intensive study by the best minds in labor, industry, and Government. And since the Labor Department will remain close to the center of the struggle, it will need to gird itself for still more intensive service.

[From the Washington Star]

LABOR DEPARTMENT'S FULL 50 YEARS

(By Truman R. Temple)

It took agitation by the labor movement from the end of the Civil War to the eve of World War I to create it.

When the Department was created by a stroke of President Taft's pen on his last day of office March 4, 1913, 18,000 children were working underground in mines.

Two years earlier, 146 workers at the Triangle Waist Co. in New York had been killed in a fire. A little-known social worker named Frances Perkins, who happened on the scene, watched in horror as some of the women leaped from windows to their death. She later pushed through a new State code for factories before becoming Secretary of Labor.

THE CLIMATE

Five men were killed in work accidents for every million tons of coal mined in 1913. One railroad worker in 500 lost his life on the job. Less than half the States had any workmen's compensation laws. Unemployment insurance did not exist, and 23 years would pass before it came into being.

It was this kind of climate that gave birth to the U.S. Department of Labor. Tomorrow President Kennedy will join with labor and management leaders at a banquet in the Sheraton-Park Hotel celebrating the agency's 50th birthday, in a climate so changed that observers would be hard pressed to find any similarities with 1913.

Today the American wage earner is the envy and the model for the rest of the world. A large measure of his well-being can be attributed to the Department here that administers the many laws protecting him.

In its first half century, the Labor Department has scored some unusual firsts. It was the first of Cabinet rank to be headed by a woman, Frances Perkins—who incidentally will attend tomorrow's ceremonies.

Her appointment by F.D.R. in 1933 was not hailed with joy by American unions. The head of the AFL said Miss Perkins was a charming lady but unacceptable to organized labor. Unimpressed, she went on to hold office for 12 years, longer than any other Secretary before or since.

Labor also remains the smallest of all Cabinet rank departments, with only 8,642 employees last year compared to 64,762 in Interior, 110,934 in Agriculture, over 1 million in the Defense Department. And its budget was $563 million, compared to $873 million for Interior, $7.1 billion for Agriculture, and $49 billion for Defense.

Among other firsts, Labor can claim authorship of the alltime publication, "Infant Care," first printed in 1913. More than 45 million copies have been published and a new 11th edition will appear next month.

THE PRESENT SECRETARY

The current Secretary, W. Willard Wirtz, is considered the wittiest of Cabinet members. He once served as a member of the Illinois Liquor Control Commission and of the Winnetka, Ill., Library Board for 5 years, and recalled later, "I got to the point that every time I opened a book I felt compelled to open a bottle. It was a spiritual experience, and one which I must say prepared me for this tour of duty in Washington beyond any I can imagine."

Should the Labor Department race from one major strike to another like a Federal fire department? Under Secretary Goldberg, now safely transferred to the quieter realm of the Supreme Court, it often seemed so. In fact aids once contemplated equipping his office with an alarm bell and fire chief's hat.

DIFFERENT IDEAS

But neither Mr. Wirtz nor Miss Perkins hold this view, though the present Secretary has won some notable settlements. "Many people have the idea," Miss Perkins said on the Department's 25th anniversary "that the Government has the right to intervene in strikes and settle disputes, to step in between warring labor factions.

"It cannot dictate any settlement in either case. If it could, this country would not be a democracy. This Department can only help each side to see the other's point of view and to endeavor to point a way to a settlement which will be satisfactory to both sides."

In any event, it seems likely no Labor Secretary could sustain Mr. Goldberg's phenomenal run of luck in ending strikes including one at the Metropolitan Opera, traditional haven of temperament, even if he wanted to. And as one observer warned on White House interventions, "If the President hangs out his shingle, he's going to get all the business."

Like others before him, the present Labor Secretary sees the Department's basic challenges in long-range problems of full employment, manpower retraining and the like.

He accepts the problems of change, even though he once remarked that history "ought to be arrested for reckless driving." In looking back at the Department's first half century, Mr. Wirtz notes that change has been its steady companion.

In World War I it was embroiled in supplying manpower to win the war. In following years it worked for more security for workers hit by technological change to mass production.

MANY ACTIVITIES

After the 1929 crash, the Department added many activities—the national employment service, wage and hour law enforcement, apprenticeship and training, and new labor standards to improve working conditions.

In this era other agencies were removed, including Immigration and Naturalization, the Children's Bureau, and the Mediation and Conciliation Service. The Hoover Commission urged putting some back, but they remain elsewhere.

As Mr. Wirtz remarks, in a statement prepared for its golden anniversary tomorrow, "The history of the Department is thus a record of response to change, always the welfare of the American worker and his family dominating the aims, thoughts, efforts and actions of the Department."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 3, 1963]

LABOR DEPARTMENT IS 50 YEARS OLD, AND IT TOOK A TAFT TO START IT

(By Morton Mintz)

Although the Government had been in labor since 1884, when it established a Bureau of Labor in the Interior Department, it didn't give birth to a full-fledged Department until March 4, 1913.

The 29-year gestation period ended when President William Howard Taft, on his last day in office, signed the law bringing the Department of Labor into the world—a world in which the working man, the working woman, and the working child need all the help they could get.

Monday is the 50th anniversary of the Department. The anniversary will be observed with regional banquets and conferences in 16 cities.

The Washington banquet, which will follow other special events during the day, will be held Monday night at the Sheraton-Park. President Kennedy, Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz, three former Secretaries—Frances Perkins, James P. Mitchell, and Justice Arthur J. Goldberg—and leaders of industry, the AFL–CIO, and the three branches of Government are among those scheduled to attend.

TO IMPROVE CONDITIONS

The law that created the Department said its purpose was "to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment."

Today few would question that the law's purpose reflected compelling needs.

A 1913 Government report, for example, said that almost 30 percent of the Nation's steelworkers were on a 7-day week, that some worked 18 to 24 hours without letup, and that two out of five worked 72 or more hours a week.

The report said that 42 percent were earning less than 18 cents an hour, with a weekly potential maximum of $12.50. From their pay, deductions were made for such things as ice water, disablement funds, medical fees, rent for company houses and identification badges.

Owning almost everything in towns where many workers lived, employers could charge what they wished for rent, transportation, and even food.

In the 1st decade of the 20th century there were few laws governing safety, health, sanitary conditions, or child labor. Sick leave, paid vacations, and other fringe benefits were virtually unknown.

A common laborer toiled 50 hours a week for an average of $11—and a child may have worked beside him under dangerous conditions. Illness or old age could cut off his income.

More than 40 percent of his take-home pay went for food, beverages, and tobacco—compared with about 25 percent today. A suit of clothes took 75 hours' work—compared with 20 hours today.

To the Department's 10th Secretary the task today is equal in magnitude to the challenges of 1913.

In an anniversary statement, Wirtz said that the Department "carries much of the responsibility for a major decision we must face as a people: Can we make our economy a human as well as a technical success?"

The Secretary said that we have today "an economy so forward and aggressive in its technical ability that it has outstripped the skills of millions of persons, deprived itself of that many consumers, and come to an impasse of demand. * * *

"As framer of the manpower policies of this Nation, the Department of Labor must keep pace with the scientific advancements that offer promise of man's fulfillment.

"We have the responsibility of developing those programs which will safeguard the person who may, as an individual, be adversely affected by a technological development which greatly benefits the community as a whole. * * *

"We are going to have to review our seniority, our job-right systems, our employment security programs, and our retirement programs in order to find ways of insuring man's rights despite his displacement by a machine."

Of the four units that comprised the Department when it was born, only the Bureau of Labor Statistics remains in it. Within the last quarter century the Bureau of Immigration was transferred to the Justice Department and the Children's Bureau to what is now the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Mediation and Conciliation Service has become an independent agency.

But changing times have brought changing needs, and the Department's activities and responsibilities are now of a scope that could not have been imagined 50 years ago.

EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

They include career counseling for women, reemployment help to veterans, the U.S. Employment Service, training in labor subjects for about a thousand foreign visitors annually, apprenticeship and training programs, publication of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (a new edition will list about 40,000), studies of the chronically unemployed, thousands of investigations to assure compliance with the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, help in retraining jobless workers (an estimated 400,000 in the next 3 years) and enforcement of fair labor standards.

"During its first half century of service to the United States," Wirtz said, "the concern of the Department of Labor can be expressed in one word: People. Human welfare remains its interest."

CREATION OF IDAHO TERRITORY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, 100 years ago yesterday this body amended and passed House bill No. 738. The House of Representatives subsequently concurred in the amendments, passed the bill, and it was rushed to the White House and there signed—on March 3, 1863—by President Abraham Lincoln.

This was the historic legislative act, Mr. President, which created the Territory of Idaho.

Establishment of this vast government, which included much of the present States of Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming—as it was first created—was the preliminary to Idaho's entrance into the Union as the 43d State. Even then, statehood did not come until 1890.

In 1863, this new territory was a mountain wilderness, and other than various tribes of Indians, its only population several thousand miners who had flocked to rich diggings on the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers in the north and Boise Basin in the south.

It has been said that Idaho was born in a gold pan; it was not until after 1860, when a handful of adventurers led by Capt. E. D. Pierce, discovered gold on Orofino Creek in the Clearwater River watershed, that a brave young population washed into the mountain wilderness and set up housekeeping. Prior to this, only hardy Mormon settlers from Utah had ventured into southern Idaho seeking a permanent settlement; this region was primarily a path for the Oregon Trail, and before that had known only the explorers and the fur traders.

But with the wave of miners came a demand for foodstuffs, freighting, professional services, and other requirements for existence. Settlements grew where trails bisected the mining traffic, and roads followed. Establishment of the Territory in 1863 brought the framework for law and order, social and economic progress.

It is remarkable that a Congress, so concerned with the problems of a tragic war, could at this particular time respond to the needs of tiny frontier settlements more than 2,000 miles to the west. I have just completed reading the Congressional Globe, forerunner of our present CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the 3d session of the 37th Congress, which convened on December 1, 1862, and adjourned in March 1863. In these detailed accounts of the debates concerning the war and its many ramifications, is sandwiched the story of the creation of Idaho Territory. It is most interesting to note that but for the lateness of the bill's consideration, and the insistence of Senator Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts, Idaho Territory might never have existed but would have been Montana Territory instead.

An outstanding historian-teacher of Idaho, Miss Annie Laurie Bird, of Nampa, recently suggested that the account from the Congressional Globe might well be compiled in digest form for the benefit of future historians. I believe this should be done in this territorial centennial year, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the RECORD these highlights of that important and historic legislative action.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Congressional Globe, Dec. 15, 1862 (House)]

PROPOSED NEW TERRITORY

Mr. KELLOGG, of Illinois. I was absent when the State of Illinois was called, and ask consent now to introduce a resolution of inquiry.

No objection being made, Mr. Kellogg, of Illinois, submitted the following resolution; which was read, considered and agreed to:

"*Resolved,* That the Committee on Territories be instructed to inquire into the propriety of establishing a territorial government for that region of country in which are situate the Salmon River gold mines; and that they report by bill or otherwise."

[From the Congressional Globe, Dec. 22, 1862 (House)]

TERRITORY OF IDAHO

Mr. Ashley also introduced a bill to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Idaho; which was read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

[From the Congressional Globe, Feb. 11, 1863 (House)]

TERRITORY OF MONTANA

Mr. Ashley, from the Committee on Territories, reported back House bill No. 626, to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Montana; which was ordered to be printed, and recommitted to the same committee.

[From the Congressional Globe, Feb. 12, 1863 (Senate)]

BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. Lane, of Kansas, asked, and by unanimous consent obtained leave to introduce a bill (S. No. 521) to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Montana; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

[From the Congressional Globe, Feb. 12, 1863 (House)]

MONTANA

Mr. Ashley, from the Committee on Territories, reported back House bill No. 738, to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Montana, with the recommendation that it do pass.

(**Editor's Note.**—Minor changes in wording of bill made following debate.)

Mr. Allen, of Ohio, demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and it was decided in the affirmative—yeas 85, nays 39.

So the bill was passed.

[From the Congressional Globe, Feb. 13, 1863 (Senate)]

Message From the House

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Etheridge, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (No. 707) making appropriations for the construction, preservation, and repairs of certain fortifications and other works of defense for the year ending 30th of June 1864; and

A bill (No. 738) to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Montana.

(The bill was referred to the Committee on Territories.)

[From the Congressional Globe, Saturday, Feb. 14, 1863 (Senate)]

Reports From Committees

Mr. Wade, from the Committee on Territories, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. No. 738) to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Montana, reported it without amendment.

[From the Congressional Globe, Mar. 3, 1863 (Senate)]

Provisional Governments

(**Editor's Note.**—The Senate began consideration of S. No. 200, a bill to establish provisional governments, and a move to "lay it on the table" failed; a move to adjourn the Senate also failed.)

The **Presiding Officer**. There is a question before the Senate. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Virginia to the amendment of the Senator from New York to Senate bill No. 200.

Mr. **Wilkinson**. I move to lay aside the pending bill and all other orders, and take up House bill No. 738, providing for a temporary government for the Territory of Montana.

Mr. **Harris**. I hope not.

Mr. **Wilkinson**. This bill has passed the House of Representatives, and I think it is necessary that it should pass this body. I am in favor of the bill which is now before the Senate, but I do not believe it can pass; or if it passes this body, it certainly cannot pass the other. It seems to me entirely futile to undertake to press it at this late day of the session.

The **Presiding Officer**. The Senator from Minnesota moves to postpone the pending bill and all prior orders, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill indicated by him.

Mr. **Harris**. I hope that motion will not prevail. I hope we shall have action on this bill. * * * The question is whether or not the President shall go on appointing Governors for the rebel States, as we get possession of them, without any authority, perhaps, of law, as a mere matter of necessity, or whether we shall regulate it by act of Congress * * *.

Mr. **Wilkinson**. If I thought the Senate could come to any decision on the Senator's bill without a long discussion, I would not urge this motion; but I do not believe it can. I believe there is great diversity of opinion here, and I am satisfied the bill will be strenuously opposed. I therefore move that it be laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider the bill which I have named.

Mr. **Sumner**. I would suggest to my friend from Minnesota that perhaps it would be better to proceed with the consideration of the bill now in charge of the Senator from New York. If there be such opposition to it as the Senator anticipates, we shall then know it. I am not aware of it now. Besides, the Senator says if the bill passes the Senate, it cannot pass the House of Representatives. Now, I am of opinion that if it passes the Senate it can pass the House of Representatives.

Mr. **Wilkinson**. I may be mistaken about that.

Mr. **Sumner**. That is my idea; and on the whole, I think we had better make the experiment.

Mr. **Doolittle**. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota. I am a practical man. I do not believe, practically, that you can pass this bill through the Senate and the House of Representatives at the present stage of the session. It is a bill which will necessarily lead to debate both in this House and the House of Representatives; and we are now in the last day of the session. The bill which he proposes to take up, to organize the territory of Montana, is a practical measure; it has passed the House of Representatives; it is simply pending in this body, awaiting action here. We can take it up and pass it. It is important that it should be passed. The territory of Montana is an important territory, with great gold mines in it, and with a large population in it already.

Mr. **Grimes**. Where is it?

Mr. **Doolittle**. North of Utah, taking what lies east of Oregon and east of Washington territory, and north of Utah, and taking a portion of Dakota, embracing the fine gold mines and a large population.

(**Editor's Note.**—Some debate left out here.)

Mr. **Nesmith**. I trust that the motion of the Senator from Minnesota will prevail. There is a very great necessity for the organization of the proposed territory. There are today from 15,000 to 20,000 persons there. They are remotely situated, some 500 or 1,000 miles from any seat of government. There have been recent discoveries of rich gold mines there; and I have no doubt that within the next 4 or 5 months there will be 50,000 or 60,000 people there, who will be entirely without law or municipal regulation for their government unless this bill shall pass. A class of people go there whom it is necessary to have some regulation to control. I trust therefore the bill will be taken up for the benefit of the people who are there without law and without government.

Mr. **Harris**. Mr. President, I do not forget that this is the last evening of the session. Now, sir, in relation to the bill to organize the territory of Montana, if I am correctly informed, it is a bill of very doubtful expediency, and one which may well be postponed until another session of the Congress.

The **President** pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Minnesota that the Senate postpone the pending and all prior orders, and proceed to the consideration of the bill to organize the territory of Montana.

Mr. **Harris** called for the yeas and nays; and they were ordered.

Mr. **Howe**. I beg to offer just this word upon this motion; I shall vote against it, because however important it may be to organize a government for the territory of Montana, I do conceive and submit that its importance is utterly insignificant compared with that of organizing governments for this large body of people, spread out between us and the Gulf of Mexico, who for the last 2 years have been subject to two rules, a military rule, which, however well adapted it may be to the government of military men, is utterly unfitted for the government and regulation of civil society * * *.

(**Editor's Note.**—Senators here continued their discussion of the bill to provide provisional governments.)

Mr. **Harding**. Mr. President, the territory proposed to be organized under a territorial government by the bill referred to by the Senator from Minnesota has not at this time a population exceeding probably 5,000. During the last summer, in the mining district known as the Salmon River mines, there were probably 10,000 persons. The usual severity of the winter in that country has induced most of those miners to leave there and go to the lower country for the winter. Since August, other mines have been discovered on Boise River, where there are now probably from two to three thousand miners at work, according to the best information we can get. In the Salmon River mines there are now probably one, two, or three thousand miners altogether.

The territory included in the boundaries fixed in the bill contains but little agricultural country, and there are, probably, not today more than a few dozen families residing within that territory; but all the accounts we receive from there show that the mines are very rich, and that large numbers of people intend to go there early this spring. I suppose the prospects of the territory are as good today as the prospects of Nevada were the day its territorial organization was completed.

As the bill now stands I cannot vote for it, because it does not include the population east of the Cascade Mountains who desire a territorial organization; but by a proper amendment I think the bill can be made a good one. I hope it will be taken up and amended, and then passed.

Mr. **Lane** of Kansas. The Senator from Oregon, in his estimate of the population, does not count the people on the eastern slope of the mountains.

Mr. **Harding**. That is so. I know nothing of the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains on this side. I only speak of the western side.

Mr. **Lane** of Kansas. The delegate from Dakota estimates the number of miners on the eastern slope of the mountains as equal to the number given by the Senator from Oregon, which would make a population of from 8,000 to 10,000 persons. I do hope that the Montana bill will be passed; and that then we shall take up the bill to enable Nevada and Colorado to form State governments, and pass them.

The question being taken by yeas and nays on Mr. Wilkinson's motion, resulted—yeas 22, nays 13.

TERRITORY OF MONTANA, OR IDAHO

So the motion was agreed to, and the bill (H.R. 738) to organize the Territory of Montana was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. **Wilson** of Massachusetts. I move to strike out the name of the territory, and insert "Idaho." Montana is no name at all.

Mr. **Doolittle**. I hope not. I hope there will be no amendment at all. Montana sounds just as well as Idaho.

Mr. **Wilson** of Massachusetts. It has no meaning. The other has.

Mr. **Doolittle**. It has a meaning; it refers to the mountainous character of the country.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. **Harding**. I move to strike out of the first section all after the words "to wit," in the fourth line, to the word "the" in the 26th line, being the boundaries of the proposed territory, and in lieu of the words stricken out to insert:

"Beginning at a point to the middle channel of the Snake River, where the northern boundary of Oregon intersects the same; then following down said channel of Snake River to a point opposite the mouth of the Kooskooskia or Clearwater River; thence due north to the 49th parallel of latitude; thence east along said parallel to the 27th degree of longitude, west of Washington; thence south along said degree of longitude to the northern boundary of Colorado Territory; thence west along said boundary to the 33d degree of longitude west of Washington; thence north along said degree to the 42d parallel of latitude; thence west along said parallel to the eastern boundary of the State of Oregon; thence north along said boundary to the place of beginning."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

Mr. **Wilson** of Massachusetts. I renew the amendment to change the name from "Montana" to "Idaho."

Mr. **Doolittle**. As the bill has already been amended, and will have to go back to the House of Representatives, I do not care much about the name; and if it pleases my honorable friend from Massachusetts to call it Idaho instead of Montana, I am willing to yield to his suggestion.

Mr. **Harding**. I think the name of Idaho is much preferable to Montana. Montana, to my mind, signifies nothing at all. Idaho, in English, signifies "the gem of the mountains." This is a mountainous country, and the name Idaho is well understood in signification and orthography in all that country; and I prefer it to the present name.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time. The bill was read the third time.

Mr. Carlile called for yeas and nays on the passage of the bill, and they were ordered; and being taken, resulted—yeas 25, nays 12.

So the bill was passed.

The title was amended by striking out "Montana" and inserting "Idaho."

[From the Congressional Globe, Mar. 3, 1863 (House)]

Territory of Montana

An act (H.R. 738) to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Montana, returned from the Senate with amendments.

The amendments were read.

Mr. **Ashley**. I move that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendments, and ask a committee of conference.

Mr. **Sargent**. I hope that will not be done. I should somewhat hesitate to try the experiment of the gentleman from Ohio, a friend of this bill, at this very late hour of the session, thereby sending it back to the Senate, and hence to a committee of conference. I am as desirous of the passage of this bill as he is, but at the same time it is better to concur in the Senate amendments as they now stand, rather than to risk the loss of the bill entirely.

Mr. **Ashley**. I am very much obliged to the gentleman from California for his advice. The Committee on Territories have had this matter in charge, and I ask this House to nonconcur in the Senate amendments, and ask a committee of conference.

Mr. **Sargent**. I was not offering advice to the gentleman from Ohio. I do not presume to give him information on this or any subject; but as the bill relates to the erection of a Territory upon the Pacific, and as I am anxious for the passage of the bill, as I believe the gentleman himself is, I suggested to the House—not to the gentleman—that it might be well not to hazard the passage of the bill by nonconcurring in the amendments of the Senate at this late hour of the session. That seems to me to be good policy. I made the suggestion to the House, and the gentleman is under no obligation to me. I call the previous question.

The previous question was seconded, and the main question ordered.

Mr. **Wadsworth**. Is this a mere contest between the two names of Montana and Idaho?

Mr. **Ashley**. Oh, no; there is a change in the boundaries as well as in the name. I call for tellers on concurring in the amendments of the Senate.

The tellers were not ordered.

The amendments were concurred in—ayes 65, noes 33.

[From the Congressional Globe, Mar. 3, 1863 (Senate)]

Bills Become Laws

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Nicolay, his Secretary, announced that the President had this day, approved and signed the following bills and joint resolutions:

A bill (H.R. No. 738) to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Idaho.

SETTLEMENT OF GENERAL ANILINE & FILM CORP. CASE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last year I was pleased to support the bill authorizing the sale of the last major industry still held by the Federal Government under the alien property laws. Litigation over the ownership of General Analine & Film Corp. had continued for many years. It had come before the Supreme Court on two occasions. During this extended period, the corporation did not develop its full potential. It was clear that, if General Analine was to grow and extend its employment rolls, it should compete in the market on the same basis as did other private firms and under private management. The bill we passed last year was the necessary first step in bringing about that result.

Yesterday the Attorney General announced that an agreement for the sale of General Aniline had been completed. I ask unanimous consent that a press release from the Department of Justice concerning this matter be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of Justice,
March 3, 1963.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy today announced that the Department of Justice has secured an agreement in principle which will permit the Government both to sell the General Aniline & Film Corp. and to conclude 20 years of legal dispute over its ownership.

Mr. Kennedy said the agreement was reached with representatives of Interhandel, a Swiss holding company, which since 1943 has contested the Government's seizure of General Aniline as an enemy asset in 1942.

If the agreement is approved by Interhandel's stockholders and the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, the Attorney General will be able without further litigation to sell General Aniline on a competitive bid basis as authorized by Congress last fall, and divide the proceeds according to specific terms.

Mr. Kennedy said the exact amount each side would receive cannot be known until the sales price is known. However, if the sales price, as an example, is $200 million, the Government would receive about $140 million and Interhandel about $60 million, Mr. Kennedy said. If the price were $250 million, the Government's share would be about $170 million and Interhandel's about $85 million.

If the sales price were higher, Mr. Kennedy said, both the Government and Interhandel would receive correspondingly larger amounts.

General Aniline, known as GAF, is a large chemical and dye manufacturer, whose products include Ansco photographic equipment. Its headquarters are in New York City and it has plants in New York, New Jersey, Alabama, California, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Texas.

The Government seized 93.5 percent of the stock of the company in 1942 as a German asset under the Trading With the Enemy Act. Interhandel began administrative recovery action February 1, 1943, and took the case to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, October 29, 1948.

Interhandel has claimed that it, a Swiss corporation—and thus not a company of an enemy country—owned 89 percent of the stock seized. The Government has contended that Interhandel did not own the stock but was in reality a cloak for the actual owner, the I. G. Farbenindustrie, A.G., a giant German industrial firm.

The case has gone to the International Court of Justice once, the Supreme Court of the United States twice, the court of appeals a number of times and still has not come to trial. The case now is before a special master appointed by the district court.

Mr. Kennedy said Interhandel stockholders are expected to vote on the proposed settlement this month. If they approve, the Government and Interhandel would enter into a consent judgment, subject to the approval of the district court.

"The General Aniline Co. has been controlled by the Government through four administrations," Mr. Kennedy said. "The Government has sought to let the company operate in as free and competitive a manner as possible. In recent years, the company has done well and its net income in the first 6 months of 1962 was the highest in history.

"Nevertheless, our fundamental aim throughout has been for the Government to step out of its unnatural role as the owner of a private corporation, and to end the extensive litigation in this case.

"It is already the second oldest proceeding still pending in the Department of Justice. Substantial questions of fact and law still remain to be decided, both in American courts and in the International Court of Justice. Such litigation might last for a decade or longer.

"Even if the Government were to seek to sell General Aniline, as authorized in the Sales Act," Mr. Kennedy said, "the Government would be faced with from 1 to 3 years of litigation over its right to do so." "As soon as we would try to sell," he said, "the constitutionality of the Sales Act almost certainly would be challenged immediately.

"This settlement would permit us to sell the company to the highest American bidder; to increase considerably the war claims fund with our sales proceeds; to settle the pending claims in an equitable manner; and to bring to an end one of the longest and most complex court actions in history."

Since Interhandel has contested the ownership of only 89 percent of the GAF stock owned by the Government, the first 11 percent of the sales proceeds would go to the Government.

The proposed settlement provides that Interhandel and the Government each will receive half the proceeds from the remaining 89 percent. However, the settlement also provides that Interhandel, out of its share, would pay the Government nearly $24 million and will assume the defense of claim by 1,800 stockholders who have intervened in the suit, paying such claims as may be successful.

The $24 million payment would be for a disputed tax claim of $17,500,000 against Interhandel and for $6,430,000 on Interhandel shares previously accepted by the Government as dividends.

The proposed settlement also provides that the Government would retain $5,277,000 in cash dividends and cash seized at the time of the General Aniline seizure.

Interhandel representatives have given assurances that payment to the Swiss will be accomplished in a manner which will not adversely affect the U.S. balance-of-payments position.

The Attorney General will appoint a committee of financial experts to advise him on when and how to conduct the sealed-bid sale in order to secure the highest price. Mr. Kennedy said he would request Interhandel to suggest the name of at least one American expert to serve on this committee.

Government proceeds from the sale of GAF would go, by law and like other proceeds from alien property sales, into the War Claims Fund. This fund is used to pay claims to American citizens for injuries and property damage suffered at the hands of enemies during World War II and for other claims authorized by Congress.

Legal negotiations were conducted over a period of months with Dr. Alfred Schaefer, chairman of the board of Interhandel, John J. Wilson, Washington counsel for Interhandel in the long litigation and other representatives of the company, Mr. Kennedy said.

Interhandel's full name is the Societe Internationale pour Participations Industrielles et Commerciales S.A. "Interhandel" comes from its name in German, the International Industrie und Handelsbeteiligungen A.G., previously known as I. G. Chemie. The firm's headquarters are in Basle, Switzerland.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am glad to see this long-delayed move get underway. I commend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], for their persistence in bringing about the passage of the enabling legislation; and I commend the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] for his long study of the basic problem of vested enemy assets. I hope we will see the fruits of this sale in the form of higher employment, a vigorous management policy, and increased competition in the industry.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, last year Congress enacted legislation permitting the early return of the vast General Aniline & Film Co. to private American enterprise after 20 years of Government control. A bipartisan group in the House and Senate—led by Representatives HOWARD W. ROBISON and LEO O'BRIEN—joined several of us in the Senate in bringing this legislation to fruition after many years of delay and obstruction by its opponents. It was our view that this important company and its thousands of employees could reach levels of growth and prosperity under private enterprise which could not possibly be attained under continued Government management.

The Department of Justice has advised me that passage of this General Aniline & Film Co. sale legislation significantly strengthened the Government's hand in the negotiations leading to a settlement of the long drawn-out litigation over the ownership of General Aniline & Film Co. and that the actual sale of General Aniline & Film Co. will be accomplished on a competitive bid basis as authorized in the sale legislation. Certainly all of those who worked for the sale bill are delighted with its important contribution to the Government's efforts in this case.

It should be made clear, however, that under our bill, General Aniline & Film Co. could have been sold without any settlement of the pending suit and that nothing in our bill required a settlement on any particular terms.

It was the publicly stated position of the Department of Justice that any challenge to a sale of General Aniline & Film Co. during the pendency of the ownership litigation would be successfully overcome within a year.

Under these circumstances the terms of settlement are bound to strike some observers as extremely generous from the point of view of the United States. What the United States has agreed to, in effect, is a 50–50 split with Interhandel in the proceeds of the sale of the contested shares of stock with Interhandel agreeing to absorb tax and other claims in the neighborhood of some $24 million out of its share. The net total payment to Interhandel under these arrangements could exceed $60 million.

Any settlement of this magnitude deserves close scrutiny to make certain that it is in the interests of the United States. In the first instance, this will be the task of the district court, which will have to approve any consent judgment submitted by the parties. But, Congress also has a legitimate concern in this transaction, and congressional study of the settlement would not be at all inappropriate.

There is no suggestion that the Department of Justice has not been sufficiently zealous in the protection of the interests of the United States in arriving at this settlement. I recognize as a lawyer that there is no certainty in any. lawsuit and also that a settlement will lead to the disposition of GAF with the least amount of further delay.

At the same time, we cannot lose sight of a number of salient facts: First, that GAF is an extremely valuable asset of the Government; secondly, that hundreds of millions of dollars have been realized by the Government for payment to American war claimants out of the sales of other vested assets, in most cases with no settlement at all with the former owners and in no case with a settlement approaching this amount; thirdly, that any amount paid to Interhandel as a result of the sale of the stock of GAF will reduce the funds which would be available for payment to American war claimants—some of whom have received nothing on their war claims to this very day.

Charges have been made that a Government deal to turn GAF over to a Swiss cartel has been concluded under the direction of William H. Orrick, Jr., now Deputy Under Secretary of State and formerly Assistant Attorney General. The settlement announced today makes it obvious that these charges are without foundation. Under no view of the settlement can it be fairly said to constitute a transfer of GAF to Swiss control. On the contrary this settlement will guarantee, in accordance with the GAF sale bill, that GAF will be sold to American interests and never be returned, whether to its former German or alleged Swiss owners.

In order that the record may be complete on this issue, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks the text of a February 13, 1963, letter from me to Mr. Orrick on this very point and Mr. Orrick's reply of February 19.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 13, 1963.

Mr. WILLIAM H. ORRICK, Jr.,
Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ORRICK: It has been reported to me that you are in charge of negotiations for a possible settlement of the General Aniline case.

As you know, legislation was enacted during the last session of Congress authorizing the Government to sell this property despite the pending litigation as to its ownership. In my judgment, the continued operation of this company under Government management is a severe handicap to its growth and prosperity. Its sale to private enterprise on favorable terms, therefore, is a matter of considerable importance to the thousands of employees of the company and the communities in which it operates.

In the hearings on this legislation, Government representatives expressed complete confidence in the ultimate outcome of the pending litigation and any new suit challenging the constitutionality of the sale bill. Under these circumstances, I am concerned about the reports that the Government is contemplating a settlement which may involve a substantial payment to the litigants and which may serve to delay unreasonably the Government's disposition of this property.

Since this is a matter of particular importance to several areas in the State of New York, I would appreciate your furnishing me with full information with respect to this situation.

Your cooperation, as always, is very gratifying.

Very sincerely yours,
KENNETH B. KEATING.

FEBRUARY 19, 1963.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I have your letter of February 13 and appreciate your natural concern in the disposition of the General Aniline case.

As you undoubtedly know, I was intimately involved in this case when I was Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Divison. However, since I have been working in the Department of State for the last 9 months, I no longer have any direct responsibility over the General Aniline case, nor am I in charge of any of the negotiations which may look toward the eventual settlement of the case.

I can assure you, however, that from my experience in the Department of Justice and from my knowledge of the Attorney General's view of the case, the Government would not enter into any settlement which did not coincide with a fair estimate of the Government's case on the merits, or which would unreasonably delay the Government's disposal of the property.

May I suggest that the present officials in the Department of Justice would be in a better position than I to furnish you with a more complete and up-to-date status of any negotiations which may be in progress.

With best wishes, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM H. ORRICK, Jr.

Mr. KEATING. As will be noted, Mr. Orrick's reply categorically denies that he has had any direct responsibility over the General Aniline & Film case since joining the Department of State or that he is in charge of any of the negotiations which may look toward the eventual settlement of the case. I am disclosing this exchange of correspondence at this time in fairness to Mr. Orrick.

It may very well be that Swiss pressures were a factor in the willingness of U.S. officials to agree to the generous terms of this settlement. The General Aniline & Film litigation has been an irritant in United States-Swiss relations ever since Interhandel filed its suit, and I know that our Ambassador to Switzerland has been anxious for a settlement. In these circumstances, it is not unlikely that foreign policy considerations played as important a role as the merits of the case in inducing the United States to accept a 50–50 share of the proceeds with Interhandel.

General Aniline & Film is a major American concern with important facilities in a number of areas in New York. My major concern always has been to allow this company to operate under conditions which would best promote the welfare of the communities in which it operates and its thousands of employees. For this reason I am gratified that as a result of the General Aniline & Film sale bill we have moved very close to the day when this company can become part of the mainstream of our free enterprise system and reach its full potential of growth and prosperity, for the benefit of the stockholders, the employees, and the communities where the plants are located, all of whom have been unanimous in their desire to remove the dead hand of the Government from this company and return it to the free enterprise system.

I am hopeful also that this objective will be accomplished in a manner which fully protects and safeguards the interest of the United States.

CONTRADICTIONS ON CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as new and alarming information on Cuba comes to light, many persons are asking if the United States suffers from an intelligence gap.

It is becoming clearer each day that no such gap exists. The events of the past year, as the story of Soviet-Cuban aggression has slowly and painfully unwound, have shown that our intelligence community is hard at work, producing accurate information—in other words, "doing the job."

We do suffer, however, from unwillingness of our top officials to believe what our intelligence produces, from attempts to gloss over facts revealed by our intelligence, and in some instances attempts to suppress information entirely.

Last weekend the testimony of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. John McCone, given before the House Foreign Affairs on February 19, was released. His statements directly contradict Secretary of Defense McNamara's incredible assertions that Cuba is not being used as a base for subversion against other Latin American countries, and fully confirm statements I made on the Senate floor on January 31.

This is another of many striking instances in which high Government officials have first denied, then admitted, facts I have disclosed about Soviet activities in Cuba. These examples strongly suggest that the crisis of confidence now existing is more the result of refusal to convey hard truths to the American people than any gap in our intelligence capabilities.

On January 31 I said, with reference to Soviet activity in Cuba:

> What they are planning to do—in fact they are already doing it—is mount an increasing wave of sabotage, terrorism, political subversion and agitation throughout Latin America. Already riots in Venezuela, Peru, Brazil clearly and demonstrably are the work of Communists trained and armed in Cuba.

This was emphatically denied from the top level within a week. On February 6, in a 2-hour television presentation on Cuba, the Secretary of Defense said:

> I have no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion directed against Latin American countries. It is a matter that is of constant interest to us and one we are monitoring continuously.

If our Government is "monitoring continuously," as the Secretary said, how do we account for what happened only 8 days later? On February 19, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency flatly contradicted the Defense Secretary's statements. Mr. McCone told the House Foreign Affairs Committee:

> Fidel Castro is spurring and supporting the efforts of Communists and other revolutionary elements to overthrow and seize control of the governments in Latin America.

At another point, Mr. McCone states:

> Some guerrilla forces in Peru are equipped with Czech weapons which most probably came from Cuba.

How did that get by the "continuous monitoring" of the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. McCone also revealed that the trainees in Cuba are instructed to operate rifles and machineguns they would presumably steal or capture from local police or security units. They are being taught how to manufacture homemade "Molotov cocktail" bombs.

Comparing the terrorist tactics of the early Castro days with the present training, Mr. McCone said:

> Today the Cuban effort is far more sophisticated, more covert, and more deadly. In its professional tradecraft, it shows guidance and training by experienced Communist advisers from the Soviet bloc, including veteran Spanish Communists.

From a news conference held February 28 we learned that Soviet bombers have been tracking U.S. aircraft carriers for some time. An announcement of flights which occurred from January 27 to February 22 was made, according to news reports, 6 days later, on February 28. Interestingly enough one of the Soviet planes flew over the carrier *Forrestal*, just off Gibraltar, on February 22. Many are wondering whether the fact that a group of editors and publishers were aboard, and saw the overflight, encouraged the Defense Department to at last release this interesting information the day before the *Forrestal* docked with the newspapermen aboard.

Examples such as this suggest that the crisis of credibility is not the result of any intelligence gap but rather the result of a gap in disclosing information to the public.

According to many reliable press reports covering the events of the past year, CIA Director McCone was warning as early as last August that the Soviets probably would place offensive missiles in Cuba. As substantiation for his position gradually came into the public view—first through unchecked refugee reports, then through thoroughly checked intelligence material, and later through statements of alarmed Members of Congress of both parties—our Government kept busy denying everything. At last, on October 22, when the President clamped down a blockade, the frightening facts were suddenly officially unloaded on the American people.

There are disturbing indications that an attempt is being made to use the intelligence community as a scapegoat and whipping boy for the present crisis of confidence in the Government's handling of the Cuban situation. No intelligence system is perfect, and it may be that problems of coordination and cooperation have hampered the CIA's effectiveness on some occasions. In my judgment, however, we would be placing the onus on the wrong source if we blamed the fact gatherers rather than the policymakers for the failure to give the American people an accurate and complete picture of Communist activities in Cuba.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to fill the Republican vacancy on the National Forest Reservation Commission.

The Chair appoints the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] chairman of the Special Committee on Aging, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], as members of the special committee.

To the Mexico Interparliamentary Group, the Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem], and the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel].

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, March 7, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 4, 1963:

United Nations

Charles F. Baldwin, of the District of Columbia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Federation of Malaya, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America to the 19th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

U.S. Marshal

Paul G. April, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Hampshire for the term of 4 years, vice Royal Dion, resigned.

Mississippi River Commission

Brig. Gen. Robert F. Seedlock, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress, approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37) (33 U.S.C. 642), vice Brig. Gen. Jackson Graham, reassigned.

Postmasters

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Liberty B. Todd, Attalla, Ala., in place of W. L. Mason, deceased.

William H. McCarty, Moulton, Ala., in place of J. C. Weatherwax, deceased.

ARKANSAS

Leslie H. Johnson, Hackett, Ark., in place of O. E. Mathis, retired.

Milton M. Hemingway, McGehee, Ark., in place of H. G. Boyd, deceased.

Joe D. Taylor, Plainview, Ark., in place of Leola Garner, retired.

James E. Landes, Stamps, Ark., in place of B. R. Tatom, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Laura B. Morgan, Clayton, Calif., in place of J. D. Bloching, resigned.

Alice O. Mills, Finley, Calif., in place of D. K. Manning, retired.

Edgar L. King, Stratford, Calif., in place of O. L. Edman, retired.

Lee B. Downs, Whittier, Calif., in place of W. H. Mitchener, retired.

DELAWARE

Thomas Holcomb, New Castle, Del., in place of A. P. Gallagher, retired.

FLORIDA

Myrla M. Bishop, Archer, Fla., in place of E. L. Grantham, retired.

Ross C. Marler, Destin, Fla., in place of Nellie Baker, resigned.

Ruth A. Childers, Florahome, Fla., in place of F. R. Cook, deceased.

J. Donald Carter, Fort Myers Beach, Fla., in place of Charles Wyland, deceased.

Daniel D. Clements, Land O'Lakes, Fla., in place of A. M. Douglas, retired.

A. Edward Hoyt, Port Richey, Fla., in place of T. R. Hillsamer, resigned.

GEORGIA

Charles E. Garrett, Alley, Ga., in place of G. B. McIntyre, retired.

Newt S. Hinton, Porterdale, Ga., in place of B. C. Chapman, retired.

C. Wayne Shannon, Preston, Ga., in place of J. S. Rees, transferred.

IDAHO

Don C. Chrystal, Bovill, Idaho, in place of E. R. David, retired.

Elmer M. Fetzer, Paul, Idaho, in place of E. R. Morgan, retired.

ILLINOIS

James C. Hobbs, Abingdon, Ill., in place of J. W. Lucas, resigned.

Charles E. Resch, Anna, Ill., in place of Frank Keistler, Jr., declined.

Peter W. Bast, Ashland, Ill., in place of Pearl Caswell, removed.

Lola M. Baumunk, Bardolph, Ill., in place of J. L. Baumunk, retired.

Rudolph E. Beranek, Berwyn, Ill., in place of J. J. A. Borkovec, retired.

Joseph F. Alfeld, Carrollton, Ill., in place of M. D. Dowdall, retired.

Verna H. Welsh, Durand, Ill., in place of Lillie Doyle, retired.

Arthur J. Lawrence, East Alton, Ill., in place of E. R. Hill, deceased.

Richard C. Hazer, Elizabeth, Ill., in place of E. J. Coveny, deceased.

Robert A. Smith, Elvaston, Ill., in place of J. N. Cunningham, retired.

Clifford L. Lehman, Eureka, Ill., in place of C. B. O'Marah, retired.

William H. Haycraft, Franklin, Ill., in place of W. A. Tranbarger, transferred.

Charles J. Nash, Greenville, Ill., in place of D. J. McAlister, retired.

Edythe A. Grover, Hamburg, Ill., in place of E. F. Day, retired.

Paul D. Jordan, Herscher, Ill., in place of A. C. Westphal, retired.

L. Dale Wingo, Kenney, Ill., in place of Enid Trowbridge, retired.

Dona J. Beard, Leaf River, Ill., in place of A. L. McCaw, resigned.

Richard J. Thilmony, Loda, Ill., in place of H. E. Goodell, retired.

Ora K. Reid, Media, Ill., in place of R. E. Sullivan, deceased.

John R. Ryan, Mundelein, Ill., in place of C. E. Teson, retired.

Morris A. Mettendorf, Neoga, Ill., in place of J. V. Worland, retired.

Anton Macrowski, Jr., North Chicago, Ill., in place of W. H. Woodard, retired.

Norbert W. Haberer, Pocahontas, Ill., in place of H. F. Mounger, transferred.

Leo A. Hayes, Ramsey, Ill., in place of O. W. Hinton, removed.

Charles F. Schultz, Reynolds, Ill., in place of B. W. Sharp, retired.

Leonard M. Koeberlein, St. Elmo, Ill., in place of P. E. Ball, retired.

Wendell L. Smith, Sandwich, Ill., in place of J. R. Montgomery, retired.

G. Kenneth Furrer, San Jose, Ill., in place of F. E. Smith, retired.

W. Rex Butler, Saybrook, Ill., in place of E. E. Tipsord, transferred.

G. Clark Ewing, Sheldon, Ill., in place of W. G. McEwan, deceased.

Ralph F. Bennett, Sidell, Ill., in place of C. W. Pyle, retired.

William J. Murphy, Stockton, Ill., in place of F. C. Niemeyer, deceased.

Kenneth B. Lorenson, Sullivan, Ill., in place of G. C. Miller, retired.

Gerald A. Melvin, Tamaroa, Ill., in place of J. E. Lee, removed.

Edwin B. Wirth, Techny, Ill., in place of W. E. Halvey, resigned.

William E. Morgan, Tennessee, Ill., in place of B. P. Hodges, retired.

Dorothy E. Anderson, Thomasboro, Ill., in place of A. J. Ulrich, retired.

Donovan O. Hutchins, Viola, Ill., in place of F. H. Weihler, transferred.

John R. Graves, Virginia, Ill., in place of C. R. Wilson, retired.

Warden D. White, Wayne City, Ill., in place of Ira Dezouche, retired.

INDIANA

Andrew E. Street, Crane, Ind., in place of J. F. O'Neal, retired.

Charles R. Forgey, Freetown, Ind., in place of C. J. Bebout, retired.

George R. Bills, Lewisville, Ind., in place of G. C. Davison, retired.

IOWA

Clifford S. Heng, Cylinder, Iowa, in place of Mary Coway, retired.

Iva M. Mauck, Garwin, Iowa, in place of E. L. Ochs, retired.

Don H. Richards, Hinton, Iowa, in place of W. A. Spies, transferred.

Cecil C. Ramsdell, Toledo, Iowa, in place of C. E. Brandt, retired.

Glenn W. Fleck, Vinton, Iowa, in place of H. E. Carrier, resigned.

KANSAS

Burgess L. Stephenson, Leoti, Kans., in place of E. F. Giesick, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Edward A. Runyan, Marion, Ky., in place of H. G. McConnell, deceased.

James C. Tracy, Smithland, Ky., in place of H. B. Rappolee, retired.

LOUISIANA

Rhea L. McIlveene, Cotton Valley, La., in place of J. A. Moody, retired.

Nelson J. Falcon, Duson, La., in place of R. D. Comeaux, transferred.

Frances B. Farmer, Princeton, La., in place of A. H. McWilliams, resigned.

MAINE

Lorraine J. Bragdon, North Vassalboro, Maine, in place of M. E. Donnelly, retired.

Lloyd E. Beckett, Thomaston, Maine, in place of D. P. George, retired.

MARYLAND

Richard H. Bates, Branchville, Md., in place of F. K. Hazard, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Harry W. Vozella, Franklin, Mass., in place of C. H. Carlson, retired.

MINNESOTA

Charles C. Lenz, Ellsworth, Minn., in place of L. N. Riley, retired.

Harold A. Legatt, Rice, Minn., in place of M. A. Marchand, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Norman E. Snowden, Collinsville, Miss., in place of I. E. Blanks, retired.

Samuel L. Westmoreland, Houlka, Miss., in place of A. N. Graves, retired.

MISSOURI

Lawrence O. Kinyon, Forsyth, Mo., in place of J. V. Moore, retired.

MONTANA

L. Preston Blakeley, Absarokee, Mont., in place of J. W. Campbell, retired.

Lois M. Walker, Wolf Creek, Mont., in place of M. E. Jacobson, retired.

NEBRASKA

Donald F. Carey, Bancroft, Nebr., in place of W. C. Schleusener, retired.

Norman I. Anderson, Concord, Nebr., in place of E. J. Hughes, retired.

NEVADA

Maxine A. Anderson, Verdi, Nev., in place of E. E. Ubbins, deceased.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Roger E. Hebert, Hooksett, N.H., in place of D. P. St. Germain, deceased.

Martin J. Keenan, Jr., Peterborough, N.H., in place of M. J. Keenan, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Calvin L. Naylor, Blackwood, N.J., in place of J. A. Beetle, resigned.

Joseph J. Stahley, East Brunswick, N.J. Office established April 1, 1959.

Thelma C. Cooper, Navesink, N.J., in place of C. C. Cooper, deceased.

Richard M. Johnson, Ridgefield, N.J., in place of H. J. Formon, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

R. Warner Dutro, Anthony, N. Mex., in place of A. N. Ealy, removed.

Artenia L. Crick, Williamsburg, N. Mex., in place of T. B. Williams, removed.

NEW YORK

John P. Frey, Atlantic Beach, N.Y., in place of Catherine Damme, retired.

James F. Hill, Centerport, N.Y., in place of Elizabeth Zoeller, retired.

Marie L. Murray, Ellington, N.Y., in place of R. M. Seekins, retired.

George L. Nelson, Glen Head, N.Y., in place of J. T. McLaughlin, retired.

John W. Carroll, Jr., Great Neck, N.Y., in place of E. F. Higgins, retired.

Hugh E. Birdslow, Lacona, N.Y., in place of G. C. Edick, retired.

John W. McCormick, Maine, N.Y., in place of I. E. Tymeson, retired.

Gerard R. T. O'Grady, Malverne, N.Y., in place of K. R. Brewer, retired.

Ruby L. Folds, Maple View, N.Y., in place of M. W. Newton, retired.

Joan C. Jendral, Mastic Beach, N.Y., in place of C. S. Jendral, deceased.

Dominic A. Amuso, Mount Kisco, N.Y., in place of Bernard Daley, retired.

Mary A. Jones, Oyster Bay, N.Y., in place of D. V. Walker, retired.

Ella N. DeLaire, Prospect, N.Y., in place of E. B. Dailey, retired.

Walter F. Schlener, Sardinia, N.Y., in place of M. C. Cudoba, deceased.

William B. Mackey, Schenectady, N.Y., in place of J. F. Connelly, deceased.

Victor W. Humel, Shirley, N.Y., in place of F. M. Landau, deceased.

Louis P. Kriss, West Islip, N.Y. Office established September 15, 1958.

Michael J. Taylor, Whitney Point, N.Y., in place of M. C. Wilcox, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

George B. Herndon, Fayetteville, N.C., in place of W. M. Shaw, retired.

OHIO

Frank I. Miller, Ada, Ohio, in place of V. W. Spellman, retired.

Kathryn E. Peters, Arcadia, Ohio, in place of L. M. Crawford, retired.

Herbert G. Wright, Grand Rapids, Ohio, in place of J. P. Minnick, retired.

Emmet F. Millard, Oregonia, Ohio, in place of R. E. Sherwood, retired.

Wesley D. Wickline, Rio Grande, Ohio, in place of L. A. Myers, retired.

Billy H. Ten Eyck, Vanburen, Ohio, in place of E. G. Duffield, retired.

Kenneth H. Haynes, Whitehouse, Ohio, in place of A. N. Weckerly, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Earl A. Moore, Boley, Okla., in place of L. L. Dolphin, retired.

William R. Kilgore, Sr., Idabel, Okla., in place of T. F. Bonner, deceased.

OREGON

Ned Palmer, Dayton, Oreg., in place of F. B. Willert, retired.

Vernon E. Stewart, Haines, Oreg., in place of M. E. Potter, retired.

Eva L. Albert, Trail, Oreg., in place of I. H. Howe, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jack A. Lanager, Clearfield, Pa., in place of A. R. Hinkle, retired.

Daniel J. Gildea, Coaldale, Pa., in place of J. M. Donahue, deceased.

Richard D. Hetrick, Easton, Pa., in place of H. C. Schultz, retired.

Shirley G. Marmer, Frederick, Pa., in place of Howard Hasson, deceased.

George W. Nase, Tylersport, Pa., in place of N. W. Nase, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ralph E. Edenfield, North Augusta, N.C. Office established October 2, 1961.

TENNESSEE

Gladys I. Price, Saint Bethlehem, Tenn., in place of C. B. Young, retired.

John E. Griffith, South Pittsburg, Tenn., in place of Lois McReynolds, retired.

TEXAS

Charlie T. Cummings, Alvarado, Tex., in place of E. P. Robinson, retired.

Marjorie W. Duncan, Bedias, Tex., in place of Lallie Griffith, retired.

A. Earl Beck, Dumas, Tex., in place of G. K. Denman, deceased.

Mary N. Barger, Goree, Tex., in place of E. L. Chamberlain, resigned.

Gilma C. Jones, Graford, Tex., in place of L. M. Dye, retired.

Maurice P. Long, Mount Vernon, Tex., in place of W. L. Nelson, deceased.

Preston R. Wheeler, Slaton, Tex., in place of T. E. McClanahan, retired.

VERMONT

Robert H. Lawrence, South Hero, Vt., in place of C. S. Joslyn, retired.

VIRGINIA

Annie D. Berry, Madison, Va., in place of E. S. Cave, retired.

WASHINGTON

Jean M. Olson, Manchester, Wash., in place of M. E. Randall, retired

Dorothy E. Bjornsgaard, Rosburg, Wash., in place of L. H. Olson, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Cora M. Smith, Lost Creek, W. Va., in place of G. P. Rector, retired.

Clyde E. McClung, Reedy, W. Va., in place of M. C. Carpenter, retired.

WISCONSIN

Daniel A. Wirkus, Edgar, Wis., in place of F. J. Shortner, retired.

Raymond A. Austad, Hawkins, Wis., in place of F. W. Anderson, deceased.

Charles F. Held, Jackson, Wis., in place of A. W. Quade, deceased.

Irene L. Genisot, Montreal, Wis., in place of F. M. Kirby, retired.

Charles M. Bruner, Prentice, Wis., in place of C. A. Lundborg, retired.

Donald C. Tuttle, Suamico, Wis., in place of Ambrose Sheedy, deceased.

George P. Grabarec, Union Grove, Wis., in place of E. K. Sheen, retired.

Elmer F. Crowell, Wittenberg, Wis., in place of K. C. Meisner, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 4, 1963:

National Labor Relations Board

John Harold Fanning, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring December 16, 1967, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Commissioner of Education

Dr. Francis Keppel, of Massachusetts, to be Commissioner of Education, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Labor Department

Daniel Patrick Moynihan, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

National Mediation Board

Howard G. Gamser, of New York, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1966.

Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review

George C. Trevorrow, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for the remainder of the term expiring July 15, 1965.

Public Health Service

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

I. FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS APPOINTMENT

To be surgeons

David Frost
Raymond T. Moore
Patricia K. Roberts
Paul G. Smith
Wesley W. Wieland

To be senior assistant surgeons

Scott I. Allen
Ronald L. McCartney
William P. McElwain
Will L. Nash
Milton Z. Nichaman
Stuart C. Nottingham
Raphael T. Nussdorf
S. David Rockoff
Bruce I. Shackter
Leland L. Sprague

To be dental surgeon

Edward A. Graykowski

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Richard R. Baker
Meade E. Butler
Richard Q. Dunn
Donald W. Johnson
James V. Petersen
Keith J. Ryan
John W. Topping, Jr.
Dale S. Pyke

To be senior sanitary engineer

John H. McCutchen

To be sanitary engineer

Theodore C. Ferris

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Oscar E. Dickason
Rodger L. Leupold
Albert C. Printz, Jr.

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

Fred O. Bridges
Troy Marceleno
Walter S. Smith

To be senior assistant pharmacist

Robert Frankel

To be assistant pharmacists

Donald E. Hill
John J. Lucas
Donnie L. Powell

To be senior scientist

Richard B. Eads

To be scientist

Thomas W. Haines

To be senior assistant scientist

McWilson Warren

To be sanitarian

Francis J. Goldsmith

To be senior assistant sanitarians

Donald R. Johnston
Gerald J. Karches
Arthur L. Kenney

To be assistant sanitarians

Joseph Lovett
Thomas C. Rozzell

To be veterinary officer

Robert L. Rausch

To be senior assistant veterinary officer

Calvin E. Sevy

To be nurse officers

Agnes Des Marais
Mary J. McGee
Marjorie E. Myren

To be senior assistant nurse officer

Marion N. Keagle

To be senior assistant therapist

Gordon S. Pocock

To be assistant therapists

Richard S. Mazzacone
Herbert R. Pruett

To be health services officer

Viola L. Cunningham

II. FOR CONFIRMATION OF RECESS PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

Richard D. Grundy

To be assistant sanitary engineer

William A. Felsing, Jr.

To be senior veterinary officer

Lauri Luoto

To be senior assistant nurse officer

Juanita M. Barkley

To be senior assistant health services officer

Martha G. Barclay

III. FOR APPOINTMENT

To be senior assistant surgeons

Morton G. Miller
Roger W. Schuler

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Allen Doorn
Earl F. Pierce, Jr.

To be assistant sanitary engineers

John J. Henderson
Thomas C. Tucker

To be assistant therapists

C. Douglas Billion
James L. Witt

IV. FOR PERMANENT PROMOTION

To be senior assistant therapist

Richard S. Mazzacone

To be senior surgeon

Joseph C. Robinson

To be surgeon

Jerry C. Rosenberg

To be senior assistant surgeons

N. Burton Attico
John P. Blake
Ormond V. Brody
Rawser P. Crank, Jr.
Anthony N. Damato
Raymond A. Dieter, Jr.
Rodney G. Elliott
Frank P. Greene
Wallace H. Holthaus
James E. Maynard
Leslie G. Nelson
Thomas B. Stucker
Christfried J. Urner

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Paul L. Beckley
Douglas G. Bell
William F. Bird
Clinton C. Cox
Stanford E. Hamburger
John S. Huling, Jr.
Val D. Jensen
Orlen N. Johnson
Sanford Krotenberg
Winslow B. Lee
Gene P. Lewis
Rollie W. Lyman
Glenn W. Smith
John J. Timmermans

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Francis M. McGowan
Donald W. Mantay
Francis G. Mattern
Donald G. Remark
Lowel A. Van Den Berg

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

B. David Clark
Walter W. Liberick, Jr.
Edgar D. Preissner

To be assistant pharmacist

Henry W. Winship III

To be junior assistant pharmacist

James C. Yatsco

To be scientist

Samuel L. Buker

To be senior assistant sanitarians

John R. Bagby, Jr.
Harry Haverland
Wendall C. McElwee
Gene W. McElyea

To be assistant sanitarian

Gerald J. Lauer

To be veterinary officer

James R. Ganaway

To be senior assistant veterinary officers

Carl E. Miller
Robert D. Phemister

To be senior assistant dietitians

Lois R. Seidler
Betty J. Shuler

To be senior assistant therapists

John B. Allis
Thelma L. Reeder

To be assistant therapist

Gary L. Smidt

To be health services officer

David D. Haworth

To be senior assistant health services officer

Robert H. Bradford

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 50th Anniversary of the U.S. Department of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, during the 50 years since its formal organization on March 4, 1913, the U.S. Department of Labor has faithfully and fully discharged its mission to "foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment." The Department has served equally both organized and unorganized labor in accordance with the best interests of the American people as a whole, and has been directly responsible for much beneficial change which has been achieved.

It is altogether fitting that we, as a nation, should pause to pay tribute to the U.S. Department of Labor as it marks the completion of a half-century of service in the public interest. As a member of the President's Committee for the Department of Labor 50th Anniversary Year, I am gratified to note that popular recognition of the meaningful contributions of the Department has been widespread and sincere. Citizens realize the importance and desirability of a well-conceived and effective governmental agency staffed by experienced and dedicated experts who seek to promote healthy cooperation and justice in areas of labor-management concern.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and earlier, as a member of the Labor Committee in the House of Representatives under President Franklin D. Roosevelt and President Harry S. Truman, it has been my responsibility to aid in the drafting and passage of significant legislation designed to support the efforts of the Department of Labor and advance the well-being of American working men and women. Much has been achieved in creating safer and more healthful working conditions, workman's compensation and rehabilitation benefits, sound labor standards, unemployment insurance, impartial mediation, and many other functions which have created in America the healthiest working climate in the world.

During the New Deal administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, as a Member of the House of Representatives I was privileged to support a number of far-reaching measures which were instrumental in strengthening and raising the status of labor. Although trade unionism had been previously established in the United States it was under legislation of the New Deal era that the employer was first enjoined from interfering with the workers' right to organize; moreover, the employer was additionally obligated to recognize unions and to bargain with them in good faith. These provisions came into being under the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, often termed the Magna Carta of labor, and was one of the New Deal's major contributions to economic and social justice.

Two other pieces of meaningful legislation enacted during this period were, the Government Contracts Act of 1936, and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. The first required that persons employed by Government contractors must be paid not less than the standard minimum wage determined by the Secretary of Labor; while the latter established the principle of a universal floor under wages and a universal standard for hours in interstate commerce. It is interesting to note that the concept that the worker has the right to share in the benefits flowing from America's rising capacity to produce enjoyed its greatest legislative implementation during the New Deal.

And, it has become abundantly clear that the Department of Labor, through its many and diverse functions, has been instrumental in seeking more effective application of the Employment Act of 1946. This monumental piece of legislation was, according to the respected economist Gerhard Colm, "an expression of the peoples determination that appropriate Government policies would be used to avert depressions and unemployment. It was, in a way, an expression of confidence that a satisfactory economic performance could be accomplished within the framework of a free society; not through a policy of laissez faire, but through deliberate economic and fiscal measures."

It is in the areas of formulating and implementing these measures to uphold the performance of the economy as a whole that the Department of Labor has exhibited outstanding and consistent leadership. The Department has effectively demonstrated that we can, through diligent and imaginative effort, achieve the goals of the Employment Act of 1946, namely: To reach maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

The battle is far from over, however, and many challenges must be overcome before we realize the full intent of the Employment Act. Our country is engaged in a worldwide effort to prove that an economy based on free enterprise and free institutions can be adapted to fit the needs of a complex industrial society. Deliberate governmental policies, programs and implementation will be required, and it is in this area that the U.S. Department of Labor will continue to serve the American people as it has for the past 50 years.

The Department will aid in the drafting of legislation, it will regulate the administration of law, it will mediate labor disputes, and will act as a factfinding and statistical service. But, most important, it will serve to protect the interest of American workers and American employers, and through them, it will safeguard every citizen of this Nation.

Let us join in offering heartiest congratulations to the Department on this, its 50th anniversary. May the next half century prove even more fruitful.

Amendment to Administrative Expenses Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which is aimed at correcting an inequality in the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended.

The act provides that appropriations for the departments shall be available for travel and transportation expenses of student trainees when promoted upon completion of college work to positions for which there is determined by the Civil Service Commission to be a manpower shortage.

Ostensibly, the act provides authority for all student trainees who, upon graduation are placed in shortage category positions. Actually, a small group of trainees, approximately 50 each year, are excluded from coverage. Although assuming full professional status upon graduation, these trainees do not, at that time, receive a promotion to a higher grade. These are the trainees covered by special training agreements between their employing agencies and the Civil Service Commission. These agreements are desirable, because of critical shortages in some occupations, to provide for more rapid advancements of trainees. This small group has, prior to graduation, already reached the grade level to which the majority of the trainees are promoted at the time of graduation.

This perfecting amendment to the Administrative Expenses Act is intended to provide the same authority for payment to all student trainees, whether or not a promotion to a higher grade level at the time of graduation is involved. Enactment of this amendment will affect very few employees but will remove a potential source of irritation over unequal treatment of two groups of employees.

The annual cost of the transportation expenses provided for by this amendment is estimated to be between $15,000 and $20,000. This does not represent any increase in Federal expenditures over earlier cost estimates for this purpose since Public Law 86–587 was enacted on the assumption that all student trainees moving into shortage category positions upon graduation would be eligible to receive these payments.

Save Your Vision Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, today is the first day of Save Your Vision Week and I would not like it to pass without a word of commendation for the work of our optometrists who sponsor this observance annually through their professional society, the American Optometric Association.

Largely through the efforts of our 18,000 practicing optometrists this Nation has the highest standards of vision care in the world. How important this is we realize when we consider that more than 80 percent of our knowledge comes to us through that most precious sense of all, our vision.

To those Members of Congress who are or have been the beneficiaries of optometric services, there should be little need for emphasizing the importance of good vision in our daily pursuits. However, we are apt to take this for granted. And yet, when we break, lose, or leave our glasses at home, we find our productivity—and disposition—greatly impaired. We become different persons, with newly imposed limitations of mobility and accomplishment until our eyeglasses are again at hand and our keenness of vision restored.

Among our duties as representatives of this great Nation are the promotion and development of its free enterprise system. Its continued progress depends in part on how efficiently its operations are conducted. Better vision contributes considerably to such efficiency, so therefore I wish to voice our appreciation to the American Optometric Association and its State affiliates for their public educational programs which alert all of us to the latest techniques and procedures of optometric care. Surely the efficiency of our productive and educational systems has been raised by attention to such care.

Because of the excellent services of our 18,000 optometrists, 60 million American men, women, and children are getting more out of life and giving more to others in both work and play.

There are some 400 optometrists commissioned in our armed services who are making an outstanding contribution to our national defense. America is indebted to its professional vision specialists for their contributions to our total well being.

Yet, there is a great unmet need, for statistical evidence has come to my attention that two out of three adults have inefficient vision which can handicap their work and personal job advancement opportunities.

During National Save Your Vision Week, it is proper that we recognize both our high vision standards and our unmet vision needs.

We should always be mindful of the fact that our modern pace of living is making ever-increasing demands on our vision capabilities.

Independence Day of Morocco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, the Republic of Morocco celebrated the anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, I wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Majesty, King Hassan II; and His Excellency, the Moroccan Ambassador to the United States, Ali Benjelloun.

Late last year, yet another momentous event of modern reform occurred in independent Morocco when the King promulgated a constitution whereby the Moroccan people would be able to take part in the governing of their country. This constitution, promised to the people by the late and great King, Mohammed V, and now fulfilled by his son, Hassan II, the present ruler, established the King as hereditary chief executive and a parliament. It also created all people of Morocco equal, with no discrimination against any minority. Women were given equal rights with men.

The constitution is the culmination of the democratic processes of law initiated when Morocco achieved its independence from the French on March 2, 1956. On that date, the French Government rescinded the Treaty of Fez of March 30, 1912, which had established the French protectorate, and had recognized the independence of Morocco. The French protectorate had ended an independent kingdom which had been founded by the

Arabs in the eighth century. At one time, the Moroccan cities of Fez and Marrakesh were considered to be the most prominent seats of learning in the world. The Moroccans were unable to stem the tide of French expansionism, though, and fell prey to colonial rule. Resistance persisted, however, and became an active force to contend with when the French deposed their beloved Sultan, Mohammed V, in 1953. At this time the entire nation rose up against the French and demanded independence. Three years of bitter struggle were to ensue before sovereignty was achieved.

Since its independence, the country has progressed toward modernization. Faced with a 92-percent illiteracy rate, the Government has placed emphasis on education projects. By the end of this year, all children of primary school age will be enrolled in schools. Agriculture and industry have also been stressed to relieve the rampant unemployment situation. Morocco is now the world's second largest producer and leading exporter of phosphates. A new 5-year plan has inaugurated several irrigation projects to reclaim new lands for agriculture development.

Relations with the United States have been amicable. The U.S. Government has aided the Moroccan people at times when the need was great. The drought of 1961 and the Agadir earthquake were only two disasters for which we extended a helping hand. Hassan II is expected in this country in the near future to continue the furtherance of these friendly relations.

In its own sphere of influence, the King is attempting to establish closer collaboration between the countries of north Africa—Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco—thus creating a union more able to compete successfully with other nations of the world. He is also assuming a position of stature among the other African nations. It is his dream that Morocco may once more resume the leadership that it once held before French intervention.

We in the United States recognize the accomplishments of the people of Morocco and salute them on their independence day anniversary. It is with sincere expectations that the relations between our two countries remain amicable, that they may prove to be a symbol to other nations in promoting world peace.

Federal Inventions Administrations Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which if passed will be known as the Federal Inventions Administration Act.

The bill prescribes a national policy with respect to the encouragement of invention by employees of the Government and its contractors, the result of which would be many contributions to the advancement of the Nation's welfare. It aims to achieve this objective by providing for the simplified administration in the public interest of the property rights to inventions resulting from research or development which is financed at least in part through the expenditure of public funds.

In many respects the bill represents a compromise between the extreme views voiced by various individuals in congressional hearings which have been held in recent years. The bill provides that in every case the Government would obtain a royalty-free, nonexclusive license to use any invention arising from a Government-sponsored research or development project. Title to each such invention and any patents covering it would remain with the inventor or his assignee subject to one condition: Instead of just owning the patent and optionally doing nothing about the invention, he has to put it into commercial use either on his own or by licensing someone else to make, use, or sell it. The patent owner has 5 years within which to do this after the patent issues, and if he fails to do it by then the Government can step in, take back title to the patent, and reassign it to someone who gives assurances he will put the invention into public use.

The cardinal objectives of the bill are to get into actual circulation as many as possible of the inventions which stem from Government-sponsored research, and to encourage qualified contractors to seek Government contracts. It should eliminate the objections which many concerns have had with respect to the policies of such agencies as the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration whose enabling statutes require that almost all inventions made in the performance of their contracts be assigned to the Government. Contractors who have been clamoring that they should be allowed to hold on to the patent rights will get them, but they will not be able to suppress them. In recognition of the public's interest in those inventions, which public funds helped to make possible, the inventions will have to be "put to work" publicly.

Government employees who make inventions will be treated in the same way as Government contractors. They can keep or assign title to their inventions, but within the stated time interval they also must establish that the inventions have been publicly utilized or forfeit their right to keep title. This provision should help the Government agencies to recruit and retain scientific and technical personnel who might otherwise be tempted to leave the Government for higher paying positions in industry.

Another feature of the bill is the proviso that any Government contractor who seeks to take advantage of the title-retention rights which it provides must install an approved award and rewards program. According to that program, any of the contractor's employees making an invention while working on the Government contract will be eligible to receive cash rewards for his efforts. This provision is similar in some respects to laws now in force in some European countries which require all employers to give their employee-inventors a share of the profits derived from their inventions over and above any normal salary considerations which may be in effect. Such awards programs are, of course, not unknown in the United States, as many domestic corporations have used such means for years in order to stimulate the inventive activity of their personnel.

Administration of the proposed law would be entrusted to an Office of Federal Inventions, established in the Department of Commerce. The single Office and Government-wide administration of a uniform law should effect tremendous economies, as it would make unnecessary the comparable offices now functioning in practically every Government department and agency for the purpose of settling matters dealing with inventions made by Government employees and contractors.

Statement by Hon. Jacob H. Gilbert, 22d District of New York, Before Committee on Education and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my statement to the Committee on Education and Labor, concerning the important subject of assistance to the youth of our Nation:

> Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Education and Labor, I am grateful for this opportunity to speak on a subject which is of vast importance and which should be of great concern to all of us—assistance to the youth of our Nation.
>
> My bill, H.R. 2396, to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps is before you for consideration. May I say at the outset, that I am also heartily in favor of another bill before you, based upon the President's recommendations, to provide jobs for youths in the city as well as in the countryside, the Youth Employment Act.
>
> It is a tragic fact that there is a lost generation growing up in our great country with no skills and little hope; that there are about 700,000 young people looking for jobs; jobs are unavailable to them; a high percentage are school dropouts, who need the opportunity to work if they are to be saved from a life of delinquency and crime.
>
> Mobilization for Youth on New York's Lower East Side, which operates under grants from the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, is probably one of the most far-reaching programs to help school dropouts and other problem youths; it has proved conclusively that youths want to work; that they prefer employment to idleness and the evils created by idleness; they need to feel useful and wanted.
>
> The Youth Conservation Corps has aroused great interest among school and youth officials and the youth of our Nation; it would put young men to work in our National and State forests, tackling the $8 billion backlog of needed conservation work. Ten hours' weekly training and basic educational skills would be provided, and the complex tools and equipment the young men would use in their work would provide them with many skills needed in industry today.
>
> The number of school dropouts, in urban and rural areas both, has reached tremendous proportions. Communities cannot meet the problems alone; the fullest Federal assistance possible is required if we are to meet the problem in a constructive manner and if we are to develop and conserve the human resources represented by the army of young people now denied employment and usefulness. Many thousands of young people exist under terrible conditions in the slums of our cities; many belong to minority groups and suffer from discrimination and lack of job opportunities; they live without hope and their futures are bleak. Certainly, these countless young people are to be given a helping hand and hope for a brighter future, the gratification brought by employment, and the opportunity to take their places as working, respected, members of their communities. To take a boy out of an atmosphere of defeat and slum existence and to place him under the guidance of people who care about him, is to provide him with hope and incentive.
>
> It was recently pointed out in hearings on this question that the $100 million annual cost of the program advocated by the President amounted to only what our Nation spends on defense in a matter of hours. To what avail is it to create for ourselves the strongest nation in the world, from a military standpoint, when we permit our very foundations to crumble—for the future strength of our Nation is truly dependent upon our youth; our young people are our future. No money must be spared, no efforts curtailed in what must be our aim now—to help and save our young people from idleness and feelings of rejection and futility, to assist them along the path of industrious living and good citizenship, to give them pride in their heritage as citizens of our great Nation.
>
> The duty of this Congress is clear and I urge your committee to take favorable action without delay, so that the Congress can enact this greatly needed and important measure and work can go forward under the programs provided, as soon as possible.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include my Washington Report of February 27 dealing with the Operation Water Moccasin III. Since the report was written, the Army has revealed the various nations involved.

While I concur in the training of our allied officers in jungle warfare. the emphasis of my objection lies with the imposition of this training upon the population living within this 1½-million-acre area.

The training should be carried out within the enclave of our military reservation. The towns and villages should not be subjected to military law.

A similar operation was carried on in California in the summer of 1951 and was billed as a United Nations takeover, and the civilian population which refused to cooperate were threatened with prosecution.

The report follows:

> WASHINGTON REPORT
>
> (By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)
>
> Now hear this and listen well. By the time this Washington Report reaches you, there will be underway one of the most fantastic and, to me, truly frightening, military maneuvers ever to be held in the United States. It is called Exercise Water Moccasin III, and is just as deadly. These maneuvers will be held on a 2,500-square-mile area of 1,500,000 acres, covering all of four counties and parts of four other counties in the State of Georgia, just south of Savannah. It will include the participation of 16 foreign allied nations and involves guerrila warfare, psychological warfare, and counterinsurgency.
>
> The area, for lack of a better name, will be called the mythical country of Claxtonia, a free world nation. Claxtonia is to be invaded by foreign guerrilla troops, whose goal is to take over that mythical country. Opposing troops will be brought in by parachute drop in an effort to resist this invasion. It seems impossible to get much information on these maneuvers from the Pentagon intelligence, which denies any knowledge of this operation. Those in the know refuse to identify the 16 foreign allied nations involved, nor can we determine the number of troops involved. They may be members of NATO, SEATO, or CENTO
>
> A form sheet came to my desk in response to many inquiries, but I cannot tell from this sheet which department issued it. The memo indicates that the operation will include 600 personnel. Other authoritative sources say there will be 3,000 personnel. If there are only 600, that would be one man for every 2,500 acres, which is ridiculous on the face of it.
>
> The cities, towns, and villages, and the rural inhabitants of Claxtonia, are supposed to participate in this operation and will be targets of intensive propaganda campaigns by the invaders and by the counterinsurgency troops. This intensive propaganda campaign will be carried on by three local radio stations which will be supporting the counterinsurgent guerrillas of Claxtonia, and by two radio stations in Savannah supporting the invading guerrillas. The inhabitants of Claxtonia have been requested to take sides. Having done so, they are to house, feed, keep and aid the guerrillas of their choice and transport them to ambush sites. The various cities are to either accept or impel the invaders. The psychological effect on American citizens placed in this position will be enormous. These maneuvers will last for about 3 weeks. Signs have been posted throughout the area in five different languages. There will be foreign observers as well as a U.N. contingent.
>
> It is my belief that this operation comes squarely under Article 43 of the United Nations Charter. This, of course, will be vehemently denied by the State Department, as was everything else that happened in Cuba, the truth notwithstanding.
>
> We do not know whether African troops will be involved or not, but we do know that there is a large contingent of barefooted Africans that have been moved into Cuba for training in guerrilla warfare. I would like to quote a few lines from 13-year-old Anna Maria Delgado, who escaped from Cuba:
>
> "I went to a church school. They closed it about a year ago. The Russians and all sorts of foreigners moved in * * * Then about 3 weeks ago, these Africans came. They're all over the place * * * Men and women too. They put them in my school. It looked like a whole tribe. * * * "I was terrified of them. They're savages. I heard one of them beat a woman.
>
> "They're always barefooted and they wear short skirts that come just above their knees. They have big rings in their ears and noses.
>
> "They talk funny and nobody understands what they're saying. * * *
>
> "They can't go out on the streets unless some militiamen go with them. Everybody's afraid of them. I wouldn't go near them."
>
> Who brought these Africans to Cuba? Was it the United Nations? Was it Russia? Or was it the United States? And are they being trained for the forthcoming invasion of peaceful Angola, which, with the knowledge and consent of the U.N., has been subjected to murder, pillage and rape from bases in the central Congo? Instead of bringing peace to the world, the U.N. has brought war, and it has brought disgrace upon the United States.
>
> With the subjugation of Katanga, you can look forward to seeing the U.N. move its "peaceful" forces into Angola, Northern Rhodesia, Mozambique, and the Republic of South Africa, simply because these countries desire self-determination rather than to be subjected to the communist-infested United Nations.

The Dangers of Increased Imports of Residual Fuel Oil and Increased Imports Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, imports of residual fuel oil into the United States have increased greatly. This has resulted in the loss of thousands of jobs and millions of dollars of income. Increasing imports have been a contributing factor in creating numerous areas of unemployment throughout the coal and oil producing sectors of the Nation.

Not only have the imports of all forms of residual fuel oil increased, but also, the quotas have been raised several times on imports of residual fuel oil used only for fuel which have been under mandatory import control by quota since April 1, 1959—except for amounts withdrawn from bonded warehouses for ship supplies or for export. In addition, overland imports from Canada and Mexico are exempt from control.

Imports of all types of residual fuel oil rose from 36.5 million barrels in 1944 to 182 million barrels in 1958, and, in spite of import quotas, under the mandatory control program, inaugurated in 1959, the import of 232.9 million barrels of residual oil in 1961 represents an increase of 50.9 million barrels over 1958.

Total imports and import quotas are still zooming upward. This has recently been sharply brought to notice, because on January 30, 1963, quotas were increased to allow imports of an additional 6.5 million barrels before March 30, 1963.

Import quotas have been changed several times. They have risen, for example, from 343,347 barrels per day for the period from April 1–June 30, 1959, to 507,497 barrels daily from April 1, 1962 to January 30, 1963, and to 525,408 barrels a day as announced January 30, 1963, by the Oil Import Administration. The press release inferred that the additional 18,011 barrels daily could be retroactive back to April 1, 1962.

Reportedly, it has been calculated that the increase in the quota from 154 million barrels in 1960 to an estimated 190 million barrels per year via the recent quota rise will permit an increase of 36 million barrels of imports annually which in itself is equal, for example, to the displacement of 8.3 million tons of coal, and loss of the equivalent of 3,300 coal miners' jobs.

On February 13, 1963, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning recommended that in the interest of national security and the attainment of Western Hemisphere objectives there should be a relaxation of controls on residual fuel oil imports. Some individuals and organizations have vigorously disagreed with that recommendation, stressing, among other things, that healthy industries, and greater job security in the United States are more vital national security considerations. Furthermore, these criticisms emphasize that we should not take lightly, or ignore, the ominous threats of Communist takeover of governments or the sabotage of industries in Central and South America from which we import 90 percent of our residual fuel oil.

It is high time we considered seriously the rising tide of residual fuel oil imports and their effects on our national security here at home, and the maintenance of our free economy and the economic and social well-being of our people.

Congress Should Pass Legislation To Eliminate National Origin Quota System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1963, the Honorable Emanuel Celler, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am a member, introduced H.R. 3926 to eliminate our national origin quota system. I am heartily in favor of this proposed legislation and have introduced today an identical bill, to indicate my strong support.

Since 1924, our immigration system has been based upon the unfair and discriminatory principles of national origin. Under present laws, controlling factors as to whether an immigrant may be admitted to the United States, his admission delayed, or refused, are area of the world in which he was born, his race, and nationality. My bill would eliminate this repugnant principle. It provides that the person he is, and his fitness to become a citizen of the United States would determine his right to come here—not his place of birth, his race, or his nationality.

The bill provides for a total annual immigration quota of 250,000 to be distributed among four specifically defined classes: first, family unification class; second, occupational class; third, refugee asylum class; and fourth, resettlement class. There would be an annual distribution of the overall immigration quota under the following procedure. Each year the President of the United States, after consulting with the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Labor, and with the Attorney General, would submit to the Congress, prior to March 1, the proposed allocation for each of the four classes and Congress will have 60 days following the submission of the President's proposal to disapprove it by passing a concurrent resolution. If the proposal is not disapproved by the Congress, it takes effect on the first day of the fiscal year immediately following. If the Congress disagrees with the President, the allocation effective in the preceding fiscal year would automatically become effective.

The flexible distribution of a permanently fixed annual quota will permit us to decide what category of immigrants would at any particular time best serve our country's needs and suit world conditions.

I would point out that an important provision of the bill provides a guarantee that no unfair distribution of immigrant visas for the benefit of inhabitants of one particular country can take place. Within each of the four classes, no more than 15 percent of the annual allocation could be issued to inhabitants of any single country.

My assistance has been asked in hundreds of immigration cases, and I know the suffering and heartache endured by countless persons who are prevented from coming to our country because of our antiquated and unfair quota system based on national origin and race. Many must be registered with a U.S. consul for half a lifetime before they can be reached under the quota; many do not live long enough to be reached. It is high time that we let intending immigrants know that we shall be happy to admit them as soon as possible and practicable, if they meet reasonable qualifications—that is, that they will be considered as persons, individuals—not solely on the basis of geography or color of skin. Brotherhood—love for our fellow man—should be our guiding motives, not cruel discrimination and implied downgrading of human beings because of their race, color, or place of birth.

The bill also contains additional proposed amendments to remove restrictive features such as the needless distinctions between natural born and naturalized citizens; it also provides for a statute of limitations on deportations. It seeks improvement of administrative structure as well as of administrative and judicial review.

Our Committee on the Judiciary last year undertook an extensive study of population and immigration problems. This study is being continued, and it is hoped that helpful results will be obtained. I feel certain that the study will prove conclusively the need for the new legislation covered by this bill. I trust that the Congress will realistically approach the problem and take favorable action so that these greatly needed improvements in our immigration and nationality laws will become a reality.

Independence Day of Ghana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, the Republic of Ghana will celebrate the sixth anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, I wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah; and His Excellency, the Ghana Chargé d'Affaires ad interim to the United States, Osei Tutu.

The birth of the Republic of Ghana on March 6, 1957, stirred the imagination of all the world, for Ghana was the first of the countries of sub-Saharan Africa to achieve independence after World War II. Ghana's hard-won privilege was also an immense responsibility, for the eyes of all peoples, independent and dependent, great and small, rich and poor, were turned toward the former British colony on the West Coast of Africa. Would Ghana make a go of it? Could her political institutions survive or would they be destroyed by old tribal rivalries? Could she develop her economy sufficiently to achieve a satisfactory living standard for her whole population?

These questions are no longer asked. Ghana has made a go of it. Ghana has become a leading nation of Africa, indeed of the neutral world. In the council chambers of the United Nations the Ghanaian Ambassador is listened to carefully as one of the chief spokesmen of the nonalined nations. Within the African Continent Ghana has been one of the stanchest advocates of pan-Africanism. Under the able and dedicated leadership of President Kwame Nkrumah, the Republic of Ghana has developed a deep national consciousness; the pessimists who predicted that the newly independent nation would soon be torn asunder by tribal rivalries vastly underestimated the capabilities of Ghana's President and the sincere devotion which he was able to inspire in the hearts of the Ghanaian people.

Economically Ghana is progressing admirably. Although Ghana is a comparatively small country—smaller than our State of Wyoming—it is centrally located in west Africa and is endowed with significant natural resources. Ghana is handy to the sealanes of the South Atlantic and to some of the African Continent's busiest highways and airlines. Its forests are rich in hardwoods such

as mahogany, and the country is well endowed with mineral wealth. Gold, Ghana's most important mineral, has been one of the country's leading exports for over 400 years; Ghana was, in fact, formerly called the Gold Coast because of its trade in gold dust. Manganese and bauxite are also important export products. But it is cocoa which is Ghana's chief moneymaker. Ghana produces over one-third of the world's cocoa crop, of which American manufacturers purchase approximately 23 percent. As for manufacturing, Ghana has many flourishing small-scale industries in such fields as palm oil extracting, furniture making, and ivory working. Development plans called for the further expansion of industry and for broadening the economic base of the country. The Volta River dam and hydroelectric project, which the United States is helping to finance, will be an additional spur to Ghana's economy, for it will provide hydroelectric power for refining the country's vast bauxite resources into aluminum.

The old Ghana, which was a flourishing west African kingdom in the medieval ages, would be proud of the new Republic of Ghana. Ghana's per capita income is one of the highest in Africa. Her political leadership is able. Her people are industrious. The Ghanaian national flag is an accurate symbol of the new Ghana: its three horizontal stripes of red represent the blood and sweat of those who worked for independence; the gold stripe, the wealth of the country; and the green, its forests and farms. The five-pointed black star in the center of the gold stripe is the lodestar of African freedom.

On this sixth anniversary of independence, we salute Osagyefo Dr. Kwame Nkrumah and the people of Ghana; we wish them continued prosperity in the future.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 4, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am herewith submitting the text of my newsletter, "Washington Report" of March 2, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman Bruce Alger, Fifth District, Texas)

MARCH, 2, 1963.

VITAL ISSUES DISCUSSED IN HOUSE THIS WEEK

In the first full week of House sessions this year, a number of vital issues were discussed. To keep you abreast of how your Representative is participating in debate on the problems we face, I am including in this newsletter excerpts from the Congressional Record containing my remarks on various problems:

On Monday, February 25, Congressman Frank J. Becker, of New York, took the floor to challenge President Kennedy's demand for bipartisan approval of all his actions in foreign policy. My part of the discussion follows:

"Mr. Alger. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the gentleman from New York in his discussion and his definition of the use and misuse of the word 'bipartisan.' My question is this: Does the gentleman not feel first of all that it is the prerogative, indeed, the duty of Members of Congress to be critical of foreign policy and, secondly, not to be shut off by the use of the word 'bipartisan' as though they are not supposed to be critical of the foreign policy which affects all of us?

"Mr. Becker. This is exactly the intent of my remarks today. I believe that we would be irresponsible—irresponsible to the *n*th degree—if we attempted to roll over and play dead every time the President makes a mistake, whether it be our domestic or foreign policy.

"The mistakes that have been made during the past 2 years, from the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion right on down the line to Laos—keep occurring. What happened recently during the so-called blockade of Cuba as to whether missiles were or were not in Cuba? What happened in the situation with reference to Canada? These things create a responsibility on the part of Members of Congress to let the American people know that we are not parties to that decision. I assure the gentleman I would not have been a party to them myself.

"Mr. Alger. If the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman feel that some of the concern expressed now by the administration is the fear indeed of congressional criticism of policies that do not reflect the will of the people?

"Mr. Becker. I am quite sure of that. Permit me to call the attention of the gentleman to this: You know when the situation with the administration had become very, very critical and bad in recent months and when the people were catching up with it, you know what happened. They pulled a 50-mile hike out of the bag in order to get front-page publicity. They got important news off the front pages and off the radio and television. Instead we heard and read about 50-mile hikes. The minds of the people are supposed to be taken off the real problems confronting us. This is the type of thing that is going on, and I think we should make the people understand why.

"Mr. Alger. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I comment further and ask another question of him?

"Mr. Becker. I am happy to yield.

"Mr. Alger. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by very dedicated Americans who are sincerely concerned, and who are also worried about criticism of the Commander in Chief if, indeed, we are weakening his posture and the posture of our Nation today when we are critical; so I want to ask the gentleman, Is there not even greater danger that if we stifle and eliminate freedom of speech in this country in order to defeat the enemy, we have actually adopted the enemy's techniques and have already been defeated by him, so that there does not need to be any party or parties, except one party and a dictatorship?

"Mr. Becker. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I might call the gentleman's attention to an article that appeared yesterday in the Washington Star 'Krock Calls Kennedy Policy Cynical on News.' I suggest the gentleman read that article. I intend to put it in the Record."

Tuesday, February 26, several Republican Members defended the integrity of Congress against one Member charged with indiscretions in connection with junketing.

"Mr. Alger. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. Ashbrook. I yield to the gentleman.

"Mr. Alger. I, too, want to join with the gentleman and thank him for having the courage as well as the forthrightness to say what needed to be said. And so that my colleagues understand, even as each of us, of course, is responsible for his own conduct, and I have the honor as has each other Member to represent some mighty fine people, I put my views on this in the Record yesterday at page 2987 with reference to the expenditures made by one of the Members of this body when he was overseas.

"It is my further contention that there are times when the Members of this body not only must travel the world but should travel all over the world when we have so many commitments abroad, but there are many trips that might very well be curtailed. I am going into my 9th year here. I have not been called upon to travel abroad. I hope some day if I can make any contribution to the matter then under consideration I may have the opportunity, but I do not intend to be reckless.

"I am sure there are many others who will say that the conduct of one of our colleagues does not speak for the rest of us in this body. Certainly it does not speak for the Member from the Fifth District of Texas. I join with others who feel that we should do whatever housecleaning is necessary when this body is not properly represented, as the representatives of the people not only of Texas but throughout the United States."

The House voted on Wednesday, February 27, a $508,172,000 appropriation to continue Public Law 480 for disposing of agricultural products. The bill passed 254 to 154. In debate I said:

"Mr. Alger. Mr. Speaker, my opposition to House Joint Resolution 284, supplement appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, is very basic. Public Law 480 has become not just a means of disposing of surplus foods, but a reason for continuing the piling up of surpluses. The tail is wagging the dog. An emergency program has become self-perpetuating. Further, this program is really a foreign aid program, yet has seldom been so considered except incidentally in totaling yearly aid. The abuse or misuse of taxpayers' money is best seen on those many occasions when we have shipped these foods to Communist countries.

"Nor is there much to commend the generating of counterpart funds. We get no pay, except in local currency that must be used locally, and which has been subject to much abuse.

"Finally, the Federal Government is not intended to be in the business of feeding people. It is unconstitutional."

One of our fine Dallas high schools won high honors in a debate tournament in the Nation's Capital and I was pleased to call attention to the achievement in this insertion in the Congressional Record:

"DALLAS HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE TEAM DEFEATS 117 RIVALS IN TOURNAMENT

"(Extension of remarks of Hon. Bruce Alger, of Texas, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, February 21, 1963)

"Mr. Alger. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I announce the victory of a debate team from Jesuit High School in Dallas last weekend in the National Invitational High School Cherry Blossom Tournament sponsored by Georgetown University. The Jesuit High School students, Rick Atkinson and Jim Turner, competed against 117 other high schools, public and private, representing 20 States. The debate topic was "That the United States Should Provide a Common Market for the Western Hemisphere." The Jesuit team took the affirmative side in the final debate, but debated both sides of the question in the course of the tournament. Jim Turner also won an award as third highest ranking speaker out of all the orators in the tournament.

"Mr. Speaker, this achievement by a team representing one of our fine Dallas high schools is another indication of the fine record of Dallas County. It is natural for Dallas to lead. Our people have always prided themselves on getting things done and as a result we have one of the greatest metropolitan areas of the Nation. Our achievements in industry, retailing, education, and cultural activities are a constant wonder to people everywhere. It always gives me great satisfaction to announce the achievements of Dallas people and to call attention to the fact that our progress as a community, in every field, is done through the efforts of our own people.

"That success in scholastic achievement is not confined to one Dallas high school was stressed by Rev. Father Herlong, of Jesuit, talking of the friendly rivalry between the various school debate teams. He said the Dallas students have a close bond with one another. He told how this was demonstrated last year in an intercity debate in which Byran Adams, a public high school, and Jesuit competed. Jesuit was declared the winner and when the announcement was made, the whole Bryan Adams team stood up and cheered. Father Herlong paid tribute to Bryan Adams as well as Garland High School and said they are both on a par with Jesuit and he feels that in last week's tournament they would have done as well and perhaps even better than Jesuit.

"Incidentally, on a personal note, Father Herlong is a distant cousin of our colleague, Congressman Sid Herlong, of Florida."

In a continuing effort to arouse a sense of rededication to basic American principles, I included in the Record some remarks on a truth too often overlooked in the Declaration of Independence:

"HAPPINESS MUST BE EARNED

"(Extension of remarks of Hon. Bruce Alger, of Texas, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, February 21, 1963)

"Mr. Alger. Mr. Speaker, the following copy from the advertisement of the Warner & Swasey Co., in the February 25 issue of U.S. News & World Report, should be read by all freedom-loving Americans. It reminds us that no government can guarantee happiness, only the right to seek happiness. Too many our our people today are becoming imbued with the idea that the guarantee of happiness is a right, forgetting the happiness must be bred within the individual and cannot be superimposed by any outside force. Any attempt by a government to give to its people some kind of happiness means a subsequent loss of freedom, and without freedom no man can be truly happy.

"The article follows:

"*'Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness*

"'When you read the Declaration of Independence (and everyone of us should) read it all. Too many Americans think it guarantees them life, liberty, and happiness. Not at all—only the pursuit of happiness.

"'No one but a selfish child thinks he has the right to happiness. Adults know it has to be deserved, earned—and the only way to earn it is to contribute more to the world than you take.

"'If you are a worker, you produce enough to pay your wage plus enough to pay for the machine, without which you would have no job.

"'If you're a businesman, you produce enough to pay your workman a fair wage, enough for an incentive return to your stockholders whose savings built the company, and enough for your share of necessary taxes to protect your country.

"'If you're a politician you work first for the good of your country, not your party or yourself.

"'That is the honest way to happiness as every intelligent adult knows. Anything seized in any other way is grasping greed, of which any self-respecting American should be ashamed.

"'Is it useless to hope for that kind of Americanism? We don't think so.'"

These excerpts from the Congressional Record are just a sampling of the week's work of a Member of Congress. In addition to debate on the floor, most of my time this week was spent in committee where we continued the hearings on the President's tax proposals and on his request for an extension of the increase in the debt ceiling.

Witness after witness, under my questioning and that of my Republican colleagues on the committee, have been forced to admit the proposals of the President, if enacted into law, will retard, not accelerate our economy. I continued to hammer home the fact that while tax cuts are necessary and justified, they will be completely meaningless unless a substantial cut is made in Federal spending. Without reduced spending a $10-to-$20 billion tax cut will cause inflationary pressures which will mean higher prices, lower dividends on investments and savings, higher insurance premiums, and in the end the great majority of our people will have less money to spend, and business growth will be hindered, not helped.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Chronicles 29: 5: *Who then is willing to consecrate his service this day unto the Lord?*

O Thou gracious Benefactor, who alone can supply our temporal needs and satisfy our eternal longings, help us to walk the way of life with a determination of courage which nothing can daunt and a splendor of faith which can never be eclipsed by doubt or despair.

May the mind and heart of our President, our Speaker, and all the Members of Congress be strengthened and sustained by lofty principles and purposes as they seek, in unity of spirit, to discharge faithfully the arduous tasks of their high vocation.

Grant that this Lenten season may not only be a time of commemoration but of consecration when we shall commit ourselves unreservedly to the doing of Thy will and the building of a finer social order.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 4, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 13. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark.; and

S. 345. An act to provide for the approval of a payment in lieu of taxes to be made for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to title 16, United States Code, section 513, had appointed Mr. Aiken to be a member of the National Forest Reservation Commission to fill an existing vacancy.

The message also announced that Mr. Robertson, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, pursuant to section 712(a) of Public Law 774, 81st Congress, appointed Mr. Tower a member of the Joint Committee on Defense Production to fill an existing vacancy.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. Johnston and Mr. Carlson members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 63–8.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION ENROLLED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had, on March 5, 1963, examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Monday, March 4, 1963, he did on March 5, 1963, sign the following enrolled joint resolution of the House:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

DISSEMINATION OF OBSCENE MATTER THROUGH THE MAILS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems existing in our Nation today is the harm that is caused to our people, especially the youth of our country, through the dissemination of obscene literature and other degrading publications and pornographic material through the mails.

The Post Office Department has been hampered in the efforts it has made to ban such material from the mails by reason of the lack of adequate statutory authority.

Our church, patriotic, and civic organizations throughout the country are making a splendid effort to curb the dissemination of obscene matter through the mails. Unless adequate statutory authority exists, however, for the Post Office Department to punish those engaged in distributing immoral and degrading matter the problem will continue to exist.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which, if enacted, will do much to halt the spread of obscene matter. My measure prescribes what I believe to be adequate penalties for those who would engage in the distribution of material which has such an adverse effect on the moral health of our Nation.

My bill provides that anyone who places in the mails a lewd, lascivious, or degrading article, publication, or picture of any kind shall be subject to a fine for the first offense up to $5,000 and imprisonment up to 5 years, or both. For a second offense a person would be liable to a fine of $10,000 and imprisonment from 5 to 10 years, or both.

I feel that the Congress has no greater duty than to provide adequate safeguards against the distribution of obscene matter in the mails, and it is my sincere hope that my colleagues in the House will support the enactment of my measure.

THE SOVIET BUILDUP IN CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, during the Soviet buildup in Cuba last year, allied merchant ships indirectly aided the Communist bloc by chartering their hulls for nonmilitary cargoes, thus freeing the limited Communist merchant fleet for military shipments to Cuba. Along with several other Members of Congress who realized this situation, I advocated that U.S. ports be closed to flagships of nations engaged in hauling goods of any kind to Cuba.

Little has been done by the U.S. Government since that time to thwart allied shipping to Cuba. The only real change in the situation has been the shifting of public attention from allied shipping to Cuba to several other aspects of the Cuban problem—namely, such matters as the debate over whether Communist arms in Cuba are offensive or defensive in nature.

However, I am pleased to see the recent reports that bear out my suggestions that all U.S. ports be closed to flagships calling in Cuba. Last week, wire service reports were carried stating that the State Department is holding further talks with nations engaged in this commerce—namely, Great Britain, Japan, Greece, Lebanon, Italy, and Norway. As you can see, these nations are among our closest allies, yet they continue their shipping for our avowed Communist enemies.

Life magazine has now endorsed the suggestion that U.S. ports be closed in this week's issue, pointing out that such a closure would place severe economic restrictions on Castro, yet not constitute an act of war. I urge that this Government intensify its efforts to cut off allied shipping, and increase our efforts by closing U.S. ports to the flag of any nation which allows its ships to trade with Cuba.

SERVICES OF LEWIS DESCHLER, PARLIAMENTARIAN

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in extending congratulations to Lew Deschler as he passes the 35-year landmark of superb service as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives.

As he always proves helpful to Members in House proceedings, so has his counsel been my guide rail on numerous occasions. And his assistance and advice are always given willingly, generously, and courteously.

Mr. Deschler's work is of a demanding nature, and his efficiency in resolving complex problems of parliamentary procedure quickly convinces one that here is a man who really knows his job. Such a facility for coping with congressional complexities can be the product only of vast wisdom and long experience.

In a large sense, Lew can be likened unto a referee who officiates in one of the greatest of all games, the vital game of legislation. And we who are players in that game cannot help but feel surer of foot and more certain of our moves because of the proven ability of the man who calls the rules on the plays.

It gives me great pleasure then, on this occasion, to express to Lew my great appreciation for the many kindnesses and courtesies he has extended me.

And I am certainly happy to lend my voice to those who, with sure sincerity and good cause, acclaim Lew Deschler as a "parliamentarian's parliamentarian."

CUBA AS A BASE FOR SUBVERSION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, 1963, at 5 p.m., the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Robert S. McNamara, held a so-called press conference in the State Department Auditorium, and it is my understanding it was broadcast throughout the Nation by television and radio.

He was asked this question at that interview:

> Mr. Secretary, could you comment on the possibilities that Cuba is being used as a training base for subversion in other Latin American countries.
>
> Secretary McNamara. I have no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion directed against other Latin American countries.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and its Inter-American Subcommittee has been holding hearings on the situation with respect to Cuba and the Central and South American area. Mr. McCone, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, appeared before the committee on February 19, 1963. Let me quote one paragraph from his testimony:

> At least 1,000 to 1,500 persons came to Cuba during 1962, from all the other Latin American countries with the possible exception of Uruguay, to receive ideological indoctrination or guerrilla warfare training or both. More have gone in 1963 despite the limited facilities for reaching Cuba at present.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to those who administer the affairs of this Government, I ask whether the left hand knows what the right hand is doing?

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 228 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That effective from January 3, 1963, the expenses of conducting the investigations and studies authorized by H. Res. 179, Eighty-eighth Congress, by the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $530,000 for the Eighty-eighth Congress, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Line 5, strike out "$530,000" and insert "$180,000".
>
> Line 13, insert the following new paragraph:
>
> "Sec. 2. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee and the full Committee on House Administration have agreed to give the Banking and Currency Committee the amount of $180,000. This was done after very careful consideration and justification of the need for this minimum appropriation.

Our committee feels that if the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee finds he does not have sufficient funds later on, he can come back and request an additional appropriation if he can justify it. We assure him that our committee will give him a prompt hearing on any such request.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. As one of the members of the subcommittee, I just want to say I think what the gentleman has said is obviously an invitation to come back, and I want to say that the amount with reference to this committee has escalated from $5,000, for 2 years in the last Congress, to where we have given them $180,000 for 1 year and if the chairman of the committee accepts the invitation of the gentleman from Maryland, he had better be prepared to do a lot of justifying.

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is just what I said. If it is justified, the committee would consider it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman], for the purpose of making a statement.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I invite the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that one private organization, the Commission on Money and Credit, recently completed a study of the Nation's money and credit system. This commission spent 3 years at the task and spent almost $2 million of private money. When a private organization spends $2 million to make a study of matters needing legislation by the Congress, it shows there is a public need and demand for information about problems which are the responsibility of Congress.

The need is there. As this commission report points out, there has been no overall study of our money and credit system since the study of the Aldrich commission, made more than 50 years ago.

The Commission on Money and Credit issued a report which makes at least 85 major recommendations for changes in the laws affecting the Nation's financial institutions, public and private. If the subject matter of these recommendations is important enough to call for the expenditure of $2 million of private money, then they are important enough for the Congress to spend a few thousand dollars to study this matter, so that it can legislate intelligently.

Obviously, our committee cannot simply accept or reject these recommendations without itself looking into the factual situations which underlie them. In fact, I am not at all sure that the Commission on Money and Credit actually gathered any new facts. It seems to me that their scholars mostly did think pieces, and the recommendations were based on these. For example, I asked Mr. Frazar Wilde, the chairman of the Commission on Money and Credit, a question along these lines:

> Did you consider the significance of the decreasing number of commercial banks in the country over the past 40 years? During these years, the period of greatest growth in our history, the number of commercial banks has gone down from 31,000 to 13,500. Did your commission go into that to determine why the number of commercial banks is going down?

Mr. Wilde answered "No," that the commission did not examine into this question.

Now, that is a very important question, and it should be gone into; we should find out the reason for this trend. We need a good banking system. We need a profitable banking system. We need commercial banks in time of peace and in time of war. We cannot do without them.

There are many questions in the jurisdiction of our committee that should be gone into, that have not been gone into in the last 50 years.

Obviously it is impossible even for this one task to be performed without funds. If we have the funds I would expect to obtain the help of some of the college professors and other experts. I would expect to use some of the same professors who worked for the Commission on Money and Credit; some of them have complained to me that they were not privileged to obtain some of the facts they needed. That is the reason why in our budget we have stated that we will use people on a contractual basis, college professors, for example, where we can get them only for 6 weeks, 3 months, or for a year. The money, if appropriated, will be prudently spent, of course.

Our studies and investigations will not be for the purpose of trying to embarrass any political party, any person, or any group of financial institutions. It will be for the purpose of making factual studies.

I respectfully suggest that the amount of funds which the Committee on House Administration approved is low. The committee has recognized, however, that this amount is just for 10 months, and if we can make a showing at the end of that time that we need more money, then we can come back to that committee and ask for more money. Any money we get we expect to use in the most careful possible way, and for the public interest. If we do not use it all, we will, of course, turn it back.

May I say also that our committee has pending an extremely large volume of legislation, the reason being in part, I think, because it has been so long since we have made any study of our money and credit system and the component financial institutions.

I thank my colleague the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure that this is not construed as an invitation for any committee to come back for more funds. They will have to justify any additional request, but if they can justify such a request, we will hear them while the House is in session.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of this subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration for the past 14 years and some months with the exception of a period of 2 or 3 months in the 83d Congress. A lot of committees have come before the committee in that length of time.

I have no quarrel with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I want to see him have as much money as he needs, but I am telling him that if he is going to take every report that some committee downtown submits to this body, I do not care whether it costs $2 million or $20 million, there is not enough money in the contingency fund to finance it. For instance, many reports come to the Foreign Affairs Committee. There was the report of the Draper Committee, and I do not know how many others; but when we get a report we file it in file 13, the round one under the desk, and then proceed to have our own committee hearings and make the decision which is our responsibility to make.

You can have a hearing about money and credit from here on out. You can have a hearing about many phases of banking. There are endless hearings and investigations that could be had. We hear a lot about the spending of counterpart money by Members who go abroad, but I can point to you that there are at least half a dozen committees in this House who spend more—I know one last year that spent more than the total amount spent by all Members on foreign travel put together. I am not going to name names, but there are two committees that contract for employees. I was on the select committee of the Committee on House Administration to study these contracts last year, and there were two committees of this House who had—23 in one committee and 30 in another—people under contract for amounts varying from $500 to $10,000 supposedly to make studies and reports to the committee, and I will bet you not 1 of the 63 could justify their existence. One of them was the secretary of the NAACP. He was under private contract for $10,000. I maintain that we should not have the secretary of any organization—White Citizens Committee, Grain Dealers of America, or any other organization—making a private investigation under his own steam, while being paid with Government funds.

The Committee on House Administration, Mr. Speaker, has never crippled any committee. The only reason I take this time is to say to the gentleman from Texas and all the rest, there has been a lot of criticism of some committees, there has been a lot of criticism of these people being hired under contract. All I said before and all I am saying now is that if you come in again before the first of next year, you had better have a lot of facts and figures to justify what you are asking for, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kilburn].

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the amount recommended by the Committee on House Administration for the Committee on Banking and Currency. I thought the first request was too large. I think they have arrived at a fair figure.

I would also like to inform the House that the chairman of the committee [Mr. Patman] and I have come to a fine agreement as far as staff is concerned. The gentleman from Texas has been very fair. Our present staff is 10, 2 to the minority and 8 to the majority; but of those 8, some of them serve us just the same as they do the majority. If he adds five more members to the staff, one would be for the minority and four for the majority. If he adds 10, 2 will be for us and 8 for the majority. I think a lot of them will be nonpartisan and we can all use them. The thing has worked out very well, due to the fine cooperation of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman].

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Schenck].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep personal appreciation to the chairman of the full Committee on House Administration, Mr. Burleson, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Friedel, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, and my colleagues, both majority and minority, on the committee for the very sincere and hard work they have done and for their high degree of fairness on all the difficult questions raised during the thorough considerations for the appropriations for the operation and work of the committees of the House.

Our committee has worked hard and long on these appropriation resolutions. It has not been easy. There have been honest differences of opinion, but they have been resolved as sensible people should resolve differences of opinion and without sacrificing sound principles.

I want to associate myself with the comments of my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] and my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Friedel] as to the question of justification for any additional appropriations. It has seemed to me, Mr. Speaker, there has arisen a misunderstanding of the reasons for making these 1-year appropriations.

When I first suggested to our chairman, Mr. Burleson, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the idea of making these appropriations for 1 year, and we agreed on that, my purpose was to give the Committee on House Administration an opportunity, as has been said, to review the expenditures and the work done by the various committees each year and to thus establish better control over these expenditures. This was not intended, Mr. Speaker, as an invitation to come back to the House Committee on Administration for more funds; neither was it our intention to permit chairmen of committees to develop studies which would take extensive time and money for staff, and then come to our committee later and say, we have only partially completed our investigation and we will need additional funds to complete our unfinished work.

Mr. Speaker, it was my own personal intention in making the suggestion to the chairman of our Committee on House Administration, that all the committee chairmen of the House be cautioned to spend the money allocated to them with prudence and responsibility so that the work and program they intended to do can be fully completed within the appropriation allotted for this year of the Congress. Also, Mr. Speaker, that if it should become necessary for any committee chairman to request additional funds for any purpose whatsoever, that the chairman of such committee would be on notice and fully aware of the need to completely justify and document any such subsequent request for any additional funds.

Mr. Speaker, on February 27, when we here on this floor approved some 20 committee appropriations, both the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, and as I recall, the majority leader of the House of Representatives—these two distinguished gentlemen—called attention to the fact that the majority party in the House does have the full responsibility for the regulation and supervision of committee policies and procedures and that the majority party both recognizes and will exercise this responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone doubts that those statements were made he can refer to pages 3053, 3054, and 3055 of the Congressional Record of February 27, 1963, and read again these flat statements.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the majority will fully assume its proper responsibility and that its leadership will guide the studies and the investigations to be developed by all the committees of the House and their chairmen.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO EMPLOY TWO ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 225 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That effective February 1, 1963, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ two additional employees at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES FOR STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS TO BE CONDUCTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Resolution 254, with committee amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That, effective from January 3, 1963, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 103 by the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $697,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.
>
> Sec. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendments:

> Page 1, line 5, strike out "$697,000" and insert "$200,000".
>
> Page 1, line 11, after "House" insert a period and strike out all that follows down through and including the period on page 2, line 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Of such amount $25,000 shall be available for each of six subcommittees of the Committee on Education and Labor, and not to exceed $50,000 shall be available to the Committee on Education and Labor. All amounts authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund by this resolution shall, in the case of each subcommittee, be paid on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of the subcommittee, cosigned by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration; in the case of the committee, such amount shall be paid on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration."
>
> Page 2, line 17, insert the following new section:
>
> "Sec. 3. No part of the funds authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House, and the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I desire recognition on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution on the Education and Labor Committee. We are authorizing $200,000 for a single year. We have restricted $150,000 of that $200,000 to be channeled through the subcommittee chairmen, six subcommittee chairmen. All vouchers presumably from this $150,000 given to the subcommittee chairmen must be approved in advance by the subcommittee chairmen.

Mr. Speaker, there is an additional $50,000, making the total $200,000, which will be available to the full committee and to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that I think the end effect of what we are doing will be to disable completely the minority on the Committee on Education and Labor. We are at this point prepared, as a minority, to hire expert professional help in the field of education and in the field of labor. We would like to hire them. Hearings have been going on in both these fields for some time. We need that professional help.

The chairman is going to have, with this $200,000 that is authorized here, $50,000 with which presumably he could meet the needs of the minority and also take care of all of his own committee expenses; reporting services, stenographic, telephone bills, and that type of thing.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should understand what we are doing. I think there have been abuses, and we had a bipartisan front in the House Administration Committee to try to control the expenditure of these funds. But as a practical matter the passage of this resolution in its present form will give nothing to the minority. Perhaps I am premature. We intend to request the chairman to grant the minority some help, and perhaps he will accede to that request. But I think in view of past experience that it is a very highly optimistic view—to presume that he may accede to that request, especially under present circumstances. I think we are going to be back here very shortly with further requests to try to protect the minority.

I want to pay tribute to the members of the majority party on the House Administration Committee in this respect. There was expressed throughout these hearings a willingness and a desire and an intention to protect the minority, to give them an opportunity to hire the necessary professional help which we need. Unfortunately, it was not put into precise language in this resolution to give us the guarantee that we need.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in agreement with much that the gentleman is saying. I think the gentleman will agree that in the last 24 hours an unproductive but reasonable solution or agreement had been reached. I think the gentleman will find that most members of the majority on the Committee on Education and Labor are anxious that the minority have the staff which we acknowledge it needs, in particular an education and a labor expert; that if following the adoption of this resolution there is constructive action taken we can reach an agreement rather quickly and bring about a more equitable solution for everyone.

We have been cut, in my judgment, by this resolution, not only to the bone but into the bone. It is an unhappy set of circumstances which brings this about. Once the resolution is adopted, however, I am certain we can reach an agreement and I, for one, will work with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] and the ranking member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen], to bring this about.

Mr. GOODELL. May I express appreciation for that assurance, but I want to emphasize that this is a very immediate need and a very critical need on the part of the minority on the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. We recognize that.

Mr. GOODELL. We cannot wait a month or 2 months to see how unsatisfactory our situation is because of the refusal to recognize minority rights in our committee. We are well along with hearings in the field of education, the Youth Conservation Corps, and other fields. Two months have passed by without our having the professional help we need. We hope in someway we can provide a means to meet this immediate need in a fair and bipartisan way.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this resolution. However, I hear that there is a possibility that a motion to recommit will be made to add $35,000 for the minority.

I should like to point out that this committee, the same as every other committee in the House, has a provision in the reorganization act for 10 staff members. I understand from the testimony adduced from the minority itself that two of these men are assigned to the minority. Of this money, $150,000 is assigned to the subcommittees. I would think from what I have heard from both sides that the minority will get fair and equitable treatment in the subcommittees.

I want to make another point. I have heard a lot of conversation about the tremendous amount of work this committee does, and I am sure it does, and how they have been cut out of funds. Last year the Committee on Foreign Affairs handled the foreign aid bill, which started out with $4 billion, the Peace Corps bill, the disarmament bill, and a half a dozen others of great importance, with exactly one-third the amount of money the House Committee on Education and Labor had to spend last year.

We have a professional staff on that committee. If somebody said, "Here is a million dollars if you can tell me the politics of three of them or whether they are of the majority or minority," I could not accept the money because I do not know. Most of them have been there from the time the Republicans controlled this House, and they have stayed on. That committee turns out a lot of work, yet nobody knows who the minority members are. They are staff members and they do the job when they are asked to do it. This might be the solution for the Education and Labor Committee.

We have heard a lot of testimony about how they are asking too much money for both sides. We have assured them if they are really being crippled they can come in and get a further hearing before our committee. But we had testimony from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Landrum], among others—and I hope he does not mind my mentioning his name—that there are many employees of this committee that he had never seen or knew where they were working, if they were working at all, and there were a great number of people under private contract. The select subcommittee of which I was chairman looked into these private contracts and found that nobody on this committee except the chairman had any knowledge of these employees whatsoever. This is an attempt on the part of the House to sort of regulate this so that the employees, wherever—I am sorry—whoever they may be, will be here in Washington working for the committee and not drawing checks when they are off some place in some other part of the country.

There has been talk about abuses in connection with the appointment of staff members. I expect this committee was pretty high on the list of those who abuse it. We read a lot of news in the papers about a shortage of college professors. There were so many under contract around here in these committees last year, that I can understand that is why we have this shortage. That is why we have this rule not to hire anybody under contract unless the House Administration Committee takes a look at the contract. We want them to get back to the university and get back to teaching.

I do not think that will be an entirely unwholesome proposition when it finally works out. I just want to point out in conclusion that every other committee in the House has refrained from having stipulated how much money the minority would get, and if you do it for this committee by a motion to recommit or otherwise, you can expect to destroy the nonpartisan staffs of a great many committees that the Members on both sides would not like to see destroyed—and I can mention the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services as two of them.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. What do you propose to do about the minority staff problem on the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. HAYS. I propose that you settle it in your committee and, if there is a real abuse, I think you can get enough of the people on our side to vote with you to do something about it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Under the resolution you have reported only $50,000 is available to the chairman.

Mr. HAYS. That is right. The chairman now has 10 employees of which you say you have 2.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Do you think the chairman is going to give any of that $50,000 for minority staffing?

Mr. HAYS. I expect that he will not.

Mr. GRIFFIN. All right, then.

Mr. HAYS. But I do not think he can hire very many people with it and still pay travel and phone bills either so your ratio is not going to be too bad.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I believe I am correct in saying that the $50,000 referred to by the gentleman from Michigan is available not to the chairman but to the committee, and if the gentleman on the other side of the aisle wishes to discuss the matter not only with the chairman but with the entire membership of the committee, that is the proper place to do it. Unfortunately, the chairman of the committee is ill today with influenza and cannot be here.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman will find his description of the uncooperative spirit of the chairman with respect to the $50,000 is quite wrong. If he wants to bring this forward and have a discussion, I think as soon as the chairman is on his feet and is able to be here, he will find that he will be able to do so and I am sure it will be in the very near future.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Frelinghuysen], the ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief observation?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. With respect to the allocation of funds, I would like to point out to the House that on page 2 of the resolution on lines 2 through 5, there is this language: "of such amount $25,000 shall be available for each of the six subcommittees of the Committee on Education and Labor and not to exceed $50,000 shall be available to the Committee on Education and Labor."

Now this is the language of the resolution and it is the language of the Reorganization Act. The moneys are within the control of the majority of the committee. All we are trying to indicate, and at least what I am trying to indicate, is the assurance that the majority will make an effort to see that justice is done.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I appreciate the gentleman's assurances. I only wish I had something more substantial from the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind my colleagues that 8 weeks ago today this Congress convened. I, for one, feel it is high time that the Committee on Education and Labor received funds so it can operate properly. I should also like to point out that it is almost 3 months ago, on December 14, to be exact, that I had a discussion with the chairman of the full committee with respect to funds for the minority staff. We have had a very serious problem over the last 2 years, with respect to the necessity for more adequate staffing. Since that time, unfortunately, I have had until very recently no discussion with the chairman of the full committee with respect to the staff. Nor have I had any answers to my letters since December requesting information as to his position on this question. Finally, on February 28, I did receive a brief memo which stated his position, and I quote:

> This is a firm commitment that out of the present budget, $110,000 will be allotted to the minority to use as they see fit.
>
> Plus two minority staff personnel, Mr. Richard T. Burress and Mrs. Beverly Pearson, will be on the standing committee at all times.

I should like to correct an observation made by the gentleman from Ohio with respect to what the minority presently has on the standing committee. We have only one member on the standing committee at this time. We hope that the firm commitment from the chairman will insure that we will have two members on that committee hereafter.

I do not know whether this proposed cutting of funds will make him change his mind about what he has described as a firm commitment. I did receive from the clerk of the full committee yesterday a telephone notice, and I quote:

> The chairman can give no commitments to the minority until he finds out how much he is getting.

In other words, the firm commitment which I got last week is apparently worth nothing because of the reduced amount which is to be made available to the committee.

I consider it essential that the minority have an adequate amount. I would like to ask the chairman of the House Administration Subcommittee what perhaps we might anticipate, in his view, as a reasonable amount? A total of $200,000 is to be made available, of which $50,000 is to be made available to the committee itself.

I notice that the request for funds for the committee's operation was $25,000 for the next 2-year period. This would seem to mear. that $12,500 a year would be sufficient for the full committee. Might not the House Administration seem to indicate that the reduction in funds should be directed primarily at the so-called investigative task force, for which $202,000 was requested in the next 2-year period?

I hope we can anticipate that the minority can get a substantial amount of that $50,000. We need some reassurance from the chairman, or the committee itself, that we are entitled to it. We need some indication with respect to a percentage of the total, or the specific number of employees that we can have. I for one am very much disturbed about the uncertainty of things.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The language of the resolution leaves the question not up to the Committee on House Administration but to the Committee on Education and Labor. I again would like to assure the gentleman and the minority that a majority of the majority side is anxious to resolve this question and to do it within a matter of as few days as possible. The gentleman knows something of the tentative agreement which we have. We can do this within a matter of days.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I can only say that if the committee has that power, I wish they had reached a firm agreement before now, and thus avoiding the necessity of coming here and publicly airing our problems.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. There can be no doubt the power exists.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. It is obvious, of course, to all who have listened to this discussion that there have been difficult problems in connection with this particular resolution. I think it is worthy of note that in connection with previous similar resolutions accommodations that were fairly satisfactory were arrived at.

I think it is fair to say that as of today no such accommodation has been arrived at with respect to this resolution as it passed the Committee on Education and Labor. In view of that fact, there has been a difference of opinion on the minority side as to what best ought to be done about it, and I do not know what ultimately might be done. But I do want to say that with the assurances that have been given to us, first of all the other day when we had some general discussion involving this matter of minority rights and responsibilities in connection with committee staffs, I thought very fair statements were made by the leaders on the majority side of the aisle.

I certainly feel today there have been assurances given that cannot be put into effect immediately, but assurances given by responsible members not only of the House Administration Committee but of the Committee on Education and Labor, that I am sure were meant in good faith, in all sincerity, by people of integrity; and I would certainly express the hope that if this resolution goes through as it has been reported, that very, very soon some accommodation could be reached that would protect what I feel are the essential rights of the minority on this very important committee.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, apropos of what the gentleman from Indiana has said, I think the gentleman will agree with me that under the resolution pending, and under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, this is a matter which has always been left to the legislative committees.

I think the gentleman would further agree that in a matter of this kind, if we want to depart from the objectives of the Reorganization Act we ought to do it by amending the rules and not by starting a piecemeal departure, committee by committee. If we do anything else, we are going to get ourselves in the position of amending the rules of the House piecemeal in the wrong forum, at the wrong time, and under the wrong circumstances.

With respect to what the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey has said, may I say that this very committee in previous years, by a majority vote of the committee, under the control of this side of the House, vetoed the action of a previous chairman relating to the appointment of a staff member. That power rests in the committee, and if the committee in its wisdom cannot work out its problems, it would seem to me that the gentleman and others interested in this matter would approach the matter of amending the rules of the House in such a manner as to provide for equal treatment of all committees.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend by remarks and include a statement I made to the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on House Administration for the action it has taken. I can imagine it took a great deal of courage to do the things that it had to do. Simultaneously, I want to give my assurance, if any is needed, to the minority that I will work with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON]; the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT]; and the other members of the committee who are subcommittee chairmen, in trying to work this problem of money out to the complete satisfaction of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a committee which has jurisdiction over two of the most live subject matters of the day. Education is the foundation on which this country will continue to grow and be the powerful leader in the world it must be. If we do not give proper and adequate attention to that subject and adjust ourselves to the changing needs of education, then our structure of government is going to fall because of it.

Likewise, this committee deals with another most sensitive and important subject, that of labor, which, if it does not give proper, careful, studious attention to, the country's productive capacity will suffer tremendously, and instead of growing, our standard of living will cease to grow at the rate we require.

So I say rather than have the two delicate, important, and sensitive subject matters lumped under one head, it is high time the House of Representatives recognize that the real problem here does not lie in the amount of money that comes to one particular member, whether he be chairman or not chairman, to do with as he pleases, to carry on studies that he wants for his own particular benefit, but that we amend the rules of this House by dissolving the present Committee on Education and Labor and establishing separate committees instead.

I hold a resolution which I intend to drop in the hopper, and on which I intend to ask for a hearing and consideration at the earliest possible time. These two major subject matters have to be separated, and a major Committee on Education, consisting of 25 members, and a major Committee on Labor, consisting of 25 members, be established under the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is my opinion that if we will get down to business on this important matter then we can eliminate the great overlap that exists throughout this Government in the field of education.

Mr. Speaker, we come here annually and discuss the matter of Federal assistance to education and some are opposed to it, and say that they want no part of Federal aid to education. Listen, the Federal Government is saturated, it is pregnant with educational assistance. Each year we spawn something here in the field of Federal assistance to education about which few people know, and 2 or 3 years down the road we arrive at "Well, what have we done? We have not helped education, but we have helped a particular group or a particular institution."

Mr. Speaker, it is time we begin to study the fact that almost every agency of this Federal Government is conducting some form of educational program. Moreover, it is high time that we recognize the fact that while there might have been some justification for joining the areas of education and labor when the Reorganization Act was passed in 1946, there is no basis for continuing to study these vital subjects under one committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman has stated that this committee is a very important committee. It has two very important functions. I agree with the gentleman, but I would just like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the committee has always had these responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I think I know about what the Members of the House are alarmed at this time, and that is that in the 83d Congress this committee received $125,000. In the 84th Congress again it received $125,000. In the 85th Congress it received $125,000 for 2 years of its operations.

I think every Member of this Congress will agree that they did a good job during those 6 years. Yet in the 87th Congress this committee spent $633,000.

Could the gentleman tell me what responsibilities this committee has that it did not have back in those years?

Mr. LANDRUM. Well, I will say to the gentleman from Florida that so far as I know there are no additional responsibilities, but maybe some additional activities have been undertaken.

Mr. HALEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. LANDRUM. I will say to the gentleman from Florida that in the statement I shall include with my remarks here this morning the gentleman will find not only the figures which the gentleman has given to the Members of the House, but the additional figures for the other two Congresses, together with the amounts which were returned for each Congress through the 86th, and stating that nothing was returned from the 87th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include at this point the statement which I delivered to the Committee on House Administration yesterday on this subject.

The statement referred to follows:

> Mr. Chairman, the proposed budget of the House Committee on Education and Labor for the 88th Congress is outrageously high. Frankly after careful study of all the responsibilities devolving upon this committee I am compelled to state that the request for the sum of $697,000 is an unconscionable affront to the Members of the House of Representatives and the U.S. taxpayers.
>
> Specifically it is my considered judgment that the request for $202,000 appropriation to support an investigative task force ought to be eliminated in its entirety. All information required by the committee on labor-management irregularities and federally supported education activities, can be, and is supplied by the various units set up in the Department of Labor for enforcing and policing labor-management laws. Likewise, the Office of the Commissioner of Education can do, and does do, an adequate job of keeping the committee informed on federally supported education activities.
>
> A careful study of the activities of the investigative task force inaugurated in the 87th Congress will show that no benefits have accrued to the committee or to the Congress as a result of sums expended on such activities. This $202,000 is a shrewdly calculated patronage grab. It ought to be deleted by this Committee on House Administration. The self-respect of each Member of Congress requires condemnation by the entire membership. Official records available to your committee support this contention.
>
> I have also made a very careful study of the activities of the various subcommittees, six in number, for which specific sums of $60,000 for each committee is requested. I can and do appreciate the responsibilities of a subcommittee and its chairmen to discharge the committee's obligations. I do not believe, however, that the obligation of any one of these subcommittees require such exorbitant sums of money. It is my belief that each of these subcommittees can operate effectively on no more than $20,000 annual budget.

> Adoption of the recommendations I make here would reduce the proposed budget by $322,000. I have made no recommendation with regard to the amount requested for the full committee for reporting services, telephone, telegraph, supplies, witness fees, and miscellaneous or on the amount requested for the minority staff. I have no specific information on which to base an opinion, or a conclusion on these items.
>
> I have been a member of the Committee on Education and Labor for the entire 10 years I have served in the Congress. These conclusions are based on a careful study of the committee budgets over this 10-year period of service. For 6 of these 10 years, the committee appropriation stayed the same with fairly high amounts turned back each session. Then for the 86th Congress, the appropriation increased markedly. During the last Congress this increased appropriation nearly doubled.
>
> Here are the specific appropriations for the past 10 years. For the 83d Congress $125,000 was authorized of which $40,356 was returned. For the 84th Congress $125,000 was authorized and $68,971 was turned back. The 85th Congress saw $125,000 again authorized with $12,353 returned. The first big boost came during the 86th Congress when $328,000 was authorized of which $41,949 was turned back. For the 87th Congress $633,000 was authorized and nothing was returned.
>
> When the request was made last session for a near 100 percent increase, I spoke with several leaders in Congress at that time and urged that the budget be reduced. I pointed out then that the Committee on Education and Labor was about to be injected into activities not contemplated by the rules of the House.
>
> I most respectfully yet urgently maintain that unless this budget request is reduced drastically, and travel and patronage of the committee diminished proportionately, respect for the committee will cease to exist, and embarrassment will be heaped upon the Congress and upon each Member individually.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on House Administration who has attended every session of that committee, the gentleman from Iowa seeks to clarify his position, his motives and his practice in the light of this afternoon's discussion.

His purpose has been twofold. First, it has been his goal to assist in developing the kinds of principles, policies, and procedures which create an atmosphere conducive to proper performance of our congressional duties. It has been his purpose to eliminate duplication of efforts which consume time of legislators, staff members, and committees already overburdened by obligations of our office. It has been his purpose to help in designing and implementing guidelines for expenditure of money so that the House can set an example in fiscal responsibility—so that we can say in truth, "Our porch has been swept"—and from that point we can in good conscience take necessary steps to insure wise use of tax moneys in other departments of the Government. This job, our House rules tell us, we must do.

There is, in the second instance, a deeper philosophic purpose. The U.S. House of Representatives is the greatest legislative body in the world. Its conception, the purposes to which it is dedicated, the manner in which it is constituted, make it a true instrument of free government.

No government can long exist without the confidence of its citizens. The citizen must respect our high office—not tolerate it. The citizen must honor the office—not deprecate it. In America, the citizen must criticize the office—not ridicule it.

In turn we must treat our office as a seat of dignity and integrity and service and not a political prize to be won in a periodic political carnival.

Under the Constitution, the House and the Congress have prerogatives under a philosophy of separation of powers. This separation was by design, to prevent concentration of power in an executive. There have been moments in history when such concentration has been necessary and when it has been of benefit. In the end, continuation of such concentration can mean only the destruction of individual freedom and representative government. This is a consideration which must be pondered many times each session of the Congress. Much erosion of our constitutional authority has not been caused by theft. It has been given away. Too many times, we have succumbed to pressures. We have built in a custom under which legislative proposals are accompanied by reports from the administrative branch—reports which approve or disapprove the proposition under consideration. The Presidents now determine what the legislative proposals shall be, and in the effort which they call responsibility of leadership, try to dictate the course which the Congress shall pursue. The practice can be carried to an extreme at which traditional constitutional concepts are canceled or reversed. We even find ourselves considering propositions which would see the administrative branch legislating and the Congress having the veto power.

This distortion of separations of power are aided and abetted by the waywardness and the peregrinations and the lack of responsibility exhibited by a few Members of the Congress. One bad apple does not cause all other Members of the congressional barrel to spoil. But the presence of a few spoilers causes a deterioration in the attractiveness and the effectiveness of the Congress.

We have been subject to much criticism—some justified; most not justified. Our image is tarnished. Sometimes the portrait of the Congress is painfully photographic. Sometimes it is as distorted as the wildest surealism. In either case, the best remedy is a good look at ourselves and the glass house in which we operate.

We can solve our own problems. In so doing we can restore the faith and confidence of our American citizens in their representative government. It is gratifying to note that we are making progress.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat that we did receive a firm commitment from the chairman of the full committee that $55,000 a year would be made available to the minority. If we could have received some assurance that a proportionate share of the reduced amount being made available to the committee would be made available to the minority, this problem never would have developed. We need such reassurance now.

I would like to stress again that the role of the minority on the Education and Labor Committee is very considerable. To make my point clear, the minority now has only two employees on the staff. Over the past 2 years the majority has averaged about 50 employees.

I am going to put in some information with respect to what we have developed in the way of views of our own. The problem is that without adequate staff assistance we cannot perform satisfactorily. I have no desire to belabor this point, but I do think that as matters stand now we Republicans are left without any assurance. With these funds sharply reduced there is every prospect, despite all the good will in the world, that we will not have sufficient funds with which to operate in the next year.

The following tabulation provides an indication of the considerable responsibilities of the minority during the 87th Congress:

WORK OF THE MINORITY STAFF EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE—87TH CONGRESS

I. MINORITY AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

Education, first session:

House Report No. 440, College Academic Facilities and Scholarship Act, H.R. 7215.

House Report No. 445, School Assistance Act of 1961, H.R. 7300.

House Report No. 674, National Defense Education Act amendment of 1961, H.R. 7904.

House Report No. 674, National Defense Education Act amendment of 1961 (part 2).

Education, second session:

House Report No. 1551, Adult Basic Education Act of 1962, H.R. 10896.

House Report No. 1750, General University Extension Education Act of 1962, H.R. 11340.

House Report No. 1962, Migrant Agricultural Employees and Children, S. 1124.
Educational Assistance Act of 1961, H.R. ——.

Labor, first session:

House Report No. 75, Fair Labor Standards amendments of 1961, H.R. 3935.

House Report No. 879, Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961, H.R. 8399.

House Report No. 998, Welfare and Pension Plan amendments of 1961, H.R. 8723.

House Report No. 833, Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961, H.R. 8354.

Labor, second session:

House Report No. 1554, amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act, H.R. 10946.

House Report No. 1370, Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1962, H.R. 10144.

House Report No. 1719, Joint industry promotion, H.R. 11537.

House Report No. 1963, National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor, S. 1132.

House Report No. 1666, Employment of Children in Agriculture, S. 1123.

House Report No. 1965, Occupational Safety Act of 1962, H.R. 12306.

House Report No. 1540, Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1962, H.R. 10682.

II. SPECIAL INVESTIGATIVE SUBCOMMITTEES

1. Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation:

(a) Extensive hearings.

(b) Assisted in the preparation of the subcommittee report. (See House report dated September 1961.)

2. Subcommittee on the Administration of the National Labor Relations Act by the National Labor Relations Board:

(a) Extensive hearings.

(b) Minority and supplemental views prepared. (See House report dated September 1961.)

3. Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment:

(a) Extensive hearings.

(b) Supplemental views prepared. (See House report dated May 1962.)

4. Special Subcommittee inquiry on the administration of the Davis-Bacon Act:

(a) Extensive hearings.

(b) Report now being prepared.

5. Subcommittee on Irregularities in the Garment Industry:

(a) Extensive hearings.

(b) No report prepared.

6. Racial discrimination in schools receiving Federal assistance in federally impacted areas:

(a) Extensive hearings.

(b) Assisted in preparation of report. (See House Rept. No. 1751.)

III. MAJOR FLOOR DEBATES

1. Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961 (H.R. 3935).

2. Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961 (H.R. 8399).

3. Welfare and Pension Plan Amendments of 1961 (H.R. 8723).

4. College Academic Facilities Act (H.R. 8900).

5. School Lunch Act as amended (H.R. 11665).

6. Equal Pay Act of 1962 (H.R. 11880).

7. Amendment to Fair Labor Standards Act dealing with child labor (S. 1123).

IV. MINORITY SUBSTITUTE BILLS ADOPTED BY HOUSE

1. Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961 (H.R. 3935).

2. Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961 (H.R. 8723).

V. HOUSE-SENATE CONFERENCES

1. Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961 (H.R. 3935).

2. Manpower Development and Training Act of 1961 (H.R. 8399).

3. Welfare and Pension Plan Amendments of 1961 (H.R. 8723).

4. College Academic Facilities Act (H.R. 8900).

5. School Lunch Act as amended (H.R. 11665).

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Administration Committee and a member of the Subcommittee on Accounts of that committee, I have consistently opposed the granting of Chairman POWELL's budget request for $697,000. I have maintained that his budget should be cut to the bare essential needed for his committee to function because of the unacceptable manner in which he has served in his capacity as chairman. I would advocate even greater cuts in his budget except for the fact that I do not want to cripple the good men who are members of his committee and who have consistently done a good job. With the addition of further restrictions as to how and by whom this money is spent and for what purpose it is spent, I hope we can by this action, restore the faith of the people in this committee and in the Congress. Certainly that is my desire.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the restriction of $25,000 for each subcommittee provided in the budget for the Committee on Education and Labor is one with which I, as a chairman, can live. I will have to live with it. But it will impair our efficiency.

During the 87th Congress when we were on a 2-year budget, each subcommittee was given $26,000 per year—a total of $52,000. I was the chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Education. Salaries of staff employees of the subcommittee amounted to about $20,000 per year. During 1962 I spent $21,103.79 on salaries of personnel. I spent approximately $1,000 per year on office supplies—items from the stationery room—long-distance telephone calls and telegrams. The balance, something less than $4,000 per year, was spent on travel.

The subcommittee conducted 2 days of hearings in San Francisco and 2 days in New York City in our study of the economic problems in the performing arts. We had 1 day of hearings jointly with the General Subcommittee on Labor in Morehead, Ky., and 1 day of hearings in Providence, R.I.

Legislation from my subcommittee that eventually was reported to the House included the general university extension bill, the Federal Advisory Council on Arts bill, the quality in education bill, and the educational and training films for the deaf bill. This latter became Public Law 87–715. In addition my subcommittee shared in the consideration of legislation to extend and expand the National Defense Education Act, which was also reported to the House. My subcommittee also reported to the full committee a bill to establish a Carver Memorial Library.

The 87th Congress, in its wisdom, provided for a 7-percent pay raise for all Federal employees, including employees of the House of Representatives. On the $25,000 which is being made available for the Special Subcommittee on Labor which I am heading now, I am either going to have to take that pay raise away from my staff employees, or the subcommittee can conduct no field hearings or field investigations. In either case—and I cannot expect my staff to take the full burden of this action—we shall be hampered in discharging our responsibility to the Congress.

My subcommittee's jurisdiction embraces the Taft-Hartley Act, the Landrum-Griffin Act, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Equal Pay Act of 1963, upon which hearings are scheduled. We shall also have such other matters as the chairman may see fit to assign.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Committee on House Administration for this action in which it has vindicated the entire membership of this House. Because of the manner in which the affairs of the Committee on Education and Labor have been conducted during the past 2 years, I feel that each Member of this body was in the position of deciding whether or not we should condone and continue the policies which will now be held in close check due to the timely action of this watchdog committee.

Some will say that the cuts are too deep. I think not. As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] so well put it, it will very definitely mean cutting back on some of the employees whom we never saw, rarely heard of, and little benefited by. It will mean fewer opportunities for lavish spending, fewer trips, and without doubt, less waste of taxpayers' money. The basic work of our committee will be accomplished on the fourth floor suite of the Old House Office Building. It will be accomplished by Members of Congress whose pay is not charged against this committee. If we buckle down and proceed expeditiously, we can do as much or more with less costly expenditure. The effort of the committee members and not the dollars expended will be the true test of accomplishment.

What we have done today, however, is but a first step in getting our own House in order. The chairman of the Rules Committee has promised to tighten up the provisions for oversea travel, not only for our committee but for the entire membership of this body. Other expenditures should be scrutinized.

It seems ridiculous to me that our State Department should be in the position of arranging for the oversea travel of Members of this body. At a time when world conditions command every ounce of resourcefulness and initiative that we can display, why should we put them in the position of being advance men for those of us who travel in foreign countries.

I would like to read a telegram that they sent to their embassies last summer as a case in point, and I quote:

> Congressman ADAM C. POWELL, chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, accompanied by Mrs. Tamara J. Wall and Miss Corrine Huff, staff members, traveling Western Europe accordance following itinerary:
>
> August 8 sailing *Queen Mary* arriving Southampton, August 13; Paris, August 16; Venice, August 20; Rome, August 23; Athens, August 27; Delphi, August 30; sailing *Leonardo da Vinci*, September 15 from Gibraltar. Arrival times and flights forwarded when firm.
>
> Provisions handbook congressional travel apply. Codel and party authorized use local currencies 19FT561 funds. Meet assist appoint control officers.
>
> Request one single and one double with bath as follows: London-Cumberland Marbel Arch Hotel; Paris Hotel San Regis; Venice Royal Denieli; Rome (1) Excelsior (2) Flora (3) Victoria whichever has special embassy rates; Athens beachhouse at Astir Hotel Delphi new government hotel name unknown. Confirm Department soonest.
>
> London, request three tickets August 14 and 15, best shows playing, except Broadway plays.
>
> Paris-Codel desires use U.S. Army car and chauffeur. Reserve three for first show and dinner best table Lido August 16.
>
> Southampton-Codel requests be met at *Queen Mary* Cherbourg with $100 U.S. equivalent in local currencies for each member party.

Mr. Speaker, let me again say that I commend Chairman BURLESON and the members of this committee as well as the entire body of the House for the action taken today. Let us not forget that it is merely a start.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution as amended is agreed to, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

NURSERY STOCK, PLANT, AND SEEDS QUARANTINE NO. 37

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1963, the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture held a hearing with respect to the proposed amendment to nursery stock, plant, and seeds quarantine No. 37.

The proposed change would permit growing media in which plants were grown in foreign countries to be brought into this country, and would require the United States to furnish specifications for buildings and employees to supervise production of foreign plants in foreign countries for as much as 2 years.

The proposal by the Department would not be limited to letting azaleas into the country from Belgium, but would in effect provide a change in policy which would permit foreign countries to bring into the United States growing media which admittedly "could" serve to bring in the thousands of injurious pests and diseases which, fortunately, we do not yet have.

The Government has spent hundreds of millions of dollars because of them. Notwithstanding these facts, there are probably 20,000 injurious insects and diseases which we do not yet have in this country, which according to the Department would endanger up to $30 billion worth of crops annually if ever they reached here.

The Department's proposal to supply employees to provide specifications for buildings and supervise the growing plants in foreign countries for as long as 2 years, though the cost of such employees would be repaid by the foreign country. This would be taking a further step along the road of providing assistance to foreign growers to enable them to better compete with U.S. growers. If we were to furnish Department of Agriculture employees to help foreign producers, as is proposed in this case, where are we going to draw the line?

If you once start this, there is no telling how far it will go. I hope that the Members will secure copies of these hearings and see how dangerous this proposed change would be.

Even now, we are intercepting an injurious insect coming into this country every 16 minutes of every day.

Mr. Speaker, we have therefore asked the Secretary to cancel this proposed amendment.

THE MICA STOCKPILE PROGRAM

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, when the Government program of purchasing mica for the national defense stockpile terminated in July of 1962, thousands of North Carolinians, engaged in the production of this critical mineral, were thrown out of employment.

While a number of counties in western North Carolina were affected by the termination of the mica stockpile program, two counties in my congressional district suffered unusual economic hardship through the loss of jobs brought about by the closing of the program. I refer to the counties of Avery and Mitchell.

The counties have some of the finest mica in the United States. Approximately 3,500 people, miners and mica processers, were engaged in the stockpile program while it was in operation. Now that the program has terminated, many of these people have been left without suitable employment. The counties of Avery and Mitchell have been declared depressed areas by the Federal Government, and the Area Redevelopment Administration is making an effort to create new job opportunities for those who were left without jobs when the stockpile program was terminated.

Mr. Speaker, while mica is a mineral vital to our defense requirements in time of war, it is also a mineral that must be in plentiful supply to keep the wheels of industry turning in time of peace. I believe it would be a great economic tragedy for our mica mines to close, not only in North Carolina but in those other areas of the Nation where mica can be mined successfully.

While we feel we have enough mica on hand at the present time to satisfy future requirements in time of peace and war, no one can definitely predict the course of future events in our country. In my opinion I feel that the only safe course we can follow is to keep our mica mines in operation. Not only will we be keeping an industry alive necessary to our security, we will be affording employment opportunities to thousands of people, many of whom are living in areas that are receiving assistance through various Federal programs.

In order to keep our mica mines open, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to establish a program for the purchase and resale of domestically produced, newly mined, processed mica and mica ore. The bill which I have introduced calls for a new type of Government purchase program. It would give the Department of the Interior the authority to purchase mica for a period of 5 years.

During each 90 days while the purchase program is in effect an auction will be held by the Department of the Interior for the purpose of selling to domestic users and fabricators the mica acquired during the previous quarter. The funds received by the Secretary of the Interior for the mica could then be used for the purchase of additional mica and for expenses involved in carrying on the program.

The price of mica under the provisions of my bill would be at the level established at the time the General Services Administration stockpile mica purchase program terminated in July of 1962. My bill provides that the Department of the Interior can expend a sum not to exceed $5 million each year in the form of a subsidy to equalize the difference between the amount received from the sale of mica at the auctions and the total price paid to the producer. The program to be set up under my measure would terminate on July 1, 1968.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of a subsidy to keep vital industries in operation in our Nation is not new to our economic system. While I am not one who advocates indiscriminate use of subsidies, I nevertheless feel that the overriding considerations of national defense and economic hardship for mica miners certainly justify the imposition of a small temporary subsidy to keep our mica mines operating. It is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues in the Congress will join with me in supporting my bill.

THE CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an analysis and copy of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1963, I introduced a bill—H.R. 4415—whose purpose is to provide for the mounting of a comprehensive national effort to control the great scourge of air pollution which presently jeopardizes the health and well-being of our Nation and which, unless prompt action is taken, will become increasingly severe over the next few years.

The need for such an effort has become increasingly apparent to me after careful study of the problem in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The problem of air pollution has been under consideration by the committee for many years. In 1955, the committee reported favorably on the basic legislation establishing the present Federal air pollution research and technical assistance program.

In 1956, the Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety of the committee made a study of noxious, toxic, and harmful motor vehicle exhaust fumes in connection with a comprehensive investigation of highway traffic fumes in connection with a comprehensive investigation of highway traffic safety. Testimony was taken and research activities of the industry were studied on visits to manufacturing plants.

Hearings have been held by the Health and Safety Subcommittee in 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1962 on various bills concerned with extension of the Federal air pollution program and on the progress being made in air pollution control, particularly with regard to motor vehicle exhausts.

In 1959, the committee reported favorably on legislation to extend the Federal air pollution program—Public Law 86–365—and in 1960, a favorable committee report was made on a bill requiring increased emphasis on research into the motor vehicle exhaust problem and a report to Congress on the results of such investigations—Public Law 86–493.

Last year, the committee reported favorably on legislation to extend the Federal program for an additional period of 2 years and to enact into permanent law the substance of Public Law 86–493 requiring the Surgeon General specifically to conduct studies on motor vehicle exhaust as it affects human health through the pollution of air—Public Law 87–761.

Thus, over the course of years the air pollution problem has been carefully studied. During these years significant progress has been made, through research, in understanding the nature of the problem and the methods for its control. But, in comparison with the magnitude of the problem, far too little has been done at all levels of government, to actually apply the knowledge we now possess to control the existing problem and to prevent its aggravation in the future. The record of the National Conference on Air Pollution documents in detail the nature of the problem and the terrible threat to our Nation's health and well-being which it poses. And to this record of words, the London smog of only 3 months ago, in which hundreds of people in that great metropolis became ill and died, should serve as a grim reminder that action to protect the purity of the air we breathe can no longer be delayed.

What is the nature of this threat? Looking superficially at the vastness of the air resources available to the entire country, it would seem a virtual impossibility to seriously threaten it. But the problem can be understood when it is realized that only a small part of the vast supply is available for our use in any single location. Over one-half of our population now lives on less than 10 percent of the land area of the country. For the most part, sources of air pollution are concentrated where people are concentrated. Furthermore, there is every indication that by 1970 two-thirds of our population at that time will live in this same limited land area.

We are already overburdening those portions of the air resource available to many of our cities. Few people realize the enormous magnitude of the quantities of pollutants being discharged to the atmosphere. In one of our larger American cities a well-known research institute has estimated the emissions of pollutants at 25,000 tons daily—comprised of a great variety of contaminant gases and liquid and solid aerosols. Despite daily and seasonal variations, the air supply available to this city, as to our other cities, is basically fixed, and the ability of the atmosphere to dilute and disperse pollutants is limited.

Air pollution is a heavy economic burden to this country, causing extensive economic damage through its effects on animal and plant life, the corrosion and soiling of materials and structures, depreciation of property values, interference with air and surface transport, and losses of unburnt fuel. Estimates of such losses have tended to increase as research has progressed on these problems. Thus, in the case of agricultural losses, estimates of damage to crops in southern California have risen from $500,000 in 1939, to over $3 million in 1953, and over $8 million in 1958. It is reported informally that truck crop losses from air pollution in New Jersey have recently totaled many millions of dollars annually. Summation of estimates of the various types of economic damage from air pollution have led a number of investigators to conclude that these may amount to over $11 billion a year.

Of even greater concern are its adverse effects on human health. Research conducted over the past several years has produced a growing body of evidence which indicates that the long-term effects of exposure of community populations to ordinary concentrations of air pollutants adversely affects the health of many and may result in chronic disease, and premature death. Air pollution has been linked with increased mortality from cardiorespiratory causes, increased susceptibility to respiratory disease, and interference with normal respiratory functions. Specific diseases associated in one degree or another with air pollution are emphysema, chronic bronchitis, asthma, and lung cancer.

When we combine the threat to health posed by air pollution and the economic damages it causes, it appears clear that we must put to work all of the procedures which are now available for use in the control of air pollution. At a technical level, procedures are available by which the majority of air pollutants can be controlled or prevented, generally at costs far below the social costs to the Nation of economic damage, illness, and death which is associated with air pollution. The fact that for some types of pollutants technically feasible control methods are not available and the need for additional research concerning the nature and effects of the problem does not provide justifiable reasons for waiting to do what can be done now.

Over the past several years, on requests from the Surgeon General, the President, and the Congress, several committees composed of highly qualified people have examined the problem of air pollution in the United States and the actions needed in coping with it. All of these groups have emphasized the essentiality of preserving the quality of our air resource and the need for more research and technically trained manpower, and greater application of our available technology in preventing air pollution.

The wide-scale application of available technical procedures is dependent upon the development and operation of community programs on State and local government levels. Here, the situation nationally is far from adequate for dealing effectively with the needs for air pollution control. With respect to our urban population, approximately 90 percent lives in localities having air pollution problems. It is estimated that all 232 communities in this country with a population greater than 50,000 have air pollution problems; approximately 40 percent of the communities in the 2,500 to 50,000 population range have problems. In total, about 6,000 communities in the United States have air pollution problems of varying degrees for which action programs should be initiated or strengthened as soon as practicable.

At this time, there are only 106 local control programs on record which have full-time staffs. These programs serve 342 local political jurisdictions, which comprise about 45 percent of the national urban population. Only 28 of these control programs have 5 or more full-time employees. There is an additional number of local programs with part-time staffs. The median annual expenditure is about 10 cents per capita, an amount highly inadequate to do the job which is necessary to attain effective control.

On the State level, during the past decade, there has been some improvement in the status of State air pollution legislation and the development of comprehensive programs dealing with problems in this area. Thus, about 15 States now have enactments which authorize the conduct of specific programs, whereas no State had such authorization as of 1950. But, the inadequacies of these programs is reflected in the fact that little more than $2 million was spent for air pollution by all States in 1961 and that, of this, more than $1 million was spent by the State of California.

Air pollution control practices currently are largely pragmatic in character, with regulatory requirements necessarily based on judgments as to what control measures are technically and economically feasible. More rational air quality criteria and standards are desirable and can be developed as we improved our knowledge through research

and improved understanding of local and regional problems.

Nationally, it is clear we have a long way to go and a lot of catching up to do in dealing adequately with problems of air pollution. It is particularly important in this connection that State and local government air pollution control programs be extended in coverage and strengthened in depth to cope with the complex technical problems with which they must deal. Further, in recognition of the fact that the air currents respect no boundaries, authority needs to be given to the National Government to control interstate problems when the States fail to do so.

The ultimate national objective in air pollution control is to protect the quality of the air resource used in common by the American people to the end that: First, death and sickness caused by polluted air will be prevented; and second, property damage and economic loss from air pollution will be minimized. In support of these recommendations, I have introduced H.R. 4415. As noted earlier the bill is the product of years of study by myself and the other members of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety. In these studies, particular note should be made of the role of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman PAUL F. SCHENCK, who has made such outstanding contributions to the work of the subcommittee and whose concern for the problems caused by motor vehicle exhausts is reflected in this bill.

The purpose of the bill I have introduced is to develop a comprehensive national program for the prevention and control of air pollution, providing for Federal leadership while recognizing the fundamental responsibilities of State and local governments.

The bill provides for—

First. Establishment of a national research and development program for air pollution prevention and control, including continuation of investigations into the motor vehicle emission problem.

Second. A 5-year, $30 million matching grant program to State and local agencies to assist them in establishing, improving, and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution.

Third. Enforcement measures against air pollution, with Federal enforcement of interstate pollution, and State enforcement of intrastate pollution. Federal, State, and local governments would become partners in effective action to abate pollution.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the full text of the bill and a section-by-section analysis in the RECORD at this point:

CLEAN AIR ACT—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 4415

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

This section makes congressional findings that the predominant part of the Nation's population live in urban areas which are generally interstate in character; that air pollution has become a serious and major problem especially in these areas; that the primary responsibility for solving this problem rests with State and local governments; and that Federal leadership and financial assistance are essential for the development of cooperative Federal, State, regional, and local programs.

The purposes of the act are to protect the Nation's air resource; initiate and accelerate a national research and development program; provide technical and financial assistance to State and local programs; and encourage regional program development.

SECTION 2. COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES AND UNIFORM LAWS

(a) This subsection provides that the Secretary shall:

1. Encourage cooperative activities by the State and local governments for prevention and control of air pollution.

2. Encourage the enactment of improved and uniform laws where practicable.

3. Encourage agreements and compacts between States for prevention and control of air pollution.

(b) This subsection requires that the Secretary cooperate with and encourage cooperative activities by all Federal departments—so as to assure utilization of all facilities and resources of the Federal Government.

(c) Consent of Congress is given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance and (2) for establishment of agencies joint or otherwise for prevention and control of air pollution. No compact or agreement is binding until approved by the Congress.

SECTION 3. RESEARCH, INVESTIGATION, TRAINING, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

Subsection (a) requires the Secretary to establish a national research and development program for prevention and control of air pollution. As a part of such a program:

It is provided that the Federal Government shall conduct and promote the coordination and acceleration of research, investigations, training, demonstrations, surveys and studies relating to the causes, effects, and prevention and control of air pollution; encourage, cooperate with and render technical and financial assistance to local and State agencies.

That the Secretary conduct investigations, research, and surveys concerning any specific problem of air pollution if he is requested to do so or if, in his judgment such a problem may affect or be of concern to communities in various parts of the Nation or is interstate in nature with a view to recommending a solution to the problem.

The Secretary would specifically be required to conduct studies regarding the discharges from motor vehicles from the standpoint of human health.

Subsection (b) authorizes the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of the preceding subsection to:

1. Collect and distribute information pertaining to research and other activities including appropriate recommendations.

2. Cooperate with other Federal, State, and local departments and agencies and with private organizations, including industry, in the preparation and conduct of research activities.

3. Make grants to air pollution control agencies and other agencies and individuals for the conduct of appropriate air pollution programs; upon such terms and conditions as he may determine.

4. Enter into contracts for the conduct of research, investigations, training, and other authorized activities.

5. Provide training for and make training grants to qualified individuals.

6. Establish and maintain research fellowships in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and at public or nonprofit private educational institutions, etc.

7. Collect and disseminate basic data relating to the prevention and control of air pollution; chemical, physical, and biological air quality data.

8. Develop effective and practical processes, methods, and prototype devices for the prevention or control of air pollution.

9. Recommend to air pollution control agencies and other appropriate organizations such criteria of air quality, after such research as may be necessary to protect the public health and welfare.

SECTION 4. GRANTS FOR SUPPORT OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

(a) Authorizes to be appropriated $30 million over a 5-year period for grants to air pollution control agencies in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining program for prevention and control of air pollution. Such sums remain available during fiscal year appropriated and the succeeding fiscal year.

(b) The Secretary is required to make allotments to States, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of (1) population, (2) extent of the problem, and (3) financial need of the respective States.

(c) From each State's allotment the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies in an amount equal to two-thirds of the cost of establishing and maintaining such programs. Grants equal to three-fourths of such cost may be made to regional air pollution programs meeting specified criteria. Interstate air pollution agency grants will be made from the allotments of the constituent States.

(d) Grants to be made in accordance with regulations and terms and conditions of the Secretary.

(e) Funds allotted to a State which have not been obligated by the end of the fiscal year because of a lack of approvable applications shall be reallocated by the Secretary to other States.

SECTION 5. ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION

Interstate pollution: In the case of air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates, the Secretary is empowered to call a conference of the air pollution control agencies of the States involved either at the request of the State or States involved (including municipalities with the concurrence of the State agency) or on his own initiative. The purpose of the conference is to determine the extent of the pollution problem, what is being done about it, and the nature of any delays being encountered in abatement work. Following the conference, if the Secretary believes that effective progress is not being made toward abatement he shall recommend appropriate remedial action. If after 6 months such action has not been taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing. Each State involved will be able to choose one member of the hearing board. The hearing board shall hear evidence and make findings on the basis of such evidence as to whether pollution exists and whether effective progress toward abatement is being made. The board will recommend appropriate remedial measures if such are necessary. The findings and recommendations of the board will be sent by the Secretary to those causing or contributing to the pollution and to the States and local air pollution control agencies with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than 6 months) to secure abatement. If appropriate action is not taken in the specified time, the Secretary can request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement. The court giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, will have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

Intrastate pollution: The same procedure as above is followed in cases involving pollution occurring wholly within one State except that Federal action can be taken only at the request of the Governor of a State or a State air pollution agency or a municipality with the concurrence of the State agency. Such findings and recommendations shall be turned over to the Governor or Attorney General for appropriate State action. The Secretary would be authorized, upon the request of the Governor or Attorney General, to provide technical and other assistance necessary to assist the State in judicial proceedings to secure abatement under State or local law.

In all cases of intrastate air pollution it is required that the municipality affected or the municipality in which such pollution originates either has made or concurred in the request to the Secretary for the holding of a conference and subsequent actions as provided in this section. The Secretary is further granted the discretion of not calling a conference if in his judgment the effect of such pollution is not of such significance as to warrant the exercise of Federal jurisdiction under this section.

Federal property: The Secretary is required to include in his summary of any conference references to any discharges contributing to air pollution from Federal property. Notices of hearings involving any pollution alleged to be affected by such discharges shall be given to the Federal agency having jurisdiction.

SECTION 6. REQUIREMENT OF REPORTS

(a) This section authorizes the Secretary to require any person whose activities result in the emission of air pollution which has been the subject of a conference under section 5 to file reports relating to the character, kind and quantity of pollutants discharged and the use of devices or other means to prevent or reduce the emission of pollutants. All information bearing on trade secrets and similar matters in such reports is considered confidential.

(b) Failure to file reports within the time fixed by the Secretary will result in a $100 forfeiture for each day of such failure. The Secretary is further authorized to remit or mitigate such forfeiture.

(c) Requires the various U.S. attorneys under the direction of the Attorney General to prosecute for recovery forfeitures.

SECTION 7. COOPERATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES TO CONTROL AIR POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL FACILITIES

This section presents the intent of the Congress that Federal departments and agencies should, to the extent practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and with air pollution control agencies in preventing and controlling air pollution from Federal facilities.

SECTION 8. INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC

This section requires that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments be made available to the public from research contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored, or otherwise authorized under the provisions of the bill. The rights of the owner of any background patent are protected.

SECTION 9. ADMINISTRATION

Regulations and delegation of functions: Subsection (a) provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under the act, and to delegate his functions except the making of regulations.

Loans of Federal personnel: Subsection (b) would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare upon the request of an air pollution control agency, to detail personnel of the Public Health Service to such an agency. The provisions of section 214(d) of the PHS Act shall be applicable with respect to such personnel.

Grant payment methods: Subsection (c) authorizes the payment of grants, under the act, in advance, in installments, or by way of reimbursement.

SECTION 10. DEFINITIONS

This section defines the term "Secretary" as meaning the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The term "air pollution control agency" means a single State agency designated by the Governor thereof; an agency established by two or more States; a city, county, or other local government health authority or other single agency having specific responsibility; an agency of two or more municipalities in the same or different States.

The term "interstate air pollution control agency" means an air pollution control agency established by two or more States or two or more municipalities in different States.

The District of Columbia, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam are included in the term "State".

Definitions are also included for the terms "person" and "municipality".

SECTION 11. OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED

This section provides that the act shall not be construed as superseding or limiting the authorities and responsibilities, under any other provision of law, of the Secretary or of any other Federal officer, department, or agency.

SECTION 12. SEPARABILITY

This section contains a standard separability clause.

SECTION 13. SHORT TITLE

This section would amend the present act to provide that the act may be cited as the "Clean Air Act."

H.R. 4415

A bill to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of July 14, 1955, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857–1857g), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

"Sec. 1. (a) The Congress finds—

"(1) that the predominant part of the Nation's population is located in its rapidly expanding metropolitan and other urban areas, which generally cross the boundary lines of local jurisdictions and often extend into two or more States;

"(2) that the growth in the amount and complexity of air pollution brought about by urbanization, industrial development, and the increasing use of motor vehicles, has resulted in mounting dangers to the public health and welfare, injury to agricultural crops and livestock, damage to and the deterioration of property, and hazards to air and ground transportation;

"(3) that the prevention and control of air pollution at its source is the primary responsibility of States and local governments; and

"(4) that Federal financial assistance and leadership is essential for the development of cooperative Federal, State, regional, and local programs to prevent and control air pollution.

"(b) The purposes of this Act are—

"(1) to protect the Nation's air resources so as to promote the public health and welfare and the productive capacity of its population;

"(2) to initiate and accelerate a national research and development program to achieve the prevention and control of air pollution;

"(3) to provide technical and financial assistance to State and local governments in connection with the development and execution of their air pollution prevention and control programs; and

"(4) to encourage and assist the development and operation of regional air pollution control programs.

"COOPERATIVE ACTIVITIES AND UNIFORM LAWS

"Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary shall encourage cooperative activities by the States and local governments for the prevention and control of air pollution; encourage the enactment of improved and, so far as practicable in the light of varying conditions and needs, uniform State and local laws relating to the prevention and control of air pollution; and encourage the making of agreements and compacts between States for the prevention and control of air pollution.

"(b) The Secretary shall cooperate with and encourage cooperative activities by all Federal departments and agencies having functions relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, so as to assure the utilization in the Federal air pollution control program of all appropriate and available facilities and resources within the Federal Government.

"(c) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to two or more States to negotiate and enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law or treaty of the United States, for (1) cooperative effort and mutual assistance for the prevention and control of air pollution and the enforcement of their respective laws relating thereto, and (2) the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements or compacts. No such agreement or compact shall be binding or obligatory upon any State a party thereto unless and until it has been approved by Congress.

"RESEARCH, INVESTIGATIONS, TRAINING, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES

"Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary shall establish a national research and development program for the prevention and control of air pollution and as part of such program shall—

"(1) conduct, and promote the coordination and acceleration of, research, investigations, experiments, training, demonstrations, surveys, and studies relating to the causes, effects, extent, prevention, and control of air pollution; and

"(2) encourage, cooperate with, and render technical services and provide financial assistance to air pollution control agencies and other appropriate public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and individuals in the conduct of such activities; and

"(3) conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of air pollution confronting any air pollution control agency with a view to recommending a solution of such problem, if he is requested to do so by such agency or if, in his judgment, such problem may affect or be of concern to communities in various parts of the Nation or may affect any community or communities in a State other than that in which the source of the matter causing or contributing to the pollution is located.

"(4) in view of the nationwide significance of the problems of air pollution from motor vehicles, conduct studies of the amounts and kinds of substances discharged from the exhausts of motor vehicles and of the effects of the discharge of such substances, including the amounts and kinds of such substances which, from the standpoint of human health, it is safe for motor vehicles to discharge into the atmosphere.

"(b) In carrying out the provisions of the preceding subsection the Secretary is authorized to—

"(1) collect and make available, through publications and other appropriate means, the results of and other information, including appropriate recommendations by him in connection therewith, pertaining to such research and other activities;

"(2) cooperate with other Federal departments and agencies, with air pollution control agencies, with other public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with any industries involved, in the preparation and conduct of such research and other activities;

"(3) make grants to air pollution control agencies, to other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and to individuals, upon such terms and conditions as he may determine;

"(4) contract with public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, and with individuals, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5);

"(5) provide training for, and make training grants to, personnel of air pollution control agencies and other persons with suitable qualifications;

"(6) establish and maintain research fellowships, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and at public or nonprofit private educational institutions or research organizations;

"(7) collect and disseminate, in cooperation with other Federal departments and agencies, and with other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations having related responsibilities, basic data on chemical, physical, and biological air quality and other information pertaining to air pollution and the prevention and control thereof;

"(8) develop effective and practical processes, methods, and prototype devices for the prevention or control of air pollution; and

"(9) recommend to air pollution control agencies and to other appropriate organizations, after such research as he determines to be necessary, such criteria of air quality as in his judgment may be necessary to protect the public health and welfare.

"GRANTS FOR SUPPORT OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

"Sec. 4. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $6,000,000 for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and $7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, for grants to air pollution control agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution. Sums so appropriated shall remain available for making grants as provided in this section during the fiscal year for which appropriated and the succeeding fiscal year.

"(b) From the sums available therefor for any fiscal year the Secretary shall from time to time make allotments to the several States, in accordance with regulations, on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the extent of the air pollution problem, and (3) the financial need of the respective States. For purposes of this section, population shall be determined on the basis of the latest figures furnished by the Department of Commerce, and per capita income for each State and for the United States shall be determined on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the continental United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

"(c) From each State's allotment under paragraph (b) for any fiscal year, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies in such State in an amount equal to two-thirds of the cost of establishing and maintaining programs for the prevention and control of air pollution: *Provided,* That the Secretary is authorized to make grants to air pollution control agencies described in section 10(b) (2) or (4) in an amount equal to three-fourths of the cost of establishing and maintaining regional air pollution control programs which meet criteria established in regulations by the Secretary as necessary for the effective control of air pollution in the area: *And provided further,* That in the case of grants to an interstate air pollution control agency (as defined in this Act) the grant shall be made from the allotments of the several States which are members of such agency on such basis as the Secretary finds reasonable and equitable. As used in this subsection, the term "regional air pollution control program" means a program for the prevention and control of air pollution in an area that includes the areas of two or more municipalities, whether in the same State or different States.

"(d) Such grants shall be made, in accordance with regulations, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(e) Sums allotted to a State under subsection (b) of this section which have not been obligated by the end of the fiscal year for which they were allotted because of a lack of approval applications shall be reallotted by the Secretary, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable and in accordance with regulations promulgated by him, to States from which approvable applications have been made but which have not been approved for grants because of a lack of funds in the allotment of such State. Any sum made available to a State by reallotment under the preceding sentence shall be in addition to any funds otherwise allotted to such State under this Act and shall be available for grants to air pollution control agencies in such State.

"ABATEMENT OF AIR POLLUTION

"Sec. 5. (a) The pollution of the air in any State or States which endangers the health or welfare of any persons, shall be subject to abatement as provided in this section.

"(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this Act, municipal, State, and interstate action to abate air pollution shall be encouraged and shall not be displaced by Federal enforcement action except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to a court order under subsection (f)(1).

"(c)(1)(A) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to air pollution which is alleged to endanger the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, give formal notification thereof to the air pollution control agency of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate, to the air pollution control agency of the State in which such municipality is located, and to the interstate air pollution control agency, if any, in whose jurisdictional area such municipality is located, and shall call promptly a conference of such agency or agencies and of the air pollution control agencies of the municipalities which may be adversely affected by such pollution, and the air pollution control agency, if any, of each State, or for each area, in which any such municipality is located.

"(B) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State air pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the State air pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to alleged air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate and if a municipality affected by such air pollution, or the municipality in which such pollution originates, has either made or concurred in such request, give formal notification thereof to the State air pollution control agency, to the air pollution control agencies of the municipality where such discharge or discharges originate and of the municipality or municipalities alleged to be adversely affected thereby, and to any interstate air pollution control agency, whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality, and shall promptly call a conference of such agency or agencies, unless, in the judgment of the Secretary, the effect of such pollution is not of such significance as to warrant exercise of Federal jurisdiction under this section.

"(C) The Secretary shall also call such a conference whenever, on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, he has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges originate is occurring.

"(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. Not less than three weeks' prior notice of the conference date shall be given to such agencies.

"(3) Following this conference, the Secretary shall prepare and forward to all air pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of air pollution subject to abatement under this Act; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

"(d) If the Secretary believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of any persons is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State or municipal air pollution control agency (or to both such agencies) that it take necessary remedial action. The Secretary shall allow at least six months from the date he makes such recommendations for the taking of such recommended action.

"(e)(1) If, at the conclusion of the period so allowed, such remedial action or other action which in the judgment of the Secretary is reasonably calculated to secure abatement of such pollution has not been taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a hearing board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of such hearing board and at least one member shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of such hearing board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least three weeks' prior notice of such hearing shall be given to the State, interstate, and municipal air pollution control agencies called to attend such hearing and to the alleged polluter or polluters.

"(2) On the basis of evidence presented at such hearing, the hearing board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the hearing board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement thereof is not being made it shall make recommendations to the Secretary concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and suitable to secure abatement of such pollution.

"(3) The Secretary shall send such findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution; to air pollution control agencies of the State or States and of the municipality or municipalities where such discharge or discharges originate; and to any interstate air pollution control agency whose jurisdictional area includes any such municipality, together with a notice specifying a reasonable time (not less than six months) to secure abatement of such pollution.

"(f) If such action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution within the time specified in the notice following the public hearing is not taken, the Secretary—

"(1) in the case of air pollution which is endangering the health and welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure abatement of the pollution. The court shall receive in evidence in any such suit a transcript of the proceedings before the hearing board in such case and a copy of such board's recommendations and shall receive such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper. The court, giving due consideration to the practicability and to the physical and economic feasibility of securing abatement of any pollution proved, shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment, and orders enforcing such judgment, as the public interest and the equities of the case may require.

"(2) in the case of air pollution which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originate, shall send to the Governor and the attorney general of such State the findings and recommendations of the hearing board and his notice, together with a transcript of the hearing and his finding that action reasonably calculated to secure abatement of the pollution has not been taken, and at the request of such Governor or attorney general he shall provide such technical and other assistance as in his judgment is necessary to assist the State in judicial proceedings to secure abatement of the pollution under State or local law.

"(h) Members of any hearing board appointed pursuant to subsection (e) who are not regular full-time officers or employees of the United States shall, while participating in the hearing conducted by such board or otherwise engaged on the work of such board, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(i) In his summary of any conference pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall include references to any discharges allegedly contributing to pollution from any Federal property. Notice of any hearing pursuant to this section involving any pollution alleged to be affected by any such discharges shall also be given to the Federal agency having jurisdiction over the property involved and the findings and recommendations of the hearing board conducting such hearing shall also include references to any such discharges which are contributing to the pollution found by such hearing board.

"REQUIREMENT OF REPORTS

"Sec. 6. (a) The Secretary is authorized to require any person whose activities result in the emission of air pollutants causing or contributing to air pollution which has been the subject of a conference under section 5 to file with him, in such form as he may prescribe, a report, furnishing to the Secretary such information as may reasonably be required as to the character, kind, and quantity of pollutants discharged and the use of devices or other means to prevent or reduce the emission of pollutants by the person filing such reports. Such report shall be made under oath or otherwise, as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall be filed with the Secretary within such reasonable period as the Secretary may prescribe, unless additional time be granted by the Secretary. All information in such report shall be considered confidential for the purposes of section 1905 of title 18 of the United States Code.

"(b) If any person required to file any report under this section shall fail to do so within the time fixed by the Secretary for filing the same, and such failure shall continue for thirty days after notice of such default, such person shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each and every day of the continuance of such failure, which forfeiture shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States, and shall be recoverable in a civil suit in the name of the United States brought in the district where such person has his principal office or in any district in which he does business: *Provided*, That the Secretary may upon application therefor remit or mitigate any forfeiture provided for under this subsection and he shall have authority to determine the facts upon all such applications.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the various United States attorneys, under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, to prosecute for the recovery of such forfeitures. The costs and expenses of such prosecution shall be paid out of the appropriation for the expenses of the courts of the United States.

"COOPERATION BY FEDERAL AGENCIES TO CONTROL AIR POLLUTION FROM FEDERAL FACILITIES

"Sec. 7. It is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall, to the extent practicable and consistent with the interests of the United States and within any available appropriations, cooperate with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and with any air pollution control agency in preventing and controlling the pollution of the air in any area insofar as the discharge of any matter from or by such building, installation, or other property may cause or contribute to pollution of the air in such area.

"INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO PUBLIC

"Sec. 8. All research within the United States contracted for, sponsored, cosponsored, or authorized under authority of this Act shall be provided for in such manner that all information, uses, products, processes, patents, and other developments resulting from such research developed by Government expenditure will (with such exceptions and limitations, if any, as the Secretary may find to be necessary in the interest of national defense) be available to the general public. This subsection shall not be so construed as to deprive the owner of any background patent relating thereto of such rights as he may have thereunder.

"ADMINISTRATION

"Sec. 9. (a) The Secretary is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under this Act. The Secretary may delegate to any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such of his powers and duties under this Act, except the making of regulations, as he may deem necessary or expedient.

"(b) Upon the request of an air pollution control agency, personnel of the Public Health Service may be detailed to such agency for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act. The provisions of section 214(d) of the Public Health Service Act shall be applicable with respect to any personnel so detailed to the same extent as if such personnel had been detailed under section 214(b) of that Act.

"(c) Payments under grants made under this Act may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary.

"DEFINITIONS

"Sec. 10. When used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"(b) The term 'air pollution control agency' means any of the following:

"(1) A single State agency designated by the Governor of that State as the official State air pollution control agency for purposes of this Act;

"(2) An agency established by two or more States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of air pollution;

"(3) A city, county, or other local government health authority, or, in the case of any city, county, or other local government in which there is an agency other than the health authority charged with responsibility for enforcing ordinances or laws relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, such other agency; or

"(4) An agency of two or more municipalities located in the same State or in different States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of air pollution.

"(c) The term 'interstate air pollution control agency' means—

"(1) an air pollution control agency established by two or more States, or

"(2) an air pollution control agency of two or more municipalities located in different States.

"(d) The term 'State' means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

"(e) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, municipality, and political subdivision of a State.

"(f) The term 'municipality' means a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law.

"OTHER AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED

"Sec. 11. This Act shall not be construed as superseding or limiting the authorities and responsibilities, under any other provision of the law, of the Secretary or any other Federal officer, department, or agency.

"SEPARABILITY

"Sec. 12. If any provision of this Act, or the application of any provision of this Act to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, and the remainder of this Act, shall not be affected thereby.

"SHORT TITLE

"Sec. 13. This Act may be cited as the 'Clean Air Act'."

Sec. 2. The title of such Act of July 14, 1955, is amended to read: "An Act to provide for air pollution prevention and control activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes".

RETURN TO ONE-PRICE COTTON

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing two bills which would return us to a one-price cotton system. It is my hope the Agriculture Committee will consider both of these bills and report now one or the other or a combination of both.

The situation is urgent and even desperate. The cotton farmer is confused. He can never plan from one year to the next. The textile industry is faced with growing unemployment. It is unfair and almost criminal for our textile industry to be forced to pay 8½ cents per pound more for cotton than our foreign competitor.

Mr. Speaker, the American textile industry is the greatest friend of the American cotton farmer. The American textile industry purchases more than 70 percent of its cotton from the American cotton farmer. If the American textile industry and the American cotton farmer are to stay in business, something must be done now.

I represent a district where cotton is grown. My district also includes some of the most efficient cotton textile manufacturing plants in the world. I have a vital interest in the welfare of cotton farmers and the textile workers in my district. For more than 25 years I have watched the control program operate with respect to cotton. Each year, except during World War II and the Korean conflict, the situation with regard to the cotton industry has constantly deteriorated.

At the present time we are faced with a situation where, in my opinion, if something is not done rather quickly, we are on the threshold of liquidating this great industry. This will be a tremendous blow to not only the cotton farmers in some 20 States but it will mean unemployment for a large number of very highly skilled people who are engaged in the manufacture of cotton textiles.

My colleagues from the textile manufacturing areas know what has happened. We are allowing our competitors abroad an 8½-cent-per-pound advantage in price. This, coupled with the cheap labor supply, has allowed a flood of textiles to be imported into the United States. This is a very serious situation. Just as serious is the fact that many domestic users of cotton have changed to synthetics while the importation of foreign synthetic fiber is on the increase and thus the per capita consumption of cotton is going down, down, down. This is due primarily to price.

I believe that if we are going to maintain any semblance of a cotton industry we must reduce the Government-guaranteed price.

The bills I am introducing today are designed to move in a direction that will restore confidence in the cotton industry, increase the consumption of cotton both at home and abroad, lessen the drain on the Federal Treasury, and above all, improve and increase the net per family farm income of cotton producers.

THE HONORABLE GRAHAM B. PURCELL, JR.

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a speech by the Vice President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1963, more than 1,200 citizens of the 13th District of Texas turned out at Wichita Falls to pay respects to their Congressman and our colleague, the Honorable GRAHAM PURCELL.

It was a great honor for me to participate in the recognition paid this outstanding Texan.

On this occasion, the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, was the principal speaker, and under unanimous consent I include herewith his timely remarks:

> There is no place I am ever more willing to come—and no place I am more reluctant to leave—than Wichita Falls. I have been especially anxious to come here for this occasion tonight.
>
> So long as I can remember Wichita Falls has been distinguishing itself in producing leadership for our State and Nation. There was a time back in the 1930's when nearly every major candidate for Governor—both Democrat and Republican—came from Wichita Falls. You gave Texas one of its very finest Governors—James V. Allred.
>
> Through my service in Congress, this district was represented by some of the most able men ever to serve in Washington—my good friends, W. D. MacFarland, Ed Gossett, and Frank Ikard. While I might feel the less said about his party the better, you have now given Texas one of its U.S. Senators, a vigorous young member of the Republican Party, JOHN TOWER.
>
> This is a distinguished record for Wichita Falls. Few other cities can equal it—and I am sure none have excelled it. That is why I am happy to come tonight to tell you—as I hope you already realize—that you have done yourselves proud once more by sending to the Congress of the United States the man we honor on this occasion, GRAHAM PURCELL.
>
> Woodrow Wilson once said that one of two things happen to a man when he goes to Washington—he either grows or swells. In these last 12 months, GRAHAM PURCELL has grown.
>
> If there has been any swelling, it is because he pulled a muscle playing football with that fine homegrown backfield he and his wife are raising. In Washington, you see many types of men come and go. I remember the story of the new first-term Congressman who had just arrived in Washington and felt called upon to make a speech to his colleagues nearly every day. In speech after speech, he told the House that he would rather be right than President. One day the wise old Speaker, presiding over the Chamber, rapped his gavel and said: "The gentleman need not be so worried—he will never be either."
>
> In his service as your Representative, GRAHAM PURCELL has not tried to be Commander in Chief, Chief Justice, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and Budget Director—all rolled into one. He has been doing what you elected him to do: serving the people of this district, by serving the Nation every time the roll is called.
>
> None of us will ever forget that great American, Sam Rayburn. Mr. Rayburn was a man of much wisdom and few words. The highest compliment he ever gave new Congressmen when he was convinced of their worth consisted of two words: "He'll do." If the gentleman from Bonham were with us tonight, I believe he would say of GRAHAM PURCELL: "He'll do."
>
> Since he left home here a year ago, GRAHAM PURCELL—like all of us in Washington—has been both a witness to and a participant in the making of some of the most significant history of the century. While none of us can yet be sure of what the future holds, I believe that when the final judgment on our era is written, the year of 1962 will be remembered and pinpointed as one of the decisive turning points of the cold war and of the whole long struggle between freedom and tyranny.
>
> In that year two events occurred which cannot be ignored or dismissed—and cannot be downgraded.
>
> First, after 15 years of containment, the Russian Communists gambled desperately in an attempt to extend their armed empire across the oceans to the Western Hemisphere. They gambled greatly—and they lost.
>
> Second, after that failure, the Russian Communists turned back to an empire in which—for the first time since communism came into existence—they found their own leadership and control defied and challenged by the Chinese Communists. And the whole myth of Communist unity exploded.
>
> The finger of history rises slowly. Those who are witness to history's great movements often are unaware of the meaning of what their eyes behold. We may be unaware of the full import of the events which have transpired in recent months. But I like to recall the episode of history which Winston Churchill cited to us back in the dark days of 1950 when the Russian threat to Western Europe seemed so grave and the armed might of Communist aggressors seemed so irresistible.
>
> Sir Winston pointed out that 500 years ago the West had been prostrate before the Mongol hordes advancing from the East. In two separate battles, which occurred on almost the same day in Poland and in Austria, the last remaining armies of western civilization were defeated and destroyed. Nothing stood in the way of the aggressors from the East.
>
> But at that critical moment, the great Khan died. The Mongol armies turned back to travel 7,000 miles homeward to resolve their internal differences. And, as Sir Winston put it, "They never returned till now."
>
> In the year of our Lord 1962, it was no chance of fate or accident of history that turned back the aggressors from the East. They found themselves facing the hard reality of an America ready, an America prepared, an America resolute. In the face of that preparedness and resolve, the forces of communism backed away. And today the two great powers of the Communist bloc are being drawn into a vicious and decisive struggle with each other.
>
> Our need for vigilance has not ended. Our need for preparedness will not end during your lifetime or mine. America must continue to maintain its strength—and this we shall do. But there is one vital point which I believe needs to be brought home. The American strength which Khrushchev faced in Cuba—the strength which has held the line against aggression through all these years of the cold war—is not solely the strength of arms and planes and missiles and

bombs. The greater strength which has carried us through these years of peril is the strength of this country's political system—the system of which all of us are part and to which each of us adds or subtracts strength and solidarity.

Through the ages, every great civilization has made its contribution to the progress of man. The contribution of some have been philosophy or art or literature. The imprint which American civilization has left indelibly upon this century—and upon all centuries to come is political.

The genius of our system is described in many different ways by many different people. The businessman may say it is the profit motive. The working man may say it is the right to organize. The school man may say it is educational. The farmer may say it is agricultural. All these answers are right but none is complete.

The abiding genius of America is our ability, under the Constitution, to unite ourselves together to resolve our national problems, to face our common dangers, and to achieve through our efforts the greatest good for the greatest number.

The heart of this genius is the fact that the American people can and do rise above party and above the doctrine and dogma and division of partisanship, to unite in common devotion to principles which transcend the interests of parties, of class or region or race or religion.

This is a greater strength than we remember—a source of strength we too often forget. In the Communist-controlled countries—as in the Axis powers of the 1930's—the party is supreme and paramount. The people are exhorted to rally to the party, to give up their freedom, their possessions, and even their lives to the cause of party, not principles. Time will prove that this is the fatal defect of the totalitarian way.

I say this tonight for a reason. This is not a partisan occasion. If we are partisans at all, we are here as partisans of our friend and neighbor and faithful servant, GRAHAM PURCELL. But we are passing through a time in the history of our Republic when many voices counsel Americans that partisanship is the end-all and be-all of citizenship. This is counsel we should not heed.

In our national history, there are no heroes who made their names as partisans. The only men remembered—the only men worth remembering—have always been those who have placed the country above party and principle above partisanship. We shall have lost the keystone from the arch of our national strength if ever our values are otherwise.

There is much for Americans to be proud of, much for which we should be grateful. We live the freest lives of any peoples on earth. We enjoy the greatest abundance of any peoples who have ever lived. We are the least policed and least afraid of all God's children. At the heart of what we enjoy in this regard is the sense of individual responsibility.

In 1962, Americans paid more than $90 billion in taxes to the Government. Of that huge total, 97 percent was self-assessed and voluntarily paid. In no other country—today or ever—has there been a comparable record. We build our schools; we care for the aged; we minister to the sick; we concern ourselves with the problems of our youth because of this inherent sense of individual responsibility. For the same reason and in the same way, we give of our resources so that other men and women half a world away may keep the freedom they want to keep for their children too.

The world is not ungrateful. The world is not unaware of what we do. Around this globe, nation after nation has adopted for itself constitutions modeled after the Constitution of the United States. Of the more than 50 new nations which have become independent during the years of the cold war, not one has chosen voluntarily to live under communism or to submit to Communist rule. That revolution of freedom that began on these shores 200 years ago continues to be the greatest and most compelling force in the world today—and it is a revolution which knows no partisanship, no dogma, and no partisan doctrine.

This political system which we have wrought is made stronger when the will of the people is represented by men like GRAHAM PURCELL. While GRAHAM PURCELL never forgets the principles of the party of which he is a member, he never remembers the party affiliation of a constituent he serves who enters his office with a worthy cause. This is what makes America strong—not arms alone, not factories alone, not fields alone.

The ultimate strength of America is the capacity of her people to unite together for common cause and higher purposes. And those who would have us divide ourselves along lines of partisanship and party subtract from our strength rather than add to it.

FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, many taxpayers regard their tax payments as an onerous tribute exacted from them to keep Washington bureaucrats on the payroll. Since they get no merchandise back in return for their tax payments, they feel that they are getting nothing for their money. Accustomed as they are to seeing the shiny paint and chromium when they acquire a new car, or the fine fabric when they purchase a new garment, they somehow get the feeling that their tax dollars purchase nothing tangible or valuable for them.

It is the aim of this statement to inquire into the purposes for which our income tax money is spent, and the alternatives to such spending. Americans in and out of political life talk much about our determination to protect our precious freedoms and to resist the spread of government by dictatorship throughout the world. The question arises, however, as to whether we really hold these freedoms to be so precious that we are willing to pay for them with the hard cash of tax dollars. We must decide whether we are ready to invest in freedom and democracy with the sure knowledge that these twin blessings are not bought cheaply. To use a blunt expression, we must determine whether or not we are willing to put our money where our mouth is.

The principal misconception that must be cleared away is that our national budget is so astronomical because of all kinds of welfare programs in which the Government participates. The fact of the matter is that in fiscal 1963, out of every dollar which the taxpayer paid to his National Government, approximately 74 cents goes for national defense and security, space exploration, and the direct cost of our involvement in past wars. The entire remaining cost of Government and its various domestic and international programs, departments, courts, and agencies comes from the 26 cents left over.

Our total budget in fiscal 1963 amounted to over $94 billion. Out of this sum, almost $50 billion was appropriated for the cost of our Armed Forces and our national defense. It should be emphasized, moreover, that these appropriations were made by the House of Representatives by a unanimous vote after unanimous recommendation of both the House Armed Services Committee and the House Appropriations Committee.

Thus, we see that military appropriations alone in fiscal 1963 came to 54 percent of our national budget, or 54 cents out of every tax dollar. Interestingly enough, some of those Congressmen who were most vocal in their support of these and other expenditures which will be dealt with hereafter are also the most vociferous in condemning the high level of Federal spending.

Congress in its foreign aid program for fiscal 1963 also allocated almost $1½ billion exclusively for military assistance to help our allies protect themselves, and ultimately ourselves, against Communist expansion. This expense likewise was generally supported as a desirable alternative to sending additional American troops abroad at a much greater cost and at great hardship to many American families.

Do we remember the day Col. John Glenn successfully accomplished his historic mission into space? Can we recall how thrilled and proud we were to be an American when he and our other astronauts performed their fateful tasks so brilliantly? Well, in fiscal 1963, the U.S. Congress appropriated over $3½ billion for space exploration. The vote in the House of Representatives was unanimous, and came upon the heels of the unanimous recommendations of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and the House Appropriations Committee. This accounted for more than 3½ cents out of every tax dollar.

At this point it should be made clear that I do not suggest that there is not waste in defense or space expenditures. Constant vigilance and scrutiny by those responsible for the administration of such costs is indeed vitally needed. However, the figure of $49,455,000 for military appropriations in 1963 was not picked out of the sky as an attractive round figure. It was arrived at after long and careful consideration and study by the committees of the House and Senate charged with the responsibility of providing for the national defense. Broken down item by item, it calls for a given amount for missiles, aircraft, naval vessels, operational training facilities, and so forth.

When the House Armed Services Committee after months of conscientious consultation with dedicated military personnel unanimously recommends that the sum of almost $50 billion is required to make us impregnable and keep us at full strength, what Congressman can with responsibility call for across-the-

board slashes. To do so would be to engage in a perilous game of Russian roulette with our national security, and you can be sure that it would expose the dissenter to charges of "soft on communism" from the very persons who most loudly bewail our high Federal budget.

Nevertheless, we must realistically face the fact that until such time as we can make significant reductions in our spending for military and space programs, economies effected in other areas cannot be substantial enough in terms of the overall budget to have the desired impact on our national spending picture. Despite the fact that opponents of social welfare and international cooperation programs are trying to use the budget problem as an excuse to scuttle these programs, the ultimate fiscal solution lies in the field of defense and space appropriations which account for the lion's share of our great national cost.

Is it not strange that those who uncomplainingly support appropriations for military aircraft costing millions of dollars apiece will do battle against expenditures for the National Institutes of Health and its associated projects for health research? Yet it may indeed be true that the value of military and space equipment destroyed yearly in accidents alone exceeds our total expenditures for health research.

Returning once more to our list of military expenditures, our involvements in the wars that have plagued the 20th century have brought us face to face with the problem of veterans' benefits. Congress faced the issue in fiscal 1963 by appropriating about $5½ billion for veterans' benefits, or over 5½ cents out of every tax dollar. This was accomplished without significant dissent after unanimous recommendation of the House Veterans Affairs Committee and the House Appropriations Committee.

We could, of course, eliminate or reduce the cost of veterans' benefits but to do so would involve turning our backs on those who suffered the most to protect our way of life. No one seriously suggests that this should be done. It would be a justifiably unpopular act to scale down our veterans' hospitals program or to take disability benefits away from those who are maimed or disabled by reason of serving their country. It is true that there may be some small percentage of cases of veterans who receive benefits to which they are not entirely entitled, but this again is a matter calling for careful administration rather than broadside budget cutting. To slash the appropriation for veterans' benefits because of a very limited number of abuses would be tantamount to throwing out the baby with the wash.

Let us now turn to the expenditure for interest on the national debt. In 1963 our annual interest payment on the national debt amounted to almost $10 billion, or more than 10 cents out of every tax dollar. This is an expenditure which is roundly decried. However, it should be borne in mind that our national debt is overwhelmingly the result of the participation of the United States in World War II followed by the Korean war. The national debt swelled from $43 billion in 1940 to $269 billion at the end of World War II.

During the dark years of World War II the U.S. Government was faced with the need to borrow money from the American people in order to finance the heroic war effort. Most of us recall the bond rallies at which the American people were exhorted to invest in Government bonds. Bright stars of the entertainment world sang, danced, and quipped in a patriotic endeavor to induce us to finance our struggle against our totalitarian enemies. Fortunately, the people responded, and they responded well.

We could have avoided the enormous financial expense of World War II by the very simple expedient of surrender. After the attack at Pearl Harbor, we might have ignominously capitulated to the Japanese war lords. Likewise, we might have done business with Adolph Hitler. By so doing we would have held down our national debt. We also would have ceased to exist as a nation.

Had we as a nation failed to do what was necessary in 1941 to maintain our democratic system, we would have earned the scorn and calumny of future generations. In view of this, the argument that by our national indebtedness we are passing an intolerable burden along to our descendants has a hollow ring indeed.

What of the argument that we are spending our way into a welfare state? It can best be answered with the statistic that out of every tax dollar in fiscal 1963, only 7 to 9 cents was allocated to so-called welfare programs. The figure contracts or expands from 7 to 9 cents depending on your definition of the term "welfare." However, included among such programs are aid to to aged and blind, medical research and hospital construction, the national scholarship and college aid system, school lunch programs, manpower retraining, and so forth. In 1939, 45 cents of the tax dollar, as contrasted with today's 7 to 9 cents, were allocated to labor and welfare programs.

Many persons ask why the Federal Government cannot live within its means like State and local governments. As a matter of fact, if State and local governments did not have the advantage of Federal grants paid for out of the National Treasury, their burdens would be insupportable. Your U.S. Government could probably balance the budget tomorrow if it withdrew the prop of Federal money from the various State and local governments.

Whisking along a wide four-lane highway, we should consider that we would very likely be poking along a narrow, choked road from congested city to congested city if the U.S. Government had not paid 90 percent of the cost. Stop to think what it would cost local governments too if the Federal Treasury did not foot a great part of the bill for relief, hospital construction, and many other purely local necessities.

We constantly read in the press editorials charging that legislators support spending programs to perpetuate themselves in office. As a matter of fact, however, it is not true that all spending programs are popular and that Congressmen support them for political advantage. On the contrary, it often takes more political courage for a Congressman to support than to oppose some spending measures which are not widely in demand, but which he believes to be in the national interest. Consider, for instance, the issues of foreign aid and the purchase of United Nations bonds.

Actually, our tax payments represent an investment in liberty. Liberty being a concept, it cannot be seen or measured or weighed. How much freedom makes a pound? But talk to any American who has been in a dictator-ridden country and has come back home. He will tell you that liberty can surely be felt. And when you make an investment in that bright commodity, believe me you are getting a lot for your money.

I do not suggest that governmental economies are not possible. Of course, the Congress has the responsibility of seeing that the peoples' money is not wasted by maladministration or by top-heavy payrolls. This responsibility is all the more heightened by the dimensions of our expansive programs. However, we should not deny or begrudge our own Government the just cost of our sizable and complicated operations. Any person who receives the benefits of orderly democratic processes under freedom is immature and unreasonable if not willing to help his Government support such processes financially.

I once heard a man say: "Living is a waste of money. I can't afford it." Let us not as Americans say the same thing about democracy.

MORE WASTE IN DEFENSE SPENDING

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Mandrake, the magician, had nothing on the Navy Department's procurement experts. Believe it or not, Navy now has a procurement underway which requires a manufacturer to make an item before he can bid on it, but he cannot get the drawings he needs to meet this requirement.

The end result, unless this purchase is stopped and revised, will be that a favored company will get the contract, some Navy employee or employees will get an evening's or an afternoon's entertainment, and the taxpayer will get it in the neck again.

Once you wade through a maze of boilerplate documents the details are simple. They add up to another before-the-fact disclosure of the capriciousness and irresponsibility of middle-grade servants. They point to a serious error which must be immediately corrected.

Last June 26 the Navy signed a contract with General Atronics Corp., of Philadelphia. It covered development of an oscilloscope, a device which visually measures changes in a varying current. Development, drawings, and services totaled $49,415 under terms of this contract—NObsr 87573. Production was also generated under another contract for production of the oscilloscope, called the USM–117, and this contract cost the taxpayer $107,325.

After spending $150,000 for development and first production, the Navy decided it needs 927 more of these devices. This time the requirement was put out for competitive bidding, only Navy purchasing officials rigged the rules to keep all other firms out of the action.

Currently scheduled to close May 1, 1963, is Navy invitation to bid 600–481–63. Under terms of this document all manufacturers who want to bid are first required to make a sample unit and have it approved by Navy. This will cost a manufacturer about $25,000, with no guarantee of getting the contract, but several manufacturers are interested even on these terms. The problem is that they cannot get the plans to build the equipment. This purchase is under the supervision of Navy purchasing office chief, Capt. C. A. Appleby, contract negotiator, C. Lear—telephone Oxford 6–6696—and engineer, Raymond Usilton—telephone Oxford 6–2010. These men have issued an invitation which stipulates that microfilms of manufacturing drawings will be issued to a contractor only after the award of contract. This provision is on page 14 of IFB 600–481–63–S.

In other words, a manufacturer must make the equipment and have it approved by the Navy before he can even be considered in the bidding. However, the same man cannot get the necessary drawings until he has won the contract, and he cannot build the set until he gets the drawings.

It is very plain to see that the stage has been set for a contract award to a company which already has the drawings and the only firm that has them—the company that developed the set and produced it first on a sole-source basis.

In short, Mr. Speaker, you just cannot get from here to there, and all this is because of the capricious and irresponsible action of Mr. Usilton, Mr. Lear, and Captain Appleby. There is absolutely nothing fair about this sort of conduct, and as a representative of American taxpayers, I protest vigorously. I also want to remind the Secretary of Defense that this sort of conduct is in direct conflict with his freedom of information policy issued last December which was supposed to aid manufacturers in getting every paper they needed to do business with Uncle Sam.

What should be done right now is to make these manufacturing drawings available to anyone who wants them for the cost of reproduction. The requirement to build a set before you can bid on it should be removed and this procurement should be made 100 percent competitive. If this is done, we will get a truly competitive procurement, provided some other bureaucrat does not change the rules again. If Navy continues to hide the drawings, it will again demonstrate its inefficiency and incompetency in handling public moneys.

I say today that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy should put the drawings for this oscilloscope out on the counter, make this a truly competitive procurement, and let American industry go to work. I have great confidence in the results.

LEGALIZING A NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, to those Members of Congress who react with shocked feelings at the mere thought of legalizing a national lottery, I would like to bring to their attention some interesting facts which prove that tens of millions of our American citizens enjoy the relaxation and pleasures of gambling.

The National Association of State Racing Commissioners has just released its 1962 report on horse racing in the United States. It shows that $3,669,463,825 was wagered in 24 States where gambling on horses is legal and proper—at least inside the gates. I might point out that this figure represents an increase of over $202 million from last year.

The interesting part of this report, Mr. Speaker, is the tax revenue to the 24 States—collected painlessly and voluntarily—amounted to almost $288 million. This also is an increase of over $23 million over last year.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of our sanctimonious attitude about gambling, our Federal Treasury was the recipient of additional millions of dollars in taxes collected on admission charges from 50,582,092 persons whose urge to gamble brought them through the turnstiles.

To those who look upon gambling as wicked and immoral, I would like to point out to them that gambling funds collected in all 24 States are commingled with other State revenues and used to build schools and teach our children. As a matter of fact, the State of Florida last year programed nine extra racing days which were allotted for scholarships and charities.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for the average American taxpayer to understand why all the resistence to a National Lottery when every day millions of dollars change hands at every stock exchange, at every race track, at just about every sporting event that is staged. Are these transactions any different than buying a lottery ticket? Are these activities any different than the lotteries conducted every month by thousands of civic and fraternal clubs, churches, and welfare organizations where automobiles, television sets, and other prizes are raffled off to the lucky ticket holder?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for this Congress to stop pussyfooting. I think the time has come for this Congress to wipe out hypocrisy and recognize the indisputable fact that man, by his very nature, is a gambler and wants a chance to legally satisfy his gambling thirst.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come for this Congress to realize that a national lottery is the only painless, sensible, and voluntary way to raise over $10 billion a year in additional revenue which can be used to reduce our national debt and cut the heavy tax burden carried by our American wage earners.

THE WASHINGTON POST AND THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, today's editorial in the Washington Post entitled "Seeing Reds" once again reflects an illogical and unreasonable prejudice against the important work and objectives of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. For a paper that repeatedly claims to pride itself on a claimed objectivity of approach to important national issues, it seems to me that the Post does the public a disservice in repeatedly so editorializing as to slant facts against this Committee.

For example, "Seeing Reds" finds the Post repeating the well-worn strawman that we do not need the House Un-American Activities Committee because we have an FBI. This is ridiculous as the Post well knows. Why? Because, first, while the FBI is a splendid, efficient, and effective organization, the limited number of FBI agents—approximately 6,000—are required to do a great deal in the way of criminal and security investigation entirely unrelated to subversion; only a very small number of agents are available at any one time for subversive detail; but, second, even if detailed to subversive investigation, or surveillance, the FBI is an investigating agency lacking, completely, the power to compel testimony under oath. In the investigation of subversion it is indispensable that the activities of Communists should be developed by a process that compels answers under oath to relevant questions that are subject to penalties of perjury and wherein refusal to answer is punishable by contempt; otherwise there just would be little reliable information; third, in the important mission of keeping abreast of subversion within the United States the work of the FBI, House Un-American Activities Committee, and the Internal Security Subcommittee of Senate Judiciary are complementary, not opposed. They can and do work toward the single desirable objective, the safety and security of the American people.

It is unfortunate that the Post should continue to minimize or misrepresent the fundamental importance of the House Un-American Activities Committee and its continuation because of occasional differences of opinion as to method or application in individual cases. The committee is composed of sincere and loyal men who do not conceive themselves as superior in loyalty to other Americans but who are deeply concerned that there can be some who call themselves Americans who either profess membership in the Communist Party or knowingly and intentionally give aid and comfort to Communist Party objectives in this country. When we consider that the No. 1 objective of communism is the destruction of this Nation, the killing of its Government, its judges, and its leadership, it becomes reasonably obvious that Communist activity in the United States demands continuing investigation.

The tremendous bipartisan endorsement of this House of the continuation of its Un-American Activities Committee reflects the overwhelming support of the American people in which I am glad to say I join.

U.N. AID TO CUBA

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in my first statement to this House last month concerning the workings of the United Nations Special Fund, I said that an investigation was continuing into U.N. aid going to Cuba from sources other than the Special Fund.

Today, I will outline a number of U.N. aid projects being conducted in Communist Cuba with the subsidization of American taxpayers. These are over and beyond the $1.2 million Special Fund project for Cuban agriculture, and the Special Fund project for nuclear research in Red Yugoslavia.

Cuba has been receiving U.N. assistance under the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance since the 1950's. In programs scheduled in the 1961 to 1964 period Cuba has continued to receive U.N. aid, and currently—1962 to 1963—some $1,033,080 is being spent by the U.N. in its efforts of technical assistance designed to strengthen Cuba.

This aid is administered by five suborganizations of the U.N.—International Labor Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization, and World Health Organization.

All of these organizations have high, altruistic aims and goals in the service of mankind. We Americans, certainly, agree with their general work. But once again, in the case of Cuba, American taxpayers who keep the U.N. solvent are being put in the position of paying to strengthen a Communist, enemy nation.

It is my purpose here today to provide for the House additional details about these projects so that Americans can be made aware of what they are paying for under the U.N. Americans may wish to continue to support some of the humanitarian programs listed here. On the other hand, they might prefer to curtail our support of others.

I already have addressed the House about the International Civil Aviation Organization program for training Cubans in aircraft operations and maintenance—a $17,280 project.

Here are the other U.N. aid projects for Cuba:

1. INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

The ILO is conducting in Cuba a $69,000 project concerning social security. This project has been underway since the pre-Castro days of 1955, but has been continued to the Communist dictator's benefit.

It is planned that in 1963 at least three ILO experts will be in Cuba to further this project. In previous years two experts have been provided.

The project is designed in the words of the United Nations to "overcome a situation which might cause serious economic and social repercussions." It involves a study and recommendations about actuarial difficulties involved in a number of pension funds operated in Cuba with a view to combining some of the funds.

The project includes a "review of the policy of social security in the country as a whole."

That leads one to wonder if social security benefits are being paid to the widows and orphans of the men murdered by Castro firing squads.

2. FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

The FAO is conducting a continuing project in Cuba programed in the 1963 to 1964 financial year for $160,000 and for increasing amounts until 1968. The project is entitled "Fisheries Development."

Main objectives of this project, the U.N. says, are to develop Cuba's fishery resources along the Continental Shelf and on the high seas. To do this the U.N. plans to help Cuba improve its fishing fleet, explore fisheries and study fish biology and inland water restocking possibilities.

The U.N. says that among its objectives is one to "facilitate the Government's shipbuilding and marine investigation projects."

It may occur to some Americans that shipbuilding is a necessary adjunct for the conducting of guerrilla operations in Latin America.

Also the FAO, subsidized by American dollars, is helping Cuba in its "general economic development and food supply plans." FAO is providing experts to assist the Cuban Fishing Research Center of the Fishing Department of the National Institute of Agrarian Reform.

Castro's Communist agrarian reform movement is well known in this House of Representatives.

3. UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

UNESCO is conducting two projects in Cuba at this time.

The first is entitled "Educational Services" and is costing the U.N. and its American supporters $13,500. Under this program, the U.N. says, an expert will cooperate with the Cuban Higher Institute of Education in preparing curricula and textbooks, organizing courses, and planning research.

This work is being done in connection with Castro's educational reorganization program, which, if it is at all like his other reorganizations, is being reorganized to teach children to parrot the Red line.

The second UNESCO project in Cuba is entitled "Marine Biology" and provides for $54,000 for work in close conjunction with the FAO fisheries project in Cuba discussed above. Why two U.N. organizations are conducting the same project with separate funds has not been explained by the U.N.

This UNESCO project also is planned for continuation through 1968.

4. WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The WHO, U.N. organization with which I am well acquainted as a doctor and as a Member of Congress who attended as an adviser of this House the WHO meeting in Geneva last year, has a number of projects underway in Cuba. The chief one is entitled "Public Health Administration" and is programed for a current cost of $152,000.

Essentially, it is designed to investigate the human resources and physical health facilities of Cuba and to train technical and auxiliary staffs in the fields of public health. It is proposed, the U.N. says, that the program will "progressively cover the whole territory of the Republic of Cuba, in a network of protection, promotion, and rehabilitation of the health of inhabitants." The plan will last for 10 years or more.

There are several other WHO projects in Cuba, all designed to improve the health of the unfortunate people enslaved on that Red island—a goal with which few Americans will find fault. These projects include:

First. A drive to eradicate the yellow fever mosquito from the Havana area at a 1963–64 cost of $143,000. It is planned that the area involved will be expanded in later years. Staffers include a medical officer and two sanitarians.

Second. A project in nursing education features a school of nursing adapted to Cuba's needs and opened in October, 1960, with 94 students. By 1962 the school had 100 students and trained them at 400-bed National Hospital. In addition a special 6-month course for preparation of nursing instructors is given in Cuba.

Third. A malaria eradication project under the WHO general budget lists expenses for 1963 to 1964 of $170,000. It involves a survey of the malarious area of Cuba, including Oriente and Camaguey Provinces, and the area around the U.S. base at Guantanamo. Provision is made for a malariologist, a sanitary engineer, two sanitarians, and an entomologist.

Fourth. A program for fellowships in public health training under the WHO and the Pan American Health Organization is slated to cost $254,300 for the 1963 to 1964 period. These fellows are to collaborate with the government in training staff for improvement and expansion of its public health services.

Fifth. A final Cuban project undertaken by the United Nations World Health Organization is entitled "Refuse Disposal" and provides for a consultant to advise Cuba in establishing facilities for proper disposal of refuse from Havana and adjacent areas. Fellowships were provided under this plan in 1962.

Supplemental United Nations aid projects in Cuba, 1963–64 financial year

Project title	Supervisory agency	Cost estimate
Social security	International Labor Organization	$69,000
Fisheries development	Food and Agriculture Organization	160,000
Educational services	UNESCO	13,500
Marine biology	UNESCO	54,000
Public health administration	World Health Organization	152,000
Yellow fever eradication	do	143,000
Nursing education	do	(1)
Malaria eradication	do	170,000
Public health training fellowship	do	254,300
Havana refuse disposal	do	(1)
Air operations training	International Civil Aviation Organization	17,280
Total costs available		1,033,080

[1] Unavailable.

THE CRISIS OF CREDIBILITY

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the effectiveness of any democratic government depends to a great degree on whether or not the people believe that the government is dealing with them in a forthright manner. This is entirely as it should be, for this is a government of the people.

As Americans the significance to us of this realism is not confined to our 50 States alone. The actions of our Government and the statements of our leaders are as meaningful in Karachi and Rome as they are in Kalamazoo and Sacramento. Without seeking it we have come to a position of world influence and we find that millions of people the world over look to us hopefully not only for bread and encouragement but for what they, as nations, desperately seek most of all: their national integrity and the right to develop national self-determination.

In the 50 States and in all non-Communist nations, U.S. leadership is essential: our diplomatic stance must build confidence, our military position must be convincing, our dollar must have the solidity of a rock, and our pronouncements must carry the weight of reliability.

In the years leading to 1961 our Government carefully constructed the kind of reliable stance demanded under the trying conditions of postwar reconstruction and the search for national and world tranquillity. Whether one agrees or disagrees with every action taken by the Truman administration or by the Eisenhower administration, the U.S. Government had been forthright with our own people and with the world in these important years.

Statements of our Presidential leadership accurately reflected our intent, and actions supported the statements. The most basic requirement of moral leadership was met. People everywhere believed what the U.S. Government said.

Since 1961 we have stumbled and fallen, losing concern for reliability. Our present leadership, taking maximum advantage of the reputation previously acquired, has demonstrated more faith in the superficial impressions of what it says rather than in the basic meaning of what it does. As a result we as a people and our friends abroad are coming to view with suspicion what used to be a responsible Government concern for truth. Official statements no longer carry the weight of reliability. We now face a crisis of credibility.

To what do we owe this condition? How can it be that a credibility of such sound foundation could be undermined and cast in doubt in a relatively brief period? Our people, and those the world over, are fairminded and sound thinkers in matters of this kind. We should not conclude that loss of credibility results from one, two, or even a few incidents. People reach judgments on the basis of what they see over a period of time; on a trend rather than on a single piece of evidence. Perhaps it will serve us well if we examine some events which may have contributed to the trend.

A recent event of significance is the statement of Mr. Kennedy, February 14, regarding the plan of the United Nations Special Fund to spend $1.1 million on an agricultural project in Cuba. Mr. Kennedy said:

> There are not any U.S. dollars that will go into that program.

Americans and our friends abroad are unconvinced. They know the United States provides 40 percent of the money used by the United Nations Special Fund, and that the money loses its identity when utilized. They have a right to ask if the Kennedy statement is based simply on a U.N. bookkeeping exercise designed to camouflage the actual manner in which U.S. taxpayers' money is put to use.

Our people have a right to ask if the United Nations itself has not lost a great deal in this kind of incident, since the U.N. can be effective only to the degree that people believe in its purposes and methods. The Kennedy attempt to obscure the facts of the Cuban agriculture project does a real disservice to the United Nations itself.

It is another chapter in the unfortunate story which began with the U.S. involvement in the Congo, an affair about which misleading statements rather than accurate information served to becloud and confuse, thereby creating doubt and despair. In what was evidently a move to justify the Kennedy support for military action against Katanga, the President and his associates made a substantial effort to discredit the Katanga government.

On September 27, 1961, Assistant Secretary of State Carl T. Rowan said the Katanga lobby was conducting a clever big-money campaign in the United States through the Katanga Information Service.

Mr. Kennedy should now deny or confirm that Justice Department files show that while Katanga operated on an information budget of about $100,000 annually, the central Congo Government spent $219,552 for this purpose in 1962. The Adoula government evidently more than doubled Katanga's expenditures and did it through two different public relations agencies in New York, one of which operated on a monthly retainer of $2,000. This effort was designed to reshape American opinion toward the Congo so as to accord with Kennedy policy. Americans rightly want to know by what standards the Kennedys judged the two groups.

The substantial loss of credibility suffered by the Kennedy administration in recent months is related also to the policy of managed news.

Managed news is the control of public information either by outright falsification of the facts, controlled public interpretation of the meaning of events, deliberate stoppage of the release of undesirable news, or the actual manufacturing of desirable news. Kennedy people have demonstrated their readiness to practice all these arts, and have advanced the practice to a precise skill.

Of course this phenomenon is not new. The most ancient of governments found that their people could be controlled if public information could be controlled. The esteemed editor of the Hartford Courant, Mr. Herbert Brucker, wrote in 1949 in his book "Freedom of Information":

> What the people of a democracy must know, whether in war or in peace, is not what official opinion holds good for them to know, but what has happened. If something has happened, or has been said in important places, or has been decided on, the people have an inalienable right to know it.

In contrast with that, Mr. Kennedy and his administration have embarked on a policy which sets themselves up as the judges of what the people are to know. Mr. Kennedy said in a press conference that he wished to clear up the controversy over public information "so that there is a free flow of the news to which the press is entitled and which I think ought to be in the press." Clearly he feels himself to be the judge of what the people should know.

Responsible newspapermen, and all of our people, find this to be an idea foreign to our concept of democratic government. Mr. Kennedy's actions to assume a controlling influence over the Nation's news media is viewed with extreme seriousness.

In time of war or extreme national peril, the United States has always granted a degree of news management to its leadership. This is commonsense. And if this is what Mr. Kennedy has in mind, we would feel little concern. But the evidence is to the contrary. Mr. Richard Wilson, long respected and able Washington newsman wrote recently: "For many months the President and his associates have been instructing the press on what it publishes right and what it publishes wrong."

Mr. Wilson lists several examples of outright falsehoods perpetuated by Mr. Kennedy on the people. They range from the story that the Kennedy-Khrushchev discussions in Vienna were conducted in a friendly atmosphere to the inaccuracies regarding the military buildup in Cuba.

I want to commend and give my support to this body's special Subcommittee on Government Information and its chairman, the gentleman from California, Congressman JOHN MOSS. The subcommittee has been engaged in highly useful and constructive work, and its objectives take on even more importance now as the Nation is faced with intense and skillful news management by the Kennedy administration.

The gentleman from California, Congressman Moss, was right when he said in San Francisco last November 30 that President Kennedy has taken firm control of the management of Government news in a manner that is unprecedented and unique in peacetime. He said important newsmaking events are under firm Presidential control, and he rightly called for a broad public discussion.

The subcommittee's current examination of news management will have the support of the entire country and in fact has already been commended in responsible newspapers around the country, including the St. Paul, Minn., Dispatch, in its lead editorial February 9.

We are not justified in feeling that the managed news policy of the Kennedys is an accident. Assistant Defense Secretary Arthur Sylvester said in New York December 6 that news generated by the Government is considered as a weapon.

He said the Government has an inherent right to lie. He added:

> If any of us are virtuous 51 percent of the time in life, it's a good record and in politics an amazing record.

In my opinion, this tells us a lot about the Kennedy administration.

The distinguished New York Times newsman, Mr. Arthur Krock, elaborated in his Fortune magazine article where he said the Kennedys are managing the news with a cynicism, boldness, and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history.

He said news management has been used to inflate success or to gloss over error. Mr. Kennedy himself was pictured as the most brilliant operator of the subtle, indirect method of administration news management.

In recent days, various Kennedy spokesmen have spoken of what they term irresponsible Republican criticisms which they say threaten the national interest. They have said that Republicans offer no alternative policies to Kennedy policies they oppose. These contentions deserve comment.

The American people and people all over the world recall vividly the reckless charges of John Kennedy in the 1960 election campaign that our country had fallen way behind in the production of missiles. These charges, repeated over and over, were echoed throughout the world and served to cast a heavy pall of concern for the ability of this country to defend itself and to defend friendly nations against an aggressive enemy. The irresponsibility of the missile gap charges was unprecedented and of grave consequence. The inaccuracies were so pronounced that they had to be counteracted very shortly after Mr. Kennedy's inauguration. The Secretary of Defense was put in the uncomfortable position of having to set the record straight in order to try to undo some of the damage that had been recklessly done to the national interest. In this light the recent politically motivated accusations of Kennedy spokesmen are exposed as simply extensions of the Kennedy management of public information.

Examination of the attacks by Republicans on the Kennedy foreign policy will show that they are responsible and constructive comments on matters which are of legitimate concern to us all. For example, revelations of Communist military strength on the island of Cuba have been substantiated. Even the newest estimates by administration critics have not been convincingly contradicted. On the contrary, they have stimulated the Kennedy administration to provide more information relating to the military buildup than it had released previously. A troubled American Nation does not call this irresponsibility. We have witnessed one falsehood after another regarding Cuba, each one serving to lessen our faith in our leadership. Even the loss of four young American men at the Bay of Pigs was concealed until discovered by those who, Mr. Kennedy would have us believe, are irresponsible.

There are two main concerns regarding Cuba today. The first is the real extent of the Communist military buildup, and how we can best learn about it in the face of Mr. Kennedy's avowed policy to provide the news only as he sees fit. The second is just as important: What is the meaning that we give to the buildup in terms of our national interest and in terms of the interests of the Western Hemisphere? To what degree is Cuba being used as a base for the terrorist and revolutionary activities we see growing elsewhere in Latin America?

It is these points which are the concern of the American people and of the administration's critics. Republican comments are directed at stimulating a meaningful dialog on these issues of national policy, and the attempts to call this irresponsible fall on ears which have been deadened by the cries of the missile gap.

We must also consider the matter of Republican alternatives. It speaks well for the effectiveness of Kennedy news management that administration spokesmen have made considerable progress in their attempts to portray Republicans as offering blind obstruction, without providing alternatives.

The truth is that Republicans have offered constructive and workable alternatives to virtually all major legislative program which they oppose. They provide responsible opposition. And further, Mr. Kennedy and his associates have sometimes grasped these Republican ideas and implemented them and claimed them as their own. The Manpower Retraining Act of the 87th Congress, termed a great Democrat success by the Kennedy people, is basically the Republican program. It is the result of hard, progressive, constructive work by the gentleman from New York, Congressman CHARLES GOODELL, and many other Republicans.

Mr. Kennedy's action in October 1962 setting up a partial blockade of Cuba was a Republican proposal advanced 13 months earlier. Several Republican Members of Congress, myself included, in September 1961 proposed a peaceful search and seizure program to prevent further Communist military equipment from reaching Cuba. Had our idea been accepted earlier, there would have been no need to go to the brink last fall. During most of 1962 Republicans who originated and presented this alternative were on one hand accused of presenting no alternatives, and on the other were accused of irresponsible and trigger-happy moves right up to the very hour, literally speaking, at which Mr. Kennedy said that he would take the action we recommended. We only regret that Mr. Kennedy has not fully implemented his announced intentions in that October 22 speech. We respectfully ask that he do so.

Our people are coming to learn more of the Republican alternatives. The Republican education proposal, for example, holds promise of making real progress toward providing meaningful Federal Government assistance to those school districts where the need is the greatest. The Republican proposal for providing additional opportunity for voluntary Federal help to senior citizens in obtaining medical and hospital care is also a program of real potential. As more and more citizens learn of these constructive Republican programs, it becomes easier for people to see the concern of our party for national progress. The political public relations gimmicks of the Kennedys stand exposed.

It is in the area of civil rights that we should pay special attention. We have all heard eloquent words from the Kennedy people of the need for effective action to extend full citizenship rights and responsibilities to all Americans. I call attention to the civil rights proposal advanced in this session of the Congress by myself and other Republican members of the Judiciary Committee. We think it is a constructive proposal which merits serious consideration. We welcome and suggest a full comparison with the well-publicized but superficial

Kennedy proposal of February 28. The inadequate Kennedy message is a retreat from progress because it invites defeat of any truly meaningful civil rights legislation in the 88th Congress.

However much Mr. Kennedy's loss of credibility has impaired his leadership in matters of importance within our own borders, the same phenomenon reaches most serious consequences in terms of the free world alliances. Here we have heard from Mr. Kennedy himself that bold American leadership is needed. But we are faced with a serious deterioration in our international position. Presidents Truman and Eisenhower steadily, patiently, and effectively constructed a system of alliances of substantial meaning. They built a reliability for our country, and convinced friend and foe alike of our determination to stand firm in defense of our principles.

Today the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is faltering to the point of crisis. France has rejected all pretense of cooperation and is saying openly that we cannot be relied upon; England has taken two serious blows in succession, first from this country and then from France. The source of greatest influence toward reconciliation is now West Germany, not the United States. The SEATO pact has become meaningless and our good friends in Pakistan are having to review their trust in our country. The Alliance for Progress is in deep trouble, and we are soon to be treated to the spectacle of lively anti-American sentiment from what should be the least likely source, Canada.

The integrity of the American dollar is a major part of this country's claim to leadership. But even here, the Kennedy loss of credibility has had serious consequences both at home and abroad. Mr. Kennedy's budget estimate for fiscal year 1963 was first stated as a small surplus of about $400 million. But that goal is grossly impossible, and a deficit in excess of $8 billion is expected.

Mr. Kennedy, in his efforts to convince us that any national problem can be solved through expanded government activity, attempts to show that anyone with other ideas is opposed to progress. Reliance on the individual, the family, and on local and State government is thus strangely equated with objection to the public interest. This further harms the Kennedy credibility.

The Government's spending on nonessential programs is growing so fast as to alarm all responsible people. Senator John L. McClellan, for example, says the "crime of national insolvency" callously and mercilessly burdens the livelihood and earnings of future generations with a tremendous, oppressive national debt." In this body our esteemed chairman of the Appropriations Committee refers to the newest Kennedy budget as being nothing like he has ever seen in 40 years. He reminds us that it is a recordbreaker, that it proposes spending in an amount $500 million more than we spent in the peak year of World War II when survival was the sole object, and that much of this huge amount is for nondefense purposes.

Last year Mr. Kennedy said he would propose a balanced budget for fiscal year 1964. But despite that statement, and even though national revenues are expected to be at a record high level in the new fiscal year, Mr. Kennedy is now proposing a budget deficit of $11.9 billion, which is clearly a tentative and precarious estimate only. The final actual deficit will be considerably greater. The effect is frightening, to us and to our friends abroad. It is small wonder that our allies hesitate to rely on us.

Mr. Kennedy's credibility has not been enhanced by his current tax proposals. He presented his tax message as tax reduction and reform. But in fact it has been shown that some taxpayers would actually find their tax liability increased under the Kennedy plan. And what he called reform has been shown to be simply alteration of the present morass of tax regulations. The noted economic columnist, J. A. Livingston, writes that the proposed alterations would enable the Government to take with one hand what it yields with the other. "It makes neither good sense nor suits the normal standards of logic or equity," he says.

Perhaps the most telling blow of all to the credibility of the Kennedy administration has been struck on this issue of taxes. Mr. Kennedy's inaugural speech was noted for its eloquent passage, "Ask not what the country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." This idea touched all of us for its simple expression of the national interest.

But soon after the Kennedy tax message of January 24, 1963, began to stir an undercurrent of discontent, Mr. Walter Heller, Chairman of the Kennedy Council of Economic Advisers, said he was surprised to see these objections. He laid it to a Puritan ethic in our people. This was the only reason he could see that would cause people to object to reductions in their own taxes.

It appears that despite the noble sentiments of inauguration day the Kennedy people do not really believe people are motivated by concern for the national interest. They believe the people are motivated by selfish interests, and that a proposal for reduced taxes would automatically be received with great favor by the voters because it would appeal to these selfish interests.

My opinion is that Americans today feel a great concern indeed for the national interest. They do not ask for reduced taxes if it means greatly increased budget deficits. The letters coming from constituents demonstrate this. Our people want to eliminate nonessential Government spending; they want a balanced budget in times of relative peace and national economic health; and they want a tax structure designed to stimulate, not discourage, the proper exercise of individual economic incentive. They want a government as servant of the people, not a people as servant of the government.

Most important, our people want credibility in their leaders. It is not only desirable, but essential, that we as a nation work to restore our Government standards to the high level of veracity and integrity expected by our people and by the world.

The present crisis of credibility can and must be overcome so that the United States will reestablish its rightful position as diplomatic, military, economic, and moral leader of the free world.

RECOGNITION BY LAW OF ORGANIZATIONS OF POSTAL AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of my colleagues to a bill which I have this day introduced providing for recognition by law of organizations of postal and Federal employees.

This bill is similar to my previous bill in the 87th Congress, H.R. 4078, and, if approved, it would not only provide recognition for Federal employee unions, but it would also specify procedures for the adjustment of grievances.

It is highly appropriate that this legislation should be presented today because of the fact that employee organizations are in the process of signing, today, a contract under the terms of Executive Order 10988 which enables the Federal Government to recognize employee organizations in a fashion similar to that which would be accomplished were my bill to be enacted into law.

My bill is submitted for introduction notwithstanding the fact that contracts are now being signed, and the bill is presented because of two things:

First. In my opinion the matter at hand is of such significance that it should be on the statute books, rather than remain subject to amendment by a Chief Executive who may be less favorably inclined toward the responsibilities and prerogatives of Federal employee organizations than is the present incumbent in the White House.

Second. The omission from the contract of any provision for an orderly promotion procedure in the Post Office Department seems to me to allow chaos to be continued in the postal service, where the largest number of rank and file Federal employees is concentrated.

In view of the fact that the contract is just now being signed, we in Congress cannot have yet any way of knowing precisely what is included in that document.

However, the contract covering the postal service will apply to a larger number of employees than perhaps any single industrial union contract currently extant.

My act of introducing appropriate legislation is intended to portray my deep and abiding awareness of the need to solemnize by law, the marriage between Government, as employer, and the organizations which represent the various groups of employees.

In spite of the lack of current access to the exact terms of the contract, I have been advised by employee leaders of the omission of a promotion program as has already been indicated.

Another very salient point in my estimation is the fact that the contract does not provide for disposal of the infamous stopwatch system which was initiated in the Postal Service by the previous administration, and which has a surface appeal to those legislators and the fiscal watchdogs of the executive department who have been persuaded to believe that an elaborate array of production statistics may be a valid substitute for true efficiency and high employee morale.

I have introduced separate legislation to correct that condition. However, the topic of stopwatches is pertinent to the matter of labor-management relations because the Post Office Department has maintained that its administration of the work measurement system is not a topic of negotiable character. Consequently, I understand there will be nothing on work measurement appearing in the contract.

Because of considerations such as these and because of my deep concern for the dignity of postal employees wherever they may be assigned, I decided, Mr. Speaker, to reintroduce my legislation concerning recognition of employee organizations.

I hope that consideration may be early and swift.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT OF 1959

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced an important bill to eliminate some built-in inequities in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. I have requested unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record so that I might discuss this bill with my colleagues and point out the need for this legislation to correct existing inequities.

In my opinion, the Health Benefits Act is one of the most useful and intelligent pieces of legislation ever passed by the Congress of the United States. It gives to approximately 2,500,000 Federal employees a measure of protection and security that had been denied them for too many years.

However, no legislation devised by the mind of man is ever perfect. In two significant respects the Health Benefits Act has failed to achieve what the Congress intended it to achieve. The bill I have introduced will, in effect, restore to the act the intentions the Congress had when it was first signed into law.

Congress, Mr. Speaker, intended to give the Federal employees a health insurance program equal to those prevailing in modern American industry. To do this, the Federal Government—as the employer—would have to contribute to the program at least half the overall cost, with the employees contributing the other half.

Because of technical difficulties, which my bill would correct and overcome, things have not worked out that way. The Federal Government's contribution today averages around 38 percent, while the employees' contributions average around 62 percent.

The Federal Government should serve as an example for private industry in these matters. Instead, we are considerably behind private industry in the management of our health benefits program. My bill would bring the Federal Government up to date in the health benefits field by making it an equal partner with the employee in paying for the program on a 50–50 basis.

This was the intention of the Congress when the bill was discussed and passed in 1959. I feel certain of this. By approving this bill that I have introduced, we shall merely be carrying out the original intentions of the Congress.

There is another inequity in the original bill which was never intended. This concerns married women with nondependent husbands. A nondependent husband is presently excluded from the benefits of the act, while a nondependent wife is included. This is not only illogical, it is contrary to the spirit of our times. In addition, it is grossly unfair. My bill would also eliminate this inequity.

I sincerely hope and trust that the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will consider this bill as soon as possible. Since I have the honor to be a member of that committee, I shall do everything in my power to assist in winning for this bill a speedy approval, both in the committee and on the floor.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note and to respond to the murmurs of criticism, which I have heard in recent weeks, aimed at the present President of the United States, who is in fact a disabled veteran of World War II, and who, it is alleged, is trying to reap political advantage from his status as a veteran.

There seems to be building up a resentment against the status of the President as a disabled veteran, his deep interest in veterans' affairs, and his feeling of closeness to our former fighting men and their families.

There seems to be implied in this undercurrent of carping a strange theory that somehow the President is making political capital of his veteran's status and his interest in their affairs.

This sniping reminds me of the sniping on the great battlefields of World War I. It was always the courageous fellow advancing in front of all the other soldiers who drew the heaviest enemy fire.

This seems to be happening now to the President.

Now it is undeniable that he is a veteran, and—a disabled veteran—others have called him a war hero. But never has he himself referred to his combat record as anything but that of a citizen doing his best, the same way most veterans regard their wartime contribution.

As evidence to support this outlandish political theory, it is pointed out that President Kennedy participated personally in the 1961 Veterans' Day ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery; that he has seen fit to honor the memory of deceased veterans by issuing a Memorial Certificate to the next of kin; that he twice proposed that Congress increase the compensation rates of the service connected; that, following enactment of this increase, the veteran received a notice with his check stating "President Kennedy has signed a law"—that veterans were similarly reminded of the President's role in the acceleration of insurance dividend checks.

It is undeniably true that President Kennedy has felt deeply his kinship with veterans. He was the first President to play an active part in the national observance of Veterans' Day. Not since 1954, when this holiday was so named, did a Chief Executive personally participate in the ceremony as he did in 1961.

Mr. Speaker, I honor the President for his personal participation in the Veterans' Day ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery, for by doing so he is relating service to one's country with the history of our Nation, with our national character, purposes, and present-day problems. This is a most fitting, a most proper usage of the prestige and power of the head of state.

I would say that his leadership of the national ceremonies did much to lift this great day of dedication out of the obscurity and apathy into which it had declined.

I would say that it is absurd to grumble and to point out that President Kennedy's predecessor did not do likewise.

Likewise, it is absurd to look behind the President's issuance of a Memorial Certificate for a political motive. This is a decent, thoughtful, human act. I am appalled to hear it referred to as a "politically inspired action."

The critics also mutter darkly about inserts mailed out with insurance dividend and compensation checks. The facts are simple. The insert used with the regular 1961 Government life insurance dividend said that the payment was "part of the President's program." This was done to clearly call attention to the fact that it was an advance payment made on the assumption that policy premiums would be continued for the entire year, or else an overpayment would take place. It was the first time dividends had ever been paid in advance. Normally, they are paid over an entire year at the anniversary date of each individual policy. At the time, the press was full of news about the President's program to advance the economy and of the part to be played by paying GI dividends ahead of time. Therefore, this wording was used to identify the checks, and so prevent needless, delaying queries from individuals.

Similarly, a notice went out with payment of service-connected compensation checks of October 1962, following enactment of the law which provided for an increase in the service-connected compensation rates. The purpose was to explain that the veteran's check was augmented by a 3-month retroactive increase, and to forestall a deluge of telephone calls, letters, and personal visits inquiring about the extra amount.

Again, press attention at the time had focused on the President's action in signing the compensation increase, a measure he had twice urged Congress to pass. The VA so identified the check. In effect, it was simply a quick, easily understood method of saying "this is the compensation increase you have been reading about in the newspapers."

The criticism of these inserts seems to be based on an unusual theory of the President's freedom of speech.

It is permissible, so this theory goes, for the President to talk to the American people on radio or television. He may also deliver a speech, address, or remark in person. It is acceptable for him to give interviews and be quoted extensively in newspapers, magazines, or books—both hard cover and paperback. The President may also direct a message to the public via posters or signs.

However, if a Presidential message—or even bare mention of his name or office finds its way into envelopes that are mailed to individuals or groups, then complaints are heard about "political motivation and partisan machinations."

May I add that the use of the name of the President of the United States in announcing actions of the Federal Government is common practice. The President, after all, is the Chief Executive. Illustrative of this practice is the enclosed announcement to all Federal civilian employees. It mentions a new low-cost group life insurance plan "developed as a part of the program of this administration." It bears the personal signature of President Eisenhower.

GROUP LIFE INSURANCE FOR FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., August 17, 1954.

To Federal Civilian Employees:

As a result of favorable action by Congress, we are now able to provide the benefits of low-cost group life insurance to Federal employees. The proposal to provide this protection to employees through private insurance companies, with Government assuming a portion of the cost, was developed as a part of the program of this administration to improve the Government's personnel system.

I urge all eligible employees to give serious consideration to this worthwhile program which will help provide economic security for their families.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE PLAN AT A GLANCE

What are the benefits?

Life insurance at low cost without requiring a medical examination.

Payment of double indemnity for accidental death.

Payment for accidental loss of one or more limbs or eyesight (dismemberment).

Life insurance after retirement at no cost to you.

Free insurance if you are 65 years of age or older.

Am I eligible?

Yes, unless you (1) are a noncitizen employed overseas, or (2) fall within the small group of employees excluded because of the nature and type of employment, such as part time, seasonal, or intermittent employment.

Who pays for the insurance?

You pay 25 cents per $1,000 of insurance each biweekly pay period by payroll deduction until you reach age 65. If you are paid on other than a biweekly basis, the cost is proportionate. (See table following.)

The Government helps to pay the cost of this insurance by contributing half as much as you do.

How do I become insured?

If eligible, you will be automatically insured unless you fill out standard form 53 (waiver of life insurance coverage) which is available at your personnel office.

For how much will I be insured?

The amount of insurance depends upon your annual basic salary. (See table following.)

You may not choose a lesser or greater amount of insurance.

If you are 65 years of age or older, or when you become age 65, the amount of your insurance will be reduced by 2 percent for each month you are over 65 until a reduction of 75 percent is reached. The remaining 25 percent stays in effect.

Must I name a beneficiary?

No. Your life insurance will be payable in the following order: (1) widow or widower, (2) children, (3) parents, (4) estate, (5) next of kin. Your personnel office will have the proper form for you to use if you wish to change this order or name someone else.

What if I retire?

Your life insurance is provided without further cost, if you retire on an immediate annuity either for disability or after at least 15 years of creditable service, at least 5 years of which are civilian. Your double indemnity and dismemberment protection stops.

What if I leave Government Service?

Your life insurance continues in effect 31 days during which you may buy, without a medical examination, an individual life insurance policy at standard rates.

May I cancel my insurance under this plan?

Yes, at any time.

Insurance schedule

If annual basic salary—	Amount of insurance	Amount of deductions per pay period			
		Weekly	Biweekly	Semi-monthly	Monthly
Is not more than—					
$1,000	$1,000	$0.13	$0.25	$0.27	$0.54
$2,000	2,000	.25	.50	.54	1.08
$3,000	3,000	.38	.75	.81	1.63
$4,000	4,000	.50	1.00	1.08	2.17
$5,000	5,000	.63	1.25	1.35	2.71
$6,000	6,000	.75	1.50	1.63	3.25
$7,000	7,000	.88	1.75	1.90	3.79
$8,000	8,000	1.00	2.00	2.17	4.33
$9,000	9,000	1.13	2.25	2.44	4.88
$10,000	10,000	1.25	2.50	2.71	5.42
$11,000	11,000	1.38	2.75	2.98	5.96
$12,000	12,000	1.50	3.00	3.25	6.50
$13,000	13,000	1.63	3.25	3.52	7.04
$14,000	14,000	1.75	3.50	3.79	7.58
$15,000	15,000	1.88	3.75	4.06	8.13
$16,000	16,000	2.00	4.00	4.33	8.67
$17,000	17,000	2.13	4.25	4.60	9.21
$18,000	18,000	2.25	4.50	4.88	9.75
$19,000	19,000	2.38	4.75	5.15	10.29
Is above $19,000	20,000	2.50	5.00	5.42	10.83

A FINAL WORD ABOUT THIS INSURANCE PLAN

This plan will provide an added measure of family security at low cost. It is, however, term insurance and does not carry cash surrender or loan privileges. You should not look upon this plan as a substitute for regular individual insurance policies purchased through your own insurance agent.

This leaflet outlines the principal features of the plan for your general information only. Each insured employee will receive a certificate outlining in more detail the benefits and terms of this group insurance.

SPECIAL DIVIDEND, 1961

The enclosed check or statement is a special dividend on your Government life insurance policy. This dividend is an extra one being paid in 1961, and represents your share of gains and savings in the insurance fund.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION.

Always keep your choice of beneficiary up to date.

(VA form 9–5976 (NR), May 1961.)

NOTICE SENT TO INSURED TO HAVE DIVIDENDS LEFT ON DEPOSIT

The VA is paying ahead of schedule the 1961 dividend on Government life insurance as part of the President's program for advancing the economy. These advance payments are made on the assumption that your premiums will continue to be paid for the remainder of your policy year. If premiums are not so paid, this dividend will constitute a partial overpayment which will become an indebtedness against your insurance.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION.

(VA form 9–5974 (NR), February 1961.)

NOTICE

President Kennedy has signed a law increasing service-connected compensation rates for disabled veterans. The increase is included in the enclosed check. This check also includes a retroactive payment equal to a 3-month increase as provided by the new law unless special action is necessary. In that case you will get your adjustment check in the near future.

The table on the back of this notice shows some of the new wartime rates. Compensation based on peacetime service is paid on approximately 80 percent of the amounts shown.

Degree of disability	Old rate of payment	New rate of payment [1]
10 percent	$19	$20
20 percent	36	38
30 percent	55	58
40 percent	73	77
50 percent [2]	100	107
60 percent [2]	120	128
70 percent [2]	140	149
80 percent [2]	160	170
90 percent [2]	179	191
100 percent [2]	225	250

[1] The amount payable for all checks received after the first one.

[2] Veterans disabled 50 percent or more may receive an additional allowance for dependents. The law does not change the amounts paid for dependents.

[U.S. SEAL]

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

HONORS THE MEMORY OF

——— ———

This certificate is awarded by a grateful nation in recognition of devoted and selfless consecration to the service of our country in the Armed Forces of the United States.

——— ———,
President of the United States.

RECORD OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the action just taken by the House there does not seem to be much point in continuing this particular discussion. However, I originally requested this time in order to clarify the record established by the Committee on Education and Labor during the last session of Congress under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New York, the Honorable ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, with the various members of the committee cooperating with him; and also to indicate some of the vital items of legislation before the committee in this Congress.

In order that various Members may have the opportunity to discuss their own particular work, Mr. Speaker, at this time I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may include their remarks on this subject, in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. RYAN of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, rather than to take up the time of the House now, I think it would be proper for me to put my remarks in the RECORD at this point and simply add that in view of what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] had to say, I hope that he also will read these remarks as others will, because I think he will find that in many areas education and labor are not quite as separable as might seem to be the case on the surface. We have a bill, for instance, that has to do with manpower training and retraining and this affects not only labor but is a matter of education. We have a matter before us now of the so-called youth opportunity bill which again is very close to both the labor area and the educational area.

I think before we come to any hasty conclusion we should study it very carefully and reach a sound decision.

At this point I am submitting for the RECORD the subject matter under the general jurisdiction of the committee as established under rule XI of the House of Representatives and the committee amplification thereof. At the conclusion of my remarks I will submit a complete record of the legislative achievements of the committee during the 87th Congress.

The importance of some of the major education and labor statutes under the jurisdiction of the committee cannot be overemphasized. Among them are: the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947; the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958; the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959; the Davis-Bacon Act of 1931; the Work House Act of 1962; the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of 1916; the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act; the National Defense Education Act of 1958; the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1954; impacted area laws; Juvenile Delinquency Control Act of 1961; school lunch laws; vocational education laws; teacher training laws for retarded and deaf.

The legislative record of the committee during the 87th Congress is one of notable achievement: 44 bills, requiring extensive hearings and studies by the committee members and staff, were reported to the House. Of these 44 bills, 18 were enacted into law. Among the major laws were the Manpower Development and Training Act; the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act amendments; amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act; extension of the National Defense Education Act; the Work Hours Act of 1962, Juvenile Delinquency, and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. This, of course, is not a complete list, but only an attempt to indicate to the Members of the House the momentous work being done by the Committee on Education and Labor and the progress made through enactment of measures considered by it. Suffice it to say that the legislative achievements of the committee were significant. Of the 18 bills reported by the committee which were enacted into law, 14 of those bills were enacted in the first 14 months of the 87th Congress.

I need not elaborate on the importance to our country and indeed the whole world of the progress we made in the areas of education and labor. Our position as leader of the free world certainly depends upon such progress. When the leadership of our Nation is threatened, not only by the Soviet Union and the Communist world, but by the impact of the European Common Market and other regional and social organizations, we cannot afford to stand still in these two vital fields. The challenges in these areas are many. All of us, I am sure, realize the tremendous impact of automation in this country; of the difficulty experienced by an unskilled person in finding a job; of the heavy burden of unemployment both to the unemployed and to our society, and of school dropouts and the waste of human talent and energy. It is to these unsolved problems that Congress must address itself.

I can tell you that the members of the Committee on Education and Labor are anxious to fill their legislative responsibilities in these areas. The committee has no intention of resting upon its past achievements, but, rather, looks critically toward the demands of the future. Hearings have just been concluded on the President's youth opportunities bill. During the past 3 weeks the administration's omnibus education bill, H.R. 3000, has been the subject of extensive hearings. Merged into this bill are general aid to elementary and secondary education and Federal aid to higher education, special education and vocational rehabilitation, renewal and revision of the National Defense Education Act, vocational education and renewal and revision of aid to federally impacted areas. Soon we will begin hearings on the Domestic Peace Corps. No one can overemphasize the importance of the legislation to the future growth and vitality of this great Nation.

Other education bills before our committee having major legislative importance involve creating a National Fine Arts Center, legislation relating to the aged and aging which includes the establishment of a Bureau of Senior Citizens and provisions for Federal assistance for programs in States for projects which will benefit older persons. On the labor side of the committee there are bills concerning the shorter workweek, national emergency disputes, equal pay for equal work, amendments to the Davis-Bacon Act, migratory labor, and others which deserve committee study and action. The committee has embarked upon and is eager to continue the work in these important areas. If the United States is to maintain its paramount position in a rapidly changing and highly competitive world it must give serious consideration to the condition of education and labor and act upon the conclusions of such serious and realistic analysis. We must look ahead now or we shall have only a past to look upon.

In speaking about the legislative accomplishments of the committee I would be derelict if I did not give proper recognition to the invaluable assistance and competency of the committee staff. Dr. Wolfe, the education chief, is presently on leave from Queens College of New York City. She has been in the education field for 23 years with experience as a teacher at all levels and as a principal and administrator. She received her doctor of education degree from Columbia University and did advance work at Vassar College and postdoctoral work at the University of Pennsylvania. She has published numerous articles and made invaluable contributions to American education.

Mr. Gamser, chief counsel for labor-management, after graduating from the New York Law School, had extensive experience in the labor field working for the National Labor Relations Board. He received a Fulbright grant as a lecturer in labor law and has taught labor law at Cornell and Columbia Universities. Through the respective efforts of Dr. Wolfe, Mr. Gamser, and the other very competent members of the staff, the work of the committee has been ably accomplished. Incidentally, Mr. Gamser has only this week been confirmed as a member of the National Mediation Board.

With the aid of a competent staff the committee has published some very comprehensive and valuable studies. To name a few: "Congressional Action for Higher Education," "Federal Assistance for Educational Purposes," "Problems of the Aged and Aging," "Pioneer Ideas in

Education," "Impact of Automation on Employment," "Administration of the Labor-Management Relations Act by the NLRB," and "The New Image in Labor."

Before concluding these general remarks, I should like to point out to the Members that the Committee on Education and Labor, with the enormous workload, though in nature one committee, is in essence two committees. Two subjects as significant, extensive and complex as education and labor could be intellectually divided into separate committees. But through the wisdom of this House by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, envisaging the enormous community of interests of education and labor, the two separate committees were combined and have remained joined. In the highly complex society of today an education in its full sense is certainly necessary for job opportunities. The interrelationships between education and labor are borne out by such legislation as vocational education and rehabilitation, manpower development and training, education of the handicapped. But though this great identity of interests exists, the committee does consider two subjects which in terms of workload and expense are equal to two separate committees. With absolutely no desire to have the committee divided, I do recommend that the double work and expense load be considered.

The Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor is concerned primarily with higher education legislation, education and rehabilitation of the handicapped and prevention and control of juvenile delinquency. I think it cannot be disputed that these are areas vital to the welfare and well-being of our country. As President Kennedy has said in his education message to the Congress on January 29 of this year:

> Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress.

In the 87th Congress, the Special Subcommittee on Education reported out eight bills after countless hours of public hearings, consultations, discussions and study. The subcommittee answered thousands of letters and inquiries regarding this legislation. On one subject alone, special education for handicapped children, more than 500 letters were received, from all parts of the country. Nearly every Member of the House has referred a letter or inquiry to the subcommittee regarding legislation pending before it. All eight bills reported out by the subcommittee were approved by the Committee on Education and Labor, and five were enacted into law.

These enactments were:

Public Law 87–274, the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act.

Public Law 87–276, to assist in training teachers of the deaf.

Public Law 87–294, authorizing wider distribution of books for the blind.

Public Law 87–262, authorizing a new teaching hospital at Howard University and transferring Freedmen's Hospital to the university.

Public Law 87–137, authorizing an additional Assistant Secretary of Labor.

It was most regrettable that the conference report on H.R. 8900, the College Academic Facilities and Student Assistance Act was not approved and that another bill considered by this subcommittee, H.R. 12070, the special education and rehabilitation bill, was not enacted.

During the 87th Congress, the Special Subcommittee on Education, also considered H.R. 10396 and related bills to assist in developing programs to train highly skilled technicians needed by industry today. No final action was taken on these bills last year.

And in the 87th Congress, the subcommittee initiated a special study of all Federal education programs in order to obtain an overall picture of the educational activities of 42 different Federal agencies and departments. This study is primarily concerned with possible duplication, overlapping, and inconsistencies in the educational programs. The subcommittee will consider and publish its final report on the study in the very near future.

In the 88th Congress, the Special Subcommittee on Education again will turn its attention primarily to higher education and special education legislation. The needs of our colleges and universities for classrooms to teach the growing student population are becoming more pressing. Since this House passed the College Academic Facilities Act on January 30, 1962, college enrollments have increased by more than 8 percent. Let us consider college enrollments in the present decade.

In 1960, there were 3,582,000 students enrolled in our higher education institutions. By last fall, the number had increased to 4,207,000; by 1965, the figure will be 5,220,000; and by 1970, it will climb to 6,595,000—if there is sufficient space for these students.

The student loan fund established by the National Defense Education Act of 1958 currently is providing loans to about 5 percent of the students in institutions participating in this program. But the overall ceiling on loan funds, and the limit on funds for any one institution, has restricted the program at some of our largest colleges and State universities. More than 90 colleges and universities, with an enrollment of some 900,000 students, would be eligible for larger loan funds if the present institutional ceiling did not exist.

The President's Science Advisory Committee tells us that our increasingly technical civilization will require substantial gains in the number of Ph. D. and master's degrees awarded each year in the physical sciences, mathematics and engineering. We are frequently reminded that we need more engineers, more technicians, more highly trained personnel in almost every field.

In special education, we still are desperately short of adequately trained teachers for the 6 million handicapped children of school age. Only one-fourth of these children now are receiving the special education they require.

These are some of the areas which the Special Subcommittee on Education must consider during the 88th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in the time I have taken to make these remarks I have attempted to affirmatively state, not defend, the record of the committee. That record can stand on its own merits. The committee and the staff did anticipate a highly productive year resulting from application of skills and knowledge to an enormous workload. We are aware of our responsibilities to the House and to the Nation and eagerly seek to fulfill them. It would seem to me a most shameful waste if we are to jeopardize needed, significant legislative accomplishments by letting personal animosities control us.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for reference a detailed record of the accomplishments of the House Committee on Education and Labor:

JURISDICTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, ESTABLISHED BY RULE XI, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(a) Measures relating to education or labor generally.

(b) Child labor.

(c) Columbia Institution for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind; Howard University; Freedmen's Hospital, and St. Elizabeths Hospital.

(d) Convict labor and the entry of goods made by convicts into interstate commerce.

(e) Labor standards.

(f) Labor statistics.

(g) Mediation and arbitration of labor disputes.

(h) Regulation or prevention of importation of foreign laborers under contract.

(i) School lunch program.

(j) U.S. Employees' Compensation Commission.

(k) Vocational rehabilitation.

(l) Wages and hours of labor.

(m) Welfare of miners.

Legislative activities in the fields of education and labor during the 87th Congress

GENERAL STATEMENT

Bills referred to the committee	741
Total bills reported out of committee	44
A. Bills reported by the committee and enacted into law	18
B. Bills reported by the committee, passed in House and Senate and pending in conference at end of the 87th Congress	1
C. Bills reported by the committee and denied a rule	[1]2
D. Bills reported by the committee and pending before Rules Committee at end of the 87th Congress	[2]21
E. Bills reported by the committee, granted a rule, but consideration not completed in the House	1
F. Other legislative inquiries	10
G. Committee prints	10
H. House reports on legislation	41
I. Conference reports	4
J. Hearings held	49

[1] Equal Pay Act of 1962 passed House; passed Senate as rider to H.R. 11880, Foreign Service Building Authorization Act:

[2] Includes one bill which was considered and tabled by Rules Committee, S. 1126 (crew leader registration, migratory labor).

A. Bills reported by the committee and enacted into law:

The Practical Nurse Training Extension Act of 1961, Public Law 87–22. (April 24, 1961.)

Fair Labor Standards Act Amendments of 1961, Public Law 87–30. (May 5, 1961.)

Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act Amendments, Public Law 87–87. (July 14, 1961.)

Additional Assistant Secretary of Labor, Public Law 87–137. (August 11, 1961.)

Establishment of Teaching Hospital for Howard University, Public Law 87–262. (September 22, 1961.)

Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, Public Law 87–274. (September 22, 1961.)

Teachers for the Deaf and Speech Pathologists and Audiologists, Public Law 87–276. (September 22, 1961.)

Education of the blind and increased appropriations for the American Printing House for the Blind, Public Law 87–294. (September 22, 1961.)

Metallic and Nonmetallic Mines Safety Act, Public Law 87–300. (September 26, 1961.)

Federal Employees' Compensation Act Amendments, Public Law 87–339. (October 3, 1961.)

Extend National Defense Education Act of 1958; extend impacted areas (extension of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874), Public Law 87–344. (October 3, 1961.)

Amendment to title II of National Defense Education Act, Public Law 87–400. (October 5, 1961.)

Manpower Development and Training Act, Public Law 87–415. (March 15, 1962.)

Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments, Public Law 87–420. (March 20, 1962.)

Work Hours Act, Public Law 87–581. (August 13, 1962.)

Captioned Films for the Deaf, Public Law 87–715. (September 28, 1962.)

Amendment to Manpower Development and Training Act, Public Law 87–729. (October 1, 1962.)

National School Lunch Act Amendment, Public Law 87–823. (October 15, 1962.)

B. Bills reported by committee, passed in House and Senate and pending in conference at end of the 87th Congress:

College Academic Facilities Act, H.R. 8900. (Passed House 319 to 79, January 30, 1962.)

Equal pay for equal work, H.R. 11677. (Passed House by voice vote July 25, 1962.[1])

C. Bills reported by the committee and denied a rule:

Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments, H.R. 5741. Reported April 13, 1961; denied a rule June 7, 1961.

Crew Leader Registration Act, H.R. 7812. Reported July 19, 1961; denied a rule August 23, 1961.

D. Bills passed by committee and pending before Rules Committee at end of the 87th Congress (date referred):

Education:

Federal aid to higher education, H.R. 7215 (May 26, 1961).

H.R. 7300, general aid to elementary and secondary education (June 1, 1961).

Overall revision of National Defense Education Act, H.R. 7904 (July 6, 1961).

Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, H.R. 4172 (July 19, 1961).

Emergency Educational Aid Act, 1961, H.R. 8890 (August 24, 1961).

Revision, National School Lunch Act, H.R. 8962 (February 21, 1962).

Adult basic education, H.R. 10896 (April 2, 1962).

Amendment to Land-Grant Colleges Act to eliminate the "separate but equitable" clause of the act, H.R. 11707 (May 23, 1962).

Amendments to impacted areas laws to deny payments to school districts that practice racial discrimination and segregation, H.R. 10056 (May 31, 1962).

University extension, H.R. 11340 (May 31, 1962).

Quality Education Act, H.R. 11888 (May 31, 1962).

Special education and vocational rehabilitation, H.R. 12070 (July 5, 1962).

Amendment to titles II and III of National Defense Education Act (H.R. 13204) (October 2, 1962).

Labor:

Youth Employment Opportunities Act, H.R. 10682 (March 29, 1962). (This superseded earlier bill referred to rules in first session.)

Occupational Safety Act, H.R. 12306 (July 5, 1962).

Equal Employment Opportunities Act, H.R. 10144 (February 8, 1962).

Davis-Bacon Act Amendments, H.R. 10946 (April 5, 1962).

National Council on Migratory Labor, S. 1132 (July 5, 1962).

Crew Leader Registration Act, S. 1126. (Referred April 18 and tabled September 20, 1962.)

Education for migratory children, S. 1124 (July 5, 1962).

Joint industry promotion (amendment to sec. 302(c)(6) of Labor-Management Relations Act, H.R. 11537 (May 22, 1962).

E. Bill reported by committee, granted rule, consideration not completed in House at end of session: Amendment to Fair Labor Standards Act dealing with migratory child labor, S. 1123 (considered on floor October 4, 1962).

F. Other legislation inquiries—ad hoc subcommittees:

Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation.

Subcommittee on the Administration of the National Labor Relations Act by the National Labor Relations Board.

Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment.

Special subcommittee inquiry on the administration of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Subcommittee on Irregularities in the Garment Industry.

Advisory Committee on Higher Education.

Subcommittee on Integration in Federally Assisted Public Education.

Study group on federally impacted areas.

Special study on federally assisted educational programs.

Field study of juvenile delinquency.

G. Committee Prints:

Education:

Federal Aid for Education. (A history of proposals which have received consideration by the Congress of the United States, 1789 to 1960.) May 1961.

The University in Latin America: Argentine and the Alliance for Progress, September 1961.

Federal Interest in Education, September 1961.

Activities and Accomplishments of the Committee on Education and Labor During the 1st Session of the 87th Congress, December 1961.

Higher Education in the Soviet Union, January 1962.

Congressional Action for Higher Education, January 1962.

The New Image in Education, February 1962.

A Directory of Federally Financed Student Loans, Fellowships, and Career Training Programs in the Field of Higher Education in the United States, April 1962.

Cultural Factfinding Mission to Latin America and Caribbean Countries, April 1962.

Integration in Public Education Programs, May 1962.

Views on Relationships of Church and State in the Field of Education, May 1962.

Interim Report on Education and Citizenship in the Public School System of Puerto Rico, August 1962.

Problems of the Aged and Aging, October 1962.

Publications With a Major Emphasis Upon Education. (A selected bibliography.) November 1962.

Pioneer Ideas in Education, December 1962.

Federal Assistance for Educational Purposes. (Part I: Digest of Laws; Part II: A History of Proposals Which Have Received Consideration by the Congress, 1789 to 1962.) December 1962.

Labor:

Worker Participation in Business Management, February 1961.

Some Important Dates in the History of American Labor, February 1961.

A compilation of economic data on industries affected by H.R. 3935 and other bills to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, February 1961.

Comparative print showing changes to be made in existing law by H.R. 3935 as reported by the committee, March 1961.

Federal Labor Laws, a Compilation, March 1961.

Impact of Automation on Employment, June 1961.

Farm Labor Contract Registration Act of 1961, July 1961.

Fair Labor Standards Act Amendments of 1961, July 1961.

Administration of the Labor-Management Relations Act by the National Labor Relations Board, September 1961.

Applicability of Anti-Trust Legislation to Labor Unions; Selected Excerpts and Bibliography, September 1961.

Federal Labor Laws, Revised Compilation, November 1961.

Activities and Accomplishments of the Committee on Education and Labor—Activities in the Area of Labor Legislation, December 1961.

The New Image in Labor, June 1962.

Legislative History of the Davis-Bacon Act, September 1962.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, during the 87th Congress the General Subcommittee on Labor had pending before it a number of legislative proposals involving youth employment, Youth Conservation Corps camps, construction site picketing, disabled Government employees compensation, programs for providing adult basic education for uneducated adults and programs in the field of occupational safety.

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

Hearings were held by the subcommittee beginning on June 14 and extending through July 6 on H.R. 7536 and related measures to establish programs of on-the-job training, public service employment on a Youth Conservation Corps in order to provide employment opportunities and increase the employability of out-of-school and unemployed young people between the ages of 16 and 22. Following subcommittee action on this measure the full committee reported H.R. 8354—House Report 833—on August 2, 1961. The subsequent passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act included an amendment providing on-the-job training opportunities for young people obviating the need for title I of H.R. 8354. Following the subcommittee's consideration, the full committee reported H.R. 10682—House Report 1540—which bill eliminated title I of H.R. 8354 and made other modifications to the previously reported bill. On May 16 the House Rules Committee held 1 day of hearings on the request of the House Education and Labor Committee for a rule on H.R. 10682. No further action was taken on the measure in the 87th Congress.

---

[1] Senate passed an Equal Pay Act as a rider to H.R. 11880, the Foreign Service Building Authorization Act, thereby placing final passage within jurisdiction of Foreign Affairs Committee. There was objection to unanimous consent to go to conference on H.R. 11880 in form presented by Senate.

In the 1st session of the 88th Congress the General Subcommitte on Education conducted 6 days of hearings on H.R. 1890, the Youth Employment Act, making provision for a Youth Conservation Corps in title I and a local public service employment and training program. The subcommittee has held 3 days of executive sessions to consider further action on the bill. We hope to have the Youth Conservation Corps legislation before the full committee of the House Education and Labor Committee next week for consideration.

CONSTRUCTION SITE PICKETING

Since the Supreme Court decision in the *Denver Building Trades* case, 341 U.S. 675, decided in June 1951, various legislative proposals have been made with respect to amending section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. Such legislation has been often referred to as construction site picketing bills which deal generally with the question of whether or not picketing activities at a construction location because of a dispute with a subcontractor should be considered a secondary boycott and an unfair labor practice when there is no dispute with the prime contractor. Extensive hearings were conducted on this legislative issue by the General Subcommittee on Labor in the 1st session of the 87th Congress. This identical legislation in the 86th Congress was reported out of the Education and Labor Committee, but did not clear the House Rules Committee.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION ACT

The subcommittee held hearings on amendments to the Federal Employees Compensation Act during the 1st session of the 87th Congress and reported H.R. 8871 to the full committee. This measure corrected an oversight in the Federal Employees Compensation Act, Public Law 86–767, which excluded District of Columbia government employees from the benefits of section 104 of the act. H.R. 8871 passed the House of Representatives on September 12, 1961, and passed the Senate on September 14—Public Law 87–339.

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION

Because large numbers of adult citizens, in many instances comprising the hard core of our unemployment, lacked the basic education to enable them to be retrainable under State and Federal programs designed to increase the employability of unemployed workers, the General Subcommittee on Labor took an active interest in legislative proposals to establish programs of adult basic education instruction. Consequently, the General Subcommittee on Labor with the Select Committee on Education, held hearings on various legislative proposals in this field resulting in report of H.R. 10896 on April 2, 1962, House Report 1551.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY LEGISLATURE

On April 17, 1962, the General Subcommittee on Labor started hearings on H.R. 11192 and related measures which would encourage the development, initiation and expansion of occupational safety programs in the States through grants to States for demonstrations and experiments on occupational safety. Hearings were concluded on May 2. At an executive session of the subcommittee on June 27, a clean bill, H.R. 12306, was reported to the full committee. On June 28 the full committee ordered reported favorably H.R. 12306—House Report 1965.

In discussing the work of the Education and Labor Committee in this session of Congress, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the administration for its comprehensive and penetrating analysis of the problems facing American education and the constructive program for dealing with those problems which is embodied in the proposals of H.R. 3000, the National Education Improvement Act of 1963.

Recognizing the vital role of education in the life of the individual citizen and the dependence of the Nation's future upon the competence of a fully educated people, the administration has surveyed the American educational scene in its entirety and proposed for our consideration a program carefully designed to deal simultaneously and effectively with the major problem areas in which the Federal Government must play a more crucial role.

The program is selective. It is not designed to solve all domestic problems, nor to usurp the traditional local responsibilities for education, but rather to concentrate Federal resources in such a way as to stimulate State and local response and thus to strengthen the independence of existing school systems. Wherever possible, it is transitional—aimed at providing immediate and adequate relief to acute problems—while permitting local authorities to prepare to deal with them on a continuing basis. Above all, it is a balanced program, related in all its parts to achieving over the whole spectrum of American education its aims of improving the quality of education at all levels; meeting the challenge of providing facilities for the vastly increased school-age population which faces us in the sixties; and enlarging the opportunities for each individual, whatever his present level of education, to develop his capabilities to their fullest potential.

This is not a partisan approach. Nearly half—11—of the programs are based on the continuation and expansion of programs already voted into law by preceding Congresses. The results and experience gained under the National Defense Education Act, the Library Services Act, and the Vocational Education Act, together with consultations with the various educational organizations, the resources of the Office of Education, and the wisdom of specially appointed panels of independent experts have all been skillfully weighed in creating the 13 new proposals.

The 24 programs contained in the bill fall into 5 major categories:

First. The expansion of opportunities for individuals in higher education.

Second. The expansion and improvement of facilities for higher education.

Third. The improvement of educational quality through better teaching methods and more and better teacher training.

Fourth. The strengthening of elementary and secondary education through the construction of facilities and the raising of teachers' salaries.

Fifth. The expansion and improvement of opportunities for vocational and continuing education at many levels.

These programs necessarily take many forms. The problems facing American education today are neither simple nor unrelated. The task of this committee in carrying out its responsibilities has been immeasurably aided by the precision and sound judgment which this bill represents in identfying and defining the most urgent of these problems. These numerous proposals have been developed into a cohesive program.

Nevertheless, the field is controversial, the programs are detailed, and the study of this measure in its entirety is a responsibility of great magnitude for this committee and its staff.

Perhaps no task facing this body this year will have as far-reaching effect on both the individual citizens of this country and the future of this Nation—as an example to the world of the benefits to be derived from free institutions—as the full and deliberate consideration of this comprehensive approach to the education of our youth.

The General Subcommittee on Education plans to hold extensive hearings on vocational educational needs. It plans to continue studies and hold hearings on educational problems in connection with retraining, particularly with respect to the educational opportunities and needs of an estimated 11 million American adults who lack formal education in the basic areas of mathematics, reading, and writing.

The General Subcommittee on Education plans to conduct hearings regarding special educational needs in economically distressed areas of the Nation to ascertain to what extent the Federal Government can or should be providing assistance to bolster educational facilities in areas where there has been long prevailing unemployment or underemployment. It will be recalled that the Public Works Acceleration Act, Public Law 87–658, specifically precluded the use of public works funds for planning or construction directly or indirectly of any school or other educational facility. Preliminary information available at this time indicates that in areas where unemployment has prevailed over a long period of time, educational deficiencies are the severest and contribute substantially to a growing national problem involving increasing numbers of hard-to-employ citizens, increased welfare and other public financial loads. This area should be fully explored as to what specific improvements to the educational assistance in such areas are needed and to what extent assistance to these areas will be in the national interest.

I am confident that when we, the Members of this 88th Congress, have completed our work, that we will pass a

bill that will give the Nation a comprehensive program of Federal aid to education. As America moves into the age of space, every young person in every corner of the land must have an opportunity to receive a good education so that he can develop his maximum abilities. Then we will guarantee the ever expanding growth and security of our country.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on at least two occasions in the past several weeks it has been stated by Democratic members of the Education and Labor Committee that the Harlem project was a fine example of the programs which would be accomplished under the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. A close check of the slipshod manner in which this project has started gives little to substantiate the high hopes of these colleagues.

Close scrutiny of the handling of the affairs of the project group indicates many interesting discrepancies which lead me to believe that we are in really poor shape if this particular project is supposed to be the model which Attorney General Kennedy, this administration and Members of Congress picture.

As is often the case, a little homework will unearth some truths which are glossed over when superlatives are used to describe a project or program the merit of which is more political and superficial than real.

The Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development has been obliged to mildly chastise the project in Harlem which is proceeding under a grant of $250,000 made last year. Training project No. 63201 is currently being conducted by Associated Community Teams, Inc., known as ACT. Many interesting discrepancies were turned up in a recent audit. It was determined that a very incomplete accounting and auditing system was being used. The regional auditor, Division of Grant-in-Aid Audits of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare noted that transactions "involved a number of errors which were not adjusted in any systematic way."

Further, it was noted that accounts "are inadequate to control the expenditures being made by this agency."

It was even necessary to call in a CPA for the purpose of auditing these accounts.

Anyone who knows anything about the incorporation of an organization is aware of the fact that basic records must be kept concerning original meetings, bylaws, and so forth. Yet, the auditor noted:

> Although an "official minute book" was purchased, the formal original minutes were not available.

Little pretext was given as far as carrying on a businesslike operation is concerned. I do not know the laws of the State of New York but after reading the auditor's report, I would be surprised if ACT were in compliance with the corporation statutes of that State. In an almost cryptic comment, the auditor tells us:

> Other than as noted in this memorandum, no particularly significant entries were found.

On the very face of the lease of space from the Adam Clayton Powell Community Center on West 137th Street in New York City, it can be seen that the period of the lease extends 2 months beyond the present approved termination date of this project. Are they so sure that it will be renewed? The rent of $2,000 per month was not questioned although I am still of the opinion that the Committee on Government Operations should take a good look at the setup involved in this training project, the lease and every facet of its operation.

In the important area of personnel, several interesting factors were noted by the auditor. The project director is being paid at a salary of $15,000 which exceeds any of the salaries provided for in the approved budget. The auditor gives us a good idea of what has been going on when he reported:

> During the period under audit (July 1, 1962, to November 30, 1962), there were no time, leave, or attendance reports kept.

It is also interesting to note that no procedure was in effect for formally documenting personnel actions, appointments or changes in pay, nor was there any written statement of conditions of employment or personnel policies. About the only thing that was definite in this arrangement was the salaries. The record is very silent as to working hours, responsibilities, leave policies, and so forth.

The facts cited are nothing more than a superficial checking of this Harlem project. I hesitate to guess what would be brought out if a thorough investigation of this project were completed.

Attorney General Kennedy used superlatives to describe this vanguard of the Domestic Peace Corps. Members of my Committee on Education and Labor have used superlatives to describe it. Some have suggested that they are a little tired of hearing about it since they feel any criticism of it is an attack on our committee chairman which is certainly not the case.

Consider the very inefficient manner in which the taxpayers' funds have been accounted for. I have known Mr. Wingate, the project director, for 2 years and found him a very competent employee of our committee. It appears to me that he was thrown into the middle of this situation and is confronted with a virtual impossible task. I certainly hope he can give us something to show for the quarter of a million dollars we will spend.

The payroll of ACT approaches $60,000 per year as can be seen in the report which I have included after these remarks. Coupled with the $24,000 rent of their quarters we see a bureaucratic overhead of almost $85,000 at the very start.

I submit that none of us here in Congress would, in a private capacity, tolerate such a situation. None of us as responsible businessmen, lenders, stockholders, directors, or managers would touch anything which is so loosely drawn and poorly organized. Why do we tolerate such a condition to exist simply because the Government is picking up the bill?

When you look around at the mushrooming growth of Federal bureaucracy and the waste and duplication that we have in so many other areas of Federal activity, you can only come to the conclusion that this Harlem project, described in so many superlatives by our top brass, is a fitting offspring to an irresponsible parent. I suggest that Secretary Celebrezze and Attorney General Kennedy take a good second look at the activities of Associated Community Teams, Inc.

FEBRUARY 15, 1963.

(Attention: Chief, Field Branch.)

To: Office of Field Administration, OS Division of Grant-in-Aid Audits, Room 5743 HEW Building, North.

From: Albert Hirt, regional auditor, New York.

Subject: Audit of juvenile delinquency grant, ACT.

At the request of the Special Assistant to the Secretary for Juvenile Delinquency we have made a review of the fiscal transactions of the Associated Community Teams, Inc., Training Project No. 63201, as reported on a preliminary financial statement for the period July 1, 1962, through November 30, 1962. Although we made the usual verification of the actuality and accuracy of expenditures and fund balances, our chief attention was directed toward the propriety of expenditures to date and acceptability of the fiscal and related procedures now in use. We made no attempt to evaluate program operations or personnel qualifications since these areas are outside the scope of our competency. We were accompanied during the review by Mr. George Roemer of the special assistant's staff.

We have the following comments:

1. ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

At the time of our visit, January 30, 1963, the accounts consisted of a cash disbursements book and a checkbook. The last posting to the cashbook was November 30, 1962. Check transactions, as reflected in the stubs, involved a number of errors which were not adjusted in any systematic way. The balance in the checking account was not carried forward after January 7, 1963. These accounts are inadequate to control the expenditures being made by this agency. When requested to prepare a statement of expenditures (as of November 30, 1962) it was necessary to call in a CPA for this purpose. The position of "bookkeeper-auditor" provided in the approved budget has not been filled.

2. BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETINGS

Although an official minute book was purchased, the formal (original) minutes were not available. Loose copies in a manila folder were provided and covered the following meetings: August 11, 16, 23, September 7, 27, November 11, November 8, 20, December 13, 20, all in 1962. After encountering a reference to a meeting on October 25, 1962, we asked about the corresponding minutes. A freshly made photo copy was given us. We were assured by Mr. Wingate, acting executive director, that the file of minutes was now complete. Other than as noted in this memorandum, no particular significant entries were found.

3. RENT OF PREMISES

ACT has formally rented space (approximately 25 rooms) on the first (3,737 square feet) and second (3,917 square feet) floors of the Adam Clayton Powell Community Center on West 137th Street in New York City. The period of the lease is July 9, 1962, through December 1963 (project termination date). Use of furniture and fixtures in the space and maintenance of the premises are included in the rental which amounted to $1,155.74 for the initial period from July 9, 1962 to August 31, 1962, and $6,000 per quarter, payable in advance, for the remainder of the lease term until December 1, 1963, when payment of $2,000 will be due. Before establishing this rate the agency obtained two appraisals of the premises. The first (Frost) resulted in a $3 per foot estimate including furniture, utilities and maintenance. The second (Hanson) produced the same rate including janitor services but no utilities. The lease at the rate of $2,000 per month was thereafter completed.

The terms of this lease provide for $6,000 payments on September 1, December 1, 1962, March 1, June 1, 1963, etc. It should be noted that any payment on June 1, 1963, for a quarterly period will cover 2 months beyond the present approved termination date of this project.

4. PERSONNEL

There is attached a schedule setting forth the salary data concerning personnel employed during the period of audit and comparing titles and rates of pay with the approved budget. In addition, the minutes of November 20, 1962, authorize the appointment of Mr. Carl Johnson as Director of Peace Corps and Acting Project Director at a salary of $15,000.

During the period under audit there were no time, leave, or attendance records kept. Some time thereafter a procedure for daily sign in and out sheets was instituted.

No procedure was in effect for formally documenting personnel actions (appointments, changes in pay, etc.). The minutes indicated Board approval of some appointments but made no mention of others.

No written statement of conditions of employment or personnel policies (leave policies, working hours, etc.) could be located.

5. OTHER

Two reported expenditures requires future adjustment. A payment of $400 (miscellaneous) covers a deposit with the telephone company and a reported unliquidated obligation (subsequently paid—check No. 1134, $483.16) covers expenses of Mr. Fred Hubbard, a per diem consultant. A refund is due on this payment because only a portion of Mr. Hubbard's time was devoted to ACT. According to correspondence between ACT and Mr. Russell of DHEW the remainder of Mr. Hubbard's time is chargeable to the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency.

Copies of some of the ACT publicity material are attached for your information.

Associated Community Teams, Inc.—Summary of salary expenditures and comparison with budget

Position title	Annual salary rate		Incumbent	From	To
	Budgeted	Expended			
Project director	$14,000	$14,000	M. Lewis	July 16, 1962 [1]	Aug. 24, 1962 [2]
Program coordinator	13,000	13,000	R. Kurahara	do [1]	(3)
Trainee supervisor	8,500	8,500	G. Jones	do [1]	(3)
Office manager-administrative assistant	7,500	7,500	B. Griggs	do [1]	(3)
Telephone operator-receptionist-typist	4,800	4,800	W. S. Bowden	Aug. 14, 1962	(3)
Special assistant to director		12,500	G. Broadfield [4]	Oct. 22, 1962	(3)
Stenographer		3,640	M. Clark	Oct. 9, 1962	Nov. 4, 1962
Do		4,160	do	Nov. 5, 1962	(3)
Trainee supervisor	8,500	4,100	R. Giles	Nov. 20, 1962	(3)

[1] Appointments approved by Board action Aug. 11, 1962, effective July 16, 1962.

[2] Resigned.

[3] Through Nov. 30, 1962 (end of audit period).

[4] Appointment authorized by Board per minutes of Oct. 11, 1962. Salary $10,000 to $13,000, "to serve in any capacity the Board sees fit."

NOTE.—Appointed as consultant at $75 per day from Oct. 9 to 12, 1962; at $200 per week from Oct. 15 to 19, 1962

FEBRUARY 20, 1963.

Mr. LIVINGSTON WINGATE,
ACT, Inc., Adam Clayton Powell Community Center, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. WINGATE: We have just received the report of our regional auditor in New York who audited your books on January 30, 1963. He notes a number of deficiencies, including the following:

1. THE ACCOUNTING SYSTEM

The balance in the checking account was not carried forward after January 7, 1963. The last posting to the cash book was November 30, 1962. The position of bookkeeper-auditor provided in the approval has not been filled.

2. BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETINGS

The formal (original) minutes were not available.

3. RENT OF PREMISES

The terms of the lease provided for payment beyond the life of the grant.

4. PERSONNEL

Inadequate time records were kept.

These and other deficiencies noted make it important that I discuss this with you and our regional auditor at your earliest convenience. Please contact me immediately so that we can arrange this meeting for a followup on the audit.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD RUSSELL,
Director, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in the defense of the Committee on Education and Labor—the committee of which I have been a member for the past 7 years. This is a role, I might say, that I never expected to be required to play.

The record this committee established during the 87th Congress is one the majority of other House committees will find hard to equal.

This committee, during those 2 years, did more for the field of education and the plight of the workers in America than was accomplished in the previous 8 years during the era of the Eisenhower-Barden leadership.

It seemed to many of us, who were members of Education and Labor for those nonproductive years, that those gentlemen believed in neither education nor in labor.

The ranks of the unemployed grew and grew with each new recession under the Eisenhower administration.

But, nothing constructive was done. No effort was made to assist our unemployed toward rehabilitation, toward reentering the active working force again. Yet there was legislation in the Education and Labor Committee to offer such a program while Mr. Barden was chairman and Mr. Eisenhower was President.

I know for I introduced it in 1957 and there it remained, until Mr. Eisenhower left Washington, and Mr. Barden retired to his farm.

A sop was offered to the unemployed in the form of "temporary unemployment insurance" but, after that, came the inevitable active membership on our relief rolls.

The only monument erected for labor, under Eisenhower and Barden, was one approved by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and every ultraconservative and reactionary group in America, the infamous Landrum-Griffin bill, which restricted our recognized labor unions and created conditions forcing them to expend their energies and moneys to protect the rights they had secured through previous legislation. Their chances for expansion and growth went out the window with the passage of that act.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, during those years, this committee was run under the guidance and with the full approval of big business and with no thought nor consideration for the average American citizen who tomorrow might join the ranks of the unemployed.

In regard to the field of education the other major responsibility of our committee the record under Eisenhower and Barden is not only pitiful but disgraceful.

With the need for additional educational opportunities becoming more and more apparent each year, our committee remained stagnant.

In 1956, I introduced legislation providing scholarships for students who were mentally capable and desirous of furthering their education but were financially unable to meet the required expenses.

These scholarships were to be under the direction of the National Science Foundation, strictly nonpolitical, the Nation, as a whole, would have benefited. There was, even then, a need for engineers, a shortage of scientists, a dearth of mathematicians, teachers in our secondary and elementary schools, and our colleges and universities were scouring the Nation for qualified personnel.

In 1957, I reintroduced this legislation and all we heard was from our friends at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers saying "this is a local matter, it can be handled better at the local level; all those who want to get an education can find a way to do it."

That session of Congress closed, adjourned, on August 30, with no action.

Then, in October of 1957, sputnik entered space.

In November, Mr. Eisenhower started making speeches on our need for more educational facilities and more opportunities. He even thought a few scholarships, financed by the Federal Government, might be wise.

Well, we got the National Defense Education Act, in 1958—with student loan programs, with assistance and loans to our institutions of higher education.

But, we owe our thanks for this progressive move not to the Eisenhower-

Barden leadership but to Russia and to Sputnik.

In the following 2 years no further gains were made in the educational field. We maintained our status quo.

However, in 1961, when the leadership of this Nation and the leadership of this committee changed hands the whole atmosphere in the field of education and labor changed.

At the end of the 87th Congress the record shows that this Committee on Education and Labor reported to the Rules Committee 44 bills, 22 on education and 22 on labor.

The 87th Congress passed 18 of these bills, 9 on education and 9 on labor, and they were good bills. They were legislation in the interest of the people of America, not just the vested interests of the Nation.

The manpower training bill, to train and educate our long-term unemployed, was passed. That was what I wanted Eisenhower to do back in 1957, but he and Barden did not believe in recognizing we had an unemployment problem. Profits were still coming in at a satisfactory rate.

The Minimum Wage Act was improved and increased, the Welfare and Pension Act was improved, a survey to determine requirements for mine safety was approved, specific hours were set for workers on projects operating with or by Federal moneys, the railroad workers were included in our Manpower Training Act, programs were enacted for practical nurses' training, additional special programs were initiated for teaching the blind and the deaf, school lunches were extended, student and construction loans were extended under the National Defense Education Act, a program was started for the correction and control of juvenile delinquency, and other long-overdue measures were enacted into law.

This is the record of the Committee on Education and Labor under the dual leadership of Kennedy and POWELL.

These men believe in both education and in labor.

There is still much to be done to catch up for the 8 years of idleness we drifted through under disinterested and incapable leadership.

The whole Nation is now aware of the inadequate educational program we have allowed to exist—

With approximately three-quarters of a million dropouts from high school, untrained and uneducated for gainful employment in the space era we are entering;

With the prospects of 7 million more this decade, unless we act and act quickly;

With automation and technological advancements increasing output daily—while it decreases employment in these same areas;

With hundreds of thousands of our adults needing special academic educational programs as well as technical ones;

With the problem of those between the ages of 40 and 65 that industry feels are too old to start new careers, but, we know they are too young to retire;

With all these issues to be faced and solutions to be found, this committee must have an adequate staff and adequate funds to do the job.

The chamber of commerce and the NAM are still sending out flyers—newsletters and special announcements—that these jobs should be done at a local level—that Congress should not interfere, that we should settle back and not bother ourselves, just let nature take its course.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we have learned our lesson. I hope we realize we cannot retreat into our shell and watch the world go by.

If our people are not gainfully employed and almost 6 percent of our people are not, then our Nation will suffer.

During this 88th Congress I hope to be able to continue what we started last session.

Many of the Members of this House realize that the findings of my Subcommittee on Unemployment and Automation, which resulted in the Manpower Training and Development Act of 1962, merely scratched the surface of our most serious domestic problem. When this legislation was passed, just a year ago this month, it was stated in this House that "this program, we know, will not completely solve our unemployment problem but it is a step in the right direction, and the first of many we will have to take to attain full employment and insure an expanding economy."

We cannot afford to stop now, Mr. Speaker. If we do, these problems we still have will not even be considered and no attempt will even be made to try to find solutions.

I sincerely feel the record of the Committee on Education and Labor, in the 87th Congress, is one to be held in high esteem and it is one that we, who are members of this committee, can be proud we helped produce, for the legislation we sponsored and we had passed was for the benefit of the average American and the good of the Nation as a whole.

NEW FRONTIER PROGRAMS IGNORE TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, last October 5 I had occasion to make a long speech about urban renewal and certain abuses which had developed in that program. I was trying to place emphasis on technical difficulties which were responsible for the embarrassing position in which the administration found itself. As I examine the proposed budget for fiscal 1964, I find many of the same technical difficulties. The President seems to be acting on impulse rather than on any sound technical basis.

This is a serious charge and I do not make it lightly. Therefore, I should like to submit evidence in support of the assertion just made.

For the present, my attention will be focused on the welfare part of the New Frontier program, which, in spite of suggestions to the contrary, is being expanded at a faster rate than most other segments of the budget, including national defense. The justification for this expansion is political rather than logical or reasonable. The New Frontier is trying to capitalize on a formula developed by the New Deal. That formula reads somewhat as follows:

First. Many persons are in need.

Second. The Nation has resources with which to meet the need.

Third. The Federal Government should use the resources to meet the need.

This is not a syllogism with its major premise, minor premise, and conclusion. It presents no logical pattern of reasoning. The justification for the formula is the assumption that people will accept and support it. That assumption, which stood up rather well for about 30 years, is now beginning to wear thin and is in danger of falling under the heavy load which the President is trying to place upon it.

I am not going to argue with the first two points in the New Deal formula. They have too much popular appeal. They also have just enough truth in them to make difficult their denial.

My quarrel is with the third point in the New Deal formula. And in this fight, the technological evidence is on my side. Logically, points 1 and 2 do not justify the conclusion implied in point 3. Technologically, no standards or criteria can be developed by which to administer Federal social welfare programs to produce the results which the administration promises when it proposes Federal financial involvement.

Let me move immediately to a set of specific examples which will show both the failure of past budget appropriations to produce the results expected and the probability that future appropriations of the same kind can lead only to the disillusionment of people and a waste of the Nation's substance.

URBAN RENEWAL

The first example has to do with urban renewal. It summarizes the evidence submitted to this House on October 5 last, and in a previous speech. Some of you may recall that in the October 5 speech my indictment of the urban renewal program was built around the following three simple questions:

First. How is need for urban renewal determined?

Second. Where does the money come from?

Third. Who gets the money?

Discussion of need centered on the impossibility of establishing standards by which to measure the extent of need. As a result the recipients were allowed to determine the extent of their need. Abuses inevitably resulted. When the Federal Government failed to correct the abuses it made itself a party to the fraud and encouraged other communities to participate in the fraud.

Discussion of the millions of dollars involved indicated that, as a national policy, the Congress of the United States was taking tax moneys from the poor and sending that money into the greatest centers of population and wealth in the Nation. Such a policy is unprecedented in a democracy.

Discussion of who gets the money suggested that the poor families displaced from urban renewal areas do not benefit financially. The money actually provides windfall profits to slum landlords, excessive fees to planning consultants, and opportunities for great profits with minimum risk for large corporations now taking over the redevelopment of project areas all across the United States.

Does someone suggest that these are abuses which can be corrected without casting doubt on the validity of Federal participation in urban renewal? Any such suggestion indicates a complete misunderstanding of the technology which must apply to this activity. The fact is that no patterns or procedures can be developed in advance, which can be made applicable on a national scale, and which will predict the results of projects to be undertaken with Federal funds. The advocates of Federal urban renewal and many other programs are making false promises when they appear before the committees of Congress and say, "If you will appropriate funds, we will find ways to administer the programs so that they will produce the results expected from them."

MUST BE MEASURED BY RESULTS ACHIEVED

The best technology in this field was developed before the New Deal formula was invented. Dr. Clarence E. Ridley, for years the executive secretary of the International City Managers' Association, investigated the development of standards by which to measure the effectiveness of public services, and said they could be measured but only in terms of results achieved, not in terms of methods or procedures formulated. All his subsequent studies served only to confirm that thesis.

What Dr. Ridley has done is to pull the rug from under the New Dealers and the New Frontiersmen in any promises of performance which they make in connection with welfare programs. The only valid test of these programs is the result achieved. In urban renewal the evidence is that the Federal effort has been a failure. More than 200 projects initiated with assurances of the fullest possible Federal support have failed. Seventy percent of the land cleared for redevelopment has not been put to the originally planned reuse.

This statement is not made in opposition to urban renewal. I am for urban renewal. But I am for a program which works. And, in spite of all the successes which are claimed for the Federal program, I know that it will never be technologically sound until it is completely revamped. Federal appropriations to continue it in its present form are a waste of taxpayers' money. It is slower, more costly, and less efficient by far than completely local programs which have been developed and demonstrated and which are available for national application.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

My second example is the area redevelopment program established in the Department of Commerce but with assistance from the Departments of Agriculture and Labor, among others. The stated purpose is to assist areas of substantial and persistent unemployment or underemployment in planning and financing economic redevelopment, and to establish stable and diversified local economies.

This program has been in operation long enough to demonstrate that its political expediency far outweighs its technical soundness. The program has been used to "bail out" communities where need undoubtedly existed but where precedents, established to meet the need, can plague the economy as a whole. The program has injected Government into economic and industrial development in ways never contemplated in the Constitution.

Let us not take time to examine the constitutional question involved. That would raise an endless debate about policy on which evidence may not be conclusive to some.

Let us concentrate instead on certain aspects of the program where the results speak for themselves.

The record indicates clearly that the Department of Commerce has been willing to assist low-wage precarious industries to help a locality even when such help is in conflict with national goals of high wages, increased productivity, sound investment, and healthy profits. Two examples which are part of the record, follow:

First. Dan Goldy, Deputy Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration, speaking before the Western Forest Industries Association in San Francisco in March 1962, said:

> We might as well go out of business if we can't make loans although there might be plenty of capacity in an industry already.

Second. The Washington Post for December 9, 1961, carried a story about the first project approved by ARA. The headline was: "Mountain Home Territory Didn't Get Its Industrial Revolution for Nothing." The introductory paragraphs of the story follow:

> MOUNTAIN HOME, ARK.—To get a shirt factory employing 500 women at low wages this depressed area had to—
>
> Provide a modern, air-conditioned building financed with a $535,000 bond issue.
>
> Lease the 75,000-square-foot, one-story building to the shirt company for 35 years at a monthly rental of $1,500, a sum that is not large enough to cover the cost of the structure and interest on the bond issue.
>
> Raise real estate levies $6 a year for the average taxpayer to make up the difference between the cost of the plant and the rental income.
>
> Allow the shirt manufacturer to renew his lease for another 64 years at a token cost to him of only $1 a year.
>
> Maintain the building and its 20-acre site, which is in a field 7 miles west and one-half mile east of the tiny town of Gassville, Ark.
>
> Furnish temporary quarters, at a cost to area businessmen of at least $10,000, so workers could be trained and production could begin before the new building was completed.
>
> Obtain $160,000 in aid from the Area Redevelopment Administration—the first grant and loan under the new depressed areas program—to build a water system adequate to the needs of the plant.
>
> Agree not to encourage the location of any plant in the area that would compete with the shirt factory for women workers.
>
> Become partner to a further agreement that in effect pledges the community to help the company keep a union out of the plant.

A second aspect of the ARA program on which the record speaks with eloquence has to do with planning. The law requires that before any locality can become eligible for this particular form of Federal aid, an overall economic development plan must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Commerce.

NO TECHNICAL STANDARDS

The Area Redevelopment Administration has been unable to develop technical standards or criteria by which to judge impartially and objectively the merits of these submissions. The result is that the Government is free to exercise discrimination either for or against a community. It can put a locality into a business where it does not belong and where the long-range outlook is dismal. It can help one community to upset an entire industry.

The ARA is gathering information in Washington which could be used to undermine the private enterprise system. The Government can use the information to plan and compel certain kinds of economic activity to be undertaken in certain parts of the Nation. This is already being done in the missile and space programs, presumably in the interests of national defense. A comparable control can be established over much of the economy by the area redevelopment program and without any comparable justification.

Once such control has been established by the Federal Government, the average businessman will no longer be free to exercise his independent judgment in the operation of his business. His decisions are no longer determining. He must wait to see what the Government is going to do. If the Government decides to set someone up in competition with him under conditions more favorable than he can create for himself, his economic fate is sealed.

The fate of communities can be controlled also. The sound economy of one city can be destroyed by actions taken by the ARA under existing legal authorizations. The data which these communities submit in support of their applications for Federal aid can be used against them. Political decisions can take the place of economic forces in the determination of their future.

ARA IN AGRICULTURE

One final aspect of the area redevelopment program deserves consideration in this look at the record. It concerns the part which the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture is asked to play.

As you know, the Extension Service has had a long service in helping the American farmer. It has been an educational and an advisory service designed to help the individual farmer make his most advantageous adjustment to circumstances.

The Extension Service has been concerned with policy questions in agriculture but always on a basis which kept the Service from becoming involved in

controversy. The traditional approach of the Service to public problems has been set forth clearly in the following statement from Cornell University in connection with what it has chosen to call Operation Advance:

> The objective of Operation Advance is not consensus. Everyone in a group is not expected to agree on answers. The purpose of the discussion is to help each leader develop and refine his or her own judgments. This is done by forcing the examination of individual concerns in broad context, by stretching individual thinking, and by developing some understanding of unfamiliar considerations, points of view and interests. The purpose of Operation Advance is not to make policy, but to serve as a basis for informed action by individual leaders. Therefore, agreement or consensus by the group is neither essential nor helpful. Thus, Operation Advance provides education support for leaders of organizations and groups involved in action in a political democracy.

As part of the area redevelopment program the Extension Service has been asked to combine its traditional service to individuals with group decisions and social action. Consensus is to be relied upon to decide the projects for which Federal aid is to be requested. This can involve the coercion of minorities by majorities. It can generate conflict instead of the cooperation which is essential for sound community development.

We are doing a favor to the President when we eliminate these technically unsupportable items from his budget. We are saving him from grievous failures which can have an adverse effect on the economy and must finally turn the people against him.

ADVANCING CIVILIAN TECHNOLOGY

My third example of budget requests which cannot be technically supported has to do with a request for $7.4 million for "advancing civilian technology." The construction, machine tool, and textile industries have been selected as the immediate focus for this kind of technological advancement.

Let us concede that everyone wants to advance civilian technology. Let us also concede that some of the research which might be helpful is not now being done.

Such an admission of need offers no technical support for the proposed appropriation. It leaves completely unanswered the question: How will the Federal appropriation accomplish what is needed?

Emphasis on the improvement of civilian technology is not original with this administration. The problem of improvement has been under study for about 10 years in connection with the work of the Small Business Administration. That agency has had funds with which to study and to take advantage of every possible technological advance for the benefit of small business. The results have been meager. It is results rather than predictions or promises upon which the Congress must rely in appropriating public funds.

Let me comment specifically on the concept of advancing civilian technology as it applies to the construction industry. The need for such a program is not generally accepted. Indeed many individuals and organizations certain to be affected by the program are not sure what the program is intended to accomplish, how it will be operated, or how it may affect the vast research program which private enterprise is now financing.

At present, research programs are being carried out by many individual corporations, large and small, and by various trade associations. While no accurate information is available about the total funds involved, many experts are convinced that the amount exceeds $250 million. In many areas the construction industry has developed technical advances which are years ahead of what the public is prepared to accept.

The administration has no clearly defined procedure for this program of advancing civilian technology. It has not even discussed its general approach to the problem with important segments of the construction industry. Leaders of this industry, whose cooperation is essential to the success of the Government's program, do not have confidence in it and are not prepared to help make it work.

The only way to reassure the construction industry about this program is for the Government to formulate in advance the criteria or standards by which the program will be controlled. The available evidence indicates that such a formulation is technologically impossible. That is what makes the administration's position untenable and requires that the Congress refuse to make the requested appropriation.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

My fourth example is taken from the field of education. Here again the President has seen fit to make excursions into uncharted fields without any substantial technical support.

To help concentrate attention on the technical aspects of Federal aid to education, let me make certain disavowals. I am discussing the obvious need for every American to receive the best possible education. Nor am I raising any question about the availability of resources with which to make that education possible. I am asking what technical evidence exists to support the claim that the Federal Government either can or should control the course of American education. I concede that we can appropriate money. I insist that money alone will not insure the kind of education which America needs.

Last year the President made certain recommendations about Federal aid to education. Because he could not give necessary assurances about the effect of these proposals he was not successful in having them enacted. As I understand the situation, both he and the Congress agreed that certain studies should be made to establish a foundation of fact upon which new proposals could be based. These studies were initiated. The results have not yet been made available for the consideration and reaction of many of the important segments of education certain to be affected by any decisions made and action taken. Nevertheless, the President has seen fit, without waiting for the facts which he once recognized to be essential, has submitted a most elaborate program of recommendations to the Congress. He has given no indication of standards or criteria by which the programs will be administered. He can give no assurances about results which will flow from the programs.

Let me review quickly three of the principal studies which were initiated in an effort to determine the proper place of the Federal Government in education.

The first was initiated by a Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor. The report of the Special Subcommittee has not yet been made public and presumably was not available at the time when the President's program was formulated. Certainly, its technological contribution has not been tested in the crucible of public discussion.

The second study was referred to in the President's message. It concerns the report of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education. That report has not yet been published and subjected to public criticism. There is available at present no evidence that the report will provide any technical foundation for the proposals which the President has incorporated in title V of H.R. 3000.

The third study is being made by the President's Committee on Youth Employment. No report has been made public. Nevertheless, the President has seen fit to make recommendations which cannot be supported technically until the report has been published and ample time for the reaction of interested groups has been allowed.

How serious is this lack of technological support? Some of my colleagues across the aisle may suggest that it is not damaging at all. That my claim that the President, in acting before the facts have been established, is not making recommendations contrary to the facts. They may suggest that the studies, when completed and made public, will support the President's position.

The matter is not that simple. The wisdom of the ages will not be found in the three reports just mentioned. There already exists an extensive body of technology which the President has chosen to ignore.

Let me give you a single example involving the question of whether Federal aid should consist of general appropriations without control or itemized appropriations with careful specifications of activities. Senator Robert Taft used to say that Federal aid must involve either strict control or waste. He insisted that no middle ground could exist.

The President is now trying to straddle that issue. He is trying to do both. And he is acting before he has a sound technical basis for either one.

I am sure all of you know that the Hoover report indicated the existence of more than 200 educational programs in the Federal Government. No administration has been powerful enough to establish coordination of these programs at the Federal level. There is no semblance of control over the impact of these programs on educational institutions and on communities.

Partial evidence has accumulated to indicate that Federal programs are already beginning to have harmful impact. A recent Brookings Institution report indicates that Federal programs have already become a major influence on the career planning of individuals. Many college leaders are concerned about the emphasis on science and mathematics at the expense of the humanities and the social sciences.

The President may have standards or criteria of his own on which he is willing to base fundamental educational decisions for the American people. But these standards have not been revealed to the people. They do not have the support of scholars in the field. They can become a menace to the entire educational system of the Nation. We should examine them most carefully before we attempt to implement them with Federal funds.

A fifth, and an almost perfect example of either ignoring or violating the technical knowledge of the day is to be found in the Youth Employment Act proposed by the President and now under consideration by the House Committee on Education and Labor.

The Youth Conservation Corps proposed by this bill, H.R. 1890, would abandon the realistic desire to provide youth with salable skills to fill identified job opportunities in favor of a program designed to remove young men of the Corps from the ongoing economic activities of their communities and States. The Corps men will be no better prepared to fill manpower needs after their tour in the "woods."

The YCC proposal appears to assume economic conditions in the 1960's comparable to those in the 1930's when the predecessor program, the Civilian Conservation Corps was established. However, our unemployment today is but a fraction of that of 30 years ago. Actually a shortage rather than excess of skilled labor exists.

Here again technology is being ignored. The administration has no criteria or standards by which to justify the proposals included in the Youth Employment Act. Nevertheless it persists in trying to make political capital out of problems which its proposed procedures cannot help solve.

This is my effort to present what I think to be the technological failure of this administration in the various programs confronting us. We are spending money like water without actually getting back to the guidelines that I referred to.

That philosophy I say is in error; that is, since the American people have needs, and the United States has resources to meet the needs that the Federal Government should use those resources to meet the needs. I do not believe that is the role of the Federal Government and technologically the evidence is all on my side.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman said something about control in Federal aid to education. I am wondering if the gentleman from Texas is suggesting that perhaps there would be no more control over aid to education than there is over aid to the farmer.

Mr. ALGER. I think the gentleman has given an apt analogy. There would be control, and he and I know it. I think the majority of the American people have the proof that the farmer is so controlled that he cannot even decide what he shall grow on his own farm to use for his children and his own stock. But that kind of control is embraced in anything that the Federal Government does. That was set out in the remark of Senator Taft. The gentleman knows and I know that when the Government gets into education, the education of our youth will indeed be controlled.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas on this very excellent and timely presentation. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor I have had the opportunity to hear some of the testimony in regard to the Youth Conservation Corps proposal. One of the very mystifying developments is the contradiction in testimony by Cabinet-level officers as to what the purpose of this training program would be. Several have denied emphatically that it was intended to impart new skills to those attending, while other members of the Cabinet have insisted that that was the proper purpose. So here indeed the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing or is even proposing to do.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his observation. I think once again, where a need is recognized, and we can all recognize needs, we too frequently immediately formulate Federal programs. But there is no assurance that first, this is the area for the Federal Government and that, second, we can accomplish under any procedure or criteria or standards these goals that they say need to be attained.

Mr. Speaker, the point of my entire presentation has been this. We all agree that there are needs and we know that somehow or other these needs will be met. But the Federal Government, by going in right away with money, has been unable to set up standards under which this money can be equitably distributed into the various districts of our country, or where the programs may be set up, or where results may be achieved in accordance with what we set out to do. That is the burden of my entire statement today, that by the yardstick of results achieved, ever since the early days of the New Deal, it was proven over and over and over again, that the Federal Government, even when it goes into a field presumably to solve a problem, does not solve that problem. For instance, in the welfare field, because of an inability to lay down procedures and guidelines this merely postpones the day of reckoning, or admits that it was a failure. That was the result in trying to solve unemployment, or the farm problem. And now we are trying to do the same in the welfare field by spending proportionately more than even our defense. It strikes me that it is time to look for a technological base by which we can measure the Federal programs, where the Federal Government is to be involved, or indeed make the agonizing reappraisal that will delete, will eliminate, Federal programs that have failed to solve problems, measured by results achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I hold that the Federal Government is not designed nor intended to feed, clothe, house, provide jobs, medicines and the basic necessities of life. That is my philosophy. Constitutionally I think our forefathers had this their reason for not laying down those areas as the role of the Federal Government. When we get into them as government, there is no technology that we can use. The Federal Government cannot do a better job than the people can do for themselves. I really believe the American people can do for themselves better than government can. They can spend their own money better than government can spend it for them.

PUBLIC OPINION ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the first time I have had a special order since I was a freshman Member of the House of Representatives. I do so now only, as I see it, to set straight a record which I think should be set straight. I would not even do that if I were not concerned about some effort being made to distort the record and the impact that this effort could have.

I have a profound respect for the press of this country. I spent my college years as a newspaper reporter.

I have a profound respect for the magazines in our country. I try as best I can, with the limited amount of time that all of us have, to read most of the magazines. I particularly respect the U.S. News & World Report, which comes to the desk, I think, of every Member of Congress every week. I get it here and at my home in Orleans.

What I have to say has nothing to do with the editorial opinion taken by that magazine or any publication. What appears on the editorial page is the property of the publisher. One may disagree with what appears. That is in the tradition of American journalism, and is as it should be. But it has come to my attention that there has been a questionnaire circulated among the Members of the House. I will not read all of the questions, but they go something like this:

1. Why is President Kennedy, as a Democrat, able to exert so little influence over a House and Senate that have majorities heavily Democratic?

2. White House messages and ideas go to Congress and seem to disappear. As far as anyone can see they generate no response out in the country. Why?

3. Has the President failed to get into tune with the mood of the country?

4. Is there a feeling that the President's plans do not command wide support among the voters?

And so forth. There are several others that I will place in the Record. They are already in the Record, in fact. There is no secret about them. They appear on page 3220.

I am familiar with polls. I may say that anyone who makes a poll and anyone who uses a poll never asks what is regarded as a loaded question, because if you are going to take a poll you want to get honest answers. You want facts, not fiction.

I remember seeing the great chairman of the Republican National Committee just a week before the last election. He was and still is a good friend of mine. He is a member of the other body. The rules being what they are, I will not mention his name.

We talked about the upcoming election. It was the 1960 election.

He said to me, "All of our indications are it is very, very close."

I said, "What do you mean by your indications?"

He said, "The polls that we have conducted,"—and one thing led to another, and finally he said, "Well, there is no secret about this, I will show you one." And he did. It indicated that the election would be within one or two percentage points throughout the Nation. That was an accurate poll. Now when his committee hired whoever made that poll, they did not give them a set of loaded questions—they went out to find out exactly what the people were thinking, they were not attempting to justify a preconceived notion about what people might be thinking.

Now let us analyze some of these questions for just one moment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. I have listened to the gentleman explain about the questionnaire. I am sure I never received one. I have inquired of some of our Members here on the floor, and they say to me that they never received any such questionnaire. I might have been tempted to respond with some answers had I received a questionnaire. Could the gentleman tell us whether that was just distributed to Members on the other side of the Capitol, or did Members on his side here in the House of Representatives receive a questionnaire?

Mr. BOGGS. I am frank to tell you that I do not know. I had a gentleman from this magazine come to see me and ask me some of these questions. He did not hand me the questions, however, to be quite frank with the gentleman. The questions, as I read them to you, are as inserted in the Record by a Member of the other body, and I was informed that they had been circulated. If they have not been circulated, then I am in error.

Mr. HALLECK. Certainly I am very positive that no such questionnaire came to me, and no one has come to my office to interrogate me along the line of any of these questions. Of course, there might have been a rather limited circulation on the questionnaire. I might ask at this time if any of my colleagues who are now present on the floor on our side of the aisle received any such questionnaire? Evidently no one has received any such questionnaire, and the indication is negative in reply to that inquiry.

Mr. BOGGS. I am reassured by the gentleman from Indiana because the tenor of the questionnaire alarmed me from the point of view of objectivity and from the point of view of what the function of the Congress is.

Mr. HALLECK. I would add this further thought, if the gentleman will yield, with reference to the inquiry as to who might have received the questionnaire, I would not want that to be taken as some sort of condemnation so far as I am concerned of the distribution of the questionnaire.

Mr. BOGGS. I did not interpret the gentleman's remarks as a condemnation of it at all, and if I gave any such impression, I wish to make it plain that that was not my intention. But I will say to the gentleman, some of these questions—although not all of them—were asked of me by a staff member of this magazine. Of course, I am not being critical of the magazine, but I am being critical of this approach and I will discuss this as objectively as I know how. In the first place, I do not think that any Congress should be a simple echo of the executive branch of the Government. I have had the great privilege of serving here for a good many years, and I respect what this body is—a House of Representatives. I consider myself first, last, and always a Representative of the people who elected me. But this is quite different from an attitude of obstructionism. For we have another branch of Government called the executive branch of Government. It is the duty of the executive branch of Government to give direction and to execute and administer the laws enacted by the Congress. The executive branch must carry out the foreign policy of the United States and perform all the other duties that are enunciated in the Constitution and in the statutes passed by the Congress.

Now let us just examine some of the implications implicit in the questions. I hope that they have not been circulated or even asked in this fashion of others. But they are a matter of record and I would like to talk about them for just a few minutes.

Let us talk about the question of the President's messages. I do not think there is anything particularly sacred about a message from the President of the United States, but I am sure I can pretty well demonstrate that these messages have not just suddenly evaporated and that nothing further has been heard about them or that "they seem to disappear." If anyone has any such notion, it is just not correct. Let me read the subject matter of some of these messages.

There was the state of the Union message on January 14. No one will take exception to a state of the Union message by the President of the United States.

Then on the 17th of January there was the budget message. If anyone says that it has disappeared, then obviously no one is watching television programs or reading editorials in the press or listening to witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee or before the Appropriations Committee. As a matter of fact, regardless of what position you may take on the budget, whether you think it is too big, too small, inadequate, inflationary, whatever it may be, anyone who thinks that that message has suddenly disappeared is just not acquainted with the facts of life in this month of March 1963.

Then there was the economic report. Did it disappear? It seems to me the gentleman from Missouri, for whom I have a deep respect—he and I serve on two committees together—I think the Joint Economic Committee is meeting this afternoon to agree or disagree on its own analysis of the economic health of the Nation—can answer that question.

Here are the facts: each year the President submits an economic report which goes into detail about the economy as he sees it; then the Joint Economic Committee holds hearings on the President's report—the message that he sends down to the Congress—the one that allegedly disappeared. We have had a whole host of very distinguished witnesses appear before that committee to comment on that message. Some have agreed with the President's recommendations, the President's analysis; some have disagreed. Some have said that the tax proposals are wrong; some have said they are right. Some have said they are adequate; some have said they are inadequate. But this has been the subject of great discussion before the Joint Committee for the past month.

So to say that the question has been laid aside is just not so.

Just a few moments ago we heard the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished gentleman from Dallas, Mr. Alger, make a very fine statement of his beliefs. Just a few moments ago he disagreed with the recommendations of the President relative to the young people in our country. But this shows that the message on youth has not disappeared. This matter is being discussed very widely. You will hear more about the youth employment act, about the domestic Peace Corps, about the Conservation Corps. You will hear more about the growing problem of juvenile delinquency. Why will you hear more about it? Because whether the President sends a message about it or not the problem is with us. It is estimated that within the next several years there will be 70 million young people under the age of 20 living in our country. So we are bound to hear a great deal about juvenile delinquency and youth problems.

The President also sent up a message on mental health, the first one that ever came to Congress on this question, and the related one of retarded children. There is hardly a family in the United States that does not have some experience with this whether it be as a result of the devastations of service in World

War II or in Korea, or the strains and stresses of the times in which we live, whether it be the advance of medical science which has enabled doctors to maintain life where it could not be maintained before, especially of children who might have died under former circumstances. This is a problem that confronts us.

This morning I heard on the radio that the American Medical Association, which does not always agree with the recommendations of the present administration, had endorsed many of these proposals relative to mental health. And I am informed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that a bill pending before his committee would aid medical education—which bill overlaps both the education message and the mental health message—is nearing completion in that committee.

I could go on with these messages. There is the one about taxes. Would anybody for one moment say that we have disregarded that message? We have a list of witnesses a mile long scheduled to appear before the Ways and Means Committee. We have hearings scheduled until the end of March, with the most distinguished panel of witnesses I have ever seen.

The point I am making is that I do not understand this kind of approach. The notion that these messages have no impact, that there is no responsibility, that they have no connection with the problems confronting the country, the Nation, and the world, is not so.

Let us deal with some of these other matters. The first proposition in the questionaire. The notion that the President has not exerted any influence on the Congress.

As I said a moment ago, I am not one who thinks because the President says X ought to be X that it should necessarily be X. I had the great privilege of sitting in on some Presidential conferences with a former Speaker of the House, and I have the privilege today of sitting in these conferences. As all of you know the legislative leaders confer with the President. Speaker Rayburn used to say to the President—to quite a few presidents—and these gentlemen say to him today: "Mr. President, that cannot be done. We disagree."

Nobody requires complete agreement. In the years I have been here there has been only one Congress where the Republican Party was in control of the House and also in control of the executive branch of the Government. We had the 80th Congress, when President Truman was President of the United States, and the Republicans were in control of the House. The only other Congress was the 83d Congress. If my memory serves me correctly, those are the only two times since 1930 when the Republicans controlled the Congress.

How did President Kennedy's program fare in his first term compared to President Eisenhower's in his first term?

I have compiled some figures. I trust they are accurate. If they are not accurate, I will certainly correct the Record to make them so. Here are the figures I got.

To the 87th Congress, President Kennedy made recommendations on 53 major matters. That is in the first session. In the second session, he made recommendations on 54 major matters. Approved in the first session were 33 major matters, in the second 40 matters. The first session approved 62 percent, the second session 74 percent.

In the 83d Congress, President Eisenhower's percentages of major recommendations that won approval were 52 and 40 percent. So President Kennedy has fared mighty well.

No one has ever denied the popularity of President Eisenhower. No one ever said President Eisenhower did not fit the mood of the people of the United States. We Democrats who were confronted with running a candidate against him knew what we were up against. Whether we agreed with him or disagreed with him, he had captured the imagination of the American people. Yet, despite that, his percentages were 52 and 40 as compared to 62 and 74 percent for President Kennedy. And despite his popularity in the 83d Congress, President Eisenhower lost the 84th Congress, and the Democrats took control.

The question is asked: Does the President of the United States fit the mood of the people? Well, take a look at what happened last November. There are three more Democratic Senators than prior to 1962, an off-year election, and the character of the House of Representatives changed hardly at all where normally there is quite a change.

I do not cite this in a partisan way. I know my party makes mistakes, and I know that the other party does too. But to give the impression that the President of the United States is devoid of leadership, and in the process to give the impression this Congress has accomplished nothing, is a wrong impression.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I am curious to find out about these questions, because taking up where the minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck], left off, apparently no one over here has seen them, except that I have because the gentleman directed my attention to them.

Was this circulated? It has not been published. Were these questions circulated among the Democratic Members?

Mr. BOGGS. It may be that the questions were withdrawn. I gave the best answer I could give to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck] a moment ago.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield further, did anyone on this side receive it? Did all of you on the other side receive questions like this? I think somebody is playing a joke on us. That is what I think.

Mr. BOGGS. The questions are so ludicrous that it does take on that aspect.

Mr. CURTIS. I think somebody has played a joke on the gentleman. I do not know. But unless these questions were circulated on the other side—Senator Douglas in his statement just said they asked this. It does not say who asked the questions. But I agree that these are leading questions.

Mr. BOGGS. I said to the gentleman from Indiana that I had been asked several of these questions by a representative of this magazine—that I personally had been.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield further, I think perhaps they are just putting a needle in you.

Mr. BOGGS. They could have been. I would not think that that was the case. I know the gentleman from Missouri was speaking half earnestly and half facetiously, but I would not expect a major magazine to put the needle in me or anyone else. This would be most surprising.

Mr. CURTIS. That is why I was trying to identify the situation. Apparently this has not been published, and at least as far as I can find out, I know I did not receive any questionnaire. No one over here apparently did. I thought maybe there was a wide circulation on your side. Maybe it is just putting a needle in your leadership.

Mr. BOGGS. It could be.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. If my office has received a copy of these questions, I must confess that I have not seen it. I did see this list of questions in the Congressional Record where it was indicated that they were prepared by U.S. News & World Report. It would be unparliamentary to read the entire article.

First of all, I want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] for the presentation he is making. If a representative of this very respectable magazine did prepare this list of questions he was engaging in a form of journalism which is far below the standards we expect of that type magazine. Every single question is loaded. Every question involves a premise which is adverse to the President of the United States. Every question assumes that the President of the United States does not have that standing among the Democratic Members of this House, or among the Members of the Congress as a whole, or in the Nation as a whole, which we would expect of the leader of this country or of a great political party. This simply is not true.

I think the gentleman in pointing this up is doing the House a service, because this matter is a serious matter, whether the questionnaire has been distributed to every Member of the House or not. The figures, which the gentleman has just put into the Record, are accurate in my opinion. I have similar figures which have been prepared by my staff, and they are very, very close to the figures which the gentleman has given us.

The first question asks: "Why is President Kennedy as a Democrat able to exert so little influence over a House and Senate that have majorities that are heavily Democratic?"

The truth of the matter is that the Democratic Party of this House has supported the proposals of the President of the United States time after time in heavy majorities on issue after issue over the opposition of a majority of those on the other side of the aisle. When this House passed the act extending area redevelopment to rural areas 100 percent of the Democrats voted for the proposal, 75 percent of the Republicans voted against it.

On passage of the bill for aid to distressed areas, which was one of the very important measures submitted by the President of the United States, 83 percent of the Democrats in this House voted on the side of the President and 74 percent of the Republicans voted on the other side. I am not criticizing my friends, I am just reciting the facts.

On the Kitchin-Ayres amendment to narrow and reduce the Minimum Wage Act, 71 percent of the Democrats voted for a higher minimum wage and broader coverage as recommended by President Kennedy; 85 percent of the Republicans voted the other way.

On the greatest Housing Act ever passed by this Congress, the Housing Act of 1961, 85 percent of the Democrats voted for the bill; 85 percent of the Republicans voted against extending housing legislation as contemplated in that bill.

On the water pollution control amendments, to provide pure water for the American people, which was a strong administration measure, 99 percent of the Democrats voted for that bill; 88 percent of the Republicans voted against it.

On the Emergency Education Act of 1961 to provide classrooms for American children 67 percent of the Democrats voted for the bill; 96 percent of the Republicans voted against it.

On the public welfare amendments 99 percent of the Democrats voted "yea" and less than 60 percent of the Republicans voted "yea" although a majority of the Republicans did support that bill.

On the public works acceleration bill 82 percent of the Democrats voted "yea." This was one of the President's really important measures, one that he stressed over and over again to the press and in meetings which the gentlemen attended last year at the White House; 89 percent of the Republicans voted against it.

On the farm bill 84 percent of the Democrats voted "yea" and 99 percent of the Republicans voted "nay."

The story of the 87th Congress is a story of progressive legislation in which the Democrats of this House supported the President of the United States in overwhelming numbers while the Republicans, on the whole, did not do so. These are the facts. This is the answer to the loaded questionnaire to which the distinguished Democratic whip has referred.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I think that is a proper presentation of the record. I glory in my Republican colleagues taking their point of view. This is the way democratic institutions are supposed to function. If it were otherwise we would not have a United States of America. But I think it is a terrible mistake to try to imply that there is no direction, no leadership of any kind in this Congress. When the gentleman from Massachusetts, Joe Martin, and my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana, Charlie Halleck, were leading the House of Representatives back in the 80th Congress and again in the 83d Congress, I had profound respect for their leadership. There were times when they took positions that were somewhat different from those which they had taken when they were in the minority. I understood that, because the problem of being in the majority is quite different from that of being in the minority. When you are in the majority you have to act, you have to decide, you have the responsibility and it is quite a different business from being in the minority. So the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader, in my judgment has properly stated the case.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that when Members of the House did support the President the same politicians of the press made the charge that this was a "rubber-stamp" Congress and that those who supported the President were "rubber-stamp" Congressmen.

Mr. BOGGS. Well, that is right. I would say that that is another matter I would like to touch on for just a moment, because in many ways this is an attack, as I see it, if this thing is going on—and I hope my friend from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] is right; maybe I am just being needled. In many ways though this is an attack on Congress. I have been reading newspaper pieces and other things to the effect, "Is Congress Outmoded?" And then there are other pieces indicating that Congress cannot function, that somehow or other the 20th century has left us behind. Of course, if you really want to create a dictatorship, just abolish Congress. I do not care whether you are a Democrat, a Republican, an independent, or whatever you want to call yourself, what this really is is an attack on the Congress itself. I want to go into that for just a moment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to commend the gentleman initially for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. May I add further that the fact that the gentleman was asked some of these specific questions by a representative of this magazine is all the evidence in the world that should be needed by any Member of this body to establish the authenticity of the magazine as a source for these questions.

Mr. BOGGS. The response I have made to the gentleman from Missouri and the response I made to the gentleman from Indiana are totally accurate. I am not even implying this thing was circulated.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman from Illinois may have put the source of the item in the Congressional Record. It may throw some light on this.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think I can throw some light on it. I have it on good authority that the magazine had asked for an interview on a series of questions, and the magazine was requested to submit the list of questions that were going to be involved in the interview, and the magazine had submitted the questions in a letter. At that point it was made clear that other magazines asked similar questions of other Members of Congress. Apparently there was no blanket questionnaire sent out.

Mr. BOGGS. The best answer, of course, would come from the magazine itself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do not know how many other Members of this body may have been questioned by the Gallup poll. Personally I have never been asked a question by the Gallup poll. Most of the people I have talked to have never been interviewed by a representative of the Gallup poll. But the existence of the Gallup poll and the fact that that questionnaire was put out and was given wide circulation and was given a lot of publicity certainly could not be denied by anybody in this body.

Mr. CURTIS. If the gentleman will yield, the only publicity given to this was by the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Douglas, and right here and now, that I know of, unless someone else can point to the publicity. That is what we are trying to find out, or at least I am. I happen to think these are loaded questions, and I think they are rather funny questions in a way, and needless questions to the leaders of your party. I know I get loaded questions all the time. All of us do. If we have not learned by now how to take the sting out of them and turn it back again—I think we all know that. But if this was publicized in any way other than by the people to whom it was directed, I think we are being a little unfair to the U.S. News & World Report.

Mr. BOGGS. I have tried to keep the record completely straight so far as I am concerned. I have no desire to be unfair.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has been very fair.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Unfortunately I was at a meeting and did not get in on the start of this discussion. Are you discussing the USIA poll throughout the world that nobody seems to know anything about, and that the administration has under wraps?

Mr. BOGGS. No. I wish they would release them if they do have them under wraps.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows they do. We have not been able to get this report.

Mr. BOGGS. No, we were not discussing that; but if time permits and the gentleman wants to discuss it, I will be very glad to discuss it to the best of my ability.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to commend the gentleman for calling this subject to our attention today. I am particularly interested in one question that was asked in this survey: "Has the President failed to get into tune with the mood of the country?"

It would appear to me that if the U.S. News & World Report will look at the most recent Gallup poll, they can find their answer there from an awful lot of people in America because, if my memory serves me correctly, the Gallup poll sustains the President in refusing to be stampeded into an invasion of Cuba. The President certainly has tried very hard to resolve this problem and 63 percent of the people of America said the other day through a Gallup poll that they are opposed and are against any invasion of Cuba at this time. So it would appear to me that the President is certainly reading the mood of the people of this country a lot better than those who have been making big speeches here trying to goad him into some sort of military action in Cuba.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, if time permits, I would like to go along for just a few minutes to discuss what I consider the damaging effect of this sort of approach. I do not think it is the function of the Congress to have to pass a dozen laws every day. Some people have pointed out, and I think quite wisely, that ofttimes it is better not to legislate than it is to legislate.

Congress has a wide variety of functions. We have been able to move into these difficult days in which we live, I believe, quite ably and quite well.

Just think of the fact that 10 years ago there was not even such a thing as a space program. I saw the distinguished chairman of that committee walk on this floor a minute ago. We had to go out and hire experts who were able to advise us and consult with us and give us information about such a program as the space program. The distinguished Speaker of this House of Representatives had much to do with the creation of that committee.

This has nothing to do with partisanship. We have had to move into this period of fantastic weaponry such as the hydrogen bomb and nuclear energy and all of these other aspects, and I think the Congress by and large is entirely adequate.

I remember at this time last year that we had all this business about the 87th Congress being described as a "do nothing" Congress. Yet, I noticed there was inserted in the Record a few days ago by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George] an article which appeared in one of the local newspapers on Sunday last entitled "Congress Has Been Maligned."

I am not going to read that article to you, but I commend it to your attention regardless of what position you may take. Incidentally, the gentlewoman from New York, I suppose, as a member of the Republican Party, did not vote for many of these programs which are set out in this article, but I will read you just a word or two. It says:

> The daily reports of the 87th Congress made it appear to many as a catastrophe.

That is true. I remember reading those reports just as you remember reading them.

It reads:

> Yet with a hindsight view of its accomplishments, we can judge it a smashing success. In the area of foreign and security affairs, Congress approved the defense buildup, the Peace Corps, the Disarmament Agency, the Alliance for Progress, an expansion of the food-for-peace program and the important Trade Act.
>
> In the domestic area, it passed among others, the most comprehensive housing program in our history; the area redevelopment, manpower retraining; and emergency public works programs; an increase in the minimum wage to $1.25; expansion of the social security system, including lowering the male retirement age to 62; complete revision of the public assistance programs; an increase in postal rates; revision of civil service and other Federal salary systems—

And so forth. I could add the drug bill and the satellite program and countless other programs.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STINSON. Did the gentleman ask the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George] or did he tell her that he was going to use her name this afternoon?

Mr. BOGGS. No, I did not; but I did not use her name unfavorably. The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George] is a very good friend of mine and has been for a long time. I did not want to imply that she had voted for or against some of these things.

Mr. STINSON. The gentleman said that she voted against some of these programs.

Mr. BOGGS. I said that I presumed she voted against them. I repeat that the gentlewoman from New York is one of my very close friends and I admire her very much.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. STAGGERS. I commend the gentleman from Louisiana for his brilliant discussion here today, and I would like to say with reference to these questions that I agree with him that it does not become a national magazine to get into this kind of interrogation in any way.

I would like to remind the gentleman from Louisiana and the Members of this Congress that this is the only body I know of on earth in which if a vacancy occurs it cannot be filled either by appointment or succession, for we are responsible only to the residents of our districts. We are not responsible to the President of the United States. Our first responsibility is to the people of our districts to do what they want us to do. If we were responsible to the President, we would just be rubberstamps and the people would not need us here to represent them.

I am not always in favor of everything the President suggests, but I always will support the principles of my party. I may vote against some of his propositions, but I will stand by the principles of my party.

This President of ours has inherited more problems than any President in the history of America or any man in the long span of history, and I think that he has acted with vision, sometimes ahead of most of the Members of this Congress here in the House of Representatives and in the other body. I believe that history will put him in the place that he has earned, that of a great leader not only of America but of the free world. I believe that when history is written he will go down as one of the great Presidents of these United States. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. BOGGS. Some of us here have traveled about and seen some other parliamentary bodies, even the alleged sedate House of Commons in London; and I have had opportunity to compare whatever you will, the efficiency, the dedication, the ability of the average Member of the House of Representatives, yes, and the ethics—and I do not care whether he be Republican or Democrat—with other members of parliamentary bodies, and I think that in every category we would compare favorably.

You have heard the uproars in some of these legislative bodies. I have sat in the gallery of the Chamber of Deputies in Paris and watched what I considered sheer disorder, something that would appall a Member of this body. I have seen things happen which no American Representative would dream of doing.

So in many ways what this really in effect constitutes is an attack upon the free institution of Congress itself which is the ultimate safeguard of the liberties of the people of the United States of America.

As some persons have so well said and what all of us at times have said, the President of the United States does not need anyone to defend him; he does very well himself.

I remember our late Speaker Rayburn saying in times of stress—and in this case he was referring to a Republican President, President Eisenhower—but I have heard him refer oftentimes to that President and other Presidents and say: "Either he is my leader and the leader of the United States of America or we have no leader."

This does not mean you have to acquiesce in everything the President is for, not by any stretch of the imagination, but there is a difference between total obstruction and opposition just because it comes from a person of an opposite party, and constructive loyal opposition, as the expression is used elsewhere in the world.

One of the proudest documents I have is a letter written by President Eisenhower in which he gave me some credit for the enactment of the trade agreements program of his administration. I am proud of that letter, and I am happy that I was able to make some small contribution to the passage of that bill which he considered vital to his administration.

The President of the United States cannot be right about everything; but, on the contrary, he cannot be wrong about everything either. I must say that I get a little bit annoyed at people who are able to find that De Gaulle is right about everything; that Diefenbaker is right about everything; and even Mr. Tshombe is right about everything, but the President of the United States is wrong about everything.

They talk about people whom we work with who come from the White House. There is a certain implication in this. I have known Larry O'Brien for a long time. He, too, does not need anybody to defend him. I invite any member of the opposition to indicate to me any time where he has been unfair, where the thing he did was not right and what a man in his position was required to do and should do, if there is to be comity between the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

As far as I am personally concerned, all that Americans require of a public official, regardless of party, and from those instruments which go to make public policy—namely, the press, newspapers, radio, editorialists—is that all of us act responsibly.

I do not know of a single Member of this body who does not know how to act irresponsibly. It is so easy to do. I do not know of anyone who does not know how to join in the public clamor, whatever it may be.

The only monument on the Capitol Grounds is erected to a former Republican Member of the Congress of the United States, the other body. I refer to the distinguished former Senator from Ohio, Senator Taft.

One of the things for which that monument ultimately came to him was the fact he stood alone in the other body and said he would be against drafting workers into the Army to run the railroads, despite the fact that this body had voted for it, with only a few dissenting votes.

The point I make is: it is difficult to act responsibly at times, but it is important to act responsibly. We have the greatest nation on earth and the freest nation on earth. The way to lose it is to be irresponsible, and it is just as bad for a journalistic enterprise to be irresponsible as it is for you, me, or any other person who is charged with some responsibility.

CUBAN REFUGEE AGITATION AND RIOTING SHOULD NOT HAPPEN AGAIN

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Ryan of New York). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1963, and again on February 26, 1963, I addressed the Members of this body with reference to the problems that have arisen in Miami and south Florida with the Cuban refugees.

At that time I called the Members' attention to a riot between the Cuban refugees and local police authority at about 10 a.m. February 21.

At the session of February 21, I spread on the Record the stories of this uncalled for outburst as they were carried on the wires of the Associated Press and United Press.

At the session of February 26, I respread on the Record these same wire stories and included for the Record a story written by Milt Sosin, a reporter of the Cox newspapers for the Miami News, wherein he ably presented the story of this tragic and untimely incident. There was also spread on the Record an editorial from a Knight newspaper, the Miami Herald, dated February 26, titled "No Right To Riot."

The day before the appearance of the four or five picketing members of the Committee for Nonviolent Action in front of the Cuban Revolutionary Council headquarters in Miami, and the ensuing riotous action of the Cuban refugees, the editorial staff of the Miami News, in the evening edition of February 20, 1963, carried the following editorial comment:

> ### Refugees Should Ignore Peace Agitators
>
> The Committee for Nonviolent Action seems determined to keep busy until it stirs up a little violent action.
>
> What these extreme pacifists hope to accomplish by announcing—2 days in advance—that pickets will parade tomorrow in front of the Cuban Revolutionary Council headquarters is not too hard to understand. The refugee would only be playing into their hands by marching against the pickets in force.
>
> The Cuban radio announcer who urged the demonstration against the pickets showed poor judgment. A riot on Biscayne Boulevard would end a 4-year record of peaceful assimilation by the Cubans into the community, a record remarkably free of violence.
>
> There is no disposition here to come out against peace, nor against the right of people to assemble or picket for special causes, no matter how unpopular or extreme the causes.
>
> But we think the Committee for Nonviolent Action has tipped its hand in electing to taunt a refugee population that is understandably edgy and which has no vote in the political matters that interest the committee.
>
> This committee is out to make propaganda for a program which, if followed along its unlikely course, would leave the United States unarmed and defenseless against communism. Their exploitation of the Cuban refugees is calloused and cruel, and the refugees would be smart to ignore them.

On February 20, 1963, the day prior to the pacifist picketing of the Cuban Refugee Council headquarters, Ralph Renick, vice president in charge of news at WTVJ, channel 4, Miami, issued the following TV editorial:

> The National Committee for Nonviolent Action has been provoking violent action by staging demonstrations in Miami Shores, Coral Gables, and Homestead Air Force Base. Tomorrow the committee members intend to set up shop outside the headquarters of the Cuban Revolutionary Council. It should be said that these people claim they hate nobody. They just want the United States to disarm and disband our military services. The theory is we can trust the Communists to do the same and therefore peace will reign forevermore. This would be great except the Communists have openly demonstrated and stated their intention to take over this little world of ours by whatever means necessary, including deceit and lies. The only thing they can be trusted to do is be untrustworthy.
>
> These pickets are irritating—but the best thing to do is to do nothing; just ignore them. To do otherwise would play into their hands.

On February 21, 1963, Ralph Renick, vice president in charge of news, WTVJ channel 4, Miami, and their Latin news editor, Manolo Reyes, issued the following TV editorial comment:

> ### Cuban Riots: Why It Shouldn't Have Happened
>
> What happened at Biscayne Boulevard and 17th Street this morning is deplorable. Riot action of any kind can only give a city a black eye and considering the tense state of Caribbean affairs at the moment, a riot in Miami is bound to create undue fear elsewhere that it is somehow unsafe to visit here.
>
> We should like to note that channel 4 in its twice-daily Spanish language news program pleaded for all Cuban exiles to stay clear of the revolutionary council headquarters where the pacifist picketing was to take place.
>
> Last night and this morning, Mayor High appeared on the program, speaking in Spanish, telling Cuban residents to ignore the picketing.
>
> There are probably 150,000 Cubans here—149,700 heeded this advice. The 300 that didn't are guilty of giving all of their fellow exiles a black eye along with the city.
>
> What happened should never have happened. Miami police and firemen are to be commended for efficiently handling a volatile situation. It should be said that the revolutionary council and its leader, Dr. Jose Miro Cardona, did little to prevent the gathering of the mob nor to quell the action which followed at its headquarters.
>
> Channel 4 Latin News Editor Manolo Reyes, on WTVJ's program "News En Espanol," later tonight and tomorrow morning, will carry an editorial addressed to the Cubans saying "the law comes before the will of men and no one is authorized to take justice by his own hand. The law is to be respected above all personal prejudice or emotion or justified anger."
>
> Reyes deplores the fact that a minority group of Cubans fell into the trap made by a group of pacifists. He called upon the Cubans to "think with their head and not their heart."
>
> It is time for Miami's Cuban colony to develop a form of leadership which can exert self-discipline. To do otherwise will gravitate this community to an explosive state of human relations which will hurt the exiles, the town and its permanent population.

These timely and well-stated words of warning, unfortunately, went unheeded. Nonetheless, they bear repeating lest some other persons with misguided, or possibly purposeful intentions, again attempt to rile the emotions of persons who have been angered and oppressed by the Communist tyranny within their homeland, Cuba.

In our great country, within the framework of our democracy, we provide that each citizen shall have the basic right to agree or disagree, or present his views, publicly or otherwise, by peaceful means.

These are the rights which the Communist would have us destroy.

The Cuban refugee would do well to remember that had he, and other persons oppressed by tyrannical governments ruled from extremes of either the right or the left, been permitted the right to think, speak, and act peacefully, without fear of governmental reprisal, he might not have found himself today, nor during prior governmental regimes, the victim of oppression.

They would do well to remember that in our democracy, we settle our differences through judicial, peaceful means rather than with emotional and riotous outbursts.

Those who demonstrate for peace would similarly do well to remember that they may well be aiding the cause of communism and those who would overthrow the Government—that peace cannot be found through public actions that tend to incite riot—nor those actions that prey upon the emotions of refugees from oppression.

The incident of February 21 should not have occurred and should not happen again.

CUBAN REFUGEES RESPONSIBILITY OF ENTIRE NATION—NOT JUST SOUTH FLORIDA

Mr. Speaker, through January 25, 1963, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reports they have resettled 53,974 Cuban refugees from Miami, Dade County, Fla., to other parts of the United States. This is not quite one-third of the 157,525 persons who had entered the United States and registered at Miami from Cuba.

Untold numbers of Cuban refugees who entered the Miami area did not register. Therefore, the 157,525 Cuban refugees figure is not entirely accurate. Reliable sources estimate the actual number of Cuban refugees entering the south Florida area at 200,000 or more.

Whether the figure is 105,000 or 155,000 Cuban refugees still remaining in Miami is immaterial.

The point is that there are well over 100,000, in fact maybe as many as 200,000 Cuban refugees, still in the Greater Miami, Fla., community; an area which had a population of only 1 million.

No community, no matter how large, could withstand the almost immediate impact of a 10- to 20-percent increase in population; the number of persons bringing about this increase being penniless and destitute without homes, clothing, food, in many cases without friends, with little or no knowledge of the English language, and all unemployed.

The situation is worsened by the fact that there already existed in Dade County, Fla., a serious unemployment problem—so much so that the U.S. Department of Labor and the Area Redevelopment Administration had long ago found that there were a sufficient number of unemployed American citizens so as to qualify Dade County as a class D labor surplus market area.

The result: The American citizens of south Florida were thrown into open competition with the Cuban refugees for the very limited number of jobs available.

The Cuban refugee, in desperate straits, was willing to work for ridiculously low wages. Employers in a distressed State, seeking to keep their economic heads above water, engaged the refugee at a lesser wage, and an American thereby became unemployed. Approximately 30,000 Cuban refugees are employed in the Miami area.

The laboring classes—and the Negro particularly—suffered from the influx of the refugees who entered in large numbers in the field of domestic work, light manufacturing, and the many other areas of nonskilled as well as professional labor. They had no Cuban refugee center to turn to when their jobs were gone and their funds expired. Often, he became the refugee—pulling up stakes before his funds ran completely out; some left Florida and went to areas foreign to them in search of work.

We are all well aware of the tremendous sum of money that the Federal Government has pumped into the Dade County area to assist with the Cuban refugee situation. Without this Federal financial assistance, the community might well have been substantially more economically distressed.

The Greater Miami-Dade County area has opened its arms and its pocketbooks to these refugees and has done and will continue to do everything humanly possible to assist them to maintain their livelihood and their honor.

However, the situation in Miami obviously did not result from foreign policy actions of the Floridians. The responsibility is that of the entire Nation. Uttering nice words about the wonderful way in which the Miamians have reacted to the situation was, and is, no substitute for more equitable actions—actions of other cities and States and the Federal Government to share in greater proportion a burden which is theirs as well.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to commend the gentleman on the forceful and fair manner in which he is bringing this problem to the House and to commend his city on the tremendous job it has done in dealing with these people who are refugees from a tyranny that seeks to threaten the United States. I think the job has national implications, and I think the gentleman in pointing up its national implications is doing a service to this country as well as to his own constituents.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman. This is one purpose of my remarks as I have made them from time to time on this subject on the floor of this House; also I seek the continued assistance of our House Democratic leadership, which has assisted us so generously as it has other areas which have a similar unemployment problem.

Along with the majority of Congress, I have strongly supported some administration policies dealing with the economic plight of our American citizens whether in West Virginia, Florida, Pennsylvania, Detroit, or some other State. I want to advise any Member of Congress if he wants to listen to me that all it takes is for serious economic distress to happen to you one time, to your district and your people, and as you see other economically distressed areas around the country, you will decide quickly that your problem is not one for the community to take care of by itself.

Every day here in Congress we have to draw a line regarding each issue we confront. Sure, it is easy to be in political opposition to anything. We all know that. That is no trick. But blind political oppositon is also the height of irresponsibility. But in the stand we individually take on every issue there is a right place to draw a line based on our own criteria and responsible judgment, whether our decision is based on what we responsibly believe is the national interest, the national security, the desires of our constituents, or the principles of our party.

That is why I was very much interested in the remarks previously made here today by our distinguished majority whip on this question of blind political opposition and irresponsibility. It does not make any difference whether the Republicans are in power or the Democrats are in power, we have to recognize the problems in this country and then attempt to do the best within our ability and judgment to meet and solve those problems. There we are going to have arguments. There we are going to make political capital out of the differences which exist, as to how the country's needs should be met. That is part of the American political system. This is what we love, this is what we fight for.

But as was so ably stated by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, our majority leader, Hon. CARL ALBERT, and also in the forceful remarks of the distinguished majority whip, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. HALE BOGGS, the pattern of irresponsible political attack that seems to be emerging I call frightening, discouraging, I call disheartening, and I call downright dangerous. The pattern of irresponsibility is to attack blindly; attack the democratic institution of the Congress of the United States; attack it; weaken the confidence of the American people in the greatest democratic assemblage the world has ever known; destroy it; attack the Chief Executive of the United States; attack the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces; attack, destroy, and weaken the confidence of the American people in the ability of a democratic government to hold off the tyranny of communism; attack the Defense Department; weaken and destroy the confidence of the American people in the ability of our military people to exercise the proper judgment and to meet the challenges that we have to face; attack and destroy the State Department; weaken the confidence of the American people in those who are responsible for carrying out the foreign policy decisions of the United States; attack the Supreme Court, abolish it, modify it, change its powers, weaken the confidence of the American people in the democratic institution of divided powers and authority.

Do all this—for political purposes? God forbid—but the dangerous pattern faintly but clearly emerges out of the cloud of irresponsible political venom filling the air.

Do all this—to accomplish what?

Win the Congress? Win the White House? Throw out the "ins"?

Let us have our political opposition. Let us have our political fights. Let us draw the lines on the issues. Let us call them very clearly to the attention of the American people. But let us be responsible and preserve, not attack, our democratic institutions. Let us be responsible and then go to our own people and let them decide who should carry on.

Mr. Speaker, it is in this context that I bring to this body today the problems that exist in my area with respect to the Cuban refugees who are fleeing the tyranny of communism in Cuba.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I want to associate myself very strongly with the sentiments expressed by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and to ask him whether in that part of his remarks which I did not hear he called attention to the fact that the gentleman and I have planned to hold hearings within a few days in Miami and to have all the agencies of the Federal Government that have to do with the relocation program of the Cuban refugees present with us and to let them, in our presence, hear the sentiment of the people of our country as to the impact, economic and otherwise, of the Cuban refugees upon our economy. Did my distinguished colleague cover that in his very able remarks?

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the distinguished gentleman, who is my able colleague from my former district. I did not include that in my remarks and I am very happy that the gentleman made mention of it. I want to take this opportunity, by the way, since I have not had the opportunity before, to say I am delighted that my district has been split in half and that you now so ably represent the other half. I also want to say here on the record that from the day you have been here you have interested yourself ably in this problem and have exercised great leadership and knowledge with respect to it. I know that we can solve this problem. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank my colleague.

MINNESOTA TACONITE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of New York). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACGREGOR] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, all of us in this body are concerned, as are our colleagues in the other body, with the problems of our country's depressed areas. All of us are disturbed by the continuing problem of serious unemployment in this country. We are concerned with proper solutions to the problems of these economically unfortunate areas, and many of us recognize that the best solutions lie in the efforts of private citizens, private associations, and companies, and the efforts of local and State governments.

In this connection, there is about to be written in the State of Minnesota a successful conclusion to an effort to properly bring to northeastern Minnesota the economic health which that area of the State and of the country deserves to enjoy. That success story is not the result of action by the Federal Government, but rather it stems from concerted activity by municipal and local government officials, by the executive and legislative branches of the Minnesota State government, and by officials of the United States Steel Corp. and the United Steelworkers.

Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman from the State of Minnesota I desire to inform the House of Representatives of an issue of vital importance to the people of economically depressed northeastern Minnesota, indeed to the entire State of Minnesota, and to the Nation. That issue is taconite, and the related attempt to add a taconite tax amendment to the Minnesota State constitution. The argument for the amendment had been arrived at only after careful study and analysis. I should like to present some of the background of this proposal.

For more than three-quarters of a century, Minnesota and iron ore have been linked together. Since 1884, when the Soudan Mine was opened on the Vermilion Range, iron mining has played a major role in Minnesota's economy.

Vermilion Range iron mining operations were much like those of Michigan and other areas—underground mining for the most part. But when the great Mesabi Range began to sprout mining camps, a revolution was about to begin in the American iron and steel business. Never before had iron ore of such rich quality been attainable so easily from open pits.

The Mesabi Range began to produce ore shortly after 1890 when iron ore was discovered near Iron Mountain, Minn. Further discoveries near Biwabik led to the construction of the Duluth, Mesabi, and Northern Railroad line in 1892, when the first Mesabi ore was shipped to dockside in Duluth.

The Mesabi Range proved to be far larger than any of its discoverers had ever dreamed. Within a few years after 1892, the ore—chiefly soft hematite—was discovered all the way from Babbitt on the east to Grand Rapids, 110 miles to the southwest. Then when ore shipments from the Cuyuna Range began to flow down the Great Lakes in 1911, Minnesota's position as the world's foremost iron ore producer was assured.

As mining methods improved, and with the demands of World War I and the economic growth that followed it in the 1920's, Minnesota's importance as a source of iron ore steadily grew. By 1940, Minnesota had produced more than 1.2 billion tons of iron ore. Indeed, Minnesota had the lion's share of the iron ore market.

World War II brought an even greater demand for Minnesota ore, and during the 5 war years, Minnesota's mining industry produced over 338 million tons of ore—ore for all but a minute percentage of our war armaments. And the next 5 years saw only a slight lessening of the need for Minnesota-produced ore, with 295 million tons being shipped.

Then came the Korean war and the prosperity of the 1950's—a time during which Minnesota had its biggest ore-producing years—79 million tons in 1951, a Korean war year, and 81 million tons in 1953. These were good years for Minnesota and its iron mining industry, good years for iron miners and their communities.

Today, however, conditions are much different. Minnesota no longer has a monopoly on iron ore sources. In fact, our largest fields of rich, pure ore are close to being depleted. Ore today is being produced in dozens of different places, all of which compete with our Minnesota ore. While Minnesota's share of the iron ore market has declined, the State has been unable to keep pace with other areas in attracting investments for iron ore products.

PROBLEMS FOR MINNESOTA ORE PRODUCERS

Actually, Minnesota's iron ore problem can be traced to a number of different causes—all of which have contributed to the overall problem. The problem, basically, is that Minnesota no longer dominates the market for iron ore as it previously has. The reason for this loss of hold on the market is that other areas can produce ore of equal or better quality at an equal or lower cost. If iron ore cannot compete on the quality-cost front, then it cannot sell, and if it does not sell, there are no opportunities for jobs. This is the current problem—demand for high-quality ore at a reasonable and competitive cost.

It would seem reasonable to assume that iron ore produced in Minnesota should cost approximately the same as iron ore produced elsewhere in the Nation, if not in the world when added to shipping costs, but it does not. Iron ore, depending on its quality and structure, sells for a certain price in a competitive market. This does not mean, however, that all iron ore producers make the same profit on their ore, because it may cost a producer in one place more to mine and treat the ore than it does a producer in another. The Minnesota iron ore producer may have higher costs than his counterpart in, say, Michigan, Missouri, Canada, or Venezuela.

In Minnesota, as elsewhere, taxes are a cost to be met. Full and true value is supposed to be the market value of the property if it were to be sold. In practice, however, assessors do not value property in this way. According to the Minnesota Department of Taxation, the average full and true value of real property in Minnesota as valued by assessors amounts to only 34.2 percent of the property's actual market value.

The practice of undervaluing property is common throughout the State. This practice does not apply, though, in the case of iron ore. Iron ore is valued by the State Department of Taxation. It is not valued by local assessors. Drill cores and other data taken from the various mining properties are reported to the School of Mines of the University of Minnesota. The School of Mines then reports the tonnage figures and the quality analysis of the ore to the Commissioner of Taxation. He then values the ore at 100 percent of its market value.

It has been argued that these differences in assessment practices mean that there are great discrepancies between the valuation of mineral and nonmineral properties. They point to the average valuation of nonmineral property in St. Louis County, which is 20 percent of market value and where most of the mines are located, comparing it to mineral properties, which are valued at 100 percent of market value.

This combination of factors—the higher assessment rate, and the undervaluing of nonmineral property—means that iron mining companies are required to pay up to 20 times more in property tax dollars than nonmining properties of the same value.

Higher State and local taxes for mining have been upheld by the natural heritage theory, a position which holds that removal of an irreplacable raw material should be taxed higher than other products. Local governments and the State government have looked to iron ore as a major source of tax revenues, and both political parties for years have based this policy on the natural heritage theory.

Basically, there are three taxes on iron ore in Minnesota. There is the ad valorem, or general property tax, the occupation tax, and the royalty tax. The ad valorem tax is a general property tax levied against real and personal property, with certain exemptions, and requires that mined and unmined ore be assessed at 50 percent of the appraised full and true value. Other property in Minnesota is assessed at rates ranging from 40 percent of full and true value down to 10 percent.

The occupation tax is not designed to tax profits like the corporation income tax, but instead, it is a tax on the occupation of mining—a tax to be paid for the right to do business in Minnesota.

The occupation tax was established 40 years ago when the people passed an amendment to the State constitution setting up a special tax for mining. There was some question at the time regarding the legality of creating a special tax for iron mining which would have been different from that imposed on other business in the State, but on November 7, 1922, the occupation tax amendment passed by an overwhelming vote. At current levels, the occupation tax amounts to 14.25 percent of the value of the ore at the mouth of the mine, versus the present corporation income tax rate of 10.2 percent.

The third ore tax is a royalty tax. A royalty is a payment made by the mine operator to the owner of the land which is being mined. In Minnesota there is a tax on these payments. In other words the mine operator pays twice, once to the landowner, and again to the State in the form of a tax on the royalty payment.

TACONITE: WHAT IS IT?

Taconite first attracted the interest of an early prospector named Peter Mitchell. Mitchell traveled through northeastern Minnesota in 1869, 1870, and 1871, and sank some test pits in the Babbitt area. While Mitchell felt that taconite offered great promise, 80 years were to pass before taconite began to show real signs of fulfilling that promise.

Taconite is the basic rock of the Mesabi iron formation. It is a sedimentary deposit laid down, according to some estimates, around 1 billion years ago. The vast deposits of taconite, stretching from Babbitt on the east to Grand Rapids on the southwest, underwent a number of physical changes over the millions of years of its formation. On the eastern end of the Mesabi Range some hot, molten material flowed from the earth near the taconite deposits, and the tremendous heat baked the rock, giving it its extreme hardness and also converting its iron content from hematite to magnetite. Elsewhere, along the formation, where the taconite was not so hard, the forces of nature broke up the taconite in certain areas allowing ground waters and erosion to carry away silicate and other impurities. It was this action which formed the natural iron ore deposits of the Mesabi Range.

Taconite, then, is the iron-bearing formation of the Mesabi Range. For the most part, it contains only 25 to 30 percent iron, in the form of tiny particles, spread through the taconite. Taconite derives its name from the Taconic Mountains of western Massachusetts. A geologist noted similarities between the two areas and named the material taconite.

Today taconite is often called an ore, but for years it was considered to be too low in iron content to be an ore. Taconite has been referred to as "lean and mean." Since taconite is not very high in iron content, it received little attention. The direct shipping ores of the Mesabi were being developed, and no one had much time for the supposedly inferior product.

There were a few, however, who did see great potentials in taconite, and among these few was a young electrical engineer at the University of Minnesota, E. W. Davis. Davis worked, experimentally, with magnetic taconite from the Mesabi Range. He developed a laboratory device which could separate the magnetic iron ore particles from the waste material in the taconite, and he worked to develop methods of breaking up the hard, stubborn rock.

As the years passed Davis continued his work at the mines experiment station of the University's School of Mines, as did various mining companies and private research organizations. In the 1930's, two mining companies were formed for the possible development of taconite. They were Reserve Mining Co. and Erie Mining Co.

Then, in 1941, the Minnesota Legislature passed a bill which was to have far-reaching effect upon Minnesota's taconite potential. Again Davis played an important role in this effort. The bill for the taconite tax law passed the conservative house and senate, and was signed into law by Republican Gov. Harold Stassen. The purpose of the law was to stimulate development of taconite processing. Its effect is widely known. Taconite companies moved ahead with their plans, secured investment money approaching half a billion dollars in total, and proceeded with construction work.

Taconite developments in Minnesota, and the development of similar mineral resources in other areas do require vast amounts of investment in money. Insofar as the American steel industry's interest in domestic and continental ores is concerned, attention seems to have been shifted from direct shipping high grade ores—of which there is a rapidly dwindling supply now known in the United States—to low-grade ores, of which we have great abundance. With such great and scattered supplies of these low-grade ores available, competition is keen for investment money to develop local projects.

While it is true that Minnesota in prior years virtually monopolized the American iron ore market, it is equally true today that Minnesota's share of this market has drastically declined. In 1950, for example, Minnesota mines supplied 62 percent of the iron ore used in the American steel industry, while other U.S. areas supplied 30 percent, and foreign imports supplied but 8 percent. However, by 1960, Minnesota's share had fallen to but 47 percent; other U.S. areas went down to 24 percent, but foreign imports jumped to 29 percent.

In analyzing the reasons for this Minnesota decline, the same two factors mentioned previously stand out—cost and quality. Mining officials say that taxes, as a part of their costs, discourage investors from making capital available for Minnesota ore projects in the taconite field. It is argued that vast tonnages of high-quality and taconite-type ores in other States and nations makes it mandatory for Minnesota to improve both its ore product and its tax structure if it is to be competitive once again in the iron ore market, in which Canadian, Brazilian, Peruvian, Venezuelan, and Liberian producers are now active, as well as other American States.

Taconite operations in Minnesota currently employ about 5,000 persons. Since taconite operations continue through the winter months, these—unlike high-grade ore positions—are year-round jobs. Naturally, enlargement of Minnesota's taconite industry would not produce economic solvency for the area immediately. But from the ground breaking for a new plant right on through the start of production, growth would come gradually and increase rapidly in an area that today has one of the highest percentages of unemployment and economic depression in the Nation. The raw materials are there—the product, and the workers, but the product needs developing, and the men need jobs.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce in 1956 prepared a study which shows that for every 100 new factory workers in a community, there are 296 more people, 112 more households, 51 more schoolchildren, $590,000 more in personal income every year, $270,000 more in bank deposits, 107 more passenger cars registered, 174 more workers employed, 4 more retail establishments, and $360,000 more in retail sales per year.

PRESENT TACONITE TAXES IN MINNESOTA

State and local taxes on taconite operations differ from those on natural iron ore operations. The taconite tax law passed by the legislature in 1941 exempted taconite from the ad valorem taxes paid by other mining companies. Instead, a tonnage tax was imposed amounting to 5 cents for each gross ton of taconite concentrate. An additional one-tenth of a cent is imposed for each 1 percent of iron content in the concentrate in excess of 55 percent. This production tax amounts to between 5 and 6 cents per ton of taconite concentrate, since Minnesota taconite products contain about 62 percent iron.

The taconite tax is paid in lieu of ad valorem taxes, although taconite companies are required to pay a property tax of $1 per acre on lands containing unmined taconite. The taconite tax is basically designed to support local units of government.

Taconite companies in Minnesota are also required to pay a railroad gross earnings tax of 5 percent. Both Erie Mining Co. and Reserve Mining Co. own their own railroad facilities which are used to haul crude taconite or taconite pellets. The law provides that the gross earnings of these railroads are defined as a "sum of money equal to the amount which would be charged under established tariffs of common carriers for the transportation of an equal tonnage of iron ore from Mesabi Range ports at the head of Lake Superior.

The revenue from this tax amounts to 7.4 cents per gross ton of taconite concentrate, and it is distributed in the same way as the taconite tax.

Taconite companies which have had to build new communities also pay additional tax levies for local purposes. More than $13 million in special levies against taconite operations have been passed by various legislative sessions during the past 6 years. These levies have been passed with the support of taconite companies themselves. In addition taconite companies, in building new communities, have paid for the installation of streets, sewers, water treatment plants, recreational facilities, and other items which would normally be paid by property owners.

Taconite companies pay State occupation and royalty taxes. The rate, however, is lower than it is for natural ore producers. When the legislature added the surtax on the occupation tax, taconite operations were not included. Therefore, the basic rate of the occupation tax on taconite operations is 11 percent of the value of the product at the plant. The basic rate of the royalty tax, likewise, is 11 percent. Added to this basic rate for the occupation and royalty tax, is 1 percent for the veterans bonus. Labor credits can be applied against both the occupation and royalty taxes, as they can with natural ore operations.

A special tax law was written during the 1959 session of the Minnesota Legislature to provide for the taxation of semitaconite. The semitaconite tax is quite similar to the taconite production tax, and revenues from it are distributed in the same way as the taconite tax. This tax law was developed to encourage research and investment in the development of semitaconite, another low-grade ore resource found on the western end of the Mesabi Range.

THE TACONITE AMENDMENT: ITS NEED

In the summer of 1960, a group of northeastern Minnesota mayors proposed that something be done to help the distressed condition of the Iron Range where thousands of men had been and still are unemployed, some for 3 or 4 years. Their suggestion came in the form of a proposed amendment to the State constitution which would establish the principle that the taxes imposed upon taconite would be kept in balance with taxes on other industry in the State.

Elmer L. Andersen, then Republican candidate for Governor in 1960, proposed a similar idea during the course of the campaign. In his tax message to the legislature on February 6, 1961, Governor Andersen urged the legislators, as part of the tax program, to "adopt a constitutional amendment that will assure firms engaged in taconite production that their taxes will not exceed those of manufacturing and other industrial concerns. This is simply an assurance of equality, and not a grant of special privilege nor a freezing of tax rates."

On March 24, 1961, the taconite tax amendment was introduced in the legislature. As the Minneapolis Tribune reported the next day:

> Its [the bill's] purpose is to allay the fears of the industry that, if more high-cost plants are built to process lower grade ores, the legislature will single them out for higher taxes. Occupation revenues are expected to drop as high-grade ore production fades.

The regular session bill sought to spur taconite construction plants by specifying that the amendment, if approved, would not become effective until such time as the total capacity of the industry in the State reached 19.5 million tons. It presently is about 17 million. The amendment stated that combined royalty, excise, and occupation taxes imposed on the processing of taconite and semitaconite shall not exceed the taxes computed under present ore tax laws or under income tax laws, whichever are greater.

On April 13, 1961, the liberal-controlled Minnesota House Tax Committee adjourned without taking action on the bill. The committee chairman, apparently motivated by political ambition and the fear that the Republican Governor would be given credit for this piece of legislation, said he planned no more meetings of the committee in the regular session. The vote on the motion for adjournment followed strict party lines, as did the vote killing the bill. The previous Tuesday the conservative-controlled Minnesota Senate Tax Committee had all but unanimously approved the measure.

With the defeat of the bill in the house, the matter was temporarily dropped in capitol halls, but it was soon to come up again. In the meantime, the full fury of an aroused electorate was to be felt in the St. Paul mayoralty election.

The amendment had originated with the nonpolitical Northeastern Minnesota Mayors Association, many members of which are lifelong Democrats. Republican Gov. Elmer L. Andersen and strong Republican Party support gave the bill a truly bipartisan flavor. The amendment dealt only with State taxes, leaving local tax policies to the communities. It simply recognized that times have changed in the mining industry, and the industry was building in States which were willing to take action to stimulate investment. The amendment was to be Minnesota's demonstration of its desire to successfully compete with its sister States and foreign nations.

Liberal State legislators and the Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party in Minnesota argued that tax legislation should not be written into the State's constitution. Yet the amendment is needed because of a present constitutional provision passed in 1922 under which special mining taxes are now paid. That provision made it legal for iron mining in Minnesota to be taxed at a rate higher than other industry in the State. The proposed amendment would limit the effect the 1922 law has on taconite at the present time. Futhermore, there are presently 19 amendments and several other sections dealing with State fiscal matters in the present Minnesota State constitution.

These same groups further argued that there was no need for a constitutional amendment. If any change were needed, they maintained, a legislative statute certainly should be sufficient. The difference is both simple and far-reaching. A statute can be passed by one session of the legislature and repealed by the next, indeed passed and repealed by the same session if they so desired; while an amendment could certainly be repealed, it would take a vote of the people to do so, and is a much more permanent and stable assurance to the mining industry that they are both protected and the provision is going to stay on the books for a while. After the tax "bleeding" the industry underwent in Minnesota when the State had a monopoly on its raw material, their concern is both valid and well justified.

A Minnesota poll of September 10, 1961, showed that 63 percent of all Minnesotans supported the amendment idea, including 55 percent of the Democrats, 76 percent of the Republicans, 71 percent of the Independents, and 64 percent of the labor union members. Since that time the percentage of voters supporting the idea has approached 70. Yet the amendment process continued to be opposed by leaders of the labor unions, the Democrat-Farmer-Labor Party, the Farmers Union, and other liberal-Democrat-Farmer-Labor oriented groups.

On April 25, 1961, Governor Andersen called the legislature into special session. On that date, in an address before the legislature, the Governor said:

> Failure to give our people a chance to vote on a constitutional amendment designed only to assure those engaged in processing taconite and semitaconite to taxation equal to that imposed on other industry could be a tragic mistake. Adoption of this amendment could well be the signal for ore processing development assuring jobs for thousands. There is so much to gain, the assurance is so minimal, the competition so keen, I find your hesitation incredible.

On May 8 testimony began on the controversial amendment before the house tax committee. The bill in the special session was the same as the one in the regular session except for the restrictions as to the effect and the date it should go into effect.

By late afternoon on May 11, the committee had heard all those wishing to speak on the bill and were ready to take the vote. The liberal-Democrat-Farm-Labor leadership, who had been a stumbling block in the regular session, moved to lay the bill on the table. The vote was taken and, almost on straight party lines, the motion passed 16 to 10, thus killing the bill again.

In December of 1961 the Governor once more called a special legislative session, this time a 2-day affair to accomplish congressional redistricting which the Democrat-Farm-Labor-liberal caucus in the legislature had also blocked during the regular and first special session. Again Governor Andersen and the Minnesota Republican Party joined with northeastern Minnesota and statewide civic groups in urging the legislature to put the taconite amendment on the ballot in the 1962 general election. "Just give the people the right to vote," they urged. But again the opposition held their stubborn ground. Again the proposal did not carry the day.

As the 1962 Minnesota State and legislative campaigns grew more heated, the taconite issue played an ever-increasing role in the campaign oratory; Republicans and conservatives were for, Democrat-Farmer-Laborite and liberals were against. The people wanted the right to vote on the amendment. Not receiving that privilege, they vented their anger on many legislators who had prevented them from doing so. Both houses of the Minnesota Legislature are now controlled by the conservatives, the liberals having lost control of the State house for the first time since 1955.

While not as certain as the control of the legislature, it also would appear that the people of Minnesota are finally going to get the right to vote on the taconite tax amendment. The present Minnesota Legisature seems certain to pass the amendment and put it on the November 1964 ballot. The district 33, United Steelworker's Council has endorsed the proposal, and the Democrat-Farmer-Laborite Party seems to be moving toward a compromise position on the matter. Regardless of the outcome of Minnesota's gubernatorial recount now in progress, it is to the lasting credit of Gov. Elmer L. Andersen that he stuck to his guns and that he has contributed greatly to date in bringing the taconite tax amendment to the threshold of victory.

As evidence of what this matter will mean to the State of Minnesota should it be approved by the State's electorate next November, I include herein the following statement made to the Minnesota House of Representatives yesterday by Mr. Christian F. Beukema, president of the Oliver Iron Mining Division of United States Steel Corp.:

STATEMENT OF CHRISTIAN F. BEUKEMA

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee; I welcome the opportunity to appear before your committee to urge favorable consideration of this important piece of legislation. As an official of a major producer of iron ore in Minnesota, I have previously discussed the importance of a favorable tax climate to the competitive position of Minnesota ores.

During the last several years substantial progress has been made in acquainting the people of Minnesota with the mining industry's problems at both the State and local levels and in acquiring their understanding toward reasonable solutions. A start has been made toward finding a solution to the very serious question of fairness in local tax valuations. With increased understanding and cooperation on the part of all concerned we believe more progress will be made in this very essential area so important to the competitive position of natural ores and taconites in Minnesota.

In the light of this belief in the progress made and faith in continued progress to be made on local tax matters, and in order that this committee, Minnesota's legislature and its people may be assured of the position of United States Steel Corp. and Oliver Iron Mining Division and of our desire and intention to continue as a major producer of iron ore in Minnesota, we wish to make the following statement:

We are convinced that the proposed constitutional amendment gives assurance to the taconite industry of an equitable tax climate at the State level and, if recommended to the voters by the legislature, will be approved in the referendum of November 1964. Promptly after the constitutional amendment has been so adopted, United States Steel Corp. will complete engineering and commence construction of a major taconite plant in the vicinity of Mountain Iron, Minn., of not less than 3 or 4 million tons capacity. The new plant will be so designed that it may be expanded readily.

This commitment is offered to assist the unification efforts of all sincerely concerned Minnesotans as they seek satisfactory solutions to the problem of assuring fair tax treatment for taconite and semitaconite. Substantial progress toward a bipartisan approach has already been made. The authorship and submission of this bill with committee sponsorship is one example.

Another example of progress toward a desirable solution is the forthright approach of District 33, United Steelworkers. Through understanding and cooperation with the industry, the United Steelworkers have contributed a practical approach to the issues involved in the constitutional debate. Opening the door to additional jobmaking investments which are so vital to the economic status of northeastern Minnesota is a matter of continuing importance and the position of United Steelworkers recognizes the serious import of this matter.

The deteriorating position of Minnesota natural ores in comparison with high quality ores from many sources has a consequent impact on both present employment and future expectations of employment. The local tax burdens which have been historically carried by natural ores are of such magnitude that they cannot be shifted to taconite and semitaconite if Minnesota is to encourage new investments in taconite plants of substantial capacities. The passage of the constitutional amendment will be reassuring to investors in taconite and will go far toward establishing for the Minnesota mining industry a more competitive position and related increased employment.

United States Steel Corp. believes that further clarification of its position at this time will be of benefit to those who wish to achieve a bipartisan support for the proposed amendment, to those seeking the advantages of taconite investments for the State of Minnesota, and to those whose jobs are dependent upon or benefit from iron ore production.

The commitment now to construct a taconite plant after adoption of this constitutional amendment by the voters at the end of 1964 naturally involves some uncertainties and the commitment must be subject to war, governmental or legal restrictions, or other unusual conditions beyond our control which may delay or prevent the consummation of such a program. With this necessary limitation, it is nevertheless a commitment which United States Steel Corp. willingly undertakes in the interest of all concerned.

This is a statement of major importance for Minnesota and its mining industry; its significance is indicated in the following article from the March 6, 1963, Wall Street Journal:

UNITED STATES STEEL PLANS TACONITE PLANT IN MINNESOTA—PROJECT HINGES ON ASSURANCE OF FAIR TAX TREATMENT; ISSUE MAY GO TO VOTERS—COST PUT AT OVER $120 MILLION

ST. PAUL.—United States Steel Corp.'s Oliver Iron Mining Division said it plans to build a taconite plant near Mountain Iron, Minn., if what it considers fair tax treatment is assured.

Christian F. Beukema, division president, told the Minnesota house of representatives tax committee the company plans a facility "of not less than 3 or 4 million tons capacity" a year. Though he didn't discuss cost, it is estimated such a plant would cost between $120 and $160 million.

Taconite plants extract iron ore from flinty taconite rock and send it in pellet or powder form to steel mills. The low-grade taconite ore requires processing before it can be used.

The committee is considering an amendment to the State constitution which would guarantee the taconite industry that there would be no disproportionate rise in industry taxes for 20 years. Under present Minnesota law, taconite plants are taxed on a tonnage basis instead of under real estate levies applying to other industry. The amendment, if approved by the legislature, must be submitted to the voters.

"We are convinced that the proposed constitutional amendment gives assurance to the taconite industry of an equitable tax climate at the State level and, if recommended to the voters by the legislature, will be approved in the referendum of November 1964," Mr. Beukema said.

Immediately after the amendment's adoption, he said, United States Steel will complete engineering and begin construction of the plant. The division has operated a 1-million-ton capacity pilot taconite plant at Mountain Iron since 1953.

Ford Motor Co. late last month said it is considered a taconite plant at Eveleth, Minn., in association with Oglebay Norton Co., a Cleveland mining company. The plant is understood to have a planned capacity of about 1.5 million tons a year. Erie Mining Co. and Reserve Mining Co., both owned by various steelmakers, have taconite plants in the State, and McLouth Steel Corp. has expressed interest in building one.

The Oliver official said the company's commitment "naturally involves some uncertainties and must be subject to war, governmental or legal restrictions or other unusual conditions beyond our control which may delay or prevent the consummation of such a program."

Walter E. Weber, vice president of Hanna Mining Co., told the committee Hanna is considering building a plant in Minnesota for processing semitaconite. The facility would have a capacity of 1.5 million to 2 million tons annually and cost $30 to $60 million, he said.

In Cleveland, Hanna officials said many aspects of the plans still had to be considered before the company moved ahead with the project.

Semitaconite is similar to taconite but requires a different processing method.

THE FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, in his recent message to the Congress, the President said that tax reduction and reform is the most urgent task confronting the Congress in 1963. The announced objectives of the President's program are to step up the growth and vigor of our national economy—to increase job and investment opportunities—to improve our productivity.

Now that the initial effect of the President's proposals have given way to deeper reflection of specific provisions for tax reform, this whole program is encountering serious resistance. Many of the recommendations for so-called reforms are hard to justify and have only created confusion and controversy. The President himself has made the situation more puzzling when, in the face of a budget deficit of approximately $12 billion this year, he appears to be retreating from his insistence for tax reform by indicating his willingness to accept a tax cut without tax revision.

In seeking a way to accomplish the urgent objective of spurring our economy, I simply cannot comprehend why the administration has given no consideration to the possibility of reducing or repealing the discriminatory 10 percent automobile excise tax which is imposed on the largest single segment of our economy. Not only has the administration ignored the possibility of excise tax reduction, but its recommendations to stimulate economic activity are based upon the premise that our largest industrial community should, in fact, continue to pay a temporary wartime tax that has no parallel in our entire tax structure.

As all of you must be quite aware, I have long advocated the repeal or reduction of this tax and now, with public discussions centering around the use of tax reduction as a stimulant to our economy, it seems to me that the climate has never been more appropriate, the stage was never so well set, to achieve this, and to give real impetus to our whole economy at the same time.

Year after year, I have vigorously protested the extension of this tax through every source available to me. I have spoken from the floor of the house, until some have dubbed me the "automobile horn of Congress"; I have inserted pertinent material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I felt warranted serious study; I have written letters not only to my colleagues, but to many officials in the executive department; I have originated extensive research on the subject; and I have appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee whenever I have been permitted to do so.

Just recently my attention has been called to an analysis prepared last December by the Automobile Manufacturers Association, "The Federal Excise Tax on New Passenger Automobiles," which so clearly sets forth the many factors involved that I would like to have it included in the RECORD in its entirety.

I anticipate that it will not be many weeks before we will be called upon to act on recommendations for tax revision and also to extend our present excise taxes. With this in mind, I urge all of you to give this analysis your careful examination and study, for I am confident it will convince you that here is an opportunity to help fulfill the President's objective of stimulating our economy and, as I have said, correct a gross inequity in our tax structure:

THE FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON NEW PASSENGER AUTOMOBILES

SUMMARY

This statement reviews the economic consequences arising from the Federal 10-percent excise tax on new passenger automobiles, which averages $230 per car, and points out the necessity for the elimination or substantial reduction of this excessive wartime rate in the interest of national economic growth as well as tax equity.

The postwar growth of the U.S. economy is not attributable to any single factor, but rather has reflected the conjunction of a great many forces arising out of both the war and the depression preceding it. Under these circumstances, economic demand increased almost without regard to tax or other deterrents. The momentum of this process certainly stimulated U.S. economic growth through 1957. Since 1957, the growth rate has been slower; and it is no longer possible to endorse repressive taxation on the one hand, while giving allegiance to economic growth on the other.

The present Federal excise tax structure is largely a product of war emergency needs to increase Federal revenues and to reduce consumption. Under such circumstances, the overall economic consequences of such excises have understandably been of secondary concern. In today's climate of slow economic growth, it is especially necessary to reconsider and reduce such deterrents as the 10-percent excise tax on new passenger automobiles.

In recent years, the selective and discriminatory aspects of the new passenger automobile excise tax have become even more pronounced as Congress has granted rate reductions in the excise tax on other consumer goods and services. It will be recalled that, in recent years, tax reductions have been made by Congress on numerous items—electric, gas, and oil appliances, refrigerators, jewelry, cosmetics, and only this year on passenger rail, bus, and airline fares. A new passenger automobile is the principal consumer durable which is still subject to tax at wartime rates. In the case of a new passenger car, this averages about $230, an amount in excess of the annual individual income tax paid by several million taxpayers. Over 11 years have now passed since the current 10 percent rate was first imposed; and over 21 years have elapsed since the rate was increased from 3½ to 7 percent to meet the needs of World War II.

Viewed in terms of its broad economic impact, the 10 percent excise tax on new passenger cars is comparable in its effect to a tariff—designed to limit rather than to stimulate consumption. In fact, it is clear that the increases to 7 percent and then to 10 percent were intended to discourage consumption of cars and raw materials as well as to increase Federal revenues. The long-term direct result in an economy no longer primarily oriented toward war is less vigorous growth—less production, less employment, and less investment than would otherwise be forthcoming. The indirect results of such repressive taxation touch all the hundreds of thousands of businesses, small and large, that depend upon the growing production and use of passenger automobiles.

The automotive industry's vital role in the economy is clear—it provides about 6 million jobs in the production, distribution and service of its product and constitutes nearly 10 percent of the Nation's gross national product. In 1960, for example, the automotive industry consumed 21 percent of all steel, 62 percent of all rubber, 11 percent of all aluminum, 47 percent of all lead, and 35 percent of all the zinc used in the United States. In addition, it provides a substantial share of the market for a host of other materials and products—textiles, copper, electrical goods.

In the post World War II period, the automotive industry's $14 billion investment in new plant and equipment plus added billions for new tools and techniques has provided an important stimulus and been an innovating force felt throughout the whole economy. New jobs and new products have resulted from these automotive investments.

Moreover, the indirect effects of the industry have been even more beneficial to the economy. The growth of the passenger car industry has been the stimulus which has reshaped the American landscape—new highways, new urban developments, new shopping centers and new housing have all been affected and stimulated by the growth of automobile use. Thus, the industry generates effects on consumption and investment that are far more widespread than almost any other industry's contribution since the railroads opened up the country in the 19th century.

The many requests by the automobile industry in the past for relief from the burden of a high and discriminatory excise tax rate have received the careful and sympathetic consideration of the congressional tax committees and the Treasury. Nevertheless, immediate revenue needs have been given priority in considering the tax on automobiles on past occasions. Now, in conjunction with a general review of the Federal tax structure's effects on economic growth, the longrun effects of the automobile tax also require further consideration. To the extent that this tax acts as a brake on the Nation's economic growth, it may actually impede the related growth in Federal tax revenues from all sources.

If the automobile excise tax were reduced from 10 percent to, say, 3 percent, it is estimated that $1 billion of added purchasing power would be immediately released. Normally, an increase in consumer income of two times the amount of the tax cut, in this case about $2 billion, would be added annually to the income stream. In turn, this $2 billion increase would generate an estimated $600 million additional Federal tax revenues. This increase would offset 60 percent of the immediate revenue reduction attributable to a 7-percentage-point cut in the automobile excise tax rate.

There is a growing realization in and out of Government that the current tax structure constitutes a drag on economic growth. This view also holds that, in the long run, the revenue requirements of the Federal Government can best be met by a vigorously expanding economy. Ultimately, elimination of the present 10-percent Federal excise tax on passenger cars, and presently, a substantial reduction in the tax from 10 percent to not more than 3 percent would remove a discriminatory levy on the sale of new automobiles. This levy has been permitted, for short-term considerations, to persist too long after the emergencies which prompted its imposition.

BACKGROUND

History of the automobile excise tax

The crises of war in this century have imposed two major economic requirements on the national economy. The first was the need for a prompt increase in Federal revenues to finance war costs. The second need was to discourage private demand in order to release economic resources required for the war effort. Excise taxes, of which the automobile excise is an outstanding example, have served both purposes efficiently in wartime. However, under wartime circumstances, measures to stimulate the rate of economic growth were not and did not need to be vital considerations. The economy operated at forced draft with full or overfull utilization of labor and capital facilities to meet military demands.

The first automobile excise tax was imposed during World War I at a rate of 3 percent of the manufacturer's selling price. A subsequent increase to 5 percent was enacted early in 1919 to help defray the war costs and those of demobilization. However, Congress recognized the war-related nature of the tax, and within a few years first reduced and then repealed the emergency automobile excises created by the war emergency. Thus, in 1926, the 5 percent tax on passenger cars was reduced to 3 percent, and in 1928, the tax was repealed. In the face of these tax reductions, overall Government revenues continued to increase steadily during the 1920's. In fact, the tax reductions which left more dollars in the hands of consumers may well have played an important role in the vigor displayed by the economy during this period.

To meet a budgetary crisis arising out of the depression, and in lieu of a general manufacturer's sales tax, a number of emergency excise taxes were imposed in the economically depressed year of 1932. One such tax was the 3-percent excise tax imposed on new passenger automobiles. These selective excises were continued during the depression years. No definite answer can be given as to the extent that the imposition of these taxes during the depression may have retarded recovery. However, it is noteworthy that, even under the growing pressures of a rearming economy, following the outbreak of actual war in Europe in 1939, Congress saw fit to impose an automobile excise tax of only 3½ percent in 1940. This was followed by an increase to 7 percent in the fall of 1941. This rate, however, was largely ineffective during the war, owing to production limitations. And, in the immediate postwar years, the pressures of pent-up demand effectively obscured the economic effects of the tax.

With the outbreak of the Korean war, it will be recalled, the automobile excise rate was increased to a "temporary" 10 percent. But this "temporary" Korean war rate has been continued for over 11 years despite the fact that wartime inflationary pressures, which obscure the economic effects of discriminatory excise taxes, have long since vanished.

The historical record of the legislative changes in the Federal excise tax on new passenger cars since 1917 is shown in the table below:

Federal excise tax rates on new passenger automobiles 1917–62

[Excise tax rate on manufacturer's selling price]

Effective date:	*Percent*
Oct. 4, 1917	3
Feb. 25, 1919	5
Mar. 28, 1926	3
May 29, 1928	-----
June 21, 1932	3
July 1, 1940	3½
Oct. 1, 1941	7
Nov. 1, 1951, to date	10

The high wartime automobile excise tax rate should now be modified to a level compatible with our longrun peacetime economic goals of growth and full employment. With the current emphasis on restructuring the Federal tax system to accomplish these objectives, Congress now has such an opportunity.

Congressional action on other emergency excise taxes

While the 10 percent automobile excise tax has remained unchanged since the Korean war, Congress has subsequently reduced or repealed numerous other so-called emergency taxes on both goods and services. In 1954, Congress reduced the Federal excise taxes on several major groups of consumer goods. These included refrigerators, electric, gas and oil appliances, as well as jewelry, cameras, and sporting goods.

In 1954, Congress also lowered the excise taxes on general admissions and local telephone service. Subsequently, in 1958, the excise taxes on the transportation of freight and the movement of oil by pipeline were repealed. Only this year, the 10 percent tax on rail and bus fares was repealed, while the 10 percent tax on air fares was reduced to 5 percent.

These periodic excise tax reductions on other goods and services have accentuated the selective and discriminatory nature of the 10 percent tax on new passenger cars. A new automobile is the principal consumer durable goods still subject to excise tax at wartime rates. This tax averages about $230 per car, an amount in excess of the annual individual income tax paid by several millions of taxpayers.

Vital economic use of passenger automobile

The passenger automobile, today, plays a vital role in the Nation's economic life. For a host of business and professional men, such as doctors, salesmen, lawyers, accountants, and insurance representatives, a car is a vital business tool contributing importantly to their efficiency. Recent studies prepared by the Bureau of Public Roads of the U.S. Department of Commerce disclosed the fact that car use by the general public is predominantly for necessity—e.g., for business, school and shopping purposes, with less than 20 percent of all automobile trips by urban residents being made for social or recreational purposes. Americans find their cars essential to modern living and business.

Congress, in enacting the 10-percent rate on passenger cars, acknowledged the burden imposed by this high rate on car purchases. Thus, both the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee in their reports on the Revenue Act of 1951, stated:

"However, your committee recognizes that cars represent a necessity to a large segment of the population under present conditions and, therefore, deemed it inappropriate to increase the rate above 10 percent on the manufacturer's price, the rate applying in the case of most manufacturers' excises. Moreover, the purchase of a car represents a larger outlay on the part of the consumer than is true in the case of most other durable consumption items, with the result that the amount of the tax payment in these cases is larger than in the purchase of other durable goods and, therefore, likely to be considered more burdensome."

The burden of the tax on passenger cars has even wider implications, however, than those suggested above. In today's circumstances, the burden imposed by a repressive automobile tax is felt by the whole economy whose growth is constricted by a consumption tax that retards both production and investment. Our concern, therefore, is not only with the impact of the tax on the car buyer and the automobile industry, but also with its significance in terms of national economic growth.

The economic importance of the automobile industry

In measuring the economic effects of the 10-percent excise tax on new passenger cars, the relative magnitude of the automobile industry in the economy is highly significant. Few industries can match the automobile industry for its overall impact on the national economy. For example, in 1960, automotive related sales, including the purchase of passenger cars and the cost of their operation, totaled $47 billion and represented 9.4 percent of the gross national product.

In terms of manpower, the employment opportunities provided by the automotive industry are well known. The number and variety of jobs generated directly and indirectly by the industry would be legion. While the manufacture of automobiles, alone, has provided work directly for nearly 700,000 people, the total employment opportunities generated by those who supply the industry and service and distribute its product is many times that number—with the total for the industry possibly in excess of 6 million employees.

It should also be recognized that almost one business out of every six in the United States is dependent upon the manufacture, distribution, service and use of motor vehicles. On the basis of an analysis of data developed in the 1958 Census of Manufactures and Census of Business, the AMA has estimated that close to 800,000 individual businesses in the United States depend on the motor vehicle and, primarily, on the

passenger car. This includes close to 300,000 passenger car dealers and gasoline service stations, and over 100,000 independent automobile repair shops.

It should also be noted that the automotive consumption of many materials sustains the growth and development of numerous other industries vital to our industrial base and economic growth. For example, in 1960, 21 percent of all steel, 62 percent of all rubber, 35 percent of all zinc, 11 percent of all aluminum, and 47 percent of all the lead used in the United States was for automotive purposes.

In the light of the foregoing data, it is apparent that the adverse effects of an excessive tax on new passenger cars will be widespread throughout the whole economy. The impact of the new car excise extends from basic industries such as steel and aluminum to hundreds of thousands of small businesses in manufacturing, distribution, and servicing of automobiles.

AUTOMOBILES AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

Economic growth in the United States has often been described as the resultant of one or more major innovating forces which combine to open up a wide range of new investment opportunities. The development of the railroads in the last half of the 19th century and early 20th century is often cited as a major factor in the dynamic growth of the economy during that period. Following World War I, the rising automobile industry replaced the railroad system as a major innovating force.

However, the ability of the automobile industry to continue as a dynamic factor in national long-term economic growth will be facilitated by relief from discriminatory taxation which impairs its freedom to compete on equal terms with other industries in the U.S. economy. It is with the long-term economic consequences of the repressive 10 percent new automobile excise tax to the Nation, not just one industry, that Congress must primarily be concerned. It is clear that the economic vitality of the automobile industry will be intimately involved in the Nation's growth rate for the future, as it is currently and has been in the past. Freed of excessive tax burdens, the industry can be expected to continue to play its role in making the investment needed to meet our economic goals.

Investment in plant and equipment by the automotive industry

The postwar growth of the U.S. economy is not attributable to any single factor, but rather has reflected the conjunction of a great many forces arising out of both the war and the depression preceding it. Under these circumstances, economic demand increased almost without regard to tax or other deterrents. The momentum of this process certainly stimulated U.S. economic growth through 1957. Since 1957, the growth rate has been slower; and it is no longer possible to endorse repressive taxation on the one hand, while giving allegiance to economic growth on the other. The excise tax on new passenger cars is one such repressive tax. Its only effect can be to retard growth, and the harmful effects of the tax can extend far beyond the limits of the automobile industry into almost every phase of contemporary life.

From the automobile industry's very beginning, the force of innovation has been one of its outstanding characteristics. Moreover, it has acted as a spur to the growth of other industries and a strengthening force to the Nation's economy. The very nature of competition in the automobile industry (including competition with foreign manufacturers) has required that each manufacturer strive constantly to turn out better products than its competitors at the lowest possible cost. This has led to continual improvement, from one model year to another. Such improvement requires substantial investment in both plant and equipment.

Excise taxes which press on long-term demand will certainly constitute a more substantial deterrent to new economic growth in the future than they have in the early postwar years. They can, to a significant degree, offset much of the effort of American industry to achieve the growth in volume demand which is basic to rising investment. As Dr. Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, has recently said:

"By strengthening sales and pushing output closer to capacity, tax reduction spurs investment in inventories and in new equipment and new plants. This impact on investment in productive capacity is called the 'accelerator effect.' The increased production of capital goods expands gross national product, stimulates further consumption and increases profits. It reduces the deterrent effect of excess capacity, which has tended to discourage investment in productive facilities during the past 5 years or so."

During the period from 1946–62, the automotive industry has been a leader in plant and equipment expenditures for both the modernization and expansion of its production facilities. The industry invested $14 billion in manufacturing facilities, excluding the heavy cost of tools for new model cars. This represented nearly one-sixth of all the plant and equipment expenditures by durable goods producers during the 1946–62 period. It would not be unreasonable to claim that this volume of plant and equipment expenditures has been a significant factor in the postwar growth and prosperity of the national economy. It has enabled the industry, in spite of rising labor costs, to meet consumer demand efficiently and to contribute importantly to price stability. Significantly, for example, since 1958 the list prices of comparable automobiles have remained virtually unchanged.

An especially important part of new investment is that which contributes to technological improvement under the stress of increasingly competitive markets. The technological change fostered by the automotive industry's investment has been a major innovating force in our economy. New and better products as well as improved production methods have resulted therefrom. This has opened up a wide spectrum of opportunities for men with imagination and initiative. Such change thus promotes new jobs and, in turn, stimulates further new capital investment. The President, in his 1962 economic message, pointed out this close relationship between technological innovation and investment when he stated:

"Investment in new equipment serves as a vehicle for technological improvements and is perhaps the most important way in which laboratory discoveries become incorporated in the productive process."

The investment by the automotive industry of $14 billion in new plant and equipment during the post-World War II period has been such a vehicle. It has permitted the industry to provide better products and, as noted, has enabled it in recent years to hold the price line.

The interstate highway program

The investment in other areas of the economy resulting from rising car usage is clearly seen in connection with the Interstate Highway System now in process of construction. This program is wholly financed by taxes levied on the direct beneficiaries of the highway program and will involve an average national expenditure of some $4 billion annually over a 10-year period. In addition to its direct investment effects, the highway program will contribute to the increased efficiency of the movement of goods and people, with greater safety than ever before. The program also adds importantly to our national defense capabilities. Further, it opens up new and more productive uses of land for industrial development with attendant rises in land values and commercial activity which have improved the tax resources of State and local governments.

Living changes attributable to increased car use

The tremendous shifts of industry and population occurring in the United States since World War II provide another example of investment opportunities which have been induced by the growth of automobile use. The automobile has changed the face of the American landscape and the whole mode of living for millions of our citizens. Out of this has come new demand creating forces that have expanded whole industries beyond anything imagined before World War II.

The rapid growth of metropolitan areas after World War II unquestionably was fostered by the automobile and the expanded road systems around the urban centers. The remarkable increase in private residential housing after World War II has been unequalled in the history of this or any other country. The construction of nearly 1,300 new shopping centers in the United States during the period 1947–60 can also be attributed in large part to the increased mobility of the American consumer provided by the automobile.

The examples above are but a few dramatic illustrations of how a major force like the passenger automobile can promote investment which contributes to national economic growth and better living standards for millions. As shown, the demand for automobiles carries with it a derived demand for a host of other products and services requiring new investment that helps to build and develop our entire national economy.

Excise tax reduction—Effect on aggregate consumer demand

As observed earlier, the increase in the automobile excise tax reflected, in part, a desire to reduce new car demand under the pressures of a war emergency. In contrast, under today's very different economic circumstances, it seems clear that a reduction in the 10-percent excise tax on new passenger cars would favorably influence overall economic demand in the long run, even if this effect might not be immediately evident. The importance of this type of economic stimulation through tax reduction has already been recognized by both the Canadian and British Governments, which have been faced with similar problems of accelerating economic growth.

Under the intense competitive pressures existing in the automobile markets today, reduction in the excise tax on new passenger cars would be reflected in lower costs to the consumer. The tax today, on the average, is $230. Reduction of this tax from 10 percent to, say, 3 percent would reduce the tax by about $160 per car.

While the industry believes it is logical and appropriate to assume that a reduction in the new passenger car excise tax will stimulate aggregate consumer demand in the long run, it is, of course, difficult to specify the precise demand increase to be expected. Nevertheless, the release of an amount in excess of $1 billion is certain to influence favorably aggregate consumer demand—that is, the demand for all types of goods and services. Over a period of a year, it is generally considered reasonable to expect aggregate demand to increase by at least two times the amount of any tax reduction.

While the benefit of an automobile excise tax reduction to purchasers of new cars is readily apparent, a benefit will also be afforded to purchasers of used cars even though such vehicles are not subject to any Federal excise tax. In 1960, over 40 percent of all used and new car sales were in overlapping or competitive price groups. As a result, any lower price on new cars attributable to a reduction in the excise tax would induce a used car price decline, in order for them to remain competitive with new cars. Thus, the beneficial effects of a reduction in the new car excise tax would (1) result in a cost saving on the price of a used car, (2) bring buyers into the used car market who could not afford cars offered at prices reflecting the current high excise and (3) release these substantial savings on cars for use elsewhere in the economy.

Thus, the stone of tax reduction cast into the economic pool creates an ever-widening circle of effects throughout the economy—all favorable. Some broad estimates of these effects are discussed below.

Stimulating effect of an automobile excise tax reduction

There is widespread agreement that tax reduction has a stimulating effect on spending and income and produces an increase in gross national product generally equal to two or more times the amount of the original tax cut. To the extent that this occurs, of course, additional tax revenues are generated by the increased economic activity. As a result, the ultimate revenue effect for the Government can be substantially different from the immediate effect associated with the initial tax reduction.

Thus, if the automobile excise tax were reduced from 10 percent to, say, 3 percent, it is estimated that $1 billion of added purchasing power would be immediately released. If we assume that the increase in consumer income will be about two times the amount of the tax cut (i.e., the tax reduction will turn over twice within the year), then $2 billion would be added annually to the income stream (gross national product) as a result of the tax cut—providing this excise tax reduction is not offset by corresponding increases in other taxes. In turn, this $2 billion increase in gross national product would generate an estimated $600 million additional Federal tax revenues. This increase would offset 60 percent of the immediate revenue reduction attributable to a 7 percentage point cut in the automobile excise tax rate of 10 percent.

A favorable effect on aggregate investment as well as consumption can also arise out of reduction of the car excise tax. Where sales press upon industrial capacity, an incentive would be given to spending for new plant capacity. This, in turn, would further expand both national income and consumption and thereby generate added Federal revenues. As a result, a tax cut could, in the long run, increase overall tax revenues. The experience of the 1920's tends to bear this out. In Great Britain, the Government has just reduced the tax on domestically purchased automobiles in an effort to stimulate the economy. Only a year or so ago, Canada repealed its special excise tax on cars to aid its total economy.

The United States is now in a position to make the long overdue reduction in the new passenger car excise which other countries have already undertaken. As noted above, the entire economy would benefit from such a stimulus to economic growth. Tax reduction can be the needed impetus required to achieve the accelerated growth rate required for full employment of the Nation's manpower and physical resources.

We can no longer afford the retention of taxes at wartime rate levels designed to repress consumption and investment. In today's economy, discriminatory and excessive tax rates put a burden upon the consumer and business which is reflected in lagging consumption and investment with resulting high unemployment and underutilization of plant and equipment.

The Automobile Manufacturers Association therefore respectfully submits that Congress should give a high priority to reduction or elimination of the 10-percent excise tax on new passenger cars, as a meaningful and necessary contribution to the progress and growth of the American economy.

GENERAL NOTE

As presented in the foregoing statement, the Automobile Manufacturers Association holds strongly to the conviction that selective excise taxes, at discriminatory rates, are harmful to the economy as well as to the industries whose products are so taxed. However, the association recognizes that, under certain circumstances, revenue needs as well as the requirements of a balanced tax structure may require some form of excise taxation. Therefore, the association wishes to make it clear that it will not oppose any nondiscriminatory taxes levied on consumer goods and services at low rates if Congress should feel that such taxation were required.

The AMA recognizes that the best means to the attainment of needed tax reduction is control of Federal expenditures to prevent their growth at a rate equal to or exceeding that of national income. Under such circumstances, economic growth, over the long term, can be expected to yield adequate revenues to meet all reasonable requirements of the Federal Government at tax rates well below the excessive levels currently imposed.

APPENDIX

TABLE 1.—*Percent remaining of Korean war rates in Federal excise taxes on selected manufactured goods*

Manufactured goods	Unit of tax	Percent remaining of Korean war rate	Year Korean rate reduced
Passenger automobiles.	Manufacturer's sales price.	100	--------
Refrigerators	do	50	1954
Electric, gas, and oil appliances.	do	50	1954
Cigarette, cigar, and pipe lighters.	do	66⅔	1954
Electric light bulbs	do	50	1954
Cameras	do	50	1954
Sporting goods	do	66⅔	1954
Jewelry	do	50	1954

Source: Derived from U.S. Treasury Department data.

TABLE 2.—*Distribution of passenger-car trips by major purpose of travel*

Purpose of travel	Percentage distribution of—	
	Trips	Vehicle-miles
Earning a living:		
To and from work	33.6	26.0
Related business	13.9	17.7
Total	47.5	43.7
Family business:		
Medical and dental	1.4	1.9
Shopping	15.0	6.9
Other	10.7	8.7
Total	27.1	17.5
Educational, civic, and religious	6.1	3.2
Social and recreational:		
Vacations	.2	4.8
Pleasure rides	7.2	12.8
Other	11.9	18.0
Total	19.3	35.6
All purposes	100.0	100.0

Source: Highway Transportation, Office of Research, Bureau of Public Roads, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1960.

TABLE 3.—*Purchases of passenger cars and related automobile expenditures by consumers and business, 1960*

[Billions of dollars]

Expenditures by consumers and business:	
Purchases of passenger cars	18
Auto—related items:	
Gas and oil	14
Repairs and service	6
Tires, parts and accessories	4
Financing charges	3
Insurance and miscellaneous	2
Subtotal	29
Total	47

Source: Derived from U.S. Department of Commerce data.

TABLE 4.—*Automotive consumption of selected raw materials—1960*

	U.S. total consumption	Automotive consumption	Percent automotive
Steel, all forms (tons)	71,149,218	14,610,424	20.5
Rubber (long tons)	1,834,808	1,144,620	62.3
Zinc (tons)	861,125	299,775	34.8
Aluminum (tons)	2,329,000	257,000	11.0
Lead (tons)	1,021,200	479,300	46.9

Source: Based on data from various trade associations published in Automobile Facts and Figures, 1962, Automobile Manufacturers Association.

PRESIDENT'S YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT MAKES POSSIBLE ESTABLISHMENT OF HOMETOWN YOUTH CORPS IN CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. **BYRNE** of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the decade of the 1960's, 26 million young people will enter the labor market—an average of about 2½ million each year. The lack of experience of these young people who have already entered into the competition for jobs has been determined during the early years of this decade. In January 1963, over 700,000 young people aged 16 through 21 years of age were dropouts of school and out of work.

Unemployment rates in the 16 through 21 age group are about three times as high as unemployment in the adult population. Among those unfortunate youngsters who dropped out of school before completing high school the problem of unemployment reaches its most intense form with 28 out of every 100 school dropouts unemployed, according to Department of Labor studies.

To meet the challenge of putting our young people to work during the 1960's will require the creation of 25,000 new jobs each week for the next 10 years. In commenting on this urgent problem, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz made the following statement to the House Labor Committee:

> We recognize that the basic answer to this problem must be in the achievement of that growth rate in the economy which will mean more jobs through private employment. Better education, training, and counseling are also necessary. But there is also increasing evidence that special measures are required to provide some of our unemployed youngsters with special opportunities for learning work disciplines and skills, with the added dividend of motivation to return to school for further education and training.

I believe H.R. 1890, the President's Youth Employment Act, will serve admirably the need to provide the special training opportunities that presently out-of-work young people must receive to fit them for beginning jobs.

Title I of the act creates a Youth Conservation Corps modeled after the highly successful Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's. Under this provision, 15,000 young men aged 16 through 21 years would be given the chance to work in camps in national forests and parks under the supervision of skilled workmen, and with classroom schoolwork in the evenings to fill in the gaps in their education. Enrollments would be for a period of 6 months, with the opportunity to reenlist for additional 6-month periods up to a total of 2 years. Work in the camps would be done on projects to make our national lands more attractive for recreational use.

The boys will work with tools such as light construction equipment, power tools, compressor drills, and the like which are used extensively in civilian work. Following completion of enlistment, the Youth Conservation Corps trained youth will return to the local office of the State employment service through which he was originally selected. Here his skills, work habits, and classroom training will be evaluated and, on the basis of this newly acquired experience, he will be referred to potential employers for job interviews. The purpose of the YCC is to follow a young man from original selection, through training in the Corps, through the job interview stage, and into the job.

Title II of the bill, which has come to be referred to as the "Home Town Youth Corps" has great potential usefulness for the city of Philadelphia. Briefly, the Home Town Youth Corps will provide for programs of useful employment of a public service nature to be sponsored by city or county governments, with 50 percent of the cost to be borne by the Federal Government. In testifying on this part of the Youth Employment Act before a Senate subcommittee, Randolph E. Wise, Philadelphia welfare commissioner, said the program was urgently needed by urban centers.

In Philadelphia, nearly 8,000 youths 16 years of age and older dropped out of school prior to graduation from high school in 1961 alone, according to Mr. Wise. And he added that the size and scope of the problem make it obvious that the Federal Government must share responsibility for its prevention and control.

Work in the Hometown Youth Corps will be performed by both young men and young women aged 16 through 21. The work will include service in hospitals where nurse aids are very much in demand; in schools where members of the Hometown Youth Corps can perform clerical work, and thus free teachers for classroom work; in libraries, in welfare agencies; in children's homes and in other branches of Government where they will be learning job skills without displacing regular workers. When a young person has completed work in a Hometown Youth Corps project he or she will be referred to the local employment service office for placement.

All of us must make the transition from the schoolday world of youth to the adult working world. The transition is not an easy one to make. It is even more difficult these days because of the disappearance of many of the unskilled jobs once performed by youngsters just out of school. Our responsibility to young people does not end when they leave school. In a very real sense it begins at once when they cannot find an established place of employment in the complicated world in which we live and continues until they are placed in a job. The President's Youth Employment Act offers a needed lift to our young people at the most critical period in their lives.

CAN PUBLIC FUNDS BE CONSTITUTIONALLY GRANTED TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS?

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, the issues joined for Congress in proposals for Federal aid to education are not simple ones, nor are they new ones. There are enormously important questions, including those of need, of scope, of formulation, of policy, and of national purpose. The Congress has considered these matters in various ways for years and the complexities presented are evidenced by the important fact that they are still with us for consideration in this session.

Among the important issues that have confronted us in the past and are before the Congress again relate directly to private schools at the college level and at the elementary and secondary levels. These schools are enmeshed in the same considerations already mentioned but present special additional issues for deliberation and resolution, partly because they are private schools, but importantly, because of mistaken and misleading attitudes toward them. The term "private school" itself presents its complexities. It is legally recognized as an integral part of the States' public school programs for the purpose of compulsory attendance laws. There is no quarrel over recognition of the immense contribution made by these schools to public purposes and none respecting the excellence of the education given to citizen students. There is no question remaining respecting their juridical status. But there persists widespread misconception of these schools and lingering but diminishing controversy over the permissability of provision of public funds for education in these private schools.

Opponents to the participation of private schools, especially the church related, private school, premise opposition on a disturbing absolutism in asserting a constitutional prohibition to their entitled participation in public assistance in any form. But support of that position mainly rests on dicta in decisions and extremely dubious interpretation of relevant constitutional precedent.

Fortunately, the pendency of the proposals for Federal assistance to education has stimulated new and substantive research into these important constitutional questions. Legal scholars, in increasing numbers across the country, are devoting renewed attention to the constitutional issues and with penetrating new vision. It is important to Members of Congress to be aware of this developing and expanding concentration and especially the clarification and illumination these research efforts impart to the problem before us.

At a symposium on church-state problems, sponsored by the University of Chicago Law School, an important address was given by Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J., dean, Boston College Law School, entitled "Can Public Funds Be Constitutionally Granted to Private Schools?" This is only an example, but an important one in the current scholarly evaluation of constitutional principles. To assist my colleagues in Congress in their heavy responsibilities to review again these issues, Dean Drinan's address follows:

CAN PUBLIC FUNDS BE CONSTITUTIONALLY GRANTED TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS?

(By Rev. Robert F. Drinan, S.J.)

It would be an easy answer to the question under discussion in this paper if we could simply state that no public funds should ever be expended for private purposes. With regard to schools, however, the fact is that no nonpublic school can be private in every sense of that term. American law recognized in the Pierce decision the right of the private school to exist and has thereby given to it a juridical status. This status, however ambiguous, has rendered the private school a quasi-public or, if you will, a parapublic institution.

The fundamental issue therefore in the controversy over public funds for private schools arises out of the fact that private schools are public schools for the purpose of compulsory attendance laws but have not been designated as public schools capable of being the beneficiaries of public funds. The anomolous juridical status of the private school in America has no parallel or precedent in any other phase of our law. Those who seek to retain Pierce and yet reverse Everson do not appreciate the implications of the juridical position conferred on the private school by Pierce. Those who seek to retain Pierce and who would accept Everson as containing the ultimate concessions which can be made to the private school likewise do not appreciate the logical implications of the holding in Pierce.

THE PUBLIC DIMENSIONS OF PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Let us start then with Pierce and see if from this decision there can be developed a line of reasoning by which the private school can claim to be an institution charged with a public responsibility and hence eligible for some public funds.

As is well known, Pierce was decided a few days before the guarantees of the 1st amendment were for the first time transferred to the States via the 14th amendment. Consequently, Pierce decided nothing about first amendment freedoms in relation to the existence of the private school. But the spirit of the Pierce decision clearly affirmed that no institutionalized dissent from educational orthodoxy could be constitutionally suppressed. The brief opinion in Pierce, however, left almost totally unsolved the extent to which a private school, legally recognized as a permissible substitute for the public school, could on this basis claim a right to be supported by public funds.

A plausible argument can be made for the proposition that the Pierce decision elevated the private school to the status of a publicly recognized institution which cannot logically and fairly be granted State accreditation and denied State subsidization. Even if, however, everyone agreed with this conclusion the real issue confronting the Nation today and the thorny problem to be discussed in this paper would not be resolved. That issue is, of course, not the private but the church-related school and, more particularly, the Catholic school.

In order, therefore, to give reality to the discussion it is proposed to talk here not in a conceptualistic way about public money and private schools but in a realistic way about Federal aid and Catholic educational institutions. At the same time it must be recognized that no satisfactory resolution of the controversy over the very small subsidy to church-related schools which is in issue in connection with Federal aid can be reached without attaining some agreement on the function and juridical nature of the private school in America.

What then is the claim being made by Catholic parents and Catholic officials? The claim is a very small one; the Catholic contention is that, if Federal aid is to be enacted, some recognition should be given to Catholic schools. This Catholic request is grounded on several factors among which are the following:

1. About 92 percent of all children attending private schools in America today are enrolled in Catholic elementary and secondary schools.

2. Some 6 million students—or every eighth child in America—attend a Catholic school. Any program designed to elevate the Nation's standards of educational excellence which ignores the 12 percent of the Nation's schoolchildren enrolled in nonpublic schools is neglecting in a serious manner a significant element in the population.

3. The first program of massive Federal aid to education must in the nature of things be designed either to help public schools alone or to elevate the educational excellence of all schools. Consequently, an important public policy decision must be made before Federal aid can become a reality.

Even this telescoped version of the Catholic case for a share in the distribution of Federal aid to education will indicate that the controversy over this issue involves profound questions of public policy. These questions can be resolved in a speculative way by peering into the interstices of the half dozen church-state opinions which the Supreme Court has written from Everson to Engel. But even the most resourceful and convinced advocate or opponent of Federal aid for Catholic schools must confess that the most careful reading of all Supreme Court decisions and dicta leads only to the feeling that the real questions have not yet been asked, much less resolved, in Supreme Court jurisprudence.

Some few "absolutes," however, with regard to religion and education have emerged from the Everson to Engel line of cases. The following principles seem to have a secure place in church-state law:

I. The benefits of public welfare legislation may not be granted or denied to citizens because of their religious faith or their lack of it.

II. If the State, in the pursuit of a legitimate public purpose, selects means to achieve this purpose which have an incidental effect of assisting religion, such means are not thereby unconstitutional—especially if no alternate means are as easily available.

III. No sectarian teaching or religious practice may be constitutionally permitted on the premises of a tax-supported school—even if student and teacher participation is on a truly voluntary basis.

Analyzing in turn each of these three broad principles, what can one conclude about the constitutionality of a grant of public money to a Catholic school?

I. PUBLIC WELFARE LEGISLATION

If there was one thing that Mr. Justice Black sought to make clear in Everson it was the finding that the challenged statute authorizing reimbursement to Catholic parents for school bus transportation for their children was public welfare legislation. Mr. Justice Black assumed or asserted several conclusions which formed the following line of reasoning:

1. Public welfare legislation is ordinarily identifiable as a particular type of law and should not be nullified by the courts except for the gravest reasons.

2. Such public welfare legislation is not unconstitutional even if it facilitates attendance at church-related schools.

3. Such legislation does not offend against the wall of separation between church and state provided that (1) any aid given to religion is incidental to the main purpose of the law and (2) a denial of such aid would be discrimination against persons or groups because of their faith or lack of it.

It may be that someone would challenge the foregoing summary of Everson as inadequate and even misleading. Such a person could indeed cite respectable authority for his position because the fact is that several State courts have been confused about the meaning and thrust of Everson. The opinion of Mr. Justice Black is more encouraging to the advocate of Federal aid for Catholic schools than are the several interpretations placed on the opinion by the four dissenting Justices in Everson. Equally discouraging are the interpretations given to Everson by the Supreme Courts of the States of Washington, New Mexico, Oregon, Wisconsin, and Alaska. All these tribunals have given lip service to Everson but have declared laws granting bus transportation or other benefits to Catholic schoolchildren to be unconstitutional even though these laws were concededly written and enacted as public welfare legislation. In other words, State courts have not accepted the idea that public welfare legislation is constitutionally permissible if it only grants to children in Catholic schools those benefits which are also granted to pupils in public schools. The basic rationale of Everson has either been misunderstood, misinterpreted or rejected. Only the Supreme Courts of Connecticut and Maine have accepted and followed Everson as meaning that bus transportation statutes can be framed as public welfare legislation in such a manner as to be constitutionally unassailable.

The confusion over the meaning of Everson has not been lessened by the fact that the U.S. Supreme Court has since 1951 refused to review decisions based on Everson from the States of Washington, Connecticut, Oregon, and Alaska. One can argue, therefore, either that Everson is properly interpreted by the highest court of Connecticut which sustained the constitutionality of a law authorizing bus transportation to private schools or, on the other hand, that Everson has almost no relevance or meaning at the State level—as the highest courts of Washington, Wisconsin, and Alaska have declared.

It will be seen, therefore, that the history of Everson does not encourage one to employ it as a firm foundation for a case for Federal aid to Catholic schools. At the same time the literal wording of Mr. Justice Black's opinion in Everson supplies a solid basis for a line of argument that would support the case which Catholics and others are making on behalf of the constitutionality of Federal aid for private schools. The fact is that Everson reaffirmed Cochran and the child-benefit theory and that Everson is still good law—despite McCollum, Torcaso, and Engel. Mr. Leo Pfeffer highlights the consequences of Mr. Justice Black's opinion in this comment:

"When the Everson decision is coupled with the Cochran decision they lead logically to the conclusion that the State may, notwithstanding the first amendment, finance practically every aspect of parochial education, with the exception of such comparatively minor items as the proportionate salaries of teachers while they teach the catechism." ("Church, State and Freedom," p. 476.)

One could add a dimension to Mr. Pfeffer's reading of the Cochran-Everson rule by urging that in the ultimate analysis Everson follows from Pierce; public money, in other words, cannot logically be withheld from the private school if it is publicly accredited as an institution where children may fulfill their legal duty to attend school.

The many ambiguities in the Pierce-Cochran-Everson line of cases arise from the enigma which lies behind the institution to which has been assigned the nondescriptive and unenlightening name of the nonpublic or private school. Schools of this kind have an equivocal juridical status in America and until that status is clarified the entire controversy over the financing of such schools will be carried on in language and with concepts which do not really express the realities which they seek to describe. The terminology of "private" and "public" schools becomes even less useful when the private school in issue turns out to be a church-related school. The thorny issues involved in this area lead us to a discussion of the second "absolute" in the Everson to Engel line of cases—namely, the proposition that the State may constitutionally achieve a legitimate public purpose in such a way that an unintended incidental benefit comes to religion.

II. STATE PROGRAMS WHICH GIVE INCIDENTAL AID TO RELIGION

The various Supreme Court opinions in the Sunday law cases made it very clear that the requirement of separation between church and state does not mean that the state, in carrying out a legitimate secular purpose, must do so in a way which gives no aid to religion. It is significant to note that Mr. Justice Black, who wrote the rigorously separationist language in Everson and McCollum, sees no problem involving establishment or of free exercise of religion in Sunday laws which, whatever their present purpose may be said to be, clearly aid the Christian religion by fixing Sunday as a day of universal rest.

It is the secular purpose behind Sunday laws which, in the mind of the Supreme Court, renders them constitutional. As Mr. Justice Frankfurter put it in his concurring opinion in the Sunday law cases: "not every regulation, some of whose practical effects may facilitate the observance of a religion by its adherents, affronts the requirement of church-state separation."

Employing this reasoning the majority of the Supreme Court held that the incidental aid which Sunday laws give to the Christian religion does not make them unconstitutional. Nor are these laws contrary to the first amendment because of the "indirect burden on religious observance" which they impose on Sabbatarians. There is, however, a qualification on the power of the state to impose such a burden. As Chief Justice Warren put it:

"If the state regulates conduct by enacting a general law within its power, the purpose and effect of which is to advance the state's secular goals, the statute is valid despite its indirect burden on religious observance unless a state may accomplish its purpose by means which do not impose such a burden."

Is it arguable from this principle that the state in carrying out its "secular goals" in the field of education has some obligation to do so, if possible, in a manner which does not impose even an "indirect burden on religious observance"? If Catholics could demonstrate that the denial of aid to their schools imposed a burden on their religious observance would such a law be subject to the qualification which Chief Justice Warren attached to Sunday laws?

Whatever one might answer to that question it is clear that the establishment clause has not been interpreted by the Supreme Court to mean that the secular aims of the state must be achieved in a manner deliberately designed to preclude any incidental aid to religion. In view of this position then, what policy can the state adopt with regard to the distribution of funds for the purpose of raising the Nation's standards of excellence in education?

The advocates of Federal aid for Catholic schools ground their plea on the principle that the state, in carrying out its secular goals in the field of education, can comply with the first amendment if it makes available funds for strictly secular purposes in all schools. Under such an arrangement no aid is intended for religion and whatever benefits students in church-related schools may receive are exclusively of a secular nature.

The two most fundamental objections to this line of reasoning are the following:

1. Even if public money were given to a Catholic school for strictly secular objectives these objectives would be carried forward in an atmosphere permeated by a Catholic orientation.

2. Even if this permeation can be prevented the grant of public money to a Catholic school makes available to this school funds which would otherwise be committed to the teaching of secular subjects.

Let us try to analyze and, if possible, bring some clarification to these two issues.

1. Reflections on permeation

The permeation argument against aid to Catholic schools does not contend that the legitimate secular purpose which the state seeks to fulfill in giving aid for education in secular subjects is thwarted or frustrated in Catholic schools. The secular purpose is concededly carried out in Catholic schools but it is permeated—and somehow constitutionally contaminated—by a sectarian atmosphere. The argument against aid to church-related schools because of the permeation of sacred or sectarian values into the teaching of secular subjects must assume for its validity the viewpoint that the state is constitutionally required to seek out ways to carry out its secular objectives which will not give even incidental aid to religion. No such constitutional requirement can be found in the decisions from *Everson* to *Engel* and indeed the opinions in the Sunday law cases expressly deny the existence of any such constitutional requirement.

The opponents of Federal aid for Catholic schools who place great reliance on the permeation argument must logically say that the secular or silent attitude with regard to religion in the public schools is the only official orthodoxy which the state is allowed to promote in the pursuance of its public welfare objectives. This may be a philosophy of education subscribed to by a majority of the American people but it is not good constitutional law or, it is submitted, sound public policy.

Some recent writings on the permeation issue have focused attention on some graphic examples of the intermingling or rather the intrusion of sectarian teaching into textbooks on secular subjects used in Catholic schools. Two comments on this matter seem appropriate:

A. No scientific study has ever been done on the question of the extent of the permeation of sectarian teaching in the instruction in secular subjects in Catholic schools. Concrete examples of such permeation in textbooks can be cited but an important distinction should be made between the factitious and indefensible insertion of sectarian symbols or teaching into secular subjects and the conclusions or judgments based on religious values which are properly found in texts in the area of the social sciences. The latter type of permeation is much more significant than the former and is, moreover, a justifiable exercise of academic freedom by social scientists writing from a particular point of view.

B. Although there undoubtedly exist some unjustifiable examples of permeation in secular textbooks used in Catholic schools little work has been done on the extent to which ultranationalistic or secularistic symbols and teachings have permeated the textbooks used in the public schools of America. Studies have shown, however, that the beliefs of minority groups, religious influences in American history and the religions of lands different from America have received very inadequate treatment in the textbooks which enjoy widespread use in the Nation's public schools. Many of these texts can be fairly and properly criticized as being permeated with an excessive emphasis on the secular with a resulting failure to give adequate treatment to the sacred, the sectarian or the spiritual elements in the life of man and of society.

Permeation is, therefore, a factor in every textbook since values are omnipresent. If the state, therefore, cannot constitutionally give public money for instruction in secular subjects if religious values are commingled in the instruction the state is equally disabled from financing instruction in secular subjects where the orientation of the instruction is, by silence or by implication, permeated with a secularistic outlook.

Those who argue against Federal aid for Catholic schools because there exists in these schools some permeation of secular subjects with sacred values must be prepared to accept the major premise of their argument—the assumption that the orientation of secular humanism is the only type of educational orthodoxy which the state can subsidize.

Even if permeation of secular instruction with sectarian teaching can be prevented, however, the additional argument is made that the granting of public money to nonpublic schools for instruction in secular subjects relieves this school from a financial obligation which it would otherwise have. Hence a church-related school would have more funds available to it and such funds could be used for sectarian purposes.

The logical thrust of this argument leads to the conclusion that any church-related school must be placed not in the category of a school but of a church. To deny public funds to nonpublic schools for secular instruction because such a grant would bring to the church-related school a freeing of otherwise committed funds is to state that the fully accredited school which is affiliated to a church thereby loses its right to any public funds even for exclusively secular purposes. Such a conclusion is specifically contrary to the Everson decision where Mr. Justice Black in effect conceded that the public money granted to parents for bus transportation of their children to a Catholic school would make available to the parents and to the school more money for other purposes.

The contention that the State should refuse public funds for the attainment of a secular purpose unrelated to the religious function of a church-related school simply because such a grant would free the funds of this school for a religious purpose leads logically to the conclusion that no church-related institution may be entrusted with the implementation of any of the secular objectives of the state. Such a conclusion runs contrary to the basic traditions and the widespread contemporary practice of the state assisting church-related social welfare agencies in caring for the sick, the aged and those in need of social sciences.

It should be remembered that Everson sustained the constitutionality of a law which granted the benefits of public welfare legislation to individuals even though such benefits helped them to get to a church-related school. This result was reached in an opinion in which Mr. Justice Black stated:

"No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt, to teach or practice religion."

This famous sentence proscribes tax support only for "religious activities or institutions" in whatever form they may adopt "to teach or practice religion." It does not proscribe public funds for instruction in secular subjects even though such instruction may be conducted under the auspices of a religious institution. Far less does it forbid the granting of public funds to a church-related institution for the accomplishment of a secular purpose simply because such a grant might liberate other funds of this institution for a religious purpose.

Aid to religion as such is clearly forbidden by all the decisions from Everson to Engel. But state aid for the improvement of secular education need not be distributed only under circumstances where not even any incidental aid to religion may occur. The broadening of the concept of separation of church and state to this point must necessarily assume the validity of the theory that America is a completely secular state. Such a viewpoint makes it difficult if not impossible to reconcile the mandate of the establishment clause with the guarantee of the free exercise of religion clause.

It must be noted, however, that Supreme Court opinions from Everson to Engel are ambiguous at best with regard to the central question of whether America is a completely secular state. No decision has repudiated Mr. Justice Douglas' assertion in Zorach that "we are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being" but in the very same opinion Mr. Justice Douglas wrote that "Government may not blend secular and sectarian education." The Court has seemingly supported a theistic basis for America's legal institutions but has simultaneously insisted that the public school may not blend any "sectarian education" into its program. This apparent paradox leads us to a consideration of our third absolute in church-state law—the unconstitutionality of religious teaching or practices in the public schools—even when they are conducted on a truly voluntary basis.

III. THE SECULAR ORIENTATION OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL

Mr. Justice Rutledge, dissenting in Everson, gave as a reason for the Pierce decision his conviction that children should not be required to attend public schools because "their atmosphere is wholly secular". While it would be difficult to prove or disprove that the Supreme Court has agreed that the public school must have an atmosphere that is wholly secular the Court would seem to be pointing in that direction.

If the Supreme Court in its present term declares the reading of the Bible and the recitation of the Lord's prayer to be unconstitutional in a public school the secularization of the public school will be, at least in popular opinion, considerably extended. In a certain sense, however, the reasoning of the Court in the Bible-reading case will be more important than the result reached. The Court can develop a line of reasoning employed in the past and forbid Bible reading as contrary to the establishment clause—even if no infringement of religious liberty is found to be present. The Court seems to have followed this reasoning in the Engel decision although the fact of State authorship of the prayer involved in that case made the Court's decision unique.

Very few scholars and no group of religionists have sought to explore the implications of the Supreme Court's recently developed interpretation of the establishment clause as constituting a source of rights independently of the free exercise-of-religion clause. The theory that the establishment clause is merely instrumental to the implementation of the free exercise clause has been rejected by the Court. And by this rejection the Court has opened up the following possible arguments on behalf of the constitutionality of aid for private schools:

1. Can religionists claim that the secularized public school violates the establishment clause because it prefers irreligion over religion?

2. Can religionists claim further that the state by assisting only the secularized school subscribes to and promotes an orthodoxy which is imposed on all students to whom by law the state has given a pledge of a free education unaffected by any officially established indoctrination?

Let us search through these ideas in the light of the recent Supreme Court interpretation of the establishment clause.

1. Secularized schools and the establishment clause

The theory advanced by Mr. Justice Black in Torcaso, McGowan and Engel that the establishment clause can be violated without a violation of the free exercise of religion clause may now have become an accepted part of Supreme Court jurisprudence. Under this interpretation of the first amendment can it be argued that the secularization of the public school amounts to a violation of the establishment clause since a particular form of religion (or irreligion) is given a preferential status? If such a violation of the establishment clause can be shown, Catholics or others can enjoin it even though there is no infringement of anyone's religious freedom.

Aside from the question of standing to sue, can religious parents prove a violation of the establishment clause if the state gives financial assistance only to the school where education is deliberately divorced from religion? Preferential treatment to irreligion would seem to be as constitutionally objectionable as any preference given to religion.

Some Catholics have asserted that attendance at a public school by their children violates or restricts the religious freedom of both children and parents. The assertion is made that Catholics have a right to be treated like conscientious objectors or like Jehovah's Witnesses who have been granted an exemption from laws requiring a flag salute in a public school.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter saw the force of this analogy when, dissenting in Barnette, he voted against granting an exemption from the flag salute to children conscientiously opposed to the practice. Mr. Justice Frankfurter saw the consequences of the Court's bowing to the religious scruples of a minority and raised this question:

"What of the claims of equality of treatment of those parents who, because of religious scruples, cannot send their children to public schools?"

This potential argument of the Catholic or other parent has not been developed or litigated. To be able to show that religious parents "because of religious scruples cannot send their children to public schools" (to use Mr. Justice Frankfurter's language) would seem to require more proof of an antireligious bias in the public school than would appear to be now provable.

It is not now necessary, however, to have such proof before one can claim rights by reason of the first amendment. Under the interpretation of the establishment clause adopted in recent years by the Supreme Court any preferential treatment granted by the state to religion or irreligion constitutes a violation of constitutional rights. The allegation that is difficult to prove is, of course, the assertion that the secularized public school gives preferential treatment to irreligion. The widespread and deeply held conviction persists that silence about religion in the public school is the same as neutrality or impartiality. On this basic conception is built the whole thesis that the public school can be fair to believers and nonbelievers by assuming that their differences for the purposes of education are without significance. It is this basic assumption of the public school which, it is submitted, violates the letter and the spirit of the establishment clause.

The secularized public school meets and treats its students only as future citizens. Their religious or spiritual beliefs are to be regarded as irrelevant and hence unimportant with respect to the entire educational process. It is this basic disregard of the great ideas and religious aspirations in the lives of the students in a public school which is the gravamen of the religionist's complaint. To the believer—at least to many believers—the silent assumption by the public school that religion in any meaningful sense is irrelevant to the educational process amounts to an official establishment of secular values.

2. Secularized schools and the ideal of a free education

Two of the greatest ideas underlying American democracy were born in the mid-19th century; they are the pledge of the State to give a free education to every child in an atmosphere not affected by a sectarian orientation. When these twin ideals emerged more than a century ago their fulfillment was relatively easy in a pan-Protestant nation. Today, however, in a religiously pluralistic society those ideals have become more difficult to realize because the nondenominational pan-Protestant environment of the common school has been largely displaced by a secularistic orientation. The tendency of the law from Everson to Engel has been to make mandatory the secularization of the public school without at the same time providing for a free education in a school without a secularistic orientation.

The denial of public funds to church-related schools means in effect that the ideal of a free education in an atmosphere apart from any officially fixed indoctrination has been compromised. The important thing here to prove, of course, is that there is a secularistic indoctrination which accompanies an education in the public school. This is the most important and the most difficult point of dispute in the entire controversy over public funds for private schools. But in a nation whose law knows no heresy and whose legal institutions support no orthodoxy how is it possible to reject the contention made by a substantial minority of citizens that the tax-supported school by its silent disregard of religion thereby promotes irreligion? This, of course, is the essence of the Catholic parent's case and no satisfactory answer seems to have been given.

It is uncertain what American law would say if tomorrow all the Catholics of the Nation withdrew all their children from the public schools because of their conviction that the secularistic orientation of these schools was destructive of the faith of their children. American courts could compel the children to return to the public schools or could give financing for schools consistent with the consciences of Catholics.

American law today confronts the situation where about half of all the Catholic children of the Nation have withdrawn from the public school because of a profound disagreement with the approach to education and to life which that institution has adopted. American society and American law do not seem concerned that these children who for compelling religious reasons have forfeited the education offered to them must be thereby deprived of their right to share in the commitment of the state to provide a free education for every future citizen.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It seems clear that many converging forces have precipitated the national debate about the advisability of parochial schools sharing in some part of Federal aid to education if such assistance is authorized by the Congress. The debate is filled with anomalies the most curious of which is the fact that no controversy exists at the State level over parochial schools since at that level the question was resolved in the last century when virtually all States enacted laws prohibiting the distribution of public funds to sectarian schools. In the Federal aid controversy Catholic spokesmen are in effect asserting that this policy embraced in the last century by the States is not a wise or fair one for the Federal Government to follow.

Cogent arguments exist to support the Catholic contention. Among them are the following:

1. The fully accredited private school has important public dimensions in that it carries out the secular goals of the State; because of this semipublic status conferred on the private school this institution has some claim to share in the public funds set aside by the State for the education of all of its future citizens.

2. Public welfare benefits surely include secular education and by the rulings in Cochran and Everson the benefits extended by the State to all citizens may not be denied to anyone, because of his religious faith or lack of it.

3. In the distribution of these public welfare benefits no Supreme Court opinion has held that the only constitutional formula is one which prevents even some incidental aid to religion. The Sunday law decisions in fact expressly hold that the state is not precluded from implementing its secular goals in a way which bestows some collateral benefits on religion.

4. In view of clear Supreme Court rulings precluding sectarian teaching and religious practices in public schools it can be persuasively argued that the granting of funds only to the public school is a violation of the establishment clause because such a policy endorses and prefers one educational and philosophical orthodoxy over all others. This is the very essence of the Catholic case.

It seems fair to conclude that neither the Congress nor the Supreme Court of the United States have confronted the claim which is being made by parents who are dissenters from the orthodoxy which the public school represents. No quotation seems more appropriate to express their sentiments and to affirm the spirit with which the entire controversy over church-related schools should be discussed than the ringing words of Mr. Justice Jackson in the *Barnette* decision:

"If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

CAPTIVE UKRAINE, COSSACKIA AND A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the past month the editors of the Washington Star performed a most valuable public service by publishing an article and several letters dealing with the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. They deserve our highest praise, and I for one congratulate them on their contribution to public enlightenment in our Nation's Capital on a subject of most fundamental importance to our national security and to our chances for victory in the cold war. I presume, however, that our State Department's goal is a victory in the cold war.

NEED FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The material published in the Star points up more than anything else the undeniable need for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. Unlike the haphazard perfunctory, and careless hearings and reports of a subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee last year, such a special committee would seriously address itself to the captive nations issue, with particular stress on captive Ukraine, Cossackia, Byelorussia, and all other captive non-Russian nations and peoples in the Soviet Union. The Star has helped immensely in showing how important it is for our citizens to know about these captive nations in the very front yard of Moscow's vast colonial empire.

Mr. Speaker, despite the broad, popular demand for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, the 87th Congress failed to establish this necessary committee in the House. The several maneuvers used to sidetrack this vital issue have by no means discouraged our citizenry to see such an indispensable committee created. We look forward to the creation of this committee in the 88th Congress. Periodically, more evidence will be furnished as to why this special committee is desperately needed for our people and our country in the struggle against Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism. For the moment, the published material in the Star should stimulate the interest and concern of every Member in this Chamber.

THE WASHINGTON STAR CONTRIBUTION

Mr. Speaker, I request that at the conclusion of my remarks the following material, making up the Washington Star contribution, be printed for the interest of our Members in the RECORD: First, the eloquent article on "The Ukraine and You," by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, in the Sunday Star, January 27, 1963; second, the two letters on "The Ukraine and You" in the Sunday Star, February 3, 1963; third, two letters "'The Ukraine and You' Plus Some Others" attacking Dr. Harris and also Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, in the Evening Star, February 6; fourth, a letter, "Knows the Ukraine," in the Sunday Star, February 10; fifth, the full text of the reply by Dr. Dobriansky, which for want of space was published almost in its entirety under the caption "Captive Ukraine and 'Holy Mother Russia' Complex" in the Evening Star, February 14; and sixth, the letter, "Cossackia," in the Sunday Star, February 17.

MOSCOW ATTACKS ROCKEFELLER AND OTHERS

In addition, highly pertinent to this Star material are the simultaneous attacks unleashed by Moscow against Governor Rockefeller and others in connection with our Ukrainian Independence Day celebrations in this country. It is evident that colonial Moscow seeks to conceal from the world the captive status of Ukraine and for that matter all the other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. With a Special Committee on the Captive Nations we could develop worldwide knowledge in showing the imperio-colonial system that exists in the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Speaker, as an example of the Moscow and puppet attacks against our leaders, I request that the January 23 Associated Press release be printed in the RECORD, followed by a report on "Violent Soviet Reaction to Ukraine's Independence Celebration," which appeared on February 21 in Amerika, a leading Ukrainian and English language daily in this country:

THE UKRAINE AND YOU

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

The independence of the Ukraine, now a non-Russian captive nation, was proclaimed on January 22, 1918. On the 45th anniversary of that light which failed until truth crushed to earth shall rise again, the cause of that dauntless people, yearning to breathe free, was lifted up to the God of justice in the prayer, offered by a representative of the Ukrainian Church, which opened the U.S. Senate. To the petitions there offered for fetters to be broken there echoed the fervent "amen" of over 2 million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry.

To a recently held congress of these fine citizens of this free land came felicitations from 33 State Governors, 40 U.S. Senators, and 140 Members of the House, where a vital bill for a permanent captive nations committee is now pending. In this convention the voice of the Governor of New York was also heard as he cried out, "We protest with you against the Soviet persecution of millions for their Jewish faith. We deplore the Red oppression of the Ukrainian Catholic and Ukrainian Orthodox Churches. This convention is a sobering reminder to all the world that the cold war at many times and places is not cold at all—it cost the lives of men like Lev Rebet and Stepan Bandera, two Soviet-murdered Ukrainian underground leaders." To this council there was added a ringing salute from President Kennedy, declaring that the just aspirations and rights of all people to choose their own rulers "is and will remain a basic goal of U.S. world policy."

Now what is the truth regarding the Ukraine—a territory a little larger than Texas? This fair land, with its face always toward the West, richly endowed with natural resources, with a favorable climate conducive to the raising of various crops, has long been called the granary of Europe. It is now the breadbasket and the sugar bowl of the U.S.S.R. But the salient historic fact is that the Ukrainian people are not Russian and their country has never belonged to Russia except by physical force. A thousand years ago their culture and commerce were at high levels but always these fiercely independent-minded people had to fight predatory neighbors. In 1709 Czar Peter I, by his military might, annexed the Ukraine as a conquered province. The long years that followed are valiant with the struggle to gain freedom. When at long last the 1917 Bolshevik revolution pulverized the sovereignty of the Czar, a new day of glorious emancipation seemed to gild the long darkened sky. In the ancient city of Kiev, as bells of freedom rang out, the Independent National Republic was proclaimed.

But, that proved to be but a fleeting dream. The rapacious arms of Soviet aggression, using their familiar upside down jargon, called the Kremlin manipulated regime they imposed "The Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic." It was the anniversary of the Ukrainian vow to be free which was observed in the Senate of the United States. The 2 score years plus 5 which have passed since that January 22d are written in crimson letters of heartless cruelty. The blood of a martyred host cries from the ravaged ground. It is a record of imposed famine, genocide, deportation, torture, and liquidation. In spite of these fiery trials the population of the Ukraine is presently over 40 million.

Religious leaders have suffered persecution matching that of the early church. Thousands of Christian churches and chapels have been desecrated. Over 200 literary Ukrainian men and women have paid with their lives because they scorned to dip their pen in the venom of the Communist line.

To this day a saintly archbishop, Metropolitan Slipy, languishes in barren, cold Siberian dungeons sentenced to degrading servitude. He has spent 17 of his 71 years in that blasphemous captivity because he has refused to bow the knee to a pagan Baal in the image of a subservient church hierarchy in his homeland.

The voice of a Ukrainian poet of a hundred years ago, who died during Lincoln's first year in the White House, yet speaketh. His name, Taras Shevchenko. His message is about to be amplified to all Americans, as well as loyal Ukrainians, and we might add, to the Russians too. To honor him the American Congress has authorized the erection of a statue which will be a perpetual prayer in stone. That sculptured form is now being fashioned and will be erected near the Capitol in Washington. Listen to the prophetic song of Shevchenko ringing clear across a hundred years:

> It makes a great difference to me
> That evil folk and wicked men
> Attack our Ukraine once so free
> And rob and plunder it at will.
> That makes a great difference to me.

In 1963 that is still the sad story of the Ukraine, and, it makes a great difference to this sweet land of liberty.

In the pathos of Shevchenko's lines is mirrored the plight of all the other captive nations, including Latvia, Lithuanian, Hungary, Rumania, and now Cuba, and all the rest, held in the grip of Soviet colonialism. That makes a difference, a great difference, to the United States of America.

There is a silence that is not golden but craven concerning captive nations. In a world that cannot permanently remain half slave and half free, calloused indifference as the policy of any so-called democracy not only dooms the captives now in foreign fetters but also passes the sentence of ultimate death upon its own freedom. Yes, it makes a great difference to you and the Ukraine—and to the whole world of tomorrow.

The Ukraine and You

The article by Dr. Harris on "The Ukraine and You" is one of the most magnificent pieces I've ever read. As a student of East European history, I heartily congratulate Dr. Harris for his excellent grasp of this vital subject and thank him for the public service he has been performing through his instructive column, "Spires of the Spirit."

In the real struggle against Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism, Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. constitute our most formidable weapon in the cold war. Unfortunately, this fact is not sufficiently understood in the highest quarters of our Government. I strongly suggest that copies of Dr. Harris' article be sent to the White House, the Secretary of State, Mr. Rostow, and Senator Fulbright. There is enough documentary proof to show the deficient understanding each of these has displayed with regard to the makeup of the U.S.S.R. Dr. Harris' brilliant article might inspire them to undertake some serious research on the majority of non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

Mary Kusy.

So little is known in this country about Ukraine, and so often is it appendaged to Russia, that every truthful bit of information on the subject is welcome. And Dr. Harris' fine feature is not only truthful, but also bursting with deep sympathy and friendliness toward the hapless Ukrainian people—one of the first victims of Russian Communist imperialism and one of the greatest martyrs in the history of mankind.

G. D. Corbett.

"The Ukraine and You" Plus Some Others

The recent article, "The Ukraine and You," by Dr. Frederick B. Harris, repeats some shocking misinformation about the Ukraine.

It should be remembered that: (1) The population of the Ukraine had never voted concerning separation from Russia; (2) a handful of separatists which proclaimed the separation of the Ukraine from Russia 45 years ago was not supported by the people and fled to get help from the German Army; (3) the present leaders of emigre Ukrainian separatists have no formal or moral right to speak in the name of the population of the Ukraine.

The above points were made by Andrey A. Diky in the January 19, 1963, issue of the New York anti-Soviet Russian language daily Novoye Russkoye Slovo. I know that they are true and I, therefore, indorse them.

The greatest guilt of the Ukrainian separatist emigres however is that their leader, Lev Dobriansky, so thoroughly misinformed the U.S. Congress that the so-called Captive Nations U.S. Public Law 86–9C even includes several mythical "nations," such as "Cossackia." This makes an aggressive farce out of the present congressional approach to the captive nations question, in spite of the glowing references to it by Dr. Harris. (According to the Congressional Record, Dobriansky claims that it was he who substantially provided and wrote the clauses in addition to the basic ideas of that law.)

Fifteen permanent tenure and emeriti professors of 12 American universities have joined me in a published statement which condemns the present form of that law and calls for its repeal since it aims at the complete dismemberment of Russian territories.

To expose the hoaxes of the "Captive Nations" law, I hereby formally offer to pay $1,000 to the first person who will be able to prove to a properly constituted arbitration commission of American historians that there ever was a nation called Cossackia the national independence of which—according to the U.S. Public Law 86–90—was subjugated by the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia."

This particular clearcut point is easiest for me to deal with since I am a former Don Cossack officer who had fought the Reds in south Russia so that I know that there was no Cossackia in existence then or later.

As an American citizen for over 20 years I cannot remain indifferent when Dr. Harris succumbs to the false propaganda of people whom I have dubbed the merchants of hate. In these days of menacing nuclear holocaust such things should be of the gravest concern to every American.

Gregory P. Tschebotarioff,
Professor of Civil Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

After reading Dr. Frederick Brown Harris' sermon on freedom abstract and freedom specifically for the Ukrainians, I have found the answer to why the men of the cloth have so little effect in the councils of men despite their moral posture.

To carry influence, eloquence is one of the more superficial requisites; many more important is a cleavage to the truth and the avoidance of that opportunistic bias lightly mistaken for patriotism.

Indeed, Dr. Harris, what are the facts about the Ukraine? First of all the Ukrainians are related to the Russians by race, religion, common cultural heritage, and even common enemies. In his statement about the Ukrainians fighting for their freedom from predatory neighbors for 1,000 years he avoids mentioning that those predators were not the Russians, but the Tatars, Turks, Lithuanians, and Poles. This is a neat bit of semantics for the gist of the article leads the reader to the desired wrong assumption.

It is a matter of historic record that the Ukrainians under Ataman Bogdan Khmelnitsky, in 1653, 30 odd years before Peter the Great was born, when the ravages of their neighbors were becoming too great to bear alone, voted to be under the eastern Czar who was like them, "of the same race and Orthodox religion." It was the time of the Cossacks' fight for survival against rapacious Poland, whose troops were absolved by the Holy Father in Rome of all sins in their aggression against the schismatics.

True, at the time of the battle of Poltava, Peter the Great's erstwhile friend, the Hetman Mazeppa, betrayed him and went over to the Swedes. But, the majority of Ukrainians were loyal and thus Charles XII, one of the long line of would-be conquerors of barbaric, but rich, Russia, was utterly defeated and fled ignominiously to the fat pasha in the Divine Porte.

Later czars and czarinas pushed the Poles back to Poland proper. (This process was completed after World War II with the Soviet's addition of the Carpathians, the Galicians and the Bukovenians to the Ukraine—not to mention the millions of Ukrainians who were in prewar Poland.) The wicked czars continued the battles of the cossacks and pushed, first the Crimean Tartars and then the Turks beyond the northern shores of the Black Sea. Thus all the Dnieper and the Crimea became a part of the great Ukraine one sees carved, way beforehand, by the assorted emigres and their not disinterested backers.

A little scholarly reading of history, instead of satisfying perusals of sensational Jesuit, German (Kaisern or Nazi) and other poop-sheets will show why—despite all the differences real and imagined, between these two closely related peoples, neither the Roman Catholic Church, Poland, Turkey, the Swedes, Napoleon, the Kaiser, or Hitler, have ever been able to sunder the Union.

And now as a contrast let's look at our little glass house. How, good Doctor, was the Confederacy kept in our Union? Did we allow the ballot box or the will of a dissident people to rule supreme in their desire to go their own way? Didn't we use the overwhelming wealth and power of the North to destroy this aspiration and to fasten a rigid military dictatorship over the conquered provinces? What happened to that pure American type freedom we had preached to all the wicked world of centralized governments? We found that we, too, could not afford that objective freedom, for there were too many practical considerations, sometime called Manifest Destiny, but all ending in the inviolability of the sacred Union.

Russell Forrest.

Knows the Ukraine

Being of Ukrainian descent, I resent letters criticizing the Ukraine article by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris. He has given the true picture of the situation. I know, because my parents came to America from the Ukraine and they speak of their homeland as a beautiful, fertile country taken over by the Russians. I also resent being classed with the Russians. The Ukrainian people are an entirely different people, with customs all their own. They are, as a whole, gentle, peace-loving Catholics, as compared to the fiery, aggressive Russians.

Olga B. Roylance.

Captive Ukraine and Holy Mother Russia Complex

To the Editor of the Evening Star:

Since my name was injected into an issue of crucial importance to our foreign policy and national security, I trust you will afford me the opportunity of replying in full text to the Tschebotarioff and Forrest letters. Not only does Dr. Harris have my warmest congratulations on his recent masterpiece "The Ukraine and You," but also my compliments go to the Star's editors for bringing to public view these two excellent examples of calculated disinformation and apology for traditional Russian imperialism, both Czarist and Soviet.

Considering the Tschebotarioff letter first, it was most intriguing for me to learn that allegedly I have the honor of leading "Ukrainian separatist emigres." If with some respect for truth the writer had checked biographical sources, such as "Who's Who in America," he would have found this to be an impossible characterization. I have never led any such group, nor could I, by virtue of birth, loyalty, and thorough American training. This low level of credibility features both letters.

As the record plainly shows, my scholarly and educational endeavors have been directed at a comprehensive understanding by our people of the Soviet Russian imperiocolonial system that prevails in the U.S.S.R. By all evidence this system is the most vulnerable sector in the expanded empire of Moscow. The persistent struggle for independence and freedom by all the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. against the one remaining imperialist system in the world is of the same spirit and substance as our own American Revolution. Once we understand and appreciate this fundamental truth, tremendous opportunities for our victory in the cold war will be open to us. Glimmers of such opportunities have already appeared in the U.N. debates on Soviet Russian colonialism, Congress passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution, the Captive Nations Week observances, and many other events. Moscow's reactions have been most defensive and fearful.

The interesting aspect of my endeavors has been the discovery that a common denominator of an imperialist "Holy Mother Russia" complex exists between Soviet Russian

propagandists and numerous Russian and Russianized emigres and their unknowing friends who, despite the privileges of American citizenship, would misguide us in not exploring this whole new non-Russian dimension in the U.S.S.R. Every argument and position taken in these two letters exemplifies this; even the terms are meaningful. For example, the term, "Ukrainian separatist emigre" is a favorite Russian usage applied to Ukrainian patriots, and as shown just last October in the Stashynsky trial in West Germany, even the mighty Khrushchev had out of fear to order the assassination of two Ukrainian emigre leaders.

The fantasies about Ukraine not voting separation from Russia, a handful of separatists proclaiming independence, and Ukrainian emigres not having a moral right to speak in behalf of their captive homeland are also familiar Soviet Russian tunes. These typical Russianistic distortions of the histories of conquered nations are easily contradicted by the Ukrainian Congresses held in 1917, from which delegates were elected to form the independent Republic, the recognition by the Russian Council of People's Commissars in December 1917 of "the Ukrainian National Republic and its right to full separation from Russia," and after the rape of independent Ukraine and its forced incorporation into the U.S.S.R., the existence of article 17 in the U.S.S.R. Constitution, "The right freely to secede from the U.S.S.R. is reserved to every Union Republic."

A measure of commonsense on these Soviet Russian responses to the Ukrainian drive for independence should alone suggest that they weren't made in a vacuum but rather with an eye to the expressed popular will of the historic Ukrainian nation. If the reader is not familiar with this history, he can consult the compact bibliography on Ukraine and other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., published in the February 4 issue of the Congressional Record. From our American viewpoint in the cold war, we should press the present Russian imperio-colonialists to demonstrate under U.N. auspices the "free right" the Ukrainian people have to secede from the Union.

Another striking identity of position between the first letter and Soviet Russian propaganda is their opposition to the Captive Nations Week resolution. From the time I worked on this resolution with former Congressman Cretella of Connecticut in 1958 to the very present, it has been quite educational to see who and what groups in this country have lined up with Khrushchev in denouncing the resolution. Invariably, those bred in the Russian political environment and their few friends have supported the hands-off position on Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. Americans who for some time have understood this problem in our midst (e.g. James Bundy, Containment or Liberation? p. 236) have wondered on whose side these people will be when a showdown comes; and this includes the 15 professors cited in the first letter. Needless to say, we've had many other university professors in this country sympathetic to the various policies of imperial Moscow.

Finally, as concerns Cossackia, it doesn't surprise me that the first writer shows little appreciation of the national sinews binding the Cossack people. His outlook is so totalitarian Russian that he no longer recognizes his own ancestry. Such Russianized types have been the ripe products of systematic Russification both under the white and red czars. As Lenin once pointed out, they even out-Russianize the chauvinist Russians. However, since he resorted to the rather cheap pecuniary bravado of offering $1,000 to prove the points on Cossackia and since the Star publicized this, I suggest that in behalf of public enlightenment the Star arrange for the formation of a committee of competent scholars, here and abroad, to judge this. There are many intellectual Americans of Cossack ancestry who would be willing to oblige in showing the Cossack struggle against Russian domination and Cossackia's declaration of independence in 1918. In fact, if the engineer has any $1,000 bonuses to offer on Idel-Ural, Turkestan, and the non-Russian entities of North Caucasia, the editors could rest assured of an enthusiastic Moslem response. This would be one effective way of informing our people about the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., our allies in the cause of universal freedom.

As for the Forrest letter, its anticlerical tone and Russian version of Ukrainian history are enough to substantiate my several comments above. However, here, too, it is important to observe the selfsame arguments used by Moscow for free world consumption. Indeed, the writer almost competes with Khrushchev as a defender of the enforced union of Ukraine with Russia. His version of the actual military treaty between Khmelnitsky's Ukraine and Muscovy in 1654 is exactly the same version found in Tass' "Theses on the Tercentenary of the Reunion of the Ukraine with Russia—1654 to 1954." A military treaty is scarcely an organic union. Significantly, both fail to mention that after Moscow, in typical Russian fashion, broke the treaty and attempted to enslave Ukraine, the two were at war in 1659. The words of Hetman Vyhovsky, leading the Ukrainian forces then, are strikingly pertinent for our times: "The treacherous action of Moscow was apparent in preparing for us a slavery primarily by means of instigating a civil war in Ukraine."

The writer's comments on Mazeppa and the war against the Russian tyrant, Peter the Great, are also sheer fabrications which one often finds in Soviet Russian adulations of the empire-builder. Imagine, in this Nation dedicated to the freedom and independence of all nations, the writer has the gall also to extol Russia's tyrants for consolidating Ukraine's territories, which only meant the conquest of the entire nation as a springboard for further Russian expansionism. Lastly, his reference to the Confederacy as an analogy to the Russo-Ukrainian situation—which Moscow also employs from time to time—doesn't even make logical sense in the framework of his own argument. Ours was a nation divided; Ukraine and Russia are two distinct nations, the latter imprisoning the former in sacred union.

Isn't it significant that while Dr. Harris is being attacked for his American insights into the 45th anniversary of Ukraine's independence by the Russia-first cabal in this country, Moscow attacks Governor Rockefeller for his proclamation of the event (AP, January 23, Moscow)? The common denominator shows itself again. As we continue to flush out the exponents of the "Holy Mother Russia" complex—those who view Ukraine, Armenia, Georgia, etc., as "traditional parts of the Soviet Union" (e.g. Secretary Rusk's letter to Hon. Howard W. Smith, Aug. 22, 1961)—the ground will be set for the exposure of the worst imperiocolonial system in modern history, the Russian one in the U.S.S.R. itself. As he's demonstrated so often, Khrushchev has nightmares over this; we have a cold war to win with this.

Lev E. Dobriansky,
Georgetown University.

"Cossackia"

Yes, Professor Tschebotarioff, there was a Cossackia, a nation which consisted of the territory where you were born yourself, and which was populated by your own people, the Don Cossacks. In the Russian empire this territory was called "The region of the Don Host," and in the Soviet Union this region is now called "The Rostov on the Don region."

It was after the Russian Revolution of 1917 that the Don Cossacks proclaimed this territory and its people an independent nation. Its first president was Don Cossacks Gen. Bogayevsky African Petrovich. That was the nation, which was mentioned in the American Congress' resolution on the Captive Nations Week. Congress called it "Cossackia" because of the difficulties of pronunciation of the archaic name, Vsevelikoye Voisko Donskoye.

But I do not pretend to get the professor's money. I ask him to send $500 to the Jew's Home for the Old and $500 for the Ukrainian Home for Old Age. Perhaps there now are living there old men and women who in their youth were beaten by the long whips in which Don Cossacks officers used to delight.

Mrs. A. Sycynsky.

Moscow Attacks Governor Rockefeller for Proclaiming "Ukrainian Independence Day"

Moscow, January 23.—The news agency Tass reported today a "groundswell of indignation" among the working people of Ukraine over New York Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller's proclamation of a "Ukrainian Independence Day."

Tass quoted from letters of workers, one of whom denounced Rockefeller as a "capitalist who has waxed rich on the blood and sweat of millions."

Earlier this week the Governor proclaimed yesterday as "Ukrainian Independence Day," calling it a gesture of "our keen sympathies" with the Ukrainian people's hope for freedom.

Without saying how the people in Ukraine learned of the proclamation, Tass cited these reactions from among the "numerous letters" received from Ukrainians:

Piotr Stepanchuk, building worker, "hero of Socialist labor" and deputy of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet: "Look who is showing concern for us; Rockefeller, a capitalist who waxed rich on the blood and sweat of millions of people * * *. My people do not need aid from anybody * * * to our self-appointed benefactor from abroad I say, Don't butt your nose, Mr. Rockefeller, into our Soviet home."

Nikolai Tarnavsky, a writer who Tass said lived 49 years in the United States: "Don't make like simpletons. The people of the whole world are well aware that it is your famous America that lacks freedom. What goes on in your Southern States? The Ukrainian people freed themselves long ago, as far back as 1917, when they did away with the rule of the czars and such magnates as you."

Vasili Rubanik, chairman of a collective farm: "We do not want your freedom. We have no use for it. American correspondents who visited our collective farm last year expected to see dilapidated huts, but they saw spacious houses, they saw abundance instead of misery. You ask about this from Lauren Soth, the editor of the Des Moines (Iowa) Register-Tribune, and other newsmen. They could not understand how it was possible in such short time and after a devastating war to achieve such success."

Violent Soviet Reaction to Ukraine's Independence Celebrations

New York.—Observances of the 45th anniversary of Ukraine's independence by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America throughout the United States and especially the solemn observances in the U.S. Congress evoked violent reaction in the Soviet Union. Immediately after the proclamations of "Ukrainian Independence Day" were issued by American Governors and after prayers were delivered by Ukrainian clergymen in Congress, a number of Governors, especially Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, and other American officials, U.S. Senators were assailed by the Moscow radio for taking part in these observances. Subsequently, a series of articles, caricatures, verses, and other satiric and abusive reports appeared in the following Soviet organs in Moscow and Kiev: Izvestia (January 24, 1963), Pravda (January 23, 1963), Izvestia (January 25, 1963, and article by Lubomyr Dmyterko, member of the Ukrainian S.S.R. mission to the U.N. in New York), all of which were in the Russian language and printed in Moscow, and Radyanska Ukraina (January 24, 1963), Molod Ukrainy (January 26, 1963), and Robitnycha Hazeta (January 24, 1963), in the Ukrainian language in Kiev. Also Pravda Ukrainy, a Russian-language daily appearing in Kiev, on January 24, 1963, printed a vitriolic article against the observances of Ukrainian independence in the United States.

All these articles are replete with accusations of "American imperialism" and protestations that the Ukrainian people were "liberated" in December 1917 (reference to the establishment of a Soviet puppet regime in Kharkiv), and that the United States need not worry about the present position of the Ukrainian people.

QUOTA ALLOCATIONS FOR IMPORTATION OF RESIDUAL OIL

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Nygaard] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, last week I requested and received permission to insert in the Congressional Record a copy of a letter I had addressed to the Secretary of the Interior asking that the proposed new quota allocations for importation of residual oil be withheld until such time as interested Congressmen had had an opportunity to review them. I have not been notified of an announcement of these allocations, and I understand unofficially that conferences have been arranged between Department of the Interior officials and Members objecting to increases in import levels.

I find it hard to believe that the economic welfare of the U.S. workers could be deliberately sacrificed on the altar of foreign political expediency. Surely the administration cannot rate Venezuelans as more important than its own citizens. Yet if the President chooses to accept the recommendations contained in the Office of Emergency Planning report, that is what his action will signify.

Mr. McDermott's view that hemispheric solidarity—whatever that means—must be achieved at any cost, does not add up to sound thinking.

Does he think Venezuela would permit the United States to sell uncontrolled amounts of a waste product to it where this would compete unfairly with one of its industries and deprive Venezuelans of jobs? Of course it would not.

It is a strange foreign policy, indeed, where our Government is solicitous of and caters to the people of other nations to the detriment of U.S. citizens. Sure we know we are fighting communism in Latin America. But what guarantee do we have, no matter what we do, that Venezuela will not succumb to the techniques and ideas of this insidious Soviet philosophy?

We believe in a policy of imports and exports that operates in the interest of the people of the United States. What advantage do we obtain by favoring a nation of dubious importance and questionable stability at the expense of our own citizens? Self-interest is just good national commonsense. Could it be that commonsense has flown out the windows of the ivory towers in which the administration's economic and political pundits concoct their fanciful theories?

You may ask, Mr. President, why North Dakota way out in the Midwest is so seriously concerned with imports of residual oil into east coast markets. The answer is relatively simple. The dislocation or elimination of big coal markets on the east coast through inequitable oil competition has a marked effect on the economy of Midwestern States.

And that is not all. North Dakota is fighting for the right to develop a major industry for the State. While coal production in recent years has been only a few million tons, we have every reason to believe that this amount can be increased manyfold because of the way demand for coal is growing in the Midwest. Did you know that North Dakota has one of the largest reserves of coal in the country, a grand total of recoverable deposits of 175,359 million tons?

Since the location of oil there in 1951, North Dakota has developed into one of the important States in oil production. Because of the lack of oil markets at this time, the extent of our oilfields has not been fully explored, and the continuation of imports of residual oil has had a very depressing effect upon the American oil industry as a whole.

So of course we are concerned, profoundly concerned. We have high hopes of developing industries of considerable magnitude and importance to the State from our vast oil and lignite deposits. We do not want to see them wrecked on the shoals of increasing imports of foreign residual oil.

If more residual oil pours into the east coast, big coal and oil producing States will lose more and more business, more miners and oil workers will lose jobs, more mines and oilfields will close. The railroads will sustain severe revenue losses. Many other industries and trades will be gravely injured financially. And you had better believe that the economies of many States other than those on the east coast will feel serious repercussions.

Another way of saying "big imports of residual oil" is "big economic disaster for thousands of U.S. citizens."

The economic havoc which can be wrought by the residual oil import policy fostered by the OEP report, of course, represents only half the story. Mr. McDermott also failed to face up squarely to the sober facts of national security. His so-called hemispheric solidarity may be actually only a myth—an abstraction that can evaporate overnight. It is scant comfort when our national security is threatened, as it may well be.

You know as well as I that a communistic revolt could erupt in Venezuela overnight. Oil wells could be dynamited as they were once before. A situation could develop where Russian subs based in Cuba could disrupt oil supply lines with Venezuela.

One of the grave dangers of allowing more volumes of residual oil to flood into our east coast is that more and more defense plants will use it. Actually the only merit of residual oil is its dump price. It cannot be stockpiled—it has to be used up quickly. Consequently most companies using it would be without any fuel in a matter of days once shipments of it were cut off.

Few companies now have dual burning facilities, so they could not quickly convert to coal. Prolonged loss of markets by a shortsighted residual oil import policy also causes mines to shut down and coal production to diminish. The coal industry cannot operate on a standby basis. It could not be magically restored to production to meet the immense demands of an emergency. Our Nation might therefore suffer from economic strangulation for a considerable period when time was of the essence and it was imperative to produce war material fast.

No patriotic, clear-thinking American wants to gamble with this Nation's security through politically expedient foreign import policies. We cannot believe the President does, either.

The people of the State of North Dakota have a big stake in what would happen if residual oil imports are relaxed just as much as other coal producing States. We raise our voices, Mr. President, with utmost vehemence. We strongly protest any change in residual oil import controls. We urge this administration to reject the strange thinking of Mr. McDermott that the national security implications of the residual oil import program are irrelevant, that the economic welfare of the coal and related industries are inconsequential.

Strict controls on residual oil imports must be kept on for the security of our Nation and for the economic benefit of U.S. workers. Let us start using some commonsense. Let us solve our domestic problems first.

DR. WILLIAM S. MIDDLETON

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, during the period that I had the privilege of serving as Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, I came to know and admire a great man. This man, Dr. William S. Middleton, was Chief Medical Director of the VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery.

Citing his title tells you something of his position, but may actually be misleading about the man himself. For Dr. Middleton was no austere medical administrator, sitting in an office high above the arena of man's pain and suffering. The symbol of Dr. Middleton was never the plush chair and the big desk; rather, his most treasured possession, one always physically close to him, was the stethoscope he carried for the 43 years he served the University of Wisconsin Medical School, including 22 years as dean. Certainly during the time I was his associate in the Veterans' Administration, Dr. Middleton was never happier than when touring the wards of a veterans' hospital, combining his stethoscope, his magnificent brain, and his deep feeling for his fellow man in order to cure and to soothe.

On the first of March, after 8 years as Chief Medical Director, Dr. Middleton, now 73, retired. Behind him he leaves many friends, those who have known him, and those—perhaps never having heard his name—who have received better medical care as a result of his service.

Also retiring after 45 years of service to veterans is "Senator" Robinson E. "Bob" Adkins, who has been the principal administrative adviser and assistant to VA chief medical directors since October 1945.

Bob was a close friend and confidant of Dr. Middleton, the two making an admirable working team, particularly since they agreed 100 percent that VA medicine must not only continue its position in the first rank, but must never settle for less than a deep and genuine sympathy for each individual veteran, not as a patient or a case, but as a human being with a medical problem. That the Department of Medicine and Surgery has succeeded and is succeeding in this endeavor is, in large measure, due to Dr. William S. Middleton and Robinson E. Adkins.

INCOME TAX EXEMPTION

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, a year ago I introduced a bill which would provide an income tax exemption of an additional $1,000 to taxpayers with dependent students in institutions of higher education. The reasons which prompted me to introduce this legislation then are still extremely valid.

Even with Federal aid in the form of student loans, housing grants, and subsidies to scientific activity, our colleges and universities have been forced to raise their tuition fees in order to meet rising costs on a fixed endowment base.

It seems only reasonable, Mr. Speaker, to give some form of support to families who are making every financial sacrifice possible in order to give their children a fine higher education. Therefore, I am reintroducing this bill and I will continue to work for its passage as vigorously as I know how.

THE FRESH AIR OF COMPETITION

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Keith] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the good fortune to hear an address on the state of the economy by Dr. Charles F. Phillips, the distinguished president of Bates College. It was delivered to a meeting of the Life Underwriters Association of the District of Columbia, but deserves a much wider audience.

Dr. Phillips has a way of being very entertaining and down to earth, yet direct and incisive in his comments on the economic facts of life. I was so impressed with his remarks that I made arrangements to have the tape recording transcribed and edited for inclusion in the Congressional Record. I did so because I know that many of my colleagues have a high regard for Dr. Phillips and will want to read this very timely and pertinent speech.

With all the discussion today about economic stimulants, the controversy surrounding proposed tax measures, and the unhappy task we face in dealing with the largest peacetime budget in history, I sometimes think we often lose sight of the basic issues behind the more apparent economic problems. Dr. Phillips has not lost sight of the real issue and has placed it very ably into its proper perspective. He concludes that more than anything else, our economy needs a restoration of competition, and that this will not occur unless those of us who believe in the American system of a free economy get out and fight for the best solutions. I agree with Dr. Phillips and commend this excellent speech to the attention of my colleagues in Congress:

Speech of Dr. Charles F. Phillips, President of Bates College, Lewiston, Maine, January 23, 1963, in Washington, Before the District of Columbia Life Underwriters Association

Mr. President, Mr. Chairman, members, and guests of this association, ladies and gentlemen, I want you to know how pleasant it is to be here with you this afternoon, to leave the Bates campus down in the State of Maine, to fly here so comfortably, to meet with those of you who are members of this association and your many guests and to have this chance of chatting with you for just a few minutes.

And, of course, it is especially pleasant to be introduced by one of my own distinguished colleagues from the field of education and to have so many others from the field of education here.

And since this is such a pleasant occasion from my point of view, I want to be sure equally well that it's pleasant for you. And so let me tell you right at the beginning that I plan to follow my usual practice of not chatting for very long. You see, I think all speakers should follow the advice of that current advertisement for an electric washing machine. If you noticed it, it says, "After it spins dry, it automatically shuts itself off." [Laughter and applause.]

I don't know what agency prepared that, but I think it has very broad application [laughter] throughout many areas of American life so far as that's concerned.

Actually, though, I have another reason for chatting for a very short time today, and that's simply because I want to get back on the Bates campus. So many interesting and fascinating things have been happening there of late that I just don't want to be away any longer than I have to and miss them. For example, just to pick one, one night last spring—in fact, it was the night just before Colonel Glenn went into orbit, you remember—and a group of students, as students sometimes do, President Carroll, decided to explore a building which we were then putting up—nowhere near completed but the frame was up, and at the top—it was a science building—was a big dome; eventually, you know, it would have a track inside for the telescopes; the dome would open and the telescope would point up to the sky. And this group got in the building and went up to the top. The telescope wasn't there; the dome was and the track was there. Somehow they got this track to go around and around. It isn't supposed to now; its supposed to go just 180 degrees and come back, and it's never been quite right since [laughter] but they did. They opened the top and placed on the revolving track an American flag which they had with them, together with a great big sign on which they had written "Good Luck Glenn." And you know what bothered me, President Carroll? You knew they were college boys—they spelled Glenn, G-l-e-n. [Laughter.] Who else could do this? [Laughter.] In fact, I could even pick the nearby college from which they came. [Laughter and applause.]

When something like this happens I feel exactly like that little kindergarten teacher who had one of those terrible days in class, everything has gone wrong; all of her little angels have turned into hellions. And as she was leaving for home that night one of the other teachers heard her mutter to herself, "Tomorrow I'm going to find some quicksand for them to play in" [laughter].

I came here to Washington today because I want to take you on a little trip with me. I hope you find it an interesting trip; I think it will be somewhat unusual, because what I would like to do in these very few minutes together is take you on a little space flight with me. Actually, in the couple of minutes I've been standing here, this whole room has been picked up, we have jetted to Cape Canaveral, we've been on the launching pad, we've had our blast-off, and now we're soaring. But in contrast to most spaceships, we're not going to orbit around this earth; we are going to move at exactly the same speed as the earth so that in effect we place ourselves right up over the United States where we can take a bird's eye view of what's going on down here, but free from all the economic, social, and political pressures which surrounds us when we are on this earth.

And this particular spaceship has one wonderful gadget. It has a button which is right under my thumb, here, right on the podium, which if I push, backs us up just a little bit in time and then brings us forward ever so quickly to get a bird's-eye view of the last year.

I'm going to push it now and the next voice you're going to hear is that of the President of the United States a year ago, in January, when he was then giving his January message to Congress and his Economic Report was being read. And as we listen to him, we soon get the point that no President, ever in the history of the United States, gave such an optimistic forecast as did President Kennedy just a year ago: Gross national product 521 in 1961 would go up to 570 in 1962; labor was to gain by higher wages and a decrease in unemployment; stockholders would gain by a 23-percent increase in corporate profits; consumers would benefit from an increased output of goods and services at stable prices. And we would have all of this and a balanced budget, because while spending would go up about $3.5 billion, Government income would increase at a more rapid rate so we would end up the year with about a half-billion dollar surplus.

And as I push this gadget and we come along just a little bit in the year, we see in many ways the year is being a good year. Looking down we see some 67, 68, 69, to 70—depending on the time of the year—millions of people scurrying to work each morning against 2 or 3 million fewer people the previous year. Through our radio connections with the earth we hear cash registers ringing up new highs in retail sales; we hear the pound of hammers as home starts reach, not a new all-time high, but certainly the highest point in the previous 3 years.

But as I push this gadget and we come along a little bit more, we see that in a number of areas what's actually happening is falling substantially behind the forecast of the President. This gross national product which was to go from 521 to 570, gets around 550 and 554 and becomes very sticky. Unemployment, which was to go down month after month, reaches the 4 million range and then just hangs there. The index of production which was to go up month after month after month gets up to around 119 by midyear and then has a difficult job just to hold at that level.

In fact, some very disquieting signs develop, signs as disquieting as the experience of the man at the dentist's with a bad tooth. Said the dentist: "I'll have to pull it for you." "Oh, Doc, how much is it going to cost?" "Ten dollars." "Doc, isn't that an awful lot of money for 30 seconds' work?" "All right, I'll pull it for you more slowly, if you like." [Laughter.] This was disquieting.

And likewise it was disquieting by midyear to see a stock market tumble in 6 months about 25 percent, taking along with it some $94 billion of paper value. It was somewhat discouraging to see this market decline give rise in the minds of many people to a worry about recession, a worry which was accentuated by a steady rise in the rate of business failures.

Even more important, we discovered by midyear that we were plowing back into plant and equipment nowhere near as much as had been our normal custom. Ten years ago we were putting back each year about 6.6 of our gross national product into expanding plant and equipment, and this is the only way a competitive economy can grow—to plow back funds into plant and equipment. Ten years ago, about 6.6 percent; last year, about 4.9 percent. In other words, we spent too much of the year living off of our past capital; we were not being as realistic as the man living the life of Riley on the town. Finally, when he began to feel a bit run down, he went to the doctor, and the doctor took one look at him, put him down in a chair and began to give him a lecture about the way he was living.

"Doc," he said, "you stop right there. I didn't come here to have you tell me I was burning the candle at both ends; I came for more wax." [Laughter.]

We just didn't use enough reinvestment.

And then, of course, by midyear, it became perfectly clear to everyone that what was to be a surplus was rapidly turning into a deficit, which is now estimated at roughly $9 billion for the fiscal year. This deficit, in turn, has given rise to worry about the stability of the American dollar as gold has again begun to leave our country.

So here on our spaceship, Mr. Chairman, with this brief review behind us, we get together in a little huddle. We say, "Why has this happened?" On the surface, we have everything; we have fine managers, able workers, huge capital sums for investment; we have superb natural resources. Why are we growing at such a slow rate?

And the answer to this question—as seen from our spaceship, where we don't have to worry about all the pressures of events that force themselves upon us when we're down below—becomes perfectly clear the minute we ask ourselves another question: What is it that makes a competitive, private economy grow? What is the thing that encourages businessmen to take funds and reinvest them to expand their plant and equipment—literally, if you like, to create jobs?

The answer: the rate of profit. When the rate of profit is increasing and is deemed adequate, expansion takes place. When it starts going down, expansion slows up; and if it goes down rapidly enough, we go into a period of contraction.

The rate of profit is the same kind of incentive that one farmer found in the football. After painting it white, he took it out to the hen coop and dropped it in and said, "I want you gals to see what some of the ladies next door are doing." It's the same kind of incentive. [Laughter.]

But what has been happening to the rate of profit? No matter how you measure it—whether you put it in terms of percentage return on capital invested, in terms of percentage on manufacturer sales, or in terms of percentage of our total gross national product—any way you want to look at it—for 12 years it has, with minor inconsistencies, been running downhill. Twelve years ago manufacturers earning roughly 7.1 percent net, after taxes, per dollar of sales; currently they are earning about 4.3 percent.

So you ask yourself, sitting up in our spaceship, "Why did this happen?" And again it is perfectly clear. Profits are nothing but the difference between cost, including taxes, and prices and for the past 10 years we have been shrinking this margin. While the price level has gone up a bit, about 13 percent, costs have gone up much more. So year after year we have been shrinking the driving force of a competitive economy. We have been shrinking it (1) because of certain cost policies and practices which we have been following, (2) because of a 47 percent increase in average hourly earnings, and (3) because of a tax structure which today is the highest tax structure of any industrial nation of the world.

How do we get ourselves out of this situation? How do we restore the profit margin that makes Johnny run? Obviously, we cannot do it by raising prices. If we do, we will price ourselves out of the market, and we have already done a pretty good job of that. Therefore, if we want to restore our profit margin, it must be done by an all-out attack on the three factors I just mentioned which have affected our cost structure. So may I now turn to a few suggestions as to how we may get our cost structure under control.

Let me start with two illustrations of cost policies and practices which have worked to our own detriment.

First, our farm program. The basic problem, here, of course, is that we simply have too many people on our farms. When I was a youngster living on a farm it took one farmer to raise enough food to feed five people. By 1940 he could feed 10, today he can feed 20, tomorrow, meaning the middle of the next decade, he will be able to feed 40. A complete agricultural revolution has taken place and yet through Government support and loan programs we have encouraged people to remain on the farms where they continue to produce. These programs raise prices—and remember that higher prices to the farmer means higher costs to the businessmen. They also curtail our foreign markets. In addition, we end up with the Government owning some $8 to $10 billions in so-called surplus products on which the annual cost just for storage is in excess of a billion dollars. I tell you this makes no sense.

How do we get out of this jam? By bringing in the fresh air of competition. When you overproduce something you must let prices go down. Don't misunderstand me, I'm not suggesting that we bankrupt our farmers. But I am suggesting that we take our price-fixing program and turn it into an insurance program. Instead of saying, "We will hold prices at a certain level," we should say to the farmer, "We won't let any great catastrophe hit you in any one year." Consequently we will guarantee that prices will not fall more than 10 percent in any particular year, but they can fall several years in a row so pressure is exerted to move people out of this part of our economy.

As a second illustration, consider the practice of featherbedding, the tendency to hang onto jobs after the economic need for these jobs has gone by. We usually think of featherbedding as existing only on our railroads. We think of the firemen—originally put on a locomotive to shovel coal—still riding the electric or the diesel today where there are neither fires to stoke nor boilers to tend. Or we think of the engine crew with its payday based upon a 100-mile trip—which made sense when the average freight went 12½ miles per hour. But today, when this distance is covered in from 2 to 4 hours, it becomes a practice of featherbedding.

Actually featherbedding is rampant throughout industry. It exists in our textile mills with the setting of the number of looms that a man is allowed to handle. It exists in our building trade, where for many jobs that practically anyone can do, we still require skilled labor. It exists in our great air transportation industry. Today's jets, easier to fly, so my good friends, air pilots tell me, easier to fly than the giant props which they are replacing, and yet on many lines still today, crews of from three to four are required where two or three can do the job.

How do we get out of this situation? Again by bringing in the fresh air of competition. By making union membership voluntary so you can join if you want to or refuse to join. It is under such conditions competitive influence can be brought to bear to put an end to this type of featherbedding practice.

Turning to our wage structure, our basic job is to educate people that the policy we have been following for a number of years doesn't make sense. This is going to be terrifically difficult because the most widely accepted economic idea in the United States is that every increase in productivity must be followed by an equal increase in the average wage level. That is, the majority of our citizens believe that if the output per man-hour, which is what we mean by productivity, goes up by 2 percent in 1 year, wages should go up 2 percent; if it goes up 3 percent, wages should go up 3 percent. This idea is accepted by the present President of the United States and the one before him, which gets both political parties involved. It is deeply imbedded in many of our labor contracts. Fourteen years ago the General Motors Corp. signed its first automatic escalator clause contract with the United Auto Workers, which was based on the assumption that output per man-hour would go up 2 percent a year and, therefore, wages would go up 2 percent per year. This idea of an automatic escalator clause spread to the other automobile companies and then to

other industries and today one-third of all the labor contracts of the United States have in them automatic escalator clauses.

Despite the popularity of relating wages to productivity, I stand here in all sincerity to say to you that this idea is bad for our country, for labor, for you, and for your customers. Instead we should let this great increase in productivity reflect itself in gradually falling prices. Why do I say this? For two very simple reasons.

In the first place, if we let our increase in productivity be reflected in gradually falling prices we would raise the standard of living of everyone, not just those who are in the position to achieve higher wages. For example, during the past 20 years, the price of your private passenger car has gone up 300 percent. This means that anyone whose income, net after taxes, has not advanced 300 percent is less well off in terms of buying private passenger cars for transportation today than he was 20 years ago. Which of course means that thousands of Government employees, teachers, and retired individuals, just to select three groups at random, now have less in standard of living in this area than they had two decades ago. Whereas, had we let the tremendous increase in productive possibilities of our automobile industry be reflected in gradually falling prices, everyone would be better off—even if their wages had remained exactly as they were.

Secondly, I suggest that if we would let this increased productivity reflect itself in falling prices, we would protect, note "protect," our home markets. I don't have to say to a group like this, as knowledgeable as you are, how American manufacturers are being increasingly undercut pricewise even within our own country. A few years ago if you wanted to see any great number of foreign-made cars you had to get on a plane and go to the German autobahn, the streets of London or Paris, or to Italy's Amalfi Drive. Today you don't have to—you can see them on the highways and the byways of the United States anywhere you want to go. And what is happening in automobiles, is also happening in steel, with German cameras and typewriters, and with Japanese transistor radios and sewing machines. And the end is not yet. As I travel around the world and talk with my manufacturing friends of other nations, the one thing of which they are sure is that in the years ahead they will take over a greater share of the American market.

Now don't misunderstand me. I am not suggesting to you for one moment to go back to protectionism. Nor am I suggesting that we turn around and cut wages. And I am certainly not suggesting that labor should have no share in the growing productiveness of our economy. But I am saying that labor should share in our economy on the same basis as everyone else does, no more and no less. And the only way to distribute our gains equitably is to do it through gradually falling prices which raise the standard of living of everyone, protect markets at home, and expand markets throughout the world.

As for taxes, here we must start from two obvious facts. On the one hand, taxes retard production. On the other hand, no matter what we want to do, we've got to collect great amounts of taxes. Taxes retard production by taking funds that otherwise might be reinvested in plant and equipment. It takes about $14,000 in the United States to put a man to work—to buy the plant and equipment necessary to go along with his job. Every time we take $14,000 out of the hands of some private company, we make it less possible for that company to create that job. But taxes do something else; they decrease individual initiative. When we have a corporate tax of 52 percent and pile on top of that a personal income tax ranging from 20 to 91 percent, we stifle the degree of initiative, make people less venturesome. It becomes much safer to put money into tax-exempt securities, rather than in new enterprises. Yet, as I just stated, we cannot have a $94 billion budget like we have today without collecting great amounts of taxes.

What do we do when we face this kind of paradoxical situation? May I suggest that we do two very simple things. One, that we turn to those areas where we can make substantial reductions in our spending and start making those reductions. And when you have a total budget of $94 billion it is not difficult to find soft spots. The farm program, on which I have commented already, is costing us $5,800 million a year. Let us turn it into an insurance program with a maximum cost of $1 billion. Our foreign aid program, of which I have been a firm supporter and into which we have put some $63 billion since the end of World War II.

When we have cut spending—created a little elbow room—then I want to make another suggestion: a tax cut. Now I am not recommending an emergency tax cut. An emergency tax cut in which one does not know whether this will be in effect for 1 month, for 5 months, or for 5 years will not put a penny to work. What we need is a carefully thought out program in which we commit ourselves now, that over the next 10 years we will make a 1- to 2-percent gradual reduction each and every year to bring that 52 percent corporate tax down to 40 percent. We need a 4- to 6-percent reduction each year in the high personal income tax brackets to bring the 91 percent down to 50 percent over this period of time.

Will such a tax program unbalance our budget? It may. I don't lose too much sleep over that. I'd have been dead long ago, had I. We have operated on an unbalanced budget for 24 of the past 30 years. But a careful tax reduction program may not unbalance the budget. If annual reductions can be counted upon, this would spur our economy. This has happened before. Back in 1954, in the early days of the Eisenhower administration, taxes were cut by 7½ billion; yet 2 years later, because of the remarkable growth of the economy, at the lower rates we were collecting more in dollars than we were at the higher rates of 2 years before. Our economy needs this kind of stimulation. Its growth rate is too low, its unemployment rate is too high.

Now let's leave our spaceship. It has landed, the capsule has opened, we are walking around the United States. And all of a sudden we feel the pressures that we did not feel up in free space. We feel the social pressures, the economic pressures, the political pressure. Can we do the things we talked about while up in space? Can we put them into effect? Can we do these things necessary to stimulate the growth of our economy? Obviously we cannot do them in the clearcut fashion that I have just suggested. The farm vote is too strong to turn the farm program overnight into an insurance program; the strength of labor is too great to bring unions under our antitrust laws overnight. The desires for spending are too great to achieve quick reductions.

And so I am saying to you that if you are realistic, you won't look for all of these things to happen quickly. You won't look for the economy to take off as rapidly as it could if we were willing to do these things. Does this make you pessimistic? Do you react to it like the old cow munching in the field and, seeing a tank of milk going by with a sign, "Our milk is pasteurized, homogenized, standardized," turning to a neighboring muncher to say, "Doesn't that sign make you feel sort of inadequate?" Is that the way you react? Or do you come up fighting? Do you come up like the two babes walking down Broadway with a sailor following about 10 paces behind. After an hour of this, one of the babes turned to him and said, "Look, stupid, stop following us, or at least have enough gumption to go and find another sailor." Do you come up like that? We need to recognize whether you like it or not, that life is a compromise. It always has been. We have compromised with inflation since 1900 because basically, since 1900, we have had a rising price level. We have compromised with the devaluation of the dollar before—in the early days of the Roosevelt administration when we took the ounce of gold from $20.67 to $35. Yet despite all these compromises, the competitive economy has still given us a higher standard of living. It will do the same in the years ahead if all of us will make every effort to get the best possible compromise to restore the force of competition.

As a matter of fact, wherever in the world the power of competition is allowed to function, it results in higher living standards. If I could take you with me to Japan, to Hong Kong, to Thailand, and to the Malayan Peninsula, I would be showing you countries in which private enterprise is the basic factor—and these are all growing areas. In contrast, if I took you to the slow-growing areas, I'd be taking you to India, into Indonesia, and into Burma; areas in which government control and government operations are playing the dominant role. In brief, wherever you go in this world, a competitive system, even though under restraint, is still doing the best job. A competitive economy does something else: it helps to maintain freedoms which are important to you and me. The history of this world makes it clear that when people lose the right to select their own careers, to buy and sell in competitive markets, they also lose their freedom of speech, of assembly and of religion.

What am I saying to you today? With all the sincerity I can command, really five simple things. I'm saying to you in the first place that 1962, which began on such a note of optimism gave way as the months went by to a feeling of despair as the economy failed to grow as rapidly as you and I know it should. Second, that this is basically because of the slow growth of an economy which, in turn, is related to a gradual fall in the profit margin. Third, I have tried to suggest certain ways in which we could move to restore competition—give our economy the boost that it needs. Fourth, this won't happen at all unless enough people who believe in this kind of an economic system will get out each and every day of their lives and fight and work for the best possible compromises. Finally, I am saying to you, not only will a private economy produce the world's highest standard of living, but it is the only economy devised by man which gives any promise of preserving freedom—freedoms which are important to any people who maintain that among their unalienable rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

TRIBUTE TO LEWIS DESCHLER

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to join in the tribute that the House has paid to Lew Deschler on the occasion of his 35th anniversary as the Parliamentarian of the House.

Lew Deschler's highly professional contribution to the House of Representatives, his profound understanding of its workings, and his unfailing assistance to the Speaker and Members on all occasions has merited the deepest respect and appreciation of us all. The knowledge and experience which he constantly imparts to others is an insurance that our free institutions will continue to uphold the principles of a democracy under the rule of law.

I am especially grateful for the advice and help which Lew Deschler has so willingly given me and my staff during my service in this body. I wish him many continued years of service to the House and to our country.

BUDGET CUT

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Snyder] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said both on and off the floor of this House requesting that the minority suggest where the proposed budget might be substantially cut. Last Monday I tried to mention a few such instances. Today I would like for the House to have the benefit of an editorial appearing in the March issue of the Kentucky Farm Bureau wherein they requested that $1 billion be cut from the agriculture budget.

I commend this editorial to the Members of this House and to the members of the Appropriations Committee.

A Tax Cut Will Be Justified if Budget Is Balanced First

On January 17 President Kennedy presented his budget to Congress. The proposed expenditure budget of $98,802,000 is the largest since 1789. It tops that of World War II spending by $500 million. And it is $4,491 million above the current year's estimated level. Even with the tax revisions, it proposes to take more from the people than in any year since 1789, war or peace.

To add to the fiscal confusion and lack of consistency, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon in his appearance before the House Committee on Ways and Means on February 6 said that the administration will almost certainly ask for an increase of the debt limit from $308 billion to $320 billion.

Senators, Representatives, and Farm Bureau members across the country have expressed concern about increasing the national debt. Many are very much concerned about a reduction in taxes without a reduction in expenditures.

We all realize that dealing with the Federal budget is becoming increasingly difficult, and complicated. But we believe that Farm Bureau's approach to the problem is a sound and sensible one.

Farm Bureau is recommending a $11.8 billion reduction in expenditures which would produce a balanced budget and justify the consideration of a tax cut by Congress.

To show good faith and willingness to share in the general appropriations cut, Farm Bureau is recommending a reduction of $1 billion in the current level of expenditures for the Department of Agriculture and we believe it can be done if Farm Bureau's farm program is adopted.

Items included in the $1 billion agriculture reduction include: Elimination of emergency feed grain program—$800 million. Reduction of export subsidies on cotton—$62,500,000. Reduction of export subsidies on wheat—$360 million. Revised estimate of USDA figures for Public Law 480 (foreign trade aid program) based on more realistic estimates—$177,500,000.

Considering the reduced estimated cost of Farm Bureau cropland retirement program (20 million acres at $20 per acre for 1964 crop year) the estimated net saving from the budget request for fiscal year 1964 is $1 billion.

Farm Bureau is not recommending any cuts from the President's budget requests for such programs as Soil Conservation Service, Farmers Home, and REA lending authorization, and others.

Farm Bureau members have established this policy concerning Government spending and tax reduction:

"A high level of Government spending is inflationary even with a balanced budget. We cannot hope to prevent inflation if the Federal Government continually engages in deficit spending.

"The Government must exercise strict economy, eliminate duplication of effort, and promote efficient operations.

"Congress must take effective measures to manage and control Federal expenditures. The practice of authorizing expenditures from public debt transactions as a means of avoiding annual review by the Appropriations Committee should be discontinued.

"The continued growth of the American economy requires a sustained growth in savings and investment. Extreme graduation in income tax rates tends to discourage the incentive to save and invest. Economic growth and private control of the economy cannot be maintained if a continually increasing proportion of the national income is withdrawn from the economy through taxes.

"Tax programs should be designed to maintain our private competitive enterprise system and to bring about a fair and equitable distribution of the tax burden.

"We recognize the need for a substantial downward adjustment in Federal taxes to create a better climate for economic growth; however, the current budget deficit and our mounting national debt make it mandatory that a cut in Federal expenditures accompany any general reduction in taxes. We are opposed to tax cut proposals which would further unbalance the budget and add to our already excessive national debt.

"We recommend, therefore, that the Federal budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963 be reduced at least 10 percent below the current level in order to permit both a reduction in the deficit and a tax cut.

"We recognize that Federal expenditures for agriculture are contributing to the need for high taxes, and, as evidence of our willingness to share in the proposed reduction of Federal spending, we recommend that the budget of the U.S. Department of Agriculture for price support operations and payments be reduced by $1 billion, effective in fiscal 1964.

"We challenge all other groups who agree that a tax cut is desirable to make specific recommendations to Congress for comparable reductions in expenditures. We believe that the foreign aid program, for example, can be reduced by $1 billion—and improved in the process.

"We recognize the need for, and strongly favor, an adequate defense program; however, we believe that several billion dollars can be saved without impairing our defense posture by insisting that the military establishment provide a dollar's worth of defense for each dollar of expenditure."

The time has come we believe for the budget to be balanced. This is basic to sound government. Any plan for tax reduction must be based on this principle.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUDGET

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the bills which were recommended to the Congress by the President and by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to carry into effect the proposals which the President made to put the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia on a sound permanent basis. I am happy to say that I am joined in the sponsorship of these two bills by several of my colleagues on the Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson], the gentlemen from California [Mr. Cohelan and Mr. Sisk], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Diggs].

Mr. Speaker, on January 18, 1963, for the first time within my memory, a President transmitted to Congress a message accompanying the budget for the District of Columbia. President Kennedy did it because, as he said, the financial problems of the District have become so critical that they present a challenge to the National Government which must be met. While the District faces many problems, the basic one is a need for additional funds for many vital programs.

The existing authorizations for appropriations for the District of Columbia fall short by more than $33 million in meeting the needs which it must meet next year. These are vital, basic needs. The budget message from the President dramatically illustrated some of them—in the fields of education, of welfare and health, of public safety. We have been for too long unwilling to provide the District with the tools which it needs in education. For example, good teachers, adequate school buildings with adequate textbooks and other materials.

We cannot say that we have done what we can to provide a capital city worthy of the greatest nation on earth when we countenance thousands of children in split sessions, for lack of classroom space; hundreds of children on the waiting list for kindergarten, because of lack of both space and teachers; textbooks which are woefully out of date; to say nothing of inadequate counselors, special classes, and the like.

But what must be realized is that even this inadequate level of support—which is just as bad in the fields of health, welfare, recreation, and others—will further deteriorate unless additional authorizations are provided. The population of the District has declined, but the population in need of services—the young, school-age group, and the aged, over-65 group—is increasing, and increasing rapidly.

To add to the problem, the Congress was recently compelled to increase wage rates for District employees, as well as all Federal employees. This alone cost the District more than $13 million.

We could, of course, grapple only with the problem of fiscal 1964. In the President's budget message, however, he proposed what I believe to be a far better solution, and one which will relieve the Congress of the need to consider the adequacy of authorizations for at least the rest of the decade. He proposes, in short, that the Federal payment to the District be made equitable by a formula which would authorize the appropriation of just what the Federal Government would pay in District taxes if it were a taxable business rather than a government. Under such a formula, while the overwhelming proportion of the funds for the District would continue to be derived from the businesses and individuals who now pay taxes to the District, the District's biggest "business," its biggest landholder and employer, would contribute its equitable share.

The President's proposed solution to the District's financial problems also included additional, and in some cases higher local taxes, to produce $11 or $12 million annually. The Commissioners, after a hearing, have proposed and presented a tax package to accomplish this part of the solution. This package is included in the bills introduced today. It is wholly appropriate that the taxpayers of the District contribute a portion of the additional funds which the District so sorely needs.

Finally, the President proposes an increase in the authority of the District to borrow money for capital improvements for schools, health centers, libraries, firehouses, and all the rest except highways and sewers, which are separately funded. Again, rather than authorization to meet only immediate needs, the budget message proposes a long-range solution—that the limit on borrowing be, as it is in most States, a percentage of the taxable property in the District reflecting the District's ability to repay.

The present authorization of $75 million has been committed. The bills which we have introduced would increase the figure to 6 percent of the tax base, or about $225 million. Unless the District is to stop, almost entirely, its capital works program, this additional borrowing authority is essential.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has the opportunity to redeem some of the inadequacies which blight many parts of our Capital. We do not cure them with money alone, but neither can we cure them without it.

The Appropriations Committees in both this House and the Senate will insure that the funds which the Congress authorizes will be spent properly, and in the most effective way.

I believe the President has presented this Congress with an opportunity, as well as a challenge. I sincerely hope that the proposals which he has presented will be given the fullest consideration by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROTECTION OF NATION'S ANTHRACITE COAL RESOURCES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I reintroduced my bill which has the twin purpose of protecting the Nation's vital anthracite coal resources and preventing pollution of Pennsylvania streams.

Specifically, this measure would further permit the use of Federal and State of Pennsylvania funds authorized under the Federal Mine Dewatering Act of 1955, which I sponsored, for a percentage of the cost of the operation and maintenance of pumps in mines.

This proposed bill is a companion measure to the act authorized in last year's Congress which provided for the control and drainage of water in the anthracite coal formations by sealing and filling abandoned coal mines.

No new appropriations are requested of Congress in the bill I have introduced today. Both this bill and the one enacted last year are intended to implement the Federal Mine Dewatering Act of 1955, also known as the Mine Drainage Act, for which appropriations have already been made.

Under the 1955 act, the Federal Government appropriated $8.5 million, which was equally matched by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, for the purchase and installation of pumps and other necessary machinery for the pumping of water from the mines.

Mr. Speaker, because of the sharp decline in the anthracite industry, and particularly because of the disastrous floods of 1959 which broke into many of the mine operations, a great many anthracite mines have been abandoned. As a result, there is no one to operate and maintain the pumps in these abandoned mines, and the overflow endangers operating mines.

At the time the Mine Sealing Act was passed last year there was $10 million left in the fund, of which half, of course, were Federal funds. Last year's legislation reserved $1.5 million for water pumping and a Commonwealth of Pennsylvania companion measure reserved $2 million of State funds for the same purpose.

In addition to those interested in protecting this vital national resource, the sportsmen and conservationists of Pennsylvania should welcome this legislation as a further protection against acid water pollution of Pennsylvania streams.

The operating anthracite coal companies are presently pumping water from their mines under controlled conditions imposed by the State health department. Unless they are continuously pumped out, the water levels would eventually reach the point where the overflow would seep into the rivers and streams downstate with wholesale acid water pollution.

Mr. Speaker, the anthracite coal industry cannot bear the full costs of water pumping caused by conditions in abandoned mines beyond their control and still be able to sell coal at prices which will keep them in business.

Unless steps such as called for in this legislation are taken we can drive the remaining anthracite industry out of business. If that happens, the uncontrolled acid water seepage will cause a water pollution problem in Pennsylvania streams the likes of which have never been seen before.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight Friday night to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. Thompson of Texas), leave of absence was granted to Mr. Teague of Texas for Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, March 6, 7, and 8, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 13. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain land situated in the State of Arkansas to the city of Fayetteville, Ark.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 345. An act to provide for the approval of a payment in lieu of taxes to be made for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, by the Hawaii Housing Authority to the city and county of Honolulu; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FASCELL, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. MACGREGOR, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BOW, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, for 10 minutes, today.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, for 30 minutes tomorrow, March 7, 1963.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, for 10 minutes, today and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. HECHLER, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow, Thursday, March 7. 1963.

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 60 minutes, on March 7, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FINDLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SIBAL.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ST. ONGE in two instances.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. BURKHALTER.

Mr. POOL.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 7, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

512. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of two proposed bills as follows: (1) "A bill to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers, and for other purposes"; and (2) "A bill to provide for strengthening and improving the national transportation system, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

513. A letter from the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and Disability Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting the 23d Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to section 201(c) of the Social Security Act, as amended (H. Doc. No. 80); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

514. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, relative to reporting a violation of an overobligation of the amount permitted by agency regulations issued pursuant to the following legislation pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 665 (1)(2); to the Committee on Appropriations.

515. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the rejection of the low bid on procurement of AN/GRC–19 radio sets by the U.S. Army Electronics Materiel Agency, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

516. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for inspection, maintenance and repair of fixed equipment in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

517. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

518. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

519. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the 49th Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the year 1962, pursuant to section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 228. Resolution to provide funds for the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 179; with an amendment (Rept. No. 58). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2438. A bill to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 59). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 225. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to employ two additional employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 60). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 254. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 103; without amendment (Rept. No. 61). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2440. A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 62). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 200. A bill to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 63). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 211. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans; without amendment (Rept. No. 64). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 220. A bill to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan; without amendment (Rept. No. 65). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 228. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of directors and chiefs of staff of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers; with amendment (Rept. No. 66). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 242. A bill to amend section 1820 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 67). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 243. A bill to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein; without amendment (Rept. No. 68). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans Affairs. H.R. 248. A bill to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain blind veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of a lower extremity; without amendment (Rept. No. 69). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 249. A bill to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans; with amendment (Rept. No. 70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary: H.R. 1048. A bill providing for the design of the flag of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 71). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2837. A bill to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311); without amendment (Rept. No. 72). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4374. A bill to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 57). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 4511. A bill to amend titles I and XVI of the Social Security Act to permit the administration of medical assistance for the aged under an approved State plan by or under the supervision of a State agency separate from the State agency administering the rest of the plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 4512. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 4513. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that under certain conditions the profit from the sale of a home shall not be considered as income; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROMWELL:

H.R. 4514. A bill to authorize wartime benefits under certain circumstances for peacetime veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4515. A bill to amend section 602 of title 18, United States Code, to make it a crime for certain persons, for political purposes, to divulge information relating to lists or names of persons employed by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4516. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to make its provisions applicable to agriculture; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4517. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States to improve educational opportunities for migrant agricultural employees and their children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4518. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain improved, voluntary methods of recruiting, training, transporting, and distributing agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4519. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Council to be known as the "National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4520. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4521. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938, as amended, to provide for minimum wages for certain persons employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4522. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a program to assist farmers in providing adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4523. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 4524. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4525. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, with respect to the contributions made by Government toward health benefit protection for employees and annuitants and members of their families; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4526. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4527. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the Battle of Bushy Run; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4528. A bill to revitalize the cotton growing and cotton manufacturing industry and to reduce Federal expenditures for price support operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4529. A bill to revitalize the cotton growing and cotton manufacturing industry and to reduce Government expenditures for price support and other subsidy operations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4530. A bill granting to persons in the classified (competitive) civil service the right to a hearing before removal or suspension, and the right to a judicial review of a removal or suspension; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4531. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1955, relating to the conservation of anthracite coal resources, to remove certain restrictions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4532. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 4533. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prohibit the prescribing or administering of certain prescription drugs without first informing the patient, or his representatives, that death could result from the use of such drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4534. A bill to authorize mortgage insurance and loans to help finance the cost of constructing and equipping facilities for the group practice of medicine and dentistry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HORAN (by request):

H.R. 4535. A bill to authorize a per capita distribution of $350 from funds arising from judgments in favor of any of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H.R. 4536. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 4537. A bill to assist the several States in establishing hospital facilities and programs of posthospital aftercare for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4538. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs, or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4539. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition paid by him for the education of a dependent child at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORTON:

H.R. 4540. A bill to provide for reimbursement of toll charges necessarily incurred by Federal jurors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 4541. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 4542. A bill to prohibit the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4543. A bill to increase to 15 percent the night differential of postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4544. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in 1965 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 4545. A bill to amend section 356 of title 38, United States Code, to provide a permanent rating of 50 percent disability for veterans who have suffered from active tuberculosis for 10 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H.R. 4546. A bill to amend section 2(d) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit the payment of annuities to retired railroad workers whether or not they render service to the last person (other than a railroad) by whom employed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 4547. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of certain contributions to nonprofit medical research organizations and to provide exemptions from certain excise taxes for such organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 4548. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4549. A bill to amend section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 4550. A bill to establish in the Department of the Interior a Gold Procurement and Sales Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITENER:

H.R. 4551. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4552. A bill to establish a program for the Government purchase and resale of domestically produced, newly mined processed mica and mica ore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4553. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 4554. A bill to permit certain employees of a State or political subdivision thereof to elect coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, as self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 4555. A bill to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87–346, relating to dual rate contracts; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4556. A bill to amend section 883 of title 46, United States Code; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4557. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4558. A bill to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 4559. A bill to amend section 104 (b)(3) of title 23, United States Code, relating to the apportionment of funds for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and Federal-aid secondary systems within urban areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 4560. A bill to amend chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period within which certain ministers, members of religious orders, and Christian Science practitioners may elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 4561. A bill to improve intergovernmental relations and Government operations by assisting the States to carry out on a continuing basis inservice training programs for officers and employees of State and local governments with a view to increasing efficiency and economy in the operations of State and local governments, including the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the possessions of the United States, and encouraging the highest standards of performance in the transaction of the public business; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 4562. A bill to provide for a program of weather modification to be carried out by the Secretary of the Interior, acting in cooperation with the National Science Foundation, to increase substantially the annual average of usable supply of water available in the Colorado River drainage basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 4563. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4564. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to authorize payment of old-age insurance benefits to all individuals who have attained age 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4565. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit for amounts paid for tuition or fees to institutions of higher education or for occupational training or retraining, to allow a credit for taxes paid for public education, and to exempt from income tax certain scholarships, fellowships, and student assistantships; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 4566. A bill to appropriate funds to initiate preconstruction planning of improvements to Wilmington Harbor, N.C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 4567. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code (Copyrights), to permit a further extension of copyrights for a 15-year period and to provide that one-half of the royalties received during that period shall be used to assist promising young composers and authors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 4568. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4569. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption of $1,000 for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4570. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 4571. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic petroleum-based detergents manufactured in the United States or imported into the United States comply with certain standards of decomposability; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 4572. A bill to establish penalties for the operation of a motor vehicle between States by a person while his motor vehicle operator's license is suspended or revoked; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 4573. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4574. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4575. A bill to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4576. A bill to establish a new program of loans to be made from a revolving fund by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to assist in the provision and rehabilitation of housing for middle-income families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4577. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to prohibit the construction of luxury housing in the redevelopment of urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4578. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to require the establishment of more effective procedures for the relocation of individuals, families, and business concerns from the area of urban renewal projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4579. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide more adequate relocation payments for individuals, families, and business concerns displaced from urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4580. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that individuals, families, and business concerns displaced by an urban renewal project shall have a priority of opportunity to relocate in the project area after its redevelopment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4581. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize Federal participation in the cost of acquiring air rights as a part of an urban renewal project, and to prohibit luxury housing in the redevelopment of urban renewal areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4582. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to permit occupants of dwelling units in low-rent public housing projects to purchase such units; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4583. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to provide Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance for individuals purchasing dwelling units in cooperative housing projects in the same way that such insurance is provided for individuals purchasing other single-family residences; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4584. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to provide that a tenant in a low-rent public housing project may not be evicted therefrom without a public hearing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4585. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to require the owner of an apartment building or other multifamily structure to establish and utilize a repair, replacement, and maintenance reserve as a condition of the allowance of a depreciation deduction with respect to such structure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4586. A bill to provide that no Federal financial or other assistance may be extended to any educational institution which discriminates against students or prospective students on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4587. A bill to provide for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 4588. A bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Mojave B Aerial Gunnery Range, San Bernardino County, Calif., for defense purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4589. A bill to provide that in determining the amount of retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay payable to any enlisted man, all service shall be counted which would have been counted for the same purposes if he were a commissioned officer; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4590. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4591. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4592. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 4593. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4594. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 4595. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4596 A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4597. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting the costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize Federal loans to the District of Columbia for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4598. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 4599. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 4600 A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 4601 A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4602. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4603. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.J. Res. 305. Joint resolution to temporarily suspend the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve consolidations, unifications, or acquisitions of control of railroad properties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.J. Res. 306. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.J. Res. 307. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6 percent emergency quota on all imports of softwood lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.J. Res. 308. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 309. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make a study to determine the best means of providing an expanded college education program at Howard University by agreement with the Board of Trustees of Howard University; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.J. Res. 310. Joint resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the situation in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of "How Our Laws Are Made" as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution to favor the establishment of an international living museum; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Res. 279. Resolution authorizing a Captive Nations Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. Res. 280. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANDRUM:

H. Res. 281. Resolution to amend the rules of the House by creating a separate standing Committee on Labor; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H. Res. 282. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct an investigation and study of the operation of the slum clearance and urban renewal program in New York City and the other major cities of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H. Res. 283. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 284. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the use of the Panama Canal by vessels engaged in trade with Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LIBONATI:

Memorial of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, urging the adoption and enactment of appropriate measures to relieve the financial burdens of States and local governments as a result of interstate residential changes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER:

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to a commemorative stamp honoring Hollywood's entertainment industry; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4604. A bill for the relief of certain retired officers of the U.S. Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 4605. A bill for the relief of Carlota Figueira Miguens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN (by request):

H.R. 4606. A bill for the relief of Mercedes De Toffoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 4607. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan C. Jacobe, and their four children, Angela Jacobe, Teresita Jacobe, Leo Jacobe and Ramon Jacobe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4608. A bill for the relief of Gertrude P. Splaine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 4609. A bill for the relief of Hisae Otsu Coleman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 4610. A bill for the relief of Juanita Alice Lind; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 4611. A bill for the relief of Sister Rosaria Carlino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4612. A bill for the relief of Sister Ornella Longo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4613. A bill for the relief of Sister Corrada Amoroso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4614. A bill for the relief of Cynthia L. Morrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4615. A bill for the relief of Inez Humphreys Dixon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 4616. A bill for the relief of Yu Bing Chuck, Yu Lai Jing, Yu Lai Chun, and Yu Bing Cheong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 4617. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carole Ann Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4618. A bill for the relief of Rene Sportes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

61. By Mr. SCHENCK: Petition of Paul R. Deger and 184 others to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

62. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Z. Michael Szaz, Queens County Young Republican Association, Richmond Hill, N.Y. relative to recommending that the U.S. Government shall, by extending a short time limit, demand from the Cuban and Soviet Governments that a ground and air inspection of missile and air bases be permitted under the supervision of the Organization of American States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Unnecessary Elk Slaughter in Yellowstone National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention by many sportsmen from California and other States, that there have been several hundred elk killed each year for the last 3 or 4 years in the Yellowstone Park area by the National Park Service. During the winter of 1961–62 the herd was reduced by a total of 5,229 head. Following is an excerpt from information received from the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission, regarding the reduction numbers and categories as reported by Acting Superintendent Luis A. Gastellum:

Direct kill by rangers in park	4,309
Hunter kill outside of park	125
Live trapped and shipped	297
Lost in trapping operations	13
Winter kill	476
Total reduction	5,220

I would also like to quote from a report I received from the Department of the Interior, National Park Service covering the winter season of 1962–63 up to and including February 15, as follows:

Direct control (inside Yellowstone)	404
Live shipped	671
Hunter killed (outside)	530
Biological collection	108
Lost in trap (unsalvable 10, salvable 4)	10
Miscellaneous	10
Total reduction	1,735

Live trapping

Live trapped	1,468
Neckbanded and released	390
Retrapped elk	8
Escaped	397

Many of these sportsmen who are complaining about this annual elk massacre, make annual hunting trips to the States which border Yellowstone Park, and each spend approximately $500 for gasoline, automobile repairs, motels, hotels, restaurants, sporting goods, heavy clothing, ammunition, groceries, snake bite medicine, guides, packers, pack animals, airplanes, and many other things, in addition to $75 to $100 for a nonresident hunting license.

Many of the States out West, including California, where I hail from, have established a protective policy for deer, elk, and antelope, when there is a surplus of these animals in a given area, or on the winter range, where they bunch up in large herds and do damage to the farmers' haystacks, fences, and livestock. Action has been taken along one of two prescribed lines, as has been decided in meetings held by the fish and game departments and the sportsmen in California. When conditions arise on the range, as described above, the department of fish and game either takes hay and grain out into the areas where the game is doing damage and/or starving, and feed them; or if the department feels there is a surplus of a certain kind of game in a given area, the department traps the amount of game they feel is surplus and moves them in padded trucks to other parts of the State where there is a shortage of that particular game. Different game has been moved as far as 500 miles in California, and even to neighboring States. There is always the chance of losing a few animals during this transplanting; however, it has been well below 15 percent of the total group.

These same varieties of animals, largely elk and mule deer, however, bunch up during the heavy winters on land under control of the U.S. Forest Service, and overgraze these lands during the winter months, inflicting heavy and irreparable damage to the surrounding timber and shrubbery. However, it is the overwhelming opinion of the sportsmen that this direct method of control killing is far too drastic, and that the Park Service in cooperation with the adjoining States' fish and game departments should carry on a more extensive program of live trapping and transplanting in the future.

It is my thinking, as well as that of many sportsmen, biologists, and wildlife and conservation authorities, that the problem I refer to is the joint responsibility of the departments of fish and game of the respective States that border Yellowstone National Park and the National Park Service. Since our warehouses in this country are overflowing with surplus farm commodities, such as grain and other forage crops, possibly much of this material could be used to good advantage to prevent the game from starving on their winter range, or doing damage in our national parks.

Also, it is the opinion of many sportsmen that the elk and deer seasons open too early, since the game is still in the high country, and spread over such a large area, the percentage of hunters that go hunting in early October are not as successful as the hunters that go hunting later when the elk and deer are starting to work their way down to their winter feeding grounds. A later season would give the hunters a chance to harvest all surplus elk before they get into the Yellowstone Park area. I know many hunters who have been hunting for years in those States bordering Yellowstone Park, and unless these States open their seasons later, and the National Park Service stops killing elk promiscuously, many of the hunters will switch their annual hunting trips to other States, such as Washington, Oregon, New Mexico, Colorado, and Arizona, where the deer and elk hunting is almost on a par with that of Montana and Wyoming.

In some of the States mentioned, I believe, the State legislatures, the departments of fish and game, and the fish and game commissions are influenced too greatly by the packers and guides who insist on the early season so they can pack the hunters into the high country. However, the guides will have to alter their routine to give the hunters the full advantage of the replanted herds. This will mean more trips of shorter duration, which in turn, would mean many more satisfied hunters, returning home with a valued elk. This later season will eventually result in a better season for the hunter, and a more remunerative season for the guide and pack animal owners.

I hope that the National Park Service, the U.S. Congress, the departments of fish and game, the fish and game commissions, and the State legislatures of the States involved will give this problem their immediate attention.

Poland Is Part of Vast Communist Prison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a brief address I delivered last Sunday afternoon, March 3, 1963, at the annual convention of the Connecticut District of the Polish American Congress, held in Hartford, Conn. I was very pleased to meet with my Polish friends and to express my support for their cause.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, MARCH 3, 1963, HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am delighted to be here with you today and to have the opportunity to address your annual convention. As you know, I came specially from Putnam to be here with you and to meet many of my friends.

Just as many of your leaders and members are well known to me, so the objectives and activities of the Polish American Congress are not unfamiliar to me. Your work in behalf of the people of Poland in the past, and your deep anxiety about your kinsmen abroad who are suffering now under the yoke of communism, is a chapter in itself which is well known to many Americans. We are with you in this struggle and in your efforts to help them.

We in Connecticut are very proud of our citizens of Polish ancestry. They are a good, sturdy, hard-working, industrious, and patriotic element. The men, women and children of Polish origin who have immigrated into this country in substantial numbers over these many decades brought with them the rich heritage of their culture, civilization, religion, as well as their passionate love for freedom. They have made great contributions to America in every sphere of activity. They have helped to enrich the American way of life and American democracy.

Americans of Polish descent have not forgotten their motherland, Poland, nor have they forgotten the millions of freedom-loving Poles who live there today under a ruthless regime. Your anxiety about them is understandable. They are your blood and flesh. Poland is your ancestral homeland. You have cultural and religous ties with the country and its people.

About 2 weeks ago I introduced a resolution in Congress requesting that the United States do all in its power through the United Nations to obtain the liberation of the Baltic States, which have been incorporated into the Soviet Union lock, stock and barrel. In the case of Poland, however, there exists the myth of an independent country, but you and I know well that the people of Poland no more enjoy freedom and independence than do the people of the Baltic States. They are just as enslaved to Communism, just as subservient to the leaders of the Kremlin.

The people of Poland today are a silenced, grim, and unhappy people. They are not free to speak their mind. They cannot practice their religion freely. They cannot observe their historic events and holidays. Poland is not a happy land, a free "People's Democracy," as the Communist leaders would have us believe. The truth of the matter is that Poland is a part of that vast prison of captive European nations which make up the Communist empire.

Neither Poland nor any of the other countries subjugated to Moscow are today independent and sovereign states. They have no freedom. They have no right of self-determination. They are not the masters of their own destiny. Those masters sit in the Kremlin.

The masters in the Kremlin are dedicated to their goal of world domination. That goal does not change, it remains constant. Today it is directed against your kinsmen in Poland and the other countries of Eastern Europe. Tomorrow it will be directed against free nations in other parts of the world. Eventually, it will be directed against us in the United States. They are conducting the cold war in deadly earnest—make no mistake about it!

But let me say to you, my friends, that it would be a hopeless and depressing picture if we were to look at it from one side only. We know that the Poles and the other peoples have a profound attachment to Western culture, civilization, and ideas. Their desire for freedom cannot be crushed. Their hopes for self-determination are burning bright in their hearts. We must nurture those hopes. We must give them all the courage we can.

I am convinced that we, in our lifetime, will yet see the liberation of the enslaved nations of Europe. I am convinced that communism is not the wave of the future, but the nightmare of the past. Let us all work together to bring this nightmare to an early end.

Item No. 1: Where To Cut the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Democratic leadership invited members of the Republican Party interested in cutting the recordbreaking budget of this administration to stop generalizing and instead name specific areas where cuts could be implemented without jeopardizing the security of the United States.

I regard this as an appropriate request and from this point on intend to suggest specific items in line with the Democratic leadership's suggestion. Here is the first one I would like to draw to your attention. It involves the TFX contract award presently under Senate investigation. Here is a case where the administration, overriding the recommendations of five military boards, selected a second-class design costing $500 million more than the design of the Boeing Airplane Co. During the current hearings it has been demonstrated that the Boeing design could have been produced at the much lesser cost and with a much greater flight range of military capability.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I offer this in evidence as item No. 1 for reduction of the administration's budgetary requests.

Sikorsky Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago today a new company was incorporated under the name of Sikorsky Aero Engineering Corp. Its physical assets were meager, but its hopes were great.

Today that company is Sikorsky Aircraft, of Stratford, Conn., a division of United Aircraft Corp. and a world leader in the design and manufacture of helicopters.

President and guiding light of the 1923 organization was Igor I. Sikorsky, then just 33 years old but already a legend in aviation. The first location was a farm on Long Island near Roosevelt Field; the first workers were Russian immigrants and friends of Mr. Sikorsky.

Four years before, this young engineer had arrived in New York City, a refugee from the revolution in his native Russia where he had established himself as a man of vision in the field of aeronautics.

Behind him were early experiments with helicopters in Russia, and success with the Grand, the world's first multiengine—four—airplane and forerunner of World War I's most successful bomber.

The first aircraft built by Sikorsky Aero Engineering Corp. was the S–29–A—the A for America—a twin-engine, all-metal transport which proved a model for future airliners. Despite an early shortage of funds, a number of aircraft followed—including the twin-engine S–38 amphibian with which Pan American Airways pioneered in establishing air routes to Central and South America. With the success of the S–38 came an opportunity for Mr. Sikorsky's company to become a subsidiary of United Aircraft Corp. in 1929.

Under United, Mr. Sikorsky developed a number of flying boats which set outstanding records. In 1935 the S–42 opened air trails to Hawaii and the Orient, and paved the way for regular transatlantic flights. A later and more advanced flying boat, the S–44, established itself as the first airliner capable of regular transatlantic runs without stopping and without refueling.

Early in 1939, Mr. Sikorsky returned to his first great interest, the helicopter. On September 14, 1939, the VS–300—with Mr. Sikorsky at the controls—lifted itself a few feet from the ground in Stratford, and the Western Hemisphere knew its first practical helicopter. In 1943, quantity manufacture of the R–4 made it the world's first production helicopter and the only rotary-wing aircraft to see action in World War II.

Sikorsky helicopters came into their own during the Korean war. S–51's, and later S–55's, flew rescue and troop-carrying missions that provided a new perspective of helicopters as military vehicles. There followed bigger and faster helicopters as turbine engines took the place of piston engines; helicopters blazed new trails in private industry, and as passenger aircraft. Latest Sikorsky helicopter is the S–64 Skycrane, a heavy lifter that can carry loads of various shapes and sizes up to 10 tons in weight.

Mr. Sikorsky retired as engineering manager of the division in 1957, but he still serves as consultant to a new generation of engineers at Sikorsky Aircraft. He has received numerous honors in a lifetime of leadership in both fixed-wing and rotary-wing aeronautics.

He can look back 40 years to the beginning of a company on a small farm in Long Island and ahead to new aircraft, with new dimensions in design, ability, and use, coming from the present Sikorsky plant in Stratford.

Republicans Coming Up With Positive and Constructive Answers—Partial Text of a Speech by Representative Florence Dwyer, of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, Before the Legislative Dinner, Morris County Woman's Republican Club, Inc., Morris County Golf Club, Convent Station, N.J., Saturday, February 9, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, exciting things are happening within Republican Party circles these days. The GOP is actualy the Go party for 1963 and 1964. When Republican speakers take to the hustings these days they can electrify and inspire their audiences with news of what the Republicans are doing in Congress to offer a positive and constructive program for meeting the challenge of the sixties.

One of our talented spokesmen is Representative FLORENCE DWYER, of New

Jersey, who recently presented a factual summary of the new sense of direction which is taking place on Capital Hill. Her February 9 speech before the Morris County (N.J.) Woman's Republican Club, Inc., is a great one which bears further attention. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Representative DWYER's speech in the RECORD:

(Partial text of a speech by Representative FLORENCE P. DWYER, Republican, Sixth District, before the legislative dinner, Morris County Woman's Republican Club, Inc., Saturday, February 9, 1963, 7 p.m., Morris County Golf Club, Convent Station, N.J.)

I am particularly pleased at the opportunity to talk with you today, for I know, both personally and through our mutual friend Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN, of your deep and enlightened interest in the Republican Party. We share many interests, I am sure, but above all we share the determination to make our party a stronger, more effective, and more successful party—a party fully equipped to take over the reins of government in the United States and provide our people with the kind of leadership that will assure the security and well-being of our country.

With this in mind, therefore, I am delighted to report to you that things are happening today in Washington that hold out great hope for the Republican Party in the months and years ahead.

It is not too much to say, I think, that a new vigor, a new sense of purpose, a new direction even, and certainly an added enthusiasm is evident among Republicans on Capitol Hill.

Although the signs I see indicate this is happening at all levels of the Republican Party throughout the country—our new Governors, our increased numbers in State legislatures, our renewed activity and strength in local government—I speak especially of the Congress and more particularly of the House of Representatives where the real decisions of national policy will be made this year.

Basically, what is happening is this. Republicans are reassuring what it means to be the opposition party and coming up with some positive and constructive answers. Congressional Republicans are not going to be satisfied to sit back and play dead to the Democrats. This is not opposition in any sense at all. Republicans are not going to be content to say nothing but "no—no—no." This is opposition only in the very narrowest and least meaningful sense. Republicans are not going to permit a political vacuum to grow in which the opposition would be allowed to appear as the only party which has any ideas, any social conscience, any sense of obligation to the public interest. This would not be opposition; it would be surrender.

The greatest Republican of them all—Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we celebrate on Tuesday—had some words to say on this subject which, though we have heard them many times, seem most appropriate at this point in our party's history.

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present," Lincoln said. "The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."

Today, Republicans in Congress are thinking anew and acting anew. We are responding affirmatively and responsibly to the far-reaching changes in technology which have made our globe so much smaller and more complex. We are confident that our party has the resources of people and talent and ideas to deal effectively with these changes. Republicans provided 8 straight years of sound and progressive government under President Eisenhower. Our party's 1960 platform is an up-to-date statement of Republican principles and policies, a model of balance between the imperatives of progress and the claims of an older tradition—in brief, a chart to be relied upon to navigate a course through troubled, shoal-filled waters.

What we Republicans are proposing, in effect, is the rather revolutionary idea that we take our platform seriously—seriously enough to use it as a foundation of a program of action in Congress.

We believe our platform was an excellent one to run on in 1960 and much too good today to run away from—which seems so often to be the fate of party platforms.

We believe that if the platform was good enough to be the blueprint for 4 more years of a Republican President—and, certainly, it was not the fault of the platform that we lost the 1960 election—then that platform is good enough to guide us through 4 years of opposition.

We believe that opposition must be more than a negative thing, that it necessarily involves proposing positive programs, where the need for action is real, as well as opposing programs we believe go too far or not far enough.

We believe the people will judge the Republican Party by what we stand for as well as by what we stand against.

We believe the people should be given a choice between a Democratic Party we believe is too often inadequate, opportunistic and misguided in its legislative leadership and a Republican Party that offers a realistic promise of stable, commonsense, progressive government, government that will benefit all our people.

We believe that the place in which to make this choice plain and clear to all who will see is in the Halls of Congress where both parties must write the records which the people will judge for themselves.

How are we doing this job? What do I see that gives me so much confidence that Republicans are on the right track?

Before attempting my answers to these questions, I suggest we recall just what it was that first raised the question of what kind of opposition the Republican Party should be.

Republicans lost the 1960 election when we had almost every reason to expect we would win it. To say the least, defeat came as something of a shock. And the hair-thin margin of our loss only added to the sense of frustration that resulted. For Republicans, this was the first experience in 8 long years in adjusting to the difficult role of opposition party. The fact that Democrats had controlled the Congress during 6 of the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration did not lessen the problem, since even as a minority in Congress our energies were devoted to obtaining approval of the Eisenhower program.

As 1961 arrived and the new Kennedy administration prepared to take office, rumors spread to the effect that Republicans would seek a coalition with conservative southern Democrats for the purpose of blocking the new administration's program even before that program had been prepared and sent to Congress.

In that atmosphere, seven Republican Members of the House, including two of us from New Jersey, urged the House Republican conference to repudiate the idea of a coalition and preserve our freedom as an opposition party to oppose the President when we felt he was wrong or support him when we believed he was acting in the best interests of the country.

Although the conference did not act on our resolution, the issue came before the House soon after in the form of the famous proposal to enlarge the membership of the Rules Committee—a proposal intended to make it possible, at least, for important legislation to reach the floor of the House for consideration. Since it is Congress responsibility to vote one way or the other on bills reported by its committees, this was hardly a very radical proposal.

Fortunately, enough Republicans joined us on this issue and voted in favor of enlarging the Rules Committee that the resolution was approved. This was a major factor, I believe, in shaping the kind of opposition party the Republicans in the House have become. While it did nothing to prevent or weaken Republican opposition to the objectionable parts of the Kennedy program, it made it impossible for the Democrats to succeed in portraying Republicans as the party of negativism and blind obstructionism. Moreover, it has helped encourage Republicans to take the initiative in advancing counterproposals and constructive alternatives when we believed that administration programs were unacceptable.

The first major example of this came last year in connection with the Manpower Training and Development Act. For several months, Republicans in the House conducted a thorough study of the problems of automation and unemployment and developed a number of recommendations to deal with this difficult situation. When the manpower bill came to the House floor, Republicans were ready and virtually rewrote the Democratic legislation making of it a Republican program. The Republican position was so sound that a majority of Democrats joined us to pass it.

This year, the trend toward an active, positive Republican opposition has continued—and with results that are already gratifying.

In its first action of the 88th Congress, the conference of all Republican Members of the House replaced its chairman with a younger, more energetic leader who is fully committed to the principle that Republicans should not forfeit leadership to the Democrats. We have broadened the membership of the House policy committee making it more responsive to like-minded members of the party.

One of the first projects of the conference, for instance, is an effort to obtain for the Republican minority a larger share of the staff members assigned to the legislative committees. This is particularly important if Republican Members are to play an active role in the decisions of Congress and fulfill our responsibilities effectively.

Republicans in the House have also moved ahead with our own alternative programs, even at this early stage of the session, in two very significant areas of legislation—education and civil rights.

Under the leadership of your own Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, Republican members of the Committee on Education and Labor have drafted and introduced legislation designed to help solve the No. 1 problem of American education, the need to provide increased facilities for the millions of young Americans who will want and need a college education.

This Republican proposal is sharply in contrast with the administration's education program—a catchall, multibillion-dollar bill that covers no less than 24 separate items. Rather than indulging in the expensive luxury of a gigantic program which has no chance of approval, Republicans have chosen the realistic and responsible approach, a bill aimed at the top priority problem, a bill that will make a decisive impact on this problem, and a bill that can be passed.

In the field of civil rights, there is a different kind of contrast between Republican and Democratic methods. Here, Democrats are caught in their age-old dilemma between high-sounding promises and the inability to perform. Despite their claims of interest in guaranteeing the equal rights of all our citizens, the administration has

retreated to the point where it is recommending only a single civil rights measure, a voting rights bill.

In my judgment, civil rights is the chief moral and practical problem facing the United States here at home. Legislation is badly needed—moderate, even-handed legislation that will strengthen the hands of those now working to improve racial relations and eliminate the burdens of segregation. The need for this legislation should not be sacrificed on the altar of political expediency.

Once again, Republicans have come forward with a realistic and effective civil rights bill. Under the leadership of Congressman LINDSAY, of New York, 24 House Republicans, including the majority of the New Jersey Republican delegation, have introduced civil rights bills—the most carefully drawn and comprehensive civil rights bill since President Eisenhower's 1957 program. Moreover, this bill has the support of the Republican leadership in the House.

Slowly, perhaps, but surely, this new initiative and energy among congressional Republicans is beginning to attract wide attention. The story has not yet been completed and will not be completed, I hope, until Congress has finished its business. Republicans will take the lead in other fields, as well—the vital matter of putting some sense and order and direction into the tangled affairs of our urban areas, for example, a subject to which I am devoting considerable attention at this time.

This is the kind of activity, however, by which Republicans will write a successful record in the 88th Congress. It will be a record, I am confident, that will document for the entire Nation our claim to be the party of responsibility, of concern for people, the party on which all can depend to give America the good government it deserves.

Does the United States Have Nuclear Weapons Superiority?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the No. 1 argument for a nuclear test ban treaty given by U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Administrator William C. Foster, and others on behalf of the administration, is this: The United States has nuclear superiority and unless further nuclear testing is prohibited the United States will gradually lose that superiority.

This squarely brings into issue the following question: Does the United States have nuclear weapons superiority?

Careful examination of statements by the President, Mr. Foster, his deputy, Adrian S. Fisher, and others reveals the following:

SUPERIORITY

Claims for superiority: First, regarding nuclear weapons yield to weight ratios—that is, more bang per pound of warhead—and, second, greater variety and numbers of tactical nuclear weapons in stockpile.

PARITY

In general, parity between the United States and the U.S.S.R. seems to be admitted respecting, first, lack of complete knowledge of weapons effects—that is, effects of radiation on radar detection, communications, command and control systems, "hardened" installations, and so forth—second, unavailability of really effective antimissile warheads, and, third, nondevelopment of pure fusion weapons—that is, the neutron bomb.

INFERIORITY

No claims are made respecting very high yield, U.S. weapons superiority. The Soviets are known to have tested a 58-megaton weapon and claim the ability to scale it up without further testing to 100 megatons.

The foregoing may be assumed to be a relatively accurate assessment of the relative capabilities of the United States and the U.S.S.R. if it also is assumed those making the claims have relatively accurate information regarding: first, the Soviet stockpile; second, all Soviet tests, including small, undetectable yield underground experiments with tactical and pure fusion weapons.

In evaluating whether or not the assessment of relative capabilities actually supports the advantage claimed for a test ban treaty—that is, that the United States will retain its lead longer under conditions of nontesting than conditions of testing—the following should be in mind:

First. Small yield-to-weight ratios are important to the American military which does not possess very large thrust rocket engines and thus must rely on lighter warheads for its missiles. This ratio is less critical to the Soviet military which does possess very large thrust rocket engines.

Second. Tactical weapons will be most useful to the American military in defending the homelands of its allies against invasion by an aggressor. Severe limitations on the actual use of tactical nuclear weapons on free world soil in defense of free world soil will be imposed by the necessity to protect friendly populations from the effects of fallout. Additionally, defenders must have in stockpile many such tactical defensive weapons at a variety of locations which the aggressor might choose for its thrust.

Since the Soviet military can expect its role to be that of the aggressive invader of foreign soil at locations of its own choice, it has little need in its arsenal either for variety in or large numbers of tactical nuclear weapons. On the contrary, relatively crude and dirty weapons might conceivably appear advantageous to Soviet tacticians.

Third. In relation to facts set forth in the previous paragraph, it is obvious that pure fusion tactical weapons capability would be of markedly greater advantage to the American military than the Soviet military.

Fourth. In the role of defender rather than aggressor, it would seem that knowledge of weapons effects and truly effective antimissile warheads would be of much greater relative advantage to the American military than to the Soviet military. On a recent occasion Premier Khrushchev claimed Soviet scientists had "solved" the antimissile problem.

Fifth. In light of Defense Secretary McNamara's recent testimony that considerable hardening of Soviet missile bases is taking place, the advisability of including very high yield warheads in the U.S. stockpile deserves knowledgeable consideration.

Sixth. Inasmuch as this argument for a nuclear test ban treaty does not contend the United States will succeed in keeping its "nuclear superiority"—only that it might do so for a longer time under conditions of nontesting—it implies that Soviet laboratories would move faster than our own under a test ban. Inevitably then Soviet capability would catch up with us. Then surpass us. What happens then?

It is desired to emphasize that U.S. nuclear capabilities as set forth above are only those collected from various statements by administration officials while speaking on test ban questions. Therefore they do not necessarily represent my own opinions or the actual situation.

Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege this morning to testify before the House Ways and Means Committee on the subject of the revision of our tax structure.

My statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 6, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today to comment on the President's proposal to revise our tax structure.

In dealing with legislation as important as this and covering as wide an area, it is unlikely that we will find many people who will agree with every facet of the President's recommendations. I assure you that I do not envy the tremendous burden which you must assume in performing the task of bringing out a bill that will be acceptable to a majority of Members of the House. I do trust that my comments will prove helpful and not further confuse an already complicated problem.

In the interests of time I will not discuss the general principles underlying these tax recommendations but will address myself to specific parts thereof. I would like, however, to make this one general statement, to wit, the enactment of the bulk of the President's recommendations should redound to the benefit of the entire economy of our country and more particularly to the benefit of the small businessman and to the lower income groups.

I address myself first to the matter of treatment of itemized deductions from personal income.

The proposed new treatment of these deductions by limiting them to that in excess of 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income is in my opinion the wrong way to tackle this problem. This would hit hardest at the lower income groups whose deductions while small dollarwise are most meaningful to them. There certainly will be no incentive to anyone to meet their civic and charitable obligations by saying to them that they can get no tax deduction or credit until after they have paid 5 percent of their income. It works an even greater hardship to say to them that the first 3, 4, or 5 percent of their gross income which they actually expend for medical expenses is not deductible. I could never understand the theory by which only the excess over these percentages was deductible.

The recommendation as to minor casualty losses so as to exclude all deductions up to 4 percent of the taxpayer's income would merely create another incentive to cheat. This is analogous to insurance policies which provide that the first $25 or $50 of loss is not payable by the insurance company. Insurance carriers will tell you that this results in most people getting bills for double the amount of the loss in order to cover the excludable portion thereof. The same thing will undoubtedly occur if this provision should be enacted. The Internal Revenue Service couldn't find a force large enough to investigate and check upon those items. It would undoubtedly cost the Government many times more to unsuccessfully attempt to collect the taxes for these deductions than the deductions themselves would aggregate.

Any attempt to remove the exemption from interest on mortgages and the real estate taxes on homeowners' properties would be nothing less than a breach of faith by our Government. Thomas Jefferson wrote, "The small landowners are the most precious part of a State." For years our Government has been urging our citizens to become homeowners. The latest statistics show that almost 60 percent of our families own their own homes today. One of the greatest incentives to the acquisition of homes was the fact repeatedly stressed that interest on mortgages and real estate taxes were deductions from gross income for tax purposes. I urge that we do not change that exclusion.

Another recommendation that I oppose is the repeal of the $50 and 4 percent deduction on dividend income. This exemption was to have been a first step toward the elimination of the unfair and inequitable double taxation on earnings.

In considering what should be done with this recommendation I urge that this committee do not consider how much tax can be received by our Government but rather, do we have a right to tax earnings twice? Once the earnings of a corporation have been taxed, the net amount belongs to the stockholders and, while there might be some logic in taxing a corporation for failure to pay those earnings as dividends to the stockholders, we cannot justify taxing those identical earnings a second time when they are distributed to the owners thereof.

With reference to capital gains, I urge that you will decrease the net revenue payable to the Government on capital gains by extending the period from 6 months to 1 year in order to qualify for a long-term capital gain. It is my opinion that the capital gains taxes payable to the Government would increase two or three times if instead of increasing the period we decreased it to 3 or 4 months. By decreasing the period to 3 or 4 months these capital assets would turn over that much more frequently and each time they were sold there would be a capital gains tax paid.

I heartily endorse the recommendation to tax as earnings and not as capital gains the moneys realized on stock options. But I suggest that that tax be payable not on earnings in connection with stock options granted after enactment of the law but on all earnings received after the enactment of the law, regardless of when the stock option was granted. The proposed changes of the rate of taxation will apply to all earnings thereafter received and any change in the tax structure should equally be made to apply to all earnings thereafter received regardless of when and where contracted for.

The President has recommended an additional tax credit of $300 for all people age 65 or over regardless of the source of their income. This credit is to replace both the extra exemption allowed to older people and the retirement income credit. Our senior citizens are greatly in need of tax relief since the annuities which they receive are usually not enough to live on. I believe that the Committee should consider the exemption from Federal income tax of annuities received by individuals age 65 and over. As a partial step in this direction I have introduced H.R. 4182, which would exempt amounts up to $2,400 in annuities, pensions, or requirement benefits paid by local, State, or Federal governments.

I strongly urge that as recommended in H.R. 4182 all annuities paid by State, local, and Federal governments be exempt from Federal income tax.

I recommend that the provisions of my bill, H.R. 525, to assist small business and persons engaged in small business by allowing a deduction from Federal income tax for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable, should be included in any new tax bill enacted.

I also urge the inclusion of the provisions of my bill, H.R. 530, which would amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business by permitting individuals and partnerships filing income tax returns for small businesses to revoke an election to be taxed as a corporation; to provide a normal tax rate of 20 percent for taxable years after June 30, 1963, and to increase the surtax exemption; to provide a growth, expansion, and modernization exemption on net taxable earnings; to liberalize the income tax treatment of losses incurred through loans; to provide an exemption for goodwill in the determination of the value of an estate and to provide family sized farmers an exemption for the improvement, modernization, and renewal of buildings or equipment used in the production, care and marketing of farm products and to provide family sized farms the same exemption.

I believe that these last two items will greatly stimulate small business.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Three Thousand Two Hundred Space-Related Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the honor of accompanying Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON and Gen. Bernard Schriever to Texas for a look at the aerospace industry in an area where we have always been aware, and proud, of space.

In Grand Prairie, we visited Ling-Temco-Vought, one of the leading aerospace firms producing the weapons carriers, rocket boosters, guidance and detections systems used in the U.S. defense and exploration efforts. We toured the facilities and spoke with men who are tops in the field of space science and its needs. General Schriever spoke for our delegation when he said he was impressed with the tremendous resources, technology, and management, which he saw there.

The place of a firm such as Ling-Temco-Vought in the present and future economy of a space-studious United States is, of course, obvious. But the needs of space age production offer an invitation also to smaller firms in less obvious areas of production.

The following day Vice President JOHNSON spoke at a board of city development dinner in the southwest Texas city of San Angelo. He spoke of the ways in which small business participates in the aerospace industry, in a speech which is cogent for many, many areas of this Nation. I am pleased to offer for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made by the Vice President in San Angelo on February 22.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, BOARD OF CITY DEVELOPMENT DINNER, SAN ANGELO, TEX., FEBRUARY 22, 1963

As long as I can remember, people have been saying they like San Angelo because the air is better here. I agree, the air is mighty good. But what I like about San Angelo—and what has always made your city one of my favorites—is the people.

I like the spirit of progress, the sense of civic pride, the confidence in the future that has always been so much a part of the people of San Angelo and southwest Texas. It is good to be with you once again—and I am most grateful for all your generous courtesies today.

When I accepted this invitation, I asked one of your distinguished citizens what he thought I should talk about tonight.

He replied, "Why don't you talk about space, we have so much of it."

Space is a good subject—an increasingly important subject for Texans, as for all Americans. We are moving far faster than most of us realize into the age of space, and our lives are being reshaped every day by the flow of invention and discovery coming from space research.

That is what I would like to talk about tonight—about the practical, down-to-earth implications of our great national effort to explore the distant realms of outer space.

You of San Angelo understand the first and foremost implication. You are demonstrating this by the support you are giving to education—at the college level as well as at the public school level. The clear and immediate challenge of space requires that we make available to all of our young people far better education than any of their parents enjoyed.

Ninety percent of the scientists who ever lived are alive today. Ten years from now three-fourths of the people working in the plants and factories of the United States will be working on products not yet invented or discovered. If our sons and daughters are to have an even break in the competition of the 1970's and 1980's, education—at all levels—must have the kind of support throughout the Nation that it has here in San Angelo.

Some are quick to say that there is no place in our system of the small local area college. But as you well know, that is simply not so. Hundreds of thousands of young people are being denied essential college educations because there is no college in their own community. The likelihood of a high school graduate going on to college is 50 percent greater when the student lives within 20 to 25 miles of an institution of higher learning.

Whether close to home or far away we need better education at all levels. We need to be turning out two and one-half times more

Ph. D.'s in engineering, mathematics, and the sciences. At the present rate, the United States will be short 90,000 doctoral degree holders by 1970. We need a wider dispersal of the graduate schools from which such degrees are obtained, because today three-fourths of all Ph. D.'s are being granted by a handful of universities located in only 12 States.

When I say these things to you I am not talking about education for education's sake alone. I know you love freedom. I know how you cherish independence. If we love freedom, if we cherish independence, we will recognize that the battlefield on which these great heritages will be won or lost in this century is the classroom.

The United States leads the world in the aggregate annual number of higher education graduates. But in the Soviet Union institutions of higher learning are today graduating three times as many engineers and four times as many physicians as the United States. I am unwilling—as I know you are unwilling—to be content with second place. In education—as in all things—we have the resources, we have the ability, we have the wealth to be first, and we must not settle for less than the best.

When we talk of space and space research there are those who raise the question that our efforts cost too much. Certainly American leadership in space is not cheap. We are now spending 20 cents per week per capita on our national space program. But, at the same time, we are spending each year more than four times our space budget on golf and fishing and movies and other recreation.

Out of this effort that we are making, many Americans ask the question: Is the effort we are putting forth worthwhile? Is it practical? What will it mean to those of us on earth for one or two among us to land on the moon?

I would like to answer that question in terms we can all understand. We are today only in the infancy of the age of space. Our efforts have only just begun. When we look back over the past, we remember that it took us 112 years to develop photography, 56 years to develop the telephone, 35 years to perfect the radio, 15 years to develop radar. Television took 12 years. The atomic bomb took 6 years. Even the transistor took 5 years.

While the space age is not yet 5 years old, we have made remarkable strides in producing usable down-to-earth products. More than 5,000 companies and research organizations have been or are now involved in our space effort. We have produced more than 3,200 different space-related products, many of which are already being put to use.

As one example, at Lawton, Okla., a small hatmaking company experienced difficulty and costly losses because the resin used to stiffen hats often stuck to the heating blocks. That company contacted the Office of Industrial Applications of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA gave them information about nonstick coatings which had been developed in connection with space research on solid rocket fuels. Today, the little hat company in Oklahoma is coating their presses with this substance and its problem has been solved.

I could cite many more examples such as this. But the truth is we have only just begun to realize the benefits of our concentrated space research. These future applications will have meaning for all of us.

Let me give you some other examples. Medical scientists have determined that the kind of space suits worn by our astronauts—such as Colonel Glenn—can be and soon will be used to relieve the discomfort of victims of strokes. In our hospitals and medical centers, the little wire sensors used to signal the earth about the physical conditions of the astronauts will be put to use to keep constant check on the physical conditions of patients in their sickbeds. One product of our research on rocket propellants is already being used to treat tuberculosis.

A great many housewives today are using in the kitchen pots and pans made of ceramics which are the result of space research. Thermoelectric devices, first used to provide power for space satellites, are now being used in heating and refrigeration systems for our homes.

Out here in west Texas we know that the future is being shaped by the application of space technology to such projects as taking salt out of sea water and making the inexhaustible gallons of the gulf available for irrigation in this area. When space technology will permit us to modify the weather, we do not know. We do know that the weather satellites already projected will permit us to make great savings of lives and property in combating storm damage, providing early warning against floods, tornadoes, and hurricanes. Our space scientists even tell me that we will someday soon be using those satellites to guard against invasion of grasshoppers in west Texas and locusts in other parts of the world.

Within a generation it may be possible for us to predict the weather as far in advance as a year, and think what that will mean to both ranchers and farmers in this area.

The day is not too distant when you will be able to pick up your telephone and call distant continents—Europe, Australia, or Asia—as quickly and as cheaply as you can call other Texas cities today. Live television shows will reach your living room from all points of the globe. The scientists in India or Africa or South America will be able to solve problems on computers located at Rice University or the University of Texas. Texas businessmen will be able to check their inventories in warehouses and retail establishments throughout the world in a matter of seconds.

When we recite prospects such as this, I know it is hard for the mind to grasp the full implications. But it is important that we make the effort to see beyond the present and to recognize the full import and impact of the future. Many of us present remember when people were saying that the automobile would never replace the horse and that airplanes would never fly safely and successfully. Twenty or forty years from now our children will be smiling indulgently at our own conservatism and caution today.

You and I—and our 180 million fellow Americans—stand now at the edge of one of the great adventures of mankind. In these years ahead the exploits and adventures of our young pioneers in space will make the headlines. But here on earth without fanfare, without much notice and without us even realizing it, our lives will be changed as never they have been changed in any comparable period of man's experience.

If, in this new age, America is to retain its position as a leader of the cause of freedom it will be necessary for us as a nation to mobilize the full resources of nature and of humankind. We cannot indulge the luxuries of leaving idle the mineral resources and other resources of nature which underlie these rocks and plains of southwest Texas. We cannot afford the expense of undertraining and undereducating our young people. We shall need—and we must have—the full natural and human resources of America mobilized for the great thrust forward which is coming within your lifetime and mine.

When this century began, only 1 out of 10 adult Americans had a high school or college education. Today, such an education is a first requirement for an ever-increasing number of jobs in our economy. Yet, only 43 percent of our adults have completed high school. Only 8 percent have completed college. And nearly 40 percent of our young people are dropping out of high school before they receive their diplomas.

The treasure of America today as always is its young people. We must not permit that treasure to be lost or wasted. Here in San Angelo your community dedication to education has won national attention. You have built one of the finest high schools in America—you are proud of it and you have the respect of your countrymen for the sense of local responsibility which you have shown. In the same sense, you are showing comparable support for higher education through your college.

It is this sense of local responsibility that has made America strong. It is this sense of local responsibility that will help America realize the full rewards and potential of the future. I come here tonight to salute you, to congratulate you, and to commend your example of local responsibility to communities throughout the Nation.

Our strength as a nation—and as the center of the free world alliance—depends upon the sense of local responsibility which freemen in every county, every city, and every State manifest through these times of trial and peril. Governments at all levels—Federal, State, and local—is the creation of the people and the servant of the people. There is no room for contests and conflicts in a struggle for power between the levels of government. There is only room for effort and assertion on the part of all Americans to make our system strong, to make our Nation strong, and to make our cause successful.

We are extending our reach today—we are reaching among the stars to touch the new frontier of man's experience. That longer reach will bring us rewards of which we have never dreamed. We shall live a life of greater freedom, a life of greater reward, a life of greater peace—and this is what we all want to have for our children.

Temper of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Missouri Ozarks has a fond affection for my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, Representative AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, ranking minority member of our Committee on Un-American Activities, who incidentally is married to the sister of Dr. George Wood, an outstanding physician in the town of Carthage, Mo. On February 19, the gentleman from Michigan, Representative JOHANSEN, delivered an outstanding, thoughtful, and discerning speech before the Battle Creek, Mich., Lions Club. His remarks were timely, to the point, and reflected the views of many Members of Congress sitting on both sides of the aisle. I commend them to the attention of all Members:

(Address by Congressman AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, Battle Creek Lions Club, February 19, 1963, Battle Creek, Mich.)

I welcome this opportunity to be with you. This half hour is an interlude between a 12-day stay here at home in my congressional district and my return to Washington for the real start of legislative business in the new 88th Congress.

Let me say a word about this session of Congress and also about the time I have spent here at home.

This is the beginning of my 9th year in Congress. I am certain that the months ahead in Washington will be by far the most controversial, the most difficult, and the most crucial that I have experienced as a Member of Congress. By the same token, they can also be the most constructive and fruitful in many years. The potentials of wise, beneficial contributions to the general welfare are there.

Whether or not we make the gains which are so urgently needed depends upon a three-way partnership—a partnership which includes the President, the Congress, and the American people. And the American people themselves can be the decisive factor. I hope you, as citizens, will meet your responsibility and make your power felt by making known to the Congress and the Executive your judgment and your will with respect to the grave issues facing our country.

While I have made a few speeches during the 12 days I have been home I have also done a great deal of listening. If I rightly understand the sentiments and the temper of the people of this district—and I think they are typical of a great many Americans—they are acutely aware of events and of problems; they are thinking earnestly and with deep concern; and they are voicing their thoughts and their concerns and their frustrations, both to each other and to their representatives in Government.

This situation, it seems to me, offers a great opportunity for sound, broad-gage leadership. It imposes a very heavy responsibility on that leadership. And it poses a grave danger. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick" and persistent frustration can be explosive and immensely damaging.

Today I want to speak to you briefly, bluntly, and from the heart about some of the things which I am convinced gravely concern the American people. And I hope to relate those concerns to a few of the specific issues and problems which confront the Congress in the weeks ahead.

1. Never has the desire of the American people to know the facts or their desire to be able to believe what they are told by their leaders—and by the media of public information—been so urgent, or so desperately insistent.

The American people accept the fact that some information regarding the activities and affairs of Government cannot be generally divulged.

But they want—and have the right—to know that the withholding or the editing of information is not for the purpose of covering up mistakes, protecting blunderers, or serving partisan or personal political advantage.

They are disturbed, and rightly so, by references to news as part of the "weaponry." They are disturbed, and rightly so, by abuses of executive privilege which result in denial of vital information to Congress by the executive branch. They are disturbed, and rightly so, by suggestions that Members of Congress refrain from responsible discussion of grave international problems. They are disturbed, and rightly so, by the knowledge that under the past administration one Herbert Matthews, of the New York Times, not only took the lead in formulating a completely, tragically mistaken estimate of the Castro takeover in Cuba on the part of the American people, but that this same Herbert Matthews was actually designated to guide official U.S. policy in the State Department regarding Cuba.

The American people are disturbed, and rightly so, by the fact that allegations and warnings from responsible Members of Congress—of both parties—have been flatly contradicted and denied; then partially conceded to be accurate; and finally acknowledged to be entirely true.

There is plenty of blame to go around for this situation. And the American people themselves share in this blame. We have become the victims of our own genius for advertising, for so-called public relations.

We have become obsessed with a horrible, detestable, abominable thing called the public image. Everyone talks about the "image" we want to build for our political party, for our State, for our Nation, for a segment of our society, for a candidate or other individual.

I am fed up with this word. I think the American people are becoming fed up with it. I think they are becoming desperately concerned, not about the image, but about the reality, the substance, the hard facts, the unvarnished truth.

And all the more so when we learn by bitter experience and disillusionment that the "image" is, in fact, a false facade. We are beginning to learn that what we appear to be is important only as it faithfuly reflects what we actually are.

The most compassionate man who ever walked the earth had a biting phrase for the image makers of his own day: "Whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones."

The American people cry desperately for the truth. And they hope with equal desperation for a restoration of confidence in the spoken words of their elected leaders. What a supreme irony it would be if, in this golden age of modern communications, we should lose the one priceless thing which makes communication meaningful and worthwhile—confidence in what is said and heard.

The matter is summed up in the ancient adage: The penalty of being a suspected or proven liar is that one is not believed even when he speaks the truth.

There are already underway many congressional investigations of official policies and actions in your Federal Government. There will be more. Do not believe it when you are told that these are merely politically motivated. Do not believe it when you are told that they are solely for the purpose of dredging up past blunders.

They are a part of the necessary process of getting the truth, of profiting by past mistakes, of charting wiser courses of action in the future.

2. The American people are gravely concerned about fiscal policies, about fiscal responsibility, about the factors which undergird our economic security and well-being, our economic opportunity, our chances for better business and more jobs.

It is a tragedy if we equate this concern with greed. It is a tragedy if we assume that this concern is merely one which puts dollars ahead of people.

The Communists are wrong when they declare materialism to be the supreme factor of life. The undisciplined humanitarians, on the other hand, are equally wrong when they make unrestrained human wants the basis of all legislative and spending decisions.

Increased conscientious liberals, like the the late Senator Neuberger, Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin, and Congresswoman Griffiths of Michigan, are recognizing this fact, and voicing their alarm.

Increasingly, thoughtful Americans are asking—and they are asking me—how we can continue to raise expenditures, increase deficits, add to the national debt and to the interest charges on that debt, and still decrease revenues. And when they ask me, they expect answers, not doubletalk.

And yet a top economic adviser to the President told the Joint Economic Committee of Congress the other day that those who would deny themselves a tax cut merely in order to avoid further deficits are victims of "a Puritan ethic."

This sort of folly is beginning to greatly alarm the American people. It is a justifiable alarm. It is a healthy alarm. I share the alarm.

3. The American people are awakening to the fact that there are no rights in a free society without matching responsibilities—that these are the two sides of an indivisible coin.

They are beginning to recognize this truth with respect to big labor as well as big business. They believe in the right of collective bargaining. They believe in the need and the right of workers to protect themselves through organization against uncontrolled greed for profit. But they likewise know that profit is the lifeblood of business and industry. They know that ownership and management and, above all, the public interest, also have rights and also have need for protection against unchecked greed for power.

It is quite possible that this truth will be reflected in legislative proposals and action this session in the field of labor law. Let us hope that it will be reflected in corrective and not merely punitive legislation.

The American people are beginning to recognize this truth also with respect to relationships between majorities and minorities in our society—whether those majorities and minorities are racial, or religious, or political, or ideological. Unless there is a mutual recognition of mutual rights and also of mutual duties and responsibilities, we can look forward only to more and more controversy, more and more internal conflict, more Oxford, Mississippis; more dubious no-prayer decisions by the Supreme Court; more shameful lawlessness in the Nation's Capital; more intolerance; more chaos.

The American people basically are dedicated to justice, to equal opportunity, to the preservation of rights. But they are heartsick also in their yearning for domestic tranquility. And only responsibility matching the clamor for rights can bring us that. Only that way can we live together in peace and progress.

4. Finally, the American people are beginning to understand that the ultimate defense against our enemies, and the ultimate hope for victory, rest upon firmness in the right, upon resoluteness of will, and upon boldness of action. And they are beginning to demand policies and actions based upon such resoluteness.

Military might is necessary, but it alone is not enough. Military solutions alone are not enough. Indeed we are caught in the ironical situation in which the very destructiveness of our ultimate weapons is such that that we are tempted totally to renounce force as an instrument of national policy, and in the process we may also renounce courage and resoluteness, and so expose ourselves to defeat by nuclear blackmail. And meanwhile our enemies go ahead with their little wars of national liberation, as in Cuba; with their subversion, infiltration, and internal takeovers.

And we find ourselves confronted with such contradictory statements within the period of 24 hours as Senator Fulbright's assertion Sunday, "I do not regard Cuba, as such, as a threat to the physical security of this country or any other country in the hemisphere," and, on the other hand, the testimony of Assistant Secretary of State Martin, yesterday, that the Soviet Union, from its base in Cuba, is expected to step up terrorism, sabotage, and guerrilla activities in months ahead.

What a confusing, paralyzing, and vacillating effect these conflicting expressions from supposedly responsible leaders of our Nation is bound to have.

Small wonder my own constituents write me, call me, and confront me face to face to demand: What is happening? Have we no guts? How long before we take again the posture of firmness of last October 22 and this time follow through?

Clarity of purpose * * * resoluteness of will * * * firmness of action. These are the ultimate weapons and the only ultimate hope of victory and survival for ourselves and our way of life.

In General MacArthur's words: "It must be of the spirit, if we are to save the flesh."

Religion Versus Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Record the text of an address which I delivered last Sunday, March 3, 1963, at a communion breakfast of the Knights of Columbus in New Britain, Conn. Our distinguished colleague, the Honorabe Emilio Q. Daddario, was scheduled to address this gathering, but he was designated as U.S. member of the Subcommittee on Space Law meeting in Geneva and had to leave just a few days before the meeting in New Britain. I was glad to substitute for him as speaker.

The address is as follows:

Religion Versus Communism

(Address by Congressman William L. St. Onge, communion breakfast, Daly Council No. 12, Knights of Columbus, New Britain, March 3, 1963)

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, friends, I am very pleased to be here with you this morning. It is a delight for me to break bread with you and to have the opportunity to exchange a few thoughts with you.

As you know, Congressman Daddario was supposed to have been your speaker here today. He is presently on an important mission in Geneva for the U.S. Government as a member of the Interparliamentary Union Subcommittee on Space Law. As you know, the United States and the Soviet Union are in sharp conflict over proposals for the solution of legal space problems.

The late Pope Pius XII, in his annual Christmas message to the world in 1956, spoke of the divine grandeur and its meaning for mankind in our day. His holiness made this observation:

"In truth modern man, precisely because in possession of all that the mind and labor of man have produced, ought to recognize even more the infinite distance between what he can do and what proceeds from the limitless power of God."

I think this is very sage and sound advice. Unless we recognize the infinite distance between what man can do and that which proceeds from the unlimited powers of God, we are in danger of being carried far away from the belief in God and turn to the belief in a single all-powerful man—a belief which is based more on fear than on conviction.

We need not look too far afield for this possibility. The present regimes in Soviet Russia, Communist China, and the other countries of the Communist bloc, which are all based on a godless philosophy and a way of life from which religion has been completely excluded, are perfect examples of man living in fear instead of freedom, of man living with brutal power instead of God's words of truth and love.

I often wonder how much better life could be for the entire human race, if we would live by God's words. I wonder how much more pleasant it could be if mankind would really practice truth and love, and charity and helpfulness, toward one another. Instead we have a world that is confused, a mankind that is tormented, a way of life which for half of humanity means living in constant fear and enjoying no freedom and no dignity as human beings.

In our lifetime we have experienced the destruction brought on by three great wars. We have witnessed the extermination of millions of people. We have seen whole nations and hundreds of millions of peoples in Eastern Europe and Asia become enslaved and tyrannized by a ruthless and godless ideology. And let us not overlook the fact that we have developed the most awesome weapons, which constitute the greatest danger to human survival in the future. Surely, the genius of man is not destined to reach its zenith in the destruction of all human life on earth? In the last 2,000 years the world has gained much knowledge, but when we observe the direction in which mankind is headed, I am afraid that we have gained very little wisdom.

To my mind, the Roman Catholic faith is beyond all doubt the most formidable spiritual weapon against this antireligious conspiracy known as communism. Spiritual coexistence between religion and communism is impossible. The church and communism must remain forever mutually antagonistic. Communism is the embodiment of the total state which represents a definite danger to civilization itself. It goes to the very roots of life. It is political, economic, it is personal, it affects every phase of day-to-day living.

For us the great danger represented by communism is spiritual. In our form of government there is no conflict between God and loyalty to country. Our system of government accepts the supremacy of God—the Communist state does not. There is the underlying difference.

You can share economically. You can endure politically. You can even suffer personally. But no system has yet been devised for cutting the human soul in two and making it serve two masters. Our soul belongs only to God, and not to the state. The Communist state cannot share its monolithic authority with any other institution. Its basic credo forbids it to accept democratic rule by the people or the principle of obedience to God. With diabolical cunning it seeks to subvert religion and God to a position of subordination to the state.

This is the most wicked element of all in the total fraud that is the total state. Against an enemy of this kind there is nothing left for us to do but to wage a total struggle, a spiritual war, under leadership of the church. By giving voice to your faith, you will help bring about the doom of the enemies of God. We who have faith know that, regardless of its temporary gains, communism will eventually be destroyed because of its godless philosophy.

As we struggle to preserve the peace and fredom of our people, we are also fighting to preserve the peace and freedom of all mankind. With the help of God and in the American spirit that every man is entitled to walk upright in human dignity before God and men, we shall succeed in winning this struggle.

We know that truth and knowledge and charity to our fellow men will, in themselves, not win wars, but we also know that they constitute basic ingredients of freedom and justice, and they can serve as solid foundations upon which to build permanent peace. It is important that we gather these ingredients, strengthen them, and build on them with patience and loving care. We must do so not only with nations as a whole, but also with individuals. We must help them become better human beings, more wholesome citizens, persons with good character and with a positive approach to life. We must not only lend a helping hand to those who need our help, but we must also strengthen the hands of those who are laboring in the vineyards of truth and knowledge and charity.

I should like to conclude with a little story. Shortly after the end of World War II, a devastated city in England began the heartbreaking task of restoring and rebuilding its life. In the old city square had stood, before the destruction, a large statue of Christ, with hands outstretched in an attitude of invitation to the people. On the pedestal were carved the words: "Come unto Me."

During the bombings of the city the statue was struck and shattered. When the restoration began, master artists and sculptors were brought to the city to help restore the statue. The figure was eventually reassembled, except for the hands, of which no fragments could be found anywhere in the rubble. At first it was suggested that new hands be fashioned, but later many people said: "No, leave Him without hands."

And so, today there stands in the public square of that city the restored statue of Christ without hands, and on its base are carved the words: "Christ has no hands but ours."

And so, I say to you: Let us strengthen the hands of those who labor for God and man, those who seek to help their fellow men, and all those who strive for genuine peace in the world.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, enable, we pray, with the light of Thy wisdom and the strength of Thy might, those who in these fear-haunted times are in this Chamber entrusted with the stewardship of the Nation's life.

When it seems to us that our times are too perplexing and oppressive, and we are at our wits end, and that evil casts a depressing shadow over all our dreams for a fairer humanity, remind us that so it seemed to those who went before us, and that we can find, as they found, that the prayer for wisdom, for vision, for courage, and for the kindly light that leads, is the prayer that never goes unanswered.

So we dare ask for light upon one step ahead, faith to take one day at a time, and endurance in the darkness to wait in patience and confidence for the dawn.

We ask it in the name of the Holy One whose life is light. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 4, 1963, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 4, 1963,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, on March 6, 1963, signed the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, submitting the nomination of Fred Gates, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department, vice William C. Doherty, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO TRANSPORTATION

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers, and for other purposes; and to provide for strengthening and improving the national transportation system, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation in that Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO STANDARDS OF ELECTRICAL AND PHOTOMETRIC MEASUREMENTS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A CORRECTIONAL INDUSTRIES FUND FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish in the Treasury a correctional industries fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND AND THE FEDERAL DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST FUND

A letter from the Managing Trustee of the Trust Funds and members of the Board of Trustees of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance and disability insurance trust funds, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON STUDY OF FINANCIAL ADVANTAGES OF PURCHASING OVER LEASING OF ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the study of financial advantages of purchasing over leasing of electronic data processing equipment in the Federal Government, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF COSTS TO THE GOVERNMENT FOR STORAGE OF CERTAIN PETROLEUM

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of the costs to the Government for storage of petroleum in new commercial facilities under Department of Defense negotiated contracts, dated February 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF THE REJECTION OF LOW BID ON PROCUREMENT OF AN/GRC-19 RADIO SETS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the rejection of low bid on procurement of AN/GRC-19 radio sets by the U.S. Army Electronics Materiel Agency, dated February 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF MANNED AIRCRAFT NUCLEAR PROPULSION PROGRAM, ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of manned aircraft nuclear propulsion program, Atomic Energy Commission and Department of Defense, dated February 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

CONTRACTS FOR THE INSPECTION, MAINTENANCE, AND REPAIR OF FIXED EQUIPMENT IN FEDERAL BUILDINGS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance and repair of fixed equipment in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, REGARDING CERTIFICATION OF FACTS BASED UPON TRANSFERRED RECORDS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

BACK PAY ACT OF 1963

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF MAY 29, 1930

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

NOMINATION OF JOHN GREEN TO BE COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, DULUTH, MINN.

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the memorial of Proctor Lodge No. 672, International Association of Machinists, of Proctor, Minn., remonstrating against the confirmation of the nomination of John Green to be collector of customs for the port of Duluth, Minn., which was ordered to lie on the table.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF WYOMING LEGISLATURE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate two joint memorials adopted by the State Legislature of Wyoming memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to supporting basic changes in Federal reclamation laws to make it possible for reclamation development to meet the needs of today and memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed to return to the State of Wyoming additional sections of land from the public domain.

Mr. President, I request that the memorials be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 5

Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to supporting basic changes in Federal reclamation laws to make it possible for reclamation development to meet the needs of today

Whereas several statewide organizations, such as the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, Wyoming State Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, Wyoming Farm Bureau, and the Wyoming Development Association have taken formal positions requesting that the land limitation restrictions of reclamation law be revised to recognize the economic conditions and farming practices of today; and

Whereas these organizations have recognized that the large proportion of irrigated land in Wyoming was provided water through private initiative, and that, in many instances, these lands need a supplemental supply of water; and

Whereas the development of irrigation should be accomplished in a manner that is compatible with existing irrigation, livestock, industrial, municipal, tourist, and recreational interests insofar as possible; and

Whereas irrigated agriculture in the State of Wyoming does not produce crops that are in surplus as defined by section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate of such legislature concurring), That the President and the Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to: (1) provide adequate size of farm units on reclamation projects in the State of Wyoming; (2) give special emphasis to planning projects which will provide supplemental water supplies to existing irrigated land and without acreage restrictions for such lands requiring a supplemental supply; and (3) orient planning activities to develop projects compatible with existing irrigation, livestock, industrial, municipal, tourist, and recreational interests insofar as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies hereof be transmitted promptly to U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

Approved January 29, 1963.

CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
Governor.
CHARLES G. IRWIN,
President of the Senate.
MARLIN T. KURTZ,
Speaker of the House.

ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 6

Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed to return to the State of Wyoming additional sections of land from the public domain

Whereas the State of Wyoming is at a disadvantage due to the fact that in excess of 50 percent of the land area of the State is owned or controlled by the Federal Government; and

Whereas the State of Wyoming has received two sections per township from the public domain for the support of public schools and whereas many States, including several Western States have received four sections per township for similar purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate of such legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America, be, and they are hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to return to the State of Wyoming the two additional sections from the public domain the same as have been granted other States, or the equivalent thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies hereof be transmitted promptly to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

Approved January 29, 1963.

CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
Governor.
CHARLES G. IRWIN,
President of the Senate.
MARLIN T. KURTZ,
Speaker of the House.

OREGON LEGISLATIVE MEMORIAL ON TIMBER SALES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, members of the Oregon State Legislative Assembly are concerned over the manner in which timber, blown down in a severe storm on October 12, 1962, will be disposed of by agencies of the Federal Government.

Some segments of the lumber industry in my home State of Oregon have encountered difficulty in recent months because of the vast increase in softwood lumber imports from Canada. Unless timber damaged in the Columbus Day storm is disposed of in an orderly and efficient manner, this situation could become even more complicated.

The 52d Legislative Assembly of Oregon recently adopted Senate Joint Memorial 1, urging action by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior to expedite salvage and sale of the damaged timber.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD with my remarks the text of the memorial and the certificate from the secretary of state of the State of Oregon which accompanied the statement.

There being no objection, the certificate and joint resolution were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

ENROLLED SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

To His Excellency, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent that:

Whereas the standing timber which was blown down in the severe storm of October 12, 1962, is an economic loss to the State; and

Whereas the loss will become greater as a result of infestation if the timber is not salvaged; and

Whereas the downed timber constitutes a severe fire hazard; and

Whereas much of this salvageable timber is located in an economically depressed area of this State; and

Whereas the salvage operation is one well suited to the small operator: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Interior are urged to expedite the salvage and sale of the downed timber by:

(a) Authorizing sale of small tracts, particularly those located adjacent to existing access roads.

(b) Establishing scaling stations to determine the quantity of timber removed and thus avoiding the time and cost of recruising.

(c) Authorizing local supervisors to make sales of timber up to $10,000 estimated value without lengthy public advertisement.

2. The Congress of the United States is urged to enact any necessary enabling legislation which may be required.

3. The Oregon Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives are urged to encourage action on the part of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior and to promote and support any needed legislation.

4. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the Secretaries of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by senate February 5, 1963.

DALE A. HENDERSON,
Secretary of Senate.
BEN MUSA,
President of Senate.

Adopted by house February 15, 1963.

CLARENCE BARTON,
Speaker of House.

Filed February 26, 1963.

——— ———,
Secretary of State.

STUDY OF CERTAIN MATTERS BY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, reported the resolution (S. Res. 29) authorizing the Committee on Commerce to make a study of certain matters under its jurisdiction, with amendments, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

William J. Porter, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria;

Dr. James Watt, of the District of Columbia, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization;

Charles D. Withers, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Rwanda;

Carl T. Rowan, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Finland;

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations;

Edward M. Korry, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ethiopia;

Archibald S. Alexander, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency;

Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations; and

Charles F. Baldwin, of the District of Columbia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Federation of Malaya, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America to the 19th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably the following nominations that have already been printed in the Congressional Record. In order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk, for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Arkansas.

The nominations are as follows:

Edward Glion Curtis, of the District of Columbia, Leo M. Goodman, of New York, and Joseph O. Zurhellen, Jr., of New York, now Foreign Service officers of class 2 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America;

Miss Mary Vance Trent, of the District of Columbia, for reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service;

Paul M. Bergman, of New Jersey, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service;

Frederick C. Ashley, of Ohio, and sundry other persons, for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service;

Laurence Desaix Anderson, Jr., of Mississippi, and sundry other persons, for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service;

Irl W. Smith, of Illinois, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service;

James D. Bartlett, of Pennsylvania, and sundry other Foreign Service Reserve officers, to be consuls in the diplomatic service;

Paul A. Arsenault, of Maryland, and sundry other Foreign Service Reserve officers, to be vice consuls in the diplomatic service;

Earl R. Allison, of Nebraska, and sundry other Foreign Service Reserve officers, to be secretaries in the diplomatic service; and

Archie Davies, of Florida, John A. Tarin, of Texas, and Miss Catherina Van Lier Ribbink, of California, Foreign Service Staff officers, to be consuls in the diplomatic service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Beall, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Case, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Fong, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Javits, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Keating, Mr. Miller, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 1011. A bill to authorize wartime benefits under certain circumstances for peacetime veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Johnston, Mr. McClellan, and Mr. Byrd of Virginia):

S. 1012. A bill to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ervin when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Hartke):

S. 1013. A bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip and surface mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Lausche when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1014. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joyce Mark Bouvier; and

S. 1015. A bill for the relief of Edith Annikki McRae; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1016. A bill for the relief of Irene Golato and Clorinda Golato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1017. A bill for the relief of Angelo Coppola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1018. A bill for the relief of William E. Blythe; and

S. 1019. A bill for the relief of Robert W. Kube, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. Bible, Mr. Cannon, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Moss, Mr. Engle, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. McGee, and Mr. Bennett):

S. 1020. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program in five areas of the United States to increase usable precipitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Anderson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1021. A bill for the relief of Mansour Batarse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself and Mr. Randolph):

S. 1022. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, in the State of West Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. Magnuson):

S. 1023. A bill to provide for increasing the storage capacity of the Bumping Lake Reservoir, Yakima River Basin, Wash.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1024. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1025. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Library of Congress to provide books and sound-reproduction records for the blind so as to make the books and sound-reproduction records available to armless readers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1026. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an otherwise qualified disabled widow to receive widow's insurance benefits thereunder even though she has not attained age 62; and

S. 1027. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the restriction on the period during which an application for a determination of disability is granted full retroactivity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1028. A bill for the relief of Jessie Hunter Todd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1029. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain inequities and restrictions and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 1030. A bill for the relief of Sister Aurora Martin Gelado (also known as Sister Nieve); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1031. A bill to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act;

S. 1032. A bill to exclude cargo which is lumber from certain tariff filing requirements under the Shipping Act, 1916;

S. 1033. A bill to establish a uniform system of time standards and measurement for the United States and to require the observance of such time standards for all purposes;

S. 1034. A bill to amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to penalties for falsification of records, and for other purposes;

S. 1035. A bill to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87–346, relating to dual rate contracts;

S. 1036. A bill to amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes; and

S. 1037. A bill to amend section 208(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1038. A bill to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 1039. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purpose; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1040. A bill to direct the Surgeon General to establish and publish criteria useful in indicating the harmful effects of various air pollution agents; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Case when he introduced the above bill which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 1041. A bill to provide for the humane care and treatment of vertebrate animals used in research, experiments, testing, or training by departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants and awards from the United States, and to encourage the study and development of new methods of minimizing pain and discomfort of animals used for such purposes, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Randolph when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1042. A bill for the relief of Susan A. Tikiryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. Engle):

S. 1043. A bill to provide for the conservation of anadromous fish spawning areas in the Salmon River, Idaho; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Church when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1044. A bill for the relief of Earl H. Smith and his wife, Dorothy Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. Bennett):

S. 1045. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Genevieve Olsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1046. A bill to provide hospital, domiciliary, and medical care for non-service-connected disabilities to certain recipients of the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1047. A bill to amend the act of August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 699), relating to elections in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 57. Joint resolution designating the American marigold (Tagetes erecta) as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 133 OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT, RELATIVE TO PROCEDURE ON APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. CLARK submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (relating to committee procedure) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) In each session of the Congress one-half of the bills making appropriations of the revenue for the support of the Government shall be introduced in the House of Representatives, and one-half of such bills shall be introduced in the Senate. The chairmen of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives shall determine by agreement which of such bills shall be introduced in each House. No such bill shall be introduced in more than one House of the Congress. Hearings upon each such bill shall be conducted jointly by the Committee on Appropriations of the two Houses, or by subcommittees of those committees. A member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House in which any such bill was introduced shall preside at all joint hearings upon that bill."

VOLUNTARY ADMISSIONS AND CONFESSIONS ADMISSIBLE AGAINST DEFENDANTS IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators Eastland, Johnston, McClellan, Byrd of Virginia, and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible against defendants in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, the rising tide of crime in the District of Columbia points up once again the need for legislation to reverse this trend. I feel that the results of this trend during the year 1962 are demonstrated in an article which appeared in the Washington Post for Monday, March 4, 1963, which I ask unanimous consent be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Crime Up 4.9 Percent in District in 1962

Washington ranked fifth among 16 cities of its population class last year in the incidence of serious crime but was first in aggravated assaults and second in robberies.

The 1962 figures, compiled both locally and by the FBI on a national basis, showed a 4.9-percent rise here in overall crime, with a 16.6-percent increase in robberies leading the various categories. The overall increases in crime nationally was 7 percent, the FBI said.

The District's 1962 totals, as compared with those of the previous year (in parentheses) follow:

Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, 91 (88); aggravated assaults, 3,005 (2,955); forcible rape, 100 (82); robbery, 1,572 (1,348); burglary (housebreaking), 5,022 (4,902); larceny, 2,666 (2,464), and auto theft, 2,581 (2,459).

Among the 16 cities in the 500,000-1 million population range for which the figures were compiled, Washington ranked fourth in population behind Baltimore, Houston, and Cleveland, but was behind those cities in its crime figures only in the incidence of murder.

Only Baltimore, Houston, and St. Louis were close to Washington's assault score which ranked it first both in the actual number of such crimes and in the rate per 1,000 population.

The city's rapes, which showed an 18-percent increase from 1961, ranked it 10th among the cities and its larcenies and auto thefts put it in the same position.

Mr. ERVIN. I feel that this significant increase in the lawlessness in our Nation's Capital points to the need for legislation to clarify the Supreme Court ruling of 1957 in *Mallory* v. *United States* (354 U.S. 449) and the more recent decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals, Killough against United States, which extended the scope of the Mallory decision even further. The Mallory ruling held inadmissible the voluntary statement of a convicted and self-confessed rapist because of the delay in taking him before a committing magistrate. The Court held that a delay of 7½ hours in arraigning the prisoner violated rule 5(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure which requires that an arrested person be taken before a committing officer without unnecessary delay.

The Mallory ruling and the decision in the earlier case of *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U.S. 332) have resulted in abolishing an old and fundamental rule of evidence regarding the admissibility of a confession. Prior to these decisions, the sole test of the admissibility of a confession was whether it was made voluntarily. Under this test, if a confession was freely and voluntarily made, it was deemed to be trustworthy. Of course, if there was a showing that the delay itself constituted sufficient inducement to confess, the court could, in its discretion, render such a confession inadmissible. But, the point is that mere delay in itself was not enough to invalidate a confession.

In the Mallory case, time alone was the deciding factor. There was no showing that any duress was used in extracting the confession from the prisoner. Indeed, there was no allegation on the part of the prisoner that any force whatever was used to have him confess to the crime. There was nothing to indicate that the confession was anything but voluntarily given. Nevertheless, despite the voluntary nature of the confession and despite the fact that the confession was substantiated by all the facts of the crime charged against the prisoner, it was invalidated merely because of the passage of time.

The Mallory rule was extended even further in the decision of Killough against United States, decided on October 4, 1962, by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. In Killough, the prisoner had confessed two separate times to the murder of his wife, once prior to arraignment and once thereafter. Not only did the Court use the Mallory doctrine to throw out the voluntary confession of the accused made prior to his arraignment, but the Court extended this doctrine to invalidate an admission made after the arraignment. The Court reasoned that the second confession was prompted by the first admission, which was illegal under Mallory. Judge Burger alluded to the departure from precedent and the ramifications of this decision in his dissenting opinion; he stated, as follows:

> The majority holding today is one of the most significant and far-reaching of this court in many years. It goes far beyond the statute it purports to interpret and far beyond any prior opinion of this court or the Supreme Court. No statute remotely authorizes the holding. No one even suggests that any right under the Constitution is involved.
>
> The majority holding constructs an entirely new statute and takes a step neither contemplated by Congress nor remotely warranted by the Mallory case. The Mallory doctrine operated to exclude or suppress incriminating statements made during unnecessary delay before taking the arrested person to a committing magistrate. The entire rationale of Mallory is that the statements are barred because made while detention is unlawful—unlawful for failure to have a prompt hearing. Today's majority holding, carries the "fruit of the poisonous tree" doctrine to new lengths and means in effect, that statements made either before

> or after the hearing are to be excluded unless the statements are made with the defendant's lawyer at his elbow. For all practical purposes the majority bars any admissions except where the accused is advised and prepared to enter a guilty plea. It would be difficult to overstate the enormity and scope of this incredible interpretation of rule 5(a). Mallory to a large extent foreclosed police investigation prior to preliminary hearing; this holding eliminates any interrogation of an accused after he has had the judicial warning until he secures a lawyer. In light of this holding it is ironic that in the Mallory opinion Justice Frankfurter characterized rule 5(a) as a part of the procedure devised by Congress for safeguarding individual rights without hampering effective and intelligent law enforcement.

Mr. President, I contend that it is both unsound and unreasonable to apply time alone as a measure of admissibility. This subverts a rule of procedure relating to the duty of an arresting officer into a rule of evidence. Because a police officer fails to observe the requirements of rule 5(a) a self-confessed criminal may be turned back to society, even though he may have confessed again subsequent to his arraignment. In other words, the supposed sins of the policeman are visited upon an innocent society.

I submit, Mr. President, that when Congress approved the promulgation of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, it did not intend to throw on the scrapheap the time-honored test of voluntariness concerning the admissibility of a confession. I submit that Congress had no intention of making convictions impossible simply because a police officer failed to take a prisoner before a committing magistrate until 7½ hours had elapsed.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, Mr. President, I am not unmindful of the many protections which the Constitution of the United States bestows upon the persons accused of crimes within our society. But, in the words of Judge Alexander Holtzoff, U.S. district judge for the District of Columbia, who testified at subcommittee hearings on the subject of "Confessions and Police Detention," in 1958:

> We must bear in mind that the purpose of the criminal law is to protect the public. On the one hand, it is essential that no innocent person be convicted of a crime and that oppressive methods be not used against the guilty. On the other hand, it is equally indispensable that victims of a crime and potential victims of possible future crimes receive protection. The victim must not become a forgotten man. As was said by Mr. Justice Cardozo in *Snyder* v. *Massachusetts* (291 (U.S. 97, 122), "Justice, through due the accused, is due to the accuser also. The concept of fairness must not be strained till it is narrowed to a filament. We are to keep the balance true."

In considering the effect of these decisions, Mr. President, we should keep in mind that the Supreme Court did not base its decisions on any constitutional issue. It did not suggest that to admit Mallory's confession into evidence would be a violation of due process. The Court in both Mallory and Killough based its decision on its interpretation of the will of Congress as expressed in rule 5(a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. I do not believe that the Court has correctly interpreted the will and intent of Congress in this matter. It is for this reason that I have introduced, for appropriate reference, this bill to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 7 days so that additional Senators may add their names as cosponsors, and that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table as requested by the Senator from North Carolina, and may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1012) to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. ERVIN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of rule 5 of the Rules of Criminal Procedure for the United States District Courts or any other rule or statute of like purport, a voluntary admission or a voluntary confession of an accused shall be admissible against him in any criminal proceeding or prosecution in the courts of the United States or of the District of Columbia, and the finding of the trial court in respect to the voluntariness of the admission or confession shall be binding upon any reviewing court in the event it is supported by substantial evidence.

STRIP MINE RECLAMATION STUDY BILL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, for myself, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], a bill to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip- and surface-mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study.

Strip- and surface-mining operations in many sections of our country, in recent years, have made possible the tapping of some of our mineral resources in quantities of great magnitude and at costs far below those of deep-shaft and other mining methods. While one might justifiably say this progress has been beneficial to our economy as a whole, nevertheless, we must face the fact that it also, in a majority of instances, has destroyed all other usefulness of the land and has left abominable, grotesque scars. Plainly stating it, Mr. President, in many areas the land has been robbed of its resources and abandoned to the wrath of the elements. Time alone will not heal these wounds.

There are large areas in Ohio and other States where, as a result of stripping operations, public highways have suffered severe damage by reason of slippage; streams, lakes, and wells have been polluted; wildlife cover has been destroyed; and, finally, the entire areas themselves have been abandoned as unproductive and virtual wasteland. The future economy of these areas is seriously threatened.

Mr. President, during my administration as Governor of Ohio, after many unsuccessful attempts, there was finally enacted a strip mine reclamation law requiring strip mine operators to restore the usefulness of the land by a degree of leveling of the spoil banks and planting of them in grasses and trees. While the law has been helpful in land restoration, I have always felt that it should have required more strict conservation measures. Faced with almost insurmountable opposition, it was the best that I could get.

While some other States have had some strip mining regulation laws enacted in recent years, there remain throughout the country thousands upon thousands of acres of prelaw spoil banks, which can, it is my belief, be converted to some useful purpose with a little help. Strip and surface mining operations are no longer confined to the once-limited areas. These operations are spreading daily in many of the mineral producing States. With the cooperation of the several States and the Department of the Interior, as our bill provides, a very beneficial land use study would be made in order that the Congress could determine in what manner and in what degree it would have responsibility in helping to restore to usefulness these ever-growing numbers of acres of desolation.

Mr. President, during the 87th session of the Congress, I introduced a similar bill, which, subject to two minor perfecting amendments, met with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Interior. Those suggested amendments are incorporated in the bill I introduce today. I urge speedy and favorable consideration of this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1013) to provide for a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip and surface mining operations in the United States and for a report to Congress of the results of such study, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That, (a) in order that the extent and effect of strip and surface mining operations in the United States can be ascertained, and in order to develop information which may aid in determining what remedial action with respect to such operations can be taken by Congress and by the several States, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to make a survey and study of strip and surface mining operations in the United States.
>
> (b) The Secretary of the Interior shall make the study and survey authorized in subsection (a) in full cooperation with appropriate Federal and State agencies, including the Department of Agriculture.
>
> SEC. 2. The survey and study authorized by the first section of this Act shall include, but not be limited to, the following matters—
>
> (1) the nature and extent of strip and surface mining operations in the United States;
>
> (2) the ownership of the real property involved in strip and surface mining operations;
>
> (3) the safety of the conduct of such strip and surface mining operations;
>
> (4) the hazards to public health and safety resulting from such operations;
>
> (5) the effect of strip and surface mining operations on highway programs of the United States and the several States;
>
> (6) the effect of strip and surface mining operations on the scenic features of the United States and the several States;
>
> (7) the effect of strip and surface mining operations on the fish and wildlife and other natural resources of the United States and the several States; and
>
> (8) the public interest in and public benefits which may result from the appropriate development and use of areas subjected to strip and surface mining operations.
>
> SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall transmit to Congress a report on the survey and study authorized by the first section of this Act. Such report shall contain all information developed as a result of such survey and study together with the recommendations of the Secretary, based on the finding of this study and on techniques developed by Federal agencies as part of their continuing programs, and shall be made as soon as practicable after the completion of the survey and study, but not later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act.
>
> (b) The Secretary of the Interior shall transmit a copy of the report which he submits to Congress under subsection (a) of this section to the Governor of each State of the United States and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the bill contemplates a study by the Secretary of the Interior of strip and surface mining operations in the United States, and a report to Congress on the results of such study.

Strip and surface mining operations in many sections of our country in recent years have made possible the tapping of some of our mineral resources in quantities of great magnitude and at costs far below those of deep shaft and other mining methods, but while moneys have been saved that way the surface of the land has been denuded and rendered sterile. The banks have been left exposed. The fertile topsoil has been plowed under. Instead of growth and grass coverage there is nothing now but barrenness.

Ohio is a State which has suffered very substantially. The State of Tennessee likewise has suffered, as have the States of Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be included in the RECORD an article carried in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Thursday, March 7, dealing with the situation as it prevails in Tennessee.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TVA STUDY DUCKS ISSUE OF RESTORING STRIP-MINED LAND

(By Julius Duscha)

> The Tennessee Valley Authority has sidestepped one of the Nation's most difficult and most controversial conservation problems.
>
> The problem is the reclamation of fields and mountainsides devastated by strip-mining operations.
>
> Strip mining is a process used to get at coal deposits by first stripping away soil or rocks covering the coal and then digging the coal out with power equipment.
>
> The process denudes the countryside and leaves land so badly churned up and so full of acid that it is often difficult to get anything to grow on it. Strip mining also leads to serious erosion problems.
>
> In 1961, the last year for which complete figures are available, strip mining accounted for 30 percent of the Nation's coal production.
>
> TVA, which now produces more electric power from coal than from water, is one of the Nation's largest users of coal.
>
> In 1961 about 50 percent of the coal bought by TVA was produced in strip-mining operations.
>
> In recent years this pioneering New Deal agency has come under attack from its former supporters who have charged that it has turned into nothing more than a big electric utility interested only in the cheap production of power and no longer concerned with conservation matters.
>
> In releasing a report on strip mining the TVA Board of Directors said that the reclamation of areas following such mining operations should be controlled by States.
>
> The facts are that coal strip mining, its effects and the methods of land reclamation are so varied that no overall remedy to the problem can possibly be prescribed, the TVA directors said in a statement issued last week both in Washington and Knoxville, Tenn., the agency's headquarters.
>
> As a purchaser of coal, the statement continued, TVA pays in the price of the coal it buys the cost of reclamation where it is required by State law.
>
> As a conservation agency, TVA is anxious to work with States, private agencies and coal producers in achieving the best techniques for reclamation and use of stripped areas.
>
> However, the authority and, we believe, the responsibility to act lies with State governments and TVA's efforts will be directed toward working with the States in the exercise of this authority and responsibility.
>
> The TVA report said that reclamation of strip-mined areas would cost less than three cents for each ton of coal mined in such areas.
>
> The report said that strip mining is far more economical than deep underground mining.
>
> Strip-mining operations recover from 90 to 95 percent of the coal while recovery through underground mining methods ranges from 35 to 85 percent.
>
> A man can produce 25 tons of coal a day in a strip-mining operation compared with 11 tons in deep mining.
>
> Since the first strip-mining operations began nearly 50 years ago 500,000 acres have been stripped of coal. The TVA report estimated that at least another 1.5 million acres will eventually be stripped.
>
> Most land that has been strip mined is good only for the planting of trees. Even this sometimes cannot be done until 3 years after the mining operations have ended because the stripping operation disturbs the soil and fills it with acid.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to read a brief excerpt from the article:

> The Tennessee Valley Authority has sidestepped one of the Nation's most difficult and most controversial conservation problems.
>
> The problem is the reclamation of fields and mountainsides devastated by strip-mining operations.
>
> Strip mining is a process used to get at coal deposits by first stripping away soil or rocks covering the coal and then digging the coal out with power equipment.
>
> The process denudes the countryside and leaves land so badly churned up and so full of acid that it is often difficult to get anything to grow on it. Strip mining also leads to serious erosion problems.

It is not generally known, but in the stripping of the land they have developed booms of 100 feet in length, which grab 50 to 60 tons of the top coverage at one time, thus digging deep into the land to get out the coal which lies beneath.

The Federal Government is the owner of much land on which mineral rights have been given to others. In Ohio we have seen the spectacle of the Federal Government being the owner of some of the land with mineral rights belonging to coal companies, and the coal companies taking off the coverage—all of it—exposing nothing but rock and shale, and finally a mixture of coal with it, which creates a toxic condition, making it impossible for anything to grow.

I am asking that a study be made of this subject. I think the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is probably familiar with what is happening. I think a study ought to be made and a report ought to be sent to the Congress as to how the Federal Government should interest itself in this problem.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I am indeed interested in the subject. I hope something constructive will flow from the efforts of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio. I think perhaps the TVA, an individual agency of the Federal Government, insofar as its authority and capacity is concerned, has reached a proper conclusion. It is a problem which is nationwide in its scope and one with which a lone agency of the Government cannot cope.

I assume the Senator wants a broad study in order to reach a national policy on the problem.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. I thank the Senator for his contribution very much.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. I was wondering whether the Senator's proposal for a study included an intent to go into the question of what should be done with the land.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be granted an additional 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Does the Senator plan to have studied the problem as to what should be done to level the cuts and rehabilitate the land? I do not know about Ohio, but in Indiana, after this land has been stripped, its value for assessment purposes and property taxes is practically none, therefore, leaving the land in an unusable condition for a long period of time, without any value to anybody at all. Is that the point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the point I have in mind. May I say that 12 years ago I led the fight for the adoption of a law in Ohio. I succeeded in getting a law passed which I never believed was adequate. The power of the coal operators was so great that I could not get a satisfactory law. I can only say that if anybody with some sense of esthetic value goes into the strip mining areas and sees what has been done, he can do nothing else but weep at the cruelty of mankind in destroying and butchering the beauty of the land.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I think such a study should be made at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the Senator from Ohio has not mentioned one thing about strip mining. Strip mining is done to a great extent in the mountain areas, where there is clear water both for domestic use and for recreation. Wherever strip mining has taken place, the water thereafter cannot be used for any purpose, including trout fishing. The study which should be made will lay the foundation for State laws to prohibit any company which strip mines from failing to cover the land after its operations. I think such a study should be made, and I think that can be done.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think it can be done.

INCREASE OF USABLE PRECIPITATION

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BIBLE, CANNON, MOSS, ENGLE, KUCHEL, MCGEE, BENNETT, and MCGOVERN, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program in five areas of the United States to increase usable precipitation and for other purposes.

Mr. President, the possibility of providing some measure of control over weather has been one of man's dreams from earliest recorded history. However, it was not until the World War II studies of fog particles by Dr. Langmuir and Dr. Schaefer that it was demonstrated that clouds could be modified and some precipitation produced by scientific means. This particular experiment involved the use of dry ice seeding of supercooled clouds. Project Cirrus by the Department of Defense in 1947 and the cloud physics program of the U.S. Weather Bureau in 1948 were followed by commercial rainmaking activities on a multimillion dollar scale especially after the discovery that silver iodide particles were similarly effective. These projects generally employed ground generators which produced silver iodide smoke as the cloud seeding material.

The advent of major droughts which gripped parts of the country during the mid-1930's, the late 1940's and the early 1950's made the subject of weather modification and rainmaking a matter of national concern. The extravagant claims of some rainmakers were countered by severe criticism from parts of the scientific community and this led Congress in 1953 to create an Advisory Committee on Weather Control "to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification."

As a result of these studies and experiments, the American Meteorological Society recently reported:

> Developments in recent years have suggested that limited control of weather and climate may be possible. Among these developments are:
>
> 1. The demonstration that clouds can be modified artificially by seeding them with dry ice or silver iodide.
>
> 2. The demonstration that physical laws governing atmospheric motions can be cast in mathematical form suitable for processing on high speed electronic computers, to predict the future state of the atmosphere.

Mr. President, the practicability and economic feasibility of weather control and modification of climate is likely to remain uncertain for some time to come. However, these uncertainties are balanced by two very important considerations: First, the tremendous economic and humanitarian advantages if a significant degree of control or modification turns out to be possible; and second, the likely result of basic research studies required to answer this question will lead to improved accuracy in weather prediction and extension of the time period for which useful weather forecasts can be prepared.

The potential importance of the problem warrants a substantial effort in meteorological research, both basic and applied. Almost every human activity is affected to some degree by the weather. Availability of water supplies for the growth of crops is one of the basic requirements of society which is almost entirely dependent on precipitation and other weather factors and, as yet, this area of research has generally been bypassed. For example, a special report prepared by the Water Information Center, Inc., states:

> Actually, more than six times as much water flows across the United States in the atmosphere than is carried by all of the country's rivers. Some of this water vapor has traveled 3,000 miles without ever having fallen on land below, and has passed over arid and semiarid parts of the country that could become highly developed if rain could be induced to fall. The economic value of this potential rainfall is immense. A mere 15-percent increase in total precipitation, for example, on a 1,000-square-mile watershed having a normal annual rainfall of 15 inches, would yield an additional 100,000 acre-feet of water. If this water were to fall in the drier parts of the Southwestern United States, it would have an estimated monetary value of $2,000 per square mile if used for crop irrigation, or $5,000 per square mile if used for municipal water supplies (assuming its worth to be $20 per acre-foot for irrigation and 15 cents per 1,000 gallons for water supply).

Mr. President, it is readily apparent that it is vital to the public interest to reassess the position of weather modification research with a view toward paralleling Government-supported basic research with more extensive field applications of processes already known to be adapted to practical application.

My purpose in directing this legislation to the Secretary of the Interior is because the Bureau of Reclamation is the only agency in the U.S. Government whose primary function is the engineering and development of irrigation projects that have their repayment capacities inexorably associated with water supply conditions. It has constructed and is continuing to construct an extensive network of water storage facilities throughout the Western United States. Water resource development on many western watersheds is rapidly approaching the limit of water supply capabilities under present conditions. During times of drought, supplies of stored water are depleted and shortages of municipal, industrial, and irrigation water occur. Even during wet years many of the storage reservoirs are not filled to capacity. It is conceivable that an operational program of weather modification conducted during the periods when the air masses are naturally carrying large amounts of water could result in the filling of these reservoirs. The water could then be retained to assist in the amelioration of water deficiency which now occurs under natural conditions.

Mr. President, I request that the bill lie on the desk for 3 days in order that other Senators interested in this program may join as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bill (S. 1020) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program in five areas of the United States to increase usable precipitation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the opportunity to join the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and other able western colleagues, in sponsorship of the bill stressing the need to accelerate the adaptation of scientific principles to providing increased precipitation.

As Senator ANDERSON has pointed out, the bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a program in five areas of the United States designed to increase usable precipitation where such an increase would be beneficial.

This is a subject which has generated my personal interest for some time, because of the distinct hope it holds for the greater development of my State of Nevada, as well as stepped up development of the entire southwest portion of our Nation.

Early in 1957, I conducted hearings on the bill to provide for an experimental research program in cloud seeding.

At that time, I reminded those in attendance that congressional hearings between 1951 and 1953 yielded some very revealing facts. Those hearings, I noted, disclosed that farmers, ranchers, electric utilities, municipalities and other water users were paying from 2 cents to 20 cents per acre, thus annually spending between $3 million and $5 million on cloud seeding activities. These activities covered approximately 10 percent of the land area of the Nation.

The hearings also showed a definite necessity for an impartial evaluation of these extensive cloud seeding activities in order to ascertain what results, if any, they were producing.

My 1957 hearings resulted in the enactment of Public Law 85–510, which provided for a $5 million 5-year cooperative Federal-State experimental research program.

Mr. President, I have been so encouraged by the results of the experiments conducted under Public Law 85–510 that I firmly believe the time has arrived for active field demonstrations conducted on an adequately large scale to prove the value of the program.

In this respect, I should like to call the Senate's attention to a statement made by Dr. Vincent J. Schaefer, one of the Nation's foremost atmospheric scientists. In a brilliant paper presented at the Nevada Water Conference, held last fall in Carson City, Dr. Schaefer said:

> While there remain uncertainties concerning the economic value of cloud seeding activities, and we are still waiting for results acceptable to the statistician, a number of us who have been active in this field are convinced the time has arrived when we must encourage the development of what might be termed the engineering phase of weather modification.

Continuing, Dr. Schaefer said:

> It would be, in my opinion, a mistake to delay the inauguration of this step until everything is understood to the ultimate degree. A certain degree of gambling is necessary in any applied science development.

Mr. President, Dr. Schaefer summed up the faith in the premise we are on the right track when he borrowed from an esteemed colleague, Dr. I. Langmuir, to state:

> It may be easier to make the weather than to predict its behavior.

In Nevada, a 5-year cooperative program is presently being conducted between the local governments on the Humboldt River, the State of Nevada, the Desert Research Institute of the University of Nevada, the National Science Foundation, and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. President, the program as envisioned in the terms of the bill introduced today by Senator ANDERSON has my full support. I believe it could well transform vast expanses of parched desert into productive range lands where grass will grow cinch-high on a saddle horse.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the full text of the paper by Dr. Schaefer, to which I made earlier reference, be made a part of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME PROBLEMS CONCERNING WEATHER CONTROL

(By Vincent J. Schaefer)

In the 16 years which have passed since the writer dropped 6 pounds of dry ice into a supercooled altocumulus cloud over Greylock Mountain in Massachusetts,[1] the field of experimental meteorology has developed into a major scientific activity engaging atmospheric scientists throughout the world.

The rash of entrepeneurs and rainmakers, which developed shortly after these experiments were announced, and the expansive claims and brash attitudes, played on the relative ignorance and desperate situation of groups of farmers and ranchers, mulcting them of hundreds of thousands of dollars; at the same time putting the entire field of experimental meteorology in disrepute. This unfortunate development has gradually been supplanted by individual scientists and research groups anxious to establish the scientific facts and thus delineate the possibilities and limitations existing in this new area of science.

The task of establishing a sound scientific understanding of the effects of seeding and other trigger-like effects which interfere with the natural course of events in atmospheric processes, is fraught with intricate problems, not the least of which is our limited knowledge of many of the fundamental dynamic properties of the atmosphere. Such seemingly simple things as the formation of snow and rain, the cause of the electrical charge buildup in thunderstorms, and the structural features of cumulus clouds, are inadequately understood at the present time despite several decades of intensive studies.

In view of the current discrepancies in our knowledge, it is not surprising that occasional disagreements take place during meteorological meetings dealing with the effects of cloud seeding operations. Because of its vast complexity, there is probably no scientific subject more difficult to understand than the behavior of the atmosphere.

As Langmuir has pointed out,[2] the many atmospheric processes which combine to cause weather developments include phenomena of a divergent nature. Such phenomena defy prediction, since they result from minor disturbance which trigger off major results. Only convergent type phenomena lend themselves to prediction. In one of his later public lectures, Langmuir said, "It may be easier to make the weather than to predict its behavior."

The activities of Project Cirrus[3] between 1947 and 1952 established a number of the potentialities and limitations of the use of dry ice and silver iodide as seeding materials. In the 10-year period following the termination of the Cirrus operation, a number of more elaborate research programs were conducted, the results of which are only now being published.

As might have been expected, the results of these efforts are not without disagreement. They range from the reports of research groups in Arizona[4] and California[5] covering 4 years of aerial and ground seeding effects with the use of silver iodide generators, reporting no statistical evidence supporting increased precipitation; to the findings of the Australian group,[6] showing precipitation increases of 9 percent to 21 percent with some statistical significance; to the highly positive but not yet statistically significant of the Japanese,[7] reporting increases of 150 percent precipitation downwind of the Sea of Japan. Other studies, not yet ready for publication but conducted by capable researchers known to the writer, imply that the Japanese result may be quite real due to ideal conditions and well designed and operated field work. In areas of the world adjacent to rich moisture sources where supercooled clouds develop in abundance and naturally occurring ice nuclei are rare, seeding effects may be quite spectacular if intelligent activities are conducted. On the other hand, there will be geographical areas where little if any effects can be expected no matter how intensive or intelligent the effort.

At the present time there are few countries in the world that do not have field programs underway in experimental meteorology.[8] At the International Conference on Cloud Physics[9] held September 1961 in Australia, more than 70 scientists representing 17 countries described the progress being made in their respective areas. These efforts ranged from token activities to very elaborate and intensive studies on a wide front. Research is now being directed toward a wide variety of problems related to experimental meteorology ranging from cloud modification to some which closely approach weather control. These include such efforts as the studies of simple systems involving supercooled fogs and stratus clouds, hailstorms, orographic snowstorms, lake effect snowstorms, thunderstorms, tornadoes, orographic cumulus, manmade cumulus, blowdown storms, hurricanes, frontal cyclones, and largescale circulation. Some of these studies are well underway; others in only the initial exploratory phase. In a number of instances multiple studies of these storm types are underway in different parts of the world. Some results will be similar, but others are bound to show differences since there are few places where all of the significant variables are the same or even have any but the most superficial features in common.

Dry ice and silver iodide are still the most promising materials for producing trigger effects in atmospheric clouds, although they are strictly limited to supercooled clouds.

---

[1] Schaefer, V. J., "The Formation of Ice Crystals in the Laboratory and the Atmosphere," Chem. Rev. 44, 2 (1949).

[2] Langmuir, I., "Science, Common Sense and Decency," Science 97, 1, (1943).

[3] Schaefer, V. J., "Final Report, Project Cirrus Part I," laboratory, field and flight experiments contract No. DA 36–039–SC–15345, rept. No. RL785 General Electric Research Laboratory, Schenectady, N.Y. (Mar. 1953).

[4] Battan, L. J., and Kassander, Jr., A. R., "Cloud Seeding Experiments in Arizona," monograph No. 16, Int. Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, Paris, January 1962, p. 73.

[5] Neyman, J., Scott, E. L., and Vasilevskis, M., "Statistical Evaluation of the Santa Barbara Randomized Cloud Seeding Experiment," Bull. Amer. Meteoro. Soc. 41, 531 (1960).

[6] Adderly, E. E., "Analysis of Cloud Seeding Trials in Australia," monograph No. 16 Int. Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, Paris, January 1962, p. 77.

[7] Isono, Kenji, "Some Results of Cloud Seeding Experiments With Use of Silver Iodide Ground Generators," monograph No. 16, Int. Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, Paris, January 1962, p. 75.

[8] Third Annual Report on Weather Modification (1961) National Science Foundation, 78 pages, Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C.

[9] International Conference on Cloud Physics, Monograph No. 16, Paris, January 1962, p. 89; International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics; Int. Assoc. of Meteor. and Atmos. Physics.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

While the majority of the activities in various parts of the world utilize silver iodide invisible smokes from ground and airborne generators,[10][11] a number of new materials and effects are the subject of investigations. The introduction of positive or negative ion clouds in substantial quantities has been achieved by Vonnegut[12] in Texas, Illinois, and New Mexico. Claims have recently been advanced by the Russians that substances such as phloroglucinol are as effective as silver iodide and become active as nuclei for ice crystal formation at a temperature of −2°C. Procedures for generating high concentrations of these materials are not currently as easy to carry out as with silver iodide.

The placing of finely divided carbon black into clouds to modify them was given enthusiastic support for a short period. Further studies, however, failed to confirm the results claimed, and the present status appears to be that effects, if any, are of dubious economic value for affecting clouds.

Sodium and calcium chloride, ammonium sulfate, and similar substances, some having a hygroscopic nature, have been tried as materials which hopefully would initiate warm rain precipitation. It was hoped that the results might be as effective in warm clouds as silver iodide and dry ice is in supercooled clouds. These materials thus far have failed to produce effects to a degree of economic value. This is because the warm cloud lacks the instability that makes the supercooled cloud so easy to modify. The other feature so important in economic evaluation is that silver iodide is effective when about 0.01 micron in diameter. Dry ice and similar materials colder than −40° C. are as efficient as silver iodide, weight for weight, when used properly. Materials thus far used in warm clouds must be 1 to 10 microns to have any effect. Thus the volume or weight of materials necessary to produce triggering reactions (if they can) must be at least a million times greater. If delivery is by plane or even by some sort of ground generator, the logistical problems make such procedures of doubtful economic value.

While it has been demonstrated[13][14] that relatively small amounts of water can initiate precipitation in warm clouds by a "chain reaction," the economic value of such operations is also doubtful except under very special conditions.

An example of such a condition exists in the Hawaiian Islands. On the island of Maui, Hawaii water from a mountain stream, which ordinarily flows into the sea, has been diverted and sprayed continuously into the oncoming streams of trade wind clouds at the point where they contact a steep cliff and are forced rapidly upward. The droplets sprayed into the cloud grow about a hundredfold in volume while in the upward moving clouds. They then fall earthward from the clouds as a drizzle at a point where the resulting precipitation can be caught in a flume and usefully deployed.

Similar conditions probably occur on many forested mountains swept by storm clouds.

While there remain uncertainties concerning the economic value of cloud seeding activities and we are still waiting for results acceptable to the statistician, a number of us who have been active in the field are convinced that the time has arrived when we must encourage the development of what might be termed the engineering phase of weather modification.[15] This activity would deal with the procedures, logistics, and routine operational problems which are the steps necessary to implement a reliable large scale utilization of scientific knowledge. It would be, in my opinion, a mistake to delay the inauguration of this step until everything is understood to the ultimate degree. A certain degree of gambling is necessary in any applied science development.

If plans are laid carefully, with thoroughness and intelligence, many worthwhile results will accrue from such activity. The greatest care must be exercised to insure that such projects are designed to take advantage of the most up-to-date scientific knowledge available and that active field research programs are superimposed on the field activities.

The trend of nearly every long-range precipitation increase operation I am aware of in America and in other countries shows evidence that positive effects occur when seeding activities are carefully executed and realistically applied in relation to the local weather systems. Some of these effects cannot be interpreted as having important economic value, although the majority indicate the results have value in excess of the cost of the seeding activities. In fact the relative cost of seeding compared to the economic advantages possible in most areas is so great that the utmost effort must be directed to understanding the possibilities and limitations of such activities.

The economics of cloud precipitation in each area must be better evaluated in order to establish these relationships. Even trace amounts of rain or snow at critical periods of the year may have value or cause losses entirely out of proportion to much larger amounts at other periods. The secondary effects and byproducts of the type of studies which need to be made might in special cases actually turn out to be of greater value than the seeding effects.

The definite buildup of interest in the atmospheric sciences now underway as part of the concerted effort[16][17] of government, educational institutions, private industry, and the scientific community, is bound to provide useful information, manpower and ideas that will need testing and operational activities by weather engineering groups.

The increase of supply of irrigation water in semi-arid regions by augmentation of the snow pack in the high mountains nearby is a logical development which might be anticipated. In addition to increasing the snowfall by more effective cloud water extraction by intelligent seeding activities, increased supplies in the lowlands might also be achieved by improved forest management, evaporation reduction, melting control, and other manipulations of the mountain precipitation.

If methods are discovered which will lead to a control of the general circulation, potential troubles to the economy might occur to a dry land adaption such as has been achieved by Reno, Palm Springs, Phoenix, and Albuquerque, to mention a few American cities which have grown because of the predominance of sunny skies and mild dry climate. Much of the economy of such places is based on an adjustment to the salubrious climate, an inherent feature of a dry environment.

The augmentation of rainfall in the local area to any considerable degree would cause many painful economic readjustments because of the change in sunshine, humidity, and the general ecology that would follow a radical change in the precipitation regime. It is unlikely this problem will confront us immediately, but we should be actively evaluating all such possibilities as part of a broad plan dealing with the proper use of our natural resources.

While it may be desirable to concentrate efforts in certain watersheds, especially those already in critical supply such as the Colorado, it may be desirable to direct attention to other areas too, such as the Sacramento, the Columbia, the Platte, the Missouri, and the Hudson. Some of these latter might provide more useful procedural information in the early stages of weather engineering development than areas where economic pressure demands immediate attention.

Encouragement should be extended to the university community throughout the United States so that they might bring their specialized knowledge to bear on the multidisciplinary problems involved.

It seems to me that the logical partners in such an activity are the National Science Foundation (to provide support for basic studies), the Bureau of Reclamation (to provide the engineering design and supervision), and the Weather Bureau to provide the weather forecasts and observations. Cooperation from the scientific and engineering community will support a comprehensive plan if it is carefully developed and conducted with enthusiasm and imagination. The best individuals in each area of activity must be utilized in making the plans. We should continually search for high-ability young people to become actively involved in these activities if we are to achieve the long-range potential of such efforts.

I sincerely hope the time has come when we can go forward without further delay with a comprehensive plan for the development of our water resources in the sky, on and under the ground, enjoying the fullest cooperation of public and private organizations, scientists, engineers, technicians, and our representatives at the State and Federal level. All are essential since we deal with one of the most complex and challenging problems in science.

Water and air are among our most valuable natural resources. Until we adequately understand them and their interrelationship, we will not be able to properly develop, conserve, and utilize them to the betterment of mankind.

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills to amend title II of the Social Security Act.

The first bill would permit an otherwise qualified disabled widow to receive widow's insurance benefits under the social security system even though she had not attained age 62. The equity in this provision is self-apparent. If a widow is disabled and unable to provide for her livelihood, I see little justice in preventing her from receiving widow's insurance until she reaches age 62. Very probably the recipient is living on a small disability pension; my bill provides a sensible way to augment this small sum with funds for which she would eventually qualify under social security.

My second bill eliminates the restriction on the period during which an application for a determination of disability is granted full retroactivity. This bill is similar to H.R. 12877 of the 87th Congress. It would provide the Social Security Administration with the authority to consider the application of many disabled persons who delayed filing their disability applications past the deadline of June 30, 1962. Passage of this bill would remove a technical provision in the social security laws that has proven to be unfair and unjust in a large number of cases.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of both bills be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the Record.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Humphrey, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1026

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an otherwise qualified disabled widow to receive widow's insurance benefits thereunder even though she has not attained age 62

Be it enacted, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 202(e)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(B)(i) has attained age 62, or (ii) has not attained age 62 but is under a disability (as defined in section 223(c)(2)),".

(b) Section 202(e)(1)(C) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) has filed application for widow's insurance benefits, or (in case of a widow who has attained age 62)—

"(i) was entitled, after attainment of age 62, to wife's insurance benefits, on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of such individual, for the month preceding the month in which he died, or

"(ii) was entitled, on the basis of such wages and self-employment income, to mother's insurance benefits for the month preceding the month in which she attained age 62, and".

(c) Section 202(e)(1) of such Act is further amended by inserting after "remarries, dies," the following: "ceases to be under a disability (as defined in section 223(c)(2)) before attaining age 62,".

(d) Section 223(a)(3) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The preceding sentence shall not apply in the case of an individual whose entitlement to widow's insurance benefits is based upon a disability (as defined in subsection (c)(2)) of such individual, if such individual ceases to be under such disability prior to attaining age 62."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to monthly insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act four months after the month in which this Act is enacted.

S. 1027

A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the restriction on the period during which an application for a determination of disability is granted full retroactivity, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 216(i)(2) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "A period of disability shall (subject to section 223(a)(3)) begin—

"(A) on the day the disability began, but only if the individual satisfies the requirements of paragraph (3) on such day;

"(B) if such individual does not satisfy the requirements of paragraph (3) on such day, then on the first day of the first quarter thereafter in which he satisfies such requirements."

(b) Section 216(i)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "of paragraphs (2) and (4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "of paragraph (2)".

(c) Section 216(i)(4) of such Act is repealed.

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply in the case of applications for disability determinations filed after June 30, 1962.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I have received from the Director of the Social Security Administration relating to a particular case in point be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

January 25, 1963.

Re Mrs. Eva M. Rogers, 2060 North Northwood Drive, North St. Paul, Minn.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Humphrey: This is in further reference to Mrs. Rogers' disability claim.

As you know, to be considered disabled under the disability provisions of the Social Security Act, a person must meet two basic requirements. First, he must have a mental or physical condition so severe that it prevents him from doing substantial gainful work in any occupation. Secondly, he must have sufficient earnings for social security credits in 20 calendar quarters (5 years) of the 10 years ending with the quarter in which the disability began. In the case of applications filed prior to July 1, 1962, a disabled worker could qualify if he met the earnings requirement as of any date he became disabled. In the case of applications filed on or after July 1, 1962, however, the law now provides that the earnings requirement must be met within 18 months of the date of the application. Since Mrs. Rogers filed her application on October 25, 1962, and her social security record shows that she does not have the required 5 years of covered employment during the 10-year period that ended April 24, 1961 (which is 18 months before the date she filed her application), she does not meet the earnings requirement under the present provisions of the law.

A sizable number of persons who became disabled long ago and did not apply for disability protection prior to July 1, 1962, are faced with a similar problem. In a number of instances, disabled persons who did not work for many years before filing application not only fail to meet the requirement of substantial, recent employment for disability protection but also are no longer insured for retirement or survivor protection.

The insured-status requirement for disability protection applicable to disabled workers who file applications on or after July 1, 1962, stems from a provision enacted in 1954 that was designed to avoid possible problems in obtaining the facts on which to make a disability determination where an individual does not file application until long after he becomes disabled. Subsequent experience in making disability determinations has indicated that such problems are somewhat less difficult than anticipated. This consideration and the consideration that many disabled workers do not file timely disability applications led Congress to postpone the deadline on several occasions in the past, and most recently to June 30, 1962.

When it became clear that, despite our efforts to inform disabled people of the need to file timely applications, there would continue to be a sizeable number of disabled workers who delay filing for relatively long periods of time, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recommended last year that the June 30, 1962, deadline be eliminated. A bill—H.R. 12877—to implement the Department's recommendation was introduced. The 87th Congress, however, adjourned without taking action to extend or eliminate the June 30, 1962, deadline.

In view of these circumstances, and the possibility that legislation may be considered to adjust or remove the retroactivity limitations of applications filed on or after July 1, 1962, we have felt it advisable to temporarily postpone what would otherwise have to be a denial action on applications like Mrs. Rogers' involving the earnings requirement of the law, until such time as there are clearer indications of the outcome of any proposed legislation and its effect on existing claims of this type.

Accordingly, Mrs. Rogers will be notified that a final decision on her claim is being held in abeyance for the reasons indicated. It is not necessary for her to contact us or take further action at this time. As soon as a final decision is made she will be notified. It should be noted that since Mrs. Rogers does not meet the earnings requirement at this time, no determination has been made as to whether her impairment is so severe as to meet the disability requirement of the law.

If Mrs. Rogers desires further information, she should feel free to contact her local social security district office.

Senator Eugene J. McCarthy and Representative Joseph E. Karth also inquired about the disability claim of Mrs. Rogers.

Sincerely yours,

Victor Christgau,
Director.

HUMANITARIAN AND OLD AGE RIGHTS ACT

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, my Humanitarian and Old Age Rights Act. This bill removes certain inequities and inhumane restrictions that still exist in the Federal public assistance programs.

These proposals continue the modernization of this country's welfare laws and programs begun so successfully last session. Encouraging progress has been made. It is our obligation to continue this record in the 88th Congress.

The purpose of my proposal is summarized in the bill's introductory policy statement:

> It is the purpose of this Act to provide more effectively for the protection, care, and assistance of the people of the United States who are in need thereof, and to promote the welfare and happiness of the people of the United States by providing public assistance to its needy and distressed, administered promptly and humanely, with due regard for the preservation of family life, to encourage self-respect, self-reliance, and the desire to be a good citizen.

---

[10] Schaefer, V. J. and Dieterich, J. H., "The Seeding of Cumulus Clouds by Ground Based Silver Iodide Generators," Jour. of Appl. Math. and Phys., 10, 174 (1959).

[11] Fuquay, D. M., "Generator Technology for Cloud Seeding," Journ. Irrigation and Drainage, Division Proc., Amer. Soc. Civil Engineers, 86 No. IRI, 79 (1960).

[12] Vonnegut, B., "Recent Studies of Cloud Electrification," monograph No. 16, Int. Union of Geod. and Geophys., Paris, January 1962, p. 29.

[13] Langmuir, I., "The Production of Rain by a Chain Reaction in Cumulus Clouds at Temperatures Above Freezing," Journal of Meteorology 5, 175 (1948).

[14] Braham, Roscoe R. et al., "Artificial Nucleation of Cumulus Clouds," Meteorological Monographs 2, 47 (1957), American Meteorological Society, Boston.

[15] Schaefer, V. J., "Serendipity and the Development of Experimental Meteorology," Journ. of the Irrigation and Drainage Division, Proc. of the Amer. Soc. of Civil Engineers 86, 1(1960).

[16] The Atmospheric Sciences 1961–1971, vols. I & II, Public No. 946, National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, Washington, D.C. 1962.

[17] Schaefer, V. J., "Atmospheric Sciences Program for High-Ability Students," Weatherwise 14, 183 (1961).

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

We have a great moral obligation to the needy, aged, the blind, the physically handicapped, and dependent children. In a society as prosperous as ours—truly an affluent society by any known standard—there is no justification for such persons being denied dignity and self-respect through administrative inequities and restrictions, particularly when the principle of public assistance for these persons has been established. Moreover, we have the obligation to administer these programs in a fashion that—to the greatest extent possible—will serve to restore the persons as self-supporting and productive members of society.

AGE REQUIREMENT FOR OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

First, this proposed legislation provides that the age requirement for old-age assistance recipients will be the same as the age established for old-age beneficiaries under title II of the Social Security Act.

When one considers the relatively low minimum benefits currently paid under the OASI program, the need for this modification is clear. Many beneficiaries simply cannot exist on OASI benefit payments of $50 to $60 per month, those received in the lowest category. In order to supplement this meager income, they are forced to apply for public assistance. In 1956 the age for women OASI beneficiaries was lowered to 62, but Congress did not make a corresponding change in the public assistance program. Therefore, the original purpose of this age liberalization was nullified in many instances. My amendment would rectify this unfortunate situation.

EARNINGS ALLOWANCE

This proposed legislation would also permit the aged and handicapped on public assistance to earn up to $50 per month and the families of needy children up to $30 per month in order to supplement the payments received through the public assistance program.

I might add that that is a very limited sum. It is inconceivable to me that we would not authorize that modest amount.

This provision enables public assistance recipients to develop self-reliance and begin the difficult task of becoming self-supporting members of society. We should certainly encourage such efforts rather than inflict penalties.

The Senate version of the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 contained this provision, but unfortunately the Senate could not sustain this item in conference. I sincerely hope that both Houses of Congress will pass this amendment in the 88th Congress.

HOMEOWNERSHIP

My bill would allow public assistance recipients to own a home of an assessed valuation, less all encumbrances, of up to $5,000. The current practice of forcing an aged person to sign over title of his home—a home he might have spent many years acquiring—as a condition of receiving public assistance in time of need, is cruel and unnecessary.

My bill would also exempt household furnishings and other personal effects, plus insurance policies or burial funds up to $500 in value, when considering need and would establish a floor of $1,200 under the amount of personal property a single recipient is permitted to hold.

Why should we require persons to become total paupers before considering them qualified for assistance in obtaining the basic necessities of daily life? To force them to abandon every personal resource before receiving such public assistance is to strip them of personal dignity and the few remnants of security they still possess. If, for example, an aged and poor couple has been sufficiently thrifty through the years to purchase a burial policy, I do not believe they should be forced to cash this policy and thereby probably sentence themselves to potter's field.

HARASSMENT OF RELATIVES

This legislation would prohibit the practice of some States whereby the public assistance laws are used to enforce, or as a substitute for, the general support laws of the State. These so-called responsible relative laws are often used by State and county administrators to harass children of pensioners even though the children may not be financially able to support their aged parents.

I firmly subscribe to the belief that it is the moral responsibility of children to care for their parents to the limit of their financial resources. But I maintain this objective should be achieved through State support laws specifically drawn for such purposes.

The results of using our public assistance laws to harass relatives often works a real hardship on the aged recipients. For example, in some States the mere existence of a living relative of the aged person is sufficient reason for denying public assistance. Whether or not the relative is actually supporting the needy person—or capable of providing such support—is not considered.

OUTLAW THE SHAME LIST

My bill further provides that each State must administer the public assistance program in such a manner to insure uniform treatment of the needy in all its political subdivisions. It would also reinstate the congressional policy that names of recipients must be kept confidential.

That is, it would outlaw the shame list which occasionally is used as a means of exposing public assistance recipients to ridicule. I believe this guarantee of anonymity is absolutely essential.

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

This legislation also provides a means to modify the residence requirements that many States impose before granting public assistance to otherwise qualified recipients.

Frankly, the entire concept of a residence requirement makes little sense in the context of the public assistance program. Although I am a-resident of the great State of Minnesota, I am also an American citizen. When I travel to Washington, I do not apply for a visa or carry a Minnesota passport with me in order to return to my home State. I am just as much an American citizen in California, in Nebraska, or in Florida as I am in Minnesota. Therefore, my bill provides that the Federal share of public assistance funds available within a State shall be immediately available to an otherwise qualified applicant if the person is unable to meet the State's residence requirement. Moreover, my bill provides for an incentive payment of one-half of 1 percent of the Federal share of public assistance funds if the State removes all residence requirements. If every State of the Union would remove all residence requirements, the effect on the national program of public assistance would be highly beneficial.

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

The 87th Congress extended through June 30, 1967, the 1961 amendment to the Social Security Act which made children of unemployed fathers eligible for ADC grants. My bill would establish this provision on a permanent basis.

Several years ago the Advisory Council on Public Assistance made this highly intelligent assessment of the situation:

> On the premise that a hungry, ill-clothed child is as hungry and ill-clothed if he lives in an unbroken home as if he were orphaned or illegitimate, the program for aid to dependent children should be expanded to include any financially needy children living with any relative or relatives.

The Congress indicated their general agreement with this proposition when it expanded ADC eligibility criteria to include children of the needy unemployed. I hope this temporary extension can become a permanent provision in the public welfare statutes.

Mr. President, none of these amendments would change materially the nature of the existing public welfare programs. But they would remove, modify, or improve many aspects of these programs to make them more effective, humane, and equitable. I happen to believe that Congress should look upon such modifications as an obligation we have toward these less fortunate members of society. I urge prompt consideration of these amendments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this bill be printed in the Record at this point. I also ask unanimous consent that this bill remain at the desk for an additional week so that other Senators may join as cosponsors if they desire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from Minnesota, and will be printed at this point in the Record.

The bill (S. 1029) to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain inequities and restrictions and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds introduced by Mr. Humphrey, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1029

A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain inequities and restrictions and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this

Act may be cited as the "Humanitarian and Old-Age Rights Act".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND POLICY

Sec. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to provide more effectively for the protection, care, and assistance of the people of the United States who are in need thereof, and to promote the welfare and happiness of the people of the United States by providing public assistance to its needy and distressed. It is the policy of the Congress that assistance under titles I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act, as amended by this Act, shall be administered promptly and humanely, with due regard for the preservation of family life and without discrimination on account of race, religion, or political affiliation, and that such assistance shall be so administered as to encourage self-respect, self-reliance, and the desire to be a good citizen, useful to society. Titles, I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act shall be liberally construed in order to carry out this purpose and policy.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

Sec. 3. (a) (1) (A) Section 2(a) (1) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State;".

(B) Section 2(a) (3) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer the plan;".

(2) Section 2(a) (10) (A) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(A) provide that the State agency shall, in determining need for such assistance, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming old-age assistance, as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any such income; except that, in making such determination, the State agency shall disregard (i) the first $50 per month of earned incomes, (ii) the ownership by such individual alone or with his or her spouse) of a home having an assessed value, less all encumbrances of record thereon, of less than $5,000 (except to the extent that he is receiving rental income therefrom), (iii) the ability of such individual's family and relatives to provide for his support, (iv) any donations of surplus food which may have been made to such individual from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and (v) the first $1,200 in value (over and above all encumbrances of record) of personal property owned by such individual;".

(3) Section 2(a) of such Act is further amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (11) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon followed by the word "and", and by adding at the end of such section 2(a) the following new paragraph:

"(12) provide that there will be no discrimination based on sex in determining the needs of individuals receiving assistance under the plan."

(4) Section 2(a) of such Act is further amended by adding after paragraph (12) the following new sentence: "For purposes of paragraph (10) (A) (v), no life insurance policy shall be valued at more than its present surrender value to the individual, and the term 'personal property' shall not include (A) the individual's clothing, furniture, household equipment, foodstuffs, fuel, personal jewelry, or other personal effects, or (B) interment plots, money placed in trust or insurance for funeral, interment, or similar expenses, or any contract rights connected therewith, if such money, insurance, or contract rights do not exceed $500 in value."

(5) Section 2(b) (1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) an age requirement at any given time which is greater than the minimum age at which individuals are permitted at such time to become entitled to old-age insurance benefits under title II of this Act; or".

(6) Section 2(b) (2) (A) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(A) in the case of applicants for old-age assistance, excludes any resident of the State who has resided therein continuously for one year immediately preceding the application, and".

(b) The second sentence of section 1 of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "but no payment shall be made under this title to any State which has not also submitted, and had approved by the Secretary, State plans under this Act for aid and services to needy families with children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled".

(c) Section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (1), by adding "or" at the end of paragraph (2), and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) that in the administration of the plan there is imposed, as a condition of old-age assistance to any individual, a requirement that such individual subject his home to a lien of any kind or transfer to the State agency any interest in his home;".

(d) Title I of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"Direct payments to individuals not satisfying residence requirements

"Sec. 7. If an individual, after making application for old-age assistance, is denied such assistance by the State agency solely because he does not satisfy the residence requirements imposed under the State plan, and if such individual is not entitled to old-age assistance by reason of prior residence in another State, the State agency shall promptly notify the Secretary of the fact that such individual has made such application and would be eligible for old-age assistance if he satisfied such requirements. The Secretary shall thereupon pay directly to such individual for each month, beginning with the first month (after the month of such individual's application) in which such individual would have been eligible for old-age assistance if he satisfied such residence requirments and ending with the month preceding the first month in which he satisfies such requirements, an amount (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary) equal to the Federal Government's proportionate share of the old-age assistance which such individual would receive for such month if he then satisfied such requirements.

"Assistance for needs of recipient only

"Sec. 8. Assistance provided to any individual under this title is provided for the purpose of assisting him in meeting his individual needs and is not for the benefit of any other person; and such assistance shall not be regarded as income of any person other than such individual."

ADDITIONAL FEDERAL FUNDS FOR STATES WITHOUT ANY RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS UNDER PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Sec. 4. (a) Section 1101(a) (8) (A) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "except that the Federal percentage shall in no case" and inserting in lieu thereof "except that (i) the Federal percentage (except as provided in clause (ii)) shall in no case" and by inserting before the period at the end thereof ", and shall be 50 per centum for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, and (ii) for purposes of determining the amount to be paid to a State under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 3(a), 1603(a), 403(a), 1003(a), or 1403(a), the percentage for a State otherwise determined hereunder for a quarter shall be increased by one-half of 1 percentage point if no plan of such State approved under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI includes during such quarter, as a condition of eligibility for aid under the plan (or for old-age assistance or medical assistance for the aged in the case of the plan approved under title I), a residence requirement which excludes any individual who is in need in the State".

(b) (1) The first sentence of section 6(c) of such Act is amended by inserting "(except as provided in clause (iii))" after "in no case" in clause (i) and after "shall" in clause (ii), and by inserting before the period at the end of such sentence ", and (iii) in case of a State to which the provisions of clause (ii) of section 1101(a) (8) (A) are applicable for a quarter, the percentage otherwise determined under this subsection for such quarter shall be increased by one-half of 1 percentage point".

(2) Paragraph (2) of sections 3(a), 403(a), 1003(a), 1403(a), and 1603(a) are each amended by striking out "one-half" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "the Federal percentage".

AID TO NEEDY FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Sec. 5. (a) (1) (A) Section 402(a) (1) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows: "(1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State;".

(B) Section 402(a) (3) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(3) provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer the plan,".

(2) Section 402(a) (7) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(7) provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of any child or relative claiming aid to families with dependent children, as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any such income; except that in making such determination the State agency (A) shall disregard the first $15 per month of income earned by such child and the first $30 per month of income earned by his parent or guardian, (B) shall disregard the ownership by such child (or by his parent or guardian) of a home having an assessed value, less all encumbrances of record thereof, of less than $5,000 (except to the extent that he is receiving rental income therefrom), (C) shall disregard any donations of surplus food which may have been made to or for such child (or his parent or guardian) from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and (D) may, subject to regulations prescribed by the Secretary, permit all or any portion of earned or other income to be set aside for future identifiable needs of such child;".

(3) Section 402(a) of such Act is further amended by (A) striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (12) thereof, and (B) inserting immediately before the period at the end of clause (13) thereof the following: "; (14) provide that there will be no discrimination based on sex in determining the needs of individuals receiving assistance under the plan; and (15) in providing aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, include (A) provision for entering into cooperative arrangements with the system of public employment offices in the State looking toward employment of the unemployed parents of such children, including appropriate provision for registration and periodic reregistration of the unemployed parent of any such child and for maximum utilization of the job placement services and other services and facilities of such offices, (B) provisions to assure that aid to families with dependent children is not provided to any such child or relative if, and for so long as, the unemployed parent refuses without good cause to accept employment, in which he is able to engage, which (i) is offered through such public employment offices, or (ii) is otherwise offered by an employer if the offer is determined by the State or local agency

administering the State plan, after notification by such employer, to be a bona fide offer of such employment, and (C) provision (i) for entering into cooperative arrangements with the State agency responsible for administering or supervising the administration of vocational education in the State, looking toward maximum utilization of available public vocational education services and facilities in the State in order to encourage the retraining of individuals capable of being retrained, and (ii) for denying aid to families with dependent children to any such child or relative if, and for so long as the unemployed parent refuses without good cause to undergo any such retraining."

(4) Section 406(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The term 'dependent child' also includes a needy child under the age of eighteen who has been deprived of parental support or care by reason of the unemployment (as defined by the State) of a parent and who is living with any of the relatives specified in the preceding sentence in a place of residence maintained by one or more of such relatives as his (or their) own home."

(5) Section 407 of such Act is hereby repealed.

(b) The second sentence of section 401 of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "but no payment shall be made under this title to any State which has not also submitted, and had approved by the Secretary, State plans under this Act for old-age assistance, for aid to the blind, and for aid to the permanently and totally disabled".

(c) Section 404(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (1), by adding "or" at the end of paragraph (2), and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) that in the administration of the plan there is imposed, as a condition of aid under such plan, a requirement that any dependent child (or his parent or guardian) subject his (or their) home to a lien of any kind or transfer to the State agency any interest in such home;".

(d) Title IV of such Act is further amended by adding after section 406 thereof the followed new section:

"DIRECT PAYMENTS TO NEEDY FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN NOT SATISFYING RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 407. If an individual, who has filed application claiming aid to needy families with dependent children, is denied such aid by the State agency solely because he does not satisfy the residence requirements imposed under the State plan, and if such individual is not entitled to aid to families with dependent children by reason of prior residence in another State, the State agency shall promptly notify the Secretary of the fact that such individual has filed application and would be eligible for such aid if he satisfied such requirements. The Secretary shall thereupon pay directly to such individual for each month, beginning with the first month (after the month in which such application is filed) in which such individual would have been eligible for such aid if he had satisfied such residence requirements and ending with the month preceding the first month in which he satisfies such requirements, an amount (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary) equal to the Federal Government's proportionate share of the aid to families with dependent children which such individual would receive for such month if he then satisfied such requirements."

AID TO THE BLIND

Sec. 6. (a)(1)(A) Section 1002(a)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows: "(1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State;".

(B) Section 102(a)(3) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(3) provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer the plan;".

(2) Section 1002(a)(8) of such Act is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (A) thereof, and by inserting before the semicolon at the end of clause (B) thereof, a comma and the following: "(C) the ownership by such individual (alone or with his or her spouse) of a home having an assessed value, less all encumbrances of record thereon, of less than $5,000 (except to the extent that he is receiving rental income therefrom), (D) the ability of such individual's family and relatives to provide for his support, (E) any donations of surplus food which may have been made to such individual from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and (F) the first $1,200 in value (over and above all encumbrances of record) of personal property owned by such individual".

(3) Section 1002(a) of such Act is further amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (12) thereof, and by inserting immediately before the period at the end of clause (13) thereof the following: "; and (14) provide that there will be no discrimination based on sex in determining the needs of individuals receiving assistance under the plan".

(4) Section 1002(a) of such Act is further amended by adding after clause (14) thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of clause (8)(F), no life insurance policy shall be valued at more than its present surrender value to the individual, and the term 'personal property' shall not include (A) the individual's clothing, furniture, household equipment, foodstuffs, fuel, personal jewelry, or other personal effects, or (B) interment plots, money placed in trust or insurance for funeral, interment, or similar expenses, or any contract rights connected therewith, if such money, insurance, or contract rights do not exceed $500 in value."

(5) Section 1002(b)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Any residence requirement which excludes any resident of the State who has resided therein continuously for one year immediately preceding the application; or".

(b) The second sentence of section 1001 of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "but no payment shall be made under this title to any State which has not also submitted, and had approved by the Secretary, State plans under this Act for old-age assistance, for aid and services to needy families with children, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled."

(c) Section 1004 of such Act is amended by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (1), by adding "or" at the end of paragraph (2), and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) that in the administration of the plan there is imposed, as a condition of aid to any individual, a requirement that such individual subject his home to a lien of any kind or transfer to the State agency any interest in his home;".

(d) Title X of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"DIRECT PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUALS NOT SATISFYING RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 1007. If an individual, after making application for aid to the blind, is denied such aid by the State agency solely because he does not satisfy the residence requirements imposed under the State plan, and if such individual is not entitled to aid to the blind by reason of prior residence in another State, the State agency shall promptly notify the Secretary of the fact that such individual has made such application and would be eligible for such aid if he satisfied such requirements. The Secretary shall thereupon pay directly to such individual for each month, beginning with the first month (after the month of such individual's application) in which such individual would have been eligible for aid to the blind if he satisfied such residence requirements and ending with the month preceding the first month in which he satisfies such requirements, an amount (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary) equal to the Federal Government's proportionate share of the aid to the blind which such individual would receive for such month if he then satisfied such requirements.

"ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDS OF RECIPIENT ONLY

"SEC. 1008. Assistance paid to any individual under this title is provided for the purpose of assisting him in meeting his individual needs and is not for the benefit of any other person; and such assistance shall not be regarded as income of any person other than such individual."

AID TO THE PERMANENTLY AND TOTALLY DISABLED

SEC. 7. (a)(1)(A) Section 1402(a)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows: "(1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State;".

(B) Section 1402(a)(3) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(3) provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer the plan;".

(2) Section 1402(a)(8) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(8) provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming aid to the permanently and totally disabled, as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any such income; except that, in making such determination, the State agency shall disregard (A) the first $50 per month of earned income, (B) the ownership by such individual (alone or with his or her spouse) of a home having an assessed value, less all encumbrances of record thereon, of less than $5,000 (except to the extent that he is receiving rental income therefrom), (C) the ability of such individual's family and relatives to provide for his support, (D) any donations of surplus food which may have been made to such individual from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and (E) the first $1,200 in value (over and above all encumbrances of record) of personal property owned by such individual;".

(3) Section 1402(a) of such Act is further amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (11) thereof, and by inserting immediately before the period at the end of clause (12) thereof the following: "; and (13) provide that there will be no discrimination based on sex in determining the needs of individuals receiving assistance under the plan".

(4) Section 1402(a) of such Act is further amended by adding after clause (13) thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of clause (8)(E), no life insurance policy shall be valued at more than its present surrender value to the individual, and the term 'personal property' shall not include (A) the individual's clothing, furniture, household equipment, foodstuffs, fuel, personal jewelry, or other personal effects, or (B) interment plots, money placed in trust or insurance for funeral, interment, or similar expenses, or any contract rights connected therewith, if such money, insurance, or contract rights do not exceed $500 in value."

(5) Section 1402(b)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Any residence requirement which excludes any resident of the State who has

resided therein continuously for one year immediately preceding the application; or".

(b) The second sentence of section 1401 of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "but no payment shall be made under this title to any State which has not also submitted, and had approved by the Secretary, State plans under this Act for old-age assistance, aid and services to needy families with children, and aid to the blind".

(c) Section 1404 of such Act is amended by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (1), by adding "or" at the end of paragraph (2), and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) that in the administration of the plan there is imposed, as a condition of aid to any individual, a requirement that such individual subject his home to a lien of any kind or transfer to the State agency any interest in his home;".

(d) Title XIV of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"DIRECT PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUALS NOT SATISFYING RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 1406. If an individual, after making application for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, is denied such aid by the State agency solely because he does not satisfy the residence requirements imposed under the State plan, and if such individual is not entitled to aid to the permanently and totally disabled by reason of prior residence in another State, the State agency shall promptly notify the Secretary of the fact that such individual has made such application and would be eligible for such aid if he satisfied such requirements. The Secretary shall thereupon pay directly to such individual for each month, beginning with the first month (after the month of such individual's application) in which such individual would have been eligible for aid to the permanently and totally disabled if he satisfied such residence requirements and ending with the month preceding the first month in which he satisfies such requirements, an amount (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary) equal to the Federal Government's proportionate share of the aid to the permanently and totally disabled which such individual would receive for such month if he then satisfied such requirements.

"ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDS OF RECIPIENT ONLY

"SEC. 1407. Assistance paid to any individual under this title is provided for the purpose of assisting him in meeting his individual needs and is not for the benefit of any other person; and such assistance shall not be regarded as income of any person other than such individual."

COMBINED PROGRAMS OF AID TO THE AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED, OR AID TO THE AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED, AND MEDICAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE BLIND

SEC. 8. (a)(1)(A) Section 1602(a)(1) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State;".

(B) Section 1602(a)(3) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) provide for the establishment or designation of a single State agency to administer the plan;".

(2) Section 1602(a)(14) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(14) provide that the State agency shall, in determining need for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled, take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming such aid, as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any such income; except that, in making such determination, the State agency shall disregard (A)(i) in the case of an individual claiming aid to the blind, the first $85 per month of earned income plus one-half of earned income in excess of $85 per month, and for a period not in excess of twelve months, such additional amounts of other income and resources, in case such individual has a plan for achieving self-support approved by the State agency, as may be necessary for the fulfillment of such plan, and (ii) in the case of an individual claiming aid to the aged or disabled, the first $50 per month of earned income, (B) the ownership by such individual (alone or with his or her spouse) of a home having an assessed value, less all encumbrances of record thereon, of less than $5,000 (except to the extent that he is receiving rental income therefrom), (C) the ability of such individual's family and relatives to provide for his support, (D) any donations of surplus food which may have been made to such individual from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and (E) the first $1,200 in value (over and above all encumbrances of record) of personal property owned by such individual;".

(3) Section 1602(a) of such act is further amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (14), by striking out the period at the end of clause (15) and inserting in lieu of such period a semicolon followed by the word "and", and by adding after clause (15) the following new clause:

"(16) provide that there will be no discrimination based on sex in determining the needs of individuals receiving assistance under the plan."

(4) Section 1602(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of (14)(E), no life insurance policy shall be valued at more than its present surrender value to the individual, and the term 'personal property' shall not include (A) the individual's clothing, furniture, household equipment, foodstuffs, fuel, personal jewelry, or other personal effects, or (B) interment plots, money placed in trust or insurance for funeral, interment, or similar expenses, or any contract rights connected therewith, if such money, insurance, or contract rights do not exceed $500 in value."

(5) Section 1602(b)(1) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(1) an age requirement at any given time which is greater than the minimum age at which individuals are permitted at such time to become entitled to old-age insurance benefits under title II of this Act; or".

(6) Section 1602(b)(2)(A) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(A) in the case of applicants for aid to the aged, blind, or disabled excludes any resident of the State who has resided therein continuously for one year immediately preceding the application, and".

(b) The second sentence of section 1601 of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following:

"but no payment shall be made under this title to any State which has submitted a State plan under this title unless such State undertakes to provide, pursuant to such plan and other State plans approved by the Secretary under other titles of this Act, for old-age assistance, aid and services to needy families with children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled".

(c) Section 1604 of such Act is amended by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (1), by adding "or" at the end of paragraph (2), and by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) that in the administration of the plan there is imposed, as a condition of assistance to any individual, a requirement that such individual subject his home to a lien of any kind or transfer to the State agency any interest in his home;".

(d) Title XVI of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"DIRECT PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUALS NOT SATISFYING RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

"SEC. 1606. If an individual, after making application for assistance under a State plan approved pursuant to this title, is denied such assistance by the State agency solely because he does not satisfy the residence requirements imposed under the State plan, and if such individual is not entitled to similar assistance under a State plan (approved pursuant to this Act) of another State by reason of prior residence in such other State, the State agency shall promptly notify the Secretary of the fact that such individual has made such application and would be eligible for assistance if he satisfied such requirements. The Secretary shall thereupon pay directly to such individual for each month, beginning with the first month (after the month of such individual's application) in which such individual would have been eligible for such assistance if he satisfied such residence requirements and ending with the month preceding the first month in which he satisfies such requirements, an amount (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary) equal to the Federal Government's proportionate share of the assistance which such individual would receive for such month if he then satisfied such requirements.

"ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDS OF RECIPIENT ONLY

"SEC. 1607. Assistance provided to any individual under this title is provided for the purpose of assisting him in meeting his individual needs and is not for the benefit of any other person; and such assistance shall not be regarded as income of any person other than such individual."

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) Section 618 of the Revenue Act of 1951 (relating to public access to State public assistance records) is repealed.

(b) No check or warrant drawn in payment of assistance to any individual under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act, and no envelope or other outer covering therefor, shall bear any printing or marking which indicates or implies that such individual is indigent or a pauper.

(c) The amendments made by sections 3(d), 5(d), 6(d), 7(d), and 8(d) shall apply with respect to months beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act. Section 7(a) shall apply with respect to payments to which the States (including the agencies and political subdivisions thereof) became entitled after the date of the enactment of this Act. Section 7(b) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act. The amendments made by section 4 shall be applicable in the case of expenditures, under a State plan approved under title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act, made after the calendar quarter in which this Act is enacted; and for purposes of this sentence, the term "calendar quarter" means a three-month period commencing on January 1, April 1, July 1, or October 1. The remaining amendments made by this Act shall take effect on July 1, 1964.

REPEAL OF INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the president of the Federal Barge Lines, of St. Louis, Mo., relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred;

and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1031) to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

Federal Barge Lines,
St. Louis, Mo., February 1, 1962.
Hon. Warren G. Magnuson,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Magnuson: As you know, in 1924 the Inland Waterways Corporation was created as a temporary instrument to carry out the Government's policy of reestablishing water transportation on the Mississippi River. It was contemplated that as soon as this purpose was accomplished, the Government would withdraw from the business, and the enabling act spelled out the prerequisite conditions.

As the Congress hoped, water transportation did in fact "come back to life" on the Mississippi, due in no small measure to the example of the Federal Barge Line. By 1953 the growth of private enterprise in the barge business had reduced the relative importance of the Federal Barge Line to about 5 percent of the total. Accordingly, the facilities were sold in 1953 to the highest bidder by contract drawn up to satisfy the conditions in the 1924 enabling act.

The price was $9 million, payable in annual installments with interest.

One of the conditions of sale spelled out in the law, which was made one of the covenants in the sale contract, is the requirement that the purchaser agree to continue to operate the facilities "in the common carrier service in a manner substantially similar to the service rendered by the corporation." Because the contracting parties realized that service in a dynamic industry like transportation is not a static concept, this requirement was hedged in the sale contract with escape clauses which sought to provide for every reasonable contingency that might arise in the transportation industry where technological progress, keen competition, and changing distribution practices of commerce and industry make an ever-changing pattern.

Federal Barge Lines under its new ownership has for nearly 9 years performed faithfully under the terms of the sale contract. Payments have been made on schedule; the remaining unpaid balance of the purchase price is $5 million, to be paid off by June 30, 1969. All service covenants have been met or failure excused under appropriate provisions of the contract. Not one service complaint has been made to the Government.

However, as time passes, the obsolescence of the service requirements in the contract, with their qualifying escape clauses, becomes increasingly apparent. The barge service that is practical and needed in today's keenly competitive transportation market is just as different from that performed by the Government bargeline in 1953 as that 1953 service was different from what the Government performed in 1941, before World War II. Accordingly, the Federal Barge Lines approached the Secretary of Commerce last year and sought a modification of the sale contract to remove the obsolete and burdensome service requirements, so as to leave the Federal Barge Lines in the same position as to service requirements as are other competing common carrier bargelines, who are only responsible to the Interstate Commerce Commission as to the proper performance of their obligation to serve the public.

The Secretary of Commerce viewed our request sympathetically and consulted the Attorney General, who advised him that the service requirements of the sale contract could not be modified under the terms of the 1924 enabling act, and that we should seek relief in a change in the statute. The possibility of such congressional action was contemplated in the sale contract itself, which provides:

"Should Congress through legislation grant relief with respect to the present requirement of said law that the purchaser continue its common carrier service in a manner substantially similar to the service rendered by the corporation, the contract shall be deemed as modified to reflect such change."

This letter is to ask if you will place the matter before your committee in the form of a bill to repeal the Inland Waterways Corporation Act (sec. 151–157, title 49, U.S.C.).

We believe that such a bill would be generally supported. The Transportation Association of America, representing the users, investors, and all forms of transportation adopted the following position on the subject on January 15, 1953:

"'The Inland Waterways Corporation should be dissolved and the properties and routes of its operating unit, the Federal Barge Lines, should be sold or otherwise disposed of within 2 years of the enactment of legislation embodying this proposal, such sale or other disposition to be conducted without regard to the restrictions and conditions placed on such sale or other disposition by the Denison Act (sec. 153 of title 49, U.S.C.)."

Respectfully yours,
A. C. Ingersoll, Jr.,
President.

EXCLUSION OF LUMBER FROM CERTAIN TARIFF FILING REQUIREMENTS UNDER SHIPPING ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to exclude lumber from tariff filing requirements under the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of purpose of the proposed legislation be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement of purposes will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1032) to exclude cargo which is lumber from certain tariff filing requirements under the Shipping Act, 1916, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The statement of purposes presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

Purpose of Legislation To Exclude Lumber From Tariff Filing Requirements Under the Shipping Act of 1916 as Amended by the Provisions of Public Law 87–346

Public Law 87–346 amending the Shipping Act became effective January 1, 1962, and requires the filing of rates charged for the movement of freight by the steamship companies operating a regular service between the United States and foreign countries.

No upward revision in freight rates which can meet changing world conditions can be made in less than 30 days. Reductions can be made on short notice but it is necessary for the steamship companies to publish the rates and have them on file with the Federal Maritime Commission before they can be made effective.

There is severe competition from British Columbia in Canada to all the foreign markets reached from the United States. They have been gaining in the relative volume shipped to each of these foreign markets. One of the reasons is that there is no such filing requirement on the movement from British Columbia to foreign markets, and there is a hesitancy on the part of the steamship companies to lower rates when the market on freight rates is down from U.S. shipping points because if the market takes a current upward trend then it takes them 30 days to get an advance in effect.

The published rate effective February 1 from U.S. ports to United Kingdom for example is 305 shillings, or $42.70 per thousand feet of lumber shipped, whereas the rate is open from Canada but currently they are quoting 240 shillings—a total of $33.60 for freight. This indicates a freighting charge of $9.10 more from the United States than from British Columbia. The action requested by the lumber industry is supported by the Steamship Conferences and by the Federal Maritime Commission under whose jurisdiction the filing must be made. The Department of Commerce is urging American business to endeavor to develop foreign trade to a greater extent, and in conformity with this desire on the part of the Department of Commerce we have been in touch with their Trade Mission Section and are planning a trade mission to Europe early in 1963.

It is imperative that the block of transportation charges be removed prior to the trade mission if at all possible, and therefore, we urge the Members of the Senate and House to promptly enact such legislation.

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF TIME STANDARDS AND MEASUREMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to establish a uniform system of time standards and measurement for the United States and to require the observance of such time standards for all purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a recommendation and justification, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter, recommendation and justification, will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1033) to establish a uniform system of time standards and measurement for the United States and to require the observance of such time standards for all purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter, recommendation, and justification, presented by Mr. Magnuson, are as follows:

Interstate
Commerce Commission,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1963.
The Honorable Warren G. Magnuson,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Chairman Magnuson: I am submitting herewith for your consideration 40 copies of a draft bill (together with statement of justification therefor) which would give effect to Legislative Recommendation No. 1 in the Commission's 76th Annual Report.

I believe it appropriate to observe, however, that the Commission is not unanimous concerning the propriety of its initiating a detailed draft bill of the type here transmitted, the ramifications of which extend

far beyond matters relating to surface transportation. On the other hand, we are agreed both as to the need for some additional time legislation and for a redetermination by Congress as to whether the Commission is the most appropriate agency to administer present or future legislation relating to standard time.

Accordingly, and to the extent that such action will focus attention on and help to resolve these problems, your assistance in having the enclosed draft bill introduced and scheduling a hearing thereon would be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
Laurence K. Walrath,
Chairman.

Recommendation No. 1

This proposed bill would give effect to legislative recommendation No. 1 of the Interstate Commerce Commission as set forth on page 198 of its 76th annual report to Congress as follows:

"We recommend that Congress amend the Standard Time Act for the reasons set forth in the 'Standard time zones' chapter in this report, and if Congress does not see fit to so amend the statute, that we be relieved of the responsibility for its administration."

Justification

The present Standard Time Act was enacted by Congress in 1918 largely in response to an immediate need for increased national efficiency during World War I. Its stated purpose "To save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," coupled with an injunction directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to define the limits of the zones "having regard for the convenience of commerce" (not just interstate commerce) and a requirement that standard time be observed in relation to acts required to be performed "by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States," was thought to evince the intent of Congress to fix standards of time for all purposes.

For a brief period, the standards of time prescribed under the act were universally observed despite the fact that it contains no enforcement procedure or penalty provisions. The daylight-saving feature, however, was repealed in 1919 over President Wilson's veto, and shortly thereafter the Commission began to experience difficulty due to the limited scope of the act and the tendency of individual States and cities to exercise a claimed right of local option. Thus, local daylight saving time, adopted at first by Boston, New York, and Chicago, gradually spread to many other cities and towns in the East and Midwest. In a suit to enjoin the authorities of Massachusetts from enforcing the observance of an advanced time standard, a Federal district court held that, in enacting the Standard Time Act, Congress had not fully occupied the time field and, consequently, that there was no necessary conflict between that act and the enforcement of a different standard of time designed for purposes other than those specified in the act. See *Massachusetts State Grange* v. *Benton,* 10 F. (2d) 515, *Aff'd. sub nom. Mass. State Grange* v. *Benton,* 272 U.S. 525 (1926).

With the way open to States and individual communities to act independently, an ever-increasing confusion and conflict of time standards has developed; and, in an era characterized by jet speed and by remarkable advances in space technology, this situation has become particularly aggravated and, therefore, potentially dangerous.

The situation in Indiana, as depicted in Standard Time Zone Investigation, 314 I.C.C. 101 (126–129), decided June 6, 1961, provides a pointed illustration of the problem. There, among other things, the evidence details the difficulties experienced by numerous commercial, communications, and transport concerns as well as the extreme confusion attending the arrival and departure of air flights at the Indianapolis airport. Another example is the recent time law of Virginia, which provides for daylight-saving time for most of the State from Memorial Day to Labor Day, but exempts Bristol, and permits the usual period of daylight saving for that part of the Washington metropolitan area located in Virginia. Accordingly, the same standard is observed in Richmond, Arlington, and Bristol during the winter and early spring. From the last Sunday in April until May 30, however, Richmond time is the same as Bristol, but an hour behind Arlington; from May 30 to the first Monday in September, Richmond time is the same as Arlington, but an hour ahead of Bristol; and, from the first Monday in September to the last Sunday in October, Richmond time is the same as Bristol and an hour behind Arlington. Thereafter, the same time is again observed by all three localities. While this arrangement is confusing, it is undoubtedly superior to the situation which existed when each community in Virginia determined for itself whether it would observe daylight saving time and for what period.

For many years, annual reports of the Interstate Commerce Commission have directed the attention of Congress to the need for additional time legislation; and, at the same time, in proceedings held under the act, the Commission has earnestly endeavored to find a solution to the numerous conflicts caused by the action of State or local authorities in changing local time standards. The pattern is usually the same. The shift in local time brings a flood of complaints and petitions for a change in the zone boundaries or for some action restoring the former situation, which finally impel a reopening of the proceeding for reconsideration. Thus, the Commission is repeatedly injected into bitter local controversies without power to resolve them with any reasonable regard for the convenience and safety of the area as a whole. If it is found that the requested change would not enhance the convenience of commerce, a denial of the petition, in most instances, merely perpetuates the existing conflict and causes it to spread to additional areas. On the other hand, a grant of the relief sought often produces a similar outcome, since the resulting mutation of boundaries creates inconvenience in adjacent areas and, thereby, precipitates other independent local changes followed by further complaints and petitions for further modifications.

The Commission's experience amply demonstrates that any attempt to confine the application of the standard of time solely to Federal matters or to interstate commerce, while local matters or intrastate commerce are governed by a different standard, is bound to result in chaos. The original idea of Congress that a Federal standard would dominate and control local time has not been borne out in the practice. Instead, the conflict between Federal and local standards is usually resolved by the observance of local time by Federal officers and establishments.

The Commission has consistently taken the position that this hopeless intermingling of Federal and local time standards adequately justifies the complete occupancy by Congress of the field of standard time regulation. In this respect, however, it is not necessary to rely solely upon the commerce clause, since, in the opinion of the Commission, other clauses of the Constitution, including the standards of weights and measures clause, grant Congress the power to prescribe a uniform system of standard time for the country which is not limited to matters relating to interstate commerce or foreign commerce.

In its current annual report, this Commission has reiterated its prior recommendations that the scope of the Standard Time Act be broadened by providing that the standard time of the zone shall be the exclusive measure of time and by adding more definite standards, requirements for observance, penalties for violation, and provisions for administration and enforcement. The proposed bill has been drawn to accomplish these purposes.

The general intent of the draft bill—to provide a uniform system of time standards and measurement for the United States—is stated in section 4. In addition, to the five existing zones, this section would add one zone to the east primarily to provide a substitute for the designation "eastern daylight-saving time," and two to the West in order to cover Alaska and Hawaii adequately.

It is useful to recognize that the 8 designated zones are parts of the international system of 24 zones stretching from Greenwich east and west around the world, as is done in section 5.

The meridians of longitude dividing the designated zones are specified in section 6. The names selected for the zones are those which are now in use or, as in the designation "Alaska-Hawaii," appear to be appropriate choices. It should be noted, however, that the position of the word "standard," which in the official designations in the present act precedes the names of particular zones, has been changed to follow the names, so as to conform to general usage. Thus, the designation "eastern standard time" is used rather than the now official form "standard eastern time."

Section 7 follows the present act and authorizes the "agency" designated as administrator to define the limits of the zones and to modify them from time to time. The proviso would continue existing boundary determinations until changed. Provision is made for the continued observance of daylight saving time until the designated agency has had an opportunity to define the limits of subzones provided for in the act or for 1 year.

Section 8 includes a number of general principles which the Commission has found useful in determining the zone boundaries in the past. Difficulty is experienced in adhering to them, however, due to lack of explicit authority under the present act and also because commercial interests would have the Commission confine its consideration strictly to the convenience of interstate commerce. This section also provides that, in fixing the boundaries, the designated agency shall not include in any zone a point or area for which the standard time would be more than 1 hour faster than sun time.

Numerous bills presented to Congress in prior years have required national observance either of standard time throughout the year or of standard time coupled with a provision for daylight-saving time during that portion of the year when daylight extends considerably beyond normal work hours. Straight standard time bills, however, are apt to engender vigorous opposition from the large areas in the Northeast, Midwest, and Pacific coast which now observe daylight-saving time. On the other hand, bills requiring nationwide observance of daylight-saving time generally are unpopular in certain remaining portions of the country.

The draft bill meets and, in the opinion of the Commission, obviates these difficulties in section 9. Where desirable in the public interest, the administering agency would be authorized to delineate an area within any zone—a subzone—for transfer during a specified period to the zone immediately to the east. If, for example, a subzone were defined in the northeastern part of the central standard time zone, such subzone would become a part of the eastern standard time zone during the summertime. Accordingly, this section introduces a needed flexibility into the application of an advanced time standard. In those zones or portions of zones where no popular demand for a faster standard of time is manifested, none will be provided.

Sections 10, 11, and 12 would authorize the administering agency to conduct necessary proceedings, to issue subpenas, to employ the staff necessary to perform its duties under the act, and to receive and hear petitions as to the time zones. The present act contains no provisions for its administration.

Sections 13 and 14 contain important provisions making the standard time of the zone the measure of time for the transaction of all public business by the Federal or State Governments or by persons subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, except for scientific purposes or for other purposes expressly exempted by the designated agency under a provision designed to foster and protect the public interest.

Provisions for the execution and enforcement of the draft bill, entirely absent from the present act, are provided in sections 15 to 18. These include injunctive relief, civil forfeitures, and fines for willful violations.

In total effect, the proposed bill would provide for the United States a stable and orderly system of time characterized by clearly defined boundaries and truly geared to the vastly accelerated tempo of the age in which we live. Accordingly, it is recommended that this bill be enacted substantially in its present form.

Finally, it must be observed that the Commission's experience indicates that the convenience of transportation is only one of the many considerations in time-zone hearings, and that the major portion of the testimony adduced at such hearings is elicited from a broad spectrum of sources, including representatives of Federal, State, county, and municipal governments, banks, brokers, insurance companies, manufacturers, mining companies, refineries, wholesale and retail dealers, radio and television broadcasters, telephone and telegraph companies, newspapers, lawyers, doctors, hospitals, tour bureaus, school boards, farmers, stock breeders, and dairymen. For this reason, it is also recommended that careful consideration be given to the question of whether the Interstate Commerce Commission is the most appropriate agency to administer the provisions of any future law relating to standard time. In any event, should the Congress not see fit to change or amend the present Standard Time Act so as to provide a more efficient and effective system of time regulation, it is recommended that the Commission be relieved of the responsibility for its administration.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, RELATING TO PENALTIES FOR FALSIFICATION OF RECORDS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to penalties for falsification of records, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1034) to amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to penalties for falsification of records, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

Federal Aviation Agency,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1963.

Dear Mr. President: I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a draft bill "To amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to penalties for falsification of records, and for other purposes."

Section 902(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 presently provides criminal sanctions for failures to submit or preserve accurate records as required by law. The section is an important part of the Agency's authority to monitor air safety through the examination of relevant documents. The bill would amend section 902(e) in three particulars: it would broaden the class of persons to which the section applies; it would add a prison sentence as an alternative sanction; it would make a minor correction in the syntax of the section as now drafted.

Section 902(e) presently provides for the punishment of "air carriers" or their representatives for willfully failing to submit or preserve accurate records. No criminal sanctions, however, are available under the act for use against other operators who are required to submit and preserve records, but who are not "air carriers." Recent experience indicates the need for more effective sanctions with respect to non-air-carrier operators. Last year, for example, two especially flagrant violation of recordkeeping obligations were discovered involving part 45 commercial operators. These operators were found to have falsified applications, airmen records, aircraft logs, loading schedules, passenger manifests, maintenance records and flight records. While these commercial operations are in many cases technically indistinguishable from air carrier operations, and while part 45 operators may, under the regulations, owe the same recordkeeping obligations as scheduled and supplemental air carriers, no criminal sanctions are available against them since they are not technically "air carriers."

The two remedies which are available have not proved satisfactory. In cases such as those mentioned above, the Administrator can revoke the operating authority of the operator. This was in fact done in the two cases mentioned. But, in these frequently small companies, there is a real need for authority to proceed directly against the individuals responsible for the violations. Such individuals are otherwise able to (and in fact have) set up new companies, securing new operating authority by the use of still further record falsifications. Authority to move directly against these individuals would provide a more effective deterrent.

The other available remedy allows such a direct approach, but to a limited degree only. Title 18 of the United States Code provides in section 1001 that certain types of record falsification shall be punished as felonies. Because of the severity of the penalties imposed, however, the statute is narrowly drawn. It does not directly reach, for example, failures to make required reports, failures to keep and preserve accurate records, or failures to submit records in the form and manner prescribed by law. All of these requirements are presently covered by section 902(a) since they are critical in the process of monitoring air safety. Further, title 18 has not proved a satisfactory deterrent even where it applies because of the understandable reluctance of the Department of Justice to prosecute violations which may not rise to real felony proportions. The instant bill will punish these violations as misdemeanors and, being easier to enforce, should prove a more effective deterrent.

It is proposed by the present bill to broaden the coverage of section 902(e) by substituting the phrase "Any person" for the phrase "Any carrier, or any officer, agent, employee, or representative thereof" in the first line of the section.

The bill also adds a prison sentence as an alternative to the monetary penalty now authorized. This will increase the deterrent effect of the section. Similar alternative sanctions are presently available under sections 902(b), 902(c), 902(f), 902(g), and 902(h) of the Federal Aviation Act, and under section 19 of the Federal Airport Act.

Finally, the bill will clarify the question of whether the proscription of section 902(e) runs to falsification of reports required by regulation as well as to the falsification of reports required by the act. The language can now be interpreted to refer only to the latter. Since there are no reports specifically required by the Act, it was obviously the intent of Congress to refer to the former and, to make this intent clear, the phrase "or by regulations promulgated under this act" has been added to the third line of section 902(e), immediately following the comma.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely,

N. E. Halaby,
Administrator.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF SECTION 3 OF PUBLIC LAW 87-346, RELATING TO DUAL RATE CONTRACTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a statement of the purpose and provisions of the bill, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. Magnuson are as follows:

Federal Maritime Commission,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There are submitted herewith four copies of a proposed bill, together with a statement of purpose and need for the draft bill, to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346.

The need for and purpose of the proposed bill are set forth in the accompanying statement.

The Federal Maritime Commission urges enactment of the bill at the 1st session of the 88th Congress for the reasons set forth in the accompanying statement.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas E. Stakem,
Chairman.

Purpose and Provisions of Bill To Extend the Provisions of Section 3 of Public Law 87-346

The bill would extend the period during which the Federal Maritime Commission shall approve, disapprove, cancel or modify, existing dual-rate contracts in use in our waterborne foreign commerce for a period of 1 year.

By Public Law 87-346 Congress imposed comprehensive requirements which must be included in dual-rate contracts. Section 3 of Public Law 87-346 provides that all existing dual-rate contracts which were lawful on the date that the law was enacted, if modified to comply with the requirements of Public Law 87-346 within 6 months (April 3, 1962), would remain lawful for a period not to exceed 1 year (April 3, 1963).

The section provided that the Commission within such year approve, disapprove, cancel or modify such contract in accordance with the new requirement contained in that Public Law.

On or about April 3, 1962, amendments to some 60 dual-rate contracts were filed with the Commission pursuant to the foregoing statutory provisions.

As required by law by appropriate notice in the Federal Register the Commission requested the views of interested persons. Comments were received from many interested parties particularly shippers, exporters and importers which raised objection to many of the amendments proposed, and requested an opportunity to be heard as provided by Public Law 87-346 before the Commission took action to approve, disapprove, cancel or modify the contracts.

In accordance with the desires of Congress as expressed in the House and Senate committee reports on the bill which became Public Law 87-346, the Commission has also undertaken by a former rulemaking proceeding to deal with certain matters which, to some extent, were left unsolved by the public law. This rulemaking proceeding must of necessity, be closely coordinated with the 60 individual contract proceedings.

In order to afford all persons the rights accorded to them under the procedures set out in Public Law 87-346 and in view of the many complex questions which unavoidably flow from the Commission's attempt to accord due weight to the many and diverse interests represented in these matters, additional time is needed to allow the Commission to discharge its responsibility in approving, disapproving, canceling or modifying the amended contracts. The bill would extend until April 3, 1964, the time by which the Commission must pass upon the lawfulness of all current contracts; and, while it is our serious hope and intention that the matter will be disposed of short of that time, prudence suggests that the April 3, 1964, date would not be unreasonable.

AMENDMENT OF INLAND AND WESTERN RIVERS RULES, RELATING TO CERTAIN LIGHTS AND SIGNALS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a comparative type showing changes in existing law made by the proposed legislation, and a sectional analysis, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter, comparative type, and sectional analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1036) to amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter, comparative type, and sectional analysis, presented by Mr. Magnuson, are as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, February 20, 1963.

Dear Mr. President: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To amend the inland and western rivers rules concerning anchor lights and fog signals required in special anchorage areas, and for other purposes."

The purpose of this proposed legislation is, first, to ameliorate existing statutory requirements of inland and western rivers rules for anchor lights and fog signals with respect to certain classes of vessels when anchored in "special anchorage areas" designated by the Secretary of the Army under authority of 33 U.S.C. 180 and 322, and, second, to make the inland and western rivers rules regarding anchor lights uniform.

Under existing provisions of the above rules, vessels at anchor in "special anchorage areas" must, with one exception, carry the same lights and sound the same fog signals as vessels anchored elsewhere. Those under 150 feet in length must carry a single all-around white light in the forward part of the vessel, visible for at least 2 miles under western rivers rules, 1 mile under inland rules. Those of 150 feet or upward in length must carry a second such light in the afterpart of the vessel, at least 15 feet lower than the forward light. All vessels must, under conditions of fog or reduced visibility, sound the prescribed fog signal. This consists of rapidly ringing a bell for about 5 seconds at intervals of not more than once every minute. The one exception is that vessels of not more than 65 feet in length when anchored in these special anchorage areas need not display any anchor light.

A subcommittee of the Western Rivers Panel of the United States Coast Guard's Merchant Marine Council, upon completion of a recent study of problems facing towboat and barge operators on interior and coastal waters of the United States, recommended that the above requirements be modified in certain particulars. This group pointed out that "special anchorage areas" which are designated by the Secretary of the Army can be safe, well marked, removed from the immediate vicinity of navigable channels or fairways, and published to mariners generally; that barges, scows, and other nondescript craft would often be tied together and anchored in these areas in groups; that such craft are customarily left unmanned; and that existing lighting and fog signal requirements for vessels of this type when anchored in these special areas can safely be reduced. The Merchant Marine Council carefully studied these recommendations and approved them to the extent reflected in this bill.

The bill would ameliorate existing requirements for vessels at anchor in these special anchorage areas in the following particulars:

(1) Barges, scows, canalboats and other nondescript craft of 150 feet or upwards in length would carry a single anchor light in lieu of the two which are presently required.

(2) When barges, scows, canalboats or other nondescript craft are tied together and anchored as a group, only the vessel with its anchor down would display an anchor light.

(3) Barges, scows, canalboats and other nondescript craft of all sizes would be exempt from the requirement of sounding a fog signal.

(4) Vessels of any type not more than 65 feet in length would be exempt from the requirement of sounding a fog signal.

Existing provisions of the inland and western rivers rules with respect to anchor lights are divergent in several minor particulars. Under the inland rules, the forward anchor light of a vessel of 150 feet or upward in length must be displayed at a position not less than 20 or more than 40 feet above the hull; under the western river rules, only the minimum distance is specified. The inland rules require that a vessel of under 150 feet in length display its single anchor light at a height not exceeding 20 feet above the hull; the western river rules make no such requirement. The inland rules prescribe that the visibility of anchor lights shall be at least 1 mile; the western rivers rules prescribe 2 miles. The proposed bill would eliminate these differences and make both sets of rules uniform in these particulars.

It is believed that these changes will remove an unnecessary burden from the shipping industry without materially reducing safety of navigation.

There is enclosed for your convenient reference a comparative type showing the changes in existing law that would be made by the proposed bill, along with a sectional analysis of the bill.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Douglas Dillon.

Comparative Type Showing Changes in Existing Law Made by the Proposed Bill

[Matter proposed to be omitted is enclosed in brackets; new matter is in italic]

ARTICLE 11 OF THE RULES OF THE ROAD FOR INLAND WATERS AS CONTAINED IN THE ACT OF JUNE 7, 1897, AS AMENDED (33 U.S.C. 180)

Art. 11. (*a*) *Except as provided in paragraph* (c) *of this article,* [A] *a* vessel under one hundred and fifty feet in length when at anchor shall carry forward, where it can best be seen, [but at a height not exceeding twenty feet above the hull,] a white light in a lantern so constructed as to show a clear, uniform, and unbroken light visible all around the horizon at a distance of at least [one mile] *two miles.* [*Provided,* That the Secretary of the Army may, after investigation, by rule, regulation, or order, designate such areas as he may deem proper as "special anchorage areas"; such special anchorage areas may from time to time be changed, or abolished, if after investigation the Secretary of the Army shall deem such change or abolition in the interest of navigation: *Provided further,* That vessels not more than sixty-five feet in length when at anchor in any such special anchorage area shall not be required to carry or exhibit the white light required by this article.]

(*b*) *Except as provided in paragraph* (c) *of this article,* [A] a vessel of one hundred and fifty feet or upward in length, when at anchor, shall carry in the forward part of the vessel, at a height of not less than twenty [and not exceeding forty] feet above the hull, one such light, and at or near the stern of the vessel, and at such a height that it shall be not less than fifteen feet lower than the forward light, another such light.

[The length of a vessel shall be deemed to be the length appearing in her certificate of registry.]

(c) *The Secretary of the Army may, after investigation, by rule, regulation, or order, designate such areas as he may deem proper as "special anchorage areas"; such special anchorage areas may from time to time be changed, or abolished, if after investigation the Secretary of the Army shall deem such change or abolition in the interest of navigation. When anchored within such an area—*

(1) a vessel of not more than sixty-five feet in length shall not be required to carry or exhibit the white light required by this article;

(2) a barge, canal boat, scow, or other nondescript craft of one hundred and fifty feet or upward in length may carry and exhibit the single white light prescribed by paragraph (a) *of this article in lieu of the two white lights prescribed by paragraph* (b) *of this article; and*

(3) where two or more barges, canal boats, scows, or other nondescript craft are tied together and anchored as a unit, the anchor light prescribed by this article need be displayed only on the vessel having its anchor down.

ARTICLE 15 OF THE RULES OF THE ROAD FOR INLAND WATERS AS CONTAINED IN THE ACT OF JUNE 7, 1897 (33 U.S.C. 191)

ART. 15. * * *.

In fog, mist, falling snow, or heavy rainstorms, whether by day or night, the signals described in this article shall be used as follows, namely:

* * * * *

(d) A vessel when at anchor shall, at intervals[,] of not more than one minute, ring the bell rapidly for about five seconds[.] *, except that the following vessels shall not be required to sound this signal when anchored in a special anchorage area established pursuant to paragraph* (c) *of article 11:*

(1) a vessel of not more than sixty-five feet in length; and

(2) a barge, canal boat, scow, or other nondescript craft.

RULE NUMBERED 13 OF THE RULES OF THE ROAD FOR WESTERN RIVERS AS CONTAINED IN SECTION 4233 OF THE REVISED STATUTES (33 U.S.C. 322)

RULE No. 13. (a) *Except as provided in paragraph* (c) *of this rule,* [A] *a* vessel under one hundred and fifty feet in length, when at anchor [and not moored to the bank or wharf,] shall carry forward, where it can best be seen, a white light in a lantern so constructed as to show a clear, uniform, and unbroken light visible all around the horizon at a distance of at least two [miles] *miles.* [: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Army may, after investigation, by rule, regulation, or order, designate such areas as he may deem proper as "special anchorage areas"; such special anchorage areas may from time to time be changed, or abolished, if after investigation the Secretary of the Army shall deem such change or abolition in the interest of navigation: *Provided further,* That vessels not more than sixty-five feet in length when at anchor in any such special anchorage area shall not be required to carry or exhibit the white light required by this article.]

(b) *Except as provided in paragraph* (c) *of this rule,* [A] *a* vessel of one hundred and fifty feet or upward in length, when at anchor, [and not moored to the bank or a wharf,] shall carry in the forward part of the vessel, [where it can best be seen,] *at a height of not less than twenty feet above the hull,* one such light, and at or near the stern of the vessel, and at such a height that it shall not be less than fifteen feet lower than the forward light, another such light.

(c) The Secretary of the Army may, after investigation, by rule, regulation, or order, designate such areas as he may deem proper as "special anchorage areas"; such special anchorage areas may from time to time be changed, or abolished, if after investigation the Secretary of the Army shall deem such change or abolition in the interests of navigation. When anchored within such an area—

(1) a vessel of not more than sixty-five feet in length shall not be required to carry or exhibit the white light required by this rule:

(2) a barge, canal boat, scow, or other nondescript craft of one hundred and fifty feet or upward in length may carry and exhibit the single white light prescribed by paragraph (a) of this rule in lieu of the two white lights prescribed by paragraph (b) of this rule; and

(3) where two or more barges, canal boats, scows, or other nondescript craft are tied together and anchored as a unit, the anchor light prescribed by this rule need be displayed only on the vessel having its anchor down.

RULE NUMBERED 15 OF THE RULES OF THE ROAD FOR WESTERN RIVERS AS CONTAINED IN SECTION 4233 OF THE REVISED STATUTES (33 U.S.C. 331).

RULE No. 15. * * *.

In fog, mist, falling snow, heavy rainstorms, or any other condition similarly restricting visibility, whether by day or night, the signals described by this article shall be used as follows, namely:

* * * * *

(d) A vessel when at anchor shall, at intervals of not more than one minute, ring the bell rapidly for about five seconds [.], *except that the following vessels shall not be required to sound this signal when anchored in a special anchorage area established pursuant to paragraph (c) of rule 13:*

(1) a vessel not more than sixty-five feet in length; and

(2) a barge, canal boat, scow or other nondescript craft.

Sectional analysis

SECTION 1: This section amends article 11 of the inland rules of the road (33 U.S.C. 180), relating to lights required for vessels at anchor, in the following particulars:

(1) It eliminates the present requirements that the single anchor light carried by a vessel of under 150 feet in length be located at a height not exceeding 20 feet above the hull (conforming to western rivers rules).

(2) It eliminates the present requirement that the forward anchor light carried by a vessel of 150 feet or upward in length be located at a height not exceeding 40 feet above the hull (conforming to western rivers rules).

(3) It extends the visibility requirement of anchor lights from 1 to 2 miles (conforming to western rivers rules).

(4) It ameliorates existing anchor light requirements with respect to vessels at anchor in "special anchorage areas" designated by the Secretary of the Army, in the following particulars:

(a) Vessels of not more than 65 feet in length are exempt from the requirements of displaying an anchor light.

(b) Barges, scows, canal boats, or other nondescript craft of 150 feet or upward in length will carry a single anchor light of the type prescribed for vessels of under 150 feet in length in lieu of the two which are presently required.

(c) Barges, scows, canal boats, or other nondescript craft which are tied together and anchored as a group need display only a single anchor light of the type prescribed for vessels under 150 feet in length, such light to be displayed on the vessel which has its anchor down.

(5) It deletes the existing provision that the length of a vessel shall be deemed to be the length appearing on her certificate of registry (conforming to western rivers rules).

Section 2. This section amends subsection (d) of article 15 of the inland rules of the road (33 U.S.C. 191), relating to sound signals for fog, by exempting the following classes of vessels from the requirement of sounding fog signals when anchored in "special anchorage areas" established by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to article 11(c):

(1) Vessels of not more than 65 feet in length.

(2) Barges, scows, canal boats, or other nondescript craft.

Section 3: This section amends rule No. 13 of the western rivers rules (33 U.S.C. 322). relating to lights required to be carried by vessels at anchor, in the following particulars:

(1) It interjects a new requirement that the forward light carried by a vessel of 150 feet or upward in length be displayed not less than 20 feet above the hull (conforming to the inland rules).

(2) It ameliorates existing anchor light requirements with respect to vessels at anchor in "special anchorage areas" designated by the Secretary of the Army, in the following particulars:

(a) Barges, scows, canal boats or other nondescript craft of 150 feet or upwards in length will carry a single anchor light of the type prescribed for vessels of under 150 feet in length in lieu of the two which are presently required.

(b) Barges, scows, canal boats or other nondescript craft which are tied together and anchored as a group need display only a single anchor light of the type prescribed for vessels under 150 feet in length, such light to be displayed on the vessel which has its anchor down.

Section 4: This section amends subsection (d) of rule No. 15, western rivers rules (33 U.S.C. 331), relating to signals for fog, by exempting the following classes of vessels from the requirement of sounding fog signals when anchored in "special anchorage areas" established by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to rule No. 11:

(1) Vessels of not more than 65 feet in length.

(2) Barges, scows, canal boats or other nondescript craft.

The net results of these amendments are that (1) of the inland rules and the western rivers rules are made uniform and consistent in their requirements as to anchor lights and fog signals, and (2) under both sets of rules new and lesser requirements are established with respect to anchor lights and fog signals for certain classes of vessels which are anchored in "special anchorage areas" designated by the Secretary of the Army.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 208(c) OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 208(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1037) to amend section 208(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The explanation presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

REPEAL OF AUTOMATIC CHARTER RIGHTS FOR MOTOR CARRIERS OF PASSENGERS

INTRODUCTION

The intercity bus industry, represented by its national trade association, National Association of Motor Bus Owners, urges amendment of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act to abolish automatic charter rights. The effect of the proposal would be to require future applicants for passenger certificates to prove public convenience and necessity for charter operations. Grandfather rights would be accorded existing certificates. As a result, there has not in the past been opposition to this legislation.

The proposal is to substitute for the present section 208(c) of the act of the following provision:

"(c) Any common carrier by motor vehicle transporting passengers under a certificate issued under this part on or before 180 days following the effective date of this section, or under any reissuance of the operating rights contained in such certificate may transport in interstate or foreign commerce to any place special or chartered parties under such rules and regulations as the Commission shall have prescribed."

Similar legislation was recommended by the Interstate Commerce Commission in each of its annual reports from 1955 through 1959. It was omitted from the 1960 and subsequent reports because, it is understood, the Commission felt the bus industry itself must assume the burden of pressing for enactment.

S. 1459, embodying this proposal, was passed by the Senate in the 85th Congress. H.R. 5660 was introduced in the same Congress and hearings were held before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. However, the bill was not reported out of committee.

REASON FOR LEGISLATION

There has been widespread abuse of the present provision of section 208(c) of the act relating to charter operations, as the Interstate Commerce Commission pointed out in its legislative recommendations for 1955 through 1959. Applications for regular-route motor passenger certificates, particularly over short routes, have frequently been made solely or primarily for the purpose of securing these incidental unlimited character rights. In many instances only token service is offered on regular routes in order to keep alive the charter rights automatically granted with the regular-route certificate.

This situation is of particular concern to the established regular-route carriers which render bona fide essential services to thousands of communities which are entirely dependent upon intercity buses for their only means of public passenger transport. Much of this service tends to be noncompensatory, particularly over short routes, and a very significant portion of it is actually supplied at a loss to the carriers. In many cases the service would necessarily be discontinued if it were not for the revenues received from charter business which offset the losses on the regular-route service.

Charter services were only a small part of common carrier passenger operations at the time section 208(c) of the act was passed. They were then truly incidental to regular-route operations. Accordingly, proof of need for regular-route authority was sufficient safeguard to protect the public from the destructive consequences of overcrowding in the charter field. For that reason the provisions of section 208(c) granting charter rights as an incident to regular-route authority were sufficient to assure the integrity of the principles contained in the national transportation policy for an orderly development of an adequate transportation system.

However, the situation has undergone a radical change since that time. Charter services have increased many times in amount and they have become essential as a support for regular-route operations. They are an important part of our transportation system. They are no longer merely incidental to regular-route services.

Despite the importance of charter services, there has not been a controlled development such as we have had for regular-route operations. The result is that the field is tremendously overcrowded. A grossly wasteful duplication of charter facilities exists which has led to destructive competition for charters contrary to the basic purposes of the Interstate Commerce Act. The proposed amendment of section 208(c) would tend to correct this situation.

In view of the present growth and importance of charter services, they should not be authorized except upon proof of need in the same way that a need must be shown for regular-route authority. The proposed amendment would accomplish this objective. The amendment would not bar bona fide applicants for charter services and it would reduce the existing effects of overcrowding in this field.

The financial plight of the established regular-route carriers would now be less serious if they had not been confronted with this condition of overcrowding. The proposed amendment would tend to restore the bus transportation industry to the sound economic conditions for which the Motor Carrier Act was originally enacted.

CIVIL REDRESS TO PERSONS DAMAGED BY UNFAIR COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES IN OR AFFECTING COMMERCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide civil redress to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce. Recommended by the committee on trademarks and unfair competition of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, the bill is designed to create a uniform body of Federal law on unfair competition, enforceable in the Federal courts, in cases where interstate commerce is affected. First introduced in 1959 in the House of Representatives, the bill was introduced by me in the 87th Congress as S. 1036 and subsequently in a revised version as S. 2784. The bill has since been further perfected by the bar association committee after consultation with other bar and business groups. A parallel measure is being introduced today in the House of Representatives by Congressman LINDSAY.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be incorporated as a part of my remarks the text of the bill, together with an explanatory memorandum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1038) to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the intent of this Act is to regulate all commerce which may lawfully be regulated by Congress by making actionable in a Federal forum all unfair commercial activities set forth herein thereby to protect any person engaged in interstate commerce against such unfair commercial activities whether used or committed locally or in interstate commerce.

SEC. 2. Any person damaged or likely to be damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce shall be entitled to an injunction in a civil action brought by that person against any person who has engaged in such activities. The prevailing party in any such action also shall be entitled to judgment for taxable costs and disbursements and, in the discretion of the court, reasonable attorneys' fees.

SEC. 3. Unfair commercial activities under this Act shall be—

(a) the commission of any act or practice or the use of any statement which is likely (1) to cause confusion as to the affiliation, connection, or association of the person charged therewith or (2) to cause confusion as to the origin, source, or sponsorship of the goods or services of such person or (3) to dilute the distinctive quality of a trademark or trade name of another;

(b) the use for purposes of profit of any statement of fact as to the goods or services of either party which is false or misleading by reason either of misstatement or omission of a material fact;

(c) the commission for purposes of profit of any other act or practice which is likely to deceive or which violates reasonable standards of commercial ethics; or

(d) the institution of an action under this Act in bad faith.

SEC. 4. Absence of competition between the parties, of actual damage to the person seeking protection, or of a public interest in such unfair commercial activities shall not be a defense to an action brought under this Act.

SEC. 5. Absence of knowledge or intent shall be a defense to any action brought under this Act against a publisher or broadcaster in respect of any contents of any news, literary, educational, advertising, or entertainment medium.

SEC. 6. Relief shall not be available under this Act in respect of an issue of a newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical, the broadcast of any radio or television program, or the showing of any motion picture when restraining the appearance or performance of any particular issue of such periodical, program; or picture would delay its dissemination after the regular time therefor, and such delay would be due to the method by which dissemination is customarily conducted in accordance with sound business practice and not to any method or device adopted for the evasion of this Act or to prevent or delay the issuance of an injunction or restraining order.

SEC. 7. This Act shall not be construed so as to extend or enlarge the rights and remedies provided under the patent or copyright laws of the United States.

SEC. 8. The district and territorial courts of the United States shall have exclusive original jurisdiction and the circuit courts of appeal of the United States and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive appellate jurisdiction, of all actions whatsoever under this Act without regard to the amount in controversy or to diversity or lack of diversity of the citizenship of the parties. Writs of certiorari may be granted by the Supreme Court of the United States for the review of cases arising under this Act.

SEC. 9. The relief provided for by this Act shall be in addition to and not in exclusion of those rights and remedies otherwise available under the common law or pursuant to the statutes of any State or of the United States. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to preempt the jurisdiction of any State to grant relief in cases of unfair commercial activities.

SEC. 10. In the construction of this Act, unless the contrary is plainly apparent from the context—

1. The term "person" includes any individual, partnership, corporation, association, union, or other organization capable of suing or being sued in a court of law.

2. The term "commerce" means all commerce which may lawfully be regulated by Congress.

3. Words used in the singular include the plural and vice versa.

4. The term "trademark" includes any word, name, symbol, or device or any combination thereof adopted and used by a manufacturer or merchant to identify his goods and distinguish them from those manufactured or sold by others; any mark used in the sale or advertising of services to identify the services of one person and distinguish them from the services of others, including without limitation the titles, character names and other distinctive features of radio and television programs notwithstanding that they, or the programs, may advertise the goods of the sponsor; any mark used upon or in connection with the products or services of one or more persons other than the owner of the mark to certify regional or other origin, material, mode of manufacture, quality, accuracy, or other characteristics of such goods or services or that the work or labor on the goods or services was performed by members of a union or other organization; or any mark used by the members of a cooperative, an association or other collective group or organization, including marks used to indicate membership in a union, an association, or other organization.

5. The term "trade name" includes individual names and surnames, firm names and trade names used by manufacturers, industrialists, merchants, agriculturists, and others to identify their businesses, vocations, or occupations or the names or titles lawfully adopted and used by persons, firms, associations, corporations, companies, unions, and any manufacturing, industrial, commercial, agricultural, or other organizations engaged in trade or commerce and capable of suing and being sued in a court of law.

SEC. 11. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 12. This Act shall be in force and take effect immediately upon its enactment but shall not affect any suit, proceeding or appeal then pending.

SEC. 13. This Act may be cited as the "Unfair Commercial Activities Act."

The memorandum presented by Mr. JAVITS is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

The accompanying bill essentially is the same as H.R. 7833, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959); H.R. 4590, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961); S. 1036, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961); H.R. 10038, 87th Cong., 2d sess. (1962); and S. 2784, 87th Cong., 2d sess. (1962). Although no hearings were held on any of these bills, they have been the subject of considerable study within the legal profession which has led to various modifications, culminating in the present version. The original bill was drafted by the committee on trade marks and unfair competition of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, which also has prepared each of the successive variations in response to comment and criticism from other bar associations, trade associations and the like.

The basic purpose of the bill is to create a Federal statutory cause of action that could be invoked by an injured party as an alternative to the common-law tort of unfair competition in cases where interstate commerce is affected. In the absence of such a statute, there can be no uniform Federal rules in the law of unfair competition. This comes about because of the decision of the United States Supreme Court in 1938 in the famous case of *Erie R. Co.* v. *Tompkins*, 304 U.S. 64, which held that there is no Federal common law. As a result, Federal courts that have jurisdiction of cases because of the diversity of citizenship of the parties must apply the law of the State in which they sit; and this extends to unfair competition cases.

There are many branches of law where the rule of *Erie* v. *Tompkins* has salutary effects because it prevents the accidental availability of Federal jurisdiction from affecting the law applicable to a given controversy. In the field of unfair competition, however, the effect of this decision has been to prevent the development of uniform nationwide rules of business fair play and this situation has been widely criticized.

As communication and transportation become increasingly rapid, business activities tend more and more to be interstate in character and even local operations more often than not will have an effect on the interstate business of someone else. Accordingly, there is a clear need for uniformity in the law applicable to unfair commercial activities, and this has been recognized by many eminent authorities. However, uniformity cannot be secured under the present checkerboard system where the specific legal principles of the individual States must be applied even by the Federal courts. This bill would make unfair commercial activities an offense cognizable in the Federal courts as the violation of a right created by a Federal statute. As a result, a uniform body of law would be created. This would provide certainty for businessmen, prevent forum shopping and tend to raise the level of commercial morality in the country as a whole.

The bill does not favor any particular class, group or industry as against any other. It is an effort by disinterested lawyers to improve the administration of justice in the important field of unfair competition.

Section 1 states the intent of the bill, which is to protect any person engaged in interstate commerce against unfair commercial activities by making actionable in a Federal forum all unfair commercial activities set forth in the bill, whether used or committed locally or in interstate commerce. Section 1 is designed to invoke the fullest possible scope of congressional power under the commerce clause of the Constitution. This statement of intent is somewhat reminiscent of the corresponding provision in the Lanham Act, the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C., sec. 1127, "Intent of Act"), but is even more explicit in its language.

Section 2 sets forth the scope of relief to be available under the bill. The right of action is for an injunction; no damages may be recovered. There are two main reasons for the limitation to injunctive relief. It is believed that plaintiffs in most cases of this nature are interested primarily in bringing about the cessation of the unlawful acts rather than in collecting damages, which may be difficult to prove even in the best of circumstances. Furthermore, the absence of any provision for damages should prevent the use of the new right of action as the basis for strike suits. At the same time, a party with a genuine claim should not be deterred from bringing an action because of its expense; accordingly, section 2 provides for reasonable attorneys' fees in the discretion of the court, in addition to taxable costs and disbursements. Such a judgment is available not merely to a successful plaintiff, but to the prevailing party, so that a successful defendant also is entitled to make an application for counsel fees, as well as to recover statutory costs and disbursements.

Section 3 lists the unfair commercial activities that are made actionable. The expression "unfair commercial activities" was selected deliberately because it was felt that "unfair competition" might be construed as a limitation, since some unfair competition cases have required a showing of actual competition, in addition to a showing of unfairness, as a prerequisite to relief. Section 3 contains only four subsections. This brief list of unfair commercial activities that would violate the statute represents a carefully chosen compromise. On the one hand, it would be a practical impossibility to define in detail every type of conduct sought to be prohibited; as the U.S. Supreme Court said in the case of *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Gratz*, 253 U.S. 421, 437 (1920), "An enumeration, however comprehensive, of existing methods of unfair competition must necessarily prove incomplete, as with new conditions constantly arising novel unfair methods would be devised and developed." On the other hand, a simple statement that all unfair acts in commerce shall be unlawful would not have been sufficiently precise to serve as a basis for the desired uniformity of decision throughout the Federal judicial system.

Section 3(a) is framed in terms of the "commission" of an act or practice, or the "use" of a statement. This introductory language is intended to embrace all forms of activity, including the unfair use of a statement prepared by a third party. There are three parts to subsection (a); the first two of these cover confusion as to the affiliation, connection, or association of the defendant, and confusion as to the origin, source, or sponsorship of the goods or services of the defendant. The concept of confusion is the basis of trademark infringement under the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. 1114(1)); the bill would extend this concept to confusion caused by means other than the use of colorable imitations of a trademark. In addition, section 3(a)(2) would codify the law of confusion of sponsorship, which (under that designation) has developed largely in cases involving questions of the registrability of trademarks, and make it available in nontrademark cases as well. Section 3(a)(3) would be a Federal anti-dilution law, paralleling similar enactments in recent years in Georgia, Illinois, Massachusetts, and New York. This liberal doctrine thus would become available in any trademark or trade name case where interstate commerce was affected.

Section 3(b) prohibits the use of false or misleading statements about the goods or services of either party. It is limited to statements of fact in order to avoid prohibiting anyone from stating his opinion. Since section 3(b) applies to statements about the goods or services of either party, it covers not only false advertising of what the defendant is offering, but also trade libel or disparagement directed against the plaintiff's products or services. Doubts about the availability of injunctive relief against disparagement, caused in some jurisdictions by false analogies to libel and slander, thus would be removed. Section 3(b) specifically contemplates the possibility that a statement may be false or misleading by reason of the omission of a material fact as well as by an actual misstatement of fact. In this respect, it resembles the definition of a false advertisement in the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C., sec. 55(a)(1)).

Section 3(c) is a deliberate catchall. It is directed against "the commission for purposes of profit of any other act or practice

which is likely to deceive or which violates reasonable standards of commercial ethics." This language resembles the provisions of two multilateral treaties to which the United States is a party: Article 10 bis, paragraph 2, of the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, which provides, "Any act of competition contrary to honest practices in industrial or commercial matters constitutes an act of unfair competition"; and article 20 of the Pan-American Trade-Mark Convention, which provides, "Every act or deed contrary to commercial good faith or to the normal and honorable development of industrial or business activities shall be considered as unfair competition and, therefore, unjust and prohibited."

Section 3(d) is a provision against the institution in bad faith of an action under the proposed new act itself. This is considered to be an obviously desirable protective feature to avoid possible abuses of the statutory right.

In summary, section 3 has for its purpose the establishment of guideposts for the Federal courts that are explicit enough to identify the principal types of unlawful activity and yet will allow the flexibility of interpretation that is essential in a field where rapid technological advances in business and communications constantly create new opportunities for exploitation by the unscrupulous few.

Section 4 is designed to provide additional assurance of a broad, liberal construction for the bill. It states that, "Absence of competition between the parties * * * shall not be a defense to an action brought under this act.'" Section 4 also assures the widest possible access to the benefits of the statute by providing that no showing of actual damage shall be a prerequisite to relief and that absence of any public interest in the subject-matter of the action shall not constitute a defense.

Section 5 protects innocent publishers and broadcasters by making the absence of knowledge or intent a defense in an action against such a party in respect of the contents of "any news, literary, educational, advertising, or entertainment medium." Section 6 provides that relief under the statute shall not be available when the injunction would delay the dissemination of a particular issue of a periodical, the broadcast of a radio or television program, or the showing of a motion picture, after the regularly scheduled time therefor. These provisions are similar to the corresponding section in the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C., sec. 1114(2)) and also resemble the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C., sec. 53(b)).

Section 7 limits the substantive offense by providing that the statute is not to be so construed as to "extend or enlarge the rights and remedies provided under the patent or copyright laws of the United States." The purpose of this provision is to guard against possible attempts that might otherwise be made to use the new statute as a device for increasing the scope or duration of a patent or copyright monopoly. Trademarks are not mentioned in section 7 because they stand on a different footing from copyrights and patents. The bill does broaden the rights of trademark proprietors; and the possible criticism about extending the duration of the right that might have been made (in the absence of sec. 7) with respect to copyrights and patents is inapplicable to trademarks, because a trademark remains valid indefinitely under existing law so long as it is not abandoned.

Sections 8 and 9 should be considered together. Section 8 grants exclusive jurisdiction to the Federal courts of all actions arising under the statute, without regard to diversity of citizenship or jurisdictional amount. However, this does not mean that State law is discarded. Section 9 of the bill provides that the relief available under the statute "shall be in addition to and not in exclusion of those rights and remedies otherwise available under the common law or pursuant to the statutes of any State or of the United States." Section 9 goes on to state explicitly that the statute shall not be construed in such a way as to preempt the jurisdiction of any State to grant relief against unfair commercial activities. The net effect of these provisions is to create a new right of action cognizable exclusively in the Federal courts, but at the same time to preserve existing State law in the same field. Most cases of unfair competition tend to be brought in the Federal courts and it is expected that in the future such cases would invoke the new statute. However, a plaintiff who wished to invoke State law would be free to proceed in the State court based on the same facts that also would create a right of action under the new Federal statute; such a party would be entitled to all the benefits of State law if he chose to pursue them, either in addition to or in substitution for the Federal right of action, entirely unaffected by the provisions of the bill.

Section 10 contains definitions of a number of terms used in the bill. Most of these are borrowed almost verbatim from the definition section of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C., sec. 1127).

Section 11 is the customary saving clause for partial invalidity.

Section 12 provides that the new statute shall take effect immediately upon its enactment, but that it shall not affect any proceeding pending at that time.

Section 13 provides a short title for the statute, viz., the "Unfair Commercial Activities Act."

AIR POLLUTION CRITERIA

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to direct the Surgeon General to establish and publish criteria useful in indicating the harmful effects of various air-pollution agents. This would help greatly to bring about an informed public understanding of the growing problem of air pollution, and would also add strength to the effort for its prevention and control.

Over the country there are some 175 State and local air sampling stations, in addition to the continuous air monitoring stations operated by the Federal Government in 9 major cities. The data they record flow into the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, in Cincinnati, an agency of the U.S. Public Health Service.

Our critical need, however, is for readily available information on the effects of the various substances which are polluting our atmosphere. I believe that one of the reasons why relatively little effort is being made by many of our States to control air pollution is the existence of the largely unnecessary smog of public confusion and uncertainty about the meaning of air-pollution levels.

According to the Washington Post of February 7, the amount of sulfur dioxide in the air, as reported by the Washington Air Monitoring Station on February 6, reached the highest level since the station began to monitor air in Washington. For 8½ hours the sulfur dioxide measured more than 0.3 parts per million parts of air.

What does this mean? Does 0.3 part per million of sulfur dioxide in the air constitute a reasonably healthy level, perhaps merely imparting a bracing and vigorous tang to the air? Or does this amount mean that we are close to the sort of disaster which claimed many lives in Liege, Belgium; in Donora, Pa.; and, on two occasions, in London? All of these tragedies involved, in part, at least, air pollution from the oxides of sulfur, as well as the weather phenomenon known as air inversion.

In the absence of standards indicating the relative danger of various levels of sulfur dioxide pollution, the public has no way of placing in perspective this air pollution reading, even with the most careful reporting of the immediately observable effects. Such information may not even be possessed by health and air-pollution officials.

A conference on air pollution, open to the public, was held in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department auditorium the day following the record reading of sulfur dioxide here in Washington. A Public Health Service speaker at the conference was asked to explain the significance of 0.3 part per million of sulfur dioxide in the air, as recorded in Washington, D.C., on the previous day. He indicated he could not answer the question, because there were no Federal air pollution standards, and because he did not have at hand a copy of the California standards.

California is the only State which has developed and published extensive air-pollution standards. The following is an excerpt from a table entitled "California Standards for Ambient Air Quality," as amended by the California State Board of Public Health on March 16, 1962, and as incorporated into the California Administrative Code, title 17, chapter 5, subchapter 5, article 1:

CALIFORNIA STANDARDS FOR AMBIENT AIR QUALITY

POLLUTANT

Adverse level: Level at which there will be sensory irritation, damage to vegetation, reduction in visibility, or similar effects.

Serious level: Level at which there will be alteration of bodily function or which is likely to lead to chronic disease.

Emergency level: Level at which it is likely that acute sickness or death in sensitive groups of persons will occur.

SULFUR DIOXIDE

Adverse level: 1 part per million for 1 hour or 0.3 part per million for 8 hours (plant damage).

Serious level: 5 parts per million for 1 hour (bronchoconstriction in human subjects).

Emergency level: 10 parts per million for 1 hour (severe distress in human subjects).

Mr. President, this table permits one to make some judgment as to the significance of the reported level of sulfur dioxide. Furthermore, the California standards also indicate the more powerful effects of sulfuric acid mist, into which the oxides of sulfur in moist air are sometimes converted. I believe that the table of California standards, still admittedly incomplete in regard to a number of pollutants, illustrates one of many possible ways in which the Federal Government could well make available to the public information on specific air pollutants and combinations of them.

The basic facts about the effects of air-pollution agents do not vary from State to State. The Federal Government, with its great research facilities, is obviously in the best position to bring together all the known research on air pollutants and to carry on the research necessary to formulate criteria of air quality.

In the current fiscal year, the Congress has made available to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare $9.6 million for research on air pollution, including $2.9 million for grant programs. It is my understanding that the Air Pollution Division of the Public Health Service already has sufficient information to establish criteria for a number of specific pollutants. Under the provisions of my bill, further additions would be made as new scientific evidence becomes available.

Helpful as the California standards are, scientific knowledge about air pollution is developing so rapidly the information provided by the Federal Government will certainly need supplementing from time to time. Only this week, studies conducted in various cities in New Jersey, Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania have been reported, indicating that a link exists between sulfur dioxide air pollution and the common cold. Earlier this week, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] discussed the relationship; and yesterday the Washington Post published an article, by Morton Mintz, providing further information and comment on it. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have part of Mr. Mintz's article printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE LINKS COLDS TO AIR POLLUTION

(By Morton Mintz)

The Public Health Service said yesterday it believes a link exists between colds and air pollution.

Surg. Gen. Luther L. Terry said "there is strong circumstantial evidence" that airborne sulfur compounds "trigger outbreaks of upper respiratory infections."

Dr. Terry added that the frequency and duration of such infections—running and stuffed noses, coughs, mild sore throats—appear related to the amount of sulfur dioxide, sulfur trioxide, and related sulfur compounds in the atmosphere.

The relationship was called dramatic by Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon Monday in a Senate speech in which she cited studies by Dr. F. Curtis Dohan, of the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine.

Dr. Terry's statements were made in response to a request by The Washington Post for comment on the Neuberger speech, in which she noted colds cost the Nation tens of millions of lost workdays a year.

Sulfur compounds are released into the air by the burning of coal and oil in factories. powerplants, and home furnaces, and through oil refining, ore roasting, acid manufacture, and other industrial processes.

Although modern precipitators on industrial stacks efficiently collect smoke, fly ash and other solids, they are very ineffective in trapping sulfur gases.

The studies by Dr. Dohan, associate professor of preventive medicine at the University and also medical director of the Radio Corporation of America, were conducted among 15,600 office and industrial women employees of 10 RCA plants in 8 cities.

The cites were Harrison, Camden, and Woodbridge, N.J., Indianapolis, Bloomington, and Marion, Ind., Cincinnati, Ohio, and Lancaster, Pa.

Dr. Dohan found direct correlations between frequency of absence from work, upper respiratory infections and the concentration of sulfur compounds in the air.

No correlation was found between the absence caused by such infections, pollutants other than sulfur compounds and additional factors ranging from local weather to employee morale.

In Lancaster and Cincinnati, where sulfur compound pollution levels were lowest, the incidence of respiratory infections was lowest. The levels were highest in Harrison and second highest in Camden—and so were the rates of infection-caused absence.

Primarily for reasons of statistical reliability, the only absences tabulated were those lasting 7 or more days.

However, Dr. Richard A. Prindle, Deputy Chief of the Division of Air Pollution of the PHS, said it is believed that a correlation with light colds also exists.

Air pollution of various types has long been suspected of being a contributing factor in such chronic respiratory diseases as asthma, emphysema, bronchitis, and lung cancer, and also in circulatory diseases, allergies and other afflictions.

In recent years, PHS-supported studies at Nashville, Tenn., have indicated a lockstep relationship between asthmatic attacks and high levels of sulfur dioxide.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I believe that Mr. Mintz' article indicates the type of development we can expect in the years ahead, and which might well be reflected in addition to air-pollution criteria established by the Federal Government.

Such criteria would be enormously useful at all levels of government. They would be useful to State, interstate, and municipal agencies, in connection with their own air-pollution detection and control efforts, as well as to Federal health and air-pollution officials. They would be useful to State and local legislative bodies, in connection with laws and ordinances on air pollution. But my bill is particularly important, I believe, in the way it relates to the general public and the press.

The problem of air pollution is a large and growing one. A much greater nationwide effort than has yet been evident is necessary in order to cope with it. Essential to that effort is an aroused public opinion; and my bill will, I believe, help provide the public with the facts on which it can form that opinion. This is a very simple step, and one which can be taken quickly. I hope we get prompt action on it.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that a summary of the provisions of my bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, along with the text of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1040) to direct the Surgeon General to establish and publish criteria useful in indicating the harmful effects of various air-pollution agents, introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide research and technical assistance relating to air-pollution control", approved July 14, 1955 (69 Stat. 322, 42 U.S.C. 1857b), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c)(1) The Surgeon General shall conduct research on, and survey the results of other scientific studies on, the harmful effects on the public health or general welfare of the various known air-pollution agents (or combinations of agents).

"(2) Whenever the Surgeon General determines that there is substantial scientific agreement that a particular air-pollution agent (or combination of agents), when present in the air in certain quantities, produces effects harmful to the public health or general welfare, he shall establish and publish criteria useful in indicating the kind and extent of such effects which may be expected from the presence of such air-pollution agent (or combination of agents) in the air in varying quantities. Any such criteria shall be published by the Surgeon General for informational purposes only and shall have no legal effect. The Surgeon General shall revise and add to such criteria whenever necessary accurately to reflect developing scientific knowledge.

"(3) The Surgeon General shall submit an annual report to the Congress with respect to the administration of this subsection. Such report shall include a list of air-pollution agents for which criteria have been established under paragraph (1), and the status of research on known air-pollution agents with respect to which such criteria have not previously been published or with respect to which the criteria previously published under paragraph (1) are not complete."

The summary presented by Mr. CASE is as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE PROVISIONS OF SENATOR CASE'S BILL TO DIRECT THE SURGEON GENERAL TO ESTABLISH AND PUBLISH CRITERIA USEFUL IN INDICATING THE HARMFUL EFFECTS OF VARIOUS AIR POLLUTION AGENTS

The bill would amend the 1955 act relating to air pollution control, adding three new provisions:

1. While the 1955 act authorizes the Surgeon General to carry out research activities relating to air pollution, this bill specifically directs the Surgeon General to conduct research on, and to survey the results of other scientific studies on, the harmful effects of air pollution agents.

2. The Surgeon General is directed to establish and publish criteria indicating the harmful effects on the public health or the general welfare of different levels of various air pollution agents. The Surgeon General would publish such criteria for informational purposes only, and he would revise or add to them as new scientific knowledge warranted.

3. The Surgeon General would report annually to the Congress on the progress made and on the status of research on air pollution agents where criteria had not yet been established and published.

HUMANE TREATMENT OF CERTAIN ANIMALS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the humane treatment of animals used in research and training by agencies of the United States and by recipients of grants from governmental agencies.

Efforts to achieve such protection for experimental animals in the United States have in previous years generated rather heated controversy between some segments of the scientific community and those who have pressed for animal protection.

A similar controversy prevailed, prior to passage of the Humane Slaughter Act in the 87th Congress, between the commercial meatpackers of America and the various humane societies. However, I believe there now prevails a fairly general consensus that the act has contributed significantly to more humane treatment of animals without working to the economic detriment of the meatpacking industry.

It is my opinion, Mr. President, based on my own study as well as the testimony of experimental scientists, that proposals for the humane treatment of experimental animals submitted to the Congress in previous years have contained provisions which might unnecessarily hamper the orderly progress of scientific research. It is for this reason that the measure I propose would place the appraisal and enforcement activities within the present grant-making structure of Federal agencies disbursing research and training funds, and thus encourage the scientific community to police its own ranks in this respect.

I would hope that when and if hearings are conducted on the pending measure it will facilitate a more meaningful level of discourse between experimental scientists and those who are primarily concerned with the humane treatment of animals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill—S. 1041—to provide for the humane care and treatment of vertebrate animals used in research, experiments, testing, or training by departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants and awards from the United States, and to encourage the study and development of new methods of minimizing pain and discomfort of animals used for such purposes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONSERVATION OF ANADROMOUS FISH SPAWNING AREAS IN THE SALMON RIVER, IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Mrs. NEUBERGER, and Mr. ENGLE, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the Salmon River preservation bill, a measure to provide for the conservation of anadromous fish spawning areas on the Salmon River, in the State of Idaho. The bill would prohibit the Federal Power Commission from authorizing any structures on the Salmon River which would restrict the passage of anadromous fish to reach spawning areas or which would flood established spawning grounds.

I introduced a similar measure in the 86th Congress, cosponsored by the late great Senator from Oregon, Richard L. Neuberger. That bill, after referral to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, was the subject of extensive hearings in Lewiston, Idaho, in November 1959. Over 50 witnesses testified, and although overwhelming support was expressed for the basic objective of the bill, many expressed the view that its prohibiting language should be strengthened. Therefore, in the opening days of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, Senator Neuberger and I introduced a strengthening amendment.

No action was taken in the 86th Congress, so the bill, with minor revisions, was again introduced in the early days of the 87th Congress, this time, on behalf of myself, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, and the distinguished junior Senator from California. The bill I introduce today is identical to that introduced in the 87th Congress, and I again want to emphasize the importance for favorable action on this measure.

The nursery areas for Chinook salmon in Idaho are found in the high mountain valleys of the central part of the State. The Middle Fork of the Salmon, widely known as the River of No Return, runs almost entirely through primitive areas from its headwaters in Bear Valley, including its tributaries, Sulphur Creek, Marsh Creek, Loon Creek, and Big Creek. The main Salmon, which rises in the uplands of the Sawtooth Mountains and its tributaries like Yankee Fork Creek, the Pahsimeroi, and the Lemhi, also have retained their natural character.

This vast nursery area is of immense significance to the great number of sportsmen in my State, as well as to the great anadromous fish resource of the Northwest. No other river system contributes so heavily to the Chinook runs. No other river system has so long escaped the works of man. And no amount of protection in the spawning areas avails us if the fish cannot get to them.

Evidence indicates that projected development of the upper Columbia will reduce the spawning there as the reservoir areas and slack water encroach upon spawning grounds. The Salmon River's importance as the principal spawning stream will proportionately increase.

Salmon fishing has become a favorite sport for thousands of Idahoans. In addition, Idaho attracts fishermen from all over the Nation, and this, in turn, is a boost to the economy of the State. But fishing for these salmon is more than just a sport, for, as you all know, once caught, the salmon is one of the tastiest of fish. Indeed, it is now widely appreciated that the anadromous fishery resource in the Columbia River Basin is of major economic importance to the area.

It is, therefore, imperative that a solution be found to protect and perpetuate the salmon. By enacting this bill, the Congress would express its will that the solution to the fish-passage problem past high dams be worked out before any structures restricting fish passage are built on the Salmon River, whether for power, flood control, or otherwise.

Fortunately, such a prohibition against dam construction on the Salmon River will have no detrimental effect on the economy or the growth of Idaho or the Northwest. For many years to come, we have sufficient damsites available on our other major rivers to provide all of the water storage, the power, the flood control, and the navigational benefits that the growing needs of the Northwest may require.

The desirability of this bill entitles it to sympathetic consideration in the Congress. A similar bill introduced in the 87th Congress—S. 323—was the subject of hearings conducted by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, held in October of 1961, at Seattle, Wash. These hearings again demonstrated the need for, and the overwhelming support of, this measure. The future of one of our greatest outdoor sports, and that of one of the Northwest's important industries may depend on this measure, Mr. President, so I am hopeful that the Congress will meet its responsibility by enacting it in this session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill—S. 1043—to provide for the conservation of anadromous fish spawning areas in the Salmon River, Idaho, introduced by Mr. CHURCH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in recognition of the fact that the Salmon River and its tributaries constitute one of the principal spawning areas of anadromous fish from the Pacific Ocean, it is the purpose of this Act to prohibit, until developments justify a change in this policy, the authorization of structures on the Salmon River that would restrict the passage of such fish to reach spawning areas or which would flood established spawning grounds.

SEC. 2. The Federal Power Commission shall not authorize under the provisions of the Federal Power Act a structure for the storage or collection of water or the development of power on the Salmon River in Idaho or its tributaries which would restrict the passage of anadromous fish, or which would flood established spawning grounds.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress developments in fish conservation or in the construction of dams and reservoirs that in his opinion justify amending the provisions of this Act.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ELECTION LAWS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the District of Columbia election laws.

In 1960, there were 75,660 registered voters in the District of Columbia. According to the District of Columbia Board of Elections, of the 75,660 registered voters, approximately 30,025 cast their ballots. In my judgment these figures are not a credit to the citizens of the Nation's Capital.

In 1960, Congress adopted legislation imposing restrictions on citizens seeking to register to vote. The action taken by Congress, in my judgment, was a serious mistake. Rather than making it difficult for people to register we should be making it easier. This is especially true in the District of Columbia where its citizens will for the first time be able to vote for President and Vice President and have not been conditioned to register and vote. Thus, it is imperative that if there is to be a reasonably large vote next year in the primary and general elections in the Nation's Capital every effort must be made now to get citizens registered and the election machinery set up to handle the vast amount of work which must be done. We all know what criticism we will hear if there is a small turnout at the polls.

According to the 1960 census, 509,110 persons 21 years or older resided in the District of Columbia. I think the Board of Elections is doing a lot of wishful thinking when it estimates that 100,000 persons will vote in the 1964 May primary election and 250,000 persons will vote in the 1964 November election. The estimated 100,000 voters in next year's primary election is roughly double those who voted in 1956, and triple those who voted in 1960. Next year's November election estimate prepared by the Board is approximately seven times those who voted in 1960 and six times those who voted in 1956. Unless the Board of Elections and the two political parties in the District of Columbia have been doing a lot of work that I am completely unaware of, I am at a complete loss to understand how such estimates were reached.

Under the present provisions of the District of Columbia Code, the board of elections is required only to maintain a registry. The 1961 amendment to the code deleted the word "permanent" in this regard. My bill restores the permanent character of such registry.

The code also provides that a person may vote only if he is a qualified elector and if he registers in the District of Columbia during the year in which such election is to be held. This means that there must be complete reregistration of voters for each election. Under my amendment, a single registration will suffice to meet the requirement in any election, and a person so registered may vote if he is otherwise qualified as an elector.

My bill provides that the registry shall be closed Sundays and holidays and during the 30-day period immediately preceding any election. In addition, it provides, first, for the establishment and maintenance of official registry offices; second, that such registry offices shall be open during the normal business hours of each day; and, third, that during the 10-day period immediately preceding the date of closing the registry for any election, that is, the date of the beginning of the 30-day period immediately preceding any election—the registry offices shall not close before 9:30 p.m.

In essence, my amendment provides for the establishment of registry offices and regulates the hours of operation of such offices. The present statute only infers such authority from the general grant of authority to maintain a registry and to prescribe rules and regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

The act currently provides that the registry shall be open from January 1 until 45 days before the first Tuesday following the first Monday in November during each presidential election year except the 45-day period which ends on the first Tuesday in May, and except as provided by the board of elections in the case of a special election.

The remaining provision of my bill would add two new sections to the District of Columbia Code. These sections provide for the following:

That the board of elections shall appoint two deputy registrars from each voting precinct in the District of Columbia. Their duties would be to assist registrars in conducting registration and to register or change registration of any eligible citizen residing in the precinct from which such registrars were appointed. Such registration by a deputy registrar could be at any time other than during the period that the registry is closed for an election as provided in my bill.

In the selection of deputy registrars each political party which has had its candidate elected as President of the United States after January 1, 1950, and prior to the date of the enactment of my bill, shall be entitled to have a member of its party appointed as one of the two deputy registrars appointed in each precinct.

In effect, my bill guarantees that one Democratic Party and one Republican Party member shall be appointed as a deputy registrar in each precinct.

My bill provides a training program for all appointed deputy registrars conducted by the board of elections.

The District of Columbia Commissioners would fix the rate of compensation without reference to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

The District of Columbia as a Federal city stands as a symbol as the Capital of a democratic nation and the Capital of the free world. We are faced in this city with a unique situation with the people being given the opportunity to vote for President and Vice President for the first time. The election machinery is not well established and the political parties are not well organized. There is a tremendous amount of work to be done between now and the November election in 1964 and I am fearful that far too few party leaders and District officials are aware of this.

In my judgment, Mr. President, unless people are permitted to begin registering soon, I have serious doubts whether many more people will register and vote in 1964 than in 1960. Because of my firm belief that every eligible citizen has a duty and responsibility to register and vote in elections, and because I think we should make it as easy as possible for them to do so, I introduce my bill today.

I sincerely hope that hearings can be scheduled on my bill at an early date because if action is not taken on it soon, there will be little need to take action until after the 1964 elections. I am hopeful that the measure will receive the support of the White House, the two national committees of our political parties, and the two local political committees, as well as other organizations in the community.

I ask that the text of the bill and a summary outline of its contents be printed at this point in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1047) to amend the act of August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 699), relating to elections in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. Morse, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the election in the District of Columbia of electors of President and Vice President of the United States and of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes", approved August 12, 1955 (69 Stat. 699; D.C. Code, sec. 1–1101), is amended by inserting "permanent" immediately before "registry".

(b) Subsection (a) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out "he registers in the District during the year in which such election is to be held" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "is registered in the District".

(c) Subsection (d) of section 7 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The registry shall be kept open except during the thirty-day period immediately preceding any election held pursuant to this Act. In conducting registrations under this Act, the Board shall establish and maintain official registry offices which shall be open for registration or changes of registration during the normal hours of business of each day (other than Sundays and holidays) during the period that the registry is open; except that for the ten-day period immediately preceding the date of closing the registry for any election, such offices shall not be closed prior to 9:30 p.m."

(d) Section 7 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(f) For the purpose of assisting registrars in conducting registrations under this Act, the Board of Elections shall appoint two deputy registrars from each voting precinct in the District. Each political party which has had its candidate elected as President of the United States after January 1, 1950, and prior to the date of enactment of this subsection shall be entitled to have a member of its party appointed as one of the two deputy registrars so appointed in each precinct. It shall be the duty of such deputy registrars to register or change the registration of any eligible citizen residing in the precinct from which such registrars were appointed upon application by such citizen in accordance with the provisions of this Act. Any such deputy registrar may register or change the registration of any such eligible citizen at any time other than during a period that the registry is closed for an election as provided under subsection (d) of this section. The Board of Elections shall establish a training program for all deputy registrars so appointed. Deputy registrars appointed under this subsection shall be compensated for their services at a rate of compensation fixed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, without reference to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(g) If any person registered in the District and otherwise qualified to vote in a general election in the District fails to cast a ballot in that election, such person's name shall be removed from the permanent registry and he shall not thereafter be entitled to vote in any election held under this Act unless he again registers in accordance with the provisions thereof."

The summary presented by Mr. Morse is, as follows:

The Morse election bill provides for the following:

(1) Permanent registration;

(2) Registration permitted at any time during the year except for 30-day period immediately preceding any election;

(3) Establishes registry offices and regulates the hours of operation of such offices;

(4) Appointment of two deputy registrars from each voting precinct to register any eligible citizen residing within the voting precinct at any time other than 30-day period that registry is closed prior to an election;

(5) Democratic and Republican member appointed deputy registrar in each precinct;

(6) Training program for deputy registrars conducted by Board of Elections;

(7) Compensation to be fixed by District Commissioners without reference to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

THE MARIGOLD AS THE NATIONAL FLOWER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the rather cold and distressing weather which has enveloped the earth has doubtless made people conjecture as to whether spring would ever come. I find great comfort in the lines of Shelley:

> If winter comes, can spring be far behind?

So, Mr. President, unless some supernal force disturbes the procession of the seasons, there will be spring; and when spring comes, there will be flowers. We shall be delighted with the earlier flowers—the tulips, the daffodils, the redbud, and the dogwood blossoms.

A little later will come all the delightful annual flowers, which nature compels us to cultivate every year, but leaves a residue of seed which makes them almost perpetual. They will include the humble but beautiful petunia, the zinnia and the calendula, and also the marigold.

Two or three years ago, I introduced a joint resolution to make the marigold the national flower. That stirred quite a controversy; and, as a result, the corn tassel and the rose and other flowers were advanced as candidates for our national floral emblem.

But I still find myself wedded to the marigold—robust, rugged, bright, stately, single colored and multicolored, somehow able to resist the onslaught of insects; it takes in its stride extreme changes in temperature, and fights back the scorching sun in summer and the chill of early spring evenings. What a flower the marigold is. I am looking forward to the time when these gay flowers will salute and intrigue our sense of beauty.

So, Mr. President, once more I find myself impelled to introduce a joint resolution to make the American marigold—its botanical name is Tagetes erecta—the national flower of our country.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I merely wish to ask our distinguished minority leader a question: Of what country is the marigold a native?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mexico, I believe.

Mr. AIKEN. At any rate, it is not the United States?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. As a matter of fact, the marigold started in Mexico as something of a wild flower. It was taken to Europe, and there was hybridized and improved; and then, at long last, the American nurserymen took it up. What a magnificent thing they have made of the marigold. What I like about it is that it will flourish in soil not blessed with fertility. It takes on every stage of weather. It marches through three of the four seasons—through spring, summer, and autumn—until at long last the heavy frosts of early winter finally make it fold.

But what a wonderful flower it is, and what rich dividends in beauty one receives for such a minimum of care, because its nurture requires so little attention.

Mr. AIKEN. So the Senator from Illinois is saying that the marigold went to school in Europe. But has it been naturalized since its return?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes, Mr. President; our nurserymen have naturalized it, and have cultivated it, and have refined it into the thing of beauty it really is. I can think of no other variety of flower that with its gay colors so beautifully salutes the human eye with its grace.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the 3-minute limitation of the morning hour, the time available to the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the extraordinarily exhilarating speech the distinguished minority leader is making, plus the sound advice being given by the Senate's first expert on agriculture, Mr. Vermont, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois be allowed 15 additional minutes. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the Senator from Illinois is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. O, Mr. President, I shall not take 15 minutes, because it takes only a moment for one to express the sense that is in his heart about the beauty of flowers.

I remember what Wordsworth wrote in his poem on the daffodils:

> Ten thousand saw I at a glance,
> Tossing their heads in a sprightly dance.

In those two lines Wordsworth captured a sentiment which probably I could not capture if I took not only the 15 minutes allowed me, but even much more time, in order to extol the grace, the beauty, and the loveliness of that flower.

But I still think the marigold is extraordinarily rich in dividends for everyone. As a consequence, I enter it as a contender, because the carnation was entered when a seminar on the national floral emblem was held in the Caucus Room 2 or 3 years ago. The rose also was entered; likewise, the corn tassel was entered; and I presume that others were suggested.

So, Mr. President, in order to make sure that our discriminating public will have a chance to evaluate the importance of the matter and to make a decision, I very humbly submit the marigold.

Mr. AIKEN. I would not desire to say anything which would discredit the marigold, because it certainly provides a great deal of color for a few cents of expense. I point out that Wisconsin has the violet, which is a native American flower, and of which there are 100 species or more. We have phlox, many species of which are native to Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The violet is the official flower of my State.

Mr. AIKEN. Which violet?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, just any violet.

Mr. AIKEN. The violet in Wisconsin is Viola Pedata bicolor. I do not know what the Illinois violet is. But the violet is a wonderful flower. So is the rose. We have many native species of roses, although perhaps some of the high-colored packaged ones have been developed. We are developing the rose in our country probably more than it is being developed in any other country at the present time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure we are.

Mr. AIKEN. All but one known species of phlox is native to the United States. It was taken to Europe and became educated, too. The phlox species came back here with all the colors of the rainbow, wearing Paris gowns, and so forth.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My trouble with phlox is as follows: The rabbits will let the salvia alone, and they will not bother the pansies. They will not bother the petunias. But the rabbit is a discriminating animal. He always nibbles off my phlox.

Mr. AIKEN. But the rabbit does not nibble the marigold. He does not like its flavor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has a distinctive flavor.

Mr. AIKEN. It has a distinctive smell, too.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has a distinctive fragrance all its own.

I have been informed that the Vice President is having difficulty in hearing us.

Mr. AIKEN. The blue bonnet is an annual, if the Vice President is thinking of some flower that is native to Texas. The blue bonnet is a beautiful flower; it is the State flower of Texas but it is not a perennial. Seeds must be planted every year. Marigold seeds must be planted every year, too.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The marigold is an annual also.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But nature has wisely provided at the end of the season a seed, which is stored, and in the following spring there it is for perpetuation of the flower and to make possible improvement of the strain.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true, but whether we should consider adopting an alien as our national flower——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is having difficulty hearing the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Whether we should consider adopting an alien as a national flower of the United States is a question which is, to say the least, subject to considerable debate. We do not permit an alien to be President of the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I end where I began. I bring comfort to those who think that, perhaps, because of the unseasonable weather which we have had all over the country, there will be no spring. But Shelley wrote it beautifully when he said:

> If winter comes, can spring be far behind?

Mr. President, I introduce the joint resolution for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 57) designating the American marigold (Tagetes erecta) as the national floral emblem of the United States, introduced by Mr. Dirksen, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. At the outset I should like to say that if spring has heard the beguiling words of the young man from Illinois, it will come hurrying to us on impatient feet with the perfume of flowers and thoughts of love.

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I wish to announce that I have appointed the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

APPOINTMENT TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Commerce, I wish to announce that I have appointed the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 15, and that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Senate Joint Resolution 15, which would authorize the construction of a monument to James Madison, is substantially identical to Senate Joint Resolution 119 of the 87th Congress, on which hearings were held last year by the Committee on Public Works. If this request is granted, I am reliably advised that the Committee on Public Works, because of its previous study of the proposal involved, would be able to report the bill to the Senate at an early date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on Rules and Administration is discharged from further consideration of the bill, and the bill will be re-referred to the Committee on Public Works.

FLYING THE AMERICAN FLAG OVER THE REMAINS OF THE U.S.S. "UTAH" — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators Williams of New Jersey and Bartlett may be added to the bill (S. 703) to provide for the flying of the American flag over the remains of the U.S.S. *Utah* in honor of the heroic men who were entombed in her hull on December 7, 1941, introduced by me on February 5, 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 865) to provide for the establishment of the National Academy of Foreign Affairs, the names of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be added as cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senator Kuchel, Senator Curtis, and Senator Fong be added as cosponsors to S. 869, the bill which I introduced to provide for the burial of certain news correspondents in national cemeteries.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of Senator Douglas be added as a cosponsor to S. 1009, to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORARY CITIZENSHIP FOR SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, earlier in this session, in January, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 3 authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation declaring Sir Winston Churchill to be an honorary citizen of the United States of America. My colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], wishes to be listed as a cosponsor of the joint resolution at its next printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of February 28, 1962, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and joint resolution:

S. 943. A bill to provide for denial of passports to supporters of the international Communist movement, for review of passport denials, and for other purposes: Mr. Dodd and Mr. Dominick.

S. 956. A bill providing a program of financial assistance to the States for the construction of public community colleges: Mr. Scott.

S. 957. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin: Mr. Allott, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

S. 958. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that only lumber and other wood products which have been produced in the United States may be used in construction or rehabilitation covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages: Mr. Allott, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

S. 960. A bill to establish the Joint Committee on Defense and Space Contracts, and for other purposes: Mr. Dominick, Mr. Douglas, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Proxmire, and Mr. Williams of Delaware.

S. 961. A bill to require public disclosure of certain information concerning the award of contracts entered into by the Armed Forces and by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and for other purposes: Mr. Dominick, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Kuchel, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Proxmire, and Mr. Williams of Delaware.

S. 962. A bill to amend section 22 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773; 7 U.S.C. 624), to require the Secretary of Agriculture to include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act: Mr. Allott, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

S.J. Res. 56. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President to impose an immediate 6-percent emergency quota

on all imports of softwood lumber: Mr. Allott, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Ervin, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Tower, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN W. DOUGLAS TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, March 14, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of John W. Douglas, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice William H. Orrick, Jr., resigned.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULING OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CARL E. McGOWAN, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been rescheduled for Tuesday, March 12, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Carl E. McGowan, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge, District of Columbia Circuit, vice Henry W. Edgerton, retiring.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearings may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], chairman, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], and myself.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. PASTORE:

Address delivered by Senator Hartke at the luncheon session of the eighth annual conference of State Broadcasters Association presidents.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Editorial entitled "Honoring Sir Winston," from the Washington Post of March 4, 1963; editorial entitled "Citizen Churchill," from the Washington Post of March 6, 1963; excerpts from an article entitled "Urgency Noted on Citizenship for Churchill," written by Edward T. Folliard and published in the Washington Post of January 13, 1963; also an exchange of correspondence between Sir Winston Churchill and Senator Randolph.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERTSON, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Virginia and the Nation are indeed fortunate to have in the Senate an outstanding Member of the calibre of its junior Senator [Mr. Robertson].

Here is a man whose unfaltering dedication to duty knows no bounds, whose untiring love for hard work makes no task too large or too difficult to undertake, and whose devotion to the principles of our republican government as laid down by our forefathers is steadfast.

Senator Robertson has served his State and Nation in the Congress for 3 decades, and I join his many friends and associates in saluting him. On March 4, 1963, the Richmond News Leader published an excellent article marking the 30th anniversary in the Congress of the junior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Thirty Years in Congress—Robertson Observes Big Day by Working

Washington, March 4.—Senator A. Willis Robertson celebrated his 30th anniversary of congressional service today—and the occasion was to be just another working day for a man who has seen 10,000 such days come and go in Washington.

He started it as he has started every day since he was in training as a football player at Richmond College nearly 60 years ago, when he learned to begin each day with sitting-up exercises, a brisk walk, and a hearty breakfast.

Predictably, he will end the day with a workout in the Senate gymnasium, a light dinner and an hour or so of reading before retiring early to bed.

During the course of the day, he will have made a speech on the Senate floor, dictated replies to an estimated 100 or so letters from constituents, and conferred with professional staff members of two separate committees to schedule the hearings he will conduct with a minimum of overlapping.

He also will have put a little more polish on a major address he is preparing in which he will urge substantial budget cuts to offset a tax reduction he feels sure is in the making.

Robertson, who will be 76 on March 27, stands 6-foot-2 and weighs the same (190 pounds) as he did when he took the oath of office as a Member of the House of Representatives in 1933.

DEMONSTRATED AGILITY

On his last birthday, he demonstrated for a skeptical reporter his ability to kick his hand when held straight out (a loosening-up exercise much favored by football punters and placekickers).

His working habits follow much the same pattern as that established by his fondness for regular physical exercise. He has never tried to emulate Caesar's feat of dictating to eight stenographers at the same time. But it is not unusual for him to stride through the rooms in his office suite giving instructions over his shoulder to each employee he passes to "find out so-and-so" or to "get me such-and-such" or "tell him I say * * *" or "find out if * * *" and then depart for the floor to make a speech or cast a vote.

When he returns, he expects the answers to be waiting for him. He is not accustomed to being disappointed in this respect.

While speaking on the floor—or while dictating in his office—Robertson falls into the habit of pacing two steps back and forth, hands clasped behind his back, head turning, and voice rising and falling with modulated emphasis.

On the floor of the Senate, this restless pacing has worn the carpet behind his desk in a definite pattern. In lengthy discussion, Robertson says, pacing keeps him from becoming tired and sluggish, mentally as well as physically.

Over the years in Congress, Robertson is best known perhaps for his legislation in the banking field on the Senate side and for the major tax bills and conservation legislation he wrote in the House.

His political philosophy is patterned on the principles of Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson. His economic philosophy is based at least partly on the belief that neither men nor nations can spend themselves into prosperity with money they have not worked to earn.

A descendant of early Virginia colonists, Robertson has always taken a keen personal interest in the history of colonial Virginia and in the period in which the Constitution was being shaped by Jefferson and other Virginians of his day.

Robertson's father's grandfather, 12 generations removed, came to Jamestown with Governor Yeardley in 1619 as surgeon to the troops brought over for the protection of the Virginia settlers. Three of his mother's ancestors served in the Virginia Convention of 1788, which ratified the Philadelphia Constitution.

Ever since he started hunting and fishing, as a boy of 12 on his grandfather's farm in Culpeper, Robertson's principal recreation has been field sports.

Even in his relaxation, however, his physical restlessness asserts itself. Robertson is not so fond of still hunting, from a duck blind or a deer stand, as he is of tramping the fields for quail, grouse and pheasant shooting.

In his climb up the political ladder—through service in the State senate, as Rockbridge County commonwealth's attorney, as first chairman of the Virginia Game Commission, as Seventh District Representative and as junior U.S. Senator—Robertson has never lost an election. In his last race, for reelection to the Senate in 1960, he rolled up the largest vote ever cast for any candidate in a Virginia election (including presidential balloting) and was returned for his current term with the biggest majority ever accorded to a candidate in a statewide election.

But neither Senator Robertson nor Senator Byrd, who today completed 30 years of service in the Senate, is the dean of Virginia's congressional delegation.

The deanship is claimed by Representative Howard W. "Judge" Smith, who entered the House 2 years before Franklin D. Roosevelt's first inauguration.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Georgia for a tribute that is very kind, generous, and flattering to the junior Senator from Virginia. I thank my colleague.

Mr. TALMADGE. I know of no Senator who is more worthy of any tribute that could be paid by either the junior Senator from Georgia or the distinguished newspaper in the State which he has the honor to serve in the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader a question about the legislative program. I understand there are to be some lengthy speeches today. I should like to know whether it is contemplated that we will get to the so-called outdoor recreation bill today. It is a controversial measure, and I expect to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on it in due course.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, it is my understanding that the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] gave notice several days ago that he intended to make his annual report to the Senate on the basis of his inspection tours overseas late last year, and that the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] likewise has remarks to deliver, which I understand will be of some duration, having to do with reductions in the budget.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. On Monday I notified the clerk of the distinguished majority leader that I was preparing a speech and desired assurance that the Senate would be in session on Thursday. I was informed that it would be. I said that that was when I would ask to be recognized. I have given copies of my address to the press for release in this afternoon's newspapers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] also called the leadership and asked whether we were going to meet on Thursday. He desired to be prepared to deliver his address today also. From listening to previous speeches made by the Senator from Louisiana I would say that his remarks would be well worth listening to, as, of course, would be the speech of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson].

Then I understand that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] has a speech which he wishes to deliver today. Those speeches would indicate that a good portion of the afternoon might be taken up in that manner. However, the leadership did notify the Senate earlier this week that the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes would be called up today. It is the intention of the leadership to call up that bill today. If consideration of the measure is not completed today, I ask unanimous consent at this time that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Following action on that measure it is the intention of the leadership to call up the bill (S. 812) to provide for the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America, and also the bill (S. 816), for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology.

That is what the future portends for us in the way of proposed legislation now on the calendar.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. When did the majority leader state that the bill to establish a Commission on Science and Technology will be called up?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That bill and the other bill reported by the Committee on Government Operations, of which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] is the chairman, relative to the release of restrictions and reservations on certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Arkansas by the United States of America, would follow action on the bill related to outdoor recreation, which will at least be laid before the Senate today. If action is not completed on that measure today, we will meet tomorrow, and upon that bill being taken up, I understand that the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] has indicated that it is his intention to oppose it and to call for a yea-and-nay vote on it. At the conclusion of action on the outdoor recreation bill the two bills reported by the Committee on Government Operations will be brought up for consideration.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will that be this afternoon, or tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not this afternoon, the way things are going.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Some time tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope so.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator will yield further, am I to understand that the distinguished minority leader will oppose the two bills reported from my committee?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. The Senator will oppose the outdoor recreation bill, reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader a further question.

The majority leader observed last week that there was little likelihood, if any likelihood at all, of an Easter recess.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know the distinguished assistant majority leader uttered a brave entreaty on this floor when the bad news came. I note, upon examining the Record, that he said, "O, Senator. O, Leader." And he was greatly discomforted.

I thought that between then and now the distinguished majority leader might have had occasion to reexamine all the premises and bring the Senate a little comfort with respect to an Easter recess.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say, in reply, "No comfort. No hope."

UNNECESSARY EXPENDITURES BY THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT OF $21 MILLION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Comptroller General has called our attention to three examples involving unnecessary expenditures of over $21 million in the procurement program of the Defense Department.

The first instance disclosed Army plans to buy at a cost of about $6.3 million 1,365 unneeded generator sets as a result of failure: First, to provide for the continued use of acceptable substitute 30-kilowatt generators already on hand; second, to consider a reduction in the need for generators because of the conversion to commercial power sources; third, to use the actual rather than the estimated wear-out rates in determining the need to procure new generators; and fourth, to utilize 10-kilowatt generators available in the Department of the Navy.

The Comptroller General stated that at Fort Bliss the Army disposed of 59 generators—30 kilowatts—in excellent condition as excess property, and 57 of these were disposd of at public sale for an average of about $150 per generator. The Army then purchased new 45-kilowatt replacements at a cost of $4,879.

After the Comptroller General questioned this action on the basis that these good 30-kilowatt generators could be used as a substitute for the 45-kilowatt generators on procurement, the Corps of Engineers then canceled orders for 466 generators in fiscal 1961—worth $2.2 million. They eliminated planned procurement for 1962 of 484 generators worth $2.4 million and filled their requirements from existing stocks of generators as recommended by the Comptroller General.

There is no reason for the procurement officers of the Army to have been selling these new generators as surplus at ridiculously low prices when at the same time they were buying new generators.

Second. The Comptroller General cites an instance wherein the Government incurred unnecessary costs of about $5 million in fiscal 1960 to rebuild unused deteriorated tracks for tanks and other combat vehicles because the Army had allowed its inventory of such tracks to deteriorate while in storage.

The Comptroller General charged that this deterioration of the stock of rubber tracks was caused by failure to: First, issue oldest tracks first by a slight modification of the tracks; second, furnish tracks to contractors for use in production of new vehicles; and third, protect the tracks by storing them inside.

In this report the Comptroller General again calls attention to a glaring example of the calloused attitude of the procurement officers of the Defense Department in regard to spending the taxpayers' money. The bulk of these unnecessary costs resulted from the complete failure of the Defense Department to use its oldest inventory first and, to make the situation even worse, these rubber tracks were stored outside rather than being placed in a warehouse where

they could be protected from the weather.

Third. The Comptroller General cited a third instance wherein the Defense Department under eight negotiated contracts involving petroleum storage will incur about $10.3 million in higher costs than necessary.

I quote from the Comptroller General's report of February 28, 1963:

> Our review disclosed that, in order to satisfy Department of the Air Force requirements, the Defense Petroleum Supply Center negotiated eight contracts for petroleum storage in new dispersed and protected commercial facilities and, as a result, the Government will incur about $10.3 million higher costs than if similar Government facilities had been acquired. The increased costs will amount to almost one-third of the Government's total expenditures for the fixed periods of the contracts, and the Government will not have title to the facilities unless an additional $9 million is paid. The increased costs result primarily because contract prices include funds needed by contractors to finance construction of commercial facilities within relatively short periods.
>
> We found no evidence that Air Force officials had compared the costs of commercial facilities with the costs of Government facilities before decisions were made to contract for commercial facilities. Had such comparisons been made, they should have disclosed that disproportionately higher costs would be incurred for storage in commercial facilities and that contracting for storage in Government facilities would result in substantial savings to the Government.

Administration officials have challenged those of us who think that the budget can be cut, to show specific examples of where to start.

I give them one suggestion which if adopted would save hundreds of millions of dollars annually; and that is that they insist upon the procurement officers of the Defense Department exercising the same degree of good commonsense in handling the taxpayers' money as they would in spending their own.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that the letters of the Comptroller General which accompanied these three reports of February 26, 27, and 28, be printed at this point, and I suggest that both the Congress and the Defense Department read these reports in their entirety.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Comptroller General of
the United States,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1963.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Enclosed is our report on review of unnecessary deterioration of unused rubber tracks for Army combat vehicles.

We found that the Government incurred unnecessary cost of about $5 million in fiscal year 1960 to rebuild unused deteriorated tracks for tanks and other combat vehicles because the Army allowed these tracks to deteriorate in storage. The deterioration of the rubber tracks was caused by failure to (1) issue oldest tracks first by a slight modification of the tracks, (2) furnish tracks to contractors for use in production of new vehicles, and (3) protect the tracks by storing them inside.

The management weaknesses disclosed in this report on rubber track are the type that could pertain to all of the Army's replacement parts which are subject to loss of serviceability through deterioration. Accordingly, we are recommending that the Secretary of the Army require the Army Materiel Command to review such items and take the necessary actions to provide that they are protected to the maximum extent practicable from the elements causing deterioration and that the oldest stocks are issued before the more recently procured stocks. Where improvements have been made to the item, consideration should be given to making appropriate modifications to the stock in storage so that this stock can be issued before it deteriorates and before large quantities of the new version are procured. In addition, consideration should be given to issuing older stocks as Government-furnished property on new end items being procured.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army.

Joseph Campbell,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

Comptroller General
of the United States,
Washington, D.C., February 27, 1963.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Enclosed is our report on review of unnecessary planned procurement of generators by the Department of the Army.

Our review of supply management of generators disclosed that the Army was planning to buy, at a cost of about $6.3 million, 1,365 unneeded generator sets as a result of failure (1) to provide for the continued use of acceptable substitute 30-kilowatt generators already on hand, (2) to consider a reduction in the need for generators because of the conversion to commercial power sources, (3) to use the actual rather than the estimated wear-out rates in determining the need to procure new generators, and (4) to utilize 10-kilowatt generators available in the Department of the Navy.

When we presented our findings to Corps of Engineers officials, they cancelled purchase requests for 466 generators in fiscal year 1961 worth $2.2 million, eliminated planned procurement for 1962 of 484 generators worth $2.4 million, and reduced planned procurement for subsequent years. Procurement of 45-kilowatt generators could have been reduced by an additional 316 generators worth $1.5 million had the Corps of Engineers not unnecessarily disposed of a like number of acceptable substitute 30-kilowatt generators in the years 1959 and 1960. The Corps of Engineers did suspend further disposals when we pointed out the continuing need for these items. After we suggested that the Corps of Engineers consider use of the excess Navy 10-kilowatt generators similar to units the Corps of Engineers was procuring, the corps obtained 124 units worth $232,000 and took action to provide for more careful review of material declared excess by the other military departments.

Although the Corps of Engineers has taken considerable corrective action, we believe that further action should be taken by the Department of the Army to assure maximum utilization of the less expensive 30-kilowatt generators as substitutes for the 45-kilowatt generators. About 1,500 30-kilowatt units have been reported to be on hand, whereas only 383 of them have been considered by the Engineer Supply Control Office in its recomputation of requirements for the 45-kilowatt generators. We are recommending that the Secretary of the Army make an examination into the actual power requirements of generator users to determine whether greater utilization of the 30-kilowatt generators can be obtained.

We found that the Army's failure to adequately utilize substitute items to prevent unnecessary procurement has occurred despite various policy statements of the Secretary of Defense designed to prevent such situations from occurring. We are recommending that the Secretary of Defense take steps to assure himself that his policies for full utilization of substitute items are being effectively applied by the military departments in considering the need for new procurement.

We believe that the deficiency of the Corps of Engineers in screening listings of excess Navy generators is further demonstration of the need for better procedures for identification of suitable substitute items in the various military departments. In our August 31, 1962, report on "Review of the Utilization of Excess and Surplus Property Within the Department of Defense," we recommended that the inventory managers at the various control points in the military departments be directed to continuously research items managed by them to identify suitable substitutes, record the substitutions when found, and report such substitutability to the Defense Logistics Services Center for future screening purposes. We believe that prompt adoption of this recommendation will materially assist in providing a means of identifying suitable substitute items in the military supply system to prevent unnecessary procurement.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army.

Joseph Campbell,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

Comptroller General
of the United States,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1963.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Enclosed is our report on examination of the costs to the Government for storage of petroleum in new commercial facilities under Department of Defense negotiated contracts.

Our review disclosed that, in order to satisfy Department of the Air Force requirements, the Defense Petroleum Supply Center negotiated eight contracts for petroleum storage in new dispersed and protected commercial (contractor owned and operated) facilities; and, as a result, the Government will incur about $10.3 million higher costs than if similar Government facilities had been acquired. The increased costs will amount to almost one-third of the Government's total expenditures for the fixed periods of the contracts, and the Government will not have title to the facilities unless an additional $9 million is paid. The increased costs result primarily because contract prices include funds needed by contractors to finance construction of commercial facilities within relatively short periods. We found no evidence that Air Force officials had compared the costs of commercial facilities with the costs of Government facilities before decisions were made to contract for commercial facilities. Had such comparisons been made, they should have disclosed that disproportionately higher costs would be incurred for storage in commercial facilities and that contracting for storage in Government facilities would result in substantial savings to the Government.

By letter dated October 8, 1962, the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics) disagreed with our estimate of the increased costs but informed us that, if other dispersed and protected storage facilities are required, appropriate consideration will be given to the relative costs of Government ownership of needed storage facilities compared with contractor ownership of such facilities. The Assistant Secretary stated that the Defense Petroleum Supply Center (now under the Defense Supply Agency) has no responsibility for making recommendations concerning acquisition of Government or commercial petroleum facilities but has responsibility only for advising the military departments on the availability of commercial facilities and for contracting to satisfy the military departments' requirements for the facilities. Thus, the Defense Petroleum Supply Center is not required to question the basis for a department's decision to use commercial petroleum facilities, even though there may be indications of increased or unnecessary costs to the Government in the prices proposed by contractors.

In order to assure that the Government is not incurring disproportionately higher costs for petroleum storage which requires construction of commercial facilities, we are recommending to the Secretary of Defense that the military departments be required to give appropriate consideration to the cost of Government ownership of needed storage facilities compared with commercial ownership of such facilities before decisions are made to acquire or lease such facilities. We are also recommending to the Secretary of Defense that military departments requesting procurement of new commercial petroleum facilities be required to furnish comparative estimates for Government facilities to the Defense Petroleum Supply Center so that the latter can ascertain before contract prices are negotiated that costs for commercial facilities will in fact be lower than the estimates for Government facilities. Further, we are recommending that the Secretary of Defense and the Director, Bureau of the Budget, amend existing policy regulations so that cost justifications will be required before decisions are made to contract for products or services requiring construction of either commercial or Government facilities.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretaries of the Air Force and the Navy.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

HIGHER INTEREST RATES TO STEM FLOW OF FUNDS ABROAD WILL STIFLE ECONOMY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the Wall Street Journal carried a lead article which reads, "U.S. Settles on Boost in Interest Rates To Cut Flow of Funds Abroad." The lead paragraph in this article reads:

> Uncle Sam's dollar defenders have picked what they hope will be their decisive weapon for ending the deficit in the U.S. balance of international payments: A deliberate boost in short-term interest rates.

I earnestly hope this decision is not the final decision. The testimony before the Joint Economic Committee last year and this year has underlined the fact that this is no way to solve the problem of adverse balance of payments.

There have been only two studies of the effect of interest differentials on capital flow, one by Dr. Philip Bell, of Haverford College, and one by Dr. Robert Gemmill, of the Federal Reserve Board. Both studies show that interest differentials do not significantly affect capital flow, that speculation is a far more significant influencing factor. The fact is that a number of countries have higher interest rates than this country has right now.

In the last issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin is a statement by the only Kennedy appointment to the Federal Reserve Board, George W. Mitchell, a highly able monetary economist. I read from his statement before the Joint Economic Committee:

> I would not deny that reduced credit availability and higher interest rates might have some significant and lasting effects in reducing net capital outflows. They could; but much depends on the circumstances. In the economic environment of today, my judgment is that it would take more monetary action than is desirable to significantly curtail net capital exports.

He goes on to say:

> To attack the balance-of-payments problem with stringent monetary measures would risk imposing a costly drag on an already sluggish pace of economic growth.

Of course, Dr. Mitchell is absolutely right. The testimony before our committee was that if we continue to have high interest rates, or if interest rates rose, the effect of the tax cut would be nullified.

I want to read one more statement from Dr. Mitchell:

> We might consider a more direct attack on the capital outflow problem. The United States has the largest and most accessible capital market in the world, and it ought to be kept free of exchange restrictions. It is proper and desirable that capital-poor developing countries should utilize this market to meet a portion of their enormous needs for foreign capital. It is not so clear, however, that it is either necessary or desirable for advanced countries, with balance-of-payments surpluses, to have recourse to our capital market on the recent large scale while they restrict and hamper entry of outside borrowers to their own capital markets.

Dr. Mitchell proposes what seems to me to be an eminently practical and sensible method of solving the problem by getting together with our allies and agreeing on capital flows in a sensible way, by seeking their help in our difficulties as we helped them in the 1950's. That is a far better method of solving the problem than by hiking interest rates and gutting our economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both articles, the article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal, and the article by George W. Mitchell, a member of the Federal Reserve System, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOLLAR-GAP STRATEGY: UNITED STATES SETTLES ON BOOST IN INTEREST RATES TO CUT FLOW OF FUNDS ABROAD—LIKELY RISE IN DISCOUNT RATE WOULD AWAIT OUTCOME OF TAX BILL—WILL CANADA HELP?—FIGHTING "EASY MONEY" MEN

(By Allen J. Large)

WASHINGTON.—Uncle Sam's dollar defenders have picked what they hope will be their decisive weapon for ending the deficit in the U.S. balance of international payments: A deliberate boost in short-term interest rates.

Kennedy administration officials figure this may be the year for such a direct attempt to curb the outflow of U.S. investment dollars now seeking higher interest rates in Canada and Europe than are available at home. This flow lately has equaled somewhere near half of the gold-draining gap between the total U.S. dollar outgo abroad and dollar income from foreign lands. The payments deficit last year was a disappointingly large $2.2 billion, almost as wide as the year before.

The most likely technique for keeping investment funds at home is an increase in the Federal Reserve System's 3-percent discount rate—the fee the Federal Reserve charges on loans to member commercial banks. The effect would be to shove other U.S. short-term rates upward. Some officials suggest an increase to 3½ percent, carrying the discount rate back to the point from which it was cut in 1960, would be logical; the step might be taken in two stages to ease any shock to "easy money" advocates.

Though initiated by the "independent" Federal Reserve Board, a discount-rate rise would have the administration's support if tricky questions of timing can be resolved.

CANADA AND THE TIMETABLE

The administration would like the timetable geared to events in Canada and the U.S. Congress. President Kennedy's financial experts hope to wait until after Canada's April 8 elections, then put pressure on the new Government to cut that country's own discount rate of 4 percent. If Canada complies, it would help curb some of the northward flow of short-term U.S. investment funds.

Such Canadian action would let American officials delay boosting interest rates here until the fate of the administration's tax-cut bill is known. If Congress approves a tax cut this summer or fall, that's the time a deliberate boost in U.S. interest rates would be most likely. Officials reason a tax cut could supplant the Federal Reserve's present easy-credit policy as a domestic business stimulator, allowing a rise in U.S. interest rates.

The reasoning is summed up by the recent annual report of the New York Federal Reserve Bank:

"Tax reductions, although primarily designed to spur the domestic economy, should not be taken to imply any letdown in concern over the balance of payments. On the contrary, if tax cuts have the expected expansionary effects, the monetary (credit-regulating) authorities would have increased freedom to move significantly away from the long-continued policy of credit ease, should international considerations make this necessary."

EVENTS COULD CHANGE TIMING

The highly tentative timetable for translating this reasoning into action could be altered quickly by unforeseen events. Federal Reserve officials always hold an emergency discount-rate boost at the ready to combat not only a sudden sharp increase in the outflow of investment dollars, but also any massive conversion of foreign-owned dollars into the Treasury's gold; thus they'd aim to keep U.S. gold reserves from sinking dangerously low. Canadian refusal to lower interest rates might make early American action imperative. On the other hand, congressional postponement of a tax cut until the 1964 session could set back the Government's interest rate plans.

Timing aside, it's highly significant that top administration officials now see higher interest rates as an acceptable technique for overcoming the persistent payments deficit. Until lately they resisted the idea of a deliberate boost for fear it would cramp economic growth.

A deliberate boost in short-term rates surely would prompt protests from "easy money" Democrats in Congress, notably House Banking Committee Chairman PATMAN, of Texas. But President Kennedy himself is said to be prepared to stand this heat if the rate increase is modest. Complaints will be met with the counterargument that a full-scale dollar crisis would require a much stiffer rise in rates than that now contemplated.

A raft of other devices have been set in motion since late 1960 to reduce dollar outlays abroad and raise this country's foreign income. Some dollar-spending servicemen have been brought home from Europe; Germany and Italy are using their dollars to buy arms in the United States; foreign aid recipients are ordered to spend their money here; American tourist spending abroad is discouraged and a tub-thumping campaign attempts to coax U.S. businessmen to expand exports.

TOURISTS AND DOLLARS

These measures will be continued. The 1961 law which cut the duty-free exemption on goods brought home by tourists to $100 from $500 expires on June 30; the Treasury shortly will ask Congress to extend the exemption at the $100 level, though officials admit the lower ceiling hasn't discouraged tourist spending abroad as much as hoped.

Tourist complaints about the $100 duty-free limit have been so loud, however, that there's some talk in Congress of raising it to $200. The Treasury is ready to accept that figure, if it's made permanent. But Treasury men would resist any move to let the exemption revert to $500.

Other refinements of existing dollar-saving measures are in the works. Federal agencies this month are drawing up estimates of what they'll spend abroad in the 1964 fiscal year starting July 1. These forecasts will make up a so-called gold budget, and some agencies' pet foreign projects will be chopped by the Budget Bureau.

Under scrutiny will be such dollar outflow sources as medical research grants made overseas by the National Institutes of Health, pension payments sent abroad by the Veterans' Administration and a host of housekeeping expenses by U.S. agencies operating in foreign lands. Many of the items open to gold budget chopping are admittedly in the nickel-and-dime category, but officials hope for some savings.

MEDICINE NOT STRONG ENOUGH

Administration men now concede the gold-saving medicine employed so far probably isn't strong enough to end the chronic payments deficit soon enough. From a fat $3.9 billion in 1960, the deficit was cut to $2.4 billion in 1961. At one point the Treasury hoped for further reduction in 1962 to less than $1.5 billion, and a balance at the end of this year. But those hopes are gone. Last year's deficit of $2.2 billion emerged mainly because imports jumped 11 percent from the year before to $16.4 billion while exports crept up only 4 percent to $20.9 billion. This lopped nearly $1 billion off the favorable U.S. balance of trade.

A year or so ago, Federal analysts were betting on a lunge in 1963 exports to deal the final blow to the payments deficit. These bets are now off.

"We're going to have to run fast just to hold our own," says a Commerce Department export promoter. A drop in 1963 from last year's total exports is conceivable, he suggests. The reason: Expected declines in sales of U.S. farm products, commercial aircraft, and machine tools.

Some private analysts are more optimistic. A 5-percent gain in 1963 exports is forecast by Walter H. Diamond, economist for the Foreign Credit Insurance Association in New York. The FCIA is a group of insurance companies, assembled under Federal auspices, that guarantees repayment of credit extended to foreign buyers by U.S. exporters. Mr. Diamond says FCIA programs last year resulted in $200 million of exports that wouldn't have otherwise been made, and he expects the 1963 impact to double to $400 million.

WORRY OVER IMPORT GAIN

Even if exports rise, however, the chief worry centers on another big gain in imports that would permit no improvement in net U.S. trade earnings. The tax cut that would stimulate domestic business also would increase U.S. demand for foreign products, it's reasoned.

Whatever the short-run effect of U.S. economic expansion, administration officials have tirelessly pointed to two long-run developments in Europe that promise to ease the dollar problem. One is Europe's faster increase in labor costs than the United States is experiencing; higher prices could make European goods less competitive with American products. The second is an apparent slackening in Europe's economic growth that makes it less attractive for Americans to invest there; this development, it's claimed, may divert U.S. investment funds into underdeveloped areas, stimulating their economies and creating new markets for American goods.

But the administration has come under sharp attack in recent months for dwelling on these long-run prospects while proposing no new tangible measures for ending the payments deficit quickly. The American Bankers Association has declared: "We do not believe that the United States has either the time or the maneuverability which would allow it to seek answers to its balance-of-payments problems in essentially long-range approaches."

Such pressure, among other things, has caused the administration to isolate short-term investment outflow as a key area for attack.

DECLINE FROM 1961

By one statistical measurement, private short-term capital outflows in 1961 topped $2 billion, equal to nearly all the total payments deficit. Those outflows included private U.S. bank loans to Japanese borrowers and American purchases of British treasury bills, short-term securities of local British governments and British consumer credit paper.

Last year bank loans to Japan declined sharply, and British treasury bills became less attractive relative to U.S. Treasury bills and other short-term securities. The 1962 short-term outflow thus declined to around $1 billion, if heavy unrecorded transactions are included. But officials say American purchases of certain securities in Canada and Britain are continuing, and they'd like to erase the attractiveness of these investments.

"There's no other category in the balance of payments where we see a chance of picking up something as big as $1 billion," says one policymaker.

Administration officials hope thus to avoid more drastic dollar-saving measures, including heavy withdrawals of troops from Europe, special tax incentives to spur exports, and direct or indirect Government restrictions on movements of capital abroad. Officials swear they won't cooperate with French efforts to restrict American investments there.

[From the Federal Reserve Bulletin,
February 1963]

STATEMENT OF GEORGE W. MITCHELL, MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, BEFORE THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 1, 1963

Two problems—slack growth in the domestic economy and an adverse balance of payments in our international accounts—now occupy the stage of economic policy discussion. Not so many years ago, a persistently rising price level and an apparent dollar shortage in the world economy were the dominant problems of such discussion.

Though the problems have changed, the tools to deal with them are unchanged: fiscal policy, monetary policy, and structural alterations in particular institutions, practices, or programs. The mix of these alternative and complementary approaches depends on varying judgments of their relative efficacy and on the current economic environment and outlook. In my remarks today, I want mainly to focus on the recent role of monetary policy in coping with both problems and to suggest in very general terms the role that monetary policy might play in the developing situation.

Much of the commentary on the recent performance of the U.S. economy has noted that 1962 was the most prosperous year in our history. This is true but not especially notable. Real output per capita rose during the year but 1 percent. Total output increased less than 3 percent from the end of 1961 to the end of 1962 even though we had excessive unemployment and idle plant capacity throughout the year.

At the same time, the continuing deficit in our balance of payments acted as a constraint on efforts to stimulate higher levels of domestic economic activity. A trade surplus of between $4 billion and $5 billion was exceeded by our payments abroad on account of private capital, military outlays, and foreign aid. To reduce this deficit is a most pressing problem for the year ahead.

BUSINESS OUTLOOK

At the moment, it seems to me that the immediate economic prospects are favorable—more favorable than for some time past. Spurred by the excellent public reception of the 1963 model cars, retail sales rose substantially in the fourth quarter, and consumer demand generally now appears more vigorous than at any time during 1962. Government purchases, especially at State and local levels, are clearly destined to continue upward, under the pressure of our defense, space, and international requirements and the needs of our rapidly growing population. Total construction expenditures have been running at record highs, and the recent volume of contract awards suggests a continued high level of construction activity in the period ahead.

The expansion in final sales, if continued, should soon call for a higher rate of industrial output and should serve to augment business demands as well. Business inventories, for example, have changed very little in recent months, but with final sales up strongly, some restocking to accommodate a larger volume of business may now be in order.

The outlook as regards business capital outlays is more doubtful. The rate of expansion in such outlays last year was disappointing, reflecting mainly the lack of pressure on existing productive facilities, and the official surveys project a small decline in the current quarter. But operating rates in many industries have been inching upward, and it seems to me that the combination of rising final sales, continued high-level profits, and the considerable incentives provided by the tax credit and accelerated depreciation actions last summer and the prospective tax reduction for this year should give renewed impetus to investment plans and outlays as the year progresses.

The basis for accelerated economic expansion which I have sketched here owes much to the dramatic turn in business and public psychology which followed the quick and successful conclusion of the Cuban crisis. Since then, the pronounced recovery in stock market prices, the more buoyant attitude of consumers revealed by recent surveys, the strength in new car sales and housing starts—all point to a marked improvement in the business tone. It is important to note also that the stimulating effect of tax reduction on consumer buying and business investment plans will be buttressed by the record increase last year in public holdings of liquid assets and by the ready availability of credit on relatively favorable terms.

I have characterized the balance-of-payments problem as a most urgent issue. I say this because delay in its solution increasingly exposes us to pressure from our creditors and because it inhibits our freedom to stimulate a sluggish domestic economy, which has performed below par for several years.

I fully agree with those who say that we cannot neglect either the domestic or the international problem as we pursue a solution to the other. On the other hand, the two problems may call for different types of solution.

In these circumstances, what contribution can monetary policy make to achievement of fuller use of domestic resources and to improvement in the balance of payments?

MONETARY POLICY IN 1962

The bare financial facts usually used in an evaluation of monetary policy over the past year are as follows: While gross national product in current dollars rose about 4 percent, bank credit—that is, total loans and security holdings of commercial banks—increased about 9 percent. The money supply, narrowly defined as currency and demand deposits, increased about 1.5 percent, but time and savings deposits went up 18 percent. The rate of turnover of the money supply increased about 8 percent. Market interest rates were relatively stable over the year, as long-term yields crept downward and short-term rates edged up.

On the surface, these facts are conflicting in that (1) bank credit and time deposits rose by large amounts and this would seem to indicate that monetary policy was strongly stimulative; but (2) the money supply rose very little for the year as a whole, and not at all until the fourth quarter, and its rate of use increased sharply, suggesting that monetary policy was not actively expansionary. When analyzed in the context of other developments during the year, these facts seem to me to show that monetary policy was inhibited throughout much of the year by balance-of-payments considerations and was less stimulative than was appropriate to the domestic situation.

All of the monetary and credit magnitudes for 1962 were significantly affected by the upward movement a year ago in the interest rates paid on commercial bank time deposits, following the change in the Board's regulation Q. In order to interpret and appraise monetary developments during the year, it is vital to disentangle the various effects of this change, which enabled commercial banks to attract a large inflow of time and savings deposits.

Where did these time and savings deposits come from? Do they represent in effect a net addition to the community's stock of money, which the public chooses to hold as time rather than as demand deposits? Or, does the buildup in time deposits reflect a rechanneling of the flows of saving, as the public decided to hold more of its financial assets in the form of interest-earning deposits at commercial banks and less of its financial assets in the form of securities and deposits in other institutions?

I believe it is correct to say that a sizable fraction of the buildup in time and savings deposits at commercial banks last year simply represented a shift in the public's attitude toward the commercial bank as a financial intermediary. We know, for example, that individuals acquired a considerably smaller volume of State and local government bonds and corporate stock in 1962 than in earlier years, even though their total savings increased. It is reasonable to think that .as individuals reduced their purchases of securities, they put the funds into time and savings deposits, on which interest payments were now higher. Similarly, corporations acquired a substantial volume of newly available negotiable certificates of deposit at commercial banks in 1962. These funds, too, would presumably have gone directly into Treasury bills and other short-term securities if they had not gone into commercial banks time accounts.

What happened, in other words, was that, to a degree, the public chose to invest indirectly through acquiring commercial bank time balances rather than directly by purchasing securities. The banks' role as financial intermediaries between savers and credit market was thereby enlarged. To the extent that this happened, the resulting increase in total bank deposits and total bank assets should not be regarded as constituting monetary expansion or as contributing to total credit expansion. Rather, it represented merely a rechanneling of the financial flow of funds, as the public exchanged securities for bank time deposits.

Another portion of the increase in commercial bank time deposits includes funds that would have gone into other savings institutions if commercial banks had not raised their rates. Although deposits at mutual savings banks and shares at savings and loan associations increased substantially in 1962, they might have gone up even more if commercial banks had not become more attractive as savings depositaries. Here again, to the extent that commercial banks increased their role as savings institutions at the expense of these other outlets for savings, the resulting increase in bank assets and deposits does not represent injections of new money and credit into the economy.

Finally, there is no doubt that the advance in bank interest rates induced some individuals and business corporations to shift from demand deposits to interest-earning time deposits at commercial banks. That is, the attractiveness of a prominent near-money asset was enhanced, and the public was thereby induced to economize further its holdings of cash balances. Or to put it differently, as bank credit expanded in 1962, the public found it desirable to place the monetary counterpart of the credit expansion into time and savings deposits. To the extent that such conversions occurred, our comparative statistics on money supply fail to take into account the increased substitution of time for demand deposits.

It is unfortunate that we are unable to measure and compare these various components of the buildup in time deposits. All we can say is that the growth of total bank credit and deposits exaggerates the degree of monetary stimulus in 1962, while the growth of money supply understates the contribution of monetary policy to economic expansion. Let us, therefore, examine two other variables that usually express the extent to which the economy has been supplied with new money and bank credit.

The turnover of demand deposits, a measure of the velocity or rate of use of money balances, has trended upward in the postwar period. If we look at the cycles around this rising trend, we find that they conform rather well to the business cycle. We also find that turnover has generally increased faster in years of monetary restraint and slower in years of monetary ease. In the year just ended, the rate of turnover rose by as much as it did in some earlier years of vigorous economic expansion and restrictive monetary policy. I take this as an indication that the public has not been supplied with redundant amounts of new money in relation to its transactions and income.

This observation is confirmed by what happened to interest rates in 1962. As I noted earlier, short-term rates crept up during the year. Although long-term rates sank a little, they remain high by historical standards. Reflecting, as they do, the interaction of the supply of funds with the demand for funds, interest-rate movements in 1962 reveal to us that the supply was not pressing very strongly on demand.

All in all, therefore, I would characterize monetary policy in 1962 as having been passively responsive to the bank credit and monetary needs of the economy but not actively stimulative. And this judgment is borne out by the fact that it was not until the final quarter of the year, when business and consumer psychology strengthened and business loan demand picked up, that money supply rose. It was at this point that the economy overtook the monetary posture of supplying reserves on terms consistent with a short-term rate pattern based on balance-of-payments considerations.

Could monetary policy have done more to encourage economic expansion in 1962? I believe that the answer is "Yes" but judgments may differ on this—and particularly would they differ as to the consequences on the balance of payments. The range of difference is not very wide and would not cover, so far as I am concerned, a sufficiently aggressive monetary policy to have singlehandedly restored the economy to full use of its resources. As far as long-run growth is concerned, the major contribution that monetary policy can make is in shortening the duration, and cutting down the amplitude, of cyclical downswings and extending the period and amplitude of upswings. The secular tilt of the economy is more appropriately the concern of fiscal actions and structural reforms.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS CONSIDERATION

Just how is monetary policy constrained by balance-of-payments considerations? Since 1961 the objective has been to maintain a level of short-term interest rates in the United States that is tolerably competitive, exchange risk considered, with the level of short-term rates in other money markets, mainly in London and, to a lesser extent, Western Europe. This competitive level has succeeded in limiting, though not eliminating, incentives that U.S. banks and corporations, or foreigners with short-term dollar holdings, would otherwise have to add to the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit by switching from short-term dollar investments to short-term investment abroad.

Flows of funds of this kind are sometimes interpreted by important dollar holders, domestic as well as foreign, not as rate-conscious money seeking gain from interest differentials, but as the consequence of apprehensions about the strength of the dollar. Thus, monetary policy has in effect been directed at maintaining a psychology of international confidence in the dollar.

This is a perfectly proper objective for monetary policy to pursue, but it is not one that can have a significant impact on correcting whatever basic imbalance exists in our trading-investing relationships with the rest of the world. And it is only through changes in these basic factors that a real solution to the problem can be achieved. Can monetary policy also play a role here? First, as to investing relationships.

A number of domestic and foreign observers have noted that our international transactions on current account and Government economic aid have in fact given rise to nearly equal U.S. payments and receipts in recent years. In consequence, they have identified our deficit on all transactions with our deficit on private capital account. They have argued that in order to bring our overall payments flows into balance, we must sharply reduce net outflows of private capital. They have thought this result might readily be accomplished by a tightening of monetary policy and a rise in interest rates.

I would not deny that reduced credit availability and higher interest rates might have some significant and lasting effects in reducing net capital outflows. They could; but much depends on the circumstances. In the economic environment of today, my judgment is that it would take more monetary action than is desirable to significantly curtail net capital exports.

The largest outflows of U.S. capital represent direct investments by U.S. corporations in foreign branches and subsidiaries. Basically, these investment decisions must take into account the relationship between long-term interest yields on market investments and the prospective profit yield of a particular investment. If credit conditions in this country should tighten as a result of vigorous, but noninflationary, domestic economic expansion in which the relative profitability of investment in this country was rapidly improving, then indeed U.S. firms would invest more at home and less abroad, and foreign capital, too, would be attracted here. But if last year's climate of less than vigorous growth, with some slack in resource use, were to continue and credit conditions were tightened by restrictive monetary policy alone, a large retarding effect on the direct foreign investments of U.S. business could only be significantly effective at the expense of declines in other closely linked sectors of the domestic capital markets and therefore domestic expenditure.

Other flows of capital are probably more responsive than direct investments to changes in credit and interest-rate conditions, but some of these flows, too, are less responsive than is often supposed. Much foreign borrowing last year, for example, through bond issues in our markets—the second largest category of capital outflow—was by foreign governments whose demands for external funds were not very flexible because they could find no other international capital market open and able to accommodate their transactions. Also, a good deal of lending abroad by U.S. banks was associated with U.S. exports whose financing could not readily be transferred to foreign credit markets.

Furthermore, it can hardly be argued that reduced credit availability and higher interest levels could have big effects on international capital flows but only minor effects on domestic credit flows. To have tightened monetary policy last year enough to have exerted significant restraint on those outflows of capital that are responsive could, in my judgment, also have had a strong braking effect on the lagging domestic economic expansion.

How could monetary policy be used to improve our basic trading position—to make our exports of goods and services more competitive? There is traditional orthodox prescription for a certain situation. The classical case for the application of monetary discipline, so called, is that in which a country is suffering from excess demand and is attempting to deal with the twin phenomena of inflation at home and a deficit abroad. Here monetary restraint has the dual purpose of tempering the climate of the domestic economy and reducing the deficit in the international accounts. But our current domestic problem is not one of inflation but of lagging expansion, and to attack the balance-of-payments problem with stringent monetary measures would risk imposing a costly drag on an already sluggish pace of economic growth.

Thus, the role of monetary policy can be, under present circumstances, only of limited effectiveness in dealing with the basic balance-of-payments problem just as it is of limited effectiveness in dealing with the domestic problem of lagging long-run economic growth.

In the past 2 years a good deal of direct attention has been given to the conditions and environments which can be altered to improve our basic international economic position—through the reduction of tariffs, lowering of barriers to capital outflow by other high-savings industrial nations, the tieing of foreign aid, and the fuller sharing of free world burdens for mutual security. But the situation fails to show the degree of improvement needed to clearly indicate to the rest of the world our capacity and intent to reach an equilibrium payments position. We probably should be giving consideration to alternatives that up to now have been rejected.

For example, we might consider a more direct attack on the capital outflow problem. The United States has the largest and most accessible capital market in the world, and it ought to be kept free of exchange restrictions. It is proper and desirable that capital-poor developing countries should utilize this market to meet a portion of their enormous needs for foreign capital. It is not so clear, however, that it is either necessary or desirable for advanced countries, with balance-of-payments surpluses, to have recourse to our capital market on the recent large scale while they restrict and hamper entry of outside borrowers to their own capital markets. If these countries are unwilling to open their capital markets, possibly we should look toward tax measures that might help to remedy this unbalanced position. In general, we need to explore the possibilities of various tax measures that might, consistent with our obligations as an international good neighbor, and with the status of the dollar as a world reserve currency, discourage capital movements that appear to flow "uphill" to countries that are already capital rich.

We also need to explore the possibility that tax measures might be used to encourage exports. As a matter of principle, there is no good reason why our exports should bear U.S. taxes. Taxation is a means by which we pay for government services. Why should foreign purchasers of our exports help to pay for the services provided by the U.S. Government to its citizens, and why should our exporters be expected to be so competitive that their product prices have to absorb U.S. as well as foreign taxes and tariffs?

It may be that foreign countries in their tax policies also discriminate against their nationals' exporting activities This is not easy to ascertain given the complication of various National, State, and local tax laws and conditions under which tax burdens are shifted to customers. But the discrimination against exporters of our country can hardly be doubted.

MONETARY AND FISCAL POLICY IN THE YEAR AHEAD

If the proposed tax reduction is successful in stimulating more rapid economic expansion, bank credit and monetary needs will in all likelihood accelerate. Business demands for loans will increase, consumers will impose larger calls on credit markets, and the Treasury will be financing an enlarged deficit. In such circumstances, the supply of bank credit and money can increase without downward pressures on interest rates and aggravation of capital outflows. In fact, bank credit, the money supply, and interest rates might well rise more in relation to advancing gross national product than in comparable periods of expansion. This is so because monetary expansion has lagged during the past year. The fact that deposit turnover or velocity has continued to rise rapidly over the past year suggests that we cannot count as much as in other recent periods on past monetary creation to satisfy future monetary needs.

As to the question of how the enlarged budget deficit will be financed, I see this as a problem that can only be considered in the economic environment in which it occurs. The budget went into deficit during the recession of 1960 and, just as the recovery in the economy has been incomplete, the restoration of balance in the budget has been incomplete. The past year's deficit has been successfully financed outside the banking system.

The proposed tax cut will enlarge the deficit, but gradually rather than all at once. In view of the purpose of the tax cut, which is to stimulate the economy, a consistent national policy would hardly call for monetary action to offset its effects if the economy continued to operate well below its capacity. Similarly, if excess demand develops, generating inflationary pressures and psychology, offsetting action by the Federal Reserve would be clearly appropriate. Thus, the economic climate at the time should determine the posture of our monetary policy. In judging monetary policy in relation to deficit financing, what matters most is not whether the banks or the nonbank public purchase the securities to finance the deficit, but whether the economy as a whole is provided with a volume of money and bank credit consistent with sustainable expansion at relatively stable prices. This is not to say that the Treasury does not have a debt maturity problem. Its market offerings need to be fitted into a balanced structure of maturities. In financing an enlarged deficit, the Treasury may find it necessary at various points to compete with other borrowers in the different maturity sectors of the market. Under the economic enviroment that we hope to achieve, the competition may prove to be strong and the Treasury should be prepared to meet it.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN OFFICES OF TREASURY DEPARTMENT TO BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it was announced Tuesday that the transfer of the duties of certain offices of the Treasury Department to the larger cities will result in some reduction in personnel and reduce the cost of the Department by $5 million annually. If it is true that this action will reduce the cost of operating the Revenue Bureau without any corresponding reduction in services it will meet our approval. However, I am not sure that this will be the result, and I am disappointed that the Department saw fit not to consult at least some members of the Finance Committee before releasing this announcement to the newspapers. It would have been much better had we been advised on what is planned. In the absence of any background information, all I can do is look at the report.

First, I have been somewhat puzzled that so much of this transfer is being concentrated in Boston. It could be argued that removing offices from Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, and transferring them to Boston was an attempt to centralize in the larger cities, but I do not understand how transferring the main office out of New York to Boston can be justified on the same line of reasoning. Therefore, that line of reasoning is invalid. There is a suspicion that political consideration may have been a factor in making these decisions.

The release says they are going to save $5 million for the taxpayers. I would compliment them on that objective, but in the budget submitted by the administration they are asking for an additional $430 million to run the Treasury Department next year. Furthermore, according to the 1964 budget they are planning to add 4,149 extra employees for the Treasury Department. If we must increase next year's appropriations by $430 million and add an additional 4,100 employees to save this $5 million my only comment is that on that basis we can soon save ourselves into bankruptcy.

I hope the Department can make a better justification for the transfer than that outlined in their press release. If they can show that this is a bona fide reduction in expenditures without handicapping the service I will support them notwithstanding the fact that it affects one of the offices in my State. I think this agency and all agencies should be operated as economically as possible. But I do not think we should boast of savings if it merely means transferring offices or jobs from one place to another. Such irresponsible transfers would be not only inconvenient to the employees involved but inconvenient to the American taxpayers as well.

While the Treasury Department has a responsibility to operate its Department as economically as possible, it also has a responsibility to render proper service to the taxpayers, and taxpayers in Delaware and the other 49 States are just as worthy of consideration as are the voters in Boston.

TEST-BAN NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I commend President Kennedy for the statement he made at his press conference yesterday on the test ban negotiations. It contained a categorical assurance to the Senate and to the American people that this administration will not negotiate a test-ban treaty which allows the possibility of undetected Soviet cheating.

I quote from the press conference transcript:

> Question. Mr. President, on Monday Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said even if the Russians were able to test underground indefinitely this would not alter the strategic military balance between the United States and the Soviet Union. He said this was the executive assessment. Given that assessment, can you tell us what considerations then would prevent accepting a test ban on the terms set by Russia?
>
> Answer. I don't think, if I may say so—in my opinion that is not what is the administration's position. We have suggested that we would not accept a test ban which would permit indefinite underground testing by the Soviet Union. We would not accept a test ban which did not give us every assurance that we could detect a series of tests underground. That is the administration's position. We would not submit a treaty which did not provide that assurance to the U.S. Senate. Nor would the Senate approve it.

While the President was making this statement, Carl F. Romney, assistant technical director, Air Force Technical Application Center, in testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy pointed out that it is possible for the Soviets to make significant underground tests without any possibility of seismic detection by us.

I quote from the Washington Post:

> Replying to questions, Romney said that a potential cheater would be able to test 1-kiloton devices in granite; 2- to 6-kiloton devices in tuff (a volcanic ash); and 10- to 20-kiloton devices in dry alluvium (a sandy material), with no seismic means presently available to catch the cheater * * *
>
> In previous testimony before the Committee it was noted that the majority of U.S. underground nuclear tests being conducted in Nevada involved devices of 4 kilotons or less, indicating that atomic weapons progress can be made using devices of these sizes.

Mr. President, I believe it is clear from this, that the contentions expressed by Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, in a recent statement of official policy, have been repudiated by the President in two highly significant ways.

Mr. Fisher said we were willing to accept a treaty that contained a possible risk that a series of underground tests could go undetected, and that we could accept this risk because the progress the Russians could make through secret tests would not be significant enough to alter the balance of power.

I was greatly heartened by the President's statement that this was not his policy, that he would never accept a treaty that did not contain every assurance that the Soviets could not conduct a series of secret tests.

I support the view expressed by the President, and I assume that the Disarmament Agency and the negotiators at Geneva will conform to the President's view and make whatever alterations are necessary in Mr. Fisher's statement of policy.

During the past several days the real issues involved in the test-ban treaty have been brought to the American people more closely than ever before.

I am happy to have had the opportunity to play a small role in accelerating this debate and bringing these issues before the people.

I believe that Mr. Adrian Fisher should be congratulated for candidly and clearly presenting a statement of policy that is supported by many test-ban advocates but that differs significantly from the policy laid down yesterday by the President. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has performed an invaluable service by conducting excellent hearings which have pointed out clearly the dangers inherent in our present test-ban proposal. The Washington Post also deserves commendation for using so much of its editorial and news space to present both sides of this issue.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the following items which trace the development of this debate:

A copy of the Washington Post story describing my February 21 speech on the floor of the Senate concerning the nuclear test-ban negotiations.

A February 22 Washington Post editorial critical of my speech.

My March 1 reply to the Washington Post editorial.

The March 4 reply to my letter by Mr. Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

A March 5 Washington Post editorial supporting Mr. Fisher's position.

My March 5 reply to Mr. Fisher in the form of a letter to the Washington Post.

The March 7 Washington Post news story concerning President Kennedy's news conference and testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

An extract from the President's news conference as printed in the Washington Post of March 7.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1963]

U.S. Concessions on A-Test Ban Court War, Dodd Warns Senate

(By Julius Duscha)

Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut, charged yesterday that the Kennedy administration is courting war by granting concessions to the Soviet Union in nuclear test-ban negotiations.

In a lengthy Senate speech, Dodd, a conservative Democrat frequently at odds with American foreign policy, said that both the Kennedy and Eisenhower administrations have made concession after concession to the Russians.

Dodd said that so many concessions have been made that he would vote against a test-ban treaty that included these concessions and he would try to prevent its ratification.

He declared that "there are two roads to peace with the Communist world * * * the proved road of strength and vigilance and * * * the unproved road of valid negotiations and reliable agreements."

WANTS PATH OF STRENGTH

"The first road is one which we can travel by our own will;" he added, "the second we must travel in yoke with our declared enemy who has thus far hobbled us at every step. * * *

"Let us place our trust in the path of strength and our hope in the path of honest negotiations. To forsake either of these paths is to court war and to invite the destruction of our country and our civilization."

Seldom has a Senator announced that he would oppose a treaty before it has ever been negotiated.

The essence of Dodd's expressed opposition to a test-ban treaty of the sort being sought by the administration is that the United States has made all of the concessions in the negotiations and that the Russians simply cannot be trusted.

FOLLOWS GOP ATTACKS

Dodd's speech follows a series of Republican attacks in the House on the test-ban negotiations. The GOP House campaign against the treaty is being led by Representative Craig Hosmer, Republican of California, a conservative Republican who is the ranking GOP member on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Dodd maintained that the United States needs to continue nuclear testing to perfect smaller strategic atomic weapons and to develop the so-called neutron bomb.

This is a concept of a nuclear weapon supposedly designed to destroy people without nuclear fallout or disastrous fire storms.

Dodd went on to charge that an aggressive faction in the scientific community has given both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations persistently wrongheaded advice stemming from "an appalling lack of political realities."

The only scientist he named was Hans Bethe, who was science adviser to former President Eisenhower.

The concessions that Dodd said had been made by the United States to the Russians included:

A reduction from 20 to 5 in the number of inspections each year in the Soviet Union to police the test ban.

A cutback in the number of worldwide monitoring stations from 180 to 80.

A decision to allow citizens of a country to man monitoring stations in their own country rather than to have citizens of other countries do it on an international basis.

The elimination of any specific threshold of a seismic shock of an undetermined origin that would be checked.

Acceptance of the use of supposedly tamperproof black boxes to monitor the test ban.

Approval of a test-ban control body in which the Soviet Union could exercise a veto.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 22, 1963]

Dodd and the Test Ban

An astonishing assumption that two successive administrations would deliberately imperil the security of the United States underlies Senator Thomas J. Dodd's attack upon the test-ban treaty and his announced opposition to it. He charged in the Senate speech he made yesterday that the adoption of the treaty would jeopardize the country because it would preclude further development on the neutron bomb and on antimissile missiles.

Another assumption in the Senator's address is that any change in the U.S. position during negotiations is a concession and a retreat. The United States has changed its positions many times during these negotiations. The changes have not been in the same direction. Many of them have been in response to better scientific information than that available in the first instance. Our position on the detection of underground tests became more unacceptable to the Soviet Union when research indicated the possibility of concealing small-caliber explosions by decoupling devices. Our position on inspection moved the other way as technical know-how needed to discriminate between natural and artificial earth tremors has improved. All revisions are not necessarily concessions.

Any test-ban treaty that reaches the Senate is not likely to preclude further scientific progress toward antimissile missiles or the neutron bomb. At the moment, the antimissile missile is not being held up by any inhibition on thermonuclear testing. The need to test is not likely to arise for some time in the neutron bomb development. There are no proposals for a treaty banning inquiry, research and development.

Senator Dodd, like many other critics of a test ban, seems to believe any treaty will advantage the Soviet Union. As McGeorge Bundy pointed out in the Yale address of February 16: "the effort for the control and limitation of nuclear weaponry is exactly as much a part of our national security and an element in our national defense as our arrangements for an effective nuclear deterrent. It is simply not true as some seem to believe, that any arms agreement must be a disadvantage to one side or the other."

There always is the risk, as Senator Dodd and others point out, that the Soviet Union will some day renounce a treaty and resume testing. This risk, as Mr. Bundy said at Yale, is, in the judgment of both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy, "substantially outweighed" by other considerations. Notwithstanding all the difficulties and dangers, "both administrations have believed that the basic deterrent strength of the United States can be maintained if testing is stopped on both sides, and that the disadvantages we might suffer from a sudden resumption, while real, are far from decisive."

The object of the test-ban negotiations is to obtain a treaty that will reduce the dangers inherent in the thermonuclear tests themselves and the risks resulting from the impetus they give to the competition in the development of thermonuclear weapons. It is not likely that this or any other administration will lay before the Senate a treaty that, in Senator Dodd's words, "would gravely imperil the security of the United States."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 1, 1963]

Dodd and the Test Ban

I would like to comment on your editorial of February 22 which misrepresented my position in several respects.

I have never stated or implied anything so preposterous as that this administration or its predecessor would deliberately imperil the security of the United States. I do contend that the test-ban policy pursued in good faith by both administrations has already cost us our nuclear superiority over the Soviets, and will gravely imperil our security unless soon revised.

My assumptions are these: Such peace as we have is based upon our nuclear parity with Russia; if the Soviets continue nuclear tests, and we do not, they will develop weapons so superior to ours that they can confront us with a choice between surrender or annihilation; the safeguards in our current test-ban proposal are so inadequate that the Soviets can continue testing in secret, after they have disarmed us through the signing of a treaty.

It is demonstrable that in 4 years of negotiations, the Soviets have whittled down our detection and inspection provisions to the point where they are only one-tenth as effective as those in our original proposal. And the whittling goes on.

We once demanded the right to inspect all seismic disturbances of a significant size; i.e., several hundred per year; we then dropped to 20, and then to 12, and then to 8, and then to 7, and now to 5.

We once insisted on 600 monitoring stations, then 180, and now 80.

We once insisted that monitoring stations be manned by nonnationals of the country involved. We now accept the principle that these stations may be manned by nationals, which means that the Russians are to be the judges of whether or not they themselves are cheating.

We once excluded from the treaty tests so small that they could not possibly be detected. We now include these undetectable shots.

We once proposed a control body on which no nation had the power of veto. We now give the Communist bloc the veto power.

We have made all of these retreats despite the testimony last September of our Disarmament Director, William Foster, that there has been no improvement in our verification capability.

Continued nuclear testing is essential to the perfection of the antimissile missile and to the development of the neutron bomb. The nation which first perfects either of these weapons will decisively overturn the balance of power. The kind of testing involved here is underground testing of small yields, which is precisely the kind most easily hidden. Under the provisions of this treaty, our chance of detecting sneak tests is one in a thousand. I am not willing to stake the survival of this country on such a gamble. . .

The question, then, recurs: Is it possible that any administration would negotiate a treaty as dangerous as I contend this one to be?

The Washington Post answers "No" and its answer seems to be based more on an act of faith than on an examination of fact. As a Senator it is my duty to assume that such a mistake is possible; and the history of all major nations in the 20th century is replete with mistakes of similar magnitude.

There is one supreme question which the Senate must ask about any nuclear test-ban treaty: Does it provide reasonable protection against cheating by the Soviets? If it does not it is worthless, worse than worthless, because it could lead to our national destruction. In my judgment, the present proposal of the United States does not meet that test. And so I am against it.

Thomas J. Dodd,
Senator from Connecticut.

Washington.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1963]

A Communication

On March 1 your newspaper carried a letter from the senior Senator from Connecticut, Thomas J. Dodd, in which he gave reasons why he believed the present U.S. position in the nuclear test ban negotiations was unsound. It is with great reluctance that I find myself having to express a disagreement with the Senator, a respected lawmaker and a distinguished public servant. But since it is the firm view of the national security advisers to the President that an effective test ban treaty is in the national interest and that our position at the negotiations is eminently sound, a few comments should be made with respect to the U.S. position and the points raised in the Senator's letter, as well as in his recent speech in the Senate.

1. The Senator stated that the test ban policy pursued by both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations "has already cost us our nuclear superiority over the Soviets." The actual situation is quite different. The United States has not lost its nuclear superiority over the U.S.S.R. The trend with unlimited testing, however, in the absence of an agreement will be toward equality in the major nuclear forces between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

2. A test ban agreement would inhibit nonnuclear powers from obtaining a nuclear weapons capability. The national interest of the United States is served more by a policy of inhibiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons than by a policy of being indifferent to the number of countries that may develop nuclear weapons of their own. A test ban agreement would not in itself be sufficient to prevent the spread of independent national nuclear capability, but it would be a definite step in the right direction. This question of nonproliferation is one that must be included in any total appraisal of the importance of a test ban agreement to the United States.

3. The Senator states that if the Soviets continue testing in secret under an agreement and we do not test, "they can confront us with a choice between surrender or annihilation." This is not correct. It is true that if the U.S.S.R. were able to test small devices clandestinely underground for an indefinite period, they could make significant advances in the general field of small nuclear weapons. However, every analysis conducted by the executive branch in recent years has reached the conclusion that the strategic military balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. could not be altered in any major way by such developments. Furthermore, the risks of detection of a series of such tests would not be ignored by the U.S.S.R.

One test would hardly be significant to a nation bent on attempting to gain a military advantage by testing secretly. Such a nation would more likely want to conduct a series of tests, and a series runs a much greater probability of detection than a single test. The risk of undetected cheating would be present under any treaty. The type of treaty prepared by the United States would provide deterrence against Soviet attempts at undetected cheating so that while such a risk must be recognized, on balance the security of the United States would be better served by taking this risk than taking the risk of continued unlimited testing with no agreement.

4. It is contended that the U.S. provisions for inspection and detection are only one-tenth as effective as those in our original proposals because the United States is now proposing fewer detection stations and fewer inspections. The monitoring system now proposed will have at least the same degree of deterrent effect as that contemplated 4 years ago. The original proposal of an internationally operated system of 180 control posts located in every geographic area of the world was made at a time when we had less knowledge about the detection and identification of underground events and was for a system designed to monitor the entire globe. On the basis of knowledge and experience of of seismic events in the Soviet Union, we now know that the areas of interest can be monitored by a much smaller system which places primary reliance for the detection of events in the Soviet Union upon U.S. national systems located outside the Soviet Union. This is what we propose.

The original proposal would have required some 4 to 6 years to install and the international staff of technicians would have had to have been recruited and in many cases trained from scratch. Under the present proposal the United States would be relying on its own detection system which could begin operating immediately and which would be operated by United States and United Kingdom nationals who are already trained and skilled. This proposal would give the United States both maximum flexibility and maximum control of the detection system.

The previous proposal of the United States would have excluded from inspection underground events below a certain size—roughly, anything below a 20-kiloton explosion detonated in tuff, a relatively soft rock. And, at the same time, the United States would have agreed on a 3-year moratorium against conducting tests below this size. The present U.S. proposal would permit the United States to inspect, within the quota, for any underground event that had been detected and had not been positively identified as being an earthquake.

We also now know that the number of earthquakes in the U.S.S.R. is less by a factor of 2½ than we previously believed. This, coupled with our increased knowledge of earthquake identification, means that the number of unidentified underground events for which we might consider inspection, will be very substantially smaller than was assumed a few years ago. Furthermore, our knowledge in these areas is now based on actual observation, whereas only a few years ago it was based in large part on uncertain estimates.

5. It is suggested that the United States now is willing to accept the principle that monitoring stations be manned by Russians and that Russians "are to be the judges of whether or not they themselves are cheating.". Again, this is not a correct statement. The detection stations on which the United States would rely would be operated or supervised by the United States and United Kingdom and would be outside of the Soviet Union. No Soviet national would judge whether the Soviets are cheating. Automatic recording seismic stations inside the Soviet Union would play a supplementary role only; furthermore, the sealed recording devices which these would contain would be serviced and the records would be picked up by non-Soviet personnel.

6. It is said that we now propose to give the Communist bloc a veto power on the control body of the test-ban organization. No veto on inspection has ever been proposed by the United States, and there is no consideration of proposing such a veto in the future.

7. It is stated that William Foster, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, testified in September that there had been no improvement in our verification capability. On the contrary, Mr. Foster testified in September concerning two significant developments which increased our verification capability. The first was a "better capability for long-distance detection of earth tremors caused by nuclear explosions or earthquakes." The second was that "an earlier estimate of the number of tremors from earthquakes in the Soviet Union which might be confused with tremors from nuclear explosions has been shown by actual observations and research to be several times too large. Since there are fewer actual earthquakes which produce tremors similar to those of an explosion, the number of on-site inspections needed to identify the cause of any observed tremors is less." (Hearings before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, Sept. 17, 1962, p. 6.)

8. The Senator believes that continued testing is essential to the perfection of the antimissile missile and to the development of the neutron bomb, and that the nation which first perfects either of these weapons will decisively overturn the balance of power. These contentions were refuted generally in points 1–3 above. Additionally, the perfection of the antimissile missile does not rest primarily on nuclear weapons testing. It rests on other kinds of activities. Even then, our military experts are of the view that the nation sending a missile to its target will always have the advantage over any forceseeable anti missile-missile defense system. With respect to the neutron bomb, a weapon whose successful development is by no means assured no matter how many tests are made, the chief interest of the United States is to prevent the Soviet Union and other states from acquiring this kind of a weapon. These states are much more likely to be inhibited from developing and producing the neutron bomb under a test-ban agreement than under a situation of unlimited testing.

The United States will continue to persist in its negotiations with the Soviets to achieve an effective treaty. We do this because we firmly believe such an agreement is in the national interest of the United States.

Every person weighing the value and the risks of a test-ban agreement must face squarely the situation in which we reach no agreements and allow testing to go on, unlimited, and see the arms race continue to spiral upward. Those within both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations who have studied these questions and these alternatives thoroughly, have concluded that every effort to bring the arms race under control, of which nuclear testing is a part, must be pursued diligently.

I would hope that this letter demonstrates that the kind of test-ban agreement now being negotiated by the United States is one that is in the national interest.

ADRIAN S. FISHER,
Deputy Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 5, 1963]

THE TEST-BAN DEBATE

The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is caught in the usual dilemma of all American treaty negotiators since John Jay: the negotiating foreign power must be convinced that concessions are being made and the Congress must be convinced that no concessions are being made. When the Agency produces a treaty—if it ever does—the document is likely to get about the same reception that Mr. Jay's treaty with Great Britain received at the hands of Congress. In Washington's administration the congressional critics at least waited until the treaty was before Congress.

To the critics on the Hill the Agency now has made, through Deputy Director Adrian S. Fisher, a point-by-point defense of its latest proposals that is calm, convincing, and persuasive. It sets the record straight on several points. Contrary to critics of the voluntary moratorium and opponents of any further test suspension, the United States has not lost its nuclear superiority over the U.S.S.R.

Far from a series of retreats on inspection, the Agency believes the system it now proposes will have at least the same degree of deterrent effect as that contemplated 4 years ago. The changes reflect scientific advances in detection and not political retreats in negotiation.

The objections that a test ban may permit the Soviet Union to get ahead on antimissile missiles or on the development of a neutron bomb are effectively dealt with. So far as the antimissile development is concerned the point is well made that thermonuclear experiment is not the primary matter in perfecting the antimissile missile. So far as the neutron bomb is concerned, the Agency once again emphasizes that the perfection of such a weapon is by no means assured and its development is likely to be deferred, in the Soviet Union as well as in this country, by carefully inspected test suspension. If no one ever develops it, mankind will be the gainer.

The risks of test suspension are put in perspective by Fisher's declaration that clandestine testing of small weapons devices would not imperil the strategic military balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Two administrations, the Fisher report declares, have "concluded that every effort to bring the arms race under control (including nuclear testing) must be pursued diligently." It is a conclusion that public opinion in this country overwhelmingly supports, in our judgment.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency did not pretend that there are no risks involved in test suspension. There very definitely are some risks. There are risks in continued testing, too. We do not have a choice between risk and no risk but a choice between risks. This is the light in which the treaty proposals must be examined. There is bound to be a great debate over such choices of policy. Let us hope it may be conducted throughout on the high plane of the brief submitted Monday by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1963]

A COMMUNICATION

In a detailed communication published by the Washington Post on March 4 and released to the general press, Mr. Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, has challenged certain of the assertions I made in a recent speech on the floor of the Senate and in a previous letter to the editor of the Post.

I welcome Mr. Fisher's statement because I feel that only good can come from a public discussion of the issues involved. Mr. Fisher, incidentally, was my colleague at the Nuremberg trial and while I disagree sharply with some of his statements on the test-ban issue, I have the greatest respect

for him both as a man and as a Government official.

For almost two decades, the peace and security of the United States and the free world have rested upon the unchallengeable military power with which our nuclear technology has armed us. All of our honorable efforts toward lasting peace and disarmament through negotiation have failed, each in its turn, because of the calculated deceit and treachery of the Communists. Yet, because of our nuclear technology, we have preserved a form of peace.

Five years ago we began to fritter away our nuclear supremacy. We stopped testing and trusted the Soviets to stop. We halted or hobbled our development of a variety of new, revolutionary weapons. Then we awoke one September morning to find that the Soviets had cheated us again.

When the mushroom clouds of their awesome series of gigantic test shots had faded, we discovered that our precious nuclear supremacy had vanished and we suddenly entered the more perilous age of parity in nuclear technology.

TESTIMONY CITED

Mr. Fisher disputes this loss of supremacy, but all scientists with access to the facts, from Edward Teller to Hans Bethe, have testified that the Soviets have eliminated our technological lead in the field of strategic nuclear weapons.

We are now asked by the administration to end all further nuclear development by entering into a treaty with the Soviets to permanently stop all tests. We are asked to do this despite the fact that we are on the threshold of decisive new discoveries, denied us by the previous test ban, discoveries that might restore our lead and dramatically strengthen the security and peace of the free world.

The great question before us is: Does this treaty provide an adequate system of inspection with reasonable assurance that the Soviets are not secretly continuing nuclear tests that can give them the revolutionary weapons denied to us by our observance of the test ban?

I have laboriously pointed out in speeches and letters that there is no such assurance; that we have no way of detecting underground tests of a size below several kilotons; that we have no way of detecting test shots in outer space of any size. This has been conceded by administration witnesses at congressional hearings. It is through hidden tests of these kinds that defy detection that the Soviets could develop a neutron bomb, and antimissile missile warhead and other decisive weapons.

Mr. Fisher's widely publicized letter purports to answer these statements. But the remarkable fact is that nowhere in his detailed defense of the administration position is it said that this treaty gives us solid assurance that the Soviets cannot continue tests and develop new weapons while we are immobilized. On the contrary, he confirms my misgivings. He affirms that the proposed treaty does involve the risk of undetected cheating. He affirms that individual tests could go undetected. He concedes that there is only a probability that a whole series of tests could be detected, not a certainty, but a probability, which means that there is a possibility that whole series of tests could not be detected. He says we must accept the risk of undetected Soviet cheating because other risks are more dangerous. I challenge this last contention, but before going on to it I want to nail down the fact that the proposed inspection terms do not give us a guarantee against cheating. This is the cardinal fact to which all other considerations must be subordinate.

REASON IS GIVEN

The reason why the proposed inspection system is inadequate as I have tried to point out in the past, is that we have made so many retreats and concessions to the Soviets in 5 years of negotiations that our proposed system of monitoring stations and on-site inspections within the Soviet Union is now a hollow shell.

Mr. Fisher disputes this in two ways: First, he says that improvements in the science of detecting earthquakes and underground explosions have justified a vastly reduced inspection system within the Soviet Union. I dispute this. I say that advances in the science of deception have outraced advances in the science of detection and I point to the fact that it is now possible for the Soviets to test secretly in outer space and to test large weapons underground without any possibility of detection. This situation did not exist 5 years ago and it makes any gain in earthquake science irrelevant and insignificant by comparison.

Second, he says that it does not matter, anyway, because our reliance is based, not upon monitoring inside the Soviet Union, but upon monitoring stations outside. Here the cardinal principle of American disarmament policy for 16 years goes down the drain. That principle was adequate onsite inspection and control. For 16 years the Soviets have rejected this principle and we now yield to them by saying that our reliance is on a system of outside monitoring and that the token inspection inside the Soviet Union is only supplemental and unimportant.

I do not take lightly the efforts of honest men to develop an inspection system that would get around the Soviet roadblock against on-site inspections, but I say to the American people: When we consider the vast land expanse of the Communist world, occupying one-fifth of the earth's surface; when we consider the limitless capacity of the Communists for fraud and deceit; when we consider their present capacity for undetectable tests underground and in space; when we consider the unknown possibilities for deception which perverted science will give them in the future, we cannot, we must not, entrust our national survival to a treaty which denies us a reasonably foolproof inspection system inside the Soviet Union. We must not entrust the future of freedom to a system of absentee monitoring.

CALLED SPECULATION

I am willing to rest my case against the treaty right here, but for the sake of adequate reply I will take up Mr. Fisher's contentions that a treaty should be ratified which admittedly involves great risk and abandons adequate onsite inspection.

The reasons he advances are in the realm of political and strategic speculation. It is contended that the risks of not signing this treaty are greater than the acknowledged risks of signing it. These greater risks are continued testing by the Soviets and the spread of nuclear technology to other nations. This argument is entirely irrelevant because the proposed treaty does not prevent all testing by the Soviet Union and does not even pretend to prevent the spread of nuclear weaponry to other nations. France and China have already repudiated the negotiations.

I voted for the establishment of the Disarmament Agency because I hoped and still hope that it can lead us to improved systems of detection which will make reliable disarmament treaties possible. I am ready to vote for such treaties and I say to the administration: Give us a proposal that does prevent continued Soviet testing and we shall all support it. Give us a proposal that does prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations and we shall all support it. But do not give us a treaty which prevents only the nuclear development of the United States and Great Britain, the principal defenders of freedom in the world.

It is contended by Mr. Fisher that we can risk clandestine Soviet testing because the type of weapons that could be developed will not significantly alter the military balance of power. This argument is accompanied by speculation that it is unlikely that an effective antimissile system or a neutron bomb can be perfected.

LABELED "DEFEATIST"

This reveals a defeatist train of thought which is perhaps the most dangerous element of the administration proposal. This is a philosophy that rests its hope upon scientific stagnation and thus runs against the grain of human experience. This is a Maginot line philosophy applied to the nuclear age. This is a philosophy that says "we are going to stop here"—and that "new scientific developments by the other side won't really make any difference." This is a philosophy that says about the neutron bomb what the French once said of the German tank, "it won't make any difference anyway."

How ridiculous to say that live testing is not essential to the development of the antimissile missile. You cannot make an automobile without live tests. Does anyone suppose that the most complicated weapon ever attempted can be perfected without testing in its final assembled form?

How blind to say that the neutron bomb would not alter the balance of power. The nation that has it can destroy opposing armies without risk of fallout, or damage to the property of friend or foe. The nation that does not have it will be faced with a choice between surrender or starting an all-out nuclear war.

In the age of nuclear warfare you can make only one mistake. So long as this treaty leaves a possibility that the Russians will attain these weapons, we must have them and we must have them first.

I would like also to reply to certain challenges made by Mr. Fisher which are not central to the real argument but which do reflect upon the accuracy of those who oppose the test proposal.

Mr. Fisher disputes my contention that we have given the Communists a veto power on the control body of the test ban organization. I refer him to article IV, clause 4 of our recent draft treaty which gives the Soviets a veto power over the budget of the control body and, therefore, over its effectiveness, and to article IV, clause 8 which gives the Communists a veto over the appointment of the executive officer, thus establishing the veto precedent.

QUOTES FROM RECORD

Mr. Fisher denies my statement that Disarmament Director William Foster stated last September that there had been no improvement in our verification capabilities. I refer Mr. Fisher to page 66 of the Stennis subcommittee hearings of last September. Let me quote from the record:

"Mr. KENDALL. I was glad you made it clear, Mr. Foster, that it is important that we make a distinction between our ability to detect and our ability to identify whether an event is nuclear or nonnuclear. I believe you said, if I understand you correctly, that there had been no significant breakthrough or advancement of our ability to identify. Is that correct?

"Mr. FOSTER. That is correct."

We are constrained to walk a path that is strewn with awesome risks forced upon us by our declared enemies. We cannot lessen these risks by a policy which is a blend of defeatism, groundless idealism, and blind trust of the Soviet Union.

Since the proposed treaty does not of a certainty prevent continued Soviet nuclear development, we must place our trust in our own development. We must stake our future, not on what our enemies will forbear to do, but on what we can and must do. We must rest our faith upon the conviction that freemen, free thought, and free science, dedicated to the noble motive of preserving Western civilization, is resourceful enough to give us the tools we need to preserve our peace and our freedom.

THOMAS J. DODD.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1963]

KENNEDY GIVES A-BAN POSITION

(By Howard Simons)

President Kennedy yesterday sought to assure Congress that his administration has no intention of signing a nuclear test ban agreement with the Soviet Union that would imperil American security.

The President's remarks came as congressional concern heightened following continued Defense Department testimony pointing up scientific and technological limitations of present U.S. capability to detect and identify secret underground nuclear tests from afar.

Setting forth the Administration's position in the current test-ban negotiations at his news conference, Mr. Kennedy said:

"We have suggested that we would not accept a test ban which did not give us every assurance that we could detect a series of tests underground. We would not submit a treaty which did not provide that assurance to the U.S. Senate. Nor would the Senate approve it."

EXPERTS TESTIFY

At about the same time yesterday morning that the President was clarifying his position, Defense Department experts appearing before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy were continuing to chip away at any suggestion that today's seismic or earthquake detection methods, by themselves, enable experts to distinguish between earthquakes and explosions.

It is for this reason that the United States has repeatedly insisted upon a certain number of on-site inspections of Soviet territory. As Mr. Kennedy put it yesterday, "We have not been able to make discriminations so effective that we can do without on-site inspections and without a sufficient number to prevent a series of tests carried out which would be undetected."

Basically, what the Joint Committee heard yesterday was an assessment of present U.S. capability to detect and to identify seismic events occuring in Russia using detection stations outside Soviet territory. The assessment came largely from Carl Romney of the Air Force Technical Applications Center and amounted to the following:

Of the seismic events that can now be detected from afar with good reliability, about 170 occur on the average in the Soviet Union every year. Of these, 20 can be definitely ruled out as earthquakes.

Of the remaining 150, about 75 will still be suspect—that is, they cannot be easily identified as either an earthquake or a secret underground nuclear explosion. But these 75 events will give enough telltale signs to be partially identified as one or the other.

Of the last 75 events, there would be no information whatsoever to give detection experts a clue as to the true nature of these events. It is for these reasons that onsite inspections are necessary.

Replying to questions, Romney said that a potential cheater would be able to test 1-kiloton devices in granite; 2- to 6-kiloton devices in tuff (a volcanic ash); and 10- to 20-kiloton devices in dry alluvium (a sandy material), with no seismic means presently available to catch the cheater.

PROGRESS POSSIBLE

In previous testimony before the committee it was noted that the majority of U.S. underground nuclear tests being conducted in Nevada involved devices of 4 kilotons or less, indicating that atomic weapons progress can be made using devices of these sizes.

The President and Joint Committee members essentially agreed yesterday in their separate commentaries that detection was only one of the problems to be resolved with Russia. Many more exist, some as difficult to solve as seismic detection, including, as was noted yesterday, the number of onsite inspections, the kind of such inspections, and the circumstances under which the inspections would be carried out.

At one point in yesterday's Joint Committee hearings, the chairman, Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, apparently reacting to the many recent Republican attacks on the President's handling of the test-ban talks, said the record should show that the first "giveaway, if that term is appropriate," began during the Eisenhower administration.

PASTORE was referring to the Eisenhower administration's acceptance, of a Soviet proposal in 1960, which would have amounted to an unpoliced moratorium on all nuclear tests below a certain magnitude.

"Where were those loud voices in 1960, that we are hearing today?" PASTORE asked.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1963]

TRANSCRIPT OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S NEWS CONFERENCE

TEST BAN

Question. Mr. President, on Monday Adrian Fisher, Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency said even if the Russians were able to test underground indefinitely this would not alter the strategic military balance between the United States and the Soviet Union. He said this was the executive assessment. Given that assessment, can you tell us what considerations then would prevent accepting a test ban on the terms set by Russia?

Answer. I don't think, if I may say so—in my opinion that is not what is the administration's position. We have suggested that we would not accept a test ban which would permit indefinite underground testing by the Soviet Union. We would not accept a test ban which did not give us every assurance that we could detect a series of tests underground. That is the administration's position. We would not submit a treaty which did not provide that assurance to the U.S. Senate. Nor would the Senate approve it.

INSPECTIONS

Question. You believe that the present insistence upon seven will have to be maintained, is that correct?

Answer. I believe we will insist upon a test-ban treaty which gives us assurance that if any country conducted a series of clandestine underground tests that series would be detected.

Now we have not only the problem of the number of inspections, but the kinds of inspections, the circumstances under which the inspections would be carried out, so that we have a good deal of distance to go in securing an agreement with the Soviet Union.

We have not been able to make any real progress on the question of the numbers, but I want to emphasize that this is only one phase of it. We have to also discuss what the area would be, in each test, what would be the conditions under which the inspectors would move in and out.

I want to say that we have made substantial progress as a result of a good deal of work by the U.S. Government in recent years, in improving our detection capabilities.

We have been able to determine that there are substantially less number of earthquakes in the Soviet Union than we had formerly imagined. We have also been able to make far more discriminating our judgments from a long distance of what would be perhaps an atomic test and what would be an earthquake. But we have not been able to make discriminations so effective that we can do without on-site inspections and without a sufficient number to prevent a series of tests being carried out which would be undetected. I can assure you that no agreement will be accepted which would permit any such conditions.

SEABEE DAY IN RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this is a week of celebration for the Navy Seabees and their friends. This is especially true in my State of Rhode Island where our Governor proclaimed the very first day of March as Seabee Day; and the people have joined with their Seabee neighbors in the observance of March 5, actually the 21st anniversary of this historic organization.

The universal observance by the Seabees will be March 9 and it seems fitting and proper to add this day, March 7 in the Congress, and to include my few but appreciative remarks, to the calendar of acclaim of the Seabees.

All the people of Rhode Island have justifiable pride in this component of our Armed Forces. We would, I am sure, be proud of them under any circumstance, but our close association with them over the years while we have followed their accomplishments in both war and peace has heightened our appreciation of this fine group of men.

The Seabees were organized in Rhode Island in 1942 at what is now the Naval Construction Battalion Center, Davisville. We in Rhode Island have witnessed the birth of this new concept in the use of naval personnel—a builder-fighter who picks up his tools and weapons and goes to all parts of the globe to build shore facilities in support of the fleet. During World War II, we saw the seasoned construction worker, much older than the ordinary naval recruit, receive combat training to complement his construction skills. We saw more than 100,000 of these men train in Rhode Island to build and to fight, to operate in the forefront of amphibious assaults, or to do any other necessary job in far-off places which are now associated with hard-won victories in the annals of World War II. We heard of the immense energy and enthusiasm with which they resolved the most difficult problems and we received reports of their prodigious construction feats.

Where did they serve? The combat zone need only be named and the Seabees were there—amphibious operations in the Pacific, in North Africa, Sicily, Salerno, Omaha and Utah beaches in Normandy, the Rhine crossing. They constructed fuel depots, ship repair facilities, naval airfields, ammunition depots, and other similar advance naval base facilities in the Caribbean, Iceland, Newfoundland, Alaska, and the Aleutians.

The exploits of the Seabees have been well recognized in books, movies, on the Broadway stage and on television. This young naval organization, small by the usual standards, has indeed struck a

responsive chord in the minds and sympathies of the American people.

Thus, is it any wonder that Rhode Islanders are extremely proud of their "can do" Seabees?

However, while it is gratifying that the World War II Seabee is remembered for his deeds, all recitals must not be in the past tense as the Seabee does not belong to a bygone era.

The "home of the Atlantic Seabees," the Naval Construction Battalion Center, Davisville, R.I., is today a "CB hive" of activity. Here the Seabees are housed, fed, and are provided with training and recreational facilities while they are in home port between arduous deployments. While the Seabees are given leave, rest, and training for their next assignment, the center is busily engaged in complex preparations for the future. In close cooperation with the Seabees, center personnel determine the materials that will be required for construction projects. Construction materials are procured, packed, and shipped. When the material arrives at the construction site, the Seabees have every timber, nail, bag of cement, and light bulb, necessary to erect and occupy their current project. In the meantime, their vehicles and construction equipment have been overhauled by the center and are shipped to them in tiptop operating condition.

The Construction Battalion Center takes these assignments in stride because during the more than 20 years it has worked hand in hand with the Seabees in war and peace and it has always been alert to their ever-changing needs. During World War II, innumerable quonset huts, Navy pontoons, and thousands of tons of advance base construction material were shipped. From quonset huts to nuclear reactors, the Construction Battalion Center along with the Seabees has kept pace with technological advancement and continues to serve the Seabees whether in a tropical location or snowbound Antarctica.

Today, Seabees stand ready for immediate deployment to any part of the world. They help support the U.S. scientific programs by construction of remote tracking stations for satellites and by construction of facilities in the Antarctic from McMurdo to the pole. They recently completed the installation of the first nuclear power plant in the Antarctic at McMurdo Sound. By assisting, when requested, they actively support the President's people-to-people program. Specificially, assistance in Chile after the recent horrible earthquake, assistance to the Navy in Ecuador in construction of the Naval Academy, assistance in Haiti after recent floods and in connection with improvement of port facilities.

This world service of the Seabees, Mr. President, service in the emergencies of peace no less than war, endear them to what we like to call their Rhode Island home.

Every Rhode Islander, individual and official, has a warm spot in his or her heart for the Seabee as exemplified in the proclamation of Seabee Day by Rhode Island's Governor, John H. Chafee, and I ask unanimous consent that this proclamation may be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION FOR SEABEE DAY BY JOHN H. CHAFEE, GOVERNOR

Whereas the celebration of the Seabees' 21st anniversary will be on March 1, 1963; and

Whereas on this date units of the Naval Construction Battalion will mark another year of distinguished service to our country, and throughout the world Seabees will celebrate their 21st anniversary with the traditional birthday balls and cake-cutting ceremonies; and

Whereas Rhode Island is the home of the Atlantic Fleet and its citizens are unanimous in their admiration and respect for all components of the United States Navy; now, therefore, do I, John H. Chafee, Governor of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, proclaim Friday, March 1, 1963, as Seabee Day, and call upon the citizens of this State to join in tribute to the endeavors and achievements of the Seabees, an organization of outstanding merit.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State to be affixed this 30th day of January, in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three, and of independence, the one hundred and eighty-seventh.

JOHN H. CHAFEE,
Governor.

By the Governor:
[SEAL] AUGUST P. LAFRANCE,
Secretary of State.

JOHN G. FEILD AND THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the record of achievement of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, I believe, when analyzed, will be one of the most dramatic events of recent years. It is my hope in the days ahead to have the opportunity to fully develop for the RECORD this remarkable success story.

Today I should like to place in the RECORD a series of letters which reflect in a nutshell the attitude of a man whose lifetime dedication to the cause of civil rights is well known in Michigan, and, I believe, across the country. I refer to John G. Feild, Executive Director of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

First I should say that John Feild and I have long been associated in this and other efforts; indeed, he and I came to Washington together in 1959.

I should like to place in the RECORD certain letters, so that everyone may better understand the attitude and sentiment of John Feild in his taking leave of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

The first letter, his letter of resignation, is directed to the Secretary of Labor, the Honorable W. Willard Wirtz, and is dated February 5, 1963.

In this letter Mr. Feild outlines the past 22 months, when a vast reorganization of the Federal Government's means to eliminate discriminatory employment practices within Government agencies and on the part of Government contractors took place.

He states:

> It is, therefore, with some pride on behalf of the Committee's staff that I report that this first phase of the Committee's assignment has been substantially completed and that this program is now producing unprecedented results. Not only have twice as many complaints been processed during this period than were received during the entire preceding 8 years, but the rate at which we have taken corrective action is now running two or three times that of our predecessor committees.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1963.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, I have served as the Executive Director of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity since it was established in April 1961. As the Committee's full-time staff director I was responsible for the organization of the Committee's program and the supervision of the Committee's staff under the overall policy guidance of Assistant Secretary of Labor Jerry Holleman, who was the Committee's Executive Vice Chairman until his resignation.

During the past 22 months we have completed a vast reorganization of the Federal Government's means and capability to eliminate discriminatory employment practices within its own agencies and on the part of Government contractors. New programs designed to add emphasis and effectiveness to our efforts have been brought into being. These have included the comprehensive compliance reporting programs involving nearly 100,000 Government contractors and more than 15 million workers. They have also included new programs designed to work cooperatively with labor organizations toward the elimination of restrictive practices; to work with vocational educational resources in the improvement of training opportunities, including apprenticeship; to work with community organizations throughout the country for the greater involvement of local leadership in the advancement of the Committee's objectives; and to work with leading businesses and trade groups toward the same objectives.

In addition, the new annual Federal Census of the Status of the Minority Workers in the Federal Establishment has been launched and regularized, placing in the hands of agency executives new tools with which to identify employment problems and improve employment opportunities for all Federal workers.

It is, therefore, with some pride on behalf of the Committee's staff that I report that this first phase of the Committee's assignment has been substantially completed and that this program is now producing unprecedented results. Not only have twice as many complaints been processed during this period than were received during the entire preceding 8 years, but the rate at which we have taken corrective action is now running two and three times that of our predecessor committees. For example, whole new patterns of employment opportunity have been introduced into the tobacco industry, in the petro-chemical industry, in electronics, in the auto and aircraft industries, in shipbuilding, and in various segments of other industries. A beginning has been made in affecting the practices of the textile industry in the South, although substantial

> need for improvement remains. The same could be said for utilities located in the South. Encouraging new developments have begun in the insurance industry, although the enlargement of opportunities in this and similar areas remains a formidable challenge.
>
> For these reasons and with the Committee's policy statement adopted at its September meeting in mind, I am convinced that the Committee's commitments under the Executive Order to a program which will bring about equal employment opportunity have been firmly implemented with a new structure and a new degree of coordination among the many Federal agencies involved. It has been an honor to all of us to have worked toward these goals under the energetic leadership of Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON and your predecessor, Justice Arthur Goldberg.
>
> With the appointment by the President of a new full-time Executive Vice Chairman, the Committee is now in a position to move forward effectively and comprehensively in extending its program both within government and among government contractors. As you know, this transition has been accomplished during the past few months, and I have every reason to believe that the executive leadership now being fully exercised by our Executive Vice Chairman will accomplish the goals which all of us share.
>
> For these reasons, as you know, I have recommended that the organizational framework of the Committee be streamlined and that the Committee's small staff be coordinated under the direct executive leadership of the Executive Vice Chairman. The greatly improved capability of the various operating agencies to carry out the objectives of the Committee makes it even more important that the Committee's coordinating and reviewing responsibilities should be highly centralized.
>
> With these considerations in mind, I have recently accepted an assignment with the Potomac Institute, a nonprofit organization working in the field of human relations, which has undertaken numerous important studies for various Federal agencies. My assignment with the Potomac Institute will enable me to direct a number of special projects which, hopefully, will contribute not only to the program of the President's Committee but to the broader field of civil rights and human relations problems.
>
> I am, therefore, at this time submitting my resignation to you as chief administrative officer of the Committee. It would be my hope that I could be relieved of my duties as close to the first of March as possible, although as per your request, I will continue to make myself available for as long a period as you may deem necessary.
>
> Let me say in conclusion that I have personally appreciated your strong interest in the Committee's program and I will look forward to continued association with you from my new position.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> JOHN G. FEILD,
> *Executive Director.*

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the next letter is directed to the Vice President, who is the Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. Mr. Feild's letter to the Secretary of Labor was enclosed with this letter to the Vice President. The letter to the Vice President is dated February 5, 1963. In it Mr. Feild says:

> As Chairman of the Committee, I wish to extend to you my sincere appreciation for the opportunity and honor of serving under you in this important undertaking. Your energetic and determined leadership has made this committee the most valuable research developed in the field of civil rights since the days of the Emancipation.
>
> I wish to add my admiration to those of your fellow Americans for the contribution you are making toward the improvement of opportunities for all Americans.

This tribute to the Vice President is most significant, not only because of the dedication and identification of John Feild, but because it is a tribute to the Vice President from the inside on the kind of drive and leadership that has been given in this area of critical importance to ourselves and to all our people by the Vice President.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter also be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON
> EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY,
> *Washington, D.C., February 5, 1963.*
>
> THE VICE PRESIDENT,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Attached you will find a letter which I have forwarded to Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz in which I have submitted to him, as the Committee's chief administrative officer, my resignation.
>
> As Chairman of the Committee, I wish to extend to you my sincere appreciation for the opportunity and honor of serving under you in this important undertaking. Your energetic and determined leadership has made this Committee the most valuable resource developed in the field of civil rights since the days of the Emancipation.
>
> I wish to add my admiration to those of your fellow Americans for the contribution you are making toward the improvement of opportunities for all Americans. I have tried to the best of my ability to reflect in my actions on the Committee's staff the standards you have expected of our efforts. I sincerely hope that the days ahead will see even greater success for the Committee.
>
> I want to wish you Godspeed in your efforts.
>
> Respectfully yours,
>
> JOHN G. FEILD,
> *Executive Director.*

Mr. HART. Mr. President, finally I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the letter of the Vice President to Mr. Feild.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> THE VICE PRESIDENT,
> *Washington, D.C., February 11, 1963.*
>
> Mr. JOHN G. FEILD,
> *Executive Director, the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR JOHN: I want you to know that I deeply appreciate your warm letter. I believe you exhibited a high degree of dedication to the cause of human rights during the months that you served as Executive Director of the Committee and your dedication will stand you in good stead.
>
> It was pleasing to know that you are going to continue in the field that is so close to your heart, and I wish you every success in the days that lie ahead.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE OFFICES

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to discuss for a few minutes a subject which was discussed earlier by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]; namely, the announcement by the Internal Revenue Service that it is consolidating 12 of its offices in the smaller States with offices in larger States. I am particularly concerned over the announcement of the Internal Revenue Service that the work of this Service in Maine and New Hampshire and Vermont will be transferred largely to Boston.

I intend to disregard the political aspects of this latest maneuver of the Internal Revenue Service. I do not intend to discuss the assurance which they have given the employees that they will not be demoted until after the 1964 election.

As for moving the regional offices from New York to Boston, I have full confidence in the ability of Governor Rockefeller and the State of New York to protect themselves. If Governor Rockefeller does not yet know that the campaign of 1964 is well underway, I think he should be discouraged from becoming a candidate for office. However, I feel that perhaps he does not realize that the campaign of 1964 is underway.

Why should offices in Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont be abolished or, in effect, abolished, and all the authority which has gone with these offices transferred to Boston?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not have any time to yield, unless I am given additional time.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be given additional time so that he may yield to me for a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Oregon so that the Senator from Oregon may ask him a question?

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont may be given an additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator from Vermont being granted an additional minute?

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to have 5 or 10 minutes or a half hour.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to have 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a feeling that the Senator from Vermont, as the dean on the Republican side of the aisle, may be able to get some information from my party's administration. If he is able to do so, we will be very grateful to him. I cannot get an answer from the administration. Therefore, I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont if he will try to find out what the reason is for moving some offices of the Treasury from Portland, Oreg., out of my State. There is only one-way traffic with regard to Oregon. All the offices are being moved out of the State, whether they concern the Treasury, the regional offices of the Post Office, or the Federal Power Commission. As I say, it is all one-way traffic in Oregon. We cannot understand the

reason for this move. If the dean on the Republican side of the aisle can obtain the answer for us, he will be doing a great personal favor for the people of Oregon.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. AIKEN. I will yield, if the time is not taken out of my 10 minutes.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may be given an additional 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. HART. First I should like to say that the commitment which had been given to the people of Michigan and to their delegation in Congress has gone competely by the board. After a careful and intensive survey it was determined by the Internal Revenue Service that a data-processing center, one of nine throughout the country, would be located in the Detroit metropolitan area, which embraces a region of many counties.

The reorganization plan proposed yesterday by the Treasury Department has removed that data-processing center.

To us this proposal must be a complete oversight. I say that because I am convinced that the administration would not go back on its commitment, given to us so solidly.

When we heard about it, we went to the White House. I believe that is the euphemistic way of referring to people without describing them further. At the White House we voiced our protest against this proposal.

I trust that the commitment given to us will be honored. If the Treasury Department has any concern about getting a tax bill through Congress, it ought to double check its relationship with Congress. The proposed step is not one which will be found in any basic text on how to get along with people or how to win friends.

Mr. AIKEN. I really appreciate the comments of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield me another 10 seconds?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont may have an additional 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Vermont is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am particularly proud of myself for having asked the dean of the Republican side to get this information for me from the present administration, particularly the Republican Secretary of the Treasury, who, after all, must assume some responsibility for some of the moves. I should like to work with the Senator from Vermont to see if, between us, we can get an answer from the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know what degree of responsibility is assumed by the Republican Secretary of the Treasury.

Over the years, the Internal Revenue offices of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont—and I think I may include Rhode Island, too, since Rhode Island also is affected by this order—have been efficient and respected and have never been touched by the breath of scandal.

Why at this time should all these offices be moved into Boston? The personnel of those offices have served well for 20 years; yet now they are told that they will have to fight for their new jobs, if they can get them. The only assurance they have is that they will not have their pay cut or will not lose their jobs until after the next election—or 2 years from now.

Why should a system which has worked so well over the years now be upset in favor of one which is dubious?

In reply to the question asked by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], this latest act on the part of the Internal Revenue Service merely follows a pattern which, while it originated a long time ago, has been accelerated rapidly during the past 2 years, namely, the pattern of breaking down State lines and concentrating the activities in a few urban centers of wealth, population, industry, and political power.

It is said by the administration that this is being done in only 12 States; and that the other 38 States certainly will not complain. I hope the other 38 States are not deluding themselves in any way; their turn is coming. As soon as the administration has abolished the offices and destroyed the pride of management of good offices in 12 States, it will certainly select 12 more States. The administration has not tried to touch any State south of Delaware yet; but it will. I assure the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and the Senators from the other Southern States that their turn will come. The administration is selecting a few States at a time in order to accomplish its program, but it is following a pattern of concentrating its power in a few great urban centers of the United States, from which operations can be more easily controlled by a few persons in Washington.

I hope I have made it clear that I do not approve of the action taken by the Secretary of the Treasury.

I observe the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] on his feet. If he wishes to defend New York, that is all right. I believe the regional office of the Internal Revenue Service in New England has been well handled and has been under good management. When the Government now seeks to consolidate district offices on a flimsy pretext, it is time for us to look out.

BAY OF PIGS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, our sympathy goes out to the widows and children of the four Americans who were killed in the Bay of Pigs invasion in April 1961. They were mature men, not boys seeking adventure. Possibly they were employees of the Central Intelligence Agency who had been given the job of training anti-Castro Cubans in Guatemala for the invasion then being planned. This was during the Eisenhower administration. According to news accounts, their pay was $1,900 per month. Whether this big pay made them soldiers of fortune, if they volunteered for combat just before the ill-fated invasion, is a matter for argument. Undoubtedly, it was not expected that they would themselves engage in combat. Their job was to teach and train. Presumably in the excitement of the invasion, they offered to go in fighting. They became casualties of the Bay of Pigs invasion. It may be that the checks for $225 received every other week by each of these four widows come from the CIA. It is said that these payments will continue until the widows remarry. Let us see: $225 every other week amounts to approximately $487 per month. Unfortunately there are a number of widows, with children now of college age, of officers of our Air Force who lost their lives in combat in the service of their country in World War II. Have those war widows whose husbands, Air Force pilots or bombardiers in World War II who died heroically for their country, received as much as $487 per month from a grateful Government?

A niece of mine, whose husband, a young lawyer who became a tank captain and was killed in action in Europe in 1944, leaving her with a child who is now a college boy, must have read with surprise the newspaper accounts of the very substantial amounts of the checks received by these other widows, whose husbands were unfortunately killed in the Bay of Pigs invasion.

THE WELFARE OF OUR FARMERS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, although I am no longer a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on which I had the honor to serve for 4 years under the chairman of that committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I still have a great interest in the prosperity of our farmers. I am glad to observe the chairman in the Chamber. I hold him in high admiration for the achievements and the leadership of that committee during the 4 years of my service under his chairmanship.

The present administration has done much toward making less burdensome the serious problems with which our farmers were and are faced. I am positive that we in Congress shall continue to legislate for the welfare and prosperity of our farmers. I feel certain that this will be done so long as the present majority and the present chairman control the operations of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Therefore, I read with interest the editorial response to President Kennedy's farm message in two of Ohio's widely read, outstanding metropolitan newspapers, the Akron Beacon Journal and the Columbus Dispatch. Both recognize that farm legislation enacted by the 87th Congress reduced the surplus of wheat and feed grains, increased farm income, and put surplus foods to worthwhile use through school lunches, food stamp pilot programs, distribution to needy families, and the food-for-peace program. Both recognize that the President's farm proposals point the way to further farm program improvements.

Inasmuch as these editorials are thoughtful reviews of the farm situation and the operation of farm programs, I believe they merit the attention of my colleagues. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch, Feb. 3, 1963]

FARM PROGRAM OFFERS SOME HOPE OF SOLUTION

President Kennedy's farm message to Congress omits most of the mandatory crop control proposals that stirred up a hornet's nest of opposition last year. In most respects the proposed program would retain the present system of voluntary controls in feed grains (with some amplification), make little change in the wheat program launched last year, and retain such features as the wheat referendum and the current system of price supports and bonuses.

The President and his farm advisers feel that the system, while not ideal, is beginning to work and already has made progress toward its goals.

The goals are considerable: Reduction of surpluses, reduction in expenditures for price-support programs, improved income for farm families, lower prices to consumers for food and fiber, and expanded exports.

Nevertheless, the President tells us, there is a substantial improvement in farm income, a substantial decrease in Government holdings of agricultural products, and a substantial reduction in costs to the taxpayer for carrying farm surpluses, without increasing the consumer's burden.

Probably the most vital phase of the program for Ohio is the part which pertains to feed grains. The President's proposals in this field include the following:

Extension of the current voluntary acreage-cutting program for perhaps 2 more years beginning with 1964, but with a contemplated easing of curbs next year. The general goal of keeping Government feed grain stock from dropping below the 45-million-ton supply deemed adequate as an emergency reserve, but continuing the reduction from the record high of 85 million tons in mid-1961. The reduction has come about mainly because of acreage cutting, increasing domestic consumption, and heavy exports.

The President called for an affirmative vote in the forthcoming wheat referendum to be held under the legislation enacted by Congress last year.

If two-thirds of the wheat producers in the Nation vote this spring to approve the bushel marketing law authorized by that law, the President declared, the present income of wheat farmers will be protected and "the overhanging surpluses of wheat will be further reduced."

Failure to approve the wheat program will leave the wheat farmer without either supply management or effective price supports—"at the mercy of unlimited production and unprotected prices."

If the wheat stabilization program is retained in the upcoming nationwide referendum, each wheat farmer will be assigned an acreage allotment. As previously, marketing quota penalties apply to excess wheat. Marketing quotas do not apply to farms that have 15 acres or less of wheat for harvest.

A support averaging $1.82 per bushel, nationally, on the 1963 wheat production will be available to a farmer who complies with his farm acreage allotment. In addition, an 18-cent-per-bushel price support payment will be available if the farmer complies with the 1963 stabilization program in its entirety.

Ohio wheat farmers traditionally have rejected the Government program because of deep-rooted opposition to Government intervention. As in the past, if the control program is voted this year, it will be because of the favorable vote in the Western States, with their huge wheat acreage, where the farmers want to make sure they receive the Government price support.

The Ohio farmer then is in the position of being able to take advantage of the price supports, meanwhile submitting to the control features which are distasteful to him.

An imponderable in the farm picture and the efficacy of the intricately devised program, replete with political concessions one way and the other, is the weather. One drought year, for instance, could wipe out the surplus in feed grains. The effect of prolonged subzero winter weather or a late planting of corn due to heavy spring rains and flooding, perhaps followed by unfavorable growing weather, could throw even so cleverly devised a program into disarray, with deeply disturbing results.

Because of its voluntary compliance features and some evidence that the program is working favorably in most of its several aspects, farmers generally, we believe, will look with reasonable favor on the President's latest version of his farm program, although some organized elements already are arrayed against it.

For one thing, the administration, we understand, does not plan to put all its proposals in one package, on which all its provisions would have to rise or fall. Instead, the various phases of the program are to be presented in separate bills, which will allow fuller debate and separate votes on the proposals affecting various crops and dairy products, food distribution, land use adjustment, rural electrification, vocational training and water retention.

Whether the program will bring order out of chaos, or produce more chaos, remains to be seen, but there is more reasonableness in the President's program as laid down in Congress last week than in some of the earlier approaches and recommendations.

[From the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal, Feb. 1, 1963]

THAT FARM PROBLEM

President Kennedy yesterday talked about the problem which is the envy of Premier Khrushchev—the overproduction of farm commodities.

Whereas the Russian Communists—and the Chinese Communists, too—carry on an endless, uphill struggle to expand agricultural production to meet the bare requirements of their people, the chronic problem here is just the opposite.

The President summed it up when he said:

"Our capacity to produce still outruns the growth of both domestic and foreign demand for food and fiber. Our abundance must still be harnessed in such a way as to bring supply and demand more nearly into balance. And the benefits of our agricultural progress still need to be translated into improved income to farm families, lower prices to consumers for food and fiber, expanded exports, and reduced expenditures for price support programs."

Mr. Kennedy's message was not entirely gloomy.

Net farm income at the end of 1962 was $1.8 billion a year higher than in 1960. Government stockpiles of surplus grain are down by 929 million bushels from their 1961 peak. Exports of farm commodities reached a record $5.1 billion in fiscal 1962. The emergency and temporary feed grain legislation of 1961 has been successful. Surplus foods have been put to good use through a variety of programs—school lunches and surplus commodity distribution to needy families, the food stamp experiment, and the oversea food-for-peace program.

But there was much to be reported on the negative side.

Unless wheat producers vote this spring to approve the bushel marketing program authorized by the 1962 law, wheat farmers again will be at the mercy of unlimited production and unprotected prices. New legislation is necessary to preserve the gains made in corn and other feed grains. The cotton industry is in trouble; help is needed both for producers and for textile mills.

And as for the dairy industry, the President reminded Congress that he warned last year that failure to pass legislation in this field would cost the Treasury $440 million a year in price support payments. The legislation was not passed. What happened?

"Costs have recently been running at a rate in excess of $500 million a year, and the income of the dairy farmer has fallen by over $100 million a year," Mr. Kennedy said.

Despite maximum use of dairy products in the various food distribution programs (the needy receiving surplus foods are using twice as much butter per person as other consumers), stocks continue to pile up; we now have 300 million pounds of butter in storage.

The remedy, Mr. Kennedy said, is to "enact a program under which only producers who cooperate by reducing their marketings would receive, through market prices and payments, a return on their marketings substantially greater than the noncooperators who choose not to join the program."

Overall, the legislative approach outlined by the President involves a greater degree of compulsion than is provided in present laws, though it still leaves farmers considerable freedom to go their own ruggedly individualistic ways.

Theoretically, the only sound solution for the surplus problem is total freedom for farmers, with prices governed wholly by the law of supply and demand, or total regimentation, with production strictly controlled and prices guaranteed by the Government.

But Congress has never been willing to accept either of these harsh extremes. It has always compromised. Probably it always will.

The relative success gained through present legislation may be partly luck, but it raises hope that additional success can be achieved with adoption of Mr. Kennedy's recommendations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the Senator from Ohio for his very worthwhile and constructive activity as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as one who has been a true friend of the agricultural producers, and as a Senator who has understood the intricate problems of agricultural policy. We are very fortunate to have the benefit of the service and guidance of the Senator from Ohio. Although these editorials refer favorably to the President's program, it would not have been a program in action if it had not been for men such as the Senator from Ohio, who so vigorously supported it. So I heartily commend him.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I express my gratitude to the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota.

I yield the floor.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE REGIONAL OFFICE FROM NEW YORK CITY TO BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, probably it comes as no surprise to any Senator to know that I wish to say a few words about the proposed transfer of the Internal Revenue Service regional office from New York City to Boston.

Mr. HUMPHREY. To where?

Mr. KEATING. To Boston, Mass.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes; I have heard of that city. But I thought the Senator said "Austin."

Mr. KEATING. That could be; perhaps that will be the next move. [Laughter.]

A public official in elected office should not complain—in fact, he should be grateful—if a move which will save some tax dollars is proposed.

It is claimed by the Secretary of the Treasury that from the entire series of changes there will be a tax saving of more than $5 million.

Before attacking this plan, I wish to express my gratitude to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the courtesy they did me by notifying me of the devastating New York shift on the morning before the afternoon it was announced.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of the letter from Mr. Caplin to me.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, D.C., March 5, 1963

MY DEAR SENATOR: About noon today, Secretary Dillon will announce publicly a series of changes he has authorized me to make in Internal Revenue Service field offices. I believe these changes will be of interest to you, so I am taking this means of giving you advance information on them.

The changes we are announcing will result in total savings of over $5 million annually, when they are fully implemented. Taxpayers will not be disadvantaged in any way by these changes; they will continue to receive all of the services they now receive. The changes are mainly in behind-the-scenes activities.

In response to President Kennedy's call upon all Federal agencies to achieve lean, fit organizations, I have recommended, and the Secretary has authorized me to make, the following changes in the field office structure of the Service.

I. DISTRICT OFFICE CHANGES

A. Reduction of overhead in 12 small districts

Since the 1951–52 reorganization, our basic operating unit has been the district offices. As we have one in each State, and more than one in some of the more populous States, district offices range in size from Anchorage with 94,000 tax returns and 65 employees, to the Manhattan district with 3.8 million tax returns and 2,800 employees.

Despite these disparities in size, the basic organization structure of all districts has been fairly uniform. For example, there is a chief of audit in each district. Yet in Manhattan the chief supervises 1,400 employees, while the chief in Anchorage supervises 26 employees. Consequently, the ratio of overhead personnel to front-line enforcement personnel has been much higher in the small districts.

On the basis of a recent study, however, we concluded that we can eliminate many overhead positions in our 12 smallest districts, simply by modifying their organizational structure. What we plan to do in these districts is eliminate most of the managerial positions under the district director by having the nearest large district provide the necessary technical staff support and perform the other processing and support activities.

Taxpayers will continue to file their returns with the district director in these districts, and will continue to receive all of the services they now receive.

The districts involved are listed in attachment No. 1.

B. Merger of four multistate districts

Our studies have also demonstrated that existing workload does not justify having 62 separate district offices in the 50 States. Therefore, operations of four district offices located in States with more than one district will be merged with those of nearby districts in the same State. Large field offices will be maintained, however, in cities affected by this change, and taxpayers will continue to receive substantially all the local service they now have.

The districts involved are also listed in attachment No. 1.

II. REGIONAL CHANGES

This modification in district structure makes it possible for us to operate effectively with seven regional offices, instead of the present nine.

The regional offices to be eliminated are those now located in Omaha and New York City. The resulting regional boundaries and headquarters cities are shown in attachment No. 2.

Since most parts of our regional offices have very little contact with taxpayers, these regional realinements will not affect taxpayers significantly. The only parts of the regional office that do have substantial contacts with taxpayers are the appellate and chief counsel field offices, and we will continue to render these services in their present locations.

III. SERVICE CENTER CHANGES

As you probably know, the Internal Revenue Service is now installing an automatic data processing system that will permit us to use electronic machines to perform the millions of record-handling operations involved in the maintenance of taxpayer accounts, the issuance of bills and refunds, the matching of information documents and the many other data processing activities we must conduct.

Since we need one automatic data processing center in each region to perform this work, our decision to reduce from nine regions to seven means that we will need only seven centers instead of the nine we had planned.

IV. IMPLEMENTING THE CHANGES

Most of these changes will be put into effect gradually and the timing probably will vary from one district to another according to local circumstances.

While most taxpayers probably will not even be aware of these changes, those of your constituents who are employed by us, will be very much aware of them and some of those affected may very well write to you about them. If they do, you can assure them, as we are, that we will try to reduce the adverse impact on them as much as we can. We feel obligated to do this since most of the officials and employees whose positions will be eliminated or transferred as a result of the changes are people who have been with us for a long time, who have risen to their present positions by doing their work well, and who have experience and skill that the IRS does not want to lose.

Fortunately, because the changes will be put into effect gradually, we expect to be able to handle most of the cutbacks by attrition and transfers. However, in many of the affected districts, attrition is slow and many of the employees are both too young to retire and unwilling to move for personal reasons. Consequently, we cannot promise that no one will be hurt. We do promise, however, that we will try to minimize the hardships to our employees in every way that we properly can.

In summary, we believe that these changes will save the taxpayers substantial amounts of money, without diminishing in any way the services they are now receiving. At the same time, they enable us to take a significant step toward the President's goal of a "lean, fit, and efficient Federal Establishment."

Sincerely,

MORTIMER M. CAPLIN,
Commissioner.

(Enclosures (1) a listing of changes in IRS districts; (2) a map showing the new seven Internal Revenue regions; (3) a map showing the former nine Internal Revenue regions.)

Districts to be modified

Stato	Modified district	Servicing district
Alaska	Anchorage	Seattle.
Delaware	Wilmington	Philadelphia.
Idaho	Boise	Salt Lake City.
Maine	Augusta	Boston.
Montana	Helena	Salt Lake City.
Nevada	Reno	San Francisco.
New Hampshire	Portsmouth	Boston.
North Dakota	Fargo	St. Paul.
Rhode Island	Providence	Hartford.
South Dakota	Aberdeen	St. Paul.
Vermont	Burlington	Boston.
Wyoming	Cheyenne	Denver.

Districts to be merged

State	District
Missouri	Kansas City into St. Louis.
New Jersey	Camden into Newark.
New York	Syracuse into Buffalo.
Pennsylvania	Scranton into Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this proposal involves elimination of the New York State regional office located in New York City and the shifting of that Office to Boston where the New York State and New England regions will hereafter have consolidated headquarters. I am told that the taxpayers of New York State pour into the coffers of the tax collectors from two to three times the amount of money taken in, not only in Boston, but in all of New England. The Manhattan District of the New York region alone processes 3.8 million tax returns. Yet by the proposed shift, as announced by the Commissioner, New Yorkers—not only those in New York City, but also those as far west as the Niagara frontier—would have to handle their tax business on the regional level through a Boston regional office.

Mr. President, I do not have to spell out the dollars and cents of the situation to state in all candor that this proposal makes no sense whatever to me; it would be a case of the tail wagging the dog.

If consolidation is needed, the place to consolidate is in New York City, where the amount of regional tax business done is two or three times as great as all such business done in the entire New England States region.

One of the reasons that may be advanced for a New York-to-Boston rather than a Boston-to-New York transfer is that the automatic data-processing equipment, which is due to be phased gradually into the operations of the Internal Revenue Service, is destined to be located at Lawrence—which I may say to the Senator from Minnesota is also in Massachusetts. Lawrence, Mass., is to have the data-processing equipment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from New York have any objection to that?

Mr. KEATING. Well, the Lawrence decision is water over the dam. The point is that I have heard the argument that because that equipment is to be located in Lawrence, Mass., it is necessary to locate the regional office in Boston, Mass.

However, Mr. President, although San Francisco is the regional office on the west coast, the data-processing equipment is located in Ogden, Utah—which is, I would guess, at least 1,000 miles distant from San Francisco.

It is my sincere hope that no steps will be taken to implement the proposed change until some of the interested Members of Congress have been heard from.

I have protested emphatically to the Secretary of the Treasury. I have asked to be heard. I have taken steps to alert to this situation both the New York State steering committee—composed of the New York congressional delegation of both parties—as well as Governor Rockefeller. They also have addressed the Secretary of the Treasury, asking to be heard.

I cannot urge too strongly that the planned transfer be held up at least until we have had a full opportunity to present our case to the Secretary of the Treasury.

ROME AIR MATERIEL AREA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in Griffiss Air Force Base and particularly in the procurement center ROAMA, central New York has one of the best and most efficient military establishments in the Nation. We can be proud of its past accomplishments and we must continue to look with hope and confidence toward its future.

Mr. President, I have read with great interest a recent editorial from the Rome, N.Y., Daily Sentinel of February 27 on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that this forward-looking and well-justified comment be printed in the Record following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Stop Downgrading ROAMA

We should stop downgrading Rome Air Materiel Area (ROAMA).

It is a going concern, busily engaged in support of ground communications/electronics military systems. With GEEIA (Ground Electronics Engineering Installations Agency), ROAMA is unique in its field in the Air Force. And GEEIA is remaining as part of ROAMA.

Certainly there are changes at ROAMA. There always are changes in progress at an installation of more than 6,000 personnel. On the whole, these changes are making ROAMA more the hard core of Air Force activity in its field.

It may well be that certain electrical procurement and supply activities will be transferred elsewhere. It is the belief that these do not belong within the specialized mission of ROAMA, as it is now conceived. The personnel involved, not many in number, can remain at ROAMA.

Efficiency of the ROAMA operation, once next to the last of the nine Air Force air materiel areas, is now fifth or sixth and a determined effort is underway to improve that.

In cold figures, number of personnel at ROAMA has decreased by nine in a 2-year period, 1960–62. In this same period, the logistics command to which ROAMA belongs, has been reduced in strength by many thousands.

While employment at ROAMA has remained constant, the payroll at ROAMA is up nearly $10 million in the past 10 years. This is due to an upgrading of civilian personnel into higher paying positions, plus overall pay increases.

Meanwhile, the total workload has increased to the point where, without additional personnel, there is a severe manpower pinch in some departments.

ROAMA is not expected to grow in personnel strength in the foreseeable future, neither is it expected to decrease in manpower. It will increase its importance to the Air Force as the ground communications/electronics mission demands pile up, both on the military and on the space side.

The work being done at ROAMA has to be accomplished by the Air Force. It will either be done at ROAMA or elsewhere and there is no reason for elsewhere. The big danger to ROAMA, in fact, is that it could be given more work than it could handle, necessitating establishing a second installation to share the load. Should this happen, ROAMA would not have its unique position of being the one air materiel area that takes care of ground communications/electronics systems support.

It is understandable that rumors fly off Griffiss Air Force Base about ROAMA, that procedural changes are magnified into imaginary disasters, that personnel shifts and rating reports are twisted out of meaning. It was only 2 years ago that the Pentagon was considering closing ROAMA and transferring its functions elsewhere. While that never happened, it did shake the community from its complacency about the military installations at Griffiss Air Force Base.

That was 2 years ago. ROAMA is still here. The manpower is almost the same; the payroll is $65 million a year; ROAMA is central New York's largest civilian employer.

As far as can be seen ahead, all indications are ROAMA will continue at about the same personnel strength but steadily gaining in workload and importance.

This community needs to regain its confidence about ROAMA.

ROLE OF REGISTERED FOREIGN AGENTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee on the activities of lobbyists and registered foreign agents have attracted considerable attention and should be very useful. Foreign agents as well as lobbyists can serve an important and legitimate function, but effective regulation of their activities is essential and there undoubtedly have been some excesses in recent years. I assume that the committee will make recommendations after it concludes its hearings and these certainly will have my sympathetic consideration.

Unfortunately, there is a great deal of misunderstanding of the role of the legitimate foreign agent, both in this country and abroad. Recently, the German Press Club of New York, which was founded 75 years ago, invited a distinguished citizen, Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, to address them. General Klein is a native of Chicago and a pioneer in the field of international public relations. I know that he enjoys the friendship and respect of many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. He had a distinguished war record as a combat commander and was also the author of the Army's combat public relations plan. His speech sheds considerable light on the role of the legitimate foreign agent and contains many unusual insights into this subject.

I know that General Klein's speech to the German Press Club will be of interest to many Members and I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, Retired, to German Press Club, January 21, 1963

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentleman of the press, in the middle of the 18th century the great mercantile houses, such as Baring Bros. of Liverpool and Almy & Brown of Providence, established correspondents in major cities of the world. Their task was to report news regularly from those places. But there was another assignment for them.

These mercantile correspondents conducted a never-ending series of pamphlet wars over the merits or disadvantages of such controversial issues as the navigation and trade acts, hard versus paper money, and restrictions on imports.

These correspondents also informed the citizens of their communities of the speed and comfort of their employers' ships as well as the times of arrivals and departures and cargoes.

Parliament, the colonial assemblies and European court circles were their constant haunts. They were well known to the newspaperman of the day.

The mercantile correspondent became very popular during the last part of the 18th century and by the opening of the 19th century a great many commercial organizations were utilizing their services to gain new business abroad through publicity efforts, and to attract greater attention at home with their news reports.

As the world grew more complex the mercantile correspondent evolved into two 20th century phenomena we know today as the

foreign correspondent and the foreign agent. You, ladies and gentlemen, are foreign correspondents. I, thanks to our society's demand for short and sweet labels for everything, am a foreign agent.

Foreign agentry, of course, connotes something sinister. In today's lexicon a foreign agent wears a big hat scrunched down on his head, a black cape covers his face, his pockets contain a gun, a dagger, an envelope filled with cyanide powder, a vial of acid, an infrared microfilm camera, a miniature tape recorder.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have no cloak, no dagger, no poison. My weapons are my experience, my knowledge, my typewriter. I conduct my business, not in dark alleys, but in the large industrial offices of the world.

When it is said I am a foreign agent, it means I am a representative of a friendly foreign interest. As a public relations consultant to this foreign principal I give the same services that I give such domestic clients as, for example, the California World's Fair of 1967–68. Techniques may change because of the special problems of each client, but the services are always constant.

For example, my services assume the role of a management function that evaluates public attitudes, identifies the policies and procedures of the client with the public interest, and executes a program of action to earn public understanding and acceptance. As a result my advice becomes the administrative philosophy of my client.

My services are not something that can be bought like a drill press, or suspended like an order for component parts. It is a way of life that expresses itself in attitudes and actions affecting workers, customers and the community.

In my address to you tonight I shall explain foreign agents and foreign agentry to you in light of misunderstandings and distortions of the facts in recent German press reports of activities of public relations firms that specialize in representing foreign interests. I hope that I will be able to clear up some of the misunderstandings that exist and correct the mistaken impressions, especially with a congressional hearing of nondiplomatic activities of foreign agents only a few weeks away.

Announcement of these legislative hearings some months ago brought forth a number of stories in the German press that unfortunately not only confused the purpose of the hearings, but led to unfounded attacks upon my profession and myself. May I add, however, that the more responsible segments of the German press exercised good judgment and understanding in their reports about the hearings and the foreign agents issue.

In beginning, I want to impress on you most strongly that a congressional hearing is not a court proceeding. Occasionally, in the past it has taken on such an appearance. A decade ago my good friend Estes Kefauver led a Senate committee into the underworld where a number of criminals were exposed to the light of public knowledge. Just this past year a congressional committee investigated the alleged crimes of Billie Sol Estes.

But the purpose of a hearing is not to find wrongdoers. It is to discover if proper laws exist. The hearing is designed to aid the Congress in formulating workable laws. And that is what the forthcoming review of the foreign agents registration act involves.

Speaking of the hearings on the floor of the Senate recently, Edward V. Long, the distinguished Senator from Missouri, said he feels that many reputable practitioners of the art of public relations have been unduly maligned. He remarked further:

"I might mention that several unfortunate articles recently have appeared on the subject in the German press. It was obvious that these publications did not even comprehend the difference between a lobbyist and a foreign agent, the latter being a public relations professional, a lawyer or a person who is registered with the Department of Justice as the U.S. representative of a foreign official body."

Some German newspapers, the Senator further observed, went so far as to write that one of the most reputable foreign agents in the United States may be involved in "a court hearing by the State Department."

The Senator explained: "Perhaps they were referring to the forthcoming hearings by the Foreign Relations Committee, but if so, something was very definitely lost in the translation."

Senator J. W. Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, wrote in a foreword to a preliminary study on the subject: "The purpose of examining foreign government lobbying is not to show that these activities are necessarily wrong. In many instances, State Department officials themselves agree that legitimate representation by U.S. citizens on behalf of certain foreign principals is necessary due to the complexities of current international problems."

Senator Fulbright went on to say his hearing is not meant to condemn, but to determine where the Foreign Agents Registration Act can be changed to make it a more effective and practical law.

Although Senator Fulbright's committee will be examining all nondiplomatic activities of foreign agents, the hearing will center on determining whether or not the activities of these foreign agents are having any detrimental effect on the U.S. foreign policy. The committee will be looking for any loopholes in the foreign agents law that need to be closed in this connection.

With respect to U.S. foreign policy, speaking for my firm and myself, in serving friendly nations that are our political and military allies, we are at the same time rendering a service to our Nation. We provide a channel of communication not otherwise available.

In fact, we are foreign agents in the reverse sense. That is, we not only work to convey our clients' viewpoint to the American community, but more importantly, our major effort consists of attempting to inform our friends, by explaining to them this country's position on current issues, and seeking better understanding and cooperation in the complex nature of today's political relationships.

This thought was carried forward in a statement made by Congressman Emanuel Celler when he remarked on the floor of the House on October 25, in connection with criticism of my activities in the German press that, "he (General Klein) represents numerous German firms in America and interprets for the United States the interests, aims, and purposes of his German clientele. He is to that extent a 'foreign agent' and has registered as such."

In serving a foreign principal our philosophy has always been that America's interest and security are first—that any difference of opinion Americans might have on domestic or foreign policy must end where the waters begin.

The current furor over foreign agents began in 1960 when the United States withdrew the sugar quota given to Castro Cuba and prepared to divide this quota among other Latin American countries.

Under the U.S. Sugar Act the various sugar producing countries of Latin America are limited to the amount of sugar they can export to the United States. This sugar is purchased by the United States at a premium rate, several cents above the world market price.

Now, at the time the House of Representatives Agricultural Committee was considering how to divide up the Cuban quota among the other Latin American countries, the Secretary of State was talking with members of the Organization of American States concerning applying sanctions against the totalitarian regime of Raphael Trujillo in the Dominican Republic. In fact, the OAS did vote, 20–0, to censure Trujillo, break off diplomatic relations, embargo arms shipment and effect a partial suspension of trade in other commodities.

It was against this background that the U.S. Congress voted to give the Trujillo regime a $90 million a year sugar bonus.

A half year later, the Secretary of State appeared before the Agricultural Committee and was able to persuade the Congressmen to withdraw this sugar bonus from the Dominican Republic.

Again, this past summer, the Dominican sugar quota issue grabbed top headlines, as the quota was reevaluated in light of the changes in the sugar market.

During each of those three instances when the Dominican Republic's sugar quota was being considered by the Congress, activity by persons and organizations representing the Trujillo regime reached a dizzying intensity.

It was this activity that made many Congressmen ask: Is there something wrong here? To what extent does this activity affect the policy of the United States?

The law itself does not prohibit an American from representing a foreign government or other official foreign organizations for any reason. All the law says is when a person does represent a foreign principal, he must register his name, his client's name, and the amount of compensation. In addition certain publications and other printed matter distributed on behalf of the client must be labeled that it has been prepared for a foreign interest.

The only drawback to an American representing interests detrimental to the United States is a person's own national loyalty.

I would like to say at this point that I love my country. I would never support a position detrimental to the national interest. I would resign an account without thinking twice if that client wanted me to do something I thought was against the national interest.

That is what I will not do as a foreign agent. But what will I do? What are the services that I offer to my clients whether they be foreign or domestic?

I do nothing special for a foreign interest. Whether the person is a Prime Minister or a board chairman, a finance minister or a comptroller, my services are the same.

To give you an example of what I do, and also to give you an even greater understanding of the services I offer friendly foreign interests and business alike, I would like to invent for you a client—the Pied Piper Co., of Hamelin, Germany.

Let us say, arbitrarily, the Pied Piper Co. has invented that cliche of our times, the better mousetrap. Only, much to their sorrow, they find the world is not beating the proverbial path to their door.

This is not unusual. There are a great many manufacturers in the world who have a product that meets a widespread need, yet they cannot sell this product. They cannot sell because the right people—the potential customers—do not know of this product's existence, or just what the product can do for them.

This is the situation of our Pied Piper Co. and its better mousetrap. The company has a sales staff that makes the right contacts. But every time the salesmen meet a buyer they are faced with a stoney stare and the comment: "I don't know you; I don't know your company; I don't know your product; I am a very busy man; what is it you have to say?"

The Pied Piper Co. has a communications problem, and they take it to an expert in solving communications problems—me. They come to our office at 22 Neue Mainzerstrasse in Frankfurt, lay out the problem in front of us, and we go to work.

The work I am about to describe using this fictitious case, is almost identical to the work we do for all our clients. It is because I do just this very same procedure for a foreign principal that I am called a foreign agent.

The first thing we do is to determine the attitude of the potential customers toward the company and the product. We analyze the state of opinion. Then we formulate a policy, plan activities, and carry out a program.

The objectives of the public relations campaign we devise for the Pied Piper Co. are nine in number. They include:

1. Corporate prestige: In order to do business in a world full of competing businesses, our client's name must be as respected and well known as, say, the name of Du Pont. To achieve this we undertake a broad image-building campaign.

2. Promotion of products and sales: There is more than just publicity involved here. We write stories saying how marvelous Pied Piper mousetraps are, certainly, but we also have special events, an international contest among flute-playing young lasses to select a "Miss Pied Piper of 1963"; the establishment of a Pied Piper Flutist Club organizing the flutists of the world; we arrange with Walt Disney to make a cartoon motion picture in 27 languages including Swahili of the Pied Piper legend; we conduct a contest between a cat and a Pied Piper mousetrap, putting both in a mouse-infested house to see which one catches the most mice.

3. Stockholders relations: We prepare reports telling the stockholders of the progress of their company.

4. Industry relations: We work for the establishment of an International Society of Mousetrap Manufacturers that will give greater scope to promotional efforts to educate the public concerning the benefits of automation in mousing.

5. Employee relations: Programs will be developed to make the employees feel they are part of a warm, intimate organization. There will be employee sporting teams, clubs, social gatherings, an employee publication.

6. Community relations: There will probably be people in Hamelin Town, as in any other town, who will feel the factory is a bad thing. It makes dirt, pollutes the air and streams, increases traffic congestion, etc. We counter this bad community relations with some positive action, not just defensive denials. We have the company sponsor an air pollution study and map plans to improve traffic conditions. Company executives join local civic associations and other groups.

7. Dealer relations: We will design and prepare an attractive package to present to dealers whom we hope will sell Pied Piper mousetraps on their store shelves.

8. Special campaigns: Some event may occur that will create some unfavorable publicity. The cat world might unite against losing their jobs to automation. The Antivivisection League might start a campaign against killing mice. We would have to respond to such campaigns in a positive way with a special program.

9. Management counseling: The eight previous services that I offer to the Pied Piper Co. and to any other company that comes to me for assistance, deal with education of the people with whom Pied Piper deals. It is just as important for me to educate Pied Piper itself. No matter how hard I try to give this company good public relations, I cannot succeed unless the company is inherently good. And, as I pointed out before, I will never do anything that would be detrimental to the interests of the United States. So, therefore, we must maintain close liaison with management, giving our advice on company practices and policies, making certain that the company has a sound base from which to launch these other eight services.

This, ladies and gentlemen, is what I do. When I do it for a domestic client I am called a public relations consultant. When I do it for a friendly foreign interest I am called a foreign agent.

Now, so far I have been talking about foreign agents and foreign agentry. Of late there has been a good deal of confusion of the terms "foreign agent" and "lobbyist." These terms are not interchangeable. However, you hear quite often someone referred to as a "foreign lobbyist."

As far as the American legal terminology goes there is no such animal as a foreign lobbyist. A public relations consultant, like myself, may be both a foreign agent and a lobbyist. But being one, does not make him the other. There are two distinct laws involved here.

Jacob K. Javits, senior Senator from New York, discussed this confusion recently on the floor of the Senate. Speaking about the Fulbright hearings, the Senator said:

"It has been approximately 20 years since Congress examined this field of activity and I am sure that these hearings will prove fruitful, if only to clear away the uncertainty which surrounds the popular conception of the nature of the functions performed by lobbyists and registered foreign agents."

The Senator then went on to praise an article that appeared in what he described as a responsible German publication, and which subsequently was inserted in the Congressional Record issue of November 2. The story in queston deals with "Public Relations in Industry and Politics" and points out that:

"The translation of 'hearing' with the German term 'unterschung' and of 'foreign agents' with 'auslandsagenten' is entirely justified, but in the German language these terms assume a double meaning which invited sensational stories."

The wide circulation in Germany of these sensational stories with their distortions, citing me as the whipping boy in the Fulbright hearings was undoubtedly due to lack of knowledge.

To give you an example of what a lobbyist does, let us go back to our mythical Pied Piper Co. I am giving this company, as I have noted, nine services. There is a tenth service I might give them—government relations.

Say, for example, there is a Federal law classifying mousetraps as a dangerous weapon, and that for a person to own a mouse trap, he must register with the local police. This law acts as a brake against mousetrap sales. As a service to my client, I therefore endeavor to get the law taken off the books, or at least modified.

Once I begin doing this type of work, I must register under the Congressional Lobbying Act, and then I become a lobbyist as well as a foreign agent.

In my services as a public relations consultant I have counseled and served many American and foreign business, financial, transport, and industrial organizations. I have been properly registered with the Department of Justice for my representation of foreign governmental agencies. I have also been registered as a lobbyist on several occasions, but I am not now engaged in any lobbying activities, nor have I any interest in such activities at this time.

If, however, any client or prospective client came to me with a request for lobbying services, I would accept that assignment only if I felt that the national interest would not be harmed.

At this point, having already outlined the task of the foreign agent, I would like to explain to you the task of the lobbyist. Only I shall not use my own words. Instead I shall borrow the words of the President of the United States.

When John F. Kennedy was a Senator in 1956, he wrote an article for the Sunday magazine section of the New York Times, in which he said, in part:

"Lobbyists are in many cases expert technicians and capable of explaining complex and difficult subjects in a clear, understandable fashion. They engage in personal discussions with Members of Congress in which they can explain in detail the reasons for positions they advocate.

"Lobbyists prepare briefs, memorandums, legislative analyses, and draft legislation for use by committees and Members of Congress; they are necessarily masters of their subject and, in fact, they frequently can provide useful statistics and information not otherwise available.

"Competent lobbyists can present the most persuasive arguments in support of their positions. Indeed, there is no more effective manner of learning all important arguments and facts on a controversial issue than to have the opposing lobbyists present their cases.

"Concededly, each is biased; but such a procedure is not unlike the advocacy of lawyers in court which has proven so successful in resolving judicial controversies. Because our congressional representatives is based on geographical boundaries, the lobbyists who speak for the various economic, commercial, and other functional interests of this country serve a very useful purpose and have assumed an important role in the legislative process."

I personally consider this description of the functions of a lobbyist eminently fair and accurate.

There is one more misunderstanding I would like to clear up. In a democracy such as the United States, politics means little in public relations.

It is a distortion to say that because I am a Republican, I cannot adequately represent my clients with a Democratic administration in Washington. Partisan politics in this country is reserved for the elections. The President, his advisers, the distinguished men and women of Congress have too great a sense of responsibility to allow partisan politics to interfere with the administration of the Government. I only need point to the Republicans who hold some of the most important positions in the land—Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, Central Intelligence Agency Chief John McCone, Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin, Jr., and top White House Aid, McGeorge Bundy.

The Honorable Senator Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota, Democratic whip in the Senate, referred to criticism that my effectiveness in representing my clients' interests in Washington was hampered because I am a Republican, with the following words:

"Tell anyone that Julius Klein has more friends in the Senate and the House of Representatives than any man I know. We respect his partisanship, but even more, we cherish his friendship."

These, my good friends, are the facts in this matter. As a former newspaperman I appreciate the value of facts and writing factually. One of the important lessons I learned during my newspaper career is the responsibility the press has to its readers.

The power of the press is immense. It can accomplish almost anything it sets out to do. It is because it has such vast power, backed by the right to be uncensored, that it has an obligation to the truth, and is the protector of freedom and democracy.

I hope, ladies and gentlemen, that I have explained this issue clearly, and I thank you for giving me the opportunity to do so. There will be a number of things I am sure you want to know, so fire away with your questions, I'm ready for them.

CONGRESS DESERVES CREDIT FOR PROGRESS, INNOVATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a former colleague of mine at Harvard, when I was a teaching fellow and tutor, is Arthur Maass, who also was a teaching fellow and tutor at the same time. He is now a professor of government at Harvard and an outstanding member of the Harvard faculty.

Recently, he wrote for the Washington Post an article entitled "Congress Has Been Maligned." In view of the considerable amount of criticism of Congress and its alleged slowness to operate, I think his article is most important. I wish to read some excerpts from it, as follows:

> Most of Congress' present rules were adopted in this century, and a great many reforms have been made since World War II. The committee structure of both the House and the Senate has been reorganized completely; professional staffs have been provided for all committees. * * *
>
> Moreover, Congress has refined and used extensively a new technique, the legislative veto, to check on how the Executive uses its discretionary power. With this technique available, it has granted the Executive greater discretion than it would have otherwise. * * *
>
> The Senate Democrats have modified the seniority rule, providing that freshmen Senators may sit on one committee of their choice. By shortening the terms of authorizations and through investigations, the legislative committees have taken an active role in overseeing the conduct of Government programs.
>
> As a result, they have given a different, often more sympathetic review of executive programs than have the Appropriations Committees, and have staged public debates on important issues previously not aired adequately, as in the annual authorization bills for missiles, aircraft, and ships.
>
> Finally, Congress has legislated in three areas requiring the organization of new committees. In two of these, atomic energy and general economic affairs, Congress has experimented with joint House-Senate committees. The period since World War II has been exciting for observers of Congress just because the rate of innovation has been so high.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Prof. Arthur Maass be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Congress Has Been Maligned

(By Arthur Maass)

"When the 88th Congress assembles in January, it should turn first to self-reform, to revising its rules for conducting the Nation's legislative business." Newspaper readers have been told this repeatedly since the 87th Congress adjourned last October. We could assume, then, that the need for legislative reform is well understood.

To the contrary, this need, though widely believed, is poorly sensed because so much exaggeration and misinformation about Congress passes for intelligence. Two examples will illustrate this view.

First, Congress is held responsible for all the ills of the legislative process. Yet Congress is only one participant in a process usually initiated by the Executive. It is the President who sets the agenda for action by the legislature.

Often when Congress is criticized for concerning itself with picayune details, it is these very details that have been served up by the Executive. Even the pork barrel, which many consider a prototype of misspent congressional energies, if not misconduct, originates in the Executive, for Congress seldom authorizes projects that have not been recommended by the President.

Now, one might argue that the Executive provides the pieces of pork for the barrel because Congress wants it that way. But the initiative in the legislative process is the President's, and if he preferred some form of general legislation in the resources field to the authorization of individual projects, he could propose it. Yet since World War II no such initiative has been taken, with the possible exception of President Truman's proposals for Columbia and Missouri Valley authorities.

A second misconception is that Congress has doggedly resisted change. (The Washington Post speaks of "the antiquated, medieval-minded procedures" of the House.) Perhaps all Government institutions resist change, but the organizations and procedures of the legislature have been no more resistant than those of the bureaucracy or of the courts.

Most of Congress' present rules were adopted in this century, and a great many reforms have been made since World War II. The committee structure of both the House and the Senate have been reorganized completely; professional staffs have been provided for all committees; the House tried and then rejected a new procedure, the 21st day rule, to bypass its Rules Committee.

Moreover, Congress has refined and used extensively a new technique, the legislative veto, to check on how the Executive uses its discretionary power. With this technique available, it has granted the Executive greater discretion than it would have otherwise.

Also, Congress tried, and when it was found defective, discarded a new procedure for handling money matters: the single appropriations bill.

The Senate Democrats have modified the seniority rule, providing that freshman Senators may sit on one committee of their choice. By shortening the terms of authorizations and through investigations, the legislative committees have taken an active role in overseeing the conduct of Government programs.

As a result, they have given a different, often more sympathetic, review of Executive programs than have the appropriations committees and have staged public debates on important issues previously not aired adequately, as in the annual authorization bills for missiles, aircraft and ships.

Finally, Congress has legislated in three areas requiring the organization of new committees. In two of these, atomic energy and general economic affairs, Congress has experimented with joint House-Senate committees.

The period since World War II has been exciting for observers of Congress just because the rate of innovation has been so high. Let anyone who doubts the legislature's interest in, or capacity for change, read the debates on the annual foreign aid authorization bills. In 1961, for example, Congress argued over annual versus long-term authorizations, annual versus long-term appropriations, the legislative veto, use of the concurrent resolution to terminate programs, methods of reporting to Congress, auditing and inspecting and the meaning of all of these for organization and procedure of both Houses of Congress.

Why do so many misconceptions about our legislature persist? Why does Congress have a worse reputation than it deserves?

First, Congress, unlike the Executive, operates in a goldfish bowl. Almost every step of the congressional decision process is open to public scrutiny, whereas quite often only the final and polished step of the Executive decision process is known. If a Member of Congress asks a stupid question or proposes an offbeat solution in a public hearing, this is reported and reflects on him, on his committee and on Congress.

Who knows how many stupid questions and off-beat solutions are proposed in meetings of the National Security Council and in the proceedings by which most Executive decisions are reached? A misguided amendment to a bill is adopted in a subcommittee, and full publicity is given to this action, as it should be; yet the chances are good that the amendment will be dropped in the full committee, or on the floor, or in the other house and the conference. An equally misguided proposal made in the early stages of the executive decision process and later dropped is seldom known and reported.

Where, as in Congress, all steps in the decision process are reported, there is a heavy obligation on the reporters to construct the whole from its parts. But this is not easy, and in my opinion few reporters of national politics have shown that they have the necessary interest and skill to do so.

The daily reports of the 87th Congress made it appear to many as a catastrophe. Yet with a hindsight view of its accomplishments, we can judge it a smashing success. In the area of foreign and security affairs, Congress approved the defense buildup, the Peace Corps, the Disarmament Agency, the Alliance for Progress, an expansion of the food for peace program and the important Trade Act.

In the domestic area it passed, among others, the most comprehensive housing program in our history; the area redevelopment, manpower retraining, and emergency public works programs; an increase in the minimum wage to $1.25; expansion of the social security system, including lowering the male retirement age to 62; complete revision of the public assistance programs; an increase in postal rates; revision of Civil Service and other Federal salary systems, which some consider the most significant legislation in this area in more than a quarter century; new tax incentives for capital investments; drug controls; authorization of the communications satellite program; three seashore parks, and repeal of the disclaimer affidavit in the Federal scholarship and loan programs.

I do not ignore Congress' failure to act on education, medical care for the aged, a Department of Urban Affairs, certain tax reforms and the wilderness bill. But much more of Congress' unpopular image stems from temporary crises in the legislative histories of the bills finally passed in good form.

A second and related reason for misconceptions and excessive criticism of the legislature is simply that, compared with the Executive, Congress has a bad press. In large part this is due to its open operations and to its pluralistic organization. No one would expect Congress to be able to match the President's centralized and powerful press mechanism; at the same time, Congress as a whole suffers from not having one.

Congress suffers also from what appears to be a double standard for reporting the conduct of public servants. If an Assistant Secretary of State attends the Folies Bergere while participating in a Paris international conference, this is not likely to be reported. If it is, it will be with understanding.

If a Member of Congress sees the same girlie show while on official committee business in Paris, this will be reported, and in a muckraking style.

Finally, basic principles of our national system of government are poorly taught and poorly understood, and this is the fault of American political scientists among others. We all learned in ninth grade civics that all legislative powers are vested in Congress and all executive and administrative powers in the President and departments and that these assignments of power may be modified somewhat by what we called checks and balances.

And in the introductory college course in public administration we learned as a first rule that Congress should not interfere with the administrative processes of government.

Yet these principles, however qualified, are not the basic precepts of our National Government, and the resultant misunderstanding generally reflects unfavorably on Congress. In fact, the dominant influence in the legislative process is not normally Congress but the President; this is not because the President has a veto power, but because he may assume, with some few exceptions, the initiative in the legislative process.

For this reason the President should be given considerable credit for legislative successes and indeed he is. He should also be given credit for many, if not most, of the so-called failings. But here we are inconsistent and more likely to lay the full blame on the legislature. Also we are inclined to condemn Congress and congressional committees for sticking their fingers into the administrative process.

Yet one of the most important tasks for an elected legislature is to oversee the administrative process. We have never been willing to rely solely on the elected Chief Executive, the courts, or professional standards of the civil service to hold the bureaucracy accountable. Just as the President participates in the legislative process of our Government, so Congress plays a legitimate and important role in the administrative process.

Congress, then, is often badly misjudged. However, this does not mean that there is no need for reform. Congress, for example, has been overexuberant in using its new device, the legislative veto, for granting broad discretion to the Executive and retaining control over its application in specific cases.

The veto needs to be brought under control by intelligent analysis that leads to the setting of criteria for its proper use. For instance, authority to use the veto probably should not rest with a congressional committee, as happened when a House committee blocked the Defense Department's attempt to close the 18th century ropewalk at the Boston Navy Yard.

Instead, the veto should be exercised by one or both Houses of Congress. But the analysis needed to make distinctions of this type obviously cannot start from erroneous views about Congress.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF THOMAS MASARYK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today is the 113th anniversary of Thomas G. Masaryk, one of the principal founders and the first President of the Czechoslovak Republic. Less than 2 weeks ago we observed in sorrow the 15th anniversary of the Communist revolution in that unfortunate nation. It is fitting that today we note the birthdate of the elder Masaryk, who gave so much of his life to the ideal of Czechoslovakian independence, and who, fortunately, did not live to see his country enslaved by either Nazi Germany or Soviet Russia.

Masaryk came to the United States toward the close of World War I and secured from this country support for an independent Czechoslovakia. Gaining the support of our Allies, he and his countrymen were able to bring the new nation into being later that year. He was elected President and served until his resignation in 1935, being reelected in 1920 and again in 1934. He died in 1937.

The following year, Munich occurred; and from that date the life of the young nation has been hard, indeed. Liberated in 1945, Czechoslovakia enjoyed 3 precarious years of freedom, ever conscious of the Communist threat both from within and without to its existence. In 1948, the Communist coup snuffed out the light of freedom in Czechoslovakia and the life of Masaryk's son, Jan.

We in the United States, beset as we are by threats in the Caribbean, Germany, and the Far East, might nevertheless pause a moment today to count our blessings. We have survived nearly two decades of cold war; our democratic form of government retains its vigor. While we dedicate ourselves anew to the task of preserving our freedom and winning the cold war, we might reaffirm our pledge that Czechoslovakia will one day be free again, and that the lifework of Thomas Masaryk shall not have been in vain.

ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF AMERIGO VESPUCCI

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, everyone who calls himself an American preserves the memory of Amerigo Vespucci, the 15th-century Italian merchant astronomer whose name was given to the two continents of the New World. On March 9 we shall observe the anniversary of his birth.

Vespucci, coming after only Columbus, might be called the second great Italian-American. Much of his life was a saga in what we call the American tradition: He began as a clerk in the Florentine commercial offices of the Medici. Sent to Spain, he became connected with a company which fitted ships for Atlantic voyages; it is believed that he helped supply Columbus' second expedition. He came to the New World four times; and in his time his name became so well known among the seafaring explorers that early in the 16th century it began to appear on maps of this hemisphere.

Columbus and Vespucci were the earliest of a vast number of Italians and Italian-Americans whose names are written on the brightest pages of American history. As we pause briefly in our deliberations to note the anniversary of Vespucci's birth, we might recall to mind these facts: that Americans of Italian birth or descent have stood high among our finest citizens; yet Italians were for many decades cruelly discriminated against in this country. Just as Vespucci and Columbus, crossing the uncharted ocean, brought the dawn of a new day in the history of the world, we ought to bend our efforts toward another new day when there will be no discrimination and when the opportunities symbolized by discovery and exploration will be open to all.

PROF. JOHN M. GAUS VISITS MADISON

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Prof. John M. Gaus was a very distinguished professor at the University of Wisconsin until 1948. He left the University of Wisconsin to go to Harvard. He is one of the outstanding pragmatic professors of political science in America. His return visit to Madison, Wis., was celebrated with a perceptive article in the Madison Capital Times, discussing Professor Gaus and his great record in political science and what his learning and his attitude have meant in making political science a far more practical and useful discipline.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Gaus, Man Who Saved Political Science, Visits University After 16 Years

(By Elliott Maraniss)

Prof. John M. Gaus, the man who saved political science from dying of irrelevancy—the Dutch elm disease in the groves of academe—has returned to the University of Wisconsin campus.

Dr. Gaus will spend a week here visiting his old classes in public administration, regional planning, and political theory.

Among the political scientists in South Hall, this has aroused the same kind of excitement that would be found among historians if Frederick Jackson Turner suddenly showed up at old Bascom.

In the opinion of Prof. James McCamy, one of Dr. Gaus' hosts this week, the comparison is appropriate.

"Professor Gaus is to political science what Turner was to history," Dr. McCamy said Monday.

"He took it out of the law books and put it into life, among the people and in the communities in which they live. He said government is not just statutes and constitutions, but people dealing with other people."

For 20 memorable years between 1927 and 1947 the Wisconsin campus and the Badger State were the vineyards of Professor Gaus' fruitful labors.

A graduate of Amherst College with a master's degree and a doctorate from Harvard, he came here to become part of an Amherst triumvirate which made an imperishable contribution to Wisconsin's rise to greatness.

Dr. Alexander Meikeljohn had been president of Amherst, and Dr. Walter Agard had been an Amherst classmate. Dr. Gaus happily responded to their invitation to join them here in establishing the famed Experimental College. Dr. Agard taught the first-year course in Greek civilization and Dr.

Gaus taught the second-year course in American civilization.

In those years the Wisconsin idea—putting the resources of the university in the service of the people of the State—provided a perfect basis for Dr. Gaus' ideas about political science.

Gov. Phil LaFollette named him executive secretary of the Wisconsin State Planning Board, an advisory board of legislators and citizens, charged with the task of "making a continuing inventory of the State government and its functions and suggesting ways as to how the State may operate more efficiently and economically."

Together with Robert Goodman, who later became chairman of the Conservation Commission, F. L. Sensenbrenner, then president of Kimberly Clark, Charles W. Nash, then president of the Nash Motor Co., Dr. Gaus and his board made many important recommendations, the most lasting of which was a far-sighted plan for the uses of the State's forest resources.

As a member of the Madison Area Planning Council, Dr. Gaus helped devise an orderly plan for the growth of the city.

In every one of those 20 years Dr. Gaus was the object of flattering and bountiful offers from rich and famous universities such as Harvard and Chicago, but he turned them all down, saying "Wisconsin is where my heart belongs."

Ironically, it was during one of those dark periods when the Wisconsin spirit faltered temporarily that Dr. Gaus finally left here.

In 1947 the board of regents refused to appoint Prof. Howard J. McMurray to the political science faculty. Dr. McMurray had served a term in Congress and had sought political office as a Democratic candidate two other times while a member of the faculty.

Dr. Gaus disagreed with the regents' decision and accepted an offer to go to Harvard as professor of government. At Harvard, Dr. Gaus' reputation continued to grow and was culminated with his election as president of the American Political Science Association.

In June of 1961, Dr. Gaus retired as professor emeritus of government at Harvard and returned with his wife to a farmstead in the lovely dairy and forest country in the Adirondacks in New York State, where he was born 68 years ago, the grandson of German immigrants.

There, Dr. Gaus said in an interview Monday, he has found a perfect laboratory for his lifelong interest in the interaction of city and country.

"I really don't know what kind of society we are coming into," Dr. Gaus said. "There are thousands of people who live in the open country, yet are city oriented in their work and their recreation."

Dr. Gaus said the metropolitan areas of the country are faced with "tremendous problems" presented by the profound changes in distribution of the American population, not only in terms of space but also in terms of employment and technological development.

He remains hopeful, however, that the problems will be solved.

"It's amazing how people will respond to a really objective, factual diagnosis of what is going on if you put it to them in human terms," Dr. Gaus said.

Putting things in human terms is what Dr. Gaus has been doing all his life.

SOVIET CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Washington Post has published two very fine editorials dealing with the problem of Soviet Cuba. While it is believed by Government officials that last fall we were successful in forcing removal of Soviet intermediate and medium range missiles and bombers, it is now recognized that the Soviets are continuing to maintain a powerful military base in this hemisphere.

The first editorial, published on March 4, strongly affirms:

> Peace in this hemisphere will not be secure as long as Castro rules in Cuba. * * * The regime in Cuba is one with which its neighbors will not be permitted to live in peace.

The second editorial this morning is still more explicit. It suggests that the distinction between defensive and offensive weapons may have been erroneous or largely a semantic one. It then calls for an end to recriminations over the past and a recognition that Castro's Communist regime in Cuba is a very real threat to the safety of every democratic regime in its vicinity.

With that view I am in full agreement. Our concern must be with the danger Soviet Cuba poses at the present moment. This is a much more important issue than what the situation may have been in the past.

These editorials clarify the perils of the present situation and, in my judgment, emphasize the need for a firm and effective policy to meet the problem, a policy which, so far as I know, has not been made evident.

I ask unanimous consent to have both editorials printed following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1963]

No Peace With Cuba

Peace in this hemisphere will not be secure as long as Castro rules in Cuba. That is the meaning of the events of the past week—whether they relate to disclosures of Cuba's role in training subversive forces in neighboring countries or to the movement of Soviet personnel from Cuban ports. No one will ever be sure how much subversion is going on and, in spite of the efficacy of aerial surveillance, no one can be certain how large are the remaining Soviet forces.

The regime in Cuba is one with which its neighbors will not be permitted to live in peace. The threat to the security and peace will rise and fall as their own precautions are extended or contracted. There is every present indication that no country can afford to allow its guard to relax.

As long as Cuba remains a center from which Communist infiltration is carried on, it cannot expect the United States or any of its other neighbors to make any firm pledge against the invasion of Cuba. The day may arrive when these belligerent operations will reach a level of military significance to which there will be no appropriate response but military operations. To make sure that this pitch of activity is not achieved in total secrecy the scrutiny of operations on the island must be maintained at the highest level.

The Western Hemisphere must live in danger while this situation persists. The precautions necessary to contain this threat are so onerous, disagreeable, and unsettling that the United States will be under continuous pressure to take arms against this sea of trouble and end it. Were there any assurance that it could indeed be ended by extreme measures, it would be harder to resist such counsels. There is, however, no assurance that even this dangerous alternative would end the crisis. It might only start a greater crisis.

There is no easy escape from the Cuban nuisance. There is no present alternative to the maintenance of a high state of readiness for extreme action, a continuous scrutiny of Cuban measures for signs of increasing hostility, an unremitting readiness to defend any threatened country in the hemisphere. All that we can be sure of for the moment is that as long as this regime lasts, there can be no real peace.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 7, 1963]

Past and Future in Cuba

What is going to be done about Cuba tomorrow is a question of such pressing urgency for the survival of freedom in the Western Hemisphere that it is too bad to see it put into eclipse by a debate over what was done about Cuba yesterday.

The intellectual resources of the administration and of its opponents, unfortunately, seem to be going chiefly into the controversy about the past. No aspect of this debate is more unproductive than that which centers about the date when the administration decided that the Soviet arms buildup was offensive in character and so dangerous as to require the strong measures that were taken. The charges that the administration knew of the offensive character of the weaponry long before it disclosed its knowledge and acted on it is essentially political in character. If the charge ever is proven true or false it will leave the future quite unaffected.

Perhaps the administration erred in trying to make a distinction between defensive and offensive arms. Certainly it is a very difficult thing to do. The argument is largely a semantic one. The antiaircraft weapons, the defending fighters and the antimissile missiles are defensive in one sense of the word. They are, at the same time, components in any offensive weapon system. As it turns out, these weapons in Cuba were the first components in a total offensive weapons system that became complete with the arrival of intermediate range missiles. In this sense, they were offensive weapons—or, at least, parts of an offensive weapons system, from the beginning.

There is some evidence that Chairman John McCone of the CIA began to suspect this before the heavy missiles arrived. If this Government had acted on these suspicions, however, its posture might have been difficult. Could it have acted with the firmness it exhibited once the intermediate range missiles were in place? If it had, wouldn't Cuba and the Soviet Union have blandly asserted that only defensive weapons were installed? And wouldn't the vigorous measures of the administration have seemed premature, in this context? Surely, they would have seemed premature to most of our NATO allies and to many South American governments. A strong case can be made for the argument that the American timing, whether due to ignorance, concealment or design, was well suited to achieve the desired result. A little earlier would have been too early and a little later might have been too late.

The debate over what was right or wrong with the operations of last October is not as urgent as the debate over what is the right thing for this country to do now. Castro's Communist regime in Cuba is a very real threat to the safety of every democratic regime in its vicinity. The administration is unable to perfect, or at least unable to disclose, measures for dealing with it that seem adequate. In the absence of plans for dealing with it, those who argue for the most extreme measures are having a field day. They can enlist behind dangerous and oversimplified solutions the well-known American belief that you can "do something" about every problem. The administration runs the risk that this impulse will push it into doing something reckless and unwise unless it can perfect and disclose a policy that is safer and sounder than the policies its critics propose.

VETERANS IN THE STATE OF MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, several days ago my attention was directed to a new and very informative pamphlet on the veterans in Montana. The document is based on information gathered in the 1960 census.

I am proud, as is every Montanan, of the major contribution made by the men and women of the Treasure State in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. Eight out of every ten Montana men between the ages of 35 and 39 years are war veterans, a record of which we are extremely proud.

The research staff at the Veterans' Administration has brought together a number of interesting and helpful facts on the veterans of my State. The statistics cover such things as length of service, residence, occupation, education, and a number of personal details. The Administrator, J. S. Gleason, Jr., is to be complimented for a job well done.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD the summary which appears on pages 1 through 4 of the pamphlet.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS IN THE STATE OF MONTANA, 1960

SUMMARY

Three out of eight of the civilian males 18 or more years old living in Montana in April 1960 had served in the U.S. Armed Forces during World War I, World War II, or the Korean war. Another 6 percent had served only during peacetime.

Fifty-four percent of the State's 89,300 male veterans, as compared to 47 percent of the 114,600 nonveteran males 18 years old or over, were living in cities and towns. One-third of both veterans and nonveterans lived in rural nonfarm areas. Proportionately fewer veterans than nonveterans lived on farms (veterans, 1 out of 8; nonveterans, 1 out of 5).

Of the 89,300 veterans in Montana, 51,100 had served in World War II; 17,600 in the Korean war (of whom 2,800 were also World War II veterans); and 11,400 in World War I. The remaining veterans (12,000) were peacetime ex-servicemen, except for about 180 Spanish-American War veterans.

The median age of the 89,300 veterans in April 1960 was 38.3 years. World War I veterans were the oldest—median, 66.4 years. World War II veterans were 40.2 years old (median), and Korean war veterans were 29.2 years old (median). The other service veterans were the youngest (median—25.0 years), reflecting the fact that most of them had served in the Armed Forces since the Korean war ended in January 1955.

Eight out of 10 men in Montana between the ages of 35 and 39 years were war veterans. Four out of every 10 men 25 and older had served in the Armed Forces during a war period. The lowest proportions of war veterans to total males were 1 out of 8 for the 55- to 59-year age group; 1 out of 8 for the 70 years and over group; and 1 out of 20 for the youngest males—18 to 24 years.

Of the 56 counties in the State, Yellowstone had the most male veterans: 10,100 war veterans and 1,500 peacetime ex-servicemen. Petroleum County had the smallest veteran population: 103 war veterans and no peacetime ex-servicemen.

Of the State's 89,300 male veterans, 80 percent were married; almost 15 percent were single; 4 percent were divorced; and 2 percent were widowed.

Six out of ten Montana veterans were living in a different house in April 1960 than they had occupied 5 years earlier. Three out of ten moved within the same county and one out of eight moved from one Montana county to another. One out of seven male veterans had moved to Montana from another State since 1955. The movers (those who had lived in a different house in 1955) were more than 8 years younger than the veterans who remained at the same address (median age: movers, 35.2 years; nonmovers, 43.6 years). Veterans who moved within the county were almost 2 years older (median age, 36.9 years) than those who moved to another county in Montana (median age, 35.2 years). The veterans who came to Montana from another State were even younger; median age, 33.2 years.

The average veteran in Montana had finished part of the first year of college. One out of eight had completed 1 to 3 years of college; another one out of eight was a college graduate (1 out of 20 had finished 1 or more years of postgraduate study). Three out of ten completed high school, but not a year or more of college. One out of five (19 percent) completed his education with 1 to 3 years of high school; and one out of four (26 percent) had completed no more than 8 years of elementary school.

Eighty-eight percent of the Montana male veterans were members of families—9 out of 10 of them were family heads, the others were related to the family head (son, father, or other relative). Another 1 out of 10 were living alone or with unrelated persons. Of the 2 percent (1,800) who were not living in households, 4 out of 10 were in institutions, and 6 out of 10 lived in roominghouses, college dormitories, and other group quarters.

In April 1960, 84 out of 100 (74,500) male veterans in Montana were working, another 5 out of 100 (4,800) were unemployed. The 11 out of 100 veterans who were not in the labor force were about 27 years older than those in the labor force (median age—64.1 years as compared to 37.5 years).

One-third (34 percent) of the employed Montana veterans in 1960 were craftsmen, foremen, operatives, and similar workers. One-fourth were professional and technical workers, managers, officials, and proprietors. One out of eight employed veterans was a clerical or sales worker; 1 out of 6 was a service worker, laborer, or farmworker; and 1 out of 10 was a farmowner or manager.

Median personal income in 1959 of Montana male veterans was $4,653. Veterans between 35 and 44 years old had the highest income (median, $5,502); those 70 years old and over had the lowest (median, $2,041). Six percent of all veterans reported incomes of $10,000 or more. One out of five (18 percent) had less than $2,000 and 1 out of 12 had under $1,000 of income in 1959.

Five thousand, eight hundred and fifty seven dollars was the median income in 1959 of the Montana families headed by male veterans. Twelve percent of these families had an annual income of $10,000 or more; 36 percent had between $6,000 and $10,000; 30 percent reported income from $4,000 to $6,000; and 22 percent had under $4,000. One out of eight veterans' families had a 1959 income of less than $3,000.

Of the 9,900 Montana veterans who were unrelated individuals—living alone, or with nonrelatives, or in noninstitutional group quarters—4 out of 10 had less than $2,000 of income in 1959; 3 out of 10 reported between $2,000 and $4,000; 2 out of 10 (18 percent) had between $4,000 and $6,000; and over 1 out of 10 had $6,000 or more. Their median annual income was $2,580, compared with the $4,653 median personal income of all veterans.

THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for all its emphasis on the need for increased material benefits to the people of Latin America, we should not lose sight of the fact that the Alliance for Progress represents first and foremost a battle for men's minds. This makes the work of the Alliance in the field of education of crucial importance.

Although largely unpublicized, the work of Alliance and AID people in raising educational standards is going forward on several fronts. The magnitude of the operation is summarized very well in a speech by the Honorable Teodoro Moscoso, coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, before the California Teachers Association in Los Angeles on March 1.

After reviewing the general problem of illiteracy in areas of Latin America—and the factors contributing to it—Mr. Moscoso outlines what is being done in the field of teacher training, school construction, furnishing of school supplies, assistance to higher education and student scholarships. Even with luck, it will be a long time before significant results of our effort can be pointed to. Yet some of our first steps have been very promising.

For instance, some 2½ million primary readers—costing only about 12 cents apiece—will be distributed for the first time in the history of the elementary schools in the five Central American countries to first and second graders.

Another encouraging development is the growth of university-to-university relationships between institutions of this country and Latin America. Soon more than 35 U.S. universities will have working arrangements with some 50 sister institutions in 15 Alliance countries whereby student and faculty exchanges and other types of assistance will be carried on. The 50 Latin American universities, by the way, represent a selected 25 percent of all such institutions of higher learning in that region.

Mr. President, there are several such promising developments covered in Mr. Moscoso's speech. I recommend its reading to all those who are interested both in the Alliance for Progress and the field of education, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE TEODORO MOSCOSO BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., MARCH 1, 1963

I am pleased and honored tonight to speak to this distinguished audience of educators in a State with which we recently undertook a new venture in building the Alliance for Progress. California, thanks to the leadership of your State government and a group of imaginative men in your State's agricultural community, has decided to explore ways in which to make its experience

available to a Latin American country which has problems similar to those California once encountered and has since conquered—Chile.

President Kennedy found this venture significant enough to join Governor Brown in announcing it. He called it a pioneering effort to give the Alliance a new dimension. I salute you and your State for joining in this potentially great and productive undertaking—a step that helps show in still another way the resources of our people available in the great endeavor to help the peoples of Latin America make their societies over in the image of the 20th century.

I

We North Americans often think of Latin America in terms of a stereotype—a Latino asleep under a cactus, with his sombrero over his face. This "sleepy Latino" would be as out of place in Caracas or São Paulo or Santiago as here in Los Angeles. We tend to think of Latin America as a cultural unit, which it is not. We think of it as Spanish speaking, yet nearly one-third of its people claim Portuguese or Indian dialects as their mother tongue. While it is true that the Latin influence is dominant in all of the Americas south of the Rio Grande, there are other influences which color the Latin culture.

Renzo Sereno, professor of political science at Johns Hopkins University, prefers to think of it as consisting of three distinct zones. He refers to the South American countries of Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, and southern Chile as "Ibero America." In these countries the Spanish and Portuguese cultural influence is relatively undiluted. He refers to the Andean countries of Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, and Colombia as well as parts of Mexico and Guatemala, as "Indo-America," for in these areas the cultural influence of the great Inca and Aztec civilizations is still strongly felt and lends a different tone to this region. He refers to the lands bordering the Caribbean as "Afro-America," for in these lands the attitudes of the peoples of African origin can be seen, integrated with the dominant Spanish, and in some cases French or Portuguese cultures. Let us not think, then, of Latin America as an homogenous cultural unit.

Its geography is even more diverse. From the cold damp winds of Tierra del Fuego to the tropical rain forests of western Brazil and eastern Ecuador there is more climatic and geographic variation than people who are familiar only with Europe and North America can imagine. And in the Andean highlands of Bolivia and Peru, millions of people live at the altitude of the peak of Mount Whitney.

The levels of industry and agriculture, the ways in which people make their livelihood are just as varied as the culture and the climate. Even within Brazil there is extreme contrast. Sao Paulo is an industrial complex that resembles Chicago, with thousands of manufacturing plants, including 17 automobile factories. Paulistas set about their work with purpose and drive. Many workers own homes with TV sets and other appliances. They go to work over freeways; In northeast Brazil, on the other hand, there are huge depressed rural zones where millions of people barely eke out a living from a harsh land, where few can read and write, and suffer the cruel punishment of alternating floods and droughts.

II

It is logical, then, that the educational problems of Latin America are as variable as the people and the conditions in which they live. In turn, there are vast differences between us North Americans and Latin Americans—in historical development, political patterns and, of course, economic and social conditions. But there is one deep and abiding bond that ties all of us in this hemisphere together: the Judaeo-Christian heritage that underlies our Western civilization and that has given us common ideals to pursue: the dignity of the individual, equality before the law, and above all, liberty.

This bond is stronger than the misunderstandings and frictions that often beset our day-to-day relationships and that are the stuff of headlines and bylines. It gives us a powerful advantage in working with our Latin American sister peoples, particularly in the cultural and educational fields.

Starting out from this basic premise, let us take a look at the hard and concrete facts that go to make up the education lag in Latin America today.

As educators well know, statistics on educational attainment are hard to obtain and may be variously interpreted. One area in which we do have statistics is the area of literacy. Of course, literacy is only one small part of education, but it is the basic tool of all other formal education.

Illiteracy in Latin America varies from a low in Argentina of 12 percent, to 89 percent in Haiti. There is a striking difference in illiteracy rates between rural and urban populations in most of the Latin American countries. In almost all cases illiteracy is at least twice as high in the rural population as in the urban. In some cases rural illiteracy is five or six times that of the urban population in the same country.

It is interesting to note that in Argentina, the country with the highest literacy in all South America, the foundation of the educational system was laid by Domingo Sarmiento, President from 1866 to 1874. He was known as the "schoolmaster President" and was responsible for the founding of over 1,000 public primary schools. Though he came from humble beginnings, he traveled widely in Europe and the United States, and formed a close and lasting friendship with Horace Mann. From Mann he learned much about democratic education and became a champion of popular education in his country. Sarmiento is still remembered in Argentina, not only as a great President but as the "father of the normal school." He and his two immediate successors in the Presidency brought 64 North American teachers to Argentina to establish and direct normal schools in 14 Argentine provinces. The influence of these normal schools can be seen in the pattern of Argentine education to this day. So, you see, educational aid to Latin America is not a new thing.

To return to the problem of illiteracy for a moment: In 1950, for Latin America as a whole, the illiteracy rate was 41 percent for the population over 14 years of age. This covered 38 million people.

What are the causes behind such high illiteracy figures? Cases from two countries will serve to illustrate. In 1960 in Guatemala 61 percent of the children 7 to 14 years old were not in school. In Ecuador, of 100 students entering the first grade only 54 enroll for second grade, and by sixth grade only 14 are left. Some of them drop out because they are needed at home to work and herd animals. Others drop out of school from lack of interest and are not required to attend by their parents, who do not understand the value of schooling. Still others simply have no school to go to. Many are lost by nonpromotion. Figures from Guatemala indicate that of all the students enrolled at all levels 36 percent are not promoted.

In many cases the children who do go to school find it trying to do their learning. Schoolrooms are often small, crowded, too hot or too cold and teaching materials are almost nonexistent. Teachers, in the absence of books, reference materials, and teaching aids, must rely largely on the straight lecture method, drawing on their own, often skimpy, educational background. In addition to teaching under very adverse conditions of overcrowding, lacking books and educational materials, a high percentage of teachers in Latin America have only primary education.

Your reaction to the shortage of educational facilities will doubtless be that Latin America is not spending enough for education, and this may be true. However, our figures indicate that they are spending about the same proportion of their national income on education as are we in the United States. The scarcity of educational investment is a reflection of the severe economic problems of the area.

In order that the people of Latin America may improve their economic and social well-being, they must have trained people and knowledgeable leaders who can direct, manage, and supervise the gigantic tasks of industrial and agricultural development, of business management and government service. These leaders and technicians require educational systems which press toward providing educational opportunity for the many, while selecting the able—of any bent—for advanced study and training, regardless of origin or means. Obviously, this task cannot be accomplished in a short time. But it must be pursued, for the aspirations of the people for education are becoming more insistent all the time and demand a response. Only a major effort in the field of education can do the job.

III

This educational effort must function at all levels, and all levels of education require teachers. Therefore, major emphasis in the Alliance for Progress program in education is in the area of higher education and teacher training. We are placing much of our effort in the preparation of the teachers of future leaders. In this way we try to take advantage of the multiplier effect.

In some 15 countries the AID is working in the field of teacher training. In Bolivia, where some 4,500 rural teachers have had no specialized training and for the most part have had only 5 years of schooling, the AID mission is cooperating in an inservice program which brings these teachers in groups of 1,000 a year to a center where they are housed and given a 6-week training program. A similar effort is underway in Paraguay. We are assisting in the expansion of the three normal schools in Costa Rica, providing training materials and working with the University of Costa Rica in the development of programs for secondary school teachers. In Brazil, we are cooperating in an elementary education project in Belo Horizonte in the State of Minas Gerais where training for over 750 principals and supervisors is being given in 1963. In one of the States of Northeast Brazil, we participate in the training of some 8,000 elementary school teachers.

We also have five training centers in the United States, each providing programs for improving the work of Latin Americans who are or will become supervisors or instructors of prospective teachers in their own countries. These centers are located at Pennsylvania State University, Geneseo State College in New York, Akron University at Akron, Ohio, and at Wisconsin and Indiana Universities.

Not only are we engaged in programs of teacher education; we are also contributing to the common effort to provide textbooks and instructional materials for these teachers to use.

This spring in the five Central American countries—Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Costa Rica—some 500,000 first- and second-grade youngsters will be receiving 2,500,000 readers for the first time in the history of the elementary schools of these countries. Of course, these are not the hard-back, multicolored books we in this country are accustomed to. Nor do they have the same quality of paper. They are soft covered, with the pages stapled together, but they do have illustrations, and they have been produced by the teachers of each of these countries under the supervision of textbook experts in our AID mission in Guatemala. They are being printed commercially in each country. Most importantly, they cost only about 12 cents a copy. Over the next 5 years the AID regional center in Central America hopes to produce texts and teacher manuals in each subject for all six grades. These will be written at the center by selected teachers from each country, so that after a 6-year period not only will the individual countries have a series of texts which they have developed and which they can afford to continue to supply with their own funds but they will also have a core of specialists who can help staff and strengthen the ministries of education.

While teachers, books, and equipment are essential needs, we are also engaged in very substantial school construction activities. Many of these are of a self-help nature, with the host country providing some of the materials or the labor or both. In Guatemala, for example, an agreement was signed in 1960 whereby the U.S. AID mission would give technical and financial assistance to build 2,250 classrooms in some 400 schools over a 3-year period. These were to be essentially primary rural and small urban schools. The cosponsors were to be the U.S. Government, the Government of Guatemala, and the recipient community on the basis of equal financial contributions. Community self-help was to be in the form of land, labor, and materials. To date, the local communities have exceeded their quota by providing 49 percent of the total project costs; 228 schools of 1,173 classrooms have been completed, and 115 schools with 554 classrooms are under construction. CARE is providing furniture for some 20,000 of the pupils in 500 classrooms.

In nine of the countries of Latin America where we have the most active programs, the construction of approximately 8,500 classrooms for elementary and secondary school classrooms is scheduled for 1963.

But attention to educational needs at the elementary level must not lead us to lose sight of the importance of a balanced effort which takes account of the requirements for secondary and university opportunities. AID's efforts here are beginning to expand in the direction of supporting comprehensive high school programs and the introduction or improvement of science education.

For the immediate present, we have concentrated rather heavily on vocational education. These programs are being examined and developed in the light of manpower surveys which are being conducted in 11 countries with AID collaboration. In Brazil we are cooperating in the development of a system of industrial secondary schools for young people as well as a system of productivity centers for training of the adult worker. In Ecuador, we are involved in a program to improve the training facilities and programs in five vocational secondary schools and in two post-secondary industrial institutes. In all, we have active programs in some 15 countries.

Of all our efforts in education in the last 2 years perhaps the most significant is in the field of higher education in which we have been fortunate to have the cooperation of many universities in the United States, as well as of private foundations. North American University personnel is helping to build stronger faculties in Latin American institutions in such vital fields as engineering, agriculture, science, economics, business and public administration and education.

Existing and pending university-to-university relationships are reaching a magnitude reflected by the following statistics: Within the next few weeks the total of the major U.S. universities engaged in programs in Latin America will reach more than 35, including institutions such as California, University of Southern California, Chicago, Columbia, Minnesota, Pittsburgh, Stanford, Texas A. & M., Iowa State, Michigan, Michigan State, Purdue, Indiana, Louisiana State University, Tennessee, Cornell, Catholic University of America, Syracuse, and Tulane. These institutions are or will be working in 15 Alliance countries with more than 50 Latin American universities or other institutions of higher learning, in many cases involving themselves with more than one faculty or school in each of these institutions. It is interesting to note that best estimates of existing educational institutions of this type in Latin America approximate 200, making present AID coverage approximately 25 percent—a selected 25 percent of the existing Latin American institutions.

It is also interesting to note that these relationships are of a "sister" type in that in many cases there is a mutual exchange of faculty and students and a developing concentration upon Latin American matters in the U.S. institutions concurrently with the assistance given on the Latin American campus.

IV

Of growing significance to the university effort in Latin America, in addition to the financial help forthcoming in this way, has been a growing partnership among Latin American educators in exchanging and better utilizing existing resources. The activities of the OAS special task force on education, recently concluded, have emphasized deficiencies and problems facing Latin American universities and are offering useful suggestions for their correction. A meeting is just now closing in Mexico City which has brought together rectors from leading Latin American universities and presidents of major U.S. institutions, as well as foundations and multilateral agency bodies interested in Latin American higher education.

These university activities are in addition to participant training opportunities offered directly to approximately 1,500 Latin Americans by the U.S. Government each year. Many other governmental and non-governmental sources are helping to make it possible for approximately 10,000 Latin Americans to study in U.S. colleges and universities annually. The disparity between this number and a present university population in excess of 500,000 in Latin America indicates how little can be done to solve the Latin American university problem in terms of quantity alone, to say nothing of quality. Incidentally, the potentially eligible university population is 10 times larger than the actual student body if we use the U.S. ratio of students to eligible population as our criterion. Another significant comparison is that Latin America is estimated to have some 50,000 engineers and technicians in a population larger than that of the United States where we have more than 1 million such qualified people. Obviously, gigantic efforts must be made to improve Latin American institutions in each country.

The economic problem in increasing attendance can also be alleviated by institutions such as one in Colombia, providing low interest loans with deferred payments and access to foreign currency at a discount for those who study outside Colombia. AID has made a loan of $200,000 to this organization. A bill has been introduced in the Chilean Senate providing for a similar organization.

Another interesting development is that of regional junior colleges in Chile which will provide facilities during 2 years of higher education for provincial students who are prevented from attendance at universities by sheer distance. This effort is being supported by the U.S.-supplied Social Progress Trust Fund of the Inter-American Development Bank.

And, finally, there is a great potential which exists already in Latin American institutions if only there were greater mobility and cooperation between institutions in the same country, and regionally. The development of a regional council on higher education, known officially as the Superior Council of Universities of Central America is unquestionably the most heartening development in favor of a better utilization of insufficient resources in higher education. Instead of duplicating each other's curricula and facilities, instead of continuing to turn out a surplus of lawyers, these universities will work to complement each other's programs in an effort to turn out those specialists and experts that the five countries need most badly for their development as an integrated economic and social region.

V

I have sought tonight to describe in broad brush strokes the varied programs we are carrying on in cooperation with the great universities of this Nation to broaden the base and vary the fare of education on all levels throughout Latin America.

We attribute top priority to these programs. For the youth of Latin America today is threatened by despair and a trend toward nihilism. Its frustrations are making it increasingly easy prey to the seductive call to violence, voiced by extremists of both right and left, but particularly the left.

Our effort, under the Alliance for Progress, to build stronger economies would surely fail, if we were to neglect the equally vital task of helping to build open and vigorous societies. Latin America must provide room at and near the top for all those whose talents entitle them to play a meaningful and self-fulfilling role in the conduct of their nations' affairs. If Latin America's youth finds the opportunity to exchange dogmatism for pragmatism, to plot solutions instead of revolutions, to demonstrate results instead of merely demonstrating—we shall be on the road to success of the Alliance for Progress.

When I say "we," I do not merely speak of the United States but of all the 20 nations who make up the Alliance, signed its charter and thus committed themselves freely and independently to the objectives of the program. On our part, this means cooperation in terms of loans, grants and assistance in building the institutions of modern society. On the part of the Latin Americans, it means much more: it means providing the lion's share of the financial resources and undertaking the bold and often politically risky reforms that must come to Latin America if the hemisphere is to move into the 20th century—if the bulk of the peoples are to enjoy the rights and the opportunities that are the hallmarks of the modern free society.

In this vast endeavor, education is a key that unlocks many of the doors that are now closed. We continue to count on the support, the expert assistance and the guidance of you, the leaders and practitioners of education in this great democracy.

EDWARD P. MORGAN ESSAY CONTEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday I had the privilege of meeting the two national winners of the 1962–63 Edward P. Morgan essay contest. Top honors went to Miss Carla Lipsig, a freshman at Brandeis University, and Richard C. Frazier, a senior at Queens College in Flushing, N.Y., for their penetrating compositions on "Youth's Challenge in the Labor Market of the Sixties." Both were honored last Monday night at the 50th anniversary celebration of the founding of the Department of Labor. In addition, they will receive scholarships to gc on to graduate school.

Mr. President, I have read the essays of these two young people. They show a sharp insight into the very serious problems confronting our youth today. Both Miss Lipsig and Mr. Frazier stressed the obligation of society to youth, and of youth to themselves, to strive for educational excellence so that as newcomers to the labor force, they will possess marketable skills. This message has particular urgency today.

The Edward P. Morgan Essay Contest is held each year. It provides a real service by focusing the attention of our youth on important current topics. The caliber of this year's winners is an indication of its success, and I again congratulate them.

I might add, Mr. President, that one of the judges of this latest contest was our distinguished colleague, the senior senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the news release about the winners, plus their essays, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news release and essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVENTEEN-YEAR-OLD BRANDEIS CO-ED AND QUEENS COLLEGE NIGHT SCHOOL SENIOR ARE FIRST-PLACE WINNERS OF EDWARD P. MORGAN ESSAY CONTEST

Carla Lipsig, a 17-year-old freshman student at Brandeis University in Waltham, Mass., and Richard C. Frazier, a 32-year-old married senior attending night sessions at Queens College in Flushing, N.Y., have been judged winners of the 1962–63 Edward P. Morgan Essay Contest, it was announced today by ABC Radio Network President Robert R. Pauley.

The two top winners will receive graduate school scholarships and a visit to Washington where they will be special guests at a dinner Monday, March 4, celebrating the U.S. Department of Labor's 50th anniversary. Next Tuesday and Wednesday, they will meet, talk, and dine with the Nation's leading policymakers in the areas of Government, labor, education, and broadcasting.

Runners-up, each of whom will be awarded a 24-volume set of the new Collier's Encyclopedia, are: Mary Treacy, College of St. Katherine, St. Paul, Minn.; Sandra Lee Miller, San Francisco State College; Richard J. Cassidy, Sacred Heart Seminary, Detroit, Mich.; Dock (CQ) Burke, Jr., Texas A. & M. College, College Station, Texas; and Terry Segal, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass. They will be invited to attend regional functions celebrating the Labor Department's birthday.

The topic for the essay competition was "Youth's Challenge in the Labor Market of the Sixties."

Judges of the 1962–63 contest were Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz; Supreme Court Justice and former Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg; former Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell; former Labor Secretary Frances Perkins; Senator JACOB K. JAVITS of New York; AFL–CIO President George Meany; John McConnell, president of the University of New Hampshire and former dean of Cornell University's School of Industrial and Labor Relations; ABC newsman Edward P. Morgan; and Mr. Pauley.

All entries were subjected to preliminary screening by the Reuben H. Donnelley Corporation.

Miss Lipsig wants to become a labor lawyer. Her parents live in New York City. She has a recorded I.Q. of 173, and was graduated from Columbia Grammar School and Hunter College Elementary School before entering Brandeis.

Mr. Frazier is majoring in education, with heavy emphasis on history and political science. He completed 2 years at Princeton University, and currently attends night school. During the day, he is assistant manager of the mail order department at Tiffany's in New York City. He is married to the former Dorothy Reaser, a legal secretary.

ABC Radio and the AFL–CIO, sponsor of the network's "Edward P. Morgan and the News," were joined this year by the Labor Department in their association with the contest. Secretary Wirtz has commented that "Efforts like the Edward P. Morgan Essay Contest encourage thoughtful consideration by American youth of their own contribution to our Nation's goals."

YOUTH'S CHALLENGE IN THE LABOR MARKET OF THE SIXTIES

(By Carla Lipsig)

The challenge is twofold: it is presented by youth to the labor market; it is presented to youth by the labor market.

The challenge to youth is manifested most clearly by the fact that those under 20 in the labor market have the highest unemployment rate of any age group. And the trend seems likely to continue.

Automation creates a growing dilemma—not only is it displacing blue-collar workers, but is is encroaching upon white-collar jobs. The number of those engaging in competition for jobs is in an almost inverse ratio to the number of new jobs created by economic growth. New jobs are quickly swallowed up by workers displaced by technical advances elsewhere.

President Kennedy has pointed out that "in this era of rapidly changing industrial techniques and new approaches to many aspects of our economic life, the development of this Nation's skilled craftsmen is of vital importance to the continued national security and economic growth of the United States." The view, then, is dim indeed for those with a high school education or less, aspiring to jobs in this fiercely competitive labor market of the sixties.

Young people must meet this challenge by extending their education as far as possible, and by acquiring needed skills. But the cost of higher education is heavy. They cannot meet it alone. A more massive program must be adopted than has yet been proposed, of governmental aid to education, sholarships, loans, and grants.

The second challenge presented, therefore, is that the labor market is faced with the task of providing jobs for these many young, unemployed workers.

But the labor market in the United States is an inevitable outgrowth of our so-called free economy. For this reason, there is no social or governmental institution that can create jobs by fiat.

There are institutions that aid in channeling the course of economic development, notably the U.S. Department of Labor, but with limited power. As a Commissioner of Labor pointed out 78 years ago, "a bureau of labor cannot solve industrial or social problems, nor can it bring direct returns in a material way to the citizens of the country; but its work must be classed among educational efforts."

Therefore, it is the task of those directly or indirectly affected by the labor market, to assert what influence is possible to direct it toward its most productive state, an economy growing dynamically, at no less than a rate of 50 percent annual increase in productivity.

The burden of intelligent participation must lie with the more fully educated youth. His is the prize of a college education, carrying with it the broadening of his horizons, the deepening of his comprehension. To a lesser, but nevertheless important degree, this will also be true of the student who has had expanded vocational training. When he enters the labor market, he will not be an unknowing competitor. He will have an understanding of the market in which he is involved. Through this comprehension of its virtues and its vices, he will be able to criticize intelligently. In his union, his office, the school or university where he will teach, this well-educated youth has the ability to offer ideas to stimulate the economy, to harness automation, to decrease unemployment.

There is yet another, more abstract challenge that youth presents to the labor market, which lies in the fundamental nature of youth itself. Youth is of a new generation, and wants to wreak changes. It is energetic, it is optimistic. It loooks to the solution of internal ills through world peace and idealistic perfectionism. By its very nature, youth may bring vast, as yet unseen, changes to the labor market, changes yet unborn even in the minds of the new generation.

YOUTH'S CHALLENGE IN THE LABOR MARKET OF THE SIXTIES

(By Richard C. Frazier)

Whither American youth in the labor market of today and the remainder of this decade? With each passing month, this question assumes a greater and greater urgency. The challenge to American youth is not only that of the income which will be earned by each young man and woman, it is also that of dedication to, and support of, the American ideal and ethic. If American youth fails to answer this challenge in an affirmative and imaginative way, no degree of affluence and material well-being will suffice to preserve our heritage of freedom and democracy. Young, working America will be rich and self-satisfied; America, the Nation, will have lost her soul.

Enlightened and intelligent citizenship is a demanding responsibility. Voting and knowing the political issues of the day are only a small part of this obligation. True citizenship demands that each member of society develop his individual capacity to the utmost, as did the Greeks during the golden age of Athens. The young American worker facing the future owes it to himself, to his fellow citizens, and to the survival of his country to prepare himself as completely as his intellect and circumstance will permit. To sacrifice a longer period of training and mental cultivation for immediate personal gain or profit is not only a selfish and shortsighted decision, it also undermines the future development and existence of America. As President Kennedy so aptly remarked in his inaugural address, "Ask not what America can do for you, ask what you can do for America."

In today's fast moving world of technical progress and change, America and the youth of America are best served by a continuing growth of skills and training in the young worker. A grade or high school education is no longer a sufficient preparation for further acquisition of the skills that are necessary if the youth of America is to exploit its natural endowment to the fullest extent possible.

The young American who is undereducated is, in reality, a wasted natural resource. Today, brain power and intellect are assets that we can ill afford to lose; they are resources that are to be valued far above the more prosaic ones of metal and fiber with which nature so generously blessed this great land of ours. Today's youth will squander this greatest of all God's gifts only at his own risk and the peril of the United States. What, then, can youth do to meet this challenge? What manner of man will be needed in the future to answer the summons of destiny? Education and training, as has been suggested, are the font of future growth and progress both for the individual and the Nation. However, formal education is not the complete answer. Each American, after he has completed all the education that his own situation will allow, must never cease to grow and to nurture his skills and knowledge. Each achievement must be a spur to further study and learning. Curiosity, one of humanity's greatest boons, must not be allowed to wither; stasis and reaction are the cancers that have destroyed many civilizations in the past.

With educational maturity comes self-confidence and a belief in the power to accomplish just ends. The man who lacks a sense of adequacy cannot be expected to produce to his ultimate capacity. With freedom from a feeling of inferiority will come the power and the strength to meet the unknown, to accept the challenge of tomorrow, secure in the knowledge that he has heeded the stricture, "To thine own self be true."

OPPOSITION TO REMOVAL OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE OFFICE FROM AUGUSTA, MAINE, TO BOSTON, MASS.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the citizens of Augusta, Maine, are on the verge of having a Boston Tea Party of their own over the proposed drastic removal of Internal Revenue Service jobs from Augusta, Maine, to Boston, Mass., as announced by the Kennedy administration.

This movement of more to Massachusetts and Boston at the expense of the three northern New England States is but the latest development in the long established colonial attitude of Massachusetts and Bostonians toward Maine. Apparently it is still regarded as a mere colony of Massachusetts even though Maine broke off from Massachusetts on its own in 1820 and became a separate State.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the body of the RECORD at this point a telegram which I received this afternoon expressing the official views of the Augusta, Maine, City Council and the mayor of Augusta.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUSTA, MAINE, *March 7, 1963.*

Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Mayor Gilbert and the members of the Augusta City Council respectfully request your consideration in initiating an investigation of the reorganization of the Internal Revenue Service and your taking adequate steps in abating the move of eliminating local service here in Augusta. Should the reorganization be allowed the Federal savings of $5 million annually on the national level will affect economically not only the citizens of Augusta and the State of Maine but four of the six New England States. There are 53 residents of the city of Augusta that will be affected by the change. The city assessed valuation on their homes exceeds $419,000 representing over $14,000 of a municipal property tax income of the community the citizens of Augusta and private industries cannot absorb the unnecessary burden that will be placed upon them. It is fully realized that the President's tax cut proposal demands curtailment of certain Federal services but a cut of this nature will create local economic problems far beyond the community's ability to absorb. The local internal revenue office initially processes over 500,000 returns a year. Of these 200,000 are fully processed here in Augusta. The citizens of the State of Maine in paying an average of 20 percent of their salaries to the Federal Government for income tax alone are certainly entitled to direct personal service which can only be afforded them through a local office here in central Maine and not by satellite service from Boston.

PAUL G. POULIN,
City Clerk of the City of Augusta.

ALL-WEATHER SERVICE AT YORK, PA., AIRPORT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the March 1963 issue of Skyways magazine contains an article which I would like to bring to the attention of every Senator. The article describes the successful efforts of the York Airport, York, Pa., to provide the best service to its customers. As a result of 2 years of ingenious labor and a total expediture of about $5,000, the airport now provides its customers—40 aircraft—with all-weather capability. The improvement was brought about through the installation of a LF "H" homer. The owners and operators of the York Airport should be commended for taking this valuable step to improve air safety.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in question be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO YEARS PLUS $5,000 EQUALS LF HOMER FOR YORK—BUSINESS FLYING GETS AN ALL-WEATHER AIRPORT

(By Oscar L. Hostetter)

This is the story of how one business-flying airport, at a cost of 2 years of effort and about $5,000, provided all-weather capability to its customers through installation of an LF "H" homer.

York Airport, located 8 miles west of York, Pa., is the home base of 40 aircraft, 10 of them multiengine corporate airplanes with professional flight crews. Regular users of the field include 20 business firms which have plants or branches in York, 60 air taxi operators, more than 200 other business airplanes, and student and private pilots.

The airport was built in 1939, and in a major improvement program in 1955 a 4,200-by-100-foot macadam runway was constructed, along with a 120 by 152 hangar and 30 T-hangars. Three 72 by 80 hangars and one 40 by 72 hangar were already in existence.

With the opening of the new runway, York Airport's weather limitations became obvious. The absence of radio facilities forced uncounted flights to go elsewhere in bad weather; local operators often found themselves unable to return home when weather deteriorated.

The logical answer to the problem was a homing facility. Thus in January 1961 we began to explore the possibility of acquiring a TVOR. At the request of FAA we prepared studies of need, traffic potential, and other justifications, and in the end the Agency suggested we build our own facility in order to prove our instrument operation count and then request Federal aid.

In the meantime we learned that many people involved in accidents blame malfunctioning omnis and erroneous directional information for the mishaps, though few prove their case.

For these reasons, in November 1961 we decided an LF homer would be more desirable, less complicated, and less expensive, and made a formal request to FAA for a site survey.

An on-site inspection was made by the Agency the following January. In April a flight check and an airspace study indicated that there were no serious objections to location of a homer at York Airport, and minimums of 700 feet and 1 mile for circling were recommended.

At the same time we were given a suggested homer location by the Agency, but after considerable terrain study we found the location would not be satisfactory. Another site was chosen, and final site approval was granted on June 12, 1962.

We could not start to build, however. First we needed site survey and drawings, a land lease contract, airspace site approval, a 5-year FAA operational contract, and a contract by which we agreed to pay FAA $700 for ground and flight checks before commissioning (checks after commissioning are done for free).

By early August the installation was nearly complete, and FAA granted a frequency and power of 242 kilocycles at 25 watts. This allocation still had to be coordinated with the Federal Communications Commission, and the necessary FCC application was mailed in late August. The application was returned for additional information, which was supplied, and final FCC approval was granted on November 7.

On November 11 we went on the air on a test basis. FAA flew in on November 13 for flight testing, and pronounced themselves well pleased. The next step was to make eight copies of a manual of operations, and to locate a monitoring radio receiver to indicate any malfunction (off frequency or low power). Since the receiver must be monitored 24 hours a day, we arranged with the cooperation of York's mayor, to locate it in the city police department. York Airport was responsible for installation, maintenance, and operating expense.

On January 12, 1963, York Airport's LF homer was commissioned by FAA. After proper publication in the Federal Register, instrument approaches were authorized as of February 23.

Out-of-pocket cost for our homer was about $5,000, with the Pennsylvania Aeronautics Commission furnishing $2,600 of this amount. We held our costs down by leasing a surplus LF radio, keyer and monitor receiver from FAA—cost of this equipment new would be about $2,000.

A licensed radio technician to do the installation cost $500, and an 8-by-8-by-7-foot metal, insulated building to house the radio facility cost another $500.

The ground system consisted of stringing No. 8 copper wire underground in a 100-foot radius connected to 8-foot lightning rods driven below ground level. The antenna system was composed of two 60-foot poles 250° apart, dropping the feed from the center of the cable stretched between the poles. A 110-volt line was also necessary. Total cost of this installation was aproximately $1,500.

We estimate the annual operating cost of the homer at a few hundred dollars. Requirements include weekly functional checks, monthly maintenance checks which must be reported to FAA, and an FAA inspection each 6 months. The inspections must be conducted by an FCC-licensed radio

technician, and cost for this service will depend on location and circumstances. Cost of parts and electricity are modest, and in our case land rental is $100 a year.

The York homer has a range of about 60 miles with the identification code of THV. We are now working toward a straight-in approach with lower minimums, and we are in hopes that traffic one day will warrant installation of an omni near the airport.

Much effort went into establishment of this facility, but we feel the effort will be repaid in customer satisfaction.

SUPERFICIAL CHANGES IN RUSSIA DURING THE PAST DECADE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in the Tuesday, March 5, 1963, issue of the Wall Street Journal, William Henry Chamberlin reports on the superficial changes which have taken place over the past decade in Russia. Although the wilder excesses of Stalinism have been abated and some of the approaches altered, the Soviet Union still retains the same totalitarian framework it did 10 years ago. The ambitions of its rulers have not changed in that they will take as much as they can get until stopped with a strong show of force.

I ask unanimous consent that this article by William Henry Chamberlin be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUSSIA SINCE STALIN—THE CHANGES IN THE PAST DECADE HAVE BEEN MORE IN STYLE THAN IN SUBSTANCE

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

Ten years ago today, the death of Josef Stalin ended one of the longest and most frightful reigns of terror in recorded history. For a quarter of a century, from the time when Stalin eliminated his last political rivals until his death in the mystery-haunted Kremlin, scene of more than one bloody palace coup in medieval Russia, Stalin ruled the vast Soviet Empire with a pitiless savagery that challenges comparison with the most notorious Asiatic despots, Genghis Khan and Tamerlane, and, in Russian history, with Ivan the Terrible.

By comparison with Stalin's dictatorship, the reign of terror in the French Revolution was shortlived and seems almost humane. The number of his victims easily exceeds 10 million—4 million peasants deliberately starved to death in 1932–33 to break the resistance to collective farming; whole national communities uprooted and banished to slave labor; a million "kulak" families liquidated; many millions consigned to the bleak concentration camps of North Russia and Siberia; a huge number of veteran Communists slaughtered during his paranoid purges in the 1930's; 15,000 Polish war prisoners slaughtered in the Katyn Forest and elsewhere.

Two facts testify to the degree of terror which even the dead Stalin inspired. It was 3 years after his death before a word of criticism was publicly uttered in the Soviet Union, before Khrushchev delivered a much expurgated indictment of his crimes before a secret session of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party. Much more time elapsed before Stalin's embalmed body was removed from the Communist shrine which it had formerly shared with Lenin's on Moscow's Red Square. And it is only within the last few weeks that one of Stalin's greatest crimes, his slave labor concentration camps, was exposed in print in the Soviet Union in a grim novel by a former inmate.

CHANGES OF STYLE

During the 10 years since Stalin died, amid rumors that he was preparing still another purge, there have been unmistakable changes in the Soviet Union, some of substance, more of style and manner.

Stalin remained secluded in the Kremlin, many foreign ambassadors leaving Moscow without having met him. Khrushchev, on the other hand, strikes a gregarious pose, receiving individuals and delegations from abroad, making the round of embassy receptions, slapping journalists on the back and joking with them. Tension in everyday Soviet life has relaxed; an early morning knock is more likely to be the milkman than the policeman. Living conditions have improved, although not as fast as in the United States and Western Europe.

There is more, although strictly rationed, freedom of expression. Editors and poets like Tvardovsky and Yevtushenko can voice thoughts that would have got them sent to a concentration camp in Stalin's time.

Yet, with full recognition of these changes, the totalitarian framework of Soviet society remains basically untouched. A self-perpetuating Communist bureaucracy is the source of all power. There is no freedom of political discussion. Elections are farces, with one handpicked list of candidates to vote for. The Iron Curtain is no empty figure of speech. Moscow is the only large European capital where it is impossible to buy the leading newspapers of the United States and Great Britain. An enormous amount of labor and technical resources is devoted to jamming foreign radio broadcasts in Russia.

The status of the peasants remains what it has been since the introduction of collective farming, that of serfs, with the state as their landlord, telling them how they must work, what they must plant, how much they may receive for their produce, although, again like the serfs who were liberated a century ago, they are permitted to sell their garden produce freely.

The death penalty for "economic offenses," in many cases for what would be called initiative under a free economy, has been extended. A new instrument of tyranny is the organized youth group, going about and checking up on so-called antisocial behavior, from decadent jazz to western hairdos. Although the wilder excesses of Stalinism have abated, the Soviet Union remains a tightly governed police state, with a minority of rulers dictating to a majority of ruled.

ATTEMPTS AT INTIMIDATION

Subtler and more sophisticated than Stalin in his methods, Khrushchev loves to repeat such attractive sounding words as peace and coexistence. Yet, ever since the Suez crisis, he has tried again and again to use Soviet possession of missiles and rockets as a means of intimidation. In 1961 he threatened to blow up the Acropolis. More recently, in an insulting communication to Chancellor Adenauer, he boasted that West Germany, in the event of war, would "burn like a candle."

Since Suez, the "peace loving" Soviet Government has threatened 20 countries, on 130 occasions, with its nuclear weapons. Khrushchev repeatedly tried, fortunately without success, to frighten the United States out of standing by its treaty obligations to the Chinese Nationalists and to West Berlin. The memory of his attempted nuclear blackmail in Cuba is much too recent to be forgotten, especially in view of the continuing Soviet effort to turn Cuba into a hostile military and subversion base against the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

There have been changes in the Soviet Union since Stalin's death and there will probably be more. But there has been no basic alteration in the nature of the Soviet State or in the ambitions of its rulers which would warrant the least letting down of America's guard. In periods of comparative lull, our policymakers would be well advised to remember the shrewd observation of Britain's famous Foreign Secretary, Lord Palmerston, to another Victorian statesman, Lord Clarendon:

"The policy and practice of the Russian Government have always been to push forward its encroachments as fast and as far as the apathy or want of firmness of other governments would allow it to go, but always to stop and retire when it met with decided resistance, and then to wait for the next favorable opportunity to make another spring on its intended victim."

IMMIGRATION POLICY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on February 8 I proposed legislation, on behalf of myself and 34 other Senators, to replace the national origins quota system of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. Several Members of the House have introduced similar bills. And from across the country there is a growing favorable response to our proposed legislation—S. 747—from private organizations and individual citizens. As I said in my introductory remarks, the impressive support for S. 747 evidences a growing public awareness of the need for immigration reform, and an evolving consensus as to the kind of reform that is needed.

The bill is based on a reasonable and factual approach to the problem and need of determining an equitable and useful immigration policy for America. It is the product of diligent and serious thought. It follows the counsel of America's foremost immigration specialists. It is in line with the estimates of our leading economists, both in government and the private sector, regarding the number and kind of immigrants this country's economy can profitably absorb.

I want to emphasize this latter point, Mr. President, because there is a sincere concern in some quarters over the potential economic impact of our proposed legislation. Unquestionably, the economic aspects of immigration are complex—I would be the first to say it. But I would also make it abundantly clear that S. 747 has not been introduced without thoughtful consideration by its sponsors of our economic situation and the hard facts of our complex technological economy. We believe this program would enhance our economic growth, help stimulate our economy, and generate employment opportunities during this decade of development. The best data available substantiates our conviction. And I am hopeful that when hearings are held on the bill, the facts will be spread on the record in greater detail.

In this connection, Mr. President, I call to the attention of Senators two excellent statements on the economic aspects of immigration. The first, by Raymond D. Larson, assistant to the Director of the Labor Department's Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, is the substance of an address before the annual meeting of the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference in October 1962. The second, by

Frank L. Mott, also of the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training, appeared in the November 20, 1962, issue of Manpower Report, a publication of the Department of Labor.

These statements boil down to two points. First, immigration can help alleviate our shortage of manpower in the central age range of 24 through 44. Secondly, immigration can bring to the United States large numbers of people who possess skill and talent our economy sorely needs. Recent trends indicate clearly that an increasingly high proportion of immigrants are in the central age range of 24 through 44, the prime years of their working life, and, as Mr. Larson points out, "that the proportion of immigrants with a high degree of skill has gone up significantly in the last 10 years." Additionally, it has been determined that on the average only 47 percent of the yearly influx of immigrants enters the labor force.

That America will continue to need the economic stimulation immigration historically has given was graphically pictured before a House subcommittee studying this problem last fall by Dr. Seymour L. Wolfbein, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Employment and Manpower of the Department of Labor. He pointed out that the favorable prognosis for job opportunities over the next decade would not be upset if the current level of immigration is maintained. He even suggested a slight increase in admissions during this period would be a boon, in terms of economic growth, if the skill level and occupational composition of added immigration fell in categories of need. A major objective of S. 747 is to eliminate present obstacles to the admission of such immigrants.

Mr. President, if recent immigration trends continue, and we have every reason to believe they will, the enactment of S. 747 is highly desirable from the standpoint of economic growth. It removes the discriminatory aspects of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, and updates this law to conform with the needs of our time. It stresses the admission of exceptional immigrants, in addition to the reunion of families. It does not substantially alter the current level of immigration, which, incidentally, is not being achieved under the act of 1952 but through a series of special enactments to circumvent the strictures and inequities of our basic statute.

I commend to Senators the timely statements of Mr. Larson and Mr. Mott, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Refugees and Immigrants Constitute a Peace Corps in Reverse, Helping Us With Their Skills

(By Raymond D. Larson)

The basic philosophy and ideas behind the Peace Corps, it seems to me, are closely related to those of the groups which favor liberalization of American immigration policies. The Peace Corps believes that by sending people with skills and knowledge to developing nations we can help them to develop their economies, create a better life for their citizens.

If this idea works for the Peace Corps—and it does—then it must also work in reverse; it must be true that people with skills and knowledge coming from other countries can help us to improve our economy and to raise the cultural and material levels of our people. It was hardly necessary to say this to the groups represented at the recent annual meeting of the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference. They have broadcast this idea for many years and have furnished thousands of dramatic examples of persons who have contributed enormously to the welfare and security of the United States. Indeed, it is difficult to understand, with all the examples of invaluable contributions on the part of immigrants, why it is so hard to sell liberalized immigration. However, let us look at one argument often used by those who oppose it.

Ignoring the people who are against liberalizing immigration because of prejudice and intolerance, there are those who are opposed because they strongly believe that additional immigrants will add to our problem of unemployment. This argument, while it appears logical, does not stand up when subjected to reasonable analysis. It is similar, as a matter of fact, to the argument—so often presented—that the way to solve our unemployment problems is to deny jobs to women.

The people who use this approach seem unaware that the elimination of women from the labor force would result not only in the loss of most of our elementary school teachers, nearly all our nurses, and virtually 100 percent of our stenographers and secretaries, but would bring about no discernible reduction in the number of unemployed. Unemployment does not always mean a shortage of jobs; it sometimes indicates lack of knowledge, skills, and abilities on the part of those who are unemployed.

We in the Department of Labor are becoming increasingly conscious of the fact that it is possible for substantial unemployment and numerous job openings to exist side by side. We are now moving into high gear on the retraining programs passed by Congress in the last couple of years and have discovered that even in labor surplus areas there are many jobs available for persons with proper training. To date the record of placement under the Area Redevelopment Act's training program, for example, has been about 60 percent of those who have been trained. Sixty percent does not seem like a remarkable achievement until we remind ourselves that this training and job placement is taking place in areas of the United States where economic activity is at its lowest ebb and where there has been a surplus of workers over a period of many years.

It is clear from this experience that there are a great many jobs in the United States that go unfilled because persons with proper skills are not available. To the extent that immigrants coming into the United States have these needed skills, they do not affect the number of persons on the unemployment rolls. Actually, finding jobs for refugees and immigrants has been much easier than was expected.

FOUR POSITIVE VALUES

Having said that the effect of the immigrants on unemployment is not nearly as serious as is commonly supposed, I should like to outline very briefly four positive values that the United States gains from its immigrants. I should like to make clear that these are economic values and that the obvious and important humanitarian and democratic values are barely touched upon.

1. During the next decade the immigrants can help us to make up for a shortage of people in the central age ranges from ages 25 through 44. This shortage has arisen because during the 1930's, the depression decade, the number of children born in the United States fell off sharply. The babies of the 1930's are now the men and women who are between 30 and 40 years of age. This age group is the one which supplies many of the skilled workers, foremen, executive trainees and middle management personnel in the United States, an age group relied on very heavily by employers. A much higher proportion of our immigrants are in the 25 through 44 age range. This is demonstrated by the age distribution of the immigrants in 1961 compared with the age distribution of our national population.

Age distribution of population in the United States and of immigrants admitted to the United States

	U.S. population in 1960 (thousands)		Immigrants admitted to United States, 1961[1]	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	179,323	100.0	271,344	100.0
Under 15	55,786	31.1	61,562	22.7
15 to 24	24,020	13.4	74,414	27.4
25 to 34	22,818	12.7	66,832	24.6
35 to 44	24,081	13.4	32,617	12.0
45 and over	52,618	29.3	35,919	13.2
Male	88,331	100.0	121,380	100.0
Under 15	28,358	32.1	31,102	25.6
15 to 24	11,906	13.5	26,772	22.1
25 to 34	11,179	12.7	31,412	25.9
35 to 44	11,756	13.3	16,049	13.2
45 and over	25,132	28.5	16,045	13.2
Female	90,992	100.0	149,964	100.0
Under 15	27,427	30.1	30,460	20.3
15 to 24	12,114	13.3	47,642	31.8
25 to 34	11,639	12.8	35,420	23.6
35 to 44	12,326	13.5	16,568	11.0
45 and over	27,486	30.2	19,874	13.3

[1] Data on immigrants are compiled on a fiscal year basis. For 1961, the period covered is July 1, 1960, through June 30, 1961.

Source: Age Distribution of U.S. Population, Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, U.S. Census of Population, 1960. Age Distribution of Immigrants Admitted to United States, annual report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, 1961.

2. The second point which makes the immigrants valuable to us from an economic point of view, is that they are bringing to the United States in large numbers the kinds of skills we need. For example, one of our most serious occupational shortages has been a lack of engineers. During the last decade 31,000 immigrant engineers have entered our country. While this does not seem like such a large figure by itself, it does represent 80 percent of the number of engineers graduated from U.S. schools in the year 1961. Moreover, during the last 10 years more than 100,000 immigrants entering this country have possessed skills declared to be in critically short supply in the United States. Finally, in this connection, it is interesting to note that the proportion of immigrants with a high degree of skill has gone up significantly in the last 10 years. There were, for example, 20 percent more engineers entering the country in 1961 than in 1952 and 84 percent more technicians.

VALUE OF EDUCATION

3. A third point in favor of immigrants, and one which is receiving increasing attention from economists, is the economic value of educated people. In recent years economists and other social scientists have begun to recognize that much of the wealth which we had formerly attributed to resources and capital equipment really came from education. It has been demonstrated, for example, that solely from the point of view of the individual, investment in elementary education provides a rate of return upward of 30 percent, and high school education a return of about 15 percent, and college a return of nearly 10 percent. These calculations exclude the value of educated persons to the community, which is probably much greater than the value to the individuals themselves. If this is true, then every educated immigrant who comes to our shores brings with him a potentially significant contribution to our economic and social welfare.

4. Finally, and perhaps most important, the value of immigrants to the United States increases as nations reach out to their neighbors more and more with each passing year. Increasing internationalism makes the immigrant of today much more valuable to the United States than the immigrant of 50 years ago in terms of our relationships with and our understanding of the rest of the world. Our diversified national backgrounds provide the United States with a national asset of incalculable value, both economic and humanitarian. In many parts of the world we have a deep reservoir of good will which is directly related to the fact that the people have direct personal ties with our citizens. Admission of immigrants from additional countries would enable us to share similar warm basic relationships with other people.

[From USDA Manpower Report, Nov. 20, 1962]

Manpower and Immigration

The number of immigrant workers entering the United States in any single year in the postwar period represented a small proportion of the total labor force. However, many immigrants who came in the prewar and postwar periods were able to make important contributions to our economy because, before they arrived, they were fully trained for occupations which were in great demand. While the individual contributions of such notable figures as Enrico Fermi, Albert Einstein, Felix Frankfurter, Igor Sikorsky, and Eugene Ormandy are outstanding, this country has also benefited from the day-to-day work of the many lesser-known professional, technical, and skilled workers who have entered America in recent years.

IMMIGRANT CHARACTERISTICS

In the late 19th and early 20th century, the flow of immigrants satisfied the needs for unskilled and semiskilled labor in developing industries such as coal mining, steel, apparel, meatpacking, and transportation. In contrast, many of the post-World War II immigrants were equipped to satisfy the occupational requirements of our more complex and advanced economy. Of all immigrant workers arriving since 1947, about one of every three reported that his occupation was in a professional, technical, or skilled category.

Of the 3.5 million immigrants who entered the United States from 1947 through 1961, about half were reported as having occupational attachments. (See table 1.) The remainder were primarily housewives, young persons, and retired people.

OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION

About 16 percent, or more than a quarter of a million of the immigrants who reported their occupations during the 1947–61 period were in the professional and technical categories, whereas, professional and technical workers in the Nation's employed labor force averaged only about 9 percent during that period. About one of every six immigrants in the postwar period was reported as a skilled worker. Approximately one out of every eight American workers was employed as a craftsman from 1947 through 1961. The proportion of all immigrant workers classified as professional and technical workers has been consistently higher than the percentage of American workers classified in these occupations, for every year since 1947. For skilled workers, this has been true since 1949.

Unskilled laborers accounted for about 10 percent of the immigrant group. In the Nation as a whole, laborers average about 6 percent of the civilian labor force during this 15-year period.

The occupational distribution of post-World War II immigrants coincided with the needs of our economy and also reflected somewhat, some of the changes made in immigration policy. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 gave first preference to immigrants "of special skills or ability who would be substantially beneficial to the national economy, cultural interests or welfare of the United States." This contrasts with the first preference which was given to skilled agriculturists in the 1924 Immigration Act.

IMMIGRANTS IN CRITICAL OCCUPATIONS

The potential contribution to the Nation's workforce is illustrated by the number of immigrants who entered with occupations similar to those classified as critical, or those considered to be in short supply by the Technical Committee on Critical Occupations of the U.S. Department of Labor. These occupations are used by the Selective Service System in determining deferments in the national interest. From 1952 to 1961, over 100,000 immigrants in such critical occupational areas as engineering, physics, nursing, and tool- and die-making entered this country. (See table 2.)

The proportion of immigrants in the occupations in short supply has been higher in recent years than in the early 1950's. Although the number of immigrant workers admitted in 1952 was about the same as in 1961, the number of engineers was 20 percent higher in 1961, and the number of technicians was 84 percent more than those who entered in 1952.

Some immigrants first enter occupations which require less skill, education, or training than those in which they had worked in their native lands. After overcoming problems such as language and licensing requirements, they are frequently able to move into the occupations for which they were originally trained.

In some cases, immigrants may not be able to make their full contribution to our economy and society until they receive special assistance in the form of retraining and education. Efforts have been made in many localities to help immigrants make the necessary adjustments to their new environment. Some of these programs have been particularly successful in assisting immigrants to secure employment in occupations which are the same, or related to, the occupations in which they had experience in their native countries. Localities which establish training programs can, in many cases, help expedite and increase the contributions of immigrants to our society.

The training of professional and technical workers represents a heavy economic investment for the people of a country. As indicated earlier, many immigrants are fully trained when they arrive. The receiving country benefits from the education and training which were acquired in the country of the immigrant's origin. Thus, the United States received immigrants who brought with them not only a willingness to work but a diversified knowledge, education, and training which were needed throughout the economy.

During the 1952–61 period, the United States profited when its supply of engineers was increased by more than 30,000 immigrants with training in the engineering field. (See table 2.) In this same period, over 300,000 U.S. students earned their first degree in engineering. The immigrant engineers, during this 10-year period were almost equivalent in number to the entire 1961 graduating class of U.S. engineers (35,860) who earned their first degree.

Some 14,000 immigrant physicians and surgeons and about 28,000 nurses helped alleviate the shortage of trained workers in the critical medical field in the 1952–61 period. About 4,900 chemists and nearly 1,100 physicists contributed their technical know-how to industry and government. According to the recent National Science Foundation publication, "Scientific Manpower from Abroad," (NSF 62–24), 15 of the 40 U.S. Nobel Prize winners in the fields of chemistry and physics were foreign born. Six of the foreign born received their prizes before immigrating to this country.

More than 12,000 immigrant technicians, the vitally needed workers who assist and support scientists and engineers, were also admitted during the 1952–61 period. About 9,000 machinists and 7,000 tool and die makers added their skills to our supply of craftsmen.

In terms of year-to-year occupational changes, the number of trained and educated immigrants who enter the country may be significant. For example, if all the professional and technical workers who entered the United States in 1961 worked in their respective occupations that year, they would account for nearly 10 percent of the increase over the preceding year in that occupational group. The comparable figure for skilled craftsmen would be an increase of 28 percent.

AGE DISTRIBUTION

A higher proportion of immigrants are in the prime years of their working life than the U.S. population as a whole. About 37 percent of all immigrants who entered the country in 1961 were in the 25–44 age group. Only about 26 percent of the U.S. population was in that age group in 1960. Approximately 40 percent of the male immigrants were between the ages of 25 to 44, whereas, only about 26 percent of the U.S. men were in that age group.

As shown in the following table, if recent trends in the age distribution of immigrants continue throughout the 1960's, immigrants could contribute significantly to alleviating the expected shortage in the prime working age group 35–44 in the United States in the coming decade.

Estimated changes in the number of workers in each age group from 1960 to 1970, with and without immigration

[In millions]

	With immigration	Without immigration
Total, all ages	12.6	11.1
Under 25	6.2	5.9
25 to 34	1.6	1.1
35 to 44	−.3	−.7
45 and over	5.1	4.8

Workers in the 35–44 age group represent a crucial group whose leadership, management know-how, skills, and experience are needed in our economy. Because of declining birth rates during the 1930's, the number of workers expected in this age group would be 700,000 fewer in 1970 than in 1960 if there were no immigration. With immigration continuing at the current level, however, this key age group would decline by only 300,000.

Frank L. Mott,
Division of Manpower Requirements and Resources.

TABLE 1.—*Number and percent distribution of immigrants by broad occupational groups for 1947–61 and for selected years*

[Fiscal years]

Occupational groups	Total, 1947 through 1961		1961		1954		1947	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total admitted	3,542,189	100.0	271,344	100.0	208,177	100.0	147,292	100.0
With occupation	1,671,003	47.2	123,688	45.6	96,110	46.2	65,583	44.5
No occupation	[1] 1,871,186	52.8	135,704	50.0	[1] 112,067	53.8	[1] 81,709	55.5
No occupation reported	(1)		11,952	4.4	(1)		(1)	
With occupation [2]	[1] 1,671,003	100.0	123,688	100.0	96,110	100.0	65,583	100.0
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	263,018	15.7	21,455	17.3	13,817	14.4	10,891	16.6
Farmers and farm managers	87,083	5.2	3,002	2.4	3,846	4.0	3,462	5.3
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	83,346	5.0	5,363	4.3	5,296	5.5	5,886	9.0
Clerical, sales, and kindred workers	283,432	17.0	25,198	20.4	16,018	16.7	13,961	21.3
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	268,555	16.1	17,679	14.3	15,396	16.0	8,726	13.3
Operatives and kindred workers	238,141	14.3	13,288	10.8	16,755	17.4	10,580	16.1
Private household workers	129,643	7.8	8,811	7.1	8,096	8.4	4,922	7.5
Service workers, except private household	95,851	5.7	8,399	6.8	5,203	5.4	3,882	5.9
Farm laborers and foremen	53,792	3.2	4,799	3.9	1,622	1.7	442	.7
Laborers, except farm and mine	168,142	10.1	15,694	12.7	10,061	10.5	2,831	4.3

[1] "No occupation" includes "No occupation reported" group.

[2] Includes immigrants age 14 years and over.

Source: Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE 2.—*Number of immigrants in selected critical occupations admitted each year, 1952–61* [1]

[Fiscal years]

Occupation	Total, 1952–61	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954	1953	1952
Biological scientists	420	48	53	57	56	51	35	36	23	34	27
Chemists	4,899	551	504	645	626	668	494	351	383	276	401
Dentists	1,271	119	110	99	129	132	159	113	116	103	191
Engineers	30,373	2,868	3,338	3,936	4,008	4,524	2,794	2,067	2,391	2,059	2,388
Geologists and geophysicists	474	66	42	59	58	62	51	41	34	31	30
Mathematicians	243	24	31	29	32	35	17	18	14	22	21
Nurses	28,235	3,449	3,828	3,620	3,729	3,517	3,064	1,864	1,502	1,796	1,866
Physicians and surgeons	14,340	1,683	1,574	1,630	1,934	1,990	1,388	1,046	1,040	845	1,210
Physicists	1,096	151	162	155	145	128	75	75	74	73	58
College professors and instructors	3,147	500	367	340	352	372	290	173	184	252	317
Teachers, not specified	19,278	2,686	2,532	2,670	2,471	2,304	655	1,549	1,356	1,227	1,828
Technicians	12,217	1,635	1,632	1,821	1,346	1,553	1,095	840	804	602	889
Machinists	9,025	819	993	1,476	836	1,393	1,106	594	488	583	737
Toolmakers, diemakers and setters	7,250	460	706	654	858	1,150	894	587	760	675	506
Pattern and model makers, except paper	501	26	34	25	63	123	118	60	32	13	7

[1] The occupational categories listed in this table are those which immigrants reported on their arrival in the United States. It was not possible in a few instances, because of lack of sufficient occupational detail to make a precise match with the occupations which appear on the list of currently critical occupations as determined by the Technical Committee on Critical Occupations of the U.S. Department of Labor. For this reason, totals are not shown.

Source: 1959 through 1961: Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice. 1952 through 1958: Data furnished by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

JOHAN LUDVIG RUNEBERG

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Tuesday, March 5, marked the 159th anniversary of the birth of Johan Ludvig Runeberg, the great 19th-century Scandinavian poet. A Finn who wrote in Swedish, Runeberg is honored as the national poet of Finland, and his writings are also well known in Sweden.

Runeberg's father was an impoverished merchant sea captain, so the talented young man supported his studies at the University of Abo by giving private instruction. Runeberg later combined a distinguished academic career with belles-lettres. He also founded a Helsinki newspaper, which he edited with great success. In 1847 he became rector of an advanced secondary school in Borga—now Porvoo—and a year later the first part of his greatest work was published. This is a series of narrative poems whose motif is the Finnish war of independence in 1808. The poem adopted as the Finnish national anthem appears in this patriotic work.

These poems brought Runeberg great fame, and he was proclaimed Finland's national poet. They also forged strong ties with Sweden by recalling the role which Sweden has played in the Finnish war of independence. As a Finn writing in Swedish, Runeberg remains one of the main sources of friendship between the two Scandinavian neighbors. Blessed be the memory of this great poet who combined the qualities of patriotism and national amity.

THE GRAND RIVER BASIN OF MISSOURI

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the northwest part of our State a great newspaper is determined that the decline and fall of the Middle West is not inevitable; and therefore this paper is doing its best to acquaint the citizens of that area with the facts, so these people in turn can gather together, and work together, to prevent occurring in the 1960's what has happened to that area in the past decade.

During that time every county but one of the some 17 counties in the Grand River Basin in Missouri lost population—a tragic situation indeed in this the most prosperous Nation in world history.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a recent article "What's Ahead for the Grand River Basin" from the St. Joseph News-Press be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S AHEAD FOR THE GRAND RIVER BASIN?—ENGINEERS ENVISION NOT ONLY FLOOD CONTROL BUT ALSO CREATION OF A VAST WATER RECREATIONAL AREA

(By Robert L. Slater)

A comprehensive plan for development of the water resources of the Grand River Basin may hold the key to the future prosperity of northwest Missouri.

This plan, now nearing completion in the Army Corps of Engineers offices in Kansas City, offers far more than flood control benefits for the area, located east of St. Joseph.

Flood control itself is a highly significant factor, of course. In a 20-year period from 1942, Grand River Basin floods have caused more than $60 million in estimated damages.

But the six-reservoir development plan, including also 230 miles of levee and channel improvement work, goes far beyond flood control.

RECREATIONAL AREA

It would mean creation of a recreational area with a potential comparable with that of the Lake of the Ozarks. Six manmade lakes resulting from the dams built along the Grand and its major tributaries would provide water for swimming, boating, water skiing, fishing, and fish and wildlife conservation.

They also would provide a guarantee of an adequate water supply for the entire area, a vital point in the highly competitive battle to attract new industry.

It would mean a relative stabilization of the now erratic flow of the Grand River, with a consequent improvement in the quality of the water supply.

Fulfillment of the minimum plan would be at an estimated cost in excess of $170 million, with most of the expense borne by the Federal Government.

INTEREST NEEDED

But the multiple benefits to be derived from this plan would more than offset the costs, according to data now being compiled by the Engineers in Kansas City.

Whether this entire plan will be realized depends on how much the people in this part of the State are interested in its tremendous possibilities.

It depends in many respects on their vision: How well they may be able to see what this completed plan will mean for an area that now is suffering from a population decline, an area that now is fighting an uphill battle in the effort to attract new industry.

The Grand River Basin is an area 150 miles long and 90 miles wide, starting in southern Iowa and extending south toward the Missouri River as it flows across the State to the east.

On maps prepared by the Corps of Engineers, the western edge of the leaf- or fan-shaped Grand River Basin is only about 20 miles east of St. Joseph. The basin takes in the northwest Missouri counties of Worth, Harrison, Mercer, Gentry, Daviess, Grundy, Livingston, Caldwell, Linn, and Sullivan; substantial portions of De Kalb, Clinton, Putnam, Carroll, and Chariton, and small sections of Nodaway and Ray Counties.

It is an area where development of water resources is falling far behind.

The accompanying map indicates the many projects either already completed or under way in the Kansas City district of the Corps of Engineers. Throughout northwest Missouri, there is a clear absence of such improvements.

A POPULATION LINK

And many people will insist there is a significant relationship between this and the decline in population in northwest Missouri from 1950 to 1960. While the rest of the Nation was achieving a rapid population growth, and Missouri itself was showing an 8.6 percent rise, every county in the Grand River Basin suffered a population loss in the decade.

The Grand River Basin project is described by Sam Farney, a planning engineer in the Kansas City district, as "a long-range opportunity to change the economy of the area."

The Grand River itself begins in Iowa, near Greenfield, and empties into the Missouri at Brunswick. The comprehensive plan for development of the Grand River Basin would mean work also on the major tributaries of the Grand, including the Weldon and Thompson Rivers and Locust, Yellow, and Shoal Creeks.

The Grand River project is similar to, but on a smaller scale than, the mammoth one now nearing completion on the upper Missouri River. The Grand River project, as the one on the Missouri, fits into the Corps of Engineers aim to gain maximum benefits from the Nation's water supplies.

These goals were explained to Arthur V. Burrowes, editor of the News-Press & Gazette, and this reporter on recent trips to the Missouri River division offices of the Corps of Engineers, at Omaha, and the district office in Kansas City.

Through development of the six reservoirs and 230 miles of levee and channel improvements, the Army Engineers hope to accomplish these results in the Grand River Basin:

Flood control, with significant flooding no more frequent than once each 50 years.

Recreational use, including boating, fishing, and swimming.

Adequate regulated water supply, sufficient for municipal and industrial demands.

Improvement of water quality.

Preservation of fish and wildlife.

How the Engineers hope to do this, what it will mean to the area, and other significant facts will be discussed in subsequent articles.

Development of the comprehensive basin plan would mean setting up a minimum flow of perhaps 1,000 cubic feet per second on the Grand River. "We can do it" says Mr. Farney, planning engineer in the Kansas City district of the Corps of Engineers.

The Grand River Basin plan, Engineers are convinced, offers help toward meeting many of the problems now facing this entire area.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, just as no nation can survive without an adequate supply of clean fresh water, so no area can maintain its position unless that water is made available to its citizens.

I am certain my colleagues will be both willing and anxious to allow the residents of the great Grand River Basin of Missouri the benefits of the same water development that has been and is being granted to other parts of our State and Nation.

ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF "CHAMP" CLARK

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, today marks the 113th birth anniversary of the late Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, James Beauchamp "Champ" Clark, 12-term Congressman from my home district in northeast Missouri—the same district that has, for the past 40 years, been served so ably by our dear friend and trusted colleague, Representative CLARENCE CANNON.

The legend of "Champ" Clark has been told many times. It is the story of a man whose devotion to public duty so far transcended the ordinary that it will still be retold over and over in generations yet unborn. And when the day comes, as surely it must for every mortal man, when his name is lost in the obscurity of time, "Champ" Clark's contributions to the free and democratic institutions of government will continue living as never-ending service to his fellow man.

Bowling Green, Mo., was his hometown—as it is mine. We in Bowling Green are proud of our fellow townsman, as are all Missourians proud of this man from our State, who gave so much to our Nation. Many of our colleagues will also remember his son, the late Joel Bennett Clark, who served Missouri here in the Senate from 1933 to 1945.

But there is something beyond pride that we feel—and that is a feeling I am certain is shared, consciously or unconsciously, by all Americans today, and in all of the future. That is deep thankfulness for his leadership and guidance in helping to formulate and construct the very foundations of freedom, justice, and dignity in the institutions of our great system of American Government.

FOREIGN POLICY PROBLEMS IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, one of America's outstanding editors, Mr. William R. Mathews, of the Arizona Daily Star, is at the same time one of our most perceptive students of foreign policy. No armchair reasoner, Mr. Mathews backs up his arguments with annual trips to the remote and not so remote corners of our world to gain firsthand information on the status of our policy and at the same time to further his understanding of those corners. Recently he and 12 other editors visited Venezuela during the course of which visit he wrote of his observations in a series of articles for his newspaper published in Tucson, Ariz. He also made an address before the Pan Am Management Club touching on our responsibilities in this hemisphere and on the problems of our neighbors to the south.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles and Mr. Mathews' address be printed in the RECORD at this place in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Jan. 26, 1963]

EDITORS OFF ON TOUR OF VENEZUELA—THEY'LL GET TO LISTEN TO THE OPPOSITION

(By William R. Mathews)

(NOTE.—This is the first article of several which will be written by William R. Mathews, editor of the Star, on a trip to Venezuela. Others will appear as they are received.)

EN ROUTE TO NEW YORK AND CARACAS, VENEZUELA, JANUARY 20.—This is the first story on a junket of 13 editors from around the country, and 2 magazines, but no newspaper editors from New York City. We come from Montreal, Buffalo, Detroit, Memphis, Seattle, Los Angeles, Vancouver, Wash., Salt Lake City, and Tucson. We have just taken off in a Convair 880 at 3:50 p.m. and are due to arrive in Caracas at 8 p.m.

Tomorrow, Monday, we will start going to school again. For a week we are going to listen to lectures on Venezuela by college professors of Venezuela, political leaders, including the official opposition, economists, and finally by President Betancourt. The following week we will spend touring the country from Lake Maracaibo, the great oil-producing region, to the iron-ore mines on the Orinoco River to Island Margarita, which lies off the north shore of Venezuela. Everywhere we go we will meet and talk with very important Venezuelans, and, not the least, all travel will be deluxe.

We are traveling as guests of the Venezuelan Government in a study group sponsored by Stanford University. Of course, the objective is to brainwash us on Venezuela. However, President Betancourt, who some years ago was a Communist in Costa Rica, and who looms up as the first President in the history of Venezuela to finish his 5-year term, to which he was elected in December, has insisted that his opposition be heard by us.

My trip from Tucson to New York yesterday was interesting. We made Chicago in 2½ hours, thanks to a good tailwind. But we landed in Chicago amidst a typical Chicago winter snowstorm. It was 10 above, with only a 500-foot ceiling amid the falling snow. In the airport, it was interesting to see how men, women, and children of Chicago and points north manage to live like polar bears. They dress for it with galoshes, furs, heavy coats and headdress, mittens, and gloves.

All I saw looked vigorously healthy and quite unconcerned about the snow and cold, and that included babies in their mothers' arms.

Ninety minutes after we took off for New York, the picture changed. The ceiling was 800 feet. We landed in a light rain. The temperature was above freezing. Most everybody wore heavy overcoats, but there were few furs and galoshes.

This morning as I was going down to breakfast in the Waldorf who should I run into but Jim Farley. He recognized me and called me by name. Only Arizona's Henry Ashurst could excel him in connecting names with faces. Although he is 75, he looks as trim and fit as a man of 60. This meeting reminded me of his numerous phone calls of 1932 "B.C."—before the convention that nominated F.D.R. He used to address me, "Hello, Mr. Editor."

This morning he asked, "How do you account for the way that Barry Goldwater runs so strong in Arizona, while Carl Hayden gets such a good vote?"

My answer was "It's the women's vote."

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Jan. 28, 1963]

Tension Mounts as Venezuela Ballot Nears—So Far President Betancourt Has Been Able To Weather Leftwing Trouble

(By William R. Mathews)

(Editor's Note.—This is the second article of several which will be written by William R. Mathews, Star editor, on a trip to Venezuela. The third will appear Tuesday.)

Caracas, Venezuela, January 23.—There is a bit of political tension in this capital city that may come to a head today on the fifth anniversary of the overthrow of the dictatorship, and the rise of the democratic government headed by President Betancourt.

The tension has been growing steadily. Last week was marked by the bold theft of several paintings, loaned by the French to the local museum, by 10 armed men and 3 women. The trail led to the Central University of Venezuela. Three of the thieves were caught and the pictures recovered. The thieves were university students belonging to a leftwing Communist organization. Two were wounded by gunfire.

Sunday afternoon, the day we arrived, Ambassador Allan Stewart, who 35 years ago was the Star's sports editor, narrowly escaped assassination when he spoke at a public meeting in Maracaibo. The bomb exploded in a store next to where he spoke.

Monday evening, January 21, extremist students tried to stage a demonstration on the university campus. They were met by an opposing group. The police were called. There was some shooting. A professor and a girl were wounded slightly by ricochet bullets.

Yesterday, Tuesday, January 22, a couple of buses were stopped and burned. There was some shooting, but no one was injured. The administration of the university announced the closing of the school for 4 days. High schools also were closed as a precautionary measure.

Extreme leftwing organizations were denied permission to stage a protest meeting in the public square, the name of which is Silencio. There is a probability that they will try to demonstrate today.

It is quite evident that the Communists, whose party has been recognized legally until recently, have orders to carry on a terrorist policy. The idea is to provoke the army leaders into overthrowing the Betancourt government. Amid the resulting chaos, the Communists would hope to seize power themselves.

The university has been a strategic point, because under its charter of autonomy, the government is forbidden to enter its grounds without a warrent showing probable cause. The university is administered by the faculty and students. The government has no power over its administration. The head of the journalism department is a well-known Communist. This autonomy was granted by the provisional government after Betancourt was elected, but before he took office.

Until recently the extreme leftwingers had their way, but their conduct, with its terror, disgusted other students, who have organized an opposition. But the university is a haven and an arsenal, and a rendezvous, for the Communists. Until recently Castro of Cuba was admired greatly, and the Communist students thrived with a growing prestige. The tide now definitely has turned against them.

What happens today is important, because it will determine whether, for the first time in Venezuelan history, an elected president will be allowed to finish his term. This year is election year, the last year of President Betancourt's 5-year term. The election will come in December. If Betancourt can finish his term—he is not eligible for reelection—he will make a historical achievement.

He was a Communist party member and organizer 25 years ago in Latin America. But as president, he has proven so far to be a man of unusual ability in developing and maintaining a successful parliamentary government—one that has a recognized democratic opposition.

I visited the city in 1955, and interviewed the dictator, President Perez Jiminez. The change that has taken place in Caracas is refreshing to me, despite the prevailing tension.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Jan. 29, 1963]

Venezuelan Terrorists Are Busy—Newspapermen Hear Shots in Night

(By William R. Mathews)

(Editor's Note.—This is the third of a series of articles written by William R. Mathews, Star editor, on a trip to Venezuela. Others will appear as they reach Tucson.)

Caracas, Venezuela, January 24.—The 23d of January, which marked the 5th anniversary of the overthrow of the 10-year dictatorship of Venezuela, came and went without any big public meetings or organized demonstrations.

The terror was stepped up a bit. The papers this morning announced 12 wounded and 1 death. Two service stations were set afire.

Purely by chance I saw how one phase of the terror works. John McClelland, of the Longview, Wash., News, and I were returning to our hotel about 7 p.m. We passed through the Plaza El Silencio in the heart of the city. A little farther on we heard three shots, "Bang, bang, bang." Our driver stepped on the gas. Someone close by was shooting. We did not stop to investigate.

Back at the hotel, the Tamanaca, my open window looks over the city. It was 8 p.m. Through the night air came a distinct "boom" and a minute later, another one. That was all. The lights of the city continued to blaze while the congested auto traffic moved on as usual. No fires broke out.

The day ended in relative peace. The government had met the challenge. But the terror can go on. It is so easy to shoot a few shots from a window into the auto traffic. It is easy to hand a package with a bomb in it to a loafer, and pay him to deliver it to an assigned target and leave it to explode.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 2, 1963]

Betancourt Is Calm, Quiet—Venezuela's Leader Is Ex-Communist

(By William R. Mathews)

(Editor's Note.—This is the fourth of a series of stories about a trip to Venezuela made by the Star's editor, William R. Mathews. Other articles will be published as they are received.)

Caracas, Venezuela, January 25.—Late this afternoon our group interviewed a man who, 25 years ago, was a Communist Party member and organizer, but who today is president of the Republic of Venezuela, serving his last year of a 5-year term.

His name is Romulo Betancourt, and the interview was on the record. Each of us had a chance to ask him a question of our own and to each question he gave an answer, usually a long one. It was a TV-radio affair given in one of the large reception rooms of Miraflores Palace. After the press conference, he gave us a reception in an adjoining room. He mixed freely with us and others.

He is a small, corpulent man, in his early fifties. He exercised perfect self-control, and spoke his long answers calmly, and very slowly. He is a quiet sort of a man, but one quite able to take care of himself.

His left hand still was bandaged from the injury he suffered when assassins attempted to kill him. In his right hand he carried a pipe, and at times, although he never lit it, he drew on it. A couple of times he reached down and knocked it against the leg of his table. If there had been any ashes or tobacco they would have gone on the rich, thick carpet of the room. The pipe was empty.

This interview touched on hot political issues, which might be summarized as follows:

1. The phrases "leftwing" and "rightwing" should be changed to "progressive" and "reactionary." Communists at times work with rightwing extremists. Since 1958 there has been an essential shift of forces. Some that were for him now are opposing him, and some who opposed him then are supporting him now (which is conspicuously true).

2. As President it is his duty to govern. The Constitution provides that parties must regulate by law, but the legislature has failed to enact such a law. It is his duty to see that fundamental constitutional rights are maintained, but when some people threaten the existence of the Government by violent acts, and the legislature refuses to convene, it is his duty as President to suspend constitutional rights in order to protect the rights of the law abiding. This power has been used only partially, he explained. (For some months the President has been ruling by decree).

3. Former dictator Perez Jiminez now under arrest along with some of his friends, absconded with an estimated $13 million. It is necessary to set a precedent that such public officers who flee with state funds should be punished. Stolen funds are entitled to be recovered. The treaty of 1920 between the United States and Venezuela provides for mutual extradition of those charged with crimes of peculation.

It is up to the Supreme Court of Venezuela. He is willing to vouch for the safety and a fair trial for Perez Jiminez when he is returned to Venezuela.

4. Betancourt will not participate in choosing the nominee for the presidency to succeed him. Choice will be made by the Democratic Action Party. The President of Venezuela cannot campaign for a candidate the way the President of the United States can. When he ends his term, he expects to take up his old profession as a writer for periodicals in Venezuela and abroad.

5. The decree adopted by the provisional government (before he took office), giving autonomy to the Central University at Caracas, must be revised. The elected officials of the university are opposed to it being used as a political center. The university cannot be allowed to convert student buildings into refuges and asylums for either political criminals or common criminals.

6. When the proposal was made to enact a tax on the dividend payment of corporations doing business in Venezuela, he opposed it because it would adversely affect the inflow of capital from foreign investors. No such tax will be enacted while he is President.

7. Contrary to rumors, the plan of 1963–66 does not call for the nationalization of public utilities owned by private investors. Betancourt went into a long explanation of this plan as a project that will be used to achieve the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 3, 1963]

Arizonians Meet in Caracas—Ambassador Was Star Sports Editor

(By William R. Mathews)

(Editor's Note.—This is the fifth of a series of articles by the Star's editor and publisher, William R. Mathews, on his trip to Venezuela. Another will be published Monday morning.)

Caracas, Venezuela, January 27.—This evening the American Ambassador entertained our group, and who should he be but Allan Stewart, who in 1927 was the Star's sports editor. He was such a good one he was stolen by Gen. Frank Hitchcock of the Citizen. He recounted this incident and its ending. When the big depression hit in 1931, his salary was cut and later he was fired. He asked to be remembered to Alex Parker, Jack Weadock, and Clare Ellinwood. He has happy memories of his sports column, "Mulligan by Stew."

There was another delightful surprise. The American consul general in Caracas also is a University of Arizona graduate. He is George W. Skora of the class of 1935. He took his master's degree in 1936. He was a Star carrier boy while going to high school.

The night before, I met Oscar Morales, whose family used to live on North Stone Avenue. He was born in Tucson and graduated from the University of Arizona. He, too, was a Star carrier boy, and carried old route 37. He teaches music in a private school.

The day before, I went out with still another University of Arizona graduate. He is Lloyd Allyn, formerly of Phoenix and Clifton, where his father was a superior court judge.

As he explained it, he has been in Caracas for 23 years. He worked for an oil company, but when he and the manager disagreed on how the company should be run, he got fired. He and his wife liked Caracas. The fact that all eggs had to be imported prompted him to become an egg farmer. He was the first one to keep laying hens on a mass-production basis. Now he has numerous competitors.

His farm is 65 miles southwest of Caracas. He drove me down there over a fine six-lane highway. We crossed a mountain range at 60 miles an hour.

He has developed quite an egg factory, and he loves his chickens. He knows all their ills and habits. He markets 6,000 eggs a day to good customers in Caracas. He has a fine home in Caracas in an excellent neighborhood, to which he commutes for weekends. At the farm, he has a little colony of his own workers living in neat, small houses.

To get back to Ambassador Stewart's briefing and reception. He is a bull on Venezuela. Things are much better than they were, and are getting better. The Alliance for Progress really is taking hold. It has stimulated Venezuelans into helping themselves.

Betancourt, the President, will finish his term. The Communists are discredited completely. Their influence is waning. The terror is their last gasp in their program to cause the military to interfere and overthrow Betancourt. The President is a good friend of the United States and today is the leader of the anti-Communist and prodemocracy forces. Whereas the former dictator, Pérez Jiménez, spent money in and around Caracas, Betancourt is spending it out in the country.

On a recent trip to Merida, Stewart met with a small group of Peace Corps workers. They are doing a fine job. They have organized a B–5 Club that corresponds to our 4–H Clubs. There are some 90 Peace Corps workers in the country.

The Venezuelan Army consists of 14,000 personnel; the Navy 6,000; Air Force 2,600. There is a National Guard of 9,000 to 10,000, but it is strictly a police force whose mission is to support municipal police forces all over the country.

The future candidate of the Government's coalition party will not be named for awhile. It would be a political mistake to nominate him too soon. He will become a target when he is nominated, and he will have to be a man commanding a wide respect.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 4, 1963]

Farm Reforms Moving Ahead in Venezuela—In Fertile Valley of Maracay More Than 20,000 Persons Have Settled on Land

(By William R. Mathews)

(Editor's Note.—This is the sixth of a series of articles by the Star's editor, William R. Mathews, written while on a trip to Venezuela.)

Maracay, Venezuela, January 28.—We flew down to this beautiful city yesterday, 80 miles southwest of Caracas. It was a favorite resting place of the old dictator, Gomez, who ruled for 27 years. It is the capital of the state of Aragua and is located in the valley of the Aragua River. This is a fertile valley.

Maracay has its problems: In 2 years, more than 20,000 persons have settled on approximately 640 acres of land owned by the municipality. These several thousand families stampeded onto this land and staked out their lots, measuring approximately 30 by 80 feet. On them, they have built their shacks, varying in size up to 15 by 25 feet.

When word spread around that a few had done it without being disturbed, the stampede took place. They came from miles around, not only seeking a better place to live, but the ownership of a piece of land. Many of them already had humble homes, but saw this chance as an opportunity to enrich themselves. The shacks are built mostly of corrugated iron sheets, along with paperboard and other pieces of lumber the people could find.

Before the city, state and national governments could act, 6,405 of these shanties were built, and they are a shocking looking affair. The city also found out there were 4,700 other units that should be replaced.

We visited one of the groups, known as El Pinonal. It had no sewerage and no running water. We inspected a couple of these shanty homes. One was about 15 by 25 feet, with two rooms. As we walked in the front door, the husband greeted us from a hammock he had stretched across the room. His wife was sitting on the floor. There was no other furniture.

A couple of pigs grunted when disturbed, but this couple had brought a batch of guinea pigs who also enjoyed the freedom of the room. There was a crude pallet or bed in the other room. This couple had come from the llanos in southern Venezuela. Behind the house was a crude water closet, which, of course, the pigs did not have to use.

The other one was a bit better. The mother was a much better housekeeper, but there was no running water or sewage disposal.

Adjoining this development, the government, which means a combination of city, state and national ones, had gone to work on a project that was creating a model, but modest, residential district of small austere homes built largely by their inhabitants. The project calls for 1,228 houses, of which several hundred are already built and inhabited.

Part of this area has been cleared of shanties. In some cases where space permitted the new houses were built in front of the shanties. Some of the shanties evidently had been rented to a new family by the original builder.

The fine thing about the rehabilitation project is that the members of the families chosen to occupy these homes have to contribute their work. The people of Maracay contributed $13,400; the state government $67,000; the Workers Bank $335,000. The plan calls for the government to build the first two rooms and the foundation of the other two rooms. The other two rooms have to be built by their occupants, who become the owners.

Loans are granted to low-income residents with large families. Repayment is made over a period of 19 years at a monthly rate of $7.25. Each house has running water and sewerage connections. Each is wired for electricity. Construction is sturdy. The rooms are small, something like 8 to 9 feet square. A school is being built to handle 300 students in 2 shifts. The cost of each house runs to about $1,000.

Only a short distance away, in another neighborhood, we visited an "agrarian reform project." Each family that is chosen has to be agrarian. The project is called La Julia Agricultural Colony. Eighty-five farm families have been settled on a fertile area of 650 acres.

Their homes have been built on 60- by 100-foot lots. The idea is that they can keep chickens and some pigs, and can grow fruit and vegetables. They work the farmland they have received, and in offseasons seek other work to supplant what might be called subsistence on the homesteads. They have a three-room school.

When they are chosen, they have to sign notes for their houses, and they have to contribute their work to building the houses. When husband and wife split up, the one who assumes the responsibility for the children gets the home. Since more than 60 percent of the marriages are common-law marriages, this responsibility for the children was invoked. All families chosen must have children.

All of this work toward decent housing is in the pioneer stage, but should go forward much faster in the future as more administrative talent is developed.

These two projects in housing qualify for help under the Alliance for Progress, but that contribution is a very small one, unless the requirement for self-help, which is working, might be considered as an influential contribution.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 5, 1963]

Lake Maracaibo Oil Operations Are Big, Rich—About 3 Million Barrels of Petroleum Taken Daily From Beneath Water

(By William R. Mathews)

(Editor's Note.—This is the seventh of a series of articles, written by William R.

Mathews, editor of the Star, on his trip to Venezuela.)

Maracaibo, Venezuela, January 30.—This growing city of 400,000 people is the administrative center of one of the biggest and richest oilfield operations in the world. Look at the map of South America and note Venezuela at the north, fronting on the Caribbean Sea. In the northwestern section of this country is a great lake, 100 miles long and 60 miles wide. It is Lake Maracaibo.

From under the waters of this lake is taken around 3 million barrels of oil each day, which amounts to more than a billion barrels a year. It comes mostly from the eastern part of the lake, in an area something like 60 miles north and south by 30 miles east and west.

The Shell Oil Co. was the discoverer when in 1922 its original well, drilled offshore, blew in with a roar of 100,000 barrels a day. Three days later it caved in to stop the flow, but it proved the field. Many of the Shell wells drilled on land close to the shoreline in previous years had proven the presence of oil, and many of them are still producing on the pump.

Because Shell's concession was limited to this land area and a kilometerwide area in the lake, other oil companies saw the opportunity to get concessions from the Venezuelan Government out beyond the Shell's 1-kilometer limit.

Today Creole Oil Co., owned 96 percent by Standard Oil of New Jersey, has become the biggest single producer, with 1.3 million barrels of the total by all companies of 3 million a day. Next comes Shell. Mine Grand, a pioneer company owned by Gulf Oil, is next. Then comes some of the newcomers like Superior, Phillips, Signal, and Richmond.

There is a forest of 12,000 derricks out in this lake, of which 9,000 are producing oil. Most of the wells produce from a depth ranging from 600 feet—the old ones—to 6,000 feet. The average is 3,600, but many others are 10,000 to 12,000 feet. The lake is only a bit more than 100 feet deep. There are wells, wildcats, that have gone down below 15,000 feet that were duds.

Lake drilling is expensive. To erect the drilling platform costs some $75,000. The total cost of wells runs up to $600,000, but that is only a beginning. When the wells produce, the oil has to be gathered at what might be called delousing stations, but in the lake where the gas and water is taken out of the oil, much of the gas is saved and pumped back in wells. These lake stations cost a mere $25 million each to build and equip. The Creole Oil Co., whose guests we have been, has four of these stations, and it has to maintain 2,400 miles of pipelines lying on the mud in the bottom of the lake.

These pipelines vary from 3 to 40 inches. The latter is actually 50 inches because it is encased all around with a concrete coat 5 inches thick. This big boy is the one that finally delivers the oil to the refinery miles away, or to the storage tanks on the shore.

Creole maintains a crew of deepwater divers to repair leaks in the pipes. All the pipes underwater have a concrete protective jacket, but there are as many as 50 breaks a day.

These delousing or gathering stations perform another service. They store the gas taken out of the oil and put it under high pressure. Then the gas, under pressure, is piped back to wells that have ceased to flow naturally. This gas pushes up the remaining oil.

The average daily well production of Creole is 440 barrels. More than half of the wells flow naturally, with some producing 3,500 barrels a day.

These stations out in the lake also carry on what is known as water flooding. Lake water is pumped down into some wells to cause the oil to rise. This is a common practice in all oilfields, but this lake provides an abundant supply of water.

There are also lots of fish in the lake. Small, tender, delicious shrimp are abundant.

Creole maintains quite a navy of tugs and launches. It operates 175 of them for transporting personnel and 200 more for transporting supplies. It has a shipyard and drydocks that would command the approval of any admiral. It also maintains electric generating plants with capabilities totaling 375,000 kilowatts, which is nearly as much as the Tucson utility has.

All of Creole's labor is Venezuelan. Of its staff of 800 administrative executives, 500 are Venezuelans.

The pay of the oilfield workers is good. The lowest are paid $7.50 a day, plus fringe benefits that amount to another $7.50. Included are good housing, for which they pay $2.50 a week; all medical and hospital expenses for the entire family, and low prices on what they want to buy from the company commissary. The company provides good schools.

The workers show their good living conditions in their generally robust physiques. They are more mentally alert than the average Venezuelan worker.

The oil industry pays 60 percent of the nation's annual national budget of $1.5 billion. The industry's tax bill amounts to a division of 70 percent of its profits to the Government and 30 percent for itself.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 6, 1963]

Opportunity Apparent in Venezuela—Breadbasket Area Could Be Developed

(By William R. Mathews)

(Editor's Note—This is the eighth article in a series written by William R. Mathews, editor of the Star, while on a trip to Venezuela.)

Barinas, Venezuela.—A 2-hour flight from Maracaibo in a veteran DC–3 brought us south to this small, but growing, city located at the western end of the great plains, the "llanos" of Venezuela. From the foothills of the low Andes these plains stretch to the delta of the Orinoco.

Their development is barely beginning. The soil is rich. There are many fine forests of valuable timber. Imagine 50,000 square miles of land of such quality lying relatively idle and undeveloped in the United States.

The underground water level is shallow. All the land needs is some human initiative and muscle to make it produce an abundance. It could be the breadbasket of Venezuela and change that paradox of poverty in the midst of potential abundance, that characterizes Venezuelan life.

Until recent years malaria has prevented or dulled initiative, but malaria has been conquered. It is true that 15 or so traditional landowners have great haciendas. But it is equally true that much of the land is public domain.

If it were opened for settlement, the way the Homestead Act opened the West in the United States, these great plains soon would be producing a wealth of food and raw materials each year. Two young men from North Carolina, who know how to grow tobacco, have established a tobacco farm that is successful. A few others are growing cotton on some 10,000 acres.

American oil scouts found a small oil field which is producing 80,000 barrels a day near this city. Such initiative has been blighted by the Government's new oil policy of making no more concessions.

Instead of formulating a program that could stimulate a vast increase in wealth production, the Government, under the excuse of agrarian reform, has begun a program to divide the great haciendas, and their animals. Small 30-acre farms are the result. This amounts to establishing a system of subsistence homesteads and merely dividing existing wealth. Such a program will defeat rather than take care of the problem of doubling of Venezuela's population within the next 25 years. Today its 4-percent annual increase in population is the highest in the world.

Barinas has grown from a small town of 1,500 in 1945 to a city of more than 25,000 today. In many respects it reminds me of Tucson in 1924, although it has many more paved streets than Tucson had then. It has two hospitals, numerous schools, a teachers club, and an adjoining workers club, built by the state, and two beautiful buildings a few centuries old.

They are the Commandante and the Catholic church, whose early Spanish colonial architecture stand out as beautiful treasures of the past. They are both kept in good condition and are serving the same purposes they have for centuries.

The excellent hotel is a real beauty in its rambling architecture. It was planned and built under the administration of Dictator Perez Jimenez, as a part of a string of tourist hotels.

It does not have air conditioning, but it does have ceiling fans. The climate is tropical, but not nearly as hot as Tucson has been during the past few days.

The Governor of the state, which also is named Barinas, is a young man between 35 and 40, and his name is Luciano Valero. He gave us a reception at the hotel last night. All of the Governors we have met so far are young men, and appear to be dedicated public servants.

Barinas has something like 5,000 Italians and Portuguese. They have added to the life of the community in their enterprise and willingness to work. They are the gardeners, some also are storekeepers.

Barinas is distinctly a progressive community. It has comparatively little poverty, and is one we would be proud to have in Arizona.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 7, 1963]

Port City Boasts Big Steel Mill—Ore Lies Exposed in Venezuela

(Editor's Note.—This is the ninth of a series of articles written by the editor of the Star, William R. Mathews, while in Venezuela.)

(By William R. Mathews)

Puerto Ordaz, Venezuela.—This is a new port city of Venezuela, upstream 187 miles from the Atlantic Ocean on the big Orinoco River. It is a raw, booming mining camp that would compare to some of the old ones in the United States, but it is destined to become one of the most important cities in Venezuela.

It lies at the eastern edge of the great "llanos." Yesterday morning we flew the 800 miles from Barinas over these great plains with the forests and rivers. Whenever the Venezuelan Government will permit human beings to exercise their initiative in developing these great plains, Puerto Ordaz and the new developments that surround it will make it the market point and seaport.

The new developments are one of the most modern steel mills in the world, with an 800,000-ton annual capacity, and two great iron ore deposits that lie 45 and 90 miles

south of the city. One is owned by Bethlehem Steel, the other by United States Steel. They are mining 62 and 58 percent iron ore, respectively. The ore lies exposed. All that has to be done is to dig it up with electric shovels, dump it onto trains, which run it to the docks, where the ore again is dumped into oceangoing ships bound mostly for Chesapeake Bay ports.

The steel mill was a revelation to me, because I had never been through one before. This mill is an integrated, automatic one, that takes the raw ore, converts it into pig iron, which in turn is converted into steel, and the steel converted into various shapes ranging from bars to pipe. The mill employs 2,500, of whom only 500 are Americans or foreigners. Its operation is distinguished by the fact that sheer force of circumstances has compelled it to recruit labor so raw that much of it has never been in a big city, or done any labor other than farmwork.

The management has done what our Navy did so successfully during World War II. It has broken down the operations into numerous simplified jobs, and trained these raw, young men to perform simplified tasks with professional skill. Much of the work is done from consoles, where levers and buttons are pushed. Highly skilled Americans, along with similar Venezuelans, are on hand to supervise the work.

The plant is an efficient one, despite the fact that it is government-owned. The ore trains are pulled by diesel locomotives with only one man in the cab. The iron-ore smelter looks much like the copper smelter at Douglas with its great overhead cranes handling the big buckets of ore and liquid iron.

The steel mill was unique to me. One of the American superintendents picked me out, as our group lined up to watch its operations, and took me right up to the open-hearth furnaces. He gave me some pink-colored glasses to wear so I could look through the peephole into the furnaces. It was hot up there, standing a couple of feet away from those furnaces raging internally with 2,800° heat, as they took the iron ore and melted it with various other things that go into making steel.

At the first furnace, only flames blazing under high pressure could be seen. Four furnaces down, I could peep in and see a great white mass of something bubbling rather contentedly. That was the steel. It was very hot, being so close. Automatically, the steel would be run out into molds and, also automatically, would be transferred to the blooming mill, where it would go through big rollers that would squeeze it out into various shapes. I saw enough quickly.

At one of these big rollers stood a man, who looked like an American. It was his job to keep the slabs of pink-hot steel in their groove as they skidded into the roller. One of them was a bit obstinate, whereupon with his right hand this man picked up a big sledgehammer. With one hand and arm he slugged that pink-hot billet back into its groove, with as much ease as an ordinary man would use a tack hammer.

This steel mill was built under the orders of Dictator Perez Jimenez, and completed by the Betancourt government. Its big pipe mill has a market in the oil fields, but it now faces world competition in finding customers for most of its other shapes. Its development is, to say the least, a bit premature, and its annual deficit will have to be made up by the taxpayers of Venezuela. The mill will have to cut its prices, if it expects to sell the shapes other than pipe.

However, it could be a valuable asset, when and if the Venezuelan Government allows the great llanos to be opened for settlement and development. In this vast Orinoco basin lies the future of Venezuela, and it will take much more than socialistic government development to do the development job. It is too big a job for any government to do.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 8, 1963]

Venezuela Mine Like Ajo, but Upside Down—Operations Begin Atop Mountain of Ore and Work Toward Bottom

(By William R. Mathews)

(Editor's Note.—This is the 10th of a series of articles written by William R. Mathews, editor of the Star, on his trip to Venezuela.)

El Pao (or Piar), Venezuela.—This community is a company town, beautifully laid out and developed, of the Orinoco Mining Co., a subsidiary of United States Steel. El Pao is 90 miles south of Puerto Ordaz and 390 nautical miles north of the Equator. It is the site of a big hill of iron ore.

Interestingly enough, the boss man of the operation is a former University of Arizona man, Arthur W. Ruff. He got his master's degree in mining in 1952 and worked at Cananea. Joe Davis, superintendent of production, is still another University of Arizona man; while another man, Wayne Davis, wrote in my notebook, "Tell Dr. Forester and Dr. Morris hello for me."

This mountain of iron ore is 4½ miles long and nearly 1 mile wide. It was discovered in 1947. Operations began in 1952. It is estimated to have 1.5 billion tons of ore, averaging 58 percent iron.

The operation is much like Ruff described it—"This is an upside down Ajo operation"—because it was started at the top of the mountain and works down, instead of starting at ground level and going down.

Numerous electric shovels with 8- and 9-yard dippers dump their loads into 90-ton railroad cars, or into brandnew 65-ton dump trucks, that in turn dump their loads into the railroad cars. Strings of 10 or 12 cars are pulled from the shovels by diesel locomotives to form 100- to 125-car ore trains, that take the ore down to the docks at Puerto Ordaz. Oceangoing ships take about 70 percent of it to the United States, with the remainder going to various world markets.

The operation is working at about half capacity, producing some 10,000 tons of ore a day. Only 150 of the 896 employees are Americans. The others are Venezuelans. All of the work is skilled or semiskilled. From all appearances, the tempo of the work compares with that in Arizona open-pit mines. The Venezuelans have been trained successfully to do the skilled mining, while numerous other Venezuelans do staff work.

Since the site is some 2,500 feet above sea level, the railway to Puerto Ordaz is downhill. There is one long 3.5-percent grade close to the summit, which compels the three diesel locomotives to do a reverse job. They have to furnish the air to tighten the two sets of brakes per wheel. Each of the ore cars has an air reservoir of its own in reserve. When the ore trains get underway at night, the sparks from the brakes and wheels make them look like big Fourth of July pinwheels. Friction heats the wheels to 390°.

This enterprise is operated as a concession, with 50 percent of its net profits going to the Venezuelan Government. The ore body has an estimated life of 50 years, but "there are other ore bodies not far off," one official added.

Although close to the Equator, this community has a delightful climate. It happens to be the dry season now, but there have been sufficient rains to bring out a lot of green on the plains and knolls. The area looks much like that of the Sonoita country after a rain. There is all kinds of wild game, including snakes. There are pythons and boa constrictors as well as an abundance of rattlesnakes.

The community has its own airstrip and a paved highway to Puerto Ordaz. After lunch at the community country club, our plane took us in 2 hours due north to Porlomar, a seaside community on Santa Margarita Island off the coast, where we found a good hotel right on the beach of the blue Caribbean. With the sun shining and the cool trade winds blowing gently, it was wonderful, and a good place to wash off the iron ore dust we had accumulated in nearly every nook and corner of our clothes and skin.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 9, 1963]

Turbulence Is Rife in Venezuela—Rural Population Moving to Cities

(Editor's Note.—This is the 11th in a series of articles written by William R. Mathews, editor of the Star, while on a trip to Venezuela.)

(By William R. Mathews)

Caracas, Venezuela.—The country is undergoing a social revolution caused primarily by the historic transition of a society based on agriculture with an aristocratic governing class, into one based increasingly on industry with a growing middle class, seeking to govern.

The change is a turbulent one. The population is increasing at the rate of 4 percent annually, and thus will double in 20 to 25 years. Much of this increase is moving into the cities. Here in Caracas the movement is spectacular. The people, know as rancheros, are swarming over the foothills of the mountains, and building shacks on tiny plots of hillside land, which they claim as their own, and are called ranchos.

Most of the land belongs to the municipality or the public domain. No government dares to drive the rancheros off, even though at times they squat on privately owned land. These little one- and two-room shacks are built of any kind of material that can be found or stolen. The city government has piped water to various localities where these people can get it by the bucket or oil can. Most of these areas have no sewers.

The local privately owned public utility has extended its services to those who want electricity. In one case an armed group of rancheros moved in on a local substation and by force diverted electricity to their area, for which they now refuse to pay. The company dares not change this lawless diversion, and neither does the city.

More than 300,000 human beings live in this manner, and the number is increasing steadily. The attraction of city life brings them in; and, deplorable as their habitations are, they are said to claim they are living better than they did out in the country.

Dictator Perez Jimenez sought to meet the situation by bulldozing away the shacks and building scores of gigantic high-rise apartments for the people. This helped out, but the stream continued to pour in as a kind of endless tide, covering more and more great empty places that remained on the foothills.

Some of these older rancho neighborhoods show improvement over the way I saw them in 1955. A few have put in sewage systems and have connected with city water mains. Others have planted flower gardens, and painted their shacks, which they have gradually remodeled into small homes.

Life goes on at a pretty low level. A mother may have three children, but the father of each one may be a different man. Some of these shacks have television sets. Bad as the worst may be, it represents an improvement over the life they lived in the country.

Never have I seen anywhere else in the world such a spectacular demonstration of this historical movement, which is going on nearly everywhere, of human beings leaving their agricultural existence to seek a better life in the city.

Venezuela is just waking up to the implications of this great change. No government by itself can meet the challenge. A government in some way must give incentives to its people to use their creative ability as well as to work harder than ever.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 10, 1963]

Education Booms in Venezuela—Great Steps Taken Under Betancourt

(By William R. Mathews)

(Editor's Note.—This is the 12th of a series of articles written by William R. Mathews, Star editor, as a result of his recent trip to Venezuela. It also is the first of two articles discussing education in Venezuela.)

Since I have returned home from Venezuela, if I were asked what is the most outstanding accomplishment of the Betancourt government, my answer would be the magnificent job that it has done in elementary and secondary education.

If I were asked what were the two most dangerous situations I saw there, it would be the weak, amateur police force, which Communist terrorists make look like old Keystone Cops Comedy police; and the intellectual anarchy and irresponsibility of most of the universities of the country.

Now as to the elementary and secondary schools. The Betancourt government in 4 years has built more schools than up to that time were built since the discovery of the country. Dr. R. Leandro Mora, minister of education, gave us editors a first-hand account, and submitted to a tough third-degree examination afterwards. The following figures are his:

During the period of the Perez Jiminez dictatorship there were always 500,000 children without schooling; in 1957 the enrollment in the elementary schools was 751,571. In 1962 the enrollment had increased to 1,346,751. The dictatorship took no interest in training teachers. Normal schools for training teachers were closed.

The job of expanding Venezuela's educational program had to be done by all kinds of improvisation, because fully qualified teachers took time to train, and school buildings took time to build. In some schools there would be three sessions a day. In 1958, there were 883 school buildings. Since then 1,322 school buildings have been built.

We saw a number of these new school buildings, when we made our circuit of the country outside of Caracas. They were well built, and already were overflowing with students. At present, 86 percent of those who are eligible to attend primary schools are in school.

As to secondary education, in the year 1957–58 there were 68 high schools in the country. Today there are 135. Previously there were 93 technical schools. Today there are 194. Enrollments increased from 55,194 in 1957–58 to 137,823 in 1962.

Increasing emphasis is being placed on technical schools. These have increased in enrollment from 19,330 in 1957–58 to 50,651 in 1962.

In this same period, teachers in training have increased from 346 to 2,744. Elementary teachers have increased from 20,221 to 38,187.

In 1958 of those over 15 years of age, 2,426,100 were illiterate, unable to read or write. This has been reduced to 1,163,814. The minister said it has been done by the Office of Adult Education and the educational program applied to military personnel.

He expressed some concern about the increasing percentage of women teachers. "They have babies and have to leave," he explained.

The educational budget for the year 1962–63 is 638,000 bolivars—the bolivar is worth 22.2 cents—or slightly over 10 percent of the total government budget of 63 billion bolivars. However, the state governments contribute the equivalent of what amounts to another 10 percent.

There is no question that this new educational program has helped to snap the country out of its lethargy. The response to it shows that. As an eyewitness I can vouch for it.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 11, 1963]

Run by Committees, Higher Education in Venezuela Is Sorry Mess—Under Guise of Autonomy, Students, Faculty—Not Presidents—Run Schools

(By William R. Mathews)

(Editor's Note.—This is the 13th of a series of articles written by William R. Mathews, Star editor, as a result of his recent trip to Venezuela. It is the second of two articles on education in Venezuela.)

Yesterday I discussed elementary and secondary education in Venezuela, and praised it. But in contrast to the good program at those levels, the program of higher education is a sorry mess and, indirectly if not directly, is involved in helping to carry on the reign of terror that prevails.

The provisional government that assumed power before the election and inauguration of President Betancourt, entered a decree giving the universities what is called autonomy. The idea was to keep politicians from exercising influence over them.

Just the opposite results have followed. Under the guise of autonomy, the universities were to be governed by their students and faculty. Each group elects their representatives to what might be called the administrative committee. This committee elects the president, and it can also dismiss him. It hires faculty members and fires them.

The universities have a long tradition of sympathy for Marxist socialism as the ideal way to bring about that eternal dream of providing wealth, happiness, and peace for all. Private enterprise is something whose greed and corruption must be tolerated, pending the time when the righteous government will take over all enterprise, and end all troubles. Such is the popular philosophy.

This long-prevailing atmosphere—which exists in most other Latin American countries—is one that makes it easy for trained Communist revolutionaries to have a continual picnic. It takes only a few Communist Party professors to develop a sympathetic group of students. It is easy to divert student love of pranks into the mysteries of making bombs, staging holdups, and carrying on a program of terror.

The director of the school of journalism at the Central University of Venezuela in Caracas is a known Communist Party member. My contacts with seminars at the University of Zulia in Maracaibo and the University of Carabobo in Valencia indicated the presence of faculty members who spoke out in our seminars with the same old Communist singsong and slogans.

Their attempts to monopolize each of these two seminars, where only students or working journalists were supposed to have been invited, by asking questions, which were turned into anti-American speeches, made me boil over. At each place I had to rise and make a point of order, to shut them up, and give some others a chance to ask questions. In each case the faculty chairman let these men run on and on, until I acted.

Later on one faculty member came up and thanked me for doing what I did. When I lamented at the weakness of the faculty chairman, he explained very kindly, "Why he did not dare stop those men from talking. They are important political figures. Our universities are political institutions."

When, during our brief 2 weeks in the country, two of the universities closed—the one in Caracas and the one in Merida—because of student disorders and closely allied terror acts, the status of higher education under the autonomy of student-faculty administration, spoke for itself. They were closed not by the government, but by their own administration.

Government peace officials cannot even enter the grounds of a university, unless they go before a court and get a special warrant describing what their reasons are.

That is one reason why I asked President Betancourt in his open press conference with us, if these universities are going to be permitted to carry on in this manner of allying themselves with thugs, criminals, etc. He gave a long-winded reply, but in it he mentioned twice that the decree of the provisional government in establishing autonomy "must be revised."

The incompetency of the police force has its roots in the fact that with the fall of Dictator Perez Jimenez, the new government replaced his police with new personnel, most of it completely amateur, and much of it political.

Combine this inadequacy with equally inexperienced judges and prosecutors, and the stage is set for a criminals' festival, plus an unusual opportunity for trained Communists to have lots of fun.

There is good reason to believe that the situation is improving, as these new government employees get more and more experience. It is part of the price that evidently has to be paid when a democratic government composed mostly of amateurs takes over from what was one of the tightest police-state dictatorships in the world—a dictatorship that lasted for 10 years.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, Ariz., Feb. 12, 1963]

Visit Summarized—Progress Made Despite Woes in Venezuela

(By William R. Mathews)

(Editor's Note.—This is the 14th and last of a series of articles written by William R. Mathews, editor of the Star, as a result of his trip to Venezuela.)

This is a summary of my 2-week visit to Venezuela, during which a group of us editors had the red carpet rolled out to meet every wish we expressed. We saw much of the country and quite a bit of the people.

Venezuela is going through a social revolution in which a society based largely on agriculture and a government by aristocrats, is changing into an industrial society, with a government largely dominated by the middle class. This middle class has much to learn about the art of government, but progress is being made.

President Betancourt is doing everything that any president of the country could do in the present circumstances. Conditions are improving, despite the turbulence in a few critical spots like Caracas and the universities.

Although he has suspended constitutional decrees as a means of meeting trouble, a wide degree of freedom prevails. We ran into no censorship. There is complete freedom of the press.

Venezuela is one of the richest countries in Latin America. It has an annual per capita income of $700 a year, which is the highest in all of South America. Its potential wealth is enormous, but its development will be a lethargic affair, if left to government initiative alone.

The Government has gone into the oil business and brought an end to all concessions. The result is that the government is the only one performing any new development and scouting for new oil deposits. By a more liberal policy, it could have a dozen oil companies scouting for oil all over its territory.

In striving to take care of the hundreds of thousands of people who are flocking to the cities, the Government is working at its agrarian reform program, which amounts to providing for mere subsistence homesteads. A more enlightened policy could reverse this flight to the cities by opening the vast "llanos," 50,000 to 50,000 square miles of undeveloped plains and forests, for settlement the way we opened our own West.

The oil company production is the backbone of Venezuelan life. Taxes on it, at a rate of 70 percent, pay more than 60 percent of the nation's annual budget. Its workers live the closest to an American standard of living that can be found in the hemisphere, unless it be Canada.

Education has been the big deficiency, as is shown by the fact that there have been more schools built since Betancourt came into power than in all of the previous centuries. That progress is going on at full speed.

The Catholic Church plays a minor role in Venezuela as compared to the influential role it plays, for instance, in Colombia. Most of the marriages of the men and women streaming into the cities from the interior are common-law marriages. Churches and priests are not seen as frequently in the cities of Venezuela as they are seen in most Latin-American countries.

Venezuela has, what the officials admit, is the highest rate of net population gain, 4 percent a year. The population will double in the next 20 to 25 years. This situation has been brought about by a reduction in the death rate, by much better health controls. Malaria has been completely conquered.

Since in all of its history no President of Venezuela has finished his term of office, the present political situation calls for close watching. Betancourt has only 1 more year to serve, and he cannot succeed himself.

The election campaigns are getting underway, although the parties have not held conventions to nominate their candidates. The elections are scheduled for the period from October to December. The new President is scheduled to take office a year from now, in February 1964. If this peaceful transfer of political power can be made, it might easily prove to be as big a stabilizing effect as the transfer by Cardenas in Mexico of his Presidential power to an elected candidate back in 1942.

Since the only way that Venezuela can pay for what she buys abroad is by the sale of her oil, a more liberal American policy, particularly on heavy fuel oil, would nearly eliminate the need for American foreign aid. If, on top of that, the peaceful transfer of power can be made, a more sympathetic policy can be taken toward foreign capital to encourage more than $100 million of fugitive bank accounts of Venezuelans to return home and an official recognition be made that an active and vigorous sector of private initiative and investment needs to be developed to work with the slow-moving Government sector, Venezuela could supplant the present system of poverty amidst potential abundance.

Allan Stewart, the American Ambassador, who was the Star's sports editor in 1927, is doing a good job. So is George W. Skora, American consul general in Caracas, who used to be a Star carrier. Both of them graduated from the University of Arizona, and both of them for many years have specialized in Latin-America affairs. The Ambassador is optimistic, and did not hesitate to speak out and say so.

I forgot to say that Venezuela has one of the best climates in the world. It rarely if ever freezes, except in the mountains. Venezuela gets a steady flow of trade winds from the northeast which keep the temperature at a warm, delightful level, day and night.

Speech of William R. Mathews Before Pan Am Management Club, February 19, 1963

When President James Monroe proclaimed the Monroe Doctrine in 1823, he made Latin America a matter of primary interest to the United States. A matter involving national security. The record through the next 113 years, to 1936, reflects this. Never was this doctrine compromised. To the contrary, it was enforced. While our Government had to accept the French invasion of Mexico in the 1860's, as soon as the Civil War was over, we used our influence to bring an end to that French expansion of imperial power.

Under President Grant we toyed with the idea of annexing what was then Santa Domingo, but which is now known as the Dominican Republic. In 1896, President Grover Cleveland spoke out emphatically declaring that our word was flat on international matters affecting the Western Hemisphere. Two years later we went to war to break Spain's power in Cuba, and also in the Pacific.

We acquired the Guantanamo Naval Base from Cuba. We made Puerto Rico a kind of principality which might become our 51st State. We bought the Virgin Islands in 1915 to keep them from falling into the hands of imperial Germany.

We built the Panama Canal primarily as a naval effort. We intervened in numerous Central American Republics, including Cuba, Santa Domingo, and Haiti.

The Panama Canal is an artery of life, whose security should never be compromised. It should never be internationalized. Never should we tolerate any interference in its operation, in an effort to please some hungry politicos of Panama. Our record in making certain concessions in recent years has not made us any better liked. Respect for us has been reduced, rather than enhanced. The time has come to stop such trifling with its security and without any apologies to anyone, let the world know that it belongs to us, and that we are going to keep it and protect it.

In 1936 President Franklin Roosevelt sent Secretary Hull to Buenos Aires to negotiate what became known as the Treaty of Buenos Aires. It forbid intervention in any form, either direct or indirect, unless it was done after receiving full consent of the various signatories.

This treaty was an unfortunate one. It compromised a matter of primary interest which has through time become clearly recognized as the Caribbean area, as distinguished from Latin America. Today in Cuba we are paying the penalty for the compromise this treaty imposed on both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. Not until the danger assumed the proportion of threatening our destruction, did our political leaders feel free to mobilize our military power and challenge Moscow with a timed ultimatum.

For the future it seems to me that we Americans should distinguish between the Caribbean Sea area, and South America south of the equator. The former is vital to our security, while the latter has relatively little strategic importance. We must never compromise our control of the Caribbean and the Panama Canal.

This brief outline of the impact of the past on what we face today is necessary as a background to answer that question, Where does America go from here in her relations with Latin America? Our first task is to take care of our security.

Events of the past few years have spectacularly emphasized that we Americans, as part of our destiny, have a job to do in the whole of the Western Hemisphere. The Alliance for Progress is our first organized effort. The job is a difficult and delicate one. It must at all times acknowledge scrupulously the independent sovereignty of all of these nations, large and small. At the same time it requires huge aggregations of capital, and the best brains and administrative ability to make the mountains, jungles, deserts and plains yield the hidden resources of this vast area.

Any discussion or planning on what we should do, or can do, must be based on the stern realization that it is the job of a lifetime. It will probably last as long as we are a great power. We might as well realize that there is no miraculous quick solution that mere money can buy, although billions of dollars will be needed. Latin America is not a vending machine where one can drop in some coins, press a button or pull a lever, and get what we want to buy.

Two basic challenging facts confront us. We must deal with people who have a different culture, heritage, ambitions and outlook than our own. Secondly, we begin this job at a tough period in history when throughout the world a great historic change is taking place, and particularly in Latin America. What has been a civilization, based largely on an agricultural economy with aristocratic governments of a relatively few people doing the governing, is now going through a transition into an industrial civilization, governed by a rising middle class.

There is a wide variation of this transition in the many governments of Latin America. Such a situation means that governments in Latin America are going to go through many phases of instability as they strive to meet this change. Their cultures reflect wide differences in literacy, competency, ambitions, aptitudes and skills. No one rule can be laid down that can be applied uniformly to all of them.

Bolivia, for example, is a relatively primitive nation composed largely of Indians with only a small intelligentsia of Spanish origin. We Americans with our know-how could make Bolivia bloom because we have the know-how and the capital to make the jungles and the mountains of that country yield their hidden wealth. The first thing we would do would be to start educating the Bolivians by training and educating them, while we went ahead with development projects by the efforts of individuals, rather than Government. As it is we have been in Bolivia for 10 years, but so far we have little to show for what we have done.

Uraguay on the other hand is a highly developed social welfare state that needs no help whatever. Its people have probably the highest standard of living in all of Latin America, and the most stable government. But the Uraguayans are a nation of homogeneous people of Latin heritage. They have no Indians. As a nation of well educated people they can take care of themselves just as easily as Switzerland does.

Peru has nearly 5 million Indians living in the high Andes. That is nearly one-half of Peru's population. Who are we to tell the Peruvians how to treat their Indians? The American Indians are not integrated in the life of our Nation despite all of the money we have spent on them.

We must not be too gullible in swallowing that old, old issue of agrarian reform. Certainly large, unproductive estates, whether they are owned by the Catholic Church or private individuals, should be broken up. On the other hand, should large areas of productive land be broken up into small plots, experience elsewhere in the world shows that productivity will decline sharply. As we Americans have proven, the greatest productivity comes from large-scale production. Since the vast eastern areas of Colombia and Bolivia, which are nearly uninhabited, do offer an opportunity for development, the lack of initiative, lack of willingness to adventure and pioneer, creates the ironic situation of poverty amidst a potential abundance. If agrarian reform is to better the peasantry and the country as a whole, it must be carried out by agricultural experts and not by political experts, or do-gooder reformers.

These wide disparities in a basic culture we will be compelled to recognize. We must remember to be cautious about assuming that perfectly constructed and other legal institutions and reforms, that work well with us, will not necessarily bring peace, stability, democracy, and prosperity to these many nations.

The fact that most of their constitutions have been modeled after our own, but have failed to work continuously should caution us that we cannot impose American ideas of government on them. We must expect ups and downs with periods of democratic government followed by periods of dictatorial government.

Since the education of most of the intellectuals has been European, the doctrine of socialism has wide acceptance as a guiding gospel to follow. Too many of the intellectuals think in terms of national socialism as a means of national independence. Freedom means national freedom as distinguished from the individual freedom we cherish. We will have a difficult job inspiring the free enterprise that we take for granted at home.

Latin culture has a different standard of morals than our own. It teaches respect for authority and by implication teaches that the will of a majority is so righteous that it can scorn the rights of minorities. Most of the people do not know how to make a parliamentary government work. They respect strength and have only contempt for weakness. Too often they take generosity and extreme patience as a sign of weakness.

Because socialism has the reputation of promising the ideal society of abundance for all with peace and prosperity, it naturally makes a moving appeal to politicians in search of a campaign issue, and masses of people looking for an easy answer to their ills. Therein lies the appeal of communism with its promise to build Socialist societies, but instead of doing it peacefully, do it by creating the dictatorship of the proletariat. Its glorification of the use of dictatorial power makes an attractive appeal to Latin American politicos.

We must foster public education as a basic necessity in developing workers who can take their necessary place in the development of modern industrial societies. The same muscle and energy that have gone into the building of churches should now be called upon to build schoolhouses.

The increase in wealth production must be our main goal. Only by that means can the lot of the masses be improved. That will require not only enormous aggregation of capital from abroad, and the best technicians and administrative talent, it will require much harder work on the part of the people themselves. It cannot be achieved with a 6-hour day and 5-day week that prevails today in too many places in Latin America.

We can no longer tolerate expropriation of wealth creating American investments. Such action nullifies the fact that unless foreign capital is attracted, the Alliance for Progress program will languish. All help should be withdrawn immediately from any nation that carries out expropriations. It is just as necessary to help create a climate that will attract foreign capital as it is to furnish help by our Alliance for Progress program. The latter cannot do the job alone.

We must see that all funds granted by our Government, or its agencies, be wisely spent. It is not enough to make grants and assume that each government will spend such money wisely.

The population explosion that has been going on throughout the world is taking place in Latin America with more increase than perhaps any other locality in the world. That means increased number of mouths will have to be fed. Increasing importance requires the means to earn a livelihood, which must come from increased industrial production. Certainly, there are needs that will require the toil of every adult worker available.

Where is the capital and technical and administrative ability coming from to make this possible? Without an enormous increase in productivity, 30 years from now people will be less better off. We will have to run in order to stand still, as Alice would say.

Consequently, if the Alliance for Progress is to be successful we must approach this job with a fair but firm attitude and our eyes open. We must expect, and have, full cooperation of those whom we plan to help. We must take steps to see that the dollars we provide are not used to finance the flight of monetary wealth of wealthy people of these countries. There is good authority for the statement that some $10 billion have been sent by the wealthy people of Latin America to Switzerland.

The most encouraging thing I can say about the Alliance for Progress is that so little appears to have been done during its first year. That is a welcome sign that we are making progress. It will take time, several years, for wealth-creating projects to take form, and still more years to make their productivity available to the masses.

All of what we might try to do, in both the economic and social welfare fields can be defeated, unless the political and intellectual leaders of Latin America zealously assume a financial responsibility that can bring the widely present inflation under control. Only where this is done should funds be advanced to finance economic development. Unless we are willing to act with such realism, we will be wasting our taxpayers' money.

Spending a few billion dollars as a kind of dole to individuals would be spectacular while it lasted, but it would obviously be unwise and harmful. Our job is a tough one but it is a wonderful challenge to our own heritage. Out of it we can hope will emerge the American substitute for what in the past has been known as imperialism. We will not be plundering. We will not be colonizing. We will be trying to prove that by helping others we will help ourselves.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, when I first entered this body some 10 years ago, it fell my lot to be placed on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. From the very beginning, the steady file of witnesses appearing on behalf of labor was starred by the now Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Arthur Goldberg. While he and I have seldom seen eye to eye on matters concerning the relationship of management, labor and the public, nevertheless, I have always respected his integrity and his ability. He has, it seems to me, a genuine interest in the problems of these groups and he at no time has expressed this interest better than in his speech made on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Department of Labor. In this speech Mr. Goldberg has stated what has long been overlooked in the balance between both sides of the bargaining table, that no worker can get something for nothing; that we must work, "not less but more;" "that in increased productivity, labor, industry, and the public can all benefit and share."

This is an exceptional speech made at a time in our history when its impact, if accepted, can work in only one direction and that is the good of America. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address By Arthur J. Goldberg, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, 50th Anniversary Celebration of the Department of Labor

I am glad to participate with the President, Secretaries Wirtz, Perkins, and Mitchell, representatives of labor and management, and former colleagues in the Labor Department in this jubilee celebration.

An occasion, such as this, transcends the traditional anniversary of a governmental department, important as all anniversaries are. For today we, whether government servants, labor officials, or management executives count our blessing as free Americans dedicated to free enterprise and free labor.

While the goal of the Department of Labor has remained constant since its establishment 50 years ago, the world today is far different from the world of a half century ago.

Circumstances change: no period in our economic development is like another, and the trials of understanding are renewed in different form for each generation.

Today, two obvious challenges confront our labor-management system. The first is external—the continuing pressure of an economic opponent, the Communist bloc, always striving to match and surpass us as the leading innovators, producers and consumers of the world.

This is a challenge that I believe we can meet and master as we have—in full stride. Our free system of enterprise and of democratic unionism consistently out-produces the Communist controlled system of both enterprise and so-called unions. The wealth of our factories and farms and mines and businesses will continue to stand second to none, as will the economic power generated by the skill and energy of our people who find their own incentives and seek their own rewards.

But the second challenge will, I believe, demand a refocusing of purpose and productive will on our part. It comes, happily, from our friends and it represents, at its heart, the triumph in the free world of the American concept of fair and earnest competition. We are no longer the vast island of haves in a sea of have nots. We are engaged, instead, by strong free economies, by rising productive might, and by determined competitors.

And even though the work and wage and living standards of our free competitors are rising toward the eventual levels of our own, we cannot at this time compete successfully without a reexamination of our own methods and goals. I consider this the basic challenge today to American labor and American business and to the institution of collective bargaining that has served us so well in the past.

I believe this challenge carries its own moral. We must work, not less, but more. We must work not only hard but well, increasing our productive capability as we increase our production.

There are no shortcuts and no panaceas to relieve us of the necessity for finding our own security in abundance, not in a sharing of scarcity. The only lasting security for both labor and management is in dedicated work at fair wages, in more sales at fair prices, in products of dependable quality, in meeting the markets of the world on terms that guarantee an increasing share of the world's business.

The attainment of this already difficult goal is made more complex because we must strive for it during a period of rapidly advancing technology. The dilemma that results is that yielding to technological demand creates many problems, often severe, often of a personal nature, for the American labor force, while not yielding to technological demand is sacrificing our best opportunity to improve our competitive position.

This dilemma has led to the proposals for scarcity sharing, for sharing work and distributing available markets among major producers. This solution is apparent rather than real. Expansion rather than contraction is the solution to the problems of both labor and management. In an expanding economy, we can advance technologically and protect human values. We must do both. In increased productivity, labor, industry and the public can all benefit and share.

We have, and I am confident always will, rejected compulsion as the instrument for serving the national interest. Legal strictures and statutory regulation are poor servants of a free economy.

Our policy must be not to stifle but to stimulate collective bargaining to an awareness of the full context of interests within which it operates, and which it influences. We must bring home to the parties and to the American people, that bargaining, while remaining free, must also be realistic. This, I believe, is still our best hope for the future.

This policy has thus far worked. It has not worked perfectly, of course, as no policy ever will. There should be no tampering with our free institutions, no deprivation of responsibility, no prerogative of labor and management denied or questioned, and no interference in the final judgment of the parties. But to enjoy this freedom, the parties to collective bargaining must exercise responsibility. No one has the monoply to define the public interest; everyone has the obligation to serve it.

I would summarize the past 50 years of labor-management relations in the United States by saying that having done well, we must strive to do better; having achieved much, we must determine to achieve more; always mindful that our goal is not material but spiritual—to safeguard and advance the dignity of the individual, this is the high purpose for which the Labor Department was established. May it continue its great service in the interests of mankind and our beloved country.

WHAT GOES ON?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, during his hour-long television interview on December 17, 1962, President Kennedy had some remarks to make about onsite inspections of Communist countries that I believe deserve some attention in light of current disarmament negotiations going on at Geneva. At that time, it will be remembered, the President informed the Nation that this country had, in effect, backed down from its demand for onsite inspection of Cuba to make sure all the Russian missiles had been removed. He was asked whether an onsite inspection of Cuba might have provided a breakthrough in efforts to bring peace in the world. This was his reply—and I quote:

> No, I don't think that would have materially affected it, because I don't think we would have gotten the kind of inspection which is really necessary, because a totalitarian system cannot accept the kind of inspection which really is desirable. What you are saying, really, is that Cuba be opened, the Soviet Union be opened. They are not going to open it, because a totalitarian system must exist only in secrecy.

Now, Mr. President, let me call particular attention to the President's assertions, first, that a totalitarian system cannot accept the kind of inspection that is desirable and, second, that a totalitarian system must exist only in secrecy.

Given this conviction on the part of the Chief Executive, what are we to think of the actions of the United States in the nuclear test ban negotiations? Much of the present discussion in these negotiations is over how many onsite inspections there are to be in Russia if the United States should suspect the Soviet of cheating on a nuclear test ban agreement.

What goes on? If the President really feels that a totalitarian system cannot open up, cannot permit the kind of inspections that are desirable, cannot exist in any state other than secrecy, what are we doing negotiating in an attempt to get them to accept onsite inspections?

Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I believe it is proper to ask if the administration is actually engaged in an attempt to arrange a test ban without any inspections. When you take a look at the concessions we have already made in this area, you can see that we certainly are headed in that general direction. For example, our original position at Geneva in 1958 demanded the right to inspect all seismic events of undetermined origin above 5 kilotons and 20 percent of all such events under the 5-kiloton level. By February 1960, we had reduced this original demand to 20 on-site inspections a year no matter how many seismic events of undetermined origin occurred. Now we have chipped away at our original demand until we are talking at Geneva about as few as five or six on-site inspections. I believe our official position still calls for seven but hardly a day goes by that the newspapers do not tell of an intention on the part of U.S. negotiators to reduce this figure in an effort to get closer to the Soviet position calling for only three on-site inspections.

Mr. President, in light of our past performance it seems logical to assume that eventually we will find some excuse for accepting the Soviet's offer of three on-site inspections. Assuming we go this far, or assuming that the Russians meet us halfway or even accept as many as eight on-site inspections, the question arises as to whether they would be the kind of inspections that would insure the United States against Soviet cheating and, thus, protect the security of the free world. For the answer to this, I refer you to the President of the United States and his television remarks of December 17 when he said "a totalitarian system cannot accept the kind of inspection which is really necessary."

In this I agree with the President. I do not believe that a totalitarian system can accept the kind of inspection required to guard the strategic interest of the United States. And I do not believe that the Soviet Union is likely to turn into something other than a totalitarian system in the course of the Geneva negotiations.

In short, we should bring our negotiators home and get on with the job of keeping America strong.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. VIRGINIA L. MATHIAS, OF WAIAKOA, MAUI

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, this past week in a little town in my State of Hawaii, a gentle lady of 63 years passed on to eternal rest. My distinguished colleagues in the Senate probably have not heard of Mrs. Virginia L. Mathias, of Waiakoa, Maui, and I want to tell them about her and pay tribute to her because she had attained a significant and praiseworthy role in our postal service.

Two years ago in an all-State survey, the Postmaster's Gazette found that Mrs. Mathias held the unmatched record in length of service. No other postmaster in the entire United States outranked Hawaii's own Mrs. Mathias in years of service as a postmaster. Since 1917 and for 46 consecutive years, she performed duties with dedication as postmaster of Waiakoa on the slopes of Haleakala, a dormant volcano which is part of our national park system.

She looked forward to retirement which would have begun in a matter of weeks—on March 30 to be exact. But one night last week, the call of her Creator came to her in slumber and she heeded that call, slipping away in quiet and solitude.

It was my privilege to have met this gentle lady last December while on an inspection tour of Hawaii postal facilities as a member of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Mrs. Mathias expressed great joy in anticipation of a well-earned retirement, but asked my assistance in clearing a matter prior to her retirement.

When she first started with the postal service, Waiakoa was a fourth-class post office for which she was obliged to purchase—with her own personal funds—certain equipment such as desks, safe, post office boxes, and other office equipment.

Mrs. Mathias wanted to dispose of her equipment still in use but no authority exists for transference of her property to the Government. This is indeed an unusual but not a unique situation and I have called this matter to the attention of the committee asking consideration to allow for purchase of such equipment at a fair appraised value for the sake of other postmasters in this predicament.

Somewhat of a pioneer in the service, Mrs. Mathias first served the Post Office Department as a young bride. Tragedy befell her almost immediately after her marriage to the postmaster of the Waiakoa Post Office. Within 15 months, during which time she substituted without pay for her husband as postmaster, she was a widow with a 2½-month-old daughter.

At age 18, Mrs. Mathias was appointed Waiakoa postmaster during President Woodrow Wilson's administration and subsequently served under six more Chief Executives—Harding, Coolidge, Franklin Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy.

She received her first Presidential appointment signed by President Roosevelt and Postmaster General James A. Farley on June 25, 1940.

By 1933 the Waiakoa Post Office had grown to third-class status and on July 1 this year is scheduled to become a second-class postal facility.

In those early days, mail was delivered to Maui only twice a week for Mrs. Mathias' 11 customers. The ensuing years have seen her salary grow from $7 to about $500 a month; service extended to 600 families plus a subpost office and rural and star routes; and a staff of one to a postmastership with two clerks and a rural carrier.

It is with a heavy heart that we of Hawaii say "aloha oe" to an outstanding citizen who has served our people and our country so well.

To her family, I wish to extend my heartfelt condolences. I know that even in their period of sorrow they have found some measure of solace in the loyal and dedicated manner in which she performed her duties as postmaster at Waiakoa for 46 years.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS MASARYK. CZECH PATRIOT

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in a few of history's chosen men, there glows a fire that is unquenchable.

Abraham Lincoln was such a man. Despite the most savage and inflammatory denouncement by his critics during his lifetime, he has emerged through the years as a wellspring of truth and honesty, of trust in the people, of the concept of government by consent of the governed.

Even now, a century after his death, there continue to arise little fragments of something Lincoln had written, or something someone wrote about him, or perhaps it is a letter, long lost, which sheds some new meaning on the gentle and serene wisdom and faith that was his.

Czechoslovakia had such a man. His name was Thomas Masaryk and March 7 is the 113th anniversary of his birth.

During the first years of the Czech Republic, monuments to him were erected in the village squares. Now that that unhappy land is no longer free, the Communists have undertaken a campaign to demolish the monuments.

But the campaign is not completely successful. It frequently backfires because, according to the newspaper, Svet Prace, the more desperately a government tries to "take Masaryk's halo away from him, the more vividly Masaryk's figure emerges in the minds of the people; so under this aspect, at least, the people are satisfied with the government."

This little story is part of an absorbing article Stanislav Koutnik wrote last fall for the Christian Science Monitor. I wanted to share it with the Senate today and to salute Mr. Koutnik for reminding us of the greatness of Masaryk, a greatness that still has an impact more than a quarter of a century after his death.

As Senator DODD observed in a tribute to this great Czech patriot on the 25th anniversary of his death, Masaryk believed with George Washington that nothing can be politically right that is morally wrong.

Thomas Masaryk told his people to "be honest; tell the truth." And when because of illness, he was forced to lay down the burden of his office, he cautioned, "I shall continue to watch over you, to see that you know what to do."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD on this anniversary of Masaryk's birth, the article by Stanislav Koutnik from the November 5, 1962, edition of the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASARYK: THORN TO REDS

(By Stanislav Koutnik)

During the early years of the Czechoslovak Republic, when the communal elections were on, the candidates for the various offices even in the most remote villages were in the habit of promising their electorate: "I'll do what I can do to see that we can soon have a Masaryk monument."

This was so clinching an argument that it often sufficed to get a man elected. So it is not surprising to know that for years now the population of Czechoslovakia has waged small battles to preserve these monuments. Towns and villages which still have a monument standing are very proud of them.

If the Communist regime does destroy these monuments only in secret, it is evident that their gesture is unpopular. When people wake up in the morning, they may suddenly find only the base of the statue left. People entrusted with the task of demolishing them come stealthily into the villages and wait until the population is asleep before setting about their business.

One morning, at Brno, Czechoslovakia's second-largest city, students on their way to school found only the pedestal of the monument standing. Instead of proceeding toward their school, they picked flowers and silently put them on the mutilated base. Naturally the police stepped in at once, but hundreds of workers and women instantly came running to protect the students.

PITCHFORK PROTECTION

Sometimes the government even apologizes for what happens. At Litvinov the monument was demolished under the pretext that a new road had to pass precisely where it was standing. At Lovesice near Prerov the authorities were able only to lop off the head on Masaryk's statue during the night, and for a long time the monument remained there without its head.

In Moravia, where the peasants would keep watch during the night, armed with pitchforks to defend their parish priests against the police in the past, they now keep watch in turn to protect the monument. It is really a grotesque situation. Every time March 7 is approaching—the anniversary of Masaryk's birthday—the Government is forced to give special instructions to the police. For a long time now, the tomb of Masaryk has been sealed off for some distance all about it by barbed wire, to prevent passers-by from putting flowers on it.

When Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru came to Prague the Government wished him to visit the imposing mausoleum of Gottwald during his stay. But Mr. Nehru answered: "I did not know Gottwald, so I do not think it necessary for me to visit it. I would rather you show me the tomb of Thomas G. Masaryk." For obvious reasons, this visit was postponed until the police had had time to put the grave in order. But the people of Czechoslovakia are fond of Mr. Nehru not only becasue he honored Masaryk's memory but also because he expressed the wish that the largest possible number of Communist ministers went with him to the tomb.

VIVIDLY REMEMBERED

From the historic point of view Masaryk was one of the founders of the Czechoslovak Republic. In popular legend he was a wise father to the nation, a servant of justice, a defender of the oppressed, and their leader in dark days. The slightest hostile allusion to him could cause a riot, and the Communists are aware of it.

In the beginning they tried to convert Masaryk into a forerunner, a prophet of communism, as they had already done with such heterogeneous people as Ivan Hrozny, Avicenna, and Leonardo da Vinci, calling them "Communists prior to the Communist era." But Masaryk is still so vividly remembered a figure that he represents a danger for every totalitarian government. All the weapons of communism are impotent in the face of his influence on individuals.

Yet the Communists had to begin sometime. One morning the Prague radio, after broadcasting the Soviet anthem, launched its first effort: "The people should by now have understood that Thomas Garrigue Masaryk was not a herald of humanities, a friend of the working people * * * but was really an agent of the Western imperialists and the instrument of the bourgeoisie against the interests of the people * * *." The mechanism of propaganda was in motion. An official history against Masaryk appeared, and the Communist paper, Rude Pravo, opened its campaign: "Destroy his legend."

Documents on Masaryk's alleged intrigues against the Soviets were published, while the press and the radio endeavored to elaborate the theme: "The party liberates workers from the influence of Masaryk thought." University professors have been called into action, a book on the antirevolutionary policy of Masaryk and Beneš against the Soviet was published, and special courses to debunk Masaryk were established at the universities. The entire administrative machine of the country has been reeducated in order that it may reeducate the other citizens. In the name of this anti-Masaryk crusade a colossal structure has been built: state bureaucracy against Masaryk.

COMMUNISM DENOUNCED

But the population recalls how Masaryk had warned them: "Bolshevik aggression must be rejected as forcefully as possible. That is all the Bolsheviks understand." They know that his historic analysis of "Russia and Europe" is more alive today after 67 years than when it first appeared. Nor do they forget that in the "Social Question" Masaryk said: "If socialism means love of my neighbor, then I am a socialist"—while elsewhere he had written: "Reject communism. In a true democracy neither the individual nor the community can exploit its fellow citizens, because men cannot ever become just an instrument to the state." And again: "There is only one remedy against any evil springing from political freedom and freedom of the press: and that is a still greater freedom."

The whole of this anti-Masaryk campaign is a singular paradox in the history of Marxist dialectics. The more desperately a government tries to take Masaryk's halo away from him (according to the newspaper Svet Prace), the more vividly Masaryk's figure emerges in the minds of the people; so under this aspect at least, the population is satisfied with the government.

BE HONEST—TELL THE TRUTH

The problem of how to get rid of him still exists in all its impact. Learned and scientific men have already examined every known letter which Masaryk ever wrote, have even shown that a leaflet against him was circulating among workers during his lifetime. But an overzealous scholar brought out the fact—by mistake—that this leaflet was written in Moscow. They have proved that Masaryk had learned the trade of blacksmith, but did not succeed in this business so he became a university professor.

"I shall continue to watch over you, to see that you know what to do," Masaryk said, when in 1935 he abdicated from the office of President of the Republic. Even though the people of Czechoslovakia only remembered that Masaryk constantly repeated in his inspiring way, with uplifted finger: "Be honest—tell the truth," he would be their leader in their present situation by reason of this alone.

At Brandys on the Elbe the monument of Masaryk is placed so that he is looking right toward the windows of the building where the STB (the secret state police) now officiate. For some years the Communists have been asking one another: "How can we get rid of him?" The last time they tried to do so was on the occasion of the celebrations for the 12th anniversary of the Communist regime. But an old local Communist woman who for 30 years had sold vegetables near the monument in the square has succeeded in persuading the Communist committee of the area to allow Masaryk to remain where he is. "I'm so used to him that I'd feel sad without him," she argued in her application.

But so that Masaryk would not continue to stare into the windows of the offices of the political police force, and repeat his motto to the police there day and night: "Be honest—tell the truth," they have draped the windows with new curtains.

MR. HOOVER OF THE FBI

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, J. Edgar Hoover is about a year short of completing four decades of service as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but this year marks his 50th anniversary of Federal Government service, since it was in 1913 that he began his career in the Library of Congress.

Few men in the Federal service, now or in the past, can match the sterling record of J. Edgar Hoover and the organization he heads.

A tribute to this service appears in the March 4 issue of Newsweek in which columnist Raymond Moley recounts from Don Whitehead's excellent book, "The FBI Story," the scene in which the gruff and frosty New Englander, Harlan Fiske Stone, offered young Hoover the job as Director of the FBI.

I should like to share with the Senate a sort of sequel to that scene and one which will have special significance to Members of this body.

Young Hoover had made it eminently clear that politics would play no part in the selection or promotion of an agent. This policy was tested when he transferred an agent from Washington to the Southwest.

A Senator with considerable influence and prestige called on Hoover to remonstrate with him, explaining that the agent was needed to help with the Senator's coming campaign. Hoover said:

> I'm very sorry, Senator, but I think it would be best for the agent and best for the Bureau if he gets away from his political ties. This will give him a new chance.

The ruffled Senator threatened to take the matter up with Attorney General Stone and later executed that threat.

Stone shortly called in the Director and asked Hoover what were the facts in this case.

Hoover explained the situation. Mr. Stone said, "I think you are not entirely on sound grounds." Hoover's heart sank and he thought to himself, "Here's where I resign." And then the Attorney General added, "I'm surprised you didn't fire the fellow at once."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD Mr. Moley's column from the current issue of Newsweek.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FAITH OF THE FBI

(By Raymond Moley)

As J. Edgar Hoover is completing four decades of service as Chief of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, it might be suggested that the letters FBI could stand for fidelity, bravery, and intelligence. For scores of FBI men in fierce and sometimes bloody encounters have shown rare courage. And on other occasions the fine intelligence of Hoover's men has outwitted and frustrated the sharpest crooks in the underworld and the elite among alien subversives.

But what most distinguishes the career of J. Edgar Hoover is his fidelity to the limited function of his organization and to constitutional restrictions. Americans should remind themselves from time to time that the FBI is largely an investigative agency. It does not prosecute. It does not judge. It finds the facts and submits them to agencies responsible for doing something about them. The FBI lets facts speak for themselves.

This concentration of function has marked J. Edgar Hoover as more than a superdetective, more than an uncommonly capable executive, more than a protector of American security against alien enemies. He has the essential qualities of a statesman. For true statesmanship is found in an individual who when in power understands the limitations within which that power should be prudently used. He can live with power without succumbing to its narcotic effect.

NO POLITICS

In a government where the expansion of authority and the growth of the establishment are the rule, the FBI has provided a luminous exception. Its size has grown to 16,000 employees, but every addition has been made in response to congressional action on urgent problems.

On many occasions Hoover has been asked to step beyond the limits of his assigned duties and literally take over functions of a State or county prosecutor or police force. Often this demand has been accompanied by great political pressure. Unusual integrity and discretion have resisted such pressure.

Serving under his sixth President, Hoover has survived 12 Attorneys General. In 1933, when party control in the executive department changed, the political nabobs around Roosevelt demanded his job for this or that ambitious police chief of their ilk. Attorney General Cummings asked for time, and after a month demanded and received Presidential authorization to keep Hoover where he had been and where he is now.

LIBERTY PROTECTED

After the sad days of the Department of Justice under Harry Daugherty, Harlan F. Stone was appointed Attorney General in 1924. The Bureau in which Hoover was a young subordinate was ridden with politics and encumbered with bureaucratic hacks. Stone offered Hoover the job of rehabilitation. Hoover made a condition of his acceptance that the Bureau should be completely divorced from politics, that he should be responsible only to the Attorney General, that appointments should require high standards of merit, and that promotions should be determined only on proven ability.

Stone, never a demonstrative man, said coldly that he would have made the offer only with that in mind. "That's all. Good day."

Hoover transformed the Bureau into a "tight ship." He emphasized quality rather than quantity in employing operatives. New procedures were introduced. Fresh methods of operation were determined. Scientific methods built up over the years have had incredible usefulness.

As long as Hoover or the Hoover tradition is on guard, Americans need not fear the perils of a police state. He has said: "The secret of crime eradication lies not in a national police force but in solidarity and the linking of all law-enforcement agencies." He has gained that solidarity, better called cooperation, by never usurping but in helping local, State, and other Federal authorities through mutual respect and trust.

Finally, he and his extraordinary staff have indefatigably guarded the liberties of Americans against the hot blood of overzealous pursuers of alleged wrongdoing. He has kept in mind the old rule that not only must there be guardians, but that someone must guard the guardians.

MEMBERSHIP OF DISTRICT JUDGES ON JUDICIAL COUNCILS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on Friday, March 1, the distingushed chairman of the Subcommittee for Improvements in Judicial Machinery, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], introduced S. 979 which will strengthen the Federal court system by adding district judges to the membership of the judicial councils of the circuits. I was pleased to cosponsor the measure.

The judicial councils have a key function in the operation of the Federal courts. Under section 332 of title 28, United States Code, they have been given the responsibility for the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts within their respective circuits. The statute empowers the councils to make all necessary orders to that end and provides that the district court judges shall promptly carry these orders into effect.

Although the activities of the judicial councils directly concern the operations of the district courts, only circuit judges serve on the councils. Under the present law, the membership is composed of the chief judge and each of the circuit judges for the circuit. The bill introduced today would expand this membership to include district judges.

In this manner, the councils would be given more ready access to the views and experience of the trial court judges. Since these judges are involved in the day-to-day operations of the district courts, they have a close familiarity with the problems which arise and hence could contribute a great deal to the deliberations of the councils. This consideration becomes particularly important when we realize that many of the circuit judges have never served as district judges.

It is also felt that giving the district judges a voice on the councils will lead to closer cooperation between the judges and the councils and will enable them to better coordinate their efforts. In 1957, district judges were added to the Judicial Conference of the United States, and the experience there has been very gratifying in terms of the effectiveness of that organization.

The present bill is identical to H.R. 6690 which was passed by the House and was reported out favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee during the last Congress. It provides for the addition of two district judges to the judicial council of each circuit having five or more circuit judges in regular active service. One of those new members would be the district judge who represents the circuit in the Judicial Conference of the United States, and the other would be chosen by his fellow judges for a 3-year term.

In a circuit which has fewer than five circuit judges, only the district judge who represents the circuit in the Judicial Conference of the United States would be added to the council. This provision would apply only to the first circuit since it is the only circuit not having at least five judges serving on its court of appeals. In all of the other circuits two district judges would be added.

The bill also provides that the clerks of the U.S. courts of appeals shall serve as secretaries for the judicial councils of their respective circuits.

This legislation has been the subject of discussion for several years by various committees of the Judicial Conference of the United States. On September 20, 1961, and again on March 8, 1962, the Judicial Conference voted its approval of H.R. 6690.

The Senate Judiciary Committee reported H.R. 6690 to the Senate on September 7, 1961. Because of some objections that the bill had not been adequately considered, it was subsequently recommitted to the committee for hearings and further study, and was then again reported out favorably on September 20, 1962.

Since this measure was thoroughly considered during the last Congress, I hope that it will be possible for the Senate to take action on it early in this session.

NOTRE DAME BIOLOGISTS ASK THAT INDIANA DUNES BE SAVED

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, nearly all those who would destroy the Indiana dunes for the benefit of two steel companies and a few other selfish interests make the extraordinary—because it is wholly untrue—claim that there is nothing about the dunes worth saving.

Thirteen members of the faculty of the department of biology of the University of Notre Dame, which is located in northern Indiana, have recently put the lie to these false assertions of the dunes despoilers.

In a letter to the South Bend, Ind., Tribune which appeared in that newspaper's Voice of the People column on February 22, these 13 Indiana scientists stated that in their opinion, the Indiana dunes is "perhaps the most outstanding natural resource of Indiana, or for that matter any of our Midwestern States." They continue:

> It is, therefore, with the deepest concern, amazement, and regret that we have observed the ever-increasing efforts of those who are attempting to do away with this priceless asset. Once removed, Indiana will have forfeited one of its most valuable recreational areas. Once removed, the country will have been deprived of a unique and wondrous geological and biological phenomenon.

They conclude by advancing the really basic argument for locating a new Indiana harbor elsewhere saying:

> The paramount justification for the placement of the port at any of the other more suitable Indiana sites is provided by the dunes themselves.

Mr. President, I hope this expert counsel will be read by many people in Indiana and the country, and I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Record along with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE UNIQUE DUNES

It would appear that anyone who opposes the development of a deep-water port at the Burns Ditch site is either an agent of an out-of-State interest group or a bird watcher, but most certainly is against Indiana. At the risk of being so labeled, we wish to go on record as favoring the preservation of the dunes through the establishment of a national monument in this area.

An informative history of the Burns Ditch area, including a most enlightening discussion of the principal individuals and interest groups supporting a port at this site, may be found in the February 1963 Atlantic Monthly. To be sure, no bird watchers are found among the supporters of the Burns Ditch port site, although out-of-State interests are well represented.

Perhaps the most outstanding natural resource of Indiana, or for that matter any of our Midwestern States, is the dunes. It is, therefore, with the deepest concern, amazement, and regret that we have observed the ever-increasing efforts of those who are attempting to do away with this priceless asset. Once removed, the dunes would be irrevocably lost. Once removed, Indiana will have forfeited one of its most valuable recreational areas. Once removed, the country will have been deprived of a unique and wondrous geological and biological phenomenon.

As residents of Indiana and as professional biologists, it is our sincere belief that the loss of the dunes would be tragic to this and to future generations. Our strongest wish and recommendation is that this great natural area be saved. The paramount justification for the placement of the port at any of the other more suitable Indiana sites is provided by the dunes themselves.

G. T. A. Benda; Harvey A. Bender; George B. Craig, Jr.; James P. Doll, C.S.C.; Ronald J. Downey; Robert Gordon; Robert P. McIntosh; Morris Pollard; Karamjit S. Rai; Ralph E. Thorson; Joseph A. Tihen; Kenyon S. Tweedel; Bro. Raphael Wilson, C.S.C., Department of Biology, University of Notre Dame.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEATING BEFORE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, it was my great pleasure earlier this week to attend the annual award dinner of the National Conference of Christians and Jews held in Wilmington, Del., at which Senator Kenneth B. Keating was the principal speaker.

The national conference is an outstanding civic group which seeks through education and discussion to promote cooperation and mutual understanding among men of good will of all religious faiths. It has accomplished a great deal of good not only in my State but throughout the Nation, and its work has earned the praise of many citizens concerned with the basic problems of justice and brotherhood.

Senator Keating was an ideal choice to be this year's speaker. He is one of outstanding leaders in the struggle to break down the barriers of discrimination which separate Americans on the basis of race or creed. His efforts in the field of civil rights have been acclaimed on many occasions and continues to be one of his principal concerns in the Congress. He is a man dedicated to fairplay and to equal justice, and one of the most eloquent defenders of the principles of our Constitution ever to serve in the Senate.

His remarks at the annual dinner were a stirring reminder of the importance of human dignity and individual rights in the American tradition. He received a tremendous ovation from those in attendance at the dinner—not only because of what he had to say that night, but, I am sure, also in tribute to the magnificent record he has achieved in the areas of such deep concern to the national conference.

Mr. President, because I know that many Members will be interested in reading Senator Keating's speech to the national conference, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Senator Keating

Mr. Chairman, Senator Boggs, Mayor Smith, distinguished officers, and members of the Delaware region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, it is indeed a pleasure to be with you on this meaningful occasion. Mayor Smith, I am deeply pleased to join with your legion of friends—both those here with us tonight, and those in the wider circle of your friendship and your humanity—in congratulating you on the most gratifying tribute of recognition represented

by the splendid and richly deserved award you have received tonight.

* * * * *

My pleasure in being here with you tonight in this good company is intensified, enriched, by the nature and purpose of this conference.

The most epochal, most meaningful treaty in the history of the world is an unwritten treaty. It is the pact of brotherhood. It is a pact entered into freely by the human mind, the human heart—in response to an inbred need, to a sense of oneness—of common destiny that knows no distinction of land, of race, of creed, or color.

Nature created mountains and seas which, historically, have impeded brotherhood. Man himself, in his ignorance, in his self-betrayal has erected walls to keep brotherhood out, or to fragment brotherhood—which is to deny it. But humanity is not long a prisoner of distrust and enmity. Its innate urge is to level walls not to build them.

Our presence here tonight bears witness—living witness—to the success toward which we are moving in the great struggle to assert and to vivify the concept that in this voyage of life we all travel together on the same flight—a flight which has no first class, second class, or third class—because the travelers, by right of birth, are traveling together, not separately.

For true brotherhood is not a complex of clubs. Not in its fullest, richest, truest sense. It is rather a universal club every individual is born into, by the very fact of birth.

This need for the solidarity, the unity, and the cooperation of men of good will, springs from no body of law. It springs from the highest, finest impulses of the human heart. It distinguishes man, the spiritual being, from man the physical being. It is a priority project of the soul.

There are those today who speak loftily of human dignity but who conceive of it only as something they possess, not as something they must share, as though the sharing would dilute the force and meaning of the sacred term, as though if human dignity were accorded to all, it would be a devalued wealth, a stone less precious, a gold alloyed.

Such people, in a sense, presanctify themselves, while denying sanctity to others. They protest their love of freedom while denying the very core and basis of freedom. They are for America 100 percent, but not for Americans 100 percent, which is an anomaly that never seems to pierce the fog of their self-delusion.

In any age, in any time, the dignity of the individual must rightly be a reality rather than a slogan. But in our present times, as never before, that reality must be made to live, to shine, to triumph, for it is being challenged in a manner and on a scale unparalleled in recorded history.

For danger stalks the world today—danger not so much of material destruction, but the planned campaign of conquest that has as its target the spirit, the identity of man as a free individual in a free society.

I speak of the mass operation to dehumanize, to despiritualize the individual—to establish in his place one omniscient, omnipotent, inexorable deity—the state.

* * * * *

Actually, as history has so clearly recorded, the Russian revolution has become the most extensive prison system in the history of the world—locking in not merely the physical body of man but clamping chains on his mind, his heart, his very soul.

The historical significance for the rest of the world lay in the fact that communism was not marketed for domestic consumption only—it was conceived as an ideological article of export, and its salesmen are now found wherever on this globe the product can advantageously be pushed.

This global marketing leads sometimes to the fatal error that because communism is bad, freedom is perfect—or at least, the practical working out of freedom particularly in such citadels of freedom as our own United States.

The mistake we make, I believe, is that we too often and too readily conceive of the danger to our free way of life as coming wholly from without, as though freedom were a walled city and its defenders were massed as one man to prevent infiltration and conquest.

* * * * *

Communism's weakness is that it is not an affirmation, it is a denial. It is not the wave of the future, it is the wave of the past. It is not dynamic, it is sterile. And the heart of its error lies in the concept that people are statistics, not souls; that man is a creature of the state, not a creature of God; that an individual has only the worth that is stamped on him, like a price tag.

If we did not believe these values were false, we would not be here tonight. But we are not here passively, to personify brotherhood as a realization.

We are here militantly, in a fight to extend the frontiers of brotherhood, to create an awareness that no enemy we face as a nation is a greater enemy, a more dangerous enemy than the often well dressed, soft-spoken, proper, respectable agents of bigotry, intolerance, discrimination and hatred.

There is, today, in the public mind, a tendency to compute national strength in terms of armaments, of nuclear thrust, of payload potential, of satellites in orbit. This kind of calculation is fallacious, it is misleading, it is dangerous.

The arithmetic of booster strength is not a way of life. At best it is but a reflection of one facet of life—the physical adaptation of man to the climate of danger in which he lives. The essence of life, after all, is not to be able to defend, but to have something to defend—something precious beyond arsenals, armies or navies, something, indeed, which gives these elements their only reason for existence.

Here in Delaware, your fine organization has not merely cherished the high concepts of good will, of unity, of brotherhood. You have made those concepts operational. In the field of religion and public affairs, your dialog group meetings constitute a dynamic and hopeful fusing force.

In education, the summer workshop program has been brought to vibrant life here, extending and deepening the base study of human relations. I was impressed to note that your region alone has provided 75 of these invaluable workshop scholarships for educators.

* * * * *

So many people wonder: What can I do for my country? The answer is simple. It does not call for heroics—it calls for no spectacular demonstration of patriotism. What anyone can do—and should do—is precisely what you are doing—daily, devotedly, dynamically—helping to build the sense of oneness, of common fraternity, of common destiny that is the true and indispensable foundation of the structure of freedom, of the vast home we call America.

The true America is not measurable in the brute power of megatons. It is measured, rather, in the power of principles, of values, of ideals—in the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—and in those rights without qualifications, without amendments, without reservations.

Because this is so, men have loved America enough to die for it. Because this is so, this conference of Christians and Jews is not a mere name, but a living act of faith, not yet a fulfillment but a striving, a dynamic, dedicated, tireless striving to assure that this great Nation of ours, like the hand of God, finds room for all, and touches all, indiscriminately with the common indelible mark of human dignity.

UNIVERSITIES IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Washington Post on March 5 carried two articles on universities in Latin America. Anyone who has studied the troubled lives of many South American nations in recent years knows only too well that the Communists have been quite successful in utilizing the energy and impatience of youth for their own ends.

These two articles show that the United States is beginning to compete very effectively in the universities for the sympathies of the students. I am sure that once the propaganda is stripped away that these students will realize that freedom of choice and action as represented in the democratic way of life is the only system that can bring permanent liberty to their countries.

One article deals with student activities and the other with a real increase in the cooperation between universities and colleges in the United States and those in Latin America. These cooperative programs should do much to make Latin American higher education an effective support to the new and diversified economies now rapidly developing in these nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these two articles printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 5, 1963]

Central American Universities Ease Away From Reds' Clutches

(By Bert Quint)

Tegucigalpa, Honduras.—What could be a trend away from Communist control of the universities of Central America is becoming faintly noticeable in two countries of this strategic region.

They are Honduras, where a majority of the 2,000 students of the national university voted a few days ago to break away from the Prague-based International Students Union, and El Salvador, where extreme leftist deans of two schools of the Salvadoran national university were voted out of their jobs by the student body of 2,400.

For more than a generation, the Communists have concentrated on the area's universities. Communists work their way into key faculty posts and until recently had little serious competition in gaining positions of student leadership.

Three years ago, youths influenced by Communist agitators controlled the University of Honduras, and they pushed through a vote to join the Communist-front International Students Union.

But since then, the non-Communist United Democratic University Front (FUUD) has been winning student elections and gradually increasing its strength. Last July, it won by some 200 votes.

SWAN ISLAND OCCUPATION

Still, these students hesitated to take the issue of a break with the Communist-front union to a student assembly. Finally, in February, they risked it—after making use of a subterfuge that some say was suggested by the U.S. Embassy.

The FUUD sent a delegation to an International Students Union convention in Leningrad. There it tried to bring up the question of U.S. occupation of the Swan Islands, off the Honduran coast, so as "to denounce American imperialism." Suspecting a trick, the convention organizers refused to permit the topic to be raised.

That was what the youths wanted. They thus were able to say that the Communist group refused to discuss a "legitimate complaint of Honduran students."

The student assembly backed rupture with the union by a large majority.

At El Salvador University, where administrative officials are elected by students, Communists had held absolute power. Anti-Communists were frightened into inactivity.

DEANS REPLACED

But this year, in elections in January and February, Communist deans of the schools of economy and humanities were replaced by leftist, but non-Communist, educators.

A man considered a Communist, Fabio Castillo, was elected rector, replacing a left-wing intellectual. But Castillo has stated that students should study rather than get involved in politics.

In both countries, the Caribbean crisis, which showed that the Soviet Union is the real boss in Cuba, also contributed to the students' disenchantment. They are now beginning to seek a third position—neither pro-Communist nor pro-American.

An equally important factor, one that U.S. officials are reluctant to discuss publicly, is the effort to get the American side of the story across. In some countries—and El Salvador is one—young Americans attached to the U.S. embassies devote their full time to mingling with the students and trying to win them over. In others, the public affairs officer or cultural attaché does the job.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 5, 1963]

THIRTY-SEVEN U.S. UNIVERSITIES ARE AIDING INSTITUTIONS IN 16 LATIN NATIONS

(By Dan Kurzman)

U.S. universities have begun to play an important role in the development of education in Latin America.

Increasingly aware that today's 550,000 Latin university students may determine the continent's future ideological orientation, the universities are vying to help sister institutions south of the border.

Thirty-seven U.S. universities have already entered into aid contracts with 57 Latin institutions in 16 countries under a U.S. Government-financed Alliance for Progress program. These account for more than one-fourth of the 200-odd universities in Latin America, and many new contracts are expected to be concluded in the future.

The extreme interest of United States and Latin American universities today is in marked contrast to their reluctance to deal with each other in pre-Alliance years when an annual average of only 5 to 10 contracts were in force.

U.S. institutions preferred to help other areas, while Latin academic centers devoted themselves mainly to prestigious liberal arts training conducted in traditional ways.

ADJUST TO NEW TEMPO

But with the telescoping of economic and social development under the Alliance, it has become clear to hemisphere educators that Latin universities would have to gear themselves to the new tempo.

One of the principal obstacles to the Alliance today is the lack of trained technicians to plan and implement development programs. The American universities are now helping to remedy this situation, as well as to engender greater good will toward the United States on the part of Latin students, who tend to distrust this country for its past imperialism.

The Agency for International Development (AID) has committed $24 million in aid to the 57 Latin university projects for expansion of training in such technical fields as agriculture, education, public and business administration, engineering, and economics. Another $50 million is likely to be expended to bring these projects, about 40 of which are already underway, to completion.

In addition, the U.S.-contributed Social Trust Fund administered by the Inter-American Development Bank has earmarked $25 million for such educational schemes. The Ford, Rockefeller and other foundations, as well as the United Nations Special Fund, are also contributors.

UNIVERSITIES LISTED

Among the American universities that will send professors and educational technicians to Latin institutions are California, Chicago, Columbia, Minnesota, Pittsburgh, Texas A. & M., Iowa State, North Carolina State, Michigan, Michigan State, Purdue, Southern California, Indiana, Louisiana State, Tennessee, Cornell, Catholic University, Syracuse, Stanford, and Tulane. Most of these institutions have arrangements with only one or two Latin universities.

Recently, Pittsburgh and the Central University of Ecuador reached the most comprehensive agreement ever concluded between a United States and a Latin American university. Pittsburgh will send more than 20 professors from 9 different fields to Quito and bring some 100 Ecuadoreans to its own campus for training under a $1 million AID-financed project. Ecuador will provide local facilities under the grant.

The professors, like those from other American institutions, will provide technical advice and guidance in their particular fields for improvement of academic programs, for the development of teaching laboratories and basic libraries, and inservice training.

"A year ago we had to look for American universities to aid Latin American institutions," said Marvin Weissman, Director of the Office of Institutional Development, which is operating the AID program under the Alliance. "Today more U.S. universities are asking to help than we can accommodate immediately."

Latin American universities have shifted a considerable share of their normal resources from such fields as law, medicine, and fine arts to new technical fields. In many cases the salaries of professors have been increased permitting them to teach and conduct research full time, as they had not been able to do previously.

Students are receiving more scholarships, have been supplied with new facilities and equipment, and are being instructed with new teaching methods.

From a political standpoint, the raising of educational standards is expected to encourage students to devote more time to study, reducing their interest in the demagoguery of Communists who have helped to turn many Latin campuses into sanctuaries for youthful rioters.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN WYOMING

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the traditional headgear for the State of Wyoming has been the 10-gallon hat. But in the past few years this versatile hat has had to share a peg on the hatrack with the "hard hat" on heavy industry and construction.

For Wyoming is undergoing a revolution and is finding that under her rich rangelands lie vast mineral deposits of inestimable value. Many of these deposits had been thought of little value until men with imagination and new techniques took a second look and now progress is a way of life.

As one who has spent long hours in seeking to develop Wyoming's potential I am naturally highly pleased with these recent developments in my State. An article in the Rocky Mountain News, of Denver, Colo., on February 17, called Wyoming the emerging "Ruhr of the United States."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD. It is a fine account of our State's progress and I commend it to the Members of this body.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WYOMING EMERGING AS RUHR OF UNITED STATES

(By Morton L. Margolin)

CHEYENNE, February 16.—Wyoming, a land long associated in the minds of many as country fit only for cattle and cowboys, is beginning to emerge as the potential Ruhr Valley of the West.

New mineral discoveries, coupled with new technologies for their extraction and use, have brought some of the Nation's biggest industries to the high plains of Wyoming.

In the past 4 years, new plants costing a total of $192 million to build, have begun operations in the vast stretches of the Equality State. And the experts say it's only the beginning.

The economic future is bright, and it gets rosier the further ahead the projection extends.

Full development?

"We probably won't see it in our lifetime," says J. A. (Buck) Buchanan, director of the Wyoming Natural Resources Board. "But it is coming as sure as anything. There is no stopping it."

Comments Harry Evans, of Casper, special representative for the Burlington & Colorado and Southern Railroads: "We may have the last frontier, but we've got the natural resources, and the space for the people who will be needed to develop them. Other areas, like California, are filling up fast. Where else are people to go for opportunity?"

Except for the oil industry, which has been Wyoming's big ace in the hole for decades, most of the other developments are still pretty much in the pilot plant stage.

But at this point they look like successful operations which will eventually lead to much bigger operations. The roll of owners includes some of the biggest industrial names in the Nation.

In the South Pass area, near Lander, where the ruts of the westbound wagon trains are still visible, the Columbia-Geneva division of United States Steel started operations in its new $60 million taconite beneficiating plant at Atlantic City last September.

The low grade ore, which comes out of the ground less than 30 percent iron, is concentrated in the plant, and emerges at better than 60 percent iron concentrate. The plant, the most modern in the Nation, is one of the new technological developments and depends for success on the high magnetic properties of the Wyoming ore.

In July, the Stauffer Chemical Co. dedicated its $10 million trona mine and soda ash plant in the Green River Basin of western Wyoming.

Trona is trisodium phosphate, commonly known as soda ash. The Stauffer plant will produce 150,000 to 200,000 tons annually. Reserves are estimated at 200 million tons.

The chemical, in almost pure state, is found about 900 feet below the surface in layers interlaced with easily disposable shale.

A year earlier, Food Machinery Corp., which had been mining and processing soda ash at Green River, completed a $4 million expansion of its facilities, running its Wyoming investment to $30 million.

Early in 1962, Petratomics, opened a $2 million uranium mill in the Shirley Basin. It is the State's sixth and newest uranium mill. In 1961, Wyoming mills turned out $28.2 million worth of uranium.

Other major industrial developments of the past year saw:

Completion of a $1 million fertilizer plant by American Humates, Inc., near Glenrock. The process uses low grade coals in the area.

Similar coal deposits near Glenrock are the reason for the location of the Pacific Power & Light Co.'s huge electric generating plant there. Using local coal, strip mined on the site, the plant will eventually cost $67 million and produce 400,000 kilowatts. Two stages have been built. The third is to be finished in 1964.

Utah Power & Light Co. passed the 85-percent complete mark on the first 150,000-kilowatt unit of its new coal burning electric generating plant near Kemmerer. An automatic coal-handling system, designed to handle local coal from a nearby mine, will deliver fuel to the plant.

Food Machinery Corp. in a joint venture with United States Steel developed a process for making metallurgical coke from Kemmerer's noncoking, low-ash, subbituminous coals. The plant produces 250 tons a day.

Western Nuclear Co. completed a 110-ton-per-day sulfuric acid plant at Jeffery City in November. The $700,000 operation provides the acid for Western Nuclear's uranium milling operations.

So much for the promise of the future. What about the present?

Art Roberts, of Casper, executive vice president of the Wyoming Oil Industry Committee, points out the oil industry along with agriculture, is still the backbone of the Wyoming economy.

New technologies for secondary recovery are extending the life of some of the old oilfields. They are expected to produce well beyond the year 2000. In addition, new discoveries give Wyoming one of the highest success ratings in the country.

With an average production of 40 barrels per day per well, Wyoming ranks fifth in the Nation in oil production, and explorers are spending $250 million a year to find new wells.

Sinclair is modernizing its refinery near Rawlins, and plans to build a new pipeline to supply the Denver market, with completion set for 1964.

Jack Knott, manager of the Associated General Contractors of Wyoming forecasts a heavy construction year of around $38 million worth of work for 1963. That would be slightly ahead of 1962 as work proceeds on interstate highways, reclamation projects, and city improvements such as sewage and water facilities.

State Representative Ed Breece, Republican, of Lander, noting Wyoming's agricultural development is limited by water, altitude, and a short growing season, forecasts a big step forward if and when the State can get some local feedlots and packing plants.

Russ Beamer, of Riverton, spokesman for the mining industry, agreed with Breece that Wyoming's greatest opportunities lie in further development of its own resources.

"If the people in Wyoming have the opportunity to utilize their resources, they'll do a better job for themselves than Uncle Sam will," Beamer commented.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on Saturday, March 2, the State of Michigan was honored with a visit by the Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and his charming wife, Lady Bird, who came to Detroit as guests of honor at the 1963 Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner of the Michigan Democratic Party.

We were particularly appreciative of their visit since it took place on the anniversary of Texas Independence Day, and we know that Texans do not lightly absent themselves from Texas on the observance of this important State holiday.

But we are glad they did, because their presence in Detroit made the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner an outstanding success.

The highlight of this dinner was the inspiring address by the Vice President. Many of the points he made in his remarks have such widespread application that they deserve to be shared with more than the 2,400 persons in the hall.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of the address by the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, DETROIT, MICH., MARCH 2, 1963

I have been sitting here tonight basking in the warm glow of peace and harmony that Democrats always enjoy right after a convention and just before an election.

I have been following with some interest the communiques on the engagement at Grand Rapids. I understand the Grand Rapids Chamber of Commerce has commemorated that affair by adopting a new slogan: "The City of Brotherly Love."

In view of what has been happening lately here in Michigan, it is especially appropriate that we meet to honor two great Democrats: Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

Both were sturdy, unabashed partisans who believed in speaking their minds, and they founded the tradition of our party—that when people differ, they go to the mat.

So, while Republicans can never understand it, I take it that Michigan Democrats have been busy doing what has always come naturally for Democrats—just warming up on each other in practice for the main event.

As Will Rogers once said: "I am not a member of any organized party, I am a Democrat."

But lambasting fellow Democrats is not the only activity in our party. Democrats also know how to unite—how to unite our party, and most important of all, how to unite the Nation in its hours of trouble. Because Democrats do have this ability, we have—and we will continue to have—a record of success.

You have another opportunity for success coming up very soon. And I know that every one of you is going to work your fingers to the bone to insure the election or the reelection of men like your distinguished educator, Dr. Lynn Bartlett, and such distinguished jurists as Justice Paul Adams and Justice Eugene Black. These represent the high caliber of men that the Democratic habit of success has brought to the people.

I am told that here in Michigan the Republicans want to change things and get around the Democratic habit of success. They are plugging a new constitution which would cut down the frequency of elections and reduce the number of elected officials.

In other words, "If you can't win them, cancel them."

But I did not come here tonight to talk about Republicans. They do enough of that themselves. I came here to talk about your party and my party—and, what is more important, your country and my country.

The day after tomorrow will mark the 30th anniversary of the start of the most vital period of social and economic democracy in our century. It was on Monday 30 years ago that the United States inaugurated as its President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

On that cold, gray day in 1933, Franklin Roosevelt told a doubting and despairing America, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."

From that moment, American courage and American confidence were reborn. Through three decades since, Americans have been at work moving forward—moving not to the right, not to the left, but moving upward to a better life for all the people.

Today some say that the New Deal was an experiment. Some say that it was a failure. Some say that it has now become outmoded and obsolete.

I say that the philosophy of government which helps the people to help protect themselves against depression, against unemployment, against old age will never be outmoded or obsolete. I say that the program which protects family bank accounts, which protects against worthless stocks, which protects against 60-hour weeks and pittance wages is not a failure. And, I say that a program which survived 8 years of Republicanism with only one minor bill being repealed cannot be described as an experiment.

What Franklin Roosevelt stood for—and fought for—is forever and eternally a part of American life and a part of the values of freemen throughout the world.

That work for the people begun three decades ago is being carried forward today by the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy.

It is being carried forward by vigorous Democrats from your State like your two outstanding Senators, PAT MCNAMARA and PHIL HART.

Let me say of your two Senators—they are good for Michigan and they are very good for the country.

It is good for America to have a man in the Senate who will quietly but effectively work to protect the consumers from mislabeling, work to protect our families from untested drugs, work to solve the difficult problems of human rights as does PHIL HART.

The real hallmark of a Democrat is that he cares about people—and that is the hallmark of PHIL HART.

In Michigan—and in all parts of our country—Democrats believe in the concept that our country is best served through partnership—partnership between research and industry; education and business; government and the productive system; the Nation and the State.

Here in Michigan you realize full well that selfishness does not pay—that it takes a healthy national economy to have a healthy State economy. That is the attitude which makes good Americans out of all of us regardless of the State that we call home.

The work begun under Franklin D. Roosevelt is far from finished. The challenges to a free society are always with us and they face this generation of Americans as much as the generation of 30 years ago. So long as men and women through no fault of their own are treated as second-class citizens, or cannot support their families, or educate their children, or receive decent medical care and live their declining years in decency and dignity, there will be a need for leadership with a heart and a need for a united Democratic Party.

Freedom does not confer on us only the right to starve or to be exploited. The policies of the Democratic Party have been born in the knowledge that so long as one man is in chains, none of us is truly free.

And freedom must be fulfillment—not just promise.

This administration is seeking to make freedom meaningful by making available to all, without regard to irrelevant considerations of ancestry, the blessings of equal opportunity in every legitimate area of human activity. The only test applied to a man or a woman in our democracy must be merit—not race, not color, not creed, not national origin.

But equal opportunity is a hollow shell if its only meaning is to share with others the right to be hungry, the right to be insecure, the right to raise children in hopelessness, the right to go bankrupt, the right to die in poverty. Such rights do not represent the fulfillment of the American promise.

That is why your President and your administration are committed to the achievement of a full employment, full production economy where every person who wants work can find it. It is our goal that people have equal opportunity to share life's blessings as well as life's trials.

In the past 2 years we have made a start on the problem of getting the country moving again. Under Democratic leadership, our Congress has passed a widespread housing bill, a $1.25 minimum wage, an Area Redevelopment Act (and those of you from the northern peninsula know how much this means), a Manpower Retraining Act for those who have been left in the backwash of modern technology, a Farm Act, relief for the children of unemployed workers, and other measures based upon our deep concern for people.

And now President Kennedy has recommended a sweeping program of tax reduction—to put additional billions of dollars into the hands of consumers and producers and raise the level of economic activity to new heights.

I am aware of the criticisms leveled against this program. I would be surprised if there were none. This is part of the Democratic dialog—the discussion of issues, methods, and means.

But we discuss to resolve issues—not to create them. And I am convinced that we will—as Democrats always do—find a solution to our differences and spur the forces that will lead to a more prosperous economy.

This administration is also determined to work for the enactment of a program of medical care for our aged through the social security system. There is no greater moral imperative and no greater economic necessity than to lift some of the grinding burden from our senior citizens who have made their contribution to America and who are entitled to dignity in their advancing years.

Human rights, full employment and full production, medical care for our older citizens, security for our freedoms in the world—these are the immediate goals of this administration and with your active support, and the support of those you represent, we can begin to complete America's unfinished business.

I would remind you, however, that the final judgment always rests with the people. It is to them that we must turn, for their consent is the mainspring of democracy.

It was to the people that President Kennedy turned in the dark days of October when it became clear that the Soviet Union had begun to probe the Western Hemisphere and had in fact installed offensive weapons in the Caribbean. And the people, as they always do when they are given the facts, responded positively in support of freedom.

In the Cuban threat, President Kennedy acted with speed and courage. He was fully aware of the risk, but he acted in the secure knowledge that he was backed by a strong, united people determined to preserve their liberty.

Franklin Roosevelt more than 20 years ago faced with a similar, although far less immediate threat to our security, said: "We, too, born to freedom and believing in freedom, are willing to fight to maintain freedom. We, and all others who believe as deeply as we do, would rather die on our feet, than live on our knees."

It was this spirit which extinguished the ugly fires of nazism and fascism—and it is this spirit which will lead to the eventual triumph of liberty over the forces of darkness and tyranny which exist today.

I would say to you—and to all our countrymen—that now, as 30 years ago, there is a leader of courage in the White House—a leader who is not afraid to act and not afraid to be patient for he knows that he leads a strong and prepared nation.

In these times, as in times past, the only thing we have to fear is fear itself. America can—and America will—survive the enemies of freedom if America is not made victim of the fears of the few who for reasons of partisanship would have our people mistrust their own leaders.

No debate over principles and issues can hurt our land. A democracy is always strengthened by the free exchange of ideas, no matter how far apart those ideas may be.

But when debate degenerates into a squabble over motives, when we allow legitimate differences of opinion to descend to the level of name calling, when any of us decide that those who disagree with us are unpatriotic, when any of us seek to tear down confidence in the integrity of our own leaders, then we are playing, however unwittingly, the game of our adversaries by dividing our strength instead of multiplying it.

I do not think any policy of any administration should be so sacred that it cannot be challenged by those who disagree. But neither do I think partisan disputes should be permitted to become so irresponsible that we challenge the good faith and the motives of those who are responsible for guiding our affairs.

A little more than 10 years ago, I met with the Democratic Senators who had just accorded me the honor of being their leader. Our party had just lost control of the executive branch for the first time in 20 years. Congress belonged to the opposition and statehouse after statehouse had fallen.

At that time I said:

"We are now in the minority. I have never agreed with the statement that it is 'the business of the opposition to oppose.' I do not believe that the American people have sent us here to obstruct.

"I believe we are here to fight for a positive program—a program geared not just to opposing the majority but to serving America. I think that is the real desire of every Democrat—even though we may disagree as to methods."

Today, after the passage of 10 years, I think I can say that philosophy is the desire of every American—and has been proved at the polls.

I can also say to you: Be proud of your party. Be proud not just because it wins elections but because it serves the people, whether we are in the majority or in the minority. Be proud because it is a constructive party with constructive leadership. Be proud because we seek to preserve America—and not just destroy the opposition.

The doubters and the doomsayers will always be with us. The overeager partisans will never depart.

But so will the Democratic Party always be with us—a party that is not afraid to carry America's banner in the dark hours as well as the hours of prosperity.

In our national efforts to make this a world of peace and freedom and justice for all men, we have made much progress. We are far nearer success than some want Americans to recognize.

At the peace tables in Geneva, we hold the initiative. In the Atlantic community, in Africa, in Asia, it is the force of freedom that is moving forward irresistibly toward unity, toward prosperity, toward greater human freedom. In our own hemisphere, it is the alliance of independent American Republics which will shape the future, not the forces which seek to betray freedom to its foes.

The tide runs with us today. We must move forward on that tide as a people confident, a people united, a people fearing only fear itself.

REMOVAL OF REGIONAL OFFICE OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE FROM NEW YORK TO BOSTON

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I join with a number of my colleagues in the protests directed at the removal of the regional office of the Internal Revenue Service from New York to Boston. I think it is quite fitting that the Secretary of the Treasury should have announced today that he intends to review that question.

New York is the biggest tax-paying unit in the United States. It is inconceivable that removal to Boston of a regional office can be justified.

The move is not justified by the fact that data processing equipment exists at Lawrence Mass., because there are regional offices in other parts of the country which are not located near data processing equipment of the IRS.

I have asked today that the Treasury Department afford us an open hearing. I think the matter is important and critical to warrant it.

Secretary Dillon's announcement that he will review this proposal to reorganize a number of Internal Revenue Service offices is most welcome. I predict that if Mr. Dillon conducts a thorough review, even to the extent of granting a public hearing—to hear the views of public officials, community leaders, bar associations, tax practitioners, and taxpayers—the result will be that the regional tax office will remain in New York City, where it has been since regional offices were established by the Internal Revenue Service in 1952, and where it belongs.

RAIL MERGER CRITERIA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to commend the President for the recent statement of rail merger criteria developed by his Interagency Committee on Transport Mergers, which he has made a part of his transportation message. Many of us concerned with this present move toward monopolies in the transportation industry have been eagerly awaiting these recommended criteria, which now

are officially the administration's policy on rail and air mergers and will become the guidelines for the Department of Justice in presenting the public interest record in merger cases before the regulatory bodies, and in the courts.

It was little over a year ago that I recommended in a letter to the President that he establish an executive commission to investigate and recommend safeguards in connection with the rapidly moving merger trend in the transportation industry. This Interagency Committee, although falling far short of what we had hoped would be established, nevertheless is a step in the direction of a needed examination of this problem in the public interest.

I am particularly pleased that the criteria suggested placed considerable emphasis on the necessity for the preservation of competition between carriers in the same mode of transport, as well as between carriers of different modes. I was indeed impressed with the demand that inquiry be made as to whether the economies sought by the mergers could not be achieved by devices short of merger, such as leasing, joint terminals, maintenance facilities, and the like. I am glad that this Committee has recognized the danger that increased market power of a merged carrier might have substantial undesirable repercussions on other carriers. Certainly this criterion should be explored at length by the Department of Justice in the Pennsylvania-Central case, and the Pan American-TWA application, among others.

Finally, I am pleased to see the recommendation that each merger must assure the public of lower fares and rates, better and more frequent service, and longrun innovations and improvement in an overall transportation network, rather than the mere satisfaction of the desires of controlling financial interests.

Much of these recommended criteria, though general in nature, have nevertheless been brought out in the hearings before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly and in speeches and letters by many interested Members of Congress during the past year. A perceptive expansion on the need for greater safeguards and the testing of merger cases can be found in the recent report from the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, entitled "The Railroad Merger Problem," issued March 4 of this year. The views of the President's group are but a part of a growing series of expressions of serious concern over the proposed concentration of economic power in the transportation industry.

Although generally pleased with the tone of the report, I was deeply disturbed over the lack of any suggestion or support for the effectuation of a merger moratorium on those crucial transportation cases presently pending before regulatory bodies, so that the administration can have the time to develop fully their criteria, and the Congress can have time to implement such recommendations into effective law. Except for the Pennsylvania and Pan American mergers, most major merger or control cases have wound up their records. Coming at such a late date, these perceptive criteria may well be academic. In any event, the fact that the President has authorized such criteria to be put into effect, is indeed an implied warning to us all to "stop, look, and listen" before we continue on this road to consolidation, from where there will be no turning back.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the press release from the White House setting forth recommendations of great interest, and also the report of the Interagency Committee on Transport Mergers to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the press release and report were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Press Release From the Office of the White House Press Secretary, the White House

The White House released today the report of the Interagency Committee on Transport Mergers, containing a statement of the general criteria applicable to mergers in the railroad and airline industries. The report specifies the lines of inquiry which should be pursued in the evaluation of proposed mergers in order to determine whether they are in the public interest.

In his 1962 transportation message to the Congress, the President directed the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and Labor, and the Council of Economic Advisers to form an Interagency Committee to develop such criteria. The report issued today was submitted by that Committee, composed of Clarence D. Martin, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, Chairman; Walter H. Heller, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers; Lee Loevinger, Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, Department of Justice; and James J. Reynolds, Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The merger criteria, expressed in the form of questions, are as follows:

1. Will the proposed merger restrict effective competition in the provision of transportation services in the areas affected?

2. Will the proposed merger permit an economically more efficient use of resources, through fuller utilization, over a period of time, of plant and equipment and/or reduction in direct costs per unit of output, which will reduce costs while maintaining or improving the general quality of service offered to users?

3. Can the economies sought by the proposed merger be achieved by alternatives more easily revocable which promise to be of comparable effect in accomplishing the improvement in overall efficiency?

4. Will the cost and quality benefits resulting from the merger be reflected in benefits to the public?

5. Will the proposed merger, with the increased market power of the merged carrier, have substantial undesirable repercussions on other carriers in the industry?

6. Will the proposed merger serve the longrun interests of both the public and the carriers concerned, or is it merely an attempt to meet a short-run crisis arising either because of unfavorable economic conditions in general or a particular transitory problem?

7. Is the merger proposed, in part, because of the imminent failure of one or more of the merging carriers, and is it the most appropriate solution to this difficulty?

8. Are the legitimate interests of existing creditors and equity holders of the merging carriers adequately protected?

9. Does the merger provide adequate protection and assistance to affected employees, and take into account community employment effects?

10. Will the proposed merger serve other objectives of public policy, including a reduction in public subsidies?

In forwarding the report to the President, the Committee pointed out that the criteria "will be useful to the Department of Justice in its efforts to clarify the issues involved in individual merger applications before the regulatory bodies. As a statement of the public interest factors in transport mergers, it could be utilized by the regulatory agencies as suggested guidelines. Moreover, it should prove of value to the industries involved by providing an authoritative statement of the criteria by which agencies in the executive branch will assess proposed mergers."

Criteria To Implement the Merger Provisions of the President's Transportation Message—Report of the Interagency Committee on Transport Mergers Provided in the President's Transportation Message of April 5, 1962

INTRODUCTION

This report is addressed to the task assigned by the President in his transportation message of April 5, 1962, to the Interagency Merger Committee. It consists of three parts. The first part contains a brief summary of existing law applicable to mergers in the rail and air transport industries, which is the premise upon which the Committee has formulated its criteria. The second part states the basic principles governing the formulation and intended application of the criteria. The report concludes with the statement of the criteria themselves. In spelling out the broad criteria stated by the President, the Committee has thus far concentrated its attention on rail and air transportation and its criteria were developed with reference to these two industries.

Both rail and air transportation are experiencing severe problems of adjustment to changing economic and technological conditions. The impact of these changes has not been uniform throughout each industry, but for a variety of reasons has affected some companies and territories more than others. The leaders of these industries, in seeking constructive means of solving their problems, have turned to merger as one of the possible opportunities for improvements in earning power and technical performance, including cost savings. The Committee respects the efforts of leaders in the railroad and airline industries to improve their positions and solve their problems. It offers this elaboration of the President's criteria partly as a means of providing guidance concerning the manner in which the public interest should be interpreted with respect to presently proposed and prospective mergers.

While the Committee believes that these criteria have general applicability to mergers occurring in other modes of transport, it recognizes that the particular character of one or more of these other modes may call for some modification of the criteria here set forth. Actual experience with rail and air merger cases may also indicate needs for revision.

I. SUMMARY OF EXISTING LEGISLATION UPON WHICH THE CRITERIA ARE PREDICATED

The creation of this Committee underscored the special public interest in transportation. The special public interest aspects of transportation have many formulations in legislative history and in present statutes. The objectives and criteria of the Interagency Committee are based on those objectives and standards already included in existing laws. The principal enactments involved are the Interstate Commerce Act governing domestic surface transportation and the Federal Aviation Act governing air transportation.

The Interstate Commerce Act

In applying the Interstate Commerce Act, the Interstate Commerce Commission must observe standards and criteria that are implied and those that are stated specifically.

The legislative history of the act implies that the basic structure of the transportation industry shall be based on the initiative of the carriers, subject to the monitoring of the Interstate Commerce Commission in order that the public interest shall be protected. This standard is implied in the provisions of the Transportation Act of 1940 which repealed those provisions in the Transportation Act of 1920 calling for extensive public determination of railroad industry structure.

The Commission also has the obligation to weigh a proposed merger in the light of the policies of the antitrust laws, particularly the maintenance of competition and prevention of monopoly to the extent feasible. The Commission is thus obliged to make the proper accommodation of the Interstate Commerce Act and the antitrust legislation.

In administering the Interstate Commerce Act the Commission must give effect to the national transportation policy contained in the preamble to the act. This provides for the maintenance of the optimum transportation system for public needs and for preserving the inherent advantages of the several transportation modes.

Under section 5 of the act governing mergers and acquisition of control the Commission is bound to make a finding in each case that the action proposed is in the public interest and may establish such conditions as are just and reasonable. In considering the public interest the Commission must give weight to four specific criteria: (1) the effect of the proposed transaction upon adequate transportation service to the public; (2) the effect upon the public interest of the inclusion, or failure to include, other railroads in the territory involved in the proposed transaction; (3) the total fixed charges resulting from the proposed transaction; and (4) the interest of the carrier employees affected. Each of these criteria has a definite legislative history which requires a finding by the Commission. The Commission, however, is not restricted to the criteria listed, but may consider other aspects of the public interest.

The maintenance of a reasonable degree of competition appears implicit in the act itself, although such a criterion is not specifically stated. For example, in the sections of the act regulating rail ownership of motor or water carriage, the Commission is required to observe that competition not be unduly lessened. The preservation of inherent advantage of individual modes and adequate transportation service to the public implies a degree of competitive effort. The public interest concept itself implies sufficient competition where practicable between carriers in the same mode of transportation, as well as between different modes.

The Federal Aviation Act

The Civil Aeronautics Board is required to give consideration in its determinations to general public policies and legal standards, including the principles of the antitrust laws. In addition, a specific standard in the Federal Aviation Act applicable to mergers is in section 408(b) which provides "That the Board shall not approve any consolidation, merger, purchase, lease, operating contract, or acquisition of control which would result in creating a monopoly or monopolies and thereby restrain competition or jeopardize another air carrier not a party" to the proposed combination.

In aviation, as in domestic surface transportation, there is an obligation to respect the initiative of the carriers themselves in shaping the structure of the industry, so long as the public interest is protected.

The Civil Aeronautics Board is required to evaluate merger proposals on the basis of the public interest standards of the act. Section 102 sets forth these standards as follows:

"In the exercise and performance of its powers and duties under this Act, the Board shall consider the following, among other things, as being in the public interest, and in accordance with the public convenience and necessity:

"(a) The encouragement and development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States; of the Postal Service, and of the national defense;

"(b) The regulation of air transportation in such manner as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of, assure the highest degree of safety in, and foster sound economic conditions in, such transportation, and to improve the relations between, and coordinate transportation by, air carriers;

"(c) The promotion of adequate, economical, and efficient service by air carriers at reasonable charges, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices;

"(d) Competition to the extent necessary to assure the sound development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense;

"(e) The promotion of safety in air commerce; and

"(f) The promotion, encouragement, and development of civil aeronautics."

II. BASIC PRINCIPLES GOVERNING THE CRITERIA STATEMENT

The underlying philosophy which has guided our traditional national attitudes toward mergers in this country is reflected in the President's transportation message of April 5, 1962, and has guided the Committee in developing these criteria. Mergers among carriers in transportation industries must be viewed in the light of the special character of these industries, particularly the fact that they are regulated by public agencies. Such public regulation has been developed because it was recognized that the characteristics of these industries, plus the vital public interest in the manner in which they are operated, have made undesirable the complete reliance on a free market system. Thus, in considering mergers in the transportation industries it must be recognized that the rate charged for the services rendered, entry into the industry and into particular markets, the quality, type and frequency of service, plus numerous other decisions, are all subject at present to some degree of regulation.

However, the President recognized in his message that changes in recent decades require a reappraisal of the role of public regulation. As a result of impressive changes in technology and in the structure of transportation industries, including the development of important new modes of transportation in the past half century, much greater reliance upon competition is now possible. Recognizing these developments, the President made clear the desirability of relying whenever, and insofar as, possible on competition to provide the necessary protection of the public interest. This goal is reflected in the general criteria suggested in the message on transportation and in the more detailed criteria which follow.

The more closely a proposed merger comes to meeting all the standards of the criteria and guidelines set forth herein, the more likely it is to serve the public interest. The application of these criteria to any proposed merger may, however, produce results which are mixed. Since these criteria cannot be measured on a single scale, no objective weighting system is possible and judgment must be relied upon, not only in the application of each criterion separately, but in the overall assessment of their joint application to any given merger.

In applying the criteria, specific and detailed information should be obtained and analyzed. In connection with certain criteria, statistical analysis, based on historical data and engineering and marketing projections, should be employed. Each proposed merger must be considered in the light of the possible longrun structural patterns of the industry, taking into account the transportation requirements necessary for the longterm economic development of the Nation as a whole and particular regions thereof. Information as to the underlying motives for the merger of the carriers proposing it will be useful in evaluating certain criteria.

While public policy clearly relies on the initiative of private firms in proposing and implementing specific mergers, it is not inconsistent, and is indeed desirable, for the Government to develop overall guidelines pointing to the range of acceptable structures of transportation industries deemed consistent with the public interest. Thus, continuing study of the evolving pattern of the industry, its problems and potential, will provide the appropriate background against which to evaluate particular merger proposals.

III. CRITERIA TO BE EMPLOYED IN EVALUATION OF TRANSPORT MERGERS

The criteria are based on the three broad criteria laid down by the President as general guidelines for the evaluation of mergers by the Committee. These criteria as stated by the President are:

"1. Effective competition should be maintained among alternative forms of transportation, and, where traffic volume permits, between competing firms in the same mode of transportation.

"2. The goals of economical, efficient, and adequate service to the public—and reduction in any public subsidies—should be secured by the realization of genuine economies.

"3. Affected workers should be given the assistance to make any necessary adjustments caused by the merger."

In applying the criteria set out by the President and seeking to ascertain the public interest, the Committee will seek detailed facts that will enable it to arrive at some conclusions with respect to the following lines of inquiry. It is believed that these lines of inquiry are based upon the Presidential criteria and specify the data that must be known in order to determine whether or not a particular proposal meets the criteria and serves the public interest. In addition to indicating the questions which the Committee will ask in formulating a position with respect to any particular proposal, the following questions also set forth the Committee's view of the considerations that should be taken into account by carriers and other private parties in deciding whether or not to propose or urge a particular merger. The determination of a position respecting a particular proposed merger requires sufficient information to afford an answer to the following lines of inquiry:

1. Will the proposed merger restrict effective competition in the provision of transportation services in the areas affected?

This criterion is based on the fundamental proposition that competition among suppliers is ordinarily the best guarantee of maximum benefits to consumers of transportation, as well as other goods and services. Among the benefits of competition are pressures to lower prices, to improve service, to introduce innovations of all types including technical, managerial and marketing. This criterion sounds a warning that a reduction of competition may result in reduced benefits to users and that the possibility of this result must be considered

in evaluating a proposed merger. It is appropriate in connection with the application of this criterion to consider the impact of competition from modes of transportation other than that in which the merging firms operate.

2. Will the proposed merger permit an economically more efficient use of resources, through fuller utilization, over a period of time, of plant and equipment and/or reduction in direct costs per unit of output, which will reduce costs while maintaining or improving the general quality of service offered to users?

This criterion recognizes that a merger may make possible a reduction in fixed overhead expense per unit of output and also may make possible lower variable cost, resulting, for example, from lower advertising and customer service costs such as those related to ticketing, baggage, and freight handling, more efficient management, or lower maintenance expense.

3. Can the economies sought by the proposed merger be achieved by alternatives more easily revocable which promise to be of comparable effect in accomplishing the improvement in overall efficiency?

This criterion requires explicit examination of alternative devices such as lease arrangements, joint operation of terminals, maintenance facilities, etc., for achieving any desirable results the merger promises to yield. Many such arrangements short of merger may be capable of realizing the desired economies without reducing the number of enterprises capable of exercising independent initiative.

4. Will the cost and quality benefits resulting from the merger be reflected in the benefits to the public? To what extent will potential passengers or shippers retain a choice of services from this or other modes of transportation?

Public interest justification of a merger which substantially increases the market power of the companies involved requires that cost and quality benefits be translated, at least in substantial part, into definite benefits to the users of the services. Merger proposals should set forth with specificity a practical program for the transfer of these benefits to the public.

Over the long run, effective competition is ordinarily the best guarantee of transfer of benefits. The effect of competition from modes of transportation other than that in which the merging firms operate, should be considered in this context.

5. Will the proposed merger, with the increased market power of the merged carrier, have substantial undesirable repercussions on other carriers in the industry?

This criterion implies that any given merger proposed should be evaluated in the light of the overall structure of the industry and the probable effects upon the anticipated future development of the industry.

6. Will the proposed merger serve the long-run interests of the public and of the carriers concerned, or is it merely an attempt to meet a short-run crisis arising because of unfavorable economic conditions in general, or a particular transitory problem?

7. Is the merger proposed, in part, because of the imminent failure of one or more of the merging carriers, and is it the most appropriate solution to this difficulty?

While the failing firm doctrine is well established as a reason for merger, it should not automatically imply that the merger is in the public interest. The underlying reasons for the imminent or probable failure of the carrier(s) should be examined and alternative solutions should be considered, including reorganization or dissolution. In any case, the failing firm justification does not eliminate the need to evaluate the merger in the light of other criteria included herein.

8. Are the legitimate interests of existing creditors and equity holders of the merging carriers adequately protected?

9. Does the merger provide adequate protection and assistance to affected employees, and take into account community employment effects?

This criterion should be viewed in the light of statutory requirements for employee protection and of evolving concepts as to the nature and extent of such protection. Any proposed merger should, as a minimum, provide protection commensurate with statutory requirements as interpreted or applied by the regulatory agencies in similar prior merger cases. The application of standards equal to statutory requirements should not preclude reasonable changes in the form of structure or protection which may be warranted due to the particular characteristics of a given situation or to changes in conditions over a period of time. Arrangements developed through collective bargaining (either in a given case or in an agreement having more general application) should be recognized and encouraged. Such arrangements should assure equitable treatment for all employees adversely affected. Effective administrative and procedural machinery should be provided for expeditious, equitable, and final resolution of disagreements which may arise in the formulation of such arrangements.

In addition to consideration of the effect of the merger on particular employees, attention should be given to its effect on employment opportunities in particular communities. The possibility that a merger will create unemployment in a community should not preclude merger. However, appropriate steps should be taken to lessen the employment impact of the merger upon communities substantially affected. Advance notice to, and consultation with, community leaders, phasing out operations on a gradual basis, where practicable, and similar steps to cushion the impact of discontinued facilities or service abandonments would all serve to reduce the effects of employee displacement. Such steps would afford community leaders the opportunity to avail themselves of services offered by appropriate State and Federal economic redevelopment and retraining agencies.

10. Will the proposed merger serve other objectives of public policy?

Such objectives include, but are not limited to: (a) The maintenance of a common carrier system; (b) protection of the national security interest and the maintenance of an efficient service; and (c) protection of the public health and safety.

CLARENCE D. MARTIN, Jr.
WALTER W. HELLER.
LEE LOEVINGER.
JAMES J. REYNOLDS.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION—A SUGGESTION TO THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, today's issue of the Wall Street Journal carries an editorial expressing opposition to the administration-supported urban mass transportation bill I have sponsored with 22 other Senators.

The problem of traffic congestion and deteriorating transit service is, they blithely assert, a local problem that should be solved by the cities themselves with "their comparatively ample financial and engineering resources." Why, they ask, should the Federal Government be asked to share part of the burden?

The interesting thing is that the answer can be found right on the front page of the very same issue of their own newspaper.

The lead article tells the story right in the first paragraph with the statistic that "Spending by State and local governments has increased nearly 400 percent since World War II."

This is in contrast to "the much tamer Federal increase—up 69 percent since 1946."

The article goes on to explain that:

> The increasing concentration of families in urban centers is driving up the expenses of non-Federal governments. Some 70 percent of the population is bunched in towns and cities today, compared with only 64 percent in 1950, Government figures show, and experts foresee no reversal of this trend.
>
> The urban concentration is causing sharp increases in costs of such largely non-Federal services as police, sanitation, and firefighting facilities.

And of course the big State and local expense comes in public education.

This information alone should have been sufficient to temper the outlook of the editors of the Wall Street Journal, but I suppose that as they gaze out on the bustle and physical display of wealth in the world's greatest financial center in which they are located, they assume that our cities as a whole must be rolling in dough.

CITY WEALTH

However, if they had happened to come across the extensive study on taxation and urban land use published recently by the very reputable Urban Land Institute, they would have read that:

> Although the central cities continue to sustain a large proportion of regional employment, these municipalities do not possess fiscal resources commensurate with their economic responsibilities. Chapter II demonstrated clearly that the per capita value of real property in core A communities (the highly builtup centers), is well below that of other parts of the region. This finding is a flat contradiction of the ubiquitous impression that the big cities are wealthy—an impression based largely on the perspective of the central business district. Beyond the office buildings and department stores are extensive gray areas where the combination of low-value residential property and extremely high population density cancels any fiscal benefits of nonresidential property.

So I have a suggestion to make to the editors of the Wall Street Journal. I suggest they at least read the articles in their own news columns before taking pen to paper, and perhaps even a little more.

I have one other suggestion—that the editors strive a little harder for accuracy and completeness in their editorial columns.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON TRANSIT

For example, today's editorial states that less than 2 percent of the chamber of commerce's 2,700 State and local members support the administration's transit program, according to a recent survey.

A number of points must be made. First the figure was 3 percent, and the number of responses to the survey was 1,254, not 2,700. In addition, another 23 percent favored some kind of Federal assistance in this field.

But the significant information can be found in who did not reply to the chamber's survey. One of those who did not reply was the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, which embraces the entire Boston region of more than 3 million people, or half of the entire Massachusetts population.

The Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce strongly supports this legislation. In fact it has testified for the last 2 or 3 years to that effect during Senate and House hearings.

In addition, the legislation enjoys the support of the New York, Atlanta, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Chicago, and San Francisco chambers of commerce, among others.

This is surprising enough in the face of the heated opposition of the parent body. And I am willing to bet that the chambers which do support the legislation embrace metropolitan areas with more than half of the Nation's population.

Does this mean that only the big city chambers favor Federal assistance? No. On the contrary, according to the chamber's own testimony more than half of those favoring the administration's bill come from communities with less than 50,000 population. Two-thirds of those favoring Federal loans come from communities smaller than 50,000.

Finally we come to the most important point and that is the fact that the chambers of commerce do not speak for the people of our urban communities. They speak for the business interests. To the extent that anyone speaks for the people. It is the responsible elected officials, the mayors and the county officials. The national organizations of each are firmly in support of this legislation.

I personally am gratified to see such a large degree of chamber of commerce support for this legislation, but I do not think one can draw too many conclusions from the fact that perhaps a numerical majority of its members are in opposition.

I shall ask unanimous consent that some excerpts from the hearings this year on the chamber's position be included in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. These do not include such statements as the one made in 1961 by the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce, that:

> As a general principle, the Pennsylvania State Chamber believes that governmental problems should be handled by that level of government which is most closely concerned with the problem, and that it is unwise to request Federal help until it is certain that the local governments concerned have done what they can to solve the problem themselves. We are satisfied that the present proposal is in agreement with this principle, and that this is an appropriate field for Federal action.

BIG CITY PROBLEM?

One final point, dealing with the editrial's assertion that the support for this program comes only from a "few huge metropolitan centers, where almost everybody will concede transit problems exist."

I am tempted to ask: So what if it were true?

There are more people living in just the New York metropolitan area than there are farmers in the entire Nation.

Frankly, I am growing sick and tired of the way some people brush off the crushing problems facing the millions of people living in our large metropolitan areas, as though it were just a trifling problem affecting just a small number of people.

But the fact is that the problem is not limited to a few huge metropolitan areas.

During the hearings held during the past several years, we have heard in addition to the giants from Atlanta; Dade County, Fla.; Detroit; St. Louis; Seattle; Baltimore; Laurel, Mississippi; Pittsburgh; Cape Canaveral; Oakland; Cleveland; and Montgomery, Ala., among others.

In addition, since enactment of the mass transportation provisions in the Housing Act of 1961, the agency has received inquiries and requests for assistance from more than 250 cities across the Nation.

On top of that, there are 69 cities and towns with populations of 25,000 or more which have no public transportation service at all, despite the large percentage of people who must depend on public transportation to meet their travel needs—those too old, too young, too poor or to infirm to drive, say nothing of the millions of moderate income working families who may have two jobs but only one car.

In addition, the American Transit Association estimates that since 1954, more than 400 transit companies have been sold or abandoned, resulting in no or sharply reduced service for the communities.

Mr. President, these problems are critical and nationwide, and I certainly feel that if we can pour out about $6 billion a year on agriculture, we can spend $500 million over a 3-year period to improve transit service and reduce traffic congestion in our urban areas—which would not only bring great relief to the millions of this Nation's bus and rail commuters, but also make it easier and cheaper for the farmer to get his product from the farm to the market by reducing city traffic congestion and making more highway funds available for construction in the outlying suburban and rural communities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal's article and editorial, to which I have referred, together with the excerpts from the hearings to which I have referred, be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the article, editorial, and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 7, 1963]

Spending Giants: Governments of States, Localities Lift Outlays Far Faster Than U.S.—Surge in School-Age Children, Migration to Cities Cited; Non-Federal Payrolls Soar—Rising Taxes and Resistance

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

Spending by State and local governments has increased nearly 400 percent since World War II.

The increase is greater by far than the postwar rise of Federal expenditures. It has triggered a steep climb in State and local tax rates and, despite mounting taxpayer resistance, is continuing unabated.

"State and local spending constitutes about the only area where we economic forecasters can always predict correctly what's going to happen next," says William M. Burke, a senior economist at the National Industrial Conference Board (NICB).

The table traces the sweeping climb of non-Federal spending in the postwar era, and also shows the much tamer Federal increase (up 69 percent since 1946). Dollars are in billions and the years are fiscal periods ending June 30.

[In billions]

Fiscal year	State	Local	Federal
1946	$6.2	$7.0	$66.6
1954	15.8	17.8	77.7
1962	29.2	33.0	112.2

The extra-steep climb of State and local spending, compared with Federal spending, reflects partly the fact Federal expenditures were abnormally high in 1946, from lingering World War II expenses.

REFLECTS POPULATION SHIFTS

But the dramatic State and local rise stems also from basic postwar population trends: A sharp increase in persons of school age and a massive migration of families to cities and towns from the country.

"There's no question that State and local governments are bearing the brunt of the school-age population bulge, as well as of the increasing concentration of persons in urban centers," says Robert W. French, president of the Tax Foundation, Inc., a research organization.

In the last decade, enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools has soared by nearly 50 percent to above 40 million. Total U.S. population has increased only 20 percent in the same span.

Costs per pupil are rising rapidly; they are up 70 percent since the 1952–53 school year. Teachers' salaries, on average, have climbed at about the same pace. And the expense of school construction keeps mounting; capital outlays, up 75 percent in a decade, will top $3 billion for the first time this year.

BURDEN OF SCHOOL COSTS

State and local governments pay for about 96 percent of public school costs, reports the National Education Association. The table below outlines the rise of public school expenses and of yearly costs per pupil. The total cost figures are in billions.

School year	Total cost	Cost per pupil
	Billions	
1954–55	$9.8	$275
1958–59	14.3	350
1962–63	19.5	432

School costs will continue to mount, talks with educators suggest. Government projections indicate 25.4 percent of the 1970 population will be of school age (5–17). That's up slightly from the 1960 school-age rate of 25.2 percent and well above 1950's 20.3 percent level.

"Education costs, I'm afraid, have nowhere to go but up and up some more," says an NEA official.

The increasing concentration of families in urban centers is driving up the expenses of non-Federal governments. Some 70 percent of the population is bunched in towns and cities today, compared with only 64 percent in 1950, Government figures show, and experts foresee no reversal of this trend.

The urban concentration is causing sharp increases in costs of such largely non-Federal services as police, sanitation and firefighting facilities.

"On the farm, there was no need for a big, professional police force or fire department," notes NICB's Mr. Burke. "But in the city, you can't do without them."

HUGE COST OF SERVICES

The Federal Government, of course, maintains some key urban services, such as certain prisons and health facilities. These make up only a fraction of Federal spending, however; as the table below shows, such services are a major expense for State and local authorities. Figures are in billions.

[In billions]

Service	Federal support	State and local support
Police		$2.0
Fire		1.1
Prisons	$0.1	.8
Health and sanitation	1.0	6.1

Non-Federal Government payrolls are expanding much faster than the Federal one. Since 1954, the number of civilians employed by the Federal Government has increased by 5 percent, to about 2.5 million, while the State and local job force has leaped nearly 40 percent, to almost 7 million.

In Government, the increase of non-Federal spending outpaces the rise of State and local tax receipts. In fiscal 1962, State and local tax revenues amounted to about $44 billion, far less than the non-Federal spending total of $62.2 billion. Federal grants in aid and funds from nontax sources helped close the gap.

State and local debt is piling up rapidly. The table below, computed from Government data by the Tax Foundation, shows the climb of per capita public debt at State and local levels, as well as the reduction of per capita Federal debt.

	State	Local	Federal
1946	$18	$102	$2,034
1954	61	185	1,713
1962	118	325	1,630

Above $80 billion for the first time last year, total State and local government debt is now a quarter the size of the Federal debt. In 1950, it was less than a tenth the Federal total.

Official concern is increasing over the pileup of non-Federal debt.

Gov. James Rhodes, of debt-ridden Ohio, for instance, not long ago fired more than 3,000 recently hired State employees, ordered all State departments to cut spending back about 10 percent and requested all State employees to work on Lincoln's and Washington's birthdays.

Many States, at the same time, are considering sharp tax boosts this year.

Before Nebraska's Legislature, for example, are proposals to eliminate some property tax exemptions and institute a personal income tax. Other possibilities facing Nebraska taxpayers: A gas tax boost of up to 8 cents per gallon and a new 2-percent sales tax.

The 47 State legislatures meeting this year are expected to consider measures that would add $1.5 billion to the States' tax bills, the Tax Foundation estimates.

Tax collections in many States would receive an added boost if the Kennedy administration's proposal to reduce Federal tax rates becomes law. In 19 States, Federal tax payments may be deducted from income subject to State taxation. And in many States curbs on personal deductions, proposed by the administration, would mean similar curbs on State tax deductions, without any offsetting cut in State tax rates.

The following table breaks down the major sources of State and local revenues. The percentages are based on Department of Commerce data.

Source of revenue	*Percent of total*
Property tax	33
Sales tax	21
Income tax	5
Vehicle tax	3
Corporation tax	2
Other	36

The most rapidly rising source of State tax revenues: Receipts from taxes levied on tobacco sales, now above the $1 billion mark and twice the 1956 total.

The relentless climb of State and local spending is encountering increased taxpayer opposition in some areas.

Example: Residents of Ridgewood, N.J., one of New York City's wealthiest suburbs, recently rejected school board plans to boost sharply the community's school budget. The voters later approved a school budget scaled down by $151,422.

Despite such taxpayer efforts, however, overall non-Federal governmental spending—and taxes—will surely keep mounting, most experts agree. Expressing the view of many, NICB's Mr. Burke says: "So long as the need for education facilities and for municipal services continues to grow, State and local taxpayers will have to keep digging deeper into their pockets."

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 7, 1963]

Who Needs It?

The administration's 3-year half-billion-dollar urban mass transit bill, just dispatched to Congress for the second time, would make possible Federal subsidy of public transportation in communities of 2,500 or more.

Yet a recent survey by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States among 2,700 local and State chambers indicates that less than 2 percent approve such a plan. These communities either don't have much of a transit problem or are taking care of it themselves.

So what agitation there is for this sprawling program obviously isn't coming from the grass roots but from a few huge metropolitan centers, such as New York and Philadelphia, where almost everybody will concede transit problems exist. And even some of the major metropolitan complexes aren't looking to Washington for a subsidy. In the San Francisco area, for example, voters have approved a $792 million bond issue to set up a rapid transit rail system.

Now if a few other large cities, with their comparatively ample financial and engineering resources, can't figure out what to do about their own transportation, it's doubtful still another Washington handout will do the trick.

It's also a trifle unreasonable to expect taxpayers of the Nation's thousands of smaller communities to pay for problems big-city politicians have brought on themselves and their long-suffering constituents.

Mass Transportation and the Chamber of Commerce

(Note.—Excerpts from testimony given at hearings on mass transportation bills, S. 6 and S. 917, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, February 28–March 7, 1963.)

TESTIMONY OF RICHARD SULLIVAN, COMMUTER TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE, GREATER BOSTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. Sullivan. The Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce in the past has suggested and has supported programs relating to the need for balanced transportation facilities in urban areas including Federal aid to mass transportation. We did in fact appear before the subcommittee last year in support of such Federal aid.

The chamber would like to take this opportunity to again urge that action be taken this year by Congress to enact a program of Federal assistance for mass transportation as outlined in S. 6. and S. 917.

* * * * *

Mr. Sullivan. I had been advised that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is opposing the bill, but I wish to assure you they do not represent the feeling of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce in this matter, nor I daresay would they represent the voice of the chamber of commerce on the other major urban cities who are most likely affected by such things.

We are so solidly fixed on the other side, sir, I do not think there is any question. We know that the life of Boston depends upon getting rail rapid transit extensions to extend out beyond their present stubs. Our system was built years ago. It stopped within 5 miles of the city. Now we have to run those extensions out beyond that to at least Route 128, which is the circumferential highway around the city of Boston, and there, with huge parking lots, we should be in a position to afford good coordinated transportation for the people in the Greater Boston area.

Senator Williams. I believe we have had expressions of support for this legislation from other local chambers of commerce.

Senator Sparkman. We had last year I know.

Senator Williams. Yes. New York, Philadelphia, Atlanta, San Francisco, and it is, of course, interesting to us.

TESTIMONY OF GRANT ARNOLD, VICE PRESIDENT, E. J. LAVINO & CO., PHILADELPHIA, PA., ON BEHALF OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES

Senator Douglas. Now, may I ask Mr. Arnold: Do you represent the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce in your statement?

Mr. Arnold. No, I do not, sir. To be truthful——

Senator Douglas. Do you know the attitude of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce?

Mr. Arnold. Yes. I was about to say they are supporting this program.

Senator Douglas. They are supporting the Williams bill?

Mr. Arnold. I believe they are; yes sir.

Senator Douglas. That is what I thought. So that you are speaking for the national chamber, not for the local chamber?

Mr. Arnold. That is right.

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR RIBICOFF

Senator Ribicoff. But in all due respect to the United States Chamber of Commerce, who sits here in Washington and makes its pronunciamentos, you talk to the chambers of commerce strung along the rights-of-way of every urban area and I think you would find a completely different attitude as to whether this is or is not needed.

I would be willing to try to see what the chambers of commerce strung along the New Haven Railroad's right-of-way would say as to whether this was or was not needed. Or along the New Jersey.

Yet all these chambers of commerce are members of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

I do not think the position of the United States Chamber of Commerce always reflects the thinking of their individual memberships. They too are bureaucratic, and it is a bureaucracy in Washington that sometimes does their thinking for them and not the thinking of the local groups that may be scattered across the width and breadth and byways and highways of our own Nation.

TESTIMONY OF JAMES M. SYMES, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD AND CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD CO.

Mr. Symes. The other thing I would like to comment on is the testimony that was presented by the United States Chamber of Commerce, I believe last week, before this committee.

The chamber is apparently not concerned with the public interest but, rather with biased actions which appear to be dictated primarily by certain self-centered interests.

The chamber has been most inconsistent in the implementation of its transportation policies. Some of its basic policies are logical, such as equality of treatment for competitive modes of transportation, an application of user charges to cover the costs of publicly provided transport facilities.

If the chamber believes in equality of treatment as it alleges, then this urban mass transportation legislation represents a principle which the chamber should have supported in an attempt to provide a small measure of equality in the transport picture.

The chamber has contended that the problem of urban transportation is primarily local in nature. By so doing it ignores the fact that other Federal expenditures and actions have created transportation problems particularly in our urban areas.

The Conference on Freeways and the Urban Setting, sponsored by the Automotive Safety Foundation, in Hershey, Pa., in June of 1962, reported that the highway program being carried out under the Federal Highway Act of 1956 constitutes the largest form of Federal assistance to urban development.

In this area the Federal Government has intervened extensively in local affairs, and in connection with other subsidies has created the urban mass transportation problem.

Yet there has been no campaign by the United States Chamber to oppose Federal financing of highways in the urban areas, even though radial highways and especially those designed with multiple lanes to carry large peak-hour commuter loads are obviously a local matter.

Helicopter air services duplicating surface transportation in urban areas, and between airports, are also local matters.

The chamber has not opposed the Federal subsidy granted these carriers in the local areas of New York, Chicago and Los Angeles, much less waged any extensive campaign against these subsidies.

Furthermore, the chamber has never opposed the billion dollar a year subsidy to aviation which helped create a problem for the railroads handling large commuter loads.

The proposed urban mass transportation bill would provide funds only to public bodies, not to private bodies, not to private corporations, and the public would benefit. However, helicopters, airlines, bus companies, truckers and commuting motorists in local areas are receiving similar but more extensive aid, and this is for their personal benefit.

There is, therefore, a very important principle involved, and I hope from the facts that other witnesses and I have presented at these hearings that you recognize that this is more than just a local problem.

Senator WILLIAMS. Well, we emphasize the fact that this is U.S. Chamber inconsistency. But down at the local level we have had strong and increasing support from the local chambers of commerce speaking from the communities where the problem is.

So where the problem is, people are for this bill. And the national group just did not seem to pipe in very clearly. They had a survey. No mandatory requirement that the individual members reply. And on that survey where the replies were very spotty they launched this conclusion which you have certainly——

Mr. SYMES. I was asked this morning before the House whether I thought because of what this one Congressman thought might be a limited number of people that would benefit whether or not it should be done nationally. And I said it is a national problem because all of the people of this country are going to benefit whether they use this service or not, because if they do not they are going to have to put up tax dollars which they otherwise would not have to do if your bill goes through.

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, Jan. 18, 1963]

CHAMBER VOTE BACKS TRANSIT LEGISLATION

(By William Allan)

The Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce backs the proposed mass transit legislation, now before Congress.

Chamber board members favoring the Federal legislation fought and won on the basis that mass transit right now is the Greater Pittsburgh area's No. 1 problem and it cannot be solved without Federal aid.

Its officers right now strongly favor the Federal legislation and are in close contact with Washington in connection with aid.

It is no secret here that financing is the big drawback to the port authority's plan to acquire and integrate into one system the 30-odd mass transits operating in the county.

Federal aid, therefore, could be the key which unlocks the problem.

LETTER TO SENATOR WILLIAMS, FEBRUARY 1, 1963, FROM THE COMMERCE & INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK

The board of directors of Commerce & Industry Association, the largest service chamber of commerce in the East, and recognized as the voice of New York business, last year adopted a policy position based on recommendation of its commuter transportation committee, in support of Federal legislation to provide assistance for the development of mass transportation systems in urban areas. We are thus able to give such support as may be helpful during this session of Congress toward enactment of S. 6.

STATEMENT OF GERALD T. HORTON, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH, ATLANTA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY IN HEARINGS ON MASS TRANSPORTATION LEGISLATION, 1963

I represent the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, the organization of the business and economic interests of our city. The Atlanta chamber established a rapid transit committee in 1960 and since that time it has actively pursued the construction of a mass transportation system. We have a six-point program of work for the chamber and the establishment of a rapid transit system is one of those six points.

The members of that committee have investigated all manner of rapid transit systems and the means for financing their construction. It is the considered opinion of the committee that Federal assistance will be needed if Atlanta is to have a rapid transit system and still carry out its local functions of building schools, sewers, local thoroughfares, and the many other projects that demand the local tax dollars.

DISPOSITION OF GOVERNMENT-HELD STOCK OF GENERAL ANILINE & FILM CORP.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on March 3, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy announced that the Department of Justice had secured an agreement in principle with Interhandel, a Swiss holding company, which would allow the Attorney General, without further litigation, to sell the Government-held stock of the General Aniline and Film Corp.

Should this agreement be approved by the Interhandel stockholders and by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, a competitive sale of the stock authorized by legislation last year will go forward promptly. There will thus be concluded perhaps the most complex and extensive litigation in which the Federal Government has ever participated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials commenting on this settlement be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. One editorial comes from the Washington Post-Times Herald for March 5; the other from the western edition of the New York Times for March 6. Both editorials concentrate wisely on the major factors involved in this settlement. They note that the competitive position of the General Aniline and Film Corp. is vastly improved by the announcement of this settlement; that their ability to compete within the framework of the free enterprise system is now fully guaranteed for the first time since World War II. They note that the entire procedure of disposing of the stock of the firm will be subjected to the most strict overseeing by both the Department of Justice and by the courts. They note that the Federal Government will be quickly withdrawn from the operation of a commercial enterprise, and they might have noted that the Attorney General has expressed due concern that payments to the Swiss firm will be conducted in such a manner that the U.S. balance of payments will not be adversely affected.

Certainly these factors are of major concern to the Federal Government and to the American people.

As a lawyer, I am aware that any out-of-court settlement is subject to conflicting evaluations. But as a lawyer, I also subscribe to the view that all the facts in any dispute should be known intimately before one is competent to comment meaningfully on them.

I hope that if this settlement is to be the subject of further discussion by those in or out of Government that the settlement's broad impact on our economy will be duly noted, and that due regard will be paid to all the many complexities of this suit.

In short, the settlement, like many other settlements, should be subject to the closest critical inspection, but its intimate involvement in the national interest requires that that inspection be conducted on the most informed and statesmanlike basis.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times western edition, Mar. 6, 1963]

BACK TO THE PUBLIC

The agreement permitting the public sale of General Aniline & Film Corp., which was seized as enemy property in 1942, has been so long in the making that it seemed as if it would never materialize. But the Justice Department has at last come to terms with Interhandel (the Swiss holding company that claims ownership of General Aniline) in order to get the U.S. Government out of the business of managing a private enterprise.

There may still be considerable dispute over the disposition of the proceeds of the sale, but the Justice Department has provided sufficient safeguards to protect American interests. It has arranged that Interhandel must defend and pay on any claims upheld in the courts. The company will be sold only to Americans.

General Aniline will now go where it belongs—into the hands of private owners. While the company has made money under Government control, its board of directors has been something of a sinecure for politicians, and its management has not had an opportunity to diversify or grow as rapidly as its private competitors. In selling General Aniline to the public, the Government will be acquiring cash and will also be giving the company a chance to prosper in a free competitive atmosphere.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Mar. 5, 1963]

ENDING A LAWSUIT

The litigation involving the General Aniline and Film Corp. might have been disposed of in any one of at least three different ways. The Justice Department could have sold the company and settled the claims of the Swiss holding company Interhandel in subsequent litigation. It could have continued the company under Government ownership and let the litigation drag on. Or it could have taken the method announced Monday—the sale of the company to a private bidder with an out-of-court agreement on the distribution of the sale price.

The Justice Department has taken the course that is the most hazardous politically. Any out-of-court settlement of litigation involves matters of judgment on which authorities are bound to differ and the Justice Department never will be able to prove that it made a better settlement than it could have reached in court. Its critics will have the advantage of comparing the real out-of-court settlement with a conjectural settlement in court as advantageous to this country as their own imaginations will allow. Why did it take the course that is most dangerous politically?

For one thing, either other course probably would have involved the Government in litigation lasting years or even decades. While it lasted, the company would have been inhibited in its own plans for expansion and development, if the Government had retained control. It might not have been entirely free to proceed while any legal cloud rested upon its ownership, if the Government sold the company in advance of settlement.

The out-of-court settlement, it is said, is on terms more favorable than those hitherto obtainable. It has the virtue of cleaning up the long litigation surely and swiftly. It has the advantage of freeing the company for successful operation under new American private ownership, determined by sealed competitive bidding, and subject to the approval and confirmation of the courts.

The Justice Department also can cite the first rule of the law—a poor settlement is better than a good lawsuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Is there any further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order No. 6, S. 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, line 10, after the word "United", to strike out "States, including to the extent practicable the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa" and insert "States"; on page 3, line 10, after the word "and"; to insert "private interests including"; in line 18, after the word "such", to strike out "purposes without regard to the limitations of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529) concerning advantages of funds when he considers such action in the public interest;" and insert "purposes"; and on page 4, after line 16, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. The term "United States" as used in this Act shall include the District of Columbia; and, to the extent practicable in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the terms "United States" and "States" may include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds and declares that the general welfare of the Nation requires that all American people of present and future generations shall be assured such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources as are necessary and desirable, and that prompt and coordinated action is required by all levels of government and by private interests on a nationwide basis to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, after consultation with the Recreation Advisory Council and with the heads of Federal departments and agencies concerned, to perform the following functions and activities:

(a) INVENTORY.—Prepare and maintain a continuing inventory and evaluation of outdoor recreation needs and resources of the United States.

(b) CLASSIFICATION.—Prepare a system for classification of outdoor recreation resources to assist in the effective and beneficial use and management of such resources.

(c) NATIONWIDE PLAN.—Formulate and maintain a comprehensive nationwide outdoor recreation plan, taking into consideration the plans of the various Federal agencies, States, and their political subdivisions. The plan shall set forth the needs and demands of the public for outdoor recreation and the current and foreseeable availability in the future of outdoor recreation resources to meet those needs. The plan shall identify critical outdoor recreation problems, recommend solutions, and identify the desirable actions to be taken at each level of government and by private interests.

The Secretary shall transmit the initial plan, which shall be prepared as soon as practicable within five years hereafter, to the President for transmittal to the Congress. Future revisions of the plan shall be similarly transmitted at succeeding five-year intervals. When a plan or revision is transmitted to the Congress, the Secretary shall transmit copies to the Governors of the several States.

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Provide technical assistance and advice to and cooperate with States, political subdivisions, and private interests including nonprofit organizations with respect to outdoor recreation.

(e) REGIONAL COOPERATION.—Encourage interstate and regional cooperation in the planning, acquisition, and development of outdoor recreation resources.

(f) RESEARCH AND EDUCATION.—(1) Sponsor, engage in, and assist in research relating to outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreements, and make payments for such purposes; (2) undertake studies and assemble information concerning outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreement, and disseminate such information without regard to the provisions of section 321n, title 39, United States Code; and (3) cooperate with educational institutions and others in order to assist in establishing education programs and activities and to encourage public use and benefits from outdoor recreation.

(g) INTERDEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION.—(1) Cooperate with and provide technical assistance to Federal departments and agencies and obtain from them information, data, reports, advice, and assistance that are needed and can reasonably be furnished in carrying out the purposes of this Act; and (2) promote coordination of Federal plans and activities generally relating to outdoor recreation. Any department or agency furnishing advice or assistance hereunder may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement, as may be agreed to by that agency.

(h) DONATIONS.—Accept and use donations of money, property, personal services, or facilities for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. The term "United States" as used in this Act shall include the District of Columbia; and, to the extent practicable in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the terms "United States" and "States" may include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

SOUND FISCAL POLICIES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, for the first time in many moons a President of the United States has recommended a tax cut. And he says it should have the characteristics of a mountain and not a mouse. What a pleasure it would give me to vote to lighten the far too heavy tax load, provided I could do so with a clear conscience. But I feel that if all of the spending schemes recommended by the President are implemented we shall have a deficit of $10 to $12 billion without a tax cut. I could not with a clear conscience vote to impose a $10 billion tax cut on top of a deficit of those proportions.

Since the President has abandoned the proposal of the Treasury Department to accompany a tax cut with an increase on certain individuals and corporations totaling more than $3 billion—sometimes pleasingly referred to as a tax reform—at least it seemed that he had abandoned it, until yesterday, when the President made a statement indicating that he would still like to have the reforms—there are many well-informed observers of political trends who confidently predict that before adjournment this Congress will pass the type of tax cut recommended by the President. It therefore behooves all Members of the Congress who believe in economy and the preservation of a stable dollar to give careful consideration to the need for a reduction in the proposed spending program.

In 1932, I was elected to the House of Representatives on a platform which bitterly criticized the extravagance of the previous administration and pledged the Democratic Party to a reduction of 25 percent in Federal spending. As a freshman Member of the House one of my first votes was to cut my own pay and that of all Government employees. During the intervening years, upon seeing a complete reversal of the philosophy on which I was first elected to the Congress and to which I have since adhered as faithfully as any Member of the Congress, I have been well aware of what old Ulysses meant when, returning from foreign travels, he said, "Many things have I seen—a part of which I was."

Not because I believed in high taxes but because I was terribly opposed to the deficit being created by spending which I could not stop, I helped to write 12 tax bills during a service of 10 years on the Ways and Means Committee, each of which was higher than the preceding one and the last of which, with respect to income taxes, is still the law. However, I can take some pride in the fact that as burdensome as those income tax rates are, they are not nearly so burdensome as they would have been had we followed the insistence of the then Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau. He advocated an income tax bill that would increase the burden on the middle and higher incomes by $8 billion and leave practically untouched the then average salary of industrial workers.

Realizing that wage earners in the middle income brackets, to say nothing of those in the low brackets who had never paid income taxes, would never save enough out of current earnings to meet the heavy tax bill that would be presented to them in March of the following year, I sponsored the pay-as-you-go provision. Under that provision all the normal tax due after exemptions and deductions would be withheld at the source from those who were not self-employed.

And realizing how difficult it would be for those who had never filed tax returns before to fill out the complicated form then being used, I sponsored the provision for a very short form. In order to provide for that form, I proposed and the Congress adopted, a uniform exemption for spouse and dependent children and a 10-percent deduction for gifts to charity if the taxpayer did not desire to enumerate such gifts.

I refer to this legislative history to emphasize two pertinent facts:

First. No one is more familiar than I with the history of tax legislation during the past 30 years, because, as I have said, "A part of which I was."

Second. I have consistently opposed pump priming and deficit financing. I have continued to support the heavy burden of income taxes, originally imposed to finance World War II, only because I thought that in the long run higher taxes would cause less hardship upon the people of the great State I represented and of the Nation at large than the galloping inflation which undoubtedly would have resulted had we continued to spend regardless of the deficits being created.

As I indicated in brief remarks to the Senate on February 28 on the proposal to fix the debt ceiling at $308 billion, the spend and spend, elect and elect philosophy of the late Harry Hopkins was actually inaugurated with a $4,880 million relief and recovery bill in 1935. At that time we embarked upon a trial of what has later been known as the "pump priming" theory. The pump priming theory is based upon the assumption that an increase in Government spending will automatically increase prosperity. At the time the theory was adopted during the depression of the thirties, we heard little about the gross national product and nothing about the sine qua non of a growth rate in the gross national product in excess of 3 percent per year. The first pump priming was designed primarily to make jobs for the unemployed, which some unkind critics called "leaf raking."

If we learn anything from history—and Edmund Burke said nations never do—we defintely know that the pump priming theory was a failure. Our real recovery from the terrible depression of the thirties did not start until we started spending in 1940 for military hardware—what might be called durable goods—in anticipation that we might become involved in the war then raging in Western Europe.

Of course, when we entered that war we made—as we should have made—an all-out effort to win it. The Congress appropriated so much money for the President to spend in winning the war that at the end of the war the Secretary of the Treasury had on hand an embarrassing surplus. The surplus was, of course, properly applied to a reduction of the war debt that had been incurred.

But there were other inflationary factors in the Second World War besides deficit financing. An unprecedented number of workers were withdrawn from civilian production for military service, leaving an acute labor shortage. The demand of our allies upon our steel, oil, and other basic resources was so great that home building was stopped, the production of automobiles for civilian use was reduced to a trickle, and the consumption of gasoline for pleasure travel was virtually prohibited.

In other words, the full employment and great prosperity generated by the war effort that started in 1940 and continued for some years after the end of that war proved a great economic truth—certain types of public spending result in creating new jobs and others do not.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted that the Senator is delivering this speech today. It is one which should be made. It is very important that an outstanding Senator like the Senator from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, should speak his strong convictions on economy in Government.

The point which the Senator has made about spending can also be made in terms of quantity as well as quality. The Senator is correct in highlighting the quality of spending, as to the kind of spending involved. But is it not also true that the deficits in the 1930's, though enormous in terms of the gross national product at that time, would be equivalent to about $20 billion a year today, and were wholly dwarfed by the fantastic deficits in the period of the war, which would be equivalent to about $100 billion a year? Obviously, when one considers such fantastic deficits as those we had in 1942, 1943, and 1944—the years in which the deficits were so enormous—he realizes that, of course, there was a stimulation of the economy.

The Senator from Virginia is absolutely correct. There was a stimulation of the economy because of the quality of spending, spending of a different kind from that being now considered. To derive, from what happened in the war experience, a conclusion to prove that all we have to do to solve the problems of the moment is to run a deficit and spend more money, would mean talking about a deficit figure in the area of $100 billion, in the first instance; and, secondly, of a quality of spending quite different from the kind being discussed today.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Wisconsin is absolutely correct. First we must consider the quality of spending. As I tried to point out, not until there was spending for what were in effect durable goods was there a significant effect.

Secondly we must consider the quantity of spending. The gross national product at that time was only about one-third of what it is now. One would have to multiply the spending now three or four times to get the effect which then took place.

Our gross national product is now approximately $555 billion and still rising. I recall that some economists, in the midst of the depression, estimated that the entire wealth of our Nation was only $300 billion. That shows the great difference.

The Senator is quite correct. One cannot draw an inference from prosperity which resulted from huge wartime deficit spending, and reach the conclusion that a possible $10 billion, $15 billion or $20 billion deficit now, will guarantee full empoyment and be an answer to what in some sections of the country is chronic unemployment.

Mr. President, with that truth, as Senator PROXMIRE and I have explained it, I challenge what may be called the Walter Reuther theory that a $10 billion tax cut geared primarily to those in the low income brackets and superimposed upon a larger spending public program than that advocated by the President will automatically relieve the problem of unemployment.

The theory of Dr. Heller and other Presidential advisers, that without the tax cut we shall have a serious recession, has apparently been largely abandoned. In its place we find a new theory that an automatic growth of the gross national product in excess of 3 percent a year is a categorical imperative. I likewise challenge that theory.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am pleased to yield to my friend, the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have in my hand a booklet carrying the proceedings which were had last November by the fiscal and monetary policy committee gathered to give advice to the President on how our fiscal and monetary affairs should be run. This was the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy.

Mr. Heller was one the principal participants.

In the booklet, on page 77, there appear the figures for the fiscal situation in 1961 actually, in 1962 actually, and the estimate for 1963. The deficit in 1961, according to the report, was $3.9 billion. In 1962 the deficit was $6.3 billion. Next is the significant figure. It is that the surplus for the fiscal year 1963 was estimated to be $500 million.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the estimate which was made. What is the actual fact?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The actual fact is that the deficit will be more than $8 billion. Dr. Heller, who advised the President to make that report, missed his guess as to the gross national product by more than $20 billion. That is why he became so concerned about giving a booster to the gross national product. It had not moved up as fast as he predicted it should move, and therefore everything had gone helter-skelter.

Mr. LAUSCHE. He was one of the participants at the conference, and a rather active one.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. I remember the position held by Dr. Heller when he and I first started writing tax laws before World War II. He was a very able economist at the Department of the Treasury at that time. I would say he then had his feet on the ground. I do not know where his feet are now, but I sometimes think his head is in the clouds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It was estimated that by June 30, 1963, there would be a $500 million surplus for this fiscal year, but, instead, there will be a deficit of how much?

Mr. ROBERTSON. $8 billion, as well as we can now estimate. I think that is the official estimate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So they missed the figure by $8 billion. Does the $8 billion estimated deficit include the additional deficit that will come if the President's tax reduction is carried into effect?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Not unless the tax reduction applies to some part of fiscal 1963. I am not too sure when they want the tax cut to apply, but I did not understand that much, if any, of it was to be retroactive.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It will apply primarily in the next fiscal year. It was originally intended to apply for the first 6 months of this year.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So if the bill is passed and it is to apply to a part of this fiscal year, the amount lost as a result of the tax reduction will have to be added to the $8 billion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Now I should like to point out another important aspect of this conference. There must have been 150 participants in it, many labor leaders, some businessmen, some bankers.

When the conference assembled, after some discussion, they broke into panels or roundtables.

I am directing the Senator's attention to two panels, especially, one led by a Dr. Rees and another led by Dr. Colm.

When these two panels reported back, the one led by Dr. Rees, chairman of the Department of Economics of the University of Chicago, it was stated by Dr. Rees, speaking to the assembly:

> Our group spent part of the afternoon discussing monetary policy. We were fortunate to have in the group several representatives of banking institutions. The discussion of monetary policy was perhaps somewhat more restricted to certain members of the group than the discussion of fiscal policy had been in the morning session. I will say, first, that those who were informed on the subject felt that the so-called twist policy, the policy of keeping long-term rates relatively low and short-term rates relatively high, was a desirable policy and that it had been possible to carry it out to a substantial extent.
>
> It was also pointed out that there had been a substantial growth in bank credit over the past year, but that almost all of it had taken the form of increases in time and savings deposits, rather than in the form of demand deposits. This was considered to be related to the increase in interest rates permitted on time deposits.

I am coming to the crucial part of it now:

> There was quite some concern in the group that if we do get a tax cut, which has been promised, and which all groups have urged, the effects of the tax cut on the economy should not be negated by a tightening of monetary policy. There was very considerable agreement on this.
>
> We recognize that the tax cut has to be financed—

Listen to this:

> we recognize that the tax cut has to be financed, that one of the initial impacts of the financing of a tax cut or an increased deficit might be some upward movement in interest rates. But the feeling was that this upward movement in interest rates should be restrained, and in effect, the tax cut should be largely financed through the creation of additional money rather than through pulling money away from other uses.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, that raises a very serious economic problem. If we have a deficit of $18, $20, or $22 billion, by imposing a $10 billion tax cut upon a deficit which, I think, if we implemented all the spending schemes proposed, will be $10 or $12 billion, somebody will have to buy those bonds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Who is going to buy them? That is the question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Well, if the commercial banks buy them, they could theoretically extend $6 or $7 in credit for each dollar of bonds they buy. That would be inflationary. But the Federal Reserve Board, which is responsible for maintaining the stability of our dollar, might turn around and increase the Federal Reserve requirements, which would cut down on what the banks could lend, and this would increase interest rates.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Dr. Rees reported that his Panel had concluded the tax cut deficit should be financed through the creation of additional money. Does not that mean printing-press money, in effect?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes. In that regard, I have been invited to have lunch with the Finance Minister of Brazil. The Brazilians are going to entertain the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury. Because I was in Brazil and looked into the fiscal and monetary problems in Brazil, they invited me to the luncheon. I have read in the papers that they want new credit of $400 to $500 million.

Brazil has been having problems with inflation. Brazil has been financing one-half of its expenditures with printing-press money. The Government of Brazil owns and controls the Bank of Brazil. The Government gives the Bank of Brazil an I O U, and the bank employs a firm in America to print their money on the basis of these I O U's. This method of making money is all too easy. So more and more money is printed and the prices in Brazil go up and up.

The result is that a bank in Brazil will not ordinarily lend anyone money for more than 1 month. The going interest rate is from 25 to 35 percent a year. In other words, we have an illustration of what happens when a country resorts to printing press money. Brazil is a country whose land area is greater than ours, whose population is one-fourth of the entire population of Latin America, a country which is the largest producer of coffee in the world, and the second largest producer of cocoa, a land which has one of the largest known iron ore reserves, a land which has inexhaustible resources of timber, a land with such a varied climate that it can produce any kind of agriculture—and yet what has happened? Brazil is faced with a runaway inflation. Let us be frank about it. I do not want to see that happen to this country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in fairness, I point out that, when Secretary Dillon made his presentation, he said these deficit bonds should be bought by the public, but if there is a $20 billion deficit one year and another one of that type the second year, and if the public does not buy the bonds, then the banks and the Federal Reserve will have to buy them. When that is done we, in effect, have printing-press money.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have said that I anticipate we are going to have a tax cut, and, if we had it, I thought it would soften the inflationary impact if we cut some of the spending programs.

There will be plenty of time, before we finally act, to discuss the issue of who is going to buy the bonds, whether the Federal Reserve Board is going to raise the interest rates, and whether or not the Federal Reserve Board is going to "print" the money. Those issues will come up, although they are not essential to the discussion I am undertaking today.

All that I am trying to say now is that if we are going to have a tax cut—and it is likely that we will have one—we ought to cut spending to some extent. I will indicate where I believe $6 billion could be trimmed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. To return to Dr. Colm and the roundtable group. Dr. Colm is the chief economist of the National Planning Association. He reported back that the members of his panel got into an argument as to who will buy the bonds. He makes this statement:

> Toward the end we got a sort of 99-percent agreement when I think the latter group agreed, at least one of them—the other kept quiet—that bank financing might be tolerated, if necessary, as an interim measure if, then, out of the growing gross national product, income, and increased profits, more savings funds would be forthcoming so that in the long run the financing could be shifted entirely to private savings. That was a discussion from this particular panel which I found very interesting.

In this panel they argued that the banks should not be made to buy the bonds out of their current fluid assets, but that the bonds should be bought by the Federal Reserve, and that the Federal Reserve requirements on banks be lessened. In my opinion that again would lead to what I call printing-press money.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That process is bound to be inflationary, because we must remember that a currency is sound, whether geared to gold or not, as long as money is issued solely with reference to the money-work to be done, that is, the production it finances. If we greatly increase that supply of money artificially without any relation to the money-work that is to be done, it is like having goods in a warehouse and issuing tickets, and providing that five tickets, let us say, will get out a pair of shoes. If we double the number of tickets, then it will take 10 tickets to get a pair of shoes out. It is as simple as that. That is what happens if we flood the country with money without relation to the money-work to be done.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I commend the Senator from Virginia for his presentation. I may vote for a tax cut, but it must be accompanied by a reduction in expenditures. I will go along with the Senator from Virginia in his efforts to reduce the expenditures.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia has not yet announced that he is in favor of a tax cut, but he has said that if we are going to have one—and apparently we will have one—then we should cut spending first.

Of course when we get down to the question of who is to buy the bonds, and what action the Federal Reserve Board is to take, that will give an opportunity for more speeches on this subject.

I now return to the text of my speech.

To be sure, I am not unmindful of the problem of unemployment. I am concerned to see it solved, although I do not think that boys who drop out of high school, housewives who have never had and do not want full employment, and certain others who have become firmly wedded to rocking-chair money, should be included with the chronically unemployed such as we have in the coal mining fields of southwest Virginia and elsewhere in the Nation. More than that, I fear that many who blithely talk about the growth rate of the gross national product do not clearly understand what the gross national product means.

The gross national product represents the total national output of goods and services measured in current market prices. The Nation's annual output is expressed through the GNP in terms of the expenditures by which the goods that have been produced are acquired. Expenditures are classified under four major headings:

First, personal consumption expenditures; second, gross private domestic investment; third, net exports of goods and services; and, fourth, Government purchases of goods and services.

By and large, the goods and services included in the GNP, with the exception of net changes in inventories, are actually bought for final use in legal markets. Thus, intermediate products are excluded, and double counting of the value of products is avoided. The gross national product does contain a number of imputed items, that is, items not in fact sold in markets but evaluated as if so sold. The most important of these is the imputed rental value of owner-occupied dwellings. Also, some elements of production are omitted from the gross national product because of the difficulty of imputing a market value.

A familiar example is the omission of the value of the services of housewives. Thus, if a man marries his housekeeper, this is a reduction in the gross national product.

To turn to the components of the gross national product, personal consumption expenditures measure the sum of money plus the imputed expenditures made by consumers—individuals, nonprofit institutions such as hospitals, and so forth—for goods and services. Such expenditures are subclassified into durables, nondurables, and services. "Durable goods" are those items which generally last 3 years or longer in use. "Nondurable goods" are tangible commodities with a shorter life. "Services" include housing, telephone, electricity, shoe repair, gas and water, and also such expenses as those of handling insurance and banking services. "Net exports of goods and services" measures the net contribution of foreigners to the purchase of the U.S. output for a given period. It is estimated by evaluating "exports" of goods and services—that is, the domestic output which is sold abroad, plus the production abroad which is credited to resources owned by the United States—and subtracting "imports"—that is, U.S. purchases of foreign output plus production in the United States credited to foreign-owned resources, plus net private cash remittances to other countries. The rationale of the concept of net exports of goods and services is that such expenditures represent a part of the gross demand for U.S. production.

Only Government purchases representing current productive activity are included in the gross national product. Transfer payments—social security, veterans' payments, and so forth—are excluded. Moreover, Government purchases of goods and services in the gross national product accounts differ from Government expenditures as they appear in the Federal budget. Some items in the gross national product do not appear in the Federal budget. Also, appropriations in the Federal budget may not generate expenditures that are recorded in the gross national product accounts in the same year as appropriated.

The gross national product is described as "gross" because it includes expenditures for the replacement of the Nation's tangible reproducible capital. Net national product subtracts from gross national product the amount of replacement of capital. Approximately one-eleventh of the gross national product is devoted to replacement.

The following are the components of the gross national product:

Personal consumption expenditures: durable goods, nondurable goods, and services.

Gross private domestic investment: new construction—residential nonfarm and other business construction—producers durable equipment, and change in business inventories.

Net exports of goods and services.

Government purchases of goods and services: Federal, State, and local.

Suffice it to say, the formula of the GNP is so complicated that the average layman cannot understand it. Even our best economists admit that the formula is not a perfect measuring rod of national production, though they claim it is the best measuring rod which up to this time they have been able to devise.

But the limitations of the GNP concept are vitally important to keep in mind in setting budget and tax policy. To illustrate what a poor measuring rod the GNP may be in reflecting employment levels, we may take the case of Trinidad. I learned last October in Trinidad that the growth rate of the GNP for that island had been 10 percent a year for the past 2 years, yet the current rate of unemployment was 20 percent. The explanation, of course, was the tremendous expansion during the past 2 years in the output of oil and asphalt which was accomplished with few additional workers.

The lesson of Trinidad applies to us. For example, the output of domestic oil companies, operating in Texas, for instance, could be increased 300 percent with present equipment and very few additional workers. And this is only one of many examples in which GNP growth need not mean employment expansion.

Not only is the tax program based on such new untried theories as that of the Heller growth rate. The proposal to embark upon what I consider to be a permanent program of deficit financing involves also the repudiation of a number of early American concepts. They include what has recently been termed the Puritan ethic of living within one's means, and the constitutional concept of leaving to the States and the people thereof all functions which they can better discharge than the Federal Government. And last, but by no means least, the new spending programs of the budget represent a serious inroad upon the American concept of the system of private enterprise.

The threat to our American system of continued increases in Federal spending

is gradual, but therefore all the more important to reflect upon and combat with determination. Our Nation, as the life history of nations go, is a very young nation. The city-state of Athens, in which the population—exclusive of slaves—was less than the District of Columbia, dominated a large section of the Hellenic world for several hundred years, during which time it produced some of the world's greatest philosophers and some of the world's greatest artists. Fewer Italians lived in Rome in the days of Julius Caesar than we have in New York City today, but Rome dominated the great area conquered by Caesar for some 400 years after his assassination. In contrast, the first Congress of the United States of America convened in 1789, only 174 years ago. In the relatively brief span of less than two centuries we have become not only the most powerful nation in the world but likewise the richest and the freest; and if we are not the happiest nation in the world, it is our own fault.

Throughout the major part of the development from 13 weak and struggling colonies with a population of 3 million people to 50 proud and sovereign States with a population of more than 185 million, our economy has been based upon a system of free competitive enterprise—more frequently called private enterprise—which was firmly imbedded in the Philadelphia Constitution of 1787. Certain of the ratifying States—notably the two largest, Virginia and New York—to make that fundamental principle secure for all time to come, insisted on an amendment to the Constitution, now known as the 10th amendment which provided that all powers not delegated to the Federal Government nor prohibited to the States should be "reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

In recent years every branch of the Federal Government has openly and unblushingly violated that fundamental provision of the Constitution. President Roosevelt threatened to pack the Supreme Court when it held that both NRA and the law imposing a processing tax on wheat for distribution to farmers violated the 10th amendment. The following year the Supreme Court, in the case of Helvering against Davis, abolished the 10th amendment so far as Federal spending was concerned. In doing so, it not only authorized the Congress to incur terrific deficits for any type of spending it chose, but also made implicit in many of those spending schemes a radical departure from the fundamental concept of private enterprise.

No good purpose will be served by indicating at this time the clear intent of those who framed the Constitution and those who ratified it that the general welfare clause was to be a limitation upon the powers expressly delegated by the Constitution to the Federal Government. Suffice it to say that the Congress can now spend for anything it pleases and does not even have to resort to the previous hocus-pocus of a preamble saying the sugarplums proposed to be distributed are for the general welfare. That brings me to the current problem confronting us. We are told that:

First. The gross national product is not rising fast enough.

Second. A faster rate of growth will increase prosperity and economic employment.

Third. A tax cut without any reduction in spending is the most vital domestic need of our Nation today.

It is not clear that a tax cut without spending reductions will increase the growth rate of the GNP; economists appearing before the Joint Economic Committee already have expressed their doubts as to the numerical value and timing of so-called "multiplier" and "accelerator" effects that are supposed to bring this about. Moreover, it is not clear that a faster rate of growth in the GNP total, even if achieved, would in itself solve our unemployment. Therefore, if tax cuts are desirable for their impact on business and consumer incentives, I am convinced they should be enacted only with corresponding reductions in spending that also enhance incentives by restoring confidence in the soundness of our fiscal policy on the part of business investors in durable goods, which themselves generate jobs, income, and prosperity.

Let us therefore turn to the budget for fiscal 1964 and carefully examine its spending proposals. In a year with no recession and no shooting war, the fiscal 1964 budget proposes the expenditure of an alltime high of $98.8 billion and seeks new spending authority totaling $107.8 billion. Personnel increases projected in the 1964 budget in nondefense agencies total 47,000 people.

I digress to point out what an increase in Federal employment of 47,000 persons means. That is equivalent to adding each year to the Federal payroll the population of a city the size of Lynchburg, Va., in which I lived when I was a boy. And assuming that each worker can support three people on the salary he receives, it means a county as big as Arlington County, which adjoins the District of Columbia.

When we talk about 47,000 persons being added to the Federal payroll in one single year, we do not realize what a burden we are loading upon the taxpayers. Perhaps they could conceive its meaning better if we said we would support everyone in Arlington County with the taxpayers' money from now on.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Virginia is talking about the 1964 budget, is he not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that the only department of the Federal Government which will not increase the number of its employees is the Department of Defense? That is the conviction of the Senator from Wisconsin, which is based upon the budget, which breaks down the increases for each department. It seems to me that that document indicated that only the Department of Defense—I believe there was one minor department also—would not increase the number of Federal employees.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I assume the Senator is speaking about civilian employees.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Defense Department does contemplate another increase in military personnel.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Oh, yes; I am speaking only of civilian employees.

Is it not true that the Department of Commerce will increase its personnel about 11 percent?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think that is correct. I have not tried to estimate the percentage for each department; but I will indicate some major cuts which could be made in the various departments.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not also true that the Department of Agriculture will increase its large number of employees by 5,000?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct, according to my understanding.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to me, despite the fact that the President of the United States has wisely and properly said that he will try to maintain expenditures and not increase them in nondefense and nonspace areas, that every department of the Government, with the exception of the Department of Defense, plans to increase its personnel, the number of employees, and the size of its payroll. So is it not clear that we will be increasing our effective spending in these other areas?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I think the Senator is correct. He will recall that one phase of the pay raise bill provided that this year attrition among Government employees would offset the pay raise; yet all Government departments are asking for new money to provide for the 7-percent pay increase.

Mr. PROXMIRE. These are increases in the number of persons employed by each department.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. Besides not offsetting the pay raise by not filling vacancies which occur by reason of death or retirement, the departments and agencies propose to add a total of 47,000 new employees, although not in the Department of Defense, as the Senator has pointed out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am again reading the figures from the booklet which reports the conference of labor and management advisers. It shows that the budget expenditures for the fiscal year 1961 were $81.5 billion; for 1962, $87.7 billion; for 1963, they are estimated to be $92.5 billion; and the Senator from Virginia has just pointed out that the budget for fiscal 1964 will be $98.8 billion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I also pointed out that the new spending schemes will automatically raise that amount in the next fiscal year to about $107 billion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So in the most recent 3 years our governmental expenditures will have risen approximately $17.3 billion, from $81.5 billion to $98.8 billion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Ohio is correct. The increase is entirely too much.

Mr. President, beyond the personnel increases to which I have referred, the 1964 budget projects presently modest expenditures on a series of new projects requested for the first time which, if enacted, would have an eventual annual cost of over $2 billion.

Over the short period of the past 3 fiscal years, already high budget expenditures have gone up by one-fifth and new spending authority requested has risen by an astonishing one-third. Any objective observer looking at these facts would surely have to ask whether funds are not being appropriated and spent faster than agencies can absorb them. The time has come to slow down this process of spending increases, to consider no item in the budget untouchable in doing so, and to examine with great care even the most critical governmental functions.

I have diligently examined the budget for fiscal 1964 and wish to offer specific reductions for the consideration of the Members of the Senate.

I agree with President Kennedy, in his speech on Tuesday before the Labor Department, that no category of spending is untouchable, and so I recommend reductions in both nondefense and defense appropriations. I propose to indicate how the budget can be reduced at least $6 billion to accompany any tax cut which may be passed in order to move toward the goal of a sound fiscal policy.

In the area of nondefense spending, reductions can be made in proposed new spending programs, several existing loan programs, civilian research programs, foreign aid spending, and civilian personnel expansion.

Reductions can be achieved in spending requests for new programs because their need is not established as being sufficiently vital to justify an increase in the deficit, their cost impact on the 1964 and later budgets is by no means fully determined, and insofar as the objectives of these programs may be desirable, they can be met privately or by State or local governments.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I gladly yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Virginia on the speech he is making.

I ask him: What is the purpose of taxes?

Mr. ROBERTSON. To pay the necessary expenses of government.

Mr. TALMADGE. From the standpoint of the taxpayers, then, the ideal government would require no taxes at all; is that not true?

Mr. ROBERTSON. It would require a minimum of taxes. That would be the ideal government, I assume. I believe that under the government of Athens, which was a pure democracy, there were no paid government officials. But they would all get together, and sometimes there would be a thousand men on the jury. They would not get any pay. Still, they brought in a mighty poor verdict when they told Socrates he had to drink the cup of hemlock.

It does not necessarily follow that if government employees work for nothing, the government is better. However, Jefferson said that the least governed are the best governed. He advocated economy.

Our other patron saint, Andrew Jackson, paid off all the public debt while he was President.

So I think the Senator from Georgia is correct when he says that we look upon the government which does not burden us too much as being a good government.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does it not necessarily follow that if we had no government, we would have no taxes?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I presume that is true; but I do not believe that we could have 185 million people in this land of ours and have government without taxes.

Even in the period of the Revolution, when the population of the Nation was about 3 million, several thousand were living in New York. I heard the colloquy this morning concerning the removal of the tax collection agency from New York to Boston. I do not believe so many people could live together without being taxed.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that taxes are occasioned by the necessary expenses of government?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

Mr. TALMADGE. Whatever the Government spends, either the present or future taxpayers must pay.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. We are already placing a burden of $300 million on future taxpayers.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not the opinion of the Senator from Virginia that no budget is sacrosanct, and that expenditures can be reduced?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I agree to that.

Mr. TALMADGE. Has the Senator from Virginia visited, as I have, many of the Federal office buildings in Washington and seen hundreds, sometimes thousands, of persons at their desks, not looking very busy?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have seen entirely too many. I did not make a count, but there were certainly a great many of them.

Mr. TALMADGE. Has the Senator had occasion to read the books of the distinguished economist C. Northcote Parkinson? Parkinson has written some books in recent months and years showing how expenditures tend to rise to meet income.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I read that discussion. It is very interesting. That was one of Parkinson's laws, was it not?

Mr. TALMADGE. Yes; it was.

Is it not true that it has been the history of bureaucracy in government from the days of ancient Rome and Greece to the present time that when bureaus are organized, they tend to perpetuate themselves and tend to obtain increased salaries and increased authority?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct.

The Senator from Georgia knows that when his father was Governor of Georgia, he once saw an old man on the square in the capital. Finally the Governor gave him a job. But about 60 days later the Governor saw him out in the square again. He said to him, "John, didn't I give you a job?"

John replied, "Yes, boss. But I ain't got nobody under me."

The regular attitude of bureaucracy is, "What is the use of having a job if you do not have someone under you? You are not getting very far if you don't."

Mr. TALMADGE. Has not that been the history of government throughout the ages?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Undoubtedly it has.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the distinguished Senator from Virginia think that if Congress makes up its mind to have reduced expenditures, and if it pursues that policy with determination, a great deal of reduction can be made in the budget—not only in the budget for the fiscal year 1964, but also in the budgets for the years to come?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is absolutely correct. Although I am proposing only a $6 billion reduction in the spending program at this time, in the future it could amount to a reduction of $12 billion to $15 billion, because such things will pyramid.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Senator from Virginia think the field of foreign aid, in which we have sent about $105 billion to nations all over the world—non-Communist nations and Communist nations, alike—is a fertile field for reduced expenditures?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; and I shall recommend a reduction of about $1.8 billion in that regard.

Mr. TALMADGE. I agree with my friend. Nothing so greatly distresses the taxpayers—and I may say it also distresses me—as to see appropriations made year after year for Communist countries such as Poland, Yugoslavia, and other countries of that type. Does not the Senator from Virginia think the American taxpayers are fed up with expenditures of that kind?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am sure the taxpayers in Virginia are, and I am sure that the taxpayers throughout the Nation feel more or less the same way. We have not made friends by our lavish giveaway programs; neither have they converted anyone to Christianity or to democratic principles.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does not the Senator from Virginia think it is utterly impossible for the American taxpayers to bring the people of the world up to our standard of living and to recreate nations in our own image?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely so. In these remarks I have pointed out that in 174 years, based upon a system of private enterprise, and, of course, with a goodly amount of natural resources, and by hard work and by admitting that we are a Christian nation and by living up to a code of ethics, we have become the richest nation in the world. But by spending billions of dollars we cannot lift up a nation that does not have our principles and does not have education and does not have ambition. That is simply impossible.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator from Virginia recall that last year he and I were privileged, together with other Senators, to visit Latin America as official Senate delegates to the conference of the International Parliamentary Union, in Brasilia?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; and I recall distinctly the wonderful speech the Senator from Georgia made in Rio de Janeiro. I hope he will tell the Senate about it.

Mr. TALMADGE. I am complimented by the Senator's remark; but let me ask whether he recalls that when we were in Buenos Aires, and saw there much evidence of great wealth, and made inquiry as to what the people of Argentina were doing with their capital, we were advised that most of them were sending it—in fact, to the extent of about $5 billion—overseas, for investment, and that a great deal of it was coming to the United States.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; and it was coming to the United States for safekeeping and for investment in sound dollars.

Mr. TALMADGE. Was that being done because the people of that nation did not have enough confidence in their own country to be willing to make the investments in their own land?

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. We said we were willing to help Brazil, but that neither God nor any nation on earth could help a nation that did not help itself.

Mr. TALMADGE. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brewster in the chair). Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to commend the Senator from Virginia for his remarks and for his proposal. A copy of his speech has come to my office, and I have examined it. What he is proposing certainly merits the support of all Senators.

In my opinion, the budget can be balanced. What is needed is the will to do so on the part of each and every person connected with the Federal Government. If that exists, the balancing of the budget can be accomplished.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I appreciate that friendly comment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. My comment must be brief, Mr. President; but I am on the floor at this time because of my interest in the speech of the distinguished Senator from Virginia. I have already had the privilege of reading it.

I wish to expressly and generously commend the Senator from Virginia for putting together the substance of his speech, and for the fine analysis he has prepared, and for dealing with the problems to which his speech relates. He is eminently qualified, because of his fine background, inasmuch as formerly he was a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and later he became a member of the Senate committee which deals with financial matters.

I commend him for his analysis, which I believe to be the best which has been made this year, and I do not believe its high quality will be exceeded. Certainly if we followed the substance of it—even though all of us may not agree as to all the details—I am sure we would be on a sound basis, and would have a balanced budget, and certainly would be on the road to sounder fiscal policy.

I also note that in connection with this matter, he has not played favorites in so far as the departments are concerned. He is familiar with them, and he has recommended these reductions, regardless of the department involved or what its position may be.

I wish to ask him a question: With reference to the importance of achieving a sound economy, does the Senator from Virginia believe that unless we restrict foreign aid expenditures—assuming that we have to have some foreign aid program for the time being—and unless we exercise economy in that field, we shall ever achieve economy in connection with our domestic affairs?

Mr. ROBERTSON. First, Mr. President; let me say that I appreciate very much the commendation by the Senator from Mississippi, particularly in view of the fact that only today I read in the newspapers that one of his colleagues has nominated him for membership on the U.S. Supreme Court. I am sure he deserves that praise. Certainly, Mr. President, any man as qualified as he for service on the Appropriations Committee and for membership on the U.S. Supreme Court must be a man of well-rounded judgment and great ability.

The Senator from Mississippi has referred to a very important point. He said that if we had the will to balance the budget, we could balance it—some day, of course, for I do not propose that it be balanced overnight. But the Senator from Mississippi is not as old as I am, and he may not remember the great evangelist named Billy Sunday. He started as a great baseball player. He ended by getting thousands of people to "hit the sawdust trail," as it was then called.

Billy Sunday, speaking in Roanoke, Va., said, "I would rather be one step from hell headed toward heaven than a thousand miles from hell headed in the wrong direction."

All I ask is that we start heading in the right direction. Let us cut down something. We cannot balance the budget immediately, but let us show the American people that we do not intend to spend them into bankruptcy.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a good story.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Perhaps we could turn around.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas has said that perhaps we could turn around. He has reminded me of the man in Scotland who was lost. He said to another, "My friend, is this the road to Edinburgh?"

The man said, "Yes, Mister, but you will get there sooner if you turn around and go in the other direction."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to my friend from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I commend my friend, the junior Senator from Virginia, for the responsible task he has undertaken today. It has been my privilege for the past 12 years to serve with him on the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I have come to have a high respect for his understanding of the Nation's fiscal and monetary problems. There is nothing wrong with the will of the Senator from Virginia. I wish all the rest of us in this body had as much will. After having read the statement that the Senator prepared for delivery today, I was inspired to respond with a statement of my own. I shall not impose on my friend's good nature to ask him to sit still while I read it. I shall deliver it when the Senator has concluded.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank my friend from Utah.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Before the Senator from Virginia proceeds to point out where the budget can be cut, I think it would be appropriate for the Record to show that in the past 2 years the debt limitation has been lifted three times. It is now proposed that in this year of 1963 it be lifted a fourth time.

At the end of 1961 the debt limitation was $293 billion. On June 30, 1961, it was increased to $298 billion. On March 13, 1962, it was increased to $300 billion. On July 1, 1962, it was increased to $308 billion. Thus, in 2 years, the aggregate lifting of the debt ceiling was from $293 billion to $308 billion. It is now proposed to raise the debt ceiling again this year to the figure of $320 billion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Let me put it this way. On June 30 the debt limit goes back to the permanent limit of $285 billion. But it stands today at $305 billion. We have a temporary limit of $308 billion. It is requested that that temporary limit be carried forward to June 30 instead of letting it go back to $285 billion. We know that we cannot possibly get the debt down to that figure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with that statement.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then if we should enact a $10 billion tax cut and place that amount on top of all the other proposed expenditures, our next debt limit would have to be $320 billion. But that has not yet come.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It has not come, but the signs are with us, and unless we cut spending, it will be up to $320 billion.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is a fair assumption.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. When we consider bringing back a balanced budget in our fiscal situation, does not the Senator from Virginia agree with me that in circumstances such as those in which we now find our spending program, a wise course for the Congress to pursue would be not to enact more new legislation which would incur additional obligations until our revenues catch up with our spending?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is eminently correct. As I continue I shall point out that first one and then another new program is proposed. Such programs might be very desirable if we had ample money; but certainly to put them into operation with an escalator clause which would require them to double and triple in future years and to be paid for in borrowed money is not a sound fiscal policy.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator agree with me that those of us who have the responsibility of public affairs today in both the legislative and the executive branches of the Government have a moral responsibility to future generations not to unduly and unnecessarily encumber their heritage?

Mr. ROBERTSON. There is no doubt about it. If we act, in violation of intellectual honesty, to debase our currency in a manner that cannot be justified, we are certainly acting in an unmoral, if not in an immoral way.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to ask the Senator one further question. When we as a government live as we are now living—beyond our income and beyond our ability to pay or beyond our willingness to pay, if we have the ability—are we not doing an injustice to those who will inherit the debt?

Mr. ROBERTSON. In 1935, when it was proposed that we approve a $4,800 million recovery program, and the debt was then something over $19 billion, I said that if we started spending in that manner, we would live to see the debt go to $50 billion, and that if we did so, we would be mortgaging the future of generations yet unborn. Since then we have run the debt over $300 billion. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to make the observation that whatever is necessary to spend for the defense of our country and the preservation of our liberties, if we have to spend in that category, is also spending for the welfare and security of those who will follow us.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But if, on the other hand, we must spend to the limit of our resources to sustain and maintain our national security, does not common prudence dictate that in other areas of spending we should forgo things which perhaps we would like to have, but which we cannot afford without charging the expenditure to others?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is entirely correct. The Senator is correct in saying that we should not put a price tag upon our security and our survival. For that reason, last year, as acting chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, I introduced a $50 billion defense bill. I justified that action because, as I said at the time, the weapons which would be produced in the program would stay the hand of a potential aggressor. Since there is no adequate defense in nuclear war, and 35 million or more may be killed in the first day of such a war, it is highly essential for us to maintain our nuclear superiority over Russia; and on that ground I justified the defense budget.

But today, when the proposed budget is more than $55 billion, I am going to suggest items with respect to which I think we might safely cut it by $1,258,800,000.

I shall not do that categorically. I shall await the proof. If clear and convincing proof is presented that such a cut would imperil us, I shall not offer the amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I commend the Senator for his address, what he has said in the debate. I hope it will attract interest. I also express the hope that it will have influence with many of the Senator's colleagues.

I say that not in a desire to join remarks in a spirit of criticism, for I know the distinguished Senator from Virginia is not speaking in that spirit. I share the Senator's sentiments, which he has so well expressed, and I do so out of a conscientious duty of service and obligation to my country.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank my colleague. Later in my prepared speech I say I am speaking as a loyal Democrat. I think I owe it to our great Chief and to all his department heads to specify where I think the budget can be cut. Being forewarned, they may be forearmed, and put their best foot forward when they present the budget.

I do not know what would be good for our party in all of the States, but I know what would be good in Virginia. I know economy in government is a good policy in Virginia. I would think that if we should have inflation by the fall of next year, in all of the 50 States, it would be a party liability everywhere we went before the people.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, almost $2 billion can be saved by eliminating new programs in the fiscal 1964 budget. An appropriation of $1.2 billion is proposed for a large scale Federal aid to education program that would plunge the Federal Government ever more deeply into financing public school and college aids to education. An appropriation of $100 million is proposed as the first in a series intended for a 3-year, $500 million matching grant plan by which the Federal Government is to donate money to help the Nation's biggest cities finance mass transportation improvement. An appropriation of $100 million for 1964 is proposed for a youth employment and training program which is surely only the beginning of a more and more expensive effort, even though retraining methods are as yet untried, their results wholly untested and their sponsorship by government rather than in industry open to serious question. Appropriations for a long list—medical school construction and medical scholarships, nursing homes, hospital renovation, housing for the elderly, rural housing credit insurance, and funds for rural recreational facilities—totaling more than $200 million are proposed. They can surely be postponed without grave risk to the Nation in a year of near-record if not new-record deficit. And there are other new appropriation requests of a miscellaneous nature, which I shall not enumerate now.

The budget for fiscal 1964 proposes funds for loan programs which are unneeded and competitive with private lenders. The Rural Electrification Administration requests $495 million of new loan funds for electrification and telephones in 1964. Yet, today, 98 percent of the Nation's farms now have electric power. And five out of every six of the new member customers of REA-financed electric cooperatives in recent years have been industrial, commercial, and nonfarm residential consumers. Without specifying the amount to be cut from these requested funds, I am certain that a sizable reduction can be achieved if such spending is held to the proper purpose of the REA. To be sure, we should do everything necessary to extend services to farmers under this long accepted program. But the steady shift of REA activity into direct competition with industrial, commercial, and urban facilities is patently unneeded and unwarranted, and it should be halted.

An increase in loan authorization ceilings for area redevelopment of $350 million is proposed in the budget for fiscal 1964. I urge that this request be rejected. Proponents of the legislation in 1961 asserted that the $300 million which Congress authorized at that time would be adequate to meet the objectives of the legislation. Now we find a request that might more than double the original authorization and that would expand the Federal Government's activities in this area of local activity and local responsibility all over the Nation with its corresponding threat to local initiative and control in local affairs.

The recent rapid growth of large scale civilian research activities of the Federal Government raises questions of whether funds for such programs proposed in the budget for fiscal 1964 can possibly be used to best advantage. The National Science Foundation requests $589 million, an increase of $267 million or 80 percent over 1963. Appropriations for the National Institutes of Health have been increased from $733 million to nearly $1 billion in 2 fiscal years. In every single year since 1952, the Congress has provided more money for the NIH research programs. Such rapid growth raises the threat of funds being wasted. It also encourages expensive research methods whose results are not commensurate with their costs.

Another category in the budget requests that can be reduced is foreign aid, which should be cut by $1.8 billion. Funds requested in the fiscal 1964 budget total $4.9 billion, an increase of $1 billion over 1963. The increases proposed include $151 million for a contingent fund for unforeseen emergencies, $175 million for development loans under the Alliance for Progress, another

$273 million for other development loan funds, and $880 million for a food-for-peace program. I urge that the Senate reduce aid funds by at least $1.8 billion because of the growing criticisms of the administration of our aid funds, which reflect a public recognition that we have not been getting our dollar's worth from this expensive, cumbersome, and confused undertaking.

Finally, in the area of nondefense spending, I urge my colleagues to insist upon a 5-percent reduction of personnel in every department of the Federal Government. The budget for fiscal 1964 again reflects an increase in Federal employment in nondefense agencies which is only another in a long series of such increases. The 1962 Federal pay increase legislation provided that the Federal agencies should absorb the pay increase, but throughout the fiscal 1964 budget, appropriations are requested to cover such increases. The discipline imposed upon Federal agency administrators by a 5-percent employment reduction would, without question, increase the efficiency of agency operations. And also, without question, such a reduction could be achieved with dispatch in many agencies whose current requests seek an increase in personnel.

I now turn to the budget requests for the Department of Defense, which total $53.7 billion exclusive of the requests for civil functions of the Department of the Army. This total of $53.7 billion includes funds for the military functions of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, including military construction and family housing and funds for the civil defense and military assistance programs.

I have made a preliminary study of the budget for the Department of Defense and have concluded that reductions totaling $1,258,800,000 can be made without seriously impairing our present military posture.

I have frequently said, "We cannot place a price tag on our security," and in proposing these reductions, I am not abandoning that principle. If during the hearings for the Senate Committee on Appropriations compelling and convincing evidence is presented in support of any of the programs where I have proposed a reduction, I will withdraw that particular proposed amendment. However, during this period when serious inflation could be caused by tremendous deficits, we must look at the Defense budget with the view in mind of making all reductions that are possible without impairing our present defense posture.

Specific reductions which I shall recommend are as follows:

First. Defense procurement programs, $633 million.

This amount represents the total net increase in procurement funds requested for fiscal 1964 over those available in fiscal 1963. In my opinion, these reductions, made in all three services, should be accomplished in the area of conventional warfare, which I have discussed in my detailed statement which I now ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I continue the listing of items:

Second. Military construction, $123 million.

This represents a reduction of 10 percent in the request, certainly a modest amount when one considers the fluidity of the construction program and that the increases for the Army and Navy alone over last year total over $200 million.

Third. Family housing, $137 million.

In making this recommendation, I have limited the appropriation to the same amount as was appropriated for fiscal 1963.

Fourth. Civil defense, $217.8 million.

Of the total request of $300 million for civil defense, $217.8 million is for the shelter program. I recommend that this be deleted. We either need a far greater shelter program or none at all.

Fifth. Military assistance, $148 million.

This is a relatively modest reduction of 10 percent in a program which would cost us another $1,480 million. It might help to impress upon the 60 nations to whom we contribute funds in the name of defense that cooperation is not a one-way street.

Mr. President, taking defense and nondefense spending requests together, my preliminary study of the budget indicates it is perfectly feasible, giving all due consideration to national defense and welfare, to reduce the budget—spending authorizations—by at least $6 billion in fiscal 1964. This can be achieved by a $1.3 billion cut in defense spending requests and a cut in nondefense spending requests of $4.6 billion before allowance is made for the saving from a 5-percent reduction in force of Federal employees across the board.

In conclusion, I desire to make it crystal clear that in making suggestions for eliminating or curtailing some of the President's spending proposals, I am acting as a loyal Democrat who has never left his party and who wants to help and not harm his party's success in the elections of 1964. I may not know what will help the party in all of the 50 States, but I definitely know what will help to carry Virginia for a Democratic candidate next year, and I likewise feel safe in assuming that if we have serious inflation as a result of deficit financing such an issue in 1964 would be a definite party liability in every State, especially those States where even with inflation, unemployment may not have been much reduced.

I also wish to make it clear that in indicating specific items that I think could be cut and suggesting tentatively, of course, the amount of such cuts, I have neither the desire nor the intention to prejudge the action of any Appropriations Subcommittee of either the House or the Senate. However, if a Senator is to approach an economy program from a friendly standpoint, he owes it to the head of his party to specify the items that he thinks can be cut in order that each Department head being forewarned can be forearmed and thus put his best foot forward when he appears in support of the programs under his jurisdiction. Some of the cuts I have suggested have much popular support, but I shall not undertake to be all things to all men. I shall make a public stand for the economy that I advocate and that also will enable the public, if it favors a program of freewheel spending, to deluge the Congress with spending pleas.

I also feel that I owe it to the distinguished and popular head of my party to give my alternative to a $10 billion tax cut without any reduction in spending.

In the first place, while the economy may be said to be sluggish, the gross national product—for whatever that may be worth—is at an alltime high and so is the national produced income. Therefore, if we admit that the economy is on a plateau it is still the highest plateau in the history of our Nation.

In the second place, if some booster, as is used to accelerate the takeoff of a jet plane, is necessary to move our economy from the present plateau to some higher peak of achievement, it will be found in verse 15 of the 14th chapter of Exodus, where God said to Moses: "Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward." The atheists, Communists, and other deniers of God and the Bible, will be unfamiliar with this reference but members of our Senate breakfast group know it relates to the time when Moses was leading a million and a half Jewish captives out of Egypt and into the "promised land." The multitude had made fine progress until it reached the shore of the Red Sea and then it came to a sudden and painful halt. What was the element needed for further progress? The answer, of course, is "confidence." Let our President restore the confidence of American businessmen in the perpetuity of constitutional liberty and free competitive enterprise and they will go forward without the "shot in the arm" of a $10 billion tax cut to be financed with borrowed dollars.

The problem confronting us is not a new one. A neighbor in Springfield watched Abraham Lincoln striding by with his two boys, both of them crying. "What's the matter with your boys, Mr. Lincoln?" asked the neighbor. "Just what's wrong with the whole world," said Lincoln. "I've got three walnuts, and both of 'em want two."

Lincoln gave the answer to that problem which is as true as when he uttered it more than a hundred years ago:

> No man living is more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty—none less inclined to take or touch aught which they have not honestly earned.
>
> Nor should this lead to a war upon property or the owners of property. Property is the fruit of labor, property is desirable, is a positive good to the world.
>
> That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him labor diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Exhibit 1

Department of Defense

I now turn to the budget requests for the Department of Defense which total $53.7 billion exclusive of the requests for civil functions of the Department of the Army. This total of $53.7 billion includes funds for the military functions of the Army, Navy, and Air Force including military construction and family housing and funds for the civil defense and military assistance programs.

I have made a preliminary study of the budget for the Department of Defense and have concluded that reductions totaling $1,258,800,000 can be made without seriously impairing our present military posture.

I have frequently said, "We cannot place a price tag on our security," and in proposing these reductions, I am not abandoning that principle. If during the hearings for the Senate Committee on Appropriations compelling and convincing evidence is presented in support of any of the programs where I have proposed a reduction, I will withdraw that particular proposed amendment. However, during this period when serious inflation could be caused by tremendous deficits we must look at the Defense budget with the view in mind of making all possible reductions that are possible without impairing our present defense posture.

The budget for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1964 includes a substantial increase for the strengthing of our conventional forces, i.e., those forces that we would rely on in a military operation short of general nuclear war. These conventional forces include most of the Army's combat and combat support units; virtually all Navy units (the Polaris fleet being the major exception); all Marine Corps units; the tactical units of the Air Force; the airlift and sealift forces; and the Reserve and National Guard forces.

The Secretary of Defense in his appearance before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives in discussing "General Purpose Forces" (those forces enumerated above exclusive of the airlift and sealift forces and the Reserve and National Guard forces) said:

"In addition to the general purpose forces study and the unilateral service studies, we also had the advantage of strategic evaluations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Drawing on all of these sources we have concluded that:

* * * * *

"(4) The presently programed forces, in general, could by nonnuclear means alone, counter a wide spectrum of Sino-Soviet bloc aggressions in regions other than Europe.

"(5) With regard to Europe, the presently programed U.S. forces, together with the present forces of other NATO countries, would not be able to contain an all-out conventional Soviet attack without invoking the use of nuclear weapons."

It is clear that our existing conventional forces are adequate for any situation other than the defense of Western Europe against an all-out Soviet attack. Earlier in his statement the Secretary of Defense said:

"Fortunately, most of our NATO allies are now in a much better position to support adequate military forces and thereby make a larger contribution to the collective defense."

Frankly, I have been disappointed by the failure of our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance to meet their commitments. In reporting the Department of Defense appropriation bill for the current fiscal year, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate stated:

"In past years, this committee has expressed the view that the matter of defense against the Communist threat is a collective one; that is, responsibilities and burdens should be shared equally among the nations of the free world to the extent that such nations have the economic resources to bear such burdens.

"Again, the committee recommends that the executive branch of the Government on all levels do its utmost to secure from our allies the cooperation necessary to support this policy of collective defense" (S. Rept. No. 1578, 87th Cong.).

In making this preliminary study of the Defense budget I asked the Secretary of Defense for information on the contribution of funds and resources of the member nations of NATO. I regret that the Department has seen fit to impose the classification of "secret" on most of this information.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Record following these remarks, a letter I addressed to the Secretary of Defense on March 4 in which I indicated that I will try to develop this information for the public record.

The fact that the European member nations of NATO have never met their commitments is not classified information. Mr. President, they have not met their commitments based on relatively small NATO force goals that are to be supported by nuclear weapons. Consider then how much greater the gap between goals and actual forces would be if a defense of Western Europe without the use of nuclear weapons were envisaged. Since the other members of NATO have failed to reach those limited goals which are supported with nuclear weapons, one would be blindly sanguine to anticipate the greatly enlarged conventional forces on the part of our European allies necessary for a defense of Western Europe without the support of nuclear weapons.

We should give a careful look at the cost of defending Western Europe without the use of nuclear weapons, because based on the past experience of our NATO allies, it is clear that we will have to carry the cost of this burden, and it will be a tremendous cost.

None of the reductions I am proposing will be directly applicable to our nuclear forces such as the Polaris submarine fleet; the ICBM's; and the manned-bomber forces of the Strategic Air Command. It is my view that the Secretary of Defense in canceling the Skybolt air-launched ballistic missile; by refusing funds appropriated by the Congress for the development of the RS–70 as an operational weapons system; and his refusal to use fiscal year 1692 funds for the procurement of additional on-range bombers has seriously impaired our one area of superiority—nuclear forces. I want to make it clear that I am willing to support a program, if it is not too late, to develop an operational manned weapons system as a followon for our present long-range bomber force.

I have dealt at length with this matter because it is so important to an understanding of the first of a series of recommendations which I wish to make in the budget for the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS

The budget includes requests totaling $16,724,800,000 in new obligational authority for the three services and the defense agencies. However, it is anticipated that $948 million will be available from other sources for a total procurement program of $17,672,800,000, which is an increase of $633 million over the total available for the current fiscal year. I suggest that the fiscal year 1964 procurement program be held to the current year's level of $17,039,800,000 which will result in a reduction of $633 million in new obligational authority which is to be applied to the various procurement programs in those areas that represent a substantial increase in conventional forces. It is not my intent to limit this reduction to any one or any two services, since all three military branches request substantial funds for conventional warfare.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

The budget contains a request for $1,232 million in new obligational authority for military construction (Budget, p. 194). Increases for the Army and Navy alone total over $200 million over last year. I recommend that the total request be reduced by $123 million, a reduction of 10 percent. This need in no way interfere with the vital construction associated with new missile bases. However, it might impress upon our military spenders the need for economy insofar as it relates to the possible utilization of existing facilities wherever possible. The fluidity, flexibility and uncertainty of this program are demonstrated by the fact that although the budget was presented almost 2 months ago, with the total military construction figures provided, no breakdown of these figures has as yet been submitted to the Congress. Under such conditions, there is no doubt in my mind that substantial adjustments can and will be made.

FAMILY HOUSING

For family housing of our Armed Forces, the budget requests $734,400,000. These funds would provide for the construction of 12,100 new family units and for the maintenance and operation of 370,000 units, as well as for interest payments on Capehart and Wherry housing (Budget, p. 195). I believe that it is the duty of the Congress to provide adequate housing for our military personnel in all areas where other housing is not available. But, I do not believe that it is advantageous to either the military or the economy of the country to burgeon forth with a greatly expanded housing program at a time when the fluidity of the international situation and the rapid changes in our technology may well render weapons—and the posts, camps, and stations which serve them—obsolete, virtually overnight. We are all too familiar with instances where installations have been built only to find that history has passed them by. Nor, do we wish to aggravate economic distress through the failure to utilize existing civilian facilities available to the military. Therefore, I propose that a reduction of $137 million be made in this area. This would provide the same amount of funds as was appropriated during the present fiscal year and should certainly be sufficient to maintain the existing forces, which themselves are not expanding.

CIVIL DEFENSE

The 1964 budget requests of $300 million in new obligational authority for the civil defense program includes $217.8 million for the shelter program. The statement is made (Budget appendix, p. 315) that this program provides for incorporation of shelters in the facilities of nonprofit institutions and in existing Federal structures, for the construction of protected regional centers for Federal emergency operations in the field, and for experimental shelter programs.

If we are to embark on a shelter program at all, we should admit that this amount is but a drop in the financial bucket compared to what would be needed to protect even a relatively small proportion of our population. And if history were to repeat itself, and "H" hour were to occur at approximately the same time and day as the last such surprise attack—Pearl Harbor—we would find most of the shelters indicated above would be either closed or unoccupied.

The appropriation of such funds would in no wise deter war. Rather, it might tend to lull our civilian populace into a false sense of security. Mr. President, at this time I do not believe the appropriation of these funds would be either wise or profitable, and

I suggest that the request of $217.8 million for the shelter program be disallowed.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

The 1964 budget calls for new obligational authority of $1,480,000,000 for military assistance to some 60 nations. The budget states that the emphasis in such assistance is "shifting to the less developed nations, where more attention is being placed on building up units trained and equipped to maintain internal security and to contribute constructively to local development." The statement is also made that most NATO nations now provide full financial support for their own military forces—that our military assistance fulfills only prior U.S. commitments. In other words, if I interpret these statements correctly, we are being asked to appropriate over a billion dollars to maintain and develop backward nations and to fulfill obligations to NATO countries, many of which have not lived up to their own promises. I believe that mutual defense of the free world should no longer be considered—as it evidently is in many quarters—as a one-way street. I have the highest regard for those nations which value their national sovereignty. No other nation in history can pride itself on the care which we have exercised—even under extreme duress—to protect that sovereignty in all free world countries. But, this does not mean that we should not expect cooperation. It does not mean that other nations should willfully flout solemn commitments when they are well able to fulfill them. And it does not mean that the undeveloped areas of the world should expect us to pick up the check for their future military development beyond that which is in our Nation's specific interests. I see no reason to maintain our troops in such countries as Vietnam unless full cooperation is extended to our efforts.

Therefore, I recommend that a modest reduction of $148 million be accomplished in our foreign assistance budget and that these reductions be accomplished in those areas where cooperation is most needed.

I am certain that the statement will be made that such reductions as are proposed herein for the Department of Defense will jeopardize our defenses. If I believed that this were so, I would be the first one to refuse to make any such reductions. But I know that this is not necessarily the case. In most of the areas touched upon in this presentation, the program is highly flexible. Let me give you a couple of illustrations. We are all aware that in the military assistance request there is a multitude of specific programs which have not yet been formulated. I have already indicated that the Department has not as yet been able to weld together a specific program for military construction to present to the Congress. Yet, the totals for such programs are locked in the budget. The same may be said of some other programs. I asked the Department of the Army recently for specifics in regard to one of their major items of procurement, funds for which were included in the budget. They were unable to tell me anything. They had not as yet made up their minds as to what quantity of what weapons to purchase. Yet, this is one of the most important items of the Army hardware.

I do not say this necessarily in criticism of these programs. In an undertaking of this magnitude, it may well be that it is impossible to formulate to the last dollar—or even to the last hundred million dollars—the items which ultimately will make up that budget. A certain flexibility is not only understandable, it is advisable. The frequency and size of reprograming actions which the Department of Defense makes annually is an indication of this. My point is that the budget figure, at this stage in the game, is in many, many cases not firmly fixed in detail. It is, therefore, subject to change. The Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget have annually cut billions from the service presentations prior to presentation to the Congress. I believe that the Congress is sufficiently knowledgeable to make relatively minor reductions in programs totaling half of our national budget.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Appropriations,
March 4, 1963.

Hon. Robert S. McNamara,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: In response to my letter of February 18, in which I asked eight questions concerning funds included in the Department of Defense budget for fiscal year 1964, I have received a letter dated February 27 from Mr. David E. McGiffert, Assistant to the Secretary, a portion of which has been classified as "secret."

I regret that the Department of Defense has seen fit to impose the classification of "secret" to the answer to "How many military men (Army, Air, Navy, and Marine Corps) are now committed to NATO?" and to "What is the total commitment of our NATO allies?"

In considering the budget for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1964, the Congress is asked to provide a substantial increase in funds to support an increase in the size of our conventional forces which are primarily required for the defense of Western Europe. It is my view that the American taxpayer is entitled to know just what the countries of Western Europe, allied with the United States in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, are contributing to the defense of this area.

During your appearance before the Department of Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. Senate in open session, I will attempt to develop for the public record the dismal failure of the other member countries of NATO to meet their commitments. It is my hope that you will reconsider the Department's classification of "secret" to the answers to the two questions quoted above.

Sincerely yours,
A. Willis Robertson,
U.S. Senator.

SUBSTANTIAL SPENDING CUTS MUST GO WITH TAX CUTS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the people of America are being subjected to an unprecedented propaganda barrage by the Kennedy administration calling at the same time for massive deficit financing and major tax cuts. The purported objective of this remarkable program is to stimulate the economy. Initially, we were told that it was designed to increase economic growth and employment, but evidently this was not considered to be dramatic enough to inspire the American people and Congress to turn their backs on fiscal responsibility; so the new strategy is to claim that the goal is to prevent an economic recession soon.

Every thinking American is concerned with the sluggishness of the economy. This concern has been increased by the fact that the New Frontier spending programs which were touted as sure cures for this sluggishness have failed miserably. Apparently the administration now turns to the opposite side of Government policy in the hope that a tax reduction, combined with massive spending and deficits can do what spending increases alone could not. In the name of economic growth, we are asked by the New Frontier to return to the reactionary policies of the 1930's which failed dismally. For, after 8 years of New Deal pump priming and deficit financing, there were 10 million unemployed in 1940.

Evidently President Kennedy's economic advisers are prisoners of the past and cannot rise above the discredited policies of the 1930's.

UNDISCIPLINED NEW FRONTIER

Frankly I am alarmed at the total lack of fiscal discipline and responsibility, and the complete refusal of the administration to develop any system of priorities to guide Federal spending. A multitude of new programs is thrown at Congress almost daily, and all are billed by the New Frontiersmen as of earth-shaking importance. There is no indication whatever that they are aware that there is such a thing as economy in Government and that some programs may not be as important as others.

Furthermore, there is no indication that the administration's economists recognize that we have high taxes because spending is high, and that the best way to cut taxes is to first cut spending. In his tax message President Kennedy said, "Our choice today is not between a tax cut and a balanced budget." I agree. The ideal solution would be a tax cut following a balanced budget, and the next best thing would be a tax cut tied to and dependent on a reduction in Government expenditures. Since we have had two Kennedy deficits without a tax cut, the American people might accept a third Kennedy deficit created in part by a tax cut, if the extent of the deficit were drastically reduced by all-out administration support for the elimination of waste and the curtailment of unnecessary programs, particularly those programs which were tried in the first 2 years as stimulants to progress and have failed.

RECORD SPENDING

The evidence of this total lack of fiscal discipline and responsibility is abundantly manifested all about us here in Washington. The President has submitted a budget to Congress calling for a $98.8 billion expenditure in fiscal year 1964. This is the highest spending level in the history of our Nation, even higher than any year during World War II. This represents an increase of $17 billion in our annual rate of spending since Mr. Kennedy took office.

But this is just the beginning, for the $98.8 billion does not include spending for such programs as social security, highways, and other trust funds. When these are added, total spending will hit the staggering level of $122.5 billion, another record.

We in Congress understand the difference between actual expenditures and requests for "new obligational authority" to spend. This new spending authority requested by the President for fiscal year 1964 totals $108 billion, a fantastic leap of $27.2 billion, or 34 percent higher than for the last Eisenhower budget, submitted just 2 years ago. It is this new obligational authority which is particularly significant since it forecasts an ever-increasing spending level by the Kennedy administration for the future.

This sad situation is further compounded by the staggering total of unexpended balances in appropriations available to the administration over which Congress has little or no control. These will total after June 30, 1963, $87.2 billion. Total appropriations and other expenditure authorizations—including those for back-door spending—available for spending beginning July 1 are estimated at $195 billion.

WELFARE SPENDING UP

Administration officials make the fallacious claim that we cannot make cuts without harming our defense and space programs. However, nondefense and welfare state expenditures generally have gone up $7.5 billion since President Kennedy took office. Moreover, nondefense spending since fiscal year 1954 has gone up almost $20 billion; so it can hardly be argued that there are no opportunities to cut nondefense spending. This is further highlighted by seven new spending programs which the President has included in his budget calling for an overall expenditure of $1.5 billion, of which $245 million would be spent during the coming fiscal year. These include 24 Federal aid to education programs, many of them new.

It is obvious that the administration has done some of the fanciest figure juggling on record in an effort to give the false impression that it has attempted to economize in nondefense and space areas. This has been most evidenced in alleged reductions of about $2 billion on such programs as farm price support payments, anticipated sales of surplus cotton, sales of Export-Import Bank loans to private investors, and purported reductions of a similar nature for FNMA, FHA, REA, and defense production. As the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has said:

> It is highly doubtful that such so-called deductions as these should be regarded as bona fide reductions in expenditure estimates.

Moreover, we must not regard defense and space spending as sacred cows. Stories of substantial waste in these programs come to light almost daily, and it is obvious that cuts could and should be made without endangering in any way our national security.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN PAYROLL UP 215,000

Further evidence of fat in the budget is the fantastic increase in the number of people on the Federal payroll added by the Kennedy administration. Through the coming fiscal year 215,000 civilian Federal employees will have been added. This is in addition to the 220,000 added or to be added to the armed services. Elimination by attrition of just half of these positions would save $866 million a year.

DEFICIT FINANCING —DEBT INCREASES

The other side of the spending coin is the fantastic increase in deficit financing and the ever-rising national debt under the Kennedy administration. The predicted deficit for the coming fiscal year is $11.9 billion, but it could go much higher if any or all of the many doubtful assumptions used in estimating the deficit should not hold true. This danger is real since the President predicted a budget surplus for the current fiscal year whereas we shall have a deficit in the vicinity of $8.8 billion. From fiscal 1960 through the estimates for fiscal 1964, deficits under the New Frontier will total at least $27 billion. This is $5 billion more in that short period than the total net deficit of the 8 fiscal years of the Eisenhower administration.

DELIBERATE DEFICITS

The New Frontier has introduced something entirely new and terribly dangerous into our national economic policies. For the first time, an administration has embarked on a policy of deliberate deficits. Indeed, Secretary Dillon admits that the budget probably will not be balanced until 1967, if then. The Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Walter Heller, has attempted to shroud this irresponsible policy beneath the phrase "Deficits of Strength" in contrast to unplanned deficits which he calls deficits of weakness. He, with the President, openly disparages those who believe that we should balance our budget and live within our means, particularly during times of prosperity. The President describes such people as being guilty of "stereotype thinking" and of succumbing to "myths." Mr. Heller, on the other hand, inveighs against those of us who believe in what he calls the Puritan ethic. He obviously does not believe that the Puritan principles of hard work, thrift, and living within our means as a nation have any validity today. Yet these are the very principles which have made this country great, which have made us the richest and most powerful nation in the world, and which have brought us the greatest economic growth of any nation in history. These principles are to be cavalierly dismissed by Mr. Heller as a discarded relic of our past, a Puritan ethic. If we give place to this shocking doctrine, then in economic affairs this Nation shall indeed be on the "high road to Heller."

VIRTUOUS PUBLIC SECTOR

Moreover, the administration has embraced the philosophy that a dollar spent in the public sector of our economy rather than in the private sector is somehow more virtuous and effective. Therefore Federal spending must be expanded sharply under this view. Evidently Democratic politicians and Federal bureaucrats somehow know better how to spend our money than we do. The private citizen and taxpayer is not to be trusted. Wherein is this different from the socialism except in modest degree? Already the Federal Government monopolizes a fifth of our gross national product, and the New Frontiersmen want even more.

ALARMING GOLD OUTFLOW

This regrettably is just a beginning of our problems. The Kennedy administration's utter lack of fiscal discipline is fully understood abroad. This has been reflected in the loss during the last 2 years of $2 billion of our rapidly shrinking gold supply which went abroad to foreign countries. Even more would have gone had not several friendly nations made advance payments on their obligations to us. This is unlikely to happen again. At the end of 1960 our gold reserves totaled $17.9 billion. A year ago they totaled $17 billion, and they are now down to $16 billion.

Twelve billion dollars in gold is required to back our money. We now have only $16 billion available. Thus, we are within $4 billion of the amount required to back the dollar, and the gold outflow still continues at an alarming rate. This is a most serious problem and is brought about in large part since foreign countries are losing their confidence in the dollar because of our continuous domestic deficits, our increasing national debt, and the decline in the value of the dollar.

NATIONAL DEBT LIMIT INCREASE

The sharp rise in our national debt and in deficit financing is dramatically illustrated by the expected request of the Kennedy administration to hike the national debt limit from the present level of $308 billion to $320 billion by next June. It was scheduled to drop to $285 billion on July 1, 1963. Instead, it will be $35 billion higher. This, of course, is easily the highest level our national debt has ever reached. Fully 8.4 percent of this increase will have occurred under the Kennedy administration budgets introduced thus far. This occurred in a time of great relative national prosperity. If we cannot balance the budget now, when will we ever balance it?

SPENDING CUTS OF $6 TO $10 BILLION

Yet in the face of all of these problems, the Kennedy administration proposes a net tax cut of $10 billion. Such a step would merely compound problems unless substantial cuts are also made in spending. I wish to commend the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] for taking the lead today in listing, after a careful study, substantial cuts which should be made in the Kennedy budget. The total reduction which would result by the adoption of these proposals would be at least $6 billion in fiscal 1964. In my opinion, he has rendered a great national service in the Senate today.

I want to assure him that he shall have my cooperation in this effort, as well as that of nearly all of the Republicans in Congress. This support will be reflected and brought to bear on each of the appropriation bills as they come up and on each of the many new spending programs which President Kennedy has or will ask Congress to authorize. Since appropriation bills originate in the House, the Republican activity thus far has been largely concentrated there, but we in the Senate will shortly have our turn.

REPUBLICAN ECONOMY PROGRAM

A Republican task force in the House has just completed a detailed study of the Kennedy budget. The conclusion reached is that new obligational authority to spend can be reduced by at least

$10 billion, while actual spending can be reduced by from $4 to $6 billion during the coming fiscal year, and by $6 to $9 billion in subsequent years.

I am fully convinced that taxes are too high and are a drag on our economy and therefore on our economic growth. They should be reduced, and I am anxious to have them cut sharply. But this must be preceded by a concerted successful effort to make substantial slashes in Federal spending, which has reached fantastic levels under the Kennedy administration. We must not finance tax cuts by borrowing money and resorting to the Government printing press. We must not finance tax cuts by feeding the fires of inflation through massive deficit financing.

INFLATION THREAT

In his tax message the President claimed that "inflationary forces need not be revived by this tax program." But any program, whether based on tax reduction or increased expenditures, which will produce an admitted deficit of $12 billion and which may climb to $15 to $20 billion, is bound to be inflationary.

Inflation is the most vicious regressive tax of all. If there is even so much as a 1-percent increase in the consumer price index, which would likely result from such newly created inflationary pressures, all of the increase in real purchasing power from tax cuts would be wiped out. This is no idle fancy, since the Consumer Price Index went up over 1.1 percent in 1962.

I commend my colleague from Virginia. He will have my support in his efforts to make sound cuts in Federal spending followed by sound tax cuts. But with or without tax cuts, we must cut spending, deficits, and debt.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I will yield for that purpose with the understanding that thereafter I shall retain my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Louisiana may yield for the purpose of the Senator from Ohio suggesting the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the Senator from Louisiana will retain his right to the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

SPENDING BY STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me in order that I may make a brief insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we hear a great deal these days about the national debt, and we are all greatly concerned from time to time about the increase in the national debt and the problems of managing the national debt.

Sometimes, however, we are prone to overlook another debt that is rising much faster than the national debt. That is the debt of our States and municipalities. Just yesterday, in the Joint Economic Committee, I proposed that, in connection with a study we planned to make of the national debt, we also study the problem of State, municipal, and local indebtedness.

As it happens, one of the lead articles in the Wall Street Journal of today deals with that very subject, under the title "Spending Giants: Governments of States, Localities, Lift Outlays Far Faster Than United States."

The article points out that since the end of World War II the increase in the debt of States and local governments has been 400 percent. That presents a problem with which we ought to be concerned, particularly at this time when we are talking about the possibility of tax reduction. We ought to give a balanced consideration to that problem also.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the article from the Wall Street Journal to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPENDING GIANTS: GOVERNMENTS OF STATES, LOCALITIES, LIFT OUTLAYS FAR FASTER THAN UNITED STATES—SURGE IN SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN, MIGRATION TO CITIES CITED; NON-FEDERAL PAYROLLS SOAR—RISING TAXES AND RESISTANCE

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

Spending by State and local governments has increased nearly 400 percent since World War II.

The increase is greater by far than the postwar rise of Federal expenditures. It has triggered a steep climb in State and local tax rates and, despite mounting taxpayer resistance, is continuing unabated.

"State and local spending constitutes about the only area where we economic forecasters can always predict correctly what's going to happen next," says William M. Burke, a senior economist at the National Industrial Conference Board (NICB).

The table traces the sweeping climb of non-Federal spending in the postwar era, and also shows the much tamer Federal increase (up 69 percent since 1946). Dollars are in billions and the years are fiscal periods ending June 30.

[In billions]

Fiscal year	State	Local	Federal
1946	$6.2	$7.0	$66.5
1954	15.8	17.8	77.7
1962	29.2	33.0	112.2

The extra-steep climb of State and local spending, compared with Federal spending, reflects partly the fact Federal expenditures were abnormally high in 1946, from lingering World War II expenses.

REFLECTS POPULATION SHIFTS

But the dramatic State and local rise stems also from basic postwar population trends: A sharp increase in persons of school age and a massive migration of families to cities and towns from the country.

"There's no question that State and local governments are bearing the brunt of the school-age population bulge, as well as of the increasing concentration of persons in urban centers," says Robert W. French, president of the Tax Foundation, Inc., a research organization.

In the last decade, enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools has soared by nearly 50 percent to above 40 million. Total U.S. population has increased only 20 percent in the same span.

Costs per pupil are rising rapidly; they are up 70 percent since the 1952–53 school year. Teachers' salaries, on average, have climbed at about the same pace. And the expense of school construction keeps mounting; capital outlays, up 75 percent in a decade, will top $3 billion for the first time this year.

BURDEN OF SCHOOL COSTS

State and local governments pay for about 96 percent of public school costs, reports the National Education Association. The table below outlines the rise of public school expenses and of yearly costs per pupil. The total cost figures are in billions.

School year	Total cost	Cost per pupil
	Billions	
1954–55	$9.8	$275
1958–59	14.3	350
1962–63	19.5	432

School costs will continue to mount, talks with educators suggest. Government projections indicate 25.4 percent of the 1970 population will be of school age (5–17 years). That's up slightly from the 1960 school-age rate of 25.2 percent and well above 1950's 20.3-percent level.

"Education costs, I'm afraid, have nowhere to go but up and up some more," says an NEA official.

The increasing concentration of families in urban centers is driving up the expenses of non-Federal governments. Some 70 percent of the population is bunched in towns and cities today, compared with only 64 percent in 1950, Government figures show, and experts foresee no reversal of this trend.

The urban concentration is causing sharp increases in costs of such largely non-Federal services as police, sanitation, and firefighting facilities.

"On the farm, there was no need for a big, professional police force or fire department," notes NICB's Mr. Burke. "But in the city, you can't do without them."

HUGE COST OF SERVICES

The Federal Government, of course, maintains some key urban services, such as certain prisons and health facilities. These make up only a fraction of Federal spending, however; as the table below shows, such services are a major expense for State and local authorities. Figures are in billions.

[In billions]

Service	Federal support	State and local support
Police		$2.0
Fire		1.1
Prisons	$0.1	.8
Health and sanitation	1.0	6.1

Non-Federal Government payrolls are expanding much faster than the Federal one. Since 1954, the number of civilians employed by the Federal Government has increased by 5 percent to about 2.5 million, while the State and local job force has leaped nearly 40 percent, to almost 7 million.

In government, the increase of non-Federal spending outpaces the rise of State and local tax receipts. In fiscal 1962, State and local tax revenues amounted to about $44 billion, far less than the non-Federal spending total of $62.2 billion. Federal grants-in-aid and funds from nontax sources helped close the gap.

State and local debt is piling up rapidly. The table below, computed from Government data by the Tax Foundation, shows the climb of per capita public debt at State and local levels, as well as the reduction of per capita Federal debt.

	State	Local	Federal
1946	$18	$102	$2,034
1954	61	185	1,713
1962	118	325	1,630

Above $80 billion for the first time last year, total State and local government debt is now a quarter the size of the Federal debt. In 1950, it was less than a 10th the Federal total.

Official concern is increasing over the pile-up of non-Federal debt.

Gov. James Rhodes of debt-ridden Ohio, for instance, not long ago fired more than 3,000 recently hired State employees, ordered all State departments to cut spending back about 10 percent and requested all State employees to work on Lincoln's and Washington's birthdays.

Many States, at the same time, are considering sharp tax boosts this year.

Before Nebraska's legislature, for example, are proposals to eliminate some property tax exemptions and institute a personal income tax. Other possibilities facing Nebraska taxpayers: A gas tax boost of up to 8 cents per gallon and a new 2 percent sales tax.

The 47 State legislatures meeting this year are expected to consider measures that would add $1.5 billion to the States' tax bills, the Tax Foundation estimates.

Tax collections in many States would receive an added boost if the Kennedy administration's proposal to reduce Federal tax rates becomes law. In 19 States, Federal tax payments may be deducted from income subject to State taxation. And in many States curbs on personal deductions, proposed by the administration, would mean similar curbs on State tax deductions, without any offsetting cut in State tax rates.

The following table breaks down the major sources of State and local revenues. The percentages are based on Department of Commerce data.

Source of revenue:	*Percent total*
Property tax	33
Sales tax	21
Income tax	5
Vehicle tax	3
Corporation tax	2
Other	36

The most rapidly rising source of State tax revenues: Receipts from taxes levied on tobacco sales, now above the $1-billion mark and twice the 1956 total.

The relentless climb of State and local spending is encountering increased taxpayer opposition in some areas.

Example: Residents of Ridgewood, N.J., one of New York City's wealthiest suburbs, recently rejected school board plans to boost sharply the community's school budget. The voters later approved a school budget scaled down by $151,422.

Despite such taxpayer efforts, however, overall non-Federal governmental spending—and taxes—will surely keep mounting, most experts agree. Expressing the view of many, NICB's Mr. Burke says: "So long as the need for education facilities and for municipal services continues to grow, State and local taxpayers will have to keep digging deeper into their pockets.

REPORT BY SENATOR ELLENDER ON HIS AFRICAN TOUR IN THE FALL OF 1962

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I present to the Senate my report on U.S. foreign policy and our many and varied operations on the continent of Africa, as submitted by me to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

This is the 11th such report to the Senate Committee on Appropriations over the past 14 years. Last year I chose to tour Africa to find out how the wave of independence that has engulfed the continent during the last 5 years has affected our American operations.

The impact has been very noticeable. In 1957, our State Department had only 404 Americans stationed in Africa. By June 30, 1962, the number had increased to 781. USIS American employees have increased from 71 to 143, and in our AID program American employees have increased from 305 to 850 in the same period. That means an overall increase from 780 in fiscal year 1957 to 1,774 in fiscal year 1962.

Those figures related to American personnel only. There has been a corresponding increase in the number of locals employed by our missions in each country. In fiscal year 1962, the total number of persons employed by the State Department, USIS, and AID on the African Continent amounted to 4,037.

Furthermore, the number is growing larger each day. In 1963, it is estimated that the number of American State Department personnel in Africa will increase from 781 to 994; USIS will increase from 143 to 172; and the number of AID personnel will rise from 850 to 1,039. These figures relate only to our own American nationals. Thus, if all these increases are countenanced by the Congress, the total number of Americans in these three missions alone will rise from 1,774 in 1962 to 2,105 in 1963. Will it never end? How long must we continue to support a large and growing number of Americans overseas?

Since 1946, we have directly contributed a total of $1.8 billion of foreign aid to Africa. Prior to this decade, the yearly amount has been small in relation to our efforts in other parts of the world. Our aid program now threatens to grow like Topsy. We are gradually assuming burdens that should be borne by some of the countries of Western Europe that are well entrenched and deeply interested in the domestic and foreign commerce of that great continent. They also own and control the lion's share of its immense mineral resources. Africa has been within their sphere of influence for over a hundred years.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. TALMADGE. I desire to congratulate my distinguished friend and colleague in the Senate on the energy and perseverance which he has demonstrated each year in going to various portions of the world and observing the activities of the Government of the United States in operation at the grassroots level, so to speak.

I do not believe there is a Member of Congress who is more familiar with what our Government has done in every area of the world, particularly in the field of foreign aid, than the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. He has pointed out time after time on the floor of the Senate the gross waste and extravagance and abuse of discretion that has been going on throughout the world.

Did the able Senator from Louisiana find evidences of that in Africa on this visit, as he has throughout other areas of the world on previous visits?

Mr. ELLENDER. More so, as I will show and as my report will indicate. The report contains 803 pages. It contains my diary and my observations. I am sure that the Senator from Georgia will be very much interested to read and to learn about the various programs that have been started in Africa which, in my opinion, are of no use. If the Senator is able to remain in the Chamber a little while, I will point out a few of those programs.

Mr. TALMADGE. Indeed, I look forward to that with much interest.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was also curious to discover just what we had obtained for this $1.8 billion expenditure, and what we might hope to get in the future. I was curious to discover what had been done to help the native African in his strugggle against illiteracy, disease, and poverty.

I must say that I was disappointed. The comments of the esteemed investigating committee, headed by our majority leader, recently confirmed conditions that I reported to the Senate continually during the past several years. Though the comments of that committee were addressed only to Western Europe and southeast Asia, they apply as well to our African operations. I am of the firm belief that a reevaluation of our present policy must be made, and made quickly, if we ever expect to realize goals in Africa set by our planners. In fact, the goals themselves must be reexamined to determine if they are actually realistic.

Senators will find a copy of my report on their desks. I will submit copies to the State Department and all other departments of Government that may be interested. I express the hope that the report will be read and studied, not only by the departments affected, but also by a fair segment of the American people.

Mr. President, in compiling this report, I have elected to use a slightly different approach than I used in the past. This report is divided into three parts. I have added an appendix. Part 1 consists of a short historical background of Africa, along with a general summary of my observations, conclusions, and recommendations. Part 2 contains excerpts from my day-to-day comments in each of the countries I visited. Part 3 summarizes some of the information I gathered from my interrogation of the mission heads and staff members of our agencies abroad. I have also attempted to analyze these data and present them in a meaningful form.

Mr. President, the appendix of the report contains a wealth of statistical data which has been furnished by our Government agencies abroad in response to comprehensive questionnaires which had been sent to our embassies in each country, in advance of my visit.

These data include exhibits for each of the countries I visited. Exhibit A is concerned with the operations of our embassies and consulates; exhibit B covers the operations of the U.S. Information Service; and exhibit C details the operations and programs of the Agency for International Development.

That section of the appendix marked "exhibit C," which deals with our foreign aid operations, is, in my opinion, the most valuable part of the document I am presenting to the Senate today. It might also be pointed out that this section of the appendix makes up by far the greatest portion of the report. It is valuable in that a comprehensive treatment of our foreign aid programs is put together in one printed volume and made available for dissemination to the public.

Mr. President, I am not unmindful of the fact that I have frequently been criticized in respect to these reports which I have made almost annually during the past 14 years. I have often been accused, for example, of having an overexalted opinion of my ability in writing, and that I fancy myself as a real author. I can assure you, Mr. President, and Senators, that I make no claims to being an accomplished writer. I have no talents at writing deathless prose, and I make no pretense at doing anything but putting into plain, everyday language which I hope all who are interested in the subject matter can understand, the on-the-spot observations I have made in the course of my tours of investigation.

I have also been accused of including entirely irrelevant material into my reports. I do not believe this particular charge is warranted.

I believe that when trying to present the effectiveness of our far-flung aid operations in a particular country, the observation on the sanitary conditions of its cities has a place.

If, after we have been aiding a nation for the past 16 years, as we have Ethiopia, and if we have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on public health programs, is it not relevant to note that unsanitary and filthy conditions still prevail in its capital city of Addis Ababa? Also, when one learns that we have been aiding a country, such as Liberia, since 1946, to the tune of $131.5 million, and when it is noted that this country is using borrowed money—not to aid its people but to erect grandiose and pretentious public buildings and executive mansions—should that not have an impact on the reader? It should tell a story all its own, a story which in my opinion will be much more powerful than any mass of statistics and justifications. It should cause even the most fervent advocates of our foreign aid programs to pause and think and ask themselves the questions: Are our aid policies really wise? Are they actually bearing fruit? Is there hope that they will do so in the future?

Liberia, which I said we have been aiding since 1946, should by now be one of the showplaces of democracy. I fear it is a vast understatement when I say that it is not.

But, Mr. President, I am glad to say that I have let the harsh words of slanted criticism bother me but little, if at all. I can take it. At least I can say that all of the comments I have made in the past, and am making in this report, have been made in the spirit of objectivity. I have leaned over backward to be fair, and have passed out praise and criticism wherever I believed them to be due. It pleases me to note how this effort at strict objectivity over years is now beginning to return home to the fold.

Again and again, my observations have been proven to be correct. The words I wrote in 1956 concerning the conditions and progress of our aid program in Korea were proved right by an audit of the General Accounting Office last year. In my report of 1958, I was one of the first to call a spade a spade and Castro a Communist. For my efforts with respect to both Korea and Cuba, I was subjected to a full attack by many segments of the national press, but it took only a few years for my views to be vindicated. I will dwell on this aspect at greater length further in this presentation, and in future days on the Senate flooor.

On this inspection tour of our operations in Africa, I visited the former Belgian Congo. For me, it was a return trip, for I had been to that unfortunate section of the world almost 10 years ago, in 1953. At that time it was not unfortunate, for I felt it had one of the greatest potentials of any of the underdeveloped sections of the world. The potential is still there, but I believe it will be a long and hard pull before that country, now independent, can be put back on the road to progress.

The results of having no explicit criteria for independence, save the desire for it, can easily be illustrated by the situation prevailing there. I refer to my notes from my trip in 1953, when I visited that section of Africa.

At that time I gave attention to the 1952 budget of the Belgian Congo. I found that receipts were $129,460,000 with expenditures at $125,180,000. There was a surplus of $4,280,000 in 1952.

Ten years later, what did I find? There is no budget for the Belgian Congo. Over the past 2 years and for all practical purposes, there has been no Congo, Belgian or otherwise. Instead of any surplus being created, it has been necessary for the wealth of other nations to be poured into this most unfortunate former colony.

According to figures furnished to me by our AID representatives in Léopoldville, the free world has actually furnished to the Congo since independence and through June 30, 1962, $262,260,584, of which our contribution was $222,072,243. Although we have paid the full amount of our commitment to the U.N., other member nations of the U.N. have paid only $40,188,341 on a total obligation of $125,510,710.

I wish to repeat those figures. Out of a total of $262,260,584 which was paid to the new government for its upkeep, the United States paid $222,072,243, while other countries have paid only $40,188,341 up until now. I was informed that for fiscal year 1963 we plan to contribute $37,800,000 in economic assistance and $100 million to the purchase of U.N. bonds. I was unable to obtain information as to the amount of contributions, if any, which other nations of the free world would make.

In 1953, the Belgian Congo was enjoying a $2 million favorable balance of trade, with exports aggregating $408 million and imports $406 million. It will be a long while before such a situation again occurs. Traffic on the Congo River in 1953 gave evidence of a busy, thriving, expanding economy. In November of last year, that traffic was virtually nonexistent. On this trip I stood on the French side of the Congo River, in Brazzaville, and looked across to the imposing skyline of Léopoldville, built by the Belgians. It was very impressive from that distance, indicative of great strides having been made since my visit in 1953.

However, once the river was crossed, I was confronted with heartbreaking sights. The European section of the city is dead or dying. It is like walking through a graveyard. Many of the towering buildings have few occupants. Shops and stores are virtually empty, and the streets are deserted. The once thriving city of Léopoldville is now a ghost town.

Looking over my day-to-day notes of 1953, I found this observation:

> If ever Belgium got out of this territory, the natives would suffer.
>
> To my way of thinking, it will require years of schooling and training before the natives are able to govern themselves.
>
> Darkness would return here, if the settlers leave and permit the natives to take over entirely.

Here again my views have been vindicated. Darkness has returned. In the years immediately preceding independence, the Belgians had made some effort to educate and train the natives. Given time, their efforts would have borne fruit, but unfortunately time was not given. It may appear to some that the Belgians were slow in training the natives, but the problems confronting them were so enormous that one must be there and see for himself to believe.

It would be well if those advocating immediate independence for other areas of Africa—and here I mean primarily the racial agitators—could visit the Congo. What they would say upon their return would provide a reflection of their real intentions. It would indicate whether they have the interests of their people at heart, or their own aggrandizement and lust for power.

Due to the conflict that has come about in the Congo, famine has struck much of the country. The ones who went hungry and the ones who lost their means of livelihood were the natives. While Belgium governed the Congo, the natives may not have had the vote, but they had full stomachs and were from all appearances happy and content.

I express the hope—a hope which cannot be expressed too strongly—that the Belgians, who developed the colony and gave it economic substance, will be permitted to return. Those now heading the Government should bury their pride and receive the Belgians with open arms.

I also express the hope that no more Congo situations will be allowed to develop in other parts of Africa. But it appears to me that our present policy is leading in the direction of such developments. If we give support, either public or private, to the few native agitators who are trying to gain control in the Portuguese colonies of Angola or Mozambique, as well as in the Republic of South Africa, we shall see the development of events similar to those which occurred recently in the Congo. If the whites of South Africa are forced to hand over control of government to the South African natives, the result will make the Congo situation pale to insignificance. It must be remembered that the South African whites are as native to the area as is any other group. They were the first to arrive in the Cape Colony, and they found the country virtually empty. They took nothing from anyone. They used the land and resources to build up from the earth the most flourshing economy to be found in the continent.

Much of the same is true of the Portuguese in Mozambique and Angola. The Portuguese have been in those areas since the 1500's. The progress made there is due to their efforts. Instead of our Government's condemning policies of the Portuguese and South African government with which we may not agree, we should bend our efforts in an attempt to encourage them to do more and more for the Negro population. Already a good start has been made in the fields of housing, education, and health. We should beseech and encourage them to step up the pace. The problems these governments face in their attempts are almost insurmountable. But, as I have said, a good start has been made.

In my opinion, we should use the offices of the U.S. Government to stand behind Portugal and South Africa in the arena of world opinion, even if that position is not politically expedient. Since we are paying by far the greatest cost of the United Nations, it seems to me that we should be able to make our voice—based on logic, experience and history—heard and heeded by the U.N. policymakers who apparently are attempting to bring on more chaos in the African Continent.

Mr. President, I should like to direct the attention of my colleagues to the information found in the appendix to this report. If there are those who do not believe that my analysis is correct, let them make their own analyses. Let them review and present to the public the material supplied by our State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, the Agency for International Development, and the Peace Corps. Let them be objective in their criticism. This is the information that should be brought to the attention of the public. These are the facts that should be presented to a wide audience of the American people. Let them delve, for instance, into our aid operations in the Republic of Somali. They will note that currently we are building a deepwater port in Somali, at a cost of $7,518,000. This sum represents 99.8 percent of the entire project's cost. The host country is contributing $20,000. Neither this port, nor this multi-million-dollar expenditure can in any way be justified. The port is being built supposedly to export surplus agricultural commodities. At present, there are no surplus agricultural commodities in Somali.

The construction of this port is based upon and justified by studies which show that in 20 years, and under the most favorable conditions, these agricultural surplus commodities might come into being; but at present the only agricultural commodity that Somali exports in any amount is bananas. The production of those bananas is subsidized by the Italian Government.

In 1960, the corn production in Somali was 2 million bushels; and corn or maize is the staff of life for the 1.2 million population of the country. In 1961, corn production dropped to 1.6 million bushels; in 1962, it was again at 2 million bushels. Mind you, Mr. President, this is total production, not export corn. As a point of contrast, it might be noted that our little State of Delaware last year produced 7.4 million bushels. Yet, here we are, building a port at a cost of $7.5 million. How can grain be exported, in view of the fact that grain is now grown there in quantities barely sufficient to feed the native population?

Wheat is another commodity which we hoped to bring into production there, according to the justification for this port. At present, the Foreign Agricultural Service has no figures relating to the production of Somali wheat. I could ascertain only that its production was nominal.

Of course, there is an explanation for our construction of this facility. It is not a good one; it is by no means a valid and businesslike justification; but here it is:

In 1960, when I talked with the Prime Minister of Somali, I was warned that if the West did not rush in and give his country substantial and increased amounts of aid, he would turn to Russia.

This, he has done; so the Eastern bloc has promised aid, and supposedly there is nothing for us to do but rush in and try to outdo and counteract it. I devote several pages of this report to a discussion of the dogfight which has developed between East and West in Africa, and its probable consequences.

In my opinion, a great deal of credit must be given to the Russian intelligence. It has refined to a high degree the pattern of cause and effect. Here is the pattern: All the African countries need aid; they come to us, and automatically receive a certain amount; and then they turn to Russia, or threaten to, for more aid. Russia acts as if it would be granted. There is the cause; here is the reaction: Like Pavlov's dog, we bark when the bell rings. We rush forward to grant every bit of aid we can, whether the country can use it or not. We build projects that are far beyond the underdeveloped nations' ability either to finance, operate, or maintain.

A few minutes ago, I mentioned Ethiopia. This country is truly a classic example of what not to do in respect to foreign aid. Here, too, is an example of my prediction, as long as 10 years ago, of exactly what would happen.

Our aid program in Ethiopia has been going on since 1946. Through the fiscal year 1962, our contributions totaled $83 million. One would think that given 16 years in which to improve conditions in that country, some results should by now be apparent.

What do we find in Ethiopia? No comprehensive development plan currently exists. We have actually abandoned most of the ambitious—too ambitious—plans which were so bravely started years ago. One need point only to the agricultural extension program which was tried in Ethiopia, to realize the miserable failure that has been the fruit of our effort. Ten years ago, I advised that we initiate only very simple and basic programs of education and health in Ethiopia. Instead, we wasted many millions of dollars in an agricultural college and in other programs much too advanced for the natives. In 1960, when I visited Addis Ababa, I reported that the markets I visited there were as filthy as any I had seen in any corner of the world, with the possible exception of those in Haiti.

Today, at long last, we have decided to concentrate on education—as I advised 10 years ago—at the bottom rung of the ladder. I point out, parenthetically, that, in some instances, in this connection we are providing teachers through our own Peace Corps. Those teachers are under the supervision of the Ministry of Education of Ethiopia, Mr. President, so that we are to a certain extent actually subsidizing the educational system of that country.

I could go on reciting what has happened to every project that was so hopefully started years ago in Ethiopia—agricultural projects abandoned because of a lack of cooperation by the people

and the government; health conditions improved very little, if at all; and so on.

But we are still there, Mr. President, searching around for something to do to show results in this unhappy land.

I found a similar situation in many of the newly independent countries, where we have sizable crews of Americans merely to look into possibilities, to investigate, to study, to survey, and to suggest what to do to assist. It stands to reason that those people will come up with programs—as they have already done in many instances—and quite frequently exactly the type of projects which have been shown to be miserable failures in such countries as Ethiopia.

I have said many times, Mr. President—and I repeat it now—that more employees in the field beget more projects. If for no other reason, these people will have to come up with suggestions to justify their continued employment.

Turning again to Somali, which I have mentioned before in connection with the $7½ million port we have agreed to build there, these statistics, I believe, are revealing: when I was there in 1960 we had 59 Americans authorized for 1961; in 1962, we had 68 positions authorized; and for 1963 a request was made for 70 Americans and 104 locals, making a total of 174 employees. Is there any wonder why our program has increased there?

Let us take the case of Tunisia. In the 5 years since its independence, we have made available to that small country a total of over $300 million in development grants, supporting assistance, development loans repayable in local currencies, and through Public Law 480. For 1963, there are 189 employees authorized for that country, 72 of whom are Americans, 115 locals and 2 contract. This is solely the AID program I am talking about and in the administrative section alone there are 22 Americans. I am convinced that a much better job could be done in this small country with less than half the number of employees. Many of our aid projects in Tunisia, moreover, are exactly the type we have since abandoned in Ethiopia. Libya is another place where we have carried on projects that were ill-advised, to say the least. I was pleased to learn that it is intended to phase out our AID program there in a short period of time. Information furnished me indicated that we have made $122.6 million available to Libya through 1962. Since 1960, we have been paying the local government $10 million for our air base in that country—$9 million from AID funds and $1 million from Air Force funds. We pay all expenses and our presence there has been a boon to the economy, yet we are being held up for rentals. We have had an outrageously large number of Americans piddling around, and yet no progress of any note has been made in agriculture, for instance. This is just another example of where our big-eyed operators tried to foster programs not in keeping with the ability of the local people to absorb or the capability of the country to keep up after we leave. I know of no program we undertook that will be continued by the host government.

Mr. President, again I point out that we have conducted programs there for years. We have sponsored agricultural programs which I criticized 10 years ago. Today they are being abandoned. The money has been spent with no good results.

The list of countries in Africa is long, Mr. President, and the list of projects still longer—and yet in very few places could I find any definite plan of action or attainable goal suggested by our planners. They are still floundering about, still surveying, still searching for ways to spend our hard-earned tax dollars.

Let me say here and now, that I am not unalterably opposed to the granting of aid in the technical field to the underdeveloped countries of Africa. There is no question but that they need it and will need it for years and years to come.

Few places on earth have I seen such abject poverty and as high a rate of illiteracy, to name only two of the problems that must be faced and dealt with. The emerging nations cannot successfully deal with those problems by themselves. But what I am attempting to do is to direct our aid into the most productive channels. I think this will be apparent to anyone reading this report. I am trying to forestall the construction of large capital facilities which have not worked in the past in other countries and will not work now in Africa. I am trying to forestall the conditions that bring on graft and corruption, such as happened in Korea. By now we all know that story; there is no need to recap it. I might say, however, that in 1956 I pointed out exactly what the conditions were in Korea and further said that all our aid was going into velvet-lined ratholes. For my trouble, as I said before, I was maligned by the press of the country for criticizing a stanch friend of the West. It took an audit by the General Accounting Office to prove that my observations were correct.

Turning now to a few observations on some of our other missions, I am aware that this wave of independence has made it necessary for the number of our oversea personnel in all categories to increase substantially. In my view, the increase in almost every case has been far beyond the actual needs. Be that as it may, I cannot fathom the method used to scatter the available personnel among the newly independent countries. For instance, the following four nations in tropical Africa are contiguous.

They lie one beside the other and I visited them in this order—Chad, Central African Republic, Cameroon, and Gabon. In looking over the answers to my questionnaires as I arrived in each country, I was amazed to find the difference in the number of State Department personnel stationed in each. There seems to be no correlation between the number of State personnel in each country and that country's area or population. The countries of Togo and Dahomey lie side by side on the West African coast. They are almost exactly equal in size, population, and in every other respect. Yet in Togo our Embassy has 13 Americans and 15 locals employed. In Dahomey there are only 8 Americans and 7 locals. Surely there can be no substantial difference in the amount of work at the two Embassies.

Chad, for a further example, has an area of 450,000 square miles and a population of almost 3 million. In Chad we find eight Americans assigned to the Embassy.

The Central African Republic has an area of 238,000 square miles and a population of 1.2 million. There we also find eight Americans assigned to the Embassy.

In Cameroon, with an area of 184,000 square miles and a population of 4 million, we find a total of 20 State Department personnel on board, while neighboring Gabon, with an area of 102,000 square miles and a population of 421,000, again has an Embassy staffed with eight Americans. Surely this allotment is nothing short of arbitrary.

These countries all have the same general resources and approximately the same amount of business taking place. Yet here we have Gabon, with less than 500,000 people, with the same number of State Department Americans assigned as does Chad with almost 3 million and the Central African Republic with 1.2 million. Again, while there are only 8 Americans in the Embassy at Chad, there are 20 in neighboring Cameroon though the difference in population is only about 1 million. If the 8 State Department representatives in Chad, the Central African Republic and Gabon can fulfill their duties without being strained by an unduly large workload—as I am sure they are not—I can see no reason for Cameroon to have a complement of 20 State Department people. I doubt very much that these people can find enough work to keep them busy in such a post.

Similar examples could be cited and I invite Senators to study the table appearing in the appendix giving the number of Americans at each Embassy in Africa, as well as my comments as to each country.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the table which appears on page 803 of my report.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of American personnel, U.S. State Department, serving in African countries as of June 30, 1957

Algeria	14
Angola	4
Cameroon	4
Congo	13
Egypt	84
Ethiopa	36
Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland	7
Ghana	15
Ivory Coast	2
Kenya	15
Liberia	19
Libya	35
Morocco	56
Mozambique	5
Nigeria	11
Senegal	9
Somali Republic	4
Sudan	13
Tunisia	18
Uganda	2
Union of South Africa	38
Total	404

Source: State Department.

Summary of American personnel serving in Africa[1] with the State Department, U.S. Information Service, and Agency for International Development—actual totals for fiscal year 1962 and estimated totals for fiscal year 1963 (excluding contract personnel)

Country	Fiscal year 1962				Fiscal year 1963			
	State	USIS	AID	Total	State	USIS	AID	Total
Angola	6	0	0	6	6	0	0	6
Burundi	12	2	0	14	15	2	0	17
Cameroon	20	2	12	34	26	4	17	47
Central African Republic	8	2	0	10	9	3	3	15
Chad	8	2	0	10	10	2	6	18
Congo:								
Brazzaville	14	2	2	18	19	3	3	25
Léopoldville	42	9	18	69	60	18	20	98
Dahomey	8	2	5	15	9	2	9	20
Egypt	82	14	39	135	76	15	42	133
Ethiopia	46	6	111	163	43	8	84	135
Gabon	8	1	0	9	8	2	7	17
Ghana	48	7	48	103	58	8	68	134
Guinea	23	3	15	41	26	3	34	63
Ivory Coast	22	2	30	54	23	2	32	57
Kenya	21	6	30	57	23	7	34	64
Liberia	32	3	102	137	34	3	107	144
Libya	22	12	76	110	24	12	55	91
Malagasy	14	2	7	23	14	2	7	23
Mali	17	3	18	38	18	3	28	49
Mauritania	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
Morocco	80	12	42	134	77	13	46	136
Mozambique	6	0	0	6	8	0	0	8
Niger	8	3	4	15	9	3	5	17
Nigeria	39	14	104	157	62	20	160	242
Rhodesia and Nyasaland	19	5	25	49	21	7	33	61
Rwanda	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	6
Senegal	20	4	11	35	22	4	14	40
Sierra Leone	15	1	16	32	19	2	28	49
Somali	22	4	48	74	24	4	70	98
Tanganyika	10	3	11	24	12	3	12	27
Togo	13	2	8	23	19	2	18	39
Tunisia	29	6	58	93	29	6	72	107
Uganda	8	3	6	17	12	3	15	30
Union of South Africa	49	4	0	53	56	4	0	60
Upper Volta	10	2	4	16	13	2	10	25
Total	781	143	850	1,774	894	172	1,039	2,105

[1] Compiled from responses to Senator Ellender's questionnaire.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, turning now to our USIS activities, the Government of Mali is most critical of our U.S. Information Service and has gone to great lengths to restrict the scope of its functions. Unfortunately, they have not restricted the number of personnel that may be sent, but only the activity that may be engaged in. Our library has been closed; the press of the country will not accept our releases; and, in general, we are being told to cease any activities which might be classified as propaganda. Yet we find two Americans stationed in Mali to handle the duties of the U.S. Information Services. These duties consist of handling such matters as setting up exhibits, or making personal contact with the people. The same is true in Guinea, where the Government has also restricted U.S. Information Service activity. There are three Americans assigned to USIS in Guinea. Why could not this limited USIS work be handled by our Embassy? Why must we have these people stationed abroad where they can be of little value. Again I invite Senators to read my comments as to our information program in each country I visited.

I was most gratified for the opportunity to observe on this trip the workings of our Peace Corps. I believe I am the first American outside of the Peace Corps organization who has had an opportunity to view these operations at first hand and in a comprehensive manner.

I found many reasons to be proud of our young people in the Peace Corps operation. Generally they are working under the most adverse conditions and with a high degree of self-sacrifice and fortitude. However, it became apparent to me as I progressed in my inspection tour that the Peace Corps stands in very real danger of moving away from its original objectives. What I want it fully understood that I am in complete agreement with the ideals and objectives of the Corps, I do not want these objectives and ideals to be forgotten. When Mr. Sargent Shriver, Jr., was testifying before Congress at the inception of the Peace Corps program, he made it plain, and promised emphatically, that as nearly as possible the Peace Corps would use the administrative setup that was already in existence in our missions abroad. I took this to mean, and I do not see how any other meaning could be read into it, that the officers of USIS, AID, and primarily of the Embassy in each country, would be used for administrative support. According to Mr. Shriver's testimony, there would be no reason to send large numbers of administrative personnel to look after the Peace Corps volunteers. I was wholeheartedly in favor of this objective, for as we all know, the great amount of money that goes into the administration of all our missions does little real good to any persons other than the administrators. However, on this tour, and contrary to what I had been led to believe would be the case, I found many Peace Corps administration personnel on board. There were supervisors and deputy supervisors, and in many cases, the universities which trained the volunteers had sent their own supervisors at Government expense. I do not believe that this number of directors, administrators and supervisors is necessary. The volunteers should be more or less on their own. They should be sufficiently trained to look after themselves and if they are not capable of doing so, they should not be sent abroad. The administrative rents alone in the country of Nigeria amount to $50,000 per year, and if the latest request for Peace Corps vehicles is approved, there will be one vehicle for every 4.5 Peace Corps volunteers in 1963. I do not believe there is one vehicle for each 4.5 Nigerians.

The initial goal of the Peace Corps was to live near the level of the people they were working with, or only a few notches above them. This is commendable, and every effort should be made to see that this principle is adhered to and that the goal is realized.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I found that in many countries the Peace Corps is doing little more than subsidizing the educational system of the country. In other words, the host country uses the Peace Corps to obtain teachers at far less expense than they could be obtained otherwise. This may be all right in itself, but many times these teachers operate strictly under the Ministry of Education of the host country and confine their activities to teaching in the elementary and secondary schools of the large cities. This is a mistake. In my judgment, they should be sent into the bush, so to speak, where education is needed much more desperately than in the cities. Better yet, they should be used to train the native teachers.

Finally, while the Peace Corps program is gaining in popularity, I believe that an across-the-board policy should be laid down governing what share of the cost will be borne by the host countries. The present policy varies from nation to nation, and I am fearful that this may cause us trouble in the future. Also, if countries are eager to receive volunteers, they should be willing to supply a larger share of the cost than many are now doing.

To sum up, the Peace Corps operation is in the majority of cases very commendable. I am all for it. However, there is a very great danger that another little empire will be built overseas. The bureaucracy is likely to grow more and more stifling and the red tape will be wound tighter and tighter. Vehicles will be sent which will require mechanics and technicians to maintain; supervisors and administrators will require secretaries, chauffeurs, and housing which is far better than that available to the natives of the country. I know from long experience how these programs work. I express the hope that everything possible will be done to keep the Peace Corps volunteers at the level of the people and keep the program close to its initial ideals and objectives.

Mr. President, I would now like to draw particular attention to part I of my report, which is a general summary of my observations, conclusions and recommendations. In it, I attempt to give some broad, general outline of African history, which is no small task in itself. I then try to point out some of the many difficulties that face our aid efforts in Africa and will make the building of stable and viable economies very, very difficult. I attempt to make plain that our dollars alone will not do the job. What is needed is a working partnership between the European developers and the native African leaders.

It is contended by some that the attention of the world and the attention of the American aid effort in particular, should now be focused on the Dark Continent. I disagree. I have long advocated that our aid effort should be focused on Latin America. In South and Central America we have the resources necessary to keep our industry going and for that reason we should concentrate our efforts there to improve the living conditions of the citizens. In Africa, as I pointed out many times in my report, all of the business and much of the foreign policy has remained in the hands of Europeans. It would be almost impossible to provide an economic aid program to help the native African without the major benefits accruing to those European nationals who are in control of almost all aspects of the business and economic life of the continent. Aid that we provide must be directed toward developing the human resources of the continent.

Europe has historic trade and economic ties with Africa just as we have with South and Central America. The development of Africa should fall to the Europeans and not to us. Africa is out of our sphere of influence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of my remarks there be placed in the RECORD part I of my report. It is very short, and I would like to have it placed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a portion of my report is devoted to the question of military aid to Africa. Needless to say, I am against such aid in all its shapes and forms.

It will be devastating to the African nations if they have to expend even a small amount of their meager revenues to support armies. It is to be hoped that none of them will endeavor to build up their armed forces for use in expanding their territories, and everything possible should be done to promote lasting peace. I am convinced that any amount of military aid to the newly independent countries will serve only to bring on chaotic conditions. Here is a most important field where the United States could play a definite, beneficial role, by staying out of Africa. No military aid in any way, shape, or form should be tolerated.

Although we are now supposedly giving military aid only for internal security, one does not have to look too far to find programs which started out as internal security blossoming into full-fledged military support. The question is always where to draw the line. How is internal security to be defined? When do weapons furnished for internal security become weapons to be used for external aggression?

We are at present, or have been in the recent past, engaged in training paratroopers in Mali, at a cost of over $600,000. Can this be called internal security. Are paratroopers needed to maintain order?

While at the present we have no large military aid program in Africa, especially south of the Sahara, it must be remembered that these countries are new ones. Give us time. After all, Latin America was not armed overnight.

Military advisory groups, which can be expected to form the nucleus of any forthcoming military aid program, are already in evidence in a few countries where their presence cannot in the least be justified.

It is pleasing to note that many of our ambassadors have resisted, and are resisting with all their might, the establishment of military missions, as well as service attachés. Others, however, have been forced to buckle under to pressure from the Washington level.

In Senegal, our military mission is there for the express purpose of teaching the Senegalese soldiers to build roads, bridges, and other public works projects. It might be noted that we are paying all the expenses of this mission—the salaries, rent, office space, and administration costs—as well as providing the necessary equipment.

In Liberia, we have had a military mission since 1959, consisting of five officers, two warrant officers, and six enlisted men. Our military aid program in this country is growing.

I hope that military aid in all its shapes and forms will be withdrawn from Africa. No MAAG's should be established there, and plans for future military aid should be scrapped.

As I now speak, the entire continent of Africa is at peace, due perhaps primarily to the fact that the new countries do not have the ability to wage modern warfare. We should be certain that if this ability is ever gained, it is not through the offices of the United States of America. It goes without saying that if MAAG's are established, the military aid program will increase. Experience shows that in many instances the MAAG's serve for little but to stir things up and then make it necessary for the host country to call for aid.

Mr. President, for many years I have been opposed to the granting of independence to the underdeveloped countries of the world unless certain requirements were met, but my voice has been a mere cry in the wilderness. The wave of independence which has swept over Africa in the last 6 years has been greeted with many outpourings of applause from certain quarters in our Government. I cannot help but feel that a great deal of that applause was based on political expediency and little more. From the many writings and speeches by personnel high in our State Department, it seems apparent that these policymakers believe that the mere desire for self-determination is sufficient grounds for the granting of political control.

In my opinion, this political control has been attained without nearly enough self-control. In my judgment, it requires much more than a desire for independence to make a country truly self-determining. There must be sufficient trained human resources as well as a reasonable amount of natural resources to go along with desire. I cannot believe that any country can ever become truly independent and self-determining unless a minimum of prerequisites are met.

The conditions which have prevailed and are prevailing in the Congo, and which I predicted in 1953, are the direct result of having no explicit requirements for independence except a desire for the same on the part of a few native agitators. It should be the task of the United Nations to adopt some such requirements and criteria, and I believe that our country should lead the way in advocating the adoption of such criteria.

In my opinion, the requirements for independence should contain at least the following points:

First, the country should have a reasonable number of trained leaders;

Second, it should have sufficient trained manpower to perform at least the basic and semiskilled tasks;

Third, it should have a pool of sufficiently trained civil servants and administrators to handle the ordinary chores of government;

Fourth, it should have a primary and secondary education system that will insure its future growth and development;

Fifth, it should have sufficient land and other natural resources to assure its population a reasonable chance to establish a more or less balanced economy.

In none of the new nations of Africa which I have visited have even a majority of these requirements been met. I fear that our taxpayers will be called upon to bear the burden and suffer the consequences of our own and the U.N.'s present policy for decades to come.

In too many instances in Africa, these prerequisites not only have not been met, they have been ignored. The United Nations' policy, which has the blessing of our Government, makes it plain that inadequacy of political, economic or educational facilities should not serve as a pretext for delaying independence. In my report, I point out the fallacy of such reasoning and try to show that it may soon lead to the undermining and downfall of the United Nations. I firmly believe that some "independence limiting" mechanism should be adopted by the U.N., for we can continue to see our voice and power in the General Assembly grow weaker and weaker as the number of nations who are not able to manage their own affairs grows larger and larger. Also, we may see the General Assembly turn into an auction barn, where votes will be sold to the highest bidder. Many of the new nations are already successfully playing the East against the West, and I ran into much of this thinking in interviews with many of the African leaders. Too many of these leaders are not mature enough to see the danger of what they are doing. The danger is not only to their own countries, but to the entire free world. Too often, I fear, my own country has fallen into the trap by granting their demands and encouraging this type of thinking. We should not meet these demands, and should have no truck with any such bargaining.

Mr. President, while I was in Salisbury, the capital of the Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland, I held a press conference in response to requests from reporters of several newspapers. It was one of several in which I participated on my African tour. A few days after that press conference, and because of statements attributed to me by the press throughout East Africa, I became the object of controversy and I was subsequently banned from visiting the countries of Uganda, Tanganyika, Somali, and Ethiopia. I said that I was banned because of statements attributed to me in the press. That is not correct. In my estimation, I was banned not because of my statements—which I believe to be the truth and do not retract or deny—but because of a single headline that appeared over a long story in the Salisbury Sunday Mail newspaper. The story covered several subjects. The press conference itself lasted more than an hour. In the reports which appeared in the Rhodesian newspaper, and far down the page, this quotation appeared:

> If you can get somebody to stay with you for 50 years, you might be able to take over, but believe me, you won't be able to do it overnight.

I was referring, of course, to the new nations in Africa that are still heavily dependent upon European civil servants and other forms of outside aid for the operation of their governments. In particular, I was referring to an independence move that was currently taking place in the federated territory of Nyasaland. Nyasaland is one of the three territories that make up the Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland. The other two are Southern Rhodesia and Northern Rhodesia. Nyasaland was attempting to secede from the Federation and become independent. The country has no natural resources. Ninety percent of the native population are subsistence farmers and only 1 percent of those native farmers use anything other than a hoe and a rake to work their land. It was obvious to me that should this territory be allowed to secede and become independent, it would require large amounts of foreign aid for decades to come. It would require a Santa Claus to keep it going.

Further down on this page of the newspaper report I am referring to, there appeared this quote:

> The African people in some countries like Nyasaland will not reach the goal their leaders aim for in 50 years.

As I said, both of these statements, which I do not deny having made, appeared far down in the story which dealt with an interview that lasted more than an hour, yet, above the story, a banner headline across the page read: "You Will Need White Help for 50 Years."

Mr. President, I am confident that this press conference I held in Salisbury, Rhodesia, would have had no more importance than any of the others I held throughout Africa during my visit, but for one thing—the banner headline covering this article employing the word "White." I deny having ever used the word "white," and that, Mr. President, is the sum and substance of my denial. Though later reports indicated that I denied the whole of my statement, I did no such thing.

At our Embassy in Usumbura, the capital of Burundi, I tried to clear up the matter for I had seen that inflammatory headline, and I attempted to set the record straight. Through faulty reporting, the record became even more confused and I was purported to have made a retraction of my entire statement. This, I repeat, was not the case at all. The stories that appeared in newspapers outside the Rhodesias were based primarily on that one headline. The Prime Minister of Uganda made the first move to ban me and the other countries above mentioned followed like sheep.

I was further quoted as saying that the "average African is incapable of leadership without white assistance." Again, I did not use "white." I did say that if there is any place in Africa where brick and mortar had been used by the natives to build a civilization through no assistance or without the assistance or guidance of Europeans, I had yet to see it. The sentence was not mine, but was based upon that Salisbury headline. I was also quoted as saying that I have yet to see any part of Africa where Africans are ready for self-government. I did say that; I repeat it here; it is the truth.

But, Mr. President, I have no quarrel with full independence or self-government for any country if that country has the capability to achieve and maintain that independence, and here I mean capability in resources, both human and economic. I did not visit one newly formed government that did not need outside aid on a grant basis and where technical assistance was not badly needed and provided by Western Europeans and American. France and Britain are involved in developing the economies of most of the countries, and we too have programs in all of them.

Mr. President, I am making no apologies for what I have said because none are needed. It may be that I said the right thing in the wrong place. At that time there was a great furor in the politics of the Federation. It may be that I should have refused to give my opinions as to the outcome, but since I had been in the area only 2 months before the Federation was created in 1953, I felt that my views might have some merit.

Be that as it may, I only hope that the controversy that arose will not detract from the value of this objective report on our foreign operations in Africa.

In this report I have made several specific recommendations which I hope will be closely studied by the representatives of the Agency for International Development, the State Department, the U.S. Information Agency, the Peace Corps, and the Department of Defense. Therefore, Mr. President, based on all data gathered by me, I submit the following summary of recommendations.

FOREIGN AID

First. Our aid should be confined to technical assistance. Programs must be simple and basic, and should not be permitted to degenerate into the construction of capital facility projects. Technicians should be assigned on a regional basis, wherever practicable.

Second. Whenever possible, development planning should be done on a regional basis, and development aid furnished should be multilateral.

Third. As nearly as possible, any loans made should bear the same rate of interest and have similar terms of repayment as those which are made by other participants in financing projects on a multilateral basis. In this connection, I found that some of our loans were made at a rate of three-fourths of 1 percent with 10 years' grace, whereas other countries made regular commercial loans bearing from 3½ to as much as 6 percent interest.

Fourth. To accelerate the development of the whole of Africa, it is suggested that the European Economic Community be encouraged to band together in a consortia to undertake the construction of feasible development projects, particularly in the fields of transportation and communication, as well as in the generation of electric power, irrigation, and flood control.

Fifth. All commitments for aid and/or loans should be made in strict accord with laws enacted by Congress.

Sixth. Our aid programs, especially those dealing with the construction of capital facilities, should be concentrated in the Western Hemisphere where we have developed close economic ties over the years.

STATE DEPARTMENT, USIS, AND SERVICE ATTACHÉS

First. We should not embark upon a building program in Africa, except in case of absolute necessity. Should any construction be undertaken, every effort should be made to build in keeping with the architecture of the country, with simplicity as the keynote.

Second. The personnel at all Embassies, particularly in the new countries, should be kept at a minimum. All missions in any country should be administered through the Embassy under the direct supervision of our Ambassador. The political, economic, and consular sections should be consolidated and placed in the office of the chief of mission, wherever practical.

Third. The Ambassador is our Nation's highest representative where he serves, and his advice and counsel should be followed in respect to all programs. Under no condition should personnel be sent to the field except at his request and after justification. The practice of some agencies of sending personnel to an Embassy when there is no request should not be tolerated.

Fourth. Should it become necessary to establish consulates in any country, all consular reporting should be channeled through the embassy, rather than sent directly to Washington. These reports could be used by our ambassador in making direct reports to Washington.

Fifth. To prevent "gouging" of our personnel and friction among foreign nationals, the administrative section of each embassy should handle all the rental accommodations for all of our Government personnel in the country. They should not compete one against the other.

Sixth. In countries where there is only a small USIS or AID operation, all functions should be under the dirction of our ambassador, and no separate missions should be established.

Seventh. Should programs other than technical aid be engaged in, they should be administered on a regional basis.

Eighth. Binational centers such as we have established in many Latin American countries and in Spain should be established in Africa. All USIS libraries, if continued, should be located in the native quarters and not in the European sections of the cities.

Ninth. The number of service attachés should be held to a minimum, and under no condition should they be sent to a country except by and with the consent of the ambassador.

PEACE CORPS

First. While the Peace Corps program is growing in popularity, a firm policy governing the share of the volunteer's living and traveling expenses to be paid by the host country should be spelled out.

Second. The training program for the volunteers should be sufficient to enable them to look after themselves in the field, thus making it unnecessary to send large numbers of administrators, supervisors, and field personnel.

Third. The volunteers should in all cases be encouraged and required to live among the people they train and at a level just a bit higher than their counterparts.

Fourth. Every effort should be made to have the host country furnish transportation, thereby making unnecessary our sending a large number of vehicles which in time will require a staff of mechanics and other technicians for maintenance. Already the number of vehicles is steadily growing.

Fifth. The volunteers should not be placed under the direction and supervision of the local government, as is the case with many teachers in various countries. I do not believe it was ever the intention of Congress to pay a heavy subsidy to any country to augment the teaching staff in its elementary and secondary schools.

Sixth. The administrative policies of the Peace Corps should be reexamined with a view toward creating an administrative mechanism, among the volunteers themselves, which will not require a large and self-defeating bureaucracy.

GENERAL

A complete reevaluation of all reporting by our missions—State, AID, USIS, service attachés—to Washington should be made at once. Much of it is useless and entails much expensive paperwork. More authority should be given at the country level. Much time and effort could be saved, and many employees in the field as well as on the Washington level could be dispensed with.

EXHIBIT I

U.S. FOREIGN OPERATIONS IN AFRICA

PART I. A SHORT HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF AFRICA AND A GENERAL SUMMARY OF OBSERVATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Any attempt to gain some understanding of present-day Africa through a study of its history is at once seen to be complicated and frustrating. For the most part, its history is still being written. Even now there is much disagreement among students of history, anthropology, and archeology who are striving to solve the many riddles that exist. The remains of cities have been discovered, but no satisfactory explanation has been found for their construction or their disintegration. Evidences of lost cultures have been uncovered from the earth, but they are still covered by a shroud of mystery.

The history of Africa must necessarily be divided into Africa north of the Sahara—and Africa south of the great desert barrier. On the Mediterranean shore many civilizations flourished and fell, leaving behind records of their passing. Many of them served as springboards for conquering cultures, so that their knowledge and arts were assimilated and finally spread through the Western World. The Phoenicians, the Egyptians, and finally the Moors, are examples of peoples who conquered, built, then dwindled and fell, but left great contributions in the cultural repository of the West.

What we know today of Africa south of the Sahara comes mainly from the writings of these people, the Arabs and Phoenicians in particular. Caravan routes across the Sahara led the Mediterranean peoples to the interior of the continent and became avenues for trade in ivory, precious stones, gold, copper, and slaves. They later became highways of conquest as the Arabian forces swept south into west Africa and as far east as Lake Chad, down the coast from the Arabian Peninsula. They gained control of the southern trade terminals, and left in the interior a lasting imprint of Moslem religion.

Beyond the ancient writers who speak of African explorations and adventures, little that can be classified as historical fact is known about the continent. None of the many types of people developed a written language, and though kingdoms and empires existed and were conquered by their neighbors, there seems to have been no clear transmission of any advanced form of culture. No assimilation, no strengthening of the conqueror's life with possible progress made by the conquered, is evident. The destruction of any higher way of life, such as was once found in east Africa and in the Zimbabwe area of Southern Rhodesia, seems to have been complete.

Kingdoms flourished particularly in west Africa, where Timbuktu was the southern terminus of the primary Sahara trade routes. Many of the modern states such as Ghana, Mali, and Dahomey take their names from powerful ancient tribes.

On the east coast of Africa, both Arab and Indonesian influence made itself strongly felt. The Arabians moved down the East Coast, seeking raw materials for trading with India. Soon after the birth of Christ, the Indonesian people settled in the empty island of Madagascar.

From all accounts, the interior of Africa was sparsely settled. It is believed that Indonesian traders first brought to the continent many food plants, including cassava and other root crops, which spread across from east to west. This source of food made possible a large population increase from the Guinea coast to other areas under the African hump. According to some writers, this explains the population concentration along this coast, and particularly in southern Nigeria. It was from this area that the greatest migration, known as the Bantu expansion, originated. From here numerous tribes with a common language structure migrated east around the great African lakes and then south and southeast in Africa. The Bantus succeeded in overpowering many of the Nilotic people who had spread south along the upper reaches of the Nile. Those who held their ground, however, developed a relatively high culture in the area of Uganda and in the region of Lake Victoria. The terracing of the native farms in this area, a technique not found in other sections, is perhaps a holdover of Egyptian-Arabian influence.

The European scramble

But, for all practical purposes, the history of Africa begins with the European scramble for territory in the 1870's. The lines that form the borders of almost every African country were drawn during this period. A good example is the whole of west Africa, where the French, after their arrival on the coast, began moving into the interior. Either by force of arms or by treaties with the African chiefs, they in time spread their influence more than 2,000 miles into the interior. All of French West Africa was governed by the equivalent of the territorial governors who had control of vast areas of our own country before the lands west of the Mississippi were carved into States.

Although colonies or outposts of one sort or another had existed on the African coast since shortly after the Portuguese successfully rounded the Cape of Good Hope on their way to India in the 15th century, no exploration of consequence was made until about 1870. After the decline of the slave trade, which flourished principally in the British colonies, European interest in Africa abated and was confined mostly to missionary and scientific societies.

Then Stanley's famous words to Dr. Livingstone climaxed the successful end of a spectacular search that had attracted the attention of almost all the civilized world. European leaders were suddenly reminded that here lay a virgin continent, with resources to supply the industrial revolution that was beginning to boom, and with the necessary markets to absorb the finished products. It was theirs for the taking. Southward rolled the crest of empire and we are even now feeling, or perhaps just beginning to feel, the dangerous eddies and undertows created by the powerful surf receding from the rocks of independence.

The European powers came desperately close to war over Africa in the 1870's. Great Britain, France, Belgium, Portugal, and newly united Germany had all staked claims to vast chunks of territory containing indefinite promise of profit and bounded by less definite borderlines. The powers set out to consolidate their holdings in some cases, to explore and expand in others. But in no case were they willing to give up or share what they had taken as their own. Border conflicts broke out and threatened to spread to the mother countries proper. A conference called in Berlin in 1884–85 settled the major differences. From then until 1890, and to some extent after the turn of the century, individual treaties ironed out other disputes. By 1890, almost all of Africa had been arbitrarily partitioned among the major powers.

Unfortunately, the boundaries were drawn more to suit each particular nation's prestige than to please an intelligent and logical geographer. The boundaries which were the children of conflict in the past can be depended upon to bear more conflict in the future.

The boundary question

Actually, the lines of demarcation setting out each nation's sphere of influence—that is, French West and Equatorial Africa, the Belgian Congo, Portuguese Mozambique and Angola, British Nigeria, and the Union of South Africa to name but a few—would today be little cause for concern. In recent years many of them have ceased to exist, at least on maps if not as a matter of practical fact. What is likely to cause concern is the manner in which these vast tracts of territory were politically subdivided by the colonizers. To examine this, we might return to the territorial governors of French West Africa mentioned earlier.

These governors, sent into the interior in the wake of French forces were immediately faced with the problem of not knowing exactly what they were to govern. Accordingly, the governors met and drew up informal agreements as to the boundaries of their particular authority. These were sometimes based on geographic features, and sometimes represented an attempt to delineate as nearly as possible the then existing tribal boundaries. The lines drawn by the territorial governors for their own convenience today represent the borders of the West African states.

Superimposed on the resulting hodgepodge, one finds little bits and pieces of territory colonized by one power, but living wholly within an area colonized by another. Portuguese Guinea, little more than a speck on the map, lies between the former French colonies of Senegal and Guinea.

How the boundary question may be expected to cause trouble in the future can be found in the Gambia-Senegal situation. The territory of Gambia is at present a British colony, and is a long finger of land running from the ocean on each side of the Gambia River into Senegal. The Gambians and the Senegalese are alike in almost every respect, save that of language. Gambia, however, has no means of subsistence except a low level of agriculture. If it were granted independence, as the British are threatening to do at the moment, even against the wishes of the Gambian leaders themselves, it would be ruinous to its people and do violence to the laws of geography and economics. There are indications that Gambia and Senegal may be united into one country. Certainly it is to be hoped that this takes place.

A further example can be noted in the Togo-Ghana dispute. This dispute led, at least in part, to the assassination of one of the ablest African leaders—Togo's President, Sylvanus Olympio.

At one time the country of Togo, as well as the area to the west as far as the Volta River, was under the control of Germany and known as Togoland. After the First World War, the territory of Togoland was administered jointly by the United Kingdom and France. Shortly before independence was granted by the French to what is now Togo, the area under the United Kingdom's domination was incorporated into Ghana. Although this incorporation was ostensibly the will of a plebiscite, it had the effect of giving Ghana complete control of the Volta River and its valley. More importantly, it split almost directly in two the powerful and numerous Ewe tribe of natives living along the coast. Ghana is now making noises concerning the annexation of Togo, and this will no doubt cause trouble in the future.

Of perhaps more long-range importance than disputes arising over the boundaries which once lay between two colonies but now separate two independent nations, is the lasting effect of the colonials' policy of administration. Current boundary disputes can and should be settled without much ado. Though French West Africa, for example, or the Belgian Congo, were subdivided for governing convenience, they were developed economically as integral and interdependent units. The wave of independence has broken these interdependent areas into flotsam which will likely prove unable to survive the seas of national difficulty.

The economy of a colony was developed according to the needs of the territory as a whole. The construction of ports, the building of roads, the laying of tracks and communication lines were all guided by the principle of interdependence. This principle has held fast in the face of political independence. If it can remain in force and continue in its development, it will be a great boon for the area as a whole. But there are signs in both West Africa and the Congo that this will not be possible.

Our African aid policy

It is contended by some that the attention of the world and the attention of the American aid effort in particular should now be focused on the continent of Africa. This continent, which comprises some 10 million square miles, is over three times the size of the United States. The Sahara Desert alone is the size of the United States, and the Belgian Congo is almost as large as the Indian subcontinent. It has a total population of approximately 215 million people, which is about 15 percent greater than the population of our own country, yet its gross national product amounts to only about 3 percent of ours.

Current statistics reveal that 99 percent of all the industrial diamonds of the free world are produced in Africa; 66 percent of the cobalt; 66 percent of the gold; 36 percent of the antimony; 45 percent of the chromite; 42 percent of the manganese; and 25 percent of the mined copper. In addition, Africa is a major exporter of such agricultural commodities as coffee, cocoa, palm oil, sisal, peanuts, tea, hides, and lumber. What these statistics do not reveal is that all the industry and the great proportion of agricultural export production are in the hands of Europeans. Nor do they show that Africa's wealth is concentrated in a relatively few spots, and that vast tracts of land are empty, virtually uninhabited, and worthless.

The annual per capita gross national product of tropical Africa (which includes the Torrid Zone and portions of the Tropics of Cancer and Capricorn where most of the new African countries were carved, and containing approximately two-thirds of the population of the whole continent) averages between $80 and $90, about one-third of what it is in Latin America. The literacy rate averages approximately 10 percent, well below the level of some of the most backward areas of the world. Notwithstanding the fact that tropical Africa's exports account for only 3 percent of the world's total, it still is an important source of certain raw materials and agricultural commodities.

But is this mineral and agricultural wealth, plus the wave of independence that has swept over the continent, sufficient reason to justify the pouring of our borrowed dollars into an expensive, long-range, and almost fruitless attempt to raise the average African's standard of living, particularly in tropical Africa?

Our NATO allies are deeply rooted in the development of Africa. Their nationals have virtually complete control of much of the natural resources of the continent. Practically all commerce, both domestic and foreign, is in the hands of Europeans. Why should we further strain our economy in attempting to develop such a backward area of the world, when the resources with which this could be done are controlled by Europeans, and when the benefits that will accrue will be reaped by those same Europeans?

We are out of our sphere of influence. Let us remain closer to home. Long have I pleaded that our efforts for social and economic growth be concentrated in Latin America. We have had little to do in Africa. Most of our historical trade ties are not there, but to the south of us. If our own industrial progress is to continue at its present pace, we must look to the south for the raw materials necessary to feed our hungry industries.

To say that no aid should be granted in any instance would be to do ourselves and the Africans a grave injustice. But our aid program should be conducted not in hopeful and open-eyed innocence, but simply with open eyes. There is literally not enough money in our Treasury to raise the average African's standard of living to any appreciable extent, especially, I repeat, in tropical Africa. Furthermore, the reasons brought forward to justify our giving aid to Africa, as well as in other areas of the world, are often faulty. Bad motives usually lead to bad results. Our purveyors of burgeoning aid programs endeavor to get us into every area of the world to render assistance by using the argument that if we do not go in and pour our wealth into the laps of the underdeveloped countries, the Sino-Soviet bloc will move in.

If this be so, then let the Communists try. Already we have seen evidence of the results of Communist influence in some parts of Africa. In Guinea, for instance, the greatest inroads were made soon after that country gained independence from France. Today its President, Sekou Toure, has had his eyes opened. It is obvious that the Communist aid projects were not in keeping with the proper development of an infant nation.

In Guinea a huge vocational education building is now under construction, but little effort has been directed by the Communists toward the building of a sound and solid elementary and secondary school system. A huge printing plant has been completed and has proved to be far beyond Guinea's needs. Part of it now stands idle and the machinery is deteriorating. The objective of this aid, of course, was to make a big splash and create a showplace.

It will be necessary to build stable governments and establish viable economies in the independent countries of Africa wherever possible. But this cannot be done by American aid. Leadership, guidance, and assistance must come from the former colonial powers that have already established close economic ties with these countries, coupled with the cooperation of the heads of the newly formed governments. The politicians must be made to realize that the economy of any country cannot be developed except through hard word and with competent and knowledgeable leaders. European leaders must be made to understand that without the assistance of native workers, their efforts will be in vain. They must be made to realize the importance of improving the education, the health, and the living standard of the workers—that by so doing in the long pull they will be the beneficiaries. In short, the European leaders and the natives must work as a team. They need each other if real development is to come. It will require much time, effort, and above all, patience and understanding.

Foremost among the obstacles to development and progress is illiteracy. It is the main roadblock. As pointed out before, the average literacy rate for the continent as a whole approximates 10 percent, though in some areas and cities it may run to 25 percent or higher. What this means in the day-to-day life of government cannot be fully understood unless one tours the continent itself.

The leaders—and there are some good ones—are without the benefit of technicians and the vast structure of civil servants that bulwark the heads of every country in the world that could be called progressive.

The bringing of education to these people, to any real degree, can only be handled by the nations themselves. In many cases, it will be complicated by the nomadic habits of large portions of the population. In others, it will require large capital outlays, which are simply not available. This field is surely one of the few in which we could give guidance and where our dollars could be spent wisely and effectively. Too often, however, our education effort, much like the Russian projects, gets bogged down in the production of more or less useless facilities.

It must be pointed out that in the underdeveloped nations a dozen one-room school

buildings are infinitely more valuable than a dozen full-blown universities. To see an example of aid fallacy, one need only look at a country such as Ethiopia, where we have provided such a university when there exists no network of worthy feeder schools. In addition, we built a college for training agricultural extension agents, but it did not work. Most of the graduates sought white collar jobs, and those who tried to teach extension work soon found out that they had nothing to work with by way of human resources.

The improvement of the literacy rate in Africa through the expansion of basic education facilities is the first problem to be faced in the education field. At present the countries of Africa lack even the sufficiently trained manpower to perform the simplest tasks. In some countries it is necessary to teach the natives how to use a simple hand plow, since they currently lack this knowledge.

To get an idea of the enormity of the problem, let us take the country of Chad for example. Ninety-five percent of the people of this country derive their income from agriculture. Yet less than 7 years ago the average Chadien farmer was unaware of the existence of the plow, the wheeled cart, or of the use of animal in place of human power.

To increase agricultural production in this country the Chad Government is presently building a network of centers, known as paysannats, for teaching farmers the use of the plow, the wheeled cart, and animal traction. Based on these programs for fiscal year 1962, the U.S. contribution, made out of development grant funds, is estimated to be 80 percent of the initial cost of each center.

Further examples of the rudimentary nature of projects carried on in Chad may be found in the appendix to this report.

In other countries of Africa the same basic problems which confront Chad are also in evidence.

Further complicating our hope for attaining real political and economic stability are the tribal ties which separate groups within nations, and which almost invariably transcend any feelings of nationalism.

Nigeria is one of the largest independent countries in Africa, with the greatest population. Though there are many benefits to be gained through unity, there is a possibility that this country—to which we are now giving the biggest share of our African aid funds—may split into three separate countries. The probability is that each one will then demand an even larger proportionate share of our largess.

Each of the three regions of Nigeria is dominated by a tribe. Efforts have been and are being made to break down the tribal ties, to encourage all natives to think of themselves as Nigerians rather than Yoruba, Ibo, or Hausa. But the efforts have so far been largely unsuccessful.

The jealousy and rivalry which exist among the three dominant tribes are already causing greater expenditures than would otherwise be necessary, and this situation will no doubt become further aggravated. An example of such added expenditure is the agriculture station which was begun by the British and whose work is now carried on with territorial funds and American help.

Before independence the one station served all the regions. After independence the western region demanded a station of its own, and as a consequence, the research station was split in two, and one-half of it moved literally and merely across the road. There was, of course, an increase in the administrative and support cost borne by us.

There are countless examples of how the tribal ties and customs are retarding any real unification within the various countries of Africa, such as in the Congo, Rwanda, Burundi, and others. Where tribal loyalties do not cause the conflict, religious differences often do.

Although, as I pointed out previously, there are some good leaders among the African natives, for the most part they are selfish and inexperienced. Many do not have the best interests of their people at heart; instead they look for their own aggrandizement. The age-old principle of "survival of the fittest" militates against the development of unselfish leaders.

The problems of transportation and communication in Africa need little discussion. These facilities, particularly in the interior, are almost nonexistent. It goes without saying that what is there has been provided by the French in West and Equatorial Africa, the Belgians in the Congo, the Europeans of South Africa, and the Portuguese and British in other areas. As has been mentioned before, these countries developed their areas as an integral whole.

Now, since independence, the problem of getting maximum benefit from an already insufficient transportation and communications network is complicated by the fact that many of the new nations refuse to get along. Here again absence of leadership and experience causes the people to suffer. The finger of example can be pointed to a rail line connecting Mali to the sea and running through Senegal.

These two countries are at present in disagreement over ideology. As a result, Mali's access to the ocean through Senegal has been terminated. The small amount of exports from Mali must now be trucked by a longer route through another country, the Ivory Coast, at considerably greater expense. This example could be multiplied many times over.

There are those who say that these problems do not actually amount to much; that American know-how and the American dollar will soon cause them to diffuse and disappear into thin air. Is there truth in this? I believe not.

Consider the Republic of Liberia. It has been independent since it was created 150 years ago. Since 1946, beginning with our grant-aid program, we have extended $172.2 million of economic aid to this small country. Today, there is little in Liberia that has been built without our aid dollars, the dollars of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. which has invested extensively in the production of natural rubber, or the dollars of others who are investing in mining and forest products.

Furthermore, leaders of the country do not seem to learn. Monrovia, the capital city, is desperately in need of a potable water supply. A sewer system is also needed so that the many open ditches now used for disposal can be closed. Monrovia also needs an increased supply of electricity. Have the Liberian leaders made an effort in this direction? Apparently not.

Instead they have invited us to come in and do it for them, but while they are refusing to meet these primary needs, there is being constructed a lavish and pretentious executive mansion for the President, and a large court of law building, completely out of line with the needs of the country. When these buildings are completed, it might be added, they will stand directly across from some of the worst slums in the city.

Ethiopia is another country that has enjoyed independence for a considerable period. Except for the years 1936 to 1941 when it was occupied by the Italians, it has been an independent country since its founding in approximately 1000 B.C. And what do we find in Ethiopia?

Conditions there have not improved appreciably under present and past leadership. We have been aiding Emperor Haile Selassie for decades. Most of the teachings of our technicians have failed to take root, particularly in the agricultural field, and most of the projects started by us in years past have been abandoned. The simple machinery, such as plows and other metal goods, as well as machines donated by us and the U.N., are rusting in the fields. Our agriculture research station, begun so hopefully several years ago, has failed to fulfill even its original intent. Many of the buildings are not in use for the purpose intended. It seems that we never learn.

Military aid

It will be devastating to the African nations if they have to expend even a small amount of their meager revenues to support armies. It is to be hoped that none of them will endeavor to build up their armed forces for use in expanding their territories, and everything possible should be done to promote lasting peace. I am convinced that any amount of military aid to the newly independent countries will serve only to bring on chaotic conditions. Here is a most important field where the United States could play a definite, beneficial role by staying out of Africa. No military aid in any way, shape, or form should be tolerated.

Although we are now supposedly giving military aid only for "internal security," one does not have to look too far to find programs which started out as internal security blossoming into full-fledged military support. The question is always where to draw the line? How is internal security to be defined? When do weapons furnished for internal security become weapons to be used for external aggression?

We are at present, or have been in the recent past, engaged in training paratroopers in Mali, at a cost of over $600,000. Can this be called internal security? Are paratroopers needed to maintain order?

To see other effects of the consequences of our military aid program, one need only look at the dispute between Morocco and Mauritania. Morocco has been armed, if not to the teeth at least to the belt buckle, by our military aid. Now it is rumored that Hassan II is eyeing the iron mines and oil explorations in the Mauritania desert. Basing his claim on historical migrations back to the 11th century, he is trying to annex Mauritania by one means or another.

The Mauritanian president has said that Morocco's claim to Mauritania is "much like France claiming Britain because the English once occupied France in the time of Joan of Arc."

Be that as it may, arguments have been known to have little effect against an oil-and-armament combination. If trouble breaks out here, our country must share a part of the blame.

While at the present we have no large military aid program in Africa, especially south of the Sahara, it must be remembered that these countries are new ones. Give us time. After all, Latin America was not armed overnight.

Military assistance advisory groups, which can be expected to form the nucleus of any forthcoming military aid program, are already in evidence in many countries where their presence cannot in the least be justified.

It is pleasing to note that many of our Ambassadors have resisted and are resisting with all their might, the establishment of military missions, as well as service attachés. Others, however, have been forced to buckle under to pressure from the Washington level.

In Senegal, our military mission is there for the express purpose of teaching the Senegalese soldiers to build roads, bridges, and other public works projects. It might be noted that we are paying all the expenses of this mission—the salaries, rent, office space, and administration costs—as well as providing the necessary equipment.

In Liberia, we have had a military mission since 1959, consisting of five officers, two warrant officers, and six enlisted men.

Our military aid program in this country is growing.

It is hoped that military aid in all its shapes and forms will be withdrawn from Africa. No MAAG's (Military Assistance Advisory Groups) should be established there, and plans for future military aid should be scrapped.

At this writing the entire continent of Africa is at peace, due perhaps primarily to the fact that the new countries do not have the ability to wage modern warfare. We should be certain that if this ability is ever gained, it is not through the offices of the United States of America. It goes without saying that if MAAG's are established, the military aid program will increase. Experience shows that in many instances the MAAG's serve for little but to stir things up and then make it necessary for the host country to call for aid.

If it proves impossible to cancel military aid entirely, our leaders should make sure that any war materiel given is obtained from our excess stocks, which should prove ample for internal security purposes. This policy would do much to hold down the threat. Through fiscal year 1962, military aid to Africa totaled $119,002,000 and, of this amount, only $11,740,000 was obtained from excess stocks. For fiscal year 1963 it is proposed that we give Africa military aid to the tune of $38,325,000 and only $765,000 of this will come from excess stocks.

Prior to the creation of the new countries of Africa, our foreign aid program there was negligible in amount. With the advent of these new countries our aid program has been stepped up, and through fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, totaled $1,776,700,000. A breakdown of this aid is shown in the tabulation below:

U.S. aid to Africa by country, obligations and loan authorizations, cumulative, fiscal year 1946 through fiscal year 1962—preliminary

[Millions of dollars]

Country	Total economic and military	Total military	Economic assistance													
			Total economic		AID programs				Other economic assistance							
									Total	Food for peace—Public Law 480				Export-Import Bank medium- and long-term loans	Social progress trust fund	Other economic programs
										Total	Title I		Other food for peace			
			Total	Of which loans	Total	Technical cooperation/development grants	Development loans	Other AID			Total sales agreements	Planned for country use				
Total	1,776.7	112.0	1,664.7	683.2	1,036.9	259.9	226.2	550.8	627.8	380.5	(57.7)	46.4	334.1	179.2	--------	[illegible]
Algeria	15.0	--------	15.0	--------	.3	--------	--------	.3	14.7	14.7	--------	--------	14.7	--------	--------	--------
Cameroon	15.6	.3	15.3	9.2	14.6	.9	9.2	4.5	.7	.3	--------	--------	.3	--------	--------	[illegible]
Central African Republic	.2	--------	.2	--------	.2	.2	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Chad	.4	--------	.4	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	(1)	(1)	--------	--------	(1)	--------	--------	--------
Congo (Brazzaville)	1.3	--------	1.3	--------	1.3	1.3	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Congo (Leopoldville)	94.6	--------	94.6	--------	69.5	6.1	--------	63.3	25.1	25.1	(12.2)	11.0	14.1	--------	--------	--------
Dahomey	5.6	--------	5.6	--------	2.7	2.7	--------	--------	2.9	2.9	--------	--------	2.9	--------	--------	--------
Ethiopia	185.3	67.5	117.8	52.5	83.0	42.5	29.6	10.9	34.8	10.9	--------	--------	10.9	22.5	--------	[illegible]
Gabon	.5	--------	.5	--------	.5	.5	--------	--------	(1)	(1)	--------	--------	(1)	--------	--------	--------
Ghana	156.5	--------	156.5	147.0	88.1	6.1	82.0	--------	68.4	2.9	--------	--------	2.9	65.0	--------	[illegible]
Guinea	14.3	--------	14.3	4.3	8.3	2.7	--------	5.6	6.0	6.0	[2](5.7)	4.3	1.7	--------	--------	--------
Ivory Coast	4.6	--------	4.6	--------	4.2	4.2	--------	--------	.4	(1)	--------	--------	(1)	--------	--------	[illegible]
Kenya	18.5	--------	18.5	--------	8.3	4.4	--------	3.9	10.2	10.2	--------	--------	10.2	--------	--------	--------
Liberia	131.5	4.3	127.2	87.9	40.0	33.6	3.2	3.2	87.2	4.0	--------	--------	4.0	74.8	--------	[illegible]
Libya	191.7	4.5	187.2	8.5	122.1	23.5	5.0	93.6	65.1	34.7	--------	--------	34.7	--------	--------	[illegible]
Malagasy Republic	1.3	--------	1.3	--------	1.2	1.2	--------	--------	.1	.1	--------	--------	.1	--------	--------	--------
Mali, Republic of	6.1	1.0	5.1	--------	5.1	.2	--------	4.8	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Mauritania	1.6	--------	1.6	1.4	1.4	(1)	--------	[3]1.4	.2	.2	--------	--------	.2	--------	--------	--------
Morocco	352.0	(4)	352.0	233.5	239.9	3.7	23.0	213.3	112.1	112.1	(14.2)	10.6	101.5	--------	--------	--------
Niger	3.2	--------	3.2	--------	3.2	3.2	--------	--------	(1)	(1)	--------	--------	(1)	--------	--------	(1)
Nigeria	43.6	--------	43.6	5.9	38.9	34.4	3.7	.7	4.7	.5	--------	--------	.5	2.0	--------	[illegible]
Rhodesia and Nyasaland	36.1	--------	36.1	32.4	13.7	3.7	--------	10.0	22.4	(1)	--------	--------	(1)	--------	--------	[illegible]
Ruanda-Urundi	6.1	--------	6.1	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	6.1	6.1	--------	--------	6.1	--------	--------	--------
Senegal	4.6	--------	4.6	--------	4.2	4.2	--------	--------	.4	.4	--------	--------	.4	--------	--------	(1)
Sierra Leone	3.5	--------	3.5	--------	2.2	2.2	--------	--------	1.3	.5	--------	--------	.5	--------	--------	[illegible]
Somali Republic	27.4	--------	27.4	2.0	23.3	16.9	2.0	4.3	4.1	3.7	--------	--------	3.7	--------	--------	[illegible]
Sudan	65.0	--------	65.0	14.3	61.5	20.5	12.0	29.0	3.5	3.5	(4.6)	3.4	.1	--------	--------	--------
Tanganyika	17.6	--------	17.6	1.9	5.0	2.9	1.9	.2	12.6	12.3	--------	--------	12.3	--------	--------	[illegible]
Togo	5.8	--------	5.8	--------	2.3	2.0	--------	.3	3.5	3.4	--------	--------	3.4	--------	--------	[illegible]
Tunisia	293.3	(4)	293.3	69.8	166.1	17.2	54.5	94.4	127.2	124.5	(21.0)	17.1	107.4	2.4	--------	[illegible]
Uganda	5.2	--------	5.2	--------	4.4	4.3	--------	.1	.8	.8	--------	--------	.8	--------	--------	--------
Upper Volta	3.2	--------	3.2	--------	3.1	3.1	--------	--------	.1	.1	--------	--------	.1	--------	--------	--------
Zanzibar	.1	--------	.1	--------	.1	.1	--------	--------	(1)	(1)	--------	--------	(1)	--------	--------	--------
Other French communes and possessions	6.0	--------	6.0	--------	6.0	1.0	--------	5.0	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
Other Portuguese possessions	12.8	--------	12.8	12.5	.3	.3	--------	--------	[5]12.5	--------	--------	--------	--------	12.5	--------	--------
Other British territories	.9	--------	.9	--------	.3	.1	--------	.2	.6	.6	--------	--------	.6	--------	--------	--------
Regional	45.4	34.3	11.1	--------	11.1	9.5	--------	1.8	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

[1] Less than $50,000.

[2] Data include 1 year only of multiyear agreements signed in fiscal year 1962.

[3] Loan to France for Mauritania.

[4] Military data classified and included in regional total.

[5] Loan to Portugal for Mozambique.

The "physical measure of achievement"

Now our aid program threatens to grow like "Topsy." The administrators assure us that the foundations of economic and social growth can be established to insure political stability in that troubled continent. It is amazing, however, that these administrators simply cannot detach themselves from incorporating into the African program the showplace type of aid that has failed so dismally in the past. It seems to me that by now it should be fully understood that dollar diplomacy is not the solution to the world's ills. We are told that, in addition to the development of economic and human resources in Africa, our aid must also provide a physical measure of achievement to give a sense of direction and accomplishment to our program. Our past experience has proven this concept of aid to be fallacious because it is so wasteful and only invites corruption. In other areas of the world we have rushed into the underdeveloped countries to give this aid that gives a "physical measure of achievement." And what have we obtained for this type of aid?

Let us take, for example, the aid program we have conducted for the past decade in Korea. Through fiscal year 1962, we have extended aid totaling $5,453,600,000 to this tiny nation, and it has been shown that much of this has been wasted as a result of the construction of ill-planned facilities and the corruption and graft that ran rampant under the regime of Syngman Rhee. I have visited Korea on several occasions, my last visit being made in 1956. On each occasion when I returned, I faithfully reported to the Congress the orgy of waste and corruption I found. However, little attention was paid to my warnings, and we continued to pour our good dollars down the rathole. For my efforts, I was accused by the press of insulting our friends.

We must not commence any aid program in Africa that will repeat our performance in Korea. However, if such a fate is to be avoided, our present concept of aid to the new countries must be revamped.

Many of the aid programs initiated in the past and now being carried on in the African area have simply not been planned for the real needs of the people.

In 1960, I included in my itinerary the Republic of Somali, which had attained independence about 3 months before my visit. In reporting my findings to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I stated:

"What this country needs most of all is water conservation—just a simple, effective program. Emphasis should be placed on those projects that are needed. The most immediate task should be to develop more water for irrigation and livestock."

I stated further that—

"Our programs should be kept very simple, in keeping with the ability of the people to assimilate, and of the new Republic to take over and maintain. Education projects should be confined to elementary type schools for the time being, plus some vocational schools where people can be taught to use their hands. Under no circumstances should a program of advanced training be begun. People should be taught to do a better job than they can now do, using the materials readily available."

Thus, it seemed clear to me in 1960 that the great needs of the people in the Republic of Somali were water and elementary education. Therefore, before attempting any elaborate types of projects in Somali, I felt it was essential that these particular needs be met.

During my recent visit I found that we were in the process of constructing a port in the city of Chisimaio, which is about 150 miles south of the capital, Mogadiscio, at an estimated cost of $7,518,000. The host country will contribute only $20,000. Our contribution will be 99.8 percent of the total cost. It is being constructed to carry agricultural products for export and it is hoped that the port will be kept busy.

The justification for this project is as follows:

"The purpose of this activity is to design and construct at Chisimaio a small deepwater port with facilities to permit dockside cargo handling, servicing of vessels, and storage of goods in transit. This port will serve as the major outlet to the area between the Giuba and Uebi Scebeli Rivers, one of the most hopeful areas for economic improvement of the Somali Republic. The country has no deepwater port, all existing ports being lighter ports involving inefficient and costly operations. The port at Chisimaio would open up the interriver area to development and become the focal point for all additional commerce resulting from such development."

There exists in Somali, at the present time, a mere subsistence agriculture. What is really needed in this country is increased agricultural production, if that is possible, to take care of the needs of the population.

Nevertheless, our foreign aid administrators insist on placing the cart before the horse, building a port to export products that have little or no chance of being produced. Once again they are trying to start at the top rung of the ladder. To show how high this top rung is and how offbase is the avowed justification for the building of this port to export surplus agricultural products, the following figures might be relevant:

In 1960, the corn production in Somali was 2 million bushels; in 1961, a year of drought, it dropped to 1.6 million bushels; in 1962, it was again at 2 million bushels. This is total production—not export corn—and this grain is the staff of life for the Somali population. As a point of contrast, it might be noted that our little State of Delaware last year produced 7.4 million bushels. Yet we are building a port to export grain that is now grown in barely sufficient quantity to feed the native population.

Construction of this port may be explained in large part by conversations I had with the Somali leaders in 1960. It was indicated then that if Somali did not immediately get substantial quantities of aid from the West, it would turn to Russia. This came about as, approximately 100 miles north of Mogadiscio, the Soviet bloc is proposing to build another port which has little more chance of success than our own endeavor. I was informed that they hope to develop a system of state farms for agricultural resource exploitation, particularly wheat. At present the production of that commodity is nominal. We have little to fear from this quarter. If the principle of state agricultural labor has had only partial success among the Russian people, its success can be expected to be much, much less among the Somalis.

What is disturbing is that Somali has been successful in playing both ends against the middle. It is receiving from two sources misguided aid in the construction of capital facilities that are not needed and that cannot possibly be justified. Aside from that the country is not capable of operating the port either financially or otherwise.

In addition to the Chisimaio port project, we have a number of other projects that are being financed out of development grant funds of the AID. These projects are mostly in the category of technical assistance, and are concerned with research in the agricultural field, road construction, assistance to the Somali national police force, the training of teachers at the secondary level, and the refurbishing of the port at Mogadiscio.

I stated in my report of 1960, that—

"At the time of my visit, 59 Americans and 64 locals were assigned to USOM/Mogadiscio, a total of 123 people.

"There were 10 officers in the administrative section, when 5 or 6 would be ample.

"Program officials here include a director and a deputy director; a program officer and a program analyst; an executive officer, a general service officer, a supply adviser, a record supervisor, a controller, and a budget and fiscal officer—a total of 10 highly paid officers. This number should be cut in half.

"Aside from these 10 officers, there are 3 clerks assigned. There are 13 Americans assigned to the agricultural program, of whom 11 are advisers and 2 are food and agriculture officers. It is ridiculous to have so many people in such a small country, each with separate duties to perform. With such a large force, the program is bound to mushroom."

The fears I entertained in 1960 have become a reality. In 1962, we had a total of 68 American positions authorized, with 48 of these positions filled, plus 87 locals, for a total of 135 employees. For 1963, a request has been made for 70 Americans and 104 locals, for a total of 174 employees. Is there any wonder why our aid program just goes on and on? American personnel stationed in a country beget more aid for that country. It is human nature that employees overseas will do everything possible to justify the positions that they are filling.

Again turning to Liberia, it can be shown that our burgeoning aid program there has been caused by an increasing number of AID employees. There are at present 448 employees of the Agency in Liberia, as opposed to 282 in 1961. The Agency estimates that its expenditure in 1963 will almost triple the 1961 figure.

Premature independence endangers United Nations

For many years I have been opposed to granting independence to the underdeveloped countries of the world unless certain requirements are met, but my voice has been a mere cry in the wilderness. This wave of independence is being fostered by idealists in our Government who consider independence without reservation or qualification the most desirable of goals. They seem to believe that the mere desire for self-determination is sufficient grounds for the granting of political control.

It requires much more than a desire to make a country truly self-determining. There must be sufficient trained human resources, as well as a reasonable amount of natural resources to go along with the desire for self-determination, before a country can achieve political maturity.

It occurs to me that the United Nations organization should change its present policy: "That inadequacy or political, economic, social or educational unpreparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence." It should assume the responsibility now and establish criteria to be met before an area can become eligible for membership.

I would not presume to recommend precise guidelines to be followed, but what I have said in the preceding pages should certainly be taken into consideration in establishing minimum requirements. At the risk of appearing repetitious, I would like to summarize these points briefly, as follows:

1. The country should have a reasonable number of trained leaders.

2. It should have sufficient trained manpower to perform at least basic and semiskilled tasks.

3. It should have a primary and secondary education system that will insure its future growth and development.

4. It should have a pool of sufficiently trained civil servants and administrators to handle the ordinary chores of government.

5. It should have sufficient land and other natural resources to assure its population a reasonable chance to establish a more or less balanced economy.

If some such "independence limiting" mechanism is not adopted, the effectiveness of the U.N. stands in danger of being sapped further by forces which are already at work. Given the possibility that the large colonial holdings remaining in Africa may splinter into several states as has happened in West Africa and is happening in the Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland, the U.N. will be burdened by a growing number of nations unable to pay their own way, while their influence, by weight of numbers in the General Assembly, may be expected to increase.

As this influence increases, and as they strive to overcome the economics of underdevelopment, the temptation to use their U.N. vote as a fulcrum for Eastern and Western foreign policy levers will no doubt grow. There are signs that it is growing already. The instance of Somali has already been cited, and throughout my tour and in conversations with African leaders I ran into this thinking on many, many other occasions.

It goes without saying that votes in the U.N. should be cast on principle and not for the nation or nations involved offering the most. This is an idea which has not been totally embraced in the domestic policy of our own country. Whether it is followed internally by the various nations is of little concern to us; on the international level attempted bidding between the East and West becomes of the utmost concern. We should have no truck with it.

The Congo

The results of having no explicit criteria for independence, save the desire for it, can easily be illustrated by the situation prevailing in the Belgian Congo. I again refer to my notes from an earlier trip—this one in 1953, when I visited that section of Africa.

At that time I gave attention to the 1952 budget of the Belgian Congo. I found that receipts were $129,460,000 with expenditures at $125,180,000. As will be noted, there was a surplus of $4,280,000 in 1952.

Ten years later, what is the picture? There is no budget for the Belgian Congo. Over the past few years and for all practical purposes, there has been no Congo, Belgian or otherwise. Instead of any surplus being created, it has been necessary for the wealth of other nations to be poured into this most unfortunate former colony.

According to figures furnished to me by our AID representatives in Léopoldville, the free world has actually furnished to the Congo, since independence through June 30, 1962, $262,260,584, of which our contribution was $222,072,243. Although we have paid the full amount of our commitment to the U.N., other member nations of the U.N. have only paid $40,188,341 on a total obligation of $125,510,710. I was informed that for fiscal year 1963 we plan to contribute $37,800,000 in economic assistance and $100 million to the purchase of U.N. bonds. I was unable to obtain information as to the amount of contributions, if any, other nations of the free world would make.

In 1953, the Belgian Congo was enjoying a $2 million favorable balance of trade, with exports aggregating $408 million and imports $406 million. It will be a long while before such a situation again occurs. Traffic on the Congo River in 1953 gave evidence of a busy, thriving, expanding economy. In November of last year, that traffic was virtually nonexistent. Today one can stand on the French side of the Congo River, in Brazzaville, and look across to the imposing skyline of Léopoldville, built by the Belgians. It is very impressive from this distance, indicative of great strides having been made since my visit in 1953.

However, once the river is crossed, one is confronted with heartbreaking sights. The European section of the city is dead, or dying. It is like walking through a graveyard. Many of the towering buildings have few occupants. Shops and stores are virtually empty and the streets are deserted. The once thriving city of Léopoldville is now a ghost town—this is the fruit of independence granted prematurely. God forbid that such a situation develop in any other part of Africa.

Looking over my notes of 1953, I found this observation:

"If ever Belgium got out of this territory, the natives would suffer.

"To my way of thinking, it will require years of schooling and training before the natives are able to govern themselves.

"Darkness would return here, if the settlers leave and permit the natives to take over entirely."

Darkness has returned. In the years immediately preceding independence, the Belgians had made some effort to educate and train the natives. Given time, their efforts would have borne fruit, but unfortunately time was not given. It may appear to some that the Belgians were slow in training the natives, but the problems confronting them were so enormous that one must be there and see for himself to believe.

It would be well if those advocating immediate independence for other areas of Africa—and here I mean primarily the racial agitators—could visit the Congo. What they would say upon their return would provide a reflection of their real intentions. It would indicate whether they have the interests of their people at heart, or their own aggrandizement and lust for power.

Due to the conflict that has come about in the Congo, famine has struck much of the country. The ones who went hungry and the ones who lost their means of livelihood were the natives. While Belgium governed the Congo, the natives may not have had the vote, but they had full stomachs and were from all appearances happy and content.

There is no question but that Katanga should have been reunited with the Central Government. The Congo as a whole could be developed into a most flourishing and thriving state under proper guidance. It has the land and other natural resources. What it lacks are trained leaders and technicians. These will require time to obtain. Katanga may be able to develop fairly well under a copper economy at present, but in the long run it will need the resources of her five sister states. Aside from the economic question, had Katanga succeeded in its secession attempt, we would no doubt have been faced with quests for independence by each of the other provinces which now make up the nation. All would have required separate programs of outside aid. And, due to tribal loyalties which supersede the provincial boundaries, the Congo might easily have splintered into as many as 10 separate nations.

I express the hope—a hope which cannot be expressed too strongly—that the Belgians, who developed the colony and gave it economic substance, will be permitted to return. Those now heading the Government should bury their pride and receive the Belgians with open arms.

A paradox of policy

But, comparing our foreign policy stand on the Katanga question and the situation confronting the Nyasaland-Rhodesia Federation, which is equally important if less dramatic and expensive, we run into a strange paradox. On the one hand we have strongly advocated the integration of Katanga with the Central Government, while on the other hand we have expressed support for, or at least expressed no objection to the British policy of granting independence to the territory of Nyasaland—all in the name of self-determination.

Nyasaland is as poor as Katanga is rich. The native leaders of the Nyasaland territory are attempting to break away from the federation of which it is a part. Ninety percent of Nyasaland's population makes its living through subsistence agriculture of the lowest level. Some of its needed revenues for governmental operations are obtained from the mineral-rich Rhodesias. Where will these revenues come from once Nyasaland is independent? Who will be the Santa Claus? The suspicion is that much of the burden will be ours, for how can taxes be laid on a people to whom the plow is little known, who do all of their farming with the hoe and rake, who have scarcely used an ox or a burro for transportation or traction, even though these animals are available?

Who will suffer because of independence? The natives. What shall it profit them to gain independence if, in the process, they lose the means by which their government can be sustained and operated for their benefit. I suppose they feel that we will come in to provide them with a new source of revenue. Of course, this should not be permitted. Now it may be that Nyasaland is not obtaining sufficient aid from the Rhodesias, and that the present leadership in that territory does not feel secure, but that problem could no doubt be met when independence for the federation becomes a reality.

It is often charged that those who do not favor immediate independence for all the peoples of Africa are excessively concerned with economics. I found this attitude prevailing in many quarters when I was on my tour. Perhaps the concern on my part, and on the part of others, is excessive. But the fact remains that without a stable and productive economic system there is a little chance of any real development.

It is true that our aid may build some of the schools and a few hospitals; it may train a few teachers, or a few technicians. But our total effort can amount to no more than a drop in the bucket. Teachers must be paid, students must have books, and technicians must have the tools with which to work. These will be necessary as long as any country remains in any coherent form. They cannot be provided by us forever. The best we may do is point the way and provide a very small beginning.

The drive for true self-determination requires an economic base from which to move, and many new countries in Africa, including Nyasaland, do not have it. It requires a population that may be taxed and it requires, above all, the historical background and the continuing facilities needed to provide a long succession of responsible leaders.

The faulty parallel

The advocates of immediate independence are fond of pointing to the story of America's struggle for independence against the British. They delight in saying, "In the opinion of Great Britain, your own country was not ready for independence when you sought it." This much of the analogy between our country and the peoples of Africa is no doubt true; beyond this point, however, it breaks down completely.

A people who can produce a Declaration of Independence; a people who can produce the Federalist Papers; and a people whose leaders draw up these documents with the certain knowledge that a great proportion of the population will be able to read them, is eminently prepared for independence. A nation whose population by nature contains the habits of thrift necessary for capital accumulation, whose population, because of environment if nothing else, has gained the necessary habits of hard work, is certainly ready for independence.

At the time of the inception of American independence, our people were bound together by a common language. In hardly a nation in Africa south of the Sahara is there a national population sharing a lingua franca outside of that necessary for the carrying on of trade and commerce. While in some cities English or French may predominate, 20 miles out into the bush the lines of oral communication break down almost completely.

Change in colonial policy

The natives of Portuguese Angola and Mozambique, as well as those of the Nyasaland-Rhodesia Federation and the Republic of South Africa could not be observed to be suffering unduly under the bonds of reactionary colonialists. Efforts over the last few years have been and are being made to train the natives, to educate them, to generally prepare them for citizenship, and to break down the tribal and superstitious beliefs which pose gigantic problems for the creation of a new civilization.

These efforts are in evidence in the Portuguese Provinces of Angola and Mozambique. In recent years, a great deal of capital has been invested by Portugal in these areas and two development plans involving millions of dollars have been put into operation. These plans embrace a wide field, but they lay particular emphasis on the development of hydroelectric power, communications and industrial expansion.

In the social area the Portuguese have been most progressive, and in August 1961 extended full citizenship rights to all the inhabitants of Angola. As the result of the past efforts they had put forth, it was felt that there had been established in Angola a sufficiently broad base of literate, westernized native voters to guarantee the maintenance of civilized processes and public order.

I learned on my recent visit that the following measures have been put into effect in the Province of Angola:

1. The indigenato law was repealed and full political and civil rights were granted to all natives.

2. The local efforts of the municipalities and small rural communities are being reorganized so that the administrators will be elected by the local inhabitants.

3. The natives are permitted to acquire individual property in vacant lands and have been granted squatters' rights, so to speak.

4. To improve labor-management relations, the labor laws have been revamped so that the climate for collective bargaining and minimum wage regulations will promote harmony.

5. An inspection system has been put into effect in all the provinces to prevent unfair labor practices by individuals and companies.

6. Production and marketing agencies which handle the products of Angola have been moved from Lisbon for the purpose of improving the regional economy of the area and to prepare for the establishment of a common market for all Portuguese territories.

7. The problem of education has been attacked with vigor, and the building and equipping of new schools is taking place as quickly as possible.

I feel that great progress has been made and will continue to be made in the Portuguese Provinces of Angola and Mozambique if the racial agitators can be prevented from interfering. I believe we should find ways and means to encourage the Government of Portugal in the work it is doing and solicit it to step up the pace. No doubt the Congo incident will spur the Portuguese and others in more quickly providing a better way of life for the natives.

It should be noted that the territories of Angola, Mozambique, and the Republic of South Africa are the only countries in Africa where we have no aid program. It appears to be the policy of our Government to confine itself to condemning certain practices of responsible governments instead of encouraging these governments to meet squarely the problems they face.

Especially have policymakers been quick in the condemnation of South Africa. It is true that the severe application of apartheid by the South African Government may leave much to be desired, but even in South Africa, much progress toward native betterment has been made.

The slums of Johannesburg and other cities have been largely cleared and development of the native reservations is being speeded up. Although in my opinion much more could be done in this direction, it should be remembered that the 3 million Europeans of South Africa would have little hope of political survival if the 10 million natives were given the vote. If political equality were granted today, an economic system 250 years old would begin to disintegrate tomorrow.

It should also be remembered that when the Dutch colonists whose descendants are the Boers of today first arrived in South Africa in 1652, there were few, if any, native inhabitants on the Cape. They did not take anything away from anyone. The only occupants were remnants of the Hottentot people who were few in number and who had been driven south by the encroaching Bantus. South Africa offered little inducement for native settlement. The lands were largely arid and a living was much harder to obtain than in other areas farther to the east and into the interior. Actually, the Boers are in large part the native people of South Africa.

It was only when the British began to exert their influence over the Cape Town Colony that the Boers—seeking to retain their self-determination, if you will—began their trek into the interior and encountered the southward migration of the Bantus. The experience of the Voortrekkers, as they were called, closely parallels the experience of our own western pioneers. Fierce battles were fought with the Zulu and other tribes, even as our ancestors fought against the Cheyenne and Apache. The flourishing economy of South Africa today is the result of both Voortrekker and English activity.

If we take the unequivocal position in the United Nations and elsewhere of supporting the self-determination of one people against another—for this is what it amounts to—these policies cannot fail to lead to the withdrawal of the Portuguese from Mozambique and Angola and of the Dutch and English (as well as a large population of Indians who have built a flourishing commerce) from the Union of South Africa.

In the case of the Boers of South Africa, they have no place to which they may withdraw. South Africa is their homeland. If the Europeans are forced out, we shall see situations develop that will make the Congo pale into insignificance.

* * * * *

I have often expressed the view that we should never have embarked on unilateral programs of aid to Africa. If, however, we are to continue aid programs there, they should be reevaluated in the light of the many complex problems that face the natives of that continent. It is essential that such aid be for their benefit and not for that of the European nationals who still control most of the economies, including domestic and foreign commerce of the recently created independent nations.

We should draw heavily on past experience in establishing a new sense of direction for our activities. We should insist that administrators adhere closely to the legislation and intent of Congress. We should not embark on any grant aid program for the development of capital facilities in the underdeveloped countries of Africa. Our prosperous allies in Western Europe, who more or less dominate and control the extensive natural resources of the Continent, should undertake that task. Should loans be requested, the intended borrowers should offer some security, and the rate of interest should be at the level of what our Government must pay, plus cost of administration.

Emphasis should be placed on technical assistance programs designed to develop the human resources of the newly independent countries of Africa. Such programs should not be permitted to degenerate into the construction of capital facilities. Too often in the past technical assistance funds have been diverted to construction purposes, rather than used for the payment of technicians. The capital facilities recommended by technicians are too often projects that we think necessary, rather than what the country's inhabitants need or desire or themselves wish to maintain. The facilities recommended are frequently beyond the country's ability to finance, manage, or operate. It would be best, therefore, for our technicians to relegate their work to the field of instruction and advice.

The technical programs we undertake in Africa should be simple and basic. Technicians should endeavor, as much as possible, to teach those things that will be of immediate use to the native, using those materials that are readily available.

In the field of education, emphasis should be placed on primary schools before secondary, and on secondary before university or advanced education.

In the field of agriculture, which ranks second in importance only to education, emphasis should be placed on projects which will give the natives physical evidence of simple but new ways of doing for themselves. The operation of a few small experimental farms in selected locations, where some of the natives could be both employed and brought in from nearby areas to learn by seeing and doing, is one field that should be encouraged. The promotion of an elaborate extension service such as we have in our country is, in my opinion, doomed to failure. Even if it could succeed against the many difficulties, such as lack of transportation and the language barrier, it would be very costly and would take too long to show any appreciable results. We have tried it in many underdeveloped countries and have failed.

It is in the field of agriculture that "showplace" type of aid can be made effective. It is in this area that the natives have the most familiarity and where there is a fair chance that immediate results can be realized. We can quickly teach the natives how to use the plow and other simple tools. We can instruct them in new and better methods of producing their requirements of food and fiber. We can introduce simple sanitary techniques, such as whitewashing huts or even building better huts. Since the farmers live in villages and not on their farms, a few villages could be selected, with the hope that our technicians' advice will take root.

In the fields of transportation and communications, development of power, and construction of large capital facilities, the planning should be done on a regional basis where possible, with the understanding that aid furnished in these areas will be on a multilateral basis. In this connection, as I indicated earlier, I feel that all the aid should be furnished by our Western European allies who have over the years developed trade patterns and close economic ties with the many new African countries.

As I mentioned before, and as I have been advocating for many years our economic aid should be concentrated in the Western Hemisphere, where we have developed over the years close economic ties. Any aid programs we can afford should be expended in behalf of our neighbors to the south. Even there we should do all possible to encourage private enterprise to invest heavily since our own Government's resources are not sufficient to accomplish the results desired. Our foreign aid should serve only as a catalytic agent to stimulate the interests of private enterprise. Further, our efforts should be exerted to insure that the private entrepreneurs will not exploit the area in which they have investments, but on the contrary they should be compelled to use a large percentage of their gross returns to benefit the native population. Decent wages, comfortable housing, a fair amount of education and hospitalization, should be encouraged. This applies to all the underdeveloped countries.

As we should concentrate our own aid efforts in the Latin American areas, so should we urge, prod, spur, prevail upon, coerce, or do whatever is necessary to get our European allies to concentrate their efforts in the African countries, where they are now deeply interested. If this is done, there might be sufficient funds to go around and the benefits would inure not only to the natives of the undeveloped areas but to the entire free world. Surely if we continue to spread our wealth in an aid effort throughout the entire world, then we ourselves will be seriously weakened, with dire consequences for all the nations which are allied to protect freedom.

To accelerate the development of the whole African Continent, I would suggest that the European Economic Community band together in a vast consortia to undertake the necessary developmental projects, while we concentrate our efforts in our own hemisphere, all to the end of developing these vast areas primarily for the benefit of the local inhabitants. By increasing their purchasing power and bringing to them happiness and contentment, the whole world would be benefited.

The concentration of our own aid resources in Latin America and those of the European Economic Community in Africa would provide for a more uniform distribution of assistance. Interest rates and terms of repayment on loans similar in nature should be more or less uniform.

Aid could be furnished on a regional basis, taking full cognizance of the economic interdependence of the many new countries thereby resulting in a considerable reduction in the administrative costs of the programs for the entire free world.

One of the main purposes of my African tour was to study the overall operations of our many new embassies, also our Information Service and Service attachés, as well as our military missions.

In many of the new countries there is no need of a full embassy complement. We might provide regional centers for administration, and the establishment of a consulate in some countries might be ample. If, however, we must have an embassy in each country, then our Ambassador should direct all the operations of our Government in the country. He should be prepared to do political as well as economic reporting. He should also take a hand in the management of our AID program and the conduct of USIS. In many places, particularly where we have only a small AID or USIS program, this would make the services of highly paid AID directors or public affairs officers unnecessary.

In countries where we have consulates in addition to our embassy, consular reports relating to political and economic matters should be channeled through the embassy, and used by the Ambassador as a basis for reporting.

The economic section of the embassy could well take over the duties of agricultural attachés.

These last two recommendations alone would do much to cut down on both the excessive load of paperwork that is required and the large number of employees now stationed abroad.

I found that the rents being charged our personnel for housing, and our Government for office space, are almost without exception extremely exorbitant. It is true that housing is in short supply, but there is no need for us to accept the situation as a cow accepts the slaughterhouse.

In the first place, our personnel should not be permitted to compete one against the other for housing, as is the case. Often they scramble around for the best accommodations, with the result that those who have the benefit of high allowances can afford to meet unreasonable demands in order to get the best quarters. This has the tendency of pegging rents at exorbitant rates. It makes it difficult for diplomatic personnel of other countries to obtain adequate housing, since they do not have allowances which compare with those of our employees.

This recommendation is already being followed at a few embassies. It lessens this senseless gouging that often takes place, and has a salutary effect on other foreign personnel who blame us for hiking the rentals.

Turning to our U.S. Information Service, in several countries—notably Guinea, Mali, and Ethiopia, as well as others—our activity is frowned upon by the host Government. The scope of activity is severely limited by restrictions of one sort or another placed upon our personnel. Unfortunately, restrictions are not placed upon the number of our personnel, but rather upon their activity. We continue to send employees that are far beyond our needs. As pointed out previously, the functions of the U.S. Information Service, particularly in those countries where the activity is limited to the production of pamphlets, or the setting up of exhibits, could easily be handled by our Embassy.

In almost every case, the Embassy and information operations could be both physically and administratively consolidated to provide a great saving to the taxpayers. There are at present, or planned for the future, libraries maintained at the sole expense of our Government in every African capital. In many countries, these libraries are located in the European section of the city. Now here is a strange paradox. The professed purpose of our information program is to inform the natives of our way of life and the culture of the more advanced sections of the Western World. Yet our libraries are placed where natives rarely visit. This paradox should be resolved.

It would appear to me that binational centers, such as we have [illegible] in Spain and many countries in South and Central out the continent of Africa. The advantages would be many. The local political and cultural leaders would be given a sense of belonging or shaping the program and carrying the load; they would be brought into closer contact with our officials. In some instances, the host government could bear a share of the expense, but even where this proved to be unfeasible, the benefits of maintaining a binational center as opposed to simply a unilateral library, would be much greater. Indeed, in many countries, the establishment of one or several binational centers should constitute our entire USIS program. It is extremely questionable whether the vast bulk of the native population is vitally interested in the happenings in Berlin or Cuba. In those countries where our allies are already firmly established, they should be allowed to carry the load of presenting the Western point of view.

I was particularly interested to observe at close hand the workings of the Peace Corps. I found much to give me pride in our young people, but also much to cause concern. It is apparent that the Corps is in danger of moving away from its original purpose of providing close contacts with the natives and living only a few notches above those who are being taught and helped.

Although the program is in its infancy, the administrative costs are already growing unduly. Bureaucracy is burgeoning and another little empire is being built. The administrative rent for the Corps in Nigeria already amounts to $50,000 per year. The administrative costs of the Nigerian program account for 28 percent of the Peace Corps funds spent there. In Togo, 6 Americans and 2 locals are employed to look after 45 corpsmen. In addition, one more American is authorized but the postion has not been filled.

The volunteers should be more or less on their own and able to take care of themselves. That was the original intent of the program, as I recall the presentation made to Congress. There should be no need to send large numbers of supervisors, administrators, and deputy administrators, as is being done here and there.

Also there is evidence that the initial ideals of the Corps are beginning to wane. Turning again to Nigeria, if the latest request for vehicles is approved, it will mean that there will be one vehicle for every 4.5 volunteers. I do not believe there is a vehicle available for every 4.5 Nigerians.

The great majority of the Peace Corps members are teachers. In most instances, they are being used to teach in elementary and secondary schools. They are under the direct supervision of the ministry of education in several countries. This seems to be contrary to our original purpose. Our young men and women, it appears to me, should be more on their own and be in closer contact with the natives who live away from cities. If they serve merely as grade teachers, let us say, under the supervision of local officials, how can they get next to the people living in the bush or in small villages? Those are the ones who need guidance and whom I thought we were making an effort to reach.

When Mr. Sargent Shriver, Jr., Director of the Peace Corps, appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the 1963 budget, he said, among other things:

"The purpose of the Peace Corps is to make available a pool of trained Americans to help other countries meet some of their urgent needs for skilled manpower * * *

"Peace Corps volunteers will work closely with the people they help and will provide on-the-job training for cooperating country workers, who will carry on the work after the volunteers leave. Volunteers, for exam- [illegible] aids in the Philippines, agricultural workers in the Federation of the West Indies, community development workers in Colombia, and health workers in Pakistan.

"Volunteers can help to raise the standard of living or to improve educational and social levels in the less-developed areas of the world."

I again pose the question, How can volunteers work closely with the people they help and provide on-the-job training for cooperating workers, if they become ordinary teachers under the supervision and direction of officials of the host country?

From what I was able to learn and observe, most of the volunteers in Africa are grade teachers, and we are in effect partially subsidizing education in many countries.

Finally, while this program is so popular, the recipient countries should be asked to bear more of the living expenses of each volunteer. The policy varies between Ghana, where the country pays all, to Liberia, which bears approximately half of the living expenses, to Nigeria, which pays almost nothing. There should be some definite policy set out before the program gets too involved in the future.

Recommendations

Based on all data gathered by me and particularly the foregoing statement of facts, examples, and the conclusions I have drawn therefrom, I submit the following summary of recommendations:

Foreign aid

1. Our aid should be confined to technical assistance. Programs must be simple and basic, and should not be permitted to degenerate into the construction of capital facility projects. Technicians should be assigned on a regional basis, wherever practicable.

2. Whenever possible, development planning should be done on a regional basis and development aid furnished should be multilateral.

3. As nearly as possible, any loans made should bear the same rate of interest and have similar terms of repayment as those which are made by other participants in financing projects on a multilateral basis.

4. To accelerate the development of the whole of Africa, it is suggested that the European Economic Community be encouraged to band together in a consortia to undertake the construction of feasible development projects, particularly in the fields of transportation and communication, as well as in the generation of electric power, irrigation and flood control.

5. All commitments for aid and/or loans should be made in strict accord with laws enacted by the Congress.

6. Our aid programs, especially those dealing with the construction of capital facilities, should be concentrated in the Western Hemisphere where we have developed close economic ties over the years.

State Department, USIS, and service attachés

1. We should not embark upon a building program in Africa, except in case of absolute necessity. Should any construction be undertaken, every effort should be made to build in keeping with the architecture of the country, with simplicity as the keynote.

2. The personnel at all embassies, particularly in the new countries, should be kept at a minimum. All missions in any country should be administered through the Embassy under the direct supervision of our Ambassador. The political, economic and consular sections should be consolidated and placed in the office of the Chief of Mission, wherever practical.

3. The Ambassador is our Nation's highest representative where he serves, and his [illegible] tion should personnel be sent to the field except at his request and after justification. The practice of some agencies of sending personnel to an Embassy when there is no request should not be tolerated.

4. Should it be necessary to establish consulates in any country, all consular reporting should be channeled through the Embassy, rather than sent directly to Washington. These reports could be used by our Ambassador in making direct reports to Washington.

5. To prevent "gouging" of our personnel and friction among foreign nationals, the administrative section of each Embassy should handle all the rental accommodations for all of our Government personnel in the country. They should not compete one against the other.

6. In countries where there is only a small USIS or AID operation, all functions should be under the direction of our Ambassador and no separate missions should be established.

7. Should programs other than technical aid be engaged in, they should be administered on a regional basis.

8. Binational centers such as we have established in many Latin American countries and in Spain should be established in Africa. All USIS libraries, if continued, should be located in the native quarters and not in the European sections of the cities.

9. The number of Service attachés should be held to a minimum, and under no condition should they be sent to a country except by and with the consent of the Ambassador.

Peace Corps

1. While the Peace Corps program is growing in popularity, a firm policy governing the share of the volunteer's living and traveling expenses to be paid by the host country should be spelled out.

2. The training program for the volunteers should be sufficient to enable them to look after themselves in the field, thus making it unnecessary to send large numbers of administrators, supervisors, and field personnel.

3. The volunteers should in all cases be encouraged and required to live among the people they train and at a level just a bit higher than their counterparts.

4. Every effort should be made to have the host country furnish transportation, thereby making unnecessary our sending a large number of vehicles which in time will require a staff of mechanics and other technicians for maintenance. Already the number of vehicles is steadily growing.

5. The volunteers should not be placed under the direction and supervision of the local government, as is the case with many teachers in various countries. I do not believe it was ever the intention of Congress to pay a heavy subsidy to any country to augment the teaching staff in its elementary and secondary schools.

6. The administrative policies of the Peace Corps should be reexamined with a view toward creating an administrative mechanism, among the volunteers themselves, which will not require a large and self-defeating bureaucracy.

General

A complete reevaluation of all reporting by our missions (State, AID, USIS, Service attachés) to Washington should be made at once. Much of it is useless and entails much expensive paperwork. More authority should be given at the country level. Much time and effort could be saved and many employees in the field as well as on the Washington level could be dispensed with.

Mr. [illegible]. Mr. President, I [illegible] by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I believe that the copies of his report which now are in the Chamber should be gathered by the Senate attendants and should be sent to the offices of Senators, because I am sure that, as time permits, they will wish to examine the report. It is a very substantial study, and it deserves the attention of every Senator.

So, Mr. President, I respectfully suggest—I do not believe a request for unanimous consent is required—that the Chair instruct the Senate attendants to collect the copies of the report now in the Chamber and see that they reach the offices of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the attendants will see to it that the copies of the report of the Senator from Louisiana are sent to the office of each Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished minority leader in commending the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on the very great effort he has devoted to the preparation of the report.

Earlier today, he suggested to me that I might improve my general education by at least examining the introductory pages of his report—which I did. Mr. President, I already knew that the Senator from Louisiana had many fine qualities and talents; but never before did I know that he was such a remarkable historian, anthropologist, sociologist, and political scientist. I assure him that although there may be parts of the report—as is true of any report—with which some of us may not agree or which some of us may not support, nevertheless the report represents a distinct contribution by a very able, experienced, and hardworking U.S. Senator. The amount of work going into such a report is nothing short of monumental.

I compliment the Senator from Louisiana on the report and on other reports which he has made. The writing of such a report represents, not a junket, but a study mission. Certainly the Senator from Louisiana deserves the commendation of all his colleagues; and I am delighted that the minority leader has suggested that a copy of the report be sent to the office of each Senator, for his attention.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO INCREASE PUBLIC INFORMATION ON AWARDING OF LARGE DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the continuing headlines, emerging from the hear- [illegible] of Fort Worth, Tex., and the Grumman Aircraft Corp., of New York, are almost perfect evidence of the need for legislation to increase the public's information about how these multimillion-dollar and multibillion-dollar contracts are awarded.

Already these hearings have produced charges and at least partial denials of congressional intervention in the process of selection of the recipients of a contract. They have also featured charges and at least partial acknowledgment of tremendous arithmetical errors amounting to millions and millions of dollars.

Both of these important facts—certainly important to the taxpayers of the Nation, who will foot the bill, which is expected to total more than $6.5 billion—would have been in the public realm many weeks ago if the legislation which I have proposed had been in force.

I am delighted that several of my colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, have joined in cosponsoring these bills, S. 960 and S. 961.

S. 960, which is also sponsored by Senators DOMINICK, DOUGLAS, NEUBERGER, PROXMIRE, and WILLIAMS of Delaware, would establish a Joint Committee on Defense and Space Contracts, to review defense and space contract awards, with primary attention to renegotiated contracts. This watchdog committee would consist of a Democrat and a Republican appointed from each of the following committees: the Senate and the House Armed Services Committees, the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees, the Senate and the House Government Operations Committees, and the Senate and the House Space Committees.

This joint committee would have its own continuing staff, as well as assistance from the General Accounting Office. I would suggest that the chairman of the committee be a Republican, during a Democratic administration; and a Democrat, during a Republican administration.

S. 961, which is also sponsored by Senators DOMINICK, DOUGLAS, KUCHEL, NEUBERGER, PROXMIRE, and WILLIAMS of Delaware, would require that in regard to a defense or space contract, there be maintained a record, open to public inspection, of all ex parte communications, whether written or oral, by anyone, including Members of Congress or the executive branch, other than the bidder. It would also require full and complete public disclosure of the basis on which a negotiated contract award is made, except for information classified for security provisions or where forbidden by existing law.

The fact that there is a great deal of public concern about this problem is evidenced by the amount of attention which the press is giving to the current TFX hearings and the several editorial comments which have appeared on my legislative proposals and on the general problem. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the articles which have come to my attention printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. [illegible]

In many of the new countries there is no need of a full embassy complement. We might provide regional centers for administration, and the establishment of a consulate in some countries might be ample. If, however, we must have an embassy in each country, then our Ambassador should direct all the operations of our Government in the country. He should be prepared to do political as well as economic reporting. He should also take a hand in the management of our AID program and the conduct of USIS. In many places, particularly where we have only a small AID or USIS program, this would make the services of highly paid AID directors or public affairs officers unnecessary.

In countries where we have consulates in addition to our embassy, consular reports relating to political and economic matters should be channeled through the embassy, and used by the Ambassador as a basis for reporting.

The economic section of the embassy could well take over the duties of agricultural attachés.

These last two recommendations alone would do much to cut down on both the excessive load of paperwork that is required and the large number of employees now stationed abroad.

I found that the rents being charged our personnel for housing, and our Government for office space, are almost without exception extremely exorbitant. It is true that housing is in short supply, but there is no need for us to accept the situation as a cow accepts the slaughterhouse.

In the first place, our personnel should not be permitted to compete one against the other for housing, as is the case. Often they scramble around for the best accommodations, with the result that those who have the benefit of high allowances can afford to meet unreasonable demands in order to get the best quarters. This has the tendency of pegging rents at exorbitant rates. It makes it difficult for diplomatic personnel of other countries to obtain adequate housing, since they do not have allowances which compare with those of our employees.

This recommendation is already being followed at a few embassies. It lessens this senseless gouging that often takes place, and has a salutary effect on other foreign personnel who blame us for hiking the rentals.

Turning to our U.S. Information Service, in several countries—notably Guinea, Mali, and Ethiopia, as well as others—our activity is frowned upon by the host Government. The scope of activity is severely limited by restrictions of one sort or another placed upon our personnel. Unfortunately, restrictions are not placed upon the number of our personnel, but rather upon their activity. We continue to send employees that are far beyond our needs. As pointed out previously, the functions of the U.S. Information Service, particularly in those countries where the activity is limited to the production of pamphlets, or the setting up of exhibits, could easily be handled by our Embassy.

In almost every case, the Embassy and information operations could be both physically and administratively consolidated to provide a great saving to the taxpayers. There are at present, or planned for the future, libraries maintained at the sole expense of our Government in every African capital. In many countries, these libraries are located in the European section of the city. Now here is a strange paradox. The professed purpose of our information program is to inform the natives of our way of life and the culture of the more advanced sections of the Western World. Yet our libraries are placed where natives rarely visit. This paradox should be resolved.

It would appear to me that binational centers, such as are located in Spain and many countries in South and Central America, could well be established throughout the continent of Africa. The advantages would be many. The local political and cultural leaders would be given a sense of belonging or shaping the program and carrying the load; they would be brought into closer contact with our officials. In some instances, the host government could bear a share of the expense, but even where this proved to be unfeasible, the benefits of maintaining a binational center as opposed to simply a unilateral library, would be much greater. Indeed, in many countries, the establishment of one or several binational centers should constitute our entire USIS program. It is extremely questionable whether the vast bulk of the native population is vitally interested in the happenings in Berlin or Cuba. In those countries where our allies are already firmly established, they should be allowed to carry the load of presenting the Western point of view.

I was particularly interested to observe at close hand the workings of the Peace Corps. I found much to give me pride in our young people, but also much to cause concern. It is apparent that the Corps is in danger of moving away from its original purpose of providing close contacts with the natives and living only a few notches above those who are being taught and helped.

Although the program is in its infancy, the administrative costs are already growing unduly. Bureaucracy is burgeoning and another little empire is being built. The administrative rent for the Corps in Nigeria already amounts to $50,000 per year. The administrative costs of the Nigerian program account for 28 percent of the Peace Corps funds spent there. In Togo, 6 Americans and 2 locals are employed to look after 45 corpsmen. In addition, one more American is authorized but the postion has not been filled.

The volunteers should be more or less on their own and able to take care of themselves. That was the original intent of the program, as I recall the presentation made to Congress. There should be no need to send large numbers of supervisors, administrators, and deputy administrators, as is being done here and there.

Also there is evidence that the initial ideals of the Corps are beginning to wane. Turning again to Nigeria, if the latest request for vehicles is approved, it will mean that there will be one vehicle for every 4.5 volunteers. I do not believe there is a vehicle available for every 4.5 Nigerians.

The great majority of the Peace Corps members are teachers. In most instances, they are being used to teach in elementary and secondary schools. They are under the direct supervision of the ministry of education in several countries. This seems to be contrary to our original purpose. Our young men and women, it appears to me, should be more on their own and be in closer contact with the natives who live away from cities. If they serve merely as grade teachers, let us say, under the supervision of local officials, how can they get next to the people living in the bush or in small villages? Those are the ones who need guidance and whom I thought we were making an effort to reach.

When Mr. Sargent Shriver, Jr., Director of the Peace Corps, appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the 1962 budget, he said, among other things:

"The purpose of the Peace Corps is to make available a pool of trained Americans to help other countries meet some of their urgent needs for skilled manpower. * * *

"Peace Corps volunteers will work closely with the people they help and will provide on-the-job training for cooperating country workers, who will carry on the work after the volunteers leave. Volunteers, for example, will serve as surveyors in Tanganyika, secondary school teachers in Ghana, teachers' aids in the Philippines, agricultural workers in the Federation of the West Indies, community development workers in Colombia, and health workers in Pakistan.

"Volunteers can help to raise the standard of living or to improve educational and social levels in the less-developed areas of the world."

I again pose the question, How can volunteers work closely with the people they help and provide on-the-job training for cooperating workers, if they become ordinary teachers under the supervision and direction of officials of the host country?

From what I was able to learn and observe, most of the volunteers in Africa are grade teachers, and we are in effect partially subsidizing education in many countries.

Finally, while this program is so popular, the recipient countries should be asked to bear more of the living expenses of each volunteer. The policy varies between Ghana, where the country pays all, to Liberia, which bears approximately half of the living expenses, to Nigeria, which pays almost nothing. There should be some definite policy set out before the program gets too involved in the future.

Recommendations

Based on all data gathered by me and particularly the foregoing statement of facts, examples, and the conclusions I have drawn therefrom, I submit the following summary of recommendations:

Foreign aid

1. Our aid should be confined to technical assistance. Programs must be simple and basic, and should not be permitted to degenerate into the construction of capital facility projects. Technicians should be assigned on a regional basis, wherever practicable.

2. Whenever possible, development planning should be done on a regional basis and development aid furnished should be multilateral.

3. As nearly as possible, any loans made should bear the same rate of interest and have similar terms of repayment as those which are made by other participants in financing projects on a multilateral basis.

4. To accelerate the development of the whole of Africa, it is suggested that the European Economic Community be encouraged to band together in a consortia to undertake the construction of feasible development projects, particularly in the fields of transportation and communication, as well as in the generation of electric power, irrigation and flood control.

5. All commitments for aid and/or loans should be made in strict accord with laws enacted by the Congress.

6. Our aid programs, especially those dealing with the construction of capital facilities, should be concentrated in the Western Hemisphere where we have developed close economic ties over the years.

State Department, USIS, and service attachés

1. We should not embark upon a building program in Africa, except in case of absolute necessity. Should any construction be undertaken, every effort should be made to build in keeping with the architecture of the country, with simplicity as the keynote.

2. The personnel at all embassies, particularly in the new countries, should be kept at a minimum. All missions in any country should be administered through the Embassy under the direct supervision of our Ambassador. The political, economic, and consular sections should be consolidated and placed in the office of the Chief of Mission, wherever practical.

3. The Ambassador is our Nation's highest representative where he serves, and his advice and counsel should be followed in respect to all programs. Under no condition should personnel be sent to the field except at his request and after justification. The practice of some agencies of sending personnel to an Embassy when there is no request should not be tolerated.

4. Should it be necessary to establish consulates in any country, all consular reporting should be channeled through the Embassy, rather than sent directly to Washington. These reports could be used by our Ambassador in making direct reports to Washington.

5. To prevent "gouging" of our personnel and friction among foreign nationals, the administrative section of each Embassy should handle all the rental accommodations for all of our Government personnel in the country. They should not compete one against the other.

6. In countries where there is only a small USIS or AID operation, all functions should be under the direction of our Ambassador and no separate missions should be established.

7. Should programs other than technical aid be engaged in, they should be administered on a regional basis.

8. Binational centers such as we have established in many Latin American countries and in Spain should be established in Africa. All USIS libraries, if continued, should be located in the native quarters and not in the European sections of the cities.

9. The number of Service attachés should be held to a minimum, and under no condition should they be sent to a country except by and with the consent of the Ambassador.

Peace Corps

1. While the Peace Corps program is growing in popularity, a firm policy governing the share of the volunteer's living and traveling expenses to be paid by the host country should be spelled out.

2. The training program for the volunteers should be sufficient to enable them to look after themselves in the field, thus making it unnecessary to send large numbers of administrators, supervisors, and field personnel.

3. The volunteers should in all cases be encouraged and required to live among the people they train and at a level just a bit higher than their counterparts.

4. Every effort should be made to have the host country furnish transportation, thereby making unnecessary our sending a large number of vehicles which in time will require a staff of mechanics and other technicians for maintenance. Already the number of vehicles is steadily growing.

5. The volunteers should not be placed under the direction and supervision of the local government, as is the case with many teachers in various countries. I do not believe it was ever the intention of Congress to pay a heavy subsidy to any country to augment the teaching staff in its elementary and secondary schools.

6. The administrative policies of the Peace Corps should be reexamined with a view toward creating an administrative mechanism, among the volunteers themselves, which will not require a large and self-defeating bureaucracy.

General

A complete reevaluation of all, reporting by our missions (State, AID, USIS, Service attachés) to Washington should be made at once. Much of it is useless and entails much expensive paperwork. More authority should be given at the country level. Much time and effort could be saved and many employees in the field as well as on the Washington level could be dispensed with.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in view of the great amount of work done by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], I believe that the copies of his report which now are in the Chamber should be gathered by the Senate attendants and should be sent to the offices of Senators, because I am sure that, as time permits, they will wish to examine the report. It is a very substantial study, and it deserves the attention of every Senator.

So, Mr. President, I respectfully suggest—I do not believe a request for unanimous consent is required—that the Chair instruct the Senate attendants to collect the copies of the report now in the Chamber and see that they reach the offices of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the attendants will see to it that the copies of the report of the Senator from Louisiana are sent to the office of each Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished minority leader in commending the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] on the very great effort he has devoted to the preparation of the report.

Earlier today, he suggested to me that I might improve my general education by at least examining the introductory pages of his report—which I did. Mr. President, I already knew that the Senator from Louisiana had many fine qualities and talents; but never before did I know that he was such a remarkable historian, anthropologist, sociologist, and political scientist. I assure him that although there may be parts of the report—as is true of any report—with which some of us may not agree or which some of us may not support, nevertheless the report represents a distinct contribution by a very able, experienced, and hardworking U.S. Senator. The amount of work going into such a report is nothing short of monumental.

I compliment the Senator from Louisiana on the report and on other reports which he has made. The writing of such a report represents, not a junket, but a study mission. Certainly the Senator from Louisiana deserves the commendation of all his colleagues; and I am delighted that the minority leader has suggested that a copy of the report be sent to the office of each Senator, for his attention.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO INCREASE PUBLIC INFORMATION ON AWARDING OF LARGE DEFENSE CONTRACTS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the continuing headlines, emerging from the hearings of the Senate Investigating Subcommittee, on the award of the TFX airplane to the General Dynamics Corp., of Fort Worth, Tex., and the Grumman Aircraft Corp., of New York, are almost perfect evidence of the need for legislation to increase the public's information about how these multimillion-dollar and multibillion-dollar contracts are awarded.

Already these hearings have produced charges and at least partial denials of congressional intervention in the process of selection of the recipients of a contract. They have also featured charges and at least partial acknowledgment of tremendous arithmetical errors amounting to millions and millions of dollars.

Both of these important facts—certainly important to the taxpayers of the Nation, who will foot the bill, which is expected to total more than $6.5 billion—would have been in the public realm many weeks ago if the legislation which I have proposed had been in force.

I am delighted that several of my colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, have joined in cosponsoring these bills, S. 960 and S. 961.

S. 960, which is also sponsored by Senators Dominick, Douglas, Neuberger, Proxmire, and Williams of Delaware, would establish a Joint Committee on Defense and Space Contracts, to review defense and space contract awards, with primary attention to renegotiated contracts. This watchdog committee would consist of a Democrat and a Republican appointed from each of the following committees: the Senate and the House Armed Services Committees, the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees, the Senate and the House Government Operations Committees, and the Senate and the House Space Committees.

This joint committee would have its own continuing staff, as well as assistance from the General Accounting Office. I would suggest that the chairman of the committee be a Republican, during a Democratic administration; and a Democrat, during a Republican administration.

S. 961, which is also sponsored by Senators Dominick, Douglas, Kuchel, Neuberger, Proxmire, and Williams of Delaware, would require that in regard to a defense or space contract, there be maintained a record, open to public inspection, of all ex parte communications, whether written or oral, by anyone, including Members of Congress or the executive branch, other than the bidder. It would also require full and complete public disclosure of the basis on which a negotiated contract award is made, except for information classified for security provisions or where forbidden by existing law.

The fact that there is a great deal of public concern about this problem is evidenced by the amount of attention which the press is giving to the current TFX hearings and the several editorial comments which have appeared on my legislative proposals and on the general problem. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the articles which have come to my attention printed in the Congressional Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). Without objection, the articles will be printed in the Record.

The articles submitted by Mr. Case are as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 6, 1963]

Probe Reveals AF in Error on TFX Costs

(By Laurence Stern)

Senate investigators resumed their quest yesterday for evidence of favoritism in the Pentagon's handling of the $6.5 billion TFX fighter aircraft program as the entire controversy headed toward a noisy political showdown.

Chairman John L. McClellan, Democrat, of Arkansas, of the Senate Investigation Subcommittee, brought out during questioning of military evaluation officers that the Air Force made a $31.8 million mistake in computing research and development costs for the TFX. But the censored hearing transcript failed to show how this error influenced the award of the fighter contract to the General Dynamics Corp. over its sole competitor, Boeing Aircraft.

As McClellan pressed the search, his inquiry into Pentagon's decision came under sharp attack in the House from Representative Jim Wright, Democrat, of Texas, in whose home district much of the fighter contract work will be carried out.

Wright said it would be unfortunate "if a great investigating committee * * * should degenerate in the public mind to a body attempting to exercise its power to influence the selection of contracts as between competing firms."

PROMPTED BY INSINUATIONS

Wright's lengthy floor statement was prompted, he said, by insinuations growing out of the Senate inquiry that "mysterious and undisclosed political influence" dictated the award of the contract to General Dynamics.

The Texas Democrat frankly acknowledged that he tried to be "as persuasive as I know how to be" in seeking to convince military and civilian officials to award the fighter project to his home district company.

At the same time he challenged Senator Henry M. Jackson, Democrat, of Washington, in whose home State Boeing has major installations, to acknowledge that Jackson's office initiated at least seven separate contacts with top officials in Boeing's behalf prior to the award.

It was Jackson who initially sounded the call for a Senate investigation into the General Dynamics award. The Washington Senator, nicknamed "the gentleman from Boeing," is sitting in on the McClellan probe as a Senate Investigation Subcommittee member.

WHERE WORK WILL BE DONE

The TFX will be assembled at General Dynamic's Fort Worth, Tex., plant and the Long Island plant of its partner in the project, Grumman Aircraft. Boeing planned to do most of the work, had it won the contract, at Wichita, Kans., and the Seattle home plant.

During yesterday's House debate Wright was sharply challenged by Representative K. W. (Bill) Stinson, Republican of Washington, who jibed that the TFX is sometimes known as the LBJ aircraft—a sally at the Texas site of the winning contractor.

As the controversy unfolded on Capitol Hill, it became apparent that the TFX battle was shaping up as another major tug-of-war between Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and the military men under his command on unification of Pentagon procurement practices.

ROLE SLATED FOR TFX

As envisioned by McNamara the TFX advanced the goal of "commonalty"—Pentagonese for interservice pooling of equipment and programs—to the Nation's most ambitious fighter aircraft development program. The new plane is to be used jointly by the Air Force and Navy for a broad variety of tactical missions, including delivery of nuclear warheads if necessary.

Air Force Secretary Eugene M. Zuckert, in defending the award to General Dynamics last Sunday, despite contrary recommendations of four military evaluation boards, said Boeing was in effect "proposing two different airplanes * * *."

There was considerable sentiment among the military men in the Pentagon at the outset of the TFX project for separate planes to serve the separate services, a point of view that flew directly in the face of McNamara's drive for economies through integrated weapons programs.

A spokesman for McClellan said yesterday that the subcommittee expects to begin taking testimony next week from top-level civilian administrators at the Pentagon, presumably including McNamara.

TFX Jet Braking Seen Adding Millions to Cost

(By Cecil Holland)

Investigating Senators released testimony today indicating that millions of dollars would be added to the cost of the TFX warplane if General Dynamics Corp., of Fort Worth, Tex., the winning bidder, is required to install thrust reversers on the aircraft.

The Boeing Aircraft Co.'s rejected bid included this braking in its proposal.

This was developed by the Senate Investigations Subcommittee during closed-door questioning yesterday of Col. Charles A. Gayle, program director for the multipurpose TFX project.

The subcommittee, headed by Senator McClellan, Democrat, of Arkansas, is undertaking to determine whether any favoritism or faulty judgment figured in the award to General Dynamics. The subcommittee has received testimony that Boeing offered to produce a better plane for less money.

Colonel Gayle, the transcript showed, testified that Pratt & Whitney Co., which will manufacture engines for the supersonic fighter, had been approached on developing thrust reversers for the aircraft.

CALLED FOR DIVE BRAKES

The General Dynamics design called for dive brakes and spoilers for slowing the plane it proposed to build. According to expert testimony before the subcommittee, the thrust reversers would be more desirable.

The Air Force colonel testified that he was unable to estimate what the additional cost would be if the reversers were included on the General Dynamics plane, but he added: "It is probable * * * that we would have to negotiate a cost increase with the contractor."

According to subcommittee members and staff, it would cost $22 million for research and development work on the thrust reversers and $100,000 or $200,000 per plane to have them installed.

Subcommittee Counsel Jerome Adlerman estimated that the total additional cost for the 1,700 planes proposed under the TFX program would total $340 million.

Air Force Secretary Zuckert earlier acknowledged using wrong figures in his justification for awarding the controversial plane contract to General Dynamics.

In a letter to Senator McClellan the Secretary said the error occurred through "some slipup."

According to evidence produced before the subcommittee, Mr. Zuckert in the justification used figures more nearly applicable to the aircraft proposed by Boeing than to the General Dynamics design. The Secretary's explanation was included in a censored version of yesterday's closed-door testimony before the subcommittee.

SECOND ERROR NOTED

The testimony, showing numerous deletions for security reasons, was released by the subcommittee and covered detailed questioning of Colonel Gayle on the relative merits of the designs.

While Mr. Zuckert's letter explained one error, Senator McClellan during the questioning of Colonel Gayle turned up another. He said the Air Force had made a $31.8 million mistake in computing the research and development costs of the TFX.

The transcript revealed no explanation of the error and, it was indicated, Mr. Zuckert would be asked about that when he testifies.

FIGURES MIXED UP

Military experts four times recommended the Boeing proposal for the plane, but in the end were overruled by Defense Secretary McNamara, Mr. Zuckert, and Navy Secretary Korth. It was in a memorandum for the record on the reasons for the decision that Mr. Zuckert became mixed up on his figures and was asked by the subcommittee for an explanation.

The Secretary wrote that it was not the intention originally to deal with the merits of either the Boeing or General Dynamics versions but to compare the performance of the TFX type of aircraft to the best existing fighters. Then, he added, it was better to use the figures of one of the two versions and those of General Dynamics were selected.

"Unfortunately," the Secretary wrote, "through some slipup, the old figures were retained and the error was not caught. I regret very much that this oversight has resulted in confusion."

QUESTIONS AWAIT M'NAMARA

Senator Javits, Republican, of New York, a new member of the subcommittee, suggested asking Mr. Zuckert if he would have come to another conclusion on the award if he had known the figures were erroneous.

The civilian secretaries who participated in the decision are to be questioned by the subcommittee probably next week.

Senator Mundt, Republican, of South Dakota, said the Pentagon leaders "are going to have to engage in some pretty eloquent testimony" to convince him any breach of security would be involved in using such descriptions.

As the Senate hearings continued, the investigation came under a sharp attack from Representative Wright, Democrat, of Texas. He said it would be unfortunate "if a great investigative committee * * * should degenerate in the public mind to a body attempting to exercise its power to influence the selection of contracts as between competing firms."

The Texan said his comments were prompted by insinuations growing out of the Senate inquiry that "mysterious and undisclosed political influence" figured in the award of the contract to General Dynamics.

JACKSON CHALLENGED

He acknowledged that he had tried to be "as persuasive as I know how to be" in getting the contract for the Fort Worth firm in his district. He also challenged Senator Jackson, Democrat, of Washington, to acknowledge that he "initiated at least seven separate contacts with top officials" in Boeing's behalf.

Senator Jackson is a member of the investigating subcommittee and requested the inquiry now underway.

The contract eventually is expected to total more than $6.5 billion for 1,700 of the all-purpose supersonic warplanes.

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, Feb. 5, 1963]

Defense Contracts and Political Pull

In his television interview with Richard Strout, of the Washington Bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, over channel 13, Senator Case dwelt on a subject of the highest immediate interest to some of New Jersey's leading industries and their employees, including several in this area.

Strout observed that $60 billion of President Kennedy's budget involved defense contracts and asked Case if these contracts are not "very, very valuable for Congressmen to bring back to their districts if they can get them, and to their States?"

Senator Case made the obvious answer: "They're enormously important to districts and areas, cities, counties, and States because they're enormously increased in size, and are a greater and greater part of our whole economy * * * and it's perfectly true that defense spending is the biggest single chunk of business in many, many areas."

"Is there any danger," Strout asked, "that these will be considered political plums, that suspicion will * * * well, I hear suspicions now, voiced already, that politics plays its part in distributing these contracts?"

Case answered quite truthfully that "there has been very little hiding of the fact that in the last political campaign, for example, candidates were openly boasting that if they were elected, they'd do a better job of influencing the Defense Department to get business for their constituents. And this promise has not been made quietly, it's been made very, very openly, and it's very disturbing."

The New Jersey Senator said he is greatly concerned over this situation and over "constant suggestions that influence for other purposes can be effective in getting business from one place to another from the Federal Government."

Several suggestions that Case said he has in mind as remedies include enforced publicity for every statement made by a Member of Congress, any politician, anybody in the executive branch or anybody else to defense or space spending agencies. He believes that public opinion would then serve as a great corrective against wire-pulling or the back-door approach to these agencies.

Case said he wants to see New Jersey get its fair share of Government business and points to the important contributions it makes to the defense and space efforts. But he wants us to get such business in the future, as in the past, only on our merits. He believes, as every Jerseyite must, that if the competition for defense and space contracts is "in the open and on the record," we can take our chances of getting our fair share.

Whether Case can get Congress to go along with his publicity plan is a question. He believes it may be hard to do so at first, but that he will succeed in the end.

It is unnecessary to name names, but there is no doubt that candidates' claims that they could do more for their States at Washington than their rivals—whether or not in connection with Government contracts—have been and should be disturbing to the public.

If such claims are followed up by major shifts in defense and space contracts away from certain States apparently deficient in political influence at Washington to others that have an apparent abundance of it, there is still more reason for the public to be disturbed. The States that stand to suffer from such a situation should do all they can to turn the spotlight of publicity on it, as Case proposes.

[From the Plainfield (N.J.) Courier-News Feb. 4, 1963]

Sky Cavalry

A story we published recently about the conversion of the Westfield National Guard unit to "sky cavalry," and recent statements of Defense Secretary McNamara about the trend to increase the air transportability of conventional ground forces, put emphasis again on the need for cooperation among the different arms and services. The situation is not new. It requires cooperation and prior planning among ground forces, the ordnance department that supplies weapons and equipment for ground forces, and the air forces that supply the air transportation to move men and equipment.

Senator Clifford P. Case, Republican, of New Jersey, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, touched lightly on the subject yesterday in a statement regarding the awarding of defense contracts. Case said that Secretary McNamara had said the right thing in his statement to the House Armed Services Committee that defense contracting policy is to procure what we need when we need it at the lowest cost to the Government, quality and delivery schedules considered.

Case said there is confusion in the public's mind when it tries to reconcile McNamara's statement with speeches by other leaders boasting of the number of defense contracts brought to one area or another. Case said he hopes to get McNamara's support for making public the factors involved in the awarding the billions of dollars of defense contracts each year.

Getting back to "sky cavalry," it is an interesting fact that as early as 1942, when the first U.S. airborne units were activated at Fort Bragg, N.C., a helicopter battalion was planned on paper. The helicopters were never made available to ground forces since the priority was for fighter and bomber aircraft.

After the war, in 1946, a small number of Bell helicopters were assigned to the 82d Airborne Division for evaluation and test. The tests proved that the helicopter was an air vehicle of great versatility, and the idea of "sky cavalry" for reconnaissance, screening, and exploitation was again revived. But again the helicopter procurement had low priority in the Air Force's program.

It was the Navy Department and the Marine Corps that proved the versatility and the value of the helicopter in the Korean conflict. Now the Army is "discovering" the tactical wonders of "sky cavalry" many years late.

As we develop our mobility in the air, under the present program, and in space in the future, it is necessary to strive for an overall strategy that should be a "strategy for peace." Perhaps by awarding our contracts properly, and by coordinating our efforts, a highly mobile "sky cavalry" can help to maintain order and to prevent war. If Secretary McNamara and Senator Case can produce that result, they will make a great contribution to history.

[From the New Brunswick (N.J.) Daily Home News, Feb. 8, 1963]

U.S. Contracts Irk the Senator

U.S. Senator Clifford P. Case, Republican, of New Jersey, made two points last night in Washington as he spoke during the annual congressional dinner of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce.

First, he called for closer scrutiny of the awarding of Government contracts—especially space age contracts—because the winning of one contract can make a company succesful in one area of the Nation while the loss of the same contract can wreck a company, or at least a plant, in another section.

The second point is that while every Government agency wants bright and shiny new quarters when it starts out on a new project, it would be well for Uncle Sam to check around his holdings before stamping "OK" on the plans for something new.

Both points have a special meaning to Middlesex County, if not central New Jersey.

Dealing with the first point, Case became aware of the situation when he realized how the loss of Raritan Arsenal would affect 2,600 jobholders at the area base to be closed by mid-1964. He realized that the greater hold a Government installation has on an area, the greater the effect of any closing on employees and businesses dealing with the installation.

He tried unsuccessfully to drive through legislation that would tend to ease the closing impact if the area already was in trouble economically. That he failed 2 years ago has not eliminated the threat nor, apparently, his interest in the problem.

His second point also recalls the arsenal situation. At different times, it was known the Government was planning to build new space for Federal agencies while, all along, adequate modernized space has existed at the arsenal.

Boston is to be the site of a new Federal basic electronic research center with a starting cost of $6½ million and a payroll for about 2,000 people. Eventually, the cost will be $50 million.

Meanwhile, there exists in the same area the Air Force Flight System Development Center, and Case thinks it could be used. He thinks there should be a full disclosure, at least, of the contract awarding procedures.

Finally, Case told the visiting New Jerseyites last night, he hasn't liked the ring of the political boasts that have accompanied announcements that new Federal installations are coming into a certain area.

He mentioned Texas, for instance. There the line has been so finely drawn, he said, that Houston papers touted wildly their now multimillion-dollar manned space center.

But in Dallas, there have been complaints over reports that a $26 million Federal center—already approved—was put into deep freeze by the administration for as long as a Republican Congressman is in office.

Case warned with disdain:

"There is clearly a growing feeling that considerations other than actual requirements and absolute economy are entering into the selections of successful bidders on contracts."

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Feb. 11, 1963]

The Sole Criterion

Senator Case charges that politics, influence, and other extraneous considerations are involved in selecting contractors for defense and space work.

He cites one project awarded to a Houston construction firm, although it was rated least qualified of three contractors by one National Science Foundation panel, and least qualified of five by another panel. A similar topside reversal of evaluation panels, Mr. Case continued, is involved in a major Defense Department aircraft contract award.

Running into many billions of dollars, defense and space production has grown into a significant factor in the economy. For Congress it appears to have become a second pork barrel. Governors and congressional delegations scramble to get as much of this work as possible for their States.

A campaign theme of Senator Kennedy, of Massachusetts, was the not too subtle implication that he would be in a position to get more for Massachusetts. Immediately after his election he started contract-seeking forays into other States that brought indignant protest from Senator Keating, of New York.

If existing circumstances encourage such provincial competition, it nevertheless presents pernicious possibilities, including substantial waste of taxpayers' money. As Senator Case says, the national interest should be the sole criterion in awarding contracts. This means they should go to the best qualified, regardless of location or other considerations.

Senator Case is under no illusion about his ability to obtain drastic reform. Too many formidable interests are arrayed against him. But he does see a chance to improve matters by blunting the impact of improper influence. He plans to introduce legislation which would, among other things, require disclosure of all the facts on which negotiated contract awards are based, consistent with security considerations.

His proposals are modest enough and deserve support in Congress. For if contracts are awarded on the basis of influence rather than merit, wide-scale corruption is an ever-present possibility.

[From the Evening Bulletin, Feb. 11, 1963]

Letting U.S. Contracts—Case Would Have Defense, Space Agencies Keep Public Records

(By Anthony Day)

Washington.—Senator Clifford P. Case, Republican, of New Jersey, wants to let some light into those shadowy rooms where the Government's defense and space contracts are negotiated.

Case thinks there are too many signs that political and private lobbyists influence the Government's choice of contractors.

His proposals are simple.

He would have defense and space procurement agencies keep public records of all communications made to them about any contract by anyone, private lobbyist, Members of Congress, administration officials.

He would require the Government to disclose the reasons for which negotiated contracts are awarded.

MINORITY WATCHDOG

To oversee the awarding of contracts, he would establish a congressional watchdog committee under a Democratic chairman when the Republicans hold the White House and under a Republican chairman when the Democrats are in office.

Case points out that in the past fiscal year the Defense Department awarded $28 billion worth of contracts, of which about $18 billion were negotiated, the rest let through competitive bidding. Bidding is used when specifications of the job to be done are sufficiently precise; negotiation is required when the job is vague, the moon program, for instance.

The official policy of the Defense Department is to give negotiated contracts to the companies that can do the best and cheapest jobs.

"But recent actions and statements in high official circles, indeed in the highest, raise some doubts about whether what actually goes on conforms with official policy," Case told a meeting of the New Jersey Chamber of Commerce here last week.

As a Republican serving in Congress while a Democrat sits in the White House, Case cited examples of contract awards under the Kennedy administration. The $43 million Mohole project to drill into the earth's crust was given to a Texas firm rated low by two National Science Foundation panels, he said. An expensive research center is planned for Massachusetts in spite of the presence of a similar existing center that might be used instead, he said.

KEYSTONE SAMPLE

Pennsylvania can find plenty of hints about influence on contracts in their own State.

Last fall the President, campaigning for the Democratic ticket in Pennsylvania, broadly implied that he had brought more defense contracts to Pennsylvania and would give the State yet more with Richardson Dilworth as Governor.

Governor Scranton has appointed former Representative James E. Van Zandt to head a State office here whose job it is to obtain more defense and space contracts for the State. In order to obtain more political leverage, the Republicans will approach the administration behind the shield of a predominantly Democratic committee of Pennsylvania Congressmen.

Maybe there is more rumor than substance to reports of political influence. Politicians and private lobbyists are inclined for the sake of their constituents and clients to take credit for contract awards, even though they know their attempts at influence came to nothing.

Nevertheless, the rumors persist. As Case says, they are bound to when the enormous contracts now common may mean life or death for a company, and economic health or economic sickness for a city or a State.

SIMPLE, BUT OH MY

Case's proposals, though simple, could be devastatingly effective. As he said last week, the awarding of contracts is done so secretly that the public cannot now judge whether it is done well. But full disclosure, he said, would inform the public, and an informed public would exert irresistible weight against improper influence.

Case will introduce his proposals as bills shortly. The only trouble is that it will probably be a long time before Congress passes them, if it ever does. The Senator has said he knows they look revolutionary, even Utopian. To Members of Congress who thrive on promises of influence, they must seem dangerously subversive.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 1, 1963]

Congress and Contracts

The practice of letting favored Congressmen announce the award of Government contracts in their districts may have some partisan advantages, but the cost is high in terms of the longrun public confidence. Of course Senators and Members of the House are delighted to make known that so many millions of dollars will be spent in their States or districts because their constituents will assume that the announcer has wielded a potent influence in the matter. The difficulty with the practice is that such an inference is often false and that if it were true it would suggest a scandal.

The official policy of the Defense Department is the antithesis of favoritism. It provides: "Our first and paramount objective is to acquire weapons and materiel which fully meet our qualitative, quantitative and delivery requirements—at the lowest overall cost. Whenever our specifications are sufficiently precise, we must obtain competition through formal advertised bidding procedures as required by law." But when the Department announces the awarding of contracts through Democratic Congressmen and denies a comparable privilege to Republican Congressmen, it seems to fly into the face of its own policy.

The effect on Congressmen is likely to be especially unfortunate. Certainly it tends to intensify the pressures on the Department from legislators who want a larger share of the huge defense budget spent in their districts. The net effect is to encourage legislators to think of defense expenditures, not in terms of the maximum national security, but in terms of swinging lucrative contracts to their home towns.

Instead of cultivating the impression of a cozy liaison between the Defense Department and Members of Congress in the letting of contracts, Congress ought to be strengthening the safeguards against special influence and favoritism. Senator Case of New Jersey, has proposed a bill requiring that all ex parte communications in regard to defense or space contracts by persons other than the bidder be recorded for public inspection. He would also require, in the case of negotiated contracts, the disclosure of the basis on which the contract was made, except for classified information, and set up a House-Senate watchdog committee to review such contracts.

This is the direction in which Congress ought to be moving. With billions of dollars flowing from the Treasury to defense and space contractors, it is of the utmost importance to avoid favoritism and even the appearance of using defense projects as political bait.

[From the Hackensack (N.J.) Record, Mar. 2, 1963]

Taking the Hinges Off the Back Door

Senator Case has produced a depressingly impressive bill of particulars in support of his legislation to let light and air into the defense contracting system. The nature of the legislation is familiar: it requires that a record, open to public inspection, be kept of all communications, written or oral, respecting a defense or space contract, by any one except the bidder, and that means Members of Congress and the Executive; it requires, within the framework of security and law, the full and prompt disclosure of the basis on which a negotiated contract award is made; and it sets up a congressional board of review to keep an eye on the negotiated contracts which total 65 percent of the Defense Department's $28-billion-a-year awards to private business.

He has said before, this is what he proposed to do by way of corrective. Mr. Case had not so relentlessly specified why something corrective has to be done.

Item: the $43.6 million initial Mohole contract, in which a hole is to be drilled in the floor of the sea to the earth's interior, went to Brown & Root, Inc., of Houston, Tex., although the firm was rated third best in a field of three by one National Science Foundation panel and another panel rated four firms as better qualified. The contractor is running behind schedule. Costs are running ahead. He mentioned contracts' being steered toward Texas simply as an example.

Item: campaigning in West Virginia last fall, the President pointed out that four times as much defense money was being spent in that State as was spent in 1960.

Another: campaigning in Pennsylvania, the President said:

"In fact, military prime-contract awards to Pennsylvania for fiscal 1962 were nearly 50 percent higher than they were in 1960, and this is the kind of progress and collaboration which Dick Dilworth (the Democratic candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania) can continue as Governor."

Another item: still campaigning and still in Pennsylvania, said Mr. Kennedy:

"Working with Governor Lawrence since 1960, we have increased by 50 percent the number of prime defense contracts that come to Pennsylvania—job retraining, cleaning our rivers, area redevelopment, increasing our food supplies for those on relief, all these measures which can be brought about with a progressive Democratic Governor."

That was John F. Kennedy. Ted Kennedy is the one whose posters said flatly that he was the candidate who could do more for Massachusetts.

Now, it might in a pinch be argued that defense money should be used for pump-priming, for political and social purposes. Senator Case argues to the contrary, that if we don't get our dollar's worth of defense the money is wasted. Yet his legislation would not inhibit the use of defense money for therapeutic purposes in backward States. It would merely insure that the record of the benign flimflam would be open to public inspection and evaluation. It does seem rational that we know what it is we're doing with our money. Mr. Case mentioned 28 billion excellent reasons.

[From the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News, Mar. 5, 1963]

Senator Case Has the Right Idea—Defense Dollars Shouldn't Be Used as Political Bait

New Jersey's liberal Republican Senator, Clifford Case, has proposed three-point legislation to provide better protection for the integrity of the huge Federal defense spending program with its multimillion-dollar contracts that bedrock the prosperity of so many American communities.

Senator Case is concerned with the increasing public feeling that politics, influence, and other extraneous considerations are involved in the $60-billion defense and space programs. Many Americans share his concern. Too many of our politicians and public officials are stressing the "I can get it for you wholesale" prosperity of Government contracts.

Supporters of Edward M. (Teddy) Kennedy hammered at the slogan, "he can do more for Massachusetts," throughout his successful campaign for U.S. Senator last year. Republicans complained that because of his family ties with the administration Teddy Kennedy, as a candidate, was able to make the first public announcements on some $100 million in defense contracts and other Federal aid funneled into Massachusetts.

The President himself embraced this "we can do more for you" pitch in his Pennsylvania campaigning last year for Richardson Dilworth, Democratic candidate for Governor. During his 2-day western Pennsylvania swing, President Kennedy pointed at defense spending in the first years of his administration:

"In fact, military prime-contract awards for Pennsylvania for fiscal year 1962 were nearly 50 percent higher than they were in 1960—and this is the kind of progress and collaboration which Dick Dilworth can continue as Governor."

The very next day, he said it even more strongly:

"Working with Governor Lawrence since 1960, we have increased by 50 percent the prime defense contracts that come to Pennsylvania—job retraining, cleaning our rivers, area redevelopment, increasing our food supplies for those on relief—all these measures which can be brought about with a progressive Democratic Governor. So I am hopeful that you are going to elect in this State Dick Dilworth."

Senator Case pointed at these Presidential statements in the heat of the campaign and bemoaned the political reality that "the cry, 'I can do more,' has been made respectable."

Governor Scranton, the man who beat Mr. Dilworth, is putting heavy emphasis upon a drive to get Pennsylvania a larger share of the multibillion-dollar defense spending. This campaigning knows no party lines. And what is being said and done in Pennsylvania is only typical of all the States.

Senator Case has a lot of company when he wonders out loud how much public confidence has been shaken in the integrity of our huge defense-space spending program.

He calls for full disclosure—a public record of all communications, written or oral, by anyone other than the bidder in regard to a defense-space contract. This would include Members of Congress. He calls, too, for full public disclosure of the basis on which negotiated contract awards were made without bids. And he urges the establishment of a special congressional watchdog commission with authority to ride herd on all defense and space contracts. He suggests that it be chairmaned by a Republican during a Democratic administration and vice versa.

Senator Case's proposals are good ones. This public business, involving billions of dollars of public funds, must be transacted in the open. And every possible protection must be erected against plunging our vital defense-space program into the political spoils system.

[From Western Aerospace, March 1963]

Watching Washington—Standby Advice to Defense Contractors: "Smile; You're Being Investigated on TV"

(By Arthur Kranish)

Several years ago Washington was in the midst of a sensational series of investigations which disclosed a nasty blend of social, political and financial influence-peddling in the granting of television licenses.

The hearings disclosed case after case of local and national pressures on Federal officials who were bound by law to dispense lucrative franchises to the "best qualified" applicants. Their decisions were to be based, according to the rulebook, on carefully prepared presentations by the interested parties, on judicious examination of all the facts, and by an overriding concern with the public's welfare.

We soon learned, however, that the right to operate a television station in a prosperous community was not always awarded according to the rulebook. We learned that congressional intervention, White House interest, political ties, personal friendships, private loans, free inspection trips and other considerations could tip the balance in favor of one applicant or the other.

The resulting scandals, now almost forgotten, brought about a drastic series of reforms in Federal regulatory agencies—reforms which were opposed by many at first, but are now widely accepted as necessary and proper.

This bit of recent history is worth recalling because signs are now appearing that similar events are on the verge of coming to light in aviation, space and defense industries, and similar demands for investigation and reform are already beginning to be heard.

Although the pattern of events seems to be the same, the dimensions of the stage on which this new drama is to be played are inconceivably larger. Where we once worried over the misallocation of a television franchise worth millions, we must now be concerned over the awarding of contracts totaling billions. Where we once expressed concern over the welfare of a community as a function of its television viewing diet, we must now share concern over the effect of a contract on the welfare and safety of the Nation and indeed the entire free world. Where we once shuddered at the dubious morality of a ward heeler, we now must look with discomfort at men in public life who pledge to do more for their community or State or region in matters which affect our very national survival.

In our times, in the past few years alone, the burden and the power of the Federal budget have become a veritable whirlwind, sweeping from almost nowhere, and growing to immense and dangerous proportions before we were quite aware of its growth, its size, its danger. This can be said quite comfortably without quarreling with a single penny of this immense sum. And of all the funds involved, defense and space activities comprise more than half.

The poor soul on the Federal Communications Commission who had to spend many months or even years wrestling with his conscience over a television license award is, today, an almost inconsequential figure when compared with the power and authority of a bureaucrat or politician who holds the power to grant or withhold contracts in the billions.

The power these men hold is beyond question—for last year two out of every three dollars in defense and space contracts were awarded—as they often must be—through negotiated contracts rather than through competitive bid procedures. This is not an argument for more competitive bidding, which can be awkward, time consuming and unproductive. It is, rather, an illustration of the vast responsibilities which we have entrusted to the man who makes the deal.

Even greater power resides with the Federal official who can, more or less, make vast decisions affecting the safety or welfare of millions of Americans long before the time comes to negotiate a contract. In the space agency this type of power was amply illustrated—rightly or wrongly—in the decision to establish Houston, Tex., as a center of the manned spacecraft effort; and in the more recent, sudden decision to present the State of Massachusetts with a $50 million electronics research center.

We say rightly or wrongly because we have never received much in the way of solid evidence to support or negate either of these controversial decisions. In the few cases where evidence is available, the facts have often set off new controversy. Witness the congressional investigation of charges that topside in the Defense Department or White House overrode expert recommendations in the award of recent aircraft contracts; and the evidence that the National Science Foundation awarded a $44 million contract for geology research to a firm rated third and fifth in repeated evaluation processes.

Even in minor matters, considerations beyond those of statutory merit seem to appear. The space agency recently, for example, established a pilot program to disseminate the results of space technology to industry. By coincidence, the Institute which will run this program will concentrate in five States—including two which were fortunate to have powerful spokesmen in the Senate committee which oversees the space agency's programs. Someday, perhaps, the residents of the other 45 States of the Nation may come to have the same advantages.

If any of these decisions are questionable, it must be realized that human beings have frailties, and react to pressures which are an inevitable part of the democratic process. This was the case in the Federal Communications Commission several years ago, and there is no reason to believe that the counterpart officials in the Defense and space agencies are any less human. Only the scope of the problem has changed, and a whim which would affect a few thousand Americans a few years ago can affect a few million as easily today.

One of those in Congress who is free enough of "back home" pressures to take a careful look at these problems is Senator Clifford P. Case, a thoughtful, liberal New Jersey Republican, who has explored some of these recent decisions and has concluded that there may be some truth to the charges that politics, influence, and other extraneous factors are involved.

Based on his experiences on the Armed Services, Space, and Appropriations Committees, he is recommending legislation which—by coincidence—is similar to that adopted for the scandal-ridden FCC a few years ago. He suggests:

1. A complete record be maintained, open to public inspection, of all communications, whether written or oral, in regard to a defense or space contract by anyone, including Members of Congress or the executive branch, other than the bidder.

2. Require full and complete public disclosure of the basis on which a negotiated contract award is made, except for information classified for security purposes or forbidden by existing law.

3. Establish a special joint House-Senate committee authorized to review defense and space contract awards, with primary attention to negotiated contracts. This watchdog committee would have a special investigating staff and would be headed by a Republican under a Democratic administration, and by a Democrat when the Republicans are in power.

This is not the whole answer, to be sure. But it is becoming increasingly apparent that the defense and space pork barrel is too tempting a target for politicians in both parties, and in all branches of the Government. Given this fact, it is only a matter of time before a truly major scandal comes into public focus, with all the devastating effects on our defense or space program—and perhaps even on the free enterprise system—that such a scandal will inevitably bring. The time to give serious thought to proposals for review and reform is obviously at hand.

[From Aviation Week and Space Technology, Oct. 22, 1962]

Expanding Political Factor

(By Robert Hotz)

Politics have always had an influence in Government spending and indeed they should. Politics are an integral part of the Nation's business, not something that only becomes important when major elections loom. Other considerations being equal, a judicious distribution of the Federal spending of the taxpayers' dollars can contribute to a healthy and expanding economy. However, during the past year the political factor in defense and space contracting has been multiplied to the point where it may already be outweighing the technical and management skills needed to produce the required weapon and space systems. If this trend continues, it can only lead to the production of shoddy weapons and flimsy space systems which will drain the national resources without producing any useful results.

We may be able to survive the results of poorly built schools, cracking highways, and the other standard results of public works contracted for solely on political considerations. But we cannot survive the production of inferior and unreliable weapons that will be the inevitable product of this same philosophy. There is also a new trend in the announcement of defense awards that borders on chicanery. These announcements are so sparse in facts and detail and are distorted so badly as they grind through the political mill that they create a deliberately false impression of how much defense business is really going to any particular area. Some of the so-called defense contract awards, when announced by Congressmen and Senators, are cleverly designed to withhold the whole truth without actually lying, while a false and temporary optimism is generated just long enough to tide some embattled officeseeker through a critical campaign.

This Nation faces far too serious a menace all around the globe to be able to defend itself adequately with policies no more enlightened than ward politics or civil strife in the Pentagon.

[From Aerospace Management, December 1962]

Politics, Progress, and Profits

(By Tom MacNew)

The spoils system and aerospace contracts—do they go together? After the recent election, people from all ranks within the industry are wondering. Naturally, official Washington says no. But, that isn't the way the politicians played it during the campaign. Election speeches had the two stroll the same bridal path to blissful prosperity.

While companies built a managerial and technical competence, crafty campaigners tore down the image of offering constituents more defense dollars. Claims were made by both parties as though they, the politicians, were the sole marketing and technical arm of the aerospace industry. Unfortunately, the companies made no claim to the contrary to set the record straight.

It must be as frustrating as the fires of Beelzebub for professional men of industry to have the public believe that contracts are not based on capabilities, but are a part of that trite phraseology, "the political football." The administration has done the industry a disservice by not only permitting the situation to exist, but by fostering it. Even the competent men within Government who are responsible for the proper selection of contractors have been placed in a secondary role as individuals without portfolio.

How come? A main reason goes back to the early days of 1961. A ruling was handed down, that Senators and Congressmen should be the first informed on contract awards within their respective States. This permits the party to claim, "See what we've done for you." Winning contractors were supposed to be informed later. It was often much later. Then, the most-kicked-of-all footballs, the socioeconomic Government contract. This kind of contract carries provisions for small business, depressed areas and equal opportunity; it was dealt with in almost every political speech. What the campaigners didn't touch on was how they like to interfere with companies and unions alike at the bargaining table.

Contract awards should be released through the contracting agency and the winning contractor simultaneously. Plant employees should be told what was bid on and why the bid was won. The same story should be passed on to the public. Dates should be fixed by the Government on the award announcement. If an award is not made on that date, there should be a public statement. We've got to get it across that neither the people nor the industry fuel the glib whirl of the political turbine.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 18, 1963]

How Much Politics in Contract Awards?

Are politics and influence entering into the award of Government defense and space contracts that now total some $60 billion a year?

The question was raised by Republican Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey, in a speech on February 7.

Contracts supposedly are awarded on the basis of merit, Senator CASE said, "but recent actions and statements in high official circles, indeed in the highest, raise some doubts about whether what actually goes on conforms with official policy."

Senator CASE specifically questioned recent decisions involving Massachusetts, the home State of the Kennedys, and Texas, the home State of Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON.

THE BOSTON CASE

The Senator urged very close scrutiny of an administration proposal to establish a $50 million basic electronic-research center in the greater Boston area. As a member of the Senate Space Committee, Mr. CASE said he would insist on the fullest possible airing of the need for this facility.

THE DALLAS CASE

In Texas, according to Senator CASE, Dallas—which has a Republican Congressman—fares worse than Democratic Houston in its dealings with the Government. "In Dallas," he said, "the newspapers are complaining that a $26 million Federal center, approved by the General Services Administration and the House and Senate Public Works Committees, has been put in deep freeze by the administration for as long as its Republican Congressman is in office."

THE HOUSTON CASE

In Houston, which already has a multimillion-dollar manned space center, "there has been continuing good news," Senator CASE said. One recent plum awarded Houston: the $43.6 million contract for the Mohole project to drill a hole in the bottom of the sea. A Houston firm got this contract, the Senator said, "despite the fact that one National Science Foundation panel rated this firm third best in a field of three, and another NSF panel rated four firms as better qualified."

THE REMEDY

The Senator's remedy for the situation is to open up to public inspection all communications—including those from Members of Congress or the executive branch—on defense or space contracts.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 11, 1963]

Officials of companies with defense and space contracts say it is no secret in the trade that the White House plays an increasingly active role in awarding contracts. Some companies have concluded that they must convince defense officials that they can fulfill the contract, and then pass a White House screening for political acceptability.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have discussed the Outdoor Recreation Act of 1963, Senate bill 20, with the majority leader, the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and other Senators. It appears to be the consensus that we would be well advised to take our final vote on the bill on the coming Monday, with the understanding, of course, that the Senate will be in session tomorrow, so that further debate can be had on the outdoor recreation bill, as well as on other items.

Therefore, Mr. President, after appropriate consultation, I ask unanimous consent that, under the usual form of such requests, the Senate vote at 4 p.m. on Monday next; and that, following conclusion of the morning hour, the time be divided equally between the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the proponent of the bill, and the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to waive the requirement under rule XII for a quorum call?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I ask unanimous consent that the requirement be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

Unanimous-Consent Agreement

Ordered, That effective on Monday, March 11, 1963, at the conclusion of routine morning business, further debate on S. 20 (a bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes) or any amendments, motions, or appeals relative thereto (except a motion to lay on the table) shall be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]: *Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Provided further, That the Senate proceed to vote on the final passage of the said bill at 4 o'clock p.m.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A NUCLEAR TEST BAN AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the subject of the nuclear test ban and our national security.

Disarmament in general, and the current effort to achieve a nuclear test ban in particular, are a vital part of our total national effort to gain both security and peace. Far from being an abstract ideal or a purely humanitarian dream, the program of the United States for controlled disarmament, starting with a treaty to ban the testing of nuclear weapons under adequate safeguards, is solidly rooted in our vital national interests.

In defining disarmament and a nuclear weapons test-ban treaty as a vital national interest, it is essential to be clear on the limitations as well as the possibilities of limitations on armaments. In the first place, arms control is only one of the essential means by which we seek to bolster our national security while maintaining the peace. Equally important in terms of their contribution to peace and security are such programs as our military and economic assistance to the less developed free nations, our new trade policy under the trade act adopted by the Congress last year, and, above all, our continuing efforts to expand military, political, and economic cooperation in the NATO alliance and other alliances. I point to these in order to stress the point that a test-ban treaty is not a panacea but rather one vital element in an overall national strategy for security and peace.

It is equally important to recognize that the arms race is both the cause and reflection of a world struggle for power. It follows that a test ban treaty cannot be expected to resolve existing international tensions but it might certainly ameliorate them to a significant degree. In the words of Prof. Hans Morgenthau, eminent scholar in the field of international relations:

> Disarmament, no less than the armaments race, is the reflection of the power relations among the nations concerned. Disarmament, no less than the armaments race, reacts upon the power relations from which it arose. As the armaments race aggravates the struggle for power through the fear it generates and the burdens it imposes, so disarmament contributes to the improvement of the political situation by lessening political tensions and by creating confidence in the purposes of the respective nations. Such is the contribution disarmament can make to the establishment of international order and the preservation of international peace. It is an important contribution, but it is obviously not the solution to the problem of international order and peace.

PARTISAN DEBATE IS OUT OF PLACE

Because disarmament and a test-ban treaty are matters of the national interest they are not an appropriate subject of highly partisan debate. Throughout the postwar era Congress has usually, if not always, made a clear distinction between those issues which involve diverse interests within our own country and which are therefore legitimate subjects of partisan controversy and those issues of foreign affairs which involve the security of the Nation as a whole. The latter have with few exceptions been approached in a spirit of bipartisan unity. The bipartisan approach to vital questions of foreign policy is based on our recognition of the fact that when partisan controversies are permitted to divide us in the face of a resolute adversary, only our adversary can profit. No American, Republican or Democrat, wishes to repeat the tragic error of 1919 when irrational and shortsighted partisanship forced the United States to repudiate the League of Nations and with it the best hope for peace in the 20th century.

The test ban negotiations are indeed a legitimate subject of discussion and debate. But because they involve critical questions of the national security we are all under the strongest obligation to conduct this debate with reason and responsibility. We must resist the temptation to seek short-term partisan or personal advantage in an issue that has long-term implications for the peace and security of the United States.

U.S. TEST-BAN POLICY: BIPARTISAN PRECEDENTS

In this respect, the present Democratic administration has the right to ask for the same bipartisan responsibility that the preceding Republican administration asked for and received. President Eisenhower was no less committed than is President Kennedy to the search for a workable test-ban agreement, and, if I may say so, I believe that the Disarmament Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, of which I have been privileged to serve as chairman, provided him with the fullest measure of assistance and support.

As for myself, I supported President Eisenhower on most questions relating to disarmament and occasionally offered specific comments and suggestions which he graciously accepted. I recall, for example, a letter which I wrote to President Eisenhower on May 16, 1958, in which I offered the administration certain seismological data which had been collected by the subcommittee. My letter ended with these words:

> The Disarmament Subcommittee is eager to cooperate with the executive branch on this most vital and complex question of arms control.

In his reply of May 30, 1958, President Eisenhower reiterated his support for an effective and controlled arms-limitations agreement and expressed his appreciation for the information provided by the subcommittee. The bipartisan spirit which prevailed in 1958 is equally necessary in 1963. It requires sustained effort and a high degree of responsibility and self-discipline on the part of both Republican and Democratic Members of Congress working in cooperation with the national administration.

TEST-BAN SERVES U.S. NATIONAL INTEREST

I turn now to some of the specific reasons why an effective test-ban treaty is in the national interest of the United States. The fundamental reason is that on the basis of sustained and exhaustive study of the implications of a test ban, it is clear that an effective test-ban treaty will make a greater contribution to the security of the United States than the continuation of unrestricted testing. This conclusion is not a hypothesis or a speculation but a conclusion based on the most rigorous analysis of the advances which the United States might make through further testing balanced against the restraints which a treaty would impose on the Soviet Union.

It is the consensus of expert opinion that a test-ban treaty would tend to preserve the existing balance of military power, which is favorable to us, while unrestricted testing might enable the Soviets to close the gap. In the words of Paul A. Nitze, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs:

> Overall, the trend, with unlimited testing, will be toward equality in major nuclear forces between the United States and the U.S.S.R. In the field of tactical forces, continued testing would permit the Soviet Union, in time, to match the more diversified, and presently more numerous U.S. nuclear arsenal * * * both sides might develop the pure fusion weapon which could be very much cheaper in nuclear material than present weapons and would free the U.S.S.R. from her dependence on fissionable material for weapons.

I suggest to my colleagues that the statement of this highly respected officer of the Department of Defense should be carefully weighed and studied.

Another reason for an effective test ban treaty is the contribution it might make toward limiting the spread of nuclear weapons. No informed supporter of a test-ban treaty is so ingenuous as to suppose that its adoption would be quickly followed by the adherence of France and China. It would, however, represent a significant step toward preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. It is in any case clear that in the absence of a test ban treaty there is little or no chance of preventing the acquisition of nuclear arsenals by other powers, including some which are hostile to the United States.

I emphasize that the proliferation of nuclear weapons is a threat to the security of the United States. It increases and intensifies the danger of accidental war.

A test-ban treaty with the indispensable provision for onsite inspection within the Soviet Union could have constructive effects in other areas of Soviet-American relations. Honestly and fairly administered, an inspection system would disprove Soviet allegations that inspection is a disguise for espionage. It might thus open the way to broader measures of disarmament in an atmosphere of reduced tensions. It might also serve to lessen the pathological secretiveness of the Soviet Union and thus, indirectly, to strengthen such movements as exist in Soviet society for freer communication and cooperation with the West in a number of fields.

Another reason why a test-ban treaty would advance our national interests is that it would eliminate the dangers, whatever they are, of nuclear fallout. Whether or not nuclear fallout is in fact a hazard to present and future generations—and the consensus of scientific opinion is that it is such a hazard—we are at the very minimum gambling with the lives and health of our progeny in allowing the atmosphere to be contaminated with nuclear debris. The issue, moreover, is one which bestirs worldwide agitation, complicating the relations of the United States with its friends all over the world.

The overriding interest of the United States in its relations with the Soviet Union is to demonstrate to that powerful nation that it cannot pursue a policy of aggression without bringing disaster upon itself and at the same time that if it abandons its ambitions for expansion, it has nothing to fear from the West. A test ban treaty would help demonstrate to the Russians that there are, from its point of view, acceptable alternatives to continuing conflict with the West and to an onerous arms race with unforeseeable consequences. This, after all, is at the very core of our national interest: to influence Soviet policy toward the modification and ultimate abandonment of those ambitions which threaten our own peace and security—and which, I might add, threaten their own survival.

TEST-BAN ADVANTAGES OUTWEIGH RISKS OF CHEATING

There are risks in a test-ban treaty—risks of secret Soviet preparations for renewed testing and risks of successful cheating on a small scale. We must recognize these risks, and discuss this subject as objectively and honestly as we can. We can cope with the first of these risks by maintaining our own capacity to renew testing with little delay should the Soviets violate the treaty.

As to the danger of secret undetected testing, it is the consensus of expert opinion that the risk—while it is there—is small, and that in any case it is extremely unlikely that the results of cheating could have an important effect on the military balance of power. The controlling consideration must be an objective weighing of the risks of a treaty against those of unrestricted testing. On the basis of available evidence, the balance is heavily in favor of a treaty, which, though not the panacea that overzealous advocates might contend, can nevertheless make a solid contribution to the peace and security of our country.

Thus far in the discussion we have heard primarily of the difficulties involved in a ban on further testing. Almost all of the criticism has been leveled at the possibility of cheating. The other alternative or risk has seldom been mentioned, namely, the risk of unrestricted nuclear testing, which would give the Soviet Union nuclear parity with the United States and would alter the balance of power.

As of this date, the balance of power is in our favor. The balance of power 5 years ago was even more in our favor. Ten years ago it was unmistakably in our favor. Had we been able to obtain a test-ban treaty 6 years ago, the Soviet Union today would be, for all practical purposes, a second-rate power.

But some of the criticisms leveled today against a test-ban treaty were leveled against the same basic proposal 6 or 8 years ago. I held hearings of the Disarmament Subcommittee on this subject. Time after time, year after year, I have heard exactly the same thing. Yet it is now an accepted fact that had the United States of America been able to get the Soviet Union to agree to stop nuclear testing 6 years ago, the Soviet Union would never have been able to equal the power of the United States, or even come close to it.

It is interesting to me that the Soviet Union never seems to want a test-ban agreement. I gather that I know why, because I have helped to negotiate with the delegates of the Soviet Union. I know their representatives. I have sat across the conference table from them. I know that they do not want a test ban agreement, because, had the Soviet Union agreed to such a test ban some years ago, the Soviet Union today would be a second-class military power as compared with the United States of America.

I make the charge and claim that the longer the unrestricted testing goes on, the more our security is imperiled, because unrestricted testing permits the Soviet Union to catch up—just as we have been able to gain on the Soviet Union in terms of outer space research.

Had the Soviet Union been able to get us to agree to no outer space research after they launched sputnik, where would we be today?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from Minnesota. It is obvious that a number of our colleagues do not. They have, well within their rights, made some rather strong statements in the press and on the floor of the Senate in opposition to a test-ban treaty. I wonder how the Senator would answer the contention they make—that there is an almost indefinite future in the proliferation of nuclear devices of destruction; that we are ahead, and in order to stay ahead, we must keep on testing. Is it not a fact that scientists think we are approaching the law of diminishing returns in what testing can yield in giving a further lead, and that the almost inevitable result of continued testing is that we have reached pretty nearly the ceiling of where we can profitably go, whereas the Soviet Union is almost certain to catch up? They are so far behind that they are almost certain to catch up, whereas we are so far ahead that it would be most difficult for us to maintain our lead.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would say that we have reached this stage in the nuclear contest, namely, that these two nations share the basic technology of nuclear weapon manufacture and use. The problem is the ratio of weight of such weapons to yield. The last series of Soviet tests, which were in the seventies, undoubtedly took the Soviet Union as close as any nuclear power has gone in this respect.

I am saying that once a country has arrived at a point where the basic knowledge of nuclear science is commonplace among the scientific community, and the technology of fabrication and nuclear production is also well known, and all that goes with the intricate apparatus of conducting nuclear tests has been developed, it is only a matter of a short time before that country is able to equal the achievements of even the most advanced power, because that country has moved beyond the immediate hurdles and obstacles and to nuclear development and testing.

Make no mistake about it—the Soviet Union has done a remarkable job of catching up, just as the United States has done a remarkable job in the case of space exploration and in many instances actually have surpassed the Soviet Union.

A few years ago we were talking from the highest councils of the United States about the missile gap. There came a time when the missile gap was not so big. Then there came a time when there was no gap. The reason why there was no gap was that we had gone ahead and were able to put tremendous efforts behind our missile program. Once we acquired the basic knowledge and technology, all that was needed was to put it all together. This is where we stand in the field of nuclear weapons development.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with what the Senator has said about the Soviet potential for catching up, but I call attention to what appears to be a reasonable assertion, that while they are moving forward, we shall be moving forward, too, and will therefore keep our lead. It is said that we must keep up testing in order to maintain our lead, and, for example, develop the neutron bomb.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that what the Senator has said is correct. The critics of the position held by the Senator from Minnesota, and I believe by the Senator from Pennsylvania, and by President Kennedy, President Eisenhower, and by the Government of this country since 1946——

Mr. CLARK. And by the Secretary of Defense, and by the Secretary of State, and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and by the Atomic Energy Commission—am I not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. The critics of the position of those who speak of the importance of a nuclear test ban treaty is that the only way for the United States to stay ahead is by keeping ahead, by testing and testing and testing.

The fact of the matter is that the nuclear gap is closed in terms of basic knowledge and know-how. I do not say the gap is completely closed. I do not believe that anyone can make that statement. I say it is much easier to shorten the gap as compared to a highly sophisticated position. However, when we reach the point where both nations have sophisticated science or nuclear technology, the gap has a tendency to close much more slowly; and it is then that it is advantageous for the leading nation to slow down in order to inhibit the progress of the second-place nation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The extent to which the gap closes will depend to a large extent on whether the power which is behind it is free to expend an enormous amount of treasure in closing the gap. If that power is bound by a treaty, the nation which is ahead has the advantage. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Those who have been responsible for the security of the Nation—Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, and the officers of the State Department, the Defense Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, and also the Atomic Energy Commission, in all three administrations—all have agreed to what we have said, namely, that if we are ahead, the time to obtain a test-ban treaty is now, when we are ahead.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PELL. I hope the Senator will explain in his speech, as he goes along, why, when each side has the power to demolish the other, it makes any difference whether it is done with sophisticated weapons or not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. As we proceed in this discussion I will point out that the treaty would not prohibit the development of an accurate missile. It would not prohibit defense research in electronics, which is so necessary. The Senator from Rhode Island has made it manifestly clear—and it is a matter which every citizen ought to know—that the Soviet Union and the United States—and we can add to that Great Britain and France—have enough atom bombs and hydrogen bombs to devastate the earth and destroy humanity. We have what is called an over-kill capability.

That is not what we are talking about. Some Americans are concerned—and I respect their concern—that we may not have the most modern weapons.

I will get to the neutron bomb shortly. This is one item that is constantly being brought up as an argument against a nuclear test ban.

If ever there was a subject in which the United States should have an interest, it is this bomb, because this is the poor man's bomb. We have invested in the high-cost bomb. If we want a world in which unlimited testing is permitted, the only sure way is not to have a treaty which prohibits testing. Then a moderately underdeveloped nation, with capable scientists, will develop the neutron bomb. That will mean that everything we have in stock will be immediately downgraded, or at least will lose some of its effective deterrent power.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I assume the Senator will deal in his speech with the charge, which I believe to be unfounded, that we need to continue testing in order to have a perfect antimissile missile.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

It would be a matter of national policy to maintain our atomic and nuclear laboratories. I wish to underscore that statement. We do not close up shop. We maintain a constant state of readiness.

It would be a matter of national policy to maintain in full operation our atomic and nuclear laboratories and to maintain full readiness for renewal of testing in case the Soviets or any other nation engages in secret testing. It would be necessary for our Government to maintain a state of readiness and to keep competent scientific talent on the job in our nuclear laboratories. This in itself would not prevent Soviet violation, but it would minimize or limit the possibility of the Soviets being able to gain any advantage as a result of a surprise abrogation of the treaty.

I warned two administrations to be constantly ready to test in case the Soviets, during the recent moratorium period, should violate the moratorium and start testing. I wrote to the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission 2 or 3 years ago, and again a year ago, and said, "Are you ready to test on a moment's notice in case the Soviets violate the moratorium?"

We can keep our laboratories and our testing facilities in a state of readiness, just as we do our Navy and Air Force. We can keep our scientists on the job in the laboratories, just as we keep our pilots on the job and alert for action. That is what a nuclear test-ban treaty would require.

The only real possibility of Soviet cheating is in the area of underground tests. The difficulties in the detection in outer space are greater than those in the atmosphere or under water. However, our Government has on two occasions expressed its willingness to sign a test-ban treaty in the environments of outer space, atmosphere, and under water without any international inspection or system of international control and verification. The problem area is in underground tests. It is because of the difficulties in detection and identification in underground testing that we have insisted upon a broad system of inspection and verification, including on-site inspection.

The test that would prove most useful to the Soviets and be of the greatest danger to the United States would not be a single test but rather a series; but a series of tests is more readily detectable. I shall refer to this at a later point in my remarks.

What we need to keep in mind, however, is the need for balancing of these risks of Soviet cheating against the advantages which would accrue to us from a test ban. It is the view of the responsible officials of this Government, the President and his chief military and foreign policy advisers that our national security is best protected by the conclusion of an effective test-ban agreement, despite the risk of cheating.

I repeat that whenever we have evidence of cheating we are released from the obligations of the treaty and could engage in nuclear testing on whatever scale we deem necessary.

The basic position of the United States at the Geneva disarmament negotiations, which I attended only recently, is that a treaty effectively banning nuclear weapons tests is a question of the utmost priority. A vital ingredient of this position, however, is that any system banning nuclear weapons tests must be subject to adequate verification. It must, to the greatest extent possible, be self-enforcing. Before any such treaty can be placed before the U.S. Senate for ratification, we must be certain—as must all parties to the treaty—that each signatory power is observing the provisions of the pact and is not testing nuclear weapons in secret.

Yesterday the President of the United States in his press conference repeated the position of the administration. I stated this very same thought as an observer at the Nuclear Test Conference in Geneva just 2 weeks ago. I was privileged to be there with Mr. William Foster, the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Mr. Foster was handling our negotiations in the 18-nation Disarmament Conference. I pay my respects to Mr. Foster. He did remarkable work, and gave an admirable performance. He was there to protect and to advance the security of the United States. But I should say that his position was not made any easier by the news stories constantly coming out of the United States that our position had changed or that we were going to yield on this point or yield on that point, or that the Senate would never ratify a treaty.

It is not very easy to be a negotiator for the United States when the U.S. negotiating position appears on the front pages of the newspapers 24 hours before he even has official notice of the Government's position.

It seems to me that somebody in this Government had better find out why there are so many leaks of highly confidential, highly sensitive information which is essential to the conduct of our negotiations with foreign powers.

When I attended the conference at Geneva, I knew the position of the Government and I knew what modification had taken place. I had to stand before delegate after delegate and deny that I had any special information, because our Government was not ready to present it at the negotiating table.

Nevertheless, newspapers in the United States published the U.S. position 24 hours before a single American delegate was permitted to acknowledge he had the information.

I talked with the Italian Ambassador, the Ambassador from Sweden, the Ambassador from Brazil, the Ambassador from Canada, and the Ambassador from the United Kingdom. Everyone of those ambassadors asked me, "Senator, we hear that your Government is now going to offer 7 on-site inspections instead of 8 to 10. Is this true?" I happened to know that it was true at that hour, but my Government had not permitted me to say it was true, because we were not yet ready to expose our position at the conference table. We wanted to get something in return before revealing our hand. But the story appeared the day before in the Washington Star, in the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune, and in the European edition of the New York Times.

Mr. President, one of our distinguished allied representatives later wrote to me saying, "Senator, you lied to me." But if I lied, I did so at the insistence of my Government. I was not there as a private citizen.

If anyone at the White House, or the FBI, or anywhere else, should read these remarks, I hope he will seek out the professional leakers instead of chasing down every alleged leftist under every sagebrush. Let us find out who are some of the citizens who cannot keep their mouths shut, when it comes to the official negotiating positions of the United States, merely for the sake of a headline.

Mr. President, that was a digression, but I wanted to get it off my mind early, simply because I felt so sorry for Mr. Foster. I repeat: the head of our delegation at Geneva did a remarkable job.

ADVANTAGES OF U.S. VERIFICATION PROPOSALS

Much of the controversy swirling around the test-ban question these days is precisely related to this all-important subject of verification. What is the verification system currently proposed by the United States? Is it an improvement upon our earlier proposals or does it detract from the safety of a test ban agreement? To what extent does this system correspond to recent scientific and technical advances in national detection capabilities? Is the U.S. verification proposal sufficiently reliable to justify the cessation—one would hope the permanent cessation—of a program of nuclear testing? What are the answers?

First of all, there are certain general features of the U.S. verification proposal which commend themselves on simple grounds of expediency. Not only does it provide convincing assurance that no power could get away with conducting a meaningful series of secret underground tests, but it would be considerably cheaper and less complicated than the system which we proposed back in 1958. Those critics who insist on our returning to the relatively more cumbersome position of 1958 should take this fact into consideration. The 1958 system—although the best that could be devised at the time—would not have provided timely protection against a violation of a test-ban agreement.

Some people have dwelt on our so-called concessions to the Soviet Union. I returned from Geneva on a jet plane of the newest design. It can carry more than 336,000 pounds. It can carry 80 tons of fuel. It can fly more than 16 hours nonstop. Its engines are much smaller than were the first jet engines. I suppose someone might say that this plane was unsafe; that concessions had been made because the engines were smaller than the ones which were in use 6 years ago. The engines may be smaller in size and weigh less, but they generate about 500 more horsepower. These planes are better; they are safer. Science has improved the technology of jet flight.

In like manner, science has improved the technology of the inspection and detection of seismic events.

There has been an improvement in seismographic implementation, in the capacity to detect.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Does not the Senator's argument go to this length: That those who make lists of alleged concessions in our position in the test-ban negotiations—12 separate concessions, one Senator pointed out on the floor a little while ago—are really missing the point of the argument, because these concessions, so-called—the word is inappropriate—are merely an acknowledgment of progress in the art of seismic detection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Pennsylvania is correct. We have made many "concessions" to the Soviet Union. We have put all our big battleships in mothballs. It is hard to imagine that the U.S.S. *Missouri*, the U.S.S. *South Dakota*, and the U.S.S. *Iowa*, mammoth 55,000-ton battleships, are now in mothballs. But no one to my knowledge has said that the Chief of Naval Operations has sold out the security of the United States by putting the battle fleet in mothballs.

It so happens that the Polaris missile, the submarine, the missile cruiser, the fast missile-firing destroyer, and the nuclear aircraft carrier are far superior to the old battlewagon. We have made no concession to the Soviet Union; we have made a concession to science; we have made a concession to technology.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not true that as recently as 5 or 6 or 7 years ago, there were only two really qualified seismic experts in the United States, and that we had no meaningful national system which could distinguish between an earthquake and a seismic explosion?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. But as the art has progressed, our country has constructed additional stations and has trained additional men in the art, so that as of today—with the exception of a very few persons in the scientific community, such as Dr. Teller—it is almost universally admitted that tests in the atmosphere and those under water and those in outer space can be detected without establishing within the Soviet Union any stations or means of control.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is entirely correct.

Let me point out that when the so-called Berkner report was prepared—and, by the way, it was conveniently "leaked" to many sources—I received a copy of it. I had it locked in the vault in my office. Members of the Disarmament Subcommittee had seen it; but I could not release it. When I wanted to speak on that subject in the Senate, all the material I needed was marked "secret." Finally, I served notice that, if need be, I would ask that the galleries be cleared, the doors to the Senate Chamber be closed, and the Sergeant at Arms guard the doors, and then I would disclose the report to the Senate under these extraordinary circumstances. The Berkner report provided considerable information which was needed in order to improve seismology.

As a result of that difficult and hard-fought battle, we were able to put millions of dollars into advance research programs for the improvement of seismographic instrumentation. It was planned to spend, over some 5 years, approximately $200 million to improve seismology. But unless some of us had stirred up a fuss, at that time, the Berkner report would have stayed in the archives, gathering dust. However, I am happy to say that we were able to flush the report out into the open.

Today, I have in my office, for my personal use, document after document which is labeled "secret." I am told, "Do not use it; just look at it." But when I wish to engage in debate with those who hold a different point of view on the issue of nuclear tests, and when I need the evidence—such as evidence on the Vela project or data on research by the Department of Defense, and particularly by the Air Force—I am told, "You cannot do that; it is secret." Mr. President, I do not know how one can possibly come to an understanding regarding this issue if all the evidence is labeled "secret."

Mr. President, the people of the United States are getting sick and tired about this so-called secrecy. We find that, despite such claims, most of the information we need finds its way into the newspapers, because most of the press know that the information does not need to be kept secret and indeed cannot be kept secret.

So I should like to have the Defense Establishment and other agencies declassify some of this information as quickly as the Atomic Energy Commission has declassified some of its information.

In 1958, when the amount of knowledge about detection was much less than it is today, United States and Soviet scientists thought it would be necessary to construct a totally new and elaborate international detection system around the globe, with some 180 control posts,

including some 19 in the Soviet Union. This system would have taken 4 to 6 years to install, would have required the hiring and training of scores of international technicians, and would have cost, according to reliable estimates, about $2 billion to build and several hundred million dollars a year to maintain.

Today, as a result of careful observation by an outside and distant detection system of seismic events in the Soviet Union, it has been ascertained that no new international system needs to be developed in order to detect events. This is a tremendous advance.

How accurately and how reliably can nuclear weapons tests be identified at the present moment? It is common knowledge that the United States, the Soviet Union, and other countries have highly effective systems of detecting and identifying nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, under water, and in outer space. That is the chief reason why I have called repeatedly for a separate agreement banning all tests in these environments, and why our Government has proposed such a treaty. We could detect and identify any Soviet violation of such a limited agreement through means currently available and in operation. We do not need to ask the Soviet Union or any other power for permission to "turn on the switch," so to speak, that will yield us this information. We never have. Indeed, I have just finished reading David Lilienthal's gripping account, delivered in a recent lecture series, of the measures taken by the United States, as far back as 1948 and 1949, to make sure that we knew when the Soviet Union exploded its first atomic fission device. I can assure you that our present-day detection capabilities are vastly improved over the relatively primitive air-sampling techniques of the late 1940's.

Of course, it is somewhat more difficult to detect Soviet tests in outer space than it is to detect tests above ground or under water. But even here we can rely upon a national detection system; the Soviet Union could not, I assure you Mr. President, conduct a militarily significant series of tests in outer space without our ascertaining it, not through one, but through several detection systems.

The Geneva talks have stuck on the problem of the detection and identification of underground tests. Underground tests below certain magnitudes or thresholds can be too easily confused with natural earthquakes. I do not blame the Members of Congress or the public for becoming confused by the ever-changing, abstruse arguments that often seem to becloud, rather than to clarify, the issues. On no other feature of a test ban has there been more heat and less light. Considerable light can be shed on it, however, if one simple proposition is kept in mind: With today's improved methods of detection and identification of seismic events, it is possible to reduce the paraphernalia of verification—that is, the number of detection stations and the number of onsite inspections—without increasing the vulnerability of the United States to a surprise violation by the Soviet Union of a test ban.

Mr. President, as set forth this morning in the Washington Post, President Kennedy is quoted as having said yesterday:

> We have suggested that we would not accept a test ban which did not give us every assurance that we could detect a series of tests underground. We would not submit a treaty which did not provide that assurance to the U.S. Senate. Nor would the Senate approve it.

Mr. President, we should make crystal clear the care with which we have proceeded in connection with these negotiations.

Indeed, the system as now devised would be extraordinarily effective in deterring the Soviet Union or any other power from attempting to violate the agreement. Combined with an unavoidable provision for onsite inspection of suspicious events on the territory of a country in which the event occurred, the verification system put forward by the United States and the United Kingdom fits the requirements of 1963.

Let us get down to brass tacks. If an event is detected in the Soviet Union, how does one determine whether the event is a nuclear explosion or some natural occurrence, such as an earthquake?

SUBSTANTIAL IMPROVEMENT IN DETECTION CAPABILITY

Senators will be interested to know that the ability of the United States to identify earthquakes in the Soviet Union has improved substantially over the past 5 years. It has improved to the extent that in any given year, after an analysis of all events—including their location—has taken place, only a few dozen at most remain completely unidentified and are likely to be more suspicious than others. Each of these unidentified events—earth movements—would be subject to inspection under the treaty proposed by the United States and Great Britain.

I have taken my job as chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament as a very serious and heavy responsibility. I would not address the Senate on the subject of the desirability of a nuclear test ban agreement unless I thought it was in our national interest to do so. I do not favor "concessions" that would in any way jeopardize our national security. Over the past 4 years this Senator has admonished negotiator after negotiator not to be so eager for a test ban agreement that we would in any way, knowingly or unknowingly, offer concessions which we might later regret. The security of our country is too important to be bargained with merely in order to reach an agreement with the Russians. Thus, every Member of this body should have a clear answer to this very important question: Just how good is the current U.S. system for detecting and identifying seismic events?

The Joint Atomic Energy Committee has just heard some revealing testimony on this very point by several witnesses, one of whom was Dr. Carl F. Romney, Assistant Technical Director of the Air Force Technical Applications Center.

Dr. Romney described how, as a major part of the Vela-Uniform program, the Defense Department constructed five very high quality detection stations in various parts of the United States. According to his testimony, the station at Fort Sill, Okla., appeared to be capable of detecting 90 percent of all magnitude 4 events at distances of 2,000 miles or more.

He said, "all magnitude 4 events" that is, a force equal to an explosion of about 1.8 kilotons. Two additional stations also appeared to have detection thresholds of about magnitude 4 for distant seismic events.

A third station, at McMinnville, Tenn., has a detection threshold near magnitude 4.5, and a station scheduled to become operational in April, at Payson, Ariz., is expected to have a detection threshold near magnitude 4.0. Then, after citing some less favorable results of the Vela research program, Dr. Romney made the following significant comments, which I wish to insert in the Record at this point without abridgment or alteration:

I remind Senators that Dr. Romney works for the Air Force. The Air Force has not received any Oscars for its work in the field of disarmament. And it is not supposed to. The Air Force has its own mission. I am not being critical of the Air Force. I am merely saying that Dr. Romney does not work in an environment that day after day would brainwash him in the quest for disarmament. He works in an environment that says, day after day, "Be on guard. Be alert, Doctor. Watch out."

What did Dr. Romney have to say? He said:

> From our improved knowledge of the detection thresholds of the large seismic research stations, and of the signals expected from underground nuclear explosions, we can determine the capabilities of various seismic detection systems. Based on all the information now available, we can conclude that it is feasible to design a detection system, based entirely outside the Soviet Union, which is capable of detecting explosions of about 1 kiloton in granite, 2–6 kilotons in tuff, and 10–20 kilotons in alluvium. This requires no new research. The primary requirement is to select the sites for these stations very carefully, at locations where the noise level is very low. This implies that the stations must be distant from cities, heavy industrial machinery, and other sources of manmade noise. Similarly, the stations must not be in coastal areas, in regions of high average wind velocity, or near other sources of natural noise.
>
> The system might consist of about 15 stations surrounding the Soviet Union, each equipped with arrays of 10–20 seismographs—similar to the equipment in our existing Vela research stations. Seismographs in deep wells could substitute for arrays in some locations. The existing Vela research stations could well form the nucleus for such a system. Additional stations in Europe and Asia would be essential, however. We believe that existing mobile seismographic stations could be placed in such foreign locations within a few months, and replaced with permanent stations having the full capability indicated within 2–3 years. The stations would each cost about $1 million. There would, of course, be additional costs for operating the stations and for analyzing the data. Tentative estimates indicate that the system might require an annual operating budget on the order of $10 million.

Let us be clear about the fact that the United States now has the capability of detecting essentially seismic events in the Soviet Union which would be equivalent to a magnitude of 4.0 on the unified scale for measuring the size of earthquakes. Although tests in "soft" alluvium give the smallest signals—far smaller than tests in hard rock—high-yield tests in alluvium would probably form craters which would be detectable by onsite inspection. Moreover, the U.S. system is capable of detecting some seismic events below the presumed "threshold," so that no nation could be sure that its clandestine tests would go undetected. Uncertainty, I might add, is a powerful deterrent to the would-be perpetrator of any kind of mischief.

I add, Mr. President, that when my colleagues read the secret reports and read what the senior Senator from Minnesota has said, they should also read the material from which I drew this conclusion.

I wish especially to bring to my colleagues' attention what I have just stated, so I repeat the sentence: "Moreover, the U.S. system is capable of detecting some seismic events below the presumed 'threshold,' so that no nation could be sure that its clandestine tests would go undetected."

That is a masterpiece of understatement. The fact is that our detection capability is much greater than the press has led us to believe on the basis of the information it has received from the U.S. Government.

Moreover, the excavation of large holes for the purpose of conducting tamped explosions in alluvium is both expensive and difficult to conceal. The excavation of a smaller hole to obtain decoupling in a hard medium is more feasible logistically, but it too suffers from a major disadvantage: namely, that underground cheating of this type might allow a country to get away with one test, but it would not allow the undetected conduct of a whole series of tests. A nation bent on violating a nuclear test ban for military purposes would almost certainly want to conduct a series of tests—particularly if there had been a long period of nontesting by the nuclear powers, such as in the years preceding the unilateral violation of the nuclear test moratorium by the Soviet Union in 1961.

UNITED STATES OVERESTIMATED SOVIET EARTHQUAKES

In addition to improving our ability to identify earthquakes in the Soviet Union, the United States has found that the number of earthquakes in the Soviet Union of a certain magnitude is much lower than was originally expected. In fact, it is at least 2½ times lower than we had earlier calculated. When the question came up at Geneva, the Soviet representatives tried to tell the United States that we were exaggerating the number of earthquakes that took place in the U.S.S.R. but we refused to believe them.

I ask unanimous consent to place at this point in the RECORD two tables entitled "Annual Numbers of Earthquakes in Territory of the U.S.S.R." which were submitted by Dr. Carl Romney of the Air Force, on March 5 in testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNUAL NUMBERS OF EARTHQUAKES IN TERRITORY OF THE U.S.S.R.

(Focal depth less than 60 kilometers)

TABLE 1.—*1960 estimates* [1]

Yield (kilotons) explosions in tuff	Numbers of earthquakes larger than given explosion		
	Estimated minimum	Best estimate	Estimated maximum
2	225	(450)	900
5	110	(216)	430
19	50	(97)	195
40	25	(55)	110
80	20	(36)	70

[1] Based on Rand Corp. study. AFTAC estimates 25 percent higher.

TABLE 2.—*1962 estimates*

Approximate yield (kilotons)			Numbers of earthquakes larger than given explosion		
Explosions in granite	Explosions in tuff	Explosions in alluvium	Estimated minimum	Best estimate	Estimated maximum
1	2-6	10-20	125	(170)	250
2	5-15	35-70	55	(78)	110
10	19-(?)	70-150	25	(39)	55
20	40-(?)	~200	17	(24)	35
40	80-(?)	~400	11	(16)	22

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the first table is based on 1960 estimates of the Rand Corp. The second table consisting of 1962 estimates, of the number of earthquakes in the U.S.S.R., represents, in Dr. Romney's words, "a new systematic study of the seismicity of the Soviet Union." The study was conducted since the beginning of the test ban negotiations and particularly since the beginning of the Vela research program. The 1962 results are believed to be, according to Dr. Romney, a "substantial improvement over all earlier estimates." In fact, the later estimates prove that we previously overestimated seismicity in the Soviet Union, and they make us look disingenuous, to say the least.

That word "disingenuous" is a nice, polite way of saying that it looks as though we did not know what we were talking about.

It should be noted that the Commission on Seismology of the Soviet Academy of Sciences published a book in 1961, entitled "Earthquakes in the U.S.S.R.," which confirms most of our later estimates for the regions of the U.S.S.R., except for estimates of low-magnitude events in the Far East region, which is highly prone to earthquake activity.

In other words, our estimates in 1960 were wrong. The Soviet estimate was correct. Dr. Romney now says that we were from 2½ to 3 times wrong. So, when someone comes around now to say, "You are proposing fewer onsite inspections now than you proposed 2 years ago, and this represents a concession to the Soviet Union," we should say, "2 years ago the number of onsite inspections we were proposing was related to the unidentified seismic events in the Soviet Union which, according to our calculations, were from 200 to 300 percent larger than we now know them to have been."

In other words, we were wrong. When a person finds out he is wrong, he ought to admit it. We have admitted it. We have therefore reduced the number of onsite inspections we thought were necessary in the light of the reduced estimate of unidentified seismic events in the Soviet Union. This is a matter of science, not of polemics. This is a matter of scientific technology, not of oratory.

Mr. President, the book "Earthquakes in the U.S.S.R." was not available to us until the summer of 1962, but the point is that generally speaking it bears out earlier Soviet assertions; it does not bear out our own. In the words of Dr. Romney before the joint committee on March 5:

> The importance of the research described above is that we can now conclude with high confidence that there are fewer natural earthquakes in the Soviet Union equivalent in size to a given underground nuclear explosion detonated under Hardtack II coupling conditions than had been previously estimated. Considering only this factor, one can also conclude that there will be fewer unidentified events as large as or larger than such explosions than had previously been thought.

In identifying underground events in the Soviet Union as part of the verification system to monitor a test ban agreement, the U.S. position gains from the fact that earthquakes occur in very limited areas in the U.S.S.R. About 80 percent of all earthquakes—earthquakes which might be confused with nuclear explosions—in the Soviet Union occur in the extreme eastern areas of the country, that is, in the Kamchatka peninsula or in the Kurile Islands. If

---

the Soviets attempted to test in the Kurile Islands, they would be subject to observation either from neighboring countries or from aircraft or ships in international lanes or waters nearby. The Soviets could find it somewhat easier, I must say, to cheat in the Kamchatka Peninsula, but this area is extremely rugged, and effective testing would be extremely difficult. The more difficult it is to attempt to cheat, the more likely it is that the cheating will be detected, if not always by seismic instruments, then almost certainly by normal methods of intelligence.

We have more than one way of detection. We do not rely entirely on seismographs. We have electronic equipment. We have acoustical equipment. There is atmospheric analysis. There are onsite observations. There are many ways of inspection and detection.

Almost all of the remaining earthquakes in the Soviet Union occur in a small part of the area near the southern border in the central part of the country—in a region known as the Pamir Mountain area. This is also rugged country, but nuclear testing in the Pamirs is at least a feasible proposition.

When all of these factors governing the identification of underground events are analyzed, that is, first, those that can be identified positively or partially as earthquakes, using various kinds of seismic indicators; second, those that occur in exposed geographical areas or in rugged terrain; and, third, those that occur in areas more subject to certain intelligence detection methods; there are at most only a couple of dozen or so each year that are sufficiently suspicious as to require inspection for adequate verification.

I use that rather clumsy phrase, "a couple of dozen," because the cloak of secrecy demands that I cannot say to this Senate what we know. So I say to Senators, "Take a guess."

I have never heard of a more inappropriate phrase to convey scientific evidence than "a couple of dozen," but this is the parlance of the current discussion of seismic events and detection and inspection under a nuclear test ban treaty.

The number of unidentified events is important, as many of my colleagues know, because there should be a reasonable relationship between the number of such events and the number of inspections to be permitted. If no events were unidentified, then no inspections would be needed. But with some events unidentified, some inspection is necessary. It is not necessary to inspect all unidentified events. What is necessary is to be able to inspect some unidentified events—at our choice, at our selection—in order to deter a nation from attempting to cheat by testing secretly. As any undergraduate statistician knows, you can learn more from a sample than you can from a minute examination of a large volume of data. The secret is to select the right sample. This problem has been largely solved in my opinion, if the current United States-United Kingdom proposal for verification procedures, supplemented by onsite inspection, is accepted as the basis for a test ban agreement.

This question of the identification of underground events has become of such interest to my colleagues and others that I have requested the administration to make available to the public the abovementioned 5-year study of the detection and identification of underground events in the Soviet Union. This covers the period from 1958 through 1962 and it shows precisely how many events were detected, and the ways in which they can be judged to be identified in varying degrees, and the geographical areas in which they occur. This study shows clearly why the number of inspections and the number of detection stations can be reduced without in any way diminishing the effectiveness of verification. In the words of a competent administration official in whom I repose the highest confidence, the major conclusion of this 5-year analysis is that the present capability of the United States to detect and identify seismic events is so effective that primary reliance should be placed by the United States on this system, or its equivalent, to monitor a test ban agreement.

I digress for a moment to state when the Air Force wanted to prove that the Skybolt was what was needed to supplement our defense posture, newspaper stories were spread all over the United States saying what a marvelous weapon it was, even though later the President of the United States had to tell the American people it was "off target," that it was not all the Air Force said it was. But the Air Force wanted to publicize it, and they used it to shoot the President out of his negotiating chair at Nassau.

But when it comes to the issue of advances in seismology, we are handcuffed. I will abide by the law, but I do not like it. I have said to the President and to those responsible for our position on nuclear tests that the American people need to know the facts. Tell the American people of our detection system. Tell them what we have. We are always telling them what a big bomb we have. Tell them what a good detection system we have. I do not say it is foolproof or perfect. I merely say the results in 3 years of research are phenomenal, and I challenge anyone to prove the contrary.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am about to make a statement which may be provocative. Perhaps my friend will not agree, but I shall make it, anyway.

Not too many months ago President Dwight D. Eisenhower warned this country about the power of the military-industrial complex in our economy and in our political life. I think that warning was well justified. I share the concern of my friend that the industrial-military complex in this country is such an effective agent for promoting expenditures in the defense system, in the interest, really, of keeping the arms race going, that they blanket the press with propaganda that they want to give to the American public, in the interest of why we are for tests. The other position is not given to the American public, and we are led to believe, by columnist after columnist, by scientists, even by Senators, that those who seek a test ban treaty seek something that is dangerous to our security, and that no patriotic American would dare to stand up for an agreement which the Senator from Minnesota and I know would be a sensible agreement for the President to propose to this body. I noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by Dr. Teller warning against a Munich-type agreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure all those who feel that way that only a few weeks ago I sat across the table from the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, who is fighting against this test ban agreement. He is a real patriot. His name is Vasily Kuznetsov. His partner was Mr. Semyon Tsarapkin. I had lunch with them. I spent day after day with them. They are as firmly opposed to a test ban guarantee as anyone could be. They would seem to fit the definition of "patriot."

I do not contest the patriotism of any Member of this body. I may question his judgment. He has a right to question mine. Frankly, many Members of this body feel strongly in opposition to our test ban policy. Possibly they have not read the secret material. Perhaps they have access to some secret material I do not have. There is so much secret material, particularly in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, that it is pretty hard for an ordinary Senator to get in there. That is the trouble with secrecy. We get so secret that we do not dare to talk among ourselves or think for ourselves. But I have read a good many secret documents, and I am going to read some more in my capacity as a U.S. Senator. I am a member of this Government. I have all the clearance anyone can possibly have. I intend to be able to discuss the relevant portions of this "classified" information, at least in terms of their general conclusions.

For months I have wanted to release a document showing that the industrial leaders of our country favor disarmament; that the industrial leaders of 365 of the largest corporations of this country have demonstrated that we could enter into a disarmament agreement without any serious domestic economic impact. The report cannot be released. It is labeled "confidential." The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will not release it. Some Members fear that something in it will help the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union has all the economic data on the United States that it needs. It can obtain such data from weekly publications, from trade literature, or from the Government Printing Office. Corporations are required to publish their balance sheets. There is no problem about obtaining that kind of information.

But I will tell the Senate that the United States of America and certain other free countries are the only countries that have been able to disarm and have prosperity. The Soviet Union has never disarmed. It has been a police state. It has been a military camp since 1917. Military preparations and the arms race are an integral part of the economic life of a totalitarian dictatorship. But civilian and peaceful production are a part of the life and core of a free country. Yet I could not obtain my colleagues' consent to join me in releasing that document.

Mr. President, I wish to give my colleagues in the Senate an example of what we can do under our national detection system. Again I must say that I can reveal only a part of the relevant information. I ask my colleagues in the Senate to read this 5-year analysis of Soviet seismicity in the privacy of their offices and then to lock it up again.

In 1960 it was estimated that there would be over a 100 earthquakes in the U.S.S.R. annually of magnitude 4.75, which would be about equal to a 20-kiloton explosion detonated in a relatively soft rock, called tuff. According to our scientists at that time, even several international seismic stations installed on Soviet territory could not guarantee that more than a small percentage of these events could be positively identified as earthquakes in accordance with criteria specified in the treaty.

Actual experience since 1960, however, has demonstrated that these estimates were far too generous. In other words, wrong. The number of such seismic events which occurred over a 12-month period in the Soviet Union was reduced by a factor approaching 3. This was considered to be an average year in terms of seismic activity in the Soviet Union. Of the few events which occurred, still fewer—only a quarter to a third—gave no seismic evidence of being an earthquake. Moreover, the United States has the ability to detect and identify these seismic events without using any information from stations in the Soviet Union.

Basing our position on the estimates subsequently discovered to have been erroneous, we proposed 12 to 20 inspections a year in the Soviet Union. Today, having sharply downgraded our estimates of unidentifiable events in the Soviet Union, we are proposing seven inspections.

Our position today is tougher and stronger than it was in 1960 or earlier. I want my friends in the Senate and those who may listen to or read what I have to say to understand this. In 1960, when we were talking about 12 to 20 onsite inspections—and this was under the previous administration—we were working on the assumption that the number of earthquakes in the Soviet Union, or unidentified events in the Soviet Union, was two and a half to three times larger than we later determined them to be. The 1962 estimates of seismic events in the Soviet Union show them to be one-third to one-fourth of what we assumed in 1960. In 1960 we said that we could get by with 12 to 20 inspections. That was President Eisenhower's position.

That number of seismic events is now reduced from 20 to 7. We are no worse off now. In fact, our position is stronger and firmer than it was 3 years ago. We have made no concession. That is what the Soviet Union keeps telling us. The Soviet delegates pointed out quite clearly, "The United States is not making a concession. The only concession you have made is that you must now admit you were wrong about the number of seismic events in the Soviet Union."

I hasten to add, however, that there are many unidentified events in the U.S.S.R. below the magnitude of 4.75. I believe this number to be between 30 or 40, as I have said. But in 1960–61 the previous administration was willing to forgo inspecting any of these events for a 3-year period and at the same time was willing to participate in a moratorium whereby we gave our word not to test such small weapons.

I am not being critical of that position. This is a matter of history. I believe that President Eisenhower knew how to protect the security of this country. I do not believe anyone can question his patriotism. I do not believe anyone can question the patriotism of John Foster Dulles. I do not think anyone can question Allen Dulles' patriotism, or the patriotism of the former Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gates, or others. They are all patriots. They were perfectly willing to forgo inspecting any of these events below magnitude 4.75. Today we are proposing that all detected but unidentified events be eligible under an agreed-upon quota of inspections. This would include even the small events which were apparently of so little concern to us in 1960 and 1961. For example, in the 5-year study I have referred to—that is, the study which is still secret—the number of detected events was—and this is a very round number—100 in the low year and around 300 in the highest year. The range includes even some detected events which were the equivalent of tests in the subkiloton range.

Under present thinking, inspections would be conducted in the Soviet Union by non-Soviet personnel, although the United States has proposed that Soviet observers could accompany an inspection mission. The area to be inspected would be limited and would be located by using the records of the detected event from at least four detection stations. Under this procedure the Soviets could not legally circumvent an inspection. However, if the United States called for an inspection and the Soviet Union flatly refused, this would be a blatant violation of the treaty—just as it would be if the Soviets had been caught in the act of a secret test. If it wished, the United States could then withdraw from the treaty and renew testing.

SUMMARY OF U.S. POSITION ON VERIFICATION

To summarize: The verification system proposed for a test ban treaty contains two basic elements: first, stations operated and supervised by United States-United Kingdom nationals to detect events in the Soviet Union, and, second, a quota of inspections to investigate those few underground events that are thought to be highly suspicious. Finally, as supplementary to the system being operated by the United States and the United Kingdom, records from other stations would be available; first, some automatic recording seismic stations in the Soviet Union which would contain sealed records and which would be serviced and picked up a few times a year by non-Soviet personnel—these are what is sometimes referred to as the "black boxes"; second, some stations in countries bordering on the United States and U.S.S.R., and, third, some stations in the United States and U.S.S.R., the records of which would be submitted to each party for analysis.

These stations are supplementary, not essential elements of the verification system. Records from such stations could not be used to deny an inspection. But they would give us greater confidence regarding which events were more suspicious than others. And they would definitely reduce the number of unidentified events.

ANSWERS TO SPECIFIC CRITICISMS

Some of my colleagues have raised specific questions about the U.S. test ban position. These questions have been discussed in my remarks, but in order to pinpoint answers to specific questions I shall review the major questions and give specific answers.

First, it is argued that the United States should not enter into a test ban agreement because we should develop the neutron bomb, a bomb which is free from fission products.

Now what is the answer to this claim: The main interest of the United States in the neutron bomb is in preventing the Soviet Union and other countries from developing it. That is our first interest. The test ban agreement would prevent the development of such a weapon. The neutron bomb, if it can be developed, would be more useful to countries which did not have already a heavy stockpile of high cost nuclear weapons, because the neutron bomb would be cheaper. The Soviets and other countries are more likely to obtain a neutron bomb with continued testing than under an agreement, because with no inhibitions on testing nuclear weapons, nuclear technology is more likely to spread. The neutron bomb may be technically feasible to develop and produce. But the United States has such a large stockpile now of various kinds of nuclear bombs and nuclear warheads that there is no great military need for this weapon. And in terms of obtaining a pure neutron bomb, this is considered extremely difficult, next to impossible, to develop.

It is difficult. I do not believe it is impossible to do anything. If one is talking about a bomb with fewer fission products involved, the United States has already made substantial advances in this field. The point I wish to make is that we do not need to test and develop a neutron bomb. We already have a huge stockpile of highly sophisticated bombs—strategic and tactical nuclear weapons—and the neutron bomb can be developed only by means of tests. It would be to the advantage of the Soviet Union, which has fewer resources than

we have and fewer quantities of fissionable material than we have, to develop the neutron bomb.

Second. It is argued we need to continue to test in order to perfect an antimissile missile.

The answer: This is not correct. The perfection of the antimissile does not rest primarily on nuclear weapons tests. It rests primarily on other kinds of activities such as reliability of guidance, distance, performance, electronics. In addition, the nation sending a missile to its target has the advantage over the nation trying to erect a defense against such a missile. The efforts to build antimissile missiles and then to build better missiles to counteract antimissile missiles is a sure way to add another $20 to $25 billion to the Nation's armament effort, which we will do in the absence of any agreements to curtail such weapons.

I have heard several speeches today about how we could reduce our defense budget. I have read in the press how our defense budget could be reduced to $3 billion. We will not be able to cut our defense budget by getting into a race to see who can build an antimissile missile to intercept a missile, in order that we can build another antimissile missile to intercept a new missile. If, as we are told, we already have the best missile system, the largest number of missiles with the highest degree of accuracy, and the largest supply of nuclear weapons, it seems to me that it is in our interest to stop testing. I, for one, would rather see effective agreements to stop this constantly spiraling arms race than to see both the United States and U.S.S.R. exhaust their economies in such efforts, which will give neither an absolute military advantage.

Third. It is argued that the Soviet Union has already perfected the antimissile missile by test. There has been no demonstration of such a capability. We have no such information. Furthermore, an antimissile missile knocking down an incoming missile launched under ideal conditions for being intercepted is not proof of an anti-missile-missile capability under wartime, surprise attack conditions. It is not an adequate demonstration that an effective anti-missile-missile system has been developed.

Fourth. It is argued that we need to continue to test to develop bigger weapons in order to overcome such obstacles as antimissile missiles or missiles hardened in the ground. It is argued that we need to test to develop more tactical nuclear weapons to use in limited war situations. It is argued we need to test to reduce the weight of a given yield of nuclear warheads of specific missiles. My answer to such assertions is that as long as there is an arms race, the United States must stay in it and build a military force strong enough to deter the Soviets from starting a nuclear or massive conventional war. But our objective is to limit the Soviets and to slow them down, not merely to keep adding to our stockpiles. It is our stated goal as a nation, as a government, as a Congress, and as a people to end this mad arms race under adequate safeguards.

President Kennedy made this clear in one of the greatest Presidential speeches in our history—his speech at the United Nations in 1961 entitled "The Peace Race."

Fifth. It it is argued that if the Soviets cheat on an agreement to stop testing they can force the United States into surrendering completely to the Communists. That is poppycock. I do not think it even requires an argument. This is utterly false and ridiculous. In the first place, it would be difficult for the Russians to conduct even one clandestine test without considerable risk. In the second place, it would be extremely difficult to cheat on a series of tests, which is what any violator would want to do to attempt to gain a military advantage. In the third place, our Defense Department believes that no amount of cheating under the kind of verification system being proposed by the United States, and now in operation, could alter the strategic military balance.

Sixth. It is argued that the verification system proposed by the United States is less effective than that proposed previously. In many ways the verification system is more effective, given the advances made in the art and science of detection and identification of weapons tests and events which might be confused with weapons tests. The verification system would come into operation sooner than the ones previously proposed. The system would be operated or supervised by United States-United Kingdom nationals and, therefore, would not have to await the training of a new corps of technicians. The system detects underground events in the Soviet Union and identifies them better than was estimated in any previous control system proposed.

Seventh. It is argued that the verification system is weaker because it does not include stations on Soviet territory. The United States no longer needs internationally manned detection stations on Soviet territory, because our ability to detect and identify makes this unnecessary. However, the United States and the U.S.S.R. have both proposed as a supplement to the basic verification system that automatic recording stations for increased detection and identification of underground events be installed on each other's territory. The sealed instruments and records of these would be picked up and serviced, respectively, by personnel who are not nationals of the territory on which the stations were located. The United States, as I have said, has proposed seven such stations; the U.S.S.R. has proposed three.

Eighth. It is argued that the number of inspections being proposed by the United States is not adequate. The number of inspections is adequate when one compares the number with the total number of events in the Soviet Union that would be highly suspicious. At one time the United States proposed to have 12 to 20 inspections when it thought there might be as many as 70 to 100 unidentified underground events equal to a 19-kiloton explosion. At the same time we proposed not to inspect for 3 years any event which was below this size. In other words, for a 3-year period we were willing to forgo inspection altogether for all small underground tests. And we were proposing to inspect roughly 1 out of 5 unidentified events above the equivalent of 19 kilotons.

Today we are proposing that all unidentified events be subject to inspection—no more moratorium; no threshold—even though we presumably are not worried about small tests any more than we were then. We simply think this provides greater deterrence to a cheater. As to large seismic events, the number of those that are really most suspicious, that is, that give no indication of being an earthquake, number only about a dozen, as compared with the previous estimate of from 70 to 100. We can easily maintain the same ratio of inspections to number of events and have some inspections left over for the smaller events.

I repeat: Our present inspection system is an advance over what we proposed in other days. Recently—in fact, in this morning's Washington Post—a letter to the editor by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] raised some new arguments. Among other things it was said that the United States had abandoned the cardinal principle of adequate onsite inspection and control. The United States has not abandoned this principle. In fact, we are so wedded to this principle that we have insisted on an adequate number of onsite inspections. These inspections would be conducted whenever it was felt that an unidentified event should be investigated to see whether it might be a nuclear explosion. So the principle has been preserved and is being preserved.

It has been stated that the United States position now gives the Soviet Union a veto on a control body for a test ban treaty. The Soviet Union would have no veto over the conduct of an inspection. This has never been proposed. What has been proposed since 1959 is that the three permanent members of the control commission—the U.S.S.R. the United Kingdom, and the United States—must agree on the total budget for a control system. But the United States has always maintained that there could not be a veto over individual items in the budget. We have tightened up rather than conceded. The United States would pay for its own detection stations and its own participation in onsite inspections. We would not rely on a tripartite arrangement.

This position has not changed since 1959. What has changed, however, is that the control body would not have the same degree of authority under the verification system now proposed by the United States. The United States would pay for its own detection stations, and it would pay for its own participation in onsite inspection. We would not rely on a tripartite arrangement. Therefore, any control commission over a test ban treaty would not have authority over this expenditure. In this sense, the current U.S. test ban position gives a greater degree of flexibility to the United States than under previous positions.

I know about this, because it is one point about which the Soviet delegates became very angry when it was presented to them. When we reduced our required number of onsite inspections from 8 to 7, we also tightened up on the method of inspection, the question of the composition of the inspection team, of access to the site of the inspection, of the duration of the inspection, and, finally, of the analysis of the data yielded by the inspection.

Mr. President, I am not discussing a theoretical subject; neither is my discussion presented on the basis of an argument with several Senators. For hours I sat across the table from one of the most able and determined men I have ever met, the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Kuznetsov. He was educated in the United States, and has lived 30 years in the United States. He speaks English well. He knows America well. He is tougher than steel—his name means literally "Blacksmith"—and he is highly competent. He represents his country brilliantly. He knew what we were doing. If Senators do not know what the Government of the United States is proposing, I assure them that they can find it out from Mr. Kuznetsov. When we reminded him—because we wanted to retain a negotiating position—that we wanted to preserve an area of agreement, he reminded us that we were toughening our position and were making it more difficult. He was a good deal more correct than were some of our critics in the United States.

Ninth. It has been stated that Mr. Foster, before hearings of the Stennis subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, testified that there had been no significant breakthrough or advancement in our ability to identify events in the Soviet Union. This is a quotation taken completely out of context. The quotation referred to is a follows:

> Mr. Kendall. I was glad you made it clear, Mr. Foster, that it is important that we make a distinction between our ability to detect and our ability to identify whether an event is nuclear or nonnuclear. I believe you said, if I understand you correctly, that there had been no significant breakthrough or advancement of our ability to identify. Is that correct?
>
> Mr. Foster. That is correct.

This has been taken out of context, because the quotation refers to an earlier question in those hearings by the counsel to the subcommittee, which was "Do I understand that you are saying that we do not significantly increase our ability to detect or identify by having stations on Russian soil as opposed to not having them on Russian soil?" Mr. Foster's response, "I said that we did not significantly increase our ability to identify," refers only to the difference between having stations on Soviet soil or not having them on Soviet soil. This point then proves the opposite—that one can have an effective system without having internationally manned stations on the territory of the Soviet Union. The United States ability to identify events in the U.S.S.R. from a distant network of stations has definitely increased, as studies made by the executive branch have shown, and which I have referred to earlier. Just to repeat one example: In 1960 and 1961, we were proposing 12 to 20 inspections, when we thought the number of unidentified events equal to a 19-kiloton explosion were 70 to 100. But today we know that the number of events that would not be in any way identified using seismic indicators is not 70 to 100, but is closer to 12. This is one example of our increased ability to identify events in the Soviet Union.

It is contended that we need to develop the neutron bomb, because the nation that has such a bomb can "destroy opposing armies without risk of fallout or damage to the property of friend or foe." As I have stated, it is difficult to know whether such a pure fusion bomb can be developed, and, even if it could be developed, to know whether this would in any significant degree alter the balance of power. But, perhaps even more important, if the United States had the neutron bomb and if the Soviet Union did not, how much comfort would it be to us to be able to use fallout-free weapons on the Soviet Union, when the response of the Soviet Union would consist of nuclear bombs, dropped on our people, which would have radioactive fallout. Is this development the comfort that the proponents of the neutron bomb wish to make it? Let not anyone pretend that either the United States or the Soviet Union has such power that it could devastate the other with nuclear weapons, without being devastated in return.

My position is that our present nuclear stockpile is an adequate deterrent, unless testing continues. If testing continues, we cannot tell what will happen.

It is claimed that the test ban policies pursued by the Eisenhower and the Kennedy administrations have cost the United States a lead in nuclear weaponry. Actually it would have been more in the U.S. interest if a nuclear test ban treaty could have been achieved in 1958 and 1959. It would have been better to have stopped nuclear developments at that point in time, rather than to have the current situation, in which there is no treaty and both the United States and the Soviet Union have conducted several additional tests. Both administrations have recognized realistically that no disarmament or nuclear test ban agreement would be without risks. President Eisenhower stated on more than one occasion the view that it would be better to proceed with an agreement which involved some risks, rather than to drop all hope of any agreement at all. Let me quote some previous statements of President Eisenhower. I shall refer to statements made at a news conference on October 15, 1958—long before we had a detection system as good as the one we have now.

> Well, as you are going smaller, you are obviously posing less danger than is inherent in one of the big bombs. But the technicians were trying to establish a system that would work for all practical purposes, I mean a technical system. They were technically advising.
>
> Now, to get 100 percent of perfection in this kind of a thing would unquestionably demand mechanisms, organisms, agencies and men of really very, very large size, and I think that you could come to the old law of diminishing returns, that you just put too much to gain too little. I really believe that they feel there is little danger in the kind of a thing which you are talking about.

These are news conference remarks of President Eisenhower on June 17, 1959:

> We would be foolish if we expect 100 percent from any system.

Of course, he was referring to a detection and control system.

Then he said:

> There is no system, whether it be defensive or detection or intelligence or planning or anything else, that is 100 percent perfect. What we have to do is to refine the process to the point where we minimize risks and indeed bring them down below the level where they could be truly dangerous to the country.

The arms race, including nuclear testing, is buying the United States less security than we would have with effective arms control and disarmament agreements, one of which would be an effective treaty banning nuclear weapons tests.

The position of the United States at this time is a position that has been carefully developed by all of the interested agencies of the Government, and it is supported by those agencies—the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of State, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, all of which have responsibilities in the field of our national security. All support the U.S. position now being advanced, and each of these agencies has participated thoroughly in all aspects of that position. Furthermore, it is a position that is basically similar to the position taken by the previous administration. Therefore, this is a nonpartisan position, and one that should command the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

BENEFITS OF PUBLIC DISCUSSION

Mr. President, I have clearly indicated that I welcome public discussion of the pros and cons of a test ban, even if not all of the arguments advanced appeal to me either rationally or emotionally. This is a question on which honorable men can differ honorably. The important thing is for the Congress to be informed and for the Senate to fulfill its constitutional role as a partner of the executive branch in the determination of our foreign policy. I believe the present discussion is contributing to this end.

No one, I hope, will jump to conclusions about my own position. I do not advocate a nuclear test ban for the sake of a test ban alone. I do not support the United Nations just because I believe in the brotherhood of man. I support these goals and this institution because in my view they can be of positive benefit to the United States. Never has the Senator from Minnesota uttered a word advocating the slightest weakening or diminishing of our national defense posture. I have always said that disarmament or arms control is the other side of the coin of national defense. Without the capacity for self-defense, we could

not long survive in the world of today. In the world of tomorrow we may find that the arms race itself has become the principal threat to our national existence. In anticipation of that day, in full cognizance of the need for safeguards, I have taken the floor to urge that Senators give thoughtful consideration to the factors involved in a test ban agreement. I can assure Senators that if the issue is decided on the basis of emotion, rather than reason, we shall inflict a self-administered defeat upon the United States.

In the preceding remarks, I have suggested that no aspect of the test ban question should be dodged or neglected by the Congress. The relevant committees and subcommittees should delve with meticulous care into the complex technical, military, strategic, and policy questions which are involved. Nor should this question be approached except from the standpoint of United States national interest. This has been my guiding principle. That is why I have welcomed the current hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and am looking forward to the hearings reportedly planned by my colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Preparedness.

CONFUSING DIVERSITY OF TEST BAN HEARINGS

Yet the very diversity of these hearings, Mr. President, brings me to what is perhaps the major point of my remarks today. Is it necessary, is it in the national interest, is it in the interest of Senate efficiency and productivity, that a matter which falls under the jurisdiction of three separate Senate committees be handled by each of them separately with no means of coordination? Are we not unnecessarily muddying the waters, thoughtlessly confusing the public, and heedlessly stirring up passions and rivalries among ourselves by adopting this procedure?

There was a time, Mr. President, when disarmament and arms control was considered to be a fit subject for joint consideration by the representatives of the three committees most directly involved in national security policy. I am speaking of the years 1955 to 1958, when the special Disarmament Subcommittee under my chairmanship consisted of representatives of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Armed Services Committee, and the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. Several members of this joint subcommittee served on more than one of the parent committees, thus permitting a high degree of continuity and a maximum of intercommittee coordination. It was possible then to synthesize conflicting viewpoints. At that time there was no question but that matters pertaining to a nuclear test ban, the discussion of which was in its infancy, were properly under the jurisdiction of the Disarmament Subcommittee. Much important work was done in those years—work which is still useful and which is still referred to by the students of arms control. The subcommittee had a permanent staff which was free—and I should add "competent"—to follow through on all questions of interest to the chairman and the members.

On July 31, 1958, this amalgamation of talents and goals dissolved. As a result of Senate Resolution 241, which was approved by the Senate on January 29, 1958, it was decided to merge the Disarmament Subcommittee with the Committee on Foreign Relations. Gone was the organic link with the armed services and Joint Atomic Energy Committees. Gone, too, was the separate professional staff which had served the Congress so faithfully and competently between 1955 and 1958. The Disarmament Subcommittee was reduced to the status of just another ad hoc subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations. From that time onward, Mr. President, the Disarmament Subcommittee has rightly been called moribund. It has undertaken little work of real national significance. Its one important study completed since 1958 was classified "confidential" by the full committee and has remained unseen by the public—despite the fact that it was cleared twice by the Department of Defense and despite the fact that it contains data applicable to 1959 at the latest. I refer to the report—already well known by its title alone—called "The Economic Impact of Arms Control Agreements."

Mr. President, there would be less confusion surrounding the test ban today if the Disarmament Subcommittee as previously constituted were still in existence. I regret exceedingly that there is no forum in which members of the Committee on Armed Services, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations can meet to iron out their differences—differences which are undeniably hampering the President in his conduct of foreign relations. I regret that the small staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, despite the able dedication of its members and the best will of its chairman and its chief of staff, is simply not in a position to do the work on disarmament and arms control that needs to be done. It is not enough—not by any means enough—to rely exclusively on the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency of the executive branch. The ACDA can be and has been of significant help to Senators who stand on both sides of the nuclear test ban issue. But do we need to be reminded that we are members of the legislative, not the executive branch? Do we have any illusions as to the ability of an executive agency to perform a function which properly belongs to the legislative branch?

I have no doubt as to the right answer to these questions. As regards the Disarmament Subcommittee, however, this is all water over the dam. I resisted those changes, but to no avail. The subcommittee must continue to languish in its present relatively inactive status. It is not for me to renew the lost battles of nearly 4 years ago.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

I cannot stand by, however, while the gravest issues of national security are being tossed about on the Senate floor like a volleyball. The test ban is one example and Cuba is another. What we need—and I state this in all seriousness—is coordinating machinery which will help to keep the debates within the bounds of responsibility, if not of objectivity.

Now taking the test ban as an example, our policy on this vital question has been decided for years by what is known as the Committee of Principals—a group representing the heads of the various Government agencies which would be directly concerned in the negotiation or the implementation of a test ban agreement. The President, of course, makes the final decision. He can take the advice of the Principals or leave it; he can resolve any differences that remain among them or he can send a problem back to the agencies for further deliberation.

In the overall area of national security we have established, by act of Congress, the National Security Council. The National Security Council brings together the principal officers and agencies of the executive branch which are vitally concerned with problems of defense, foreign policy, and national security affairs in general. The executive branch, therefore, is organized for appropriate consultation and coordination in the realms of national security policy and decisionmaking.

Since the Congress also has specific responsibilities in the areas of national security, it is necessary that its structural organization bear some relation to that of the Executive, but without in any way infringing the responsibilities or the jurisdiction of the standing committees of the Congress. It is imperative that a Joint Committee on National Security Affairs be formed by this Congress. This committee in the legislative branch would be the counterpart of the National Security Council in the executive branch. This joint committee should include representatives of the majority and minority membership of at least the Senate and House Committees on Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Experience teaches that the new joint committee must have its own professional staff, free from Executive interference and the jurisdiction of the standing committees. The joint committee should have as its principal function that of advice and counsel on overall national security policy to the Congress and should be empowered to make its recommendations to the appropriate standing committees of each House of Congress.

Its mission would cover the spectrum of national security as it pertains to international relations, defense policy, and nuclear development. A committee of this type would satisfy a demonstrated need. It would not be a panacea for our problems, but it would go far toward eliminating the jurisdictional disputes which already threaten to divide committee from committee and Senator from Senator.

Mr. President, let us make no mistake. The Armed Services Committee sees these problems in a different light than does the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Joint Committee, cloaked in secrecy, sees these problems differently from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and even the Committee on the Armed Services. Yet all three committees are hearing the same witnesses. They are asking the same witnesses to appear for cross-examination. It seems to me that what we need is a synthesis of activity in the Congress on national security affairs. We at least ought to have one Joint Committee on National Security Affairs that could bring together the respective points of view or the conclusions and recommendations developed by the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The last thing we want is a frozen hierarchy of committees jealously guarding their prerogatives over matters which unavoidably cut across committee lines. Even worse is the prospect of a Senate fragmented into warring cliques whose hardened points of view on national security affairs preclude the possibility of consensus.

For all these reasons I commend to Senators' favorable attention the suggestion of forming a Joint Committee on National Security Affairs consisting of representatives of the above-mentioned three committees.

The proposed congressional joint committee could then act as the legislative counterpart of the National Security Council. We could better harmonize and synthesize our efforts in the Congress to promote the national security of this great Republic.

I have taken a good deal of time today to answer some of the arguments that have been made on the question of a nuclear test ban. I thank Senators for their indulgence. I hope that what has been said here today will at least be of some help to the public and to the Members of Congress in the all-important debate that is now underway.

I have one more point to make before yielding the floor. It is a point which in its simplicity is all too easily overlooked.

There are those who charge that the United States and the United Kingdom have made too many concessions to the Soviets in our effort to obtain a workable, safeguarded agreement to prevent nuclear testing, and that we are thereby weakening U.S. security.

If this is true, why has not the Soviet Union jumped at the chance to sign such an agreement?

If our proposals would weaken our security and strengthen the hand of the Soviet Union, then logically the Soviets would accept them.

The fact is that the Soviets have refused reasonable test ban agreements since the Baruch plan of 1946. The Soviets have found that unlimited nuclear testing is to their advantage.

Once, we had a monopoly of nuclear weapons. Today, we face the prospect of Soviet equality of nuclear power.

Why? Because nuclear testing permits the nations that are behind to catch up.

It would be reasonable to conclude that those who oppose a nuclear test ban are unwittingly and unknowingly encouraging a situation which permits the Soviets to gain new power.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an article which appeared in today's Washington Post under the headline "Kennedy Gives A-Ban Position," written by Howard Simons.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

KENNEDY GIVES A-BAN POSITION

(By Howard Simons)

President Kennedy yesterday sought to assure Congress that his administration has no intention of signing a nuclear-test-ban agreement with the Soviet Union that would imperil American security.

The President's remarks came as congressional concern heightened following continued Defense Department testimony pointing up scientific and technological limitations of present U.S. capability to detect and identify secret underground nuclear tests from afar.

Setting forth the administration's position in the current test-ban negotiations at his news conference, Mr. Kennedy said:

"We have suggested that we would not accept a test ban which did not give us every assurance that we could detect a series of tests underground. We would not submit a treaty which did not provide that assurance to the U.S. Senate. Nor would the Senate approve it."

EXPERTS TESTIFY

At about the same time yesterday morning that the President was clarifying his position, Defense Department experts appearing before the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy were continuing to chip away at any suggestion that today's seismic or earthquake detection methods, by themselves, enable experts to distinguish between earthquakes and explosions.

It is for this reason that the United States has repeatedly insisted upon a certain number of onsite inspections of Soviet territory. As Mr. Kennedy put it yesterday, "We have not been able to make discriminations so effective that we can do without onsite inspections and without a sufficient number to prevent a series of tests carried out which would be undetected."

Basically, what the Joint Committee heard yesterday was an assessment of present U.S. capability to detect and to identify seismic events occurring in Russia using detection stations outside Soviet territory. The assessment came largely from Carl Romney of the Air Force Technical Application Center and amounted to the following:

Of the seismic events that can now be detected from afar with good reliability, about 170 occur on the average in the Soviet Union every year. Of these, 20 can be definitely ruled out as earthquakes.

Of the remaining 150, about 75 will still be suspect; that is, they cannot be easily identified as either an earthquake or a secret underground nuclear explosion. But these 75 events will give enough telltale signs to be partially identified as one or the other.

Of the last 75 events, there would be no information whatsoever to give detection experts a clue as to the true nature of these events. It is for these reasons that onsite inspections are necessary.

Replying to questions, Romney said that a potential cheater would be able to test 1-kiloton devices in granite; 2- to 6-kiloton devices in tuff (a volcanic ash); and 10- to 20-kiloton devices in dry alluvium (a sandy material), with no seismic means presently available to catch the cheater.

PROGRESS POSSIBLE

In previous testimony before the committee it was noted that the majority of U.S. underground nuclear tests being conducted in Nevada involved devices of 4 kilotons or less, indicating that atomic weapons progress can be made using devices of these sizes.

The President and Joint Committee members essentially agreed yesterday in their separate commentaries that detection was only one of the problems to be resolved with Russia. Many more exist, some as difficult to solve as seismic detection, including, as was noted yesterday, the number of onsite inspections, the kind of such inspections, and the circumstances under which the inspections would be carried out.

At one point in yesterday's Joint Committee hearings, the chairman, Senator John O. Pastore, Democrat, of Rhode Island, apparently reacting to the many recent Republican attacks on the President's handling of the test-ban talks, said the record should show that the first "giveaway," if that term is appropriate, began during the Eisenhower administration.

Pastore was referring to the Eisenhower administration's acceptance of a Soviet proposal in 1960 which would have amounted to an unpoliced moratorium on all nuclear tests below a certain magnitude.

"Where were those loud voices in 1960 that we are hearing today?" Pastore asked.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Would the Senator's proposed committee have jurisdiction, as well, over intelligence activities? If there was one conclusion to which we came after the Bay of Pigs, it was that intelligence collection and intelligence operations should be separated, that they should not be under the same roof. There was some talk at that time of such a decision being made, yet it is almost 2 years later, and none has been made, to all intents and purposes. This brings me back to the thought that the proposed committee, if it had such jurisdiction, could meet the demands suggested by similar resolutions which call for a Joint Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator very much for that suggestion. The Senator may recall that I said the committee should at least have representatives of the majority and minority of the three committees mentioned. Obviously it should have some jurisdiction over the intelligence operations of our Government. I believe this is much needed.

I do not believe that one can discuss national security in the Congress without having a good idea of the intelligence estimates of the Central Intelligence Agency and of the other intelligence offices of our Government, and of what those intelligence estimates mean in terms of the policy decisions of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the eloquent Senator from Minnesota upon his speech today. I think that we as a body should be grateful to him for bringing our attention to

peace, and his emphasizing to us that peace is as noble an objective as war. As is seen in the seal overhead with its American eagle, the palm leaves of peace occupy as much a prominent position as do the arrows of war. I think the Senator from Minnesota has placed in perspective the discussion which prevails on the subject of disarmament at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell] has made a very important suggestion. If we are to have such a committee as that suggested by the Senator from Minnesota—and the idea has great merit—I think certainly it should have jurisdiction over our intelligence services.

In a speech earlier this afternoon the Senator from Minnesota talked about the serious problem which confronts us with respect to secrecy, and he pointed out, very rightfully, in my judgment, that we have entirely too much secrecy in the operations of a government which ought to belong to a free people, but who cannot be free if they do not know what is going on in their Government, no matter what semantics one may use to try to pretend that they have freedom.

The Joint Committee which the Senator from Minnesota has proposed ought to be formed with the distinct understanding that it would be given jurisdiction over our intelligence departments as a congressional check, because I think there is growing across this country an increasing demand on the part of more and more people that the Congress stop abdicating its rights under the check and balance system of this form of government, and that the intelligence agencies, which now are responsible really only to the executive branch of the Government, be made responsible to the legislative branch of the Government as well.

I highly commend the Senator from Minnesota for a very important speech—one of the most important, I believe, to be delivered to this session of the Congress. I think the Congress must face the challenges of the speech, and I congratulate the Senator for it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very grateful to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota for a very closely reasoned, analytical, and intelligent demolition of the arguments which have been made in this body and outside this body during the past weeks and months, to the effect that we dare not enter into a test ban agreement because of the fear of underground nuclear testing conducted by the Russians.

It seems to me that no one who has listened to the speech this afternoon or who will read it in the Record or about it in the newspapers tomorrow can longer be of the view that the President of the United States and his principal advisers are taking unacceptable risks with the security of our country by advancing the position for the kind of a test ban agreement which we have been proposing at Geneva, as I know from having been at Geneva last November and December, and as the Senator from Minnesota knows from having only recently returned.

In my opinion, there can be no answer to the arguments made by the Senator from Minnesota today that we are in good hands when we follow the guidance and recommendations of the President of the United States and his duly authorized agents, who are conducting these negotiations.

I shall have something to say on this subject myself at some length within the next few days, but I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota for putting the debate back into perspective and, I say again, for demolishing the arguments which have been made against the position of the President of the United States.

Second, the Senator from Minnesota with great ability has put his finger on another of the many organizational inadequacies of this body. It has been my privilege to talk in the past at some length—and, really, frequently to bore my colleagues with strong views—about the fact that we must update the procedures of the Senate of the United States if the Senate is to play its part in the constitutional form of government laid down by our Founding Fathers and to perform its responsibilities as our upper legislative body in the modern world.

The Senator from Minnesota has indicated the complete inadequacy of a very important segment of our system, in that this whole problem of national security is broken up into little pieces—a part of it in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; a part of it in the Committee on Armed Services, and in the Preparedness Subcommittee; and a part of it in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I deplore particularly the way in which the fine work the Senator from Minnesota has been doing for so many years with respect to his disarmament subcommittee has gradually been whittled away until little is left, in terms of authority or in terms of funds, for the magnificent and brilliant work the Senator from Minnesota has been doing so long.

The Senator from Rhode Island and I happen to serve on the Committee on Rules and Administration. There are other members of that committee, I am confident, who are as concerned as we are with respect to the inadequacy of our present organizational system. I plead with my friend from Minnesota that he promptly draft, in this regard, the kind of rule which he thinks would adequately serve the needs of this great and important problem and this great and continuing task of providing for our national security. Although I am a very junior member of that committee, as the Senator well knows, I think I can almost assure the Senator that prompt and adequate hearings will be held on such a resolution. I should like to have the honor of cosponsoring it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I should like the Senator to know that I am asking the Legislative Drafting Service to be of help to me in this regard. The discussion today will be exceedingly helpful in getting a proper interpretation of the jurisdiction and the role of such a committee.

I add my appreciation for the remarks of my colleagues and for their attention today, because these debates really ought to command attention—not because the Senator from Minnesota speaks, but because this is a matter of national security and of survival. I do not believe that the debates read as well outside, in the newspaper columns, as they actually sound in this Chamber, where such matters ought to be discussed.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Minnesota this afternoon. I agree with the Senator from Oregon that we have heard one of the most significant statements—and I think the most significant statement—made on the floor of the Senate in this session of the Congress.

The Senator from Minnesota has addressed himself to the most important single problem facing us—that is, the problem of controlling nuclear energy for our survival and for the preservation of the peace.

We all recognize that the Senator speaks from an unusual background of experience and knowledge in this field, which ought to prompt all of us to give careful consideration to everything he has had to say.

I fervently hope that every Member of the Congress will read the address, and that it will be read very carefully by the American people, since I think the question involved is the most crucial of all questions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I join in commending the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I may say to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] that one of the defects in the Senate rules is that sometimes we do not get notice of significant addresses to be made on the Senate floor. Thus, it was not my privilege to hear entirely the Senator's address. I entered the Chamber near the conclusion of his remarks, and I was very much impressed by them.

I take it one of the objectives the Senator is attempting to accomplish with his proposal is to place the national security in better perspective insofar as the Congress is concerned.

It was my privilege, only yesterday, to listen to the very able address by Mr. Adrian Fisher. He said we are attempting, through the nuclear balance of terror, to prevent smoking in the room we live in by stacking around a great many open barrels of gasoline. This for a time may prevent smoking, but it is hardly a way that has the approval of most fire wardens for preventing ultimate destruction of the room. Sometime, someone will slip.

So if there is some element of risk involved in attempting to open the door out of the room that leads toward a stable peace in the world, we must measure that risk against the risk of remaining in the locked room, trying to prevent smoking by placing around the room open tins of gasoline.

That is what is so hard to get into perspective. If we focus all our attention on the element of risk that may be involved in the course before us in a nuclear test ban, and pay no attention at all to the terrible risks involved if the arms race continues indefinitely on its present course, we shall never achieve national security, for the present course is one that is hardly designed to preserve the safety of the Nation. In the long run, unless we find a way to turn the arms race down, there will come a time, and mathematical odds assure it, when some misstep, some miscalculation, some error of judgment, will trigger a missile. Once that happens, there will be no nation left to secure, either on this side of the Atlantic or the other.

Therefore, in the broadest sense, we must measure the national security against all the risks we are taking, and we must judge the proposed course that leads the country toward a nuclear test ban in that light.

The proposal of the Senator from Minnesota deserves commendation, because it may give Congress the machinery to do the job—machinery which is not now available through a multiplicity of committees that have attacked this problem on a piecemeal basis.

I join my colleagues in commending the Senator from Minnesota for the service he has rendered this afternoon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank my friend. If ever I was grateful for the processes of free elections that permitted a distinguished Senator to return to his post of duty, it was when the people of that great State of Idaho, in their good judgment and wisdom, returned to the U.S. Senate the Senator from Idaho. The Senator from Idaho is a champion of freedom, justice, and peace, at a time when all too few voices are raised in this country for the concepts of social justice and peace within the framework of freedom.

Every time I hear the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and other Senators—and I do not limit myself to those Senators exclusively—speak in the Chamber and raise their voices for peace and social justice in the cause of freedom, it is a happier day; for all too often, we hear nothing but voices speaking about a terrible new weapon or about how we can destroy this or that, when the people are crying out for some voice, some nation, some power, someone, to lead in the path of peace, without appeasement, without loss of principles, without prostrating ourselves before evil.

Senators who have joined me in this discussion today—have made a real contribution to the elevation of the moral tone of this Nation, because America ought to stand for peace through strength and strength through peace, for social justice and freedom.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. I should like to add my commendation for the address delivered by the senior Senator from Minnesota. He has called to our minds with eloquence the moral position that this Nation must occupy if we are able to find a solution for the ever-increasing tempo of the collision course on which we seem to be embarked.

I concur with the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] in his remarks. I thought it was apt for him to recall the remarks of Mr. Fisher, that so far all we have done is stack gasoline cans around a room to stop smoking.

I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his address and for his great leadership in this field. It is something which must enter into the thinking of this body and in the thinking of the whole country.

A FREE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC AND A NEW PRESIDENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on February 27, 1963, I was privileged to attend the inauguration of President Juan Bosch, the first freely elected President in the Dominican Republic in 30 years. It was a memorable event for all those believing in free government in this hemisphere. After 30 years of dictatorship under Trujillo, the election of President Bosch has now brought to the people of the Dominican Republic a great opportunity to build strong, stable democratic institutions, buttressed by economic and social progress.

The importance of this event was duly recognized by the leaders of this hemisphere. The presence of many of the leading democratic leaders of this hemisphere is both a high tribute to President Bosch and to the Dominican people. President Kennedy recognized the importance of this event in sending as his representative the distinguished Vice President of the United States, LYNDON JOHNSON, who represented our country with dignity, honor, and warmth. Included in the group attending the inauguration were President Betancourt, of Venezuela; President Orlich, of Costa Rica; President Villea-Morales, of Honduras; President Bustamante, of Jamaica, ex-President Jose Figueres, of Costa Rica; and Governor Muñoz-Marin, of Puerto Rico. The successful accomplishment of the transition from Trujillo rule to a democratically elected government was accomplished through the effort of the Council of State.

When one considers the conditions in the Dominican Republic immediately after the downfall of the dictator, conditions resulting from 30 years of dictatorship which had destroyed any initiative and any experience in representative government, one can appreciate the whole scope of the Council of States achievement. The preservation of order in a society left without trained internal security forces and without the administrative mechinery required for the normal operation of society, is in itself a great accomplishment. I salute Chairman Bonelly and his colleagues on the Council for their work .

The U.S. officials have made it unmistakably clear, both during President-elect Bosch's visit to Washington and at his inauguration in Santo Domingo, that the new Dominican Government will have the firm and full support of the U.S. Government in implementing President Bosch's proposed social and economic projects through the Alliance for Progress. The Dominican Republic will enjoy a high priority through the Alliance. In the next few months, I would hope that we would display great patience, tolerance, and understanding of the problems that will be confronting the new government. We can expect some difficult times ahead. There will be repeated attempts to embarrass the government. There may be a good deal of demagoguery and a good deal of antagonism expressed toward the United States. Lacking administrative experience, the new government will have to feel its way in dealing with the pressing problems of the country.

In encouraging and working with the new Government in achieving its social and economic programs, we must help to guide the Government toward a new appreciation of the role that private capital can play in developing the Dominican Republic. We must encourage U.S. businessmen working in the Dominican Republic to be patient and tolerant toward the Government and to be aware of the many difficulties facing it.

In the Dominican Republic, with its large number of unemployed and increasing unrest, immediate impact projects will have to be stressed even more than in most other Latin American countries. It may be necessary for the United States to share direct operational responsibility in some of the social programs in the fields of health, education, and housing, perhaps through servicio-type institutions that have proved effective in other Latin American countries in early stages of their development. In this rich, fertile, country, rural development must not be slighted. People from the rural areas are flocking to the cities from neglected undeveloped rural land—only to become part of the unemployed urban masses. If the problems of the city are to be kept within manageable proportions, the exodus to the city must be slowed. The development of the interior will require solving the water problem. Trained technicians in the field of agriculture must be available, together with the capital machinery needed for the development of modern farming including substantial amounts of supervised farm credits—small loans for small farms.

With the help of the United States and other member nations of the OAS, and guided by the able and dedicated leadership of President Bosch, the Dominican Republic stands a chance of becoming a model democratic island republic in a troubled Caribbean. Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to introduce into the RECORD the inspiring inaugural address of President Bosch and the statement of President Kennedy's representative at the inauguration, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON, upon his arrival in Santo Domingo.

There being no objection, the address and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT JUAN BOSCH'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Dr. Segundo Armando González Tamayo and I have just sworn that in our capacities as Vice President and President of the Republic we will fulfill and will have fulfilled the constitution and the laws that govern us; and we say accurately that they govern us, because in a democracy there should be no more government than that of the law, and men, whatever may be their positions, are called to be nothing more than the executors of those laws.

Fine enough, at the same time, as the executors of the laws, it behooves us to be representatives and defenders of the people; and in the name of those people that are here before us and also far away in cities and isolated towns we request indispensable laws from the National Congress to insure in this country not only democratic policy but also economic democracy and social justice. From you senators and deputies elected by the people, whatever your party may be, the Government that begins today expects a continued effort to give the Dominicans a place in the sun among the advanced countries of America.

America watches us with interest and with love as the presence of leaders of the hemisphere and distinguished visitors who have come from all areas of the Americas to this testify. Never before have so many illustrious men, elected by their people for the highest functions of government, so many leaders of popular parties, so many legal representatives of continental culture been assembled in the Dominican Republic. The happy reunion of these great gentlemen of politics and thought, to whom we all owe gratitude for the eagerness with which they helped us to be free, is only a sample of that interest and the love with which our brothers of the hemisphere are watching us. As an American country we should make intelligent use of our political resources to give that interest and that love official character within the regional system of pacts and treaties that unite the entire continent, without forgetting that our people want to act jointly in defense of their democratic liberties but at the same time they have a lively sense of pride for the legacy of national sovereignty that they received from their Founding Fathers.

As an American country we find ourselves in the center of the great revolutionary current that is shaking the New World, and if we take into account that that powerful force is more forceful in countries that have not been able to develop in time because tyrannies or other social forces, negative to progress, impeded it, we must admit that in the Dominican Republic we are obliged to advance rapidly, as rapidly as possible without leaving democratic norms at any time, which insist that other rights be respected, because without respect to others' rights there cannot be peace, and without peace there cannot be well-being for the millions of Dominicans that insist on a better life.

We want political peace and for that reason we offered posts in the Cabinet to five parties. Four refused to accept those posts, and as that which begins today is an authentic democracy, we should all respect the wishes of those parties—National Civic Union, National Revolutionary Democratic Party, Revolutionary Vanguard, and Social Democratic Alliance—but the entire country should know that we have not wanted to form a government based only on the party that won the elections of the 20th of December of last year, as we did not not wish to form a government based only on those that joined us before the 20th of December. We have wanted that those who yesterday fought among themselves would be united today, each one giving the best of his efforts to the people that are ours as well as theirs. We do not want power to govern with friends against enemies, but to govern with Dominicans for the good of Dominicans.

A democratic leader must have his ears open to hear the truth, alert his eyes to see evil before it is done, a vigilant mind so that nothing could put the liberty of each citizen in jeopardy and a heart free of hates dedicated day and night only to the service of the people. We swear here on this solemn day that if our limited capacity keeps us from having open ears, alert eyes, a vigilant mind, our nature and our history assure the Dominicans that we have a heart free of hate. Let no one expect the use of hate while we are governing. We are here with the decision to work, not to hate, disposed to create, not to destroy; to defend and to shelter, not to persecute. Let us join our hearts together in the task of doing away with hate among Dominicans as one does away with weeds in the field that is going to be sown; let us join our hearts together in the task of building regimes that will give shelter to those that never had it, that will give work to those who seek it not finding it, that will give land to those farmers that need it, and will give security to those born here and to all those that wander the earth in search of shelter from misery and persecution.

The world in which we live seems to be full of pride and hate; but when we enter it with a clear view, of one without bitterness we find that millions and millions of persons are working quitely for a better tomorrow. We Dominicans must unite ourselves to that legion of men and women who march toward the future, because if God's creature was not given the faculty to remake his past, he was given on the other hand the faculty of shaping his future, and the future of the people is the work of their children more than of their parents, of those that live and of those who are going to live more than those that performed their task and left with the ages. The good work of those dead, like their evil work belong to history; but the good work of the future is the fruit of the good intentions and the capacity to convert those intentions into deeds.

And we must convert our good wishes into deeds. Self-respecting people like men with moral stature seek to give, not to receive; seek to help, not to ask for help. If, due to the tragic fate which was ours during 32 years, we have been obliged to travel throughout the democratic world in search of help, we must not become accustomed to live depending on such help. We have received and we are loyally grateful for it as those who are well born. But we should prepare ourselves to become self-sufficient, elevate ourselves through our own forces, to mold the statue of our future with Dominican hands. Just as there was a time when the democratic minded citizens of this country wandered the world with their heads bowed in shame, let us now take steps so that the democratic minded citizens of the Americas will raise their heads in wonder to see how, in this land, the very same people who once suffered under tyranny are building a home for dignity, for freedom, for abundance, and for culture.

Nothing can be accomplished overnight; according to the Bible, it took God himself 6 days to create the world and to settle it with human beings, to bring trees and light to it. But everything can be accomplished through work, perseverance and faith. Perseverance and faith where the attributes of those who founded this Dominican Republic, on one part of an island and with a very small population—like a premature baby among nations; faith and perseverance were the attributes of those who went to war, 100 years ago, to regain their lost sovereignty; faith and perseverance were the attributes of those who won back our country's freedom in 1924; faith and perseverance were the attributes of those who fought until they overthrew tyranny. Without the perseverance and the faith of one and all, without their valor and their martyrdom, we would not be assembled here today. That is why it is proper that, at this time, we think of them and thank them with the devotion of the son for the mother who bore him; for the heroes of liberty are like the mothers of men, and we owe them the respect and love that is a mother's due.

Just as nothing is accomplished overnight, nothing is accomplished without struggle. We must struggle and we will struggle against the obstacles which stand in the path of the Republic. The next few months will be months of austerity for many, because we are in the position of attempting to avoid the collapse of our national economy as a result of uncontrolled expenditures. But we live in a country of great riches, which sells more than it buys, and if Dominicans cooperate with the government so as not to make unnecessary expenditures, we could soon see ourselves with unlimited foreign exchange. Also if you, senators and deputies, work with perseverance, as we are sure you will, to approve the measures that will permit the government to carry out the agrarian reform and have the indispensable means for increasing agricultural production, we will be able to avoid the threat of inflation.

Our country is rich and our people are intelligent. We have a fertile land and people that want to work it. In other countries of America the major land areas are found in private hands, but here the most extensive farms belong to the state. We are going to join man with the land, the intelligent Dominican man with the rich Dominican land and let us be sure that that is done or there will not be democracy in this country.

We Dominicans begin today to be actors in our own drama and all of America is there across the continent as an anxious spectator. Let us work for our people and for America. Let us work with tenacity and with humility. This day of Juan Pablo Duarte, of Francisco del Rosario Sanchez, of Ramón Matias Mella in whose memory we offer this act is also by coincidence, Ash Wednesday; and on Ash Wednesday when the sign of the cross is made on the forehead, the faithful hear the eternal worlds: "Remember man that thou art dust and unto dust thou shall return."

We will all be dust someday; and we will only be remembered if we give to these people and to America what the Dominican people and America expect of us.

Tenacity for the struggle, and humility to receive the opinion of adversaries and the judgment of history is what we offer you, illustrous visitors who have had the kindness to come to testify that in the Dominican Republic a democracy is being born; to you representatives of friendly governments who give us the support of your presence; to you gentlemen, senators and deputies brought to these illustrious functions by popular vote, to you Dominicans of the cities and the country, the reason of all our struggle the object of tenacity and receivers of the humility that we offer.

Besides this, you, the visitors, may count on the affection of this people; you will notice that with civilian or military dress all Dominicans look on you with affection and remember that with civilian or military dress all came together, each one within his function, to guarantee the freedom of men and women of this land to vote according to his conscience. All of them then, uniformed members of the armed forces and people with work or farmers clothes or middle class, gave the unexpected example and to them and to you the motive for gathering together today under the sky of a little piece of America.

Don Romulo Betancourt, Don Ramón Villeda Morales, Don Francisco Orlich, Don Lyndon Johnson, Don Alexander Bustamante, Don Luis Muñoz Marin, your excellencies diplomatic representatives of friendly countries; professors, writers, poets, newsmen, political leaders who are visiting us; friends that have come from afar to be with us in this solemm hour; to all of you, those who govern, those who represent, and those who lead, those who beautify with their works, to all we bid you a most cordial welcome and we ask you all as you return to your countries that you take and spread the words with which we end this message; "while we govern, liberty will not perish in the Dominican Republic."

Arrival Statement of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson in the Dominican Republic

You do my country a great honor by your welcome. We are most grateful.

It is my privilege to come today both as chairman of the official delegation from the United States and as the personal representative of the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy.

As your neighbors, friends and well-wishers, the people of the United States have, during the past year, observed with gratification and admiration the triumph of the democratic processes in your country. Tomorrow we will celebrate with you the rebirth of representative democracy with the inauguration of your Republic's first freely elected President in 39 years, Juan Bosch.

This event is a historic triumph for the Dominican people. It is, also, a triumph for our hemisphere. It is a triumph for that philosophy of freedom—born in this New World—that governments should derive their powers from the consent of the governed.

We recognize—as you and your elected leaders recognize—that formidable problems must be solved. If the Dominican people are to enjoy lives blessed with a full measure of freedom, justice, and peace, cures must be found for the ancient ills of poverty, hunger, disease, unemployment, poor housing, and poor schools. I come today to tell you that in the efforts you make under freedom, you of the Dominican Republic can count on the United States for our help and support.

We offer to the Dominican people and to their chosen leaders our full cooperation in their struggle for economic progress and social justice. We do so in a spirit of mutual cooperation and mutual respect among the nations of our hemisphere—the spirit of the Alliance for Progress.

Our purpose—the only purpose of the United States—is to help the Dominican people build for themselves and their children a better life and to fulfill the highest hopes which live in the hearts of Dominicans. Oppression and tyranny did not extinguish the flame of freedom here. That flame will burn evermore brightly as you—and all in this hemisphere who love freedom—work together to fulfill the opportunity and promise of the Dominican Republic in the future.

INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT BOSCH OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has reported on his mission to the inauguration of President Bosch in the Dominican Republic, in which visit I was included with him and Representative BRADEMAS, of Indiana, as a guest of the Dominican Government.

The Vice President of the United States represented us there, together with the Honorable George Backer, of New York, Assistant Secretary of State Edwin M. Martin, and the Honorable Teodoro Moscoso, U.S. coordinator for the Alliance for Progress.

I wish to pay tribute to our Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, His Excellency John B. Martin, who is doing an outstandingly fine job.

The Dominican Republic is part of the island of Hispaniola, one of the earliest settled by Europeans in our hemisphere, going back to its settlement in 1494. Incidentally, it was ruled by Diego, the son of Christopher Columbus, from 1509 to 1523. It has great traditions of history. It has great resources. It has a small population. It has every opportunity to make a big success. It was literally destroyed—ground into the dust spiritually—by the dictator, Trujillo, in 32 years of tyrannical rule. During that time it was exhausted, physically, spiritually, and in every other way. President Bosch has many challenges, but he has one big advantage. The great economic and social miracle of our continent could be performed in the Dominican Republic in an enormous success for freedom after over three decades of tyranny—and this on an island right next to Cuba.

We could not have a more dramatic juxtaposition than that. President Bosch understands that he must work with private enterprise as well as with the United States and other countries, European—I am very much interested in bringing European effort into Latin American development—as well as in our own hemisphere. I think President Bosch is entitled to all the support, sympathy, and understanding that we can give him. Together with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and others, I hope to invoke that support.

An opportunity for democracy to perform its own miracle in a dramatic way—to completely outshine all of Castro's machinations directed at the very heart and jugular vein of the Americas—is possible in the Dominican Republic in the dramatic contrast between three decades of Trujillo tyranny and a freely elected government having the strong support of the Dominican people, as they showed in the election last December.

It is our responsibility, as well as that of President Bosch and his associates, first, for him to be true—as I know he will be—to his pledges of respecting free institutions in every way, to work with public and private enterprise, and, on our part and to understand the critical importance of the success of the Dominican Republic in this great historical hour when that nation has an opportunity to succeed not only for its own freedom, but also for freedom throughout the Western Hemisphere.

FOOD FOR PEACE AT WORK

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one program already having a great impact on the people of the Dominican Republic is the surplus food program administered by the Catholic Relief Services under the foor-for-peace program.

This year over 300,000 people will be fed from surplus food stocks. Through the efforts of this voluntary organization, surplus food is getting to those who need it and it is doing much to alleviate food shortages during this difficult transitional period. This is another good example of the success of our food-for-peace program in meeting the urgent needs of people in a neighboring land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, which describes in further detail this program in the Dominican Republic, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Caritas de Santo Domingo-Dominican Republic Catholic Relief Services, NCWC

Caritas de Santo Domingo, the first Alliance for Progress program in the Dominican Republic has been operating for the past 15 months.

The first program was planned to feed 30,000 people. By the spring of 1962 Caritas was servicing 150,000 and the new program planned for 1963 will provide foodstuffs to over 330,000 people—one-tenth of the total population of the Dominican Republic.

Total amount of food received by Caritas de Santo Domingo up until today has reached the incredible figure of 40,798,331 pounds. This figure includes, in pounds:

Corn	8, 215, 632
Cornmeal	13, 729, 050
Flour	8, 938, 600
Milk	5, 444, 010
Cheese	797, 839
Oil	1, 983, 544
Shortening	693, 504
Beans	996, 152

The Dominican Government has provided storage space and free inland transportation from the docks in Santo Domingo to 14 main distribution points located at Santa Domingo, Barahona, San Juan, Azua, Hato Mayor, La Romana, La Vega, Bonao, Sanchez, Nagua, San Francisco de Macoris, Santiago, Monte Cristi, and Puerto Plata.

Caritas de Santo Domingo has over 2,000 Dominicans working as volunteers throughout its 128 distribution centers all over the country. These volunteers investigate needy cases, keep records and prepare the food for distribution. In addition to distributing food to individual families, these centers have provided foodstocks to 23 institutions, 17 schools, 21 hospitals and 32 milk stations. The food supplies were transported throughout the country by a group of 1,500 trucks and drivers paid for by the Dominican Government. In the future Caritas de Santo Domingo will distribute bulgur wheat and butter oil. Over 80,070 pounds of used clothing and 31,059 pounds of used shoes received in March 1962 from the annual Thanksgiving clothing collection in Catholic parishes all over the United States have been distributed. Another shipment of 280,000 pounds of used clothing and shoes is scheduled to arrive next month.

There is small loss from ship to distribution points. All distribution is completely controlled at the storage warehouses by the volunteer workers. Individual families are issued ration cards which allow them to collect exactly what they need and no more. Placards have been printed that inform the recipients that this food is a gift from the people of the United States to the Dominican people, and the Allanza para el Progreso handclasp symbol is shown. This is also stated on the individual family card of the recipient.

Officials agree that this cooperation between the people of the United States and the Governments of the United States and the Dominican Republic is truly a humanistic people-to-people effort with little or no Government intervention, except for bearing the financial burden of shipping and local transportation.

THE SATURDAY EVENING POST AND INTEGRATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a fine editorial entitled, "The Post and Integration," which was published in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Post and Integration

In recent months we have received many letters from our readers asking us to state our position on integration. We have been accused with considerable vehemence of being pro-Negro, perhaps because we have felt it necessary to deal at great length and depth with the problem of the Negro in America.

Let us put it as frankly as possible. Of course we are pro-Negro. We are also pro-white, pro-Jew, pro-Catholic, and pro-Protestant. We believe, as we frequently said, that the promise of American democracy will never be fulfilled so long as any citizen is deprived of his rights because of his race or religion. Private relationships are matters of conscience, but every American is entitled to full enjoyment of the benefits of citizenship.

We do not suggest that integration is easy. We know very well that there are many forms of discrimination in the North as well as the South. But there is a difference. The Negro in the North is not as frequently reminded of any "inferior" status. He can eat in the restaurants and drink from the fountains and not be publicly humiliated because of his color.

Even if we were not convinced of the moral necessity for ending segregation, we would favor it for another reason, one that is every bit as compelling. We are a nation of laws, and it is the law. Southern Governors such as George Wallace of Alabama (p. 11) may delude themselves into believing that they can interpose the authority of a State, but the supreme law is the Federal law. That point was settled a hundred years ago.

There is a third reason, more practical than either of the others, for favoring peaceful integration. It is the utter futility and the self-destructive waste of attempting to check the relentless march of history. Governors Orval Faubus and Ross Barnett proved the point. They swore eternal opposition to the law of the land, but Little Rock today is integrated, James Meredith is attending the University of Mississippi, and all that Faubus and Barnett have to show for their obstruction is bloodshed, sufferings and the shame that was heaped upon their States. Gov. George Wallace, Bull Connor, and other diehards in Alabama should profit by these examples. It is time we stopped fighting the last century's battles here at home and closed ranks against the common enemy abroad—communism.

As editors of a national magazine, we at the Post have a very special responsibility to report on the progress of major events in this Nation and the world at large. The emergence of the Negro is one of the most profound developments in American history. His rise from economic and political bondage in this Nation and his momentous migration to the North and West are stories that compare in importance with the great westward migration of the 19th century, the two world wars and that great American tragedy, the Civil War. School integration, sit-in and freedom rides are so much a part of the fabric of our times that responsible editors could not conceivably ignore them. The migration of the Negro is staggering in its social, economic and political ramifications for the entire Nation. Negroes used to vote—when they could vote—Republican. Some experts, such as Theodore H. White, in his book "The Making of the President" contend now that this new Negro population in the Northeast actually swung the 1960 election to Democrat John F. Kennedy.

It is essential that all of us understand these things and place them in proper historical perspective. The Post has covered the story of the American Negro with responsible, illuminating reports. The first and most memorable of these was a five-part series by John Bartlow Martin "The Deep South Says Never" (June 15–July 13, 1957). In recent months we have described the strategy of the Negro youth's new march on Dixie (September 8, 1962). In November we devoted 13 pages to the dramatic, costly desegregation at the University of Mississippi (November 10, 1962). We have published articles on the Negro aristocracy and the Negro hate group, the Black Muslims. Recently we published "Speaking Out" by Carl T. Rowan, Negro Assistant Secretary of State, on "The Travesty of Integration."

This week the Post is proud to publish a moving and penetrating report on the mood of Birmingham by Joe David Brown (pages 11–19). Birmingham faces the prospect of forced integration. Alabama is the only remaining State where not a single Negro has yet been integrated. Birmingham, as the piece makes clear, is an explosive situation, the next great arena in the integration struggle. It is this kind of dramatic, incisive reporting that is the role of the Post in our rapidly changing era.

EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR HUMANE TREATMENT OF VERTEBRATE ANIMALS IN LABORATORY TESTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I introduced for the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and myself a bill (S. 533) to promote the humane treatment of vertebrate animals in laboratory tests. I am pleased to note a favorable editorial in the Christian Science Monitor of February 27, 1963, endorsing the bill.

Those inclined to scoff at the need for this legislation should read the news item which appeared in the March 6, 1963, Washington Evening Star, concerning the deaths of hundreds of dogs and cats at a farm in Gainesville, Va., which was supplying laboratory animals to the National Institutes of Health. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and news story be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hundreds of Dogs and Cats Are Found Buried on Farm

(By Hugh Wells and Jack Kelso)

Discovery of the bodies of several hundred dogs and cats on a Prince William County farm today was under investigation by Virginia animal welfare officials.

The dead animals were found in trenches behind a huge two-story barn on a former dairy farm near Gainesville, Va.

The property, a section of Cloverland Farms, was sublet to Zoological Worldwide, Inc., a corporation that collected dogs for sale to medical schools and research institutes.

Richard G. Turner, accountant for Zoological Worldwide, said the dogs and cats were sold to Bethesda Naval Hospital, the National Institutes of Health and medical schools in the Baltimore area.

BARN CLEANED OUT

When a Star reporter visited the site today, he found that the operation no longer was in existence. The barn had been cleaned out—only one dead cat remained in the building.

But behind the barn, three trenches about 70 feet long were found. Two of the trenches appeared filled with the bodies of dogs, cats, and rabbits. A third trench was covered with water, making it impossible to tell what was underneath.

The bodies of a collie dog and a cocker spaniel puppy were clearly visible on top of the piles.

Still alive outside the barn were a few ducks, a hutch with 10 rabbits in it and 1 shivering, tan and brown hound in a cage 2 feet by 2 feet.

OPERATION CLOSED

Mr. Turner said the operation had been closed down by the end of last week, after a visit by Mrs. Pearl Twyne, president of the Virginia Federation of Humane Societies and of the Animal Welfare League of Arlington, and other various officials.

"This has been quite unfortunate and I recommend they immediately close the place up," Mr. Turner said, adding that the corporation is "trying to do the right thing."

Mr. Turner said he had not known, until it was pointed out to him, that the water pipes to the building had frozen and there was no heat in the building.

The corporation, he said, had tried to convert the barn into a proper kennel to hold the animals for shipment but that it was impossible.

The corporation now has shut down its operation and will not open again until proper kennels, possibly like those used by NIH and the Arlington Welfare League, can be built, Mr. Turner said.

TEN STOCKHOLDERS

All the dogs that remained when the operation was closed down have been sold, he said.

"The animals," he said, "originally were picked up from dog pounds and from registered animal dealers."

About 10 stockholders comprise the corporation, Mr. Turner said, but he declined to identify them.

Mr. Turner said that some of the dogs had died of distemper and that others had contracted distemper and had to be destroyed. Some of the dogs were shot, he said.

He said he understood that only about 40 to 50 dogs had died in about a year.

The operation was brought to light by a woman who declined to be identified. She told animal welfare officials she saw a truck with some dogs in the back.

The woman said she asked the driver if she could buy one of the beagles and he said she would have to talk with the lawyer of the corporation.

Rather than do that, the woman recounted, she drove to the farm, where she saw conditions there. She said there was no heat, windows were broken and there were dead dogs among the live ones.

NEIGHBOR MOVED

Mrs. Marie Moore, who formerly lived next door to the farm, said her family had to move down the road because she couldn't stand the situation any longer.

"Just a little warm wind would make you sick," Mrs. Moore said.

She said her son, Stanley, had gone to the farm himself and buried some of the dogs once because the odor was so bad.

When the corporation first began trucking animals to the farm, Mrs. Moore said, the dead animals were buried. Last fall, the trenches were dug with a bulldozer, she recalled.

By November, she said, she had to move down the road.

PROTECTION FROM CRUELTY AND NEGLECT

In the midst of national and international crises, there is an important job that the 88th Congress should not neglect. That is to bring to vote, and to pass, bill S. 533, introduced January 25 by Senators JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and MAURINE NEUBERGER, of Oregon.

This is an amended and clarified form of a bill on which congressional hearings were held last fall. Its object is to insure humane treatment of animals used for experimental purposes in research laboratories. It does not seek to abolish animal experimentation, but to safeguard against unregulated performance and against needless cruelty and neglect. Among its provisions are included: licensing of each person who uses animals, with provision for loss of license for inhumane acts; registration of premises; recordkeeping; adequate food, water, comfortable resting places and normal exercise for the animals; unannounced inspection of laboratories.

That such legislation is urgently needed was amply evidenced in last September's congressional hearings, which brought to light facts as authentic as they are shocking—facts which many medical doctors deplore.

The public, many of whose tax and Community Chest dollars are channeled into animal experimentation, has a right to demand that this experimentation be regulated to insure the greatest possible humanity.

THE MENACE OF RUSSIAN SEAPOWER

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, while we are spending billions to keep the Soviet Union from surpassing us in space, let us not lose sight of the importance of shoring up our supremacy on land and sea.

Although it is not as true as it once was that the nation which controls the seas controls the world, mastery of the seas can still be a most decisive factor—as was well demonstrated to us in the October Cuban crisis. The Soviet Union knows this all too well, and is racing for the control of the seas which encircle the world as well as the space around it. She is challenging us in the construction of merchantmen, tankers, and in general shipbuilding, as well as in research and naval power.

Look magazine recently carried a comprehensive survey entitled "The Menace of Russia's Seapower," which was written by Fletcher Knebel. I ask unanimous consent that it be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MENACE OF RUSSIA'S SEAPOWER

(By Fletcher Knebel)

Soviet Russia, for centuries a giant land turtle, suddenly is striking out to sea with an agility and determination that surprise some U.S. military strategists and alarm others. While the eyes of the world have been focused on feats of rocketry in outer space, the Kremlin's orders have resulted in startling Communist progress in the far more familiar element of water. With its recent maritime surge little noticed save by marine experts, Russia now looms as a powerful bidder for supremacy on the high seas. The facts are not comforting:

Navy: The U.S.S.R. has passed Great Britain and now boasts the world's second largest war fleet, outranked only by that of the United States. Russia's 750,000-man Navy floats 25 cruisers, 165 destroyers, 430 submarines, including some missile-firing and atom-powered subs, 275 frigates, 500 motor torpedo boats, 900 minesweepers, a host of auxiliary craft and sizable shore-based naval aviation.

Merchant marine: Soviet freighters and tankers, their stacks decorated with the hammer-and-sickle emblem, now call at 60 major ports. Russia's merchant fleet continues to expand at an ever-growing pace, while that of the United States shrinks. Its 1,050 oceangoing merchant ships, totaling about 5 million deadweight tons, now rank Russia high on the list of maritime nations.

Fishing fleet: The Soviet Union operates the world's largest and most modern high-seas fishing fleet, with 3,000 ships plying all major fishing banks around the globe. The Russians now outfish U.S. commercial fishermen in waters off Cape Cod and Alaska and are even building a fishing port in Cuba. Many Soviet trawlers double as floating intelligence centers, with electronic and sonar gear collecting data on our radar installations, Pacific atom tests and shore defenses.

Shipbuilding: No nation is building more ships faster than the Soviet Union. In addition to a recent huge expansion of its Black Sea shipyards, Russia has more than 200 freighters, tankers and passenger-cargo ships on order in the free-world yards of Japan, Italy, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, and West Germany and also in the Communist-bloc yards of East Germany, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Poland. Smaller craft are even being built in landlocked Czechoslovakia. By 1980, Russia aims to have a 20 million ton merchant fleet, matching or surpassing the commercial tonnage of Great Britain, now the merchant marine leader.

Oceanography: Russia already owns the largest and most modern marine-laboratory fleet afloat. Its 100-plus scientific vessels outnumber the 57 research ships operated by Government and private institutions in the United States. Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev has channeled some of Russia's best scientific brains into underwater research.

Marine technology: Russia is in the forefront of experimentation in design and gadgetry. A completely automated vessel recently made a trial run in the Black Sea. Some of the newest Soviet tankers can load or discharge oil with one man operating the automated console. Some freighters have closed-circuit TV for docking operations. Hydraulic hatches, an atom-powered icebreaker, hydrofoil ships carrying passengers at 40 knots, gas turbine engines, 70,000-ton tankers, fiberglass hulls, all figure in the new face of Russia on the high seas. Like the United States and Britain, Russia is even experimenting with hovercraft vessels that never touch the waves.

While Russia's missile strength is far below that of the United States, as reported in the November 6 issue of Look, Russia's rise to sea power causes grave concern at the Pentagon. "The Soviets have built the world's second-largest navy since World War II," says Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., Chief of Naval Operations, "and their merchant marine of smart, large, modern, clean ships is becoming a powerful tool for economic and political expansion."

"The trend alarms us," says Capt. D. A. Scott of the Navy's progress-analysis group. "It used to be a rare sight to see a Russian freighter. Now, two or three can be seen in almost every major port. It will be no surprise to see Russian warships maneuvering off Cape Henry (near Norfolk, Va.) in the years ahead."

"The Russians," said Assistant Secretary of the Navy Kenneth E. Belieu in a May speech, are moving "at flank speed to develop the sea-transport system they will need in order to pursue their goal of world domination. Most important of all, at this critical point in history, our own merchant fleet is declining in strength, versatility, and vigor, just when we appear to need them most."

Russia's new boldness on the high seas was flaunted under America's nose this summer when, within the space of a few weeks, the U.S.S.R. sent more than 60 ships into Cuba and unloaded heavy stocks of tanks, weapons, motor torpedo boats, and even guided missiles. Only about half of the freighters that carried arms, Communist "technicians" and supplies to Castroland were Russian. Indeed, some of the chartered bottoms belonged to our Western allies.

There was no doubt in the minds of U.S. officials, however, that Russia could have sent the entire expedition in Russian hulls had Khrushchev so desired. The Soviet maritime fleet could have handled Operation Castro easily. It was speculated that the Kremlin chartered some free world ships primarily to embarrass the United States and to make any interference with the supply line diplomatically distasteful to this country. It would have been one thing to turn back an arms-laden Soviet ship from Havana Harbor, had the Kennedy administration the appetite for such a venture, but quite another to seize and search the vessel of a NATO member.

If Russia used the seas with audacity en route to Cuba, it was no less ambitious this spring in its invasions of U.S. fishing grounds off Cape Cod in the Atlantic and off Alaska in the Pacific. The Interior Department's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in June tallied no less than 169 Soviet ships on Georges Bank, just east of Cape Cod, and 107 Communist fishing vessels in the gulf of Alaska. This record encroachment of almost 280 Red ships on traditional American fishing grounds represented a dramatic change in a short time. As recently as 1954, there were no sightings of Russian vessels off the east coast, and never until this year had Soviet fishing fleets ventured into the gulf of Alaska. This spring, two Russian vessels even tested fishing off North and South Carolina.

Soviet trawlers form formidable fishing fleets, with modern facilities and techniques far surpassing those in use by the United

States. The Russian boats are fueled and serviced by repair ships, and transfer their catches to factory ships that process and pack the fish for market and to 19,000-ton mother ships that freeze them.

Many of the trawlers double as ocean intelligence agents, measuring American H-bomb tests in the Pacific, watching Atlantic naval maneuvers, pinpointing coastal radar beams and charting harbors, banks, and shelves along U.S. coasts. Navy patrol planes have pictured Russian trawlers bristling with electronic gear. Navy intelligence has learned that some trawlers carry scientific and espionage teams. American fishermen on infrequent visits aboard Russian trawlers have been barred from certain secret quarters. In 1960, the Russian trawler *Vega* had to be chased from its observation post by U.S. Navy ships. The *Vega* stood close by a Navy task force, including a nuclear Polaris submarine, during missile-firing tests off the east coast.

Along with its intelligence catch, Russia takes a tremendous quantity of fish from the ocean and has moved ahead of the United States in total annual catch. The United States now ranks fifth as a fishing nation, behind Japan, Red China, Russia, and Peru.

"The United States," Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, told the Senate in August, "has no mother ships, no factory ships, no stern-ramp trawlers, no refrigerated transport ships, no large fisheries vessels of any kind. No modern U.S. fishing fleet exists."

To help remedy the situation, MAGNUSON joined with two other Democratic Senators to sponsor bills offering larger construction subsidies for U.S. fishing boats and authorizing the Government to build two ultramodern trawlers for pilot purposes.

It is perhaps ironic that the United States, with its historic pride in competitive free enterprise, finds itself being overtaken on the high seas by state-operated commercial fleets of a Communist power. It is even more ironic that Government subsidies are being proposed as the chief answer. But what is true of fishing vessels is also true of the merchant marine.

Russia's armada of merchant ships, crowned by glistening new tankers running up to 70,000 tons, has tripled since the opening of World War II and is expected to increase threefold again by the end of this decade. Before the war, Russia carried only 10 percent of its own trade in Soviet ships. Now, it carries about 60 percent of its trade, which has ballooned in volume. With more than 140 tankers in service and many more building, Russia powers a Communist oil offensive that is undercutting Western producers in a number of free world countries.

At the same time, our own merchant marine is dwindling. The active U.S. merchant fleet is contracting at the rate of 31 ships a year, according to the authoritative Marine Engineering Log. Our huge reserve fleet from World War II, while still largely intact, rusts into obsolescence at river and harbor anchorages. Of the 907 active ships flying the U.S. flag, 300 belong to 16 lines that receive a Government operating subsidy. Another 412 ships, aggregating almost 11 million tons, have gone under foreign flags of convenience or necessity, depending on the point of view.

Early this year, Donald W. Alexander, the Maritime Administrator, urged a revolutionary approach to the American merchant marine in the face of "competition that could destroy it." He spoke of automated ships, such as the Russians are building, and of assembly-line shipyards patterned after one in Sweden. Thus far, however, no general revolution in American methods has erupted, despite marked progress symbolized by such ships as the nuclear-powered cargo vessel, the *Savannah*, and the 106,500-ton tanker *Manhattan*.

Caught between high wages and high costs at home and foreign subsidies and state control abroad. American commercial shipping would appear to have three alternatives: (1) Slash operating costs and trim down drastically for world competition; (2) enlarge Government subsidies, or (3) suffer a continued decline in both the merchant marine and the shipbuilding facilities that support it. Which of these alternatives the Kennedy administration will choose remains unclear.

In the field of oceanography, Russia now leads the world. The U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries calls the Soviet Government's marine research a vast program and says that thousands of scientists and technologists are working for the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography. The research is coordinated by two large institutes at Murmansk and Vladivostok.

In simple terms of naval might, the United States still sails unchallenged on the seas, but Russia has built rapidly since World War II. The United States has 26 carriers on active duty. Russia has none, active or inactive. The United States has 240 destroyers to about 165 for Russia. But in other categories, Russia leads with 25 cruisers to 13 for the United States, 400 patrol-type craft to 70 in the active U.S. Fleet, and about 430 submarines to 118 U.S. subs. In addition, Russia maintains a flotilla of 500 motor torpedo boats, a few of which were sent to Cuba this summer. The United States no longer maintains the mosquito fleet that boosted President Kennedy to fame.

It is the huge Russian submarine force that worries American Navy strategists. Hitler opened World War II with only 57 U-boats, yet they scourged the sealanes and sank millions of tons of allied shipping. Should war break out today, Russia could fling more than 400 subs around the world to paralyze our merchant and warships. Though we lead Russia in the undersea missile-firing capability of the American Polaris submarines, it will be only a matter of a few years until the U.S.S.R. can threaten our inland cities with hydrogen-tipped missiles hurled from submarines hidden beneath the waves.

The duel between the submarine and the ships and planes that prey upon it is always a delicately balanced one, but right now, the submarine holds clear superiority. Nuclear power permits the sub to lurk beneath the surface for weeks. The Polaris-type missile gives it the hidden striking power of millions of tons of TNT.

Swift progress in antisubmarine warfare is a paramount task facing the U.S. Navy. Some admirals, indeed, believe it deserves the type of intense civilian-military cooperation found in the space program. Unless the answer is soon found, Russia's subs may some day take control of the seas without firing a shot.

Russia's bid for mastery on the high seas presents American leaders with an unwanted challenge; for, at the same time, the Soviet Union is racing for the upper hand in space. Yet the marine challenge is total—in merchantmen, in tankers, in research, in naval power, in fisheries and in shipbuilding. Whether Russia's seapower bid will be met in the sweeping fashion in which it has been made remains a question the Kennedy administration has yet to answer.

THE TYRANNY OF THE MINORITY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, under date of February 2, 1963, there appeared in the New York Times an editorial entitled "The Tyranny of the Minority." I believe that this subject should be brought to the attention of all Senators, as well as to thoughtful people throughout the country. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TYRANNY OF THE MINORITY

Those who dismiss as a capricious and meaningless waste of time the losing fight by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, to alter the size of and representation of committees of the Senate miss the point of a profoundly serious conflict. The real issue is not who will serve on which committees, and how they will be chosen, but rather whether the Senate—and the Congress as a whole—can be forced out of the path of obsolescence to which it is stubbornly adhering.

Essentially, the issue is this: The congressional committee structure as it has evolved over the last half century and more has inverted one of the basic concepts of democratic government—from rule of the majority to rule by a minority. This is a palpable fact of congressional life today; it is not simply a slogan of liberal soreheads.

Command of the legislative process is in control of, comparatively speaking, a handful of legislators on the individual major committees of the House and Senate. More often than not, command is wielded not even by this small group but by the individual chairmen themselves.

The chairmen and/or the clique of committee seniors whom they control—usually a bipartisan clique—can and do withhold from floor consideration bills of which they personally disapprove. The devices for this arbitrary action are manifold: a chairman can simply pocket a bill referred to him and not bring it before his committee; he can kill it by the tactics of delay; he can kill it, or emasculate it, by the choice of witnesses brought in to testify on it. There are no really effective means of forcing a reluctant committee to act.

These chairmen and their cliques are fortified in their intransigence by the rule of seniority, and most of them in a Democratic Congress come from the safe and conservative districts of the South. In terms of Senator Clark's indictment, they represent the establishment. And in terms of the Kennedy administration, they represent the real as opposed to the titular opposition.

The question is not merely whether individual items on the Kennedy program will or will not be enacted by this Congress. The greater question is whether President Kennedy—or any President—can have his program submitted to the whole Congress to be tested fairly and expeditiously in the scales of majority rule.

The bicameral system was deliberately designed to check the tyranny of the majority. It was never designed to foster the tyranny of a minority. But this tyranny has been established through the evolution of the committee structure, and there it rests today, a wasting, corroding growth on our system of government.

THE WELFARE STATE AND THE WARFARE STATE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, my colleague from Idaho, the distinguished senior Senator FRANK CHURCH, spoke recently at the University of Utah on "The Welfare State"—a subject not of his own choosing, but one on which he chose his words and arguments exceedingly well.

Mr. Turner said that some of the dogs had died of distemper and that others had contracted distemper and had to be destroyed. Some of the dogs were shot, he said.

He said he understood that only about 40 to 50 dogs had died in about a year.

The operation was brought to light by a woman who declined to be identified. She told animal welfare officials she saw a truck with some dogs in the back.

The woman said she asked the driver if she could buy one of the beagles and he said she would have to talk with the lawyer of the corporation.

Rather than do that, the woman recounted, she drove to the farm, where she saw conditions there. She said there was no heat, windows were broken and there were dead dogs among the live ones.

NEIGHBOR MOVED

Mrs. Marie Moore, who formerly lived next door to the farm, said her family had to move down the road because she couldn't stand the situation any longer.

"Just a little warm wind would make you sick," Mrs. Moore said.

She said her son, Stanley, had gone to the farm himself and buried some of the dogs once because the odor was so bad.

When the corporation first began trucking animals to the farm, Mrs. Moore said, the dead animals were buried. Last fall, the trenches were dug with a bulldozer, she recalled.

By November, she said, she had to move down the road.

PROTECTION FROM CRUELTY AND NEGLECT

In the midst of national and international crises, there is an important job that the 88th Congress should not neglect. That is to bring to vote, and to pass, bill S. 533, introduced January 25 by Senators JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and MAURINE NEUBERGER, of Oregon.

This is an amended and clarified form of a bill on which congressional hearings were held last fall. Its object is to insure humane treatment of animals used for experimental purposes in research laboratories. It does not seek to abolish animal experimentation, but to safeguard against unregulated performance and against needless cruelty and neglect. Among its provisions are included: licensing of each person who uses animals, with provision for loss of license for inhumane acts; registration of premises; recordkeeping; adequate food, water, comfortable resting places and normal exercise for the animals; unannounced inspection of laboratories.

That such legislation is urgently needed was amply evidenced in last September's congressional hearings, which brought to light facts as authentic as they are shocking—facts which many medical doctors deplore.

The public, many of whose tax and Community Chest dollars are channeled into animal experimentation, has a right to demand that this experimentation be regulated to insure the greatest possible humanity.

THE MENACE OF RUSSIAN SEAPOWER

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, while we are spending billions to keep the Soviet Union from surpassing us in space, let us not lose sight of the importance of shoring up our supremacy on land and sea.

Although it is not as true as it once was that the nation which controls the seas controls the world, mastery of the seas can still be a most decisive factor—as was well demonstrated to us in the October Cuban crisis. The Soviet Union knows this all too well, and is racing for the control of the seas which encircle the world as well as the space around it. She is challenging us in the construction of merchantmen, tankers, and in general shipbuilding, as well as in research and naval power.

Look magazine recently carried a comprehensive survey entitled "The Menace of Russia's Seapower," which was written by Fletcher Knebel. I ask unanimous consent that it be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MENACE OF RUSSIA'S SEAPOWER

(By Fletcher Knebel)

Soviet Russia, for centuries a giant land turtle, suddenly is striking out to sea with an agility and determination that surprise some U.S. military strategists and alarm others. While the eyes of the world have been focused on feats of rocketry in outer space, the Kremlin's orders have resulted in startling Communist progress in the far more familiar element of water. With its recent maritime surge little noticed save by marine experts, Russia now looms as a powerful bidder for supremacy on the high seas. The facts are not comforting:

Navy: The U.S.S.R. has passed Great Britain and now boasts the world's second largest war fleet, outranked only by that of the United States. Russia's 750,000-man Navy floats 25 cruisers, 165 destroyers, 430 submarines, including some missile-firing and atom-powered subs, 275 frigates, 500 motor torpedo boats, 900 minesweepers, a host of auxiliary craft and sizable shore-based naval aviation.

Merchant marine: Soviet freighters and tankers, their stacks decorated with the hammer-and-sickle emblem, now call at 60 major ports. Russia's merchant fleet continues to expand at an ever-growing pace, while that of the United States shrinks. Its 1,050 oceangoing merchant ships, totaling about 5 million deadweight tons, now rank Russia high on the list of maritime nations.

Fishing fleet: The Soviet Union operates the world's largest and most modern high-seas fishing fleet, with 3,000 ships plying all major fishing banks around the globe. The Russians now outfish U.S. commercial fishermen in waters off Cape Cod and Alaska and are even building a fishing port in Cuba. Many Soviet trawlers double as floating intelligence centers, with electronic and sonar gear collecting data on our radar installations, Pacific atom tests and shore defenses.

Shipbuilding: No nation is building more ships faster than the Soviet Union. In addition to a recent huge expansion of its Black Sea shipyards, Russia has more than 200 freighters, tankers and passenger-cargo ships on order in the free-world yards of Japan, Italy, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, and West Germany and also in the Communist-bloc yards of East Germany, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Poland. Smaller craft are even being built in landlocked Czechoslovakia. By 1980, Russia aims to have a 20 million ton merchant fleet, matching or surpassing the commercial tonnage of Great Britain, now the merchant marine leader.

Oceanography: Russia already owns the largest and most modern marine-laboratory fleet afloat. Its 100-plus scientific vessels outnumber the 57 research ships operated by Government and private institutions in the United States. Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev has channeled some of Russia's best scientific brains into underwater research.

Marine technology: Russia is in the forefront of experimentation in design and gadgetry. A completely automated vessel recently made a trial run in the Black Sea. Some of the newest Soviet tankers can load or discharge oil with one man operating the automated console. Some freighters have closed-circuit TV for docking operations. Hydraulic hatches, an atom-powered icebreaker, hydrofoil ships carrying passengers at 40 knots, gas turbine engines, 70,000-ton tankers, fiberglass hulls, all figure in the new face of Russia on the high seas. Like the United States and Britain, Russia is even experimenting with hovercraft vessels that never touch the waves.

While Russia's missile strength is far below that of the United States, as reported in the November 6 issue of Look, Russia's rise to sea power causes grave concern at the Pentagon. "The Soviets have built the world's second-largest navy since World War II," says Adm. George W. Anderson, Jr., Chief of Naval Operations, "and their merchant marine of smart, large, modern, clean ships is becoming a powerful tool for economic and political expansion."

"The trend alarms us," says Capt. D. A. Scott of the Navy's progress-analysis group. "It used to be a rare sight to see a Russian freighter. Now, two or three can be seen in almost every major port. It will be no surprise to see Russian warships maneuvering off Cape Henry (near Norfolk, Va.) in the years ahead."

"The Russians," said Assistant Secretary of the Navy Kenneth E. Belieu in a May speech, are moving "at flank speed to develop the sea-transport system they will need in order to pursue their goal of world domination. Most important of all, at this critical point in history, our own merchant fleet is declining in strength, versatility, and vigor, just when we appear to need them most."

Russia's new boldness on the high seas was flaunted under America's nose this summer when, within the space of a few weeks, the U.S.S.R. sent more than 60 ships into Cuba and unloaded heavy stocks of tanks, weapons, motor torpedo boats, and even guided missiles. Only about half of the freighters that carried arms, Communist "technicians" and supplies to Castroland were Russian. Indeed, some of the chartered bottoms belonged to our Western allies.

There was no doubt in the minds of U.S. officials, however, that Russia could have sent the entire expedition in Russian hulls had Khrushchev so desired. The Soviet maritime fleet could have handled Operation Castro easily. It was speculated that the Kremlin chartered some free world ships primarily to embarrass the United States and to make any interference with the supply line diplomatically distasteful to this country. It would have been one thing to turn back an arms-laden Soviet ship from Havana Harbor, had the Kennedy administration the appetite for such a venture, but quite another to seize and search the vessel of a NATO member.

If Russia used the seas with audacity en route to Cuba, it was no less ambitious this spring in its invasions of U.S. fishing grounds off Cape Cod in the Atlantic and off Alaska in the Pacific. The Interior Department's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in June tallied no less than 169 Soviet ships on Georges Bank, just east of Cape Cod, and 107 Communist fishing vessels in the gulf of Alaska. This record encroachment of almost 280 Red ships on traditional American fishing grounds represented a dramatic change in a short time. As recently as 1954, there were no sightings of Russian vessels off the east coast, and never until this year had Soviet fishing fleets ventured into the gulf of Alaska. This spring, two Russian vessels even tested fishing off North and South Carolina.

Soviet trawlers form formidable fishing fleets, with modern facilities and techniques far surpassing those in use by the United

States. The Russian boats are fueled and serviced by repair ships, and transfer their catches to factory ships that process and pack the fish for market and to 10,000-ton mother ships that freeze them.

Many of the trawlers double as ocean intelligence agents, measuring American H-bomb tests in the Pacific, watching Atlantic naval maneuvers, pinpointing coastal radar beams and charting harbors, banks, and shelves along U.S. coasts. Navy patrol planes have pictured Russian trawlers bristling with electronic gear. Navy intelligence has learned that some trawlers carry scientific and espionage teams. American fishermen on infrequent visits aboard Russian trawlers have been barred from certain secret quarters. In 1960, the Russian trawler *Vega* had to be chased from its observation post by U.S. Navy ships. The *Vega* stood close by a Navy task force, including a nuclear Polaris submarine, during missile-firing tests off the east coast.

Along with its intelligence catch, Russia takes a tremendous quantity of fish from the ocean and has moved ahead of the United States in total annual catch. The United States now ranks fifth as a fishing nation, behind Japan, Red China, Russia, and Peru.

"The United States," Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, told the Senate in August, "has no mother ships, no factory ships, no stern-ramp trawlers, no refrigerated transport ships, no large fisheries vessels of any kind. No modern U.S. fishing fleet exists."

To help remedy the situation, MAGNUSON joined with two other Democratic Senators to sponsor bills offering larger construction subsidies for U.S. fishing boats and authorizing the Government to build two ultramodern trawlers for pilot purposes.

It is perhaps ironic that the United States, with its historic pride in competitive free enterprise, finds itself being overtaken on the high seas by state-operated commercial fleets of a Communist power. It is even more ironic that Government subsidies are being proposed as the chief answer. But what is true of fishing vessels is also true of the merchant marine.

Russia's armada of merchant ships, crowned by glistening new tankers running up to 70,000 tons, has tripled since the opening of World War II and is expected to increase threefold again by the end of this decade. Before the war, Russia carried only 10 percent of its own trade in Soviet ships. Now, it carries about 60 percent of its trade, which has ballooned in volume. With more than 140 tankers in service and many more building, Russia powers a Communist oil offensive that is undercutting Western producers in a number of free world countries.

At the same time, our own merchant marine is dwindling. The active U.S. merchant fleet is contracting at the rate of 31 ships a year, according to the authoritative Marine Engineering Log. Our huge reserve fleet from World War II, while still largely intact, rusts into obsolescence at river and harbor anchorages. Of the 907 active ships flying the U.S. flag, 300 belong to 16 lines that receive a Government operating subsidy. Another 412 ships, aggregating almost 11 million tons, have gone under foreign flags of convenience or necessity, depending on the point of view.

Early this year, Donald W. Alexander, the Maritime Administrator, urged a revolutionary approach to the American merchant marine in the face of "competition that could destroy it." He spoke of automated ships, such as the Russians are building, and of assembly-line shipyards patterned after one in Sweden. Thus far, however, no general revolution in American methods has erupted, despite marked progress symbolized by such ships as the nuclear-powered cargo vessel, the *Savannah*, and the 106,500-ton tanker *Manhattan*.

Caught between high wages and high costs at home and foreign subsidies and state control abroad. American commercial shipping would appear to have three alternatives: (1) Slash operating costs and trim down drastically for world competition; (2) enlarge Government subsidies, or (3) suffer a continued decline in both the merchant marine and the shipbuilding facilities that support it. Which of these alternatives the Kennedy administration will choose remains unclear.

In the field of oceanography, Russia now leads the world. The U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries calls the Soviet Government's marine research a vast program and says that thousands of scientists and technologists are working for the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Marine Fisheries and Oceanography. The research is coordinated by two large institutes at Murmansk and Vladivostok.

In simple terms of naval might, the United States still sails unchallenged on the seas, but Russia has built rapidly since World War II. The United States has 26 carriers on active duty. Russia has none, active or inactive. The United States has 240 destroyers to about 165 for Russia. But in other categories, Russia leads with 25 cruisers to 13 for the United States, 400 patrol-type craft to 70 in the active U.S. Fleet, and about 430 submarines to 118 U.S. subs. In addition, Russia maintains a flotilla of 500 motor torpedo boats, a few of which were sent to Cuba this summer. The United States no longer maintains the mosquito fleet that boosted President Kennedy to fame.

It is the huge Russian submarine force that worries American Navy strategists. Hitler opened World War II with only 57 U-boats, yet they scourged the sealanes and sank millions of tons of allied shipping. Should war break out today, Russia could fling more than 400 subs around the world to paralyze our merchant and warships. Though we lead Russia in the undersea missile-firing capability of the American Polaris submarines, it will be only a matter of a few years until the U.S.S.R. can threaten our inland cities with hydrogen-tipped missiles hurled from submarines hidden beneath the waves.

The duel between the submarine and the ships and planes that prey upon it is always a delicately balanced one, but right now, the submarine holds clear superiority. Nuclear power permits the sub to lurk beneath the surface for weeks. The Polaris-type missile gives it the hidden striking power of millions of tons of TNT.

Swift progress in antisubmarine warfare is a paramount task facing the U.S. Navy. Some admirals, indeed, believe it deserves the type of intense civilian-military cooperation found in the space program. Unless the answer is soon found, Russia's subs may some day take control of the seas without firing a shot.

Russia's bid for mastery on the high seas presents American leaders with an unwanted challenge; for, at the same time, the Soviet Union is racing for the upper hand in space. Yet the marine challenge is total—in merchantmen, in tankers, in research, in naval power, in fisheries and in shipbuilding. Whether Russia's seapower bid will be met in the sweeping fashion in which it has been made remains a question the Kennedy administration has yet to answer.

THE TYRANNY OF THE MINORITY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, under date of February 2, 1963, there appeared in the New York Times an editorial entitled "The Tyranny of the Minority." I believe that this subject should be brought to the attention of all Senators, as well as to thoughtful people throughout the country. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TYRANNY OF THE MINORITY

Those who dismiss as a capricious and meaningless waste of time the losing fight by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, to alter the size of and representation of committees of the Senate miss the point of a profoundly serious conflict. The real issue is not who will serve on which committees, and how they will be chosen, but rather whether the Senate—and the Congress as a whole—can be forced out of the path of obsolescence to which it is stubbornly adhering.

Essentially, the issue is this: The congressional committee structure as it has evolved over the last half century and more has inverted one of the basic concepts of democratic government—from rule of the majority to rule by a minority. This is a palpable fact of congressional life today; it is not simply a slogan of liberal soreheads.

Command of the legislative process is in control of, comparatively speaking, a handful of legislators on the individual major committees of the House and Senate. More often than not, command is wielded not even by this small group but by the individual chairmen themselves.

The chairmen and/or the clique of committee seniors whom they control—usually a bipartisan clique—can and do withhold from floor consideration bills of which they personally disapprove. The devices for this arbitrary action are manifold: a chairman can simply pocket a bill referred to him and not bring it before his committee; he can kill it by the tactics of delay; he can kill it, or emasculate it, by the choice of witnesses brought in to testify on it. There are no really effective means of forcing a reluctant committee to act.

These chairmen and their cliques are fortified in their intransigence by the rule of seniority, and most of them in a Democratic Congress come from the safe and conservative districts of the South. In terms of Senator Clark's indictment, they represent the establishment. And in terms of the Kennedy administration, they represent the real as opposed to the titular opposition.

The question is not merely whether individual items on the Kennedy program will or will not be enacted by this Congress. The greater question is whether President Kennedy—or any President—can have his program submitted to the whole Congress to be tested fairly and expeditiously in the scales of majority rule.

The bicameral system was deliberately designed to check the tyranny of the majority. It was never designed to foster the tyranny of a minority. But this tyranny has been established through the evolution of the committee structure, and there it rests today, a wasting, corroding growth on our system of government.

THE WELFARE STATE AND THE WARFARE STATE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, my colleague from Idaho, the distinguished senior Senator FRANK CHURCH, spoke recently at the University of Utah on "The Welfare State"—a subject not of his own choosing, but one on which he chose his words and arguments exceedingly well.

He pointed out that our present high Federal spending levels are not the result of the welfare state, but of what he called the warfare state. His eloquent and comprehensive treatment of this broad subject deserves widespread reading and consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the excellent address made by Senator CHURCH at the University of Utah on February 28 of this year be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The topic which has been assigned to me is "The Welfare State." Evidently, it is the gift of your "committee in charge of persecuting guest speakers."

If the words, taken in the context of their current political usage, carried only their literal meaning, I would have no cause for complaint. Governments which are heedless of the welfare of the people usually fall to a violent death. The right of the people to overthrow such governments is one of the self-evident truths proclaimed by our own Declaration of Independence, while the affirmative obligation to promote the general welfare is listed among the express purposes for which the Federal Government was established, in the preamble to the Constitution of the United States.

But the term "welfare state" has come to connote something quite different from the wholesome concept of a government rightfully concerned about the welfare of its citizens. Extremists on the radical right use the phrase as a label for the villain in their well-oiled political spook show, now on the road from coast to coast. For them, "welfare state" means:

> The do-gooders are at it again. They want the Government (meaning the Federal Government) to act as wet nurse for the whole population, from the cradle to the grave, insuring that every want is uniformly satisfied, and that the shiftless, the improvident, and the lazy are taken care of at the expense of the steady, the foresighted, and the energetic. They either don't know, or don't care, that to do this will destroy the fundamental qualities of character—known to the old frontier—which have made our country great. They are extracting, through ever-higher taxes, the good citizens' hard-earned money (which he can certainly spend for better purposes than the Government can devise) and they are doling it out to bad citizens.
>
> In the process, the Government has become insolvent, the Nation has been brought to the brink of bankruptcy, and a monstrous bureaucracy has arisen which engulfs Congress and stretches its tentacles around the 50 States, slowly squeezing them to death. This bureaucracy, best typified by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is dedicated to socialism, determined to destroy free enterprise, and undermine the liberties of the people. Further, it has been designed by the do-gooders as a means for perpetuating themselves in power by buying the votes of the no-gooders. Shades of the Roman circuses. And finally, we suspect these do-gooders are actually fellow-travelers whose purpose it is to so weaken the country from within that the Communists can take it over without ever firing a shot.

Now, if there are any among you who believe in this nightmare version of "the welfare state," there is little I can say to awaken you. I might just as well try to defend the Inquisition or medieval methods of torture.

So I must speak to the unspooked among you—to those of you who would rather pull the sheets off would-be ghosts than quail before them. With you, then, who are the open-minded and inquiring students, let me proceed to examine each of these hobgoblins, one by one.

To begin with, what accounts for the big Government we have in Washington today, and for the relatively high level of Federal taxation needed to support it? Take a look at the Federal budget for 1963, and the answer is at once evident. Big Government on the Potomac is chiefly the product of warfare, not welfare. Over half the total budget goes directly to the Armed Forces.

In order to emphasize the magnitude of our military spending, allow me to relate it to something with which we are all familiar. We see, every day, impressive evidence of the effort and expense required for the education of our youngsters. In nearly every small town, in your State and mine, the largest buildings are the public schools. For every 25 or 30 youngsters, there is a full-time, professional educator. Teachers' salaries alone are a big chunk of the State and local taxes we must pay. Yet the Federal Government is spending, every year, for defense, more than treble the cost of all the educational programs in the country—including the school buildings themselves, the salaries of teachers and administrators, the books and supplies and lab equipment, the janitorial and upkeep services, light and heat, the gymnasiums and stadiums, down to the last football helmet and catchers mitt. Three times as much. It is this tremendous expenditure, which we have had to sustain, almost without letup, for more than 20 years, that mainly accounts for the big Government in Washington today.

But, before you accuse me of telling only half the story, let's turn the Federal tax dollar over and have a look at the nonmilitary side. You may be surprised to find, on this side of the taxpayer's dollar, that most of the spending once again relates to warfare requirements, past and prospective, not to welfare programs. Our Space Technology, Atomic Energy, and Central Intelligence Agencies are all directly linked to our national security. The swollen costs of diplomacy and foreign aid, including military assistance to our allies, also relate to the security needs of the United States. Add these along with the continuing cost of our involvment in past wars, veterans' benefits and interest payments on the war debt, to what we spend each year on the armed forces, and the grand total accounts for a staggering 80 percent of all Federal spending.

This leaves 20 cents out of each Federal tax dollar still to be accounted for, much less than half of which goes to pay the costs of the Federal health, education, and welfare programs which lie at the heart of the controversy over "the welfare state." To be exact, 7 cents out of each taxpayer's dollar is all that is being spent by the Federal Government on welfare, which is a lesser percentage of our gross national product than the Government spent on welfare 25 years ago.

What are these welfare programs? They include Federal grants-in-aid to the States for aged, blind, and disabled citizens, and dependent children; Federal grants, usually given on a matching basis, for public health, hospital construction, water and sewage pollution, and food and drug administration. Also included are all forms of Federal aid to education, Federal impact funds, the school lunch program, vocational rehabilitation, and the special assistance to schools and students made available through the National Defense Education Act. Also the costs of administering unemployment compensation, policing of unions, and financing research for medical cures of cancer, heart disease, infantile paralysis, multiple sclerosis, and a host of other diseases of mind and body.

Meat-ax these programs, if you will, eliminate most of them in their entirety, and cut the remainder to ribbons, and you might save 5 percent on your Federal income tax—for such is the relative cost of all the welfare programs to the total cost of the Federal Government today. I submit that the Federal budget establishes, beyond question, that big government on the national level, as we know it today, is the creature of the warfare state, not the welfare state.

Some of the other hobgoblins of the radical right, to which I earlier referred, can now be discarded with relative ease.

What about the burgeoning Federal bureaucracy spreading through every State and stifling the scope of State government? Actually, Federal employment no longer keeps pace with the growth of the country. In 1952, there were 16 Federal employees for every thousand of population. By 1958, this number had dropped to 14, and it will be 13 in fiscal 1964. In the decade from 1952 to 1962, total Federal civilian employment fell 3 percent, while employment by State and local governments increased by 63 percent. If creeping socialism is measured by the rising tide of government employees, the sentinels better station themselves closer to home.

What then of the hobgoblin of fiscal irresponsibility and imminent insolvency? Is the Federal Government spending itself into bankruptcy? The national debt, accumulated mainly through our participation in two world wars, is very large indeed. In 1947, at the close of World War II, the national debt exceeded our national wealth, as measured by the value of all the goods and services produced by the American people in that year. In 1963, though the debt had climbed still higher, our national wealth had doubled, and more. A person who has a $10,000 income is in a better position to carry a $5,000 debt than a person with a $4,000 income. The same is true of a nation. Right after World War II, our national debt was nearly 130 percent of our GNP. Today it is just under 50 percent. In 1947, the national debt per person amounted to $1,900. Today it is $1,600. While we would all like to see the Federal debt reduced, our growing wealth has steadily improved our capacity to handle it, and the debt per person is substantially less today than at almost any time in the last 25 years.

I think you will find it of interest, also, that while the total debt of the Federal Government has increased by 15 percent since 1947, the aggregate debt of State and local governments has increased an astonishing 332 percent, in the total amount of $56 billion. Private business debt has increased, in this same period, by $271 billion, reflecting the tremendous expansion in all business activity. Again I must conclude that if deficit spending is the measure of fiscal irresponsibility, as most conservatives would have us believe, then the Federal Government is coming off best these days, when compared with either State and local governments, or with the private sector of the economy.

Now that we have put into somewhat better perspective some of the facts about our "welfare state," it is apparent that we are not dealing with such a monster as might first have been supposed. Most of the Federal giant's bulk is made up of muscles for our defense. He spends less of his income coddling us than he used to; he is not growing so fast as we are; and the lesser monsters at the State capital and the county seat are running us into debt faster than he is.

But he is big. Let us now ask ourselves how and why he got that way. Was it the result of some conscious conspiracy to concentrate power in Washington at the expense of the States? Was it the product of some alien doctrine? Was it really a plot for perpetuating politicians in office?

These questions seem to have some plausibility, because we tend to compare the size

and scope of the Federal Government, in our time, with the limited role originally assigned to it by the Founding Fathers. We remind ourselves of Thomas Jefferson's famous admonition, "that government rules best that rules least," overlooking the fact that the standard was meant to apply to the life and times of a rural and sparsely populated Colonial America. Nor was it wholly believed even then, for had it been, the Founding Fathers would hardly have spent that hot summer of 1787 in Philadelphia. They would have had no need to draft the Federal Constitution there. The Government established by the Articles of Confederation would have been quite adequate. It would have been, in fact, ideal, for one can hardly imagine a government which did less governing.

The men who lived in colonial times could not foresee the sweeping changes the future held in store for their infant country. They could not possibly have envisioned how our lives would be transformed by stampeding science, by mammoth industry, and by the burgeoning growth and urbanization of America.

Would Adam Smith recognize our free enterprise system today, where the classical capitalism of his time has been so largely supplanted by the corporate capitalism of ours?

Would Alexander Hamilton, who believed public affairs should be handled by an educated elite, the rich and well-born, ever have thought it possible that his countrymen would come to adopt a system of socialized education, that is to say, a tax-supported universal system of free public schools?

What questions would George Washington be most apt to put to John F. Kennedy, if he could visit him today in the White House? Would he look out over the teeming city that bears his name, in and around which there are more people thickly settled than lived in all the country when he became our first President, and ask, "Why has the Government grown so large?"

I very much doubt it.

I think, rather, that he would look with wonder at the 35th President of the United States, whose jurisdiction extends from the Atlantic seaboard Washington knew, northward as far as the Arctic Circle and westward across a mighty continent and beyond as far as the mid-Pacific itself, and he would say to him, "Mr. President, how is it that our little Republic ever endured? Through all of this, what miracle has preserved a constitutional system we designed two centuries ago to meet the simple needs of 13 backwoods Colonies?

I submit that our constitutional system has survived, because it has found the means to accommodate the changing needs of the people. The Federal Government has grown up with the country, and its role has expanded in order to protect the public interest in finding satisfactory solutions for the new problems thrust upon us by a highly-industrialized payroll economy, dominated by gigantic corporations and equally gigantic labor unions, and increasingly characterized by the growing interdependence which results from congested urban life.

Today, Federal agencies regulate the rates which may be charged by railroads, trucking companies, airlines, electric and gas utilities, and telephone and telegraph companies. Others supervise the use of the airwaves to assure the orderly transmission of radio and television broadcasts. Still others see that certain drugs are not dispensed without a prescription, and that others are properly labelled, and that the public is not cheated by false advertising claims. All of these regulatory activities are connected in a certain way with our welfare; none of them presented a problem, for local, State, or National Government, when the Federal Union was first joined.

Why have we created, over a long period of time, a welfare state, at least to the extent of assigning these particular functions to the Federal Government? Isn't it because the advances of science and industry, of trade and commerce, created novel problems unknown before, which were beyond the effective reach of State or local government, and which had to be solved in some way?

Can the airwaves be usurped without any kind of regulation in the public interest? If not, can the State of Utah stop a broadcast from Denver at the State boundary line? Can the State of Texas insure that consumers of natural gas in Illinois are not overcharged? I suggest these questions answer themselves.

We in the West, living in the less developed region of our country, have especially benefited from the expanded role of the Federal Government. To speed our development, we need the advantage of investment from without, investment of both private and public capital. Outside investment of public capital must come from the Federal Government, and its role has been of crucial importance to the growth of the West.

Take, for example, the interstate highway system, now under construction to meet the projected needs of the Nation's economy. Over 90 percent of the money is furnished through the Federal Government. In Idaho, some 65 percent of the money for our secondary highways and farm-to-market roads, comes from the Federal Government. In States like ours, where there are fewer than 10 persons per square mile, if the population were evenly spread over the area across which roads must be built, Federal money is essential to the construction of a modern road system. Without it, we would still be driving in the dirt.

And the same is true of much of the reclamation that causes our deserts to bloom. The Federal Government alone had the capital necessary to finance its great reclamation projects. Private sources could not furnish it, and neither could our State governments. Today, in Idaho, the Federal Government has begun the construction of a dam which will exceed the cost of the entire State budget for the next 2 years. Yet, the dam will be a sound investment; it will nourish our regional economy, and it will pay for itself, with interest, in 50 years. The point is, had we left such dams to the States to build, we might just as well have left them to the beavers.

Don't fool yourselves. The West has profited more from Federal investment than any other section of the country. More Federal money is today being spent in Utah, on a per capita basis, than any other State in the country. Yet you send to Congress a crop of candidates who say they are against this spending. Somehow, you have managed to have your cake and eat it too.

But if Congress has been willing, over the years, to expand the role of Federal investment in the West, it has been reluctant, on the whole, to extend the range of Federal intervention in the general economy. Fifteen million people stood in breadlines, in the dark, desperate days of the great depression, before Congress at last realized that our economy had outgrown effective local control, and required sufficient national regulation to police the nation's stock exchange, to stabilize the national banks, and to protect the people against the total collapse of the nation's business. Unemployment compensation, social security, minimum wage and hour laws, were then made the instruments of reform, as we began the long climb back to recovery.

Our own history is the basis for my contention that the Federal Government has grown bigger, assuming a larger role in the life of the people, not because anyone planned it that way, not in pursuit of any conspiracy to concentrate power on the Potomac, not, indeed, because any body of doctrine required it, but simply because the country grew and changed, problems arose which existing machinery could not solve, and new ways were worked out, usually on a trial-and-error basis, to meet them. What I am saying is that we have not been doctrinaire, holding something to be good or bad as soon as some label could be affixed to it, but pragmatic, looking for the solution most apt to work, whatever it might be.

And I would say that the pragmatic method has served us well. Indeed, I would go further, and offer the judgment that it is a key source of strength and viability in the system we have evolved together for solving the problems of the 20th century.

Contrast it, if you will, to the approach to problem solving in Communist lands. It is there that dogma rules supreme. There it is supposed that one formula exists which offers the correct answer to every question; it is the fixed and final mold of a perfect society. When new problems arise, solutions are sought by searching the writings of the Communist prophets, and if one faction dislikes what another proposes, they attack it by saying that it is not in accordance with the principles of Marxist-Leninist doctrine. This straitjacket, since it leaves little room for change and adjustment, must eventually be torn asunder, by the inevitable pressures of new problems that cannot find solution within the rigid pattern of dogma handed down from an earlier, and much different, period.

This is why the best minds in the free world are confident that time is on our side in the struggle with communism, while it is the timid and the troubled among us, who seek the comfort of conformity, and want to solve all problems of the present by reciting the ritual slogans of the past, who fear that communism, being inflexible and disciplined by dogma, will soon overwhelm us.

You may accept it as the liberal view that neither the formulas of the radical left, nor those of the radical right, offer us acceptable blueprints for the future. This does not mean that we lack values, as some have rudely charged; it means only that we do not claim to be prophetic. We do not presume to know what the future holds, and so we strive, from day to day, to keep our society open and free, knowing that in this way we can continue to apply the same pragmatic test to the problems of the future, as has served us so well in the past.

This brings us to an examination of the last hobgoblin in the political spook-show version of the welfare state, with which I commenced this discourse, the familiar assertion that the huge Federal octopus is crushing our basic freedom. This question ought to be paramount in any appraisal of the larger role the Federal Government has come to play in our society.

Has the expanding activity of the Federal Government infringed upon the freedom of the individual? If by freedom one means the bundle of individual rights guaranteed to each citizen by the Federal Constitution, then there is no evidence to support the charge. The whole movement of our history has been in the direction of enlarging the bundle: slavery has been abolished, women's suffrage has been won, the many restrictions that once made voting the privilege of the propertied few, have been steadily sloughed away. The complaints I get about current decisions of the Supreme Court are not to the effect that the Court is giving too little attention to the rights of the individual, but too much.

I confess I most often hear the cry that our freedom is being lost, in some sumptuous living room or beside some sparkling private swimming pool. In this setting, it is usually a fancy way of saying, "Taxes are too high." Now, despite the fact that our free enterprise system seems to be surviving the heavy burden of taxes it carries, I agree that a tax cut would very likely stimulate our economic growth and further reduce unemployment. I wish conditions in the world were such as might permit us to cut taxes massively. But as long as external danger forces us to hold up the heavy shield of a warfare state, massive tax cuts will not occur.

Nevertheless, I must remind you that, over the past decade, the trend in Federal taxes has been moderately downward, while the trend in State and local taxes has been sharply up. In 1953, the Federal income tax was reduced 10 percent, and the rates will probably be reduced again in this session of Congress. During the same period, in my own State of Idaho, per capita taxes increased by more than 100 percent.

Still, candor obliges me to acknowledge, that neither this disposal of the question of taxes, nor the spreading scope we are giving to individual rights under the Constitution, quite suffices to remove the lingering doubt that somehow our freedom is being impaired. This is an emotion many people share. Again I suggest it may spring from traditional and historic roots.

The ideal of freedom which motivated the founders of our Republic was based upon a way of life that has long since disappeared. The social and economic order they knew and valued was founded on land ownership. They envisioned a society of freeholders, each producing on the land nearly everything he and his family needed, and consuming nearly everything produced. They conceived that the independence, industry, and self-reliance of these farmer-freeholders, supplemented by a small minority of equally independent craftsmen and artisans, would yield a maximum of freedom. In such a society, there was need for only a minimum of government, which was suspect anyway, owing to the tyranny of the King. The natural attitude was to hold government down, permit no interference with freedom of speech and religion, insure fair and orderly judicial proceedings, keep the tax collector away, and all will be well. This early concept of freedom remains very much a part of our birthright.

We westerners have nurtured an even more windswept notion of freedom, drawn from the legend and romance of the old frontier. We recall the mountain men who roamed the vastness of the West in the early days. Here indeed was freedom. The mountain man needed only his rifle and his knife, the wide, empty world to live in, and to be left alone—and he had all these things. By himself he wrested from the wilderness what he needed for food, for clothing, and for shelter. True, he knew nothing of books or finery; he was often cold and hungry; and if he got sick, he usually lived or died alone. But he was as free as the wild animals he preyed upon.

Now, the modern man, who works for wages in a factory or an office, or who tractors a big spread of land on which he grows only wheat or potatoes, is both more and less free than his mountain predecessor and the self-sufficient freeholder of the 18th century. In some ways, he is a wheel within a wheel within a wheel, pulling the same lever on an assembly line, or bearing the same leather dispatch case, full of papers, which is one of those status symbols of the organization man. He has come to need many things which his ancestors didn't even know about, and couldn't possibly have imagined. He is hemmed in by laws and regulations, and he pays taxes.

In exchange, his life is longer, fuller, and easier. He is literate, and if he avails himself of the opportunity, he may know the pleasures of good books, good music, and good drama. He has leisure time for travel and recreation, and he can readily know much about what goes on in the big world around him. If he is taken sick, there are doctors, nurses, and well-equipped hospitals to care for him. Wherever he may live, he can easily stay in touch with his parents or grandparents, children or grandchildren. And he is conscious, if he ever stops to think about it, that his fellowmen, whether they are engaged in chipping away at the malignant mysteries of cancer, or giving penicillin to the diseased children of Africa, or probing the alien darkness of outer space, are being sustained, in part, by the product of his labor.

Who is to say whether freedom has been gained or lost through the upheaval of science and industry that has so changed the character of our lives? The form of the free life known to the old frontier is disappearing, and there is no way to recapture it. Of this, I am sure. We stand upon what President Kennedy has chosen to describe as a New Frontier. It is a time of peril and of promise for the human race. Science has given us the tools to either cinderize the earth in the witchfire of nuclear war, or make of it man's footstool to the stars.

God only knows what our fate is to be. But on this earth He has left our destiny in our hands. We can best prepare for it, by facing the future, by recognizing that our welfare state, as we know it today, has been fashioned by the effort of free men to regulate their affairs in response to the needs of the changing times. Let the process continue, for it cannot be stopped. And let us pray that it will be directed, in the future as it has in the past, by unbigoted and pragmatic men, who have no fear of hobgoblins, and who are dedicated to the everlasting quest of keeping our society open and free.

DR. HOWARD R. DRIGGS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, one of Utah's most illustrious sons, Dr. Howard R. Driggs, died recently in New York City at the ripe old age of 89, and made the long trip back to his hometown of Pleasant Grove for his final resting place.

The author of more than 50 books on western pioneer life, Dr. Driggs was clear minded and hearty up to his last years, publishing "Money Rock, a Drama of the Pony Express," in 1960.

He was a supervisor of English at the University of Utah School of Education from 1906 to 1912, and later served as English education chairman at New York University. In this post he was one of the first educators in the country to use radio in the classroom.

During all of the years he was teaching he was also writing about the part of the country which was his first love—the West. Among his best known books were "Red Feather," "Deadwood Gold," "The Pioneer Life," "The Rise of the Lone Star," and "Westward America." He also edited and produced the "American Trails" film series.

The Ogden Standard Examiner and the Salt Lake Tribune both carried brief but eloquent editorials on Dr. Driggs and his contribution to America, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Standard Examiner, Feb. 19, 1963]

HISTORIAN H. R. DRIGGS

Utah's Howard Roscoe Driggs is one man who definitely will go down in American history.

Definitely because Howard Driggs wrote many of the best histories of the western part of our Nation.

Mr. Driggs, who died Sunday at 89, was the author of 20 books of his own and coauthor of 12 more. The Pleasant Grove, Utah, native taught history and English 45 years before his retirement in 1942 as professor emeritus of English education at New York University.

When he was graduated in 1897 from the University of Utah, Howard Driggs was named "class poet." In the 66 active years that followed his graduation, he was more than a poet although his writings had the "ring" of fine poetry.

Howard Driggs in his full life contributed greatly to the understanding of the West—past, present and future.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune]

DR. HOWARD R. DRIGGS

American awareness of the role of the West in U.S. history is largely due to the work of scholars like Dr. Howard R. Driggs, who died in New York Sunday at the age of 89.

Dr. Driggs, professor emeritus of English education at New York University, devoted much of his time, especially since retirement 21 years ago, to collecting and publishing the stories of western pioneers. He wrote more than a score of books and was coauthor of a dozen. His last work was "Money Rock, a Drama of the Pony Express," which appeared in 1960.

But it was probably as president of the American Pioneer Trails and Landmarks Association that Dr. Driggs had the greatest impact in bringing the history of the West to the attention of the Nation. He edited and produced films for the association until shortly before his death, and he was widely known as a speaker on such subjects as the Utah handcart pioneers. His constant theme was that a country's true wealth is based upon the character and heritage of its people.

Many honors came to Dr. Driggs, among them election to the Western Hall of Fame. He was respected and admired as an educator, scholar, and historian. He was an outstanding citizen whose death will be mourned across the Nation. The Tribune joins in saluting the memory of this eminent son of Utah, who will be laid to rest this week at Pleasant Grove where he was born in 1873.

U.S. RESIDUAL FUEL OIL IMPORT POLICY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Utah and other coal-producing States of the Nation, asking only fair treatment in the marketplace and a reasonable and stable oil import policy for long-range planning, are worse off already in 1963, than last year.

On January 30, 1963, Secretary of Interior Udall announced an increase of 6.5 million barrels of imported residual oil for the remainder of the quota year. This meant an increase of 108,000 barrels daily during the months of February and March 1963. This blow, defended by the Interior Department on the basis of cold weather and unexpected decline in domestic production, had an effect on the coal industry comparable to throwing pails of water in the face of a drowning man.

Already economically sick from excessive residual oil imports, the coal-producing areas of the country had better brace themselves for a possible knockout punch. The recommendation of the

Office of Emergency Planning to relax import controls on residual oil sets the stage for the momentous decision as to the level of imports in the coming quota year beginning April 1. U.S. dollars to Venezuelan doughnuts, the decision may be the bitterest pill the coal industry ever has been obliged to swallow. The betting is on President Betancourt of Venezuela to score another victory for his country's oil economy over the economy of the coal- and oil-producing States of our country.

Utah produces about 5 million tons of bituminous coal annually, with a coal industry payroll estimated at over $10 million. The value of production of Utah coal runs to more than $30 million. The coal industry employs about 2,200 persons. Utah's railroad industry benefits from hauling coal. In 1961 the estimated railroad revenue derived from Utah coal shipments was $15,994,000.

Just think how these figures would skyrocket if the Federal Government should adopt a policy of promoting the coal industry on equal terms with atomic energy, for example, not to mention imported residual oil and the sales of interruptible gas.

Utah possesses close to 14 billion net tons of recoverable reserves of coal, assuming 50 percent recovery. Other States possess even greater volumes of reserves. The United States has sufficient coal reserves to keep our vast industrial machine going for many centuries.

However, the coal industry of Utah and other coal producing States apparently is not going to get much sympathy or help from Washington.

For some reason, which I am unable to fathom, the administration has turned its back on the American coal miner in a time of danger to the national security. The American coal miner has never let this country down in wartime or any other emergency.

One does not have to be a military expert to perceive that the present government of Venezuela is living under a continuing threat imposed by Castro. Oil wells are blown up, the power supply dynamited, and ships are hijacked by the Communists.

In time of war, and if Russia intervened, the east coast fuel supply certainly would be jeopardized.

Oblivious to the risks and perils of depending upon a foreign fuel in these days of crisis in the Caribbean, there are loud voices from New England clamoring for more and more residual oil and actually demanding an end to import quota restrictions of any kind.

I am sure that just about any major coal producing States that could be named, buys more products of New England manufacturing plants than does Venezuela. I am sure that the United States will never solve its balance-of-payments problem if it relies upon Venezuela to buy as much or more from us than we buy from her.

On February 7, 1963, 102 Members of the House of Representatives signed a letter to the President of the United States. They told the President:

> It is our firm conviction that controls on imports of residual oil must not only be retained but they must also be strengthened and made effective. The close correlation between excessive residual imports and the ability of domestic fuels and fuels transportation to meet the demands of national security is just as true now as it was when the control program was established.

I am in complete agreement with this statement, as well as the following one in the letter to the President:

> The coal, railroad, and related industries, and those millions of people dependent directly and indirectly upon them for a livelihood, urgently need assurances that the residual import control program will be retained and strengthened. There must be a certainty that reasonable controls will be in effect for a period of several years and that the program will be administered in a realistic manner. Import quotas should permit imported oil to share in the increase in the Nation's total fuel needs, but not to fill all of the increasing demand, as has been the case in recent years.

The Office of Emergency Planning report has not only alarmed the coal industry but also domestic oil producers, because the report declared that the Nation should not depend on resources within its own borders for security. They interpret this statement to mean that the report's author sees no justification for retaining import restrictions on crude petroleum and products, as well as residual oil.

I feel strongly that if the Office of Emergency Planning, Interior, and other Government agencies are unable to solve the residual oil import problem to the satisfaction of the domestic coal and oil industries, then it will be up to the Congress to do so.

The friendship of Venezuela and support of its Government against Communist pressures is greatly to be desired. I do not believe that it is necessary to wreck the economy of our coal-producing States to retain this friendship.

AFRICAN STUDENTS IN BULGARIA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the startling exodus of a number of African students from Bulgaria points up vividly the fact that the Communists have stumbled over their own shortcomings in wooing students from the developing nations. The students' disenchantment with conditions in Bulgaria—the racial discrimination, active segregation, and overt Communist indoctrination—demonstrates once again the imperfections of the Communist world, which has boasted so often of its racial tolerance.

Now we are faced with the very real problem of our own reaction to this situation. In a true sense, the challenge is to our own responsibility. We have been meeting it to a large degree, as the statistics point out quite clearly. Students from non-European nations presently studying in the West number well over 120,000, whereas those in the Eastern bloc countries are less than one-sixth; in number, approximately 18,000. The United States has been carrying a large share of this burden. We are taking 43,000 students of the 120,000 total; 8,277 from the Near and Middle East; 21,568 from the Far East; and 9,915 from Latin America. This is a significant share of the total. Can and will we go beyond it?

A group of young American students have reacted to the situation in a manner that must surely make us proud. The Brown University African Students Committee, comprised of David A. Lovenheim, Alan I. Brenner, Jonathan Kagan, Jeffrey Liss, and David London, has organized a drive to finance the education of at least one qualified African student who has fled from Bulgaria. These students gathered over 1,600 petitioners in support of such a move. Even more commendable is the fact that they have raised more than $3,000 by private contributions to pay the educational expenses of any student brought over. I am told that the president of Brown University, Barnaby Keeney, has responded to this student effort by pledging a dollar for dollar matching grant toward tuition costs. And I am informed that any contribution to the university for this project is eligible for matching funds on a one for two basis under the Ford Foundation challenge grant program.

Mr. Lincoln White, the State Department press officer, stated on March 1 that his department is coordinating its activities through the Institute of International Education. An official of this organization is being sent to Europe to interview these African students with a view toward determining which are eligible for admission to American universities and colleges, and which institutions have room and offer the curriculum these students are interested in. His findings may lead to the selection of students who are qualified to respond to Brown's generous offer.

Brown University in Rhode Island is the first American college to undertake such a project. The student committee, the student body as a whole, and the faculty has responded to the challenge in a spirited and positive fashion. They have set the guidelines, and they are to be much commended. I would hope that other American colleges will make this a nationwide effort so that, unlike the Communist nations, we may be judged by our sincere efforts.

HOSPITALIZATION FOR MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently my attention was directed to the fact that there is an omission in the law relative to veterans benefits to recipients of the Medal of Honor Award.

I became aware of this omission for the first time when Mr. Gene W. Rossman, the very capable Executive Director of the Housing Authority of Portland, Oreg., wrote to inform me that an Oregon resident, Mr. Jacob Volz, who was awarded the Medal of Honor in 1911, is in urgent need of hospitalization and medical care and is without funds to defray the expenses of such care.

As soon as I learned of Mr. Volz' problem, I directed an inquiry to Administrator Gleason, of the Veterans' Administration, and asked for full information concerning the possibility of obtaining help for Mr. Volz through the facilities of the Veterans' Administration. The report I received from Mr. Gleason was most discouraging. It indicated that Mr. Volz did not incur a disability in the line of duty and that he did not receive service-connected injuries which would entitle him to receive disability compensation.

Mr. Rossman was informed of the information supplied by the Veterans' Administration, and in response he told me that Mr. Volz' case is one involving great urgency, calling for the immediate service of a doctor and hospital care. Mr. Rossman added:

> If this man is allowed to die for lack of VA medical and hospital care, it will serve as a sad commentary on the meaning of the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Because of the persuasive nature of Mr. Rossman's comments, I asked Administrator Gleason to review Mr. Volz' case and to provide me with the draft of a bill designed to provide medical and hospital assistance under the program of the VA for recipients of the Medal of Honor. The Administrator supplied a draft which I intend to introduce today in slightly amended form.

Mr. President, in my opinion it is unthinkable that a member of our Armed Forces who has performed outstanding acts of valor and who demonstrated his willingness to sacrifice his life for his country, should be deprived of medical and hospital benefits in the closing years of his life. I feel that a veteran who has thus demonstrated his love for his country should, in turn, have some help from his country when that help is needed most urgently.

Jacob Volz' valor, in the service of his country, is beyond question. His Medal of Honor certificate recites that the Medal of Honor was awarded to him "on the 13th day of December 1911, for service while attached to the U.S.S. *Pampang* during action against the Moros on the island of Basilan, Philippine Islands, on September 24, 1911. Volz was one of a shore party moving in to capture Mundang."

At my request, the Department of the Navy supplied further details concerning Jacob Volz' outstanding acts of courage. The Department stated:

> While attached to the U.S.S. *Pampang*, Volz was one of a shore party moved in to capture Mundang, on the island of Basilan, Philippine Islands, on September 24, 1911. Investigating a group of Nipa huts close to the trail, the advance scout party was suddenly taken under point blank fire and rushed by approximately 20 enemy Moros attacking from inside the huts and other concealed positions. Volz responded instantly to calls for help and, finding all members of the scout party writhing on the ground but still firing, he blazed his rifle into the outlaws with telling effect, destroying several of the Moros and assisting in the rout of the remainder. By his aggressive charging of the enemy under heavy fire and in the face of great odds, Volz contributed materially to the success of the engagement.

Jacob Volz ably displayed his courage and valor and clearly demonstrated his willingness to serve far above and beyond the call of duty. The fact that the United States was not technically at war in 1911, in my opinion, is immaterial. The important point is that Volz engaged in the kind of heroism of the same magnitude as heroic acts that are performed by our military forces in time of war.

We have an obligation to our valiant men who have received the Medal of Honor, and I believe this obligation extends to providing medical and hospital assistance when the need is clearly demonstrated. The omission in the law which precludes such assistance to Medal of Honor winners, deserves thorough review by the Congress.

Mr. President, the Library of Congress has supplied me with information concerning the number of Medal of Honor Awards that have been issued since the inception of the award. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

	Deceased recipients	Living recipients
Department of the Navy	729	59
U.S. Marine Corps	236	51
Department of the Army	2,199	180
Department of the Air Force	4	0
U.S. Coast Guard	1	0
Total	3,169	290

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for those who are interested in the fiscal effects of my bill, the Veterans' Administration informed me that of the 290 living recipients of the Medal of Honor only 16, including Jacob Volz, could conceivably qualify for benefits under the bill I am about to introduce. Obviously, therefore, the cost of the benefits to be conferred under the bill would be relatively minor.

Therefore, to make provisions for situations such as those in which Jacob Volz, a holder of the Medal of Honor, finds himself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide the necessary corrective legislation. This bill would give to veterans holding the Medal of Honor, whether awarded in time of war or not, all of the medical, hospital, and veterans' domiciliary benefits now enjoyed by veterans who served in time of war and who are eligible for benefits under the Veterans' Benefit Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks a letter dated July 30, 1962, addressed to me by Administrator Gleason of the VA; my letter of January 7, 1962, addressed to Mr. Gene W. Rossman; and Administrator Gleason's letter of January 24, 1963, supplying helpful comments on this case.

I also ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Medal of Honor Certificate issued to Mr. Volz on December 13, 1911, be set forth in the Record.

I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

July 30, 1962.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for your letter of July 19, 1962, concerning the possibility of Veterans' Administration medical benefits for Mr. Jacob Volz who holds a Congressional Medal of Honor which entitles him to pension of $100 a month.

Unfortunately for Mr. Volz, the basic law relating to the Medal of Honor makes no provision for medical benefits. As a result, since Mr. Volz has peacetime service only, one of the following requirements would have to be met before we could furnish hospitalization:

(a) He must be separated (this term includes discharge, release, or retirement) from active military, naval, or air service for a disability incurred in line of duty; or

(b) He must be in receipt of compensation, or but for the receipt of retirement pay would be entitled to receive disability compensation.

Since Mr. Volz was not discharged for disability incurred in line of duty and service connection has not been established to a compensable degree, he does not meet either requirement of the law. Therefore, under the law as it now exists, he is not entitled to medical benefits from the Veterans' Administration.

I most sincerely regret that the Veterans' Administration is unable to be of assistance to Mr. Volz at this time.

Sincerely,

J. S. Gleason, Jr.,
Administrator.

January 7, 1962.

Mr. Gene W. Rossman,
Executive Director, Portland Housing Authority, Portland, Oreg.

Dear Mr. Rossman: Many thanks for your letter of January 3 in which you commented further on the Jacob Volz case.

The executive branch of the Government, speaking through the Veterans' Administration, has taken the position that no medical benefits can be made available to Mr. Volz under the program of the Veterans' Administration. The reasons are set forth in Administrator Gleason's letter of July 30, a copy of which I forwarded to you on August 16.

In view of your suggestion that we obtain congressional action to provide Mr. Volz with the requested medical benefits, I am doing some checking to see whether such legislation would have a chance of passing the Congress. As soon as my review of this matter has been completed, I shall get in touch with you again.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

Wayne Morse.

Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D.C., January 24, 1963.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Thank you for your letter of January 8, 1963, concerning medical benefits for Mr. Jacob Volz and other holders of the Medal of Honor who did not serve during a period of war as defined in laws governing our hospital and medical program.

With the recent enactment of Public Law 87–583, a veteran may be granted necessary hospital or outpatient treatment for a service-connected condition regardless of whether it arose within a period of war. Moreover, any veteran who was separated from service for disability incurred or aggravated in line of duty or who is receiving compensation for a service-connected disability, but requires hospitalization for a non-service-connected condition, may be furnished such care if Government beds are available. In addition, a veteran who has had service during one of the war periods as defined in our laws may be admitted on a bed-available basis to a Veterans' Administration facility for hospital treatment of a non-service-connected disorder if he is unable to defray the cost of private care.

Eligibility for outpatient treatment is generally limited to a service-connected condition, even as to veterans who served during a period of war. There is a special concession in the law to veterans of the Spanish-American War or the Indian wars whose disabilities are presumed to be service-connected when they apply for outpatient treatment.

We assume from the circumstances in which Mr. Volz finds himself that the chief problem is obtaining needed hospital treatment for extensive non-service-connected disabilities, rather than occasional outpatient treatment which might not present the same problem of expense to him. In compliance with your request, we are therefore enclosing a draft bill which would amend sections 610 and 624 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize needed hospitalization, if a Government bed is available, to one who holds the Medal of Honor, who is unable to defray the expense of private hospitalization, and does not qualify at present because he did not serve in a period of war as defined in VA laws. If you should desire this expanded to include a provision for outpatient treatment, we shall be glad to draft additional language to that effect.

As to my views on this matter, I can state at this time that there is strong appeal in this proposal for the benefit of an outstanding group of veterans needing extensive hospital care when they are financially unable to provide it for themselves. A very small number would be affected since we understand that the great majority of those heretofore awarded the Medal of Honor served during one of the war periods defined in title 38. However, I have some misgivings about the policy of granting this preference, even to a small and singularly worthy group, in view of the fact that many other seriously disabled and aged veterans of peacetime service would continue to be excluded.

You may be sure that if a bill of this kind is introduced and is referred for a formal report, it will be most carefully considered and our official comments submitted to the appropriate committee after clearance with the Bureau of the Budget under established procedures.

We hope that this will help you in your further consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

J. S. Gleason, Jr.,
Administrator.

Medal of Honor Certificate Issued Under the Provisions of the Act of Congress Approved April 27, 1916

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that Jacob Volz was enlisted on the 22d day of January, 1908, to serve 4 years, and was discharged on the 18th day of March, 1912, by reason of honorable discharge while holding the rating of Cm3c; that a Medal of Honor was awarded to him on the 13th day of December 1911, for service while attached to the U.S.S. *Pampang* during action against the Moros on the island of Basilan, Philippine Islands, on 24 September 1911. Volz was one of a shore party moving in to capture Mundang; that his name was entered and recorded on the Army and Navy Medal of Honor Roll on the 31st day of March 1955, as authorized under the provisions of the act of Congress approved April 27, 1916, and that he is entitled to receive the special pension granted by that act.

Given at the Navy Department, Washington, D.C., this 31st day of March, 1955.

By authority of the Secretary of the Navy:

J. L. Holloway, Jr.,
Chief of Naval Personnel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1046) to provide hospital, domiciliary, and medical care for non-service-connected disabilities to certain recipients of the Medal of Honor, introduced by Mr. Morse, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That paragraph (2) of section 601 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "Indian Wars" the following: ", or any veteran awarded the Medal of Honor."

ORCHARDISTS OF THE YEAR AWARDS BANQUET AT HOOD RIVER, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. George D. Bartch, manager of the Hood River County Chamber of Commerce, has brought to my attention a news release issued by his organization concerning the annual Orchardists of the Year awards banquet recently held at Hood River, Oreg. At this banquet outstanding men and women are accorded recognition by their associates.

I ask unanimous consent that the news release containing the names of the award winners be printed at this point in my remarks. I welcome this opportunity to extend to each of the award winners my heartiest congratulations.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hood River Honors Citizens

Hood River had one of its most successful annual awards banquets Monday night when 350 men and women filled the Elks Temple banquet room for a full program of civic recognition.

Alan Bickford was named 1962 Orchardist of the Year. He is a member of a pioneer business and farming family.

McDon Bonta, of Cascade Locks, was awarded the Senior Citizen of the Year plaque.

Mrs. A. J. Brunquist, of Parkdale, was selected Woman of the Year.

Mr. R. B. Leavens received the Junior First Citizen honor.

The capacity crowd heard T. S. Prideaux, vice president, United States National Bank, deliver the principal address. J. E. Klahre, general manager of the Hood River Apple Growers Association, acted as toastmaster for the banquet, which is a highlight of the mid-Columbia region.

The Orchardist of the Year was introduced by Ross Hukari, agriculture director of the Hood River County Chamber of Commerce. According to Hukari, Orchardist of the Year Alan Bickford has grown to become a vital adjunct to the family organization and to the orchard industry. He has served his community through 10 years on the volunteer fire department, cub scoutmaster, irrigation district board member, county farm labor committee, county extension advisory committee, Little League baseball program, Riverside Church, valued service to the Oregon and Washington Horticulture Societies.

Numerous achievements and service to his county and to the Cascade Locks area were cited in the presentation of the senior citizen of the year by Hood River County Chamber of Commerce President Arch Tainer. Senior Citizen McDon Bonta has served his community as chairman of the local school board; scoutmaster of Cub Scouts; moderator and treasurer of his church; past commander of VFW; neighborhood commissioner, District of Columbia Boy Scouts of America; recorder for city council; PTA worker; past master of Masonic Lodge No. 117; city light manager; deputy director for civil defense; member of Hood River School Board District No. 1.

Mrs. Charles Richie, president of American Association of University Women, introduced Mrs. A. J. Brunquist as their woman of the year. She has a long history of service to her county and to the citizens of Parkdale. In 1931 she organized 4–H clubs in Parkdale and was a leader for many years. She has actively taught Red Cross courses, German lessons, home extension, and for 43 years has been a working member of her church school program. A charter member of Hood River American Association of University Women, she also served the pioneer association, garden club, historical society, United Nations Association, and the Hood River Writer's Club.

R. B. (Lefty) Leavens, Jaycee Junior Citizen of the Year, was presented by their president, Percy Jensen. Leavens has had a distinguished career during the past 5 years he has resided in Hood River County. Chief engineer for the apple growers association, he is a director of the chamber of commerce; secretary of the North Slope Ski Club; a charter member of Hood River Meadows Ski Area; secretary of the Hood River Improvement Corp.; a past vice president of the Hood River Jaycees and has traveled internationally for the jaycees; he is also a member of the Rotary club, Elks lodge, Crag Rats, the Pine Grove Methodist Church; the number of community projects he has worked on during the past 3 years are too numerous to mention. The Hood River Jaycees are proud to announce this year's winner of the Distinguished Service Award is the chief engineer of the apple growers association, Mr. Lefty Leavens.

OREGON TURKEY PRODUCTION AND FEED GRAINS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the February 2 issue of the Oregon Journal carried an editorial regarding Oregon's turkey industry. The editorial was occasioned by the fact that although turkey production has increased by 3 percent nationally, Oregon turkey growers intend to raise 3 percent fewer turkeys in 1963 than they did in 1962. The major reason for this decline in production, as given in the editorial, is the penalty costs of feed grains.

My Senate colleagues are aware that the senior Senator from Oregon has more than once addressed himself vigorously to the Department of Agriculture in an effort to get the Department to give more equitable treatment to our northwest livestock and poultry producers. At this time he simply wishes to assure the Department of Agriculture and his colleagues that he intends to continue to do everything he can to obtain for his constituents the simple justice to which they are entitled.

The coming wheat referendum, from all indications, is going to be a touch-and-go proposition. I suggest to the Department that if feed grain legislation can be adopted before the wheat referendum, much uncertainty can perhaps be allayed. I know the wheat producers of my area have worked long and hard to get the two-price wheat program enacted. I fear that unless the administration pushes for, and is successful in achieving the passage of a feed grain bill which includes wheat as a feed grain before the wheat referendum occurs, much of the hard work will have gone down the drain, and with it might very well go permanently the two-price wheat program.

Grain producers in my section of the country, I believe, want desperately to raise wheat for food on diverted acres, but they feel that there is no assurance that the two-price wheat legislation will be of any help if noncertificate wheat is to be priced at $1.30 per bushel while effective supports on corn will be $1.07, the figures mentioned in many of the discussions to date.

I trust that the administration and the Department of Agriculture will give serious consideration to this problem, and that, as a result, they will take immediate and vigorous steps to secure feed grain legislation which will apply to the 1964 crops in the very near future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred be printed at this point in the Record, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Let 'Em Gobble Oregon Grain

Think of turkeys and, if you are imaginatively inclined, you think of brown and savory drumsticks, marching agreeably onto Thanksgiving tables.

Oregon people have for quite a long time been proud to make an annually increased count of the marching drumsticks. Our producers have made quite a go of the broad-breasted bronze.

Now comes the Oregon Crop and Livestock Report Service to say "Oregon turkey growers intend to raise 3 percent fewer turkeys in 1963 than in 1962."

By contrast, the Nation's turkey growers intend to raise 3 percent more than last year.

The reason for the reduction in Oregon, it seems, is not deficiency in quality, which is as high as ever, but the penalty cost of feed grains. Feed grains for Oregon flocks cost about $16 to $20 a ton more than in the Middle West and along the Atlantic coast. The differential, which represents freight costs, can present a real challenge to turkey economy.

Once Oregon turkeys were sent to the tables of the Middle West and the Atlantic coast. Now, the principal market is in and around Portland with the second-best market around Seattle. California produces most of its own holiday birds and even sends selected sizes to the shopping centers of Portland.

We hate to think of those marching Oregon drumsticks in shorter columns. Some hope can be seen in the plan for wheat marketing on which the Nation's wheat farmers will vote this year. If the grain growers approve it, the Department of Agriculture would set a lower price for feed wheat than for wheat used for human consumption. And if that feed price is favorable, it could be a boon to Oregon turkey growers and wheat farmers alike.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 8, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 7, 1963:

Post Office Department

Fred Gates, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department, vice William C. Doherty.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Maurice Lamm, Floral Park Jewish Center, Floral Park, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Supreme and Allwise Lawgiver: Thou who hast endowed men with the noble ambition and blessed ability to lead fellow men in the paths of right in the affairs of state, and hast inspired them to serve the people of these United States with honor:

Invest those legislators gathered here in august assembly with deep souls so that, by personal example, they may illustrate the finest and most worthy traditions of this great Republic to the end that they will lead not by pointing to high ideals but by standing for them.

Grant them great hearts so that through their kindness and care they may bring on a time of healing for the multitude of lives emptied of meaning, for the multitude of souls scarred with the weary search for peace and rest, for the multitude of hearts stabbed with the frustrations of our incredibly complex existence.

Bless them with powerful hands so that, with the practical sagacity which is their hallmark, they may unite and solidify a globe jigsawed with boundaries, separated by Iron and Bamboo Curtains, cut up into airspace, divided by latitude numbers, and fenced with radar screens.

Bestow upon these servants of the public Thy blessings, O Lord.

May the Lord grant strength unto His people.

May He bless His people with peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RAPID EROSION OF OUR NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE EFFORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House to undertake to coordinate a course of action for the purpose of halting the rapid erosion of our national intelligence effort. The present situation is outrageous and intolerable.

There has been talk of an intelligence gap. There is an intelligence gap. The gap is in the intelligence of those who are daily revealing the secrets of the intelligence operations of the U.S. Government. In recent weeks there has been a great excess of talk about the procedures of our intelligence apparatus. Critics have made public statements on matters which should never be discussed in public. The administration has mistakenly allowed itself to be goaded into revealing information detrimental to our best interests.

Along with many other Americans I am tired of these demonstrations of bad judgment. Every day some high ranking intelligence officer is quoted in the newspapers on one subject or another. These are men who, from the standpoint of the general public, should neither be seen nor heard. A passion for anonymity is an integral part of their jobs. Members of both the legislative and executive branches have publicly discussed matters which should only be discussed behind closed doors. Headlines are not so precious as to warrant jeopardizing our national security.

The deterioration of secrecy in regard to our intelligence-gathering techniques began in 1960 when a U-2 plane was shot down over Russia. Neither the executive branch nor the legislative branch is blameless in revealing secrets. Both Democrats and Republicans must share the blame. The question, however, is not so much who is to blame for the past, but where do we go from here?

To be successful, intelligence activities must be secret. To let the enemy know just how many of his secrets we know and just which ones we do not know, gives him a priceless advantage. Today's headline may cost the lives of the human sources of information. The enemy can find our intelligence sources much more easily when he knows what we have found out. This knowledge helps to pinpoint the location of intelligence activities, and once knowing the location, the discovery of the means is much easier and as a result intelligence sources dry up.

Our immaturity and indiscretion in these constant disclosures is making us the laughingstock of the world. Officials in Moscow, Peiping, and Havana must applaud our stupidity in announcing publicly facts which they would gladly spend huge sums of money endeavoring to obtain. Responsibility on our part is urgently required. Let us be silent with respect to these sensitive matters.

Mr. John McCone, as Director of CIA, is charged with protection of intelligence sources. Public Law 253, 80th Congress, 1st session, states:

> *And provided further*, That the Director of Central Intelligence shall be responsible for protecting intelligence sources and methods from unauthorized disclosure.

I call on him to fully carry out the difficult and important duties of his office in this respect. A governmentwide coordination of effort is required.

The American people are interested in our intelligence activities. They are interested in all phases of the workings of their Government and their curiosities are aroused by the aura of mystery and adventure which surrounds the intelligence business. But we are not playing games. Our national survival to a great extent depends upon our knowledge of our enemies' activities. The price we pay for the luxury of public disclosure of intelligence activities is the further erosion of our capabilities in this field. It is difficult enough to obtain information from closed Communist societies. The American people, the press, and the officials of the executive and legislative branches of the Government must stop making a most difficult task more difficult.

There is room for plenty of discussion and criticism of our Government without revealing sensitive intelligence information.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight Saturday to file a report on H.R. 3872, the Export-Import Bank, along with minority views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia have until midnight Saturday, March 9, to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER TO PAY TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE AND IDEALS OF ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just received permission for a special order to address the House for 2 hours on Wednesday, March 27. The purpose of this special order is to afford an opportunity to all Members of the House to pay tribute to the life and ideals of Eleanor Roosevelt, who because of her great contribution to humanity came to be known as the First Lady of the World. Since Congress was not in session at the time of her death last November, I think it is fitting that we pause to pay our respects to the memory of the beloved and revered Eleanor Roosevelt.

CONGRESS MUST RENEW PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN CIA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the entire scope of this Nation's intelligence operations have come under serious discussion in recent weeks. It is true that a vital need exists for coordinating the intelligence functions of the CIA, State Department, and the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Clearly, this need has come forth in the wake of each new phase of the current Cuban crisis.

But as responsible Americans and elected officials we must address ourselves to the responsibilities inherent in citizenship in our Nation. The proper arena for coordinating the daily classified actions of the CIA and other intelligence agencies is not on the floors of the House and Senate, but within the sanctity of a joint congressional watchdog committee composed of Members of both the House and Senate.

House Joint Resolution 211, which I introduced, proposes such a committee, as do the growing number of companion bills being introduced almost daily by Members of both the House and Senate.

The establishment of this watchdog committee would cure the ills which have resulted from poorly coordinated intelligence information, and serve a twofold purpose:

First. It would allow Congress to give regular scrutiny and constant review to our intelligence operations.

Second. It would reestablish public confidence in our Nation's intelligence community.

Support for this committee is growing as its need becomes more evident. The reasoning for congressional check on intelligence operations is clearly put forward in the very fine editorial in today's Washington Daily News.

This joint watchdog committee was recommended by the Hoover Commission, the bipartisan panel created by Congress to study ways of bringing greater efficiency to our Government. I urge all these who have not yet done so to join the movement now underway to perfect our Nation's intelligence affairs.

Whistle Up the Watchdog

Senator Keating, of New York, was the first to sound a warning about the Soviet buildup in Cuba. He has been the most persistent, and consistent, of those declaiming on the way the Kennedy administration has handled this hot cigar.

This week the Senator was at pains, in remarks on the Senate floor, to say our intelligence services—and specifically the mysterious Central Intelligence Agency—have been "hard at work, producing accurate information."

According to him, there is no "intelligence gap," as some have alleged. The gap, the Senator charged, is not in the fact-gathering but in what he called the failure of the administration to pass the facts along to the people.

Coming from Senator Keating, this applause for the CIA—about which so few know so little—is comforting. And it helps make the point that Congress should set up a "watchdog" committee to keep track of what that hush-hush Agency is doing. Its operations are secret, necessarily, but if the public can hear from men like Senator Keating, who is a Republican, that the job is being properly done, it can feel more secure.

Also, if a bipartisan committee of Congress is "in the know" with the CIA, it will be less easy for any administration to hold back facts the public should know.

The CIA watchdog committee was recommended 8 years ago by a Hoover Commission task force headed by Gen. Mark W. Clark, World War II hero. It has been urged at this session of Congress by such Democrats as Senators McCarthy, of Minnesota, and Smathers, of Florida, and by Congressman Paul Rogers, of Florida.

The idea is sound, safe, urgent, necessary.

PROPOSAL FOR COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP HONORING CUSTOMS MEN WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN THE SERVICE

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, 1964, the Bureau of Customs of the Treasury Department is planning to celebrate the 175th anniversary of the creation of the customs service by the First Continental Congress. The month of August 1964 will mark the culmination of 1¾ centuries of unbroken dedication to the advancement and protection of the American people by the Bureau of Customs.

It is interesting to recall that three of the first five statutes enacted by that First Congress dealt with customs matters. The first statute enacted by the First Congress provided for the time and manner of administering the oath of office for Members of the Federal Legislature, certain executive officers, and certain officials of the several States (1 Stat. 23, approved June 1, 1789). The second statute was approved on July 4, 1789, and provided for levying duties on imported merchandise. This was the first Tariff Act (1 Stat. 24). The third law imposed duties on tonnage of ships and vessels (1 Stat. 27, approved July 20, 1789). The fourth enactment established an executive department called the Department of Foreign Affairs (1 Stat. 28, approved July 27, 1789). And the fifth statute established the customs service. It was entitled "An act to regulate the collection of the duties imposed by law on the tonnage of ships or vessels, and on goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States" and was approved on July 31, 1789 (1 Stat. 29).

The role played by the customs service in molding the United States to its preeminent position in world history has largely been unrecognized by the principal beneficiary—the American people themselves. Since the Continental Congress established the first uniform duties, imposts, and excises throughout the United States, the customs service has systematically and indefatigably dedicated itself to our Nation's development. When our industries were just getting started, the customs laws protected them against foreign competition until they grew to the point where they are a bulwark of democracy. The customs service provided the major share of our Nation's revenue before the income tax was passed by Congress in 1916. Today, customs collections account for $1¾ billion which still represents a sizable chunk of our national revenue.

The United States has not been extravagant in the use of commemorative stamps as a means of recognition of service to our people, perhaps rightfully. However, it seems to me that our customs service, which has been doing a magnificent job in administering and enforcing our complex tariff laws, combating smuggling, assisting many other U.S. agencies in enforcing their laws and performing countless other important duties, deserves the recognition of a commemorative postage stamp to honor its surpassing performance.

Very few Americans are aware of the fact that many customs officials have sacrificed their lives in carrying out their official duties down through the years since the customs service was born. No better illustration of this exists than the memorial plaque which hangs in the office of the U.S. Commissioner of Customs in Washington. This plaque consists of 17 mounted photographs of officers who lost their lives in the service.

There was the case of Bert Ellison, a mounted inspector from San Antonio, Tex., who lost his life in 1930 while pursuing five Mexican bootleggers. Then there was John Henry Heard, of El Paso, who died from gunshot wounds inflicted in line of duty while investigating horse smuggling, and Loy C. Henry who was shot to death by a paid assassin while combating a ring of narcotics smugglers. There are others from many other States who also laid down their lives in the line of duty.

Since 1900, 42 customs officers were killed in line of duty by violators of customs laws or by accident while on duty; 49 were seriously wounded or injured by violators; 68 were seriously injured while on duty. During this period 95 smugglers are known to have been killed in gun battles with customs enforcement officers.

It seems fitting that the customs service which entails for some the most hazardous kind of duties, is deserving of recognition in the form of a commemorative postage stamp to be issued on the occasion of the 175th anniversary of the Bureau of Customs. Of course, many branches of the customs service are not hazardous under today's conditions. However, the spirit of dedication is equally strong in these, and members of these branches would sacrifice their lives if the occasion arose.

Mr. Speaker, I request permission to publish in the RECORD for the first time a list of the customs officers who were killed by smugglers, killed in line of duty, or who were wounded by smugglers. I have today introduced a bill authorizing the Postmaster General to issue at such time and for such period in the year 1964 as he shall deem appropriate, a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 175th anniversary of the U.S. Bureau of Customs and those employees who were killed in line of duty. I believe this would be particularly appropriate that special recognition thus be given to the forthcoming celebration:

CUSTOMS OFFICERS WHO HAVE DIED IN THE PERFORMANCE OF DUTY

Frank Chapman, Lajitas, Tex., July 21, 1908.

John S. H. Howard, Pilares, Tex., February 10, 1913.

Joseph R. Sitter, Valentine, Tex., May 24, 1915.

Fred Tate, Brownsville, Tex., August 11, 1918.

Robert S. Rumsey, Laredo, Tex., August 19, 1922.

Gunther J. Jones, Mercedes, Tex., October 1, 1922.

James A. Wallen, Rio, Tex., March 6, 1923.

Orville Preuster, Niagara Falls, N.Y., March 1, 1925.

E. B. Webb, Colchester, Vt., March 10, 1926.

John W. Parrott, El Paso, Tex., December 30, 1926.

Gerardo Pescara, San Juan, Puerto Rico, January 17, 1927.

Stephen S. Dawson, El Paso, Tex., February 27, 1928.

Thomas S. Morriss, Fabens, Tex., December 23, 1928.

C. N. Titcomb, Perch Point, Mich., January 15, 1929.

Arthur M. Beaman, Detroit, Mich., July 23, 1929.

Charles W. Rogers, Vero Beach, Fla., September 24, 1929.

R. J. Sandlands, Detroit, Mich., July 3, 1930.

Bert Ellison, San Antonio, Tex., August 9, 1930.

John L. Kelly, New Orleans, La., February 9, 1931.

L. E. Babcock, Lake Champlain, N.Y., August 17, 1931.

Arnold W. Gilbert, St. Albans, Vt., November 2, 1931.

Clyde M. Bristow, Tucson, Ariz., January 2, 1932.

Daniel A. Romberger, Dania Beach, Fla., April 25, 1932.

John Henry Heard, El Paso, Tex., May 2, 1932.

Herff A. Carnes, Ysleta, Tex., December 2, 1932.

Ralph E. Bowden, El Paso, Tex., March 19, 1932.

R. C. Nichols, El Paso, Tex., November 24, 1933.

Earl Brown, Fort Pierce, Fla., February, 1933.

Loy C. Henry, San Antonio, Tex., June 20, 1934.

Herbert O. Plasman, Bridgeton, N.J., April 12, 1935.

Wilson Bourland, Terlingua, Tex., October 13, 1935.

Matthew Kononen, San Francisco, Calif., March 5, 1939.

Joseph T. Brown, Sebastian, Tex., April 2, 1940.

Vernon E. Thompson, Limestone, Maine, February 1, 1943.

George E. Spencer, Rio Grande River, Tex., February 24, 1945.

John E. Fasset, Blaine, Wash., February 21, 1945.

Anthony Cozza, Blaine, Wash., February 24, 1945.

Clarence Trask, Washington Camp, Ariz., April 8, 1947.

Benjamin B. Stone, Brownsville, Tex., October 7, 1957.

John Sellenthin, New York, N.Y., September 2, 1962.

George M. Bacon, Norfolk, Va., February 4, 1955.

THE TWO-PRICE COTTON PROGRAM

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions I have called to the attention of the House the critical situation existing in the American textile industry by reason of excessive textile imports and the inequity existing in our two-price cotton program.

I was very pleased, therefore, when the General Assembly of North Carolina adopted a resolution on March 5, 1963, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to eliminate the inequity existing in the two-price cotton program. The members of the North Carolina General Assembly are to be commended on taking a very forthright and sound position in regard to this extremely important matter.

Over 200,000 North Carolinians owe their livelihood to the textile industry. One out of every two manufacturing employees in the State of North Carolina works in a textile mill. The future of the textile industry is vital to our State, and indeed to every State in our Union. The producers of cotton and the manufacturers of cotton in our country have an inseparable interest in an overall healthy cotton economy.

If our cotton economy is to continue to enjoy its vital role in the economic life of our Nation the Congress must take action as quickly as circumstances will permit to remove the advantage enjoyed by foreign textile manufacturers in the purchase of American cotton. The House Agriculture Committee has legislation under consideration on the subject. It is my hope that it will be possible for us to secure enactment of a sound cotton bill without undue delay.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the resolution adopted by the North Carolina General Assembly on March 5, 1963, in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 16

Joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to eliminate the inequity of the two-price system of cotton cost

Whereas on September 6, 1962, the President of the United States, following the Tariff Commission's rejection of the Department of Agriculture's recommendation for an import fee of 8½ cents a pound on the raw cotton content of textile imports to offset the difference between the price of raw American cotton to foreign mills and the price which American mills are required to pay for the same cotton, stated the following:

"Thus, the inequity of the two-price system of cotton costs remains as a unique burden upon the American textile industry, for which solution must be found in the near future.

"I am, therefore, requesting the Department of Agriculture to give immediate attention to the formulation of a domestic program that would eliminate this inequity. I am also instructing all other departments and offices of the executive branch to cooperate fully to this end. Such a program will undoubtedly require enabling legislation"; and

Whereas in his farm message of January 31, 1963, the President stated, a healthy, growing cotton industry is vital to the strength and prosperity of our Nation. Over a million persons are engaged in producing our cotton crop. Another million and a half are employed in converting the raw cotton into consumer items. Additional millions supply goods and services to this industry. Cotton exports contribute significantly to our balance-of-payments position.

"Our cotton industry—both producers and mills—is confronted with many problems which it alone cannot resolve. Because domestic prices are much higher than those of foreign producers, our cotton mills must pay substantially more for cotton than their offshore competitors. Domestic cotton textile products are being displaced not only by substitute fibers in consumer products but also by increased cotton imports. Cotton exports are sharply lower.

"Loss of markets for U.S. cotton increases surplus stocks held by the CCC, causes higher and higher Government costs, and reduces the cotton farmer's income"; and

Whereas the textile industry in North Carolina is and has been the backbone of the economy of our State, directly employing 219,000 persons or nearly 1 out of every 2 manufacturing employees in the State; and

Whereas many additional thousands of North Carolinians are employed in supplying services and goods to the textile industry and hundreds of thousands more are dependent on it for a livelihood; and

Whereas imports of foreign cotton textiles have reached an alltime high and are increasing at an alarming rate; and

Whereas these imports of foreign cotton textiles and the unjust inequity of the two-price system for cotton have created a situation that seriously threatens the entire economy of our State and Nation and are responsible for the loss of hundreds of thousands of textile jobs, curtailment of the hours worked in the textile industry, and the closing of many textile plants; and

Whereas it is acknowledged that the welfare of all North Carolinians is vitally independent on a healthy, growing textile industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

SECTION 1. That the North Carolina General Assembly implores the President and the Congress of the United States to take whatever steps are necessary to make American cotton available to American purchasers at the same price American cotton is made available to foreign purchasers.

SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States; the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, State, Labor, and Treasury; and the North Carolina congressional delegation.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified, this the 5th day of March 1963.

T. CLARENCE STONE,
President of the Senate.
H. CLIFTON BLUE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Examined and found correct:
DAN L. DRUMMOND,
(For committee).

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the general subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

A JOB STILL TO BE DONE

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on civil rights was a compelling and forceful presentation relative to this most basic national problem. The address was at once both encouraging in its factual description of recent progress toward securing equal rights for all American citizens, and sobering in its realistic assessment of the progress which must still be made.

The President has outlined major gains in the civil rights area through active and intensive efforts of both Government and private groups. More progress has been made in the continuing struggle to achieve equal opportunity for all people regardless of race, creed or national origin in the last 2 years than in any comparable period in our national history since the passage of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution of the United States. Unquestionably the Executive is wholly committed in both word and deed to the venerable principle of equal opportunities for each individual, free from invidious and arbitrary distinctions. Concrete achievements have become quite evident in education, employment and transportation as a result of such conviction.

Once having recognized the forward strides in the field of civil rights, a more critical analysis is needed. Based upon the day-to-day administration and execution of civil rights legislation, and substantial deficiencies in the laws have been recognized, and thus in his message the President has recommended the passage of several items of legislation essential to the securing of constitutional rights and opportunities demanded by moral imperatives.

The message has placed greatest emphasis upon the right to vote. It is through the free and equal exercise of this right that the gains so demanded in other areas can be achieved, but this right has been frustrated by delay and arbitrary use of discretion by election officials. The legislation recommended by the President is directed at eliminating these abuses.

The President has further proposed the enactment of legislation to financially assist educational districts engaged in the process of desegregation, to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 4 years, and to make that Commission a clearinghouse for technical information and advice to requesting agencies. The enactment of these proposals will represent substantial increments to existing civil rights legislation.

In his conclusion, the President made it abundantly clear that his proposals do not constitute a final answer to the problem of racial discrimination in this country. He added:

> Other measures directed toward these same goals will be favorably commented on and supported, as they have in the past—and they will be signed, if enacted into law.

While I wholeheartedly applaud the President's message, I was nevertheless disappointed that he did not mention specifically the Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Act, which I introduced (H.R. 405) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, ancestry, or age. To fulfill its purpose, the bill proposes to establish a commission to enforce fair employment practices. Indiscriminatory employment practices are as much a part of American values concerning liberty and equality of opportunity as are equal access to public facilities and integrated schools. Passage of such legislation is a necessary and vital adjunct to a program for obtaining full civil rights for all our people.

The goal will be only partially attained should we obtain universally uniform voting rights, free and equally accessible education, and integration of all public facilities—only to discover that qualified persons are being restricted in opportunities for employment due to irrational and obstinate policies of discrimination. This is a most fundamental problem. If not solved, it will result in economically established segregation when all other vestiges of prejudicial discrimination disappear. Educated, trained, and skilled members of minorities are rejected from their rightful place in the labor force, and are justifiably bitter. Unskilled members of these same groups are placed below similarly untrained white workers, and suffer first and most extensively from unemployment. Here again I would like to quote from the President's stirring message:

> Race discrimination hampers our economic growth by preventing the maximum development and utilization of our manpower. It hampers our world leadership by contradicting at home the message we preach abroad. It mars the atmosphere of a united and classless society in which this Nation rose to greatness. It increases the costs of public welfare, crime, delinquency, and disorder. Above all, it is wrong.

I would like here to note my pleasure at the colloquy between several members of the minority party relating to civil rights. The President, I am sure, will be equally pleased inasmuch as he urged bipartisan support for his civil rights program. Noting this support, I urge that we now get along with the task of enacting meaningful civil-rights legislation under the aegis of bipartisanship.

Progress is being made by a conscientious and energetic Federal administration, and by extraordinarily courageous and dedicated individuals and private groups. More is needed. In accordance with declared congressional policy and American principles of justice, it is incumbent upon this body to enact into law legislation along the foregoing lines.

I urge all my colleagues to support this measure and hope that it will receive favorable consideration in the very near future.

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act to eliminate the ceiling upon amounts that may be appropriated for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Section 49 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (75 Stat. 639) now provides that the total appropriations for the Agency is not to exceed $10 million.

Mr. Speaker, the search for disarmament with effective international controls is the most important endeavor of this Government and, indeed, of mankind. We are at a stage in history in which nations are capable of destroying civilization as we know it. The recent Cuban crisis brought home this fact. In his eloquent address to the United Nations on September 25, 1961, President Kennedy warned the world:

> Every man, woman and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.

The Agency charged with the responsibility for disarmament should not be hamstrung by an arbitrary limit upon its appropriations. Under the present law the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency cannot receive more than $10 million during the life of the Agency. The Congress appropriated $1.8 million to the Agency for fiscal year 1962. For fiscal year 1963 we appropriated $6.5 million for the Agency. Out of the total appropriation of $10 million allowed under the act, the Congress has already appropriated $8.3 million, which leaves a $1.7 million for all future efforts. Unless the law is amended, the situation will be intolerable. Compare the more than $50 billion we spend for defense in a single fiscal year with $1.8 million remaining under present law for the future life of the Disarmament Agency. The budget for fiscal year 1964 calls for $15 million for the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This will require a change in the law.

U.N. SPECIAL FUND AIDING RED YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in continuation of my remarks to this House about United Nations aid to Communists, which Americans are subsidizing, I want to say that I am heartened by the developments in New York City yesterday afternoon. As you know, the United States has served notice on the United Nations that we now will pay only our assessed share of future peacekeeping operations—and nothing more—unless other countries meet their part of the costs.

It is high time the United States got around to taking this stand. In light of what our investigation has shown to be the situation with regard to U.N. aid to Cuba and other Communist nations, I sincerely hope that yesterday's "cracking down" by our delegation to the United Nations is only the first step in a complete reappraisal of American aid to the world body.

Now, back on my investigation topic and concerning the United Nations Special Fund, I wish to point out to our colleagues two little-known projects which the Special Fund supports in Communist Yugoslavia.

As we in this House now realize all too well, this is the United Nations fund which is financed 40 percent by the contributions of American taxpayers. And, this is the fund which leads the way for the U.N.'s aid that has involved American taxpayers in the contradictory position of paying to strengthen our enemies.

My colleagues will remember that in recent weeks I have advised the House of Special Fund aid for nuclear research in this same Yugoslavia, of Special Fund aid in the field of aviation for Red Cuba, and of Special Fund and other U.N. aid to Poland and to Cuba in a number of other fields ranging from building of "fishing boats" to development of social security system and of Communist teaching techniques.

Today I turn from the sad state of the enslaved peoples of Cuba to a nation much nearer to the center of the Communist menace and deeply committed as a satellite of that bury-the-Americans ideology.

Let us talk, then, about Yugoslavia where there are two projects receiving U.S.-subsidized United Nations aid:

1. YUGOSLAVIA—LAND RECLAMATION PROJECT

The Special Fund now is conducting a 4-year project entitled "Pilot Land Reclamation," which is costing the Special Fund a total of $1,037,100. Forty percent of that—the American subsidy—is $414,840.

This project was started just last May 1962, and has as its purpose, according to the U.N.:

> To establish an experimental farm and to undertake land reclamation investigations in order to determine the technical and economic feasibility of land utilization in the area of the Lower Neretva Basin.

The Food and Agriculture Organization—FAO—of the U.N. is administering the project. It may be that many Americans will recall that the FAO also is concerned with that $1.2 million agricultural project in Cuba.

I find upon investigation that the Neretva, a river in the southwest of Yugoslavia, runs into the Adriatic Sea in an area where it is estimated that 70,000 hectares of land could be reclaimed. To quote the U.N.:

> The government considers that the lower Neretva plain is particularly suitable for experimental and demonstration work in land reclamation * * * the area has a good climate, promising soils, good markets, and an industrious population.

May I ask my colleagues to mentally underline that phrase "The government considers." Nobody has asked what the American taxpayer considers. We have not been consulted even 40 percent's worth.

The Yugoslav view is continued, in a restricted U.N. Special Fund pamphlet, to the effect that the real, long-range goal for the Neretva River is a large-scale program of flood control, drainage and irrigation. No doubt the Special Fund expects to be asked to help pay for that big job just as soon as the Special Fund-financed land study proves flood control feasible. I hope they do not call in our U.S. Department of the Army Corps of Engineers.

We are told the preliminary study consists of:

> A series of investigations in two selected polders, one on saline land and one on peaty soils.

The investigations are being conducted in the fields of water control, drainage, irrigation, reclamation, soil analysis, agronomy and farm economics.

The Special Fund is providing a total of 21½ man-years of expert services, 6 man-years of fellowships, plus equipment and vehicles. All of this coming from the nearly bankrupt United Nations—if the United States keeps bailing it out financially—and going to strengthen a Communist nation.

Besides, Mr. Speaker, by what logic have we come to the place where we reclaim land and raise food for the enemy bellies any army travels on?

2. YUGOSLAVIA—TRAINING OF VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTIONS

The second Yugoslav project which I wish to discuss today involves a Special Fund contribution of $905,000 and is entitled "Training of Vocational Instructors." It began in January 1960, and apparently is not so important as the preceding project since this one is discussed in a Special Fund document classified only for limited distribution.

Or maybe limited is worse than restricted. Only the United Nations knows for sure—certainly not our taxpayers.

Anyhow, this project is being administered by the International Labor Organization—ILO. And I hope they are doing as well on this one as they are on that project I discussed here recently on setting up social security for Cubans.

The 4-year project is designed, the U.N. says: "to establish training institutes for instructors in vocational schools."

We are told in the Special Fund document that the Yugoslav Government is seeking to place greater emphasis on training of both those already employed and those who are entering industry for the first time.

Let us keep in mind that it is the Red Yugoslav Government who wants to increase its industry and its communistic national strength—not the nonconsulted Americans who are subsidizing the project while suffering increasing percentages of uemployment.

I find that the ILO has had, in the past 6 years, a program under which a large number of Yugoslav foremen have been sent abroad as worker-trainees in foreign factories. That fits in well with the Communist design involving the exporting of the Red ideology.

And, once again, we are told that—

> The Government has decided that, in order to increase the facilities for vocational training, a network of vocational training schools should be established.

How nice that the Government of Yugoslavia can decide that. Could we expect them to decide otherwise? And, who asked the opinion of those Americans who hold 40 percent of the Special Fund stock in this venture?

Nobody, that is who.

This project plans specifically for setting up of a centrally located school and of several functional institutes for the training of instructors. The functional institutes are for metal, building, wood, commerce, and agriculture. U.N. experts are provided for them.

The training institute for metal workers is for instructors in electric welding, lathe operation, shaping machine operation, fitting, moulding, and electromechanics. Equipment cost is $230,000.

The training institute for the building industry is for masons, concrete workers, operators of building construction equipment, carpenters, painters, plumbers, and electricians. Equipment cost is $70,000.

The training institute for the wood industry would be for foresters, loggers, sawmill workers and cabinetmakers. Equipment cost is $75,000.

There also would be an agriculture training institute for instructors in farm machine maintenance and tractor driving. Equipment cost is figured at $45,000.

One of the most interesting projects of all is for a commercial institute for instructors to train retail salesmen. It would be attached to the Yugoslav Federation of Chambers of Commerce and supplied with equipment costing $40,000.

So, here we Americans are, placed in the position of supporting the chamber of commerce activities of a communistic nation. Activities which, I suppose, involve promotion of the benefits of the Red ideology and the joys of living in their nation. As a former president of the Missouri State Chamber of Commerce I stand aghast at this simplemindedness with which American taxpayers are being saddled.

I wonder if the CCC proposal we hear talk about today in Washington means "Communist Chamber of Commerce?"

Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to include in the RECORD tables detailing these Yugoslav special fund projects. I only wish that this could be the last of my talks here about this fund. Unfortunately, we still must deal with the U.N. aid going to Communist Poland. I will address myself to that topic in coming days.

Financial provisions, Yugoslav project

PILOT LAND RECLAMATION

It has been estimated that the total special fund allocation will be $1,037,100 over 4 years, as follows:

	Total cost (in U.S. dollars)	Phasing of expenditure			
		1st year	2d year	3d year	4th year
Experts	[1] $385,000	$96,200	$96,200	$96,300	$96,300
Fellowships	30,000	15,000	15,000		
Equipment	540,000	300,000	240,000		
Miscellaneous	23,100	5,800	5,800	5,800	5,700
Total project cost	978,100	417,000	357,000	102,100	102,000
Executing agency overhead cost	59,000				
Total special fund allocation	1,037,100				

[1] Gross cost, representing 21 man-years and 6 man-months.

TRAINING OF VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTORS

The total cost to the special fund would be $905,000. This would be spent as follows:

	Experts	Fellowships	Equipment	Total
1st year	$60,000			$60,000
2d year	120,000	$50,000	$500,000	670,000
3d year	70,000	100,000		170,000
4th year	5,000			5,000
Total	255,000	150,000	500,000	905,000

RESTRICTING COMPETITION ON BIDS

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I brought to the attention of my colleagues a most serious and wasteful purchasing practice of our Defense Department—a sole source method that is disguised to appear competitive. The case I bring to you today is identical to that of yesterday, only this time it came to my attention in a different manner.

A reputable manufacturing firm called me yesterday, stating its desire to bid competitively on the manufacture of the USM–116 multimeter, whch in simple terms is a voltage tester. This item is listed for competitive purchase, but a wall has been built around it that restricts the bidding to one firm. This wall is called a QPL—Qualified Products List. To bid on the equipment you must be on the list. To be on the list you must make a model. To make a model you must have the drawings, but this firm was told no drawings are available. As I said yesterday you cannot get from here to there. Only one firm has the plans and is on the QPL list—the firm that had a prior sole-source and development contract.

Upon contacting the contract negotiator for this procurement, Mr. Griffith Jones, Naval Purchasing Office—telephone: Oxford 6–3768—I was told the same story as the manufacturer—no drawings available. This simply did not make sense to me. As in the past I was not willing to take no for an answer. I proceeded to contact higher authorities, in this instance, Capt. J. A. Scott, assistant to the Chief of the Office of Naval Material. Less than 10 minutes after I contacted Captain Scott, the company I refer to here today was told over the telephone that plans and specifications were available for their use.

Who told the company? Raymond Usilton, engineer—telephone: Oxford 6–2010—the same engineer I spoke of here yesterday. While the contract negotiator, Jones, who gets his technical information from Usilton, had been telling people that no drawings were available, Usilton suddenly discovered there were.

This method of operation makes it almost impossible to bring competition into this sort of procurement. It is most certainly not conducive to providing our Nation with the best defense at a reasonable cost. State and municipal governments could not operate this way, and this method explains the high cost of defense.

This purchase I speak of today is for 3,592 of these multimeters. The last time they were bought, it was a sole-source deal and the unit price was $300, so it is easy to see this is a million-dollar matter. The Navy should be ordered to issue drawings to any responsible industry, and real competition should be induced in this purchase.

Mr. Speaker, the Defense budget can be cut, and materially so, and at the same time we can have greater security through the force of competition on government contracts and development.

As this matter developed yesterday, Mr. Charles Nicodemus, a reporter for The Chicago Daily News, was in my office. Here is his account of the matter:

WASHINGTON.—The Pentagon has promised to "straighten out" a Navy civilian official whom Representative EARL WILSON says he caught trying to restrict competition on a pending, $1 million electronics contract.

WILSON, Republican of Indiana, quoted Capt. J. A. Scott, special assistant to the chief of the Office of Naval Material, as saying:

"This man [the civilian official] made a mistake. He's a relatively new employee. He's being straightened out."

WILSON said the official, a contract officer named Griffith Jones, told the Washington agent for an Indiana firm that there are no manufacturing drawings available for an electronics item on which the firm wants to bid—making a competitive bid impossible.

The Indiana Republican said that when the firm sought his help, and his aid double-checked with Jones, the contracting officer again insisted no drawings of the equipment existed.

A veteran critic of waste and abuses in defense buying, Wilson said he knew this was untrue. For a quick check with his sources in the electronics industry had shown that the Navy had bought the same equipment for the first time last April from a Cleveland firm and had routinely required the contractor to provide drawings.

WILSON, who has learned from experience where to complain of Navy procurement abuses, said he immediately contacted Captain Scott, explained the problem and demanded an explanation. Scott said he would check.

WILSON disclosed that 10 minutes later, the agent for the Indiana firm, Model Engineering Co. of Huntington, was informed by telephone by a Navy engineer named Ray Usilton that drawings existed and were indeed available. WILSON said Usilton works with Jones.

Scott then called back a half hour later, WILSON said, and gave him the statement about getting Jones "straightened out."

WILSON suggested, however, that "the facts in this case indicate that we need to fire some people in Navy procurement—not just straighten them out."

WILSON said that under the supervision of Jones and Usilton, the Navy had set up a requirement that anyone wanting to bid on the equipment must first build a model and submit it to the Navy for approval. Firms winning approval were to go on a "Qualified Products List" of manufacturers who would be permitted to bid.

"But of course, Jones was telling people there were no drawings available," WILSON said. "That meant no one could get on the qualified products list except the Cleveland firm that had done the first production and still has copies of the drawings."

On the April contract, a sole-source (noncompetitive) award, WILSON said the Navy paid $300 each for the equipment—a "multimeter" used to test voltage and current in other electronic devices.

Under the procurement now planned, records show the Navy will buy up to 3,592 of the units.

"This means that a neat, $1 million contract—which the Navy tries to say is 'competitive'—actually was being channeled to a favored past producer," WILSON declared, "instead of being put out in the open, so that competition would bring the price down."

On Wednesday, WILSON disclosed that the same engineer who is handling the multimeter contract—Usilton—had successfully recommended the same type of restriction on availability of drawings for another procurement now underway, for purchase of 927 oscilloscopes.

WHY IS REGIONAL OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE DEPARTMENT BEING TRANSFERRED FROM NEW YORK TO BOSTON?

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has just announced that the regional office in New York is being closed down and its functions transferred to the regional office in Boston, Mass. This is being done, it is said, as part of a reduction in number from nine to seven of the regional offices in the United States. I am all for streamlining the Federal bureaucracy, but why Boston over New York? If there is to be one regional office it should be located in New York City. The tax collections in New York are 2 to 3 times the volume of collections of all the New England States put together. The U.S. Tax Court schedules 15 calendars in New York to every 1 in Boston.

Mr. Speaker, it becomes increasingly clear that an offensive political slogan, "I Can Do More for Massachusetts," is being translated into U.S. Government policy.

The city of New York and my own congressional district will be prejudiced by this move. We can ill afford to lose employment to another area for political reasons, to say nothing of the inconvenience caused our citizens and our commerce and trade.

I urge the Secretary of the Treasury to reconsider.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the letter that I received from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue which gives no reason whatsoever for the selection of Boston over New York:

MARCH 5, 1963.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: About noon today, Secretary Dillon will announce publicly a series of changes he has authorized me to make in Internal Revenue Service field offices. I believe these changes will be of interest to you so I am taking this means of giving you advance information on them.

The changes we are announcing will result in total savings of over $5 million annually, when they are fully implemented. Taxpayers will not be disadvantaged in any way by these changes; they will continue to receive all of the services they now receive. The changes are mainly in behind-the-scenes activities.

In response to President Kennedy's call upon all Federal agenices to achieve "lean, fit" organizations, I have recommended, and the Secretary has authorized me to make, the following changes in the field office structure of the Service.

I. DISTRICT OFFICE CHANGES

A. Reduction of overhead in 12 small districts:

Since the 1951–52 reorganization, our basic operating unit has been the district offices. As we have 1 in each State, and more than 1 in some of the more populous States, district offices range in size from Anchorage with 94,000 tax returns and 65 employees, to the Manhattan district with 3.8 million tax returns and 2,800 employees.

Despite these disparities in size, the basic organization structure of all districts has been fairly uniform. For example, there is a chief of audit in each district. Yet in Manhattan the chief supervises 1,400 employees; while the chief in Anchorage supervises 26 employees. Consequently, the ratio of overhead personnel to frontline enforcement personnel has been much higher in the small districts.

On the basis of a recent study, however, we concluded that we can eliminate many "overhead" positions in our 12 smallest districts, simply by modifying their organizational structure. What we plan to do in these districts is eliminate most of the managerial positions under the district director by having the nearest large district provide the necessary technical staff support and perform the other processing and support activities.

Taxpayers will continue to file their returns with the district director in these districts, and will continue to receive all of the services they now receive.

The districts involved are listed in attachment No. 1.

B. Merger of four multi-State districts:

Our studies have also demonstrated that existing workload does not justify having 62 separate district offices in the 50 States. Therefore, operations of four district offices located in States with more than one district will be merged with those of nearby districts in the same State. Large field offices will be maintained, however, in cities affected by this change, and taxpayers will continue to receive substantially all the local service they now have.

The districts involved are also listed in attachment No. 1.

II. REGIONAL CHANGES

This modification in district structure makes it possible for us to operate effectively with seven regional offices, instead of the present nine.

The regional offices to be eliminated are those now located in Omaha and New York City. The resulting regional boundaries and headquarters cities are shown in attachment No. 2.

Since most parts of our regional offices have very little contact with taxpayers, these regional realinements will not affect taxpayers significantly. The only parts of the regional office that do have substantial contacts with taxpayers are the Appellate and Chief Counsel field offices, and we will continue to render these services in those present locations.

III. SERVICE CENTER CHANGES

As you probably know, the Internal Revenue Service is now installing an automatic data processing system that will permit us to use electronic machines to perform the millions of record-handling operations involved in the maintenance of taxpayer accounts, the issuance of bills and refunds, the matching of information documents and the many other data processing activities we must conduct.

Since we need one ADP center in each region to perform this work, our decision to reduce from nine regions to seven means that we will need only seven centers instead of the nine we had planned.

IV. IMPLEMENTING THE CHANGES

Most of these changes will be put into effect gradually and the timing probably will vary from one district to another according to local circumstances.

While most taxpayers probably will not even be aware of these changes, those of your constituents who are employed by us, will be very much aware of them and some of those affected may very well write to you about them. If they do, you can assure them, as we are, that we will try to reduce the adverse impact on them as much as we can. We feel obligated to do this since most of the officials and employees whose positions will be eliminated or transferred as a result of the changes are people who have been with us for a long time, who have risen to their present positions by doing their work well, and who have experience and skill that the IRS does not want to lose.

Fortunately, because the changes will be put into effect gradually, we expect to be able to handle most of the cutbacks by attrition and transfers. However, in many of the affected districts, attrition is slow and many of the employees are both too young to retire and unwilling to move for personal reasons. Consequently, we cannot promise that no one will be hurt. We do promise, however, that we will try to minimize the hardships to our employees in every way that we properly can.

In summary, we believe that these changes will save the taxpayers substantial amounts of money, without diminishing in any way the services they are now receiving. At the same time, they enable us to take a significant step toward the President's goal of a "lean, fit, and efficient Federal establishment."

Sincerely,

MORTIMER M. CAPLIN,
Commissioner.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring as to the legislative program for the balance of this week and next week since a number of Members have been making inquiry of me, and if the majority leader could announce the program at this time, it would be very helpful.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, I would advise that we have no further legislative business for this week.

The legislative program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day. There are nine bills which I am not able to enumerate just at this moment, but which will be printed in the RECORD. They will be as follows:

H.R. 39, District of Columbia Armory Board appointment.

H.R. 682, deeds of trust, new trustees.

H.R. 1933, registration of nurses.

H.R. 1935, authorization, Metropolitan Police dogs.

H.R. 1937, Life Insurance Act.

H.R. 1982, Traffic Act, collision of vehicles.

H.R. 2485, prevention and control; communicable and preventable diseases.

H.R. 2696, municipal court, small claims.

H.R. 3537, municipal court, change of title.

These bills may not necessarily be called in the order listed.

Also on Monday, the bill H.R. 2438 will be taken up. That is a bill to extend the universal military training and service act. I am advised by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia, that he will ask for a rollcall vote on final passage on that bill on Monday.

On Tuesday, H.R. 2440, authorization of aircraft missiles and naval vessels, Armed Forces. I have also been advised by the gentleman from Georgia that he will ask for a rollcall vote on the passage of that bill.

Also on Tuesday, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, has advised me that he will ask unanimous consent to bring up H.R. 4374, conferring honorary citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill. There may be a rollcall vote on that day.

Wednesday and the balance of the week: The program will be announced later.

I make this announcement, of course, subject to the usual reservation that any further program may be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 11

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have completed the legislative business of the week, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATE AND RATE STRUCTURE

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, all Members of the House are concerned about the steadily increasing income tax, and the killing of incentive in the upper brackets. I call the attention of my colleagues to a statement made before the Ways and Means Committee this morning by Prof. William H. Peterson, of New York University. His statement is entitled "Individual Income Tax Rate and Rate Structure." I call it to the attention of my colleagues for their interest.

The statement referred to follows:

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATE AND RATE STRUCTURE

My name is William H. Peterson and I am an associate professor of economics at New York University's Graduate School of Business Administration.

My concern in the President's tax proposals is broad, for I believe they touch upon practically every aspect of national economic growth and individual well-being. For the purposes of this statement, however, I wish to look at but one phase of the President's tax plans—namely, the remaining steepness in individual income tax rate progression (from 14 to 65 percent of taxable income) under the proposed administration program when it would become fully effective in calendar year 1965. And I wish to show how this steepness, especially when linked to the proposed 5 percent rule on itemized deductions, affords virtually no tax relief to the middle and little to the upper brackets. I regard the middle and upper brackets as prime sources of America's capital formation and hence of economic growth.

In this statement I seek to make but three points: First, to demonstrate the nonscientific and antieconomic growth deficiencies of rate progression in general. Second, to show how the President's tax proposals reflect these deficiencies and are hence self-defeating of their stated goal of economic growth. And third, to give support to maximum correction at this time of the deficiencies of graduation.

I stress economic growth, taking a cue from the President's tax message to Congress on January 24, 1963, in which he said that our present tax system is "the largest single barrier to full employment of our manpower and resources and to a higher rate of economic growth." And I stress the need for flattening the rate structure to the maximum extent possible, taking another cue from the President, this time from his television address of August 13, 1962, in which he said that our tax rates "are so high as to weaken the very essence of the progress of a free society—the incentive for additional return for additional effort."

The first point to be considered is the lack of scientific evidence in support of the theory of graduation—a point recognized by many but, admittedly, by no means all economists. Yet scientific evidence appears to be lacking on presumptions of equality of sacrifice, ability to pay, benefits conferred, economic stabilization, economic equalitarianism, and Federal revenue needs.

The unscientific nature or even sheer caprice of graduated rates and income brackets over time or at any one time is amply seen in the history of the income tax since passage of the 16th amendment in 1913. Originally the rate on highest incomes was but 7 percent. In 1929 the top rate was but 24 percent. But out of the social turbulence of the thirties emerged a top rate of 79 percent. World War II brought an upper rate of 94 percent, and it is virtually at this rate under which we live today, with the 50-percent level reached at but $16,000 of taxable income for the unmarried individual.

So the Federal income tax rate structure in its relatively brief life of 50 years has grown like Topsy, subject to no end of whim and pressure, producing rates which Dan Throop Smith, former special assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury in charge of tax policy, has said "are not only repressive but appear to be excessive by almost all ethical standards except those based on extremes of equalitarianism."[1] Smith's raising of the question of ethics is indeed a pertinent question. For does not graduation constitute discrimination against a minority? And was not this the fear that impelled the Founding Fathers to incorporate in article I, section 9, of the Constitution the restriction that no direct tax should be levied by the Federal Government "unless in proportion to the census"? I believe the use of the word "proportion" in the foregoing constitutional phrase is of significance. Proportionality is nondiscriminatory. It recognizes ability to pay. It recognizes equality before the law. It gives no vent to envy and vindictiveness, to—to use a blunter phrase—"soaking the rich."

Surely the history of Federal graduation attests to the wisdom of Scottish economist John Ramsay McCulloch who noted:[2]

"The moment you abandon * * * the cardinal principle of exacting from all individuals the same proportion of their income or their property, you are at sea without rudder or compass, and there is no amount of injustice or folly you may not commit. In such matters the maxim of obsta principiis should be firmly adhered to by every prudent and honest statesman. Graduation is not an evil to be paltered with. Adopt it and you will effectually paralyze industry and check accumulation, at the same time that every man who has any property will hasten, by carrying it out of the country, to protect it from confiscation. The savages described by Montesquieu, who to get at the fruit cut down the tree, are about as good financiers as the advocates of this sort of taxes."

The McCulloch observation seems to be based upon sound economic logic. No proponent of graduation has ever been able to prove just how much faster, if at all, ability to pay is supposed to increase than income. No demonstrably scientific method appears to be used to determine the height of the graduated scale or the brackets of income covered. At best the graduated rate structure becomes the result of rule of thumb, arbitrary conjecture, and conflicting pressures of different groups and organizations. Contrast this makeshift and complex result with the simplicity of proportionality, seen, for example, in the Judaeo-Christian practice of tithing, with the tithe at 10 percent, varying proportionately with a man's income and with good times and bad.

Frequently it is argued that apart from ethical and scientific considerations, the Government has budgeting needs that can only be satisfied by rate progression. Dan Throop Smith has noted that progression beyond 50 percent of taxable income yields the Treasury only about $1 billion, or about enough to run the Government for 4 days.[3]

Indeed, it is arguable that rates beyond 50 percent, and likely much less, do not in fact yield long-term revenue but reduce it because of their inhibiting effect on incentives to produce and invest.

Incentive is the thing. It accounts for enterprise and ingenuity. It is the secret of American prosperity. And yet we seem to be killing off this tremendous force for social good for a relative pittance in terms of Federal revenue. For it has been well established that all the graduation—the 71 percentage points above the bottom personal rate of 20 percent—yields but 15 percent while the bottom rate yields 85 percent of the personal income tax revenue. This means that a flat 20 percent rate on all taxable income would still yield 85 percent of the present personal tax revenue, even assuming no increase in income as a result of rate reductions. This assumption, however, is not tenable because of the effect of released incentives on production and investment, and of released funds presently consumed by taxation that could otherwise be used for capital formation.

Thus the logic or illogic of rate graduation strongly suggests that a reduction from present rate levels is more likely to increase revenue than to reduce it. As Geoffrey H. Moore of the National Bureau of Economic Research noted in the "American Economic Review," high tax rates have "no doubt operated to reduce income before taxes in the upper income groups."[4] Simon Kuznets of Harvard University reached much the same conclusion in his 1953 study,[5] "Shares of Upper Income Groups in Income and Savings," observing that, among other things, the top 5 percent has incurred a marked decline in its share of total income. Further, the top 1 percent of the population received 13 percent of the total income in 1919–38; in 1947–48, however, the top 1 percent received 8½ percent of total income. The contrast is even more striking in terms of average income. To wit: the per capita income of the top 1 percent in 1913 was some 20 times greater than the per capita income of the lower 99 percent, but in 1948 it was but 10 times as great.[6]

Let me stress that steep progression has meant more than mere redistribution of income; it has meant, I am convinced, reduction of income—the national income. In other words, not only reduced income for the rich and hence reduced capital formation, but reduced income thereby for the poor—for everybody.

So it would appear that we have somehow managed to hamper financially and psychologically the most productive, inventive, talented, and venturesome members of our society. We have also forced many of these doers, builders, and job creators to divert much of their energy and talent to ways and means of outwitting the tax collector, to cut back on their output, or to quit work entirely. As the late Summer Slichter, of Harvard University remarked in 1942: "The tax history of the United States in recent years has been fairly sensational. A visitor from Mars would suspect that a Communist fifth columnist was writing the laws for the purpose of making private enterprise unworkable."

To be sure, Federal revenue needs are vast but this fact should not blind us to the diminishing rate of revenue return on high graduated rates, or to the necessity for not succumbing to the elastic ethic that the end justifies the means. For clearly there are different means to the same end of achieving the Government's revenue needs. Let us consider one of these means—a flat rate.

Economist Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago demonstrates that a flat rate of 23.5 percent on taxable income as presently reported, defined, and with presently allowable deductions would produce as much revenue as the current highly progressive rate structure of 20 to 91 percent. Indeed, argues Dr. Friedman, this flat rate would yield a greater revenue for three important reasons: less tax avoidance, meaning less incentive to adopt legal but costly schemes to reduce the amount of reported taxable income; less tax evasion, that is less incentive to fail to report income that legally should be reported; and less disincentives to production and investment and hence to greater national income and Federal revenue.[7]

Another argument put forth in defense of rate graduation is the argument of the welfare school of economics employing the theory of diminishing personal utility of added increments of money, which in turn is used to buttress the equal sacrifice theory of rate progression. This theory leads to a Robin Hood frame of mind among prominent economists on both sides of the Atlantic. Hence, says Prof. A. C. Pigou, of Cambridge University: "It is evident that any transference of income from a relatively rich man to a relatively poor man of similar temperament, since it enables more intense wants to be satisfied at the expense of less intense wants, must increase the aggregate sum of satisfactions."[8] And Prof. Abba P. Lerner, of Michigan State University, states: "The probable value of total satisfactions is maximized by dividing income evenly."[9]

But the plausibility of this kind of economic thinking leaves much to be desired. It is not at all demonstrable that the satisfactions of different people can be measured through a common denominator. Each individual is a unique entity with varying emotions and values—emotions and values which change with time and with changes in income. Nor is it demonstrable that the marginal utility of an additional increment of $1,000 to A, whose annual income is at the $30,000 level, is less than the marginal utility of a similar increment to B, whose annual income is at the $5,000 level. Of course, we could ask A and B how each would react to an additional $1,000. It's quite possible that A would insist that his individual satisfactions would be more fully maximized by the increment than B's satisfactions. B might insist that he got the most satisfaction at the margin. Who can be sure that A is wrong and B is right? Certainly there is nothing in such a mere opinion-culling method that would provide scientific evidence. Interpersonal utility comparisons simply cannot be measured scientifically.

Furthermore, the theory of diminishing utility of income tends to blur into a theory of equalization or semiequalization of income, or, more bluntly, a redistribution of income.

But redistribution assumes a standard of distributive justice different from the standards of our market economy. It assumes that the market knows least and Government knows best. But what is our market economy but the American people, constantly and voluntarily adjusting the incomes of each and every one of us, financially rewarding those who produce more and financially penalizing those who produce less? This democratic market system, this incentive system, is precisely the means by which, I am convinced, we have become the richest and freest people in all the world.

Even the Russians seem to be catching on to this incentive idea—deviating sharply from the Marxist-Leninist concept of from each according to his ability and to each according to his need—for a recent issue of Voprosy Ekonomiki, official periodical of the Soviet Institute of Economics, disowns "petty bourgeois egalitarianism" and explains in an article:[10]

---

[1] Proceedings, 1963, National Tax Association, p. 541.

[2] John Ramsay McCulloch, "Taxation and the Funding System," (1845), quoted by Walter J. Blum and Harry Kalven, Jr., in "The Uneasy Case for Progressive Taxation" (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1953), pp. 45–46.

[3] Morgan Guaranty Survey, July 1960.

[4] Geoffrey H. Moore, "Secular Changes in the Distribution of Income," "American Economic Review," May 1952, p. 542.

[5] National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, 1953, pp. xxxv, xxxvi, 619, 635.

[6] Moore, op. cit., p. 581.

[7] "Capitalism and Freedom" (University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 175.

[8] A. C. Pigou, Economics of Welfare, 4th ed., Macmillan, New York, 1948, p. 89.

[9] Abba C. Lerner, The Economics of Control, 3d ed., Macmillan, New York, 1947, p. 32.

[10] First National City Bank of New York Monthly Letter, December 1959.

"The many years of experience in the organization of social labor under socialism have shown that equalitarianism is incompatible with the interests of the development of socialist production. In order to create the abundance of products the principle of personal material incentives to all personnel is of major significance. * * * It is necessary to give industrial and institutional management the right to raise the salaries of persons showing maximum initiative, capacity, and conscientousness. At the same time, it is necessary to improve the system of bonuses to managerial, engineering, technical, and office personnel."

So much for my first point on graduation; now for my second and third points on the administration's proposed graduation in particular and on what I believe to be an improvement on the administration's approach.

To be sure, the administration program gives the appearance of meeting some of the objections to graduation by offering a lower top rate. The rub is, however, that the top rate of 65 percent is still the culmination of 23 as yet steeply progressive steps which afford little or no relief to the middle brackets, that the administration tax program seeks primarily to stimulate consumption through a magical multiplier, which presumably will expand total demand by an amount several times greater than the amount of the tax cut.

It is clear that the administration, because of alleged industrial overcapacity, is not seeking to directly stimulate investment—the very investment which is the taproot of economic growth.

The trouble with the administration emphasis on consumption is that, coupled to deficit finance as it is, it raises the danger of further inflation and of a worsening in our already precarious international balance of payments situation. Another trouble with the deficit financed-consumption emphasis is that it employs in effect the rather illusory addition of money income as the stimulus to the economy as opposed to the addition of real income, which would be the upshot of an increase in the capital formation rate—that is, in the rate of investment.

I believe the Herlong-Baker bill is the only fiscally feasible and responsible alternative to our present income tax structure. It stresses investment, whereas the administration stresses current consumption. In sharp contrast to the administration's program, it would reform the present steep schedule of rate graduation while—over a longer period of time—providing substantially as much tax relief as the administration at the lower income levels. The Herlong-Baker bill provides a top rate of 42 percent as contrasted with a top of 65 percent in the administration program. But the gap of 23 percentage points between the two bills in no way tells the full story, inasmuch as the Herlong-Baker bill has but mild progression in the income brackets between its top and bottom rates, and does not carry the administration feature of the 5-percent rule on deductions. The absence of this rule plus the lower scale in Herlong-Baker means that the upper and especially the middle brackets get a better tax break than they do in the administration program and thus have a better chance to apply their demonstrated resources and capabilities toward expanding the national product, toward accelerating economic growth, toward creating more jobs.

The proof of this statement lies in a comparison of the rate structure in the two approaches. The slope which the two curves of rate progression would have is significant. The administration would put even more tax pressure, relatively, on the middle-income brackets than under present tax legislation, while Herlong-Baker would ease it. Under our present graduated taxes, the midpoint of graduation (56 percent) is reached at the $20,000 income level for the single individual, while it requires another $180,000 of income to reach the maximum 91-percent rate. Under the 14- to 65-percent range of the administration program, the new midpoint of graduation (40 percent) in its scale would be reached in the bracket beginning at $16,000; thus half of the climb in rates is reached at a lower point. Under Herlong-Baker's 15- to 42-percent spread the midpoint (29 percent) is reached at $38,000.

Again, under the administration's proposed rate structure, 77 percent of the revenue would come from the bottom rate of 14 percent on taxable income and 23 percent would come from graduation. Herlong-Baker, on the other hand, would provide only 7 percent from graduation and 93 percent from the 15-percent bottom rate. Herlong-Baker, then, promises the greatest capital formation rate.

Capital formation is, clearly the road to growth. There is, practically speaking, no other way. The more capital, the more economic growth. The sluggish American economy is deficient mainly on the score of inadequate capital formation. Our gross capital formation rate is one of the lowest among the industrialized countries of the world. We apply but 16 percent of our gross national product to gross capital formation. By contrast, according to Central Intelligence Agency estimates, Western Europe shows the following rates in 1960: West Germany 24 percent, Austria 24 percent, Italy 22 percent, France 18 percent, and Belgium 18 percent. The CIA has also reported that 30 percent of the U.S.S.R. gross national product goes into gross capital formation. The rate for Japan in 1960 was 31 percent.

And the U.S. capital formation situation seems to be getting worse. Economist Simon Kuznets pointed out in his National Bureau of Economic Research study, "Capital in the American Economy," published in December 1961, that net capital formation as a percentage of gross national product has been falling for a long time. The fall has been from 14.6 percent of GNP in the period 1869–88 to 7 percent of gross national product in 1946–55, measured in constant prices. It follows that the saving rate has similarly fallen off. Ironically, as the rate of saving has been falling, the rate of technological advance has been apparently rising, with the result being a relative shortage of capital and the shelving of many fruitful investment projects—projects which could create jobs and more of the good things of life at less cost for more people. As Dr. Kuznets observed, the persistent bottleneck in the exploitation of new technical knowledge has been the scarcity of capital funds. And noting the U.S. population boom upon us, especially of new entrants into the labor force and of new family makers, he writes: "The demand for capital over the coming two and a half or three decades is likely to be large."[11]

To be sure, there are economists who hold that consumption and not direct capital investment is the right road to growth. Their argument seems to be mainly one of overcapacity (euphemistically, "economic slack")—overcapacity in railroads, textiles, steel, coal, lead, zinc, paper, timber, and so on. It should be noted that overcapacity statistics are generally deficient, as the joint congressional committee's subcommittee on economic statistics held in its report last year on measures of productive capacity. The subcommittee's distinction between engineering capacity and economic capacity is significant.

So I believe the administration's stress on overcapacity misses the point. For the real point is not simply overcapacity, but the nature and causes of excess capacity—the composition of capacity, the relative age and efficiency of plant and equipment, and the cost structure, including wages, of output. Overcapacity, in short, seems to be a function of price and of cost. If cost and price are excessively high—that is, high in the mind of the purchaser or the consumer—there will be but a partial sale or perhaps no sale at all.

Why, for example, do we have overcapacity in cotton, wheat, and virtually all other price-supported farm products? Because the price is propped beyond the interest of many buyers who shift to substitute sources abroad or to substitute products. Were the price to come down, the long-term trend would show that, I think, inefficient high-cost producers would shift to more remunerative ventures, the quantity demanded would expand, production would advance, overcapacity would decline, and the farmer, the taxpayer, and the consumer would be much happier for it.

Basically, then, overcapacity is a matter of inefficiency. Much of our overcapacity stems from marginal, high-cost, obsolescent plant and equipment. To an extent, but not by any means to a great enough extent, the new equipment tax credit and the Treasury's accelerated depreciation schedules ameliorate this situation. More should be done on this score.

Much of our overcapacity also stems from obsolete work practices and excessive union bargaining power which raise the unit cost of production and lessen effective demand. This latter problem, I know, is not a direct legislative concern of this committee; nonetheless, inasmuch as tax reform and tax cuts have been made the fulcrum of economic growth, I believe, it would be a mistake to assign to tax measures, however important, the full burden of economic growth.

In sum, Herlong-Baker is a fiscally sound corrective of the present unsound tax structure.

UNESCO BOOKLET

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on February 13 the newspapers of this country reported that UNESCO, United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, had issued a booklet which held the Soviet Union as a nation of free people.

The United Press International and the Chicago Tribune reported as follows:

> A United Nations body, whose largest financial support is given by the U.S. Government, has published a booklet denouncing "colonialist oppression" by Western nations and describing the Soviet Union as a "brotherhood of free and equal peoples," it was learned today.
>
> It was the Communist Party which showed the peoples of Russia the true way to free themselves from social and national oppression, the booklet asserted.

This intrigued me, so I wrote to Mr. Adlai Stevenson, Ambassador to the United Nations, on February 14, 1963, and asked him to provide me with a copy of the booklet. This morning I received a letter from the Ambassador to the United Nations and I would like to read to you the first sentence:

> I wish I could oblige you with a copy of the UNESCO booklet entitled "Equality of

---

[11] National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, 1961, pp. 391 and 459.

Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.," but, alas, I have not been able to lay hold of one myself.

Mr. Speaker, I would still like to get my hands on a copy and if worst comes to worst I shall be constrained to ask the distinguished Speaker of the House, the distinguished majority leader, and the distinguished minority leader to lend me a hand to help get a copy of this Communist propaganda booklet which has been published and is being circulated throughout the world with American taxpayers footing a substantial part of the bill.

REMAGEN BRIDGE ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1945—18 years ago—a small band of courageous American armored infantry, tankers, and armored engineers came upon a railroad bridge over the Rhine River at the little resort town of Remagen, Germany.

In the face of determined German efforts to blow up the structure, the heroic American troops stormed across the Remagen Bridge under fire and thus captured the first crossing of the Rhine River in World War II.

This great feat resulted in the saving of thousands of American lives, and materially shortened the war.

Augsburg, Germany.—Sfc. Joseph A. DeLisio, the bantam rooster infantryman who won the U.S. second highest award for valor, the Distinguished Service Cross, for his part in capturing the Remagen Bridge during World War II, is looking for the two Germans who were his enemies in March of 1945.

The Bronx, N.Y., career soldier, now serving as a weapons squad leader with the 24th Infantry Division's 2d Battle Group, 2d Infantry, in Germany, wants to shake hands with former German Army Capts. Willi Bratge and Karl Freisenhahn.

"I want to have a reunion," says the sergeant, "right there at Remagen on March 7 of this year, 17 years after my outfit secured and held the only bridgehead on the Rhine River."

But Sergeant De Lisio doesn't know how to reach the two Germans who opposed his platoon of Company A, 27th Armored Infantry Battalion in 1945.

"I got the names out of a book of Ken Hechler," adds De Lisio, "and he says that in 1954 Mr. Bratge was a schoolteacher in a small town near East Germany."

The other former German Army captain identified in the book, "The Bridge at Remagen," Karl Freisenhahn was last placed in Koblenz where he supervised an athletic club.

According to former Army Historian Hechler, the Germans would look forward to a reunion at the site of the Remagen Bridge. In his book he quotes Captain Bratge as saying that "we can use a reunion as a symbol to express and demonstrate the friendship between America and Germany today, and also our human friendships as individuals."

"If we could only meet and shake hands," added the captain, "at the very point where we shed our blood in 1945, I believe it would emphasize our feeling of good will, one toward another."

Sergeant De Lisio and the other Americans who were decorated for the Remagen Bridge crossing are held in high esteem by at least one other of their former enemies.

Captain Friesenhahn, when told by author Ken Hechler that the group had been decorated with the Nation's second highest award, said in 1954:

"They deserved them—and then some. They saw us trying to blow that bridge, and by all odds it should have blown up while they were crossing it. In my mind, they were the greatest heroes in the whole war."

So Taro Leaf soldier Joseph De Lisio wants a reunion. And if there is anyone who knows where ex-German Army Capts. Karl Friesenhahn and Willi Bratge are today they might get the word down to the 24th Infantry Division.

And then perhaps the sergeant and the two ex-captains can shake hands by the stone pilings on the Rhine that are all that remains of the bridge at Remagen.

Sergeant DeLisio Locates Former Enemies; Remagen Bridgehead Reunion Scheduled for March 7

Augsburg.—Sfc. Joseph A. DeLisio, the 24th Infantry Division's Remagen bridgehead veteran, will be at Remagen on the Rhine on March 7. His search for the German soldiers who opposed him 17 years ago with death dealing fire is over.

Through the combined efforts of German and American newspapers the defenders of the bridge were finally discovered.

Former German Army Capt. Willi Bratge who has exchanged his military title for the more peaceful one of "Lehrer," teacher, has contacted the Bronx, N.Y., Victory Division weapons squad leader.

And in a letter from the town of Remagen itself, a former German Army sergeant, Gerhard Rothe, writes "I was a member of the Bridge Security Company as a master sergeant and served there until March 7, 1945."

"And this day I was wounded," continues the former German sergeant, "and was perhaps the last soldier to cross the bridge before you took it. Doing so my thoughts were likely similar to yours, as the bridge was supposed to be destroyed already at this time."

Herr Rothe, now owner of a hotel in Remagen, has invited Sergeant DeLisio and other participants in the reunion to be his guests.

Both Rothe and Bratge have confirmed that former German Army Capt. Karl Friesenhahn, another of the defenders of the Remagen Bridge died several years ago.

Sergeant DeLisio, on duty with the 24th Division's 2d Battle Group, 19th Infantry, first planned this reunion at the pilings which are the only remnants of the strategic World War II route, after reading a book written by West Virginia's Congressman, Mr. Ken Hechler.

It was Congressman Hechler's authoritative "The Bridge at Remagen," written on facts garnered as a World War II Army historian, and subsequent visits to Remagen, that sparked DeLisio's reunion idea.

Author Hechler noted in his book that Captain Bratge said, "If we could only meet and shake hands at the very point where we shed our blood in 1945, I believe it would emphasize our feeling of good will, one toward another."

DeLisio was one of 13 men who received Distinguished Service Crosses, the United States second highest award for valor, for their part in the Remagen Bridge crossing.

The late Captain Freisenhahn, when told by Author Hechler in 1954 that the group had been decorated said:

"They deserved them * * * and then some. They saw us trying to blow that bridge, by all odds it should have been blown up while they were crossing it. In my mind, they were the greatest heroes in the whole war."

Former President Eisenhower commenting on the exploits of the World War II GI's at Remagen said:

"It wasn't the biggest battle of all times, but it represents the dash, ingenuity, and readiness to seize opportunity that characterizes the American soldier."

Former Enemies Shake Hands at Remagen Bridge Reunion

Remagen, March 7, 1962.—This town's historic bridge site was the scene today of a reunion between a 24th Infantry Division soldier and three German veterans of World War II.

Sgt. Joseph A. DeLisio and former Capt. Willi Bratge and former Sgts. Gerhard Rothe and Jakob Kleebach were reunited in ceremonies commemorating the 17th anniversary of the unexpected capture of Remagen Bridge by American forces.

On March 7, 1945, Sergeant DeLisio, then a member of the 9th Armored Division, earned this Nation's second highest award for valor, the Distinguished Service Cross, when he singlehandedly captured a German machinegun crew that had pinned down the American advance over the bridge.

REMINISCED

Speaking at the Central Hotel owned by Gerhard Rothe, the four men described their feelings on the same date 17 years before. "I came to the top of a bluff overlooking the Rhine and I saw the bridge below me. The sight was so beautiful that for that moment I forgot about the war," Sergeant DeLisio remembers.

In the wake of the American advance, Rothe lay on the bridge wounded attempting to crawl his way back to the German side. Misunderstanding the American order to halt, he was shot at and wounded a second time after having crawled more than 100 feet. "I thought that I was going to be killed," Rothe recalls. "I'm afraid we all had the same thought," DeLisio added, "we were thinking about living."

BRATGE

Bratge, in charge of the Remagen defense, surrendered to the Americans when explosives failed to topple the only bridge left over the Rhine. Seizing the advantage, enough American troops and equipment poured over the bridge to shorten the war by 6 months. The weakened structure collapsed 10 days later of its own accord, and Bratge, an American prisoner, learned that the German high command had put a sentence of death on his head for surrendering the vital structure.

Following the meeting at the hotel, the party moved to the bridge site where Sergeant DeLisio, with a mixture of joy and sadness, presented the German veterans with mementoes of the reunion "signifying that one-time enemies can be joined together in a common bond of peace."

SPEECH

In an emotional speech describing the last 17 years, Bratge concluded, "A bridge of steel and iron has collapsed, now let the bridge of friendship last forever."

The reunion, covered extensively by major German and American press, was arranged for by the 24th Infantry Division Public Information Office at the request of Sergeant DeLisio. "It exceeded anything I had hoped for," DeLisio said.

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY OF THE SOUTH AND THE TWO-PRICE COTTON SYSTEM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Hemphill] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to again discuss a problem which is an increasingly serious problem in this Nation having to do with the textile industry, involving what we call the two-price cotton system which the President has called a system of inequity.

Today I have met the situation as I see it head on. I have introduced two pieces of legislation. One of these pieces of legislation would do away entirely with the 8½-cent subsidy presently enjoyed by foreigners who purchase our cotton.

I would like to say here that I have no objection to any of the programs which have been proposed by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, whom I admire, or any of those members of the Committee on Agriculture who not long ago paid us the great honor of visiting North and South Carolina to look into the textile industry and the two-price cotton situation in fact and in reality. I admire what they did, and I thank them for coming.

May I say also I will support any legislation that committee reports out which is of a curative nature, insofar as the two-price cotton system is concerned.

But the problem has to be met head on. As we know now, not only are our textile mills and their ability to produce affected, but we are getting into a transition period from the use of cotton fibers to manmade fibers to the degree that if this trend is to continue, and it will continue unless the two-price cotton system is done away with, it is my prediction the cotton farmers of this Nation will soon reach the place where they do not have an adequate domestic market for the cotton they produce.

Mr. Speaker, I have also introduced another bill which is a piece of legislation stemming from the failure of the Tariff Commission to act when we had the section 22 hearing on the import fee which the Department of Agriculture, under the direction of the President, had promoted. The Commission failed to honor the necessities of the domestic textile industry by imposing an import fee. As we prepared this particular piece of legislation, the thought occurred to me we ought to have these pieces of legislation in the alternative. I say in the alternative or any substitute that will get rid of the two-price cotton system, either by some equalization in the form of an import fee or, better still, do away with the system entirely. I prefer the latter.

Let me commend the gentleman from North Carolina who has read into the Record a very timely resolution of the North Carolina General Assembly.

The gentleman is with us today although he had an important delegation meeting. I am sure the textile people of his district and mine know that he is always with us in meeting this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I might call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that the situation has become so serious that one of the banks in my district put into its show window a bale of cotton and there appeared in the newspaper this particular headline: "Lint Inequity Fight Spreads to Camden as Banks Join In."

Of course, Camden is located in South Carolina and is a very lovely town in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in my remarks at this time the story of that particular effort on the part of the business community to alert the people to the growing inequity and the growing harm of the two-price cotton system.

The article referred to follows:

Two-Price Cotton—Lint Inequity Fight Spreads to Camden as Banks Join In

Camden's two banks have now entered the flurry over two-price cotton.

Citizens & Southern National Bank and South Carolina National Bank are displaying cotton bales in their lobbies with signs tacked to them that call attention to the fact that foreign mills pay $42.50 less per bale for U.S.-produced cotton than our local mills.

The bale-in-the-bank idea is spreading throughout the Southeast, and Pierce Cantey, of South Carolina National Bank, and Hugh Chapman, of Citizens & Southern National Bank, are in hopes that all banks of the two statewide chains will follow Camden's lead in this State and help tell the textile industry's plight.

It is believed that the cotton bale display originated with Swift Spinning Mills and the Fourth National Bank at Columbus, Ga. Two North Carolina banks picked up the idea and it has since spread throughout the Tar Heel State.

"Seventy percent of the industrial economy of South Carolina depends on the textile industry, and we feel this inequity in price should be of great concern to every one of our citizens," said Citizens & Southern National Bank Vice President Hugh Chapman.

"Actually both Senators Olin D. Johnston and Strom Thurmond, and Congressman Robert Hemphill are foursquare behind the textile industry and the National Cotton Council in this fight, but we feel that if the general public knew the situation, and would write these officials en masse, it would strengthened their hand with the administration," Mr. Chapman said.

Mr. Speaker, on this bale of cotton in large figures is the price that the American manufacturers, the domestic users, pay for a bale of cotton. That price is approximately $182.50. On this particular bale the price that the foreign purchaser pays is approximately $140, a differential of $42.50.

In the photograph which, of course, cannot be included in the Congressional Record, I find this question: "Is this fair to you?"

I am asking the Congress of the United States, and I think I should sound forth for my district—I am asking the Nation—is it fair to anyone dependent upon the textile industry as a source of income and as a source of livelihood? Is it fair? Of course not. It is not fair.

I say to the Members of the House that 1 million American textile people depend upon this industry. I say to you also that these people who are buying this cotton in foreign nations do not pay 1 cent of tax to support this Government, its ambitions or its defense, or the way of life that you and I enjoy under this great Government in a great and free land.

Something has to be done about it. Only this morning I was down at the Department of Agriculture attending a meeting at which many of us had opposed the plan of the Department of Agriculture to change the method which the Commodity Credit Corporation presently practices in the storage of cotton where it is convenient to the farmer and convenient to the purchaser on a local level. This change, of course, would cost a lot of money. But I might say also that looming in the background at that meeting I could not help but sense the fact that unless something is done about this two-price cotton system I do not believe the Congress in the future will support an agricultural program with such inequities included.

I believe, if my experience here has taught me anything, and my observation has been, that agricultural programs are becoming less and less popular just because of situations like this which we can no longer justify. It is not only unfair; it is not right. It represents an imposition on the American cotton producer and upon the textile mills themselves.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am always happy to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener]. I had hoped he would be here and am pleased that he did so notwithstanding an important meeting of his delegation.

Mr. WHITENER. I came back from the very important meeting because I knew the gentleman would make a very excellent contribution today, as the gentleman always does on this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I think what the gentleman is saying about agricultural legislation and its future possibilities in the Congress is certainly sound. When I look in our own section of the country—which is a heavy textile as well as agricultural area—and see for the first time a side-taking operation going on between agriculture and industry, I think this indicates the seriousness of the situation confronting agricultural legislation in the future.

I might say to the gentleman that just last Saturday night I had a discussion with a high-ranking official in the Department of Agriculture along this line. While I have a great affection for the gentleman with whom I was speaking on Saturday night, I must say that I was quite shocked to find that one in such high place in the Department of

Agriculture could be so totally disoriented to the true facts with reference to the cotton agricultural economy and its relationship to the textile industry in America the main source of sales of American-grown cotton.

As the gentleman well knows the General Assembly of North Carolina on March 5 passed a resolution on this subject imploring the Congress and the President of the United States to take immediate and positive action to eliminate the inequitable situation confronting every living soul who makes his living in the textile industry by reason of this two-price cotton situation. This was a timely plea from the general assembly of my State. I was delighted that they had taken this action.

There are many who think that we are talking about this matter to entertain ourselves. There are many who take the position that it is a political issue. And since I have not called the name of this agricultural official with whom I was talking Saturday night I must say to the gentleman that I was utterly amazed at the statement he made during the course of my conversation with him when he said:

> You know, there were not but two counties west of Raleigh that went Democratic in North Carolina on the national level.

I immediately asked him the question:

> What does that have to do with the issue? Are you saying that the domestic economy is placed upon a political platter, that the jobs of over 200,000 North Carolinians in textile plants are in jeopardy because in a democratic society a majority of the people in a textile area did not see fit to vote a certain way?

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to those who listen, that I have no intention whatever of walking down the path that some folks expect us to walk in agricultural legislation unless a realistic, intelligent, fairminded, honest attitude is taken by those who lead in the Department of Agriculture today. Some of these men have been close personal friends of mine for years, but they are wrong. They have misled the people of my section of the country. They have misled the leaders in the textile industry as well as the workers in the textile industry. And unless the Congress asserts itself quickly they will mislead the American people and do great violence to our economy.

I am sorry that I must say this. I have been patient, as have all other Members of Congress, with the promises and the hopes that have been held out, with the unfortunate paths down which some of the textile people. I can only say—without criticism of those who went down those paths—that I today am happy that in some way I had the inspiration, or whatever you may call it, not to be misled. And I say that those who are unaware of the seriousness of this situation had better wake up because there are bad days ahead in the textile industry unless something is done. I might say that unless something is done there are bad days ahead for the cotton farmers in this country.

In the districts of the gentleman from South Carolina a press release was issued this week that the Springs Cotton Mills were building a multi-million-dollar textile plant, not to run cotton, but to run synthetic fibers.

Throughout the industry the use of synthetics as the total content of fabrics is increasing. More frightening, or it should be frightening to those charged with the responsibility of aiding the cotton farmer, is the great increase in the blending of a little bit of cotton with a great deal of synthetic to make a fabric. It is high time that some of those who are so blind, who have responsibility in some of these administrative agencies, wake up to the seriousness of the problem.

I am sorry I took so much of the gentleman's time, but I do appreciate what he is doing for the people of his district and for the people of the Nation, including the people of my own congressional district.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I want to thank the gentleman and say that when he takes up time from me it is for the good of the Nation. I thank him for taking part here at considerable personal inconvenience.

I might comment on his remarks. I am going to yield to some other friends from North Carolina in just a second. We are not talking just to entertain ourselves. I am happy there are a few of us left who are determined to keep talking about this. The gentleman from North Carolina is certainly among those.

As far as this being a political issue, this is not a political issue, but is an issue of bread and meat, an issue of economic life or death to a great industry and a great segment of people whom I love, because they have done me the honor of electing me politically time after time, and they have been my friends.

Mr. WHITENER. I should like to point out one other thing in line with what the gentleman has just suggested. In the past week I would estimate we have received in my office at least 50 letters written by folks who described themselves as textile workers in my congressional district. Some of these letters are written with pencil, some with pen, but none typewritten. In these letters they are begging us to do something because their jobs are falling by the wayside.

I say to the gentleman that unless something is done to eliminate the two-price cotton situation it will not be many months until we will begin to get letters from cotton farmers saying, "Do something to equalize this problem so that we can produce this crop and have a market for it."

I may say to the gentleman that it has been reliably estimated that if the Department of Agriculture would place on the market in this country some of this $1,049 million worth of cotton that they say is involved in the last year's crop at the world price, I am told by one of the leading textile men the world, by telephone yesterday, that if that were done within a week at least $400 million worth of that cotton would move immediately into the domestic textile industry.

Yet they came in here a few days ago and asked us to vote an additional $500 million so that they can bring in some $368 million underestimated cotton in the Commodity Credit Corporation program instead of saying to our people in America that we are going to let you have this American cotton at the same price that a Japanese or a German or some other foreigner can buy it.

I say this is a comedy of errors, and it is time that folks quit just entertaining themselves by pointing at some of us who are concerned about it and saying we are unduly excited, and look at the true facts of the matter.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank my colleague.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I would like to say to my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], that I was on the floor when he made the remarks about his conversation with the gentleman from the Department of Agriculture. Certainly, being one who benefited from the trend there toward the other party, I want to say to him that this problem certainly is not a political problem because it certainly is serious and it is one that requires a bipartisan approach. I certainly would like to say this: You know the textile industry is a friend—the best friend of the American cotton farmer. This is the thing we need to realize, that the textile industry buys the great majority of its raw material requirements from the American farmer. If both of them are to stay in business, certainly something needs to be done. I agree with these remarks. This is a situation and a problem that has been created by Federal policies which have attempted to be all things to all people. What we will see is the wreckage of an industry along the way unless we can solve it here. The continuation of the two-price cotton policy also is going to bring grave retribution on the cotton farmer himself.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. I have heard with interest the remarks of my friend from the district adjoining mine. I want to say that my remarks earlier about the comment made to me by this Agriculture Department official was not made in a partisan way, and I did not mean to give my colleague any opportunity here to brag about the mistake made by so many of our people at the polls in the last election. I am not saying that, of course, with reference to the gentleman himself. But I take no pride in that and I just point that out to indicate that this is a problem that transcends political parties. I do not think how people vote in a particular area should enter into how we handle the public's business. I know the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL] will agree with that even though he and I may have serious differences as to the wisdom of folks voting for his party and for my party. I would hope by reason of positive action that we can take here in the Congress that there will be such a deep appreciation on the part of all our people that they will see that this party of ours, that is, the Democratic Party, has had the wisdom to undo that which was done by the party of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL] over a period of time under the leadership of former Secretary Benson.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I would simply like to say, I want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina for again forcefully bringing to the attention of the House this most vital matter. This is a matter that is vital not only to the gentleman's district, but to my congressional district and to many other districts and to the country as a whole, and to the textile industry as a whole and to the people who work in that industry and to the cotton farmers. I think the gentleman from South Carolina is certainly due a great deal of commendation for the time and effort he has put into this presentation and for his untiring efforts and undying interest that has been exhibited through the years in doing everything he can and in urging others to follow him and to help in the salvation of the No. 2 industry in the United States of America.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank my colleague. I just hope the people of the gentleman's district recognize and appreciate the fact that since he has come to the Congress he has been untiring in his efforts, and I thank him for the many times that he has supported us here in trying to tell our textile story again and again, and like the gentleman from Gastonia who asked me to yield, we hope and pray that we will not have to be getting up on the floor of the Congress to talk about this because we would like to see some solution to this problem.

We have been working for some solution and voting to trying to get some solution. It is a funny thing—I have been sitting in the Congress here only 6 years, which is a very short time, and I recognize that I am one of the younger Members here, but it has been my policy when some other area or some other industry was in trouble to help them, because it seemed to me to be a pretty poor thing when you will not lend a hoe to a neighbor to kill a snake.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have followed for several years the matter about which the gentlemen from North Carolina and South Carolina have been addressing the House. I think it is well known that I do not have one farm in my district. My Republican friends up my way occasionally refer to me as the urban farmer, which title I accept with the greatest of pleasure.

Several years ago in reading an article on this very subject I was impressed with the fact that cotton was sold abroad at 8 or 8½ cents per pound less than the price American industry could buy it for. Is my recollection correct?

Mr. HEMPHILL. It is eminently correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was so impressed that I introduced a bill to try to bring about an equalization so that American industry would receive the same benefits that were given to foreign industry. I introduced a similar bill in the succeeding Congress. I remember on one occasion shortly after I introduced the bill a measure relating to agriculture was before the House. I went to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and to the ranking Republican member, and spoke to them about offering my bill as an amendment to the pending bill. What happened? My bill was not germane to the pending bill but they said they would not raise a point of order and that they would accept the amendment. So I offered the amendment. Unfortunately, however, one of our Members, not a Democrat, and not a member of the Committee on Agriculture, exercising his rights under the rules of the House, made a point of order and, of course, the point of order was sustained.

I refer to the fact that on two occasions in past Congresses I have introduced bills because I feel that there is injustice in the treatment of textiles. Any situation which results in injustice should be corrected so that one of America's principal industries will at least be on a comparable basis with this same industry in other countries.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I want to thank the distinguished Speaker and say that I speak with the gratitude of the people of my State and area. The Speaker certainly has made a contribution today. I am happy to have his support, and thank him from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield.

Mr. HOEVEN. I am quite sure the gentleman knows that the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture recently held several days of hearings on a cotton bill introduced by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. It was soon discovered that the mill operators, and the processors, and the growers were in complete disagreement; whereupon the chairman issued a public statement saying that until and unless those interested could agree upon some specific program the hearings would be suspended. It has also been intimated that there might not be any cotton legislation at this session unless some agreement was reached.

In view of the circumstances as they pertain to the Committee on Agriculture, does the gentleman see any hope of an agreement which would make it possible to pass a bill at this session of Congress?

Mr. HEMPHILL. May I say to the gentleman I am happy to have his question. While he did not come out with any legislation, I want to thank him and every member of his committee for even considering the problem. It was a noble thing to do. I had hoped you would come here with legislation that the House could support. I had hoped that the effort would be nonpartisan because this is an issue that affects the American economy.

I may say to the gentleman I do not think we have reached an agreement, but I think an agreement can be reached. In my opinion, the Committee on Agriculture, with its distinguished members on both sides of the aisle, has the ability and the experience, and because of the fact some of those very fine men on both sides of the aisle visited North Carolina and saw what we are doing, certainly could bring out legislation. That is my hope.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I was so proud of the fact that as a result of the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina and the special order he got today, the distinguished Speaker of the House has again said, as he has stated for many years, that this inequitable situation should be eliminated in this country. The Speaker of the House is from an area which is very heavily involved in the textile industry and has been from the early days of this Nation. Knowing him as I do, I know that he would be just as concerned about this situation as if there never had been a textile plant within the State of Massachusetts. He has shown that by his interest in the farmers. As he has pointed out, he has no farmers in his district. I think it is magnificent that we have here by our side and on our side the great American who now serves us so capably as Speaker of the House of Representatives. I know that when the people of our respective districts, yours in South Carolina and mine adjoining in North Carolina, are again made aware of the fact that one of the most able soldiers on the legislative front has gone to war again to preserve their jobs and to preserve a great industry, they will rise up and say a word of thanks from their hearts to him.

Now, if I might impose upon the gentleman briefly to say something about what our dear friend and my neighbor in the House Office Building, the gentleman from Iowa, said, I too appreciate the problems which have confronted the committee.

I know that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] as the ranking member on the Committee on Agriculture, by nature and by general traits of character on this and on other matters of legislation will not be partisan in his approach and will not be influenced whatever by the fact that in the great area from whence he comes the textile industry is not a big economic factor.

However, with reference to the gentleman's question as to agreement, I daresay that seldom do we have legislation of any consequence on which all people involved agree thoroughly. I see no area for disagreement in this proposition, however. There is no area for argument.

As the Speaker of the House of Representatives has just pointed out, we have a situation where American-grown cotton can be bought by a foreigner at 8½ cents a pound cheaper than it can be bought by an American manufacturer. That in itself is the problem. There is no room for argument. The only way to eliminate the inequity is to in some way make it possible for the domestic manufacturer to buy this American cotton at the same price that his foreign competition can purchase it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about disagreement, let me remind you that there was none when the Secretary of Agriculture filed a section 22 petition with the Tariff Commission in which he sought to have an 8.5-cent-a-pound offset fee set upon the incoming cotton textile fabrics from foreign nations placed upon the cotton equivalent of those fabrics. Now, we proceeded with the common understanding and with the common knowledge of the 8.5-cent disparity. Yet, as the gentleman from Iowa knows, to the surprise of everyone, on one bright morning the Department of Agriculture representatives appeared before the gentleman's great Committee on Agriculture and started talking about a 5-cent and 6-cent adjustment to take care of this problem. That is why I said earlier, if my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, will remember, that if the people in the domestic textile industry working at the machines and who are engaged in textiles at all levels had not been doublecrossed by somebody, they would have had unanimity in meeting the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can get around to this matter in the Congress and do something about this question without a lot of argument, dilly-dallying, and reading a lot of fine print published by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I would be happy to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. There may be an inequity in this situation, but there are a lot of other inequities dealing with agriculture alone. There are a lot of other inequities with respect to imports of foreign products into this country. The thing that I protest in this legislation is this: I hope it will be brought out to the floor under an open rule so we can offer amendments to the bill to take care of other inequities, and if we cannot get the other inequities taken care of I am ready, willing, and able to vote against the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I might say to the gentleman that I am happy now to hear that the gentleman is going to help us and I will tell him that I am going to held him, because the gentleman and I have stood together on this import situation time after time. May I also say to the gentleman how much I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is a champion of the buy-American proposition and the American producer. I thank the gentleman for his contribution here today.

I now want to bring to the attention of the Members of the House certain things which came out in the magazine called the Textile Reporter. I commend it to the Members of the House because it is concerned with the industry. It is published in Greenville, S.C., which is not in my district, but it is a good magazine and it keeps up with the textile industry. It represents one of the ways in which I try to keep up with the industry from day to day.

There are certain facts that came out in a recent issue which are significant.

> Manmade fiber-fabric imports soared by 57 percent to 63.4 million yards last year from 40.5 million in 1961. The Census Bureau reports the value of these goods rose 52 percent to $22.2 million from $13.3 million. Japanese shipments accounted for most of the increases rising from 33 million yards in 1961 to 56 million yards in 1962.

Not only are we having to compete with the Japanese, who seem to have our State Department at its mercy in any trade negotiations—they can outsmart them or out-trick them—not only are we having to compete in the cotton cloth fabrics, but we are getting in competition now in the manmade fibers. The reason for this is obvious. The Japanese apparently sense the trend or the transition from the use of cotton to the use of manmade fibers and they are getting ready to make their effort to keep the markets they have taken from us or which have been given away by the erroneous policies of the United States, in trying to buy friends, or something of that kind.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman on the very strong statement he has made and the firm stand that he has taken in respect to the cotton textile situation with which he is very intimately concerned. I want to join him in expressing concern not only in this instance, but I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina is aware of the bipartisan interest that his problem has raised in our Committee on Agriculture. I would also recall to the gentleman the present difficulty that our country is now involved in with regard to sugar. Our very excellent chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], last year tried to bring out a program that would give equitable consideration to the consumers and the producers and our offshore supplies of sugar. I am sure the gentleman is aware of the difficulties that have arisen. I could cite other instances of equal merit. It seems to me, in accord with what the gentleman has just said, that the State Department certainly has lost sight of the fact that the first concern of our country ought to be that our own economy be preserved and permitted to grow.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his support. I certainly agree with him that the American economy is our first concern and should be the first concern of the State Department. I thank him again for participating.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture I should like to compliment the gentleman for bringing public attention to this very critical problem. Truly I believe the cotton farmer is in deep trouble and has a very bleak future ahead unless something is done by Congress. Second, I would like to support the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa that the approach has been on a bipartisan basis. I believe the gentleman will recall, during the hearings of the Subcommittee on Cotton, I did present what I considered to be a constructive approach to the problem in an effort to try to meet some of the critical problems the cotton farmer faces. Further I would like to speak a word in regard to the role which the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman COOLEY, of the House Committee on Agriculture, has played. I think he has been quite proper in delaying consideration because apparently the other interests involved, primarily from the administration, cannot agree upon an approach which they will back.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his support of our position in our problem and say to him that I commend him for taking a great and patriotic interest in a problem which really affects my part of the country more than other parts of the country because of the concentration of textiles there.

Let me assure the gentleman that I look for an opportunity to be of service to help him with the problems in his district.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have here from America's Textile Reporter of the 28th of February two articles which I shall include at this time in my remarks. One is called "Let's Knock It Off." It talks about making cotton available at the same price to our mills as to the foreign mills. This article reads as follows:

LET'S KNOCK IT OFF

Commenting on the National Cotton Council's agreement to make U.S. cotton available to American mills at the same price it is made available to foreign mills (through additional subsidies), Seton Ross of the Cotton Trade Journal said the council did the practical, and therefore, the logical thing.

He added: "We don't like export subsidies, but they are recognized as a necessary evil. We don't like domestic subsidies, but they too have become a necessary evil. Some delegates to the National Cotton Council convention mourned what they termed a 'surrender of principles' the council had long and vigorously upheld but we don't see it that way. It was retreat—not a surrender: a retreat before the compelling pressures of lost markets and the threat of rebuilt surpluses. And to those who insist on calling it a surrender, we put this question: Which would you rather surrender—a belief, or an industry?"

Now, that question is rather all encompassing with finality. We don't believe we have to do either, in the first place. But why are export subsidies and domestic subsidies necessary evils? Should we condone evil by labeling it necessary? They are not necessary. As a millman wrote to Congressman BASIL WHITENER, of North Carolina, the reason for these necessary evils simply is: "It is easier for our representatives to legislate this money away rather than to drop these farm subsidies at the risk of losing some votes."

The way to get rid of these "necessary evils" is offered by another millman who said: "I believe we should take off the 8½ cents per pound allowed foreign purchasers and make them pay the same amount as the American market; let the cotton farmer paddle his own canoe if he overproduces, or let him sell his surplus to foreign countries at less money if he chooses to overproduce."

The answers are simple but the courage is lacking.

But back to Mr. Ross' comments on "principles" about which he speaks so lightly, we would remind him that whenever this country has made even the slightest "retreat" on principles, Marxist doctrines gain another foothold. There was principle behind the Monroe Doctrine—now look at Cuba.

If it is possible to compare principles upon which our many American freedoms were founded with principles involving commodities in a free market, then analogically Mr. Ross is subscribing to a reversal of the wording (where cotton is concerned), "I'd rather be dead than Red."

There is no conceivable reason why the Federal Government should make another mistake to help cover up an original mistake.

If such errors are compounded past the present utterly ridiculous point, this thing could turn into a perpetual game of drop the handkerchief.

As the Charlotte Observer said in a recent editorial: "Cotton's troubles need surgery, not first aid. A new subsidy in the cotton program would be nothing more than a feeble excuse for the failure of Congress to face up to its duty. It must have the political courage to begin the surgery that in a few years would get the Government out of the cotton business, except for the production advice it gives to growers."

Every honest man knows the answer, so let's knock it off.

The second article is part 1 of an article in three parts. I am not sure I agree with all of this, but I think in any approach to this problem if somebody has some reason on the other side of it I am happy to present it here, because we should know all of the reasons and we should always be sure that what we are saying is for the good of the country. I feel today that these people who have contributed have done so for the good of the Nation.

This article is as follows:

COTTON TEXTILES—A SQUARE INDUSTRY IN A ROUND ECONOMY?—PART ONE OF AN ARTICLE IN THREE PARTS BY PETER M. STRANG

In these days of the New Frontier, businessmen frequently do not see eye to eye with modern welfare economists. The business structure has such numerous and varied ramifications that disastrous repercussions may take place when persons who lack a thorough knowledge of business force the adoption of ill-advised but well-intentioned programs. This thought has been well expressed by Sylvia Porter who recently used the following introduction in a financial column for the Boston Herald.

"A little learning is a dangerous thing;

"Drink deep, or taste not the Pierian spring."

"When Alexander Pope wrote these familiar lines more than 2 centuries ago, he of course never dreamed that they could be applied to the state of the U.S. economy and the safety of the U.S. dollar, circa 1962, but I think it's about as apt a poetic reference to a serious economic situation as could be found today.

"For confusion is being compounded, fears being spread which could bring about the very event feared by homemade economists and amateur financiers who overnight are pretending to be experts in subjects they hadn't even heard of—much less carefully studied—a year ago."

Businessmen may take consolation from the fact that similar conditions have appeared in other vocations. With reference to art, John Canaday, art editor of the New York Times, has written: "The true artist has been replaced by the amateur in a cushy atmosphere of patronage by an amateur public."

Has the staid science of economics acquired an entourage of inexperienced practitioners whose schemes receive support from a gullible, superficially educated public? This question should be legitimate for the business world to ask. To many who read the newspapers and listen to the pontifications of some politicians, or radio and television commentators, the answer will be "Yes."

This is especially true of engineers and manufacturers engaged in the production of goods not directly connected with or of immediate importance to the space age. Men who have spent their lives in the cotton textile industry foresee the death of their industry together with greater maladjustment in the national economy if some present Government programs are not modified.

REASONS FOR SKEPTICISM

It is natural for businessmen to look skeptically upon the ready acceptance of untried economic theories because in a historical social science, such as economics, new theories cannot be proved or disproved within the controlled conditions of a laboratory. For businessmen, advanced degrees are often obtained in the school of hard knocks. The formal education of one of the most successful businessmen the writer ever met consisted of four grades in grammar school. Yet this man had acquired an uncanny knowledge of economic principles. This is not to imply that a sound education in business, economics, or liberal arts is not a good foundation upon which to build an industrial career. The point to be stressed is that in sciences which involve the behavior of living people, theory without practice furnishes a questionable background for making decisions either in business or Government.

A review of the history of Great Britain and the United States during the last 60 years spotlights many instances in which the prophecies and panaceas of economists were not infallible. It is ironical to observe that usually whenever one economist gained acclaim with a new theory possessing popular appeal another economist of repute would promptly point to the flaws in that theory. In 1910 by studies of economics that were translated into 11 languages, Norman Angell proved that a war involving the major powers of the world was impossible. Four years later World War I completely discredited him. Roger Babson was the only eminent economist to predict the collapse of the stock market in 1929 but he failed to foresee the debacle which took place a few years later. During the 1930's Keynes promulgated surprising tenets which, according to modern economists, proved to have many deficiencies but inaugurated new concepts in their science. Attempts made to alleviate the depression in accordance with Keynes' theories were ineffective. In this same decade agricultural economists with supposedly advanced theories guided the enactment of laws to aid the farmers in this country. Without reaching the roots of the agricultural problem these laws, with subsequent modifications, have created conditions whereby mills in foreign countries purchase this Nation's cotton 25 percent cheaper than the taxpaying mills in the United States. After World War II when the Armed Forces disbanded, the dire predictions of many economists regarding business and unemployment did not materialize.

The transitions of this country's cotton textile industry illustrate economic principles in operation and also the effects of fallacious economic theorizing and tinkering. The industry grew under a protective tariff and reached its maximum size about 1929. However, in the 1920's several unrelated developments began to alter the textile picture. The styles of women's clothing changed radically so that the well-dressed woman required smaller quantities of fabrics made from yarns of medium count. Producers of fine dress goods or coarse ginghams lost their markets. Bags of paper and plastics began to replace cotton bags in the cement and grocery trades. The rubber companies built mills of their own to make simplified tire fabrics. The chemical companies added to the complications by introducing synthetic fibers to compete with cotton in dress goods. By operating 24 hours a day, chemical plants demonstrated to cotton manufacturers that continuous operation with three shifts was cheaper than partial operation each day with one or two shifts.

In a very short time these factors helped to transform a growing industry into an industry with far too much productive capacity. As three-shift operation became general, fewer spindles were required to supply the market, and as the average yarn became heavier greater output per spindle-hour was obtained. In their struggle to survive, cotton manufacturers entered into a continuing war of economic attrition. Today there are but 19 million spindles in this country to supply 180 million inhabitants whereas in 1929 there was 37 million spindles for 120 million people.

TARIFFS AND COTTON MANUFACTURING

Due to economic attrition the bulk of the remaining industry has gradually concentrated in the Southeastern States. It is safe to say that cotton manufacturing has survived in this country during the last 30 years and can exist today only because of a protective tariff. The drop in textile employment which followed the recent GATT agreements in Geneva furnishes ample evidence that any reduction in the textile tariffs affects some manufacturers adversely.

In theory, tariffs should be abolished because they raise the price of the protected goods in the home market and hamper the flow of world trade. In theory, low-wage industries such as cotton manufacturing should be eliminated from the United States. In theory, it may be of great advantage in the long run to become closely associated with the European Common Market. In theory, textile mills form a logical base for the industrialization of an undeveloped country. However, when there are large numbers of unemployed and the rate of economic growth is not adequate for the increasing population, the immediate and the long-term effects on the Nation should be considered before the rigorous application of any economic theory is attempted.

Bearing in mind that cotton manufacturers employ 353,000 persons directly, purchase 55 percent of the output of some 509,000 cotton growers, and together these industries also give employment to thousands for services and supplies, examination of the past experience and the present status of cotton manufacturers and cotton growers provides the basis for one such study. In analyses of this type it must be remembered that the average American prefers a steady job even though the working conditions and wages are not superlative rather than long-term unemployment benefits.

Cotton manufacturing is the oldest mass production industry in the world and its development was largely responsible for the industrial revolution in the 19th century. No other mass production industry has reached the stage of development where standardized mills with standardized processes and standardized machines, for which the operations of the workers have also been standardized, can be erected anywhere on the globe. Consequently American manufacturers continually have to balance their costs plus their tariff protection against the selling prices of foreign competitors who benefit through lower wage rates and cheaper raw material cotton.

In the United States, a federation of States where there is free trade among members, where the same tariff protects all, where cotton is uniformly priced, where the same language is spoken, and where the same customs prevail, the center of gravity of the cotton textile industry has gradually shifted from New England to the Southeastern States in a period of 30 years because restrictions as to operation were fewer and at the outset wage rates were about 20 percent lower. There are cities in New England that have never fully recovered from the loss of their textile plants. Is there any wonder that the surviving cotton manufacturers in the United States see ruin ahead in governmental policies which tend to reduce their tariff protection when, even in the most advanced nation of the European Common Market, mills can buy American cotton 25 percent cheaper and process this cotton with workers whose wage rates and fringe benefits are 60 percent lower than those here?

Before becoming aware that an overcapacity to produce was their stumbling block, the manufacturers clamored for a higher tariff and the Smoot-Hawley Act resulted. In retrospect it can be seen that the increased rates did not aid the cotton processors and that a reduction in rates at that time would have caused greater unemployment during the depression. In the early 1930's the National Recovery Act aimed to spread the work and increase the purchasing power of labor, limit the hours of labor, determine minimum wage rates, restrict the hours of machine operation, etc. From the date the NRA was declared unconstitutional in 1935, the main assistance that the cotton textile industry has received from the Government has been tariff protection, although the Federal budgets of 1961 and 1962 show that the Commodity Credit Corporation has made miniscule payments "designed to protect the competitive position of the domestic cotton industry in relation to sales of cotton products manufactured abroad from American cotton purchased at export prices."

In order to survive, manufacturers have been required to strengthen management, to reduce costs, to improve old products, and to find new products. Costs were reduced through the direct purchase of cotton at gins, better methods of selling, the purchase of new machines or of modifications to improve old machines, and the scientific utilization of labor by means of job classification and job assignments. Severe competition has forced manufacturers to pass most of their savings in costs to the consumers in lowered prices or to labor in higher wages. The percentage increase in price of some common cotton fabrics has been less than that of the average hourly earnings of textile workers or of the cost of living.

NATIONAL PROBLEMS

While the cotton manufacturers face extinction through a governmental policy to reduce tariffs, the cotton-growing industry faces extinction because of the failure of the numerous governmental policies directed toward its aid. Cotton has become so high priced that the export market has been adversely affected and synthetic fibers are replacing cotton in the home markets in snowballing amounts. For decades two related industries, cotton manufacturing which consumes over 50 percent of the annual 14 million-bale American crop, and cotton growing which now produces about 30 percent of the world's supply, have been plagued with the problem of overproductive capacity. Mechanization has continuously freed more land for raising cash crops on existing farms as the need to produce food for work animals has diminished. An estimate made in the 1930's indicated that the substitution of tractors for horses and mules in the Cotton Belt in 1929 had released from the production of fodder, farmland equal in area to 5.9 percent of the cotton acreage harvested that year. Federal irrigation projects have also made large tracts of fertile new farmland available for cotton production.

The manufacturers have attempted to solve their problem by means of economic attrition behind a tariff barrier but the growers still face the problem which has been worstened by well-intentioned agricultural economists who have instigated a hodgepodge of conflicting laws presumably to aid farmers—laws which will be difficult to untangle or repeal. Today in comparison with 1929, there are one-third as many cotton farmers, the acreage harvested is one-third as great, the average yield per acre has more than doubled, the average man-hours to produce a bale has been halved, but the price of cotton is maintained through legislation which involves parity of income based upon the purchasing power of commodities between 1909 and 1914, price supports, acreage allotments, soil conservation payments, export subsidies, and even a tariff on cotton which has a staple length of 1⅛ inches or more.

The overall effects of existing agricultural legislation should be examined before too great an effort is made to increase the export of American cotton in a world where the annual per capita consumption is decreasing and greater quantities of the staple are being grown abroad. Although American mills are the chief consumers of this country's cotton little thought has been given to what must be done with more than half of the crop if these manufacturers pass from the picture.

The following changes are occurring across the Nation. Farmworkers in the Southeast are being displaced as more and more cotton is produced on the huge mechanized farms in the West; the numbers of unemployed in cities are being augmented by the influx of displaced farmworkers; factories in the North are moving to the Southeast because of the abundance of labor and lower operating costs, and workers in the North are thus made jobless. Should not facts such as these receive consideration when negotiations are conducted to extend trade with nations whose traditions, customs, methods of business, and wage scales differ widely among themselves and more widely from those of the United States? Should not defects in existing legislation be remedied before greater complications are added to the economy of the Nation by trying to increase foreign trade in agricultural commodities through promiscuous reductions in tariffs and subsequently by providing subsidies to the industries adversely affected?

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] has discussed the fact that we were offered a 5-cent subsidy. I might say I agree with him that the subsidy ought to be 8.5 cents, but I also must say that we are looking for any kind of relief we can get. While it is not my political philosophy to have just half a loaf, still half a loaf is better than none. We need so much relief. Maybe it would give us a little confidence in the future, because we need that confidence if we are going to expand and continue, and if the people who have the capital investments are to continue to operate.

Let me talk about the Springs Mills in my area. I was in New York the other day when they dedicated a 21-story building. I put an article about that in the RECORD. This great company went down into the garment district of New York City and built there a beautiful building. There they exhibited the fabrics created by the workers in my district. Every one of their mills is in my district, and I am proud of it.

They have the finest profit-sharing system I have ever heard of. It so happens that every man who is working there, weaving, grinding, carding, or whatever he is doing, has an investment because he is a profit sharer. What he has made of his life and his work because of his savings in the profit sharing is there invested and it involves his family's future. The decisions which the management must make must be based on what the future will bring to the textile industry, what the Congress will do with the two-price cotton system, what the Congress will do with the import system. So we have a responsibility right here. It is just as American as any question ever could be.

When the president of that great organization made the statement at that dedication—and I have here an article about it—that the Springs Mills had a plan for synthetic operation, I knew that they were forced into it. I knew they did it with the great courage they have always exhibited. They are building a new plant. When I think of the thousands of people employed and the thousands of people whose future depends on what happens with this transition and what happens with the two-price system, it means we are dealing with human lives and human fortunes as well as the economy of our Nation.

Mr. FINDLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I should like to inquire of the gentleman if another possible way to approach this problem and to help

relieve the serious problem that faces the textile firms would be to move toward a lower level of price support on domestic cotton. Would that not have the same, equivalent effect in aiding the textile mills? I realize it would present problems to the cotton farmers, but insofar as the textile mills are concerned would this not be a helpful step for the textile firms?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I think any reduction at this time would work such havoc on those people who have the small acreage allotments and it would create a great inequity. I do say to the gentleman that I do think it is proper that his great Committee on Agriculture look into that with a great deal of care.

Certainly, there may be room there for elasticity or some change.

I just had not intended to discuss that today. I wish I had the answer. As a matter of fact, I wish I did not have to get up here in the well of the House and present to the Nation time after time our problem. But someone's voice has got to be heard about this thing, and we are getting more and more of a hearing. I want to commend the gentleman for the bipartisan support we have received from his side of the aisle and from him personally.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a letter from a textile manufacturer in my area. He is not the largest textile manufacturer. It is a very moderate sized operation. But you know to the fellow who is working in that mill or to the fellow who is selling his cotton to the mill or to the merchant uptown who is dependent upon the income that the people get to buy his products and, yes, let us say to the preacher and to the church—that mill is important. Its continuation is a necessity in the local community. If you throw 200 people out of work in a community and recognize the impact it has on the lives of the people involved—let us say there are 5 people to a family—that would be 5,000 people in distress overnight plus the merchant and everybody else and then you will know how everybody suffers.

I put in the RECORD at this point the wonderful letter that he wrote to Secretary Freeman about this problem.

The letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1963.

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FREEMAN: The cotton textile industry appreciates the efforts of your Department in pursuing the recent section 22 case before the Tariff Commission, and also your efforts in following the President's directive regarding the elimination of the two-price cotton system.

The matter has not been resolved, however, and we have experienced some disruption in our markets because of uncertainty regarding the future price of cotton. This future is dependent upon the action of your Department and the Congress. We were hopeful that the President's speech on agriculture indicated that a start would be made in lowering the price supports of cotton, and that purely as an emergency measure, equalization payments would be used to make American cotton fully competitive with foreign cotton and with rayon in the domestic market.

Instead, we have seen action taken which maintains price supports at the present level and the Department now is unwilling to go along with the idea of making cotton fully competitive. We have borne and are bearing the burden of $42.50 per bale cost disadvantage over foreign spinners. A reduction to $20 per bale cost disadvantage will cost the taxpayers money over the present situation and still not get the job done.

Cotton is in trouble—consumption is down, and the customers are confused because of the uncertainties, complexities and unreality of the program. Mills which formerly were completely loyal to cotton are now using rayon and will continue to do so unless cotton is fully competitive in price. Rayon sells for 26 cents per pound, contains no foreign matter, is sold on net weight, 30-day terms and is uniform running. In blends with cotton, the product gives a good appearance and is serviceable. The real people who will suffer from an unrealistic pricing and marketing policy are the farmers.

A crash program of research to perfect techniques for complete elimination of the boll weevil and control of grasses will enable the farmer to compete with rayon and foreign growths of cotton. They will then be in a position to compete because their costs will be materially reduced. Any action which does not get to the root of the problem—lower prices through reduced costs—will only result in increased surpluses and higher costs for the taxpayer.

We do not feel that continued high supports is the answer. Cost reduction and quality improvements will increase consumption and keep the cotton farmer in business—anything less than this will mean his gradual demise. We in the textile industry have followed the policy of quality improvement and cost reduction. We have had to in order to survive, and we know it will work.

All that we ask now is that a way be devised temporarily to make cotton available to the U.S. spinners at world prices while a crash program of cost reduction and quality improvement enable the cotton farmer to effectively compete with other fibers and foreign growths without subsidies and equalization payments.

Finally, the employees of our mill have been receiving reduced paychecks because our operations have been curtailed. We feel this is directly because the uncertainties regarding cotton's future have disrupted normal planning and marketing. We feel textile employees interests, as well as the interests of the cotton farmer should be considered by the administration seeking solutions to these problems.

Yours sincerely,
CHERAW COTTON MILLS, INC.,
WM. MANNING MALLOY,
Vice President and Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I recently received a thing called Cotton Comments and I just want to read from it. It says:

DEMAND FOR ONE-PRICE COTTON INCREASES

There is good reason for the cotton trade to be in a depressed mood. The whole industry backs a one-price system, and the administration counters with a 32.47 percent loan and states they want an 8½-cent subsidy for export, with a lesser subsidy to the domestic mills, all of which adds up to a three-price system for cotton. Unless the subsidy is paid to the producers—where it rightfully belongs—or to the first buyer, for camouflage reasons, a three-price system will result and will destroy the merchant trade and cotton futures market. It will continue to force mills to use synthetics and reduce the potential market for U.S. cotton and hence involve U.S. taxpayers in making a further unknown and unwanted speculation in cotton. At present the taxpayers have a financial speculative investment in about 10.5 million bales, or upward of $1.7 billion, and the prospects are for a reduced market for the 1963 crop unless cotton is priced competitively. So, the outlook for the cotton industry and the taxpayers is bleak. Who is responsible for this situation?

I subscribe to that and I commend them for saying it. I certainly hope it continues. There is good reason for the cotton trade to be in a depressed mood. The whole industry backs a one-price system and the administration can with a 32.47-percent loan.

Let me say to my wonderful friend from Illinois, if this trend continues and if the mills go to manmade fibers, I do not think we are going to have the question any more of price supports for cotton so far as our agricultural commodities are concerned because if this can ever be done, if we ever reach the situation where manmade fibers can duplicate all the advantages and qualities of cotton, and surely research is on the way to doing that, then it would be my prediction that it would be so much easier and cheaper and quicker and cleaner to use synthetics and that cotton will go out of the picture. Cotton has gone out of the picture in so many areas of the country.

Let me read to you just a few remarks from people who have written to me and with whom I have corresponded.

Here is the president of the National Cotton Council who happens to live right outside of my district, but whom the people of my district love and admire. He says:

> I agree with you we have failed to convince the cotton producing areas of the South that textile mills can substitute synthetic fiber for cotton and will do so if the price differential favors it.

Think of that.

Think of that. He recognized that and he is president of the National Cotton Council of a great country.

Then I find here a letter from a fine friend who was such a wonderful host when we went down to North Carolina, Mr. Charles A. Cannon, the head of the Cannon Mills Co., when the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] made available transportation to us as members of the subcommittee. This is the letter he wrote to the Under Secretary of Agriculture but I think it is sound and I include it at this point in my remarks.

The letter referred to follows:

FEBRUARY 12, 1963.

Re my letter to you of January 22; Mr. Joseph C. Moss' reply of February 8.

Hon. CHARLES S. MURPHY,
Under Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MURPHY: I realize that action was so fast in Washington on February 6 and 7 that Mr. Moss' letter of the 8th did not take into consideration the condition of cotton on February 8, which is the date of his letter.

It seems to me we are simply shadowboxing and are not getting down to the facts of one of the most critical situations we have ever faced.

In the President's farm message of January 31, 1963, under the heading of "Cotton," he mentioned a healthy growing cotton industry is vital to the strength and prosperity of our Nation. He further stated that "over a million persons are engaged in producing cotton, another million and a half are employed in converting raw cotton into consumer items," and "additional millions supply goods and services to this industry," and that "cotton exports contribute significantly to our balance-of-payment position."

These statements certainly show the President's complete understanding of the importance of the cotton economy from the grower to the retail counter, to this country, and to our employment problems, as well as the importance of the export of cotton to our balance of trade.

The increased imports of cotton textiles, largely manufactured from foreign-grown cotton, help create an unfavorable balance of trade and a drain on our gold reserve.

Further, in the President's message he states, and I quote, "I urge that Congress give early consideration to cotton legislation that will make this important fiber more competitive and help recapture its market. I feel it should be signed into law before the end of February and made applicable to the planting of the 1963 crop."

The delay which is now being caused, apparently, by the dissension as to allowing the American mills a price equal to the price paid by foreign mills for cotton and the dissension between some of the growers as to how the increased acreage and support price should be handled, is doing irreparable damage every day to the distribution of this year's cotton crop.

This delay is depriving the workers in the textile industry of full-time employment through reduced hours or, in some cases, through loss of jobs. All of this is bound to reflect back on the industries that supply the textile industry and create a drag on the economy, which the President's statement of September 1962 and his farm message of January are both intended to avoid.

If the one-price system for cotton could be established immediately, we would, at once, increase the daily consumption of American cotton, and, on this point, we have unanimous approval of our entire industry, backed by the President's statement. It seems to me the importance of this is being reflected by the fact that for the first 5 months of the cotton year ended December 1962, the American consumption of cotton, as compared with the year before, had decreased by 359,417 bales. The alarming part of this decrease is the fact that for the month of November the daily consumption was off 3,866 bales; and for the month of December, 3,711 bales. Considering the state of the market, I see no reason to think that January will show any improvement.

The red herring that has been drawn across the path with reference to freight should not be allowed to disrupt immediate action to put the American mills back on a competitive basis with the foreign mills.

When the export subsidy on cotton was established, there was no consideration of any freight rate differential. When the loan value for cotton was established, the price differentials were put into effect, based on the delivery charges to the American mill points from the ginning or shipping areas. The sad part of this situation is that the California cotton, which has become some of the most desirable cotton from a spinning standpoint, is best located for Oriental shipment; therefore, they not only get the benefit from the 8½ cents, but they start out against a support price, which is lower because of the distance of California from American mill consuming points.

This statement as to the freight differential's being a red herring is backed by the fact that for many years every bale of foreign cotton that the American mills have purchased has been delivered to the American mill at a lower price than the same quality of cotton could be bought in the American market. Please understand that this fact is true, in spite of the fact that the loading charges, water freight, import charges at the ports in America, tariff, insurance, as well as the transportation charges from the ports to the American mills, are all taken into consideration. As further evidence that this freight problem is a red herring, when we esablished an export payment on cotton textiles shipped out of this country to equalize the export fee on cotton, no consideration was given to freight rate differentials. If, in fact, the American mills were able to secure their American cotton at a more favorable freight rate than the foreigners, it seems to me only logical to conclude that our exports of cotton textiles would have been more attractive to our foreign customers, and our exports would have increased. The reverse has been true. With a full equalization fee of 8½ cents, plus waste differentials being allowed on goods being shipped out of this country, we have declined steadily in the volume of our export business.

We should never overlook the fact that the American mills' consumption far exceeds our export market for raw cotton. While we recognize we must export cotton and we are willing to pay a subsidy of 8½ cents a pound, according to my information, we did not export for dollars but about one third of the number of bales of cotton consumed in the United States. The figures I have indicate exports for dollars of about 3.2 million bales, and American mills' consumption of 9 million bales. The balance between the 3.2 million bales exported for dollars and the total exported was made up by exports under Public Law 480 and longtime barter or credit. If this information is correct, then our export business is not costing us 8½ cents a pound, but nearer 17.14 cents a pound, less whatever value we may ultimately get out of Public Law 480 or the barter and long-term-agreement money.

Mr. Moss, in his last paragraph, indicates that the carryover, from your viewpoint, may be smaller than indicated in my letter to you of January 22. At that time, January 11, 1963, statistical figures show you had 9,757,000 bales of cotton on loan or owned by the Government in CCC. On February 1, this Government-held cotton had increased to 10,338,000 bales.

Between February 2, 1962, and July 27, 1962, the CCC's stock of cotton decreased by 768,325 bales. If the same amount should be repossessed between now and July 27, 1963, the Government's stock would be 9,569,000 bales; however, I see no reason to expect the American mills to be in the market for anything like the normal requirements for cotton during this period unless we do get relief from the two-price system at once.

Your export figures for this year show that the exports are running at less than 50 percent of the export figures for last year. In my judgment, the combination—decreased American consumption and the present fact that the exports are way below expected figures—indicates that the Government-held stock on August 1 will be exceedingly high.

I should like very much to see some overall cotton program adopted that would contribute to an expanding production, expanding consumption, and, certainly, at a much lower cost to the Government.

I do not see how this can be accomplished by choking American mill consumption while debate goes on as to whether or not the cotton farmer is going to be given some relief from the present 16 million base acreage. Every day that the mills fail to consume cotton makes the farmers' position more critical, and, certainly, the one-price system for cotton for the American mills now would do him no harm.

If the present condition is allowed to continue and if Congress has not enacted one-price legislation within the next few months, the question will be whether or not the cotton farmer will have more acreage than he needs at 16 million rather than an increased acreage for the following year.

I hope that everyone realizes that every bale of cotton that goes into the Government's hands as of August 1, 1963, will never come out above the world price unless we have a war or some other emergency. This certainly cannot be an economical or a sensible way to handle the present emergency.

Sincerely yours,

C. A. CANNON.

Now I might just call again upon the magazine I mentioned before for some information I got out of it, because I do not want to plagiarize and say these are my statements. They come from this magazine, the Textile Reporter:

> U.S. cotton fabric imports in the first 3 months of the long-term international cotton textile agreement rose 47 percent over the same period of the 1-year pact. Census Bureau figures indicate 117.3 million yards were shipped in between October 1 and January 1 compared with 79.7 million a year earlier. Imports during October, first month of the long-term agreement, amounted to 53.5 million yards, which prompted U.S. Government restraints on further shipments from Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Portugal. Result: General fabric imports dropped to 28.4 million yards in November. But there was an increase to 35.5 million in December.

I do not know how much of that was cotton purchased in this country at 8½ cents below what our local industry could purchase it for, but the remarkable thing is that that cheap cotton accounts for 75 percent of the cotton imports.

Of course we cannot export and pay higher wages with an 8½-cent differential against us.

Here is another quotation from the Textile Reporter:

> Failures among textile mill products manufacturers rose to 11 in January with $8,685,000 in liabilities from 7, with $339,000 in liabilities, a year earlier. Although failures among producers of apparel and other finished products rose to 32 in January from 31 a year earlier, liabilities soared from $1,803,000 to $2,524,000 Dun & Bradstreet reports. The number of failures in textile and apparel retailing dropped to 115 from 147 but liabilities rose to $8,806,000 from $6,553,000.

So there are many failures. I think this system is conducive to failure. When we first started the two-price cotton system it worked for a time. I do not criticize those who were the originators and initiators of this policy but I say we have outgrown it and the Nation is past that stage.

At the same time I find this:

> Japan complains that U.S. restraints on 39 categories of cotton textile imports are unreasonable. So-called voluntary controls are sufficient, Japanese representatives told the GATT Council meeting in Geneva last week. Textile interests say th[illegible] proposal to limit 1963 imports is unfriendly and ignores Japan's sacrifices through 7 years of self-restriction. They threaten to cut back use of American raw cotton if import ceilings are lowered.

I think it is unreasonable for them to complain. They take our cotton at 8½ cents a pound below what our producers have to pay for it, then come back in here and sell the finished product to us.

When we went up to the Tariff Commission hearing under section 22 there sitting in the room were the Japanese. It was a terrible thing to me, because I was thinking about the people back home who have confidence in their Government and this great system of freedom. I saw foreign competitors being given a preference—were given a preference. It was one of the black days of decision for the textile industry the day the Tariff Commission brought out their 3-to-1 decision; it was a terrible thing for the industry.

Here are two other quotations of interest in this connection:

> Increase in the use of manmade fibers appears to be worldwide. World production of man-mades in 1962 reached 3,940,000 metric tons against 3,525,000 in 1961, an increase of 12 percent. U.S. output was up 22 percent. Other countries showed the following increases: Spain, 21 percent; Italy, 17 percent; Germany, 14 percent; United Kingdom and Nordic countries, 10 percent; France, 9 percent; Benelux and Austria, 8 percent; and Japan, 2 percent.
>
> Manmade fiber fabric imports soared by 57 percent to 63.4 million yards last year from 40.5 million in 1961. The Census Bureau reports value of these goods rose 52 percent to $20.2 million from $13.3 million. Japanese shipments accounted for most of the increase, rising from 30 million yards in 1961 to 56 million in 1962.

Finally, I would like to conclude with a word about wool, although I do not have any woolen manufacturers in my district. I do, however, have them in my State, and we are glad to have them. They are doing a great job. They give a lot of employment and their payrolls are very important to certain sections. They sent me an article entitled "We Have Been Flooded With Imports," and on the second page of this release is the statement, "Town Loses 300-Job Payroll as Main Industry Closes." Then they give some statistics.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this article and the accompanying table in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

YALE WOOLEN MILLS CLOSED, 1963—FOUNDED 1881

("We have been flooded with imports."—Robert E. Andreae, secretary-treasurer, Yale Woolen Mills.)

("The mill has been the lifeblood of Yale and the surrounding territory."—Hoard A. Pelton, mayor, Yale, Mich.)

("There are a lot of heartsick people here. Everyone has been hit. You can't escape it."—Mrs. Pearl Knapp, city clerk, Yale, Mich.)

Packed into this press story of a mill closing are the stark, cruel consequences to management, the workers, and the townspeople. It is all the more grievous because it was needless, and because others will follow unless Government acts promptly with respect to unbridled, unfair import competition.

TOWN LOSES 300-JOB PAYROLL AS MAIN INDUSTRY CLOSES

YALE, MICH., January 24.—Subzero thermometer readings were minor irritations compared to the cold fear gripping this St. Clair County town of 1,600 today.

Yale Woolen Mills, the main industry for miles around, has gone out of business. With it went 300 jobs, an annual payroll of about $1 million, and a quarter of the local tax base.

If this weren't bad enough, Yale citizens—many of them now without jobs or prospects—will be forced to pay for a new sewage plant ordered by the State health department. Its cost has been estimated at more than $400,000.

Then, there's the $1 million issue for a new school. It's slated for the April election. Turned down by the voters once before, it has little, if any, chance of going through this time.

The nub of the problem revolves around the woolen mill. Founded here in 1881, it halted operations Tuesday.

"Believe me," Robert E. Andreae, secretary-treasurer and descendant of the founders, said, "we in management did a lot of soul searching before deciding we simply had to close down.

"The bottom's been dropping out of the wool and textile industry for years.

"We kept in business against increasing odds merely to provide employment. So many depended on us we felt we couldn't stop as long as there was any hope."

The decision to close was based on changing patterns of world commerce, the trend of laws governing imports and inroads made in the wool business by synthetic fibers.

"Understand this," Andreae said. "We're not blaming labor, industry, or the law as such. We simply can't meet the competition in wools from countries where costs are cheaper. We have been flooded with imports.

SELL EQUIPMENT

He said the company, founded by Charles Andreae and still controlled by the family, would sell its equipment.

"We will hold the buildings, however," he said.

He said management was anxious to rent or lease them to a new industry if one can be found to move into the community. Yale is in the northern part of St. Clair County, which adjoins Macomb County.

"We want to help the community recover from this blow," he said. "We'd sell the property if it would be advantageous to Yale but, as long as we retain title, we can protect the people."

HUNT FOR INDUSTRY

He said the company had refused to sell everything outright "because there are a lot of professional manipulators who would buy it all and then dump everything.

"Nobody would win that way," he said.

The mill has been working with the Port Huron Industrial Development Corp. and the Michigan Economic Development Committee in efforts to find a new industry to take over the buildings.

Working with them is Mayor Hoard A. Pelton, local hardware merchant.

"The mill has been the lifeblood of Yale and the surrounding territory," Pelton said. "We're trying to see what we can do to get the property into the hands of someone who can use it for industrial work."

The millhands come from several nearby small communities, such as Valley Center, Melvin, Brockway, Avoca, Fargo, Roseburg, and Brown City.

Yale's business district, 2 blocks long, has 5 empty stores among about 30 commercial firms and professional offices.

"Unless something turns up pretty soon," a local resident said, "we may wind up with only five places going, including gas stations."

"This is going to be mighty tough to get over," Louis J. Joyce, a city council member and mill supervisor said.

A veteran of 24 years with the mill, he is one of the few supervisory employees still working. Their employment will terminate by April.

"It's going to mean increased taxes, for one thing," Joyce said.

"Someone's got to take up the slack now that the mill has gone, and that can only mean the rest of the taxpayers. The retired folks and those on fixed incomes are going to be hit hard, I'm afraid."

He said the company officials had kept supervisory employees informed of the situation for months.

"We've been going kind of thin for the last 5 years, as far as work is concerned," he said.

LINGERING DEATH

The mill's peak payroll of more than 550 persons was reached in about 1940. Since then, things have been declining as the competition, at first a pinch and then a vise which squeezed the mill dry, became overpowering.

It was somewhat akin to having a relative die of a lingering illness. It was expected. But, when the end came, it was still a shock.

William Salerno, shoe merchant and former councilman, noted that Yale has only two other industries, both small.

"We had a community improvement association organized awhile back to bring new business here," he said. "They got a machine shop out of New Haven but that only has jobs for seven or eight men.

"Another small factory moved in from Imlay City and hired six or seven. We'll really have to get busy again—and on a much bigger scale."

Of the 300 workers on the last payroll, about 100 were women.

"I don't know what these people are going to do now," Mrs. Pearl Knapp, city clerk, said, "but the mill's down for good. Committees are looking around for a new buyer but that's just a dream, I'm afraid.

"There are a lot of heartsick people here. Everyone has been hit. You can't escape it. You just tighten up the belt and work harder to find work."

Older employees are doubtful that they would be hired by a new industry.

Howard Barr, 57, had worked 41 years in the mill. His wife, Verna, 58, worked there 40 years.

Barr pointed out that neither are old enough for social security benefits but too old to go out and get other jobs easily.

Mr. and Mrs. Lavern Carl worked 35 years at the mill. Carl is 62, Mrs. Carl, 59.

"At our age, there isn't much you can do," Mrs. Carl said.

Donald Winkler, 43, secretary-treasurer of local 980, Textile Workers of America, the union at the mill, finds himself unemployed with eight children to support.

Winkler said wages averaged $1.70 an hour, with an average weekly check of $67.

Imports into United States for consumption of selected semimanufactures and manufactures wholly or in chief value of wool and similar hair

[All figures in thousands]

Period	Total (pounds)	Tops (pounds)	Yarns (pounds)	Woven cloths				Knit cloths (pounds)	Blankets and robes (pounds)	Wearing apparel	
				Pile (pounds)	Tapestry and upholstery (pounds)	Other				Knit (pounds)	Not knit or crocheted (pounds)
						Pounds	Square yards				
1951	24,490	10,399	1,605	12	19	8,983	18,697	12	239	2,557	674
1952	41,967	23,122	2,385	8	14	12,491	24,031	23	447	2,675	802
1953	24,067	5,638	2,113	9	19	12,053	24,276	73	420	2,988	759
1954	14,861	448	1,642	19	18	9,288	19,528	60	195	2,555	636
1955	21,017	365	2,032	31	26	14,318	29,221	70	151	3,190	834
1956	27,795	1,173	2,401	46	50	17,295	34,852	70	119	5,078	1,563
1957	26,072	926	2,308	49	59	15,897	32,235	110	159	4,820	1,744
1958	27,032	1,222	2,420	40	64	16,391	34,331	125	191	4,693	1,886
1959	44,310	4,145	5,230	50	132	22,488	46,431	118	291	6,394	5,462
1960	54,039	4,592	5,250	26	240	29,332	62,019	646	233	8,065	5,655
1961	43,822	3,396	5,496	126	298	[1] 18,910	[1] 42,921	1,594	296	8,661	5,045
1962 [2]	68,200	5,700	9,200	100	300	[1] 27,600	[1] 64,200	2,300	300	12,700	10,000

[1] Includes imports of woven cloths in part of braid or through the Virgin Islands in 1962 of 6,000,000 pounds or 14,000,000 square yards and in 1961 of 120,000 pounds or 260,000 square yards.

[2] Preliminary.

Source: U.S. Bureau of Census FT 110, U.S. Imports of Merchandise for Consumption.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I do not claim that either of the bills I have introduced offers a final solution. I do say that they are here for your consideration. For my part, I subscribe openly to the abolition entirely of the two-price cotton system.

Any other solution is a temporary proposition, and no other solution will adjust the inequities that the President described and to which our distinguished Speaker gave voice today.

COTTON UNDER BENSON AND FREEMAN

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I did not ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] to yield to me during his special order for the purpose of my remarks at this time for reasons I wish to explain. I wish to speak in respect to the program for cotton which was inaugurated under Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

Mr. Benson's name was brought into the discussion, not by the gentleman from South Carolina, but by a Member of this body to whom the gentleman from South Carolina had yielded. I, therefore, did not think it fair to impose upon the time of the gentleman from South Carolina for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the suggestion was made that cotton today is in trouble because of alleged mismanagement under the Benson administration. I would like the RECORD to show that cotton indeed was headed down the right road toward a sound and profitable basis under Secretary Benson.

When Secretary Freeman took office as Secretary of Agriculture, he raised the level of price supports for cotton. Under the program inaugurated by Secretary Benson the support levels were moving down toward the market levels, where they should be. This trend was reversed under Secretary Freeman. He saw fit to increase the level of price supports for cotton to 32½ cents a pound. He did this in his first year in office, and he announced just a few weeks ago that he was keeping the level at the same high, unrealistic rate. As a result, today we have more Government cotton in warehouses than we did when Secretary Freeman took office, and by August of this year, it is estimated that warehouses holding Government cotton will have about 10 million bales either owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, or under loan by the Commodity Credit Corporation. In either event, the responsibility and probably the ultimate property of the American taxpayer.

So one could not honestly and properly conclude that the American cotton farmer is in a better situation today than he was under Secretary Benson. He is indeed in a worse fix, and moving in the wrong direction.

The gentleman from South Carolina spoke of the desirability of eliminating the two-price system for cotton. That, indeed, was the objective and the final goal of the Benson program for cotton. Cotton was proceeding in that direction in an orderly manner until the advent of Secretary Freeman.

Since the 1930's, U.S. taxpayers have tried manfully to help the cotton farmer by: first, paying heavy export subsidies to keep U.S. cotton moving in world markets; second, buying, handling, and storing mountains of cotton through Commodity Credit Corporation; and, third, paying premium prices for cotton products.

Despite all this the cotton farmer has severe income problems, textile firms are at a disadvantage, and so are consumers and taxpayers.

Because taxpayers subsidize export prices, U.S. cotton sells much lower abroad than at home. This raw material differential causes U.S. textile firms to lose out to foreign competitors. Meanwhile the cotton farmer has restricted plantings and loses markets at home and abroad to synthetic fibers.

This Committee on Agriculture has considered a proposal which ostensibly would get cotton product prices back where they belong and at the same time help textile firms meet foreign competition.

Known as the Gathings bill, it would set in motion a new round of subsidies. It would let the Secretary of Agriculture pay a subsidy to mills, handlers, or retailers in order to make possible a cut in cotton product prices.

Under this proposal the taxpayer would continue to pay out money to keep raw cotton prices high, but would also start forking over—from the same hard-pressed pocketbook—other dollars to bring these prices back down, once the cotton leaves the farm.

Why does the bill specify that the new subsidy must go to somebody other than the cotton farmer?

Certainly, it would be a lot simpler, less costly, and more straightforward to send each farmer a Treasury check for 8½ cents for each pound of allotment cotton he raises. At least Congressmen and other taxpayers would then have a clearer notion of what is going on, and what it costs.

However, if other Congressmen find out this bill actually proposes to use tax dollars to force down prices that other tax dollars are forcing up, I doubt that it will pass. If made to mills, this subsidy would mean huge checks to big nonfarm enterprises. Wherever spent, the subsidy would increase Government costs at a time when we are confronted with a budget $11 billion in the red.

It would leave the small cotton farmer about where he is now.

The bill would permit above-allotment planting only if this does not increase stocks. Consensus seems to be this would rule out increased planting.

In my judgment the proposal is inadequate and ill-advised whether it passes or not. At best, it would leave both the textile mill and the farmer on an artificial base, subject to the changing whims of Government and unable to build a sound future in a realistic marketplace.

It would call for a new army of Federal inspectors, and make the land of cotton's legislative briarpatch even thicker.

HOW TO END THE COTTON HEADACHE

What is needed is legislation which will ultimately:

First. Enlarge income opportunities for the cotton farmer.

Second. Reestablish a one-price cotton market.

Third. Permit the cotton farmer to compete fairly with foreign competitors and synthetics.

Fourth. Get Government out of the cotton business.

To achieve these goals, I propose a 3-year program during which Uncle Sam would, first, sell the cotton surplus back to the cotton farmer at an attractive price in exchange for 1-year land-conserving agreements; second, step down the level of price supports to world price; and, third, increase plantings, with unrestricted planting after 3 years, at which time crop loans would be authorized at 90 percent of U.S. market price.

HOW IT WOULD WORK

Before planting time each year, the Secretary of Agriculture would make contracts with farmers owning allotment land. This would be on a voluntary basis—first come, first served.

The contract would entitle the farmer to buy at harvest time a quantity of Government cotton equal to his own annual production of allotment cotton. The price—just low enough to get the desired participation—would be specified in the contract, with allowance for grade, condition, and location.

At harvest time the farmer would receive a cotton certificate. He would either sell it, or use it to claim the cotton at the designated place of storage.

In return for the attractive price, the farmer would agree not to raise any cotton that year, and to put to soil-conserving uses an acreage sufficient to produce a like amount of cotton. This acreage would be in addition to land he would normally leave idle or fallow.

The Secretary could not sell in any one year a quantity of cotton greater than 30 percent of the U.S. annual production would minimize hardship on industries and services dependent upon the cotton farmer.

Present estimates indicate the August 1 Government carryover of cotton will be over 9 million bales. Total Government commitment today is 8.2 million bales—4.7 owned, 3.5 under loan. Present production of cotton is about 14 million bales.

I propose that the surplus cotton be sold back to farmers at the rate of about 3 million bales a year.

In order to ease the transition from the present artificial pricing to competitive levels, I suggest these changes in price supports and acreage limits:

Crop year	Price support	Acreage limit
1963	30 cents	16 million.
1964	28 cents	17 million.
1965	26 cents	18 million.
1966 and after	90 percent of market price.[1]	No limit.

[1] Ultimately a 3-year U.S. market average.

ADVANTAGES

Farmer income would be protected during the transition period, and after 3 years he would have the opportunity to compete fairly for expanding markets. He would no longer be hobbled with acre limits and artificial pricing.

The cotton farmer would, for the first time, be able to compete efficiently and effectively with synthetics.

Cotton mills would no longer be placed at a disadvantage by an export subsidy.

Today's surplus cotton would be converted to cash.

Government would be out of the cotton business in 3 years.

The heavy tax cost of buying, handling, and storing cotton would end.

Cotton supplies would not be disturbed during the sell-back period. Government cotton would not enter market channels until harvest time, and each bale entering then would be matched by a bale cutback in production.

Government domination of cotton would end. This proposal would grant no authority for Government to dump cotton on the market. It would place the marketing of Government cotton where it belongs: in the hands of the cotton farmer.

Taxpayers would have more money in their pocketbooks, and consumers would find shelf prices lower.

THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN'S ACT OF 1963

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing for appropriate reference a bill to encourage the expansion and improvement of State programs of special education and related services for exceptional children through Federal financial assistance to such programs; to assist colleges and universities to provide special courses of instruction and scholarships; to establish research grants and special projects; and for other purposes. The short title of this bill is the Exceptional Children's Act of 1963.

If enacted into law, this bill would meet a long apparent and pressing need by making it possible for States and local communities to provide more adequately for the special education of their exceptional children—the physically and mentally handicapped and the gifted. In short, it would provide for a comprehensive program for the special education of physically and mentally handicapped children similar to the comprehensive program for handicapped adults already established under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act for many years.

We all know the outstanding record of the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program over the years, and we are justifiably proud of the accomplishment of this partnership between the Federal Government and our respective States in restoring a steadily growing number of our handicapped citizens to the working force of the Nation as useful and productive citizens. We know that this program has paid for itself many times over in terms of tax dollars these individuals gladly pay and in terms of welfare payments they do not have to receive. In calculating the true value of this program to our Nation, we must not overlook the rapidly increasing demand for skilled manpower which the technological age is making. Now and increasingly as we progress, the need for highly skilled workers regardless of physical handicap, will be great; and the vocational rehabilitation program is doing its part to fill this need.

Yet, we seem to have overlooked a vital step in this entire process—the provision of an adequate basic education to large numbers of physically and mentally handicapped children, so that they can progress into the vocational rehabilitation program with the fundamental education and skills which can be built upon through advanced education and training programs to provide the kind of productive people who have made our country grow and prosper.

Briefly, my bill would do the following: First, establish a program of Federal grants-in-aid to the States on a matching fund basis to assist them to establish and operate programs of special education for handicapped and gifted children; second, provide for extension and improvement grants to the States for special education programs; third, provide for a program of grants to colleges and universities as well as to State educational agencies for scholarships and fellowships to train teachers and other specialized personnel needed in the education of exceptional children; and fourth, establish in the Office of Education a research and demonstration projects program in the education of exceptional children.

Most of these provisions embody the essential elements which have made the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program so successful for handicapped adults. In fact, the scholarship and fellowship provisions merely extend provisions of existing law to train teachers and leadership personnel needed in the education of mentally retarded and deaf children to cover teachers and other specialized personnel needed in the education of all types of exceptional children. I was pleased to be able to play a part in the enactment into law of these programs for mentally retarded children in 1958 and for deaf children in 1961; and I am proud to be associated with this equally meritorious effort to extend these programs to the blind, the orthopedically disabled, and other types of exceptional children.

The Council for Exceptional Children, in consultation with the major national organizations devoted to the welfare of specific disability groups played a major role in developing the provisions of this bill. Thus, the bill has extensive support from most of the national organizations concerned about the education of exceptional children—and their numerous local affiliates—interested in the special educational problems of handicapped and gifted children.

I commend this bill to all of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives as one worthy of the support of every Member in meeting a serious nationwide need.

BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Title I contains general provisions and declares that the maximum development of the potentialities of exceptional children through adequate provision of special education and related services is in the national interest. It further declares that Federal assistance in these programs is necessary and in the national interest but prohibits any Federal control over the curriculum, instruction, administration, or personnel of any education system or institution.

The term exceptional children is defined to include blind, partially sighted, deaf, hearing impaired, speech defective, crippled, cerebral palsied, mentally retarded, emotionally handicapped, and gifted children.

Special education is defined as the provision of special educational materials, facilities, testing and evaluation, and special courses of instruction conducted by personnel with special qualifications to meet the special needs of exceptional children.

A State allotment percentage and the Federal share are determined by formulas based on the State per capita income related to the national per capita income. The Federal share ranges from 50 to 70 percent of the cost.

The bill authorizes an additional Assistant Commissioner of Education and other personnel to carry out its provisions. It establishes in the Office of Education an Advisory Council on Special Education for Exceptional Children consisting of 15 to 25 members. The bill also directs the Commissioner of Education to establish technical advisory committees and authorizes appropriations to carry out the provisions of title I.

Under title II, covering financial assistance to the States for special education and related services, the bill authorizes an appropriation of $1 million for the fiscal year 1964 to develop State plans. The bill authorizes appropriations of $20 million for the fiscal year of 1964, $30 million for fiscal 1965, and such sums as the Congress may thereafter determine for payments to the States to provide special education and related services for exceptional children.

States desiring to receive Federal payments for special education and related services must submit State plans including provisions that funds will be spent solely for special education and related services by public elementary and secondary schools for exceptional children and for residential school and preschool services, whether provided directly by the public schools or through contracts with public or other nonprofit organizations. Among other provisions, State plans must provide for financial participation by the State after the close of the fiscal year 1965.

Title III of the bill authorizes appropriations of $3 million for the fiscal year 1964, $4 million for the fiscal year 1965, and such sums as the Congress thereafter determines to be necessary for extension and improvement grants to State or local school systems for extension and improvement grants to finance improvement of special education projects for a specific period of time.

Title IV of the bill authorizes appropriations of $12 million for fiscal 1964, $12 million for fiscal 1965, and such sums as the Congress may determine thereafter to be necessary for personnel training and special projects. The Commissioner of Education is authorized to make grants to public and other nonprofit colleges and universities to provide training of special education teachers and other specialized professional personnel. To receive grants, colleges and universities must be accredited for the training offered and must offer fellowships and stipends for the training.

The Commissioner is also authorized to make grants to State educational agencies to improve the qualifications of personnel engaged in, or preparing to engage in, administration or supervision of special education and related services. These grants may be used for scholarships and fellowships with appropriate stipends and for seminars and other special training programs.

The bill also authorizes the Commissioner to make grants to public and other nonprofit agencies or organizations for special short-term training projects needed in the education of exceptional children.

Title V of the bill authorizes appropriations of $5 million for fiscal 1964, $10 million for fiscal 1965, and such sums as the Congress may thereafter determine to be necessary for research and demonstration grants to State agencies, colleges and universities, or public and other nonprofit educational or research organizations for projects which hold promise of improving special education and related services to exceptional children.

PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION ACT OF 1963

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill entitled the "Presidential Transition Act of 1963." This is similar to H.R. 12479 which I introduced in the 87th Congress.

This bill was introduced by me to carry out a recommendation made to the Congress by President Kennedy on May 29, 1962, along with certain other proposals dealing with the financing of presidential election campaigns. The various proposals resulted from a study and report prepared by the President's Commission on Campaign Costs. This was a bipartisan committee made up of members with varied and extensive experience in political finance, such as Alexander Heard, Chairman; V. O. Key, Jr.; Dan Kimball; Malcolm C. Moos; Paul A. Porter; Neil O. Staebler; Walter N. Thayer; John M. Vorys; and James C. Worthy.

My bill deals with the transfer of executive power when there is to be a change of administration. It is related to the problem of campaign financing because it was estimated by the Commission that in 1952–53, the cost to a special Republican committee of the transition period between the election and the inauguration of President Eisenhower exceeded $200,000. In 1960–61 the cost to the Democratic National Committee for the transition period preceding the inauguration of President Kennedy totaled at least $360,000.

These figures cover only a proportion of the costs involved in the transition period between changes of administration. During this time the President-elect must select his Cabinet, the Ambassadors to man diplomatic posts all over the world, top echelon administrative officials, as well as key personnel to staff governmental and White House executive offices.

Some of the individuals chosen by the President-elect to fill crucial roles in the construction and maintenance of the new administration, in the past, have been able to do so only at considerable personal sacrifice. Transportation of such individuals is in itself an expensive item. Housing during the conference period is also costly. When the conferences end in an appointment, the new appointee in most cases must incur hotel expenses until permanent housing is procured. The requirement to work without pay for 2 or 3 months while incurring the increased personal expenditures is an unreasonable demand upon persons of limited means. Some of the special studies requested by President-elect Kennedy were produced through the generosity of his consultants, not only with respect to their own time but with respect to the substantial clerical and administrative costs as well. Such costs in 1960-61 totaled almost $1 million, in addition to the $360,000 payment by the Democratic National Committee.

The time is long since past when an American President may dispense with all but a few preliminaries in assuming office. The size and complexity of today's Federal Government, the pressing domestic and international problems facing the President, all combine to make it imperative that the machinery of transition be as efficient as possible and sufficient resources available for the required orientation of the new leader.

This orientation can only be provided by the outgoing administration. Therefore, it must be recognized as a legitimate function of government and a legitimate expense of government. Under present conditions, a new President, in one sense, begins working for the Government the morning after the election.

It is understood that both President-elect Eisenhower and President-elect Kennedy were given the cooperation of their predecessors and access to needed information. This is a tribute to the intelligent and friendly attitude of all these gentlemen. But at this period of our history, I believe it more fitting that we establish a formal process supported by law. Rather than leave this important matter to the discretion or whim of the individuals concerned, it would seem wisdom to guard against the dangers of noncooperation, remote as they may be. Under certain circumstances, such as a campaigning incumbent defeated by the President-elect in a hard fought campaign, such dangers could arise.

I submit that the vital transition of Executive power from the outgoing to the incoming administration is a matter of bipartisan national interest. The use of political party funds for such an activity is not desirable. Nor can we escape the fact that there is a lack of dignity in a system which requires party solicitors to seek out private funds to support the necessary activities of the President-elect of the United States.

Briefly, the bill I am bringing before you does the following:

Section 1 gives the title: "The Presidential Transition Act of 1963."

Section 2 declares its purpose to promote the orderly transfer of Executive power during the several months of transition from one administration to the other.

Section 3 authorizes certain services to be provided by the General Services Administration to President-elect and Vice-Presidents-elect, such as office space, compensation for staff personnel and experts, travel expenses, and so forth.

Section 4 authorizes necessary services, office space, and so forth to outgoing Presidents and Vice Presidents for 6 months following the expiration of their terms.

Section 5 authorizes the Congress to appropriate such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I draw your attention to the fact that this bill to provide Federal Government funds for the vital transition of Executive power from the outgoing to the incoming administration has received the endorsement of President Kennedy and former Presidents Harry S Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower, as well as former presidential candidates Thomas E. Dewey, Adlai E. Stevenson, and Richard M. Nixon.

John M. Bailey and Congressman WILLIAM E. MILLER, the chairman of the two major political parties, have also lent their full endorsement and support.

Mr. Speaker, I can see no valid reason why this body should not enact the necessary legislation to meet this kind of transition as a matter of organized procedure and as a matter of law in order to orient and in order to effect the orderly transition of power into the new Government, particularly, Mr. Speaker, at a time when it is extremely necessary for a new Government taking over this Government of ours to be able to meet almost immediately the challenges which are constantly hurled at us, the American people, every hour of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CUBAN CAVES

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, I made a statement concerning Cuban caves which appeared on page 3251 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. At the time, I stated I had written to the Legislative Reference Service asking for any available information on Cuban caves. The information I received was fragmentary and inconclusive.

At the end of my statement, I called upon the administration to release any information it possessed concerning Cuban caves. I did this because the administration had set a precedent in releasing aerial photographs of missile sites last fall. Also, the gravity of the situation led me to believe that the American people should know—one way or another—about Cuban caves.

This morning, the Chicago Tribune has a large headline, "Cuban Caves Hide Arms." The article was written by the distinguished journalist, Willard Edwards, of the Chicago Tribune press service. The Edwards article is based on testimony by Army Intelligence Chief Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch before the Senate Armed Services Committee yesterday.

Mr. Edwards says in the article:

> Aerial photography has further revealed the building of new roads to cave locations, Major General Fitch testified, and it is considered highly probable that much military equipment and supplies are being stored underground.

I wish to insert the complete Chicago Tribune story at this point in my remarks:

CUBAN CAVES HIDE ARMS—AERIAL PHOTOS BARE BUILDING OF NEW ROADS—RUSSIAN TROOPS SHOW MUCH ACTIVITY

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, March 6.—The Army's intelligence chief reported to Senate investigators today that Russian troops in Cuba are showing much activity in connection with caves throughout the island.

Aerial photography has further revealed the building of new roads to cave locations, Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch testified, and "it is considered highly probable that much military equipment and supplies are being stored underground."

MISSILE CREWS LEAVE

"To date, there are no indications that Russian ground force units have departed from Cuba other than those associated with the missile systems which were removed last fall," Fitch said.

This information was contained in a statement released as Fitch went into a closed session with the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, headed by Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, which is probing all angles of the Cuban threat.

"Cuban refugees continue to report that strategic missiles were not all actually removed from Cuba and that they have been stored in caves and underground installations," Fitch stated.

"While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis, it is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems that were in Cuba at the time of the quarantine last October 22.

"From the large volume and frequency of reports concerning the underground storage of ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft, it is certain that there is considerable activity in connection with underground installations throughout the island.

"In numerous cases, reports indicate that this activity is being carried out solely by Soviet personnel and that Cubans, including highly placed military, are not permitted access thereto."

AIR-CONDITIONED CAVES

"There are several thousand caves in Cuba and many have been used for storage over the years. With the reported addition of dehumidification and air-conditioning equipment, many would be suited to storage of both large and delicate electronic items."

Fitch said there had been "a substantial increase both in quantity and quality of heavy military equipment in Cuba in the last year.

"Modern tanks, artillery mortars, and motor transport vehicles have been noted, including the free rocket overground [Frog] missile which has a nuclear capacity," Fitch reported. "Other missiles and armored personnel carriers are similar to those in use by American forces," he said.

INCLUDES T–54 TANKS

"Other modern items in Cuba include the T–54 tank with a 100 mm. gun, similar to our M–60 main battle tank with 105 mm. gun," he told the committee. "There are also medium tanks, truck-mounted multiple rocket launchers, and amphibious personnel carriers.

"With the introduction of this equipment into Cuba, the potential firepower and mobility of ground forces has been increased considerably. We do not believe any of the sophisticated equipment—rocket launchers and tanks—have yet been turned over to the Cubans.

"Training activities have been intensified, improving the capabilities of Cuban personnel to utilize soviet equipment. No nuclear warheads are believed to be in Cuba although it is possible that they could be used by some of the weapons systems there."

Today's Washington Post & Times Herald carried an article on page 2 entitled "Army Gives Report on Cuba Caves." Staff Reporter John G. Norris quotes Major General Fitch as saying:

> Cuban refugees continue to report that strategic missiles were not all actually removed from Cuba and that they have been stored in caves.

General Fitch goes on to say:

> While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis. It is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems that were in Cuba at the time the quarantine was imposed.

Although General Fitch conceded that "ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft" might be stored in "several thousand caves," he was unable to confirm or deny that Soviet missiles had been completely removed from Cuba.

The complete Washington Post article follows:

ARMY GIVES REPORT ON CUBA CAVES

(By John G. Norris)

The Army's intelligence chief testified yesterday that thousands of caves in Cuba are being used to store Soviet weapons. But he voiced doubt that the hidden war stocks include offensive missiles or bombers.

Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch, reporting to the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee in its investigation of the Russian military buildup there, gave the most detailed official report yet on what American intelligence knows about underground weapons storage in Cuba.

A censored version of his testimony in closed session, released to the press, also declared that:

To date there are no indications that Soviet ground force units have left Cuba other than those associated with the withdrawn missile forces.

No nuclear warheads are believed to be in Cuba, although they possibly could be used by some of the Soviet weapons systems now there.

REFUGEE REPORTS

In his discussion of the underground weapons storage, Fitch said that "Cuban refugees continue to report that strategic missiles were not all actually removed from Cuba and that they have been stored in caves."

"While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis," he went on, "it is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems that were in Cuba at the time the quarantine was imposed."

But Fitch said that in light of the large volume and frequency of intelligence reports about the underground storage of ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft it is certain that there is much activity in connection with the several thousand caves in Cuba.

Reports indicate, he said, that such underground storage is handled by Russians and that Cubans—including high-ranking military men—are not allowed access to the caves.

SUITABLE FOR STORAGE

Intelligence reports tell of the use of dehumidification and air-conditioning equipment in the caves, which would make them suitable for storage of both large and delicate electronic items. Aerial photography, Fitch reported, has revealed that roads have been built to both known and suspected cave locations.

In the 6-month period before the mid-October Cuban crisis, Fitch said, military intelligence received about 3,000 reports that were evaluated and coordinated with the data obtained from aerial reconnaissance.

Fitch listed the following heavy modern army equipment introduced into Cuba: T–54 tanks mounting a 100-millimeter gun; SU-100 assault guns of similar caliber on tracks; truck-mounted multiple rocket launchers; Snapper wire-guided antitank missiles: new (1961 model) 8-wheeled armored personnel carriers; Frog missiles, similar to the U.S. Honest John rockets, with a nuclear capability; artillery motars, and amphibious personnel carriers.

This equipment, Fitch said, increases considerably the potential firepower and mobility of Communist forces in Cuba. But he added that it was doubted that any of the more sophisticated weapons had as yet been turned over to the Cubans, although training to this end has been intensified.

Major General Fitch's testimony before the Armed Services Committee yesterday gives us little to be happy about. However, I applaud the fact that this administration has seen fit to tell the American people just what it knows about Cuban caves.

I hope as time goes on that we will have more precise information concerning Soviet weapons in Cuba. The American people have a right to know the nature and extent of the Cuban threat to this hemisphere.

HOW STRONG IS THE DOLLAR?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on March 5 the Washington Post and Times Herald had an article on page 8 entitled "De Gaulle Considering Purchase of U.S. Bonds."

This story, filed in Paris, states that our Government is trying to get the French Government to buy $100 million to $150 million in short-term U.S. Treasury bonds. The reason given for this action is:

> The American Government anticipates possible difficulty in defending the dollar toward the end of 1963 or the beginning of 1964.

The complete article as follows:

DE GAULLE CONSIDERING PURCHASE OF U.S. BONDS

PARIS, March 4.—President Charles de Gaulle is considering whether to authorize the purchase of U.S. Treasury bonds to support the dollar, it is reported here tonight.

The result may be made known after Tuesday's weekly Cabinet meeting.

France's decision may depend on whether the American Government is willing or able to curb America investments in key sectors of the European economy. Officials here fear control of these sectors may be purchased by foreign capital.

America's request for financial aid from France was formally presented last Thursday to Finance Minister Valery Giscard d'Estaing by Robert Roosa, American Under Secretary of the Treasury. Roosa is understood to have asked for the purchase, in francs, of $100 million to $150 million worth of short-term (15 month) Treasury bonds. Switzerland, Italy, and Germany have all bought bonds in their own currencies under similar arrangements.

Financial circles here interpret the offering of these short-term bonds as an indication that the American Government anticipates possible difficulty in defending the dollar toward the end of 1963 or the beginning of 1964.

It is felt here that the request may give De Gaulle a good opportunity to bring pressure on the United States to restrict investment in French fields where American capital has recently become unwelcome—oil, real estate, automobiles, and the food industry.

It seems paradoxical, French experts are remarking, that the U.S. Government should be obliged to seek foreign support for its currency at the same time that private companies in America are exporting large sums, thus aggravating the balance of payments situation for the United States.

Not only are these American companies exporting funds for new investments, these observers say; they are also holding in Europe profits made on previous investments, placing them chiefly in Swiss holding companies, instead of repatriating them to the United States.

The question is raised here whether present American legislation permits the U.S. Government to curb foreign investment. Present French legislation in most cases does not enable the French Government to bar it directly.

An organization just set up may be regarded by the French as a possible channel for regulating a flow of funds that for the moment neither country seems able to control. This is Eurofinance, a group of five European banks, including the French Société Générale, and five American banks, ostensibly simply a research center to provide information to Americans or Europeans or Europeans desirous of investing in Europe.

If true, this story raises the specter of inflation—inflation spelling bad news for Americans living on fixed incomes.

It seems paradoxical to me, that our Government is proposing deficit financing at a time when we are forced to buy foreign exchange. Perhaps we should consider surplus financing or, at the very least, a solidly balanced budget.

PROBLEMS OF URBAN AREAS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the Congress of the United States is engaged in the study and consideration of a number of matters of vital importance to our fast growing metropolitan areas. Hearings are just being completed on proposals to aid mass transportation; other studies are underway on a variety of subjects including juvenile delinquency, air pollution, and crime. What has struck me about all of this activity is the lack of coordination between these areas of inquiry. Two years ago, I introduced a resolution to creat a select committee composed of 13 Members of the House of Representatives. This committee was to "conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the problems of urban areas, including housing, urban renewal, slum clearance, prevention and elimination of urban blight, air and water pollution, water supply, sewage facilities, transportation, and other problems of urban areas."

Little progress seems to have been made in coordinating these studies. Therefore I am again submitting this resolution in the hope that a study, such as the one proposed, will enable the House to act on the basis of informed, coherent judgment in dealing with these problems. The areas of concern which I have mentioned are necessarily related; they can thus be considered most profitably together. I urge my colleagues to turn their attention to this matter.

UNFAIR COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today for appropriate reference a bill to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce. This is a revised version of previous bills which I have introduced on the same subject.

The text has been rearranged so that some of the sections appear in a different order and a few additional alterations have been made in language in a continuing effort to allay the fears which have been expressed by certain persons that this proposed legislation would interfere in some way with the power of the States to continue to enforce their own laws in the field of unfair competition. This view is based on a misconception of the purpose of the bill.

It is not the intention of this proposed legislation to take away from the courts of the several States their jurisdiction over unfair competition cases between citizens of the same or different States. The purpose of the legislation is to establish a Federal cause of action for unfair competition in addition to the existing common law right of action and to grant to Federal courts exclusive jurisdiction over actions under this legislation. The States retain full jurisdiction to enforce their own standards, and this bill leaves an aggrieved party who believes he has a cause of action under State law perfectly free to proceed in a State court if that is his preference.

The bill uses the term "unfair commercial activities" instead of the more usual expression "unfair competition" in order to avoid the possible limiting effect of the latter term. The proposed legislation is designed to establish uniform Federal rules of fair practice in all forms of commercial activity. These rules will be enforcible in the Federal courts by any person who is damaged or likely to be damaged by the unfair act or practice; provided, of course, that the commerce affected is within the proper scope of congressional regulation under the Constitution.

I am pleased to announce that an identical bill has been introduced by Senator JAVITS in the other body, and I wish to commend the Committee on Trade Marks and Unfair Competition of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York for their fine assistance in the drafting of this legislation.

Finally, I enclose the text of a memorandum which explains the bill in greater detail:

MEMORANDUM TO ACCOMPANY BILL TO PROVIDE CIVIL REMEDIES TO PERSONS DAMAGED BY UNFAIR COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES IN OR AFFECTING COMMERCE

The accompanying bill essentially is the same as H.R. 7833, 86th Congress, 1st session (1959); H.R. 4590, 87th Congress, 1st session (1961); S. 1036, 87th Congress, 1st session (1961); H.R. 10038, 87th Congress, 2d session (1962); and S. 2784, 87th Congress, 2d session (1962). Although no hearings were held on any of these bills, they have been the subject of considerable study within the legal profession which has led to various modifications, culminating in the present version. The original bill was drafted by the Committee on Trade Marks and Unfair Competition of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, which also has prepared each of the successive variations in response to comment and criticism from other bar associations, trade associations and the like.

The basic purpose of the bill is to create a Federal statutory cause of action that could be invoked by an injured party as an alternative to the common-law tort of unfair competition in cases where interstate commerce is affected.

In the absence of such a statute, there can be no uniform Federal rules in the law of unfair competition. This comes about because of the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1938 in the famous case of *Erie R. Co.* v. *Tompkins* (304 U.S. 64), which held that there is no Federal common law. As a result, Federal courts that have jurisdiction of cases because of the diversity of citizenship of the parties must apply the law of the State in which they sit; and this extends to unfair competition cases.

There are many branches of law where the rule of *Erie* v. *Tompkins* has salutary effects because it prevents the accidental availability of Federal jurisdiction from affecting the law applicable to a given controversy. In the field of unfair competition, however, the effect of this decision has been to prevent the development of uniform nationwide rules of business fairplay and this situation has been widely criticized.

As communication and transportation become increasingly rapid, business activities tend more and more to be interstate in character and even local operations more often than not will have an effect on the interstate business of someone else. Accordingly, there is a clear need for uniformity in the law applicable to unfair commercial activities, and this has been recognized by many eminent authorities. However, uniformity cannot be secured under the present checkerboard system where the specific legal principles of the individual States must be applied even by the Federal courts. This bill would make unfair commercial activities an offense cognizable in the Federal courts as the violation of a right created by a Federal statute. As a result, a uniform body of law would be created. This would provide certainty for businessmen, prevent forum-shopping and tend to raise the level of commercial morality in the country as a whole.

The bill does not favor any particular class, group, or industry as against any other. It is an effort by disinterested lawyers to improve the administration of justice in the important field of unfair competition.

Section 1 states the intent of the bill, which is to protect any person engaged in interstate commerce against unfair commercial activities by making actionable in a Federal forum all unfair commercial activities set forth in the bill, whether used or committed locally or in interstate commerce. Section 1 is designed to invoke the fullest possible scope of congressional power under the commerce clause of the Constitution. This statement of intent is somewhat reminiscent of the corresponding provision in the Lanham Act, the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S. sec. 1127; Intent of Act), but is even more explicit in its language.

Section 2 sets forth the scope of relief to be available under the bill. The right of action is for an injunction; no damages may be recovered. There are two main reasons for the limitation to injunctive relief. It is believed that plaintiffs in most cases of this nature are interested primarily in bringing about the cessation of the unlawful acts rather than in collecting damages, which may be difficult to prove even in the best of circumstances. Furthermore, the absence of any provision for damages should prevent the use of the new right of action as the basis for "strike" suits. At the same time, a party with a genuine claim should not be deterred from bringing an action because of its expense; accordingly, section 2 provides for reasonable attorneys' fees in the discretion of the court, in addition to taxable costs and disbursements. Such a judgment is available not merely to a successful plaintiff, but to the "prevailing party," so that a successful defendant also is entitled to make an application for counsel fees, as well as to recover statutory costs and disbursements.

Section 3 lists the "unfair commercial activities" that are made actionable. The expression "unfair commercial activities" was selected deliberately because it was felt that "unfair competition" might be construed as a limitation, since some "unfair competition" cases have required a showing of actual competition, in addition to a showing of unfairness, as a prerequisite to relief. Section 3 contains only four subsections. This brief list of unfair commercial activities that would violate the statute represents a carefully chosen compromise. On the one hand, it would be a practical impossibility to define in detail every type of conduct sought to be prohibited; as the U.S. Supreme Court said in the case of *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Gratz* (253 U.S. 421, 437 (1920)), "An enumeration, however comprehensive, of existing methods of unfair competition must necessarily prove incomplete, as with new conditions constantly arising, novel unfair methods would be devised and developed." On the other hand, a simple statement that all unfair acts in commerce shall be unlawful would not have been sufficiently precise to serve as a basis for the desired uniformity of decision throughout the Federal judicial system.

Section 3(a) is framed in terms of the "commission" of an act or practice, or the "use" of a statement. This introductory language is intended to embrace all forms of activity, including the unfair use of a statement prepared by a third party. There are three parts to subsection (a); the first two of these cover confusion as to the affiliation, connection, or association of the defendant, and confusion as to the origin, source, or sponsorship of the goods or services of the defendant. The concept of confusion is the basis of trademark infringement under the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. 1114 (1); the bill would extend this concept to confusion caused by means other than the use of colorable imitations of a trademark. In addition, section 3(a)(2) would codify the law of confusion of sponsorship, which (under that designation) has developed largely in cases involving questions of the registrability of trademarks, and make it available in nontrademark cases as well. Section 3(a)(3) would be a Federal antidilution law, paralleling similar enactments in recent years in Georgia, Illinois, Massachusetts, and New York. This liberal doctrine thus would become available in any trademark or trade name case where interstate commerce was affected.

Section 3(b) prohibits the use of false or misleading statements about the goods or services of either party. It is limited to statements "of fact" in order to avoid prohibiting anyone from stating his opinion. Since section 3(b) applies to statements about the goods or services of "either party," it covers not only false advertising of what the defendant is offering, but also trade libel or disparagement directed against the plaintiff's products or services. Doubts about the availability of injunctive relief against disparagement, caused in some jurisdictions by false analogies to libel and slander, thus would be removed. Section 3(b) specifically contemplates the possibility that a statement may be false or misleading by reason of the omission of a material fact as well as by an actual misstatement of fact. In this respect, it resembles the definition of a false advertisement in the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. sec. 55(a)(1)).

Section 3(c) is a deliberate catchall. It is directed against "the commission for purposes of profit of any other act or practice which is likely to deceive or which violates reasonable standards of commercial ethics." This language resembles the provisions of two multilateral treaties to which the Uni[illegible] States is a party: Article 10 bis, paragraph 2, of the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, which provides, "Any act of competition contrary to honest practices in industrial or commercial matters constitutes an act of unfair competition"; and article 20 of the Pan-American Trade-Mark Convention, which provides, "Every act or deed contrary to commercial good faith or to the normal and honorable development of industrial or business activities shall be considered as unfair competition and, therefore, unjust and prohibited."

Section 3(d) is a provision against the institution in bad faith of an action under the proposed new act itself. This is considered to be an obviously desirable protective feature to avoid possible abuses of the statutory right.

In summary, section 3 has for its purpose the establishment of guideposts for the Federal courts that are explicit enough to identify the principal types of unlawful activity and yet will allow the flexibility of interpretation that is essential in a field where rapid technological advances in business and communications constantly create new opportunities for exploitation by the unscrupulous few.

Section 4 is designed to provide additional assurance of a broad, liberal construction for the bill. It states that, "Absence of competition between the parties * * * shall not be a defense to an action brought under this act." Section 4 also assures the widest possible access to the benefits of the statute by providing that no showing of actual damage shall be a prerequisite to relief and that absence of any public interest in the subject matter of the action shall not constitute a defense.

Section 5 protects innocent publishers and broadcasters by making the absence of knowledge or intent a defense in an action against such a party in respect of the contents of "any news, literary, educational, advertising, or entertainment medium." Section 6 provides that relief under the statute shall not be available when the injunction would delay the dissemination of a particular issue of a periodical, the broadcast of a radio or television program, or the showing of a motion picture, after the regularly scheduled time therefor. These provisions are similar to the corresponding section in the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. sec. 1114(2)) and also resemble the provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. sec. 53(b)).

Section 7 limits the substantive offense by providing that the statute is not to be so construed as to "extend or enlarge the rights and remedies provided under the patent or copyright laws of the United States." The purpose of this provision is to guard against possible attempts that might otherwise be made to use the new statute as a device for increasing the scope or duration of a patent or copyright monopoly. Trademarks are not mentioned in section 7 because they stand on a different footing from copyrights and patents. The bill does broaden the rights of trademark proprietors; and the possible criticism about extending the duration of the right that might have been made (in the absence of sec. 7) with respect to copyrights and patents is inapplicable to trademarks, because a trademark remains valid indefinitely under existing law so long as it is not abandoned.

Sections 8 and 9 should be considered together. Section 8 grants exclusive jurisdiction to the Federal courts of all actions arising under the statute, without regard to diversity of citizenship or jurisdictional amount. However, this does not mean that State law is discarded. Section 9 of the bill provides that the relief available under the statute "shall be in addition to and not in exclusion of those rights and remedies otherwise available under the common law or pursuant to the statutes of any State or of the United States." Section 9 goes on to state explicitly that the statute shall not be construed in such a way as to preempt the jurisdiction of any State to grant relief against unfair commercial activities. The net effect of these provisions is to create a new right of action cognizable exclusively in the Federal courts, but at the same time to preserve existing State law in the same field. Most cases of unfair competition tend to be brought in the Federal courts and it is expected that in the future such cases would invoke the new statute. However, a plaintiff who wished to invoke State law would be free to proceed in the State court based on the same facts that also would create a right of action under the new Federal statute; such a party would be entitled to all the benefits of State law if he chose to pursue them, either in addition to or in substitution for the Federal right of action, entirely unaffected by the provisions of the bill.

Section 10 contains definitions of a number of terms used in the bill. Most of these are borrowed almost verbatim from the definition section of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. 1127).

Section 11 is the customary saving clause for partial invalidity.

Section 12 provides that the new statute shall take effect immediately upon its enactment, but that it shall not affect any proceeding pending at that time.

Section 13 provides a short title for the statute, viz, the Unfair Commercial Activities Act.

FREE ENTERPRISE — THE TRUE FOUNDATION OF A FREE WORLD

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently one of America's leading industrialists and builders was honored for his contributions to the free enterprise system we cherish so much. The man selected to receive the first International Broadcasting Award was Henry J. Kaiser. Mr. Kaiser has played an important role in the growth of the industrial might of this country, and more recently, the developing nations of the world.

True to his credo, "Find a Need and Fill It," Mr. Kaiser is searching the corners of the earth for opportunities that will help all mankind enjoy a fuller, more rewarding life. It has been said that Mr. Kaiser never looks back upon his accomplishments—instead, he constantly is looking ahead, seeking out new areas of need.

As he accepted the Free Enterprise Award he presented such an inspiring appraisal of the future that I wanted to call your attention to his enthusiastic forecast. I ask unanimous consent to place into the body of the RECORD his remarks at the International Broadcasting Award dinner on February 26 in Hollywood:

FREE ENTERPRISE—THE TRUE FOUNDATION OF A FREE WORLD

(By Henry J. Kaiser)

Tonight I salute the great world of broadcasting and advertising, embracing, as you do, drama, entertainment, music, song, art, the printed and spoken word—the most powerful force of all time to bring pleasure, enlightenment, and the fruits of free enterprise to people.

I am grateful with all my heart for the award you have presented me. Yet after saying "thank you more than I can voice"—I would prove unworthy of the honors if I didn't say—"now let's get on with our jobs ahead."

What kind of a tomorrow are we going to build?

What will the United States be like in the mid-1970's and by the year 2000?

Fortunately we have some solid forecasts in figures. Our Government joined two national planning associations in predicting what Americans will achieve in the last one-third of this century.[1]

Their report, just issued, stimulates me tremendously. The experts look at the long-pull trends.

The trouble with short-run estimates often is that forecasts just for this year may be conflicting and confusing, perhaps influenced by a temporary situation or clashing theories. Under short-range estimates, the forecaster may miss the forest for the trees.

But this long-range forecast takes account of the historic past performance of our economy and projects the trends that should prevail.

So here are highlights of this official forecast for the year 1976:

Only 13 years from now—this country's annual output of goods and services will reach about one thousand billion dollars.

Our employment will exceed 92 million with the labor force one-third again as large as now.

Almost 70 percent of American families will be earning, at current prices, more than $6,000 a year.

America's population will top 235 million people.

Two-thousand-miles-an-hour planes will fly us from Los Angeles to New York in 90 minutes—New York to Moscow in 2 hours.

Those are some of the official forecasts.

To me they emphasize that there lie immediately ahead times of spectacular change, challenges of revolutionary impact, yet undreamed-of opportunities.

Science and industry are jet propelling this generation into lightning progress of material civilization far outmatching anything mankind has ever known.

Scientists and free enterprisers are making breakthrough in every field.

In electronics alone, you well know how millions of robots are at work for us in our daily lives with computers and pushbutton control systems making it possible to do jobs in factories, offices, and laboratories that before have been too complex or laborious for humans. In television, there are the wonders of transistors and of Telstar spanning the continents, as man learns how to send messages millions of miles along a beam of light.

Our lives will be affected by the peaceful use of atomic energy and new, vaster sources

---

[1] "Projections to the Years 1976 and 2000: Economic Growth, Population, Labor Force and Leisure, and Transportation," reports to Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, to the President and Congress; U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

of power by amazing discoveries in chemistry, drugs, and living cells by new uses of metals and other materials and new processes providing us with thousands of new products for you to advertise and sell.

I have just quoted you the forecasts for 13 years from today. Now let's consider the forecasts that this same important report makes for the year 2000.

Here are some of the things that the able economists state will take place in the next 37 years:

The Nation will have 350 million people—almost twice as many as today.

The goods and services produced annually will be almost four times our current gross national product. They will reach $2,000 billion.

Just imagine what this 2-trillion-a-year economy will mean in more of all the things for the people who produce, market, and consume the abundance of a fabulous age.

The average family's yearly income—after taxes and in 1959 dollars, mind you—will soar to $14,750, the survey states.

Fifteen times as many families will be earning $20,000 a year and up.

I don't for a minute blink at staggering forecasts like these. I remember being warned years ago, "Henry, don't be fantastic; don't soar into the wild blue yonder," when I urged—let's set our goals for the postwar at 60 million jobs and a 400-billion-a-year economy in the United States. Yet that target has been well exceeded. These forecasts force us to raise our sights.

Spending for housing will triple, the report forecasts.

Five times as much probably will be invested in plant and equipment.

By the turn of this century, we are told we will almost double today's number of jobs. There will be 135 million people gainfully employed.

Their average workweek will be 30 to 31 hours—some 8 hours less than now.

They will have month-long vacations as a rule. They will travel nearly three times as much as now—on the average 11,000 miles a year per person.

Turning to California, I dug into the 434-page book of projections and thought back 15 years ago when skeptics scoffed when I predicted this State's population by 1970 would gain 50 percent and would reach 20 million. I was too conservative. California is headed for 18 million people this year and more than 22 million by 1970. Then what? The forecast is that California in a mere 37 years will have 41 million people.

Now I'm leaving the figures on the magnitude of the growth ahead, and looking to the deeper meanings.

More skills and knowledge than ever before will be called upon in coming years.

The psychologist Walter Pitkin showed that not more than one-fifth of the average man's brain is ever used as it might be, and perhaps half of one's brain remains unused from birth to death. We should not be satisfied with that.

For the future that's right upon us, our youth must be educated to their maximum capacities trained to the skills that will be in serious shortage for this age of science. And equally important—they desperately need to be grounded in the humanities—in human relations—and the realms of the spirit.

The jobs ahead call for more ideas and ideals—more courage and will—more zest for work—more brainpower. There always will be still tougher so-called "impossibles." Personally, I occasionally look back on the past only to goad myself to the faith that the pending "impossibles" can be done. We should take the "t" out of "can't."

The skeptics said a new cement plant could not make it in northern California which they claimed already had too much capacity. Yet that company's capacity has been multiplied seven times.

Doubting Thomases said the west coast could not mass-produce ships; it didn't have the shipbuilders. Yet ships were built at record low cost at a rate of one a day.

Hardheaded men argued that the west coast had neither the raw materials nor the markets to build its own integrated steel industry. However, a 3-million-ton-a-year steel plant today feeds the industrialization of the West.

Sixteen reasons were given why a newcomer would flop trying to enter the aluminum industry. Two hundred firms turned down operating the wartime aluminum plants, convinced "aluminum will be running out of our ears." Yet that aluminum business has multiplied nearly six times.

Opponents said that they would kill a "new economics of medical care." Yet some 60 hospitals and medical clinics now provide care to 1 million health plan members.

These examples illustrate this credo—find a need and fill it.

At this time of new and unprecedented opportunities, find the needs for tomorrow—to make life fuller, richer, more meaningful, more satisfying to the inner individual.

The revolt is rising to rebuild our huge but decaying, traffic-clogged, nightmarish cities.

Let us resolve that increasing affluence and leisure shall not bring wasteful idleness, heedlessness, and the rot of soft living.

A tremendously greater number of people will engage in a gigantic upsurge of the service businesses and trades. We will spend far more for all the cultural arts. We seek to create a climate more rewarding to the life of the intellect, and the arts, the adventure and learning of travel—all the self-fulfillments of human growth.

Man is discovering through research and science so many ways for people to live longer, and one of the vital ingredients is to keep young at heart.

A towering strength of the American people's free way of life is our system's ability to meet constant changes.

Freedom for Americans means nothing is ever finished.

We are not under dictator rule that we cannot improve ourselves as individuals. The worth and dignity and freedom of the individual are paramount.

The people's right to vote in free elections guarantees the people's veto over the abuse of power and the right to accomplish changes to meet the public will. It is the genius of the people that they have proved they can make democracy work, however fierce are the onslaughts against it.

It is my abiding faith that our system of freedom under law and justice will endure and prevail, both at home and ultimately around the world.

The talent for struggling through and coming up with ever-better solutions should mean, for one thing, that employers and employee unions can find a better way than crippling strikes to arrive at an equitable sharing of the fruits of productivity.

Kaiser Steel employees and management—with the public represented in the program—are experimenting to find better answers to sharing gains of productivity and to cushioning the impact of technological advances.

Our slogan "Together We Build" could be applied to every citizen, because to live up to our opportunities in this land and win the victory for lasting peace and freedom require everlasting teamwork.

No people in history have given so much to assist other peoples shake off slavery and poverty in mind, body, and spirit.

I was awakened to how much American free enterprise can do to help other peoples when I flew 75,000 miles on industrial development missions in 1954–55 through Latin America.

We were told all the stock, scare reasons that it couldn't be done. Yet in Argentina and Brazil, there were established full automotive manufacturing industries, employing the people's skills, making nearly all the parts there, raising living standards, earning profits, filling needs.

This is done under the "partnership pattern" which is proving itself so much also in other hemispheres.

The grandest achievement that could usher in the 21st century would be that our age should succeed in extending the benefits of civilization to the entire human race.

Win we must—and it's my faith we will win mankind's ceaseless struggle to avert another world war and to attain peace and freedom.

This dip into the future suggests a lot for each and every one of us to do our part.

The world of broadcasting and advertising can carry a powerful message to the people, spurring on the limitless potentials immediately ahead.

The prospects are as limitless as the minds and hearts of men, yet as real as the bold imagination, the faith, the love, and the will to work that men can unleash.

"To be alive in such an age!
With every year a lightning page,
When miracles are everywhere,
And every inch of common air
Throbs a tremendous prophecy
Of greater marvels yet to be.

"To be alive in such an age—
To live in it,
To give to it!
Give thanks with all thy flaming heart—
Crave but to have in it a part."[2]

And may you never underestimate the part you yourself can take. For—

"We never know how high we are,
Till we are called to rise;
And then if we are true to plan,
Our statures touch the skies."[3]

CUBA AND THE PLATT AMENDMENT—OR FORMER PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN SUFFERS A MENTAL LAPSE

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, former President Harry S. Truman came forward with a suggested solution to the Cuban crisis which, insofar as it relates to the Platt amendment, would be about as effective as the present administration's handling of this matter.

For clarification of the record, I am herewith including a copy of an article by R. H. Shackford, Scripps-Howard staff writer, on Mr. Truman's proposal in which he points out that the Platt amendment was actually partially repealed in 1934 and a new treaty was substituted on May 29 of that year. I also include a memorandum from the Library of Congress on the subject of the Platt amendment and a copy of the treaty of May 29, 1934, which superseded it, believing it is important to keep the record straight as it relates to Cuba. I am glad to see, however, that the former President did recommend that the Monroe Doctrine should be one of the guiding principles of our actions on Cuba, which is consistent with House Joint Resolution 227, which I introduced calling for the restatement and implementation of the Monroe Doctrine:

---

[2] Angela Morgan, "Today."

[3] Emily Dickinson, "Aspiration."

"DEAD" PLATT AMENDMENT ON INTERVENTION INVOLVED—MENTAL LAPSE ATTRIBUTED TO TRUMAN ON CUBAN CRISIS

(By R. H. Shackford)

Former President Harry S. Truman, who prides himself as a scholar of American history, had a major lapse last weekend which should leave him blushing.

In a copyrighted newspaper article on the Cuban crisis he suggested that the Platt amendment was still in effect. Actually, Franklin D. Roosevelt abrogated the Platt amendment in 1934 when he proposed a new treaty with Cuba to supersede the 1903 treaty which included the Platt amendment.

His proposal was ratified by the Senate on June 9, 1934, about 6 months before Mr. Truman became a U.S. Senator.

RIGHTS

The amendment reserved the right of the United States to intervene militarily in Cuba whenever necessary. On May 29, 1934, in asking Senate consent to ratification of a new treaty with Cuba, Mr. Roosevelt said:

"I have publicly declared 'that the definite policy of the United States from now on is one opposed to armed intervention.' In this new treaty with Cuba, the contractual right to intervene in Cuba is abolished, and those further rights, likewise granted to the United States in the same instrument, involving participation in the determination of such domestic policies of the Republic of Cuba as those relating to finance and to sanitation, are omitted therefrom.

"By the consummation of this treaty, this Government will make it clear that it not only opposes the policy of armed intervention, but that it renounces those rights of intervention and interference in Cuba."

CARRIED FURTHER

While Mr. Truman was President this renuncition of U.S. intervention was carried further under the Rio Mutual Defense Treaty. In this pact, intervention anywhere in the hemisphere was renounced.

Mr. Truman's apparent forgetfulness of American history showed up in his article after he had cited the various provisions of the Platt amendment. Then he added:

"It seems to me that when it appeared that the situation in Cuba (under Castro) was getting out of hand and that a threat to the security of this hemisphere was clearly in the making, we should have considered that the basic implications of the Monroe Doctrine were at stake, as well as the reservation imposed by the Platt amendment, which anticipated precisely such a move.

"These provisions, the Monroe Doctrine and the Platt amendment, were there as much for the welfare and protection of Cubans as for the security of all the other nations of this continent."

But the Platt amendment was not "there." It has been dead for almost 30 years.

TREATY OF RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CUBA, SIGNED AT WASHINGTON, MAY 29, 1934

(Department of State, Treaty Series, No. 866. The treaty was ratified by the President of the United States, June 5, 1934)

The United States of America and the Republic of Cuba, being animated by the desire to fortify the relations of friendship between the two countries and to modify, with this purpose, the relations established between them by the Treaty of Relations signed at Havana, May 22, 1903, have appointed, with this intention, as their plenipotentiaries:

[Names of plenipotentiaries]

Who, after having communicated to each other their full powers which were found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I

The Treaty of Relations which was concluded between the two contracting parties on May 22, 1903, shall cease to be in force, and is abrogated, from the date on which the present treaty goes into effect.

ARTICLE II

All the acts effected in Cuba by the United States of America during its military occupation of the island, up to May 20, 1902, the date on which the Republic of Cuba was established, have been ratified and held as valid; and all the rights legally acquired by virtue of those acts shall be maintained and protected.

ARTICLE III

Until the two contracting parties agree to the modification or abrogation of the stipulations of the agreement in regard to the lease to the United States of America of lands in Cuba for coaling and naval stations signed by the President of the Republic of Cuba on February 16, 1903, and by the President of the United States of America on the 23d day of the same month and year, the stipulations of that agreement with regard to the naval station of Guantanamo shall continue in effect. The supplementary agreement in regard to naval or coaling stations signed between the two Governments on July 2, 1903, also shall continue in effect in the same form and on the same conditions with respect to the naval station at Guantanamo. So long as the United States of America shall not abandon the said naval station of Guantanamo or the two Governments shall not agree to a modification of its present limits, the station shall continue to have the territorial area that it now has, with the limits that it has on the date of the signature of the present treaty.

ARTICLE IV

If at any time in the future a situation should arise that appears to point to an outbreak of contagious disease in the territory of either of the contracting parties, either of the two Governments shall, for its own protection, and without its act being considered unfriendly, exercise freely and at its discretion the right to suspend communications between those of its ports that it may designate and all or part of the territory of the other party, and for the period that it may consider to be advisable.

ARTICLE V

The present Treaty shall be ratified by the contracting parties in accordance with their respective constitutional methods; and shall go into effect on the date of the exchange of their ratifications, which shall take place in the city of Washington as soon as possible.

In faith whereof, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have affixed their seals hereto.

Done in duplicate, in the English and Spanish languages, at Washington on the 29th day of May 1934.

[SEAL] CORDELL HULL,
[SEAL] SUMNER WELLES,
[SEAL] M. MÁRQUEZ STERLING.

THE PLATT AMENDMENT

Following the Spanish-American War, Cuba was occupied by American soldiers until 1902. In 1900, Governor Leonard Wood, acting under orders from Washington, announced an election of an assembly which would draft a constitution for a Cuban government to which the United States would transfer authority. When this assembly was eventually convened, it met with American stipulations. These stipulations, largely drafted by Secretary of War Elihu Root, were introduced in the Senate by Senator Orville H. Platt, of Connecticut, as an amendment to the Army appropriation bill of March 2, 1901, and was adopted by Congress in that form. According to one historian, the Platt amendment "was designed to place such limits upon the island Republic's activities as to make her a safe and tractable neighbor."[1] The amendment authorized the President to terminate the military occupation of Cuba as soon as a Cuban government should have been established under a constitution which "either as a part thereof or in an ordinance appended thereto," would define future relations with the United States as follows:

1. Cuba should never make any treaty with any foreign power which would impair its independence, nor permit any foreign power to obtain "lodgement or control over any portion of said island."

2. Cuba should agree not to contract any debt beyond the capacity of its ordinary revenues to pay.

3. Cuba should consent that the United States might intervene "for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty," and for the discharging of treaty obligations which would now devolve upon Cuba from the United States.

4. Cuba should ratify all the acts of the U.S. military government.

5. It should agree to execute the sanitary program instituted by the military government.

6. Title to the Isle of Pines (an island south of the western end of Cuba) should be left to future adjustment by treaty with the United States.

7. Cuba should sell or lease to the United States the lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at points to be agreed upon.

8. These provisions should be embodied in a permanent treaty with the United States.

The American demand that these stipulations be included in the Cuban constitution were at first resisted by the constituent assembly, but were eventually accepted after Secretary Root assured the Cubans that the intervention contemplated in the third article would take place only in the event of foreign threat or domestic disturbance. The amendment was added as an annex to the Cuban constitution, and embodied in a permanent treaty between the United States and Cuba in 1903.

OCCASIONS FOR INTERVENTION

The first test for the Platt amendment came in 1906. The first President of Cuba, Estrada Palma, had been reelected, but within a few months there was a revolution. Little fighting actually took place, but Estrada Palma appealed for help to President Theodore Roosevelt. President Roosevelt sent William Howard Taft to Cuba to try to get the quarreling Cuban factions to settle their differences. This mission failed, the President of Cuba then resigned, the Cuban Congress received his resignation and then adjourned without choosing a successor.

With Cuba thus left without any effective government, Taft proclaimed a provisional regime. President Roosevelt appointed Charles Magoon provisional governor of Cuba. A "handful of soldiers" occupied Cuba, while Magoon strove to carry out various reforms. After reasonably honest elections in 1909, the United States withdrew.

---

[1] Herring, Hubert, "A History of Latin America." New York. Knopf, 1959. p. 404.

In 1911, dissension, riots, and armed uprisings flared again in Cuba. The United States took measures preparatory to intervention. These measures consisted of the dispatch of a few companies of marines to Guantanamo, to aid the established Government in the event anarchy threatened.[2] As events worked out, no greater troop movements were necessary at the time.

Again in 1917, intervention followed on the heels of a disputed election. Declaring that this Government would not recognize a regime established by violence, Secretary of State Lansing urged Cubans to refrain from civil war. Marines were landed to preserve order, and the rebellious faction was defeated. This was the last direct military intervention by the United States in Cuba.

However, we did subsequently send a financial adviser to Cuba, Gen. Enoch Crowder. In 1922 our Government asked Cuba to recognize our right, under the Platt amendment, to investigate certain departments of the Cuban Government. Despite Cuban protests, Crowder proceeded to carry on such an investigation. Under Crowder's direction the budget was cut, crooked contracts uncovered, and the formation of an "honest cabinet" imposed. This latter step was the U.S. requirement for consent to a loan to Cuba by a New York bank. Crowder left Cuba briefly, returned in 1923 as American Ambassador, and this advisory form of intervention was over.

ABROGATION OF THE AMENDMENT

During the late 1920's and early 1930's the regime of President Gerardo Machado grew steadily more repressive. However, President Hoover's administration in this country refrained from intervention. When the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt assumed office, Sumner Welles was sent as Ambassador to Cuba, as Dr. Julius Pratt wrote, "ostensibly to mediate between Machado and his enemies; really, there is reason to think, to secure Machado's resignation."[3] In any event, Machado did resign and flee the country on August 12, 1933. Several short-lived regimes followed. The United States eventually recognized the regime of Col. Carlos Mendieta, and in May 1934, negotiated a treaty with his government by which the Platt amendment was abrogated, with the United States reserving only the right to use the naval base at Guantanamo Bay until that right might be set aside by mutual consent. The treaty was signed on May 29, 1934, and approved by the Senate 2 days later without a dissenting vote. According to one source, it represented a growing sensitivity to Latin American opinion, and an attempt on our part to convince Latin America of our good and anti-imperialist intentions.[4]

U.S. TAXPAYERS DOLLARS USED IN CUBAN PRISONER EXCHANGE MARCH 7, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, after a 5-month delay the General Accounting Office has finally answered my inquiry addressed to the Comptroller General on October 9, 1962, relating to the Cuban prisoner blackmail proposals by Castro and the action of the U.S. Government relating thereto.

It appears that contrary to what has been reported to the American people by the Kennedy administration the Government of the United States did participate financially in the Cuban prisoner exchange.

This becomes apparent as a result of the reply I received from Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General, dated March 1.

The Comptroller General's answer, though 5 months late in coming, did reveal "the U.S. Government provided 5 million pounds of nonfat dried milk solids."

This is in complete contradiction to the President's statement that no U.S. goods were included and that the American taxpayer was not involved in the prisoner exchange.

The Comptroller General reported to me that administrative costs of Government services, such as the use of telephones, transportation and salary and overtime expenses were also incurred.

Not even the Comptroller General could find any authority for these expenses; but, and quoting the Comptroller General:

> We do not propose to pursue the matter further.

Campbell wrote me that further supplies of dried milk may be requested by the American Red Cross if it appears that supplies from private contributors are insufficient.

I am hereby protesting any further use of taxpayer's goods for indemnity to Castro and am calling for a full disclosure of this Government's participation in the ransom deal.

Most of my other questions were also answered by the Secretary of State within the context of this letter from the Comptroller General, and those replies are most revealing. I am, therefore, reprinting the letter in full for the information of the Members of the House.

MARCH 1, 1963.

Hon. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: This is in response to your telegram of October 9, 1962, questioning U.S. participation in the recent negotiations for the release of Cuban prisoners from a policy standpoint as well as from the standpoint of legal authority for using Government funds for such purpose. You raised the following specific questions:

1. How much in U.S.-owned foodstuffs and other things of value are being made available for this purpose?

2. What authority exists for anyone to negotiate for payment in U.S.-owned foodstuffs to Castro and the Communists?

3. What right does Donovan or any other private citizen have to negotiate with Castro and an enemy government?

4. If Donovan is negotiating on behalf of private citizens only, what right does he have under the Logan Act, 18 U.S.C. 953, to do so—let alone a violation of recent policy statement of the Congress? Doesn't his visit to Cuba require Government approval?

5. If Donovan is negotiating in a manner that obligates the U.S. Government to make up the difference between contributions and the $60 million demanded, is he doing so as an agent of the U.S. Government?

6. Why hasn't a full disclosure of all the facts been made before the deal is closed between Donovan and Castro?

The Secretary of State has reported to us that the release of the prisoners was accomplished by the Cuban Families Committee, a private organization composed of the relatives and friends of the prisoners, assisted by a citizen committee under Gen. Lucius Clay and with the cooperation of private firms and the American Red Cross. The Secretary stated that Mr. James B. Donovan was the principal negotiator for the committee and that the main role of the U.S. Government was to insure that the private effort was not hampered by procedural problems within the Government and to expedite and coordinate the governmental and private aspects of the effort. In answer to the specific questions which you raised there is presented below the information which the Secretary of State furnished us and our comments thereon:

"1. The U.S. Government has provided 5 million pounds of nonfat dried milk solids from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks through the American Red Cross upon the latter's request under general statutory authority (7 U.S.C. 1431) providing for donations to needy peoples, in order to fill any gap that may exist in private donations of goods for the exchange. Representatives of the American Red Cross and the Cuban Red Cross will supervise distribution of the milk in Cuba to insure that it will reach children and other needy persons. The Red Cross has indicated that the Cuban Families Committee expects to raise funds to reimburse the Department of Agriculture. Further supplies of dried milk may be requested by the American Red Cross if it appears that the baby food obtainable from private contributors is insufficient to complete the shipment of goods for the Cuban prisoners' exchange and the Department of Agriculture is prepared to make additional quantities available on such request. The terms of that Department's action were described in its release of January 8, 1963.

"Other than the commitment of dried milk from the surplus stocks of the Department of Agriculture, no U.S. Government funds were used in the prisoner exchange project save for minor administrative costs of Government services, such as use of telephones, some transportation, and some salary and overtime expense. The Government hopes to recover the cost of these services. No unvouchered funds have been used at any time. No tax rulings were issued to contributing companies which were not clearly authorized or required by law or governing court decisions."

Section 1431 of title 7, United States Code, provides, in part, that:

"In order to prevent the waste of commodities whether in private stocks or acquired through price-support operations by the Commodity Credit Corporation before they can be disposed of in normal domestic channels without impairment of the price-support program or sold abroad at competitive world prices, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized, on such terms and under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem in the public interest: * * * (4) to donate any such food commodities in excess of anticipated disposition under clauses (1), (2), and (3) above to nonprofit voluntary agencies registered with the Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid of the Foreign Operations Administration or other appropriate department or agency of the Federal Government and intergovernmental organizations for use in the assistance of needy persons outside the United States * * *."

There does not appear to be any question but that the donation as described by the

---

[2] Bemis, Samuel Flagg, "A Diplomatic History of the United States." 4th edition. New York. Henry Holt & Co., 1955, p. 506.

[3] Pratt, Julius W., "A History of U.S. Foreign Policy." New York. Prentice-Hall. 1955, p. 613.

[4] Thomas, Ann Van Wynen and A. J. Thomas, Jr. "Nonintervention." Dallas. Southern Methodist University Press. 1956, p. 28.

Secretary of State of nonfat dried milk solids through the Red Cross to needy persons in Cuba is, policy considerations aside, authorized under the quoted statutory provisions. However, we could not find any authority for incurring telephone, transportation, salary, and overtime expenses to the extent that such expenses were not related to the donation under section 1431, above. The Department of State reports that such expenditures were nominal; therefore, in view of the time and effort which undoubtedly would be required to isolate the costs involved and since the violations are clearly of a nonrecurring nature, we do not propose to pursue the matter further.

"2–3. The Cuban Families Committee, which was organized in June 1961, continued the negotiations with Cuban officials for exchange of the prisoners which were begun by the Tractors-for-Freedom Committee in May 1961. The President stated the following on May 24, 1961, in support of the tractors-for-freedom movement:

" 'The U.S. Government has not been and cannot be a party to these negotiations. But when private citizens seek to help prevent suffering in other lands through voluntary contributions—which is a great American tradition—this Government should not interfere with their humanitarian efforts.

" 'Neither law nor equity calls upon us to impose obstacles in their path as they seek to save those who fought to restore freedom in our hemisphere. I am advised that the Logan Act is not involved, * * * that tax exemption is granted as a mater of course to any charitable organizations engaged in the rehabilitation and assistance of needy refugees; and that export licenses are routinely granted for humanitarian reasons, to ship farm produce and medicines to Cuba.'

"The views of the President in regard to the tractors-for-freedom movement may be applied as well to the efforts of the Cuban Families Committee. With regard to the latter the President restated the position that the U.S. Government could not be a party to negotiations for this purpose. However, he has stated on more than one occasion his sympathy with the efforts of the Cuban Families Committee to obtain the prisoners' release.

"No U.S. official participated in Mr. James B. Donovan's discussions with Cuban officials of the terms and arrangements for exchange of the invasion prisoners. The U.S. Government was not represented in any way at these meetings.

"4. Permission to visit Cuba was granted Mr. Donovan by the Department of State in view of his humanitarian mission. The Logan Act, 18 U.S.C. 953, is not in question since Mr. Donovan's discussions with Cuban officials were not 'in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States or to defeat the measures of the United States.'

"Further, the U.S. embargo on trade with Cuba was not circumvented by the terms of the prisoners' exchange since the embargo provisions excepted most foodstuffs, medicines and medical supplies, and almost all of the products pledged in the prisoners' exchange are items that are currently permitted to be shipped to Cuba under general license. Some items involved in the prisoners' exchange do require individual validated licenses under existing export control regulations. These are chiefly foodstuffs, medicinals, pesticides for household and agricultural purposes, and medical equipment, which would help to fill an evident need of the Cuban people but not otherwise aid the Cuban economy. However, offers to donate insecticides valued at approximately $2 million and suitable for use on sugar crops—Cuba's primary export commodity—have been rejected even though Cuba does not use insecticides on its sugar crops.

"Further, the total amount and nature of the goods involved in the transaction do not constitute any significant or lasting benefit to the political position of the Castro regime in Cuba. The major item in the transaction is pharmaceuticals (approximately $24 million). Cuba used to consume about $85 to $100 million of pharmaceuticals annually, of which over $60 million was imported. Therefore, the pharmaceuticals to be supplied constitute less than 6 months' normal imports. The Castro government had budgeted approximately $1 million in foreign exchange for the importation of pharmaceuticals—consequently, the delivery of pharmaceuticals to Cuba will release only this comparatively small amount of foreign exchange."

The Logan Act provides, in pertinent part, that "Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or agency or officer thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years or both."

This provision of law, in that it contains fine and imprisonment terms, is criminal in nature and not within the purview of the General Accounting Office to enforce. Responsibility for application of the Logan Act lies with the Department of Justice.

"5. The U.S. Government was in no way committed by Mr. Donovan's agreement with Cuban officials, and Mr. Donovan had no authority to commit the United States during his discussions in Habana.

"The final terms of the prisoner exchange agreement reached as a result of Mr. Donovan's efforts call for the delivery by July 1, 1963 of $53 million worth of goods, c.i.f. Habana. Cuban officials accepted 15 percent as the calculation for charges of handling freight and insuranace which is to be included in the $53 million total. The wholesale value of the goods eventually to be delivered is therefore estimated at approximately $46 million. In addition, before the transaction could be consummated, the fines for the 60 wounded prisoners who were released on credit in April 1962 had to be paid in cash by the Cuban Families Committee. The amount of the fines, totaling $2,925,000, was raised primarily by Gen. Lucius Clay on behalf of the committee entirely from private sources.

"6. A full disclosure of the facts concerning the Cuban invasion prisoner transaction could not be made by the U.S. Government before agreement was reached (1) because the U.S. Government was not a party to the negotiations; (2) while the negotiations were still in progress, it was not known what the final terms of the exchange arrangements might be, or how soon the negotiations would be successfully terminated, if at all; (3) it was not possible to say before the terms were agreed upon whether the private committee planned to request U.S. Government assistance in meeting these terms; (4) premature disclosure of information available to this Government would have constituted U.S. Government intervention in the matter and might have prejudiced the negotiations.

"The position of the U.S. Government toward the prisoner exchange has been fully and currently reported in the press, except during the period in which there was a hazard that publicity might endanger the safety of the prisoners. Attention can be called to the extensive and generally accurate reports printed immediately after the exchange in the Washington Evening Star of December 24, the Washington Post of December 25, and the New York Times News Service of December 26, 1962."

In summary, it appears, aside from the nominal administrative costs that may have been involved, that the entire transaction so far as the Government's interest was concerned involves matters of policy and the applicability of criminal statutes within the jurisdiction of the executive branch of the Government to determine. Regarding the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, 50 U.S.C. App. 1–39, and Presidential Proclamation 3447 of February 3, 1962, 27 F.R. 1085, declaring an embargo on all trade with Cuba, it should be noted that provisions are made in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Proclamation for the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce to make exceptions to the restrictions on imports from and exports to Cuba. In view of all of the facts and circumstances as disclosed by the report of the Secretary of State and since the essential basis for controversy over the transaction as finally consummated lies in the realm of policy and statutory considerations outside the scope of the jurisdiction of this Office, we do not propose to take any action in the matter.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

THE 1963 LINCOLN BANQUET

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of February 5, 1963, the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia again sponsored their annual Lincoln banquet in observance of the birth of our most American American, Abraham Lincoln. This year it was held at the National Press Club. Some 150 avid, interested, and recognized students of Lincoln were present to enjoy the occasion and to learn more about the life and work of this great American.

The president of the group is Dr. Paul Gantt who pointed out that there was reason for us to commemorate the anniversary of Lincoln's birth on the 5th of February rather than the 12th as is our custom when it can be arranged. He pointed out some of Lincoln's activities on February 5 which included the following:

February 5, 1861, while still in Springfield, Ill., Lincoln visited with Horace Greeley.

February 5, 1862, Lincoln received his salary warrant of $2,083.33. Mrs. Lincoln gave an unprecedented White House ball and 633 people filled the East Room.

February 5, 1863, he again received a salary warrant, this time amounting to $2,022.33. On the same day he wrote to Gen. Franz Sigel:

> General Schurz thinks I was a little cross in my late note to you. If I was, I ask pardon. If I do get up a little temper I have no sufficient time to keep it up.

February 5, 1864, he again received a salary warrant of $2,022.33. On the same day he wrote to Secretary Edwin M. Stanton:

> On principle I dislike an oath which requires a man to swear he has not done wrong. It rejects the Christian principle of forgiveness on terms of repentance. I think it is enough if the man does no wrong thereafter.

February 5, 1865, at 7 p.m., the President read to the Cabinet a proposal to pay $400 million to 16 States pro rata on their slave population in return to cessation of all resistance to national authority by April 1, 1865.

The "Lincoln Day by Day" book tersely notes:

> Cabinet unanimously disapproves.

After these remarks he extended the greetings of the group, paid tribute to the committee, and then introduced the master of ceremonies for the occasion, Mr. Eldon Billings, the vice president of the Lincoln group, a student of history, an authority on Lincoln, and a very capable economist at the Library of Congress. His background and capabilities fit very well the opportunity he was given to be master of ceremonies. He performed this task with tact, appropriateness, and dignity.

The group heard the Singing Sergeants give several renditions which were interesting and appropriate. Again we were reminded of the great talent and sense of dedication that the young men in our armed services have and were impressed once more with the ability of our leaders to bring out and display in a very fine manner the talents that are present among those who serve us in our Defense Establishments. They were given a generous hand and were appreciated beyond measure by all who heard them.

One of the features of the banquet each year is the announcement and presentation of the Lincoln Award of the Year to someone who, in the opinion of the awards committee of the Lincoln group, has through the years made contributions in the general area of Lincolniana. This year we were pleased to honor a man who was most deserving of this recognition—Ralph Geoffrey Newman—for 30 years of unselfish devotion to the Lincoln story, and those who tell it. Servant, student seeker, scholar, discoverer and discerner, propagator and expositor, counselor and critic and comrade, editor, writer, collaborator, publisher, often fastidiously anonymous, always the happy, the generous participant, formulator, fashioner and founder of tables round, bookman rare and bibliographer learned, acknowledged authority and changeless, exuberant, eager amateur, friend to the Lincoln men, preceptor of the past for the enlightenment of the present.

SPEAKERS

As is our custom, we again had outstanding speakers who talked from both great knowledge and feeling for the heritage of our country as reflected in the life and work of this noble citizen in our heritage.

This being the 100th anniversary of the Proclamation of Emancipation, it was natural that Carl Haverlin, last year's winner of the Lincoln Award, should talk on the Proclamation of Emancipation. Because what he said is so meaningful and is worthwhile for us to know about as we contend with the complex problems of this age, I am asking that this be placed in the RECORD so that every Member of Congress and all who receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may have the opportunity of reading this splendid dissertation in which he points up the salient fact that Lincoln regarded our kind of democracy as "the last best hope of earth." And, because Lincoln had such strong feelings about this he was moved to issue the Emancipation Proclamation at a time when it could be implemented and in a way that made it legal. In pointing out its many ramifications and great impact he quotes Dr. John Hope Franklin, who was our principal speaker 2 years ago when he said:

> The ramifications as well as the implications of the Emancipation Proclamation seem endless.

When we think of this great state paper we are aware that this, as is true with so many things in our heritage, had an impact that went far beyond the immediate objective. And, we are reminded again, as we should often be, of the importance of applying the lessons that we have learned in history to our present day problems. Mr. Speaker, this speech by Mr. Haverlin was indeed a great contribution to the Lincoln story and it is worthy of our study and consideration today.

The second speaker on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, was a colleague of ours, the gentleman from Illinois, Representative PAUL FINDLEY, who represents the district in which Lincoln lived so long and where he made preparation for the statesmanship that he later displayed so eloquently as President of the United States. PAUL FINDLEY not only represents the Lincoln district but he also lives in Pittsfield, Ill., the home town of John G. Nicolay, one of Lincoln's confidants and secretaries during that critical period in our Nation's history. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], spoke of the fact that Nicolay had so many advantages that no other man in that time had and that is because he was privileged to be present when Lincoln brought forth so many ennobling, uplifting and moving statements that helped to shape the direction and destiny of our system and form of government and which did so much to not only preserve but to promote the great ideals that were a major part of the thinking and action of our earlier patriots who Lincoln honored and respected so much. The splendid speech given by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] was the result, I am sure, of much research and study and because it reveals Lincoln through one of his secretaries and through a distinguished and able Representative from Illinois 100 years later, I take great pleasure in placing it in the RECORD with the hope that what this young man said on that occasion will be read and thought on by many people today and in the future. The speeches follow:

CARL HAVERLIN'S TALK BEFORE LINCOLN GROUP OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, FEBRUARY 5, 1963

To know what this Nation stands for, and not just what it stands against, the world need not look beyond our wholehearted observances of the centenary of the Emancipation Proclamation. With Magna Carta and our own Declaration of Independence and Constitution, the proclamation stands with the imperishable capstones of liberty.

By their very nature, they are profoundly moving documents, and meaningful to all men everywhere, regardless of color. Whether we be descendant of slaves, descendant of their masters, or of those who detested or those who condoned slavery, all mankind is the fortunate legatee of the proclamation.

For as Lincoln said so logically in his second annual message to Congress, "In giving freedom to the slave, we assure freedom to the free—honorable alike in what we give and what we receive."

Abraham Lincoln has been called throughout the world the most beloved American. Other peoples throughout the world have affection and respect for him as deep as our own. He stirs their emotions not only because he freed the slaves, but because he was ever a mighty spokesman for people like themselves and for democracy. Our example has made it clear to them that the placement of the concerns of the citizen above the concerns of the state is the veritable foundation of a democracy. They know that we hold the sole purpose of the state is to guarantee and preserve inviolate the existence of the individual.

Lincoln often expressed his faith not only in our democracy, but in the ultimate power of the individual citizen, but never more explicitly than in his first inaugural address. In it he asked, "Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world?"

He regarded democracy as "the last best hope of earth" and termed it that form of government which promised "that in due time the weight would be lifted from the shoulders of all men." He coupled his antagonism to slavery with his fervor for popular government. While he held slavery to be a monstrous injustice in itself, he hated it even more because, he said, "it enables the enemies of free institutions, with plausibility, to taunt us as hypocrites."

In his preliminary Emancipation Proclamation he promised that 100 days thereafter the slaves in the States then still in rebellion against the Federal Government "shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free."

On the hundredth day, January 1, 1863, that promise was fulfilled insofar as the power of the Presidency could fulfill it; but in the final proclamation the moving phrase of freedom rang—"are, and henceforward shall be free."

However, the dual proclamations were but the first two notes of a major triad. The cadence of freedom was resolved in December 1865, when the 13th amendment was adopted and the slaves were guaranteed their freedom under constitutional law.

For the sake of our domestic conscience and our repute abroad, it is sad that I cannot go on to say that the newly enfranchised came at once into the full sunlight of all their civil liberties. But in the face of history, we must acknowledge our human imperfections, past and present. We must admit that the new laws, by themselves, could no more lead to full freedom than the old laws, which they replaced, could made for total slavery.

Though the proclamations and succeeding legislation did bestow freedom on the slave, the grant was not everywhere complete—for beyond the power of the law was the power of prejudice. Although the law could set the Negro free, there was no law that could free a man from prejudice. Its cruel shackles can be unlocked only with the keys of understanding and compassion—and those two keys lie buried deep within the minds of the prejudiced.

It is cold comfort for us to reflect that the struggle for human rights which still agitates this Nation is not unique to us nor to the century just concluded.

Rare and blessed is that country which can affirm it has not been and is not so troubled. Since the dawn of history, minorities have been forced to eat the bitter fruit of prejudice; and those of good will among the majorities who have been unable to make it sweet for the few have found this failure equally bitter.

Though, admittedly, we have not achieved completely all our objectives for all our citizens, the world knows our vast majority has tried earnestly to achieve the long-set goals. Most important, it knows that we shall never cease in our efforts until they are reached—for this is the popular will.

In preparing my thoughts for this address, I had before me a copy of John Hope Franklin's "The Emancipation Proclamation." The Lincoln Group may take pride in the fact that the chapter which nobly resolves the book, "Victory More Certain," is the address delivered before this organization by Dr. Franklin on the 11th of February 1961.

I commend his book to you. In a forthcoming review, Bruce Catton terms it "a scholarly and thoughtful examination of a great state paper." I believe it to be the finest exposition of the Emancipation Proclamation yet published.

While reading Dr. Franklin's preface I came upon this sentence: "The ramifications as well as the implications of the Emancipation Proclamation seem endless, and many of them have doubtless escaped me." Reading his book with this point before me led inevitably to a theory which I propose for the consideration of Dr. Franklin and other historians.

We are now in the second century since the Emancipation Proclamation. For 100 years its friends and its enemies have considered it a military necessity. But was that proclamation issued only as a war measure? Was it only the superficial expression of an indeterminate military necessity? Indeed how heavy was the weight of the military need for emancipation? How compelling was congressional pressure upon the President? Were these two elements the primary forces that impelled him on September 22 and January 1?

Or had the heat of war and the chill of defeats weakened the bulwarks of slavery as the weathering years soften the stones in old gardens, letting seeds and roots long buried and restrained send out their tendrils to the sun?

Was the proclamation, in short, imposed by the Commander-in-Chief of the military forces wholly as a strategic device that would at once weaken the enemy and quiet the radical Congressmen?

Or, on the contrary, as I shall propose, did not Abraham Lincoln, remembering his long thoughts about slavery and sensing the convictions of the humane majorities in both the North and South, take advantage of the situation to render justice to the slave, lift a burden from his master, and cleanse the consciences of all? If these suggestions have merit, then the emancipation's military significance would have been of secondary importance to him.

I hope these considerations will bring us closer to the solution of what I believe to be the underlying mystery of the Emancipation Proclamations.

Although the two proclamations are themselves in evidence, the open facts about them are unchallenged, and the testimony of the principles is before us, nevertheless in my opinion, the motivation of the President is not yet entirely clear.

Over the years, and indeed to this very day, cynical men have sought to minimize the import of emancipation. They have quoted with relish, from the overt evidence, to prove to their satisfaction that slavery was either embraced or tolerated by a careless people and a callous President until a transcending fear rather than a transcending sympathy for human misery and respect for human dignity caused its abolition. That fear? The fear of military defeat.

I have heard men sneer at Lincoln on these same grounds and call him a hypocrite. In fact, within the week an acquaintance, learning that I would speak here, offered to supply my text:

"The Devil was sick—the Devil a monk would be.

"The Devil was well—the Devil a monk was he."

I have said I think there is a mystery surrounding the two proclamations. It is this: I cannot find the voice of Lincoln the poet in either of them, though I have every reason to expect it since his great gift of lyric utterance, in matters that stirred him, shines out from so many other state papers. Not once does the lightning flicker nor the thunder roll, and excepting "forever free," no phase is memorable.

So eminent and qualified a judge as Allan Nevins, in his recent excellent article in the Saturday Review, flatly terms the two proclamations "Lincoln's two immortal documents." Immortal they are indeed, but from a literary viewpoint they are at best only examples of clear and forthright exposition. In reading them I am reminded of the magician's greatest ally—misdirection. It is what he does in seeming innocence with one hand while with the other he does the impossible.

In the final proclamation even these are not the words of Lincoln, but were the suggestion of Salmon P. Chase: "and upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice * * * I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of Almighty God." More significantly, in the same paragraph Lincoln struck out Chase's phrase, "an act of duty demanded by the present condition of the country," and replaced it with "upon military necessity."

I need not labor the point that Lincoln was deeply conscious of the profound importance of emancipation nor that he was fully aware that he would be remembered by it. He said so.

Nor do I need to do more than remind you that when he was moved by event, occasion, or emotion, Lincoln could summon up a lyric eloquence that has never been surpassed.

Why then did this Prospero choose on this occasion to "drown his book deeper than did ever plummet sound?"

I think an early clue may be found in the browning pages of the house journal, 10th general assembly, 1st session of the Illinois Legislature, pages 817 and 818. Under date of March 3, 1837, a protest signed by Dan Stone and Abraham Lincoln was presented to the house, read and ordered to be spread on the journals. It reads in part:

"Resolutions upon the subject of domestic slavery having passed both branches of the general assembly, the undersigned hereby protest against the passage of the same.

"They believe that the institution of slavery is founded on both injustice and bad policy; . . . they believe that the Congress of the United States has no power under the Constitution, to interfere with the institution of slavery . . ."

Certainly these paragraphs were written neither cynically nor expediently. Opposing Stone and Lincoln was an overwhelming majority. These two protested from personal conviction. Over the next quarter of a century. Lincoln continued to be exquisitely balanced between the poles of the juridical and the humane. These two poles were neither antithetical nor antonymous. But they provided a constant dilemma for Lincoln until the last years of his life. Did he believe it to be a Gordian knot that could be released only by the sword; that is, by the invocation of the magic phrase "military necessity"?

Throughout all of the speeches and letters of the next 25 years in the monumental Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln, I find nothing that shows any deviation from Lincoln's early abhorrence of slavery and his profound respect for the law. He sounds both notes over and over again.

It is my belief that in September of 1862 he felt the time was ripe for him to strike at slavery with legality and with a stroke of his pen transfer the United States to the column of freedom from the column of slavery—where it stood with only two other nations, Cuba and Brazil. After careful deliberation I think he decided to do so wholly on presumed military merits and without benefit of emotional appeal or psychological coloration.

Nothing that I or anyone else can say or write will add or subtract from the magnitude of the author or the work. But it may be that if my suggestion is found to have merit, more competent men may tell us later why the heart of Abraham Lincoln sang on September 22, 1862, and January 1, 1863, though his pen did not.

Whatever the motivation of the President, we may take pride in emancipation and all our momentous milestones of human freedom and in the globe-circling spread of our spirit of national independence. During the past century the two have walked hand in hand.

For as Lincoln is a polestar of freedom for the individual, so have the United States of America, the mother of republics, pointed out the road to independence for the new nations.

The world is still troubled by national birth pangs. Since that day upon which emancipation was promulgated, more than one hundred new countries have joined the sovereign powers of the globe. All of them have followed us into democracy or at least have assumed the coloration of a democracy as the first step in their road to national freedom. Each transition from the old to the new has been accompanied by stress and tribulation—not only for the emerging nations, but for their citizenry.

As a nation, we ask all those who have human kindness, all men of conscience, all who are devoted to the common good, whoever they may be and wherever they may live, to dedicate themselves to help us finish the task that Lincoln began.

In so doing, we shall add our strength to the solution of a global problem—for the freedom of the individual and the guarantee of his rights is still the major unfinished business of the world.

This is the centenary of a promise made 100 years ago by Abraham Lincoln. It is my profound conviction that as a nation, within the law and under the benign providence of an Almighty God, we shall yet make that promise good.

In the closing pages of Carl Sandburg's one-volume "Abraham Lincoln," he quotes from Bishop Matthew Simpson's words at the interment of Abraham Lincoln in Oak Ridge Cemetery on May 4, 1865. Bishop Simpson said: "There are moments which involve in themselves eternities. There are instants which seem to contain germs which shall develop and bloom forever. Such a moment came in the tide of time to our land when a question must be settled, affecting all the powers of the earth. The contest was for human freedom. Not for this Republic merely, not for the Union simply, but to decide whether the people, as a people, in their entire majesty, were destined to be the governments or whether they were to be subject to tyrants or aristocrats, or to class rule of any kind. This is the great question for which we have been fighting, and the result of this contest will affect the ages to

come. If successful, republics will spread in spite of monarchs all over this earth."

Mr. Sandburg closes with:

"And the night came with great quiet.

"And there was rest.

"The prairie years, the war years, were over."

They were indeed over for Abraham Lincoln, but for our forefathers and for ourselves, the war had just begun. Not a hundred years' war, but perhaps an endless war. Not a war of violence, of guns, bullets and bayonets, but a quiet war of ideas, ideals and thoughts and prayers.

The Living Lincoln

(By Representative PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois)

One hundred thirty-one years ago Abraham Lincoln was elected to the Illinois Legislature. He was 23 years old, a citizen of New Salem. It was his first public office. From that moment on, he was in the public eye—either in office, or running for office or campaigning for someone or on some issue of public interest. From that moment on, that is, until Good Friday, 1865, when he was shot in the back of the head while attending a play at Ford's Theater in Washington.

He was carried to the little Peterson house across the street and spent the long hours of the night hovering between life and death. At 7:22 in the morning he heaved his last breath. Following the custom of the day the attending surgeon fished two silver coins from his pocket, placed one on each of Lincoln's eyes and said, "He is dead."

Secretary of War Edwin Stanton, who had been running the country from an adjoining bedroom during the long night, announced tersely, "Now he belongs to the ages."

Now he belongs to the ages—Stanton could not possibly have known the accuracy of his appraisal.

In the 98 years since Lincoln's death, he has become perhaps the most fascinating personality since history began.

More books have been written about Lincoln than anyone in history except Christ. In 1945 the State of Illinois published a listing of all books about Lincoln. The listing was so great that two large volumes were required. All told, 3,975 titles. And the pace quickens with passing years. Every year brings new studies into his life, and it is now estimated over 5,000 books have been published about Lincoln.

There are specialists who have spent a lifetime studying this man. An example of the intensive research into his life is the 3-volume set "Lincoln Day by Day." It lists each day in Lincoln's life, giving all that is known concerning his activities on that day.

Lincoln is an absorbing hobby for hundreds of thousands of people throughout the world. Several quarterly publications are issued exclusively for Lincoln collectors. There is also a weekly newsletter for Lincoln fans, "Lincoln Lore."

And you ask why? Why a century after his death, Lincoln is the most written-about person, the center of a farflung hobby, more inspiring and better known today than during his own lifetime?

Was it his rise from log cabin to White House? his position of near dictatorial power in a time of crisis? his ability as a military commander and as an executive? his homespun ways, his wit, his sense of humor?

Other men have had these qualities and responsibilities, yet none reached Lincoln's pinnacle of fame.

The answer to his greatness lies—I believe—in his speeches, speeches which a young country editor from Pittsfield, Illinois, had the rare privilege of hearing firsthand.

The young editor was John G. Nicolay, an immigrant from Bavaria, who first met Lincoln in Pittsfield when the future President was traveling circuit as a lawyer.

Young Nicolay had come to Pittsfield as a printer's devil, learned the trade, became part owner of the newspaper where he worked, and at the same time became a leader in Whig politics.

He was a delegate to the convention of 1856 in Bloomington where the Republican Party of Illinois was born from a splinter of the old Whig Party. There he helped nominate his neighbor, O. M. Hatch, of Griggsville, as candidate for Illinois secretary of state. At the convention, Nicolay heard Lincoln's "Lost Speech," in which Lincoln was on fire for the first time over the slavery issue. His speech was so electrifying the reporters dropped their pencils and forgot their work. Only brief passages were reported. Nicolay heard Lincoln say: "We must put aside all our prejudices and march shoulder to shoulder in the great army of freedom."

Two years later Nicolay moved to Springfield, where he got a political plum, appointed as clerk by Illinois' newly elected and first Republican secretary of state.

Thus Nicolay was on hand in Representatives' Hall, Springfield, where Lincoln gave his historic "House Divided" speech, which foretold so clearly the impending struggle over slavery and set the stage for the debates with Douglas.

In it, Lincoln declared, "'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' I believe this Government cannot endure, permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other."

Nicolay was assigned by a St. Louis newspaper to cover the 1860 Republican nominating convention in Chicago's Wigwam. He was there to witness the all-night struggle between the Seward and Lincoln forces, observe firsthand the final dramatic rollcall and hear the thunderous applause which greeted Lincoln's nomination to the Presidency.

Nicolay returned to his clerk's job in the State capitol building in Springfield. There he was touched again by the hand of destiny. Lincoln established campaign headquarters in the Governor's office, and hired Nicolay as his secretary—his only paid staff member of the campaign. Salary? Seventy dollars a month.

It was a difficult assignment. National passions were running high. Lincoln the candidate vowed he would say or write nothing to aggravate these passions. Delicate tasks lay on young Nicolay. He handled the assignment so well that when election day was over, Lincoln chose Nicolay to go with him to the White House as his private secretary.

February 11, 1861 when Lincoln went to the railway station in Springfield for the trip to Washington, Nicolay was with him and heard his masterful extemporaneous farewell. When the train pulled out of the station a New York newspaperman asked Lincoln for a copy of his remarks. He had no written text, but took a pencil and paper and began to write. The train began shaking and he assigned the writing task to young Nicolay, dictating the remainder. Thus Nicolay had the privilege of recording these great phrases: "I now leave, not knowing when, or whether ever, I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being, whoever attended him, I cannot succeed. With that assistance I cannot fail. Trusting in Him, who can go with me and remain with you and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well."

But all was not well. The train rolled on through a troubled land. The clouds of war were gathering. The Confederacy was already a month old. Assassination rumors were common. When Lincoln stepped to the inaugural platform in Washington, he was in an outpost of the north, surrounded by areas sympathetic to the South. The only land connection to the North was by way of Baltimore, and it was weeks before it was clear that Baltimore would permit Federal troops to come to the rescue of the Nation's Capitol. We cannot today appreciate the tense, ominous feeling which prevailed when Lincoln stepped to the inaugural platform.

Two seats away was Nicolay. If the farewell to Springfield was Lincoln's benediction, his first inaugural was his prayer for conciliation.

Nicolay heard him say, "We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, streching [sic] from every battlefield and patriot grave, to every living heart and hearthstone, all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature."

At the White House, Nicolay became Lincoln's confidant, closer in his counsels than any member of the Cabinet. He shared with Lincoln the tortures of the Presidency: the mounting toll of civil war as fellow countrymen drew each other's blood; the discouragement of military inaction and reverses; the search for a military commander who could win.

Finally, the tide of battle turned—in the bloody conflict at Gettysburg. Shortly thereafter, the battlefield was to be dedicated as a national cemetery, and Lincoln was invited to speak.

The day before the ceremony, Nicolay accompanied Lincoln to Gettysburg. The next day he heard these closing words:

"It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Nicolay was on the platform to hear this most famous of all speeches.

And finally Nicolay was on the platform to hear Lincoln's great sermon, the second inaugural. It was a different scene from 4 years earlier. There was victory in the air. It was only a matter of time before the war would end. A note of triumph might have been expected. There was none. No malice. Only mercy and charity, plus a clear defense of Lincoln's conduct of the war.

Nicolay heard Lincoln read these words, "Fondly do we hope—fervently do we pray—that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue, until all the wealth piled up by the bondman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash, shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said 'the judgments of the Lord, are true and righteous altogether.'

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just, and a lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations."

There is the living Lincoln. In these great speeches Lincoln lives on, more vital, more influential than in his own lifetime. Here is supreme example of the conservation of values beyond death—positive evidence of a hereafter for those who humbly serve the Master.

In these speeches, Lincoln uttered the deep yearnings of the American people their passion for liberty; their willingness to fight and die for freedom; their belief in the supreme importance of the human spirit; their deep and abiding faith in God.

In them, Lincoln expressed the American ideal a government that protects liberty and provides equal justice for all; a durable and majestic federal union that keeps sovereignty in the hands of the individual citizens.

And he did so in such rich clear phrases they are read and reread and memorized year after year for their content and because they are great pieces of literature.

Lincoln lives on, just as surely as our Federal Union and freedom itself live on.

He was—and still is—the living symbol of our pledge of allegiance: "One nation under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all."

OUTLAW UN-AMERICAN SYMBOLS

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in Miami Beach last week there occurred the latest in a series of outrages by a group of fanatics calling themselves the American Nazi Party.

This small group set off a near riot outside the Fontainebleau Hotel at a State of Israel bond banquet at which the distinguished Trygve Lie, First Secretary General of the United Nations, and the Honorable Hubert Humphrey of the U.S. Senate were in attendance as guests.

These so-called American Nazis were not gathered for a peaceful demonstration, but for the obvious purpose of provoking trouble and attracting attention to themselves.

This is the second such incident which has occurred in the Dade County, Fla., area within recent months. Earlier, members of this group were arrested on our main Miami street for disturbing the peace and were confined to the city jail.

In addition to these incidents, these people are now carrying on an active cold war of hate through the U.S. mails, with obnoxious un-American printed materials. One such item is a gummed label with the Nazi swastika in black print against a bright red background. I don't know how many thousands of pieces of mail these labels have been affixed to, but the number is said to be staggering.

I, personally, have been the victim of this vicious smear campaign and have received such items through the mails with the Nazi swastika affixed. I have also received other mail from equally disturbing elements which have adopted the Communist hammer and sickle as their torch.

A few months ago, our distinguished State attorney, Richard E. Gerstein, and members of his capable staff, placed behind bars in the Florida State Penitentiary, a man whom they convicted of leading a terror group in the county which was involved in suspected bombings of places of worship. The home of the editor of the Miami Herald was one of the victims of this bomber and his hate group.

There was discovered in this man's possession, a considerable amount of this Nazi hate literature.

I have introduced in this honorable House today, a bill to amend the United States Code by providing that—

> Whoever displays (other than for entertainment purposes) any flag, insignia, emblem, or other device bearing or constituting a replica of a swastika or of a hammer and sickle shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

I should like to call attention of the House to an article which appeared in the Miami Herald of Sunday, March 3, 1963 with regard to the latest incident, and an article which appeared in the Miami News, Monday, March 4, with regard to this activity.

I should also like to call attention of the House to two typical letters from people in Dade County who have been writing me about this matter.

The above-mentioned material follows:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald]

Police Grab Nazi Pickets, Avert Riot at Bond Rally

(By Gene Miller)

Two American Nazis calling themselves "storm troopers" set off a near riot Saturday night outside the Fontainebleau Hotel at an Israel bond banquet.

Taxi drivers and carhops, seething with hatred, tore into the uniformed Nazis, trying frantically to grab them away from police.

Police saved the Nazis' necks.

"They would have killed them," said Chief Mike Fox.

The Nazis, realizing they would need protection, telephoned ahead of time, both to the FBI and to Beach police, telling their plans to picket the banquet.

At 7:32 p.m., as 1,500 Jewish community leaders attended the 15th annual national inaugural conference for bonds for Israel inside the Fontainebleau, a blue station wagon pulled up to the sidewalk.

Out jumped khaki-clad medal-bedecked John McClure, 23, and David Peterson, 21, both wearing swastika armbands and paratrooper boots.

They carried cardboard picket signs and scrawled in red was "Zionism Is Treason," "Death to Traitors," "Buy U.S. Bonds, Not Israel Bonds," and "Forget Israel, Free Cuba."

They walked hurriedly, obviously frightened, in a tight 10-yard oval. Their walk lasted perhaps a minute.

Cabbies from the waiting line along Collins Avenue ganged along the pink concrete sidewalk, then moved in.

A burly ex-Marine, a carhop from the Fontainebleau, jumped a line of bushes and muttered, "I'll get the s--."

"OK," said Sgt. John Tighe to the Nazis. "We're taking you in for protective custody."

Chief Fox had 4 detectives and 6 uniformed men on the sidewalk—and another 22 motorized men a block away.

But as police moved in so did a cabbie.

He landed a haymaker. The Nazi dropped his sign and put his hands to his head.

The scuffling suddenly was a brawl of perhaps 10 or 15 men, the police trying to pitch the Nazis into waiting squad cars and the carhops and cabbies wanting to handle things their own way.

Sergeant Tighe radioed for reinforcements and seconds later three squad cars screeched to a halt, blocking traffic in three lanes of eight-laned Collins Avenue.

No arrests of the attackers were made. "I don't know who they were," said Chief Fox.

McClure and Peterson were taken to headquarters and released. They gave their address as 327 NE. First Avenue, room 504, the new headquarters of the American Nazi Party in Miami.

"I understand one of those cabbies was a former president of the Jewish War Veterans," said Beach Councilman Bernie Frank, who was in the Fontainebleau driveway when the fighting stopped.

"It's a strange thing," he said. "Only 18 years ago they gave out medals for killing those guys.

Inside the hotel, Senator Hubert Humphrey, a speaker at the $1,000-bond-a-plate banquet, declined comment. "I didn't see it," he said.

Trygve Lie, first Secretary General of the United Nations, spoke at the banquet of the establishment of Israel as "one of the epic events of history."

He also spoke of the "unparalleled loss of Jewish life during the Hitler era."

Israel bond sales for the 1963 campaign already total $19,750,000, said Samuel Rothberg, national campaign chairman.

[From the Miami (Fla.) News]

Raid Starts Drive To Oust Nazis

(By Dick Nellius)

Miami City Attorney Robert D. Zahner pulled a surprise "raid" on the American Nazi Party headquarters here today in an effort to shut it down.

Zahner said later he would try to get canceled the Nazis' 1-year lease for a tiny office in the Pacific Building, 327 NE. First Avenue, across from the Federal Building.

INCITING TO RIOT

Failing this, he added, he would have the Nazis arrested for wearing the swatiska armband, around town.

"In view of our large Jewish community, this is inciting to riot," Zahner said.

Three young Nazis, one in unform and two in civilian clothes, were in the office (room 504) when Zahner and his chief legal investigator, Clarence Hall, came bursting through the unlocked door.

Waving a copy of the lease issued to ANP Deputy District Commander John McClure, 23, to operate a political office in his own name, Zahner demanded to know if the ANP is a registered political party in Florida.

SPORTS CUT EYE

McClure, sporting a cut near his eye received in a fight Saturday night when he and David Peterson, 21, picketed the Israel bond drive banquet on Miami Beach, said no.

Asked about the loaded 45-caliber pistol Peterson was carrying, McClure said he just returned from having it registered.

Just before the raid the Nazi said they have no intention of being forced out of Miami.

Miami, Fla., *January 6, 1963.*

Dear Senator Pepper: I would like to know if you would consider outlawing the use of the swastika through an appropriate bill in the 88th Congress? As you are aware, the formation and activities of the American Nazi Party is a matter of grave concern to many of your friends in the Third Congressional District, and it occurred to me that you might want to consider action along this line.

This ominous sign has frightening memories for thousands of Americans, and they should not be senselessly and needlessly subjected to the hate literature with the swastika emblazoned thereon.

As you know, I am an assistant State attorney, and it was the pleasure of our office to place behind bars a person associated with this group.

Sincerely,

Ellen J. Morphonios.

Miami, Fla., *March 4, 1963.*

Hon. Spessard Holland,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Holland: Recently there have been several very small but extremely important publications in our local Miami, Fla., newspapers, referring to the opening of a Nazi office in our downtown area. This office is to be headed by John McClure, a storm trooper and brilliant protege of the famed horror, Adolf Hitler.

This may seem unimportant to some, but World War II is still very clearly imprinted in my mind, enough so that these articles disturbed me. I am particularly concerned that our local political leaders have allowed this situation. I can see absolutely no justification in this, or any other subversive group being allowed to open an office in the heart of our city, or any other, for that matter. In fact, I was under the impression that the Nazi Party met its defeat when Germany lost the last war. Am I to believe, that the leaders of our U.S. Government, as well as our local political powers, have forgotten what happened some 20 years ago, to say nothing of the recent situation in Cuba? Believe me, I am not so smug as to believe that this situation could not come about again, especially if we allow this sort of thing to continue.

I would most certainly appreciate your assistance in both defining the activities of this organization and its useful purpose.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. Jane O'Grady.

(Cc: Senator George Smathers, Hon. Dante Fascell, Hon. Claude Pepper, Miami Herald, Miami Daily News.)

HUMANE TREATMENT BILL

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few brief moments to call the attention of my colleagues to a bill which I am introducing today, the purpose of which is to insure that animals used in institutions wholly or partly supported by taxpayers' money are not experimented upon in cruel ways and that they do not suffer through neglect, abuse, or excessively close confinement.

This is not a new proposal, Mr. Speaker. Humane treatment bills have been introduced in the 86th Congress and again in the 87th Congress. Hearings were held last year by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It has come to my attention, however, that such a bill has not been reintroduced in the 88th Congress and I am prompted by the appalling article, which appeared in yesterday's Washington Evening Star, to resubmit this proposed legislation for the consideration of this body. I am more firmly convinced than ever, Mr. Speaker, that this is necessary and desirable legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have received voluminous correspondence on this matter which clearly indicates a mounting public concern for corrective legislation. I am sure that many of my colleagues have also. I ask prompt committee consideration of the bill I have offered and urge its support by my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

The newspaper article, to which I referred, follows:

Hundreds of Dogs and Cats Are Found Buried on Farm

(By Hugh Wells and Jack Kelso)

Discovery of the bodies of several hundred dogs and cats on a Prince William County farm today was under investigation by Virginia animal welfare officials.

The dead animals were found in trenches behind a huge two-story barn on a former dairy farm near Gainesville, Va.

The property, a section of Cloverland Farms, was sublet to Zoological Worldwide, Inc., a corporation that collected dogs for sale to medical schools and research institutes.

Richard G. Turner, accountant for Zoological Worldwide, Inc., said the dogs and cats were sold to Bethesda Naval Hospital, the National Institutes of Health and medical schools in the Baltimore area.

BARN CLEANED OUT

When a Star reporter visited the site today, he found that the operation no longer was in existence. The barn had been cleaned out—only one dead cat remained in the building.

But behind the barn, three trenches about 70 feet long were found. Two of the trenches appeared filled with the bodies of dogs, cats and rabbits. A third trench was covered with water, making it impossible to tell what was underneath.

The bodies of a collie dog and a cocker spaniel puppy were clearly visible on top of the piles.

Still alive outside the barn were a few ducks, a hutch with 10 rabbits in it and one shivering, tan and brown hound in a cage 2 feet by 2 feet.

OPERATION CLOSED

Mr. Turner said the operation had been closed down by the end of last week, after a visit by Mrs. Pearl Twyne, president of the Virginia Federation of Humane Societies and of the Animal Welfare League of Arlington, and other various officials.

"This has been quite unfortunate and I recommended they immediately close the place up," Mr. Turner said, adding that the corporation is "trying to do the right thing."

Mr. Turner said he had not known, until it was pointed out to him, that the water pipes to the building had frozen and there was no heat in the building.

The corporation, he said, had tried to convert the barn into a proper kennel to hold the animals for shipment but that it was impossible.

The corporation now has shut down its operation and will not open again until proper kennels, possibly like those used by NIH and the Arlington Welfare League, can be built, Mr. Turner said.

TEN STOCKHOLDERS

All the dogs that remained when the operation was closed down have been sold, he said.

The animals, he said, originally were picked up from dog pounds and from registered animal dealers.

About 10 stockholders comprise the corporation, Mr. Turner said, but he declined to identify them.

Mr. Turner said that some of the dogs had died of distemper and that others had contracted distemper and had to be destroyed. Some of the dogs were shot, he said.

He said he understood that only about 40 to 50 dogs had died in about a year.

The operation was brought to light by a woman who declined to be identified. She told animal welfare officials she saw a truck with some dogs in the back.

The woman said she asked the driver if she could buy one of the beagles and he said she would have to talk with the lawyer of the corporation.

Rather than do that, the woman recounted, she drove to the farm, where she saw conditions there. She said there was no heat, windows were broken and there were dead dogs among the live ones.

NEIGHBOR MOVED

Mrs. Marie Moore, who formerly lived next door to the farm, said her family had to move down the road because she couldn't stand the situation any longer.

"Just a little warm wind would make you sick," Mrs. Moore said.

She said her son, Stanley, had gone to the farm himself and buried some of the dogs once because the odor was so bad.

When the corporation first began trucking animals to the farm, Mrs. Moore said, the dead animals were buried. Last fall, the trenches were dug with a bulldozer, she recalled.

By November, she said, she had to move down the road.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago tomorrow, March 8, 1961, I submitted House Resolution 211 for the purpose of establishing a House Committee on the Captive Nations. Referred to the Committee on Rules, the resolution was not reported through the remainder of the 87th Congress. However, a motion to table it was defeated. This year, on January 10, I reintroduced the same resolution which is now known as House Resolution 14. It has been most gratifying that so many of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in the House have joined with me by sponsoring this measure. Unfortunately, in the 2 months that have elapsed since the introduction in this session of the Congress no action has been taken on my resolution or similar resolutions.

On the eve of this second anniversary of House Resolution 211 and House Resolution 14, I looked up the Congressional Record for several years and discovered that in the past both the Committee on Rules and the whole House used to act with much greater speed on similar resolutions where the captive nations were concerned. Mr. Speaker, I shall take but a few minutes to pass in review the most important of these resolutions.

In the 82d Congress, 1st session, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden] submitted House Resolution 390 establishing a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the Katyn

Forest Massacre. On August 15, 1951, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules. The very next day it was reported by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith] as a privileged resolution. The committee made no amendments.

Two years later, on July 21, 1953, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Kersten, submitted to the 83d Congress, 1st session, House resolution 346 establishing a select committee to investigate Communist aggression and forced incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. On July 27, it was called up for consideration. Our present distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], associated himself with the resolution, and it was passed unanimously.

During the debate, no evidence came to light that the Department of State opposed the establishment of the so-called Baltic Committee, contrasting with the Department's present attitude toward the establishment of a Committee on the Captive Nations. Moreover, evidence became available soon after the passage of House Resolution 346 that the Department was highly complimentary of the job the Baltic Committee had been doing and that it favored the expansion of its work scope. I shall quote in this connection from a memorandum, signed on February 8, 1954, by the then Under Secretary of State, Walter B. Smith:

> 1. The Department considers that the work of the House Committee has been wisely planned and effectively conducted. It is apparent that the hearings held to date have made a valuable contribution to U.S. objectives in disseminating impressive evidence of Soviet disrespect for the rights and sovereignty of small nations.
>
> 2. The Department believes that it will be beneficial to broaden the scope of the committee's work to provide for inquiry into similar cases where communism has extended its domination over free peoples. Careful, well-documented investigation of such cases would be valuable (a) to assure the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain that they are not forgotten and that the United States does not endorse their captivity; and (b) to educate public opinion in the free world regarding Communist techniques in seizing power and the terrible realities of life under Communist rule.

This memorandum was written in response to the draft Resolution 438, the purpose of which was "to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the subversion and destruction of free institutions and human liberties" not only in the Baltic States, but also "in all areas controlled, directly or indirectly, by world communism, including the treatment of the peoples in such areas."

Submitted by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Kersten, to the 83d Congress, 2d session, on February 9, 1954, House Resolution 438 was reported by the Committee on Rules on February 25, and passed by the House on March 4. Provided with this vehicle, the committee covered with its investigation of Communist aggression, in addition to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, also Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, East Germany, Russia, and other non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R. It took depositions from dozens of witnesses here and abroad, examined hundreds of pertinent documents, and published thousands of pages of its findings.

Even today the committee's reports offer an invaluable source of material for researchers. For example, a scholarly study, "Soviet Policy Toward the Baltic States, 1918–40," by Dr. Albert N. Tarulis, of the Library of Congress, is largely based on materials assembled by the committee in addition to other hard evidence. It was published by the University of Notre Dame Press. Through such studies, the committee has achieved its objective of "disseminating impressive evidence of Soviet disrespect for the rights and sovereignty of small nations."

Speaking on the same subject, I would also like to quote the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden] who disclosed during the debate that the Voice of America had carried the Karsten committee's proceedings behind the Iron Curtain, and that hearings in London and Frankfurt, lasting 6 days in each locality, attracted 60 to 80 newspaper reporters and commentators every day. No wonder the Kremlin got mad. I further quote the gentleman from Indiana:

> The Baltic Committee is probably the only one established by the House in recent years to win 14 attacks in 3 weeks by the big guns of the Moscow propaganda machine.

Mr. Speaker, the same concern about the plight of the captive nations guided the 86th Congress when it concurred in Senate Joint Resolution 111 on July 9, 1959, designating the third week of July as "Captive Nations Week." In this case, too, the House acted with great speed. The resolution was received from the Senate on July 7. Two days later, our distinguished Speaker, then majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], asked unanimous consent for consideration of the resolution. He himself conducted the debate. The resolution was passed the same day. On July 17, it became Public Law 86–90, and Captive Nations Week has been observed every year since then. The impact of Public Law 86–90 on the Kremlin has been overwhelming. I quote from House Resolution 211:

> Following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the observance of Captive Nations Week in 1960, Moscow displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union.

The reaction was violent every year. Mr. Khrushchev himself found it necessary to engage in a public debate over the issue. Our Senators, Congressmen, Governors, and even the Senate Chaplain were ridiculed for their support of the captive nations' rights to self-determination.

The reaction could have been easily predicted, as was the case with the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee, the Baltic Committee, or the Committee on Communist Aggression. Nevertheless, at no time did the Department of State raise any objections.

Since the language of Senate Joint Resolution 111 and of House Resolution 211 and House Resolution 214 is similar in many places, and their spirit is the same, the change of mind at the Department of State between 1959 and 1961, as exemplified in Secretary Dean Rusk's well-known letter to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith], written on August 22, 1961, is truly surprising.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan] have conclusively proven the utter lack of substance in Mr. Rusk's arguments against the passage of House Resolution 211 and House Resolution 214. I also repeatedly took the floor for the same purpose, and I shall avail myself of another opportunity to dwell on the background of Mr. Rusk's opposition.

Mr. Speaker, on this second anniversary of the introduction of House Resolution 211 on March 8, 1961, it is my earnest hope that the Committee on Rules once again will display the same consideration about the captive nations that had prompted it to report favorably on the various resolutions referred to in the foregoing. House Resolution 14 is one such resolution. It still awaits action, and I wish the Committee on Rules would stop looking over the shoulder at what the Department of State likes or dislikes in the discharge of our duties. After all, we are not an adjunct to the Department of State.

STORM DAMAGED TIMBER IN OREGON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentlemen from Oregon, Representative Al Ullman and Representative Robert B. Duncan, and myself, I wish to place in the Record a certified copy of Senate Joint Memorial 1, a memorial relating to timber damaged by the November storm. This memorial was enacted by the Oregon Legislative Assembly now in biennial session at Salem, the State capital.

I think it is evidence of deep concern by the duly elected State legislators over the conditions in one segment of the forest-related industries which play a major role in the economic life of Oregon:

> SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 1
>
> (Introduced by Senator Chapman and Representative Back)
>
> *To His Excellency, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:*
>
> We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent that:
>
> Whereas the standing timber which was blown down in the severe storm of October 12, 1962, is an economic loss to the State; and
>
> Whereas the loss will become greater as a result of infestation if the timber is not salvaged; and
>
> Whereas the downed timber constitutes a severe fire hazard; and

> Whereas much of this salvageable timber is located in an economically depressed area of this State; and
>
> Whereas the salvage operation is one well suited to the small operator. Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:*
>
> 1. The U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Interior are urged to expedite the salvage and sale of the downed timber by:
>
> (a) Authorizing sale of small tracts, particularly those located adjacent to existing access roads.
>
> (b) Establishing scaling stations to determine the quantity of timber removed and thus avoiding the time and cost of recruising.
>
> (c) Authorizing local supervisors to make sales of timber up to $10,000 estimated value without lengthy public advertisement.
>
> (2) The Congress of the United States is urged to enact any necessary enabling legislation which may be required.
>
> 3. The Oregon Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives are urged to encourage action on the part of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior and to promote and support any needed legislation.
>
> 4. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the Secretaries of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Pike, for Monday, March 11, to Friday, March 15, on account of official business (representative of Hon. Carl Vinson to Annapolis Board of Visitors).

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Fogarty (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ryan of New York, for 2 hours, on March 27.

Mr. Findley, for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, March 12, 1963.

Mr. Derwinski (at the request of Mr. Findley), for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, March 12.

Mrs. Green of Oregon (at the request of Mr. Weltner), for 5 minutes, today, to revise and extend her remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. Green of Oregon (at the request of Mr. Weltner), for 30 minutes, on March 11, to revise and extend her remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Whitener (at the request of Mr. Weltner), for 60 minutes, on Monday, March 18, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Poage and to include a speech delivered by the Vice President in Waco, Tex.

Mr. Staebler.

Mr. Sikes.

Mr. Pucinski.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Findley) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Pillion.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Weltner) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Rooney.

Mr. Brademas.

Mr. Flood.

Mr. Marsh.

Mr. St. Onge.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 11, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

520. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a copy of the statistical supplement, stockpile report to the Congress, for the period ending December 1962, pursuant to Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

521. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on a study of the relative financial advantages of purchasing over leasing of electronic data processing equipment in the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

522. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to establish in the Treasury a correctional industries fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

523. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XXIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular affairs. H.R. 2821. A bill to authorize modification of the repayment contract with the Grand Valley Water Users' Association; with amendment (Rept. No. 73). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4619. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 4620. A bill to provide for the humane treatment of animals used in experiments and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 4621. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Senator Francis Case Memorial Park Committee, Rapid City, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 4622. A bill to provide for assistance in the construction and initial operation of community mental health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4623. A bill to assist States in combating mental retardation through construction of research centers and facilities for the mentally retarded; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 4624. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 4625. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional $2,400 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 4626. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4627. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery at Westfield, Mass; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4628. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4629. A bill to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, to authorize programs of information, education, advisory services, and financial assistance for the encouragement and advancement of artistic and cultural activities, and for the development of a more widespread appreciation of America's cultural heritage and accomplishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4630. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4631. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Bureau of Senior Citizens within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help senior citizens; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 4632. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4633. A bill to provide financial assistance to State governments for public education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4634. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4635. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4636. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4637. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4638. A bill to promote the orderly transfer of the executive power in connection with the expiration of the term of office of a President and the inauguration of a new President; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4639. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 4640. A bill to encourage the expansion and improvement of State programs of special education and related services for exceptional children through Federal financial participation in the cost of development and implementation of such programs and in the cost of colleges and universities in providing special courses of instruction and scholarships for persons preparing for professional participation in such programs, and for establishing research grants and special projects and by establishing and providing for consultation with a National Training and Research Council and technical advisory committees on education of exceptional children in the administration of this act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 4641. A bill to permit the State of Texas to obtain social security coverage, under its State agreement entered into pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, for policemen in cities of 250,000 or less; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 4642. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to prohibit the use of foreign lumber or other wood products in any construction or rehabilitation covered by Federal Housing Administration-insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 4643. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $75,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed Sierra Way in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 4644. A bill to discontinue export subsidies on cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4645. A bill to impose import fees on cotton and cotton goods equal to the export subsidy paid on cotton exports by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 4646. A bill to declare a portion of the Benton Harbor Canal, Benton Harbor, Mich., a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 4647. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $75,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed Sierra Way in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4648. A bill to repeal the last sentence of section 48(d) (relating to certain leased property), and section 48(g) (relating to adjustments to basis of property), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 4649. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize the use of certain volatile fruit-flavor concentrates in the cellar treatment of wine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 4650. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 4651. A bill to provide civil remedies to persons damaged by unfair commercial activities in or affecting commerce; to the Committee on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 4652. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make certain public housing agencies eligible for donations of surplus personal property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 4653. A bill for the establishment of a commission to study and appraise the organization and operation of the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 4654. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission on congressional reorganization; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4655. A bill to amend title IX of the Social Security Act with respect to the amount authorized to be made available to the States out of the employment security administration account for certain administrative expenses, to reduce the rate of the Federal unemployment tax on the calendar year 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4656. A bill to amend title IX of the Social Security Act with respect to the amount authorized to be made available to the States out of the employment security administration account for certain administrative account for certain administrative expenses, to reduce the rate of the Federal unemployment tax for the calendar year 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4657. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exclude from gross income gain realized from the sale of his principal residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 4658. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H.R. 4659. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to provide that only lumber and other wood products which have been produced in the United States may be used in construction or rehabilitation covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 4660. A bill to authorize reimbursement for certain moving expenses and property losses to any person who is compelled to relocate his home or business because of the acquisition of property by the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 4661. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the Federal income tax for State and local income taxes paid by an individual during the taxable year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4662. A bill to donate to certain Indian tribes certain submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservations involved; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4663. A bill to assist States in combatting mental retardation through construction of research centers and facilities for the mentally retarded; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4664. A bill to provide for assistance in the construction and initial operation of community mental health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4665. A bill to prohibit the display of the swastika and the hammer and sickle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4666. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to place in grade 18 of the general schedule the position of hearing examiners of the Social Security Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4667. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions of $100 per month to World War I veterans, subject to a $2,400 and $3,600 annual income limitation; to provide that retirement income such as social security shall not be counted as income; to provide that such pension shall be increased by 10 percent where the veteran served overseas during World War I; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 4668. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 175th anniversary of the establishment of the Customs Service, and of custom employees killed in enforcing the customs law; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 4669. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the filing of reports by surety companies with the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4670. A bill to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 with respect to the nature of bond required; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4671. A bill to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to permit bonding by foreign surety companies and to permit alternative methods of bonding in certain cases; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4672. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act to eliminate the ceiling upon amounts that may be appropriated to carry out that act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4673. A bill to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 4674. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4675. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $75,000 with

which to make a survey of a proposed Sierra Way in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 4676. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 4677. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in 1965 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 4678. A bill to provide for the loss of U.S. citizenship by persons convicted for evading military service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 4679. A bill to provide for the loss of U.S. citizenship by persons convicted for evading military service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 311. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting representation in the electoral college to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.J. Res. 312. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.J. Res. 313. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H. Res. 285. Resolution relating to anti-back-door spending; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Res. 286. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the problems of urban areas; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. HARRISON presented a Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed to return to the State of Wyoming additional sections of land from the public domain, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 4680. A bill to require, in the alternative, delivery and return of property of the estate of John F. Hackfeld, deceased, vested by the Alien Property Custodian, on the basis of ownership by an enemy alien, or the repayment of income and estate taxes to said estate, collected on the basis of American citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 4681. A bill for the relief of CWO James A. McQuaig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4682. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred T. Winfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 4683. A bill for the relief of Kuo Chew Toy, his wife, Kwong So Kuen Toy, and their daughter, Mabel Toy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4684. A bill for the relief of Antoine Nasrallah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 4685. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joseph Faludi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 4686. A bill for the relief of Jan Piotr Spolnik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4687. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Esposito and Eduardo Amodio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 4688. A bill for the relief of James Panarites; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4689. A bill for the relief of Peter Panarites; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4690. A bill for the relief of Sofia Gargiulo Tinalli, Gennero Tinalli, and Italo Tinalli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4691. A bill for the relief of Paolo Scaffedi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4692. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kerstin Margareta Codrington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 4693. A bill for the relief of Juana V. Cadorna McNinch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4694. A bill for the relief of Georgios Vilis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 4695. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eusebio N. Gayol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Congressional Staffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this year the issue of minority staffing has received more attention and discussion than ever before. Republican members are becoming increasingly aware of the injustice of the present circumstances. On February 23 the Washington Post published an editorial critical of Republican efforts. Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL has done much to clarify some of the distortions of the Post editorial. Under unanimous consent I include this letter in the RECORD:

CONGRESSIONAL STAFFS

On February 23 you published an editorial chastising the Republican Party for asking for additional minority employees on congressional committee staffs. It appears to me this editorial overlooks two important points.

First, there is an assumption implicit within the editorial that all staff positions can be equated somehow with nonpartisan appointment. There is no more reason to introduce this assumption into the area of committee staffing than there is to appoint all Cabinet and sub-Cabinet posts through civil service. The executive department, as well as the Legislative Reference Service set up by Congress, provide the great majority of factual material for congressional use, outside of committee investigations. The Legislative Counsel is available for aid in bill drafting.

What is needed, particularly if you concede the Congress its proper role as the originator of laws and policy, is staff members with the knowledge and experience to interpret the facts into legislative proposals according to the policy position of the political party in control. At the same time, if there is to be a responsible opposition, it must have access to staff personnel attuned to its political philosophy as well.

No doubt there are exceptions. Clerical and secretarial staff people, for instance, although even here the designation of such personnel as minority or majority staff, however chosen, creates an invaluable priority system in terms of their time and availability. An additional exception would be staffs of a subcommittee such as the House Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee. In certain instances special outside counsel brought in for investigatory purposes would be appropriate.

The second point overlooked is the simple matter of the present situation. Even assuming a totally nonpartisan staff operation was appropriate, what precisely is the minority party to do while waiting for a benevolent majority not only to increase the capacity of the opposition but decrease their own partisan advantage as well? Some balance must be obtained if only as a temporary expedient.

It is rather puzzling to me that the Washington Post concerns itself with partisan appointments on the Hill which have some justification, and yet ignores the revelation of last week that henceforth patronage considerations will intrude into the summer job picture for high school and college students in the face of an existing nonpartisan personnel system—the civil service.

WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
Representative, Seventh District,
New Jersey.

The Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, although Czechoslovakia today is under Communist rule and has been for 15 years, there are men in that country's past who we can hold up as ideals for those of us today to attempt to model ourselves after.

Just 113 years ago—March 7, 1850—Thomas G. Masaryk was born in Moravia, marking a point of utmost importance for the people of Czechoslovakia. For it was Thomas Masaryk who 68 years later was elected first President of the Republic of Czechoslovakia after a long struggle displaying the intelligence and extreme bravery of the man.

Thomas Masaryk, a philosopher and highly perceptive viewer of society, was elected to the Austrian Parliament in 1891, only to courageously resign his position 2 years later in a protest over treatment of Czechoslovak nationalists.

There followed years of writing on history and philosophy, aiming penetrating criticism at Karl Marx and his ideas. With the coming of World War I, Masaryk fled to Paris and, with Dr. Eduard Benes, formed the Czechoslovakian National Council, which became the recognized government of Czechoslovakia.

Czechoslovakia was recognized as a republic in 1918 and formally proclaimed in October of that year. Masaryk became President and was reelected three times before finally resigning his leadership in 1935 at the age of 85 and with a lifetime of devotion to a cause he saw as all-important—the freedom of his country.

We must constantly be alert to dangers to the element of freedom, now so abundant but always in danger of being lost by those who do not jealously guard it. This is why today, the anniversary of the birth of Thomas Masaryk, should be important to us all.

Address Delivered by Senator Hartke at Conference of National Association of Broadcasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, last week the conference of presidents of the State broadcasters' association assembled in Washington under the auspices of the National Association of Broadcasters.

At their luncheon session at the Shoreham Hotel on Tuesday, February 26, the conference had the good fortune to have as its luncheon speaker, our colleague Senator HARTKE, of Indiana.

As a member of our Senate Commerce Subcommittee on Communications, Senator HARTKE is most knowledgeable in the area of broadcasting. His address on that occasion was instructive and provocative, couched in apt phrasing, and I feel it should be a part of the record of this Senate where we do give a great deal of thought and attention to the responsibilities of broadcasters and our own legislative responsibility in the mass media of communication.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator HARTKE's address be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HARTKE ADDRESSES STATE BROADCASTERS' ASSOCIATION PRESIDENTS CONFERENCE

If the broadcaster feels puzzled or lost today, if he feels caught in the crossfire of laws, regulations, orders, community needs, and the necessity of making money, he is not alone. Many people feel lost today in a world they do not understand.

Perhaps we all stand a little too close to the proverbial forest and, thereby, have difficulty with the trees. Maybe we ought to back off and have a look at the whole from a new perspective.

Your industry is unique in our system. On the one hand, the American way insures free speech, the right to criticize, and the other constitutional guarantees we hold so dear. On the other hand, for reasons which you know well, the licensing of broadcasting is necessary and proper since the spectrum is limited and since the ether belongs to all of us. The basic consideration in granting a license is, of course, public service. And one man's public service is another man's poison—especially under our system.

I would, however, like to share some views with you on the service that I think should be performed by the broadcasting industry and the role which I think you and your colleagues and their stations should fill in today's world.

The inherent regulation of the business and the early growing pains have had a lasting effect. But I think there has been no trauma. Rather, I think, the patient need only to examine his past to understand his present so that he can face the future.

As I see the broadcast industry, a radio or television station is not a newspaper of the air, except to the extent that both media ought to be dedicated to public service—the newspaper because of the obligation implicit in the constitutional guarantees and the radio or television outlet because the law says so.

There are today, as you know, many communities in which there is no daily newspaper while there is a local radio station. In these cases, the need to serve the public interest—to fill the gap, if you will—transcends that required by law. There is a moral requisite which equals, if not exceeds, the legal requirement.

If you do not accept this, look at it this way: The holder of a license to broadcast holds a valuable commodity given to him by the Government of the people. The mere issuance of the license turns a paper corporation into a business which can be sold, traded, used, misused, milked, and bilked. Or it can be put to the highest service.

I do not want you to think that I believe that radio and television must broadcast nothing but public service programs. I certainly know that we who own the 55 or 60 million television sets of the country and the 200-odd million radio sets, neither want nor expect continuous doses of news, panels, public affairs, and public service. I like these; they are concerned with my business which is government. I also like steak, pork chops, fried chicken and hamburger. But, as I prefer my steak, pork chops and hamburger to be varied with occasional fish, salads, cheese, roast beef and other dishes, so I prefer my news and public affairs to be varied with entertainment of various kinds. I love music of all types. I enjoy westerns. I respect the rights of my teenage children to indulge in the twist and rock-and-roll.

It is easy to understand why, in a market like Washington or any other big city, the broadcast media tend to specialize. It is, I suppose, like the big city physician or dentist. But I think we are tending to overspecialization in all of these. I don't think a dentist should specialize exclusively in the care, cleaning and repair of back teeth only. I don't think a physician should turn away a neighbor with a stomach ache because he specializes only in treatment of broken arms. And I certainly don't think that it is necessary for a station to cater exclusively to devotees of rock-and-roll, long-hair music or anything else. Specialization in certain markets—maybe. Specialization to the exclusion of any variety—no.

I do not think any hard and fast rules can be or should be laid down. I think it's a matter for the industry to suggest in keeping with your own policing activities through the broadcasting code.

I do not think you serve the public interest by confining your public service programing to weekends, to class C time, and other offpeak listening and viewing periods. There is nothing to hide or be ashamed of in these programs. If there is, it's the station's fault for airing that kind of program. Government, religion, news and public affairs need not be dull. If a station is to serve the public interest and the needs of the community and the Nation, it has a duty not just to log some air time for this kind of program, but to put a little effort into making it palatable to the listener and viewer. The networks have—ever since the "vast wasteland" speech if not before—shown increasing awareness of these needs. And, in the fine public affairs programs now being aired, they have found new commercial commodities. A good, comprehensive news or public affairs program need neither be dull nor sustaining to be interesting.

In meeting this public service need, a station should be aware of the viewers and listeners beyond the shadow of its antenna. I think this is particularly true now that we have the controversy over the size of a listening area and the issue of interference in the context of the sign-on and sign-off times of daytime radio stations. If a station is going to claim some kind of squatters rights over a vast territory, it ought to be prepared to serve that vast territory, and not just with entertainment or even news of national interest. I think the public service obligation grows with the area being served. After all, the commercial possibilities and the rates grow with the size of the area.

When the broadcast industry recognizes these needs and meets them, it most effectively blocks the critics who feel that radio and television are not grown up. These critics are the ones who fear the lifting of Section 315 permanently, for instance. These critics think that radio and television must remain spoon-fed forever. I do not.

I like to think that a grownup, affluent and responsible free-enterprise broadcast industry has had long enough to learn its obligations in the straitjacket of regulation and ought now be turned as loose as possible. But such action would have to be tempered by the industry's own demonstration of increased responsibility and by government's insistence that the day of reckoning—the day of permit renewal—will be something more than a pro forma thing.

The broadcast industry ought to dare to experiment, dare to be different, dare to educate, enlighten, entertain, explain and criticize. I think stations, which now number 2½ times the number of newspapers in the United States, ought to dare to be more colorful, more complete and more objective than newspapers. Too many newspapers today have fallen or thrown themselves into the chasm of carping criticism. Too many seek to promote selfish ends by blinding themselves to the other side or other viewpoint. I know one newspaper that, during a recent political campaign dig at the opposition, printed on page 1, "read both sides in the ———." Responsible journalism has reached low ebb when this is necessary. I challenge my friends in the electronics journalism field to move into this vacuum

and to provide the ingenious and objective coverage of news and public affairs that some people cannot get otherwise. Fortunately, this is not a common need. But it happens too often.

You will recall that I was one of the leaders in the drive to free the industry from the shackles of restriction imposed by section 315. My bill in 1959 would have repealed this section. It was the forerunner of hearings to suspend the section in part or in whole temporarily. It led to the suspension that allowed the famous Kennedy-Nixon debates of 1960.

The President has now proposed that the section be set aside for the 1964 campaign. I, personally, see no reason why section 315 should shackle coverage of any campaign or any news for that matter. The final decisions on news value and coverage should be left to the experts in the newsrooms of radio and television stations and networks. If stations are competent to make other decisions and judgments, surely they can make these.

A section that has been bypassed once and partially shelved and which the President feels should again be partly set aside, is not serving the public needs. I think it's obvious that a law which needs to be lifted in whole or part from time to time is not a good law.

I think if the suspension can be afforded in the contest for the highest office in the land, it can be for all contests for all offices.

I shall propose the repeal of section 315 together with the requirement that there be continuous study of the way in which the industry treats its new freedom.

I appreciate having the equal time accorded to me to tell you broadcasters my views of your business as some of you have told me your views of my business. And I don't mind that as long as it is a fair comment based upon factual information or sincere thought.

I do not want people to be unconcerned with what we say or do here. I would prefer that people agree with me, but if they can't, then I prefer that they disagree with me. For it is important that people be concerned about politics and government. If people neither agree nor disagree with what I do or say, they are, in effect, failing to be concerned about our country and its future. I do not ask people to love me, but only to share with me and my colleagues the responsibility of a great government and a great system.

Remarks of Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, Chamber of Commerce Dinner, Waco, Tex., Thursday, February 21, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Vice President JOHNSON at Waco, Tex., Thursday, February 21, 1963:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE DINNER, WACO, TEX., THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1963

Several weeks ago one of your Waco leaders called me long distance to invite me to have dinner with him at this annual chamber of commerce banquet. Now I like the chamber of commerce. But I am very happy with Lady Bird's food, and I began to tell him that my calendar was rather crowded. But he said, "LYNDON, we have a special honor in mind for you if you can come."

Needless to say, that put things in a different light.

I perked up when I heard that.

He began explaining, "We know that Texas has moved to the forefront of the space age, and we feel it would be appropriate this year for us to give credit where credit is due."

I was really listening by then.

My caller went on—"We think it's time to recognize the Texan who has been out in front in space from the beginning—a man who has risen from a humble Texas background to one of the most commanding positions in the Nation."

I was all smiles by then—and thinking how good the food would taste in Waco. "Why didn't you tell me what you had in mind from the beginning," I said. "Naturally, I'll be there."

Then he said, "Why, thank you LYNDON. I'll tell the board tomorrow that you have accepted and will be on hand for the honor of introducing that distinguished Texan, General Schriever."

Now, you realize, of course, that is just who I thought he had in mind all along.

So, I am here—and let me make it clear, I did not hike the last 50 miles. I told the President in 1960 I would go all the way with J.F.K.—but, if it were all the same to him, I would prefer to ride.

I am sure that you will agree that two of the finest things that ever happened to this part of our State have been BOS POAGE—and that great American, Tom Connally. But, historically, two of the greatest things to happen to this region of Texas have been these: First, the influx into the fertile valleys of central Texas of the great migrations of hardy settlers of all nationalities who populated the region in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

The second most important thing is just beginning to happen—that is the space age.

Your guest of honor tonight personifies both chapters of this history. As a very young boy, Bernie Schriever was brought to this country and this State by his parents. Like so many others of the same origins, he has returned much to his adopted country—and Texas and America are richer for it. I would think that even the Baylorites and the ex-Longhorns could forgive him his Aggie days.

Before General Schriever speaks, let me say a few words to you.

Many here remember the days when cotton was king, and these black lands were cotton's empire. In recent years, some have been quick to say that this region is on the decline—that its future is behind it. Like the reports of Mark Twain's death, such gloomy views of central Texas are highly premature.

Where once the future of this region lay at the edge of a plow, today, the future lies in the explorations out among the stars. Waco stands at the center of a vast new complex of space activities. As the triangle—Houston to San Antonio, and Fort Worth and Dallas—grows, Waco is destined to grow and prosper and fill an increasingly important role in the life and leadership of Texas and the Nation.

The industrious people of Waco—led by the kind of community leaders and builders present tonight—are the kind of people America counts on to build a better future for themselves and their children.

Our generations living today are greatly challenged. We live in a time of trial and a time of peril. But the revolution which began on these shores 200 years ago is the revolution of independence and freedom which still is the greatest force in the world.

Fifteen years ago all of Europe, all of the Middle East, all of Asia lay prostrate at the feet of the Red armies. There seemed to be nothing which could stand in the way of consolidation of the Communist empire from the Bering Straits to the Rock of Gibraltar and from the North Pole to the Cape of Good Hope. At that moment, the American people stood behind their President—President Harry S. Truman—when he drew the line at Greece and Turkey and Iran.

We drew the line at the edge of the Communist empire. We said to the aggressor, "This far and no farther." Fifteen years have passed. That line has never been crossed. That frontier of freedom has never been breached. Today within the empire of communism, a great division and dissension has begun between the Russian Communists and the Chinese Communists. While we stand firm, we can responsibly believe that the first stages of disintegration and deterioration of the Communist bloc have begun.

Men of little faith—men of little courage—men blinded by partisan ambition may cry out their prophecies of gloom and doom. But when we see the strength of Western Europe, when we see the commitment to freedom of the new nations of Africa, when we see the valiant stand of the freedom-loving people of Asia, when we see the courage of our friends south of the border, we cannot responsibly conclude other than that the tide of this century is running with us. Communism will not bury us and cannot bury freedom.

The cause for which we stand—the cause to which we are committed—is opening the grave and rolling away the headstones where man's highest aspirations have too long been buried. Our side is the winning side and the knowledge of this should both make us all feel more secure in our homes tonight and give us new incentives to support our country and its cause in the years ahead.

This generation of Americans—like all generations before us—is dedicated to peace. We want a world of peace in which justice and freedom will be part of the lives of all mankind. That fact that the world is now at peace, the fact that freedom is now strong is due in no small measure to the vision, dedication, and determination of men like your guest tonight, who have done and are doing so much to keep the peace and make possible the building of a stronger, safer, and saner world.

It is my privilege to introduce to you Gen. Bernard Schriever.

Brotherhood of Silence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have often stood here before my colleagues in this House to tell them of the gallant efforts of the captive people behind the Iron Curtain in Eastern Europe who fight, in silence and anonymity, to remain the captains of their souls. In the forefront of this battle are the undergrounds, the resistance movements in each country that still exist despite everything the Communist state can do. Year in, year out, the secret war between the Red rulers and the anti-Communist undergrounds go on.

Now a book has been published that tells far more eloquently than I of the courage and drama of the resistance. It is called "Brotherhood of Silence" and it is the thrilling story of the anti-Communist underground in Slovakia. It was written by a leader of the Slovak underground who now lives in the West, Stefan Ilok, with an American journalist, Lester Tanzer. Stefan Ilok is not the author's real name, but it is one by which he is known to many members of the Slovak underground. Through his trips to Europe, through the flight of Slovaks to the United States, through an elaborate network of couriers, Mr. Ilok has amassed firsthand reports of men and women who have risked their lives to harass, sabotage, and thwart the oppressive rulers of their native land. Their names have been changed to protect the identities of those who now carry on the dangerous fight for freedom, but the stories that appear in this book are documented in the files of the underground leaders.

In the days right after World War II, the underground organized itself as a secret state. It had its own general staff and army—the guerrillas; its own communication system, built around the couriers; its own labor unions, intelligence network, and division of psychological warfare. But sabotage and large-scale guerrilla warfare seemed to advance the Slovaks' cause little if any. Conventional sabotage was but a thorn in the Communists' side: bothersome but not particularly dangerous. Such tactics had succeeded in preserving the ideal of freedom in Slovakia but they had not toppled the Red rulers.

So the underground struggle had to enter a new phase. Now, the resistance must throw its resources into the broader struggle between East and West. More particularly, into the new war for supremacy in science and technology, a bloodless war with vast significance to the future of the world. Now the underground seeks to tap the scientific strength of the Communist empire for the benefit of the West. Now it engages in scientific and military espionage, probing for information to help keep the West abreast of Communist accomplishments—and weaknesses. I think it is no secret that such information from the Slovak underground has already found its way into committees of this House.

How the underground has evolved in Slovakia is graphically told in Brotherhood of Silence. But underlying the more violent activities of the underground is the Church of Silence, to my mind the most fascinating and most meaningful section of Brotherhood of Silence. Men of all faiths will be uplifted by the account of the brave Catholic priests who, driven underground by the Communist rulers, clandestinely minister to the devout Catholics of Slovakia, performing the sacraments, conducting masses in caves, basements, and mountain hideouts. So long as a man believes in a power greater than his own, so long as he believes in God, his mind and soul has not succumbed to communism. It is the members of the Church of Silence, the secret church, who keep religion alive in the shadow of the godless police state, and by so doing nourish the people's hope of eventual freedom.

The Washington Star has called "Brotherhood of Silence" "a story of vast courage and heroism." Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, has called it "an inspiring piece of literature." Doctor Daniel Poling has said of "Brotherhood" that—

> In its field as of now, this is the one and just about the only book. * * * In these flaming pages, the cause of freedom, both physical and spiritual, takes on proportions of grandeur.

I would like to add one final word. Though "Brotherhood of Silence" deals primarily with Slovakia, it is more than just a book about the Slovak people. The struggle of Slovakia is not a unique story, but a universal one. Over the years we have seen the people of Hungary, Poland, and East Germany rise against their rulers. In recent weeks and months, the activities of anti-Communist undergrounds in Cuba and Communist China have made the headlines. There have even been food riots and demonstrations against suppression of religion within the Soviet Union itself. Nowhere, not even at the heart of the Communist Empire, can the spirit of man forever remain shackled.

This is the moral, the lesson of "Brotherhood of Silence." In Mr. Ilok's closing words—

> I have told the story of the Slovak underground not to glorify my native land, but to exalt man's indomitable resistance to tyranny everywhere, his unquenchable yearning to be free.

Keep the Flame of Freedom Burning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], who has taken a vigorous role in the study of the plight of captive nations under Communist domination, was a speaker at a dinner February 14, 1963, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York. The dinner was sponsored by the American-Bulgarian League honoring the Free Europe Committee and Radio Free Europe. With permission to extend my remarks at this point, I include the text of Mr. MONAGAN's speech:

SPEECH OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN S. MONAGAN, DEMOCRAT OF CONNECTICUT, AT WALDORF-ASTORIA HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, AT DINNER SPONSORED BY AMERICAN-BULGARIAN LEAGUE HONORING THE FREE EUROPE COMMITTEE AND RADIO FREE EUROPE

I am honored to have this opportunity to talk with a group of people who by birth, nationality, background, or human sympathy are interested in the fate and future of the hapless and historic people of the great country of Bulgaria.

I am also pleased to join in this ceremonial which does honor to Radio Free Europe and the Free Europe Committee. I have just returned from a trip behind the Iron Curtain and I know the importance and the potential of the work done by this committee and this service.

Unfortunately, in this world of feeble human beings, power often bulks larger than principle and fate too often seems to be on the side of the big battalions. It is also regrettably true that even the most worthy cries of the oppressed and the downtrodden with the passage of time frequently seem to lose urgency to the average citizen and even to the average nation in spite of honest sympathy and good will.

That is why it is so important for interested citizens to meet regularly in order to refresh the recollection of the people of our country and of the world with a repetition of the facts of the Communist takeover of central Europe and to recall to their sympathies the present tragic and persistent condition of the friendly and downtrodden men and women of the captive nations.

It is frequently said that time heals all things and with the passage of the months and years there is a danger that the world will become complacent about the fate of these brothers behind the Communist border and that the rough edge of their tragedy will become smooth in our memories through forgetfulness.

This, my friends, must never be. Self-determination and freedom are not mere catchwords to be bandied about without thought or consideration. They are living principles upon which our Nation and associations of freemen everywhere are based. They are as valid today as they were when enunciated in our Declaration of Independence and their appeal to the victims of tyranny is stronger today than ever because these unfortunate human beings have greater cause than ever to understand their soundness and the need for their realization if the common aspirations of these imprisoned populations are to be realized.

And let there be no question about the fact that these peoples are imprisoned and that these nations are rightly termed captive nations.

I have seen the obscene wall in Berlin. I have seen the barbed wire, the watchtowers, the guards, the automatic rifles, and the dogs at the boundary between free Austria and captive Czechoslovakia.

We know that these barriers have been erected to prevent the wholesale desertions that would occur and have occurred through the departure of eager fugitives from the blessings of the Communist system.

These regimes were not fully chosen by the people. They were imposed by force and have been maintained in the same fashion. In Hungary and even recently in Russia, itself, the Communist overlords have demonstrated that they will not shrink from using the ultimate force in order to maintain their control.

This reality of the willingness to use force is the ultimate and basic fact of life in the guardhouse state.

Bulgaria has been the tragic victim of this imposition of forced control. Through mistaken reliance upon Russian assurances of free elections, the Communists were permitted to take control, and this control—in the now well-known pattern of Communist conduct—has never been relinquished.

I am sorry to say that American credulity and innocence were substantial factors in this takeover.

Partly for this reason, but particularly because we are the most powerful guardians of the liberties of the world, do I feel that the United States has an obligation to work for the restoration of freedom and self-determination to Bulgaria and other similar nations.

It is true that we cannot take up arms for this purpose, but there are many measures, short of war, which we can legitimately take to achieve this end.

During the recent hearings of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Captive Nations which I was privileged to conduct, some of these measures were emphasized and recommended to the executive branch.

First of all, we must keep this question of the seized countries alive. We must take every opportunity in the United Nations and in other forums to emphasize that this problem remains unsettled, but that it should be settled in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.

We must seize this and other opportunities to put pressure on the Russians. They do the same to us at every opportunity. Why should we be so punctilious?

We should not be dissuaded by the lack of enthusiasm of some of our allies. The fact remains that the fate of human brothers is at stake and we must never admit that we can become bored or restless at the repetition of claims for freedom and self-expression.

We must also do everything to keep the hopes of the captive peoples alive.

They have fought the good fight. They have remained steadfast. They have resisted both force and blandishments. Our expression of support will encourage them to hold out further toward the day of the inevitable victory.

As our committee recommended, our Government should step up the use of our informational media—to proclaim our support to the world.

This recommendation has a particular application to the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. It is not only the volume of broadcasts which should be increased, but also the force and the scope of these broadcasts—both in electric power and in political content. After all, this is a war that we are fighting.

Either we mean what we say and we do support the people of Bulgaria and we turn our support into definite actions or we bow to tyranny, change our policy, and permit these good and loyal friends to sink beyond redemption into the Communist quagmire.

I believe that we do mean what we say; that we do support the people of the captive nations and that we are gradually realizing more clearly the folly of attempting to deal on principle with a Communist regime.

I believe that our support will increase and grow and I am convinced that this support and the natural instinct of the captive peoples for freedom and self-improvement will sap the strength of the sterile Leninist creed and will bring a new birth of freedom to the people of central Europe.

Five to Ten Billion Dollars Lost Annually by Wastages and Mismanagement in U.S. Executive Departments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I consider it to be my duty to direct the attention of the citizens of this Nation, the President, the members of the Cabinet, all administrative officials of our Government, and the Members of this Congress to the reports of the General Accounting Office—GAO.

The General Accounting Office is an independent, nonpolitical, and reliable source of information on the fiscal and management operations of Federal agencies. Its reports contain findings on inefficient and uneconomic functioning in the administration of the executive department.

The GAO is directed by the Comptroller of the United States, Hon. Joseph Campbell. The Comptroller General and his staff are performing a most valuable public service in finding and disclosing the inefficiencies, the maladministration, and the mismanagement that exists throughout the huge Federal bureaucracy.

The GAO reports are based upon investigations, examinations, and audits of Federal agencies. It issues hundreds of reports annually to the Congress, the President, and various executive agencies. These reports reveal a uniform pattern of gross maladministration and mismanagement that permeates our Federal operations. There are literally thousands of areas of Federal activity where shocking and massive wastages repeatedly take place.

Mr. Speaker, the following are five briefs extracted from the Comptroller General reports issued between February 26 and February 28, 1963.

U.S. MILITARY IN JAPAN FAIL TO PROPERLY UTILIZE CIVILIAN MANPOWER

In 1961, U.S. military installations in Japan were staffed by about 1,800 Japanese nationals in excess of accepted manning guides at an annual wasted cost of $2.7 million.

Despite this overstaffing, many facilities had not been adequately maintained and large backlogs of work had accumulated. Part of this backlog, which should have been performed by station forces, was performed under contract in fiscal year 1961 at an additional cost of about $465,000.

The Comptroller General's Office reported that the Army, Navy, and Air Force had failed to develop complete and valid manning guides as to the number of personnel required to maintain facilities and operate utilities in Japan.

The GAO cited inadequate management controls, inefficient use of personnel, lack of adequate work standards, and failure of management personnel to properly perform their duties, as contributing factors to this deplorable situation.

U.S. ARMY FAILURE TO PROTECT RUBBER TRACKS FOR TANKS AND COMBAT VEHICLES

In 1960, the U.S. Army incurred an unnecessary cost of $5 million to rebuild rubber tracks for tanks that were allowed to deteriorate.

The deteriorations were caused by the failure of the U.S. Army to (a) issue and use the oldest tracks first; (b) furnish unused tracks to manufacturers of new tanks; (c) protect the tracks by inside storage.

The General Accounting Office report states: "The management weaknesses disclosed in this report on rubber tracks are the type that could pertain to all of the Army's replacement parts which are subject to deterioration."

U.S. ARMY ENGINEERS DISPOSAL OF STEAM SHOVELS

From April 1960 to April 1962, 103 10-ton crane shovels purchased by the U.S. Army Engineers were released for disposition. These shovels had an acquisition cost of more than $2 million.

Twenty-five crane shovels were sold for $207,850, which cost the U.S. Army Engineers $541,200.

Eight crane shovels sold for $56,000, although their cost to the U.S. Government was $173,000.

A large portion of the shovels were completely new, unused shovels.

During the same period, the U.S. Army Engineers sold $350,000 worth of repair parts for its crane shovels.

While these new and serviceable shovels and parts were being given away or sold for bargain prices, the U.S. Army Engineers had full knowledge of their future need for these shovels.

A study by the U.S. Army Engineers dated April 18, 1962, recommended the purchase of several hundred similar shovels for the period 1965 to 1967, at a cost of $12 million. There have been no technological improvements in these crane shovels and none were expected in the near future.

The Comptroller's report describes these transactions in the following language:

"Improvident disposals," "undoubtedly result in substantial waste," "inconsistency indicates a lack of coordination and control within the Corps of Engineers."

U.S. ENGINEERS UNNECESSARILY EXPEND $575,000, AND PLAN TO SPEND ANOTHER $321,000 FOR OUTBOARD MOTORS

In 1959, the U.S. Army Engineers had 1,400 25-horsepower outboard motors on hand. These were completely new and unused motors.

At the same time in 1959, the U.S. Army Engineers unnecessarily purchased 925 25-horsepower motors at a cost of $575,000. They also planned to purchase 553 new 25-horsepower motors to replace new or slightly used motors.

There was no indication of technical obsolescence of the 1,400 new motors on hand.

The Comptroller's report refers to these transactions as: "Unnecessarily bought." "We recommend no further disposal of 25-horsepower motors for which there is a foreseeable need."

U.S. ARMY ENGINEERS PURCHASE AND SALE OF GENERATORS

From July 1959 to September 1960, the U.S. Army Engineers sold 316 30-kilowatt generators in excellent or in good condition at an average price of $150 per generator.

At the same time, it purchased a larger number of 45-kilowatt generators at a replacement cost of $4,879 each. The 30-kilowatt generators were, at the same period, classified by the U.S. Army Engineers as acceptable substitutes for the 45-kilowatt generators. The cost of the new 45-kilowatt generators for which the U.S. Army Engineers had acceptable substitute 30-kilowatt generators was $1.5 million.

In 1960, the Navy was disposing of 10-kilowatt generators as excess. At the same time, the U.S. Army Engineers were purchasing new generators at a cost of about $1,500 each. The Comptroller General's office found that the capacity and specifications of the Navy generators being sold were the same as those that the U.S. Army Engineers were purchasing.

Although appropriation and taxing power is vested in Congress by our Constitution, the executive department is charged with the responsibility for the efficient administration and management of public funds.

The critically dangerous fiscal insolvency of this Nation, both at home and internationally, is the result of the failure of both Congress and the executive department to faithfully discharge their respective constitutional responsibilities.

I would like to emphasize that the irresponsible dissipation of tax funds has existed and grown over many past administrations. But, today's rampant administrative fiscal abuses and mismanagements are the prime responsibility of today's executive department and its administrative officials.

Based upon the reports of the Comptroller General of the United States, I am convinced that the wastages and the squandering of public funds in the executive department exceeds $5 billion annually.

Mr. Speaker, the 1964 budget appropriations of $107.9 billion recommended by President Kennedy could be reached by upward of $5 billion if the President and the executive branch of our Government were to dedicate themselves to the exercise of reasonably good business practices.

This enormous saving could be realized for the taxpayers of this Nation without in any way reducing our military power, or sacrificing any present public service.

This sorely needed fiscal relief for our economy and our taxpayers cannot be gained without a clear, immediate public demand and the coordinated efforts of the Congress and the executive department.

Virginia Maple Sirup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, it is maple sirup time in Virginia. Yes, with all proper deference to the reputations of sister States which produce this delicacy, Virginia claims preeminence in quality and flavor for its maple sirup.

For many years, we kept this treasure to ourselves, savoring it in secret, and left the ballyhoo of commerce to maple-tree tappers elsewhere. More recently, however, we have found it possible to spare some of this superb product of the Virginia highlands for visitors to the Commonwealth. It is a pleasure, therefore, to extend an invitation from Highland County, Va., to attend the fifth annual Highland Maple Festival, to be held the weekends of March 16–17 and 23–24.

Highland County, which styles itself pridefully and with ample scenic reason as "The Switzerland of Virginia," is a center of maple sirup production. The festival, concentrating on informal hospitality, is sponsored by the Highland County Chamber of Commerce. Dr. T. E. Billingsley, chairman this year, has announced that four sugar camps will be open to the public.

To see maple-sugaring operations at their best, and to taste maple sirup at its finest, therefore, the public is invited to head for Monterey, the county seat of Highland County, on one of the festival weekends, and watch for the welcoming buckets which the festival committee will have in place on maple trees along the main highway leading to Monterey.

I am confident that all who accept this invitation will return home bearing a new realization that, on the basis of taste appeal, Virginia maple sirup takes first rank.

West Virginia State Legislature Adopts Resolution Making Sir Winston Churchill an Honorary Citizen of the State of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on January 14, 1963, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 3, which would confer honorary citizenship of this country on Sir Winston Churchill of Great Britain.

In the 87th Congress it was my privilege to present a similar measure, as did my capable colleague, Senator Stephen M. Young, and others. Members who cosponsored this legislation (S.J. Res. 218) which I introduced were Senator Estes Kefauver and Senator Frank J. Lausche.

My colleagues who cosponsored Senate Joint Resolution 3 are Senators Robert C. Byrd, Ernest Gruening, Thruston B. Morton, Winston L. Prouty, Hugh Scott, and John G. Tower.

I am happy to have the opportunity of announcing in the Senate of the United States that the West Virginia State Legislature, February 22, 1963, adopted a resolution making Sir Winston an honorary citizen of the State of West Virginia, and memorializing the Congress to award him honorary citizenship as an American.

It is gratifying to know that the citizens of West Virginia share our esteem of Sir Winston and recognize his personal and official contribution to the cause of freedom and justice, not only to his country but throughout the world, including America.

House Concurrent Resolution No. 24 was introduced in the House of Delegates of the West Virginia State Legislature on February 7, 1963, by the Honorable J. F. Bedell, Jr., a delegate from Kanawha County. It was adopted by the house on that date; amended—in a minor way—and approved by the State senate on February 21. The house agreed to the senate amendments and adopted the resolution on February 22, 1963.

I commend the members of the West Virginia State Legislature for their expeditious and conclusive consideration of the resolution and for their judiciousness in adopting it on one of the most significant dates in the history of our Nation—February 22—the birthdate of George Washington, the first President of the United States.

The resolution reads as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 24 MAKING SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL AN HONORARY CITIZEN OF THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Whereas Sir Winston Churchill, a citizen of Great Britain by birth, has close ties with the United States of America; and

Whereas said Sir Winston Churchill has demonstrated during the strife and turmoil of two World Wars that he is a friend and ally of the United States; and

Whereas he also has demonstrated his loyalty and devotion to the aims, purposes, and aspirations of this Nation at peace conferences, world trade meetings, the United Nations, and elsewhere; and

Whereas there is now a proposal before the Congress that he be made an honorary citizen of the United States; and

Whereas it is appropriate that this great soldier, world statesman, and noted historian and writer be made a citizen of our State prior to being made an honorary citizen of the United States; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia, That said Sir Winston Churchill be made an honorary citizen of West Virginia and that the Congress of the United States be memorialized to award him honorary citizenship as an American.

President Kennedy favors making Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States. At a news conference on January 24, 1963, he stated that honorary citizenship would not be essential to show the high regard that Americans have for him.

But I would be delighted if the Congress passed a resolution, whether it is (for) honorary citizenship or an expression of esteem.

Some way or other it would be appropriate, perhaps to remind Sir Winston Churchill of our high regard for him. It is written very large in any case, but this would be a gracious act at this time.

Although there has been no action in the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on my resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 3—or on other pending similar legislation, the House Committee on the Judiciary approved a measure for this purpose on March 5 and early approval by the House of Representatives is expected.

I am hopeful that the Senate will act expeditiously on this proposal and provide a symbolic memorial to a great statesman and leader whose bond with the United States of America is further enhanced because his mother, Jennie Jerome, was an American.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record:

Editorials from the Washington Post, "Honoring Sir Winston" on March 4, 1963, and "Citizen Churchill," March 6, 1963, excerpts from an article in the Washington Post by Edward T. Folliard, "Urgency Noted on Citizenship for Churchill," January 13, 1963, and my exchange of correspondence with Sir Winston Churchill.

There being no objection, the material was order to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1963]

HONORING SIR WINSTON

Now that Sir Winston Churchill has indicated that he would be delighted to accept honorary U.S. citizenship, Congress should act with all speed to bestow the honor. Since Sir Winston had said in 1958 that he might be disposed to decline such a "remarkable compliment," there had been some understandable hesitation on Capitol Hill. With the great British statesman now declaring that he would be "deeply moved by such an honor," it would be ungracious of Congress not to grant what almost every American citizen would like to bestow.

It is not, of course, a matter of trying to claim for the United States this great leader who did so much to save the free world. To be sure, the American people do lay some claim to him because his mother was an American, and there is a feeling in many countries that Churchill, like Lincoln, "belongs to the ages." But there is no thought here of rivaling Britain in Sir Winston's allegiance or affections. Rather, the movement to confer honorary citizenship upon him reflects a general desire to pay tribute to a great Briton who has rendered immeasurable service to mankind.

Nor are the obligations of American citizenship involved. What would be conferred upon the revered former Prime Minister of Britain would be all the honors of American citizenship and none of its responsibilities. Whether or not he would ever come to these shores to accept the honor would naturally be left to his own discretion and would have to be governed in any event by the state of his health. The only question that should concern Congress is the prompt completion of a gracious gesture that will convey to Sir Winston the warmth of the American feeling toward him. Nothing short of unanimous approval in both the House and Senate will do justice to the occasion.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 6, 1963]

CITIZEN CHURCHILL

The House Judiciary Committee has moved with gratifying speed to complete its action on the resolution conferring honorary citizenship upon Sir Winston Churchill. It is to be hoped that Congress will speed the measure toward final enactment.

The esteem and affection in which "a certain naval person" is held by the people of the United States has not been kept a secret. It is already so well known that no formal act is required to advertise it. It has been demonstrated on one occasion after another. His every visit to this country has elicited from citizens in every walk of life, from officials and from Congress evidences of affection and regard that citizens and officials usually reserve for the most honored and loved of our own countrymen.

Such manifestations of sentiment, however impressive and universal, do not diminish the need for or the wisdom of a formal act of Congress that will place upon the public records of this country an imperishable acknowledgement of a free country's devotion to one who in the gravest of trials spoke, not only for his own compatriots, but for free men in this and every other land.

It has been said that republics are notoriously ungrateful, but it is not true of this Republic. It is equally false to say that the gratitude of democracies is an impulse aroused by the expectation of future favor. These cynical assumptions of ignoble impulse are belied by a thousand evidences that the people of this country have a sure and instinctive response to greatness and a swift and generous reaction to sacrifice in the public good.

The Congress that passes this resolution will speak for a people who are united in their sentiments toward this great man, unanimous in their respect for his genius and wisdom and universally in favor of national tribute as unique as the man it honors.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 13, 1963]

URGENCY NOTED ON CITIZENSHIP FOR CHURCHILL

(By Edward T. Folliard)

The campaign to make Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States is being waged again in Congress, this time with more urgency.

The need for urgency is obvious. Sir Winston is now 88, and as time goes on seems more and more prone to afflictions—his latest being a broken hip, complicated by a bronchial infection. The great Englishman, whose mother was an American, Jennie Jerome, has seemed to be indestructible; but he is well aware of the aphorism, "We all owe God a death."

There can be little doubt that President Kennedy hopes Congress will approve a joint resolution declaring Sir Winston an honorary American citizen. He backed such a move on April 15, 1959, as a Senator from Massachusetts.

Said Mr. Kennedy on that occasion:

"I believe, now that Sir Winston has left active political office, that a grant of honorary U.S. citizenship to him would be a worthy and fully deserved gesture." * * *

Action by Congress authorizing President Kennedy to proclaim Sir Winston an honorary American citizen, is of course, essential.

* * *

Mrs. Bolton reintroduced her joint resolution in the House on the day the 88th Congress convened. Senator Young intends to reintroduce his this week, but he will not be alone. Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat, of West Virginia, also will offer such a resolution, as he did last year.

In the last session, Senators Frank Lausche, Democrat, of Ohio, and Estes Kefauver, Democrat, of Tennessee, joined in sponsoring the resolution.

Senator Randolph, commenting on a January 9 editorial in The Washington Post, headed "Citizen Churchill," which endorsed the idea of honorary American citizenship for the old British lion, said in a letter to this newspaper yesterday that the editorial was "an eloquent and moving tribute to one whose imprint on the pages of history will inspire and challenge uncounted future generations."

The West Virginian recalled Sir Winston's role in World War II and said:

"And yet, his heroism in war is only a small part of the bountiful legacy of Winston Churchill. We think of him today as an astute political leader, an international statesman, philosopher, artist and learned man of letters. He is revered as a man of peace."

Senator Randolph said that the praise given Churchill in the Post editorial would be "echoed in the minds and hearts of all our countrymen." He said he would reintroduce his resolution and press for its adoption.

"May we soon bring to pass this meaningful recognition which tangibly expresses the heartfelt gratitude and affection, which the American people hold for Sir Winston Churchill," he concluded.

To judge from the Gallup poll, Senator Randolph is not exaggerating when he writes of American admiration for Sir Winston. Over the years, Gallup's agents have asked a cross section of Americans to list the 10 men in the world they most admire.

Year after year, beginning in 1957, the former British Prime Minister was second, topped only by President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

In a poll taken in December 1962, he was the third "most admired." President Kennedy was first and General Eisenhower second.

There must be many things Americans like about Sir Winston—his courage and stirring oratory in the war years, his brilliance as a writer, his eloquently expressed affection for United States—but his wit certainly should not be overlooked.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., September 5, 1962.

The Right Honorable Sir WINSTON CHURCHILL,
London, England.

DEAR SIR WINSTON: On August 16, 1962, it was my privilege to introduce in the Senate of the United States, legislation which would confer on you the ultimate recognition of esteem and gratitude which the American people may officially offer—that of honorary U.S. citizenship.

Believing that your life and works have ever been devoted to the cause of peace, as well as to brotherhood and cooperation between this Nation and the United Kingdom, this proposed honor would have added significance as a further pledge of cooperative effort by both countries. Especially today, when the need for harmony and unity of action are of paramount importance, would such a pledge be meaningful.

Having genuinely admired your contributions in a variety of fields and unfailing courage in times of stress, I felt that you would not deem it inappropriate to include a copy of my remarks when introducing Senate Joint Resolution 218.

With hope for the continued improvement of your health, I am

Truly,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

LONDON, *September 7, 1962.*

My Dear SENATOR: I am indeed obliged to you for your letter of September 5, and for the gracious and complimentary terms in which you refer to me. Pray accept my very good wishes.

Yours very sincerely,

WINSTON CHURCHILL.

Society for the Propagation of the Faith Raises $5,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, recently the Columbian Squires, which is the Junior Order of the Knights of Columbus, of which you and the gentleman of New York addressing you are members conducted a service-type activity for the

Society for the Propagation of the Faith. Squires throughout the United States participated in various kinds of fund-raising projects with all proceeds going to the society. When the final tabulation was made, over $5,000 had been raised. A check for the amount raised was presented to His Excellency the Most Reverend Fulton J. Sheen, national director of the society, by the New York State Chief Squire, Robert W. J. Wysocki, a resident of the 14th Congressional District of New York, in behalf of the Squires throughout the Nation.

Appropriation for U.S. Coast Guard Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a statement which I submitted today, to the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee on Appropriations in support of the 1964 appropriation for the U.S. Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn., which is in my congressional district. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the subcommittee, I appreciate this opportunity to present to you a brief statement in connection with the annual appropriation which you are now considering for the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, located at New London, Conn., which is in my congressional district.

The Coast Guard Academy provides professional instruction to cadets who, upon the completion of a 4-year course of studies, become eligible to receive commissions as ensigns in the Coast Guard "in the service of their country and humanity." There are some 600 cadets enrolled at the Academy, coming from all parts of the country. They are fine, upright, and dedicated young men.

We in the eastern part of Connecticut are extremely proud of the Coast Guard Academy, its record of fine achievements over the years, and its role in training young men in seamanship, in the sciences, and in the service of their Nation. This is true in wartime, as well as in peacetime.

As a result of a comprehensive survey conducted by an architectural and engineering firm in 1961, an 8-year long-range program was undertaken for the expansion and modernization of the Academy. The improvement program scheduled for the fiscal year 1964 will cost a total of $1,750,000. The biggest part of the project calls for modernization of athletic facilities. The present indoor athletic facilities of the Academy are contained in a gymnasium building known as Billiard Hall and a small fieldhouse of temporary construction during World War II. These facilities are crowded and inadequate for the Academy's physical education program.

It is proposed to build a new wing to Billiard Hall which will provide more indoor athletic space, as well as the construction of adjacent outdoor athletic fields. In addition, there will be replacement of the heating and plumbing systems, rehabilitation of the electrical system, construction of the first phase of a fieldhouse, alterations of space in Billiard Hall, and the building of roadways and exterior utilities.

All of this is part of a forward planning program which will considerably help to improve the Coast Guard Academy and make it a modern institution for training our youth in this very important service to the Nation.

The U.S. Coast Guard Academy was established in 1876. In the year 1910 it was set up at Fort Trumbull in New London, and in 1932 it was relocated to its present plant. Thus, the Academy has been in New London for the past 53 years. It has become a very important factor in the community and the surrounding area, economically and in other ways.

I have been honored recently when our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, appointed me as a member of the Board of Visitors of the Coast Guard Academy. I am now looking forward to the official visits as a member of the Board to inspect the physical facilities of the institution, the morale of the cadets, and the progress of the modernization and improvement program at the Academy. In due time, we shall report back to Congress our findings and recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, in the interests of national security and the continued need for this specialized training, I strongly urge you and the members of this subcommittee to approve the full budget requested for the Coast Guard Academy for the coming fiscal year. Any reduction of the sum requested will only delay the realization of this program of improvement in the time specified and will hinder the work of the Academy in meeting the Nation's goals prescribed for it.

Report to the People of the Third Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, here is my first report for 1963 to the people of my congressional district, bringing them up to date with factual information on the activities of this Congress:

YOUR WASHINGTON REPORT FROM STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, REPRESENTATIVE, THIRD DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, MARCH 1963

DEAR FRIEND: What actually goes on in Washington? You must often wonder. During my 10 years in Congress, it has always been my policy to keep my constituents fully informed. Now, at a time when you have indicated increasing interest in so many things that bear directly upon your lives and pocketbooks, it has become increasingly difficult for all of you to get an accurate and true picture.

With "managed news"—a situation being widely criticized in the press—it's harder than ever to separate fact from fancy. Assistant Defense Secretary Sylvester has said that deliberate distortion of the news is justified. I disagree—100 percent. Democracy can't work unless the people know the truth.

That's why I've decided to send you a factual, personal report from time to time, discussing public affairs and explaining where I stand, and why.

I'm a member of the House Ways and Means Committee, which must originate all tax and tax-related legislation. In the last Congress, our committee handled the tax, trade, and debt-limit bills, social security and unemployment compensation proposals, customs and excise bills, and other important legislation. Our 25-member committee is currently holding hearings on the President's tax message of 1963.

What about your taxes? The President's new tax proposals are just part of the entire fiscal picture. They must be considered in the light of his evermore lavish spending program. And, although his tax reduction program urges cuts of $13.5 billion over 3 years, his matching tax reform program, to a great extent, is nothing more than the shifting of the tax burden from one group of taxpayers to another. For many Americans, these so-called reforms would actually mean higher taxes.

How about Federal spending? Here are some startling—and alarming—facts you should know: In 1961, the U.S. budget deficit was $3.8 billion. In 1962, Mr. Kennedy's first full year as President, it rose 68 percent to $6.4 billion; for 1963, it will be an estimated $8.8 billion—up another 37 percent. And now, by the President's own estimate, the fiscal 1964 budget will mean an $11.9 billion deficit—up 35 percent again, and 3 times bigger than 1961's.

Remember the story about the bachelor whose blanket was too short to cover his feet? He cut some off the top of the blanket, sewed it on the bottom, and then wondered why the blanket was shorter than ever. This seems to be the way the President's thinking has run on the tax-spending-deficit question. Senator John F. Kennedy, campaigning in Philadelphia on October 31, 1960, promised that "we are pledged to maintain a balanced budget except in times of national emergency or severe recession. Furthermore, we will seek to maintain a budget surplus in times of prosperity, as a brake on inflationary forces." Walter Heller, the President's No. 1 economic adviser, said in 1961 that if the budget deficit ever reached $4 billion, he would recommend "higher taxes to offset the impact of spending," i.e., to prevent inflation.

What has happened here? Both the President and Mr. Heller have said, rightly, that deficits contribute to inflation—and promised that deficits would not be incurred except in national emergency or to stop recession. But, although he does not claim that either situation now exists, the President now proposes not only a tax cut but also this tremendous, inflationary $11.9 billion deficit. Why this switch?

Every time an American child is born, he or she inherits a $1,600 debt liability, his or her share of our staggering $308 billion national debt, highest in history. Treasury Secretary Dillon has said that he will ask Congress to authorize increasing this debt to at least $320 billion. We taxpayers now pay almost $10 billion of deadweight annual interest, with no debt reduction.

Many of you have written to me, supporting my constant demand that the Federal Government curtail needless expenditures. The President's proposals mean more inflation, an unsound dollar, greater drains upon our already strapped gold reserve, an unstable economy and increased unemployment.

Middle-income taxpayers would be hurt by certain of the President's tax reform proposals, for example:

(1) The 5-percent "floor" on itemized deductions: A taxpayer (say his annual income is $7,000) now may take full deductions, if itemized, for mortgage interest and other interest payments, real estate taxes, charitable contributions, and unreimbursed casualty losses. If his total expense here comes to $1,000, he may now deduct it all.

Under the President's proposal, the first $350 (5 percent of the $7,000 income) could not be deducted. The taxpayer could deduct only $650 of the $1,000 he had actually spent for these purposes.

(2) No more 4-percent, $50 dividend income exclusion: In 1954, I voted for the tax law permitting taxpayers to exclude from taxable income a part of their dividend income. This was intended to encourage investment in our Nation's economy, especially by people with limited incomes—and it did. Since 1954, the number of investors has risen from 7,400,000 to 17,100,000, more than double. President Kennedy now wants to repeal this investment growth incentive.

(3) No more $600 exemptions for people over 65: The President's tax reform program would knock out the present extra $600 exemption for people over 65 years of age, yet he publicly pleads for aid to the aging.

(4) Profit-sharing funds taxed as ordinary income: Under the President's plan, the value of your retirement nestegg will be materially reduced. Profit-sharing funds, when withdrawn, would be taxed at ordinary income rates rather than the lower capital gains rates at which such funds are now taxed.

(5) Small estates will be taxed: The President proposes, for example, that a widow, not liable for Federal estate taxes under present law, would be subject to a capital gains tax upon her husband's death, even though no sale of his property has taken place.

I will oppose all five of these Kennedy proposals, because they discriminate against the homeowner, the generous giver, the investor, the elderly person, and the workingman who plans to retire.

Here are some of the constructive proposals I have made:

The Derounian tax-reduction bill, designed not as a flashy "shot-in-the-arm" for a weak economy, but to free a great economic potential from the straitjacket of our punitive tax structure, would reduce personal and corporate tax rates over a 5-year period, provided that the budget be kept in balance.

To keep your tax money from dribbling out "the back door," a term describing administration spending for unauthorized purposes from the Treasury, I've introduced House Resolution 89, assuring congressional control over spending.

The Derounian commuter bill, H.R. 2387, allows deductions for income tax purposes of expenses for transportation to and from work.

Removal of the present 10-percent excise taxes on phone calls and telegrams, on jewelry costing under $5, and on basic cosmetics and other toilet preparations, is another objective of my tax-reduction program. President Truman asked for, and got, these "wartime" taxes on a temporary basis; they should be repealed.

Tax relief for widows is provided by my bill which states that a widow 65 or older may sell or exchange the home in which she has lived, without including the gain therefrom in her gross taxable income, if the home is worth $30,000 or less.

The Derounian school prayer amendment has been introduced as House Joint Resolution 29, an amendment to the Constitution authorizing the States to permit the offering in any public school or any other public place of the same simple, nondenominational prayer used in New York State's schools until the Supreme Court forbade it: "Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our country."

The right to a secret strike ballot is essential to protect labor union members and the public against arbitrary exercise of power by union bosses. I have proposed legislation requiring majority approval, by secret ballot of the union membership involved, before a strike may be called. In addition, I am one of the cosponsors of the comprehensive civil rights bill introduced in Congress.

Removal of the limitation on outside income for social security recipients is proposed in another of my bills, permitting senior citizens to earn what they can while receiving social security benefits they have paid for over the years. The Social Security Act was never intended to prohibit people from working—to force older people into unwanted idleness. Equally important, their living costs keep rising, without comparable increases in their social security benefits.

What's going to be done about Soviet-occupied Cuba? On February 7, President Kennedy, speaking of dangerous situations, said "I cannot set down any time in which I can clearly see the end to the Castro regime. I believe it is going to come, but I couldn't possibly give a time limit." Yet Senator Kennedy pledged in 1960 that "we must let Mr. Khrushchev know that we are permitting no expansion of his foothold in our hemisphere."

Are we going to have to live with the Soviets in Cuba indefinitely? Our President says that the Russian planes, tanks, guns and missiles there are all of a defensive character, and therefore no threat to us or to Latin American nations. The Russian troops? They are technicians. I say they are technical experts in subversion, now fanning out from Cuba to all of Latin America.

Has President Kennedy made another Yalta deal with Khrushchev? Why is it that we do not now insist, as we once did, upon onsite inspection of Red missile bases in Cuba? Have we promised not to invade Cuba? Why have we been withdrawing our missiles from around the world? Why have we reduced our nuclear testing requirements to a very dangerous minimum, about which we have been warned by Dr. Edward Teller, the world's outstanding nuclear physicist?

What are the answers to these questions? Only the President and his advisers know, and they aren't letting you and me in on the secret.

We do know that the world situation won't ease until the Russians are made to get out of Cuba. We do know that we can't tolerate the presence of the second most powerful—and exclusively Communist—military force in this hemisphere, just 6 jet minutes from Miami. The American people, if told the facts, can face any situation with courage and determination. The President must face it, too.

I supported the extension of the draft, as absolutely necessary to our national defense in these perilous times.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities, prime target of U.S. Reds and their sympathizers, won another overwhelming victory as its 1963 funds were voted by a vast bipartisan majority in the House. Only 20 Democratic Members voted "nay." I voted for this appropriation, because I believe that the committee has helped to alert the American people to the dangers of subversion in the United States.

I opposed the President's effort to "pack" the House Rules Committee by adding to its membership.

Backers of President Kennedy's "revised" medicare proposal rarely mention cost, but its cost will determine whether or not the whole social security system goes bankrupt. Even the higher 1963 taxable wage base of $5,000 would bring in only about $1.5 billion annually to finance medicare—but medicare cost estimates go as high as $7 billion per year.

How much can you afford? Right now, without medicare, just under 10 percent of a man's pay, in employer-employee contributions, goes to social security taxes. Take a man with a wife and four children, earning $4,000 a year. He pays $5 income tax—but $145 social security tax. Can he afford the added tax burden of medicare? Can you?

I am in favor of medical care for the aged, but not the President's plan. I voted for the Kerr-Mills law, a Democratic-sponsored proposal now in successful operation in New York and most other States. I will support any responsible plan of improvement if done through the private sector of our economy. We have the finest medical system in the world. Why toss it into the ashcan for a will-o'-the-wisp socialized medicine program that means lower quality medical care, on a compulsory basis, at tremendous additional cost to the American people?

When you come to Washington, please try to include a visit with me at my office, No. 1627 in the New House Office Building, across the street from the Capitol. I'll see to it that you will get passes for the sessions of Congress, and I will be happy to arrange visits to the FBI and other places of interest in the Federal Government.

And I look forward to meeting and chatting with you.

In the meantime, your views on any issue will be most welcome. Your letter will receive my immediate attention and a prompt reply.

Your Congressman,

STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN.

Midwinter Conference of Reserve Officers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday evening the 1st of March many of the Members of the Congress and the leaders of our military services joined the Reserve Officers Association of the United States at the Reserve Officers Association's annual midwinter banquet. This banquet climaxes a 3-day midwinter conference of the leaders of this association who come here from throughout the United States and oversea theaters to discuss matters of vital importance to them and to our national defense.

This was a particularly significant meeting for many reasons. First, this association gathered to do honor to one of the Members of the Congress who had given great and outstanding service to the cause of national defense before his death only this last fall. The Reserve Officers Association gave to the widow of the late Dennis Chavez, one-time Member of this House, its annual Minute Man Award as the citizen who has contributed most to national defense. Many of us recall the outstanding service of the late Mr. Chavez in the House and later in the other body and it was our privilege to join in honoring his memory and paying our respects to his lovely widow.

The occasion also marked the award by Reserve Officers Association of its Chaplain of the Year citation to Lt. Col. Maurice Kleinberg, who flew to Washington from his post of duty in Korea, to receive this award and to receive the recognition of all those hundreds who were present and who also were happy and privileged to do him honor.

Also, in the group was a representative party from the Confederation of Inter-Allied Officers representing the countries who joined with the United States under the Atlantic Pact in a mutual treaty of defense. This group was lead by His Royal Highness, Prince Peter of Greece, who appeared in the United States as a lieutenant colonel in the Greek Army Reserve.

Prince Peter's brief remarks to the banquet stirred us all and made us all aware of the deep commitment of the NATO Allies including especially our friends from the European countries who have fought by our side in the past to the cause which our great Nation is committed.

Prior to the banquet the national officers of the Reserve Officers Association together with Prince Peter and the other 12 officers from the European countries were received at the White House where President Kennedy, Maj. Gen. John H. Foster, the president of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States and Prince Peter, as president of the Confederation of Inter-Allied Reserve Officers—NATO, exchanged their views of their mutual commitment to this program of allied effort for the peace and security of the Western World.

Mr. Speaker, because these events do and will have a lasting effect on our security and because of the fact that all of these events have some significance in our current history, I am presenting for publication in the Record, the remarks of the various individuals involved in these happenings.

I should like to point out that the principal speaker at the banquet on last Friday evening was the great majority leader of this House, the Honorable Carl Albert, of Oklahoma. Mr. Albert's remarks were a simple and outstanding tribute to the cause for which the Reserve Officers Association works and to which all of us as Members of the Congress are committed. I am asking these various remarks to be presented in the order in which they were given.

Remarks of His Royal Highness Prince Peter of Greece and Denmark, Lieutenant Colonel of the Greek Army Reserve, and President of the Confederation of Inter-Allied Reserve Officers, Before the Annual Midwinter Banquet of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, March 1, 1963, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Secretary of State for the Army, Mr. Secretary of State for the Navy, admirals, generals, fellow officers, ladies and gentlemen: The cold war is a tragic event, but it has had this advantage, that it has brought us together. It has brought us together, us from the old countries of Europe and you the extension of Europe into this continent and we are proud that you should be an extension from our continent, because fancy what it would be if the Chinese had got here first. And because you are an extension from us, you have, after the last war with the tragic events of the Second World War and with the enormous development of armaments, been drawn into the inevitable vortex of world affairs to which we in Europe have been used to for many centuries. Especially us who live in the southeast part of Europe, in Greece, where for 2,500 years already, we have been in the frontline of the East-West conflicts. Unfortunately situated at a crossroad between three continents of Europe, Africa, and Asia, we have first already in the fifth century, B.C., repulsed the advance of central Asian hordes, and as you know the Persian wars against Greece were halted at Marathon, Salamis, and Plataea. Then with Alexander the Great we pushed back Asia as far as India and thus allowed Rome to develop in the Mediterranean, which eventually took over from us.

I should say that our relations with yours are very much those of the ancient city-states of Greece, or the Hellenistic states and of the Roman Empire. They bear a parallel I think which exists today. After the fall of the Roman Empire, Byzantium carried on the struggle guarding Europe against the East and it was only with the fall of Constantinople in the 15th century that we were eventually overrun, but this advance of the central Asians caused the expansion of Europe overseas and in this way was this continent peopled.

With the last war we have again come back to the same situation. Our civilization of the West versus that of central Asia today, represented by the Soviet Union, and the struggle thus goes on with weapons, which we never had before, which oblige us on both sides of the Atlantic to try to avoid an open conflict with our hereditary enemies because of the terrible effect that this would have, and in his cold war I think the role of Reserve officers has changed from what it was before because the reserves must be ready much quicker and be on their toes continually.

The Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, who received me yesterday and I was honored to be received by him, mentioned to me how much he thought it was important that Reserves were ready immediately and available at any moment's notice. And thus again in the tradition of the citizen-soldier of the city-states of Greece, where Demonthenes, Xenophon, where Epaminodas fought in the front ranks of the city-states army, we the reserves must be ready at any moment to help, especially in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and that is why we are so pleased and privileged to have been been invited over here to see how your organization works.

The last 2 days have been very important, very interesting for us. We go back with a feeling, when we go to Europe, that we should like to work in closer with you; and that our organization, the CIOR, of which I am privileged to be the president for 2 years, is entirely at your disposal to tighten the bond between us for this common defense.

Remarks of Gen. James E. Frank, U.S. Army Reserve, National Vice President of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States in Presenting the Chaplain of the Year Award to Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Maurice S. Kleinberg

The chaplain to whom I am honored to make this presentation has flown here, especially to receive this award, from Korea where he is now serving his second tour. He is a man of considerable intellectual attainment and has served in several pulpits throughout this country. He is currently assigned to Headquarters 8th Army in Korea and has served the Army well in the Office of the Chief of Army Chaplains and also in the Military District of Washington. I would like to now read the award from the Reserve Officers Association of the United States:

"AN ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION, WITH RESPECT TO THE SERVICE OF CHAPLAIN (LT. COL.) MAURICE S. KLEINBERG

"Whereas, Maurice S. Kleinberg, an officer and leader in the Chaplain Corps in the Military Force of the United States has at personal sacrifice and with exemplary devotion to duty given unselfishly of himself, his talents, and his energies, to provide meaningful spiritual development in the Armed Forces, and has contributed substantially to the welfare of personnel both in precept and example: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this association awards to Chaplain Kleinberg, in meaningful recognition and sincere gratitude to him as representative of the corps this citation as Chaplain of the Year.

"For the association, the national council, March 1, 1963,

"John H. Foster,
"*Major General, Air Force Reserve, National President,*
"John T. Carlton,
"*Colonel, U.S. Army Reserve, Executive Director.*"

It gives me a great deal of pleasure, Chaplain Kleinberg, to present this award to you in the name of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States and particularly as representative of the Army section of this great association.

Address of Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Maurice S. Kleinberg in Response to Chaplain-of-the-Year Award by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States Annual Minuteman Banquet, March 1, 1963

Honored guests, I don't know when it will come to my lot again to address such an august gathering as this and I have completely forgotten the protocol. There are altogether so many dignitaries, so many great people, members of the Armed Forces, beginning with the Secretary of the Army and other Secretaries of services, we have the Congress with us, we have the Senate with us, we have almost every dignitary you can about imagine.

I am like the old prophet who looked out upon a great audience once and he said, "I am astounded and confounded, dazed and amazed."

I couldn't anticipate what would be in my lot tonight and I am really surprised despite the fact that I've known of this award for some time.

I am sure I can't read the manuscript in front of me because the light shining in my unphotographic countenance, and so I am going to extemporize to you tonight and bring you a message that I feel keenly ought to be said to such a tremendous and influential group as this.

Some of you men who have been in the service long before I have, remember the time when the chaplain had difficulty establishing his position. In fact, nobody knew quite what to do with the chaplains in the service. There was a time, I was told, when the chaplain had to be the special service officer on the side. He had to be in charge of some athletic functions. Yes, sometimes even to be in charge of monitoring the post exchange activity.

I am happy to tell you tonight that that has long been changed.

The chaplain's work and the chaplain's service has been recognized as it is tonight by the generous award of the Reserve Officers Association in giving annually a chaplain's citation.

I think this is tremendously important because it represents a tremendous amount of progress in appreciation of the value of religious forces in our great and glorious country.

The chaplain has found his place. He is welcome and there isn't a commanding officer today worth his salt who doesn't appreciate the position of the chaplain and his value on the training team of young men who serve in the Armed Forces of our country and who serve under circumstances where their character is being challenged, their emotions are being in a state of upheaval and all the rest of their background is being disturbed.

The chaplain functions as a builder of character, as a guardian of the basics of this great and glorious country.

Now, I want to say that it is because we have had high standards in the chaplains' branch beginning with the Chiefs of Chaplains, who have set up the standard that they would not compromise with, and they have set up and they have programed for the finest interfaith activity that we enjoy in this country.

They have established an esprit de corps where rabbis, priests, ministers, march shoulder to shoulder under the motto of cooperation without compromise.

It is the greatest opportunity for a young clergyman to find life unfolding in the full; rich and poor live side by side, the races, the colors, and the creeds are mingled, as we find the finest and the best in each individual.

This is the job of the chaplain; this is the job of religious forces in our great and glorious services; and this is the privilege that has been mine to be a part of throughout these many years.

I want here publicly to give expression of thanksgiving to those Chiefs of Chaplains beginning with Chaplain Dr. Ivan L. Bennett, Msgr. Patrick J. Ryan, Rev. Dr. Frank A. Toby, and our present Chief of Chaplains, who happens to be with us, Chaplain (Maj. Gen.) Charles E. Brown, Jr.

Those men have offered me in my career as a chaplain an opportunity to test my strength and to test my faith, and I am grateful to them for the opportunities for service which they have given me over these many years.

I want to say here and now that it is a great privilege to bear this honor tonight and I trust that I shall deserve it as my career goes on. I hope that all of us together may go from strength to strength so that we may be a part of expanding the free world where men can grow from being brother's brother to becoming our brother's brother's brother.

House Majority Leader Carl Albert, of Oklahoma, Before Reserve Officers Association Banquet

Mr. President, Mrs. Chavez, Mr. Secretary Vance, Mr. Secretary Korth, Senator Russell, Chairman Vinson, General Lemay, General Wheeler, Prince Peter and fellow reservists of the Confederation of Inter-allied Reserve Officers, ladies, fellow Members of Congress and fellow members of the Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

We gather here tonight in the name of the Nation's Minute Man—the symbol of every citizen's commitment to serve his country in war and in peace—to do honor to a tradition, and to pay tribute to those who have helped to build this tradition.

We of the Reserve Officers Association, now in its 41st year, take pride in our contribution toward the building of "a military policy which will provide adequate national security."

Our organization strives to implement this goal in both the national and international areas, through the use of conventional methods and again through such innovations as its grassroots exchange program with the European allies of the United States.

It is an honor to have with us tonight Prince Peter of Greece and Denmark, who is also a lieutenant colonel in the Greek Army Reserve, and the president of the Confederation of Inter-allied Reserve Officers.

He has been accompanied to the United States by 11 CIOR leaders from European nations. It has been a unique and valuable experience to have had these outstanding allied officers with us for the ROA conference and banquet. We have gained much from their visit which will contribute to the establishment of greater understanding and harmony among reserve leaders and ultimately toward the strengthening of the free world alliance.

Many of us in this room have served in uniform, some of us have served in the Congress, and some of us have served and are serving in both the legislative and the military branches of the Government.

Many years ago we were reminded by a great citizen-soldier—George Washington—that "when we assume the soldier, we do not put aside the citizen."

Those who are here as civilians, those who are here as professional military men and women, and those who are here as Reserve officers, can say they fully share in an understanding of that dual responsibility in their lives.

The implementation of this responsibility is the primary goal of this association.

The Reserve Officers Association since its inception has consistently sought to focus both public and governmental attention upon our national requirements for modern, well-trained and well-equipped, Ready Reserves. This has never been an easy assignment. In the post World War I period, the public tendency was to look away from the need for military preparedness, toward a more pacific way of life, even toward disarmament. Again, after World War II, there still remained, although to a lesser degree, some apathy toward sustained reservist readiness.

The experience of Korea prompted the Reserve Officers Association to ask for the development of high priority, instantly ready for action, fit and trained Reserves—available for call within the hour. The state of world affairs since that time has accentuated the need for this kind of readiness. There is not, within the foreseeable future, a time when we will have no requirement for a competent Reserve force.

One of the former national presidents of ROA, present tonight, as long as 8 years ago urged that a limited force be selected, organized, trained, and equipped.

The administration's new programs, about which we have heard so much lately and about which there has been some misunderstanding, had their inception in our association's programs.

The Reserves have changed and are changing—the military equation overall has changed—and we must respond accordingly.

In the words of General MacArthur, the Reserves became "truly professional in World War II."

Military capabilities and requirements being what they are today, nothing short of a truly professional standard of training would enable the Reserves to function in a crisis. For that reason it is desirable that the patterns of the regular services and the Reserves be almost identical—since in crisis their missions will be identical.

More than a decade after World War II, the active forces of the military still included within their temporary structure reservists who constituted a majority of the officer corps on duty. It was in this period that the career reservist came into being.

The changed makeup of our overall military strength, both regular and reserve, and the importance of both to our national defense, make it incumbent upon the Congress in writing legislation to provide for their equal treatment under the law.

The Reserve Officers Association had a share in the development of the one-Army concept—which, of course, applies to the other services as well, and in the same manner and spirit. The Reserve Officers Association read the signs of the times and acted accordingly. An articulate spokesman for the modern Army was Gen. Bruce Clarke, who is with us tonight. General Clarke was among the first to advocate the one-Army concept.

The broad base of our citizen-reservist forces must be maintained. I know that President Kennedy is going to see that it is maintained. I know that the military leaders and the leaders of the Congress who are here tonight—and those who are not here—are going to see that it is maintained.

We have heard some suggestions about the ROTC programs. The ROTC units are the wellsprings for the development of competent military personnel. They also must keep pace with modern-day concepts.

Far from abandoning our high school and college ROTC programs, we should foster and encourage their role in preparing our young men to participate in the defense of our country.

The role of the Reserve, its importance within our overall defense effort, and our entire concept of preparedness, all of which mean so much to the security of the free world today, have had many great champions in the Congress of the United States. Among these, few have played such a significant part over so long a period of time, as the great national leader to whose memory we pay tribute tonight.

The career of Senator Dennis Chavez in the Congress had many distinctions but none more noteworthy than his commitment to the cause of strength as the path to peace and security.

His legacy to unborn generations cannot be measured.

His image will remain as real to us as that of the minuteman whose symbolic cloak it is our privilege to drape about him.

Before I read the resolution which our association has addressed to honor the memory of this great man, I would like to ask his beloved companion and helpmate, Mrs. Chavez, to stand beside me.

"Whereas, throughout his lifetime, (a) his devotion to the purest concept of duty to country; (b) the nobility of his purpose in leadership for adequate national security; (c) the steadfastness of his dedication to the citizen-reservist tradition; (d) the clarity of his judgment to insure strength, effectiveness, and high morale in the Nations military force, have given confidence to his generation, inspiration to posterity, and safety to this Nation's institutions and ideals: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That in the name of the minuteman, whose genius in patriotism gave our citizens the will to exist as a free people, in recognition of his great service to the United States, the Reserve Officers Association dedicates to the memory of Dennis Chavez its annual minuteman award as the citizen whose career contributed most to the national security of these times."

In the name of our association, it is with a deep sense of privilege—and it is my sincere personal pleasure—to present to you, Mrs. Chavez, this award.

Remarks of Senator Leverett Saltonstall Before the Reserve Officers Association of the United States Annual Minuteman Banquet, March 1, 1963

General Foster, Mrs. Chavez and Dennis Chavez' family, Chaplain Dummet, Colonel Kleinberg, Secretaries of the Services, my colleagues in the House and the Senate of Congress, officers of our armed services, Reserve officers and their ladies, and the Reserve and members of the confederation of Reserve officers from abroad, it is a great honor for me to be asked to respond on behalf of the lovely widow of Dennis Chavez to the honor that has just been presented in his memory, a citizen who has contributed most to national security.

Truly, Dennis Chavez has contributed most all of his life to the national security.

Because while he was born in humble circumstances in New Mexico, he worked hard to get an education and he succeeded in getting sufficient education to come to Washington and take over a small position in the U.S. Senate while he worked to get his degree as a lawyer from Georgetown University.

Eleven years later he came to Congress, in 1931, and there he has been practically all the rest of his life.

What appealed to me most about Dennis Chavez was his patriotism and his insistence on building our national security.

We served together as members of the Senate Appropriations Committee on Defense.

He was chairman of that committee and I was a senior minority member for a number of years, I think 6 years. During that time we became fast friends.

Now his concern also was for the welfare of the military man—his housing, the hospital facilities, the opportunities to carry out the good family life and especially to see that he was adequately paid for his services.

Dennis Chavez' concern was more for the personalities that were concerned with the military, perhaps even more than the procurement and other parts of providing for our services.

And then too, what appealed to me was his concern for the small men, the private and the corporal in the military services and the small industry, the small leader in industry throughout the country.

I know I remember of one instance where a small manufacturer with plants in New Jersey and Massachusetts, far from New Mexico, was being put out of business because of the product that came from Japan.

So Dennis Chavez did much to put into the act the provision of "buy America," and incidentally, in the case of that industrial leader, he found that after he had this "buy America" in, the product of that man was better than the product that they were getting from Japan.

During our service together we had many friendly discussions. We grew to have respect for each other's opinions. At times we disagreed, but not often, and when we disagreed we always worked in a calm quiet manner to settle and compromise on our differences of opinion.

And so, when Dennis was no longer with us this year, I felt that I had lost a real friend.

And I have got to continue in the days to come my discussion with Mrs. Chavez to reach a conclusion on a question that Dennis and I were never able to decide.

We discussed many times whether the Spanish from whom he was descended came up through Mexico into New Mexico before the Anglo Saxons from whom I've descended came into Plymouth and Salem in Massachusetts.

So, Mrs. Chavez, you and I have something to discuss in the future and it is a great honor and privilege for me to respond in behalf of Mrs. Chavez to this very distinguished award which was given to your late husband, a gentleman whom we will always remember in the U.S. Senate as a patriot and a lover of his country and a fine, fine public servant in the best sense of that word.

An Amendment To Lower the Draft Age to 22

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, next week when H.R. 2438, a bill to extend the Universal Training and Service Act for another 4 years, comes up for action before the House, it is my intention to introduce an amendment which would reduce the draft age to 22.

Under existing law, all young men, ages 18½ to 26, must register under the selective service program.

Testimony before the Armed Services Committee during 2 days of hearings on this very important bill discloses that while there are more than 10 million American youths now registered under the draft and while an additional 1,500,000 more young men who reach the registration age of 18½ annually are added to the list of those eligible for the draft, only 76,000 American youths are expected to be drafted during the current fiscal year. Assistant Defense Secretary Norman Paul, the Pentagon manpower chief, estimated that about 90,000 young men would be drafted during each of the next 4 years if current Army strength is maintained.

It appears to me somewhat cruel and illogical to subject more than 10 million American young men to the shadow of the draft for a period of 7½ years when we only take an infinitesimal fraction of these young men into the Army every year.

It might be well to point out that of the 76,000 young men who will be drafted this fiscal year, nearly half of those drafted will have volunteered for induction so that actually, Mr. Speaker, we are drafting into military service in this country at this time 38,000 young Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure we are all very much impressed with the depth of concern and understanding President Kennedy has shown for the young people of America. The President has proposed various programs to Congress to try to alleviate the problems of unemployment among young people in this Nation.

It is significant to note that out of 4 million people unemployed in this country, 800,000 of these are young men of draft age. These young men constitute the largest single group of unemployed in this country, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Selective Service Act in its present form has seriously contributed toward this large rate of unemployment among our young people.

As a member of the House Committee on Labor, I have had an opportunity to study this entire subject of unemployment among our young people; and several witnesses, men high in this Government, have agreed that employers are reluctant to hire young men of draft age for two basic reasons:

First. An employer is reluctant to invest in the training of a young worker whom he will lose to the military service within a relatively short time.

Second. Employers do not like to commit themselves to keeping a job open for 2 years, as required under the law, when a young man is drafted into the service.

This second point is extremely important to remember. I have talked to employers who have stated they could reconcile themselves to the idea that when they hire a man of draft age they may lose him to the military but their great objection is that when this young worker does go into the service, the employer must freeze this job for 2 years so that it will be available to the young man when he returns from military service. If an employer hires another worker to fill the gap, he is confronted with a difficult decision of either carrying both these workers when the selectee returns or dismissing the second worker, even though his work may be acceptable.

I have talked to many young men in my district of 1–A status who have told me the first question they are asked when they apply for a job is their draft status. These young men have stated that when they tell a potential employer they are 1–A, they are politely told that there is no work available for them.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with human beings, not chattels, in this legislation. These are young Americans who I am sure are perfectly willing to make whatever sacrifices are necessary, just as have their forebears, in the defense of freedom and survival of America. I do not know of a single young man who has tried to intentionally or willfully shirk his responsibility to his country. On the contrary, many of these young men have come to me and stated they want to volunteer for military service so they can get their 2 years over with as quickly as possible; but in many instances throughout the country, even those who want to volunteer for the 2-year enlistment under the draft have to wait for a very long time before sufficient quota numbers are available for 2-year voluntary enlistment.

It appears to me that the amendment which I intend to offer would in no way disturb the present Defense Establishment. My amendment provides that:

> After July 1, 1963, no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces pursuant to this Act except as provided in section 4(l) and section 6(h) of this title, after he has attained the age of 22 years. This paragraph shall not apply during any period of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President.

It is clear from this amendment that the stimulus which the Defense Department claims it needs to encourage young Americans to volunteer for military service would remain. Certainly those Americans between the ages of 18½ and 22 who do not want to take their chance on being drafted would continue to volunteer for any of the defense services as they do at the present time.

Under my amendment, any time the President felt we needed more young men than are being drafted, he could restore this act to its original status with all of its present provisions simply by declaring the need for a return to the original legislation.

My amendment in no way disturbs the present system of deferments, and those young men who want to go on to college to continue their education would continue getting the same deferments as they do under existing law.

The only change that would occur under my amendment is that an estimated 2,500,000 Americans who now must wait before they are called up for duty would be exempt after they reach the age of 22.

The practical effect of this amendment would be that those young Americans who are not called up for military duty before they reach their 22d birthday could then proceed to plan their

lives in an orderly manner and could also have new job opportunities made available to them. They would remain registered under the draft, however, for any possible national emergency when, of course, all Americans would respond.

Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the argument presented by the Defense Department that any changes in the present Selective Service System would reduce the voluntary enlistments which constitute the overwhelming majority of our military personnel.

Secretary Paul told the Armed Services Committee that it is the local obligation for military service that has enabled the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps to maintain their strength for years without using the draft, and for the Army to maintain a force of five volunteers to each draftee in recent years. Mr. Paul believes that without the spur of the draft, the armed services would be unable to fill the National Guard and Reserve ranks, the ROTC route to officer status, or get enough doctors and dentists to care for the men in uniform.

It would appear to me that my amendment would in no way disturb this conclusion. But my amendment would help the military get the type of soldier it needs more efficiently.

It should be a source of great concern to us that out of 1,110,000 Americans who became 26 years old last year, 300,000 or 27 percent were ruled physically or mentally unfit under our present service requirements; 11 percent or 130,000 were permanently deferred because they were fathers; and 40,000 or 4 percent held student or other deferments.

While it is true that 640,000 or 58 percent of this group of 1,110,000 who became 26 had had or were undergoing military service, this particular group represents less than 60 percent of the total. From these figures we gather that as these men become older, their potential use to the Armed Forces diminishes in direct proportion.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that our present policy of drafting men up to the age of 26 is wasteful and creates indescribable sociological problems in this country.

It is wasteful because I am sure we can all agree that a man in his middle 20's does not have the stamina to stand up to basic military training as the young man in his teens. Under present law we are faced with this dilemma of providing the military with selectees whose average age gets higher every year, when in the modern Armed Forces of America the great need is for younger men with greater stamina. It is unfortunate that the Pentagon has not been able, or willing, to face up to this reality.

If we are to talk about inequities under the present act, I should like to cite a figure which appeared in the Washington Post on March 6, which revealed a total of 123,000 men above the age of 26 who now hold no deferment of any kind but are not being called because the Army wants younger men. These men who are put near the potential of the induction priority system escaped induction at the normal 23-year-old induction age because they then held deferments and did not lose them until they were past 26.

Mr. Speaker, the present act imposes an unfair burden on draft boards throughout America. These draft boards realize the tremendous backlog of potential selectees that is building up in their respective communities. It is entirely conceivable that these draft boards would want to draft younger men to meet the modern needs of the services. However, under the present law the draft board has no choice but to take the selectees off the top, and as a result, older men are being called up.

Recently my attention was called to a directive sent out by the State selective service director in Illinois, in which he urged local draft boards to be as lenient as possible in granting deferments because of the tremendous backlog of potential selectees that is being built up in this one State alone. His directive stated that as of last September, there were 60,000 young men registered under the draft in the State of Illinois between the ages of 18½ and 26 classified as 1–A. The State's draft quota has been averaging around 260 selectees for the entire State of Illinois, and half of this monthly quota was being filled by volunteers. We are receiving several thousand new registrants every month, and so the State director called this problem to the attention of local draft boards. He pointed out in his directive that the State of Illinois was compelled to select men at the age of 23, 24, and 25 to fill the meager State quota when in fact the military is asking for younger men.

I am sure the same problem exists in every State in the Union.

Under the amendment which I intend to propose, it is true that younger men would be selected. But it is also true that those who are not called by the time they reach their 22d birthday would in fact be able to plan their future in a more orderly manner unless some major catastrophe besets this country.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment will not in any way interfere with the present impetus to get volunteers. However, I would not be fair with myself and my constituents if I did not take this opportunity to register a strong protest against the manner in which the Defense Department has been conducting its recruitment program.

In this period of labor surplus in America, I feel sure thousands more of our young men would give serious consideration to voluntary enlistments in the military service if the recruiting program was being carried out in a more effective manner. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that some of the recruiting practices now border on sheer fraud, and the word has gotten around to the young men in this country that those fancy posters which the military uses to induce enlistments too often cannot be believed.

Just the other day I had one of my constituents fly to Washington from Germany at his own expense. I believe he told me it cost him $390 of his own money for air passage to fly to Washington during his furlough to try to unscramble his mixed up military career. This young man volunteered a year and a half ago under the 3-year voluntary enlistment program, which has as its slogan, "Choice—not chance." This young man was attracted to voluntary service because he had been told if he volunteers for 3 years, he can select his assignment and the school he wants to attend. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that I must report to this House that during the past year and a half, while stationed in Germany, this young man's glamorous assignment was to serve as an orderly in a recreation barracks. It should come as no surprise that under these circumstances, a soldier can become very bitter and pose serious discipline problems to the military.

I have any number of letters, and I am sure other Members have similar letters, from young men who have been attracted to the military service by these fine slogans and multicolored signs on how one can get a career in the military service—only to find when they signed on the dotted line, that they were misled.

If the military wants to increase voluntary enlistments, let the Defense Department take a hard look at its recruiting practices and let it assure young Americans that the least they can do is have faith and confidence in the integrity of the military service for which they volunteer.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm hope that the House will face up to the problem we have in America today. The Armed Services Committee itself admits that surely by 1967, basic changes will have to be made in this entire approach of selective service. Their own statistics show that by that time the post-World War II bumper baby crop will have reached military age, and there will be far more men available than the Armed Forces of the present size could use, allowing for father, student, and other deferment policies.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we need not wait 4 years. The House ought to face up to the problem today because we already have more than 10 million men whose lives are being seriously disrupted. I do not know of a single one of these young men who would want to avoid his responsibility to his country, and I am sure these young men are not seeking any avoidance of their military responsibility. But the point is crystal clear that it is a mathematical impossibility for these young men to be called up during their early years because of a system that is erroneous in its basic premise. Millions of these young men cannot make adequate plans for the future.

I served in World War II. I volunteered long before Pearl Harbor and so, Mr. Speaker, I never was a part of the draft. Should this Nation go to war again, I certainly would not hesitate to again offer my services. I mention this merely to emphasize that I am fully aware of the great sacrifice men who serve our country make, and I have the highest respect for these men. But keeping the draft age in its present form from 18½ to 26 in my judgment does not serve the best interest of the country and creates not only unemployment problems, but to a certain extent, Mr.

Speaker, accelerates our rate of juvenile delinquency. It would not surprise me one bit to find a direct correlation between this inability to get jobs among young men, on the one hand, and their decision through restlessness to follow a path to young delinquency.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the committee will accept the amendment, particularly since the President can negate this action at any time he feels that a reduction in draft age is either impeding voluntary enlistments or there exists a need for larger numbers for military personnel. We are the only nation in the world that drafts men into the Army at the ripe age of 26; all other nations draft their soldiers at much lower ages. Is it not time we ended this foolishness and folly? I hope we do by adopting my amendment.

SENATE

Friday, March 8, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in this moment of quietness, hushing all discordant noises, that we may hear Thy voice, we would ponder the pattern our lives are weaving, as we bow in Thy searching presence, O God, unto whom all hearts are open, and from whom no desires or secrets are hid.

When in the light of Thy righteousness and truth we examine ourselves, our hearts are filled with regret and discontent, for we confess with sorrow that we have so often missed the shining marks of our high calling which beckon us even from the valley of defeat.

Yet even in all our failure to attain, we are lured by the haunting creed that life is capacity for the excellent. Help us to make it a pursuit of the best, and, casting aside all counsels of despair, to press on with buoyant feet, firm in the faith that for ourselves, our Nation, and our world, the best is yet to be in a golden tomorrow for all mankind.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. **Mansfield**, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 7, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. **Mansfield**, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. **Mansfield**, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces the following appointments.

To the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy: Senators **Pastore**, **Kefauver**, and **Keating**.

To the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy: Senators **Robertson**, **Bartlett**, and **Beall**.

To the Board of Visitors to the Air Force Academy: Senators **Holland**, **Humphrey**, and **Goldwater**.

To the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy: Senator **Bayh**.

To the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy: Senator **Dodd**.

To the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board: Senators **Magnuson** (4-year term) and **Prouty** (2-year term).

To the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission: Senator **Neuberger**.

To the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: Senators **Ervin**, **Mundt**, and **Muskie**.

To the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission: Senators **Ellender**, **Long** of Louisiana, **Cooper**, **Morton**, **Eastland**, **Stennis**, **Kefauver**, and **Gore**.

To the Senate Office Building Commission: Senators **Jordan** of North Carolina, **Cannon**, and **Dirksen**.

To the National Memorial Stadium Commission: Senators **Hartke** and **Dominick**.

To the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures: Senators Long of Louisiana, vice Senator Kerr, deceased, and Saltonstall, vice Senator Dirksen, resigned.

To the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission: Senator **Hruska**, to fill the vacancy caused by the expiration of the term as Senator of Mr. Capehart.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT OF 1963

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein)*, That this general assembly respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'Article—

" 'Section 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" ' "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the Legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

" ' "Sec. 2. This Article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission" '; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of Illinois to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representativs of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Adopted by the Senate, January 29, 1963.

"Samuel H. Shapiro,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Edward E. Ferrandes,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"Concurred in by the House of Representatives, March 5, 1963.

"John W. Lewis, Jr.,
"*Speaker of House of Representatives.*
"Fredric B. Selcke,
"*Clerk of House of Representatives.*"

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Concurrent Resolution Q–1

"Concurrent resolution requesting Congress to investigate and study the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the U.S. Department of State

"Whereas all Americans are disturbed about conflicting reports and contradictory policies emanating from the State Department of the United States in these times of recurring crisis; and

"Whereas the U.S. House of Representatives has before it for consideration House Resolution 104 authorizing and directing their Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a

full and complete investigation and study of the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments and the personnel practices of the Department of State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota respectfully requests the 88th Congress of the United States, to authorize its House Foreign Affairs Committee to conduct an investigation and study the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the U.S. Department of State; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State forward copies of this resolution to our congressional delegation, and to the chairman of the House of Representatives Rules Committee.

"Stanley Sangrant,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Gerald L. Stair,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*
"Frank A. Winstrom,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Howard F. Doherty,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA STATE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, recently Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman announced the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.7 cents per pound. This announcement came as good news to cotton farmers for it means their income will be sustained.

There have been attempts by some who want prices dropped to say that farmers were not pleased with the action holding the support price at this level. Nothing could be further from the truth. Farmers in South Carolina well remember the "sliding down" price-support program under former Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson. They have not forgotten what it did to their income.

Anyone doubting South Carolina's satisfaction with Secretary Freeman's price-support program for cotton should read the senate resolution adopted and approved by the South Carolina Senate March 5 commending Secretary Freeman for his program and clearly pointing out the material importance of this resolution to our State and cotton farmers for whom he has done so much.

Mr. President, in this connection I send to the desk this senate resolution and ask that it be printed in the Record along with my remarks on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. **Thurmond**].

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Senate Resolution 190

Senate resolution to express the appreciation of the members of the Senate of the State of South Carolina to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32 and 47 hundredths cent per pound

Whereas cotton farmers will take a 10 percent reduction in the 1963 cotton acreage allotment and there is all indication that the cotton production cost per acre will continue at high or higher levels than the 1962 crop; and

Whereas it is becoming increasingly difficult for family size farms to exist and provide the necessities of life for such families; and

Whereas the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture has announced the 1963 support rate on Middling 1-inch upland cotton as 32.47 cents per pound and this decision of the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, is of material importance to cotton producers of South Carolina and the economy of the State; and

Whereas any reduction from this base support price would be punitive to the State's cotton growers and general economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate, That the members of the Senate of the State of South Carolina express appreciation to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate and to each Senator from South Carolina and to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 1048. A bill to amend section 5899 of title 10, United States Code, to provide permanent authority under which Naval Reserve officers in the grade of captain shall be eligible for consideration for promotion when their running mates are eligible for consideration for promotion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 1049. A bill relating to the Indian heirship land problem; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. **Church** when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1050. A bill to make permanent the provisions of law authorizing certain suspension of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mrs. **Neuberger** when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. **Bartlett**, Mr. **Ervin**, Mr. **McCarthy**, Mr. **McGee**, Mr. **Moss**, Mr. **Mundt**, Mr. **Nelson**, Mr. **Pearson**, Mr. **Prouty**, Mr. **Randolph**, Mr. **Tower**, and Mr. **Williams** of New Jersey):

S. 1051. A bill to amend section 314 of the Public Health Service Act, by providing greater flexibility to States in the use of certain public health grants-in-aid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. **Muskie** when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 1052. A bill for the relief of Carlo Dimino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INDIAN HEIRSHIP BILL

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill relating to the Indian heirship land problem, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, of which I am chairman, has been engaged for several years in an effort to resolve one of the most complex problems in the field of Indian affairs—the multiple ownership of Indian allotments. The Indian heirship land problem arises from the fact that the United States holds in trust for Indians about 41,000 tracts of allotted land—approximately 6 million acres—that are in fractionated ownership. This situation arose when, upon the death of the original allottee, his or her estate was probated and the heirs were given undivided interests in the tract.

Through the years, successive probates have taken place affecting the same tract until at the present time there may be anywhere from 2 to 200 heirs holding fractional interests in the same piece of trust land. This fractionation of ownership has created serious problems for the heirs themselves, the tribes, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which has responsibility for managing trust land.

In an effort to learn all the facts relating to the multiple ownership of Indian land, the staffs of the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, in conjunction with the specialists of the Library of Congress, made extensive studies of the problem, beginning in 1959. In 1961, two heirship land survey reports were published by the House and Senate. These documents contain the most complete and up-to-date information on what the heirship problems are and where the problems exist. The reports also reflect suggested solutions by Indian owners of these lands, as well as administrators in the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Based on the committee studies, I introduced S. 1392 on March 21, 1961, and that bill was used as a vehicle for exploring further the viewpoints and wishes of the people most affected by this problem. Hearings were conducted in August 1961, and valuable testimony was received from Members of the Senate and House, the Interior Department, the Justice Department, the General Accounting Office, Indian organizations, and Indian tribes.

At the completion of the hearings there was a mass of materials, suggestions, and recommendations. I instructed the staff to study the hearings thoroughly and redraft the bill or amendments thereto based on the excellent material then available. Unfortunately, due to the excessive congressional workload, there was no opportunity for further hearings on proposed amendments.

In February 1962, I introduced a second bill, S. 2899, relating to the Indian heirship land problem. The provisions of S. 2899 included many of the recommendations that had been made to the committee during the hearing in the preceding year on S. 1392. Again extensive hearings were held and published and widely distributed to Indian tribes and others concerned with the problem. Since the close of hearings on S. 2899 the staff has been busy consulting with the various Indian organizations, tribal representatives, and Federal agencies over changes that would make the bill more effective and acceptable.

The recommendations and suggestions made during and after the hearings have been sifted and analyzed at great length, and the bill that I am sponsoring today is the product of many months and years of investigation into the extent of heirship and the solutions needed to resolve this most difficult problem in the administration of Indian affairs. Every effort has been made in drafting the bill to authorize and implement an effective program to alleviate the heirship problem. Particular attention has been given in designing a bill to maximize the opportunity to return multiple-owned land to individual Indian ownership or to tribal ownership and to preserve its trust status.

The language of this new measure gives the Secretary of the Interior sufficient latitude to solve the problem but allows him enough discretion to protect the best interests of the Indian owners. The most controversial sections of the earlier bills have been modified or eliminated completely, but the Secretary is still provided the necessary tools to relieve what has been a worsening problem, one that has adversely affected many Indian owners of allotted lands.

Mr. President, our committee has had two complete hearings on two separate bills, and they have been so productive I want to have additional comment and suggestions, not only from the executive departments but from representatives of Indian tribal organizations and the tribes themselves. It is my intention to schedule hearings at an early date, and I feel certain that, with the cooperation of all of those who have a vital interest in this matter, we will be able to report corrective legislation to the Senate early in this session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill I am introducing today may be printed in full following these brief remarks and that a section-by-section analysis of the bill, as prepared by the staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, may also be included in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1049) relating to the Indian heirship land problem, introduced by Mr. Church, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the owners of not less than a 50 per centum interest in any land, where ten or fewer persons own undivided interests, or the owners of not less than a 25 per centum interest in any land where eleven or more persons own undivided interests, where all of the undivided interests are in a trust or restricted status, may request the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), and the Secretary is hereby authorized to partition the land in kind, or to partition part of the land in kind and sell the remainder, or to sell the land if partition is not practicable and a sale would be in the best interest of the Indian owners.

(b) When any of the undivided interests in a tract of land is in an unrestricted status, the owners of not less than a 50 per centum interest in the remaining undivided trust or restricted interests, where ten or fewer persons own such undivided interests, or the owners of not less than a 25 per centum interest in the remaining undivided trust or restricted interests, where eleven or more own such undivided interests, may request the Secretary, and the Secretary is hereby authorized, to sell all trust or restricted interests if a sale would be in the best interests of the Indian owners. The Secretary may also partition the land in kind, partition part of the land in kind and sell the remainder, or sell all interests if authorized to partition or sell the unrestricted interests by a power of attorney from the owner of the unrestricted interests.

Sec. 2. Whenever the Secretary, after receiving a request to partition or sell any tract of land under subsection (b) of section 1 of this Act, is unable after due effort to obtain the approval of an unrestricted interest in such tract, he shall, upon application of the persons making the foregoing request, consent to judicial partition or sale of such tract if in his judgment such action is in the best interests of the Indian owners. Where such consent is granted, jurisdiction over the land is hereby conferred on any State court of competent jurisdiction to hear and determine the partition or sale proceedings and to render judgment for partition in kind or judicial sale in accordance with the law of the State wherein the lands are situated. The United States shall be an indepensable party to any such proceeding with the right of removal of the cause to the United States district court for the district in which the land is located, following the procedure in title 28, United States Code, section 1446. The proceeds of sale of the trust or restricted interests shall be paid to the Secretary for distribution unless he waives this requirement as to any of the owners thereof. If the land so partitioned or sold is acquired by an individual Indian or an Indian tribe, title thereto shall be taken in the manner prescribed in subsection 5(d) of this Act.

Sec. 3. (a) If, with respect to any land transferred pursuant to this Act there is in existence an exemption from taxation which constitutes a vested property right, such exemption shall continue in force and effect until it terminates by virute of its own limitations.

(b) Any trust interest in oil, gas, or other minerals that is reserved to an Indian owner in any sale of land made pursuant to this Act shall be reserved in a trust status. No sale made under this Act shall include any mineral estate that has been reserved to any Indian tribe by any provision of law.

Sec. 4. For the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to represent any Indian owner (1) who is a minor, (2) who is non compos mentis, (3) whose ownership interest in a decedent's estate has not been determined, or (4) who cannot be located by the Secretary after a reasonable and diligent search and the giving of notice by publication.

Sec. 5. The Secretary shall give actual notice or notice by publication and provide an opportunity for a hearing before partitioning in kind or selling land pursuant to this Act. All sales of lands made by the Secretary pursuant to this Act shall be in accordance with the following procedure:

(a) Upon receipt of requests from the required ownership interests, the Secretary shall notify the tribe and each owner of an undivided Indian interest in the land by a letter directed to his last known address that each such owner and the tribe has a right to purchase the land for its appraised value, unless one of the owners or his authorized representative objects within the time fixed by the Secretary, or for a lower price if all of the owners agree, and that if more than one owner or if one owner and the tribe wants to purchase the land it will be sold on the basis of sealed competitive bids restricted to the owners of undivided interests in the land and the tribe unless one of the owners or his authorized representative objects within the time fixed by the Secretary.

(b) If any Indian owner or his authorized representative objects to a competitive sale restricted to the owners of undivided interests and the tribe, the Secretary shall offer the land for sale by sealed competitive bid with a preferential right in the tribe or any Indian owner to meet the high bid, unless one of the Indian owners or his authorized representative objects within the time fixed by the Secretary. All bids shall be rejected if no bid substantially equal to the appraised value is received.

(c) If any Indian owner or his authorized representative objects to a sale by sealed competitive bid with a preferential right to meet the high bid, the Secretary shall offer the land for sale by sealed bids: *Provided,* That, after notice to all interested parties including the tribe, the land shall be sold at auction immediately after the opening of the sealed bids, and auction bidding shall be limited to the Indian owners, the tribe, and persons who submitted sealed bids in amounts not less than 75 per centum of the appraised value of the land. The highest sealed bid shall be considered the opening auction bid. No sale shall be made unless the price is equal to the highest sealed bid and substantially equal to the appraised value: *And provided further,* That the term "appraised value" as used in this section shall mean the current appraised value of the land, said appraisal to be not more than one year old.

(d) Title to any land acquired by a tribe or an individual Indian pursuant to this Act shall be taken in trust unless the land is located outside the boundaries of the reservation or approved tribal consolidation area. Title to any land acquired by a tribe or an individual Indian that is outside the boundaries of the reservation and approved consolidation area shall be taken in the name of the purchaser without any restriction on alienation, control, or use.

Sec. 6. (a) In order to assist tribes that wish to purchase land offered for sale under the provisions of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to make a loan to any tribe under the conditions stated below, provided the tribe does not have funds available in an amount that is adequate to make the purchase and is unable to obtain a loan from any other source. Such loans shall be made from the revolving funds referred to in section 10 of this Act.

(b) The amount of the loan shall not exceed the appraised value of the land plus the value of any other property the tribe may mortgage or pledge as security for the loan.

(c) The tribe shall give to the United States a mortgage on the land purchased by the tribe with the loan, and on any other tribal property which the Secretary deems necessary to adequately secure the loan.

(d) A loan shall be for a term of not to exceed thirty years, and shall bear interest at a rate to be determined by the Secretary. A loan need not require repayment in equal installments, but it shall require repayment according to a schedule that will fully amortize the loan within the time specified. In the event of a default in the repayment of the loan, the Secretary of the Interior shall take such action as he deems necessary to protect the interests of the United States. If during the period of repayment the tribe is awarded a money judgment against the United States, and if the payment of any installment on the loan is in default, the installment(s) in default shall be collected from the appropriation to satisfy the judgment insofar as the amount of the appropriation will cover the same.

(e) Before a loan is made under this Act the tribe shall submit for the approval of the Secretary of the Interior a master plan for the use of all lands to be purchased. No plan shall be considered by the Secretary unless it has been first considered at a general meeting of tribal members called for that purpose, upon due notice to all adult members of the tribe, and approved by a majority of the adult members present and voting at that meeting. Any tribe preparing a plan may call upon the Secretary for technical assistance, and the Secretary shall render such assistance as may be necessary. Such plan shall include provisions for consolidation of holdings of the tribe, or acquisition of sufficient lands in conjunction with those held to permit reasonable economic utilization of the land and repayment of the loan. Such plan may be revised from time to time with the approval of the Secretary.

Sec. 7. Any tribe that adopts with the approval of the Secretary a plan pursuant to subsection 6(e) of this Act, or any other plan that does not involve a loan from the United States but which provides for the consolidation, management, use, or disposition of tribal land, is hereby authorized, with the approval of the Secretary, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to sell or encumber any tribal land or other property in furtherance of such plan.

Sec. 8. The Secretary shall approve no plan pursuant to this Act that contains any provision that will prohibit or delay a termination of Federal trust responsibilities with respect to the land during the term of the plan.

Sec. 9. This Act shall not repeal any authority of the Secretary under other law, but it shall supersede any limitation on the authority of the Secretary that is inconsistent with this Act.

Sec. 10. (a) All funds that are now or hereafter a part of the revolving fund authorized by the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), the Act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1968), and the Act of April 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 44), as amended and supplemented, including sums received in settlement of debts of livestock pursuant to the Act of May 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 190), sums collected in repayment of loans heretofore or hereafter made, shall hereafter be available for loans to organizations of Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts (hereinafter referred to as Indians), having a form of organization that is satisfactory to the Secretary, and to individual Indians of one-quarter degree or more of Indian blood who are not members of or eligible for membership in an organization that is making loans to its members, for any purpose that will promote the economic development of such organizations and their members, or the individual Indian borrowers.

(b) The appropriation authorization in section 10 of the Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986), as amended by the Act of September 15, 1961 (75 Stat. 520), is hereby amended by increasing it from $20,000,000 to $55,000,000.

Sec. 11. The Secretary is authorized to execute such patents, deeds, orders, or other instruments as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 12. The terms "owner" and "owners" as used herein include, wherever applicable, any tribe, band, group community, or pueblo of Indians, Eskimos, or Aleuts, and also include any federally chartered organizations of Indians, Eskimos, or Aleuts.

Sec. 13. (a) Sections 1 through 9 of this Act shall become effective one year after the date of its enactment.

(b) The Secretary shall, prior to the effective date of sections 1 through 9 of this Act, notify by publication Indian tribes and owners of undivided interests in Indian trust or restricted land, of the rights of such tribe or owners, under this Act.

Sec. 14. (a) The Secretary shall, prior to the conclusion of any probate proceeding conducted on or after the effective date of sections 1 through 9 of this Act, notify each heir or devisee having an interest in such proceedings of his rights under this Act.

(b) Beginning one year after the effective date of sections 1 through 9 of this Act, the Secretary shall submit an annual report to Congress setting forth the progress made in the preceding year in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. Church is as follows:

Analysis of S. 1049 Section by Section

Section 1(a): This section applies only to that heirship land where all the undivided interests are in trust status, and subdivides that land into two categories. The first category would be tracts owned by up to 10 heirs and the second, tracts owned by 11 or more. Where there are up to 10 owners any 1 or more owning a 50 percent or larger interest may request the Secretary of the Interior to sell or partition the land. In those tracts where there are 11 or more owners the requirement is reduced to 1 or more owning at least 25 percent of the land. The Secretary is authorized to partition the entire tract, partition part of the land and sell the remainder, or if this is not practicable he may sell the entire tract if the sale would be in the best interests of the Indian owners.

Section 1(b): This subsection applies to those tracts of land where there are interests in nontrust status. Generally this means that a non-Indian has inherited a share in the estate. The same categories are present as in (a) with a 50-percent minimum ownership required for authority to request partition or sale in tracts with up to 10 owners and a minimum of 25 percent in tracts with 11 or more owners. The Secretary may sell the trust or restricted interests and may, with the approval of nontrust owners, partition all of the land, partition part of the land and sell the remainder, or sell the entire tract.

Section 2: If the Secretary is unable to obtain the approval of owners with unrestricted interests to sell or partition the land he may, upon request, transfer jurisdiction to State courts for judgment to partition in kind or judicial sale in accordance with State law. The United States reserves the right of removal to the U.S. district court. Title to any land partitioned or sold that is acquired by an Indian or tribe shall be taken in trust under certain conditions (see 5(d)).

Section 3(a): Some questions in the past have been raised concerning whether tax exemption of Indian properties is a vested property right. This section is designed to protect such rights, if they exist.

Section 3(b): Provides that any trust interest in oil, gas, or other minerals that are reserved shall be held in trust, and tribal mineral interests will not be affected under this act.

Section 4: The Secretary is authorized to act for Indian owners who cannot act for themselves.

Section 5: Provides that notice by publication must be made and the interested parties provided a hearing before action is taken under this act. Procedures to carry out sale or partition are stated as follows: (a) When a request to sell or partition has been received each owner and the tribe is notified. Each is allowed to purchase the land at appraised or lower value unless one owner objects. If more than one is interested there will be sealed bids among them. (b) If action in (a) is objected to there shall be sealed competitive bids with right of tribe or owner to meet the high bid, unless there is objection. All bids will be rejected if no bid is substantially equal to the appraised value. (c) If there is objection to (b) the land shall be offered for sale by sealed competitive bids, and after notice to all parties including the tribe, it will be sold at auction. Auction is limited to owners, tribe, and those bidding more than 75 percent of appraised value. Highest sealed bid is the opening auction bid. Sale price must be substantially equal to current appraised value. (d) Land acquired by Indians or tribes under these procedures will be taken in trust if within the reservation and tribal consolidation areas.

Section 6(a): If a tribe does not have money to purchase such lands they can borrow it from the Government under certain conditions. The Government shall be given security, hold a mortgage on the land and other property. Maximum loan for 30 years with interest set by Secretary. If the tribe receives a judgment any payments in default shall be collected therefrom. A master plan for land consolidation shall be drafted by the tribe and approved by the adult membership before presentation to the Secretary. The Secretary shall render technical assistance in preparing a plan if requested.

Section 7: Any consolidation plan involving a Federal loan or not will carry with it approval to sell or encumber any tribal land or other property to carry out the purposes of the plan.

Section 8: In an effort to avoid any programs that might tend to confuse any termination activities, no plan can be approved that will prevent or delay such actions.

Section 9: The purpose of this act is to add to the Secretary's powers and shall not repeal any present authority.

Section 10: All funds presently authorized for loans to Indians would be consolidated into one revolving fund. This is in keeping with a recommendation of the Senate Appropriations Committee. An additional $35 million is authorized for loans, making a total of more than $55 million in authorizations for this purpose and other requirements.

Section 11: Provides general authority for the Secretary to execute all necessary documents to carry out the purposes of this act.

Section 12: Definition of the terms "owner" and "owners" as used in the bill.

Section 13(a): A delay of 1 year is provided during which time the Secretary can notify the tribes and they can plan their programs. This period can also be utilized by the Department to formulate necessary regulations, etc., to implement the program.

Section 13(b): The Secretary is to notify by publication heirship landowners and the tribes of their rights under this act.

Section 14(a): At all probate hearings after 1 year the Secretary shall notify each interested party of their rights.

Section 14(b): Provides that the Secretary shall submit an annual report to Congress on the workings of this act.

NORTHWEST LUMBER PRODUCTION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one day early next week a cargo vessel will dock at the port of San Juan, P.R., to discharge 1,400,000 board feet of Douglas-fir and hemlock lumber—1,400,000 feet of lumber from Oregon forests, cruised, logged, hauled, sawed, and loaded by Oregon workers.

This event would have been of little note a decade ago when Oregon and Washington forests supplied the entire

Puerto Rican need for Northwest softwood. Yet this vessel will be delivering the first shipload of Northwest U.S. lumber to Puerto Rico in more than 2 years.

What had happened to this traditional U.S. market? The answer is not obscure. Section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, the Jones Act, decrees that domestic vessels shall enjoy a monopoly in the transportation of goods from one American port to another. Because of these restrictions, the American lumber producer was forced to pay freight charges as much as $30 per 1,000 board feet greater than his competitors, the lumber producers of neighboring British Columbia, who were free to shop in the world market for steamship charters.

The Jones Act was designed to nurture and protect the domestic coastal shipping trade. During the first half of the century the protection which it furnished was both meaningful and adequate; but changing patterns of commerce transformed the Jones Act into an instrument of destruction, not only of domestic industries such as the lumber industry, but of segments of the shipping industry itself.

Despite the supposed protection of the Jones Act, domestic shipping has suffered a steady and relentless decline from its postwar highs. As late as 1955, 101 ships and 4,300 men were employed in the intercoastal trade. There are today not more than 22 vessels exclusively devoted to intercoastal shipping, employing less than 1,000 men. There are today no common carriers left to serve Northwest lumber shippers, although two private lines offer, from time to time, space to lumber producers. This month neither line had space to offer.

The shipload of lumber which arrives in Puerto Rico next week owes its very existence to the adoption by the last Congress of an amendment which I offered to permit the suspension of Jones Act restrictions on lumber shipments to Puerto Rico. The Maritime Administrator, charged with the implementation of this amendment, made the following crucial finding in granting the first of several suspensions under the terms of the amendment:

> We have here two segments of American enterprise both of which are sorely beset by foreign competition. The record of this proceeding shows that under the preexisting legislation banning the use of foreign-flag vessels in domestic shipping, no lumber from the Pacific Northwest has moved to Puerto Rico during the last 2 years, due in some part to the lower foreign-flag transportation rates which have assisted Canadian producers in capturing this formerly American-held market. Thus, the Congress decided to lift the ban under certain conditions in order to relieve the distress of at least the lumber industry. To have continued the prohibition would have had the effect of perpetuating the depression in both industries.

By next month, Mr. President, sales of Northwest U.S. lumber to Puerto Rico will have exceeded 7 million board feet—sales translated concretely into jobs for northwest lumber and sawmill workers.

But we cannot afford to stop with Puerto Rico. The distress—and there is deep distress—in the coastal lumber mill towns of Oregon and Washington arises primarily from the loss of traditional Atlantic coast markets to Canadian lumber producers. Last year British Columbia sawmills shipped 875 million board feet of lumber to the east coast, while Washington and Oregon producers shipped only 524 million board feet. The Canadians have thus gobbled up nearly two-thirds of the Atlantic coast market, though as recently as 1951 the Canadians' share of this stable market was a bare 7 percent.

Last week, I received from a Vancouver, British Columbia, newspaper a clipping heralding the sailing of a vessel laden with the largest single lumber cargo in history—more than 11 million board feet of packaged lumber "all consigned to U.S. Atlantic coast ports." One day later, I received the following grim telegram from Newport, Oreg.:

> Just received report on lumber shipment by water for month of January. Our mill is 90-percent water shipment to east coast market. Pacific Lumber Inspection Bureau report shows British Columbia shipped east coast 90,252,829 board feet; total U.S. shipments 26,751,307 board feet. British Columbia shipped approximately 75 percent of all lumber going to east coast market. We need help.
>
> L. H. Anderson,
> *President, Lincoln Lumber Sales, Inc.*

Between 1947 and 1962, employment in Oregon sawmills and planing mills alone dwindled from 45,000 to 28,000.

Was the Jones Act the culprit? The State Department, in a report prepared last year for western Senators, thought so:

> There is no question but that the 600 million board feet of lumber which moved by water from the U.S. Pacific Northwest in 1961 to the east coast was at a serious competitive disadvantage with respect to waterborne shipments from British Columbia as a result of higher transportation costs. The average margin of difference in 1961 is reported to have been on the order of $10 per thousand board feet for shipments to the Atlantic seaboard. Data are not available on comparative costs for shipments to southern California and Hawaii, but the margin of difference was probably proportionate. In the case of shipments to Puerto Rico, where Canadian lumber has also made inroads in 1960 and 1961, the difference is reported to have been about $26 per thousand board feet.
>
> During the past 5 years, there has been a decline amounting to 400 million board feet per year in the level of waterborne shipments from the U.S. Pacific coast mills and a corresponding increase in the level of waterborne shipments from British Columbia mills. While other factors may have contributed to the shift, it appears that the substantial difference in freight costs has been principally responsible. There is no reason to believe that the trend will be reversed so long as the cost difference prevails.

The Commerce Department made a similar finding; and, several weeks ago, the Tariff Commission refused to find that concessions granted under trade agreements were a principal cause of the woes of the domestic lumber industry, although the Commission did find that the trend of imports of softwood lumber is upward:

> Although imports of softwood lumber by water currently account for only about one-fourth of the total imports of such lumber, the very large and rising disparity in cargo rates favorable to imports by water has obviously contributed much more to the recent increase in imports of softwood lumber than has the aggregate of the trade-agreement concessions applicable thereto.

President Kennedy has acknowledged the need for Jones Act reform, in order to alleviate the hardship of the Northwest lumber industry. Last July, the President called for amendment of the intercoastal shipping laws to permit use of foreign vessels when those conditions exist which indicate severe hardship to American shippers. This amendment will reduce the handicaps suffered by American producers in the intercoastal shipment of lumber.

It is for these reasons, Mr. President, that I again introduce proposed legislation to suspend the provisions of the Jones Act. As I have often said in the past, I have no desire to damage what is left of the coastal shipping trade. I deeply regret that even a handful of seamen may be displaced by Jones Act reform; but I cannot in good conscience ignore the fact that the nearly 1 billion board feet of lumber shipped by Canadian watermills into our markets means the loss of at least 7,000 prime jobs for Northwest workers and support for their families and the services and trades that depend upon prime payrolls. Problems of the domestic merchant marine will not be solved by continuing conditions that put lumber and sawmill workers on the unemployment rolls.

The action of the northwest lumbermen in boldly reentering the Puerto Rican market immediately upon the lifting of the Jones Act restrictions proved beyond any reasonable doubt that the Jones Act was the crucial anticompetitive factor excluding northwest lumber from its traditional market. West coast lumbermen have shown that when they are given a chance to compete upon a basis of equality, they need no subsidy. This is demonstrably true of the Puerto Rico market. It is no less true of the Atlantic coast market and other domestic markets.

The bill which I now introduce and send to the desk represents as narrow an inroad upon the Jones Act restrictions as I could devise and still provide meaningful relief to the lumber industry. Surely Wesley Jones, for many years a distinguished Senator from the State of Washington, little dreamed that the lumber industry of his own State and of neighboring States would be crippled by the act which bears his name.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, together with various newspaper articles and editorials, be printed in the Record at the close of my remarks, and that the bill be held at the desk for 3 days, in order to provide an opportunity for other Senators to join in sponsoring it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, articles, and editorials will be printed in the Record, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 1050) to make permanent the provisions of law authorizing certain suspension of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, with respect to the transportation of lumber, introduced by Mrs. Neuberger, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes", approved October 24, 1962 (76 Stat. 1201) is amended by striking out all through "the United States" and inserting in lieu thereof "The provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. 883), shall be suspended with respect to the transportation of lumber between any ports or terminal areas".
>
> Sec. 2. Subsection (b) of section 4 of such Act of October 24, 1962, is amended by striking out ", or upon the expiration of the one-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act, whichever first occurs".

The articles and editorials presented by Mrs. Neuberger are as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Dec. 20, 1962]

Northwest Once Supplied All of Puerto Rico's Lumber

The Puerto Rican lumber market, which Oregon and Washington lumber shippers hope to reenter by means of foreign-flag ships, was entirely a U.S. market until 1950 when British Columbia began shipping to that island country, according to records of the Pacific Lumber Inspection Bureau.

The bureau's reports show that Oregon and Washington lumbermen had Puerto Rico to themselves, as far as the fir region was concerned until 13 years ago. Between 1934 and 1949, west coast shipments to Puerto Rico ranged up to 21,800,000 board feet a year except during the war years of 1943 and 1944 when no shipments were recorded.

Before World War II, Oregon and Washington loaded an average of 14,500,000 board feet a year for Puerto Rico.

Then in 1950, the PLIB reports show, British Columbia stepped in with shipments of 7,700,000 board feet to Puerto Rico while Oregon and Washington were shipping 17,300,000 board feet. The British Columbia movement dropped back to 1,200,000 board feet in 1961 but stepped up to 8,100,000 board feet in 1952 and have increased rapidly every year since.

SHIPMENTS DIP

Meanwhile, Oregon and Washington shipments gained to 22,300,000 board feet in 1953, and dropped off rapidly from that point to 1961 when no lumber went from the west coast States.

British Columbia increased its shipments to Puerto Rico to 42 million feet by 1956, to 62,800,000 by 1959, and hit 73 million board feet in 1961, the year the west coast States bowed out entirely.

During the first 10 months of 1962, British Columbia shipped 65,400,000 board feet to Puerto Rico, an average of 6,500,000 feet a month. At this rate, British Columbia may hit 78 million board feet, a new annual record, this year.

FIRMS SEEK OK

Oregon and Washington lumber firms are seeking authority from the U.S. Maritime Administration to use foreign-flag ships to haul their lumber to Puerto Rico, and one of them, Georgia-Pacific Co., has been given authority to do so, but only after U.S. flag operators have been allowed 5 days in which to match foreign-flag shipping rates.

The authority was granted by invoking provisions of the Neuberger amendment to the Jones Act which confines shipping between American ports to American bottoms.

Several other firms have applied for similar authority and were heard by a Maritime Administration examiner last week.

The lumbermen have objected to any waiting time in favor of U.S. ships because they claim they cannot hold space in foreign vessels while American owners are making up their minds.

[From the Oregonian, Mar. 4, 1963]

Canadian Lumber Producers Rebound With Increased Shipments to United States

Canadian lumber producers, who eased up on their recordbreaking shipments into the United States, while the American Tariff Commission was considering putting a brake on imports, are back strong as ever, according to Canadian and American reports.

Evidence of the stepped-up shipments to the United States appeared in Vancouver, British Columbia, this past week where lumber shippers loaded the all-time record single shipment of 11.2 million feet net, aboard the Greek ship *Paros* for the U.S. east coast market.

The new record broke a record established only a short time earlier by a sister ship, the *Signos,* also loaded with Canadian lumber.

TRUTH BROUGHT HOME

The truth of the shipping handicap facing American lumber shippers was brought home clearly by the two record loads. The Canadian mills were able to hire these vessels at rates aproximately $14 a thousand below the cheapest rates offered the American mills.

Under the Jones Act, American shippers must use only American vessels and the rates on the American vessels are $10 to $14 a thousand higher than on the foreign vessels used by Canadians in capturing the market.

The big push on the Canadian shipments was also pointed up in Crow's Weekly Lumber Letter this past week where the Pacific Lumber Inspection Bureau figures showed the Canadians shipped 90.2 million feet to the U.S. east coast in January. The American mills shipped only 25.7 million feet in the same period.

Compounding the rate differential facing the American mills was the fact that the only two U.S. lines hauling lumber cargoes intercoastal, Calmar and Weyerhaeuser, were not offering space for shipment next month.

Weyerhaeuser hauls its own lumber cargoes and does not always have space for other shippers. Calmar is a line owned by Bethlehem Steel and is used primarily for hauling steel products westward.

Senator Maurine Neuberger, with her amendment to the Jones Act, opened up Puerto Rico to foreign vessels carrying U.S. lumber earlier this year and already several loads of U.S. lumber have gone into that market, the first shipments from the U.S. mills in several years.

Now Mrs. Neuberger is planning to reintroduce a bill for the elimination of the Jones Act, a move recommended by President Kennedy and a move the American lumber shippers say they must have if they are to continue in competition with the Canadian imports.

[From the Daily Astorian, June 22, 1962]

Something Else Is Needed

Maritime interests have protested repeal of the Jones Act as a relief measure for distressed Northwest lumbermen.

This illustrates the almost inevitable fact that adjustment of governmental economic controls to benefit one segment of the economy will cause distress to some other segment, and that some compensating adjustment must be made. Which of course can lead to distress and readjustment in still a third segment, and so on.

A Government-controlled economy is full of headaches, inequities, adjustments, and readjustments.

The purpose of the Jones Act, which requires cargoes from one U.S. port to another to be carried in U.S. ships, is to keep our merchant marine alive. It just barely achieves that purpose, since foreign competition has virtually driven the U.S. merchant marine out of the offshore trade.

Lumbermen suffer under the Jones Act, which virtually requires them, as well as other coastwise or intercoastal shippers, to subsidize the merchant marine.

But obviously repeal of the act will almost put the U.S. merchant marine completely out of business, unless some compensating form of subsidy is provided.

No one wants the U.S. merchant marine eliminated. Its existence is considered essential to the national defense.

Since it cannot compete economically with foreign ships, and since it is manifestly unfair to have U.S. shippers subsidize it as they do now under the Jones Act, the only alternative seems to be repeal of the Jones Act and substitution of some form of subsidy that will enable U.S. ships to offer freight rates competitive with those of foreign ships.

[From the Oregon Statesman, July 25, 1962]

It Seems to Me

(By Charles A. Sprague)

Senator Maurine Neuberger has proposed what seems to be the most practical method of providing through Government some aid to the distressed lumber industry of the Pacific Northwest. She introduced a bill which would lift the bar in the Jones Act which prevents foreign-flag vessels from engaging in carrying freight or passengers between U.S. ports. Applied to lumber shipping this would mean that U.S. mills could compete even stephen with Canadian mills as far as freight costs to to the Atlantic coast are concerned.

Senator Magnuson would let the bar stand but would offset it by a subsidy from the Treasury to equalize shipping costs. Since he is chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce where the matter is under consideration, it is probable that his approach will be preferred over that of Senator Neuberger. It is not, in my opinion, as satisfactory a method of helping the lumber industry, and has slim chance of adoption.

This provision of the Jones Act is a form of protection to domestic shipping and to seamen. But it imposes a considerable cost on domestic shippers. Repeal of the provision would make for open competition both in shipping and in the lumber business.

In her statement before the Commerce Committee Senator Neuberger listed the following as points agreed on:

1. A significant segment of the lumber industry is depressed.
2. A major cause has been the loss of the Atlantic coast market to Canadian producers.
3. The Jones Act gives Canadian lumber producers a substantial cost advantage in competing for this market.
4. Despite the protection offered by the Jones Act intercoastal shipping has been in progressive decline.

As to the invasion of the U.S. market Mrs. Neuberger stated that British Columbia mills' share of the Atlantic coast market for waterborne shipments of Douglas fir and hemlock had increased from 7 percent in 1951 to 57 percent in 1961 and 72 percent in June 1962. Canadian shippers, free to use ocean tramp steamers, are able to lay down their lumber on the east coast at $13 below the American conference rate.

The argument for subsidizing our merchant marine is to have merchant vessels available in event of war. But, as the junior Senator from Oregon stated, only 22 vessels are exclusively engaged in the intercoastal trade. Of these, 20 are Liberty ships of World War II vintage, of which we have many in the "water bank."

The protective feature of the Jones Act hasn't maintained intercoastal shipping. The once big steamship lines like Luckenbach and American-Hawaiian have quit running from coast to coast. Mrs. Neuberger thinks the Jones Act has hurt rather than helped this shipping. She expressed the view that under the spur of foreign competition American operators may exercise American ingenuity and be able to compete.

It does seem absurd to retain a provision which hasn't worked. And it seems eminently sensible to drop it since it would provide virtually immediate benefit to U.S. lumber producers without making any draft on the Treasury.

[From the Walla Walla Union Bulletin, Jan. 1, 1963]

Priced Off the Seas

Even with Federal subsidies, few U.S. maritime concerns are in a competitive position with carriers under other flags and the situation reacted, in recent months, to the disadvantage of lumbering, one of the principal industries of the Pacific Northwest.

When Canada devalued its dollar and, with more favorable freight rates, was able to lay down lumber in the east and south of this country at prices substantially below those the mills of the Pacific Northwest could afford, petitions for modifying the Jones Act were filed with the Maritime Commission. Relief was granted, in part, when the Commission gave permission for U.S. lumber to move to Puerto Rico, a U.S. possession, in foreign ships.

In the next few weeks, as a result of that step, the first American lumber cargo in 43 years to go to an American port in a foreign ship will load 1,400,000 board feet of Douglas-fir and hemlock lumber at Coos Bay to go to San Juan, P.R.

Before negotiations were closed with a Japanese line, opportunity was required to be given owners of U.S. vessels to compete for the business. The best offer, so Georgia-Pacific, the shipper, reported, was about $17 per thousand above the winning bid. Lower ship costs and lower operating expenses of foreign vessels are factors that U.S. shipping cannot meet.

The 1920 Merchant Marine Act was written to preserve the American merchant marine coastal fleet for times of national emergency. What once was a sizable fleet now is down to about a dozen vessels, employing fewer than 500 seamen. The men who sail our vessels are the best paid of any in the world, but foreign aid by this country has at the same time helped some of our allies to modernize their merchant marine and, operating at wage scales far below those applying here, they have gained competitive advantage that, as with lumbering, has adversely affected the U.S. economy.

[From the Washington Post, July 10, 1962]

Trade Restrictions

The current difficulties of the softwood industry in the Pacific Northwest provide a graphic illustration of how an ancient restrictive practice can threaten the welfare of a large number of people and hamper the Government's efforts to expand international trade.

As recently as 1959 more than 60 percent of the lumber shipped, largely by water, to the Atlantic coast came from the States of the Pacific Northwest with British Columbia supplying most of the balance. Since then the shares have been reversed. At stake is the production of about a half billion board feet of American lumber and the loss of more than 3,000 jobs.

The difficulties of the softwood industry are attributable to three factors: the devaluation of the Canadian dollar which works to the advantage of the British Columbia lumbermen; the slightly more favorable terms on which the Canadians can purchase Government-owned timber; and the shipping cost advantage which the Canadians enjoy.

According to the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, known as the Jones Act, all cargoes shipped between Pacific and Atlantic coast ports must be carried in American-flag vessels. This ancient practice of "cabotage," or reserving the coastal trade to American vessels, originated in the reign of Edward III of England (1327–77). The British have wisely abandoned this practice long ago, but laws barring the use of foreign vessels in the American coastal trade have been in force since 1808. As a consequence, the American softwood producers must pay about $36 per thousand board feet on shipments between the Columbia River ports and Brooklyn while the Canadians, who are permitted to charter ships in the highly competitive world market, can ship at rates ranging from $4 to $11.

Clearly this is a case in which the welfare of the many is being sacrificed in order to protect the interests of the few. There are now only 13 American-flag vessels on the coastal lumber run which employ a total of 455 men. Thus 455 jobs in the maritime industry are protected at the cost of more than 3,000 jobs in the softwood industry.

We hope the current efforts to repeal or modify the restrictive provisions of the Jones Act will succeed and that the recent appeals to establish a temporary import quota for Canadian softwood will be rejected. The erection of another trade barrier can only work to the disadvantage of both the American and Canadian economies, for such an act would surely touch off a series of retaliations. The public interest will be better served by permitting the Northwest softwood producers to compete on a more equal footing.

[From the Washington Evening Star, June 23, 1962]

Equalizing Competition

As recently as 1957 the lumber producers of Oregon and Washington supplied 77 percent of the waterborne lumber needs of the east coast. By April of this year they had lost all but 28 percent of the monthly total to Canadian suppliers. The loss has cost the west coast industry some 3,500 jobs. It is not surprising that the administration has come under increasing pressure to equalize the competitive position of the American firms.

The advantage has swung to British Columbia lumber operators for a variety of reasons, as the extensive hearings before the Senate Commerce Committee have brought out. They can ship more cheaply by water. Their new money-exchange rate favors them in the U.S. market. Their wage costs are lower, and so are the prices they pay for timber. Of these, Senator Neuberger of Oregon, thinks the most important is the fact that the Canadians are free to use the chartered ships of any nation, while the west coast producers are bound by the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 which require the use of the American merchant fleet in shipment of cargoes between American ports. The difference in charter costs, according to Mrs. Neuberger, ranges from $4 to $11 per thousand board feet on lumber. Accordingly, she wants Congress to repeal the 1920 provision—an action which she contends would do no real harm to the maritime industry since the use of lumber ships in intercoastal trade already has dwindled in size from 12 shipping lines at the end of World War II to only 3 lines today, utilizing 13 ships and employing only 455 men.

Whether this proposal would provide sufficient relief to justify the action is a matter for the administration and for Congress to determine. For it is not at all likely that this alone would solve the problem completely. But it deserves consideration, along with any other means of easing the setback suffered by the west coast firms. There is no apparent sentiment, and understandably so, to impose quotas on Canadian lumber. In pursuing the worthy goal of expanded international trade, however, the administration has the obligation to find means wherever possible to sustain the competitive position of our own industries.

[From the Oregonian, Dec. 6, 1962]

One Step Forward

The quick favorable ruling by Maritime Examiner Paul N. Pfeiffer on the Georgia-Pacific Corp.'s application for permission to use foreign shipping in moving lumber from the Pacific Northwest to Puerto Rico may be an indication that the Kennedy administration is prepared at last to help the Northwest's lumber industry meet severe competition from Canada.

The examiner's ruling must be approved by the Maritime Commissioner and the Secretary of Commerce, but lumber shippers here appear confident that approval will come quickly.

If Northwest lumber shippers take advantage of this first dent in the Jones Act to recapture the 73 million board foot Puerto Rico market from Canada, their case for exemption from the restrictive maritime laws in the Atlantic coast trade will be strengthened. In the recent session of Congress, the Senate Commerce Committee reported favorably on a bill permitting use of foreign ships in the intercoastal trade, but the bill did not come up for passage. Senator Maurine Neuberger managed, however, to obtain an amendment to the Merchant Marine Act permitting the use of such ships in moving lumber to Puerto Rico. It was under this amendment that the Georgia-Pacific application was made.

Other firms have made similar applications and presumably will receive equal opportunties. Mr. Pfeiffer's decision, if approved, will permit a shipper to obtain a firm offer from a foreign line at a stated shipping rate. If American-flag lines cannot or will not meet that rate in 3 days, he will be free to use the foreign vessel.

Puerto Rico, of course, is a small part of the world and domestic market for lumber, though an important one. There are other vital factors in the Pacific Northwest's present inability to compete favorably with Canada in these markets. Among them are stumpage costs and procedures for buying Government timber, which U.S. lumbermen contend place them at a serious disadvantage.

Higher loading costs in the United States also affect the total expense of shipping lumber, though some Northwest lumber producers assert this could largely be overcome by construction of specialized carriers. Foreign shipowners appear more ready to build or convert vessels specifically for lumber and log carrying than are the American owners who have a protective umbrella in the form of the Jones Act and subsidies in the offshore trades.

The cheaper Canadian dollar is another factor.

The ruling on the Puerto Rico shipments, if approved, will not solve the problems of Northwest lumbermen. But it is a step which could lead to removal of other Government-imposed restrictions that hamper

this region's free competition in marketing its basic product. Pressure cannot be reduced until the industry is completely unshackled.

[From the Crow's Lumber Digest, Dec. 20, 1962]

The Break in the Dike

The announcement on December 14 that Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges had approved the first application under the Neuberger amendment for usage of foreign vessels in the Puerto Rican trade comes as a pleasant surprise to the industry. Even though the Secretary attached a rather sticky requirement to the permit (giving U.S. lines 5 days to match the freight rate quoted by the foreign shipowners), this action must still be regarded as a break in the dike which has been built up around U.S. cargo-shipping mills.

Puerto Rico is a U.S. possession, yet due to antiquated shipping laws the American mills slowly lost 100 percent of this market over the past 10 years. That country will take 70 to 80 million feet of lumber this year, all from Canada. Now, following months of controversy, U.S. mills have a chance to get back a little of this business.

The Puerto Rican market, however, is a drop in the bucket compared to the volume lost in the U.S. east coast market over the same period of time. In the year of 1952, the U.S. east coast took 1.275 billion feet of lumber by cargo shipment, with 1.053 billion coming from U.S. mills and the remaining 222,000 coming from Canada. In the present year, the east coast market will take approximately 1.400 billion (based on figures available for the first 10 months), and the U.S. mills will have supplied only 500,000 feet. Net loss to the U.S. mills: 500,000 feet per year. Net gain to the Canadian mills: nearly 700,000 feet per year.

This huge loss of east coast volume, coupled with the small victory on the Puerto Rican case, should give the U.S. lumber industry the needed incentive to fight for complete removal of the Jones Act restrictions as they apply to lumber. During the past year, this fight was carried on by relatively few people, with the majority of the industry taking a disinterested viewpoint. Yet all of the industry is affected, since lumber displaced on the east coast eventually seeks other markets, and the entire lumber community is forced to readjust. In many cases, this readjustment is fatal to the mills and wholesalers involved.

The hemlock, which was displaced from the east coast cargo market, found new outlets in the Midwest and in the South, very often at the expense of other established species. This big change seriously affected the price structure on all dimension items including those in the Western pine and Southern pine regions. The Douglas-fir displaced from the east coast has moved in heavier volume to California, disrupting the traditional suppliers to that important market.

The Jones Act, as we see it, is everybody's business. The removal of this restriction could, in due time, gain back some of the 500 million feet per year lost in the east coast markets. We fail to believe that there is any serious shortage of timber in the U.S. producing region, or that American lumber is inferior to Canadian stock as was reported by some eastern distributors at the Tariff Commission hearings. The simple fact remains that our mills are at a huge freight rate disadvantage, due to an outmoded shipping act aimed at preserving the merchant marine.

The industry has tried one approach to the Canadian problem (the suggested quota and tariff), and in so doing created hard feelings in many quarters. The case for complete removal of the Jones Act will also cause friction, but the stakes are large, and the entire industry is involved. Secretary Hodges' decision last week proves that the industry at least has a fighting chance.

[From the Seattle Times, Dec. 5, 1962]

Another Victory in Lumber Aid Battle

An important step toward enabling American west coast lumbermen to overcome a competitive advantage held by Canadian lumber shippers in the prime American east coast market has been taken by a Maritime Administration examiner.

The examiner ruled that a ban on foreign-flag ships in domestic trade could be relaxed under certain conditions in the movement of lumber cargoes from the Northwest to Puerto Rico.

Canadian lumbermen now monopolize the Puerto Rican market because they can send cargoes to the island at less cost in foreign-flag ships denied to their American competitors.

This advantage has helped the Canadians to expand greatly their share of the lucrative Atlantic market.

If the examiner's ruling is upheld there will be a precedent that we hope will be followed in regard to lumber shipments to the east coast.

The hard-pressed Northwest lumber industry cannot follow up any such precedent merely by filing new applications with the Maritime Administration, however. Any further relaxation of existing maritime law will require additional congressional action.

That is why it is vital that the Washington and Oregon congressional delegations fight lumber's battle as vigorously in the new Congress, in a nonelection year, as they did in the recent preelection session.

And renewed White House support is equally vital. The amending of laws to permit use of foreign vessels in intercoastal lumber shipments was one of six points set forth by President Kennedy last July as possible means of aiding the Northwest lumber industry.

Much of that six-point Kennedy program still remains in the category of unfinished business.

SIMPLIFICATION OF FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID TO STATES FOR PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, for myself and Senators Bartlett, Ervin, McCarthy, McGee, Moss, Mundt, Nelson, Pearson, Prouty, Randolph, Tower, and Williams of New Jersey, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would simplify Federal grants-in-aid to States for public health services and provide greater flexibility in the allocation of certain categorical public health service funds in the States. Similar legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives.

This proposed legislation was drafted as the result of the second report to the President by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, of which I am a member.

Last year, on August 1, 1962, I introduced S. 3592, legislation designed to simplify grants-in-aid to the States for public health services to permit greater State flexibility in the use of public health allotments. I plan to reintroduce that measure now.

The proposed legislation originated under the title S. 1467, a bill I introduced on March 29, 1961. S. 3592 included technical changes in the bill. It reflects both the judgment of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, of State health officers, and other experts in the field. Formal resolutions urging enactment of the measure have been adopted by the Governors' conference, the executive committee of the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, the National Association of State Budget Officers, Midwestern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments, the National Association of County Officials, the American Municipal Association, and the National Legislation Conference of the Council of State Governments.

The bill which I have introduced today would amend the Public Health Service Act of 1944, to permit States, at the discretion of the Governor in each case, to transfer up to one-third of the Federal funds granted in any one of five health categories to one or more of the other four such categories. The following five categorical grants are involved: General health assistance, cancer control, heart disease control, tuberculosis control, and venereal disease control. The bill would not affect the remaining categories of mental health, maternal and child health, and crippled children's services.

In addition, the bill would establish a uniform allotment and matching formula for Federal grants to States in the special categories listed above. A number of different formulas now apply to these five categories.

Under the bill, funds would be allocated to the States on the basis of population, with matching requirements established according to per capita income in the individual States. Matching requirements would range from one-third State funds to two-thirds Federal funds for the lowest income States, to two-thirds State funds to one-third Federal funds for the highest income States. This formula follows the general principle established under the Hill-Burton program.

This proposal, Mr. President, is designed to improve the flexibility of federally supported public health service programs administered by the States, without removing the present overall direction of these programs in accordance with the priorities set by Congress. Initially, several of these categories were established to allow the Federal Government to stimulate State activity. Today the major cost is borne by the States, with the Federal Government playing an important supporting role.

By allowing the States to transfer up to one-third of the funds in the five categories listed, we would provide sufficient flexibility for State administrators in meeting peculiar and changing local needs, without endangering the integrity of the overall program. It should be noted that the proposed allowance for transfers would not be applied to the categories of mental health, maternal and child health, and crippled children services, since functional lines of responsibility between the Federal Government and the States do not coincide in these categories.

This bill, Mr. President, represents the considered opinion of members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, State and Territorial health and budget officers, and other experts in this field. It offers a sensible improvement in an important facet of intergovernmental relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1051) to amend section 314 of the Public Health Service Act, by providing greater flexibility to States in the use of certain public health grants-in-aid, and for other purposes; introduced by Mr. Muskie (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

MONUMENT COMMEMORATING THE INDEPENDENCE OF MEXICO—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when there is a second printing of S. 944, a bill to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico, that the name of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] be added.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF DAVIS-BACON ACT TO CONTRACTS FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when there is a second printing of S. 945, a bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to extend its application to contracts for the maintenance of Federal installations, that the names of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], and the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett] be added.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSING FOR MIGRATORY LABOR—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 1, 1963, the names of Senators Clark, Douglas, Inouye, Javits, Long of Missouri, McCarthy, Morse, Nelson, Randolph, Ribicoff, Yarborough, and Young of Ohio were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 981) to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to assist in the provision of housing for domestic farm labor, introduced by Mr. Williams of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators) on March 1, 1963.

PROBLEMS OF UNCHECKED GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as we all know, this week marks the anniversary of the beginning of what we know as the New Deal program. Just 30 years ago saw the inauguration of a massive effort to tax and spend our way out of a worldwide depression which was to pave the way for Federal intervention into almost every field of American endeavor. At that time, Mr. President, we really had a depression. Millions were unemployed, hundreds of factories lay idle, banks were closing, and soup kitchens and apple vendors were constant reminders of our economic plight. In other words, at that stage in our history there was need for action by the Federal Government in the national interest. I do not agree with the action that was taken, and history has proven that it was not the right kind of action. Make-work projects buttressed by heavy Government control over private endeavor did not do the job. Many years after the advent of the New Deal and its programs, the depression with all its attendant unemployment and human misery was still with us. And it remained right up until the outbreak of World War II, when the necessity to rearm in a hurry put our people and our factories back to work.

Now, Mr. President, I believe it is important for us today to understand the difference between that period and the one in which we now live. Today, for example, we have a high level of employment but a persistent and nagging problem of technological unemployment. Today, we have the highest level of savings and consumer purchasing power in our history. We have the highest standard of living in the world. We also have some very tough problems largely because of unchecked Government spending and a demonstrated policy of fiscal irresponsibility related to deficit financing. We have a serious adverse balance in our international payments, a sorely threatened gold reserve, a dollar which has lost much of its former standing in world financial circles, and a growing problem with foreign competition.

And today, Mr. President, we find another New Deal—this time called the New Frontier—offering the same old answers that we got 30 years ago. Despite the vastly changed conditions, we find the Government today parceling out PWA projects and funneling funds into so-called depressed areas as though the soup kitchens had returned. We find the Congress debating what amounts to a new 1963 version of the Civilian Conservation Corps. We find the administration pushing new social security legislation designed to subject the American people to Federal paternalism "from the cradle to the grave." We find the Executive reaching again for more and more power to regulate the national economy.

When we get right down to it, the New Frontier's idea of meeting our economic problems is the same one the New Deal used—bigger Government and heavier public spending.

Mr. President, this is not only a negative response to the pressing economic problems which face us as a nation; it is a reactionary response. It is a return to old methods—methods which were thoroughly tried in the 1930's and which were found wanting. This whole idea of trying to ease unemployment and growth problems through the use of printing press money will get us into more trouble than we are in already.

Let us say goodby to the 1930's and the depression-born economic thinking which has no application to the problems which confront us in a time of record consumer spending. Let us remember that panaceas and Government-financed nostrums did not work 30 years ago because they were not sound. Let us today profit from those mistakes and begin attacking our economic problems with realism and responsibility.

PROGRAMS TO ASSIST FISH FARMERS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the 64th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas recently passed a resolution urging the acceleration of programs designed to assist fish farmers. The fish farming industry has a great future but much information is needed on proper production, processing, and marketing techniques before the industry can develop its full potential. I was the author of the legislation which led to the establishment of the Fish Farm Experiment Station at Stuttgart, Ark. The work that is being carried out under the jurisdiction of this station, and other related facilities of the Fish and Wildlife Service, is designed to solve many of the problems which have hampered the growth of the fish farming industry.

I am hopeful that the work of both the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife on fish farming problems can be expedited in the next fiscal year. This work is of great importance to all States having fish farming potential.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the Arkansas General Assembly be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and Federal agencies to accelerate research programs with respect to harvesting, processing, and marketing of farm-produced fish, and to establish uniform laws and regulations defining fish farming

Whereas the State of Arkansas has 4,500,000 acres of idle land which is ideally suited to the production of farm grown fish; and

Whereas experts have estimated that such idle land is capable of an annual production of farm grown fish having a value of $100 million; and

Whereas the United States is presently importing 50 percent of its fish and fish products, thereby indicating a great need to increase domestic fish production to halt the flow of U.S. dollars which are going to other countries for the purchase of fish; and

Whereas there is presently approximately 100,000 acres of privately owned reservoirs in the State of Arkansas that contain several million dollars worth of valuable fish which are not being harvested due to the lack of technical knowledge of harvesting, processing, and marketing; and

Whereas the laws of the Federal Government, and the regulations of a number of Federal administrative agencies, are conflicting with regard to fish farming, and because of such conflicting laws the production of farm-produced fish is being handicapped at the present time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 64th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the house of representatives concurring therein), That, the General Assembly of Arkansas respectfully requests the Congress of the United States, and the appropriate Federal agencies, to take necessary steps to accelerate research programs applicable to farm-produced fish, with such research to especially determine economic means of harvesting, processing, and marketing farm-produced fish to the end that the obviously great potentials and possibilities of this new farm crop may be realized and thousands of acres of idle land may be put into production with the resulting increase in employment and business activity attendant thereto; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States and all Federal agencies are urged to enact and promulgate a common and uniformly accepted definition of fish farming to the extent that fish farming may be recognized, for the various Federal purposes, as any other agricultural pursuit; be it further

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution a copy thereof shall be furnished, by the secretary of state, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and the appropriate Agriculture Committees of the House and Senate of the Congress of the United States, to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and to each member of the Arkansas congressional delegation.

GRAND TETON NATIONAL PARK

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, there are not superlatives enough to describe the beauty of my State of Wyoming and in particular the majesty of Grand Teton National Park. People who visit there often are completely transformed by their contact with the works of God and nature.

To illustrate this point I cite an article in the March issue of Redbook magazine written by a Detroit housewife who, with her family, spent 2 weeks at the park. Her account of that trip is concrete testimony of the wonders of that park. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Wyoming: Wild and Wonderful

(By Mary Augusta Rodgers)

Two weeks was all the time we had last summer, and we went from Detroit, Mich., to Jackson Hole, Wyo. It's a long trip—more than 3,000 miles there and back, the way we did it—and we were tried and travel stained when we returned. A neighbor, very natty in a white shirt and Bermuda shorts, observed our homecoming. "This was a vacation?" he inquired, puffing judiciously on his pipe.

Ah, but it was. One of the best we've ever had.

We had first seen the Jackson Hole country on a long trip the year before, and ever since, we had wanted to return. The scenery is magnificent, of course, but that's not the whole story; our first trip left us with the impression that the West is a vast area of incredible beauty and we were dazzled by it. But some places have that indefinable, vital note of particular personality, just as some people do, and Jackson Hole turned out to be the place for us. Those mountains, those lakes, that valley, that sky. We could hardly wait to see it all again.

We left Detroit on a Friday, behind schedule. Packing turned out to be more of a job than we had anticipated—it always is, but we never learn. "Off at dawn," my husband and I cry hopefully the night before; the boys listen, smile, and make bets about how late we'll actually be; and the most cynical among them is the one who wins. At 17 (Pete), 16 (Billy), and 14 (Mark), they naturally are prepared for the worst. Only Kitsy, who is 7, still regards her parents with absolute confidence. For example, we were 50 miles on our way when she mentioned that she had let the cat back into the house.

"But don't worry," she said cheerfully. "Daddy'll fix it."

Two hours later we were on our way. Again.

We dipped down to Chicago to pick up our seventh passenger, my husband's younger brother; this gave us five drivers for our caravan—a station wagon and a compact bus—so we took turns driving through the night, had breakfast in Wisconsin, lunch in Minnesota, and dinner in South Dakota. We camped for the night at a roadside park, and the next morning we drove through Pierre and headed for the Badlands National Monument. This was our first official sightseeing stop, and we had plenty of company. I remember watching a boy who was taking a picture of his father, who was taking a movie shot of his wife, who was taking a picture of the Badlands. It is a desertlike landscape, strangely colored and shimmering in the heat, the hills eroded into shapes resembling spires and towers and battlements.

Another night at a roadside park, this time in Wyoming, and we awoke to a brilliant summer day, hot and clear, with sunflowers and black-eyed Susans blooming along the highway. The land was beginning to look authentically western—sagebrush, grazing herds of cattle, cottonwood trees growing by sparkling streams, mesas gray-blue in the distance.

The drive through the Big Horn Mountains was spectacular. "Wow," Uncle Larry cried, giving up on the search for the mot juste. Granite Pass, Shell Canyon, Greybull, Shoshone—the very names sounded like a beating drum, and the views were thrilling almost everywhere.

By the time we drove around Yellowstone Lake at twilight, though, we were having trouble reacting to anything but the thought of a sandwich and a cup of coffee. Night fell, the road ran on endlessly, a bear appeared for a moment in the headlights of the bus—but we'd already seen 10 bears and a herd of elk. There was no moon and the sky was dark. We couldn't see the mountains, but we could feel them looming, like hidden giants. When we reached the Jenny Lake campground in the Grand Teton National Park, we were greeted by a sign which stated positively: "Camp Area Full."

We parked near the entrance and fell asleep just as we were. At 6 o'clock in the morning a ranger, looking clear-eyed, neat, and outrageously rested, emerged from the ranger station and removed the sign. The rush that followed was something like the opening of the Cherokee Strip. We were seized by the homesteader's fever, and when we finally found a good site and started driving in tent pegs, we felt triumphantly: This land is ours. We didn't even take time to look around until we had signed in at the ranger station. No matter. The mountains were still there.

They rise without foothills, dominating the valley, the peaks splendid in the light of a summer morning, glaciers shining in the sun. Their reflections lie on the surface of the lakes, their shadows fall across meadows full of wildflowers and the Snake River winds at their feet. The wind, blowing over the mountain slopes, smells of snow and pine. Remote from the big cities and the crowded States, the valley of Jackson Hole has the feeling of a high-altitude oasis, a natural version of Shangri-La.

Headquarters of the Grand Teton National Park are at Moose, 7 miles away, but much park activity centers at Jenny Lake. There is a log-cabin museum, a little shop, a boat dock, a horse corral and the Exum School of Mountaineering. Fishermen have Jenny Lake to themselves; the swimmers go down to String Lake or follow the trail beyond it to Leigh Lake. During the day, cars from nearly every State line the road near the ranger station, but there never seem to be crowds of people milling about. This is vigorous country, and even the most settled, sedentary, suburban types are irresistibly drawn to be out and doing.

Besides the Jenny Lake campground, there are others at Colter Bay, Jackson Lake and Gros Ventre (pronounced Grovont, unless you want to be considered a tenderfoot and a square). Since these are all national park campgrounds, there is no fee for the tent sites. Each site is a large space shaded by pine trees, with a parking turnout, a cooking grate and a picnic table; and there are chipmunks and ground squirrels to add to that lived-in look. Every area has a community woodpile and rubbish is collected every day. Comfort stations are maintained—although camping is camping, after all, and there is nothing especially comfortable about getting there from your tent at 6 a.m. in the rain. A sense of adventure helps—one girl told me that when leaving the Ladies' one evening, she opened the door, and before she could step out a bear stepped in. "I like to think," she added piously, "that it was a lady bear."

There are other facilities in the park, however, besides free camping sites. At Colter Bay, the Grand Teton Lodge Co. operates a trailer park with utility connections for 112 trailers, a compound of heated log cabins with baths, a tent village. The tents are set on concrete, backed with logs and equipped with electric lights; each is furnished with an outdoor grill, a wood-burning stove, double-deck bunks, a table and benches; all other housekeeping necessities, from sleeping bags to coffeepots, are available for rental; and thus it is at last possible to camp a la carte.

There is a visitors' information center at Colter Bay, an outdoor amphitheater, a swimming beach, a lakeside marina, a horse corral, a grocery store, coffee shop, taproom and (here's where it gets really exciting) a laundry with automatic washing machines and adjoining shower rooms. The showers cost 35 cents, slightly more if you forget your own towels, and all campers know that there are times when a hot shower is an event so luxurious that it verges on a debauch. Even a wait in the laundry can be a pleasure; there is always the bulletin board to study. People want to share rides, swap equipment, advertise the lost and found, leave messages for friends. The messages often provide food for thought—"Dot and Sandy: Sorry we missed you, second honeymoon, Mother off for Las Vegas, love, Betty and George"—but the most arresting in my experience was a notice written on a file card in a flowing Palmer penmanship hand that said quite simply: "Wanted, old garter. Need not be in working order." A local telephone number followed.

(My husband felt that garter was obviously a misspelling for guitar. I felt that life is mysterious and who are we to know?)

The Jackson Lake Lodge and the Jenny Lake Lodge are located as their names indicate, both operated by the Grand Teton Lodge Co. The Jackson Lake Lodge has cottages in addition to the main house, hotel service, a dining room, bar, and barber and beauty shops. In the main lounge, huge windows frame a spectacular view of the mountains behind Jackson Lake, and ordinarily energetic guests have been known to sit there for hours, fascinated by the play of light and shadow. A variety of programs is presented in the lodge auditorium; the Laubins, a couple who are experts on Indian culture, give a popular recital of Indian dances every Friday night.

At Jenny Lake, 35 log cabins, many of them the carefully restored cabins of original settlers, cluster around the lodge, which is small, cozy, and famous for its food and service. Every Sunday there is a buffet, with hors d'oeuvres packed against an ice swan, a lavish supply of entrees and salads, and the offerings of a reckless and gifted pastry chef. The buffet is open to the public for the price of the meal, and many campers avail themselves of the opportunity, granting that hot dogs and beans taste great over an open fire but feeling that there is no reason to be fanatical on the subject.

Finally, there are a number of privately owned dude or guest ranches within the boundaries of the Grand Teton Park, and hotel and motel accommodations in the town of Jackson.

Our own tents at the Jenny Lake campground looked like a small village. There was a wing tent for the children's dormitory, a pup tent for Uncle Larry's bachelor quarters, and the bus for Mother and Father. The bus, fitted out with water tank, icebox, table, storage shelves, a couch that converted into a double bed and even tie-back plaid curtains at the windows, was known as the Officers' Club. As camp cook and housekeeper, I need a lot of equipment, although I have improved since our first camping trip, when—inspired by heaven knows what dream of gracious living among the tall pines—I took along a souffle pan and a steam iron.

Those who love this country give many different reasons, but essentially what they all are saying is the same. A businessman who has been bringing his family to the same dude ranch for 15 years talked about what he liked to do—the fishing, the pack trips—and then, with mounting enthusiasm, about what he liked not to do. "No television, no radio—I hardly even read letters. And the telephone connections are so lousy," he added ecstatically, "that the office finally quit trying to get in touch with me."

The most famous visitor last summer was Astronaut John Glenn. We were in Jackson buying groceries when we heard a hubbub in the next block, inquired about it and learned that Glenn and his family were there. As long as they were in town they couldn't move without attracting an admiring crowd, but that afternoon they left for a week's camping trip in the mountains. The ranger who guided them up to their first night's campsite said afterward that John Glenn slid off his horse, looked at the mountain meadow—unchanged since the days it was known only to the Indians—and said suddenly, "For the first time in a year I feel free."

It was August and the weather was superb. As the days went by it was hard not to feel that we all were better people, in some basic way, just for being in such beautiful country. Certainly we were healthier. We used String Lake as a bathtub—in such a setting, a pretty glorious bathtub—but Leigh Lake was our favorite and we went there nearly every day. It was 2 miles through pine woods to the sandy spit where we liked to settle down and sun bathe and swim. The first time, this felt like a real hike, but in a few days the 2 miles meant no more than a stroll to the corner mailbox back home. The lake water was cold, clear, amazingly invigorating after the first breathless plunge, and it was wonderful to lie in the sun, gazing up at the grandeur of Teewinot Mountain against a brassy summer sky, lulled by a piny breeze and the sound of birds.

We seldom planned more than a day ahead, and yet the time fell into a pattern. Breakfast and dinner were substantial meals, eaten at camp; lunch was usually a picnic of bread and cheese and fruit wherever we happened to be. At night we sometimes strolled over to the amphitheater to hear nature talks by the park naturalists. One night the climbing ranger discussed mountaineering and illustrated his talk with color slides. A particularly dizzying shot showed a climber inching his way up what appeared to be a sheer wall of ice. The audience gasped, and the ranger remarked amiably, "You know that is much harder than it looks."

The country absorbed us. We went riding and saw a moose. The boys and Uncle Larry tried the fishing at the Gros Ventre River and took an all-day fishing trip down the Snake; it rained that afternoon, and they were interested to see the rubber rafts from Jackson Lake Lodge float majestically by, the passengers shielded from the rain by plastic sheets and the rafts looking like big, gift-wrapped packages. One day we hiked along the Indian Paintbrush Trail to the Continental Divide. It seemed odd to ask first at the ranger station about snow conditions in August, but a snow cornice may block the divide at any time. Another day we took the Glacier Trail to Amphitheater Lake, which begins at Lupine Meadow and ends at timber line after a 3,000-foot rise in 5½ miles of trail. (A booklet called "Teton Trails," for sale at the visitors' centers in the park, is very useful; and so is another, "Yellowstone and Grand Teton Wild Flowers." You're not supposed to pick the wildflowers, but you might as well peer at them knowingly.)

One long day we went to Yellowstone. A day is not nearly long enough to see all the areas of interest, but we saw Old Faithful and the geyser basins and the great canyon of the Yellowstone River. The stones are yellow; the lodgepole pines are dark green; the river roars furiously in the canyon; the ground steams and bubbles and boils and shoots forth geysers. It's wild, weird country; the Indians thought it was inhabited by devils and ghosts, and no wonder. We saw mule deer and a couple of coyotes and bears, bears, bears. Kitsy never failed to shriek happily at the sight of a bear, even the 18th that afternoon—she was looking for Yogi Bear (who's always in the ra-a-anger's hair).

It is hard to imagine the excuse for many of the adult tourists, who behave as if the bears were stuffed and provided solely to serve as props for comic photos. Every season about 10 or 15 visitors to the park are mauled or bitten by the bears, and the wonder is that the figure is so low. Some people do incredible things; one man put his baby in a bear's arms and then stepped back to snap a picture. (The bear, fortunately, dropped the baby.) We were particularly fretful about the motorists who at the sight of a bear slammed on brakes and stopped in the middle of fast-moving highway traffic. Impervious to the cars piling up behind them, they rolled down their windows and teased the bear with sandwiches and candy bars, all the while yelling, "Get a picture of him with his mouth open like that" and, "Oh, isn't he cute."

In Grand Teton Park we went to see the park museum at Menors Ferry and exhibits at the park headquarters at Moose, and to see where the famous Gros Ventre Slide occurred. The scar is still clearly visible where a mountain fell, like an avalanche of snow, into the valley, even without the explicit park sign: "The Gros Ventre slide occurred June 23, 1925. It dammed the river and created Lower Slide Lake. On May 18, 1927, the dam broke and the rushing water flooded the town of Kelly 4 miles below. Six lives were lost, ranch homes destroyed, livestock drowned, and other extensive damage was caused." And one afternoon we took a picnic lunch up to the top of Signal Mountain. On one side is a view of the Teton range, on the other a magnificent view of the valley, green with trees, blue in the shadow of the mountains, gray with sagebrush. The park sign begins like a poem: "Here glaciers met and melted."

It is my unsolicited opinion that the taxpayer's dollar seldom returns to him in more benign form than in the services of the national parks and their staffs. Their constant effort is to achieve two opposing goals—to preserve what little is left of this countrys' natural wilderness and to enable the public to use and enjoy it. The public—that's all of us—loves its parks, but its embrace can be as crushing as the bear's. A wrangler, leading a group on horseback up the trail to Lake Solitude, was heard to mutter, "Any day now they'll change the name to Lake Multitude."

A. B. Guthrie's novel "The Big Sky" is full of feeling for the Teton country, and at the end one of the characters says, "There was beaver for us and free country and a big way of livin' and everything we done it looks like we done against ourselves and couldn't do different if we'd knowed. We went to get away and to enjoy ourselves free and easy, but folks were bound to foller and beaver to get scarce and Injuns to be killed or tamed, and all the time the country gettin' safer and better known. We ain't see the end of it yet."

Like the South, the West is half history, half legend, and they have a good time with both in the town of Jackson. Every night at 7 at the main intersection, they try Clover the Killer. The stage clatters in; there is a holdup; the blank bullets blaze and the horses rear; the Cache Creek posse rides again. Clover is captured and dragged before the bar of justice, an archway made entirely of elk horns. "Hang him?" the announcer-judge asks, his scarf not entirely concealing the cord of the microphone around his neck "Hang him, hang him," the kids (some of them age 60) holler. In the interests of mercy and the next night's show, Clover is allowed to shoot it out with the sheriff instead. Bang, bang. Clover falls and twitches artistically. The crowd applauds. Overhead the traffic light goes back on.

It's a great show. Old hands in Jackson will tell you that if you're planning to go to a restaurant, 7 o'clock is the time to get there and order dinner.

There is the Pink Garter Theater, the Cowboy Bar, and the Silver Dollar Cafe. When the stagecoach is not being used for holdups, a young man (known as Killer Clay on the nights he substitutes for Clover) sells tickets for rides around the square. Some gaudy cowboy outfits are seen on the boardwalks of Jackson, the most resplendent usually worn by big-city citizens who wouldn't know a corral from a calaboose, but the man who set my hair in a local beauty shop had on a rather striking outfit too, complete with sombrero and gun and holster set. When he bent to roll up the back curls, he looked as though he should be shoeing a horse.

But it's not all enjoyable claptrap, the essence of 10,000 cowboy movies and TV dramas and Frankie Laine singing, "Ghost Riders in the Sky." Look anywhere. This is the country of John Colter, who had been with the Lewis and Clark Expedition and who set out for the unknown Western mountains to see what the fur trapping might be like and if the Indians were interested in trading. That was—well, there was an argument, not only about the date but about Colter's ever reaching Jackson Hole. Then in 1930 a plow, turning over virgin homestead land, uncovered a piece of dirt-covered rock, crudely carved to resemble a man's head. On one side was scratched a name,

"John Colter," and on the other side the date, "1808."

This is the country of hunters and trappers, scouts and guides, and men prospecting for gold—men like Bridger and David E. Jackson, and Beaver Dick Leigh with his Shoshonean wife named Jenny. The settlers and the farmers came last. But they stayed.

By the end of our first week in the Teton country we felt like settlers ourselves. Suntanned and hearty, the boys wore blue jeans and cowboy hats with ease and just the proper hint of swagger, and were talking about coming back another summer and getting ranch jobs on their own. Even Kitsy decided to give up her lifelong ambition to be a nurse and grow up to be a lady wrangler instead. Uncle Larry, whose previous idea of hardship was a Martini with too much vermouth in it, had formed the habit of having a swim in String Lake every morning before breakfast, about 7 a.m. Year-round mountaineering men were amazed. "Are you out of your mind?" they asked frankly. "That water is cold."

When everybody else in the family decided to go to mountain-climbing school, I decided to go along. And that was a mistake. First we went by boat to Hidden Falls, hiked to a lovely spot—I am always one to notice the view—and learned how to tie knots and handle a rope. "No, no, Mary," the guide said. "Your other left hand." The fact of the matter is that I have always detested rope tying in any form since Girl Scout days, and besides that I am afraid of heights and nobody should really expect me to cope with this sort of thing. Nevertheless, the next thing I knew, I was scraping all the skin off my knees and elbows trying to get up a steep slab of rock, while the guide stood above and shouted down, "Listen to me, Mary—stop cowering and come on." We went over three or four pitches, each worse than the last, and then it was time for lunch. After lunch we were going to try rappelling. It was explained to me, the class coward, that rappelling was different. Lots of fun—in fact, a real lark. I was just beginning to feel optimistic when the sky darkened, thunder rolled, rain began pouring down and the lark aspect of the afternoon dimmed. The other members of the class began to rappel and I observed the procedure. There is this rope, see, and you put it around you in a certain fashion, and then you step backward off a cliff. The rain poured and the wind grew cold and I huddled on a little ledge on the side of the cliff and wondered just what turn I had taken on life's highway to land me in this particular spot. Finally it was my turn. Taking the rope, I tried to hold it in the approved manner. I looked down. Then I slipped in the mud and cut my knee on a rock. I looked down again. And then—let's put it this way: I know enough to come in out of the rain.

It is only fair to emphasize that everyone else in the family felt different. They thought that climbing was exhilarating and challenging and generally terrific and mother was chicken. My husband and the two older boys immediately made plans to climb "the Grand"—the Grand Teton, highest peak in the range at 13,766 feet, and a 2-day venture with a guide.

The morning they left was beautiful, but by early afternoon the sky was cloudy and by dusk it was raining again. "Raining here, it's snowing up there," someone said.

It was a long night—I awoke with a start, looked at my watch, and saw that it was 4 a.m., just the time the climbing party would start toward the peak—and a longer day; and then about 4 o'clock they came into view along the Garnet Canyon Trail. They'd had everything—snow, hail, and electrical storm. "We were bombed," the guide said wearily.

"Never again," my husband announced, back at the camp, and started to drift off to sleep before he'd finished pulling his boots off.

"One of the greatest days of my life," was his version of the climb the next morning.

Even I felt that this was the climax, and it was just as well that the time had come to leave. Following our own quaint custom, we planned to leave at 10 in the morning, and actually got away about 3 that afternoon. It was strenuous work, breaking camp; at one point Uncle Larry stopped and directed our attention to the boys, who were lounging comfortably at the picnic table, reading magazines.

"Note that," he muttered. "The coffee break at the OK Corral."

Going home, the way seemed quicker, and more tiring. We went through Nebraska and Iowa, driving through the night again. I found myself thinking about the things that we'd wanted to do and hadn't had time for. We'd wanted to take the trip to Alaska Basin on horseback; we'd wanted to see the melodrama at the Pink Garter in Jackson; and ride the chair lift; and ride to Wilson, just a few miles beyond Jackson, to see the Saturday night rodeo; and go over to the Jackson Lake Lodge and take the all-day float trip down the Snake; and try a week of wilderness camping in the Wind River Mountains, part of the Bridger National Forest. * * *

Next time, next time.

Thinking about what we had done, I found that I was remembering moods and odd moments: the sun and the clear, cold water at Leigh Lake; a turn in the path toward Paintbrush Divide, a breathtaking view, and the sudden notion that it promised all sorts of things; simplicity and freedom and the natural rhythm of the changing seasons and the sun and moon and stars. The frontier is gone but the lure is still there, and in the Tetons the mountains and lakes and forests still remain, beautiful and unchanged.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI FERDINAND M. ISSERMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, tonight, Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman will enter the pulpit and deliver his last sermon at Temple Israel in St. Louis, where he has served God, his congregation, his city, and his fellow man since 1929.

Among his major interests have been combating prejudice against Negroes and building interfaith relationships, and the great progress St. Louis has made in these areas is flaming testimonial to the effectiveness of his efforts.

Mr. President, I am sure our colleagues would find the story of Rabbi Isserman's 33 years in St. Louis interesting and inspirational, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an excellent feature article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 21, written by Clarissa Start and entitled "Rabbi Isserman—Always on Side of the Angels."

The rabbi says he considers himself lucky to have spent such a long span of years in St. Louis. While I agree wholeheartedly with that sentiment, for St. Louis is indeed a beautiful and wonderful city in which to live, I would add to his comment a further note: "Rabbi Isserman, St. Louis is lucky that you chose her for your home, and St. Louisans are thankful that you chose them to be your neighbors."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RABBI ISSERMAN—ALWAYS ON SIDE OF THE ANGELS

(By Clarissa Start)

"I was very lucky," said Rabbi Ferdinand M. Isserman, as he tilted back in his chair, glanced ceilingward and let his mind revert to the past. "I came to St. Louis at the time of the golden age of the liberal clergy in this city. There were such men as Jay Stocking at Pilgrim Congregational, George Campbell at Union Avenue Christian, Bishop Will Scarlett and Dean Sidney Sweet at Christ Church Cathedral, Ivan Lee Holt of St. John's Methodist, William Bitting at Second Baptist, Father William Mullally of St. Mary Magdalen and Father Russell Wilbur of Notre Dame de Lourdes Catholic Churches."

No list of the liberal clergy of St. Louis would be complete without the name of Rabbi Isserman himself. The senior rabbi at Temple Israel, who is retiring next month, has been an active, constructive force in the community since he came here in 1929.

His ministry has been such a successful one that it is hard to believe he hesitated to come to St. Louis from Toronto for fear he wouldn't make the grade.

"I felt secure there and was afraid to come here," he recalls. "My predecessor at Temple Israel, Rabbi Leon Harrison, was a great orator. People crowded the temple to hear him speak. I was sure I could never take his place."

Rabbi Isserman was only 31 years old at the time but he had made a name for himself with his first three congregations.

Because he came to St. Louis from Canada, many people assumed he was Canadian, but actually he was born in Antwerp, Belgium, and came to this country with his family when he was 8. He attended school in Newark, N.J., and then went to Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, Ohio, the University of Cincinnati and the University of Pennsylvania, where he took his M.A.

He served as rabbi in Paducah, Ky., Philadelphia and then Toronto, where he made news by participating in the first Christian-Jewish pulpit exchange in Canadian history and by heading a campaign to abolish corporal punishment in Toronto schools.

Despite his trepidation about coming to St. Louis, he finally decided to accept the invitation and the challenge, and arrived here on September 1, 1929. His first duty here was to participate in the funeral services for Sigmund Baer. A few weeks later, he performed his first marriage ceremony in St. Louis, that of Louis Rothschild and Emily Bettman. On September 27 he was formally installed, with the late Rabbi Stephen S. Wise acting as installing officer and Julius Glaser representing the congregation.

The new rabbi soon found St. Louis to be a friendly place, especially in its interfaith relationships.

"The thing that has made mine a very rich ministry," says Rabbi Isserman, "is the liberal attitude of the community and the friendliness to differences. I think this climate was created by the Forty-eighters, those German immigrants who came here in 1848—men like Carl Schurz, who believed in civil liberties. They kept Missouri from becoming a slave state and going with the Confederacy. The temper of the community was hospitable to other points of view."

He remembers with special warmth his first meeting with Dean (later Bishop) Scarlett, of whom he had heard so much.

"I went to Bishop Tuttle Memorial and got permission to go upstairs; he lived in an apartment on the fifth floor," Rabbi Isserman recalled. "When he came to the door, I said, 'I'm Rabbi Harrison's successor.' He said. 'I'm Will Scarlett—call me Will.' I said, 'Call me Ferd,' and that was it."

The two men conferred with Archbishop Glennon and out of the meeting came plans for the St. Louis Seminar of Christians and Jews, held in the spring of 1930. It was a 2-day discussion period, with an audience comprised of 333 Catholics, 333 Jews, and 333 Protestants, with Gov. Henry S. Caulfield making the 1000th member.

"We called it our religious prejudice disarmament conference," said Rabbi Isserman. "It had a terrific impact on the community, and paved the way for much good interfaith work which followed. Teams of rabbis, priests, and ministers visited schools and went around the State on pilgrimages.

"Today, of course, the National Conference of Christians and Jews performs this work on a national scale and in a more intensive way, but in this community we were the pioneers. And I think the results have been evident. I remember when Louis P. Aloe ran for mayor how big a part prejudice played in his defeat. Last year Larry Roos—a boy whom I confirmed—was elected county supervisor and the issue of religion, to my knowledge, was not raised."

Also in the early 1930's Rabbi Isserman founded and became chairman of the Social Justice Commission of St. Louis, an organization of 15 clergymen and 10 professors. The late Dean Joseph Husslein of St. Louis University was a member and so was Wiley Rutledge, who went on to become a U.S. Supreme Court Justice.

"We found that rabbis, priests, and ministers often saw eye to eye on the social gospel on which the great prophets had spoken," he said. "In our union we had a great deal of strength."

Most of the accomplishments of the Social Justice Commission were in the settling of labor disputes. The commission settled a dispute between a large dairy and its milk producers; it settled a taxicab strike and a milk wagon drivers' strike and it averted a streetcar strike.

"We tried unsuccessfully to settle a quarrel between rival coal mine unions," Rabbi Isserman recalled. "John L. Lewis came to this meeting and I still remember his dramatic speech."

Rabbi Isserman visited Nazi Germany in 1933 and was so moved that he wrote a book, "Sentenced to Death," predicting the wholesale slaughter of Jews, a prophecy which was looked on as exaggerated at the time.

He had served with the Central Infantry Officers at Camp Grant, Ill., in World War I, and in World War II was granted a 6-month leave of absence to serve with the American Red Cross in the Tunisian campaign. At the end of the war he was outspoken on the subject of world peace and atomic control.

In recent years, one of his major interests has been combating prejudice against Negroes. But his stand was made clear long ago. The death of Henry Bibb, Negro janitor of Temple Israel for 47 years, occurred early in Rabbi Isserman's ministry Funeral services for the faithful employee were held in the temple with Rabbi Isserman officiating.

He has had Negro singers and speakers at Temple Israel. One of the achievements of which he is proudest is the nursery foundation, interracial nursery.

"Some people said this would create an uproar," Rabbi Isserman recalled, adding drily, "It created such an uproar that 3 years later the United Fund took it over."

Occasionally some of the members of his congregation have differed with him, but in all the years there have been few resignations over principle.

"Many disagreed with me but respected my right to my own opinion," says Rabbi Isserman.

The Reform congregation has more than doubled since he became its senior rabbi. In the 1930's, in the midst of the depression, it seemed that plans to build Temple Israel house next to the temple at Kingshighway and Washington Boulevard were stalled. But Rabbi Isserman secured a pledge from the late Charles Stix that his firm would float a bond issue to lend the temple $250,000. Rabbi Isserman obtained from members of the congregation personal pledges for $65,000 to underwrite the interest on the bonds for 5 years, and the project went ahead.

Last fall the new Temple Israel house of worship at Ladue and Spoede roads was dedicated. Appropriately enough, monumental sculptures were given to the temple by Christ Church Cathedral, a gracious reciprocal gesture for the baptistry doors which the temple had given the cathedral on the 10th anniversary of Bishop Scarlett's consecration.

"There are Old and New Testament symbols on the doors," said Rabbi Isserman, "symbolic of the fact, that, as the doors swing side by side without conflict, so can the faiths work side by side."

In addition to his many other interests, Rabbi Isserman is an art collector, and the walls of his home at 82 Arundel Place are covered with paintings, both the abstracts which he admires and the more conventional works which his wife prefers.

The Issermans have two children, a daughter, Mrs. Stanley B. Gertz, who lives on Long Island, and a son, Fred, Jr., vice president of an advertising agency, who lives in Highland Park, Ill.

On March 8, Rabbi Isserman will preach his last sermon at Temple Israel, but he is not retiring from the active ministry. He will be guest rabbi to the Jewish community in Hong Kong, and plans to study Buddhism and Confucian thought during his year there.

Appreciation of other religions has been a special interest which he has not only pursued himself but has instilled in his congregation. A requirement of confirmation at Temple Israel is the study of comparative religions, and representatives of other faiths are brought in to tell the children of their beliefs.

"I think tolerance is bad," says Rabbi Isserman. "Appreciation of other faiths—that's the thing for which we should aim."

Rabbi Isserman will be succeeded at Temple Israel by Rabbi Martin E. Katzenstein. Although Rabbi Isserman will be leaving St. Louis, at least for a year, he hopes to keep in touch with his adopted city by means of taped programs which he will send back to KSD as a continuation of his radio program of many years. There is no doubt that St. Louis will always have a great claim on him.

"St. Louis, in my opinion," he says, "is the capital of interfaith relationships."

QUADRIPARTITE TAX RELIEF

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, without an assist from the Congress or the Treasury Department, Mr. and Mrs. Phillip Axe, of Lima, Ohio, have, with the help of the good Lord, provided for themselves a considerable tax cut and at the same time contributed substantially to our gross national product.

I am pleased to extend my sincere and warm congratulations to Mr. and Mrs. Axe, who are the proud parents of quadruplets born at St. Rita's Hospital, Lima, Ohio, on Monday, March 4, 1963. The quadruplets, who are reported to be getting along nicely, range from 2 pounds 9 ounces to 4 pounds 2 ounces.

THE DEBT POOLING RACKET

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last Sunday the Washington Post carried an article by Leslie Whitten exposing the abuses in the rapidly growing and flourishing debt pooling racket in Washington, D.C. As described in the Washington Post, these so-called debt pooling firms, "offer to organize all debts, set a weekly or other regular payment from the debtor to themselves, and from this payment pay themselves a fee and send the rest out to the various creditors."

In short, the debt poolers offer to help the unwary or unfortunate consumer by charging him a stiff fee and pushing him even further into debt.

I must say that the fact that there are so many people so deeply in debt that they cannot meet their credit obligations is no surprise to me. For 3 years my subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee has held extensive hearings on various truth-in-lending bills which would require disclosure of the cost of consumer credit contracts before the consumer signs on the dotted line. The record of those hearings conclusively demonstrates to me that most consumers today are not adequately aware of the finance charges and interest rates they incur when they borrow money or buy on credit. Indeed, one of the managers of a local pooling firm explains their mushrooming growth by saying that—

> It is too much easy credit. As long as you have people borrowing so much money you will have a need for [debt consolidation] agencies.

However, it is not clear that these debt pooling firms are helpful to lenders or creditors in collecting their debts. For instance, the better business bureau in Kansas City surveyed lenders and creditors on their attitudes towards these debt pooling firms. The better business bureau found that:

> The firms were not useful or beneficial, according to 95 percent of the creditors.
>
> Proraters do not pay creditors as promptly as debtors pay proraters, according to 70 percent of the creditors.
>
> All but 2 percent of creditors said the proraters, for one reason or another, do not usually keep up payments until the entire balance of the debtor's account is paid.

Most important, the manager of the Kansas City Better Business Bureau has concluded that, "debtors are too often misled concerning the services which the prorate company is in a position to render."

On the basis of the figures supplied in the Washington Post article, it should be clearly understood that these debt poolers are charging those they are supposedly counseling and aiding as much as a 25-percent fee on the declining unpaid balances on their obligations for these services. This is in addition to the charges by the original creditors.

Of course, there is a vital need for genuine debt counseling services for those who find themselves overburdened with credit obligations. Many creditors are quite willing to provide these services themselves to customers without charge.

Many credit unions long ago established programs of debt counseling for their members. In other instances employers have offered free debt counseling services for their employees. In addition, legal aid societies as well as many types of public service agencies have in the past provided such services to the unfortunate, or unwary, without charge.

However, it is hard to see how those firms described in the Washington Post article could possibly be providing any services which would justify the very steep charges which the debtor is required to pay.

If the facts that the Washington Post have disclosed are true, these firms correctly deserve to be called debt pyramiders, not debt counselors.

I hope the Federal Trade Commission will very carefully examine the advertising these firms doing business in the District of Columbia have engaged in to make sure their representations to the debtor are truthful and accurate. Second, I hope that the District Committee will very carefully investigate this situation to see whether or not the District of Columbia should follow those many other States who have outlawed the debt pooling racket.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post be printed in its entirety at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Prorating Debt Firms Thrive Here

(By Leslie H. Whitten)

Debt consolidators are banned in Virginia and several other States, regulated in still others, but neither regulated nor prohibited in the District. Recently, they have mushroomed here.

There was only one debt consolidation firm here in 1959. Now there are at least five.

They offer to organize all debts, set a weekly or other regular payment from the debtor to themselves and from this payment pay themselves a fee and send the rest out to the various creditors.

They are called proraters because they generally disburse the funds on the basis of which creditor is owed most—or howls loudest.

Their advertising is vigorously aimed at those whose debts have put them against the wall, and thousands of area residents have put millions of dollars in debts in the proraters' hands.

"No matter how much you owe, even if you are past due everywhere—we can get you back on your feet without borrowing," asserts a direct-mail card sent by National Budget Services, Inc., a firm set up in 1959, to a couple plagued with debts.

"Get out of debt today," says an advertisement by Budget Counsellors, Inc. "All you need is a sincere desire to get out of debt," says Credit Advisors, Inc.

The fact is, the better business bureau points out, that although a debtor who can follow the prorater's payment schedule can eventually get out of debt, the net effect of going to a debt consolidator is a bigger total debt.

For example, Credit Advisors, Inc., set up last year, charges a fee of 12½ percent of gross debt. This means a man with $1,000 in debts is taking on an additional debt of $125.

A CASE HISTORY

Eddie Moore, 32, a porter taking home $50 a week to his family, had this experience with National Budget Services:

Moore, of 5437 C Street SE., owed some $1,000 to a clothing firm, a furniture store, and two finance firms. His wife, Ella, 22, heeding an advertisement, went to National Budget and signed a contract.

The fee set was $70 plus a weekly service charge of 35 cents a creditor. The Moores were to pay to National Budget $21.25 a week with a portion to go toward the fee according to the contract.

"The remainder of said weekly sums," said the contract, "will be disbursed by the company among the applicant's creditors."

The contract went on to say that should the Moores miss a payment for 5 days, they would be liable for the $70 fee plus service charges. And, the contract continued, the payments could be increased if the creditors insisted.

The Moores paid on time for 4 weeks, a total of $85, according to their receipts. Of this, according to the firm's own records, only a single check—$15 to a finance firm—was sent out to creditors.

During the time the Moores did business with National Budget, they paid it $170, but only $60 was paid out to creditors, according to National Budget's records. When the Moores protested, they were refunded $16 as payment in full, the firm said.

The box score: $60 to creditors, $94 to National Budget.

M. D. Calahan, manager of National Budget, said the firm tries to get its fee from the debtors' payments first, but he said this often is not possible.

In contrast to the Moore's case, National Budget's files, and those of other debt consolidation firms, show records of regular payments over long periods to creditors by the proraters.

HANDLING NOT ILLEGAL

Nothing in the Moore case was illegal. On the contrary, it followed the contract to the letter. There is no regulatory law in the District to make it otherwise.

The contracts of all five major debt firms specify fees and debtor's payments, but none specify when the first funds start to go out to creditors.

All have provisions for payments to the firm in case of cancellation by the client. These range from $25 on Credit Advisors contracts to the entire fee on National Budget's.

COMPLAINTS REGISTERED

The better business bureau said it gets about five or six written complaints a month against the debt consolidators. About one telephoned complaint comes in a day, said Leland S. McCarthy, bureau managing director.

In addition, there are eight or nine telephoned inquiries a day, he said. McCarthy said his workers inform callers that the consolidators' service will put them deeper in debt and that the proraters cannot guarantee a reduction in payments already agreed to by the creditor.

Beyond that there is little the Bureau can do. It has no enforcement powers.

The complaints against proraters, said McCarthy, take two general forms.

One, he said is that the prorater is not making an adequate disbursement to creditors and that queries to the prorater just "get put off."

The other, McCarthy said, is that customers say they are told "creditors will be off your back," and that nevertheless dunning calls continue. The proraters deny they make such promises, he said.

McCarthy said he is closely watching the development of the industry, but he has not taken any general action against it as was done by the Bureau in Kansas City.

There, Joe E. Birkhead, manager of the Bureau, polled banks, loan offices, finance firms, stores, and other merchants. His findings:

The firms were "not useful or beneficial," according to 95 percent of the creditors.

Proraters do not pay creditors as promptly as debtors pay proraters, according to 70 percent of the creditors.

All but 2 percent of creditors said the proraters—for one reason or another—do not usually keep up payments until the entire balance of the debtor's account is paid.

Birkhead, in an article in the Bureau's Quarterly Report last year, concluded that "debtors are too often misled concerning the services which the prorate company is in a position to render."

OREGON'S EXPERIENCE

The National Better Business Bureau, in a 1955 survey of the then infant industry, warned that too often laws regulating proraters tend to lend them dignity "as State-licensed organizations while affording little real protection to the public."

Regulation in Oregon did not prevent a debt consolidation firm from closing its doors leaving some 400 debtors holding the bag for $22,000. A similar case is reported in Chicago.

The alternative to regulation in some States has been outright prohibition. Virginia, for example, outlawed debt consolidation in 1956 except by lawyers.

"Debt poolers were making rash promises," said R. E. Booker, secretary-treasurer of the Virginia State Bar. "There were fly-by-night firms."

In the District, there is no regulatory requirement at all although Representative Joel T. Broyhill, Republican of Virginia, introduced a bill to prohibit debt consolidators in 1958. At that time, however, there was only one major firm in Washington.

FIRMS BACK REGULATION

Against this background, all the managers of the five major firms in the District say they favor regulation.

Bob Abramson, executive vice president of Credit Advisors, which operates here and under various other names in 20 States, said he did not want the situation here to develop as it did in Michigan.

There, he said, such abuses as a prorater taking $180 and paying out only $10 led to legislation in 1961.

Abramson said his firm helped push the Michigan law through and said Credit Advisors follows it even where similar statutes are not in force. It has bonding, licensing and some other provisions.

"I would love to see regulations here with strong controls," he said. "But it would still have to let us operate. I don't want a confidence man in our business. I don't want a well-intentioned jerk in our business."

Robert J. Davids, owner of Debt Help Service, who worked in the District for years with Budget Counselors, the city's oldest firm, is even more explicit.

"I see a danger developing here * * * without regulations we'll have people opening up on every corner. You will be getting places which make false promises and then skip."

Davids, who charges a maximum 10 percent of gross debt plus a service fee of 50 cents monthly per account to a maximum of $5, said fees should be strictly regulated.

Ten to twelve percent of gross debt plus a small service fee should be maximum, he said, and no more than 15 percent of the fee should come out of the debtors payments in any one month. As with other firms, he feels licensing should make sure only responsible persons enter the business.

B. H. Feldman, owner of Budget Counselors, said the money he receives one day from clients goes out the same day. Feldman, as with all the agencies but National Budget, said his policy is not to try to collect the fee at the beginning, but in small prorated portions.

Feldman pointed out that he is a local businessman and "is deeply concerned lest new firms hurt the image of our business."

BAN IS PROPOSED

Many members of the credit community, including some loan companies—which often make loans to consolidate several debts in one obligation—finance firms and collection agencies would prefer to see the industry put out of business entirely.

John K. Althaus, general manager of the Credit Bureau, Inc., a firm which records credit ratings and does collection work, said bluntly "They're taking from the man who has nothing but bills.

"They delay payment by debtors of legitimate bills," he said.

Althaus met last fall and again last month with representatives of major stores and other businesses and the matter was discussed, but no public action taken. The retailers, however, have referred the prorating question to a special committee for research and a report.

The consensus, so far, Althaus said, is that many creditors would themselves give the type of advice that debtors get from proraters.

One furniture store spokesman said when a pro-rating firm informs it that they plan to cut a debtor's payments from say $25 to $15 a month, the furniture store will often simply cancel the account and move to repossess the furniture.

"It is often uneconomical for us to allow an account which is already overdue to extend still more months because the amount of the payment is cut," said the furniture man.

In fact, some proraters say, they must seek to get reductions in debtors' payments from stores in order to draw up a budget for the debtor. Loan and finance firms, they explain, often refuse flatly to cooperate with them in reducing the amount of payments due each week or month from debtors.

WHY BUSINESS GROWS

Why has the debt consolidation business begun to mushroom?

David Shanks, Financial Arrangers manager, said "it is too much easy credit. As long as you have people borrowing so much money, you will have a need for (debt consolidation) agencies."

His own firm, he said, has offices in various parts of the country and is opening new ones at the rate of two a month. National Budget claims 10 offices around the Nation. Abramson's Credit Advisors claim a national business of $6 million paid out each year to creditors.

In Washington, National Budget claims 1,700 accounts, Credit Advisors more than 1,000 and Financial Arrangers 700 although it is just over 3 months old. Debt Help maintains about 300 active cases.

These totals indicate that debtors are increasingly attracted to the firms.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and be made the pending business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Maj. Gen. James Karrick Woolnough, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSULAR CONVENTION WITH KOREA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive B, 88th Congress, 1st session, a consular convention between the United States and Korea, which the President transmitted to the Senate today, and that the convention, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the consular convention between the United States of America and Korea signed at Seoul on January 8, 1963.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) consular convention with Korea, signed January 8, 1963.)

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 8, 1963.*

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Horace G. Torbert, Jr., of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Somali Republic;

William R. Rivkin, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Luxembourg;

Outerbridge Horsey, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic;

C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Malagasy Republic;

Donald A. Dumont, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Burundi;

William C. Doherty, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Jamaica;

Olcott H. Deming, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Uganda; and

Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

AMBASSADORS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of ambassadors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dr. James Watt, of the District of Columbia, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the United Nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Archibald S. Alexander, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the diplomatic

and Foreign Service which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

USE OF MH–30 ON TOBACCO

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, for several years there has been agitation in some circles of the tobacco industry and within some areas of the Department of Agriculture to outlaw the use of MH–30, a chemical used to control suckers in tobacco. No evidence whatsoever to show that the use of the chemical MH–30 reduces the quality of tobacco has been offered. It is a substitute for hand labor, the expense of which would be at least $50 to $75 an acre. Furthermore, hand labor would not be available if this chemical were not used in connection with the production of tobacco.

Mr. President, I think the best evidence that the use of MH–30 is not harmful to the quality of tobacco is the fact that during the calendar year 1962, only 2.38 percent of Georgia's tobacco crop went into the loan. The marketplace is the best evidence of quality. The Secretary of Agriculture has recently promulgated new grade classifications for tobacco; and if there were any defect in the quality, these grade classifications, plus the marketplace, would show it up.

Mr. President, the general assembly of Georgia has passed a joint resolution on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 188

Resolution opposing a move being made through official channels to require the identifying by tagging of tobacco treated with maleic hydrazide (MH–30)

Whereas the production of tobacco is a major source of livelihood for thousands of farmers and modern methods of production are a necessity in the competition of our times; and

Whereas the use of chemicals and other modern aids are primarily the reasons for the high level of the American standard of living; and

Whereas the use of the chemical maleic hydrazide (MH–30) as a growth inhibitor for controlling suckers in tobacco is a necessity if the farmer is to compete under contemporary economic conditions; and

Whereas the tobacco manufacturers and exporters have given no valid scientific and/or medical reasons for outlawing the use of chemical MH–30 in tobacco production; and

Whereas during recent long and costly hearings called by the Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, and conducted for the States producing flue-cured and burley tobacco, no new evidence was brought out indicating that MH–30 was a causal agent harmful to smokers; and

Whereas despite these public hearings and despite a biased report on MH–30 by a U.S. Department of Agriculture interagency committee, the tobacco companies failed in their efforts to get a 50-percent discount rate on the 1963 tobacco crop; and

Whereas the latest attempt by the manufacturers and exporters to force their will on the tobacco growers by influencing through executive decree for identifying purposes the tagging of its tobacco treated with MH–30 and place the farmers completely at the mercy of the buyers; and

Whereas the fine cooperative spirit that has long existed between the farmer and buyer has been virtually destroyed by the aforementioned unscrupulous tactics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this body condemn the subtle, insidious and secret methods attempted to discriminate against the tobacco farmers of the flue-cured and burley tobacco areas; and be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby invoke censure upon all of those responsible for the behind-the-scenes battle to arbitrarily impose their unjust scheme to achieve economic gain at the expense of the farmer; and be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby deplore the circumventing of democratic processes in this matter relating to the use of MH–30; and be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby recommend, urge and request that congressional investigation be conducted immediately into all aspects of this matter; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the U.S. Senators and Representatives, the Governors and commissioners of agriculture of the States affected and to all companies purchasing tobacco in these tobacco belts.

In senate, read and adopted, March 5, 1963.

GEORGE D. STEWART,
Secretary.

In house, read and adopted, March 4, 1963.

GLENN W. ELLARD,
Clerk.

CUBAN DISCLOSURES AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have spoken many times on the floor of the Senate on issues of foreign policy. It has never seemed to me that any reasonable concept of bipartisanship ruled out discussions—full and frank discussions—of such issues.

There is a distorted concept of bipartisanship which abhors Senate discussion. I am frank to say that it is sometimes espoused by Democrats in a Democratic administration just as readily as it is sometimes espoused by Republicans in a Republican administration. Bipartisanship, in this distortion, suggests that if you have something nice to say about the way foreign policy is being conducted, say it; otherwise do not say anything.

I think the record will show that I have never subscribed to that concept of bipartisanship in any administration, Republican or Democratic. Nor do I subscribe to it now. Mr. Kennedy did not subscribe to it as a Senator; nor does he now as President of the United States.

Cuba or any issue of foreign policy which may be of concern to the American people is of concern to the Senate. Bipartisanship does not constrain silence in these matters in the Senate. On the contrary, it compels consideration. But the highest interest of the people does place the restraints of national responsibility—not Democratic, not Republican, but national responsibility—on all of us. We need to select our words with caution and speak them with care. It does not matter whether we call these restraints bipartisanship, patriotism, common national sense or whatever. What does matter is that we remain ever aware that the margin for error is close in critical foreign policy issues, and we cannot afford to fill it up with politics as usual.

I question the motives of no Senator who may raise the Cuban question. It would be wise, however, if each Senator who deigns to speak on this dangerous matter examined consciously and conscientiously his own motives. Each of us might well ask himself three questions: First, am I talking for a partisan purpose? Second, am I talking with the full realization that my words may help to drive the people and the President's course toward war, limited or unlimited? Third, am I talking with the belief that my words will help the President in his primary task of safeguarding the security of the United States and its national reputation for honesty, integrity and decency while he attempts to exert a constructive influence for freedom and peace, not only with respect to Cuba, but throughout the hemisphere and the world?

I ask the Senate to ponder these questions. I ask each Senator to ponder them and his own silent responses to them, for these are questions which sooner or later each of us will have to answer to our own conscience, if not to our electorates.

I would ask all Senators to ponder the statement of the late Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg:

> I think the Senate is entitled, at any time it pleases, to use the advice clause of the Constitution to tell the Executive what it thinks concerning foreign affairs. But I think it would be a tragic and unfortunate thing if the habit ever became general or too contagious because I respectfully submit, * * * only in those instances in which the Senate can be sure of a complete command of all the essential information prerequisite to an intelligent decision, should it take the terrific chance of muddying the international waters by

some sort of premature and ill-advised expression of its advice to the Executive.

If there is to be public criticism of policy, in short, let it be wise, dispassionate and constructive criticism. If the President's course is to be questioned, let reasonable alternatives be offered and let them be reasonably debated.

With that as background, Mr. President, lct me say that I looked with favor on the revival of Senate discussion of the Cuban question some time ago. It seemed to me that in defusing the Soviet missile threat on the island—I would suggest that all of us, in the Senate and in the Nation, recall our feelings at that time—the President had also set the stage for useful Senate discussion of the Cuban situation. It seemed to me that wise and dispassionate consideration in the Senate would open up new thought and new ideas from which the President might benefit in discharging his grave responsibilities on behalf of all of us.

There has, indeed, been discussion of Cuba, but little of it has been dispassionate and even less of it has been constructive. What has evolved, instead, has been a trial of policy by press releases, with the size and sensationalism of the headlines which they produce serving as evidence, judge and jury. Some days ago I cautioned against the course this discussion was taking. I made a plea on the floor for consideration of the President's grave burdens. I did not argue against discussion. I argued for discussion couched in the restraints of reason, the restraints of high national interest. These restraints have not been visible. In my opinion, much of the discussion of Cuba by Members of the Congress is not helping this Nation; it is hurting it. It is not helping the President; it is hindering him. We have indeed had discussions of Cuba, but a discussion steeped in politics, panic, and the perversion of fact.

I have been reluctant to reach this conclusion, for it reflects no credit on the Senate. Nevertheless, I am compelled to it by the recent discussion of the report that four American flyers lost their lives during the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion.

I did not wish to reveal the contents of the report which I am about to reveal, but I see no alternative. When the distinguished minority leader noted that he had just learned of the death of the four flyers, I was asked by the press to confirm it. I did so. I did not know why the distinguished minority leader raised the matter, but since it was raised by him—and he is a most responsible man—I saw no point in refusing to confirm the fact. I thought that would be an end to it, for I could not conceive of any earthly advantage to the Nation in a public delving in detail into this matter. And I could conceive of many, many disadvantages to the Nation.

But I was mistaken—very much mistaken—Mr. President, if I thought that would be an end to it. On the contrary, the matter has been pressed and pressed, and to what end? Are we going to get closer to a solution of this critical problem of Cuba if we know every gruesome detail of the death of these unfortunate men, if we ascertain that 4, 8, or 16 Americans lost their lives in the ill-fated Bay of Pigs venture? Just what is it—what national purpose is served by this macabre fixation? Do we serve our own purposes or those of our adversaries when we take a dark and obscure function and throw so much light on how it operates that whatever value it may have for the security of this Nation is seriously compromised thereby? Do we serve our own purposes or those of our adversaries when we suggest—as this fixation does—that Cuban liberty can be bought with hired, well-paid American pilots, if only we hire enough and then not only hire them to fly but also give them a free hand to determine by their actions the course of U.S. policy? In this connection, I read from a UPI story of March 7, 1963—only yesterday:

> When failure of the invasion appeared sure * * * one of the American pilots proposed a plan to bring the United States into the conflict. Aircraft with Cuban markings would strafe runways and drop a few bombs on areas inside the naval base at Guantanamo.

This is no secret. This is from the news files of the United Press International, March 7, 1963—in other words, on yesterday.

Is this the way those who are looking for political profit in this affair would have the life-and-death questions of the Nation decided? Or will they stop playing with fire and get behind the President, the one man, the only man, whom the American people, in their wisdom, have chosen to make the critical decisions?

No, Mr. President, I see no national purpose served by this discussion. But I do see others. Examine for a moment, Mr. President, the context in which the drums have been struck and struck again on this matter of the death of the flyers. Clearly, the impression was permitted to gain national and international credence—and if Senators do not believe it, they can read the front pages of any newspaper in the Nation—that the tragic news of the loss of these men was suppressed by the Kennedy administration. And if the Kennedy administration would suppress this information, how much more, indeed, might it not be hiding in the dark archives of the White House and the State Department?

I now read to the Senate, Mr. President, a report which I have obtained on what occurred:

> Four Americans flying for anti-Castro forces apparently were killed during the ill-fated Cuban invasion when their cargo plane crashed in the Caribbean.
>
> A spokesman for a Miami concern that had put the Cuban rebels in touch with the fliers said the four had been missing since about April 19 and are presumed to have perished.
>
> The spokesman, Alex E. Carlson, a Miami Springs lawyer, said he represented the Double Check Corp., a concern that acted as a broker in locating fliers for Cubans attempting to overthrow Premier Fidel Castro.
>
> Mr. Carlson identified the missing fliers as Riley W. Shamburger, the pilot; Thomas W. Ray, copilot; Leo F. Baker, engineer; and Wade C. Gray, radioman, all residents of Birmingham.

That report, Mr. President corroborates the story which has recently been revealed to the press by Members of the Congress. It was this report which I have in my possession which more than anything else led me to confirm the story recently released with all the tense trappings of an uncovered skeleton in the closet of the Kennedy administration. Where did I get this report which I have just read, Mr. President? Did I copy it from those who have recently revealed it with such shocking impact? Did I ferret it out of the White House or the State Department? What is its classification? "Secret"? "Top Secret"? "Eyes only"?

I read the source, Mr. President: Dateline Birmingham, Ala., May 4—AP—from the New York Times, May 5, 1961—1961—page 11.

One year and 9 months ago, Mr. President, in the public press, we find the same story that is now being used as an uncovered secret to cast doubt on the veracity and honesty of the administration. This then is the great new revelation, the sensational new discovery, which set the tone for the revival of a great debate on Cuba, a news item which first appeared in the press a year and 9 months ago. Is this the sort of thing that helps the Nation? Is this the sort of thing that sheds light on a most difficult and complex and dangerous situation? Is this the sort of thing that represents a responsible contribution by a responsible opposition to the Nation's policies on which the security and good name of the Nation depend? Or is it a glaring example of irresponsible politics, of panic politics at its worst? That is a cruel thing, Mr. President, to do to the families of those who died, and it is a reckless thing to do to the conduct of foreign policy. It would seem to me that those who have sought to build this matter into a mountain of suspicion and distrust of the President owe an apology to Mr. Kennedy. But even more, they owe an apology to the people of this Nation.

Mr. President, the CIA, under it Director, John A. McCone, performs a useful and necessary service for the people of the Nation. It has been very frank in attempting to put the facts before the Congress—in my opinion, too frank, considering the nature of its work. I think it is about time that those who directly or by innuendo charge that the administration is "managing the news" on Cuba acknowledge that these demands, if met, can only lead to a total compromising of the work of this Agency, an embarrassment not of the President but of the Nation. Perhaps that is not too large a price to pay for full information. Each Senator will have to make that equation for himself. But it seems to me that if full disclosure is what is desired, Senators might well consider drastically curtailing this function and this agency. For, in my opinion, the Nation will be done less harm by that course than by a public examination of each and every detail of these operations.

I say once more what has been said before, it would be best for those who

have a penchant to play CIA Chief, Secretary of State and Defense to turn their attention to the legislative chores which confront them, to the needs of the people of the United States. If we must be the sleuths, let us find the culprits in the state of the Nation's sluggish economy. Let us get on with a tax cut which will strengthen the financial position of millions of Americans. Let us take an honest look at the principle of equal opportunity for all Americans, and how it is operating in practice. Let us probe in depth the educational needs of the Nation and the health and hospitalization needs. Let us take a hard look at the strangulation and the decay of our cities. Let us penetrate in depth into the questions posed by automation and persistent unemployment now at a 6.1-percent figure.

These are matters of immense concern to the present and future of this Nation, no less serious than Cuba or any other problem of foreign policy. And it will take Senators and Representatives, not sleuths, to deal with them. It will take a hard wrestle with reality to face these facts and to devise public policies for dealing with them. The President has proposed. It is about time that this Congress began to dispose.

Let me reiterate, Mr. President, that the Senator from Montana still has no objection to dispassionate discussion of the Cuban situation on the floor of the Senate. However discouraging this political prowling over the dead may be, the Senator from Montana is still hopeful that reason will prevail in this body on Cuban policies and that this body will yet make the contribution which it can make. And so he welcomes the continuance of the discussion. But let me say again, if we are to call shots in this delicate arena as we see them, let us be reasonably certain that we have seen them before we call them. And if we are to try to move the cautious and deliberate policies of the President off the course of national peace, national security, and international decency, on which he has tried to set them, let us be sure of our intentions. If there are those who would continue with this reckless flaming of public emotions, let them at least acknowledge what they are about. This is not a child's game. It is not a TV thriller. To continue to toy with these questions as has been done in the recent past is to toy with the life of the Nation.

HARTKE URGES SUPPORT OF OPERATION FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on my return from Africa last December, I urged through correspondence, Hon. Luther Hodges, the Secretary of Commerce, to consider the establishment of a Senior Peace Corps, comprised of retired businessmen who could devote some of their time to teaching their know-how to businessmen in the underdeveloped countries of the world.

Everywhere I went in Africa, there was a desire for American business methods, which are admired by nearly all Africans. Also, they seem to be impressed with the hard work that is a badge of most American businessmen.

I assumed that if this were true in Africa, it must be true in other underdeveloped countries, such as some of our neighbors to the south of us in Latin America and South America.

For several weeks now Secretary Hodges, his assistant, Dr. Jack N. Behrman, officials of the Agency for International Development, the State Department, and I have discussed this most important project.

Recently the Agency for International Development announced that a pilot project, using the idea of a peace corps, comprised of senior or retired businessmen, could be created in Liberia and in Nigeria.

Dr. Behrman plans to contact leaders in the business community soon to get their reaction to a proposed Senior Peace Corps. A recent article in the Washington Evening Star of March 6, 1963, by Mr. Robert Hochstein, contributing writer, covers some of these facts in a story headed "Business Peace Corps Wins Behrman Support," and I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS PEACE CORPS WINS BEHRMAN SUPPORT

(By Robert Hochstein)

Assistant Secretary of Commerce Jack N. Behrman plans to contact leaders in the business community soon to get their reaction to a proposed Senior Peace Corps.

Mr. Behrman said the idea to utilize the skills of retired businessmen overseas suggested by Senator HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, is an excellent one but that the initiative must come from the business community.

The Commerce Department official will get in touch with the businessmen on an informal basis. He said some businessmen have previously suggested their know-how be used in the manner proposed, but no one ever picked them up on the idea.

Mr. Behrman said costs for such a program should be on a shared basis between business and Government, but indicated the bulk of the financing should be by business.

PILOT PROJECT PROPOSED

Meanwhile, Senator HARTKE, who proposed the concept of a business peace corps, said he had been informed that the Agency for International Development would like to set up a pilot project in Liberia or Nigeria.

An AID spokesman said these countries have been suggested for two reasons.

Because the knowledge of English is widespread, barring any language problem for the retired businessmen; and because the private business sector is strong in both countries.

Mr. Behrman said if a business peace corps becomes a reality, it should not function on only one continent. He said many problems are inherent in such a program, "but the Peace Corps also had problems in the beginning."

Mr. Behrman has been in contact with the State Department, as well as AID, about the proposal.

Senator Hartke, a member of the Senate Commerce Committee, suggested the idea of a businessmen's peace corps to Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges in January after returning from a 5-week factfinding mission in Africa.

LACK CALLED APPALLING

"The absence of American participation in the business communities of Africa is appalling," he told Mr. Hodges.

The Senator said that since many skilled and knowledgeable businessmen are retired on pension, they would be able to serve abroad on modest salaries. The only other costs involved, he said, would be transportation.

Everywhere he went in Africa, Senator HARTKE said, there was a desire for American business methods which are admired by nearly all Africans.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I predict that Dr. Behrman will find the reaction good. I have received many, many letters from retired businessmen throughout the country supporting this proposal. Indicative of this support are some representative letters, which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 24, 1963.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Congratulations on your idea of a peace corps of businessmen. I feel this proposal has merit and I hope it snowballs into something.

Gobs of money, doled out in the form of foreign aid, to so-called emerging nations does no good. With the help of experienced and successful businessmen, they could be taught to help themselves.

Thank you,

PAUL B. ATWOOD.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

OSKALOOSA, IOWA,
January 14, 1963.

Senator VANCE HARTKE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Re your recommendation as to utilization of retired businessmen makes real sense.

As a retired businessman, I feel that my ability as an executive in many lines of business in the wholesale jobbing field could be put to practical use.

I am 73 years old, married, no children, in good health; own my own home. Would move if the right opportunity presented itself.

I use a typewriter, but thought you would prefer to see my handwriting.

Let me hear from you.

Yours truly,

V. B. REISMAN.

IRWIN UNION BANK & TRUST CO. OF
COLUMBUS, IND.,
January 28, 1963.

The Honorable VANCE HARTKE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: I am delighted to know that you have added my name to your mailing list.

Your idea on organizing retired businessmen and manufacturers to work with people in the underdeveloped countries, I think is indeed commendable. It certainly should bear fruit.

Sincerely,

S. E. LAUTHER,
President.

ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL,
Jamaica, N.Y., January 14, 1963.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I want to congratulate you on your plans for a businessmen's peace corps.

In Africa especially this is needed because the greatest weakness of colonial rule is the lack of administrators. America can and should supply a large share of this deficit and it cannot be adequately met by the young. As you know, you can't teach administration—it must be learned.

Wishing you success with your proposal, I am

Yours,

Hugh C. Brooks, Ph. D.

Albany, Ga.,
January 15, 1963.

Hon. Vance Hartke,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Greetings: I read your article with deep interest in January 14, 1963, Newsweek. I was with U.S. Government (civil service) 1940 to few months ago when I retired on nice annuity. Other assignments consisted of auditing, time and study, policy and procedure, etc.; last assignment being comptroller of large air base here.

I have three children—all college graduates—one an attorney with his master's degree associated with solicitor here (Malone & Drake). Other son, a contractor, graduate from Georgia Tech, in his own business at Pensacola, Fla. The baby, Katherine, a schoolteacher at Pensacola, also.

I am also a World War I veteran and prior to 1940 I was in pecan business, three of us having promoted pecan sales and production from about 15 million pounds to about 100 million pounds yearly.

I like leadership and promotion, big deals and the businessmen's peace corps appeals to me and as my past was entirely supervisory and management, I feel on the ground floor I could build with you.

Sincerely,

Julian R. Drake.

All references you want: Senators Russell, Talmadge know me personally—especially Dick Russell.

County Government Magazine,
New York, N.Y., January 17, 1963.

The Honorable Vance Hartke,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hartke: I have just read with great interest that you are planning to propose a businessmen's peace corps. The idea is most intriguing and deserves careful study. May I wish you much luck in its fulfillment.

You may be interested in reading the article on page 16 entitled "Operation Can Do" in the enclosed issue of County Government magazine, an official New York State publication. This article although it does not propose a peace corps of retired business executives, it does suggest a way whereby business and private enterprise can help the progress of less developed nations. Although your suggestion and the substance of the article are different, I feel that to a great extent the proposals are parallel.

I would be very grateful to be given the opportunity of hearing more of your proposal, and, if you have the time, to have your reactions on "Operation Can Do."

With kind regards, I am

Respectfully yours,

James H. Heineman,
Editor and Publisher.

Seattle, Wash., *January 11, 1963.*

Hon. Vance Hartke,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hartke: The attached news article published in the Seattle Times of January 6, 1963, was of interest to me since my wife and I had an opportunity to spend about 4 months in Africa (South Africa, Rhodesia, Tanganyika, Kenya) in 1961. Our visit was sponsored by the cultural exchange program of the State Department and the South African Nature Union.

Although my activities in Africa related to other than business affairs our impressions were similar to yours, as expressed in this article. In my opinion your suggestion has considerable merit. No doubt you will also agree that opportunities for beneficial cooperative efforts of this kind extend to areas other than business and industry.

Our interest in Africa—its problems and opportunities—was greatly enhanced as a result of our visit. We have given some consideration to returning following my probable retirement in about 5 years if there is any likelihood of our making some contribution in my particular field. I am professor of forestry, College of Forestry of the University of Washington, and previously spent about 20 years as park naturalist with the U.S. National Park Service. Thus, my interest and abilities revolve about natural resource conservation with emphasis on recreational land planning and administration. It was our thought that upon my retirement we might associate ourselves in some manner with some sort of educational institution such as Makerere College in Entebbe, Uganda. Unless something unforeseen develops financial considerations would not be a dominant factor—the main idea being the satisfaction of contributing a bit toward better understanding as well as greater knowledge of American methods in my particular field of interest.

Current planned retirement age is 65 (my wife is about 8 years younger). My health and physical ability is and always has been good since my work over many years demanded considerable self-sufficiency and outdoor activity. If your suggested program meets with approval and can be expanded to include people with a background such as mine, I may contact you when my retirement plans become more definite.

Very truly yours,

C. Frank Brockman.

[From the Seattle Times, Jan. 6, 1963]

African Aid by Retired Men Is Urged

Washington, January 5.—Senator Hartke, Democrat, of Indiana, recommended today that the Government send retired businessmen from this country to the emerging nations to advise their business leaders.

Hartke made the suggestion in a statement and letter to Secretary of Commerce Hodges.

The Senator said a recent trip to Africa convinced him that leaders there need advice on business and production techniques.

"Everywhere I went there was a thirst for knowledge of American business methods, which are admired by nearly all Africans," **he said.**

In his letter, Hartke added:

"Businessmen and industrialists * * * would have the chance to serve the cause of freedom and free enterprise. * * * They would contribute to the expansion of our own trade; develop a business community capable of increased world trade and increase the standards of living and purchasing power of their peoples."

Syracuse, N.Y., *January 14, 1963.*

Re Businessmen's Peace Corps.

Dear Sir: I have been reading with keen interest your program relative to the businessmen's peace corps. As I am semiretired I should care to offer my services, gratis, relative to recruitment.

This being contacts with businessmen, groups, and organizations, and giving talks before such groups.

I am well acquainted with business groups throughout New York State, Pennsylvania, and eastern Ohio. Presently, my time is devoted to presenting talks and writing speeches for business and professional men.

If you feel that I can be of any service to this project—I wish no salary—only my expenses—please advise me.

Very truly yours,

Edward J. Michel.

Bergdahl, McCarthy, Court Associates,
New York., January 22, 1963.

Senator Vance Hartke,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Hartke: Recently I read in Newsweek that you were intending to propose a businessmen's peace corps to be recruited for Government use in consulting and advisory capacities in foreign lands.

This writer is a retired executive with extensive experience and believes that your idea is an excellent one. Many retired executives would undoubtedly be glad to offer their services on the basis you have suggested if they felt they were really contributing something for the benefit of backward countries as well as for U.S.A.

The writer sincerely hopes that you will push this idea.

Yours very truly,

H. O. Bergdahl.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in addition to the letters, there have been telephone messages and telegrams urging that such a program be initiated.

Each year, Mr. President, the Congress of the United States appropriates millions of dollars for foreign aid. Some of it, unfortunately, is not spent wisely; so that today there is in some quarters of our citizenry a hue and cry to stop all foreign aid. But our American businessmen, who have proved that their know-how can make them successful businessmen, are now free in retirement to impart their know-how to their foreign businessmen, so that they can begin to stand on their own feet and not rely on American foreign aid for assistance. I view this businessmen's peace corps as a project which could be rightfully termed "Operation Free Enterprise," an operation destined to bring to these new nations of the world the opportunity to develop, under their own system of government, a free business economy and one in which men can produce their products in a free economy—not a controlled economy.

This type of project is one more way that the tide of communism can be stemmed, and I urge my colleagues of this great deliberative body to lend support to this program and to work closely with Dr. Behrman and other Government officials to get these new nations moving forward under the free enterprise system.

MARYLAND MOVES TOWARD 17-YEAR-OLD SCHOOL ATTENDANCE TO END HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this morning the newspapers revealed that unemployment has reached the level of 6.1 percent, the highest level of unemployment we have suffered for a long time, more than a year. One of the reasons why unemployment is so high is that a very large number of young people are out of school and out of work. As a group these young people were the

most heavily unemployed of any age group. The problem of high school dropouts is a serious one throughout the Nation. This is why earlier this year, in January, I submitted a resolution calling on school authorities to use their influence to raise the mandatory school-leaving age to 17.

I am delighted that this morning I can announce that I have a letter from the chairman of the House Education Committee of the Maryland House of Delegates, at Annapolis, who has informed me that as of the date of the letter, February 20, he was intending to introduce a bill to raise the mandatory school-attendance age to 17 in Maryland. I notice, on the basis of press reports, that the bill was introduced yesterday.

I am delighted to see progress being made. Although my resolution, submitted in January, has not had a hearing and has not been acted on yet, it appears it is having some influence. I commend the chairman of the House Education Committee of the Maryland House of Delegates.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter to me and my reply to Mr. Dillon be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

March 7, 1963.

Hon. R. Samuel Dillon, Jr.,
Chairman, House Education Committee,
House of Delegates, Annapolis, Md.

Dear Mr. Dillon: Many thanks for your thoughtful note.

I'm delighted that you and a large number of the house education committee will submit a bill to the general assembly within the next few days to raise Maryland's compulsory attendance to 17 or completion of the 12th grade.

You deserve much credit for taking this step. You not only serve well the interests of the youngsters involved and their parents, but of your State and our Nation too.

The high school dropout and teenage unemployment problem is unquestionably one of our most serious. You are taking a long step toward correcting it.

Sincerely,

William Proxmire,
U.S. Senator.

House of Delegates,
Annapolis, Md., February 20, 1963.

The Honorable William Proxmire,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Proxmire: Thank you very much for the copy of your resolution requesting the States to raise the compulsory school attendance to age 17.

I, and probably a large number of the members of the house education committee, with the support of the Maryland State Department of Education, will submit a bill to the general assembly within the next few days to raise Maryland's compulsory attendance to 17 or completion of the 12th grade.

With all best wishes, I am

Most sincerely,

R. Samuel Dillon, Jr.,
Chairman, House Education Committee.

EXTRAVAGANCE AND WASTE IN STATUARY IN WASHINGTON

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, earlier in this session I introduced a joint resolution supporting Secretary of the Interior Udall's plea that we establish a commission to study proposals for memorializing distinguished statesmen. I pointed out that if we did not do something like this, Washington is going to become a jumbled and endless sea of statuary, without much relationship to esthetic values or planning. This joint resolution has been supported by a number of newspapers throughout the country.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Marinette (Wis.) Eagle-Star, supporting my resolution, and an article from the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic, reporting my resolution, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Marinette (Wis.) Eagle-Star]

Proxmire Against Cluttering Capital

Senator William Proxmire, Democrat, of Wisconsin, has in effect joined forces with Interior Secretary Stewart Udall in an effort to discourage undiscriminating erection of statutes and memorials in Washington. Udall made a preliminary sortie against promoters of Capital statuary soon after he joined President Kennedy's Cabinet. Without help from Congress his efforts undoubtedly will prove futile.

Proxmire's immediate target is a proposed $39 million memorial to former President James Madison. The Senator called it a multimillion-dollar boondoggle and predicted that opposition to it would be denounced as an insult to a father of the Constitution and fourth President of the United States. He foresaw resentment by spokesmen for Virginia, Madison's birthplace.

Proxmire is taking a stand that others should support to get behind Udall in bringing some kind of order out of the chaos of Washington statuary and memorials. It is time that some kind of a critical organization, such as the Capital Parks Memorial Board, Proxmire proposes, be established to exercise some judgment over what is accepted for installation in the already cluttered Washington scene.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic, Feb. 16, 1963]

Washington's Monumental Problem: Proxmire Asks Curb

(By Joe Fisher)

Washington.—Senator William Proxmire, Democrat, of Wisconsin, has waded into a monumental problem. He wants to put a lid on Federal spending for massive memorials and monuments in the Nation's Capital.

Proxmire opened his campaign this week when he introduced a joint resolution to create a National Capital Parks Memorial Board. The board would evaluate all memorial proposals and recommend guidelines and policies to Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall.

Already, there are 96 memorials on hand in the National Capital Parks System, and each session of Congress brings a rash of proposals for bigger and better monuments. In the 86th Congress (1959–60), at least 17 bills were introduced for memorial construction. In the 87th Congress, 8 memorial bills were offered.

Proxmire said it has become a custom to tag a revered American name to some unnecessary building or monument that leaves Congress with the dilemma of spending another $30 to $40 million for a monument, or failing to show due respect for the departed statesman.

"In such a clash, reverence for the departed statesman always clobbers economy," said Proxmire.

A case in point is the $39 million James Madison Memorial. While the project has not yet won congressional approval, members of the Memorial Commission have been appointed. The memorial will cost $15 million, but will be combined with a $24 million underground annex to the Library of Congress.

Proxmire said the Madison Memorial was a "multimillion-dollar boondoggle." At the same time, he said "any opposition will be viewed as an affront to the father of the Constitution, and probably as a calculated insult to Virginia, President Madison's birthplace.

Aside from the dollars involved in memorial construction, there are other important considerations. Who is to say whether a particular memorial blends with the overall Washington plan? Where are the new memorials to be placed?

The Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial Commission still is trying to come up with a design which will appeal to the National Fine Arts Commission. Representative John H. Kyle, Republican, of Iowa, has proposed swapping the 10-acre site reserved for the $30 million National Cultural Center for the 27-acre site set aside for the F.D.R. Memorial. As Kyle sees it, the site for the cultural center is "the worst in the Nation's Capital from almost every point of view."

One of the big objections to the F.D.R. Memorial is the design calling for eight slabs of assorted sizes set at odd angles to each other. The design certainly would be out of harmony with the nearby Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials. Kyle has suggested a Franklin D. Roosevelt festival hall as a substitute for a monument. Such a building, requiring adequate parking facilities, would be even less harmonious.

Washington is a beautiful city with broad streets and wide expanses of park land. The indiscriminate placement of memorials can do nothing but detract from that beauty.

Proxmire's proposal seems reasonable. Without some guidelines for memorial construction, Washington could become a city cluttered with stony statutary and, as Proxmire suggests, economy will be clobbered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the March 4, 1963, issue of the Dallas Times-Herald there appeared a compelling editorial entitled "The Right To Vote." The editorial rightly describes the sense of outrage Americans feel when their fellow Americans are denied the right to vote. It concludes with this reflection:

> We must ask ourselves why the situation is such that Americans need special help from the Federal Government to obtain rights that were extended to them nearly a century ago.

Perhaps we can take further steps to remedy this situation during the 88th Congress, Mr. President. Certainly the support of newspapers such as the Dallas Times-Herald will help us to take these steps, just as the work of the Presiding Officer of the Senate, Vice President Lyndon Johnson, of Texas, was instrumental while majority leader in securing the first Federal laws protecting voting rights in 80 years.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial may appear in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times-Herald, Mar. 4, 1963]

The Right To Vote

The President's civil rights message deals in the main with a matter that should have been settled 100 years ago—the right of every American citizen to vote.

People have been shot in this country, not in 1863, but in 1963, because they believe the Constitution, because they think every amendment to the Constitution is basic to to whole document. One man was shot last week in Mississippi as he tried to help others obtain a place in the voting booth, a place so many of us take for granted.

President Kennedy is not asking the Congress to say who should associate with whom. The question is, do the rights guaranteed Americans in the Constitution apply to all citizens of the United States?

Congress can pass the laws that will make the answer an emphatic "yes."

States rights is not the question; it is individuals' rights. And the rights of an individual, guaranteed by the Constitution, should be of paramount concern.

The pity of the situation is not that the Federal Government is considering such legislation. The true concern should transcend even its passage. We must ask ourselves why the situation is such that Americans need special help from the Federal Government to obtain rights that were extended to them nearly a century ago.

OUTDOOR RECREATION—MODIFICATION OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished minority leader and the senior Senator from Minnesota worked out a unanimous-consent agreement relating to a vote on S. 20, a bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation.

There was an agreement to vote at 4 o'clock on Monday. However, some problems have arisen with respect to that agreement, and I would like now to modify the agreement, and, indeed, to offer a new unanimous-consent request, in the regular order of the unanimous-consent statement, that the Senate vote on the outdoor recreation bill, S. 20, Calendar No. 6, at 3 o'clock on Tuesday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That would mean that the time following the completion of morning business, whatever hour that might me, would be divided equally between the minority leader and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], or the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], whichever Senator was handling the bill at that time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I reserved my right to object only to say that this request is indicative of the fact that there will be a session on Monday, and that there will be an opportunity on Monday to discuss this question, which is highly controversial. Therefore, the vote will go over until 3 o'clock on Tuesday, and the time after the morning hour on Tuesday and before 3 o'clock will be equally divided.

Mr. HUMPHREY. At the conclusion of the business of the Senate today, I will move that the Senate adjourn until Monday. Therefore, there will be notice with respect to this unanimous-consent request. I ask action on the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unanimous consent as previously agreed upon yesterday contained some other provisions. Is it the Senator's intention to eliminate those other provisions?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator merely wishes to modify the order originally entered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; that the vote be at 3 o'clock on Tuesday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He wishes to modify the unanimous-consent agreement only in that respect. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was not aware that there were other provisions in the unanimous-consent request agreed upon yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It also provided "that no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received." The Senator from Minnesota asks that the order be modified to substitute, instead of "Monday, March 11, 1963, at the conclusion of the routine morning business," the following: "Tuesday, March 12, 1963"; also, to change the hour of voting from 4 o'clock p.m. to 3 o'clock p.m. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 816, Calendar No. 14.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 816) for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to express my support of the enactment of S. 816 to establish a Commission on Science and Technology.

The Senate has unanimously approved this legislation previously. It is not, therefore, necessary to reiterate the case for it in great detail.

In my view, a Hoover-type commission is an essential mechanism for taking an independent look at this vast problem: how to organize, or, if need be, reorganize, the U.S. Government so as to meet the formidable problems of science and technology in our time.

It is not enough that the executive branch can and does make studies of this nature on selected scientific issues. It is not enough that the President's Science Advisory Committee has made numerous important reports in the last 2 years, and that many distinguished panels are now at work.

These panels are chosen by the executive branch. They report to the executive branch. The report may or may not be released by the executive branch. I am not questioning the caliber of men who have been appointed to make these studies; they comprise many of the greatest scientific names in the land.

I am merely stressing the need for an independent "look-see"—to which the Congress has direct access and in which it, itself, participates.

I want to mention this, too, as regards the membership of these distinguished panels. There has been a feeling in some quarters that a sort of game of musical chairs goes on. Relatively small numbers of approximately the same numbers of able scientists are over and over again called upon by Government to appraise governmental programs. Many of them have formally served in Government. They invariably are men of outstanding caliber, but there is still concern in many quarters that the most candid and independent judgment may not always be obtained.

A so-called mixed commission along the lines of the Hoover Commission could secure independent judgment. It could review Federal policies on scientific manpower. It could look at the haphazard way in which certain scientific functions have evolved within some of the newer and older line agencies of the executive branch. It could look at the vital activities of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council. Many of us feel that the Academy-Council have not, for a variety of reasons, fulfilled a fraction of their potential usefulness to the U.S. Government.

I particularly invite attention to the fact that the Commission could take an important new look at the organization of the Federal Government for science information purposes. On pages 16 to 19 of Senate Report 16, I have personally presented a statement based upon my findings during work as chairman of the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee. I point out, for example, on page 19, that an independent Commission could make the type of root-to-branch analyses of the information confusion and disuniformity which still tends to characterize so much of the activity within the executive branch.

Many important information improvements have been made by individual agencies. An extremely important report has been prepared by the panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee on Information. There is, however, not the slightest reorganization or consolidation of Federal information services as yet in sight. There is not yet in sight any executive plan for a national network of information systems and services which this subcommittee has so long recommended.

I hope, therefore, that the Senate will enact this Commission bill and I trust that our colleagues in the House of Representatives will approve it this time.

The bill has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Government Operations, and it was previously unanimously reported on two or three other occasions. It has wide support.

It is a good measure. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] is its main author, and has been for several years. The senior Senator from Minnesota held hearings on this subject. I hope the Senate will approve the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if there is other material in the report accompanying the bill, which might be explanatory and worthwhile, I respectfully suggest that it be inserted at this point in the Record.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have marked in the committee report relating to the bill certain passages which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record. I believe these statements make very clear the objectives and purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Analysis of Provisions of S. 816

DECLARATION OF POLICY

This bill proposes the creation of a Commission to be known as the Commission on Science and Technology. Section 1 of S. 816 declares it to be the policy cf the Congress to strengthen American science and technology as an essential resources toward the attainment of the highest potential of Government contribution toward (a) the promotion of the national security; (b) continued national progress in an era of universal scientific and technical development; (c) the procurement and training of the best qualified leadership to maintain and promote world peace; and (d) insuring the maximum utilization of all available scientific know-how and information by coordinating the research and development programs of the Federal departments and agencies with those of American business and industry and with nonprofit organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions.

Section 1 also emphasizes the importance of formulating a program for the establishment of national policies which will require coordination of science and technology programs and operations of the Federal Government, through necessary reorganizations of existing departments and agencies which relate directly to Federal science, scientific research and technology, increased efficiency in establishing systems for perfecting a scientific information program, and for the improvement of policies for recruiting, training, and utilizing Federal scientific and engineering manpower.

The bill includes, also, a special provision relating to, and assessing, the importance of how the executive and legislative branches can more effectively achieve common objectives for the advancement of science and technology in the legislative process, as recommended by witnesses appearing at the hearings on an identical bill in the 87th Congress, held on May 10 and July 24, 1962.

OBJECTIVES

Section 2 sets out precise objectives to which the Commission might direct its attention to include, among other areas of study, the following:

1. The establishment of programs, methods, and procedures for the effective reorganization of Federal departments and agencies operating, conducting, or financing scientific programs and supporting basic research in science and technology, with the objective of insuring more effective performance of these essential services, activities, and functions;

2. The elimination of undesirable duplication and overlapping between Government departments and agencies engaged in scientific and technological research, and in information storage, processing and distribution services, activities, and functions, with particular emphasis upon effecting the maximum utilization of the resources of private industry and nonprofit research organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions; and

3. The assurance of the conservation and efficient utilization of scientific and engineering manpower.

The Commission would be further authorized and directed under section 2 to make a determination as to the need for establishing within the executive branch of the Government a Department of Science and Technology, or for the reorganization of existing scientific and technological functions through the transfer of such functions to existing or new executive departments or agencies, to provide more effective and better coordinated Federal science programs and operations. The bill provides that, if such a Department of Science and Technology is deemed necessary, the Commission should, in so recommending, determine what existing functions or agencies should be transferred to the new Department, or to other departments, and which functions and operations, now performed by Federal departments and agencies, can more properly be performed by private industries or nonprofit organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions.

The Bureau of the Budget interposed objections to certain committee guidelines contained in section 2 of the previous bills to create a Commission on a Department of Science and Technology (S. 1581, 86th Cong., and S. 2771, 87th Cong.), on the premise that it might be construed as a directive to the proposed Commission to submit such a recommendation. The committee feels, however, that inasmuch as practically all witnesses, and numerous statements, articles, and extracts from publications and books which were inserted in the Record of the hearings, advanced or dealt at length (either for or against), with recommendations that a Cabinet officer for science and technology should or should not be appointed, the proposed legislation should contain a specific directive that the Commission determine whether such a department is necessary.

Some of the members of this committee have indicated that they were inclined to support the creation of such a department, but have been unable to recommend legislation to achieve this objective. There was no agreement among the expert witnesses who have testified as to what functions or agencies should be included in such a department, if it is established. All witnesses were in agreement that many of the scientific and technological functions of the Government should remain a part of the mission of existing departments, and that certain of those agencies established to perform functions in specialized areas of science, education, or research and development might operate better as independent agencies, or as presently constituted. None made specific proposals as to which agencies or functions should be included or which should continue to operate outside of such a department. Accordingly, the bill also directs that the Commission recommend, if it should determine that such a department is necessary, what functions and operations should be transferred to the new department, which should remain independent, or remain as an essential component of existing departments as essential to the primary mission of the department in which they are presently located.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 3 of the bill waives the application of conflict-of-interest statutes for members or employees of the Commission while serving on a part-time or full-time basis with or without compensation.

Section 4 provides that the Commission shall be composed of 12 members of whom (a) 4 are to be appointed by the President, 2 from the executive branch of the Government who are participating in Federal scientific or technological activities, and 2 from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scientific research and technological activities; (b) 4 to be appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scientific research and technological activities; and (c) 4 appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 from the House of Representatives and 2 from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scientific research and technological activities.

Sections 5 and 6 provide that the Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members, and that seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

Section 7 provides that Members of Congress and members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that now received, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. Other members of the Commission shall receive $100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of such duties, plus necessary expenses.

Section 8 authorizes the Commission to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be required in accordance with provisions of the civil service laws and Classification Act of 1949; and that the Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act, temporary and intermittent services at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

Under this section, the Commission would also be authorized to negotiate and enter into contracts with private business and nonprofit research organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutes; to conduct such studies and prepare such reports as the Commission feels necessary to discharge its duties; and that financing and administrative services may be provided to the Commission by the General Services Administration.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A SCIENCE ADVISORY PANEL

Section 9 provides that the Commission shall establish an advisory panel, including competent and experienced members of the scientific and technical communities of the United States, to serve on request as consultants to the Commission or to individual members thereof while performing the duties of the Commission. The panel would consist of such number of qualified persons drawn equally from Government, private industry, and nonprofit organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions as the Commission deems to be adequate, who shall be chosen on the basis of competence, experience, integrity, availability, and ability to communicate not only to professional scientists but to laymen.

REPORTS, HEARINGS, AND TERMINATION OF COMMISSION

Section 10 requires that the Commission shall submit interim reports to the President and the Congress as it deems advisable, and that its final report shall be submitted to the President and the Congress not later than January 1, 1965. The final report of the Commission shall propose such legislation and administrative actions as in its judgment are deemed necessary to achieve its recommendations.

Sections 11, 12, and 13 authorize the Commission to hold hearings and take testimony as may be deemed advisable to secure required information and other data from executive departments or agencies upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman; the necessary appropriations; and that the Commission shall terminate 30 days after submitting its final report.

SIGNIFICANCE TO PROPOSED COMMISSION ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. HUMPHREY. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization, I expressed the view that the shortcomings in science information which the subcommittee has brought to light represent one of the many important reasons for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology, concluding as follows:

> A Commission on Science and Technology could serve as an important instrument for the examination of problems relating to the processing of science information. Only an independent Commission could make the type of root-to-branch analyses of the information confusion which continues to characterize the executive branch.
>
> Experience indicates that no Federal agency is likely to take the initiative of recommending the reduction of its own size. Thus, none is likely to recommend the transfer even of those of its information functions which bear no inherent relationship to the agency's central mission. Yet, some interagency information functions can be consolidated in the interest of economy, efficiency, and service—and without the slightest impairment of individual agency missions.
>
> No one claims that coordinating information is a cure-all for management ills; but few ills will be cured if information is too late, too disuniform, too fragmented, too hard to get, too unreliable.
>
> Five years ago, the doubters looked askance when the Committee on Government Operations and this subcommittee claimed that the information explosion had precipitated an information crisis. Today, most of these doubters are quoting our very words. But today, the doubters deny that a reorganization of information services is necessary. I believe that the future will prove them just as wrong as has the past.

Mr. President, I also wish to include the following extracts from a speech by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, when he introduced the bill in the Senate on February 18, 1963.

He said:

> One of the basic objectives of the bill is to provide a medium through which individual Members and committees of the Congress can obtain information which is not now available to enable them to take appropriate legislative action to establish definite Federal policies in the field of science and technology. The reports and recommendations of the Commission will also provide a basis for an evaluation of programs which are presently in operation as well as those which are being proposed.
>
> Evidence was also submitted at the hearings on S. 2771 in the 87th Congress which indicated that the Bureau of the Budget has reported that a detailed evaluation of existing science and technological operations of the numerous agencies operating in these fields has been found to be too difficult. The result has been that the agencies interested in procuring appropriated funds are not required to submit an evaluation of achievement under existing programs, but merely attempt to justify further appropriations of funds. Under this procedure, it was pointed out that Congress is required to appropriate funds on faith alone, since the appropriate committees and individual Members of Congress have no information which would permit them to evaluate the programs or to take the necessary action to eliminate excessive duplication and waste.
>
> Should the Congress enact this measure, it will be provided with a means of obtaining information and facts that will better enable it to perform its appropriate constitutional function. The Committee on Government Operations is firmly convinced that there is a real need for a bipartisan commission to study all of the science and technological programs of the Federal Government as proposed by this bill. It is further convinced that its enactment will insure maximum utilization of the resources of private industry and nonprofit research organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions, in the formulation of a properly coordinated program with the maximum utilization of the resources of private industry, nonprofit, and other technological institutions at a reduced cost.
>
> The committee in recommending this legislation in past Congresses considered it to be an essential first step in achieving these objectives so that the Congress and the President may have the benefit of the recommendation of qualified experts in the fields of science, engineering, and technology upon which appropriate legislative action may be taken to promote more efficiency in the operation of these programs and to effect economies that are essential in conserving Federal funds and technological manpower.
>
> In view of our current fiscal difficulties, I am sure all of my colleagues are sympathetic to any measures which seek a balanced budget. Nevertheless, our science and technological programs must not be hampered or neglected. I submit that this measure should result in material savings through a freer exchange of ideas and a better coordination between the various Federal agencies dealing with science and technology. It should eliminate much of the current duplication of effort. I, therefore, urge enactment of this measure during the 88th Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to strengthen American science and technology as an essential resource toward the attainment of the highest potential of Government contribution toward (a) the promotion of the national security; (b) continued national progress in an era of universal scientific and technical development; (c) the procurement and training of the best qualified leadership to maintain and promote world peace; (d) insuring the maximum utilization of all available scientific know-how and information by coordinating the research and development programs of the Federal departments and agencies with those of American business and industry, and with nonprofit organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions; (e) the establishment of national policies which will require coordination of Federal science and technology programs and operations of the Federal Government through necessary reorganizations of departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, foundations, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government which relate directly to Federal science generally, scientific research, and technology; (f) insuring increased efficiency in establishing systems for acquiring, translating, storing, documenting, indexing, retrieving, and distributing scientific information through the establishment of the most modern systems of technology and automation; (g) improvement of policies for recruiting, training, and utilizing Federal scientific and engineering manpower; and (h) assessment of how the executive and legislative branches can more effectively achieve common objectives in the legislative process.

OBJECTIVES

SEC. 2. To determine the action necessary for implementing this policy, the Congress hereby declares that immediate consideration should be given to studying the means for attaining the following objectives:

(1) The establishment of programs, methods, and procedures for the effective reorganization of Federal departments and agencies operating, conducting, or financing scientific programs and supporting basic research in science and technology, with the purpose of insuring more effective performance of these essential services, activities, and functions;

(2) The elimination of undesirable duplication and overlapping between Government departments and agencies engaged in scientific and technological research, and in information storage, processing and distribution services, activities and functions, with particular emphasis upon effecting the maximum utilization of the resources of private industry and nonprofit research organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions;

(3) The assurance of the conservation and efficient utilization of scientific and engineering manpower;

(4) The determination of the need for establishing within the executive branch of the Government a Department of Science and Technology, or for the reorganization of existing Government scientific and technological functions through the transfer of such functions to existing or new executive departments or agencies, in order to provide more effective and better coordinated Federal science programs and operations; and

(5) If the establishment of a Department of Science and Technology is found to be necessary, the determination of functions now exercised by other departments or agencies of the Federal Government which should be transferred to that or other departments and what, if any, new functions should be given to such departments, as well as those which more properly should be transferred to and performed by private industry or nonprofit organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions.

SEC. 3. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Science and Technology (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government who are participating in Federal scientific or technological activities, and two from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scientific research and technological activities;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scien- scientific research and technological activi- and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life who are eminent in one or more fields of science or engineering, or who are qualified and experienced in policy determination and administration of industrial scientific research and technological activities.

(b) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 6. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive $100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

(c) The Commission is authorized to negotiate and enter into contracts with private business and nonprofit research organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions, to conduct such studies and to prepare such reports as the Commission feels necessary in order to discharge its duties.

(d) Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) may be provided the Commission by the General Services Administration, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Administrator of General Services: *Provided*, That the regulations of the General Services Administration for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments (5 U.S.C. 46d) shall apply to the collection of erroneous payments made to or on behalf of a Commission employee, and regulations of said Administrator for the administrative control of funds (31 U.S.C. 665(g)) shall apply to appropriations of the Commission: *And provided further*, That the Commission shall not be required to prescribe such regulations.

SCIENCE ADVISORY PANEL

SEC. 9. (a) The Commission shall establish an advisory panel, including competent and experienced members of the scientific and technical communities of the United States, to serve on request as consultants to the Commission or to individual members of the Commission while performing the duties of the Commission.

(b) The panel shall consist of such number of qualified persons drawn equally from Government, private industry and nonprofit organizations, including universities and other educational or technological institutions, as the Commission deems to be adequate, who shall be chosen on the basis of competence, experience, integrity, availability, and ability to communicate not only to professional scientists but to laymen.

(c) Any member of such panel who is a Government officer or employee shall receive no compensation for his services as such a member, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of his duties as such a member.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) INVESTIGATION.—The Commission shall determine means of attaining the objectives of this Act as stated in section 2.

(b) REPORT.—The Commission shall submit interim reports to the President and the Congress at such time or times as the Commission deems advisable, and shall submit its final report to the President and the Congress not later than January 1, 1965. The final report of the Commission shall propose such legislation and administrative actions as in its judgment are deemed necessary to achieve its recommendations.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 11. (a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission, or any member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions [illegible] this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member.

(b) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment or instrumentality is authorized and directed, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

TERMINATION OF COMMISSION

SEC. 13. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after submitting its final report as required under section 10.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

FEDERAL COORDINATION IN DRUG POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on March 20 and 21, 1963, the Senate Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations will resume hearings on Federal drug policy.

As before, these hearings will examine interagency coordination in drug research and regulation.

We will explore administrative and scientific problems, primarily within the Food and Drug Administration, but also extending to the entire Federal scientific community, including the U.S. Public Health Service and other agencies.

The principal examination of Food and Drug Administration organization and policy will not come until next month, however. At that time, the committee will hear testimony from Federal agency officials, including Mr. Boisfeuillet Jones, Special Assistant for Health and Medical Affairs to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Anthony Celebrezze, and Commissioner George Larrick of the Food and Drug Administration.

By contrast, in our March hearings we will receive expert testimony from largely private witnesses on selected drug issues confronting Federal agencies and also of great consequence to the health of the American people.

The list of witnesses will be announced as soon as the final confirmations have been received.

The subcommittee has compiled a mass of scientific evidence and judgment—far more than our other commitments will permit us to cover orally during the presently scheduled hearings. Much of this additional material will be printed verbatim, as heretofore, in supplementary exhibit volumes.

REPORT ON ONE-FIFTH OF A MILLION DRUG ARTICLES YEARLY

Included are several factual compilations, prepared at our request by Federal agencies. One, to be released shortly, is an important survey, "The Nature and Magnitude of Drug Literature." This report was prepared by the National Library of Medicine. It estimates there are around 200,000 original professional articles and papers in the world's pharmaceutical literature each year.

The report also briefly summarizes the extent of other printed outlets of the "drug explosion"—in the form of direct mail, detail men's brochures, as well as books, desk references, abstracting and indexing publications, and so forth.

RECENT PROGRESS PLAN FOR WHO SYSTEM

Since the subcommittee's hearings in August 1962, following the worldwide Thalidomide tragedy, certain important and favorable developments have occurred.

In some of these developments, observers have stated that the reorganization subcommittee has played a helpful role. For example, at this very time, experts convened by the World Health Organization are preparing recommendations for a formal, pioneering program in international exchange of drug information. This was a key goal of our past hearings and of subsequent subcommittee correspondence with governments and scientists throughout the world.

FDA NEEDED TIME FOR ACTION, REVIEW

In our own country, the past several months have afforded the Food and Drug Administration much-needed opportunity to propose new regulations under the Kefauver-Harris Act of 1962 and to consider the recommendations contained in the report of the second Citizens' Advisory Committee on FDA.

The time is at hand to take stock of progress to date and to examine continuing problem areas.

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF SUBCOMMITTEE

Fortunately, the subcommittee now includes, in addition to all of its previous members, three additional distinguished and able members, including Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, former HEW Secretary, as well as Senators CLAIBORNE PELL and JAMES PEARSON.

INTEREST OF OTHER COMMITTEES

As before, the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee will study those phases of Federal drug policy appropriate to our jurisdiction of interagency coordination. Other committees of the Senate and House will be taking up problems pertinent to their respective fields. We have been happy to forward our past findings to each of them, including the House Government Operations Subcommittee on Inter-Governmental Relations.

In this period, the Food and Drug Administration will be presenting its case for the expanded 1964 fiscal year appropriations, recommended by the President.

Speaking personally, I feel confident that the expert Senate and House Appropriations Subcommittees for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare will examine the President's budget recommendations most sympathetically. I believe that the Congress is now well aware that FDA cannot possibly fulfill the enormous burdens which have been placed upon it, unless it is given more adequate resources.

But Federal drug actions involve more than levels of appropriations; they involve policy decisions and administrative and scientific implementation.

It is the subcommittee's task to submit to the Congress and the Nation the best judgment which can be mobilized from America's healing arts on these topics.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON RELIGION AND RACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last year I introduced a resolution (S.J. Res. 200) to establish a Century of Freedom Commission that would have provided nationwide coordination in developing and executing suitable plans to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. President Lincoln's historic proclamation took effect on January 1, 1863. Today it stands as one of the most significant actions ever taken by a President of the United States in the never-ending struggle for human freedom and justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Emancipation Proclamation be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the Emancipation Proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION, JANUARY 1, 1863

Whereas, on the twenty-second day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-two, a proclamation was issued by the President of the United States, containing, among other things, the following, to wit:—

"That on the first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, all persons held as slaves within any State, or designated part of a State, the people whereof shall then be in rebellion against the United States, shall be then, thenceforward, and forever free; and the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authority thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons, and will do no act or acts to repress such persons, or any of them, in any efforts they may make for their actual freedom.

"That the Executive will, on the first day of January aforesaid, by proclamation, designate the States and parts of States, if any, in which the people thereof respectively shall then be in rebellion against the United States; and the fact that any State, or the people thereof, shall on that day be in good faith represented in the Congress of the United States by members chosen thereto at elections wherein a majority of the qualified voters of such State shall have participated, shall in the absence of strong countervailing testimony be deemed conclusive evidence that such State and the people thereof are not then in rebellion against the United States."

Now, therefore, I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, by virtue of the power in me vested as commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States, in time of actual armed rebellion against the authority and Government of the United States, and as a fit and necessary war measure for suppressing said rebellion, do, on this first day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and in accordance with my purpose so to do, publicly proclaimed for the full period of 100 days from the day first above mentioned, order and designate as the States and parts of States wherein the people thereof, respectively, are this day in rebellion against the United States, the following, to wit:—

Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana (except the parishes of St. Bernard, Plaquemines, Jefferson, St. John, St. Charles, St. James, Ascension, Assumption, Terre Bonne, Lafourche, St. Mary, St. Martin, and Orleans, (including the city of New Orleans), Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia (except the forty-eight counties designated as West Virginia, and also the counties of Berkeley, Accomac, Northampton, Elizabeth City, York, Princess Ann, and Norfolk, including the cities of Norfolk and Portsmouth), and which excepted parts are for the present left precisely as if this proclamation were not issued.

And by virtue of the power and for the purpose aforesaid, I do order and declare that all persons held as slaves within said designated States and parts of States are, and henceforth shall be, free; and that the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of said persons.

And I hereby enjoin upon the people so declared to be free to abstain from all violence, unless in necessary self-defence; and I recommend to them, in all cases when allowed, they labor faithfully for reasonable wages.

And I further declare and make known that such persons of suitable condition will be received into the armed service of the United States to garrison forts, positions, stations, and other places, and to man vessels of all sorts in said service.

And upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice, warranted by the Constitution upon military necessity, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of Almighty God.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, unfortunately Congress did not act on my Century of Freedom resolution to establish machinery to provide for appropriate commemoration of this important anniversary. Nevertheless a number of such events have already been held; others are planned for this year.

Today I would like to draw special attention to one such event of unusual importance, the National Conference on Religion and Race that was held in Chicago, January 15–17. The National Council of Churches, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and the Synagogue Council of America sponsored this conference to explore the contemporary forms and effects of racial discrimination and segregation. This cooperative effort constituted an impressive demonstration of interfaith concern for this country's most urgent human problem.

This conference held on the anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation did not dwell on the significant achievements of Negro citizens during the past century, or the progress that has been made in the quest for racial equality, but rather concentrated on the vast problems that still exist. The American dilemma described by Gunnar Myrdal still remains with its far-reaching impact on American life and society. An examination of these fundamental and unresolved questions of human dignity, equality, and justice constituted the principal work of the National Conference on Race and Religion.

The speeches and discussions exhibited a common realization that the time for mere words, ideas, and intentions had passed. The imperatives of the present situation could only be met

through dedicated, courageous, and sacrificial personal action and deeds. This theme characterized major addresses by such individuals as Archbishop Cardinal Meyer, Rev. Martin Luther King, Rabbi Abraham J. Heschel, Franklin H. Littell, R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., Rabbi Julius Mark, and J. Irwin Miller. Small working and discussion groups disclosed a similar determination. Concrete ideas for the improvements of race relations in this country were explored with unusual frankness and honesty.

Few participants coming to the conference brought the illusion that total solutions to such vast problems could emerge from 3 days of the most intense study and discussion. But lesser objectives were realistic and feasible, and the conference accomplished many of these. It brought the precise nature of the race problems in this country into sharper focus. It demonstrated that persons of all religious faiths actively seek the eventual resolution of these problems. It identified new channels and opportunities for such activity. It generated a feeling of commitment among the many religious faiths and denominations in attendance.

This commitment was given tangible form through the adoption of "An Appeal to the Conscience of the American People" by the conference delegates. This moving statement by persons representing all principal religious faiths is an action without parallel in the social and religious life of this country.

This appeal condemns no section of the United States. It admits that the churches themselves have often evaded and rejected their responsibilities. It recognizes that progress has been achieved in certain areas; but it asserts that far more remains to be accomplished. It closes with a call to every American to act courageously in the cause of human equality and dignity while the opportunity for such action remains.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this historic affirmation, "An Appeal to the Conscience of the American People," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN APPEAL TO THE CONSCIENCE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(From the National Conference on Religion and Race, January 17, 1963, Chicago, Ill.)

We have met as members of the great Jewish and Christian faiths held by the majority of the American people, to counsel together concerning the tragic fact of racial prejudice, discrimination, and segregation in our society. Coming as we do out of various religious backgrounds, each of us has more to say than can be said here. But this statement is what we as religious people are moved to say together.

I

Racism is our most serious domestic evil. We must eradicate it with all diligence and speed. For this purpose we appeal to the consciences of the American people.

This evil has deep roots; it will not be easily eradicated. While the Declaration of Independence did declare "that all men are created equal" and "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," slavery was permitted for almost a century. Even after the Emancipation Proclamation, compulsory racial segregation and its degrading badge of racial inequality received judicial sanction until our own time.

We rejoice in such recent evidences of greater wisdom and courage in our national life as the Supreme Court decisions against segregation and the heroic, nonviolent protests of thousands of Americans. However, we mourn the fact that patterns of segregation remain entrenched everywhere—North and South, East and West. The spirit and the letter of our laws are mocked and violated.

Our primary concern is for the laws of God. We Americans of all religious faiths have been slow to recognize that racial discrimination and segregation are an insult to God, the giver of human dignity and human rights. Even worse, we all have participated in perpetuating racial discrimination and segregation in civil, political, industrial, social, and private life. And worse still, in our houses of worship, our religious schools, hospitals, welfare institutions, and fraternal organizations we have often failed our own religious commitments. With few exceptions we have evaded the mandates and rejected the promises of the faiths we represent.

We repent our failures and ask the forgiveness of God. We ask also the forgiveness of our brothers, whose rights we have ignored and whose dignity we have offended. We call for a renewed religious conscience on this basically moral evil.

II

Our appeal to the American people is this:

Seek a reign of justice in which voting rights and equal protection of the law will everywhere be enjoyed; public facilities and private ones serving a public purpose will be accessible to all; equal education and cultural opportunities, hiring and promotion, medical and hospital care, open occupancy in housing will be available to all.

Seek a reign of love in which the wounds of past injustices will not be used as excuses for new ones; racial barriers will be eliminated; the stranger will be sought and welcomed; any man will be received as brother—his rights, your rights; his pain, your pain; his prison, your prison.

Seek a reign of courage in which the people of God will make their faith their binding commitment; in which men willingly suffer for justice and love; in which churches and synagogues lead, not follow.

Seek a reign of prayer in which God is praised and worshipped as the Lord of the universe, before whom all racial idols fall, who makes us one family and to whom we are all responsible.

In making this appeal we affirm our common religious commitment to the essential dignity and equality of all men under God. We dedicate ourselves to work together to make this commitment a vital factor in our total life.

We call upon all the American people to work, to pray and to act courageously in the cause of human equality and dignity while there is still time, to eliminate racism permanently and decisively, to seize the historic opportunity the Lord has given us for healing an ancient rupture in the human family, to do this for the glory of God.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the conference provided for local follow-up committees throughout the country. Groups have already been established in Chicago, Atlanta, Detroit, New Orleans, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, San Antonio, San Francisco, and Oakland. Other local committees will be formed when administrative funds become available. Moreover, the secretariat of the conference will continue to function for a period of time in order to transmit the work of the conference to these local groups.

Two excellent articles describing the work of the National Conference on Religion and Race also have been brought to my attention. One appeared in Christianity and Crisis, the outstanding journal founded by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr and his associates at Union Theological Seminary in New York City. The other report appeared in the respected weekly journal, the Christian Century. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both these articles be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial appearing in the Minneapolis Star relating to this conference be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Christianity and Crisis, Feb. 4, 1963]

SPECIAL REPORT ON RELIGION AND RACE

(By Stephen C. Rose)

CHICAGO, ILL.—Which biblical prophet is more relevant to the American dilemma, Amos or Jeremiah? I found myself forced to this question in attempting to understand the significance of the National Conference on Religion and Race, held in Chicago, January 14–17, on the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.

Both Amos and Jeremiah predicted the worst for Israel, but they differed in their estimate of Israel's capacity to extricate herself from national sin. Amos proclaimed the devastating lion's roar but suggested that man could turn from evil to good. Two centuries after the prosperous time of Amos, Jeremiah surveyed the wreckage of Israel and concluded that his nation was incapable of repentance.

Israel, in the person of the three major faiths, met in the land of Lincoln to bewail the national sin of race—the publicists ascribed a positive significance to this being the first such meeting—and to propose solutions to the problem. On the very first day the issue was drawn.

Jeremiah's mantle was donned by New York Attorney William Stringfellow who told the 600 delegates that the conference was, in his opinion, "too little, too late, and too lily white." A Jewish delegate arose to condemn the prospect of "4 days of breast beating and self-flagellation." And Rabbi Abraham Heschel, the keynote speaker, responded to Stringfellow by saying, "The greatest heresy is despair of man's power to goodness."

It was this latter note that dominated the conference and was reflected in the unanimously approved "Appeal to Conscience." History will determine whether this modern Israel—the American religious establishment—was, in fact, able to repent.

There was some substance to the allegation that the conference was too lily white. Only 1 of the 11 major addresses was given by a Negro, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Dr. King's speech came on the last day when major deliberations had been completed.

Although there were many Negroes present, certain significant groups did not attend: The National Baptist Convention refused the invitation of the conveners. CORE and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee were not invited because they were not considered religious organizations. Perhaps the Black Muslims should have been represented, either in person or through a presentation of the threat that they offer to advocates of peaceful change.

Nevertheless the conference did bring together top representatives of 70 religious organizations in a determined effort to speak out in unequivocal terms against the sin of race. The 4-day session ended with a question common to many religious meetings: How are insights to be translated into action?

To some extent the conference was organized to answer this question. Although speeches were numerous, major emphasis was placed on hours of deliberation in small work groups, designed for frank discussion and the formulation of specific proposals. Although the conference was not organized with the authority to promulgate and implement specific policies, numerous suggestions were offered in the hope that they would provide a solid foundation for witness in specific situations.

Among them were the following: Whites should seek membership in Negro congregations and vice versa; the formation of small, direct action groups of laymen to meet problems; solicitation of open-occupancy pledges and sponsorship of voter-education drives; unequivocal preaching; rejection of offers of free land for church construction from promoters of segregated developments; elimination of discrimination in hiring qualified Negro employees in schools, hospitals, etc., operated by religious institutions; use of pension funds and other investments as weapons in the racial struggle by withholding investments from institutions that practice discrimination and consciously investing in Negro banks in order to increase available mortgage funds and integrated housing developments; purchasing only from companies with nondiscriminatory employment clauses; encourage members who are teachers to work in ghetto area schools; spark revision of textbooks that give an outmoded picture of the Negro; begin a "justice corps" of young people to augment the direct-action approach of the student nonviolent movement and CORE; encourage similar interfaith meetings on a local level.

These proposals are not new. But it was hoped that the setting of the meeting, the expressions of cooperation on the race issue by the major faiths and unanimous commitment of the "Appeal to Conscience" would operate to give impetus to a new effort by the religious establishment to speed the end of racism in America.

The 3-page "Appeal to Conscience of the American People" was approved with full awareness of the potential hypocrisy of another religious pronouncement. It embodies both repentance—"With few exceptions we have evaded the mandates and rejected the promises of the faiths we represent"—and a call to obedience—"Seek a reign of courage in which * * * men willingly suffer for justice; in which church and synagogues lead, not follow."

On paper, at least, the three faiths have now stated together what each has said separately in the past. The appeal also endorses the heroic, nonviolent protests of thousands of Americans as an evidence of greater wisdom and courage in our national life.

The ecumenical significance of the meeting is difficult to determine. It was suggested more than once that such a meeting—involving intimate conversation and mutual policymaking—could not have taken place during the pre-Vatican II era, and there is little question that the spirit of Pope John XXIII increased its ecumenical spirit. A clearer indication of the ecumenical trends will be given when the effect of the conference on a local level is known.

In preparation for the conference, pilot interfaith groups to deal with the race problem were formed in several cities, and it is hoped that such efforts will increase. The conference secretariat will continue for four months, primarily to disseminate insights to the local level. A permanent steering committee has been formed to forward the work of the conference and determine the need for future efforts on a national level.

The addresses were generally of high quality. Speaking for the Government, Peace Corps Director Sargent Shriver (whose journey to Chicago was regarded by the press in a political rather than religious context) minced few words: "The Government," he said, "looks to the religious community for its share of the task and encounters, too often, a bland philosophy of laissez faire."

In an excellent discussion of religion and race in its historical perspective, Prof. Franklin Littell observed, "Racialism has the same meaning where found among American Protestant churches as have the bitter anti-Catholicism and anti-Semitism which so frequently accompany it. They mark and mar a religion which has lost faith in the author of history, which is anxiously striving to retain old ways rather than retool to meet the challenges of the new age."

Another thrust at the conference was a largely unexpressed undercurrent; namely, that the time may come when the white community in America (and those elements of the Negro community that make their livelihood in white-sponsored race relations work) will no longer be able to take the initiative in the racial crisis. The shadow of Malcolm X was not absent from the corridors of the Edgewater Beach Hotel, and one suspects that subconscious fear was among the motivations of the assembled delegates.

In the wake of a potentially significant conference, filled with prophetic utterances and declarations, the Amos-Jeremiah dichotomy remains. Has the judgment been passed? Is it too late to achieve the American dream to which Martin Luther King referred so eloquently?

The tension between optimism and pessimism about religion's role in the solution of the racial dilemma remains with me, because at moments it actually seemed that the tremendous force represented by the Protestant, Catholic and Jewish communities might finally rise up and reverse the years of apathy and neglect. For a moment it seemed that the delegates might become evangelists of justice armed with the insight of James Baldwin's remark, "It's not a matter of acceptance or tolerance. We've got to sit down and rebuild this house." Only on the basis of such a radical response—rooted finally in the mystery of God's action in history—will the conference attain its high purpose.

[From the Christian Century, Jan. 30, 1963]

Religion and Race

(By Kyle Haselden)

One hundred years after the Emancipation Proclamation the religious organizations in the United States finally came together in one body to discuss the moral problem of racial discrimination and segregation in specific and concrete terms. Six hundred fifty delegates from 70 religious groups met in the first National Conference on Religion and Race at the Edgewater Beach hotel, Chicago, January 14–17. This interreligious conference, the first of its kind in the Nation's history, was convened by the Department of Racial and Cultural Relations of the National Council of Churches, the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the Social Action Commission of the Synagogue Council of America. The conference thus had the approval and support of the highest representative officers of the participating bodies. In addition to the delegates, several hundred observers and visitors attended the open sessions.

In the depth of the planning for the conference, the efficiency of its machinery, the comfort and conveniences of the housing provided for it, the mood of congeniality and cooperativeness which pervaded it, the earnestness of the delegates in grasping the problems which called them together, the auspices under which it met—in all of this the National Conference on Religion and Race was extraordinarily successful. But the tests of the true success of this gathering run deeper.

Whatever the values of the conference in the solution of the racial problem, it made a deep and far-reaching contribution to the solution of the interfaith problem. This was the most cosmopolitan gathering of religious leaders under religious auspices in American history. What Will D. Campbell said and William Stringfellow and others implied was in some measure accomplished: it is more realistic to seek a true inner life for church and synagogue through the race problem than to seek a solution to the race problem through the inner life of church and synagogue. The Nation's No. 1 domestic problem called together and introduced to each other people who on religious grounds have long been estranged. What else could have put in one room representatives of the American Ethical Union, the Christian life commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, the Polish National Catholic Church, the Rabbinical Council of America, the Unitarian Universalist Association, the National Council of Catholic Men?

If a family so big is to gather in peace in one room, it has to be a room big enough to hold all its members. Particularities had to be submerged; generalities had to be avoided and the greatest common denominators sought. The harmony and the mutual dedications which were achieved were paid for in patience, restraint, understanding, courtesy, and a willingness not to say everything that could be said. It was an open conference, but the delegates operated on the healthful Pauline principle that though all things are lawful, not all are expedient. Brought together by a great cause, the delegates stayed together and arrived at mutual dedications despite the theological chasms dividing them.

But was it a successful conference on race? No, if it is supposed that such gatherings solve problems. Yes, if it is assumed that the meeting of minds and hearts on a vast and grave human problem is a beginning rather than an ending. Such conferences do not solve problems; they discover problems. They lift up the unresolved issues, identify the unused talent and resources, dramatize the unfinished business, renew the faltering commitments. In these respects the National Conference on Religion and Race was successful not only in the interfaith but also in the interracial quest. Two, three, five years from now will be soon enough to ask what good came of it.

From the brilliant, scholarly opening address by Rabbi Abraham J. Heschel to the moving plea of Martin Luther King, Jr., at the close the accent was on action. In the plenary addresses by Archbishop Cardinal Meyer, J. Irwin Miller, Rabbi Julius Mark, Franklin H. Littell, Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., in the forums and work groups the accent was on action. Who, indeed, can say anything more than has been said? Who can resolve anything more than has been resolved? The conference declared explicitly and implicitly that what is lacking in human relations is not ideas, instructions, resolutions, but deeds—deeds such as picket lines, sit-ins, freedom rides; the less dramatic but equally creative deeds of love and justice in our homes, our neighborhoods, our churches and synagogues, our public and private facilities; the personal deeds of prayer, faithful obedience, courageous individual witness to the will of the God who set the solitary in families and made all men one.

Provision was made for a followup committee and, temporarily, for a continuing secretariat to put the resources of the conference at the disposal of local groups which want to transform words, ideas, and plans into action. The life of the secretariat, without which the accumulated values and resources of the conference will be inadequately used, will depend on the availability of funds for its support. But this is not the action the delegates had in mind; it is merely a means to such action. Already 10 follow-up local committees have been or are being formed—in Chicago, Atlanta, Detroit, New Orleans, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, San Antonio, San Francisco, and Oakland.

What were the complaints about the conference? It was said, largely unjustly, that Negroes were not adequately represented on the program and in the number of delegates. There is a measure of truth in the first part of this criticism. President Benjamin E. Mays, of Morehouse College, Atlanta, was chairman of the conference. With the exception of him and Martin Luther King, Jr., the talent and insight of the Negro were neglected. But it is incorrect to say that Negroes were not proportionately represented. All the religious groups in the Negro community were invited to send delegates. Although some of the groups did not accept the invitation, roughly one-fourth of the delegates were Negroes. Since delegates were selected on a religious rather than a racial basis, the Negro contingency was disproportionately large.

There were more serious omissions. A conference on religion and race should not—as this one did—ignore the Indian and other minority racial groupings. It would have been fitting to have paid some attention to the plight of Spanish Americans in the United States. Although most Spanish Americans are identified as Caucasians, their speech and physical traits subject them to the same kind of oppressions suffered by Negroes in American society. But even more serious was the failure to give recognition, credit, and responsibility to women. With the exception of Mahalia Jackson, who sang, and the Reverend May Yoho Ward, who gave an invocation, no woman appeared anywhere on the program. Yet the fact, which some of the delegates and participating groups seemed not to realize, is that the women of the United States have been far in advance of men in the field of interracial activity. This was a regrettable oversight, but fortunately it will not halt the courageous, farsighted services of women and women's organizations.

The conference, tied to the nationwide celebration of the centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation, was the brain child of a young Roman Catholic layman, Mathew Ahmann of the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, who deserves immense credit for the quiet, efficient work which brought this meeting to fruition. With the cooperation of Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum, of the American Jewish Committee, and J. Oscar Lee, executive director of the department of racial and cultural relations of the National Council of Churches, he initiated, planned, and directed the development of this historic gathering. He placed himself—and often the religious group to which he belongs—in the background and brought off without bitterness, rancor, or envy on the part of anyone an interreligious gathering which may prove to be epochal.

[From the Minneapolis Star, Jan. 17, 1963]

The Churches and Race

The National Conference on Religion and Race in Chicago found R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., appealing to churches and synagogues to "bury religious laissez faire in racial problems." The need, the Peace Corps Director said, is for social action programs which will produce concrete gains. Such programs could end segregation in churches where it now exists, Shriver suggested, and "introduce Negroes to every social and community event which the church sponsors or participates in."

It is difficult to generalize about the role of the churches in combatting the evils of discrimination. Even in the Deep South, where strictly segregated congregations are the rule, there is a wide range of opinion among laymen as to the morality of discrimination and many religious leaders have spoken out courageously against it.

But we think it will be generally agreed that even in the North, the example set by such leaders often does not reach deeply enough into congregations. As Shriver suggests, the example is frequently not translated into social action on behalf of basic principles.

It has been our impression, one sustained by inquiry, that Minneapolis churches and synagogues are generally outstanding in their dedicated work on behalf of these principles. The part played by various religious groups in combatting residential segregation and their efforts to educate the citizen to his responsibilities under Minnesota's newly effective Fair Housing Act, clearly suggests the presence of a powerful leaven of conscience which does not stop short of action.

We do not mean to imply that much more could not be done by these groups or by the congregations which they represent. But the picture often drawn of a spiritual leadership reluctant to war on discrimination, and of a lay leadership indifferent to inequalities of racial opportunity does not, in our opinion, apply to this community.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the National Conference on Religion and Race was a most relevant expression of the same concern for human values that prompted President Lincoln to promulgate the Emancipation Proclamation. I commend the persons responsible for conceiving and organizing this interreligious conference of historic significance.

A BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY—CUBA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was conducting an executive hearing of the Internal Security Subcommittee. In consequence, I was late in getting to the floor, and therefore did not hear the statement made by the majority leader with respect to a continuing discussion of certain problems relating to Cuba. He was kind enough to let me see the manuscript of his remarks. I believe it is appropriate that I make at least this one comment.

I was curious, when, 20 months after the Bay of Pigs incident, and after it had lain dormant all that time, the Attorney General should see fit to bring the matter out on the front page of the newspapers. I was curious as to the reason and why, after it had languished for 20 months, new life was being breathed into what was, at the time it happened, a controversy.

I have an interest only in the truth. It was written on the ancient parchment, long ago:

> Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

I think that is good gospel and that is good philosophy and that is sound doctrine for government.

It was in pursuance of that doctrine that I laid the matter before the policy committee of my own party and asked whether they thought it ought to be explored and whether a further report should be made on it. I have been exploring it, although it has not been necessary for me to energetically explore it, because it has explored itself from time to time. The letters, telephone calls, and telegrams and other material which have come to me bearing upon the matter indicate that there is a high degree of public interest in this subject. I have been exceedingly circumspect in anything I have said with respect thereto. I have sought under no circumstances to prejudge the matter. I leave that to take place after an appropriate committee of the Senate, where both parties have representation may, after an evaluation of the testimony, has come to a conclusion, and when one can ask any member of the newspaper fraternity. That is as much as anyone has received from the minority leader on this point.

It was only when a distinguished Member of the Senate, on a television performance, indicated that it was "spilled milk" that I, perhaps inadvertently, mentioned that spilled milk is one thing, but spilled blood is quite another. When he said, "What do you mean by spilled blood?" I said, "Well, I simply mean that perhaps Americans were killed in the Bay of Pigs operation, and you don't lightly cast aside spilled American blood."

I left it right there. But they worked their own will. They worked their own thinking upon that little morsel. May it be said to the everlasting commendation of the majority leader that he did then state on the floor of the Senate or in a press conference that four American flyers had been killed at the Bay of Pigs.

I asked nobody for confirmation. I was no party to any conference or any session, at the White House or elsewhere, where such a disclosure was made. But the majority leader stated, so that all the world could note, that four American flyers had been killed at the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

Of course, it is no wonder that this disclosure has seized upon the imagination of our people. It is small wonder that it has intrigued the interest of the press. So people continue to conjecture: What was the truth? What is the truth? What did happen? That is the only interest I have in the matter. I do not like to see a gap in contemporary history that may someday be referred to as the Bay of Pigs gap.

If there is any merit in the old expression, it would have merit now; that is, that open confession is good for the soul. So why not lay all the facts upon the record and let us have done with it? Then the whole truth shall have been told, and our people shall have been satisfied on that point. If there are other questions appertaining to Cuba which need discussion, they can be raised when the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], who is chairman of a subcommittee which is investigating the question, will finally make his report.

So, Mr. President, for myself, I must insist that my own approach to the matter has been most circumspect. I have at no time and under no circumstance undertaken to prejudge the matter. I leave it right there until such time as an appropriate group or subgroup of this body can go into the subject further.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I was very sorry to read in the morning newspapers that the Republican leadership has announced its determination to fight the bill which is now before the Senate—S. 20. I think it would be well for the Senate, particularly the Republican leadership, to understand the background and origin of S. 20 and exactly what it seeks to do.

Public Law 85–470 of the 85th Congress, signed by Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower on June 28, 1958, created an Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The Commission was composed of four Senators and four Representatives, equally divided between the two political parties, plus seven public members appointed by President Eisenhower. Mr. Eisenhower appointed as the Chairman of the Commission Mr. Laurance Rockefeller, of New York. Senator Clinton P. Anderson and I served on the Commission. Republican Senators Barrett, of Wyoming, and Watkins, of Utah, served on it for a time. They were succeeded by Senator Henry Dworshak, of Idaho, and Senator Thomas Martin, of Iowa. Senator Martin was succeeded by Senator Jack Miller, of Iowa.

In 1961, when President Kennedy took office, Senator Anderson asked him to retain the Commission as it was constituted, even though it was predominantly Republican. This was done.

The Commission reported on January 31, 1962, after a 3-year study, including many detailed research projects. The Commission found—and I wish to emphasize that the findings were unanimous:

> The [recreation] demand is surging. Whatever the measuring rod—visits to the Federal and State recreation areas, fishing license holders, the number of outboard motors in use—it is clear that Americans are seeking the outdoors as never before. And this is only a foretaste of what is to come.
>
> Not only will there be many more people, they will want to do more, and they will have more money and time to do it with.

Recreation "activity occasions" ran 4.4 billion in 1960. It is estimated that by 1976 they will run 6.9 billion. They will be more than 12.4 billion—tripled—by 2000. These calculations are based on extensive studies, including a poll of 16,000 persons by Census Bureau for the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The report continues:

> After 3 years of research, and an aggregate of some 50 days of discussion among the Commissioners, the Commission has developed specific recommendations for a recreation program. The 15 members brought differing political, social, and resource-use opinions. During the course of the study and discussion, views of the individual members developed, and the collective opinion crystallized. The final recommendations are a consensus of the Commission.

Here on the very first page of the report are the personal signatures of every one of the 15 members—proof of their individual agreement to the statement and to the fact that the report was the unanimous consensus of all of us.

I invite the attention of Senators to the names of members of the Commission who signed the report, which is the basis for the proposed legislation which is now before the Senate.

The Chairman was Laurance S. Rockefeller, chairman of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, New York, N.Y.

From the U.S. Senate: Senator Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; the late Senator Henry C. Dworshak, of Idaho; the junior Senator from Washington, Senator Jackson; and Senator Jack Miller, of Iowa.

From the House of Representatives, Representative John P. Saylor, of Pennsylvania, the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; former Representative Gracie Pfost, of Idaho; Representative Ralph J. Rivers, of Alaska; and Representative John H. Kyl, of Iowa.

The Presidential Commissioners appointed—and I again emphasize that they were appointed by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower—were:

Samuel T. Dana, dean emeritus of the School of Natural Resources, the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Mrs. Marian S. Drvfoos, associate director of special activities, the New York Times, New York, N.Y.

Bernard L. Orrell, vice president, Weyerhaeuser Co., Tacoma, Wash.

Joseph W. Penfold, conservation director, Izaak Walton League of America, Washington, D.C.

M. Frederik Smith, vice president, Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N.J.

Chester S. Wilson, former Minnesota State Commissioner of Conservation, Stillwater, Minn.

All these individuals were appointed by President Eisenhower, with the exception of Mrs. Marian S. Dryfoos, who was appointed by President Kennedy in, I believe, 1961 by reason of the death of one of the members.

Mr. President, the names to which I have just now referred give the background and parentage of the recommendations which are before us. Certainly this group is composed of distinguished Americans who have been appointed without regard to party. The entire burden of the effort of the Commission was to do an effective, nonpartisan job, so that we could get a report which would result in general agreement.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to my friend, the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from the State of Washington for yielding to me.

I wish to say that I think the Commission, which was appointed by President Eisenhower without regard to party, was an excellent one, and made an excellent report to the present administration.

I had hoped, and I still hope, that the extremely important recreation industry and its development and expansion will not become involved in any way in party politics. It would seem to me to be very shortsighted, indeed, to let that happen.

Recreation is one of the most rapidly growing industries in the United States today, and it shows signs of growing in the future at an even more rapid rate.

With the development of technology and assembly-line production, it has become possible for our industrialists to turn out the same amount of equipment of all kinds with much less labor than the amount previously required. Now we must find some way to take up the slack in employment which automation is creating; and the recreation industry lies immediately before us, waiting to be developed to several times its present size. That is particularly true in the part of the country which I represent.

Not only would the recreation industry take up the slack in employment, insofar as operating recreational areas goes, but in recent years there has been developed in the recreation field a demand for much new equipment which was not even on the market a few years ago; and this demand creates new industries and new employment in them.

The recreation industry has created a great new field for investment in this country. Even in our small State of Vermont we see millions of dollars of new money being put into recreation areas annually and thus creating new markets for recreational articles and new jobs for persons who otherwise perhaps would be unemployed. All of this, Mr. President, contributes to the taxable income of the country. I know small towns in my State which 10 or 20 years ago contributed virtually no taxes to the State, but now make very substantial tax contributions, not only on the property there and not only through the employment taxes on those who work in these areas, but also through the tobacco taxes, the gasoline taxes, and all the other taxes. If that tax income were to be lost, its loss could spell disaster to the economy of the State.

In addition, Mr. President, we must consider the agricultural situation of the country. In that connection, in order to keep in economic competition, farmers have had to change their way of doing business. They have had to double or treble the size of their farms, and they have had to purchase new machinery. All this has meant that thousands of small, uneconomic farms have had to be taken out of production. Then how were the small farms used? They were used as residential property; and more particularly, they now contribute to the recreation industry, for today there is a great demand for living accommodations for people who wish to come for a week or a month, or even to live there indefinitely.

In one ski area in Vermont, the manager of the operations told me that presently there is a shortage of 2,500 beds in that one area, and that 2,500 additional beds are needed in order to take care of those who wish to come from other parts of the Nation to visit or live there.

Mr. President, if we were to restrict this development in any way, if we were to turn down cold the recommendations which this Commission, appointed by President Eisenhower, has made, we would literally be taking the bread out of the mouths of our people, and possibly the recovery from the economic shock and loss caused by such action would not occur during this generation.

So I wish to support the Senator from Washington, and to state that I hope there will be no partisan position on this legislation or on legislation of this type. I hope we shall—as we did last year—enact this bill unanimously, so there could be no question about where we stand, and so that no one could charge any of us with obstructing the development of what is possibly one of the most rapidly growing industries in the Nation.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont. As usual, he has approched this problem—as he has approached so many other problems—in a statesmanlike way.

It would be most unfortunate if this matter were to become a subject of bitter partisanship. Actually, Mr. President, if the objective is economy and saving money, then the implementation of this proposal, by both the Federal Government and the States, will be a way to achieve it. It will avoid a waste, both of human and of material resources. The States are undertaking all sorts of programs in this area; and those programs need to be coordinated with the programs of the Federal Government. We have an opportunity through S. 20 to utilize the resources of the Federal Government, and also those of the States, to carry out a long-range, coordinated program to deal with problems arising out of what has been so commonly referred to as the great population explosion.

As the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, many great problems which are arising socially, economically, and politically as a result of our rapidly changing industrial technology. Our need is to find proper areas for recreation, not only for the youth of the country, but also for our older citizens. This bill—S. 20—is part of a desire on the part of all citizens—Republicans and Democrats alike—to meet sensibly this great demand which faces us.

This is not a wild-eyed program. I do not think Laurance Rockefeller and other businessmen on the Commission would jump off the deep end with a program which would hurt the economy of the Nation. This is a realistic program.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] pointed out that a number of industries in our country have been growing and flourishing—in fact, they are called growth industries—because they are oriented toward the recreational needs and requirements of our people. Recreation is giving employment and new opportunities for business and for working men and women throughout America. I wish to commend the Senator for the point that he has made.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am speaking not only for myself personally, but I am also speaking for my State, which supports the bill (S. 20) and the subsequent bill (S. 859) which was introduced by the Senator from Washington, and upon which hearings are now being held. The State Director of Forests and Parks for Vermont had intended to testify in favor of that proposed legislation before the Interior Committee, but unfortunately we had too much snow, sleet, and rain, so that the planes did not fly and he did not get here. But he has sent me his testimony, which I have asked to have inserted in the record of the hearings. So I wish it understood that I am speaking not only for myself alone—although I believe everything that I have said—but I am also representing the position of my State.

Mr. JACKSON. We appreciate that. I think it should be brought to the attention of Senators that the bill before the Senate is a bipartisan bill. It is supported not only by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] and the junior Senator from Washington, but also the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the junior Senator from California [Mr. Engle], and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], as well. We hope that the whole problem can be approached from that point of view. If we fail to do so, I think we will be rendering a great disservice to the country as a whole.

Mr. President, I should now like to turn to some of the recommendations made by the Commission.

The Commission made extensive and very detailed recommendations to meet the tremendously expanded recreation demand which is ahead.

They recommended not only a national recreation policy—by unanimous consensus of all the members—but also many specific steps which should be taken to implement that policy.

The national recreation policy unanimously recommended on page 6 of the report before me states:

> It shall be the national policy, through the conservation and wise use of resources, to preserve, develop, and make accessible to all American people such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation as will be necessary and desirable for individual enjoyment and to assure the physical, cultural, and spiritual benefits of outdoor recreation.
>
> Implementation of this policy will require the cooperative participation of all levels of Government and private enterprise. In some aspects, the Government responsibility is greater; in others, private initiative is better equipped to do the job.
>
> The role of the Federal Government should be:
>
> 1. Preservation of scenic areas, natural wonders, primitive areas, and historic sites of national significance.
> 2. Management of Federal lands for the broadest possible recreation benefit consistent with other essential uses.
> 3. Cooperation with the States through technical and financial assistance.
> 4. Promotion of interstate arrangements, including Federal participation where necessary.
> 5. Assumption of vigorous, cooperative leadership in a nationwide recreation effort.

To implement this policy, the Commission recommended, among many others, the following specific steps:

It recommended that we set up and adopt a national classification system for outdoor recreation areas, to facilitate understanding, planning and management.

It recommended that every State develop a statewide recreation plan.

It recommended systematic and continuing research, both fundamental and applied, to provide the basis for sound planning and decisions.

At page 9 of the voluminous report it recommended as follows:

> A BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION
>
> A Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should be established in the Department of the Interior. This Bureau would have overall responsibility for leadership of a nationwide effort by coordinating the various Federal programs and assisting other levels of Government to meet the demand for outdoor recreation.
>
> Specifically, the new Bureau would—
>
> 1. Coordinate the recreation activities of the more than 20 Federal agencies whose activities affect outdoor recreation.
> 2. Assist State and local governments with technical aid in planning and administration, including the development of standards for personnel, procedures, and operations.
> 3. Administer a grants-in-aid program to States for planning and for development and acquisition of needed areas.
> 4. Act as a clearinghouse for information and guide, stimulate, and sponsor research as needed.
> 5. Encourage interstate and regional cooperation, including Federal participation where necessary.

WHAT S. 20 WOULD DO

The Secretary of the Interior established the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation on April 2, 1962, in response to the report, issued January 31, 1962.

In other words, Secretary of the Interior Udall carried out the specific recommendations of the unanimous report of a bipartisan commission headed by Mr. Laurance Rockefeller.

The Bureau will do exactly what the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recommended.

Secretary of the Interior Udall transferred planning and State cooperation functions to it from National Park Service—duties imposed on that Service, as we all know, under the act of June 23, 1936. These functions were transferred and placed in the new Bureau. Secretary Udall did not have the other powers and authorities, as recommended by the Commission, to transfer to the new Bureau. So Congress has been asked to provide the authorities. The bill (S. 20) now before the Senate would direct and authorize the Secretary, through the Bureau, to first, maintain an inventory; second, prepare a system of classification of types of recreation areas; third, develop a nationwide plan, built on State plans; fourth, provide technical assistance as ORRRC proposed; fifth, encourage interstate and regional cooperation; sixth, sponsor, conduct, and assist in research; and seventh, encourage Federal departments and agencies to cooperate.

Incidentally, I might comment here that, the wonderful cooperation that now exists between Secretary of the Interior Udall and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman is to be most highly commended. They appeared jointly before the committee yesterday to testify together in support of other proposed legislation in this same general field.

Eighth, to encourage donations to the cause—money, lands, and other property that may be of help.

BUREAU IN EXISTENCE

The next point I wish to make is that the Bureau is in existence. Last year $1.1 million was transferred to it from the Park Service budget. In other words, the funds that the Park Service had for the functions that I have mentioned were transferred to the new Bureau. In the 1964 budget, which is now before the Congress, the request is for $2.2 million. What I desire to emphasize is that this will be a small bureau, a service organization, and not a land-management agency. The director, Dr. Crafts, has testified that, as far as he can see, at the very outside the budget will never go beyond $5 million. It will probably be considerably less than that, as a matter of fact at the peak.

There is no money authorization in the bill, because the Bureau is already in existence; and is a budgeted agency.

Mr. President, I do not think there is any question about the fact that this will be a sound, sensible, first step toward carrying out the unanimous recommendations of a very able commission, a commission which has approached the problem without regard to partisanship. I think it would be a serious mistake if the proposed legislation were even to pass the Senate by a narrow vote. Certainly it will pass, but I do not think it would encourage fairminded citizens, regardless of party, to undertake work in behalf of such important programs as the matter now pending before the Senate, if the programs are to be turned into partisan political footballs.

President Eisenhower tried to select people uniquely qualified to serve on the Commission, to approach the problems without regard to partisanship. President Kennedy has followed the same approach, with the same attitude. President Kennedy is now seeking to carry out recommendations made by the original Eisenhower Commission.

Mr. President, I hope that when the Senate votes on Tuesday, it will give a resounding vote of confidence and support to all Americans, to all of our citizens who are interested in dealing with our recreation resources, and the future well-being of our children. I hope the Senate will give a large, healthy—even overwhelming—majority vote in support of the pending bill, S. 20.

BAY OF PIGS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, yesterday I adverted to certain incidents surrounding the Bay of Pigs invasion in Cuba in April 1961, and I expressed then, as I express now, my sympathy to the widows and children of the four Americans who were killed in that ill-fated incident.

Reference has been made in this Chamber today, to that invasion, and reference has also been made to it by the former Vice President of the United States, Mr. Nixon. I should like to make some supplementary remarks on this same subject.

It is exceedingly unfortunate that any American men were killed in that abortive invasion. It is a matter of great regret that four fine American young men had the misfortune to be shot down.

The facts are that all of the four were mature men. One had been a test pilot, and a former World War II pilot. He was 37 years of age. His name was Riley W. Shamburger, Jr. It is stated that he received $2,100 per month while he was training Cubans as aviators preliminary to the invasion, presumably in Nicaragua and Guatemala.

The second man referred to in the news item was, Thomas Ray, I find, 30 years of age at the time, and had just returned from military duty. Evidently he was not employed at the time he enrolled at $1,900 a month to train Cubans.

The third, Wade C. Gray, was unemployed at the time he was hired. He had been a radio and electronics technician. He was 33 years of age.

The fourth man, Lee F. Baker, was 35 years of age. He operated a pizza establishment, and also had worked as a pilot.

So, Mr. President, they were mature men. They were either recruited, or offered their services; one at $2,100 a month and the others at $1,900 a month. Their recruitment was for the purpose of training Cuban exiles. Their recruitment was not for the purpose of combat duty. Evidently in the excitement of the moment at the time of the invasion, realizing there was a need for trained pilots, they voluntarily took over the controls of two planes. Unfortunately, both of them were shot down.

Since that time there have been statements back and forth regarding these men. Let us accept the statements of the unfortunate widows, the mothers of their children, that their husbands were not soldiers of fortune. But they were mature men who entered this perilous work, one might say, at high salaries. Their widows are presently receiving $487 a month.

Mr. President, I have done some research on the subject of pensions for widows of servicemen killed in combat. If a captain in the Air Force serving in World War II were shot down, as these men serving in the invasion were, the widow of that captain, without a child, would be entitled to receive approximately $164 a month from a grateful government until such time as she remarried.

Unfortunately, during World War II many Air Force officers with the rank of captain who had little children were shot down.

If the widow had one child, she would be receiving, from a grateful government, $205 a month up to the time that the child reaches 18 years of age. With two children, the widow would receive $225 from our Government. When her children reach 18—and presumably they have by this time—the payment of the pension to the widow, if she has not remarried, would revert to $164.

I stated yesterday that some of the widows of our men in World War II, who left their comfortable homes and loved ones and made the ultimate sacrifice for their country, and who today are receiving $164 a month, must be somewhat surprised to read in the papers that the widows of these four unfortunate pilots who were killed at the Bay of Pigs invasion in April of 1961 are receiving $487 a month and expect to receive that amount as long as they remain unmarried.

I make these remarks only to show what our Government has done and what is being done—I do not know for sure by whom. It may be the Central Intelligence Agency or an organization of Cuban freedom fighters, many of whom are sons of men of wealth in Cuba who were dispossessed. Presumably it is not from that source. I have no knowledge on the subject, but my view is that it may be the Central Intelligence Agency that is making the payments.

That leads me to the conclusion that it would be an excellent idea for the Congress to legislate and select a joint watchdog committee to keep the CIA under observation and see that the expenditures of the organization are properly made. Sometimes, when agencies of our Government have ample funds to spend, some of the officials may not always be zealous in the interest of saving taxpayers' money. My belief is that our Central Intelligence Agency is overstaffed and is spending too much of the taxpayers' money. Frankly, I could not prove that. No Member of Congress could. This is another reason why there should be a joint committee of Congress to act as watchdog, and to keep the expenditures and operations of the CIA under constant scrutiny.

Frankly, Mr. President, I have supported appropriations for the defense of our country, which includes tremendous sums for the CIA. I am fearful that having available such huge funds and being top heavy with executives has encouraged this agency to be spendthrift on occasions. It is high time we become more vigilant and work hard to cut out

unnecessary spending and lop off unneeded personnel in the CIA and other agencies.

Mr. President, I wish to add one concluding thought which comes to me because I have just taken from the bulletin board a report of a statement by former Vice President Nixon, who said in an interview that he has changed his mind about withdrawing from public life.

That is not surprising, and he certainly has the right to change his mind about retiring from public life. It occurs to me it is quite likely that he will try to continue in public life and in the end become California's Harold Stassen. Richard Nixon and Harold Stassen have both in the past been the wonder boys of the Republican Party. I recall that Harold Stassen served as Governor of Minnesota, and then sought the presidential nomination of that Grand Old Party, of which I am not a member, but which I hold in the highest respect. He later occupied an exceedingly high position in the Eisenhower administration.

Finally, as I recall, I believe he ran for the city council in Philadelphia and was defeated.

Mr. President, Mr. Nixon, according to this news item, charged that President Kennedy blundered by failing to provide air cover for the invasion that could have toppled, he says, the Fidel Castro regime, and, he says, former President Eisenhower would never have made that mistake.

The fact is that in 1960, when General Eisenhower was President of the United States, and this California Stassen, Mr. Nixon, was Vice President of the United States, the Castro regime suddenly, and without warning, seized the property of American citizens in Cuba; seized, for instance, millions of dollars of the property of American corporations which were lawfully in Cuba.

Fidel Castro made no pretext then, and has made no pretext since, of giving any payment whatever to corporations owned by American stockholders, or to American individuals when he despoiled them of their properties.

Was there a peep out of the Vice President at that time about a quarantine against Cuba? Was there an utterance from the then President of the United States about invading Cuba? Firm action would have been justified. Vice President Nixon did not utter one yelp, one cry of protest at that time. Now he is talking big. He wants to be a War Hawk in 1963, but he was extremely silent in 1959 and 1960, when the then administration and its leaders also had a real grievance against Castro's Cuba.

I support the firm, determined, resolute, and unyielding policy toward Cuba of our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. I am proud of the fact that his policy caused Khrushchev to turn tail last October and to withdraw the aggressive missiles and the aggressive planes from that little island.

I am proud, as a supporter of the foreign policy of the administration, that we are pursuing a policy of isolation and insulation against Castro's Cuba. In the end, despite what the new War Hawks, such as Mr. Nixon, have to say, I am certain that Castroism and Castro himself will be ousted entirely from the Western Hemisphere, due to the wise policy of the administration.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I do not rise for the purpose of answering my very able friend from Ohio, except to say that the hazards which confront this Nation are common to all the American people and that the incorrect decisions which are attributable to the man in the White House—any man in the White House—concern all of us. No one devoted more zeal or more courage to the cause of America and a just peace in the world than the gallant man from Gettysburg, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I remember that when Eisenhower finally decided to break off diplomatic relations with the infamous Castro regime this Chamber resounded with imprecations from some quarters against him for taking that step. I remember how proud I was when I stood on the floor to see the Democratic majority leader join the Republican minority leader in urging the Senate to approve legislation in the field of sugar and sugar quotas, by which that ugly Communist island would be prohibited from profiting from the sale of its sugar to this country. The Senate approved the Eisenhower bill only to see it die in the House. It is to the credit of the present Chief Executive of the United States, John F. Kennedy, that when he became President he asked Congress to enact the same kind of law recommended by a Republican administration and Congress did at long last do so.

Therefore, I simply say that in my opinion there is no need for anyone to defend the illustrious career in the White House of Dwight Eisenhower and of the Vice President at that time, Richard Nixon.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GALLANT NANCY BOYD

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, during its brief period of operation, the Peace Corps has won global admiration for the devotion, perseverance, willingness, and zeal of self-sacrificing men and women, of all ages and from every walk of life, who answered a unique call to service in the interest of democracy and of humanity.

The performance of the Corps indeed has demonstrated in remote corners of the earth the lofty ideals of America and the limitless sympathy which our Nation feels for those in less fortunate circumstances.

When they responded to the call, the Peace Corps volunteers signified a complete readiness to assume extraordinary responsibilities. They eagerly underwent rigorous training. They were content wtih unusually modest compensation. They were prepared to undergo physical hardship and to embark upon a mode of living far removed from the comfortable circumstances to which they were accustomed.

Now, in a tragic airplane accident in a foreign land, two members of the Peace Corps have given their lives. A resident of my State of California, Miss Nancy Boyd, of Martinez, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Paul C. Boyd, was one. The other was Philip Water Maggard, of Buffalo, Wyo.

Miss Boyd early joined this constructive program because she felt she could make a worthwhile contribution as a teacher, carrying the message of independence and self-determination and the dignity of man to younger generations who ultimately will be charged with keeping the flame of freedom glowing. In less than a year, as a member of the seventh contingent of volunteers sent to the Philippine Republic, this young woman, who received her training at San Jose State College in California, lay dead in the wreckage of a commercial airliner which crashed on Mindanao Island.

This patriotic young Californian, motivated by thoughts of the great opportunity offered in inculcating a love of liberty along with precious knowledge in children of another race and in a distant country, will be long remembered as a heroine of the cold war. I wish to pay tribute to her loyalty and her dedication to the cause for which she gave her life.

With these remarks, I wish to extend deepest sympathy to her parents and as evidence of the esteem and appreciation felt for her I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a message of sympathy from the President of the Philippine Republic, along with a letter from the Acting Director of the Peace Corps, and a press release issued by that agency relating the tragic circumstances of her death.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House:

We express the profound grief of entire Filipino nation at the death of two fine young persons, Nancy Boyd and Philip Maggard, of the Peace Corps, in airplane crash here. Their work in our country will long live in the hearts of our people. Kindly convey our sorrow to the American people.

President DIOSDADO MACAPAGAL.

PEACE CORPS,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1963.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: As you know, Nancy Boyd had served with the Peace Corps since June 1962. She graduated in 1960 from Alhambra Union High School in Martinez, Calif., where she was a fine student and an active member of the student council. She worked two summers for the Contra Costa County Library in Pleasant Hill and had served as a practice elementary schoolteacher in Martinez. Nancy was studying for a degree in history from the University of California in Santa Barbara when she joined the Peace Corps last summer.

From the time she arrived at San Jose State College to participate in the Peace Corps training program for the Philippines, Nancy impressed members of the Peace Corps staff, the San Jose faculty, and her fellow volunteers with her warmth, enthusiasm.

imagination, and her deep concern and interest in other people. She successfully completed the 8-week course in late August and left for the Philippines in September.

Nancy served as a teacher's aid in the small town of Mabini in Davao Province on the island of Mindanao. There, teaching science and English to elementary school children and deeply engaged in the work of the community, she won the hearts of all with whom she worked. One of 630 Peace Corps volunteers in the Philippines, she was making a significant personal contribution to the development of the nation's educational system.

Returning to Mabini on March 3 from a Peace Corps training seminar in Zamboanga, the plane in which Nancy was flying crashed on a remote mountain in eastern Mindanao leaving no survivors.

Some time ago, describing her reasons for serving in the Peace Corps, Nancy wrote: "I think that understanding between peoples cannot help but lead to peace. * * * I believe that I could find much common ground with other peoples and that we are basically alike in many ways. Because of this belief in basic similarities I feel that by serving in the Peace Corps I could have a part in preserving the peace."

Nancy lived this part she described admirably. She was an outstanding Peace Corps volunteer. Her death represents not only a great personal loss to the Boyd family but a loss to our country as well.

If you can think of any way in which we can be of further assistance to Mr. and Mrs. Boyd, please do not hesitate to call me.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

BILL MOYERS,
Acting Director.

PEACE CORPS PRESS RELEASE,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Director of the Peace Corps, the Philippine Ambassador to the United States, and the superintendent of the schools in which they worked, paid tribute today to two Peace Corps volunteers who were killed Friday in the crash of a Philippine airliner on Mindanao Island.

The volunteers were Nancy Ann Boyd, 20, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Paul C. Boyd, of 805 Lafayette St., Martinez, Calif., and Philip Walter Maggard, 22, son of Mr. and Mrs. J. Merida Maggard, of 207 S. Lobban Avenue, Buffalo, Wyo.

Both Miss Boyd and Mr. Maggard entered Peace Corps training in June 1962, as members of the seventh contingent of volunteers to be assigned to the Philippines.

After completing training at San Jose State College in California, they arrived in the Philippines in September and were assigned as elementary school teachers on the island of Mindanao.

Sargent Shriver, Peace Corps Director, said: "I extend my deepest sympathies to the parents and friends of these fine young people. Nancy and Phil were both outstanding volunteers who were performing a valuable service to their country and to the Philippines."

The Philippine Ambassador to the United States, Amelito R. Mutuc, said the death of the volunteers "is a great and irreparable loss, not only to their parents, their country, and the Peace Corps, but also to the townspeople among whom they worked and to the people of the Philippines, for whom they dedicated their time, energy, and youthful ideals." He added: "Their loved ones should find consolation, indeed, inner satisfaction, in the fact that they have died in pursuit of the highest ideals of their country and the free world."

The volunteers were described as outstanding Americans who were doing highly commendable work by the superintendent of schools of Davao Province, in which they worked. "They were very popular with our people," he said. "They will be missed greatly."

Funeral services for Miss Boyd will be held Saturday at 11 a.m. at the Connelly and Taylor funeral chapel, 1124 Ferry Street, Martinez, Calif. In lieu of flowers, contributions may be made to the Nancy Boyd Philippine Scholarship Fund, care of Mert Cerri, Bank of California, Martinez.

Miss Boyd graduated from Alhambra Union High School, where she was a member of the executive committee of the student council. She attended the University of California at Santa Barbara, majoring in history. She had worked during summers as a clerk-typist in the Contra Costa County school department and as an apprentice library assistant in the Contra Costa County library.

In her application for service as a Peace Corps volunteer, she noted that, as a history major, "I have a high interest in peoples of all countries, and wish to learn all I can about them." She added: "Also, I have a strong desire to do my part for my country."

Volunteer Maggard had planned on a career in the priesthood. An Episcopalian, he had been a member of the Acolyte Guild at the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., and vice president of the Canterbury Club at his church in Buffalo, St. Luke's. During one summer he had been church organist.

Of his plan to become a priest, he wrote on his application: "I have only 1 year of college left, and the idea of immediately entering seminary is rather frightening. For example, I would be ordained a clergyman at the age of 26 with practically no experience in the world itself. Since my ministry would be concerned with an attempt to help humanity, I feel that the Peace Corps would provide a way of gaining experience that would make that attempt more feasible."

He concluded: "And, having worked with the Peace Corps, I should hope to feel that I had left my area better than I had found it."

Besides the University of the South, he had attended the University of Wyoming at Laramie. During summers he had been employed as a State highway department crewman and as a printer's devil at the Buffalo Bulletin. He also had taught piano and organ to beginning students.

A CRITIQUE OF THE LAUSCHE TRANSIT BILL

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] introduced an urban transit bill, S. 807.

Since a number of observations were made during the course of his introductory statement about the administration's urban mass transportation bill I have sponsored with 23 of my colleagues, I thought Senators might appreciate a few reflections on this important problem.

First, let me say how gratified I am to see this latest confirmation—notwithstanding the Senator's assertions to the contrary—that the problem of deterioration and decline of transit service in our cities and towns is truly a national crisis. How else can we explain the introduction of this extraordinary billion-dollar bill of direct and indirect Federal support to perhaps every single public or private transit company in the United States?

The bill speaks for itself as to the gravity and national scope of the transit crisis. It makes me wonder whether the administration has not been entirely too modest and conservative in its approach to the problem.

Another important feature of the bill is its recognition of the fact that the severity of the problem is so great it requires what the Senator from Ohio described "at first blush would appear to be indirect Federal subsidies." And indeed the bill does provide subsidies, at first blush and at last blush.

But, Mr. President, while these are important concessions, coming from the leader of the opposition to effective Federal legislation in the field of urban transit, I must regretfully say that this is fundamentally bad proposed legislation, the justifications for which are filled with inconsistencies and contradictions.

I cannot help concluding that a vote for the bill will be a vote against helping our cities to alleviate the growing problem of traffic congestion and to provide genuinely improved public transportation service for the millions of bus, rail, and rapid transit riders of the country who want and need modern, dependable, and reasonably priced transit service.

I shall now discuss some of the contraditions that have been presented, and explain why the bill is so ill-conceived, unsound, and extreme.

I believe the analysis will demonstrate without doubt that the administration's proposed is infinitely more modest and sound.

I believe the analysis will also demonstrate that it is the bill of the Senator from Ohio, not the administration's bill, which runs the grave risk of wholesale intervention by the Federal Government into the rights and responsibilities of State and local governments and private enterprise—Federal intervention into everything from profits to working conditions in local transit systems.

THE CONTRADICTIONS

The Senator from Ohio charges that the administration's bill is a permanent subsidy program, whereas his does "not involve the Federal Government in a costly and permanent subsidy program."

The fact, is, if Senators will take the trouble to examine both bills, that the exact reverse is true.

A subsidy is a form of Federal financial assistance given directly to a private enterprise. The administration's bill provides capital grants to public bodies for mass transportation facilities and equipment. The bill of the Senator from Ohio is a genuine subsidy through the granting of tax relief to potentially every private transit company in the country, regardless of need.

The administration's bill clearly terminates at the end of 3 years. The bill of the Senator from Ohio provides tax relief which, once granted, is permanent. It provides another form of Federal involvement which, once enacted, will last a minimum of 50 years.

The Senator from Ohio asserts as evidence that no national crisis exists—which his own bill belies—the claim that only the larger metropolitan areas, a few smaller ones, and organizations with a vested interest have expressed support for the administration bill.

I suppose none of us is free from some kind of vested interest. But the fact is that the mayors of the Nation support the administration's proposed legislation, the county officials of the Nation support it, many Governors support it, many chambers of commerce support it, organized labor supports it, the rail and bus operators support it, the planners support it, the housing and redevelopment officials of the country support it, homebuilders support it, savings bankers support it.

The fact is that not only Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, New York, and a few other lesser sized communities have expressed support for the bill. Over the course of the last 3 years, Congress has heard as well from Atlanta; Dade County, Fla.; Detroit; St. Louis; Seattle; Baltimore; Laurel, Miss.; Pittsburgh; Cape Canaveral; Oakland; Cleveland; and Montgomery, Ala.; among others. In addition, since the enactment of the mass transportation provisions in the Housing Act of 1961, the Agency has received inquiries and requests for assistance from more than 250 cities across the Nation.

FLAWS OF THE GUARANTEE APPROACH

What is proposed under title II of the Senator's bill, S. 807?

Briefly, the bill proposes that the Federal Treasury guarantee revenue bonds issued for the construction of wholly new rapid transit systems, or extensions thereto.

It is suggested that such guarantees would be available to either public or private transit agencies, but it is quite clear to anyone familiar with the subject that we are only talking about public agencies, for no private company is in a position to undertake such a large endeavor, and no city in its right mind would allow a private company, with the aid of the Federal Government, to walk in and on its own authority build a major new rapid transit system which would have profound effects on every aspect of that city's life.

This kind of transit operation has historically been a public responsibility, and actually it cannot be otherwise.

But the public transit authorities are public bodies, and, therefore, their bonds are tax free. What the bill provides, then, is a solid-gold windfall to private investors, who would enjoy not only tax-free interest on the bonds, but also no risk on their investment because of the Federal guarantee.

This proposal has several consequences, aside from providing such a luxurious windfall to the investors. For one thing, because it eliminates the element of risk, it eliminates the safeguards of prudence and careful scrutiny we normally expect from private investors when they are laying their money on the line.

But more serious is the fact that it opens up an entirely new type of investment opportunity—an investment involving no tax and no risk. Naturally, funds in the private money market will be drawn to such an opportunity, and the consequence will be that the Treasury Department will have to pay higher interest rates on the bonds it is trying to issue, which are not tax exempt. Then, of course, this type of guarantee could be extended to any number of other worthy public endeavors, and Pandora's box would really be opened. Who would pay for this indirect subsidy? The taxpayer, of course, but he would never know how much he was paying because it would all be so indirect, unlike the administration proposal.

A second drawback lies in the fact that this type financial assistance puts maximum pressure on the farebox, which will have to bear the whole burden of the capital and operating costs of the transit system. This would require exceedingly high fares, which would have to be increased should the revenue be insufficient to pay off the principal and interest on the bonds. But this is an absolutely self-defeating effort, because the higher the fares, the fewer the riders. The whole point of mass transportation is to help to alleviate rush-hour traffic congestion by attracting as many riders as possible. This, above all, requires reasonably priced fares.

A third drawback involves a question of basic public policy. Under the bill, whether we are talking about public or private transit agencies, it would be entirely possible to have a major new rapid transit system imposed on a city without the responsible elected community officials or the people having a single word to say about it. Most transit authorities are independently managed by appointed officials, who I have no reason to doubt are perfectly capable, but who are, nonetheless, not directly responsible to the people of the community nor its elected officials. Under the administration bill, we can be sure that any new rapid transit system built in any city in the country will have the support of the people and their elected representatives, because they will be required to share a substantial part of the cost of the system with a cash contribution. This would not be the case under the bill of the Senator from Ohio.

THE DANGER OF FEDERAL CONTROL

Then we come to what is undoubtedly the most serious aspect of the guarantee approach—the cost and the likelihood of far greater Federal intervention in and control of the very things the sponsors of this bill presumably seek to avoid.

In essence, this proposal leaves the Federal Government holding the bag for the entire life of the transit agency's bond issue, probably 40 or 50 years.

Perhaps because the FHA guarantee program on home loans has been so successful over the years, we tend to think of Federal guarantees generally as relatively safe and inexpensive ways of getting something done which could not otherwise get done without the credit of the Federal Government backing it.

But I can assure Senators that the transit industry is not the housing industry, and we generalize at our own peril when we assume that the success of guarantees in one field assures success in every other.

As a matter of fact, we need not look any further than the $15 million federally guaranteed private loans on which the New Haven Railroad defaulted, requiring the Federal Government to pick up the tab.

Given the present trends of declining transit ridership and revenue, I think the Members of Congress would be well advised to think twice before committing the Federal Government to a permanent program of loan guarantees amounting to between $750 million and $1 billion in the transit field, depending on interest rates, should the program prove effective. It could be very expensive in the long run, by which time if there was widespread defaulting, there would be no alternative but for the Federal Government to bail the transit systems out.

This is not to say that the Federal Government should assume no risks in this field. I think the problem of traffic congestion demands that we must, but it should be with our eyes open.

Under the administration bill, the Federal Government must weigh the proposals submitted by the States or local governments, which will be demonstrating their confidence in the wisdom of the project through the willingness to assume at least one-third of the cost in cash. The Federal Government will make a grant on the basis of its best estimate of the likelihood that the project will be sound and successful, based on careful local planning—a provision lacking in the bill of the Senator from Ohio.

And then the Federal responsibility terminates.

If the project proves in later years not to be as successful as original estimates indicated, it will be the responsibility of the State or local government—not of the Federal Government.

In other words, we are not faced with a choice of an expensive way, through grants, as opposed to an inexpensive way, through guarantees, of accomplishing the same thing.

We are faced with assuming a known and limited Federal expenditure as opposed to an unknown long-term risk, which may or may not be more costly than the administration approach.

But in addition to assuming an unknown, long-term risk under the guarantee approach, we are also running a grave risk of large-scale Federal intervention in local transit affairs.

The reason is very simple. Since the Federal Government is holding the bag for the life of the bond issue, it cannot escape the responsibility of taking every possible step to insure that it does not end with a huge bill at the end of life of the bond issue.

Obviously, the amount that any local transit agency will have available to pay the principal and interest on the bond will be its net revenue—the amount left over after the operating expenses are subtracted.

But equally obviously, in order to insure that the net revenue will remain sufficient over the life of the bond, the Federal Government will have to intervene to make sure that fares are kept at necessary levels. The Federal Government will have to intervene to make sure that unwarranted wage increases are not granted. The Federal Government will have to intervene continuously to make sure that managerial efficiency remains at a peak. It will have to intervene on questions of how much service is to be provided by the system to the community. It will have to intervene to make sure that the most economical maintenance procedures are followed and that equipment purchases are not excessively costly or unnecessary. Where private transit agencies are involved, it will have to intervene to make sure that profits are not excessive and that the executives are not getting paid too much for their service. And so on and on.

Is this the kind of situation that we want the Federal Government to get into? I do not think so. That is why the administration's proposal is so much more sound.

Not only does the Federal Government's financial responsibility terminate when a grant is made; its interest terminates, as well. Once the grant is made, all responsibility for the matters I have just mentioned remains where it belongs—at the local level.

I feel confident that the vast majority of the Members of Congress would prefer this much cleaner and more prudent approach.

USELESSNESS OF THE GUARANTEE APPROACH

Finally, I come to the crowning irony of S. 807.

Not only does it suffer all the potential liabilities I have just discussed; it also suffers the fatal liability—and that is its almost complete uselessness.

I know that the distinguished Senator from Ohio, in his introductory statement, stated that transit authority officials from Los Angeles testified last year that the bond guarantee financing approach would make it possible for them to build and pay for a transit system costing over $600 million without a Federal loan or grant.

The Senator from Ohio concluded that—

> It is only logical to believe, therefore, that if Los Angeles, the most auto-oriented city in the world, can support a complex system of the kind contemplated for that area out of the farebox, then cities having a less auto-oriented population should be able to support their own transit improvements.

However, I must point out several factors which render this conclusion wholly invalid.

In the first place, the officials testified only about the feasibility of constructing one segment of a much larger transit system through the bond guarantee. This was the so-called backbone route, a 22-mile rapid transit line running along the most heavily traveled and highly built-up corridor of the metropolitan area, the cost of which would have been $288 million, not $600 million.

The point is that this segment represented the cream of the crop, so to speak, and these officials did not—and I am sure would not—testify that it would be possible to build any of the planned extensions out into the lower-density suburbs with bond guarantee financing. The revenues simply would not cover the capital costs of such extensions, guarantee or no guarantee.

But the most significant and overlooked fact is that the only reason why this project came within even close distance of being feasible with a bond guarantee is that the Los Angeles Transit Authority has jurisdiction of the surface bus system in Los Angeles, and the surplus revenues from the bus system, as well as the rapid transit system, would have been necessary to repay a substantial part of the principal and interest on the bond.

Thus without the revenues from the bus system, even this backbone project probably would not have been feasible. Also, quite obviously the same bus revenues would not be available to finance further extensions of the rapid transit system.

Then we must ask how many other cities have transit authorities which would have jurisdiction over both rapid transit and bus operations? And where this situation exists, how many of the bus systems enjoy sufficient revenue to help finance a rapid transit system, assuming that it were desirable to do so? Almost none.

The fact is that history and the experience of almost every other city fly in the face of the assumption that major capital improvements can be supported from the fare box, even with the help of a bond guarantee.

The European countries, with much more compact cities and far fewer cars per capita, have long since recognized the futility of relying exclusively on the fare box, and almost without exception they use public funds to cover the capital costs of their systems and fare box revenue to cover operating costs. I might add that New York City does exactly the same thing. It is, in fact, the only sensible solution.

THE TAX RELIEF PROPOSALS

As for the tax relief proposals, I have already pointed out that they are, of course, subsidies. From the standpoint of the general taxpayer, he still pays the bill, whether Federal expenditures are increased by x dollars or whether Federal revenues are decreased by x dollars, as would occur under my colleague's tax relief subsidies.

Again, however, it is interesting to note that under the administration bill the taxpayer knows exactly what he is paying. Under the other approach he does not, though I am informed that the tax relief measures might amount to somewhere between $15 million and $50 million a year.

Furthermore, not only does the taxpayer know what he is giving under the administration bill, he knows what he is getting. He is getting $500 million worth of actual modernization and construction of mass transportation facilities and equipment. And this amount is, of course, multiplied by the State and local contribution, as well as the private investment which the program would trigger.

But when the taxpayer pays for tax relief to purely private companies, how does he know what he is getting? Instead of improved transit service, he may be getting higher paid transit executives and richer stockholders.

I have long advocated that State and local governments give greater tax relief to faltering transit carriers. For reasons I shall not discuss here, I am quite confident that the administration's program will stimulate that effort.

But there is no doubt that a number of questions are involved in these tax proposals.

The foremost of them is, as I indicated, what assurance we will have that the tax relief will in fact result in better transit service?

In cities where there are a number of separate bus systems, or a mixture of transit systems, this financial assistance could possibly lead to greater confusion and lack of coordination of service, which is a problem that plagues many of our cities today, since the bill provides no planning requirements as the administration bill does.

On the value of the proposals to exempt transit carriers from Federal taxation to the extent they are granted tax concessions by State or local governments, I only question the belief of the Senator from Ohio that this would stimulate "considerably more action" on the part of the State and local governments.

Perhaps there is some reluctance to grant tax relief for fear full value may not be received by the private carriers because of the Federal tax laws, but I rather suspect that the reluctance is more basic than that—stemming from the fact that most of our State and local governments are themselves in very difficult financial straits, and simply cannot afford except under most compelling circumstances to give up any more tax revenue than they absolutely have to.

As for the proposal to establish tax-free reserve funds for new equipment, it is my impression that most State and local regulatory agencies already allow the establishment of such reserves. But more important is the fact that this proposal would be of benefit only to those transit companies which are making money and thus paying Federal taxes. It would be of no use to those who might need it most—the companies that are losing money.

AGENCY JURISDICTION OF TRANSIT PROGRAM

Finally, we come to the question of which agency shall have jurisdiction of whatever urban mass transit program is enacted.

The Senator from Ohio suggests that we dismiss the 2 years of experience the Housing Agency has acquired in administering this program, and that the President's considered judgment on the matter be overturned by transferring existing functions and any additional functions to a new Division of Urban Transportation to be located in the Commerce

Department's Office of the Under Secretary for Transportation.

I think it should be sufficient to ask, Who is better qualified to decide questions of executive branch organization than the President of the United States?

But let me make these additional observations.

First, as the Senator from Ohio himself acknowledged, we already have a variety of transportation activities which are not lodged in the Department of Commerce—from the ICC to the FAA. I would think that if we are to reorganize all the transportation activities of the Federal Government, it ought to be done in some comprehensive manner, rather than on this sort of piecemeal basis.

As for the suggestion that jurisdiction of the program was placed in the Housing Agency to avoid the "prohighway influence of the Bureau of Public Roads" let me say that the Senator from Ohio has never heard me make that statement. On the contrary, the Bureau of Public Roads and the Housing Agency have established an excellent working relationship with each other on their common concerns.

But, the basic point is that transit problems are fundamentally an urban problem, not a transportation problem. And this legislation has essentially nothing to do with interstate or intercity transportation, as for example between Boston and Washington.

This legislation is concerned with the movement of people within the urban area and you simply cannot deal with transit apart from the land uses of the urban area. The reason why many of our transit systems are having trouble today is that we have neglected the land-use aspect of the problem. The location and densities of commercial, industrial, and residential land uses are heavily involved in the determination of sound transit policies and in the administration of an effective transit program.

If this is, then, an urban problem, an inseparable facet of the shape and form of our cities, as I believe it is, then I think the logic of placing this program in the Housing Agency is inescapable.

And in fact, when the Housing Subcommittee was first considering this legislative area, back in 1961, we asked a wide array of witnesses about this relationship and the question of Agency jurisdiction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this testimony be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I sincerely believe that anyone who carefully considers this whole subject and the proposed legislation that is before Congress will agree that the administration's bill is sound, well conceived, modest, and better designed than any other to meet the urgent transit problems facing the country in a fashion that will strengthen and uphold the traditions and values that have made our Nation such a success.

EXHIBIT 1

EXCERPTS OF TESTIMONY ON S. 345 ON THE IMPORTANCE OF RELATING MASS TRANSPORTATION TO OTHER HHFA PROGRAMS AFFECTING URBAN LAND USE

DR. WEAVER TESTIMONY

(House hearings, April 4)

Senator WILLIAMS. I don't want to prolong my part of this but I do want to deal with two other aspects of your statement, Dr. Weaver, which I certainly applaud you for. I think that the President in his objectives in terms of housing speaks of the necessity for the sound growth of our rapidly expanding metropolitan areas and I was very interested in your statement on page 13 that increased emphasis would be given to the transportation and open space aspects of comprehensive urban planning. Now you are talking planning here in the 701 part of your legislation. I wonder can we conclude that there is also developing an attitude that following the planning and with the planning will go program? I take it that is true certainly in open space.

Dr. WEAVER. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. And land reserves where the President spoke of the urgency and the need to get underway immediately.

Dr. WEAVER. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. I would think that you would agree that the same program effort must come in transportation, which is so vital to land use and the proper, as the President says, sound growth of our rapidly expanding metropolitan areas.

Dr. WEAVER. I think there is no question that the administration is fully cognizant and very much concerned with the problem of mass transportation, realizing that it is a very, very vital part of the development of the communities and of the way in which housing and community development would mature as time goes on. I think also that there is complete agreement on the fact that we have to start and do more in the area of planning. There is also, I think, agreement that further action is required. There has not yet been any determination as to what that further action should be, but this is something which we are certainly cognizant of and certainly are trying to work out.

* * * * *

Senator SPARKMAN. While we are talking about community facilities, community development, etc., I would like to ask Mr. Slayton this question, and it bears directly upon this mass transportation program that Senator WILLIAMS asked a few questions about a few minutes ago. We did hold hearings in this subcommittee last year on this mass transportation problem that the big cities, primarily the big cities, have. But many people wonder why it was before the Housing Subcommittee. As a matter of fact, Mr. Slayton, or both of you, the community facilities and the urban renewal do; doesn't it tie right into your programs?

Mr. SLAYTON. Well, certainly it does, Senator. In the urban renewal program, transportation, mass transportation, becomes an extremely important part of your planning of the projects, and in the 701 planning assistance program this becomes an extremely important part. It ties into both very definitely.

Senator SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, isn't a great part of the problem that you usually find with the deteriorating central city area the mass transportation problem?

Mr. SLAYTON. It is indeed.

Senator SPARKMAN. Do you feel—and I believe Dr. Weaver has already indicated—that if such legislation is passed you would be perfectly willing to take over the administration of it, and Dr. Weaver do you agree with what has been said as to its being inherently a part of our urban renewal and community development?

Dr. WEAVER. I think it is a very crucial part, Senator, and I think a very necessary part and one which, if we are going to do this job, we have to pay a lot of attention to it.

Senator SPARKMAN. Yes.

Dr. WEAVER. Of course it would be no burden to take over the administration of it.

Senator SPARKMAN. Of course, I am not asking you to testify on it now, because we have had some hearings already in this subcommittee on the separate bill that Senator WILLIAMS introduced, but it is contemplated that if it is passed in anything like the form that Senator WILLIAMS has introduced it, that its administration will go to the HHFA, and I thought it well to put in the record some reason for that justification, and it is really a part of the program that we are carrying on.

MAYOR DILWORTH TESTIMONY

(Housing hearings, April 5)

Senator WILLIAMS. Just one more line of inquiry. Yesterday there was some discussion about mass transportation and its importance to the objectives of the various programs here, housing and urban renewal, community facilities and the college program. First, is it your feeling that improved and efficient mass transportation facilities are vital to the success of the objectives of the program here in the housing bill?

Mayor DILWORTH. Without immediate help—and I really mean immediate help—for mass transportation, and as I say, it is not just in the large cities, I think there is 400 cities, isn't there—

Mr. GUNTHER. Yes.

Mayor DILWORTH. Four hundred small cities, and by that I mean from 25,000 to 100,000 and 150,000, have lost all their mass transportation since World War II—have none, and it has hurt them terribly. In the larger cities I don't think—my own personal opinion would be that no plan for renewal of anything resembling the center city should be approved unless an area can come up with a decent mass transportation program because otherwise the renewal may prove valueless.

As you said, when we were testifying down here, we had a meeting at the request of the President, to spur up building, and a group of store owners came to us, builders of apartment houses, office buildings, theaters, and all of those things, and said to us that if they could be assured not only of continuity of the redevelopment program, and they were quite sure of that, but if they could be assured they were going to get some real help on mass transportation, they would be willing to pledge themselves to a total private expenditure in excess of a half billion dollars in the next 10 years in our center city. * * *

We can, with your bill, really solve our mass transportation problems, and again I think it is important to point out that the cities are doing their utmost. We are spending just on commutation alone now $1,600,000 a year to get better commutation service. We are paying that direct to the railroads. We are going to spend this year and next year a total of $14 million for capital improvements to commutation, for cars, improving the stations, parking and all of those things. But if we could get this additional Federal help we could really shoot ahead because in our own city one of the things that we have got to do is link together our two big commutation roads and make it a loop instead of two dead end operations. The result of that would be to save $2 million in operation, give us much more efficient service, permit interchange of cars using the same amount of car, also permit us to use subways, permit us to improve our whole big shopping area subway situation. The total cost would be $40 million, the saving in excess of $2 million. We can finance one-half of it but we cannot swing the other half. And if we could swing the whole deal we would immediately have a tremendous redevelopment and revival of our great heart of the city area.

Senator Williams. Thank you, Mayor. Just one final question. I wonder if you would comment on the logic of the method of approach in dealing with mass transportation. Now the bulk of this housing legislation before us deals with the sound growth and development of metropolitan areas. The Housing and Home Finance Agency with old tools and with improved tools and some new tools is dealing with that problem. Transportation is vital to the success of it. Would you comment on the logic or the wisdom of giving mass transportation a place in this metropolitan program of Housing and Home Finance?

Mayor Dilworth. I think, Senator—and this is as president of the United States Conference of Mayors and Vice President of the American Municipal Association—I think there is absolute unanimity on the part of the mayors, on the part of the staffs of both of our organizations—they both have excellent staffs—that there is only one logical place for the mass transportation program and that is in the Housing Administration. I don't think there is a dissent from any single mayor of a city of any size on that. The staffs of both groups are absolutely unanimous on it. It's just—well—it's just inconceivable to us that it could go any place else and be effective, and here it can be tremendously effective, because every renewal program, particularly for cities, ought to be studied in connection with the mass transportation program and the two ought to go hand in hand if they are to be effective.

Senator Williams. Thank you very much, Mayor Dilworth.

Hearings on S. 345 (March 20–22)

William C. Wheaton, policy committee, National Housing Conference, and director, Institute for Urban Studies, University of Pennsylvania:

"We support the provisions of the bill and stress these functions in the Housing and Home Finance Agency where they would be closely tied to the related programs of urban renewal and urban development. The Housing Agency now conducts a program of grants to the city and metropolitan planning which, in some cities like Philadelphia, have been of assistance in developing the kind of transportation plans to which Mr. Symes made reference.

"The bill contains incentives for the kind of metropolitan action which is certainly needed in the long run. The question in my mind is as to whether or not the bill might not also authorize interstate compacts in advance to solve transportation problems, but we believe that these functions can well be performed in the Housing Agency, which has experience with this kind of loan, fully repayable loan programs which has experience with grant programs; which has established ties with all the Government agencies and which is sympathetic to the objectives of providing transit service in connection with urban renewal programs for our central cities."

O. Roy Chalk, president, D.C. Transit:

"I would emphasize the very great need for the closest possible coordination between urban redevelopment on the one hand and mass transportation on the other hand.

"Urban redevelopment and mass transportation must and do go together hand in hand. Mobility of people and mobility of goods are prerequisites for large metropolitan areas. Without mass transportation to move large numbers of people from place to place, there could be only villages. Without mass transportation, we could not have large industrial areas, extensive distribution centers, adequate housing facilities, recreational facilities, or any form of community life. * * *

"It is no exaggeration to say that most of the difficult problems facing our city and metropolitan area planners have their roots in the field of mass transportation. Transit is at the heart of such matters as population density, school locations, central city business stagnation, shopping center locations, airport locations, taxation policies, local governmental structures, and the like.

"Yet, billions of dollars are being and will be spent, publicly and privately, for massive suburbs and for urban redevelopment without taking into account the tens or hundreds of millions required for mass transportation needs.

"When properly tied in with investment for adequate mass transportation, our huge development and redevelopment expenditures more than justify their cost. In fact, the joint results are worth more than the separate outlays; it is an example of $2 plus $2 equaling $6.

"As this subcommittee well knows, every house that is built requires a road, and every road requires a transit system to serve it directly or indirectly. Housing and transit are mutually interdependent. United and coordinated, both survive and flourish. Separated, neither can survive.

"The importance of mass transportation in urban redevelopment program is so great that the mass transportation plan for any given area should be made an integral part of the urban redevelopment program. Unless the mass transportation plan is integrated with the urban redevelopment plan, urban redevelopment programs will be obsolete before they are even instituted."

William B. Saunders, president, Transportation Research, and consultant for the Department of Commerce:

"My first reaction was a negative one last year when this came up, but I have really wrestled with that and I have concluded that certainly for the moment it makes more sense to give HHFA the basic responsibility for running this program. * * * I do have the feeling that as time goes on we will want to devise techniques for integrating the administration and the planning of our total transportation. This is going to have to be worked out slowly, both at the Federal Government level as I see it, and also at the local level. We are going to be creating new organizations as we go along in this field. * * * Yes, I think for the moment it ought to be given to HHFA to get the ball started rolling."

Edward J. Logue, development administrator, Boston:

"The Senate's passage of the predecessor to S. 345 last year was the first indication we had that the Federal Government took this problem as seriously as we in the major metropolitan areas knew it would become. We would also like to register ourselves in favor of the administration of this program by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and eventually by the proposed Department of Urban Affairs.

"Any major, any urban mass transportation program in the older cities is closely linked with an urban renewal program and I may say that every single major older city has recognized need for a far greater, more comprehensive urban renewal program than they have undertaken today, but because of the metropolitan character and technical nature of the transportation problem it cannot be solved in a purely urban renewal context but it must be solved with the two of them together.

"This belongs, therefore, in the Housing Agency."

Anthony Celebrezze, mayor, Cleveland:

"Leave one end loose and you are going to get into difficulty, and if you leave mass transportation loose, you are going to be in real difficulty in the years ahead of us. * * *

"I firmly believe that this would be a proper function of the Department of Urban Affairs, if and when such a department is created. But I presume that if such a department is created, the HHFA would be part of it anyway, and the tying of the two under one administrative head would be essential. I think in the absence of such a department, because we have to work so closely with HHFA on urban renewal and on loans and so forth, this would be a proper department for it at this time."

Harold S. Wise, chairman, national legislative committee, American Institute of Planning:

"We support the program of planning that is incorporated in this bill. Then it recognizes the importance and key role of local planning of metropolitan and regional organization, and it recognizes also that there are other Federal agencies that are involved that are concerned with the development of the urban environment in our metropolitan areas, and seeks to achieve a coordination as between these agencies as transit is being planned. * * *

"We support the fact that you intend to place this agency within the framework of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, because they are familiar, increasingly so, with the urban development problems in our metropolitan areas."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MALLORY CASE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last Saturday, the Washington Evening Star published an editorial in which it paid its disrespects to me because I believe in following the Constitution of the United States and upholding the great decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Mallory case. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial criticism of me, which was published last Saturday, March 2, in the Washington Evening Star, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mallory Champion

One might search far and wide without finding a pledge more superfluous than that given this week by Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon. The Senator told his colleagues that "I shall strenuously oppose any change whatsoever in the Mallory rule." This, in our judgment, is roughly comparable to a pledge from Horatius to the Romans that he would strenuously defend the bridge. After all—what else? If Horatius had fallen back, or if Senator Morse should sheathe his pro-Mallory sword, who would be left to defend the people and slay the dragons?

The Mallory rule has its main impact and its principal adverse effect on law enforcement in the Nation's Capital. A test case on this question is shaping up in the Senator's home State of Oregon. But as of now the Oregon courts do not outlaw a voluntary confession merely because there has been a delay in arraigning the criminal. Yet the Oregon Senator will strenuously resist any change in the Federal rule which, merely because of delay in arraignment, has freed rapists and killers in the Nation's Capital.

In his remarks the other day, Senator Morse said he would not yield to pressure of a police department. Who has said that he should? He invoked the pre-Revolutionary specter of the British Crown, police-state methods, and the tyrannical fashion of the King's officers. Doubtless these are, or were, awesome instrumentalities. But what have they to do with the Mallory rule and 1963?

The proposed change in the Mallory rule would provide that a voluntary confession shall not be held inadmissible at a trial merely because of a reasonable delay in arraigning the person who made the confession. This is all that it would do. It would not revive the star chamber. It would not establish tyranny in this country. It would not license the King's agents to torture citizens and extort confessions from them. Everyone, or almost everyone, knows this to be so. The proposed change would simply establish in the city of Washington the same criminal law which prevails in the States. A confession which is voluntary could be used as evidence. A confession which is coerced or which, for some other reason, is involuntary, could not be used.

In 1958 a law to this effect passed the House and almost passed the Senate. It died on a point of order in the Senate at 4:10 a.m. on the closing Sunday morning of the session.

Senator Morse did not raise the point of order. He had, however, been active in organizing a small group of liberal Senators to talk the Mallory-change bill to death in that last night. In this connection, a friendly writer described Senator Morse as follows: "A fighting liberal of the last-ditch variety who is one of the Senates champion filibusterers."

This is puzzling. We had thought that the champion filibusterers came from the South and that they were illiberal, not liberal. But, on second thought, this characterization of Senator Morse may make as much sense as the ban in the Nation's Capital on voluntary confessions which would be admissible in the States, including the State of Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I pass along a bit of friendly advice to the Washington Evening Star: if it wishes to remove me from public life, a way to do it would be to publish a really favorable editorial about me. I might suffer a heart attack, and in that way it might be possible to get me out of the Senate.

I responded to the editorial by sending to the editors of the Star a letter which the Star got around to publishing today. I ask unanimous consent that my response to the Washington Evening Star be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Due Process of Law

The tongue-in-cheek tone of your March 2 editorial does not disguise the issue at stake in the current effort to overturn the Mallory rule and to perpetuate arrests for investigation, a practice the District of Columbia Commissioners admit is unconstitutional.

It is, of course, naive to expect the Star to be interested in the historic reasons why "due process of law" was required in Federal cases by the Constitution, or in the wisdom of our constitutional fathers in realizing that the techniques of a police state have timeless qualities, as have the essentials of personal liberty. To impress your editorial writer, I should have referred instead to the heavy reliance by Castro's secret police and the Soviet Committee for State Security upon the very same practice of detention of individuals at the pleasure of the police. Arrest for investigation is only our more polite name for it.

Let the Star and its readers be assured that there is great interest among citizens of Oregon in this general subject. In nearby Mountain Home, Idaho, a case involving a U.S. Air Force airman has brought many protests to my office. It concerns the detention of an Air Force enlisted man (white) in connection with the rape and murder of a Mountain Home housewife and the murder of her 2-year-old son. Airman Anderson was held and questioned off and on for 8 days by the Air Force. He, too, made a "voluntary" confession. He was then turned over to civil authorities and arraigned. Before his trial he repudiated his confession, and another man in civil custody on another charge confessed to the Mountain Home murders. Airman Anderson has been released and honorably discharged from the service.

However this case turns out, the Air Force has much to answer for; so does the Defense Department. The ambiguous conditions under which Anderson was held and the allegation by an Idaho judge that "gestapo" tactics of browbeating were used to obtain the confession, are under investigation by the FBI.

The question of what is "voluntary" is the entire issue in these cases. I am delighted that State practice in this area is to come under the scrutiny of the Federal courts, because the Constitution's 14th amendment requires the States, too, to follow due process of law. For the information of your editorial writer, it requires a test to be brought to the Federal courts by a complainant before a decision can be made by the Federal courts on the practice in Oregon or any other State on arrests and arraignment.

Your writer should also be informed that a U.S. Senator does not fix the laws and police procedures in his own State. His jurisdiction is limited to Federal laws. But I shall welcome the application of the same due process requirement to the States—including Oregon—as is required in Federal jurisdictions.

The Star is free to put the word "voluntary" in front of any kind of confession it wishes. For my part, I shall stand with the Federal courts in their determination of what can be presumed to be voluntary and what cannot. I continue to hope that someday the Star will join in encouraging respect for law and order in the District of Columbia by upholding the definition of law instead of flouting it.

As for the filibuster, I shall not embark on any defense of the Mallory rule through prolonged debate without first offering again my resolution to permit a simple majority of Senators to terminate debate. I always offer that proposal when I participate in prolonged debate. It would afford about 2 weeks for a minority to present its case before a vote is taken on the merits of the measure under consideration. Any time the Southern Senators beloved of the Star want to vote such a rule into effect, they will have my help.

Wayne Morse,
Senator From Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star has complimented me by publishing another editorial attacking me. This editorial is entitled "Our Verbose Correspondent." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Verbose Correspondent

Our chief regret in printing Senator Wayne Morse's letter is the amount of space consumed by his windy irrelevancies. His appraisal of the Star's position on the Mallory rule and arrests for investigation is unfortunate hyperbole—not because it is directed at the Star, but because it exemplifies a brand of political liberalism which handicaps valid law enforcement in the District of Columbia of obscuring the points at issue.

Instead of abdicating its legislative function to Federal judges of various persuasions in this jurisdiction, Congress should amend or clarify, as to its intent, rule 5(a) of Federal procedure. The broadening judicial interpretations of this rule and its basic principle since Mallory reflect more inventive genius than hitherto accepted precedent. Congress should also review and make more precise local statutes relating to police interrogation and detention in criminal investigation. The inadequacies in this field contribute to an uncertainty and confusion that discredit the police and make more difficult their prevention and solution of crime.

A determined search by Congress for appropriate and needed legislation would be of more benefit in dealing with a dangerous and disgraceful crime condition in Washington than any amount of pointless breast beating about due process under the Constitution by the verbose senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate this kind of political support, and I am accustomed to it. For years, the daily newspapers of my State which engage in the same kind of half-baked journalism in which the Washington Star engages have opposed me—except for a new newspaper in Portland called the Reporter, the Coos Bay World, and the Medford Mail-Tribune. I have also enjoyed the support of a highly select group of weeklies in Oregon, the Capital Journal in Salem, the Record-Courier in Baker, and one or two others. The opposition of so much of the Oregon press brings me thousands of votes, because the journalists of America do not fool the American people. The people of the country know that American journalism, by and large, has failed in its responsibilities under the first amendment to tell the truth. They also know that American journalism has—with some notable exceptions—succumbed to the powerful commercial interests which own the American press. So we find Pravda-like propaganda published in most American newspapers, such as the Washington Evening Star.

Let me say that I happen to be one politician who for 18 years in the Senate has not hesitated to "take on" the press, because I do not recognize the members of the press as particularly superior men. Their reading is generally limited to their own writings, and as a result we get from them such misrepresentations of fact and ad hominem arguments, which are so typical of the editorials of the Washington Evening Star.

This failure of the American press to tell the truth is becoming so widely accepted by the general public that the press is playing a smaller and smaller role in American politics, especially in political campaigns. My difference with Mr. Nixon on the role of the press is simply that I think he was defeated in spite of the press, not because of it. Most of us are coming to welcome the opposition of the press because we have found so much distrust among voters of what they read in the papers.

The editorial which the Star has published today is particularly delightful; but after reading it and then reading my so-called "verbose" letter to the editors—to use the language used by the Star—one finds that at no point in the editorial do the editors of the Star join issue with me. They do not come to grips with the point I raised in support of the unanimous decision by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Of course in its editorial of last Saturday, the Star's editors talked about a voluntary confession; but they missed entirely the point of the decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Mallory case. I say to the editors of the Star that their calling a confession a voluntary one does not make it voluntary. That is the very essence of the great constitutional issue which confronts Congress with respect to the Mallory case, for we find that when a person is arrested, and then is subjected to hours of "cross-examination" by a police department instead of being arraigned, presumptively he does not give a voluntary confession.

It was to protect that precious right of the American citizen against a situation which would permit of the third degree that the Supreme Court of the United States wrote its great historic decision involving the Mallory rule in regard to Federal jurisdiction.

Mr. President, we know what happens when mere men are given unchecked power, even though those mere men may be policemen, police chiefs, detectives, or police departments. For years I worked in the field of crime investigation. I know what the record throughout our history shows in relation to what flows from unchecked police departments across our country, and how sound the U.S. Supreme Court was in the famous Mallory decision.

If we are going to protect the liberties of the American people, we must see to it at all times that adequate checks are placed upon police departments so that they cannot exercise arbitrary power. Thus, the U.S. Supreme Court in unanimous decision has held that when an American citizen is arrested by a Federal officer—and I shall come to the State problem in a moment—that citizen shall be taken without delay to a committing magistrate to determine whether or not he shall be held or released. What is wrong with that?

As I said some years ago, if a U.S. Senator were willing to waive immunity so that he would be subject to arrest, and would walk out of the Senate Chamber some night and have a District policeman put his hand on his shoulder and notify him that he was under arrest, and then take him to a police station, those who are so anxious to change the Mallory rule might for the first time appreciate the Mallory rule, for it is a rule that seeks to protect all, the innocent as well as the guilty.

Are we ready to waive another precious protection of free men—the presumption of innocence—and the requirement that the State and the Federal Government must establish guilt, or waive such rules as those that pertain to a requirement of immediate arraignment that protect the precious presumption of innocence?

I would not expect nonreading editors to familiarize themselves with constitutional history. If there ever was a collection of ignoramuses in regard to constitutional rights that surpassed the collection that comprises the editorial board of the Evening Star, I should like to see that collection of human beings, because in all the discussions of the Evening Star, in carrying on its propaganda drive to try to change this important U.S. Supreme Court decision, I have yet to read the first intelligent evidence that they are even aware of our constitutional history in the field of civil liberties and the protection of the guarantees, such as the guarantee of a presumption of innocence.

But I have come to expect such action from the Evening Star. Its editors amuse me, although I pity them for their ignorance. I am sad that a newspaper that ought to be a great defender of the precious right of freedom of the press would so abuse that right as to publish the kind of propaganda—Pravda-like in its nature—that it is publishing in respect to the Mallory case.

But in the editorial of last Saturday, the Evening Star irreleventl commented on the law of Oregon. The editorial staff again showed their gross ignorance, for it is the law of Oregon that after one is arrested, he must be arraigned "without delay." They refer to a case that is shaping up in the State of Oregon which allegedly, according to the Washington Star, raises the principle of the Mallory case. They ought to read the case. It is being appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court to determine whether or not a procedure that was followed in connection with the arrest of the person involved in the case in any way affected a confession that was elicited from the defendant.

Oregon statute 133.510 declares that after arrest upon warrant for felony:

> If the crime charged in the warrant is a felony, the officer making the arrest shall take the defendant before the magistrate who issued the warrant or before some other magistrate as provided in ORDS 133.530.

The Oregon statute 133.550 states:

> The defendant shall in all cases be taken before the magistrate without delay.

The Oregon case being brought to the U.S. Supreme Court involves a defendant held overnight before arraignment who claims that such delay was in violation of the statute.

Yet if Senators should read the editorial that appeared in last Saturday's edition of the Evening Star, they would be left with the impression that the police in Oregon can hold an arrested person for whatever period of time the police desire to hold him. That does not happen to be the law of the State of Oregon.

But suffice for now, Mr. President. I do not expect that this is the last time that the editors of the Washington Evening Star and the senior Senator from Oregon will exchange their disrespects.

I only wish to point out that if Senators today read the editorial to which I have referred, and my letter to the editor published on the same page, it would become crystal clear that the editors could not meet me on the issues involved in the Mallory case. Therefore they resorted to their ad hominem arguments, for which I thank them, because if the time ever comes when I find the editors of the Evening Star writing anything favorable about the Senator from Oregon, I shall take a look at myself and see why I slipped so far. I am proud of the fact that I am not one of the favorites of the editors of the Washington Star.

As I say in my letter to the editors today to show how important the precious safeguard of the Mallory rule is, one only has to look to the Anderson case involving the Air Force in the State of Idaho, a case to the everlasting shame of the U.S. Air Force. In that case, Air Force officers held a man under examination for hours and wormed out of him a confession of double murder only sometime later to discover that he was not the guilty party. They found the guilty party, but he was not the one who had been subjected to the third-degree methods of the U.S. Air Force.

I am interested by the failure of the Star even to mention this case in its editorial of today.

The principle for which the senior Senator from Oregon is fighting goes back to the founding of this Republic, for it was one of the abuses of the star chamber proceedings of the British Crown, which led to the Revolution and brought this Republic into being.

It is so easy for us in these times to forget what was sacrificed to win these precious legal rights. I thank God that within a stone's throw of where I speak there is a great citadel of justice which can determine for the American people what is due process of law and can hand down great landmark decisions such as the Mallory case.

When there are such journalistic "pee wees" as the editors of the Evening Star sniping at the heels of that great Court, they make themselves look truly ridiculous.

Mr. President, in a city with 54 percent of the population colored, with all the racial problems which are constantly arising, with unemployment at an exceedingly high rate and at an exceptionally high rate among the colored, we particularly need to be on guard to see that human rights under the law are protected for all, irrespective of the color of their skin.

In an executive session the other day I raised an alleged hypothetical case involving the handling of colored people in

the District of Columbia by the Washington, D.C., Police Department, and I asked the Chief of Police, if such a hypothetical were in fact a reality, whether or not he could justify it. He said that if those facts took place, it would be a mistake. Those facts did take place.

That case is not singular in the District of Columbia. Just as Mallory, a Negro, needed the protection of the principle of the Mallory case, which the U.S. Supreme Court gave him, let me say on the floor of the Senate today that the Washington Police Department must not be given unchecked power in the District of Columbia. It needs to be checked by the principles of the Mallory case, and needs to be constantly checked also by all the other precious safeguards of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence in respect to criminal justice administration.

The senior Senator from Oregon is not going to be silenced, diverted, or intimidated by the ignoramuses who comprise the editorial board of the Washington Evening Star on any issue involving human rights in the District of Columbia or in the entire Nation.

I am well aware of the fact that there are forces in the District of Columbia not too happy about the fact that the senior Senator from Oregon uses his seniority rights to stay on the District of Columbia Committee of the Senate. Because of my long years of service on the District of Columbia Committee, I know how important it is to have continuity of service on that District of Columbia Committee. I know how important it is to have serve on that committee one who is aware of the need for seeing to it that these precious safeguards protecting human rights and liberties in the District of Columbia have an ever-present guardian on the committee to maintain constant vigilance to see to it that wrongs are not committed.

It would be a great wrong, may I say, to change the Mallory rule in the District of Columbia and to give to the Washington, D.C., Police Department the unchecked power for abuse that would flow from the eradication or elimination of the Mallory rule.

There will be more later on this subject from the senior Senator from Oregon not only in future replies to the Evening Star but also in future replies to others who for some reason think that a police department cannot enforce the law unless it is given unchecked power.

I take pride in the fact that I have always supported the strengthening of the Washington, D.C., Police Department in terms of its funds, as to enlarging its staff, and as to giving it the assistance for which it asks within the framework of constitutional guarantees. But let me make clear to the chief of the Washington Police Force today that I do not intend to go along with the drive which he is heading, with the assistance of the editorial board of the Evening Star, seeking to give to his Police Department the unchecked power for the abuses that I am sure would result therefrom by the elimination of the rule in the Mallory case.

Mr. President, I turn to another subject.

COMMENDATION OF HOWARD MORGAN—RESOLUTION OF MULTNOMAH COUNTY, OREG., DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a communication I have received from Mr. Frank L. Roberts, chairman of the Multnomah County, Oreg., Democratic Central Committee, Portland, Oreg., setting forth certain resolutions which were passed at the last meeting of the committee.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Multnomah County Democratic
Central Committee,
Portland, Oreg., March 4, 1963.

The Honorable Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: I have been asked to inform you of the following resolution which was adopted by the Democratic Central Committee of Multnomah County at its regular monthly meeting on February 28, 1963:

"Whereas the Democratic Party traditionally has fostered the conservation and development of the Nation's resources for the benefit of all the people, and thereby has greatly advanced the well-being of the Pacific Northwest in particular; and

"Whereas President Kennedy's administration has marked a return to the best traditions of the Democratic Party in subordinating special privilege to the general public interest; and

"Whereas Howard Morgan has demonstrated, in national and State office, and in public and party office, those qualities of integrity, vigor, fearlessness, and intellectual capacity which are especially important in the protection of the public interest in the Nation's resources: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Multnomah County Democratic Central Committee commends Howard Morgan for his outstanding service as Federal Power Commissioner in the promotion of sound public power policies, expresses its regret that he has decided to remove himself from this position of great public trust, and voices its hope that this action represents but a temporary retirement from public life; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this body urges the President of the United States, in his search for a successor to Howard Morgan, to seek out and to appoint a man who has demonstrated in practical application the same qualities of character in the discharge of public trust; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to Commissioner Morgan, to the U.S. Senators from Oregon and to the Congresswoman from Multnomah County."

Sincerely yours,
Frank L. Roberts,
Chairman.

DEATH OF DR. JUAN MARIN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Richard Butrick, a retired Foreign Service officer residing in the District of Columbia, has informed me of the death in Chile of Dr. Juan Marin.

Dr. Marin's passing is a genuine loss to the United States. On December 8, 1941, while serving as Chilean Chargé d'Affaires in China, he immediately offered his services in representation of the several hundred Americans, both official and private, and their interests in Shanghai, and carried on in that capacity, at considerable personal danger from inflamed Japanese, until the U.S. Government several weeks later appointed the Swiss Government as its official representative.

Dr. Marin, whose broad-faceted career included service as a doctor, naval officer, diplomat representing Chile in China, India, Egypt, and San Salvador, and distinguished contemporary writer, at the time of his death was on leave from his position as Director of Cultural Affairs of the Organization of American States and serving as director of the summer school of the University of Chile, which was dedicating this session to a study of inter-American relations and the operation of the Alliance for Progress.

In his many posts abroad and in Washington since 1956, Dr. Marin and his wife, Milena, established a wide circle of devoted American friends who will greatly miss him and whose sorrow at his passing merges with that of his widow.

THE LUMBER SITUATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently a number of bills were introduced designed by the National Lumber Manufacturers Association to assist in dealing with the subject of lumber imports.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks the following items: A letter of February 25 from Mr. Mortimer Doyle, of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association; my letters of January 7 and March 1 to Mr. Doyle; a letter to the editor of the Oregonian by a lumberman who is a member of the Oregon State Legislature, Mr. Sidney Leiken; an Oregonian article of February 22 on the timber capital gains tax; a memorandum by the Western Forest Industries Association on the lumber standards issue; an Oregonian story on ICC action to reduce the transcontinental rail rates on lumber; and five news stories and editorials regarding the efforts by western lumber marketers to secure what they believe to be equitable treatment in the shipment of lumber by rail through return of the freehold privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 through 12.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in connection with the ICC action on rail rates, I note that southern lumber producers objected to this action, which would benefit western lumber shippers and consumers nationally to the extent of $20 million annually.

It is interesting to note that the large lumber operators oppose the efforts of the smaller operators in the Northwest to secure a railroad freehold opportunity while the large operators appear to have certain advantages of their own.

One Oregon lumber producer told me, and I quote him:

> The dual nature of these large industry giants has reached proportions where the

smaller operators and wholesalers are being quietly clubbed to death under the noisy banner of concern over our poor, beleaguered Northwest lumber industry.

At the identical time that these large lumber giants who support and dominate the major industry trade associations were petitioning the Congress and Maritime Commission for Jones Act relief, they were fighting our widely supported rail petition which would grant relief to hundreds of smaller rail mills from pressures created by decisions of the past 2 years which have restricted the marketing freedom by rail of these smaller mills. As the Tariff Commission has denied the recent application for restriction of Canadian imports, these smaller mills need every bit of internal domestic assistance possible to stay alive in this age of consolidations, mergers, and bigger business. We, as an association, as lumber businessmen, and as private citizens are more greatly disturbed than ever at the ability of these giants to stifle a service which would have been of continued assistance to the entire lumber industry; whereas, the denial of this service could only serve to the advantage of those who are blessed with the resources and vast sales apparatus to be able to avoid in-transit sales.

At the San Francisco public hearings on this tariff, 11 mills appeared in opposition to this proposal and they included such giants as Weyerhaeuser, Georgia-Pacific, Simpson Timber, International Paper, etc. What was significant to me was that their opposition to this proposal was not based on any grounds that it might be harmful to the Northwest lumber industry, but rather their opposition concerned itself with the railroads profit plight, boxcar shortages, and other objections one step removed from the problems of the Northwest lumber manufacturers.

The letter from Mr. Sidney Leiken, included as one of my exhibits, points out his causes of concern, and he is especially disturbed over the position taken by some in the industry regarding the Federal Wage and Hour Act.

In addition, the Western Forest Industries Association expresses strong concern over efforts to change lumber standards. The association contends, for example, that one facet of the proposal being advanced by the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, if adopted, would mean that the shipper of green lumber would be required to pay the additional freight for an extra thickness of lumber. He would be required to pay additional freight as compared to the dry lumber producer, and the impact upon the green lumber producer would be close to $10 million in additional freight rates. It is the position of this organization that the present data on lumber shrinkage and strength is inadequate, and they urge that there be a thorough and careful review so that the overall result would be beneficial to the entire lumber industry and to the users of wood.

On the tax front, the administration has proposed a substantial revision of the present capital gains afforded timber. The Treasury Department data indicates that a possible two-thirds or even more of the benefits of this provision of law is enjoyed by 25 out of 7,500 corporations. I have not yet reached a conclusion on the extent to which the Treasury tax proposal will affect the overall lumber situation, but I would hope that what can be achieved will be an equitable spread of the taxload and the elimination of favoritism to a select few in the tax laws.

There is one final item on which I would like to comment briefly, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement on national forest timber sale activities for calendar year 1962 be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 13.)

Mr. MORSE. Last June 12 the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], on behalf of all the northwest Senators, asked that the Forest Service provide a better reporting on its activities. This has been done and I call to the attention of those in the forest products' industry both the overall picture and, for the benefit of those in particular areas, the situation where they operate.

In my judgment, this report is extremely encouraging, while, at the same time, providing the basis for improvement. The timber harvest during 1962 was the highest ever on the national forests, exceeding the 1959 record by 300 million board feet. The record shows a continued strong interest in the purchase of national forest timber and a continuation of bidding by the industry, often in amounts substantially in excess of Forest Service appraised rates.

I take particular note of the candid manner in which the report presents data and the statement that "improvement is needed in a few localized situations." On certain national forests in Oregon, there is evidence that sale of timber can be improved, and I trust that rapid action will be taken in those locations to do this to the full extent that there is a market for the timber.

These exhibits form an interesting panorama for they give some insight into the diverse points of view in the highly competitive lumber industry. Even more, they indicate, as I did in my letter to Mr. Doyle on March 1, the difficulty of getting a definition of the true situation, the causes, and the best solutions to existing problems.

It is my intention to do all I can to help our domestic lumber industry, for I am convinced it does have problems. It would be a disservice for me to do less than show that the course to be taken is not easily chosen.

I welcome the introduction of the several bills to deal with lumber matters and hope that as we proceed with the legislative process we can identify the real problems and select reasonable solutions.

EXHIBIT 1

JANUARY 7, 1963.

Mr. MORTIMER B. DOYLE,
National Lumber Manufacturers Association,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Many thanks for your good letter of November 26. I have been giving a great deal of thought to the facts contained in that letter and the overall aspects of the problems facing our domestic lumber industry.

I believe it would be most useful to have prepared an analysis of the various steps which might be considered. Such an analysis should include those things which can be done by the industry itself, those things which might be done by local and State governments and those things which might be done in cooperation with private organizations and groups and those steps which might be undertaken by the Federal Government.

In the field where the Federal Government would be involved, it would be useful to include discussions of the steps which would be taken administratively and those which would require legislation. Such an analysis should be set forth in as succinct a form as possible with appropriate references to the laws applicable and the exact changes in legislation which might be considered. This would form an extremely useful basis for future definitive consideration.

In my talks with numerous people during the fall, I have become convinced that the best possible course to take is the one which produces long-range solutions, but at the same time there must be very careful selection of the steps which can be taken immediately so that long-range solutions will have the opportunity to be fully effective.

Inasmuch as the Tariff Commission has not yet made the recommendation, there is no way to ascertain the conclusion it may reach, and thus it would be useful to chart a course based on steps which would be desirable in the event of an affirmative finding by the Tariff Commission and the steps that would be desirable if their finding is negative.

It seems to me that the association and my colleagues in the Senate and House should continue to stress the importance of industry divided solutions which involve the minimum intervention on the part of the Government.

I say this because while I have no personal objection to the Government participating in those facets of economic and social affairs where this participation is indicated, I firmly believe that the best effort occurs when the individuals concerned make a maximum contribution to their own welfare.

I would be pleased to discuss further steps with you when you have had a chance to prepare the material suggested. I recognize that this is a substantial request to make, but I do not think it more than you would want to do yourself in the light of the situation confronting the industry.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

EXHIBIT 2

NATIONAL LUMBER
MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1963.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Thank you for your kind letter of January 7 requesting information on the lumber industry's major problems, and the programs which it has recommended and is pursuing in an effort to effectively resolve these problems.

Some of these matters are, of course, more urgent than others, and, of course, it would be impossible in a letter to evaluate thoroughly all aspects of our industry's numerous and complex problems. However, I sincerely hope that the material set forth in the following paragraphs of this letter will be of some assistance to you.

In analyzing our problems, I cannot avoid feeling—particularly in the light of our existing economic problems—that unless something is done to bring about immediate action to resolve these problems we will suffer an economic decline during the next few years far worse than the rate which we have experienced in the recent past.

It is axiomatic that an industry to be prosperous must enjoy continuing and sustainable growth attended by an ever-rising level of overall demand for its products. Only under such circumstances will it be

able to supply job opportunities for a steadily growing population and make the reasonable profits necessary to encourage adequate investment. Our industry has urged and will strongly support an economic program that (1) leads to expanding employment; (2) encourages private investment; (3) creates rising productive efficiency and lower costs; (4) provides better prices and greater buying demand; and (5) increases production and is a source of reasonable profits.

As you point out in your letter, an essential quality of self-government is that the private individual is permitted to have the largest practicable degree of decision making and, in accordance with this principle, that government is best which interferes least, so long, however, as such individual's actions are consistent with those national purposes which are considered central to the welfare of our society.

On the other hand, we must recognize that government is an agency of the people and must be utilized to serve those purposes and do those things which individuals cannot and should not do. The international ramifications concerned with our import problem, for example, preclude individuals from taking any direct action to resolve this problem. The government must do this.

Some of our problems admittedly are very difficult, but their difficulty does not mean that they can be ignored. President Kennedy has said that "this Nation has not come to its present position of leadership by avoiding hard problems. We are at a point in history when we must face and resolve these problems." We firmly believe that the administration is aware of our industry's dilemma, and that it is sympathetic. Indication of this may be found in a statement on the lumber problem prepared by the Forest Products Division of the Business and Defense Services Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, copy of which is enclosed. Although we would not agree with it in its entirety, it is, overall, a good report.

To date, however, our Government has prescribed hardly any medicine for our malady except exhortation. We strongly urge that our Government now examine its own responsibility to the American lumber industry and its employees, and following this with the affirmative action that is needed to improve the economic position of our industry, and those communities and their citizens which are dependent upon a prosperous forest products industry for their continued existence.

Briefly outlined, the major problems of our industry, and our recommendations for their equitable solution, include the following:

TAXATION

The primary issue with respect to taxation, insofar as the timber industry is concerned, relates to the application of capital gain treatment to timber proceeds. To assure the equitable tax treatment of forestry and timber operations the industry supports the programs conceived and advanced by the forest industries committee on timber valuation and taxation. This committee vigorously opposes any proposals which endanger the equitable tax treatment of timber income.

We were quite shocked to learn that among the administration's tax revisions proposed to the House Ways and Means Committee on February 6 by Secretary Dillon was a repeal of the capital gains treatment of income from timber.

Under the changes proposed by Secretary Dillon, net proceeds from timber sales exceeding $5,000 (regardless of the kind of transaction involved) would be treated as ordinary income and taxed accordingly. Some industry spokesmen assert that repeal of the capital gains treatment would place the lumber industry in a worse position than prior to 1944 when the law was enacted. Even then, they say outright sale of timber was afforded the capital gains treatment. The new proposals would have no such provision.

Enactment of this proposal, coupled with the problem of constantly mounting imports, could easily result in the destruction of our industry as a major element of the American economy, and the primary source of industrial employment in thousands of American communities.

Other tax problems also exist. The lumber industry believes it is inequitable for its trucks, using private roads, or roads privately constructed and maintained, to be required to pay the taxes used to construct and maintain the Interstate Highway System. So far, our efforts to get Congress to enact legislation to eliminate this tax have been unsuccessful. We intend, however, to continue to press for equity in this area.

LUMBER IMPORTS

Our country imported approximately 4.5 billion board feet of softwood lumber from Canada last year or approximately 17 percent of U.S. softwood lumber markets as of the close of the year. This percentage is expected to rise substantially in 1963 unless counteraction is taken.

In an effort to reasonably resolve the unemployment and operation problems imposed upon the American lumber industry by an unchecked flood of imported Canadian softwood lumber, the industry constantly seeks the assistance of Congress and other responsible public officials. It has held a number of informal congressional conferences. It has pursued congressional and administrative hearings. It instituted an unsuccessful escape clause appeal before the U.S. Tariff Commission.

Among the possible solutions to its import problem, the industry has consistently recommended: (1) Establishment of an import quota on softwood lumber by direct legislative action; (2) that measures be taken to require that all imported lumber be marked to show country of origin (Canadian lumber has been specifically exempted from this requirement); (3) that lumber be made eligible under the quota provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act so that quantitative limitations could be placed on the importation of forest products into the United States; (4) implementation and extension of the buy-American principle as may be necessary to assure that all lumber and wood products used in construction federally financed or federally insured (as in FHA-insured housing) is of domestic manufacture; and (5) that a thorough market study in foreign countries should be made in cooperation with the Department of Commerce, with the specific objective of expanding the export of American forest products.

RIGHT-OF-WAY (NATIONAL FOREST INGRESS AND EGRESS)

I have written you separately, February 21, on the matter of rights-of-way across national forest land to permit access to private land. Clearly, the Government should agree not to demand a reciprocal right-of-way of greater value than the value of the right-of-way across Federal land a private owner requests. Also, provision for immediate access to inholdings, where needed, must be included in recommended legislation and the determination of values of rights-of-way must be placed in impartial hands.

APPEALS PROCEDURES

The Forest Service in its management of the national forests is not subject to the requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act. The present appeals procedure is slow and expensive, and the final decision in any dispute over timber sales matters remains with the seller—the Forest Service.

On February 21, 1962, the lumber industry presented the Secretary of Agriculture with a program to help improve the timber management and sales practices of the U.S. Forest Service. One of these points was a request for a more equitable method to appeal administrative decisions of the Forest Service.

Although the Secretary of Agriculture has ample authority to establish a new appeals procedure, enactment of special legislation may be necessary to insure that corrective action is taken. Such a law would assure a timber operator an appeal to a level higher than the one with which he is dealing on his contract, and additionally, there should be a further appeals board established within the Department of Agriculture.

WILDERNESS LEGISLATION

The lumber industry, generally, is not convinced that general wilderness legislation is necessary. During the last Congress a bill to set aside up to 15 million acres (there would be an additional 45 million acres of land that could be affected and eventually might become wilderness lands) of wilderness, wild canoe, and primitive lands for the national wilderness preservation system was the subject of much action, and, in fact, it passed the Senate.

However, while not advocating legislative action, lumbermen will generally support wilderness legislation which includes a requirement for (1) a review of primitive lands before they are recommended for inclusion in a wilderness system; and (2) positive congressional approval of any wilderness additions.

FEDERAL TIMBER SALES PROCEDURES

At present, the Forest Service manages timber under the basic law of 1897 which requires only that timber be "designated and appraised" and advertised and sold. Under this authority Secretaries of Agriculture have so far written 29 regulations, some of which have been withdrawn or superseded over the years. The Forest Service timber management program is governed by these regulations.

The first proposal in this area which the industry endorses has to do with management of national forest timber and would establish standards of performance for national forest management. It would require an annual report in the nature of an accounting which could be used to appraise the productivity of the national forests.

The second has to do with timber appraisal practices and is intended to allow the Forest Service to sell Government timber without taking advantage of its monopoly position where there are no alternative sources of timber supply.

The third proposal is a request for a new appeals procedure. It proposes a prompt and impartial procedure for resolving contract and contract administration and performance differences. The present appeals procedure is slow and expensive, and the final decision remains with the seller, the Federal agency.

The fourth proposal is a request for a complete revision of the timber sales contract form in order to establish a normal buyer-and-seller relationship between the Forest Service and the industry. At the present time, the contract form permits a one-sided relationship of the seller, permitting arbitrary, unilateral seller domination of the buyer-and-seller relationship. With the exception on the appeals procedure matter, no new legislation is recommended at the present time.

WOOD PROMOTION

The erosion of the domestic lumber market in the mid-1950's had a different and alarming ring than previous short-lived fluctuations and resulted in the first move toward the formation of a national wood promotion program, and the beginning of efforts to analyze the industry's current and prospective merchandising, research, and promotion program at all levels.

It was determined during this period that a positive stepped-up sales promotion, plus a comprehensive product development and marketing program, was needed to halt lumber's loss of volume. A vital action program involving at the present time expenditures amounting to an estimated $10 million or more annually, and financed through national, regional, and company sources, is being carried forward actively. While the industry has been heartened by the results of this overall effort, there is much work to be accomplished before its success can be measured. Currently, the NWPP is devoting its efforts to gaining the cooperation and support of all groups interested in increasing the demand for lumber and wood products.

LUMBER GRADES AND STANDARDS

The industry's recommendations for resolving problems concerned with lumber grade simplification and standardization call for (a) standardization of industry grade names for all species of softwood lumber used in residential construction to facilitate ease of specification by the home building industry; (b) grade descriptions to supply comparable quality based upon end-use requirements to make lumber more economical and less confusing to use; (c) standardized sizes for seasoned and unseasoned lumber which will place lumber standards on a sound technical and more meaningful basis; (d) a new size of boards (five-eighths inch thick) for sheathing and subflooring to make lumber more competitive with other materials which are only one-half inch or less in thickness and which are presently making strong inroads into lumber housing markets; and (e) a simplified method of presenting span tables for joists and rafters. We are actively working toward these goals.

Quite frankly, Senator, we could go on ad infinitum with a monolog of the problems of our industry and their recommended solutions. We are, however, aware that your keen interest and concern has made you quite knowledgeable about our industry and its problems. Because of this, I have attempted only to highlight in writing those areas which at the moment are of the most serious concern to lumbermen throughout the Nation and our proposals for equitably and immediately resolving them.

Admittedly, our industry is faced with some problems created by the thrust of new technology and automation. These obstacles are minor, however, for our economic difficulties have not been due primarily to the lack of a skilled labor force or to a lack of managerial skills or inventiveness. The greatest deterrent to the growth of a strong domestic lumber industry lies in the threat of inequitable tax treatment by our Government, and in a flood of foreign lumber, particularly at a time when it is not needed. The problems of our industry are economic problems and not technological problems.

Unless a reasonable limitation on lumber imports is immediately effected, we firmly believe that (a) lumber imports will flow into this country in ever-mounting quantities, disproportionate to the quantities needed to supplement domestic supply; (b) there will be a resultant discouragement of, and decrease in, domestic production, and (c) this Nation may, perhaps, someday regret to find itself without a domestic lumber industry able to meet its lumber and wood products needs.

Jobs and job opportunities are declining in our industry. Our profit rate is also declining. The demand for U.S.-produced lumber is insufficient to meet existing productive capacity. We cannot hope to grow in technology without a higher rate of investment, and entrepreneurs simply will not invest in an industry unless they see growing markets for its products.

Any member of our NLMA staff will be glad to discuss further with you, or any member of your staff, the chronic rise in idle manpower and plant capacity in our industry, and our recommendations for coping with the serious economic slack which has gripped our industry during the past few years. I am enclosing a copy of the several proposed laws that we believe will be of help to do that which you have said is so important, "to keep the cash registers ringing on Main Street" in our lumber-dependent communities.

Your interest and concern in the American lumber industry and its employees is, of course, greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

MORTIMER B. DOYLE.

PROPOSED REFUND OF HIGHWAY USE TAXES IN THE CASE OF OFF-HIGHWAY USE OF VEHICLES

The attached proposed bill is based on the premise that highway users should pay for the expanded highway construction program; and the converse of this, that nonhighway users should not pay for the expanded highway construction program.

"It is no more proper that those who do not ride the facility be charged for a ticket on it than for everybody to be forced by law to buy a season round-trip ticket every year on the B. & O. Railroad whether they ever ride that or any other train." (C. D. Martin, Jr., Under Secretary of Commerce, before the House Ways and Means Committee, March 14, 1961.)

The forest products industries own and operate thousands of trucks for logging purposes that move largely on privately owned or privately maintained road systems in the forested regions of the United States. It is unfair for these trucks to support an interstate highway system which they will never utilize when at the same time the owners of these vehicles are expending large sums of money to build and maintain their own road systems.

The proposed amendment is not an exemption from the highway-user taxes. It does, however, provide a refund of such taxes based upon the extent to which vehicles operate over privately owned or otherwise privately maintained roads.

As in other tax refund circumstances, the burden is upon the taxpayer to maintain the necessary records to prove his entitlement to the refunds. Experience under comparable State tax refund statutes demonstrate the administrative feasibility of such a refund system.

The proposed amendment is in complete accordance with the Federal pay-as-you-go highway program and actually implements the user-tax principle of the highway trust fund.

PROPOSED BILL, 88th CONGRESS, 1st SESSION

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a refund of the highway use tax in the case of trucks and other vehicles which do not operate on the Interstate Highway System, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6416(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special cases in which tax payments are considered as overpayments) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(R) If a highway motor vehicle, whether licensed to operate upon a public highway or not, operates over (1) any road, thoroughfare or property in private ownership, or (2) any public road or thoroughfare constructed by, or maintained by, the owner of such motor vehicle who is not otherwise reimbursed for such construction or maintenance, or (3) any road or thoroughfare pursuant to an agreement with any agency of the United States or of any State or with a licensee of any such agency, or both, if the agreement imposes upon the user of such road or thoroughfare the obligation either to construct such road at his own expense, to maintain the same at his own expense, or to pay any such agency or its licensee a reasonable consideration for the use of such road or thoroughfare, and such highway motor vehicle uses or consumes articles in respect of which tax has been imposed under section 4041, subsection (a) (1), (3) or (4) of section 4071, or section 4081, or such highway motor vehicle is one in respect of which tax has been imposed under section 4481, the Secretary or his delegate shall refund (without interest) to the ultimate purchaser of such article or to the person in respect of whom tax has been imposed under section 4481, a proportionate part of such tax based upon the number of miles traveled by such highway motor vehicle over such road, thoroughfare or property as compared to the total number of miles traveled by such vehicle. The Secretary or his delegate shall have authority to prescribe regulations and recordkeeping requirements in respect of such refund."

PROVISIONS OF FUEL AND MOTOR VEHICLE USE TAXES OF THE STATES OF OREGON AND IDAHO

Tax imposed	*Refunds or credits*	*Recordkeeping*
	OREGON	
A "mills per mile" use tax for different weight categories "for use of the highways," the tax to be used for public highway construction. (O.R.C. 767.325.)	Excludes application of tax to persons or motor vehicles "when operating over any road or thoroughfare in private ownership" or "when using any road or thoroughfare, other than a State highway or county road, pursuant to an agreement with any agency of the United States or with a licensee of such agency, or both, if the agreement imposes upon the user of such road or thoroughfare the obligation either to construct or maintain it at his own expense, or to pay such agency or licensee of such agency a reasonable consideration for the use * * * of such road. * * *". (O.R.C. 767.035.)	Requires daily mileage record on all vehicles and monthly report thereon; gives commissioner other broad supervisory powers—"Regulatory and Enforcement Provisions." (O.R.C. 767.405–767.990.)

PROVISIONS OF FUEL AND MOTOR VEHICLE USE TAXES OF THE STATES OF OREGON AND IDAHO—Continued

Tax imposed	*Refunds or credits*	*Recordkeeping*
	IDAHO	
A "mills per mile" use tax for different weight categories of commercial vehicles based on mileage operated over State highways. (I.C. 49–127.)	Allow deduction at time of payment for "miles traveled on roadways maintained with private funds by agreement with the public agency or agencies having jurisdiction over the same." (I.C. 49–127.)	Quarterly report required on mileage operated over State roads; vehicle owner required to maintain records and to purchase documents to justify use of rate schedules in code; penalties provided. (I.C. 49–127a.)
	OREGON	
Six-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline and motor vehicle fuels usable as fuel for operation of motor vehicles. (O.R.C. 319.000.)	Provides refund to person using fuel for operating a motor vehicle, whether licensed to operate upon the public highway or not, if used over privately owned, or privately built or maintained roads, such refunds being based upon a proportionate part—"The proportionate part shall be based upon the number of miles traveled over such roads" as compared to the total vehicle mileage. (O.R.C. 319.320.)	Authorizes secretary of state to impose recordkeeping and refund requirements. (O.R.C. 319.320.)
	IDAHO	
Six cents a gallon on special fuel used in "any motor vehicle while operated upon the highway" (tax is collected at time of sale by the seller from the user). (I.C. 49–731, 730.)	Allows refund to person who has paid fuel tax, either directly or indirectly, where fuel has been "used for purposes other than for the propulsion of motor vehicles upon the public highways. * * *" (I.C. 49–736, 737.)	Licenses required of special fuel dealers; records and monthly reports required of both dealer and user; penalties provided for failure to keep records. (49 I.C. 733, 734, 735, 746.)
	OREGON	
Six-cent-a-gallon use fuel tax imposed on motor vehicle fuels (diesel, etc.). (O.R.S. 319, 520, 530.)	Provides exemption for fuel used in propelling vehicle "over any road or thoroughfare in private ownership," or over any road built or maintained by the user at his own expense under agreement with any agency. (O.R.S. 319.540.)	Use-fuel tax license required of user; faithful performance bond required; emblem required to be displayed upon vehicle; monthly reports required. (O.R.S. 319, 550, 570, 600, 690.)

EXHIBIT 3

MARCH 1, 1963.

Mr. MORTIMER B. DOYLE,
Executive Vice President, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: Your good letter of February 25, responding to the suggestion in my January 7 letter to you regarding lumber industry problems, was very much appreciated. As I have told you in the past, I think that we can work together on those points upon which we are in agreement, and we need not be disturbed should we not be in full agreement on every issue.

On the matter of taxation, as it relates to both capital gains and road use, I have not reached a final decision. Should there be information and material which the forest industrial committee on timber evaluation and taxation feels would be useful to me, I would be very pleased to have it. I am taking the liberty of transmitting the material on the road-use tax to the Secretary of the Treasury for analysis.

On the matter of lumber imports, it is my view that action should be taken which will protect our domestic lumber industry against unfair competition from outside. Already the administration has done a number of things which I believe have proven useful. These include the $25 million change in depreciation allowance schedules and the recent decision by the Interstate Commerce Commission on lumber freight rates from the Pacific Northwest, estimated by the ICC to have an effect of $10 million annually. The Federal agencies have been proceeding vigorously with a domestic lumber procurement program; the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior have not only increased allowable cuts from the public forest but have taken positive action on the blowdown situation in the Pacific Northwest. In addition, the modest amendment in the Jones Act has been of considerable value to our Northwest shippers.

However, in my judgment, much remains to be done. It is my hope that the Northwest Senators will be able to get together in the very near future and outline a program of constructive action which will place us in a position where we can evaluate which of the several measures restricting imports would be best calculated to be most effective and least onerous to other segments of our economy.

For example, I am concerned that the buy-American principle, if applied to FHA housing, would pose some problems for the homebuilding industry. I do not want to imply by this statement that I would oppose such a provision but I want to weigh most carefully whether it is something that I should urge at this time. My present feeling is that we may want to press for a somewhat more substantial quota than is suggested by your legislative staff, but again, I wish to evaluate this situation a little further.

In a separate letter I have discussed the right-of-way issue.

On the appeals procedure, I am informed there is an understanding between the Forest Service and your association that further action will be deferred until the small working party which has been discussing possible revisions of the Forest Service timber sale contract has completed its work and circulated its suggestions for broader industry approval.

On the wilderness legislation, I must be frank to state that my view here is that we should have such legislation. I would further say that if we in the Congress are going to have the time to take care of the basic economic problems confronting our lumber industry it is essential that we follow the pattern of last year's Senate-passed legislation which, in my judgment, provides for an adequate review of primitive areas and does not burden the Congress with approval of each and every one of them. As you know, the legislation definitely contemplates that there will be congressional approval on any new additions to the wilderness system. I think there is much merit in this suggestion since the wilderness legislation would come before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which is composed mainly of western Senators who are from the heavy lumber producing regions of our Nation.

On Forest Service timber sale procedures, I am of the opinion that substantial progress is being made. On the first proposal made by your organization last year dealing with the management of national forest timber and annual reports, Secretary Freeman has taken the necessary action. On timber appraisal matters, I am advised by the Department of Agriculture that a committee of three experts in the field will commence its review this March, soliciting cooperation of the industry as its proceeds in this complex technical subject. The third proposal in this category has already been discussed in my letter as has the fourth on which substantial progress, I am told, is being made.

I would like at this point to deal collectively with the two items you entitle "Wood Promotion" and "Lumber Grades and Standards." Expressions of concern have been voiced by a number of Northwest lumber producers on the question of lumber grades and standards. I believe that some improvements could be made in this field and the proposals that have been made seem to be pointed in this direction. On the other hand, I am inclined to agree with the people from the Northwest who have spoken to me on this issue, that a thorough study should be made before lumber grades and standards are changed and that we should have the best possible technical information at our disposal. Also, I think that it is essential that any new program of such broad dimensions be carefully analyzed before it is put into effect in order that we do not disrupt producers who are not presently geared to the manufacture of the type of lumber which would be more preferred under the suggested program.

On wood promotion, I believe there is a definite Government responsibility to be of positive assistance. For this reason, I would support an enlargement of the legislation that Senator MAGNUSON introduced last year which would allocate a part of our tariff collections from Canadian lumber to the benefit of the wood-using industry. One step which I think would be useful would be to allocate a portion of the tariff collection to checking the lumber grades and standards of incoming Canadian lumber. Even more important, I think, would be the allocation of a part of the funds to wood promotion and market development. In my judgment, the entire tariff collected should be placed at the disposal of the domestic lumber industry through a coordinated program operated by the proper agencies in the Federal Government.

I am especially interested in finding all of the constructive steps that can be taken domestically which will improve per capita consumption of lumber. I hope that the steps that I have outlined, limited though they may be, are indicative of the type of things which I think would be useful.

It is my hope that we will have an early report from the Secretary of Agriculture on the access matter and from the Secretary of the Treasury on the road use tax matter. When these reports arrive, I would like to schedule a meeting with you and your associates so that we may review exactly where we stand on the question of Canadian lumber imports and the condition of the domestic lumber industry.

The several draft bills which you submitted to me dealing with Canadian lumber imports on a restrictive basis have been introduced by Members of the Senate. The question, therefore, is now properly before the appropriate Senate committees. My judgment is that it will be necessary to decide which of these bills would be most effective, taken together with other constructive action, in dealing with the situation. In the final analysis, you can be assured of my support of whatever action is reasonable and proper.

Your views on the suggestions that I have made here would be most helpful. Your further suggestions at any time will certainly be welcome.

With best personal regards.

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

EXHIBIT 4

[From the Oregonian, Feb. 22, 1963]

WEST VERSUS SOUTH

To the EDITOR:

The February 13 edition of the Oregonian carried a letter from Mortimer B. Doyle, executive vice president, National Lumber Manufacturers Association, in which he sought to explain away the opposition of his organization to a proposed amendment to the Federal Wage and Hour Act that would require equal pay for women who do work equivalent to that performed by men. In his letter, Mr. Doyle purported to speak for lumbermen and the lumber industry.

There is a substantial segment of the lumber industry in the West that is not a part of Mr. Doyle's organization, that does not share Mr. Doyle's views, and for which Mr. Doyle certainly does not speak.

Canadian lumber, alone, is not the sole problem of the western lumber industry. Of equal concern is the southern pine industry, whose views on this occasion are reflected in Mr. Doyle's letter. The southern pine industry may not like Canadian lumber imports, but it likes even less the producers of lumber in the Western States. Hence, it is the southern pine industry that urges retention of the Jones Act whereby the Government prohibits west coast lumber producers from using available ships of foreign registry. This prevents west coast lumber producers from regaining their east coast markets. It is southern lumber producers, now joined by a few westerners, who are pressuring the Federal Government to discriminate against the sizes of lumber that our great water shipping mills produce and ship. And it is the southern mills that pay low wages and now resist efforts to see that women are paid fairly for the work they do.

Mr. Doyle says the core issue is whether individuals with limited skills should be forced into unemployment by a Government requirement for payment of high wages. Lumber manufacturers of Oregon and Washington pay decent hourly wages that enable families to live with the dignity of American citizens. We do not complain, but we cannot compete in the eastern and middle western lumber markets with manufacturers of southern pine who want to manufacture lumber with cheap labor

Mr. Doyle's organization wants the Government to force the rejection of the products of our water shipping mills. But Government interferes too much, he says, when it compels a decent minimum wage.

Mr. Doyle speaks for the National Lumber Manufacturers Association. He reflects accurately the wondrous views of the southern wing of that association. But he certainly does not speak for me or the many other western lumbermen like me.

SIDNEY LEIKEN,
Oregon State Representative and President, L. & H. Lumber Co.
SUTHERLIN.

EXHIBIT 5

[From the Oregonian, Feb. 22, 1963]

BILL WOULD PLUG TIMBER TAX HOLE

(By Julius Duscha)

WASHINGTON.—A little-noticed provision in President Kennedy's tax program would plug a loophole that has provided big timber, lumber, and paper companies with hundreds of millions of dollars in benefits for nearly 20 years.

The loophole was placed in the law to encourage good forestry practices, but for the most part it has had the opposite effect.

Since 1944 all profits from the sale of timber have been treated as capital gains and taxed at the low capital gains rate of 25 percent.

When the capital gains rate was applied to all timber sales it was argued that small timber operators would benefit the most and that the change would foster good timber practices.

But large corporations have been the big beneficiaries. According to a Treasury Department study, they have used the provision to speed up the cutting of their timber holdings in a manner not conducive to the good forestry practices of selective cutting and reforestation.

Here are some examples from the Treasury study of the effects of the timber loopholes in 1959, the latest year for which complete figures are available.

In the timber industry, 3 companies received 42 percent of the $44 million in tax benefits given timber operators, while 12 companies out of a total of 2,427 in the industry got more than half of the benefits.

In the plywood industry, 2 companies got more than 90 percent of the $11 million in timber capital gains benefits received by the industry, 4 firms got all but 5 percent of the benefits and the other 1,400 firms in this industry received less than $500,000 in capital gains benefits.

Of the 3,464 companies in the paper industry, the 15 largest ones got more than 82 percent of the timber capital gains benefits given that industry.

Before 1944 a farmer or timber grower who owned timber and cut it for his own business or who had someone harvest the timber under a cutting contract could not treat his profits as capital gains. To get the capital gains treatment the timber and the land had to be sold outright.

Under the best timber-cutting practices timber is harvested selectively and the land is carefully reforested so that over a period of years timber can become an annual crop.

But before 1944, the tax laws encouraged the outright sale of timber, which generally means the denuding of timberland, and penalized the careful cutting and reforestation practices.

A Treasury Department analysis of the timber capital gains provision points out that lumber, pulp and paper companies buy timberlands to assure themselves a permanent supply of timber.

"For these buyers," the Department said, "capital gains treatment on a portion of their profit margin * * * is an essentially fortuitous tax advantage * * * this advantage bears little or no relationship to conservation and good forestry management."

The Treasury study also said that capital gains treatment for timber is "facilitating the wholesale cutting of accumulated timber stands in order quickly to pay off debt financing" and calls into "grave question the effect of this feature of the tax laws on resource conservation."

The President has asked Congress to remedy this situation by treating the timber income of corporations as ordinary income and limiting the capital gains treatment on timber to $5 thousand annually in the case of individuals.

"This level of coverage * * * will still provide a full capital gain opportunity to over 99 percent of the forest land owners," the Treasury Department said.

EXHIBIT 6

MEMORANDUM ON THE LUMBER STANDARDS ISSUE

WESTERN FOREST INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION,
Portland, Oreg., February 22, 1963.

The purpose of this report is to clarify issues and to discuss certain remarks as presented by Representative E. Y. BERRY, Republican, of South Dakota, before the House of Representatives and as reported on page 2232 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 14, 1963. The subject pertains to proposed new lumber standards and the desire by a segment of the lumber industry to establish new dimensions for studs, joists, rafters, and other framing lumber.

It is important to place the controversy over lumber standards in its true economic perspective. The basic push for changed lumber standards stems from the difficult economic problems facing the lumber industry highlighted at this time by the controversy over increased imports from Canada. With the domestic demand for softwood lumber at a stationary low level and with a realization that the domestic demand for lumber will probably continue at this stationary low level for several more years, the proposed change in standards is a device being pushed by one segment of the lumber industry to gain significant competitive advantage over another segment of the lumber industry. The purpose of this competitive advantage is to protect existing domestic markets for one segment in the face of the onslaught of Canadian exports at the expense of another segment of the domestic lumber industry. The controversy on lumber standards was probably inevitable and stems directly from the economic difficulties forced by our industry.

Clearly, a major segment of the western lumber industry is not in favor of changed lumber sizes which have as a result the real possibility of tremendous economic hardship. Accordingly, Western Forest Industries Association has been and is opposed to the proposed changes in lumber sizes. However, Western Forest Industries Association is always ready to assess any proposed changes from the standpoint of facts. This memorandum will go into a factual analysis of the proposed changes. The method by which proposed new dimensions of lumber have been promulgated is open to serious challenge. The establishment of new dimensions for framing components must be tied to the ability of such dimensions to meet the strength and performance requirements specified by present span tables. The claimed ability of the new proposed dimensions to meet these strength requirements has been premised upon the application of certain values for the shrinkage of lumber that have heretofore been casually accepted by producers and consumers of lumber. Acceptance of these values has been casual because of what has been a relative lack of their application to the everyday problems of manufacturing and using framing lumber. With the current attempt to compare new sizes for lumber to sizes that have been in use for many years the order of magnitude of shrinkage that occurs during the natural seasoning of lumber immediately gains new and important significance.

The values for shrinkage used in arriving at new recommended sizes for dimension lumber were provided by the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. In providing these values for shrinkage, the laboratory at Madison called upon its own resources of data and information that were derived through research activities conducted more than 25 years ago. The research work from which these data were obtained did not have as its objective the establishment of shrinkage values that would be applied to the determination of relative sizes and strength of lumber. Because this work had as its purpose the solution of another problem, the methods of procedure and the analysis of results were only indirectly related to the problem at hand. The determinations of shrinkage were based upon the amount of shrinkage that occurred at equilibrium moisture content of the test specimens. This is as opposed to the practical everyday use requirement of determining shrinkage at a condition of average moisture content throughout the cross section of a piece of lumber. Further departures from practical application of the research results are to be found in that drying conditions did not approximate those related to the natural seasoning of lumber and the test specimens were very small in size and represented limited and ideal conditions of wood structure. The procedure that was applied failed to give deserved consideration to geographic location of growth area, rapidity of growth, relationship of sapwood to heart wood, direction of grain, and proportion of summer wood to spring wood. These are factors that logically should be given close consideration by any program of research having as its objective the determination of shrinkage values to be applied with accuracy as a basis for recommending new product sizes for the lumber industry throughout the entire United States and to assure that those new sizes can satisfy the span tables as presently enforced by FHA.

A recent independent study (and the first of its kind for the present application) of the shrinkage of Douglas-fir lumber conducted under the auspices of the Western Forest Industries Association confirmed that the shrinkage values applied in arriving at the proposed new dimensions of lumber were roughly 100 percent greater than were developed during actual seasoning of lumber from a green condition (30 percent or above in moisture content) to an average moisture content value of 15 percent. The values of shrinkage applied were in the immediate vicinity of 4 percent whereas the values for shrinkage exposed by the independent study were found to be less than 2 percent. It should also be pointed out that the study referred to indicated a shrinkage value to 19 percent average moisture content of something over 1 percent. These seemingly small percentile figures gain economic significance when it is understood that 1-percent shrinkage amounts to ten one-thousanths of 1 inch per inch of lumber, or one sixty-fourth of 1 inch for lumber that is 1⅝ inches in thickness. The difference between 2-percent shrinkage and 4-percent shrinkage represent one thirty-seconds of 1 inch of lumber. If the recommended new dimensions for lumber were adopted, it would mean that the shipper of green lumber would be required to pay the additional freight for an extra one thirty-second of 1 inch of lumber for each nominal 2 inches of lumber thickness he shipped. The producer of dry lumber would be allowed to remove this amount of material from each piece of lumber and thus gain considerable benefit by reduction of his shipping weight. On the west coast alone, the impact of this upon the producer of green lumber will be to incur additional tens of millions of dollars per year in payment of freight as compared to the lower cost of shipping dry lumber of smaller dimension. This economic relationship between the shipment of dry and green lumber points up an absolute necessity for establishing accurate values for the shrinkage of wood during seasoning if indeed any change is made.

The importance of premising values for shrinkage of lumber upon the practical circumstances related to the manufacture and use of lumber cannot be overemphasized. The use of shrinkage values based upon the physical response of wood when drying to an equilibrium moisture content (the same moisture content throughout the entire cross section area) is academic and not applicable to the practical problem at hand. Shrinkage values must be based upon the determination of average moisture content for it is on the basis of average moisture that dried lumber is sized to its finished dimension. Also, the application of existing span tables is based upon average moisture conditions.

To relate new dimensions for lumber to an excessively high shrinkage value will, as explained, give the producer of dry framing lumber an economic advantage in his competitive position with green producers. What is not generally recognized is that this same high value for shrinkage, when applied to the relationship of dry to green sizes for lumber, can have a thoroughly detrimental effect upon the dry producer as well. Referring back to the significance of span tables, it is important to keep in mind that the tables that are presently accepted and in use have been derived through empirical means. They are not premised upon the actual physical testing of pieces of lumber, but they have been found adequate and applicable over a good number of years of use. A letter addressed to Mr. R. J. Canavan, Assistant FHA Commissioner, and written by Edward G. Locke, Director of the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory states, "Our calculations indicate that the proposed new dry sizes, 1½ inches in thickness and present ALS widths are equal or slightly greater in strength and stiffness than the present standard ALS sizes dressed green." This letter, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following Mr. BERRY's remarks, fails to state that the calculations mentioned were premised upon shrinkage values in the area of 4 percent. The shrinkage value used in the development of such calculations is vital. The calculations are evolved by relating an assumed piece of lumber of the desired size (machined dry) to the assumed shrunken size of a piece of lumber that had been machined when green. By using this comparative situation it is apparent that as the order of magnitude of shrinkage is increased, the assumed dry (15 percent moisture content) size of the piece that was sized when green will be increasingly smaller. By relating back to the practices of applying span tables now in use, it follows that whatever the dry (seasoned) size of a piece of lumber that was machined when green, it will have adequate strength to meet the requirements of the span tables. So, in relating the machined dry size to the shrunken dry size, it becomes obvious that as the "calculated" shrunken size becomes smaller there will be an ever closer strength relationship between it and some arbitrarily selected smaller new size for dry dressed lumber.

The fact that the user of lumber has been completely ignored by the application of unrealistically high shrinkage values becomes evident as soon as it is realized that the recommended new dimensions for framing lumber seem to have been theoretically compared to an artificially small dry size for lumber that was dressed when green. This means that the strength of lumber sized when dry to the new recommended dimensions could well be below strength requirements as enforced today by FHA. Without a realistic value for shrinkage upon which to base calculations of strength, it is incongruous to say that the proposed new dry size of 1½ inches in thickness will meet the requirements of existing span tables.

Credence is given to the claimed lack of data and information concerning the shrinkage of lumber by the fact that the Forest Research Laboratory of the State of Oregon has undertaken a study of shrinkage of Douglas fir. This study was originally requested by the west coast lumber inspection bureau as a result of information brought to its attention that evidenced reasonable doubt as to the validity of applying the high shrinkage values used in the development of the proposed new sizes for framing lumber.

The same technical and economic information presented before WCLIB was exposed to the National Lumber Standards Subcommittee at its Chicago meeting on January 23 and 24. This exposure resulted in the committee postponing action on endorsement of the proposed 1½-inch dry lumber size pending further study and resolution of the percent of shrinkage of lumber during seasoning. Proposed size equivalents between green and dry lumber could not be acted upon because of the lack of applicable information and data upon which to establish a relationship.

On January 28 and 29, a group of spokesmen for a major segment of the western lumber industry that questions the proposed new sizes met with officials of FHA and the Office of Technical Standards, Department of Commerce, for the purpose of exposing the same information previously presented to WCLIB and ALS. It is partly on the basis of these meetings and the resulting exposure of true economic and technical facts that FHA has seen fit to withhold its approval of a 1½-inch size for dry lumber. When the Department of Commerce learned that the Forest Research Laboratory of Oregon had agreed to conduct a study of the shrinkage of lumber for the specific purpose of applying information derived to a logical determination of new sizes for lumber, it volunteered to support a technician to observe the conduct of the study. It was expected that this technical observer would be provided by the Madison Forest Products Laboratory and that the Department of Commerce would pay per diem and travel expenses for the individual. It was later learned that when the Madison Forest Products Laboratory was confronted by the Department of Commerce and FHA with a request for cooperation and the services of a qualified individual, the request was rejected.

That the forest research laboratory, an official activity of the State of Oregon, considers existing information concerning the shrinkage of lumber to be inadequate is evidenced by the fact that the laboratory is using State funds for the conduct of the current research study. It is expected that this study will reach a point that will yield significant results sometime toward the end of April. The study, incidentally, is premised upon a determination of the shrinkage of lumber when it reaches various average moisture content values not an equilibrium moisture content value.

The accusation by Mr. Berry that the Federal Housing Administration has become responsive to political pressure seems uncalled for in view of the serious technical discrepancies pointed out above. These discrepancies are obvious to anyone who studies the matter, as is an understanding of the economic impact imposed by these technical considerations. The inference that FHA presently accepts 1$\frac{9}{16}$-inch lumber on an equal status with 1⅝-inch lumber is incorrect. Span tables state specifically that 1$\frac{9}{16}$-inch lumber can be used only under reduced strength values. In view of this, it seems incomprehensible that FHA would be expected to give consideration to accepting 1½-inch lumber at a par for strength with 1⅝-inch lumber. FHA is consistent in recognizing the fact that lumber thinner than 1⅝-inch does not qualify under existing span tables.

With an understanding of the true nature of the problem of sizing lumber it is obvious that no change can be tolerated until exact technical information is developed and all of the manifestations of the problem at hand are on record. It follows that if the forest research laboratory at Corvallis, Oreg., finds that shrinkage values at average moisture content are significantly below the shrinkage values applied in the development of new size recommendations, then the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., must undertake a comprehensive study of the shrinkage of framing lumber. Such a study must be applied to all commercially important species and must include considerations of the natural variability of wood, its physical structure, its growth location, and the size of the pieces being tested.

The problem of strength of wood by species and sizes is of overriding importance in terms of ability of consumers to specify lumber for its various uses with assurance that lumber will adequately do the job. The Western Forest Industries Association has been studying intensively the existing status of information being used by the Government bearing on the question of existing span tables and strength ratings for various species and sizes of lumber. While our information is not yet complete it would appear that the present span tables and strength determinations are not based on actual tests of the strength of lumber presently being used by the American consumer. If our investigation bears out that we do not have existing studies to support the strength characteristics for softwood lumber, then clearly we will insist that such studies be conducted and completed prior to any changes in lumber standards or sizes which carry with them such tremendous economic significance both to the manufacturers of lumber and the consumer.

The American Lumber Standards Subcommittee at the January meeting in Chicago adopted a position that in determining the shrinkage values for naturally seasoned lumber shrinkage should be determined to an average moisture content of 15 percent. The 15 percent figure was adopted on the assumption that kiln dried framing lumber in the West was in fact dried on the average to 15 percent moisture content. Again no reliable statistical data confirms this assumption. Western Forest Industries Association is now engaged in an intensive analysis of the average moisture content of kiln dried framing lumber on the west coast. If our research should indicate that the average moisture content of kiln dried framing lumber is higher than 15 percent, we will then insist that shrinkage factors be applied to that higher percentage.

The American Lumber Standards Subcommittee also adopted a recommendation that the grading rules for kiln dried framing lumber be changed so that kiln dried lumber will have a maximum moisture content of 19 percent. Existing grading rules for kiln dried framing lumber provide for a maximum of 19 percent moisture content with an allowance that 10 percent of the pieces can be up to 25 percent moisture content. If this recommendation is adopted by the American Lumber Standard Committee in May, the dry lumber manufacturers in the West will be economically disadvantaged in relation to the producers of southern lumber. Such a proposal would add to the costs of producing dry lumber in the West.

We hope it is clear from this memorandum that Western Forest Industries Association and the Government agencies involved in this question are concerned with the facts and will insist upon adequate facts where such facts are not today available. Once the facts are determined we can then make meaningful decisions. It is the National Lumber Manufacturers Association who tried to railroad a change in size standards based upon inadequate factual information. As the inadequate base of NLMA's facts came to light and the Government agencies decided accordingly to not act in haste, National Lumber Manufacturers Association decided apparently to make a political issue of the matter with the obvious purpose of trying to politically force the Government to adopt its proposals. Representative Berry's remarks on the floor of the House may reflect the start of this political pressure.

Exhibit 7

[From The Oregonian, Feb. 22, 1963]

ICC Group Approves Reduced Rates on Lumber Shipments by Railroads

Washington.—A 3-member division of the Interstate Commerce Commission Thursday approved reduced rates on railroad shipments of lumber from Pacific coast to eastern points.

The decision which may be appealed to the full 11-man Commission, was regarded as a major victory for railroad interests in their fight with water barge owners for the lumber shipping business.

The ICC division approved a reduction of 7 cents per 100 pounds on lumber and related items shipped from the west coast to the east, provided shipments are made in minimum carload units of at least 55,000, 70,000, or 75,000 pounds—depending on type of car used.

Present minimum weight requirements involved in lumber shipping charges are 38,000, 44,000, and 54,000 pounds.

An example of the effect of the decision is the lowering of the $1.61 rate to $1.54 a 100 pounds of lumber shipped from Portland, Oreg. to New York City.

Joining intercoastal water carriers in opposing the reduction were southern and southwestern lumber producers and some port of New York interests.

The water carriers contended the reduced rates would be lower than necessary to meet competition. Railroads said the proposed rates were intended to encourage heavier carloadings, rather than to drive water carriers out of the lumber shipping business.

The differentials between the new rail rates and water carrier rates "are less than those found to be necessary and proper in some rail-water competitive rate cases," the ICC division said.

But any greater differential would "hobble" the railroads, which have an inherent advantage in lumber shipping, and would impair "their ability to transport the existing volume of rail lumber traffic at lower rates while increasing their net revenues," the division said.

In Portland, Ken Batchelder, traffic manager of West Coast Lumbermen's Association, said the rate reduction would mean a savings of $20 million a year for western lumber shippers.

He said the rate has been in effect since December of 1961 but has been under fire from southern pine lumber interests.

Western piue, Douglas Fir Plywood Association, California Redwood Association, and the WCLA participated in the initial battle to get the rate reduction and have since been active in defending it, Batchelder stated.

Exhibit 8

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Journal of Commerce, Feb. 15, 1963]

Freehold Services and Lumber

Distance from midwestern and eastern markets has always been a problem to producers in the Pacific Northwest, and this is particularly true when bulky products, such as lumber and other wood products, are involved.

Regulatory groups have the problem of striking a balance between an industry which is very sensitive to freight rates, and transportation, which seems to have a chronic condition resulting from a variety of reasons.

The Jones Act was formulated to aid American water shipping, and not until the act had completely eliminated services to some areas was the act modified.

In order to aid the railroads, the historical hold services which railroads granted western lumber shippers was dropped. Now, with the pinch from Canadian lumber competition, lack of this service is proving detrimental to those who ship western forest products by rail, and particularly the smaller operators. As a result the Western Lumber Marketing Association sought to have reinstated, on a reduced scale, the hold services.

Last week this was denied by the Western Railroad Traffic Association. In Portland this week Hershal M. Tanzer, WLMA president, dealt with the subject, and possible results of the denial, at some length.

There seems little doubt that if the competition from Canadian lumber continues, many of the small mills face a problem which may be insurmountable. The hold services are a definite marketing aid.

Reduction of lumber shipments cannot work to the advantage of railroads, and failure to restore limited freehold services on eastbound shipments may well reduce the railroads' share of lumber shipments. The Jones Act, designed to aid American shipping, almost eliminated waterborne lumber cargoes; failure to make modification in rail tariffs could have the same effect upon lumber shipments by rail.

Exhibit 9

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Reporter, Feb. 12, 1963]

Marketing Advantages Said Lost to Lumber

Another one of the lumber marketing advantages has disappeared with the recent decision of the Western Railroad Traffic Association turning down the 5-day freehold of transit operators. This was emphasized by Hershal M. Tanzer, Portland, vice president, Buckeye-Pacific Lumber Co. and Western Lumber Marketing Association president, at a Tuesday press conference at the Benson Hotel.

"This is a tremendous compromise on the part of the shippers from the railroad service that had been standard for 80-odd years,"

Tanzer told the Portland Reporter. "We felt that this tariff would finalize the long struggle and prolong bickering that has taken place within the industry and resolve the issue in a final and fixed tariff with which all parties could live and which would be a great service to our industry. We felt that this would bring order out of a confused situation."

The proposal which was turned down by the WRTA executive committee requested a reduction in the hold time on lumber from 15 days, formerly granted, to 5 days with 7 additional days at a $3-per-day charge. Regular penalty demurrage would go into effect at the expiration of this time.

Lyle Baker, editor of the Lyle Baker Reports, KPTV, explained that while there has been abuses of transit privileges he and other western lumber industry representatives feel that the railroad industry has gone too far in eliminating a marketing tool which is of vital necessity to certain industry segments.

Roland Wirt, Portland, WLMA traffic commission chairman, said, "If western rail lumber is to compete with other producing sections of the country some marketing assistance of a definite nature is necessary."

Exhibit 10

[From the Portland Reporter, Feb. 16, 1963]

Give Small Operators a Break

A decision has been made affecting the Northwest lumber industry as important, in an adverse way, as the Jones Act revision was in a positive sense.

It is the recent decision of the executive committee of the Western Railroad Traffic Association to deny tariff application No. 60-1 for restoration of limited freehold services on eastbound shipments of western forest products.

WLMA's proposal requested a reduction in the hold time on lumber from 15 days, formerly granted, to 5 days with 7 additional days at $3 per day charge. At the expiration of this time, regular penalty demurrage would go into effect.

The request was supported by over 250 American lumber manufacturers and over 200 midwestern and eastern wholesalers, jobbers and retailers of lumber products. They argued the historical hold services, which railroads have granted western lumber shippers for 80 years and were instrumental in keeping western products competitive, should be reinstated.

Hershal M. Tanzer, WLMA president, stated: "This rejection has dealt a severe blow to hundreds of small and middle-size mills who need every bit of support and assistance possible to remain competitive in a market in which Canadian exports are increasing and in which cost factors are rising. It is ironic to note that on the very date that the first foreign vessel loaded with lumber from an American port for Puerto Rico under Jones Act modification, an act of assistance for the large water mills, the WRTA rejected this vital rail proposal which would have granted a significant measure of assistance to hundreds of smaller mills who must ship by rail rather than by water."

The rail group's executive committee disapproved: Any hold period free of charge; the restriction on granting any hold period with or without charge to lower grade cars; the restriction on any hold period, with or without charge, to cars not over 40 feet 6 inches in length and doors not to exceed 6 feet in width, under tariff provisions which would permit of no substitution of equipment.

The committee did, however, leave one loophole, stating: It is impossible at this time to arrive at any conclusion as to whether a hold period could be granted, subject to any particular detention charge, until final decision is made upon proposals now pending before the Association of American Railroads for per diem charges graduated upon age and condition of cars. Therefore any further action was held in abeyance until such a decision is reached.

WLMA spokesmen, however, feel any decision on per diem charges is an idle dream. It has been, and will be, discussed for years. For all practical purposes, WLMA's request is denied.

Railroads, of course, traditionally have objected to tying up cars in transit, though their policy is not always consistent in that such services are still granted grain and coal shippers and hold services and lower demurrage rates are maintained for lumber shipments destined for export by water.

Railroads say shippers' use of cars in transit, in effect, supplies them with warehouses, a charge the smaller shippers cheerfully admit. The small shippers say they lack the capital to build extensive warehouse facilities, that in-transit selling gets products on the way quickly, it has been traditional, and it helps keep little operators in competition with the giants.

Both sides in the controversy present valid arguments. But with lumbering facing a declining and more competitive market, it would appear there is merit in reinstating the time-honored practice. Railroads likewise are experiencing financial troubles and they might well be advised to take a less discriminatory look at problems of the medium and small lumber firms.

Anything which will benefit the rapidly disappearing little businessman will in turn benefit the railroads. The conclusion that lack of cooperation will help only the big operators, who don't have to worry about warehouse costs is hard to ignore.

We think the WLMA's request has merit.

Exhibit 11

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregon Journal, Feb. 13, 1963]

WLMA Studies Freehold Alternatives

(By Paul Manley)

Introduction by the Nation's railroads of expedited schedules for forest products—guaranteeing delivery at their destination at a specified time—may someday supersede the present practice of transiting in the lumber industry.

This hope was extended Tuesday to members of the Western Lumber Marketing Association by their president, Hershal M. Tanzer, in the wake of a setback for the organization's efforts to restore limited freehold privileges on eastbound shipments of forest products.

The WLMA had petitioned the Western Railroad Traffic Association to allow 5 days' freehold on carloads of lumber destined for points in the East, with an additional 7 days' storage at $3 per day.

Denial of the petition refocused attention on the plight of the lumber wholesalers and small sawmill operators who constitute the membership of the WLMA. They had become accustomed to the practice of seeking buyers for their lumber while it was aboard boxcars en route to the East, and if they didn't line up a purchaser immediately, they could count on 15 days of free storage in the rail car while they shopped around. Last year the freehold practice was ordered discontinued.

Tanzer pointed out Tuesday that many agricultural products other than lumber enjoy expedited schedules, enabling shippers to accept firm delivery contracts, and suggested that application of this practice on forest products consignments might relieve small western mills of the necessity of transiting.

He contended that lack of a definite delivery date actually fosters the practice of starting carloads of lumber rolling eastward without a specific destination, because the frequently lengthy travel time makes it practical to line up a buyer while the cargo is in transit.

Tanzer said elimination of the freehold has forced WLMA members to use "what circuitous routings are legitimately available" and to do a greater portion of their business on firm orders.

But he defended in-transit selling as "one of the most successful and efficient methods of getting western lumber to market."

"It has been an important factor in making forest products more accessible and attractive in the consuming area of the Midwest and East," the WLMA president maintained. "It has been an important method of keeping western production competitive with lumber from Southern States, which is already close to its consuming market."

"I know of no other commodity that has such a high percentage of distribution cost," Tanzer added, estimating that about 40 percent of the cost of western lumber in eastern markets is represented by freight charges, against 15 to 20 percent for southern pine.

He also claimed that rejection of the freehold renewal application "will make the purchase of lumber from many Canadian origins more attractive to the American buyer."

Tanzer expressed the belief that the railroads, by refusing to adopt a modified freehold, are opening the door to stepped-up competition from trucklines for lumber traffic.

He said this would become evident as the highway system is improved and as lumber buyers become more fussy about deliveries.

He predicted a major break, sooner or later in the Jones Act restrictions to allow foreign vessels to carry lumber between ports in the United States, and speculated that when this takes place it will be cheaper to ship lumber by water to the east coast and then backhaul it hundreds of miles by truck than it will be to route the same cargo from mill to market entirely by rail.

"Even today it costs more to ship lumber from Portland to New York by rail than it does by water," he observed.

The WLMA president deplored the operation of warehouses in the East and Midwest by large integrated lumber producers contending that the practice increases distribution costs, which ultimately are passed on to the consumer.

For this reason he rejected a suggestion that WLMA members pool their marketing efforts through central warehouses, claiming it would be neither efficient nor economical, and the additional handling would raise the cost to the consumer.

Indicating that the search will continue for alternatives to the freehold, Tanzer stressed, "None of us are going out of business."

Exhibit 12

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian, Feb. 17, 1963]

Up to Congress

The U.S. lumber industry never had much of a chance of obtaining Government restrictions on Canadian lumber imports. Such quotas violate the free-trade policy President Kennedy urges and preceding administrations supported. And, besides, Canada buys much more of all goods from the United States than we buy from her.

If the U.S. Tariff Commission had not rejected the request for lumber quotas on the ground it was not proved increasing imports were caused in major part by past tariff concessions, chances are some other reason would have been found.

The U.S. lumbermen's best hope for relief from serious Canadian competition now lies with Congress. A bill already introduced would require all FHA-financed construction projects use U.S.-made lumber. Whether this is sound legislation may be open to argument. But there are restrictions, placed by law or regulation, on American lumber, such as the Jones Act and perhaps too extreme requirements for investments in harvesting Government timber, which could be eased. The Jones Act was modified slightly by Congress last year to permit shipping lumber to Puerto Rico in foreign vessels. If shipping to Atlantic coast ports could also be by other than American-flag ships, a considerable advantage now held by Canadian tidewater mills would vanish.

Of course, the U.S. industry is not of one mind as to what form relief should take. Small Northwest mills that ship by rail and sell in transit wish reinstatement of freehold privileges on railroads which were abolished recently after 80 years. This freehold was for 15 days. Last week, the Western Railroad Traffic Association denied a compromise proposal, that a hold time of 5 days, with 7 additional days at $3 a day, be granted. Canada dropped its 15-day freehold under pressure last year. But officials of the Western Lumber Marketing Association contend this did not put small western lumbermen back in a competitive position with Canadians. Lumber from many Canadian origins remains more attractive to American buyers, they say.

Large mills, which have their own distribution facilities, are opposed to freeholds, which permit their smaller competitors to use freight cars for storage. There are also many differences of opinion between western and southern producers.

What the lumber industry needs most of all is a boom in home building. If there were a brisk demand for lumber, there would be little worry about Canadian competition. Even now some operators are doing well, as annual reports prove.

One can expect continued pressure on Congress for needed remedial legislation, more squabbling among the various segments of the industry itself and continued concentration of lumbering into large, integrated plants better equipped to achieve full utilization of the log.

EXHIBIT 13

NATIONAL FOREST TIMBER SALE ACTIVITIES FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1962

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1963.

This report has been prepared in response to Senator MAGNUSON's request expressed in his statement to the Senate on June 12, 1962.

The timber harvest of 9.6 billion board feet in 1962 is the highest rate of cutting yet otbained in any calendar year on the national forests. It exceeds the previous record high year of 1959 by 300 million board feet. The attainment of this new record during a year when domestic lumber production was at a relatively low ebb is particularly gratifying. For the 6-month period ending December 31, 1962, timber harvesting totaled 600 million board feet more than for the same period in the preceding year. This accelerated rate of cutting is indicative of a new record for calendar year 1963 in excess of 10 billion board feet.

The tables in this report show for each national forest allowable cutting rates, cut and sell objectives used in the allotment of timber sale funds to each national forest, the actual volumes cut and sold and the backlog of timber under contract on December 31, 1962. Also shown is the volume of timber offered but not sold and average prices at which timber was advertised and average prices at which it was sold.

Since accomplishment goals from timber sale funds made available to each national forest are set by fiscal years, it has been necessary to assume that the planned rate of cutting and sales for calendar year 1962 is equal to one-half of the established goals for fiscal year 1962 and one-half for fiscal year 1963. Over a series of years, this assumption will average out. It is not precisely correct for a single year. A high rate of sales activity is scheduled for the last half of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, particularly on the 42 national forests of the Pacific Coast and Inland Empire States where timber demand-supply relationships are critical. This sales activity for this current 6-month period is expected to bring sales up to planned goals on the 42 national forest group. On the other national forests, the possibility of catching up on indicated sales accomplishment below goals will be dependent upon local markets.

The first table in the report is a special summary of the situation on the 42 national forests of the Pacific Coast and Inland Empire States where timber demand-supply relationships are critical. This is a group of forests to which special attention and analysis was given in the forest service statement to the Senate Commerce Committee on June 15, 1962. These 42 national forests account for approximately 75 percent of the allowable cut for saw logs.

Details for every national forest are shown in the series of tables following this summary table. The full statement for each forest is presented in two adjoining sheets. A discussion of the highlights shown by these records follows the table presentation.

This report is the first of a planned series of annual reports on timber sale activities. The Forest Service will be glad to have comments or suggestions for arrangement or subject coverage which would make the report more useful in subsequent years.

HIGHLIGHTS FOR 1962

The 42-national-forest area

The first table of this report summarizes timber sale activities on the 42 national forests of the Pacific Coast and Inland Empire States where timber demand-supply relationships are critical.

During calendar year 1962, the actual cut of 7,032.7 million board feet amounted to 98 percent of the allowable cut as of January 1, 1962, and represented 98 percent of planned work. A volume of 7,112.5 million board feet was sold. This is 99 percent of the annual allowable cut and 92 percent of the planned sell. In addition 145.3 million board feet or 2 percent was advertised, but not sold.

There are some variations from the overall levels of accomplishment that indicate local problems. For example, both sales and cutting are depressed on the Clearwater National Forest in north Idaho because construction of a major road into the North Fork Clearwater River is not yet completed. Accelerated construction to provide access in this area is scheduled for fiscal year 1964. Volume cut on the St. Joe National Forest in Idaho has declined because a major producer shifted cutting from that forest to company-owned and other private and State lands.

Cut and sell accomplishments in California have been variable by forests due in part to changing plans of local operators. On the Sequoia National Forest planned sales have been delayed because of issues raised by organizations opposed to timber cutting on portions of the forest It is expected that this controversy will be settled in time so that the planned sale offerings for fiscal year 1963 will be made before June 30. On the Tahoe National Forest a cut of approximately 50 million board feet in excess of allowable cut rates was expected to result from salvage of timber burned in the last 2 preceding years. The salvable amount proved to be less than anticipated. Cut volume on the Stanislaus National Forest was only 46 percent of planned volume because two major mills were strike bound.

Adjustment of programs on the national forests of Oregon and Washington, and to a lesser extent in northern California, have been necessary to meet the blowdown situation caused by the October 12, 1962 storm. These adjustments are not reflected in the tabulations for calendar year 1962. An accelerated program of salvage sales is now underway which will meet or exceed previously planned sale volume objectives for fiscal year 1963.

Those national forests having a backlog of timber uncut under contract at least twice the annual allowable cut are considered to be in good condition from a sales standpoint. In the 42 forest area, 14 national forests have built up such backlogs. This indicates a need for an expanded sales program on the remaining 28 national forests. For the 42 national forests as a group, the uncut volume under contract equals 1.7 times the annual allowable cut.

The annual allowable cut for the 42 national forests was increased from 7,159 million board feet to 7,706 million board feet on October 12, 1962. These increases will be taken into account in scheduling sale objectives for fiscal year 1964.

General performance in the 42-national-forest area is considered satisfactory though improvement is needed in a few localized situations. The rate of sales during the period January 1 to June 30, 1963, is such that sale volume objectives for fiscal year 1963 generally will be achieved.

National forests outside the 42-national-forest area

There are 112 national forests outside of the 42-national-forest area. Insofar as timber production is concerned, these 112 forests can be grouped into the Rocky Mountain and Intermountain States; the Southwest; the Lake States, Northeast and Southern States; and Alaska. The allowable cut for these 112 national forests is 4.1 billion board feet or 37 percent of the total allowable cut as of January 1, 1962. This includes pulpwood and other products of less than saw-log size for the national forests east of the Great Plains. The 2.6 billion board feet cut in 1962 amounted to 27 percent of the total volume harvested from all national forests.

Rocky Mountain and Intermountain National Forests

Lodgepole pine, Engelmann spruce and Douglas-fir are the predominant species on this group of forests. In addition, there are substantial stands of ponderosa pine in the Black Hills of South Dakota, in southwestern Colorado and on the Dixie National Forest in Utah. In general, this timber is small in size, low in value, and remote from centers of lumber consumption. The rate of lumbering activity is strongly affected by the price swings of the lumber market. Local industries have experienced considerable difficulty in maintaining profitable production during 1962. Appraised timber prices are relatively low and there is little competitive bidding. Installed milling capacity is generally less than permissible allowable cut rates. Additional timber access roads are needed to expand current cutting rates. The rate of sales in 1962 was lower than anticipated because of adverse market conditions. Uncut timber under contract is generally ample and averages more than twice allowable cutting rates. Progress toward marketing the full allowable cut is dependent upon improved markets and increased accessibility through timber access road construction.

Southwestern area

Ponderosa pine is the predominant species in New Mexico and Arizona. Installed milling capacity and allowable cuts are generally approximately in balance. The adequacy of timber supply for mills in this area is demonstrated by nominal competition for national forest timber sale offerings. Timber quality is lower than for ponderosa pine of the Pacific Coast and Inland Empire States. For a variety of economic reasons, the lumber industry of the Southwest has operated on rather narrow margins and is strongly affected by the swing in lumber prices. Because of these factors, sales and cutting in 1962 were not as high as anticipated. Saw log timber under contract but not yet cut is approximately double allowable cut rates. Substantial cutting on a large pulpwood sale to the first pulpmill in the Southwest began in 1962. Sales in this area can be maintained at a rate adequate to supply existing industry. Expansion of sales and cutting rates is dependent primarily on a recovery in the lumber market.

Lake States, northeast and southern forests

In the forests east of the Great Plains, there are substantial markets for material less than saw-log size, primarily for pulpwood. Because of such markets, a separate calculation of allowable cut for material of less than saw-log size is established. This amounts to the equivalent of more than one billion board feet. It was possible to market only 56 percent of this allowable cut in 1962.

In the areas east of the Great Plains, national forest timber is generally a minor portion of the total timber resources available to local plants. During 1962 many purchasers either reduced cutting or shifted operations to other timber ownerships. As a result, the rate of cutting was 89 percent of the anticipated rate. Ninety-seven percent of the planned sales were offered but approximately 200 million board feet or 12 percent of such offerings were not purchased.

Approximately 8 percent of the total allowable cut in this broad area is not yet considered to be marketable. This is primarily hardwood material of less than saw log size, which is not yet in demand by pulpmills. A rise in sale and cutting activity to the levels which had been planned for in 1962 is dependent upon market recovery for lumber and other forest products.

Alaska

Approximately 40 percent of the allowable cut for the national forests in Alaska is now being harvested. The primary markets for this material are the two major pulpmills now in operation. Cutting and sales activity in Alaska in 1962 were substantially on schedule. A major increase in the timber harvesting program is dependent upon additional pulpmill installation. Capacities of the two existing plants have been increased, but there appears to be no immediate prospect for installation of additional pulp plants in Alaska.

Summary of timber sale accomplishment and allowable cut on the 42 national forests of the Pacific coast and inland empire States where timber demand-supply relationships are critical, calendar year 1962

Region and State	National forest	Allowable cut of sawtimber, Jan. 1, 1962	Financed cut, sawtimber (millions of board feet)			Financed sell, sawtimber (millions of board feet)			Advertised, not sold	Uncut volume under contract, Dec. 31, 1962	Average appraised price	Average sold price
			Planned	Accomplished	Percent accomplished	Planned	Accomplished	Percent accomplished				
Region 1:												
Idaho	Clearwater	211	121.0	98.7	82	142.5	63.5	45		248.9	$2.37	$4.50
	Coeur d'Alene	151	131.0	145.4	111	149.0	123.9	83		191.7	4.85	5.98
	Kaniksu	140	133.5	145.2	109	165.0	193.4	117		313.6	4.72	7.28
	Nezperce	112	87.0	81.1	93	113.5	130.5	115		282.5	2.73	6.25
	St. Joe	100	67.5	47.8	71	88.0	110.8	126	4.2	251.4	3.47	3.97
Montana	Flathead	137	128.4	129.7	101	137.5	146.4	106		214.1	4.46	13.01
	Kootenai	185	167.5	168.4	101	191.5	163.2	85	13.0	302.9	2.46	5.31
	Lolo	162	110.5	113.9	103	147.5	196.0	132	1.0	240.3	3.64	6.39
Washington	Colville	80	62.5	71.2	114	103.0	103.5	100		167.5	4.04	7.23
Subtotal		1,278	1,008.9	1,001.4	99	1,237.5	1,230.2	99	18.2	2,212.9		
Region 4: Idaho	Boise	130	135.0	141.9	105	132.5	87.7	66	4.6	145.2	5.61	9.19
	Payette	91	80.3	65.6	82	134.9	63.7	47	13.2	185.5	4.05	4.65
Subtotal		221	215.3	207.5	96	267.4	151.4	57	17.8	330.7		
Region 5: California	Eldorado	116	102.9	74.5	72	130.4	112.7	86	5.9	97.0	7.73	15.48
	Klamath	185	200.7	161.7	81	219.2	153.9	70		206.7	4.85	6.73
	Lassen	99	107.8	109.3	101	114.1	67.4	59		127.1	9.83	16.10
	Mendocino	81	95.7	73.0	76	102.8	79.5	77		78.0	3.96	4.75
	Modoc	51	57.7	48.4	84	67.1	74.2	111		88.0	6.65	10.83
	Plumas	183	193.6	151.8	78	201.6	209.0	104	.3	247.2	10.66	14.35
	Sequoia	101	63.5	39.5	62	90.8	10.0	11	16.9	172.3	6.46	6.46
	Shasta-Trinity	218	221.7	210.1	95	249.7	286.0	115	.6	322.7	10.73	15.92
	Sierra	114	115.2	154.9	134	138.4	117.9	85	18.2	119.5	5.54	7.21
	Six Rivers	156	141.7	133.1	94	179.9	201.4	112	4.7	255.0	9.52	13.73
	Stanislaus	123	128.2	59.4	46	135.4	135.9	100		103.3	7.08	8.38
	Tahoe	130	186.7	123.5	66	108.6	77.4	71		70.0	7.09	13.19
Subtotal		1,557	1,615.4	1,339.2	83	1,738.0	1,525.3	88	46.6	1,913.8		
Region 6:												
Oregon	Deschutes	136	136.7	136.2	100	158.5	102.7	65		259.1	12.77	16.93
	Fremont	126	128.7	91.4	71	103.7	160.2	154	20.8	209.1	14.23	14.41
	Malheur	171	162.3	142.6	88	140.3	193.9	138		353.4	8.61	8.82
	Mount Hood	315	351.7	369.9	105	305.1	334.2	110		560.0	12.94	21.64
	Ochoco	98	121.6	140.2	115	73.1	35.4	48	.3	143.0	7.25	9.56
	Rogue River	126	164.7	209.1	127	174.0	181.3	104		158.8	11.89	15.83
	Siskiyou	179	183.4	177.2	97	188.8	152.3	81		277.6	13.64	18.54
	Siuslaw	327	359.4	345.9	96	318.4	330.4	104	.2	433.6	20.86	25.57
	Umatilla	129	124.4	109.4	88	117.5	93.2	79		280.2	7.99	11.28
	Umpqua	340	352.6	386.1	109	330.5	424.2	125		807.8	15.36	18.74
	Wallowa-Whitman	160	135.0	117.5	87	173.6	162.6	94	13.8	244.8	7.05	7.48
	Willamette	566	599.2	812.5	136	593.3	637.9	108		987.2	15.71	23.68
	Winema	90	100.4	74.8	74	119.8	161.7	135		403.7	14.06	19.84
Washington	Gifford Pinchot	395	475.8	442.8	93	506.8	433.2	85	3.5	925.5	11.20	19.50
	Mount Baker	201	236.4	226.8	96	217.9	209.7	96		438.0	5.07	11.19
	Okanogan	90	77.4	83.0	107	118.0	115.1	98	3.2	98.0	6.48	7.44
	Olympic	341	293.5	273.4	93	377.4	186.1	49		881.2	6.62	8.49
	Snoqualmie	207	221.3	222.6	101	352.0	183.9	52	19.6	433.7	13.39	18.55
	Wenatchee	106	134.0	123.2	92	117.1	107.6	92	1.3	174.5	8.56	9.83
Subtotal		4,103	4,358.5	4,484.6	103	4,494.8	4,205.6	94	62.7	8,069.2		
Grand total		7,159	7,198.1	7,032.7	98	7,737.7	7,112.5	92	145.3	12,526.6		

Summary of timber sale accomplishment and allowable cut on the national forests, calendar year 1962

[Millions of board feet]

Region and national forest	Annual allowable cut									Financed cut, calendar year 1962					Financed sell, calendar year 1962				
	Jan. 1, 1961			Jan. 1, 1962			Jan. 1, 1963			January-June	July-December	Total		Percent accomplished	January-June	July-December	Total		Percent accomplished
	Saw-timber	Convertible products	Total volume	Saw-timber	Convertible products	Total volume	Saw-timber	Convertible products	Total volume			Planned	Accomplishment				Planned	Accomplishment	
Region 1:																			
Clearwater	158.0		158.0	211.0		211.0	212.0		212.0	66.0	55.0	121.0	98.7	82	65.0	77.5	142.5	63.5	45
Coeur d'Alene	127.0		127.0	151.0		151.0	145.0		145.0	66.5	64.5	131.0	145.4	111	73.5	75.5	149.0	123.9	83
Kaniksu	132.0		132.0	140.0		140.0	147.0		147.0	66.0	67.5	133.5	145.2	109	82.5	82.5	165.0	193.4	117
Nezperce	98.0		98.0	112.0		112.0	110.0		110.0	45.0	42.0	87.0	81.1	93	60.0	53.5	113.5	130.5	115
St. Joe	52.0		52.0	100.0		100.0	99.0		99.0	37.5	30.0	67.5	47.8	71	42.5	45.5	88.0	110.8	126
Beaverhead	35.4		35.4	35.4		35.4	36.4		36.4	5.0	5.5	10.5	6.3	60	12.5	2.5	15.0	5.7	38
Bitterroot	26.0		26.0	26.0		26.0	45.7		45.7	20.0	22.5	42.5	76.8	181	32.5	23.5	56.0	34.1	61
Custer	10.2		10.2	18.2		18.2	18.2		18.2	1.4	1.5	2.9	1.6	55	3.3	7.5	10.8	1.8	17
Deerlodge	39.0		39.0	39.0		39.0	39.0		39.0	10.0	10.5	20.5	11.6	57	13.0	13.0	26.0	2.0	8
Flathead	116.0		116.0	137.0		137.0	136.0		136.0	65.0	63.4	128.4	129.7	101	67.5	70.0	137.5	146.4	106
Gallatin	43.0		43.0	47.0		47.0	49.9		49.9	12.5	12.0	24.5	32.9	134	27.5	25.0	52.5	44.5	85
Helena	35.7		35.7	35.7		35.7	36.5		36.5	10.0	9.5	19.5	17.0	87	27.5	22.5	50.0	24.0	48
Kootenai	164.0		164.0	185.0		185.0	182.0		182.0	85.0	82.5	167.5	168.4	101	95.0	96.5	191.5	163.2	85
Lewis and Clark	52.5		52.5	56.2		56.2	57.5		57.5	6.7	7.5	14.2	20.2	142	15.0	7.5	22.5	14.6	65
Lolo	157.0		157.0	162.0		162.0	162.0		162.0	58.0	52.5	110.5	113.9	103	75.0	72.5	147.5	195.0	132
Colville	68.0		68.0	80.0		80.0	79.0		79.0	32.5	30.0	62.5	71.2	114	55.0	48.0	103.0	103.5	100
Total	1,313.8		1,313.8	1,535.5		1,535.5	1,555.2		1,555.2	587.1	556.4	1,143.5	1,167.8	102	747.3	723.0	1,470.3	1,356.9	92
Region 2:																			
Arapaho	21.5		21.5	21.5		21.5	28.5		28.5	9.0	9.0	18.0	25.7	143	18.5	20.5	39.0	19.6	50
Grand Mesa-Uncompahgre	17.5		17.5	17.5		17.5	40.0		40.0	9.0	7.0	16.0	10.5	66	22.5	25.0	47.5	10.2	21
Gunnison	29.5		29.5	29.5		29.5	29.5		29.5	5.0	4.0	9.0	2.0	22	27.5	25.5	53.0	2.8	5
Pike	4.6		4.6	4.6		4.6	10.0		10.0	2.0	2.5	4.5	3.3	73	2.0	5.5	7.5	1.3	17
Rio Grande	28.8		28.8	28.8		28.8	28.8		28.8	12.5	5.0	17.5	10.3	59	22.0	20.5	42.5	34.4	81
Roosevelt	21.0		21.0	21.0		21.0	28.3		28.3	5.0	4.0	9.0	11.6	129	11.5	17.5	29.0	5.4	19
Routt	32.7		32.7	50.7		50.7	50.7		50.7	13.5	11.5	25.0	29.8	119	27.0	32.5	59.5	49.8	84
San Isabel	9.0		9.0	9.0		9.0	10.0		10.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	3.7	92	6.5	2.5	9.0	1.8	20
San Juan	50.0		50.0	50.0		50.0	50.0		50.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	38.4	77	76.0	85.0	161.0	134.9	84
White River	9.0		9.0	9.0		9.0	38.8		38.8	6.5	5.0	11.5	11.3	98	37.5	11.5	49.0	32.4	66
Nebraska										.5	.2	.7	.6	86	1.5	.5	2.0	.8	40
Black Hills	60.1		60.1	60.1		60.1	60.1		60.1	32.5	25.0	57.5	49.1	85	32.5	50.0	82.5	58.1	70
Bighorn	15.0		15.0	15.0		15.0	15.0		15.0	7.5	4.0	11.5	4.6	40	29.0	15.0	44.0	3.9	9
Medicine Bow	50.0		50.0	60.1		60.1	60.1		60.1	25.0	20.0	45.0	30.9	69	59.5	25.5	85.0	7.1	8
Shoshone	15.0		15.0	15.0		15.0	15.0		15.0	6.0	5.5	11.5	16.7	145	19.0	17.5	36.5	37.5	103
Total	363.7		363.7	391.8		391.8	464.8		464.8	161.0	129.7	290.7	248.5	85	392.5	354.5	747.0	400.0	54
Region 3:																			
Apache	69.7		69.7	68.7		68.7	68.7		68.7	39.1	43.0	82.1	50.5	62	9.2	7.9	17.1	3.4	20
Coconino	56.8		56.8	56.8		56.8	56.8		56.8	31.6	42.2	73.8	66.6	90	29.2	29.1	58.3	14.1	24
Coronado	6.0		6.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	1.4	35	2.0	1.5	3.5	1.3	37
Kaibab	44.3		44.3	54.0		54.0	54.0		54.0	31.4	35.0	66.4	45.9	69	24.5	19.8	44.3	33.8	76
Prescott	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	2.5	2.2	4.7	3.0	64	2.9	2.2	5.1	15.9	312
Sitgreaves	56.2		56.2	56.2		56.2	56.2		56.2	34.8	37.5	72.3	76.4	106	7.2	14.4	21.6	15.8	73
Tonto	7.0		7.0	7.0		7.0	7.0		7.0	5.4	8.5	13.9	15.1	109	.7	.4	1.1	2.1	191
Carson	21.9		21.9	29.7		29.7	29.7		29.7	25.8	31.1	56.9	18.5	33	6.0	4.0	10.0	21.5	215
Cibola	18.0		18.0	18.0		18.0	18.0		18.0	4.5	3.0	7.5	4.9	65	5.0	3.2	8.2	6.5	79
Gila	30.3		30.3	30.3		30.3	30.3		30.3	15.2	16.6	31.8	6.1	19	14.2	19.1	33.3	3.0	9
Lincoln	12.0		12.0	10.3		10.3	10.3		10.3	4.7	7.0	11.7	5.3	45	10.3	9.4	19.7	5.5	28
Santa Fe	44.4		44.4	44.9		44.9	46.6		46.6	22.1	21.7	43.8	13.5	31	27.3	24.4	51.7	22.1	43
Total	370.6		370.6	383.9		383.9	385.6		385.6	219.1	249.8	468.9	307.2	66	138.5	135.4	273.9	145.0	53
Region 4:																			
Boise	130.0		130.0	130.0		130.0	135.0		135.0	68.0	67.0	135.0	141.9	105	64.0	68.5	132.5	87.7	66
Caribou	8.0		8.0	7.8		7.8	7.8		7.8	.3	1.5	1.8	2.2	122	.1	1.2	1.3	2.1	162
Challis	10.0		10.0	25.8		25.8	10.0		10.0	1.7	1.7	3.4	2.6	76	1.4	4.4	5.8	2.8	48
Payette	91.0		91.0	91.0		91.0	95.0		95.0	40.0	40.3	80.3	65.6	82	80.4	54.5	134.9	63.7	47
Salmon	20.0		20.0	24.5		24.5	24.5		24.5	9.4	12.0	21.4	18.9	88	10.4	16.5	26.9	14.1	52
Sawtooth	21.0		21.0	21.0		21.0	21.0		21.0	5.7	8.6	14.3	12.6	88	27.0	8.8	35.8	22.4	63
Targhee	40.0		40.0	69.0		69.0	50.0		50.0	7.2	16.5	23.7	11.0	46	7.5	11.4	18.9	19.0	101
Humboldt													.1					.1	
Toiyabe	7.0		7.0	25.0		25.0	17.7		17.7	4.0	4.5	8.5	2.0	24	2.4	6.0	8.4	.9	11
Ashley	18.5		18.5	32.4		32.4	24.2		24.2	6.4	6.0	12.4	9.2	74	4.0	9.5	13.5	1.4	10
Cache	8.0		8.0	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0	1.3	1.4	2.7	2.0	74	.6	2.2	2.8	.9	32
Dixie	30.1		30.1	30.1		30.1	32.1		32.1	13.5	13.3	26.8	25.0	93	13.0	19.5	32.5	47.9	147
Fishlake	3.0		3.0	12.7		12.7	12.7		12.7	1.1	1.6	2.7	1.4	52	4.1	4.5	8.6	.4	5
Manti-La Sal	7.5		7.5	11.2		11.2	31.3		31.3	7.4	5.5	12.9	14.3	111	1.6	3.0	4.6	2.1	46
Uinta	3.0		3.0	13.8		13.8	13.5		13.5	2.3	4.0	6.3	3.7	59	3.2	7.6	10.8	4.2	39
Wasatch	16.0		16.0	15.0		15.0	27.5		27.5	12.5	5.7	18.2	6.5	36	19.2	9.6	28.8	2.3	8
Bridger	54.8		54.8	54.8		54.8	51.5		51.5	10.6	9.5	20.1	11.7	58	4.1	20.0	24.1	3.7	15
Teton	16.0		16.0	25.1		25.1	29.5		29.5	4.6	5.8	10.4	13.0	125	17.5	15.4	32.9	3.2	
Total	483.9		483.9	594.2		594.2	588.3		588.3	196.0	204.9	400.9	343.7	86	260.5	262.6	523.1	272.5	52
Region 5:																			
Angeles							3.4		3.4	3.7	.7	4.4	.7	16	1.6	.5	2.1	1.2	57
Cleveland				.2		.2	.2		.2	.1	.1	.2	.1	50	.1	.1	.2	.1	50
Eldorado	96.0		96.0	116.0		116.0	130.0		130.0	50.7	52.2	102.9	74.5	72	63.4	67.0	130.4	112.7	86
Inyo	19.2		19.2	19.2		19.2	19.2		19.2	8.5	7.0	15.5	11.7	75	4.2	6.0	10.2	5.5	54
Klamath	183.0		183.0	185.0		185.0	238.0		238.0	100.2	100.5	200.7	161.7	81	103.2	116.0	219.2	153.9	70
Lassen	95.0		95.0	99.0		99.0	170.0		170.0	51.9	55.9	107.8	109.3	101	55.1	59.0	114.1	67.4	59
Los Padres							3.6		3.6	.1	2.3	2.4	4.6	192	3.2		3.2	6.3	197
Mendocino	76.0		76.0	81.0		81.0	89.0		89.0	49.7	46.0	95.7	73.0	76	45.3	57.5	102.8	79.5	77
Modoc	51.0		51.0	51.0		51.0	62.0		62.0	29.1	28.6	57.7	48.4	84	31.6	35.5	67.1	74.2	111
Plumas	169.0		169.0	183.0		183.0	218.0		218.0	100.1	93.5	193.6	151.8	78	100.6	101.0	201.6	209.0	104
San Bernardino							11.0		11.0	5.0	10.2	15.2	10.1	66	5.9	9.0	14.9	5.3	36
Sequoia	86.0		86.0	101.0		101.0	110.0		110.0	32.8	30.7	63.5	39.5	62	51.8	39.0	90.8	10.0	11
Shasta-Trinity	218.0		218.0	218.0		218.0	284.0		284.0	107.7	114.0	221.7	210.1	95	124.2	125.5	249.7	286.0	115
Sierra	91.0		91.0	114.0		114.0	152.0		152.0	48.3	66.9	115.2	154.9	134	63.4	75.0	138.4	117.9	85
Six Rivers	162.0		162.0	156.0		156.0	198.0		198.0	65.0	76.7	141.7	133.1	94	87.4	92.5	179.9	201.4	112
Stanislaus	102.0		102.0	123.0		123.0	139.0		139.0	61.3	66.9	128.2	59.4	46	63.4	72.0	135.4	135.9	100
Tahoe	109.0		109.0	130.0		130.0	149.0		149.0	119.5	67.2	186.7	123.5	66	58.1	50.5	108.6	77.4	71
Total	1,457.2		1,457.2	1,576.4		1,576.4	1,976.4		1,976.4	833.7	819.4	1,653.1	1,366.4	83	862.5	906.1	1,768.6	1,543.7	87
Region 6:																			
Deschutes	136.0		136.0	136.0		136.0	138.0		138.0	75.0	61.7	136.7	136.2	100	72.1	86.4	158.5	102.7	65
Fremont	126.0		126.0	126.0		126.0	129.0		129.0	70.5	58.2	128.7	91.4	71	40.1	63.6	103.7	160.2	154
Malheur	138.0		138.0	171.0		171.0	171.0		171.0	81.4	80.9	162.3	142.6	88	54.6	85.7	140.3	193.9	138
Mount Hood	315.0		315.0	315.0		315.0	330.0		330.0	185.9	165.8	351.7	309.9	105	134.5	170.6	305.1	334.2	110
Ochoco	96.0		96.0	98.0		98.0	98.0		98.0	70.8	50.8	121.6	140.2	115	22.9	50.2	73.1	35.4	48
Rogue River	135.0		135.0	126.0		126.0	176.0		176.0	90.3	74.4	164.7	209.1	127	89.5	84.5	174.0	181.3	104
Siskiyou	185.0		185.0	179.0		179.0	191.0		191.0	90.2	93.2	183.4	177.2	97	100.4	88.4	188.8	152.3	81
Siuslaw	315.0		315.0	327.0		327.0	334.0		334.0	187.6	171.8	359.4	345.9	96	155.4	163.0	318.4	330.4	104
Umatilla	110.0		110.0	129.0		129.0	135.0		135.0	56.4	68.0	124.4	109.4	88	61.8	55.7	117.5	93.2	79
Umpqua	303.0		303.0	340.0		340.0	357.0		357.0	172.0	180.6	352.6	386.1	109	161.0	178.5	339.5	424.2	125
Wallowa-Whitman	121.0		121.0	160.0		160.0	168.0		168.0	71.4	63.6	135.0	117.5	87	71.9	101.7	173.6	162.6	94
Willamette	529.0		529.0	566.0		566.0	615.0		615.0	288.4	310.8	599.2	812.5	136	296.9	296.9	593.3	637.9	108
Winema	90.0		90.0	90.0		90.0	91.0		91.0	58.9	41.5	100.4	74.8	74	70.2	49.6	119.8	161.7	135
Gifford Pinchot	395.0		395.0	395.0		395.0	381.0		381.0	237.7	238.1	475.8	442.8	93	294.6	212.2	506.8	433.2	85
Mount Baker	201.0		201.0	201.0		201.0	164.0		164.0	121.9	114.5	236.4	226.8	96	117.3	100.6	217.9	209.7	96
Okanogan	70.0		70.0	90.0		90.0	90.0		90.0	37.7	39.7	77.4	83.0	107	58.0	60.0	118.0	115.1	98
Olympic	341.0		341.0	341.0		341.0	343.0		343.0	148.2	145.3	293.5	273.4	93	228.7	148.7	377.4	186.1	49
Snoqualmie	207.0		207.0	207.0		207.0	229.0		229.0	117.0	104.3	221.3	222.6	101	167.1	184.9	352.0	183.9	52
Wenatchee	107.0		107.0	106.0		106.0	125.0		125.0	69.4	64.6	134.0	123.2	92	63.2	53.9	117.1	107.6	92
Total	3,920.0		3,920.0	4,103.0		4,103.0	4,265.0		4,265.0	2,230.7	2,127.8	4,358.5	4,484.6	103	2,260.2	2,234.6	4,494.8	4,205.6	94
Region 7:																			
Cumberland	24.9	13.5	38.4	24.9	13.5	38.4	24.9	13.5	38.4	11.5	12.0	23.5	20.5	87	12.5	15.5	28.0	23.7	85
White Mountain	11.0	12.0	23.0	11.0	12.0	23.0	15.0	40.0	55.0	12.5	12.0	24.5	24.8	101	8.0	12.5	20.5	16.4	80
Allegheny	9.3	64.0	73.3	25.0	73.8	98.8	25.0	73.8	98.8	13.5	13.0	26.5	27.5	104	17.5	19.0	36.5	27.0	74
Green Mountain	7.0	8.0	15.0	7.0	8.0	15.0	18.0	22.5	40.5	5.1	5.0	10.1	9.9	98	6.0	6.5	12.5	10.6	85
George Washington	25.7	64.6	90.3	20.0	52.0	72.0	20.0	52.0	72.0	15.5	13.5	29.0	25.5	88	13.5	14.5	28.0	23.4	84
Jefferson	13.6	28.4	42.0	13.6	28.4	42.0	13.6	28.4	42.0	8.0	7.5	15.5	13.8	89	10.0	10.5	20.5	19.2	94
Monongahela	31.0	44.0	75.0	31.0	44.0	75.0	31.0	44.0	75.0	17.0	16.5	33.5	29.5	88	20.5	21.5	42.0	38.7	92
Total	122.5	234.5	357.0	132.5	231.7	64.2	147.5	274.2	21.7	83.1	79.5	162.6	151.5	93	88.0	100.0	188.0	159.0	85
Region 8:																			
Alabama	43.1	11.5	54.6	42.8	16.5	59.3	45.3	21.3	66.6	34.5	27.5	62.0	57.3	92	26.5	29.0	55.5	52.8	95
Ouachita	89.9	43.1	133.0	89.2	42.4	131.6	89.2	42.4	131.6	72.5	65.0	137.5	120.7	88	67.5	68.0	135.5	134.2	99
Ozark-St. Francis	35.6	4.7	40.3	36.5	4.6	41.1	36.5	4.6	41.1	24.0	20.0	44.0	34.9	79	22.5	22.5	45.0	54.6	121
Florida	14.3	47.1	61.4	14.3	46.6	60.9	14.3	46.6	60.9	41.5	35.0	76.5	72.8	95	39.5	42.0	81.5	87.4	107
Georgia	38.0	5.9	43.9	44.0	5.9	49.9	44.0	5.9	49.9	26.5	22.5	49.0	42.5	87	28.0	29.0	57.0	47.8	84
Kisatchie	40.8	25.1	65.9	44.9	27.5	72.4	44.9	27.5	72.4	43.5	31.5	75.0	69.5	93	41.0	42.0	83.0	56.1	68
Mississippi	96.3	53.7	150.0	99.4	75.9	175.3	102.1	73.0	175.1	77.5	75.0	152.5	159.1	104	84.5	87.0	171.5	158.4	92
North Carolina	42.5	19.2	61.7	43.3	18.4	61.7	38.9	10.2	49.1	27.5	25.0	52.5	45.4	86	32.0	33.0	65.0	60.8	94
South Carolina	39.4	23.1	62.5	39.4	23.1	62.5	39.4	23.1	62.5	45.0	45.0	90.0	93.2	104	50.0	53.0	103.0	115.3	112
Cherokee	23.5	1.5	25.0	22.1	1.7	23.8	20.9	5.2	26.1	19.5	17.5	37.0	32.6	88	19.5	23.0	42.5	35.6	84
Texas	69.6	38.9	108.5	69.5	39.0	108.5	69.5	39.0	108.5	70.0	50.0	120.0	89.3	74	54.0	62.5	116.5	70.4	60
Total	533.0	273.8	806.8	545.4	301.6	847.0	545.0	298.8	843.8	482.0	414.0	896.0	817.3	91	465.0	491.0	956.0	873.4	91

Summary of timber sale accomplishment and allowable cut on the national forests, calendar year 1962—Continued

[Millions of board feet]

Region and national forest	Annual allowable cut									Financed cut, calendar year 1962					Financed sell, calendar year 1962				
	Jan. 1, 1961			Jan. 1, 1962			Jan. 1, 1963			January-June	July-December	Total		Percent accomplished	January-June	July-December	Total		Percent accomplished
	Saw-timber	Convertible products	Total volume	Saw-timber	Convertible products	Total volume	Saw-timber	Convertible products	Total volume			Planned	Accomplishment				Planned	Accomplishment	
Region 9:																			
Chequamegon	8.4	60.6	69.0	8.4	60.6	69.0	8.4	60.6	69.0	17.6	15.3	32.9	27.0	82	20.2	18.5	38.7	42.0	109
Nicolet	5.2	32.9	38.1	5.2	32.9	38.1	5.2	32.9	38.1	18.7	17.2	35.9	34.9	97	20.4	22.1	42.5	35.4	83
Chippewa	4.3	43.7	48.0	8.4	70.9	79.3	8.4	70.9	79.3	18.4	20.3	38.7	30.2	78	20.0	22.8	42.8	50.6	118
Superior	13.2	170.1	183.3	13.2	170.1	183.3	13.2	170.1	183.3	52.5	47.5	100.0	73.0	73	90.2	90.1	180.3	56.9	32
Missouri	47.0	5.8	52.8	50.0	9.4	59.4	50.0	9.4	59.4	17.4	16.5	33.9	23.7	70	20.5	22.1	42.6	27.0	63
Hiawatha	7.5	49.3	56.8	7.5	49.3	56.8	7.5	49.3	56.8	20.9	18.3	39.2	36.1	92	26.5	25.0	51.5	48.1	93
Lower Michigan	6.0	53.0	59.0	6.0	53.0	59.0	6.0	53.0	59.0	29.2	26.5	55.7	48.0	86	25.4	25.7	51.1	51.3	100
Ottawa	10.7	32.2	42.9	10.7	32.2	42.9	10.7	32.2	42.9	22.6	24.0	46.6	40.4	87	25.6	26.1	51.7	40.8	79
Shawnee	5.8		5.8	10.1	2.0	12.1	10.1	2.0	12.1	2.7	3.6	6.3	14.3	227	2.0	2.3	4.3	17.2	400
Wayne-Hoosier	10.4	.9	11.3	9.7	2.5	12.2	9.7	2.5	12.2	5.0	5.2	10.2	8.2	80	6.7	5.8	12.5	9.1	73
Total[1]	118.5	448.5	567.0	129.2	482.9	612.1	129.2	482.9	612.1	205.0	194.4	399.4	335.8	84	257.5	260.5	518.0	378.4	73
Region 10:																			
Chugach	79.0		79.0	79.0		79.0	79.0		79.0	6.3	3.5	9.8	7.2	73	3.3	4.3	7.6	1.0	13
North Tongass	530.1		530.1	530.1		530.1	530.1		530.1	85.0	79.8	164.8	177.2	108	83.9	49.6	133.5	59.6	45
South Tongass	270.0		270.0	294.2		294.2	293.8		293.8	93.6	91.2	184.8	189.2	102	48.2	28.3	76.5	137.8	180
Total	879.1		879.1	903.3		903.3	902.9		902.9	184.9	174.5	359.4	373.4	104	135.4	82.2	217.6	198.4	91
Grand total	9,562.3	956.8	10,519.1	10,295.2	1,016.2	11,311.4	10,959.9	1,055.9	12,015.8	5,182.6	4,950.4	10,133.0	9,596.2	95	5,607.4	5,549.9	11,157.3	9,532.9	85

[1] All conifers except hemlock, white pine and red pine measured as cordwood. Aspen and balm of gilead measured only as cordwood.

Region and national forest	Advertised but not sold, calendar year 1962 (millions of board feet)			Uncut volume under contract, Dec 31, 1962 (millions of board feet)	Average appraised price per thousand sold, calendar year 1962						Average sold, price per thousand for advertised sales sold, calendar year 1962					
	January-June	July-December	Total volume		Sawtimber			Pulpwood			Sawtimber			Pulpwood		
					January-June	July-December	Entire year	January-June	July-December	Entire year	January-June	July-December	Entire year	January-June	July-December	Entire year
Region 1:																
Clearwater				248.9	$2.37		$2.37				$4.50		$4.50			
Coeur d'Alene				191.7	4.52	$5.30	4.85				4.99	$7.32	5.98			
Kaniksu				313.6	5.37	4.33	4.72				8.42	6.61	7.28			
Nezperce				282.5	2.42	4.51	2.73				6.28	6.10	6.25			
St. Joe	4.2		4.2	251.4	2.24	4.56	3.47				2.84	4.97	3.97			
Beaverhead				76.2		1.95	1.95					2.24	2.24			
Bitterroot				60.3	2.91	3.61	3.20				5.61	7.36	6.33			
Custer		.7	.7	8.4	5.00		5.00				5.01		5.01			
Deerlodge				89.7												
Flathead				214.1	3.13	6.07	4.46				12.36	13.78	13.01			
Gallatin		5.5	5.5	72.7	1.97	3.57	2.17				1.97	3.58	2.17			
Helena	4.4		4.4	87.7	2.04		2.04				2.04		2.04			
Kootenai	8.5	4.5	13.0	302.9	2.45	2.50	2.46				5.75	3.74	5.31			
Lewis and Clark				142.1	2.27	2.00	2.24				3.41	3.20	3.30			
Lolo		1.0	1.0	240.3	2.70	6.08	3.64				5.53	8.63	6.39			
Colville				167.5	4.42	3.62	4.04				8.44	5.85	7.23			
Total	17.1	11.7	28.8	2,750.0	3.06	4.65	3.63				6.15	7.31	6.56			
Region 2:																
Arapaho		20.0	20.0	44.0	2.00	2.00	2.00				4.80	2.00	3.78			
Grand Mesa-Uncompahgre		.6	.6	63.3	2.54	5.49	3.63				8.58	6.49	7.85			
Gunnison		3.2	3.2	156.7	2.00	2.62	2.17				5.05	5.86	5.28			
Pike				15.8		6.75	6.75					6.75	6.75			
Rio Grande				86.3	8.20	2.70	2.78				8.30	2.71	2.80			
Roosevelt		76.8	76.8	43.3		4.38	4.38					4.43	4.43			
Routt				48.5	2.58	3.57	2.67				3.57	3.33	3.35			
San Isabel		.2	.2	10.6		4.13	4.13					3.45	3.45			
San Juan				338.1	2.73	2.00	2.17				4.35	6.14	5.72			
White River		11.6	11.6	70.3		2.13	2.13					2.17	2.17			
Nebraska				.3												
Black Hills	6.0	48.3	54.3	132.2	5.11	5.42	5.26				5.26	5.94	5.58			
Bighorn		14.4	14.4	32.2		3.37	3.37					3.37	3.37			
Medicine Bow				192.4	2.00		2.00				2.00		2.00			
Shoshone				51.0	1.89	1.82	1.85				2.64	1.91	2.26			
Total	6.0	181.9	187.9	1,285.0	2.68	2.48	2.56				4.27	6.28	5.50			
Region 3:																
Apache				1,369.0	6.55	6.84	6.80				6.55	6.84	6.80			
Coconino				666.0		5.17	5.17					5.20	5.20			
Coronado				1.4	9.85		9.85				9.85		9.85			
Kaibab				572.2	3.00	4.63	4.38				3.00	4.63	4.38			
Prescott		.8	.8	12.6		3.09	3.09					3.09	3.09			
Sitgreaves				645.0	8.30	4.29	8.15				8.36	8.31	8.36			
Tonto				305.0	3.00		3.00				3.00		3.00			
Carson				78.0	[2] 1.11	4.16	2.75				2.05	4.10	2.70			
Cibola				2.5	5.19	4.88	4.92				8.29	5.51	6.06			
Gila				21.6	4.86	2.53	3.28				4.86	2.53	3.28			
Lincoln				17.0	8.70	6.34	7.52				10.35	8.21	9.28			
Santa Fe		13.1	13.1	42.3	2.75	2.70	2.72				2.75	2.70	2.72			
Total		13.9	13.9	3,732.6	3.99	4.07	4.04				4.18	4.13	4.15			
Region 4:																
Boise		4.6	4.6	145.2	5.36	6.60	5.61				9.59	7.56	9.19			
Caribou				.4	4.20	3.90	4.05				4.48	3.90	4.19			
Challis				11.0	3.00	2.80	2.86				3.00	2.80	2.86			
Payette		13.2	13.2	185.5	4.98	2.64	4.05				5.05	4.04	4.65			
Salmon	3.6		3.6	25.8	3.51		3.51				3.59		3.59			
Sawtooth				45.2	3.85	3.85	3.85				7.88	3.97	5.87			
Targhee		2.8	2.8	372.7		2.32	2.32					2.32	2.32			
Humboldt																
Toiyabe				9.5		2.32	2.32					2.83	2.83			
Ashley				25.7	5.50	4.10	4.84				5.50	5.35	5.42			
Cache				1.3	3.00		3.00				3.00		3.00			
Dixie		1.8	1.8	34.3	5.83	4.27	5.12				5.91	4.27	5.17			
Fishlake				5.1		4.40	4.40					4.40	4.40			
Manti-La Sal	1.2	.4	1.6	8.9		3.51	3.51					4.62	4.62			
Uinta	.5		.5	.2	2.79		2.79				2.98		2.98			
Wasatch		28.2	28.2	17.6		5.20	5.20					5.25	5.25			
Bridger		7.4	7.4	25.5	3.50	3.69	3.60				4.95	3.69	4.32			
Teton		.7	.7	9.5		1.90	1.90					1.90	1.90			
Total	5.3	59.1	64.4	923.4	5.32	3.80	4.80				7.27	4.30	6.26			
Region 5:																
Eldorado	5.9		5.9	97.0	6.79	10.00	7.73				14.56	17.70	15.48			
Inyo				4.0		1.40	1.40					1.40	1.40			
Klamath				206.7	4.51	5.34	4.85				7.50	5.64	6.73			
Lassen				127.1	9.65	5.00	9.53				16.11	16.10	16.10			
Los Padres				1.8	2.65		2.65				2.65		2.65			
Mendocino				78.0	5.19	3.44	3.96				5.50	4.43	4.75			
Modoc				88.0	2.91	9.14	6.65				10.31	11.17	10.83			
Plumas	.3		.3	247.2	10.36	11.33	10.66				14.66	13.65	14.35			
San Bernardino				6.5	3.70		3.70				3.70		3.70			
Sequoia		16.9	16.9	172.3	8.45	6.03	6.46				8.45	6.03	6.46			
Shasta-Trinity		.6	.6	322.7	9.33	14.33	10.73				14.90	18.55	15.92			
Sierra	9.8	8.4	18.2	110.5	5.06	8.74	5.54				6.42	12.49	7.21			
Six Rivers		4.7	4.7	255.0	8.90	12.29	9.52				13.31	15.62	13.73			
Stanislaus				130.3	7.70	5.39	7.08				8.16	8.98	8.38			
Tahoe				70.0	7.22	6.57	7.09				12.89	14.35	13.19			
Total	16.0	30.6	46.6	1,926.1	7.87	8.83	8.17				12.13	11.65	11.98			
Region 6:																
Deschutes				259.1	15.21	9.63	12.77				18.80	14.53	16.93			
Fremont	8.3	12.5	20.8	209.1	14.52	12.78	14.23				14.58	13.53	14.41			
Malheur				353.4	7.80	9.62	8.61				8.14	9.67	8.82			
Mount Hood				560.0	11.15	18.15	12.94				18.96	29.44	21.64			
Ochoco		.3	.3	143.0	6.99	7.30	7.25				8.76	9.70	9.56			
Rogue River				158.8	11.53	13.00	11.89				14.44	20.18	15.83			
Siskiyou				277.6	12.65	15.10	13.64				16.75	21.20	18.54			
Siuslaw		.2	.2	433.6	20.33	23.07	20.86				25.33	26.56	25.57			
Umatilla				280.2	8.31	6.28	7.99				11.75	8.81	11.28			
Umpqua				807.8	13.45	16.56	15.36				16.49	20.14	18.74			
Wallowa-Whitman	1.0	12.8	13.8	244.8	6.23	10.35	7.05				6.77	10.36	7.48			
Willamette				987.2	14.40	18.26	15.71				21.16	28.56	23.68			

[2] Spruce salvage.

Summary of timber sale accomplishment and allowable cut on the national forests, calendar year 1962—Continued

Region and national forest	Advertised but not sold, calendar year 1962 (millions of board feet)			Uncut volume under contract, Dec. 31, 1962 (millions of board feet)	Average appraised price per thousand sold, calendar year 1962						Average sold, price per thousand for advertised sales sold, calendar year 1962					
					Sawtimber			Pulpwood			Sawtimber			Pulpwood		
	January-June	July-December	Total volume		January-June	July-December	Entire year	January-June	July-December	Entire year	January-June	July-December	Entire year	January-June	July-December	Entire year
Region 6—Continued																
Winema				403.7	$15.72	$10.42	$14.08				$23.65	$11.36	$19.84			
Gifford Pinchot	0.2	3.3	3.5	925.5	10.21	15.62	11.20				18.93	22.07	19.50			
Mount Baker				438.0	6.17	3.66	5.07				15.51	5.66	11.19			
Okanogan		3.2	3.2	98.0	4.62	7.42	6.48				6.52	7.92	7.44			
Olympic				881.2	6.32	6.82	6.62				9.00	8.16	8.49			
Snoqualmie	.3	19.3	10.6	433.7	12.46	13.89	13.39				18.67	18.48	18.55			
Wenatchee	1.3		1.3	174.5	7.56	14.25	8.56				8.57	17.01	9.83			
Total east side					10.39	9.41	10.07				12.48	10.75	11.90			
Total west side					12.80	14.85	13.55				19.11	20.67	19.68			
Total	11.1	51.6	62.7	8,069.2	12.14	13.53	12.64				17.30	18.26	17.64			
Region 7:																
Cumberland	1.3	1.0	2.3	16.3	14.29	14.89	14.51		$3.00	$3.00	15.63	16.24	15.85		$3.39	$3.39
White Mountain		.1	.1	30.9	16.07	15.42	15.65	$8.64	1.26	4.74	20.11	16.36	17.65	$10.96	1.29	5.85
Allegheny	5.5		5.5	32.9	42.56	40.05	41.73	1.08	1.67	1.29	52.01	53.73	52.59	1.08	1.67	1.29
Green Mountain	.1		.1	9.9	25.19		25.19	3.00		3.00	32.77		32.77	3.04		3.04
George Washington	.4	3.2	3.6	55.4	20.11	18.91	19.84		1.46	1.46	20.11	19.01	19.86		1.46	1.46
Jefferson	.2		.2	18.2	11.33	16.05	13.36		1.30	1.30	16.98	19.33	17.99		1.53	1.53
Monongahela	4.9	1.8	6.7	37.8	18.72	18.64	18.69	.82	1.05	.87	21.38	18.65	20.29	.95	1.25	1.01
Total	12.4	6.1	18.5	200.9	23.47	21.39	22.75	2.59	2.46	3.08	28.09	25.77	27.93	3.04	1.55	2.38
Region 8:																
Alabama	1.8	5.5	7.3	80.0	22.28	24.33	22.60	4.31	4.11	4.20	24.83	28.90	25.64	4.83	4.38	4.58
Ouachita		1.9	1.9	105.3	23.64	26.02	24.22	2.44	3.44	2.74	28.31	32.20	29.27	2.78	3.66	3.04
Ozark		.3	.3	42.5	15.89	16.95	16.09	5.76	5.25	5.62	19.09	20.34	19.33	6.44	5.32	6.13
Florida	4.5	.7	5.2	130.0	29.96	29.03	29.64	10.78	10.64	10.72	33.49	31.08	32.69	11.98	13.18	12.56
Georgia	.8	.5	1.3	33.7	21.05	24.89	22.32	12.16	11.13	11.36	27.42	30.76	28.52	13.06	11.88	12.15
Kisatchie	4.6	3.7	8.3	73.5	20.78	20.51	20.67	7.22	7.24	7.22	22.27	22.34	22.30	7.76	7.68	7.70
Mississippi	10.1	15.5	25.6	126.7	20.84	21.28	20.58	7.06	7.39	7.15	22.37	23.11	22.53	7.48	7.41	7.46
North Carolina	.5	.5	1.0	70.8	17.72	16.78	17.54	4.46	8.74	4.85	19.96	17.01	19.37	5.23	9.61	5.62
South Carolina		.5	.5	128.4	28.51	27.07	28.07	10.67	10.21	10.51	33.60	32.95	33.40	13.13	13.20	13.15
Cherokee	3.7	2.5	6.2	52.8	14.14	17.97	15.60	5.17	3.32	4.63	15.73	18.11	16.64	5.21	3.25	4.67
Texas	16.7	4.6	21.3	56.0	21.57	19.07	20.94	8.10	6.70	7.12	22.07	19.21	21.35	8.10	6.72	7.14
Total	42.7	36.2	78.9	899.7	21.56	22.72	21.86	7.85	8.54	8.11	24.69	26.13	25.07	8.89	9.92	9.28
Region 9:																
Chequamegon	2.0	1.3	3.3	91.1	23.83	13.25	16.68	4.46	3.00	3.68	31.40	13.78	19.48	6.22	3.42	4.74
Nicolet	5.4	2.0	7.4	81.8	25.71	25.33	25.53	4.34	3.28	3.96	43.04	39.69	41.47	5.12	3.42	4.50
Chippewa	2.7	3.4	6.1	87.4	17.58	18.63	18.03	2.90	2.92	2.90	18.62	19.85	19.15	3.68	2.98	3.30
Superior	19.6	39.0	58.6	502.8	11.69	9.59	10.60	3.56	3.60	3.58	24.51	13.56	18.71	4.76	4.46	4.66
Missouri	3.3	.3	3.6	54.6												
Clark					6.96	7.22	7.03				8.54	7.72	8.30			
Mark Twain					9.23	7.39	8.62				12.04	10.98	11.69			
Hiawatha	9.2	.8	10.0	87.0	13.38	13.47	13.40	5.06	3.36	4.74	23.26	22.06	23.00	6.34	5.68	6.20
Lower Michigan	9.7	1.5	11.2	153.5	8.61	5.83	7.18	3.84	5.38	4.30	8.85	6.59	7.69	4.22	5.60	4.62
Ottawa	2.5		2.5	81.0	14.05	20.39	16.14	3.54	3.58	3.56	24.47	36.03	28.28	3.68	4.34	3.88
Shawnee				28.3	14.87	6.80	10.99				18.73	6.98	13.08			
Wayne-Hoosier	1.0	.7	1.7	17.9	9.53	9.75	9.64				10.06	10.19	10.13			
Total	55.4	49.0	104.4	1,185.4	11.85	12.26	12.00	3.98	3.48	3.82	16.82	16.81	16.81	4.94	3.98	4.58
Region 10:[3]																
North Tongass	14.8	3.8	18.6	8,005.7	2.45	1.71	2.18				2.62	1.71	2.28			
South Tongass	1.3		1.3	7,413.0	2.83	2.02	2.13				2.83	2.02	2.13			
Total	16.1	3.8	19.9	15,418.7	2.57	1.98	2.14				2.69	1.98	2.18			
Grand total	182.1	443.9	626.0	36,391.0												

[3] Large pulpwood sales (80 percent) included as sawtimber.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, President Kennedy in his budget message singled out a few agencies for special commendation for the manner in which they had increased the efficiency of their operations.

One of the agencies so recognized was the Farmers Home Administration. The President pointed out the remarkable increase in the past 2 years in the number of loans processed per employee.

But this is only a part of the story about that organization and its accomplishments. Let me take the Senate back a few years in history.

When the Republican administration assumed power in 1953, the Farmers Home Administration was a well-established agency doing a good job of helping family farmers adjust to changing conditions and helping veterans become reestablished in farming. It was a solid and extremely useful agency.

What happened under the Benson administration?

The Farmers Home Administration was gutted. The staff of the agency was sharply reduced and a blanket was spread over its operations. If any progress was made at all during those long 8 years it was because the staff that remained kept on serving the needs of farmers despite every effort on the part of the administration to discourage such service.

With the advent of the Kennedy administration in 1961 the Farmers Home Administration took a new lease on life.

During its hibernation many dreadful things happened to American agriculture.

The farm population declined at the rate of 1 million persons a year.

Hundreds of rural communities lost large parts of their populations.

Net farm income spiraled downward.

Farm people and rural problems were swept into the ashcan of neglect.

Let me remind Senators of some of the steps the Farmers Home Administration has taken on its comeback trail.

In the first spring of the Kennedy-Freeman administration the Farmers Home Administration, through the intervention of the President, obtained $85 million in funds that had been frozen by the previous administration.

These funds were used to help small farmers finance their 1961 farming operations and to help farmers obtain better housing.

Before the spring was over Secretary Freeman, in recognition of the special problems rural communities face in their struggle to avoid extinction, had established a rural areas development program and placed the Farmers Home Administration in a leadership position.

During the summer of 1961 the Farmers Home Administration received its first appropriations under the Kennedy administration. The amounts were hard to come by, for the Eisenhower budget had reduced FHA expenditures to the minimum. But the results were satisfying; a 60-percent increase was obtained. The agency moved ahead.

Then came the agriculture and housing bills for 1961.

The Agricultural Act literally remade the Farmers Home Administration. The ceiling on loans for farm operating expenses was increased. With this liberalization many farmers who had been shut off from the capital they needed received new hope. Loans to buy and enlarge farms were extended to cover the full range of family farms.

Loans were authorized to provide rural community water systems. As a result, during the past year and one-half, thousands of rural families have acquired a decent supply of good water.

Generally speaking, the whole program was made more flexible.

The insured loan program was reorganized in a manner that made it really workable for the first time.

The rural housing program was extended to enable the agency to serve the housing needs of families living in small rural communities. A special program to provide housing for domestic farm laborers was authorized.

In the spring of 1962 the agency announced a new forestry loan program. Drawing upon the authorities it possessed, the Farmers Home Administration worked out a special program of low-interest, deferred payment loans that matched the needs of family farmers who want to build their farm forests into income producing enterprises.

Last fall brought a further modernization of agency activities.

Under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 the Farmers Home Administration was authorized to make loans to farmers for recreational enterprises and to make loans to associations serving farmers and other rural people to shift cropland into recreation areas, grassland, forest land and other uses. Authority also was provided for the development of rural renewal projects.

Under the Senior Citizens Housing Act of 1962, the Farmers Home Administration was authorized to make special loans to elderly people in rural areas so they may build or buy homes suited to their special needs. Loans for the development of rental housing for the elderly in rural areas also were authorized.

It is a gratifying experience for the people that form an agency of Government to see the need for their special services recognized and to receive additional authorities in a more or less continual stream.

And it is equally gratifying to find that some additional funds have been provided so that the responsibilities newly acquired can be met. But while the supply of loan funds has increased, there are still many urgent demands that cannot be met.

Currently there is an urgent need for operating loan funds. In this area the agency has not grown as it should have grown. It needs at least $50 million more for loans to help farmers buy equipment, livestock, feed, and fertilizer this spring.

The agency also is in real difficulty in the matter of funds for personnel.

In fiscal 1963 the Farmers Home Administration will loan approximately $820 million. In fiscal 1960 the FHA loaned $309 million. This is a 166-percent increase.

In fiscal 1963 the agency will have on June 30 about $2 billion of loans outstanding. This is nearly double the amount outstanding on June 30, 1960. I hasten to add that losses on loans, however, are less than 1 percent of the principal advanced.

Despite the tremendous increase in lending, the Farmers Home Administration has a staff today that is only slightly larger than the staff it had in 1960.

Let me summarize what has happened.

In the 1950's the agency was cut down, far more than any other agency in the Department of Agriculture.

During the past 2 years the agency has really forged ahead.

But the whole burden of new business has fallen on the shoulders of the reduced staff of employees who already had all they could handle.

The present staff is carrying an extremely heavy workload and is doing so to a large extent by personal sacrifice. The extent of personal sacrifice is illustrated by the fact that in 1962 employees put in over 260 man-years of voluntary noncompensated overtime. Forty-five percent of the employees lost annual leave.

To fully appreciate the extent of the demand for the services of the Farmers Home Administration, it is necessary to look beyond the statistics of loans and collections. These are impressive. The volume of lending has more than doubled since 1960. In fact, at the rate the organization is progressing the volume of its loans in 1964 will be three times as large as the 1960 program. But these figures are only a crude measure of the service rendered by the agency.

The Farmers Home Administration provides much more than a credit service. Each of the loans made by the agency is accompanied by technical supervision in farm and financial management.

The county supervisors of the Farmers Home Administration spend hours with every applicant helping him develop a farm plan that will make the most of his resources. And they work with their borrowers until they reach a point where they can qualify for credit from other services.

This type of work is becoming more difficult each year. The cost-price squeeze has cut profit margins in farming to such a low level that it is no easy task to help a family farmer figure out how to keep his head above water.

More and more of the farmers who call at the county offices of the Farmers Home Administration have, in their efforts to keep going, acquired a long string of debts. The time spent in helping these farmers work out a debt management program, including a budget that when followed will gradually get them back on their feet, is monumental.

We cannot afford to see the caliber of the work performed by the staff of the Farmers Home Administration diminished in any respect. This agency is the bulwark between family farmers and the forces that continually threaten their existence. If it is not properly staffed and funded, thousands of family farmers will be forced into contract farming. This agency is most responsive to the needs of the times. It has proved a most responsible caretaker of public funds. The losses on loans in the many programs it currently is administering run to less than 1 percent of the principal advanced.

The importance of the Farmers Home Administration to rural communities is growing daily. Through the years, the dollars loaned to farmers by the agency and the increased incomes and net worths of borrowers have done much to stimulate the economies of small towns. Now, with the additional authorities the agency has received in the past 2 years, it has even more to offer rural areas. The new programs that finance rural community water systems, homes for elderly rural people, income producing recreational enterprises, and rural renewal programs, give direct and much needed support to the small towns of our country.

I have recommended to the Committee on Appropriations that at least $800,000 be provided to the Farmers Home Administration for the remainder of this fiscal year, so that a start can be made in raising the size of the FHA staff to a level commensurate with the demands for their services.

SUPPORT FOR HUMPHREY YOUTH BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of the Senate shares my deep concern over the February unemployment figures which were recently released by the Department of Labor. I shall comment further, at another time, on the relationship between the overall rise in the percentage of unemployed to total employment from 5.8 percent to 6.1 percent and the President's tax proposals.

Of course, it is my view that the President's tax program will do as much as any one thing that we can do to stimulate our economy and thereby improve the employment picture.

But today I wish to emphasize the dramatic increase that again occurred among young people. The unemployment rate among teenagers rose from 13.9 to 15.6 percent, an increase so large that it accounted for almost half of the total increase.

The relationship of this increase to the need for prompt action on my Youth Employment Act is obvious. I regret that I must stand on the floor today and cite such evidence in behalf of this legislation. Nothing would be more gratifying to me than a steady declining rate of youth unemployment. But, as the February figures indicate, this is not likely to happen without some specific employment assistance directed toward this age group.

The hearings on the Youth Employment Act have concluded in both the House and the Senate. The testimony in these hearings highlighted the particular difficulties encountered in solving unemployment problems in the 16 to 21 age group.

During the Senate hearings the Secretary of Labor, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare appeared simultaneously in support of S. 1 before the Labor Subcommittee on Manpower and Employment chaired by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. The burden of the testimony presented by this impressive array of Cabinet officials, and numerous other persons from public and private life, indicated overwhelming support for the principal concepts embodied in the Humphrey youth bill. Several important aspects of the total youth employment program envisioned in this legislation should be emphasized.

First, as the principal author of this legislation, I do not advocate its passage with the unrealistic notion that the Youth Conservation Corps and the Hometown Youth Corps, in themselves, offer an ultimate solution to the problem of youth unemployment. What I do see this legislation providing is a sensible, reasonable, and tested method whereby a major start will be made toward meeting this critical problem.

Regarding title I of this legislation that establishes the Youth Conservation Corps, the results achieved through the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's provide compelling evidence of what such a program can accomplish. It provides precisely what most unemployed young people lack: self-confidence, maturity, responsibility, and the mental health that only comes from hard physical labor. I maintain that until many of our young people acquire these personal qualities they will be unable to function as self-supporting and productive members of society. This fact is no less true in the 1960's than it was in the 1930's.

The Youth Conservation Corps will provide the opportunity to develop these personal qualities, but it will also do much more. There will be both on-the-job training and vocational training supplemented by certain basic academic instruction.

I mentioned this point because some critics of the Youth Conservation Corps have said that we ought to have more education in this program. Regrettably, sometimes these same critics vote against Federal aid to education. These critics say there ought to be more vocational training in the bill, so that the young people who come into the program will be equipped by training and experience to move into regular jobs once they have left the Youth Conservation Corps.

I agree. However, this program, which is supported by the President, and was outlined in his youth message, and which I was privileged to introduce in the Senate, provides vocational and technical training, which will make it possible for young people to get this very valuable training so they can move into the regular employment force once they leave the Youth Conservation Corps. I repeat that there will be both on-the-job training and vocational training, supplemented by certain academic instruction. It will be worked out in conjunction with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with the State boards of education or commissioners of education, and in cooperation and in coordination with local school authorities.

The Youth Conservation Corps offers not only the opportunity for gainful employment; it also offers the greatest opportunity that we can give to young men between the ages of 16 and 21 for advanced training in vocational and technical areas of our present educational needs.

No one denies the crucial importance of these additional training and educational opportunities. The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare offer firm assurances that such training will be provided.

One other complaint that has been made against the Youth Conservation Corps by some of its critics is that it is too small; that it ought to be bigger; that if unemployment is as large as some of us say it is—and what we say, of course, is based on statistical facts—the program ought to be much bigger.

I am delighted to hear that statement made. I think the program ought to be much larger. The same critics who say that, however, also want to cut the budget.

Mr. President, it is not possible to cut the budget and cut out new programs and cut down old programs, and still have a Youth Conservation Corps larger than is proposed here. The truth is that as this bill was developed, we worked very closely with the people in the White House, the special assistants to the President, and with the Department of Labor and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and with the Bureau of the Budget. We tried to come up with a program which was reasonable and was not too costly, and represented a beginning of a program which would encourage State and local governments to take on additional responsibilities.

We get the criticism, much of it in the hearings, at least from limited sources, to the effect that the program is not big enough, and that it does not offer enough education. The same critics are asking that the budget be cut and are not supporting the programs for aid to education.

There are numerous ways this training could be organized. For example, those enrollees who demonstrate an aptitude and interest in electronic repair work could be sent to a camp where this

specialty is provided. Those interested in auto mechanics could be directed to a camp specializing in this vocation skill. Or they could be directed to camps where the facilities in the local schools nearby will meet these requirements. Enrollees desiring to become proficient in handling of heavy machinery could go to a camp where work projects called for such machinery. This is one approach whereby meaningful vocation training could be provided.

Coupled with this training received in camps, the local employment service personnel who recruited the enrollee will have the responsibility of either locating a job or providing the opportunity for additional vocational training. When the YCC enrollee completes his period of enrollment, he will return with a record of personal accomplishment that will go a long way toward opening doors that were previously closed. He will have demonstrated his ability and willingness to work long, hard hours; he will have made a real beginning toward acquiring job skills. And in many cases, he will have experienced for the first time the thrill of self-fulfillment and self-satisfaction that only comes from a job well done.

I was much gratified by President Kennedy's endorsement of S. 1 made at his Wednesday press conference. I would like to quote from his opening statement:

> First, hearings are being completed in both Houses on the youth employment opportunities bill and I hope this measure can be enacted before the Easter recess. One million of our youth are out of school and out of work, creating an explosive social situation in nearly every community. This bill would put their hands to work, and minds, in our parks and forests, manning our hospitals and juvenile centers, and developing skills and work experience which will help them in later life.

President Kennedy's plea for action before the Easter recess represents the feelings of many Members of Congress, assuming we have an Easter recess—which is a rather doubtful assumption.

I suggest to the three Members of the Senate who are on the floor that they might wish to call this little passage to the attention of their beloved colleagues.

I certainly intend to do everything in my power to bring this legislation to a successful conclusion as promptly as possible.

I was also most pleased to learn of the statement of support for the Youth Employment Act adopted by the AFL–CIO Executive Council during their recent meetings at Bal Harbour, Fla. This statement is direct, hard hitting, and argues the case for prompt passage of S. 1 in a highly persuasive fashion. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the AFL–CIO Executive Council be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON YOUTH EMPLOYMENT BILL, BAL HARBOUR, FLA., FEBRUARY 21, 1963
>
> This country cannot afford any further postponement in dealing with the employment needs of its young people. Delay now, in the face of the rapidly increasing numbers of youths pouring into the labor market, is unthinkable. For this reason, the AFL–CIO urges prompt action on the youth employment bill.
>
> In 1962, nearly 1 million youths, 16 to 21 years old, who were in the market for jobs, were unable to find them. They represented nearly 25 percent of the total unemployed.
>
> In addition to these 1 million unemployed young people, several hundred thousand more youths were compelled to work part time, because full-time employment was not available. Moreover, thousands more, indeed, tens of thousands, were not only out of school and out of work, they were also out of the labor force, not even bothering to look for work, because they had lost hope of finding jobs.
>
> This is truly a situation loaded with social dynamite, and one which time alone will not remedy. The number of new young workers entering the labor force is increasing steadily; by 1970, young people will be entering the labor force at the rate of 3 million each year. This contrasts sharply with the decade of the 1950's, when the annual average of new young entrants into the labor force was less than 2 million.
>
> A substantial increase in jobs is needed generally—for all those who are willing, able, and seeking work. But even in an improved economic climate, many young people will find it impossible to obtain jobs, because they will not possess the skills or education that modern technology requires. Thirty percent of the new entrants into the labor force in this decade will not have completed high school, and another 45 percent will end their education with only a high-school diploma. As a consequence, three-fourths of these new jobseekers, who will number 3 million a year by 1970, will be looking for work with inadequate preparation, in a period of rapid technological change, when employers are demanding a more skilled and a more educated work force. The amount of unemployment among youths that can result in the next 10 years is a bone-chilling prospect.
>
> The most expensive course that can be taken now is inaction—to be impassive about a very real problem that is with us already and is growing each year.
>
> The youth employment bill will channel the energies of some of these young people—albeit a modest number—into productive employment. It will provide jobs for youths—15,000 during the first year and up to 60,000 thereafter—in outdoor conservation work. In addition, the bill would also enable some young people—up to 50,000 during the first year and whatever numbers Congress determines for subsequent years—to enroll for such community service work as libraries, playgrounds, and hospitals.
>
> Measured against the size of the problem, the youth employment bill is a most modest effort. The number of openings authorized for young people should be greatly increased. But at least it is a start. It will enable young people to gain some practical job training and some employment experience, and thereby ease their transition from school to work. At the same time, the proposed bill will permit the participants to make a positive contribution to the Nation and its communities, by their work to conserve and develop our natural resources and to participate in community service programs.
>
> The job problem of our youth population is critical, and left unattended it will get worse. The time to act is now, and the action needed is to adopt the youth employment bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have received similar indications of support from all sections of the United States and from all segments of society. Never before in the long history of this struggle has public attention been so directly focused on the critical need for constructive and sensible programs to begin an attack on the problem of youth unemployment.

I have received literally thousands of letters from associations, societies, commissions, committees, and individuals concerned with problems of our young people. The percentage endorsing the passage of S. 1 is certainly over 98 percent. A number of these letters were reproduced in the Senate hearings and I urge my colleagues to glance through them when printed copies are released in the near future.

There also have been many editorials in newspapers and magazines supporting passage of S. 1, the Humphrey youth bill. A number of excellent feature articles have appeared during the past weeks.

Mr. President, from this welter of letters, editorials, articles, and statements supporting the Youth Employment Act I have gleaned several that are of special significance. In particular, I have received a marvelous letter from my good friend Frederick Manfred, the eminent Minnesota author. He describes in glowing language the importance of providing ways by which our young men expend their normal enthusiasm and drive in constructive channels. I ask unanimous consent that this letter from Frederick Manfred be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> JANUARY 30, 1963.
>
> Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: I have now had a chance to study your bill, Youth Employment Act of 1963, which contains two principal proposals: the creation of a Youth Conservation Corps and a program of youth local area employment.
>
> Many colleges and universities have set up scholarship programs to help out the bright boy or girl coming from a poor or needy family. This is all to the good. It will help to keep our democracy fresh and vital.
>
> But it is not enough. Many a young man still graduates from high school who hasn't quite made up his mind what to do with his life. He doesn't particularly care to go to college, though he might be bright enough, and he hasn't particularly made up his mind what kind of trade he should go into. He finds himself at loose ends, with no goal in mind, at the same time that he is loaded with energy. Such a boy, no matter how good he might be, very possibly can be headed for trouble. He is looking for something real to do, and it just isn't there to be done.
>
> In the old days, before 1900, much of this kind of aimless energy of young men was taken care of by the needs of our expanding economy, particularly all along the western frontier. We always had a real safety valve in our Far West. But those days are gone. We now need to look for new frontiers for these kind of young fellows.
>
> In my researches for my books about the old Far West, and about prewhite Indian times, I've often been struck by the interesting way that the old chiefs handled their young men with itchy natures. They let the young braves expend their extra energy in little sorties against the enemy in the form of horse-raiding parties or war skirmishes. None of these "attacks" were ever

intended to be serious. In fact, the old chiefs and shamans, when telling of their exploits to little boys, made it a point to stress that a successful raid was one where horses were taken without loss of life to either side. The greatest coup of all was the one in which a young brave entered an enemy camp stealthily at night, touched an enemy brave with his spear or bowtip, and then successfully got away without being caught. Touching the enemy without getting caught, a sort of white man's tag, was the great thing. Actual scalping and killing was far down the lists of accomplishments. This pretty well took care of the young antsy braves in those days.

I was 17 and full of exploding beans myself once. I had so much of it I could shock grain all day from 5 in the morning until 6 in the evening, and still have enough drive left to pitch a 9-inning game of baseball. And after the ballgame still have enough of a whistle left to want to paint the town red until 2 in the morning. So I can readily appreciate what some of these young fellows are up against these days.

It seems to me that the YCC answers many problems. It keeps the young man busy, it gives him some money and as such financial freedom, and it allows him to work at something that in his mind has some meaning, is worth doing, can be bragged about amongst the boys. He will be outdoors, he can flex, and yes, even tire, his muscles, he will be close to his original mother, nature, and he will have a chance to see himself as a worthwhile part of a great nation.

Meanwhile, we, the Nation, are the real gainers. We will not only be getting some necessary and worthwhile work done, we shall be growing men in our midst.

Sincerely yours,

Frederick Manfred.

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I also have for insertion in the Record some of the editorials that have recently appeared in favor of the Youth Employment Act. Included are editorials from the Saturday Evening Post, Forbes Business and Finance, the Chicago Daily News, and the Washington Post. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that various editorials supporting the Humphrey youth bill be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Feb. 9, 1963]

Unemployment and the Reading Problem

Unemployment in the United States continues at a disturbingly high level, about 5.5 percent. In the age of automation it is most severe among the unskilled, causing a nationwide chorus of advice to young people to stay in school. Yet of the 26 million who will come into the labor market during the next decade, nearly one-third, if present trends continue, will not have a high-school diploma. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the 300,000 increase in unemployed late in 1962 was made up almost entirely of teenagers.

Among several reasons for school dropouts, one of the most important is that the student never really learned to read. In a New York State training school for young lawbreakers one-third of the boys from 12 to 15 could read only at the second-grade level. Dr. Emery Stoops, of the University of Southern California says, "Poor reading ability handicaps students in all subjects, poor readers tend to get poor marks, and students with poor marks get discouraged and drop out of school." Dr. James B. Conant recently reported: "In the slums one finds today an incredibly large percentage of pupils who may properly be designated as slow and very slow readers." In a Negro slum in a large American city, Dr. Conant found 70 percent of the boys and girls over 16 out of school and unemployed. Joblessness for those under 21, he reported, is 2½ times as high as for the whole population. Today there are an estimated three dropouts for every two unskilled jobs—a really alarming figure. Among the poor readers a good proportion have intelligence well above the average.

The dropouts are very likely to become delinquents. Dr. Melitta Schmideberg, a psychiatrist doing research in this field, says, "Reading retardation makes it almost impossible for the delinquent to find a job and unemployment aggravates his delinquency."

In Chicago half the people on relief are "functional illiterates"—either they cannot read at all or can read so little as to be useless. Similar facts were unearthed in Detroit and Philadelphia. In some cities those on relief are compelled to study reading. In many communities it is being taught by television, early in the morning; some people who are too proud to join classes are willing to learn in this way.

In regions with very high chronic unemployment, where retraining programs have been instituted, about one-third of the potential retrainees are barred because of illiteracy. In some universities 20 percent of the freshmen have to take remedial reading; obviously the percentage of those who need the remedy is higher among dropouts from elementary or secondary school.

A bitter battle is raging in the educational world over methods used in the United States to teach reading. Few laymen are competent to judge the merits of the battle, but they can see that it is time to abandon prejudices and solve the reading problem.

Arthur S. Trace, Jr., in "What Ivan Knows That Johnny Doesn't," notes that no such difficulty exists in the Soviet Union. Educators who have studied the question report that most Russian children learn to read early and well. The countries of Latin America, Africa, and Asia say there is rarely any problem, once a child—or an adult—has been given a chance to learn.

It is embarrassing that the greatest nation on earth should have such a high rate of unemployment that can in large measure be associated with a failure to teach many of our young people anything so fundamental as reading. The 87th Congress passed the Manpower Retraining Act to cope with the problem of training unskilled workers but failed to act on two other important measures: the adult basic education bill and the youth opportunities bill. The 88th Congress should pass both of them.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Feb. 15, 1963]

Sensible Proposals for Youth

There may be room for debate on the mechanics of President Kennedy's new youth program, but certainly it strikes at the heart of the problem with its central proposition: Give the idle hands something constructive to do.

Particularly promising is the proposal for a Youth Conservation Corps of 15,000, to work and be trained in national forests and recreational areas. As part of the same program the Federal Government would provide matching payments to communities that established similar local projects.

To the extent that these programs were wisely conceived and implemented, they could make a considerable contribution.

They would provide a practical means of attacking the high school dropout problem and the juvenile crime and delinquency associated with that problem. Virtually every community is struggling to get this generation's outside horde of dropouts off the streets and into some kind of constructive pursuits. As the President said, the communities have primary responsibility for their own, but the Federal Government has unique facilities to care for a portion of these hapless youngsters.

Of all the depression-born agencies created to take up the job slack, the Civilian Conservation Corps (on which the new Youth Conservation Corps will obviously be modeled) was the most successful. It provided work and pay over the years for some 2 million men, but more than that, it gave them a chance to learn useful skills in a healthful, body-building regimen.

In this time when lack of skills contributes so heavily to unemployment, the new program could provide invaluable training, as well as a livelihood, for thousands of potentially useful young people.

Among the President's other youth program proposals, we welcome the suggestion that the Juvenile Delinquency Act be extended for another 3 years. Delinquency is manifestly a nationwide problem, and the Federal Government has a proper role in coordinating research and disseminating knowledge.

As to the National Service Corps—the long-heralded domestic Peace Corps—we will need some convincing. The President says volunteers in this Corps would serve in hospitals, mental health centers, on Indian reservations, and in slums. There is urgent work to be done in all these areas, of course. We would like, first, to know just how the young corps men and women are to be trained and put to useful service.

[From the Mankato (Minn.) Free Press, Feb. 16, 1963]

The Youth Proposal

President Kennedy's proposed youth legislation is different from previous attempts in this area in that it attacks the problem from a new angle. The President didn't say so directly, but his proposed program recognizes that mounting delinquency is the product of industrial progress and automation.

For the past two or three decades people who spent their youth in the days of the wood burning stove, the horse and buggy and the family cow, have looked longingly back on those years and said that was the kind of life the modern youngster needed. There was more truth to those statements than we frequently have been willing to admit.

No matter what else may be said, one of the prime causes of problems among youngsters is idleness. When we ceased living close to the land we had trouble finding enough for our boys and girls to do. Recently has been added the difficulty in getting a job if you do not have advanced education. This is what is known now as the dropout problem.

The President's program, which if we remember correctly was first proposed by Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota several years ago, recognizes first of all the necessity for keeping young people busy. He called for a youth conservation corps to work in national parks and forests. He also urged what he called a hometown youth corps.

The objective of both of these plans is to put youngsters to work. Those who are unable to find jobs because they have left school at too early an age will have something to do in the field of manual labor. The youngsters who have been idle for possibly other reasons and only have been getting themselves into trouble can be induced to join the youth corps.

The question certainly will be raised as to what might be the ultimate cost of this project. It is sure not to be small. But weighed against the outlay of dollars must be the saving of young people who otherwise stand to cost the Nation and the various States many millions of dollars by pursuing lives of crime. It doesn't seem reasonable to dismiss this proposal merely on the grounds that it costs too much.

[From the Mesabi Daily News, Virginia, Minn., Jan. 8, 1963]

The YCC Bill: A Boon to Northeastern Minnesota

(By Ham and Herm)

Questionable as some relief acts may have been for producing material of lasting value, it goes without saying that the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) of depression days in the 1930's did northern Minnesota a lot of lasting good. It came at a time when the State's conservationists, a mere handful of them at the time, saw no way of doing anything about the sad plight into which our State's land, timber, and waterways had deteriorated.

With the CCC program launched, Minnesota's Department of Conservation had long-range plans off drawing boards and ready for reconstruction of our woodlands and waterways, just waiting for an opportunity to be put into effect. Consequently, Minnesota got off to a real good start in its reforestation program, woods-road building, and improvement of its canoe routes and portage trails. Minnesota led all States in having a program of improvement ready.

History has recorded the untold wealth this program brought to our section of the State. Work done on our forests in those days has paid off thousandsfold already, and real earnings are still being harvested. In plain dollars and cents, timber operators, resort owners, wilderness canoe outfitters, sporting goods outlets, guides, boatmakers, pulpcutters, and dozens of related enterprises have received bounteously and directly from the comparatively small investments made in the CCC program.

With the advent of war, the program ceased. Occasionally trial balloons for resuming the program have been sent up without any great result. Bills have been introduced in the Nation's Capitol at varied times to reactivate the program, which have either died in committee or were voted down.

Now Senator Hubert Humphrey has again introduced legislation to reactivate the program, under the banner of a Youth Conservation Corps, which would provide youth of the country an opportunity to work for board, room, clothing, and modicum pay at camps in areas of the country where there are national parks and great demands for improvements on waterways and soil erosion districts. With serious unemployment having hit certain sections of the country, northeastern Minnesota being one of them, it is believed the bill now may have a better chance of going through Congress and receiving approval of the President.

For many years, off and on through this column, we have suggested that such a program, especially for northeastern Minnesota, would be a fine thing. We have observed through the years what wonders many of our young men developed in their characters as a direct result of having served in the CCC for a year or two.

On occasion while on canoe trips along the Border Chain we have met canoeists from big cities outside this State, who were making visits again in the country where they had worked in CCC camps, and where they had learned their first valuable lessons in woods and lake lore. The tremendous upswing in family camping trips developing in the country today largely can be laid to a generation of boys having learned something of the outdoors and its wonders through the old CCC program. These boys now are family men. They are now exposing their wives and children to the same outdoors they had received so much from as young men.

Of all the relief programs there were in effect in the United States in the days of the old depression, none still holds its values as greatly as does the old CCC program. Men now, who took advantage of the CCC as boys, are proud of having been in it. The value of their work can be appreciated in bas relief today.

Where in the 1930's only windfall-strewn areas, held up by blackened stumps of past devastating forest fires, covered thousands of acres of our wild land and surrounding sections of lakeshores there now grow beautiful stands of timber. Where our streams flowed only in trickles in the 1930's, navigable waters now tumble, twist and wind through fascinating ever-increasing woodland acreages.

The thousands of canoeists who every summer take to the canoe-pack trails along our great chain of historical waterways, are perpetual reminders of what the CCC program of old has done for our people, not only in providing places for great recreation and spiritual replenishing, but also providing the climate for a thriving vacationland commerce.

If the present YCC bill up before the Nation's lawmakers is passed this year, it will be a great boon to our vacationland, farming and timber industries. And perhaps more valuable, but not to be measured in dollars and cents, it will provide another generation of young men and boys another great opportunity of finding the lasting spiritual and character-building values which the great out-of-doors reveals to those who will visit her and live with her for a time.

Let's send some messages to our lawmakers. They already are sold on the proposal, but no doubt they would welcome encouragement. Northeastern Minnesota of all places in the country would profit most from the program. The time, for here, is ripe.

[From Forbes Business & Finance, Feb. 15, 1963]

Poignant Unemployment

(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

The disastrous impact of lengthy unemployment of family breadwinners needs no documentation. As in the case of the other fellow's toothache, it is easy to extend one's sympathy without feeling the pain.

Rightly, most attention and most attempts to tackle unemployment emphasize the dire situation confronting a workless man with a family to support. His problems are immediate and imperative.

Less pressing, but perhaps wreaking greater individual havoc, is unemployment of the quite young—the teenagers out of school or no longer able to afford school. For youth, with a vitality unvitiated by age, drift often means disaster. The young have to be doing, and if it cannot be the doing of work, it is sometimes the doing of bad. A man of more years, and particularly a man with a family, has the maturity of experience. He doesn't seek to solve his galling idleness with what the psychologists call antisocial activities. It is established that among the 4.7 million of unemployed, 709,000 are under 20 years of age. Before these young people have the habit of work, they have had to learn to cope with idleness, to develop a busy life doing nothing. Sourness and cynicism are the inevitable accompaniments.

Fortunately for many in this category, it is an ideal time to put in the required military service in the course of which, often, useful skills are learned.

But for a large number of these young unemployed there must be some other avenue. Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, has placed a Youth Conservation Corps bill before the Senate. It seeks to provide outdoor training and employment for young men in the conservation of natural resources, similar in principle to the former Civilian Conservation Corps. Enlistment in this program would be for 6 months to 2 years. Another feature of the bill is a youth public service employment program wherein the Federal Government could match State funds for the local employment of youngsters.

The bill is a sound, good concept.

[From Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News Dec. 27, 1962]

Better for Youths To Keep Busy

The recent rise in unemployment is ominous in a special way because it has occurred largely among young people. In a plea for speedy action on his youth employment opportunities bill when Congress reconvenes, Senator Hubert Humphrey noted that unemployment rates among adults were not significantly changed, but the rate among teenagers rose from 13.3 percent in October to 15.2 percent in November.

Idle youth is likely to be youth in trouble. And it is likely to entail a tragic frustration and waste of the Nation's potentially most valuable asset. Senator Humphrey's bill, which would put young men and women of good character from 16 through 21 years of age to work on useful conservation projects in Federal and State forests or on local public service programs, is itself a soundly sensible and constructive conservation measure. It aims at conservation of human resources. There is now an alarmingly abundant demonstration of need for this pragmatic program.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 19, 1962]

Idle Youth

The recent rise in unemployment is ominous in a special way because it has occurred largely among young people. In a plea for speedy action on his youth employment opportunities bill when Congress reconvenes, Senator Hubert Humphrey noted that unemployment rates among adults were not significantly changed, but the rate among teenagers rose from 13.3 percent in October to 15.2 percent in November.

Idle youth is likely to be youth in trouble. And it is likely to entail a tragic frustration and waste of the Nation's potentially most valuable asset. Senator Humphrey's bill, which would put young men and women of good character from 16 through 21 years of age to work on useful conservation projects in Federal and State forests or on local public service programs, is itself a soundly sensible and constructive conservation measure. It aims at conservation of human resources. There is now an alarmingly abundant demonstration of need for this pragmatic program.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 19, 1963]

Idle Youth

"Idle youths on our city streets create a host of problems," said the President the other day. It is not alone that they are adrift and unable to find their way and thus be a problem to themselves; from the point of view of the Nation, the economy is deprived of their potential contribution, and because they cannot find lawful employment, they are all too likely to occupy their time unlawfully.

"Unemployment among young workers today is 2½ times the national average, and even higher among minority groups and those unable to complete their high school education," the President reported to the Congress. "During the 1960's 7½ million students will drop out of school without a high school education, at present rates, thereby entering the labor market unprepared for anything except the diminishing number of unskilled labor openings."

This is, in itself, a national scandal, of course, and needs to be countered by a dramatic strengthening of the public school system. In the meantime, however, there is an immediate and urgent need for Federal action to rescue these unhappy castaways. President Kennedy has, therefore, asked Congress to enact a double-barreled program.

One part of it is patterned on the Civilian Conservation Corps which proved such a boon to idle youth during the depression years of the New Deal. It would consist of a Youth Conservation Corps and a Home Town Youth Corps—both proposed in the last Congress by Senator Hubert Humphrey—to give young people healthful employment at tasks of genuine usefulness to the Nation.

The other part is a National Service Corps, patterned on the Peace Corps, save that it would enlist the latent enthusiasm of young persons for domestic instead of foreign service. Like the Peace Corps abroad, it can do immensely important work in underdeveloped urban neighborhoods—and do it to the immense benefit of the Corps members as well as the people they help.

The need for these projects is now, and it is an extremely pressing need. Congress ought to give these Presidential recommendations priority and a swift, hearty endorsement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, finally, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my prepared testimony before the Clark subcommittee and a transcript of remarks by Secretary of Labor Wirtz and myself as delivered on a recent television report to Minnesota be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the testimony and the transcript were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Youth Employment Act

(Statement of Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, before Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, February 25, 1963)

Mr. Chairman, I am honored and privileged to open the Senate hearings on the Youth Employment Act of 1963. I am particularly pleased to testify before the subcommittee chaired by my good friend from Pennsylvania, Senator Clark. His concern for problems of young people has been a distinguishing feature of his outstanding service in this body.

My testimony before the appropriate subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee has become something of a biannual ritual. This is the third time I have appeared to urge the passage of legislation to establish the Youth Conservation Corps and the Hometown Youth Corps. While the earlier two sets of hearings did not lead to legislation, they were most valuable in gathering evidence, facts, opinions, and statements relating to the desirability of programs designed to fight the growing problem of youth unemployment.

But unless I read the signs and sentiments of the country incorrectly, I believe that the time has arrived for the prompt enactment of the Youth Employment Act. As you know, it was the first bill introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. I have pledged myself to making it the first major item of legislation in the 88th Congress. I deeply hope that this objective will be achieved before the Congress adjourns for the Easter recess.

It might be helpful for the committee if I briefly reviewed the past history of this legislation. I first proposed the establishment of a pilot Youth Conservation Corps program in the 85th Congress. However, no action was taken on this pilot proposal and the bill died. In the 86th Congress, despite the opposition of the Eisenhower administration, the Youth Conservation Corps bill was reported favorably by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, largely through the fine efforts and leadership of the senior Senator from West Virginia, the Honorable Jennings Randolph. The Senate passed this bill, S. 812, by a narrow margin of 47 to 45 in August 1959. The House of Representatives failed to act and once again the legislation died at the end of the 86th Congress. In the 87th Congress, my original bill to create a Youth Conservation Corps, S. 404, was supplemented with President Kennedy's proposals to establish a broader youth employment opportunities program. This committee amended S. 404 to include a Hometown Youth Corps and favorably reported the bill in September 1961. The legislation remained on the Senate calendar throughout the 2d session of the 87th Congress waiting for favorable action in the House. Once again, this action was not forthcoming.

Mr. Chairman, this brings us to the 88th Congress and the introduction of S. 1. As you know, hearings have been underway in the House of Representatives for 1 week. The Senate hearings begin today. The President has endorsed this legislation and sent a special message on youth urging prompt enactment of S. 1. This morning I am here with the same message.

MAJOR PROVISIONS

Mr. Chairman, I believe the members of the subcommittee are quite familiar with the provisions of the Humphrey youth bill. Title I provides for a Youth Conservation Corps "to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas." The Youth Conservation Corps will be established in the Department of Labor under the immediate supervision of a Director who will be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Enrollment in the Youth Conservation Corps will be open to young men 15 through 21. Minimum enrollment period will be 6 months with a maximum enrollment of 2 years. Enrollees will receive $60 per month in wages and also receive board, lodging, clothing, tools, and equipment, medical care, and other necessities. The present legislation calls for a YCC not to exceed 15,000 enrollees during the first fiscal year of operation and thereafter such size as Congress may determine through appropriations but not to exceed 60,000 enrollees at any one time during the next 4 years. I will comment further on the size of the YCC later in my testimony.

Two-thirds of the YCC will work on lands of the national forests, national parks, and other Federal conservation agencies. One-third of the Corps will be available for similar work on State forests and parks on a 50–50 matching funds basis.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that a summary of the provisions of S. 1 be printed in the hearing record at this point in my testimony.

• • • • •

OPPORTUNITY FOR A NEW LIFE

I am not here to provide the subcommittee with masses of statistical and technical data demonstrating the need for enactment of the Youth Employment Act. I willingly defer in this task to the many experts from the executive agencies and private life who will appear in the coming days. But I am here to reaffirm the need for the programs contained in the Humphrey youth bill in view of the rising number of unemployed youth in this Nation and in view of the vast amounts of useful and productive work that exist for such young people to do.

There are obvious similarities between the Youth Conservation Corps and the highly successful Civilian Conservation Corps that existed during the 1930's. Certain critics of the YCC have alleged that the problems of unemployed youths today are greatly different from the unemployment problems that existed during the great depression. Therefore they oppose the YCC as being inadequate to the needs of today. I would like to take several minutes to spell out why I reject this argument.

Most of the young men who will enroll in the Youth Conservation Corps will have dropped out of high school prior to graduation. They will have failed in the job of getting a basic education. Having dropped out of school, they will have attempted to secure some manner of employment to support themselves. Lacking adequate education and job skills, they have been unable to find steady employment. Once again, they will have failed. Now they are loafing around the streets, staying at home, getting in the way, and are reminded repeatedly of their failures in school and employment.

In short, their lives have been little more than a succession of failures. As one of its important functions, I see the Youth Conservation Corps providing these young men with an opportunity to break this pattern of defeat and frustration and substitute for it an experience of accomplishment and self-fulfillment. I recently encountered a study made of 272 boys who participated in the Civilian Conservation Corps. In some detail this study explored the operation of the corps and its effect on this selected group of enrollees. I would like to quote from the conclusions of this study: "The values which these 272 boys received from their camp experiences seem to fall into two general classifications: those having to do with the more or less concrete factors of improved physical health, increased weight, and financial gains, and those having to do with the intangible but significant factors of greater maturity, increased self-confidence and general security. As we review the experiences and comments of these boys, we are impressed with the values from which many of them benefited, but we are impressed, too, by the responsibility placed on the individual boy for seeing and obtaining these values."

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to include in my testimony portions of case studies of individual boys that relate to this specific point. This study, "The CCC Through the Eyes of 272 Boys," is highly objective. It does not praise every phase of the corps operation; it contains a number of constructive suggestions. Those persons charged with organizing the YCC could learn a great deal from this study. But, in all objectivity, the burden of this study is highly favorable to the total results achieved through the Civilian Conservation Corps.

I believe this opportunity to create self-confidence in discouraged young men, to bring forth maturity in the immature, and to provide accomplishment in place of failure, will have lasting impact on the lives of many enrollees in the Youth Conservation Corps. Do young men ever outgrow the need for such feelings of self-confidence, maturity, and accomplishment? The answer to this question is self-evident.

If the Civilian Conservation Corps succeeded in providing such an opportunity to young men in the 1930's, I believe the Youth Conservation Corps can fulfill a similar need in the 1960's.

There are, of course, numerous other reasons to support the Humphrey youth bill. The enrollees will receive job experience and training that will vastly improve their chances of obtaining steady employment once they leave the Youth Conservation Corps. Let me cite some of the specific jobs that would have to be done by YCC enrollees: building fences, carpentry work, planting trees, driving trucks and tractors, stringing telephone lines, painting camps, jack-hammer jobs, fighting forest fires, fighting blister rust, surveying, machine maintenance, pick and shovel work, laying brick and stone, mixing cement, camp maintenance work, etc. Some of the work will be hard manual labor; other aspects of the work program will consist of more advanced and skilled training.

A minimum of 10 hours per week of more formalized training will supplement the on-the-job experience. This training will be provided through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and State and local school officials. It will consist of supplementary academic subjects, such as writing, reading, and basic mathematics skills, and vocational subjects relating to future job opportunities. Also included in the total program available to each YCC enrollee will be the active efforts of the local State employment service to have a suitable job situation ready when the tour of duty has been completed.

This last factor is most important to the success of the total program. I intend to insist that no effort be spared by the local employment officers in every State to provide every YCC enrollee with at least one opportunity to demonstrate to the community what he has achieved through his enrollment.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO NATION'S RESOURCES

Mr. Chairman, up to this point in my testimony I have concentrated entirely on the benefits that will accrue to the young men who will enroll in the Youth Conservation Corps. That is entirely proper since we are primarily concerned with bringing unemployed young men back into the mainstream of society. But we should not overlook the great contributions these young men will make to the preservation and conservation of our national forests and parks. These are the dividends that will accrue to this country for many generations to come.

I am confident that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior will provide full documentation of the extensive work that is ready and waiting in our national forests and parks. The figure runs to many billions of dollars and this is the type of work that will have direct financial return to the Government for many future generations.

In the 87th Congress this committee assembled figures relating to the comparable costs of conservation work performed by regular employees and YCC enrollees. On the basis of the data submitted by various departments, it would cost $5,120 to support one regular worker per year; the comparable cost per YCC enrollee would be $3,640. This suggests that the Federal and State Governments will be getting a good bargain for the funds they invest in this program.

If those persons who criticize the Youth Conservation Corps because of so-called excessive cost would only deduct the eventual financial benefits from the initial operating cost figure, they would be hard pressed to continue their opposition on the basis of finances. I have always said that the entire Youth Conservation Corps program could be justified merely on the financial benefits that would eventually accrue to the United States. This would certainly be an extremely shortsighted view of the problem, but it could be done.

I am confident that testimony presented by the executive departments will fully confirm this statement.

MODEST SIZE OF YCC

I must also emphasize the relatively modest size of the YCC provided for in S. 1. As the Senators know, I have advocated a much larger corps in earlier versions of this legislation. S. 404, for example, provided for a YCC that would eventually enroll 150,000 young men. However, the administration felt unable to support a YCC of that magnitude. A number of Members of Congress likewise had some hesitation about establishing a corps of that size. The present legislation provides for a YCC not to exceed 15,000 enrollees in the first fiscal year and thereafter such size as Congress may determine through appropriations but not to exceed 60,000 enrollees at any one time during the next 4 years. I believe this represents a size that all interested parties can accept in good faith. Moreover, I am confident that Congress will be sufficiently impressed with the success of the YCC to increase its authorized strength considerably at the end of 5 years.

I wish to emphasize that President Kennedy supports the size of the YCC established in S. 1. The identical legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives. Never before in the history of this legislation has there existed such unanimous agreement over the particular details of the program. This, in itself, is impressive testimony to the fundamental soundness and reasonableness of the Humphrey youth bill.

LOCAL AREA EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

I do not wish to conclude my testimony before I comment on title II, the local area youth employment programs or the hometown youth corps. This program provides an extremely important complement to the Youth Conservation Corps; namely, an opportunity for both young men and women to receive the benefits of supervised and planned job opportunities in local public service agencies.

Enrollees will remain in their home communities and work on a full-time or part-time basis. Hopefully those persons working part time will also maintain a relationship with their local schools. Those working full time will be encouraged to return to school at the conclusion of an enrollment period. The program will be geared to providing sufficient job skills and training to enable the enrollees to maintain steady employment on their own or to reawaken in the enrollees a desire to resume their formal education.

This legislation provides that these local employment programs will be initiated by the State or local community. Specific programs will be proposed to the Secretary of Labor for his approval. Once approved, the Federal Government will provide half the funds necessary to operate the entire program. It is projected that enrollees will receive approximately $40 per week for their services.

What type of jobs will be available to the enrollees? There are a wide variety of jobs existing in the local public service agencies participating in the program. Let me suggest some that come to mind: secretaries, hospital and laboratory technicians, kitchen assistants, playground workers, gardeners, truckdrivers, office helpers, athletic instructors, maintenance employees, etc. As in the Youth Conservation Corps, the actual job experience would be supplemented by personal counselling after hours, educational opportunities, and assistance in obtaining regular employment at the conclusion of the program.

S. 1 authorizes a Hometown Youth Corps of 50,000 enrollees on a 50–50 matching basis for a period of 3 years. I have as much faith in the success of the Hometown Youth Corps as I do in the Youth Conservation Corps. I predict that Congress will establish the program on a permanent basis once the initial 3-year authorization has expired.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to keep my testimony brief. I know that members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee are intimately familiar with the fundamentals of this legislation. It has been through the mill several times before, as they say.

However, with the permission of the chairman, I would like to submit for inclusion in the record of these hearings a number of documents that relate to the Humphrey youth bill. For example, I have located a short pamphlet that outlines the accomplishments of the Civilian Conservation Corps in my home State of Minnesota. This pamphlet provides compelling evidence for the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps. I have a number of personal letters that testify to the great merits of this legislation.

In closing, I have this final comment: These proposals have been before the Congress for 6 years. There is nothing novel, radical, unknown, or irresponsible about them. While Congress has been considering these proposals, the problem of youth unemployment has become extremely grave. Recent unemployment figures relating to young people show that the problem is about to get totally out of hand. Therefore I say to the Congress, let us procrastinate no longer. The time has come for decisions, not additional years of consideration.

The opportunity is ours. Let us seize it with firm determination.

Report on Youth Unemployment

(By Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, and Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, Senate majority whip)

Introduction: This is Washington, and this is Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota. Today the Senate majority whip has a special and distinguished guest to report on some important questions of vital interest to the people of Minnesota, as well as the Nation. Now, here is Senator Humphrey.

Mr. Humphrey. Today I want to visit with you and to inquire of our guest about the Department of Labor, one of the important Cabinet level Departments in our Government. The Department of Labor has special responsibilities for the welfare of the American working man and woman, and it has special obligations relating to the enforcement of certain labor-management laws that have been enacted by Congress. This Department obviously has a great concern about problems such as unemployment and the lack of the proper and full use of our plant capacity.

Today I have as our guest a good friend, a gentleman I've known for many years, and one of our most distinguished national leaders and public servants. His name is Willard Wirtz and he is the Secretary of Labor. Secretary Wirtz is a fellow midwesterner. He comes from De Kalb, Ill., and he was educated in the Midwest at Beloit College, in Beloit, Wis. He received his law degree at Harvard University, which surely qualifies him for a prominent place in this administration, and later taught at the University of Iowa and at Northwestern University as a professor of law. Secretary Wirtz has had more than 20 years of good, substantial experience in labor-management relations. In January of 1961 he was appointed Under Secretary of the Department of Labor. With the appointment of Arthur Goldberg to the position of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Wirtz last year became the Secretary of Labor by appointment of President Kennedy.

We are honored to have you with us today, Mr. Secretary. But I'm going to toss you a few "hot ones," as they say, because you preside over one of the most interesting, and I think important departments of our Government—the kind of department that's in the midst of controversy, not of your own making, but because of the very nature of our economy.

First, Mr. Secretary, let's take a moment of your time to ask you: How do you describe your job?

Mr. Wirtz. Senator, it's interesting. The Department of Labor is going to be 50 years old next week. I was checking back the other day on the original statutes describing the responsibilities of the Department of Labor. They are clearly defined. Our obligation in the Department of Labor is to develop, preserve, and promote the interest of the wage earners, and particularly to do anything we can to increase job opportunities for wage earners. We figure most of us in this country are wage earners, so I do not think that this is any narrow partisan interest at all. The answer to your question is really that our principal interest is in seeing to it that there is the fullest possible opportunity for a person of this Nation to enjoy the basic right to work, in the truest sense of the term. That would be the common denominator of most of our concerns.

Mr. Humphrey. You also have administrative responsibilities in the field of labor-management relations due to public law.

Mr. Wirtz. Yes. There is the minimum wage law, the 1959 act establishing the responsibility of labor unions, the unemployment insurance program, the apprenticeship program, the Bureau of Labor Statistics research program, and an international program.

Mr. Humphrey. Isn't it your department that always comes out at least once a month with the cost of living index?

Mr. Wirtz. We come out with either good news or bad news twice a month. Once in connection with the cost of living index, which is administered and worked out by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and then again on these monthly reports on employment and unemployment.

Mr. Humphrey. Now I want to get down to an issue that's before the Congress. The first bill that was introduced in this Congress, and one that has now received the active support of President Kennedy and the administration is the bill which I was privileged to sponsor, along with many other Senators, known as the Youth Employment Act of 1963. Your department will have real responsibilities under that act. How do you see the Youth Employment Act? Do you consider this important legislation? Does this have any real contribution it can make to our overall economic and social problems?

Mr. Wirtz. From the standpoint of our interests, Senator, it is one of the two important programs this year. The other is the tax program. We think it is essential to get the economy moving to that point where there will be job opportunities for everybody. But beyond that, with respect to the unemployment problems specifically as it affects the younger members of the work force, the Youth Employment Act is at the top of our list of priority measures. I can't tell you how grateful we are for the support that has come for programs of this kind from you and from others who realize as you do the importance of this situation. If you don't mind one statistic, I'd like to suggest the importance from that standpoint of this Youth Employment Act. In the decade of the 1960's, before we are through, there are going to be 6 million more age 14 to 24 people in the work force than there were in 1960. That isn't so important unless you realize that in the previous decade that number went up only 425,000, which means that we have to find jobs in the next 8 years for 15 times as many youngsters as we did in the previous decade. Now statistics always bother me when you start applying them to people, but the impact of this one alone is enough to suggest that we simply have to meet this youth unemployment problem as a separate problem.

Mr. Humphrey. And it would be a tragedy if our Nation, with all of its wealth, and all of its scientific and technological know-how is incapable or unable to meet the job opportunity problem, or the provision of work opportunities for our young people. I noticed the other day a statistic that was shocking—and this is one of the reasons I feel so strongly about the Youth Employment Act—that there are between 800,000 and 1 million young men and women who are unemployed. They are out of school, and they are out of work. It is to that problem that the Youth Employment Act is directed in part—to get these young people out into the forests, out into our national parks and State parks to give them constructive work along the lines of the old Civilian Conservation Corps program. And there is the second feature that you feel so strongly about, as I do—the public service feature.

Mr. Wirtz. Yes, the community employment program. We are working out projects for both boys and girls in urban communities. If this act is passed, they will be able to live home and find employment opportunities. That will be in addition to this extremely attractive program to put young men into camps for work on conservation programs.

Let me mention one thing about what you said. You talked about the dropout problem. It is hard for me to realize, but I know it's true that there are fewer kids dropping out of school today, in percentage terms, than used to be the case. It isn't that the dropout problem has become worse. It's that there are fewer job opportunities when they do drop out, because in this automated economy that we're moving into, the number of unskilled jobs is going way down. It used to be true that if a boy or a girl who wanted to work dropped out of school, there was an unskilled job. There won't be now. That's what complicates this problem. That's what makes this legislation so vitally important.

Mr. Humphrey. That—along with the Manpower Retraining Act to train people in new skills when they lose old jobs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, S. 1, and H.R. 1890, are now being considered and evaluated by the respective committees in both Houses. I have been advised by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] and Representative Carl Perkins, of Kentucky, chairman of the House subcommittee considering H.R. 1890, that they expect their committees to complete their work in the near future. I congratulate both Members of the Senate and the House for their thoughtful and intelligent consideration of this legislation during the recent hearings.

I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] upon the enthusiasm he has demonstrated for this particular proposed legislation and the diligence which he has demonstrated in the hearings. He has done a masterful job.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Two weeks ago I held the third of the hearings which I have held in Chicago on the employment problems of youth. On that occasion, as on all the previous occasions, there was a unanimous vote in **favor of the bill** which has been sponsored for so many years by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey]. The hearing was a representative one, with about 100 persons from various groups in the city in attendance. The discussion was not only interesting, but also constructive. I have forwarded to the respective committees a transcript of the hearings.

I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota upon the work which he has done. I only hope that it will eventuate in legislation, and that the Youth Conservation Corps and the civilian group in the various cities and localities will come to fruition. In order that that may happen, some hard hearts must be touched, and public sentiment aroused.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am grateful to the Senator from Illinois for those comments, and more so for the fine work he has been doing to elicit public comment about the proposed legislation. A large number of organizations have been conducting surveys in their respective areas concerning the proposed legislation and everyone, without exception, has come out in strong support of it. I remind the Senate that I know of no organization of any size or of any national distinction in the United States which has not expressed interest in or support for the Youth Conservation Corps concept as a way of meeting some of the problems of our young people.

I understand we may have difficulty in passing the proposal. But I am an optimist. I believe the people want it. I believe Congress can make an impressive record and a great name for itself by doing something concrete, constructive, and positive for the young people of our country.

We ought at least to be willing to make this beginning.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I, too, was very much disturbed by the employment figures issued by the Department of Labor yesterday, and which we all saw in the press this morning. This is a problem that is with us, a problem which we must face up to as Members of Congress.

However, as I listened to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, I could not help recalling his statement on a program which has gained some prestige in this country, the program called Meet the Press. As I recall, it was in January 1962, that the Senator from Minnesota said:

> I predict that by the end of the coming calendar year, by December 30, 1962, the problem of unemployment in the United States will be a page in the history book, rather than a living fact.

I believe I participated in that program with the Senator from Minnesota. I raised some questions at that time. I am glad that he now agrees with those questions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Kentucky has expressed today the thought that I had at that particular moment. He has done so in much more beautiful and decorative words than the Senator from Minnesota was able to use on that program.

The statement of the Senator from Kentucky was clear; it was persuasive. He has almost made me say it all over again.

I say to the Senator from Kentucky: I was wrong. One of the things I have found out is that when one is wrong, he might just as well admit it.

I had hoped we would get willing cooperation from our Republican friends during the last Congress, the 87th Congress. I was hopeful that they would help us with youth conservation. I was hopeful that they would help us pass a much larger public works program than was passed. I was hopeful that they would help us enthusiastically with the area redevelopment program. I was hopeful they would help us to pass a better tax bill than was passed. I simply had such a sense of optimism and faith in my country and faith in my Republican friends that I thought they would help us more. But my faith was misplaced. I grieve over that, because it is difficult for a man to foresee these emotional shocks in these trying and difficult days.

For example, I had hoped that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton] would lead the fight to strike down the dangerous beast called unemployment. When the proposed legislation for area redevelopment and unemployment compensation, for public works, for small business and expansion, and many other fine programs, was offered, much of which had to be cut back because of the combination of conservative opposition in the Senate, I was hopeful that our Republican friends would stand with us as the defenders of the Republic, the protectors of the good life, the champions of full employment. I was hopeful that they would help us to overcome these difficulties.

But alas and alack, we received little or no help. Despite that, we did better than our predecessors. That is not much of a standard by which to measure oneself, but we did a little better than those who preceded us.

Mr. MORTON. Many of us Republicans stood by the Democrats. Considered by Republican standards, the Democrats have a workable majority in this body. The fact that the Democrats cannot make their programs succeed is not the fault of the Republicans. If we had as much of a majority as the Democrats have, or even half as much, in my opinion we would make some of the programs work.

I agree with the Senator from Minnesota. I, too, have been wrong. I was even so wrong that I organized Willkie clubs in 1940 and thought we were going to win.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was pretty wrong.

Mr. MORTON. I was wrong in 1960.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So was I. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORTON. I understand that the repayment of the debt to West Virginia has so far consisted of the presentation of an autographed copy of "Profiles in Courage" to the library at St. Albans. I know that some of my coal mine friends there find the situation today worse than it was when the Senator from Minnesota made his heroic, courageous effort in 1960.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator like to add the word "futile," too?

Mr. MORTON. No; I think the Senator from Minnesota rendered a great service. In all fairness and honesty, I think the Senator from Minnesota rendered a great service.

However, because the Senator from Minnesota is so understanding, has such a keen sense of humor, and is one of the great Members of this body, one who can "take it" as well as "dish it out," I could not help reminding him of our joint appearance on "Meet the Press," when he so adamantly said that unemployment would be a page in history by the time the calendar year had ended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Now that the Senator from Kentucky has been so kind as to remind me of that statement once, I hope he will forget it from here on out. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota has spoken of unrequited hope. I wonder if he remembers the somewhat well known quatrain in poetry, which has become somewhat moth-eaten by now:

> Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again;
>   The eternal years of God are hers;
> But error, wounded, writhes in pain,
>   And dies among his worshipers.

Does not the Senator from Minnesota believe that that is an apt characterization of the two political parties—the party of hope and the party of error?

Mr. MORTON. It is simply a question of which is which. I am the one who needs hope now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate that confession. [Laughter.] This is one of the signs of the rebirth of the Republican Party—when Republicans speak with such sincerity of hope. I wish to commend the Senator. [Laughter.]

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no other business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 11, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 8, 1963:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. James Karrick Woolnough, O18709, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 8, 1963:

AMBASSADORS

William J. Porter, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria.

Charles D. Withers, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Rwanda.

Carl T. Rowan, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

Edward M. Korry, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ethiopia.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Dr. James Watt, of the District of Columbia, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

UNITED NATIONS

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Sidney R. Yates, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

Charles F. Baldwin, of the District of Columbia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Federation of Malaya, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America to the 19th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Archibald S. Alexander, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The nominations beginning Edward Glion Curtis to be a consul general of the United States of America, and ending Miss Catherina Van Lier Ribbink to be a consul of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 15, 1963.

* * *

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. E. L. Bartlett, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

Rabbi Albert Shulman, national chaplain, the American Legion, South Bend, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father: Life is essentially a matter of human relations. Human relations is the art of living together. And living together is a matter of sharing our love, our talents, and our blessings for the betterment of mankind. These are embodied in the general welfare of our country and our people.

Through the wise use of the mind and the heart, our America can be made into the great dream that vests every man with dignity, freedom, and promise.

We are grateful that this body of lawmakers is dedicated to the principle that only freemen living in a free society can live with dignity, freedom, and promise. We are grateful that we have fashioned a nation in which every individual is considered a child of God, and every human being is entitled to share the blessings of our American way of life.

May our America always stand for all that is good, just, and right. May our America always be the symbol of man's eternal struggle to achieve the good life. May our America always stand for a grateful people ever mindful of the many treasures that make up our American way of life. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. E. L. Bartlett, a Senator from the State of Alaska, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARTLETT thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 8, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–906, as amended, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Fourth Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure covering the period ending December 31, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 11, 1963.*

MANPOWER REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1963.

The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.
The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am transmitting herewith my manpower report as required under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Secretary of Labor, who in turn, has had the assistance of members of the Cabinet, heads of independent agencies, and the National Manpower Advisory Committee appointed under this act.

Together with my report I am presenting the report of the Secretary of Labor on manpower requirements, resources, use, and training required by section 104 of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Respectfully,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Banking and Currency Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideratioh of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

AMBASSADORS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of Ambassadors.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

ENVOY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Donald A. Dumont, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Burundi.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1966, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Construction of an Electronics, Instrumentation, and Materials Laboratory at Mississippi Test Facility

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting pursuant to law, on the construction of an Electronics, Instrumentation, and Materials Laboratory at the Mississippi Test Facility; to the Committee on Aeronautical Space Sciences.

Report on Reprograming of Funds Relating to Construction of Load Test Annex at Marshall Space Flight Center

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law on the reprograming of funds relating to the construction of a load test annex at the Marshall Space Flight Center; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Amendment of Title 10, United States Code, Relating to the Appointment, Promotion, Separation, and Retirement of Members of the Armed Forces

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of members of the armed forces, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Statistical Supplement, Stockpile Report

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statistical supplement, Stockpile Report, for the period July–December 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Comptroller General of the United States

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the activities of the United States General Accounting Office, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Audit Report on U.S. Study Commission on Certain River Basins, State of Texas

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the U.S. Study Commission on the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe, San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River Basins and intervening areas, State of Texas, for the period August 28, 1958, through August 28, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Selected Purchase Orders Issued by Sandia Corp., Albuquerque, N. Mex.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected purchase orders issued by Sandia Corp., Albuquerque, N. Mex., under contract AT(29–1)–789 with the Atomic Energy Commission, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Amendment of Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, To Improve the Administration of Transfers and Conveyances of Certain Real Property

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to improve the administration of transfers and conveyances of certain real property for various public uses, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Relief of Certain Naval Officers

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amendment of Section 1825, Title 28, United States Code, To Authorize Payment of Certain Witness' Fees

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28, for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Temporary Admission Into the United States of Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Admission Into the United States of Certain Defector Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions To Classify Status of Certain Aliens for First Preference

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, petitions to classify status of certain aliens for first preference (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Increase of Appropriation for Continuing Work in the Missouri River Basin

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

"Joint memorial of the senate and house of representatives requesting that the Federal portion of cost on Federal aid primary highways and secondary highways be increased from about 57 percent to 75 percent

"Whereas in recognition of the heavy interstate traffic on highways built and maintained by the various States, the Federal Government now contributes 50 percent of the total costs of construction on highways designated as Federal aid primary highways; and

"Whereas in recognition of the additional financial burden which would be placed on the various States having large areas of land owned by the Federal Government, an additional payment is made, in the case of Montana about 7 percent, to compensate for the Federal lands; and

"Whereas having a large area, sparse population, and being a bridge State for interstate traffic, Montana highways contribute a great deal to the welfare and pleasure of the entire Nation; and

"Whereas due to these conditions, the citizens of Montana must make very high per capita contributions to build and maintain this system; and

"Whereas the additional 7 percent contribution now made by the Federal Government for Federal aid primary highways and secondary highways is entirely inadequate to cover the costs of construction and maintenance borne by Montana as a result of heavy interstate traffic: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana*, That the Legislative Assembly of Montana hereby respectfully requests that Congress take action to increase the additional payment made to Montana for Federal aid primary highways from 7 to 20 percent; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is instructed ot send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, to the Secretary of Commerce, to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, to each member of the Montana congressional delegation, and to each member of the Montana Highway Commission.

"DAVID F. JAMES,
"*President of the Senate.*
"——— ———,
Speaker of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable LEE METCALF, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable JAMES BATTIN and the Honorable ARNOLD H. OLSEN, Representatives from the State of Montana; to the Secretary of the Interior and to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, urging the passage of legislation to amend the Reclamation Act and any other laws or rules, to waive the application of the land limitation clause in the area above Canyon Ferry Dam in the State of Montana

"Whereas the Reclamation Act of 1902 applied primarily to public lands; and

"Whereas in an effort to limit the application of this Act to family sized farms, the maximum holding of land in a single ownership was fixed at 160 acres or less; and

"Whereas the present reclamation laws requiring acreage limitations are based on outmoded, half-century-old farming methods of the walking plow and horse team days; and

"Whereas the present farm acreage that one man can handle is two to five times the amount that could be handled at the time the reclamation laws were passed in 1902; and

"Whereas the gross income has not kept pace with the total acres that one man can handle; and

"Whereas the area above Canyon Ferry Reservoir on the Missouri River is at high elevations which limits the crops to stock raising purposes, requiring large acreages for a balanced economy; and

"Whereas present acreage limitations will not permit farmers in the area above Canyon Ferry to own sufficient crop acreage to give them full employment and a gross income sufficient to maintain the standard of living generally provided in farm areas of the humid or subhumid regions; and

"Whereas since the passage of the original Reclamation Act in 1902, it has been amended to include furnishing supplemental waters to lands already irrigated; and

"Whereas in order to establish a realistic family sized farm in this area, the acreage allowed in a single holding often must be greater than 160 acres: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved, by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana as follows:*

"1. That the land limitation provisions of the Reclamation Act, and any other laws and rules, be waived and not applied in the area above Canyon Ferry in the State of Montana; recognize the difference in types of farming and crop production and provide for flexibility in acreage found to be needed for farm units.

"2. That such legislation provide for relaxation of the acreage limitation provisions as to supplemental water supply projects for established farming areas.

"3. That any legislation amending the land limitation provisions shall not be retroactively applied to areas now exempt from such land limitation provisions.

"4. That the acreage allowed in a single holding may be determined by the Bureau of Reclamation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana; to the President of the Senate of the United States; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United

States; and to the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable LEE METCALF, Senators from Montana; and the Honorable ARNOLD H. OLSEN and the Honorable JAMES BATTIN, Representatives in the Congress from Montana; to the Secretary of the Interior; and to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

"DAVID F. JAMES,
"President of the Senate.
"——— ———
"Speaker of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 15

"Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives petitioning Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas the authority to apportion the legislative body of each State properly belongs to the legislative assembly, or to the people of that State, and

"Whereas through its decision in *Baker v. Carr* the Supreme Court of the United States has attempted to extend the judicial power of the courts into an area which is traditionally, properly, and constitutionally a prerogative of the legislative branch of State government.

"Whereas article V of the U.S. Constitution provides that Congress, 'on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That the legislative assembly petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

" 'SEC. 2. The Judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourth of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.'; and be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Montana congressional delegation.

"DAVID F. JAMES,
"President of the Senate.
"——— ———,
"Speaker of the House."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 24

"Resolution of the West Virginia Legislature making Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the State of West Virginia

"Whereas Sir Winston Churchill, a citizen of Great Britain by birth, has close ties with the United States of America; and

"Whereas said Sir Winston Churchill has demonstrated during the strife and turmoil of two World Wars that he is a friend and ally of the United States; and

"Whereas he also has demonstrated his loyalty and devotion to the aims, purposes, and aspirations of this Nation at peace conferences, world trade meetings, the United Nations, and elsewhere; and

"Whereas there is now a proposal before the Congress that he be made an honorary citizen of the United States; and

"Whereas it is appropriate that this great soldier, world statesman, and noted historian and writer be made a citizen of our State prior to being made an honorary citizen of the United States: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia, That said Sir Winston Churchill be made an honorary citizen of West Virginia and that the Congress of the United States be memorialized to award him honorary citizenship as an American."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"RESOLUTION 3

"A resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America to outlaw the poll tax

"Whereas, both Houses of the Congress of the United States by a joint resolution proposed an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which reads as follows:

" 'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

" *'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.* That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" ' "ARTICLE —

" ' "SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" ' "SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation" ': Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota.

"The secretary of state is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the presiding officer of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and transmit an official notice of this resolution to the Secretary of State of the United States as provided by the law of this State.

"——— ———,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"A. W. KEITH,
"President of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives this 19th day of February in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk,
"House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate this 27th day of February in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three.

"——— ———,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved March 6, 1963.

"ELMER L. ANDERSEN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 190

"A Senate resolution to express the appreciation of the members of the Senate of the State of South Carolina to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound.

"Whereas cotton farmers will take a 10-percent reduction in the 1963 cotton acreage allotment and there is all indication that the cotton production cost per acre will continue at high or higher levels than the 1962 crop; and

"Whereas it is becoming increasingly difficult for family size farms to exist and provide the necessities of life for such families; and

"Whereas the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture has announced the 1963 support rate on middling one inch upland cotton as thirty-two and forty-seven hundredths cents per pound and this decision of the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, is of material importance to cotton producers of South Carolina and the economy of the State; and

"Whereas any reduction from this base support price would be punitive to the State's cotton growers and general economy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate: That the Members of the Senate of the State of South Carolina express appreciation to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at thirty-two and forty-seven hundredths cents per pound; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the presiding officer of the U.S. Senate and to each Senator from South Carolina and to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman."

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 11

"A resolution petitioning the President of the United States to reject reports favoring relaxation of import controls on foreign residual oil

"Whereas the mining of bituminous coal is one of Kentucky's major industries, and, as such, contributes substantially to the overall economy of the Commonwealth and particularly to the economic well-being of thousands of Kentuckians whose livelihood is dependent upon the coal, railroad, and related industries; and

"Whereas the coal industry in Kentucky and elsewhere is now and has been for some time in a depressed condition, which would be further compounded by any cause which would lessen coal's ability to compete in the fuels market; and

"Whereas the importation of foreign residual oil (waste) in an increasingly excessive volume at unrealistic prices has adversely affected coal's competitive position, and, thereby, has been and is now responsible for the displacement of millions of tons of American coal, and, hence, thousands of jobs and millions of dollars of wages to workers; and,

"Whereas the President of the United States has received a report from the Office of Emergency Planning recommending that there be a gradual relaxation of import controls on foreign residual oil; and

"Whereas the supporting reason given by Mr. Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, is that such relaxation will not adversely affect the security of this Nation; and

"Whereas this supporting reason is based on the statement that, in conventional-type warfare, oil tankers from Central and South America could deliver crude and residual oil to the east coast, which is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to justify and substantiate, especially if the experience to the contrary in World War II, when Germany with only 75 submarines did great damage to oil tankers in the Atlantic Ocean, is projected to the present-day situation with Russia having a reported 600 or more modern submarines: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, That the senate, in special session assembled, does hereby petition the President of the United States to completely reject the report from the Office of Emergency Planning regarding the relaxation of import controls on foreign residual oil, and, further, that he utilize existing legislative authority to implement a program which will keep these imports within limitations that will permit domestic coal and oil to maintain production at a level which will protect the security and economy of this Nation, and thereby halt further economic hardship upon the coal industry, the coal-hauling railroads and related industries, and upon the Kentuckians and other Americans whose employment is provided by these industries; and be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Members of Congress from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

"Attest:

"JOHN W. WILLIS,
"Clerk of Senate."

A resolution of the house of representatives of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 26

"A resolution respectfully urging the U.S. Senate to pass the bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps

"Whereas the U.S. Senate is considering a proposal to establish a Youth Conservation Corps; and

"Whereas a serious problem has been created by the 1 million youths from the ages of 16 to 22 years that are out of school and unemployed; and

"Whereas these young people lack the necessary skills to obtain employment; and

"Whereas the seriousness of the situation is evidenced by the actions of the President and the testimony of five Cabinet officers who appeared before the Senate labor subcommittee urging passage of the bill; and

"Whereas the program would provide training for approximately 1,800 of Kentucky's unemployed youths: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives of the general assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky: That the U.S. Senate be and hereby is respectfully urged to pass the Youth Conservation Corps bill; and that the clerk of the house of representatives transmit copies of this resolution to Kentucky's U.S. Senators and to the presiding officer of the U.S. Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 10

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 37th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas it is known that one of the most pressing problems facing all areas of the United States and in fact all areas of the world today is the securing of the maximum beneficial use of land and water resources for the further progress of our people, of our State, and of our Nation, not only to realize the most from our present resources for the immediate problems of today, but also to meet our future needs for the long-range future; and

"Whereas the area of southwestern Idaho known as the Mountain Home Snake River plain area contains a large body of land which is both economically and engineeringly feasible for the development of a highly productive and economically desirable potential for the further development of the people of this area and of the Nation and which would add greatly to the overall economy and assist in stabilizing the existing economy of this State and of the Nation, and would present many opportunities to stimulate the economic growth of the State and of the Nation; and

"Whereas adjacent to this fine body of potential irrigated land there are adequate supplies of water in the Snake River which are now running off and unused in the State of Idaho to the detriment of the State and Nation's economy; and

"Whereas upstream developments have been demonstrated to be in the long-range interest for providing the best and most comprehensive plan of development for the utilization of the water and land potential of our river basins; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with local interests, has been making engineering, water resource, and land classification studies which have indicated economic and engineering feasibility of a development of this area under a plan known as the Guffey plan of development; and

"Whereas the orderly continued investigation and ultimate construction and development of a water resource program for the irrigation of this potentially productive area of the State of Idaho will inure to the benefit of the State and of the Nation at large: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the senate and house of representatives concurring, That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to give early consideration to the continued investigation and construction of the Mountain Home division, Snake River project, Guffey plan of development; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the United States.

"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the senate on the 21st day of February 1963.

"W. E. DREVLOW,
"President of the Senate.

"This senate joint memorial was adopted by the house of representatives on the 25th day of February 1963.

"PETE T. CENARRUSA,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 9

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"Be it resolved, by the thirty-seventh session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the senate and house of representatives concurring, That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. A $350 billion limit to be set on the U.S. Federal Government indebtedness.

" 'SEC. 2. Upon a declaration of a national emergency, approved by 75 percent of the House and Senate, this debt limit can be temporarily extended but the amount of debt temporarily extended must be retired within 10 years after the cessation of hostilities or declaration of an emergency.

" 'SEC. 3. All national debt commencing with the year 1970, whatever the sum, as of July 1, 1970, shall be retired at the rate of $3 billion a year in addition to payments of interest.

" 'SEC. 4. The national debt limit of $350 billion may be raised beyond said sum, upon being approved by Congress and ratified by two-thirds of the States, exclusive of those amounts defined in section 2.'

"The secretary of state is hereby directed to send duly authenticated copies of this memorial to the President and Clerk of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives and to each Member of Congress from the State of Idaho, and to the presiding officers of the senate and house of representatives of the several States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

"Concurrent resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors

"Whereas the United States is proud to be considered one of the world's leading democracies, and Hawaii is equally proud to share in that great tradition; and

"Whereas the preservation of the great traditions nurtured and passed on by our forefathers requires the constant vigilance of an enlightened population; and

"Whereas there have been injustices in our country which demand the attention of our people and require action by those who have been entrusted with the authority to govern by the people; and

"Whereas one of the most flagrant injustices has been the artificial barrier to participation in the electoral process provided by the imposition of the poll tax in some of these United States; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has taken steps to remove one of these injustices by initiating an amendment to the Constitution of the United States through U.S. Senate Joint Resolution 29 which reads as follows:

" 'S.J. RES. 29

" 'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors

" *'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" ' "ARTICLE —

" ' "SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" ' "Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation" ': Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Second State Legislature of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1963 (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the article proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as set forth in United States Senate Joint Resolution 29, dated August 27, 1962, be and it is hereby ratified; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a certified copy of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the Administrator, General Services Administration, and that copies of this concurrent resolution also be transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to the members of Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States.

"We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the Senate of the second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963, on March 6, 1963.

"Nelson K. Doi,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Sei Chi Hirai,
"*Clerk of the Senate.*

"We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives of the second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963, on March 6, 1963.

"Elmer F. Cravalho,
"*Speaker, House of Representatives.*
"Shigeto Kanemoto,
"*Clerk, House of Representatives.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas the State of Hawaii possesses a history and development unlike that of other States in the United States; and

"Whereas the United States of America through its Congress and its Department of Interior has seen fit to recognize this unique history; and

"Whereas Congress has implemented this recognition by the appropriation of $175,000 for the restoration of the City of Refuge; and

"Whereas pursuant to said appropriation, the Department of Interior through its National Park Service has begun the restoration of the historic trails and general area abounding the City of Refuge; and

"Whereas this project will preserve in living form a part of the history of these isles, for the enlightment and education of our own people as well as our visitors; and

"Whereas this project is also providing employment for a great number of citizens: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1963*, That sincere appreciation and Aloha be extended to the Congress of the United States and the Department of Interior for its continuing interest in these fairest of all islands; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior and to each of Hawaii's delegation to the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Resolution 21

"Resolution relating to the promotion of State commercial fishery research and development projects

"Whereas the several States of the Union have taken the initiative in fishery research and development; and

"Whereas the off-shore fishery resources of the United States are the proper concern of both the Federal and State governments; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has an obligation to encourage and assist in State research and development programs; and

"Whereas a bold program to assist the States in their efforts to develop their fishery resources is essential to the proper conservation and utilization of this basic resource: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress is respectfully requested to give favorable consideration to H.R. 3738 introduced by the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, U.S. Representative from Alaska, a bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce; the Honorable Herbert Bonner, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the senate March 4, 1963.

"Frank Peratrovich,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Marysville, Calif., protesting against the proposed subsidy formula of the Civil Aeronautics Board; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Association of Electric Cooperatives, relating to the death of the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 8

"A concurrent resolution, memorializing Congress to take all necessary steps in promoting the sale of grain and to guarantee continuing access of U.S. wheat to the Common Market countries

"Whereas the production and sale of wheat forms a vital part of the economy of South Dakota;

"Whereas the countries now involved in the formation of the European Economic Community—including West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg—represent one of the best cash customers of U.S. wheatgrowers;

"Whereas there is a danger that the European Economic Community may develop policies which would curtail the importation of U.S. wheat;

"Whereas the adoption of protectionist and inward-directed trade restricting agricultural policies would seriously damage the economy of South Dakota and other major wheat growing States of the Great Plains and would greatly hamper the free exchange of goods between the United States and the Common Market countries: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the South Dakota Legislature hereby urges the U.S. Government to take all necessary steps to guarantee continuing access of U.S. wheat to the Common Market countries in line with the spirit of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Adopted by the Senate February 19, 1963.

"Concurred in by the House of Representatives February 25, 1963.

"Nils A. Boe,
"*Lieutenant Governor,*
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"Niels P. Jensen,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"Paul E. Brown,
"*Speaker,*
"*House of Representatives.*

"Attest:

"W. J. Matson,
"*Chief Clerk,*
"*House of Representatives.*"

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 8

"A concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal statutes in order to provide for payments in lieu of property taxes imposed on land prior to acquisition by the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and Wildlife Agency

"Whereas the State game, fish, and parks department, supplied with Federal matching funds, has and will continue to purchase wetlands and marshlands for the State of South Dakota for the purpose of protecting present breeding and feeding areas of migratory waterfowl;

"Whereas this State, vested with the titles to such lands as the game, fish, and parks department has purchased, provides to the several counties and their school districts, within which wetlands owned by the State of South Dakota are located, payments and grants in lieu of property taxes;

"Whereas the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has and will continue to purchase similar tracts of land for identical purposes and is not subject to county or school district tax levies or required to make payments in lieu of property taxes;

"Whereas the tax burden of the people of South Dakota and the landowners residing within the several counties and their school districts in which certain land titles are held by the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in the name of the Federal Government is necessarily increased in direct proportion to the amount of land purchased by the Fish and Wildlife Agency: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the 38th Legislature of the State of South Dakota, the senate concurring, do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal statutes in order to provide payments in lieu of property taxes no longer able to be levied on those wetlands and marshlands acquired by the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in order to equalize generally the tax burden of the citizens of the State of South Dakota and specifically the tax burden of the citizens of the several counties and their school districts; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States.

"Adopted by the house, February 16, 1963.

"Concurred in by the senate, February 25, 1963.

"Nils A. Boe,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Niels P. Jensen,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"Paul E. Brown,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"W. J. Matson,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*"

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.)

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency, the President of the United States; the Secretary of the Interior of the United States; and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States; to allow singing at Mount Rushmore by nonprofessional student workers and to remove the restrictions imposed in 1962 which caused this to cease

"Whereas singing at Mount Rushmore by student help at the concession is a source of enjoyment to the more than 1 million persons who annually visit the shrine of democracy; and

"Whereas the nonprofessional singing student waiters have voluntarily inaugurated this custom for their own pleasure and the enjoyment of those they serve without this being a part of their duties; and

"Whereas the figures of Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt are symbolic of freedom and the democratic way of life; and

"Whereas impromptu singing by young people at work is a manifestation of the joys of freedom inherent to the United States and the free world; and

"Whereas this singing is an additional source of inspiration to all visitors in the true meaning of democracy as exemplified by this showplace of freedom: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the house of representatives concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States; His Excellency, the President of the United States; the Secretary of the Interior of the United States; and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, that in the interests of the millions who seek this inspiration at Mount Rushmore and as a source of encouragement to the youth of America to enjoy their freedom of choice of endeavor, the National Government allow this singing on a voluntary basis by nonprofessional student workers and remove the restrictions imposed in 1962; which caused it to cease; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to forward enrolled copies of this concurrent resolution to His Excellency, the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, to U.S. Senators Karl Mundt and George McGovern, and to U.S. Congressmen E. Y. Berry and Ben Reifel.

"Adopted by the senate February 23, 1963.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives March 4, 1963.

"Nils A. Boe,
"*Lieutenant Governor,*
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"Niels P. Jensen,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"Paul E. Brown,
"*Speaker,*
"*House of Representatives.*

"Attest:

"W. J. Matson,
"*Chief Clerk,*
"*House of Representatives.*"

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 12

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency the President of the United States to support construction of the Crazy Horse Memorial near Custer, S. Dak.

"Whereas the Black Hills of South Dakota is one of the outstanding recreation areas of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States of America has assisted greatly with development of the Black Hills as a recreation area through its program of national parks, shrines, and monuments; and

"Whereas continued development of the Black Hills is necessary so future generations can enjoy the same outdoor natural beauties as their predecessors; and

"Whereas one of the outstanding attractions of the future Black Hills development is being developed by a private group through the carving of Crazy Horse Memorial, a tribute to the heritage of the American Indian; and

"Whereas the Sioux Indians of South Dakota will benefit educationally, socially, and esthetically when the monument is completed; and

"Whereas funds from the self-supporting Crazy Horse carving on Thunder Mountain by Sculptor Korczak Ziolkowski are inadequate to complete the monument expeditiously: Now therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the house of representatives concurring, therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and His Excellency the President to assist the Crazy Horse Memorial Foundation Commission in speeding completion of the monument by providing funds to be repaid from admissions and concession sales during and after construction of the mountain carving; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to forward copies of this concurrent resolution to His Excellency, the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both Houses of the Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to U.S. Senators Karl Mundt and George McGovern and to Congressmen E. Y. Berry and Ben Reifel.

"Adopted by the senate, March 2, 1963.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives, March 5, 1963.

"Nils A. Boe,
"*Lieutenant Governor,*
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"Niels P. Jensen,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"Paul E. Brown,
"*Speaker,*
"*House of Representatives.*

"Attest:

"W. J. Matson,
"*Chief Clerk,*
"*House of Representatives.*"

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 9

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States, relative to the so-called right-to-work laws of the respective States of this Union

"Whereas the people of the sovereign State of South Dakota have adopted as an integral part of their State constitution the following section in their bill of rights:

" 'Article VI—Bill of Rights

" 'Sec. 2. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law. The right of persons to work shall not be denied or abridged on account of membership or nonmembership in any labor union, or labor organization'; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the sovereign State of South Dakota has implemented said section of the State constitution with statutory law to enforce this constitutional provision.

"Whereas 20 States in this Union have the same or similar constitutional or legislative enactments: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the members of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota respectfully request that the Congress of the United States refrain from any legislation abrogating the rights of the respective States in this field of civil rights; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate be instructed to send out a duly attested copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Adopted by the senate February 21, 1963.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives February 28, 1963.

"Nils A. Boe,
"*Lieutenant Governor,*
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"Niels P. Jensen,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"Paul E. Brown,
"*Speaker, House of Representatives.*

"Attest:

"W. J. Matson,
"*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*"

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the appointment of electors of the President and Vice President on a basis similar to the election of the Congress of the United States

"Whereas under the Constitution of the United States election of the President and Vice President is by electors in the several States, appointed in each State as directed by its legislature, with each State having an elector for each of its Senators and Representatives in Congress; and

"Whereas the legislature in each State has directed that the appointment of its electors be by popular election on a statewide basis, a method that is not representative of the division of the voters within most of the States; and

"Whereas the whole body of electors (the electoral college) is the exact counterpart of a joint session of the two Houses of Congress in the representation of the States as units as well as the population of the States, and should be elected on a comparable basis so as to give the President and the whole Congress the same form of voting constituency; and

"Whereas the executive and legislative branches of the Government of the United States rest upon nationwide constituencies so altogether different as to make presidential U.S.A. and congressional U.S.A. two different countries within one national boundary: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, that the Congress of the United States of America is respectfully requested to propose the article of amendment as proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 12, now pending in the U.S. Senate, as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted immediately to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, directed to the Secretary of each body; to the Members of Congress from this State; and to each house of the legislature of each of the other States.

"Adopted by the senate February 26, 1963.

"Concurred in by the house of representatives March 4, 1963.

"NILS A. BOE,
"Lieutenant Governor,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"PAUL E. BROWN,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 14

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide financial relief either through amending Public Law 81–874 or direct grants to the Fort Pierre Independent School District, Stanley County, S. Dak.

"Whereas the program of the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers for the construction on the Missouri River in central South Dakota of Oahe Dam, an important link in harnessing the upper Missouri River, necessitated a peak employment of thousands of skilled and unskilled personnel during the past decade, which caused the population of Fort Pierre, a small, historic community within immediate proximity to the dam construction site, to explode with the rapid influx of Federal and Federal-contractor employees, their wives, and, of immediate consequence to the Fort Pierre Independent School District, their children; and

"Whereas the housing patterns of Government and private personnel employed in the construction of Oahe Dam resulted in substantial numbers of mobile homes being moved into Fort Pierre, with relatively few permanent dwelling structures being constructed, while the school population increased by 234 percent, thereby decreasing the equity and effectiveness of the property tax, Fort Pierre's normal tool for financing education; and

"Whereas under Public Law 81–874, as amended, the Fort Pierre Independent School District received payments from the Federal Government to ameliorate the sudden and massive increase in school enrollments which continued through the past decade but which the Corps of Army Engineers discontinued upon the completion of Oahe Dam, no longer requiring the services of large numbers of personnel; and

"Whereas the completion of the construction of the Oahe Dam should have resulted in the community losing the temporary population gained in the beginning of the last decade, but with a similar dam being constructed only 66 highway miles downstream, many workers lingered in the community commuting to the new damsite, and continuing to educate their children in Fort Pierre schools, despite the school district's loss of impacted area funds; and

"Whereas the burden of supporting the community's educational facilities now rests entirely upon State aid and the property taxes paid by established, home owning and permanent community residents who are already taxed at the maximum constitutional amount and who have, lacking other alternatives, turned to the State for immediate and emergency assistance; and

"Whereas the constitution of the State of South Dakota prohibits the State legislature from enacting special appropriations to relieve the plight of the Fort Pierre Independent School District; and

"Whereas the Federal Government remains the only remaining source of assistance and aid to solve the community's rapidly deteriorating school district financial condition arising from the construction of the Oahe Dam and the subsequent and sudden withdrawal of financial support: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), do memorialize the Congress of the United States, to take immediate and necessary action to recognize the ignored responsibility of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers and provide financial relief, either through direct financial aid or an amendment to Public Law 81–874, as amended, to the Fort Pierre Independent School District, Stanley County, S. Dak., to be effective until the construction employment patterns of the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers and its contractors no longer affect the enrollment of the school district; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the chairmen of the Committee on Education of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Committees on Public Works of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and the members of the South Dakota delegations to the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the Senate March 5, 1963.

"Concurred in by the House of Representatives March 6, 1963.

"NILS A. BOE,
"Lieutenant Governor,
"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"PAUL E. BROWN,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"Attest:

"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 95. Resolution to provide funds for additional staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Rept. No. 42).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without additional amendment:

S. Res. 14. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations (Rept. No. 20);

S. Res. 15. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters pertaining to public and private housing (Rept. No. 21);

S. Res. 22. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to examine, investigate, and study matters pertaining to migratory labor (Rept. No. 43); and

S. Res. 75. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to national defense (Rept. No. 18).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an additional amendment:

S. Res. 74. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to make a study of matters pertaining to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies (Rept. No. 17); and

S. Res. 79. Resolution to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on strategic and critical stockpiling (Rept. No. 19).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 16. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction and authorizing certain expenditures therefor (Rept. No. 28);

S. Res. 20. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ additional clerical assistance (Rept. No. 44); and

S. Res. 64. Resolution to investigate national penitentiaries (Rept. No. 37).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Res. 12. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Works to investigate certain matters (Rept. No. 46);

S. Res. 13. Resolution to study certain aspects of national security operations (Rept. No. 27);

S. Res. 17. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government (Rept. No. 24);

S. Res. 18. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate the postal service and the civil service system (Rept. No. 45);

S. Res. 23. Resolution extending the Special Committee on Aging through January 31, 1964 (Rept. No. 49);

S. Res. 25. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine, investigate, and make studies of matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration (Rept. No. 23);

S. Res. 26. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to continue its study of the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals (Rept. No. 22);

S. Res. 27. Resolution to provide funds for the study of matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency (Rept. No. 25);

S. Res. 45. Resolution authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities (Rept. No. 26);

S. Res. 49. Resolution authorizing the Select Committee on Small Business to make a study of American small and independent business problems (Rept. No. 48);

S. Res. 55. Resolution to study administrative practice and procedure (Rept. No. 29);

S. Res. 57. Resolution authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendment (Rept. No. 30);

S. Res. 58. Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights (Rept. No. 31);

S. Res. 59. Resolution to consider matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations (Rept. No. 32);

S. Res. 60. Resolution to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization (Rept. No. 34);

S. Res. 61. Resolution to study and examine the Federal judicial system (Rept. No. 33);

S. Res. 62. Resolution to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act (Rept. No. 35);

S. Res. 63. Resolution to investigate juvenile delinquency (Rept. No. 36);

S. Res. 65. Resolution to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office (Rept. No. 38);

S. Res. 66. Resolution to investigate problems created by flow of escapees and refugees from communistic tyranny (Rept. No. 39);

S. Res. 67. Resolution to study revision and codification of the Statutes of the United States (Rept. No. 40);

S. Res. 68. Resolution to investigate the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act (Rept. No. 41); and

S. Res. 73. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and to employ temporary personnel (Rept. No. 47).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 92. A bill for the relief of Hom Wah Yook (also known as Hom Bok Heung) (Rept. No. 51);

S. 97. A bill for the relief of Purificacion Siat (Rept. No. 52);

S. 208. A bill for the relief of Young Wai (Rept. No. 53);

S. 234. A bill for the relief of Harold and Sylvia Freda Karro and their three minor children, Allan Karro, Jennifer Karro, and Michelle Karro (Rept. No. 54);

S. 436. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Bialoglowski (Rept. No. 55);

S. 506. A bill for the relief of Panagiota Makris (Rept. No. 56);

S. 574. A bill for the relief of Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez (Rept. No. 57);

S. 596. A bill for the relief of Roswitha Seib (Rept. No. 58); and

S. 688. A bill for the relief of Ronald Whiting (Rept. No. 59).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 193. A bill for the relief of Michelina Lanni (Rept. No. 60).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 195. A bill for the relief of Isabel Loretta Allen (Rept. No. 61);

S. 421. A bill for the relief of Ho Koon Chew (Rept. No. 62); and

S. 635. A bill for the relief of Krystyna Rataj (Rept. No. 63).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 4. Joint resolution to provide for the actual participation of the United States in the West Virginia centennial celebration (Rept. No. 50).

TO REPRINT COMMITTEE PRINT, 87TH CONGRESS, ENTITLED "PART 1 OF CONCENTRATION RATIOS IN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY, 1958"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary two thousand additional copies of part 1 of its committee print of the Eighty-seventh Congress entitled "Concentration Ratios in Manufacturing Industry, 1958", a report prepared by the Bureau of the Census for the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN, of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 107); which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. HAYDEN, of Arizona; Mr. JORDAN, of North Carolina; and Mr. SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. JORDAN, of North Carolina; Mr. Pell, of Rhode Island; Mr. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; Mr. COOPER, of Kentucky; and Mr. SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON UTILIZATION OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports of the Committees on Public Works; Labor and Public Welfare; the Judiciary; and the Joint Economic Committee concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by those committees in 1962 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Jennings Randolph: Mexico	Peso	400	31.10	140	11.20	900	72.40	528	42.30	1,968	158.00
Senator Ernest Gruening: Mexico	do	460	36.50	350	28.00	950	76.00	520	41.80	2,280	182.30
Theo W. Sneed: Mexico	do	350	28.00	200	16.00	800	64.10	430	34.40	1,780	142.50
Lorenzo E. Tapia: Mexico	do	460	36.90	350	28.00	800	64.10	330	26.50	1,940	155.50
Herbert W. Beaser: Mexico	do	350	28.00	100	8.00	800	64.10	237	19.00	1,487	119.10
Total			161.50		91.20		340.70		164.00		757.40

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	757.40

PAT MCNAMARA,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

MARCH 4, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Pat McNamara: Switzerland	Franc	512	128	488	122	4,122	1,030.50			5,122	1,280.50
Total			128		122		1,030.50				1,280.50

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,280.50

LISTER HILL,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FEBRUARY 27, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Kenneth B. Keating:											
Austria	Schilling							165.90	6.83	165.90	6.83
Belgium	Franc	1,285	25.70			425	8.50	250	5.24	1,960	39.44
Germany	Deutsche mark							96	24.00	96	24.00
Italy	Lira					11,178	18.00			11,178	18.00
Nigeria	Nigerian pound							1/10/0	4.23	1/10/0	4.23
Poland	Zloty	1,115	44.60					407	18.82	1,522	63.42
United Kingdom	Pound					4/17/6	13.65			4/17/6	13.65
Netherlands	Dutch guilder					3934.17	[1] 1,094.65				[1] 1,094.65
Subtotal			70.30				1,134.80		59.12		1,264.22
Milton Eisenberg:											
Nigeria	Pound	17	48.00	7	20.00			2/2/5	6.00	26/2/5	74.00
Netherlands	Dutch guilder					3,496.96	973.00				973.00
Subtotal			48.00		20.00				6.00		1,047.00
Paul L. Laskin:											
France	Franc					5,438	1,109.74			5,438	1,109.74
Italy	Lire	47,330	76.20	21,000	33.82	3,870	6.23	10,800	17.40	83,000	133.65
Subtotal			76.20		33.82		1,115.97		17.40		1,243.39
Phyllis T. Piotrow:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	208.35	52.09	28.60	7.15	143	35.75	24.80	6.20	404.75	101.19
Italy	Lira	9,793	15.75	4,310	7.00	2,200	3.55	2,352	3.75	18,655	30.05
United Kingdom	Pound	18/1/10	50.65	2-2-10	6.00	1-19-6	5.55	1-4-11	3.50	23-9-1	65.70
Netherlands	Dutch guilder					2,425.95	[1] 675.00				[1] 675.00
Subtotal			118.49		20.15		719.85		13.45		871.94
Total			312.99		73.97		3,943.62		95.97		4,426.55

[1] Certain portions of this ticket were not used and refunds for such will be made by airlines.

[2] Ticket not used; amount will be refunded by airline.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	4,426.55

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

MARCH 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Martha W. Griffiths:											
Panama	Balboa	60	60.00	18.75	18.75			3	3.00	[1] 81.75	81.75
Costa Rica	Colón	350	52.60	203	30.50			145	21.80	[1] 698	104.90
Guatemala	Quetzal	18.40	18.40	13.55	13.55			5	5.00	[1] 36.95	36.95
Mexico	Peso	525	42.00	432	34.60	440.00	35.20	45.50	3.60	1,442.50	115.40
Netherlands	Guilder					1,513.8	420.50			1,513.8	420.50
Subtotal			173.00		97.40		455.70		33.40		759.50
Ann Cooper Penning:											
Panama	Balboa	60	60.00	16.70	16.70			3.35	3.35	[1] 80.05	80.05
Costa Rica	Colón	163.20	24.50	134.30	20.20			47	7.10	[1] 344.50	51.80
Guatemala	Quetzal	18.40	18.40	11.50	11.50			3	3.00	[1] 32.90	32.90
Mexico	Peso	525	42.00	420	33.60	365	29.20	37.90	3.10	1,347.90	107.90
West Germany	Deutsche mark					1,866	466.55			1,866	466.55
Subtotal			144.90		82,00		495.75		16.55		739.20
William H. Moore:											
Panama	Balboa	60	60.00	19.75	19.75			6	6.00	[1] 75.75	85.75
Costa Rica	Colón	163.20	24.50	126.20	19.00			45	6.90	[1] 334.50	50.40
Guatemala	Quetzal	18.40	18.40	13.50	13.50			6	6.00	[1] 37.90	37.90
Mexico	Peso	525	42.00	406	32.50	295	23.60	71	5.70	1,295	103.80
West Germany	Deutsche mark					1,866	466.50			1,866	466.50
Subtotal			144.90		84.75		490.10		24.60		744.35
Hon. Jacob K. Javits:											
Germany	Deutsche mark			60	15.00			40	10.00	100	25.00
Netherlands	Guilder					2,078.28	577.30			2,078.28	577.30
France	New franc			1,343.70	268.74					1,343.70	[2] 268.74
Total					283.74		577.30		10.00		871.04
Belle Notkin, France	do	615.65	125.64	474.50	96.83	195	39.80	230.50	47.05	1,515.65	309.32
Ettore Lolli,[3] Italy	Lira					125,000	201.29			125,000	201.29
Jurg Niehans,[3] Switzerland	Franc					4,411	1,019.64	119.75	27.69	4,530.75	1,047.33
Alan Day,[3] United Kingdom	Pound sterling	35-0-0	94.50	22-0-0	59.40	334-5-0	936.54	0-2-10	6.10	391-7-10	1,096.54
Subtotal			94.50		59.40		2,157.47		33.79		2,345.16

See footnote at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Joint Economic Committee, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Harvey J. Winter:											
Italy	Lira	35,200	56.77	33,100	53.38	7,300	11.77	9,400	15.16	85,000	137.08
France	New franc	465	93.00	445	89.00	5,472.95	1,107.80	55	11.00	6,437.95	1,300.80
Subtotal			149.77		142.38		1,118.57		26.16		1,437.88
D. B. Hardeman:											
Netherlands	Guilder					4,818	1,340.82			4,818	1,340.82
Poland	Zloty	760	31.67	1,043	43.46			639	26.62	2,442	101.75
Yugoslavia	Dinar	60,425	90.57	33,820	45.09	39,405	52.54	16,350	21.80	150,000	200.00
Subtotal			112.24		88.55		1,393.36		48.42		1,642.57
Hon. Henry S. Reuss:											
France	New franc	350	70.00	215	43.00					565	113.00
Switzerland	Franc	195.50	48.88	85	21.25					280.50	70.13
Belgium	do					88	22.00			88	22.00
Subtotal			118.88		64.25		22.00				205.13
Harold A. Levin:											
Belgium	Franc	260	5.20	125	2.50	23	.46	100	2.00	508	10.16
England	Pound	10-10-9	29.49	3-7-9	9.47	0-10-0	1.40	0-7-6	1.04	15-16-0	44.20
West Germany	Deutsche mark	170.55	42.64	54.45	13.61	4,168.75	[4] 1,044.80			4,393.75	1,101.05
Subtotal			77.33		25.58		1,046.66		5.84		1,155.41
Thomas H. Boggs, Jr.:											
France	New franc	313.6	64.00	362.6	74.00	65	13.27	58.8	12.00	800	163.27
Italy	Lira	25,900	41.11	32,130	51.00	5,040	8.00	6,930	11.00	70,000	111.11
Germany	Deutsche mark					4,921	1,224.00			4,921	1,224.00
Subtotal			105.11		125.00		1,245.27		23.00		1,498.38
Philip Patman:											
Belgium and Luxembourg	Franc	3,040	60.80	4,120	82.40	2,661	53.20	420	8.40	10,241	204.80
Germany	Deutsche mark	285	71.25	360	90.00	5,810.66	1,381.20	100	25.00	6,556.66	1,567.45
Austria	Schilling	1,560	60.00	1,325	50.95	105	4.00	310	11.95	3,300	126.90
Greece	Drachma	1,755	58.50	1,680	56.00	155	5.15	410	13.70	4,000	133.35
Italy	Lira	24,800	39.35	30,250	48.00	3,850	6.15	6,100	9.65	65,000	103.15
France	New franc	641	130.80	535	109.20	204	41.65	60	12.20	1,440	293.85
Subtotal			420.70		436.55		1,491.35		80.90		2,429.50
W. Andrew Carothers, Jr.:											
Belgium	Franc	3,950	79.00	4,400	88.00	900	18.00	355	7.10	9,605	192.10
France	New franc	724	147.75	552	112.65	348	71.02	196	40.00	1,820	371.42
West Germany	Deutsche mark	364	91.00	408	102.00	6,126.66	1,437.20	125	31.25	7,023.66	1,661.45
Greece	Drachma	1,755	58.50	1,595	53.17	650	21.66	500	16.67	4,500	150.00
Italy	Lira	25,000	39.66	32,000	50.78	5,800	9.20	7,200	11.48	70,000	111.12
Turkey	do	360	40.00	415	46.11	97	10.77	128	14.23	1,000	111.11
Subtotal			455.91		452.71		1,567.85		120.73		2,597.20
Robert G. Williams:											
Luxembourg and Belgium	Belgian franc	4,843	96.80	5,000	100.00	776	15.52			10,619	212.32
West Germany	Deutsche mark	465.39	116.34	500	124.60	6,100.75	1,532.85	74.61	18.65	7,140.75	1,792.44
Austria	Schilling	1,361.30	51.40	1,639	63.35	300	11.55			3,300	126.30
Greece	Drachma	1,117	37.25	1,483	49.41			400	13.34	3,000	100.00
Italy	Lira	27,520	44.70	43,070	69.00	9,470	15.50	95.70	15.50	90,000	144.70
France	New franc	298.20	81.23	500.20	102.08	6,180	12.44	40	8.16	1,000	203.91
Subtotal			427.72		508.44		1,587.86		55.65		2,579.67
Vernon A. Mund:											
Belgium and Luxembourg	Belgian franc	4,800	96.00	5,900	118.00	1,273	44.52	2,200	44.00	14,757	302.52
Germany	Deutsche mark	384	96.00	384	96.00	7,016	1,664.70	382	95.00	8,166	1,951.70
Austria	Schilling	1,600	61.80	1,600	61.80			1,800	69.50	5,000	193.10
Greece	Drachma	2,250	75.00	2,050	68.00			1,100	36.00	5,400	179.00
Italy	Lira	30,000	48.39	35,000	56.45			35,000	56.45	100,000	161.29
France	New franc	490	100.00	441	90.00			169	34.00	1,100	224.00
Subtotal			477.19		490.25		1709.22		334.95		3,011.61

[1] Purchased with Mexican pesos.

[2] Represents cost of luncheon meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians' Economic Committee, of which Senator Javits is Chairman, at Pavilion Dauphine in Paris.

[3] Witnesses brought to United States to testify at hearings.

[4] Less unused portion of ticket.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	22,325.92

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee.

MARCH 8, 1963.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE,
March 8, 1963.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: In conformity with section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act, enclosed is the report on foreign currencies expended under authorization of the Joint Economic Committee for the period January 1–December 31, 1962.

These expenditures were authorized by the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee who held that office during the 87th Congress.

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 1053. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1054. A bill for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1055. A bill for the relief of Jack Baer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1056. A bill to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. Hruska):

S. 1057. A bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1058. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to survivor annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Neuberger when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1059. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Old Fort Hays National Historic Site in the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Carlson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 1060. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annie Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. Clark):

S.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution establishing a commission to participate in the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT, WITH ILLUSTRATIONS, A "REPORT ON U.S. FOREIGN OPERATIONS," BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document, a report entitled "A Report on United States Foreign Operations in Africa", submitted by Senator Allen J. Ellender to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and that four thousand additional copies be printed for the use of that Committee.

TO REPRINT COMMITTEE PRINT, 87TH CONGRESS, ENTITLED "PART 1 OF CONCENTRATION RATIOS IN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY, 1958"

Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) to reprint copies of the committee print, 87th Congress, entitled "Part 1 of Concentration Ratios in Manufacturing Industry, 1958," which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Kefauver, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

RESOLUTION

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 107) providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Report of a Committee.")

LIBERALIZATION NEEDED IN CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SURVIVORSHIP

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Congress in 1948 wisely provided survivorship benefits for those retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act. This was an important step forward. Last year Congress liberalized the survivorship formula so as to decrease the reduction in annuitants' retirement in order to provide for survivors. Health benefits have also been extended to eligible survivors.

One of the serious weaknesses of the survivorship program is that when a person retires with a reduced annuity with a survivorship annuity provision, the survivorship provision covers only benefits for the spouse living at the time of retirement. If this spouse should die prior to the death of the annuitant, there is no way in which survivorship benefits, under present law, can be extended to a new husband or wife. This is indeed cruel, and creates extreme hardship in many cases.

I have received heart-rending letters from all parts of the country pointing out this hardship situation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks just two of the many recent letters I have received.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hackettstown, N.J.,
January 28, 1963.

Senator Maurine B. Neuberger,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Neuberger: I enjoyed reading your comments on retirement legislation in the January issue of Retirement Life magazine. We are deeply grateful for the interest you have taken and the bills you have introduced to benefit us.

My former husband, who served as a letter carrier for 39 years, died in 1940. In 1958 I received a monthly pension of $50, granted to the "forgotten widows." I lost my annuity when I remarried in 1960.

My present husband, a retired letter carrier, who served 33 years, designated his former wife for survivor benefits. He is still receiving a reduced pension even though she predeceased him.

My husband feels that since he is paying for survivor benefits, and since I gave up survivor benefits when I remarried, that he should be able to name me as his beneficiary and thus provide for me in the event of his death. This, I know would give him peace of mind.

I hope this session of Congress will pass a bill to solve this problem. I waited 18 years for the "forgotten widows" bill to pass. Now I don't have that much time left.

Again, may I say we are deeply grateful for your efforts in our behalf. Somehow, I feel that when the sunset of your life rolls around, you will be blessed for your kindness to us.

Very truly yours,

Charlotte A. Gee.

Spartansburg, S.C.,
January 7, 1963.

Hon. Maurine B. Neuberger,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Neuberger: I was deeply interested in the reproduction of your recent address to the Portland, Oreg., chapter of retired civil employees, which appeared in the January issue of Retirement Life magazine. It was especially interesting to read what you had to say relative to survivorship provisions.

My husband and I were married 10 years ago, 1953, and I am his second wife, and we were married after his retirement. His first wife was designated as his beneficiary and since her death he has been paying on his first wife, as beneficiary, since his retirement on February 1, 1950, and will have to continue to pay under the present law.

I am sure that there are similar cases such as mine and it would be most helpful to thousands of retirees if this injustice could be corrected. We appreciate all that you have done, and are doing for retirees. We are also grateful to you for the assistance given in the last raise of 5 percent; however, it would have been more helpful toward the high cost of living had your more liberal bill been passed.

Wishing you much success in all of your undertakings in the 88th Congress,

Very truly yours,

Nanna P. Harrison.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am introducing today proposed legislation to alleviate this hardship situation. My bill provides that an annuitant retired on a reduced annuity with a survivor annuity may, in the event of death or divorce of his spouse and remarriage continuing for at least 2 years, designate the second wife or husband to receive survivor annuity benefits. I realized that more liberal bills have been introduced previously, and while they have merit they have failed of enactment. I am aware that my bill is more restrictive, but because of the reduced cost involved I am hopeful that it will stand a good chance of favorable consideration.

Other governmental retirement laws such as social security and railroad retirement do provide adequately for survivorship, without the restrictions imposed by the civil service retirement system. It is my hope that Congress will give favorable consideration to liberalizing the survivorship provisions along the lines which exist in social security and railroad retirement.

Under present law when an annuitant retires and provides survivorship benefits by taking a reduced annuity, the reduced annuity remains in force even though the spouse precedes in death and no benefits are derived from survivorship reduction.

As a member of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, I feel that present civil service survivor provisions are unduly restrictive and primarily cause grievous injury to widows, who are oftentimes left destitute in old age. I ask Congress to extend simple justice to our retired Federal employees by liberalizing the survivorship provisions.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act as amended with respect to survivor annuities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1058) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, with respect to survivor annuities, introduced by Mrs. Neuberger, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DESIGNATION OF THE KANSAS HISTORICAL PARK AS A NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the formation and development of the Midwest and West of the United States produced many shining examples of bravery and heroism. Kansas, the center of the United States, played a most important part in this development.

Its brilliant history resplendent in courage, stamina, and character helped to make it a great State—and this a great Nation. Many of the great historical events in the development of our country took place within the boundaries of Kansas. I sincerely believe some of the events and the sites upon which they happened should be memorialized and preserved for future generations.

One of these is Old Fort Hays, Kans.

Established in 1867, Fort Hays played an important role in the opening of the West to settlement and to the building of the Kansas Pacific Railroad across the Plains country. It was one of the last important outposts established for protection of railroad workers and settlers from the Indians who inhabited the Plains.

Many of the famous military men who had fought in the Civil War were stationed here: General Philip Sheridan; General Forsyth; General Armstrong Custer; the famous 7th Cavalry unit and many famous officers of lesser rank. The fort was active for 22 years and in 1889 was abandoned because, it was said, the West had become civilized and there was no longer danger from foes within the Nation.

Two buildings, the famous Block House and the Guard House, both constructed in 1867 of native sandstone, are still in perfect state of preservation and attract tourist attention continuously. The Block House was the headquarters building when the fort was active.

Two highways intersect at the corner of the reservation, U.S. 40 and 183, and there is a constant flow of visitors to the reservation. The story of the fort is known across the Nation and it attracts general attention. In 3 months' time last summer when the Old Fort Hays Museum, in the Block House, was open, more than 19,000 visitors registered. They were from both coasts and many foreign countries. These buildings are now a part of the Kansas Frontier Historical Park. I believe it should be made a national center of interest to all people. Therefore, Mr. President, I am introducing, for appropriate referral, a bill which would designate the Kansas Historical Park as a national historic site.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1059) to provide for the establishment of the Old Fort Hays National Historic Site in the State of Kansas, introduced by Mr. Carlson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COMMISSION TO PARTICIPATE IN 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG AND LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this year Americans everywhere will observe the centennial of the Battle of Gettysburg and the centennial of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, two of the most important events in our Nation's history.

I am offering a bill today that would authorize the President to appoint a commission of 10 persons to cooperate with the commission appointed by Governor Scranton, of Pennsylvania, to plan and carry out the ceremonies relating to those events. It also would authorize the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to provide for the participation of the armed services in the observances.

The State of Pennsylvania has already allocated $105,000 for use by the State commission and this bill authorizes up to $150,000 for Federal participation.

My senior colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator Clark, is cosponsoring this bill, and Congressman George A. Goodling, of Pennsylvania, is introducing an identical measure in the House.

Although the center of activity for these observances is in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Battle of Gettysburg and Lincoln's address at the battlefield are integral parts of American history. I am hopeful that the Congress will recognize the great national interest in these events and act favorably on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 58) establishing a commission to participate in the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, introduced by Mr. Scott (for himself and Mr. Clark), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In behalf of the Vice President the Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] to be a delegate to the Mexican parliamentary meeting, in place of the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers]; and also the appointment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] in place of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] to the same meeting.

Also, on behalf of the Vice President, and pursuant to the provisions of section I of Public Law 87–883, the Chair announces the appointment as members of the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission, the following Senators: Lausche and Young, of Ohio, Keating, of New York, and Scott, of Pennsylvania.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it had been the belief of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] and me that I was a cosponsor of Senate bill 287, placing the transport industries under the antitrust laws, and Senate bill 288, prohibiting strikes at missile sites, but making provision for compulsory arbitration.

An examination of the Record shows we were both mistaken in that belief.

Having obtained the consent of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] to become a cosponsor of both bills, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added to the bills as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio. We are very happy to have his support of these measures. I think they are important. I think they are measures which this Congress should act on. I do not think we can continue indifferently and permit some conditions that exist now in the labor-management field. I think both of these measures are necessary for the Congress to meet its responsibilities in meeting the problems involved. I thank the Senator for his support and great concern in this field.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES IN FISHERY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] be added as cosponsors to my bill S. 627, which will assist States in their fishery research development programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Article entitled "U.S. and Burma Reach Accord in Working Road to Mandalay," appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Post of March 8, 1963; also, an adaptation by Senator Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, of Kipling's poem, "On the Road to Mandalay."

PROBLEMS OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the March issue of Armed Forces Management appears an excellent editorial on the current problems which confront the Secretary of Defense and the manner in which he has gone about dealing with them.

No job in this Government—other than the Presidency—is more complex or more taxing than that of Secretary of Defense. Secretary McNamara has been exceptional in discharging its responsibilities. As is to be expected of anyone in public office, he is subjected from time to time to criticism. But as Secretary of Defense he has to look at defense from every angle, and at the total cost of defense in juxtaposition with the total problem of defense. He cannot afford the luxury of putting on blinders and not considering all aspects of defense and all elements in its cost. And let me say that we, as a Nation, cannot afford that luxury, either.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I was struck by this editorial. It provides some understanding of the immense scope of the Secretary's current organizational tasks, and a well-balanced evaluation of the way in which he is trying—with great dedication—to discharge them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This Horrendous State of Affairs

Packs of nasty little academic debates have been scurrying around military circles, and even beyond, recently over a tongue-twisting polysyllable mouthful called the "trend to centralization of decisionmaking authority" in the Pentagon.

While we sympathize with the subjective reasons for this fretting, we find little objective fact to support the argument that McNamara's mailed fist is creating in the ranks, all by itself, a truly horrendous state of affairs.

Having just finished an analysis of the 15-year evolution in how the Defense Department has been run, we are convinced today's apprehensive palaver (that "the trend" must be reversed) is largely overloaded with nonsense.

Part of the complainer's difficulty comes from their being forced to view the total national defense need from somewhere below the top level. Properly, but unfortunately for their peace of mind, the nature of the challenge and of the resources we have to meet it can be evaluated best only from Defense Secretary McNamara's office—and this would be so, incidentally, whether he or someone else was warming the chair.

On top of that, the cause of good personnel relations is boosted little when the job itself is such that a new Secretary, whether he wants to or not, must operate not unlike, interestingly enough, Boston Celtics Basketball Coach Red Auerbach. Said Auerbach recently, describing why his ball club has for years been so successful, "They [the team] must adjust to me. I don't have to adjust to them."

It is hardly surprising then that McNamara faces a raft of internal communications problems. The manned bomber force is being told it has precious little life expectancy left. The fleets are under serious challenge to prove they have any mission worth their expense. The Army is struggling with an organizational shakeup greater than anything it has faced in recent history.

Drop into that environment a hard-driving leader who analyzes problems and options with cold, unemotional logic and makes rapid-fire decisions based on cost-effectiveness facts—all of which are changing drastically the former decisionmaking routine of the services—and some human turmoil is bound to result.

Significantly, much of the chatter has cropped up at budget hearing time on Capitol Hill. Thus Pentagon veterans write about 20 percent of the talk off to "Gamesmanship," that grand old military art of setting the proper congressional stage for stating why a particular program should be given by the legislators better than it got from its own military review.

Not that the Secretary's office is executing its decisions these days with unchallengeable excellence. Its sledgehammer implementation in some very detailed areas has caused considerable consternation; discouraged all but the most courageous crusaders from responding to a key McNamara philosophy (printed in AFM 2 years ago) that he expected "prompt decisions from Defense personnel who accepted responsibility and did not seek excessive advice."

But translating philosophy into procedure in as complex a setup as Defense takes quite a while. Until McNamara closes the large-sized information gap which exists, particularly at the working military level, over who is supposed to do what and why, he will probably have to continue to make many decisions on details. (The fact that they haven't bogged him down so far is a break for the rest of the organization.)

However, this understandable lag in awareness has been twisted around lately by some incomprehensible thought process into a set of qualifying credentials for criticizing McNamara. Even more ridiculous: he's being charged, basically, not with incompetence but with having the audacity to do what the law says he's supposed to do—run the Defense Department.

If you inspect the record, it is clear that most, if not all, the barbs being thrown at McNamara accuse him of doing today what a Defense Secretary was being chastized for not doing just 3 years ago.

Understandably, observers who don't have their emotions all jangled up in this debate are considerably confused by the flip-flop nature of the protagonists' new viewpoint, find few facts to support it and know many facts that don't.

For instance, this ridiculous business that he ignores his professional military leaders' views, apart from being an incredibly suspect charge on the face of it, ignores a couple key points:

1. McNamara is pushing programs which were not that popular before. The reason, said one general, "There have been too many problems critical to the total national defense interest which we and the other services, with limited resources and our own rating of mission priority, could only be half interested in before."

2. His highly skeptical questioning of service statements on new weapons has soured a lot of military types but considering the current, generally poor military track record for estimating hardware cost, development time, and performance, he can hardly be blamed for that.

Unless this complaining is allowed to well up into a crusade, we have little doubt that the internal hassle over decisionmaking will ease off eventually if (1) McNamara and his team stick with the job another couple years and (2) all levels—McNamara's immediate staff, the service staffs, the field installations—bend over backward a little to view problems as seen by the rest of the outfit.

To nurture understanding (which in final analysis is the only real problem) will require the highest kind of statesmanship. But we can hardly expect much progress when reasonable, responsible people are tangled instead in a distracting separatist argument full of high-flown theorizing and ghostly managerial abstractions which have no fact-supported substance except in their own minds.

C. W. Borklund.

ADMINISTRATION POLICY OF CONCEALING INFORMATION FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this administration is adopting a policy of concealing from the American people far too much information which has no bearing on our security. It is becoming a habit to conceal waste of the taxpayers' money, under the stamp of a confidential or secret classification.

Today, I call the attention of the Senate to a typical example of unnecessary secrecy. Under date of February 15, 1963, the Comptroller General of the United States submitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives a report in which the first paragraph reads as follows:

Comptroller General of the
United States,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1963.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Enclosed is our report on the review of license fees being charged the U.S. Government for the right to produce the SS-11 antitank guided missile mutually developed by France and the United States under the mutual weapons development program.

The report then proceeds to describe an expenditure of several million dollars, which should have been wholly unnecessary had the Department been exercising the proper degree of caution in the administration of previous programs.

All of this information, however, is marked "confidential." Under this formula the information is for the use of the committee members only, and is not to be repeated to the American people.

I should emphasize that my criticism here today is not directed against the Comptroller General, since it is my understanding that he does not have the jurisdiction of releasing information which is classified as confidential by the

Department of Defense or the State Department.

The final paragraph of this report, however, is "unclassified," and it reads as follows:

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army.

Joseph Campbell,
Comptroller General of the United States.

These two paragraphs—the first and the last paragraph of the report—are the only ones which are not classified.

Mr. President, I do not blame the Department for being ashamed of these unnecessary expenditures, but I disagree completely with their right to keep the information from the American people.

THE COAST GUARD SHOULD NOT BE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S PRIVATE GUARD

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss a new policy of the Kennedy administration under which the Attorney General of the United States has commandeered the U.S. Coast Guard to act as his special nursemaid when sailing his sloop on the Chesapeake Bay. He is demanding this special attention even to the extent of having the Coast Guard ignore calls from other boats in distress.

The U.S. Coast Guard has over the years established an enviable record in protecting the lives and safeguarding the property of those in distress. It has always been the rule of the Coast Guard that people in distress would be helped, without regard to their social or political position.

With this historical background of service, it is with regret that I find that in the present administration there are those who have taken it upon themselves to order the Coast Guard to give special protection to them and their friends, even to the point of ignoring a distress call from others.

This new policy was forcibly called to my attention when a constituent who was cruising in the Chesapeake Bay last October 14 had his motor stall, and appealed to the Coast Guard for assistance. Utilizing his two-way radio, this man called the Tilghman Island Light Attendant Station, and asked for assistance.

His message was intercepted by the Coast Guard auxiliary boat which was cruising in the area. The Coast Guard cutter soon arrived alongside the boat in distress, and the one in charge discussed its problem, but stated that he was unable to render any assistance, due to the fact that he was under special orders to trail the yacht or sailing sloop of the Attorney General of the United States around the bay, just in case his boat developed some trouble. He left after telling the man in the broken down boat that he would try to send someone else to help.

The result was that the man and his party were left with a stalled motor, to await assistance from some other source, which hours later came from a private company which towed them to port.

Adm. E. J. Roland, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, has confirmed that the reason for this was that orders had been received the week before, from the Attorney General's office, instructing that the Coast Guard make arrangements to provide communication with the yacht *Honya*, which would be sailing on Chesapeake Bay during the 13th and 14th with the Attorney General of the United States on board.

Based on this request, *CG–40572*, from Tilghman Island Light Station, was assigned the special mission of surveillance of the *Honya*, the Attorney General's sailing yacht, on October 14. It was while the Coast Guard cutter was carrying out this special assignment that a boat in distress was ignored and was left to wait and hope for assistance from some other source.

It is true that the weather was calm and clear at the time; so, in the absence of any sudden squall, the boat was in no danger; but this is all the more reason why the Attorney General did not need an escort.

Neither the Attorney General of the United States nor any other member of the President's Cabinet nor any Member of Congress has any right to order that the services of the Coast Guard be devoted to his exclusive protection.

It was highly improper for the Attorney General, even though he is a brother of the President of the United States, to allow the Coast Guard to disregard a boat which was in distress, just to trail him around as a special nursemaid.

This administration has said much about businessmen who charge off on their expense accounts the cost of operation of their yachts. But in my opinion it is even worse for an official of the U.S. Government to charge to the American taxpayers the expense of having a Coast Guard cutter operate exclusively just to trail his own yacht around the Chesapeake Bay.

It has always been the responsibility of the Coast Guard to patrol these waters and to stand ready to assist anyone in distress; and over the years they have established an enviable record in that connection.

I am not criticizing the Commandant of the Coast Guard; I appreciate the position in which he found himself when he received such orders from the brother of the President of the United States. But I sincerely hope that in the future he will instruct the Attorney General—who should know the law—that he is not entitled to any consideration different from that accorded any other boating party cruising in the area.

We all recognize that the President of the United States and the immediate members of his family do, and very properly should, have special protection. No one takes exception to that point, but I doubt that even he would ask the Coast Guard to ignore a boat in trouble.

Not only do I very much regret that this incident happened, from the standpoint of the unnecessary inconvenience to my constituent, but this incident is even more regrettable from the standpoint of the embarrassing position in which it placed the Coast Guard.

I sincerely hope that in the future the Attorney General will be more discreet.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that a letter signed by Adm. E. J. Roland, Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, confirming these special arrangements, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

December 14, 1962.

Hon. John J. Williams,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Williams: This is in further reply to your letter of October 22, 1962, concerning the failure of the Coast Guard to assist Mr. ———, of Wilmington, Del., when he requested them to do so.

I have received a full report of this matter from the commander, 5th Coast Guard District. This report discloses that the Attorney General's Office requested the Coast Guard to make arrangements in case of emergency to provide communications with the yacht *Honya*, which would be sailing on Chesapeake Bay during October 13 and 14, 1962, with the Attorney General of the United States on board. Based on this request, the *CG–40572* from Tilghman Island Light Attendant Station (rescue) was assigned the mission of surveillance of the *Honya* to provide communications as necessary on October 14.

At about 1445 hours the *Helen R* is reported to have called for Coast Guard assistance on 2182 kilocycles. This signal was not received by the Tilghman Island station. However, it was heard by the Coast Guard auxiliary boat *Black Jack III*, which immediately relayed the call to the Tilghman Island station. The Tilghman Island station was unable to contact the *Helen R* directly, therefore the *Black Jack III* acted as a relay station and forwarded the necessary information to Tilghman Island station. The Tilghman Island station then notified the *CG-40572* on 2702 kilocycles that the *Helen R* was anchored off Wade Point with engine trouble. The *CG–40572*, which was en route to the *Honya*, at this time, proceeded to the *Helen R* to investigate.

At 1455 hours the *CG–40572* arrived alongside the *Helen R* which was safely anchored and in no immediate danger. The weather at the time was clear with light airs and a calm sea. The coxswain of the *CG–40572*, because of his assigned surveillance duties, called the Baltimore group commander and advised him of the circumstances and conditions. The group commander, when advised of the situation, called the Tidewater Fisheries Service and inquired if that organization could provide assistance to the *Helen R*. The group commander was advised that the Tidewater Fisheries patrol boat at St. Michaels, Tilghman Island, could provide the necessary assistance and would get underway immediately.

In view of the fact that the *Helen R* was in no danger and that the Tidewater Fisheries vessel would take her in tow, the *CG–40572* was ordered to proceed on its assigned mission. This information was given by radio to the *CG–40572* and the coxswain of the boat advised Mr. ——— that a Tidewater Fisheries vessel had been called to tow them in. The Tidewater Fisheries patrol boat got underway at approximately 1520 hours and arrived alongside the *Helen R* at about 1600 hours. It towed the *Helen R* into Claiborne Harbor, arriving there at approximately 1630 hours.

From the investigative report, it does not appear that the safety of the *Helen R* was jeopardized by waiting for the Tidewater Fisheries boat. However, it does appear that a clear understanding of the actions of the crew of the *CG–40572* and the Coast Guard in calling for assistance for the *Helen R* was not fully made known to Mr. ———.

Sincerely yours,

E. J. Roland,
Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard,
Commandant.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today I called the attention of the Senate to an incident that happened last October in which the Attorney General of the United States had ordered the Coast Guard to follow him around and act as a nursemaid for his yacht during a little sailing cruise in the Chesapeake Bay. Since I made my statement the Attorney General has issued a statement, which I should like to read:

> In a statement, Kennedy's office said the Attorney General "took the normal precautions that any boatowner would do and advised the Coast Guard of his proposed course." The statement said Kennedy's "only request of the Coast Guard was 'that they be able to locate him in the event of an emergency.'" It said the Attorney General had no knowledge of any boat in trouble and found it strange that Williams would put out 5 months later "this distorted version of the incident."

First I answer the Attorney General as to why it took me 5 months to develop the facts. The answer is very simple—I do not have the entire FBI at my disposal where I can order them out in the middle of the night to interview prospective witnesses.

I understand that in his reply the Attorney General also pointed out the fact that the incident occurred in a period in which there was a grave crisis with Cuba. Presumably this was an argument to support his ordering the Coast Guard to stand by.

I wish to keep the record straight for the Attorney General, whose memory apparently slipped. The report which I put in the Record was confirmed by the Commandant of the Coast Guard himself, who said that during the week before the Attorney General took his October 13 and 14 cruise, which was on a Saturday and Sunday, his office had been called and asked to stand by for surveillance of the yacht of the Attorney General, which would be cruising in the bay on those dates.

I understand that the Attorney General now claims that one of the reasons he had his office call was that he was inexperienced in sailing. I recognize the danger of sailing when one is inexperienced, but that fact would not give the Attorney General the right to take over the Coast Guard and ask them to trail him around. On that same day the Coast Guard had to bypass a vessel that was in trouble.

As to the Attorney General's reference to a crisis at that time in Cuba, I am glad to know that he has belatedly recognized the crisis, but he certainly must not have known anything about it on this particular occasion because this trip took place on the 13th and 14th of October. He called the Commandant of the Coast Guard and set up the arrangements a day or two before, but based upon the statement of the President of the United States as made to the country on October 22, the President himself did not receive any information about the real problem in Cuba until October 16, which was Tuesday morning. So unless the Attorney General of the United States knew more about the fact that Russia had offensive weapons in Cuba than did the President of the United States or his Secretary of Defense he certainly cannot use that as any excuse.

On October 22, the President said:

> Upon receiving the first preliminary hard information of this nature last Tuesday morning at 9 a.m., I directed that our surveillance be stepped up. And having now confirmed and completed our evaluation of the evidence and our decision on a course of action, this Government feels obliged to report this new crisis to you in full detail.

That is a quotation from the President's speech to the country on October 22. The Tuesday to which he referred was October 16.

Furthermore, Secretary of Defense McNamara, in his press conference on Tuesday, October 23, said:

> The first evidence, the first hard evidence was received by me at 10 p.m. a week ago last night and was presented to the President at 9 o'clock Tuesday morning. This was the first hard evidence giving any indication, and that was but partial of the movement of offensive weapons into Cuba.

Here we find the Secretary of Defense saying he knew nothing about the buildup in Cuba with offensive weapons until 10 p.m., Monday evening, which was October 15. The President was advised, based upon both statements, the following Tuesday morning at 9 a.m.

But we now find the Attorney General, who was cruising in the Chesapeake Bay on the Saturday and Sunday before, using this crisis as an excuse for having the Coast Guard stand by. Either the administration was kidding somebody then, or he is kidding them now.

I flatly refuse to accept any such excuse.

I wish to make the record very clear that I still think this was an arrogant usurpation of power by the Attorney General. By what line of reasoning does he think that when he takes a cruise on the Chesapeake Bay he has the authority to order a Coast Guard cutter in service to trail him around just in case he might have trouble when at the same time other boats which may be in trouble would be bypassed.

Mr. President, I should like to read from the letter written by the man who was left drifting around the Bay on that particular day. The letter states:

> Dear Sir: I recently had an experience that I believe will be of interest to all boatowners. Five of us went out fishing in Eastern Bay, a branch of the Chesapeake, on Sunday afternoon, October 14. Due to an oversight, the marina that installed a new engine last spring failed to place a resistor in line with the coil. The overburdened article finally burned out when we were approximately one-half mile offshore from Claiborne Harbor. We tried to signal some passing yachts without success, so I finally called the Coast Guard at Tilghmans Island. To my surprise a boat, *Black Jack III*, answered my call saying I could not get through to the Coast Guard but that they would relay my message. This was very unusual. I had never heard of a situation in which the Coast Guard Station could not be reached by radio using the emergency frequency, unless some disaster had rendered their communications system inoperable. However, even more unusual things were to follow.
>
> We gave our description, location, number of passengers and nature of our trouble to *Black Jack III*, who called back in a few minutes to inform us the Coast Guard boat would be along shortly. After 20 minutes had elapsed, we sighted the Coast Guard 40 footer across Eastern Bay and signalled to him. When he came along side, the skipper informed us that he could not help us then because he had to watch the "Secretary General" who was taking a sail. He hung around for a few minutes about 50 feet away and we could hear him across the water talking with someone on the radio describing our boat.
>
> Without any further word, he left and followed a sloop of about 30 feet that was taking a leisurely sail back and forth across Eastern Bay. We watched until both boats were completely out of sight beyond Poplar Island.
>
> Two and one-half hours later, a Maryland Tidewater Fisheries boat came by and asked if we were broken down. They very courteously gave us a tow into Claiborne harbor which took between 5 and 10 minutes. There we found a mechanic who quickly installed a new coil and we were finally on our way again. The skipper of the fisheries boat informed us that Bobby Kennedy was taking a sail that afternoon in Eastern Bay.
>
> There are some implications in this incident that bother me a great deal. Perhaps my background is partially to blame for my concern. I was born and raised on the North Carolina coast. There the life saving service had its origin and subsequently was expanded into the U.S. Coast Guard. The men in that service were the heroes in our section. They were the ones who willingly risked their lives to give assistance to boats in distress. They never refused, regardless of the conditions. They were always on call.
>
> Now I wonder what has been done to that wonderful organization? Has it become a political football to be used as a private babysitter for political appointees? Of one thing we can be sure. Someone ordered that Coast Guard boat to follow Bobby Kennedy. They did not close down a whole Coast Guard station on their own initiative. Who issued such an order and from where came the authority to do so? What would have happened if a real emergency had occurred and the skipper tried in vain to reach a Coast Guard station that was not monitoring the emergency channel?
>
> As I mentioned previously, I am bothered and I believe a number of the boating fraternity will be also.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> ——— ———.

Mr. President, certainly the Attorney General did not know the week before that he was going to break down on the following Sunday. If he did, he should have stayed in the harbor. Furthermore, he cannot say that he was out in the bay at a time when there was fear of a Cuban crisis. If there was he should have been in Washington attending to his business.

In addition, I should like to know how he knew so much about what would happen in Cuba the following week, when the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense disclaimed any knowledge until the following week as to what was happening.

I still think that what occurred was an arrogant action on the part of the Attorney General. I hope he will be more discreet in the future.

HIGHER INTEREST RATES NO SOLUTION TO BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DIFFICULTIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the difficulties of the proposed tax cut is bound to be an adverse effect on our international balance of payments,

which is already adverse. That is true because the increase in spending at home is sure to increase imports. At the same time testimony before the Joint Economic Committee by economic experts is that a tax cut would also be likely to increase costs and prices, which would decrease our exports. The administration has proposed that one way to counteract this tendency would be to increase interest rates in order to encourage investment of capital in our country. Such a procedure has many weaknesses and difficulties.

I was very much impressed by the fact that the Wall Street Journal, which has been consistently in favor of high interest rates, published this morning an article by the able and accomplished commentator George Shea on that very issue. Mr. Shea points out that the great difficulties involved in trying to improve our balance-of-payment situation by increasing interest rates. He suggests that such action aimed primarily at short-term interest rates would be sure to increase long-term interest rates and tend to slow down the economy. That position was corroborated by economic experts brought before the committee, some of whom said that if we persisted in the monetary policy suggested by Secretary Dillon and Chairman Martin, the multiplier effect of the tax cut would be sharply reduced, and that whatever stimulating effect a tax cut might have on the economy would be very greatly diminished.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent that the thoughtful and authoritative article by Mr. George Shea on the front page of the Wall Street Journal be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Appraisal of Current Trends in Business and Finance

The Kennedy administration seems to be leaning toward higher interest rates on borrowed money as a means of combating the deficit in the Nation's international payments. However, causing or permitting interest rates to rise entails some difficult problems.

The theory is that higher interest rates would help reduce our deficit because they would cause investors, businesses, banks—foreign as well as domestic—to lend their cash here instead of abroad where interest rates now are higher than they are in this country. The sending of such money abroad has been a substantial factor in the size of the deficit in the last few years. Also, the administration has noted that England and more recently Canada have found their international deficits shrinking rapidly when they raised interest rates at home substantially.

However, one problem that faces the money managers if they decide to raise the cost of borrowed money is that they would like to concentrate the boost in rates on short-term funds. It is this kind of money that moves most quickly across international borders in search of the most attractive interest rates. Long-term money likes high interest rates, too, but it is also influenced by other important considerations.

In addition, high rates on, and restricted supplies of, long-term credit are supposed to be bad for general business, whereas the rates on short-term loans are not so important. Businessmen, it is widely believed, hesitate to commit themselves to pay high interest rates for years ahead to build a new plant or apartment house, or to buy new equipment, but they don't mind so much in the case of a loan that will be repaid in a few months.

The questions are whether it is possible to change rates on one kind of money only and how it can be done. The answers are, first, that it isn't entirely possible, but that short-term rates can be changed much more quickly and widely than long-term rates; and second that the only measure that works at all well is a change in the supply of credit—which sooner or later affects long as well as short rates.

Long rates almost always move with short rates because lenders or borrowers can switch from one to another. If short-term rates soar to 6 percent while long-term rates stay at 4 percent, lenders will stop offering money at long term, tending to cause the rates on long-term money to rise, and will offer their money at short term, tending to cause those rates to fall.

The fact that short-term rates fluctuate more sharply than long-term rates is clear from the record of recent years. The following table gives average rates by years through 1962 and so far this year on U.S. Treasury 3-month bills and U.S. long-term bonds:

[In percent]

	Bills	Bonds
1963	2.9	3.9
1962	2.8	4.0
1961	2.4	3.9
1960	2.9	4.0
1959	3.4	4.1
1958	1.8	3.4
1957	3.3	3.5
1956	2.3	3.1
1955	1.8	2.9
1954	1.0	2.7

In that period of more than 9 years the short-term rate has fluctuated between 1 percent and 3.4 percent, or 2.4 points, whereas the rates on long-term bonds have an extreme range only between 2.7 and 4.1 percent, or 1.4 points. Put another way, the differential between the long and short rates has been as wide as 1.7 in 1954 and as narrow as 0.2 in 1957.

The causes of these fluctuations in the differential provide a good answer to how such changes can be engineered. Since late in 1960 the Federal Reserve Board and the U.S. Treasury have been seeking jointly to keep short-term rates strong for the same balance-of-payments reason that now concerns them. They've tried to do it by keeping the supply of Treasury bills available in the market especially large by selling such bills whenever they could. But at the same time the "Fed" has kept the Nation's banks supplied with substantial unlent reserves.

The measure of their success has been that the differential has narrowed from 1.8 late in 1960—when bills paid 2.2 percent and bonds 4 percent—to 1.2 now. In contrast, note what happened in 1954–57 or 1955–57, when there was no particular effort to stiffen short-term rather than long-term rates, but when the supply of unused bank credit was gradually restricted as business boomed. The differential then narrowed from 1.7 in 1954 and 1.1 in 1955 to 0.2 in 1957.

Another means of raising short-term rates, being mentioned aside from restrictions on bank credit, is boosting the Federal Reserve discount rate. That's the interest banks pay when they borrow from the Reserve banks. By itself that probably wouldn't work well either. The discount rate is effective when banks are borrowing heavily in order to make loans, and at such times they want to earn more than the discount rate of any loans or securities they hold. At present the bill of 2.9 percent is below the 3-percent discount rate, because the banks aren't borrowing much. Just raising the discount rate now would be acting almost in a vacuum.

Thus one problem the Government faces is that the only way it can engineer the boost in short-term rates is to restrict credit generally, and it hesitates to do it at present because of a fear it might hurt business. That's why Secretary of the Treasury Dillon the other day brought forward as a new argument for a tax cut that it would strengthen business enough to stand higher interest rates, which he said were needed to reduce the international deficit.

There is another problem, too. A lot of the short-term funds that have gone abroad in search of higher interest rates have gone to England, as well as to other European nations. The difference is that while the nations of the Continent seem pretty well able to stand a reversal of the flow of funds back to the United States, England is regarded as vulnerable, its balance of payments being precarious like ours. After this newspaper had reported on the new interest-rate plan of the administration last week, the British pound weakened in the foreign exchange market.

George Shea.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL SUPPORTS RESOLUTION FOR MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have introduced proposed legislation to support the appeal of Secretary of the Interior Udall for a commission which would consider proposed statuary to commemorate distinguished statesmen. A number of newspapers around the country have supported my proposal. I am happy to see that some newspapers in our own State of Wisconsin are included among those.

One of the recent editorials on that subject appeared in the Milwaukee Journal. The editorial pointed out that among those who have been honored by statuary in the District of Columbia are Charlie Kutz, Joe Darlington, Frank Newlands, Sam Hahnemann, Joe Henry, Andy Downing, Bill Schuetz, Julie Jusserant, Sam Gross, and the original patentees of the District of Columbia.

The fact is that whenever a proposal to honor almost anyone is made by a Senator or Representative in behalf of a friend or a person he supports, it is difficult and embarrassing for a Member of Congress to oppose the proposal. That is why I think the commission suggested by Secretary Udall makes sense, not only from the standpoint of the District of Columbia, but also particularly from the standpoint of the American taxpayer, because it could discourage wasteful expenditure of funds. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal,
Mar. 6, 1963]

Clutter of Statuary

"Unless we exercise some discrimination in honoring our great departed statesmen, Washington will become a clutter of stony statuary," Senator Proxmire, Democrat, of Wisconsin, said in criticizing the continuing practice of his congressional colleagues in approving monuments.

Proxmire is backing up Interior Secretary Udall, who wants a curb on new monuments and a commission to make sure that any that are approved are deserving.

Ever hear of Charlie Kutz, Joe Darlington, Frank Newlands, Sam Hahnemann, Joe Henry, Andy Downing, Bill Schuetz, Julie Jusserant, Sam Gross or "The Original Patentees of the District of Columbia"?

The Interior Department, according to the Washington Post, reports that these individuals are among those honored by some 96 statues or memorials in District of Columbia park land. They stand as evidence that memorials often don't stir memories after a generation or so. And they argue for being extremely selective in deciding upon future memorials to give pigeons a roosting place.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr KEATING. Mr. President, on February 17, 1963, there was a mass meeting of Lithuanian Americans in New York City under the auspices of the Lithuanian American Council of New York commemorating the 45th anniversary of restoration of Lithuania's independence.

Mr. President, this dedicated group, all citizens and permanent residents of the United States, are seeking independence and freedom from the tryranny and evil of Soviet colonialism for those who remain in Lithuania. They seek the liberation of those with whom they have ancestral and close family ties.

This was a sad occasion for this group. As free people themselves, they know that the chains of communism cannot bind the hopes of men nor hold back the desire of people, who were once self-governing, again to attain the sacred goal of independence and freedom.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record following my remarks the resolution adopted by the Lithuanian rally of February 17, 1963.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> We, Lithuanian Americans of Greater New York, citizens and permanent residents of the United States, gathered on February 17 of this year of grace 1963 at Webster Hall in New York City to commemorate the 45th anniversary of the restoration of the Independent Lithuanian State;
>
> Voicing once more our indignation and our protest against the brutal suppression by Soviet Russia of Lithuania's independence and freedom and her subjugation by Soviet colonial rule;
>
> Acclaiming the firmness and determination of the President of the United States during the Cuban confrontation and his unequivocal attitude toward the evil of Soviet colonialism, as expressed in the state of the Union message last January;
>
> Acknowledging with gratitude the stand taken by the U.S. delegation in the United Nations on self-determination for Lithuania and the other captive European countries;
>
> Pointing out that the global surge toward national independence poses a particular challenge to the United States and other Western countries to press for the restoration to Lithuania and to all other captive European nations of a free exercise of their right to self-determination and the respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms;
>
> *Resolved:*
>
> 1. To appeal to the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States firmly to restate and vigorously to promote in the United Nations and elsewhere the established U.S. policy of the restoration of the independence and freedom of Lithuania through free and unfettered elections after the withdrawal of Soviet armed forces and agents, and to reaffirm the determination of the Government of this great country not to be a party to any agreement or treaty which would confirm or prolong the subjugation of Lithuania, now held in bondage by the U.S.S.R.;
>
> 2. To ask the President of the United States to designate the third week of July 1963, as Captive Nations Week;
>
> 3. To urge that the Radio Free Europe extend in its broadcasts the use of the Lithuanian language;
>
> 4. To rededicate ourselves to the just cause of Lithuania's independence and freedom and to combating communism, Soviet imperialism and colonialism;
>
> 5. To assure the Lithuanian people under Soviet occupation of the indissolubility of our ties and of our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal of the Lithuanian nation—its independence and its freedom;
>
> 6. To support actively the policy of the U.S. Government aiming at the establishment in Europe and elsewhere of a just and durable peace based on the inalienable right of the respective peoples to government of their own choice.
>
> J. Kiaune,
> *President.*
> A. Skerys,
> *Secretary.*

THE 245TH NIKE MISSILE BATTALION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in the reorganization of the Army National Guard, one unit that has been designated for elimination in New York State is the 245th Nike Missile Battalion. This unit has a particularly long and fine tradition of service to the Nation, dating all the way back to 1654.

Naturally, changing defense needs call for continued reevaluation and planning but in my judgment, it is most unfortunate when a unit with such a historic background is told it can no longer play its honored role in national defense.

I am asking the Department of Defense for a full report on this matter, but in the meantime I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record follow my remarks a brief history of the regiment.

There being no objection, the history was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This Is Your Regiment

In 1654, a company of "Minute Men" was organized by the Dutch burghers in Breucklen (Brooklyn), to suppress lawlessness and smuggling in their village and nearby communities along Long Island Sound.

To that early body of Dutch "Minute Men", the present 245th Nike Missile Battalion traces its proud lineage, and can well boast as being one of the oldest continually active units in U.S. Military Establishment.

When, in 1776, the 64th Regiment of Foot was organized as a part of the Continental Army, this same Brooklyn unit of "Minute Men" was given the signal honor of becoming the "Right Flank Company" of that regiment and fought as such throughout the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812.

Old family records and authorized histories establish a continuity of service of individuals through this "Right Flank Company" of the 64th Regiment of Foot to the "Old Village Guard" which, later, when the village of Brooklyn became an incorporated township, consolidated with the Nassau Guards to form the "Brooklyn City Guard."

In 1847, the New York State militia was composed wholly of independent companies without any battalion or regimental organization. This heterogeneous composition finally attracted the attention of the State legislature with the result that a new division of 12 distinct regiments was authorized for Brooklyn alone.

One of the leading companies in point of numbers and efficiency, at this period, was the aforementioned "Brooklyn City Guard." Through the efforts of this company, 8 other independent companies joined with them in forming a regiment which was embodies into State service on July 5, 1847, as the first of the 12 newly authorized regiments and designated as the 13th Regiment of Infantry.

To conform to the regulations of this period, the assignment of the companies was as follows:

Right flank company of light artillery, Brooklyn City Guard; Company A, Pearson's Light Guard; Company B, Washington Horse Guard; Company C, Brooklyn Light Guard; Company D, Williamsburg Light Artillery; Company E, Williamsburg Light Artillery; Company F, Oregon Guard; Company G, Washington Guard Rifles; Company H, Jefferson Guards.

The two companies of Williamsburg Light Artillery shortly after withdrew and two other companies were admitted; City Cadets as Company D; Greenwood Rifles as Company E.

In the present organization of the 245th Nike Missile Battalion, Battery A is the direct lineal descendent element of the old right flank company of that original 13th Regiment of Infantry.

The first time this 13th Regiment of Infantry was called for active Federal duty was for Civil War service when it was the first New York militia regiment to volunteer to a man for service and was in the field for three known periods from April 23 to August 6, 1861, May 28 to September 12, 1862, and June 20 to July 20, 1863. It has been confirmed that the records covering the regiment's further periods of service in the Civil War were lost in the unfortunate fire which destroyed the old armory on Hanson Place in Brooklyn.

The regiment's next tour of Federal service was in the Spanish-American War when it was mustered in on May 24, 1898, as part of the 22d New York Volunteers with which it served until it was mustered out on November 23 of the same year.

The regiment remained as the 13th Infantry until 1900, when it was organized as artillery and designated the 13th Heavy Artillery and companies then became batteries. This designation was changed on September 1, 1906, to the 13th Coast Artillery. On June 23, 1908, they were changed to the 13th Artillery District and on August 10, 1914, to the 13th Coast Defense Command. During the disintegration of the regiment at the time of World War I, this number and title were temporarily discontinued, but were revived on the reorganization of the National Guard in 1919.

In World War I, the regiment entered the Federal service on July 23, 1917, and was assigned to Forts Wadsworth, Hamilton, and Tilden, in the New York Harbor defenses. The command was shortly after broken up, the greater part forming the nucleus of the newly organized 59th and 70th Coast Artillery regiments, and officers and men were also assigned to the 38th, 46th, 50th, and 74th Coast Artillery, 119th Field Artillery, Trench Mortar battalions, ammunition trains, motor transport and the 6th Antiaircraft Light Artillery. A great majority of these organizations served with distinction and efficiency in combat action in France, particularly in the St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne offensives and the defensive sector of the 1st Army, the Lorraine sector. After the departure of the regiment for World War I action, the

13th Coast Artillery Corps, New York Guard, was formed for emergency State service as infantry and was disbanded when the National Guard was reorganized at the war's end, the return of the war personnel who again resumed normal peacetime service as the 13th Coast Defense Command, which designation continued until January 1, 1924, when the regiment was given the number and title, 245th Coast Artillery.

Under the Presidential proclamation of national emergency in 1940, the 245th Coast Artillery was once again called to Federal service and sent to garrison the artillery fortifications at Fort Hancock, Sandy Hook, N.J. After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December of 1941, most of the senior noncoms and officers of the regiment were sent to various training camps over the country as cadres to train the rapidly expanding Army that was to eventually carry the United States to victory over the Axis Powers. The remainder of the regiment was brought to full combat strength and served throughout World War II. Members of the 245th saw action in all parts of the globe during the monstrous conflict; in all theaters of the war, from Bataan to Okinawa. Some older veteran officers and noncoms of the regiment became the nucleus for the 13th Regiment of Infantry, New York Guard, formed for State duty in 1941 and deactivated in 1945 with the reorganization of the 245th at the end of World War II.

Once more the "call to arms" was sounded, this time in 1951 when the Communist forces of North Korea attacked South Korea, and a United Nations force was alerted, and the 245th was again called to service until the cessation of hostilities in 1955.

Over the years, the regiment has been called for State service in aid of civil authorities as follows: New York draft riots, 1863, when it was rushed from Gettysburg, immediately following that battle to help quell the bloody riots in New York City; the orange riots of 1871; railroad riots in 1877; Buffalo railroad strike in 1892; Fire Island, 1892; Brooklyn trolley strike, 1895; guard for public property, 1917.

At the present time, the 245th Nike Missile Battalion is serving the Nation at missile bases on Long Island, proud of the fact that from the early company of Dutch "Minute Men" to the present battalion of "Missile Men," this staunch and venerable organization of American fighting men has ever been ready to serve its country's call, and will, in the words of the late Gen. Sydney Grant, one of its beloved commanding officers, always "Carry On."

AFRICAN STUDENTS LEAVE BULGARIA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a constituent of mine—a young man from Rochester—has written to me about a commendable project which has been undertaken by the students at Brown University. Recently, 12 students from Ghana and 6 from Ethiopia fled from Communist Bulgaria, where they were attending a university as exchange students. They charged racial bias on the part of the Communists and asserted that they had encountered forced political indoctrination, police brutality, arrest and constant insults behind the Iron Curtain.

Upon reading of this incident, students at Brown decided that the situation presented them with a golden opportunity to demonstrate America's good will and interest in the education of African students. A petition was circulated requesting the administration of the university to offer a scholarship to one of these African boys. Within hours, 200 Brown and Pembroke undergraduates signed the petition and over the weekend, the university administration acceded to their request. The university has pledged to match any funds which are raised by the students themselves, and to offer admission to one of the Africans who is qualified. The students, have raised a substantial share and hope that the full amount will be raised in time for the exchange student to come to this country in September.

I call this incident to the attention of the Members of the Senate, because I feel it is a fine example both of American initiative and the good will of our youth toward the many visiting students we welcome to our shores each year. It is exactly this kind of spirit which gives me assurance that the recipient of this scholarship will be far happier in the United States than he was in Communist Bulgaria.

GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is an honor and a privilege for me today to pay tribute to the Girl Scouts of America during this the week of their 51st birthday.

We all welcome the sight every spring of those familiar figures in brown and green in groups of two's and three's, laden with boxes of cookies, beginning their annual sale. The event serves to underline the fact that the organization which developed out of the Girl Guides of England is another year older.

It was on March 12, 1912, in Savannah, Ga., that Juliette Gordon Low founded the first troop of Girl Scouts in this country with 12 members. Since that time the Girl Scouts have captured the imagination of millions and become an American institution.

In those early days of the Scouting movement, the Girl Scouts waived tradition and moved into the realm of outdoor activities such as camping and active sports previously reserved for their male counterparts. One of their prime aims has always been to develop the whole worth and dignity of the individual, not merely one segment of it.

Today the Scouting program for girls from 8–18, Brownies to Senior Scouts, is carried on in 51 nations of the world. Its interesting and worthwhile projects, its ideal of service to community and country have directly affected the lives of over 18 million girls in the United States alone, and have had an indirect influence on countless others.

I feel that I should say something, too, about the indebtedness of the organization to the millions of men and women who have volunteered their time and energies as leaders and administrators to help make the Scouting program a success.

The Scouting program has helped to guide girls into the path of maturity by offering them a solid basis upon which to build for the future. The Girl Scout laws set forth an ethical code by which to live and develop into responsible citizens of a free democracy, willing to assume the task of making our country a better place in which to live.

To quote the Girl Scout Council of the Nation's Capital:

> Girl Scouting is more than fun. It opens windows to knowledge, doors to skills, and provides opportunities for friendship and service across the Nation and around the world. Girl Scouting is learning by doing and living by the best ideals of democracy.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE RHODE ISLAND HOSPITAL

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, perhaps never in our national history has medical care been of such universal concern as in this year of 1963. Fortunate are those areas where the people enjoy abundant hospital facilities and a dedicated medical profession.

Such an area is my State of Rhode Island and particularly its capital city of Providence.

This year—this very week—is the centennial of one of the great centers of medical concern and service to both the city and the State.

The Rhode Island Hospital is celebrating its 100th anniversary.

One hundred years ago this week the General Assembly of Rhode Island passed the act to incorporate the hospital and on March 13, 1863, the then Governor of Rhode Island put his signature to the document.

As the Rhode Island history of that month of March 1863 is intertwined with the history of this Senate, it seems appropriate to present the record here in a single paragraph.

There had been a quick change of command in Rhode Island. The man who was Governor on March 13, 1863, had been merely a State senator 2 weeks earlier. He had succeeded to the presidency of the State senate and then to the Governorship only because both the Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Rhode Island in March 1863 were in this U.S. Senate recently removed to this Chamber. On March 4, 1863, Gov. William Sprague succeeded Lt. Gov. Samuel Greene Arnold who had been U.S. Senator from December 1, 1862. Samuel Greene Arnold was the granduncle of our beloved former colleague, Theodore Francis Green, who was born only 4 years after Rhode Island Hospital was founded.

March 1863 was indeed an historic period. In the words of a speaker at the dedication of Rhode Island Hospital—

> the Civil War was at the height of its grim and desolating fury. It was a time when, if ever, men are inspired with generous sentiments and are ready to acknowledge the high humanities and duties that bind them to each other and to their race.
>
> But an institution for the healing of the sick and the care of the injured must be an expression of something more than Christian benevolence alone. It must also be the embodiment of every device and arrangement which science has discovered or art has contrived for the alleviation of suffering and the restoration of health. Philanthropy prompts the enterprise but it is science that presides over its accomplishment and fits it for its high ends. Civilization must lavish upon it its choicest treasures both of humanity and knowledge, in making it all that it ought to be.

For all this century Rhode Island Hospital has taken the spirit of that oration as an obligation. Out of the generosity of individuals and with the cooperation of the official community there has been built upon the gift of land and buildings—extended land and expanding buildings—one of the largest voluntary hospitals in all our land.

It has assumed what might have been immediate burdens of city and State and in an annual cost of $10 million has given more than a million dollars in free services to the community.

Last year 20,000 of its neighbors were admitted for bed care and over 40,000 more received emergency treatment. Seven hundred thousand bed patients have known Rhode Island Hospital's care.

Its medical and surgical staff have made important contributions to the advancement of medical science—it has been a center of teaching and research; and Brown University has honored its staff in the projection of their new medical studies. In every respect the hospital has the potential for meeting the needs of a modern progressive medical school.

The original incorporators were all physicians but its practical encouragement came from all segments of our people and that close affinity has prevailed through this century of substantial cooperation.

We of Rhode Island are proud that the hospital bears the name of our State, but is as independent as the independent man who stands atop our state house. Our Governor and our general assembly by proclamation renew this week their enthusiasm of March 1863.

Every man, woman, and child, of every race and faith, salutes Rhode Island Hospital for its century of superlative service.

TRIBUTE TO A DEPARTED MOTHER

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the loss of a loved one is an experience that everyone of us must have. While it is a loss and grief that our friends share with us, no one can ever really know the true meaning of the loss to the individual.

We cannot capture the inner emotions of the individual and we keenly feel our own inadequacy to express our sympathy.

That distinguished writer and commentator, Tris Coffin, has written a tribute to the mother of a mutual friend of ours. It is a moving tribute that comes the nearest to capturing the inner emotions of one's sorrow that I have ever read or heard.

Because I think it has a very deep and meaningful message for most everyone, I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tribute by Tris Coffin

I have a friend who drives 15 miles to work every morning and then the same 15 miles home again. In the morning, the drive isn't bad, for this is a new day. He sees the frost glistening on the ground if it is winter, or if the time is spring he has been walking in the dew, or if summer picking wild strawberries. This gives a tang to the day, and he leaves the country in good spirits. This pulls him through even the terrible traffic snarl at the point where all the suburban roads dump into one overcrowded city street, to the tune of impatient horns.

The evening is different. My friend works hard and in a very competitive society, the Congress. He is conscientious to an extreme, has a great generalship for plotting and conducting the sieges and countersieges. And what is also rare, he is intelligent and daring. This means that by the end of the day, 6 o'clock or even as late as 9, much of his emotional energy has been spent, he is weary beyond account, and still intent on the wars of the day.

An associate who rides with him tells me my friend, Bill, may drive all through the horrible rush-hour traffic of the city saying nothing but an occasional terse, ironic phrase, and grim faced.

There is a point, an exact point, when he changes, throws off the mask of the office. This is when the city is left behind—its noise, its confusion, its overbright signs, its deceits, and he can see open spaces. Perhaps they are overgrown with weeds and the owner is waiting to sell for a good price, but it is country.

My friend Bill begins to relax. His fingers on the wheel loosen. The hard lines of his face fall away and he smiles.

His mind has sped ahead to the moment when the car will pull in the driveway of the house with the white fence around it, and he will get out, and look up at the window. A face will smile at him, perhaps waving a hand or nodding, depending on how she feels this night. This face is beautiful, it seems to me, and indeed it is, for it shows always, steadfastly a joy in life. No matter what has happened, her face is proud of living.

She is my friend's mother, and she has been an invalid for a number of years, sitting in the chair at the window, watching the bluebirds, the squirrels scampering across the snow, the wind tossing the upper branches of the trees, the pattern of the clouds, the gathering gray of dusk. She had been an active, talented woman, a lawyer and a beauty. Sickness altered her life, as much as if she had been picked up by a storm and sent spinning off to Timbuktu. More, because she had to accept quietness, reflection, the knowledge that death may fall with the next shadow.

To hear him tell of her, with great admiration, the new life has not shrunken but enlarged, nobled, and given an almost cosmic dimension. She discovered joys lost to most of us, joys dearer than all those we pursue so madly. My friend was able to share some of these joys with her, and this is why when the city was gone and only the stretch of country left, he smiled in secret enjoyment.

He might wonder what it was she had seen today to make her life more exciting, sitting there by the window. Would it be that the bluejays came again, big and brilliant and comic, or a rabbit crossing the yard had paused to look up at her and stare, his nose twitching? He looked forward eagerly to hearing from her. The end of the day always had this promise for him.

But no joy is ever eternal. Bill and his mother understood this, she better than he. This is what he tries to remember now when, driving in the evening, he leaves the rumble of the city. He knows that when he enters the driveway and looks at the window, there will be no smile for him. She has left him, as she knew she would. Still she is there in all the things she loved outside her window.

This is the essence, perhaps, of death and transfiguration. No one ever dies completely, but remains in the rose tumbling over the arbor, the evening star, the first call of the song sparrow.

EXPANSION OF JUNIOR ROTC

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, many Americans have been shocked by the proposal of the Secretary of Defense to cut back or eliminate the junior ROTC program. In my judgment, this is one of the finest youth programs in our country. Under the program, young men are taught discipline and love of country. I believe the program has instilled in our youth a desire to participate in the national defense program.

I have seen many young men who were in the junior ROTC programs go on to college, further their ROTC education, become some of the finest officers in the military organization of our country, and serve for long periods of time in the defense of the Nation. Probably the desire to perform this service was inculcated during their participation in the junior ROTC program.

It is strange indeed that we would be considering programs for a domestic Peace Corps and for a youth program and at the same time the Secretary of Defense would be discussing eliminating or abolishing the ROTC program, which I believe costs the magnificent sum of approximately $5,500,000. I am informed through articles in the press that the Secretary of Defense is considering or is reappraising this program. I hope he will reach the conclusion that the program not be abolished.

Mr. President, the General Assembly of Georgia has adopted a resolution on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 68

Resolution opposing the proposed cutback and urging the expansion of junior ROTC; and for other purposes

(By Senator Hunt of the 26th)

Whereas the Defense Department has recommended a proposal to eliminate the Reserve officer training program in our high schools and to streamline the college ROTC program; and

Whereas military service is still compulsory in the United States; and

Whereas money now being spent on compulsory training could be diverted into an expanded junior ROTC program to sustain summer training; and

Whereas the money would be reasonable pay to the young men involved which could eliminate financial hardships; and

Whereas summer military training would reduce the summer influx on the labor market and reduce juvenile delinquency; and

Whereas in many cases the present system is harmful to many of our young men because they postpone making decisions on their future education, training, or professions because of their service obligation; and

Whereas under a new and expanded program the military could select volunteer military personnel who excel in ROTC; and

Whereas through a system of promotions and further inducements the military would produce high-type personnel who were trained during the years when they learned best and excelled most; and

Whereas the rigors of an intensive and thorough military training program would give our young men an outlet for their energies which would be used to a productive and healthful advantage; and

Whereas under this program training would be continuous until completed rather than interrupted as at present (or no training at all) until the youth enlists or is drafted under the current compulsory military training program; and

Whereas the best soldiers are generally between the ages of 18 and 25 when given the proper training and leadership; and

Whereas if we discontinue high school ROTC this will mean raising our average training age several years which will be a decided deterioration of our military potential: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That we go on record as opposing any cutback in the present junior ROTC program and further go on record as recommending a proper and adequate expansion of junior ROTC; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby instructed to transmit a suitable copy of this resolution to each Member of the Georgia delegation of the U.S. Senate and U.S. House of Representatives.

Approved in senate March 5, 1963.

Approved in house March 6, 1963.

IN GOD IS OUR TRUST

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate a speech prepared by Mr. Ed Webster, a senior at Cody High School, Cody, Wyo. Eddie is an outstanding young American who is presently the president of the Cody High School student body and an active member of his church. He is truly a student of Americanism as indicated by his keen insight into the things that have made this country the envy of the world. He has prepared a speech entitled "In God Is Our Trust," which points out the anguish suffered by the God-loving people of America when the Supreme Court recently ruled that the 22-word nondenominational New York school prayer was unconstitutional.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this speech be made a part of the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

In God Is Our Trust

We are citizens of the greatest Nation in the world today. A nation which offers untold opportunities for man to better himself. A nation who proclaims to the world:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore;
Send these, the homeless, and tempest-tost to me,
I lift my lamp beside the Golden door."

This Nation was founded by the people seeking an opportunity to worship God, how, when, and where they would. This factor was so important to these founders of yesteryear that they inscribed into almost every national document an assurance that this loyalty to, and fraternization of God, would continue as long as these United States should endure.

The worship of God as one deems fit, and the guarantee that all others have the same right is insured in our Bill of Rights; on every coinage of this country is the statement, "In God we trust"; the Declaration of Independence is believed by many to have been inspired of God; in the national anthem is reference to our trust in God.

Belief and worship of God has been a factor of strength and hope throughout our Nation's history. This belief was so strong as to induce thousands to leave their homes and come to this promised land when it was hard, cruel, treacherous, and unknown. The army of George Washington, as it fought for our independence, is reported to have had a minister in the lines; and throughout the years the soldiers of the United States have had a chaplain with them to give them spiritual guidance and comfort.

From the very beginning of the First Continental Congress, a prayer has been said at the beginning of every day's session of the Supreme Court, and of Congress. As late as 1954, the line "under God" was inserted into the Pledge of Allegiance to the U.S. Flag, again proving the devotion of the American people to Almighty God.

It might be well to remember that when Adolf Hitler came to power in Germany, his first move toward world conquest was the expulsion of religion from the schools. Slowly and methodically he succeeded in doing away with religion in the schools, the government, and lives of the German people. It would seem that this example, and others of godless nations who rose to great power and then toppled, would serve as sufficient warning to the wise; however, today we find ourselves facing an alarming situation: Dateline 1962: The Supreme Court of the United States ruled it unconstitutional for a 22-word prayer to be said at the beginning of every schoolday in New York schools. This prayer read:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country."

This prayer was repeated at the beginning of each schoolday along with the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. Those who did not wish to participate, could remain silent or be excused from the room; or even come late to miss the prayer. There was no possible way that anybody could take offense at a prayer which was set up in this way; yet, because one family took a dislike to this prayer, it was ruled unconstitutional.

Justice Stewart, who gave the one vote for the constitutionality of the prayer, remarked: "Is the Court suggesting that the Constitution permits judges and Congressmen and Presidents to join in prayer, but prohibits schoolchildren from doing so?"

Nearly half the States require or authorize either prayers or Bible reading in their schools, however, steps are now being taken by the American Civil Liberties Union, who sponsored the New York case, to bring these cases into question, along with the legality of a Christmas program in the schools, recitation of the Lord's Prayer, and baccalaureate services.

Presently there is question being raised as to the constitutionality of saying a prayer at the beginning of each day of Congress, action is also being taken against the last verse of the national anthem which states: "And this be our motto; in God is our trust."

But this is not the end, if these measures are allowed to be ruled unconstitutional, there will be an ever-ending flow of cases concerning the coinage, Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, and every Bible reading, or religious holiday observances in the 35,000 schools which now participate in such practices.

Now, I ask you, Will this great Nation, founded under a strong faith in God, now deny that same faith—that same God? Will this great Nation, who has prospered above all other nations, forsake the very creed on which its prosperity has flourished? A strong and unwavering faith in the Almighty has grown to be one of the predominating factors in America's greatness. What were our forefathers looking for when they stepped ashore on the desolate, windswept shores of America of yesteryear? A place where they could worship their God in peace, without censor or magistrates. Freedom of worship—foremost among all the freedoms we hold so dear.

Tyrants and dictators throughout the ages have denied the existence of the Almighty—have tried to replace His hallowed presence with the false image of greatness they have built around themselves. Allegiance to a cause, rather than to God, and they have failed miserably.

Will our beloved America follow in the foosteps of these godless tyrants?

The voices of millions of Americans, raised in unison, thunder a defiant "No." And as silently, these millions bow their heads together, and in the faith that makes them great whisper in humility, "In God we trust."

JOINT RESOLUTION OF WYOMING LEGISLATURE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate a joint memorial adopted by the State Legislature of Wyoming memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to limiting and reducing the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I request that the memorial be made a part of the Record.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Enrolled Joint Memorial 19

Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to limiting and reducing the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere

Whereas the people of the Western Hemisphere have for over 100 years had the privilege of determining, without outside intervention, their own form of government; and

Whereas the United States of America has supported their privilege through enforcement of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine; and

Whereas there now exists within this hemisphere a militant and aggressive arm of international communism, that has formed its roots in Cuba; and

Whereas the existence of the Communist government of Cuba is dependent upon support from outside this hemisphere; and

Whereas the avowed purpose of the Communist government of Cuba is to export its revolution throughout the Americas, with the aid of governments beyond our hemisphere; and

Whereas this situation is not conducive to the continued peace, harmony, and progress among nations of free peoples in this hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the house of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate of such legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider the welfare and interest of the people of Wyoming, the United States of America, and our sister republics throughout the Western Hemisphere who favor a strong and vigorous action through every available means to limit and reduce the Communist threat to our safety and wellbeing; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Senator Gale W. McGee, Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress, William Henry Harrison.

Approved February 13, 1963.

Clifford P. Hansen,
Governor.
Charles G. Irwin,
President of the Senate.
Marlin T. Kurtz,
Speaker of the House.

NATIONAL SECURITY STAFFING AND OPERATIONS—STATEMENT BY GEN. LAURIS NORSTAD

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, Gen. Lauris Norstad made a brilliant and able statement before the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations this morning. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Gen. Lauris Norstad, Former Supreme Allied Commander, Europe; Member, Board of Directors, Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp., and President, International Division; Chairman, Atlantic Council, Before Senate Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations, Senator Henry M. Jackson, Chairman, Monday, March 11, 1963

I am honored to appear as the opening witness in your study of national security staffing and operations.

Until now my experience has been entirely in the armed services, and what I have to say this morning will be based on that experience. I have had the good fortune to participate in some interesting enterprises. When I was in the War Department shortly after the last war, I worked with one of the most distinguished military leaders of our time, the late Adm. Forrest Sherman, on a number of studies which helped to clear away some of the final obstacles to the reorganization of the Nation's Military Establishment in 1947. These studies included worldwide military command arrangements, roles and missions of the three services and finally the details of the agreement between the War and Navy Departments which was the basis or starting point of the Unification Act itself.

But an unusually large part of my experience has been overseas—with American and Allied commands. Since I first put on a uniform 37 years ago, more than half of my service has been abroad—which may be a record of some sort—and perhaps living and working far from our shores has given me a certain kind of perspective as it has many others who have shared this experience—a perspective which is not necessarily better but one which comes from a slightly different angle.

An outstanding characteristic of the years since the Second World War has been the steadiness of purpose and action of the United States in building strength in the free world. The Soviets have pursued their ambitions with determination. But they have encountered a will at least as firm as their own. The confrontation we call the cold war has, right from the start, involved a test of wills. On the outcome of this test depends in good degree the future of the freedom we hold dear.

For many years we were preoccupied with the weakness of Western Europe. For years to come we will be adjusting to the fact of its strength. In great part, the problems ahead—and there are and will be great problems—arise from the success of our policies. But I would far rather live with such problems than to be wrestling with the difficulties that would have grown out of continued European weakness.

Sometimes people talk as though success were a state of affairs in which there were no problems. But as I see it a successful country, like a successful man, will never see the day that does not bring a fresh quota of problems, and the mark of success is to deal with them effectively.

We learned some important lessons from World War II, and we have shown a capacity to go on learning. That is the important thing. I have no qualms about the future so long as we can examine the past coolly in order to improve our performance in the future.

Along with other democracies, we learned at great cost in the thirties that a foreign policy is no more impressive than the force that exists to back it up. It took us a long time to learn this elementary principle of international affairs. Back in 1911 Admiral Mahan said to a congressional committee:

> It appears to me that the three functions of Government—the diplomatic, the Army, and the Navy—work now in what you might call watertight compartments. * * * It seems there is very little appreciation in the country of the relation between diplomacy and Army and Navy. * * * Our military and naval policy depends substantially upon what we conceive our relation to be with foreign countries, a forecast of the future, and what the probabilities of the future are. * * * I think what is very much needed in this country is to bring the three functions into necessary relation with one another.

In 1947, when Congress passed the National Security Act, creating the Department of Defense and the National Security Council, we took a substantial step in the direction indicated by Admiral Mahan in 1911.

The President has always had full authority over the armed services, and still does. No President, however, can give the management of military affairs the time the job requires. He needs a deputy who can. If we did not have a Secretary of Defense with authority, a President could, in times like the present, spend all of his energy dealing with military issues—and still not get the job done.

It is sometimes said, I know, that the 1947 act did not unify the armed services but instead further divided them. The charge does not stand up. The National Security Act with its amendments has created a strong Department of Defense and has given strength and authority to the Office of the Secretary of Defense. We can, we should, we do criticize when criticism is warranted but it seems to me that the structure of the Military Establishment permits us to have strong military services, balanced internally and in relation to one another, and all under the supervision, direction, and control provided for by law. If we sometimes have difficulties, what would be the situation, today, with all its complexities, if we had not taken the road to unification in 1947? It is hard to imagine, frightening to contemplate.

I have served in unified commands—and although I know that you of this committee appreciate the significance of this development, I do not believe that there is a full understanding in the country of the degree to which the services are now organized and operated according to the tasks to be performed and not according to the color of a man's uniform. Unified commands were, of course, established in World War II but the progress in this field, in the last 10 or 15 years, although it has been so quiet that many people have not noticed it, has in fact been quite dramatic.

The creation of the Department of Defense, the 1947 Reorganization Act and all that has flowed from it, have not only improved our military posture but have made it far easier to relate defense to national policy as a whole.

The creation of the National Security Council was another part of our national effort to learn and apply the lessons of the Second World War. Congress charged the Council with the task of advising the President "with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security."

It is obvious that we have not always achieved a successful integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies. And I think this committee is doing a most interesting and important work in studying our policy processes with a view to improving them. There is most certainly room for improvement, and some will consider this a notable understatement. But we should also keep in mind that the National Security Act of 1947 has served us well. On the whole our Military Establishment has effectively served our foreign policies and has meshed effectively with allied forces. The contrast with earlier periods—the approach to World War II for instance—is striking.

But you are interested in possible improvements. And here I would like to draw mainly on my NATO experience. Looking at the policy process in Washington from overseas, I have drawn a few conclusions that may be of interest to the committee in its work.

1. In thinking about problems of administration, too much attention tends to be paid to system and perhaps to little to men and their relationships. System is obviously important. But policy is not the product of a system. It is the product of responsible men who are in touch with one another.

A crisis highlights this fact, for it engages the attention of the highest authority and by stripping away the nonessential from the essential relationships, it identifies the men who are in fact his advisers and helpers, whatever the organization charts may say. Authority attracts authority. Responsible men attract responsible men around them. I have never known it to fail that when the going gets rough, responsible authorities are drawn to each other.

This is just as true and as necessary in allied relationships as in national. When one has command responsibilities, he feels a need to be in personal touch with key allied leaders. In a crisis, authority comes to have a very personal meaning, and one must go to the sources of authority before taking action. Things have to be done that way. A commander has got to know, of course, where the top political authorities stand, but more than this he must have a "feel" for their attitudes, a sense of their moods. A direct contact, therefore, is most useful.

At a time like the Cuban crisis last October the President, it seems to me, acts virtually as a commander, personally assuming direction of detailed operations on which depend peace and war. He is in frequent and intimate touch with his assistants in Washington and the field. And decisions are made as they go along.

Involving the highest authority in this degree of detail is, I suppose, a new departure. Certainly the President's title as "Commander in Chief" evokes a picture of larger and grander units than those with which he sometimes has to concern himself at the early stage of a serious development. We in the military service may sometimes feel that this is "getting into our business." But in my judgment the power and the speed we deal with today makes it necessary. At time of crisis, when the issue is peace or war, there is no substitute for direct, person-to-person relationships between the highest political and military authorities, and this inevitably involves the Commander in Chief, the President, in considerable detail.

A key factor is the quality of the relationships between the men who carry responsibility. No one can write directives fast enough to meet a crisis situation, like a Berlin or a Cuba. The man in the field may have to make decisions—and it is essential that he be in direct contact with the political authorities. In terms of my own experience, the NATO machinery works but it can and should be improved in this respect. I have tried to suggest some ways in which this could be done. But the machinery is less important than the personal relationships that have been built up over the past 14 years among leaders in the allied countries.

I speak emphatically—and freely—on this subject because my own experience in this respect has been a most satisfactory one. My own work as Supreme Allied Commander Europe was made possible by the understanding and support of the leaders of the 14 countries with whom we are allied in NATO, and, when necessary, by direct contact with the President of the United States in the two administrations under which I have served.

2. The second point I wish to raise is really a question of definition. To say that any issue or policy—economic, military, cultural, or whatever—which bears directly on our relations with other countries is essentially political, will startle no one who has thought about the subject. Our military forces, for instance, serve political ends. The limits or constraints within which we act are political in nature—as recent events in Europe eloquently demonstrate. The most powerful military force is helpless without the will to use it and the political ability to control and direct it.

One of our real problems in formulating policy at any level is that too many people become involved in it, with too many preconceived ideas, producing too many little policies.

Policy—and here I speak of what we might call grand policy—must be established at the top. That is the only way clarity as to our objectives can be achieved—and without such clarity day-to-day decisions on this or that particular issue will lack focus and coherence. Moreover, the higher policy is made the less likely it is to be a pale concoction of warmed-over ideas. One of the things I have learned over the years is that the higher one's responsibilities, the less one can afford the luxury of preconceived ideas.

Grand policy, or national policy, can be coordinated in a committee, a board, or a council but it cannot be developed there. Someone has to think through the problems and propose what our policy should be—for consideration and decision at the highest level. In the foreign field, for example, Defense and other agencies make contributions, and proposals can and should be examined and debated in groups or committees. But the particular responsibility belongs to the Secretary of State and his associates. If this conclusion, because it is so obvious, falls short of being a notable one, perhaps we should ask ourselves whether our practice faithfully reflects it.

One sentence in the committee's staff report struck home with great force. It is that "the nature of concrete policy issues and the character of governmental action processes push for a pragmatic one-thing-at-a-time-on-its-own-terms approach" to policymaking. And of course this is true. When a specific issue arises, we so often shop around for a solution to the problem in its own terms rather than in terms of our larger purposes.

Good staff work is supposed to insure the careful and broad look at a problem—and we should gratefully take advantage of whatever help it can provide. Clarity at the top is probably a precondition to good staff work, for if your staff does not know what you are trying to accomplish, how can the staff advise you about the consequences of this or that particular decision?

But given a clear understanding of objectives, then a staff of knowledgeable persons, tuned to the political realities, who have developed over the years the ability to sense the full implications of a situation, can be extremely helpful.

3. Another conclusion I have reached is that we Americans talk too much, especially when we are abroad. Paris was a good place to observe this phenomenon, for almost everyone came to Paris, sooner or later, and almost everyone had something to say.

It seemed to me that we sometimes spoke with too many voices. On a number of occasions important European officials asked me how seriously to take what appeared to be a statement of a new American position on a subject of interest to NATO, made by someone just off the plane from Washington. I could always say quite honestly that the American position remained as it had been stated to NATO bodies by the appropriate American representatives. Nevertheless, such episodes can lead to serious misunderstandings.

I think we should strictly follow the established procedures for making known the American position on policy questions.

In my experience, our officials who travel about the world saying that American policy is this or that rarely say it in exactly the same way. It comes out differently each time, and this is quite understandable.

It is a rather pleasant American habit, in some ways, to do our thinking out loud, but it is not a way to conduct affairs with other governments.

My own rule at SHAPE was to report facts but not to try to make news. In the first place, SHAPE was not supposed to be a policymaking organization, and I did not want it to be thought of as an important source of news. My public relations officers sometimes got a little impatient with me about this, but I am sure that had we talked more, it would have made it more difficult for us to do the jobs we were sent there to do.

We were able to speak with great frankness to allied governments, and when necessary to express sharp disappointment at their policies. We could do this because they knew the discussions were confidential and would not be spread all over the morning papers or even reported to other official agencies which had no need or right to such information. I think that we often accomplished a good deal because they were grateful that delicate matters were not aired too freely.

4. A closely related point is that reappraisals of our policies should be made as quietly as possible. Of course, we must review our policies from time to time. A new administration, for instance, certainly has an obligation to do so. I have always thought that it is useful to throw the policy papers away every so often, and reexamine things from the ground up. Unless one does this, the tendency is to work on producing a better mousetrap instead of asking whether a mousetrap is the best way to catch the mouse.

But it should be done privately. For as soon as one begins an analysis, reappraisal, or reassessment, one attacks, or at least brings into question, the validity of one's plans, policies, or strategy. And, furthermore, it may be that once the basic concepts are opened up for reassessment, one will find that some people want to go in one direction and others in exactly the opposite direction. This is especially true in dealings with allies. Some may want to reduce their commitments at the very time we think that their commitments ought to be increased. In that case reappraisals may become agonizing indeed.

I am afraid that we tend to involve too many people in such reassessments. There are too many Indians writing too many papers. The fewer the people, the better their product is likely to be. I once created a planning staff at SHAPE and assigned five colonels to it. It was a planning group that was all chiefs and no Indians. The idea was to get fewer papers but a better product. Believe me, it worked.

5. The last point I want to raise is that we should make a deliberate effort to develop our most promising talent.

A good man is still hard to find. When we find one with judgment and courage, with intellect and intuitiveness, we should do everything we can to bring him along fast, to put him in situations where he can develop—especially situations where he is called upon to carry responsibilities at least as heavy as he can carry, even a little heavier.

I remember that back in the thirties a lieutenant I knew received a promotion to captain. He had been a lieutenant for almost 20 years. I congratulated him, but did not get a warm response and asked him why he wasn't happier about his promotion. I will never forget his reply. He said: "Norstad, don't you know that a man who has been a lieutenant for 20 years will always be a lieutenant?"

When we find a good man, therefore, we ought to push him ahead rapidly, even if this means some preferential treatment. For men grow when they have to make decisions and carry responsibility.

I might also add that we should make every effort to build up and give support to our officials, civilian and military, who serve in allied groups. I am not talking about press-agent techniques, but about the marks of confidence and support that say much more about personal trust and reliance.

We want our officials in allied groups to have influence and to be effective advocates of our interests. There is no better way to help them than to show that they have influence in our own counsels and have the respect and confidence of the men for whom they work.

Finally, the tasks of national security, I believe, may well be more complex and demanding today than ever before. Foreseeing as early as 1946 our basic dilemma, Henry Stimson said these wise words:

"The sinfulness and weakness of man are evident to anyone who lives in the active world. But men are also good and great, kind and wise. Honor begets honor; trust begets trust; faith begets faith; and hope is the mainspring of life. I have lived with the reality of war, and I have praised soldiers; but the hope of honorable, faithful peace is a greater thing, and I have lived with that, too. That a man must live with both together is inherent in the nature of our present stormy stage of human progress, but it has also many times been the nature of progress in the past, and it is not reason for despair."

The choices before us are profoundly difficult and they lie within firmly fixed limits: we must devise the means that will discourage and prevent war with its terrible destructiveness, but we cannot weaken the guarantees of freedom, we cannot forfeit the means of defending the future of our Nation and of the individual liberty without which we could not live.

THE TASK OF IMPPROVEMENT OF U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Thursday, March 7, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon addressed the 10th Annual Monetary Conference of the American Bankers Association on the subject "Our Unfinished Task of Improving the U.S. Balance of Payments."

This address is a very fine exposition of the relationship between the President's tax program and the balance-of-payments problem, and I commend it to the attention of the Senate especially in this respect.

I ask unanimous consent that the address and an editorial commenting on it, published in the Washington Post of March 11, 1963, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OUR UNFINISHED TASK OF IMPROVING THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

(Remarks by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, at the 10th Annual Monetary Conference of the American Bankers Association, Princeton, N.J., Thursday, March 7, 1963)

A year ago, in Rome, I reviewed with you our balance-of-payments problem and the measures we were taking to deal with it. Today, I would like to appraise the record of the past 12 months in the perspective of the hard tasks still before us, and discuss the contributions which can be made to equilibrium in our international accounts by the President's tax proposals.

While last year's progress toward our goal of overall balance was disappointing, we continued to move ahead, and the groundwork for further improvement was laid. I am convinced that tax reduction, prudently financed and accompanied by persistent and firm expenditure control, can play a major role in that improvement. It will also free the hands of American monetary authorities to deal more vigorously with any contingencies that may arise—thus reinforcing our already strong defenses against pressures on the dollar during the difficult period until balance is fully restored.

Last year's overall balance-of-payments deficit amounted to $2.2 billion—the smallest annual deficit since 1957, and only a little more than half the total 2 years ago. But, measured against the $2.4 billion deficit of 1961, progress was limited, and the gold outflow continued at close to $900 million.

However, it must be remembered that during 1962 we absorbed the full impact of the rebound of imports from the abnormally low, recession-induced levels of 1961. As business recovered at home, imports increased by $1.7 billion, or 12 percent. Exports also rose substantially during the first part of the year, but then tapered off, reflecting the slower growth of our export markets in Europe and Japan. The Canadian tariff surcharges, together with adjustments in the Canadian exchange rate also, had a measurable adverse effect on exports during the latter part of the year since Canada is our single, largest foreign market. As a result, our commercial trade surplus (which excludes aid-financed shipments) declined by about $1.2 billion from the exceptionally favorable 1961 figure. While this surplus, at $2 billion, was still larger than that of any other Nation, its decline last year offset almost all of the improvement in our other accounts.

A major source of improvement during 1962 reflected our persistent efforts to curtail the outflow of dollars stemming from our commitments for defense and aid. Taken together, the net balance-of-payments drain from these two programs was reduced by more than $700 million. Much of this improvement stemmed from implementation of the cooperative logistics agreements with West Germany, providing for increased purchases of American military goods and services, while simultaneously strengthening the defense capabilities of both countries.

The vigorous efforts of the Department of Defense to economize in its own foreign exchange outlays were unfortunately offset by rising local costs and the full-year impact of the "Berlin buildup" on the size of our forces based in Europe. Moreover, the usual long interval between foreign aid commitments and actual spending obscured the progress that has been made in supplying a larger share of American assistance to the developing countries in the form of American goods and services.

However, on the basis of current policies and directives, there is a clear prospect of further savings in these two areas in the years ahead. For example, more than three quarters of AID commitments during this fiscal year will be directly reflected in purchases in this country, and that percentage is being raised still higher. A new agreement with Italy provides for the purchase of American-produced military equipment in an amount in excess of the foreign exchange costs of maintaining our forces in that country during 1963. And the Defense Department is continuing to reduce its foreign exchange outlays.

Smaller outflows of short-term capital also contributed to last year's improvement. However, the outflow was larger than we had expected. Much of it was submerged among unrecorded transactions making it difficult to pinpoint the precise cause and the source of these outflows. Certainly, our effort to maintain a structure of short-term rates in the American market that would reduce the incentive to shift funds abroad in search of higher interest returns—an effort that was greatly facilitated by downward rate adjustments in some important European markets—appeared to be reasonably successful, and the upward trend of trade financing and foreign bank loans tapered off. However, the total of short-term and unrecorded outflows, placed at more than $1½ billion in preliminary reports, remained uncomfortably high and clearly indicated an area where much further progress is required.

Outflows of longer term private capital, approximating $2½ billion, continued in undiminished volume, although the composition shifted somewhat as direct investment fell off moderately while the total of new foreign bond issues on the New York market rose. In discussing this problem at Rome last year—when the anomalous pattern of borrowers in Western European countries with strong payments positions seeking large amounts of long-term funds in the United States was already becoming clear—I suggested that much of the difficulty stemmed from the absence in Europe of an efficient, fully effective capital market mechanism, freely open to potential foreign borrowers and capable of absorbing new issues in the required volume. The fact that roughly 45 percent of the total official European, Australian, and New Zealand flotations in New York last year were taken up by foreign buyers—in some instances located in the same country as the borrower—provides further confirmation of this analysis.

It has been gratifying to us that during the past year a number of European countries have begun to reexamine their capital market mechanisms, recognizing their own internal need for more efficient means of mobilizing and distributing savings to support further rapid growth. Italy has made particular progress in developing and strengthening its capital markets and has also found it possible to open them to a few international institutions, as well as to initiate measures to free portfolio investment abroad by its own residents. I have also been glad to see signs of greater interest on the part of American commercial and investment bankers in participating in this process of strengthening European capital markets. That is an area where efforts to provide better service to your customers operating abroad by assisting them to raise local capital and credit can also have important benefits, both for the host country and the United States. Dramatic results cannot be expected within a limited period of time, but over the years ahead, the result will be a healthy freedom from dependence on the New York market, with a consequent lessening of one drain on our balance of payments.

Other factors of basic, long-run strength became more apparent during 1962. For instance, the flow of earnings from our $60 billion of private foreign investment rose by almost 10 percent to a new record of more than $3.5 billion—a figure that will continue mounting in the years ahead. Even more important, for it underlies our whole international trading position, has been the sustained stability in the prices of our industrial goods and materials. Unit wage costs have not risen since 1961, and the index of wholesale prices has now been virtually unchanged for 5 years. In contrast, pronounced upward cost pressures have developed in most industrialized countries in Europe, squeezing profits and bringing price pressures of the sort that have been all too familiar in this country.

A few years ago, there was much talk of a deterioration of the international competitive position of the United States. Today, that talk is diminishing—and for good reason. Our share of world exports of manufactured goods, after declining substantially during the fifties, has been essentially stable since 1959.

At the same time, however, we must recognize—as our alert competitors did long ago—that our competitive position depends on more than price alone. Knowledge of markets and willingness to search them out, product design, sales and servicing facilities, and export credit facilities are all vitally important. Recognizing the key role of commercial exports, the Government is improving and strengthening the facilities of the Export-Import Bank, as well as the export programs of the Department of Commerce. But, in the last analysis, it is the American businessman who must make the sale—and I should add that alert banks can play an important role as catalysts.

Now let us see how our program of tax rate reduction and reform can help to reinforce and support these various developments that are contributing to longer run balance of payments improvement. First of all, it will provide new incentives for investment and intelligent risk taking—increasing profits directly through lower tax rates, and indirectly through enlarged domestic markets and the establishment of a better atmosphere for growth. This is the best way—and ultimately the only way consistent with our free market system—to encourage the productive employment of American capital at home, and to attract more foreign investment to our shores.

It is clear that enlarged domestic spending for plant and equipment will help to employ the abundant supply of savings that today is aggressively seeking longer run investment—and at times seeping out in excessive volume abroad. An attempt to dry up those savings through severe credit contraction would run a serious risk of impeding domestic expansion. The far more constructive route toward the same objective is to bring about the sort of conditions in which these savings can be fully and productively utilized at home—and in which increases in interest rates are a reflection of the improved profitability of investment opportunities.

The more rapid growth fostered by tax reduction will, to be sure, generate further increases in our imports. To the extent that this results in higher foreign exchange earnings by the developing countries, we can expect larger demands for our exports as well. But more directly, the tax program can also help to sharpen the competitive position of our industries in world markets. Our export effort must be concentrated on new and sophisticated manufactured goods, for it is there that export markets are strongest, and there that the needed expansion in our foreign sales must be centered—but it is also there that our foreign competitors have made their greatest strides. We must redouble our efforts to remain at the very forefront of technological progress by applying our scientific abilities to industrial products and processes, and incorporating our new technology in new investment. The President's proposal to permit equipment used in research and development to be charged off as a current expense will directly support this objective. But far more important is the basic encouragement tax rate reductions can give to investment and growth, so that our industry can be better equipped to pour out in ever-increasing volume the new products the world wants.

Thus, there are sound reasons for believing that the tax program will, as it becomes fully effective, reinforce the fundamental longer run factors that are moving our payments position toward equilibrium. But I would not want to lull anyone into a false sense of confidence over the immediate outlook. The sound medicines of more profitable investment at home, stable prices, and a dynamic industry penetrating new export markets can work their cure only with time.

The immediate prospect, as nearly as any one can judge, is for another year of deficit in 1963, and for further gold losses. Faced with this prospect, it is vitally important that we redouble our efforts to reduce further the drains related to our Government programs overseas, and to achieve the kind of performance of our market economy that will bring higher exports and move attractive investment opportunities at home. At the same time, to meet our immediate problems, we need to maintain sound defenses for the dollar. That is why we have worked so steadily, in full cooperation with our friends abroad, to test and develop a wide variety of techniques designed to head off speculative disturbances in the gold and exchange markets and to absorb temporarily excessive supplies of dollars passing into the hands of foreigners.

We fully recognize that these devices are not substitutes for balance-of-payments equilibrium. Indeed, their success ultimately depends upon confidence in our ability and willingness to deal with our fundamental payments problem. But they are an important bulwark for the international payments system upon which all free nations depend, and which ultimately rests upon the free interchange of gold and dollars. Moreover, the usefulness of these arrangements in meeting potential or actual pressures on the dollar and on other currencies has now been amply demonstrated—for example, at the time of the stock market break, the Canadian crisis, and last fall's Cuban showdown.

But, during this critical period, we also need flexible monetary policies, alert to possible strains on the dollar and free to respond promptly in time of need. The difficulty today is that in the absence of expansionary fiscal or tax policy, a sharp and substantial tightening of credit could present real risks to the domestic economy. But, as the President has emphasized on several occasions, and specifically in his tax message, "a nation operating closer to capacity will be freer to use monetary tools to protect its international accounts, should events so require." In short our immediate balance-of-payments situation offers one of the most telling arguments in favor of a tax policy designed to stimulate the economy and thus give greater freedom to those who bear the heavy responsibility of administering monetary policy.

I do not pretend that the tax program alone can meet all of our problems at home or abroad, or that it entails no risks. That would be nonsense. Fiscal policy is not a tool to be used with abandon. We would much prefer to have been able to present our tax program within the context of a balanced budget, and we had hoped to do so. But we cannot afford to wait—and the prospect of budgetary balance in the years ahead will be enhanced, rather than reduced, by soundly conceived tax reduction. Our unsatisfactory growth of recent years, the sluggishness of our investment, the pressures on profits, our idle capacity and manpower, and the failure of revenues to expand with more vigor, can all be traced in good part to the restraining effects of a tax structure unsuited to today's needs. I am firmly convinced—along with a broad cross section of the business community—that to continue operating with the present tax structure would not be consistent with true fiscal responsibility.

We have arranged the phasing of the proposed tax reductions over 3 fiscal years in a manner, consistent with earlier proposals by business groups, that will minimize the transitional budgetary deficits. In fiscal 1964, the great bulk of the anticipated $12 billion deficit would face us in any event, and has no connection with the tax program. The critical need is to finance this deficit in a way that will not give rise to renewed inflationary pressures as we move closer to full employment and reasonably full capacity operations. This is what we have done in financing the deficits of the past 2 years—and what we mean to do in the future.

Our latest figures on the distribution of the public debt, those for January 31, show that the entire increase over the preceding 12 months was financed outside the banking system—an increase of $1.8 billion in Federal Reserve holdings being fully offset by an equivalent decrease in commercial bank holdings. Furthermore, the increase in the outstanding marketable debt maturing in 5 years or more was larger than the total deficit. This policy of working persistently toward a balanced debt structure can be symbolized in a short-hand way by the fact that on March 15, after taking into account the results of our current advance refunding, the average maturity of the marketable debt will be 5 years and 1 month, 11 percent longer than at the end of 1960, and the longest since the fall of 1958.

Some observers have felt that we have been over zealous in our desire to maintain a debt structure that will avoid the danger of excessive liquidity and a future inflationary problem. But this view, in my judgment, underrates the continued availability of new savings in amounts more than adequate to meet the current borrowing requirements of business, individuals, and State and local governments, as well as the essential need to forestall any rebirth of inflation as the stimulus from the tax program takes hold. Moreover, the techniques available to us—and especially the device of advance refundings—have enabled us to attract longer term funds with a minimum of market disturbance.

As I look ahead, I see no reason to believe that we cannot continue for some time to finance the deficit largely from savings, without bringing strong upward pressures on market rates, for there is today a vast flow of funds through our financial institutions seeking longer term commitments. Of course, as investment activity increases in response to the stimulus of tax reductions, private credit demands will also expand, and the available supply of savings will be more fully absorbed. As I have suggested, this is one of the primary reasons why the tax program can be helpful to our balance of payments. We must also recognize that under these conditions, interest rates may rise in response to market forces—even though savings, too, can be expected to rise with incomes.

I can assure you that we have no intention of retreating at that point to excessive monetization of debt to meet our financing needs. When the economy approaches more closely the limits of its capacity, we will need to redouble our guard against potential inflationary pressures. Even more to the point, the higher revenues generated by economic expansion would be directed toward achieving budgetary balance and surplus, thereby releasing savings for productive use by other sectors of the economy.

The President has repeatedly stated that, after enactment of the tax program, a substantial portion of the increased revenues that can be expected in the years ahead will be devoted to reducing and eliminating the budgetary deficit. This policy is an integral and essential part of our financial and tax program. In recognition of the need to accompany tax reduction with rigorous expenditure control, several billions of dollars were cut from estimates developed only a few months ago. Programs that in other circumstances might have been expanded were cut back or deferred. Efforts to achieve economies—including those within the Defense Department—were intensified. And we are proceeding vigorously with efforts to substitute private for public credit wherever feasible.

Nevertheless, a realistic appraisal of the international situation has compelled a further increase in our spending for defense. And our program to put a man on the moon in this decade required an increase of $1.8 billion in space expenditures. These items, together with interest costs, account for more than 70 percent of our entire budget, and for all of the increase in fiscal 1964. Total spending for civilian programs is scheduled to decline. In a longer perspective, it is worth noting that, of the total increase of $17.3 billion in administrative budget expenditures over the 3 fiscal years from 1961 to 1964, $12.6 billion is for defense, space and interest on the public debt, while not much more than a quarter, or $4.7 billion, is for civilian programs. In the 3 preceding fiscal years—excluding temporary unemployment compensation and all the other antirecession expenditures incurred by this administration during the closing months of fiscal 1961—the rise in civilian spending was over $4 billion, or almost as large.

Our Defense Establishment is now approaching the new level of readiness set by the administration, and Secretary McNamara has expressed his confidence that the upward spending trend will taper off after fiscal 1964. If our lunar exploration timetable is to be met, another sizable—but probably smaller—increase in spending for space will be necessary in fiscal 1965, but the prospect here also is for a leveling trend thereafter. This will substantially ease our budgetary task, but we recognize that it will not relieve us from the need for continuous rigorous screening of domestic civilian programs.

A compelling case can be made for increased spending for certain of these civilian programs, some of them new, that are vital to the national interest, but it is our job to find the savings in other areas that will make these programs possible within the confines set by our target of budgetary balance. In undertaking our program of tax reduction we have committed ourselves to do just that. But to defer the tax program to some indefinite future point in the hope that budgetary balance can somehow be achieved with present tax rates—when it is those very rates that stifle the growth we need—seems to me to be self-defeating, and to carry grave risks both for domestic expansion and the balance of payments.

There are simply no easy solutions to our multiple problems at home and abroad. The challenge, for both Government and business, is to appraise these problems realistically, and to seek together in a spirit of partnership the kinds of answers that are fully consistent with our traditions of free markets and free enterprise. The special role of Government, beyond intensive efforts to economize in its own oversea spending, must be to provide an environment of monetary stability, responsible budgetary and debt management policies, and freedom from oppressive taxation in which private enterprise can find renewed incentives to invest at home and to seek our profitable export markets. The special responsibility of business is to make extra efforts—consistent with its own longrun interest—to develop foreign markets and sources of foreign finance, to exercise appropriate restraint in wage and pricing decisions, and—by no means least—to contribute to a process of serious discussion and debate from which intelligent public policy can emerge. Over the past 10 years these monetary conferences sponsored by the American Bankers Association have provided a forum for just such discussion, and I am especially grateful to have had this opportunity to discuss our thinking with you today.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 11, 1963]

GROWTH AND PAYMENTS

Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon's speech at the annual monetary conference of the American Bankers Association in Princeton provides an effective antidote to the unfounded fears that a tax cut and a larger fiscal deficit will aggravate the balance-of-payments problem and accelerate the outflow of gold.

The Secretary's cogent analysis provides a timely rebuttal to the argument advanced by a segment of the banking community which holds that there is a direct and inexorable series of causal links between fiscal deficits, increases in the domestic money supply, balance-of-payments deficts and gold losses. According to this view, which has an articulate proponent in John Exter, vice president of the First National City Bank of New York, a balance-of-payments equilibrium can only be achieved by restrictive monetary and fiscal policies. But this view flies in the face of both logic and the dreary monetary experience of the 1930's. Far from solving the balance-of-payments problem, restrictive monetary and fiscal policies would at this juncture plunge the economy into a recession and do irreparable damage to confidence in the international dollar.

Mr. Dillon was on firm ground in insisting that the only hope for improving our balance-of-payments position lies in accelerating the growth of the American economy. By expanding the volume of activity and increasing the demand for domestic investment funds, the tax cut will strengthen our international payments position by reversing outflow of capital. And the Secretary added that "it is clear that the enlarged domestic spending for plant and equipment will help to employ the abundant supply of savings that today is aggressively seeking longer-run investment—and at times seeping out in excessive volume abroad. An attempt to dry up those savings through severe credit contraction would run a serious risk of impeding domestic expansion. The far more constructive route toward the same objective is to bring about the sort of conditions in which these savings can be fully and productively utilized at home."

Mr. Dillon also said tax reduction will "free the hands of the American monetary authorities to deal more vigorously with any contingencies that may arise." This remark has strengthened the speculation that the monetary authorities may act to raise short-term interest rates after the passage of the tax bill. But since high interest rates have hardly been successful in stanching the outflow of short-term capital, other alternatives should be exhausted before measures which arrest domestic activity are adopted.

EDUCATION AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, recently, there came to my attention a notable address delivered to the graduating class of the Connecticut State Police, by Samuel F. Pryor, Jr., vice president of Pan American Airways, who resides in Greenwich, Conn. There were 34 graduates, 4 being sons of State police officers and the majority being former members of the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. Pryor's address centered around the point that if we are to save our society from crumbling from within we must give much more attention to the professions of education and law enforcement.

It was an address filled with good sense, from a man who is not only one of the most outstanding businessmen in the country, but one who has also given so generously of his time and energy to civic causes.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SAMUEL F. PRYOR, JR.

I thank your commissioner for inviting me to say a few words on law enforcement to this graduating class. In addition to the privilege he has given me of cooperating with your State police force and the privilege Chief Robbins has given me for many years of cooperating with our Greenwich police force, I have for some years had the honor of being an official adviser to the Bureau of Narcotics of the U.S. Treasury Department. I attended their Advanced Narcotics Training School, and just last year represented the commissioner at the interpol convention in Copenhagen. This experience has convinced me that Edgar Hoover was right in saying that law preserves the heart of our democracy and freedom; but the existence of law itself is no guarantee that it will be administered effectively. You must play your part in effective administration. How law is administered is the safeguard to democracy and freedom, which each and everyone of us treasure so deeply. I strongly believe that if the moral fiber of our country is to be maintained—if we are to survive in a competitive world—we must have greater citizen cooperation and assistance in support of our law enforcement agencies. Crime is a community problem, not just a police problem.

My business takes me to 81 countries of our world, so possibly I see law enforcement at work in many countries, cities, and towns—in many ways—good and bad—more than the average citizen. It has been my privilege to visit many of the ancient cities, which are now either in ruins or buried under desert sands, not only in the European countries but also in the pre-Christian kingdoms, and on our own continent, the Mayan civilization, the Aztec, and the Inca. Some of these civilizations have been dead now over 2,000 years. Each of these nations, at its peak, stood in the forefront of civilized achievement and accomplishment. Each asserted its influence throughout the then known world. Each was the leader of its time.

Pondering over these ruins caused me to wonder about ourselves. What is happening to us today—right now in this year 1963. Crime in the United States increased five times faster than the Nation's population in the 5 years preceding 1962. Some 7,800 law-enforcement agencies in the country reported an estimated 1,926,090 serious crimes in 1961, 3 percent more than in 1960. On the average there was a murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, major larceny, or automobile theft every 16 seconds in 1961.

Preliminary statistics for 1962 show a continuing upward surge. A 5-percent increase was recorded in the first 9 months of 1962 over the same period of 1961.

A major increase has occurred in one of the more serious types of crime—bank robberies, burglaries, and larcenies in 1962. There has been an average of 100 such crimes each month for an increase of about 25 percent over 1961.

An analysis of crime statistics reveals that the crime rate—number of offenses per 100,000 inhabitants—generally is higher in the areas with the largest population increase. The crime rate in metropolitan areas—cities over 50,000 and their fringes—is three times greater than in rural areas, and twice that of smaller cities.

Over half the cash and property stolen in robberies, burglaries, larcenies, and auto thefts in 1961 was recovered through effective law enforcement work. Also, the vast majority of crimes committed directly against individuals were cleared by arrest, ranging from 93 percent of all murders to 73 percent of all forcible rapes.

There is an average of just under two police employees for every 1,000 inhabitants in the United States. This should leave no doubt that greater citizen cooperation and assistance is needed by law enforcement agencies in protecting the safety and welfare of the Nation and its citizens. Every citizen should do what they can to combat crime. A great help would be the taking of simple precautions with property of value. Of the burglaries committed in 1961, 21 percent took place in buildings to which some means of access had been left open. A great reduction in the $22 billion annual crime bill could be effected if citizens merely took normal, intelligent steps to protect their property.

Crimes reported from agencies within our State of Connecticut for the first 9 months of the 1962 calendar year were up 18 percent from 1961—the increase primarily attributable to the increase in burglary and larceny categories. The percentage of reported crimes cleared by arrest for this same period was approximately 38 percent, which is above the national average.

As each of you goes out from here to join the ranks of law enforcers, you will come to wonder how the citizens of this country can be so unaware as to virtually invite the committing of crime daily. The fact remains that the public is often naive, and this will be a constant irritant to you in the days and years ahead.

Yet you must never lose sight of the need—indeed, the duty—to teach the everyday citizen to help you safeguard his freedom. This aspect—education—can be as important in your new role as that of actual crime detection and prevention.

If you will permit me a bit of pride as a resident of Connecticut, let me emphasize to you the State's program of education, for example, in the area of motor traffic alone. Whereas many States appear to welcome speeders as a potential source of income, laying traps for the unsuspecting (and unwarned) driver, Connecticut does everything it can to educate the driver to exercise prudence before it cracks down. This genuine attempt to help citizens protect themselves is a goal to keep before you always. Law-enforcement agencies reflect the spirit of their communities.

As I mentioned before, I have had an interest in a special area of law enforcement—narcotics. In no other area can education do so much to prevent the thrill-seeker, the depressed, the experimenter from becoming a rotting shell of a human being.

While the Soviet countries have us all looking into space, they are encouraging the distribution of narcotics, not in their countries, but in all other countries around the world including our own. A teenager can become a dangerous criminal by becoming an addict to heroin. Governments can fall or surrender to the Communists easily if

enough government officials, using bad judgment, should come under the influence of narcotics.

Nationwide attention was directed to this problem in the latter part of September, during the White House Conference on Narcotic and Drug Abuse. It was my privilege to be a representative at this Conference. The Conference, which was held on September 27 and 28, brought together 400 experts in the various fields of medicine, the social sciences, and law enforcement.

Two aspects of the Conference are particularly noteworthy. First, the President announced his intention to appoint a special committee to advise him regarding a program for the civil commitment of narcotic addicts and their rehabilitation. Second, it was pointed out that the abusive use of dangerous drugs (i.e., barbiturates and amphetamines) may be a more serious problem than the abusive use of narcotic drugs. The President's advisory committee is to inform him regarding any needed Federal legislation in this area.

Arnold Toynbee has documented, in the case of civilization after civilization, that complete destruction comes from within. Egypt, Babylon, Crete, Greece, Assyria, Rome—and in our own hemisphere the Mayas and the Incas—were not destroyed from without. In each and every case the conquerer found a civilization which had begun its self-destruction from within. We can look back through the long, long vista of human history and we can see that today the whole cause of human freedom is in the greatest danger mankind has ever known.

Thinking about this has brought me to the conclusion that there are two professions that we in this country must encourage and strengthen to the utmost—teaching and law enforcement. I do not think we are going to have a nuclear war. Our one enemy capable of waging nuclear war against us realizes that there is no such thing as victory today; if they attacked us, our country would be half dead, but they themselves would be three-fourths dead. Therefore, the war in which we will engage will be a war of minds, so education of our young must be greatly strengthened. The teaching profession must be a chosen profession with much greater respect and remuneration. However, this cannot be accomplished without first our law enforcement profession being also a most honored and respected profession. This is the profession you have chosen.

In the Marine Corps the highest honor that one can wish for is to be called a good marine. You as police officers must have spotless integrity, uncommon bravery, and complete devotion to duty—then you will be judged by your community with what should be one of the highest community honors—you will be called a good police officer. We need you.

Good luck to you and God bless you.

MORE INDIANA SCIENTISTS PLEAD THAT DUNES BE SAVED

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the vigorous support of the scientific community for the effort to save the Indiana Dunes is heartening. This support, which has come from the universities and colleges of Indiana, and from throughout the free world, should put to rest the completely untrue claim made by Bethlehem Steel Co. and the other dunes despoilers that nothing of value remains in the dunes to be saved.

On March 7, I had printed in the RECORD at page 3666, the fine letter of the members of the biology department of Notre Dame University which clearly states the uniqueness and irreplaceability of the dunes.

On February 4, I discussed in the Senate the appeal made by 166 scientists and educators working within the State of Indiana that the central section of the dunes be preserved because of the high scientific and recreational values.

Last July, some of the most famous zoologists, biologists, and ornithologists of the world appealed to Northwestern University and other participants in the planned destruction of the key section of the dunes to reconsider their actions. I put a full account of this appeal by European and American scientists in the RECORD of July 27, 1962.

Numerous other individual scientists and scientific associations have written to me and to the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands, stating their expert opinions that the Indiana Dunes are unique, irreplaceable, and of inestimable scientific and recreational value.

Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add to this irrefutable record by having printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter written by 19 members of the faculty of Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., which appeared in the Lafayette Journal-Courier of February 22, 1963.

This letter from prominent Hoosiers corrects some of the propaganda of the dunes destroyers and Burns ditch harbor proponents and takes the position which more and more Indiana people are expressing, namely, "We favor combining all the economic benefits, including tourism, by having the port elsewhere, and having a great lakeshore park where it belongs."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DUNES VERSUS PORT

The charge is being made that opposition to the State's Burns ditch port plan is heavily financed by Chicago interests attempting to impede Indiana's economic development. None of this is true. The Save-the-Dunes Council has a $19,000 annual budget derived from dues and contributions from its 3,000 members, and from sale of Christmas cards. The attempt to portray this group of dedicated volunteer workers for conservation, without paid officers, as a sinister economic octopus is ludicrous when one considers the combined forces of officialdom, industry, press, and political power arrayed on the other side. Nevertheless, the undersigned council members and sympathizers deny and resent these reckless accusations against their intregity and motives.

Many pertinent facts have been obscured in the public furor over the proposed Burns ditch port site. Only after persistent urging by Indiana citizens unable to enlist support for dunes conservation from Hoosier politicians did Senator DOUGLAS reluctantly consent to assist the largely Indiana organization, the Save-the-Dunes Council. The unjustified campaign of vilification against him has put our State in a very bad light. If we resent "interference in our sovereign business" by out-of-Staters, we should stop agitating for Federal funds to build our port.

Far from opposing another lake port in Indiana (although we now have four, two of which are open to public use), Senator DOUGLAS has pledged his influence to obtain generous Federal funds for one, anywhere except in the contested dunes and beach area. It is a question of where, not whether. Specifically, he has accepted (1) the tricity site, for which the 87th Congress appropriated funds for a thorough Army Engineers feasibility study, and (2) the Burns ditch compromise plan drawn up by the Lake Michigan Region Planning Council, an affiliate of the American Institute of Architects. This plan calls for a canal leading inland to an excavated port behind the strip of dunes in question.

The economic argument for a port at the Burns ditch site is unconvincing. The number of new jobs it would bring about is variously claimed as from 25,000 to 100,000 These figures were picked out of the air, they are hardly confirmed by Bethlehem Steel's announcement of about 2,000 employees for the automated mill it has planned and for which the land is being prepared. Professor Efroymson, Butler University economist, wrote that more economic benefit for Indiana would result in the long run by a lakeshore park to stimulate our tourist industry, than from a port at Burns ditch. Other economists judge that the new jobs there would be more than offest by resulting increased unemployment in the less automated steel mills in Indiana farther west. The United Steelworkers, representing 65,000 Hoosiers, have declared against the Burns ditch site.

The legislators who were given the recent conducted tour have never seen the land in question except in the dead of winter and with the earth scorched by fires set to facilitate clearing and bulldozing. Is their judgment of parkland quality better than that of Interior Secretary Udall and National Park Service authorities who found that the area meets the exacting standards of quality for inclusion in the national park system? Or better than that of the 165 outdoors-oriented Indiana scientists who wrote President Kennedy jointly urging the lakeshore?

We favor combining all the economic benefits, including tourism, by having the port elsewhere, and having a great lakeshore park where it belongs.

Preston Adams, Irving W. Burr, Marjorie K. Eisinger, Raymond E. Girton, Clarence J. Goodnight, Marie L. Goodnight, Arthur T. Guard, Joseph A. Kuc, Alton A. Lindsey, James S. Lovett, Phyllis K. Martin, Melvin G. Mellon, Russell E. Mumford, Elroy L. Rice, Sumner A. Rifenburgh, Oscar G. Ward, Jr., Barbara Webster, Grady Webster, and Arthur H. Westing.

THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PROGRAM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Stanley Surrey, spoke recently before the Juristic Society of Philadelphia about the President's tax program.

As there is so much misinformation about the program, I think it important that Members of the Congress and the public generally have access to Mr. Surrey's remarks where he explains factually just what many of the proposals would do.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TAX PROGRAM IN PERSPECTIVE

(Remarks by Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury before the Juristic Society of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa., February 28, 1963)

THE BACKGROUND—WIDESPREAD CRITICISM OF THE TAX STRUCTURE

Throughout the postwar period there has been increasing recognition that the Federal income-tax structure deserved revision. It has been criticized on the ground that its high rates are a heritage of war and postwar inflationary pressure, and that these rates dull initiative, destroy incentives, and inhibit risktaking.

There have also been charges that our tax law contains special preferences, which discriminate without justification among taxpayers and contribute to gross unfairness. The many exclusions and deductions have been blamed for unduly narrowing the tax base, contributing to the need for high rates. The tax system has been blamed for showing favoritism to some industries and transactions, and distorting the allocation of resources in the economy as well as interfering with the free play of market forces. As a result of all this, the energies and talents of many people—including a great number of highly skilled executives and professional people—have been taken up devising intricate schemes to take maximum advantage of opportunities for tax reduction.

It is hardly surprising, then, that criticism of our tax system became more insistent as the postwar period lengthened. The Congress took account of such criticism in 1955 and 1959, when, under the leadership of Chairman WILBUR MILLS, of Arkansas, noteworthy studies of our tax system were made. Considerable testimony from professional experts was compiled in these studies, not merely on the criticisms themselves, but on the possible lines of improvement which might be taken.

That was the situation when President Kennedy took office. He immediately set tax revision as one of the major domestic goals of his administration. He made his views clear in his first tax message to the Congress, in April of 1961. In that message he urged the adoption of an investment tax credit as a stimulus to spur investment and accelerate growth, proposed a series of specific tax reforms, and ordered a Treasury study of additional, broader changes in the income tax structure.

The Congress responded with the Revenue Act of 1962, containing both the investment tax credit and significant reform provisions in almost all of the areas recommended by the President—in all nearly a billion dollars of tax reform to roughly match the revenue lost by the investment credit. A significant first step in revision of the tax structure was thus accomplished.

YEAR 1963—THE CASE FOR TAX REVISION BECOMES IMPERATIVE

The year 1963, however, brought a new dimension to the situation. The tax revision that all had agreed was one of our desirable domestic goals came to be recognized as imperative to our economic health.

We have seen four recessions since the end of World War II. We have seen unplanned deficits resulting from a failure of the economy to achieve levels of operation consistent with its potential in terms of capital, manpower, and productivity. The gap between our potential and our actual performance—now about $40 billion in terms of lost gross national product per year—is evident in unused industrial capacity, high unemployment, and a lagging rate of capital formation. As a result we are running the risk of recessions that could cut deeper and last longer, followed by shorter recoveries. Furthermore, the America we all want—with full employment, with more and better schools, health facilities, and public services, with urban redevelopment on a faster and larger scale, with better living standards for all—will come about far more quickly through an economy yielding us all that our resources in men and capital are capable of producing.

The overwhelming weight of economic analysis indicates that the income tax structure presses too heavily on the economy. Its especially high individual income tax rates, starting at 20 percent, sweep too much out of private hands in relation to our GNP, so that consumer demand is kept throttled down in periods of recovery. The rate structure, rising to 91 percent, means high marginal tax rates that deter incentive, risk taking, and personal effort, thereby lessening the contribution that private initiative is able to make. The corporate tax rate, at 52 percent, unduly limits the profitability of corporate investment and presents corporate management with the fact that the shareholders are the lesser and the Government the greater partner in the enterprises they guide. Added to all this is the waste arising from the distortions induced by the special preferences—the uneconomic allocation of resources, the talents and time lost in the pursuit of tax schemes, the resentments created by the gross unfairnesses.

We thus come to these conclusions—the America we want and the America we must have to meet our international obligations and hazards can be obtained only by a more productive economy. We possess the resources required for a higher level of economic activity. Our task is to secure the full utilization of those resources. The most effective way to achieve that full utilization is to revise the tax system. Tax revision, by removing the present tax restraints on the private sector, will enable it to provide the force and initiative so necessary to economic vitality. Tax revision—for long acknowledged as a desirable thing to do—is now of paramount economic importance.

THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSED REVISION—THE RATE REDUCTIONS

In full recognition of the imperative of tax revision, the President's tax program recommends large reductions in the rate scale and significant structural changes. Combined these mean, in full operation, a reduction of $10.3 billion in tax liabilities—about 15 percent of our present individual and corporate tax liabilities. Let us start with the major reform of the tax structure, the reduction in tax rates. The present individual rates run from 20 percent in the bottom bracket of $2,000 to $4,000 for a married couple—to 91 percent at the top. President Kennedy's tax program would start the tax scale at 14 percent on the first $1,000 to $2,000 for a married couple—and rise to a maximum of 65 percent. The intermediate rates are all pulled down—the present marginal rate of 30 percent for the $15,000 married man would be 24 percent, of 43 percent for the $25,000 man would be 34 percent. The 50-percent marginal rate now reached at $32,000 would be reached at $52,000. The 60-percent marginal rate now reached at $52,000 would not be reached until $140,000. These large reductions in the marginal tax rates—the rates on added dollars of income—show the significant increase in incentives inherent in the program.

The resulting rate scale means a reduction of $11 billion in individual income tax liabilities.

On the corporate side our present rates are 30 percent on the first $25,000 of income and 52 percent on the remainder. The proposed tax rates would be 22 percent on the first $25,000 and 47 percent on the balance. The 22 percent rate for small business—a rate which would apply to 80 percent of all taxpaying corporations—is a reduction of 27 percent. It means a significant lift for a large segment of American enterprise. The 47-percent rate is a 10-percent reduction, so that the reduction for the corporations above $25,000 ranges in between—it is 16 percent for a $50,000 corporation, 12 percent for a $100,000 corporation. The overall reduction in corporate tax liabilities is $2.6 billion. This reduction is about the same as that obtained in 1962, when over $2 billion of corporation tax liabilities were removed through the combined effect of the investment credit and administrative revision of the depreciation rules. The resulting total would mean that overall corporate tax liabilities would be reduced by nearly 20 percent.

These reductions would thus achieve a sizable lowering of the individual and corporate rate structures. In terms of increased incentives, of increased private resources available for consumer spending and capital investment, of a significant lessening of the weight of the tax system on all private enterprise and activity, of the impetus given to cost cutting and improvements in productive efficiency, the new rates represent the most significant of the reforms of the tax system that the program embodies. They are a direct and effective response to the need for loosening the present tax restraints on the economy. They recognize that the achievement of a greater level of economic recovery and more rapid growth cannot rest either on increased consumer spending alone or on increased incentives and savings for investment alone. Both are vitally needed, consumer demand to press on existing and future capacity to bring us to full employment and lead to a higher level of investment; the investment incentives to stimulate us to go on to a higher level of capital formation and economic growth. The rate reductions pull back the entire rate structure, individual and corporate, from top to bottom.

THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSED REVISION—THE STRUCTURAL CHANGES

The major reform in the tax program is thus the large reduction in tax rates. These reductions are complemented by—and their revenue cost partially offset by—a number of proposed structural changes. These structural changes are not all in one direction—some involve revenue losses and some revenue gains, some affect corporations and some individuals, some are directly associated with changes in the rate structure and some are required by the objectives of eliminating hardships, unfairness, and unjustified preferences.

Individual structural changes that lose revenue: On the individual side, a number of structural changes are proposed to remove particular hardships and unfairnesses that rate reduction by itself will not rectify. Thus, at the lower end of the scale, the insistence by many that exemptions be raised has been prompted by the realization that an income tax reaching as low as $667 for single persons and $1,333 for married couples taxes persons in the area of real poverty. Rate reductions alone obviously cannot meet this problem. Yet the solution of raising exemptions by $100 would mean a revenue loss of $2.5 billion under proposed rates and remove 3 million taxpayers from the rolls; an increase of $200 in exemptions means a revenue loss of almost $5 billion and removal of 6½ million taxpayers. This exemption approach is wasteful of revenue, since its effects reach beyond the lower levels where the particular relief is needed, and is often overgenerous where family size is large. Of the $2.5 billion of revenue that would be lost through a $100 increase in exemptions, only 20 percent or $550 million would go to the group below $5,000.

As a more appropriate solution the program proposes a minimum standard deduction of $300 for a single person and an additional $100 for a spouse and for each dependent. As a consequence, single persons below $900, married persons below $1,600, and married persons with two dependents below $3,000 cease to be taxable—as compared with $667, $1,333, and $2,666 levels of today. The revenue loss is only $310 million, concentrated almost entirely in the group below $5,000. Yet this approach achieves in the lowest income range the equivalent of an exemption increase of as much as $233 for a single person, of as much as $133 for each spouse of the married couple, and of as much as $83 for each member of the

family of four. About 1.5 million persons would become nontaxable by this proposal.

In short, the minimum standard deduction proposal uses the deduction factor of the tax computation as a technique to achieve a fair adjustment of the tax burdens at the lowest levels of income, in preference to the more traditional, yet wastefully expensive technique, of raising exemptions.

Another hardship that tax rate reduction alone cannot meet is the present complex and discriminatory treatment of the aged. Present law embodies an extra $600 exemption—which at higher income levels is unneeded and thus a revenue waste—and a complicated retirement income credit designed to give pensioners and those receiving investment income a tax reduction somewhat comparable to the exclusion of social security benefits from income. Its effect is to discriminate against all those over 65 who receive earned income—about three out of every four taxpayers over 65. The consequent unfairnesses among the aged in the income levels below $10,000, depending on source of income, are too great to tolerate—a tax of zero for a $3,000 income from interest and rent, but a tax of $300 if wages are the only source of income. And again the credit is unneeded in the upper levels.

The tax program proposes to substitute for all this a flat $300 credit against tax for each person over age 65. Recognition of the present social security exclusion is taken account of in the proposal. This is done by reducing the credit by an amount based on one-half of social security benefits times the taxpayer's bracket or marginal tax rate. This procedure reflects the fact that both the employee and employer contribute equally to the benefits. The cost of this change is $320 million, one-half of which goes to persons below the $5,000 income level and most of the balance to those with incomes between $5,000 and $10,000. This change would thus continue the present policy that age is a factor justifying tax relief, and then provide a mechanism which both grants that relief in a fair and simple way and confines it to the income levels where it is needed most.

A third structural change under the individual income tax also meets a hardship which rate reduction cannot solve—that faced by the person with fluctuating yearly income. While fluctuating incomes may be more characteristic of people in certain occupations, such as authors, artists, actors, athletes, ranchers, fisherman, farmers, architects, and individual business proprietorships, it obviously may be experienced in many other situations. The combination of graduated tax rates and an irregular pattern of income produces more tax today over a period of years than does a stable income pattern. The tax program meets this hardship by a uniform averaging formula applicable to all, under which income is, in effect, averaged over a 5-year period whenever the current year's income is significantly higher than the average of the preceding 4 years. The revenue cost is about $40 million.

A fourth structural change, involving a revenue cost of $50 million, is aimed at meeting the hardship experienced by persons who must incur moving expenses for themselves and their families as a consequence of a change in employment. The burden can often be severe and its impact, apart from hardship, can be such as to place an undesirable restriction on labor mobility. The tax program proposes a deduction for these moving expenses, both for a transferred person who continues to work for the same employer and for a person who changes his employer.

The remaining individual structural changes that lose revenue smooth out or extend existing provisions respecting certain expenditures. One change would expand the benefits of the child-care provision (revenue cost 20 billion); another would apply the 30-percent limitation uniformly to all publicly supported charities, thereby replacing the present distinctions between a 20-percent and a 30-percent limitation for these charities (revenue cost nominal); and a third would clarify and simplify the medical expense deduction (revenue cost nominal).

In sum, this group of reforms, which in total involve a revenue cost of $740 million, will thus meet some of the persistent and well-founded complaints regarding the hardships resulting today, not from the present rate scale but from the operation of the tax structure even under a reasonable rate scale. They deal with specific unfairnesses requiring specific reforms for their cure. It is just as important to the persons affected, in terms of fairness under an income tax, that their problems be met as it is to those whose objections are directed to the present rate scales. Moreover, these changes have a considerable bearing on the economic scene in terms of labor mobility and allocation of individual skills. This group of reforms or structural changes thus contributes significantly to the insistent urgings for improvement in the tax structure.

Individual structural changes that gain revenue: The remaining individual structural changes involve revenue gains. The most significant from a revenue standpoint is the proposed floor on deductions for personal expenses—interest, charitable contributions, State and local taxes, medical expenses, casualty losses. Under this proposal only the total of those expenses above 5 percent of adjusted gross income would be deductible. A consideration of this proposal in its proper perspective requires that we go back to the origin and effect of the standard deduction. The Congress in 1944 adopted our present standard deduction of 10 percent of adjusted gross income up to a $1,000 maximum as a device to simplify the tax law. Since the 10-percent figure chosen was somewhat above the average of those expenses then being itemized as deductions, the policy also eliminated any distinctions between itemizers and nonitemizers among taxpayers below or around the average level.

Since 1944 there has been a considerable growth in the average amount of these personal expenses, as a result of rising income levels, rising costs, and changing habits. In 1944, about 35 million returns used the standard deduction and only 8 million used itemized deductions; in 1962 the figures were 26 and 25 million respectively. In 1944, the standard deduction represented 63 percent of the total of all deductions for these personal expenses; in 1962 this figure had dropped to 23 percent. In 1944 the itemized and standard deductions combined represented about 10 percent of adjusted gross income; in 1962 they represented about 15 percent. The standard deduction now comes to $12½ billion. The itemized deductions come to $41 billion, used by taxpayers with an adjusted gross income of $217 billion, or about 20 percent. In 1944, the itemized deductions amounted to only $4.6 billion, used by taxpayers with $32.5 billion adjusted gross income, or about 14 percent. This is the key figure, for it indicates the persistent narrowing of the tax base that has occurred in postwar years as a result of the large increase in amount of itemized deductions—from 14 percent to 20 percent of the adjusted gross income of the returns involved. Parenthetically, by contrast the total of personal exemptions has dropped from about 40 to 27 percent of adjusted gross income.

The standard deduction represents a congressional policy of eliminating distinctions between itemization and nonitemization of expenses at the level of average expenses for taxpayers with incomes below $10,000. Underlying this policy was a desire for simplification and a willingness to recognize that some of the rental expenses of the renter reflected personal expense akin to those of the howeowner. In view of the increase in these personal expenses relative to gross income, it is obvious that if we were today adopting the policy of the standard deduction for the first time, the appropriate figure would be about 15 percent instead of 10 percent, with a limit perhaps of $1,500. But in the meantime we have seen that the narrowing of the tax base represented by the rise in personal expenses is a factor in keeping marginal rates at an excessively high level. A standard deduction at 15 percent would also have a base-narrowing effect and mean a loss of revenue. The intent behind the standard deduction, however, can be as well expressed through a different mechanism, that of placing a floor under itemized deductions. Instead then of a standard deduction of 15 percent, the objectives can be achieved by continuing the standard deduction of 10 percent and adopting a 5-percent floor under itemized deductions. This policy would, of course, gain revenue. Since it would be adopted to keep the base from narrowing and thereby keeping or forcing tax rates up, it is appropriate that the revenue gained be devoted to a lowering of the rates.

The policies behind the standard deduction—simplification and a balanced allowance to all taxpayers of the average of personal expenses—today in the light of the great increase in personal expenses would thus appear to require either a rise in the standard deduction or a floor under itemized deductions. The expression of that policy through an increase in the standard deduction would contribute to further narrowing of the tax base and would necessitate higher rates. An expression of that policy in the 5-percent floor will broaden the tax base and permit a far larger reduction in marginal tax rates. Some may feel that the continuation, through the use of a floor, of this policy of achieving some balance in the recognition of personal expenses raises problems, especially in those brackets where the itemizers and nonitemizers are both significantly represented. Expression could be given to this viewpoint by combining a floor on itemized deductions with some comparable reduction in the standard deduction.

The combination of the 5-percent floor and rate reduction will leave itemizers with significant tax reductions. Further, the 5-percent floor will not reduce the incentives that the deductions for personal expenses seek to encourage, such as home ownership or charitable contributions. Itemized expenses today average about 20 percent of adjusted gross income, so that most of present expenses and, of course, all new expenses are above the floor. Those, for example, who have expressed fears over reduced charitable or educational giving should be relieved of their worries when they study the facts. Clearly for most itemizers the present nondiscretionary expenses of State taxes, mortgage interest, and medical expenses are obviously above a 5-percent floor. Voluntary charitable contributions, therefore, would be fully deductible. Moreover, despite the forebodings of some of these institutions in 1944 when the standard deduction was adopted—and 80 percent of taxpayers were shifted to that method—charitable giving was not adversely affected. Finally, the volume of charitable giving appears to depend primarily on the level of income—for years it has been about 2 percent of national personal income despite changes in tax rates and structure. The tax program will not only increase the after-tax incomes of individuals but through its effect on the economy will greatly increase national personal income. A rise in that income from the present $440 to $525 billion—which could be achieved under the tax program—would alone increase charitable giving from its present $8.8 to $10.5 billion.

The 5-percent floor is thus not only in keeping with the policies behind the standard deduction, but it also expresses those policies in a manner that permits a larger tax rate reduction than would otherwise be possible. The revenue gain from the floor is $2.3 billion. If this $2.3 billion were not thus available, then the rate scale would have to be raised, primarily in the middle and upper brackets if the revenue involved were to be distributed in the same fashion as reflected by the floor. This would mean top bracket marginal tax rates would be scaled to 75 percent and not 65 percent.

The 5-percent floor, while keeping the essential policies underlying the deductions for personal expenses, also contributes to a rate scale more conducive to personal incentives and economic well being. The basic point is to preserve and strengthen all of the incentives that are important—both those involved in the deductions for personal expenses and those involved in lower marginal tax rates—and the combination of the 5-percent floor and the lower rate scale it permits achieves this result.

The remaining individual revenue-raising changes raise about $700 million—an amount equal to the revenue-losing changes. Two of the changes are associated with reductions in the rates, especially the top rates, and would remove preferences or escapes not justifiable under lowered top rates. The proposal to eliminate the dividend credit and exclusion would alone recover $460 million in tax revenue. Nearly 80 percent of the benefits of these provisions presently goes to taxpayers over $10,000, and over 50 percent to those over $20,000. Even as to the exclusion only 15 percent of its benefits goes to persons under $5,000, with 60 percent of the benefits to those over $10,000. This, of course, is merely a reflection of the concentration of corporate ownership and dividends in middle and upper income groups. In 1960 only 5 percent of the returns under $5,000 reported dividends, which dividends amounted to one percent of the total adjusted gross income on these returns; these returns accounted for 14 percent of dividends reported. Returns over $20,000 accounted for 60 percent of the dividends, and almost all returns reported some dividends; these dividends represent 10 percent of adjusted gross income at $20,000, 20 percent at $50,000 and 40 percent above $200,000.

It is appropriate to eliminate this special preference for dividends, which has achieved no useful economic purpose, at a time when the individual rate scale is being lowered and the corporate rate also reduced. The incentives for investment and risk-taking which these lower rates provide would be far more significant in their impact on the economy than the dividend credit and exclusion. Moreover, the 5-point proposed reduction in the corporate rate will give more relief from double taxation than does the 4 percent credit for incomes up to $186,000. The credit reduces double taxation by amounts ranging from 4.3 percent for taxpayers in the first bracket to 10.4 percent in the proposed top bracket. The five-point reduction in the corporate tax rate would reduce double taxation by 10 percent for everyone. The other proposal related to the rates is a tightening of the personal holding company rules, to end the escapes from individual taxation now available through the use of these devices to shelter investment income or income from personal efforts.

The other revenue-gaining changes would eliminate undesirable or inequitable preferences that now exist and improve existing rules. These involve elimination of the sick-pay exclusion; the taxation to the employee of the value of the economic benefit of employer-provided group term life insurance above a minimum figure, in keeping with the present tax treatment of other forms of employer-provided insurance; the institution of a 4-percent floor under casualty losses comparable to that under medical expenses, and the elimination of the unlimited charitable deduction.

In sum, the revenue-raising structural changes in the individual area—seven in number—involve about $3 billion, of which $2.3 billion is concentrated in the 5 percent floor and $700 million in the remaining items. They offset to this extent the $11.7 billion revenue loss involved in a rate scale running from 14 to 65 percent and the $740 million of changes needed to eliminate hardships that cannot be reached by rate reduction. They represent reforms responsive to the persistent urgings that our tax structure be altered to keep the tax base from constantly narrowing and to eliminate unfair preferences. They involve no departures from basic income tax concepts and no complications of technical implementation. They clearly do not broaden the individual tax base as much as some have urged. At the same time, they represent significant improvements in the tax structure. Together with the changes designed to eliminate hardships, they contribute to a balanced program of revision in the tax structure.

Corporate structural changes: The structural changes in the corporate tax are few in number. Two are associated with the reduction of the normal tax on the first $25,000 of corporate income from 30 to 22 percent. The normal tax concept represents a policy designed to assist "small business" and the reduction in this rate—a 27-percent reduction—will strengthen that assistance. It is important that this tax benefit—and the consequent revenue loss—be confined to what are truly small businesses. However, we find that enterprises and activities which are conducted with multiple corporate structures could obtain this small business tax benefit many times over if each corporation in the structure were taxed at only 22 percent on its first $25,000 of income. It is obvious that a rational application of a tax policy designed to assist small business requires aggregation of corporations under common ownership before the $25,000 test is applied. This is so whether the multiple corporations serve genuine business purposes or are simply tax motivated. It may be observed that eligibility for the other nontax small business benefits accorded by the Congress is determined on such a consolidated basis.

The tax program, in order to make possible the reduction of the small business rate to 22 percent, thus proposes only a single surtax exemption for multiple corporation enterprises, the change to be phased over 5 years. The revenue gain is $120 million. At the same time, in further application of this policy of neutralizing the tax effect of multiple corporate structures, it is proposed that the two percent additional tax on consolidated returns be eliminated and that intercorporate dividends between affiliated corporations not be taxes. The revenue cost is $50 million.

These two structural changes are thus directly linked to the new corporate rate structure. Of the remaining structural changes, one that costs revenue ($50 million) would permit the current expensing of equipment used in research and development activities, with the objective of encouraging the expansion of private civilian research. A change that would gain revenue (about $250 million, of which $10 million comes from individuals) involves improvements in the taxation of natural resource activities designed to carry out the purposes behind the existing depletion policies.

In sum, these corporate structural changes, few in number, involve revenue costs of $100 million and gains of $360 million. They reduce the $2.63 billion of corporate rate reduction to about $2.3 billion. Here also a balance is preserved, with the changes proposed being either necessitated by the new rate structure or designed to meet particular problems in the corporate area. A further significant structural change—the acceleration in the current corporate tax payment of larger corporations—would yield $1.5 billion in annual budget receipts in the next 5 years but would not increase tax liabilities.

THE NATURE OF THE PROPOSED REVISION—THE CAPITAL GAIN CHANGES

The final set of recommendations in the tax program relates to the area of capital gains and losses. This area has always involved complex tax issues, since it is necessary to give proper weight to a number of factors that do not all work in the same direction—the fact that capital gains accrue over time and arise from a variety of economic causes; the importance of encouraging private risk-taking and initiative; the importance of maintaining the flow and mobility of capital, and the need to maintain on equity grounds an appropriate relationship to the taxation of other types of profit and income. Our present system, for individuals, is to include only 50 percent of capital gains, limit the taxation of the gain to a maximum rate of 25 percent, and permit the gain represented by appreciation accumulated until death to escape income taxation entirely.

The tax program proposes several basic changes, whose primary objective is to achieve increased mobility of capital and encourage private risk-taking. First, it would reduce the present 50 percent inclusion ratio to only 30 percent of the gain. With a proposed basic rate scale running from 14 to 65 percent, capital gains would thus be taxed at a scale running from 4.2 to 19.5 percent. This is far lower than the present range of 10 percent at $2,000 of taxable income to 25 percent at about $32,000 and higher on a joint return. The proposed rate at $32,000 of taxable income would only be 12 percent. The combination of reducing the 50 percent inclusion to 30 percent, and then reducing the basic rate scale, thus involves reductions in capital gains tax ranging from 58 percent for first-bracket taxpayers to 52 percent for taxpayers at $32,000, 40 percent at $52,000, 30 percent at $100,000, on down to 22 percent for top-bracket taxpayers. The benefits would be concerned mainly in the middle and upper income groups. Nearly 50 percent of present capital gains are realized by persons with incomes between $10,000 and $100,000, and these gains represent 3 percent of adjusted gross income at $10,000 and about 20 percent at $100,000. A complementary provision would extend the present 5-year carryover of capital losses to an unlimited carryover (revenue cost of $20 million). The corporate capital gain rate would be reduced from 25 to 22 percent.

A significant obstacle to the mobility of capital today, and one which "locks in" many an investor, is the inducement under present rules to hold an appreciated asset until death so that the gain will escape tax. The tax program would end this lock-in effect by treating as a taxable capital gain any gain present in assets transferred at death. The advantage in capital mobility, with consequent benefits to increased initiative and risk-taking, would be highly beneficial to economic growth. The revenue gain involved would offset the cost of the lowered capital gain rates and make those rates possible. The result is an integrated treatment of capital gains and losses that should have a large positive effect on increasing investment and capital formation.

Necessarily the proposal to tax gains transferred at death—which will affect annually only about 3 percent of decedents—must be implemented by technical rules designed to permit as fair and as practical an application of this approach as is possible—such as the exemption of the gain on a residence and on personal or household effects, the exemption of gains passing to a wife along the lines of the present estate tax marital deduction, a blanket $15,000 exemption of gain to eliminate small estates, an exemption of transfers to charity, an averaging device, provisions to ease the time of payment of the tax, a transition period before the new rule is to become fully effective, and so on.

The benefits to taxpayers and the economy of the new low rates on capital gains turn also on one other necessary change, that of a reexamination of the definition of capital gains. If something called a capital gain is to be included to the extent of only 30 percent of the gain—as compared to a 100-percent inclusion for wages, salaries, business profits, interest, dividends, and so on—it becomes imperative that the present eligibility rules defining capital gains be considerably tightened. It is in this area, even under the present capital gain rates, that the suggestions for reforms to end the special preferences resulting from ordinary income items being classified as capital gain have been perhaps the most insistent. With capital gain rates being reduced by 22 to 58 percent, the existing definitional rules would involve intolerable special preferences and inequities. The tax program therefore proposes a number of definitional changes which can be grouped into three categories: One, the proposal that the holding period be extended from 6 months to a year. Two, changes affecting the interrelationship of ordinary deductions and capital gain, designed to extend the approach of the 1962 act under which that part of the gain on the sale of an asset that represents prior deductions would be treated as ordinary income—these changes affect the real-estate shelter, sales of oil and other natural resource interests, and certain sales of cattle and farm assets. Three, changes affecting ordinary income items now treated as capital gains, designed to reverse this characterization where appropriate—these changes affect such items as employee stock options, lump-sum distributions under pension and profit-sharing plans, the sale of patents, the cutting or sale of timber, and the sale of life estates. Some of these provisions either came into or remained in the law as an offset to the high marginal top rates. With a reduction in those rates to 65 percent and lower, for this reason alone these provisions are no longer justifiable.

The direct revenue effect of all the changes is a gain of $100 million, assuming the present character and volume of transactions. However, the increased turnover of assets resulting from the unlocking of asset holdings, together with the net effects on transactions of the other changes, is expected to yield an additional $650 million.

These then are the main details of the tax program. We believe the program is a balanced one, treating all levels of income and all types of taxpayers as fairly as possible. It is difficult to obtain any precise measure or index of the distribution of its benefits. Some may point to the percentage change in tax liability at each income level, and show that the highest percentages of reduction are in the bottom and the lowest at the top. Whether one likes or dislikes this result we must remember it fails to reflect the proportion of total tax liabilities paid at each level. Some may point to the percentage increase in after-tax incomes, and show that the highest percentage is at the top. Whether one likes or dislikes this result, it does fail to reflect the impact of the present rate scales which, under almost any program, would produce such an after-tax effect. Moreover, in any allocation of the benefits, it is necessary to remember that the corporate rate changes and the capital gain changes will yield large benefits to the middle and upper income groups, first through the increase in dividends consequent upon higher corporate after-tax profits and second through lower capital gain rates combined with increased mobility of capital. It is difficult to quantify these benefits.

We believe that when all the changes are considered, and their effects weighed as carefully as possible, the overall result is a distribution that bears a close relationship to the present pattern except where relief for the extremes of low income hardship or old age are involved.

It is at this point that we must consider the final dimension of the tax program, that of its relationship to the current economic climate. Three aspects stand out: One, we are faced with an economy which while sluggish is still moving slowly upward. This means that the program need not be geared to a shot-in-the-arm approach to ward off an immediate recession threat. Instead, the tax program can be responsive to the insistent demands for a basic tax revision that will make a lasting contribution to economic growth and lessen the risk of recurring recessions. It also means that while tax reduction is an imperative, there is legislative time to work out this year, with effective and expeditious action, a properly constructed bill.

Second, we are faced with a deficit for fiscal 1964 that, apart from the tax program, would be $9.2 billion. While this deficit is the direct consequence of an economy moving at a slow rate, which the tax program is intended to accelerate, care must be taken that the costs of tax reduction are handled in a fiscally responsible manner to keep the transitional deficit within prudent bounds. The tax program meets this requirement, one additional to the substantive issues of tax revision, in three ways: One, the rate reductions are staged over 3 years, commencing in 1963, with the structural changes starting essentially in 1964; two, appropriate structural changes keep the overall revenue cost of the rate reductions within a prudent figure of $10.3 billion; three, another structural change—the proposal to accelerate under a 5-year transition the payments of estimate tax of the larger corporations—will improve the budget picture by about $1.5 billion so that the budgetary cost of the program is an overall $8.8 billion before any feedback.

A third aspect of our present situation is that we must end our unplanned deficits and move on to a budget balance at a high level of employment. As far as the tax program is concerned, this means an effect on the economy that will produce sufficient revenues for this purpose. It is believed that the large rate reductions and the effects of the entire program on consumer spending and investment incentives will permit the economy rapidly to move to new heights. At these higher levels of gross national product, the resulting revenues even under reduced rates will be in excess of our present revenues. The difference, of course, is that the resulting dynamic economy will be able to maintain these higher revenues, whereas our present sluggish economy finds the tax structure an impediment to growth.

But revenues are only one side of the budget. The other requirement is firm control over expenditure policy. The President and the Budget Director have made these matters clear: one, civilian expenditures will be firmly controlled, and in the 1964 budget have been reduced; two, defense and space expenditures should begin to level off; and third, as the tax reduction becomes fully effective, and the economy moves upward, a part of the revenue increases must go to eliminating the deficit.

Under this combination of revenue increases and a budgetary policy of firm expenditure control, we can move on to a balanced budget and full employment. To be sure, certain assumptions and expectations respecting the economic response to the tax program underlie this belief. But we must remember that the alternative course would not be without its set of assumptions and expectations. Indeed, in the light of the history of our business cycles, without tax action the risks become far greater of a recession coming and of its lasting longer and cutting deeper. Such a recession would increase the deficit far more than the program, without affording even any hope of improvement or offset.

CONCLUSION

The tax program is responsive to two main requirements. First, it responds to the imperative need for the large reductions in individual, corporate, and capital gain rates required now to enable the economy to reach its full potential for output and growth, while at the same time permitting these rate reductions to be achieved in a fiscally responsible manner compatible with the deficit condition of the budget. Second, it responds to the long-felt need for a revision of the income tax structure that would scale down the rates, broaden the tax base, eliminate serious hardships, and end unjustifiable abuses and preferences. The program thus fits into the efforts that commenced with the Revenue Act of 1962 to achieve the tax revision which the earlier studies of the Congress delineated as vitally necessary.

As the President has firmly and consistently stated, the core and central theme of the tax program are the large reductions in all the tax rates—reductions that remove the restraints now imposed by the tax system on the economy and on incentives for private initiative. The cost of these reductions, plus the elimination of hardships which the rate reductions cannot reach comes to over $14 billion. The revenue gained from structural changes, important in themselves as contributing to equity and economic growth, and from increased mobility through capital gains revisions will bring that cost down to $10.3 billion. A further structural change, the acceleration of corporate payments, reduces this figure to a budgetary cost, before feedback, of $8.8 billion. The structural changes thus bring the rate reductions within a budgetary cost that is clearly fiscally responsible. If these structural changes are to be substantially altered, the overall program would, therefore, have to be reshaped by significantly limiting the rate reductions—so that we would not achieve an individual rate scale running from 14 to 65 percent, a corporate rate reduction to 47 percent, and elimination of hardship for the poor and the aged—thus significantly lessening the effect on the economy and on incentives; or it must be reshaped by increasing the cost and budgetary impact of the program, or by some combination of these approaches. Naturally, it is not necessary to enact all the changes exactly as proposed. But a measure designed to provide the maximum effect on the economy through rate reductions and to do so in a manner most consonant with appropriate fiscal responsibility would involve some structural changes of one sort or another.

These are decisions which must and will be made in Congress. The Committee on Ways and Means has commenced its consideration of the tax program. It will shape a tax bill that takes account of the helpful criticisms and suggestions which the legislative process produces. The Treasury Department will fully cooperate in this process.

In the process of moving forward with a tax program so vitally needed, we must not let all of the detailed bits and pieces inevitable in tax legislation obscure the objectives we are seeking to accomplish. The total is far more than the bits and pieces, far more than how each of our individual pocketbooks is affected, far more than how much tax reduction this or that person gets in

1963, or in 1964 or in 1965. The total is a revision of our income tax which will enable us to achieve, as far as it lies within the power and effect of the tax system, the strong and growing economy which is vital to the kind of America we all desire.

THE McNAMARA MONARCHY?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the latest issue of the Saturday Evening Post contains an excellent article by Hanson W. Baldwin entitled "The McNamara Monarchy." Mr. Baldwin is one of the world's foremost military affairs writers. He is the military editor of the New York Times where he has worked since 1929. In 1944 he won a Pulitzer Prize for his reporting on the war in the Pacific.

Mr. Baldwin's article raises questions that have been giving serious concern to many of us in recent months. We have no objection to bright young men participating in the military affairs of this country. On the other hand, some of us believe that there is a tendency to disregard the experienced military advisers in the Defense Department. The TFX contract is now under investigation. Without passing on the merits of that controversy, a question is naturally raised when four evaluation boards are reversed. The controversy of the Skybolt is well known. Some members of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate bowed to the slowup on the RS–70 on the assurance that the Skybolt would give the B–52 a longer life. This was done, I am sure, with some misgivings. But the Skybolt, notwithstanding previous assurance to our committees, has been canceled.

Four committees of the Congress consistently urged the development of the B–70—now called the RS–70—as a complete weapons system. Those committees are the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services. Repeatedly, we have given Secretary McNamara more money than he requested but he has refused to spend it.

I believe that Members of Congress would be interested in what Mr. Baldwin has to say in his article. I believe that the questions he raises will be matters of continuing discussion here in the Congress. I call the article to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE McNAMARA MONARCHY

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The unification of the armed services sponsored by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara poses some subtle and insidious dangers—creeping dangers that are political, military and administrative. And they could present, in their ultimate form, almost as great a threat to a secure and free nation as the attempted military coup, envisaged in the recent novel, "Seven Days in May."

For the kind of unification being practiced and preached today has ominous overtones. It is dangerous to the Nation's political system of checks and balances, dangerous to the continued development of sound military advice and effective military leadership, dangerous to managerial and administrative efficiency.

Mr. McNamara is, first and foremost, trying to make the armed services speak with one voice and attempting to reduce greatly or eliminate altogether interservice competition.

He has established tremendous Defense Department superagencies, such as the Defense Intelligence Agency, which has taken over most of the intelligence functions formerly performed by the individual services.

This centralization of intelligence has made service dissent on intelligence more difficult, and it has facilitated the molding of intelligence estimates to preconceived policies. In the Cuban situation, the primary reason for delay was the insistence of the Kremlinologists that it won't happen here, that Mr. Khrushchev would not take the risk. There's not much doubt that intelligence was influenced by this atmosphere of certainty. In fact, this centralization facilitates top political and policy control of military intelligence. And this is politically dangerous—domestically and internationally.

But this is only one area where Mr. McNamara is attempting to have the Pentagon speak with one voice. The Defense Supply Agency, a huge superagency, is procuring so-called common items for all the services. A Defense Communications Agency is being groomed for further expansion into a National Communications Agency which might well place virtually all of the Government's long-line communications systems under military control. Budgeting, the selection of weapons systems, contracting, personnel standards, uniforms, codes of justice, administrative procedures—all are now tailored to the pattern set by the Secretary of Defense.

Objections or dissent, even to Congress, are discouraged, muted or, when possible, stifled. Mr. McNamara has pressured the Joint Chiefs to sign written statements testifying to Congress that the administration's defense budget is adequate. He has censored, deleted, and altered statements to Congress by the chiefs of the services and their secretaries. He has downgraded, ignored, bypassed or overruled the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, is a known advocate of the abolition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff system. He favors a single voice.

PROGRESS MEANS PERIL

Mr. McNamara has not yet succeeded in forcing all the services to speak, officially or unofficially, with one public voice. But he has come much closer to it than anyone before him, and he is still trying. And the progress he has made carries its own political dangers.

For 175 years of our history, separate Army and Navy Departments (and then an Air Force) provided a natural interservice system of checks and balances. The services did not speak with one voice, and politically this was a desirable safeguard. They balanced each other, and their secretaries provided contrasting viewpoints at Cabinet level. Now only the Secretary of Defense is a Cabinet officer; the service secretaries as well as the uniformed chiefs of the services are submerged in an immense Pentagon hierarchy.

The latest reorganization of the State-controlled National Guard, still opposed by some Governors, may ultimately extend Washington's power over the Guard. Such developments represent dangerous weakening of our traditional military checks and balances.

Equally threatening to the Nation's future is the concentration of politicomilitary power, not merely in Washington but in one department. It places more and more power over the military-industrial complex in the hands of a few men in the executive branch of Government. The dollar volumes of military contracts amount to more than $20 billion annually, with billions more in backlog orders outstanding. The individual services no longer have the final power to contract. The rewarding or cancellation of contracts—which may make or break companies and affect thousands of workers—is now ultimately controlled by a very few men in the top echelons of the Defense Department.

Perhaps the greatest military danger in this centralization and unification is that it overrides the voice of professional experience and substitutes a military party line, a single strategic concept. The opinions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, unless they happen to coincide with Mr. McNamara's, are usually given short shrift. Managerial techniques, computer analyses, cost-effectiveness yardsticks—rather than judgments learned on the battlefield—dominate decisions on strategy, weapons choices, even force levels.

Alternatives, variations, disagreements are the breath of life in any organization; imposed solutions, inflexible strategies, a party line from which no deviation is permitted could mean disaster. Mr. McNamara's policies are ostensibly intended to provide alternatives and increase flexibility, but there are many who feel they are having exactly the opposite effect. As Air Force magazine noted in its January 1963, issue, the decision of the Secretary of Defense to phase out the manned bomber will mean that by 1970 the Nation will be almost entirely dependent upon missiles for strategic nuclear delivery.

"We will have substituted rigidity for flexibility," states the magazine. "There will be fewer, rather than more, options for a future President to exercise."

The "one voice" unification trend in the Pentagon presents another potential danger: the development of future generations of officers who will be essentially military yes-men and conformists. They may be wizards of the new techniques of operational analyses and computer calculations, but without the moral courage of leadership qualifications required by the battlefield.

COMPROMISES ON WEAPONS

The single-voice concept is also enforcing—in the name of conformity and standardization—undesirable compromises in weapons systems. Technical competition between the services is being discouraged despite the lessons of the past. The air-cooled and liquid-cooled aircraft engines which ultimately gave us air supremacy in World War II were a direct result of differing Army and Navy technical concepts and interservice competition. In the Cuban crisis of last fall, a Navy camera used in low-level reconnaissance flights over Cuban missile sites proved to be far superior to a camera used by the Air Force low-level flights. The Air Force planes were hastily reequipped with the Navy camera.

Yet, ever since Mr. McNamara took office his slide-rule statisticians have been pressuring both industry and the services into designing and producing a single, all-purpose aircraft supposedly capable of doing the varied jobs of all the services. The objective is economy, but the indications are that the attempts to force all into a single mold, may ultimately cost more—in combat-effectiveness, if not in dollars. The so-called TFX tactical fighter has been delayed for 2 years while the Defense Department tried to force a design for a fighter that could perform equally well from carrier decks and land airfields. The final result—though officially described as a standard airplane—is actually two variants, of them probably compromised in effectiveness by enforced conformities. The obvious danger of this approach is the production of a series of hybrid weapons rather than the kind of equipment the men who do the fighting and dying would like to have.

Finally, what about administrative efficiency; what has Mr. McNamara's brand of unification done to the Pentagon? Not only policy formulation, but operations and administration are directed from the office of the Secretary of Defense.

A program called the 5-year force structure and financial management program, dubbed "the book" in the Pentagon, attempts to chart and elaborate nearly every detail of weapons systems and force structures required by the Armed Forces for the next 5 years. Any significant change in this plan requires an elaborate process of justification, review and approval all along the line from lowest to highest echelons. Contracting budgeting, progress on weapons systems—even lawn cutting—is programed and controlled in detail from various echelons of the Secretary's office.

The reporting and analytical system required has resulted in a tremendous burgeoning of paper work and great increase in numbers and rank of both civilian and military personnel assigned to echelons above the fighting services in the Department of Defense. But there has been no commensurate reduction, as yet, in administrative personnel and their workloads in the services.

When Mr. McNamara took office, he set out, as the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal and Register put it, "Courageously and confidently to streamline top echelon Department of Defense management." Instead he has added more to top overhead—the apex of the Defense pyramid—than any Secretary before him. There were 15 Presidential appointees of Assistant Secretary of Defense rank or higher in January 1961; there are 15 today, though responsibilities and functions have been rearranged. There were 11 Deputy Assistant Secretaries of Defense 2 years ago; there are 26 today.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff is limited by law—a law approved by a Congress wary of the development of a "greater general staff"—to 400 officers. But the restriction has been evaded by assigning at least 250 other officers to an amorphous division, called the Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The total military personnel assigned to the Joint Chiefs of Staff today is about five to six times as large as it was a decade ago. Yet one of the tentative plans discussed in the Pentagon contemplates a further considerable increase in the Joint Staff and the Organization of the Joint Chiefs.

There has been a steady increase in the numbers of top-ranking, high-salaried personnel—particularly civil service top grades—assigned to the Office of the Secretary, the Department of Defense, and the Pentagon. As of June 30, 1959, there were 3,009 civilians in the GS–14 to 18 brackets (the top-salaried brackets); last June there were 3,950. Moreover, their salaries had gone up from a minimum of $11,355 to a top of $17,500 in 1959 to a minimum of $12,845 and a top of $20,000 in 1962.

This topheavy system has obviously built-in delay factors, and, as the record of the McNamara administration shows, it is far harder to start a new project or weapons system than it is to cancel or curtail an old one. In the first 18 months of the McNamara regime, no major new weapons system was started. Even today the Defense Department can find no military requirement for man in space, and it has curtailed, eliminated, or held back such important development projects as a future manned-bomber system (the RS–70), the Skybolt air-to-ground missile, and the Nike-Zeus antiballistic-missile system.

Though Mr. McNamara has centralized to a far greater degree than any other Secretary, he alone is by no means responsible for the trend toward a monolithic Department of Defense. It has been going on ever since the war.

CONGRESS SHARES BLAME

Concentration of power in the hands of the Secretary of Defense has been hastened by the loosening of congressional control over the Pentagon. The power to raise and maintain armies and navies, conveyed to the legislative branch by the Constitution, has been watered down as a result of the sheer immensity and size of the Defense Department, the tremendous increase in executive power, and the weakness and mistakes of Congress itself. In the Senate and the House, intercommittee jealousies and the small size of the staffs of these committees—which have not matched, in any way, the growth in size of the armed services—have hampered examinations and control. And Congress, by loose legislation, conferred upon the President and the Secretary of Defense such immense power to reorganize the Pentagon that it has, in the view of some legislators, virtually abandoned its former power to check, control and approve every detail of defense policy and organization.

The process of centralization in the Pentagon has gone so far there is very considerable doubt that the service departments can remain separate at all.

Both Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, retired Chief of Naval Operations, and Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, now NATO Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, have publicly opposed a single chief-of-staff system, and have endorsed the separate service "techniques of land warfare, naval warfare and air warfare." Former Secretary of the Navy, later Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates has warned against centralization and has said that to "submerge * * * honest differences of (service) opinion and free expression * * * in any monolithic system would be a fatal mistake."

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, U.S. Army (retired), spoke in 1960 against reduction of "everything to its lowest denominator, one service, one uniform * * * to the dead level of mediocrity, jacks of all trades, masters of none, a group of 'Yes' men always in unanimous agreement—what an insidiously dangerous philosophy."

If the Pentagon ever does speak with one voice, if the Nation's Armed Forces do come, as the trend now indicates, to represent a monolithic military-political point of view, both freedom and security will be in jeopardy through the slow erosion of domocracy into a garrison state and the stagnant conformity that leads to combat ineffectiveness.

EXPORT AND TOURISM EXPANSION PROGRAM

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, last Monday, March 4, the President's E Award for export promotion was conferred upon the Air Transport Association of America in recognition of that organization's significant contribution to our Nation's export and tourism expansion program.

The Air Transport Association, which was founded in 1936, is the national trade and service organization of the U.S. scheduled airlines, both domestic and international. It has long been a leader in our country's endeavors to facilitate and promote international travel and trade.

In presenting the E Award to ATA's President Stuart G. Tipton, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges said this:

> The Air Transport Association of America has worked continuously to develop travel to the United States. Its international promotion efforts, through a wide variety of programs, have stirred interest in tourism overseas, and its program to streamline requirements and procedures to visitors has resulted in the elimination of many time-consuming formalities. It has worked assiduously to promote exports and obtain more simplified shipping requirements. These efforts reflect credit on the organization and our private enterprise system, and constitute a substantial contribution to the export expansion programs of the United States.

Secretary Hodges echoes precisely my own sentiments and, I am certain, those of many other Members of this body. As one who has long urged increased efforts to increase American trade and thereby improve our balance-of-payments position and stem the gold flow, I commend the Air Transport Association for its constructive program and the Department of Commerce for its work in promoting exports and attracting tourists. I think the conferring of this award is a timely reminder to all of us of the tremendous importance to the Nation of the U.S. flag air transport industry and of its conspicuous achievements in international commerce and trade.

SOUTH DAKOTA SIOUX INDIANS POINT THE WAY TO BETTER LIFE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most urgent challenges confronting the Nation today is the necessity of raising standards of life on our American Indian reservations. It is well known that health, housing educational and job opportunities for the American Indian lag far behind conditions for our citizens as a whole.

It is gratifying to note that with the cooperation of public authorities, the Indian tribes have been making an effort to build a better life for themselves and their children. I am especially pleased with progress that has been made by the South Dakota Sioux Indians on the Pine Ridge reservation. This reservation became the center for the first public housing program for American Indians when the Kennedy administration declared Indians eligible for such assistance under the public housing authority. The Pine Ridge reservation has also pioneered in the field of industrial job development.

Both of these encouraging steps have been well reported in a series of articles by Mr. Aubrey A. Graves, staff reporter for the Washington Post. As Mr. Graves points out, attorney Richard Schifter of Washington, D.C., who represents the Oglala Sioux, was a prime mover in instigating these two hopeful developments. I commend the Washington Post, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Graves' two articles to date appearing in the Washington Post of March 10 and March 11 be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 10, 1963]

IN WELTER OF CITIES, THE RED MAN WITHERS

(By Aubrey Graves)

An almost complete about face has occurred in the past decade in the Federal Government's manner of dealing with Indians living on reservations.

During the 1950's, policies pushed by Indian Commissioner Dillon Myer were put into effect looking toward early termination of the Government's trusteeship. The Bureau of Indian Affairs undertook a national program of relocation assistance for Indian "volunteers." Carried out in cooperation with State and Federal employment services, it was focused at first on seasonal employment in agriculture and on the railroads.

Indians were given help in moving permanently away from the reservations. They were shipped off to large cities, particularly Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, and San Francisco.

Help provided the Indian jobseekers and their family dependents included transportation to the relocation destination, subsistence grants prior to receipt of the first paycheck and guidance in community adjustment. These grants averaged $1,700 for single Indians, $3,500 for family groups.

In 1953, as a result of increased appropriations made available by Congress, the bureau increased both the geographic scope of the program and the range of services provided. Three years later, Congress gave the program additional impetus by authorizing the bureau to provide Indians, chiefly between the ages of 18 and 35, with vocational training, on-the-job training and apprenticeship training.

During the 1950's, the BIA was held largely to a custodial, recordkeeping function. Little was done about housing needs or human resource development on the reservations and previously existing bureau services (except for education) were severely curtailed.

Seeking relief from poverty and miserable living conditions on the reservations, Indians by the thousands ventured, or were pushed, into the white man's world. Here, many felt discriminated against and, in the slums to which their economic and social position consigned them, they were unable even to see the sky.

Homesickness set in. In their frustration, many heads of families took to drink and lost their jobs. Others decided it was better to live without comforts in a hovel, out of which a man could step into wide, open, sunny places where, at least, congenial companionship could be found.

Forty percent of the tribesmen drifted back to the reservations, some after having been resettled two and three times.

Toward the end of the Eisenhower administration, Assistant Secretary of Interior Roger Ernst decided that the experiment had failed. It had become evident that, under the resettlement policy, the more skilled and enterprising people moved away and the less enterprising stayed on, or came back to, the reservation. The effect was to distill off the most competent people, generation after generation. With the support of Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton, Ernst called off the pressure for assimilation.

WORK, NOT WELFARE

Today, the emphasis has shifted from resettlement to improvement of the Indian in his natural habitat. Health and educational services have been stepped up, decent housing is beginning to be provided and vocational training is being expanded.

"There is very little wrong in the Indian picture," said Indian Commissioner Philleo Nash, "that jobs won't fix. The Indian people want work, not welfare. Our goal is to train the Indian workers and get them connected with opportunities, wherever they may be. It means teaching the Indians, on and off the reservation, a trade or a vocation for which there is a real demand in the job market."

In short, the white man's world, with some of its comforts and opportunities, is being taken to the reservations.

Last month, in order to observe the effects of the shift of emphasis, I spent 4 days and nights on the Oglala Sioux Indian Reservation at Pine Ridge, S. Dak. During that period, it was slowly thawing out after a spell of 40-below-zero temperatures. This winter, I was told, has been colder than most. But at Pine Ridge, all winters are cruel.

SITE OF LAST MASSACRE

The Pine Ridge Reservation—about 40 miles wide and 100 miles long—was chosen because it is one of the largest in both acreage and population. Here, members of the Oglala Sioux Tribe have lived in peace—and most of them in extreme poverty—since buffalo hunters killed off the herds and the U.S. Army crushed the Indian warriors.

The massacre at Wounded Knee in 1890, the last engagement in which U.S. soldiers killed Indians, took place on Pine Ridge. It is a living and bitter memory to men who are still walking and talking today.

The population of the reservation is now about 1,900 families—(8,303 people at the last count). Two-thirds or more live in shacks, tepees and canvas tents that are dirty, draughty, and overcrowded. A 1961 survey by the Public Housing Administration showed 98 percent of all the habitations to be substandard. Two-thirds of the heads of families are unemployed.

But on Pine Ridge I saw also a glimmer of hope in 51 modern residences nearing completion. For the first time, public housing is being made available to Indians living on a reservation.

For these new dwellings, the Indians owe thanks in large measure to attorney Richard Schifter, who represents the Oglala Sioux and three other tribes in Washington. In 1961, Schifter persuaded the Public Housing Administration, which since its inception had done its work in larger centers of the country, that it had the legal authority to help Indian reservations as well.

With money borrowed from the Federal Government, the newly created, tribally controlled Oglala Sioux Housing Authority proceeded to clear land, lay out streets, and construct homes.

CHARACTER A QUALIFICATION

Twenty-four of the houses have 4 bedrooms, 22 have 3 bedrooms each, 3 have 2 bedrooms, and 2 have only 1. The homes were built on 60- by 100-foot lots at an average cost of $8,000. These are said to be equal in value to privately constructed off-reservation homes costing from $11,000 to $12,000.

The dwellings are being rented by the OSHA on the basis of need and character, particularly sobriety. Preference is given to displaced or homeless families, war veterans and the disabled or handicapped.

A few have been assigned to families on permanent relief. Rent, which includes electricity, water, propane gas, and maintenance, ranges from $28 to $58 a month, depending on ability to pay.

With the exception of the sheet metal work, Indians performed all the labor. Of 135 who initially applied for work, only 2 could be classified as journeymen carpenters. Most had no tools at all; some had only hammer and saw. None had any experience in laying cement blocks.

Under the tutelage of the two carpenters and Federal Housing Inspector Charles Heintzelman, the novices learned as they worked. A lone plumber and a lone electrician likewise taught their trades to others.

Heintzelman soon discovered that it was costing 50 cents each to lay foundation blocks. He told the Indians they would have to do much better or non-Indians would be brought in.

"This work is for Indians only," he was reminded. "Only for Indians who work," Heintzelman countered.

The effect of the warning was good. Soon the cost of laying blocks dropped to 17 cents each. Reviewing his work at the end of the year, Heintzelman said: "Indians can do good work, skillfully, with their hands after a little training. Never before in my experience have I seen such a change in a group of men."

Now all the Indian construction workers own their tools. Soon they are to begin work on 76 similar homes on the reservation.

OWN INTERIOR DECORATORS

Emil Redwing, with his wife and children, moved into the first completed house. Emil had taken the carpenter trainee course. Into the second went a widow, Athelia Yellow Boy, and her five children. Another was assigned to Margaret Fills Pipe, a widow with four young ones. Ten houses now have tenants, another 10 are scheduled to be occupied by April.

Few of the families to whom houses were assigned had any belongings to speak of. So the tribal council appropriated $500 to buy old and broken furniture and new upholstery supplies. In a workshop conducted by a State home demonstration agent, Bessie T. Cornelius, Indian men and women repaired and refinished their own secondhand beds, tables, lamps, and chairs.

Hovelwives about to become housewives were shown how to take care of floors and walls, bathrooms and electric refrigerators, and how to operate washing machines. In sewing classes, the women learned to make their own curtains, draperies, and slipcovers.

Classes were conducted in time management (the Sioux language contains no word meaning "time"); the women were shown the advantages of budgeting their hours and days. Instruction was given in family and neighbor relations, first aid and personal hygiene, and in the preparation of balanced, nutritious meals.

HOUSEPROUD TENANTS

There is some skepticism about how these houses will look after they have been lived in 6 months or so. The tenants I interviewed showed extreme pride in their new abodes; the homes I visited were sparsely furnished but immaculate.

Last October 28, a message to the Oglala Sioux from President Kennedy expressed his "fervent hope that these new homes, built by your own people, are the beginning of a better life for your community. As industry, commerce, and tourist trade develop, poverty and disease can be stamped out and the people of the Pine Ridge Reservation can at last enjoy a standard of living comparable to that of the country as a whole."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 11, 1963]

FISHHOOK INDUSTRY GIVES SIOUX A LIFT

(By Aubrey A. Graves)

What has been the effect of the Federal Government's decision to call off its emphasis on early termination of its trusteeship over the American Indians, and instead to start creating employment and improving living conditions on their reservations?

On the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota, I found that more Indians are gainfully employed today than at any time since the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's.

Here, a simple, inexpensive item—a fishhook—has given the Oglala Sioux Tribe a substantial economic lift and many secondary benefits.

MINIMUM WAGE

Two hundred and twenty-four heads of families are now employed in three plants established by the Wright & McGill Co. of Denver. Bare fishhooks are sent to the reservation, where the Indians snell (tie leaders on) them. Then the finished product is shipped back to Denver.

Paid the minimum wage of $1.15 an hour, the Indian workers draw $46 a week. Many receive bonuses for overquota production. This adds up to a weekly payroll in excess of $10,000 in an impoverished community where 1,300 of the 1,900 heads of families are still unemployed.

These incomes have enabled some of the workers to move their families out of canvas tents and log shacks into some of the 51 modern dwellings being built at Pine Ridge with Federal funds.

Seventy-six similar homes are to be started soon at Wounded Knee and Kyle, within walking distance of the Wright & McGill plants at those two centers.

The tribesmen have developed high skill at this work. The men tie from 80 to 100 dozen hooks a day, the women average about 60 dozen.

"Nothing has happened since tribal days to so boost the economic situation and morale of the Sioux," declared Leslie Towle, superintendent of the Bureau of Indian Affairs at Pine Ridge.

ENTER TRAINING

Seven hundred and thirty-one Indians entered training for the jobs; 439 successfully completed the course. As of May, 1962, 388 were working. Excess inventories at the Denver factory have since caused 164 to be laid off. The training program cost the BIA $66,000. The apprentices were paid 57½ cents an hour, out of BIA funds, during the learning period.

The Indians have taken great pride in their success. "It used to be a great honor when one of our fellows came home with a buffalo," said Emil Redfish, manager of the three plants. "Songs were sung for him, there was dancing, and powwows were given in his honor. Strangely, these celebrations are coming back with this industry."

PRIDE WONDERFUL

Redfish said the Denver office was bewildered when the payroll was sent in containing such names as Many Cartridges, George Respects Nothing, Return From Scout and Afraid of Hawk. "A Wright & McGill lady telephoned," he recalled with a chuckle, "and asked if these were the real names that were supposed to go on the paychecks."

It is wonderful, Redfish said, to see the pride displayed by his people when they come out of the plant on Friday with that check in hand. "One man told me it was the first time he was able to walk into a store, pick out what he wanted and pay for it."

Redfish said that about one-third of the employees are women. He explained that "we have a lot of women who need jobs who have families. Mrs. McGill, the head of the company, insists on women having equal opportunity. Believe me, when the boss says put this many women on, you don't answer her back."

In one respect, the women proved superior to the men. "We have 44 machines in use," explained Redfish. "We had men on these machines and they handled them like they would a truck. They were banging them around and it was costing a little money to keep them in repair every month, so we switched over to women and we haven't had one cent of repair expense since."

AREA DIRECTOR

All workers must punch a timeclock. When one is late, he is docked. When he is absent from work more than once and doesn't call in or have a valid excuse when he comes back, he is fired. "The Wright & McGill Indians," said Redfish, "now understand what time is."

The area director for BIA in Aberdeen, S. Dak., Martin Holm, made a survey of benefits resulting from the existence of the plants. They had resulted, he reported, in increased school attendance. The children are better dressed and better fed. Study habits and classroom work have improved.

"When parents get up in the morning to go to work," he wrote, "they naturally send the children to school more regularly. And, because their parents work near home, they no longer drag their children out of school to the potato fields at harvest time."

Because of the new employment, general assistance payments dropped at Pine Ridge from $53,864 during 3 winter months of 1961 to $41,226 during the same 3 months in 1962, when the plants were operating. The names of 74 families on relief rolls in 1961 were not on them in 1962.

One adverse effect has been noted. Because the Indians have more money to spend, drinking has increased in the locale of the plants, particularly among single male workers. "They are prone to dissipate their checks for alcoholic beverages," the report said. "The married workers tend to use their checks for self and family improvement."

MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON HELPS TO DRAMATIZE FEDERAL AID TO ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, West Virginians will not soon forget the March 1, 1963, visit of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson to the cities of St. Albans and Charleston, W. Va. The Vice President's wife, braving a heavy rain, cheerfully participated in groundbreaking ceremonies for a new library, the construction of which is made possible by an accelerated public works program grant of $69,000.

On that same day, and with none of her good spirits diminished, Mrs. Johnson toured the Food Machinery Corp. plant in Charleston, W. Va., presenting diplomas to previously unemployed workers who were retrained, under the area redevelopment administration program, for the good jobs they now hold with FMC.

To West Virginians who saw her in action on that memorable day, Mrs. Johnson was a lovely, gracious, and spirited symbol of the continuing high interest which President Kennedy's administration holds for the people of the Mountain State. None of us who accompanied her will ever forget the affection which she engendered and the encouragement she imparted to the many people she met and to those who turned out to hear her inspiring words.

The story of Mrs. Johnson's visit to West Virginia is excellently related in the Wednesday, March 6, 1963, edition of the Christian Science Monitor by Staff Correspondent Josephine Ripley. If anything, Miss Ripley's account stirs one with appreciation for the Vice President's wife, and for the many thoughtful ways in which she is serving the Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have Miss Ripley's article printed at this point in the RECORD so that Mrs. Johnson's fine efforts on this occasion in West Virginia can be universally read and admired.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES LENDS HELP IN WEST VIRGINIA

(By Josephine Ripley)

CHARLESTON, W. VA.—The visit of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, wife of the Vice President, to West Virginia in the beating rain dramatized the helping hand which the Federal Government is extending to this mountainous State with its long unemployment lines.

While a local official held a huge umbrella over her head, Mrs. Johnson participated in the groundbreaking ceremonies on March 1 for a new library in St. Albans, turning over a ladylike spade full of mud.

But the scene was by no means dreary. A crowd had turned out for the occasion. It was a big day in St. Albans, if not a bright one.

BOOKS PRESENTED

Massed umbrellas roofed the small stand where speakers one by one, including Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, stepped to the microphone, and Mrs. Johnson presented the new library with a dozen or more books autographed by the President, the Vice President and others.

There was a pause after announcement of each book as someone groped for it under the cover placed over the carton to protect the volumes from the rain.

But despite the dripping umbrellas, the muddy site of the new library, and the damp costumes of the majorettes whose act was canceled by the weather, the occasion was not a dismal one.

On the contrary, the ground breaking represented a $69,000 public works grant by the Federal Government. It heralded a construction project which will give jobs to nearly a hundred townspeople. It will mean a real library in St. Albans for the first time—a civic project toward which the town has worked for the past 7 years.

Officials regard it as symbolic of some $15 million worth of public works projects in West Virginia designed to spur employment. These are projects toward which the State contributes half the necessary amount with the Federal Government making up the rest.

Mrs. Johnson's next official stop in her 1-day trip to Charleston was at the FMC plant where another form of aid, under the Area Redevelopment Administration is being extended to the State.

RETRAINEE CEREMONY

The huge, cavernous factory clattered, clanged, and spat blinding flame as acetylene torches bit into steel. At the end of the assembly line stood a lumbering, tractor-like vehicle known as a personnel carrier.

These carriers are being manufactured under a defense contract for the transportation of military troops.

Mrs. Johnson's task, surprisingly, was to preside here in the factory at a kind of graduation ceremony for retrainees to whom she presented diplomas.

These were former miners, construction workers, and laborers of various kinds—all unemployed—who had taken the ARA retraining course to become machinists, welders, metalworkers of various kinds, and qualify for work in the FMC plant.

The men who put down their tools to step up and receive the diploma inscribed with their name and their newly acquired skill studied it closely—and liked what they saw.

FORMER MINEWORKER

A former mineworker who had earned no more than $5 a day, and sometimes as little as 40 cents a day, at his old job, is now making $2.08 an hour with a 40-hour week. Others told of similar wage improvement.

West Virginia's unemployed now total 66,800. Retraining of miners for whom there is now no mining and for others whose jobs have been eliminated by changing times is a slow process.

The FMC plant employs 230 retrained workers today, with the number expected to increase to 1,000 eventually as the program turns out more qualified "graduates."

In the State as a whole, more than 2,000 men have been retrained for new employment.

The FMC itself, whose home plant is in California, opened its West Virginia branch under the ARA which encourages plants with defense contracts to locate in States with heavy unemployment, if conditions warrant such a move.

The company here moved into an abandoned ordnance plant built in World War I.

West Virginia has received $4,300,000 in aid under the ARA program over the past year.

"Much has been done," as Mrs. Johnson put it when she presented diplomas to the FMC retrainees, "much more needs to be done. The problems in the depressed areas of the country didn't spring up overnight, and they will not be cured overnight. But we have started."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF HON. OREN E. LONG TO THE SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it was with a great deal of personal pleasure that I noted the appointment a few days ago of my longtime friend and former colleague, Oren E. Long, as senior U.S. member of the South Pacific Commission.

His appointment recognizes Oren Long's special knowledge, background, and longtime interest in the important problems of the Pacific Basin. He has expressed his pleasure in accepting this appointment, since it would enable him to continue his residence in his beloved Hawaii. Nevertheless I am sure his legion of friends realize his qualifications merit even greater honors.

Six months ago, near the close of the 87th Congress, I delivered a farewell tribute on the Senate floor to Oren Long, who had announced earlier his decision not to seek reelection to the Senate. Oren and I worked closely on numerous problems involving the new State of Hawaii—problems that faced the 50th State as it shed its territorial status and assumed new and heavier responsibilities of statehood. We attained a fine working relationship—a relationship which I am happy to say is being continued on the same high plane and mutual cooperation by Oren Long's successor, my friend and distinguished colleague, DAN INOUYE.

I fervently hope that the President's appointment of Oren Long will be the forerunner of more appointments to come for others in Hawaii who, like Oren, have given so much to their State and country. I regret to say that the 50th State has been conspicuously overlooked in the matter of major appointments in the national administration. We have among our population outstanding men and women who have demonstrated their talents and capabilities in government, the professions, business, agriculture, and industry. As the Pacific crossroads, Hawaii has developed a reservoir of educated and specialized persons who are particularly knowledgeable about the Orient and the Occident, the East and the West.

We are disappointed that Hawaii has been bypassed by the White House, especially when we note that our island friends in Puerto Rico and Guam have received recognition in appointments to high posts in the U.S. Government. We salute such appointees from Puerto Rico as Dr. Arturo Morales-Carrion, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, and Mr. Teodoro Moscoso, Chief of the Alliance for Progress; and from Guam, Mr. Richard F. Taitano, Director of the Office of Territories, Department of the Interior.

There are men and women in Hawaii, talented, dedicated, and skillful in special fields, who are ready and eager to serve. They ask not what America will do for them but rather what they can do for their country. I say to President Kennedy: Give these islanders the opportunity to work for their country. They will more than prove their merit, especially in problems involving Asia and the Pacific basin.

DISPOSAL OF ELLIS ISLAND TO TRAINING SCHOOL AT VINELAND, N.J.—STATMENT BY SENATOR CASE

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is unable to be present in the Senate today. He has been called away from Washington by reason of his duties as a member of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy, and he is in Annapolis at the present time.

He had prepared a statement for the RECORD dealing with the disposal of Ellis Island to the training school at Vineland, N.J.

I ask unanimous consent, in the absence of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, that the full text of the remarks which he had prepared be inserted in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR CASE, MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1963, ON SENATE FLOOR ON DISPOSAL OF ELLIS ISLAND TO THE TRAINING SCHOOL AT VINELAND, N.J.

There are three recent developments which encourage me to reintroduce a bill to authorize the disposal of Ellis Island to the training school at Vineland, N.J.

First, Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, has written me of the "effective presentation" made by Author Pearl Buck, chairman of the training school's board of directors, and another official of the Vineland institution for retarded children at hearings conducted late last year by the Muskie subcommittee. I recognize fully that this letter does not constitute a commitment for the bill, but it does point up the decided advantages of the Vineland program.

Second, President Kennedy has focused on the enormous effort that needs to be made if mental retardation is to be effectively prevented and controlled. On February 5, the President sent a special message to Congress dealing with mental illness and mental retardation in which he recommended an impressive expenditure of Federal funds for the expansion of facilities throughout the Nation. The President's program emphasizes the need for diagnostic and other facilities of the very type proposed by the Vineland school, which is an internationally recognized private institution, willing to pay the Government for the privilege of taking the idle island off its hands.

Third, I have been joined in sponsoring the bill by Senator PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan, who is deeply interested in the problems which the Vineland Training School seeks to meet.

The full text of the letter written by Chairman MUSKIE is as follows:

MARCH 1, 1963.

DEAR CLIFF: I have your good letter of March 1, advising of your tentative plans to reintroduce legislation similar to S. 2852 of the 87th Congress, which authorized the disposal of Ellis Island to the training school at Vineland, N.J.

As of this moment, the subcommittee is awaiting the printing of the record of the hearings held last year on the disposition of Ellis Island. I anticipate that these hearings should be printed within the next 2 weeks, and I hope that in the very near future we can move to further consideration of this matter.

You will be pleased to know that Miss Buck and Dr. Jacob made a very effective presentation at our New York City hearings in behalf of the proposed disposal of the island to the training school at Vineland, N.J. Certainly, the Vineland plan is one of the best developed proposals which has been presented to the subcommittee and it has the added advantage of emanating from a long-established institution which enjoys an outstanding reputation in the field of mental retardation.

I assume that the subcommittee will decide to give further study and consideration to the matter of the disposition and future utilization of Ellis Island. If that is the case, I am confident that the plan presented by the training school at Vineland will be carefully examined.

Hoping that we may look forward to further counsel and advice from you on this very complicated question, and with warmest personal regards, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate, Chairman.

In his special message, President Kennedy emphasized the magnitude of the problem of mental retardation when he noted:

"The care and treatment of mental retardation, and research into its causes and cure, have—as in the case of mental illness—been too long neglected. Mental retardation ranks as a major national health, social, and economic problem. It strikes our most precious asset—our children. It disables 10 times as many people as diabetes, 20 times as many as tuberculosis, 25 times as many as muscular dystrophy, and 600 times as many as infantile paralysis. About 400,000 children are so retarded they require constant care or supervision; more than 200,000 of these are in residential institutions. There are between 5 and 6 million mentally retarded children and adults—an estimated 3 percent of the population. Yet, despite these grim statistics, and despite an admirable effort by private voluntary associations, until a decade ago not a single State health department offered any special community services for the mentally retarded or their families.

"States and local communities spend $300 million a year for residential treatment of the mentally retarded, and another $250 million for special education, welfare, rehabilitation, and other benefits and services. The Federal Government will this year obligate $37 million for research, training and special services for the retarded and about three times as much for their income maintenance. But these efforts are fragmented and inadequate.

"Mental retardation strikes children without regard for class, creed, or economic level. Each year sees an estimated 126,000 new cases. But it hits more often—and harder—at the underprivileged and the poor; and most often of all—and most severely—in city tenements and rural slums where there are heavy concentrations of families with poor education and low income."

There is every reason to believe, as the President does, that we are on the threshold of important advances in this field. Fifteen to twenty-five percent of the cases of mental retardation can now be identified as to cause. But many specific causes are still unknown. Preventive steps are wholly inadequate. Lack of prenatal care can be tied directly to resultant cases of mental retardation. Community services are not sufficient to the task. Frequently, they are outmoded in concept.

New institutional services are needed. Public understanding of the problem must be improved. Diagnostic, health, educational, training, rehabilitation, employment, welfare, and legal aid services need to be strengthened. We need to improve our research facilities. There is a need to expand special education, training and rehabilitation services. Due to a lack of trained teachers, supervisors and the rest, only about one-fourth of the Nation's 1,250,000 retarded children of school age have access to the special education they require.

Several years ago Ellis Island was declared surplus to the needs of the Federal Government and the General Services Administration was authorized to arrange for disposal of this white elephant. In 1960 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare invited applications for acquisition of Ellis Island at up to 100 percent public discount to groups acting in the field of health, education or welfare or a combination thereof. After reviewing the applications submitted at that time, the Department rejected them all and, in effect, returned the problem of disposing of Ellis Island to the General Services Administration.

Early in the first session of the last Congress several bills were introduced in both the House and the Senate, each directing the head of the General Services Administration to convey Ellis Island to a particular organization for a particular purpose. My own bill was S. 2852.

The training school sought to purchase Ellis Island outright from the General Services Administration but was informed that inasmuch as these bills were pending in the Congress, the agency could not consider any bids.

It is apparent that GSA is looking to Congress to make the policy decision both as to the purpose to which Ellis Island shall be devoted in the future and as to which organization should acquire the island to carry out this purpose.

The training school at Vineland is a nonprofit corporation of the State of New Jersey and has pioneered in the field of mental retardation since 1888. Diagnosis is necessarily the first step in any program of training or treatment. The school was one of the first institutions in the world to establish a laboratory for basic research in mental retardation and also a school for the training of teachers in this field. This has led to the development of techniques of special education which are commonplace today. The result is that the training school has become a demonstration center receiving annually more than 5,000 visitors from all over the world to study these techniques and methods in action.

The training school seeks to acquire Ellis Island to expand its programs in this vital area by establishing there an international diagnostic center for development and exposition of efficient methods of diagnosis of mental deficiency. Such a center would also afford greatly expanded clinical study and examination in a comprehensive variety of fields related to mental deficiency. A research and professional training program in the field of mental retardation would be developed in cooperation with universities and other organizations interested in mental deficiency. All of these services would be made available on an international basis, with worldwide dissemination of the information acquired.

The bill we have introduced would direct the Administrator to convey Ellis Island to the training school at a price equaling the appraised value as determined by the administration of the General Services Administration, less such public discount as may be recommended by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The training school is an outstanding institution which has been advancing the frontiers of knowledge in mental deficiency for nearly three-quarters of a century and has achieved a worldwide reputation in this field. For much of this period, arrival at Ellis Island, in the shadow of the Statue of Liberty, represented the achievement of years of work and hope on the part of millions of people yearning to be free—free from tyranny, free from persecution, free from lack of opportunity.

Freedom from the handicaps of mental retardation is still another freedom to which historic Ellis Island can yet be the gateway.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MUST THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS FAIL?—THE ACID TEST IS AT HAND

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Alliance for Progress was one of the great, constructive, imaginative proposals of President Kennedy. It proposed, through U.S. financial aid, plus U.S. know-how, expertise, and cooperation, to help the Latin American countries move into the mid-20th century. It proposed, by means of a cooperative understanding, based on a willingness on the part of the Latin American governments, to establish long overdue reforms—taxation, anti-inflation measures, cessation of usurious lending practices, land distribution, a willingness to increase the efficiency and integrity of government operation to prevent aid funds from being wasted or misappropriated—and thereby to achieve, by evolutionary means, a peaceful economic and social revolution. Such a peaceful revolution is essential if a violent, bloody revolution is to be obviated.

The fact is that many of the countries of Latin America are ripe for revolution. At the top of an antiquated feudal structure is entrenched a power elite who control both government and the financial and economic resources of the nation. Theirs is the power monopoly that maintains the archaic political, economic, and social structure which makes the majority of Latin American countries a fertile ground for revolution by the exploited, ill nourished, ill housed, virtually destitute and hopeless vast majority.

Such countries—in the absence of the needed reform and in the failure by those on top to provide it—should have revolutions. Unfortunately, any revolution today is promptly infiltrated by international communism—as in Cuba—directed by Moscow or Peking and diverted from its legitimate goals.

Mexico furnishes an illustration in point. Its long overdue, needed revolution began in 1910 and was concluded at the end of the century's second decade. It was both a political and social revolution. It abolished usurped continuity in the presidential office, such as that of Parfirio Diaz, who had overthrown existing constitutional provisions and kept himself—a dictator—in the presidency for a generation, by providing one 6-year term for the president and no reelection. It provided for the breakup of the vast latifundios, or land estates, and the distribution of the land to the peasantry. The ideology and motivations of the Mexican revolutionaries—Madero, Zapata, Carranza, Obregon, Calles, and their associates—were wholly indigenous. They were drawn out of Mexico's own experience and responded to Mexico's needs. There was no foreign infiltration, either ideologically or materially.

But we may be certain that had the Mexican revolution taken place a quarter of a century or more later, it would have been invaded by Kremlin agents, who would have attempted to take it over and to spread their subversion throughout Latin America.

The sad fact, however, is that the noble concept of the Alianza para el Progreso is about to fail, because those in power in Latin America have not, in the great majority of cases, initiated or carried through the needed reforms. It was perhaps a bit naive to expect those entrenched in power—politically, economically, and socially—to yield in any substantial degree their vested prerogatives, their palaces, their landed estates, their "conspicuous consumption", to borrow a phrase from Thorstein Veblen, in order that the people on whose backs and shoulders their affluence rested might be lifted from their abject misery. Nevertheless, that was the hope, and President Kennedy's prescription of such action on the part of the Latin

American power elite was supposedly a sine qua non of the Alliance.

A large part of the fault, however, is ours. The administration itself has been inveigled into giving without receiving its stipulated quid pro quo. It has continued to pour our dollars into unstable and uncooperative regimes, to buttress their follies, to give them budgetary support, to finance their deficits. By doing this it has not merely wasted our substance, but actually, by supporting the feudal edifice, given encouragement and comfort to the very subversive forces which seek to overthrow the existing regimes and enthrone Communist-dominated leadership in their place.

The time has passed when lipservice from these power elites should suffice to turn on the numerous spigots—variously, grants, development loans, and other so-called loans or credits, or refunding operations.

The issue is pertinently and crucially posed by the presence in Washington of a high-powered financial delegation from Brazil which seeks to persuade President Kennedy that just once more the pitcher should go to the well of American financial assistance and rescue the Government of Brazil from its past extravagances and follies.

It will be argued—as it has been argued before—that this time it is different. It will be eloquently pleaded that President Goulart has a new mandate to establish an austerity regime; that he has already taken and proposes to take such-and-such steps.

On the basis of such or similar previous promises, the United States has poured over $2 billion into Brazil. What is there to show for it?

If the Alliance for Progress is to succeed, it is imperative that for once our Government stand firm and wait at least 6 months or a year to see how these promises are carried out and whether the Goulart government is capable of seeing them through into the realm of tangible results.

If again we weaken—as we did in the case of Peru after our 1 week's firm stand against the military takeover—and as we have repeatedly "refunded" Brazil's financial chaos, our Government itself can take to itself a large share of the blame for the collapse of the Alianza.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that various articles bearing on this subject be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. They are: An article from the Washington Post of March 10, entitled "Dantas Due Here for Talks Vital to United States-Brazilian Ties"; an article from this morning's Washington Post, by its distinguished columnist, Marquis Childs, entitled "Brazil's Choice: Reform or Ruin"; an article from the Miami Herald entitled "Alliance Makes Little Headway in Four Key Latin Countries."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the last article mentioned does not deal with Brazil. It deals with four other countries—smaller countries—Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru—where, certainly in the case of the first two, the efforts of their governments to meet President Kennedy's prescriptions have been valiantly attempted. Even there the difficulties and problems are great. But if in the case of Brazil we now again become soft and an easy touch before the evidence of compliant action by the Brazilian Government is crystal clear and demonstrable after adequate trial, we shall be making the task of successful implementation of the Alianza in other countries even more difficult, if not virtually impossible.

Our action now in the case of Brazil—and for the sake of Brazil—will constitute, in my judgment, at least, the acid test of whether the Alianza Para El Progreso can be made to succeed.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 10, 1963]

DANTAS DUE HERE FOR TALKS VITAL TO UNITED STATES-BRAZILIAN TIES

(By Dan Kurzman)

Brazilian Finance Minister Francisco Clementino de San Tiago Dantas will arrive here this evening on a mission that could determine the future pattern of American-Brazilian relations.

Ties between the two Nations have been strained in recent months owing to U.S. dissatisfaction with Brazil's efforts to stabilize its inflation-ridden economy and contain extreme leftist activities.

This friction was underscored when Attorney General Robert Kennedy made a hurried trip to Brazil earlier this year. Kennedy let President Joao Goulart know that Washington's inclination to aid Brazil under the Alliance for Progress will hinge on Brazil's willingness to help itself.

Since the Kennedy mission, the Brazilian Government has shown signs of embarking on a serious endeavor to strengthen its economy and its resistance to far leftist infiltration. And the visit of Finance Minister Dantas reflects American satisfaction with this progress.

In Dantas, the most powerful man in the Brazilian Cabinet, the United States will be dealing with a man who does not always see eye to eye with Washington's hemisphere policy.

FAVORS CUBA NEGOTIATIONS

He has often said that the American Republics should negotiate with Cuba instead of isolating it. As Foreign Minister in an earlier Goulart government, he opposed the ouster of Cuba from the Organization of American States (OAS) in early 1962. He also pushed for the renewal of Brazilian diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union in 1961.

In his new role of Finance Minister, Dantas, who will meet with President Kennedy, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, and other U.S. officials, is not expected to discuss Cuba on a formal basis. But the subject may come up informally in the course of the conversations.

With the United States edging toward a coexistence policy regarding Cuba, the views of Brazil and this country are probably closer than they had been in the past. The United States, however, may suggest that the Brazilian Government tighten up its efforts to control Castroite subversion in Brazil, particularly travel to and from Cuba by agents and trainees.

The main purpose of Dantas' visit, however, is to solicit American assistance in stabilizing Brazil's finances and implementing development projects under a newly blueprinted 3-year plan.

SEEKS DEBT REVISION

Dantas will ask the United States to reschedule repayment of debts falling due in 1963, 1964, and 1965 over a period of about 20 years. Of Brazil's total world debt of $2.8 billion, $1.5 billion must be repaid with interest in the next 3 years.

About two-thirds of this $1.5 billion is owed the United States, the remainder to European countries and several international financial organizations, including the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Dantas will ask the other creditors as well as the United States for rescheduling of debt payments.

The foreign exchange liberated by agreement of the creditors to this request, Dantas will argue, could be used to finance development projects.

U.S. officials indicate they may consider such a request for rescheduling, but that in most cases refinancing would be more feasible. That is, Brazil would be required to pay off its debt on time and then would be offered new credits.

Such credits may come from a release of part of the $338 million committed to Brazil in 1961. Eighty-four million dollars of this has been held up because of Brazil's apparent lack of effort until recently to take effective anti-inflationary and other economic measures.

The changing U.S. attitude toward Brazil can be attributed to a number of measures taken since full presidential powers were restored to Goulart following a plebiscite in early January.

Goulart, because of his leftist tendencies, had been denied these powers by Congress when he took over the government following the dramatic resignation of President Janio Quadros in 1961. Brazil's Armed Forces had pressed for such limitations.

Having regained these powers with the help of the far left, Goulart has increasingly dissociated himself from the extremists. These groups now are accusing the President and Dantas of conservatism.

Economically, the government has, despite the political dangers, adopted an anti-inflationary program calling for a 35 percent slash in government spending.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 11, 1963]

BRAZIL'S CHOICE: REFORM OR RUIN

(By Marquis Childs)

The Government in Brazil got hold of some secret documents the other day that illustrate the depth of the split between the hard-line Chinese Communists and the followers of the Khrushchev line of coexistence. Throughout Latin America the split is developing into more or less open conflict.

The seized documents reveal a quarrel between hard-line leaders over funds believed sent from Havana for carrying out propaganda and subversion in Brazil's poverty-ridden northeast. The accusation was that somewhere along the way sticky fingers held back part of the money. As word of the documents got around, an emissary of the Moscow coexistence faction approached the Government with a request for copies—they would be useful in blasting the enemy.

Cuba, as seen from Brazil, has quite a different look than the perspective from Washington. The blacks and the whites are not nearly so well defined. President Joao Goulart has told recent visitors of his concern that the United States by directly attacking Cuba might bring the quarreling factions together and thereby put an end to the greatest hope since 1917 of permanently dividing the world Communist movement.

To see ourselves as others see us—or, more important, in the current struggle to see the world as it looks to others—is a difficult task as we become increasingly preoccupied with our own immediate troubles. This applies to all of Latin America and particularly to Brazil, which has just sent an important mission to Washington headed by Minister of Finance Francisco San Tiago Dantas.

As India is the key to the future in Asia, so Brazil is the test for Latin America. What Guatemala or Nicaragua have to say may serve the purposes of American foreign policy. But what Brazil says—and does—is likely to be decisive. And so critical is Brazil's raging inflation that perhaps no more than 2 to 2½ years of choice remain.

This is not to suggest any real parallel between the economies of the two nations. São Paulo has industry as advanced as anywhere in the world, and Rio de Janeiro is a modern capital in every sense of the word.

But the desperate poverty in Brazil's northeast, where in some areas per capita income is no more than $50, bears a close resemblance to the problem of India with its average per capita income of $69.

In presenting his case for rescheduling $89 million of loans and for further economic assistance to American and international loan and monetary agencies, Dantas is pointing to stern measures to curb inflation. These include a major tax reform, a cut in the Federal budget of 35 percent, eliminating subsidies on imported wheat and fuel and an effort to put some sense into the chaotic government-owned transport and communication system with a raise in rates.

Stringent efforts are being made to check the flight of capital. Since the plebiscite in January ending the political crisis and giving Goulart authority, Brazil's currency has strengthened.

Dantas claims wide support from the non-Communist left for the anti-inflationary program, with workers realizing that a 52-percent inflation, as in 1962, robs the rich more than the poor. At the same time he is pushing the 3-year development program, with two-thirds of new investment to come from the private sector.

In Brazil, as in most of Latin America, there is a growing skepticism over the Alliance for Progress. On a TV program in Rio the other day a speaker said:

"The Alliance for Progress is dead, however much I should hope for its resurrection. The main reason for its failure seems to be the following: It was necessary to establish close coordination between help from the Alliance and basic reforms.

"But unfortunately the rich in Latin America talk too much about reform and label as Communists all those who would enforce it. This is easy to understand: The rich in Latin America go on holding 80 percent of the land on the continent. Often they control parliament and have the intensity of their idealism and hope in the future gaged by the bank deposits kept in their names in the United States and in Europe."

These words were spoken not by a radical leftist but by Dom Helder Camara, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Rio. They underscore how very late the hour is. In Brazil, with its furious economic and political currents, time is rapidly running out.

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald]

ALLIANCE MAKES LITTLE HEADWAY IN FOUR KEY LATIN COUNTRIES

(By Dom Bonafede)

LIMA, PERU.—After almost 2 years, the Alliance for Progress has hardly made a ripple in four strategic countries in Latin America.

An on-the-scene assessment of the program in Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru indicates that little, if any, headway has been made toward the original concept of the Alliance—to promote social and economic reforms for the betterment of the Latin masses within a decade.

For the most part the humanitarian objectives of the program have been amended. Instead of working at the bottom of the social structure, Alliance funds and manpower are concentrated in the rarified atmosphere of higher economics, apparently on the theory that political stability and industrial growth must precede help for the common man.

Large doses of money are being poured into these countries to prop up the national economy, balance budgets (including those top-heavy with military expenditures), and improve balance-of-payments deficits.

"In order to pay for the social improvements envisaged under the Alliance there must be a significant increase in economic production," reported an official of the Agency for International Development (AID) in Quito, Ecuador.

CAMPESINO MUST WAIT

Meanwhile, the illiterate, barefoot campesino with the tubercular wife and famished children is waiting for help to filter down to him.

In many cases claims made by AID officials are distorted since the amount of money earmarked for a country and the actual funds disbursed vary greatly, the latter being considerably less.

Here is a summary of how each of the four countries are faring under the Alliance:

Venezuela: In 1961 the country was scheduled to receive $115 million. Of this $80 million from the Export Bank was mainly used for bolstering the balance-of-payments structure, $3 million went for housing. Last year $92 million was available on paper but only $6.5 million has been put into use—$5 million for aqueducts and $1.5 million for rural housing.

Colombia: This is the country which AID portrays as the showcase for the Alliance in South America. But Alliance funds have been used in most part to plug the economic gap caused by falling coffee prices. An agrarian reform program is bogged down in politics, lack of trained administrators, and peasant disinterest.

Banditry and violence in the rich coffee-growing regions have frightened many campesinos into leaving their small farms. Lower income workers complain that there is too much redtape involved in getting into the new housing projects near Bogotá, including the one visited by President Kennedy during his trip there. Yet, the Alliance appears to have the best chance of succeeding here, if only because of the all-out effort.

Ecuador: Of $64.5 million made available, less than a third has actually been disbursed. Despite the pitiful plight of Indian sharecroppers an agrarian reform program has not yet come out of the planning stage. AID officials say that a few hospitals and schools have been built under the Alliance but no houses. A recently approved loan has been granted to open up the dark jungle interior. And a loan application of $4 million is pending for the construction of 2,000 classrooms and 700 teacher lodgings.

Peru: Suspension of United States-Peruvian relations in July 1962 interrupted the AID program. With the lifting of the suspension aid has been resumed but is only beginning to trickle in. Palace spokesmen maintain that Jorge Grieve, Peruvian member of the "nine wise men" who pass on Alliance economic proposals, is opposed to the ruling junta and is blocking credit for the country.

"We would rather deal with North Americans than Latins," declared Julio Vargas Prado, secretary to the military government.

Plans have been drafted to develop the Communist-infiltrated Convencion Valley. The Peace Corps, which feeds 182,000 Peruvian children through a school lunch program, is making a favorable impression.

OFFICIALS PLEAD FOR TIME

In each country AID officials plead for time. However, the high birth rates of these countries, the flight of foreign capital and the drop in basic commodity prices means that injections of money cannot keep pace with the vast needs of the people.

In Venezuela, which boasts a 3.6 percent annual population explosion—the highest in Latin America—President Romulo Betancourt has resettled some 53,000 families under an agrarian reform program, started incidentally prior to the launching of the Alliance. But the country's housing shortage is estimated at more than 700,000 units with an annual demand of about 60,000 units.

Declared an AID executive in Caracas: "There is no organized resistance here. But a feeling of urgency does not permeate all levels of government, especially at the lower levels. We're ready to go whenever they are."

While visiting the new housing projects it was found that some of the tenants had refrigerators and gas stoves but no electricity or gas to operate them.

Disenchantment with the Alliance has led to Latins blaming the United States and AID officials blaming the Latins.

In Peru, international politics is said to take precedence over the need for help.

"We have received practically no money under the Alliance for social development since the junta look over last year," reported Vargas Prado.

The Kennedy administration is known to be cool towards the junta government. The relationship between the two governments points up the unresolved problem whether aid should be dispensed along humanitarian lines unaffected by political bias.

Many Latins complain that the Alliance is not revolutionary enough. Yet when innovations are introduced with which they are unacquainted, such as savings and loan associations, they are slow in accepting them.

THE U.S. QUARANTINE OF CUBA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, we are all aware of the forthright action taken by President Kennedy last October to force the removal of Russian missiles and bombers from Cuba. I think we all agree that the President acted properly, in view of the fact that the national security of the United States as well as that of the entire free world was at stake. What the President did was necessary, even though at the time there was probably no chance to make a careful study of its legality.

A scholarly article has recently been written, however, which demonstrates that the U.S. quarantine of Cuba violated neither the Charter of the United Nations nor the established rules of international law. This article, written by a member of the New York Bar, appeared in the February edition of the American Bar Association Journal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LEGALITY OF U.S. QUARANTINE ACTION UNDER THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

(By Eustace Seligman)

(NOTE.—In this article, Mr. Seligman examines the legal position of the action of the United States in imposing a quarantine on shipments to Castro at the height of the Cuban crisis. His analysis indicates that the U.S. action was consistent both with the U.N. Charter and with established principles of international law.)

The question of whether the quarantine action taken by the United States was or was not a violation of its obligations under the U.N. Charter is one of great importance, and not merely to lawyers. We profess to believe in sanctity of obligations, we demand that of other nations, and yet we hear it frequently stated in connection with the Cuban quarantine that, since our national security was involved, we could not be deterred by legal niceties.

Was our action in imposing the quarantine of this nature in violation of our written word? It is believed not, for the reasons hereinafter set forth.

ARTICLE 2 (4) OF THE CHARTER

The basic restriction on the use of force in the U.N. Charter is article 2(4). This article does not expressly prohibit all use of force—but only force of specific kinds. It reads as follows:

"All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

In order for a use of force to come within the prohibition of article 2(4) it must be of a kind enumerated unless the enumeration is to be deemed surplusage and ignored, which would appear to be unjustified by any sound rule of construction.

As is stated in Bowett, "Self-Defense in International Law," 1958, at page 151: "This, in effect, was the construction which the U.K. agent, Sir Eric Beckett, sought to place on the article in contending before the International Court of Justice in the Corfu Channel case that Operation Retail, the subsequent minesweeping operation, was not contrary to article 2(4). He said: 'But our action on the 12th and 13th of November threatened neither the territorial integrity nor the political independence of Albania. Albania suffered thereby neither territorial loss nor any part of its political independence.'

"As previously indicated, the finding of the Court against the United Kingdom on this point, made no specific reference either to this argument or indeed to article 2(4)."

Writers on international law have expressed conflicting views on the question. However, Bowett, after weighing them, concludes at page 152: "Despite these reasons it is submitted that, the phrase having been included, it must be given its plain meaning. Moreover, to give it its plain meaning coincides with the limitations on the obligation of nonintervention which traditional international law recognizes."

Unless article 2(4) is construed to prevent all use of force, it is difficult to conceive of any use of force which would be more clearly excluded from the scope of article 2(4) than a quarantine to prevent the introduction of offensive weapons. The quarantine was not a use of force, (a) against the territorial integrity of Cuba; or (b) against the political independence of Cuba; or (c) in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations—of which the paramount one under article 1 is to maintain peace and security—the objective of the quarantine.

It would, therefore, appear that under the sound construction of article 2(4), which has heretofore been advocated by Britain, the U.S. quarantine did not violate its obligations under the U.N. Charter.

SELF-DEFENSE

Even if article 2(4) could be construed to include in its prohibition the use of force involved in a quarantine, it is well recognized that it cannot properly be construed to prohibit a quarantine or any other use of force, if carried out in self-defense.

This question is fully discussed in Bowett, op. cit., who concludes at page 186: "For these reasons we would maintain that the obligation assumed under article 2(4) is in no way inconsistent with the right of self-defense recognized in international law."

However, the use of the words "armed attack" in article 51 of the charter raises a further question as to whether the charter as a whole should be construed to forbid "anticipatory" self-defense—that is, action prior to an actual armed attack. Article 51 reads as follows: "Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if any armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."

There is a full discussion of this question also in Bowett, who concludes at page 191: "It is not believed, therefore, that article 51 restricts the traditional right of self-defense so as to exclude action taken against an imminent danger but before an 'armed attack occurs.' In our view such a restriction is both unnecessary and inconsistent with article 2(4) which forbids not only force but the threat of force, and, furthermore, it is a restriction which bears no relation to the realities of a situation which may arise prior to an actual attack and call for self-defense immediately if it is to be of any avail at all. No state can be expected to await an initial attack which in the present state of armaments, may well destroy the state's capacity for further resistance and so jeopardize its very existence."

The traditional right of self-defense which it is believed was preserved by the charter has been described by Westlake, "International Law," second edition 1910, part I, page 312, as follows: "A state may defend itself, by preventive means if in its conscientious judgment necessary, against attack by another state, threat of attack, or preparations or other conduct from which an intention to attack may reasonably be apprehended. In so doing it will be acting in a manner intrinsically defensive even though externally aggressive."

From this it follows that the legality of the quarantine depends upon whether it was an act of genuine self-defense even though anticipatory, or in fact an unprovoked act of aggression. The answer to this is clear: The conveying to Cuba by the Sino-Soviet powers of offensive weapons was the initiating cause which led to the U.S. reaction and was a threat to U.S. security. The unprovoked and unjustified secret installation of offensive nuclear weapons in an area previously free from them and close to another state, creates a threat to such other state justifying under the right of self-defense the use of force in order to cause their removal.

Applying the test laid down by Westlake quoted above, the installation of such weapons under all the attendant circumstances, including Castro's threats against Guantanamo and various Latin American countries, was conduct from which an intention to attack may reasonably be apprehended." Who outside the Kremlin knows what the purpose was of secretly building up nuclear offensive weapons in Cuba, located so as to be able to bypass our DEW line radar detective network? Was another Pearl Harbor planned? Or was it intended once the installation was completed to deliver to us an ultimatum to withdraw from West Berlin, Europe, Turkey, or elsewhere? Surely the possibility of this was sufficiently great so as to justify our taking immediate action to remove the danger.

Furthermore, the limited nature of the U.S. reaction confirms that it was defensive only and solely designed to eliminate the threat to its security caused by the introduction of the offensive weapons. Consequently, the quarantine was not an act of aggression prohibited by the obligations we have entered into when we signed the U.N. Charter.

One of the problems raised by the claim of self-defense is the difficulty of deciding when it is false and when legitimate. The justification of anticipatory self-defense has frequently been falsely advanced—as in the case of Hitler's claim in September 1939, that Germany had been attacked by Polish troops. This, however, is no reason for denying reliance upon it when it is in fact justified.

The U.N. Charter has endeavored to solve this problem by recognizing the necessity of an immediate unilateral decision by a threatened state of when and how to react, but under article 51 requires it to report immediately to the Security Council the action taken. This is clearly set forth in Oppenheim's "International Law," eighth edition, 1957, edited by Lauterpacht, volume 1, at page 299: "The reason of the thing, of course, makes it necessary for every State to judge for itself, in the first instance, whether a case of necessity in self-defense has arisen. But unless the notion of self-preservation is to be eliminated as a legal conception, or unless it is used as a cloak for concealing deliberate breaches of the law, it is obvious that the question of the legality of action taken in self-preservation is suitable for determination and must ultimately be determined by a judicial authority or by a political body, like the Security Council of the United Nations, acting in a judicial capacity. The Charter lays down expressly that measures taken in the exercise of the right of self-defense must be immediately reported to the Security Council."

This obligation to report to the Security Council was complied with by the United States.

Oppenheim (op. cit. p. 299) gives the following example of the exercise of the right of anticipatory self-defense, of a far more extreme nature than the quarantine: "After the peace of Tilsit of 1807, the British Government was cognizant of a secret article of this treaty, according to which Denmark should, in certain circumstances, be coerced into declaring war against Great Britain, and France should be enabled to seize the Danish fleet so as to make use of it against Great Britain. As Denmark was not capable of defending herself against an attack of the French Army in North Germany under Bernadotte and Davoust, who had orders to invade Denmark, the British Government requested Denmark to deliver up her fleet to the custody of Great Britain, and promised to restore it after the war. Denmark, however, refused to comply with the British demands; whereupon the British considered that a case of necessity in self-defense had arisen, shelled, Copenhagen, and seized the Danish fleet."

In a footnote on the following page Lauterpacht states that: "The action of Great Britain in this case, while condemned by most continental writers, is approved by many British and American writers."

One of the British writers who states that this action is "justifiable in our opinion" is Westlake (op. cit. p. 315).

Two other arguments should be considered in connection with our reliance on self-defense. First, it has been urged that the Russian-Cuban action was not a threat of the use of force, but itself justified by self-defense of Cuba to prevent a U.S. invasion. This contention is clearly fictitious. The Castro regime has been in power for almost 4 years and yet no attempt has been made by U.S. forces to invade the island. On several occasions Cuba has appealed to the Security Council to ask protection against a threatened invasion, but has never been

able to adduce any evidence in support of its claim. Finally, proof conclusive of its falsity was furnished when at the time of the landing at the Bay of Pigs by the returning Cubans we refused to give them the assistance of our Air Force which they desired.

Second, it has been suggested that if the position of the United States is sound, it follows that the action which the United States took in establishing a base in Turkey was similarly a threat to the peace in violation of the Charter.

This suggestion is without merit for the following reasons:

The action we took in Turkey was not the initiating action of an aggressive nature, but our response to the prior aggressive steps taken by Russia in its expansionist program, and was of a defensive nature. As has been well stated by Mr. Frank Altschul, vice president of the Council on Foreign Relations, in a letter to the New York Times of October 29, 1962:

"There are few things less in keeping with our national tradition or desires than to have, in time of peace, Armed Forces of the United States stationed far from home at distant points around the globe. Yet we have felt obliged to break with tradition and preference in response to Soviet conduct, which has, ever since the fall of Czechoslovakia, in and out of the United Nations carried the conviction that the Soviet Union has in no sense placed limits on its well-advertised determination to spread its dominion to the farthest corners of the earth.

"Our bases, accordingly, represented an important, if by no means the only, contribution we have made to the defense of the non-Soviet world against the overweening ambitions of the Kremlin.

"The Soviet missile base in Cuba, on the other hand, is of quite a different character. Our history, as Mr. Kennedy said in his eloquent address, unlike the Soviet's since the end of World War II, demonstrates we have no desire to conquer or dominate any other nation or impose our system on its people.'

"The masters of the Kremlin know as well as we do that the missile base, so furtively under construction in Cuba, cannot possibly be regarded as essential either to the defense of the Soviet Union or Cuba. Located close to our shores, it is purely aggressive in nature and furnishes evidence that the Soviet Union still regards the threat of a nuclear holocaust as a useful instrument for advancing Soviet objectives."

THE ACTION OF THE OAS

It has been suggested by our State Department that there is a different legal basis for the quarantine in the resolution adopted on October 23, 1962, by the Council of the OAS authorizing action which would include and go beyond the quarantine. The argument advanced is that the Charter specifically recognizes regional organizations and assigns to them an important place in carrying out the purposes of the United Nations in that article 52(1) states that "Nothing in the present charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations."

It is urged that this article gives to regional organizations the right to use force collectively for the removal of threats to the peace in their region in a situation where an individual State would not have the right to use force.

This position seems to be of doubtful validity. Certainly the wording of article 52 (1) above quoted gives it no support. Nor do the debates at the San Francisco Conference and the discussion there of the Act of Chapultepec support the suggested construction, for that act specifically provided only for the collective use of force "to prevent or repel aggression."

It would therefore seem that under the charter the resolution of the OAS would not justify the quarantine action by the United States if it had not been justified, absent the resolution.

The resolution does, however, have very real weight on the issue of the validity of the contention of the United States that the quarantine was in fact an act of self-defense. Instead of relying on a unilateral decision of the United States that it was acting in self-defense, there is now the unanimous judgment of the 20 members of the OAS after considering the evidence that the peace of the continent was threatened and that the United States and the other members should take necessary action including the use of armed force to stop the flow of offensive missiles into Cuba.

In addition the resolution of the OAS furnishes convincing refutation to the asserted claim referred to above, that the United States was contemplating an invasion of Cuba to overthrow Castro and that the installation of even offensive weapons was defensive and not a threat of aggression. Surely it could not be claimed that the 20 members of the OAS all contemplated joining in an invasion of Cuba; nor could they have believed that the United States had such a plan in mind when the resolution of October 23 was adopted by them. On the contrary, this resolution constitutes their unanimous judgment that this excuse for the introduction of missiles in Cuba is unjustified.

This action of the OAS is thus of the greatest importance in confirming that the quarantine was an act of self-defense and that the action of the United States was not in violation of its obligation under the Charter.

MILITARY AID TO WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial appearing recently in one of the largest and most influential newspapers in the West, the Salt Lake Tribune. This editorial alerts the paper's readers to the disproportionate burden the United States is carrying in providing an adequate system of European defense. The editorial shows that our NATO allies are not meeting their share of this burden, either in terms of money or manpower.

The editorial points out that the United States is now supporting about the same number of men under arms as all of the NATO countries put together, even though the population of the NATO countries is almost 100 million larger than that of the United States. In addition, defense spending in the United States is currently about $52 billion a year, or $277 per capita, while the current spending of all NATO countries is only $15 billion, or $53 per capita.

The editorial concludes with a plea that this relationship between the United States and our NATO allies be corrected. And correct it we must.

As I have pointed out on numerous occasions in the past, there is no justification for the United States to continue subsidizing the armed forces of our prosperous NATO allies. Congress stopped further substantial economic aid to these countries some 9 years ago, when it was recognized that they had fully recovered their capacity to be self-supporting.

Yet, since 1950, the United States has given to the nations of Western Europe, in the form of outright military assistance grants, a sum approaching $15 billion. This vast sum is in addition to our contribution to the NATO infrastructure. These countries have long since recovered their capacity to support their own armed forces without further help from us. The United States, however, continues to extend these military grants, to the tune of $314½ million in fiscal 1963 alone. Must the taxpayers of this country pay this bill indefinitely? Is there to be no end to the subsidy?

I am certainly aware, Mr. President, of the great wealth of the United States, and I am also aware that our per capita gross national product is much higher in the United States than in Western Europe. But is this difference in wealth proportionate to the burden being carried by the United States? The figures indicate otherwise. The per capita GNP in the United States is about 2.6 times as great as that of Western Europe. But, as I mentioned before, the average American taxpayer spends $277 yearly for defense purposes, while his West European counterpart pays only $53 yearly for defense purposes. The average American taxpayer is therefore spending over 5 times as much for defense purposes than the average taxpayer in Western Europe, which is almost twice the burden that would be warranted by comparing the individual income of each. This leaves no conclusion but that the American taxpayer has a legitimate complaint, and that it is high time for the financially successful NATO countries to assume a somewhat more equitable share of their own defense burden.

To demonstrate further the level of prosperity that has now been achieved by most of our NATO allies in Western Europe, we need look only to the unemployment figures for the United States and for the NATO countries. A study has been made which compares the unemployment levels of the United States with the countries of Western Europe, during the period from 1953 through 1961. Figures were available for all of the NATO countries except Greece, Portugal, and Turkey. In 1953, the average number of unemployed persons in Western Europe—Belgium, Luxembourg, Denmark, France, Germany, Netherlands, Italy, Norway, and the United Kingdom—was about 4.1 million of the total labor force. This number has steadily decreased over the years, until in 1961 the total unemployed in these same countries was only about 2.2 million persons. In the United States, on the other hand, our citizens have not been so fortunate in finding needed jobs. In 1953, the United States had about 1.9 million unemployed persons in our labor force, while in 1961 we had an average of over 4.8 million unemployed persons. The unemployment trend in the United States is up; in Europe, it is down.

For these reasons, I think the Tribune editorial, entitled, "Sharing Burden of Defending Freedom," is particularly appropriate. It is time for our NATO allies to pay their own way, and for this result to be realistically accomplished, it is essential that this year's foreign aid bill be amended to express such a policy by congressional action. If we continue unwarranted subsidies to rich NATO members, we not only disserve ourselves, but the alliance as well. In the long run, it will be greatly weakened, because it will lack the strong internal respect that comes from each member doing its share. This Congress should terminate further military grants to the individual NATO countries that have no further need for them.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the editorial in the February 4, 1963, issue of the Salt Lake Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHARING BURDEN OF DEFENDING FREEDOM

Something of an "agonizing reappraisal" of relationships within the Western Alliance is now in progress. It is related to the fair sharing of the burden of European defense, both in terms of money and manpower.

The reappraisal was in process well before France's brutal action in vetoing expansion of the European Common Market. But this French withdrawal from closer British and United States association is bound to further exacerbate strained relations and divergent views among the allies on defense policies and proper burden shares.

That dispute was dramatized by the furor in Britain over the United States decision to abandon the Skybolt missile. Hardly had that been ironed out at the Nassau Conference between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Macmillan, than new controversy erupted over British responsibility to pay part of the cost of the improved Polaris missiles offered as a substitute for Skybolt.

Meanwhile France insists on going its own way as a nuclear power and downgrades its commitment to NATO by assigning a puny division and a half to NATO forces—contrasted with Britain's 55,000-man NATO Army and the 400,000 men the United States has committed to NATO.

In Britain, meanwhile, the influential Manchester Guardian is challenging the whole plan to have six British Polaris submarines as not worth the estimated $1 billion cost.

At the same time the United States is challenging all its European allies to take over more of the task of defending themselves. Defense Secretary McNamara put the case quite bluntly at a recent meeting with the allies in Europe.

And there is reason for a blunt presentation.

The United States with a population of about 188 million is now supporting about the same number of men under arms as all the European NATO countries with their population of some 280 million.

The United States is the only large NATO power with a 2-year draft. Britain has none, most others 18 months or less.

The monetary comparison is even more weighted against this country. United States defense spending currently is at the rate of $52 billion a year, or $277 per capita. All 12 of our European allies spend only $15 billion, or $53 per capita.

With such a disproportionate share of the defense burden, it is no wonder America's groaning taxpayers can't provide enough tax revenues to balance the national budget; or that the international balance of payments continues to be against this country; or that the American economy and its rate of growth remains sluggish in comparison with most European nations.

This relationship must be, and it is being, reappraised.

As President Kennedy said recently, it is really fantastic what the United States has done to defend freedom around the world and to rebuild the economies of war-shattered countries, including our former enemies. This magnificent effort has undeniably halted the advance of communism and built the foundations of Europe's present prosperity.

But other nations of the Western World are now capable of resisting communism themselves, and their economies need no more support. It is time for them to accept a more equitable share of the burden of defending freedom.

Failure to resolve this problem on a basis of commonsense and reasonableness could so weaken the alliance as to make its members easy prey to Communist takeover.

OUTDOOR RECREATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 20) to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the bill—S. 20—is now before the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be now considered, and I ask unanimous consent that they be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I also send to the desk an amendment which was very carefully studied by the committee and agreed to by the members of the subcommittee, which I ask the Senate to adopt at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 21, after the word "purposes" it is proposed to delete the semicolon, insert in lieu thereof a comma and add the following: "including advance payments without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes—39 U.S.C. 4154—for initial costs of such research to any educational institution or other nonprofit organizations when necessary and in the public interest;".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] concerning the unanimous-consent agreement entered last week, I ask unanimous consent at this time that the unanimous-consent agreement for a vote at 3 o'clock tomorrow be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the reason for making the request at this time is that it is my understanding there will be no yea-and-nay vote on the measure now pending; that it is agreeable to all sides; and that the measure can be disposed of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, those who may oppose S. 20, to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, have done a very real service, whether it was intended or not. The bill will receive more careful study, and our recreation problems will become better understood as a result.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held a 1-day conference on the bill on February 5, during the debate on the Senate rules, which claimed all the headlines. The committee subsequently decided to regard its February 5 proceedings as a hearing, and printed them as a hearing record.

The committee then considered the bill at its first executive session, adopted three minor amendments, and unanimously ordered the measure, as amended, reported to the Senate. Since that time, agreement has been reached to amend one of the committee amendments in regard to advance payments for research, which we have now done.

Bringing the measure to issue and debate affords us an opportunity to use the floor of the Senate to lay before the country a little more of the background and the dimensions of the outdoor recreation problem.

In the last two decades the United States has seen a phenomenal growth in use of outdoor recreation facilities.

Their use was growing some prior to World War II, but not so tremendously that it could not be handled by the addition of a new national park occasionally, or the development of a few picnic grounds and campgrounds in the national forests.

AN OPPORTUNITY MISSED

During the depression days in the thirties, Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes foresaw the need for preservation of some areas to meet growing recreation demand. At his direction, the National Park Service made a survey of the shores of the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico to determine if steps should be taken to reserve part of them for recreation.

The Park Service recommended that at least 10 percent of the 4,025 miles of oceans and gulf shore should be reserved. It consequently recommended that the Federal Government acquire 12 tracts of land, totaling 600,000 acres with 400 miles of water frontage, at an estimated cost of $12 million. The tracts stretched all the way from Barnagat Inlet in New Jersey to Padre Island, Tex.

It is a very regrettable fact of history that the pressure for recreation facilities was not sufficient at that time to push the program through. The Nation could have acquired the 12 sites, with their 400 miles of frontage, for a very small fraction of what considerably less frontage is going to cost us today.

Only 1 of the 12 sites was acquired in the years just after the Ickes' survey—a part of Cape Hatteras off North Carolina. We are now in the process of buying a part of a second one—80 miles of the 117-mile Padre Island off Texas. It is going to cost us eight times the estimated cost of the whole 117 miles of Padre Island in 1935.

All of the other 10 sites recommended in the thirties have now been developed by private developers. A resurvey of them in 1955 showed that land values had multiplied many times in the two decades. One of the areas, Bogue Island off North Carolina, is a 30-mile island which could have been acquired in 1935 for $260,000. In 1935 there was only 9 miles still undeveloped and its value was put at more than $1 million—an increase of 1200 percent in valuation in two decades. The story at the other sites is the same. At one of them, which had been subdivided, values in 1955 were up from $26 an acre to $65 per front foot for a building lot.

WARTIME DECLINE

Part of the reason for our failure to act at that time was the approach of World War II, rising employment, and economic activity. When the war engulfed us, demand on recreation facilities plummeted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the number of visitors at National Park Service areas and at the national forests from 1941 through 1961.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Visits to national park areas and national forests

Year	Park Service areas [1]	National forests
1941	21,236,947	18,004,785
1942	9,370,969	10,407,120
1943	6,828,420	6,274,650
1944	8,339,775	7,151,953
1945	11,713,852	10,074,089
1946	21,752,315	18,240,677
1947	25,534,188	21,330,751
1948	29,858,828	24,010,964
1949	31,736,402	26,080,255
1950	33,252,589	27,367,797
1951	37,106,440	29,950,252
1952	42,299,836	33,006,885
1953	46,224,794	35,403,060
1954	47,833,913	40,304,037
1955	50,007,838	45,712,868
1956	54,923,000	52,556,084
1957	59,285,000	60,957,273
1958	58,677,000	68,449,500
1959	62,812,000	81,521,000
1960	72,288,000	92,594,500
1961	79,040,000	102,000,000
1962	88,000,000	112,762,000

[1] National park areas include parks, monuments, historical sites, and related areas.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this table tells only a part of the story of recreation demand in the United States. But it shows how demand declined during World War II, and then literally skyrocketed.

The national parks had 21 million visitors in 1941. That fell under 7 million in 1943, jumped back past 21 million in 1946, and has quadrupled since the immediate post-war period.

The Forest Service story is even more striking.

Visits to the national forests ran 18 million in 1941. They fell off to about 6 million in 1943, climbed to 10 million in 1945, and they were 10 times 10 million in 1961—102 million. The gain alone in 1962 is now estimated to be greater than the total attendance back in 1945.

GROWTH UNDERESTIMATED

We became aware of the tremendous growth in use of recreational facilities in the Nation in the fifties, when visitors and tourists started overflowing not only old facilities for recreationists, but all the new ones we could build. Our old pace of providing recreation areas and facilities wasn't keeping up with demand.

In 1954, Stephen Raushenbush of the Public Affairs Institute here in Washington went to a natural resources conference in Canada and told the participants that demand on recreational facilities was growing a great deal faster than population; that multipliers were at work. Raushenbush related rising per capita income and shorter working hours to the rising demand to explain why the increase was exceeding population growth. He made a very interesting attempt to startle the natural resources experts into a realization of the dimensions of the recreation problem they confronted by projecting demand ahead to 1960 on the basis, not just of population growth, but population growth times increased income and increased leisure. Raushenbush's projections were for a 32 percent to 50 percent increase in visits to park and forest recreation areas between 1953 and 1960. The actual increase was in the order of 110 percent. The U.S. parks and forests had 77.7 million visitors in 1953 and 164.9 million in 1960.

Raushenbush was not the only estimator in the fifties who was later shown to be overly conservative. Agencies across the country, in the recreation business, were awakening in this period to the situation which confronted them and planning to handle increased visitors, but they almost invariably set their sights too low. One factor they overlooked was the effect that post-war road building would have on recreation demand—the increased mobility of the increased numbers of people with higher incomes and more leisure time.

The 50 million visitors to National Park Service areas in 1955 were twice the capacity of facilities available to service them. Vacationists who were turned away from the crowded camping grounds and picnic areas grumbled, and they grumbled so loudly even those of us here in Washington could hear it. It came to us through the press and in our mail.

SCENIC AREAS ENDANGERED

The overload of park visitors was not only a public relations problem, it was resulting in damage to the natural and historic features of the park areas which the Park Service was supposed to protect and preserve. Campers who were unable to get into regular camping areas pitched their tents, built their fires, and left their garbage in the most scenic and interesting spots they could find. They were often right beside or even astride the finest attractions in the parks. An inadequate force of park rangers was unable to police them all.

The National Park Service has a dual responsibility under its basic charter, the National Parks Act of 1916. One is to preserve and protect the great natural scenic areas entrusted to it for the undiminished enjoyment of future generations. The other is to provide reasonable access to the areas for the pleasure and recreation of the present generation.

The 50 million visitors to the parks were making it impossible for the Park Service to discharge its preservation responsibility, and so, in 1956, it submitted to Congress a 10-year $600 million program to provide facilities to handle 80 million visitors. That was the number of visitors anticipated in 1966 under the project, known to all of us now as Mission 66.

If Senators will refer to the table I have placed in the RECORD, they will find that the number of visitors to the Park Service areas went beyond 80 million in 1962—4 years ahead of the predicted time schedule. It should have been Mission 62 instead of Mission 66.

THE FOREST SERVICE RESPONSE

The National Forest Service responded to the recreation pressure on its facilities in the midfifties with Operation Outdoors, developed in 1956 and initiated in 1957.

Operation Outdoors was less than a one-tenth part of the program for the national forests submitted to Congress in 1957. The total program for the forests was estimated to cost $1.7 billion. Out of that total, $123 million was for 102 new family camping units and similar recreational facilities.

In 1961, when demand had overrun the original estimates and after President John F. Kennedy had called for greater emphasis on natural resources conservation, mentioning the forests specifically, the Forest Service revised its program upward by 50 percent to a $2.5 billion level. But it more than tripled the share of the recreational programs in the new allocation of funds. Instead of $123 million for recreation, the revision contained $409 millions for that purpose. To handle its more than 100 million annual visits, the Forest Service proposes the reconstruction and rehabilitation of 2,000 existing campgrounds; development of 28,000 new camping and picnic areas; development of 4,000 recreation sites where boating, swimming, winter sports, and other recreational uses can be served; and special developments at outstanding scenic and recreational areas which attract unusually large crowds.

Thus, the bold new programs of the fifties, proposed by both the Park Service and the Forest Service—Mission 66 and Operation Outdoors—proved overly conservative.

It should be said, in fairness, that program proposals which reach Congress are almost invariably more modest than the original agency proposals. There is a Budget Bureau between the agency and Congress, with an eye on the dollar and the budget balance, and too little contact with the realities of life out where people live. For example, the Bureau for some years vetoed any appropriation request in behalf of the Fish and Wildlife Service for recreation, although millions of visitors were pouring into the game ranges and refuges every year. The visitors had to be policed, the garbage picked up and essential recreation services performed by staff and facilities pirated from other budget items.

Unquestionably, the Park Service and the Forest Service originally sought more adequate programs than those which were finally proposed to the Congress.

By 1958 it had become apparent even to us in the Congress that we had a bear by the tail—almost literally. We were trying to handle a bigger problem than we had realized by a handle which was wholly inadequate to the situation.

Congress enacted a bill which I was privileged to introduce in the Senate and which Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, of Colorado, introduced in the House, establishing a national Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

We instructed that Commission to inventory and evaluate the outdoor recreation resources and opportunities of the Nation, to determine the types and location of such resources and opportunities which will be required by present and future generations; and in order to make comprehensive information and recommendations leadings to these goals available to the President, the Congress, and the individual States and territories. Also the Commission shall compile such data and in the light of the data so compiled and of the information available concerning trends in population, leisure, transportation, and other factors, shall determine the amount, kind, quality, and location of such outdoor recreation resources and opportunities as will be required by the year 1976 and the year 2000, and shall recommend what policies should best be adopted and what programs initiated, at each level of government and by private organizations and other citizen groups and interests, to meet such future requirements.

The chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senator JACKSON, made a splendid, concise statement on Friday last of the nature of the Commission, its membership and its recommendations leading up to the presentation of the measure before the Senate, S. 20, and of the contents of the bill.

The Commission, appointed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower, followed the mandate of the bill. It was bipartisan, including four Senators and four Representatives equally divided between the parties. The seven citizen members appointed by Mr. Eisenhower were, as the bill directed, "citizens known to be informed about and concerned with the preservation and development of outdoor recreation resources and opportunities, and experienced in resource conservation planning for multiple resource uses."

The report of the Commission was a conscientious effort to find the best possible solutions to growing recreation demands.

This is not a Kennedy new idea measure, although the President is to be highly praised for the strong support he has given it and the whole recreation program.

S. 20 is the product of two decades of national experience with burgeoning recreation demands followed by one of the finest examples of bipartisan—indeed, nonpartisan—study and planning that will be found in the history of our country.

Seldom have a group laid their partisanship aside so completely, outlined factual studies, enlisted technicians and experts in the field, and made so thorough a study of a major national problem.

The bill which created the Commission was introduced on February 5, 1957, by Senators Anderson, Murray, Watkins, Carroll, Barrett, Kuchel, Allott, Neuberger, Morse, Mundt, and Goldwater—six Republicans and five Democrats.

The congressional posts on the Commission were divided equally between the parties. The politics of some of the commissioners appointed by President Eisenhower aren't known to most of us.

We can assume that the Chairman of the Commission, Mr. Laurance Rockefeller, brother of the Republican Governor of New York, is a Republican. One or two other of the citizen members of the Commission could be suspected of being Republicans by their identities outside the Commission, but within the Commission there was no way to tell whether Joe Penfold of the Izaak Walton League, Dean Samuel Dana, of the University of Michigan, and any of the others were Democrats or Republicans. I can testify that they have acted on this work without political or partisan prejudice.

The whole group—including the congressional members—were citizens and conservationists working together to dig out the facts and develop a sound national recreation policy and program to supplant the piecemeal and inadequate efforts of the individual agencies of government at both the Federal and State levels.

The adjectives "piecemeal" and "inadequate" are used here without any implication of criticism whatever.

The National Park Service and the Forest Service were criticized for asking as much as they did in Mission 66 and Operation Outdoors. No one can properly do anything but commend them for their early responses to the emerging problem of surging recreational demand.

Congress was not so farseeing that we pressed extra authorizations and appropriations on them with an injunction to do more than they had proposed.

Nor is Congress to be criticized. When we realized the size of the problem, we made arrangements to get the facts by the creation of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

The report of the Commission is, to my way of thinking, one of the finest ever submitted to Congress. It was expensive. The Nation invested more than $2 million in its preparation. It is worth every penny if we carry it out. It is backed up by an extensive inventory of outdoor recreation areas in the Nation, including the names of approximately 10,000 of them, plus the managing agency, acreage, county location, facilities available and much other data. It is backed up further by 25 studies of special problems involved in planning a proper recreation program. There are studies of the place of wilderness in a recreation program, of shoreline resources, hunting, and fishing. There is an extensive study of the types of recreation people enjoy and of the quality required to give the users satisfaction. More than 16,000 people were questioned extensively on their recreation activities, reactions, and aspirations to determine accurately the nature and extent of public demand.

The Commission studied the proper role of each level of government in meeting recreation needs. Study No. 11 is of the private role in supplying outdoor recreation demand, a careful appraisal of how far the Government should go, and how much of the load private agencies and private enterprise can meet.

There was detailed analysis of Government agencies involved in the recreation field, and of how Government could best organize itself to carry on a recreation program.

Copies of the Commission report were sent to every Member of Congress and I hope that every Member will get out his copy and examine it carefully before we vote on S. 20. Its thoroughness cannot fail to impress any openminded person.

It is to the credit of the Commission that it did not do as so many commissions do, and dodge the tough, controversial questions.

The Commission outlined a recreation policy for the U.S. Government and then it blueprinted in detail how that policy should be translated into action programs. It made recommendations on where responsibilities should be assigned, what should be done, and how the bill for such work should be paid.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation established by Secretary of the Interior Udall in April last year was not only recommended by the Commission, but its functions were outlined in detail—the very same functions that S. 20 proposes to have it discharge.

The citizen members of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission served without compensation. They were all able people, unselfishly contributing many, many days of their time to their Government. We met for 50 days. It took at least that many more days to study over the reports and prepare for the meetings.

Those of us in Congress are accustomed to harsh comment. But I would deeply regret that men like Dean Samuel Dana, of the University of Michigan; Bernard Orell, of Weyerheuser Lumber; Frederick Smith, of the Prudential Life Insurance Co., and some of the other citizen members might have been disturbed by a stern statement in opposition, as their first recommendation comes to the floor. They deserve our very great gratitude.

Mr. President, we frequently need the assistance of gifted citizens in the solution of major problems. We have used such commissions of citizens many times. They have the ability to take

problems outside the partisan arena and study them objectively. None has ever done a finer job than this group, headed by Laurance Rockefeller. None has ever done a more conscientious job.

I am sure that the minority leader with his usual fairness, did not intend to indicate a lack of appreciation for what the citizen members of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission did. S. 20 is not a "bright new idea" of the Kennedy administration; in reality it is the thoughtful, carefully considered and unanimous recommendation of a bipartisan group including some very splendid and outstanding citizens.

There will be at least one more measure following this one before the present Congress to implement the ORRRC report. It is now before the Interior Committee. There has been some objection to some features in it. We are going to study them carefully in the committee. I am hopeful that a fine bill will finally be presented to the Senate.

So, the sharp comment which has been made about S. 20, may ultimately serve an excellent purpose in identifying the source of this piece of recreation legislation and the impelling reasons why it has come before us with strong bipartisan support.

I trust that it will pass and I am gratified that the minority leader has relented somewhat on his call for all-out resistance to the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as indicated by the majority leader, I had intended to ask for a yea-and-nay vote; and by unanimous consent it was determined that that vote would come on Tuesday, March 12, at 3 o'clock p.m.

I prefer to have the yea-and-nay vote come on an implementing bill which, so far as I can tell, will shortly be reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. That bill is S. 859. It provides the sinew and the substance to give real validity to the pending bill.

However, I am still opposed to the bill, as such, which is before the Senate. I am opposed to it because, in effect, it enlarges the functions of a bureau which was created by an order of the Secretary of the Interior last year. The bill now contains a congressional finding and, in addition, spells out a vast variety of authority that shall be handled through the Bureau for Outdoor Recreation. The only allusion in the bill to funds is that the Bureau shall have authority to accept donations and contributions.

I believe we are faced with the enactment of a bill which would authorize Treasury advances, over a period of 8 years, of a maximum of $60 million a year. Those advances would be interest free; and if the whole potential were authorized and were utilized, it would mean that this Bureau in the Department of the Interior could then expend up to $480 million to advance moneys for the purpose recited in the pending bill. There would be no requirement to repay out of the so-called fund, to be established in the companion bill, until the 11th year. That is just another method of back-door financing.

I do not know why these bills were not combined. I do not know why the whole package, including the authorization and the funds to be used to cover those authorizations, was not set before us in a single bill. However, the fact is that the bill before the Senate is a naked authorization and a finding. That is extremely interesting, because in the very first section of S. 20 the bill recites:

> That the Congress finds and declares that the general welfare of the Nation requires that all American people of present and future generations shall be assured such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources as are necessary and desirable.

Mr. President, that is a pretty big package, I must say, when we talk about the quantity and the quality which are needed and are desirable . It reminds me of a former British Prime Minister, of whom someone once asked, "Why don't you let the country live like gentlemen?"

The Prime Minister replied, "To let the country live like gentlemen would soon mean bankruptcy for the Empire."

Mr. President, there ought to be some limitations provided in the bill. The bill contains rather fancy words, when it extends a finding by Congress as to how far we shall go in this field.

Mr. President, in the order issued on April 2, 1962, by the Secretary of the Interior, the so-called spending functions of the National Park Service were transferred to the new Outdoor Recreation Bureau. This, then, under S. 20, now before us, is an expansion and the creation of a great many new functions which this agency would undertake. In a sense it is, then, a new function; and, as such, it will require new obligational authority, which will come in a later bill, in the form of advances.

Mr. President, I would be the last Member of the Senate to be opposed to the development of the outdoor resources of this country. I was born in the country; I sort of grew up in the country; I have the same deep desire to enjoy the outdoors that anyone else does; and I do wish to see those functions properly developed. But I have to measure the undertaking of a vast function at this time—and I emphasize the words "at this time"—against the fiscal problems presently before us.

We are confronted with what is popularly referred to as a $99 billion budget. But, Mr. President, actually we are not confronted with a $99 billion budget; we are confronted with a $108 billion budget, because the $99 billion budget, as has been emphasized, is the administrative budget; it is the spending budget. However, it does not include the new obligational authority, which amounts to a little more than $9 billion. So let us be realistic about this matter, and put the budget in the correct light, and call it what it is; namely, a $108 billion budget.

We are confronted with an amazing deficit—estimated various at up to $12 billion—for the fiscal year 1964.

The rest of the fiscal program embraces the recommendations of the President that there be tax reduction and tax reform, scattered over a 3-year period; so that probably the net budget deficit might be in the $10 or $11 billion range.

Mr. President, what a strange thing to make a request for tax reduction and a $108 billion budget, and then undertake $9 billion of new functions and activities, and in so doing jeopardize the solvency of our country. That is the matter which concerns me; and I intend to lift my voice against these new authorizations. Furthermore, others will be requested, including some for the domestic Peace Corps, which presently is in the making.

I am advised that at 736 Jackson Place, in Washington, D.C., applications for the domestic Peace Corps are being accepted—although, in fact, Congress has not acted on that subject, and there is no domestic Peace Corps. But one can go to that address on Jackson Place—only a stone's throw from the White House—and can procure a form 57, to make application for work in an agency which does not exist.

That situation reminds me of the old ditty:

> The other day upon the stair,
> I saw a man who wasn't there.
> He wasn't there again, today.
> I hope that man will go away.

In short, Mr. President, this agency "isn't there," but, notwithstanding that fact, it is accepting applications. I think that is a rather astonishing state of affairs. It is in the field of new obligational authority, new functions, and new activities, along with the Youth Corps and others.

So, Mr. President, in light of our fiscal responsibilities and the obligations which will be placed upon the Government and upon the country's taxpayers, I do not see—in all good conscience—how Congress can undertake to authorize new functions and to spend additional sums and to derive them by a very interesting and appealing back-door method, because the companion bill, on which hearings have been held, and which I apprehend will in the not-too-distant future inch itself to the floor of the Senate, for consideration, contains an authorization for advances from the Treasury over an 8-year period, interest free. If my arithmetic is worth anything, I find that eight times $60 million is $480 million. Furthermore, the bill provides that repayment will not begin until the 11th year. So $480 million in advances from the Treasury, interest free, would be authorized; and then there would be a hiatus or a grace period of 3 years, before certain revenues would be supposed to be available out of the conservation fund, in order to be able to make reimbursement.

Mr. President, that is an ingenious proposal; but it occurs to me that the appropriate way would be to come in with this bill and with a request for the required appropriations, and then permit the Senate to work its will upon the proposal, because that is not only the simple approach; it is also the accepted approach; and, in my judgment, it is the constitutional approach.

Mr. President, returning to the bill now before us, let me point out that it would do the following, among other things: It would provide for an inventory of the needs and resources of our people in the field of outdoor recreation. It calls for an evaluation of those needs and resources. It provides for a system of classification of those resources. It calls for a nationwide plan of needs and "demands."

Mr. President, I presume there are a great many things that could be demanded; but, after all, the criterion should be whether we can afford them in the light of the program the President has submitted to Congress. Among other things, another function or activity would be "to identify outdoor problems." Mr. President, that is a mouthful.

We could gather a whole team of people—in fact, battalions of people—put them on the payroll, and send them forth in the country to identify outdoor problems, and they would never run out of identification work.

Then, of course, comes the crux of the thing—to recommend solutions for the problems. Those problems could be legion. I presume the solutions would be legion, too. Then to identify desirable actions by local governments—what an endless job that would be.

Then they would submit a so-called 5-year plan. It seems to me that I have heard of 5-year plans before in other areas of the earth. After the first 5-year plan, the program would doubtless require modification; so there would be authority to adduce and submit a second 5-year plan, with all necessary future revisions.

Then our old friend appears—research. Research is one of those words which have crept into the contemporary lexicon. It can cover a multitude of sins as well as a multitude of virtues.

Then they will be authorized to contract for studies. What kind of studies? Education programs, technical assistance, and other agencies. Other agencies would be allowed to spend their own money to help, with or without reimbursement. There is latitude like a 40-acre field when we say to an agency of government, "Any other agency can help you with its own funds." That has about it an aura of indirect appropriation in my book.

Perhaps it would be interesting to test out a point of order on some of the language that we find in Senate bill 20 now before us.

Mr. President, all the new authority proposed would be meaningless unless it were implemented with money. The necessary money is not provided in the pending bill. It will come in Senate bill 859. Senate bill 859 is, to say the least, an interesting bill. It is called the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1963. It contains wording which is similar, identic, and comparable to what is contained in Senate bill 20, now before us. There again appear the words "quality and quantity as are necessary and desirable." Then the bill provides funds for "Federal acquisition of certain land and water areas."

Mr. President, where are the funds to be obtained to give implementation to Senate bill 20? The related provision begins on page 2 of Senate bill 859, which was introduced on February 19 of this year by quite a number of cosponsors. What is the first source of funds? It would be "entrance and user fees." These are the entrance and user fees that cover our national outdoor resources, our parks, and recreational areas; and it would be for the President to determine what the fees and charges should be.

Among other things, the bill provides:

> The proceeds from fees or charges established by the President pursuant to this subsection for entrance or admission generally to Federal areas shall be used solely for the purposes of this act.

So we see in that provision a grant of authority to the President of the United States to impose a fee, an admission charge, or a user charge. It is not unlike providing authority to impose a tax.

When that suggestion was made in a larger frame last year, Congress got its hackles up about the idea of giving the President authority to modify taxes at its own will and desire. But now we see again proposed a grant of authority to the President of the United States to impose charges at the very same time that deep concern has been manifested to make sure that people in the low- and middle-income tax brackets get their full and fair share of the tax cut. So it is suggested that we put the cut for those people in one place, and put a new charge on them in another. No wonder that item begot such animated conversation and discussion in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. No wonder the committee members fulminated about user charges and admissions.

Mr. President, there is a broader grant of authority with respect to fees and user charges. These would apply to the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Forest Service, the Corps of Engineers, and the U.S. section of the International Boundary and Water Commission.

This is the authority:

> The President is authorized to provide for the establishment, revision, or amendment of entrance, admission, and other recreation user fees and charges at any land or water area administered by or under the authority of the Federal agencies listed in the preceding paragraph: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not authorize Federal hunting or fishing licenses, nor shall it authorize fees or charges for commercial or other activities not related to recreation.

Mr. President, in S. 859 and I think in S. 20, there is a provision for utilization of some of these areas for commercial purposes.

I point out the grant of power, and I point out the sources of funds to go into the so-called conservation fund with which to reimburse that fund after 8 years of interest-free advances; the reimbursement not to begin until the 11th year.

There is another source of funds, Mr. President, and that is surplus property sales. If I read that section correctly, it would take in what we receive on all sales of real property and related personal property, with an exception. And, insofar as I can tell, that exception is nothing more than the $8½ million of administrative expenses which are authorized in the independent offices appropriation bill.

In addition, there is another source of funds. That is the motorboat fuels tax.

Finally, there may be one or two other items in the bill of no particular moment.

But those, Mr. President, are the funds which are to be taken from Treasury receipts, and at some time 11 years from now to be used in order to reimburse the Treasury Department for these recreation and conservation purposes.

This is an astonishing approach, Mr. President. It could not have been more complicated if they had set out to make it so. I do not know whether the commission which was set up in the nature of an advisory commission in the Eisenhower administration to make all these recommendations did so or not, but they certainly could have brought it within the frame of simple appropriations, instead of 8 years of tax free advances.

I emphasize one other thing, and that is that this is essentially and definitely a new function. We ought to be pretty careful about expanding the functions of government at a time when the whole fiscal fabric is so uneasy, when there is a hope that a huge and deep tax slash can get the country from its sideways motion and get it to moving again, a hope so earnestly expressed some 2 years ago, shortly after the inauguration.

One should not trifle with the solvency of the country at a time like this, and I do not propose to do so. So I am opposed to what is before us today, though not because I oppose the objectives as such. I think those are desirable. The question is, What can we afford in the country at a given time?

Government financing in a sense is not unlike family financing. If a family is to spend out of pocket for the things which are desirable, as the bill points out, how long can it remain solvent? How long can the family maintain solvency and credit?

How long will it be before government credit will become a little shaky, in view of the fact that the Congress in this session will be confronted with a request to boost the public debt to perhaps $320 billion or $325 billion, and to accept a deficit, and to put the imprimatur of approval upon not a $99 billion budget, Mr. President, but upon a $108 billion budget? Let us be honest about it, because the new obligational authority may begin with a little money this year, but it will become the predicate for increases year after year, and year after year, and the budget will then start going into orbit all over again. That is what we are confronted with at the present time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief observation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This morning I appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency, with respect to the mass transportation bill. That supposedly involves a 3-year expenditure of $500 million by way of gifts, but it was thoroughly apparent during the questions that were asked that the program will not be a 3-year program but, in all probability, a permanent program. There is an example of the built-in authorizations and what eventualy occurs—growing larger and larger all the time, making us more and more incapable of reducing the debt and more and more incapable of reducing the deficits, precipitating us into fiscal trouble of graver and graver consequence all the time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If my friend from Ohio wants a classic example, I point out to him that the Peace Corps started with $5 million of borrowed funds. The next year they asked for and received $30 million. The following year they received $58 million. If the Senator will take a look at that unexpurgated Sears, Roebuck catalog we call the U.S. budget he will find that for fiscal year 1964 they do not want $5 million, or $30 million, or $58 million—they are asking for $108 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If one wants an example of classic growth, there it is.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the 6 years I have been in the Senate I have repeatedly listened to the argument that the initial expenditure for a proposed new program was inconsequential; but during those 6 years it has repeatedly been shown, time after time, that what in the beginning was inconsequential grew into proportions of great consequence as the years went by. Not a single one of the programs that began in a sort of miniature size failed to grow. They never stayed at that small size. They never got smaller. They grew and grew all the time, like Topsy. That has been my experience in the 6 years I have been in the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I remind my distinguished friend from Ohio that some years ago—and I think my figures are correct—there was an interesting little board in Government called the Board of Geographic Names. It was in the Department of the Interior, as I recall. In that bureau were three persons. Their job was to examine and to ascertain where our soldiers were serving, to find the names of villages, towns, and so forth, and have diacritical marks placed on the names so soldiers could pronounce them.

I am not positive, but the next time I looked into the matter, it did not have 3 employees; there were 100 persons in that bureau.

Talk about getting liquidated—it is like pulling teeth. The best medicine is not to let them get out of hand in the first instance. Then we will not have to fight all over hell's half acre to get them liquidated.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The aspects of the problem pointed out by the Senator from Illinois are serious, but there is another facet to the problem which, in my opinion, is graver. Those who say we spend little, that we should not worry about it, are making that argument knowing in their minds that next year they are going to ask for substantial increases. That is the grave aspect of the problem. It is grave because on one side we are fighting juvenile delinquency, badness of youth, while on the other side, by our example, by our approach to problems, we are showing a base, a twisted, a deceptive mind, knowing, as time goes on, that the innocent presentations made at the beginning are going to become entirely false by what, in our expectation, is going to be done in the future.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, I can say to my friend from Ohio that when I came here 30 years ago the Federal budget was a little over $4 billion for all purposes, including national defense. I do not ask the country to stand still. I do not expect it to stand still. I expect funds to be expended, that appropriations will grow from year to year; but I do expect, in connection with annual appropriations and the contingent liabilities of Government, that the Government will maintain a posture which does not jeopardize our solvency, for if the time ever came when we had to use a peremptory weapon like a moratorium, I would not like to see the shudder in the chancellories of the world and what would happen to credit. It would make October 29, 1929, look like a picnic before we got through.

Let us stop for a moment to consider the commitments that have been made. We owe the civil service retirement fund $37 billion. We agreed solemnly as a Congress that we would put in half and match the fund for every Federal employee. There are over 600,000 former Federal employees living in a retired status. They paid their share because we took it out of their pay checks. The Government has not paid its share. We owe that fund $37 billion. Perhaps we can put a moratorium on it. Perhaps we can engage in fancy financing if we like. But we still owe it, and it is a Government obligation. We owe the military funds and a great many other funds. There are so many contingent liabilities we have that it will probably amount to $450 billion before we get through.

We know the status of our fiscal structure. We cannot duck it. We cannot continue to put straws on the camel's back, under those circumstances, without inviting trouble.

Mr. President, there is little I need add to what I have said. This is a new function that is proposed. I am quite familiar with provisions for matching and the division as between the Federal Government and the States. I know about the payback provisions. I know the differences between matching and planning as distinguished from acquisition and development. But the fact of the matter is that this is a new authorization for expenditure. The provision for the money will come very shortly out of the same committee that sent this bill to the Senate floor. It will mean new obligations at a time when our fiscal problems are of the most solemn and serious nature.

Deep as my devotion is to the whole question of outdoor recreation, I still believe our first obligation is to the continuing solvency of the United States of America. That is the overriding consideration. That is the reason why I raise my voice with respect to the bill that is before us today.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to address myself for a few moments to the pending business, S. 20, which expresses the interest of the Congress in recreational facilities throughout this country.

The rapid progress which our Nation is making on all fronts—in automation, transportation, technology, education, and research—tends to provide increasing amounts of leisure for our people. It is most appropriate for us to recognize that our increased time from labor can cause us many headaches in the future unless we make every effort to see that it will be used in a healthy fashion. We must be sure that it will not evolve into simply time on our hands—into an excuse for boredom and lethargy.

We all know how difficult a problem the blessings of agricultural surpluses has become for us. We do not know what to do with good fortune; and the situation will grow worse until we make preparations to meet it.

So it is with leisure. We must be prepared to use it wisely, or it will confront us with seeds of decay.

Recreation, and its handmaiden, tourism, is a most important industry in my State of Vermont. I believe most sincerely that these two luxuries will soon become a very important necessity both to our economy and to the well-being of the American people. Vermonters have recognized this, and we have been making great strides to provide increased recreational and tourist facilities throughout our State.

Turning to the bill, S. 20, itself, I want to make two comments.

First, I am glad to see that the committee has amended the bill to include private interests, in its technical assistance provisions, and not simply to limit such assistance to State and political subdivisions.

Second, I am happy to note that the bill requires the Government to cooperate with educational institutions in research and other educational programs and activities to encourage wise use of leisure through recreation.

Mr. President, this bill is a step in the right direction. We recognize the perils of ever increasing leisure time unless we seek means to provide for its wise use. I am sure Vermont will play an ever increasing role in the rapidly expanding recreation and tourist industries. Already my State is well on the way with its plans for the future in this area. Fortunately, with a program such as is contemplated in this bill, coupled with the energies of the people of Vermont and other sections of the country, we will be prepared to prevent leisure from becoming an excuse for idleness.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to add a few words on the general subject covered by Senate bill 20, though probably not exactly in line with what the distinguished minority leader has said. I also wish to make a few remarks with respect to Senate bill 859 while I am speaking.

In the first place, I want to make it perfectly clear that I shall support the bill now that it includes the amendment which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico added earlier in the day, which provides that Revised Statutes section 3648, 39 U.S.C. 4154, will not be wholly done away with in the operation of the proposed act. That section provides that the United States may not pay for services or for goods until they have been performed or delivered.

The bill now pending, S. 20, as originally written, authorized the Secretary of Interior to make payments without regard for the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes. In my opinion, such a provision was unthinkable, and I have never been shown any real reason why the exemption should be allowed with the exception of educational institutions.

In committee we struck out that portion of the bill, and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has submitted—and the Senate has adopted—an amendment which provides that it shall apply only with respect to research with regard to educational institutions or other nonprofit organizations.

While this particular amendment is satisfactory to me, I believe that we should make exceptions to the original act only in most unusual circumstances. We do in this instance with respect to educational institutions and nonprofit organizations, upon the basis that they cannot get these projects started unless in some instances the Government does provide funds with which to start them.

For the sake of legislative history on the bill I wish to call attention to the fact that the amendment as adopted refers to "initial" costs of such research. It provides an exemption for initial costs of such research if the Secretary deems it necessary. It is not an accident that the word "initial" is included. It is in there because it is meant to be in there. It means that the Government shall not finance these projects in advance, carte blanche, but that only the initial cost shall be taken care of, and then only with respect to educational institutions and other nonprofit organizations.

Upon this basis I will support the bill. It should be observed, however, that what we are really doing is to give legislative sanction to a bureau already established and in operation—this one was set up a year ago. Our action today is ex post facto, a practice we have had to engage in many times in the last 2 years.

I must say that the gentleman who heads this Bureau, Mr. Crafts, is one of the most capable Government employees I have ever met. I have great faith in his integrity and in his ability to do a good job with respect to these recreational resources.

I wish to say, too, that what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has said is accurate. We are now operating, without any authority from Congress, with something like 75 people, if I recall correctly, in this unauthorized Bureau of the Federal Government, set up by the Secretary of the Interior. Mr. Crafts says that if the bill is enacted there will be 200 employees by the end of the year. Therefore, Parkinson's law is in operation.

When we get to the consideration of S. 859, which is the land funding portion of this bill, and which provides for a system of user fees to all national parks and all national forests, for a tax on motor fuel, and then goes to the absurdity of providing that all money realized from the sales of Federal surplus property, real and personal, will also go into this fund, I expect to have a little more to say. I wish to say right now that when that bill comes on the floor it is going to be discussed at great length. I do mean great length. It violates many basic principles of taxation, and in my opinion, as it now reads, in its present form, it is wholly unacceptable.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I would be the last person to suggest that there are not some good things which would flow from the passage of S. 20 and that there are not some worthwhile groups and individuals interested in this subject.

Certainly what I am about to say does not reflect upon the fine Senators who have interested themselves in the proposed legislation.

I shall oppose the bill, and my reason is quite simple. I believe that we are so far in debt, that our deficit is so large, that we have to say no to some desirable things. At this time I will not try to establish a priority of what proposals are most desirable. The simple fact remains that our national debt will have increased in the first 4 fiscal years of this administration by $30 billion. I called the Treasury to ask what was the average rate of interest paid on the debt, and, as I recall it, I was told it was 3.288. This means that the Government of the United States in 4 years has placed upon the backs of the people an additional billion dollars a year in interest alone. It means that year after year after year, unless at some time we start paying off this debt, it will carry a penalty for the mismanagement of Government in these 4 years of a billion dollars a year.

Frankly, I am concerned about the people who are entitled to some recreation. I think they can get a little more enjoyable recreation if the burdens of Government are not quite so heavy.

Therefore, I shall not support the pending bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the outdoor recreation resources review report appearing at page 122, entitled "Its Creation and Composition," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITS CREATION AND COMPOSITION

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should be created by vesting it with authority to carry out the functions proposed for it and transferring to it those national recreation planning responsibilities now lodged in the Secretary of the Interior and exercised by the National Park Service under the Park, Parkway, and Recreational Area Study Act of 1936.

The new Bureau should be headed by a Director and should have a small, highly qualified planning and administrative staff in Washington. Wherever possible, the Bureau should be staffed by transfer of experienced personnel from existing agencies. Regional offices should be located so as to provide effective assistance to other Federal and State agencies.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on January 31, 1962, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission submitted a report to the 87th Congress and to President Kennedy. The report was based on an exhaustive 3-year study by that Commission, a Commission, incidentally, created by the 85th Congress during the previous administration, bipartisan in composition, headed by Laurance Rockefeller, and numbering its members several of my distinguished colleagues here present. The several citizen members of that Commission were appointed by President Eisenhower.

This report made a number of specific recommendations designed to assure adequate outdoor recreational opportunity for living Americans—today—and for generations yet unborn—tomorrow. Prominent among these recommendations was one to establish in the Federal Government a bureau to act as a focal point for the planning and coordination of outdoor recreation programs. The need for such an organization was so obvious and so urgent that the administration, acting under the authority of the Reorganization Act of 1950, shifted certain funds and certain functions from other bureaus and established in the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

A bill introduced in the last Congress, which passed the Senate, would have given formal congressional sanction to this action. That bill, however, included an additional provision for grants to the States for outdoor recreational planning, and at the late stage in the session when it reached the House, it was not possible for that body to explore sufficiently all the ramifications of the proposal, so the measure was not enacted. This bill we are considering today, S. 20, does not include that provision. Its purpose is to give congressional recognition to the establishment of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and to delineate what its functions and responsibilities shall be.

Attempts have been made to demonstrate a relationship between this measure and S. 859 which would establish a land and water conservation fund and provide how such a fund would be used. But at this time I want to point out emphatically that there is no connection between these two measures other than that both relate to outdoor recreation. This bill, S. 20, gives specific statutory status to a small bureau which can coordinate the outdoor recreational activities of more than 20 Federal and more than 500 State agencies which have responsibilities in this field. Further, this Bureau will act as a focal point for the planning needed to assure the orderly development of the facilities required to meet the mushrooming demands of Americans for outdoor recreational opportunity. Its budget request is moderate, only $1,115,000 more than has been appropriated in the past for two National Park Service functions now being performed by that Bureau.

Yet it has the mission of developing a national outdoor recreation plan, of coordinating State recreational planning, of aiding the States in all aspects of outdoor recreation, of reviewing and coordinating the outdoor recreational programs of some 20 Federal agencies to prevent overlap, eliminate unnecessary expense, and to assure that Federal investment in this field is best designed to meet national needs, of stimulating needed research, and of disseminating needed information and educational material.

It contemplates a staff of only 225 employees to perform its broad responsibilities.

This is a long-needed planning and coordinating agency in the outdoor recreation field. It will prevent waste and duplication of effort. It will see that Federal, State and local recreation programs follow an orderly pattern. Its formation follows the recommendation of a bipartisan commission established during the last administration. I urge passage of S. 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question now is, Shall it pass?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the bill was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds and declares that the general welfare of the Nation requires that all American people of present and future generations shall be assured such quantity and quality of outdoor recreation resources as are necessary and desirable, and that prompt and coordinated action is required by all levels of government and by private interests on a nationwide basis to conserve, develop, and utilize such resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the American people.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, after consultation with the Recreation Advisory Council and with the heads of Federal departments and agencies concerned, to perform the following functions and activities:

(a) INVENTORY.—Prepare and maintain a continuing inventory and evaluation of outdoor recreation needs and resources of the United States.

(b) CLASSIFICATION.—Prepare a system for classification of outdoor recreation resources to assist in the effective and beneficial use and management of such resources.

(c) NATIONWIDE PLAN.—Formulate and maintain a comprehensive nationwide outdoor recreation plan, taking into consideration the plans of the various Federal agencies, States and their political subdivisions. The plan shall set forth the needs and demands of the public for outdoor recreation and the current and foreseeable availability in the future of outdoor recreation resources to meet those needs. The plan shall identify critical outdoor recreation problems, recommend solutions, and identify the desirable actions to be taken at each level of government and by private interests. The Secretary shall transmit the initial plan, which shall be prepared as soon as practicable within five years hereafter, to the President for transmittal to the Congress. Future revisions of the plan shall be similarly transmitted at succeeding five-year intervals. When a plan or revision is transmitted to the Congress, the Secretary shall transmit copies to the Governors of the several States.

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Provide technical assistance and advice to and cooperate with States, political subdivisions, and private interest including nonprofit organizations with respect to outdoor recreation.

(e) REGIONAL COOPERATION.—Encourage interstate and regional cooperation in the planning, acquisition, and development of outdoor recreation resources.

(f) RESEARCH AND EDUCATION.—(1) Sponsor, engage in, and assist in research relating to outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreements, and make payments for such purposes, including advance payments without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (39 U.S.C. 4154) for initial costs of such research to any educational institution or other nonprofit organizations when necessary and in the public interest; (2) undertake studies and assemble information concerning outdoor recreation, directly or by contract or cooperative agreement, and disseminate such information without regard to the provisions of section 321n, title 39, United States Code; and (3) cooperate with educational institutions and others in order to assist in establishing education programs and activities and to encourage public use and benefits from outdoor recreation.

(g) INTERDEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION.—(1) Cooperate with and provide technical assistance to Federal departments and agencies and obtain from them information, data, reports, advice, and assistance that are needed and can reasonably be furnished in carrying out the purposes of this Act; and (2) promote coordination of Federal plans and activities generally relating to outdoor recreation. Any department or agency furnishing advice or assistance hereunder may expend its own funds for such purposes, with or without reimbursement, as may be agreed to by that agency.

(h) DONATIONS.—Accept and use donations of money, property, personal services, or facilities for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. The term "United States" as used in this Act shall include the District of Columbia; and, to the extent practicable in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the terms "United States" and "States" may include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MORSE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY AND PROGRAM FOR THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on Thursday next, it is the intention of the leadership to call up the money resolutions which affect the conduct of affairs of the various committees during the year.

A DES MOINES NEGRO VIEW

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "District of Columbia Negro Paper Backs POWELL," written by Richard Wilson and published in the Des Moines Sunday Register of March 3, 1963.

The article relates some of the problems with respect to the recent furor over the actions of a Member of the House of Representatives, and also includes an editorial entitled "A Des Moines Negro View," which first appeared in the Iowa Bystander, a weekly newspaper published at Des Moines by and for Negroes. The editorial takes a point of view of the situation entirely different from that expressed in a Washington, D.C., newspaper published for Negroes.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, Mar. 3, 1963]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NEGRO PAPER BACKS POWELL

(By Richard Wilson)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Critics of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL should not indulge in the illusion that he lacks prestige in the nationwide Negro community, or that the recent attacks on POWELL have shaken this prestige very much.

POWELL is much admired as a symbol even by those who may deplore some of his acts. He seems to many Negroes to be one of their race who has broken through racial prejudice to stand on his own as an individual.

In Washington, with its 54 percent Negro population and its 84 percent Negro school enrollment, criticism of POWELL rasps on raw nerves in the Negro community.

REACTED ANGRILY

The Washington Afro-American, one of the chain of newspapers which strongly affects Negro opinion, reacted angrily to the attempt of Clark R. Mollenhoff of the Register's Washington bureau to pin down POWELL at a press conference. The prize-winning investigative reporter was probing POWELL on the charges of Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, Republican of Delaware, who accuses POWELL of extensive abuses of his congressional position with the connivance of Kennedy administration officials.

The reporter, a Drake University football star once optioned to the New York Giants, was criticized in a page 1 story in the Afro-American both for his questions and his physical condition.

"The pasty-faced Mollenhoff, who resembled a former shotputter who has let himself go to pot, tried repeatedly with just a trace of preciousness in his slightly lisping voice to put POWELL on the spot," the article stated. It continued with its derision of the reporter but told little of either the questions or answers at the press conference.

An editorial in the Afro-American elaborated on these views, centering its attack on Senator Williams and Columnist Drew Pearson. The editorial predicted the day would come when "this great civil rights fighter [Powell] attains even greater heights."

"When he does," the editorial continued, "18 million colored thumbs are going to go up to 18 million colored noses to remind Drew Pearson and Senator Williams that 'what's good for you white geese is sure good for us colored ganders.' "

The editor of the Washington Afro-American is C. Sumner Stone, Jr., who signed his name to the page 1 news article as "Chuck Stone."

Stone will not long remain as editor of the Afro-American. He has been appointed public affairs officer in the U.S. Information Service and will be placed in charge of the office in Tanganyika. His responsibility there will be to carry out programs of USIA intended to give to the residents of the former British colony in east Africa a clear and accurate picture of conditions, opinions, attitudes, and culture of the United States.

Stone says that he expects to go to Tanganyika in April. He reinforces in conversation his views stated in the Afro-American.

"I could take you into the bars and barber shops and street corners in Washington and show you that 95 percent of the colored people think that the attack on Powell was clearly racial," he says.

"Powell has pulled a lot of deals we don't like, but if he is going to be criticized it has got to be on the Negro's terms."

ANOTHER NEGRO VIEW

It is impossible to convince Stone and most Negroes within sound and sight of Powell that Williams was inspired by anything but racial feelings in spite of his long record to the contrary, and in spite of the role he has played over many years in the exposure of serious abuses in Government.

Negroes sharing the view of Stone, and only grudgingly aware of Powell's long and flagrant violation of generally accepted congressional standards, white or Negro, cannot conceive of any but a racial reason for William's attack.

This is saddening. It is more saddening that Powell can play upon the misguided Negro racism which is so evident in the words and tone of the Washington Afro-American.

The dialog between the races in Washington does not seem to be improving in anywhere near the measure that the circumstances justify. Nor is it reassuring that the well-mannered, well-dressed, but passionately spoken Stone is going to Tanganyika to interpret America to the people and officialdom of an emerging nation.

DIFFERENT VIEW

Wet get quite a different view than Stone's of Negro attitudes when another Negro journalist, Simeon Booker, of Ebony magazine, speaks. Booker is writing a book which he intends to make a balanced account of the need for Negro self-improvement as well as a plea for the opening of fairer opportunities.

He points out that Powell does not have much support or sympathy "among people who think." Booker's tool is rationality; Stone's is emotion; Powell's is flimflam.

[From the Des Moines Sunday Register, Mar. 3, 1963]

A Des Moines Negro View

(The following editorial appeared in the Iowa Bystander, a weekly newspaper published at Des Moines by and for Negroes.)

It often happens that some people, placed in a position of responsibility and prominence, use this situation to abuse it by doing things a far less prepared citizen does. Representative Adam Clayton Powell, of New York, is an excellent example of this.

A minister of one of the largest churches in America, elected from a district comprising mostly Negroes and Puerto Ricans, Powell has moved up to chairmanship of the Health, Education, and Welfare Committee. In this post, he could be a power in Congress and serve as an example for younger people to point to with pride that a Negro had attained such a commanding position.

There are those who opposed his elevation to that high post but the system of seniority made the choice automatic.

However, Representative Powell, unlike some other Negroes serving in Congress, has abused his position by his continued absenteeism from duty, by loading up his staff far out of proportion to the other chairmen. He has abused the expenditure of public funds and he has failed or refused to pay his taxes to the Government which pays his salary.

These derelictions of duty have brought stern criticism from Members of both Houses to the extent never before witnessed, and all because the charges lodged against him are true.

Here is a public servant, a minister who, instead of conducting himself in a straightforward manner, has done many things which bring disgrace, distrust, and shame, while representing a district whose people are entitled to a leader who should bring honor and prestige to the position which he holds. There is no excuse for Representative Powell's conduct. It should not be condoned.

ADLAI STEVENSON'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE SOVIETS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Wilson Finds Adlai Slow To Understand Soviets," written by Richard Wilson and published in the Des Moines Register of March 7, 1963.

In his article, Mr. Wilson, a distinguished columnist, indicates some concern over the fact that the U.S. representative to the United Nations has apparently taken such a long time to come to grips with the nature of the international Communist conspiracy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Wilson Finds Adlai Slow To Understand Soviets

(By Richard Wilson)

Washington, D.C.—In an interview with the Associated Press, Adlai E. Stevenson has revealed the attitude of mind toward Russian negotiations which so many have found hard to understand.

With 2 years' experience as U.N. Ambassador, Stevenson says that he has changed his mind about the Russians. He has discovered that they will stubbornly support positions which they seem fully prepared to reverse when it is expedient to do so.

It seems odd that Stevenson would have had to learn such a lesson, for this has been the uniform experience of Secretaries of State for the last quarter of a century. Stevenson has been a student of foreign affairs for at least that long.

EXPECTED RUSSIA TO ACCOMMODATE

Stevenson's statement is implicit confirmation that the Kennedy administration came into office with the belief that a new set of conditions with Russia could be created. The United States should be able to accommodate itself in some ways to Russian policy, and, in turn, if the negotiators were skillful enough, Russian policy would make accommodations, too.

Thus Secretary Rusk began his "quiet" diplomatic moves. President Kennedy conferred with Premier Khrushchev. New thoughts were formulated by Walt W. Rostow, McGeorge Bundy, and Paul Nitze.

Under almost all conditions new solutions were pursued. About all this has proved was that the American political administration had changed, but the Russian political administration had not.

Still, the idea that the Russians could somehow be made to see the light was hard to put down. This frame of mind has persisted right through the Cuban crisis, manifesting itself in the care exercised in not pushing Khrushchev too far, too fast when he was so obviously on the run.

THINKS RUSSIANS CAN BE HANDLED

The result, to borrow a phrase from Columnist Arthur Krock, has been half-won victories, which the administration continually advertises as great triumphs.

In the wake of Khrushchev's withdrawal of missiles from Cuba a wave of euphoria washed over Washington. Large but poorly described changes were foreseen. There were premonitions of some new order in the world based on Khrushchev's back down and his quarrel with his Chinese allies. It was supposed that the noncommitted nations were losing their fascination with Russia. Administration officials spoke of the missile withdrawal as if it were some historic turning point.

But now all the airy castles built on the shifting sands of the imagined new world order are coming tumbling down. The cold war seems to have been renewed. Khrushchev is seen to have achieved important objectives in Cuba, though not all he sought. The test ban negotiations are again in a state of collapse. We are warned once again that Russia will burn us up if we touch Cuba.

TROOPS ARE STILL THERE

It does not appear that there is much to be gained by not pressing advantages against the Soviet Union to their full limit when it was possible to do so, as in Cuba. Now, months after the fullest pressure could have been brought, Russian troops are still in Cuba. We do not know how many are being taken out. Nor have we achieved all the aims we sought when we confronted the world with the imminent prospect of nuclear war.

There is enough now to confirm Stevenson's new-found wisdom about the Russians. We should keep the pressure on them when we can and gain the most from it. Only too soon they will have found new ways to move toward their unchanging general objectives.

SUMMERTIME STUDENT JOBS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Plum Jam," published in the Milwaukee Sentinel of March 7, 1963. The editorial relates to the recent announcement that appointments of student trainees to Federal jobs during the summertime will be cleared through the White House.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Plum Jam

Each year, more than 10,000 students are given summer jobs by the Federal Government. The jobs mainly are in Washington. Quite a bit of personal political patronage is involved, although the Civil Service Commission requires applicants to pass civil

service examinations for clerical, typist, and stenographer jobs. In the case of student trainee jobs, in which college students take Federal summer employment in what the Government hopes will be their Federal professions after graduation, they are selected from civil service registers.

Now a storm of protest has blown up in Congress following a report in the Washington Star that the White House has taken control of student job patronage. A clearance system reportedly has been set up whereby the names of all students who have filed applications for summer employment in Government agencies will be sent to the White House, along with information as to home States and the college attended (if any).

Assuming that it is essential in the first place to hire 10,000 students for summer Federal work, the action of the White House in having them all run through the Presidential funnel for clearance fouls the civil service system. Worse yet, this latest action appears to be but another example of a New Frontier attitude that is disdainful of the spirit, if not the law, of Federal civil service.

In a Senate speech rapping the White House student patronage plan, Senator Miller, Republican, of Iowa, accused the administration of having "an irresistible urge to play politics with our civil service system."

"First," Senator Miller recalled, "there was the shocking directive to civil service employees that they should be expected to participate in trying to sell proposed new programs to the general public. This was belatedly and grudgingly withdrawn due to the revulsion of the public in general and career civil service employees in particular. Next our civil service employees were pressured to buy $100 tickets to the Democratic fundraising dinner here through the clever device of having them invited to cocktail parties of their bosses if they had purchased a ticket. * * * And now, this administration apparently is not going to wait until people have civil service status for an opportunity to engage in partisan political activities."

The Kennedy administration defends the plan by saying that its primary concern is that the student talent be put to the best use possible and groomed for regular Federal employment when the youths graduate.

Despite this high sounding explanation, the plan is highhanded. It's something new in the way of harvesting political plums—pick 'em while they're green.

DELAY SOUGHT ON FEED GRAIN PROGRAM UNTIL AFTER WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Shuman Asks Congress To Wait Until After Wheat Referendum To Write Farm Laws," published in the American Farm Bureau Federation's official newsletter of March 4, 1963, together with table 1, which indicates the various factors which have ocurred in the reduction of the carryover of feed grains. The table points up in an excellent way why the reduction of the carryover in feed grains is due in very minute part to the emergency feed grain program of the last 2 years.

There being no objection, the article and table were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Shuman Asks Congress To Wait Until After Wheat Referendum To Write Farm Laws

Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, has urged Congress to delay any decision on the type of feed grain program to be in effect after 1963.

He said the legislators should wait until after the signup under the 1963 feed grain program has been completed and the result of the forthcoming wheat referendum is known.

At a House Agricultural Subcommittee hearing last Thursday, Mr. Shuman said that if the wheat referendum carries, "there still will be ample time to consider and adopt a feed grain program for 1964.

"If the wheat referendum does not carry, which we think more likely, then by all means this committee and the Congress should consider wheat and feed grains together.

"There is urgent need for a more effective, less costly, and less disruptive program," the Farm Bureau president declared.

"We pledge our support in helping to develop such a program when the results of the wheat referendum are known."

Here is the full text of Mr. Shuman's statement at the hearing:

"We appreciate the opportunity to discuss the operation and results of the 1961 and 1962 feed grain programs. We also would like to comment briefly on the 1963 feed grain program and its implications. Finally, we would like to discuss with this committee a course of action which we believe would be wise and best for farmers.

"Before we get into a detailed discussion of the feed grain program, we would like to urge strongly that this committee delay any decision on the type of feed grain program to be in effect after 1963, until (1) the signup under the 1963 feed grain program has been completed and announced and (2) the multiple-price wheat referendum has been held and the result is known.

Our reasons for asking the committee to delay any decision on a feed grain program are:

1. Most feed grains are spring planted. There will be ample time, after the wheat referendum, for action by Congress on a future program for feed grains.

2. The signup for the 1963 feed grain program will continue until at least March 22 (or later if the time is extended). No one knows until then what feed grain producer reaction will be to the 1963 compensatory payment program.

3. If the complicated, restrictive, multiple-price wheat program is approved in the upcoming referendum, one set of circumstances will prevail. On the other hand, if it is voted down, this will create substantially different conditions for wheat, feed grain, and livestock producers. If this happens, this committee and the Congress would then most certainly want to reanalyze the entire wheat, feed grain, and livestock problem in order to do justice to all producers. This committee should not tie its own hands by acting prematurely, without having all the facts necessary for sound judgment.

You are well aware of the fact that Farm Bureau has a membership of over 1,607,000 farm families in 49 States and Puerto Rico. Most of our members produce feed grains and livestock although many, of course, have a larger economic stake in other commodities. A large number produce wheat and feed grains. Our members strongly believe that feed grain and wheat legislation are closely related and that both affect livestock production and prices. We strongly believe that any future programs for feed grains and wheat should be considered together.

RESULTS OF 1961 AND 1962 FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS

The administration claims that the so-called emergency feed grain program has been a great success, since the buildup in supplies has been halted and some progress has been made in reducing carryover stocks. What are the facts?

Fact 1. A sizable majority of the eligible producers gave the program a "no confidence" vote by staying out, both in 1961 and 1962.

In 1961 only 42 percent of the farmers with corn and grain sorghum bases signed program contracts. In 1962 contracts were signed by 44 percent of the producers with corn and grain sorghum bases and 29 percent of those with barley bases.

Fact. 2. The acreage that was diverted under the program did not result in a corresponding reduction in feed grain plantings.

In 1961 the Government contracted for approximately 4 acres for each 3 acres by which corn and grain sorghum plantings were reduced from the 1959–60 base. In 1962 it contracted for approximately 5 acres for each 3½ acres by which corn, grain sorghums, and barley were reduced from the 1959–60 base.

In 1959–60 the total acreage planted to the four principal feed grains averaged 151.3 million acres.

In 1961 farmers planted 129.3 million acres to feed grains and were paid for diverting 26.7 million acres. Thus, the total of 156 million acres planted or diverted in 1961 was 4.7 million acres greater than 1959–60 plantings.

In 1962 farmers planted 125.9 million acres to feed grains and were paid for diverting 32.7 million acres. Thus, the total planted plus the acreage diverted rose to 158.6 million acres, or 7.3 million acres more than the average planted in 1959–60.

The increase in feed grain acreage (including diverted acreage) under the program reflects increased plantings by nonparticipating farmers and adjustments in the base acreage of participating producers.

Fact 3. The production of feed grains was reduced less than the reduction in acreage planted because yields increased.

Apologists for the program have attributed most of the 1961 increase in yields to weather. But yields rose again in 1962. (Per-acre corn yields averaged 53.8 bushels in 1959–60 and rose to 62 bushels in 1961 and 64.1 bushels in 1962.)

In 1961, as compared with the base period 1959–60, the acreage devoted to four feed grains was reduced 14.5 percent and the production of four feed grains (total tonnage basis) was reduced 7.9 percent.

In 1962, as compared with the 1959–60 base, the acreage devoted to four feed grains was reduced 16.8 percent and the production of four feed grains was reduced 6.2 percent.

Fact 4. The reduction in feed grain stocks has been due almost entirely to increased utilization and not to the Government program.

At the beginning of the 1961 marketing year, feed grain stocks totaled a record of 84.7 million tons.

By the beginning of the current marketing year stocks had been reduced to 71.8 million tons. Only a very small part of this reduction of 12.9 million tons can be attributed to the feed grain program.

The production of feed grains was reduced 15 million tons in 1961, but barley and oats—which were not included in the 1961 program—accounted for 3.1 million tons of this reduction.

One of the most significant factors in the feed grain situation is the increase in utilization which has been occurring. Domestic consumption and exports of feed grains increased 8.1 million tons in the marketing year 1961 (as compared with 1960).

To summarize, under the 1961 program, stocks were reduced 12.9 million tons, but if there had been no increase in utilization and no reduction in the production of feed grains not covered by the 1961 program, the reduction in carryover would have been less than 2 million tons.

It now appears that stocks will be reduced 10.8 million tons (from 71.8 to 61 million) during the 1962 marketing year. This reduction is almost entirely accounted for by increased utilization and a reduction in the production of oats. As compared with 1961, total production of feed grains increased 2.5 million tons (from 140.6 million tons to 143.1 million tons) and exports are expected to decline by about 1.7 million tons this year.

By the fall of 1962, feed grain stocks will have been reduced by a total of approximately 23.7 million tons from the 1961 level. But, if there had been no increase in utilization and no reduction in production of crops not under the program, the total reduction in stocks would be only a little over 2 million tons (see table I). Thus, 90 percent of the reduction in feed grain carryover was due to factors other than the effect of the emergency program.

Fact 5. The total direct cost—$1.7 billion—of the 1961 and 1962 feed grain programs cannot be justified by what has actually been accomplished under these programs.

MARKET PRICES DEPRESSED

Early in 1961, when this committee was discussing the 1961 feed grain program we spoke out against one of its most disturbing features. We called this the obvious threat to use the Government's huge surplus stocks to beat down the market price of feed grains. We denounced this proposal as a brandnew and fallacious concept. We continued to oppose the dumping of CCC feed grain stocks during the 1962 program. We have continually pointed out that this use of CCC stocks is bad for our market system for grain and that it severely penalizes producers who want to sell their feed grains on the market.

As we have already pointed out, considerably more than 50 percent of all feed grain producers stayed out of the feed grain program in 1961 and in 1962. Dumping CCC feed grains on the market held down their market price and, of course, lowered their incomes.

We also pointed out early in 1961 that dumping feed grain stocks onto the market would ultimately adversely affect poultry, dairy, and livestock production and prices for these commodities. Let us review briefly what has happened in this regard.

Poultry and dairy production have continued above what they would have been if CCC stocks of feed grains had not been dumped. Prices of both these commodities have been depressed because of this unwise action.

Numbers of hogs coming to market and cattle on feed and being marketed are also up considerably. Hog prices are down, and top cattle prices have taken one of the sharpest drops in history—over $7 per hundredweight since last fall. This, too, has been caused in part by the dumping of CCC stocks of feed grain.

We realize that some persons have supported the feed grain program on the ground that it has been an effective way of pouring "free money" from Washington into the feed grain areas. But what is happening currently to livestock, dairy, and poultry prices would indicate a loss in income to feed grain, poultry, dairy, hog, and cattle producers of several times the payments made to feed grain growers under the 1961 and 1962 programs.

THE 1963 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

As we stated previously, it is too early to determine the reaction of feed grain producers to the 1963 program and the results that can be anticipated from its operation. The signup period has several weeks to run.

The 1963 program has most of the bad features of the 1961 and 1962 programs and, in addition, contains a provision for Brannan-type compensatory payments. Since payments are to be made on the "normal" yield of planted acres, they encourage producers to participate on a minimum basis and to divert their poorest acres.

As members of this committee know, we are opposed to the compensatory payment concept. Our reasons for opposing payments are spelled out in our 1963 policies as adopted by the voting delegates of the member State Farm Bureaus:

"Compensatory payments are proposed in a variety of forms. Regardless of the form in which presented, the payment approach is unsound and dangerous to our economic and political system. It would be fantastically expensive and would stimulate production, increase unit costs, depress market prices, lead to tight production controls, and make farmers dependent on congressional appropriations for a substantial part of their total income.

"Limitations on payments to individuals would place a ceiling on opportunity and level farm incomes downward.

"Payment programs would socialize the production and distribution of food and fiber by having consumers pay a part of the cost through taxes—rather than full value at the store. This is a trap for producers. Ultimately, the payment approach also would be a trap for consumers, since it would encourage inefficiency and thereby result in high real costs of food and fiber.

"We vigorously oppose any system of compensatory payments for agriculture."

In summary, we strongly urge this committeee to delay any further action on a feed grain program until after the multiple price wheat referendum. If the wheat referendum carries, there still will be ample time to consider and adopt a feed grain program for 1964. If the wheat referendum does not carry (which we think more likely), then by all means this committee and the Congress should consider wheat and feed grains together.

Finally, we have pointed out why we believe the 1961, 1962, and 1963 feed grain programs have not, and will not, solve the basic problem in feed grain and livestock agriculture. There is urgent need for a more effective, less costly, and less disruptive program. We pledge our support in helping to develop such a program when the results of the wheat referendum are known.

TABLE I.—*Factors in the reduction of feed grain stocks*

[In million tons]

	1961	1962	Total
Reduction in production from 1960 of crops covered by program:			
Corn	7.9	7.4	15.3
Grain sorghum	4.0	3.1	7.1
Barley	------	0	0
Total	11.9	10.5	22.4
Reduction in production from 1960 of crops not covered by program:			
Barley	.8	------	.8
Oats	2.3	2.0	4.3
Total	3.1	2.0	5.1
Increase in utilization from 1960 marketing year	8.1	8.3	16.4
Net effect of reduction in production of crops not covered by program and increase in utilization on carryover	−11.2	−10.3	−21.5
Total reduction in carryover	12.9	10.8	23.7
Reduction in carryover due to feed grain program	1.7	.5	2.2

NOTE.—It may be argued that the carryover would have increased if there had been no feed grain program. The point, however, is that the program has done little except to stop the buildup. The reduction in accumulated stocks is almost entirely due to increased utilization and reduced production of feed crops not covered by the program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VENEZUELAN FARMERS WANT TO HELP THEMSELVES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently I received a copy of the January 16 issue of the South Dakota Union Farmer, a publication of the Farmers Union in the State of South Dakota. In that issue I found a splendid article entitled "Assignment in South America—Venezuelan Farmers Want To Help Themselves." The article was written by Arlene Schley, education director of the South Dakota Farmers Union, who had visited in South America.

I had the privilege of being in Venezuela last November; and I visited many of the rural areas, and took a great deal of interest in the rural development program.

The Government of Venezuela, under President Betancourt, is doing an admirable job in the area of what we call agrarian reform, including not only land distribution, but also—and of equal importance—the development of farm cooperatives and the development of supervised credit, at reasonable rates of interest, over a long period in which the farmers can make repayment. In these rural areas I also found the development of housing, public health, and general community programs. It was very encouraging to see people truly helping themselves. The remarkable record of educational development in the rural areas of Venezuela should give all of us encouragement.

In the article Miss Arlene Schley tells—for example—how people there would meet in the out-of-doors—"under the trees," as she writes—while they were working on the construction of new buildings to accommodate their community activities. Her article also points out some of the shortcomings, such as the lack of proper youth programs in the rural areas.

I believe the article will commend itself to the attention of every person who is really interested in what is developing under the Alliance for Progress, and also to the Members of Congress who recognize that rural development in these essentially agrarian countries is of the utmost importance.

I wish to compliment Arlene Schley upon her splendid article and upon the excellent sense of understanding and the perception which she has exhibited in the article. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the South Dakota Union Farmer, Jan. 16, 1963]

VENEZUELAN FARMERS WANT TO HELP THEMSELVES

(By Arlene Schley)

In Venezuela, the cooperation exhibited to us between the Federcion Campesino (FCV),

the Instituto Agraria Nacional (IAN), and the Ministerio de Agriculture (MAC) stands out as one of the most gratifying aspects of the entire mission. Apparently, at times, there are some areas of disagreement between these groups as any country has overlapping of responsibilities and personality problems. I firmly believe that the way they worked together on our behalf may have far-reaching effects on their close working relationships in the future.

Prior to our visit to Venezuela and during our first week in Caracas, each of the three agencies contacted their offices in the field to notify them of our visits and urged them to plan our itineraries and to set up meetings for us. In this way, they were prepared for us and our only difficulty was to try to reduce the number of activities that they had planned so that our health could stand up for the length of time that we were to be there. In many places, we were presented with written resolutions of welcome and brotherhood to further emphasize the cordiality with which we were received.

The campesinos (farmers) are eager for improvement but at the same time appear to be somewhat frustrated. Now that action has been started by the government on their behalf, in the area of land reform programs, they are impatient for this transitional period to settle down into a way of life fair to all, with fulfillment of their demands for economic and social democracy and human dignity.

We worked in 7 states in Venezuela and during this time we contacted people from 12 states. We traveled in the interior (anywhere outside of Caracas) by Mercedes-Benz autobus for 3 weeks and by plane the fourth week. This car was furnished by IAN as well as the driver. The main highways between cities are good-surfaced roads, but in the course of the 4,000-odd miles we traveled, we covered dirt roads and paths leading from one land reform settlement to the next.

MEETS UNDER TREES

We attended and conducted approximately 35 meetings, ranging in attendance from 25 to 500 people, including get-togethers in the shade of a tree to state conventions of delegates. Our second day in the interior, we conducted three meetings between 4:30 p.m. and midnight. By doing this, we were able to meet with more people because we went to their communities, rather than expecting them, with their limited modes of transportation, to come to a central place to meet with us.

In each state, the FCV officials had preselected candidates for us to interview in their area for the second phase of our program. This includes inviting a total of 75 campesinos from six Latin American countries to spend 6 months in the United States next year.

The procedure of our meetings varied as much as the situation, location, and attendance at the meetings. In one State, approximately 200 delegates had gathered in a meeting hall on Sunday noon for our meeting. At this time, each of us, with the assistance of our interpreter, explained the various phases of the Farmers Union program, with heavy emphasis on education and cooperatives.

LACK JUNIOR PROGRAM

I found that it was very difficult at times to explain our youth education program because of the complete lack of familiarity with this type of thing. Our background is such that we automatically understand that any organization's education program is completely separate from the formal education of our schools.

Yet, in Venezuela, where the highest local educational level is six educational grades, and many only attend from 2 to 4 years, they immediately identified any education program with the special agricultural schools that they have for young farm boys. Therefore, my presentations usually took the general form of the importance of family participation in an organization that involves a family occupation, as does agriculture.

FAMILY TIES STRONG

I found this to be very well received as family ties, for security and other reasons, are very strong. Therefore, they readily accepted the concept of a family organization for family farmers.

The first day, we visited La Morita, the settlement that President and Mrs. Kennedy had visited and we received firsthand the feeling of the tremendous admiration and hope that these people have in Kennedy and his Alliance for Progress. Our reception is beyond description in the warmth and enthusiasm exhibited by the people. The reason for this enthusiasm is easy to explain in very simple terms when you consider the skepticism of these people because of their experience with broken promises in the past. But here, Kennedy had visited and promised assistance.

ARLENE-JACKIE

Then we came, not just as a Farmers Union team, but in their minds we were the Alliance for Progress and we were fulfilling a promise of President Kennedy and the United States. We were inviting 25 Venezuelan campesinos to the United States. As a strictly personal note, I would like to say that at this place, they called me "Jackie."

I would also like to insert that it was a little difficult at first, but soon I began to accept the uncanny feeling that I was something of a museum piece to these people. I'm very certain that in most areas, I was the first North American woman to visit them as a member of a project team. That a woman should be on this team was strange to them in itself because it is somewhat apart from what they ordinarily think of as being the accepted role of women in this world. However, I feel that the presence of a woman, in farm organization work, is very essential in rural community development in Latin America; not only in the areas of home and family development but also in the workings of the organization.

VISIT OFFICIALS

In several States, arrangements had been made for us to meet and talk with the Governors of the States. In this way, we received not only the welcome from the farm organization and Federal Government agencies, but also from State governments. The graciousness of their receptions included dinners at the Governors' mansions in some cases as each was extremely interested in what our program could do for his people.

One of our most interesting experiences was in Yaracuy State at a land reform settlement named Santa Maria. While meeting with the officers of their farm production cooperative there, we noted with pleasure that in the office were displayed posters depicting the Rochdale principles of cooperatives. We observed sugarcane being cut by hand with machetes and this was the beginning of a most interesting human interest story.

LOST GLASSES

Later that day, Arnold Ackermann, my fellow team member from Willmar, Minn., discovered that he had lost his glasses and determined that they must have slipped from his pocket in the sugarcane field while he was wearing his sunglasses. Since this was only the second week of our project in Latin America, the replacement of his glasses as soon as possible was of great concern to him. The cane field was a large one and the cut cane was laying from 8 to 12 inches deep and finding them seemed like an impossible task. However, the next morning at 8 a.m., the president of the cooperative and a couple of campesinos arrived at our hotel to return his glasses. A large group of campesinos had formed a "callapa" which is similar to our "harvesting bees" in the Midwest. They all got together for no pay and combed every inch of that field until they found the glasses. What a terrifically moving experience this was for all of us to have been extended such friendship and such great assistance. We are attempting to find a candidate for our program from Santa Maria as a gesture of appreciation.

EDUCATION

We observed a great deal of fine work being done by the extension service people in Venezuela. Their home demonstration agents are teaching people to make simple furniture for their homes, to boil their water to help prevent disease, and to make room dividers for their homes for a certain amount of family privacy. There are also many handicraft projects, all of which are useful in the home. County agents are beginning to develop 4–H Clubs, which they call 5–V Clubs, and have even had achievement days in some areas. But there is so much work to be done and so little money and people with which to do it.

But I will always remember the determination and impatience on the faces of the campesinos. They know that there are better ways of living and more modern methods of farming. They are going to get these things for themselves in whatever manner they can. If the United States is not willing or able to assist in the development of Latin America, then someone else is, and the time is short. As Theodoro Moscoso, Director of the Alliance for Progress, has said, "It is 1 minute to midnight in Latin America."

PUBLIC SERVICE BY MINNEAPOLIS RADIO STATION KDWB

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am proud to report that a Minneapolis radio station has performed a magnificent public service—a deed of compassion—which deserves the highest commendation. The station is KDWB, of Minneapolis.

Last Thursday, a brief wire service story came into the KDWB office and newsroom. It told of a 17-year-old Oklahoma boy ill with hemophilia in a Dallas, Tex., hospital, and of his desperate need for blood transfusions.

Station KDWB did more than offer a simple report of the story. Its staff immediately phoned the Dallas hospital, to ask: "What can we in the Twin Cities and throughout Minnesota do to help?"

The answer—a need for blood donations—brought an immediate and continuing response from KDWB. Through its radio facilities, KDWB urged blood donations by Minnesota citizens. In addition, the station sent some of its own staff members to Dallas, to make blood donations.

The result is that hundreds of pints of blood plasma have been made available for the individual case in Dallas, plus hundreds more for the general blood bank available to others.

I am pleased to note that station KDWB related this effort to the continuing need for blood donations, and stressed the general need for support of the Red Cross blood donor program during the whole year, and particularly during National Red Cross Month, this month.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the point that this is National Red Cross Month, and again it gives us an opportunity to express our eternal gratitude and appreciation to the Red Cross for all the wonderful work it undertakes and accomplishes. I wish to salute the American Red Cross and also the International Red Cross for their humanitarian activities—for the lives they have saved, for the communities they have helped, and for the encouragement they have given to so many persons. In my opinion, these activities are the finest examples of compassion and humanitarianism.

Mr. President, I also salute the effective public service exhibited in the effort of station KDWB; and I ask that a brief chronology of this effort be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRONOLOGICAL REPORT ON CREATION OF KDWB RADIO'S FLIGHT FOR LIFE

On Thursday, March 7, 1963, a national wire service carried the following story:

"A 17-year-old Oklahoma boy needs help. He needs blood. Fred Wallace is a victim of hemophilia or 'Bleeder's Disease.' Officials at Baylor University Medical Center, Dallas, Tex., say Wallace has been given more than 800 pints of blood and blood plasma since he entered the hospital last October. This, they believe, is the largest amount of blood received by a single patient in the history of medical transfusion. Wallace is now receiving four transfusions a day. An urgent call is out for voluntary donors. Fred's family has been able to replace only about 250 pints of blood so far."

Upon receipt of this news story KDWB went to work to see what Twin Citians and Minnesotans could do to help this unfortunate family in Texas. KDWB news immediately telephoned Dr. Fred Souls, assistant director of the Wadley Research Institute and Blood Bank in Dallas and asked: "What can we in the Twin Cities and throughout Minnesota do to help?" Dr. Souls, in a specially recorded telephone conversation, outlined how people could go to the Red Cross blood bank in St. Paul and donate blood in the name of Fred Wallace.

This tape recording and story were put on the air on KDWB immediately, and immediately interested people started calling the radio station for more information. The story was repeated a couple of more times on Thursday. On Friday morning the St. Paul office of the Red Cross blood bank contacted KDWB for further information on the entire story. It seems a number of people had expressed an interest to them to donate their blood for Fred Wallace in Dallas, Tex.

KDWB's public service director, in talking with Twin City Red Cross officials, realized that this public response to a couple of news stories could mean a lot more; possibly a big public service campaign drawing public attention to (1) Fred Wallace's needs, and (2) the Red Cross blood donor program, during this, National Red Cross Month.

Through KDWB management and Mr. Lou Schaefer at Braniff International Airways, tickets were purchased for six members of the KDWB air staff to fly to Dallas, Tex., and personally donate a pint of blood each to Fred Wallace. Meeting the KDWB air personalities in Dallas will be members of Dallas radio station KBOX and the Dallas Red Cross. (The KDWB personnel leave Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport at 8:35 a.m., Monday, March 11, via Braniff flight 51; they return Monday evening arriving at 10:30 p.m. in the Twin Cities.)

During the entire time the six KDWB air personalities are flying to Dallas to donate this blood, Louis (Lou) Riegert, another KDWB staff member, will run an all day marathon on the air in the Twin Cities. Throughout the day he will be announcing names of people in Minnesota who have called their local Red Cross blood bank and offered their services as a volunteer worker or offered their blood in hopes of saving somebody's life—possibly Fred Wallace's.

KDWB views this public service campaign as a sort of "domestic people to people friendship," doing, as has been mentioned, two primary things. No. 1, KDWB hopes it will draw national public attention to the Red Cross and their blood program, now during Red Cross Month. No. 2, and equally important, KDWB hopes to play some small part in possibly helping Texas medical men save the life of Fred Wallace.

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE RUSK ON NUCLEAR TEST BAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today the Secretary of State Mr. Dean Rusk appeared before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee had met to hear the testimony of our Secretary of State on the very important subject of the U.S. treaty proposals relating to a test ban on nuclear weapons testing.

This subject has been one of great importance, of considerable public interest, and of much controversy.

The Secretary of State appeared before our committee for about 2½ hours. He gave us a prepared statement which I believe is one of the most cogent and well-reasoned statements as to national policy relating to nuclear weapons and the position of this administration relating to agreeing to a nuclear test ban treaty to which I have ever listened.

The Secretary of State is a man of good judgment. He is a prudent man. He is always very careful in his testimony. At the same time, he is thoughtful and persuasive. I am very much impressed with the integrity of the Secretary of State and his grasp of the intricate problems which confront this Nation.

The Secretary of State has to be informed on many issues of both national and international importance. The proposed nuclear test ban treaty is only one of a dozen or more important problems and issues on which he must be informed, yet Dean Rusk demonstrated a mastery of the subject matter of nuclear weapons testing which was nothing short of amazing.

I take this brief moment to commend the Secretary of State and to thank him for the manner in which he explained the position of this administration and, may I say, of the previous administration. He properly pointed out that this was not a matter of partisan debate or even of partisan controversy. He appropriately pointed out that both the previous Eisenhower administration and the present Kennedy administration have endorsed as a matter of national policy the proposals in the form of a treaty which would make possible a prohibition upon further nuclear testing.

The Secretary of State called our attention to improvements in detection of underground nuclear tests. He pointed out in a convincing manner the national interest our country has in obtaining a treaty which would prohibit further tests—I might add, an enforcible treaty, a treaty with safeguards so as to minimize the risks which might be involved in any such arrangement.

The Secretary pointed out, first, that "a nuclear test ban treaty would constitute a significant step in the direction of the slackening the pace of the arms race"; and he documented his statement.

Secondly, he said that "an effective nuclear test ban treaty would be to the military advantage of the United States"; and he went on to document that conclusion.

Third, he pointed out that "a primary advantage of an effective nuclear test ban treaty to the United States in relation to the Soviet bloc is a political one." He also said:

> I have repeatedly emphasized in my public statements in the United States and at the Geneva Disarmament Conference, and in previous statements before this committee, my conviction that disarmament and secrecy are incompatible.

The Secretary went on to point out how important were the onsite inspections to the United States and, indeed, to the total relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The Secretary, with his customary candor, called to our attention the fact that "a test ban would not of itself solve the problem of proliferation of nuclear weapons," but he did say that "a nuclear test ban could lead to further steps which would deal more directly with the proliferation problem."

The Secretary also called to our attention the fact that "a nuclear test ban would be fully consistent with the possibilities for increased participation in the multilateral control of nuclear forces dedicated to NATO by our partners in the Alliance."

This was a remarkable statement, and I believe that in the main it answers many of the criticisms which have been leveled at the proposed nuclear test ban treaty.

The Secretary cited the increase in our technical ability to detect seismic events at long distances, thereby permitting us to rely upon seismic stations outside the Soviet Union to detect underground nuclear explosions inside the Soviet Union. He called to our attention the fact that "an effort has been made to increase the effectiveness of our present proposals over previous positions."

In conclusion, the Secretary cited that it was the considered judgment of the President and of his chief advisers in the national security area "that clandestine testing which might escape detection, in spite of the verification system, would not result in developments which would significantly alter the military balance." He also said:

> An announced national policy of maintaining our readiness to test will minimize the risks to the United States stemming from the possibility of Soviet abrogation of the treaty and an open resumption of testing.

He believes, and he called to our attention, the fact that "the cessation of nuclear weapons tests would advance the interests of the foreign policy of the United States."

The Secretary also said that "the present proposals of the United States for a nuclear test ban provide a sound basis for negotiation of an effective treaty."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this well-reasoned, brief, thoughtful, and excellently documented statement by our able and conscientious Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY RUSK BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, MARCH 11, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to have this opportunity to talk with the committee today about a most important aspect of our foreign policy, our long-continued effort to achieve agreement on a safeguarded nuclear test ban treaty.

Since the summer of 1958 the U.S. Government has consistently adhered to the view that a safeguarded cessation of nuclear weapons testing would be in our national interest. Periodic policy reviews in the light of shifting patterns of foreign policy, of changes in the negotiating situation, and of technical developments have always produced the same answer: that an effective test ban treaty is in our national interest.

Indeed, it is worth recalling that in 1945–46, at the very birth of the nuclear age, it was clearly perceived that a nuclear arms race would create the greatest dangers for all mankind. Consequently, President Truman directed the most serious and diligent effort to prevent such a race by bringing atomic energy under international control. Unhappily, the Baruch proposals did not succeed.

Today, I would like to discuss a nuclear test ban with you from the standpoint of our relations with the Soviet bloc and with countries outside the bloc, including our allies. I would also like to discuss what I believe to be the basic requirements for a nuclear test ban treaty to be effective. For it is clear that an illusory set of obligations on this sensitive subject ought never to be entered into by the United States.

In my judgment, the conclusion of an effective nuclear test ban treaty would have three advantages of primary importance in our relations with the Soviet Union.

First a nuclear test ban treaty would constitute a significant step in the direction of slackening the pace of the arms race. Once this step had been taken with satisfactory results, new opportunities for further steps toward turning the arms race downward might well be more within the realm of reality than at present. For the past 16 years during which the cold war has been waged, we have experienced the effect of an almost unlimited arms race on our national security and on our position in relation to the Soviet Union in the world arena. Although our position has been preserved and Communist aggression has been effectively deterred to a large extent by the buildup and deployment of our military forces, our security in that position has not necessarily been improved. Indeed, our military position might well be more secure today if we had successfully achieved agreement on a test ban treaty several years ago, earlier in the negotiations.

Because of the extensive history of past negotiations on this particular question, the narrowing of the issues that has resulted from these negotiations and the worldwide interest, I believe that this problem may be more ripe for solution than perhaps any other first step in the arms control and disarmament field. It is clear that unless at some point we are able to step off in a new direction, the upward spiral of the arms race will continue unabated. The prospects of such a future for both ourselves and the Soviet Union are not attractive.

Second, an effective nuclear test ban treaty would be to the military advantage of the United States. At the present time we feel confident in our nuclear capabilities. We have today a stockpile of nuclear weapons which ranges from a few tens of tons of TNT, equivalent to many megatons. These weapons are useful for a variety of strategic and tactical uses. The Soviet Union has a stockpile of its own.

In certain areas of the spectrum of explosive power, namely the extremely large yields, the Soviets have developed weapons for which I am informed we do not have a present military requirement. In other areas, namely in the development of intermediate and lower yield weapons, we believe that we have a more varied arsenal than the Soviet Union. The President and his chief national security advisers, including myself and the Secretary of Defense, believe it doubtful that either side would, through further testing, achieve major advances in any significant area which could be translated into a military advantage without the other side making either a similar or offsetting gain. There is one proposition which we must keep in mind despite confidence and understandable national pride: Nature does not yield up its secrets with political favoritism. The list of Nobel Prize winners in the sciences over the past half century shows that major breakthroughs in knowledge come from many directions and have little to do with national frontiers. If our present assessment of the military situation is correct, and I believe it is, now would be an opportune time from our point of view for the conclusion of a treaty to halt further nuclear weapon testing.

The third primary advantage of an effective nuclear test ban treaty to the United States in relation to the Soviet bloc is a political one. I have repeatedly emphasized in my public statements in the United States and at the Geneva Disarmament Conference, and in previous statements before this committee, my conviction that disarmament and secrecy are incompatible. The Soviet Union has reasons of its own for its penchant for secrecy. Regardless of the merits of their case, however, it is clear that a closed society breeds suspicion and distrust on the part of other nations. Such an atmosphere is not conducive to taking steps to treat the symptoms of international tensions or to come to grips with the causes of these tensions.

A nuclear test ban treaty would obviously not lift the veil of secrecy from the Soviet Union. It would not even result in any substantial opening up of Soviet society. It could, however, have a very important impact on the Soviet attitude toward secrecy, especially as it relates to problems of arms control and disarmament. The carrying out of onsite inspections on Soviet territory would provide the United States with not only the necessary assurance that unidentified seismic signals were not underground nuclear explosions but also additional advantages. If a test ban treaty can operate effectively and in ways which demonstrate that the inspection connected with it does not jeopardize Soviet security or result in any particular embarrassments to the Soviet Union and its people, then the Soviet leadership may be more inclined to enter into other similar agreements. The first step seems to be the most difficult. If it can be made successfully then further steps in the same direction might be taken with less difficulty than the first.

Therefore, in our relations with the Soviet Union I believe that a nuclear test ban treaty would have both political and military advantages. In addition, an effective nuclear test ban would have advantages in our relations with countries outside the Soviet bloc.

Among the dangers to the United States from continued testing by both sides I would consider the danger of the further spread of nuclear weapons to other countries of perhaps primary importance. Unlimited testing by both the United States and the Soviet Union would substantially increase the likelihood that more and more nations would seek the dubious, but what some might consider prestigious, distinction of membership in the nuclear club. The risks to the security of the free world from nuclear capabilities coming within the grasp of governments substantially less stable than either the United States or the Soviet Union are grave indeed.

A test ban would not of itself solve the problems of proliferation of nuclear weapons. It should be recognized that at least one present nuclear power and one power apparently bent on developing nuclear weapons might not be persuaded to subscribe to the test-ban treaty from the outset. However, many potential nuclear powers might at this stage be induced to accede to the treaty.

Moreover, a nuclear test ban could lead to further steps which would deal more directly with the proliferation problem. I am referring here to the possibility of an agreement on the one hand by the nuclear powers not to transfer control of weapons nor to give assistance in weapons development to countries not already possessing them, and on the other, by the nonnuclear powers not to produce or acquire nuclear weapons of their own. Another possibility would be an agreement to halt further production of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons and to transfer agreed quantities of such materials to peaceful uses. What should be emphasized here is that while a nuclear test ban by no means offers a total solution, it would be a necessary first step.

What I have just said is, I believe, applicable both to the problem of the spread of nuclear weapons outside the North Atlantic alliance and to the problem of the development of additional national nuclear capabilities by NATO members. I believe that a nuclear test ban would be fully consistent with the possibilities for increased participation in the multilateral control of nuclear forces dedicated to NATO by our partners in the alliance.

Of secondary, but nevertheless significant importance is the problem of radioactive fallout. In large part because of real or assumed dangers from fallout, nuclear testing has become a key political issue in a great many countries around the world. Our relations with those countries are sometimes adversely affected when our tests produce fallout outside our own borders. On the other hand, our initiatives in seeking a test ban agreement have been well received by not only our allies but by the uncommitted countries.

I have pointed out what I believe to be the primary advantages to the United States in an effective nuclear test ban treaty in terms of our relations with the Soviet Union and with other countries around the world. However, I would like to make it clear that I believe there may also be advantages to the Soviet Union in a nuclear test ban.

A certain degree of mutuality of interest is an obvious prerequisite for any agreement.

I have stated that an effective nuclear test ban would be to the military advantage of the United States. This should not exclude the possibility that the Soviet Union could at the same time have valid military reasons for entering into a nuclear test ban treaty with the intention of carrying it out. The United States and the Soviet Union have to date apparently pursued somewhat different objectives in their testing programs. This difference in emphasis appears attributable to different strategic concepts, as well as technological considerations. Therefore, while we may be assured that our own retaliatory capability in the event of nuclear attack is sufficient to deter such an attack, the Soviet Union could at the same time believe that it has a sufficient nuclear capability for its own security requirements without the need of further testing. Similarly, the possibility of the future spread of nuclear weapons is a legitimate concern not only to ourselves, but to the Soviet Union as well.

I have thus far attempted to demonstrate why and how an effective nuclear test ban treaty would serve the foreign policy interests of the United States. I would now like to address the question of what makes a nuclear test ban treaty effective.

Three requirements are, in my judgment, basic to an effective nuclear test ban treaty.

First, the verification arrangements must provide an adequate deterrent to violation on the part of the Soviet Union. However, no verification system, no matter how elaborate or intrusive, could be foolproof. Therefore, the second requirement of an effective treaty is that the scope of any violation which might escape detection must not be so extensive that it would substantially affect the military balance. Finally, a nuclear test ban treaty will be adhered to only so long as a mutuality of interest in the agreement persists. If the Soviet Union were ever to conclude that a test ban were no longer in its interests, we can be sure that the Soviet leadership would not hesitate to abrogate the treaty and resume testing. Therefore, an effective test ban treaty must not leave the United States in a state of unpreparedness in the event of a Soviet change of attitude.

In my opinion, our present test ban proposals meet these three requirements for an effective treaty.

Last week the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held a series of illuminating hearings on developments in the field of detection and identification of nuclear explosions and their relationship to the nuclear test ban negotiations. These hearings explored in considerable depth the scientific and technical basis for the present U.S. position with respect to a nuclear test ban. The efficacy of the technical underpinning for our test ban proposals is certainly an important factor in determining the overall effectiveness of a treaty based on these proposals. However, the effectiveness of the verification arrangements associated with a test ban do not depend entirely upon numbers or locations of detection stations. Nor is any particular number of onsite inspections the key to effectiveness. The verification arrangements must be considered as a totality. The effectiveness of the total system should be judged in the light of the entire geographic, technical, military, political and economic environment in which it would operate.

The increase in our technical ability to detect seismic events at long distances permits us to rely upon seismic stations outside the Soviet Union to detect underground nuclear explosions inside the Soviet Union. Moreover, a decrease by a factor of two and one-half in a previous estimate of the number of earthquakes of a given seismic magnitude occurring annually in the Soviet Union has enabled us to reduce the number of onsite inspections on Soviet territory to seven. But perhaps more important than a particular number of onsite inspections in determining its effectiveness as a deterrent to cheating is the manner in which an onsite inspection would be carried out. Our present position with respect to the number of onsite inspections which would be acceptable to us has, therefore, been very clearly stated by Mr. Foster in discussions with the Soviet representatives to be conditional upon further agreement on such important matters as the method of selecting particular earth tremors for inspection, the size and composition of inspection teams, the area and duration of search, and logistical arrangements. Finally, an effort has been made to increase the effectiveness of our present proposals over previous positions by vesting control over the installation and operation of the detection network, and control over the carrying out of onsite inspections in the Soviet Union, more completely in the hands of the United States and United Kingdom. This has resulted in a proposal for a simpler and more economical system. It would also permit us to evaluate a greater range of factors in determining whether the Soviet Union was honoring its treaty obligations than would be the case under a treaty providing for more complete international operation and control of the verification system.

I will leave to officials of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency the discussion of the details of this proposal. But it is the conclusion of the President and his chief advisers in the national security area that clandestine testing which might escape detection, in spite of the verification system, would not result in developments which would significantly alter the military balance.

Finally, an announced national policy of maintaining our readiness to test will minimize the risks to the United States stemming from the possibility of Soviet abrogation of the treaty and an open resumption of testing. Indeed, such a policy would be a deterrent to abrogation and would reinforce the effectiveness of the treaty itself.

In conclusion, I believe that the cessation of nuclear weapons tests would advance the interests of the foreign policy of the United States, and that the present proposals of the United States for a nuclear test ban provide a sound basis for negotiation of an effective treaty. In reaching this conclusion I am aware of the risks involved in an undetected Soviet violation of the treaty or its surprise abrogation. I am also aware, however, of the graver risks to our security and the security of the free world implicit in a future without any multilateral restraint on the development of nuclear weapons. In addition to the risks with and without a test ban which must be carefully weighed against each other, we should also consider the opportunities created by taking a step in the direction of controlling the arms race. I believe that if these new opportunities are placed in the scale, it will be tipped decisively in favor of our present proposals for a ban on the further testing of nuclear weapons.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate—and I know of none—under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until next Thursday at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Thursday, March 14, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 11, 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADORS

William C. Doherty, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Jamaica.

C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Malagasy Republic.

Outerbridge Horsey, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

William R. Rivkin, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

Horace G. Torbert, Jr., of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Somali Republic.

Olcott H. Deming, of Connecticut, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uganda.

ENVOY

Donald A. Dumont, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Burundi.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

Sigurd S. Larmon, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1966, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 11, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 22: 6: *Train a child in the way he should go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it.*

Eternal God, who art the Father of our hearts and our homes, in this moment of prayer, we would earnestly beseech Thee that the family and homelife of our beloved country may rise to its sacred shrines of influence and power as it seeks to mold and develop into beauty and strength of character and conduct the children and youth of our day and generation.

Grant that in our high calling as homebuilders, whether living in a castle or cottage, we may strive during this Lenten season to cultivate the fine and congenial virtues and attributes of love and kindness, of considerateness, and thoughtfulness, of peace and joy, so that childhood and youth may not be reared and spent in an atmosphere pervaded and poisoned by contention and discord.

May the children and teenagers learn and practice the noble and necessary art of self-discipline and appreciate more fully that they also are challenged and privileged to have a glorious share in contributing to the greatness and glory of our Republic and to help build a healthier and happier social order.

Hear our prayers in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 7, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

On March 6, 1963:

H.J. Res. 284. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 816. An act for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 86–420, had appointed Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. DODD, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. MECHEM, and Mr. KUCHEL to be members of the U.S. group of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group.

The message also announced that Mr. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, pursuant to title 14, United States Code, section 194(a), had appointed Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. BEALL to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

The message also announced that Mr. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, pursuant to title 46, United States Code, section 1126(c), had appointed Mr. ENGLE and Mr. SCOTT to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Resolution 32, 73d Congress, had appointed Mr. HRUSKA as a member of the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 250, 77th Congress, had appointed Mr. LONG of Louisiana and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be members of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 523, 78th Congress, had appointed Mr. HARTKE and Mr. DOMINICK to be members of the National Memorial Stadium Commission.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 87–759, had appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MORTON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. GORE to be members of the Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 3, Public Law 86–380, had appointed Mr. ERVIN, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. MUSKIE to be members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 372, 84th Congress, had appointed Mrs. NEUBERGER to be a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 87–758, had appointed Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. PROUTY to be members of the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium Advisory Board.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to title 14, United States Code, section 194, had appointed Mr. DODD to be a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 9355(a), had designated Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. GOLDWATER to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 4355(a), had designated Mr. PASTORE, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. KEATING to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to title 46, United States Code, section 1126c, had appointed Mr. BAYH to be a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 6988(a), had designated Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. BARTLETT, and Mr. BEALL to be members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, as I have done in the past, I rise today to speak on residual oil imports. I am not going to let this matter drop, and will continue to speak for the interests of New England and the entire eastern seaboard.

I am greatly disturbed with the administration's attitude on this topic. Apparently the pressure exerted on President Kennedy has been too much for the former junior Senator from Massachusetts.

As a member of the party in power in 1959, I rose to speak immediately against the import quotas placed on residual and crude oil by Mr. Eisenhower. As a new Republican in the House, this was not an easy thing to do. I was joined by the then Senator Kennedy, who said he believed in the rightness of this cause.

Now the President has decided to turn a deaf ear to the subject—except to listen to the coal barons, who keep reminding him of campaign promises. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that New England has been losing $30 million a year because these quotas prevent most of our hospitals, large apartment homes, schools, and industries from using this very practical cheap oil.

Another very direct and most important issue is the President's intellectual honesty in this issue. Just 2 weeks ago he promised President Betancourt that he would do everything he could to help the economy of that country. Now Venezuela is crippled economically because it cannot send oil to this country. The country is fighting, almost alone, Castro militancy in Latin America.

The showdown on this issue is about to come. The President cannot keep walking on both sides of a perilous street. He must walk on the humanitarian side, on the side of the people, and not the coal barons. I speak briefly today, Mr. Speaker, to say simply that the fight, from my standpoint, is just beginning.

GAS AND OIL PERCENTAGE DEPLETION TAX

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made by Ernest R. Fleck, president, North Dakota Oil & Gas Association, in which he calls attention to the deficiencies in the proposals made by the administration for revisions of tax laws governing oil and related industries:

> The proposed tax reduction and reform program presented by President Kennedy, and which is now being considered by the Congress, provides a back-door method of reducing percentage depletion. It hits the North Dakota oil and gas producing industry at its most vital point, that of exploring for and developing new reserves. If accepted by Congress, these changes will immediately reduce the incentive for the exploratory drilling which is essential to the health and future growth of North Dakota's second largest industry.

The provisions of the program are highly technical and the full ramifications can only be determined after careful and extensive study. Nevertheless, it has been stated by the administration that the proposed changes will increase the taxes of the mineral industries by over $300 million, of which $280 million will come from the petroleum branch alone. The brunt of this will be borne first and hardest by the companies, large and small, who are exploring for new oil and gas reserves. Still more taxes cannot be justified for an industry whose national drilling activity is already at the lowest point in 19 years, and at the lowest ebb in North Dakota since the beginning of oil development.

In a recent interview, Secretary of the Treasury Dillon stated that existing tax provisions have been built into the economy of the oil industry, and that oil industry earnings, after taxes, were no greater and even less than many other businesses. He further stated "that without these provisions there could be do doubt that gasoline and oil products of the oil industry would have to be priced somewhat higher."

In these critical times of world unrest it is completely without logic that the administration should propose measures which will seriously cripple the major energy producing industry of the United States, and in so doing endanger our preparedness to meet national defense emergencies.

The policies and attitudes of our Government will be a major factor in the long-range outlook for the U.S. oil supply. This attack on the sound and time-tested tax policies of the petroleum industry can only serve to seriously endanger the means of providing that supply.

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, some textile workers in my district have worked in the textile mills for more than 30 years and still cannot draw social security, though disabled to continue on that job. I have known textile employees, men and women, who worked 40 years and some even more, and still could not draw their social security because of that provision of the law which states that to be disabled, a person must be unable to engage in any other work at all.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this provision of the law is unfair and should be changed. When a person works for 30 years in a textile mill and becomes disabled because of injury or ill health, then I say, Mr. Speaker, that person should start drawing social security.

It is a hardship and it is wrong for such a person to have to go around knocking on doors seeking other employment. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, you know and I know it is next to impossible for this person to get another job.

I am speaking today primarily of textile workers because I have such a great textile industry in my congressional district. More people are employed in the textile industry in my district than all other employment combined. Although I have mentioned my textile workers as an example, I think any worker in the United States regardless of what industry should be able to draw social security after 30 years on the same job when disabled.

I have today introduced a bill which would permit a person to draw social security after 30 years on the same job when that person becomes disabled to continue on that job. I hope the Congress will consider this bill this year so as to permit our folks who have worn themselves out on the same job after 30 years to start drawing social security.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I was slightly amused at the indignation of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] about the President's order on residual oil. He kept talking over and over about coal barons. I wonder if he will be one of the same ones who next week, with others in his party, who will talk about the outflow of gold. I wonder why he is not indignant about the oil barons, such as the Rockefellers—I do not want to mention other names—who are benefiting from the dumping of this residual oil in the United States. I think that he should get upset about the plight of the coal miners, thousands of whom have lost their jobs because of this residual oil rather than referring to the plight of Venezuela, which is not doing too badly at this time, if you will look at the figures and the amount of money they get from the United States.

U.S. POST OFFICES

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, last week I called attention to some plans that were underway for the building of federally owned post office buildings. I also called attention to the inconsistencies that were evident in this program.

During the past week it has been called to my attention that in the northern part of the State of Missouri, in a town of 1,900 people, they are proposing to build a federally owned post office building costing $377,800. In an adjoining county, in a town of 12,000 people, more than 6 times as large, with post office receipts of 7 times as much, they are building a lease-type building which will cost less than $300,000, probably around $250,000.

May I also call attention to the fact that where these buildings have been built, and extravagant waste resulted, they are being criticized even by the people and the newspapers of the town where this is being done.

At Perryville, Mo., there was a post office building built in 1935, at a cost of $35,000. More than 2 years ago they came out with a proposal to modernize and enlarge that building at a cost of $275,000.

I raised cain with the Department for that, and they revised their estimate and came out with a new estimate of $175,000. They are now spending $178,400 to remodel, enlarge, and modernize a building that originally cost about $35,000. The newspaper out there said, "It could have been admitted also that it erred in having the old building practically gutted, serviceable floors torn out, and unnecessary extras added, a waste of many thousands of dollars."

No administration can make friends and gain support through a policy of profligate spending.

THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on February 18, 1963, I noticed in one of the Washington newspapers a reference to the International Secretariat of the Peace Corps.

This appeared to be something new to me, so I wrote to Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, and asked him about this International Secretariat. His letter, dated March 2, was received in my office last Saturday.

It reads in part as follows:

> The International Secretariat which you mentioned is not part of the Peace Corps. The International Peace Corps Secretariat was established for a trial period of 1 year by the act of the nations and international organizations attending the International Conference on Middle Level Manpower in San Juan, P.R., last October.
>
> You will remember that this was the meeting at which the Rockefeller Hotel reduced the rate from $56 a day to about $26 a day.
>
> The Secretariat was not established by the United States, although the U.S. delegation to that Conference did vote in favor of the resolution establishing a Secretariat and did agree to furnish it with its chief administrative officer and other personnel and funds to meet the expenses of the Secretariat during the trial period.

That is all we did, just vote the money—$150,000—to take care of the International Secretariat for the Peace Corps, and the Secretary is paid at the rate of $19,650. All the representatives of this country did was vote to provide all the money for this new outfit. Now they are coming to Congress, Mr. Shriver says, to set this up as a permanent organization. I think the Members of Congress would be interested to know how they got that way and where they are going to get the next $150,000 to pay some jackanape $19,650 a year.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 85–906, as amended, I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Fourth Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, covering the period ending December 31, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 11, 1963.*

MANPOWER REPORT — LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

The Honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.
The Honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am transmitting herewith my Manpower Report as required under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Secretary of Labor, who in turn, has had the assistance of members of the Cabinet, heads of independent agencies and the National Manpower Advisory Committee appointed under this act.

Together with my report I am presenting the report of the Secretary of Labor on manpower requirements, resources, use, and training required by section 104 of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Respectfully,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The **SPEAKER.** This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the passage of each bill, the chairman or subcommittee chairman may have permission to submit for the RECORD an explanation of the bill.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CANINE CORPS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 1935) to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, acting through the Chief of Police of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, are authorized to acquire, train, and maintain as many dogs as may be necessary to be used in connection with law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the expansion of the canine corps of the Metropolitan Police force.

The use of dogs in urban police work originated in Belgium more than 50 years ago, and has since spread to many other countries. Today, more than 40 police departments in the United States are utilizing dogs in patrol work, and the number is increasing very rapidly.

The canine corps was first established in the District of Columbia in December 1959, and on April 19, 1960, six dogs went on the streets of the city with their handlers. By the end of that year, the number had increased to 20 such teams, and today the corps consists of 59 dogs on the streets and 11 more in training, for a total strength of 70.

The effectiveness of the canine corps as an arm of the Metropolitan Police force may be evaluated from the following statistics for the calendar year 1961, which were submitted to this committee by the Police Department:

Number of arrests made by men with the assistance of dogs, classified according to types of offenses

Housebreaking	62
Robbery	37
Assault	21
Larceny	13
Disorderly	14
Homicide, assaults on police officers, destroying property, etc	50
Total	197

This total consituted 40 percent of all the arrests made by these men during that year.

This remarkable record was accomplished by a corps which ranged from 19 to 42 man-dog teams during the year. In addition to their actual participation in these arrests, the dogs of the canine corps have proved invaluable on many other occasions by the deterrent effect of their mere presence at the scene of actual or potential trouble. The dogs' keen sense of smell enables them to locate fugitives hiding in buildings, junkyards, and other places where the policemen would otherwise have a most difficult and dangerous task in apprehending them.

At a public hearing on April 4, 1962, one of our subcommittees heard testimony on this bill from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Chief and other members of the Metropolitan Police force, the trainer of the canine corps, and spokesmen for community organizations. No opposition whatever was expressed against the bill, and the success of the program was described in terms of highest praise.

Actually, the committee was told that for several reasons the program of expansion of the corps cannot be made to proceed too rapidly. First, the recruitment and selection of the dogs must be accomplished carefully and deliberately. Then the training itself takes 14 weeks, and the nature of the training work forbids too large groups. In this connection also, each dog is assigned to one particular man, and this patrolman and his dog must be trained together. Thus, any rapid acceleration in the training program would take too many patrolmen off their regular beats at one time, to the detriment of law enforcement in the city. In addition, each man-dog team in service must be brought back for 1 day of refresher training every 2 weeks. For these reasons, the Police Department estimates that not more than 25 new dogs can be acquired, trained, and added to the corps each year. Thus, it is their plan to take about another year to build the organization up to a total of 100.

Thus far, all the dogs in the canine corps have been donated, and thus have cost the police department nothing. However, if the contemplated program of expansion necessitates the purchase of any of the new dogs, it is estimated that they may cost as much as $250 each. An item of expense is involved in the fact that the policemen who handle these dogs must transport them daily in their own cars, and also must keep the dogs at their homes. This calls for fenced yards, and extra cleaning. Also, most of the work of these policemen must be performed at night. For these reasons, these men are paid additional compensation in the amount of $538 per year, as grade 2 technicians.

The cost of adding 25 man-dog teams to the present canine corps, which will take a year to accomplish, is estimated to be $19,000. This includes the patrolman's extra compensation as a technician, and the food and veterinary care for the dogs, but not any cost of purchase.

This committee strongly endorses the expansion of this arm of the District of Columbia Police Department, which in its 3 years of existence, despite its limited size, has proved such an invaluable asset as a weapon against the appalling crime situation in the District of Columbia.

The House approved this same bill last year.

LOWERING AGE LIMIT FOR REGISTERED NURSES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 1933) to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second and fourth sentences of section 4 of the Act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An Act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia" (D.C. Code, sec. 2–404), as amended, are amended by striking "twenty-one" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof, "nineteen."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to lower the minimum age for registered nurses in the District of Columbia from 21 to 19 years.

The original statute providing for the registration of graduate nurses in the District of Columbia, enacted February 9, 1907, specified that "no nurse shall be registered in the District of Columbia who has not attained the age of 21 years." It is provided also that no applicant may take the examination for licensure in the District unless she is 21 years of age or will attain that age within 6 months after the date set for the examination.

Until a few years ago, we are informed, students under 18 years of age were not admitted to schools of nursing, and therefore were not being graduated below the age of 21. Thus, the above-mentioned statute posed no problem. However, as high schools began graduating persons of 16 and 17 years, the admission age to schools of nursing was lowered to 17 years. Also, diploma programs have decreased in length from 36 months to 32 and 33 months, which has increased the problem relating to age.

According to "Facts of Nursing," published by the American Nurses' Association, 20 States presently have no minimum age requirement for registration of nurses; and the age requirements in the other States, with the exception of North Dakota and the District of Columbia, range from 18 to 20 years.

The disadvantages to the District of Columbia resulting from this situation are twofold. First, it handicaps local recruitment of the best qualified students. The better students graduate from high school at an earlier age, and they prefer to take their nursing training in jurisdictions which allow them to become registered immediately upon completion of their training program. Second, the younger student who does decide to take her nursing training course in the District of Columbia must go to the additional expense of taking her licensing examination in another jurisdiction. This will qualify her to practice as a registered nurse in that locality, whereas she is prohibited from registration and practice in the District of Columbia until she becomes 21 years of age. The result is that such nurses usually remain elsewhere to work, and the District thus loses the services of many young registered nurses.

At a public hearing conducted on September 17, 1962, testimony in favor of this proposed legislation was presented by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Capital City School of Nursing, the Washington Hospital Center School of Nursing, and the Graduate Nurses' Association of the District of Columbia. No opposition was expressed.

Passage of this bill will not involve additional expense to the District of Columbia government.

A bill identical to this was approved by the House on September 24, 1962.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ARMORY BOARD

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 39) to amend the act of June 4, 1948, as it relates to the appointment of the District of Columbia Armory Board, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not think I will object, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina a question or two concerning this bill.

What is the necessity for increasing the membership of this board?

Mr. McMILLAN. The three members of the present board came to our committee and asked that we add two additional members because they already have three members on the board who are connected with the District government, and they want two additional members who are not connected with the District government.

Mr. GROSS. Solely because they want two additional members who are not connected with the District government?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman this question: Is this some kind of a preliminary to coming to Congress for funds to take care of that white elephant stadium which the District of Columbia has on its hands?

Mr. McMILLAN. If it is, they did not let it be known at the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman think that this was directed toward a program to do what they could not do before; that is, to get Congress to dump a bunch of money into the stadium operation?

Mr. McMILLAN. I cannot see how this would be any assistance to them in getting any District funds for the stadium.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not think that is the purpose of the bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. I do not think so.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board, and for other purposes", approved June 4, 1948, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 2–1702), is amended by striking out "a third person not employed by the Federal or District Governments who shall be appointed" and inserting in lieu thereof "three other persons not employed by the Federal or District Governments each of whom shall be appointed",

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall not affect the term of office of any person serving on the Armory Board on the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1 insert the following: ", and by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ': *Provided*, That of the two persons initially appointed to the Board after the effective date of this proviso, one shall be appointed for a term of two years, and one for a term of three years'."

Page 2, line 7, insert immediately after the word "shall" the following: "take effect as of October 12, 1963, but shall".

Page 2, line 9, insert immediately after the period:

"Any member appointed to the Armory Board to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he succeeds."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to increase the membership of the District of Columbia Armory Board from three to five members, with the terms of the three non-Government-employed members to be staggered so as to provide for some continuity of membership.

Under existing law the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the commanding general of the District of Columbia Militia, and a third person not employed by the Federal or District Governments, is appointed by the chairman of the District of Columbia Committees of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives, to serve for a term of 3 years. Two of the present members of the Armory Board are ex officio members and have other duties of a substantial and time-consuming nature.

This legislation would simply increase from one person to three persons, not employed by the Federal or District Governments, to be appointed by the chairman of the District of Columbia Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives for staggered 3-year terms. This legislation has the strong endorsement of the present District of Columbia Armory Board, and at a public hearing held by a subcommittee of the House District Committee on Thursday, July 26, the three members of the Board testified to this fact.

There is no objection to the enactment of this legislation and there is no cost involved to the District of Columbia government since all the members of the Board serve without compensation.

A bill identical to this passed the House in the last Congress.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW TRUSTEES IN DEEDS OF TRUST

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] to call up a bill from Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill, H.R. 682, to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 522 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 45–603), is amended by inserting immediately after "a new trustee" the following: "by agreement of the parties pursuant to section 538(b) (D.C. Code, sec. 45–614(b)) or", and by striking out "or trustee" in the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", trustee, or new trustee".

(b) Section 534 of such Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 45–611), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Nothing contained in this section shall prevent the appointment of a new trustee pursuant to section 538(b) (D.C. Code, sec. 45–614(b)) and the execution of the trusts of said deed of trust by such new trustee."

(c) Section 537 of such Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 45–619), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Nothing contained in this section shall prevent the appointment of a new trustee pursuant to section 538(b) (D.C. Code, sec. 45–614(b)) and the execution of a deed of release by such new trustee."

(d) Section 538 of such Act of March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 45–614), is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately before "In case of the refusal" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, and notwithstanding any provision in a deed of trust to the contrary, whenever the grantors named in, and the persons secured by, the deed of trust (or their successors in interest) so desire, they may by written agreement executed and acknowledged in the same manner as an absolute deed substitute any trustee named in the deed of trust with a new trustee. No written instrument entered into pursuant to this subsection shall be effective as to any person not having actual notice thereof until a notice of the appointment of the new trustee signed, sealed, and acknowledged by the parties agreeing to the appointment of the new trustee shall be recorded among the land records in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds.

"(c) Notwithstanding any provision of a deed of trust to the contrary, the owner of the debt secured by such deed of trust may, by a written designation signed, sealed, and acknowledged by him, appoint substitute trustees, and such designation shall be effective from and after the tenth day following the filing of such designation in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and the service of a copy thereof upon the debtor in the manner provided for the service of a petition by section 534 of this subchapter, unless within such ten-day period the debtor shall file in said court an objection to the appointment of any such substitute trustee. In the event any such objection is filed in said court, further proceedings shall be in accordance with section 534 or 537 of this subchapter, or subsection (a) of this section, whichever is appropriate. The clerk of the court shall maintain a separate docket in which there shall be kept a record of designations of substitute trustees filed under this subsection."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to all deeds of trust, whether entered into before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide for the substitution of trustees under deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by means of a written instrument entered into by all the parties or their successors in interest, notwithstanding any provision of the deed of trust to the contrary.

The bill affects two situations whereby new trustees to a deed of trust can be appointed. One is where the parties to a trust agree in writing to the appointment. Provision is included that before any such instrument is effective, notice of the appointment of the new trustee, bearing the signatures under seal of the parties, and acknowledged by them, shall be recorded among the land records in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds. This affords notice to other parties not having actual notice of the designation of the new trustee.

The other situation covered by the bill is where the owner of the debt secured by a deed of trust may, unilaterally, acting on his own, and without the prior agreement of other parties to the deed of trust, appoint a new trustee by written designation signed, sealed, and acknowledged by said owner of the debt. However, in such case, such appointment of new trustee is effective only after the lapse of a 10-day period following the filing of such designation with the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and service thereof an the debtor. If the debtor within the 10-day period files an objection to the appointment of such trustee, court proceeding would follow as are provided under the District of Columbia Code for appointment of a substituted trustee in the event of death of the designated trustee, under which proceedings the court may appoint a new trustee.

In the 2d session of the 87th Congress, a bill on this subject, H.R. 8988, was amended to conform with the views expressed by the District of Columbia Commissioners, in the form of a new bill, H.R. 11698. The current bill, H.R. 682, is identical to H.R. 11698 of the last Congress as it passed the House on August 13, 1962.

INCREASE JURISDICTION FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MUNICIPAL COURT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] to call up any bills which he may have from Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill H.R. 3537 and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that this is made necessary—this legislation—partly because of the importance and dignity of the court?

Mr. DOWDY. I might say to the gentleman that the purpose of this bill is to correct what was done last year. Last year the House and Senate passed a bill which was not correctly enrolled but which was sent to the President and signed into law. This bill contains in it the provisions that the Congress of the United States passed last year.

Mr. GROSS. Then it is not alone for the purpose of increasing the importance and dignity of the court; is that correct?

Mr. DOWDY. Not alone; no, sir.

Mr. GROSS. But that is one subsidiary effect of the bill?

Mr. DOWDY. It increases jurisdiction from $3,000 to $10,000 and that would have that effect.

Mr. GROSS. The bill would extend the power of the court, as I understand, to issue and serve subpenas for attendance to anyone within a 25-mile radius of the District of Columbia. This poses no problem with respect to the States of Maryland and Virginia, is that correct?

Mr. DOWDY. As I understand from our colleagues who represent Maryland and Virginia, it is all right with them.

Mr. GROSS. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. Our colleagues who represent those two States, I understand it is all right with them. I do not know what my attitude would be if it affected the State of Texas, but it does not.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition from the States of Virginia and Maryland. The situation is simply that last year when we first passed the legislation, it provided a radius of 100 miles. When the bill passed the other body, our junior Senator from Virginia had the bill called back in order to reduce that radius from 100 miles to 25 miles. That is what caused the slipup in the enrollment of the legislation and caused the President to sign it in error. That is what we are attempting to correct at this time.

Mr. DOWDY. I think that is the only effect this bill has.

Mr. GROSS. Then it is safe to say that to extend the jurisdiction into Maryland and Virginia has the approval of those States—that is, to extend the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia Municipal Court into those States?

Mr. DOWDY. Yes, but I raised that question myself in the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. And by increasing the dignity and importance of the court by changing the name of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, it does not mean that Congress will be asked to increase the salaries to come up to the new status, does it?

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I might say to the gentleman that all of this was done last year. The real objective of this bill is to decrease that radius from 100 miles to 25 miles as the new bill provides.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the court established by the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to consolidate the Police Court of the District of Columbia and the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia, to be known as 'the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia', to create 'the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia', and for other purposes", approved April 1, 1942, as amended (56 Stat 190; D.C. Code, sec. 11-751), hereafter shall be known as the "District of Columbia Court of General Session". Whenever reference is made in any Act of Congress (other than this Act or the amendments made by this Act) or in any regulation to the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, such reference shall be held to be a reference to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions.

Sec. 2. Subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act, approved April 1, 1942, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 11-755(a)), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, as established by this Act, shall consist of the criminal, civil, and small claims and conciliation, and domestic relations branches. The court and each judge thereof shall have and exercise the same powers and jurisdiction as were heretofore had or exercised by the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia or the judges thereof on the day before the effective date of this amendatory subsection, and in addition the said court shall have exclusive jurisdiction of civil actions commenced after the effective date of this amendatory subsection, including such actions against executors, administrators and other fiduciaries, in which the claimed value of personal property or the debt or damages claimed, does not exceed the sum of $10,000 exclusive of interest and costs, and, in addition, shall have jurisdiction of all cross-claims and counterclaims interposed in all actions over which it has jurisdiction regardless of the amount involved: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall deprive the United States District Court for the District of Columbia of jurisdiction over counterclaims, cross-claims, or any other claims whether or not arising out of the same transaction or occurrence and interposed in actions over which the United States District Court for the District of Columbia has jurisdiction. The District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall also have jurisdiction over all cases properly pending in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia on the effective date of this amendatory subsection."

Sec. 3. Subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act approved April 1, 1942, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 11-756(a)), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) If, in any action, other than an action for equitable relief, pending on the effective date of this amendatory subsection or thereafter commenced in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, it shall appear to the satisfaction of the court at or subsequent to any pretrial hearing but prior to trial thereof that the action will not justify a judgment in excess of $10,000, the court may certify such action to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions for trial. The pleadings in such action, together with a copy of the docket entries and of any orders theretofore entered therein, shall be sent to the clerk of the said Court of General Sessions, together with any deposit for costs, and the case shall be called for trial in that court promptly thereafter; and shall thereafter be treated as though it had been filed originally in the said Court of General Sessions, except that the jurisdiction of that court shall extend to the amount claimed in such action, even though it exceed the sum of $10,000."

Sec. 4. Subsection (c) of section 5 of such Act approved April 1, 1942, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 11-756(c)), is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall have the power to compel the attendance of witnesses by attachment and any judge thereof shall have the power in any case or proceeding whether civil or criminal to punish for disobedience of any order, or contempt committed in the presence of the court by a fine not exceeding $50 or imprisonment not exceeding thirty days. At the request of any party subpenas for attendance at a hearing or trial in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall be issued by the clerk of the said court. A subpena may be served at any place within the District of Columbia, or at any place without the District of Columbia that is within twenty-five miles of the place of the hearing or trial specified in the subpena. The form, issuance and manner of service of a subpena shall be as otherwise prescribed by Rule 45 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure."

Sec. 5. (a) Section 1114 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1189; D.C. Code, sec. 11-1520), is hereby repealed.

(b) The paragraph relating to witness fees under the heading "District of Columbia" in the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and two, and for prior years, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 552, 561; D.C. Code, sec. 11-1520a), is amended by striking "cases in the police court of the District of Columbia" and inserting in lieu thereof "criminal cases in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions".

(c) The fees and travel allowances to be paid any witness compelled by subpena to attend any branch of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions other than the criminal branch shall be the same amount as paid a witness compelled to attend before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

Sec. 6. The court established by section 6 of the Act of April 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 190; D.C. Code, sec. 11-771), hereafter shall be known as the "District of Columbia Court of Appeals". Wherever reference is made in any Act of Congress (other than this Act) or in any regulation to the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, such reference shall be held to be a reference to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

Sec. 7. This Act shall take effect as of January 1, 1963.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, public hearings were held on similar legislation—H.R. 12708—during the 87th Congress. At those hearings testimony was received from representatives of the judicial conference for the District of Columbia, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, the Office of the Corporation Counsel, and the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. Full support for the legislation was expressed and no objections were heard by the committee.

Following the approval of the legislation—H.R. 12708—by the House, it was amended by the Senate. The House agreed to the Senate amendments. However, the text of the bill as enrolled for and approved by the President contained the text of the original unamended House bill. The pending bill, H.R. 3537, carries the text of H.R. 12708 as amended and as approved by the House and Senate in the 87th Congress. Its enactment will result in law conforming to that which was intended and approved by the House and Senate in the 87th Congress. The effective date, January 1, 1963, of H.R. 3537 is the same as that provided in H.R. 12708 of the 87th Congress, which was numbered Public Law 87-873.

The following statement of the purposes of H.R. 3537 and the section-by-section analysis are identical to those contained in House Report 2137 accompanying H.R. 12708 of the 87th Congress except for the inclusion of the amendments to that bill approved by the House and Senate and a provision for the same effective date.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

H.R. 3537 proposes, first, to increase the maximum jurisdictional amount of the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia from $3,000 to $10,000; second, to extend the power of the court to issue and serve subpenas for attendance to any point within a 25-mile radius of the District of Columbia; third, to change the name of the Municipal Court to the "District of Columbia Court of General Sessions"; and fourth, to change the name of the Municipal Court of Appeals to the "District of Columbia Court of Appeals."

In 1958, the Congress, to relieve the U.S. district courts of the increased burden of judicial business, approved legislation to increase the jurisdictional amount of such courts from $3,000 to $10,000—Public Law 85-554; 72 Stat. 415. However, the maximum jurisdictional amount for the Municipal Court of the District of Columbia—District of Columbia Code, section 11-755(a)—established at $3,000, has remained unchanged. The bill will place the courts of local and Federal jurisdiction within the District of Columbia into the same relationship as to jurisdictional amounts as exists between such courts in the other States.

The renaming of the Municipal Court and the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions and the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, respectively, is believed to be more suitable in view of the importance and dignity of these courts.

The power of the court of general sessions to serve process within 25 miles is felt to be proper and desirable in view of the close interrelationship between the District of Columbia and the metropolitan area.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

The first section of the bill amends existing provisions of law to provide that the Municipal Court established under present law shall be renamed and wherever in the existing statutes reference is made to the municipal court of the District of Columbia, such reference shall be held to refer to the "District of Columbia Court of General Sessions."

Section 2: This section amends existing law to provide that the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall consist of criminal, civil, small claims and conciliation, and domestic relations branches, and that the court and each judge thereof shall have the same powers and jurisdiction as were had by the municipal court prior to the effective date of the amendment. In addition to such jurisdiction, the court of general sessions shall have exclusive jurisdiction of civil actions, including those against executors, administrators, or fiduciaries, where the value of the personal property, debt, or damages in controversy does not exceed the sum of $10,000 exclusive of interest and costs. Further, the court shall have jurisdiction of all cross-claims or counterclaims, regardless of the amount involved, which are interposed in actions over which the court shall have jurisdiction. Finally, it is provided that nothing in the amendment shall deprive the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia of its jurisdiction over counterclaims, cross-claims, or any other claims which are interposed in actions over which the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia has jurisdiction.

Section 3: Section 3 amends existing law to provide that in any action, other than actions for equitable relief, pending on the effective date or thereafter commenced before the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, if the district court determines at or subsequent to any pretrial hearing but before the trial of the matter that the action will not justify a judgment in excess of $10,000, may certify the action, together with the pleadings, any deposits, docket entries, and order issued in connection therewith, to the court of general sessions. The jurisdiction of the court of general sessions in such case shall extend to the amount claimed even though it exceeds the amount of $10,000.

Section 4: Section 4 of the bill amends subsection (c) of section 5 of the act of April 1942. It empowers the Court of General Sessions to compel the attendance of witnesses by attachment, and grants to the judges of that court power to punish for disobedience of any order or contempt committed in the presence of the court by a fine not to exceed $50 or imprisonment not to exceed 30 days. It further provides that at the request of any party a subpena for attendance at a hearing or trial in the Court of General Sessions shall be issued by the clerk of that court. A subpena may be served any place within 25 miles of the place of the hearing or trial specified in the subpena. The form, issuance, and manner of service of the subpena shall be that prescribed by rule 45 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Section 5. Subsection (a) of this section repeals existing law regarding the payment of witness fees in civil cases.

Subsection (b) continues the present municipal court fees for witnesses in the criminal branch of the Court of General Sessions.

Subsection (c) is new language providing that the fees and travel allowances for witnesses compelled to attend any branch of the Court of General Sessions other than the criminal branch shall be the same as those provided for witnesses compelled to attend the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

Section 6: Section 6 provides a new name for the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia which shall hereafter be known as the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

Section 7: This section provides that the effective date of the act shall be January 1, 1963.

TREATMENT OF MINORS FOR COMMUNICABLE DISEASES

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill H.R. 2485, to amend the act entitled "An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases", approved August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1408), as amended (sec. 6-119 et seq., D.C. Code, 1961 ed.), is amended by renumbering section 13 as section 14 and by inserting the following new section immediately following section 12:

"IMMEDIATE TREATMENT OF MINOR WITH VENEREAL DISEASE

"Sec. 13. If a minor appears in any clinic, hospital, or other facility of the Department of Public Health of the government of the District of Columbia, and the Director of Public Health or his authorized agent, after having caused a medical examination to be made of such minor, has probable cause to believe that such minor is affected with a venereal disease or is a carrier of a venereal disease, and if, as a result of such examination, the Director of Public Health or his authorized agent determines that immediate medical treatment of the minor will adequately control the disease of the minor so as to protect his health and the health of others without having said minor detained as provided in this Act, the Director of Public Health or his authorized agent shall present to such minor a paper, upon which such minor shall state either (1) that he consents to such treatment, in which event such treatment shall be given to the minor forthwith, or (2) that he refuses to consent to such treatment, in which event no such treatment shall be given to him pursuant to this section."

Sec. 2. So much of section 3 of the Act entitled "To amend the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases', approved August 11, 1939", approved August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 919), as reads "renumbered as section 13" is amended to read "renumbered as section 15".

Sec. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners, or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill H.R. 2485 to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Department of Public Health of the District of Columbia to treat minors for venereal disease upon their own consent, when they present themselves voluntarily to the Department's health centers, rather than having to obtain such permission from their parents or guardians.

At present, minors for whom parental consent for treatment of gonorrhea cannot be obtained are given only oral antibiotics, which are relatively safe to administer but are not the drugs of choice, since effective treatment is assured only by injections, and also because oral medication is impractical in patients who are irresponsible or careless. In the case of syphilis, there is no prophylactic agent other than penicillin, and hence minors who have been exposed to this disease receive no treatment whatever without parental consent. According to testimony presented in a public hearing on August 10, 1962, this legal impediment to the administration of adequate treatment has resulted in the loss of 35 percent of the minors who are found in the Health Department clinics to have contracted or to have been exposed to venereal disease, with no treatment of any kind.

The seriousness of this situation is graphically illustrated by the following statistics which were reported to this committee by the Bureau of Disease Control of the District of Columbia Public Health Department.

District of Columbia Department of Public Health—Treated venereal disease cases age 20 and under for fiscal years 1959, 1960, 1961

	1959	1960	1961
Total syphilis	132	192	217
Primary and secondary	38	90	126
Early latent	72	68	75
Congenital	20	24	13
Other syphilis	2	10	3
Gonorrhea	3,089	3,263	[1] 2,539
Lymphogranuloma venereum	16	81	93
Chancroid	12	11	12
Granuloma inguinale	5	6	4
Total treated	3,254	3,553	2,865

[1] Notes a decrease. The basic reason for this is that in order to devote more time to the epidemiology of syphilis, it was decided that effective July 1, 1960, field investigative epidemiology of gonorrhea would not be conducted.

Venereal disease: District of Columbia, fiscal years 1956–62

Diagnosis	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Grand total	12,420	11,825	10,979	12,760	14,098	11,761	10,484
Total, syphilis	1,900	1,967	1,670	1,942	2,500	2,420	1,927
Primary and secondary	36	109	153	199	472	550	701
Early latent	263	301	268	356	432	396	331
Late latent and other	1,569	1,519	1,213	1,350	1,555	1,432	857
Congenital	32	38	36	37	41	35	38
Gonorrhea	10,418	9,781	9,231	10,679	11,215	8,901	8,295
Other venereal disease	102	77	78	139	383	440	262

NOTE.—According to the latest available statistics, the District of Columbia ranks 1st among cities of the United States in the incidence of early and infectious syphilis per 100,000 population, and 3d in the incidence of gonorrhea

Source: District of Columbia Department of Public Health, Bureau of Disease Control, Preventable and Chronic Diseases Division.

We were further informed that between the dates of August 28 and November 10, 1961, a total of 74 minors who were in need of treatment for venereal disease presented themselves to the Northwest Central Clinic without written parental consent for treatment. Of this number, 44 were treated at the discretion of the examining physician with oral antibiotics for clinical or bacteriologic gonorrhea or because they were designated sexual contacts to this disease. The other 30 were denied treatment at the time, for lack of written consent. Five of these returned the following day with signed permission and were treated; however, 24 hours had elapsed during which further infection might have been spread and irreparable damage done to the patient. The remaining 25 were never treated.

The difficulties involved in obtaining written parental permission for treatment are numerous. The minor who lives with one or both parents is said to pose few problems, provided that one parent can be readily contacted. Frequently, however, both parents are working. In other instances, a minor may be residing here with a relative other than his parents, or with a friend, and thus the required consent is extremely difficult to obtain. The most common source of difficulty, however, is probably the fact that in most cases, these minors fear the reaction on the part of their parents when the presence of these diseases is revealed to them.

The health of the community is seriously endangered by failure to treat this group of patients promptly. Through fear of their parents' displeasure, these minors frequently seek the advice of friends, older people, and thus often become the victims of quackery. Very often they allow their disease to spread through ignorance or neglect. Because they are in a very active sexual period of their lives, they are often promiscuous and are even a greater menace than the older adult who has some knowledge of venereal disease.

A survey conducted by the District of Columbia Department of Public Health revealed that treatment of minors for venereal disease upon request or presentation, without parental consent, is authorized in California, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Montana, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia, Wyoming, North Carolina, Idaho, and the territory of Puerto Rico. In their replies to the District of Columbia Health Department's questionnaire, the health departments of many of these States stressed the fact that while they do have this authority, they prefer in such cases to contact the parents and obtain their consent for treatment, and make every effort to do so. This committee is assured that the District of Columbia Health Department will pursue this same course, and will use this authority to treat without parental consent only when necessary.

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia have endorsed this bill, and no one has expressed any opposition to its passage.

A bill identical to this passed the House in the second session of the last Congress.

FALSE STATEMENTS ON INSURANCE LICENSE APPLICATIONS

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill, H.R. 1937, to amend the act known as the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 26 and 29 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act approved June 19, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 1139, 1141; sec. 35-425 and sec. 35-428, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), are hereby amended by adding after the second sentence of each such section the following: "Any such applicant who willfully files with or otherwise submits to the Superintendent, orally or in writing, any material statement, knowing such statement to be false, shall, in addition to any other penalty prescribed by law, be guilty of perjury and subject to the penalties thereof."

SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 32 of chapter II of the Fire and Casualty Act approved October 9, 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1078; sec. 35–1336, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended to read: "The person to whom the license may be issued shall file sworn answers, subject to the penalties of perjury, to such interrogatories as the Superintendent may require."

SEC. 3. Section 35 of chapter II of said Fire and Casualty Act, as amended (54 Stat. 1079; sec. 35–1339, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended by adding: "Any applicant who, in connection with such application for renewal of an expiring license, willfully files with or otherwise submits to the Superintendent, orally or in writing, any material statement under oath, knowing such statement to be false, shall, in addition to any other penalty prescribed by law, be guilty of perjury and subject to the penalties thereof."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to make the District of Columbia perjury statute applicable to those persons who make false statements under oath when applying for licenses or renewal of licenses as insurance agents and brokers in the District of Columbia.

This legislation is made necessary by a recent decision of the U.S. court of appeals—*Nelson* v. *U.S.*, U.S.C.A. D.C. No. 15726, decided January 12, 1961—which held that a person swearing falsely to the Superintendent of Insurance in an application for agent's license was not subject to the perjury statute of the District of Columbia.

The Superintendent of Insurance, in a memorandum to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, dated January 16, 1961, reported as follows:

> The urgent necessity for such a bill arises from the decision * * * of the U.S. court of appeals in the Nelson case. * * * In that case, it was decided that a person swearing falsely to the Superintendent of Insurance in applying for an agent's license is not subject to the penalties of perjury.
>
> The danger to the public in the present situation is obvious from the facts of the case * * *. Nelson obtained from the Department of Insurance a license to act in the District of Columbia as a life insurance agent. In his application he falsely swore that he had never been convicted of any offense against the laws of the District of Columbia, or of any other jurisdiction. Actually, at the time of his application he had recently been paroled from the penitentiary where he had served a sentence upon conviction of a felony involving a money transaction, and he was still reporting to the parole officer.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The business of insurance is a highly technical one, which is not understood by the average policyholder * * * (who) * * * may easily be deceived and defrauded by a dishonest salesman. There is obvious danger to the public * * * in the situation * * * whereby felons may not be convicted of perjury when they are found to have obtained licenses through false representations.

The District of Columbia perjury statute, applicable under the proposed bill, is found at section 858 of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1329; sec. 22-2501, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), and provides a penalty, upon conviction, of imprisonment in the penitentiary for not less than 2 nor more than 10 years. The perjury statute has already been made applicable by the Congress to certain violations of the insurance laws of the District of Columbia at section 27 of chapter II of the Life Insurance Act, as amended (72 Stat. 21; sec. 35–426, D.C. Code, 1951 ed., supp. VIII), and at section 9 of chapter 11 of said act (48 Stat. 1132; sec. 35–408, D.C. Code, 1951 ed.). The former provision declares that any person testifying falsely under oath at a Superintendent's hearing to determine whether a license should be suspended or revoked "shall be subject to the penalties of perjury." The latter provision states that any director, officer, agent or employee of any insurance company who willfully and knowingly makes oath to any false annual statement or other statement required by law "shall be guilty of perjury."

The proposed bill makes no change in these sections. It adds the penalty of perjury in the additional cases of false, sworn statements in applications for agents' and brokers' licenses and applications for renewal of such licenses.

The Board of Commissioners favor the bill, and its enactment will not result in additional expense for the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF MOTOR VEHICLE COLLISIONS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] to call up a bill from his subcommittee.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill H.R. 1982, to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended (43 Stat. 1124; sec. 40–609(a), D.C. Code, 1951 ed.), is amended (a) by adding at the end of the first paragraph the following: "In addition to the preceding requirements with respect to the action to be taken immediately in cases involving personal injury or substantial damage to property, every person who, in the District of Columbia, operates a motor vehicle which is involved in a collision, which has resulted in damage to the property of any one person in excess of $100 or in bodily injury to or in the death of any person, shall immediately make a written report thereof to the Chief of Police, on a form prescribed by him. Such written report shall be made without regard to the degree of personal injury resulting from such collision. In the event the operator of a motor vehicle involved in a collision is injured or otherwise disabled to such an extent as to render him incapable, in the opinion of his attending physician, of making any report of the collision as required by this subsection, such operator shall make such report within forty-eight hours after the date on which, in the opinion of his attending physician, he can reasonably be expected to have recovered from his injury or other disability to the extent of being able to prepare and submit the required report."; and (b) by striking "substantial" in the third paragraph.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Commissioners by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Commissioners may be delegated by said Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, may we have a brief explanation from the gentleman from North Carolina of this bill?

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I shall be happy to try to explain it to my friend. This is an identical bill to one the House passed last year. It was not passed by the other body.

It merely corrects a deficiency in the existing law of the District of Columbia so as to require that persons involved in motor vehicle accidents doing property damage in excess of $100 shall make a report to the Chief of Police of such collision and such damage.

Under the present law the Metropolitan Police Department does not necessarily receive complete reports upon such collisions which occur in the District. The Department of Motor Vehicles does get those reports. We feel that the Police Department should have this information. I might say to the gentleman that this provision which we would invoke into the law of the District of Columbia is consistent with the law of most States.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand this deals only with the handling of reports and does not change the amount of $100? Is the present requirement that those cases involving property damage to the amount of $100 must be reported?

Mr. WHITENER. The present law, as I indicated, requires that all accidents be reported to the Department of Motor Vehicles within 5 days. This agency is concerned primarily with the financial responsibility of the parties. Only accidents involving personal injury must be reported to the police at the present time. The police under the present law must send to the Department of Motor Vehicles copies of all reports which they get involving personal injury, but the Department of Motor Vehicles does not have to reciprocate as to property damage accident reports received by the Department of Motor Vehicles.

Mr. GROSS. Does this for the first time establish the amount of $100? If there is damage of $100 or personal injury it must be reported? Does this add a $100 provision? I am not clear on that.

Mr. WHITENER. This bill would for the first time establish the requirement that an operator of a motor vehicle make a report to the Police Department where property damage is involved. We merely reached the arbitrary figure of $100. As we all know, most any kind of bump today will do $100 worth of property damage to present-day automobiles.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to require that all collisions involving motor vehicles in the District of Columbia which result in property damage in excess of $100, or in personal injury of any degree, be reported immediately to the District of Columbia Chief of Police.

Under present law, motor vehicle collisions as described above must be reported within 5 days to the safety responsibility officer of the District of Columbia, who functions as a part of the Department of Motor Vehicles and whose primary responsibility is to determine the financial responsibility of the various parties to such accidents. However, only those collisions which result in personal injury are required to be reported to the Chief of Police. Although the Police Department is required to forward copies of all their accident reports to the safety responsibility officer, the latter does not send his reports to the Police Department.

At a public hearing conducted on July 16, 1962, this committee was informed that during fiscal year 1962, while approximately 31,000 motor vehicle collisions were reported to the safety responsibility officer, only about 22,000 were reported to the Chief of Police. Thus, during this year some 9,000 motor vehicle accidents involving property damage in excess of $100 were never reported to the police.

Two glaring weaknesses are inherent in this situation. First, whereas copies of all the Police Department's reports are sent to the Bureau of Traffic Engineering and Operations of the District of Columbia Highway Department, where they serve to reveal dangerous areas in the city's street system and thus guide the Highway Department in effecting corrective measures, the safety responsibility officer's reports are not adaptable for this purpose and hence are not sent to the Bureau of Traffic Engineering. Thus, the facts involved in 9,000 serious collisions per year are not made available to the Highway Department for this very valuable purpose.

The second major point of weakness which H.R. 1982 seeks to correct is the matter of the chronic offenders among the drivers involved in the 9,000 collisions per year of which the police are not apprised. When any driver becomes involved in accidents with sufficient frequency to cause suspicion as to his fitness to operate a motor vehicle, the safety responsibility officer reports the case to the Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles, who orders a hearing to determine the person's fitness status, both physical and with respect to attitude. An adverse finding as a result of this hearing brings about a suspension or revocation of the offender's permit to drive. However, the safety responsibility officer and the Department of Motor Vehicles do not and cannot act in any way to initiate legal prosecution against any such offender, for this is a police function. It is obvious that a chronically negligent driver, utterly lacking in a normal sense of responsibility, may become involved in frequent motor vehicle collisions and thus become a real hazard to the public; and while suspension or revocation of the operator's permit may be effective in some such cases, certainly in many others nothing short of legal prosecution can provide the protection to which the public is entitled.

H.R. 1982 therefore, is designed to bring about a degree of accident control and traffic safety which is not possible under existing law.

This same bill passed the House last year.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the business of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–420, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Guanajuato, Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963, the following members on the part of the House: Mr. Nix, of Pennsylvania, chairman; Mr. Montoya, of New Mexico; Mr. McDowell, of Delaware; Mr. Zablocki, of Wisconsin; Mr. Macdonald, of Massachusetts; Mr. Wright, of Texas; Mr. Johnson, of California; Mr. Whalley, of Pennsylvania; Mr. Derwinski, of Illinois; Mr. Hoeven, of Iowa; Mr. Norblad, of Oregon; and Mr. Springer, of Illinois.

EXTENSION OF DRAFT LAW

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up the resolution (H. Res. 287) providing for the consideration of H.R. 2438, a bill to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2438) to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Trimble] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith] and pending that I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 287 provides for the consideration of H.R. 2438, a bill to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

H.R. 2438 has five objectives of vital importance to our national security. These five objectives are as follows:

First, it will extend the authority to induct individuals into the Armed Forces from July 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967, a period of 4 years;

Second, it will extend the suspension on strength limitations of the Armed Forces from the present termination date of July 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967;

Third, it will extend the Dependents Assistance Act from July 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967;

Fourth, it will extend the so-called doctors draft law from July 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967; and

Fifth, it will extend from July 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967 the authority to grant special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians who are ordered to active duty before that date.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 287.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, House Resolution 287 will provide for the consideration of H.R. 2438 on an open rule with 2 hours' time limit. As is usual in connection with this distinguished Armed Services Committee, they have a very fine report setting forth in detail just what the bill does and what the legislation to be considered here will do. The purpose of the legislation is set forth rather succinctly on page 15 where it says:

> The principal purpose of the proposed legislation is to extend the induction authority of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 451 et seq.), and the authority to make special calls for the induction of persons in the medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, until July 1, 1967.

On page 1 of this report, there are listed the five different sections of the law which will be extended for this period of time, all being presently existing laws which are being extended. It came out of the committee, as I understand it, by unanimous vote of 37 to 0. I have received a letter from one member stating that he contemplates offering an amendment to limit the age to 22.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose we have to have legislation like this in the present precarious position that we find ourselves in in the world today. I would certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that the time will come, if we are at peace, where we can get away from this Universal Military Training and Service Act. This law causes the teenagers to become upset and concerned. As time goes on and they are waiting to finish college or to go into college and they do not know for certain what their future may be, this causes some of them to lose their incentive a little bit, Mr. Speaker, and it is a little difficult for them to make their plans for the future so that they can go ahead in the American way of life which they would like to do. So I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that in due time the situation can be worked out throughout the world so we can do away with this particular act and let American youth of today go ahead and develop their future in accord with what I believe they would like to do.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 7]

Ashley
Belcher
Bolling
Bromwell
Burkhalter
Celler
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Ellsworth
Flood
Fogarty
Fulton, Tenn.
Glenn
Griffin
Griffiths
Gurney
Healey
Henderson
Joelson
Johnson, Wis.
Kee
Macdonald
Madden
Matthews
May
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Morrison
O'Brien, Ill.
Patten
Pepper
Philbin
Pike
Powell
Rains
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roosevelt
St. George
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Tupper
Walter
Watson
Wright
Zablocki

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 384 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF DRAFT LAW

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2438) to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 2438, with Mr. Sikes in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 2438, is one of the most vital legislative items the Congress will consider during this session. Its enactment is indispensable to the maintenance of our security.

Let me explain exactly what this bill seeks to accomplish:

First, it will extend until July 1, 1967, the authority to induct men for training and service into the armed services.

Second, it will extend until July 1, 1967, the present law which suspends other provisions of law that impose restrictions on the authorized personnel strengths of the armed services.

Without suspending these provisions of law which impose ceilings on the number of personnel who may serve on active duty in our Armed Forces, the Army would be limited to 837,000 personnel; the Air Force to 502,000; the Navy, 500,000 enlisted personnel, plus the authorized number of line and staff corps officers; and the Marine Corps, 400,000.

These strength ceilings have been suspended since August 3, 1950.

As of December 31, 1962, we had an Army of 952,000 personnel; a Navy of 581,000 enlisted personnel and 74,000 officers; an Air Force of 863,000; and a Marine Corps of 188,000. Thus, if we do not extend the law which suspends these ceilings, the Army would be reduced by 115,000 personnel; the Navy by 81,000 enlisted personnel and a corresponding number of officers; and the Air Force would be reduced by 361,000 personnel.

It is obvious, therefore, that we must continue to suspend these ceilings.

Third, the bill would extend the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1967.

This act is the authority under which we pay enlisted members of the uniformed services who are in pay grades E–4 with 4 or less years of service, E–3's, E–2's, and E–1's an increased basic allowance for quarters because they have dependents.

Under this law, an enlisted man, when he allots $40 of his pay, is entitled to amounts ranging from $55 a month for one dependent, $83 for two dependents, and $105 for three or more dependents. Unless we extend this provision, these enlisted men would only be entitled to a quarters allowance of $45 a month, regardless of the number of their dependents, and, in addition, would only be entitled to such an allowance if quarters were not furnished to the enlisted man.

Fourth, the bill will extend until July 1, 1967, the authority vested in the President to provide for the special selection or induction for service in the Armed Forces of persons qualified in needed medical, dental, veterinary, or allied specialist categories. This is popularly known as the Doctors Draft Act.

Actually what happens is that under the draft law all persons who are deferred for any reason remain liable for induction up to age 35. Almost all medical, dental, and veterinary students are deferred in order to complete their training and under existing law the President, until July 1, 1963, may select for induction persons in this category who are qualified in needed medical, dental, veterinary, or allied specialist categories.

In other words, the President may induct physicians, dentists, veterinarians, or allied specialists who are over the age of 26 and have been deferred to complete their educations without regard to other persons who are in these age groups.

This provision of law must be extended until July 1, 1967, because it is the only way we can meet the medical, dental, and veterinary requirements in our Armed Forces.

Finally, the proposal would extend until July 1, 1967, the authority to grant special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians who are ordered to active duty before that date.

This special pay amounts to $100 for physicians and dentists who serve on active duty for a period of 2 years; $150 a month for physicians and dentists who serve on active duty for more than 2 years; $200 a month for physicians and dentists who serve on active duty for at least 6 years; and $250 a month for those physicians and dentists who have completed at least 10 years of active duty.

Veterinarians are entitled to a flat $100 a month.

I might add that this special pay is applicable to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians for the remainder of the time that they may serve on active duty, but no physician, dentist, or veterinarian entering on active duty after July 1, 1963, would be entitled to this special pay unless we extend the date to July 1, 1967, which is proposed in the bill before us. Without this special pay we would be unable to retain the experienced medical, dental, and veterinarian personnel so vital to the health needs of our Armed Forces.

Now, I would like to briefly describe the operation of the draft law.

All male persons in the United States must register with their local boards after they attain the age of 18.

Men are liable for induction from age 18½ to age 26.

Any person who is deferred remains liable for induction up to age 35.

After an individual registers with his local board, the board classifies each man as to his availability for service. There is an appeal procedure provided in the law for those who feel that they have been improperly classified.

There are also certain statutory deferments provided in the law for college students, which permits them to finish an academic year when they have been ordered for induction, and for high school students which permits them to stay in school to graduate or until they attain the age of 20. You might be interested to know that 363,000 students are now in a deferred status.

The law also permits the President to provide for deferments because of an individual's occupation or because of his dependency status. However, an individual may not be deferred under the law on the basis of marriage alone, except in cases of extreme hardship. Two million men are now deferred because of their dependents; 118,000 men have industrial deferments; and 18,000 men have agricultural deferments.

In addition to deferments for college students, high school students, occupations and dependency, there are also certain statutory deferments for individuals who satisfactorily participate in ROTC programs, as well as Reserve and National Guard activities. This accounts for 912,000 deferments.

In addition to deferments, there are also certain statutory exemptions, including sole-surviving sons, ministers and students of the ministry, and conscientious objectors who are opposed to both combatant and noncombatant service. At present there are 17,000 conscientious objectors, and 71,000 ministers or divinity students. Conscientious objectors may be ordered to perform 2 years of service in the national interest.

Any person who has served honorably on active duty for a period of 1 year or longer is not liable for induction except in time of war or national emergency, and a person who has been discharged for the convenience of the Government is also exempt from induction if he has served at least 6 months on active duty.

Persons who have served satisfactorily as members of the Organized Reserve since February 1, 1951, are also exempt from induction, and, as I have indicated, persons who enlist in the National Guard are deferred from induction so long as they perform satisfactorily in the National Guard. However, these persons remain liable for induction should they cease to perform satisfactorily in the National Guard, up to age 28.

All persons who are inducted are required to serve 24 months on active duty unless sooner released.

At present, the average age of induction is about 23, and men are being called in the following sequence:

First, those men who are declared delinquent for failure to comply with the law;

Second, the next to be called are those needed to fill local board quotas, or men who have volunteered for induction. Men may volunteer for induction at age 17 with parental consent, and without parental consent after age 18. Almost 50 percent of all draft quotas are being met by young men who volunteer for induction;

Third, after that the local boards call nonfathers between the ages of 19 and 26 with the oldest being called first. I might add that this group makes up the major portion of the I-A pool and will fill all needs short of a heavy mobilization; and

Fourth, after the nonfathers are called for induction, local boards, if necessary, would order fathers in I-A between the ages of 19 and 26 with the oldest first, then men over 26 who have been deferred, and finally men between the ages of 18½ and 19.

Insofar as physicians and dentists are concerned, the law provides them with an opportunity to apply for commission and they are then ordered to active duty in a grade commensurate with their professional education, experience and ability.

These are the major provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act which has now been in almost continuous operation since 1940.

For a brief period after the 1940 act expired in March of 1947, we did not have a draft law. We soon found that we could not maintain our Armed Forces on a voluntary basis, and in June of 1948 we enacted the Selective Service Act, which was renamed the Universal Military Training and Service Act in 1951.

Thus, for practical purposes, we have had an almost continuous draft law since 1940.

From the testimony we received from the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, we know that we could not maintain our present recruiting rates without the draft law.

During fiscal 1962, we inducted 157,000 men, almost twice the number that had been originally planned. To this must be added the thousands of men who voluntarily enlisted in the regular services or in a Reserve component.

Without the stimulus of a draft law, many of these men would not have volunteered for service.

Without the draft, it is clear that we could not get the needed manpower for our armed services.

Without the special provisions in the draft law dealing with physicians, dentists, and veterinarians we would be unable to meet the health needs of our armed services.

I might also add that the special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians seeks to compensate them for their expensive educational training and the years of service they spend in colleges and universities, while their line counterparts of comparable ages are advancing in grade and obtaining longevity credit on active duty.

Certainly we must continue to suspend the strength ceilings that would otherwise require a reduction in the size of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

And, finally, I am sure there is complete agreement that we must extend the Dependents Assistance Act so long as we maintain a draft law.

Mr. Chairman, no one likes a draft law. But, I am sure that almost all of us will agree that we have no practical alternative.

First, about 1,400,000 young men register for the draft each year;

Second, at any one time there are about 9½ million men between the age of 18½ and 26 who are registered and eligible for classification;

Third, by the time any age group attains the age of 26, about 58 percent of these young men will have served in the Armed Forces in one capacity or another; and

Fourth, the remaining 42 percent will consist of those who are physically or mentally disqualified, fathers, agricultural and industrial employees in essential occupations, and those who are exempt from induction by law, such as ministerial students and sole-surviving sons.

I sincerely hope the House will pass this bill unanimously, and again demonstrate to the world our firm determination to remain strong and ready, at all times.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I apologize for interrupting the gentleman during his statement, but I do have a question which relates to the matter he has been discussing before the committee.

I was in my home State a few weeks ago to meet with a group of young people. They were visiting me about joining the Peace Corps and related their contemplation as connected with their military obligations. I said:

> You understand that joining the Peace Corps is not a substitute for your military obligation?

They responded like this:

> Yes. But we understand by the time our Peace Corps service is over, Congress will act, and our service in the Corps may be counted in lieu of our military obligation.

The reason I ask the question at this time, I think the record ought to be made indelibly clear if this has been contemplated by the Committee on Armed Services or suggested by the administration.

Mr. VINSON. It has never been discussed by the Committee on Armed Services, and it is not contemplated by the Committee on Armed Services. In addition the gentleman has just stated good reasons why the draft should be extended 4 years instead of 2 years.

Mr. AVERY. I agree with the gentleman. If this is being used as a recruiting device by the Peace Corps, I deplore it.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman need not worry. No man will be exempted on account of being in the Peace Corps.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What was that good reason for extending it 4 years?

Mr. VINSON. The good reason is: First, it has been done three different times. When the gentleman offers an amendment later on——

Mr. GROSS. It may be offered by somebody else. I will offer it if someone else does not.

Mr. VINSON. We will discuss it at that time, and I will offer satisfactory reasons to the House why it should be extended 4 years instead of 2 years.

Mr. GROSS. Why not explain that now to the House?

Mr. VINSON. I will do that under the 5-minute rule. You can rest assured that there is no contemplation on the part of the Committee on Armed Services to give any consideration at all to granting an exception by statute to any member who joins the Peace Corps.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. The testimony we received from the Secretary of Defense and from the Joint Chiefs of Staff all was to the effect that it is absolutely essential, with world conditions as they are, that the draft be extended. I hope the committee will vote to extend it for 4 years. Each one of these laws must be extended 4 years. So, therefore, if the Committee this afternoon decides to accept an amendment to make it 2 years, it should apply to each one of these extensions. But I certainly hope when we debate that we can convince you we are on firm ground to let it remain like we have done in the three previous extensions of the draft.

The draft has been in operation since 1940, practically. There was only a short period when this country did not have the draft. We have agreed on this 4-year program. It enables the young men back in the Nation to map out their course without as much uncertainty as the 2-year proposal would create. So I hope when the proposition comes up of 2 years it will be the wisdom of the House not to accept the 2 years.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

I just want to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services whether he proposes to discuss at all the 6-month program.

Mr. VINSON. If an inductee or volunteer serves 6 months in the Armed Services, he is not liable to the draft.

Mr. LINDSAY. I understand that; but what is the future of the 6-month program?

Mr. VINSON. We will extend it, I am confident. I have referred that bill to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], and on Wednesday of this week we will start hearings on extending the 6-month program.

Mr. LINDSAY. The proposed 4-year extension of the draft has nothing to do with it, then?

Mr. VINSON. Nothing at all; it has no relation to it. If a boy volunteers for 6 months under the law, he gets deferred from the draft.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I would like to advise the distinguished chairman of some difficulty that I have had in my congressional district in relation to the 6-month program. Now, I have had numerous young men come to see me and inform me that the list of those who seek entrance into the 6-month program is so long that they see no possibility of ever being granted deferment.

Mr. VINSON. Well, as I stated to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] this whole matter will be opened up by our distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] on Wednesday. We will go into it thoroughly. I certainly hope that the committee will see fit, in their wisdom, to recommend an extension of it, and I feel confident that they will.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. May I also suggest, not alone extend the program but also the number of young men that can enter the program.

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Let me give the House this information. There are about 1.4 million young men registered for the draft each year. At any one time, and at this time, there are over 9.5 million men between the age of 18½ to 26 who are registered and eligible for classification, and by the time any age group attains the age of 26, about 58 percent of those registered either enter the service under the draft or as volunteers.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS].

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services has given a very clear and complete explanation of the bill before us which extends the Draft Act. As Members of the House we have no real choice except to extend the Draft Act in view of our defense needs. An amendment will doubtless be offered to reduce the length of the extension from 4 years as proposed by the committee to 2 years. It would be most unwise for us to extend the draft for less than 4 years, for two very simple reasons: First, a 4-year extension enables the young men affected to better plan for their futures and, second, of course, it seems most unlikely to me that a drastic change will occur in our defense manpower needs during the next 2 or 3 years. For these reasons, we should extend the act for 4 years.

With respect to the 6-month active duty Reserve program, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has announced that a subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] will start hearings on this program on Wednesday.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in view of the fact that the gentleman made some reference to the 6-month training program, the committee should understand that there is imposed a 5½-year Reserve obligation on the person who takes the 6 months' training.

Mr. OSMERS. The gentleman from Georgia has wisely added this important fact to the remarks he made in response to a previous question about the 6 months' program.

Mr. Chairman, some of us who originally sponsored the 6 months' active-duty Reserve program have concluded that the program is not now fulfilling its basic intended purpose.

Many Members of the House may have forgotten but this 6-months' active duty, 6½-year Reserve program when first proposed was to apply only to young men between 18 and 19½ years of age. The thinking behind the original proposal was to provide a means for young men to get their active duty obligation fulfilled between high school and college, or between high school and joining the work force.

As we all now know, by raising the age limit to 26 for the 6-month training program, we defeated to a considerable extent one of its major purposes. We now find that young men who have graduated from college at age 21, 22, and 23 are seeking places in the 6-month program as a substitute for serving 2 years under the Draft Act. We cannot criticize any young man for this for the simple reason that present law gives him a clear right to apply for the 6-month program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that the Hébert subcommittee will give very careful consideration to reducing the age of those admitted into the 6-month program. It might also add to the effectiveness of the program if the active duty period is increased from 6 months to a year. This would still allow a young man to get his active military duty out of the way before he starts college or his career yet provide for a longer active duty period.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, let me say that the Nation owes a debt of gratitude to our volunteer local draft boards who administer the Draft Act. Throughout the entire Nation, these boards perform wonderful service to the Nation and its youth. Without the dedicated help of these citizens the administration of this act would be impossible.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, naturally I rise in support of this bill.

I would like to point out that these hearings, though concluded in a very few days, afforded every person interested in this bill the opportunity to present his views.

Mr. Chairman, we heard conscientious conscientious objectors and I suspect we heard some who were not quite so conscientious. We heard people who believe that the road toward peace necessarily involves a demonstration of our good will by abandoning the draft and universal military training. We heard these views and every other shade of opinion that the mind of man could conceive.

The interesting part about all that testimony which was patiently listened to by members of our committee was that we did not hear one single new point against the draft that we did not hear 4 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I remember one of the points raised 4 years ago was the fact that we could get civilians to replace military men. We heard further that we are not properly utilizing our manpower.

I sat through lengthy hearings as a member of a Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]. Though we found room for improvement in the utilization of manpower, though our report did influence the military, did effect some very notable improvements, we still found that it was absolutely impossible for the needs of the military forces to be fulfilled except for the Universal Military Training Act.

Mr. Chairman, we heard a lot of talk about how military men were being utilized in a servant status. As we went into that subject in great depth we found that most of it was just talk, and there was little abuse of this situation by the military.

Mr. Chairman, we also found at the same time that the needs of the military must be geared to military requirements and we could not expect civilians to perform a military task.

And so I say in conclusion that there were fair, adequate, and complete hearings held on this bill. There is a requirement for the extension of this draft. Manpower is being efficiently utilized, progress is being made toward even better utilization. We should extend this draft for 4 more years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Has the gentleman been over to the Pentagon lately to see how military personnel is used for purposes other than combat duty?

Mr. GUBSER. I have been to the Pentagon quite frequently. I would not say that it is the most perfect example of utilization of manpower that one could find, but I would say that probably it is a lot better than we are giving it credit for.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Among the people who came before our committee as conscientious objectors I think it is interesting to note that some of those conscientious objectors who came before our committee and opposed any bill are on the Federal payroll right here in Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. Gubser] has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote to extend this for 2 years, but I do not see how I can vote for an extension of 4 years. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Osmers] made a good argument for an extension for 2 years. The chairman added to that argument for a 2-year extension. On the grounds that the Hébert committee is going to go into the 6 months' training program and may increase it to 1 year.

Mr. VINSON. That has no relationship to this bill.

Mr. GROSS. It has every relationship to this bill, because the conscription program is used as a club to get men into the present 6 months' program. With the conscription program, and its 2 years of obligated service, the gentleman well knows that it is used in that fashion. It is one of the prime reasons for the continuation of the conscription program. There is every reason to extend this for 2 years, and no solid reason for extending it for 4 years. There has been talk about planning. If this is a valid argument why do we not establish all governmental programs on a 4-year basis and appropriate for 4 years? That argument falls of its own weight.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman a question or two. As I understand, we have some 2.5 million men in the various branches of the uniformed services; is that about correct?

Mr. VINSON. I think the strength of the three services totals about 2,700,000.

Mr. GROSS. When does the gentleman expect to cut back on the 2,700,000 in view of all the missiles that are available?

Mr. VINSON. With world conditions as they are now I think the gentleman will agree with me that it would be very unwise to talk about cutting back the size of the armed services.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that it is about time that somebody gave some attention to it, because in this country the taxpayers cannot continue to support these huge conventional forces and at the same time stockpile and overstockpile nuclear warheads. I wish somebody in the armed services would explain this to me, the need for these huge conventional forces if we are going to fight a war with nuclear weapons? Can the gentleman tell me how he relates these two?

Mr. VINSON. I think it would be shortsighted on the part of the Government to put all of its weapons in one basket. I think that to be on safe ground we must have the capability of meeting the challenge of conventional warfare as well as nuclear warfare. Notwithstanding the fact that we have a great many missiles, nevertheless the enemy might not fight with missiles. Therefore, if you put all your eggs in that basket you could be helpless. We must have a ground force, an Air Force, a Navy, a Marine Corps, missiles, and all of these things.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: How many divisions does the United States have in NATO today?

Mr. VINSON. Five or six.

Mr. GROSS. How many total divisions are there in NATO?

Mr. VINSON. Twenty-four, I believe.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that 24 divisions can contest in conventional warfare with 240 divisions?

Mr. VINSON. It all depends on how they are used. If they use the ground forces, I think we can give a pretty good account of ourselves. We are well armed, we are not cowards, and we are going to fight if necessary.

Mr. GROSS. But if these troops do not use nuclear warheads, how can 24 divisions compete with 240 divisions?

Mr. VINSON. I find myself today in much disagreement with our learned friend from Iowa, whom I oftentimes follow. He attempts to lead me down the primrose path of defending this country with one kind of defense. That is the way to defeat.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows I am not suggesting that. However, I hope the gentleman will take me with him on one of those trips through the White House rose garden. I would like to take a sniff of them and find out what goes on there.

Mr. VINSON. I am now trying to lead the gentleman in the rose garden of the House.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I think the gentlemant should point out to us the change in the size of the military forces that came about in the advent of this administration. Prior to the advent of this administration we were building on the basis that we would at any time use all the forces at our command. President Eisenhower said at the time of the crisis of 1959 we would use any military force at our command, including nuclear weapons. But the new course now is to have more conventional forces to meet the great conventional challenge of the Soviet Union. This requires more manpower. Under the old concept it required less manpower. That is why we started a number of years ago to build what was called a pentomic army, to reduce the size of the military.

Mr. GROSS. What has happened to the men who have been made available through the recent abandonment of foreign bases?

Mr. BECKER. If the gentleman will let me follow this thought, under this concept now we must realize we have let the enemy choose the weapons and the kind of warfare. He is going to fight a conventional war, so we are to prepare for a conventional war. Therefore we need all these additional weapons and manpower to meet that challenge.

Mr. GROSS. I did not know we are actually fighting the Russians.

Mr. BECKER. We are not, except that there is the threat.

Mr. GROSS. All right, but if our troops in Europe are going to fight a conventional war with the Russians we are whipped before we start.

Mr. BECKER. I do not agree with the gentleman that we are going to fight a conventional war at any time with anybody.

I would say this, that the concept that we were following a few years ago is one that I believe many military leaders believe is the ideal one, namely, that we always hold the threat of using nuclear weapons, if we are attacked anywhere.

Mr. GROSS. Well, then, what is the shooting all about?

Mr. BECKER. That is a different version. I cannot tell you that. Maybe the chairman can answer that one—I cannot.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to have the chairman—I would like to have somebody—tell me how it is planned to fight the next war and how this country expects to win the next war unless our forces use thermonuclear weapons.

Mr. VINSON. It is my belief that the philosophy that there is more than one way to fight a war is a sound philosophy and that philosophy, as has been so ably pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Becker] was inaugurated some years ago. There is today in the Department a different concept which is something that worries me and it hurts me to see my learned friend, the gentleman from Iowa, falling into the trap of this new concept of this new philosophy. I, on the other hand, adhere to the previous and the older philosophy and I hope the gentleman from Iowa will get back on the track and stay there.

Mr. GROSS. I am on the track. It is others who are off the track and trying to have it both ways.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pirnie].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, the real question before the committee is the extension of the draft and its necessity.

Mr. Chairman, current and foreseeable national defense requirements impose upon the Congress the vital responsibility of maintaining Armed Forces exceeding 2½ million men.

From experience we have learned that these manning levels cannot be sustained by enlistments alone. We allowed the Selective Service Act to expire after World War II, but were obliged to reinstate the program only 17 months later. Volunteers could not fill the gap and

since that time Congress has found it necessary to continue the Selective Service System.

The more modest manpower requirements of the cold war permit a relatively high degree of selectivity. Thus, all our young men are not forced to fulfill military obligations. It is said that many are classified, but few are chosen. However, this is not the measure of the success of the legislation. Although the draft today does not impose universal military training, it has served effectively to stimulate widespread voluntary participation in other branches of the Military Establishment. Including all forms of military service such as the ROTC, National Guard, and Reserves, 58 percent of American men under 27 years of age have had or are undergoing military training. The remainder were either rated ineligible because of rigid peacetime standards or were deferred because they were fathers or students.

Few claim that the system produces complete equity, but even fewer say that it has not served the Nation well, both in war and in peace. Furthermore, no acceptable alternative has yet been presented which will assure accomplishment of the required objectives. No doubt future adjustments will be necessary, but for the next 4 years, we will need the selective service system. H.R. 2438 is essential to the national defense and merits our complete support.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time it is my intention to offer an amendment to this bill being reported out today by the Armed Services Committee, which would provide that no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces pursuant to this act except as provided in sections 5(a) to 6(h) of this title after he has attained his 22d birthday. But this paragraph shall not apply to any period of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President.

Mr. Chairman, in offering the amendment to H.R. 2438, sponsored by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], one cannot help having a very distinct feeling of how David felt when he met Goliath. I yield to no one in my respect for the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson].

I am convinced that when the final chapter of our Nation's victory over international communism is written, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] and the members of the Armed Services Committees on both sides of the aisle will be listed among the chief architects of that great victory.

It has been my great pleasure, my honor, and my privilege to support this committee in virtually every single bill it has brought to the House because I know how diligently this committee has worked to preserve that very precious commodity of freedom which we Americans love so dearly. In this particular instance, however, I hope the chairman will not oppose my amendment.

We now have in this country 10 million young men registered under the draft. We are now receiving, and will receive even more with the baby boom now coming in, one and one-half million additional young men every year as registrants under the draft. Testimony before this committee shows that in this fiscal year, 1964, we will draft only 76,000 young men out of the reservoir of 10 million; and half of those 76,000 will come from volunteers.

In each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years we expect to draft into the Armed Forces only 90,000 young men a year, again out of a backlog of well over 10 million; and, again, more than half of that 90,000 will come from volunteers. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I submit that while I am basically for this bill—and whether my amendment is adopted or not I shall vote for this bill—I think we are imposing a very cruel hardship on the young men of this country by keeping them in the shadow of the draft for 7½ years, from the age of 18½ to 26—when we cannot possibly use all of these men in the Armed Forces short of a major catastrophe.

My amendment permits the President to go back to the old law any time he feels such action is necessary. Before my committee, the House Labor Committee, we have ample testimony to show that there are in this country in the unemployed labor force 800,000 young men of draft age.

Employers have written to me repeatedly saying they hesitate to hire a young man of draft age for two basic reasons: because they lose him to the draft; but more important, because the employer must commit himself to a 2-year obligation once this young man goes into the service; and, therefore, employers prefer not to hire young men of draft age.

Under my amendment cutting it down to 22 years, a young man reaching the age of 22 would be exempt from service thereafter unless there was a national emergency. He would remain on the rolls but would be called only in the event of an emergency proclaimed by the President. I know we cannot completely eliminate the draft at this time. Everyone knows that the draft stimulates voluntary enlistment. My amendment would not interfere with that concept one iota; you would still have five million men between the ages of 18½ to 22 in the reservoir. These younger men would stimulate voluntary enlistments but it would give the older men a chance at permanent employment and an opportunity to plan their lives in a more orderly manner once they reached their 22d birthday and have not previously been called up for the draft. After their 22d birthday, they would be exempt except if they had taken a previous deferment. In the case of the latter, they would remain subject to the draft just as they are under existing law.

Why in heaven's name keep them under the draft until they are 26? We would actually be doing a great favor to the college students. My amendment does not disturb the formula at all. A young man who is in college and is now subject to the draft can get a deferment; but once he gets that deferment he remains liable to military service until the age of 35. When this young man gets through with his college training, gets his degree and goes out to practice law or whatever he wants to do, he is subject to draft until he is 35 years old. Under my amendment, it is true, these young men, if summoned for the draft and enrolled in college before reaching their 22d birthday, could continue to take the deferment as they can under existing law and be subject to the draft at a later age.

However, if this young man has not been called up by the time he reaches his 22d birthday, and he is attending college, the young man then is exempt from the draft, as would any other young man. We would have parity between those going to college and those not fortunate enough to go to college. We would be giving the armed services the young men they need instead of the older men.

In Illinois my attention was called to a directive that was sent to all draft boards urging them to be as lenient as possible on deferments, because in Illinois we have a backlog of 60,000 1-A men, when we are drafting only 230 a month from the whole State, half of them volunteers. So they said to the draft board, "Be as lenient as possible in deferments." But this is not meeting the problem. A deferment still leaves them subject to the draft at a later age.

Under existing law there is some question as to whether or not the President has the right to change an age bracket. Perhaps he does. But the sense of Congress can fortify the whole concept. It is my hope that this amendment will be accepted so we can go on record as being for a lowering of the draft age. While at the same time we serve notice on our allies that we are ready to help, and on our enemies, that we are going to keep our armed services ready.

As reasonable men, we can see the havoc this prolonged draft call is creating to millions of young Americans. I do not know of a single young man who is not ready and willing to serve his country. I do not know of any young men who are unwilling to make their sacrifice. But the fact remains, Why keep these men on the hook, so-called, up to the age of 26 when there is not a chance in the world under the existing backlog of recruits that we can use them.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. As I understood the gentleman's statement, in his proposed amendment he wants to change the draft age from 18½ to 22 years?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thas it correct, I want them subject to the draft at age 18½ and exempt from the draft when they reach their 22d birthday if they have not been called up by then.

Mr. VINSON. The law today is 18½ to 26?

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct. If we bring the maximum age limit down to 22, any older young man, whether he is in college or out of college, and he has reached his 22d birthday, if he has not been drafted by that time he is then excused. You are going to have to do this sooner or later, you might as well realize that.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to express my agreement with one aspect of the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski].

We Republicans on the Committee on Education and Labor last Friday presented to the public and to the Congress what we called a constructive alternative to the Youth Opportunities Employment Act. We listed some seven recommendations to replace the President's proposal for a Youth Conservation Corps. One aspect was trying to encourage enlistments and selection of some of the younger boys in this 18- and 19-year-old category, who in certain parts of our country are adrift, looking for job training, looking for jobs. They are uncertain as to when they will be called. This does now present a problem, and it is very acute with many of these young people.

I am not sure but what the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois will involve some other complications. If so, I intend to offer a softer type of amendment, which will simply say it is the sense of Congress, if possible, that they select younger men for the draft.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I want to commend the gentleman from New York on his position here, because from the studies we made in our subcommittee on youthful employment you can see there were young people 18 years of age who did not know exactly what they ought to be doing, and they have not seen fit to enlist, and I think with the draft at an earlier age it would lessen youthful unemployment and present a requirement to young men which would lessen unemployment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. As I understood the gentleman, he proposes some amendment with reference to the policy section.

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. Would the gentleman be kind enough to let us see what that amendment is?

Mr. GOODELL. I certainly will, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. I will read the amendment to the Members in the remaining time I have:

On page 1, and after line 6, insert the following new subsection:

> Section 1 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended by inserting the following subsection (f): "It is the sense of the Congress that, in the selection of men for induction for training and service under this Act, greater emphasis should be given to the selection of the younger registrant non-fathers who have not entered regular employment or continued their formal education."

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. Reid] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of H.R. 2438, which calls for extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, since I feel that such extension of the draft is necessary if we are to maintain our military strength and thereby insure our national security.

As a mother of two sons—one currently serving in the Marines and another certain to be eligible for military service in the near future—I would be the first to vote against this measure if I believed that present world conditions permitted a weakening of our defenses.

I shall, of course, strive for peace in the world—but peace with honor and with freedom—so as to make any further extension of the draft unnecessary in the future. In the meantime, however, I am convinced that it is vital to the preservation of our freedom to remain strong militarily—especially when we are faced with the Communist menace only 90 miles from our shores; and I believe that extension of the draft is vital to maintaining that strength.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate, as always, the courtesy of the great chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], in giving me this time, and I take this time because it seems to me there is an important issue of policy present in the bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, I intend at the proper time to offer a very simple amendment which would extend the draft not for 4 years but instead for 2 years, so that the next Congress, the 89th Congress, may likewise have an opportunity to examine and debate the underlying questions involved. I say that as one who, ever since he has been here, has supported the draft law, in 1955 and 1959.

But I think that there are present in the world today some considerations which were not present on those earlier occasions.

If we look at the nations of Europe, our friends and allies over there, seized, as many of them are, with the new nationalism, we hear them making demands that they conduct a larger part of our joint defense themselves. Well, the natural corollary of this is that they ought to commit more ground troops, particularly to the defense of the great ground mass of Europe. If that were done in the next 2 or 3 years, the need for an armed service level at our present level would diminish.

Secondly, I am glad to know that the Committee on Armed Services shortly is going to consider the question of pay and emoluments generally for our armed services. Action in this field could mean that the armed services become a more attractive voluntary career, and hence that the draft would one day prove to be unnecessary. I am certainly not trying to predict that in 1965 we can do away with the draft. But I am saying that the 89th Congress, in 1965, ought to have the opportunity to reach its own judgment on that.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. Very briefly. I only have 5 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. I share the position of my colleague from Wisconsin and can well understand his concern that the draft activities be reviewed every 2 years. However, in the event that his amendment fails, it is important to me as a member of the Defense Appropriations Committee that this legislation be enacted. If the 2-year amendment fails, I will then be in a position where I must support the 4-year extension.

Mr. REUSS. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that it is important that the draft law be extended and be continued for 2 years. In the case of my own vote on this question, if and when we come to that point in the proceedings, I am going to be guided very largely by the debate between then and now, but in principle I certainly agree with the gentleman.

The one reason that appears from the committee report and the testimony for not amending the bill so that the draft law would be continued for 2 years rather than 4 years is that—and here I quote the Department of Defense:

> To do so would create an element of uncertainty.

I am not sure I know just exactly what this means. But I take it the element of uncertainty that would be created would be the possibility that in 1965, due to world events, a draft would not be necessary. Common sense tells me that it is better to be uncertain about whether things will get better than certain that there will be no improvement.

Mr. Chairman, I note also that there is considerable uncertainty now in the life patterns of our young people between the ages of 18 and 25. I do not think that amending the bill to create a 2-year extension rather than a 4-year extension would in any way add to the uncertainty.

Mr. Chairman, the 89th Congress—the one that will be sitting in 1965—is entitled to the opportunity to debate and to vote on the draft.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield in order to permit me to ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services a question?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, how many men have been deferred now?

Mr. VINSON. Well, of course, they have been deferred in different groups and for different reasons.

Mr. GAVIN. In different categories?

Mr. VINSON. I said in my statement what those groups were. I do not have the figures right before me, but I did give those figures.

Mr. GAVIN. What is the total?

Mr. VINSON. My recollection is that in one group there were 3,500,000; in another group there were 2 million, and in another group of students there were 363,000. I am sorry I cannot pinpoint the groups more accurately at this time.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, 4 years ago when we considered whether or not to extend the Universal Military Training and Service Act for another 4 years, it was quite properly pointed out that we are living in a dangerous world and the dangers are not apt to be significantly lessened in the foreseeable future. Today, we are no closer to a peaceful settlement of world problems than we were in 1959.

It is a big jump, however, from the proposition that we are living in dangerous times to the conclusion that we must maintain a permanent system of military conscription. In fact, no one of those who support the extension for another 4 years of the draft maintains that conscription ought to be permanent. The fact that we extend the draft for only 4 years at a time is an indication of this feeling. We in America have traditionally resisted the concept of a permanent large Military Establishment. We may tolerate the draft, but we do not approve of it.

The question, then, is not whether we need to maintain strong defenses in today's uncertain world but rather whether we need to extend the draft for an additional 4 years.

Is the draft bill necessary? Many people say "No." Many others say "Yes." Between these divergent opinions, however, there remains a large area of agreement.

First. We can all agree that, in the present world situation, we must maintain a strong, efficient military force.

Second. We can all agree that we must spend as much money as necessary to maintain a sufficient military force. At the same time we would all agree, I think, that we should spend no more money than absolutely necessary to provide adequately for the defense of this Nation. Money that is wasted, or that is not used as efficiently as possible, does nothing to add to our safety; it only puts more of a burden on the taxpayer.

Third. We can all agree that the draft is not a desirable way to raise men for military duty. All three branches of the service have said this many times, as have the Armed Services Committees of both Houses of Congress. The most that can be said for the draft is that it is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, it had been my intention to offer an amendment similar to that which my distinguished colleage, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] plans to offer, but I shall not offer my own amendment. Rather, I shall be pleased to support the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss]. My amendment would have differed only insofar as it would have created a Presidential commission to study the problem relating to manpower utilization so that, if possible, it could then be determined whether in the years ahead it would be possible to phase out the draft.

Mr. Chairman, for one thing, every time we extend the draft for an additional 4 years, we increase the likelihood that the draft will become permanent, that the 4-year review will be pro forma. Yet there seems to be unanimous agreement that this is what we do not want.

Second, the review of our military establishments, published in what has become known as the Cordiner report, is about to bear fruit. Some time soon hearings will be held on a new military pay raise bill, designed to make military life and military service more equitably compensated, and therefore more attractive. This bill appears to have a good chance for passage. What effect it would have on the enlistment and reenlistment rates in the services cannot now be predicted with any degree of accuracy. But certainly within 2 years the effect will be felt.

Thirdly, even more than was true 4 years ago, modern warfare has become a technical and exacting business. Since 1959 we have launched a fleet of nuclear submarines, which require the greatest degree of skill to man on the part of every member of the crew. Since 1959 we have installed an entire arsenal of missiles, including intercontinental ballistic missiles, that are launched and directed by the use of complex electronic equipment. It is far clearer now than it was in 1959 that large, mass armies no longer are the mainstay of a nation's defenses. Even in those areas of the world where the use of conventional weapons is practical—and the present administration has placed much stress on the need for flexibility—the troops that are needed are small groups of highly trained fighters, expert in the use of ever more sophisticated weapons.

It is important, therefore, to ask in 1963 whether the draft serves any useful purpose in meeting today's military needs. There are many who believe there is no clear-cut answer. I am not proposing to end the draft immediately. Let us err, if we must, on the side of caution. I am suggesting, however, that we must find out if it is necessary. I believe 2 years is enough time to find out. A civilian study would, in my opinion, eliminate any possibility that competing interests of the different services, and the understandable human desire to supervise as many others as possible, will color the report.

The draft is an expensive way to run a defense program. It is expensive in terms of the people it takes away from constructive work for largely nonproductive labors. It is expensive in terms of taxpayer dollars; to train boys to be soldiers and then to have to train new boys to do the same jobs because the old ones have returned to civilian life is a waste of money.

This Nation spends over a billion dollars a week on defense. At such a rate the taxpayers have a right to ask that their money not be spent wastefully. In terms of maintaining an efficient defense program, the draft may very well be wasteful. At least we ought to find out.

I propose the establishment of a President's Commission on the Utilization of Military Manpower which would be made up of civilian experts in the field of military manpower procurement—former Secretaries of Defense, business executives, educators, psychologists, students of military affairs. This Commission would conduct a study of our present military situation, our military manpower needs, and the possible alternatives to the draft for meeting our manpower defense needs. Among other questions, the Commission would seek to answer the following:

First. What tasks do the 2.7 million men in our armed services now perform? Which of these are necessary from a military point of view; which would better be performed by civilian employees.

Second. Are men in the services adequately trained for the tasks they are now performing? How long should it take to train men to use the modern equipment for our defense? Can it be done in 6 months? In two years? How long after being trained should a serviceman serve in order to be worth the money spent to train him?

Third. What alternatives to the draft as a method of encouraging enlistment and reenlistment can be devised? What positive incentives can be offered. What would be the effect of a pay raise? How much of a pay raise would be needed to provide adequate incentive? What would the cost of such positive incentives be to the taxpayer?

Fourth. How many men would be used in a modern war? Do we now have more men under arms than we could possibly need in any foreseeable conflict? What exactly are our military manpower needs?

Fifth. What are the effects of the draft on our civilian economy? Are the armed services taking needed skills out of our Nation's manpower pool? Could these skills be supplied to the military any other way?

Sixth. What are the psychological effects of the draft? How does the military life effect those who are drafted? Those who are not? Are those who are drafted efficient soldiers, or does their unwillingness to be in uniform make them a drag on the whole Military Establishment?

These are the questions that require answers if the American people are going to get the maximum protection for their defense dollar. Merely extending the draft another 4 years does nothing toward answering the questions that remain unanswered. We must know if the draft, which no one really wants, is necessary in today's world. Our Nation must not be burdened with either the cost or the disruptive effects of conscription 1 day longer than necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier] has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute to answer a question.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that my colleague from Wisconsin will admit that it is necessary for us to extend the draft at this time and if the 2-year amendment does fail, I hope he will join with us in extending the draft. It is absolutely necessary that some action be taken. Does the gentleman concur in that point of view?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, let me say this to the gentleman from Wisconsin; it is my position that a 2-year extension should be enacted.

Mr. LAIRD. And the gentleman feels that it is necessary?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I feel it is most desirable that the extension be for 2 years.

Mr. LAIRD. But the gentleman feels it is necessary to extend it for 2 years?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. For 2 years.

Mr. LAIRD. But if that amendment does fail it is my hope that those of us on the floor of the House who do favor the 2-year review will agree that we cannot adjourn this Congress without extending the draft. This is particularly true in this year 1963 with the cold war challenge we as a nation face.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I have thought that the draft in some form will be extended, and I think the gentleman need have no fear on that point.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in getting answers to questions that puzzle me. Of course, I recognize that we all start at the same point, that we need military strength, we need manpower; people must serve and if they will not serve voluntarily, they have to be conscripted. But there are some things that disturb me. I have been reading the hearings as much as I could, since coming on the floor. For example, on page 168 and the next few pages thereafter there is the testimony of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis]. He raised some questions and problems that I cannot answer; and I am not arguing with anyone so much as I am arguing with myself. I am trying to find out. These bother me.

We are disrupting our youth and their education. We are encouraging draft dodging in every possible way, just as though we want them to dodge the draft. Of course, we do not want that. Is this universal military training or is it not? As legislation, this is an extension of a wartime bill. We are affecting many civilian programs and certainly the educational institutions in our country. We are taking 90-percent men who will be noncombatant and do not need to have A-1 physical condition. Take these men who are driving staff cars. They are drafted to do what? Drive cars? Be PX salesmen, clerks, warehousemen, cooks, and countless other services. We need to get the best men we can and use their civilian skills. These jobs can be done as civilians. Why take a man out of civilian life and make him do something he would do as a civilian?

Has the committee gone into why the Seabee technique was disbanded? Why have they not considered the use of men who do the same jobs, as civilians. They may not measure up physically, but could run bulldozers. This is but one example. That is what we took them in for, to do necessary civilian work. The 90-percent noncombatant men who are not going to fight are going to be doing jobs they might do as civilians. Frequently, today's civilians could do a much better job than men trained as military personnel.

I am asking for information from the chairman, the ranking member of the minority, or anyone, because I am just trying to find answers. Are we trying to get civilian skills through the draft? Do we have any studies that will help us use the Seabee technique and use civilian skills rather than force men into the military? Is there any study about doing this, reinstating the Seabee technique where we take men to do civilian jobs, what they were doing as civilians and did so well? Why do we not reimpose that technique?

Mr. VINSON. Because we do not think we properly should. The gentleman is perfectly right about the use of the military for civilian purposes. A study of that kind, has been going on, and we have been trying to eliminate that.

Mr. ALGER. Can the gentleman tell me if we are moving at all toward a more voluntary system by offering better pay and better conditions in order to get men into the service?

Mr. VINSON. We are going to have a pay bill coming up this week, and I certainly hope the House will adopt it. It is a very warranted and justifiable bill. But we must have the selective system to maintain our Armed Forces.

Mr. ALGER. The gentleman said there were 2.7 million men in the Armed Forces, in answer to a question a few minutes ago. We are talking about draftees numbering 100,000 a year. Half of those would be volunteers. They would not all be drafted. Are we talking about getting 50,000 men under this bill for a 2.7-million-man armed force?

Mr. VINSON. Of course, we would not attain the necessary strength if we relied on a voluntary force.

Mr. ALGER. I was referring to page 168 of the hearings and the pages thereafter that were testified before the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson]. I am drawing for this discussion today from that testimony.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I would like to say this about those who have talked today, that the basic argument is the proper utilization of military manpower. If we did have proper utilization, would we need this draft bill? The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services appointed a special committee to investigate this feature. It is a most frustrating procedure to try to get to the bottom of proper utilization.

When we were in executive session discussing the vote on this bill and to vote it out of the committee, I raised this issue again with our good chairman on this proper utilization, and the chairman has stated he was going to reconstitute that committee on proper utilization. I would say to the gentleman from Texas, I would hope this time we may be more successful and probably get to the point where we get the type of utilization out of the men in the service rather than have to get more all the time and have to have a draft and have to do all sorts of things to keep them in, and that we would probably utilize the men we have in the service. This is a frustrating job that you are trying to do and, as has been suggested, I hope the committee under the leadership of the subcommittee chairman will try once again.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] said or implied that you had been weaned over to the idea of placing reliance on missiles. It seems to me that only a year ago the gentleman from Georgia, after taking his famous walk through the White House rose garden, came back here and went against the RS-70. He placed his faith in missiles, did he not at that time?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I shall not endeavor to answer the question raised by the gentleman, but I would like to make plain to the chairman as well as to the gentlemen addressing me, I am sure the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Texas both use their best judgment at all times on the problems confronting them. I am not on the Armed Services Committee and there is much that I do not know, I am sure. But I do not mind making inquiry, even to showing my ignorance, in asking questions.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. I think it is very important that the Record show this clearly. The committee is deeply concerned about the matter of military personnel being used in occupations that could be performed by civilians, and is planning another complete study on that whole subject matter, and it may be possible that there can be a reduction of military personnel in that regard and that military personnel can be transferred to the support part of the forces instead of being used in commissaries and things of that nature. This committee is going to make a study of this matter. I am satisfied we can do something in this regard. But remember this—that would have no relation whatsoever to the draft because the bulk of these people are in the Air Force and they are not in the Army, and the Army is the only one that uses the draft.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger].

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FOREMAN. Referring to the remarks of my fellow Texan, do not be alarmed—Texas has not given up. He is not going over to the side to turn over our forces under the Arms Control Act and the Disarmament Act or to go along with the administration and try to roll over and play dead to the Communists. I think he is just raising some questions he has here in his mind concerning this. I feel sure he will be behind us in supporting this draft bill. I think he realizes as well as you and I do that in order for us to maintain freedom for this country and for around the world, we must maintain our military strength. Now, one thing you brought up a while ago on this utilization—it is not the question we are faced with here on extending this draft bill. This is something we have been assured will be brought up in committee later to study more efficient manpower utilization. Further, you stated the draft would only bring in 100,000 and that is right, but for us to be able to continue to get volunteers in the Air Force and in the Navy and the Marines, we have to continue this draft and it has been proven that we continue to bring people in.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman.

I feel I must reply to the point the gentleman from Texas raises concerning my questions. Some of you may be surprised at my inquisitiveness, but I do take a dim view of shipping American boys overseas to fight and die in a war that is not labeled a war in South Vietnam. If I knew of a way to keep from putting our men in uniform to send them over for death in an undeclared war I would heartily support it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. I do want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Foreman], a member of the Armed Services Committee, who is making an outstanding record.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. Doyle].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, with one exception I sat through every session of the Armed Services Committee as a member thereof during the study of this important subject, and while I feel that the draft as such is repugnant to our American way of life—and that has always been my position, that we must not get any thought in mind of making the draft a permanent policy of this Nation, we ought to try to set up some system whereby the American boys who are needed for our national defense and security against aggression are available without being under some compulsory system except as a last resort—I, of course, shall vote for further extension of the draft the way my committee has recommended it. I voted for the bill in committee and I shall vote for it in the House. It appears to me that there is a real necessity for it for the present.

I wish it were possible safely to reduce the period to 2 years, but I do not believe it is safe under the circumstances in which we find the world at this time. I think the world is in such shape that we in this country should at this time extend the draft for 4 years and not a day less. At any time we wish we can repeal the act or the President of the United States can order ceasing of any age group or all of the ages.

I have in mind one fact that has not been brought out so far in this debate. It is mentioned in our committee report and I call your attention to paragraph 1, page 3, which says:

> For the next 4 years, after giving full allowances to the estimates of voluntary recruitments, it is anticipated that the Army will require an annual average of 90,000 inductees to maintain its approved strength.

I again asked some of the top military personnel before our committee at that time, and I have asked the same question frequently, whether or not the Air Force and the Navy needed the draft to get their personnel. At all times the Joint Chiefs of Staff answered me, and the Secretaries answered likewise, that the only segment of the military that needed the draft was the Army, not the Navy or the Air Force. I do hope the time will come before too long when the inducement, the pay, the conditions under which they serve, and other factors, will make it so it is not necessary for the Army even to have the draft in order to obtain the number of men it needed.

When I came to the floor today two Members of this great body asked me, because they knew I was interested especially in the subject of conscientious objectors, the status of the conscientious objectors at the present time. I will not take time to read here what occurred on that subject in the Armed Services Committee, but in that committee I asked General Hershey—you all know who he is—about the subject of conscientious objectors, and whether or not it was a major problem.

I call attention to our committee hearings, page 93, and that brief discussion between General Hershey and myself, in which he stated that the question of conscientious objectors is no longer a major problem but is working out satisfactorily.

He replied as follows:

> We have, of course, two kinds: One kind are conscientiously opposed to killing people, but they are willing to go into the service and perform what they can, and do.
>
> We have had several thousand in the last 15 years that have served abroad, and I don't believe you have ever heard much about it, which is a pretty good indication that it is working. The religious groups have paid their way, so the Government hasn't had to worry about the money. I was the person who had to decide and be responsible whether what they were doing was in the national safety and interest. I think my association with the religious groups—I am very proud of it—but they better speak about how well they like it. I think we are getting along very well indeed, and I think you would hear more about it in the paper if we weren't.

Mr. Chairman, one set of figures my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], did not call attention to and I want to give them to you. These figures are quite shocking. Let me call attention to page 12. There is one item there. The number of men disqualified, on account of physical and related reasons, is 3,598,160. In other words, the greatest number of deferments of applicants or boys called for the draft are disqualified because of physical, mental, or related reasons. It seems to me that we as a nation ought to take notice of the fact that this is not evidence of good national health. It is not evidence of good public health, when the largest number of proposed draftees who are deferred are deferred on account of physical reasons. This needs immediate and adequate provisions against its continuance.

I want to compliment the local draft boards for the work they have done. They have done a magnificent job.

I have also found that, generally speaking, in these hearings before our Committee on Armed Services, you can pretty well believe what the high-ranking military personnel reports to us as the actual facts. The high-ranking military personnel said to our committee they needed this draft, that they need it now, and they need it for 4 years. While I respect the judgment of my colleagues who propose to offer amendments, I feel I cannot go along with these amendments, with the world in the state it is in now, with any recommendations other than what the military has recommended in this case. In this case I feel I must go along with the urgent request of the military, although I recognize these amendments would have some meritorious appeal contained in them.

EXTENDING UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING ACT

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, if I were present and voting today I would support House bill 2438 to extend the Universal Military Training Act as a necessary continuation of our all-out effort towards victory in the cold war. I only hope that the sense of duty shown by the American youth today serving under the provisions of this act will be matched by an equal determination on the part of all Americans to continue United States and free world supremacy in a military, an economic, and a political sense over the foe which has sworn to destroy us.

No one regrets more than I the necessity for once again approving a continuation of this legislation. However, the facts of the matter are plainly written for all to see. The Communist enemy can be impressed only by a clear dedication on our part to develop a positive strategy to make America strong.

and adequate strength to make this positive strategy work now and in the future. For these reasons, I today am expressing my support for this legislation, and if I had an opportunity to vote, I would join my colleagues who cast an "aye" vote.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask this afternoon for a general discussion on the floor of this House and a continuing discussion in this country regarding the present draft laws and their relationship to the President's theories of youth employment.

This is a serious matter, and I am proud of my colleagues in this House who have been seriously discussing a number of important questions today, and throughout this debate.

I would like to ask whether or not an earlier draft age would help stem the rising tide of juvenile delinquency? I think it would.

We have been receiving reports that one of the prime purposes behind the youth domestic corps is that it would take a number of young men off the streets and place them in meaningful surroundings.

As the present draft laws are constituted, the average age of the draft is in the 21–23 age groupings. It comes at a difficult time for a number of young men who are right in the middle of deciding on a future career. Or, as Members have suggested in this debate, at an age like 25 and 26 when careers have already begun.

The Selective Service Act and system insures that manpower from which military manpower would be mobilized is registered and classified and that it can be delivered to the Armed Forces in numbers limited only by the capacity of the Armed Forces to deliver it.

Since the operation of the system informs each young man that he does have an obligation to serve, why is it not possible to draft at 18? This, I suggest, would go a long way toward easing unemployment of youth.

It would give younger men an opportunity to take up various trades, and obtain course work in valuable subjects. These young men, I feel, would be better soldiers and ideal for career assignments—which the Army wants its young draftees and enlisted men to think about, as soon as they enter the service.

In many cases, people will not hire young men who have finished college and face the draft before they reach 26. With an earlier draft age, these young men will be more conducive to full-time employment.

Another point at issue here, is that many outstanding young men enter the other services when they complete high school as enlisted men. They do not desire to wait until they are 22 or 23 to be drafted, so they enter the Navy, Marines, and Air Force.

It is my opinion, also, that the 6-month program serves no meaningful purpose. By keeping men in a Reserve unit after 6 months of training invariably means that we have weak Reserve units and even weaker training for the 6 months.

It is the theory of the Selective Service people in Washington that the later draft age stimulates younger boys to enlist. This is true, but as I have mentioned, they do not enlist in the Army but in other services.

With a lower draft age, and I understand that the President does have the authority to draft at 18½, I think we could go along toward meeting increasing unemployment among youth and at the same time, strengthen the solid base of the military.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, during public hearings conducted by the Armed Service Committee in connection with the extension of the Draft Act in 1959, the Committee on Armed Services became aware of a belief that there would be no necessity for the provisions of the Draft Act if manpower resources available to the armed services were more efficiently utilized.

As a consequence of this assertion, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services recommended the establishment of a special subcommittee to inquire into the utilization of manpower by the Deparement of Defense.

The resolution approved by the full committee provided the widest possible jurisdiction to the subcommittee, and authorized it to inquire into every aspect of manpower administration and utilization.

I was given the honor and privilege of being the chairman of that special subcommittee, and I would like briefly today to relate to the Members of the House some of the efforts of that subcommittee together with its findings and recommendations on the subject of military manpower.

Public hearings on this subject were initiated by the subcommittee on the 12th day of May 1959. Because of the desire of the subcommittee to avail itself of the views of the various Members of the House on this subject, a written invitation was extended to every Member of the House to appear before the subcommittee on this subject.

I am happy to advise that a large number of Members availed themselves of this opportunity, and provided the subcommittee with the benefits of their views. The recommendations of these Members was an invaluable adjunct to the efforts of our subcommittee.

The subcommittee also entertained the views of numerous representatives of the executive branch, industry, education, organized labor, and various other private citizens who could make a contribution to the subcommittee's efforts.

The subcommittee completed its hearings on February 4, 1960, after which time it went into executive session to assess and analyze the information made available to it. The subcommittee report was issued on June 15, 1960, and contained four recommendations pertinent to the subject of utilization of military manpower.

The Department of Defense took immediate action to implement the subcommittee's recommendations. In anticipation of an interest in this subject in connection with extension of the Draft Act, I have requested the Department to provide me with an up-to-date summary of the action taken by the Department on the subcommittee's recommendations. If there is no objection, I will insert the letter together with its enclosures, in the RECORD at this point.

Briefly, the Department's letter indicates that on the basis of the subcommittee's recommendations, it has effected a reduction of approximately 2,300 military personnel assigned to commissaries throughout the world. In addition, it has issued a strong directive limiting the use of enlisted personnel on the personal staffs of senior officers.

The Department has also recently completed an extensive study into the rotation base of the various military departments with a view toward identifying those jobs in the military departments which can be filled by civilian personnel rather than military personnel. I understand that this study may ultimately result in the replacement of approximately 15,000 military personnel by civilians.

As I have previously mentioned, the subcommittee hearings and studies were most comprehensive. The printed hearings reflect a portion of the work done by the subcommittee, and consists of more than 800 pages of printed testimony taken by the subcommittee. Despite this intensive effort on the subcommittee's part, it was unable to uncover any evidence which would support the allegation that the more efficient use of military personnel would render unnecessary a continuation of the induction provisions of UMTS.

In that connection, I would like to read to the House the views of the subcommittee on that particular subject:

> The subcommittee wishes to make quite clear its views on the relationship of military manpower savings to the continuance of the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.
>
> As is evident throughout this report, the subcommittee is of the opinion that military manpower savings can be achieved by a continued emphasis on the more efficient use of military personnel. However, it should be kept in mind that this saving in military manpower in the support forces will:
>
> (1) Permit the transfer of such personnel from the support forces to the actual operating forces; and
>
> (2) Result in an attendant increase in the manning strength and overall combat capability of the operating forces which, in many instances, are presently undermanned.
>
> Therefore, these savings cannot, and should not, be translated into any overall decreased requirement for military personnel. On the contrary, the subcommittee has become aware that, notwithstanding the popular concept of pushbutton warfare, the increased complexity of our modern weapons system together with related defense considerations has, in fact, generated increases rather than decreases in the total manpower requirements of our armed services.
>
> Stated another way, the subcommittee was unable to develop, during the course of its inquiry, any evidence which would justify or support the contention that the more efficient use of military personnel would render unnecessary continuation of the induction provisions of universal military training and service.

The report of the subcommittee was unanimous on all of these recommendations including the views relating to continuation of the Selective Service Act.

There has been no development to my knowledge which would justify any change in the stated position of the subcommittee. I therefore recommend that the Members of this House unanimously support an extension of the provisions of the Selective Service Act.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1963.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Frank Slatinshek of your staff requested a report on actions taken to implement the recommendations of the Special Subcommittee on Utilization of Military Manpower, 86th Congress. The Department previously reported on this subject on February 13, 1962.

The subcommittee's four recommendations were on these subjects: (1) The use of enlisted personnel on personal staffs; (2) military personnel rotation requirements; (3) implementation of policies on the use of civilian personnel; and (4) the relationship of manpower provided by contractors to manpower provided by direct Government employment. A copy of the Department's memorandum which initiates implementing actions is enclosed. The Department's actions taken on each of the subcommittee's recommendations are summarized below:

Pursuant to the subcommittee's recommendations, the Department issued Department of Defense Directive 1315.9 on the Utilization of Enlisted Personnel on Personal Staffs. The directive restricts the use of enlisted personal staff to the performance of duties which are within the scope of the military and official responsibilities of the officer to whom they are assigned. A copy of the directive is enclosed.

A review of the rotation requirements of the individual military departments, as recommended by the subcommittee, was completed. The study was made available to the Secretary of Defense for consideration in connection with fiscal year 1964 force level decisions.

The subcommittee's recommendation to institute measures to enforce Department of Defense policies on the use of civilian personnel was carried out by surveys of compliance during July–November 1960, and by reemphasis of the policies in May 1961. In this connection, pursuant to the subcommittee's objective of reducing the number of military personnel in commissaries, the Department has accomplished a total reduction of approximately 2,300 military personnel in these activities between June 30, 1960, and June 30, 1962.

In accordance with the subcommittee's recommendations to develop policies for the use of contract manpower and to consider contract resources in the development of manpower ceilings, the Department has made considerable progress, particularly in such major functions as maintenance and research and development. A copy of policies which govern contracting for maintenance is enclosed. Subsequent to a Government-wide study on contracting for research and development, a comprehensive action program to strengthen the competence of Department of Defense research and development laboratories was directed by the Deputy Secretary of Defense on May 3, 1962. Among the actions taken were an increase in the number of high-level scientific positions and a significant increase in education and training to assure a steady flow of quality personnel in Government laboratories.

I can assure you that the availabilities of contractor, as well as Government resources, are fully considered in developing manpower ceilings.

For your convenience, the enclosures mentioned in my letter are in the attached folder. Please advise me if you desire additional information on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN S. PAUL.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1960.

Memorandum for the Assistant Secretary of the Army (M.P. & R.E.), Assistant Secretary of the Navy (P. & R.F.), Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Air Force (M.P. & R.F.).

Subject: Implementation of Price subcommittee report.

References: (a) Report of Special Subcommittee on Utilization of Military Manpower of the House Committee on Armed Services, June 15, 1960. (b) Memo, Assistant Secretary of Defense (M.P. & R.), subject: Price subcommittee report, dated June 27, 1960.

Distribution of the subject report was made under reference (b) and a meeting with your representatives on this subject was held July 6, 1960.

In accordance with the discussion during this meeting, it is requested that action indicated below be taken on each of the cited recommendations and the necessary reports be submitted to this office on or before the dates indicated: (numbers below correspond to recommendations in Price subcommittee report).

1. Each military service is requested to advise this office on or before August 26, 1930, of the actions taken or proposed to implement Price Subcommittee Recommendation No. 1.

2. Each military department is requested to designate a liaison officer as soon as practicable to work with the Office of Manpower Requirements and Utilization, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (M.P. & R.) in the planning of a review of rotation base requirements of the military departments, both as to numbers and skills, with the objective of more efficient utilization of military and civilian manpower. In this connection, reports previously made in response to Assistant Secretary of Defense (M.P. & R.) January 8, 1960, request subject: Price subcommittee request for skills and numbers of military personnel involved in the rotation base will be used as a point of departure for development of these plans in order to avoid duplicate reporting.

3. Each military service is requested to review its policies and procedures which implement section IV, Director of Defense Directive 1100.4, as concerns civilian staffing, to determine their adequacy to detect and correct deviations from this policy. Specific consideration should be given to the policies and procedures by which the use of military personnel in civilian-type jobs because of budgetary or manpower ceiling limitations are or can be identified, reported, and considered. A report of the foregoing review is requested no later than November 1, 1960.

4. Each military service is requested to nominate a principal and an alternate member to serve on an ad hoc working group to develop and assess the manpower implications of contract procurement and to recommend an appropriate statement of policy and implementing procedures. The ad hoc working group will develop, initially, a term of reference for its operation for the approval of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (M.P. & R.). The names of service representatives to serve on this group should be reported to this office not later than August 1, 1960.

CHARLES C. FINUCANE.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DIRECTIVE

Subject: Policies governing the use of commercial and military resources for maintenance of military materiel.

References: (a) Department of Defense Directive 3232.1, "Department of Defense maintenance engineering program"; (b) Department of Defense Directive 4100.15, "Commercial and industrial type facilities"; (c) Department of Defense Directive 3232.8, "Industrial and commercial technical services"; (d) Department of Defense Instruction 3232.6, "Commercial and industrial facilities allocation planning to accomplish depot maintenance of materiel during mobilization."

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of this directive is to establish basic management policy and related criteria for the effective and efficient use of commercial and military resources for accomplishment of materiel maintenance requirements of the Department of Defense.

II. APPLICABILITY

This directive is applicable to the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The policies and criteria contained herein are in consonance with the policies of references (a) and (b) and serve to further delineate these policies with respect to the accomplishment of maintenance by contract. This directive does not conflict with, or otherwise alter, reference (c).

III. DEFINITIONS

The following terms and definitions are applicable to this directive:

(A) Contract maintenance: That maintenance (i.e., modification, modernization, rebuild, overhaul, repair, or servicing of materiel) performed under contract by commercial organizations (including original manufacturers) on a one-time or continuing basis without distinction as to the level of maintenance, as defined by reference (a). Included within this term is that contracting for services to augment military capability for the direct maintenance support of materiel.

(B) Military maintenance: That maintenance performed by a military department under military control utilizing Government-owned or controlled facilities, tools, test equipment, spares, repair parts, and military or civilian personnel.

(C) Materiel: Materiel consists of all tangible items (including ships, tanks, self-propelled weapons, aircraft, etc., and related spares, repair parts, and support equipment; but, excluding real property, installations, and utilities) necessary to equip, operate, maintain, and support military activities without distinction as to its application for administrative or combat purposes.

(D) Mission-essential materiel: Consists of those weapons, equipments, and systems (including spare components and support equipments) which have been determined to be vital to a primary defense mission; the unserviceability of failure of such materiel to meet design performance would jeopardize a basic defense assignment or objective.

(E) Direct maintenance support: Refers to that maintenance performed to materiel while it remains under the custody of the using military command. Upon restoration to serviceable condition, the materiel normally is returned directly to service.

(F) Indirect maintenance support: Refers to that maintenance performed to materiel after its withdrawal from the custody of the using military command. Upon restoration to serviceable condition, the materiel is returned to stock for reissue, or returned directly to the user under conditions authorized by the military department concerned.

(G) Maintenance capability: Consists of those resources, namely: facilities, tools, test equipment, drawings, technical publications, trained maintenance personnel, engineering support, and an assured availability of spare parts, required to modify, retain materiel in, or restore materiel to, serviceable condition.

(H) Maintenance capacity: Is the quantitative expression of maintenance capability.

IV. BACKGROUND

(A) Materiel maintenance capability is essential to, and is an integral part of, the national defense capability. Two basic sources for materiel maintenance are available to Department of Defense activities; namely, military maintenance, and contract maintenance. It is in the public interest that the use of these sources in peacetime be planned in such manner as to provide maximum effectiveness under emergency or war conditions.

(B) Military maintenance provides a controlled source of technical competence and the necessary resources to assure the operational readiness and sustained operation of military materiel under emergency or war conditions. Such maintenance must be organized and ready to meet the requirements of primary military missions of the Department of Defense in fulfilling the national security objective.

(C) Contract maintenance provides an effective means for augmenting the resources of the Department of Defense in accomplishing maintenance of its materiel. Properly applied and administered, it can: (1) release military maintenance capability and capacity for more essential work; (2) reduce the requirement for Department of Defense investment in facilities, equipment, and training of personnel; (3) provide a cushion of flexibility to maintenance programs; (4) increase the dispersal of maintenance capability; and (5) result in net benefits to the Government without compromising basic military mission responsibilities. However, to be most beneficial, contract maintenance should be planned well in advance of the requirement; its application should not produce uneconomical utilization of existing facilities which must otherwise be retained for the maintenance of mission-essential materiel, nor should it increase overall costs to the Government through the necessity for larger pipeline inventories. Most important, contract maintenance must not prevent the timely attainment of required military maintenance capability.

(D) Contract maintenance has its greatest application for accomplishing indirect maintenance support requirements at the depot (industrial) level of maintenance. For example, original equipment manufacturers have an inherent capability of performing modernization and major modifications to their products. Also, commercial maintenance service companies normally are equipped to perform major repairs and overhauls at their plant locations. Contract maintenance is normally well suited for accomplishing maintenance requirements when quantity size lots are involved, or when a steady maintenance workload can be anticipated.

(E) Contract maintenance has a limited and specialized application for accomplishing direct maintenance support requirements at the intermediate and organizational levels of maintenance. Normally, when used for direct maintenance support at the intermediate and organizational levels, contract maintenance is intended to provide services to be performed at an operating site, under military control, and to be used to augment military capability.

(F) Interservice support arrangements offer a means of providing maintenance for materiel common to two or more departments, including mission-essential items beyond the required maintenance capability of a using military department, when capacity exists in another department.

V. POLICY

(A) It is the general policy of the Department of Defense to utilize private industry for the accomplishment of maintenance of military materiel to the maximum extent practicable, recognizing that maintenance in support of military missions is a vital part of military capability which shall not be compromised.

(B) Each military department shall develop and/or retain an in-being military depot level maintenance capability for only that mission-essential materiel which would require continuing depot level maintenance to sustain operations under emergency or wartime conditions or which would require such depot maintenance in peacetime to assure operational readiness. This policy should not be construed as requiring a complete capacity when materiel is determined mission-essential. The extent should be only the minimum capacity necessary to insure a ready and controlled source of technical competence and resources to meet military contingencies. Contractual sources or interservice support may be used for the depot maintenance of mission-essential materiel to any extent beyond the established minimum capacity.

(C) Each military department shall determine which of its items shall be designated as mission-essential materiel and shall determine the extent of depot level military maintenance capability to be developed and/or retained to meet minimum requirements for support of mission-essential materiel.

(D) Each military department shall assure an efficient level of operation for that military capacity retained for the depot maintenance support of mission-essential materiel.

(E) Each military department shall attain a self-sufficient military capability and capacity for the direct maintenance support of its tactical elements.

(F) When contract maintenance is to be used for new equipment, it shall be planned well in advance of the equipment introduction into the operating inventory in order that there will be sufficient leadtime for the contractor to obtain the required facilities, tooling, test equipment, and maintenance personnel.

(G) Contract maintenance shall be planned and employed in a manner to provide maximum effectiveness under emergency or wartime conditions, particularly with regard to long-term or continuing-type maintenance contracts. The policies and guidance for planning with industry for maintenance under emergency conditions are provided by reference (d).

(H) Contracts for maintenance shall incorporate, by reference, such work specifications and quality standards as may be required to adequately assure that materiel upon repair and return is fully satisfactory for service.

(I) Contract maintenance shall not be employed when adequate safeguards cannot be effected to protect security information from disclosure in any manner prejudicial to the interests of the United States.

(J) Contract maintenance for requirements beyond the established minimum retained capacity will be considered practicable only when it is available at reasonable price, as provided in the armed services procurement regulation, and when compared with the estimated cost of military maintenance, if performed at existing military facilities, the contract cost would not be disproportionately higher as computed under the provisions of the Bureau of the Budget Bulletin 60-2, as amended, and as implemented by reference (b).

(K) When contract maintenance is not considered practicable (par. (J) above) interservice support arrangements will be fully considered before the requiring department utilizes additional in-house capacity.

VI. CRITERIA

Within the policy statements above, contract maintenance has its principal applications in the following areas:

(A) For accomplishment of indirect maintenance requirements which exceed the military capacity retained to support mission-essential materiel.

(B) For accomplishment of direct maintenance requirements in support of nontactical elements when the military control and performance of such work is not required for military effectiveness, personnel training, or the maintenance of a rotation base.

(C) For direct maintenance support of materiel as may be necessary to augment the military capacity, normally on a one-time basis to accomplish a specific task.

(D) When it is desirable to augment military maintenance capability for an interim period to attain an earlier operational status for new military materiel being introduced.

(E) When its interim use for analytical overhaul and modification of new military materiel entering the inventory will lead to future effectiveness and efficiency in military maintenance operations by the refinement of requirements for initial spares and repair parts, maintenance tooling, testing equipment, and technical data, or through product improvement of materiel under current production.

(F) For economical quantities of materiel, or when a steady workload of overhaul and/or modification maintenance can be anticipated.

(G) When the extent or complexity of modification or modernization work to be accomplished requires the inherent technical qualifications of the original equipment manufacturer.

(H) When the inherent leadtimes and processes of maintenance by contract would not result in substantially increased cost for procurement of spares to fill an enlarged repair cycle pipeline.

(I) When the administrative cost of contracting for small lots of materiel would not be disproportionate to the cost of the maintenance to be accomplished.

VII. IMPLEMENTATION

(A) It is intended that the redistribution of maintenance workloads between industry and the military departments resulting from the implementation of this directive will produce within the departments the minimum practical levels of manpower and facility requirements for maintenance consistent with military necessity.

(B) The military departments will take action to implement this directive as follows:

(1) Applicable directives regulations, and instructions within each department will be reviewed and revised for compliance to the policy and intent of this directive.

(2) The guidance expressed herein will be analyzed for adaptability to internal departmental use. Prior to promulgation, it may be restated or expanded as considered appropriate to more effectively carry out the policy and intent of this directive.

(3) Contract maintenance shall be identified in the supporting information for budget estimates and apportionment requests in accordance with the guidance provided by the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

(4) Furnish such reports as may be requested, in accordance with DOD Directive 7700.1, to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) for review and evaluation of contract maintenance program management.

(5) When extenuating or other special circumstances exist which may warrant an exemption or deviation to the policy and intent of this directive, a military department will submit such cases with supporting justification to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) for review and approval of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

(6) Within 120 days of the date of this directive, two copies of each document implementing the above actions will be transmitted to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics).

(C) The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Supply and Logistics) will perform such reviews and evaluations of implementing documents and management by the military departments as to assure the uniform and effective application of the policy and intent of this directive within the Department of Defense.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in these troubled times when Communist aggression is an ever-present possibility, there is no question that our highly qualified and efficient military forces must be maintained in readiness. The United States must be continually prepared to confront such aggression with well-trained and experienced military forces. For this reason I will support extension of the draft law.

Although I support the President and the efforts of the Congress to maintain American military readiness of the highest quality I believe more attention should be given to better manpower utilization.

The experience of the past 12 years has demonstrated that the draft law has not been effective in maintaining the desired pool of trained manpower for emergencies. As far back as 1957, the famous Cordiner report pointed this out. Part of the problem which the Cordiner report referred to stemmed from the unreasonably low rate of military pay. Then, as now, if I understand correctly the arguments for the proposed military pay raise bill before the Armed Services Committee, military pay rates for qualified technicians were too low to attract and retain adequate numbers of the skilled personnel who currently form the backbone of the armed services.

Another weakness of the present draft law is the fact that very few of those who were inducted into the services reenlist. Thus, the existing Universal Military Training and Service Act has not fulfilled one of the major purposes for which it was designed.

An even more serious objection to the UMT is the fact that it is simply not universal. In 1957 well over 60 percent of those of draft age were not being drafted and I understand that the percentage has not decreased.

It seems to me Mr. Chairman, that military service should be made attractive enough to recruit all the manpower required effective for national defense.

New methods of warfare require not only well-trained troops but the development of brainpower to meet the challenge of this nuclear age. A GI bill of rights would make peacetime service more attractive for many young men.

Many young men who are not able to adjust themselves to military life have the capacity to contribute far more substantially in other ways to our national defense.

Proper manpower utilization therefore, is essential for the most effective national defense.

Each time this act has been renewed serious deficiencies have been well stated and often acknowledged, but the doubts always give way to inertia and the press of immediate military needs. This is a short-sighted approach to a serious and continuing problem. Congress should do everything possible in making conscription unnecessary except in time of emergency.

One obvious course is to increase the attractiveness of military service as a career to people in and out of the service. Thus we should support the new military pay bill which is designed to improve the pay and allowances at those ranks in which men are most likely to make a decision as to their future, and in those jobs which require skills much in demand in private industry.

There is no doubt in my mind that Congress will extend the draft law for another 4 years. But there is no good reason why we should not plan ahead so that we can build an even stronger military force on a voluntary basis.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that an amendment will be presented today proposing that the extension of the Universal Military Training Act be made for only a 2-year period rather than a 4-year period and that a Commission be established to study thoroughly changes that might be advisable in the program.

I also understand that an amendment will be presented to lower the ceiling age limit from 26 to 22 in order that our young men can have 4 years of their lives returned to them in which they can plan for the future and make decisions regarding employment, family and other aspects of normal living which are now denied them.

I shall support these amendments, but feel that they are wholly inadequate and that the whole draft program is wrong. We have departed a long way from the historic principles of a free society upon which the United States was founded.

I do not believe there are any basic reasons which justify the perpetuating of compulsory military service during peacetime by the United States. The two proposed amendments show that there is a great deal of discontent with the present situation.

In spite of this, we will undoubtedly approve a 4-year extension today that will continue the existing system without change—without questioning the wisdom or necessity of our action very strenuously. Neither Canada nor England find compulsory military training to be necessary to maintain their armed forces at desired strength.

The primary excuse given for the present draft is that it serves as a club over the heads of young men in order to force them into enlisting in the armed services. If it is actually a fact that we cannot fill our needs through enlistments, then the draft is necessary only because we do not provide incentives or conditions of service which are attractive enough. We are substituting compulsory training to avoid our responsibility for allowing our citizens a free choice when we are not in a period of national emergency.

In addition to this basic premise that the entire program is wrong, it is actually creating social problems that require corrective legislation.

The young man who is in jeopardy of being drafted during 8 years of his life is not a good risk for a prospective employer. It is not wise for him to hire a prospective employee who is subject to the draft and then hold this job open for 2 years—as he is required to do—while the employee serves his time.

The young man between the ages of 18 and 26 is left trying to put some order into the loose ends of a life over which he has lost control of some very basic decisions.

In addition to these points I must voice here and now—as I will on many future occasions on this floor—my conviction that almost the entire thrust of our national policy as it involves our security today is destructive of that security. We have put our faith in the power of force, violence and destruction to create a world of peace, freedom and security. These means are incompatible with our goals.

We can neither suppress the ideology of international communism by force nor spread the ideology of freedom for all men by force. To imagine that we can do this merely blinds us to the constructive efforts which we must make to create the world of the future which we seek.

I am more than willing to give my life in the battle for this better world—as I am sure we all are. Yet, to give our lives and still lose our goals is, indeed, the height of folly. This is the course we are pursuing.

I feel that universal military training in peacetime is a part of that destructive thrust which I must oppose.

For these reasons, I shall vote against any extension of the Universal Military Training Act today.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of American in Congress assembled, That section 17(c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 467(c)), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1963" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1967".

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950, chapter 537, as amended (73 Stat. 13), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1963" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1967".

SEC. 3. Section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2216), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1963" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1967".

SEC. 4. Section 9 of the Act of June 27, 1957, Public Law 85-62, as amended (73 Stat. 13), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1963" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1967".

Sec. 5. Sections 302 and 303 of title 37, United States Code, are each amended by striking out "July 1, 1963" wherever that date appears and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1967".

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the Record at this point, and open to amendment to any section of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Pucinski: On page 1, line 3, after the word "That," insert "(a)", and immediately below line 6 on page 1, insert the following:

"(b)) Section 4(a) of the Universal Military Training and Services Act (50 App. U.S.C. 454(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'After July 1, 1963, no person shall be inducted into the Armed Forces pursuant to this Act except as provided in section 5A and section 6(h) of this title, after he has attained the age of twenty-two years. This paragraph shall not apply during any period of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President.'"

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, under this amendment, which is a very simple amendment, all we are saying is that if this amendment is adopted the draft boards and the Defense Department would have 3½ years in which to select a young man for the military service between the age of 18½ through his 21st birthday; that when he reaches the age of 22 and has not previously been deferred from military service, he is no longer subject to the draft short of a national catastrophe.

Under existing law, young men are subject to the draft over a period of 7½ years, from 18½ to 26 years of age. This amendment, however, does not preclude the President from resorting to this original legislation at any time he feels that such action is in the national interest.

I have heard mention made here of a sense of Congress amendment. However, the fact remains that the draft boards under existing law cannot give priority to young men 18½ to 19, because if you look at your committee report on page 7, section 5, we have six categories of priority under existing law: The first category are delinquents; second, volunteers; third, men between 19 and 26 who are nonfathers; the fourth category, men between 19 and 26, who are fathers; fifth, men over 26 years of age; sixth, men between 18½ and 19 years of age.

In every draft board in the country there are young men who come to the board and say, "Look, I want to go in now; I want to discharge my responsibility; I want to get it over with." But, these young men cannot be taken, even if the draft board wants to take them, under existing law, because the draft board must take eligibles off the top. My amendment in no way hurts the present draft program; we are in no way denying the Defense Department the impetus it needs to get men to volunteer for the service, because we would continue the existing draft program for 18½- to 22-year-olds. Under my amendment, we would give a young fellow who cannot afford to go to college the same opportunity to serve or not to serve that we are now giving the young man going to college. Today, under this law, a man can take course after course in college; go into postgraduate work, and conceivably, because he has prolonged his college career, escape the draft. In my remarks in the Record of March 7, in testimony before the Armed Services Committee, I showed that there are now 126,000 young men in this country not being drafted because they have passed the age of 26 through various deferments. And, they are fully qualified, but the military does not want them only because they are too old. If you accept this amendment, it gives the President the full right to go back to the original law any time he feels that the manpower needs of this country are such that we need this law and take them up to the age of 26. In the meantime, if we really want to give these young Americans an opportunity to plan their lives in an orderly manner, let us exempt them from the draft after they reach their 22d birthday. I am sure that these young men would be willing to serve their country and discharge their responsibility at an earlier age so that they can plan their adult lives in a more orderly manner.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Does not the President now have the right to reduce the age to 22 or 21?

Mr. PUCINSKI. There are those who claim he does. Let there be no question; I support President Kennedy. I also supported President Eisenhower in his defense efforts. But, this is the legislative branch of Government, and I think the time has come when the Congress ought to assert its own views on what it thinks. In my opinion, if we say the age for selectees should be 18½ to 22 years of age—this is going to be the intent of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, we give the President all the authority that he may feel he needs if in his judgment this amendment is not going to serve the best interests of the country.

I think if the Congress went on record as stating it is going to give the Department of Defense 3½ years instead of 7½ years to make up its mind as to whether it needs these young Americans for military service, I am sure that the administration would not find such a pronouncement objectionable. I strongly urge my amendment be adopted so that we can have a more effective method for filling our Nation's defense needs.

For a more detailed analysis of this entire subject, I should like to refer my colleagues to page 3786 of the Record of March 7.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield just briefly in order for me to finish the question which I previously propounded to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. As I see it, this amendment does nothing than what is the law today. The President has the right——

Mr. VINSON. No——

Mr. BECKER. Now, wait a minute. I mean this: The President has the right to reduce the age at any time. On this he is going to be restricted in his use of it. At the same time the amendment is going to give him the right to increase it. I can see no merit in that method of operation.

Mr. VINSON. That is the reason I am asking the committee to vote it down. The facts and circumstances do not warrant, in my judgment, favorable consideration of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, what does the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] do? As pointed out in my statement on the floor of the House it reduces the draft age from 18½ years of age to 22 years of age. The law today is 18½ years of age to 26 years of age. The President, under section 5 of the Draft Act, can exercise the authority given him to call within age groups. Therefore, the President could call in the 22-year age group.

Mr. Chairman, the first I heard of this amendment was when it was sent out in the mail. We had a hearing. It was published before the Congress. Witnesses came here from all over the United States. I want to say that the Committee on Armed Services regrets that the learned gentleman from Illinois did not give us the benefit of time to study his amendment when we were having our hearings. However, I am satisfied we would all have been of the same opinion we are now, and that the proper thing to do is to defeat this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore ask the committee to vote this amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Reuss: On page 1, line 6, after "place thereof July 1," strike out "1967" and insert "1965."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. VINSON. I would like to see if we could not agree on a time limit on the debate on this amendment since it was debated at quite some length during general debate.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman has been very generous and I am sure we can agree on a short space of time.

Mr. VINSON. I do not desire to debate it but 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] be recognized for 5 minutes, and 5 minutes be reserved for the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard to the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto be limited to 15 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Let us see how many desire to be heard on the amendment. Let us not get in too much of a hurry.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would limit the extension of the draft to 2 years. I believe that the draft should be continued now for that period only.

In 1955 and in 1959 I vigorously supported extending the draft for 4 years. Now as then, I stand ready to do anything necessary to build up our strength to combat the Communist drive for world conquest. We must, of course, maintain our military power.

But in 1963, the situation we face is different. The world is unsettled. The Atlantic alliance has been shaken in disputes over trade and defense. The Common Market has grown to be a great factor in world affairs. The European nations have reached new heights in their spectacular economic advances. They speak of conducting more and more their own defense. Nationalisms old and new have asserted themselves. The full impact of these facts has not yet been felt.

No prophetic gift is needed to predict that the period ahead will be marked by rapid and profound changes. One change we would all cheer would be a miraculous increase in the willingness of our European allies to take over a just share of their own defense. That would allow withdrawals of American troops and would go a long way toward ending our bedeviling balance-of-payments deficit. Withdrawal of troops from Europe and many other events that we cannot foresee in a fluid world might also make unnecessary a continuation of the draft.

The world is in a state of flux. Therefore we should limit our commitment to a fixed policy to the shortest reasonable period. In the present situation, a 2-year extension is long enough. The speed with which H.R. 2438 is moving through the House shows that we can quickly extend the draft if it is still needed in 1965.

If the draft is no longer needed in 1965, we should have the opportunity to get rid of it. If needed, it is a necessary evil; but we should not and cannot long ignore its undesirable effects on our society or cease to look for the day when we can be done with it.

Now what is to be said against a 2-year extension? Not much, apparently. I have looked long and hard to find an explanation of why the draft should be continued for 4 years. I find only this from the Defense Department:

It would create an element of uncertainty in the minds of millions of young men in this country as to the future of their military service liability—as to whether they will be needed.

Does anyone suppose that the youth of this country will be put upon the rack of doubt because of a possibility that none of them will be compelled to service after 1965? Common sense, Mr. Chairman, tells us how much better it is to be uncertain about whether things will get better, than to be certain that there will be no improvement. This type of uncertainty will be cherished by the Nation.

And, in any case, who can believe that this new uncertainty is worse than the uncertainty that haunts our youths now? The uncertainty they know while the draft continues creates real distress, doubt, and distortion of natural bents—as the mail of every Member will reveal.

Is the draft board hot on my heels? Can I beat the system? Can I escape by plunging into marriage or graduate school? Has my draftsmanship put me in the nearly one-half of my age group that will never serve? Will I be the 1 in 10 actually caught in the draft's loose net?

Those are the questions that create the uncertainty that actually, presently hurts our youth and our society. In a continuance of the draft there is not only plenty of uncertainty but also significant injustice and misuse of human resources.

And I would point out that the weight of the inequities of the draft falls most heavily on youths who lack the money or knowledge to practice skillfully the degrading game of draftsmanship.

What is the reason for the draft? Apparently it is not primarily the 90,000 men who would be drafted into the Army in each of the next 4 years. If it lost them, the Army would lose its least effective, worst trained elements. In many cases, their jobs could be done by civilians.

But could the services get the 300,000 volunteer enlistments they need, if the threat of being drafted did not hang over the heads of the Nation's youths? The Defense Department says that recruitment would suffer. In the absence of any other information, we must accept this judgment.

Yet there is reason to think that 300,000 truly voluntary enlistments might be obtained if the effort were really made to get them. We are to be asked to increase military pay during this Congress. Higher pay could make military service more attractive. Other steps might be taken also to encourage volunteer service.

At a time when military technology demands highly trained, professional soldiers, and allows no time for great mobilizations, we could gain in strength from a switch to all volunteer forces. The machinery of the Selective Service System could be kept in good shape for emergency use in case of need.

Certainly the Congress should give more careful study to this possibility.

Mr. Chairman, to end the draft, if it would weaken our forces, would be inconceivable; but to retain the draft among a free people, beyond a time when it is really needed, would be intolerable.

The 89th Congress—the one that will be sitting in 1965—is entitled to the opportunity to debate and vote on whether the draft then needs to be continued for another period. This Congress should not deny it that opportunity.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman will agree that if the law is extended for an additional 4 years the 89th Congress will have the opportunity of repealing that law and consequently will have the opportunity of working its will on draft legislation.

Mr. REUSS. No, I regret that I cannot agree with the gentleman. The 37 members of the House Committee on Armed Services, who are all distinguished Members of this House, voted unanimously for a 4-year extension, and I would view it as not within the range of expectation that they would change their mind and bring out a bill in 2 years which would enable us to vote on it. Therefore, the practical alternative to 4 years is 2 years. I hope it will be 2 years.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. If for no other reason, it should be adopted to force a review of the use of manpower, and where the draft fits in and our educational and military needs for the coming decade.

On Friday of last week I tried to get a set of the hearings on this issue, which is one of the most important issues which will be discussed in this session of the Congress. The hearings were not available. I tried again on Saturday and the hearings were not available. The hearings finally became available in printed form at 10:30 this morning. I question whether this is the proper way for the Congress, either on the majority or the minority side, to be debating an issue of such vital importance.

The chief argument for the 4-year extension has been, first, precedent. "We have always done it this way," it is said. I would like to know why precedent is so sacred in the 1960's. With scientific and technological advances in the armed services and in the conduct of warfare this is no time to take refuge in the safe harbors of custom. This is a hydrogen atomic age, a mobilized mechanized age, and the manpower needs of 8, 6, 4 or even 2 years ago were quite different from what they are today.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] has raised the question of an entirely new and different situation in Europe which may impose upon our European armed manpower posture an entirely different focus than it has in the past 2 years. I looked in vain through the hearings to see where I could find a solid discussion before the Committee on Armed Services on manpower needs and the question of the future of the draft. In short, Mr. Chairman, I am not persuaded by the argument of "precedent"—that a 4-year extension of the draft is necessary. We owe it to this country to subject this matter to critical examination in the light of today's conditions at home and abroad.

The second argument that is raised for the 4-year extension is "uncertainty." The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, in testimony, said that anything less than 4 years "would create an element of uncertainty in the minds of millions of young men in this country as to their service liability." That is the chief reason given for a 4-year extension. This is Alice in Wonderland. What could be more uncertain than the draft lottery that exists today? Boys that ought to be drafted are bypassed; others that ought to be exempt are taken. I think it is necessary to have a thorough and complete review of the whole subject. This has not been done, either in the presentation that has been made today, or in the hearings—hearings which were unavailable to the Members of Congress until 10:30 in the morning of the day a major bill is discussed. When this occurs, it is the function of the minority to object.

It seems to me further that this whole matter is tied into the problem of Reserves. The reason I asked the question earlier as to the future of the 6-month program, is that I believe this is one of the areas of fat and waste that could be cut from a massive budget. The entire reserve program should be reviewed. Everybody knows there is a vested interest in the Reserves in every congressional district in the United States, but it cannot be examined in the abstract. There is a relationship between the draft extension and the reserve program that ought to be examined on the floor right now. I wonder how much the security of the country is being safeguarded by the paunchy reservist who spends one evening a week at the Reserve center chewing the fat with the boys, thereby escaping from the dishes at home and building up a very expensive—to the taxpayers—pension.

I would rather put that money into a bigger, tougher, better paid, technically competent standing army.

It seems to me that starting today and going throughout the week, there should be a complete discussion as to where we are headed in our draft, our posture in Europe related to the draft, the difficulty we have in educating young men to run some of the complicated machinery of the 1960's.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I hope that it will receive the support of the House. If the amendment fails, I shall vote for the bill convinced as I am that a 4-year extension of the draft is still preferable in these perilous times to no draft at all.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the hearings, in my opinion, are thorough on this subject. The only person quoted so far in regard to the extension for 4 years instead of 2 was the Secretary of Defense. He spoke on technical things in this bill.

On page 87 of the bill you will find General Hershey testified—I think it would be well for the House to hear what he said:

> I do really think that we have our adulthood being delayed, and not only that, but there are more and more reasons why the man in the Armed Forces could very well have the addition of college before he serves.

I will get back to some other language he used on page 87 in just a minute, but in amplification of what he said there, at the bottom of page 88 he said:

> On the other hand, there is also the problem that the man brings away from training what he brings to it. The more he knows when he comes to training, the more meaningful becomes the training and the more you are integrating training into a personality that has some other capability, where sometimes when we were young we didn't bring much to it and we didn't have many buckets to carry anything away with.

Returning to page 87, the next point General Hershey makes is this:

> The second thing is if you are not going to take all of them, if you determine, by lotteries, at 19 or 20, that you are going to take them, as far as any enlistment of people after that you are very much like the girl who said to the boy, when he said, "May I have the last dance?" and she said "You have had it."

That is not a very appropriate way to take them into the service.

Then he goes on in the very next paragraph to say:

> Well, you can't recruit, after you have made a determination in an age group of who will serve. I don't like to have people say to a kid after he finishes 2 years, "You are through," because he isn't.

General Hershey also went on to testify to our committee in some fullness about the question of trying to fit the time of the draft in with the total utilization of manpower for what is necessary. He pointed out it is difficult for these young men to have an education in science, developing them in that or some other way, and get them while they are still very young, and find out any ability to work into the service.

Some are deferred so that they can get an education. Some are channeled to scientific development. Anyway many of them come into the armed services with much better training and capacities and knowledge and abilities that are of great interest to the National Government and much more helpful to themselves as far as they individually are concerned in their ultimate service to their country. It seems to me that after hearing this testimony which was quite thorough, and every Member of the Congress had an opportunity to testify, that General Hershey made a very strong case for the 4-year draft at this time.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. I would appreciate my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Florida telling me where General Hershey on pages 86 or 87 or 88 or on any other page said that the 4-year extension was essential or said that the 2-year extension would be a bad idea. I cannot find any such testimony.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. If you read the whole page, starting on page 86, you might be able to see it. He replied where the gentleman from Indiana asked a question whether it would not be better if they could get the men as young as possible. The Secretary showed the need earlier all through his testimony. General Hershey felt, for the reasons I stated, that the system that we now have, even though it delays some people from going into the service, many of these people when they do go into the service have additional attainments and are more valuable to the services. Suppose your son was to be called to the service and he was a man capable of making a real contribution in the field of nuclear physics or something like that. Would it not be better for him to go on to get his education and bring that kind of ability and education to the threshold of the service of our country and to the military rather than coming in as a youngster right out of high school with none of those attainments?

I think the arguments General Hershey made on page 87 are in point, although they were made in response to a question as to coming in earlier into the service and I took it as one of the main reasons for the 2 years instead of 4 was to get them earlier, and that is the reason I quote this from General Hershey:

"After all what would be all of the effects of reducing this bill from 4 to 2 years? One, of course, might be to cast some doubt in the minds of the world that we are being firm in the present dangerous situation, but the point I have been attempting to discuss relates to the quality of service which the young men might be expected to perform. Assume that the amendment would end the draft in 2 years, a 2-year extension only would seem to me to bring pressure on the draft boards to call the young men at an earlier age because otherwise these people in the young age bracket might escape service to their country altogether and calling them earlier might have the adverse effects I have already discussed.

"Our country must not only maintain its present national defense power but must increase it. The chief bulwark for our national security and for international peace is in fact our national defense. We should do nothing that in any way minimizes this. In doing so we should be as fair as possible between people equally situated, and it seems to me that the 4-year extension would be preferable to the 2-year extension for all of these reasons."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I listened attentively to the gentleman from Florida. I did not hear him, when asked the question, point to any portion of the hearings or testimony on the part of General Hershey as dealing with the specific question of the extension of the draft for 2 years or for 4 years. This is the issue and nothing else: Are we going to extend conscription of American youth for 2 years or for 4 years? I am in favor of 2 years. I cannot understand for the life of me, with all the stories we hear about unemployed youths in this country, why the military services are unable to get on a volunteer basis the manpower needed. I wonder if somebody on the Committee on Armed Services would tell me why, in view of all the unemployed youths in this country and the furor that is being raised about that, why the military services cannot get the manpower needed on a voluntary basis?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. We went into that in our committee. We have an actual example of this. In the decade last past, there was a period of some 2 years when there was no draft. The actual result of this was that we did not have enough people.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell me why?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. The gentleman yielded, so I want to answer him. I will not take up too much of his time.

Mr. GROSS. Tell me why. Tell me why you cannot get them. I do not want a recital of past history. Just tell me why you cannot do it now.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. They did not do it then and the reason I presume is because the young men of our country feel that we people who are sent to the Congress of the United States should have the courage to enact laws to bring the needed manpower into the services at the proper time and that is what I ask you to vote for today.

Mr. GROSS. And I am asking you why the unemployed youth does not volunteer for the military service today?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I think, perhaps, the answer might be that they do not like the pay they receive.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOREMAN. I think one reason they do not volunteer under the draft——

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about unemployment.

Mr. FOREMAN. One reason they do not volunteer is that, in the first place, they are not paid enough money, and in the second place under our unemployment compensation policy this man can be gainfully unemployed. So they are going to be unemployed rather than to enlist.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman has something. Congress approves the Peace Corps, the Domestic Peace Corps, and organizations like the "Sons and Daughters of I Will Arise To Take Care of Them"; and, of course, they will not do any military service. Furthermore, I cannot understand why with all the enormous increase in prosperity in Europe where we have poured out billions of dollars to get them on their feet—why we cannot withdraw our five or six divisions and bring them back to this country. Can someone tell me why? Some of these countries are abandoning their conscription systems; and others are lowering the obligated service of their conscripts. They are prosperous, their industries are humming. Why can we not withdraw our five or six divisions and let them provide their own troops? Why do they not take care of their own military obligations in Europe?

That is one of the questions for which I get no answer.

I am for an extension of the draft but not for 4 years. Let it be extended until July 1, 1965, and then let Congress take a good solid look to see whether it should be continued. I am opposed to fastening universal conscription on this country and this is what is happening on the basis of these 4-year extensions.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of this committee, I have listened to all the testimony from 1959 to 1963; to all the briefings on the posture of the Military Establishment of this Nation and conditions in the world.

The same arguments have been used here today that were used before the committee in reference to the length of time of the extension and as to whether or not we should have a Selective Service System.

I do not like the draft any more than anyone else, and I am quite sure we would all like to get rid of it if we could. That is not at issue here today.

The issue is 2 years as against 4 years. I believe 2 years is too short a time. I believe 4 years is needed not only from the point of view of the Military Establishment but from the point of view of the young men of this country who go to either high school or college. Then they would know what was ahead of them in the next 4 years; whether they would be subject to military service, whether they could complete college with or without deferment.

I listened to all the testimony of Gen. Hershey and others on this bill and to those who have done the planning. It is not a question of whether we should uphold the Committee on the Armed Services or the chairman of the committee. The question is one of training, and I believe, therefore, we should extend this selective service for the next 4 years

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. COLLIER. Whatever time it is extended, how different would the man toward the end of the extended period be than the man who was faced with being drafted a year ago, a year prior to the expiration of the last extension? In other words, he cannot do any planning until he knows what the intent or the action of the Congress will be. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. BECKER. We have had many wars——

Mr. COLLIER. We are now talking about training. A year ago there was no one in the military service nor any young man in the country who could know what the action of Congress would be when the Selective Service Act expired. There can be no certainty until the young men know what the action of the Congress will be.

Mr. BECKER. That is what I am talking about. We are trying to take the indefiniteness out of it and express the intent of Congress. That is exactly what we are doing.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield I think for the information of the gentleman from Illinois that is exactly what Congress did when we extended it in 1951, 1955, and 1959.

I think in all fairness to these boys we should say that this is an extension of the draft for 4 years, not because we want the draft but because of the necessity of the situation, rather than to come back in 2 years and do the same thing all over again.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this particularly clear to everyone. Much agrument has been raised. Do we need a draft? Why do not more volunteer? We are faced with the fact that they do not volunteer. The draft is a threat. There is no question about that in my mind. I want to be perfectly honest about that. Because we have the draft we are getting a great many more volunteers than we would if we did not have the draft. I believe that. Consequently, we need an extension. I think we would be making a mistake if we did not make it for 4 years.

Mr. GROSS. Should you not then have in here a bill providing for a permanent conscription setup? If that is what you want, why do you not come in with it?

Mr. BECKER. I hope we can sometime, perhaps not in the foreseeable future, eliminate the Selective Service, but we cannot do it now.

Mr. GROSS. Let us take a good hard look at it every 2 years.

Mr. BECKER. I think we are taking a good hard look at it all the time.

Mr. ARENDS. I was here a few years ago when several of us led the fight against compulsory military training. Nobody wants military training.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

All of us know, certainly anyone who takes the time at all to look at history, that military power is the decisive force in the settlement of world affairs. Certainly we have seen this in our lifetime. Certainly we know that friendship between nations in the final analysis comes down to the point of which nation has the greatest strength in determining the course that smaller nations may take.

As we look at our hemisphere plans, as we see what is happening in Cuba, as the President of the United States begins his trip in just a few days to Central America, it is urgent that we in the Congress be responsible in extending the draft for 4 years and let the nations of this hemisphere know that we are determined to remain strong and the leader for solidarity in this hemisphere against communism. I hope we can allow the President to keep strong the military forces of our country.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, right now we are living in a very critical and chaotic world. If we attempt to cut this back from 4 years to 2 years, it will mean to the rest of the world we are receding. It will affect the morale of the people of the world. So let us not cut back from 4 years to 2 years at this critical time.

You know after World War I we let down our guard; we sank our battleships, we destroyed our fortifications, and we put our trust in treaties with people we thought were as rightminded as we were, and after that we went down the pathway of pacifistic peace. After they dumped tons of dynamite on our battleships and fortifications and wiped out 50 percent of our fleet and 3,300 lives, we were in another war, and we were again caught with our guard down, not prepared.

We demobilized after bringing World War II to a close; we demobilized our Army and Navy and Air Force, and we went down the pathway of pacifistic peace, and again we found ourselves suddenly thrust into Korea. And, what did we have? We were totally unprepared, and if it had not been for the Reserves who fought in World War II, we would have been in a terrible predicament. We called them back after they had fought in World War II, after they had started to raise their families and started their businesses, we sent them into Korea, and we were very nearly pushed back into the sea at Pusan, the most humiliating incident that ever happened in the history of this Nation. After that we passed this legislation on two different occasions each time extending the law for 4 years. Now you want to cut it back to 2 years, telling the world that we are receding and receding instead of building the greatest national strength that this country has ever known to meet any and all emergencies that may arise at any time anywhere in the world. Let us pass this bill as it is for 4 years. It is needed.

Take a boy at 18 years of age. Supposing he gets out of high school at that age. By the time he gets through with his college, being deferred for college, he is over 22. The gentleman wants to make an exception, but you certainly will have yourselves in a lot of trouble, wanting to make exceptions. Take 18 to 22. So he is deferred. But, it is all right for the boy who has not the means and wherewithal to go to college, to take him and draft him.

Now, this law has worked in a very, very satisfactory manner for a number of years, and I suggest to the Members of this House that we have confidence in the chairman of this committee who has brought this legislation before us, and let us pass it as it is. I am quite certain that we will then be able to state that we are showing the world that we are not reducing or receding or cutting back in any way, but we are going to build the greatest national defense that this country has ever had.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can agree on time for debate on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Collier] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, that will be more than ample time.

Mr. Chairman, I have no predeterminations about whether this extension should be 4 years or 2 years. But it seems to me when someone offers an argument in justification of either 2 or 4 years, there should be some validity to the argument.

All I am trying to find out here today is this: If the reasoning which has been offered in support of a 4-year extension is, in fact, valid and if all the things which have been said before in justification of 4 years are valid, then why 2 years ago did not this committee come forward with a bill to extend the draft for 4 years? As of 2 years ago the committee had no more assurance as to what would happen, regardless of the military posture, than it has today if we passed this bill extending it for 2 years.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. We did not pass it for 2 years. We passed it for 4 years.

Mr. COLLIER. Permit me to tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I was here and I voted to extend it for 4 years. I am quite aware of that.

What I am saying is this: If you need a 4-year planning period, then perhaps we were derelict 2 years ago in not having extended it to 4 years, because 2 years ago we were in no different position than you would be today if you passed it for 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, I seek light out of darkness; that is all. If the argument is good for 4 years, then why is not the argument good for 10 years? Then, we would really have a long range planning period.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I might say to the gentleman from Illinois that as far as I am concerned I can support it for a period of 10 years, until there is some peace and stability restored to this troubled, discontented world in which we live. I just want us to remain strong. If this bill passes today providing for a period of 2 years, it will indicate to the Soviets that we are cutting back.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. It seems to me we have lost sight of what is proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss]. The gentleman is simply proposing that the present law as it now exists be extended for a period of 2 years. The committee proposes its extension for a period of 4 years.

Mr. Chairman, the question is not the age at which a young man shall be subject to induction. The question is not whether or not the draft age should be reduced from 26 years to 22 years, which question was disposed of earlier. The question is simply whether or not we are going to extend this law for 2 years or for 4 years. It seems to me that by extending the law for 2 years we at the same time say to the Department of Defense that there should be a thorough review of our military manpower requirements. The important thing is to have a thorough review. By extending the draft for 4 years, we are postponing the day when this review will be undertaken.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier] has proposed the establishment of a Presidential Commission on the Utilization of Military Manpower to study our military manpower situation and the effectiveness of the draft in meeting our needs in an age of technological revolution. That makes good sense. And Congress should undertake a thorough study of the operation of the draft and gather information from educators, behavioral scientists, trade unionists, military experts and others.

The draft affects more homes and families in our country than almost any other single piece of legislation this Congress will consider.

I am not impressed by the argument that there should be a 4-year extension because of precedent. The world is moving too rapidly for us to be bound by precedent. Nor am I impressed by the emotional appeal that a 2-year extension will be interpreted as a sign of weakness. The real weakness is to cling to precedent and refuse to reevaluate past policy.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Would the gentleman vote for an extension of 2 years?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I intend to vote for the extension of the draft, if the amendment——

Mr. GAVIN. I am asking the gentleman a direct question which the gentleman can answer "yes" or "no."

Mr. RYAN of New York. If the gentleman will listen, the gentleman will hear the answer. I intend to vote for the extension of the draft for 2 years if that amendment is adopted, and for the committee's bill if the amendment is defeated. But I do believe it is important to have a thorough review of this question.

Mr. GAVIN. If the gentleman will yield further, will the gentleman vote for the bill if the period of extension is 4 years?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I said so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Gubser] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, one of the most striking things about our hearings this year was that they were almost exactly a carbon copy of the hearings on the same bill 4 years ago, and in all probability those hearings were carbon copies of the hearings held 4 years before that.

Mr. Chairman, inevitably the argument is "let us have a thorough review." We gave you a thorough review last year under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price]. I devoted days, hours and weeks, just as did every other member of that committee, going into the question of manpower utilization.

Mr. Chairman, the question is this: Are we going to take the hours and weeks of work and labor that went into that report and throw them out the window and start all over with another one?

We plan Polaris submarines 44 months in advance. Is it not wise to plan the utilization of the manpower to man those expensive implements of war at least 4 years in advance?

Mr. Chairman, we conduct a review, and we find nothing new. In my opinion, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gavin] has given to the Members of the House a most compelling and persuasive argument: that now of all times we should not say to the world that the United States is receding from its strong position of readiness.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Would not the gentleman agree also that there are five additional parts to this extension of the so-called Selective Service and Universal Military Training Act? In addition to the draft law there is the suspension of other laws, the extension of the Dependents Assistance Act, the Doctors Draft Act and the specialist incentive pay. I should think for administrative planning it would be important that the department that has submitted this bill to the Congress have these things finalized as to the length of time in which this can happen. And further, a last point. I would like to point out that the corollary is also true to some of the objections that have been raised here. Many of the advanced technical people who are well trained and seasoned and whom we need in the armed services of today and who are serving us so beautifully need this additional time in which to complete their training, and therefore they must know that they will have a full 4 years of training.

Mr. GUBSER. That is very true.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the Committee will overwhelmingly reject this amendment. Of all times to talk about letting the world think that we are reducing our forces, this is the wrong hour, this is the wrong time. Every chancery in the world would be astonished and uncertain if the word went out that the House of Representatives today had changed the period for extending the draft. What change has come over the Congress of the United States? they will say. In three different times over a period of 12 years the draft has been extended for 4 years. Now, when no one knows what the morrow will bring, we are asked to come in here and change the period of extension from 4 years to 2 years.

I certainly hope that this House under no condition will change that extension of time. I hope the Committee will reject this amendment overwhelmingly.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss], which would limit the extension of the draft to a period of 2 years, rather than the 4 years proposed in the bill before us.

I most certainly agree that during these most perilous times, it is absolutely necessary that we continue the draft. In this age of manpower versus mechanization, in this nuclear pushbutton age, I agree that we must maintain our military strength, not only for the protection of these United States, but to honor our military commitments in other far-flung areas of the world. If it is necessary that we enlarge our Armed Forces, and increase our military strength to prevent further Communist aggression, I would gladly support such a program.

However, with world conditions as unsettled as they are today, with some of our allies willing to assume additional responsibilities insofar as the defense of their own country is concerned, with so many new nations emerging which are willing and anxious to take their own places in the union of free countries, we cannot be sure of what our manpower or military requirements might be in the future. Certainly an extension of 2 years at the present time would give us the necessary time and an opportunity to thoroughly review and reconsider our military needs in the light of current and future developments. And, if as a result of the investigation and study it is determined that the draft must be continued, then it would be a fairly easy task to ask the Congress in session at that time to extend the appropriate legislation.

If this amendment is defeated, I shall, of course, vote for the committee bill, to extend the draft for a period of 4 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Reuss) there were—ayes 43, noes 154.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Goodell: On page 1, after line 6, insert the following new subsection:

"Section 1 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended by inserting the following subsection (f):

"'It is the sense of the Congress that, in the selection of men for induction for training and service under this Act, greater emphasis, consistent with the needs of the individual services, should be given to younger registrant nonfathers who have not entered regular employment or continued their formal education.'"

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize first of all that there is a problem. I am not going to belabor this, but our present selective service laws are in themselves in many instances creating a problem with our young people who reach the age of 18 or 19 years, and they are not under general circumstances going to be called into the draft until they are 23. That is the average age today. Many of these young people are adrift in our city streets. They are not going to enlist in the services.

We are talking about programs in our Committee on Education and Labor to try to take these youngsters off the city streets when they are 18 or 19 years old. One of the few good ways of taking some of these off the streets at a time when they are adrift is through the Selective Service System.

I am not proposing here by this amendment to require that the selective service officials take registrants at any specific age, 18, 19, 20, or any other time. I am simply offering as the sense of Congress that we feel, that where possible and where consistent with the needs of the individual services, they should take more youngsters at the age of 18½ or 19, as the law permits them to take them. This is something that will and can be done for these young people, taking some of the uncertainty out of their lives during this period. There is a job gap for them now. There is no question that at 18, 19, or 20 there is less disruption in the personal lives of these young men to go into the military service than later; there is less disruption in the fabric of our society, if it is possible, all other things being equal, to take them in the service.

This is an amendment to the policy section of the law. It requires nothing of the Selective Service Board or the President. It simply notifies them that this is a problem from our viewpoint, a problem to which we wish they would give some attention. At the moment the last people to be called under the present regulations are those 18½ and 19 who are nonfathers. This would presumably raise that category up to the third category, after the delinquents and those who volunteer.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I have noticed that in the amendment the gentleman offered there was a slight change made from the version he read during general debate. Apparently the new version takes into consideration the individual requirements of the services and implies, as I interpret its meaning, that this could vary from service to service.

For example, the Air Force may need men who are more mature than the Marine Corps. This would allow the service to consider their own individual needs.

Mr. GOODELL. That is right. At the suggestion, which I appreciate, of several members of the Committee on Armed Services, I added that phrase, "consistent with the needs of the individual services." It is not my intention to disrupt in any way the interests of national defense. But I think in our Committee on Education and Labor we wish to notify the people of the country and the Congress that this is a real problem.

The Selective Service Act could be used to take some of these people off the streets and contribute significantly to a solution of this problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to supplement what the gentleman from New York has brought out. We on the Committee on Education and Labor have been concerned with the so-called Youth Employment Act. This is an effort to see if in some way we might do something about some 700,000 young people who are presently out of jobs and out of work. Many of them are young men. About half of that number are presumably young women, who would not be primarily concerned either with the Selective Service Act or the Youth Employment Act.

It was our feeling that one of the problems in connection with the 18- and 19-year-old group is that they have not found a regular niche for themselves. The jobs available to them are relatively few in number, partly because they do not have sufficient training of a specialized nature. It was felt that one of the reasons why we have juvenile delinquency problems in some of our cities is that these unemployed youths find ways to keep busy which are not desirable.

It is for this reason that I rise in support of the suggestion that we encourage—but we in no sense direct—that we encourage the utilization of this younger age group as participants in the draft.

Mention was made earlier, during the discussion with respect to the length of the program, that there should be no disruption of planning on the part of the Military Establishment.

I would like to point out this resolution gives the feeling of Congress only. It would in no way disrupt the planning of the individual services. The language reads that it should be consistent with the needs of those services. I do think, if we insert such language, that it suggests there are constructive ways in which these young people may be utilized in our Military Establishment at an earlier age than they are now actually called upon.

When General Hershey was questioned on this, the general said, and unfortunately he was not questioned closely enough, that one of the reasons for the older draft age, and I quote from page 88 of the hearings:

> The more he knows when he comes to training, the more meaningful becomes the training and the more you are integrating training into a personality that has some other capability.

Of course, from the point of view of the military, I can see how a well-educated man, who is perhaps a college graduate, is of more value than one who has not received that training. However, that does not mean as a matter of public policy, that there is not a place in the Military Establishment for more young people. For that reason I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to a bill which on the surface extends the draft 4 years from the age of 18½ to 26 years of age. However, at the present time the draft really is between 23 and 26 years of age. If anybody proposed that we should have a draft law in this country between the ages of 23 and 26, you would wonder what was wrong with them. But really that is what we have right now. We are drafting men between 23 and 26 with jobs and leaving younger men who do not have jobs. It says on page 8 of the report:

> Should the President determine that the best interest of the country would be served by reducing the national average age of induction, which is now 23, he could, under this provision of law, insert after the second category a new category providing that, following the call of delinquents and volunteers, persons of any particular age group could be called.

We by this amendment say it is the sense of the Congress that he should begin calling younger men. The President sent up to us the Youth Employment Act. He is concerned because young men of an age younger than 23 do not have employment. Some of them need a change of environment so he proposes to send them to forest camps in order to develop at that place better work habits and better study habits and develop some discipline. But we have a going program of the military now which is different from the thirties. In the thirties, we had hardly any military system. Now we have one that is virtually at a wartime level and I think it would be well to permit young men and to induce young men who have not seen fit to enlist at this early age to come into the military.

This is the time they are unsettled, not knowing what they ought to do with their lives, what kind of vocational schooling they ought to adopt. Many of them do not choose to enlist. Also they find that employers are reluctant to hire or train these young men. We are talking about training. Let us not forget that the employers of this country are doing the biggest job of training, and they are reluctant today to hire those young men who have not performed their military service.

So I think this is an opportunity for us to express a desire to help these young men who because of lack of motivation, lack of help, be it in their homes, their schools, their communities, are unemployed, creating a problem for us through delinquency or getting in some other trouble. If we would draft them under a policy which is clear and understood by all we could be helping them.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman understands we are not saying to the selective service boards: "You have to draft young people."

Mr. QUIE. That is right.

Mr. GOODELL. We are just saying we feel this is a problem which the military should take into consideration since they have the establishment there to utilize these young people at a time when they are adrift in our society. If military requirements changed they do not have to do anything to take these 18½- and 19-year-olds.

Mr. QUIE. That is right. We recognize that the military has need for more highly educated people, who are older; but they can certainly utilize more of the young men rather than take only those aged 23 and above, as they do now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the committee.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to ask him this question: Would not the implementation of this amendment make even more severe the disparity between the young man who cannot go to school and the one who can?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct; and for that very reason in the various sections of the Draft Act we have refused to put the arm of protection around any group. That is exactly what would happen by this proposed amendment to the policy section, and I will tell you what will happen. More directives and authority will come out of Washington if this amendment is adopted, than do today.

This is the policy section. Nowhere in the policy section is there one line written today about who will be drafted and who will not be drafted. Here is what is said in this section:

> It is the sense of the Congress that in the selection of men for induction for training and service under this act greater emphasis shall be given to the selection of the younger registrants, nonfathers, who have not entered regular employment or continued their formal education.

Here is what the gentleman is trying to do by his amendment; he is trying to say that you must not pass a uniform method of drafting, in which we deal with all alike. Congress is very deeply concerned about this. Nowhere in the policy section have we tried to indicate who will be drafted; we want to treat them all fairly and alike.

Mr. Chairman, I think this Committee and this House has made a magnificent record here in the matter of amendments that come to us every 4 years. Similar amendments have been offered, but none adopted, since 1951. They have all gone down to defeat. The House in its wisdom has rejected them. I hope the House in its wisdom rejects this one today. Then we will go before the country with a draft law that has not been changed, a draft law that the country knows, and the country understands.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GOODELL) there were—ayes 59, noes 134.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2438) to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 287, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2438, to the House Committee on the Armed Services with instructions to report the bill forthwith with the following instructions: "On page 1, line 6, strike 1967 and insert 1965, and in sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the bill strike 1967 wherever it appears and insert in lieu thereof 1965."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting] 233 Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 388, nays 3, not voting 43, as follows:

[No. 8]

YEAS—388

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Alger
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beckworth
Beermann
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Buckley
Burke
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derounian
Devine
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Ford
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grover
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger

NAYS—3

Abele
Brown, Calif.
Gross

NOT VOTING—43

Ashley
Belcher
Bromwell
Burkhalter
Clausen
Curtis
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Ellsworth
Fogarty
Fulton, Tenn.
Glenn
Griffin
Griffiths
Gurney
Healey
Joelson
Johnson, Wis.
Kee
Keogh
Macdonald
Madden
Matthews
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Morrison
O'Brien, Ill.
Patten
Powell
Rains
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
St. George
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Tupper
Walter
Watson
Wright
Zablocki

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Patten with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Zablocki with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Glenn.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Joelson with Mr. Tupper.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Griffin.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Clausen.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.
Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Wright.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Ashley.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DRAFT LAW EXTENSION

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I voted today to extend the draft for an additional 4 years. I did so with a heavy heart. I do not know whether we really need the draft in order to meet our manpower defense needs, and I do not believe that anyone in this Congress knows. I had asked the Armed Services Committee to consider a 2-year extension of the draft and a study to determine whether alternative methods of meeting our military manpower needs could be devised—methods that would be less costly, in terms of taxpayers' dollars and interrupted lives, and more equitable. My suggestion was not heeded by the committee.

This Committee of the Whole House has just rejected my Wisconsin colleague's proposal to limit the extension to 2 years. I voted for that amendment. We were left with the simple choice of voting for or against a 4-year extension. In 1959, faced with the same choice, I voted against the 4-year extension. Today, with great reluctance, I voted for it.

The fight that was made on the floor today for a 2-year extension was a good one, as the considerable support for that proposal showed. It was not passed today, but the fight is not over. We in America cannot settle for a permanent system of compulsory conscription. Sooner or later an alternative system must be found. I will do whatever I can to see that the present method of conscription is questioned and challenged constantly, so that a future Congress can find, in its wisdom, that the draft can eventually be terminated.

INDONESIA

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest an article in the March 3 edition of the Washington Post by Chalmers Roberts which described the deep economic troubles of Indonesia. Mr. Roberts had recently spent several days researching the islands of Indonesia, and indicated in some detail the powerful financial and economic problems he found there.

It is with this background that I read, with no little surprise, in the Post on March 6 that President Sukarno has given approval to a contract for the purchase by Indonesia of three luxury American jet aircraft. They will be Convair 990's purchased from General Dynamics Corp., and must be paid for in hard cash, half of which is due by January 1, 1964.

I am not quibbling in the least with the purchase of American equipment—that is to be commended—but it does strike me as downright peculiar that the acquisition of these planes can be justified in the light of Mr. Roberts' findings. The purchase of jet aircraft has proved to be quite a financial burden for even our most prosperous U.S. carriers and an investment which does not begin to pay for itself in the initial years of use.

Obviously, Indonesia expects these new jets to pay off. However, the question arises as to how they can pay for themselves without being put into service over lucrative transatlantic routes. Over routes where our two U.S. international flag carriers must compete with each other, as well as 25 other foreign carriers. These luxury jets are supposed to add to the prestige of Indonesia and to its airline and give it a place of prominence in the field of international aviation. I am wondering whether this is a luxury that either they or we can afford.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following articles which appeared in the Washington Post of March 3 and March 6, 1963:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 6, 1963]

INDONESIA SIGNS FOR THREE JETLINERS

DJAKARTA, March 6.—Beset by financial woes, Indonesia has nevertheless just closed a $20 million deal for three luxury American jetliners for its deficit-ridden airline.

The contract for the Convair 990's has prompted critical economic experts to speak of extravagance in the name of national pride. They question the seriousness of the government's recovery program.

President Sukarno gave final approval to the jet contract last week at a meeting with a representative of General Dynamics Corp. The agreement calls for Indonesia to pay the full amount in hard currency, half of it by January 1, 1964.

This week Foreign Minister Subandrio is expected to sign a $17 million aid agreement aimed at providing emergency first aid for the nation's crippled economy.

Some critics say that the two deals are basically in conflict and raise a question of how determined the government may be in pursuing its announced plan to fight inflation, get industry rolling, and provide adequate food and clothing for 100 million people.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 3, 1963]

RICH INDONESIA IN DEEP TROUBLE ECONOMICALLY

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

DJAKARTA.—Indonesia is in economic trouble so deep that something probably is going to happen, and happen sooner rather than later.

This reporter has spent 10 days in Indonesia, chiefly in Java, where 65 million of the nation's estimated 100 million people live. Few lands are more lush or richer in natural resources. But Indonesia is more frustrating than most nations when it comes to trying to estimate where it is headed.

In talks with Indonesians, high and low, and with foreign observers of several nationalities, it is evident that economic conditions have greatly deteriorated in the past 6 months. Rice, the basic staple, is in short supply and prices have been rising erratically.

Copra, the coconut product, lies rotting or is burned because of price problems and disorganized transportation. Communists are alleged to be behind the burning of some sugarcane in the fields. People lack sugar and oils, and margarine has about disappeared. Indonesia is the world's No. 1 importer of rice, yet it is the world's fourth largest producer.

AN ELASTIC CURRENCY

The exchange rate of the Indonesian currency, the rupiah, reflects these economic troubles. The official rate is 45 to $1, the figure at which the United States must spend the rupiah it receives in exchange for the food it sends her under Public Law 480. At the Hotel Indonesia here in Djakarta, the nation's one first-rate hostelry, there is a 500 to $1 rate for food but room bills for foreigners must be paid in dollars or other hard currencies. The black market rupiah rate both here and in Singapore, however, has advanced in the past 6 months from 600 to $1 to about 1,300 to $1.

The result is too much money in circulation, too few goods for the rank and file to buy, inflated prices of rice in the free market (which is used to supplement the absolutely vital rice allowances supplied to Government and many other employees) and a vast amount of smuggling. It has been learned, for example, that half the Indonesian imports into nearby British Singapore are smuggled there from Sumatra or the islands off its coast.

Indonesia is still 80 percent agricultural and rural, only 20 percent industrialized, and few of the industries employ even 1,000 people. Yet industry as a whole is estimated to be running at only around 20 percent of capacity. This means less goods badly needed at home and less for exports to earn dollars to pay for badly needed imports. Smuggling, too, cuts deeply into foreign exchange earnings.

AID HAS BEEN MASSIVE

American aid to Indonesia since independence in 1949 has totaled around $665 million, of which about 45 percent has been in farm surplus items. Aid from all free world nations (of which Japanese reparations, credits and grants together slightly top the American total) has amounted to more than $1.5 billion, compared to an estimated $665 million in economic aid from the Communist bloc. This excludes the massive Soviet military aid.

The U.S.-built cement plant, Indonesia's biggest, is one of the few places now running at 100 percent capacity, and the United States is building a urea fertilizer plant. Each was financed by an Export-Import Bank loan and each will provide about one-third of the national need for its output. The World Bank won't do business here, so poor is Indonesia's credit rating and so shaky its economic structure.

With such a dismal picture so evident, one would expect an explosion of some sort. But Indonesians seem to have a low boiling point; the farmer somehow manages to eat and the city worker frequently resorts to graft and stealing.

A WEST IRIAN SEQUEL

The optimists here, both Indonesian and foreign, argue that these serious economic conditions are about to be faced. They say that the military rebellion against the Government has now been liquidated and the issue of West Irian (West New Guinea) will be finally solved May 1 when that territory comes under Indonesian rule by way of the

United Nations from the Dutch. Hence now is the time to tackle the economic problems.

Indonesian life, of course, is dominated by President Sukarno, as it has been since independence. He recently said that the time had come to concentrate on the economic problem and the Cabinet is reported to have formulated "a basic strategic economic principle for surmounting present economic difficulties."

Critics contend that Indonesia's economic problems are self-made, though they concede that recent floods have added to the woe. Last summer's massive buildup (for a country such as this) for the projected attack on West Irian resulted in commandeering much of the transportation equipment, including the shipping, so vital in a nation of some 3,000 islands stretched across an area the width of the continental United States.

Incidentally, senior military officials have told me that some 30,000 men were within 2 or 3 days of D-day when the Dutch-Indonesian agreement was signed.

Now that some shipping, at least, is coming back to its normal commercial uses, there is an obvious need for a revaluation of the rupiah and a currency stabilization scheme on an international basis. The hopeful think this will happen; the pessimists do not think that Sukarno, whom they rate as an economic illiterate however high they regard his political prowess, will buckle down to the job and enforce the tough decisions, if, indeed, he makes them.

POSSIBLE RED MAJORITY

Such an economic situation, of course, is ready-made for the Communists. The PKI, the Communist Party of Indonesia, and its related labor organization, known as SOBSI, are very powerful. The party now claims 3.5 million members, up from an earlier 2 million claim.

No one knows how strong they really are, but one measure is the fact that a high official remarked to me that if elections were held today, the PKI would win an absolute majority. Some outside observers tend to think he could be right and not merely justifying the lack of elections. At any rate, Indonesia is still under martial law, though it is supposed to be lifted May 1.

Ten political parties are legal, but they operate in something of a vacuum since no election is in sight. Sukarno has talked vaguely of an election in 1963; other officials say perhaps in 1964, but the franker ones concede that date is illusory, too.

As long as Sukarno is alive—he is now 61—he probably will continue to be the boss. Officials here tend to throw up their hands when you ask what will happen if he disappears, but the general view is that the military would take over with a civilian figurehead.

Sukarno has built his "guided democracy" on what we might call the principle of consensus; that is, of getting all rival forces to agree. Since he can enforce a high degree of cooperation, Sukarno has made the Communists keep within bounds.

Of late, Sukarno has been talking a good deal about something he calls NASAKOM, an alphabet soup word meaning nationalism, religion, and communism. The third element used to be socialism; the change seems to reflect the growing power of the PKI. Sukarno's proclaimed aim is to run Indonesia on this three-legged stool principle.

The Communists' aim is to increase the strength of their leg and in due course to upset the stool in their direction. Currently, they are pressing for posts in Sukarno's inner cabinet, from which so far they have been excluded though they hold posts in the so-called outer cabinet.

The Communist Party of Indonesia is said to want the Finance and Information Ministries, and the reason is obvious enough; to make more economic troubles and to control the already left-tinted public utterances of the Government and the press.

The Communist Party of Indonesia, incidentally, is officially oriented toward Peiping in its ideological dispute with Moscow, but there appears to be no evidence of a split below the Politburo level. The rank and file party members are concentrating on exploiting the economic misery. Nor is there any sign that Peiping is attempting to steer the Communist Party of Indonesia into military opposition to the Sukarno regime, a move which, now at least, probably would be as disastrous for the party as was the Stalin-ordered revolution here in the early post-World War II years.

The press in Indonesia is a disgrace by any democratic standard. News of the outside world is at a minimum and often is quite slanted. Newsprint is imported and publishers are under the Government's heel. In this capital of Djakarta, with a population estimated at 3 million, the 15 papers have a combined circulation of 860,000, of which the five Communist or far left papers have about half the total.

The radio is state-owned. Television, which Indonesia can ill afford but which is a status symbol, has begun in Djakarta, where there are an estimated 10,000 imported TV sets.

This is not a land for dissent by any democratic standard. Dissent runs afowl of the Sukarno philosophy of government, which is based on the ancient village system of concensus and which therefore has wide public appeal.

Marxist terminology abounds. When Sukarno received an honorary degree February 2 at the University of Indonesia here, he was praised for having denounced "individualism, liberalism, capitalism, imperialism, feudalism, fascism as sources of explotation of man by man." Communism was missing from the list. Any enemy of Indonesia will quickly be branded as an imperialist or neocolonialist or capitalist.

Some of this is explicable for reasons other than the power of the nation's Communist Party. As able American Ambassador Howard P. Jones, a man with 7 years' experience here, recently put it in a speech: "To the majority of Indonesians—in fact to most of the newly emerging peoples of the African and Asian world—the word 'capitalism' brings forth an immediate and vivid picture of foreign control of their economy and not infrequently, of foreign exploitation and oppression."

The Dutch, who exploited the wealth of the Indies during 300 years of rule, are still unpopular although some Indonesians want enough of them to come back to help revitalize the largely Dutch-built farm and factory equipment. The Japanese, who occupied the country from 1942 to 1945, are looked upon as liberators from the Dutch.

Those who worry publicly about communism in Indonesia are accused of having a Communist phobia. The more democratic leaders will tell you, as foreign observers also do, that the PKI's power is balanced by the military, which is rated as highly anti-Communist.

Large numbers of army, navy and air force officers have been to the United States and the resulting friendship, from the sample I have had, is impressive. The same can be said for the several thousand students and technicians who have been sent to the United States.

Indonesians talk a lot about their poorness despite their great wealth of little-tapped resources, which include the biggest oil source in Asia, much rubber, copra, tin and other items. In moments of frankness, they will say they have their hands out to both East and West—and that they expect to have their wants met.

The people, of course, are the greatest resource. They are not as aggressive as the Japanese or as hard working as the many Chinese among them, on whom they look with suspicion and often with envy despite the official Indonesian friendship with Red China. Yet Indonesians are industrious; they must be to survive, especially in Java, the most crowded major area in the world after Belgium.

They are not naturally very adept mechanically, but they are trying, or at least the upper echelon is trying, to propel the nation into the 20th century industrial revolution. Sukarno has in motion, at least, a massive education program with three shifts in the schools. But the lacks are everywhere—trained teachers, buildings, books, paper. And it costs the university student far more to board than to study.

Indonesia's problem today quite obviously is to get its economic house in order. Perhaps the optimists are right and the necessary moves will now be made. But the pessimists are correct in demanding to see the evidence.

One would be more of an optimist, despite the nation's obvious shortcomings and the massive power of the Communists, if it were not for the lurking suspicion that Sukarno would prefer another foreign policy adventure. The row with Malaya over the British colonial possessions along the northern fringe of Borneo is the subject for another article.

Then, too, the Portuguese hold half of the island of Timor, an anachronism which Indonesians hint they will get around to in due course. To many, Sukarno is a permanent revolutionary who needs such foreign issues to keep his momentum.

In short, this is an attractive yet often baffling nation where many are seeking real progress but where the machinery of government socialism is clearly inadequate to the need. Indonesia's future is questionable, yet it is full of vital people who are trying to shed the colonial past with all its inhibitions in order to come to grips with the future.

CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, this year Americans everywhere will observe the centennial of the Battle of Gettysburg and the centennial of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, two of the most important events in our Nation's history.

Congressman WALTER and I are offering bills today that would authorize the President to appoint a commission of 10 persons to cooperate with the commission appointed by Governor Scranton of Pennsylvania to plan and carry out the ceremonies relating to those events. It also would authorize the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to provide for the participation of the armed services in the observances.

The State of Pennsylvania has already allocated $105,000 for use by the State commission and this bill authorizes up to $150,000 for Federal participation.

Pennsylvania's two Senators, CLARK and SCOTT, are introducing identical measures in the Senate today.

Although the center of activity for these observances is in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Battle of Gettysburg and Lincoln's Address at the battlefield are integral parts of American history. I am hopeful that the Congress will recognize the great national interest in these events and act favorably on these bills.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress in the past has recognized the two events as part of our American history and helped provide funds to implement appropriate commemorations.

Under unanimous consent I insert as part of my remarks, prior actions by the Congress as they apply to the two events:

The following bills and/or legislative enactments relate to the 75th anniversary celebration of the Battle of Gettysburg (Congressional Record, 75th Cong., 3d sess., Jan. 3, to June 16, 1938):

1. Public Law 518 (H.R. 9784) authorized an appropriation to aid in defraying the expenses of the observance of the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg, at Gettysburg, Pa., from June 29 to July 6, 1938.

2. Public Law 501 (H. Rept. 8039) authorized the attendance of the Marine Band at the observance of the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg at Gettysburg, Adams County, Pa., on July 1, 2, and 3, 1938.

3. Public Resolution 103 (H.J. Res. 693) appropriated aid in defraying expenses to the observance of the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg.

4. H.R. 9265 authorized an appropriation to aid in defraying the expenses of the observance of the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg.

Fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg (Congressional Record, 62d Cong., 3d sess., Feb. 27, to March 4, 1913; 63d Cong., 1st and 2d sess., Apr. 7 1913, to Oct. 24, 1914):

1. Public Resolution 4 (H.J. Res. 103) appropriated $4,000 to defray traveling expenses of soldiers of the Civil War, residing in the District of Columbia, from Washington, D.C., to Gettysburg, Pa., and return.

2. House Resolution 179 accepted the invitation and appointed a committee from the House to attend the reunion celebration at Gettysburg, Pa., July 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1913 (approved June 20, 1913).

3. Senate Resolution 115 accepted the invitation to attend the reunion celebration at Gettysburg, Pa., July 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1913 and provided for a committee of eight to attend on behalf of the Senate (approved June 21, 1913).

4. S. 570 (H.R. 1742) provided for the erection of a memorial amphitheater in the Gettysburg National Cemetery, Pa.

5. S. 571 authorized the construction of a Lincoln Memorial Highway from the White House, Washington, D.C., to the battlefield in Gettysburg, Pa.

6. S. 8031 provided for the presentation of medals to all surviving soldiers of the Battle of Gettysburg.

7. S. 1751 provided for the presentation of medals to all surviving soldiers of the Battle of Gettysburg.

8. H.R. 5395 appropriated $2,500 for transportation of soldiers of the Civil War to the celebration of the Gettysburg anniversary.

9. H.R. 5848 provided for the erection of a monument on the battlefield of Gettysburg to commemorate services of the U.S. Signal Corps during the War of the Rebellion.

10. H.R. 5895 appropriated $3,500 for the tranportation of soldiers of the Civil War to the celebration of the Gettysburg anniversary.

11. H.R. 11112 created the Gettysburg Peace Memorial Commission, charged with the duty of locating the memorial on the Gettysburg battlefield to commemorate the 50th anniversary of that battle, July 1, 2, 3, and 4, 1913.

NEED TO SEPARATE KERR-MILLS FROM WELFARE PROGRAMS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1963, I introduced a bill—H.R. 4511—to amend the Social Security Act so as to allow the States to administer separately the medical assistance for the aged program under the recent Kerr-Mills law if they so elect. For some time I have had the feeling that the statutory prohibition preventing the program from operating on its own has impeded its success. Earlier in the session I prepared the above bill which I then introduced March 6.

The Kerr-Mills law—also known as medical assistance for the aged—was originally enacted into the Social Security Act in 1960 under the cosponsorship of former Senator Kerr, of the Finance Committee, and Representative Mills, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. The Kerr-Mills law provided for a program of medical aid for the aged with Federal matching funds, which could be adopted by any State. Moreover, it provided that where a State had both the old age assistance program—OAA—under earlier legislation and the Kerr-Mills program for medical assistance for the aged—MAA, both programs had to be administered, or at least supervised, by a single State agency. In practical terms, this has meant that in those States which have adopted both OAA and MAA, the programs are being administered by the respective State's department of welfare—or a similar agency.

This has resulted in an extremely undesirable and unintended situation. A State's department of welfare is an agency which, as the name denotes, handles the welfare programs—most of which are Federal-State participating or matching-of-funds programs. Clearly, the MAA program under the Kerr-Mills law is not and was never intended to be a welfare program. While the OAA program, aid to dependent children and the like are programs to aid the indigent, the MAA program is intended to aid those—who although they are not indigent—are medically-in-need due to sudden or catastrophic illness. These individuals are able to meet their day-to-day living expenses, and under no stretch of the imagination can they categorically be classified as indigents.

With MAA being administered by the same State agency that handles the true welfare programs, it has in the eyes of the public taken on the features of a welfare program. This has been bad in that it is not a welfare program. People who avail themselves of its benefits should not be made to feel that they are indigents. In other words, it has been psychologically damaging to have it under a welfare agency.

MAA has had to compete with other programs handled by the agency both as to money and personnel. Because it is not truly a welfare program, obviously it has not fared too well in competition for the necessary personnel and money with the regular welfare programs within a State department of welfare.

Although I recognize that a separate State agency can administer the MAA program under current law if it is supervised by the State department of welfare, I feel that a change is needed. In those too few States where the department of health administers the MAA program, the department of welfare maintains such control as to seriously weaken any autonomy that could and should exist. This is not the fault of any State so involved, as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare prefers to work with a single State agency in all Federal-State programs of this sort. Due to the complications and uncertainty involved in establishing a MAA program, almost all States enact simple enabling legislation. The State department of welfare then draws up a contract for Federal participation. If the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not see fit to approve the contract, then there can be no program. In the case of MAA, I have been led to understand that unless a high degree of control is vested in the department of welfare where a second State agency is brought into the picture, HEW approval will not be forthcoming.

This means that the details of the MAA program are left to the principal State agency, which in all cases is the department of welfare. It is the position of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that in all cases where the State enacting legislation does not provide specific provisions, the State department of welfare must set the standards. This means that the department of welfare would determine eligibility, the items of care to be provided, the amount of care—that is, the days of care—and the amount of payment to those eligible. Therefore, where the department of health is involved it is left to provide the services. The best description of the department of health in these situations is that it merely acts as a vehicle of the department of welfare. Thus, although a second agency can participate under present law, it is apparent that such participation is limited.

Other than the fact that MAA is not an indigent program there are other reasons for distinguishing it from OAA and other welfare programs. Even the method of payment in the case of MAA is different. The MAA program is handled entirely by vendor payments—direct payments to the provider of the particular service being compensated for. On the other hand, the OAA program and kindred welfare programs provide for direct payments to the recipients of the aid in addition to vendor payments. Moreover, MAA is under a separate matching of funds arrangement with the Federal Government—both the matching formula and the percentages are different from the other aid programs.

Under title XVI of the Social Security Act, MAA, OAA, aid to the blind, and aid to the disabled may be combined into

a single program under a single State plan. Some might wish to argue that allowing for the separation of MAA in such cases will disrupt the unity or solidarity of the program. However, in anticipation of such, let me state that under that title the aid for the blind program can be separately administered if certain conditions exist; namely, if aid for the blind was separate on the date of the passage of title XVI—January 1, 1962—and on the date the State submits such combined plan to HEW for approval.

Therefore, I cannot possibly see how the separation of MAA could weaken the purposes of title XVI when an exception already exists.

The MAA program under the Kerr-Mills law has the potential to become a program sufficient to meet the medical needs of those not able to provide for themselves and those not eligible for the bona fide welfare programs. In order for it to meet with success it needs to be given a fair chance to operate on its merits—or to stand on its own feet, so to speak.

Apart from the enactment of this bill—H.R. 4511—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should face up to the task that it has before it; effective and comprehensive implementation of the Kerr-Mills law in accordance with the express intent of the Congress.

The Kerr-Mills law recognizes the problem of adequate medical care for the aged very definitely exists throughout the Nation and that the individual States are best suited and equipped to determine the most effective types of implementation. It recognizes the broad national scope of the problem by direct appropriations from the Federal Treasury to be matched by State and local contributions.

The logical State agency to administer this program is the department of public health because the Kerr-Mills program is a health program, especially designed to meet the health needs and problems of our aged citizens.

Responsibility for the success of the administration of this program should be placed squarely where it belongs; that is upon the departments of public health of the States, counties, and municipalities.

I believe that the various departments of public health throughout the Nation, State and local governments are ready and willing to assume this responsibility and to efficiently and successfully administer the program of meeting the health needs of our aged population.

UNITED STATES HELPS MAKE COMMUNISM WORK BY SPECIAL FUND ASSISTANCE IN POLAND

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to call the attention of the House to a farm problem. Not our American farm problem—although we have a "doozie" on our own hands.

I wish to address myself to the farm problem of Communist Poland. And, I think it may be of some considerable interest to this House and to the American taxpayers to know that we are paying to help improve communism's most colossal failure—a failure they even admit.

My colleagues, under the United Nations Special Fund, American taxpayers are contributing to a project designed to teach Communists how to feed their people adequately. That is something they never have been able to do before.

We Americans are paying to help make communism work.

I refer this House to two projects of the Special Fund of the United Nations now being conducted in Red Poland. One allocates more than $1 million to aid Polish agriculture; the other allows at least $700,000 to help Polish industry. Forty percent of those grants equals some $688,000—the amount American taxpayers are coughing up under a deficit budget to help make communism work.

It might be noted here, Mr. Speaker, that Polish Communist Premier Joseph Cyrankiewicz is right next door in Mexico this week talking to Mexican officials with the announced purpose of pressuring them to lay off of Castro.

Let us also note that this Polish agriculture program is not a food-for-peace plan we Americans are subsidizing. Nor is it a plan whereby our surplus agricultural materials are used to benefit needy persons. It is a program for which we get no credit, into which we put our dollars and by which we are helping the Reds learn how to feed their people—with them getting credit for any improvement.

We are helping the Reds make a success in areas where they never have done so under their own steam. We are helping strengthen Red Cuba in agriculture and in aircraft operations, as I have discussed here. We are helping Red Yugoslavia in nuclear research, as I have shown this House.

Under this amazing second foreign aid plan Americans are giving money to the U.N., letting the U.N. spend its anywhere it wants, and abdicating any chance to check on how our money is spent.

Let us consider in more detail the Polish food project:

POLAND—FOOD PRODUCTION PROJECT

Last January the Governing Council of the U.N. Special Fund approved expenditures in Poland of $1,020,500 for a 4-year project entitled "Research and Extension Services for Food Production, Processing, and Utilization." The project goal involves establishment of a national center of nutritional research, education, and food extension services, and technical advisory services to the food industry.

The Food and Agriculture Organization—FAO—of the United Nations—remember that farm project in Cuba?—is the executing agency. The discussion of this project in a Special Fund document marked for "restricted" distribution notes that Poland wishes to bring: "special emphasis to bear on questions of nutritional policy as related to communal feeding."

This document says the Polish Government needs help to provide its people a balanced diet, palatable foods at low cost and high-grade proteins and vitamins.

Poland, the U.N. says: "has embarked on a policy of coordination, extension, and upgrading of the research now being done on food production and processing, with a view to solving the most pressing nutritional problems."

No doubt the Reds are feeling some pressure from the spirited Polish people who are getting a little hungry, but more pointedly—resent being levied on in kind. No doubt the Reds would in this case welcome a few capitalistic dollars to help them over this rough, Red spot. They also ask the U.N. to give them money for revision of courses in food technology at the Warsaw College of Agriculture.

The U.N.—without asking the American taxpayers—has agreed to help solve this Communist problem and has provided for a project to include: "Research on major food problems, nutritional surveys, study of institutional feeding, development of extension services directed toward better family feeding and broad education programs in nutrition, and advisory services to the Government on food production, processing, storage, distribution, and consumption."

The U.N. plan for institutes to carry out food research and to train Poles—no question but that they will be Poles selected by the Communist government—to understand nutritional matters. The U.N. plans to improve facilities in a Department of Food Technology at the College of Agriculture at Warsaw and also to give assistance at separate institutes on meat, fish, fats, fruits, and vegetables.

The special fund will provide 14 man-years of experts including a project manager, 9 man-years of fellowships and equipment.

Then, as a final glorious note, the restricted United Nations document observes that once the United Nations has paid to help get this program and these institutes set up the Red Polish Government will be glad to keep on using them after the U.N. has left.

How considerate that is of the Communists, especially even when Napoleon knew that armies travel on their stomachs.

But, solving the Red food crisis is not the only spending concern of the American-buttressed United Nations. Let us see what the U.N. is spending on Red Polish industry:

POLAND—TRAINING CENTER FOR INDUSTRY

In a 3-year project administered by the International Labor Organization—ILO—the Special Fund is providing at least $700,000 for a project entitled "National Center for Training Supervisory Personnel in Industry."

The American share of that grant—40 percent—is $280,000. I wonder if there are any American cities which have improvement projects needing $280,000 worth of help?

This industry project started in 1959 is designed, the U.N. says, in a document marked for "limited" distribution: "To develop a center to provide research, consulting services, and specialized training in supervisory techniques, with initial emphasis on preparing personnel to serve as instructors in regional centers."

We are told that an ILO mission to Poland estimated that there were 140,000 Poles in supervisory grades in industry, who could benefit by having specialized training. In addition the ILO estimated that 15,000 Polish engineers require further training.

Gentlemen, let us remember that it was the United Nations who decided this Communist nation's engineers need more training—not the American taxpayers.

The U.N. tells us that: "The Government of Poland is preparing to establish a series of training centers in productivity and supervisory techniques to meet both the country's short range and longer range needs."

We in the United States have heard about some of the long range goals of communism. They involve world domination and a threat to bury the free West.

The assistance which the Polish Government asked for, and which the U.N. special fund is providing, amounts to making available foreign exchange to pay for the services of international experts, for fellowships and for equipment. It is much more than total contributions to the special funds from this Red satellite.

The international staff consists of four long-term and three short-term experts a year, over the 3 years. The long-term experts are authorities on industrial cost accounting, work study, materials handling, plant transport systems, and inventory accounting.

And, in a burst of generosity, the special fund reminds us that:

> The (Communist Polish) Government will assume full financial responsibility for the maintenance and operation of the center after the special fund's grant has expired.

Is not that just grand. The Reds assure us that not only will they listen politely while we tell them how to whip us, but they also will be glad to keep on using against us all the facilities and intellect we help them to obtain.

Mr. Speaker, would it be too much to suggest that at the very least the American taxpayers may want to take a look at how the United Nations spends their money and to insist upon a careful check to see that it goes where they want it to go?

FINANCIAL PROVISIONS

Polish project—Research and food production

It has been estimated that the total special fund allocation will be as follows:

	Total cost (in U.S. dollars)	Phasing of expenditure			
		1st year	2d year	3d year	4th year
Experts	273,000	39,000	87,750	87,750	58,500
Fellowships	45,000	10,000	25,000	10,000	----------
Equipment	637,000	200,000	300,000	137,000	----------
Miscellaneous	16,000	3,000	5,000	5,000	3,000
Total project cost	971,000	252,000	417,750	239,750	61,500
Executing agency overhead cost	49,500	----------	----------	----------	----------
Total special fund allocation	1,020,500	----------	----------	----------	----------

FINANCIAL PROVISIONS

Polish project—Center for Industry Training

The Special Fund's contribution of $700,000 will be allocated, as follows:

	1st year	2d year	3d year	Total
Experts	$67,000	$66,500	$66,500	$200,000
Fellowships	28,000	36,000	36,000	100,000
Equipment	250,000	150,000	--------	400,000
Total	345,000	252,500	102,500	700,000

THE LATE ROBERT LEE STOWE, SR.

Mr. **WHITENER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. **WHITENER**. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 9, 1963, one of North Carolina's most stalwart sons, Robert Lee Stowe, Sr., of Belmont, N.C., passed from the earthly scene. Mr. Stowe would have attained the age of 97 years had he lived until April of this year.

During the long life of this great North Carolinian much of the Nation's history was written. Robert Lee Stowe helped write that history.

More than 60 years ago he brought about the building of the first textile plant in the city of Belmont, N.C. Later he was at the front in the organization of many other great textile manufacturing companies. Because of the leadership that he gave in the early days in Belmont's industrial growth there are now 27 textile plants in his home community.

Mr. Stowe was not content to merely participate in the industrial development of our area. He was one of the most public-spirited individuals that I have ever been privileged to know. His service upon the board of education of his home community extended over a period of many years. His interest in government was indicated by his service on the Board of County Commissioners of Gaston County for more than 40 years. His record of service as chairman of the governing board of my home county of Gaston for a period of 33 years is, as far as I know, an unparalleled accomplishment in the State of North Carolina.

Mr. Stowe was a very outstanding Christian layman. The Presbyterian Church, or which he was a member, always had his interest, service, and support. The institutions of that church were the recipients of his philanthropy on countless occasions.

In his private life Mr. Stowe was equally outstanding. The three children born of his marriage to the former Mrs. Nellie Lee Rhyne and their personal accomplishments bear testimony to the quality of leadership which their distinguished father gave in the home. I know of no more outstanding family anywhere.

The passing of Robert Lee Stowe leaves me with a feeling of great personal loss because of the opportunities that I had to know and appreciate his wonderful attributes of character. I have said on many occasions that one of the great privileges that I have had in life was to have had the friendship of this outstanding man. His interest in my activities of a political and personal nature from the time that I returned to my home county as a young man to commence the practice of law was most helpful to me. I shall always remember his many acts of kindness with deep appreciation.

North Carolina and the Nation have lost a great leader in the passing of Robert Lee Stowe.

The newspaper report of the death of Mr. Stowe, which appeared in the Charlotte Observer on March 11, 1963, follows:

R. L. STOWE FUNERAL IS TODAY

> R. L. Stowe, 96, pioneer textile industrialist, merchant, and public servant of Belmont, who died Saturday night, will be buried today at 11 a.m. In failing health for several years, he would have been 97 on April 5.
>
> During the more than 60 years of his full productive vigor, Stowe became something of a town and an economy unto himself. A score of Gaston County institutions are the lengthened shadows of this one man.
>
> Twenty-seven textile plants in Belmont, 16 of them cotton-spinning firms, bear his name or organizational imprint. Stowe Mills, Inc., literally made McAdenville. Stowe was the founder and, for more than half a century, the president of the Bank of Belmont.
>
> He was elected to the Gaston County Board of Commissioners in 1914 and became its chairman 8 years later. He was chairman for 33 years.
>
> Stowe was an incorporator of Belmont and served on its town council for many years. For better than half a century he was chairman of Belmont school board.
>
> For 60 years Stowe was treasurer and deacon of Belmont's First Presbyterian Church.
>
> That church's pastor, Dr. Eugene D. Witherspoon, and Dr. W. M. Currie of Greensboro's First Presbyterian Church, will preach graveside services for Stowe at 11 a.m. today at Greenwood Cemetery in Belmont.
>
> He is survived by his wife, the former Nellie Lee Rhyne; a daughter, Mrs. William J. Pharr, of McAdenville; sons, R. L. Stowe, Jr., and Daniel J. Stowe, both of Belmont; a brother, J. W. Stowe, of Belmont; and a sister, Mrs. H. P. Stowe, of Belmont.

THE COTTON TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. **KORNEGAY**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. **KORNEGAY**. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 7, my distinguished friend and colleague in the North Carolina delegation, the Honorable BASIL WHITENER, was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of North Carolina memorializing the President and the Congress to take immediate action to eliminate the inequity of the two-price system of cotton cost.

I am sure that all the members of the North Carolina delegation to whom this resolution was sent by our secretary of state, the Honorable Thad Eure, were happy to receive this corroboration of the conviction pervading our State that it is imperative to take action to offset the detrimental effects of this inequitable system in order to preserve the cotton textile industry of this Nation.

As I have said on several occasions on the House floor, through the various news media, and before committees of the Congress, an equalization fee to offset the raw cotton export subsidy is an urgently needed rectification of an inequity which has too long gone uncorrected. Our domestic industry is suffering under an unjust and indefensible penalty placed upon it which violates every concept of reasonable and fair competition.

Recently I had the privilege of presenting testimony to the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee in behalf of legislation sponsored by the chairman of that great committee, and in the course of my testimony concerning the manifest unfairness of the two-price system, I stated:

> This evil is ordinarily associated with the disadvantage which it imposes upon the cotton textile manufacturers in this country, but a careful analysis of the situation reveals that the ill effects of the two-price cotton system permeate the entire cotton business; that is to say, the grower or producer, the ginner, the seller, the manufacturer, the exporter, and finally the consumer himself. Thus the evil is endemic and self-perpetuating.

I repeat these remarks here for the purpose of underscoring my deep concern for the future of the whole cotton culture complex and for the purpose of reiterating—at the risk of being considered repetitious—my unalterable conviction that this Congress should and must take action that will remedy this situation, which in May 1961, was recognized by President Kennedy as comprising one of the items in his seven-point enunciated program for the recovery and preservation of our cotton textile industry in the United States.

In the colloquy which took place on the floor last Thursday, I was heartened and personally gratified that our distinguished Speaker of the House, who is happy to be described as an "urban farmer," took occasion to join with the Members from cotton-producing States in expressing his hope that injustices in the cotton textile industry will be corrected. Our great Speaker described his personal efforts in previous years to have a bill considered which would, to quote his own words, "bring about an equalization so that American industry would receive the same benefits that were given to foreign industry."

So here we have the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, the chairman of the Cotton Subcommittee, and numerous Members of Congress from cotton-growing and cotton-manufacturing States all in agreement that it is imperative that action be taken to correct what is now an insuperable impediment to a healthy cotton industry. This atmosphere of agreement and mutual conviction should augur well for remedial action and should, it seems, give the "go" sign to such action at the earliest possible time. But still we do not have a measure reported on this vital subject.

I want to commend the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture for his efforts to put together a measure to report to the House and at the same time to express the hope that there will be no intransigent attitude on the part of any officials in the executive departments to prevent the House from working its will to effect the best possible solution to this entrenched inequity.

And I want to express the further hope that when the committee has concluded its arduous efforts and deliberations, the reported measure will have the most interested attention of my colleagues in the House for the purpose of solving a problem which impedes the welfare of an industry which is the second largest in the United States and which at present is truly a potential giant shackled in the chains forged by the two-price cotton system.

SUMMARY OF NET BUDGET RECEIPT AND EXPENDITURE TRENDS IN CURRENT FISCAL 1963 COMPARED TO FISCAL 1962 AND TO BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL 1963

Mr. **CANNON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CANNON**. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations each month makes a concise summary of current budget results in relation to the previous year and the current budget estimates.

For the information of Members and others who may find it of interest, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a synoptic tabulation of the trend of net budget receipts and expenditures in the current fiscal year 1963 with comparisons to the official budget estimates for the fiscal year 1963 and to corresponding actual data for the previous fiscal year 1962.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

Mr. **CANNON**. Mr. Speaker, budget revenues are officially projected at $85,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30—an increase of $4,091,000,000 over fiscal 1962. Through the first 7 months—to January 31, 1963—actual budget revenues exceed the corresponding 7 months of fiscal 1962—to January 31, 1962—by $3,474,000,000.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures are officially projected at $94,311,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30—an increase of $6,524,000,000 over fiscal 1962, of which $1,901,000,000 is for national defense and $4,623,000,000 is for other than national defense.

Through the first 7 months—to January 31, 1963—actual budget expenditures exceed the corresponding 7 months of fiscal 1962—to January 31, 1962—by $4,737,000,000, of which $2,230,000,000 is for national defense and $2,507,000,000 is for other than national defense.

AVERAGE MONTHLY EXPENDITURES

Using straight averages in both instances, the table discloses that expenditures during the first 7 months of fiscal 1963 averaged $7,899,000,000—slightly more than the projected average of $7,859,000,000 for the full year based on the budget estimate of expenditures—a little less for national defense items but slightly overbalanced for nonnational defense.

BUDGET DEFICIT

The official budget estimate of the deficit for fiscal 1963 is $8,811,000,000, or $2,433,000,000 larger than the actual deficit in fiscal 1962.

Through 7 months of fiscal 1963, the actual deficit is $10,640,000,000, or $1,263,000,000 larger than the deficit during the corresponding 7 months of fiscal 1962.

The comparisons and the trends will of course vary each month between January and June in relation to the full-year amounts and in relation to each other. The table follows.

Net budget receipts and expenditures (the administrative budget) 7 months of fiscal 1963 versus 7 months of fiscal 1962 and comparison with full year estimates

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual for 7 months			Budget estimates for fiscal 1963 compared to actual for fiscal 1962		
	Fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1962	1963 compared to 1962	Budget estimate, 1963	Actual, 1962	Estimate for 1963 over actual 1962
1. Budget receipts (net)	$44,658	$41,184	+$3,474	$85,500	$81,409	+$4,0
2. Budget expenditures (net):						
(a) National defense (per official budget classification)	30,501	28,271	+2,230	53,004	51,103	+1,
(b) Other than national defense	24,797	22,290	+2,507	41,307	36,684	+4,6
3. Total expenditures	55,298	50,561	+4,737	94,311	87,787	+6,5
4. Net surplus (+) or deficit (−) (line 1 minus line 3)	−10,640	−9,377	−1,263	−8,811	−6,378	−2,4
5. Average monthly expenditures, actual 7 months of fiscal 1963 versus full year average for 1963 based on budget estimates:						
(a) National defense	4,357			4,417		
(b) Other than national defense	3,542			3,442		
Total monthly average	7,899			7,859		

Sources: Budget for 1964 and monthly Treasury statement for Jan. 31, 1963.

PERMISSION TO INCLUDE STATEMENT EACH MONTH OF THE SESSION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that we may have leave to insert a similar type of statement each month of the session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, for the last 3 weeks while we have had various discussions in this House on abuses of one sort or another, I have remained silent. I have decided I can no longer remain silent. I realize this is not a popular subject to discuss and, yet, it is one which I think needs discussion.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States has a tremendously important role in the free world's combat against tyranny. In many sectors of the world we are engaged in a wide variety of costly military and economic ventures designed to protect ourselves, our allies and the developing nations of the world against the imperialism of the Soviet Union. Imbedded in the professed ideology of the Soviet Union and the litany of its founding triumvirate, Marx, Engles, and Lenin, is a contempt for parliamentary institutions. In their discussion and in nations where they have seized power, the Communists treat parliamentary institutions as a historical bourgeoise apparatus that reflects, they claim, the oppressive forces of capitalistic production. The Communists seek to persuade us and the less sophisticated peoples of the world that parliamentary institutions are a sham, a fraud masking greed and exploitation, and meaningless in terms of providing economic and social justice for all.

We, on the other hand, are attempting to nurture representative government in lands that have not yet fully developed and to strengthen representative government in industrial lands across which falls the intimidating shadow of Soviet and Chinese power. This, I suggest, is what the ferocious cold war is about. We have appropriated billions—$98 billion in loans and grants for military and economic foreign aid since World War II—to effect our just cause.

But our larger purpose is to abort tyranny and injustice wherever they are found. And tyranny cannot flourish in any land where there is a healthy, flourishing, responsible parliamentary institution. We are attempting to lead and to demonstrate that, to use a shorthand phrase, "our way of life," is superior. And we are carrying out these vast programs as if situated in a show window along any main street in any village, town, or city of the United States. It is a show window because our proceedings here in the Congress of the United States are, when open, reported, analyzed, and criticized by the constitutionally protected rights of free press, assembly and speech. And this is as it should and must be.

Now the United States cannot, in these circumstances, adopt an attitude of "do as I say, not as I do." And I suggest that our cause is being impaired because of the growing concern both within and without Congress as to how effective our Congress is: with rules of procedure drawn in the horse-and-buggy days, while the demands of the space age press upon us; with more and more questions being asked about possible legislative conflicts-of-interest; with continuing criticisms of unjustified expenditures by Members of Congress traveling overseas and injudicious behavior while there; with the misuse of committee appropriations; with periodic outbursts of disgust about flagrant abuses in the area of nepotism. Indeed, I believe that this situation threatens to blunt the effectiveness of our message of democracy and to turn upon the Congress both the derision of the very people we seek to influence and the American people themselves.

To bring about the reform or elimination of "Senator Egoman" or "Congressman Everyone" may be a worthy cause, but not the ultimate goal, because there will be more such ones to take their places. The job for each and every one of us is to so conduct the Nation's business that the confidence of the country in the National Legislature is maintained—yes, and strengthened. And I suggest we must go deeper in order to reach the major underlying problems, and perhaps perform some major surgery instead of applying the "band-aid" to cover and protect the wound that has been inflicted and is so painful at the moment.

None of us is blameless in these developments either because of direct participation in improper activities or by acquiescence. I might say, parenthetically at this point, that some of this criticism about particular Members' performance has been unfair, and, I suspect, is generated not by concern for legislative propriety but rather for other less defensible reasons.

Nevertheless, I believe it is high time that Democrats and Republicans alike here in this Congress clean our own house lest the erosion of public confidence become a real threat to the democratic process and our own people wonder if their Government condones greed and exploitation. How can we ask for greater public interest, larger voter turnout, a more informed citizenry when the image becomes so blurred—and too often the honest, conscientious citizen reacts with "a plague on both your houses." I do not believe the real problem lies with any one Member of Congress or with any one committee. I do not believe the whole problem is resolved by restricting funds available to any one Member or committee. And to treat the current

situation confronting us these days in such isolated fashion is, in effect, to dodge a problem that I feel should and can no longer be dodged.

Others have eloquently spoken of the need to establish guidelines regulating conduct of Members of Congress in cases where their public duties may conflict with their private financial interests—or where the public has cause to wonder if this is or is not the case.

The Bar Association of the City of New York in a "seedbed" report in 1960 spelled out during a 5-year study, entitled "Conflict of Interest and Federal Service," the tangled web of legislative conflict of interest with these melancholy sentences:

> The congressional conflict-of-interest problem * * * is current, complex, and controversial. It is also largely unresolved.

Today, Mr. Speaker, 3 years later, these statements still hold true.

Inside the Congress, Members are wrestling with the problems. Outside the Congress the questions are being asked: What are the proper limits on the power of a Member of Congress to appoint his staff from among his family? What kinds of outside employment and income are compatible with what kinds of committee assignments? How far should a Member of Congress go in voting on matters in which he has some personal stake?

Now I suppose that no one believes a Member of Congress should disqualify himself from taking part in a housing bill because he owns a house. But what if he is president or a member of the board of directors of a local urban renewal agency or a large residential construction company?

No Member of Congress should disqualify himself from taking part in legislation involving oil or gas because his house is heated by gas or oil. But what if he is a major stockholder or officer in a gas transmission line, or the owner of a dozen oil wells?

No Member of Congress should disqualify himself from taking part in legislation involving our major carriers because he travels to and from his State to Washington by train. But what if he might sit on a committee that deals with this legislation and at the same time maintains connections with a law firm that has a major railroad as a client?

No Member should disqualify himself from shaping commodity legislation because he owns a farm or a ranch. But what if this Member serves as a consultant to an economic interest that seeks to knead and shape the legislation to its own ends?

Members of Congress should not disqualify themselves from accepting campaign contributions or speaking out on legislation before professional and trade organizations. But what if the speaking fee received is so inordinately large that it points to the conclusion the fee is, in effect, a campaign contribution not reported?

What of the Member of Congress who is defeated for election and then suddenly evidences during his lame-duck period a great interest in visiting the countries of the world? Is there legitimate work to justify such an expenditure?

And what of the Member who, ostensibly traveling abroad on congressional business, spends more time seeing night sights than sighting on the business at hand? And using taxpayers' dollars or counterpart funds while doing so, and later has printed at taxpayers' expense a voluminous, vacuous account of his travels?

What of a Member who may represent business interests on a retainer fee, and also is required by committee assignment to vote on tax bills, ostensibly with complete objectivity?

Where should the lines be drawn?

Neither the law nor custom provides many answers, although there are statutes relating to bribery, acceptance of compensation for services in connection with proceedings before Federal agencies and procurement of Government contracts.

The discussions on and off the floor in recent weeks have, I think, been necessary and productive.

But as the sometimes very acrimonious debate continues, I am reminded of a stanza of doggerel that probably came into being during the life of the notorious Enclosure Acts in Great Britain. My memory tells me that it runs this way:

> The law locks up the man or woman
> Who steals the goose from off the Common
> But lets the great felon loose
> Who steals the Common from the goose.

By all means let us take action on the individual offenses—let us do our best to see that every dollar is spent as wisely as possible—and I will have more to say about that a little later.

But as we save the dollar, let us not become so engrossed that we overlook the larger problems.

Do we in Congress have a double standard of conduct?

Last fall we passed a major revision of the outmoded conflict-of-interest code to govern behavior of the flood of part-time advisers to our various governmental agencies of the executive branch. It also toughened the restrictions on employment of Federal employees after they leave the Federal service.

President Kennedy in February 1962, in keeping with a campaign speech in October 1960 at Springfield, Ohio, issued a memorandum to all heads of executive departments and agencies directing them to take administrative steps to assure compliance with existing statutes, rules, and regulations governing conflicts-of-interest problems. In recent times, as a condition of confirmation, Congress has required Secretaries of Defense to divest themselves of stock in companies doing business with the Government. But no Senator or Congressman is required to dispose of any stock, even when he becomes a member of a committee particularly concerned with his investments.

Now there are some here among us who believe that continuous surveillance by the press and the election campaigns committee constitute a thorough and continuous discipline of the House and of the Senate and make specific regulations unnecessary. I think that there have been occasions when the inadequacy of these safeguards is apparent.

The topic of legislative conflict-of-interest has generated bipartisan attention and concern. Others in both the House and Senate have arisen to discuss the matter in detail and with eloquence and insight that I do not have. The suggestions I now put forward, in the form of bills I shall introduce, today or shortly thereafter, are not all new. Senators MORSE, CLARK, and CLIFFORD CASE, to mention the names of those that come most readily to mind, have for years attempted to convince their senatorial colleagues of the wisdom of congressional reform. Another distinguished colleague, Representative JOHN LINDSAY, of New York, this very session has addressed himself to the matter.

Senator CASE 2 years ago noted that Congress is diligent in holding the executive branch to strict accountability but that "at the same time, however, the whole process would be more seemly, in our view, if Members of Congress as well were subject to the requirements of disclosure as officials in the executive branch. The public has a right to know the facts in either case."

Recently, the distinguished Chief Justice of the United States, Earl Warren, proposed a new profession be developed for these complex times—the profession of "ethics counselor," available to advise businessmen, labor leaders, politicians, and others. He said:

> The man of character, sensitive to the meaning of what he is doing, will know how to discover the ethical path in the maze of possible behavior.

In the fledgling years of the United States, Thomas Jefferson wrote by hand in 1801 a strict rule of conduct for legislators. It reads in part:

> Where the private interests of a Member are concerned in a bill or question, he is to withdraw. And where such an interest has appeared, his voice has been disallowed, even after a division. In a case so contrary not only to the laws of decency, but to the fundamental principle of the social compact, which denies any man to be a judge in his own cause, it is for the honor of the House that this rule of immemorial observance should be strictly adhered to.

Alas, less than a generation later, this "immemorial observance" was breached by Daniel Webster who wrote the Biddle Bank in Philadelphia for money at the height of a battle in the Senate over renewal of the bank's controversial charter. In unminced words, Senator Webster wrote Nicholas Biddle:

> I believe my retainer has not been renewed or refreshed as usual. If it be wished that my relation to the bank should be continued, it may well be well to send me the usual retainers.

And, alas, in April 1874, House Speaker, James G. Blaine, ruled that Congressmen can vote their private interests if the measure is not for their exclusive benefit. My understanding is that Blaine's precedent remains in the rule books of the House today.

Now I am not talking about dishonesty in the general way laymen interpret it. But each passing year it becomes harder for a Congressman with legitimate outside interests to keep his eye on the ethical guideposts.

So many times I have heard Mr. Sam say, "I love this House."

I also love this House—and I count it a great good fortune that I have been allowed to sit here and represent the Third District of Oregon. I have never, never before had the opportunity, the privilege to serve with, to work with so many great people—and I mean just that—great in ability, great in desire to be of service, great in selflessness, and great in dedication to the public interest. The 40-hour week is unknown. The pressures are great. The requests and demands are voluminous. And satisfaction very seldom comes in the form of thank you letters, but only in the realization that perhaps in some small way you have had a part in drafting legislation that may make better the lives of millions, or by law or action you have removed an inequity that is onerous to a single individual.

But the discussions of the last few weeks—and the events leading to the debates have been most painful—because not just individuals have been hurt, but the Congress of the United States has been hurt. With the greatest admiration for the vast majority of my colleagues, and not impugning the motives of a single one, may I make some suggestions.

ETHICS

That there shall be established a Commission on Legislative Ethics to be composed of 15 members: 4 Members of the Senate and 4 Members of the House to be drawn in equal numbers in each body from each of the major political parties, and 7 members from the public at large, at least one of whom shall come from the field of law; at least one from the field of journalism, and at least one from the field of political science.

The Commission shall make a thorough study of conflicts-of-interest problems and relations with executive and other agencies which confront Members of Congress. The Commission, provided with whatever funds are necessary, shall submit a final report of its activities within 18 months. I would think it desirable the Commission be a permanent one with authority to issue progress reports from time to time.

FINANCIAL INTERESTS OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Each Member of the Senate and House and each and every employee of the Congress who receives a salary at a rate of $12,500 or more, shall file yearly with the clerk of the Senate and Clerk of the House a report which shall be made public containing a full and complete statement of first, the amount and resources of all income and gifts more than $100 from any one person received during the preceding calendar year. This includes speaking fees, which as I indicated earlier, are sometimes inflated so as to serve as hidden campaign contributions. Second, the value of each asset held by or entrusted to him or by him and to him and any other person, including spouse. Third, the amount and source of all contributions during the preceding calendar year received by him or by anyone, including spouse and minor children, on behalf of him or subject to the direction or control of the person. Fourth, annual reports listing all dealings in real estate, securities, and commodities by the member or by any person, including spouse, acting on his behalf. Fifth, the name of any relative who is also an employee of the Federal Government.

CLEAN ELECTIONS

Legislation in regard to election has previously been introduced by several, including myself, and given major attention only when scandal becomes public or crisis occurs. I think it is high time and past time the House came to grips with the issues posed by the clean elections bill. I hope the 88th Congress will not adjourn without having given to the people of the United States some assurance that the election of Federal officials will be conducted under better ground rules than the 1925 ones now in force.

The bill covers general, special, primary, preferential primary and convention or caucus of a political party held for the purpose of nominating candidates for President, Vice President, Senator, or Representative. A candidate for Senator or Representative-at-Large may spend up to $50,000 in each primary, nominating convention, caucus, or general or special election. A candidate for Representative may spend up to $12,500. Candidates for election as President and Vice President shall not make expenditures in excess of an amount equal to the amount obtained by multiplying 20 cents by the largest number of voters casting votes for presidential electors in any one of the last three preceding elections. This includes expenditures made by or on behalf of either or both candidates. A candidate for nomination for the office of President or Vice President in a nominating campaign shall not make expenditures in excess of 50 percent of the amount permissible in the general election for the position. Political committees which spend or receive more than $2,500 in any calendar year shall keep a detailed account of all such sums in excess of $100 for a period of 2 years. Every candidate for House and Senate shall file complete reports of receipts and expenditures with the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate. All prescribed filings shall be open to public scrutiny and be on file for 6 years.

Violations of any of these provisions of the bill shall carry a fine up to $5,000, or up to a 5-year jail sentence. Willful violations shall carry a maximum fine of $10,000 and a maximum of 2-year prison term.

COMMUNICATIONS WITH EXECUTIVE BRANCH

It seems to me we need legislation on the statute books that all written and oral communications made by a Member or a member of his staff to an officer or employee of an executive branch department or agency shall become part of the public record of any case upon which a query is made. The record shall include the name of the caller, the time, the matter queried, the proceeding, if any, involved and the nature of the inquiry. If the query indicates other than a point of information this, too, shall be noted.

I suggest serious consideration be given to laws prohibiting any use of congressional influence with any regulatory agency. And I also suggest that this would serve to protect the Members of Congress, because then when pressures mount from the homefront from special groups the answer is obvious and can be short and direct: "The law prohibits me from acceding to your request."

And so, I hope, Mr. Speaker, that these proposals engender discussion that gives off light not heat. I am not adamant about the details of these proposals, but I regard them as a provisional framework within which we should enter and assume the overdue task of regulating our own store.

But before I close let me also refer briefly to two other matters. I think we and members of the executive branch have been engaging in a lot of gobbledygook, when we blithely talk about counterpart funds, as somehow not related to tax dollars. I did not realize until this last week, when I asked for a conference with Treasury and State Department people, that there are only eight countries in the world where the United States has an excess of foreign currencies, and where the term "counterpart" might be honestly used and that in all other countries—when Members of the Congress or the executive branch travel—the U.S. Government must go out to buy the foreign currencies with American tax dollars. I undoubtedly should have known, but I believe this misinformation or misunderstanding is shared by many of my colleagues.

This makes it far more incumbent on us to make even more sure that these travel privileges are not abused either by us, or the executive branch, or the military, and if I may say so, I think that any military or State Department transportation that is requested or given to Members of Congress should be required to be reported to the House Administration Committee, the same as so-called counterpart travel is now required. Let me add that I think legitimate travel is to be encouraged.

If, as a matter of national policy, it is desirable to have, in the words of the Fulbright-Hays Act, "a better understanding of the United States and other countries and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries," then I certainly think it is desirable to have the elected representatives visit areas where we have far-flung commitments. And it seems to me, Members of Congress can vote far more intelligently on foreign policy matters if they have some first-hand knowledge, some first-hand experience, with some facets of our foreign operations.

We do not expect the Governor of a State to sit in his State capitol office and not travel to brief himself on matters within his concern. And so with Members of Congress. But let us be sure that funds appropriated for either the executive or legislative branch be spent wisely.

One other matter, Mr. Speaker. The phrase "affluent society" has been facilely accepted by us as a descriptive of the economic state of most Americans. Recent studies show that there are substantial pockets of poverty throughout our country. A recent book entitled "The Other America: Poverty in the United States," suggests that millions of Americans are living in old-fashioned poverty. These are the invisible Americans—the Americans you and I here in the Congress are not effectively representing. They do not write us—indeed, some cannot write or even read. They do not visit our offices—they do not have the money to even take a bus to an employment office. They are atomized, without face, without voice, without well-heeled, supporting lobbies writing us on fancy stationery.

I talked earlier of the "image" that this Congress is creating for the American people and the Communists abroad.

I just received a letter from a 39-year-old resident of my home city explaining in devastating detail his inability to obtain a job. His family without enough food, and about to be a family without shelter. Last Saturday, I received still another letter from an elderly constituent explaining that he was injured in a fall and is trying to keep body and soul together and mend his body as well on a social security allotment of $71.80 a month.

Will anyone in this body tell me how you and I can justify to these people—and countless others—the expenditure of funds to provide kitchen facilities and refrigerators for every suite in the New Office Building?

I suppose in a budget of billions this is a small matter—but I think a very important one. To so many of our constituents the ringing words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, spoken during the early years of his Presidency, are still so true:

> That poverty walks hand in hand with the most lavish living this world has ever known.

Let us take care of the major problems I referred to earlier, but in putting our own house in order, let us also be sure that other extravagances, other items, do not become a symbol of a bourgeois legislative body that does not care. Let us instead live up to the challenge as the greatest parliamentary body in the world.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from Oregon yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, may I thank my colleague from Oregon for bringing these matters to our attention. It is very evident that she has given them vast study, that they have been very close to her heart, that they have troubled her conscience, as they have mine. I am very happy that I was here to hear her very fine contribution to these matters.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank my friend and colleague from Ohio.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to compliment the gentlewoman from Oregon on her superb presentation here this afternoon. When she says that she loves this House we all know that she speaks the truth and that she is sincerely interested in seeing that this great legislative body be the finest in the world. She looks around the world, as we all do, and sees many parliaments, some of them once proud and of ancient history that in recent years have been brought to their knees. We see legislative bodies of newly fledged countries which at this moment look as if they may not make the grade. For just that reason it is so tremendously important that the Congress of the United States and this coordinate branch thereof be one that all the people of the United States may be fully proud of.

The specific remedies the gentlewoman from Oregon suggests deserve considered attention from the committee to which they will be referred. Without having the opportunity myself to consider the details of them, I can say this right at the outset, that they take advantage of one very wholesome and salutary principle of public life; which is, let the good bright light enter into public affairs, and the public will be the gainer.

I happen to be a member of a very fine subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Foreign Operations and Governmental Information. Our task there is to see that the light and the truth are cast upon the operations of the executive branch. This is very important. This work must continue. What the gentlewoman suggests here is that some of that same light ought to be brought to bear on the affairs of this body. In that general philosophical position I heartily support her. I am glad she brought the matter up today.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I join in commending the gentlewoman for her thoughtful remarks and her sound suggestions. I think we do need in the Congress a code of ethics. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that not in a code of ethics itself do you find the soul of dedication and integrity. That is in the soul and the mind of each individual Member.

Since I have been in Congress I have made it a rule to listen to no gossip, and I have requested every person in my office to remember that we have the job of serving our constituents, that another Member may have different problems and different methods. It is for that Member to decide, and if he makes mistakes it is for his constituents to judge and not his colleagues in this body.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, what I think this House needs is someone skilled in public relations. I do not know a Member of this House who does not work hard. I marvel at the work they do. Then I hear some comedian getting a big salary at a night club making a target of the Congress.

Yes, we are human here. Yes, we make mistakes. But I think there is more integrity, more hard work in this historic body, the House of Representatives, than in any group in government service anywhere in the world. I know that the gentlewoman from Oregon, for whom I have the highest admiration, and if I need not be misunderstood—I may be—the warmest affection, agrees with me on that.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman for making his usual good observations.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS. I too join my colleague in complimenting the gentlewoman from Oregon on the views expressed here today. I think it can be said as an axiom that where there is a conflict of interest the public suffers, and the public suffers and will suffer even if the affected legislator is completely honest in what he is trying to do, because there is no way to measure the subconscious influence on a man whose personal interests are at stake in a piece of legislation that is pending.

Here in the House of Representatives we are entitled to the truth and when a Member speaks on the floor on a piece of legislation, a portion of the truth is whether or not he has a personal stake in the legislation. Members are entitled to these facts in judging what he says. I am in favor of the principles which the gentlewoman from Oregon has espoused today. I feel very grateful that I have had the opportunity to be here.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank my colleague.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Duncan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, with her usual courage and directness, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] has put her finger on a problem which I am sure has disturbed everyone who has been closely connected with the legislative process. She is seeking to reestablish the reputation and prestige of the Congress, which many feel has been tarnished.

With her efforts I would like to associate myself, recognizing how easy it is to set the goal but how difficult it is to prescribe the mechanics for achieving that goal. How can we eliminate the conflicts of interest which inevitably must occur in any citizen government without denying ourselves the knowledge and experience which our Members can bring to the solution of a problem? This is much more easily said than done, but again the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] has made suggestions which should have the careful consideration of this body.

Without delaying consideration and action on these specifics to which the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] has directed our attention, I should like to suggest that this is only one—albeit a most important—aspect of the need for a reexamination of the entire legislative branch of the Federal Government.

As a new Member, I attended the very fine series of indoctrination lectures arranged for us by older Members of the House. Throughout these lectures—by senior and respected Members of both the Senate and the House, by respected members of the press, and others—runs the recurrent theme of congressional reorganization. Few deny the need; few are disposed to take the action required.

The problems raised by my colleague demand immediate attention. Without delaying action thereon, however, I would hope that we could move concurrently toward the appointment of a commission which would include the Members of both Houses together with distinguished laymen—if I may use that term—to make recommendations to this or succeeding Congresses as to how best to meet the problems of governing the largest and most powerful nation on earth during a most critical period of its leadership of the free world.

I hesitate to make this suggestion—and presume to do no more than make it. I would not do so had not similar sentiments been expressed by those with much experience and great knowledge of the traditions and procedures of this body.

The gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] deserves the thanks and support of all of us as she seeks the solution to these very difficult problems.

NEWS REPORTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post made some unique news in its own editorial column this morning.

This unremitting and ofttimes grossly intemperate opponent of the House Committee on Un-American Activities tendered an "unequivocal apology" to the committee's able staff director, Mr. Francis J. McNamara.

In so doing, the Post very properly repudiated a shoddy piece of untruthful reporting and a sneering, venomous and derisive editorial based on the distorted news story.

I welcome this editorial retraction and apology—as I am sure my colleagues on the committee and in this House likewise do.

I entertain the restrained hope that this action augurs a greater degree of accuracy in news reporting and a newly found moderateness in editorial comment as both relate to the committee's compliance with its recently renewed mandate from the House of Representatives.

In any event, I believe the House is entitled to a résumé of the essential facts regarding this incident which has resulted in an embarrassing denouement for the Washington Post.

On February 28, Mr. McNamara addressed the Metropolitan Washington Council of Young Americans for Freedom. In the course of his remarks, the staff director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities stated that top officials of the Department of Justice as well as leading Communist Party officials are agreed that the Communist Party today has approximately 10,000 members.

Mr. McNamara added that it would be a serious mistake, however, to judge total Communist strength, the danger of communism, and the extent of its influence in this country merely on the basis of this figure of 10,000 formally or technically enrolled members.

Thereafter in this speech, Mr. McNamara stated that on the basis of reports filed with the Post Office Department just three Communist publications which could be described as "hard core"—The Worker, People's World, and National Guardian—had a combined average paid circulation per issue of about 50,000 during the year ending October 1961.

Mr. McNamara pointed out that during the same period, domestic foreign-language publications which have been officially cited as Communist had a circulation of about 46,000 and publications of unions which have been found to be Communist-controlled and expelled from the CIO as such, a circulation of about 150,000. The combined circulation of these various categories of publications, he added, is roughly 250,000.

He said that in estimating readership on the generally accepted ratio of three persons per publication, it would appear that between 700,000 and 800,000 persons in this country regularly read either hard-core party literature or party-line publications.

Mr. McNamara further qualified his estimate with the statement that this is not to be considered a gage of Communist strength because many paid subscriptions to these publications are accounted for by Government security agencies and anti-Communist organizations and individuals, and also by the fact that many Communists and fellow travelers would obviously subscribe to more than one Communist or party-line publication.

And Mr. McNamara concluded that even if as much as 25 percent was to be deducted from the total for these types of readership, we are still faced with the fact that several hundred thousand people in this country are apparently sympathetic readers of hard-core and party-line propaganda.

From the foregoing, Mr. McNamara offered the valid observation that it would be obviously unrealistic to judge the totality of Communist strength and influence in this country by the figure of 10,000 members.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I enclose at this point the Washington Post news report on this speech, published the next day, March 1:

OVER 700,000 REDS BELIEVED IN UNITED STATES

Francis J. McNamara, staff director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, said last night there was reason to believe there are 700,000 to 800,000 Communists in the United States.

McNamara said he arrived at these figures by totaling the circulation of publications officially cited as subversive and then tripling this number.

He tripled the number in line with standard advertising practice, which estimates there are three readers for every copy, he said.

McNamara admitted this method was vague and nebulous and said the committee did not know for sure the exact number of Communists in the United States.

He pointed out, however, that the figure of 10,000 generally cited as the total of registered Communists, was misleading.

Addressing a meeting of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Young Americans for Freedom, McNamara acknowledged that there was a growth in sentiment to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee. But he cited recent House votes to show the committee was in no danger of being abolished.

The first Washington Post editorial, based on this false news story, appeared March 6. It was as follows:

SEEING REDS

Francis J. McNamara, the staff director of that remarkable research organization, the House Un-American Activities Committee, let it be known recently that there are 700,000 to 800,000 Communists in the United States. This is in rather striking contrast to assertions by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that the Communist Party reached a top strength of 80,000 in 1944, has declined every year since then and nosedived in 1961 to between 8,000 and 10,000.

Before anyone gets excited and starts talking about tossing Mr. Hoover out of his job as an incompetent, it might be worth while to look critically at Mr. McNamara's computations. He said he arrived at his estimate by totaling the circulation of all publications officially cited as subversive and tripling this number in accordance with the usual advertising hypothesis that there are three readers for every subscriber.

Estimates of this kind used to be arrived at, somewhat haphazardly, by looking at tea leaves or examining the entrails of sheep or multiplying the ambyranth of Q by the coefficient of means square contingencies. But there was always an element of error in such calculations; and anyway the Communists kept complaining that they were being underestimated. Mr. McNamara's method is much more scientific. Naturally it costs a little more money. This, evidently, is why the House of Representatives last week voted, 385 to 20, to give the House Un-American Activities Committee $360,000 for its scientific investigations this year. The 20 dissenters seem content to hobble along with that old-fashioned FBI.

Meanwhile, 2 days prior to the appearance of this editorial, the following letter to the editor of the Washington Post was mailed by Mr. Vernon W. Holleman, Jr., chairman, Metropolitan Washington chapter of Young Americans for Freedom, protesting the distorted news report.

This letter was published in this morning's Washington Post, in the "Letters to the Editor" column adjoining the editorial of retraction and apology, and is as follows:

COMMUNISTS IN THE UNITED STATES

The headline and lead paragraphs of your March 1 report about the February meeting of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Young Americans for Freedom were completely false and grievously misleading. You quoted Francis McNamara, staff director of

the House Committee on Un-American Activities, as asserting there is reason to believe that there are "700,000 to 800,000 Communists in the United States."

This is not the truth and it is not what Mr. McNamara said at the meeting. What he did say was that there are approximately 250,000 people in this country who subscribe to Communist publications like the Sunday Worker, foreign-language pro-Soviet publications, Communist-front publications, and party-line publications.

Taking the normal ratio of three readers for one subscriber he estimated that the readership of hard-core Communist publications, plus those who read general party-line material, totaled about 750,000. Mr. McNamara emphasized that some of these readers were anti-Communist, some were teachers and students, some were American security personnel; but that even discounting as much as 25 percent there were still a good many thousands of Americans reading the party line every week or month.

Granted his calm, analytical talk was not a "sensational" one, but it was warmly applauded by YAF members in search of the truth—which, unfortunately, they did not find in the Washington Post the next morning.

VERNON W. HOLLEMAN, Jr.

The editorial of apology—acknowledging, in effect, that the distortion in the news report and the admitted bias, venom, and irresponsibility of the early editorial were too much even for the Washington Post to attempt to defend—was carried this morning. It reads as follows:

SEEING RED FACES

A letter from Vernon W. Holleman, Jr., appearing elsewhere on this page today asserts that the Washington Post did an injustice to Francis MoNamara, staff director of the House Un-American Activities Committee, in reporting a recent speech by him. A subsequent editorial, Seeing Reds, based on the news story, compounded the injustice. Inquiry has satisfied us that the news story and the editorial were mistaken in imputing to Mr. McNamara the implication that all readers of Communist publications are Communists. We genuinely regret the imputation and the derisory tone of our editorial comment concerning it, and we tender to Mr. McNamara an unequivocal apology.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a news story from the Washington Post, two editorials from the Washington Post, and a letter to the editor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CUBAN REFUGEE SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced in the House the following resolution as a declaration of the sense of this House:

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, That it is the sense of the House that the entry of Soviet armed forces into Cuba was and the continued presence of such Soviet armed forces in Cuba is a violation of the Monroe Doctrine and a menace to the security of the United States; that the entry of such armed forces into Cuba was and the continued presence there is in violation of the principles of the Organization of American States and a menace to the security of all the American States; that the entry of Soviet armed forces into Cuba was and the continued presence of such forces in Cuba is in violation of the Charter of the United Nations because the presence of such armed forces in Cuba constitutes a threat to the peace of the world:

Wherefore the Government of the United States, in such manner as the President shall determine, should call upon the Organization of American States and the United Nations to join the United States in a demand that the Soviet Union shall forthwith remove all of its armed force from Cuba.

I have also introduced the following joint resolution having to do with the resettlement forthwith of the excess of Cuban refugees now living in Dade County, Fla., which includes my district:

JOINT RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON CUBAN REFUGEES

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Cuban Refugee Commission Act".

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON CUBAN REFUGEES

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Cuban Refugees (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall serve as Chairman.

(c) The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to the compensation for their services as head of a department, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

(d) The Commission may utilize the facilities and personnel of the departments under the respective jurisdictions of the members of the Commission.

Duties of the commission

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall establish, operate, and maintain a program for the orderly relocation of refugees from Cuba from the Dade County, Florida, area to such other areas within the United States as may be appropriate. Such program shall be conducted with due regard to the job opportunities, housing facilities, public educational facilities, and other pertinent factors existing in each relocation area to the end that an excessive burden shall not be placed on any one relocation area.

(b) The Commission shall initiate and conduct a study, on a continuing basis, of the respective problems involved in the relocation and resettlement within the United States of refugees from Cuba. Such study shall devote particular attention to the economic and social factors involved in such relocation and resettlement with particular reference to job opportunities, housing facilities, educational facilities, and opportunities and facilities in general for adaptation of such refugees in each relocation and resettlement area to the way of life in the United States. The Commission shall submit an annual report to the President for presentation to the Congress of the results of such continuing study together with such recommendations as the Commission deems advisable.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Commission, to remain available until expended, such sums (not to exceed the amount of $25,000,000 annually) as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that those who have criticism to offer about the present threatening and disturbing situation in Cuba owe it to the country to try to do something constructive or to offer criticism which will be helpful in the solution of the grievous burdens respecting that unhappy island which our President now has to bear. We all know the awesome responsibility the President has had to bear to meet the challenge of communistic imperialism in Cuba and to remove from power in the unhappy island of Cuba that creature whose regime has been the source of aggression and subversion against all the American States. The President deserves the commendation of the country—indeed he has received the acclaim of the Nation—for the courageous and effective manner in which he confronted aggressive communistic imperialism in Cuba and forthwith required before the observing eyes of the world the removal of the offensive missiles and planes which constituted a dangerous threat to the safety of the American people. And the President has received and continues to enjoy the gratification of the country that he is steadily bringing about the removal of Soviet armed forces from Cuba and in his announced determination that the remainder of such forces shall be withdrawn as the spearhead of communistic imperialism in the Western Hemisphere.

But the coming of such Soviet armed forces into Cuba and their continued presence in Cuba is a matter of concern not only to the United States, but to every state in the Western Hemisphere and to every peace-loving nation in the world. Such forces strengthen the hand of communistic subversion and aggression in the Western World; they constitute a dire menace and threat to the security of every American State; their presence in Cuba constitutes a distinct and dangerous threat to the peace of the world. That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a resolution expressing the sense of this House that the Government of the United States in such manner as the President should determine should call upon the Organization of the American States and the United Nations to join us in a demand that the Soviet Union forthwith remove all of its remaining armed forces from the island of Cuba. The added strength of the Organization of American States and the United Nations to our own demand will give it greater force and power and abate the breach of the Monroe Doctrine, the breach of the principles of the Organization of American States and the breach of the United Nations Charter which their presence in Cuba constitutes.

Mr. Speaker, on the first day this House met in the 88th Congress, I introduced a resolution declaring it to be the sense of this House, among other things, "that the fair isle of Cuba must and shall be freed of the curse of Castro and communism." I have been assured of an early hearing by the subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee upon this resolution. It does not attempt to prescribe for the President of the United States the method by which this high purpose shall be achieved but it does unreservedly and irrevocably declare the sentiment of the Congress of the United States that Castro and communism must go from Cuba and that we shall never falter in our determination that this isle formerly called the jewel of the Carribean shall be freed of this curse and the Western Hemisphere of this menace.

I am sure when our President speaks shortly in Costa Rica among those most endangered by the threat of Castro and communism from Cuba he will spell out many ways by which the American States can cooperate with other freedom-loving and peace-loving nations of the world in eradicating Castro and communism from Cuba. It would seem to me that other of the American States would wish to break all diplomatic relations with Cuba as the United States has done; close their ports to Cuban ships and Cuban exports; require the closing of all Cuban embassies, ministries and consulates in the respective American countries to stop them from continuing to function as hotbeds and spawning grounds of communistic aggression and subversion in the several American States; that the several Latin American nations should cooperate more closely with the United States in the coordination of their political, economic and military policies respecting Cuba as long as Castro's or any Communist government shall be in power; that the United States should also call upon all friendly states everywhere in the world to stop commerce with Castro or communistic Cuba and if such states persist in giving aid, strength, and comfort to our enemy in Cuba that we should advise them that neither their ships nor their commerce can enter the United States; that we should not extend economic assistance or cooperation even through international financial institutions to states which manifest that they prefer the friendship of Castro and communistic Cuba to that of the United States. I know we can depend upon our President to do what is the best thing to accomplish the objective upon which we are all united to free Cuba, the Western Hemisphere and the free world from the curse of Castro and communism and to remove the bridgehead of communistic, imperialistic aggression from the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, Castro and communistic tyranny in Cuba have brought to Dade County, Fla., some 200,000 Cuban refugees fleeing from communistic terror; many already robbed of all their possessions before they departed, others giving up everything they had in order to breathe the air of freedom in America. Our Government has willingly and gladly given sanctuary to these exiles from communistic persecution and horror; more than that we have been glad and proud to give them succor and sustenance in our country; we have extended to them the hand of fellowship in freedom and given them words of encouragement that we shall hasten the day when they may return to a free Cuba again. But, Mr. Speaker, the congregation of over 200,000 of these refugees in Dade County has imposed a very serious economic burden upon the people of our county. In spite of the some $70 million a year the Federal Government has given for the sustenance and care and education of the children of these refugees, they still have felt it necessary in order to enjoy a higher level of living or subsistence than the funds federally provided enable them to enjoy to go into our economy and take by responsible estimate some 30,000 jobs. We already had a labor surplus in Dade County. It is inevitable that the refugees willing to work at almost any wage have not only taken the jobs of many of our local citizens, but have lowered the wage scale for all of the people who work in our county. I wish we had jobs enough for our people and a surplus adequate to meet the needs of the refugees.

I have striven in every way I could to induce the Federal Government to help us to provide more jobs in Dade County; to provide funds to assure Federal participation in Interama which would immediately provide thousands of additional jobs for the people of our county; to aid us in getting defense contracts for which we are in so many ways so much suited; to declare us eligible for the benefits of the area redevelopment program; to aid our small business and otherwise. We are striving to get space-age industries located in Dade County, a natural and highly desirable location for them; we have labored to increase social security benefits, welfare assistance, educational aid and, in short, we have been trying in every way we could to assist our people in the hope that after our own citizens had gainful employment of suitable character there would be a surplus of jobs for the Cuban refugees. But we have not yet reached that point.

The Federal Government has not yet given us the assistance which we feel we are entitled to receive in giving jobs to the unemployed among our own citizens let alone the refugees. We are continuing to struggle to achieve this end. But meanwhile, thousands of our people are out of work, many of them having had their jobs taken by Cuban refugees. Until we can provide enough jobs for our own people and a surplus for the refugees, it is imperative that we immediately institute a resettlement program which will remove to other parts of America—which, I am sure, will also hospitably receive them—the surplus refugees beyond our ability to absorb them in jobs not required by our local people.

The agencies have been working upon the problem, but too little has been done and what has been done has been done too late. Accordingly, I have today introduced a resolution to set up a high level Cabinet committee to institute and immediately to effectuate a resettlement program for the Cuban refugees which will relieve this excessive burden and pressure upon our own people. I hope the Congress will take prompt action upon this resolution and give our people the relief to which we have been long entitled and avoid an unhappy increase in tension which has grown up in Dade County between our displaced citizens and the Cuban refugees on account of their natural effort to better themselves above the level of bare subsistence almost which the bounty of our Government provides.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, I want to commend to every Member of this House and the Congress a letter entitled "A Communication," appearing in the Sunday, March 10, issue of the Washington Post by the Honorable John C. Wiley, former Ambassador of the United States to Columbia, Iran, Portugal, and Panama, and who, though in retirement, remains an able and wise counselor of his country:

A COMMUNICATION

The public parade of Soviet missiles into Cuba and the complacently public parade of the same missiles out of Cuba appear too obvious for a simple explanation. The Soviet missile operation clearly had ulterior purposes.

The Soviet Union in Cuba is faced with a variety of problems, but the Cuban thorn in the Soviet foot is Castro himself. He is probably not more popular in the Kremlin than in the White House. Impossible to get along with, it has so far been impossible for the Kremlin to get along without him.

Soviet armed forces are in Cuba neither to attack the United States nor to defend Cuba against the United States. They are not even a saber to rattle. Actually they are a sword over Castro's head.

Monolithic communism exists only when sheltered by Red bayonets. This explains why Soviet garrisons were established in the Baltic States for "mutual security" months before the takeover. It also explains the successful rejection by China, Yugoslavia, and Albania of the primacy of the Kremlin.

The first schismatic was Trotsky. A refugee in a foreign country, armed only with ideas, he was easily disposed of. Mao Tse-tung is no Trotsky. His elimination, were it possible, would not close the chasm with China. Mao represents a massive, organized movement in a great country. When he disappears from the scene his cadres will survive.

But can the Soviet garrisons in Cuba in this late date successfully impose the Kremlin's authority in a remote island under a native leader, a self-anointed Communist and domineering authoritarian who achieved power, like Mao and Tito, without active Soviet assistance?

In Cuba, Soviet authority is, of course, great but it is limited. It has long been clear to Moscow that Castro has quietly become the ally of Mao. Throughout Latin America, the young, fiery Communists are much more attracted by the revolutionary ardor of both Mao and Castro than by, to them, the staid coexistence of Khrushchev. True, Castro's Cuba is dependent on the Soviet Union for desperately needed economic aid and for arms, munitions and military support. In this area, Mao Tse-tung can neither replace nor compete with Khrushchev, but at the same time, Moscow cannot prevent the covert financing of Castroism by China and the clandestine collaboration of Castro with Mao throughout Latin America.

Effective foreign policy is based on alternative courses of action. This is a principle followed by the Soviet Union as demonstrated over long years by frequent zigzags. What alternative policies can the Kremlin pursue toward Castro; what zigs and which zags?

Only three alternatives seem to exist. The first would be for the Soviet Union to wash its hands of the whole Cuban affair. This is obviously out of the question, if only for compelling reasons of prestige. The second alternative would be for the Soviet Union and Communist China to divide the world into two noncompetitive geographical

spheres of influence. Such a pact would be difficult to negotiate and still more difficult to carry out. Neither could trust the other. The third alternative is draconian, the harsh decision to eliminate Castro and replace him with someone subject to monolithic Kremlin discipline. This move is doubtless the only feasible choice, but it is one that requires subtle and careful preparation and great operational skill.

The elimination of Castro would not be foreign to Soviet procedures, but it would now be premature. First, Castro is still an asset internally in Cuba and his departure might precipitate the open break with Peiping that Moscow wishes to postpone until the moment arrives for a still harsher decision: what to do to prevent Communist China from developing sophisticated atomic weapons, and when to do it.

However, the Soviet Union is certainly preparing the elimination of Castro at the opportune moment, namely when it becomes either convenient or unavoidably necessary. This would probably be accomplished by one of two techniques: (1) a connived military coup by trusted elements of the Cuban Army and militia, or (2) to have Castro suddenly and officially declared insane, to which an element of plausibility would not be lacking. Then Castro would be immediately incarcerated in padded luxury on the shores of the Caspian.

Hopes rampant among Cuban refugees that disaffection in the Cuban armed forces will lead to the overthrow of Castroism are as illusory as the conception that led to the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs. Without a simultaneous invasion by the United States, any anti-Castro initiative within Cuba, not contrived by the Kremlin, could and would be quickly suppressed.

But what about the Soviet missile bases in Cuba? Surely Khrushchev did not need missile bases within Cuba itself in order to keep Castro in line.

Obviously not, but they have served as a supremely astute stratagem with Castro for the introduction of Soviet armed forces into Cuba, not merely forces to defend the Communist regime against internal disaffection, but primarily to deal with Castro whenever desirable or necessary.

The missile bases in Cuba were indeed a magnificent multipurpose example of Soviet guile. They were a tit for the tat of American missile bases on the very fringes of Russia. Moreover, in addition to their intrinsic military value, they constituted excellent bargaining pawns for the removal of our bases from Italy and Turkey. And whether the missiles introduced into and removed from Cuba were genuine or Potemken stage settings, they were excellent weapons for psychological (political) warfare. Now, the only effective opposition to Castro in Cuba is the Soviet Union itself. In any event, Khrushchev deserves credit for having perpetrated the most brilliant stroke of international chicane of the of the present century.

The Soviet Union continues to threaten war on the American mainland if the United States attacks Cuba. This is putting dry froth on stale beer. The Soviet Union knows perfectly well that the United States has no intention of attacking Cuba, just as we know perfectly well that the Soviet Union has no intention of attacking us with nuclear weapons should we do so. However, there is always the dangerous possibility that American activities with regard to Cuba might help to incite the old, perhaps compulsive urge of the messianic Russians to seek new pastures—pastures and warm waters—and serve as a precedent for so doing. This possibility has not been diminished by developments in Iraq and Yemen.

Middle East petroleum, or rather the threat of its denial to the West, could easily press the button of the holocaust. Under existing circumstances, Cuba does not involve the vital interests of any, except the Cubans themselves. On the other hand, the Middle East touches the vital interests of many. A cradle of civilization, it could be its deathbed.

JOHN C. WILEY,
Former Ambassador to Colombia, Iran, Portugal, and Panama, who retired from the Foreign Service in 1956.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House this afternoon in approving the extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act serves a necessary and practical need. With world tensions growing rather than lessening, our Armed Forces remain the protectors of peace in the world, serving as they do not only in defense of the United States but also protecting the security of all free world nations.

The Soviet Union, in its consistent propaganda, attempts to don the mantle of peace but their policies remain clear to observers, that is, the hope for world domination.

America is free, America maintains leadership in the world because of our tremendous military establishment. The extension of the draft is necessary, and I commend my colleagues of the House Armed Services Committee for the rapid manner in which they processed this proposal, the first major legislation approved by the House.

AIDING RUSSIA AND NEWS MANIPULATION

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the news managers are back in rare form. They have left no stone unturned in trying to hoodwink the public. The Brazilian Government previously announced it was sending a mission, headed by Finance Minister San Thiago Dantes, to Washington to seek liberalized terms on existing loans and $1.5 billion in new U.S. loans and investments over a 3-year period. Part of the 3-year plan the United States would be asked to help finance was a $160 million per year long-term agreement between Brazil and Russia, but this fact is being cleverly concealed.

Previously, a meeting between the State Department and the Brazilian mission was scheduled for March 4. This meeting was postponed until today. I had previously requested an explanation from Secretary of State Rusk as to why the U.S. Government would entertain any transaction or negotiation for any sum, whether it be $1.5 billion or $1, to enhance trade negotiations between Brazil and Russia. To date, I have received no answer.

The State Department's foreign policy with Latin America is "an exercise in futility." The administration is calling for $11 billion to be spent in curtailing the Communist threat in Latin America and now the State Department is entertaining negotiations with Brazil to help finance and expand a trade program with that country and Communist Russia. The result of such a deal would enhance the Reds' position in Latin America and make our expenditures futile.

Last Monday, a release was issued that the U.S. Government and Brazil were planning to start high level, economic talks in Washington, March 11, to determine America's disposition toward new aid commitments to Brazil. Nothing in the release indicated that any part of U.S. funds would be used to help finance the trade agreement between Brazil and Russia, although State Department officials knew this to be true.

I have made inquiries to the State Department concerning this matter and have been told that Brazil probably would not get as much as she was asking for. Subsequent to this, another release was issued pointing out that Brazil's finance minister would be here today to negotiate further loans and a "qualified source" indicated the sum would be in the neighborhood of $450 to $500 million. Here again, nothing was said as to what plans had been developed for the expenditure of this money. Whether it is $1.5 billion, $450 million, or $1 makes no difference. The American taxpayer does not want his money used to expand Russian trade with any country.

The camouflaged releases prove once again that the news managers are working at their best. A commitment like this is preposterous and to delude the American taxpayer by deliberately managing the news, when the officials in the State Department know that portions of these funds will be used to help finance and expand Communist trade with Brazil, is not in the best interests of our national security and under no circumstances can it be justified.

Not only is any negotiation that would enhance Red trade foolhardy and detrimental to our national security, but in direct conflict with the stated purposes of our tremendous defense budget and foreign aid outlays. Managing the news is most dangerous and detrimental to our national security, and it is done for one purpose and one purpose only and that is to control our thinking.

We should not be treated as a mass unable to comprehend. The American taxpayer is entitled to know where his money is going, he's paid enough tuition. News manipulators should be ferreted out along with those who are advocating such a disasterous loan. I believe Congress should take a long, hard look at any such policy. The administration should state publicly that it does not advocate a policy of enhancing the Soviet economy and call a halt to such ludicrous negotiations.

SPEND, SPEND, SPEND TODAY SO YOU CAN SPEND TOMORROW, TOO

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think I would be naive indeed to say that we in Congress are not aware of the unwritten law of bureaucracy that requires the spending of all appropriations so that future requests for larger appropriations can thus be justified.

Seldom, however, do we find that this unwritten law has been put down in writing. But I have at hand a column written by Maj. Gen. Frederick M. Warren which appeared under the title "The Chief's Column," in the February issue of the Army Reservist.

General Warren, who is Chief of Army Reserve and ROTC Affairs, exhorts all unit commanders to draw all equipment to which they are entitled on paper, apparently without regard to the needs of the units or whether they are at full strength or half strength.

Writes General Warren:

> Failure to draw this equipment not only could have an adverse effect on future equipment budgets, but also on programs for increased storage facilities, maintenance technicians, spare parts and tools.

The important thing, according to this message, is to draw the equipment so that it will all be used up and therefore justified. I suggest that the Appropriations Committees will want to examine this activity most closely, especially since we were told that high school ROTC had to be sacrificed due to budget needs. General Warren is in charge of Reserve and ROTC. It is apparent to me that ROTC was to be sacrificed to the bureaucratic habit of drawing all equipment, spending all the money, and making a good justification in the ledger books on which to base future budget requests.

I understand the Pentagon has backed down some on its plan to abolish high school ROTC. Indeed they had better do that and also see that the old army game of "spend today so you can get more tomorrow" is given even closer attention.

The article referred to will be inserted at the end of my remarks, but I would call the attention to two other passages which clearly indicate to me that the instructions in this case are based solely on the desire to show Congress that there is a need for more money because all the previously appropriated money was used up.

Note these two passages:

> An additional danger in the conversion of functional use of space is that failure to use space for functions prescribed in approved space criteria, can bring about the elimination of that space on the basis that it is not required since it is not used for the designated purpose.
>
> In the end, by having the equipment on hand, the need for additional supporting technicians, spare parts and the required extension of facilities will be clear for all to see.

Copies of this material will be directed to the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. I am certain it will be of value and interest in both committees.

The entire article is as follows:

THE CHIEF'S COLUMN

A matter of vital concern to all of us is the amount of equipment available to support the Army Reserve. Equipment must be available in Army Reserve centers to conduct proper home station training on a year-round basis.

Additional equipment is essential to meet the expanded requirements of summer camp training. The Berlin callup emphasized the need for equipment to meet mobilization requirements.

As a direct result of the Berlin callup, additional funds have been provided in Army budgets for acquisition of equipment for the Army Reserve to meet these requirements.

Unit commanders are therefore encouraged to draw their full complement of organizational equipment for home station training: that is, to the level specified in "Organizational Equipment Guides" (OEG's).

Failure to draw this equipment not only could have an adverse effect on future equipment budgets, but also on programs for increased storage facilities, maintenance technicians, spare parts and tools.

For the future improvement of the Army Reserve program, unit commanders should draw and accept equipment, unless it is infeasible rather than merely inconvenient or difficult to store and maintain it.

Where absolutely necessary, because of extreme limitation at home stations, arrangements may be made, on an interim basis, to store unit OEG equipment at summer camp training sites.

A related subject is the management of space in Reserve centers. It is extremely important that unit commanders conserve use of administrative space in Reserve centers. Reserve center design is predicated upon scheduled, overlapped use of administrative space in Reserve centers, not upon individual offices for each Reserve unit.

Maximum use should be made of field desks and tables. Encroachment on the unit supply areas reduces the capability to draw equipment needed for training. Elimination of lockers to create administrative space forces storage of individual equipment, which should be stored in lockers, into the already overcrowded unit supply rooms.

An additional danger in the conversion of functional use of space is that failure to use space for functions prescribed in approved space criteria, can bring about the elimination of that space on the basis that it is not required since it is not used for the designated purpose. This applies particularly to space provided for double tier lockers in the present series of standard plans.

Now is the time to build up the stocks of Reserve equipment to meet requirements. In the end, by having the equipment on hand, the need for additional supporting technicians, spare parts and the required extension of facilities will be clear for all to see. Upon attainment of equipment goals an immeasurably stronger Army Reserve will result.

FREDERICK M. WARREN,
Major General, U.S. Army, Chief, U.S. Army and ROTC Affairs.

THE NORTH DAKOTA 38TH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY URGES INVESTIGATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakots [Mr. SHORT] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I have received from the North Dakota Legislature, House Concurrent Resolution Q-1, passed unanimously, to all intents and purposes, by both houses of the legislature, urging that a full-scale investigation be launched of the Department of State's role in developing and executing foreign policy and how the Department has functioned in carrying out this vital role. Under unanimous consent I insert this resolution in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so as to bring it to the attention of my colleagues in the House, since there are several resolutions providing for such study and investigation introduced in the 88th Congress; among them, House Resolution 67, House Concurrent Resolution 60, House Resolution 104, and House Resolution 210:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION Q-1

A concurrent resolution requesting Congress to investigate and study the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the U.S. Department of State

Whereas all Americans are disturbed about conflicting reports and contradictory policies emanating from the State Department of the United States in these times of recurring crisis;

Whereas the U.S. House of Representatives has before it for consideration House Resolution 104 authorizing and directing their Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments and the personnel practices of the Department of State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, That the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota respectfully requests the 88th Congress of the United States, to authorize its House Foreign Affairs Committee to conduct an investigation and study the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the U.S. Department of State; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state forward copies of this resolution to our congressional delegation, and to the chairman of the House of Representatives Rules Committee.

STANLEY SAUGSTAD,
Speaker of the House.
GERALD L. STAIR,
Chief Clerk of the House.
FRANK A. WINSTROM,
President of the Senate.
HOWARD F. DOHERTY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that many people feel there could well be a greater order, competence, and efficiency in the Department of State, to erase the image brought to light by "The Ugly American," some of which was fiction and as such exaggerated, but still possessing a lot of truth.

My mail reveals an ever-increasing number of people seriously disturbed and concerned over what seems to be State Department policy, and I agree with their contention that it is downright ridiculous to pursue a policy of seeming concern for the welfare of foreign nations above that of our own country.

An investigation and study would do one of two things—dispel doubts now existing in the minds of many people as to the effectiveness of our present foreign policy, or it will vividly point up the need for a more realistic approach in the handling of our foreign policy.

CRITICISM AGAINST REPUBLICANS

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, apparently the reaction over the country to Senator MANSFIELD's recent criticism against Republicans has not been well received as evidence by the following editorial in the March 10 issue of the Washington Star and Abe Mellinkoff's article in the San Francisco Chronicle on February 27 which is also inserted:

FACTS WANTED

Senator MANSFIELD, in our opinion, is a man of great integrity and competence. Nevertheless, we think he missed the real point in his impassioned appeal to the Senate to refrain from "politicking" on the Cuban question.

The majority leader has suggested that recent Republican attacks were based on a news story that was published on May 5, 1961. He also has expressed the belief that these attacks are injurious to the national interest—that to "toy" with such things as the details of who bungled the Bay of Pigs operation "is to toy with the life of the Nation."

This is an argument which overlooks a basic point. The American people have been encouraged to believe that "no U.S. forces" were involved in the Cuban invasion, and that President Kennedy would not permit them to be involved under any condition. In the strictest sense, this is true. But it also strikes us as the finest kind of hairsplitting—if news reports in addition to those mentioned by Senator MANSFIELD are correct.

These additional reports, coming from presumably responsible and informed individuals, indicate that the May 5, 1961, news account told only a small part of the story. These reports suggest that 16—not 4—Americans were involved as pilots or in training capacities in the Cuban invasion. Some of them certainly were National Guard officers, evidently recruited by the Central Intelligence Agency on some kind of informal or "civilian" basis. If this is so, the statement by Attorney General Kennedy that "no U.S. forces" took part in the invasion needs very careful scrutiny.

Our feeling about this matter is not that it was wrong to use Americans to train the Cubans, or even to fly combat missions. It is a great pity, we think, that the effort at the Bay of Pigs failed because too few Americans were used, and because their equipment, including planes, was inadequate to the task.

What disturbs us is that this continuing leakage of information which, if true, casts doubt on the accuracy of former official statements, can hardly fail to make most Americans wonder whether their Government is telling the truth or is trying to brainwash them. Certainly it is necessary to protect our intelligence structure. At the very least, this means that the public cannot be told all. But when a mish-mash of conflicting information gets into the public domain, it is desirable that all of the facts—consistent with protecting national security—be put on the record. We do not believe that this has been done in the Cuban affair. On the contrary, we think that facts, undoubtedly known to Castro, are being covered up or distorted to protect individuals in this country from their responsibility for the monumental blunder at the Bay of Pigs. This is unwise and—within the limits of legitimate security considerations—unnecessary

MORNING REPORT

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD is getting after the Senate for not voting on any of President Kennedy's legislative programs. I'm not sure the lawmakers are goofing off. Maybe they're just too busy reading it.

So far they have been given programs for the sick, the aged, those overtaxed and undertaxed, commuters, wheat growers, teachers, pupils, our friends and enemies abroad, young people who need work in the cities, and also those who could better work in the woods.

But even if Congress takes none of his advice, President Kennedy hasn't wasted his time. He can always use those messages as campaign speeches in 1964.

ABE MELLINKOFF.

FISCAL NEEDS OF VA MEDICAL PROGRAM

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has recently spent a week with Mr. Gleason, the very able Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and his competent staff, reviewing their financial needs in all departments for 1964.

Administrator Gleason and his staff have done a tremendous job in all fields of VA activities. Perhaps one of the most outstanding accomplishments of the VA Administrator has been the great success of the VA medical program with its 170 hospitals. It is true the cost of the medical program will be over $1 billion in 1964; and that the cost of the medical program has increased about $300 million over the last 5 years; and during that time there has been a bed limitation in the system of 125,000 beds. But in the last 2 or 3 years an increase of at least 10 percent in bed occupancy has occurred, which means more veterans have received medical service than in years past. It is generally recognized that VA medicine throughout the entire system is excellent. In fact, no better hospitals exist in our country or any other.

The Administrator has a vast responsibility. The act of September 2, 1958, revising and codifying the laws relating to veteran benefits, states:

> The Administrator, under the direction of the President, is responsible for the proper execution and administration of all laws administered by the Veterans' Administration and for the control, direction, and management of the Veterans' Administration.

In each of the VA programs, including veterans' benefits, insurance, medicine and the others, the Administrator is continuing to move them forward. In exercising his responsibilities, Mr. Gleason receives help from many sources. In matters relating to medical care the Administrator relies on outstanding professional help and advice both within and without the VA. He works hand and glove with his Chief Medical Director in all professional and other medical matters, but he does not attempt to practice medicine. The rapport that exists between the Administrator and his medical experts is one of the reasons the VA has such a successful medical program.

The committee has urged the Administrator for several years to decentralize the medical department. Hospital managers are in a far better position on a day-to-day basis to run their respective hospitals than anybody sitting in an area office or the District of Columbia. If a hospital manager is incapable of running his hospital on a day-to-day basis under general guidelines from the Administrator and his medical chief, the manager should be replaced by someone who is. The one big complaint the average hospital manager offers is that his day-to-day operation of the hospital is slowed down, hampered, and restricted by the regional and the District of Columbia offices.

The VA in recent years has had a regional medical setup of seven offices. The staff in the area medical offices has grown year by year. In 1963 the cost will be $3,710,000 for 286 positions. This is an unnecessary layer of administration and paper shuffling, which is not an asset but a hindrance, to the practice of medicine in each of the local hospitals. As the matter recently stood, before a hospital manager could make a decision on even trivial matters such as travel, he must contact the area office and get the area office manager's approval. In most instances the area officer had to contact Washington before a final decision could be given. The result is delay, delay, delay.

The Administrator has recently moved the area medical directors and their staffs into Washington. This is a good first step, but does not go far enough. This layer should be eliminated entirely and the area medical directors and their staffs should be reassigned to the various hospitals so that they can practice medicine. The veterans throughout the country will profit by this move.

GOLD MEDAL TO EDDIE CANTOR

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 21, 1963, I introduced House Joint Resolution 276, which would authorize the President of the United States to express the high esteem and appreciation of the American people through the issuance of a gold medal to Eddie Cantor.

Twenty-five years ago my father, who suffered so severely from polio himself, called upon Mr. Cantor to help inaugurate a campaign to combat infantile paralysis. Mr. Cantor suggested that every American send in one dime to the White House and coined the phrase "March of Dimes." That first campaign in 1938 successfully focused public attention to the terrible tragedy of polio and got the national foundation underway.

Now on the silver anniversary of the March of Dimes, polio has been virtually eradicated as a public health problem. Since the introduction of the Salk vaccine in 1955 the number of persons struck down by polio has been reduced by 97 percent, and the national foundation has been able to turn its energies and funds to attack virus diseases, arthritis, birth defects, and central nervous system disorders.

All through the years Mr. Cantor has helped to raise funds for the March of Dimes. How large a part his efforts have played in the achievements of the national foundation cannot even be measured.

Mr. Cantor's humanity and love for his fellow man is always radiated through his wonderful wit and humor, which have entertained so many millions of people all over the world. His activities for all kinds of charitable and religious organizations are almost too numerous to mention. But perhaps his feeling about his giving of his time, talent and energy can best be summed up in something he once wrote:

> I have learned that service is the rent we pay for our room on earth, and I try to be a good tenant. I have learned that he who believes that charity begins at home is right, but he is wrong if it ends there.

Certainly Mr. Cantor's life has been an example of what he preaches. At this stage of his life, though, Mr. Cantor is not a well man and has been so weighed down by the loss of his wife, his devoted companion and childhood sweetheart.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge that the Committee on Banking and Currency act favorably and expeditiously on House Joint Resolution 276, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a medal in recognition of such outstanding humanitarian service of someone who has a permanent place in all of our hearts, Mr. Eddie Cantor.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES BILL, H.R. 1890

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased and honored to submit the following statement in support of the administration's Youth Employment Opportunities Act to the general Subcommittee on Education on March 5, 1963:

Thirty years ago on March 4, 1933, in his first inaugural address President Franklin Roosevelt said:

"This Nation asks for action and action now. Our greatest primary task is to put people to work. This is no unsolvable problem if we face it wisely and courageously. It can be accomplished in part by direct recruiting by the Government itself, treating the task as we would treat the emergency of a war, but at the same time through this employment, accomplishing greatly needed projects to stimulate and reorganize the use of our natural resources."

Less than 1 month ago in his youth message, President Kennedy, after surveying our current economic trends, found it necessary to nearly echo the words of President Roosevelt:

"This bill (the youth employment opportunities bill) is a measure of the first priority. The effects of unemployment are nowhere more depressing and disheartening than among the young. Commonsense and justice compel establishment of this program, which will give many many thousands of currently unemployed young persons a chance to find employment, to be paid for their services, and to acquire skills and work experience that will give them a solid start in their working lives."

I urge the speedy enactment of the Youth Employment Opportunities Act, H.R. 1890.

The Youth Employment Opportunities Act is a double-barreled proposal. Simultaneously, it will fire strength back into the economy in two areas—the training and utilization of idle manpower and the preservation of our somewhat neglected natural resources and the achievement of neglected public works projects.

As a powerful nation, we cannot afford a backlog of undone conservation and public works.

In a publication, "Social Dynamite," of the National Committee of Children and Youth which addresses itself to the young urban, unemployed high school dropout, the following remark is made:

"In 1950 youth unemployment was relatively minor. Many young men of 20 and under had been drafted for the Korean war. The country had practically full employment. Automation was a term only just coming into use, no more then than handwriting on the wall. In the records of the Midcentury White House Conference (on Children and Youth) the word 'dropout' is not to be found (this latter absence probably because a high school diploma was not yet a near exigency for obtaining a good or steady job)."

Or more directly in terms of the job market is a statment in an analysis of youth unemployment published last January by the Center for Information on America in its publication entitled "Vital Issues":

"The long-term trend has been toward the expansion of occupations which require college education or technical training, while jobs which require no prior education or skill have actually been declining. There are today about 16 professional and technical jobs for every 10 that existed in 1950; but only about 8 jobs for unskilled laborers for every 10 that existed 12 years ago."

Yet, while the complexity of the economy increases to the point where in 1970 only 5 percent of all jobs will be in the unskilled classification, the output of high school graduates (often a minimum requirement) is still below 70 percent of all youth and increases only slowly each decade.

Thus, the 1961 and 1962 figures stack up like this: one of every four dropouts was unemployed of the group that dropped out between January and October 1961; one-sixth were unemployed for one-half year or longer; 20 percent of the dropouts employed, moreover, are employed only part time.

Saddest of all, however, is one-tenth of this group have even faded from the statistical picture. Because they are no longer looking for work or desiring to work, they are not even classified as unemployed; they just exist and only very special and thorough surveys uncover them.

Title I of H.R. 1890 would get these boys out of the city, the only environment they know, and place them with new friends in radically different and serene surroundings—our parks and open spaces. Moreover, it would place these young people in a daily routine where work and study are the staples.

It must be remembered, these boys to be reached are not hardened delinquents. At worst, they will be sometime offenders or potential delinquents. We must assume some latent eagerness on their part, which will manifest itself when listlessness no longer suits their new environment.

There is precedent for those who need further proof. The Attorney General mentioned in his testimony the Lane County, Oreg., project of 1961 for potential dropouts not yet delinquent. After a summer working for the State forestry department and achieving one-third more work than the adult crews, they all returned eagerly to school.

And, in West Virginia, some 95 already delinquent boys performed $200,000 worth of conservation work. To enable this production, the State had to invest $50,000—an investment incidentally far less than would have been necessary to keep the same 95 youths confined.

The question raised here, of course, is why send them to camps after they're delinquent. We should enact this bill and do it before that happens.

As for title II, the success of one public urban youth work project in New York struck me as my most cogent argument in favor of it.

The summer teen work project in 1961 in uptown Manhattan placed delinquent and predelinquent boys in various public work capacities—painting, plastering, simonizing, and repairing. Although only boys were involved, delinquency dramatically subsided in the neighborhood (the two leaders of rumbles participated in the project).

Sheldon Seller, the director, reported his evaluation in the following manner:

"The best worker a Puerto Rican boy, evaluated his experience, saying, 'I used to think I was lazy.' Two boys were helped to find part-time jobs and one a full-time job. Two boys were encouraged to remain in school, and a third enrolled in night school. One boy for the past 5 months has been tutored. Two boys left school and refused counseling, but one recently returned for counseling. We found a job for him with a city brokerage firm, and other boys now want jobs with the same firm."

To me this is a success story. The Youth Employment Opportunities Act must be passed now by the 88th Congress. It offers the prospect of more such success stories and quickly, before we form a backlog and hard core of youth who have not only never worked, but who will be inured to the impossibility of ever learning.

THE NATIONAL EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT ACT, H.R. 3000

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to demonstrate my support for the proposed general education bill by submitting the following statement to the Education and Labor Committee on March 5, 1963:

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present my views on H.R. 3000, the proposed National Education Improvement Act of 1963.

This bill is unique in its field in both its comprehensiveness, and in its intelligent selectivity of areas in our educational structure which most need assistance and which are most eligible for improvement. A very successful precedent exists, however, for an omnibus education bill; the National Defense Education Act was passed in 1958 and its multipurpose measures have been praised ever since. But praiseworthy as its provisions may be, it should be noted that they were aimed at remedying mainly the technological shortages of our schools.

When one speaks of the responsibility for education, most often the subject is the local school district or the State education department. But I would suggest that the responsibility lies with the people, and that we have chosen the more local political bodies as a matter of historical necessity and also as the method best calculated to leave the maintenance of responsibility with the people. It does not follow that the revenues collected by the Federal Government either should not or cannot be returned to those administrative bodies for the benefit of those who have paid the taxes. It is the minds of our children that will suffer from the refusal to so act, and, collectively, it is our Nation whose intellectual development will otherwise be stunted.

H.R. 3000 recognizes the need and the importance of improving education at all levels. It will help correct, for example, the fact that in the elementary and secondary school systems in 1962 there was an excess of 1,666,711 students over the classroom capacity; it will help accommodate the 7 million college students expected by 1970, double the 1960 enrollment; it will go a long way toward making up the current additional $1 billion annually which institutions of higher education should be spending for the improvement and expansion of their physical plants. These institutions should be investing $2.2 billion annually instead of the current $1.2 billion.

The vision of H.R. 3000, and the potential of the educated energies it would unleash, can only be realized by a review of its provisions.

Title I of H.R. 3000 provides an extension of the student loan program initiated by the National Defense Education Act. Its $90 million ceiling is increased to $135 million or "necessary sums," in order to meet the demands not satisfied under the previous program. To encourage a greater number of students to enter the teaching profession, up to 50 percent of the loans may be forgiven for all who become teachers.

To provide an additional source for student financial assistance, the bill provides for the encouragement of commercial loans to students, by authorizing the Federal guarantee of such loans. Still another source of financial assistance to the undergraduate is to be provided by authorizing the payment of up to 50 percent of the wages to the needy student employed on campus in work of an educational character. Graduate fellowships and summer session fellowships also begun under the NDEA, are to be increased in number, thus assuring the continuation and magnification of the number of competent teachers returning to the college and university campus.

Pleased as I am by this bill's provisions for loans to full-time students, I would encourage the part-time student who, usually by financial necessity, is restrained from undertaking a full-time course of study. In 1962 it was estimated that it cost, on the average, $1,480 for a student to attend a public institution of higher education; of this amount, it was estimated that $370 came from student earnings. This indicates to me that there is a great source of initiative among our college students, and I can find no reason to stifle that initiative or to penalize it by discriminating against the part-time student. The terms of the NDEA loan program and those of the new insurable loan program should be amended to encourage our ambitious part-time students.

Such an amendment should provide that part-time students receive the same loan and loan insurance benefits as full-time students if they meet the criteria in all other respects save the fact that they are not pursuing a full-time course of study. The Association of University Evening Colleges supports this proposal and informs me that at the present time 50,000 undergraduate and more than 40,000 graduate students are enrolled in part-time evening programs.

To deprive these students of the benefits of the proposed legislation appears to be wholly unjustified and I might point out that it is a discrimination that many of the States do not practice. In New York, for example, there is a program established to guarantee the repayment of student loans from private banks. Part-time students qualify for these loans on the basis of a formula keyed to the limits fixed for full-time students.

Title II of H.R. 3000 provides for the expansion and improvement of educational facilities at institutions of higher education, both public and nonprofit private, and provides for the development of a new program of assistance to institutions of higher education for 2-year college level programs to train semiprofessional technicians in engineering, science, and health occupations.

The modern foreign language area centers and studies program of title VI of the NDEA is to be extended, and its authorization of funds is to be increased.

Title III of H.R. 3000 is aimed at the improvement of educational quality with emphasis placed on the preparation and continuing education of teachers. Through the teacher institutes, preparation programs, cooperative research programs and specialized training programs of this bill, we will reflect the value that all of us place on the teaching profession and on its continued improvement. The extension of the NDEA programs in new educational media research and demonstration, and in the improvement in the States' collection of educational statistics, and tools available to the teacher and the school administration will be strengthened.

For the fall of 1962 the States reported to the Office of Education that there was a shortage of 121,235 classrooms in their public elementary and secondary schools. In the administration's fact sheets on the National Education Improvement Act, it was pointed out that teacher salaries in many of our Nation's school districts are insufficient to attract and retain good teachers.

As I said earlier, I believe the States and the school districts have performed an excellent job in the establishment and financing of our tremendous system of public education. But areas of inadequacy still exist and unfortunately these are not equitably spread throughout the United States. The administration's fact sheets state, "National defense, population mobility, and our interdependent economy make these disparities cause for national concern." Title IV of H.R. 3000 accurately reflects this necessary concern.

Under title IV, a 4-year, $1.5 billion program for "the selective and urgent improvement of public elementary and secondary education" would be begun. The funds would be used to increase maximum teacher salaries, raise low starting salaries and raise low average salaries in economically disadvantaged districts. The funds would also support critical classroom construction needs, caused by overcrowding, and fire and health hazards. Special projects would also be financed to improve educational quality, particularly in disadvantaged rural and urban areas. The funds authorized for teachers' salaries are to be phased out over a period of 4 years, so that in each State, the areas of most urgent need may receive the needed assistance, while the State stabilizes and develops its own resources to carry on independently after the Federal assistance comes to an end.

Title IV of H.R. 3000 also recognizes the special needs and duties of our country by authorizing the 2-year continuation of titles III and IV of the NDEA, and the 4-year extension, with some equitable and purposeful modifications such as the inclusion of the District of Columbia, of the federally impacted areas legislation, of Public Laws 815 and 874.

Vocational education, long an accepted and needed program in our country, is treated in title V. Today's program enrolls 4 million young people and adults in courses that train them in skills necessary to our changing economy. The bill would increase the authorization of appropriations to $73 million in 1964, and necessary sums thereafter, this Federal contribution being somewhat closer to the $206 million invested yearly by the States and local communities in the program.

Title V also authorizes a program of Federal grants for assistance in the training of teachers for America's 6 million handicapped school-age children who need special education.

Title VI of H.R. 3000 concludes the complementary program of assistance envisioned in the bill. It authorizes grants for the expansion of university extension courses, for the basic education of adults up to the level of the eighth grade, and the expansion of the Library Services Act to encompass assistance to public libraries in all areas of the States.

The importance of the continuing education of our citizens cannot be overemphasized—whether in complex skills at the university, in basic knowledge at the grade school, or in the knowledge of the world and the ages at our local public libraries.

H.R. 3000 will certainly motivate the continuance of the debate over the need or lack of need of our Nation's schools, teachers, and students. I am hopeful, however, that its new approach will foster new insights into what the United States can and should accomplish—in short, emphasize what we can do and not that what we have done is good enough.

A nation's investment in its education is its most certain means of obtaining a nationwide return in development and enlightenment of its people, and in an appreciation of the working principles of the democracy that made it possible.

The argument is that which Thomas Jefferson once made in support of a proposal for student scholarship assistance: "But of the views of this law, none is more important, none more legitimate, than that of rendering the people the safe, as they are the ultimate, guardians of their own liberty."

"HONESTY TODAY AND TOMORROW": THE VIRGINIA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE INITIATES A PROGRAM TO DISCOURAGE CLASSROOM CHEATING AND ENCOURAGE HONESTY AMONG STUDENTS

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the members of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the State of Virginia and, in particular, the Jaycees of Richmond, Va., for initiating a program worthy of the attention and, I believe, support of all Members of Congress.

The Virginia Jaycees are showing splendid leadership in offering a fresh approach toward meeting what is unfortunately an apparently widespread problem, cheating by students in the classrooms of our country.

The Virginia Jaycees have launched a program entitled "Honesty Today and Tomorrow," aimed at encouraging high schools throughout the State to undertake programs for stimulating honesty among students.

I should point out that theirs is a positive program for developing honesty and not simply a negative "stop cheating" program.

Clearly the project proposed by the Virginia Jaycees is not the complete answer to this problem but it does provide the impetus for an attack on classroom cheating. The Virginia program is directed at helping individual high schools develop their own appropriate solutions for encouraging honesty among their students.

The originator of the honesty today and tomorrow program and its most articulate advocate is a dedicated and outstanding Richmond, Va., businessman, David R. White.

VIRGINIA NEWSPAPERS SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD several articles and editorials from Virginia newspapers describing and endorsing the program:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Dec. 18, 1962]

A CAMPAIGN AGAINST CHEATING

Given the national administration's open defense of "the right to lie," the admirable campaign against cheating in school and college being waged by a committee chairman of the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce takes on added importance. David R. White, Richmond businessman, is the originator of this program and its director. He hopes it will become national in scope—and so do a lot of other people.

Thousands of Virginians, and other Americans are appalled by the open acknowledgment of cheating in the classrooms of this country. A Gallup poll early this year reported that "American youngsters are not really convinced that classroom cheating is dishonest."

But as a matter of fact, the word "cheat" means to "practice fraud" or "to swindle." Isn't it astonishing that so many young people regard this as something of a game—instead of something to be deeply ashamed of? What is the difference between cheating on a test or examination and cheating at cards? The principle is the same; yet some of those who unhesitatingly condemn cheating at cards seem to think cheating in class is almost a sign of sophistication.

An article published a few years ago in This Week magazine said that "cheating is often the first step to delinquency." Even when it isn't, it is a practice that undermines the moral fiber of anyone who indulges in it.

Richmond area high schools, and high schools in other sections, have active and positive programs to promote honesty. The problem is that cheating is so widespread in so many high schools, as well as institutions of higher learning, that a long period of education is essential if significant results are to be had. There is no gainsaying the difficulties in the way.

A minority of secondary schools, as well as of colleges and universities, have effective and smoothly working honor systems. Persons who desire to see these systems adopted elsewhere would do well to study carefully the manner in which they have been made to function successfully at a limited number of institutions.

An honor-system tradition is an important element here, and this cannot be created overnight. The first prerequisite is to get the idea across that cheating in school is on a par with cheating anywhere else.

Parents can do a great deal to help. A parent who chisels on his income tax or tells untruths to his children about this or that, can't expect to influence those children to be strictly honest themselves. Fathers and mothers must set the proper example for their sons and daughters, if they expect those sons and daughters to be upstanding citizens.

So, David White will have to appeal to parents, as well as to their children, and the teachers of those children, in his campaign to combat the nationwide practice of classroom cheating. He has undertaken a formidable task, indeed. Yet its very difficulty makes it doubly worthwhile. We wish him every success.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Dec. 10, 1962]

STATE PROJECT—JAYCEE FIGHTS SCHOOL CHEATING

(By Lon Savage)

A young Richmond businessman, working as a committee chairman for the State junior chamber of commerce, has set out to help solve what he describes as a widespread problem of classroom cheating.

He is David R. White, 33, securities salesman for Mason-Hagan, Inc. He originated and directs a statewide Jaycee project which he hopes will become national in scope, focusing the attention of 250,000 Jaycees on the problem.

Cheating, White said, goes on in Richmond area high schools as well as nearly everywhere else in the country.

He based that conclusion upon reading, on conferences during the past 3 months with area school officials, and upon conversations with students.

White's program including mailing of a pamphlet, which he prepared, to all Jaycee chapters in the State. It outlined the causes of cheating and programs to combat it.

He also sent out a questionnaire to 26 leading high schools in the State to find out what they are doing to promote honesty among students.

He and his committee plan to assemble the answers in a booklet and send it to educators to show them honesty programs that are working.

The State Jaycee organization, he said, plans to submit the project for consideration by the national Jaycees as a nationwide project.

White, a VMI graduate and former Marine officer, said he has approached many students in area schools and questioned them about the cheating problem.

Speaking to them, he said, he has taken the position that nearly everyone, being human, has done things he considers somewhat dishonest.

After he spoke to them in this vein, he said, an "impressive percentage" of students told that they had cheated in class.

"They were not proud of it," he added.

What causes a student to cheat?

Most reasons, White said, fall into one of these categories: "To get into college"; "the teacher didn't prepare us properly"; "family pressure"; "to avoid memorizing a lot of useless details"; "to make the grade," and "everyone was doing it."

The last reason—that "everyone does it"—is the one "we have to fight the most," White said. In his pamphlet sent to Jaycee chapters, he wrote of his contacts with Virginia teenagers:

"Among all the teens we talked to * * * the same statement came up over and over again in different words, different schools: Everybody cheats a little.

"A girl panics in an exam and looks at the paper in front of her to 'check the answer.'

"A boy afraid of flunking sticks a crib sheet down his sock 'just in case.'

"A friend signals for help in a quiz and though you think it's wrong to give her the answer, you also think it's wrong not to; so you casually hold up your paper."

There are other factors, he said: Emphasis on grades; parents who expect too much from their children; a teacher's laxity about the problem.

In addition, he wrote in the pamphlet, "adults have often been accused of teaching you to cheat by a 'nibbling dishonesty' that has become so common it's hardly even considered dishonest any more.

"The little bit of hedging on the income tax return, the occasional speeding on the highway, the fibbing to get a 13-year-old into the movies for half price."

What can be done about it?

RICHMOND PROGRAMS

Richmond area high schools, he said, have active and positive programs to promote honesty.

Some involve teacher counseling with students caught cheating. Others involve student honor groups serving as judges of cheating cases and recommending courses of action. (In this program, the offenders remain anonymous to the student-judges.)

Some area students, he said, have reported fellow students for cheating, although many students—and their parents—believe this is wrong.

One Norfolk teacher, White said, has told his class that anyone caught cheating flunks the course. "There is no cheating in that class," he added.

"That is one man's answer," he said. But he added that there is no single answer for all classes or schools.

[From the Petersburg, Colonial Heights, and Hopewell (Va.) Tri-City News, Nov. 13, 1962]

JAYCEES HONESTY IN CLASSROOM PROGRAM GIVEN WIDE APPROVAL

A junior chamber of commerce program to encourage honesty in high school classrooms was met with approval in Colonial Heights last night when a four-man Jaycee committee presented the program to C. G. Smith, Jr., city school superintendent.

The project, called "Honesty—Today and Tomorrow," is being sponsored statewide by the Jaycees State committee on education

and school development. The purpose of the project is to have each Jaycee chapter work with local high school students, teachers, and parents, in an effort to cut down on classroom cheating. The Jaycees and local school authorities are cooperating on the program in which the students are encouraged to be honest in their work.

The Jaycees are attempting to help local schools provide preventive measures against dishonesty and to promote the honest approach. They are acquainting students and parents of the serious consequences of cheating and are suggesting courses of action.

Smith said, "Any effort on the part of any person or group to promote personal integrity is very gratifying. I would commend the Jaycees for their work which you offer to our school age citizens. I shall be happy to pass the idea and materials to our schools. I believe that our students will be impressed by the fact that your organization has taken the time and energy to present these ideas and ideals to them."

Commenting on cheating in city schools, Smith stated that no specific problem had been brought to his attention. He said, however, that school officials were making every effort to cut down the size of classes so that teachers will have more opportunity to work individually with students.

Last night, the Colonial Heights Jaycees recommended that their program be made known in the high school newspaper, that their committee work with the student honor society, and that pamphlets be distributed to teachers, and parents.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, Nov. 13, 1962]

PROGRAM OF JAYCEES IS LAUDED

The endorsement came after a four-member committee of the Colonial Heights Jaycees met the superintendent to outline the statewide project of cautioning students against cheating and make them aware of the consequences.

Smith told them, "Any effort on the part of any person or group to promote personal integrity is very gratifying. I commend the Jaycees for this program which you offer to our school-age citizens and I will be happy to pass this idea and material to our high school."

"I believe that our students will be impressed by the fact that you are taking the time and energy to present these ideas and ideals to them."

The Colonial Heights High School has an honor code and Jaycee officials said their program to make students aware of cheating "would be an aid to the code."

[From the Harrisonburg (Va.) Daily News-Record, Dec. 11, 1962]

VIRGINIA JAYCEES LAUNCH DRIVE TO CURB CLASSROOM CHEATING

RICHMOND.—"Everybody does it" and the Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce is out to stop it.

The "it" refers to classroom cheating.

The Jaycee project was originated and is headed by David R. White, a 33-year-old securities salesman who is a graduate of Virginia Military Institute and a former Marine Corps officer.

White said he hopes to bring the widespread problem to the attention of the 250,000 Jaycees in this country and make it a national project.

He recently completed a 3-month study of the problem, which included reading, conferences with school officials, and conversations with students.

In approaching the students, White said, he has taken the position that nearly everyone has done things he considers somewhat dishonest. He said an "impressive percentage" admitted they had cheated in class.

"They were not proud of it," he said.

What causes a student to cheat?

White said he found most reasons fall into one of these categories:

"To get into college"; "the teacher didn't prepare us properly"; "family pressure"; "to avoid memorizing a lot of useless details"; "to make the grade"; and "everyone does it."

White and his committee have prepared a pamphlet which was mailed to Virginia Jaycees. It outlines the causes of cheating and how to combat it.

White also plans to issue a booklet on the promotion of honesty programs based on answers to a questionnaire sent to 26 high schools.

[From the Newport News (Va.) Daily Press, Dec. 18, 1962]

CHEATING UNDER JAYCEES' FIRE

The Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce has set itself to an important and imposing task in its campaign to eradicate cheating or "cribbing" in the classroom. The group holds that though "everybody does it" there's no good reason why anybody should and will endeavor to see that nobody does.

It is hardly to be expected that the Jaycees will succeed fully in their undertaking. The pressure to cheat to make a good showing is too heavy on fond parents who want to see their children get along—at least appear to get along—as well as or better than their associates. Moreover, many parents are not above a bit of cheating on their own and set poor examples to their young. The cheater in school also is under similar pressures including those from parents who insist on junior bringing home top grades and when he doesn't to put pressure on him or run to his teacher to complain that Johnny hasn't had a fair shake.

But some pressure can be put on also by the Jaycees who hope to make their anticheating crusade national for the 250,000 members of Jaycee chapters throughout the country. Already David R. White, who heads the movement, has consulted with school officials and students to develop a background for action and to determine the scope of his project. His approach to students is that almost everyone has done things he deems somewhat dishonest and cites an "impressive percentage" of students who admit cheating in class, but they are not proud of it, he adds, and that, we think, holds out hope for developing a good climate for reform.

Most frequent reasons for cheating were found to be to get into college, family pressure, seeking to avoid having to memorize a lot of useless details, to make the grade whether they deserved it or not—and finally the resort of most people who do not want to take responsibility—"everybody does it."

The subject is most aptly chosen. Every cheater and potential cheater would do well to remember the almost invariable fate of his kind. He may cheat to get into college, cheat to make grades high enough to stay there but when he gets out into the world as a breadwinner and cheats there he soon goes into the discard for lack of basic knowledge that he would have had if he had studied rather than cheated. And finally, he is a failure because of the distrust of those with whom he deals.

That is just the material side of cheating. It does not include the moral value of being honest and able to live with respect and clear conscience with one's self. Which, of course, is the greatest of all the values of honesty.

URGE NATIONAL JAYCEE CONSIDERATION OF THE VIRGINIA PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the junior chamber of commerce in my home city of South Bend, Ind., I want to salute the Jaycees of Virginia and to express the hope that local and State junior chamber chapters throughout the United States will encourage similar programs in their own jurisdictions. It is this kind of local leadership in working with young people that I think is heartily to be applauded.

I want also to say that I hope that delegates attending the National Convention of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce in Tulsa, Okla., in a few days will give serious consideration to adopting the Virginia Jaycee "Honesty Today and Tomorrow" program as a national project of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

"CLASSROOM CHEATING; WHO'S TO BLAME"

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD an article from the magazine, Seventeen, "Classroom Cheating: Who's to Blame?":

CLASSROOM CHEATING: WHO'S TO BLAME?

Is it the teacher? your parents? society? college pressures? or you?

During final exam week last year several teenagers in three large schools had their friends sit in and take their tests for them. In one suburban school, students who helped mimeograph the tests took copies home. In another high school, teenagers paid A students to ghostwrite their term papers. In other schools, students sold history papers to the class behind them or paid to have book reports written.

Shocking? Scandalous? Is paying someone to write a book report for you so very much worse than using a hand-me-down from a friend in an upper class? Is bringing crib sheets to an exam so different from taking a copy of the test home? Among all the teens we talked to, in piecing together the puzzle of high school cheating, the same statement came up over and over again in different words, different schools: Everybody cheats a little. A girl panics in an exam and looks at the paper in front of her to "check the answer." A boy afraid of flunking, sticks a crib sheet down his sock "just in case—for an emergency." A math teacher has the class correct one another's papers and everyone fills in the right answers. Book reports are handed down from class to class. Homework copied or bartered: "I'll do English tonight if you do algebra." A friend signals for help in a quiz and though you think it's wrong to give her the answer, you also think it's wrong not to; so you casually hold up your paper.

"I don't think it's cheating if you help someone who knows the subject but just can't think of an answer," one honor student told us. "You give a little and take a little. It's friendship." "I'd be ashamed to cheat—to have my friends know I did," a 15-year-old from a suburban girls' school reported. "Well, cheating's never right, but when you see other kids doing it," a teen said, "you think, 'Why should they get a higher mark than I do?' " "Cheating is justified if the test isn't fair," was the attitude of one pretty sophomore from Tennessee. "It's never justified," a young West Point candidate said. "Your work should be a record of what you can do, whether it's homework or a test, a term paper—it doesn't matter. Cheating is cheating."

Perhaps one of the teens described or quoted above feels just as you do, perhaps not. If you're bursting to interrupt here with a "that's not it at all," we couldn't be less surprised. Attitudes and statistics about cheating vary not only regionally but from school to school and even from class to class. In two schools we visited, cheating was widespread among certain students and almost nonexistent throughout the rest of the school. "They all do it sometimes," one teacher informed us. There is no clear-cut, across-the-State picture, no neatly pigeonholed pattern of behavior, no tidy percentages of those who cheat and those who don't. And it really doesn't matter. The important thing, we think, is not how many teenagers cheat, or how, but:

THE REASONS WHY TEENAGERS CHEAT

Betty, 14, feels pressure from home is the main reason for cheating in her school. "Some parents say, 'If you fail, you can't go out for a month.' I know one boy whose father keeps threatening to take him out of the school if he doesn't do better."

"All the kids are afraid of what their families say if they don't get good marks."

Evelyn, 16, admits her class cheats regularly. "Kids get in a tight spot and cheat once. If they're not caught, they do it again and again. It's an atmosphere. No one cheated freshman year; then it started, very little at first, but it spread tremendously. I was kind of shocked in the beginning. Everyone does it, though. It grows on you. First, it's a glance at somebody's paper, then giving answers, then crib notes."

Once in a while a teenager gave a reason like laziness or spite for cheating. Some teens said they cheated "to put something over on the teacher" or "just for kicks—to see what I could get away with." But most of the reasons fell into these categories: "To get into college." "The teacher didn't prepare us properly." "Family pressure." "To avoid memorizing a lot of useless details." "To make the grade." "Everyone was doing it."

More significant perhaps than the reasons you have for cheating, if you do, are the reasons that cropped up repeatedly for not cheating. Boys, girls, seniors, freshmen—almost everyone we talked to started with the same six words: It all depends on the teacher.

"If the teacher's strict, no one cheats." An English teacher in junior high school made it clear at the beginning of the year that he would give anyone who cheated a zero in the test, call in the parents, and put it on the student's record. No one cheated. A Spanish teacher cracked down on the weekly test cheating and made anyone caught stay for Saturday detention. After the first few Saturdays, no one cheated. A science teacher told his class that no one who tried her best would fail; anyone who cheated would automatically flunk. No one cheated. Is the system to blame?

"There's too much emphasis on grades and tests, not enough on individual ability. Lots of kids cheat because they just can't do the work." Though that may sound like a teenager talking, it's a high school teacher.

Some students are hustled up from grammar school with barely third-grade reading ability. Others reach freshman class in high school with college-level reading ability. One teenager has an IQ of 150, the boy or the girl at the next desk has an IQ of 90. And yet, in many schools everyone is expected to do the same work, take the same tests and progress at an equal pace.

ARE PARENTS TOO DEMANDING?

Some are, and even the most understanding parents often exert hidden pressure simply by expecting too much. But the pressures aren't always hidden. Few parents can be objective enough to admit the limitations of their children: If marks are poor, parents are always sure their teens could do better if they tried harder. Perhaps they could. Perhaps not. Often, an honest appraisal of a student's capabilities could clear the air at home but many teachers complicate the situation by giving parents soothing cliches instead of facts. Impossible standards are raised, then privileges are denied—the pressures pile up. In some communities where the "name" colleges are part of the status symbols, parental pressure for high scholastic averages becomes one of the major reasons given—by teens and educators—for cheating problems.

ARE COLLEGE PRESSURES TO BLAME?

For many of you, the answer would seem to be "Yes." The demands of college with all the tensions and outside pressures are undeniable—but often unrealistic. Or at least avoidable. This year there were about 50 schools turning away qualified applicants and about a thousand that still had room for qualified students, according to Mr. Douglas Dillenbeck of the College Entrance Examination Board. "The competition for college admission has been overestimated and overpublicized. And any student bright enough to profit from college," adds Mr. Dillenbeck, "should be bright enough to realize you can't bluff your way in."

The most widely used college entrance exam is the college board's scholastic aptitude test, which measures a student's potential, his ability, his capabilities. About a hundred colleges use the board's achievement test, too. In either case, it's ability and real knowledge that count.

WHAT IS SOCIETY'S RESPONSIBILITY?

Adults have often been accused of teaching you to cheat by a nibbling dishonesty that has become so common it's hardly even considered dishonest any more. The little bit of hedging on the income tax return, the occasional speeding on the highway, the fibbing to get a 13 year old into the movies for half price, the payola, the expense account padding—the list is endless. "In the last 10 years something has happened to the American public," Juvenile Court Judge Philip B. Gilliam of Denver, Colo., said recently. "People claim it's all right to be a little bit of a thief, to do a little wrong. It's a new kind of crime that's sweeping the country." What's to be done about it? You, as teenagers, can't reform the adult delinquents, but you can change the ethics of your own generation. And whether you do it or not is going to make a difference in the world for a long time to come. The standards you set, good or bad, are the standards your children will live by and pass to their children.

ON YOUR HONOR

In spite of society and the system, in spite of poor teachers, bad examples, pressures, temptations, and tensions, the final responsibility for cheating rests with you. And there are many ways that only you can stop it. Honor systems are one. Only 36 percent of the high school students in a recent national survey had tried honor systems. Did they work? "Yes," said 65 percent. In the other 35 percent lies the crux of the honor system problem: It can't work unless you want it to. The report clause (students must report other students for cheating) is one of the principal reasons most students don't want an honor system. But the report clause is not always necessary. At Scarsdale High School in New York's Westchester County, the pledge system is used instead. No student is required to inform on another. If a student hands in an unsigned pledge—"I did not cheat nor did I witness any cheating"—after an exam (none are proctored) the teacher simply reports it to the Student Honor Committee. The committee reports the violation to the class; if the class votes 100 percent to try the honor system again, it gets one more chance.

The basic problem in preventing cheating is the attitude of teenagers, which among many students, is "What's so wrong about it?" To answer the question: It's a problem of personal integrity and honesty. When teenagers pull up their averages by cheating and win a scholarship or honors that other students really deserve, there is clearly an injustice involved.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, juvenile delinquency is not a bad dream; it is a reality and we cannot ignore it.

Many men and women of this Nation, especially of the District of Columbia and in particular of Capitol Hill, have been personally confronted with this terror.

On February 26, 1963, the well-known and reliable WMAL TV-radio commentator and respected member of the House of Representatives radio and TV gallery, Mr. Joseph McCaffrey, presented to the public his "Joseph McCaffrey's Commentary."

This timely and forthright broadcast regarding "juvenile delinquents but their delinquency is adult" is herewith made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the hope it will aid our leaders in formulating plans and laws to combat and erase the causes of juvenile delinquency:

JOSEPH MCCAFFREY'S COMMENTARY, WMAL-TV, FEBRUARY 26, 1963

Good evening. The joint congressional hearings on District crime will probably explore many of the back alleys of Washington before sitting down to write some firm legislative recommendations.

As yet the committee hasn't dug into one of the worst problems—the young offender. They are called juvenile delinquents but their delinquency is adult.

In the fiscal year of 1962 the total crime in the District dropped a little more than 1 percent. Yet during those same 12 months juvenile delinquency increased more than 17 percent. Almost half of the increase was due to repeaters.

A curb on the young criminal in Washington would sharply reduce the local crime record. The best way to curb the young criminal might be to redefine the term juvenile delinquent. For example, at the present time juvenile operators are tried in juvenile court for traffic violations. Some who have studied the District crime situation believe this is ridiculous. The juvenile driver has been given an adult privilege, but he is given special handling when he breaks the law.

Juvenile delinquency is judged now on age. It might be well if the laws were rewritten to determine whether a youth goes before the juvenile court judge or an adult court judge on the basis of the crime involved. Bringing yokers, knife wielders, and rapists into juvenile court is making a mockery of justice.

The joint congressional hearing should explore the role of the so-called juvenile in rocketing District crime to its present high level.

It should seriously question the value of bringing repeaters 16 and 17 years of age back, again and again, to juvenile court.

But most important, the committee should consider whether it is time to redefine the term "juvenile delinquent."

Our problem is that there is nothing, nothing juvenile about the delinquency which is blackening the reputation of the Nation's Capital.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PATTEN, for March 11, 12, 13, and 14, on account of official business away from Washington with the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight.

Mr. DADDARIO (at the request of Mr. GIAIMO), for Monday, March 11, through Thursday, March 14, on account of official business.

Mr. GURNEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HEALEY (at the request of Mr. MURPHY of New York), for Monday, March 11, 1963, on account of illness.

Mrs. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for Monday, March 11, 1963, on account of official business in her district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, for 45 minutes, today, instead of the 30 minutes previously granted her.

Mr. JOHANSEN, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Iowa), for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, March 13, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Iowa), for 30 minutes on Tuesday, March 12, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN, for 1 hour on Wednesday, March 13.

Mr. CAHILL, for 30 minutes on Tuesday, March 12.

Mr. PEPPER, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HAYS and to include an article.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLANCY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOSMER.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
Mr. SHORT.
Mr. NYGAARD.
Mr. ALGER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Iowa) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COHELAN.
Mr. EVINS.
Mr. BURKE.
Mr. EVERETT.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 816. An act for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 12, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86–472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86–628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel outside the United States, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds by Members, employees, and committees of the Congress.

The law requires the chairman of each committee to prepare a consolidated report of foreign currency expenditures and also dollar expenditures from appropriated funds within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, covering expenditures for travel outside the United States during the previous calendar year. The consolidated report is forwarded to the Committee on House Administration which, in turn, prints such report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 10 legislative days after receipt. The deadline for filing expenditure reports for travel during the calendar year 1962 was March 9, 1963.

House Committees on the District of Columbia, House Administration, Interior and Insular Affairs, Post Office and Civil Service, Rules, Un-American Activities, and Select Committee on Small Business have stated that no Members or employees traveled outside the United States on committee business during 1962.

There are submitted herewith the reports from the House committees which were received within the prescribed time limit: Agriculture, Appropriations, Armed Services, Banking and Currency, Education and Labor, Foreign Affairs, Government Operations, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Judiciary, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Public Works, Science and Astronautics, Veterans' Affairs, and Ways and Means.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Harold D. Cooley:											
France, April and November	Franc	3,000	----	1,658.75	----	----	----	1,360.10	----	6,018.85	1,228.00
Harold B. McSween:											
France	do	950	----	750.00	----	2,000.00	----	1,043.67	----	4,743.67	968.10
Italy	Lire	70,000	----	45,000	----	83,917	----	185,000	----	383,917	918.20
United Kingdom	Pound	110	----	42	----	80.17.6	----	48	----	280.17.6	786.98
Total	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	3,601.61

MARCH 8, 1963.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 196

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Defense Subcommittee	Dollar		998.01		1,247.28		3,211.85		1,066.77		[illegible]
Foreign Operations Subcommittee	do		939.00		673.65		7,796.20		351.75		[illegible]
Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee	do		272.00		181.40		457.40		46.60		[illegible]
Interior Subcommittee	do		241.66		266.23		1,819.54		193.06		[illegible]
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Subcommittee	do		797.00		568.60		5,357.37		156.45		[illegible]
Full Committee	do		943.65		921.22		7,774.74		419.20		[illegible]
Survey and Investigations Staff	do		2,248.68		2,671.97		11,069.00		222.98		[illegible]
Total			6,440.00		6,530.35		37,486.10		2,456.81		[illegible]

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations.

MARCH 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Department of Defense, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
George H. Mahon:											
United States	Dollar		35.00		20.18		408.73		12.50		[illegible]
Mexico	do		16.50		6.65		.80		4.00		[illegible]
Guatemala	do		16.50		17.50				1.75		[illegible]
Costa Rica	do		45.00		17.70				4.05		[illegible]
Panama	do		28.00						3.30		[illegible]
Jamaica	do						2.40		2.00		[illegible]
Subtotal			141.00		62.03		411.93		27.60		[illegible]
D. J. Flood:											
United States	Dollar		19.40		411.50		1,071.41		463.79		[illegible]
Peru	do		61.46		97.24		91.06		227.34		[illegible]
Ecuador	do				2.50		20.00		7.00		[illegible]
Canal Zone	do		12.00		4.13				15.56		[illegible]
Colombia	do						12.00				[illegible]
Subtotal			92.86		515.37		1,194.47		713.69		[illegible]
Harold C. Ostertag:											
United States	Dollar		55.15		69.05		198.15		29.00		[illegible]
Jamaica	do		15.00				2.40		6.00		[illegible]
Haiti	do		13.20		19.25				10.25		[illegible]
Subtotal			83.35		88.30		200.55		45.25		[illegible]
William E. Minshall:											
United States	Dollar		71.40		61.33		509.55		54.45		[illegible]
Mexico	do		35.00		30.20		2.00		6.29		[illegible]
Guatemala	do		16.50		19.90				8.75		[illegible]
Costa Rica	do		16.50		22.80		2.00		5.60		[illegible]
Panama	do		45.00		33.00				4.50		[illegible]
Jamaica	do		28.00		4.25		2.90		3.15		[illegible]
Haiti	do		13.20		21.00				13.00		[illegible]
Subtotal			225.60		192.48		516.45		95.74		[illegible]
Robert L. Michaels:											
United States	Dollar		73.40		67.50		431.70		47.65		[illegible]
Mexico	do		35.00		29.20		4.00		4.15		[illegible]
Guatemala	do		16.50		19.10				7.14		[illegible]
Costa Rica	do		14.50		22.90		2.00		4.35		[illegible]
Panama	do		45.00		30.10				6.00		[illegible]
Jamaica	do		28.00		4.50		2.90		2.40		[illegible]
Cuba	do		2.00		.50						[illegible]
Haiti	do		13.20		13.00				10.25		[illegible]
Subtotal			227.60		186.80		440.60		81.94		[illegible]
Samuel R. Preston:											
United States	Dollar		73.40		73.30		431.95		61.25		[illegible]
Mexico	do		35.00		28.85		11.50		4.25		[illegible]
Guatemala	do		16.50		19.10				9.10		[illegible]
Costa Rica	do		14.50		23.90		2.00		2.50		[illegible]
Panama	do		45.00		31.90				5.95		[illegible]
Jamaica	do		28.00		5.00		2.40		6.50		[illegible]
Cuba	do		2.00		.50						[illegible]
Haiti	do		13.20		19.75				13.00		[illegible]
Subtotal			227.60		202.30		447.85		102.55		[illegible]
Grand total	Dollar		998.01		1,247.28		3,211.85		1,066.77		[illegible]

GEORGE H. MAHON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Department of Defense.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives—Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Otto E. Passman (includes 1 trip to Western Europe and 1 trip around the world):											
Italy	U.S. dollar		54.00		27.20		4.75		20.60		106.55
Switzerland	do		64.00		48.35		6.50		39.30		158.15
Spain	do		90.00		76.55		20.75		77.00		264.30
Lebanon	do		36.00		25.95		4.75		5.15		71.85
Thailand	do		54.00		33.65		5.90		8.25		101.80
Hong Kong	do		100.00		87.65		17.25		47.80		252.70
Japan	do		30.00		27.45		5.50		11.25		74.20
United States	do		48.00		33.35		12.50		9.30		103.15
Transportation (2 trips)	do						3,425.30				3,425.30
Subtotal			476.00		860.15		3,503.20		218.65		4,558.00
Kenneth Sprankle:											
Italy	U.S. dollar		36.00		22.80		2.75		5.95		67.50
Switzerland	do		24.00		19.45		4.30		7.20		54.95
Spain	do		36.00		18.65		2.80		8.30		65.75
United States	do						4.50				4.50
Transportation	do						1,100.80				1,100.80
Subtotal			96.00		60.90		1,115.15		21.45		1,298.50
Francis G. Merrill (includes 1 trip to Western Europe and 1 trip around the world):											
Italy	U.S. dollar		36.00		21.80		3.00		6.25		67.05
Switzerland	do		57.00		39.25		6.25		12.25		114.75
Spain	do		87.00		50.20		11.50		38.05		186.75
Lebanon	do		33.00		27.25		3.50		7.50		71.25
Thailand	do		48.00		31.20		4.80		9.50		93.50
Hong Kong	do		80.00		55.60		6.75		15.90		158.25
Japan	do		26.00		17.55		3.50		8.20		55.25
United States	do				9.75		25.00		14.00		48.75
Transportation (2 trips)	do						3,113.55				3,113.55
Subtotal			367.00		252.60		3,177.85		111.65		3,909.10
Grand total			939.00		673.65		7,796.20		351.75		9,760.60

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives—Subcommittee on Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John E. Fogarty:											
Switzerland	U.S. dollar		144.00		99.25				11.20		254.45
Israel	do		128.00		82.15				35.40		245.55
Transportation	do						457.40				457.40
Total			272.00		181.40		457.40		46.60		957.40

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives—Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Michael J. Kirwan:											
United States	US. dollar		66.83		90.70		43.55		68.97		270.05
Panama	do		18.00		18.45		4.00		8.75		49.20
Mexico	do		36.00		41.50		5.00		36.08		118.58
Round trip transportation	do						874.22				874.22
Subtotal			120.83		150.65		926.77		113.80		1312.05
Eugene B. Wilhelm:											
United States	US. dollar		66.83		68.60		18.55		41.36		195.34
Panama	do		18.00		12.30				5.90		36.20
Mexico	do		36.00		34.68				32.00		102.68
Round trip transportation							874.22				874.22
Subtotal			120.83		115.58		892.77		79.26		1208.44
Total			241.6		266.23		1819.54		193.06		2520.49

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John J. Rooney:											
Italy	Dollar		72.00		53.90				23.00		148.90
Austria	do		36.00		24.60				13.40		74.00
Poland	do		82.50		58.45				12.60		153.55
Germany	do		65.00		54.60				6.75		126.35
England	do		40.00		38.00				18.30		96.30
Transportation	do						1,157.90				1,157.90
Subtotal			295.50		229.55		1,157.90		74.05		1,757.00
Hon. Frank T. Bow:											
Japan	Dollar		35.00		20.65						55.65
Hong Kong	do		45.00		22.60				3.60		71.20
Thailand	do		64.00		32.15				4.65		100.80
India	do		32.00		16.80				2.15		50.95
Italy	do		36.00		19.60						55.60
Transportation	do						3,033.37				3,033.37
Subtotal			212.00		111.80		3,033.37		10.40		3,367.57
Jay B. Howe:											
Italy	Dollar		60.00		52.50		2.90		19.25		134.65
Austria	do		28.00		19.00				5.25		52.25
Poland	do		72.50		55.25				14.80		142.25
Germany	do		45.00		43.50		1.70		11.50		101.70
England	do		84.00		57.00		3.60		21.50		166.10
Transportation	do						1,157.90				1,157.90
Subtotal			289.50		227.25		1,166.10		72.00		1,754.85
Total			797.00		568.60		5,357.37		156.45		6,879.42

JOHN J. ROONEY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. John M. Slack, Jr.:											
United States	Dollar		92.48		80.53		16.50		47.50		237.01
Japan	do		60.57		58.34		22.34		25.94		167.19
Korea	do		4.00		17.10				8.00		29.10
Okinawa	do		4.50		15.68		4.50		8.80		33.48
Taiwan	do		25.00		17.25		4.00		11.75		58.00
Hong Kong	do		43.07		47.70		21.50		22.90		135.17
Thailand	do		67.94		57.80		24.71		31.59		182.04
Vietnam	do		34.86		29.22		7.50		6.90		78.48
Transportation	do						2,503.21				2,503.21
Subtotal			332.42		323.62		2,604.26		163.38		3,423.68
Hon. George E. Shipley:											
United States	Dollar		61.54		58.58		10.50		42.26		172.88
Japan	do		28.03		27.21		10.59		15.30		81.13
Korea	do		4.00		17.10				8.00		29.10
Okinawa	do		4.50		15.68		4.50		8.80		33.48
Taiwan	do		25.00		19.08		4.00		11.00		59.08
Hong Kong	do		53.07		42.83		19.70		23.89		139.49
Thailand	do		52.71		43.81		116.80		23.02		236.34
Vietnam	do		34.86		28.65		7.50		7.39		78.40
Guam	do		15.10		29.40		10.00		16.60		71.10
Transportation	do						2,619.60				2,619.60
Subtotal			278.81		282.34		2,703.19		156.26		3,420.60
George A. Urian:											
United States	Dollar		92.48		79.50		10.25		23.33		205.56
Japan	do		60.57		57.34		12.69		16.68		147.28
Korea	do		4.00		16.60				8.00		28.60
Okinawa	do		4.50		15.25		4.50		8.80		33.05
Taiwan	do		25.00		16.58		4.00		5.05		50.63
Hong Kong	do		43.07		46.39		12.50		15.42		117.38
Thailand	do		67.94		56.10		12.64		15.69		152.37
Vietnam	do		34.86		27.50		7.50		6.59		76.45
Transportation	do						2,403.21				2,403.21
Subtotal			332.42		315.26		2,467.29		99.56		3,214.53
Total			943.65		921.22		7,774.74		419.20		10,058.81

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, surveys and investigation staff, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Curtis O. Booher:											
Japan	Dollar		88.00		127.00		1.80		5.00		221.80
Germany	do		92.00		114.00				3.00		209.00
Spain	do		75.00		99.00		1.95		3.00		178.95
Transportation	do						1,293.13				1,293.13
Subtotal			255.00		340.00		1,296.88		11.00		1,902.88
Rowland C. Halstead, Japan	Dollar		91.50		132.50		1,036.75		7.25		1,268.00
Willie C. Law:											
Japan	do		51.08		62.42		2.65		54.90		171.05
Okinawa	do		34.31		41.94						76.25
Germany	do		104.40		127.60		25.12		5.20		262.32
Italy	do		41.85		51.15		17.90		2.15		113.05
France	do		56.10		45.90		11.65				113.65
Transportation	do						1,268.35				1,268.35
Subtotal			287.74		329.01		1,325.67		62.25		2,004.67
E. Huyett Magee:											
England	Dollar		63.00		56.50		4.30		1.20		125.00
France	do		73.50		42.75		2.10		3.15		121.50
Mexico	do		64.80		54.45		3.10		1.40		123.76
Transportation	do						629.90				629.90
Subtotal			201.30		153.70		639.40		5.75		1,000.15
Hugh B. McGahey:											
Japan	Dollar		86.00		129.00		6.80		11.00		232.80
Germany	do		82.00		124.00				1.00		207.00
Spain	do		70.00		104.00		5.30				179.30
Transportation	do						1,270.15				1,270.15
Subtotal			238.00		357.00		1,282.25		12.00		1,889.25
Joseph N. Milici:											
Japan	Dollar		60.98		74.52		4.80		3.00		143.30
Okinawa	do		25.31		30.94						56.25
Germany	do		100.80		123.20		5.83		3.00		232.83
Italy	do		41.85		51.15		16.15		6.18		115.33
France	do		47.70		58.30		6.10		3.00		115.10
Transportation	do						1,263.70				1,263.70
Subtotal			276.64		338.11		1,296.58		15.18		1,926.51
William B. Soyars, Jr.:											
France	Dollar		33.75		39.30		5.15		4.65		82.85
Germany	do		16.90		36.90		6.10		4.20		64.10
Spain	do		42.00		44.40				4.25		90.65
Transportation	do						619.20				619.20
Subtotal			92.65		120.60		630.45		13.10		856.80
Eugene W. Vahey:											
Japan	Dollar		94.95		116.05		4.65		7.00		222.65
Germany	do		91.25		111.50				2.90		205.65
Spain	do		79.65		97.35		4.65				181.65
Transportation	do						1,278.80				1,278.80
Subtotal			265.85		324.90		1,288.10		9.90		1,858.75
Virgil R. Walker:											
Japan	Dollar		45.70		54.80		9.90		13.00		123.40
Okinawa	do		31.50		41.70				3.50		76.70
Germany	do		73.80		123.65		19.87		8.60		225.92
Italy	do		43.70		56.90		17.90		6.75		125.25
France	do		57.60		52.25		18.90		13.90		142.65
Transportation	do						1,268.35				1,268.35
Subtotal			252.30		329.30		1,334.92		45.75		1,962.27
Leonard M. Walters:											
England	Dollar		36.00		27.00		10.25		1.05		74.30
France	do		102.50		72.00		15.85		27.95		218.30
Germany	do		12.00		62.10		13.30		4.60		92.00
Italy	do		64.40		33.85		19.20		6.05		123.50
Transportation	do						651.00				651.00
Subtotal			214.90		194.95		709.60		39.65		1,159.10
Harold D. Watkins, Mexico	Dollar		72.80		51.90		228.40		1.15		354.25
Grand total			2,248.68		2,671.97		11,069.00		222.98		16,212.63

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
James A. Byrne:											
Appropriated funds:											
United States	Dollar				21.20		1,324.14		208.30		1,553.64
Ireland	do				4.74		5.70		51.73		62.17
Great Britain	do								11.00		11.00
Germany	do		17.50		51.57		8.02		55.50		132.59
Italy	do				2.62		12.13		21.53		36.28
Greece	do						10.00		10.00		20.00
Spain	do				5.02				13.81		18.83
Madeira	do				1.25				4.85		6.10
Total appropriated funds (Army)			17.50		86.40		1,359.99		376.72		1,840.61
Counterpart funds:											
Ireland	Pound	8-0-0	22.80	1-13-3	4.74	33-16-3	96.36	18-4-0	51.79	61-13-6	175.69
Great Britain	do	34-14-3	98.82			3-0-0	8.55	6-7-6	18.05	44-1-9	125.42
Germany	Deutsche marks	56.00	14.07	168.00	42.21	93.00	23.26	402.33	100.24	719.33	179.78
Italy	Lire	23,000	36.80	15,434	24.70	7,200	11.52	64,831	103.73	110,465	176.75
Greece	Drachma	990	33.00	482	16.07			1,432	47.73	2,904	96.80
Spain	Peseta	720	12.00	3,665.58	61.10	720	12.00	5,594.42	93.24	10,700	178.34
Total counterpart funds			217.49		148.82		151.69		414.78		932.78
Total funds expended by Mr. Byrne			234.99		235.22		1,511.68		791.50		2,773.39
Jeffery Cobelan:											
Appropriated funds:											
United States	Dollar		127.00		88.95		1,929.87		58.70		2,204.52
Fiji	do		15.24		6.61		1.00		3.58		26.43
Australia	do				1.92		1.64		1.12		4.68
Indonesia	do		53.24		7.90				5.69		66.83
Singapore	do				2.58						2.58
Malaya	do		15.84		5.96		2.97		25.03		49.80
Thailand	do				40.00				1.93		41.93
Vietnam	do								3.20		3.20
Hong Kong	do				1.25		1.00		4.50		6.75
Philippines	do				.63		2.50		8.90		12.03
Total appropriated funds (Army).	do		211.32		155.80		1,938.98		112.65		2,418.75
Counterpart funds:											
Australia	Pound	23-2-0	51.97	8-5-6	18.62	8-18-0	20.02	4-1-7	9.17	44-7-1	99.78
Indonesia	Rupee	1,800	2.25	2,063.75	2.60	12,050	15.07	5,773	7.21	21,686.75	27.13
Singapore	Dollar	45	14.85	16.08	5.31			43.92	14.52	105.00	34.68
Thailand	Baht	400	19.37	715.59	34.66	200	9.64	749.41	36.33	2,065	100.00
Vietnam	Piaster	2,700	38.57	3,239	46.27	1,500	21.43	3,681	52.58	11,120	158.85
Cambodia	Riels	565	16.22	508	14.58	750	21.53	1,451	41.66	3,274	93.99
Hong Kong	Dollar	120	21.13	127	22.36	125	22.01	528	92.95	900	158.45
Philippines	Peso	140	35.90	42.25	10.83	10	2.56	47.75	12.25	240	61.54
Total counterpart funds			200.26		155.23		112.26		266.67		734.42
Total funds expended by Mr. Cobelan.			411.58		311.03		2,051.24		379.32		3,153.17
John J. Courtney (counsel):											
Counterpart funds:											
Sweden	Kroner	386	74.37	939	180.92	160	30.82	175	33.71	1,660	319.82
Austria	Schilling	1,400	54.44	1,300	50.54	700	27.21	780	30.32	4,180	162.51
Italy	Lira	20,000	32.13	10,000	16.64			2,000	3.18	32,000	51.95
Greece	Drachma	1,800	60.00	1,900	63.10	900	30.00	600	20.00	5,200	173.10
Turkey	Lire	275	30.55	225	25.00	100	11.11	115	12.77	715	79.43
Lebanon	Pound	80-0-0	26.15	73-0-0	23.87	41-0-0	13.40	20-0-0	6.53	214-0-0	69.95
Jordan	do	5-0-0	17.77	8-0-0	28.44	7-0-0	15.64			20-0-0	61.85
Israel	Lirat	25	8.33	32	10.66	55	18.33	48	16.00	160	53.32
France	Franc	150	30.61	185	37.76	50	10.20			385	78.57
Total funds expended by Mr. Courtney (counterpart).			334.35		436.93		156.71		122.51		1,050.50
Durward G. Hall:											
Appropriated funds:											
United States	Dollar		90.68		164.04		833.51		95.46		1,183.69
Japan	do				39.18		2.39		26.31		67.88
Korea	do		2.70		8.84				12.13		23.67
Ryukyu Islands	do		2.00		.45				12.60		15.05
Philippines	do		1.50		3.11				11.78		16.39
Total appropriated funds. (Army).			96.88		215.62		835.90		158.28		1,306.68
Counterpart funds:											
Japan	Yen	23,908	67.16	36,643	102.93			91,724	257.65	152,275	427.74
Hong Kong	Dollar	88.00	15.49	247.00	43.49	185.74	32.70	322.51	56.78	843.25	148.46
Saigon, Vietnam	Piastre	1,799.70	25.71	1,791	25.58			3,927	56.10	7,517.70	107.39
Total counterpart funds			108.36		172.00		32.70		370.53		683.59
Total funds expended by Mr. Hall.			205.24		387.62		868.60		528.81		1,990.27

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Porter Hardy, Jr.:											
Appropriated funds:											
Italy	Dollar				24.00				19.06		43.06
France	do				17.79						17.79
United States	do						1,085.60				1,085.60
Total appropriated funds (Army).					41.79		1,085.60		19.06		1,146.45
Counterpart funds:											
Italy	Lira	49,941	80.42	25,042	40.33	18,717	30.14			93,700	150.89
France	Franc	80	16.23	126.4	25.63			23.6	4.80	230	46.66
Total counterpart funds			96.65		65.96		30.14		4.80		197.55
Total funds expended by Mr. Hardy.			96.65		107.75		1,115.74		23.86		1,344.00
Philip W. Kelleher (counsel):											
Appropriated funds:											
United States	Dollar						568.00				568.00
Austria	do		30.30		15.08		8.00		6.00		59.38
Denmark	do		36.00		20.00		6.00		5.00		67.00
Sweden	do		12.40		7.25						19.65
Norway	do		7.60		9.00				1.50		18.10
Total appropriated funds (Air Force).			83.60		51.33		582.00		12.50		732.13
Counterpart funds:											
Denmark	Kroner	68.80	10.00	144.48	21.00	55.04	8.00	41.28	6.00	309.60	45.00
France	Franc	490.00	100.00	343.00	70.00	171.50	35.00	171.50	35.00	1,176.00	240.00
West Germany	Deutsche mark	68.83	17.25	141.65	35.50			2.99	.75	213.47	53.50
Sweden	Kroner	46.67	9.00	51.85	10.00					98.52	19.00
Total counterpart funds			136.25		136.50		43.00		41.75		357.50
Total funds expended by Mr. Kelleher			222.55		187.83		625.00		54.25		1,089.63
Alvin E. O'Konski:											
Appropriated funds:											
United States	Dollar						166.38				166.38
Ireland	do		59.94		49.00				48.75		157.69
Total appropriated funds (Air Force)			59.94		49.00		166.38		48.75		324.07
Counterpart funds:											
Denmark	Kroner	2,900	414.00	1,500	218.00	700	100.00	350	50.00	5,600	782.00
Sweden	do	290	58.00	170	34.00	60	12.00	80	16.00	412	120.00
Norway	do	196	39.00	125	25.00	100	20.00	100	20.00	500	104.00
Poland	Zloty	960	40.00	480	20.00	480	20.00	960	40.00	3,000	120.00
France	Franc	1,900	380.00	900	180.00	200	40.00	200	40.00	3,000	640.00
Germany	Deutche mark	400	100.00	200	50.00	100	25.00	100	25.00	800	200.00
Netherlands	Guilder	260	60.00	130	30.00	45	10.00	45	10.00	359	110.00
Total counterpart funds			1,091.00		557.00		227.00		201.00		2,076.00
Total funds expended by Mr. O'Konski			1,150.94		606.00		393.38		249.75		2,400.00
L. Mendel Rivers:											
Appropriated funds: (Air Force)											
England	Dollar		72.31		36.00		9.15		19.00		136.46
Germany	do		6.00		45.00		4.30		12.00		67.30
Total appropriated funds			78.31		81.00		13.45		31.00		203.76
Counterpart funds: England	Pound	46-12-2	130.50	22-15-5	63.75	26-10-0	74.20	14-2-7	39.55	110-0-0	308.00
Total funds expended by Mr. Rivers			208.81		144.75		87.65		70.55		511.76
Total funds expended by House Committee on Armed Services			2,865.11		2,417.13		6,810.00		2,220.55		14,312.79

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollars equivalent)	6,340.34
Appropriated funds:	
H. Res.	
Other	
Government Department: (identify each)	
Department of Army	6,712.49
Department of Air Force	1,259.96
Total	14,312.79

CARL VINSON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

MARCH 5, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Seymour Halpern: Argentina	Argentine peso	5,400	53.00	5,800	57.00			5,600	55.00	16,800	165.00
Hon. James Harvey:											
Japan	Yen	30,000	83.33	35,280	98.00	8,800	24.44	10,200	27.78	84,280	233.55
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,000	25.00					586	14.65	1,586	39.65
	Yen			12,720	35.33					12,720	35.33
Philippine Islands	Peso	51.28	12.82	120	30.00	36	9.00	42.32	10.58	249.6	62.40
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	340	59.64	453.72	79.60	143.28	25.14	155	27.20	1,092	191.58
Thailand	Baht	352	17.05	315	15.25	1,032.5	50.00	100.5	4.87	1,800	87.17
India	Rupee	287.87	60.78	160	34.04	52.70	11.11	111.43	24.54	612	130.47
Turkey	Turkish lira	207	23.00	332	36.88	69.98	7.75	62.64	6.96	671.2	74.59
Italy	Lira	30,106	48.48	50,922	82.00	16,320	26.28	13,103	21.10	110,451	177.86
West Germany	Deutsche mark	290.9	72.91	316	79.00	78	19.50	57.1	14,09	742	185.50
Do	Lira							6,113	9.84	6,113	9.84
Spain	Peseta	1,800	30.00	3,606	60.10	900	15.00	891	14.85	7,197	119.95
Portugal	Escudo	1,600	55.94	1,344.2	47.00	1,075.8	37.61	270	9.45	4,290	150.00
Hon. Leonor K. Sullivan:											
Austria	Schilling	2,086	81.03	1,210	47.05	509	19.79	375	14.59	4,180	162.46
Italy	Lira	85,000	136.88	65,620	105.67	22,000	35.42	10,000	16.10	182,620	294.07
Germany	Deutsche mark	410	102.50	325	81.25	180	45.00	85	21.25	1,000	250.00
Belgium	Belgian franc	2,250	45.00	2,100	42.00			900	18.00	5,250	105.00
Do	Lira			10,000	16.10	9,000	14.50			19,000	30.60
France	New franc	449	91.63	269.81	55.06	124	25.31	75	15.31	917.81	187.31
Do	Lira			12,000	19.30					12,000	19.30
England	Pound	38	106.40	35/7/4	99.03	15/12/8	43.77	11	30.80	10.	280.00
Hon. Charles A. Vanik:											
Brazil	Cruzeiro		19.00		15.00		5.00				39.00
Argentina	Peso		78.20		40.00		15.00		9.30		142.50
Hon. Harold M. Ryan:											
France	New franc	93.75	19.13	73.50	15.00			20.34	4.15	187.59	38.28
Greece	Drachma	378.25	12.60	1,753.80	58.46	465.25	15.50	302.70	10.09	2,900	96.65
Turkey	Turkish lira	222.50	24.72	321.10	35.68	349.90	38.88	202.50	22.50	1,096	121.78
Italy	Lira	41,290.30	66.49	47,537.55	76.55	6,210	10.60	9,962.15	16.04	105,000	169.68
Germany	Deutsche mark	320.63	80.16	371	92.75	65.06	16.25	63.37	15.84		205.00
Spain	Peseta	2,202.60	36.71	3,418	57.47	378	6.30	1,271.40	21.19		121.67
Portugal	Escudo	1,890.00	66.09	1,329	46.48	208	7.28	863	30.15		150.00
Hon. Edward R. Finnegan:											
Japan	Yen	41,672	116.00	61,138	169.83	8,650	24.03	9,240	25,67	120,790	335.53
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	2,066	51.65	1,438	63.95			680	26.00	4,184	141.60
Philippines	Peso	49.72	12.43	212	53.00	48.52	12.13	94	23.50	404.24	101.06
Hong Kong	Hong Kong	812.40	142.53	1,008.70	176.97	146.40	25.68	142.50	25.00	2,110	370.18
Thailand	Baht	358	17.34	96	4.80	900	43.57	250	11.99	1,604	77.70
India	Rupee	472.50	94.50	102.50	20.50	160	32.00	60	12.00	795	159.00
Turkey	Turkish lira	282.25	31.36	355.75	39.53	192	21.35	140	15.56	970	107.80
Italy	Lira	46,863	75.47	62,905	101.30	84.20	13.55	10,200	16.42	128,388	206.74
Germany	Deutsche mark	521.20	130.30	604.80	151.20	1,292	323.00	220	55.00	2,638	659.50
France	New franc	160.18	32.69	131.61	26.86	134.26	27.40	73.95	15.09	500	102.04
Spain	Peseta	860	14.17	2,712	45.20	34,014	566.90	2,116	35.26	49.702	661.53
Hon. William A. Barrett:											
Japan	Yen	46,230	128.42	62,950	174.83	8,500	23.63	8,120	22.56	125,800	349.44
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	2,102	52.55	3,328	83.20			1,370	34.25	6,800	170.00
Philippines	Peso	10,480	26.20	241.20	60.30			100	25.00	446	111.50
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	1,101.60	193.30	1,056.60	185.40	204.10	35.85	202.70	35.58	2,565	450.13
Thailand	Baht	352	17.06			900	43.56	233	11.30	1,485	71.92
India	Rupee	448.50	89.70	77.50	15.50	134	26.80	50	10.00	710	142.00
Turkey	Turkish lira	338.25	37.59	345.50	38.38	288	32.00	117	13.00	1,088.75	120.97
Italy	Lira	53,830	86.69	63,500	102.25	9,100	14.65	3,570	5.75	130,000	209.34
Germany	Deutsche mark	334.73	83.69	360.87	90.21	190	25.00	84.40	21.10	880	220.00
Spain	Peseta	2,328.45	38.81	3,516	58.60			930	15.50	6,774.45	112.91
Portugal	Escudo	1,948	68.12	1,682	58.83			660	23.05	4,290	150.00
Robert R. Poston:											
Japan	Yen	26,464	73.45	42,300	117.50	2,460	6.91	3,376	9.37	74,600	207.23
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,320	33.00	628	15.70	1,610	40.25	130	3.25	3,688	92.20
Philippines	Peso	41.80	10.40	223.20	55.80	30.60	7.70	47.40	11.85	343	85.75
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	579.20	101.60	710.80	124.70	119.80	21.00	89.20	15.70	1,499	263.00
Thailand	Baht	365	17.68	159	7.71	900	43.57	210	10.16	1,634	79.12
India	Rupee	459.25	91.85	25.20	5.00	69.75	13.95	12.80	2.60	567	113.40
Turkey	Turkish lira	236	26.22	100.50	11.17			322	35.78	658.50	73.17
Italy	Lira	39,386	63.42	44,539	71.66	5,525	8.95	12,050	19.42	101,500	163.45
Germany	Deutsche mark	279.40	69.85	310.60	77.65	90	22.50	40	10.00	720	180.00
Spain	Peseta	1,398	23.30	2,821	47.02	890	14.83	744	12.40	5,853	97.55
Portugal	Escudo	1,780.70	62.28	1,552.30	54.25	206	7.20	687	24.02	4,225	147.7
Orman S. Fink:											
Japan	Yen	24,000	66.67	48,000	133.33	3,600	10.00	10,400	28.88	86,000	238.88
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,573.80	39.35	1,350	33.75	320	8.00	986.20	24.65	4,230	105.75
Philippines	Peso	43.22	10.81	200	50.00	24	6.00	120.68	30.17	387.90	96.98
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	390.20	68.46	776	136.14	120	21.05	200.80	35.23	1,487	260.88
Thailand	Baht	352	17.05	200	9.68	929.25	45.00	40.75	1.97	1,522	73.70
India	Rupee	240.57	50.78	120	25.35	100	21.11	18.43	3.89	479	101.13
Turkey	Turkish lira	207.50	23.06	200	22.22			57.50	6.39	465	51.67
Italy	Lira	24.355	39.22	61,000	98.23	11,000	17.71	10,645	17.14	107,000	172.30
Germany	Deutsche mark	178.68	44.67	380	95.00	80	20.00	111.32	27.83	750	187.50
Spain	Peso	1,782	29.70	3,500	58.34	600	10.00	818	13.63	6,700	111.67
Portugal	Escudo	1,615.50	56.49	1,900	66.43	390	13.64	384.50	13.44	4,290	150.00
Robert G. Stephens:											
England	Pound	10-0-0	27.44	41-7-8	115.60	17-17-4	50.00	13-3-0	38.00	82-10-8	231.04
France	New franc	325	76.28	425	85.00	150	30.00	99	20.00	1,031	211.28
Italy	Lira	35,000	55.96	62,000	99.00	16,000	25.00	9,400	15.00	123,850	194.96
Germany	Deutsche mark	343	87.18	352	88.00	80	20.00	63	16.00	838	211.18
Spain	Peseta	2,155	35.93	3,694	61.60	600	10.00	480	8.00	6,926	115.53
Portugal	Escudo	2,315	80.86	2,270	79.20	590	20.00	345	12.00	5,217	192.50

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Abraham J. Multer:											
Japan	Yen	47,708	133.00	35,280	98.00	30,960	86,00	11,044	30.70	124,992	347.70
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	4,599.50	115.00	2,810	70.25	3,650	91.25	1,300	33.50	1,235,95	310.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	1,232	216.09	567	99.50	233.70	41.00	165.70	29.00	2,198.40	385.59
Philippines	Peso	1,188	297.00	386.72	96.68	4,825.12	[1] 1,206.53	204	51.00	6,604.84	1,651.21
Guam			23.50		8.00				6.00		37.50
Hawaii			49.68		60.02		33.60		39.18		182.48
Los Angeles			124.25		65.00		22.00		32.64		243.89
Thomas L. Ashley:											
England	Pound	70/0/3	207.20	23/4/1	65.00	9/9/0	26.49	3/19/4	11.56	110/14/7	310.25
France	New franc	980	200.00	882	180.00	490	100.00	148	30.20	2,500	510.20
Total			5,797.74		5,865.17		3,936.77		1,695.35		17,295.03

[1] Includes cost of converting airplane transportation from tourist to 1st class.

NOTE.—Check for $518.38 has been forwarded to State Department for counterpart drawn in excess of that charged.

MARCH 9, 1963.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Banking and Currency.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Powell, Adam C.:											
Great Britain (9 days)	U.S. dollar		80.00		70.00		[1] 5.00		[2] 76.50 [3] 12.00		243.50
France (5 days)	do		110.00		87.50				[4] 48.00		245.50
Italy (6 days)	do		150.00		99.00				[5] 64.00		313.00
Greece (11 days)	do		192.50		181.50		75.00		[6] 88.00 [8] 10.00		547.00
Spain (4 days)	do		72.00		66.00		[7] 10.00 [7] 10.00		[9] 37.00		195.00
Zelenko, Herbert:											
Italy	Lire	52,164	84.00	37,260	60.00			19,872	32.00	109,296	176.00
France	Franc	563.5	115.00	392.0	80.00			147.0	30.00	102.5	225.00
Dent, John H.:											
Japan	Yen	44,000	122.67	41,000	114.33	14,706	41.00	2,510	7.00	102,216	285.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	915.50	160.63	715	125.40	380.50	66.76	96.90	17.00	2,107.90	369.79
Philippines [9]	Peso	216	54.00	260	65.00	64	16.00	108	27.00	648	162.00
Giaimo, Robert N.:											
Japan	Yen	45,000	125.00	41,133	115.00	8,467	23.52	5,400	15.00	100,000	278.52
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	868	155.00	740	125.00	308	55.00	84	15.00	2,000	350.00
Rome	Lire	99,468	162.00	110,520	180.00	55,260	90.00	34,384	56.00	300,000	488.00
Brademas, John:											
Switzerland	Franc	269.35	54.97	125.00	25.51	107.80	[10] 22.00	50	10.20	552.15	112.68
France	do	807.70	164.84	1,176.00	240.00	1,077.10	[11] 219.80	387.05	79.00	3,447.85	703.64
Poland	Zloty	4,229.25	176.22	3,049.40	127.06	2,088.00	87.00	4,241.90	176.75	13,608.55	567.03
Kearns, Carroll D.:											
Great Britain	Pound	68-5-0	191.10	30-5-0	84.70	20-0-0	56.00	41-0-0	114.80	159-10-0	446.60
Netherlands	Guilder	314.10	93.41	295.00	82.09	100.00	27.83	300.00	83.49	1,009.10	286.82
Denmark	Kroner	600	87.00	500.00	72.50	150.00	21.75	550.00	79.75	1,800.0	261.00
Returned										−300.0	−43.50
Total										1,500.00	217.50
Germany:											
West Berlin	Deutsche mark	304.19	76.05	204.00	51.00	100.00	25.00	200.00	50.00	808.00	202.05
Munich	do	631.90	157.97	250.00	62.50	100.00	25.00	308.00	77.00	1,289.90	322.47
Austria	Schilling	7,000.00	273.00	2,800.00	109.20	1,200.00	46.80	3,000.00	117.00	14,000.00	546.00
Returned										−2,990.00	−116.61
Total										11,010.00	429.39
Switzerland	Franc	318.90	73.83	190.00	43.98	320.00	74.08	200.00	46.30	1,028.90	238.19
Returned										−200.00	−46.30
Total										828.90	191.89
Wingate, Livingston L.:											
Jamaica	Pound	55	155.00	34	95.40	28	78.40	58.95	165.09	175.95	493.89
Argentina	Peso	11,572.10	78.65	5,200	35.37	4,704	32.00	10,916.56	72.60	31,345	218.62
Brazil	Cruzeiro	26,000	193.30	29,500	219.33	19,300	143.49	25,200	185.87	100,000	741.99
Wall, Tamara J.:											
Great Britain, (4 days)	Pound		100.00		85.00		23.00		72.00	100	280.00
France (5 days)	New franc		110.00		82.50		12.00		45.50	1,250	250.00
Italy (9 days)	Lira		205.00		148.50		25.00		71.50	286,300	450.00
Greece (4 days)	Drachma		80.00		70.00		15.00		35.00	6,000	200.00
Austria (5 days)	Schilling		65.00		52.50		12.00		22.50	3,800	152.00
Germany (3 days)	Deutsche mark		55.00		51.00		14.00		30.00	600	150.00
Denmark (5 days)	Kroner		75.00		62.00		8.00		26.00	1,200	171.00
Berens, Donald F.:											
England	Pound	17.3	48.56	16.9	47.42	9.9	27.90	7.9	21.72	52	145.60
Germany	Deutsche mark	205	51.25	438.00	109.50	137	34.25	110	27.50	890	222.50
France	New franc	286	57.20	590.00	118.00	190	38.00	184	36.80	1,250	250.00
Switzerland	Swedish franc	170	42.50	255.00	63.75	71	17.75	104	26.00	600	150.00
Italy	Lira	86,730	139.66	108.150	174.15	95,368	[12] 155.18	23.630	38.05	313,880	507.01

See footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Kearns, Carroll D.:											
Italy	Lira	33,577	50.03	40,000	64.00	46,132	73.81	38,758	62.85	158,467	[illegible]
France	New franc	1,361.55	272.31	696	139.20	160	32.00	400	80.00	2,617.55	[illegible]
Dargans, Louise Maxienne:											
United Kingdom	U.S. dollar		15.50		12.00		6.25		16.00		49.75
Spain	do		32.00		22.50		17.75		11.50		83.75
Italy	do		35.00		30.50		40.00		14.00		119.50
France	do		25.00		18.50		20.00		17.00		80.50
Morocco	do		15.00		10.00		8.00		4.00		37.00
Portugal	do		14.50		12.00		12.00		15.00		53.50
Gamser, Howard: [13]											
Japan	Yen	43,044	120.00	30,457	110.00	15,065	42.00	2,434	6.52	100,000	278.52
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	855	150.00	684	120.00	370.50	65.00	91.20	16.00	2,000	351.00
Philippines	Peso [14]										
Huff, Corrine A.:											
Great Britain (4 days)	U.S. dollar		80.00		17.50		28.00		168.00		[illegible]
France (5 days)	do		110.00		82.50		12.00		46.00		250.50
Italy (5 days)	do		150.00		99.00				56.00		305.00
Greece (11 days)	do		192.00		181.50		75.00		84.00		532.50
Spain (4 days)	do		72.00		76.00				37.00		185.00
Denmark (4 days)	do		72.00		66.00				37.00		175.00
McNeal, E. Zelda:											
England	Pound	32	90.00	45	126.00	13	36.00	6	16.00	96	[illegible]
France	Franc	2,000	400.00	1,600	320.00	1,000	200.00	400	80.00	5,000	1,000.00
Italy	Lira	70,000	112.00	65,000	104.00	15,000	24.00			150,000	240.00
Bullard, Theo H. Jr.:											
Denmark	Kroner	160	24.00	200	28.00	140	20.00	180	26.00	694	98.00
Russia	Ruble	157	165.00	82	90.00	48	56.00	61	69.00	348	380.00
Austria	Schilling	500	22.00	650	27.00	350	11.00	600	24.00	2,100	84.00
Italy	Lira	3,600	56.00	3,200	48.00	2,800	40.00	3,200	48.00	128,000	192.00
France	New Franc	900	168.00	780	144.00	660	132.00	960	180.00	3,240	624.00
England	Pound	18	48.00	18	48.00	12	36.00	15	42.00	63	174.00
Total			6,768.65		5,677.89		2,620.32		3,400.79		[illegible]

---

[1] Taxi fare: District of Columbia, $3; New York, $2.

[2] Tips: Between District of Columbia and Great Britain. District of Columbia Skycap, $1; New York Skycap, $1; pier porter, $2; deck steward, $3; cabin steward, $15; waiter, $15; dining room captain, $10; night steward, $5; dockside porter, $2; hotel bellman, $4; hotel doorman, $1; hotel waiter, $10.50; wine steward, $5; London Skycap, $2.

[3] Telephone.

[4] Tips in France: Meals, maitre d'hotel concierge, $30; Skycap, bellman and doorman, $8; miscellaneous, $10.

[5] Tips in Italy: Skycap, bellman, and doorman, $16; meals, capo cameriere, portinaio, $36; miscellaneous, $12.

[6] Tips in Greece: Skycap, bellman and doorman, $88.

[7] Taxi.

[8] Tips in Spain: Skycap, bellman, and doorman, $8; meals, majordomo, portero, $[illegible]; miscellaneous, $5.

[9] Paid staff expenses in Philippines. No funds drawn by staff, 2 days for staff ($91.00).

[10] Transportation—Stuttgart-Basle.

[11] Transportation—Paris-Warsaw-Paris.

[12] Includes railroad transportation throughout Italy; and from Rome, Italy, to Paris, France.

[13] Traveling with Ad Hoc Committee on Impact of Exports and Imports on Domestic Employment, Dec. 1-14, 1962.

[14] All foreign currency expenditures met by subcommittee chairman.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	18,[illegible]

MARCH 8, 1963.

ADAM C. POWELL,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

Report of expenditures of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Thomas E. Morgan:											
France	Franc	1,804.70	368.31	732.55	149.50	298.90	61.00	147	30.00	2,983.15	608.81
Germany	Mark	732.15	183.03	228	57.00	100	25.00	84	21.00	1,144.15	286.03
Italy	Lira	45,610	73.56	39,215	63.25	37,510	60.50	11,160	18.00	133,495	215.31
Spain	Peseta	4,200	70.00	2,880	48.00	5,601.80	93.33	480	8.00	13,161.80	219.33
Wayne L. Hays: Bermuda	Pound	38.12	108.50	15	42.00	6.10	18.60	16.10	46.32	76.12	215.42
Leonard Farbstein:											
Spain	Peseta	5,628	93.80	4,734	78.90	9,360	156.00	918	15.30	20,640	344.00
Italy	Lira	110,500	177.94	75,630	121.79	116,748	188.00	7,670	12.35	310,548	500.08
Israel	Pound	589.46	196.49	564.19	188.06	675	225.00	83.35	27.78	1,912.00	637.33
France	Franc	380	77.39	295.45	60.17	667.76	136.00	168.49	34.32	1,511.70	307.88
United States	do					4,382.67	892.60			4,382.67	892.60
Cornelius E. Gallagher:											
Switzerland	do	233.26	54.00	149.89	34.70	340.38	78.80	46.40	10.74	769.93	178.24
France	do	196.40	40.00	116.36	23.70	268.67	54.72	48.12	9.80	629.55	128.22
Italy	Lira	89,424	144.00	54,753	88.17	37,198	59.90	16,891	27.20	198,266	319.27
Germany	Mark					4,381.18	1,100.80			4,381.18	1,100.80
John S. Monagan: Bermuda	Pound	35	98.56	14	39.42	5	14.08	14.15	41.53	68.15	193.59
Robert B. Chiperfield:											
Mexico	Peso	850	68.00	748	59.84	468.75	37.50	367.38	29.39	2,434.13	194.73
Netherlands	Guilder					1,074.72	298.70			1,074.72	298.70

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1692—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Chester E. Merrow:											
France	Franc	2,604	530.34	376.03	76.58	129.20	26.32	63.15	12.87	3,172.38	646.11
Netherlands	Guilder					1,999.34	556.30			1,999.34	556.30
Walter H. Judd: Bermuda	Pound			12.50	34.49	3.00	8.45	13.00	36.60	28.50	79.54
William S. Broomfield: Bermuda	do	35.00	98.56	14.00	39.42	5.00	14.08	22.00	61.95	76.00	214.01
Robert R. Barry:											
France	Franc	825.00	168.02	389.17	79.26	522.17	106.34	88.88	18.10	1,825.21	371.72
Netherlands	Guilder					1,686.58	469.80			1,686.58	469.80
Philip B. Billings: Bermuda	Pound	33.00	92.93	13-6-10	37.45	6.00	16.90	53.43	150.08	105.10.13	297.36
Total			2,643.43		1,321.70		4,698.72		611.33		9,275.18

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	9,275.18

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MARCH 7, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Europe, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Edna F. Kelly:											
Austria	Schilling	2,088	80.39	1,320	50.82	2,085.23	80.28	410	15.78	5,903.23	227.27
Italy	Lira	83,350	137.44	55,150	88.81	76,050	122.47	20,330	32.74	236,880	381.46
Germany	Deutsche mark	253.05	63.26	236.95	59.24	135	33.75	95	23.75	720	180.00
Belgium	Franc	1,860	37.20	3,650	73.00	2,400	48.00	1,115	22.30	9,025	180.50
France	do	450	91.65	246.75	50.26	177	36.05	125	25.46	998.75	203.42
United Kingdom	Pound	40-10-0	113.40	25-5-8	70.79	60-19-0	170.66	19-4-4	53.81	145-19-0	408.66
Netherlands	Guilder					3,766.54	1,037.90			3,766.54	1,037.90
Hon. John S. Monagan:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	141.45	35.36	116.28	29.07			48.55	12.14	306.28	76.57
Denmark	Kroner	161	23.30	92	13.31	47.19	6.84	32	4.63	332.19	48.08
U.S.S.R	Danish kroner	831.74	120.35	150	21.71	72	10.42	78	11.29	1,131.74	163.77
Poland	Zloty	295	12.30	349	14.54	2,477	103.30			3,121	130.14
Do	Danish kroner	234.50	33.93	120.40	17.42					354.90	51.35
Austria	Schilling	2,094	80.62	1,210	46.58	2,018.82	77.72	463.57	17.85	5,786.39	222.77
Spain	Peseta	4,556	75.93	4,930	82.17	10,630	177.17	1,434	23.90	21,550	359.17
Portugal	Escudo	1,337	46.91	523	18.35	40	1.40	301	10.57	2,201	77.23
Hon. Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr.:											
Italy	Lira	20,308	32.70	53,600	86.31	76,050	122.47	16,092	25.91	166,050	267.39
Germany	Deutsche mark	251	62.75	240	60.00	105	26.25	64	16.00	660	165.00
Belgium	Franc	909	18.18	3,570	71.40	1,515	30.30	1,120	22.40	7,114	142.28
France	do	404	82.28	225	45.82	170	34.62	110	22.40	909	185.12
United Kingdom	Pound	29-6-6	82.11	24-10-0	68.60	53-14-0	150.36	8-2-0	22.68	115-12-6	323.75
Netherlands	Guilder					3,709.93	1,022.30			3,709.93	1,022.30
Hon. Robert R. Barry:											
Austria	Schilling	2,094	80.62	1,310	50.43	2,085.23	80.28	380	14.63	5,869.23	225.96
Italy	Lira	54,461	95.75	54,400	87.60	71,050	114.41	22,000	35.43	206,911	333.19
Germany	Deutsche mark	291.12	72.78	282	70.50	220	55.00	164.29	41.07	957.41	239.35
Belgium	Franc	1,272	25.44	2,930	58.60	2,046	40.92	985	19.70	7,233	144.66
France	do	400	81.46	384.75	78.36	260.92	53.12	141	28.72	1,186.67	241.66
United Kingdom	Pound	30-12-0	85.68	24-15-0	69.30	238-14-0	668.36	7-1-6	19.81	301-2-6	843.15
Hon. Harris B. McDowell, Jr.:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	497.03	124.26	527.70	131.92	5,479.80	1,369.95	336	84.00	6,840.53	1,710.13
Denmark	Kroner	161	23.30	104	15.05	835	120.82	329	47.61	1,429	206.78
U.S.S.R	Danish kroner	831.74	120.35	150	21.71	72	10.42	78	11.29	1,131.74	163.77
Poland	Zloty	1,499	62.46	1,667.70	69.52	5,019	209.13	1,188	49.49	9,373.70	390.60
Do	Danish kroner	157.50	22.79							157.50	22.79
Austria	Schilling	2,094	80.62	2,949	115.46	5,013.92	195.82	1,624	63.82	11,680.92	455.72
Italy	Lira	58,178	93.68	54,700	88.08	102,105	164.42	52,052	83.82	267,035	430.00
Belgium	Franc	1,417	28.34	3,620	72.40	2,100	42.00	2,143	42.86	9,280	185.60
France	do	736.60	148.97	534	107.80	471.85	95.41	475.50	96.44	2,217.95	448.62
United Kingdom	Pound	52.18	148.12	32-18-0	92.12	208-7-1	583.45	35-18-0	100.52	330-1-1	924.21
Hon. Chester E. Merrow: Belgium	Franc	2,337	46.74	2,283	45.66	351	7.02	567	11.34	5,508	110.76
Hon. William S. Broomfield:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	141.45	35.36	122	30.50	45	11.25	52.55	13.14	361	90.25
Denmark	Kroner	163.00	23.58	102	14.76	152.19	22.02	40	5.79	457.19	66.5
U.S.S.R	Danish kroner	831.74	120.35	150	21.70	65	9.41	85	12.30	1,131.74	163.76
Poland	Zloty	295	12.30	409	17.04	2,577	107.38	450	18.75	3,731	155.47
Do	Danish kroner	140.56	20.33	120.40	17.42					260.96	37.75
Austria	Schilling	2,094	80.62	1,150	44.27	2,109.82	81.23	488.57	18.81	5,842.39	224.93
Spain	Peseta	4,635	77.25	5,620	93.67	10,779	179.65	2,125	35.42	23,159	385.99
Portugal	Escudo	607	21.30	480	16.86	206	7.23	285	10.00	1,578	55.39
Franklin J. Schupp, staff consultant:											
Netherlands	Guilder	34.75	9.66	57.60	15.96	3,834.40	1,065.11	15.20	4.23	3,941.95	1,094.96
Denmark	Kroner	87.25	12.65	119.72	17.35	218.08	31.06	89.70	13	513.75	74.06
Sweden	Swedish kroner	125.60	24.38	293.55	57.50	118.66	17.80	32.19	6.25	570	105.93
Germany	Deutsche mark	195.50	48.88	321	80.25	350.50	87.50	52	13	918	229.63
Marian A. Czarnecki, staff consultant:											
Germany	do	390.50	97.63	716.40	179.04	5,642.10	1,410.52	127	31.75	6,876	1,718.94
France	Franc	737.50	149.28	507.22	102.35	457	92.40	178.70	36.09	1,880.42	380.12
Austria	Schilling	1,742.95	68.15	2,187.5	85.96	2,923.87	113.48	1,053.57	41.52	7,97.89	309.11
Poland	Zloty	849	35.38	1,375.70	57.32	3,830	159.58	863.30	35.97	6,918	288.25
Poland	Danish kroner	117.25	16.97	100	14.47					217.25	31.44
Sweden	Swedish kroner	146	28.61	306	59.98	308	60.37	63	12.35	823	161.31
Netherlands	Guilder	29.90	8.28	62.10	17.20	4,095.68	1,128.78	24	6.65	4,211.68	1,160.91

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Europe, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Marian A. Czarnecki, staff consultant—Continued											
Belgium	Franc	1,077	21.54	3,510	70.20	1,525	30.50	902	18.04	7,014	140.28
Italy	Lira	32,290	52.00	52,900	85.18	77,650	125.04	16,195	26.08	179,035	288.30
United Kingdom	Pound	29-6-6	82.11	21-0-0	58.80	61-0-0	170.80	8-16-6	24.71	120-3-0	336.42
Denmark	Kroner	138	30.97	106.65	15.43	180.19	16.07	27	3.91	451.84	66.38
U.S.S.R.	Danish kroner	831.74	120.35	150	21.70	64	9.27	76	11.00	1,121.74	162.22
John P. White, State Department escort officer:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	78.20	19.55	104.52	26.13	20	5.00	46	11.50	248.72	62.18
Denmark	Kroner	70	10.13	95	13.75	117.19	16.96	30	4.34	312.19	45.18
U.S.S.R.	Danish kroner	831.74	120.35	150	21.70	74	10.71	80	11.58	1,135.74	164.84
Poland	Zloty	295	12.30	420	17.50	2,777	111.54	259	10.79	3,651	152.13
Do	Danish kroner	76.36	11.05	120.40	17.42					196.26	28.47
Austria	Schilling	1,047	40.31	1,050	40.42	2,518.82	96.97	316.57	12.19	4,932.39	189.89
Spain	Peseta	2,898	48.30	4,620	77.00	10,537	175.62	625	11.25	18,730	312.17
Portugal	Escudo	380	13.33	405	14.21			145	5.08	930	32.62
Total			4,044.67		3,565.75		12,456.04		1,579.65		21,646.11

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	21,646.11

EDNA F. KELLY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Special Study Mission to Latin America, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Armistead I. Selden, chairman:											
Peru	Sol	1,328	49.48	296	11.04	6,931.75	258.65	338.62	12.63	8,894.37	331.80
Ecuador	Sucre	841	38.23	397	18.05			202	9.18	1,440	65.46
Colombia	Peso	640	60.95	135.50	12.89			66.50	6.35	842	80.19
Panama	U.S. dollar		68.00								68.00
Costa Rica	do		60.00								60.00
Hon. William S. Mailliard:											
Panama	do		34.00								34.00
Costa Rica	do		60.00								60.00
Guatemala	do		64.00								64.00
Netherlands	Guilder					758.93	211.40				211.40
Hon. Marguerite Stitt Church:											
Peru	Sol	657.27	24.50	954.62	35.63	6,913.75	257.99	208.23	7.75	8,733.87	325.87
Ecuador	Sucre	283.40	12.88	175.50	7.98			81.10	3.69	540	24.55
Columbia	Peso	640	60.95	57.50	5.48			22.50	2.14	720	68.57
Panama	U.S. dollar		68.00								68.00
Costa Rica	do		60.00								60.00
United States	Dollar						131.09				131.09
Hon. Laurence Curtis:											
Peru	Sol	817.4	30.50	931.3	34.75	6,931.82	258.65	239.86	8.95	8,920.38	332.85
Ecuador	Sucre	585.31	26.13	394.24	17.60			208.84	9.10	1,407.39	52.83
Colombia	Peso	673.50	60.95	133.6	12.09			68.5	6.20	875.6	79.24
Mexico	do	1,031.25	82.50	926.12	74.09	551.25	44.10	231.25	18.50	2,739.87	219.19
Panama	U.S. dollar		68.00								68.00
Costa Rica	do		60.00								60.00
Guatemala	do		96.00								96.00
United States	Dollar						63.42				63.42
Albert C. F. Westphal (staff consultant):											
Panama	U.S. dollar		34.00								34.00
Costa Rica	do		60.00								60.00
Netherlands	Guilder					758.93	211.40				211.40
Rosita Rieck Bennett (staff assistant):											
Peru	Sol	322.22	12.03	761.13	28.40	6,913.75	257.99	157.50	5.87	8,154.60	304.29
Ecuador	Sucre	863.10	39.23	181.80	8.26			79.51	3.61	1,124.41	51.10
Colombia	Peso	582.75	55.50	85.7	8.16			23.1	2.20	691.55	65.86
Panama City	U.S. dollar		68.00								68.00
Costa Rica	do		60.00								60.00
Total			1,413.83		274.42		1,694.09		96.17		3,478.11

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	2,424.00
Appropriated funds: H. Res. 61, 87th Cong.	1,054.11
Total	3,478.11

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee for Review of the Mutual Security Programs, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Bullock, Roy J., senior staff consultant:											
France	Franc	1,453.30	296.60	1,044.50	213.16	313.50	63.97	154.38	31.51	2,965.68	605.24
Netherlands	Guilder	88.25	24.51	49.58	13.77	4,123.71	1,145.47	0	0	4,261.54	1,183.75
Denmark	Krone	848	122.72	799.75	115.73	291.83	42.23	66.91	9.68	2,006.49	290.36
Norway	do	697.37	97.53	595.86	83.33	379.33	53.05	82.33	11.51	1,754.89	245.42
Germany	Deutsche mark	384.26	96.06	457.81	114.45	57.33	14.33	30.66	7.66	930.06	232.50
Italy	Lira	151,502	242.54	146,721	234.75	33,668	53.86	17,311	27.69	349,292	558.84
Belgium	Franc	4,088	81.76	2,228	44.56	475	9.50	0	0	6,791	185.82
United States	Dollar		(1)		[1] 32.		[1] 39.22	0	0		[1] 71.22
Brandt, Robert F., investigator-consultant:											
France	Franc	1,453.40	296.60	1,044.50	213.17	233.50	47.66	154.39	31.50	2,885.79	588.93
Netherlands	Guilder	88.25	24.52	49.59	13.77	3,906.88	1,085.24	0	0	4,044.72	1,123.53
Denmark	Krone	848	122.72	799.75	115.75	291.84	42.24	66.93	9.69	2,006.52	290.40
Norway	do	697.39	97.55	595.87	83.35	379.34	53.06	82.34	11.52	1,754.94	245.48
Germany	Deutche mark	384.28	96.08	457.81	114.46	57.34	14.34	30.67	7.68	930.10	232.56
Italy	Lira	151,504	242.56	146,721	234.76	33,668	53.88	17,311	27.71	349,294	558.91
United States	Dollar				[1] 32.00		39.72				71.72
Chile	Escudo	173.99	123.39	303.38	215.16	131.76	93.44	47.87	33.95	657.00	465.94
United States	Dollar						971.63		2.00		973.63
Iran	Rial	2,760	36.30	1,406	18.50	152	2.00	182	2.41	4,500	59.21
Jordan	Dinar	26.300	73.90	22.334	62.76	8.142	22.88	5.063	14.27	61.839	173.81
Lebanon	Pound	131.10	43.88	233.60	73.83			22.66	7.58	374.35	125.29
Afghanistan	U.S. dollar		(2)		(2)		27.02				415.02
Germany	Deutsche mark					7,526.14	1,886.25			7,526.14	1,886.25
United States	Dollar						10.25		2.50		12.75
Harry C. Cromer, staff consultant:											
France	Franc	1,453.30	296.60	1,044.50	213.16	233.50	47.65	154.38	31.51	2,885.68	588.92
Netherlands	Guilder	88.25	24.51	49.58	13.77	3,906.77	1,085.21			4,044.60	1,123.49
Denmark	Kroner	848	122.72	799.75	115.73	291.83	42.23	66.91	9.68	2,006.49	290.36
Norway	do	697.37	97.53	595.86	83.33	379.33	53.05	82.33	11.51	1,754.89	245.42
Germany	Deutsche mark	384.26	96.06	457.81	114.45	57.33	14.33	30.66	7.66	930.06	232.50
Italy	Lira	151.502	242.54	146,721	234.75	33,668	53.86	17.311	27.69	349,292	558.84
United States	Dollar				[1] 32.00		42.72				[1] 74.72
Total			3,387.18		2,836.45		7,110.29		326.91		13,660.83

[1] 2 days per diem.

[2] 22 days per diem, Kabul, at $16; 4 days per diem other than Kabul, at $9; $388.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	12,041.77
Appropriated funds:	
H. Res. 60 and 61, 87th Cong.	1,204.04
Government department: Department of State	415.02
Total	13,660.83

THOMAS E. MORGAN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MARCH 6, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, delegation to 8th NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Anfuso, Victor L.:											
France	Franc	1,371.31	279.86	630	128.57	170	34.69	700	142.86	2,871.31	585.98
United States	Dollar						44.50				44.50
Arends, Leslie C.:											
France	Franc	1,371.31	279.86	630	128.57	170	34.69	680	138.77	2,851.31	581.89
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	136.84	34.21	100.23	25.06	93.47	23.36	610.54	152.63
Italy	Lire	29,127	46.89	16,382	26.26	37,677.40	60.77	11,320	18.26	94,506.4	152.18
Spain	Peseta	3,427.20	57.12	1,929	32.15	5,200.20	86.67	380.40	6.34	10,936.60	182.28
United States	Dollar		64.00				112.42				176.42
Denton, Winfield K.:											
France	Franc	1,340.8	273.63	639.45	130.50	172	35.10	685	139.80	2,837.25	579.03
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	140	35.00	110	27.50	105	26.25	635	158.75
Italy	Lira	29,210	47.11	17,150	27.66	37,677.4	60.77	10,511	16.95	94,548.4	152.49
Spain	Peseta	3,610	60.17	2,150	35.83	5,000	83.33	328	5.47	11,088	184.80
United States	Dollar		64.00				99.98				163.98
Devine, Samuel L.:											
France	Franc	1,350.31	275.57	660.8	134.86	201.8	41.10	661	134.90	2,873.91	586.43
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	138.8	34.70	118	29.50	101	25.25	637.8	159.45
Italy	Lira	29,190	47.08	16,790	27.08	37,677.4	60.77	11,619	18.74	95,276.4	153.67
Spain	Peseta	3,508	58.46	2,079	34.65	5,400	90.00	420	7.00	11,407	190.11
United States	Dollar		16.00				57.54				73.54
Hays, Wayne L.:											
France [1]	Franc	1,713.51	349.69	765.15	156.15	2,009	41.00	700	142.86	3,379.56	689.70
Germany	Deutche mark	296	74.00	126.44	31.61	100.23	23.06	95.2	23.80	617.87	154.47
Italy [1]	Lira	71,291.60	114.98	40,290.6	64.98	37,677.4	60.77	12,517	20.18	161,776.6	260.91
Spain	Peseta	3,678	61.30	1,958.4	32.64	5,600	93.33	398.30	6.64	11,634.7	193.91
United States	Dollar						[1] 2,108.41				2,108.41
Lindsay, John V.:											
France	Franc	1,350.31	275.57	625	127.55	185	37.55	646.8	132.00	2,807.11	572.67
Germany	Deutche mark	275	68.75	138.75	34.69	95	23.75	91.8	22.95	600.55	150.14
Italy	Lira	27,132	43.69	15,190.8	24.46	37,677.4	60.70	11,285	18.17	91,285.2	147.02
United States	Dollar						[1] 938.39				938.39

See footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, delegation to 8th NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Rodino, Peter W., Jr.:											
France	Franc	1,340.02	273.59	570.90	116.51	185	37.76	700	142.86	2,795.92	570.72
United States	Dollar						22.35				22.35
Smith, Frank E., United States	do						976.87				976.87
Westland, Jack:											
France	Franc	1,350.31	275.57	664.34	135.58	187.43	38.25	670	136.73	2,872.08	586.13
Germany	Deutsche mark	275	68.75	135.8	33.95	115	28.75	95.7	23.92	621.5	155.37
Italy	Lire	18,130	29.24	10,127.7	16.33	18,838.7	30.38	7,950	12.82	55,046.4	88.77
Spain	Peseta	1,350	22.50	565.8	9.43	1,800	30.00	375.8	6.26	4,091.6	68.19
United States	Dollar		32.00				309.95				341.95
Crawford, Boyd:											
France	Franc	1,371.31	279.86	630	128.57	170	34.69	700	142.86	2,871.31	585.98
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	126.44	31.61	100.23	25.06	81.63	20.41	588.30	147.08
Italy	Lire	29,127	46.89	29,760	48.00	37,677.4	60.77	10,630	17.15	107,194.4	172.81
Spain	Peseta	3,427.20	57.12	2,349	39.15	2,750	45.83	290	4.83	8,816.2	146.93
Billings, Philip B.:											
France [1]	Franc	1,773.60	361.96	793.85	162.01	315.56	64.40	864.99	176.53	3,748	764.90
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	126.44	31.61	100.23	25.06	81.63	20.41	588.3	147.08
Itlay	Lire	47,500	76.61	53,754	86.70	37,677.4	60.77	74,462	120.10	213,393.4	344.18
United States [2]	Dollar		159.75		49.25		[1] 1,290.17				1,499.17
Drakert, Marcelle:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	250	62.50	136.84	34.21	100.23	25.06	39.80	9.95	526.87	131.72
Italy	Lire	23,132.25	37.25	15,525	25.00	37,677.4	60.77	6,751	10.87	83,085.65	133.89
Spain	Peseta	3,060	51.00	1,800	30.00	2,200	36.67	247.8	4.13	7,307.8	121.80
United States	Dollar		32.00				39.94				71.94
Krim, Marie H.:											
France	Franc	1,340.02	273.59	570.9	116.51	170	34.69	500	102.04	2,580.92	526.83
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	136.84	34.21	100.23	25.06	80	20.00	597.07	149.27
Italy	Lire	11,000	17.74	4,960	7.98	19,061.2	30.74	6,200	10.00	41,211.2	66.46
Litten, Jean:											
France	Franc	1,340.02	273.59	570.9	116.51	170	34.69	515	105.09	2,595.92	529.88
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	136.84	34.21	100.23	25.06	47.92	11.98	564.99	141.25
Italy	Lire	23,132.25	37.25	15,525	25.00	37,677.4	60.77	8,689	14.01	85,023.65	137.03
Spain	Peseta	3,060	51.00	1,800	30.00	2,750	45.83	306	5.10	7,916	131.93
Peak, Patricia E.:											
France	Franc	1,340.02	273.59	570.9	116.51	170	34.69	600	122.45	2,680.92	547.24
Germany	Deutsche mark	280	70.00	136.84	34.21	100.23	25.06	51.35	12.84	568.42	142.11
Italy	Lire	23,132.25	37.25	15,525	25.00	37,677.4	60.77	9,237	14.87	85,571.65	137.89
Spain	Peseta	3,060	51.00	1,800	30.00	2,200	36.67	297	4.95	7,357	122.62
Delegation expenses:											
Hotel office, France	Franc							3,109.78	634.65	3,109.78	634.65
Gratuities, France	do							250	51.02	250	51.02
Transportation, France	do					462.39	94.37			462.39	94.37
NATO reception, France	do							92.16	18.81	92.16	18.81
Overtime costs, France	do							1,144.04	233.48	1,144.04	233.48
Official luncheons and meals, France.	do			1,749.3	357.00					1,749.3	357.00
Total			5,999.33		3,187.17		8,125.25		3,281.67		20,593.42

---

[1] Includes attending meetings of NATO Parliamentarians Conference Standing Committee.

[2] Includes NATO Parliamentarians' visit, U.S. bases.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	14,175.90
Appropriated funds: Other, Public Law 689, 84th Cong	6,417.52
Total	20,593.42

Wayne L. Hays,
Chairman, Delegation to the 8th NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

March 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, delegation to Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, expended between Jan. 1, and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Broomfield, Hon. William S.: Canada	Dollar		39.00		12.34				53.00		104.34
Curtis, Hon. Laurence: Canada	do		39.00		9.02		41.86				89.88
Gallagher, Hon. Cornelius E.: Canada	do		157.50		13.19				14.35		185.04
Giaimo, Hon. Robert N.: Canada	do		70.50						3.54		74.04
Harvey, Hon. James: Canada	do		52.50								52.50
Inouye, Hon. Daniel K.: Canada	do		56.00						2.75		58.75
Johnson, Hon. Harold T.: Canada	do		70.50		7.69				13.12		91.31
Murphy, Hon. William T.: Canada	do		73.50		14.71				1.25		89.46
Robison, Hon. Howard W.: Canada	do		39.00		8.03				1.85		48.88
Slack, Hon. John M., Jr.: Canada	do		71.50		4.12				1.84		77.46
Tupper, Hon. Stanley R.: Canada	do		52.50		14.81				.51		67.46
Jellison, Mr. Fred: Canada	do		48.00		5.48				7.00		60.48
O'Brien, Mrs. Mary L.: Canada	do		50.00		5.52				3.25		58.77
Westphal, Mr. Albert C. F.: Canada	do		47.00		36.59				4.91		88.50
Delegation expenses, Canada	do								833.33		833.33
Total			866.50		131.86		41.86		940.34		1,980.56

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Public Law 86-42	1,980.56

Cornelius E. Gallagher,
Chairman, House Delegation, Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Harris B. McDowell, United States.	Dollar		138.15		19.23		194.10		12.88		364.36
Hon. Edward J. Derwinski, United States.	do		144.20		31.38		436.39		5.50		617.47
Hon. Robert B. Chiperfield, United States.	do		54.00				205.10				259.10
Hon. Ben Reifel, United States	do		60.00		9.75		399.95		1.08		470.78
Delegation expenses (host expenses such as meals, interpreters, official visits, etc.).	do								7,333.26		7,333.26
Total			396.35		60.36		1,235.54		7,352.72		9,044.97

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Public Law 86-420, 86th Cong	$9,044.97

D. S. Saund,
Chairman, House Delegation, Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, U.S. Group, Interparliamentary Union, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Harold D. Cooley: Italy	U.S. dollars		137.50		41.91		609.60		5.16		794.17
Hon. Martha W. Griffiths: Italy	do		45.83		65.00		1,104.40		60.00		1,275.23
Hon. W. R. Poage:											
Mexico	do				1.00				1.50		2.50
Peru	do		28.68		4.03		1.50				34.21
Argentina	do		35.07		104.09				18.37		157.53
Brazil	do		86.82		130.64		9.03		75.71		302.20
Trinidad	do		10.53		4.60				1.60		16.73
Hon. Paul C. Jones:											
Mexico	Mexico		69.63		18.21				6.00		93.84
Peru	do		31.09		58.80				5.00		94.89
Argentina	do		35.07		58.08				10.39		103.54
Brazil	do		96.38		128.12		3.22		40.64		268.36
Trinidad	do		16.05		10.05				1.60		27.70
Hon. Lucien Nedzi:											
Mexico	do		48.03		10.72				17.90		76.65
Peru	do		32.00		13.38						45.38
Argentina	do		35.07		85.83				34.88		155.78
Brazil	do		92.79		164.39		8.89		137.66		403.73
Trinidad	do		16.05		42.88				1.60		60.53
Hon. Thomas Downing:											
Mexico	do		32.02		13.61				.16		45.79
Peru	do		48.03		52.00		9.32		8.80		118.15
Argentina	do		35.07		61.98				16.50		113.55
Brazil	do		92.79		163.68		6.45		130.55		393.47
Trinidad	do		16.05		6.78				1.60		24.43
Hon. Phil Weaver:											
Mexico	do		48.03		38.99				16.00		103.02
Peru	do		30.84		18.08		6.80		10.26		65.98
Argentina	do		35.07		18.07		1.20		13.68		68.02
Brazil	do		96.38		213.98		3.22		33.08		346.66
Trinidad	do		16.04		21.00		5.00		1.60		43.64
Total			1,266.91		1,549.90		1,768.63		650.24		5,235.68

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee.			369.32		252.81		1,315.83		109.51		2,047.47
Total			369.32		252.81		1,315.83		109.51		2,017.47

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	2,047.47

William L. Dawson,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

March 5, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Robert P. Griffin:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	135.70	33.93	105.00	26.25	45.00	11.25	48.30	12.08	334.00	83.51
Denmark	Kroner	161.00	23.30	97.00	14.04	151.19	22.02	47.00	6.80	457.19	66.16
U.S.S.R.	do	831.74	120.35	150.00	21.70	68.00	9.84	82.00	11.87	1,131.74	163.76
Poland	Zloty	295.00	12.30	419.00	17.46	2,577.00	107.38	380.00	15.83	3,671.00	152.97
do	Kroner	76.37	11.05	120.40	17.42					196.77	28.47
Austria	Schilling	2,094.00	80.62	1,370.00	52.74	2,224.82	85.66	603.57	23.24	6,292.39	242.26
Spain	Peseta	3,988.00	66.47	5,150.00	85.83	10,699.00	178.32	1,766.00	29.43	21,603.00	360.05
Portugal	Escudo	607.00	21.30	495.00	17.37	190.00	6.66	292.50	10.26	1,584.50	55.59
Total			369.32		252.81		421.13		109.51		1,152.77

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,152.77

MARCH 5, 1963.

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mr. Albion Ross (American citizen presently residing in Beirut, Lebanon) c/o American Embassy, Beirut, Lebanon							894.70				894.70
(Mr. Albion Ross was summoned in April 1962, through the American Embassy, Beirut, Lebanon, to come to Washington, D.C., to appear before the Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee for pertinent testimony. Arrangements were made through the Secretary of State, Washington, D.C., for round-trip economy jet air transportation be purchased from 19FT561 funds for this purpose, pursuant to the provisions of Section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act, as amended.)											

RECAPITULATION:

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	894.70

MARCH 5, 1963.

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Oren Harris:											
France	Franc		48.00		36.54		11.75		5.75		102.04
Germany	Deutsche mark		27.50		46.00		17.55		7.75		98.80
England	Pound		58.80		38.87		50.46		6.00		154.13
Total			134.30		121.41		79.76		19.50		354.97
Walter Rogers:											
France	Franc		290.00		120.00		80.00		30.00		520.00
Italy	Lira		101.06		114.10		106.36		32.60		354.12
England	Pound		140.00		112.00		50.40		28.00		330.40
Total			531.06		346.10		236.76		90.60		1,204.52
William L. Springer:											
France	New franc		20.40		22.84						43.24
Switzerland	Franc		32.48		32.58						65.06
Germany	Deutsche mark		29.00		32.14						61.14
Total			81.88		87.56						169.44

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Peter F. Mack:											
France	Franc		56.05		44.20		64.22		39.61		204.08
Italy	Lira		76.25		93.70		195.33		71.59		436.87
Austria	Shilling		55.00		57.21		58.36		24.29		194.86
Total			187.30		195.11		317.91		135.49		835.81
Milton W. Glenn:											
England	Pound		126.00		98.00		28.00		28.00		280.00
Germany	Deutsche mark		100.00		125.00		12.50		12.50		250.00
Italy	Lira		150.00		80.00		26.00		16.00		272.00
Spain	Peseta		90.00		140.00		50.00		25.00		305.00
Greece	Drachma		66.00		66.00		13.00		20.00		165.00
Total			532.00		509.00		129.50		101.50		1,272.00
Morgan Moulder:											
Colombia	Peso		295.00		285.49		60.40		28.00		668.89
Mexico	do		288.20		276.12		65.00		21.00		650.32
Total			583.20		561.61		125.40		49.00		1,319.21
James C. Healey:											
France	Franc		437.00		63.94		138.00		21.00		659.94
Germany	Deutsche mark		75.00		124.94				50.00		249.94
Total			512.00		188.88		138.00		71.00		909.88
Hastings, Keith:											
Mexico	Peso		15.00		20.00						35.00
Peru	Sol								76.49		76.49
Total			15.00		20.00				76.49		111.49
Samuel L. Devine:											
Italy	Lira				47.50		17.00		16.00		80.50
Spain	Peseta				42.00		27.00		23.00		92.00
Total					89.50		44.00		39.00		172.50
W. E. Williamson:											
France	Franc		72.00		103.50		16.50		12.08		204.08
Germany	Deutsche mark		27.50		39.26		8.75		8.15		83.66
England	Pound		58.80		48.40		7.80		11.00		126.00
Total			158.30		191.16		33.05		31.23		413.64
Andrew Stevenson:											
Japan	Yen		107.40		12.35		31.57		8.40		159.72
Hong Kong	Dollar		52.26		15.42		6.84		4.02		78.54
Philippines	Peso		6.67		7.10		2.57		3.33		19.67
Australia	Pound		143.66		71.55		25.31		6.98		247.50
Total											
Andrew Stevenson:											
Thailand	Baht		29.24		6.83		6.78		4.12		46.97
India	Rupee		44.52		7.14		7.77		2.52		61.95
Lebanon	Pound		37.95		12.54		4.95		2.97		58.41
Jordan	do		8.68		1.12		13.72		4.48		28.00
United Arab Republic	do		19.32		3.68		12.65		3.45		39.10
France	Franc		54.59		16.74		13.67		10.61		95.61
Spain	Peseta		65.95		33.38		21.18		13.80		134.71
Total			570.24		187.85		147.41		64.68		970.18
Torbert H. Macdonald:											
Australia	Pound		205.00		150.95		46.00		15.00		416.95
Hong Kong	Dollar		130.00		154.18		61.00		14.00		359.18
Indonesia	Rupiah		30.00		15.11		6.00				51.11
Singapore	Dollar		40.00		25.48		6.00				71.48
Vietnam	Piaster		75.00		40.45		11.00				126.45
Total			480.00		386.17		130.00		29.00		1,025.17
Dan Rostenkowski:											
Australia	Pound		140.00		105.00		28.00		5.64		278.64
Hong Kong	Dollar		80.00		60.00		20.00		15.46		175.46
Indonesia	Rupiah		24.00		20.00		4.00		3.00		51.00
Singapore	Dollar		18.00		15.00		7.00		4.76		44.76
Vietnam	Piaster		75.00		40.00		7.00		4.45		126.45
Total			337.00		240.00		66.00		33.31		676.31

MARCH 8, 1963.

OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Francis E. Walter:											
United Kingdom	Pound	34-6	96.04	38/4	106.96	10/9	29.26	9-0	25.20	91-19	257.46
France	New franc					4,991.40	1,018.66			4,991.40	1,018.66
Switzerland	Franc	696.20	163.80	994.24	222.17	249.56	58.72	210	49.41	2,100	494.10
Walter M. Besterman:											
United Kingdom	Ponnd	34-18	97.72	28/2	78.68			7/0	19.60	70-0	196.00
France	New franc	893	178.60	741	148.20	5,645.30	1,129.06	185	37.00	7,464.30	1,492.86
Switzerland	Franc	571	134.40	418	98.40	272	64.00	136	32.00	1,397	328.80
Hon. Michael A. Feighan:											
Japan	Yen	41,254	114.60	42,999	119.44	9,547	26.52	5,987	16.63	99,787	277.19
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,280	32.00	1,208	30.20			598	14.95	3,086	77.15
Manila	Peso	38	9.50	274.40	68.60	20	5.00	91.60	22.09	424	106.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	817.20	143.36	787.70	138.20	208.60	36.60	109.85	19.27	1,923.35	337.43
Thailand	Baht	310.70	15.05	296.95	14.38	900	43.57	306.35	14.85	1,814	87.85
India	Rupee	418.50	83.70	86	17.20	122.50	24.50	60	12.00	687	137.40
Turkey	Lira	253.75	28.20	233.98	25.98	49.65	5.52	109.80	12.20	647	71.90
Italy	do	41,024	66.05	56,575	91.10	12,141	19.55	13,630	21.96	123,360	198.65
Germany	Deutsche mark	341.91	85.48	338.89	84.72	88	22.00	98.20	24.55	867	216.75
Spain	Peseta	2,335.20	38.92	3,157.20	52.63	600	10.00	1,200	20.00	7,292.40	121.55
Portugal	Escudo	2,096.40	73.30	1,573	55.00	1,327	46.40	620.60	21.70	5,617	196.40
Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.:											
Switzerland [1]	Franc	420	97.19	448	103.77	110	25.45	22	5.01	1,000	231.42
Do	Deutsche mark					4,035.89	[1] 1,011.50			4,035.89	1,011.50
Hon. Byron G. Rogers:											
France	New franc	350	71.40	368	75.08	112	22.85	22	4.49	850	173.82
Belgium	Franc	4,200	84.45	495	99.50	550	11.00	300	6.19	10,000	201.14
Germany	Deutsche mark	340	84.96	364	91.00	50	12.50	46	11.48	800	199.94
Italy	Lira	40,000	64.00	50,500	81.00	15,000	24.00	7,500	12.00	112,500	181.00
Hon. Frank Chelf:											
France	New franc	159	31.80	66	13.20			25	5.00	250	50.00
Netherlands	Guilder					3,932.76	1,093.00			3,932.76	1,093.00
Switzerland	Franc	626.80	147.24	765.50	179.80	888	209.00	238	56.00	2,518	592.04
Italy	Lira	81,351	131.00	58,374	94.00			15,525	25.00	155,250	250.00
Hon. George Meader:											
Austria	Schilling	1,964	76.20	2,830	109.80	1,933	75.00	773	30.00	7,500	291.00
France	New franc	116.20	23.24	108.80	21.76			25	5.00	250	50.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	250	62.50	312	78.00	137	34.50	80	20.00	780	195.00
Netherlands	Guilder					19,321	532.00			1,913.21	532.00
Switzerland	Franc	462.19	108.75	538.26	126.65	529.55	124.60	170	40.00	1,700	400.00
							[3] 300				300
Hon. James F. Battin:											
France	New franc					4,996.90	1,019.78			4,996.90	1,019.78
Switzerland	Franc	433.50	102.00	140.25	33.00			63.75	15.00	637.50	150
Miss Ruth Miskell:											
Netherlands	Guilder					3,971.13	1,102.40			3,971.13	1,102.40
France	New franc	163	32.60	207	41.40	80	16.00	50	10.00	500	100.00
Switzerland	Franc	325.57	76.60	110.50	26.00	100.18	23.57	63.75	15.00	600	141.17
Italy	Lira	72,036	116.00	67,689	109.00			15,525	25.00	155,250	250.00
Hon. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.:											
Belgium Holland	Franc	4,200	84.45	4,900	98.54	600	12.09	300	6.04	10,000	201.12
Germany	Deutsche mark	340	84.96	360	89.98	56	14.00	44	11.00	800	199.94
Greece	Drachma	1,350	45.01	1,500	50.02	540	18.00	310	10.30	3,700	123.33
Italy	Lira	100,000	161.03	120,000	193.24	52,260	84.18	23,150	37.32	295,410	475.77
Spain	Peseta	3,000	50.03	3,600	60.03	1,500	25.01	1,200	20.00	9,300	155.07
Portugal	Escudo	1,500	52.45	2,000	69.95	500	17.48	220	7.70	4,220	147.58
Do	Lira					70,000	[2] 112.72			70,000	112.72
Do	Franc					4,373.20	[2] 892.49			4,373.20	892.49
Charles J. Zinn:											
Italy	Lira	31,550	50.50	24,400	39.00	7,810	12.50	6,240	10.00	70,000	112.00
Germany	Duetsche mark					4,392.19	1,100.80			4,392.19	1,100.80
Hon. Francis E. Walter:											
France	New franc	178	35.60	192	38.40	80	16.00	50	10.00	500	100.00
Netherlands	Guilder					4,517.24	1,259.90			4,517.24	1,259.90
Switzerland	Franc	555.90	130.80	845.07	198.84	796.49	187.41	212.50	50.00	2410	567.05
Italy	Lira	91,163	146.80	48,562	78.20			15,525	25.00	155,250	250.00
Walter M. Besterman:											
France	New franc	1,175.90	235.18	1,144.10	228.82	380	76.00	300	60.00	3,000	600.00
Netherlands	Guilder					4,184.25	1,161.60			4,184.25	1,161.60
Italy	Lira	86,071	138.60	3,132.32	[4] 504.40	340,929	[4] 549.00	80,730	130.00	820,962	1,322.00
Switzerland	Franc	649.66	152.86	779.74	183.47	192.10	45.20	178.50	42.00	1,800	423.53
Hon. Roland V. Libonati:											
Germany	Deutsche mark			1,097.25	275.00	305.23	76.50	240.04	60.16	1,642.52	411.66
France Switzerland	Franc do			327.07	66.75	173.95	35.50	267.20	54.53	768.22	156.78
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.			448.23	78.50	236.68	41.45	110.89	19.42	795.80	139.37
Thailand	Baht			948.67	45.50	625.50	30.00	490.81	23.54	2,064.98	99.04
Vietnam	Piaster			5,566.90	76.50	1,523.81	20.94	2,909.35	39.98	10,000.06	137.42
Total			4,038.92		5,009.96		13,965.28		1,266.37		24,280.53

---

[1] Invited as congressional observer to Geneva Disarmament Conference.

[2] Air passage from United States and return.

[3] Approximate cost of return transportation. Exact figure and foreign currency not immediately available.

[4] Including expenses for transportation and meals for self, committee members and other staff members.

Emanuel Celler,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

March 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John D. Dingell, Bimini, The Bahamas. (Per diem in lieu of actual expenses, $192.00.)	Dollar						207.06				399.06

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: H. Res. 99, 87th Cong.	$399.06

H. C. Bonner,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

March 5, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Dec. 24 and 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John D. Dingell, Bimini, The Bahamas. (Per diem in lieu of actual expenses, $192.00.)	Dollar						207.06				399.06

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: H. Res. 99, 87th Cong.	$399.00

John D. Dingell,
Acting Chairman, Subcommittee on Oceanography, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

March 4, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Public Works, U.S. House of Representatives

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Frank E. Smith:											
France	Franc	545	111.09	272	55.45	410	83.57	103	21.01	1,330	271.12
United Kingdom	Pound	33/6	93.87	26/4	73.81	28/7	79.90	12/3	34.26	100/0	281.84
T. A. Thompson:											
Spain	Peseta	12,140	202.33	14,270	237.84	23,800	396.67	8,870	147.84	59,080	984.68
Italy	Lire	143,575	231.20	97,310	156.70	59,802	96.30	59,915	96.48	360,602	580.68
France	Franc	985	201.03	695	141.84	910	185.73	172.08	35.10	2,762.08	563.70
United Kingdom	Pound	97/0	272.57	45/0	126.45	308/12/6	866.73	34/2	95.82	484/14/6	1,361.57
Richard J. Sullivan: Spain	Pestea	2,700	45.00	4,860	81.00	12,200	203.70	5,440	90.66	25,200	420.36
	Deutsche mark [1]					3,902	975.50			3,902	975.50
Joseph R. Brennan: Spain	Pestea	7,837	130.62	10,200	170.00	20,650	344.17	2,963	49.38	41,650	694.17
Clifton W. Enfield: Spain	do	7,924.50	132.08	9,765.50	162.76	20,525	342.00	3,310	55.17	41,525	692.01
Total			1,419.79		1,205.85		3,574.27		625.72		6,825.63

---

[1] Transportation paid in German currency.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$6,825.63

Charles A. Buckley,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

March 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Victor L. Anfuso:											
Portugal	Escudo	2,657.20	92.80	1,227	43.82	787	28.10	286.30	10.00	4,957.50	174.72
Spain	Peseta	12,730	212.20	6,850	114.26	1.920	32.00	1,800	30.00	23,300	388.46
Italy (transportation)	Lira	243,760	392.60	139,500	225.00	315,055	507.33	16,740	27.00	715,055	1,151.93
Netherlands	Guilder					837.31	233.00			837.31	233.00
Total			697.60		383.08		800.43		67.00		1,948.11

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Corinne Riley:											
Great Britain	Pound	18	50.40	6	16.80	21	58.80	6	16.80	30	142.80
France	New franc	458	91.60	190	38.70	120	24.50	87	17.70	855	172.50
West Germany	Deutsche mark	183	45.75	100	25.60			168	40.50	450	111.25
Austria	Schilling	3,411	137.00	1,300	52.00	909	35.36	1,163	47.00	6,783	271.36
Italy	Lira	65,000	105.00	24,490	39.00	74,300	112.50	30,380	49.00	119,870	305.50
Spain	Peseta	472	8.00	720	12.00			600	10.00	1,792	30.00
Bermuda (transportation)	Pound	35	98.00	9	25.20			9	25.20	53	148.40
Netherlands	Guilder					4,317.95	1,201.43			4,317.95	1,201.43
Total			535.75		208.70		1,432.59		206.20		2,383.24
Raymond Wilcove:											
Great Britain	Pound	17	47.60	7	19.60			6	16.80	30	84.00
France	New franc	458	91.60	190	38.70	120	24.50	87	17.70	855	172.80
West Germany	Mark	183	45.75	100	25.60			168	40.50	450	115.50
Austria	Schilling	3,410	136.00	1,300	52.00			1,162	46.00	5,872	234.00
Italy	Lira	65,000	105.00	24,490	40.00			30,380	49.00	119,870	194.00
Spain	Peseta	472	8.00	720	12.00			600	10.00	1,792	30.00
Bermuda (transportation)	Pound	35	99.00	9	25.20			9	25.20	53	148.40
Netherlands	Guilder					4,317.95	1,201.43			4,317.95	1,201.43
Total			532.95		213.10		1,225.93		205.20		2,177.18
Charles F. Ducander:											
Austria	Austrian schilling.	3,003	116.79	1,525	59.32	800	31.12	552	21.40		
Greece	Drachma	248	8.27	150	5.00	52	1.73	0	0	450	15.00
Italy	Lira	30,100	48.47	28,600	46.05	12,200	19.65	1,200	1.93	72,100	116.10
France	New franc	542	110.62	405	82.66	117	23.88	186	37.96	1,250	255.12
England (transportation)	Pound	25-0-0	70.01	16-0-0	44.80	6-0-0	16.80	2-0-0	5.60	49-0-0	137.21
Germany	Deutsche mark					5,154.80	1,288.70			5,154.80	1,288.70
Total			354.16		237.83		1,381.88		66.89		2,040.76
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.:											
Austria	Austrian schilling.	2,965	115.28	1,552	60.35	835	32.47	508	19.75	5,860	227.85
Greece	Drachma	205	6.83	490	16.33	260	8.67	45	1.50	1,000	33.33
Italy	Lire	29,200	47.02	30,200	48.63	14,100	22.70	2,100	3.38	75.600	121.73
France	Franc	515	105.12	422	86.13	110	22.45	143	29.18	1,190	242.88
England (transportation)	Pound	25-0-0	70.01	1-60-0	44.80	4-0-0	11.20	2-10-0	7.00	47-10-00	133.01
Germany	Deutsche mark					5,154.80	1,288.70			5,154.80	1,288.70
Total			344.26		256.24		1,386.19		60.81		2,047.50
Emilio Q. Daddario:											
Italy (transportation)	Lira	218,240	352.00	119,040	192.00	49,600	80.00	21,520	34.70	408,400	658.70
France						5,438	1,109.79			5,438	1,109.79
Total			352.00		192.00		1,189.79		34.70		1,768.49
Emilio Q. Daddario:											
United Kingdom	Pound	50	140.00	25	70.00	17.7	49.80	7.3	20.20	100	280.00
France (transportation)	Franc	696	142.00	294	60.00	205.8	42.00	89.1	18.00	1,176	262.00
Germany	Deutsche mark					2,061.63	516.70				516.70
United Kingdom	Pound					38.7	107.45				107.45
Total			282.00		130.00		715.96		38.20		1,166.15
Grand total			3,098.72		1,620.95		8,132.76		679.00		13,531.43

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	13,531.43

GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics.

MARCH 9, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Horace R. Kornegay:											
France	New franc	821.25	176.78	515	110.58	9-5	1.97	120-75	27.70	1,552	317.03
Italy	Lire	58,840	94.78	75,500	120.95	46,627	75.26	9,460	15.60	190,427	306.59
Germany	Deutsche mark	386	96.17	540	135.06	72	18.14	95	23.94	1,093	273.31
Great Britain	Pound	22-3-9	62.22	25-0-0	70.00	3-10-0	9.80	3-6-3	9.28	54-0-0	151.30
The Netherlands	Dutch guilder					49.21	196.25			49.21	196.25
Total counterpart funds			429.96		436.59		301.42		76.52		1,244.48
Appropriated funds (Defense)	Dollar						305.60				305.60
Total expenditures, Mr. Kornegay.			429.96		436.59		607.02		76.52		1,550.08

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Robert F. Ellsworth:											
France	New franc	535	109.18	755	154.28	35	7.08	180	36.90	1,505	307.44
Italy	Lira	27,745	30.67	52,750	89.94	44,127	75.04	64,007	108.05	188,627	303.70
Germany	Deutsche mark	304	75.61	576	145.15	241	59.52	150	37.52	1,271	317.80
The Netherlands	Dutch guilder					49.21	196.25			49.21	196.25
Total, counterpart funds			215.46		389.37		337.89		182.47		1,125.19
Appropriated funds (Defense)	Dollar						330.40				330.40
Total expenditures, Mr. Ellsworth.			215.46		389.27		668.29		182.47		1,455.59
Billy E. Kirby:											
France	New franc	475	97.32	350	71.45			175	35.57	1,000	204.34
Italy	Lira	31,557	45.78	71,409	120.00	34,128	54.96	21,534	34.64	158,628	255.38
Germany	Deutsche mark	252	62.25	225	56.20	93	23.25	40	10.75	610	152.45
Great Britain	Pound	6—7—0	17.78	5—8—0	15.20			2/0/0	5.60	13—5—0	38.58
The Netherlands	Dutch guilder					49.21	196.25			49.21	196.25
Total counterpart funds			223.13		262.85		274.46		86.56		847.00
Appropriated funds (Defense)	Dollar						314.40				314.40
Total expenditures, Mr. Kirby			223.13		262.85		588.86		86.56		1,161.40
John R. Holden:											
France	New franc	471-75	96.41	492	100.36	90	18.45	133/25	27.32	1,157	242.54
Italy	Lira	32,259	50.94	87,467	140.00	43,500	69.46	17,902	31.22	181,128	291.62
Germany	Deutsche mark	309/88	77.51	197/12	49.17	133	33.52	30	7.26	670	167.46
Great Britain	Pound	6-14-8	18.89	6/0/0	16.80			1-5-4	3.59	14-0-0	39.28
The Netherlands	Dutch guilder					49.21	196.25			49.21	196.25
Total counterpart funds			243.75		306.33		317.68		69.39		937.15
Appropriated funds (Defense)	Dollar						314.40				314.40
Total expenditures, Mr. Holden			243.75		306.33		632.08		69.39		1,251.55
Total			1,112.29		1,395.14		2,496.25		414.94		5,418.62

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$4,153.62
Appropriated funds: Department of Defense	1,264.80
Total	5,418.62

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

FEBRUARY 27, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Ways and Means, U.S. House of Representatives, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hon. Herman T. Schneebeli:											
Belgium	Franc	2,400	48.00	2,000	40.00			660	13.20	5,060	101.20
England	Pound	30.7	85.00	14.6	40.00	3.12	10.00	3	8.50	51.5	143.50
Total			133.00		80.00		10.00		21.70		244.70

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$244.70

W. D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

FEBRUARY 20, 1963.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

524. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

525. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the 1962 Report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, U.S. Department of Agriculture, pursuant to the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

526. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the appointment, promotion, separation, and retirement of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

527. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the U.S. Study Commission on the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe, San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River Basins and intervening areas, State of Texas; to the Committee on Government Operations.

528. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected purchase orders issued by Sandia Corp., Albuquerque,

N. Mex., under contract AT(29-1)-789 with the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

529. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the annual report of the activities of the U.S. General Accounting Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act of June 10, 1921; to the Committee on Government Operations.

530. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to improve the administration of transfers and conveyances of certain real property for various public uses, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

531. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

532. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

533. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28, for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

534. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 383); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

535. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 3 of the act of July 21, 1961 (75 Stat. 216, 217); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

536. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

537. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which this Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification under the act, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

538. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in section 212(d)(3) was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 7, 1963, the following bills were reported on March 8, 1963:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 682. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties; without amendment (Rept. No. 74). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1933. A bill to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration; without amendment (Rept. No. 75). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1935. A bill to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 76). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1937. A bill to amend the act known as the "Life Insurance Act" of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the "Fire and Casualty Act" of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940; without amendment (Rept. No. 77). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 1982. A bill to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved; without amendment (Rept. No. 78). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 2485. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 79). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 6, 1963, the following resolutions and bills were reported on March 8, 1963:

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 287. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2438, a bill, to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 80). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 288. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2440, a bill, to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 81). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 39. A bill to amend the act of June 4, 1948, as it relates to the appointment of the District of Columbia Armory Board; with amendment (Rept. No. 82). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 3537. A bill to increase the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 83). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted March 11, 1963]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 131. A bill to provide for the renewal of certain municipal, domestic, and industrial water supply contracts entered into under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 3872. A bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 86). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 234. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; without amendment (Rept. No. 85). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 4696. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 4697. A bill to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1171), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4698. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Old Ninety-six Star Fort National Monument in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 4699. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $2,400 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4700. A bill to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4701. A bill to provide for strengthening and improving the national transportation system and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4702. A bill to establish a uniform system of time standards and time measurement for the United States and to require the observance of such time standards for all purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 4703. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 4704. A bill to establish a basic workweek of 35 hours for Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 4705. A bill to amend the provisions of law relating to the disposition of surplus real property for park and recreational area, historic monument, and fish and wildlife conservation purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 4706. A bill to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

H.R. 4707. A bill to designate the Veterans' Administration hospital at Martinez, Calif., as the Charles C. McGonegal Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4708. A bill to amend section 18 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide free transportation on any railroad carrier subject to that act for individuals receiving pensions or annuities under that act, and for their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 4709. A bill to provide assistance to certain States bordering the Mississippi River in the construction of the Great River Road; to the Committee on Public Works:

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 4710. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that service of a veteran in any campaign or expedition involving armed conflict shall be considered wartime service for the purposes of all laws granting benefits to veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 4711. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that Parkinson's disease developing a 10-percent degree of disability after separation from the service shall be considered to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 4712. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain land within the National Capital Parks System in Washington, D.C., for construction of a building by the Bureau of Water Resources of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4713. A bill to amend section 103, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4714. A bill to amend section 207, title 31, of the District of Columbia Code of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4715. A bill to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 4716. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4717. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the admission of the State of Indiana to the United States to be celebrated in 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4718. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside income which a blind individual may earn without suffering deductions from his or her benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4719. A bill to amend titles X and XVI of the Social Security Act to prohibit any State from imposing a lien on a blind individual's property as a condition of aid or assistance thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 4720. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4721. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide, for individuals who have spent substantially all of their working lives in one trade or industry, a more realistic definition of "disability" for purposes of entitlement to disability insurance benefits and the disability freeze; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 4722. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4723. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system (subject to an election in the case of those currently serving) for all officers and employees of the United States and its instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4724. A bill to amend the Social Security and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a fully insured individual may elect to have any employment or self-employment performed by him after attaining age 65 excluded (for both tax and benefit purposes) from coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4725. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who has attained age 65 or is blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4726. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 4727. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer or dependent taking advanced training in a Reserve Officers' Training Corps; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 4728. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4729. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the admission of the State of Indiana to the United States to be celebrated in 1966; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 4730. A bill establishing a presumption of death where an individual is shown to have been near the site of a nuclear explosion in time of war and no evidence of his existence has been found or received for at least 1 year after such explosion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 4731. A bill to amend section 402(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACDONALD (by request):

H.R. 4732. A bill to change the name of the U.S. Olympic Association to the U.S. Olympic Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEDZI:

H.R. 4733. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 4734. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 4735. A bill to permit Federal employees to purchase shares of Federal or State chartered credit unions through voluntary payroll allotment; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 4736. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 4737. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to provide special career incentive payments for enlisted members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4738. A bill to amend chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, providing for quarters allowances when husband and wife are members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4739. A bill to amend section 406 of title 37, United States Code, with regard to the advance movement of dependents and baggage and household effects of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 4740. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4741. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the admission of the State of Indiana to the United States to be celebrated in 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4742. A bill appropriating the sum of $4,647,467.67 to satisfy the final decree of the Indian Claims Commission against the United States in favor of the Miami Tribe; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 4743. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain land within the National Capital Parks System in Washington, D.C., for construction of a building by the Bureau of Water Resources of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 4744. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 4745. A bill to establish on a 1-year emergency basis a program of incentive payments to dairy farmers who voluntarily reduce their milk production below their 1962 production levels; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 4746. A bill to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide for the admission of certain evidence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4747. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4748. A bill to amend chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period within which certain ministers, members of religious orders, and Christian Science practitioners may elect coverage under the old age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4749. A bill to establish legislative standards for the guidance of Members of Congress and to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress thereby; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 4750. A bill to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.J. Res. 314. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.J. Res. 315. Joint resolution establishing a commission to participate in the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 316. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States pertaining to the offering of prayers in public schools and other public places in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 317. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 318. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Cuban Refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.J. Res. 319. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.J. Res. 320. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.J. Res. 321. Joint resolution establishing a commission to participate in the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Gettysburg and the 100th anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of a Spanish edition of "Infant Care"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution providing for the annual observance of the Liberty Bell anniversary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 289. Resolution creating a nonlegislative select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the aged and aging; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 290. Resolution calling upon the Organization of American States and the United Nations to join the United States in demanding the Soviet Union to remove its armed forces from Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, relative to the so-called right-to-work laws of the respective States of this Union; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, to provide financial relief either through amending Public Law 81–874 or direct grants to the Fort Pierre Independent School District, Stanley County, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, to allow singing at Mount Rushmore by nonprofessional student workers and to remove the restrictions imposed in 1962 which caused this to cease; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, urging the construction of the Crazy Horse Memorial near Custer, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON: Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, a joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to limiting and reducing the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIBONATI: Memorial of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, Senate Joint Resolution 4, proposing an amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REIFEL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal statutes in order to provide for payments in lieu of property taxes imposed on land prior to acquisition by the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and Wildlife Agency; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, requesting the Congress of the United States of America to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the appointment of electors of the President and Vice President on a basis similar to the election of the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing Congress to take all necessary steps in promoting the sale of grain and to guarantee continuing access of U.S. wheat to the Common Market countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the promotion of State commercial fishery research and development projects; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualification of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to give early consideration to the continued investigation and construction of the Mountain Home division, Snake River project, Guffey plan of development; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment for a national debt limit of $350 billion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to outlaw the poll tax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal statutes in order to provide for payments in lieu of property taxes imposed on land prior to acquisition by the Federal Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and Wildlife Agency; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to making Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 4751. A bill for the relief of Dr. Louis van den Berghe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 4752. A bill for the relief of Reni Vardalos Skoufis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4753. A bill for the relief of Theodora Vlahakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4754. A bill for the relief of Mehmet Ozguler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4755. A bill for the relief of Azizeh Abdallah Ayoub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.R. 4756. A bill for the relief of Jesse J. Locke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 4757. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Basile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 4758. A bill for the relief of George A. Grabert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 4759. A bill for the relief of W. V. Grimes, James A. Powell, and Frank Groves; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H.R. 4760. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Mary Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4761. A bill for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4762. A bill for the relief of Loreto and Giuseppina Puccia and their two minor children, Carmelo and Lucia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4763. A bill for the relief of Louisa Victoria Arledge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 4764. A bill for the relief of Gabriela C. Arnold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 4765. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to quitclaim certain property in Jackson County, Ala., to Skyline Churches Cemetery, a corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 4766. A bill for the relief of the Boren Clay Products Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 4767. A bill for the relief of Hee-Sa Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4768. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Reskin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 4769. A bill for the relief of Maria Loncaric; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4770. A bill for the relief of Efstahia Giannos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4771. A bill for the relief of Yonah Maabari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 4772. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tao Ping Li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 4773. A bill for the relief of referee in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

63. By Mr. HANNA: Petition of the (1) Committee for the Monroe Doctrine and (2) Liesure World Democratic Club; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

64. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to employers making income tax deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Secretary Dillon Emphasizes Small Business Provisions of President's Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I am deeply interested in the effect of the President's tax proposals on the small business segment of our economy. Tax reductions and revisions which are of benefit to small business are long overdue.

The Treasury Department has submitted to me as chairman of the House Small Business Committee a memorandum which summarizes the principal points in the President's tax program, which affect small business. It appears that the benefits to small business under the proposed program will be extensive.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Dillon's letter and the Treasury Department's memorandum be reprinted in the RECORD.

The letter and memorandum follow:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, March 11, 1963.

HON. JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman, House Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing pursuant to your request a memorandum which summarizes the principal points in the President's tax program which affect small business. Since small business plays a part in virtually every segment of the economy, all the proposals in the President's program may have some direct or indirect effect, but I believe the memorandum covers the major provisions and provides a good starting point for those interested in the impact of the program on small business.

I understand that John E. Horne, Administrator, Small Business Administration, will shortly submit a more detailed analysis of the proposal as it affects small business to the Committee on Ways and Means. This statement, when it is released, may also be of use to you and the committee.

Sincerely yours,
DOUGLAS DILLON.

The 4½ million small business enterprises in the United States are very important to the economy. They account for about 95 percent of all business organizations, employ about 30 million people, and are responsible for about 40 percent of total business volume.

President Kennedy's proposed tax program would benefit small business directly in a number of ways. The most important one is lower taxes. Under the program small business enterprises, whether they are corporations, partnerships or sole proprietorships, will enjoy substantial rate reduction.

Corporate income tax rates for companies with a net income of $25,000 or less will be reduced this year from 30 to 22 percent. In 1963, corporations with taxable incomes of $25,000 or less will get reductions of about 27 percent, compared with reductions of about 10 percent at $50,000 and 4 percent at $100,000.

The overall reduction in corporation tax rates will be proportionately larger for small companies. Reductions in the surtax paid by large corporations will go into effect in 1964 and 1965. But even when all three steps of the corporate tax cut are in effect, the tax reduction for small companies would be greatest. The reduction for companies with profits of $25,000 or less would amount to about 27 percent; for those earning $100,000 to $1 million, it would amount to about 11 percent; and for those earning more than $1 million annually, it would be about 10 percent. For the 467,500 corporations with incomes of $25,000 or less, the annual tax saving would total about $233 million.

Small business will also benefit directly from the individual income tax rate cuts, which will average considerably more than 20 percent. The reductions will be made over a 3-year period and will scale down the present range of 20 to 91 percent to a range of 14 to 65 percent. These rate cuts will help particularly the millions of individual proprietors and partners whose main, and sometimes only, source of income is from a business.

The tax program will also benefit small business indirectly in a number of ways. The reductions in individual tax rates will release a large volume of additional consumer purchasing power. More than 90 percent of the tax reduction will quickly find its way into consumer buying, boosting retail sales and, then, in turn, wholesalers' and manufacturers' sales. The resulting improvement in the business climate and confidence should be an important factor in sustaining an expanding economy.

The corporate and individual tax cuts would result in higher after-tax profits and retained earnings. The tax program will thus help remove one of the most persistent deterrents to the growth of small business—a lack of adequate capital. Because of their inability to obtain conventional long-term financing for expansion and modernization, small businesses are forced to rely on clostly short-term credit, which they must continually refinance, to supplement their limited internally generated funds. Tax reduction would increase the volume of earnings which can be plowed back into small businesses to sustain their healthy growth. Tax cuts would also attract new investment to small businesses, since the profitability of such enterprises would increase. At the same time, increased profit prospects would improve their borrowing power.

Inequities which now discriminate against small business will be removed by the tax program. For example, a small business may be competing with a wholly-owned subsidiary of a large corporation; the subsidiary is a legal entity, hence able to take advantage of the benefits of the $25,000 surtax exemption. A company with a number of such wholly owned subsidiaries can reduce substantially its effective tax rate compared with enterprises that have equal income but are organized as a single corporate entity. Chains of multicorporate units are in effect paying small business tax rates, yet benefiting from economies inherent in large businesses. The new law would allow only one surtax exemption to multicorporate enterprises, and thus improve the competitive position of small enterprises.

OTHER TAX PROPOSALS THAT INFLUENCE SMALL BUSINESS INCLUDE

Income averaging: If a taxpayer's individual income in a given year should rise materially compared with previous years, he may find himself in a higher tax bracket. Under the administration's proposal, a taxpayer in this situation could average his current income with that of the past 4 years and if the current income amounts to more than 133 percent of the average, he would be allowed in effect to treat the excess over 133 percent as though it were earned over a 5-year period. Thus he would be taxed at a considerably reduced rate. Incomes of small unincorporated businesses, farmers, ranchers, writers, and artists vary widely from year to year; they would benefit especially from the averaging provision.

Cost of research and development machinery and equipment to be treated as current expense deduction: Present law requires capitalization of such assets, although other business expenses for R. & D. may now be deducted as incurred. The proposed law would allow a company to treat as a current expense deduction all expenditures for machinery and equipment used directly in research and development.

Special provisions are included in the proposal to meet the needs of some small businesses with moderate R. & D. budgets that would not otherwise qualify for the current expense treatment. For larger enterprises claiming the R. & D. deduction, equipment used only part time for research and development purposes, or used in the performance of a Federal contract, would not qualify. Under the special provisions for small business, any expenditures for equipment used directly for research and development could be expensed in an amount up to 4 percent of $500,000 of total expenditures for research and development. For purposes of the special small business provision, equipment used only part time but at least 50 percent of the time for research and development would qualify to the extent of 50 percent of its cost. Moreover, research and development equipment not used exclusively in the performance of a Federal contract would qualify. The maximum deduction under this small business provision would be limited to $20,000 annually.

The proposed changes in the tax treatment of capital gains will also directly and indirectly aid small firms. The capital gains changes include:

Rate reduction: Under the program, 30 percent of long-term capital gains of individuals, instead of the present 50 percent, is includible in taxable income. Combined with the individual tax reductions this means that capital gains would be taxed at an effective rate of 4.2 percent, instead of the present 10 percent, in the lowest bracket and progress to a maximum of 19.5 percent, instead of the present 25 percent. In addition, the corporate rate on capital gains would be reduced from 25 to 22 percent.

These reductions should increase investment in small companies as investments which are now retained solely for tax reasons become "unlocked" and as the overall tax program increases the prospects for profitable investment in small business.

Extension of the holding period: The holding period for long-term capital gains would be increased from the present 6 months to 1 year. Small business investments typically require several years to mature. This change would limit long-term capital gains to bona fide investors, rather than short-term speculators and would encourage investors to devote more funds to investment in small firms.

Taxation of capital gains at time of death or gift: Under the program, net gains on capital assets would be taxed at the time of transfer at death or by gift. This change would increase the mobility of capital by reducing the tax inducement to hold assets until death.

Since the principal estate asset of a small businessman is often his business, special provisions have been included to insure that estates will not be forced to liquidate a small business to pay a capital gains tax. The first $15,000 of gain would be excluded from tax as would the gain on any property transferred to a surviving spouse, up to a maximum of one-half the gain in the estate. These exclusions are expected completely to eliminate payment of capital gains tax upon death for all but 3 percent of those who die each year. For those who would become subject to some tax, a 5-year averaging provision would reduce the effective rate of tax on the gain and the tax could be paid in installments over a period of 10 years. Redemption of stock in the company to pay the capital gains tax would be allowed without additional tax.

Unlimited capital loss carryover: The present 5-year limitation on carryover of capital losses against capital gains and up to $1,000 of ordinary income would be eliminated. The change would especially help the small investor who may not have the portfolio diversity that would make it feasible to match capital gains and losses in only 5 years. The extension of time would mean greater opportunities to offset losses, with a tax saving, for those who make substantial investments in small business, and thus increase the supply of risk capital for such enterprises. Moreover, the unlimited capital loss carryover should encourage risk investment generally, which would benefit small business.

Just as small business stands to gain in a special way from tax reforms which encourage economic growth, it stands to lose more heavily from inaction on the tax front, which would increase the chances of an early recession or continued slack in the economy. Small business lacks the resources available to larger companies to withstand an economic downturn. Therefore, the mortality rate among small firms in a recession would be heavy. The President's 1963 tax program will make a major contribution toward providing an environment that will foster the vigorous growth of the small business sector as part of a strong and expanding economy.

Fair Housing for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on this centennial year of the Emancipation Proclamation, the city of Berkeley, in the Seventh California District which I have the privilege to represent, is facing a significant test of whether "all men are created equal," of whether "they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights."

These are, of course, promises of our Declaration of Independence; they are promises which are guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. But Berkeley, like too many cities throughout our country, is confronted with the fact that our practices do not always match our precepts, that our deeds are not always as good as our words.

On April 2, the residents of Berkeley will vote on an ordinance recommended by a distinguished and representative 18-member citizens committee, and adopted by the city council, to establish a fair housing ordinance—to establish an ordinance prohibiting discrimination in the sale, rental, or lease of housing because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

This ordinance is sound because it is designed to correct a demonstrated inequity. As the citizens committee stated in its report:

> Accumulated evidence shows that discrimination in housing within the city is widespread and general, in both rental and sale of housing.

This ordinance is sound because it stresses the moderate approach of education, conferences, conciliation, and persuasion, with only final resort to public hearings and court action.

This ordinance is sound because it does not mean that an individual must sell or rent to a minority group member because he is a member of that group. It means rather, that housing cannot be withheld only because the applicant is a member of a minority group.

Finally, this ordinance is workable on the actual experience of 10 States and 3 cities which have similar laws.

Mr. Speaker, discrimination is economically wasteful. It is dangerous to our position in the world community. It is contrary to the standards upon which this country has risen to greatness. Above all, it is morally wrong.

As President Kennedy stated it so clearly in his civil rights message last month:

> Let it be clear, in our own hearts and minds, that it is not merely because of the cold war, and not merely because of the economic waste of discrimination, that we are committed to achieving true equality of opportunity. The basic reason is because it is right.

Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Berkeley have an opportunity with this fair housing ordinance to make a major attack on the dread disease of discrimination. They have an opportunity to further insure the basic civil rights promised and guaranteed by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. They have an opportunity to practice one of the fundamental precepts of America—the equal worth of every human being regardless of his race or color.

As an advocate of home rule, as a resident of Berkeley—one of our pioneering American cities in the field of good government—and as an American citizen, I am supporting this fair housing ordinance as an important step toward true equality of opportunity.

I urge my fellow Berkeleyans to continue their great tradition of leadership in the field of social justice and approve overwhelmingly the fair housing ordinance.

Activities of the Department of State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HJALMAR C. NYGAARD

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, at another point in the RECORD today, Congressman DON L. SHORT is including in his remarks, House Joint Resolution Q–1, passed by both houses of the North Dakota State Legislature without a dissenting vote.

The resolution requests Congress to investigate and study the policymaking procedures, methods of assessing foreign developments, and personnel practices of the Department of State. In other words it calls for an investigation of the activities of the State Department as it relates to our foreign policies as they in turn affect our internal welfare.

This opinion is shared by many people in and out of the Congress, and it is hoped, therefore, that for the good of this Nation and the good of the State Department the problems can be reviewed and aired in order that there may be a complete understanding among the State Department, the Members of Congress, and the citizens of this country.

Washington Post Article Recalls Adaptation of Kipling's "On the Road to Mandalay" by Senator Ernest Gruening, of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of March 8, there was an article "United States and Burma Reach Accord on Working Road to Mandalay." Apparently this project, about which there was considerable discussion several years ago, is being reactivated.

During a hearing in May 1960, on Alaska highways before the Subcommittee on Highways of the Senate Committee on Public Works, a witness from Alaska was telling of the difficulty in getting Federal cooperation in a highway program for Alaska. The consultant the Alaskans wished to employ was being sent to Asia to cooperate in the building by the International Cooperation Administration of a road from Rangoon to Mandalay, a matter of 450 miles.

At that point Senator GRUENING said:

> I have been so touched by this foreign aid project for a road to Mandalay paid for by American dollars which recalls "On the Road to Mandalay" by Rudyard Kipling, which has been famed in verse and song, that I was tempted to bring it up to date, and if it would not be undue levity, I would like to read it at this point.

I asked Senator GRUENING "Have you composed a parody?" to which he replied "I have an adaptation." Senator COOPER of Kentucky said he would be glad to listen. Senator LONG of Hawaii suggested that the adaptation should be sung and not merely recited. But as an accompanist was not present the Senator from Alaska read the poem, which, I feel, deserves to be immortalized in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Possibly the poem should be brought up to date. Since the Administration for International Development has replaced the International Cooperation Administration, perhaps Senator GRUENING's second verse, written 2 years ago, should read "Where the AID'ers play" rather than "Where the ICA'ers play." In any event, American dollars are now being used to build this highway. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post of March 8, 1963, be inserted in the RECORD, followed by Senator GRUENING's adaptation of Kipling's verses.

There being no objection, the article and poem were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 8, 1963]

UNITED STATES AND BURMA REACH ACCORD ON WORKING ROAD TO MANDALAY

The United States and Burma yesterday announced agreement on rebuilding a part of the road to Mandalay.

Engineering studies are to begin immediately on a 42-mile stretch from north of Pegu, it is hoped that construction will start with the Burma dry season which begins in December.

Funds for the road, once the cost is determined, will come from some $28 million the United States set aside to assist the road to Mandalay as long ago as the spring of 1959.

For the past year, agreement on a go-ahead has been held up by General Ne Win's government because of differing views on which route the road should take north of Pegu and on to Pyu.

Ne Win has wanted to follow the foothills along the Sittang River valley to avoid flood dangers. The United States suspects this route would be far more costly than a route along the valley floor and bypass all the population centers along the old Road to Mandalay.

Under the agreement reached yesterday, Burma and the United States decided to confine their attention to the Rangoon-Pegu stretch and face up to their Pegu-Pyu differences at a later date. Agency for International Development officials want the Pegu-Pyu stretch to follow whichever route is found to be most economical and technically feasible.

MANDALAY—1960 (WITH APOLOGIES TO RUDYARD KIPLING)

By the old Mulmein Pagoda, lookin' eastward to the sea,
There's a Burma project settin', and I doubt it works for me.
But the White House says we've got to, and the foreign echoes say
Come you back, you Yankee dollar, come you back to Mandalay.

On the road to Mandalay,
Where the ICA'ers play,
Can't you hear their 'dozers chunkin' from Rangoon to Mandalay?
On the road to Mandalay
Just another giveaway
And the dough comes up like thunder from the good old U.S.A.

Detection and Inspection or Deception and Destruction?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, this is what the Eisenhower test ban position was in 1958 when the Geneva test ban negotiations began, any treaty would include only a ban on the kinds of testing which would be subject to detection, identification, location, and verification.

It was recognized that underground testing which produced seismic shock signals of less intensity than 4.75 on the Richter seismic scale could not be detected reliably, let alone identified as possible cheating, located and then verified by on-site inspection.

Therefore, only events of greater magnitude were to be prohibited by the treaty.

This was in accordance with President Eisenhower's declaration:

> We can have no confidence in any treaty to which the Communists are a party unless that treaty contains within itself self-enforcing mechanisms.

Notwithstanding the above, this is what the Kennedy test ban position was on August 27, 1962, when at the Geneva Conference table—the administration proposed signing a treaty that would ban all underground tests, whether or not cheating could be detected and policed in the low-yield ranges.

This is what the AEC's Director of Military Applications, Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, U.S. Army, told the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on March 7, 1963, could be developed by cheat testing in the low-yield ranges below which neither individual tests nor a whole series of them could even be detected by any seismic detection system, let alone identified or located:

First. Relatively low-yield weapons of the tactical type.

Second. Higher yield tactical weapons up to a much larger yield—by extrapolation—"almost any tactical weapon one has in mind"—with such confidence that proof testing of the weapon would not be required.

Third. Much higher yield battlefield tactical weapons by extrapolation from events as small as 1 kiloton with such confidence as not to require proof testing before safely placing the new weapons in stockpile.

Fourth. At least one-half of all tactical weapons of all yields and types of interest to the military, also with such confidence as not to require proof testing before stockpiling.

Fifth. A substantial fraction of all large-yield strategic weapons of interest, by the simple expedient of testing in underground cavities which muffle explosions down to seismic effects below the 3 kiloton threshhold of detectability by "decoupling" their shock from the surrounding earth.

Although not discussed by Betts at the hearings, U.S. Ambassador Arthur Dean at the Geneva talks has affirmed that development of the pure-fusion, neutron bomb can be carried out below the threshold of detectability. The military significance of this new weapon has been described as "equal to or greater than" development of the H-bomb. Naturally, the remaining one-half of all tactical weapons of interest which could not be tested without decoupling could be tested using the technique.

What the Kennedy administration proposes to do, even in the new draft treaty presently under preparation by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for offer to the U.S.S.R. within a few weeks, is wholly to forgo U.S. testing and advances in all such weapons categories and simply to trust the Soviets to keep their word not to test them and develop them clandestinely underground.

This is what President Kennedy said about such unpoliced test ban situations on March 2, 1962, just a few days more than a year ago:

> A nation which is refraining from tests obviously cannot match the gains of a nation conducting tests.
>
> The basic lesson of some 353 negotiating sessions at Geneva is this—that the Soviets will not agree to an effective ban on nuclear tests as long as a new series of offers and prolonged negotiations, or a new uninspected moratorium, or a new agreement without controls would enable them once again to prevent the West from testing while they prepare in secret.
>
> If all testing can be halted—then the nuclear arms race would be slowed down at last. But this must be a fully effective treaty. We know enough now about broken negotiations, secret preparations and the advantages gained from a long test series never to offer again an uninspected moratorium.

This is what President Kennedy said on March 6, 1963, last Wednesday:

> We would not accept a test ban which did not give us every insurance that we could detect a series of tests underground. That is the administration's position. We would not submit a treaty which did not provide that assurance to the U.S. Senate.

So, what is the administration's position today?

Notwithstanding what Mr. Kennedy says his administration's position is, notwithstanding Mr. Kennedy's denunciation of uninspected moratoriums, that is exactly what the administration's position is today. It is not proposing a fully effective treaty. It is proposing one full of obvious cheating holes.

This inconsistency between actual position and described position is great cause for concern. It should be quickly resolved.

Americans have a right to an answer to the test ban question:

> Detection of Soviet cheating and inspection of Soviet soil or deception by Soviet duplicity and destruction by Soviet nuclear superiority?

ABCD Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, 1963, Postmaster General J. Edward Day inaugurated a new major postal service innovation—ABCD, standing for accelerated business collections and delivery—in the Washington metropolitan area.

This new service will provide 4-hour delivery of local first-class mail in the downtown business area from Monday through Friday. By the end of this calendar year, 273 cities in this country will have the advantages of accelerated business collections and delivery service, a step forward in mail service comparable in importance to the start of free city delivery a century ago.

In launching the accelerated business collections and delivery service here in Washington, Postmaster General Day paid richly deserved credit to the architect of this innovation in mail service, Assistant Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen, by presenting him with the Post Office Department's first annual Benjamin Franklin Award.

As head of the vitally important Bureau of Operations of the Post Office Department for the past 2 years, Mr. Belen is publicly credited with an impressive record of accomplishments that have resulted in numerous major improvements of national significance in the Post Office Department. His imaginative and dynamic approach to problems that have long beset the Postal Establishment has brought about improved efficiency, lower cost, and, most important, better service. He has played a major role in developing a number of progressive programs, similar to accelerated business collections and delivery designed to maintain our postal service as the most modern and efficient in the world.

I am sure my colleagues will be interested in the tribute paid to Mr. Belen by Postmaster General Day, which follows:

EXCERPT FROM THE ADDRESS BY J. EDWARD DAY, POSTMASTER GENERAL

> Introduction of the accelerated business collections and delivery program here in the Washington area provides an ideal occasion for special recognition of the architect of this very successful program of 4-hour business mail service.
>
> It is my genuine pleasure to honor Assistant Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen as the first Post Office Department official to receive the Department's esteemed Benjamin Franklin Award.
>
> The Benjamin Franklin Award is a new top honor award of the Department reserved for officials in noncareer positions whose outstanding leadership and accomplishments have resulted in major improvements of national significance in the work of the postal service.
>
> I am rather unusual among Postmasters General, because I have never been national chairman of my party or even particularly active in politics at all. In fact, when President Kennedy announced my appointment—as the first Cabinet member ever from Southern California—he emphasized that it was not because of my very incidental past political activity but because of my management experience, in State government and in business.
>
> I was associated for a number of years with one of the largest and finest law firms in the country. After that I was a senior officer for 8 years of a giant insurance company which is the third largest private corporation in the world.
>
> And yet I can state unequivocally that I have never been surrounded with such talent as I am right now that I am serving in the Federal Government. Every day I work with Federal executives who demonstrate superb imagination, energy, good judgment and practical idealism. With few exceptions I have found that the Federal executive sees himself in context with the great complicated world we live in, he has a lively interest in new ideas and in wider horizons—and he does not take himself too seriously.
>
> Fred Belen has all these qualities. He has been Assistant Postmaster General heading the Department's key Bureau of Operations since the beginning of President Kennedy's administration and for the past 8 months he has additionally carried, with distinction, many of the responsibilities of the Office of Deputy Postmaster General.
>
> Before assuming his present post in January 1961, Mr. Belen had been counsel and chief counsel of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for 14 years and was already widely acknowledged as one of the Nation's foremost authorities on postal administration.
>
> In developing and spearheading major programs of service improvement and economy, Mr. Belen has brought imaginative new approaches to the solution of longstanding problems of the postal service. Accelerated business collections and deliveries is but one example.
>
> He has shown outstanding leadership in enlisting the cooperation of the Nation's large volume business mailers, and has demonstrated that such cooperation benefit both the mailer and the Department.
>
> He has provided expert and energetic direction to the Post Office programs of cost reduction and management improvement, giving concrete expression to the President's goals of economy and manpower utilization. He has been a major contributor at the executive level to the Department's accomplishments in holding to a minimum manpower increases in the postal service, in the reduction of Christmas temporary employees from 295,000 in 1960 to approximately one-half that number in 1962, in the return of $37 million of our Department appropriation to the Treasury in fiscal 1962, and in the Department's capacity to absorb this year $40 million of the recent postal employee pay increase.
>
> Mr. Belen first inaugurated the accelerated business collection and delivery program on a pilot basis last August 14 in his home city of Lansing, Mich.
>
> In designating Frederick C. Belen as the first official to be honored with the Benjamin Franklin Award, I am proud to recognize Mr. Belen's exceptional contributions to the operation of the postal service. I now present to him this beautiful plaque of unusual three-dimensional design featuring an inset bust of the first Postmaster General, Benjamin Franklin, and a genuine specimen of the very first postage stamp issued by the U.S. Government—in 1847.
>
> The stamp carries Benjamin Franklin's portrait—and it is interesting to note that it is a 5-cent stamp.

Classroom Teachers Medals Awarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., has singularly honored Hyde Park High School, Boston, Mass., in awarding classroom teachers medals to two of the school's staff. Miss Marie E. A'Hearn was presented with the medal for her work during the school year 1961–62, and Dr. William J. Reid, head of the history department, received his award for 1960–61.

Miss A'Hearn teaches the principles of democracy course at Hyde Park High School. She conducts her classes on the theory that participation is the key to both knowledge and citizenship. Her classes learn about democracy in practice as well as in theory. When issues of a national scope are considered, the class invites its Congressman, Hon. JAMES A. BURKE, to speak to them. On State issues the representatives to the general court are asked to come and talk. On local issues, a member of the city council discusses city matters with them.

These sessions are not the usual high school assembly talks. These are working sessions. The class invites the speaker and suggests the topics to be discussed. The guest presents his talk and then is subjected to a barrage of questions. The result is some increase in knowledge, some enlightenment on the issues and, most important, increased respect by the students for our public office holders.

Arrangements for these visits are made by the students. They choose the moderator, secretary, photographer, class hostess, and all who have anything to do with the program. The students develop questions and topics and decide who should be invited.

No student passes a principles of democracy course unless he has actually worked in a political campaign. Some students who are most reluctant to participate in practical politics become some candidate's most enthusiastic workers. Concerned about the failure of more women to participate in politics, the class contacted various persons in public life, including all the ladies in the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate, to find out why this was so. The class secretaries summarized and mimeographed the results. The pupils then discussed the issue on a Boston radio program. Under the strong guidance of Miss A'Hearn, Hyde Park students are learning that democratic government depends on effective participation.

Dr. Reid's contribution lies in a somewhat different area. The Boston public schools began teaching about the menace of communism, as well as fascism and nazism, in 1939. In 1941, the Boston schools published one of the first documents about the isms used in any school system. After the war the program was expanded.

Concerned about the fact that too many youngsters leave high school before graduation and may become easy prey to the glib teachings of others, the Boston schools, in 1954, began development of a program to increase patriotism and knowledge of our democratic republican government in grade nine. This program was instituted on an experimental basis. A committee under Dr. Reid's leadership, developed material that would help pupils to understand our government on the local, State, and national levels. It also produced a curriculum guide for the ninth grade, that would make our American boys and girls aware of the menace of communism. As the preliminary projects proved successful, the program was extended to include every ninth grade student in the Boston school system. In his position as coordinator of civic education for the Boston public schools, Dr. Reid is responsible for the effectiveness and growth of the program.

At special assemblies of the student body and the faculty, Mr. Charles J. Keelon, headmaster of Hyde Park High School, congratulated the recipients on the honor they had brought to the school by their contributions to furthering our American ideals. Assistant Superintendent of Schools Frank J. Herlihy, on behalf of the Freedoms Foundation, presented the Classroom Teachers Medal to Dr. Reid on Flag Day, 1961, and Deputy Superintendent William H. Ohrenberger awarded Miss A'Hearn her medal on October 10, 1962.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 9, 1963.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman Bruce Alger)

NEW FRONTIER PROGRAMS IGNORE TECHNOLOGY

> President Kennedy completely ignores technology in the social and welfare programs he is trying to impose on the country and therefore fails to understand they cannot work. In a major speech on the floor of the House this week I pointed out that in the programs he has submitted to Congress, the President seems to be acting on impulse rather than on any sound technical basis. I focused attention on the welfare part of the New Frontier program, which, in spite of suggestions to the contrary, is being expanded at a faster rate than most other segments of the budget, including national defense. The justification for this expansion is political rather than logical or reasonable. The New Frontier is trying to capitalize on a formula developed by the New Deal—a formula that reads (1) Many persons are in need, (2) The Nation has resources with which to meet the need, (3) The Federal Government should use the resources to meet the need.
>
> It is my contention that points 1 and 2 do not justify the conclusion implied by point 3. Technologically, no standards or criteria can be developed by which to administer Federal social welfare programs to produce the results which the administration promises when it proposes Federal financial involvement. The only reasonable way to measure the effectiveness of public services is to measure them only in terms of results achieved. In my speech I outlined where desired or promised results have fallen far short in such programs as urban renewal, area redevelopment, advancing civilian technology, and in studies in connection with Federal aid to education. In order to get some idea of the complexity of trying to impose Federal participation in the social and welfare fields, try to write a formula for Federal aid which will work and which will come within the framework of the Constitution.

EXPERT WITNESSES QUESTION PRESIDENT'S TAX PROPOSALS

> Some of the best tax minds in the Nation appeared before the Ways and Means Committee this week. The development of their testimony clearly indicates the fallacies of President Kennedy's tax proposals. The first such witness was Roswell Magill who, 25 years ago, was Under Secretary of the Treasury in Franklin Roosevelt's Cabinet. Mr. Magill's statement substantiated my own challenge to the President's tax program. He said: "President Kennedy's tax program is contradictory to its announced objectives in four basic ways. First, the investment capital incentive is penalized because consumer purchasing power is overly stressed; second, the structural reforms defeat rate cuts; third, the timing is bad, there being no immediate stimulus as intended; fourth, the budget is further imbalanced through lack of expenditure control."

CONSTRUCTIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

> Mr. Magill listed a constructive program, sensible as I see it. (1) Lower individual income tax to 50 percent for highest bracket and 16 percent in the lowest bracket; (2) Let Korean taxes expire—corporate tax drop from 52 percent to 47 percent; (3) Study structural reforms separately; (4) Lower Federal spending, balance the budget.
>
> G. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, under my cross examination developed these constructive recommendations: (1) Eliminate double taxation; (2) Eliminate capital gains tax, and redefine capital gains; (3) Relate Federal spending to income—balance the budget. These recommendations are much more likely to prevent recession, of which the President warns, than the President's recommendations.

ECONOMICS PROFESSOR HITS PROGRAM

> William H. Peterson, associate professor of economics, Graduate School of Business Administration of New York University, was more blunt: He said: "In this statement I seek to make but three points: First, to demonstrate the nonscientific and antieconomic growth deficiencies of rate progression in general. Second, to show how the President's tax proposals reflect these deficiencies and are hence self-defeating of their stated goal of economic growth. And thirdly, to give support to maximum correction at this time of the deficiencies of graduation." Professor Peterson pointed out again that the President's program is self-defeating. The steepness in individual income tax rate progression, especially when linked to the proposed 5 percent rule on itemized deductions affords virtually no tax relief to the middle and little to the upper brackets. The professor said he regards the middle and upper brackets as prime sources of America's capital formation and hence of economic growth. An amazing figure in this testimony showed that tax rate progression beyond 50 percent of taxable income yields the Treasury only about $1 billion (out of a $98 billion budget) or about enough to run the Government for 4 days. So the excessive rate is not designed to raise revenue, but to penalize and, in effect, stifles initiative or, in Professor Peterson's words, "Incentive is the thing. It accounts for enterprise and ingenuity. It is the secret of American prosperity."

REDISTRIBUTION OF INCOME HURTS OUR SYSTEM

> The theory of the social planners around President Kennedy upon whose judgement his tax proposals are based, would have us believe our free economy can best be developed by a redistributon of income (the theory of equalization). But redistribution assumes a standard of distributive justice different from the standards of our market economy. "It assumes," Peterson said, "that the market knows least and Government knows best." He then reminds us, "This democratic market system, this incentive system, is precisely the means by which we have become the richest and freest people in all the world."
>
> The only way we can insure the health of the economy is to insure the rate of capital

formation—that is, in the rate of investment. This is the theory of the Alger-Baker-Herlong bill. A number of witnesses, including Professor Peterson, believe this bill is the only fiscally feasible and responsible alternative to our present income tax structure. It stresses investment, whereas the Administration stresses current consumption. In sharp contrast to the Administration's program, it would reform the present steep schedule of rate graduation while, over a longer period of time, provide substantially as much tax relief as the Administration at the lower income tax levels. Capital formation is clearly the road to growth. There is no other way. Without capital, there will be no goods for consumers to purchase.

OVERCAPACITY RESULT OF INEFFICIENCY

The administration planners stress the overcapacity of American industry. Professor Peterson points out the administration's stress on overcapacity misses the point. The real point is not simply overcapacity, but the nature and causes of excess capacity. A careful study of all the factors shows that basically, overcapacity is a matter of inefficiency. The principal criticism of the President's proposals, brought out by many witnesses in their direct testimony and in my discussion with them under cross-examination, is the lack of confidence and knowledge of our system displayed by the President, his continued efforts to downgrade the United States. Unfortunately, the results are the President's statements of problems and legislative solutions that downgrade the system and successes of the United States.

A fine representation of Dallas and Texas was made to the site subcommittee of the Republican National Committee in an effort to get the 1964 Republican Convention in our city. The Chamber of Commerce would have been proud of the quality of the presentation. John Leedom, Peter O'Donnell, Mrs. Ike Kampmann, Harry Bass, Al Fay, Senator Tower, and Ed Foreman created a remarkable impression on the committee. All Dallas is proud of this effort to bring a meeting to our community which will result in $5 to $6 million in revenue. This presentation was in the true spirit of Dallas that our people can accomplish any job, no matter how tough or how big. It is this spirit that built our city.

Meaningful Suggestions for Action Against Cuba Short of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I reject the idea advanced by high administration officials that the only choice is to do nothing in regard to Cuba or to go to war. I believe there are a number of effective and positive alternatives. I believe further that the vast majority of Americans support these alternatives, because they know that regardless of whether there are "defensive" or "offensive" jet fighters and missiles in Cuba, it is a base for exporting of communism into the other American countries.

We cannot simply let the situation drift; all reports from our own Government and other American governments clearly show that Cuba is being used as a vast training ground for Communist agents. We need only to read the report by the Organization of American States, entitled "Subversion in the Western Hemisphere" to learn what is taking place. This report says hundreds of Latin American youths have attended Cuban training centers where they have received instructions not only in Marxist-Leninist theory, "but also in propaganda techniques, the use of arms and explosives, sabotage, guerrilla warfare, and so on."

There is danger from Cuba right now to the Governments and peoples of Venezuela, Peru, Brazil, Guatemala, and other nations. The leaders of the other American countries are far ahead of our own in seeking action against Castro. We simply cannot afford to wait until Castro's henchmen and their Kremlin-oriented brothers in arms have established themselves in Central or South America before we act.

I suggest that the following steps be given serious consideration. They are not especially original with me or with my party; they come from the Nation's responsible press, from the people, and from our friends in South and Central America who are looking and waiting for action.

Many of the following suggestions are related to the serious economic situation in Cuba and would frankly be intended to increase unrest by the people there due to the continued shortages of basic goods.

First. Close the Panama Canal to any ship trading with Cuba.

Second. Close all U.S. ports to any ship trading with Cuba.

Third. Use the pressure of cutting off foreign aid to countries whose ships trade with Cuba.

Fourth. Encourage concerted action through the Organization of American States to cut off all trade with Cuba in this hemisphere.

Fifth. Encourage OAS nations to act against Communist propaganda as recommended in the OAS report.

Sixth. Demand onsite inspection of missile sites and storage areas, the sixth of President Kennedy's requirements in his October 22, 1962, speech.

Seventh. Demand fair compensation for American property seized by Castro.

Eighth. Seize all Cuban assets in this country.

Ninth. Notify Castro that we will not permit any expansion of his form of dictatorship in this hemisphere.

Tenth. Furnish arms and training to Cubans in this country and other countries so they can aid other hemisphere governments in rejecting armed force used by Castro-trained guerrillas.

Eleventh. Recognize a Cuban Government-in-exile.

Twelfth. Demand that Russian troops leave Cuba.

Thirteenth. Reinstate the blockade or quarantine of Cuba.

The last two points are strongly supported by the American people, according to pollster Samuel Lubell, writing in the Washington Star earlier this month. Points seven, eight, and nine were suggested by the President himself during the 1960 campaign.

Other suggestions could no doubt be added to this list, for there are many ways available to put pressure on a nation when it is desired to do so. But, to repeat, it is time to do something.

President Kennedy has pledged to act when the Communist revolution is exported from Cuba to the rest of the hemisphere. Is not the time for action now?

Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology on Castro and Cuba, January 2 to January 14, 1963—Part 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, my last remarks on "Cuba in 1933" appeared in the February 21 RECORD and served as a sequel to the previous chronologies parts 1 through 10. The "Cuba in 1933" speech was to serve as part 11, preceding today's part 12. Part 11 was a kind of flashback in history and I hope a pointed reminder that our problem with the Communists in Cuba did not originate—as many seemed to feel—with the overthrow by Fidel Castro of the Batista regime in Cuba. Instead, it could be traced back to the time when the Communists failed in their efforts to subvert Germany and cast around for a more profitable base of operations from which to spread their deadly doctrine of dialectical materialism, or as some term it materialism opposed to idealism or state opposed to God. Never has there been a more materialistic doctrine preached than that of communism and never a more idealistic doctrine preached—if admittedly not always practiced to the letter by individual believers—than the Sermon on the Mount. In comparing that inspired writing with the hate motif of the Communist materialism, it is clear that something far deeper than a mere political philosophy or type of ideology is involved in the struggle between Communist and free nations of the world for the minds of men.

The beginning of the year 1963 brought disheartening reports to the American people. Instead of victory, we found containment. Instead of a relaxing of tension we found increased tension, following publication of reports that on the island of Cuba there remained, in addition to the thousands of Soviet troops described in part 10, 500 Russian antiaircraft missiles, 144 missile launchers, 24 bases at different spots on the island, 60 surface-to-surface short-range missiles, over 100 Mig jet fighters, some 3,000 antiaircraft guns, mortars, field artillery pieces, and assault guns, 350 medium and heavy tanks, 34 subchasers, and missile and motor torpedo boats, as well as 70 helicopters.

We were threatened once again by the Soviet Union with war if we made any attempts to stage provocations around Cuba. Castro displayed ground-to-air missiles during his fourth anniversary celebration in Cuba. Our President was called a vulgar pirate chief by the acknowledged pirate of all pirates. The ransom paid by American citizens and businessmen for the Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners was thrown back into our faces—not literally, but verbally—by Castro. And again the Communists—this time the Chinese Communists—proved themselves past masters at twisting facts by virtuously announcing that they strongly opposed—the sacrifice of another country's sovereignty as a means of reaching a compromise with imperialism. They accused the Soviets of 100-percent appeasement, a Munich pure and simple in withdrawing missiles from Cuba.

By this time the American people were not at all sure that our triumph was anything of the sort. Instead it began to appear what Khrushchev himself termed it, a triumph of the Soviets, in that while some 40 missiles may have been removed, the island of Cuba had been successfully turned into a bristling arsenal, and any Cubans remaining who might wish to throw off the yoke of Castro's communism would find themselves in the same predicament as the Hungarians who tried to throw off communism in Hungary.

Although on January 6 both the United States and the Soviet Union requested the United Nations to close the book on the Cuban controversy. It did not seem possible to do this. Some of the Cuban exiles even accused President Kennedy of being politically motivated in his Orange Bowl appearance on December 29 of last year. And the Cuban Government set aside 10 percent—213.7 million pesos—of its record 2 billion peso budget for 1963 for national defense and public order. While Cuba was planning to defend the Castro regime against its own unhappy citizens, our American citizens were once again digging down into their jeans to raise from $10,000 to $15,000 to pay the ransom still being demanded by Castro for uninterrupted return of Cuban invasion prisoners. And an unknown donor was rumored to have been urged successfully by Attorney General Kennedy to donate $1 million for this cause.

We then found ourselves in the peculiar position of being maneuvered at the same time into helping build a $30 million agricultural experiment station in Cuba, through the United Nations voluntary Special Fund, 40 percent which was provided by the United States. This project, approved in 1961, would allocate something over $1.1 million to the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations for a 5-year project in Cuba. Cuba was to put up $1.8 million, and the uneasy suspicion began to spread that not only were we to provide 40 percent of the aforesaid fund, but our ransom money would provide the other $1.8 million as well. The collective blood pressure of thousands of Americans began to rise, along with the number of protesting letters to congressional offices about the Cuban agricultural deal.

As in most Soviet-bloc countries, it became apparent that for some reason communism and agricultural abundance had nothing in common. Adlai Stevenson admitted that although the United States opposed this agricultural aid to Cuba, there was apparently nothing we could do about it and of the $1.2 million, the U.S. taxpayers probably would find themselves paying $480,000. However, the United Nations later postponed, although temporarily—the controversial agricultural survey project for Cuba, much to the relief of the congressional Members who had been hearing some pretty strenuous objection from the American people.

Senator KEATING, known now as the man who was right last fall about Cuba, contended that Castro was now 10 times better equipped militarily than he was last spring and stated that 20,000 troops were in Cuba, along with 144 missile launchers, 24 bases, and some 500 antiaircraft missiles.

President Kennedy stated that while a danger continued, a deadly threat has been removed from Cuba. He praised the United Nations for its value in serving the cause of peace for its use as a forum in the Cuban crisis and for its task of unification in the Congo—none of which seemed to convince a goodly segment of the American people.

A chronology follows:

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA [1]

(Jan. 2, 1963 to Jan. 31, 1963)

January 2, 1963:

An article by David Kraslow in the Miami Herald stated that "Cuba has 500 Russian antiaircraft missiles and 144 missile launchers at 24 bases ringing the island.

"The list is current and is based on what the U.S. Government believes to be solid intelligence.

"Other items include over 60 surface-to-surface short-range missiles; over 100 Mig jet fighters; some 3,000 antiaircraft guns, mortars, field artillery pieces, and assault guns; 350 medium and heavy tanks; 34 subchasers and missile and motor torpedo boats, and 70 helicopters."

January 2, 1963:

The Soviet Union's leading theorist, Mikhail Suslov, pledged today that his country would "actively resist any attempts to stage provocations around Cuba," Tass news agency reported.

Communist Party Secretary Suslov told a Moscow audience that "the forces of peace and socialism must vigilantly watch over the scrupulous observance by the United States of its commitment not to attack Cuba and to restrain its allies from doing so."

January 2, 1963:

The ground-to-air missile, not generally known to have been in Castro's possession, came into view at the tail end of an hour-long display of military hardware, part of the celebration of the bearded Prime Minister's fourth anniversary of power.

In a 90-minute anniversary speech, Castro referred briefly to the missiles, saying that "today, the first ground-to-air rocket artillery crews in training have paraded past here."

He said the rockets would be used to keep Cuban airspace free of intruders.

Castro assailed President Kennedy as a "vulgar pirate chief," and claimed he forced Washington to pay indemnity for the release of Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners who were liberated for $53 million worth of food and drugs sorely needed by the Cuban regime.

"They call it ransom, but the fact is that they had to accept the payment of indemnifications. For the first time in its history, imperialism paid an indemnification of war."

Castro repeated his demand that the United States get out of its Guantanamo Bay Naval Base at the eastern tip of Cuba, but he did not intimate that any other than legal means would be employed to oust the United States.

The Prime Minister also repeated that Cuba would never accept inspection on its soil to verify the removal of land-based offensive Soviet missiles, as the United States has demanded. He made no criticism of Moscow for the withdrawal of the missiles and jet bombers, but stressed Cuba's sovereignty.

January 2, 1963:

An editorial in the Peking People's Daily stated that "Those who accuse China of opposing peaceful coexistence also attack the Chinese people for supporting the just stand of the Cuban people in their struggle against U.S. imperialism. When the heroic Cuban people and their revolutionary leader Premier Fidel Castro resolutely rejected international inspection as an infringement on Cuba's sovereignty and advanced their five just demands, the Chinese people held gigantic mass demonstrations and parades throughout the country in accordance with their consistent stand for proletarian internationalism, and firmly support the Cuban people's struggle in defense of their independence, sovereignty, and dignity.

"How can one possibly interpret the resolute support which the Chinese people gave to the Cuban people in their struggle against international inspection and in defense of their sovereignty as meaning that China was opposed to peaceful coexistence or wanted to plunge others into a thermonuclear war? On more than one occasion we have made it clear that we neither called for the establishment of missile bases in Cuba nor obstructed the withdrawal of the so-called offensive weapons from Cuba. We have never considered that it was a Marxist-Leninist attitude to brandish nuclear weapons as a way of settling international disputes. Nor have we ever considered that the avoidance of a thermonuclear war in the Caribbean crisis was a 'Munich.' What we did strongly oppose, still strongly oppose, and will strongly oppose in the future is the sacrifice of another country's sovereignty as a means of reaching a compromise with imperialism. A compromise of this sort can only be regarded as 100 percent appeasement, a 'Munich' pure and simple. A compromise of this sort has nothing in common with the policy of peaceful coexistence of the socialist countries."

January 4, 1963:

A split within the Cuban invasion brigade broke into the open today with charges by one of its members that the liberated prisoners were being used as political fodder.

The charges revealed for the first time that 100 prisoners boycotted President Kennedy's Orange Bowl appearance on December 29.

Enrique Llaca, Jr., one of the invaders recently released from Castro's prisons, singled out Manuel Artime, civilian commander of Brigade 2506, and Joe Miro Cardona, head of the exile Cuban Revolutionary Council, for criticism.

"They are using the brigade for their personal benefit," declared Llaca, 27-year-old former Cuban attorney. Both Artime and Miro Cardona denied it.

---

[1] Unless otherwise stated excerpted from the Washington Post and the Washington Star; reproduced with the permission of the Washington Post and Washington Star.

Llaca attacked President Kennedy's Orange Bowl visit to meet the brigade members as politically motivated.

January 6, 1963: Time magazine today listed the U.S. companies that contributed to the $53 million ransom paid to Premier Fidel Castro for the 1,113 Cuban invasion prisoners.

The list, including pledges, accounts for most of the $53 million ransom although in some cases only the value of goods already shipped rather than the company's full commitment, is known.

The United States and the Soviet Union asked the United Nations today to close the book on the Cuban controversy.

The two powers made their request in a terse, joint letter sent to U.N. Secretary General U Thant and signed by U.S. Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson and Vassily V. Kuznetsov, the Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister.

Today's message made no effort to conceal the deadlock in American-Soviet negotiations. But it hailed the fact that war had been avoided and expressed hope other tensions might be eased.

Stevenson and Kuznetsov suggested that the Cuban item be wiped off the Security Council agenda "in view of the degree of understanding reached" and "the extent of progress in the implementation of this understanding."

The statement ended on a note of hope:

"The Governments of the United States and of the Soviet Union express the hope that the actions taken to avert the threat of war in connection with this crisis will lead toward the adjustment of other differences between them and the general easing of tensions that could cause a further threat of war."

Carlos M. Lechuga, Cuban Ambassador to the U.N., delivered Cuba's objections in another letter 2 hours earlier.

The Cuban objections were summarized in one paragraph:

"As you know, Mr. Secretary General, the negotiations carried on with your generous intervention have not led to an effective agreement capable of guaranteeing, in a permanent way, the peace of the Caribbean and in liquidating the existing tensions."

Lechuga repeated the Cuban attacks on American "aggressive and interventionist policy."

January 7, 1963: The Cuban Government today announced a record 2 billion peso budget for 1963. About 10 percent of it—213.7 million pesos—was earmarked for "national defense and public order."

American business made a substantial contribution to Fidel Castro's last minute demand for $2.9 million in cash to assure uninterrupted return of the Cuban invasion prisoners.

A check of 25 of the Nation's largest companies indicated today that individual contributions to the special cash fund raised by Gen. Lucius D. Clay ranged from $10,000 to $150,000 and more.

Castro claimed the $2.9 million was owed him for the release of 60 prisoners in April. Of the total, $1 million was pledged by an unknown donor solicited by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

The cash fund was separate from the $53 million in drugs and food pledged to Castro.

The Kennedy administration set up special machinery yesterday to handle future policy toward Cuba.

Sterling J. Cottrell, a veteran Foreign Service officer who formerly headed a task force on the Vietnam question, was named coordinator of Government activities dealing with Cuba. He was given the title of Senior Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

As part of its economic squeeze on Cuban Premier Fidel Castro, the United States will demand that the United Nations cancel a project to help build a $3 million agricultural experimental station in Cuba.

U.S. sources said today that Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson has been instructed to fight right down the line to halt previously approved plans under which the U.N. Special Fund would grant more than $1 million for the project. The United States, which contributes 40 percent of the money spent by the Special Fund, voted against the grant on the grounds that the project could not be carried out because of the large number of Cuban agricultural technicians fleeing the country. U.S. sources said this situation was even more complicated now because of Soviet technicians in Cuba.

Under the plan approved in 1961, the Special Fund would allocate something over $1.1 million to the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) to finance the U.N. part of the project over a 5-year period. Cuba would put up $1.8 million.

The United States argues that Castro is neglecting the economic and social development of the country to concentrate on political problems and has, therefore, forfeited any right to U.N. aid.

January 8, 1963: Cuba was pictured as a land plagued by growing food shortages "where tightening of the vest is now a normal way of life."

This view of the Cuban food situation was contained in a U.S. Foreign Agriculture Service report that said the Premier Fidel Castro regime has just about wrecked the island's agriculture in 4 years.

The report described the food situation there as the poorest in years and added that it may get worse this year. Farm production, it reported, has fallen off 20 percent since Castro took over.

January 8, 1963:

United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson said today the United States has opposed from the beginning a plan to send Cuba $1.2 million in U.N. funds for an agricultural project.

But if the U.N. governing board approves the plan there isn't much that can be done about it, Stevenson said.

Of the $1.2 million, $480,000 probably would come from U.S. taxpayers.

January 9, 1963: President Kennedy talked for an hour yesterday with Vasily Vasilevich Kuznetsov, First Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union. They discussed the settlement of the Cuba crisis and took a look at disarmament and Berlin as problems that remain to be solved. The conversations, it was said, were held in a very cordial atmosphere.

January 10, 1963:

After a 2-day delay, 100 American citizens will leave for the United States Sunday on the return flight of an airliner carrying ransom supplies to Havana, a Swiss diplomat reported today.

The diplomat had no word on whether a score of Americans held in Cuban jails would follow. Thousands of Cuban relatives of the freed Bay of Pigs invasion prisoners also are anxious to leave.

Between 500 and 700 Soviet troops left Cuba during the last day or so aboard the Russian passenger ship *Baltika*, it was reported here yesterday.

Several thousand other Soviet forces are reported to have left Cuba since the end of the October missile crisis. But U.S. officials believe some 16,000 to 17,000 remain in Cuba. About 6,000 of these are known to be organized in combat units.

The reports were made as official sources said the United States is expected soon to ask the Organization of American States to consider almost total isolation of Cuba.

January 11, 1963:

Cuba trade perils aid, U.S. warns.

The United States has served notice on countries whose ships go to Cuba that they risk losing American aid.

State Department press officer Joseph W. Reap disclosed yesterday that the warnings have been conveyed in line with the new forign aid law. Congress last October attached a proviso that aid shall be cut off to countries whose ships carry goods to Cuba.

January 11, 1963:

Secretary of State Dean Rusk advised the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that even the possibility of a U.S. no-invasion pledge on Cuba no longer exists.

The administration has made clear repeatedly that President Kennedy's offer of such a pledge was conditioned on on-site inspection to verify removal of Soviet missiles and bombers from the Communist-ruled island. It has been apparent for weeks that there would be no such inspection even though negotiations to that end were not concluded until this week.

Rusk appeared before the committee yesterday, and after the closed session Chairman J. William Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, told reporters the Secretary covered the point like this:

"Any commitment was contingent on the exchange of letters (between Mr. Kennedy and Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev) which required on-site inspection as well as the removal of missiles and other offensive weapons.

"In view of the failure to get the inspection, the commitment no longer exists."

Fulbright said Rusk assured the committee that U.S. intelligence is convinced all offensive weapons of nuclear capability have been removed from Cuba.

Cuba and East Germany will establish diplomatic relations at the ambassadorial level, the Government press reported today.

The Government newspaper El Mundo said the decision to elevate the present East German-Cuban trade mission to embassies "was due to the close and friendly present relations between our two nations and will contribute to formalize and consolidate even more the bonds of friendship between our peoples."

A newspaper editor charged today that the Kennedy administration, by "manipulating" news as a cold war weapon, is imperiling the American people's right to full and accurate information on how public affairs are being handled.

The charge was made by John H. Colburn, managing editor of the Richmond Times Dispatch, in a speech before the Arizona Newspapers Association.

The editor said the American press must shoulder much of the blame for controlled news from Government because it has too often "been complacent about its responsibility to zealously seek out the truth."

"The press today could do much more to inform the public about the open and insidious efforts to keep the truth from the public," he said.

"As the result of the furor over news manipulation during the Cuban crisis last October, thoughtful people are more concerned about truth in news. Their right to truthful news is in jeopardy because the news manipulators have grown more confident as the result of their recent successes."

The Communist daily Hoy says Cuba's 1963 sugar harvest is off to a poor start. The mills are not getting enough cane to grind, a Hoy reporter complained.

The report, covering the central Province of Camaguey, said crop work at the Patria o Muerte (fatherland or death) mill Thursday, the start of the season, was below last year's level. It said the mill would have to close Monday or Tuesday unless it got more cane.

January 12, 1963: 89 Cuban-Americans, including elderly people and children clutching toys, arrived here today on a freedom flight from Havana (Miami Herald).

January 13, 1963: A controversial agricultural survey proposed for Cuba has been

temporarily postponed by the United Nations Special Fund. * * *

The decision not to act now on the Cuban project avoided a fight threatened by the United States, which puts up 40 percent of the Special Fund's resources.

Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Republican, of New York, contended yesterday that Fidel Castro is "10 times better equipped" militarily now than he was last spring.

He said Castro "has 144 missile launchers, 24 bases, and 500 antiaircraft missiles, some of them the most modern in existence, and 20,000 troops."

Keating made the comments on a program taped for New York television stations.

January 14, 1963: In his state of the Union message to Congress, President Kennedy said that while danger continues, a deadly threat has been removed from Cuba.

While we shall never weary in the defense of freedom, neither shall we ever abandon the pursuit of peace.

In this quest, the United Nations requires our full and continued support. Its value in serving the cause of peace has been shown anew in its role in the West New Guinea settlement, in its use as a forum for the Cuban crisis, and in its task of unification in the Congo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 3:17: *That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith and that ye may be rooted and grounded in love.*

Almighty God, as we grope our way through these ongoing days, which often seem so dark and dismal, may we cultivate a closer communion with Thee and gain a clearer conception of Thy gracious promises and generous purposes.

Grant that, as finite beings, we may be more sensitive and responsive to the appeals and pressures of Thy infinite grace and truth, which alone can transfigure us and transform us from what we are to what we ought to be.

May we yearn to have Thy spirit dwell in our spirit and may the light and love, the joy and peace of our blessed Lord become kindled and personalized in our human souls.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, Monday, March 11, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 20. An act to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 87–883, had appointed Mr. Lausche, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Keating, and Mr. Scott to be members of the Battle of Lake Erie Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 86–420, appointed Mr. McIntyre and Mr. Miller to be members of the U.S. group of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, vice Mr. Smathers and Mr. Allott, resigned.

THE UNIFORM ALLOWANCE ACT OF 1954

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Uniform Allowance Act of 1954 provided for the first time that the Government pay the cost of uniforms required by law or administrative order to be worn by employees in the performance of their official duties. That act limited the Government's share of the cost of such uniforms to $100 annually.

Even at that time this amount did not begin to meet the actual cost of the prescribed uniforms in many instances. Since that time the cost of uniforms has gone up along with other commodities. Thus, today, many of our employees are forced to use an unjust portion of their hard-earned wages for the purchase of uniforms prescribed by law or administrative order, and which cannot be worn or used except in the performance of their official duties. This is patently unfair.

The bill I have introduced is designed to alleviate this inequity by raising the amount the Government can pay to $150 annually, except where overcoats or other special garments are required for protection against the weather, in which cases an additional $50 annually may be allowed.

BRAZIL

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I am again calling on the U.S. Government to deny any financial aid to Brazil which would in any way be used to develop trade with Russia. Brazil has a delegation here headed by Finance Minister Dantas which seeks an $84 million loan from the United States to help develop a trade program between Brazil and Russia. Minister Dantas admitted in Washington yesterday that one of the purposes of the loan is to develop Brazil-Soviet trade. Although I have not been able to obtain such an admission from our State Department, he also is asking postponement of a $450 million loan repayment Brazil is scheduled to make this year to the United States.

Today we are voting on a record military construction bill calling for an expenditure of $15.8 billion designed to help the United States contain communism and protect the security of this Nation, and for the State Department to authorize loans to Brazil for purposes of developing Communist trade is patently ridiculous. We appear to be spending money in both directions. The enhancement of Red trade will only serve to strengthen the Communist economic and military posture. It will undermine our own economic and defensive efforts. Such a loan will enable Russia to take over our markets with Brazil. This will aggravate the balance-of-payments problem and our own unemployment dilemma. A loan for any such purpose is detrimental to the best interests of this Nation and cannot be justified under any circumstances. The American taxpayer does not want his money used to aid a government dedicated to the destruction of our American way of life.

FOREIGN EXPENDITURES BY ALL GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES—LIMITATIONS AND REPORTING

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration will consider House Joint Resolution 245, introduced by the chairman of that full committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Burleson]. This is a resolution which deserves attention of every Member of this body. It deals with the matter of foreign expenditures by all Government employees—their limitations and reporting.

On yesterday the gentleman from Texas inserted in the Record the report on foreign expenditures by the House which is required by law and by rule. Most Members have made full, accurate reports. But even a casual study of the Record indicates the necessity for adoption of the Burleson resolution.

Some of the reports are not signed. One report shows that more committee staff members traveled abroad than did members of the committee. One staff member, according to the report, spent $104 on transportation in spite of the fact that the original ticket assigned to this person was for an amount in excess of $1,400.

Members of Congress cannot perform their proper duties without firsthand examinations of foreign programs, problems, and expenditures. Trips by staff members can be completely legitimate and beneficial. But the citizens we represent have a right to know how their money is being spent by all branches of the Government. They have a right to ask, "Is this trip really necessary?" It is in our own best interest to adopt House Joint Resolution 245.

GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, though Raleigh, N.C., is not a part of my district, my study into Government procurement has led to my interest in an industry there. Due to a decision by the Comptroller General on a case I submitted last November, that industry is about to get a Government contract and save $10,000 for the taxpayers.

Due to this firm's efficiency and the Comptroller General's decision to uphold its position, a radio transceiver is going to be built for the Federal Aviation Agency at a lower cost than would have been the case. If there are more decisions with this conclusion, we can expect the cost of Government purchasing to go down in the future.

Many of my colleagues are aware that for months and months I have made a detailed study of electronics purchases by the Government. In many cases the taxpayer has been the loser. In some I have been able to report successes in changed regulations and in savings to the taxpayers. The latter is true today—a happy ending for manufacturer, taxpayer, Government and, yes, this Congressman.

Last November this firm outlined for me a problem it had with the FAA. Quoting for manufacture of a small radio transceiver, it inadvertently neglected to include a detailed description of the equipment with its proposal, as prescribed by FAA regulations. Because of this, it was ruled out of the procurement. At this very same time, this same firm was making the identical equipment for FAA under another contract, and for this reason was able to be low bidder. In other words, because of a technicality, this firm's competence was to be denied, and the price for this equipment was to rise by $10,000.

After studying the case closely, I contacted the Comptroller General and said, "While the difference between this company's bid and that of the next low bidder does not exceed $10,000, it appears to me that any award other than to this firm would be a waste of tax dollars."

After a thorough study, the Comptroller General agreed with me and advised me by letter, March 7, 1963, that he had made a determination in favor of the Raleigh firm and it should get the contract. Despite the clerical error, the Comptroller General acted in behalf of saving the taxpayers' money. It is too bad we do not have more such people.

This is another case in a long list I am going to present in this session. I will also suggest legislative corrections, such as my H.R. 4409. As these cases are compiled, I hope the Rules Committee will take heed and report H.R. 4409 to the floor for action by the House. Its enactment into law, plus enactment of other legislation I shall soon propose, would curtail many abuses now being carried out in the name of national defense and would result in tremendous savings to the taxpayer.

THE LATE MISS MARY I. BARBER

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned, with deep regret, of the passing of Miss Mary I. Barber, of Battle Creek, Mich., an able and distinguished constituent of mine in the Third Congressional District.

Miss Barber, the Nation's first dollar-a-year woman, died Sunday in Sarasota, Fla., at the age of 76.

She established the home economics department of the Kellogg Co. in 1923 and served as its director until her retirement in 1948. She was a former president of the American Dietetic Association.

From 1941 to 1945, during World War II, Miss Barber served as a special assistant to the Secretary of War, and was in charge of menu planning for American military personnel during that period. She was also editor of an Army cookbook. In 1945 she received the highest civilian award for exceptional service.

Mrs. Johansen joins me in extending sincere sympathy to Miss Barber's sister, Miss Edith Barber, also a distinguished authority in the field of dietetics and the editor of a nationally syndicated food column.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday on rollcall No. 8 I was not present. I wish the Record to indicate that had I been present I would have voted in the affirmative.

LOAN TO BRAZIL

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with considerable concern and disappointment that I read the statement in last night's Evening Star by Brazilian Finance Minister Dr. San Tiago Dantas, that part of the financial help he is asking from the United States would be used to develop trade with all countries including Russia. It was reported in an AP story appearing in the Sunday, March 10, State Journal, Lansing, Mich., that Dr. Dantas assured his countrymen before leaving Brazil he would not trade his Government's soft policy toward Cuba for U.S. aid. Added to our knowledge of the close ties maintained by the Brazilian Government with the Castro government, and the suggestion last November by a high Brazilian official that other Latin American countries reopen relations with Cuba, the Finance Minister's statement yesterday cannot help giving rise to some very serious questions. I believe the American taxpayers have a right to the answers.

Over the years we have sent Brazil more than $2¼ billion in the form of loans and grants—a staggering sum. It is reported that Dr. Dantas is hoping to persuade the United States to add some $84 million to this figure, and to agree to postponement of the $450 million Brazil is due to pay to the United States this year on its debts.

Despite the longstanding friendship we bear for our Brazilian neighbors, is it unreasonable to ask, when we are writing such a large check, that it not be negotiable and subject to being cashed and spent in Moscow or in Havana? Surely we might expect our friends to furnish us with some assurances that we are not, by helping them, helping to finance our own enemies.

MEXICAN-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

Hon. John W. McCormack,
The Speaker's Rooms, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: It is with deep regret that I must advise you that I will be unable to serve as a delegate to the meeting of the Mexican-United States Interparliamentary Group, at Guanajuato, Mexico, March 18-21, 1963. I am particularly sorry since I was keenly interested in attending this meeting and had so indicated to the minority leader.

I have just learned that circumstances beyond my control will prevent me from making the trip. Nevertheless, I do appreciate your kindness in designating me as a delegate, and I hope that my inability to serve will not unduly inconvenience you.

With warm personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Charles B. Hoeven,
Sixth District of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-420, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Guanajuato, Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel] to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

PROCLAIMING SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL AN HONORARY CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4374) to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to to request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under what circumstances will this resolution be considered? Will there be any time for discussion of the resolution, if unanimous consent is given?

The SPEAKER. In response to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Iowa, if consent is granted for the present consideration of the bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from New York may yield to such Members as he desires to yield to before moving the previous question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, is some time to be allocated to this side of the aisle?

Mr. CELLER. I intend to allocate half of the time to the other side.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the President of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to declare by proclamation that Sir Winston Churchill shall be an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff], and that he may yield such time as he desires.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I say of Winston Spencer Churchill that I know of no individual possessed of so many facets to his life and character and personality, with so many wondrous achievements in so many fields.

He is a giant in world history.

He is a man for all seasons.

His biography is like a fascinating novel.

He inspired controversy, but not without affection and respect.

His is a dazzling, stormy, but inspired career.

His public life has stretched for more than half a century from the staid and solid Victorian era to the present hopeful second Elizabethan Age.

He is a man for the ages—statesman, soldier, author and historian, artist, philosopher, naval chief, orator and recanteur, parliamentarian, war correspondent, and humorist.

The key to his character is courage, with strategic insight coming second. He is never controlled, save by himself. Generosity, candor, openness of mind come next. He has no reserves and no shams.

He scorned concealment.

He has a passion for humanity.

He wants justice done though the heavens fall and he be buried in the ruins.

He is keenly responsive to noble impulses.

His is a life and career beyond the conventional bounds of a great statesman.

He is one of the greatest Englishmen known to history—and at that, he is half American.

Historians will speak of him as the statesman to whom the whole world looked for guidance when the very skies were about to fall upon civilization. They will recount his mastery of the written and spoken word. Lord Justice Birkett said that he ever spoke with the orator's true instinct, and that he had the "sympathy and concurrence of his time." This is especially true of the speech he made after Dunkirk when we all feared the worst. He said in the House of Commons:

> We shall not flag or fail. We shall go on to the end, we shall fight in France, we shall fight on the seas and oceans, we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall defend our island whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender.

Note his prescience and wisdom in describing the actions of Russia as early as 1939—as they seemed to him as First Lord of the Admiralty—as "a riddle wrapped in mystery inside an enigma."

An incisive humor always accompanied him. He could create laughter with never a fault of tact or taste.

Had his father been American and his mother English, he would undoubtedly have made American history. As it was, his mother was American and his father British and he ascended to the premiership of Great Britain.

In honoring Winston Churchill, we do not confer citizenship in any technical sense. Rather, we give concrete expression of our affection for the man.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff] such time as he cares to use within the 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Poff] under the unanimous-consent request, which was unusual and not a precedent, is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today, the American people are speaking their respect for Sir Winston Churchill through their chosen Representatives. But we recognize that the quantity and the quality of that respect are unspeakable dimensions. So, ours is not a tribute by word; ours is a tribute by deed. What we say here is and forever will remain inadequate. What we do here, men will always remember. The richest gift is that dearest to the giver. The gift we make is the greatest treasure in the people's storehouse. It is a gift which cannot be embellished in a fancy verbal package. The gift is its own glory, untarnished by much giving. The donee is honored in the receipt and the donor is honored in the acceptance.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in supporting this bill to confer honorary American citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill.

His magnificent contributions to the cause of freemen assure him a place in history as one of the truly great leaders of this or any other age.

As the son of an American mother he has always been a part of us, and we are, with this action, proclaiming our pride in that fact.

This legislation, I understand, is without precedent. Possibly, too, this is the first time in the record of the Congress of the United States that unique legislation of this sort has met with such unprecedented support from both sides of the aisle.

Possibly, because of his achievements, he has been instrumental in bringing about such a broad area of agreement between the Democrats and Republicans, which would not be the least of his manifold accomplishments. Certainly it is clear evidence of the widespread esteem in which this distinguished gentleman is held by our countrymen.

Beyond that, I trust Sir Winston will recognize in this gesture our admiration for his courage, our high regard for his talents, and our gratitude for his leadership of a gallant ally through one of the most severe ordeals any nation has ever faced.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in adopting this legislation today, the House, speaking in behalf of the American people, will bestow upon Sir Winston S. Churchill, in an unprecedented way, the highest honor this land has ever bestowed upon any person, not an American, living or dead.

I shall not endeavor to recite what Sir Winston has done for his own country, for the unity of the English-speaking world, for the great Atlantic community, and for all the peoples of the West who were and are determined to remain free and never to succumb to a dictatorial or totalitarian rule. It would take a Plutarch to express in words Sir Winston's service to humanity.

> It is not the oratory of a statesman that deserves respect, nor the quality of his voice, said the great Greek philosopher Demosthenes, but his support of the policy willed by the people, and the fact that his country's friends and enemies are his own.

It could be, as Sir Winston wrote me back in 1958 when I suggested to him that I might introduce this type of legislation, that—to quote him—"the high regard and affection" in which he holds our country does not need "an official seal," as he expressed it.

It could be that it is indeed difficult to find an appropriate way of expressing our Nation's reciprocal feelings of esteem, high regard and admiration for Sir Winston.

Nevertheless, as this Republic does not grant titles of nobility nor civil honors or decorations, this is the best, the most appropriate and certainly unique way in which we as a nation can honor Sir Winston by adding to all his glory the title of honorary citizen of the United States, the first honorary citizen of the United States in our history. No less can we do to proclaim officially our feelings for the man who always stood for all that we stand for and who has led his country and with it the free world in hours of the gravest trials and tribulations.

It is most gratifying to me personally that I was given the privilege of introducing this legislation and having it brought before the House.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the action being taken here today in honoring this outstanding world citizen, Sir Winston Churchill, by conferring upon him honorary American citizenship is most gratifying to me, as I am sure it is to all American citizens.

This action on the part of the Congress of the United States is an unprecedented one. In all the history of this young Republic no other citizen of a foreign government has been so honored—not even the great Lafayette, the splendid friend of this young Nation. But, I can conceive of no one who is more entitled to this signal honor than Sir Winston Churchill. Surely, no world figure who strode across the stage of history throughout the memory of man contributed more to the democratic ideals of the free people than has Sir Winston Churchill. His striking and effective leadership of the Allied cause in the recent tragedy of World War II will be recorded in the annals of history as possibly the greatest factor in the victory of free peoples over nazism and its philosophy of oppression of the liberties of mankind.

Again, Mr. Speaker, being the son of an American mother and an English father, Sir Winston, more than any other, truly epitomizes the union between the two great English-speaking peoples. In fact, when he addressed a joint session of the Congress on December 26, 1941, in this very Chamber, he referred to his birth in this humorous vein:

> The fact that my American forebears have for so many generations played their part in the life of the United States, and that here I am, an Englishman, welcomed in your midst, makes this experience one of the most moving and thrilling in my life, which is already long and has not been entirely uneventful.
>
> I wish indeed that my mother, whose memory I cherish across the vale of years, could have been here to see. By the way, I cannot help reflecting that if my father had been American and my mother British, instead of the other way around, I might have got here on my own. In that case, this would not have been the first time you would have heard my voice. In that case, I should not have needed any invitation; but, if I had, it is hardly likely that it would have been unanimous. So perhaps things are better as they are.

Nature seldoms grants to any one mortal being so many talents as she has so bountifully bestowed upon this great world figure. Certainly, he is one of the most versatile characters recorded in the annals of the history of the human race. As a writer, historian, painter, orator, warrior, and statesman, he excels.

Mr. Speaker, if I may be pardoned a personal reference in order to emphasize my own personal admiration for this truly great man, I should like to relate my own personal experience as chairman of the Postwar Economic Policy and Planning Committee during the late war. I had the unusual privilege of interviewing a substantial number of world leaders, including the late, but not lamented, Joseph Stalin. Included in this group was this most unusual and talented statesman, Sir Winston, himself. I can truthfully say that the highlight of this humble Member's existence was the high privilege of being his guest at a family dinner. The memory of that eventful occasion as well as the benefit of his thinking in reference to the necessity for a firm policy in dealing with the Kremlin masters will ever remain with me.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced a resolution in August 1962 to carry out the purposes of this resolution. But, because there was some question raised at that time as to whether this met with Sir Winston's approval, I did not press the matter. However, at the beginning of this new Congress, I reintroduced the resolution, after first corresponding with him and receiving his confidential reply to my letter. I am, I repeat, very happy that the Judiciary Committee, under the leadership of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, FRANCIS WALTER, and the gentleman from New York, Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, has finally brought this timely and appropriate action to the attention of the House. I am confident that it will pass both Houses of the Congress without marked or substantial dissent and that the President of the United States will exercise the mandate of the Congress with pleasure and alacrity.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague, who has done so much to promote the cause of this legislation, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in the hope that H.R. 4374 will be passed by this House today without a dissenting voice. I am very happy that the Committee on the Judiciary has brought the bill before us today. I realize, of course, that they have rules and regulations of long standing which make it impossible for them to use the whereas clauses which I had hoped might be attached to this bill. I had no pride of authorship in these clauses which I sent to the committee, but I hoped that they might carry to Sir Winston something of the warmth and affection of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the words we all speak here today will go to Sir Winston Churchill with the assurance that we wish him everything that is good, that we recognize him as one of the great men of our era. He has earned for himself a position of prominence among the leaders of the English-speaking world as a writer, historian, and orator; and being the son of an American mother and an English father, more than any other, truly epitomizes the closeness of spirit between the two great English-speaking peoples.

The Congress of the United States, on behalf of the American people, hereby expresses itself in high appreciation for his outstanding contribution to peace and to freedom and to the courage it takes to wage war. He has served as a challenge and an inspiration to our Nation as well as to his own.

The gift of honorary citizenship in the United States of America is one honor, one token of rare esteem and love which is within this country's power to bestow here through the House of Representatives. That it was never done before makes it all the more cherished in the hearts of all of us who had hoped that this might be brought to pass. Certainly, it is worthy of Winston Churchill's place in history. This is something no man can buy or acquire in any way except through the grateful generosity of the American people. It is the most appropriate gift we can convey to symbolize the warmth and the affection that an appreciative and an admiring people feel toward him.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the resolution will be passed without a dissenting vote.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, those of you who have served with me in this Chamber for the past 18 years know that I rarely take the floor to speak and that when I do, I must needs feel very deeply and sincerely about the subject matter at hand. The legislation before us now not only interests me greatly but it is an honor and a privilege for me to urge all of you wholeheartedly to support this bill which would bestow honorary American citizenship upon that great, worldwide statesman, the very honorable Sir Winston Churchill.

This legislation unanimously passed our Immigration and Nationality Subcommittee and, within hours thereafter, it unanimously passed the full Judiciary Committee. I sincerely trust, therefore, that it will pass the House of Representatives unanimously today.

Every American and all free people the world over have a vast store of love, affection and admiration for this magnificent Englishman whose blood coursing through his veins is one-half American through his mother, the former Jennie Jerome, of New York.

During his 88 wonderful years, he has given unstintingly in loyal service to his beloved country. However, his admiration for the United States is well known. He has visited our Nation 16 times. Upon being made a member of the Society of the Cincinnati, composed of descendants of the officers who fought in the American Revolution, he said here in January 1952:

> I am deeply grateful and proud of my American ancestry and think it is a wonderful thing that I have the honor to rejoice in that fact, while at the same time I have never failed in the proper observance of correct constitutional duties to my own country.

His "blood, toil, tears, and sweat" speech delivered in the House of Commons on May 13, 1940, sounded the alert which stirred the hearts and inspired to action all people committed to the cause of freedom. This speech stands as a monumental challenge to liberty lovers, which may remain unmatched in brilliance and appeal "forever and a day, till the walls shall crumble in ruin and moulder in dust away."

He continued not only to lead the British people but, also, was a constant source of inspiration to all of our allies during the long, anguished years of World War II. As long as any of us shall live we shall carry the memory of the resolute, valiant Churchill, pictured on land and on sea, emerging even from the ashes of destruction and human misery, but always holding his hand aloft, with his fingers forming his famous V-for-victory sign, standing as a shining symbol of hope and man's determination to remain free. God willing, the young men and women of our own beloved country, including my own son, Frank, Junior, would try to emulate this world-renowned and famous leader.

As you may recall, the British general elections were held in July 1945, and the Conservative Government headed by Mr. Churchill unfortunately was defeated. I was in England during that campaign and it made me sick at heart to hear him criticized and to learn at that time that his own people did not really appreciate him.

At a private gathering at a home in England, during that visit I made a little speech with an impassioned plea. I told them how wrong I knew them to be in taking such an attitude toward him, that as an ally and a friend, I could most certainly understand their bitter disappointment over the lack of food, housing, and clothing, but that they knew in their hearts that these shortages were brought about by the war. I also told them that while they might be lacking in some material things, they had their honor, their integrity, and their very heads on their shoulders because of the leadership of this wonderful man. I quoted to them from the Bible:

> A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country and in his own house.

Oh, how glad I was to get a favorable reaction during my talk when they gave me several rousing "hear, hears." Later on, as I knew they would, the British people rallied around Sir Winston again and took him back into their confidence and their hearts where he has remained ever since and shall forevermore—actually, they had never let him out of their hearts.

While we in America cannot properly honor this well-loved man any more than he has already been honored, nevertheless, this action taken today by the U.S. House of Representatives is without precedent in all of our glorious history and will resound as a 21-gun salute, from those of us here who represent the 190 million Americans who love, respect, admire, and revere this extraordinary Englishman for his successful fight to preserve the peace of the world.

To find words adequate to describe properly this distinguished man is comparable to gilding the lily, bringing cotton to Alabama, the derby to England, and good bourbon to my native Kentucky.

His bravery, his fortitude, his tenacity of purpose, and his unyielding desire to win shall never be forgotten.

In my opinion, his achievements shall stand out forever like the Washington Monument, Big Ben, the Eiffel Tower, and the Pyramids. By his unselfish service to mankind, he has emblazoned his name with honor and everlasting distinction in huge letters of gold on the silver pages of world history. Why? Because during war, travail, "blood and tears and sweat," fear, want, privation, devastation, chaos, and despair—at a time when it seemed all was lost—this incomparable leader was the epitome of hope, the very embodiment of courage, the preserver of time, the protector of faith, the guardian of destiny, the inspiration for victory, and the successful negotiator of the peace.

These and many other attributes have endeared him not only to America, the native land of his sweet and gentle mother, but to all creeds and colors, the rich and the poor, in every nation of the free world, who love liberty, decency, and Christianity.

To paraphrase one of his own famous statements: "Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to one man."

May he have a full fruition of his dreams and a happy realization of all of his endeavors. "May his leaf never wither and whatsoever he doeth, may it prosper." May God in His infinite wisdom spare and protect our beloved friend, Sir Winston, for many years to come and may He who reigns as the King of Kings, the master of all lodges, nations, and men, smile graciously, abundantly, beautifully, and everlastingly from His wide blue canopy of heaven upon this, our worthy candidate for the position of the world's most honored peacemaker since that lowly Man walked the shores of Galilee many centuries ago.

It is said in the fifth chapter of Matthew:

> Blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God.

Sir Winston was a peacemaker but only on honorable terms. And here, my colleagues, I am reminded of those beautiful lines in the wartime song "The White Cliffs of Dover"—remember?

> There will be blue birds over
>   The white cliffs of Dover
> Tomorrow—just you wait and see
>   And there will be love and laughter
> And peace forever after
>   Tomorrow—when the world is free.

Sir Winston helped to make these words come true.

Thank the Lord, he did not place his light "under a bushel, but on a candlestick and it giveth light unto all in the house."

I trust that Sir Winston will forgive my inadequate words of praise—and I say this from a humble heart—because unfortunately, not in America nor in England nor anyplace else, on the face of the globe, is there another Churchill with the command of the King's English which he alone possesses.

May he live to be over 100 years of age and then, God willing, may we be permitted to turn the wheels of the speedometer of time back and start all over with him again.

Hail—noble Englishman.

Hail—great American.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed by this proposed legislation.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], a question:

What kind of a precedent do we establish here today by voting for H.R. 4374?

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman will yield, I will say to the gentleman that this is unprecedented. We confer honorary citizenship upon Sir Winston Churchill, but as the Department of Justice indicated—and you will find the remarks on the bottom of page 3 and top of page 4 of the report—it is not intended to confer citizenship upon Sir Winston in the technical sense of that term so as to impose upon him the legal obligations which ordinarily accompany the acquisition of U.S. nationality.

Mr. GROSS. Then the gentleman is saying, I take it, that by conferring this form of citizenship upon Churchill he will not be called upon to participate in paying some of the debt that he helped us accumulate during the war and thereafter?

Mr. CELLER. I take it that is correct. He would not pay any income taxes or assume any other obligations of citizenship.

Mr. GROSS. I will ask the gentleman if this in any way is connected with renewal of the suspension of the British debt that will have to come up pretty soon? Some 8 years ago Congress suspended all payments—principal and interest—on some $4 billion of debt that the British owe to this Government as a result of a so-called loan made to Britain following the war.

Is this in any way designed to influence another extension of the payment on the huge debt the British owe this country? This is in addition to some of their World War I debts that are still unpaid.

Mr. CELLER. This simple resolution has no relevancy in that regard, no relevancy to the subject matter the gentleman indicated.

Mr. GROSS. But Mr. Churchill then will not be called upon to help us pay off some of this war debt, under the terms of this bill?

Mr. CELLER. No, indeed. It has nothing to do with this bill at all.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the chairman of the full committee this question? He said there would be no obligation to pay income tax. What about estate taxes on the death of this fine man?

Mr. CELLER. I doubt very much whether there is anything in this bill that would include any obligation along any of those lines.

Mr. HALEY. No obligation along those lines?

Mr. CELLER. No.

Mr. HALEY. In conferring this honorary citizenship on Mr. Churchill; what about his heirs, would they receive anything?

Mr. CELLER. They would receive no emoluments, they would receive no benefits at all. This is limited to the person and character of the individual, Sir Winston Churchill.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to detract from the leadership that Mr. Churchill gave to the British Isles and the Commonwealth during World War II, but this, as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee frankly admits, would be an unprecedented action. This apparently would be a granting of U.S. citizenship, no matter how limited, on a basis accorded no other citizen of a foreign country in the history of this Republic. Who will be the next?

I am disturbed by this unprecedented proposal and I do not see how I can vote for it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Whitener].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the legislation we have under consideration today in the House of Representatives to authorize the President of the United States to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America marks a milestone in the legislative history of our country. Never before has the Congress conferred American citizenship on a citizen of another nation.

It is altogether fitting and proper that the first great figure in world history to be honored with the priceless mantle of American citizenship should be Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill. No other living person is more respected, esteemed, and venerated by our people than is Sir Winston.

He was born November 30, 1874, the son of Lord Randolph Churchill and Jenny Jerome, a vivacious, young, American girl from New York City. Sir Winston has always been proud of his American heritage. The American people have shared this pride, and Sir Winston's background has been a tie that has bound him and our people together in a bond of mutual affection.

In the course of American history there has been only one other person who has captured the hearts, the admiration, and the love of the American people as has Sir Winston Churchill. He can take his place in history along with the beloved Lafayette whose life and character have left a profound and lasting impact on the American people.

The unexcelled genius of Sir Winston has made itself felt in journalism, statesmanship, diplomacy, literature, and in the science of war. In each of these fields he has been a remarkable success.

Soon after his graduation in 1894 from Sandhurst, the English West Point, as number 8 in a class of 150, Sir Winston entered the British Army. He combined the talents of a soldier with that of a journalist, and the books and articles he wrote during the late 1890's and early 1900's form a wonderful part of our heritage of English literature.

In time of crisis the English people have always turned to Sir Winston Churchill for leadership. In 1911 he was made First Lord of the British Admiralty, and with foresight and vigor he went to work to make the British Navy ready for the war he felt certain was coming with the Germans. When the fury of World War I broke over England in 1914, the British Navy was ready to defend the island kingdom, thanks to Sir Winston.

In 1916 he went to the front as a lieutenant colonel in command of the Sixth Royal Fusiliers of the British Army. The same year he was recalled from the front and made Minister of Munitions. From 1918 to 1921 Sir Winston was Secretary of State for War and Air.

Following World War I, Sir Winston combined service in the House of Commons with his literary pursuits. As the approaching storm of World War II appeared on the horizon he called upon the British people in dynamic speech after speech to prepare themselves to meet the scourge of Nazism. His was a voice in the wilderness, however, and after Munich he stood in the House of Commons and uttered these words:

> You were given the choice between war and dishonor. You chose dishonor, and you will have war.

When the storm that Sir Winston had predicted broke over the English people he was again called to a position of great leadership in his nation. He was reappointed First Lord of the Admiralty on September 3, 1939. The following year he became chairman of the Armed Services Committee and in the same year assumed the awesome responsibility of Prime Minister.

It was during World War II that Sir Winston reached the zenith of his long and illustrious career. Through his indomitable courage, his inspired oratory, and his unfailing faith in ultimate victory, he led his people, and indeed the people of the free world, to victory.

Throughout his long career Sir Winston Churchill has been an implacable foe of communism. He was one of the first world statesmen after World War II to point out the dangers lurking behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. He has consistently urged a strong stand against communism and has never failed to speak out against the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. Speaker, Sir Winston has demonstrated his friendship for the United States time and again in speeches, in the books and articles he has written, and in actions. I think a statement that he made on December 10, 1948, conveys the feelings of this great man toward the United States. In speaking of foreign policy he said:

> What are those major themes in foreign policy? The first is an ever closer and more effective relationship, or as I like to call it, fraternal association, with the United States. In the ever closer unity of the English-speaking world lies the main hope of human freedom and a great part of the hope of our own survival.

Again on May 12, 1949, Sir Winston said:

> We give our thanks to the United States for the splendid part they are playing in the world.

Mr. Speaker, the American people heartily approve of the action we are taking today in this House to authorize the President of the United States to confer honorary American citizenship upon Sir Winston Churchill. Sir Winston is possibly the greatest living person of our age. His accomplishments and the things for which he stands tower above the ordinary events of our day.

In the broad panorama of human history Sir Winston Churchill will be numbered among the greatest men of all time. It is certain that he will be described as the greatest Englishman.

Let us pass this bill, then, and welcome Sir Winston into the inner circle of American citizenship. In so doing we will have the sure knowledge that posterity will say that England's greatest son was also an American.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is only after a thorough and exhaustive search of my conscience that I take the floor to oppose this resolution to grant honorary U.S. citizenship to Sir Winston Churchill.

It is not my purpose to cause hurt or injury to anyone and especially to Sir Winston Churchill. I would not for one minute permit my remarks to be used as a reflection on those who take a position opposite to mine with reference to this

resolution. My position is dictated solely by my feeling that U.S. citizenship is something sacred. It is my feeling, in keeping with the basic tenets of international law, that an individual is either a citizen of a country or he is not a citizen of a country. Citizenship does not come in varying degrees. It does not come in varying colors. It is not something that contains many fragmented facets that can be separated one from the other. Citizenship in the United States of America carries with it basic rights, privileges, powers, and immunities that have stemmed from the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. These are balanced by the burdens and the responsibilities that must be assumed if the rights, the privileges, the powers, and the immunities are to be preserved and protected. To me, citizenship in the United States of America does not require an adjective before it or an explanatory phrase behind it. It is a single unit that must be viewed as such and not otherwise. It is the highest citizenship to which one can aspire. It should never be associated with a position less than first. Should we adopt this resolution granting honorary citizenship to Sir Winston Churchill we set a precedent, but more than that, we fragmentize U.S. citizenship, and we create another citizenship category by statute. This should only be done, if at all, by the people of the United States of America by amendment to the Constitution.

Sir Winston Churchill is a British subject. His first allegiance is to the British Crown. I am sure that Sir Winston is deeply proud of his citizenship and of the fact that he is a subject of the Queen. I do not believe that he would, under any circumstances, renounce that status, nor do I believe that he would support a proposal to extend honorary British citizenship to any human being unless that person would swear first allegiance to the British Crown. The first allegiance of Sir Winston Churchill will always be to the British Crown. Hence, any status of citizenship granted him by this country must be in second place. I cannot subscribe to the proposition that citizenship of the United States should ever, in whole or in part, be secondary to that of any other government.

The world and the United States are deeply indebted to Sir Winston Churchill for the great contributions that he has made as an individual who has lived during our times. I would not want to detract from his just due in the slightest. I would be one of the first to stand up and request unanimous support for a resolution paying just honor and tribute to a great statesman.

I do not criticize those of you who adhere to different views on this resolution nor do I quarrel with anyone who does not care to join me. I express my views because I feel very deeply on the subject. Whatever may be the consequences or whatever may be the choice of others, my vote will never be cast to dilute the citizenship of the United States of America, nor will it be cast to yield the sovereignty of this Nation, in whole or in part, to any other individual or entity.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have the privilege of joining the Members of this House today in speaking the sentiment of the American people to pay token tribute to one of the colossal figures of history, a man whose striding in seven-league boots through the pages and the record of history is one of the great stories of mankind.

Those of us who have been privileged to have some public or private contacts with this unique, this eminent man, shall cherish those as highlights of our lives, because they were the occasions when we approached near the summit of human personality. His intrepid courage, his indomitable will, his unfaltering faith in the presence of danger and difficulty not only tended to save a good old world but were largely the foundation for the building of a nobler and a grander new.

As long as men in their hearts are thrilled by the epic deeds of heroic men, as long as gallantry and courage shall be emulated by aspiring men, women, and youth, the name of Winston Churchill shall be kept warm in the hearts of men, women, and children everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, if this Republic shall last a decade or a thousand years, its glory and its grandeur shall ever be enhanced by the action of this Congress and our President and this country in our time in adding to the roster of our citizens the imperishable, the magnificent name of Winston Churchill.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be able to participate in these activities in which the House of Representatives offers honorary citizenship to one of the world's living legends and a man who holds a place of esteem in the hearts of Americans.

Sir Winston Churchill was given a fitting tribute by the Nebraska Legislature on February 12 of this year, when by a unanimous vote citizenship in the State of Nebraska was conferred on him. Nebraska was the first State to so honor Sir Winston.

The resolution of the Nebraska Legislature reads in part:

> Whereas Sir Winston Churchill has, by his courage, tenacity, wisdom, and leadership both in war and in peace, assured for himself a place of eminence among the great men of history—

Certainly these words sum up the characteristics which the world has come to know in Sir Winston—courage, tenacity, wisdom, and leadership. In his long career of service to his government and the free world, Sir Winston has been a guest in this country on several occasions. They have been occasions on which history was made—wartime conferences, his Iron Curtain speech, or his appearance before the Congress.

He will always have a prominent place in history, not only for his achievements, but because of his writings which will give to future generations an appreciation of the events of today and yesterday.

I am pleased to offer now the resolution passed by the Nebraska Legislature.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 12

> Whereas Sir Winston Churchill has, by his courage, tenacity, wisdom, and leadership both in war and in peace, assured for himself a place of eminence among the great men of history; and
>
> Whereas it is proper that the highest honor and acclaim be accorded Sir Winston Churchill during his lifetime; and
>
> Whereas the greatest honor that this legislature can confer is the grant of citizenship in the great State of Nebraska: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 73d session assembled:*
>
> 1. That full citizenship in the great State of Nebraska, with all rights and privileges appertaining thereto, is hereby granted Sir Winston Churchill.
>
> 2. That a copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed and signed by the President of the legislature be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to Sir Winston Churchill, Vice President Johnson, Senator Young, Senator Javits, Senator Magnuson, Senator Roman Hruska, Senator Curtis, Congressmen Cunningham, Martin, and Beermann.
>
> DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
> *President of the Legislature.*
> HUGO F. SRB,
> *Clerk of the Legislature.*

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Beermann].

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, of course I wish to concur in the remarks made by the senior Member from Nebraska in the House of Representatives [Mr. Cunningham], and add that I, too, will welcome the Honorable Winston Churchill as an honorary citizen of the United States.

As my distinguished colleague has pointed out, Mr. Churchill is already an honorary citizen of my home State, Nebraska, by virtue of Legislative Resolution 12 passed by the 73d current session of the Nebraska unicameral. This action was noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 18, 1963, on page 2388.

It is my belief that many Nebraskans, particularly those of us who took part in World War II, have a great deal of respect and admiration for Mr. Churchill's strength of character. I think it can be said that it was his hand on the ship of state in England during the 1942 and 1943 bombings that was the prime reason for England's heroic defense of her perimeter.

In addition, Mr. Churchill's indomitable will and his unyielding defiance gave the English people the strength of purpose necessary to carry them successfully through this conflict. I might also add that probably as a result of Mr. Churchill's tenacity, the United States gained a measure of time, time which was used to prepare for and later win an all-out victory.

In conclusion, I earnestly commend Mr. Churchill's strength of character and purpose to this body and urge that it confer on him the greatest honor that it can possibly bestow; namely, citizenship in the United States.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Foreman].

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by my fellow Texan [Mr. Rogers] in his opposition to this bill. I recognize the good that Sir Winston Churchill has done for this world, but also I recognize the sacredness and the associated responsibility of citizenship in the United States of America. We citizens of Texas are a proud people, and I think we citizens of the United States are a proud people, proud of our country and our citizenship, and the accompanying responsibility. I think that the best we could do in paying Sir Winston Churchill a true tribute would be by a resolution expressing the appreciation of this body to Sir Winston Churchill for his contribution to the things we believe in, but not by giving him honorary citizenship in the United States of America.

In May 1958, Sir Winston Churchill wrote, in answer to an inquiry from Representative Francis E. Walter asking his views on proposed legislation at that time to make him an honorary citizen of the United States of America, as follows:

> My Dear Mr. Walter: I was deeply touched at the great honor which you have sought to do me. I am well aware of the historical implications of what you suggested, and it is a remarkable compliment which I shall always remember.
>
> Nevertheless, after most careful consideration, I think that I should decline it. As you know, I am half American by blood. I feel that I would prefer to leave the matter thus rather than have an official seal put on the affection and high regard in which I hold your country.
>
> Pray accept my very warm thanks to you personally, and my good wishes.
>
> Yours very sincerely,
>
> Winston S. Churchill.

I respectfully question the advisability of the initiation of this precedent in awarding honorary citizenship of the United States of America to anyone. My high respect, esteem, and honor for that great citizen of the free world and relentless fighter for individual freedom, Sir Winston Churchill, is by no means whatever lessened by my expressions in this instance.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation before the House today. In March the Legislature of West Virginia conferred honorary citizenship of our State on Sir Winston Churchill. I am well aware of the apprehension in some minds here today about the wisdom of what we are doing. I can only say, as a member of the subcommittee that recommended this legislation, that this action today does not confer upon Sir Winston United States citizenship as we know it and as it is referred to in the statutes. There will be no oath of allegiance to the laws of this Nation. This is a token of recognition, by Presidential proclamation solely. What we do today is to authorize by this declaration the bestowing of an honorary title on Sir Winston, rather than an act that would be an obligation, if he were to appear in a court and assume the rights and obligations of U.S. citizenship.

However, Mr. Speaker, it might be appropriate to add just a little footnote to what I have just said. Sir Winston is 88 years old now. But if he were born after May 24, 1934, he would have had a choice to become either a U.S. citizen at birth, or a citizen of Great Britain. Why? When he was born section 1933 of the Revised Statutes of the United States was still in effect and U.S. citizenship could be conferred upon a child born abroad only by his father, if he was a U.S. citizen. No mother, although born in the United States, could then have conferred U.S. citizenship upon her child born abroad. This is why Sir Winston had no claim to U.S. citizenship. That law was changed on May 24, 1934, and the change under which both a father or a mother, a U.S. citizen, could confer citizenship upon a child born abroad is in effect today.

Since we are writing history today rather than passing a bill, I believe that this short explanatory note might be in order, and perhaps interesting for those who seem to nurse qualms or worries about what we are doing today.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening with avid interest to the debate here today, I want to rise and voice my opposition to this proposition. I believe like many others do that the citizenship of America is a sacred thing, and I believe that anybody who is a citizen of America should want to carry his full share of the load as part of that citizenship and for that great privilege. Winston Churchill has been recognized and honored both by his people and by us in many ways. He is the only man for instance in the history of our Nation who has addressed a joint session of the Congress three times and in this we, indeed, gave him great honor. We were associated with his nation and with him in a great cause that preserved freedom and liberty. His record is established. He needs no honors that we can bestow on him.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad precedent and we ought not to establish this precedent. It is one that may embarrass us in some future time.

Mr. Speaker, this is the man who gave to the world a great challenge in his blood and tears speech. Free people from all over the world responded. In this country people volunteered and were drafted to serve the cause of freedom, many gave the last full measure of their devotion. Among them were thousands who did not then nor do their families now have an American citizen's right to vote. We might better spend our time and effort in giving voteless citizens their rights before we indulge in giving this kind of citizenship to this distinguished world citizen.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, were Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill to accept the offer to become an honorary citizen of the United States—for which there is now pending a bill in Congress—the honor would become a two-way street. This honor is the highest which we in the United States can offer. All this we feel for Sir Winston.

In the opposite direction, it would be difficult to exaggerate the honor which would accrue to the United States in the acquisition of so outstanding a citizen. A mere listing of the professions in which he has served is a source of astonishment. Yet not just in one but in many he has occupied a foremost position. Furthermore, he has served with such distinction that in a variety of fields he has received the highest honors. His tremendous versatility makes even a listing difficult. Where to begin? Statesman, soldier, author, artist, journalist, politician par excellence, lecturer, editor, chancellor or rector in three universities, bricklayer and—less professionally, but nonetheless competently—prophet and soothsayer; all these professions in one man's life, and all creditably performed.

To explain the "prophet and soothsayer" and to take the latter first, there are volumes upon the library shelves around the world consisting of excerpts from his wise remarks, quotations abounding in "The Wit and Wisdom of Winston Churchill"—as one title reads. As prophet, Winston Churchill has foreseen and advised the world about many things good and bad that have been of immense importance recognized only later by others. During World War I, from having been actually in it he retired in 1916 to become the Minister of Munitions. In that capacity he was in a position to promote the use of the tank as a weapon of war. According to Ludendorff, the latter course of the war was decided in no small measure by the development of the tank.

As early as 1925, Churchill had written an essay entitled "Shall We Commit Suicide?", in which he called attention to the potential danger of Germany. During the thirties he continually warned against German armament and aggression. He also argued both in Parliament and on the lecture platform for a powerful air force.

As statesman, Winston Churchill has been three times Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. During the first of these terms he led the Coalition Government through World War II, 1940–45. Through the darkest days in England's history, when the threat of Hitler's invasion was very real and there were no allies to help, it was largely the spirit of Prime Minister Churchill, a giant of faith, of courage, and of inspiration, which led his countrymen through their "finest hour."

As a soldier and Cabinet minister he had had outstanding preparation for the highest post in government in such a crisis. His soldiering had begun at an early age. Entering the British Army

when he was 21 he had served with distinction in India, won an award of Military Merit from Spain when serving with the Spanish forces in Cuba, and taken part in the Nile Expeditionary Force, writing a book about this African experience.

As author, Sir Winston Churchill was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1953. His histories of both world wars are practically unrivaled in importance. Four volumes of the first, six of the second are only a few among the total of his literary productions. Memoirs, fiction, biography, history, political studies have flowed from his pen. His speeches alone fill volumes. So prolific is his output that it is the more amazing that he is a master of style; his writings are a literary delight.

We have mentioned but a few of his accomplishments. As you are aware, the doings of this talented and energetic personage already have filled various books. By 1945 he was considered by many as the greatest man in the world; and he never rested upon his laurels. His activities have been noteworthy, however, even more for their quality than for their quantity. The phrases that characterize him and his work are manifold and, withal, highly complimentary. He is known as a man who had the ability to do what he advocated; and he advocated patience and firmness; magnanimity to the defeated enemy in war. He said:

> We must look through other people's eyes as well as our own.

He has ever been a man of humanity, of courage, intelligence of the highest order, generosity, loyalty, geniality, humor—yes, and impudence. It is safe to say that no one has delighted more people as well as inspired them.

Among the many facets of this man of apparently limitless ability, that for which we in America may be the most thankful is his interest in the promotion of the Anglo-American alliance. He has said:

> Let us be united and let our hopes lie in our unity because we understand each other. We understand when things go wrong, or things are said, or anything like that, we really can afford to pass them by.

Sir Winston has here expressed the core of the Anglo-American alliance. Our countries need statesmen with magnanimity to carry us over the rough places. We need such vision and tolerance and geniality as he has ever exhibited to keep the Anglo-American alliance as a living reality, to keep family quarrels on the small squabble level, never letting them undermine the basic friendship so valuable to us and to the world. Sir Winston in his person has made vast contributions to that friendship. What he has done will stand as a bond forever.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, there are few men I admire or respect more than the great British statesman, Sir Winston Churchill. In peace and in war, I would also be bold enough to say that no man has done more for his country than Winston Churchill, and my vote and decision on this resolution, certainly, is no reflection on his greatness as a man or as a British subject.

When this subject was broached to Sir Winston some time ago, he said that he would refuse an honorary citizenship in the United States and gave his reasons. I thought he was right at the time and still think he was right.

Secondly, I do not think we should open the doors to extend this honor to the national of any foreign country. Once we do and some Member of the Congress proposes someone else and we do not approve, then it becomes an insult. In all such matters as this, concerning a man of such stature as Sir Winston Churchill, it is not easy to say "no," far easier to take the easy way and say "yes."

Therefore, I want it well understood, that my vote in nowise is a vote against Sir Winston Churchill or Great Britain, as I am an admirer of both.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, luck is being prepared for opportunity. By such definition, Hon. Winston Churchill was a lucky man. He had prepared himself for great leadership and when world events required a man of colossal stature he was available and gave this opportunity a magnificent fruition. America, England, and all of the free world are and will always be debtors to the courage, wisdom, and superlative character of this noble man. With the enactment of this measure today there will go forward to him and his beloved wife and family the love, affection, and gratitude of every true American.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to note recent remarks attributed to Sir Winston Churchill expressing his desire to accept honorary citizenship should it be tendered to him by the United States. And I support the bill before the House today which proposes a proclamation of honorary citizenship for this great statesman.

Mankind was in one of its darkest hours when Sir Winston Churchill spoke elegant words about "their finest hour." Mankind stood close to a new dark age when Sir Winston Churchill faced a tyrannical enemy poised on the shores of the English Channel and vowed to "fight on the beaches, fight on the landing fields, fight in the fields and in the streets, in the hills; we shall never surrender." But Sir Winston did more than speak—he acted. He transmitted the required "blood, toil, tears, and sweat" to the reality of a positive strategy and strength for victory.

Winston Churchill was among the first to warn that "an Iron Curtain has descended across the Continent" as early as March 5, 1946. Today we realize that we, like the British Empire during World War II, are in a precarious position requiring the leadership of a Churchill—combining words with deeds and necessitating a will to win. For, as Churchill himself once said:

> No one can guarantee success in war, but only deserve it.

The lesson of Sir Winston Churchill to us today should give rise to policies deserving success for the entire free world now and in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I gladly support legislation tendering honorary American citizenship to Sir Winston Churchill. He said that:

> Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few.

One of the most valiant and gallant of those few was Churchill himself.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill to bestow honorary citizenship to one of America's most cherished and respected friends. Mr. Winston Churchill, who so often expresses pride in his American heritage, was the symbol of leadership in the free world during the darkest moments of our time. It seems fittingly appropriate that during the twilight years of his variegated and abundant career that the Congress of the United States, reflecting the will of the people, extend America's highest gift—that of honorary citizenship.

When captain of the ship of state his indomitable spirit narrowed the broad expanse of an ocean that separated freedom-loving people, and through his example of courage and leadership he created a bond of unity for the peoples of the Atlantic upon which our future survival depends. Winston Churchill belongs not only to Great Britain, but to the whole world, to each man who reveres liberty and the dignity of the individual. Above all he cherished the rights of the individual. I know that we shall add to a long list this honor as an expression of gratitude and respect from an aware and appreciative Nation.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr, Speaker, with thousands of other Americans, I am gratified that Congress is about to extend honorary citizenship to Sir Winston Churchill.

No American who served overseas during the war years, and observed the gallant manner in which the British people endured not only the flaring moments of tragedy but the long, grinding years of make-do and do-without could fail to realize how their load was lightened by the never-failing confidence of "Winnie."

On behalf of the people of California, it is with pride that I welcome this great man into fellow citizenship, even though it be but honorary.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, we have never thought that a Member is under an obligation to put in the Record his reasons for every record vote; but in the instance of H.R. 4374, which has its purpose to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States, it seemed to this Member that a few words were appropriate.

We went to the floor intent upon simply voting present, and when our name was called did vote present on the first call of the roll for the first time on any matter since coming to the Congress. One of the reasons for our action was that we had not read the letter from the Justice Department in explanation of the fact this was not conferring citizenship or U.S. nationality, but emphasized it was only honorary citizenship and another reason for our preliminary intention to vote present was that we felt there were so many more important things that the Congress should consider first and so much work yet to be done that many other matters should be considered before or ahead of H.R. 4374. On the other hand, we could not vote against the bill, for to do so, would amount to a slap at a person who had been a great statesman and one of the great leaders of the free world during the terrible days of World War II. It was under the leadership of Churchill that Britain held the line until America could arm itself to enter the European theater of operations as an ally. This magnificent holding action under the guidance of Sir Winston was responsible for the ultimate saving of thousands of American lives.

We quickly asked for a copy of the brief report which accompanied H.R. 4374 and finally supported the bill, with some measure of reluctance because of the realization that American citizenship is such an invaluable thing that perhaps we should not set a precedent as we have here today. We think that Sir Winston should have our high regard, affection, and respect but to grant full citizenship is something else.

But again, a close study of the title of the bill and its content reveals an emphasis on the word "honorary." Carefully considered, this means that we are doing nothing more than an appropriate recognition of the outstanding quality of Sir Winston's leadership and his contributions to the free world. The report points out that the bill is not intended to confer citizenship, or to impose the legal obligations of making him a national. It could be said to be similar in effect to conferring a medal or decoration upon him. As the report points out, it is only an honor, or expression of esteem rather than the U.S. nationality in the technical sense.

We should consider that if this bill had been defeated, there would be those among our enemies in the world who would have interpreted this defeat as a breach among the Western allies and it could very well have resulted in damaging repercussions if the bill had failed of adoption. Although we felt that there was more important work to be done first we could not vote against the bill for the reasons mentioned above. One of our earlier decisions not to support the bill was because we were of the belief that Sir Winston had back in 1958 declined the honor in a letter to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. We felt no person should be given such a great honor who had by letter already declined it.

Then, after a careful reading of the report, we found this situation had been changed and that in an official cable received as late as February 26, 1963, from the British Embassy, Sir Winston said that he would be delighted to be so honored and that he would be deeply moved by such an honor. Apparently, others in the Congress had similar feelings as our own because on the day following the cablegram expressing the change of attitude by Sir Winston, several identical bills were introduced as companion to H.R. 4374. In our quick investigation of the report, we recall that four American States have now offered honorary American citizenship and recalled that after all, Sir Winston is already half American by blood as a son of an American mother and an English father.

Finally, by supporting the passage of such a bill as this, we think it amounts to a backhand slap at one among our Western allies on the continent of Europe that has been engaging in action intended to weaken the European Economic Community and also NATO. The passage of this bill will let the world know that the people of the United States by the action of the Congress today honors this great man for his unswerving loyalty and steadfastness to his friends in these troubled times of 1963 as much as he did during the perilous days of World War II.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, rarely in the history of civilization has there appeared a man of the stature and caliber of Sir Winston Churchill. During his entire lifetime he has demonstrated a selfless devotion to his fellow man. His distinguished career in his own country includes service as a warrior and as a statesman. By his courageous and honorable deeds, he is revered as the inspiration and the moving force which rallied freedom loving peoples of the world during their most perilous period. World over, Sir Winston is known as a man of peace, a statesman of international repute, philosopher, political leader, artist, and a man of letters. And there is no person who has done so much, to the benefit of so many, in promoting and developing the bonds of strength which hold together the union of English-speaking peoples.

President Kennedy, when a U.S. Senator, stated:

> I believe now that Sir Winston has left active political office, that a grant of honorary U.S. citizenship to him would be a worthy and fully deserved gesture.

The President has reaffirmed that statement only recently.

Including my joint resolution, five bills were introduced in this session of Congress, both in the House and in the Senate, to honor Sir Winston by declaring him to be a citizen of the United States. A precedent for such action has been established by the granting of honorary citizenship to that great French nobleman, the Marquis de Lafayette, for his invaluable service to our cause. Only in this way is it possible for us to demonstrate formally the affection and high regard the American people hold for this grand old man of our time.

As the world's most honored man, Sir Winston already holds a number of American awards. These include honorary citizenship of Jacksonville, Fla.; the Gold Medal of the city of New York; the Franklin Medal of the city of Philadelphia; the American Freedom House Award; the Distinguished Service Medal; the right to wear a pilot's wings of the U.S. Air Force. In addition, Sir Winston has been decorated by 11 foreign countries as well as his own, and is an honorary citizen of 10 other cities.

It is indeed fitting that we bestow this added honor to illustrate our respect and admiration.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I will cast my vote for granting honorary citizenship to Sir Winston Churchill, fully realizing that one could justifiably oppose this bill.

Citizenship of the United States, honorary or otherwise, should always carry with it responsibilities. Were it not for the fact that Sir Winston so valiantly stood for those precepts of freedom in the dark days of World War II, and was—and still remains—the outstanding symbol of bravery and determination and faith in victory, I would be inclined to vote against this resolution.

I would not vote for this bill if I thought it could set a precedent for conferring honorary citizenship to other persons of other nations for lesser cause or for politically inspired purposes. I will cast a favorable vote, having been assured it is not intended to set such a precedent.

In conferring honorary citizenship upon Sir Winston, we honor a man, a leader, who by his example inspired in his people the will, the determination, to bring to a successful conclusion the struggle in which they were engaged against the kind of tyranny which we in our Nation have consistently opposed.

Sir Winston did not vacillate in his determination to keep his nation free, nor did he accept any appeasement-type diplomacy that could be interpreted by others to mean that freemen lack the will to win or are unwilling to make the sacrifice for that which they believe to be right and honorable.

The tyranny of communism today is the same as the tyranny of nazism against which Sir Winston and the great people of his country, of America, and indeed of all the Allied Nations, so valiantly fought. To be sure, it bears a different name. But it is marked with the same kind of ruthless authoritarianism.

Sir Winston symbolized the truth that only he can effectively lead others to sacrifice, no matter how noble the cause, who is himself willing to share in making that sacrifice.

May I add that no nation can lead other nations to sacrifice for the noble ideal of the preservation and extension of freedom and human dignity unless that nation is willing to take the lead in that sacrifice.

We are well reminded that freedom does not come cheap. It is bought—to use the classic words of Sir Winston himself—with "blood, sweat, and tears." And no generation can ever live secure

in the false belief that freedom is not its responsibility.

I feel privileged to share in conferring upon this great man of history, Sir Winston Churchill, honorary citizenship in the United States of America. I so cast my vote only after soberly weighing the proposal; after deliberating long on the responsibilities that accompany U.S. citizenship, honorary or otherwise; and after seriously considering all implications inherent in the act. I am certain Sir Winston would have it on no other grounds.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of this esteemed body, it was a great privilege to join with my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee in recommending that Sir Winston Churchill be granted honorary citizenship in the United States of America.

To be able to recognize one of the world's outstanding leaders who has worked and fought for the very ideals we Americans hold so dear—love of God, love of country and love of fellow men—is an honor I shall long treasure.

By our action today, the people of America have again shown the peoples of the world that democracy is a living, vibrant force which always stands ready to embrace those who believe in freedom.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support the legislation honoring Sir Winston Churchill as an honorary citizen. In addition to the great service which Mr. Churchill has rendered to Great Britain and to the entire British Empire, he has contributed substantially to greater understanding between our Nation and the other English-speaking peoples around the world. This understanding and mutual respect which Mr. Churchill advocated is one of the most hopeful developments in the human quest for a peaceful world.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud and happy to associate myself with this—though it be symbolic legislation—and to salute Sir Winston Churchill, a British subject, and an honorary American citizen.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am informed by a friend of mine that General Eisenhower has authorized the following statement of his views on the proposal to make Sir Winston Churchill an honorary American citizen:

> Sir Winston Churchill has been my warm personal friend for more than 20 years. I have known him both in wartime and in peace as an inspirational leader and a man dedicated to the promotion of Anglo-American friendship and the solidarity of the English-speaking community. In a long and varied career he has many extraordinary achievements to his credit, of which his reputation as the political leader of Great Britain during World War II, and his brilliance as an author are unquestionably the most widely known.
>
> All these facts, to which must be added the circumstance that his mother was of American birth, clearly justify in my opinion the awarding to him of an honor that has previously been given to only one other, General Lafayette. It is my further opinion, that in taking this action, the Congress would not in anyway create a precedent. I believe that the circumstances are such as to make the case so exceptional as to stand as practically unique.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, by granting Sir Winston Churchill honorary American citizenship, the House pays a great man a singular and well-deserved tribute.

His contributions to the preservation of American freedom in a time of supreme crisis, for all of Western civilization, fill the pages of modern history. In the 1930's he courageously defied the appeasement policies of his own country which culminated in the Munich capitulation and the advent of World War II. In the early months of the war, when Hitler's armies had triumphantly subdued the European Continent, leaving England to fight on alone, his eloquent voice and masterful personality provided a rallying point for the hopes of both the free and the enslaved nations. His dogged determination sustained England during her darkest hour and held the Atlantic frontier safe until America entered the war. Thus, he gave his nation one of its finest hours.

For these and other acts born of consummate wisdom and indomitable courage, we owe Sir Winston an immeasurable debt of gratitude which House bill 4374 discharges in part. Our affection for him is deeper, not only because his mother gave him American blood and ancestors who fought side by side with General Washington in our War of Independence, but because he represents one of the finest statesmen produced by the English-speaking peoples. In addressing the Virginia House of Delegates March 8, 1946, Sir Winston gave expression to his hope for union and understanding which we will do well to recall: "Above all, among the English-speaking peoples, there must be the union of hearts based upon conviction and common ideals. That is what I offer. That is what I seek."

In honoring this great man, we also honor ourselves.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 378, nays 21, answered "present" 5, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]

YEAS—378

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton,
  Frances P.
Bolton,
  Oliver P.
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Hoeven
Holifield
Holland
Horan
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meader
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan, N.Y.
Ryan, Mich.
St. Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.

Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Westland
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger

NAYS—21

Abele
Alger
Ashbrook
Becker
Burleson
Conte
Derounian
Dorn
Foreman
Gross
Grover
Hall
Johansen
Monagan
Rogers, Tex.
Schwengel
Short
Siler
Snyder
Tuten
Utt

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5

Hoffman
Pillion
St. George
Ullman
Van Pelt

NOT VOTING—30

Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Buckley
Byrnes, Wis.
Clausen
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Farbstein
Gray
Griffiths
Gurney
Healey
Herlong
Kee
Madden
Miller, N.Y.
Multer
O'Brien, Ill.
Patten
Rains
Rhodes, Ariz.
Senner
Smith, Va.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Tupper
Walter
Watson
Whitten
Zablocki

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Clausen.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Gurney.

Mr. BURKE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. RANDALL changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittees of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 288 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the minority, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may briefly consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 288 provides for consideration of H.R. 2440, a bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule with 4 hours of general debate.

H.R. 2440 provides authorization in the amount of $15,856,391,000 for defense programs for fiscal year 1964 in two major areas. It includes authorization of appropriation for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels in form identical to previous enactments of the fund authorizations required. It also includes a similar authorization of appropriations for the research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels as required for the first time by the amendment to sec. 412(b) contained in Public Law 87-436. This, then, is the first bill to be presented to the House in which the Armed Services Committee has exercised this additional authority.

Of the total $15,856,391,000, the bill includes $1,761,549,000 for the Army; $6,612,024,000 for the Navy and Marine Corps; and $7,482,818,000 for the Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt at this time to comment on the merits of the bill. I can only say in passing that I am alarmed at the enormity of the amount of money involved. Surely the Defense Department could get along with less.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has explained the provisions of the rule. It is an open rule. It provides for 4 hours of general debate, to be followed by discussion under the 5-minute rule, with the offering of any and all amendments that may be germane to the measure.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important piece of legislation. I feel your attention should be called to the fact that this is an authorization bill, not an appropriation bill.

It does, however, authorize later appropriations of not more than $15,456,391,000 to be used for the purchase of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and other similar equipment for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States.

This is a historic report filed by this committee, if my memory serves me correctly for it is seldom any bill is ever reported out of the Committee on Armed Services which does not carry the absolutely unanimous support of all 37 Members agreeing fully with everything that may be in the bill, and especially all those provisions of a bill which are favored, of course, by the most illustrious chairman who has ever served any committee in the history of parliamentary practices in the House of Representatives of the United States, the Honorable chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who is credited with knowing more about the needs and the strength of our Armed Forces than any other individual in America. Yet, history has been made by this report, because I see that while there is not a minority report filed, there have been additional views filed by five members of the committee which is indeed unusual. Frankly, I do not agree with the additional views, but nevertheless I think we should mark here that there have been additional views filed by members of this committee.

After this bill is approved today, as undoubtedly it will be, and after it clears the other body and is signed into law by the President, being an authorization bill only, as I explained a few moments ago, the Committee on Appropriations of the House must then pass judgment on each and every line and item contained in this measure and determine, in its wisdom, just what appropriation should actually be made under the authorization granted.

When the chairman of this illustrious Armed Services Committee was before the House Committee on Rules asking for the rule which makes consideration of this bill in order, he did make some statements that caused some alarm among the members of our own committee and, I believe, among those who were in attendance at the hearing when he pointed out provisions of the bill which authorized the building of so-called killer submarines for the purpose of destroying Russian or some other enemy submarines that could easily attack and virtually destroy by missiles cities within 300 or 400 miles of our seacoast. That statement gave concern to all of us.

However, after some questioning, Chairman VINSON did point out, as shown in this report, that we also have a great many Polaris missile firing submarines of our own and those submarines, I understand, can send our missiles a distance of anywhere from 1,000 to 1,500 miles, and even farther. Of course, as was pointed out by the chairman, under questioning, the greatest deterrent to an all-out war is the power of retaliation, and the United States does have the power to retaliate against any enemy that might decide to attack this country and, in turn, we have the power to completely destroy the enemy.

I am saying these things today on the floor of the House not because I feel that we are giving away any military secrets, for I am sure the Russians, and other nations as well, have all the information contained in this report, and a great deal more, and probably know more about our defensive and offensive strength by far than the average Member of Congress, but rather to assure the American people that from all the information some of us have been able to obtain it appears we are not in anything like the grave danger first described by the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman VINSON, when he appeared before the Rules Committee and frightened us by his discussion of how the Russians, because of the number of submarines they have could wreak great destruction against the United States and cities near our coasts.

I hope that as general debate progresses the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and other members of the committee who speak on the bill will make it clear to the American people at least, and perhaps to the peoples of the entire world, that the United States is not defenseless as has been suggested, that this country is in position, not only to defend itself against any attack, but also to retaliate in such force as to make it unprofitable for any enemy to attack the United States at any time, and that if such an attack should come that in the end, it would not be the United States but the enemy that would be the greatest sufferer, from any mistake made by starting World War III.

I want to recommend, if I may, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, that every Member of the House read carefully the report of the committee which has been filed with this bill, perhaps keep it on file in his or her office, because it contains information that will be of great value, not only now, but also in the future, in connection with answering questions about our own strength and these proposals of the Congress of the United States to increase our Nation's offensive and defensive strength for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 9 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, there is no reason to impose upon the House this afternoon to delineate in detail the purposes of the bill, because such detail will be clearly spelled out, I am sure, by the members of the Armed Services Committee. As I read this report and review the statements made by the chairman of the committee in his appearance before the Rules Committee it appears as though there are about four principal policy propositions enunciated in this bill: No. 1, that the military procurement program will first be authorized by the Congress before the Department of Defense proceeds to request funds from the Appropriations Committee.

Some new Members may ask, "What do you mean?" I mean this: This was the procedure previous to 1961. The executive department would submit a classified request to the Appropriations Committee and the Members of the House were pretty much kept in the dark as to the nature and extent of these requests until the Department of Defense appropriation bill, involving maybe $40 or $50 billion came on the floor. This was the first information any Member had as to what the procurement requests by the administration were going to be for any fiscal year.

This is the third authorization bill for military procurement. I think it is good for the House, and I do not think it will be any news or of any comfort to our adversaries to have this authorization. It is the right of the American people, the American taxpayers, to know for what purpose their money is being contemplated to be spent in the next fiscal year.

The second policy position deals with authorization of research and development. This is the first time that research has been specifically authorized by the Congress before it was undertaken or contracted by the Department of Defense. Have they been proceeding without authorization? No. But they have been proceeding on basic or general authorization. This is the first time, may I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Armed Services has outlined in detail the authorization for research and development for a fiscal year.

I wonder if you have any idea what research is costing? There will be $7 billion authorized for research in fiscal 1964. A little over $4 billion presently authorized, and there is in excess of $3 billion in new authorizations for research in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly concur with the third policy position of the committee that relates to the RS-70 bomber. Those of you who were present in the 87th Congress will remember this was a matter of considerable disagreement, we were advised, between the administration and the Committee on Armed Services. But the night before this bill was on the floor a year ago, there was some agreement reached and there was a limited amount of money made available for further research on the RS-70. But really no final decision established as far as the future of the manned bomber program is concerned.

The amount of money in this bill for the RS-70 for fiscal 1964 I understand to be some $630 million and a total additional authorization of $1.2 billion for this bomber of the future. This is a most important aspect of this section as it specifically relates to the RS-70. The most significant thing in my judgment is, it reaffirms a position of the Congress as to the future of the whole manned bomber program.

I think Members of the House are probably aware of the fact that the B-47's are now being gradually deactivated. The last L-52 was delivered in 1962. Since that time there have been no replacements in our manned bomber program or known to be contemplated for the future. It may be said that we are commencing to phase out our earlier concept of a manned bomber retaliatory force. By the inclusion in this bill of funds to program two additional RF-70's—in addition to the three that are presently authorized—and the further authorization for a weapons system to complement the craft.

I think it is a clear statement of policy by the Congress that we are not yet convinced that the usefulness of the manned bomber has been terminated. I will support the committee in this position.

In the fourth category the bill is not a clear reflection of a policy position but I think it is a very important aspect of the bill. I inquired of the chairman if there was any manifest—perhaps I should say any tangible concern on the part of the Committee on Armed Services as to the recent award of the $7 billion TFX contract, a plane with slight modification to be suitable for both Navy and Air Force employment.

The chairman replied there was not; that any tangible expression of concern on this matter was to be left to a committee of the other body. So, if that is the case, there is no need to further trespass on the time of the House this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, those of us from the Middle West are deeply concerned about this, and for a very understandable reason. Had this contract been awarded on the basis of a unanimous recommendation by the military and to the low bidder, the contract work would have been performed in Kansas and in a Government-owned facility. So, for this reason, we do have an interest in it.

But, Mr. Speaker, certainly there is no opposition to this bill. The rule should be adopted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I am reluctant to speak here this afternoon because, for the first time, I am a little bit disappointed with a bill coming out of this great committee, and I am disappointed for this reason:

Many of us here, myself included, have been anxious to see certain cuts made in these enormous authorizations and appropriations. Now, here we have a bill which is by no means small. This bill is merely for procurement. This bill, according to the committee report, states the following:

> The fiscal year 1964 request for new obligational authority for the entire Department of Defense totals $52,180,637,000. Of this amount, $15,358,691,000 was requested

by the executive branch for authorization under the provisions section 412(b) of Public Law 86–149, as amended.

Now, this is this particular bill. The committee modified the original request by adding $497,700,000. Now, I am sure that the committee had what they considered good and sufficient reason for doing this. I am in sympathy with the committee's position as far as the manned bombers are concerned; I am in great sympathy with it. But, it does seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that if they had applied themselves a little, they could have still gotten what they wanted, with which I sympathize 100 percent, and yet perhaps shaved off a little so that they did not have to come in to this House and ask for more than the administration is asking for the Defense Department.

Mr. Speaker, that, quite frankly, is my disappointment. How can we go out to our people, the harassed taxpayers of this country—and we do, all of us, on both sides of the aisle—and tell them that things have got to be cut; that we have got to slow down on these authorizations, and then have one of our greatest committees come in and say, "Oh, yes, we are bringing a bill in to you, and we have, quite frankly, upped it almost $500 million over what was asked by the administration." For this reason I am a little disappointed.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, knowing well the work, the dedication, and the knowledge of this committee, I imagine that very little can be said, and I am inclined to think that the bill as written will pass.

There is one novel thing also about this piece of legislation. That is, that for the first time in the memory of many Members of this House there is a minority report. So, perhaps, some people have become a little anxious about these appropriations and, perhaps, there is beginning to be a little wave toward the side of economy, although I do not believe it is too economical when we appropriate for procurement alone and research $15,358,691,000.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2440, with Mr. Shelley in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] is recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends] is recognized for 2 hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George], the fact that Secretary of Defense McNamara said in his testimony:

> Management improvement action instituted in the fiscal year 1962 and planned for fiscal year 1963 should ultimately produce annual savings of $1.9 billion. Our goal for end of fiscal 1965 is to initiate actions which will increase the rate of savings to over $3.4 billion each year.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to advise the Committee that out of this $52 billion budget for the security and defense of the Nation, through the superb business-management that is going on in the Department of Defense, there will be and there should be large savings, because we are making better contracts.

Mr. Chairman, it does not necessarily follow that we should reduce the hardware, reduce the personnel to get the savings. We can accomplish this savings by making better contracts than in the past.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And, when does the gentleman from Georgia say this savings will show on the books?

Mr. VINSON. It will show, based upon the statement of the Secretary of Defense—for the years following fiscal year 1963. I shall be glad to read the statement again.

Mr. GROSS. No. When does the gentleman think this saving will come about?

Mr. VINSON. He says for actions taken during fiscal year 1963—and fiscal year 1963 runs until July—should show a savings of $1.9 billion per year in the future.

Mr. GROSS. In this fiscal year?

Mr. VINSON. No; not this year. What he says here is, "and plans for fiscal year 1963 should ultimately produce savings of about $1.9 billion." Our goal for end of fiscal year 1965 is to initiate actions which will increase the rate of savings to over $3.4 billion each year.

Mr. GROSS. The figure this year, if the gentleman will yield further, is based on what? To what will the savings be applied?

Mr. VINSON. Based upon the budget of 1963.

Mr. McNamara continues, in the statement which I have been quoting from, to enumerate the many ways in which he intends to effect these savings. For example, he refers to "buying only what we need—refining the requirements calculations—increased use of excess inventories—eliminating 'gold plating' of technical specifications" and things of this kind.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. And I think he is going to do it, because we are spending as the gentleman will note when the appropriation bill comes before us, some $52 billion on defense.

That is an enormous sum of money for defense. By good business management he should be able to make worthwhile and creditable savings, and he feels confident he can do so. But that does not mean you have to reduce the forces to accomplish that goal. But he does have to sit across the bargaining table and make better contracts and do the other things which he referred to in his statement, and which I quoted.

Mr. Chairman, the Armed Services Committee is presenting to the House today the largest, single authorization bill which it has ever reported out of the committee.

And to the best of my knowledge, it is the largest authorization bill ever presented to the House of Representatives. It totals $15,856,391,000.

I should point out that one of the reasons for its larger size this year is the fact that it contains $3,492,891,000 in authorizations for research, development, test, and evaluation of future weapons systems. This particular authority has not been contained in the armed services authorization bills before.

Naturally, this research and development work was carried on but it was under very general authorities available to the departments which required only appropriations. It was not until this past year that the law was changed so as to place this kind of activity under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee.

Therefore, if we deducted the research and development authorities from the bill, we would find that the actual procurement—that is, the purchasing of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels—comes to an amount somewhat smaller than that presented to you last year.

I mention these facts only to place the bill in proper perspective and to relate it to similar bills which have been presented to the House before.

Of the total of $15,856,391,000, the Army will get $1,761,549,000, the Navy and Marine Corps will get $6,612,024,000, and the Air Froce will get $7,482,818,000.

ARMY

Let us look at the Army first. The bill authorizes $522.1 million for aircraft for the Army. This will buy 1,598 aircraft. A list of the aircraft to be bought and a description of each airplane appears on 20 and 21 of the report.

Briefly, the Army plans to buy three kinds of operational helicopters: the Iroquois, the Chinook, and observation helicopters of the Sioux and Raven types.

The bill also authorizes two kinds of fixed-wing airplanes: the Mohawk and the Caribou.

In addition to these operational aircraft, the Army will also procure other

helicopters and fixed-wing airplanes for training purposes.

I will point out, as I have pointed out before, that the aircraft used by the Army is the kind that is flown within the battlefield area. There is no duplication and no conflict in this area with the Air Force.

The Air Force will continue to provide, as it has in the past, tactical support but the Army needs its own aircraft for surveillance, to enable commanders to travel from place to place within the battle area, to evacuate the wounded, and generally to operate within the restricted battle area. Of course, also, these planes are used to move a squad of soldiers from one place to another as the situation may dictate.

Today, there are about 6,900 in Army aviation. The Army has about 6,000 airplanes in its inventory.

In the field of missiles, the bill authorizes $580.7 million for some 28,000 Army missiles. These missiles are the Hawk, Nike-Hercules, Mauler, the anti-tank missiles ANTAC and SS–11, the Honest John, Little John, the Pershing, and the Sergeant. All in all, we are purchasing some 27,888 missiles.

Of these missiles I have named, all are operational except Mauler and Pershing.

If you will look at page 22 of the report, you will see a description of each of these missiles.

In the area of research and development which, as I have mentioned, appears in the bill for the first time this year, the Army is being authorized $82.148 million for aircraft research and development and $576.6 million for missile research and development.

Much of this research and development authorization is for the improvement of existing aircraft and missiles and, of course, a very substantial portion of it looks toward the aircraft and missiles for the future. This area, looking toward the future as it does, tends to involve a great deal of classified information.

I have, however, made every effort to place in the report everything which can be told about the research and development authorization for the Army and I would suggest that you look at pages 23 through 26 in the report for a reasonably detailed description of how these authorizations will be used.

NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The Navy and Marine Corps portion of the bill in all of its essential respects is the same as that for the Army except that, of course, it also includes authority for naval vessels.

The bill contains almost $2 billion in authority for Navy and Marine Corps aircraft. The exact figure is $1,958,700,000. This will purchase almost 700 aircraft for the Navy and Marine Corps. A glance at pages 27, 28, and 29 will show a list of the aircraft and a description of each of them.

The total amount in the bill for missiles for the Navy and Marine Corps is $1,122 million. This will procure approximately 15,000 missiles of various kinds for the two services.

A glance at page 27 and pages 29 and 30 will show a list of these missiles and a description of each of them.

Included among this year's buy are the Sparrow III, the Sidewinder, Bullpup, Tartar, Talos, and Hawk along with several others.

The bill as submitted to the Congress requested authority for the construction of 41 new naval vessels and the conversion of 35 other vessels.

The conversions were left unchanged by the committee, but the committee added two attack or "killer" submarines in the new construction category.

The total shipbuilding and conversion program, and including the two "killer" submarines added by the committee, will require authorization in the amount of $2,444 million.

The bill as presented to the Congress contained 6 of these "killer" submarines although the Navy had requested the Secretary of Defense to provide 8 of them for this year.

Because of the great importance of this particular kind of submarine in the light of the extremely large Soviet submarine force, the committee added the two "killer" submarines which the Navy felt that it needed this year and the bill now contains a total of eight of them.

This added $134 million to the bill, or $67 million for each of these submarines.

In order to give the House a picture of where we stand today in the important category of attack or "killer" submarines, I would like to point out these facts: 17 in operation, plus 1 SSG(N), Halibut—a Regulus submarine—18 under construction, 4 authorized, but contract not yet let for a total of 40.

As I have mentioned, this bill adds 8 more for a total of 48 nuclear attack submarines after this bill has been approved.

All of the types which make up the 43 total new ships are named and described on pages 31, 32, and 33.

Of the 35 vessel conversions, 26 of them are of the destroyer class.

POLARIS

Thirty-five Polaris submarines were fully funded through fiscal year 1963. The last 6 of the planned fleet—or a total of 41—are contained in this bill.

Nine Polaris submarines carrying 144 missiles are now deployed at sea. Nine more of them with 144 more missiles will become deployable during fiscal year 1964.

For a description of the capabilities of these submarines and for more details on our Polaris fleet, I invite the attention of the House to page 13 of the report wherein will be found references to the A–1 missile, the A–2 missile, and the A–3 missile—this latter one with a planned capability far in excess of the other two.

NAVY-MARINE CORPS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For Navy-Marine Corps Research and Development, the bill authorizes a total of $1,087,324,000. On page 33 of the report, you will see each of these various programs broken down first by major categories and second, by the research and development programs themselves.

AIR FORCE

The bill authorizes the procurement of 964 airplanes for the Air Force for a total cost of $3,559 million. A list of these aircraft and a description of each type appear on pages 36, 37, and 38 of the Committee report.

Among the planes to be procured are the KC 135 jet tanker, the F–4C tactical fighter, the C–130E and the C–141A cargo transports.

These latter two airplanes, the C–130E and the C–141A, will provide significant modernization and improved capability in the area of airlift for troops and cargo.

In the case of missiles, the bill authorizes 16,202 missiles of various kinds for a total amount of $2,177 million. These include the intercontinental ballistic missiles Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman, the Bullpup air-to-ground missile, and the Falcon and Sparrow air-to-air missiles.

A description of each of these missiles will be found on pages 38 and 39 of the report.

The total for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation for the Air Force is $1,746,818,000. The programs which will be carried out under this authorization are described on pages 40 and 41 of the report.

I would now like to discuss the matter of the RS–70. The RS–70 represents the outstanding difference between the departmental proposal and the bill as reported by the Committee. So, this matter should be discussed in sufficient detail to permit a full understanding.

BACKGROUND

Research and development on the RS–70 began in 1955, when this strategic bomber system was known as the B–70.

From fiscal 1955 until the recent Committee hearings, a total of $1,751 million had been appropriated. Of that sum, $1,241 million had been programed. An additional sum of $50 million had been earmarked, but not allocated. Assuming that this $50 million is allocated, there remains $81 million as a carryover into fiscal 1964.

THE NATURE OF THE DISAGREEMENT

Due to the widespread misunderstanding which exists as between the recommendations of the Secretary of Defense and the House Armed Services Committee on the RS–70, the facts must be clearly stated.

The Secretary of Defense proposes to have an RS–70 development program which would produce three prototype airplanes.

In performance, they would fly some 2,000 miles per hour, for long distances, and at extremely high altitude. But under the Secretary's program, no weapons system is being developed because the Secretary's program does not provide for all the supporting systems which would be necessary in order to make a weapons system out of the RS–70.

By no stretch of the imagination would the Secretary's program develop a fighting machine.

No additional funds were requested in the fiscal 1964 budget for further work on the RS–70 program. Apparently, whatever yet remained to be done under the Secretary's program on the RS–70 would come from this $81 mililon carryover and that would be the end of the line.

The committee, on the other hand, has taken the firm position that the development program should consist of five prototypes, rather than three. It has also taken the position that with the development of the fourth and fifth prototypes, the supporting systems that would make it a weapons system would be simultaneously developed.

The committee is unable to determine why such a large sum of money should be spent merely to provide that American ingenuity can develop an airplane that will fly at three times the speed of sound, for a long distance, and at a high altitude. The scientific community concedes that this can be accomplished. So, why spend the money to prove that a flying machine with these capabilities is within our scientific and industrial capability when that point is already conceded?

It is the contention of the committee that the RS–70 program should proceed to the point where the feasibility of the RS–70 as a weapons system has been proved or disproved.

COST DIFFERENCE

During consideration of this subject in fiscal 1963, it was the position of the Secretary of Defense that his program for three prototype RS–70's would cost $1.3 billion. It was also conceded that to add two additional prototypes, as proposed by the committee, and to develop the required support systems, would cost an additional $1.2 billion. Thus, the committee's program would cost $2.5 billion as against the Secretary's program of $1.3 billion.

It must be recognized that there has been some slippage in the program due to technical difficulties, with the first flight having been delayed for a period of months. However, these relative cost projections remain valid and delineate the cost differential in the two programs.

The question arises as to whether or not the fourth and fifth prototypes as proposed by the committee, are to cost more than $500 million each. That is not the case. As a matter of fact, the cost difference clearly accentuates the importance of this disagreement. The greater part of the additional cost would be required in the development of the supporting systems such as the missiles, highly sophisticated radar, etc. It is this fact which underscores the degree of difference in the three-prototype program being pursued by the Secretary of Defense and the five-prototype program of the committee.

The committee does not now—nor has it at any time in the past—recommended the purchase of even one RS–70 from a production line. But it insists that the development program should produce all the evidence that is needed upon which the Department of Defense and the Congress can base a rational decision as to whether or not RS–70's should be produced in quantity.

This, briefly, is the fundamental difference between the recommendation of the committee and that of the Secretary of Defense.

FUTURE STRATEGIC FLEXIBILITY

Underlying this entire controversy is the basic conviction of the House Committee on Armed Services that manned strategic systems must continue to play a major role in our military capabilities.

There can be no question but that the capabilities of our conventional forces are being greatly increased.

There can be no doubt but that the current fleet of B–52's and B–58's will continue to perform a most important role during the next 5 years. But it is equally true that no nation in the free world is developing a follow-on bomber for our current strategic bombers and unless we proceed with the development of such a strategic bomber, we will today sow the seeds which will produce our strategic bomber gap in the late 1960's.

There can be no doubt that strategic missiles constitute an extremely important part of our strategic arsenal. The committee has evidenced its judgment by approving every authorization request that has ever been presented to it for strategic missiles. The concern of the committee stems from the growing tendency on the part of the Department of Defense to place more and more emphasis on the missiles and less and less on manned strategic systems. The committee considers this to be a most dangerous course of action and one with which it disagrees.

CIVILIAN CONTROL AND MILITARY JUDGMENT

In taking its position, the committee does not challenge in any degree the right or necessity of civilian control over the Department of Defense. Such control is essential.

The Secretary of Defense may completely disregard, if he chooses, the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, even though they are his principal military advisers as a matter of law. But it is pertinent to point out some recent actions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the question of the RS–70.

In September 1962, the RS–70 development program was referred to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for an expression of military judgment. On that occasion, the Joint Chiefs of Staff unanimously supported the development of the RS–70. Even in the case of one member who supported its development principally as a reconnaissance vehicle, he also supported it with its other supporting systems such as missiles, and so forth.

Shortly after that decision, two new members were appointed to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the RS–70 matter was again submitted for consideration. Again, all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with the exception of the new Chairman, supported the development of the RS–70.

It is recognized that there is some difference of opinion as to precisely what the Joint Chiefs of Staff supported. But there can be no doubt that the Joint Chiefs, with the single exception noted, supported the development of the RS–70 at a substantially higher level of development than that currently planned under the program of the Secretary of Defense. Under any fair interpretation, the best military judgment available supports the development program proposed by the committee.

SUMMARY

What are the proposed capabilities of a fully developed RS–70?

First. It would be equipped with the most outstanding air reconnaissance capabilities in the world.

Second. It would not carry gravity bombs but would be equipped with air-to-ground missiles of substantial range, having nuclear warheads. Thus, it would have an offensive or strike capability.

Third. The RS–70 would have the capability of conducting a reconnaissance mission in a hostile environment, before or after an ICBM exchange, and would be capable of striking not only preplanned targets, but those targets not precisely located, as well as mobile targets of opportunity.

Fourth. While in the performance of its mission in a hostile environment, it could report back to the command post the results of not only its own strike, but previous strikes by other weapons systems.

Fifth. The current strategic bomber force provides that military unbrella under which strictly limited warfare, of any substantial magnitude, may be conducted. This capability provides that essential element of flexibility which spans the gap between limited war capabilities and the pushbutton war of long-range missiles. It embraces that highly essential element—the judgment of man.

Sixth. Finally, the effect which the development of the RS–70 weapons system would have on the enemy would be great. The current Soviet air defense system of Soviet interceptors, radar, and surface-to-air missiles would be so seriously degraded by the capabilities of the RS–70 as to become practically worthless. Those defenses could be penetrated bebeyond all doubt.

Assuming that the development and procurement of the RS–70 in substantial quantity would entail an expenditure of $10 billion, an equivalent or greater expenditure would be required on the part of the Soviets to develop an air defense system which had any reasonable possibility of successfully coping with this weapons system.

CONCLUSION

Now, I hope I have given a good picture of what this bill will do. I have broken it down by service and by the various programs of each of the services.

I have referred on a number of occasions by page number to detailed information contained in the report. I have also mentioned that so far as procurement is concerned, the bill is slightly smaller this year than last year although the grand total of the bill is larger because of the fact that research and development is contained in the bill for the first time this year.

I would not say that the bill is really unusual in any major respect. It is simply an authorization for fiscal year 1964

for programs which have been going on for many years within the three military departments. Quite literally, it is more of the same.

I urge the wholehearted support of all Members of the House.

SUMMARY OF BILL

In summary, then, the committee added $497,700,000 to the bill for the two "killer" submarines and the first step toward two more RS–70 airplanes.

The bill authorizes some 3,000 aircraft, some 60,000 missiles, 43 new ships, and the conversion of 35 ships.

The most important of the new 43 ships are 6 Polaris submarines, 8 attack submarines, 10 destroyer escorts, 1 submarine tender, and 10 motor gunboats.

Of the 35 conversions, 26 are destroyers and 7 of these 26 are guided missile destroyers.

The bill also authorizes a grand total of $3,129,191,000 for research and development for all three departments.

The committee hearings extended from late in January to late in February and on every day but two, the committee met morning and afternoon, sometimes until 6 o'clock in the evening. The committee went into every conceivable detail with respect to all of the programs requested for authorization.

We looked at every aircraft, missile, and ship, and we studied every research and development program. We compared the inventory of the departments today as we weighed the request for the additional items.

Now, those are the highlights of the program. It is a big one, but it is a tight one. The requests from the individual departments would have made a bill very much larger than the $15 billion contained in this bill. Large as it is, it is a lean program.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will my distinguished chairman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Our very distinguished chairman has asked why. I would like, as one of the five majority Members who has taken the liberty to speak on this very important question, to refer the chairman and Members of the House to page 399 of the hearings wherein this very question was asked of the Secretary of Defense in the following colloquy between myself and Secretary McNamara:

> Mr. Cohelan. Now, Mr. Secretary, can you tell me now what the status of the RS–70 program is?
>
> I understand that we were supposed to have one in December.
>
> Secretary McNamara. Yes.
>
> Mr. Cohelan. Supposed to have one in December and one in July.
>
> Secretary McNamara. We were supposed to have the first flight of the RS–70, or the first flight of first aircraft, in December. That aircraft has not flown to date. It is uncertain as to when it will fly. The estimates range from May, I understand, through October.

Now, that is the comment of the distinguished Secretary of Defense. I wish the gentleman would comment on that.

Mr. VINSON. Yes, I will comment on it.

If we stopped every time there were some bugs or some failure in our missile program, we would have stopped building missiles a long time ago. We are getting to the point where the Atlas and the Titan in a period of time will be supplemented by the Minuteman. But even so, in the last five tests of the Minuteman it did not come up to expectations.

Mr. Chairman, this RS–70 is a most complicated plane. We know it can fly, we know it can fly at a speed three times that of sound, we know it can go very high. But when you get that knowledge you would close the book. This is where we disagree.

I say what good, what benefit to the existence of this country is it to gain that knowledge and then let it lie fallow. We say, "Get the knowledge and use that knowledge to make a weapon system out of it."

These five distinguished colleagues of mine on the Committee on Armed Services say in their separate views, "Get the knowledge, file it away, put the bushel measure over the candle light, let it die."

We say, "Carry it on, build further." If you do you will build a weapon system the like of which has never been invented by man before. There is no doubt about that. Continue the manned system. I will tell you later on what its military characteristics are. I certainly hope when we debate this at greater length we will have this Chamber full of Members. We will make all of our points, because this is a very important matter, it is a basic question of policy.

There is no doubt that the Secretary is one of the greatest men to occupy that position. The Nation respects him, I respect him, and I am going to help him save $4 billion out of this $52 billion expenditure. But 32 members of the committee simply do not agree with his position in this matter.

He came in and concluded that we do not need the B–47's. And the B–47's go out of the inventory soon. It was decided when the contract on the B–52's was finished that would be the end of the B–52's. And the same with the B–58's. They would live and fly only so long as their machinery was capable of carrying them in the air.

Thirty-two members of the Committee on Armed Services think it is not the proper thing to do to get away from manned systems. We think we should continue on with manned systems, and not put all of our offensive and defensive dependence on the Minuteman, the Titan, the Atlas, or the Polaris. We think we had better find more ways to defend this country than just one, missiles. This is the Maginot line of thinking. And a dangerous course to follow.

Now, we are not going to rush this bill here this afternoon. It will be thoroughly explained, even if it takes all week to debate this bill, because the defense of this country is at stake in what kind of policy we have and what kind of weapons systems we develop.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the distinguished chairman. On page 6 of the majority report there is one sentence that I find particularly interesting. Discussing the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with respect to the RS–70 the report states as follows:

> It is recognized that there is some difference of opinion as to precisely what the Joint Chiefs of Staff supported.

Would the gentleman kindly explain the background of this statement?

Mr. VINSON. That is going to be debated considerably by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert] and others. But, briefly here is what happened in a general way. Last September the Secretary referred this matter of the RS–70 to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Now, all of you know who constitute the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They are the Chiefs of their respective services. It is composed of a Chairman and the four Chiefs. In September he referred it to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and at that time General Lemnitzer was Chairman. After consideration by the Joint Chiefs of Staff they unanimously recommended acceleration of the RS–70 program. A short time after that a change took place in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General Lemnitzer was ordered to NATO, and General Decker's, the Army Chief, time had expired. General Wheeler was appointed from the Army, and the President's military adviser, a most distinguished officer, General Taylor, was made Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Then the Secretary submitted it to the new group, and every member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff except General Taylor recommended for the second time that this program go forward at a higher rate.

Of course, the Secretary, under the authority, direction, and control given to him by the Congress, that is, the civilian control, has the right to disregard any recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at any time he sees fit. That is civilian control. But, we did develop those facts and I think the House should have them.

There was no hesitancy on the part of an overwhelming majority of the Members for the Committee on Armed Services to write in this provision and ask this House to follow the conclusions and recommendations of the top military authorities in the Nation, those fixed by statute with the responsibility to advise the President and the Secretary of Defense on military matters. And we decided that the heavy preponderance of military opinion, which was backed up by the scientists in the Air Force, warranted the continuation of the RS–70 program at a higher level of effort.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services yield?

Mr. VINSON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. First, I would like to say that I agree with the distinguished chairman completely and have been a consistent supporter of the B–70 and the RS–70 program. However, in view of the attitude of the Secretary of Defense this past year when Congress approved and appropriated funds and they were not expended, can the chairman give us any assurance that we can convince the Secretary of Defense of the merits of this program?

Mr. VINSON. Let us cross every bridge as we come to it. When we get to that point, probably we may be more persuasive than we have been in the past. Let us carry out our own responsibility. I feel that is up to us to say that the policy of America and its defense is not going to be based on missiles alone. Bombers with men in them have maintained the peace for all these years. We have some 1,400 of them. They have represented a restraining influence and force that still keeps the peace today. I am unwilling in meeting my responsibility to say we are going to let all of that fade away and come to the pushbutton stage when all we have got to do is to push a button deep in the ground and shoot up a missile.

I do not wish to be understood as discounting the importance of missiles. We must have them just as we must have many other kinds of weapons. What I do want to have clearly understood as my position is that if we get to the point where we have told the enemy that the only thing he has to guard against is missiles, we will have failed in living up to our responsibilities in defending this country.

What we need is a "mix" of weapons. In this way we keep the enemy off balance at all times because he knows that we can attack him with a great variety of weapons against all of which he must spend his time and effort in guarding.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. When the gentleman speaks of 1,400 missiles, the gentleman must be talking about major missiles.

Mr. VINSON. I am talking about 1,400 bombers.

Mr. GROSS. Bombers?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; 1,400 bombers.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. The chairman does not mean to imply that we are going to go out of the bomber business by his remarks?

Mr. VINSON. We are going out of the strategic bombing business and, of course, you know it.

Mr. COHELAN. Will the distinguished chairman tell the Members of the House what is the strategic bomber mission?

Mr. VINSON. The mission of any strategic force is to destroy the enemy's warmaking potential and we can do that today. But I ask the question: Will we be able to do this in the all too immediate future? Of course, there will be tactical bombers. They will continue in our inventory. However, I am directing my remarks today to the issue between strategic manned operated systems, and a sole reliance on missiles.

Mr. Chairman, we think the facts—and this will be gone into at considerable length—clearly warrant the proposal to increase the level of effort on the RS–70. We also think there is another item which is highly important: We think the amendment to provide for eight "killer" submarines instead of six warrants the same favorable consideration.

Mr. Chairman, as referred to by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown], when I appeared before the Committee on Rules last Friday I did refer briefly to the capability of the Russian submarine. Of course, we know what these Russian submarines can do.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Ninety-four Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 10]

Abernethy
Blatnik
Bolling
Celler
Clausen
Curtis
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Farbstein
Griffiths
Gurney
Harsha
Hawkins
Healey
Herlong
Kee
Kluczynski
Madden
Miller, N.Y.
O'Brien, Ill
Patten
Powell
Rains
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rogers, Tex.
Sheppard
Smith, Va.
Teague, Tex.
Tupper
Utt
Walter
Watson
Zablocki

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Shelley, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 2440, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 404 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, after Chairman Vinson's detailed explanation of the purpose and contents of the pending authorization bill, nothing would be gained by my again detailing the nature of the military weapons we recommend be made a part of our defense arsenal and the reasons for our recommendation. Our committee has painstakingly examined every aspect of our defense posture: What we now have, what we now need, and what we need and should have in the foreseeable future.

This bill represents our committee's considered judgment as how best to meet those needs. We have but one objective. That is to make certain that we have a national defense second to none, that we are adequately prepared for any emergency that threatens our security, whenever, however, and wherever it may arise. And, corollary to that purpose, we are determined that our people shall have a dollar's worth of defense for each dollar expended.

The measure before us authorizes an appropriation of approximately $15,857 million for defense purposes for the next fiscal year. That is a tremendous sum but constitutes only one part of our defense program—the development and procurement of weapons: Ships, planes, and missiles. As we all so well know, national security—our own Defense Establishment and related international programs—is about one-half of our entire national budget.

This is a heavy burden on American taxpayers. But it is one which they will bear without complaint so long as they have the assurance that what is being spent for defense is being spent wisely and efficiently. To the people a defense need is a must and sacrifices must be made in other areas of Federal expenditures. First things first. A prudent family first pays the rent or installment on the mortgage, that it may be insured shelter, before it makes a down payment on a new car. It is incumbent upon us, as custodians of the taxpayers money, to be no less prudent.

A prudent family also does not rent or buy a house beyond its needs. As large as this bill is, our commnittee has determined that the items it embodies are a minimum need as our National military shelter against militant international communism.

This is not to say that our military budget is so sacred, so sanctified, and so sagaciously constituted that it must not be touched. Let no one be under the illusion that the mere authorization and appropriation of dollars for each and every thing the Department of Defense wants will give us the kind of a defense we need and should have. Military strength cannot be measured in terms of dollars. And let no one hesitate to recommend a cut in defense funds where he honestly believes the funds are not essential or not fully justified.

Our national defense operations are international in scope. There are doubtless operations here at home and operations in various places around the globe that can be reduced, eliminated, or changed without in any way affecting the bone and muscle of our defense arm. We want a defense structure that is bone and muscle. We want the fat taken off. We would be stronger by so doing. And one who finds places where we can do just that is rendering a patriotic service.

All this can doubtless be more appropriately said when we take up the Defense Department appropriation bill, when dollar by dollar we take up each and every one of the innumerable Defense Department operations. The authorization bill before us does not deal with defense operations. It deals with weapons. It deals with the very sinew of our whole defense plans and posture.

Also corollary to the determination of our Committee on Armed Services that we have a military defense fully prepared for any emergency is our determination that our national defense continue to be balanced and flexible. We consider proper balance and the maximum flexibility a primary requisite to our entire defense effort. This has been and should continue to be a cardinal principle in our defense planning.

To be sure, over the years the science of warfare has changed as new weapons have been developed. The development of gunpowder had, in its day, as tremendous an impact on military strategy and plans as the development of the airplane and nuclear power has had in our day. The changes in the weapons, however, have not brought about changes in basic defense principles. They have merely forced a change of emphasis. This country's ability to adjust its defense machinery to every new development—to be able to fight a little war, a "brush war," a naval war, a land war, a small war or an all-out war—to be able to meet any military emergency on this continent or any continent, or an island or in a mountain, at some distant place or near our homeland—our ability to meet the enemy and defeat him here, there, or anywhere, at any time, place, or under any circumstances, has been the all-important fact that we have had, and must continue to have, a defense that is both balanced and flexible.

This is basic with our committee on armed services. This is why we have at all times exercised the utmost care to preserve the integrity and identity of our respective services—Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. This is why we so carefully set up in the unification act our Joint Chiefs of Staff system, with each service having its assigned roles and missions and each having a voice in our defense plans.

I need not say how effective this system has been. It proved its worth in World War II and continues to prove its worth. And I do not think I need say that Chairman Vinson and I will resist as long as we are privileged to serve here on the Armed Services Committee any attempt by anyone to discard this system for a single Chief of Staff.

But I fear—and I think my chairman shares this fear—we have in fact, if not in name, a single Chief of Staff in Secretary of Defense McNamara. While we provided in the Unification Act for civilian control of our Armed Forces—and it is essential to our form of Government that we have such control—we never for a moment thought that civilian control would become civilian dictation of the military planning. While we feared the potential power of a military man in the role of a Chief of Staff of all our Armed Forces, we never thought that a civilian in the role of Secretary of Defense would practically make himself Chief of Staff.

This is matter that greatly disturbs me, and I believe it is a matter of greatest possible concern to our committee. It is a matter of utmost concern when we find the substitution of civilian judgment for military judgment in matters strictly military, that our whole concept of a balanced and flexible military defense is endangered.

Secretary of Defense McNamara is a dedicated public servant. To know him is to like him as a person and to admire him as a man of unusual ability. He is extremely able. He is ambitious. But "I got all the answers McNamara" is not the last word in military strategy. He may know how to manufacture military weapons, but he has had no training and experience in how military weapons might be employed or their relative value in the formulation of our defense plans.

This is not solely my opinion. Nor is it solely the opinion of most of the members of our committee. It is the view, largely unexpressed, of our professional military leaders. It is also the view of our defense experts—men who have devoted their lives to studying and writing about military matters.

Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times, is considered one of the world's foremost military-affairs writers. This is what he says in a recent magazine article entitled "The McNamara Monarchy." I commend your reading the entire article. I will quote two paragraphs:

> Objections or dissent, even to Congress, are discouraged, muted or, when possible, stifled. Mr. McNamara has pressured the Joint Chiefs of Staff to sign written statements testifying to Congress that the Administration's defense budget is adequate. He has censored, deleted, and altered statements to Congress by the Chiefs of the services and their secretaries. He has downgraded, ignored, bypassed or overruled the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, is a known advocate of the abolition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff system. He favors a single voice.

A little further on in the article Mr. Baldwin says this:

> Perhaps the greatest military danger in this centralization and unification is that it overrides the voice of professional experience and substitutes a military party line, a single strategic concept. The opinions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, unless they happen to coincide with Mr. McNamara's, are usually given short shrift. Managerial techniques, computer analyses, cost-effectiveness yardsticks—rather than judgments learned on the battlefield—dominate decisions on strategy, weapons choices, even force levels.

This is exactly what is involved in connection with the RS–70. It is the decision of Secretary McNamara, not of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that the production of bombers stop, that we proceed no further with the RS–70 development program, and that we accordingly place all our defense eggs in the missile basket. To do this robs our defense of its flexibility. We are denying ourselves an alternative. We are risking our all, so to speak, on the missile—an untried weapon.

I do not intend to go into a technical discussion of the relative merits of the missiles as against the bombers. There is no question that the missile should be emphasized, but we need the bombers to complement it, to supplement it, and to give us the necessary flexibility. There is a longstanding military principle involved here that Secretary McNamara would summarily have us now reject.

In the case of the RS–70, the Joint Chiefs of Staff immediately preceding the current one, voted unanimously that the program be substantially increased.

I want to make this emphatically clear. Every Chief of Staff and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs all voted for this increase in the RS–70 program. That was their considered military judgment, individually and collectively, as to what we should do in order to have an adequate defense looking to the future.

Shortly after this vote by the Joint Chiefs, there were two changes in the composition of the Joint Chiefs. General Decker of the Army was replaced by General Wheeler, and General Lemnitzer, the Chairman, was replaced by General Taylor who had previously been serving in the nebulous position created by the President as his military adviser.

With these two changes in the composition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Secretary of Defense McNamara requested the new Joint Chiefs to consider the RS–70. Again, all of the Joint Chiefs as representatives of each of the services, voted for a higher level of effort. The new Chairman relatively fresh from the military-politico climate of the White House voted against. Not unexpectedly, the new Chairman voted with Secretary McNamara's point of view.

I might add that in the case of the Skybolt the situation is very much the same, with the voting of the Joint Chiefs being essentially the same as took place in connection with the RS–70.

Our Committee on Armed Services has never allowed politics or partisanship to enter into our decisions. I say that with some pride. Whoever is President; whoever is Secretary of Defense; whatever political party controls the administration or the Congress, or both, our Committee on Armed Services has has always set aside every political consideration and sought solely to insure that we have the kind of defense we should have.

The Constitution vests primary responsibility for the kind and size of military defense we shall have in the Congress of the United States and in our Committee on Armed Services. The Secretary of Defense needs to be reminded of this all-important fact. When he impounded funds last year that we appropriated for the RS–70 he arrogated to himself not only the responsibilities of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; he arrogated to himself the responsibility of the Congress.

Our committee has weighed all this carefully. We have determined that if we are to continue to have a properly balanced and fully flexible defense we should proceed with the RS–70 program. We accordingly exercised our constitutional duty and responsibility, and we added around $364 million for the further development of the RS–70 bomber. In doing this we are following the advice of the seasoned, experienced, dedicated men who serve on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Our committee has also overruled the Secretary of Defense in his decision that the Navy should have only six instead of eight attack or "killer" submarines. To this end we have added $134 million to that requested for naval vessels.

With over 450 submarines, 30 cruisers, and 400 destroyer types, Russia presents a formidable threat on the high seas. This was an estimate of the Soviet naval strength given us at the recent NATO Conference. The mission of the large Soviet submarine force is obvious. They are intent upon cutting off sources of power and control between the NATO countries. We must not permit this to happen. We must maintain control of the seas. And, above all else, we must keep open the four vital gateways of the seas: Straits of Gibraltar, Suez Canal, Straits of Malaya and the Panama Canal.

This is what primarily influenced the committee to decide to grant the Navy's request for eight "killer" submarines. It should be borne in mind that a submarine is a complicated instrument of defense and cannot be built in a short period of time. We should authorize them now that we may hold the lead we now have in modern nuclear submarines.

I hope the House will support our committee in these two major decisions. If cuts are to be made in defense expenditures, this it seems to me is not the place to make them. You are here dealing with the bone and muscle of our defense arm, not the fat. You are here dealing with items that are essential if we are to be fully prepared to strike a telling military blow if and when such a need should arise.

There is no center aisle on defense matters. This bill was reported out of our committee unanimously, and I hope it will pass the House as recommended by our committee by a unanimous vote.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to ask a question of the gentleman. In this bill there is authorized $12,363 million in the area of procurement. Certainly from the hearings going on before the Defense Appropriations Committee at the present time, although we may agree on the attack submarines, we cannot agree that there is no fat in the defense budget as submitted this year. We feel there are real possibilities of making savings in this procurement area as well as in the research and development, test, and evaluation area. I hope the members of the gentleman's committee will understand that we feel we have a responsibility to cut some of the fat that is in procurement and that is in research and development, even though this authorization may be passed at this level today or tomorrow.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I think I made it abundantly clear that if there are places where reductions could be made, that is an obligation of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. LAIRD. I am sure there are.

Mr. ARENDS. That is fine. I am glad to assure the gentlemen on the Defense Appropriations Committee that they will have an opportunity to go into many of the things involved in this bill and make cuts in the budget.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. I wish the distinguished gentleman would point out to the House where the fat is so that we could be informed with respect to that.

Mr. ADAIR. Certainly, I would be very happy to if the gentleman from Illinois would yield to me.

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. In the whole total area of procurement, the hearings we are presently conducting show us that only about 50 percent of the present procurement contracts in the Department of Defense are being carried out on a true competitive bid basis. We have had certain examples brought before the committee by the General Accounting Office where we feel that by forcing the Department of Defense to go on a more competitive basis we can save substantial amounts of money. I would like to call the attention of the members of the committee today to reports of the Committee on Government Operations. The Committee on Government Operations has released in the past few months some very enlightening reports in this whole area of procurement. I feel we ought not to say that everything is all right in the Department of Defense as far as procurement is concerned. I do not believe the U.S. taxpayer is getting a dollar's worth of defense for every dollar expended in the area of procurement today. The Secretary of Defense in testimony before our committee stated he feels by better management in the procurement area alone over $2½ billion could be saved. I believe it can be saved through more competitive bidding procedures. It is up to the Congress to hold the Department of Defense's feet to the fire.

Last year our committee took a very minor reduction in the area of procurement. It was 1 percent. This 1-percent reduction did not hurt the procurement department of the Department of Defense one bit. The year before we took a 3-percent reduction in the area of procurement, and it did not slow down the Department of Defense as far as long-range planning for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force or the Marine Corps. It seems to me, it is up to the Congress through the appropriation procedures to keep the feet of the Department of Defense to the fire and to see that savings are brought about. And this can be done.

In the area of research and development, I also feel that we have a real opportunity to make some reductions. If one will just take the report of the Comptroller General and read over that particular report very carefully, I think that you cannot come to any other conclusion than that better management in this area is absolutely necessary. We have in this area a limitation which has been put on overhead. We find that some of the contracts in research and development are being funded by the Department of Defense at the present time and that the overhead costs are running as high as 85 percent of the regular contract. We have a limitation when it comes to grants in research and development, but in the contracting procedure we have no limitation on overhead costs. It seems to me it is the responsibility of the Congress to look into these matters. I do not want my vote on this bill to be a commitment in any way as to the question of appropriations, and we want the Committee on Appropriations to go over very thoroughly every dollar requested by the Department of Defense.

Mr. ARENDS. I agree with what the gentleman said, and in order to emphasize the point, let me read what I said earlier in my remarks so it will be made abundantly clear:

> This is not to say that our military budget is so sacred, so sanctified, and so sagaciously constituted that it must not be touched. Let no one be under the illusion that the mere authorization and appropriation of dollars for each and every thing the Department of Defense wants will give us the kind of a defense we need and should have. Military strength cannot be measured in terms of dollars. And let no one hesitate to recommend a cut in defense funds where he honestly believes the funds are not essential or not fully justified.

So I support the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I want to confirm what the gentleman from Wisconsin has just said in respect to this proposition that is before us today. Personally I do not think there is anything sacrosanct in the defense budget. As I said a few days ago, and was criticized in some quarters for having said it—but I meant it—if the military posture and the situation of the United States in the world today is so much better than it was 2 or 3 years ago, why is it that the defense budget under Eisenhower was $40 billion a year, but now we have got to have $50 billion a year?

I just want to say to the gentleman that as far as I am concerned, I, too, shall not be bound by this authorization bill, because I am sure that having regard to the protection and the security of our country we can find places in this defense budget where savings can be had, and the time will come when the appropriation bill is before us that we will have the opportunity to take that position.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE].

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to the benevolent and kindly chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Georgia, for letting me take this time as one of the Fearful Five who have opposed some part of this mighty defense spending program. I think it is only right that I start by saying I agree with 98 percent of everything the gentleman from Georgia said as far as the money in this bill is concerned, and I am tremendously impressed by the work this committee does. I think the committee has almost always marched together. I know those of us who are members of this committee but who signed these additional views, who were members of the committee 2 years ago, marched with the committee 2 years ago when we said we would not expand the RS–70 program. We marched with the committee last year when we said we would expand the RS–70 program, and we even counter-marched with the committee when it was necessary to do that last year.

Probably no military development within the memory of the majority of the Members of this body has been subject to as many starts and stops and speedups and slowdowns, of agonizing reappraisals as this B–70 or RS–70 program has. It is 10 years since the first studies were undertaken, and during the decade of gestation which has followed there can be found in the record references to the following programs, all of which have been the target at one time or another: First, a 3-wing program for B–70's; second, a 200-plane program for B–70's; third, a 1-wing program for B–70's; fourth, a 1-plane feasibility study of the B–70; fifth, a 12-plane program for B–70's; sixth, a 3-plane feasibility study of the B–70; seventh, a 6-plane feasibility study of 3 B–70's and 3 RS–70's; and, eighth, a 5-plane feasibility study of 3 B–70's and 2 RS–70's.

While the almost annual changes have contributed greatly to both the confusion and the cost, they are perhaps inevitable in the light of the rapidly changing military technology of the 10-year span in question.

In 1953, when this Air Force baby, yet unborn, was first considered, there was no Atlas, no Titan, and no Minuteman in the Air Force arsenal. There was no Polaris in the Navy. Today, these are not only standard items of military hardware, but in certain configurations some of them are already obsolescent. None of them, it is true, has been proved in combat. This is a principal reason advanced for the continuation of the B–70 or RS–70 program.

We must not put all of our eggs in a missile basket. Of course we must not; we have not; and no one has recommended that we should. Our B–52 strategic bombers will be operational well into the 1970's. Our tactical aircraft now in production and soon to be in production will have bombing and striking capabilities not even contemplated when the B–70 was first considered.

We are not making any manned strategic bombers at the present time. This, too, is advanced as a necessary reason for this production.

The position is a valid one only if a manned strategic bomber can accomplish something which no other weapons system or combination of systems can accomplish, or can accomplish it more effectively and efficiently. Without such a capability there is no more validity in continuing the production of manned strategic bombers than there is in continuing to maintain horse cavalry.

The manned strategic bomber is capable of reconnaissance and the missile is not. Many other aircraft, however, are also capable of reconnaissance. In the concept of the RS–70 there have been combined the reconnaissance and striking capabilities on an almost instantaneous basis. The RS–70, while not as fast as a missile, does move fast enough so that the time involved in looking at a radar picture of a possible target, determining whether the target required a strike, and launching a missile at such a target, would be about 3 minutes. Assuming that we had the radar required to provide an accurate picture from the altitudes and ranges proposed—which we have not; assuming that we had the data processing and guidance equipment necessary to guide a missile from a launching platform moving at three times the speed of sound to such a target—which we have not; assuming we had the missile—which we have not, we would nevertheless be putting a tremendously dangerous burden of decision-making on a pair of radar technicians, and asking them to make that decision in an almost impossible length of time. If we assume that no target would be authorized except a target which had already been cleared by some higher echelon, there are few targets which could not be more rapidly reconnoitered by, and effectively attacked by, our tactical aircraft.

No one has asked an end to manned strategic systems. Throughout the history of military development, however, the goal of the men in any manned system has been to develop the range of his bow and arrow, his rifle, his artillery, his rockets and his missiles, in order that he can stand back as far as possible to fire his weapon so that his enemy cannot fire back at him. To say that our strategic missile systems are not manned systems does a great disservice to the tens of thousands of trained, alert, and dedicated men who are manning them in remote and lonely outposts right now. To say that any system is not manned unless it involves a pilot or a navigator or a bombardier who looks down on his target and drops a bomb or fires a missile at it is as silly as saying that artillery is not a manned system unless the artillerymen can see the targets they are firing at.

The Air Force itself, with its operational Hound Dog missiles, has certainly recognized the desirability of standing off some 500 miles in B–52's and firing at targets which it believes are there but which it certainly cannot see. This hardly makes the B–52 anything less than a manned system.

We talk about the RS–70 as if it were a bomber, Here is a plane which does not carry any bombs. The RS–70 is a missile system, and the alternative is not between manned bombers and missiles. The alternative is between one kind of a missile system and another kind of a missile system, and I am prepared to defend the proposition that it is going to be a little more difficult to hit a target from a launching platform moving at more than three times the speed of sound.

The phrase, "manned bomber," may conjure up to many Americans glorious images of helmets and goggles and silk scarves flying in the breeze, but these images will not be adequate unless they also conjure up some images of a system which can get through to its target and destroy it. It is incumbent upon the Air Force to justify such a system in terms of 1963, not 1943, or even 1953. Lest anyone say that it has been justified many times in the past, this year's program is different from last year's program and from any other program which has ever been presented, and should be required to stand on its own two legs. No one has explained why a development which the Air Force last year said would require three additional aircraft this year only requires two additional aircraft.

Finally, the subject of money. There seems to be some sort of suspicion attached to anyone who even raises the question of the cost of any military expenditure. Yet in a fiscal year when we face a possible $11.8 billion deficit, in an age when a cold war is being fought in significant part as an economic battle, and in a Congress where we have been asked to cut taxes, I feel that the cost of this system and of this amendment to the Department of Defense program is a legitimate subject of inquiry. The cost, of course, is not $363 million for these two planes, it is ultimately over a billion dollars for these two planes.

Now, we have heard a lot about the Joint Chiefs of Staff supporting this development. They did support the development of the RS–70, and they also supported the development of the Skybolt. Nobody is saying we ought to require the Air Force to produce the Skybolt. I think that if they were asked, the Joint Chiefs of Staff would undoubtedly support the development of a lot of other weapons systems not in this budget.

And, I think further this is not the right question. The question should have been, if you were going to spend $363 million additional, would you spend it for this program? Now, you cannot tell me that the admirals of the Navy would rather see this $363 million spent here than for additional Polaris submarines. You cannot tell me that the generals of the Army would not rather see this $363 million spent for the Nike-Zeus program. And, the Air Force itself did not even say at any time in our hearings that they would rather see this $363 million spent here than anywhere else. These two planes would ultimately cost more than half a billion dollars each. I feel that in view of the alternative systems available, in view of the dubious effectiveness of the system proposed, in view of the weak justification advanced for this two-plane program this year, and in view of its fantastic cost, this amendment should not have been adopted by the committee.

I believe there are 363 places where we could better spend $1 million this year or a million places where we might better spend $363. I would like to suggest that as a very last resort, there are 100 million taxpayers who would not be outraged if we did not spend this money at all.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I address myself to the matter of providing modern equipment in the amounts needed to the Army.

The appearance of substantial increases in Army funding in fiscal year 1962, fiscal year 1963, and fiscal year 1964 can be misleading and must be tempered by the realization of these pertinent considerations: For several years preceding, the Army funds for modernization were extremely austere and even the reserve stocks were dipped into and not replaced. This situation was further aggravated by the enlargement of active duty Army strength from 860,000 to 960,000 and the resultant increase of combat ready divisions from 11 to 16 since the end of fiscal year 1961.

Additional factors for consideration are the increasing importance of the Army in a changing strategy resulting from the possibility of nuclear stalemate; the Army's involvement in this country's response to covert armed aggressions, as in southeast Asia; the urgent need to fully equip 6 reserve divisions; and the need for increased stockage of combat consumables and replacement spares for 16 divisions and supporting forces.

In light of these considerations, there is much cause for concern that a proper share of defense spending is directed to equipping and sustaining Army ground combat forces. However, even beyond this basic provision is a more important question. Is the Army afforded the degree of technological modernization it must have to face the superior manpower and growing materiel sophistication of Communist-bloc armies?

My examination discloses that at present the Army's needs for equipping its units and providing required materiel reserves are so great that it does not desire, and cannot afford, minor marginal improvements.

The Army's Chief of Staff, Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, is vigorously pursuing all aspects of materiel throughout the Army in order to achieve simplifications, reductions, eliminations and savings as well as proper orientation to real need and cost effectiveness. The recent major reorganization of the Army is bringing about fundamental improvements in the development and procurement of Army materiel.

Further, the Army's P-day concept—P equals production; simply put, the concept of buying enough during peacetime to have enough materiel on hand until industry production lines can turn out goods to equal the rate of consumption—envisions continuous combat support after D-day with minimum peacetime expense. It develops production readiness with the least possible materiel reserves instead of relying on large stagnating stocks on hand.

The Army's chronic shortage of weapons, equipment, ammunition, and supplies required to support itself in combat has been cited by the Secretary of Defense, in presenting this budget request, as one of the most serious deficiencies in this Nation's overall defense posture.

It is commendable, indeed, that the Department of Defense has established interim procurement objectives, in this and the preceding budget, to serve as successive balanced steps toward a higher state of Army readiness.

We note, however, that the corrective action in this fiscal year 1964 budget request principally moves toward completing the initial issue of equipment for combat forces, and providing replacements and consumables to sustain them in combat. Certain shortfalls exist even when the fiscal year 1964 Army budget is approved. Therefore, many of the modernization requirements remain unfilled or postponed.

Thus, it appears that the Army's requirements are minimal, and that the fiscal year 1964 "Production of equipment and materiel, Army" budget is worthy of support. We agree with the budget's objective which is to attain a substantially better quantitive position permitting a longer initial period of sustained combat. In the coming months, however, the Congress must continue close evaluation of the Army's readiness and assure itself that technological modernization gains are stressed, as promised, in subsequent Army funding requests.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, it is always difficult, of course, for any member of the Committee on Armed Services to take issue with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and, as in this case, with the chairman and with a majority of the members as well. Reference has been made on the floor that the filing of additional views on this massive authorization bill before us on the part of five members of the committee was a step without precedent in the House. I am not sure whether this is true, but it certainly is true that the deliberations of our committee have been to a very great degree conducted in a nonpartisan or a bipartisan way over the years and the divisions within the committee have not usually been along party lines. That is certainly true in this particular debate.

I do not think that the heavens will fall if five members of the committee take issue on the expenditure of some one-third of a billion dollars. But I would like to pay special tribute to the distinguished chairman of our committee who certainly throughout my experience on the committee has been more than fair to every single member of the committee; has given us an opportunity to ask questions, to express our views, and in this case to file the additional views which have been reported to be unprecedented in the history of the committee.

But when we are in a position such as we are in today, where over half of our expenditures in the Government are in the military field, it seems to me that we in this Congress have got to take a very careful look at all of these expenditures. There cannot be just one single party line about how to look at these expenditures. This House has got to have an opportunity to consider and to debate, especially when a matter of over one-third of a billion dollars is involved.

Mr. Chairman, what is the situation that we confront today? We have already had reference to it. We have the biggest Federal budget in the history of the country—$99 billion. We have a defense budget that is the fourth largest in the history of the country—$54 billion. We face the possibility of a Federal deficit of something like $12 billion, as our friends on the other side of the aisle are frequently reminding us. We have before us proposals from the executive branch for a tax cut that would amount ultimately to $13 billion. And we have had people tell us that we cannot have a tax cut unless we are prepared to cut the budget.

In fact, some of our friends on the Republican side of the aisle have said we ought to cut that budget to match the $13 billion in the proposed tax cut or that at least we ought to level off our Government expenditures. How can we possibly level off expenditures unless we are willing at the very least to hold the line on expenditures relating to the national defense?

I am inclined to agree with my distinguished friend, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], who said here a while ago in the discussion on the rule that it is disturbing that no effort has been made to reduce the proposals of the Defense Department in this bill, and that instead we find the unusual situation that those from the party which has loudly been calling for spending reductions, those from the party which has suggested, if I read the public press correctly, that it is even possible to reduce a billion dollars in each one of the three branches of our armed services, that not a single member of that political party on the Committee on Armed Services joined with the five of us in opposing an increase in defense spending of $363 million over the recommendations of the Kennedy administration and the Defense Department.

And I might point out that in addition we have a pay bill that is going to be coming along very shortly from our committee, and this too is going to be over the total sums recommended by the Kennedy administration. It will be interesting to see whether any Members on the other side of the aisle are going to oppose that boost.

Where are these predicted cuts going to come from then unless we are prepared at least to hold the line on defense spending and look a little bit more carefully at all the proposals that are made?

My suggestion here today is simply that under all these conditions, when we look at the RS–70, or the B–70, or whatever else you are going to call it, there must be just one simple test, what they call in the Pentagon cost effectiveness. It simply means are you getting enough in increased defense protection for all the money you are spending?

Let us look at that. Is the RS–70 really going to be worth all the dollars we are going to spend? I am not against the RS–70. It is a great concept. I voted with the committee last year and said, "Let us take a look at it for another year." I hope we can eventually have it added to our arsenal. But the experience of the past year has just not been very reassuring on this point, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, the plane does not even fly yet. We have spent $1,300 million on the program up to today and the plane just does not even get up into the air. It goes so fast, three times the speed of sound, that parts of the fuselage melt in flight. They have not quite got that particular "bug" ironed out of the plane, and so it does not even fly. We have had a slippage behind what the program was earlier. I suggest that when you have a plane that does not even fly there is not any immediate urgency to add on an expenditure of $363 million for further refinements in that particular plane.

Secondly, we have had a lot of talk about manned bombers here today. Let us not kid ourselves. The plane we are asked to spend this money for is not a manned bomber. That was the B–70. That plane has gone out of the window. The Air Force dropped it. The committee is asking us to spend the money today on the RS–70, a reconnaissance plane, designed to fly over the target after the first missiles have already struck, to take a look around at three times the speed of sound, and see if there is anything left. We are not here really taking issue with the missiles that make up our primary, strategic deterrent force. The missiles are indeed taking over that field. The committee is asking us to spend this money for a plane with a decidedly secondary mission. As the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE] pointed out, it is not even clear that if we gave the Air Force $363 million to spend they would really want to spend it first of all on this secondary reconnaissance strike aircraft that cannot even get off the deck.

And third and finally, before the idea of this kind of reconnaissance strike plane can become a reality we have to invent more sophisticated electronic gear we do not now have. When you are traveling at 2,000 miles an hour you are traveling over a lot of territory in a very short time. We simply do not have the equipment today to report back to an operator so he could know quickly enough whether there were any targets left or whether he should push the button to send out any additional missiles.

Oh, we are not filing the development work on the B–70 away, as the gentleman from Georgia suggested. I would like to see the aircraft fly. We want the development we paid for continued. But we suggest that it might be well to wait until we find out whether the plane will actually fly before we decide whether it will be worth the additional sums of money to try to get this sophisticated electronic gear into it. Incidentally, we have about $85 million available now which the Defense Department is going to spend this year to try to continue and develop this highly sophisticated radar.

But, is all this kind of thing really worth the fantastic cost? The price of this particular amendment to the bill is one-third of a billion dollars. We have already spent $1.3 billion to develop three B–70 planes. That is $400 million per plane. That is well over the cost of an aircraft carrier for just one single plane. Now the two more planes we are going to authorize if we accept the committee amendment will cost ultimately not just the $363 million you see here; they will cost $1.5 billion. In other words, they are going to cost about $600 million or $700 million per copy. And that is twice the cost of an aircraft carrier, for just one single plane. Think of it, if you believe in economy. The Air Force tells us, as a matter of fact, that before we can have a real RS–70 weapons system, we will need 11 of these planes, at a total cost of $10 billion over and above the $1.3 billion already spent.

Mr. Chairman, under these circumstances while this is a desirable aircraft and while there are a lot of other things we would love to have in the defense field if we could afford them, I submit in the financial situation we are in today, and if we really mean what we are talking about in terms of fiscal responsibility, if we really mean what we say about cutting the budget and if we really mean what we say about holding the line on Government spending, then how we can possibly suggest that for a system that is not going to be part of our top priority nuclear deterrent force we must nevertheless spend this kind of money today in this particular bill, right now, and before the plane can fly?

I, therefore, am opposing the committee amendment and I hope the committee amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I can only reiterate many of the things that have been recited previously by my good friends and colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE].

What I propose to do in the course of my remarks this afternoon in discussing the bill is to try to put the thing in perspective. Much has been said about the fact that some of us are taking exception to this particular amendment. I prefer to state the matter affirmatively and positively. The fact of the matter is that three of the five Members who are taking the position that they are taking today have voted for the RS–70 and they voted for it in past sessions of the Congress. It seems to me, in previous sessions when we studied this question, we had put in a considerable amount of money in the bill, and the increment then suggested and proposed for this concept, known as the B–70 made economic sense.

So my good colleagues, the gentlemen from New York [Mr. STRATTON and Mr. PIKE] in separate sessions of the Congress for these and other reasons have voted for the B–70—RS–70.

So, when we come before you today and we call your attention to a very deeply felt difference with our committee colleagues and with our distinguished chairman for whom we have a deep affection and admiration, it is because we think the time has come to blow the whistle on this request for two more.

First of all, we are for this bill. Much has been said by one of our colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] about the Secretary of Defense.

It is almost an elementary point in argumentation and debate that when you start attacking the man, you are arguing ad hominem. I would like to hear this thing argued on the terms of its merits. Nobody is arguing against this bill. We are for this bill. We are merely against adding two additional RS–70's to the present program of three.

Mr. Chairman, after lengthy hearings and study with our distinguished colleagues on the committee, we have gone into the subject of military hardware in great detail in reference to certain other things such as attack submarines. I do not want to waste the time of the House by going into detail about all these matters, but under the careful scrutiny of our chairman and knowledgeable senior members of the committee we have learned a great deal and we have formed judgments, and we feel this to be a necessary addition to the program.

But when I hear all this discussion about a man instead of an issue I think we ought to call attention to it, because at this point what some of us are talking about is the man who is bringing in the biggest peacetime program for our Military Establishment in the history of the country. This is the man who has given us a flexible defense; this is the man that our chairman says is one of the greatest Secretaries of Defense in the history of this country, and I defy anybody to say differently.

Now, I am for this bill, and I want to talk about this bill, and talk about it in terms of some of the committee issues and talk about remarks that have been made about the RS–70. Also, I want to talk about some other things besides this question of whether we ought to add two more aircraft to a program we already have.

The big issue here today is the bill that we are going to pass on. I am going to vote for it, with the exception of the RS–70 amendment. So let us remember during the debate this afternoon that the issue is only whether or not we are going to have two additional research and development aircraft added to the program we already have, which is three. The only thing, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. PIKE, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. ICHORD, and Mr. COHELAN are saying to you is that we do not think it is wise to go ahead adding to a program of research and development at enormous cost at this time. There appears to be no significant value added. There is a great deal we could say if it were not classified which has to do with reconnaissance sensors and some other systems.

But I would like now to turn to Vietnam.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman gets to that, will he yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to my good colleague and subcommittee chairman the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Does the gentleman take the position that we cannot develop the mach 3 bomber, that it will not fly? Does the gentleman take the position that the mach 3 bomber is not an airplane?

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman knows very well I do not take that position.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I know you do not. I did not want the committee to believe the statement of the gentleman from New York when he said the thing would melt in flight. I hope the gentleman does not take the position that we should stop on the RS–70 before taking it to the threshold of tests. And as to the matter of the production item and the cost which the gentleman says will be $360 million or $400 million a plane, that is just like saying that a Chevrolet car costs $100 million to produce when you take into consideration all the research and preliminary effort through the years up to the car of today. I hope the gentleman will be here tomorrow because I am going to address myself to some of these statements.

Mr. COHELAN. I look forward to being here and will listen with great interest to anything the gentleman from South Carolina has to say. We are interested in the program. We earnestly hope this project does become a reality and will have a role and mission.

I regret that I cannot yield further to the gentleman because I want to talk briefly about South Vietnam.

This Nation is deeply involved in the problems of southeast Asia. I had the great privilege of being out there this year and I wish I had time to go into my findings at some length. I think Vietnam deserves discussion because it is there that the Communists are most active at the moment in fostering subversion and insurgency, as witness the daily news accounts of happenings in Vietnam.

The Chief of Staff of the Army reports that combat operations by the dozen are taking place daily throughout that country and that the offensive is on in South Vietnam. The Secretary of Defense has told us that we now have more than 11,000 military personnel engaged in the military assistance program there, and in advising, training, and aiding the Vietnamese with airlift and communications. This is a sizable military effort by our forces.

I have been most impressed with what our Armed Forces are doing in the field of counterinsurgency. The need for special training and special techniques has been recognized and our military—particularly in the Army—are tackling the problem with energy and imagination.

I stress here the accomplishments of the Army because insurgency—and counterinsugency—are elements of land warfare. The Army therefore has the prime role to play, and must shoulder the heaviest burdens. In Vietnam, as in other wars, it is the soldier that faces most directly the hazards of combat. It is the soldier in these regions of unrest, subversion, and guerrilla activities that by advice, example, and selfless labor most directly influences the outcome. In truth, he is one of the gallant men of our time.

Since 1961 the Army has been expanding its capabilities in what it calls special warfare. This covers the many endeavors and the many individual and collective skills needed for successful action in an environment such as Vietnam. In the United States and abroad the Army has a hard core of some 8,000 personnel in this program now and plans further improvements in its special warfare capabilities in the future.

In addition to enlarging its special warfare forces, the whole subject is being stressed throughout the Army. Selected battle groups have undergone a 6-week counterinsurgency training program with emphasis on counterguerrilla tactics and techniques. Counterinsurgency instruction has been increased throughout the Army school system, from the ROTC through the Army War College. Language training is being expanded, and courses for senior officers have been inaugurated. Streamlined supply procedures have been developed, and research and development in counterinsurgency weapons and equipment has been intensified, to include a limited war laboratory to concentrate on requirements unique to this type of warfare.

The bill before us today does not address itself to our counterinsurgency effort as such. It will, however, supply helicopters and aircraft which may well be used in this role. And possibly of even greater importance, it supports the research and development from which in later years will come the improved aircraft for even more effective counterinsurgency operations.

I am convinced that we must bolster our ability to deal successfully with insurgencies and all other shades of aggression whenever and wherever they may occur. I am equally convinced that the funds for which authorization is sought by this bill are necessary toward that end. In light of these convictions, I give my full support to the authorization and urge its passage with the exception of the two additional RS–70's.

In the remainder of my time I want to refer back to the subject of the B–70's and speak about some specific points. We will add to them later in the afternoon and tomorrow.

Our distinguished chairman, and others, in discussing the matter of the RS–70 have discussed the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have taken a strong position on this. While this may be true I think it merits further investigation as to some of the reasons.

In the hearings—on page 975—on this very issue I was particularly concerned. I interrogated the Secretary of Defense and Admiral Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations. Among other things, I asked Admiral Anderson:

> Now I want to turn from there to a question that came up yesterday in the course of the interrogation relating to the RS–70.
>
> I am wondering, Admiral, if you could elaborate on the reasons why you took the position you did on the Joint Chiefs in regard to the RS–70.
>
> Once again I was a little puzzled at your response.
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. I would like to make this classified secret. [Deleted.]
>
> Mr. COHELAN. Well, that is what I thought you said.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. You were willing to provide for [deleted], were you not?
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. Pardon, sir?
>
> The CHAIRMAN. You were willing to provide—to go along with [deleted].
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. [Deleted.]
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.
>
> Mr. COHELAN. Well, Admiral, I am looking at the report last year, page 3170 of last year's posture hearings, and where the amount of money is discussed on what has already been spent on the RS–70 and the B–70, and it would seem to me that research and development is very definitely going on.
>
> Now, am I to understand that the only real difference then was the difference between [deleted].
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. The Air Force had proposed [deleted] and then the Air Force would have liked to have gone further.
>
> In our judgment, having heard——
>
> Secretary KORTH. Production, he said—into production?
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. No, sir. [Deleted.]
>
> We felt that we should hold this program down to research and development, but up to a level of [deleted] if that was necessary to carry out the research and development.
>
> Mr. COHELAN. Then [deleted], goes right along with your program, or your feeling in the matter?
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. If you can do the job with [deleted] fine. If it takes [deleted] to finish up the [deleted] then I would say to go to [deleted].
>
> Mr. COHELAN. Well, this is where I don't understand you, Admiral.
>
> Where would the value be added?
>
> I don't understand where the value would be added by another unit. We have [deleted] now in the works. Now where would the value be added with [deleted]?
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. Well, the Air Force can answer that technically far better than I can.
>
> But their proposal showed how they could carry on this system development to fruition, having listened to the argument, in my opinion, with a great degree of certainty with [deleted] you can do it with [deleted] that is fine as far as I am concerned.
>
> Mr. COHELAN. Well, what was your interest, Admiral, in the reconnaissance features of the later proposal?
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. Well, I believe that the United States needs a reconnaissance capability.
>
> The better reconnaissance capability that we can get I believe is good for the security of the United States.
>
> If you can at the same time provide a strict capability in the reconnaissance vehicle and don't have to pay too much for it, this also is good.
>
> Mr. COHELAN. Well, do you think it is better as a reconnaissance system or as a strategic retaliatory system?
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. [Deleted.]
>
> Mr. COHELAN. In other words, that is what your major——
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. That is my major concern.
>
> Mr. COHELAN. Your major concern with the B–70.
>
> And is that reflected in the Navy's request?
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. This is—I would like to make my position clear.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. That is a very important question. Answer that question, Admiral.
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. Sir?
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Answer his question, right on that point.
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. The Navy——
>
> Mr. COHELAN. You are asking for 700 aircraft this year and a good many of them are [deleted].
>
> The CHAIRMAN. That is right.
>
> Mr. COHELAN. You are interested in reconnaissance?
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. Oh, very definitely, yes, sir.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. That is right.
>
> Mr. COHELAN. Now Admiral, I don't want to put any words in your mouth, but is it fair for me to assume that in your judgment on the question at the time you made your decision, at the meeting of the Joint Chiefs, that your major interest in the system is in the [deleted] of the system, is that right?
>
> Admiral ANDERSON. That is correct.
>
> Mr. COHELAN. OK.

Mr. Chairman, I think this colloquy speaks for itself. Clearly the admiral is interested in reconnaissance, not in a manned strategic delivery system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by making this statement:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain further some of my reasons for opposing the further appropriation of public funds for the expansion of the B–70 or RS–70 program. First of all, this program will be enormously expensive, and will offer us very little benefit. The Secretary of Defense has already assured us that the forces he has recommended can cover the targets, and one has only to look at the hundreds of ICBM's and Polaris missiles to see that this must be the case. Completion of the B–70 or RS–70 program would cost many billions of dollars. It now seems optimistic to suppose that the program could be completed and a substantial force of aircraft procured for less than $10 billion. It might be as high as $15 billion. Already, the Air Force has overrun on its estimates. Two years ago, and even as recently as last year, it assured the Secretary of Defense that it could complete the construction and tests of three aircraft for a total of $1.3 billion. Now the test program is behind schedule and delays and overruns are being experienced. It is beginning to appear that several hundred million dollars more will be required just to complete the three-aircraft program. In fact, Mr. President, I cannot help but wonder whether the reason the Air Force would like to have money for two more prototype aircraft is in order to get money to cover overruns already experienced.

Moreover, the debate on the RS–70 has contained some confusion. Some people have suggested that it is a debate between manned bombers and missiles. In fact is it nothing of the sort. Rather, it is a debate between some missile systems and other missile systems, the difference being not in the delivery system but in the platform from which the missiles are launched. The RS–70 system is to carry missiles to be launched from the P–70 airplane. Therefore, arguments about the unreliability of missiles or the fact that missiles have not been tested or that we do not have experience with missiles would apply at least equally strongly to the RS–70 as they do the Minuteman and Polaris.

In fact, the key issue, then, is whether the B–70 is a good missile launching platform by comparison with underground silos and submarines. The Secretary of Defense has advanced good reasons for believing that aircraft are not good platforms. First, they are vulnerable on their bases, soft and concentrated. A bomber base can be knocked out by one or two ICBM's. If we allow our deterrent power to be concentrated on bomber bases, we are vulnerable to a nuclear Pearl Harbor. Moreover, aircraft are moving fast and they vibrate and these factors make it hard to launch reliable, accurate missiles from them.

The B–70 is based on a 1955 design and on a concept earlier than that. In fact, it was conceived before the missile era and part of its high costs are associated with the fact that it tries to do ineffectively the things that missiles can do better. Accordingly, I do not believe that these huge additional sums should be authorized.

I hope the House is completely aware of what it is being asked to approve by increasing the RS–70 test program from three to five aircraft. In the first place, the additional two-aircraft program is estimated to cost over $1 billion. In the second place, the additional two-aircraft program is not required to flight-test the aircraft—this will be accomplished by the program already authorized and underway. The additional two-aircraft program would further develop the aircraft as a weapons system in the face of a high probability that this aircraft would not provide a significant contribution to our deterrent force in the 1970's. The two added aircraft would not, however, complete the weapons system development; as recently as last year the Air Force was asking for a total of 11 for this purpose, which is consistent with the historical requirements of other programs.

The reasons why this is so were cogently stated by the Secretary of Defense to the Armed Services Committee. I should like at this point to read—or include in the RECORD—the relevant unclassified portion of the Secretary's statement:

> The next issue I had to face was the development of the B–70, or the RS–70 as it was later called. The issue here was not the future of manned strategic aircraft in general. Rather, it was whether this particular aircraft, in either of its configurations, could add enough to our already programed capabilities to make it worth its very high cost.
>
> Many of the arguments that have been advanced in support of the RS–70 actually support the case for postattack reconnaissance in combination with an improved ICBM force. We believe that there are more promising ways of performing this mission than the RS–70, when both cost and effectiveness are considered. Other than this, the RS–70 is said to have two distinct capabilities: (1) transattack reconnaissance; that is, reconnaissance during our missile attack, and (2) the ability to examine targets and attack them on the spot with strike missiles, if required. Quite apart from the technical feasibility of developing, producing and deploying such a system within the time frame proposed by the Air Force (which we do not think possible), there are better ways, when one considers both cost and effectiveness, to obtain both of these capabilities.
>
> The principal advantage of having a "reconnaissance" and a "strike" capability in an aircraft is one of timeliness. That is, it may be possible to process and interpret enough of the "recon" data in the few minutes the aircraft is still within range of the target to permit an effective air-to-surface missile strike, keeping in mind that the aircraft would be moving at a speed of over 30 miles per minute and that the missile would have a relatively short range—i.e., a few hundred miles. If this can be done "effectively" there is the advantage of being able to deal with the target within minutes instead of an hour (or more) if the "strike" had to be accomplished by some other weapon system. Quick attack is not always important, but to the extent that it is and can be accomplished effectively, a "strike" capability in the aircraft is an advantage. However, postattack reconnaissance and subsequent strike—whether by air-to-surface missiles or ICBM's—is important in two principal cases:
>
> 1. Where fixed targets whose location was not known precisely must be attacked.
>
> 2. In "mopup" operations against fixed targets of known location that have been programed for initial attack by ballistic missiles, but which may not have been destroyed.
>
> Initial attack on targets of known location can be accomplished effectively with ICBM's which have the important advantages of shorter time-to-target, lower cost, and higher survival potential. Mobile targets simply cannot be successfully attacked with an RS–70 and, in fact, such a role has not been proposed for that aircraft.
>
> The issue, therefore, resolves itself to the question: How much could we gain from a capability to attack the two types of targets I referred to earlier, with air-to-surface missiles instead of ICBM's?
>
> With regard to the first case, if a target is known to be somewhere within a relatively small area, usually its exact location can eventually be established. Moreover, such targets can be attacked by ICBM's after postattack reconnaissance. With regard to the second case, other means are expected to be available to determine whether targets previously attacked by ICBM's have been destroyed. These targets, too, once it is known that they have not been destroyed, could be attacked again with ICBM's.
>
> The RS–70, by carrying air-to-surface missiles, would provide only a very small increase in overall effectiveness. In my judgment, this increase is not worth the large additional outlay of funds estimated at more than $10 billion above the $1.35 billion already approved.
>
> Accordingly, we propose to complete the presently approved $1.3 billion B–70 development program of three aircraft and, in addition, continue the development of selected sensor components using, in the current fiscal year, $50 million of the extra $192 million provided by the Congress last year for the RS–70 program. The Air Force has not yet completed its analysis of the effect on development costs of the 3-month delay already encountered in the flight testing of the first B–70.

Mr. Chairman, returning for a moment to the question of whether the XB–70 program should be expanded from three to five aircraft.

Serious questions have been raised as to whether the RS–70 represents the best method of accomplishing mopup strikes against Soviet targets after an initial attack by our missiles. The present configuration of the aircraft was designed as a mach 3 high altitude plane. However, it does not seem likely that the Soviet air defenses can be sufficiently degraded by our missile attack so that the RS–70 can survive at high altitudes. If penetration is to be made at low altitude, the present configuration is probably not the best. Further, the Secretary of Defense has indicated that he believes the "strike" portion of the mission can be done more effectively by missiles launched from other platforms. These "strikes" would be laid on based upon reconnaissance data attained by various means.

In view of the above, the concept of restricting the program to one of flight test for the present seems very sensible.

The immediate question before the House, which is whether we should build three or five aircraft, depends primarily on technical factors. The answer hinges on what confidence we have in attaining the desired aerodynamic data from a flight test program that involves three aircraft. It is my understanding that a three vehicle flight test program provides good confidence that the desired data will be attained, and this takes into account that there could be some bad luck. On the other hand the two additional aircraft, of which only one would be fully equipped with sensors and missile launch systems, would not adequately provide for development and evaluation of the reconnaissance-strike concept. In particular, if an accident should occur, which destroyed the fifth aircraft early in its flight test, much money will have been expended with virtually no payoff except at great expense in time and money to provide still additional aircraft.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I would like to hear about this proposed cost of $60 million, due to slippage. Could the gentleman tell us how that would happen?

Mr. COHELAN. The Secretary of Defense was interrogated on this very question. These are his figures. The report is that the program is costing us in slippage about $15 to $20 million a month.

Mr. WAGGONNER. This proposed $81 million that is in the RS–70 development fund would no longer be necessary?

Mr. COHELAN. I am only reciting the record to the gentleman. If I said $60 million I was in error. The correct figure on slippage would be $15 to $20 million a month.

LET'S KEEP THE THE MANNED BOMBER UP TO DATE

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I should like to briefly state my reasons for backing the increased authorizations for the B–70, or RS–70, weapons system.

There are many of us in both Chambers of the Congress who are seriously concerned about the manned bomber weapons system. This fleet has been designed, built, perfected, and maintained at considerable cost in money and manpower. It has kept the balance of power safely on the side of the free world for many years.

We all understand, of course, that ballistic missiles present a revolutionary new weapons system, which is rapidly becoming the first line of defense of this Nation. But what concerns many is that this first line will become the only line of defense for the West. Recognizing the validity of some of the Secretary of Defense's arguments about the vulnerability of manned bombers, many professionals in the defense field, both within and outside the U.S. Air Force, still feel that a move toward complete dependence on missiles is a premature move which is potentially, if indeed not outright, dangerous for this Nation to undertake at this time.

Without going into all of the administration's arguments, with which I am sure all those concerned with defense problems are familiar, I shall quickly summarize the arguments in favor of maintaining our manned bomber force as a modern, up-to-date weapons system, reversing the present trend of downgrading development and phasing out existing forces.

First. The major reason given for phasing out manned bombers is that they are becoming increasingly vulnerable to surface-to-air missilery. I for one simply do not accept this as an inevitable truth. The magnificent multibillion-dollar aircraft and electronics industries in this country can, if given the go-ahead, solve just about any problem which arises in this age of explosive technological revolution.

Second. Even if we grant that industry cannot solve the bomber defense problem, which I do not grant, our bomber fleet is a continuingly valuable asset in the long-range cold war between the United States and the Soviet Union. The fact is that the existence of our bomber fleet compels the Soviets to maintain three very expensive capabilities: First, ICBM's which have our SAC bases as their targets; second, an extensive, highly elaborate, surface-to-air missile defense system to defend against the SAC bombers which we keep on air alert; and third, a very extensive system of air defense bases, jet interceptors, and radar systems to tie them all together and coordinate them.

Now, this asset of ours, this manned bomber fleet, is what requires the Russians to keep up all those expensive elements of their air defense system. Why should we phase out the manned bombers? This would allow the Soviets to phase out all of their considerable countermeasures to our bomber force.

Third. In the event of some future nuclear war, our strategy is apparently to be one of striking military targets first, holding the Soviet cities as hostages to force capitulation. Won't our first strike, which will be with missiles, do a lot of damage to the Soviet air defense system? I certainly hope so; but the point is, that a manned bomber force may be able to break through a heavily damaged defense system after an initial missile attack, even if it can't do so originally. It is probably for this reason that the Russians, far from dropping manned bombers, are continuing to develop modern, up-to-date, hard-striking air forces.

Fourth. Finally, in this fast-moving age of technological breakthroughs, who can say with certainty that a drastic new development will not be possible in the field of manned bomber missile defense, or antiradar electronics, or some other field. If we phase out all of our bombers, our formidable aircraft industries will die. Even if we do not consider the economic effects of such an unfortunate development, which as responsible public servants we must, the military effects would be disastrous if a breakthrough of the nature just mentioned should occur in the Soviet Union. We would be left without the industrial capacity to take advantage of the breakthrough.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to bring these remarks to a close with the following thought. We who are concerned about continuing our manned bomber force are not pro or anti-Air Force; we are not pro or anti-whiz kid; we are not pro or anti-administration. We are responsible Americans, concerned only about our national defense. Phasing out our manned bomber force seems to us to be predicated on at least debatable premises. The only positive action available to us at this time is to support an accelerated RS–70 program, and urge a resumption of research and development in the entire field of manned bomber weapons systems. The defense of the United States of America is not something with which we can take chances.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCLOSKEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to briefly comment on H.R. 2440, the authorization bill, to authorize $15,856,391,000 for the use of the Armed Forces for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels.

At the outset I wish to compliment both the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and the ranking minority members, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], for their able presentation of this highly important measure.

I particularly pay high tribute to my distinguished friend from Illinois for the position he has taken with respect to accepting cuts in the overall defense budget, and the willingness of his committee in not being obstinate in refusal of those of us who are deeply concerned about spending, to scan our recommendations for the cutting of fat where and when we can find it.

The spending or at least the authorization of such a tremendous amount of the taxpayers dollar places a real responsibility on each and every Member of this Congress.

Most certainly I for one know we must do everything in our power to keep ourselves strong. And I do not wish to do anything to reduce our military capabilities or to hinder our national security.

I am not convinced however that all the fat has been rendered from this procurement bill. I feel there are many

areas where savings can be effected. While I shall support the measure as presented today, I reserve the right to do all in my power to make substantial savings, and am hopeful the Appropriations Committee will go over this bill with a fine tooth comb.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2440, which authorizes nearly $16 billion for the procurement of the necessary aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces during fiscal year 1964. I wish to commend the chairman and the members of the Committee on Armed Services for the thorough and exhaustive examination which they have made of our Nation's military posture.

It is particularly encouraging that the committee continues to fight hard for a proper mixture of missiles and manned bombers in the military arsenal of the United States. I heartily endorse the proposal to authorize two additional prototypes of the RS-70. The committee has made a strong and convincing case for the development of five prototypes instead of three.

We are told that the three RS-70 prototypes, which have the blessings of the administration, will essentially be used to determine that this airplane can fly at three times the speed of sound, for a long distance and a high altitude. In essence the administration is prepared to spend $1.3 billion for testing the reconnaissance ability of the RS–70, but it is reluctant to develop additional aircraft to determine the feasibility of the RS–70 as a weapons system.

In reading the hearings on military posture held by the Armed Services Committee, it was encouraging to learn that the current fleet of B–52's and B–58's will continue to perform a most important role in our Nation's defense for the next 5 years.

It is disturbing, however, when we ask what comes after the B–52 and the B–58?

Mr. Chairman, the last B–52H jet bomber came off the assembly line at the Boeing Co. plant in Wichita last fall. The final B–58 will be delivered to the Air Force this year. We have been informed that the aging B–47 jet aircraft are being gradually phased out.

We know the Department of Defense recently took the higher bid of a Texas-based aeronautics plant with intentions of developing a new fighter-bomber, the F-111—TFX. But it will not be able to do the work of the B–52.

We know the RS–70, formerly known as the B–70, still is in the development and evaluation stages but the administration has no plans to go beyond those stages.

It is very possible that in the presidential campaign of 1968 the familiar issue of "gapitis" will be with us again. We will again be faced with a bomber gap. However, unlike the missile gap of 1960, the bomber gap of 1968 will be a fact.

Although I do not claim to be a military expert and certainly do not have access to our intelligence files or those of the Soviet Union, it is only necessary to call across the street to the Library of Congress to discover that the Soviet Union continues to build both bombers and missiles.

The publication Interavia, published in November 1962, contained an article entitled "The Wide Spectrum of Soviet Airpower." This article contained pictures and descriptions of the new types of Russian aircraft.

The article states:

> In the last few months, the strategic air force (U.S.S.R.) which is grouped in three or four armies, has received medium bombers of the new Tupolev Blinder type. These have a speed approaching mach 2, and their radius of action is at least equal to their predecessor, the Tupolev Badger; they are capable of carrying supersonic missiles for use against strategic targets. It cannot at present be said with certainty whether the four-jet Miasichev Bounder supersonic bomber, on show for the first time at the last Tushino Air Show, is being built in large numbers. This aircraft could be used as a tanker as well as for important reconnaissance missions. Except for the American B–70 which will shortly be completed, this is the largest supersonic aircraft in the world, and the four turbojet engines in the Bounder can be taken to be the most powerful at present in existence. In any case, the development of the Blinder and Bounder types shows that the Soviet strategic air force still attaches importance to the manned bomber.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress of the United States has time and again authorized and appropriated funds for continued production of manned bombers. We have taken such action on the knowledgeable advice of our military authorities. However, these funds have not been used by the administration.

Time and again we have learned of the recommendations of acknowledged military experts being overruled in regard to the selection of certain weapons systems by the civilian leaders of the Defense Establishment.

The B–52 bomber is a case in point.

The RS–70 is another case in point.

The Skybolt air-to-ground missile is another case in point.

And, if I may add, apparently the contract decision for the F–111—TFX—fighter-bomber is a puzzling case at point.

Like the members of the Armed Services Committee, I do not challenge the right or necessity of civilian control over the Department of Defense. However, it seems to me that the selection of weapons systems plays an important part in the way a war may be fought. We must guard against the weakening of the military voice in this regard.

Gen. Curtis LeMay, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, eloquently enunciated some guidelines for the defense and security of this Nation which are worthy of repeating. In his testimony before the committee, he stated:

> Our national objective is to have the capability to destroy those forces which would directly threaten our survival as a viable nation.
>
> We have an enemy who will take advantage of any apparent or real, technical or strategic weakness we may possess.
>
> Until there is a change in Soviet intent and aspirations, we obviously can't afford to gamble.
>
> There are certain precautions we can take, certain things we can do.
>
> First, we must retain our flexibility of action in the event of an enemy technological breakthrough. We can do this by exploring every feasible weapon system.
>
> We must have the capability, in spite of unexpected breakthroughs, to destroy those weapons directly threatening the United States and our allies. This will save American lives.
>
> Secondly, we must also continue this exploration because we cannot accept the premise that since there is no known counter to a particular threat there is nothing that we can do.
>
> If we accept this premise, and thus indicate an acceptance of a weakness in our deterrent, we invite the Soviets to vigorously probe our determination to resist.
>
> I have believed over the years, and still do, that deterrence is a state of armed forces and also a state of mind. Standing alone they will not deter, but together they are the force for continued peace.
>
> Both must remain strong and firm and be absolutely clear to the Soviets.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT] having assumed the chair, Mr. SHELLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

TRAVEL OF STAFF MEMBERS OF HOUSE COMMITTEE INDICATE MORE CHECKING NEEDED

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains the reports which are required by law dealing with the expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the various committees covering the dates of January 1 through December 31, 1962. As many of you well know, I have been very critical of the expenditure of appropriated funds by the House Committee on Education and Labor, I now would like to point out some interesting deficiencies in the reports which cover the expenditure of so-called counterpart funds by this committee.

Without a doubt, great detail is shown on some of the miscellaneous expenditures. Tips to waiters and wine stewards are well documented by the committee in this report. It is most interesting, however, to see that a vital area of expenditure has not been accounted for.

I am speaking of transportation for these trips.

Let me cite two trips which were made. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] together with two staff members, Miss Corrine A. Huff and Mrs. Tamara J. Wall, conducted a factfinding mission in Europe which took the chairman to five countries, Mrs. Wall to seven countries, and Miss Huff to six countries. The total transportation bill listed for this factfinding trip comes to $100 for the gentleman from New York, $109 for Mrs. Wall, and $115 for Miss Huff. The report on this trip is as follows:

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Powell, Adam C.:											
Great Britain (9 days)	U.S. dollar		80.00		70.00		5.00		76.50 12.00		243.50
France (5 days)	do		110.00		87.50				48.00		245.50
Italy (6 days)	do		150.00		99.00				64.00		313.00
Greece (11 days)	do		192.50		181.50		75.00		88.00 10.00		547.00
Spain (4 days)	do		72.00		66.00		10.00 10.00		37.00		195.00
Wall, Tamara J.:											
Great Britain (4 days)	Pound		100.00		85.00		23.00		72.00	100	280.00
France (5 days)	New franc		110.00		82.50		12.00		45.50	1,250	250.00
Italy (9 days)	Lira		205.00		148.50		25.00		71.50	286,300	450.00
Greece (4 days)	Drachma		80.00		70.00		15.00		35.00	6,000	200.00
Austria (5 days)	Schilling		65.00		52.50		12.00		22.50	3,800	152.00
Germany (3 days)	Deutsche mark		55.00		51.00		14.00		30.00	600	150.00
Denmark (5 days)	Kroner		75.00		62.00		8.00		26.00	1,200	171.00
Huff, Corrine A.:											
Great Britain (4 days)	U.S. dollar		80.00		17.50		28.00		168.00		293.50
France (5 days)	do		110.00		82.50		12.00		46.00		250.50
Italy (5 days)	do		150.00		99.00				56.00		305.00
Greece (11 days)	do		192.00		181.50		75.00		84.00		532.50
Spain (4 days)	do		72.00		76.00				37.00		185.00
Denmark (4 days)	do		72.00		66.00				37.00		175.00

In another factfinding mission, Mrs. Louise Dargans, a committee staff member, reports only $104 in transportation for a trip which by her own account took her to the United Kingdom, Spain, Italy, France, Morocco, and Portugal. My information which I cannot completely substantiate because of the inability to get cooperation on these funds expended indicates that Mrs. Dargans sailed on November 17, 1962, on the SS *Independence* of the American Export Lines on accommodations that would cost $975. She returned on December 11, 1962.

Her expenses are listed as follows:

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Dargans, Louise Maxienne:											
United Kingdom	U.S. dollar		15.50		12.00		6.25		16.00		49.75
Spain	do		32.00		22.50		17.75		11.50		83.75
Italy	do		35.00		30.50		40.00		14.00		119.50
France	do		25.00		18.50		20.00		17.00		80.50
Morocco	do		15.00		10.00		8.00		4.00		37.00
Portugal	do		14.50		12.00		12.00		15.00		53.50

The chairman, Miss Huff, and Mrs. Wall did not travel on MATS, according to my information. The State Department listed them as sailing on the *Queen Mary* on August 8 and arriving Southampton on August 13.

The law very clearly requires that all counterpart funds expended for transportation must be reported. This is an apparent oversight which should be corrected in the filing of an amended report.

I have been told that the Committee on House Administration has advised committee chairmen that no exemption or exceptions are made to the requirement in title 22, section 1754. All funds expended should be shown whether they were received from an agency or from counterpart funds. The only exception, of course, would be the expenditure of private funds. The law states:

FOREIGN CURRENCIES—AVAILABILITY AND USE

(a) Notwithstanding section 724 of title 31, or any other provision of law, proceeds of sales made under section 550 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, shall remain available and shall be used for any of the purposes of this chapter, giving particular regard to the following purposes—

(1) for providing military assistance to nations or mutual defense organizations eligible to receive assistance under this chapter;

(2) for purchase of goods or services in friendly nations;

(3) for loans, under applicable provisions of this chapter, to increase production of goods or services, including strategic materials, needed in any nation with which any agreement was negotiated, or in other friendly nations, with the authority to use currencies received in repayment for the purposes stated in this section or for deposit to the general account of the Treasury of the United States;

(4) for developing new markets on a mutually beneficial basis;

(5) for grants-in-aid to increase production for domestic needs in friendly countries; and

(6) for purchasing materials for United States stockpiles.

AVAILABILITY TO CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

(b) Notwithstanding section 724 of title 31, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to appropriate committees of the Congress engaged in carrying out their duties under section 190d of title 2, and to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Joint Economic Committee and the Select Committees on Small Business of the Senate and House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration of the House of Representatives and the Special Committee on Space and Astronautics of the Senate, for their local currency expenses: *Provided*, That each member or employee of any such committee shall make, to the chairman of such committee in accordance with regulations prescribed by such committee, an itemized report showing the amounts and dollar equivalent values of each such foreign currency expended and the amounts of dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds in connection with travel outside the United States, together with the purposes of the expenditure, including lodging, meals, transportation, and other purposes. Within the first sixty days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, the chairman of each such committee shall prepare a consolidated report showing the total itemized expenditures during the preceding calendar year of the committee and each subcommittee thereof, and of each member and employee of such committee or subcommittee, and shall forward such consolidated report to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (if the committee be a committee of the House of Representatives or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Clerk of the House) or to the Committee

on Appropriations of the Senate (if the committee by a Senate committee or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.) Each such report submitted by each committee shall be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within ten legislative days after receipt by the Committee on House Administration of the House or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

An interesting situation exists regarding responsibility under the title 22, section 1754 requirements. The Committee on House Administration takes the position that the law does not charge it with the obligation to check into these reports when filed and it has neither the authority nor the responsibility to so check, even when errors are apparent on the face. I am sure the committee is correct in its position.

The State Department, on the other hand, takes the position that it is not responsible either. In a telephone conversation with Mr. John Leahy, State Department official charged with providing and reporting these funds to the Congress, I learned that his reports are made only to the chairman of the various committees who authorized the travel and to the individuals who expended the funds. As a Member of Congress, I cannot check into these funds or obtain a recapitulation of moneys expended by my committee. Mr. Leahy stated that this procedure was the result of a Department rule and not an official regulation.

It is for that reason that I take this time to call this matter to the attention of the House and request that an amended report be submitted which will fill in the gaps that were inadvertently left in the report filed yesterday which therefore makes it not in compliance with title 22, section 1754. In the event that these trips were paid for by the individuals themselves or by some private agency or individual, I believe we also should know that is the case.

The chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], has indicated his full intention to file the complete report of the expenditure of these funds. In his press conference of February 20, 1963 this exact matter was brought up and the following remarks were made:

Representative POWELL. "The Senate has never followed the House in these things, we led the way a long time ago on itemizing by Members. The Senate hasn't done it.

REPORTER. Getting right down to the point, are you willing at this time to make your spending on counterpart funds available for general scrutiny just to show everyone how?

Representative POWELL. On March 1, I will, that's the date due.

REPORTER. In detail, there will be no miscellaneous this time?

Representative POWELL. No, sir.

REPORTER. It's going to be right out on the line in every respect.

Representative POWELL. Correct, I promise you that. But will the Senate do it? No.

* * * * *

REPORTER. Mr. Congressman, may I go back one moment, to the trip in September of 1961 or 1962. Will that trip be reported in your report?

Representative POWELL. Yes, sir, in detail, in detail, itemized.

REPORTER. That involved the use of counterpart funds.

Representative POWELL. Yes, sir, and not one penny of committee funds and not one penny of Federal funds. Must emphasize that.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the RECORD will be corrected expeditiously to include these apparent oversights in the expenditures of counterpart funds.

ADMINISTRATION'S COMMITMENTS TO THE WOOLEN TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD an article from the March 12 issue of the Washington Post, this article implying that the administration is refusing to follow through on its commitments to the woolen textile industry of this country. This disturbs me deeply, and I hereby urge President Kennedy to move forward immediately with such action as will prove this article's contention false.

I am also including a statement recently adopted unanimously by the board of directors of the Northern Textile Association. This statement brings into proper focus the problem presently confronting the American textile industry, and it points up the desperate need of immediate solution:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Mar. 12, 1963]

ADMINISTRATION REPORTED VETOING WOOL RAISERS' PROTECTION DEMAND

(By Julius Duscha)

The domestic wool industry apparently has lost its 2-year fight to get President Kennedy to give it special protection against imports.

It was learned last night that the President has decided to drop for the time being any effort to help the industry by trying to limit wool imports through a system of international quotas.

Mr. Kennedy's decision was said to have been made known to the industry by Christian A. Herter, the President's special representative for trade negotiations, at a secret meeting last Wednesday in Washington.

EUROPEANS OPPOSED

Herter met with members of the U.S. Wool Textile Advisory Committee following a trip to Western Europe during which he encountered stiff resistance to suggestions that wool imports be controlled through a system similar to the international cotton textile agreement that went into effect last fall.

At the meeting Herter reportedly told the industry in soft but unmistakeable language that the Kennedy administration plans to take no steps at this time to cut back wool imports.

The President himself is reported to have told Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat of Rhode Island, last Friday that the domestic industry could expect no help.

It is understood that both Herter and the President indicated that the decision against aiding the industry would be periodically reviewed and was always open to reconsideration in the light of new facts.

Mr. Kennedy's decision will have political repercussions among the New England and Western Senators who have been putting pressure on him to provide assistance to the domestic wool industry. During the 1960 presidential campaign he promised to help the industry.

LIBERAL POLICY SEEN

But the decision will be welcomed in Western Europe, particularly in the big wool-exporting countries of Britain and Italy. Together with Japan they supply 75 percent of the wool that is imported by the United States.

In Europe and Japan the decision will be taken as a welcome indication that Mr. Kennedy is determined to pursue a liberal policy under the 1962 Trade Act even in the face of domestic pressures.

Herter is reported to have flatly told the domestic wool industry that there is no way to aid them with the new trade law unless the industry institutes a case under the escape clause in the act providing relief for domestic industries that can show they are being harmed by tariff concessions.

The wool industry has been unwilling to proceed under this clause because it does not think it could win its case. The new law provides that trade concessions must be a major factor in depressing domestic industries before relief will be given them.

Herter is also understood to have ruled out for now an international wool agreement along the lines of the cotton agreement or a finding that wool imports must be restricted because the domestic industry is vital to national security.

The domestic wool industry has favored an international agreement to limit imports, which have increased from a negligible amount 10 years ago to about 20 percent of total U.S. consumption.

STATEMENT UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE NORTHERN TEXTILE ASSOCIATION

We have been encouraged by the President's obvious grasp of the nature of the textile import problem, and are conscious of the efforts made by the administration to deal with a problem which adversely affects not only New England and the South, but wool and cotton-growing areas of the West and urban apparel centers.

During the first month of the present administration, a direct and forthright approach was adopted in establishing a Cabinet Committee, followed by the announcement in May of 1961 of a program that encompassed all fiber branches of the industry.

The first International Cotton Arrangement was completed in July of 1961, and a second early last year. Both provide means for preventing market disruption by the limitation of imports.

Although it was agreed that these arrangements would be followed promptly by action to restrain imports of textiles made of wool and other fibers, nothing has been accomplished, no international conference to restrain imports has been called, and no steps for control by the United States have been developed.

Meanwhile, imports of wool products in 1962 rose 78 percent over the level of 1961, and manmade textile imports rose 39 percent. An additional 18 wool mills closed in 1962, and the share of the U.S. market taken by foreign goods has increased by over 40 percent.

Direct appeal to the administration by Members of Congress and the industry to carry out the textile program have been to no avail. The program has continued to drift, jobs have continued to disappear, and conflict between agencies of Government grow. The program announced by the President appears to be more dependent for its implementation upon the whims and changing policies of foreign governments than upon domestic direction. Our own Government delays as a major American industry is eroded.

This situation is known to textile producers and textile workers, to apparel manufacturers and apparel workers, and to wool growers throughout the country.

With a deep sense of responsibility to the employees and people in the communities where textile and apparel plants are located, to those who produce the fibers we use, and to those in the Congress who have worked for a solution of this problem, the board of directors of the Northern Textile Association calls this ominous situation to the attention of the public and to those members of Government who are unaware of the situation or whose opposition to the clear intention of the President has contributed to this crisis.

EMERGENCY MILK SURPLUS REDUCTION ACT OF 1963, H.R. 4745

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation that will make it possible for New York State dairy farmers to undertake a program of curtailing the current milk surplus that has troubled them so much, and to do this without impairing their own income. My bill is H.R. 4745, and is known as the Emergency Milk Surplus Reduction Act of 1963.

Today the dairy farmers of upstate New York clearly face an emergency situation. The size of their milk checks is going down sharply. Many milk plants in my district are closing down. A number of milk dealers have already advised dairy farmers delivering to them that they will not accept further milk after certain specified dates, or will only accept them if the farmers assume additional costs connected with transportation. These conditions have created great concern among our dairy farmers. Something must be done to help them, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that help must come through some format that will make it possible for the dairy farmers to work together to reduce this milk surplus without damaging their own income or the stability of the industry in which they are engaged.

Mr. Speaker, a good deal of effort has already been expended by dairy farm groups in upstate New York to devise such a long-range plan. Much progress has been made in this direction. Basically these farm groups seem to be in the process of reaching agreement on a so-called two-price plan for milk production. However, Mr. Speaker, there are still many differences of opinion among our farmers and our farm cooperatives with respect to many of the specific details of this two-price plan.

I feel certain that these various differences will soon be resolved, and then our farmers will be able to make common cause before the Congress in support of this permanent long-range legislation. But the situation is urgent, and I believe that while we are working in the direction of this agreement we need fast and effective emergency relief to tide us over the gap.

I believe my bill will fill this need, Mr. Speaker. It is almost exactly the same kind of emergency dairy legislation which the House passed in the last Congress as a part of the overall farm bill, but which was stricken out in the Senate.

The bill encourages voluntary reduction in the production of milk without harming the dairy farmer's income. It would do it in much the same way as we have been doing for several years with the emergency feed grains program.

Under my bill, a dairy farmer could elect to reduce his milk production below his 1962 production by a figure of between 10 to 25 percent. In return for this reduction, the participating farmer would receive $2.50 per hundredweight as an incentive payment for his reduction.

The results of this legislation will be of real help to our upstate dairy farmers. It should contribute to an appreciable reduction in the production of milk, which will then be reflected in an easing of the pressures recently mounted against our farmers as an outgrowth of the current milk surplus.

In so doing it will help to improve the stability of our upstate dairy market, and will help to continue a stable return to the farmer for his milk. In addition, the incentive payments will protect the farmer against any serious decline in his income as a result of his voluntary reductions. And, since the incentive payment is below the cost to the Government of acquiring surplus milk products, the taxpayers will actually save money on the transaction, as well as saving additional sums in storage and warehousing costs for surplus dairy products.

The program, if adopted by the Congress, would be an emergency program pure and simple. It would continue in operation, under the terms of my legislation, until September 30, 1964. By that time I feel sure we will have devised more permanent legislation in line with the requests and pleas of our upstate dairy farmers.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation I have introduced has already received the support of substantial dairy farm groups in upstate New York, including the New York State Grange and the Eastern Milk Producers Association. It is closely parallel to a similar recommendation made by the metropolitan milk bargaining agency. I believe it has the support of a substantial majority of the dairy farmers in upstate New York. I trust the bill will be promptly enacted into law, so that the relief it provides as an emergency matter can come quickly to the dairy farmers I have the honor to represent in this body.

THE UNESCO BOOKLET, "EQUALITY OF RIGHTS BETWEEN RACES AND NATIONALITIES IN THE U.S.S.R."

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, concern has been expressed in this House, and in the other Chamber of Congress, about a booklet published by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization which, among other things, distorted history and denounced "colonialist oppression by Western nations," and described the U.S.S.R. as a "brotherhood of free and equal peoples."

The United Nations booklet—and remember it is the American taxpayer who keeps the U.N.'s financial head above the breakers of bankruptcy—notes that:

> In 1940 the Soviet regime was restored in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, which voluntarily joined the Soviet Union.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it develops that this booklet which insults the West, insults the three captive Baltic States and insults history, is rather a ghost publication.

Attempts by Members of this Congress to obtain and see it, to read it, and to study it, are being met by continued refusals by United States and United Nations officials to make it available to Congress.

Our colleague here, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], was told by our United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson that no copy of the offensive booklet is available, as the gentleman informed this House March 7. In fact, the Ambassador claimed he had not "been able to lay ahold of one myself."

I would like to report today a bit of news that seems encouraging. It just may be that very few people anywhere have been able to "lay ahold" of this UNESCO booklet.

I have received this morning a letter from Mr. Philip Deane, Director of the United Nations Information Centre here in Washington.

Says Mr. Deane:

> The UNESCO booklet, "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.," has never been sold or stocked by any United Nations center or bookstore. Our headquarters (in Washington) does not have a copy. I regret, therefore, that we are unable to comply with your request for one.

Now, if we may believe this distinguished United Nations official charged with information about the U.N. in this Capital of the Nation that provides some 40 percent of U.N. funds, we may rest a bit more easily about this UNESCO booklet that praises communism.

If the booklet has, as Mr. Deane says, "never been sold or stocked by any United Nations center or bookstore," then it follows that at least innocent purchasers have not been offered it as an official U.N. publication at official U.N. offices.

However, it must be noted by American taxpayers that it is likely that the Communist nations of the world have arranged to distribute this booklet, through their own auspices, throughout the uncommitted world.

My efforts to obtain a copy of this UNESCO publication are continuing as are, I am sure, the efforts of other Members of this Congress. I suggest that it would be a good idea, even if this is a ghost publication, for the American Congress to take a close look at it even if the reading makes us sick.

UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION CENTRE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I read in part from a letter by Mr. Adlai Stevenson, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, in which he said that he had been unable to lay his hands on a copy of that infamous booklet issued by UNESCO.

A few weeks ago, in February, the United Nations Information Centre in Washington, D.C.—and I call your attention to the fact that it is spelled "C-e-n-t-r-e"—sent out a propaganda letter, a mimeographed letter, to Members of the House, in which Mr. Philip Deane, the Director of the United Nations Information Centre—C-e-n-t-r-e—in Washington, D.C., tried to pooh-pooh the idea that there was anything wrong with this UNESCO booklet which my friend from Missouri [Mr. Hall] described a few moments ago. So I wrote to Mr. Deane and asked him to supply me with a copy. On March 8, I received this reply:

> My Dear Mr. Gross: Thank you for your letter of March 7. As I mention in my letter to which you refer the United Nations has never sold nor stocked the UNESCO booklet. Centre libraries have not received copies. Consequently we are unable to supply you with the copy you requested.
>
> With my personal regards,
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> Philip Deane,
> *Director.*

What kind of skulduggery is going on when the American Ambassador to the United Nations and the head of the United Nations Information Centre in Washington cannot provide a copy of this infamous booklet. The money of American taxpayers was used to produce this Soviet propaganda and it is especially interesting that not even the U.N. information outfit can or will produce a copy.

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a civil rights bill which is most comprehensive in scope. Equally important, the bill is tailored to moderate application in order that it may be enacted into law this session of Congress. Of course, anyone can come forward with pie-in-the-sky proposals that sound sweet, but have the false ring of impossible accomplishment. As a Republican, I am sincere in proposing this civil rights bill, and have every intention of guiding it toward enactment. Sincerity, as I see it, is not in what you promise, but in what you accomplish. And as far as I am concerned, I intend to fight for deliverance of this bill to the people during the 88th Congress.

Before presenting an analysis of the bill, however, I would like to comment upon the Kennedy administration's recent civil rights message which has recently been presented to Congress, but which has yet to bring forward the introduction of a single bill. This message, indeed, is a puzzle to understand. For, it literally boasts that the present administration has done more in the field of civil rights than any other administration in the history of our Nation. An example of this boastfulness involves the statement that a far greater number of voting-rights suits have been instituted during the Kennedy administration than in previous administrations. There is a failure to acknowledge, however, that the only progressive civil rights legislation to be enacted since Reconstruction days occurred in the 8 years that President Eisenhower was in office. Without the passage of the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts, there would have been no suits to grant the voting franchise to every citizen regardless of his race, creed, or color. Moreover, if one were to compare the law suits brought during President Eisenhower's term in office with those during Mr. Kennedy's, it will readily be seen that the latter's record is nothing to shout about—particularly when it is realized that it took Republican Attorneys General time to implement the new legislation and to undertake exhaustive investigations. Similarly, many legal actions which the present administration has taken credit for were largely developed during the Eisenhower administration.

The Kennedy administration also has taken practically sole credit for school desegregation. Yet, the fallacy of this claim may be seen when one recalls that it was during the tenure of a Republican President that the famous 1954 Supreme Court decision was handed down. And following this decision, the Republican administration proceeded to institute desegregation in hundreds upon hundreds of school districts. To name but one significant example, the entire school system in the District of Columbia was totally and completely desegregated while President Eisenhower was in office.

In many other areas of civil rights, as well, the Republicans did what President Kennedy now takes credit for. Desegregation of transportation facilities, the Armed Forces, libraries, many southern universities, Federal employment, national parks, and national forests. Similarly, in the area of private employment, it was a Republican President who set up the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity to make certain that, where Federal contracts were involved, employers and labor unions would refrain from discrimination in employment.

From this, it may be seen that, instead of being the pathfinder of civil rights, the Kennedy administration merely represents the homesteader. It would therefore logically appear that if the present administration wanted to prove its vigor in defending civil rights, it would have come forward with solid legislative proposals. Yet, when one is through hearing the boastful roar of the President's civil rights message, he surely must be surprised to encounter only a mouse's squeak of newly proposed legislation.

Most surprising of all, perhaps, is that the President either ignored or greatly modified three civil rights proposals contained in the Democratic platform of 1960—those involving the Civil Rights Commission; authority of the Attorney General to bring civil school desegregation actions; and legislation involving nonsegregation in Government employment and Government contracting truthfully then, the President's message does have a hollow ring.

The civil rights bill which I have introduced today seeks to make the Civil Rights Commission permanent. In addition, it grants the Commission authority to subpoena necessary documents—authority which, if denied, will tend to curb the effectiveness of the Commission's work. Furthermore, the Commission is granted the right to look into voter fraud cases—a right which is equally as important as voter discrimination. For, to not have one's vote counted is equally as discriminatory as to not be able to vote at all. And, we all know those locales in the country where fraudulent voting practices are prominent.

In contrast, however, President Kennedy only proposes that the life of the Civil Rights Commission be extended 4 years, even though his own 1960 Democratic platform calls for the Commission being made permanent. Moreover, he bases the halfhearted gesture on the principle that it would be pessimistic to consider that our country will always need a Civil Rights Commission. Perhaps, a time will come when we can do without the need of such an agency of government, but we well know that that time will not be upon us in 4 years. I, certainly, am not a pessimist. But, I am a realist and I know that we are going to have to toil long before voter discrimination and voter frauds are eliminated. Why risk the need to fight for repeated extensions of the Commission each few years when we can correct the Commission's tenuous existence during this session of Congress? In this regard, I have learned that the Commission is losing valuable personnel for the simple reason that their future looks precarious. Let us then terminate this uncertainty and pump real life into the Commission by making its existence permanent.

Second. The civil rights bill which I have introduced would grant the Attorney General the authority to institute civil rights actions in an effort to desegregate public schools. Considerable advance has been made in this area of civil rights, but there is still progress to be made. At the present, the Attorney General only has the right to bring criminal suits in this field which, if done, can cause as much antagonism as cure—particularly since a number of Southern States have begun to adopt moderate programs. In contrast to this, however, the President has failed to recommend any action along this line even though the Democratic platform of 1960 specifically called for such legislation. What must we think of the boldness of the present administration's civil rights intentions when they fail again to follow their own campaign promises?

A third part of my civil rights bill calls for the legislative creation of a Commission on Equality of Opportunity in Employment. This Commission would have authority to conduct investigations and hearings concerning charges of discrimination in employment by business organizations or labor unions who are engaged in carrying out Government contracts. Similarly, discrimination by employment agencies, supported by Federal funds, would be rooted out. There presently exists a committee to look into similar areas of discrimination. This committee was established by President Eisenhower through Executive order and performed commendably under the skilled direction of Vice President Nixon. The Kennedy administration continued the operation of the committee and has properly carried on its work. But, an organization, if necessary and desirable, can better perform its duties if created by legislation rather than by Executive orders.

For one, the present committee is headed by various cabinet officials who cannot devote much time to its operations. Its day-to-day affairs, therefore, must be delegated to lesser employees who, surely, must consider their employment temporary and tenuous. Moreover, what one administration can create by Executive order, a second administration can disband. It would seem far more preferable, then, to establish a commission of this nature by a law of Congress which will clearly show that its functions are being taken seriously. Then, too, the authority of the newly proposed commission is more fully enhanced by granting it subpena power and by permitting it to effectively deal with discrimination in labor unions and public employment agencies—powers or duties absent or attenuated in the existing committee. President Kennedy, in his message, glowingly praises the work of the present committee under his administration without acknowledging its parentage. Similarly, he makes no recommendations for its legislative creation even though the 1960 Democratic platform called for such action. This surely must seem strange to those who see and understand the need for the elimination of discrimination in employment. The old saying, "action not words" certainly must have come into the minds of many citizens, when they read the President's message.

The civil rights bill, which I have introduced today, also includes a provision which authorizes an appropriation to aid State and local educational agencies to enable them to desegregate public schools. Here, I am pleased to add, my civil rights bill and the President's message coincide to some extent. A significant difference does exist, however. Under my bill, the State or local school agency must make the request for assistance, whereas, it appears from the President's message that aid can be forced upon the schools. Since the latter approach could interject Federal aid to education where it is not wanted, I believe that my approach is to be preferred.

While on the subject of education, moreover, I should point out that the President's message proposes that separate school facilities be created on military installations where local public schools have not desegregated. This proposal, I am pleased to say, cannot be found in my bill since it is abhorrent to the concept of uniform desegregation. I may also add that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has come out strongly against this gimmick. And, they have done so for good reason because the effect of the proposal would be to create three categories of schools: First, integrated schools on military installations; second, all-white public schools; and third, all-Negro public schools. Anyone on the base who so desired could continue to attend a segregated school in the local community and the local community could under law continue to receive Federal funds. The harm to this plan can be readily seen and I, for one, will have no part of it. What we need and what the Republican Party is striving for is public schools which are desegregated—that is, public schools which are equally open to all because the citizens in each local community have been made aware that equality for all our citizens is a necessary adjunct to a free society. Let us also remember what President Eisenhower accomplished in his administration without the loss of life and with a minimum of force.

Finally, my civil rights bill would create a presumption that any citizen, otherwise qualified to vote, shall be deemed to have sufficient literacy, comprehension and intelligence to vote in Federal election if he has completed six grades in an accredited school where instruction is carried out predominantly in the English language. My bill is similar to a recommendation contained in the President's message. And, this is for good reason since it is known that Negroes in certain States have been subjected to discriminatory intellectual tests which have not been imposed on their white neighbors at vote registration time. The elimination of this inequity seems necessary and desirable.

In another area of voter equality, however, the President has recommended that Federal referees be appointed in order to register voters before a court has determined whether or not discrimination exists. This provision would clearly invade the rights of States to manage their own elections and cannot be supported by me. Not only that, but support for such a provision could so antagonize moderate-thinking citizens, wherever they live, as to seriously jeopardize the enactment of any civil rights legislation. As I said at the beginning of my statement, my bill is comprehensive in scope, but moderate in application. And it is moderate for the obvious reason that we Republicans are sincere in our intention to enact effective civil rights legislation this session of Congress. Anyone, of course, can look at the moon, but getting there takes painstaking care and deliberate effort.

The Republican Party is dedicated to equal rights and equal opportunity for all. As a proud representative of that party, I intend to work long and hard in seeing that we carry out our pledge to enact constructive civil rights legislation.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE CORPS SECRETARIAT

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified to inform the House that in the last few months five countries have announced plans to establish national volunteer corps modeled on our own U.S. Peace Corps. These countries are Germany, Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands, and New Zealand. I am especially pleased to note that the New Zealand Peace Corps—to be known as Volunteer Service Abroad—will be headed by the world-famous Sir Edmund Hillary, K.B.E., the conqueror of Mount Everest.

These activities are, in large measure, the result of the work of the International Peace Corps Secretariat which was formed at the Conference on Human Skills in the Decade of Development which was held in Puerto Rico last October. I was one of the two congressional representatives at this Conference which was sponsored by the U.S. Peace Corps. Forty-three nations and several international organizations gathered in Puerto Rico for 3 days in order to discuss the importance of skilled manpower to the process of economic development and to find new ways of increasing the supply of such manpower. This was the largest high level conference on economic development ever held. Nearly every country was represented by cabinet level officers or higher, including the Vice Presidents of the Philippines and the Dominican Republic, the Foreign Minister of Israel, the Minister of Development of India, and dozens of other distinguished national leaders. Our own delegation was headed by Vice President JOHNSON and included the Secretaries of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. Moreover, this was the first such conference at which delegates from both industrialized and underdeveloped countries were brought together for a common discussion of the problems of development, and for a direct confrontation of the needs of the developing countries with the capacity and willingness to help of the economically advanced nations.

This may well have been the hardest working conference ever held. The average working day began at 9 in the morning and ended around midnight. But the results were well worth the effort.

Every delegation came away with a far deeper and more profound understanding of the problems of other nations, as well as greatly enhanced awareness that the need for skilled manpower was the single most pressing need of the underdeveloped world. There has been too great a tendency to assume that the problems of poverty and hunger and ignorance could be solved by large infusions of capital. The truth is that capital is worthless without skilled and trained men and women to man the factories, run the institutions of a growing economy, and administer the government. It became clear at this Conference that the success of a nation in improving its standard of living would depend, in large measure, on its success in training and supplying skilled manpower.

If the Conference had only served to create this new awareness, it would have been a great success. But it did more than this. It took several concrete and practical steps toward increasing the supply of skilled manpower available to underdeveloped countries.

It called upon private enterprise to make available its knowledge of training techniques to the underdeveloped world. And, in response to this call, the Business Council for International Understanding, backed by the voluntary contributions of American industry, is engaged in establishing three pilot training projects in the underdeveloped world.

The Conference also presented a series of new quick-training techniques which could be used to rapidly accelerate the training of skilled manpower. And model training centers based on these techniques—these new technologies of training—are in the process of preparation.

Perhaps most important of all, the Conference dramatically demonstrated the contribution which skilled volunteers—young men and women—could make to the almost limitless and urgent need for human skills. Our own Peace Corps, and its reception in other countries, was living proof of this. And a Secretariat was established to increase the flow of volunteer assistance throughout the world. In the few short months since its inception the Secretariat has announced the formation of five new Peace Corps. Several other countries have been working with the Secretariat and are hoping to establish volunteer organizations shortly.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there have been few conferences which have made such an important impact on its participants, or which have achieved such impressive results in so short a period of time. Moreover, delegates with whom I talked from all over the world were enormously impressed with the efficiency, thoroughness, and intelligence with which the Conference was organized and run. The U.S. Peace Corps is to be congratulated for having made such an important and meaningful contribution to the interests of our own country and to the hopes of the emerging nations of the world.

RECENT EVENTS IN THE NEAR EAST

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House have no doubt noted recent events in the Near East.

A political and military pattern is slowly emerging which could be a matter for serious concern.

I refer to: First, the proposal advanced by the new Deputy Premier of Iraq calling for a joint military command of the armies of Iraq, Syria, the UAR, Yemen, and Algeria; second, efforts looking toward a closer merger or union of Iraq, Syria, and the UAR; third, inflammatory propaganda of the new President of Yemen calling the peoples of Jordan and Saudi Arabia to overthrow Kings Hussein and Saud by releasing the trigger.

The United States has persistently encouraged closer peaceful cooperation among the countries in the area and welcomed planning looking toward coordinated economic development.

However, moves directed substantially toward a strong military alliance against a backdrop of inflammatory propaganda would not be reassuring.

The Secretary of State's restatement last Friday of our concern for the independence and security of Jordan and Saudi Arabia was therefore most pertinent and timely.

The House will recall that the formation on October 23, 1956, of the last joint command of Egypt, Syria, and Jordan, with the stated purpose of "the liquidation of Israel" in large measure triggered action by the Government of Israel in Sinai—as Israel believed its security was threatened and that its survival was at stake; thereby requiring action in self-defense.

It would be my hope that the House will give these developments its close attention; that the President will instruct our Ambassadors—as may be appropriate—in the relevant countries to reaffirm that our policy embraces friendly and peaceful relations with all countries in the Near East; and that any threat to the peace will result in prompt action by the United States consistent with the U.N. Charter.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: excerpts from State Department's release of Secretary of State Dean Rusk's news conference of March 8, 1963; an article in the Baltimore Sun by Weldon Wallace—March 11, 1963; an article in the Baltimore Sun—Associated Press story, datelined Aden, March 10, 1963; an article from the Washington Post, March 12, 1963; a letter from the President addressed to Prince Faysal of Saudi Arabia, released January 8, 1963:

Mr. Secretary, during this past 6 months the regimes in Iraq, Yemen, and now Syria have changed, and each time there is immediate affiliation with the United Arab Republic—at least, a friendly spirit. In view of this, do you have some concern for the longevity of the regimes in Saudi Arabia and in Jordan?

Answer. Let me say, first, on the most recent development in Syria, we have only fragmentary reports, and I would not wish to make any judgment on exactly what that might mean. We do have information that so far as we can tell the Americans in that country are safe and that the situation does not affect them. We ourselves believe that relations among the Arab States ought to be worked out on the basis of consent, on the basis of voluntary cooperation in the normal way.

We of course are concerned about the independence of these Arab States and their freedom from external penetration. We hope, for example, that the Yemen people will be left alone to decide their own future and have been working in that direction. But we do not ourselves object to the close cooperation among the Arab States on the basis of friendly cooperation among states and in ways which do not counter the normal obligations of states in the international community. We are very much interested in the independence and the security of our friends in Jordan and Saudi Arabia and will be very much alert to any threats against them.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Mar. 11, 1963]

FIVE ARAB STATES URGED TO LINK UP MILITARY FORCES—SYRIAN CROWD CHEERS PLAN BY IRAQI AID—ALGERIA, YEMEN, EGYPT ARE ALSO INVITED TO JOIN ALLIANCE

(By Weldon Wallace)

DAMASCUS, SYRIA, March 10.—A bold new military-political alliance of five Arab nations was proposed here today by the head of an Iraqi delegation that paid an official visit to the new Government, which seized control of Syria Friday morning.

A joint command for the armies of Egypt, Algeria, Iraq, Yemen, and Syria was urged by Ali Saleh Saadi, Deputy Premier of Iraq.

He represents the Government that came to power through a coup d'etat exactly 1 month before the coup staged by a Syrian army group in Damascus 3 days ago.

SYRIAN WELCOMES PLAN

Saadi presented his plan in a speech to the Syrian Premier, Salah Bitar, who promptly welcomed it.

To a cheering throng in front of the guest palace, the Syrian Government's reception house in Damascus, the Iraqi official said there were "other better things" to be proposed.

The proposition by Saadi would give the five countries the right to "take action and enter each other's territory whenever any of the states suffers foreign intrigue or threat of internal imperialist reactionary intrigue aimed at toppling the regimes of these five states."

REGIME IN CONTROL

His words stirred the crowd into a state of near hysteria. Meanwhile, on this sunny, brisk day in Damascus, the new Bitar regime seemed comfortably in control of the country.

During the morning hours there was considerable commotion—though no threat to the Government—when many hundreds, perhaps thousands of persons staged demonstration in various parts of the city.

The demonstrations did not originate as protests against the new regime. Their chief purpose was to link the new Government with President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic and with the new regime in Iraq.

EMBASSY IS TARGET

One group evidently had more grim intentions, for it gathered outside the Turkish Embassy, where the former Prime Minister of Syria has taken refuge. This is near the American Embassy.

Communists seized the opportunity to turn these various demonstrations to their own uses. They infiltrated the chanting, flag-waving, banner-carrying ranks and began to call for the return of Khalled Bakdash, Syria's chief Communist, who fled into exile when Syria joined Egypt to form the United Arab Republic. He now is in Prague.

When the Communist elements entered the picture this morning, army units with armored cars and tanks were called into action to break up the demonstrations.

All during the day groups of people milled in the streets of Damascus, and at almost every intersection and along the streets armed soldiers were to be seen with tanks and other military equipment.

CITY'S TONE CHEERFUL

They often stopped passing vehicles to determine identification, but there was no danger or threat in the atmosphere. In fact, the tone of the city was cheerful.

The change of government Friday was accomplished almost politely, with the old forces bowing out as the new ones came in.

Like the new regime that took over in Iraq, Syria's new Government is controlled by the Ba'ath Socialist Party, a group that is moderate in nature. The Ba'ath Party is committed to Arab unity, though it has not specified on what basis.

The clearest factor in the aims of the new Government is vigorous opposition to the Communists.

COMMUNISTS FEARED

The anti-Communist bent of the new Government is in keeping with this country's tradition, for it was the menacing power of the Syrian Communist Party that prompted politicians of various orientations to unite in seeking Nasser's help, leading to Syria's joining Egypt in the United Arab Republic.

Nasser, however, overplayed his hand, for Syria felt his control too dictatorial and considered that he had made Syria too subservient to Egypt.

Syria broke away from the United Arab Republic in September 1961, with an army coup. The government that came into power then lasted until March 1962, when it was ousted in another coup.

The relationship between the latest coups in Iraq and Syria has been indicated in a number of ways. The slogans, songs and general appeal used by the Ba'athists in both countries were the same.

After the Iraq changeover, a Ba'athist delegation from Damascus went to Baghdad on a mission of friendship and remained several days.

The Ba'athists, who got their start in Syria in 1951, have had a hand in engineering coups in the past, but they have never before held the power position until the latest Iraq coup.

Observers here are saying that the rise of this party to a dominant position in both Syria and Iraq could indicate the beginning of an Arab unity development on a new basis, possibly along the lines of a Federation of Arab States.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Mar. 11, 1963]

JORDAN, SAUDI ARABIA ARE URGED TO REVOLT

ADEN, March 10.—President Abdullah al-Sallal, of Yemen, today urged the people of Jordan and Saudi Arabia to overthrow their monarchs, Hussein and Saud.

"Do not hesitate," San'â' radio quoted Sallal as saying. "Revolt now and those you have always feared will run away like scared rabbits and confused mice."

The Yemeni leader urged Jordanians to "release the trigger" and depose "playboy King Hussein."

"Your first bullet in Hussein's chest will send the traitors running," Sallal said in addressing a military review in the Yemeni capital of San'â'.

The broadcast said Sallal hailed President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic as "an apostle of peace and freedom." He also pledges that Yemani forces would "fight till the last drop of our blood" to uphold Nasser's dream of Arab nationalism.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 12, 1963]

IRAQI OFFICIAL EXPECTS LINK OF THREE ARAB STATES

DAMASCUS, SYRIA, March 11.—The new revolutionary regimes of Syria and Iraq and the United Arab Republic will form a "union or federation," Iraqi Deputy Premier Ali Saleh el Saadi said today.

The visiting Iraqi leader told a news conference, however, that President Nasser of the United Arab Republic was informed of the merger only last night and his reply has yet to be received.

But he emphasized that the three nations "will definitely unite."

(Iraqi Foreign Minister Taleb Hussein Shabib arrived in Cairo today and formally presented Nasser with the Iraqi unity plan. Informed sources said the proposals were welcomed warmly but that Nasser is determined to move cautiously.

(Shabib's visit aroused speculation that he is opening the way for an early summit meeting of Nasser, Syrian Premier Salah Bitar and Iraqi President Abel Salam Aref.)

Whether the merger will be a tight union was unclear. The Baath Socialists behind last Friday's bloodless coup in Damascus lost their influence in Syria when it was joined with Egypt in the United Arab Republic military coup took Syria out of the United Arab Republic in 1961.

The Baathists who engineered Iraq's coup February 8 have worked closely with those in Syria and have talked more of a loose federation with the U.A.R. than of union.

DEMONSTRATIONS HELD

While El Saadi talked with correspondents, hundreds of demonstrators in the square outside chanted pro-Nasser slogans and waved placards calling for Arab unity.

Earlier in the day, troops dispersed smaller bands of students who shouted for reunion of Syria and Egypt. The revolutionary regime has banned demonstrations and display of pictures and slogans.

(Security measures, were tightened tonight around the Jordanian and Saudi Arabian Embassies here to avert possible demonstrations, Reuters reported.

(Security forces also continued their search for wanted politicians and publishers, including anti-Nasserites and Communists.)

El Saadi indicated the movement toward an Iraq-Syria-Egypt merger will be slow.

"We shall meet frequently to coordinate efforts and work to eliminate regional difficulties in order to bring about identical conditions in the three Arab countries," he said. "These conditions will then help us to take the next step for forming a union or federation. And we will definitely unite."

UNIFIED COMMAND SEEN

El Saadi also referred to the Iraqi proposal made Sunday for establishment of a unified army command for the five liberated Arab states—the United Arab Republic, Syria, Algeria, Iraq, and Yemen.

El Saadi visited Cairo and Algeria 2 weeks ago at the head of the same Iraqi delegation now in Damascus. But he said he did not broach this subject with the Egyptian and Algerian Governments at the time.

He said the proposed five-power joint military command, for geographical reasons, basically would mean a unified command for the United Arab Republic, Iraq, and Syria. He added this does not mean Algeria and Yemen are excluded. A way will be found to include them, he added.

The Deputy Premier said the Iraqi Communist Party "is absolutely and completely banned and will never be allowed to operate again because we regard it as a fifth column of Moscow."

OCTOBER 25, 1962.

YOUR HIGHNESS: As your Highness assumes new and important responsibilities upon returning to Saudi Arabia, I wish to recall your visit to the White House on October 5. I then stated, and I want it understood clearly, that Saudi Arabia can depend upon the friendship and the cooperation of the United States in dealing with the many tasks which lie before it in the days ahead. The United States has deep and abiding interest in Saudi Arabia and in the stability and progress of Saudi Arabia. Under your firm and enlightened leadership I am confident Saudi Arabia will move ahead successfully on the path of modernization and reform which it has already charted for itself. In pursuing this course you may be assured of full U.S. support for the maintenance of Saudi Arabia's integrity.

I am fully aware that in order to accomplish your goals you must have the requisite tranquillity—an atmosphere devoid of recriminations and instigations from within or without. I share your concern at the tensions which prevail in the area and which hamper your design to strengthen the fabric of government and society in Saudi Arabia. As I indicated to you in Washington, the United States desires to be helpful in finding means of reducing these tensions.

I foresee for our two countries not merely the continuance of the cordial relationship which began so auspiciously during the reign of your illustrious father, His Majesty Abdul Aziz Ibn Saud; rather I foresee the opening of a chapter in Saudi-United States relations in which the common bond of enlightened self-interest is firmly riveted by a common dedication to the inalienable rights of man for self-fulfillment, progress, and freedom.

I wish you success and send you my warmest personal regards. May God keep you and the Saudi people and grant you peace.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION STOCKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, early today notices concerning the subject matter of my special order were sent to each member of the Committee on Agriculture as well as to each member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations dealing with agricultural appropriations.

On February 28, 1963, the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, issued to Members of Congress a memorandum concerning the effect of wheat and feed grain programs on Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. The same data was released to news media on March 1.

It is a rare example of deceptive reasoning and misleading use of facts. It is shocking that such a document originated from a Cabinet-level officer of the U.S. Government, the head of a Department long noted for fair presentation of statistics and trends.

The memorandum was anything but fair, and I am sure its publication made the many conscientious and capable career employees of the Department blush in embarrassment.

Because of the clever deceptive character of this document, I am inserting it in the RECORD exactly as issued, except that—for the convenience of the printer—I am requesting that black brackets be used in place of the underscorings for emphasis as supplied by Secretary Freeman.

Here it is:

MEMORANDUM

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1963.

To: Members of Congress.
From: Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture.

Because of numerous requests for this type of information, I am enclosing a report on the effects of the wheat and feed grain programs on Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures. The report contains the latest data available as to the size of the reduction in stocks and the savings which are being accrued as a result.

If you would like further details, we will be pleased to help you.

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

SUMMARY OF [EFFECT OF WHEAT AND FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS ON CCC COSTS] (ASCC, FEBRUARY 28, 1963)

[HIGHLIGHTS INDICATING SUCCESS IN CUTTING SURPLUSES AND REDUCING COSTS]

1. CCC holdings of wheat and feed grains were [1.077 billion bushels] less on February 15, 1963, than the peak quantities [held in 1961] before the new program was effective, and total stocks at the end of 1963 marketing year will be 2,509 million bushels less than they would have been if the pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue.

2. The fact that the CCC does not now own the 1.077 billion bushels of grain it formerly owned is now saving the Government $770,000 each day in carrying charges—$280 million a year.

3. The 1964 budget includes [$246 million less] for carrying charges on these grains that was spent in fiscal year 1961, and $813 million—or $2.2 million a day—less than the annual rate that would have occurred by 1964 if the pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue.

These and other figures show that the new programs designed to eliminate the costly and unnecessary surpluses of wheat and feed grains, that had climbed to record levels in 1961, are working.

The Congress has given the CCC the responsibility to finance all Government price-support and commodity-purchase programs through use of its own funds and a borrowing authorization limited to $14.5 billion. Each year the Corporation's realized losses are met by appropriations by the Congress for restoration of capital impairment. The amount of appropriations needed is determined by CCC's realized losses.

The realized losses of the CCC since 1960 are shown below:

[In millions]

Fiscal year	Realized loss	
	Amount	Change from preceding year
1961	[1] $2,067.0	+$454.9
1962	2,799.4	+732.4
1963 (estimate)	2,753.6	−45.8
1964 (estimate)	2,646.9	−106.7

[1] Does not include inventory revaluation loss of $1,268,500,000 applicable to 1961 and prior years.

1. Fiscal 1962 losses were higher than the previous year, primarily because of:

(a) an increased loss on commodity sales in the disposal of large quantities of corn and grain sorghums acquired from the 1960 and prior years' crops; such grain was acquired at a higher price in the 1950's than market prices in 1962. Obviously as the grain is moved out of surplus into consumption realized losses take place.

(b) increased loss on donations, due to the donation of more dairy products, wheat flour and corn meal, thus increasing benefits to millions of people at home and around the world by a more effective use of our agricultural abundance.

(a) acreage diversion payments to farmers as the [immediate] cost of launching supply adjustment programs enacted by the Congress—programs that by now have significantly reduced stocks of grain and the costs of both acquiring and carrying such stocks, while they have brought about substantial increase in farm income.

2. Estimates indicate that realized losses for fiscal 1963 will be $45.8 million less than for the previous year, and that this encouraging trend will be stepped up in 1964 by an estimated decrease of $106.7 million below that for 1963.

3. Stocks in CCC inventory in excess of needs for an adequate reserve have been substantially reduced—by a total of 1.077 billion bushels as compared with peak quantities on hand before programs for supply adjustment began to take effect. As a result, the 1964 budget estimates before the Congress show $245.6 million less for carrying charges on wheat and feed grains for the fiscal year 1964 than the actual cost in the fiscal year 1961. The fact that the CCC does not now own the 1.077 billion bushels of grain it formerly owned is now saving the Government $770,000 each day in carrying charges—$280 million a year.

4. Cumulative savings of $480 million in carrying charges on feed grains and wheat from the record 1961 level have already resulted or are budgeted as a result of the decrease in CCC stocks, as follows:

[In millions]

Fiscal year	Total carrying charges—feed grains and wheat	Savings from 1961 level
1961	$846	
1962	776	$70
1963 (budget estimate)	682	164
1964 (budget estimate)	600	246
Cumulative savings through June 30, 1964, from 1961 level		480

5. If the new supply adjustment programs had not replaced the pre-1961 programs it is a conservative estimate that carryover stocks at the end of the marketing year for the 1963 crop would have amounted to 3.8 billion bushels of corn and grain sorghums and 1.6 billion bushels of wheat, and the [annual] carrying charges on these quantities would have amounted to at least $1.4 billion by 1964 as compared with the current estimate of $587 million for these three grains in the 1964 budget. The difference is equivalent to about $2.2 million per day.

6. If pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue and stocks had built up as indicated through 1963, it is estimated that ultimate carrying costs to the CCC before disposal of the [additional] quantities added to stocks would have amounted to approximately $3.3 billion. This would result from the time which would elapse before these added stocks would be disposed of, based on the annual rate of disposition which occurred prior to 1961. This would be 10 to 12 years for feed grains and between 6 and 7 years for wheat.

Mr. Speaker, commodity operations of the Federal Government are extremely complex. The Commodity Credit Corporation is a giant multibillion-dollar organization directed by the Secretary of Agriculture. It buys, stores, sells, and makes loans on various commodities. Data on its operations is so complicated and voluminous that Members of Congress and the press must rely upon people in positions of responsibility for interpretation.

As the administrative head of the Department controlling Commodity Credit Corporation, Mr. Freeman holds the very highest position of responsibility in this field. He is therefore the logical source of interpretation.

Let us examine the February 28 memorandum as one might expect it to be regarded by a news reporter or a Member of Congress not intimately acquainted with the details of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

What message does it convey?

Page 1 of the memorandum, personally signed by Mr. Freeman, says two things:

First. This report shows the effects of the wheat and feed grain programs on CCC expenditures.

Second. It shows how much reduction in stock has been achieved and what this means to taxpayers.

Now turn to page 2 and consider the impact of the paragraphs printed there.

The words in black brackets naturally catch the eye. Bracketed on this page: "Effect of wheat and feed grain programs on CCC costs"; "Highlights indicating success in cutting surpluses and reducing costs"; "1.077 billion bushel"; "$246 million less."

A cursory examination of this page could leave but one impression: The wheat and feed grain programs cut surpluses over a billion bushels and cut costs $246 million.

Both impressions are utterly false.

The billion-bushel figure is a fabrication of factual fragments. To put it together, Mr. Freeman did two things:

First. He told a half-truth about Government grain holdings—the part favorable to his point of view—and ignored the other part which would have put his operations in a bad light.

Second. He made the half-truth look far better than it deserved by drawing a false parallel between unrelated facts.

Few people can differentiate between grain in Government inventory and grain under Government loan. Indeed the distinction is outdated, and like the appendix in the human body is, for the most part, a useless holdover from an earlier era.

Technically, the farmer holds title to grain during the lifetime of crop loans. When the loan expires, the grain is "taken over" in title by Uncle Sam and is reclassified as Government-owned inventory. For all practical purposes, most grain becomes Government property the moment it comes under loan.

When loans were made for less than the market value of the crop, the separation of "under loan" grain from "inventory" grain had some meaning. But under the New Frontier, loans almost invariably are for more than market prices. The farmer who pays off his crop loan and reclaims his grain is as rare as a Congressman who is opposed to the family-size farm.

Secretary Freeman of course understands the technical difference between "inventory" grain and "under loan" grain, and in fairness should have counted the two as one.

He based his misleading billion-bushel figure solely on "inventory" grain. And for a good reason. Records showed the total of stock of "inventory" grain down over the past 2 years.

He ignored "under loan" grain. Again for good reason. Records showed holdings of "under loan" grain up compared with 2 years ago.

Here are the facts about "inventory" grain, based on USDA press releases 655–61 and 755–63. Oats and rye are not listed because they are not under the feed grain program. Moreover, they are extremely small in volume.

Bushels of "inventory" grain

	Jan. 31, 1961	Jan. 31, 1963
Wheat	1, 115, 482, 882	1, 035, 801, 558
Corn	1, 465, 241, 760	987, 136, 997
Grain sorghums	555, 657, 933	543, 172, 505
Barley	54, 838, 365	28, 197, 621
Total	3, 191, 220, 940	2, 594, 308, 711
Change, in 2 years, down	596, 912, 229	

The January 31, 1963, data was released by the Department of Agriculture just last week—March 7. The full texts of both releases are appended to this report.

You will note the reduction in "inventory" grain is actually 596,912,229 bushels—about half the billion-bushel figure claimed by Mr. Freeman. These figures are from the latest available official news releases on the subject.

They show a discrepancy of 480,087,771 bushels between official fact and Freeman fantasy.

Thus, even Mr. Freeman's half-truth came out stretched beyond recognition.

Here is the other half of the truth—the half Mr. Freeman chose not to mention:

Bushels of under-loan grain

	Jan. 31, 1961	Jan. 31, 1963
Wheat	380, 014, 683	299, 696, 252
Corn	591, 605, 106	769, 805, 837
Grain sorghums	197, 304, 142	215, 131, 062
Barley	62, 029, 631	40, 279, 918
Total	1, 230, 953, 562	1, 324, 913, 069
Change, in 2 years, up.	93, 959, 507	

Had Mr. Freeman chosen to report on "under-loan" grain—ignoring "inventory" grain—he would have had to report an increase in Government holdings over the same 2-year period—up 93,959,507 bushels.

If he had desired to present a true picture of the trend in Government grain holdings, he would have added "inventory" and "under-loan" grain together.

This would have produced these figures, again from official USDA reports:

Total Government holdings of wheat, corn, grain sorghums, and barley as of January 31, 1961: 4,422,174,502 bushels.

Same as of January 31, 1963: 3,919,221,780 bushels.

Change in 2 years: down 502,952,722 bushels.

Now compare this with the figure the Secretary is using: down 1,077 million. Looks as if he took the true figure and doubled it.

Here are Mr. Freeman's words March 8, 1963, in a speech to Americans for Democratic Action organization at Penn-Sheraton Hotel, Pittsburgh. Speaking of the farm programs he administers, he declared flatly:

> We have already reduced our stockpiles of surpluses by 1,077 million bushels, and the cost of maintaining them by $2.2 million per day.

A fair appraisal of surplus holdings shows holdings down only a half billion bushels. Where did the other half billion cut come from? Do we have phantom bushels, as well as phantom acres in the USDA statistical department?

If he had wished to give the ADA an honest appraisal of his price support operations through Commodity Credit Corporation, Mr. Freeman should have reported that CCC has $357,252,863 more tied up in loans and inventories than when he took office 2 years ago.

These facts are from the same CCC official reports:

TOTAL INVESTMENT IN LOANS AND INVENTORIES

January 31, 1961: $8,108,132,000.

January 31, 1963: $8,465,384,863.

John Schnittker, one of Secretary Freeman's top economists, made a statement on March 4 to the Minneapolis Farm Forum. It was similar to Mr. Freeman's ADA speech, but he had the honesty to add an explanatory phrase omitted from Mr. Freeman's ADA speech. Mr. Schnittker showed the $2.2-million-a-day saving was based on speculative guesswork when he said:

> The 1964 budget includes $246 million less for carrying charges on these grains than was spent in fiscal year 1961, and $813 million—or $2.2 million a day—less than the annual rate that would have occurred by 1964 if the pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue.

An "iffy" qualification at best, a throwback to the old political trick of setting up a ridiculous fictitious strawman, then cutting him to pieces.

"What might have been" are the most futile words in the English language. But at least the economist was straightforward enough to expose the shaky foundation on which his guesswork was based.

How did Mr. Freeman come up with the 1.077 billion bushel figure? It was not just an accident. He had to reach for it.

Instead of relating current inventory with a comparable date 2 years ago, he compared it with the peak inventory for each category in the entire year 1961.

He chose the day in 1961 when wheat inventory hit a peak for the year, and then the day when feed grains inventory hit its peak. He added these two peak figures together, and compared the result with a seasonally low single day in 1963. No wonder, with this kind of fast pencil work, he was able to come up with a billion bushel figure.

Here is how Mr. Freeman took unrelated factual fragments to come up with the billion bushel figure:

Peak day for wheat inventory in 1961 was May 31. Inventory that day was 1,276,830,000 bushels.

Peak day for feed grains inventory in 1961 was October 31. Inventory that day was 2,173,537,000 bushels.

Add the two peaks together, and you get 3,450,367,000 bushels.

This was then compared with the seasonally low inventory on February 15, 1963, for both wheat and feed grains. The figure for that day was 2,374,355,000.

Subtract this from the two peak total, and you get Mr. Freeman's 1.077 billion bushel figure.

Bear in mind these facts:

First. Mr. Freeman dealt only with inventory grain. Under-loan grain was not considered.

Second. Peak data for 1961 was not compared with peak data for another year. The highest possible inventory total for 1961 was compared with a completely unrelated item, the inventory for all grains on a single day.

Mr. Freeman's procedure was somewhat like adding cats and dogs together to find out how many cats are in the barnyard.

His reasoning violates every rule of logic and fair play. It is a supreme example of deliberate deception.

As I said earlier, I am sure this statistical skulduggery is a source of deep sorrow to the thousands of trustworthy and conscientious employees of the Department of Agriculture.

What really caused the true half billion bushel reduction in stocks?

In my opinion, it was not the result of the wheat and feed grain programs at all. It was caused by increased utilization of these grains.

But regardless of how it came to be, the actual reduction was only half the billion bushel figure mentioned repeatedly by Mr. Freeman in this memorandum, and in speeches across the country.

What of the claim that costs are down $246 million?

First of all, this alleged saving is only a budget estimate. It is not an accomplished fact, and projected savings have a habit of disappearing in the cold light of reality.

But with inventories down a half billion bushels, a cut in carrying costs could reasonably be expected. Is this necessarily a cause for taxpayers to toss their hats in glee?

Of course not. Carrying costs are just one item in the cost column.

If Mr. Freeman had ordered his entire personnel—all 121,583 of them—to switch entirely from pencils to pens in their desk work, he could also predict a drop in pencil costs. Or, if the Department of Agriculture had switched from coal-fired to gas-fired furnaces, Mr. Freeman could claim that coal expenses are down. It would be just as unfair and just as misleading.

Expenses other than carrying costs have skyrocketed during Mr. Freeman's

administration. Costs for realized losses in CCC, for example, went up $454.9 million during his first year in office, and then climbed an additional $732.4 million during his second year.

His total budget request for fiscal 1964 is up a cool billion dollars from 1963.

The total direct costs of our 2-year experience with the feed grain program alone exceeded $1.7 billion. This was largely in the form of payments to farmers for idling acres, a cost item far more significant than the cost of storing and handling the Government-owned feed grain inventory. The actual stockpile reduction was bought at a terrific price—on the most conservative estimate, more than $4 a bushel.

It is strange that Mr. Freeman is now boasting about alleged savings under the wheat and feed grain programs, when just 9 months ago the same Mr. Freeman wrote to Members of the House and Senate criticizing these programs as too costly and too ineffective.

I refer to Mr. Freeman's widely circulated letter of May 21, 1962, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In it, he made two major points: The present wheat and feed grain programs are too costly; and they provide no assurance that stocks will be reduced.

Here is the text of Mr. Freeman's letter:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 21, 1962.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: At your request I have considered the amendments you propose to S. 3225, as reported by the Senate committee on April 27, 1962. I believe the amendments to title III, subtitle A and B would be of enormous consequence to American agriculture, to farmers, to the consumers of food and to taxpayers. They reconstitute the legislation more nearly as you introduced it in the Congress at the request of the administration on February 2, 1962.

These amendments would provide for a long-range feed grain supply management program in which all producers would participate, if, in a democratic referendum, they chose to do so; and a choice for wheat producers between a wheat program of a permanent nature or no supply adjustment just as the referendum in the feed grain amendment and in existing programs for tobacco and other commodities.

The long-range feed grain amendment will cost the Government about $4 billion less over the next 4 crop-years than extension of emergency programs as proposed in S. 3225.

Government cost of alternative programs for 1963 crops

[In millions]

	Feed grains	Wheat	Feed grains and wheat
Long-range program	$644	$1, 188	$1, 832
Extension of 1961–62 emergency programs	1, 200	1, 217	2, 417
Return to 1960 programs	1, 372	1, 465	2, 837

The long-range program will reduce surpluses at far lower cost because all producers would participate to bring production in line with needs. Diversion payments under the long-range amendments would be far lower than with the temporary programs.

Diversion payments under alternative programs

[In millions]

	1963 crop	1963–66 crops
Long-range program	$750	$1, 825
Voluntary programs (S. 3225)	1, 245	4, 980
Difference	495	3, 155

In addition to lower costs and faster surplus reduction, farm income will be increased, benefiting the total population by bringing more money into the economic bloodstream of the Nation. Consumer prices for food—stable during the past year—would not increase.

The amendment on the wheat referendum is clearly needed since the voting provision now in S. 3225 would place the responsibility of choosing a wheat program on the shoulders of the wheatgrowers when such responsibility, I believe, should be borne by the administration and the Congress. The decision which should be placed before the wheatgrowers is whether they desire a supply adjustment program with adequate supports or unlimited production with limited supports. Further considerations on this subject are contained in the attached memorandum.

In view of these facts I strongly concur in your amendments and believe they deserve the full support of all who are interested in a realistic and meaningful farm program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

MEMORANDUM ON S. 3225

The farm programs of the 1950's cost far too much, and they left larger carryovers which committed the Government to continued high costs. Total budget expenditures for all programs administered by the Department of Agriculture rose from $2.9 billion in the fiscal year 1954 to $7.1 billion in 1959, and to $7.2 billion in the current fiscal year, largely because of price support, acreage diversion, storage, and surplus disposal outlays occasioned by excessive production of major farm commodities. Carrying charges alone on wheat and feed grains mounted to $900 million annually in 1961.

A steady increase in budget expenditures was certain to occur if the pre-1961 programs had been continued for 1961 and 1962 crops. If such programs were again effective beginning with 1963 crops, carryover stocks would increase by the end of the 1966 marketing year to about 4.3 billion bushels of corn and grain sorghums and 2.1 billion bushels of wheat. Annual CCC expenditures for carrying charges on these three grains would exceed $1¼ billion by the fiscal year 1967.

In contrast, the long-range programs would reduce CCC stocks of corn and grain sorghum to about 1.1 billion bushels and wheat stocks to about 655 million bushels during the same period. Carrying charges on the three grains would be reduced to $280 million annually by the 1967 fiscal year—nearly $1 billion less than if the old programs were to operate again.

The 1961–62 emergency feed grain program and the 1962 wheat program have reduced costs compared with a continuation of 1960 programs. But they are responsible programs only as temporary expedients. They were clearly better—for farmers and for taxpayers—than the programs in effect prior to 1961. But they are costly, and their results are uncertain compared with the long-range programs proposed.

Two key amendments to S. 3225 are needed to assure producers of good farm programs and taxpayers of materially lower Government costs.

1. The 1-year extension of the 1962 feed grain program should be replaced by the permanent, mandatory program about as recommended by the President and as considered by the Senate committee, possibly with some minor amendments.

2. The wheat marketing certificate program should be adopted, and the referendum choice between a 2-year extension of the temporary 1962 wheat program and the marketing certificate program should be deleted.

[REASONS FOR THE AMENDMENTS]

1. [The voluntary programs are too costly.]

(a) The additional cost to the Government of operating the voluntary feed grain and wheat programs in S. 3225 for the 1963 crops, compared with the long-range programs, would be about $600 million (table 1).

(b) If the voluntary programs were extended further, through the 1966 crops, the cumulative additional cost would be about $4 billion. This amount is equal to the average yearly Federal income tax payments of nearly 5 million taxpayers; would build 27,000 miles of modern highways; would complete 4,000 watershed projects.

(c) Future budget savings, associated with avoiding new acquisitions of grain and with stock reduction, are far higher under the long-range programs than under the temporary programs (table 2).

(d) Diversion payments alone would be half a billion dollars less in 1963, and more than $3 billion less for 4 crop-years, than with the voluntary programs (table 3).

2. [The voluntary programs provide no assurance that stocks will be reduced.] In the voluntary feed grain program, noncooperators offset much of the acreage reduction made by cooperators. In 1961, noncooperators increased their plantings by 6 to 7 million acres, offsetting about one-fourth of the acreage reduction diverted and paid for on farms of cooperators. In the voluntary wheat program, smaller carryovers depend on acreage diversion beyond the mandatory 10-percent reduction from 1961 allotments. In both programs, farmer participation is uncertain, and is dependent on crop conditions.

3. [The mandatory feed grain program is fair to farmers and the public.] It would provide producers a reasonable choice—[between good prices and incomes with production restrictions] and [no production restrictions and low price supports.]

(a) Producers of cotton, tobacco, rice, wheat and peanuts make this choice nearly every year. Feed grain producers—like other producers—should have an opportunity to approve or reject their program in a referendum. The value of feed grain production plus diversion payments under the program in 1963 would be about $6.6 billion. If the program were defeated in the referendum, so that price supports were at a level not higher than 50 percent of parity, the value of feed grain production would be less than two-thirds that level.

(b) Feed grain producers outside primary commercial feed grain areas would be largely exempt. From two-thirds to around 90 percent of the producers in most of the States in the Southeast and the Northeast could be exempt from the program because they would have allotments smaller than 25 acres (table 7). Even in States like Wisconsin and Michigan, a sizable percentage of farms could be exempt from the program because their acreages are small. Producers who chose to be exempt could not vote in the referendum.

If all of these producers eligible, chose to be exempt and to plant their 1959–60 acreages, feed grain output would not be increased materially, since so little total acreage is involved. No one can predict how many of the eligible producers would like to be exempt. But surely those producers with small acreages who elected to be subject to the program could be expected to vote in favor of it in the referendum.

(c) Many feed grain producers also have cotton or tobacco allotments. They vote to adopt a program for these crops by 90 to 95 percent majorities each year, because they know the value of a program in which all producers participate.

4. [Further reasons for amendments to the wheat section of S. 3225].

S. 3225 would provide a choice between a 2-year extension of a familiar program and permanent adoption of the marketing certificate program, which has not been in effect before.

The main fault is that it would provide a possibility of producers choosing a costly program, while turning down the less costly, more flexible certificate program.

The central advantage of the marketing certificate program over the price support program now in effect, apart from lower cost to the Government, is greater flexibility for farmers. The marketing certificates make it possible to limit the price support obligation of the Federal Government. They provide a means of distinguishing between wheat for food and export to be supported at the higher price, and wheat for feed, or for export without a subsidy cost to the Government.

The certificates provide, therefore, a practical means for continuing an attractive price support [permanently] on wheat consumed for food, and of keeping the door open for reducing the subsidy on exports gradually over time.

The Secretary of Agriculture has indicated his intention of issuing marketing certificates in connection with the 1963 crop on about 925 million bushels—approximately 85 percent of the estimated national marketing quota. CCC stocks reduction under the marketing certificate program would be an estimated 170 million bushels, while it would amount to only about 100 million bushels under the voluntary program.

The provisions permitting wheat planted on feed grain allotments to be considered as a feed grain should also be reinstated in the Senate bill. This provision would:

(a) Provide farmers with much needed flexibility to produce wheat on feed grain allotments.

(b) Provide a larger supply of quality wheats from which millers and exporters could select their supplies.

(c) Not add to feed supplies, since wheat planted on feed grain acreage would displace other grains.

Detailed comparisons of program costs, ultimate savings, and returns to producers under the alternative programs are in attached tables.

(To conserve space, tables are omitted.)

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Freeman has become widely known as an advocate of supply management, a euphemism for Government manipulation of farmers.

He is also making a name for himself as a specialist in fact management, Government manipulation of facts.

By plucking unrelated tidbits from his statistical warehouse, Mr. Freeman is striving to fool the public on the same massive scale as his effort to control farmers.

If this is typical of the propaganda being shoveled out daily by the USDA publicity machine, heaven help the American farmer as he tries to make a sensible judgment on the wheat referendum in May.

Following are texts of USDA reports on operating results and status of CCC price-support programs as of January 31, 1961, and January 31, 1963.

The reader should bear in mind that the 1961 cost-value figures were subsequently altered by a bookkeeping change effected June 30, 1961. This had the effect of separating about $1.2 billion in value from the total value shown:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, March 7, 1961.

USDA reports status of CCC price-support programs as of January 31:

The U.S. Department of Agriculture reported today that as of January 31 investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in price-support programs amounted to $9,436,396,000—made up of loans outstanding of $2,110,217,000 (including $888,177,[illegible] of loans financed by lending agencies), and the cost value of inventories, $7,326,17[illegible].

As of January 31, 1960, the investment was $9,239,499,000 of which loans outstanding amounted to $1,944,551,000, and inventories $7,294,948,000.

Price-support operations in five commodities accounted for the bulk of the January 31, 1961, loan total as follows:

	Unit	Quantity	Value
Wheat	Bushel	380, 014, 683	$882, 708, [illegible]
Corn	do	591, 605, 106	630, 404, [illegible]
Tobacco	Pound	644, 660, 406	405, 072, [illegible]
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	110, 845, 024	172, 343, [illegible]
Barley	Bushel	62, 029, 631	46, 882, [illegible]
Other			172, 808, [illegible]
Total			2, 110, 216, [illegible]

(Included under "other" were loans on upland and extra long staple cotton, peanuts, rice, honey, oats, rye, tung oil, dry edible beans, cottonseed, flaxseed, rosin, turpentine, and soybeans, the largest being $39,383,178 on upland cotton.)

Major items in the inventory of CCC as of January 31 were:

	Unit	Quantity	Value
Wheat	Bushel	1, 115, 482, 882	$2, 908, [illegible]
Corn	do	1, 465, 241, 760	2, 438, [illegible]
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	311, 168, 443	863, [illegible]
Cotton, Upland	Bale	4, 817, 871	806, [illegible]
Strategic materials			98, [illegible]
Barley	Bushel	54, 838, 365	67, 761, [illegible]
Butter	Pound	66, 636, 266	40, [illegible]
Milk, dried	do	271, 454, 022	38, 477, [illegible]
Cotton, extra long staple	Bale	58, 408	16, 610, [illegible]
Rice, rough and milled	Hundredweight	1, 718, 408	14, 159, [illegible]
Peanuts, shelled	Pound	60, 279, 942	10, 014, [illegible]
Oats	Bushel	11, 093, 774	9, 106, [illegible]
Soybeans	do	2, 799, 308	6, 678, [illegible]
Other			13, 206, [illegible]
Total			7, 326, 178, [illegible]

("Other" items in inventory include rye, farmers' stock peanuts, tung oil, and turpentine, the largest of which was rye, with a cost value of $6,252,553.)

Net realized program loss on price-support operations for 7 months ended January 31, 1961, totaled $396,000,799. For the same period last year the comparable loss was $472,676,315 (revised) and for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, the program loss on price-support operations totaled $795,469,117.

Price-support operations of CCC are financed in large part, though not completely, by borrowings. CCC is authorized by statute to borrow money as needed, but as of January 31 total borrowings could not at any time exceed in the aggregate $14.5 billion.

CCC reserves a sufficient amount of this borrowing authority to purchase at any time all loans and other obligations held by lending agencies under the Corporation's programs. As of January 31, CCC had in use $12,939,331,000 of this authority; actual borrowings amount to $12,051 million and obligations to purchase loans financed by lending agencies amounted to $888,331,000. This left a statutory borrowing authority of $1,560,669,000.

Loans and inventory figures covered in this release do not include "purchase agreements" which provide for purchase by CCC of stipulated quantities of price-support commodities if offered by producers at the end of the loan period. These purchase agreements entered into on 1960 crops through January 31, 1961, had an estimated total value of $61,530,000. Purchase agreements entered into on 1959 crops through January 31, 1960, had an estimated total value of $57,132,000.

Price support extended (total loans made plus direct purchases plus purchase agreements entered into) on 1960 crops alone through January 31, 1961, amounted to $2,937,305,168 compared with $2,796,166,[illegible] on 1959 crops through January 31, 1960.

[MOVEMENT INTO AND OUT OF CCC'S PRICE-SUPPORT INVENTORY]

Agricultural commodities purchased or otherwise acquired by CCC in January had a cost value of $151,214,007, bringing the total for the first 7 months of the 1961 fiscal year to $1,828,212,300. For the same 7-month period a year earlier purchases and acquisitions amounted to $3,059,863,404.

Movement of agricultural commodities out of CCC's inventories in January totaled $272,384,399, cost value basis, making fiscal year 1961 total through January of $2,084,240,797. The outmovements for the first 7 months of fiscal year 1960 totaled $2,324,492,807.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, March 7, 1963.

CCC OPERATING RESULTS AND STATUS OF CCC PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM AS OF JANUARY 31

Price-support loans and inventories: The U.S. Department of Agriculture reported today that as of January 31 the total investment of Commodity Credit Corporation in price-support loans and inventories amounted to $8,465,384,863. This total investment includes loans outstanding of $3,378,296,636 (lending agencies financed $1,465,784,402 of these loans) and inventories amounting to $5,087,088,227.

The January 31 estimate of the loss which will be realized upon ultimate disposition of price-support inventories amounted to

$1,314,283,000 comprised of $128,846,000 estimated loss on commodities under loan and $1,185,437,000 estimated loss on inventories.

These amounts of estimated losses are reflected as reserves for losses in the January 31 financial statements of the Corporation.

A comparison of total investment, the reserves for losses, and the net book value as of January 31, 1963, and 1962 follows:

	Investment	Reserve for losses	Net book value
Jan. 31, 1963:			
Loans	$3, 378, 296, 636	$128, 846, 000	$3, 249, 450, 636
Inventories	5, 087, 088, 227	1, 185, 437, 000	3, 901, 651, 227
Total	8, 465, 384, 863	1, 314, 283, 000	7, 151, 101, 863
Jan. 31, 1962:			
Loans	2, 812, 767, 767	171, 287, 000	2, 641, 480, 767
Inventories	5, 042, 635, 646	1, 395, 444, 000	3, 647, 191, 646
Total	7, 855, 403, 413	1, 566, 731, 000	6, 288, 672, 413

Items under price-support loan as of January 31

Commodity	Unit	Quantity		Value	
		1963	1962	1963	1962
Grains:					
Barley	Bushel	40, 279, 918	54, 641, 513	$32, 732, 235	$46, 950, 382
Beans, dry edible	Hundredweight	2, 133, 067	3, 778, 570	15, 266, 255	25, 568, 778
Corn	Bushel	769, 805, 837	657, 481, 755	859, 936, 462	726, 472, 888
Flaxseed	do	5, 119, 022	745, 732	14, 418, 578	2, 055, 209
Grain sorghum	do	215, 131, 062	201, 371, 741	242, 355, 967	219, 663, 718
Oats	do	35, 424, 489	38, 242, 458	18, 892, 577	20, 418, 671
Rice, rough	Hundredweight	4, 368, 588	3, 070, 424	21, 793, 869	15, 756, 234
Rye	Bushel	4, 503, 166	2, 257, 643	4, 114, 554	2, 005, 855
Soybeans	do	62, 706, 096	105, 413, 790	139, 854, 843	239, 861, 295
Wheat	do	299, 696, 252	270, 460, 341	617, 100, 607	484, 175, 943
Cotton:					
Extra long staple	Bale	18, 538	3, 990	4, 900, 625	1, 049, 468
Upland	do	5, 659, 237	3, 946, 994	888, 553, 492	662, 374, 923
Cottonseed	Ton	12	14	558	692
Oils and peanuts:					
Peanuts, farmers' stock	Pound	220, 162, 789	178, 515, 562	24, 386, 463	19, 391, 631
Tung oil	do	101, 303	2, 410, 257	24, 313	578, 461
Tobacco:					
Rosin	do	171, 781, 005	72, 819, 967	17, 709, 406	7, 020, 567
Tobacco	do	667, 345, 396	493, 667, 338	475, 916, 082	336, 883, 226
Almonds	do		10, 459, 659		2, 091, 932
Honey	do	2, 749, 847	3, 667, 424	339, 760	447, 694
Total				3, 378, 296, 636	2, 812, 767, 767

Items in price-support inventory of CCC as of January 31

Commodity	Unit	Quantity		Value	
		1963	1962	1963	1962
Grains:					
Barley	Bushel	28, 197, 621	35, 551, 365	$24, 263, 065	$30, 773, 836
Beans, dry edible	Hundredweight	772, 442	381, 496	5, 107, 650	2, 409, 234
Bulgur	Pound	24, 418, 900		1, 338, 538	
Corn	Bushel	987, 136, 997	1, 307, 084, 249	1, 148, 076, 131	1, 624, 943, 239
Cornmeal	Pound		15, 900		644
Flaxseed	Bushel	1, 574		4, 270	
Grain sorghum	do	543, 172, 505	586, 982, 770	575, 561, 312	624, 621, 329
Oats	do	15, 297, 460	7, 530, 373	9, 188, 763	4, 651, 813
Rice, rough and milled	Hundredweight	83, 005	1, 894, 035	732, 903	10, 290, 965
Rye	Bushel	833, 710	3, 232, 860	865, 352	3, 197, 504
Soybeans	do	17, 873, 419		42, 534, 889	
Wheat	do	1, 035, 801, 588	1, 108, 896, 598	2, 016, 161, 189	2, 191, 089, 212
Wheat flour	Pound	7, 807, 300	38, 100	435, 539	2, 130
Cotton:					
Extra long stable	Bale	15, 865	18, 243	4, 350, 337	5, 055, 606
Upland	do	4, 684, 629	1, 448, 673	809, 815, 726	245, 281, 183
Dairy:					
Butter	Pound	335, 843, 465	219, 346, 064	197, 728, 332	132, 551, 560
Butter oil	do	43, 587, 172		35, 081, 437	
Cheese	do	104, 412, 680	58, 082, 926	39, 158, 314	22, 165, 977
Ghee	do	455, 322		369, 883	
Milk, dried	do	655, 273, 510	394, 818, 687	97, 761, 792	65, 149, 770
Oils and peanuts:					
Cottonseed oil, refined	do	8, 339, 550		1, 014, 923	
Peanuts:					
Farmers' stock	do	37, 764, 836		4, 068, 801	
Shelled	do	25, 354, 191	7, 960, 739	5, 091, 378	1, 270, 174
Tung oil	do		118, 458		24, 761
Vegetable oil products	do	127, 362, 724		23, 420, 782	
Turpentine	Gallon	1, 275, 814	1, 729, 744	669, 451	907, 639
Honey	Pound	1, 045, 076		130, 868	
Exchange commodities: Strategic materials				44, 156, 602	78, 249, 070
Total				5, 087, 088, 227	5, 042, 635, 646

The loan and inventory figures do not include "purchase agreements" which provide for purchase by CCC of stipulated quantities of price-support commodities if offered by producers at the end of the loan period. The estimated maximum commitment on outstanding 1962 crop purchase agreements at January 31, 1963, was $49,168,000. The estimated maximum commitment on outstanding 1961 crop purchase agreements at January 31, 1962, was $66,542,000.

Price-support extended: The total of price-support extended on 1962 crops alone through January 31, 1963, amounted to $3,127,544,494, consisting of price-support loans made, direct purchases made, purchase agreements entered into and purchases under special purchase programs. This compares with $2,643,939,405 on 1961 crops through January 31, 1962.

Movement into and out of CCC's price-support inventory: Agricultural commodities purchased or otherwise acquired by CCC in January had an acquisition cost value of

$52,062,411, bringing the total for the first 7 months of the 1963 fiscal year to $1,610,257,113. For the same 7-month period a year earlier purchases and acquisitions amounted to $773,953,369.

Movement of agricultural commodities out of CCC's inventories in January totaled $242,049,435, acquisition cost value basis, making the fiscal year 1963 total through January of $1,023,564,875. The out-movements for the first 7 months of fiscal year 1962 totaled $1,333,387,462, acquisition cost value basis.

Borrowing authority: CCC operations are financed largely by borrowings, mostly from the U.S. Treasury, under its statutory borrowing authorization of $14.5 billion, this amount being the limit on borrowings that may be outstanding at any one time. CCC reserves a sufficient amount of this borrowing authority to purchase at any time all loans and other obligations held by private lending agencies under the Corporation's programs. As of January 31, CCC had in use $14,391,784,000 of this authority; actual borrowings from the Treasury amounted to $12,926 million and obligations to purchase loans financed by private lending agencies amounted to $1,465,784,000. This left a statutory borrowing authority available of $108,216,000.

Losses from operations: The Corporation's total net loss from all operations, including adjustments to reserves for losses amounted to $1,286,142,753 for the 7-month period ended January 31, 1963, as compared to $1,248,030,255 for the same period a year earlier.

These losses for the months of fiscal year 1963 and 1962 as of January 31, are summarized as follows:

	Fiscal year 1963 through January 1963	Fiscal year 1962 through January 1962
Realized program gains and losses:		
Commodity inventory operations:		
Losses on dispositions	[1] ($264,910,153)	($800,093,123)
Carrying charges:		
Storage and handling	[2] (223,553,764)	(238,483,745)
Transportation	[3] (59,939,911)	(49,945,970)
Total	(548,403,828)	(588,522,838)
Export payments and allowances	(82,498,470)	(135,966,604)
Special milk program for children	[4] 335,335	(54,918,772)
Feed grain programs	(487,540,665)	(451,193,897)
Wheat stabilization programs	(247,701,657)	(46,622,288)
Reseal loan storage expense	(42,832,134)	(41,473,976)
Other	(1,650,891)	1,151,892
Total program losses	(1,410,292,310)	(1,317,546,483)
Interest and other general income and expense (net)	(259,241,443)	(224,836,772)
Total realized losses	(1,669,533,753)	(1,542,383,255)
Adjustment of reserve for losses:		
Price-support programs	383,184,000	289,021,000
Other	207,000	5,332,000
Total	383,391,000	294,353,000
Net total loss	(1,286,142,753)	(1,248,030,255)

[1] This net amount includes $285,369,817 losses relating to commodities acquired from 1961 and 1962 production.

[2] Includes $66,308,013 relating to storage and handling on commodities acquired from 1961 and 1962 production.

[3] Includes $18,275,153 relating to transportation on commodities acquired from 1961 and 1962 production.

[4] Represents refund of unused amounts advanced for prior fiscal years. This program for fiscal year 1963 is not financed by CCC.

Note.—Parentheses indicate loss.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Did the gentleman mean to indicate that our inventory of feed grains has increased? The inventories have increased, I think, but not feed grains.

Mr. FINDLEY. I shall refer to the tables which I did not read in detail for brevity of presentation. The inventory figures which I presented for both January 31, 1961, and January 31, 1963, include wheat, corn, grain sorghums, and barley. The total change in inventory over that 2-year period, according to official Department reports, showed a decline in inventories of 596,912,229 bushels. The data which I presented on under-loan grain for these very same dates, and the same commodities—wheat, corn, grain sorghums, and barley, the only commodities under the feed grains program—showed an increase of 93,559,507 bushels in that same 2-year period.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Was it an exact 2-year period—the same months?

Mr. FINDLEY. Indeed it was.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. But the gentleman recognizes, does he not, that less than half of the grain that goes under loan is delivered to the Government?

Mr. FINDLEY. Our experience in the past 2 years I am quite sure indicates a greater takeover. I believe most of the corn that has gone under loan has gone into Government inventory, for example.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There were over 1 billion bushels of corn under loan and only about half of that went into inventory, did it not?

Mr. FINDLEY. As of January 31, 1963, there were 769 million bushels of corn under loan, but this is not the point.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I am sure the gentleman would not want to mislead anybody. As I tried to follow the gentleman I heard him talking about feed grains, and the gentleman is including in his figures the wheat figures also.

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes, indeed. In his memorandum Mr. Freeman was referring to wheat, too.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Not just feed grains?

Mr. FINDLEY. He was referring to wheat, too. If the gentleman will refer to Mr. Freeman's memorandum—it is entitled "The Effect of Wheat and Feed Grain Programs on CCC Costs"—he indicated the total effect of all this—this was the message he was trying to put across—the total effect of the wheat and feed grain program, was a billion-bushel reduction in stockpiles.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. In comparison with what it would have been if we had not had the program; is not that true?

Mr. FINDLEY. No. He was not dealing in predictions at this point. The peculiar thing, which I brought out in my statement, is that he did not take comparable dates. He took the peak date for wheat inventory in 1961. He took the peak date for feed grain inventory in 1961. The peaks occurred on entirely different days. He added those two figures together. Then instead of relating those peak figures to comparable peak figures in another year he chose to relate them instead to the inventory existing on February 15, 1963.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman would not claim that we have as much corn on hand in the U.S. inventory as we would have had if we had not had the feed grain program?

Mr. FINDLEY. That is speculative. I would question your conclusion. I might point out we were moving toward a sound marketplace basis for corn when Mr. Freeman took office. Disappearance of corn was increasing. The export subsidy required to keep corn moving in foreign channels was about 5 cents a bushel. Corn was headed in the right direction when Freeman took over. Now it is in a mess.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. On March 1, 1963, we had an increase of over one-half billion dollars in the inventory of cotton, and on March 1, 1963, under the Department's figures the present inventory of wheat was 968 million-plus bushels, corn 823 million, and grain sorghums some 475 million. I think the point the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] will make is that the reduction is due to utilization. This I think is possibly more important than the feed grain program advanced by this administration.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman has a good point in relating utilization to this whole program. The fact is that last year we consumed more grain than we produced. That difference between consumption and production had to come from Government stocks, so we have had to reduce Government inventory, have we not?

Mr. FINDLEY. No one is denying that a reduction occurred. The Secretary in an obvious effort to try to exaggerate the amount of reduction has tried to relate two completely unrelated pieces of data, and he has thereby created the false impression that the reduction amounts to a billion bushels, when actually it is half that amount.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman for bringing these facts to the attention

of the House. Let me refer to the RECORD of proceedings in the other body on Monday, March 4, 1963, when this very point was discussed.

I would agree with the gentleman from the sister State of Iowa that the feed grain bill has been effective in reducing the surplus. But I see no need to distort the facts by an inaccurate example of what has been accomplished. In the debate in the other body, it was pointed out that a claim was made for an approximate reduction of 1.1 billion bushels, not taking into account what was handled through Public Law 480 and not taking into account what was consumed by an additional population of livestock in this country. The comparison was not made on comparative dates of one year to another. The result was that the reduction was not 1.1 billion bushels but about 228 million bushels. I see no reason why we should use a comparison that is not a fair one. Certainly, we all want the facts presented as they should be presented.

I would like to call the gentleman's attention to another thing that is of great concern to the Midwest, not only to Minnesota but to Iowa as well and that is the feed deficit area situation. Twelve States have been declared to be a feed deficit area. Then by employment of section 22, we find that our surplus grain is now going out of Commodity Credit surplus into what has been determined to be a feed deficit area which simply means the surplus on our farms and elevators and grain terminals in the Midwest are now competing with the Federal Government in those areas where we cannot compete because we do not have a favorable rate on transportation for private industry. This grain is being sold at a rate that we cannot compete with.

The recent action by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman in selling CCC corn at reduced prices to Southeast feed interests is hurting Minnesota and other Midwest farmers.

In an announcement, never released through normal press channels, the USDA set a price for CCC corn stocks at 25 cents per bushel over the Chicago cash market price for five or more jumbo cars or 10 or more regular freight cars. This flat price was made available in 12 States in the Southeast from Maryland and Delaware south to Florida.

The use of this exclusive cutrate system is $75 to $200 per car less than normal competitive corn prices. Secretary Freeman set the price at the same level all the way from Virginia to Florida.

This is a complete rejection of the principle of a free market, and also gives an economic advantage to the Southeast feeders, especially of broilers. This Government action is lowering the price which corn farmers in the Minnesota area can receive. Private grain firms that bought corn and invested their capital in these inventories for later marketing in the Southeast area now find the market usurped by the Government. This also means that they can bid much less for corn in Minnesota.

In addition, this is providing a subsidy for the further expansion of broilers in the Southeast where most of the expansion in output occurred in the 1955–62 period. Minnesota broiler producers can compete on a fair basis, but dumping corn into Southeast at uneconomic prices is just plain unfair competition.

I have here in my hand a letter from the Minnesota Poultry Hatchery Men's Association calling attention to this fact in the Southeast and making reference to this favorable rate that we cannot compete with.

Then I have further letters here which I have written to the Secretary of Agriculture in response to a letter which I received from one of our elevators back home in Minnesota. I have yet not been able to get any figures from the Department of Agriculture as to the disparity in regional prices. I think we are entitled to this information.

I deplore the fact that we have this so-called news management, and I deplore the fact that we have been denied information which I think we are entitled to have. If there is no objection, I would like to submit for the RECORD this file relative to the sale of surplus corn to the southeastern feed deficit areas by the Department of Agriculture. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for bringing to our attention again these facts that he has so clearly related to this body.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman, and I ask unanimous consent that the data offered by the gentleman from Minnesota be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letters and material referred to are as follows:

ST. JOHN GRAIN CO.,
Waldorf, Minn., January 18, 1963.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN NELSEN: Can you tell me why it is proper for one department of the Federal Government to violate the principles of an act passed by this same Government while another department is engaged in prosecution of violators of this act in private business? I am referring to the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Justice and the Robinson-Patman Act.

Last week the Department of Agriculture announced a new program of corn sales to 12 Southeastern States which completely ignored the freight rates established for private business by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The USDA is selling this grain for a flat price of 25 cents over the Chicago cash price for 10 or more cars and 27½ cents over Chicago cash for 2 through 9 cars. This pricing system does not in any way attempt to adjust for freight rate differentials. This program apparently is allowable under section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act which apparently permits the Federal Government to ignore published freight rates by direct negotiation with the individual railroad.

We have heard the officials of the USDA loudly proclaim that the Commodity Credit Corporation was not intended to compete with established marketing channels for agricultural products. The reason for these proclamations was the Congress of the United States has specifically instructed the USDA to avoid such competition. Can the Congressman from an agricultural district condone such actions by the USDA and let them continue to act in such a capricious and arbitrary manner?

If the Congress is going to continue to allow the Federal Government's increasing usurpation of the functions of the States, individual businesses, and the individual, let them discontinue the sham of calling our country one of free enterprise and free people. If nothing else, let the Congress be honest with the people it is supposed to represent. I have faith that you, as our elected representative, will not fail to do everything in your power to halt this usurpation of power by the Federal Government. How can this tide be stemmed?

Very truly yours,

CHARLES T. ST. JOHN.

JANUARY 23, 1963.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This has reference to an announcement issued by your Department on January 9 of this year concerning the pricing policy of the Commodity Credit Corporation on grain shipped to 12 Southeastern States.

Following is an excerpt from a letter which I have received, commenting on the effect that this pricing policy tends to have on operations of the grain trade in the Midwest:

"Last week the Department of Agriculture announced a new program of corn sales to 12 Southeastern States which completely ignored the freight rates established for private business by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The USDA is selling this grain for a flat price of 25 cents over the Chicago cash price for 10 or more cars and 27½ cents over Chicago cash for 2 through 9 cars. This pricing system does not in any way attempt to adjust for freight rate differentials. This program apparently is allowable under section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act which apparently permits the Federal Government to ignore published freight rates by direct negotiation with the individual railroad.

"We have heard the officials of the USDA loudly proclaim that the Commodity Credit Corporation was not intended to compete with established marketing channels for agricultural products. The reason for these proclamations was the Congress of the United States has specifically instructed the USDA to avoid such competition. Can the Congressman from an agricultural district condone such actions by the USDA and let them continue to act in such a capricious and arbitrary manner?"

I would appreciate having your comments on this action.

Sincerely yours,

ANCHER NELSEN.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1963.

Hon. ANCHER NELSEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. NELSEN: This is in further reply to your letter of January 23, 1963, in which you quote from a letter you received regarding the Department's sale of corn for delivery in the Southeastern States, announced January 9, 1963.

The decision to make corn available in the Mid-Atlantic and Southeastern States at specific prices was based on a finding that a distortion in interregional price relationships, apparently related to the feed grain program, had begun to develop and seemed likely to widen further if no corrective action was taken.

Contrary to opinion in some quarters, the fact that reduced freight rates were available from the Southern Railway system was not considered as a justification for the action. Once the determination had been made, however, the Department in the interest of minimizing operating expenses arranged to take advantage of available reductions in transportation rates. It should be added, however, that the Department is not limiting its sales to buyers served exclusively by the Southern Railway system.

The action also is not in terms of offsetting quantitatively the effect on the area's 1962 feed grain production of program acreage diversion. The percentage of such diversion in the Southeast was approximately comparable with that in surplus-producing areas and a case could hardly be made for undertaking a quantitative offset through CCC sales. It has been and continues to be the Department's intention to conduct sales operations under the feed grain programs in a manner which would avoid, as nearly as practicable, upsetting normal competitive relationships among regions.

It is expected that feed grain prices in the Southeast can be stabilized with a rather limited volume of CCC sales. The CCC sales price is not widely different from local price levels in many localities and in some localities is clearly noncompetitive.

Meantime, the Department is keeping under review the free grain price relationships in all areas. In event distortions related to the feed grain program do develop in any area, the Department within the limits of its authority will take appropriate remedial action. Also, if it appears in succeeding weeks that a modification in the offer to the Southeast is essential to the maintenance of a normal differential with other areas, the Department will take due action. In its sales to the Southeast last year, the Department did not act to correct all of the differential since part of it appeared to have been due to variations in weather effects on 1961 per-acre yields. Selling by CCC gradually phased out as the private trade improved its competitive position through greater economies in originating and moving corn supplies.

Meantime, on January 24, the Interstate Commerce Commission approved for general availability to all shippers the reduced rate schedule requested by the Southern Railway system on multiple "jumbo" carlots. This schedule had been expected to be put into effect by the Southern in the near future, but it is now understood that such action is contingent on a decision of the Supreme Court. Thus, it is impossible to determine at this time how the final decision will relate to the feed grain price situation in the Southeast.

We are pleased to provide you with the requested information and are always ready to render further service at any time.

Sincerely yours,

H. D. Godfrey,
Administrator.

Feruary 21, 1963.

Mr. H. D. Godfrey,
Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Godfrey: I have your letter of February 19 in reply to mine of January 23 concerning the Department's announcement of January 9 on the sale of corn for delivery in the Southeastern States.

In your letter you refer to "a distortion in interregional price relationships, apparently related to the feed grain program." It is obvious to me that some such price disparity must have been the basis for the January 9 announcement and I had hoped that in your reply to my letter of January 23 that you would have indicated just what these interregional price relationships distortion amount to.

In that you have referred to interregional price relationships I assume that your statistical analysis of these price relationships has taken into account other feed deficit areas of the Nation as a basis for your comparison.

I would appreciate your providing me with a tabulation of price quotations and your analysis which gave rise to the action announced by the Department on January 9. Your early reply will be much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Ancher Nelsen.

Minnesota Poultry
Hatchery Association,
March 9, 1963.

Hon. Ancher Nelsen,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Nelsen: A recent article taken out of the Business Management Newsletter of the Southeastern Egg and Poultry Association, Decatur, Ga., has just been brought to my attention. An excerpt from this article is as follows:

"Regional grain prices: Some members of the feed industry have stated concern about regional pricing for Commodity Credit Corporation grains. Early this year, the USDA announced a set price formula for CCC corn moving into 12 Southeastern States, plus use of section 22 freight rates to move the commodity.

"This move could give Southeast favorable grain cost in comparison with other sections, by adjusting the freight rates, feed industry observers say. It can be also used under the same system, it was pointed out, to adjust freight rates to the west coast and lower the cost of feed grains there, or the Northeast, or any other section of the country."

I would appreciate any information you might have regarding this. Needless to say that we in the poultry industry are fighting southeastern competition as hard as we can and are trying to maintain our poultry industry here in the upper Midwest and especially in Minnesota.

If the southeastern section is receiving preferential price treatment in both the corn and freight rates this will be just another straw upon the back of our already groggy poultry industry. I would appreciate any information you may have regarding this matter.

Very sincerely yours,

Lloyd Stone,
Secretary.

Mr. FINDLEY. The gentleman brought out a very significant idea when he spoke of news management. This advocate of supply management is apparently also an advocate of fact management.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to respond to some of the comments made by the gentleman from Minnesota. He spoke of the effect of the Public Law 480 program and other factors and the increased utilization of these grains. That is undoubtedly true. However, in my criticism of the Secretary's statement, I adhere entirely to data supplied by the Department itself. Based on that data the fair and accurate figure representing the amount of reduction which actually did occur in the last 2-year period was a half billion bushels instead of the 1-billion-bushel figure that the Secretary used.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has used certain figures and certain data and has quoted from certain memoranda. I, myself, have not been able to examine these figures and data in detail. I know the gentleman is a fair and knowledgeable member of the Committee on Agriculture. I have served with the gentleman. I think the material he has cited should stand on its own feet. I do think the gentleman has charged the Secretary of Agriculture with certain improper motives which I do not think the Secretary of Agriculture has.

I have known the Secretary a long time. I do not expect anyone always to agree with him, but I have always found him to be a man of the highest integrity. He has never misrepresented anything to me. I have always been able to rely implicitly on his word. What I am saying to the gentleman is that I think the material he gives is certainly a pertinent matter for debate, but I think the conclusions with reference to it as a matter of fairness should be drawn by those who read or hear them.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman. I wish to state in clarification that I have inserted the full text of the memorandum upon which I base my criticism. I have inserted the full text of the official Department of Agriculture news releases, which are the latest available official news releases on this subject.

As to Mr. Freeman's motive, each of us must draw his own conclusion, but I invite the gentleman's attention to the text of the memorandum itself, and I am sure that every Member of this body received the full text of the memorandum. In that—and I quote—he said:

> The CCC holdings of wheat and feed grains are [1.077 million bushels] less on February 15, 1963, than the peak quantities held in 1961 before the new program was effected.

All of what he says can be supported from official documents, but I ask the gentleman why he underscores parts in such manner as to convey the idea that the effect of the wheat and feed grains program of the CCC is shown to result in such a great reduction in stocks? Why did he not instead report data which has been made available to the press in the Department's latest release on the subject—why did he not take that which showed clearly the inventory reports as January 31, 1963, related to the inventory levels as of January 31, 1961? Instead of that he chose the seasonally low February 15, 1963, inventory for both wheat and feed grains, then try to relate that figure with the peak figure for wheat in 1961 added to the peak figure in 1961 for feed grains? Was this fair?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Is the gentleman referring to the question of motive or interpretation? I think that is the whole point.

Mr. FINDLEY. I do not know whether the gentleman from Oklahoma heard the first part of my statement or not, but if he did he will recall, I am sure, that I referred to the full text of the memorandum and I summarized the message which the first page of this memorandum was clearly intended to

convey. If the gentleman wishes I will be glad to repeat it.

I would invite the gentleman's attention further to a quotation from Secretary Freeman's speech before the ADA in Pittsburgh.

Commenting on the effect of the farm programs he was administering, Mr. Freeman said: "We have already reduced our stockpiles of surpluses by 1,077 million bushels."

That is not a correct presentation of the true facts.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. In 1961 and 1962 the Secretary was given certificates to sell corn that would have been produced on the diverted acres. At the end of 1961, he started selling the certificates, and by January 31, 1962—that was the 1961 marketing year—he had sold about 460 million bushels out of the stockpile; but by January 31 of this year—during the 1962 marketing year—only 240 million bushels had been sold out of the stockpile. In other words, the certificates were being sold at a slower rate and by using the January 31 figure for both years would have been a misleading comparison, or would not have been an accurate measurement of the effect of the feed grain program.

Mr. FINDLEY. I did not suggest that the way for him to inform the public and the Congress as to the amount of stockpile reduction was by using the inventory figures alone. That is only a half truth, as I said. What he should have done was to total the loan figures and the inventory figures. Then he could present an honest straightforward estimate of how much the stockpiles have been reduced.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if I heard him correctly when he stated that the figures used by the Secretary are correct in the release but it was the inference that was left because of the comparison he made of a specific date; that is, taking the low point in other years was not proper. Am I correct in that?

Mr. FINDLEY. Those were not my words. What I intended to convey in my statement was that the Secretary reached into his statistical warehouse, if I may use that expression, and used unrelated facts, improperly related one to the other, in order to reach the conclusion that our stockpiles have been reduced by a billion bushels.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I was asking the gentleman, did the Secretary give any figures that the gentleman says are incorrect, not in the way he used them but the figures or statistics he used? Does the gentleman contend they are incorrect?

Mr. FINDLEY. Each isolated fact presented in a memorandum by the Secretary could be substantiated, I am sure, by going through original documents in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If that is a fact, does not the gentleman think he is being unfair with the public, with the Secretary, and misleading the Members of Congress when he makes the statement in the letter he sent out:

> In my opinion Secretary Freeman is deliberately trying to mislead Congress, the press, and the public. The memorandum was neither fair nor honest.

Mr. FINDLEY. That is a fair statement of my opinion as to the purpose of his memorandum. That is why I took this time today. That is also why I sent to the gentleman notice so that he would have knowledge of this presentation and could come and defend the Secretary, if he wished.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think I can defend the Secretary, for whom I have the highest regard and in whose integrity I have the greatest confidence and whom I have been trying to support in his efforts. I think he has done a wonderful job. He has reduced the surplus, whereas Secretary Benson went around the country stating it was costing a million dollars a day to store these things, yet today we are saving $770,000 a day in storage costs that were not being carried on during the Benson administration.

Mr. FINDLEY. I might respond to the gentleman by saying that there are many items included in the cost column. Carrying charges are just one item, as I pointed out in my statement.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. If I have the floor, yes.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. I might point out that whatever Mr. Benson may have said as Secretary of Agriculture or how much may or may not have been saved on storage costs, I think that has now been eaten up by additional employees in the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Freeman has a background for this sort of thing. I notice that during his term as Governor of Minnesota, from 1955 to 1960, the debt increased from $84 million to $211 million. This record would qualify him as a first stringer on the New Frontier team of deficit dandies.

I think we should point out, too, that Mr. Freeman, on the very first page, in the very first paragraph, flatly states there has been over a $1 billion reduction in stocks, and I think this is to be taken for what it may be worth. It is all part of the record. I have had a chance to go over it, and I certainly commend the gentleman from Illinois for making the statement today.

I noted the discrepancies you have pointed out and did a bit of checking on some of Freeman's policies dealing with his administration as Governor in the State of Minnesota.

In Minnesota in 1958 the Minnesota Legislative Research Committee, a fact-finding body set up by the legislature of that State, issued a statement that Minnesota must find $72 million of additional tax revenue to meet State expenditures. Freeman on June 23 of 1958 rose in great indignation remonstrating that this was not an accurate statement and in a letter to the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce he stated, and I quote:

> To say that we must find $72 million of new revenue for the next biennium is a reckless distortion of facts.

In his attempt to put the fires out, an additional item appeared in the Duluth Labor World in August of 1958 in which fortuneteller Freeman said:

> New industries attracted to Minnesota and more people moving into the State has brought enough new revenue to eliminate the need for new or increased taxes.

But Freeman, the fortuneteller, in January of 1959 in his budget message asked for an additional $84 million in added tax revenue. This is not a good batting average in anybody's league and I submit his juggling act has improved in 26 months as Secretary of Agriculture.

During Freeman's administration from 1955 through December 1960 the Minnesota State debt increased from $84 million to $211 million. This record should qualify him as a first-stringer on the New Frontier team of "deficit dandies."

Appropriations by the legislature pursuant to requests made by the last Republican Governor preceding Mr. Freeman totaled $306.8 million; the 1959 session of the Minnesota legislature on the basis of the last Freeman budget message appropriated $476.9 million.

The family farm and the small businessman got quite a jolt because the State levy on real estate went from 9.15 mills in 1955 to the highest level in Minnesota history of 14.32 in 1960—an increase of 5.17 mills.

One is safe in predicting Freeman has a short fuse and will blow his stack when he doesn't get his own way. As evidence of that I include an editorial that appeared in the Mankato, Minn., Free Press of July 21, 1962, commenting on his outburst following the defeat of his police-state farm bill last year.

Temper, Temper

> Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman exhibited his usual display of temper when he told a news conference recently, that the Republican party wants to keep agriculture in what he called a mess. He said the GOP tactics, which he blamed for defeating his farm bill, have a political motive.
>
> The secretary delivered the same kind of slashing attack on his political opponents as he developed a habit of doing while he was governor of Minnesota. In his home State it resulted in a defeat for his administration.
>
> Personally, Mr. Freeman is affable and there is no more sincere or harder worker than he, but he leaves himself in a bad light when he launches tirades such as he unleashed a few days ago on the Republican party.
>
> The farm problem is one that neither party has been able to solve. Mr. Freeman's solution was to give the farmers a harsh choice between strict controls and none. Democrats, as well as Republicans, objected and

that is why his legislation failed of passage. It now is up to Mr. Freeman and his agricultural advisors to frame the kind of program that Congress and the people will accept. It cannot be done however, merely by launching political attacks on the persons who disagree with him. He will advance his cause further by taking a more moderate approach.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Report of price support commodities owned as of Mar. 1, 1963

[Quantity and value in thousands]

Commodity	Unit	Estimated total stocks [1]		Estimated cost value		
		Mar. 1, 1963	Change from a year ago	Dollars per unit [2]	Total, Mar. 1, 1963	Change from a year ago
Cotton: [3]						
Upland	Bale	4,685	+3,236	$172.866	$809,877	+$564,341
Extra long staple	do	16	+1	274.209	4,387	+230
Dairy:						
Butter	Pound	265,278	+59,905	.588	155,963	[illegible]
Cheese	do	16,112	−26,448	.375	6,042	−10,216
Milk, dried	do	505,160	+277,429	.149	75,260	[illegible]
Grains and feeds:						
Wheat	Bushel	968,468	−86,100	1.946	1,884,639	[illegible]
Corn	do	823,173	−146,564	1.163	957,350	[illegible]
Barley	do	28,035	+1,211	.860	24,110	[illegible]
Oats	do	14,417	+8,089	.600	8,650	+4,739
Grain sorghum	do	475,010	−86,294	1.059	503,036	[illegible]
Rye	do	528	−2,609	1.038	548	[illegible]
Soybeans	do	1,549	+1,549	2.379	3,685	[illegible]
Flaxseed	do	81	+81	2.712	220	+220
Oils and peanuts: [3]						
Peanuts, shelled	Pound	14,516	+12,354	.200	2,903	+2,357
Cottonseed oil, refined	do	8,340	+8,340	.121	1,009	[illegible]
Naval stores: Turpentine	50 gallons	18.8	−15.8	26.200	493	−415
Total					4,438,201	[illegible]

Report of tobacco loans held by CCC as of Jan. 31, 1963

[Quantity and value in thousands]

Type	Unit	Quantity		Dollars per unit	Total loan value	
		Jan. 31, 1963	Change from a year ago		Jan. 31, 1963	Change from a year ago
Tobacco:						
Burley	Pound	85,208	+54,131	$0.695	$59,235	[illegible]
Fire-cured and dark air-cured	do	48,714	+4,958	.532	25,920	[illegible]
Flue-cured	do	503,491	+109,554	.745	375,325	[illegible]
Other	do	29,872	+5,035	.517	15,436	+2,516
Total		667,345	+173,678		475,916	[illegible]

[1] Estimated quantity of stocks owned by CCC, including commitments to purchase less commitments to sell.

[2] Estimated on the basis of average costs determined from the Jan. 31, 1963, issue of the "CCC Report of Financial Condition and Operations."

[3] Estimated total stocks as of Feb. 27, 1963.

NOTE.—The estimated cost value of inventory since June 30, 1961, is based on acquisition cost of the commodity.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my distinguished colleague from Illinois for bringing to the attention of the Congress this most serious situation. Certainly the farmers of our Nation have every right to expect that the Department of Agriculture will be completely factual in presenting the effect of wheat and feed grains programs on Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. We all have the right to expect that the Department of Agriculture will be factual at all times and if the Department is deliberately trying to mislead the farmers, the press, the Congress, and the entire public, I consider such action inexcusable.

Let me mention briefly a case in point.

The other day I received a letter from Richard Perkins, president of the Whitman County Farm Bureau in the State of Washington. Mr. Perkins informed me that farmers throughout the State are alarmed and resentful of the misrepresented information in the Department's pamphlet, "The Wheat Program for 1964." Mr. Perkins informs me this wheat referendum campaign document is definitely not a balanced presentation. He states it presents short run costs and rates to the exclusion of other factors and he states further that estimates presented by the Department of Agriculture involve highly debatable assumptions.

All rounded figures, he states, are in the direction of supporting a yes vote. As an example, the pamphlet says that the price of wheat with a no vote would be about $1.20. At the time of printing of this pamphlet, parity price of wheat was $2.45, and 50 percent of $2.45 is $1.22½.

Mr. Perkins says the pamphlet also implies that with a yes vote, a farmer would get market certificates for about 80 percent of the normal production of the farm acreage production. The statistics, however, indicate the certificates are to be issued to farmers for only 925 million bushels, or 75.8 percent of the national marketing quota of 220 million bushels.

I agree with Mr. Perkins that the information put out by the Department of Agriculture should be factual and the wheat program for 1964 which will soon be voted upon in referendum, must stand on its own merits.

I have brought my views to the attention of Secretary Freeman and I am pleased to bring my views to the attention of the House of Representatives at this time.

Again, I wish to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, for leading today's discussion. This is a serious matter which should not be allowed to continue.

POSTAL SERVICE AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES SALARY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend

the 1962 Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act to remove a special privilege reduction in second-class postage rates which was granted to associations of rural electric cooperatives in Public Law 87–793.

This special privilege is completely without justification and is, in effect, a subsidy and a grossly unfair one at that. This special privilege which my bill would correct is an abuse of the taxpayer, in addition to representing discrimination and, as I have stated, a subsidy contrary to the status of other publications in the second-class category.

There was a very disturbing series of events which led to this clever little windfall for associations of rural electric cooperatives.

First, may I direct to your attention that the classification into which these publications have been placed is that of religious, educational, fraternal, and other so-called qualified nonprofit organizations which are eligible for special low postage rates on second-class mail.

In this discussion I am not entering into the operations of these cooperatives which already are subsidized by the Nation's taxpayers; for example, in the interest rate subsidy on loans. Let me say in reference to this, however, that I compliment Secretary of the Treasury Dillon on his proposal to terminate the low-interest subsidies enjoyed by cooperatives at the expense of the general public.

However, to necessarily dramatize the history behind this latest rural electric cooperative windfall, I refer you to the legislative history of the 1962 Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act.

One of the avowed reasons for the postage increase section of that law was to alleviate at least a part of the huge postal deficit. Most of us in the Congress and many other citizens felt this was a worthwhile goal and supported the legislation.

In the House of Representatives we held almost year-long hearings on the matter without a reference to classification for these rural electric cooperatives. The matter was never presented on the floor of the House when our version of the legislation was enacted.

The matter seems to be a mystery but to the best of my knowledge certain influential Members of the other body who are evidently politically beholden to the lobbyists of rural electric cooperatives slipped this brief amendment into the bill. The matter then quietly slipped through the Senate, was accepted without discussion in the conference and was not discussed on the floor of the House when the conference report was accepted.

In effect, apparently almost unnoticed because of the serious concern expressed during the debates over the treatment of Communist propaganda mail and the consideration of pay increases for Federal employees, this amendment was cleverly inserted by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the other body into this 40-page public law which now results in a loss of revenue to the Post Office. These few words change the definition of a "publication of a qualified nonprofit organization" in section 4359(e) of title 39, United States Code, to include "associations of rural electric cooperatives." In this way, publications of associations of rural electric cooperatives are not only exempted from the new second-class postage rate increases applicable to other nonprofit business-type organizations, but are actually granted special new rates that on the basis of the minimum per copy rates are 75 percent lower than they were paying before enactment of the law. Instead of paying a minimum of one-half cent per copy as previously, they now pay only one-eighth cent per copy. There are 28 of these so-called statewide rural electric cooperative associations with publications having a circulation of almost 3 million, as well as the publications of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

The magazine, Editor & Publisher, called particular attention to this new privilege for rural electric cooperative associations on November 3, 1962. The article quoted Mr. Sanford Smith, general manager of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association as having said there was "no justification for this special privilege."

Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert at this point in my remarks this article from Editor & Publisher:

REC PAPERS GET ONE-EIGHTH-CENT RATE IN NEW BILL

Publications of the rural electric cooperatives were granted a special nonprofit rate in the Postal service bill that recently passed Congress, it was learned this week. This is a reduced second-class mailing rate one-fourth of the regular charge.

"This privilege previously was granted to certain nonprofit organizations," the U.S. Chamber of Commerce stated in its recent Washington memo. "So REA groups will now be able to enjoy a financial advantage while propagandizing against their prime target, the investor-owned private power industry. Meanwhile, the publications of the private power industry will be compelled to pay the regular rates to tell their side of the story."

NO JUSTIFICATION

Sanford Smith, general manager of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, expressed the opinion that there was "no justification for this special privilege."

Other users of second-class mail, including newspapers must pay three 10-percent increases starting January 1, 1963. According to estimates published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this will amount to an increase of $9.8 million the first year and a total increase of $27.4 by the end of 1965.

Mr. Smith commented that the special rate for the REC publications was not in the postal bill as presented for public hearings and that it must have been added in subsequent Senate and House committee hearings. This was confirmed by a spokesman for the National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association, headed by Clyde Taylor Ellis, one-time Congressman from Arkansas.

THREE MILLION CIRCULATION

There are 28 monthly REC publications covering 30 States with an aggregate circulation of about 3 million. They carry some advertising, at most 20 percent of total matter, according to a spokesman for NRECA, who described them as "nonprofit lightweight monthlies serving farmers."

Formerly these publications paid one-half cent rate, and it is estimated the special rate will approximate one-eighth-cent per copy.

On January 19, 1963, the New Mexico Press Association passed a resolution stating in part that it "finds this special additional subsidy an unfair burden to other publications and taxpayers." I wish to insert this resolution also.

RESOLUTION OF NEW MEXICO PRESS ASSOCIATION

Whereas the postal-rate legislation passed by the 87th Congress, while raising rates for most users of postage, reduced the rates for publications of rural electric cooperatives to one-fourth the regular charges for second class mail; and

Whereas all other users of second-class mail, including newspapers, must pay three 10-percent increases, starting January 1, 1963; and

Whereas the changes granting special low rates to rural electric cooperatives were not even discussed in the postal bill hearings: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New Mexico Press Association, while recognizing the great contribution of the rural electric cooperatives to farm electrification, finds this special additional subsidy an unfair burden to other publications and taxpayers; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this organization is instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Postmaster General and Members of the congressional delegation of the State of New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to ascertain from the public record exactly why—or even how—this special privilege for these rural electric cooperative associations was slipped into the new law. During April, May, and June, 1961, the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, on which I have the pleasure of serving, held extensive public hearings on the postal-rate revision bill and not one single word that I can recall was said concerning any special privileges being granted to these rural electric cooperatives.

On January 24, 1962, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 7927 and still there was no mention of any special privileges for rural electric cooperative associations.

On May 28, 1962, spokesmen for the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and three statewide rural electric cooperative associations finally came out and testified before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the other body and expressed opposition to the provisions of the postal rate increase bill passed by the House of Representatives. It is interesting to note, however, that the public testimony of this group did not request or even suggest the granting of this special privilege. They even said they were willing to pay a fair increase in their rates. Nowhere in the public record of the hearings of the other body was such a request made.

A careful study of the colloquy on the floors of both Chambers does not reveal any discussion for this new preferred status for rural electric cooperative associations. In fact, the amendment was not directly pointed out nor discussed by the floor manager of the bill. However, to the contrary, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, did say:

> I have never been in favor of the Post Office Department's balancing its budget as long as every Tom, Dick, and Harry comes to the Congress and expects their 9,900 nonprofit organizations to bear only about one-eighth of the cost of their mail delivery. We cannot do that and at the same time be fair to the other mail users if we make them balance the budget.

And, this action is directly contrary to his statement.

Mr. Speaker, how much will this amendment cost the Post Office? Because of this new provision, rural electric cooperative associations not only are exempted from an increase in postal rates, but, as I said a moment ago, will now pay a minimum per copy rate of one-fourth of what they were paying last year for their publications. It is not possible for me to estimate exactly the total loss in postal revenues represented by this change. It is possible, however, to calculate roughly the loss to the Post Office assuming these publications pay minimum charge per copy required by these new provisions of the law. I recognize that perhaps these publications never are light enough to pay the minimum; but, at least, this assumption gives us some parameters of the problem.

According to the testimony of rural electric cooperative witnesses, there are 28 such statewide associations having publications with a circulation around 2,632,693. Normal publications of business-type organizations must pay a minimum charge per copy of 0.6 cent during 1963, 0.8 cent during 1964, and 1 cent each for pieces mailed after December 31, 1964. On the other hand, publications of these 28 rural electric cooperative associations will pay a minimum charge per copy of only 0.125 cent—or one-eighth cent—throughout this period. On the basis of these data, it can be said that the annual loss to the Post Office Department as a result of this change, and considering only these statewide publications, could approach $150,000 in 1963, $213,250 in 1964, and $276,435 in 1965 and thereafter.

When one takes into consideration the very slick propaganda publication of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association entitled "Rural Electrification" and the multitude of other publications such as the Rural Electric Minuteman emanating from that organization, a very substantial additional loss must be added.

It is inconceivable to me how or why these associations of business-type organizations—even though they are cooperative type organizations—should have been permitted to get special privileges in postal rates when we were making an honest effort to ease the financial burden on the Post Office Department. It is even more inconceivable that the conscientious Members of this Congress will allow this situation to continue. The discriminatory nature of this special privilege is even greater magnified when one considers that the privilege was not even extended to associations of rural telephone cooperatives or any other farm cooperative associations or any other nonprofit, business-type organizations.

There are literally thousands of publications of other nonprofit business-type associations, but they do not get this special privilege. Take, for example, the magazine Nation's Business. This is the official publication of a nonprofit association of business-type organizations and should be just as entitled to special postage as the magazines of rural electric cooperatives. What about Public Power—the magazine of the American Public Power Association? Does not this prove the unfairness and discriminatory nature of the subsidy written into the law last year?

Mr. Speaker, I am not the only one who is concerned about this new special treatment for rural electric cooperative associations. The Citizen Patriot of Jackson, Mich., editorially calls it "A Strange Bit of Business." I wish to include this editorial at this point in my remarks:

A STRANGE BIT OF BUSINESS

> The postal service bill, passed by the Congress at its 1962 session, which raises the postage on your letters and the rates for newspapers and magazines, contains a strange concession to publications of rural electric cooperatives.
>
> Under a provision apparently slipped into the bill after public hearings were held, the REA groups were given a special "nonprofit organization" rate which amounts to one-fourth of the regular second class charge.
>
> It is difficult to see any justification in this privilege granted cooperatives which are in direct competition with private business. The REA publications (there are some 28 of them reaching a total of about 3 million readers) primarily are propaganda organs designed to carry on the public power advocates' fight against the investor-owned private power industry.
>
> In any event, a cooperative of this sort should pay its own way without special concessions from the Government. It is particularly unfair to grant it a postal rate reduction at a time when individuals and private business are being tapped to make up the perennial postal deficit.
>
> But it seems that, in this wonderland of Washington, if you have a bit of socialism on your side you have no trouble getting what you want.

The Oelwein Daily Register of Oelwein, Iowa, also discussed this matter in an editorial on December 18, 1962, which I wish to include at this point:

JANUARY 1 AND THE REA

> January 1, when most users of postage in America will start paying more for mailings, the Rural Electrification Administration—which borrows money from the Government at 2 percent that costs the U.S. Treasury about twice that much—will start enjoying a reduction in postage.
>
> Also in January the REA will intensify its demand on the taxpayer for more money; a record appropriation of nearly half a billion dollars.
>
> This statement was made by the late Sam Rayburn, coauthor of the Rural Electrification Act: "We are not in this bill (creating REA) intending to go out and compete with anybody. By this bill we hope to bring electrification to people who do not now have it. This bill was not written on the theory that we are going to punish anybody or parallel their lines or enter into competition with them."
>
> How the thinking in Washington changes. The bill which was authorized about 25 years ago did result in changing the face of America by bringing much-needed electric power to the Nation's farms. Today that job has been 96.8 percent completed, partly by REA, partly by investor-owned utilities. But as is characteristic of projects and bureaus set up by our Federal Government, it now seems that the REA is determined to perpetuate itself permanently.
>
> REA Administrator Norman M. Clapp is sparking the program that would move REA now into urban areas, competing with taxpaying investor-owned utilities, offering inducements to prospective industries on prospective new REA lines with cheap 2-percent money that costs the Treasury some 4 percent, the difference being made up by the taxpayers.
>
> One of these REA projects involved an REA-approved loan of $30,000 for the purchase of snow-making equipment for a ski-lift at the Chestnut Hills Resort at Hanover, Ill.
>
> REA hurts the U.S. taxpayer in several ways. By bidding against and encroaching upon investor-owned, taxpaying utilities it is extending its service with a non-income-tax-paying operation. Oh, it is true that the REA pays some taxes, but not to compare with those assessed against corporations. Their bids are difficult to overcome because of their saving on taxes and their use of 2-percent taxpayers' money. The goal obviously is the long-range plan of replacing all investor-owned utilities, depriving the Government of its tremendous revenue from corporate income taxes. The taxpayer, then, will have to make up the loss.
>
> This is all being done by an agency that was set up exclusively for rural areas. Now five out of six customers added by REA borrowers are nonfarm consumers.
>
> Moreover, REA appears to be financing a good many co-ops unnecessarily. A total of 246 borrowers boast general funds amounting to $600 million, $300 million of it in U.S. Government bonds. Significantly, of this total some $19 million is in special 2-percent REA bonds. The borrowers, in short, as pointed out in Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly, are reinvesting the Government's 2-percent money in Government bonds, which pay them a higher return. Some even have money in common stocks. But remember, this 2-percent money costs the U.S. Treasury nearly twice that much. The taxpayers make up the difference.
>
> Getting back to higher postal rates, and subsequent additional costs to the taxpayers by the REA operation. January 7 first-class letters advanced 5 cents, post cards 4 cents, airmail letters 8 cents, and airmail cards 6 cents. But in a last-minute change, not even discussed in the postal bill hearings, the bill passed allowing rural electric cooperatives a reduced second-class mailing rate, one-fourth the regular charges.
>
> Other users of second-class mail must pay three 10-percent increases starting January 1, 1963. There are 28 monthly rural electric cooperatives covering 30 States with an aggregate circulation of about 3 million. They carry some advertising. Formerly these publications paid a one-half-cent rate, and it is estimated the special rate will approximate one-eighth cent per copy. People paying the higher postage rates are helping make up the difference.
>
> REA groups will now be able to enjoy a financial advantage while propagandizing against their prime target, the investor-owned utilities. Meanwhile, the publications of the private power industry will be compelled to pay the regular rates to tell their side of the story.
>
> As stated above we commend the accomplishments of REA since the plan was adopted a quarter century ago. We do not believe it should be kept going in perpetuity at the expense of the taxpayers, and we are concerned over this evidence of encroachment on free enterprise, which is another example of creeping socialism.

Over in Lorain, Ohio, the Lorain Journal called the inclusion of rural electric cooperative associations in this "qualified nonprofit" category as "A Puzzling Concession." This newspaper said:

> It is difficult to imagine what argument was used to justify the cooperatives this concession in the face of a general postal increase.

I wish to include this editorial also:

A PUZZLING CONCESSION

> To purchase a commodity at a reduced price at the very time the price is being raised is a nice trick—but not an impossible one.
>
> It is being done by rural electric cooperatives, which were granted a special nonprofit rate in the postal service bill adopted by Congress to raise postal rates.
>
> Starting January 7, 1963, the cost of mailing a letter first class will advance from 4 cents to 5 cents. Rates on most other mail services will go up. Not so, however, with the Rural Electrification Administration. Publications of the electric cooperatives, now paying a half-cent per copy, will be granted a new rate of approximately one-eighth of a cent per copy.
>
> Just why the cooperatives should be given a postage price cut in the same bill that raises rates is a problem that would require explanation from inner—and perhaps smoke-filled—committee chambers. The special rate for REC's was not in the postal bill as presented for public hearings. This means that it had to be added in subsequent House and Senate committee hearings.
>
> If privately owned electric firms are chagrined by this action, their irritation is understandable. They are frequently the target of criticism by the advocates of public ownership of electrical facilities, but they are not given a special postal rate to mail out publications to defend themselves.
>
> At present there are 28 REC publications covering 30 States, with an approximate aggregate circulation of 3 million. The postal reduction from one-half to one-eighth of a cent won't break the Post Office Department, but it certainly won't help clear up the annual postal deficit.
>
> It is difficult to imagine what argument was used to justify granting the cooperatives this concession in the face of a general postal increase.

There is another editorial which I think would be worthwhile calling to the attention of my colleagues here today. The De Pere, Wis., Journal-Democrat carried this one on November 29, 1962, and I heartily commend it to your reading:

SUBSIDIZING THE REC

> Recently, Congress passed a new postal bill raising second-class rates (newspapers), first-class rates (general mail) and most other postal charges.
>
> These cost increases hold true for the Journal-Democrat, the local power utility, the local businessmen, unions, and householders.
>
> However, one group has actually "snuck" in with a postal decrease. The rural electrification co-op has been granted a special nonprofit rate in the recently passed postal bill, it was learned this week. This is a reduced second-class mailing rate, one-fourth the regular charge. This special rate was not in the postal bill as presented at public hearings and was inconspicuously included at a later date.
>
> There are 28 publications put out by REC groups with a total circulation of about 3 million. They formerly paid a one-half-cent-per-copy rate. This has been reduced to about one-eighth of a cent.
>
> The irony of the situation is that in a nation of free enterprise, the Federal Government and State government will not allow bona fide paid advertising by the taxpaying power utilities boasting that they do pay taxes (and therefore a share of the cost of government) as a business expense. Meanwhile the Federal Government gives what amounts to a subsidy to propaganda telling the story of the tax-exempt rural electrification cooperatives with our money.
>
> The American public went along with the postal increase because they felt that the postal department should be self-supporting, but as long as special privileges are being given on the sly, we defy the postal department to ever get another increase past the people.

I think my colleagues will also be interested in the following editorial from the Electrical West Industry Newsletter dated December 15, 1962:

AU REVOIR: AN EDITORIAL

> This is the last newsletter. We think you will have some interest in how it came about. Some months back the Post Office Department decided that the newsletter was not a regular issue of our magazine. Thus, by post office decree, the newsletter had to be mailed at a much more costly rate. This decision put it out of the economic ball park. We will sincerely miss the chance to visit with you in the newsletter. We like its informality and the chance to keep you better posted. All this happened some months back, and we have accepted the additional mailing costs until the first of the year to fulfill commitments to advertisers.
>
> We tell you the why of the loss of the newsletter for two reasons. First, so that you will know that the change has nothing to do with our new owner, who only inherited the problem. Second, we feel that all of us can take some concern when a governmental interpretation of some fine print can make this kind of change in our private life.
>
> We cannot overlook the irony of the action of the last Congress that placed REA publications in a special postal class far below any rate we as private business have ever enjoyed. This special class has heretofore been reserved for churches and other nonprofit organizations. Nor can we quite see how the President can condone raising first-class mail rates by $320 a ton and refuse steel a $5-a-ton raise.
>
> We believe the individuals that made this decision in the Post Office Department made the decision in full conscience. Here is our point.
>
> The hand of Government, grown too mighty, grasps at each of us.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should all give some serious second thoughts to these new subsidies. These cooperatives are getting out of paying Federal income taxes and a large part of State and local taxes—at least they are generally not taxed on a comparable basis as other electric suppliers. They are borrowing money from the Federal Treasury at less than one-half of what long-term loans cost the Government. They want to build their own high-voltage transmission lines when there is no necessity for it and in most cases where they could or are purchasing their power cheaper from existing suppliers. They want to and are competing with highly regulated and highly taxed electric companies for business—including service to industries. They are operating proprietary businesses and like to refer to themselves as free enterprise. They may have started out years ago as small operations, but today they have about a 20-percent equity in a $3.8 billion investment. They want to enjoy all of the privileges of free enterprise but without the obligations. Now, somehow or other, they have slipped into a postal rate bill a provision that lets them enjoy mailing privileges for their propaganda organs at a fraction of the cost to the postal service for handling them.

If we are all interested in fairness to our free enterprise businesses and to the taxpayers, one of our first orders of business should be to correct this mistake which was made last year. Therefore, I sincerely urge my colleagues on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee—and in this Chamber—to give serious thought and quick approval to the bill I am introducing today.

We have all seen and recognized the special interest pleading and propaganda in many of these publications. We have seen almost everyone of them calling for the enactment of legislation in their own self-interest, suggesting—if only by indirection—that the readers bring pressure on Congress for certain bills. I do not criticize them for this kind of activity. They have as much right as anybody to bring their thinking to the attention of their members. But, I do feel very strongly that Congress cannot and must not be placed in the position of further subsidizing this effort to the detriment of other taxpaying businesses or by giving them preferred postage rates to carry out their propaganda campaigns.

I am asking the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to appoint a subcommittee to look into this matter. Under standard operating procedures in the committee, all bills referred to subcommittees receive a report from the Post Office Department, in which the Department expresses either its approval or disapproval of the proposal. In advance of this procedure, on January 28, 1963, I sent a letter to the Postmaster General requesting information on this matter.

On February 4, Assistant Postmaster General Ralph W. Nicholson, responded to my inquiry saying the Post Office Department did not recommend or suggest that associations of rural electric cooperatives be included in the definition of "qualified nonprofit organizations." In fact, the Post Office expressed its opposition in writing to this change in the law on September 13, 1962. Mr. Nicholson said the special preferential postage rates are a form of subsidy which is consequential to the Department since every piece of "qualified nonprofit" second-class mail is carried at a substantial loss.

In order that my colleagues may get the full flavor of Mr. Nicholson's reply, I wish to include the entire letter at this point in my remarks:

> FEBRUARY 4, 1963.
>
> HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Postmaster General has sent me your letter of January 28 in which you asked some questions about postal rates extended to rural electric cooperatives.

1. The Post Office Department did not recommend or suggest that these associations be defined as "qualified nonprofit organizations."

2. The staff of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service asked us for our position on this matter. I replied on September 13, 1962, saying we opposed the change.

3. We do not justify the net reduction in postage.

4. We believe the Congress is in a better position than the Department to determine the fairness or equity of this change. In setting second- and third-class rates Congress faces the same question of fairness or equity. I would point out however that preferential postage rates are a form of subsidy. In the case of nonprofit second-class rates this subsidy is consequential to the Department since each piece of mail at this rate is carried at a substantial loss. From the postal point of view it would seem desirable to make a direct subsidy to an industry that merits Federal support rather than an indirect one through postal rates. The change made a number of years ago providing direct payment of subsidies to certain airlines who previously were benefited by special postal payments is a case in point.

Sincerely yours,

Ralph W. Nicholson,
Assistant Postmaster General.

Still seeking information, I sent a letter to the Rural Electrification Administrator on January 28, 1963. I received a reply from the Honorable Norman M. Clapp on February 4. He said REA was not involved directly or indirectly in obtaining the new postage rate for associations of rural electric cooperatives. Mr. Clapp, however, I feel, was a little misleading in his reply—even though he may not have meant to be—in his explanation that the Senate committee in reporting the postage revision bill "included a provision extending the nonprofit rate established in 1917 to associations of rural electric cooperatives." The implication of that sentence—standing alone—is that the committee merely extended the nonprofit rate enjoyed by others since 1917 to the electric cooperative associations. The 1917 law to which he refers was 40 Stat. 327–328, October 3, 1917. This law merely established the classification of "qualified nonprofit organizations" and none of them were associations of business-type organizations as are the associations of rural electric cooperatives.

I will also include the full text of Mr. Clapp's letter at this point in my remarks for the benefit of my colleagues:

February 7, 1963.

Hon. Edward J. Derwinski,
House of Representatives.

Dear Mr. Derwinski: This is in response to your letter of January 28, 1963, in which you ask if REA had anything to do with obtaining a new mailing rate for associations of rural electric cooperatives.

This agency was not involved, directly or indirectly, in obtaining the new rate.

When the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee held hearings in May 1962 on H.R. 7927, Postage Revision Act, testimony was presented by statewide associations of REA borrowers and by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in opposition to proposals that would increase postal rates on their publications. The Senate committee in reporting H.R. 2927 included a provision extending the nonprofit rate established in 1917 to associations of rural electric cooperatives.

The conference report on this legislation retained the Senate language and the report was adopted in the House on October 5, 1962, by a rollcall vote of 312 to 20.

Please let us know if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Norman M. Clapp,
Administrator.

I am also communicating with all of the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the other body, bringing this to their attention if it has escaped their scrutiny. I certainly hope they will see fit to remedy the situation.

When hearings are held, as I hope they will be, we will then be able to determine the background for these subsidies, and give the Post Office Department, the rural electric cooperative associations, and other interests Government officials an opportunity to join with us in correcting this situation.

In my opinion, congressional intent as well as congressional knowledge was flouted. The Members of the House understand the confusion which prevails in the closing days of a session, and I believe we have been duped by the inclusion of this special amendment in the 1962 act.

I urge you to join me in the necessary corrective legislation.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] on his interest and work in saving and looking after the savings of the taxpayers themselves with reference to the unnecessary spending of tax dollars.

Mr. Speaker, recently one of our very fine weekly newspapers in southeast Texas, the Waller County Record, had an article written by Elisabet Douthitt concerning the new low postal rates for rural electric cooperatives. This is an interesting development which seems to be coming more to the fore in recent weeks.

Like Elisabet Douthitt says, I do not have any quarrel with these rural electric cooperatives either, so long as they continue to serve the function for which they were organized. But, I do question the propriety of their getting the special postal rates to which she refers in her article if the facts she points out are correct.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us will be interested in reading her comments, so for this reason I ask unanimous consent to insert her article in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

Why Low Postal Rates for Rural Electrification Co-ops?

(By Elisabet M. Douthitt)

It is to be hoped that the Texas Press Association will follow that lead of its sister State, New Mexico's press group, in adopting a resolution denouncing the sneaky postal rate concession given to the Rural Electric Cooperatives. The New Mexico association labeled the concession "an unfair burden to other publications and taxpayers."

It is certainly all of that.

I have no quarrel with these cooperatives. Quite the contrary I think they have done a terrific job of bringing electricity to farms and ranches not served by investor-owned utility companies.

I don't, however, see where they come off getting a postal rate supposedly set up for nonprofit organizations only, because I don't believe anyone in his right mind believes them to be nonprofit organizations. It must also be noted that the rate was sneaked into the bill and that no changes granting special low rates to these cooperatives were even discussed in the postal bill hearings. It was not in the postal bill as presented for public hearings. One can only conclude it was "snuck in" during subsequent congressional committee hearings.

REA borrows money from the Government at 2 percent interest, money which costs the U.S. Treasury about 4 percent. Electric cooperative users pay a membership fee when they tie in to the REC lines. After that they pay a healthy kilowatt rate for power used. I know. I averaged between $15 and $25 a month on the ranch electric bills.

This newspaper and every other publication in the profitmaking designation got a postal hike of 10 percent this year and will get two more 10-percent hikes in 1964 and 1965. Rural electric cooperatives publish 28 monthly publications covering 30 States. These class-printed jobs carry some advertising and have an aggregate circulation of about 3 million. I'm one of them who gets the paper.

Anyone with a grain of commonsense knows that advertising is for profit and any sort of publication that carries paid advertising should be grouped with profitmaking ones.

But through a, to put it mildly, very puzzling concession the electric cooperatives got a reduction in postal rates rather than the raise everyone else got. While they had been paying the half-cent rate, they now have this special rate of about one-eighth cent per copy. Publications, such as the Record, will be helping pay for their mailing and I call it ridiculous and unfair. Moreover, the REA groups will be able to enjoy a financial advantage for issuing propaganda against their prime target, the investor-owned utilities, because of this special rate. And the private power industries will have to pay the higher rate for their publications in order to tell their side of the story.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate the widespread interest this question has received across the country. As a matter of fact, this issue is just coming to the attention of the Congress since in effect it quietly slipped through the House in the closing days of the 1962 session. In all fairness and in all logic and, let us say, in the interest of normal consistency of the Congress this should never have happened.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have always been impressed with the sincerity and thoughtfulness of the gentleman from Illinois; but, Mr. Speaker, he outdid himself today. I think in all honesty that his incisive analysis of the implications and ramifications of granting subsidy postage rates for publications of associations of REA co-ops is one of the finest statements delivered for the benefit of all Members of this body in a long time.

The whole Nation is concerned about the magnitude of Government spending, and we all would like to find some way to improve the situation—no matter how large or small the contribution might be. The gentleman from Illinois, in his quiet and unassuming way, has clearly set out for us a positive and constructive way of further reducing the postal deficit—which is a form of Government spending—while at the same time doing for the REA co-ops only what they asked Congress to do. They asked that postal rate increases be fair.

We Americans have always prided ourselves on fairplay and good sportsmanship. I agree with everyone here today who asked for the speedy consideration of this bill by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and its enactment by the Congress in the name of fairplay and good sportsmanship. It is not good sportsmanship to give these associations of REA co-ops a subsidy advantage in the postage they must pay to disseminate their propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and my taxpaying constituents, I would like to say to the gentleman from Illinois, thank you for a job well done, I hope the rest of us in this Chamber can do as well by enacting your bill as soon as possible.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment my distinguished colleague from Illinois on the scholarly approach he has taken on this question. Furthermore, the thoroughness with which he has presented the results of his research to us today must be commended.

After listening to the careful delineation of the facts he brought out concerning the special postal subsidies granted associations of rural electric cooperatives, I must agree with his sincere request for speedy congressional action to correct this mistake. I do not see how any of us in good conscience can procrastinate any longer than is absolutely required by the necessary legislative machinery to enact the bill he introduced today.

Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that consideration of this bill should be thought of as being either for or against rural electrification as such. Rather, it is a question, first and foremost, of fairness and equity to other free-enterprise, business-type organizations, and of fairness to the taxpayers who must make up the Post Office Department deficits.

Again I compliment my colleague from Illinois on his fine contribution to the Nation here today. And, with his kind permission, I would like to associate myself wholeheartedly with his remarks and with what he is sincerely trying to do in the best interest of the taxpayers and a financially sound Post Office Department.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as I sat here and listended with great interest to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois, I could not help but be reminded of those words of the immortal bard, in King Henry VIII:

> He was a scholar, a ripe and good one; exceeding wise, fair spoken, and persuading.

I think it is self-evident why these words came to mind because the gentleman's statement today indicated him to be an exceeding wise scholar, fair spoken and, at least to me, persuading.

I must admit that this special exemption which was given last year to associations of rural electric cooperatives had come to my attention in recent weeks. But, it was not until today that I realized the full significance and import of this seemingly minor change in the language of our postal laws. I compliment the gentleman for his part in alerting all of us so cogently to this situation.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York and I should like to assure the Members that I think it behooves all of us to develop a concerted program, to have at least a very careful review of the record to determine the true intent of the Congress in processing this legislation in 1962. I think the facts and the logic and the wisdom of Congress will produce the necessary change that I propose.

A CITIZENSHIP OF CONVENIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Stratton). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, 1955, Mr. Manuel E. Kulukundis was naturalized as a U.S. citizen. Yet companies in which this man has substantial interest account for approximately 30 percent of all current free world shipping to Communist Cuba, and the U.S. Government has underwritten his farflung shipping operations in the amount of some $32 million in insured loans.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks I have uncovered facts which are appalling to me as an American and a Member of Congress. As these facts are revealed, I am sure the American people and the Congress of the United States will be shocked and amazed at the extent to which the privileges of citizenship in this Nation have been violated.

From information I have obtained from the Justice Department, the Maritime Administration, and other sources, Manuel E. Kulukundis operates not only under flags of convenience, but a citizenship of convenience as well.

During the period 1951–56, after complaints were received from the Congress that some shipowners had acquired U.S. vessels from the U.S. Government under the Ship Sales Act of 1946 without meeting citizenship requirements, investigations of such sales were undertaken. One of the major corporations involved was a group controlled by Kulukundis.

Investigations disclosed that Mr. Kulukundis, while still an alien, held a direct and/or beneficial interest, often concealed, in many corporations which bought war-built surplus U.S. vessels. However, Kulukundis could not qualify for purchase of these vessels because he was an alien. Subsequently he was indicted. After lengthy negotiations, final settlement was worked out with the Department of Justice whereby the Kulukundis-controlled corporations paid fines of approximately $900,000 in cash, and consummated purchase of the vessels, on the day of June 20, 1955. Curiously, it was on that same day that Kulukundis obtained his citizenship in this country.

However, Manuel E. Kulukundis did not relinquish his shares in the family-held British shipping firm of Rethymnis & Kulukundis, Ltd. I am advised that he owns 25 of the 115 shares outstanding in that firm.

On August 27, 1958, Manuel E. Kulukundis received a U.S. Government-insured loan in the amount of $9,593,900 for the purpose of constructing a 41,000-ton oil tanker, christened the SS *Atlas*, which was registered under the American flag.

Then U.S. citizen Manuel E. Kulukundis' British firm signed a 4-year long-term shipping contract with the Soviet Union, and the first shipment of that charter took place in 1960. However, on April 27, 1960, Kulukundis received another U.S. Government-insured loan in the amount of $12,369,300 for the purpose of constructing another oil tanker, the SS *Titan*, which was registered under the American flag.

Then on June 27, 1960, Kulukundis received still another U.S. Government-insured loan in the amount of $10,792,900 for the purpose of constructing still another huge tanker, the SS *Achilles*, which was registered under the American flag.

The total amount of these loans is $32,756,100. As of February 28, 1963, Kulukundis owed a balance of $30,067,404 on his debts.

As you can see, the U.S. taxpayer has a substantial stake in this man's operations. It is shocking that a situation could occur whereby the good faith and credit of the U.S. Government could be used to keep afloat a fleet of ships owned in part by a U.S. citizen who chooses to play both ends against the middle by doing business with the Communists.

On March 1 of this year the Maritime Administration had to intercede and guarantee the wages of the crew of the *Titan*, on which is owed some $11 million, to sail the ship from the coast of Pakistan back to the United States. On that same day, the Justice Department leveled suit against Kulukundis in U.S. District Court of the Southern District of New York, because he has failed to maintain the proper security for his Government-insured loans. The suit involves some $5 million, and the Government requests sale of Kulukundis' new multistory office building at 555 Madison Avenue, New York, as part of the claim.

However, Mr. Speaker, the American people should be advised that his British company, Rethymnis & Kulukundis, Ltd., along with several companies in which it holds controlling interest, accounts for two-thirds of all current British shipping to Cuba, and is responsible for 30 percent of all free world shipping into Cuba for the first 6 weeks of this year.

Of the shipping to Cuba during the Soviet buildup of that unfortunate island in the summer months of 1962, 10 percent of all non-Communist traffic to Cuba was controlled by Kulukundis' interests. Of the 14 Kulukundis-controlled ships calling in Cuba at that time, 12 were tankers transporting vital cargo from ports located in the Soviet Union. These vessels were of British, Greek, and Panamanian registry.

A breakdown of these ships engaged in trade with Cuba during June–August 1962, is as follows:

Type	Name	Flag	Beneficial ownership	Arrival in Cuba	From—
Tanker	Aldebaran	Greek	Rethymnis & Kulukundis, Ltd.	Jan. 3, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	Cedar Hill	British	do	July 11, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	London Confidence	do	do	July 25, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	London Glory	do	do	June 29, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	London Independence	do	do	June 1, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	London Majesty	do	do	July 11, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	London Spirit	do	do	July 3, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	London Splendour	do	do	July 14, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	London Victory	do	do	do	U.S.S.R.
Do	Overseas Pioneer	do	do	Aug. 7, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	Overseas Explorer	do	do	July 5, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	Persous	Greek	do	July 17, 1962 and Aug. 31, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	Sirius	do	do	June 4, 1962	U.S.S.R.
Do	Streatham Hill	British	do	June 16, 1962	U.S.S.R.

Mr. Speaker, this U.S. citizen of convenience, Manuel Kulukundis, is accustomed to operating all over the globe, and not always in the interests of the country he is foresworn to uphold. In 1962, he was able to have construction work performed on four of his ships of American registry in foreign shipyards. Our own U.S. shipyards could have used these American dollars to combat the unemployment problem in this country.

Mr. Speaker, there are many questions surrounding the operations of Manuel E. Kulukundis. One of them has a simple answer: Close U.S. ports to shipping traffic engaged in trade with Cuba. This shipping continues today under the aegis of Kulukundis and other like him who value dollars over democracy.

The Justice Department and the Maritime Administration are doing excellent work in pursuing the violations of public trust which have occurred in this case. However, much remains to be done by the State Department in pursuing the violations of our national interest which are occurring each day as ships from countries engaging in trade with Cuba put into U.S. ports for profitable American cargoes.

In the coming weeks, much will undoubtedly come to light as the Kulukundis case unfolds. Hopefully, one of the steps which will be taken will be the closure of U.S. ports to interests engaged in trade with Cuba.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is a members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and also a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; is he not?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. Is the subject matter which he has brought to the attention of this House today a matter of investigation by either of those committees at this time?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Not at the present, but I am hopeful that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, after we develop these facts, will go into this matter very thoroughly. I personally have gone into this and I have been shocked.

Mr. FASCELL. In other words, these facts which the gentleman brings to our attention at this time are the result of the gentleman's own investigation?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. I certainly must compliment the gentleman for his diligent work in presenting these shocking facts to the Members of this House and the American people. I compliment him and I trust that this matter will be very carefully followed up not only by the gentleman but by the appropriate committees having jurisdiction.

I was interested in several facts brought out in your discussion. I do not recall, and I wish the gentleman would refresh my memory, as to when the man referred to in your remarks became a citizen. I believe you said 1955?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes, he became a citizen in 1955.

Mr. FASCELL. Then, as I recall it, there was a series of steps by which this gentleman received the benefit and assistance of programs of this Government in behalf of shipping.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is right. In other words, he obtained loans from certain companies or banks and these loans were then insured by this Government. Undoubtedly, if there had not been Government insurance for his loan program, this man probably could never have obtained these loans.

Mr. FASCELL. When was his last loan?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I believe his last loan was in June of 1960.

Mr. FASCELL. When was this gentleman indicted? Did I understand correctly that he was indicted?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. He was indicted before citizenship was granted and that is a rather unusual thing—to see citizenship granted after a man has already been indicted.

Mr. FASCELL. That would depend probably on the nature of the offense. I do not know what that was. But, actually, of paramount interest to me and to the Members of Congress and to the American people is the fact that he was able while under indictment to receive the benefits of these assistance programs; is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. This was after settlement but it is unusual.

Mr. FASCELL. When did it follow in period of time?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Actually they have just recently instituted suit. It has not been too long, because of the requirements of certain securities to be kept by the company in order to assure that the Government will not have to step in. Since these assurances have not been given the Government has entered the matter and it was necessary for the Maritime Administration, as I pointed out, to take the necessary steps to pay the wages of the crew to get one of the ships back from Pakistan to this country, because it is very vital for us to protect that interest if we are called upon as the U.S. Government to pay the owed amount on that ship if default on payments or anything were to happen to it.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman and compliment him for the work he has done in bringing this to light. I certainly would hope and I am sure the gentleman will continue his own interest and investigation. Does not the gentleman agree, it falling within the jurisdiction of the committee, that perhaps there may be need for study and investigation and legislative or administrative authorization? This matter has drawn so many developments and hearings and now we find ourselves having to resort to a suit to protect the interests of the American people.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes. Furthermore, I am hopeful, too, this will point up to us the necessity of taking effective action such as the gentleman and I have been working for, to close ports to ships doing business with Cuba.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman. As I understand, this man's ships are using U.S. ports.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The British company, I am sure, does use U.S. ports, and his own American companies which ship under the American flag certainly use American ports.

Mr. FASCELL. This subject matter of closing ports, if it becomes a legislative matter, is within the jurisdiction of the committee on which the gentleman serves.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. This could possibly be done that way, or closing of ports could be done by Presidential proclamation. As the gentleman knows, I am sure, we are trying to encourage the State Department to move on this so we can quickly close our ports to ships flying the flag of any nation which allows any of its ships to trade with Cuba; and this is a case in point.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman has made a very good case in point. I might add that I have joined with the gentleman over a long period of time to try to get this up; as a matter of fact, if my memory serves me correctly, we did something similar to this with reference to the mutual security bill, did we not?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is right.

Mr. FASCELL. So that we did in one piece of legislation try to get this body to take some action with respect to this problem.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. This has been done.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is saying that there are other forms of proposed legislation, also that the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee can act, and finally through administrative action this problem can be attacked. As I understand, a proclamation has already been issued. It does not go far enough.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is only one step.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for his interesting analysis of this problem and commend the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. His untiring efforts have been of great help in the study of this problem and have meant much not only to the people of his district but his work has thrown much light on this whole problem for the entire Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PROPOSED IRS MERGER SHOULD BE ABANDONED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time today to discuss the utter foolishness of the recently announced decision of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue concerning the merging of certain IRS offices throughout the country on the announced ground that it would save $5 million to the taxpayers of the United States. Now I do not propose to know the effect that this reorganizational plan will have on the entire country or certain parts of the country with which I am not personally familiar. It may effect some savings in these areas. But I can talk with some degree of knowledge about the proposed merger of the Newark, N.J., and Camden, N.J., offices into one office to be located in Newark, N.J. Under this plan the Camden office would be limited to investigations and all returns from all citizens in New Jersey would be mailed directly to and maintained at the Newark office. All collections would be made by the Newark office. All supervision would be located at the Newark office. In other words, the Camden office, which has been operating successfully for decades, would in effect become a substation of the Newark office and would provide little or no convenient facilities for the taxpayers of south Jersey. Now I can assure the Members of the Congress that this plan will not save the taxpayers any money. The utter foolishness of the proposed reorganizational plan and the lack of planning preparatory to its announcement is best illustrated by the fact that the Camden office had requested, and the district office had approved, additional space approximating 10,000 additional square feet for the Camden office.

This additional space was allegedly required for the additional employees necessary in the Camden office to process the increasing volume of revenue returns in the South Jersey district. Apparently the Camden office, the district office, and presumably the General Services Administration were caught by surprise by this sudden announcement of a change in plans. Had this proposal been carefully considered I am certain that a great deal of money already expended in planning for the additional space and in the many, many conferences that were held concerning it could have been eliminated and the moneys saved for the taxpayers. Aside from this, however, the merger of these two offices cannot possibly save the taxpayers money. The savings as I understand it from representatives of the Internal Revenue Service would result from the elimination of certain supervisory personnel and their followup employees in the Camden office. According to my information this work and these duties would be assigned to existing personnel in the Newark office. It has been represented to me that the existing supervisory personnel at the Newark office will be able to carry on their present work and the additional work resulting from the transfer of the Camden office without any additional personnel. Now if this is true, the supervisory personnel at the Newark office have obviously been underworked for some time. If not true, as I suspect it to be, obviously the supervisory personnel at the Newark office will, after the merger, be overworked. There is little question in my mind that additional personel will be required in the Newark office if this merger is carried out. This is so because the Camden office as of this date is processing over 1 million returns and is collecting in excess of $650 million. After a personal investigation of this matter, I am convinced, first, that the proposed saving of $5 million is strictly a publicity gimmick and has no basis in fact; and, second, that the proposed merger was announced without adequate planning and without sufficient investigation of the needs for and the impact of the proposed merger. This is best illustrated by the fact that the announcement of the proposed mergers throughout the country was made by Secretary Dillon on March 5, 1963. On March 7, 1963, 2 days later, an urgent press release titled "For Immediate Release" was issued reading as follows:

> Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon announced today that he was giving careful consideration to protests received about proposed changes in the organization of the field structure of the Internal Revenue Service, designed to increase its efficiency and economy of operation. He pointed out that none of the changes are scheduled to become effective before January 1, 1964, which will give full opportunity to review all aspects of the matter in the light of these protests. No implementing action will be taken pending the completion of such a review.

A reading of this release is convincing, I think, that no thought whatsoever was given to the facts which prompted the many protests. What investigation was made on the local scene in Camden, N.J., to determine the impact of this merger on the local community? What study was made of unemployment in the Camden area? Does not this administration, which has been preaching the need for full employment, know that today Camden, Gloucester, and Burlington Counties have the highest rate of unemployment that they have had since 1956? Do not our Treasury experts ever talk to our labor experts? Do not the planners of the Treasury Department have any liaison with the planners of the Labor Department? Why did the Treasury Department aid in unemployment in an area already "enjoying" a 9.7 percent unemployment of the existing labor force at this particular time?

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on to illustrate the lack of planning, the lack of investigation, the lack of thought in this ill-advised, ill-conceived proposal. The only comfort I can take and the only comfort that the people of the south Jersey area can take in this entire matter is the fact that after all the fanfare and all the publicity and all the cost involved in conferences throughout the country, which probably will reduce appreciably the estimated savings, the Secretary and the Commissioner now agree that they will "give careful consideration to the protests." I would like to point out to our friends in the Treasury Department that not only has our leading daily newspaper blasted this proposed merger but all forms of area communications have been united in criticizing this ill-conceived planning. In the event that the Treasury Department is interested, and with the hope that reconsideration will include some attention to the suggestions, I am submitting herewith certain reasons which I feel compel the rejection of the proposed merger and necessitate a rescinding of the proposal by the Secretary of the Treasury:

First. The Newark office is located in the northerly end of the State and is, therefore, farther removed from the field offices throughout the State than would be a centrally located office. If one office alone is indicated, it certainly should not be in Newark. Camden, geographically, is much more centrally located and south Jersey enjoys a higher rate of potential growth than any area in the State.

Second. The location of a single office in Newark would be extremely costly in view of the transportation involved for management, directors, supervisors, and supervisory personnel.

Third. The Camden office indeed would provide much better liaison with the State offices being so much closer to the State capitol at Trenton.

Fourth. More importantly, however, the regional office located in Philadelphia is approximately 5 miles from the Camden office and approximately 95 miles from the Newark office. Additional moneys in time and traveling expenses if multiplied similarly throughout the country would more than offset the proposed savings by the Internal Revenue Service.

Fifth. Obviously the Newark office space would be inadequate in view of the additional duties that would be imposed and since additional space would be more expensive in Newark than in Camden, again the possibility of any savings would be reduced.

Sixth. South Jersey has recently had approved a proposed rapid transit system which, it is believed, will develop even more rapidly the entire area. A jet airport is on the planning boards and a population explosion is anticipated by all knowing civic planners. Why the Internal Revenue Service would want to inconvenience so many hundreds of thousands of taxpayers is beyond understanding.

Seventh. The Newark office would be completely removed from the resort areas in the State of New Jersey where the administration-inspired organized crime drive is spearheaded. The cost of transportation and living expenses and time that would be consumed in travel by personnel on these assignments would again increase the cost of the operation and offset any possible saving by consolidation of supervisory personnel.

Eighth. The south Jersey area today is a depressed area from the standpoint of unemployment statistics and as outlined above has at the present time a 9.7 rate of unemployment. New jobs should be created for this district by the Federal Government rather than eliminated by the Federal Government.

Ninth. Automatic data processing which is utilized by the Internal Revenue Service as a time and money saver is located in the service center in Philadelphia. With a collection division and with all other facilities now working satisfactorily in the Camden office, it is again difficult to understand how the proposed merger will result in any savings.

Tenth. With the returns filed in Newark, the taxpayers of south Jersey, the accountants, the lawyers, and particularly those interested in adjusting, explaining, revising, or correcting an income tax return will, in all probability, be compelled to travel to Newark to discuss it. To do otherwise would mean the costly transfer of personnel from the Newark office to the Camden office and would require almost daily messenger service between the Newark and the Camden office.

Eleventh. All appeals from findings of the Internal Revenue Service would necessarily be held in Newark and would impose great inconvenience on the part of taxpayers and those representing them.

Twelfth. Lastly, I have not been able to determine by any real proof that any money will be saved, let alone $5 million. This is a figure right out of somebody's hat and is the result, in my opinion, of a vivid imagination on the part of some Treasury statistician. But even if I were to agree that some appreciable savings could be made in the merger, it would be entirely lost to the Treasury Department by reason of the tremendous damage that has already been done, and which would be increased appreciably if the merger were consummated, to the morale of the employees of the Internal Revenue Service in New Jersey and throughout the Nation.

My office has been swamped by complaints, by illustrations of hardship cases, by family problems which prevent moving to either Newark or to any place outside of the south Jersey area. The entire Camden office, and I suppose the personnel of all offices throughout the country are wondering, "what next?"

In one unthinking, unplanned, unnecessary swoop, the Commissioner and the Secretary have wrought untold harm to the morale of the employees of the Internal Revenue Service. The average worker is now saying: "If they can merge the Camden office with the Newark office, when will they merge the Newark office with the New York office" and then, of course, the $64 question will be: "When will all of the offices be merged into one presumably located in Boston?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken a lot longer than I had anticipated but I could really speak much longer and outline more reasons why this proposal should be discontinued forthwith by the Secretary of the Treasury.

While the announcement indicates that the entire matter is being reconsidered, I have been informed by authoritative sources that the planning to implement this proposal is still going on. I urge the Secretary and the Commissioner to stop wasting the taxpayer's money in planning to carry out this merger and to withhold implementation until a sincere, careful, objective study is made. I am certain that when this occurs, the Secretary and the Commissioner will permit the Camden office to remain "as is" so that it may continue as it is now doing to service the needs of the people of south Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following editorial, published in the Camden-Courier newspaper under date of Friday, March 8, 1963, in full because it expresses fully the views of all the citizens of south Jersey:

> DOWNGRADING OF CAMDEN BY INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE MERITS VIGOROUS OPPOSITION
>
> Camden once again is being given second-class, back-of-the-hand treatment in the reshuffling of a governmental agency.
>
> The Camden and Newark offices of the Internal Revenue Service are being merged to Newark's advantage and our disadvantage in a national reorganization of the IRS that affects 16 of its 62 offices.
>
> Whereas Camden up to now has been the headquarters of an independent IRS district and has had its own district office, the Camden district will now become part of the Newark district. The office here, while not to be closed entirely, will be downgraded to a branch of Newark's.
>
> The Camden district is one of only four in the entire country that are to be merged out of existence.
>
> Reasons given for the national reorganization are to effect the relatively petty saving of $5 million a year in overhead and administrative costs; and to facilitate the use of the IRS electronic processing system, which is due to be in full operation by 1966.
>
> At first, Treasury officials claimed that the reorganization would in no way inconvenience taxpayers in this area. Within 24 hours, however, they admitted that statement was in error.
>
> Taxpayers in this area will continue to file their returns at the Camden office and receive some other services there that are provided now. However, all returns will be sent to Newark and kept there instead of in Camden, and taxpayers whose returns are questioned or reviewed may be required to travel to Newark. All records will be held at Newark instead of Camden.
>
> Certified public accountants who aid taxpayers in making out their returns probably will be forced to make many trips to Newark to settle disputes.
>
> Officials also claim that few, if any, IRS employees will lose their jobs and that "reassignments in nearby offices or transfers to new duties will be made."
>
> But the first IRS statement also significantly admitted that about 93 persons in the Camden office will be affected. Of them, 33 now hold supervisory positions—including District Director William F. Culliney—and they are told that reassignments will be worked out for them to suit their personal convenience.
>
> The number of employees here, according to a second and conflicting statement given out by regional IRS officials, will drop from 350 to 150.
>
> Some may be moved to the Philadelphia service center, an IRS spokesman says. Others will be given the option of continuing as field agents in the Camden area or moving "to new, nearby assignments." But it also is stated, and certainly sounds like an ominous hint, that employees "who have 20 years of service and 50 years of age could retire," if they desire.
>
> According to Treasury Secretary Dillon, the reorganization will be gradual and timed according to local circumstances. Our share of it is scheduled to be completed by next January 1.
>
> Dillon says he and the IRS are "fully aware of the unemployment problems in the Camden area, and every effort has been made to keep the impact of this proposed change to a minimum."
>
> Nevertheless, even if every one of the 90—or 200—Camden employees affected retains a job elsewhere with the IRS, it will mean the loss of just that many jobs to Camden. As far as the city is concerned it will be a blow, an added economic loss to an area that already is struggling against its most serious unemployment situation in many years.
>
> Adding to our frustration is the disclosure that a plan by the IRS to enlarge its Camden quarters and increase its personnel by 150 will be postponed or canceled under the reorganization.
>
> It now is revealed for the first time that the agency's present 50,000-square-foot headquarters at 808 Market Street, which was remodeled extensively and expensively when it took over, has become inadequate. Plans had been prepared for a new building to add 10,000 square feet of space. The plans also called for expansion of the Camden working force from 350 to 500 when the new building was completed.
>
> Both the building and personnel expansions now must be held in abeyance. Culliney—to whom the "merger" announcement came as a surprise—does not deny that with the merger, and the resultant slash in the Camden working force, a move to smaller quarters is likely.
>
> It may be true that what you never had you'll never miss. But it is galling nonetheless to learn that Washington had thought this expansion necessary until the reorganization move sidetracked it, and that the city stands to lose not merely 93, or 200, jobs already existing here, but another 150 that might have been.
>
> Congressman Cahill is dead right in his hostile reaction to the reorganization.
>
> It is hard to believe that under it, south Jersey will get "the adequate service it gets now" from the IRS, despite pious protestations to that effect.
>
> It is even harder to see any sense in "merging" this district with—rather, into—the Newark district.
>
> It would make better sense to merge Newark into Camden, since we are nearer the geographical center of the State, even though Newark is nearer the population center.
>
> It is impossible to see where the change will mean any appreciable saving to the IRS. It is possible to see where it might cost it more.
>
> This is the same kind of a deal Camden and south Jersey got from the Veterans' Administration a few years ago in a similar "reorganization" that transferred major VA functions from Camden to Newark, to the great inconvenience and distress of veterans throughout south Jersey.
>
> It is the same kind of stepchild treatment that south Jersey is accustomed to getting from various State agencies, yet to which it never has been and never will be reconciled.
>
> The Courier-Post shares Congressman Cahill's anger at this proposed raw deal for Camden and south Jersey, and will join with him in doing all we can to prevent it.

AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Skubitz] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to provide for direct aid to the States and Territories for educational purposes only. Forgetting the protagonists of the Marxian panaceas for all that ails us, I feel certain the Members of this Congress will come to terms on three points, namely, first, that education is a responsibility of government that should be left forever under State control; second, that excessive Federal taxation has left the States with few, if any, new sources of tax revenue; and, third, that American education, through inadequate financing, has drifted to an alarmingly low level in academic standards in some areas of our country.

The bill I am introducing provides that the collectors of internal revenue of the several States and Territories shall return to the States, following each quarter, 1 percent of the personal and corporate income taxes collected within such State during that quarter.

I am not now, and never have been, in favor of Federal control over our educational institutions. This bill does not entail Federal control. It merely earmarks the funds for education, and leaves the States free to put them to use in localities where the need is the most urgent.

The merits of this bill may be briefly stated. It returns the tax dollars to the people who paid them and leaves them free, through their elected representatives, to use the money for school construction and for other countless educational needs. Mr. Speaker my bill calls for no new bureaus and in consequence removes the necessity of adding a horde of employees to the Federal payroll to administer the law. This bill insures a fair ratio of distribution. This bill meets the requirements of those who have been searching for a simple and direct plan to meet our educational needs without imposing another tax. It will allay the fears of those who properly oppose Federal control over American education.

CRIPPLING COMPETITION IN U.S. WOOLEN INDUSTRY

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. woolen industry is faced with crippling competition from abroad. Wool imports are up 80 percent over last year.

Until quite recently, the President took a position that the woolen industry should be treated as a thing apart. Moreover, this administration gave assurances following the February 9, 1962, International Cotton Textile Agreement, that a similar agreement would be concluded for the woolen industry.

The President's position left New England voters with the distinct impression that wool would be given at least equal treatment with cotton.

I read with great concern the following article in today's Washington Post and Times Herald:

> ADMINISTRATION REPORTED VETOING WOOL RAISERS' PROTECTION DEMANDS
>
> (By Julius Duscha)
>
> The domestic wool industry apparently has lost its 2-year fight to get President Kennedy to give it special protection against imports.
>
> It was learned last night that the President has decided to drop for the time being any effort to help the industry by trying to limit wool imports through a system of international quotas.
>
> Mr. Kennedy's decision was said to have been made known to the industry by Christian A. Herter, the President's special representative for trade negotiations, at a secret meeting last Wednesday in Washington.
>
> EUROPEANS OPPOSED
>
> Herter met with members of the U.S. Wool Textile Advisory Committee following a trip to Western Europe during which he encountered stiff resistance to suggestions that wool imports be controlled through a system similar to the International Cotton Textile Agreement that went into effect last fall.
>
> At the meeting Herter reportedly told the industry in soft but unmistakeable language that the Kennedy administration plans to take no steps at this time to cut back wool imports.
>
> The President himself is reported to have told Senator John O. Pastore, Democrat, of Rhode Island, last Friday that the domestic industry could expect no help.
>
> It is understood that both Herter and the President indicated that the decision against aiding the industry would be periodically reviewed and was always open to reconsideration in the light of new facts.
>
> Mr. Kennedy's decision will have political repercussions among the New England and Western Senators who have been putting pressure on him to provide assistance to the domestic wool industry. During the 1960 presidential campaign he promised to help the industry.
>
> LIBERAL POLICY SEEN
>
> But the decision will be welcomed in Western Europe, particularly in the big wool-exporting countries of Britain and Italy. Together with Japan they supply 75 percent of the wool that is imported by the United States.
>
> In Europe and Japan the decision will be taken as a welcome indication that Mr. Kennedy is determined to pursue a liberal policy under the 1962 Trade Act even in the face of domestic pressures.
>
> Herter is reported to have flatly told the domestic wool industry that there is no way to aid them with the new trade law unless the industry institutes a case under the escape clause in the act providing relief for domestic industries that can show they are being harmed by tariff concessions.
>
> The wool industry has been unwilling to proceed under this clause because it does not think it could win its case. The new law provides that trade concessions must be "a major factor" in depressing domestic industries before relief will be given them.
>
> Herter is also understood to have ruled out for now an international wool agreement along the lines of the cotton agreement or a finding that wool imports must be restricted because the domestic industry is vital to national security.
>
> The domestic wool industry has favored an international agreement to limit imports, which have increased from a negligible amount 10 years ago to about 20 percent of total U.S. consumption.

Mr. Speaker, if this story reflects the actual views of the administration, it is a sad, sad day for the American wool businesses and the thousands of jobs they provide.

According to Mr. Duscha, the President has decided against fair play for the woolen industry. He has rejected the fairplay principle of according the woolen industry similar treatment as that given the cotton industry.

He has also refused to impose quantitative restrictions pending an agreement among the major wool-exporting countries.

The only relief, suggested in the article, is under the escape clause. Now, escape-clause proceedings require time and the outcome is by no means certain.

I hope Mr. Duscha's article does not represent the final decision of this administration. Further, I hope the President will make his views known directly to the people.

On March 8, 1963, the board of directors of the Northern Textile Association unanimously adopted the following statement of policy:

> We have been encouraged by the President's obvious grasp of the nature of the textile import problem, and are conscious of the efforts made by the administration to deal with the problem which adversely affects not only New England and the South, but wool- and cotton-growing areas of the West and urban apparel centers.

During the first month of the present administration, a direct and forthright approach was adopted in establishing a Cabinet Committee, followed by the announcement in May of 1961 of a program that encompassed all fiber branches of the industry.

The first international cotton arrangement was completed in July of 1961, and a second early last year. Both provide means for preventing market disruption by the limitation of imports.

Although it was agreed that these arrangements would be followed promptly by action to restrain imports of textiles made of wool and other fibers, nothing has been accomplished; no international conference to restrain imports has been called; and no steps for control by the United States have been developed.

Meanwhile, imports of wool products in 1962 rose 78 percent over the level of 1961, and manmade textile imports rose 39 percent. An additional 18 wool mills closed in 1962, and the share of the U.S. market taken by foreign goods has increased by over 40 percent.

Direct appeal to the administration by Members of Congress and the industry to carry out the textile program have been to no avail. The program has continued to drift, jobs have continued to disappear, and conflicts between agencies of government grow. The program announced by the President appears to be more dependent for its implementation upon the whims and changing policies of foreign governments than upon domestic direction. Our own Government delays as a major American industry is eroded.

This situation is known to textile producers and textile workers, to apparel manufacturers and apparel workers, and to wool growers throughout the country.

With a deep sense of responsibility to the employees and people in the communities where textile and apparel plants are located, to those who produce the fibers we use, and to those in the Congress who have worked for a solution of this problem, the board of directors of the Northern Textile Association calls this ominous situation to the attention of the public and to those members of Government who are unaware of the situation or whose opposition to the clear intention of the President has contributed to this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, as may be seen from the foregoing, 18 woolen mills closed in 1962. The share of the U.S. market taken by foreign goods has increased by more than 40 percent.

This situation is grave and a satisfactory solution is nowhere in sight.

I hope the President's advisers will carefully consider the Northern Textile Association's statement.

As things now stand, the Kennedy administration is the court of last resort. Only this administration can save American woolen industries and the jobs they provide.

SIR WINSTON AND ROCHESTER, N.Y.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Horton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the action of our colleagues in voting to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

Because of his outstanding and distinguished record in world public life, I think we are inclined to forget the close personal ties Sir Winston has to the United States. This bond, of course, extends to his own parentage, for his maternal ancestors were citizens of this Nation.

My home community of Rochester, N.Y., is particularly proud of the fact that Sir Winston's grandmother, Clara Hall, grew up in Rochester. She later married Leonard Jerome, who came to Rochester from New York City.

While in Rochester, Leonard Jerome played an important role in the development of the Native American, a daily newspaper. In 1857, his publication combined with another to become the Democrat and American, a direct forerunner of today's Rochester Democrat & Chronicle.

For these and many other reasons, I regard my opportunity to vote in favor of this bill proclaiming Sir Winston an honorary citizen as a great privilege in behalf of a great man.

APPLICATION OF INVESTMENT CREDIT TO CERTAIN LEASED PROPERTY

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to amend section 48(d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 48(d) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, CONCERNING THE APPLICATION OF THE INVESTMENT CREDIT TO CERTAIN LEASED PROPERTY

Under section 48(d) of the Internal Revenue Code the lessor of leased new section 38 property may elect to pass through the investment credit to his lessee, in effect placing the lessee in the same position as a purchaser of the property under the investment credit provisions. The present law contains an oversight, however, which places independent distributor-lessors at a competitive disadvantage with manufacturer-lessors.

Section 48(d) as presently written provides that the amount of the investment credit is based on fair market value in the case of a lease from a manufacturer, but on cost when the lease is from an independent distributor. Since most equipment dealers and distributors receive a discount of from 10 to 20 percent, this means that they can pass through a smaller investment credit than can the manufacturer of the same equipment.

For example, if a machine having a useful life of 8 years or more would sell to a customer for $100,000, and is leased by the manufacturer to the customer, the manufacturer can pass through an investment credit of $7,000—$100,000 times 0.07—to the customer. The independent distributor, however, purchases the same machine from the manufacturer at his regular dealer's discount, say 20 percent, and on a lease to the same customer can only pass through an investment credit of $5,600—$80,000 times 0.07. It is clearly to the customer's advantage in this situation to lease from the manufacturer, rather than from the independent distributor.

The investment credit was not intended to discriminate between industry groups, and in fact it is understood that the purpose of the investment credit pass through provisions of section 48(d) was to permit the lessee of qualifying property to be put in a position equal to a purchaser of the same equipment. The distinction outlined above is clearly the result of an inadvertent oversight.

Accordingly, the attached amendment is proposed to section 48(d). The amendment would permit both manufacturers and independent distributors to base the investment credit pass through on the fair market value of the property. The lessor's basis—ordinarily cost—would apply where the property was leased by one member of an affiliated group—80 percent common control—to another member of the same group. No revenue loss will result from enactment of the proposed amendment, since under present law the lessee can always obtain the maximum investment credit by leasing from the manufacturer. In fact, a revenue saving could result from the closing of a potential abuse in the affiliated corporation lease situation. This provision will insure that the investment credit provisions will not be abused by taxpayers through lease transactions between commonly controlled corporations.

THE McKELWAY PLAN FOR THE PRESIDENT JAMES MADISON MEMORIAL, AND OTHER MEMORIALS, IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL MAY BE ONLY WHISTLING IN A GRAVEYARD

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include newspaper articles.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, growing concern is being expressed at the lengthening list of memorials in the Nation's Capital. Many people have observed that this great city is coming to resemble a graveyard through the multiplication of memorials, some to forgotten people. While some have deplored this trend few have done much about coming to grips with the problem which is misusing the few acres which remain of Washington's once vast open spaces.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall has, indeed, come up with a plan to create yet another board to deal with

the problem but is it likely that it will be more successful in coping with this matter than the boards, commissions, and committees which already exist? True, the Udall plan will accomplish something—and that something is most likely to be a multiplication of memorials. These memorials would be built under the watchful eye of the Secretary of the Interior, and quite possibly would be dedicated to heroes of the majority party rather than leading Americans regardless of party affiliation, as in the past.

The problem has now been analyzed by John McKelway, of the Washington, D.C., Evening Star, and he has come up with a solution which, while it may not immediately gain unanimous approval, still looks promising. If it were anyone but a newspaperman doing the promising it would behoove us to examine this new plan most critically, but, as we all know, newspapers do not make promises lightly, and this McKelway plan may prove to be the answer we have all been looking forward to—that is, everyone but the marble salesmen.

In any event, it sheds light on the complex matters involved, and I include the McKelway plan for memorials in the Nation's Capital for the information of my colleagues and for the edification of others throughout the country concerned with these matters, particularly the preservation of land for open spaces, and high-rise developments.

The Rambler—Puts Forth a Plan

(By John McKelway)

Some 5 acres of expensive land has been lying fallow for about a year now, in the heart of the District, just south of the Library of Congress, up on Capitol Hill.

Various suggestions have been put forth for its use. But, so far, Congress—which ultimately must decide what goes up on the land—has been unable to make up its mind.

The best bet up to now seems to be a memorial to President James Madison. It would be constructed on top of an underground annex to the Library of Congress. Cost of the whole project has been set at $39 million.

The bill authorizing the structure died in Congress last year, although it was backed by such powerful personalities as Representative Smith, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the House Rules Committee, and Speaker McCormack himself.

Judge Smith liked the idea. The relentless foe of big spending saw in the memorial a chance to impress enough people with a need to turn the country around and head back for the early 1800's. He was willing, he said, to spend $15 million on the memorial for such an experiment.

But his argument was apparently unimpressive. The plans for the memorial fell through and Congress went home.

It seems a shame, to the Rambler at least.

While wandering over the vacant land up on the Hill, the Rambler feels he hit upon a happy solution. It would lead to a remarkable, arresting structure—a tourist attraction that might even top the Washington Monument.

First, an extremely large hole would have to be excavated.

Into this would go the $10 million fish aquarium that Congress authorized last year.

It would include, on this, the basement level, an office where fish research could be conducted, and a restaurant, specializing in seafood and operated by one of the restaurant owners who were asked to leave to make room for the vacant lot.

On top of the aquarium, but still below ground, would come the much-needed annex to the Library. The floors would be of glass so that bored librarians could watch the fish.

Next, the new FBI building, to prevent all the fuss over razing buildings downtown north of Pennsylvania Avenue. This, too, should be underground to avoid any architectural difficulties with the Fine Arts Commission.

Now, above ground, and skillfully supported by the old sandstone columns removed from the east front of the Capitol, would be placed an attractive parking lot for the Supreme Court.

Then, rising from this relatively flat area, would come the Madison Memorial, a Greek-temple-like building, to show we have not lost touch with the past.

It could house Presidential papers and additional offices for librarians who felt uncomfortable doing research immediately above the fish, and under the FBI.

And, of course, to demonstrate our awareness of the future, up on top of the Madison Memorial, the eight Franklin Delano Roosevelt slabs should be situated.

These could stand proudly against the sky and support, if necessary, eight statutes of prominent individuals, yet to be named and memorialized by Congress.

It is hard to see how anyone could object to such a plan. It is a beautiful compromise, saving time, money, and talk. It provides needed space and leaves room for expansion.

It would also prevent construction—for a while, anyway—of a fourth House Office Building.

Get behind it. Write your Congressman.

ELIMINATION OF CAMDEN DISTRICT OFFICE IN THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Stratton). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Glenn] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the announcement by the Internal Revenue Service of the elimination of the Camden District Office in the State of New Jersey, and the transfer of this office to the Newark office, to cover the whole State of New Jersey, on January 1, 1964.

I join with my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable William T. Cahill, in endorsing everything he has just said, and call to your attention that his First Congressional District and my Second Congressional District encompass the whole of the south New Jersey area, and that for years we have had coverage of all internal revenue matters out of the Camden office.

The Internal Revenue Department is a big branch of the Government, and undoubtedly has contact with all citizens, and particularly with those who practice law, accountancy, and specialize in this service. It is going to be a terrific hardship on our whole south Jersey area if the Camden office is closed, because the Newark office is at the other end of the State of New Jersey. Further, this will not be an economic move, and will be a disservice to the citizens of our State.

In the long run, it will cost the Government more money in expenses in sending the agents into south Jersey from the Newark office and will be of great inconvenience and expense to the taxpayers in making the long trip to Newark rather than to Camden. If there must be a comparison, it certainly will not be of great moment—considering the small amount of money that might appear to be saved in a book evaluation—when one considers the multi-million-dollar budget, and compares this to the additional expenses which will be thrust upon the taxpayers in the closing of the Camden office, and the need of all processing of income tax matters in the Newark office. I am sure that the employees in the Camden office are going to be greatly inconvenienced in that they are homeowners in the south Jersey area, and will have to sell their homes and move to the north Jersey area, if their positions are retained and transferred to the other office.

The matter of Internal Revenue Service is such an important part of our Government, and even our economy, that to make a major change of this nature just at a point when we are certainly going to need close contact with the Internal Revenue Service will only make for confusion and difficulty both to the Service and to the citizens.

I am opposed to this move, and will make my opposition known not only to the Commissioner but to the Secretary of the Treasury, and even to the President, because this is of vital importance to the welfare of the whole south Jersey area.

FLORIDA EAST COAST RAILROAD STRIKE THREATENS NATIONAL SECURITY—CUBA CRISIS MAKES TRANSPORTATION MOBILITY VITAL

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to warn of impending crisis in the Florida East Coast Railway strike. I bring the matter to your attention in the hope of preventing a tragedy which at best could deal permanent injury to Florida's economy and at worst could derail a vital sector of the national defense program.

The direct consequences of this strike are a personal tragedy for those families involved, and possibly a serious monetary loss for the over 1,000 stockholders—reliable sources indicate losses since suspension exceed one-quarter million dollars. The number now idled as a direct strike consequence is estimated at about 2,000 persons. The number unemployed as a proximate result is inestimable, but rising.

Fruit and vegetable growers and shippers are constrained to haul their produce to far distant railheads. The damage to this group alone is estimated at $35,000 per week. This economic injury compounds the distress which the industry is experiencing from the winter freeze—the most severe in Florida history.

The construction industry, already affected, is apprehensive of long-range consequences to plant operations, employment of personnel, and cost to business. Federal, State, and local projects are jeopardized.

Tourism in its peak months will be dealt a severe blow; a blow which could scarcely be endured by a community beset with a multitude of problems brought on through absorption of 150,000 to 200,000 Cuban refugees.

The increasingly serious economic plight of the Dade County, Fla., area is well known. The official unemployment rate now stands at about 6 percent. This figure ignores the large number of unemployed Cuban refugees. It is presently under revision by the Department of Labor, in coordination with the Florida Industrial Commission. Dade County officials believe that the revised figure will more than double the present figure. Add to this malady a prolonged railway strike and you have a climate conducive to rapid deterioration.

Since the FEC railway suspended operation January 23, 1963, no progress in the negotiations is in evidence. Both parties have not agreed to bring in the National Mediation Board as a mediator—labor for, FEC no response. And as yet the Board has not taken steps to establish the existence of a national emergency.

Although the National Mediation Board has not yet certified the situation as a national emergency, it is clearly a national hazard. The Nation can ill afford a major transportation rupture in the critical south Florida area. FEC's transportation facilities would play a vital role in the mobilization of south Florida should further compounded crises from Communist Cuba arise. FEC carried approximately 50 percent of landborne military troops and hardware during the Cuban crisis of October 1962.

These rail facilities must be kept fully operational in the event needed on a moment's notice for our national defense. The apathetic manner in which the disputant parties are approaching the problem suggests that they recognize neither the local nor the national danger.

It is to be hoped that all parties will be jolted into recognition of this threat.

That the dangers implicit in this situation are clear to see, I refer you, Mr. Speaker, to an article in U.S. News & World Report of March 11, 1963, which I wish made a matter of record in order to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

WHERE RAILWORKERS ARE ON STRIKE—AND TRAINS ARE RUNNING

(For years, the Florida East Coast Railway has been in financial trouble. Now it is battling unions over wages and a principle—the right to bargain outside of national patterns.

(The unions have been striking since January 23. Yet some trains are running, manned by supervisors instead of union crews. It's the company's way of trying to break the strike.)

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.—This is an on-the-scene report of how one railroad—the Florida East Coast—is trying to break a strike.

It is the story of a "rebel" carrier that pulled away from the 192 other class 1 railroads last year. Florida East Coast's aim is to establish its right to negotiate its own wage settlement with rail unions, independent of national bargaining patterns.

The Florida East Coast is a major line with 572 miles of track running mainly between Miami and Jacksonville. It serves, in addition, such cities as Daytona Beach, St. Augustine, and Palm Beach. The carrier's tracks run through one of Florida's prosperous citrus fruit belts. Much of its business is hauling fruits and vegetables.

For years, the railroad has been in financial trouble. It was in receivership nearly 30 years. On January 1, 1961, control of the carrier was passed to Edward Ball, 74-year-old Florida financier, who bought a majority of FEC's outstanding bonds while it was in receivership.

BIG LOSER

Although out of receivership, the road is still losing money. Last year it lost nearly $1.3 million, only slightly less than losses in 1961.

The railroad unions, despite FEC's financial troubles, are insisting that the carrier bargain along with the other railroads and settle on the same terms.

The strike began on January 23 when 1,200 nonoperating employees—including office-workers, track crews, and shop repairmen—walked off their jobs. The 600 operating workers—the train crews—also refused to work.

STRIKERS FIRED

The FEC management promptly announced that all the strikers were fired. Then, on February 3, some freight trains started running again. Foremen and other supervisors took the place of regular crews. But passenger trains remained idle.

By the end of February, the FEC had two freight trains operating daily, one each way, between Miami and Jacksonville. Five times a week a train is run over a branch line.

With unions out of current operations, a single crew working about 8 hours a day runs the train the length of the line. Formerly three crews were required by union work rules. Now, too, the trains are running without firemen—a form of featherbedding other railroads are trying to end for good.

Getting rid of featherbedding when, and if, a settlement is reached is regarded as a side issue. The main questions, as defined by both sides in the dispute, are as follows:

1. The railroad insists on negotiating a settlement that meets its own situation. The unions are demanding the same pay raises granted by other roads in 1962.

2. Florida East Coast contends that its wages already are far above the going rate in Florida for comparable work. An example cited: FEC stenographers earn from $91 to $100 a week, compared with a general Florida average of $61 to $70. The unions say rail employees are specialists, deserving higher pay.

The company's positon in the dispute was spelled out by Winfred L. Thornton, vice president and chief operating officer.

As Mr. Thornton put it:

"You reach the place where you have to make a decision on these union wage demands. You have to decide whether to grant a pay raise you know you cannot afford, or you have to stand up and take a position against it.

"Our position is that no company can obligate itself to pay wage increases that it is financially unable to pay.

"If we agreed to pay these increases, the ultimate result could only be financial ruin.

"The wage increase triggered the strike, but the basic issue is whether a railroad can negotiate for itself or whether it has to be a part of a national handling. We feel we have the right to negotiate for ourselves.

"The union organizations want to keep everyone negotiating together. They are afraid that if one carrier steps out of line, next year others will do so."

Officials of the union strike committee had this to say:

"It would be dynamite for us to have separate wage agreements on each road. The National Mediation Board refused to give the Florida East Coast a separate emergency board at the start of this strike.

"The Board said the same issues had been covered in the national dispute, and an emergency board there had made its recommendations.

"This is the first time in history that a railroad has pulled out of the national handling of a dispute.

"Railroads that compete with the Florida East Coast have the same freight rates, fixed by the Government. There's no reason why this one road should get lower wage rates.

"As for the FEC talking poor mouth, there are other carriers that have been reporting losses, too. But they gave the same wage increases that the other railroads did."

OFFERED AND REJECTED

As for wages, FEC offered—and the unions rejected—a raise of 1⅔ percent retroactive to September 1, 1962, and equal increases in March and September of this year.

The "national" pay raise last year averaged about 4 percent—4 cents an hour, effective February 1, 1962, and 6.28 cents additionally last May 1.

Florida East Coast's offer, after being rejected by the unions, was withdrawn on January 30.

Where will the present controversy end? How will the railroad get back into full operation?

Each side says it is waiting for the other to change its bargaining position. Actually, no negotiations have been held since the end of January.

OPPOSING VIEWS

Mr. Thornton says the company expects to increase the volume of its freight operations as the supervisors become more experienced in handling the trains.

Union leaders predict a breakdown, since tracks and rolling stock are not getting normal maintenance.

Meanwhile shippers are pressing the Government to end the walkout. Growers of vegetables and citrus fruits along Florida's eastern shore are demanding restoration of full service. Communities which rely on FEC for passenger service are eager for settlement of the controversy.

Political pressure is being brought, too. Some Members of Congress from Florida are urging the White House to intervene. The Florida Development Commission is urging a prompt settlement.

Most of the traffic now being handled is piggyback freight—with truck trailers driven onto flatcars by nonunion truckdrivers. Most of this is general merchandise, although some perishables are being hauled in refrigerator cars.

Growers report that big crops of vegetables are due to go to market in the period just ahead. They say millions of dollars will be lost unless they can use the Florida East Coast.

Some firms have been shipping products by truck to other railroads, but there may not be enough trucks to do the job in the busy marketing season. Besides, growers say this adds greatly to shipping costs.

How it will all turn out cannot now be foreseen. But in the early days of March the end was not in sight.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I read with dismay the speech of the Honorable JOHN MARSH which appeared on page 3075 of the February 27 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is ridiculous for anyone to imply that those of us who expressed concern about activities and the excesses of the House Un-American Activities Committee "seem to be insisting that it is undemocratic and unconscionable for a democracy to post guards against its subversion."

As I stated in my remarks during the debate on appropriations for HUAC, there definitely is a need for a committee with jurisdiction over actual threats to our Government, such as sabotage and espionage. But we have no need for a committee which piously talks about its role as our guardian against subversion but which in reality uses that role to make a mockery of the basic rights of our citizens to be "wholly free to speak fearlessly for or against their officials and their laws." In many instances, this is presently being accomplished by wrongly correlating many legitimate causes, such as drives for peace, civil rights and civil liberties with communism, and un-American activities.

It was Charles Evans Hughes, in an address as president of the American Bar Association, who stated:

> The most ominous sign of our times, it seems to me, is the growth of intolerant spirit. It is more dangerous when armed, as it usually is, with sincere conviction.

Concluding his remarks, he stressed that "we be on our guard against varieties of false Americanism which profess to maintain American institutions while dethroning American ideals." Mr. Hughes sounded that alarm in 1925, but the warning could not be more apropos for today.

ALABAMA INDUSTRY COOPERATES

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to read to you and the other Members of this body a letter I recently received from the Honorable Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., Director of the Peace Corps.

I believe that this letter indicates the cooperative spirit shown by the manufacturers of Alabama and our Nation in promoting the United States in foreign fields.

This letter reads as follows:

> Last fall when I visited Ethiopia the Peace Corps volunteers there told me the country had no street signs. The volunteers offered to undertake to mount signs if we provided them with the necessary materials.
>
> When I returned home we immediately looked for the necessary materials. To the credit of several Alabamians, we not only got the materials, but we were also able to get the street signs made at no expense to the Government.
>
> Republic Steel Corp. provided the sheet metal. Then Mr. William C. Ireland, president of the Vulcan Sign & Stamping Co. of Birmingham, offered to stamp the signs. The Nifty Manufacturing Co. of Birmingham volunteered to package them for shipment to Ethiopia. Painting materials were acquired through the efforts of Mr. William E. Hood, also of Birmingham, who is president of the National Paint, Varnish & Lacquer Association. The street signs are now on their way to Ethiopia.
>
> This is one example of many where American citizens and private organizations have responded to help the Peace Corps. In this case Alabama really did a tremendous job for us.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is a typical example of what can be done by the cooperation of industry and I am proud that the industries of Alabama have taken it upon themselves to be of assistance in the interest of promoting peace throughout the world.

SALUTE TO ALABAMA VETERANS

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of this body a letter I have recently received from the Honorable J. S. Gleason, Jr., Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, of which I am very proud. I am certain that all Alabamians are proud of this letter since the information that Mr. Gleason furnished me certainly indicates that Alabamians have done more than their share in the service of their country.

Alabama was the 22d State to enter the Union. It entered the Union on December 14, 1819. It seceded from the Union on January 11, 1861, and Montgomery became the Capital of the Confederacy in Febraury of 1861. In 1865, after the War Between the States, the Constitution of Alabama adopted and ratified the 13th amendment abolishing slavery, nullified the ordinance of secession and provided for the election of State officers.

In the ensuing years, Alabama contributed to the national welfare as a great State and the men of Alabama served in the Armed Forces of the United States with great credit.

I would like to quote a paragraph from Mr. Gleason's letter:

> The fact that 7 out of every 10 Alabama men between the ages of 35 and 39 years are war veterans is a solid testimony of the Cotton State's contribution to this Nation's successful struggle for freedom—not only for ourselves but for others—in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. I am proud, as I know you are, to have a part in our country's effort now to "care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan."

There are some 316,000 Alabama war veterans. This means that 1 out of every 11 citizens of our fine State has served his country; one-third of the civilians over 18 years of age has served in either World War I, World War II, or the Korean war.

Eighty-three percent of our veterans are employed, of which 43 percent are craftsmen, foremen, operators, or in similar work. One out of every four is a professional or technical worker, manager, official, or proprietor. One out of seven employed veterans is a clerical or sales worker. One out of eight is a service worker, laborer, or farmworker; and 1 out of 25 is a farmowner or manager.

If you consider the number of veterans who have attained the age of 60 years or more and who have been institutionalized or are in school, there are less than 3½ percent of our veterans who are unemployed. This speaks highly for our State and we are proud of these men. The average income for a veteran—if single—is some $4,014 per year or, if head of a family, $5,395 per year.

I take this opportunity to talk to you about the great State of Alabama, the Cotton State, not only because I am most proud of my heritage and my State, but because I believe that the men and women of the State of Alabama who gave so much during the trying days of strife, have indeed honored us with their unselfish loyalty to their country and they have also indicated outstanding competence as veterans of the various wars in which they have participated.

I salute these men of my fine State and I salute all other veterans who have participated in the various wars in which the United States has been involved for they have demonstrated the true meaning of democracy and that they are willing to lay down their lives in defense of this great country of ours.

RESIGNATION FROM AND APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

> HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
> *Speaker of the House,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: I greatly appreciate having been appointed by you as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Mexico on March 18, 1963.
>
> It was a wonderful opportunity, I thought, to help strengthen our relationship with our good neighbors to the south.
>
> I find, however, that I will be unable to attend the meeting and therefore submit my resignation.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> J. IRVING WHALLEY,
> *Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–420, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Guanajuato, Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 20. An act to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Healey (at the request of Mr. Keogh), for Tuesday, March 12, 1963, on account of illness.

Mr. Smith of Virginia (at the request of Mr. Hardy), for an indefinite period on account of illness in family.

Mr. Riehlman (at the request of Mr. Arends), for March 13 and 14, on account of official business with House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. Gurney (at the request of Mr. Halleck), for March 13 and 14, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Adair, for 30 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. Widnall (at the request of Mr. Clancy), for 5 minutes today.

Mr. Pelly (at the request of Mr. Clancy) for 1 hour March 13.

Mr. Glenn (at the request of Mr. Clancy) for 5 minutes today.

Mr. Rogers of Florida, for 30 minutes on tomorrow, Wednesday, March 13, 1963.

Mr. Olsen of Montana (at the request of Mr. Smith of Iowa), for 10 minutes on March 14, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Philbin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Nedzi.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Bruce.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Clancy) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Westland.

Mr. Findley.

Mr. Pillion.

Mr. Derounian.

Mr. Barry.

Mr. Short in two instances.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Smith of Iowa) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. Sullivan.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 13, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

539. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the Annual Report of the U.S. Soldiers' Home for the fiscal year 1962, pursuant to 24 U.S.C. 59, 60; to the Committee on Armed Services.

540. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain laws enacted by the Sixth Guam Legislature, 1962, pursuant to section 19 of the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

541. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1964 involving decreases in the amount of $8 million in new obligational authority, and $2,225,000 in an administrative expense limitation for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 81); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

542. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of unnecessary costs incurred by the Department of the Navy in the procurement of airborne early warning search radars; to the Committee on Government Operations.

543. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission for the period of its existence, June 28, 1958, through September 1, 1962; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PHILBIN: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 307. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1087. A bill to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve; with amendment (Rept. No. 91). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 277. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1960, relative to the transfer of certain public lands to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada; with amendment (Rept. No. 92). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1892. A bill to repeal the act of October 22, 1919 (41 Stat. 293; 4 U.S.C. 351–355, 357–360); with amendment (Rept. No. 93). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2844. A bill to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have; without amendment (Rept. No. 94). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2835. A bill to clarify the status of circuit and district judges retired from regular active service; without amendment (Rept. No. 95). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2845. A bill to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting judicial business; without amendment (Rept. No. 96). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 824. A bill to incorporate Science Service, Inc., for the purposes indicated by Public Law 85–875; with amendment (Rept. No. 97). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TOLL: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2842. A bill to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 98). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2833. A bill to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding; without amendment (Rept. No. 99). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2849. A bill to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 100). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4715. A bill to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 101). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1544. A bill for the relief of David H. Forman and Julia Forman; with amendment (Rept. No. 88). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2291. A bill regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass; without amendment (Rept. No. 89). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2294. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz; without amendment (Rept. No. 90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1230. A bill for the relief of Nicholas E. Villareal; without amendment

(Rept. No. 102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3623. A bill for the relief of Col. Frank D. Schwikert, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3625. A bill for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3626. A bill for the relief of Ronnie E. Hunter; without amendment (Rept. No. 105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3627. A bill for the relief of Arthur C. Berry and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1535. A bill to amend section 2 of Private Law 87–673; without amendment (Rept. No. 107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 4774. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for reform of personal and corporate income tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 4775. A bill to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by the taxpayer for the education of a dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4776. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide increased tax incentives for individuals and corporations which manufacture or produce gooda for export by providing that amounts derived from an increase in exports of such goods will be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 4777. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4778. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 4779. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 4780. A bill to amend section 84(a) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for three divisions within the northern district for the U.S. district courts in California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 4781. A bill to provide for the tariff classification of certain particleboard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 4782. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery on a portion of the site Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Fla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H.R. 4783. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4784. A bill to revise the provisions of law relating to the methods by which amounts made available to the States pursuant to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 and title XII of the Social Security Act are to be restored to the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4785. A bill to revise the provisions of law relating to the methods by which amounts made available to the States pursuant to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 and title XII of the Social Security Act are to be restored to the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 4786. A bill for the relief of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4787. A bill to provide for the designation of a highway from Tampa, Fla., to Miami, Fla., as a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 4788. A bill to amend section 84(a) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for three divisions within the northern district for the U.S. district courts in California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 4789. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 4790. A bill to amend section 1391 of title 28 of the United States Code, relating to venue generally; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 4791. A bill to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific Flyway in the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, and Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4792. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery within Los Angeles County, Calif.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 4793. A bill relative to application of investment credit to certain leased property; to the Committee on Ways tnd Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4794. A bill to amend the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 4795. A bill to amend section 84(a) of title 28, United States Code, to provide for three divisions within the northern district for the U.S. district courts in California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 4796. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4797. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities in undergraduate and graduate institutions, and to provide additional student loan assistance for study in such institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 4798. A bill to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to extend its application to contracts for the maintenance of Federal installations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 4799. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide nonrecognition of gain where a taxpayer aged 65 or over disposes of property in connection with the acquisition of right to lifelong domiciliary care in a nursing home or home for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 4800. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to advancement by step increases of certain postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (by request):

H.R. 4801. A bill to amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 4802. A bill to provide direct aid to States and territories for educational purposes only; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 4803. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for his higher education, or for the higher education of any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 4804. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 322. Joint resolution designating March 27 as Gen. "Billy" Mitchell Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD (by request):

H.J. Res. 323. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 325. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of May 26 to June 1, 1963, as the third annual National Highway Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution relating to Panama Canal sovereignty treaty interpretations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. Res. 291. Resolution authorizing the payment of death gratuities in the case of certain employees under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol who are assigned to duty in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the calling of a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to setting a national debt limit of $350 billion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging passage of legislation to amend the Reclamation Act and any other laws or rules, to waive the application of the land limitation clause in the area above Canyon Ferry Dam in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the calling of a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to apportionment of representation in any State legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that the Federal portion of cost on Federal aid primary highways and secondary highways be increased from about 57 percent to 70 percent; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the so-called right to work laws of the respective States of this Union; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to allow singing at Mount Rushmore by nonprofessional student workers and to remove the restrictions imposed in 1962 which caused this to cease; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support construction of the Crazy Horse Memorial near Custer, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the appointment of electors of the President and Vice President on a basis similar to the election of the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take all necessary steps in promoting the sale of grain and to guarantee continuing access of U.S. wheat to the Common Market countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4805. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of the profit-sharing plan of the Arlington Realty Co. as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4806. A bill for the relief of Ulf Heinrich Goebel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4807. A bill for the relief of Ourania Hondros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 4808. A bill for the relief of Yee Chow Choi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 4809. A bill for the relief of Maria Rossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 4810. A bill for the relief of Casimira Villamil Pear; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 4811. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie Curtis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 4812. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kosara Nikolic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4813. A bill for the relief of Peter G. Corbett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4814. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yellamaty Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

65. By Mr. HANNA: Petition of the La Habra (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce opposing all plans for Federal subsidization of local transit and commuter services; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

66. By Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Petition of Dorothy N. Sutherland and 48 others to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

67. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Eugene M. Boyd, Jr., city clerk, Marysville, Calif., relative to protesting the proposed subsidy formula of the Civil Aeronautics Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Boy Scout Honors for Third District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the Third Massachusetts District, which I have the great honor and privilege to resepresent in the Congress, was signaled out for special recognition last month by the Boy Scouts of America during National Boy Scout Week.

Peter W. Kotilainen of Millbury was chosen as 1 of 12 Scouts from throughout the United States to deliver in Washington the highlights of scouting activities in region 1 as part of the annual Boy Scout Report to the Nation. His alternate was Jon David Naparstek of Ayer, also from the Third District, another outstanding young Boy Scout leader and Eagle Scout, who has been active in the affairs of Mohegan Council of Central Massachusetts.

Peter, who is the junior assistant scoutmaster of Troop 9, sponsored by the Millbury Federated Congregational Methodist Church, was designated to represent the entire New England region during the official weeklong ceremonies in Washington, New Jersey, and New York. In addition, he was awarded a $300 college scholarship by the Reader's Digest.

During his 3-day visit to Washington, Peter attended the 53d anniversary breakfast in the Presidential Room of the Statler-Hilton and met many leaders in national affairs who were honored as helpful friends of Scouting.

Among other Scout honors earned by Peter during his active association in the Boy Scout movement are the Eagle Scout Bronze Palm Medal and the God and Country Award. In addition, he holds 30 merit badges for achievement in various phases of Scouting.

In 1961, Peter was named Boy Scout of the Year by Troop 109. More recently, the troop, Beaver Patrol, under Peter's leadership, was designated the best camping patrol by Mohegan Council. In 1960, he was a patrol leader at the National Boy Scout Jamboree at Colorado Springs.

A junior at Millbury High School, Peter is active in the debating and science clubs and a member of the track team. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Toivo Kotilainen of 15 Alpine Way.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to extend my congratulations to Peter Kotilainen and Jon Naparstek and their families who may well be proud of the honors granted these young leaders by the Boy Scouts in recognition of their leadership and work in Scouting. To Peter and Jon, I also extend my very best wishes for their continued advancement in Scouting and community achievement. I predict brilliant futures for both these young men.

Physical Fitness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a report from Mr. Phillip Lorenc, of Macomb, Ill., a student teacher who has aided Mr. Gene Pavelonis, physical education instructor in a physical fitness

program for seventh and eighth grades at Bushnell Junior High School, Bushnell, Ill.

This program was undertaken as a result of President Kennedy's recommendation for improved physical fitness. A program adopted was an 18-item motor efficiency test, without apparatus. Dr. Curiton, originator of this test, demonstrated it at Western Illinois University, in Macomb, to all the school systems in the Macomb area. Each boy was rated on each of the 18 tests and the 2 top-ranking students were Tom Franck and Mike Steelman. Tom passed all 18 and Mike all but 1.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 45th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. We in Congress join freemen everywhere in observing this anniversary. We have a moral obligation to do so, for we speak not only for ourselves but for those men and women of Lithuania who must observe this anniversary in silence.

Lithuania is not a make-believe nation. It has a long and honorable history, dating back to A.D. 1009, nearly 500 years before the discovery of America. It was not only the first nation in Eastern Europe to embrace Christianity but it also was the first nation which helped stem the Tartar invasion from the East. Admittedly, the heavy Russian suppression of this small nation and the Russian reliance on deportation, execution, and colonization methods dim hopes of Lithuanian survival as a nation and as a people. Nevertheless, we should recall that Lithuania has emerged from seemingly hopeless situations in the past. During the 120-year Russian occupation, from 1795 to 1915, there were five insurrections. And when the chaos of World War I allowed Lithuania to break its chains, its people formed a free and independent government out of the ruins and amidst the opposition of its hostile neighbors. A free Lithuania affirmed its cultural traditions, and maintained a democratic form of government for 22 years until it was, once again, invaded by Russia in violation of four treaties of friendship and nonaggression.

The captive peoples of Lithuania and other Eastern European satellites stand as constant reminders to the world that it is the Soviet Union which maintains the largest colonial empire on earth today. If permitted a choice between national independence and membership in the Soviet Union, there is no doubt in my mind as to what the people of Lithuania would prefer. Let us continue to call for free elections and freedom for the captive peoples. There must be no moratorium in this struggle. I join my colleagues in expressing sympathy for the misfortune which has so often befallen the Lithuanian people, and in expressing our hope that one day they will again be free.

Fiscal Cat Is Out of the Bag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the March edition of my newsletter in the Record, so that it may have as wide a circulation as possible:

FISCAL CAT IS OUT OF THE BAG

Well, the fiscal cat is out of the bag. President Kennedy now has said that he wants a $10 billion tax cut this year, whether we get tax reforms or not, even though this means a $12 billion deficit.

This appears to me to be the old, old theory of borrowing money to spend our way into prosperity. Now, I can understand a businessman going to the bank and borrowing some money to finance the purchase of new equipment which would produce a profit for his company. But, a businessman would have to show that the new equipment would make a profit or he'd be turned down flat because, as many of you know who have borrowed from a bank, it wants assurance that it's going to be repaid. But not the Federal Government, oh no. The Secretary of the Treasury not only says it won't be paid back, but very frankly states that the Federal Government will continue at least through 1967 to have deficits.

The fact that the value of our dollars and our gold supply have reached a critical stage doesn't seem to worry the administration either. Only this week the Treasury announced it borrowed another $100 million in marks from Germany last month. This loan is in addition to the $100 million in marks Germany lent us in January and the $380 million in lire, francs and marks we borrowed from several European nations last year. Also, recently our gold supply was depleted by $100 million.

This is a sad situation for the United States, which once was the place other countries came for credit. Now we have to go out and beg for loans. How many times can we go to the well? As the saying goes, what happens when the chickens come home to roost?

Now, if I can judge by the replies I've received from my February newsletter, 99 percent of you believe this sort of fiscal policy is strictly for the birds. I agree. Almost all of you said that we must cut spending before we cut taxes. Again I agree. Well, some of us here in Congress are getting at it and when we've come up with a specific program of cutting expenditures, some people in some areas probably won't like it—and, I'll get some complaints. But, that old saying that you can't have your cake and eat it too really applies here.

Let me add, at this time, my thanks for your letters in reply to my last newsletter.

TFX HASSLE

Maybe, you've read about the TFX hassle. Briefly, Boeing and General Dynamics were competitors for a $6 or $7 billion contract for an aircraft. Despite the fact that all the military people recommended the Boeing plane, Mr. McNamara, the Secretary of Defense, and other civilians awarded the contract to General Dynamics. Politics?

General Dynamics has its plant in Texas. Boeing, of course, is in Wichita and Seattle. Senator McClellan is presently conducting an investigation into this matter, and after talking with some members of the committee, I have a hunch that the deal is going to smell to high heaven.

Certainly, if Boeing had the best proposal they should get the business even if they're not located in Texas. Y'know what some people are calling the TFX now? The LBJ. And, it costs somewhere between $80 to $400 million more.

Sincerely yours,

Jack Westland.

AS I SEE IT

(By Helen Westland)

Way back in 1945 I was a member of the American Red Cross Clubmobile unit serving in Europe during World War II. Much time was spent at ports through which almost every U.S. military unit in this theater passed at one time or another. When they did, they gave me one of their shoulder patches, telling me how their unit really won the war. I finally had all these colorful patches sewed on a jacket.

Someone mentioned to me that 20 years from then this "patch jacket" would be an historical item. Recently at a dinner, I had the privilege of sitting next to Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Director of the Smithsonian Institution, where historical items are kept. I told him about my patch jacket and he asked if I would give it to the Smithsonian. I told him I'd leave it to the Smithsonian in my will. Someday you may see it listed as "Westland's Patch Jacket," worn by the wife of the Second District Congressman of Washington State in World War II. It hardly seems possible that all of that is history today.

VISITORS

Bow: Mr. and Mrs. George Hammer.

Edmonds: Mr. L. K. Pennington, Mr. William G. Hathaway.

Marysville: Mr. Ralph A. Augustavo.

Mount Vernon: Lynn A. Dale.

Port Angeles: Mr. and Mrs. Ken Peterson, Mr. R. M. Hurt, Mr. Glenn Simkins.

Arthur Krock: A True Journalist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, as a voice crying in the journalistic wilderness, Arthur Krock is one of the great journalists of our time—independent, courageous, unmanaged. Despite his personal friendship for President Kennedy, he has properly criticized the Kennedy propaganda machine, at which Hitler would have marveled.

I have written the editor of the New York Times, expressing my appreciation of a man like Arthur Krock:

March 7, 1963.

Mr. John B. Oakes,
Editor, New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Oakes: Congratulations to the New York Times' columnist, Arthur Krock for his fine article on New Frontier management of news.

No more callous disregard for the intelligence and trust of the American public has ever been shown by any administration in the history of our country. I am more than a little amazed that President Kennedy, with his affinity for the memory of that predecessor, seems to have forgotten FDR's words: "The truth is found when men are free to pursue it." Does the current truth hurt so much that he would prevent us from finding it out?

As Mr. Krock points out, even more devious is the determined pursuit of "managing the purveyors of the news." It is to the great credit of many news people that some of these attempts have met with failure; but to the extent some have been successful, a gross injustice has been perpetrated on the Nation.

It is not a happy thing to witness an administration so desperately committed to self-perpetuation that it would stifle dissent by smothering "unfavorable" facts, not only from its political opponents, but its supporters as well.

The Times can be especially proud of its distinguished columnist Arthur Krock for his timely caveat of March 1963.

Sincerely yours,

STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN.

Maynard, Mass., Post Office Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on March 2 the new modern post office at Maynard, Mass., was dedicated with an impressive and well-conducted program arranged by Postmaster Frank C. Sheridan.

Following is the text of the dedicatory address I delivered on this memorable occasion:

MAYNARD, MASS., POST OFFICE DEDICATION

It is a very happy privilege and honor for me to be here with you today for the dedication of this beautiful, new, modern post office for the town of Maynard, and it is a special pleasure indeed, to be introduced so graciously by my old and very dear friend, Postmaster Frank Sheridan who, since the year 1935, has so conspicuously, ably, and outstandingly served this great town as its postmaster.

The Maynard Post Office goes way back in the history of our country and was first established May 30, 1850, as the Assabet Post Office. The name was changed to Maynard Post Office May 8, 1871.

Frank Sheridan has some very illustrious predecessors, Amory Maynard, one of the founding fathers, Asahel Balcom, Lorenzo Maynard, John Harriman, Abel Haynes, Benjamin and Ernest Johnson, George Flood, William R. Hall, Arthur Walker, and then the very distinguished Arthur J. Coughlan who came along in 1915, later to be succeeded by Timothy Moynihan and William Stockwell, all most worthy predecessors.

I think Frank would be interested in knowing that the salary wasn't very attractive when the office was first started. The first year, for example, the annual salary was fixed at $61.78, out of total net proceeds of $82.89, and it was 1897 before the salary went up to $1,300.

But salary or no salary, these gentlemen all gave a good account of themselves for the Federal Government and for the town, and we are proud today to acknowledge our debt of gratitude to them, and to say to our good friend, Frank, that he has left an indelible imprint upon the history of Maynard for his fine, outstanding service and spirit of dedication.

The early postmasters, obviously, had to have some other income. Amory Maynard, one of Maynard's founders, owned the big mill right across from the Town House served as a boarding house for mill employees and was subsequently taken over by the town as a municipal building. That building was torn down and our beautiful new post office has been erected on its site.

Postmaster Balcom was a successful and prosperous farmer. John Harriman ran a laundry. Abel Haynes, the general store; Ernest Johnson, a drugstore; George Flood, a livery stable; Arthur Coughlan, a man of surpassing handsomeness and personality, as well as ability, was also a selectman, and a most popular figure in the town.

The Federal Government recognizes that Maynard is a great historic community tracing back to the proudest origins of our country; its loyal devoted people stand unsurpassed in the Nation, because through the years they have given practical demonstration, not only in war but in peace, of their peerless Americanism and high patriotic motives, their reliable, industrious, enterprising habits, and their willingness to exert their very best efforts for the common good and the national well-being.

It is particularly appropriate, therefore, that today in these exercises, the Federal Government should provide this splendid new edifice under the post office lease construction program with its modern appointments and facilities, manned by a talented, devoted postmaster and a rare staff of faithful, capable postal workers, than which no finer can be found in the entire land.

The architects, engineers, and builders have done their job with great skill, capacity, and effect.

These facilities are admirably located, are charming and well constructed, are practical and functional, and are set up in every way most efficiently to serve the people and the town of Maynard.

High ranking members of our great Post Office Department are here today and I am happy indeed to congratulate them, and all others who have had any part in making these striking new facilities a reality.

I realize that today one of Frank Sheridan's fondest dreams has come to pass, because he persisted in reaching this objective when only a few of us irresponsible enthusiasts were beating the bushes for this new post office.

Fortunately, in the end, by our joint efforts, we were able to impress the Post Office Department with the need and desirability for it, and the project was finally approved. So, my friends, here we are to hail the event and to express our gratitude and appreciation to all those who helped us so generously. Surely we are making history here on this spot.

There is one more duty that we must perform today and that is to render our humble thanks to the good Lord for having guided and sustained our loyal people and our great Nation in the ways of order, security, freedom and personal liberty.

The clamors and threats of communism and materialistic philosophies may be heard through the world, and at times, they may even be heard not far from our friendly shores and reverberating through our smiling skies.

But we can be secure and confident with one thought: that if we follow the example of the gallant patriotic men and women who preceded us and stand with the same steadfastness, the same high purpose and the same firm determination which they always showed, against the disturbances, unsettlements and dangers that press upon us from time to time, that we will find the ready and successful answer to the problems of present and future, grave though they may be; that by the common efforts and the great strength that only free men and women devoted to lofty, spiritual ideals may know, we are destined to preserve and enrich the freedoms we cherish and aid the whole world in finding the blessings of universal peace.

May this beautiful, new, post office facility stand here for many years to come to serve the people of Maynard and as eloquent testimony to our great, undying faith in our beloved country.

Cost of Government Purchases To Go Down in the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL WILSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, though Raleigh, N.C., is not a part of my district, my study into Government procurement has led to my interest in an industry there. Due to a decision by the Comptroller General on a case I submitted last November, that industry is about to get a Government contract and save $10,000 for the taxpayers.

Due to this firm's efficiency and the Comptroller General's decision to uphold its position, a radio transceiver is going to be built for the Federal Aviation Agency at a lower cost than would have been the case. If there are more decisions with this conclusion, we can expect the cost of Government purchasing to go down in the future.

Many of my colleagues are aware that for months and months I have made a detailed study of electronics purchases by the Government. In many cases the taxpayer has been the loser. In some I have been able to report successes in changed regulations and in savings to the taxpayers. The latter is true today—a happy ending for manufacturer, taxpayer, Government, and, yes, this Congressman.

Last November this firm outlined for me a problem it had with the FAA. Quoting for manufacture of a small radio transceiver, it inadvertently neglected to include a detailed description of the equipment with its proposal, as prescribed by FAA regulations. Because of this, it was ruled out of the procurement. At this very same time, this same firm was making the identical equipment for FAA under another contract, and for this reason was able to be low bidder. In other words, because of a technicality, this firm's competence was to be denied, and the price for this equipment was to rise by $10,000.

After studying the case closely, I contacted the Comptroller General and said:

> While the difference between this company's bid and that of the next low bidder does not exceed $10,000, it appears to me that any award other than to this firm would be a waste of tax dollars.

After a thorough study, the Comptroller General agreed with me and advised me by letter, March 7, 1963, that he had made a determination in favor of the Raleigh firm and it should get the contract. Despite the clerical error, the Comptroller General acted in behalf of saving the taxpayer's money. It is too bad we do not have more such people.

This is another case in a long list I am going to present in this session. I will also suggest legislative corrections, such as my H.R. 4409. As these cases are compiled, I hope the Rules Committee will take heed and report H.R. 4409 to the floor for action by the House. Its enactment into law, plus enactment of other legislation I shall soon propose, would curtail many abuses now being carried out in the name of national defense and would result in tremendous savings to the taxpayer.

How To Reduce the World's Largest Budget—United States Loses $250 Million Annually on Electronic Computer Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, a minimum of $250 million could be saved annually in the totally irresponsible, uncoordinated leasing of electronic computer systems by the various Federal agencies.

At least five authoritative Federal official studies and reports have proven that massive savings could be realized by the outright purchase of electronic computer systems in place of the prevalent leasing arrangements.

As of June 30, 1963, a total of 1006 electronic data processing machines will have been installed. Despite the proven recommendations and experience that enormous savings are realized under outright purchases, 867 or 86 percent of Federal computer systems were, or will be, leased instead of purchased.

Based upon a detailed study of 523 of the 1,006 computer systems, $148 million could be saved over a 5-year period by the purchase instead of the present leasing contracts. In addition to these savings averaging $29.6 million per year, $105 million could be saved annually after the 5-year period by outright purchase of these 523 systems.

Another $100 million per year could be saved by purchase procurement instead of leasing contracts on the remaining 483 computer systems, and upon excessive overcharges for maintenance contracts on the 1,006 electronic computer systems.

Another $50 million per year could be saved by the purchase instead of the rental of electronic equipment used in classified military, intelligence, surveillance operations; by advertised competitive low bidding; by coordinated Federal volume discount purchases.

Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1963, the General Accounting Office (GAO), under the direction of the Honorable Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, issued an investigative and audit report entitled "Financial Advantages of Purchasing Over Leasing of Electronic Data Processing Equipment in the Federal Government."

This report is a shocking indictment of our system of Federal procurement of electronic equipment. It reflects a complete breakdown of managerial and administration accountability for public funds.

Although the Budget Bureau requirement states that Federal agencies should purchase electronic equipment if rental charges exceed purchase and maintenance costs over a 6-year period, our Federal officials continue to lease nearly all needed equipment. Under the Budget Bureau regulations, each agency is permitted to avoid purchasing where, in its discretion, there may be anticipated changes in data processing requirements.

The intent of the Budget Bureau purchase regulations is continually being violated by our Federal procurement officials.

Mr. Speaker, for specific examples of gross incompetence, maladministration and mismanagement of public trust, I quote from the Comptroller General's report of March 6, 1963:

> According to the inventory of the Bureau of the Budget, by June 1963, there will be 42 IBM 7090 and IBM 7094 systems in Federal usage. Of these, 6 are to be purchased and 36 are to be leased.
>
> Total estimated savings of $57,449,000 could be achieved over an initial 5-year period of use through purchasing rather than leasing these 36 systems. It shows also that estimated savings for each year of continued use past this period would be $34,378,000.
>
> Thus if these systems were purchased, rather than rented, and used for 7 years, the Government would realize savings of approximately $126,200,000.
>
> * * * * *
>
> According to the Budget Bureau, there will be 16 IBM 7080 systems in use by June 30, 1963. Of these, 1 is to be purchased and 15 are to be leased.
>
> Estimated savings of $24,413,000 could be realized over an initial 5-year period through purchasing and there would be additional savings of $11,778,000 for each year past this period.
>
> If used for a total of 7 years, the purchase of the 15 systems would produce estimated savings of $47,696,000.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We believe the Government could save hundreds of millions of dollars in the next several years as a result of the financial benefits of purchasing.
>
> The Air Force was leasing 36 IBM 650 systems. The rentals range from $4,200 to $23,000 per month. Eight of the nine components could have been purchased for approximately the cost of 1 year's rental; purchasing would have saved $146,000 over the intended period of use.

Mr. Speaker, the audit report of the Comptroller General states that both rental prices and purchase price of electronic computer systems are set by the manufacturers and are not negotiated by our Federal agencies.

Similarly, the maintenance contracts are accepted by our agencies without negotiation.

The Federal Government is at the mercy of electronic computer manufacturers. The uncoordinated separate procurement of electronic computer equipment by each Federal agency loses for the Government huge annual savings that would accrue from volume purchase discounts.

Mr. Speaker, the whole fabric of our electronic computer systems procurement is tainted with irregularity, illegality, incompetence and mismanagement.

Part 13: Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology of Castro and Cuba—January 14, 1963 to January 23, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, today's continuation of my chronology on Castro and Cuba involves a rehash of Fidel Castro's five point program—which he had announced on October 23, 1962, as being the only basis on which the Cuban and U.S. crisis could be solved.

These five points were:

First. End of economic blockade and all measures of commercial and economic pressure exercised against Cuba by the United States.

Second. End of all subversive activities, dropping and landing of arms and explosives by air and sea, organization of mercenary invasions, infiltration of spies and saboteurs, "all of which actions are organized in the territory of the United States and certain accomplice countries."

Third. End of pirate attacks carried out from bases in the United States and Puerto Rico.

Fourth. End of all violations of air and naval space by U.S. planes and ships.

Fifth. U.S. withdrawal from the naval base of Guantanamo and return of this territory to Cuba.

That these five points had suddenly assumed importance to not only Castro but also to the U.S.S.R. and Red China was proved by their quick expression of support for the statements—which they ignored at the time the crisis was at fever pitch.

Castro, emboldened now by Kremlin support for his five points—publicly called for all Latin American revolutionaries to rise up against imperialism while denouncing the United States as "the most aggressive nation in the world."

His words stating that "a war was avoided, but the peace was not won," were strikingly similar to many uttered by American citizens, including those in the political field—proving that at least there was agreement between Castro and the United States on one issue.

The only ones who appeared completely happy and satisfied with the arrangements were the Soviets—because as Khrushchev so obligingly had pointed out—the Communist regime was firmly fixed on the island of Cuba—and in exchange for only 40 or so missiles, a few planes, a few Soviet troops.

Castro designated our Alliance for Progress foreign aid program for Latin America as reactionary and antiquated—declaring it would not "prosper because it is a policy of exploitation." This was a clear indication of the Communist line to be preached in South America regarding our efforts to aid them—but many North Americans—while agreeing on the term "exploitation"—felt they were the ones being exploited—not the Latin Americans.

Diplomatic immunity had its day in court—when one of our Federal judges withdrew same from a Cuban United Nations attaché—ordering him to stand trial with two other defendants for conspiracy and failure to register as foreign agents. Since our U.S. Communist Party had also been ordered some time back to register, this seemed only just to many Americans—although Communists of all nations felt it was rank discrimination and entirely unjustified.

Once again Khrushchev effectively stopped any tendency on the part of U.S. citizens toward complacency, by pointing out his principle of coexistence—which had been violently criticized by Red Chinese—had in the past given the Communists time to build strength and was essential for future victories. He again termed ours an "ultimate defeat" because Cuba still remained a Communist nation. About this time all the Communist nations of the Western World jumped on Khrushchev's bandwagon—calling for unity and a ceasing of "washing their dirty linen" in public. The Red Chinese also declared the Cuban people, with the sympathy and support of peoples of labor in America and the world," had won the victory of Cuba's independence, her sovereignty, and fruits of her revolution. This of course did not leave our American laboring people with a good taste in their mouth.

Khrushchev indulged in his favorite pastime of "rocket rattling," declaring that as many as 120 Russian missiles were now ready to be launched at the United States in case of war, and claiming that while 40 rockets had been withdrawn from Cuba, 80 or probably even 120 had been set up in other "better places than Cuba," although he failed to name the places.

So while the Communists castigated their party members for lack of unity and irresponsible attacks on their policy, our own political parties in this country were suffering the same throes because of disagreement not only as to the proper policy but the degree of information to which the American public was entitled on the Cuban issue. This of course was not an issue in the Communists' quarrels because their citizens are not guaranteed the privilege of freedom of the press or information.

Senator FULBRIGHT renounced the constitutional right of the Congress to assist in foreign policy decisions by his statement that they—the Congress—interfered with the effectiveness of the President's leadership thus becoming at one and the same time a most unpopular man with many of his colleagues and a goodly segment of the American public. He pointed out that during the October Cuban crisis the leaders of Congress were informed, but not consulted, and deemed this to be quite proper. However, many felt that he failed by not adding that the President did receive counsel and advice—although not by congressional leaders—but instead by a group called the EX COMM—made up of some National Security Council members with a few personal additions of his own.

At long last some of the questions previously raised about Adali Stevenson's part in deliberations of the Security Council during the Cuban crisis were again brought up, and by one of the same writers who originally had brought this to the attention of the public—Stewart Alsop. However, in this instance he had the guarantee of an approved summary by Clayton Fritchey, Stevenson's official spokesman at the United Nations.

Robert Kennedy, the Attorney General and President's brother, committed what some termed his worst faux pas of a series, by allowing himself to be interviewed by the Miami Herald—as well as the U.S. News & World Report—and bringing up the subject once more of the fateful Bay of Pigs invasion. Reiterating that President Kennedy had taken full responsibility for failure of the invasion plans, he stated that the President not only had approved the plan, but it had been fully cleared by the CIA and Joint Chiefs of Staff and air cover had never been promised. Whereupon Senator GOLDWATER contradicted the Attorney General, stating he had been given a definite impression by the President, during a personal interview, that air cover had been a part of the original invasion plans, and charged Bobby Kennedy with not only "rewriting of history" but attempting "news management."

This resulted in a rash of public statements by various political leaders calling for complete investigations—and as full disclosure of the facts as possible consistent with our national security, to the American public.

Senator FULBRIGHT once again accused the Republicans of "partisanship"—but for his trouble was reminded by several newspaper columnists that he had not been heard calling for a "nonpartisan" approach during either the 1960 presidential campaign, or during President Eisenhower's administration.

Senator RUSSELL promised an investigation into the military and defense issues but not into the political issues. Senator MORSE recommended a reading of the still-secret transcript of his subcommittee hearings on Latin American affairs before partisan speeches were made but the transcripts were described by Senator GOLDWATER as being "the most inconclusive testimony I have ever read."

And once again former President Eisenhower was called upon to state whether or not his administration had conceived the ill-fated plan to invade Cuba at the Bay of Pigs—stated unequivocally that it had not, but rather had contemplated a "guerrilla type of action." And this seemed to close the chapter as far as the Eisenhower administration's part in the fiasco was concerned.

But the curiosity of the American public still mounted—and it seemed inevitable to all that something had to be done to clear up the controversy.

On one hand, many public-spirited and sincere citizens indicated they felt perhaps this curiosity was being overdone. A quotation I recently found perhaps describes their emotions to a certain degree:

> Curiosity is a kernel of the forbidden fruit, which still sticketh in the throat of a natural man, sometimes to the danger of his choking.—Fuller.

However, on the other hand, equally public-spirited citizens and equally sincere took the position which might be described by this quotation:

> The gratification of curiosity rather frees us from uneasiness, than confers pleasure. We are more pained by ignorance, than delighted by instruction. Curiosity is the thirst of the soul.—Johnson.

But the American public—not bothering with semantics—seemed rather to feel that asking for official reports giving the whole truth—as long as it did not involve giving away valuable national security information to Communist countries—was only a rightful part of their constitutional guarantees of freedom of the press and freedom of speech under a republican form of government.

Part 13 of my chronology on Castro and Cuba follows:

PART 13. SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CASTRO AND CUBA

January 14, 1963: Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vassily V. Kuznetsov came to Havana last night and gave Fidel Castro fresh assurances that the Kremlin backs the five points raised by the Cuban Prime Minister at the height of the Caribbean crisis.

The points include demands that the United States give up its Guantanamo Naval base, lift trade restrictions imposed against Cuba, and give a no-invasion pledge.

January 15, 1963: Prime Minister Fidel Castro called today for the Communist world to heal its rifts and for revolutionaries of the Western Hemisphere to rise up in violent upheaval against imperialism.

In a fiery televised speech that began last night and lasted several hours, Castro sounded his most aggressive demand yet for revolution in Latin America.

Castro's speech contained the customary denunciations of President Kennedy and the United States, which he described as "the most aggressive Nation in the world."

"For us, the Caribbean crisis has not been resolved," he said. "A war was avoided but the peace was not won.

"We don't believe in Kennedy's words," he said. "But Kennedy has given no pledge (against invasion) and if he did give it he has already withdrawn it.

"The imperialists are shipping arms, saboteurs and agents into Cuba, organizing bands of pirates and retaining a piece of our territory (the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo) that points at the heart of our nation."

Castro also attacked the U.S. sponsored Alliance for Progress as reactionary and antiquated.

"It will not prosper because it is a policy of exploitation," he said.

January 15, 1963: A Federal judge today denied diplomatic immunity to a Cuban United Nations attaché accused of sabotage conspiracy and threw doubt on immunity for staff members of any foreign U.N. missions and even for ambassadors to the U.N.

In a lengthy and perhaps precedent-setting decision, Judge Edward Weinfeld refused to grant Roberto Santiesteban a habeas corpus writ on the basis of diplomatic immunity. He ordered the Cuban to stand trial with two other defendants for conspiracy and failure to register as foreign agents.

January 15, 1963: Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev called for a truce today in the Sino-Soviet conflict.

His call for a halt in the increasingly bitter and vocal dispute between Moscow and Peiping over the Soviet Union's peaceful coexistence policy caught the free world and probably also the Communist world off balance.

In defending his principle of coexistence, Khrushchev said that in the past it had given the Communists time to build strength and was essential for future victories.

This, he claimed, was the basis of his Cuban tactics. While admitting that some critics had called removal of the rockets from Cuba "defeat," he claimed he had only been "flexible," and that President Kennedy suffered ultimate defeat because Cuba remained a Communist nation.

January 16, 1963: With Poland's Wladyslaw Gomulka setting the stage, Communist Parties of the Western world started jumping aboard Nikita S. Khrushchev's Sino-Soviet truce bandwagon today.

In a 25-minute speech to the East German Communist Party's Sixth Congress, Gomulka said that dirty linen should not be washed in public but should be cleansed patiently and quietly in "internal discussions."

"The public polemics which are damaging the cause of international unity of the Communist movement and the irresponsible attacks on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union by the leaders of some Communist Parties increased during the crisis in the Caribbean (Cuba).

"The leadership of these parties did not want to understand that the crisis was solved favorably for Cuba and the cause of world socialism, through the policy pursued by the Soviet Union."

January 16, 1963: Cuban delegate Armando Hart-Davalos made an impassioned plea at the East German Party Congress for Communist unity.

"We Cubans regard it as a vital obligation to defend Communist solidarity. With the help of serious critical analysis we should be able to prevent the present differences of opinion from reaching a crisis."

January 17, 1963: Miami, Fla., January 18.—Ninety persons, 38 of them U.S. citizens who had been living in Cuba, arrived today aboard a Pan American airliner which had flown to Havana with a load of ransom for liberated invasion prisoners.

U.S. Immigration Service officials said the other 52 passengers were relatives of the Americans.

January 18, 1963: In a speech to the East German Communist Party Congress, chief Chinese Communist delegate Wu Hsiu-Chuan stated that all the heroic Cuban people mobilized themselves, united around their revolutionary leader, comrade Fidel Castro, persevered in the five just demands for the protection of Cuba's independence and sovereignty and waged an uncompromising struggle against U.S. imperialism, thus it was the heroic Cuban people, with the sympathy and support of the peoples of labor in America and the world, who won the great victory in defense of Cuba's independence, sovereignty and the fruits of her revolution and made a great contribution to the cause of world peace.

"U.S. imperialism bullies the fainthearted but fears the stouthearted, what it fears most is the strength of a united revolutionary people."

January 18, 1963: Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev said today as many as 120 Russian missiles are ready to be launched at the United States in case of war.

"The American imperialists know that we withdrew 40 rockets from Cuba," he told East German steelworkers at Eisenhuettenstadt. "But we have set up 80, probably even 120 rockets in other places.

"Cuba is not the most convenient place to base rockets," the Communist leader said in his most anti-Western speech since he arrived for the East German Communist Party Congress last Monday. "We have better places than Cuba.

"The United States wanted to use 300,000 men against Cuba," he said. "They bared their teeth like wolves, but still did not bite. Has American imperialism lost its appetite? No, but we are a powerful club."

January 20, 1963: The Swiss announced tonight that the way had been cleared to allow between 900 and 1,000 more relatives of Cuban invasion prisoners to leave Cuba aboard the American ship *Shirley Lykes*.

An Embassy spokesman said, "The Cuban authorities have said they will make available exit permits for between 900 and 1,000 Cuban citizens directly related to the former Playa Giron (Bay of Pigs) invasion prisoners."

January 20, 1963: Citing the Cuban crisis, Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, urged today that the powers of the President to handle foreign policy be strengthened.

FULBRIGHT said foreign policy powers in Congress interfere with the effectiveness of the President's leadership.

This was demonstrated clearly in the October Cuban crisis when there was no alternative to Presidential decision and action, FULBRIGHT said.

"The circumstances were such that it was quite impossible to seek the counsel of the leaders of Congress, who, in fact, and quite properly, were informed but not consulted," the Senator continued.

January 20, 1963: Stewart Alsop said today that Adlai E. Stevenson advised the National Security Council to consider giving up the Guantanamo Naval Base, if necessary, in exchange for the dismantling of Russian rocket bases in Cuba.

Alsop said he and the coauthor of the report, Charles Bartlett, obtained their information during three lengthy talks with Clayton Fritchey, Stevenson's official spokesman at the United Nations.

He said Fritchey approved this summary of Stevenson's position: "Stevenson was only willing to discuss Guantanamo and the European bases with the Communists after a neutralization of the Cuban missiles."

Alsop quotes from notes made by Bartlett in an interview with Fritchey: "Stevenson's general approach was to avoid military action until the peacekeeping machinery of the U.N. had a chance to function. He therefore opposed the air attack and favored the blockade. As the consensus hardened on the quarantine approach, he turned his thoughts toward the possibility of a settlement, both short term and long term."

January 21, 1963: In an interview with David Kraslow of the Miami Herald, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy stated that no U.S. air cover was ever planned or promised for the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba in April, 1961.

"There never was any plan to have U.S. air cover," Kennedy said. "There never was any promise. Not even under Mr. Eisenhower was American air cover in the picture.

"From the beginning the President said no American forces would take part in the operation. It was made absolutely clear that under no condition whatsoever, would Americans be used in the invasion.

"And it simply cannot be said that the invasion failed because of any single factor. There were several major mistakes. It was just a bad plan. Victory was never close."

Kennedy confirmed that the invading force appealed to the U.S. warships for help when they were pinned down on the beach. He declined to say whether the appeals were relayed to the President.

"The decision was made that there would be no change in the ground rules," Kennedy said. "There had been a firm understanding always, accepted by everyone, that there would be no U.S. forces in the invasion under any condition. We stayed with that."

Kennedy said no invasion plan had been completed during Mr. Eisenhower's term. "There was just a general concept," he said. "The logistics and the details were worked out after the President took office.

"The President has taken responsibility for the failure and that's as it should be. He approved the plan. But it's not true that he sat down with two or three civilians and worked out this plan at the White House.

"The plan that was used was fully cleared by the CIA and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It was war gamed at the Pentagon in whatever manner they do these things."

January 21, 1963: Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, charged that Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy appeared to be trying to rewrite history in the "latest example of news management by the New Frontier."

GOLDWATER said he talked with President Kennedy at the latter's request shortly after the invasion fiasco and "I certainly got the impression then that an air cover had been part of the original invasion plans."

Also, he told the Senate, "I am sure the entire American public has understood that the air cover was definitely in the invasion plans until the President was persuaded—by some still unidentified advisers—to cancel it."

GOLDWATER also took issue with a speech last Saturday in which Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON said the "rattlesnake in Cuba" has been defanged.

"I suggest it is a highly optimistic view and one which the United States cannot afford to adopt as a matter of policy," GOLDWATER said. "Castro's Cuba is still a menace to freedom in the Western Hemisphere."

January 21, 1963: Argentine Foreign Minister Carlos Muniz agreed with Secretary of State Dean Rusk yesterday that the Organization of American States (OAS) should follow up its unified stand in the Cuban crisis with new coordinated moves against Communist Cuba.

Muniz, in a talk with Rusk, is believed to have stressed that Argentina will back solidly any action the United States may take to weaken the Cuban Government and prevent Castroite subversion in Latin America.

January 22, 1963: Senate Republicans moved to conduct their own investigation of the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion. They said they wanted to get the entire story historically accurate.

Senate GOP Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, said he proposed making such a preliminary inquiry on his own and heard no dissent when it was discussed at a GOP policy meeting, yesterday. He said his proposal was not prompted by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona.

DIRKSEN said he plans to make an exploration of his own, take it up with the GOP policy committee staff, and then decide whether the matter should be put up to a

Senate legislative committee for more formal investigation.

Senate Democratic Whip Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota, suggested that if Dirksen wants the entire story he should have his investigation include the circumstances that led to the coming to power in Cuba of Castro and communism.

Senator J. William Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said the Dirksen proposal has a very strong partisan aura, and any conclusion would be considered quite partisan.

January 23, 1963: Senator Barry Goldwater, Republican, of Arizona, proposed a full Senate Armed Services Committee investigation of the disastrous 1961 Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba.

Senator Richard B. Russell, Democrat, of Georgia, the committee chairman, said if military and defense issues and not politics are involved the committee would look into them.

"It's not our function to settle political matters," he said.

Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, whose Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs has already investigated the invasion, told the Senate its members should read the still-secret transcript of those hearings before making partisan speeches.

Goldwater fired back that he had and "it's the most inconclusive testimony I've ever read."

Goldwater proposed that the Armed Services Committee have $100,000 to finance its inquiry and report no later than March 31. Goldwater is a committee member.

The Senator said the then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, and Allen Dulles, then Central Intelligence Agency chief, should be called to testify.

January 23, 1963: Former President Eisenhower said the illfated plan to invade Cuba at the Bay of Pigs was not conceived during his administration, but that, instead, a guerrilla type of action was contemplated.

General Eisenhower discussed the Cuban situation and numerous other domestic and international topics during a taped interview with newsman Walter Cronkite on CBS (WTOP–TV in Washington).

When Cronkite asked the former Chief Executive whether the Cuban invasion plan had been made under his administration, General Eisenhower replied: "No, no, no."

He added: "There was no way. We didn't even know at that time whether we could do anything more, or whether these refugees would be sufficiently numerous and strong to do more than go into the * * * eastern part of the island, in the mountains, and start in the return a counterrevolution."

He said the planning was to find a leader for the Cuban people to help them to rise up and overthrow Cuban Premier Fidel Castro but "how are you going to find a man that was not a Batista man, and not a Castro man, and still be a leader?"

National Child Evangelism Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD C. BRUCE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, February 19 was the "National Day of Prayer for the Spiritual Needs of the Children of our Nation." In observance of this occasion, numerous churches in my district of Indianapolis, Ind., presented programs explaining the work of the International Child Evangelism Fellowship.

The week of February 17 to 24 marked the 26th anniversary of child evangelism work. Its activities under the direction of International Director Rev. Jacob DeBruin encompass all phases of Bible teaching for children. In Indianapolis, under the leadership of Mr. Joseph Hosman, chairman of the local child evangelism committee, the group offers activities such as open-air classes, summer camp, rallies, and 26 weekly good news clubs. The fellowship also offers a teacher's training program.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the very survival of our Nation as a free and prosperous land depends in large measure upon the moral and spiritual training of our youth. No nation has long maintained such a high standard of living as we have in the United States without an equally high standard of moral conduct.

The importance of programs such as that offered by the International Child Evangelism Fellowship is manifest in any study of juvenile delinquency statistics. It is clear to me that the only way to prevent development of delinquents and the only way to insure the maintenance of high moral standards in our youth is through spiritual guidance and training. This is an area where our powerful, paternalistic Government can be of no help. This work must be done by dedicated individuals, imbued with the love of humanity and the desire to serve God. That they have been doing an excellent job I am sure, I am also sure that much more needs to be done, and the work of the International Child Evangelism Fellowship and other such dedicated groups deserves our wholehearted support.

Installation of Rector of St. John's Episcopal Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 10, 1963, President John F. Kennedy continued a tradition exercised by each President since Woodrow Wilson in signing a prayerbook in St. John's Episcopal Church located opposite the White House on Lafayette Square. Many past Presidents have attended St. John's and every President since President Madison has had the occasion to visit there at some time or another. Consequently St. John's has been traditionally called the Church of the Presidents.

Significantly, in conjunction with this historic visit, was the installation of a new rector of the storied church by Rt. Rev. William F. Creighton, bishop of Washington. The new rector is the Reverend John C. Harper, who, I am very honored to tell the House, was an immediate past resident of Westchester County, New York.

Reverend Harper, a native of Massachusetts, trained for the ministry at Harvard College and the Episcopal Theological Seminary in Cambridge. After service in Massachusetts parishes he was called in 1957 to be rector of St. Matthew's Church located in Bedford which is in Westchester County. Mr. Harper served his parishioners faithfully for 5½ years until called by the vestry of the church to become rector of St. John's.

We in Westchester are sorry to lose this fine gentleman and servant of God whose presence enriched our county. However if we must lose him, we are happy that it is the Nation's Capital which shall reap the harvest of his guidance and wisdom. On behalf of my colleagues, whom I am sure join me, I extend a warm welcome to Reverend Harper, to his wife, the former Barbara Quarles, and to their three children. We hope theirs will be a pleasant and bountiful life enriched by service to God and their fellow man.

From Westchester a fond farewell—to the Nation's Capital—hail and a fruitful tenure.

Prof. Samuel Williston, Teacher and Lawgiver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the entire legal and academic world was deeply saddened by recent news of the passing at the age of 101, of Prof. Emeritus Samuel Williston of Harvard University.

Professor Williston was one of the greatest law teachers and writers of our time. The list of his authorship of legal books, tracts, and law review articles is truly prodigious and constitutes a striking and enduring contribution in his special field of contracts and sales that has never been equaled in history.

I would venture to suggest that the law does not know such painstaking research, brilliant scholarship, and penetrating analysis such as typified his great work in several volumes on the subject of contracts. This work is probably the greatest of its kind that has ever been written.

Any effort I might make to describe and evaluate Professor Williston's life work and great contribution would be feeble indeed. Truly, he was a giant in his field, standing out as the unchallenged leader of the authorities on contracts and sales of his time.

His influence in clarifying, shaping, codifying, and simplifying the law in several vital fields was, in truth, a phenomenal achievement that has left an indelible imprint upon legal and judicial institutions in this country and the world.

Great, impressive, gifted, effective teacher that he was, as several generations of Harvard Law School men will testify, his epochal work was by no means confined to the classroom, the library, or the law school lecture room. Every law office, every judge's chamber, State legislatures, and the Congress were invaluably aided by his authoritative writings on the law.

His influence was felt particularly and in a monumental way, so to speak, in the restatement of the law on contracts and sales and related subjects, and in State legislatures which he invaluably served in preparing original drafts on several uniform laws on sales, warehouse receipts, liens, freight handlers and others. The range and variety of his scholarly works can be readily seen from the following partial listing of his books:

"Cases on Engineering Contracts"; selection of cases from "Cases on the Law of Contracts," edited by Samuel Williston, arranged by Bruce Wyman. Brown and Co., 1904.

"Commercial and Banking Law," prepared for the American Institute of Banking.

"Commercial Law," prepared for the American Institute of Banking.

Draft of an act relating to the sale of goods.

"The Law Governing Sales of Goods at Common Law and Under the Uniform Sales Act."

"The Law of Contracts."

Lectures on business law and the negotiable instruments law.

"Life and Law"; an autobiography.

"Negotiable Instruments."

"Selected Cases and Statutes on the Law of Bankruptcy."

"A Selection of Cases on the Law of Contracts," by Samuel Williston, prepared for use as a textbook in Harvard Law School.

"A Selection of Cases on the Law of Contracts," edited and annotated.

"A Selection of Cases on the Law of Contracts," revised and annotated.

"A Selection of Cases on the Law of Sales," by Samuel Williston and William E. McCurdy.

"A Selection of Cases on the Law of Sales of Personal Property."

"Some Modern Tendencies in the Law."

"A Treatise on the Law of Contracts."

"The Uniform Partnership Act," with some remarks on other Uniform Commercial Laws.

"The Law Governing Sales of Goods at Common Law and under the Uniform Sales Act."

"A Selection of Cases on the Law of Contracts."

Many of these words have gone into several revised editions. This brief listing by no means covers all of Professor Williston's writings. His law review articles alone would cover a period of some 60 years and many pages of bibliography.

It would be impossible for anyone to measure precisely or adequately his memorable service to the great university where he taught for so many years, to his many students who were always the sincere, compelling object of his concern and most solicitous attention, the courts of justice, the great legal profession and innumerable public causes of magnitude and importance to which he gave so willingly and unselfishly of his superb talents and untiring efforts.

We may well say of his passing that a giant oak has fallen in the forests of humanity and its reverberations are heard in many places in the world where the rule of law is treasured.

Teacher, savant, author and public servant, Professor Williston's example of dedicated devotion to his great tasks will long shine out in the world of pure scholarship, law, and jurisprudence, beaming his learning, wisdom, and high ideals for the enlightenment and advancement of man across the dark barriers of skepticism and doubt.

Of his personal qualities, his modesty, humility, generosity of impulse, and concern for his colleagues and friends, much could be said; for the greatness and fame of his achievements never swerved him from his personal loyalties or the many warm human attachments he enjoyed during his long, useful life. In the best sense, he was an illustrious American and a great human being.

It may also be appropriately said that his loss is truly irreparable, not alone for the dear ones who survive him, but for his great university, for the world of juridicial letters, and for the many fine causes he so devotedly served.

I tender my most heartfelt sympathy to his family, his close friends, his academic colleagues, and his school. The memory of Samuel Williston will long remain green with those who knew and esteemed him.

Down the long, unbroken channels of law and jurisprudence, wherever freemen seek the light of justice for all, his honored name will be gratefully remembered and imperishably enshrined.

May he find rest and peace in his heavenly home.

"Woman's Role in the Community"—Talk by Congresswoman Sullivan Before Downtown St. Louis, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed rare for me to be away from Washington when the House is in session—I have an ironclad rule against doing so. But yesterday I broke it for what I considered good and sufficient reason: The launching in St. Louis of an annual weeklong series of events sponsored by Downtown St. Louis, Inc., an organization of our downtown business leaders, in the form of a "Salute to the Woman Who Works." As honorary chairman this year of "Downtown St. Louis Salutes the Woman Who Works," it was a pleasure for me to attend the opening luncheon and discuss "Woman's Role in the Community."

Nearly all women work—and work hard—although two-thirds of them are not gainfully employed. The one-third who are in the labor force perform work vital to the national economy. But whether employed or not, all women have many civic responsibilities outside the home, and after working hours, and these were among the points I tried to cover in my talk.

In view of the widespread interest in the subject matter of my talk, a subject which I know is under comprehensive study by the President's Commission on the Status of Women, I submit for inclusion in the Congressional Record the text of my speech, as follows:

"WOMAN'S ROLE IN THE COMMUNITY"—ADDRESS BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, HONORARY CHAIRMAN OF "DOWNTOWN ST. LOUIS SALUTES THE WOMAN WHO WORKS," MONDAY AFTERNOON, MARCH 11, 1963, AT SHERATON-JEFFERSON HOTEL, LAUNCHING WEEK-LONG SERIES OF EVENTS SPONSORED BY DOWNTOWN ST. LOUIS, INC.

On one of those bitterly cold days last month, when every householder could almost see the wings on his dollar bills—in the form of fuel going up the chimney—and there was snow and ice to chop away from the front walk, and the car wouldn't start and probably needed a new battery, and people's bones ached from the cold, and life was truly grim, one man who lives in the Third Congressional District probably felt he had taken as much of the grind as he could stand without finding a safety valve for letting off some steam. So he wrote to me. It was one of the most indignant letters I ever received as a Member of Congress. How dare we, he asked, let so many days go by without accomplishing anything? What were we being paid for? Why didn't we work at the jobs to which we were elected? What was the idea taking money under false pretense? Who did we think we were? How did we get that way? What right have Members of Congress to think they are above and beyond the moral responsibility to give a full day's work for a full day's pay? Why don't we pay back the salary we receive for not working? And so on and so on—for several pages.

Apparently, he had read a newspaper article commenting on the fact that with 6 weeks gone by, Congress had not passed a single major piece of legislation, and had acted on very few minor ones. Furthermore, out of deference to the annual desire of the Republicans in Congress to use Lincoln's Birthday week as a time for blasting the Democrats in speeches at fund-raising dinners all around the country, Congress was in semirecess for that week; and would have a similar week of informal recesses around the time of Jefferson's birthday so that the Democrats in Congress could return the compliment by going around the country attacking Republicans.

ORGANIZING A NEW CONGRESS IS COMPLEX

Actually, of course, it always takes at least a month, and often 2 months, in each new Congress—every 2 years—for a variety of organizational arrangements, including the adoption of new rules, agreement on committee ratios for the majority and minority parties, and assignments to committees, before the committees can even begin to get down to work. As everyone should know, the committees are the bill-perfecting workshops of Congress. By the time legislation comes to us on the House floor, for instance, it has pretty well been shaped by an appropriate committee into the form in which it will pass, and while amendments can be offered from the floor they are seldom accepted. So nothing is really even begun until the committees are organized. For nearly a month now, however, the committees on our side of the Capitol have been working very hard—and I can attest to that personally, since I am one of the Members on the House side with assignments on two House committees. And it seems they both usually schedule meetings at the same hours of the same days—but that's another story.

In any event, the terrible-tempered man who wrote me the indignant letter about Congress not earning its keep, picked just the wrong time to vent his spleen upon me for not working. After 10 years in the Congress, I am used to receiving abusive letters occasionally about the faults and inadequacies and shortcomings of Congress, or of individual Members of Congress, but usually these do not come from residents of my district, I am happy to say, since most of my constituents seem to know that I work pretty hard at the job.

But this fellow just picked the wrong day to write. His letter arrived on a day when my desk was piled high with letters which I had dictated and had to read carefully before signing. It had been a week of very heavy correspondence on every conceivable type of problem which is called to my attention by constituents in trouble, or in need of help, in connection with Federal Government activities, which are vast and diversified. The food stamp plan, which I had been responsible for having installed on a pilot basis in St. Louis, was running into all kinds of misunderstandings and, apparently, some bureaucratic rigidity—and so there was a lot of telephoning I had to do between Washington and St. Louis—to the mayor and other officials—and then to the Department of Agriculture. I finally set up a conference in my office to try to work out the details so that the plan could operate more effectively, and with less bureaucratic inflexibility, and less misunderstanding on the part of those eligible for its benefits.

ON A SUNDAY AFTERNOON

Further, I was engaged in a behind-the-scenes struggle with the Pentagon and the State Department and even with some of the people in the White House over the policies we should follow in connection with our rights in the Canal Zone—this comes under my responsibility as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Earlier, I had been asked to make a quick trip with my subcommittee down to Panama—where the heat was about as oppressive as the cold was up here at the same time—for an on-the-spot investigation of the very complex, and I would say extremely important, problems in our relationships with the Republic of Panama, and our plans for either building a second canal or expanding the present one to meet the constantly increasing volume of shipping waiting in line at Cristobal or Balboa to cross from one ocean to the other.

And in the midst of all of this work—in came that letter berating me—well, there must be a stronger word than that—denouncing me, on the grounds that Members of Congress were not earning their salaries and should be ashamed of themselves because the House was not in continuous session.

What made the charge so ironic at the time was that I opened that letter and read it in my office—on a Sunday afternoon, and it is not unusual at all for me to be in the office on Sundays—or for 10, and often 12 hours on most other days, either.

I mention that incident today not in order to have all of you immediately get out your handkerchiefs and shed a few tears over Congresswoman SULLIVAN's arduous life of toil—I happen to love every minute of my job for a great many reasons, and have made a practice every 2 years of asking the voters in my district to keep me working just as hard as ever at the job. I have cited the incident of the abusive letter berating Congress for not working hard at a time when I was working very hard indeed, because it illustrates a point I think is valid about most women in this country.

SALUTE TO WOMAN WHO WORKS MUST INCLUDE MOST WOMEN

Today's luncheon, and this week-long series of events sponsored by Downtown St. Louis, Inc., salute the woman who works. While I know that the salute is aimed primarily at women who work in the downtown area, I think the accolade could well apply to most women in St. Louis—and in the Nation. Most women work. About one-third of them work for pay—are gainfully employed—but most of the other two-thirds also work, and work hard, and do very essential work. They work hard at rearing children, and at making an attractive home and good home-life for their families; they work hard at innumerable volunteer tasks in the community and in the schools. Also, among the two-thirds of our women not gainfully employed, are a sizable number who are themselves in schools and colleges training for professional assignments in the future, or acquiring a firm and solid educational background which will fit them for whatever the future brings, and enable them, too, to be better mothers of tomorrow's citizens.

Work? Yes, most of the women we know work—and work hard. So a salute to the woman who works must include the homemaker, the woman rearing a family of fine children, the many women who are assisting their husbands in all manner of endeavor without any pay, the millions who make the great nonprofit voluntary organizations operate as effectively as they do in community and in other activities—the Red Cross, formed 82 years ago by a great American woman worker, the Community Chest, the Heart Fund, the March of Dimes, church activities, and so on and so on and so on—they are all manned by workingwomen who work very, very hard, whether they receive remuneration for their efforts or not.

So when anyone says only one-third of our women in this country over the age of 14 are working, implying that the rest are not working, it is as untrue and oversimplified as the letter I received denouncing me for not earning my salary because the House of Representatives was not in daily session for the week of Lincoln's Birthday. Much of the work women do in the home is taken too much for granted by those who have never had to wear themselves out doing it.

I have been a woman who works all my life—as I know many of you also have been. I have always worked at full tilt—giving any job I ever had all of my best efforts—so I can honestly say, I believe, that I have always worked hard. But whenever I begin to feel the hours might be long, or the effort exhausting, I think back to what my mother put forth in the way of effort and energy and time—and she never worked for pay in her whole long life. But she reared nine children—and she was a strict disciplinarian, as well as a loving parent. She really worked. Today's mothers of young children have many laborsaving devices my mother did not have when she was rearing her family; but I know that being a good homemaker is still hard and never-ending and exhausting work. So no one can ever downgrade in my presence the work done by the woman who stays at home.

ADVANTAGES OF DOWNTOWN ST. LOUIS

However, the one-third of our women who are gainfully employed outside the home—working for pay—are doing important work, too; they make up a very important one-third of our total labor force, I believe most of us here are in the category of employed women. We also share the pleasure of working in downtown St. Louis—although I have the chance to enjoy that pleasure now only when Congress is not in session, and that is only a few months out of the year. But I share your enthusiasm for the joys and advantages of working in the downtown area—the nearness to the stores and theaters and hotels, and the wonderful convenience of the downtown area. Years ago, I fought hard to keep the Comptometer School, where I was employed, from leaving downtown. And now every time a new apartment building or a new office building, or a new anything goes into place here in the downtown, and particularly in the redevelopment areas, I take a double personal pride in it—for in addition to my long allegiance to downtown, I can see in stone and concrete and steel and glass—and in light and airy and pleasant surroundings—some of the dramatic results of the long hours of hearings and legislative effort I have had to invest in the redevelopment program over the years as a Member of Congress serving on the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. While the downtown area has always been a wonderful place to work, it is also becoming once again now a wonderful place to live * * * and the rejuvenation which has taken place here in St. Louis of what were once depressing, dirty, airless, factory and warehouse and residential slums—into the beautiful environment now taking shape—is one of the greatest achievements of urban renewal in the entire Nation.

To the men and women of Downtown St. Louis, Inc., who have given so much time and effort and imagination, and who have invested so much money, too, toward the redevelopment of our center city, I want to address a personal salute of my own—right now. I am grateful to you.

Now, with the commercial taken care of—a bow to our sponsors—let's consider the substance of this program today: woman's role in the community, with particular reference to the woman who is employed.

WOMEN WORKING OUTSIDE THE HOME

Who are the workingwomen—we who make up about a third of all women over the age of 14 and a third of the entire labor force? There are more than half a million of us in Missouri alone and, contrary to what a lot of people seem to think, most of those women are working because they have to work—many as the sole support of families. Interestingly enough, however, there has been a very significant increase nationally in the past decade in the number of working wives, from less than 8 million 10 years ago to about 13 million now. In Missouri, for instance, although only one-third of all workers are women, and although only 1 out of every 3 married women are workers, it is interesting to note that well over half of all of those workingwomen—56 percent—are married women. The surveys indicate—with one important exception—that the higher the family income, the less likely the wife is to go out of the home to work. So it is safe to assume that a very large proportion of working wives are finding it necessary to work in order to supplement the family income for a variety of important reasons: to help a young husband with his education, perhaps, or to help him get a start on his way up the economic ladder; or to help put the youngsters through college; or to pay off debts resulting from illness or business reverses; or to make up the difference between a marginal existence and a decent standard of living. There is not too much value in trying to analyze why each and every workingwomen works, because the reasons vary among individuals. I said, however, that there was one important exception to the rule that the higher the family income, the less likely the wife is to take employment. It is this: The higher the educational level reached by the wife, the more likely she is to be found in professional or other paid employment.

Since the better educated women command higher salaries, on the average, the thesis does not hold true that all workingwomen are working entirely because of family economic necessity.

I suppose it's safe to say, however, that even where economic necessity is not a factor, families with working wives find it comparatively easy to spend at least up to the combined family income. What family doesn't?

CHANGING PATTERNS OF EMPLOYMENT

However, the facts as they have developed in recent years in relation to the workingwoman—the woman who is employed—reflect a pattern which is of great importance to the overall American economy. The idea that most women workers are casual employees—young things fresh out of school, putting in a few years before marriage, or in the early years of marriage, and will then retire from the labor force—is out of date. While it is true that the highest percentage of women workers in any age group are those between the ages of 18 and 24—45 percent of all women in that age group are employed—it is a further fact that almost as high a percentage—43 percent—of those between 33 and 44 are also employed. And 42 percent—or almost as many proportionately—of those between the ages of 45 and 64 are also employed.

So what we see here is a significant pattern: in the early years of womanhood, after schooling, before marriage, and perhaps in the first year or two of marriage, nearly half of all young women are in the labor force, working, acquiring skills, earning money for future wants, if not always for immediate needs. After age 24, however, there is a sharp drop. Only a third of our women in the age group between 25 and 34 are in the labor force. These are the years of acquiring a family, and running oneself ragged in keeping up with those human dynamos which brighten the home and exhaust the mother.

But then, gradually, more and more of these women go back into the labor force, back to work, either into new types of jobs or into the ones they worked at before marriage. There is a constant demand for trained workers; it is only the untrained woman for whom jobs seem to be elusive. But a good secretary, a nurse, a good saleswoman or manager, a business machine operator, a trained woman in many such fields, while having to meet and beat down a certain amount of age bias on the part of employers, can usually find a satisfactory position, if she has maintained her old skills or has developed new ones which are in demand in the job market. Millions of women are going in and out of the labor force each year, as family circumstances permit or require, so that from age 35 to 65, at least two out of every five women are gainfully employed. And, believe it or not, about 10 percent of all women over 65 are still working.

DECISION MUST BE A PERSONAL ONE

Many observers deplore the fact that so many women are working outside the home. Where there are young children at home, needing a mother's full time, care and attention, most of us have always felt that mother's place is at home. But sometimes the facts in individual cases may dictate otherwise. Throughout the long history of Aid to Dependent Children, from the depression days of 1935 when the program was enacted, we emphasized the importance and the desirability of enabling the mother to stay home to care for her children, with at least a bare minimum living standard assured through the assistance program. But in recent years, we have found that this policy is not always such a good one in all cases. And so, last year, in a rather historic change of direction, Congress passed a new Welfare program which is intended to encourage the ADC mothers, and other people on assistance, to acquire skills which can be used in gainful employment to become self-supporting. We need day-care centers; we need assured standards in the care of the children—particularly young children—while the mother is in training, or working, and we need more part-time job opportunities for mothers who must work but who want to be home when the children get home from school. But the point of departure from the old program was the feeling that rather than have a family of youngsters grow up living always just on the thin edge of poverty—for that's the best we really provide now through the various State welfare programs—it is better to have the family enjoy a decent standard of living, even if it takes the mother out of the home for part or most of the working day.

We can argue this point for hours, on moral and other grounds. In the final analysis, however, I think we have to agree that this is a problem each family should decide by itself, and for itself.

UNEQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN

But when a woman goes off to work, part-time or full-time, married or single, either from economic necessity or from personal preference * * * perhaps because she has skills which are valuable to the economy and which she enjoys putting to economic use—the further fact emerges that she is probably going to experience some incomprehensible discrimination when it comes to her paycheck. This is not just an impression we all have—all of us who have ever been in the business world—it is a proven fact: in job after job, there is a dual pay schedule * * * one for men, another for women, doing exactly the same work. The Post-Dispatch recently carried a Sunday article on this discrimination, and later, an editorial denouncing the practice, which I hope many of you noticed. I thought so highly of it I placed it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as support for the principle embodied in my bill to require Equal Pay for Equal Work done in interstate commerce. We passed such a bill last year in both Houses of Congress, but unfortunately, the circumstances of its passage by the Senate in the final days of the Session were such—as a rider on a foreign embassy construction bill—that the House and Senate Committees concerned could never find the magic formula for getting together in conference to resolve the differences in the two bills. So the measure died with the end of the 87th Congress. But I am hopeful we can pass similar, or even better, legislation on equal pay this year, or at least in this Congress.

Believe me, no matter how high you stand on the occupational pyramid, you would personally benefit from the existence of such a law on the books. For there is pay discrimination, and we all know it; there is discrimination in promotions, and we all know it. One of the things all of us can do as working women is to make sure the employers all know that we know of this discriminatory policy.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MAY NOT DISCRIMINATE

As one righteously—and properly—indignant St. Louis working woman wrote me a few weeks ago on this issue:

"There are thousands of widows, divorcees, and even single women with as much (and sometimes more) financial responsibility to meet than some of their male coworkers, yet these women must accept a lower wage scale because they are women, and regardless of their abilities. Female teachers, office and credit managers, accountants, bank tellers, professionals in various fields, are paid substantially less than their male counterparts. Yet when these same women pay for groceries, buy an automobile, pay medical and dental expenses, and meet other such obligations, no distinction is made because they are women. There is no double standard in costs."

Naturally, I might add, her letter was written to me in support of the equal pay bill.

The Federal Government, as far as its own employees are concerned, is under a legal prohibition against the practice of wage discrimination against women, and this has been the law for many, many years. The job carries its own salary in the Federal service, regardless of who fills that job. That is the law. But, here again, practice has not always conformed to promise: because for years there have been effective barriers to the promotion of qualified women into top career civil service positions. This is just recently being broken down, thanks to the President's Commission on the Status of Women, and particularly to Margaret Hickey's committee of that Commission—the Committee on Federal Employment Policies and Practices—which uncovered a moth-eaten old ruling from a former Attorney General which permitted Government officials to specify, in filling job vacancies, whether the job should go to a man or a woman. In most instances, there was no valid reason in the world why either sex should be specified. This has all been changed, just within the past year; under the Executive order which Margaret Hickey's committee proposed, and which the Commission on the Status of Women, and the Attorney General, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, all agreed the President should issue—and which he did issue—practically all jobs in the Federal service, and promotion opportunities, too, are to be open to competition from all qualified individuals, without regard to sex. This is a tremendous breakthrough toward fairer employment opportunities for women in the Federal service, and the results already have been rather spectacular; nearly all job openings—except for a very few which logically require men only or women only—are being offered on an even basis to all who can qualify, and, as a result, women are climbing up the civil service scale to positions, of increasing importance commensurate with their training and ability. This kind of open policy on employment opportunity would not hurt any employer, in my opinion, unless, of course, a particular job is simply not suited to women—or there are compelling reasons to limit crews to members of one sex.

IMPACT ON UNEMPLOYMENT

Nevertheless, some people raise the objection that such a policy takes away job opportunities for men—for men who need work in order to support their families. By and large, this objection is not valid. Of course, there are exceptions, but on the whole, the jobs which women tend to train for, and qualify for, and to prefer, are those which few men seem to want to do, or are willing to train for. This may change, as the new Manpower Development and Training Act gets into effective action, because the shortage occupations are, in many instances, in fields in which women seem to predominate. So we shall just have to wait and see how many unemployed or underemployed men are interested now in training for jobs as stenographers, office machine operators, computer programers, school teaching, nursing, the service trades, beauty operator, and so on. Frankly, I think it would be a very good thing for wage rates in those predominantly female occupations and professions if more men did go into them.

Generally speaking, it isn't a case of our having too few openings in this country for skilled people and that men and women must compete with each other for them. The situation is really quite different. We have a shortage of trained men and women in all of the professions and in the sciences and in nearly every field in which long years of preparation are necessary. Of course, this is not true in railroading and in coal mining and a few other industries. But generally speaking, we have unemployment primarily because we have so many untrained people for whom unskilled jobs are rapidly disappearing. Firing trained women will not open jobs for untrained men. So let's keep our perspective on this issue.

COMMISSION ON STATUS OF WOMEN

I mentioned very briefly the President's Commission on the Status of Women, on which St. Louisan Margaret Hickey serves with great distinction. This is the Commission which President Kennedy established a little more than a year ago with Eleanor Roosevelt as Chairman. She said at the time that it would be her last assignment in public service, and prophetically, her words were true. But she was spared long enough to develop a very comprehensive approach to all of the problems of women as citizens, as workers, as volunteers in civic activities—the problems of equal educational opportunities, equal pay, discriminatory legislation, and so on—and all of us, as women, can look forward with great anticipation to the report this Commission is assigned to make to President Kennedy by next October—a study of where we are and what the problems are, with recommendations on how best to solve them. Much of the work of the Commission, of course, is directed at the problems of working women, but not entirely so.

For as we all know, the concern of the women of St. Louis and of our country, whether employed or not, must be about far more than the availability of a job, or the conditions of employment on the jobs which are available, important as those things are. All of us, whether employed or not, have deep obligations as women to our community and to our country. Woman's role in the community is an all-encompassing one. She must be a force—politically and socially—for improvement and reform in all of our public responsibilities: schools; social welfare standards; the opportunities for youth to find a place in society—to acquire skills as well as education; the improvement of recreational programs; the proffering of understanding help for the mentally ill and hope for the handicapped; and care for the elderly—all of these, I insist, are primarily women's concern.

BE PART OF COMMUNITY'S SOCIAL CONSCIENCE

Women may not, in all cases, be in positions which enable them to solve these problems—the solutions may require political as well as community action, and women are in a small minority in positions of political power. But these problems will never be solved without constant agitation by women, insisting that solutions must be reached. When you have those circumstances, believe me, miracles can be achieved.

So every woman's first responsibility outside of her family is to be part of the community's conscience—and a conscience which acts like the one we all carry within us—a conscience which refuses to be quiet when wrong is being done—a conscience which cries out against apathy, and ignorance, and crime, and indecency, and poverty, and illness, and neglect.

"But," you might ask, "what can I do about these things? I'm just one person."

True enough. But one and one make two, and two and two make a committee or a delegation, or a task force. Enough women, indignant enough about a social ill, can organize, and stimulate the civic conscience into doing something about it. In our city, and in every city, crime is an acute and frightening reality; poverty is widespread; ignorance and illiteracy are far too common; municipal services are unable to cope with expanding needs; the voluntary organizations are swamped with demands for help; both public and philanthropic funds are always insufficient for the needs. There is so much which needs doing to make our cities better able to meet the problems of public health and safety.

ONE INDIVIDUAL CAN DO MUCH

These are the mayor's problems, of course, and the board of aldermen's problems. But they are yours, too. Whether you live in the city or merely work here, this city is the nerve center of your life and well-being. Solutions for urban problems are possible—but only if there is a will to solve them, and a willingness to contribute personally to the admittedly high costs of these solutions. Unless we solve these problems, it will require no H-bombs to wipe out our cities; they will just shrivel up and die from hardening of the municipal arteries. And this we cannot permit.

What can an individual do? Every American citizen—thank God—can do a lot: you can take more than just a voting interest in public affairs, you can take an active political role—whichever party you believe in. Work for it. Contribute to it.

Participate in the selection of candidates, not only in primaries, but in the ward and precinct organizations. Write letters to those of us in public life who may be in a position to influence public policy directly. Never underestimate what your lone letter might accomplish.

For instance—and I've told this story often—a single letter to me 7 years ago from the mother of a retarded child, pleading with me to try to help her child receive the educational opportunities that child could use advantageously—stressing that most retarded children could be helped—started me working on a legislative objective which I consider among my most important activities in the Congress—legislation to train more teachers for exceptional children of all categories—up to then a relatively untouched field. Now we have such Federal-aid teacher-training programs for mentally retarded children and for children with speech and hearing defects. My original bill for such teacher-training programs for all exceptional children, including gifted children, was introduced in 1957. Since then interest has gradually mounted until now the President of the United States has formally endorsed and recommended just such legislation.

MANY AVENUES FOR SERVICE

That one letter to me was not by itself responsible, of course, but it stimulated my own thinking to the point where I obtained expert help in drafting comprehensive legislation which later became the guideline for all of the omnibus bills subsequently introduced—and now I think we will finally pass such comprehensive legislation.

Individual letters to me from housewives who found glaring examples of deceptive packaging and misleading labeling in the stores—and every woman shops—were of tremendous help to me in drafting the first bill ever introduced in Congress to attack this serious economic problem. Other housewives wrote to other Members of Congress, and now there is widespread interest in the subject. Again, I think we will curb this abuse effectively.

A woman—a lone woman—doing her job conscientiously in the Federal Food and Drug Administration is now a national heroine—Dr. Francis O. Kelsey. What she did in the thalidomide incident paved the way for a dramatic illustration of how fast Congress can work when the problem is clear and the danger is real. I had introduced my comprehensive food, drug and cosmetic reform bill on January 3, 1961, and for months it was the only bill in Congress to meet head on some of the serious problems growing out of loopholes in our 23-year-old drug control legislation. I tried for a year and a half to stimulate interest in this great problem. So did Senator KEFAUVER. Our efforts were apparently bearing little fruit—indeed the issue seemed dead for the 87th Congress—until the public disclosures of the thalidomide case provided the public stimulus to action—and then Congress acted so quickly, and so effectively, that the results were spectacular * * * a milestone in consumer protection equal to the original drug law of 1938, which, in turn, in its time, was the tightest and most effective law of its kind in the world. It took approximately 100 deaths from a faulty drug—elixer sulfanilomide—in 1938—to spur the Congress to action that time.

CONGRESS REFLECTS PUBLIC

Just remember that Congress reflects the public—and it takes a great deal to arouse the public enough to stimulate Congress to action. You are part of the public—and you see much about you which you condemn and want to see changed and improved. Do you bother to speak up, to complain, to protest, to agitate, to insist on correction of conditions and situations which you believe are bad in our society?

If you don't act—and don't try to get action—you are not heartening to your womanly instincts; you are ignoring your social conscience; you are an accessory to the crime of public apathy. And that's one of the worst crimes of all in a democracy.

I want you to help me—and all of your other public officials—to represent you more effectively in trying to cure the ills of our society and our economy. On the job, or in handling household supplies, or in shopping in the stores, or in leisure time activities, any woman can spot a lot of things which need correcting and which can be corrected through the political processes of our national, State and local governments. Perhaps those of us close to the problems cannot always see them objectively—like the housewife who can instantly spot the dust on a neighbor's coffee table but is unaware that the pictures on her own living room walls are crooked. In public life, we sometimes see only what we want to see and we can easily find reasonable excuses for not acting, particularly if no one is nagging at us to act. Public officials, after all, are human too.

However, in every level of government, a successful official is usually one who can recognize a problem in time to join in its correction before everyone has spotted it. But always—in almost every instance—someone spotted it first—before the official did—and told him about it. So all of us in public life need reliable "spotters"—people who will take the trouble to call our attention to problems as they emerge, rather than wait until they become insuperable. Will you, then, volunteer for this civic responsibility?

If you will, then my salute to you today—heartfelt and sincere in any event—will be a great big hurrah for the women of Downtown St. Louis, Inc., the women of Downtown Activities, Unlimited. For my gratitude to you will also be just that, unlimited. Thank you.

Part 14: Let's Keep the Record Straight—A Selected Chronology on Castro and Cuba (January 23, 1963–January 31, 1963)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, one of our American essayists and poets, James Russell Lowell, said something once that

I feel is apropos today in connection with our running controversy with Castro in Cuba, as well as his sponsor-dictators, Mao Tse-tung and Nikita Khrushchev, of Red China and Soviet Russia: "There is no good arguing with the inevitable. The only argument available with an east wind is to put on your greatcoat."

Our approach for quite some time now appeared to be to engage in a series of diplomatic arguments and diplomatic discussions with Castro and his henchmen, just as it seemed to be our accepted method of dealing with Khrushchev and his bodyguards.

In all our diplomatic discussions, it appears that we somehow all came out on the losing side—even when temporarily it looked as though we were winning the argument, in looking back at the Cuban quarantine by our Government. About the only time I can recall with certainty when it was apparent we won an argument with Khrushchev, for instance, has been when we stopped discussing and started taking action in accordance with what we firmly believed to be right. Witness the Berlin airlift, as a prime example, when our access routes into West Berlin were closed after a series of harassments by the Soviets of the allies. The same thing applied after the wall was built between East Berlin and West Berlin and it once again appeared that the Soviets might attempt again to close our points of access and free and open travel by the military between the two segments of the divided city. And our latest example of "putting on our greatcoat" was, of course, the act of setting up our quarantine of Cuba—in spite of the huffing, puffing, and rocket rattling engaged in by Khrushchev, Mao Tse-tung, and Castro.

My chronology today concludes the January portion of events involving Castro, Cuba, and the United States. Very soon I will go into the February events.

We find in the latter part of January that the Soviets were busily transforming Cuba into a veritable armed camp—even without the 40 missiles and 42 I–28's which had been sent back to Russia. Their actions were reported by the New York Times, January 23, and also in public statements made by Senator KENNETH KEATING—the man who stated of the Soviets and Cubans that "they are now 10 times stronger than they were on July 1 of last year," and that his information "confirmed by official Government sources" indicated the Soviets had 20,000 men in Cuba, including soldiers and technicians and the force included combat troops as well.

The President was drawn into this new controversy over the Bay of Pigs invasion when he asserted that no U.S. air cover was ever planned to help the Cuban attackers. He stated instead that the plan—which failed miserably—was a strike by B–26 bombers flown by pilots not based in the United States. He denied that there was a buildup of the military, in the sense of equipment coming in from outside Cuba, but admitted that after withdrawal of 4,500 Soviet technicians since October, there was left 16,000 or 17,000 Russians still in Cuba operating technical equipment, building barracks, and acting as a part of organized military units.

Representative MINSHALL, of Ohio, introduced a resolution which called for a joint House-Senate committee to undertake a full-scale investigation of the Bay of Pigs invasion. He indicated that he felt the controversy transcended both political parties and partisan motivations. Representative MINSHALL also asserted that at this late date, honest accurate reporting of the events leading up to, and including the invasion, could not or would not break security.

A top intelligence briefing took place on the 25th of January at which time several Senators heard reports of the buildup of a powerful military and political machine in Cuba over the previous 6 months. This briefing grew out of Senator KEATING's public report of a military buildup in Cuba and made many believe that without his prodding—such a briefing could not have taken place. A variety of comments made by Senators taking part in the briefings indicate the wide variance in their thinking, or points of view, as far as the potential threat of the military buildup. It also indicated the wide variance in the Democrat Party as far as support of President Kennedy's efforts to play down the threat of such military buildup.

Republican Senator AIKEN felt the buildup was much stronger militarily and politically than it was 6 months before. Democrat Senator SYMINGTON stated the big Soviet military complex in Cuba had been constructed over the last 3 months. But Democrat Humphrey, present at the same briefing, claimed to have heard nothing to indicate there had been a significant Soviet buildup. This had the effect of building the suspicion in the minds of the American public that someone was either stretching the truth, or had a good imagination, or that someone was being either overly partisan or overly protective.

A U.S. intelligence report was circulated a little later which described a Soviet ship, *Simferopol* as being the only one which had put in at a Cuban port with a significant amount of military equipment since last fall's crisis.

This same intelligence report indicated that Russia had supplied a great deal of military equipment to Cuba prior to July of 1962—which included the following: "About 200 tanks; around 1,500 artillery pieces; 35 Mig 15 and 17 jet aircraft; and many conventional antiaircraft guns."

During the July–October influx of weapons and personnel, the report stated that the number of Mig jet fighters had tripled to a total of 106, including 42 of the advanced Mig–21 type. The number of tanks and field pieces doubled. Major new weapons were also sent into Cuba—including surface-to-air missiles deployed among 24 bases—4 coastal defense missile systems, 12 missile-armed coastal-defense boats, and a number of self-propelled mobile field pieces

Russian manpower—according to the intelligence summary—mounted from a pre-July figure of 500 to a total of about 22,000 by late October. But when Premier Khrushchev pulled out his missiles and bombers—as a result of our quarantine—this Soviet strength was supposedly cut down by about 5,000 men. But the Soviets were known to control the new equipment delivered to Cuba.

Our Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, admitted that continued presence of heavily armed Soviet combat troops in Cuba was a matter of real concern to the United States. He also admitted remaining Russian forces on the island were a substantial military presence. He reiterated what had been said many times, that "it must be our policy that penetration of this hemisphere by a Communist regime from outside is unacceptable to this hemisphere."

The diplomatic arguments went on—the east wind continued blowing—and the American people began to feel they were indeed being placed in the position of having to "put on your greatcoat."

Our January portion of the chronology ends with statements by Pentagon spokesmen assuring the American public that missile sites were not only broken up, dismantled, not being used for any military purpose, and so forth, but that such missiles, transporters, and missile erectors had been photographed en route to and at port areas, loaded aboard ship, and were aboard ships en route to the U.S.S.R.

But those who urged that we "put on our greatcoats" in the argument being carried on with the east wind, could and would not be convinced that things were as pleasant as the public was being daily assured was the case.

Part 14 of the chronology follows:

PART 14: LET'S KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT—A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CASTRO AND CUBA (JANUARY 23 TO JANUARY 31, 1963)

January 23, 1963: The New York Times news service said that Soviet forces in Cuba are reported working around the clock building and improving "highly sophisticated ground and air defenses."

A Washington-dated dispatch by Tad Szulo said private reports from Havana, confirmed in part by American experts on the Cuban situation, relate that large shipments of weapons and other materials are continuing to arrive in Cuba.

The Times story said: "Soviet encampments are being relocated and strengthened, and Soviet experts are directing Cubans in the construction of underground depots, hangars and runways.

"The construction work is apparently concentrated in the main defense complex between Havana and the San Antonio de los Banos Air Base in Camaguey Province, and in the Sierra Maestra area of Oriente Province.

"Soviet troops exclusively are doing the work and some sites are closed even to Cuban military personnel."

In Washington, Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, told a reporter he has information "confirmed by official Government sources" that Soviet weaponry has been pouring into the island.

"They now are 10 times stronger than they were on July 1 last year," Keating said.

"My information is that they (Soviets) have 20,000 men in Cuba, including soldiers and technicians. The force includes combat troops."

January 23, 1963: A planeload of 98 Cuban-Americans, many of them children, landed in Miami. The refugees reported growing food shortages and anti-Castro feeling in Cuba, and stepped-up reprisals against opponents of the Government.

January 23, 1963: The SS *Shirley Lykes* headed out of Havana for Florida tonight, packed with 1,160 refugees from Fidel Castro's Cuban regime, the Red Cross reported.

January 24, 1963: President Kennedy entered the new controversy over the abortive Bay of Pigs invasion with the assertion that no U.S. air cover was ever planned to help the Cuban attackers.

What was planned, and what proved to be a failure, he said, was a strike by B–26 bombers flown by pilots not based in the United States.

The invasion brigade thought that this attack would give it protection on the beach, but Cuban jets "were very effective" and the invasion brigade "was not able to maintain air supremacy on the beach," the President said.

President Kennedy also replied to questions about a reported new buildup of Soviet weapons in Cuba. He said one Soviet ship has arrived in Cuba since the October crisis "which may have arms on it, possibly military cargo."

But he said that there was no military buildup in the sense of equipment coming in from outside Cuba. "There is no evidence that this ship carried any offensive weapons," the President said.

Some 4,500 Soviet technicians have been withdrawn from Cuba since October, he said, and there are 16,000 or 17,000 Russians still there, operating technical equipment and building barracks. Some of the Russians are in organized military units, he said.

"Our scrutiny of Cuba is daily," the President said.

Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Republican, of New York, said the buildup consists of tanks, guns, fighter planes, and other weapons but not long-range missiles and bombers.

Keating said he had learned from refugee sources that Soviet military activity on Cuba is 10 times greater than it was last July 1 before the missile crisis.

In the House, Representative William E. Minshall, Republican, of Ohio, introduced a resolution calling for creation of a Joint House-Senate committee to make a full-scale investigation of the Bay of Pigs invasion.

Referring to the Attorney General's comment that no air cover was promised, Minshall said "this tremendously important controversy transcends political parties and partisan motivations. At this late date, an honest, accurate report of events leading up to and including the invasion would not break security."

January 25, 1963: Several Senators said, after a top intelligence briefing, that the Soviet Union has built a powerful military and political machine in Cuba over the past 6 months.

The Senate hearing was held to look into charges by Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Republican, of New York, that the military buildup in Cuba is 10 times greater than it was last July before the missile crisis.

Senator Keating said he knew of no offensive missiles and bombers going to Cuba. But he said tanks, guns, Mig fighters, and other arms were continuing to pour in.

After the briefing, Senator George D. Aiken, Republican, of Vermont, told newsmen that the Russians have built "an enormously powerful military and political base in Cuba—much stronger than it was 6 months ago."

Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat, of Missouri, said "there is a big Soviet military complex in Cuba" that was constructed over the last 6 months.

At the same time, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, said he heard nothing to indicate there had been a significant Soviet buildup.

Senator Humphrey said there was plenty of blame for both Democrats and Republicans from the invasion fiasco and little to be gained by opening old sores.

January 25, 1963: New York Attorney James B. Donovan returned to Miami from a conference with Cuban Premier Fidel Castro in Havana and said that he was "most optimistic" that about 25 Americans held prisoner in Cuba would be released soon.

January 26, 1963: An intelligence summary circulating among top U.S. officials reports that a Soviet ship carrying a "significant amount of military cargo" docked in Cuba within the past 2 weeks.

The vessel, identified as the *Simferopol*, is the only one which has put in at a Cuban port with a "significant amount" of military equipment since last fall's crisis, the report says—backing President Kennedy's contention.

The summary states that U.S. intelligence agencies have observed shipping to Cuba closely since last fall.

According to the intelligence study Russia had supplied "a great deal of military equipment to Cuba prior to July 1962, including about 200 tanks, around 1,500 artillery pieces, 35 Mig–15 and Mig–17 jet aircraft and many conventional antiaircraft guns."

As a result of a July–October influx of weapons and personnel, the number of Mig jet fighters tripled to a total of 106, including 42 of the advanced Mig–21 type. The number of tanks and fieldpieces doubled. Also major new weapons were sent into Cuba, including surface-to-air missiles now deployed among 24 bases, 4 coastal defense missile systems, and 12 missile-armed coastal defense boats, as well as a number of self-propelled mobile field pieces.

During the same period, according to the intelligence summary, Russian military manpower in Cuba mounted from a pre-July figure of 500 to a total of about 22,000 by late October. This Soviet military strength was cut down by around 5,000 men when Premier Khrushchev pulled out his missiles and bombers.

"Most of the new equipment delivered to Cuba this summer is in the hands of Soviet personnel," the report states.

January 27, 1963: Secretary of State Dean Rusk said that the continued presence of heavily armed Soviet combat troops in Cuba is a "matter of real concern" to the United States.

Rusk acknowledged that Mig fighters capable of carrying nuclear warheads are being flown by Soviet pilots in Cuba. He described remaining Russian forces on the island as a "substantial * * * military presence."

The best U.S. intelligence guess, he added, is that there are no nuclear warheads in Cuba today. But without onsite inspection, he said, "this is a problem of proving the negative." Rusk spoke on the WRC–TV (NBC) program, "Meet the Press."

Although Rusk gave no hint of U.S. deadlines for Soviet troop removal from Cuba, he said, "it must be our policy that penetration of this hemisphere by a Communist regime from outside is unacceptable to this hemisphere."

January 27, 1963: A Republican and a Democratic Senator expressed concern that more politics than patriotism may become involved in investigations of the Cuban situation.

Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican, of New York, cautioned against any partisan inquiries into the ill-fated Bay of Pigs invasion. He suggested that a special bipartisan House-Senate committee be named to study it.

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota, criticized "rash, partisan, demands for congressional investigations about past Cuban policy." Instead of an inquiry, he called on President Kennedy to propose a "manifesto of freedom" for Cuba when he meets with Central American leaders in Costa Rica next month.

Javits, appearing on New York State television stations, observed that there had been demands for "various kinds of investigations." He said there clearly ought to be an inquiry into the abortive 1961 invasion so the Nation can "profit from what occurred." But he said it must not be a partisan affair.

Humphrey, addressing a United Auto Workers' conference in New York, said partisan demands for a Cuba investigation could hurt national unity. He also said congressional investigations seldom look to the future and that is what is now needed.

Humphrey said that out of the Costa Rica conference March 18–20 should come "an announcement of determination that freedom will replace Castroism in Cuba."

He said the Cuban people have had enough of the ABC's of tyranny—Anarchy, Batista, and Castro. "Let us give them a clear message that we are determined to help them to democracy, enlightened leadership and freedom."

As for congressional investigations, Humphrey said Castro's rise was "a tragic story that will not be remedied by seeking partisan advantage of trying to assess blame on either the Eisenhower or Kennedy administration."

January 28, 1963: Two of the planned air strikes for an invasion of Cuba in 1961 were canceled by President Kennedy, Senator Frank Carlson, Republican of Kansas, told a meeting of Republican women.

Carlson stressed, however, that the United States had not promised air cover for the Bay of Pigs invasion.

Carlson, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said the Central Intelligence Agency and Department of Defense originally planned three air strikes. One strike, against Cuban planes on the ground, were carried out but the other two were canceled.

"The United States did not promise air cover," Carlson told the Kansas Federation for Republican Women, "but * * * three air strikes were planned to destroy all Cuban airpower on the ground.

"The planes to make these strikes were based on an island off Florida. Some of them were piloted by Americans, others by Cubans."

January 28, 1963: The Peruvian Foreign Ministry today announced that documents found on the bodies of Cuban Government officials killed in an air crash near Lima on November 27, 1962, link Cuba "to a conspiracy of continental dimensions."

January 30, 1963: The United States accused Cuba of declaring war against the hemisphere, and urged Latin American nations to redouble their vigilance against Castro-Communist subversion.

This was the substance of a note delivered by DeLesseps S. Morrison, U.S. Ambassador to the Organization of American States. The note was given to Ambassador Juan Bautista de Lavalle of Peru, chairman of a special OAS committee on Cuba.

Referring to a January 16 speech by Fidel Castro, the note said the Cuban Premier's statement "further defining the Cuban Government's position of encouragement and support for armed insurrection in other countries of the hemisphere * * * constitutes a declaration of war against the hemisphere.

January 31, 1963: Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Republican of New York, told the Senate that the Soviet Union is pressing a new military buildup in Cuba. He called on the Kennedy administration for the facts.

The Defense Department replied by challenging two specific statements by Keating: (1) That a Soviet ship arrived in Cuba last Friday and "unloaded a cargo of armaments," and (2) that there is "continuing, absolutely confirmed and undeniable evidence that the Soviets are maintaining" the missile bases that led to last October's crisis.

In a Senate speech, Keating said "Cuba is becoming an impregnable fortress just as fast as the Soviets can make it so," and they are building to the point where "it will be impossible to get them out with conventional weapons."

Keating said the arms shipment reached Cuba the day after President Kennedy told his news conference last Thursday that Cuba is being kept under daily surveillance and that only one ship with possibly military cargo has docked there since October.

A Defense Department spokesman said: "Within a few days of the President's press conference last week two large Soviet ships, Kasimov and Baltica, did arrive in Cuba. There is no evidence that either carried offensive weapons."

As to Keating's statement that the Soviets are continuing to maintain the missile sites they agreed to dismantle, the Pentagon spokesman said:

"Concrete launch pads were broken up and other parts of the installations were destroyed. There is no evidence that these sites are usable, that they are being used for any military purpose, or that they are being maintained."

The spokesman said also that after the agreement between Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev and President Kennedy for removal of offensive weapons it was observed that the missile sites in Cuba were being dismantled.

"Missiles, transporters and missile erectors were photographed en route to and at port areas, being loaded aboard ship, and aboard ships en route to the U.S.S.R.," he said.

Reno J. Conti,
Foreign Affairs Division.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 13, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 5: 9: *For the fruit of the spirit is found in all that is good and right and true.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, inspire us to meet the duties and responsibilities of this day with a mastery and a majesty bearing unmistakable testimony that we have a radiant faith which reflects Thy greatness and glory.

We humbly acknowledge that there are times when all life seems to present a withering and wintry aspect and the days are drab and dreary.

Grant that in this Lenten season our souls may experience a glorious springtime when Thy gracious spirit shall lay hold on us with a blossoming fragrance and a fertilizing power to bring forth the fruits of goodness, righteousness, and truth.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am recorded as not answering rollcall No. 9 on yesterday. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 5, may sit during general debate for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SLIPPAGE IN THE RS–70 PROGRAM

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday while in the Committee of the Whole in the debate on the bill that is presently pending before the House on aircraft, missiles, and ships, I inadvertently made an error in a response to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner] in respect to the cost of the slippage of the present B–70, RS–70 program.

Mr. Speaker, I have corrected that Record, and it appears on page 4016 of yesterday's Record. I have corrected it to show that the actual slippage costs are presently from $15 million to $20 million.

This figure is based upon a ratio of increased cost to the increased time. The actual amounts involved are the already authorized $171 million, plus $36 million which have recently been released by the Department of Defense.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to note this correction.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

UNESCO BOOKLET, "EQUALITY OF RIGHTS BETWEEN RACES AND NATIONALITIES IN THE U.S.S.R."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on March 7 and again yesterday I commented on my inability to obtain a copy of the infamous UNESCO booklet, "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R."

In view of my previous comments, I now wish to announce that a copy of this booklet was delivered to my office yesterday afternoon with the compliments of Frederick G. Dutton, an Assistant Secretary of State. I have written Mr. Dutton to express my appreciation for his courtesy.

Quite frankly, I had not contacted the State Department since I was led to believe that no copies were available in Washington for distribution, except on loan from the Library of Congress. If he has an additional copy, perhaps Mr. Dutton will want to pass it along to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, who informed me in a letter dated March 4 that he had "not been able to lay hold of one myself."

TRIBUTE TO HON. WILLIAM CHARLES DOHERTY, U.S. AMBASSADOR TO JAMAICA

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, recently I was in Jamaica and I had the pleasant opportunity of again meeting with the Hon. William Charles Doherty, the Ambassador of the United States of America, whom I had known for many years here in the city of Washington. He is still the same wonderful friend and it was good to see at first hand what a magnificent job he is doing in representing our country so ably. In my meanderings through Kingston, and because as a man in public life I was especially interested, I often stopped and asked the people whom I met just what they thought of our new Ambassador. Regardless of how humble or important the persons were, they knew him and they loved him.

Before his nomination to this diplomatic post, Bill Doherty was the president of the National Association of Letter Carriers—a career that lasted 20 years.

He become one of the most effective voices organized labor has ever had in promoting democracy and the American way of life among the trade unions of the free world. Not only was he a distinguished president of a great and respected union, he was also a most compelling advocate of the free enterprise system among the troubled peoples of Europe and Latin America. He exemplified the people-to-people approach in creating good will for the United States of America in those areas where this country was least strong. While he was still president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, two Presidents—of opposite political philosophies—called upon Bill Doherty's experience and know-how in the international field. President Eisenhower selected him for a special mission in Brazil; President Kennedy selected him to represent him at the famous economic conference at Punta del Este in Uruguay, and also to join Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON at the independence celebrations in Jamaica in 1962.

When Bill Doherty resigned from the position of president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, President Kennedy almost immediately tapped him for one of the most sensitive and difficult diplomatic jobs in this hemisphere—our first Ambassador to the new nation of Jamaica. The choice was both brilliant and inspired. As the first representative of organized labor ever to attain the ambassadorial rank, Bill Doherty was going to a nation in which both dominant political parties are labor parties. President Bustamente is a veteran labor leader himself—and so are the chiefs of the opposition party.

Almost as soon as he arrived, Ambassador Doherty became known to Jamaicans as "Ambassador Bill." He has been enthusiastically received and unanimously respected by those with whom he has come in contact. His is one of the great success stories in modern diplomacy, and every one in this body who knew Bill Doherty when he was doing such a grand job in representing the letter carriers of the nation will rejoice to know that he is doing an equally fine job in representing his country in this important diplomatic field. I note from the RECORD that the U.S. Senate yesterday confirmed his appointment and that this augurs well for the United States of America.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 11]

Baring
Celler
Clausen
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Diggs
Dowdy
Griffiths
Harvey, Ind.
Healey
Kee
McClory
McDade
Madden
Marsh
Matthews
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
Patten
Powell
Rains
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Smith, Va.
Steed
Stubblefield
Teague, Tex.
Tupper
Walter

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 403 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 2440, with Mr. SHELLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] had 48 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] had 1 hour and 29 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this morning I would like to discuss three things which I consider to be of major importance in our military system today. They are the Polaris submarine, antisubmarine warfare, and airlifts.

Mr. Chairman, I also plan to discuss the condition of our continental defenses in this country and touch on what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] said about fat in the defense budget, particularly this budget that we are presenting. If time allows, I intend to discuss the RS-70 and try to put in proper perspective some of the things that were discussed on yesterday.

POLARIS

The first of these is Polaris. Polaris, the Navy's fleet ballistic missile weapon system, has been operational for over 2 years. Since U.S.S. *George Washington* (SSBN-598) sailed from Charleston, S.C., on November 15, 1960, Polaris missiles have been at sea. Constantly ready for launch within minutes of receiving the command, this concealed, yet mobile force—in being—has made a contribution, beyond reckoning, to a stable world peace. The tremendous advantages of ballistic missiles, deployed in nuclear powered submarines, have been readily grasped by the peoples of all nations. As a result, Polaris is accepted as essential to our free world strategic posture.

Soon after U.S.S. *George Washington's* pioneer deployment, she was joined by four nuclear submarines of the same class, armed with the 1,200-nautical-mile Polaris A-1 missiles. Four additional SSBN's of the larger, more powerful *Ethan Allen* class have since sailed for patrol operations, carrying the improved, 1,500-nautical-mile-range Polaris A-2 missile.

These first 9 submarines are, of course, but the vanguard of the Polaris force of 41 SSBN's, now building or planned. A still larger, more efficient class of FBM submarines will soon be operational. The *Lafayette*, launched in May of last year, will soon be ready for sea—the forerunner of a new class of nuclear submarines, larger than some World War II cruisers. Designed to incorporate recent imprpvements in both the submarine vehicle and in missile subsystems, these ships are about 425 feet long and displace some 7,000 tons. They will be ready to accept the third generation 2,500-nautical-mile-range Polaris A-3 missile. Every important target on the face of the earth will be within striking range of this seaborne projection of national power.

Still, research and development actively continues. Now in flight test at Cape Canaveral, the Polaris A-3 is scheduled to be ready in mid-1964 for later operational *Lafayette*-class submarines. Through extension of earlier Polaris technology, the A-3 is larger, and will be more powerful in its destructive potential. It incorporates many advances, including a new inertial guidance system, the smallest and lightest yet devised for U.S. ballistic missiles. Fully successful flights were achieved in February of this year.

With respect to the currently approved program, the major development effort of the FBM—Polaris—system will be completed during fiscal 1963. Development of a lighter, more efficient steam ejection launching system is nearing completion; improvement of missile accuracy through navigational means is being explored; and further development of techniques to enhance the penetration capability of Polaris missiles against defended targets is being pursued.

It is a source of pride to me, to the Navy, and, I am sure, to all Americans, that this magnificent weapon system has been created so quickly and successfully.

Complementing all other elements of our national military strength, it may be emphasized that these submerged, mobile, missile-launching bases are on patrol for peace.

Someone has talked about fat in this budget. Where and how would we have gotten the A-1, the A-2, and the A-3 if we did not have research and development? This brings me to the statement that without research and development, which is something you cannot even imagine or conjecture, you would have none of these things. Look at the heartaches that went on with Admiral Raborn in the days of his very austere budget in the development of the Polaris system. Had he failed, everybody would have criticized him. But the admiral never gave up even with such an austere and marginal budget as he had.

Now it has come true. It is the greatest thing we have in our arsenal today, barring none.

ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE PROGRAMS

I know that it is unnecessary for me to tell this House that antisubmarine warfare is one of the most important and complex functions for which the Navy is responsible. It cuts across all lines of Navy endeavor. It is a team effort with surface, air and subsurface forces all contributing their share.

The Navy's antisubmarine warfare capability improved during the last year. The new P-3A Orion patrol plane was introduced into the fleet and is replacing the old Neptunes. A new fixed-wing airplane, the Tracker, has started to replace the older planes on the antisubmarine warfare carrier. The same is true for the antisubmarine warfare helicopter carried aboard the CVS. The Dash, the new drone antisubmarine warfare helicopter, has joined the fleet to give the destroyer a long-range kill capability to match the new longer range sound detectors. New sonars and weapons reached the fleets in increasing numbers. Some of these new forces and equipments were used last October during the Cuban crisis to excellent advantage. They clearly demonstrated that the antisubmarine warfare road the Navy is traveling is pointed in the right direction.

Detection and identification of the submarine below the surface of the sea is still the major problem in antisubmarine warfare. Acoustics, the propagation of sound waves in water, is still the limiting factor. As long as this remains true, improvement will be evolutionary rather than revolutionary. The Navy, therefore, is continuing to increase its efforts in the field of oceanography—studying the environment of antisubmarine warfare. While we all hope for a major scientific breakthrough in the field of submarine detection, none is in sight now. Not that the Navy is leaving any stone unturned. Other methods and phenomena are being actively explored if they show any signs of promise at all.

The Navy is not doing this alone in an ivory tower. They are in close partnership with industry and the leading scientists of the country. Such organizations as the National Security Industrial Association, the Institute of Aerospace Sciences, and the National Academy of Sciences, to name a few. All have committees or people actively studying Navy antisubmarine warfare problems. With this team effort every promising avenue of approach should be covered.

The program presented this year is a sound one and should increase our Navy's antisubmarine warfare readiness and capability. Fifty percent of this year's shipbuilding program is for antisubmarine warfare ships. Nearly 25 percent of the Navy's research and development program will be in the field of antisubmarine warfare. As a matter of fact, more than 25 percent of the Navy's total procurement budget is devoted directly to antisubmarine warfare.

The shipbuilding and conversion program contains new destroyer escorts and nuclear submarines as well as modernization for some of the older ships. Further procurement of the new aircraft that I referred to, as well as modern equipment and weapons, will enhance and strengthen our antisubmarine warfare posture. Increased research and development effort will assist us to maintain that posture.

I am pleased that the Navy is stressing this important function to counter the large submarine threat that faces us. I do not want to give the impression that the Navy has solved all of its antisubmarine warfare problems or that everything is rosy. It is still a difficult and demanding problem, but I am confident that the Navy is making every effort to keep ahead of the submarine threat and that they will succeed in doing so.

We had to raise this budget. If we had done justice to the military we would have raised it more than we did. Did you know that we do not have in our arsenal today what you could call a truly modern fighter aircraft for our defenses over the F-4H made in the great State of Missouri at the McDonnell aircraft factory? We all know that we need the ablest fighter on earth implementing the other defenses we have to give us the type of defense we need.

You have heard about the TFX. We hope that from the TFX will come a modern fighter; but as you know such a plane has a comparatively short life, assuming there is no slippage. When you get sophisticated weapons systems such as we have in the RS-70—and we need the RS-70—you are bound to have slippage here and slippage there. This is the state of the art.

We hear about cutting this budget and cutting out the fat, as the gentleman from Wisconsin said. Of course, we join in this. We have the Hébert committee now that is going to be chaired by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY]. Last year we brought back to the Treasury of the United States over $40 million in contracts that were changed. It happens in all administrations, the past administration was no exception. When you have a new weapon you cannot have competitive bidding, certainly; this is impossible. Our distinguished chairman beats it into our heads every day, day in and day out: Wherever possible have competitive bidding. But this does not assure you of a firm price on an implement of warfare. Let me tell you something, war is wasteful, war is designed to kill. If war is waste, the preparation for war likewise is wasteful, and we point this out.

AIRLIFT

I have had a long and abiding interest in the question of airlift and have, I hope, contributed to the greatly improved position in which the country now finds itself in this important area.

Many of us are familiar with the old C-119 which, although specifically designed for airborne operations, is small and slow and has a short range. We will continue to use these old C-119's as part of our reserve, but I am pleased to inform the House that we are now going to acquire several additional squads of C-130E's which are much faster, much more efficient, and to a much greater extent fulfill our true requirements in the airlift area.

As these C-130's come into our inventory, they will replace an equal number of C-124's. The C-124 also is a useful aircraft and can be used quite efficiently for strategic airlift but it is not a suitable airplane for airdrop operations.

The C-123 assault transport had been planned for phasing out during fiscal year 1964. However, it has been found to be very useful in Vietnam because of its ability to take off on very short runways and similarly to land in restricted areas. Because of these capabilities, it is planned to keep them in the inventory for the time being.

The C-141 which is our newest aircraft in the airlift area is proceeding satisfactorily and we will soon see this airplane in production.

The C-141 will be able to replace our C-133 for many of the outsize items which only the C-133 can carry today.

All in all, I am happy to report that our airlift situation is vastly improved over that which we viewed so unhappily a few short years ago.

In the world today, while it is difficult to set one military capability above another, whatever order of priority might be used, airlift would be very close to the top of any such list.

The bill that we have before us today contains among other things authority for the procurement of the C-130E turboprop transport and the C-141 transport. The passage of the bill will be another step toward the enhancement of our capabilities in the area of airlift.

I trust that this bill will be passed in the same fashion as our bill of last year, and that is to say, unanimously.

We have $135 million for two more nuclear-powered submarines and $363 million for the RS-70. These figures ought to stand. At the proper time I expect to take more time to refer to the RS-70, but time does not permit me to do that now.

There is another area which should have your attention. By the simple expedient of arithmetic your fleet is going out of business over a period of years by block obsolescence of the fleet—the U.S. Navy. I include a part of a report Mr. BATES, Mr. HARDY, and I made on this subject:

VESSEL OBSOLESCENCE

There is a very real likelihood, indeed almost mathematical certainly, that our active fleet will encounter such serious block obsolescence in years to come as to raise a serious question as to its ability to perform its assigned missions.

With this in mind a special subcommittee was appointed in the fall of last year to look into this matter and make recommendations to the full committee. The subcommittee held hearings and issued a report which only fortified the belief already held by the committee that block obsolescence constituted a major threat to our naval power. The subcommittee in its report reduced its findings to an arithmetical formula which is unavoidable in its conclusion.

A portion of this report is set out below. The conclusions reached are concurred in by the full committee:

"SUBCOMMITTEE FINDINGS

"Today there are 860 ships in our active fleet. Of this number 598 were authorized during World War II. The average age of all of the ships in the active fleet is 15 years. Based on past experience a Navy ship may be expected to have an average useful life of about 20 years.

"The active fleet planned for 1973 contemplates approximately this same number of ships (although the composition of the fleet by type will be substantially changed).

"As indicated on the chart set out in the report, 387 ships were authorized between fiscal years 1948 and 1963. This is an average of 24 ships were year.

"To approach the problem arithmetically, one need but take the average number of ships constructed each year from fiscal year 1948 through fiscal year 1963 (24 ships), multiply this by the number of years between 1963 and 1970 (7 years), and add to this result the number 355 which represents the number of ships presently in being or authorized which can be considered as assets in 1973 and the formula looks like this:

"24×7[1]=168+335[2]=503

"This means that the 860 ships in our active fleet today will decline to 503 ships 10 years hence.

"This is simple arithmetic. The result is inevitable and unarguable.

"But, one would immediately contend, no one is going to let this come about. Or, in the parlance of the recent past, 'It can't happen here.' But it can. True, the fiscal year 1962 program was 36 ships and the fiscal year 1963 program was 37 ships, well above the 24-ship average. Then let us substitute 37 for the 24 in the formula and see what is the result. The formula now would be:

"37×7[1]=259+355[2]=594

"Under a shipbuilding program of this size the fleet would decline from 860 to 594, still very short of the year 1973 requirements.

"What is the answer? A simple one: We must substitute the figure 70 for the figure 24 or 37 and by so doing our fleet in 1973 will approximate the size of today's fleet. There is no other way."

In last year's bill there were 37 new ships requested. In this year's bill 41 new ships were requested and the committee added 2 more for a total of 43. It is obvious that this level of shipbuilding must be increased in the future in order to preserve the naval power of the United States. The committee urges the Department of Defense to give this matter its closest and most serious consideration.

We are bringing to you 41 new ships this year. These are not enough. We ought to have 50 plus, 60 plus, and possibly 70 over the next 6 or 7 years.

Look at some of these figures I have in my report. We have brought you only 41 ships. We have now 335 ships built within the last 15 years. This, plus 24 a year, which we are now building, gives us 503 ships. We have 860 in our inventory. Only 503 of them are not obsolete or in various categories of being modern. The life of a ship is only 20 years. If you take a ship and FRAM it—that is bringing it up to date by fleet repair and modernization—you cannot modernize a ship any more than you can bring it up to the point it was in before.

We have missiles and missiles requiring air conditioning. You cannot put that into a hull. You can only FRAM it so much.

These submarines are getting more and more obsolete every day. If we brought in a budget that did justice to this country, it would far exceed the $15 billion we are bringing to you today. We have brought to you an austere budget. You can holler about economy all you want, but I say cut your budget somewhere else, do not take it out of the hide of your military because you cannot afford to do it. And I challenge anybody to find the fat in this bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will say to the gentleman that he is making a very fine, a very constructive statement. There is not a man in this House who served in World War II who does not remember the problems that the men in the battleline had because of the need for modernization of the weapon system, because we were unprepared. If we are unprepared when the time comes, if it should come, we would suffer in a manner that would be irreparable. I compliment the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], and the gentleman who is now speaking, for presenting to this Congress an absolutely minimum budget. I am completely convinced, although the gentleman may not get to the RS–70 problem, after reading the testimony of the committee there is no question in my mind but that it would be foolhardy if we do not adopt the committee's recommendations.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman very much.

Now, I would like to say this: Modern warfare is an expensive thing. Did you know that your Army was neglected for year upon year upon year and that we are just now getting to the point where we are modernizing our Army? Ask the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes]. He knows. He is on the Committee on Appropriations. Ask him if there is any fat in the Army budget. The Army has been marching, literally, on half soles. We are just now in this budget bringing the Army up to the point of modernity.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot cut this budget. Take our airlift, for instance. We will have to spend over a billion dollars to modernize our airlift. Our airlift had been neglected for years. Our airlift was almost nonexistent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina. The great need at this time for research and development funds in order to improve our antisubmarine forces cannot be stressed too strongly. The fact that 25 percent of the shipbuilding funds will be directed toward research and development indicates that our Navy is not standing still and is traveling in a direction that will give this Nation a fast hard-hitting force that will be able to deal with the threat of the Soviet submarines.

Forty-one new Navy vessels are included in this authorization, also 35 conversion vessels.

It is important that our Navy construct ships that can travel faster than the present new merchant ships that are breaking all records for ocean travel. We must build ships of increased cruising range. We must develop and design antisubmarine warfare vessels that can meet the test of speed, maneuverability, lower cost in construction, and lower cost of operation. This I believe can be done with the technical know-how in our private shipbuilding industry as well as in our Bureau of Ships.

At the present time some of our shipyards are losing some of the best brains in new ideas for modern shipbuilding. I hope our Government realizes that private shipyards who have the brains and the know-how cannot always continue if every ship is going to be awarded on the lowest bidder basis. While this system may seem to be saving the taxpayer some money, the truth of the matter is that it is serving to discourage private shipbuilding industry from coming up with new ideas, and we could very well digress into having a second-class Navy. We must encourage initiative; we must recognize the ability of private enterprise to come up with new methods that can improve our Navy. The so-called statement of sharpening the pencil could very well be one of the costliest errors ever made. Let us start to amend the ways of the past few years by building the very best in quality, the very best in endurance, and the type of Navy that can meet the challenge of the day.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pirnie].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Defense of our Nation is certainly an objective of highest priority. The legislation we are debating today represents our current response to this obligation. The answer is truly bipartisan, reported out of our committee by unanimous vote. It reflects the detailed study and evaluation of our Secretary of Defense, our military leaders and Service Secretaries, as well as the Armed Services Committee. The bill did not evolve in an atmosphere of complete agreement. Differences do exist respecting the emphasis to be placed upon certain weapon systems. Most of our committee have doubted the wisdom of the decision of the Defense Department to halt production of the strategic manned bomber, thus indicating our ultimate reliance on missiles. Thirty-two members, of whom I am one, view with deepest concern the continued development of the bomber by the Soviets and can foresee a true gap in this threat by the end of the sixties. Accordingly, we have been unhappy over the foot dragging by the Defense Department in the development and construction of the RS–70.

Proper evaluation of weapons is most difficult in this age of rapid technological progress. The breakthroughs have been so numerous and so far reaching that we do not discount the possibilities of witnessing even more startling advances—it is safer to discuss when than if. Therefore, I doubt whether any talent, no matter how real, any experience, no matter how extensive, any analysis, no matter how penetrating, should arbitrarily pronounce a death sentence for a weapons system as flexible as the manned bomber. Likewise we should not be deterred by difficulties or failures. The facts are that we have now solved so many of the problems attending supersonic flight that success is in sight.

In our planning we are troubled by the rapid tempo of obsolescence which threatens the validity of weapons systems even before they can be transferred from the drawing board to the production line. Also, we are faced with equally rapid changes in political, geographic, and strategic balances. We can count on scarcely a single factor to maintain such a status quo as to provide cornerstone reliability. So, the simple truth is that we must be prepared to defend our rights, which are, in essence, the rights of the free world, anywhere, any time and in any way.

We have learned the hard way that aggression anywhere is aggression against us. When Secretary of State Stimson sounded this alarm over 30 years ago at the time Manchuria was attacked, we ignored his warning until aggression became a repeated process culminating in World War II.

As a result, we should have learned that the only way to check aggression is to respond in a timely and effective way to each such threat as it arises. To do so requires a force that is in being and not on the drawing boards. To achieve this concept of instant capability has been the goal of your committee. We would provide weapons and manpower of sufficient strength and mobility, so strategically located as to insure prompt and decisive responses. With this objective in view, we have analyzed manning levels, weapons inventories, and transport capabilities in the light of today's threats. In scanning the zones of potential trouble, it is somewhat depressing to note how little of the world is truly at peace. Danger signals are flying in countless areas and in many of them the United States provides virtually the sole protective force of any consequence.

Responsibilities of such vast proportions entail monetary costs of disturbing size. The burden of expense can threaten the stability of our economy, hence, our ability to survive. The continuing attack on our way of life is as much political and economic as it is military. Therefore, we must keep our defense cost in balance. It is true that military pressure provides the more vivid and spectacular danger but the power of other techniques must never be underestimated. Accordingly, in programing the defense activities for fiscal year 1964, every effort has been made by your committee to insure the security we need at a cost we can accept.

Our distinguished chairman has ably outlined the vast scope of the military procurement necessary to meet our national responsibilities. He has made it abundantly clear that, in general, the committee acted upon the recommendations of the Defense Department in allocating funds for the several types of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels. Our action is at variance with the Secretary's request in two instances. First, we have included in the bill an authorization for two additional attack nuclear submarines, believing such action to be prudent and imperative. Secondly, we have increased funds for the development of the RS–70. The majority of our committee have been disturbed over the increased emphasis of the Department of Defense on missiles, with less and less on manned strategic systems. The last Congress shared this concern and acting upon the military judgment available to it, urged the Secretary of Defense to proceed with the development of the RS–70 as rapidly as possible and appropriated funds so to do. The opposition of the Secretary to this program, so evident at that time, continues. His conviction is no doubt sincere. Equally sincere is the attitude of the 32 members of our committee who differ with him. This disagreement in no way reflects lack of confidence in the overall capability of the Secretary. Rather does it suggest acceptance of committee responsibility instead of rubberstamp approval. This is as it should be. We have on our committee many members who have served long in their assignment, participating in defense planning during the most critical years of our history. They have seen the evolution of modern warfare firsthand and also, through the eyes of our greatest military leaders for whom a real respect has been developed.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from New York, and my colleague on the Committee on Armed Services, could tell us why the previous administration, the Eisenhower administration, did not use this money for the then B–70 program.

Mr. PIRNIE. I could only speak for the time with which I am reasonably familiar. Perhaps the state of research in any given time period may have had some bearing on it. But whether it was in the last administration or this administration, would make no difference to me. If the military leaders, those with whom we place such responsibility, say that this weapons system has value and should be advanced, then I am accepting their advice.

Mr. COHELAN. But as the gentleman recognizes, we are not arguing the question of whether or not we go forward with the B–70, RS–70 program. We in fact have such a program at the present time, as the gentleman well knows. The question is, Should we proceed with two additional aircraft in this program, and for what purpose? Is any value added in going forward with such a program?

Mr. PIRNIE. I believe the gentleman knows the capabilities that are to be included in the fourth and the fifth planes, and he also knows the difference between the third and the other two. Those capabilities, many of which are classified, have to do with making the plane a weapons system. That is the difference, is it not?

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman well knows that as far as the weapons system is concerned there is some doubt about whether this kind of project would ever in any sense become a weapons system. As the gentleman recalls from the testimony in our hearings, Admiral Anderson testified in a colloquy with me that his major interest in the program was strictly research and development for reconnaissance purposes.

Mr. PIRNIE. These members lay no claim to military genius, nor do they seek the role of the armchair strategist, but they do feel concern when the development of a weapon of such potential as the RS–70 is urged by virtually unanimous action of our military leaders and such recommendation is brushed aside. They and I have confidence in our men in uniform, particularly our several Chiefs of Staff.

In this world of fast-moving technology the effectiveness of weapons and of defenses can change from day to day. We cannot wait for the ultimate. We must have in being our most effective concept in each important category.

Let us consider the potential of the RS–70 as we understand it to be. This plane would have the capability of travel at three times the speed of sound for long distances and at high altitudes, in a hostile environment either on reconnaissance or striking missions. While so engaged, it would report back the results of its own strikes or those of other weapons systems. The effect of this new threat on the current Soviet air defense system would be tremendous. Present Soviet interceptors, radar, and surface-to-air missiles would become practically worthless, permitting penetration. As indicated in our report, the very existence of this threat would require the Soviets to extend their air defense system at a cost of not less than $10 billion before they would have any reasonable possibility of coping with the RS–70 weapon system. If we do not develop this threat, we are simplifying the defense problems for the Soviet.

However, it should be made clear that if the program is limited to the three prototypes presently planned, the supporting systems necessary to make a weapons system out of the RS–70 would not be developed. Hence, the full impact on the Soviet defense system would never materialize.

Our investment in the RS–70 program is far more than a bet on the effectiveness of a manned bomber as an offensive weapon. It represents our basic study and development of supersonic transport. All of the difficult problems which had to be solved in its construction are landmarks in the evolution of air or space travel. For example, we have developed structures, fuels, bearings, lubrication, and tires to meet the terrific temperature changes incident to such stresses and speeds. Each prototype has contained more instrumentation and greater capabilities. Planes 4 and 5, which we would authorize, embody highly classified and effective command and control systems with weapons keyed to radar capabilities which only a short time ago were termed impossible to achieve.

---

[1] The ships that would comprise the fleet in 1973 would have to be authorized and appropriated for by 1970. A 3-year leadtime is required between the date a ship is authorized and the date it joins the fleet.

[2] Testimony indicated that barring unforeseen, unpredictable technological breakthroughs, the Navy will have 335 ships, presently in being or authorized, that can be considered as assets in 1973.

Our military advisers, who have urged development of the RS–70 with all possible speed, are concerned that the successful evolution of an effective antimissile missile will make our failure to retain a proper mix of weapons very critical indeed. Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky recently said:

> I maintain that for any predictable time the manned vehicle, whether airborne, spaceborne or orbital that can maneuver in and out of orbit will be the decisive weapon in any future war.

His statement and the attitude of our military leaders clearly emphasize that foot dragging in the development of the fullest capabilities of supersonic aircraft can upset the proper striking balance of ballistic missiles and aircraft and can be a dangerous mistake. It is not necessary or wise to take this risk.

We are cost conscious. We do not wish to expend a dollar that is not necessary, but we do feel that the present investment in the RS–70 is so great and its ultimate potential so vital, that it should not be sidetracked until its feasibility as a weapons system is established or disproved. A half-hearted effort will not provide the proper answer.

We are mindful of the size of the expenditure involved in this bill. It represents $85 for every man, woman and child in the United States. The burden of such spending at a time when we are not in an all-out conflict is unprecedented. Yet the cost in dollars is more easily absorbed than the cost in blood if our guard is lowered too far. Our force in being is designed to deter attack upon our Nation and we are convinced that it is serving its purpose well.

We have been assured that our known military strength and our display of force at the time of the Cuban crisis disrupted the Soviet timetable. If so, the additional resources provided in this bill should strengthen further our resolve to deal decisively with all threats to the peace of the world, particularly those in this hemisphere. We are reminded that a significant move of a single ship of our 7th Fleet has on occasions eased critical Asiatic situations. In time of crisis, we must have at our command an alert, well-trained force, properly deployed and equipped with modern arms. This type of security we can and must have. No longer can we rely upon a warning period within which to arm. Only a capability to respond quickly and powerfully will deter the aggressor.

Yes, the stakes are high and so is the cost. This expenditure represents a heavy burden but the heaviest burden of all is our responsibility to adequately provide for the safety of our Nation. I trust we have found the proper answer to this responsibility. Future events may suggest shifts in weapon emphasis. If so, I trust all of us charged with this great decision will be quick to react. The task demands our dedicated cooperation, not stubborn opposition or selfish promotions.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, and Members of the House, it is my intention during the next 15 minutes to do a little soul searching with you, to indulge in some plain talk, and to present to you some unvarnished facts. This issue is a very simple one with those of us who support the inclusion of the so-called RS–70 in this program. However, a principle is involved in which you are a participant, the principle of whether the Congress itself will meet its responsibility in the discharge of its duty under the Constitution to raise and maintain an Army and Navy or whether the Congress is prepared to continue its abdication of authority and failure to discharge its responsibilities.

You heard the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends] yesterday make a very dynamic presentation, with which I would like to associate myself. In making these comments, let me say here and now that this is not in any manner, shape, or form or by the furthest stretch of the imagination an attack on the Secretary of Defense personally. The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan] yesterday indicated that this was an attack on the man—it is not. I have unhesitatingly said, and I say it here now that Robert S. McNamara is, perhaps, the strongest Secretary of Defense we have ever had and I have seen them all. There is no doubt he is one of the most brilliant and one of the most dedicated men I have ever met. He is a genious—undoubtedly so. I am fond of him personally and I know I am his friend and I hope he is my friend. But I suggest to you that the greatest friend man has is fire. We cannot exist without fire. But unless we control fire, we destroy civilization. Now let us take a look at the facts. I prefer to take my stand with the professional military man who has had years of experience, who has faced the enemy on the battlefield, who has defended his country when he saw his fellow men dying around him.

I take my stand with them in preference to the striplings who are the geniuses in the intellectual community but have never heard a shot fired in anger.

This record is replete and documented painstakingly and with much effort to develop before the committee exactly the position of the military in the case of the RS–70. For the first time in my recollection the actual vote of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has been made public and is a matter of record. Each individual Chief was asked these questions by me:

> Did you at any time with the Joint Chiefs collectively discuss the pros and cons of the RS–70 with the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense?

And each Chief answered in the negative, although Mr. McNamara's testimony would indicate that this was a great family affair and many discussions were held. On every occasion except when General Taylor was named Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, the military people unanimously decided that the RS–70 was a needed military weapon. In spite of this, in spite of the consensus of an experienced congressional committee, as of last year the man in civilian clothes overruled the man in uniform. He based it on what? I do not know. Perhaps on the scientific advance, or on the admonition of Dr. Harold Brown, a 35-year-old genius who refused to tell the committee, or identify to the committee, the names of the scientists that he had conferred with. This in contrast to General LeMay who frankly told the committee the names of the scientists who said that the RS–70 was a feasible weapons system and was needed militarily. I suggest to you that Dr. Charyk can compare with Dr. Brown in the field of science, and he thinks it is a feasible military weapon.

This brings us now to the real crux of the situation; this brings us necessarily to what we are facing today. Mr. McNamara has not abused one privilege in making these decisions; he has acted within his powers, powers that we, the Congress, gave him. It is about time we face up to the situation. We either decide what powers we want to reserve to the military or allow the civilian domination as it now exists to continue; either do that or stop squawking about it.

I was very much interested in what is taking place on the other side of this building. Mr. McNamara throws his arms up and suggests that the conduct of a congressional committee is undermining confidence in the Department of Defense officials, so he sends his hatchet man out under the cloak of anonymity to say that the committee was in effect prejudiced and would not conduct a fair and objective hearing. It took the committee to smoke out Mr. Sylvester, the so-called spokesman of the Pentagon—I prefer to refer to him as the "spooksman." A man who refuses to stand up and be counted is not worthy of being accepted.

I am very much concerned with the lack of morale in the Pentagon today. I believe that the Secretary of Defense should be equally concerned with me about the morale in the Pentagon and less concerned about a congressional committee's effect on the Pentagon officials who have some explaining to do.

In my 23 years here and 21 years' association with the Armed Forces of this country, I have never seen the morale of the Pentagon at such a low ebb. The Secretaries of the services are messenger boys. When the generals pass by, I understand some even sing "Twinkle, twinkle little star, who do you think you are?"

What are you going to do about it? Are we going to sit here and be a Congress of negation or are we going to assume a positive role?

Let me assure you that other people are concerned about this situation. Last year the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson], recognizing these dangers, appointed a most adequate and competent subcommittee composed of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates] to examine the situation and find out how far the Secretary of Defense was using his powers. It is all included in this report. I will read you one paragraph from it which shows the conclusion of this committee after extensive hearings:

> Since it is not the function of the Congress to pass upon the legality of public laws, we cannot state that what has been done is illegal, but we certainly believe that it is contrary to the intent of Congress. But more important, perhaps, is that these independent agencies could lead to dangerous results.

The last paragraph says:

> We can only conclude that the Congress has lost control of the organization of the Department and cannot carry out its responsibility unless we amend the National Security Act as suggested.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] stated:

> I have read the foregoing report and find myself in full accord with the conclusions and recommendations.

If there is no one who will give the House an opportunity to vote on this subject, I will.

Keep in mind what we are doing here with the committee bill. Vote for the RS–70. Now what does that favorable vote really mean?

If I can judge by what has happened in the past, it is like going through a Rotary Club's dinner in Saskatchewan, in a small town. A favorable vote will mean as much as a luncheon club vote against an Egyptian loan. That is how much your expression means in the Department of Defense today.

But do not blame Mr. McNamara. You gave him the power. You wrote it into the law. And if you are satisfied, let it stay there. If you are not, take it out.

What have we found to date in the Secretary's alternate program? Nobody here can name me one weapons system that has been initiated since Mr. McNamara came into office which is now in production.

I can tell you the negation of the RS–70 was against the judgment of the military, the Skybolt canceled against the judgment of the military, the Nike-Zeus shoved aside against the judgment of the military. Now I hear rumors that the Dyna-Soar is going to be canceled out again against the judgment of the military.

In whose hands do we place the defense of this country? Civilian control, yes; but certainly not civilian abuse. I was part and parcel of the committee that wrote this act. At that time I raised the dangers involved. I am no Johnny-come-lately.

I heard Mr. Gilpatric last Sunday on "Meet the Press" very cleverly, very adroitly, suggest to the millions of people who listened to that popular program that there was no monarchy in the Pentagon; that the Pentagon was acting under the law that the Congress passed. That is the truth, but only half the truth. Certainly nobody had any idea that this power would be extended beyond what the Congress intended. If we must spell out the authority we mean and intended, then let us spell it out.

Mr. Chairman, these are trying times.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield.

Mr. COHELAN. As the gentleman knows, I disagree with him on this particular point. But, I would like to ask the gentleman what he would suggest the Secretary of Defense do. Are you suggesting that he should accept everything that comes down from the Joint Chiefs of Staff? What role are you going to cast him in?

Mr. HÉBERT. I would cast him in a role of weaponry to accept the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are the military experts. When I want an operation for appendicitis, I do not go to a lawyer to use a scalpel. When I want a writ of habeas corpus, I do not go to a doctor to get one. I go to trained people. That is what I suggest now.

Now, let me say this in answer to the gentleman's question. I suggest that the law be amended in order that the Joint Chiefs of Staff be given the power of decision in weaponry. Keep in mind this. The Congress is involved here. Do you realize this, that you only have the power of negation? You do not have any affirmative power under this act in the manner in which it is being discharged. When the Defense Department comes before your Committee on Armed Services for authorization, under the procedures and under the action which has taken place, all we can do is to deny authority; deny something. But, we cannot add, because when we do add, the Executive then refuses to recognize what we have added. This is not peculiar to the present administration. It was rampant in the previous administration, and before that and before that, and that was the time I raised this question. I raised the question when the *United States* carrier was authorized, and then President Truman canceled it on the urging of the then Secretary of Defense who was supposedly cutting all the fat from a $13 billion budget, only to find that when Korea broke out he had cut the muscle, and we were in bad shape. Do not let that happen again.

Fat in this bill. Where? Name me one single item that can be taken out. And yet in two instances, in the matter of the RS–70 and the attack nuclear submarine, Congress and the committee in its wisdom has added these two items. What is going to happen to them will be of interest. Do we not have something to say about this country? Are we going to be passive people, merely listen to testimony, without contributing what our years of knowledge and service have vested in us? I am not ready to accept that suggestion at all, and I do not think you are. We must go before this country backing the Committee on Armed Services to the hilt. The chairman of the committee, who sits over there, with 49 years of service in this Congress, perhaps knows more about the military than any individual here, and he stands up and says we need this. He said it last year and we backed him, and the majority are backing him now.

Oh, yes, my colleagues, the day of decision is here. Let us be prepared to discharge our responsibility. Let us rededicate ourselves to the fact that we must have the strongest military institution in the world and that we must continue civilian control as we intended it. The Commander in Chief is in charge, but we must recognize what our professional military men say.

Why, coming out in the pay bill next week Members will find great retirement benefits given to our retiring generals. I think it is a waste if we are giving this money out to people who do not know what they are talking about. This is no disrespect to the Secretary or anyone. But it is a plea and a challenge and a hope that this Congress will protect its own integrity and will stand up for the Nation and say that we represent the people, we speak for the people, and we accept that responsibility in the name of the people.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I just want to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I hope he looks over his remarks very carefully and does not permit himself to be placed in a position where he is any way criticizing the judgment of the Secretary of Defense, for the very simple reason that on the ticker tape this morning there was a statement carried which was made by the Secretary of Defense at the National Press Club where he, apparently because of a low boiling point, thinks we are picking on him as an individual. But yesterday I said very emphatically in my remarks exactly what the gentleman from Louisiana has said today—that I respect the Secretary of Defense as an individual. But the Secretary of Defense has taken apparently the attitude that we have no right to criticize the procedures being followed by the Armed Forces and the Department of Defense.

Mr. HÉBERT. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I am very emphatic about this. I am not criticizing the Secretary. I again say I am very fond of the Secretary as an individual and personally I have told him already "You do not think the Congress is a necessary evil. You think it is an unnecessary evil." I have suggested even that neither Congress nor the Constitution has endowed the Secretary of Defense with the cloak of infallibility.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I have listened attentively to everything everyone has had to say during the course of this debate on this procurement authorization. However, I do not think anyone has pinpointed the circumstances that exist quite as well as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert] has done today.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I wholeheartedly concur with what the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert] has had to say about the RS–70 and the Secretary of Defense, and I do not take this to be a personal attack upon the Secretary of Defense, by any stretch of the imagination. I think it is a justifiable criticism. I personally feel that he has every ability, but I think he is prone to lean upon computer statistics in arriving at his answers. I have not found a computer that has an input for human nature, and I think the present Secretary of Defense ignores human nature. However, I feel that human nature is a very important part of this operation. We simply must build manned airplanes such as the RS–70 and we must not ignore our military specialists.

Mr. HÉBERT. I will say to the gentleman in replying that I have to return to a very well-known Democratic President who speaks the language that I like so well, Harry Truman, who said:

> If you cannot stand the heat, get out of the kitchen.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends] suggest that to the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I think my distinguished subcommittee chairman, for whom I have a very warm regard, and with whom on this occasion I strongly disagree, for yielding. But I would hope, and I sincerely ask this, that now the gentleman has had this exercise in exposing what he believes to be wrong with the Secretary of Defense, that the gentleman will take some further time before the afternoon is over and tell us what the gentleman thinks is wrong or is right about the B–70, RS–70 program. This, of course, is the fundamental point at issue.

Mr. HÉBERT. I intend to do exactly that.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us a bill which authorizes in excess of $15.8 billion for the defense of our country. This represents a large sum of money and, yet, it is only a portion of the $54 billion which is to be spent on military preparedness this coming fiscal year.

War has never been a pleasant or cheap business regardless of the context in which that word is used. Its magnitude of destruction has today reached a point beyond the comprehension of man. Indecision and unpreparedness have often been the twins that have led to war. Let us be certain that in our day and time that we are decisive and that we are prepared.

In yesterday's debate there was considerable discussion concerning the solvency of the Nation and the impact of military spending. The balance between what we need and what we can afford is not difficult. The fact is that we must provide whatever is necessary to make this Nation secure. The difficult decision really rests in eliminating those items that we can properly and safely do without. All of us must constantly explore every avenue of possible saving, and this certainly applies to every program whether it is military or otherwise. I would suggest, however, that this will not be easy and I would like to cite some examples of problems that we will face.

A year ago, the Armed Services Committee expressed its dissatisfaction with the Navy's shipbuilding program and a special committee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers] was established. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy] and I also served on this committee.

This committee concluded that if the Navy followed its shipbuilding program, which averaged 24 ships per year between 1948 and 1963, it would have only 503 ships in 1973, or 357 ships less than the Navy indicates it needs. If the program of last year alone was followed, which was the highest of the postwar years, there would still be a shortage of 206 ships by 1973. This year, although the number of ships increased from 37 to 43, the fact remains that the cost of the shipbuilding program is cut by almost a half billion dollars. We are only building smaller ships.

If I had any idea, or if anyone had the idea, that this was a real saving, we would have reason for encouragement. However, all we are really doing is putting off the inevitable day when a terrifically expanded fleet must be built. In the meantime, our shipyards might well close and we have already lost a large number of our skilled workers.

The committee was also advised that unless the Air Force recommendation of 45 T–39(A) jet trainers was accepted, that the production lines would close down. It would have to be reopened at a later date, and the cost of these planes would be increased by a cost of 25 percent. The money for these planes was denied in the bill.

I only wish to make this point. We must eliminate every bit of waste that can be found in the defense budget, but when we do it let us be certain we are not undermining our security or practicing false economy.

Before I close, I would like to refer to the RS–70. When the Secretary of Defense makes the bold decision to eliminate some of the huge costs connected with defense, we should bend over backwards to support him as long as we are satisfied that the security of our country is not being impaired. This I have tried to do but from the possible effects of such action I am constrained to follow an opposite course.

Years ago, in discussing matters of defense with an expert in countermeasures, I became convinced that a mix in our weapons was the best answer to our security. Once we have decided to follow one course, the problem for a potential enemy becomes much more simple and his defense costs much less.

Has Russia today a Nike-Zeus, or can it develop an effective one? If the answer to either of these questions is affirmative then in those years when the B–58 and the B–47 are obsolete, we must have a weapon system different from a ballistic missile which might be destroyed by techniques now under study and development. I would suggest, that once the decision was made to develop three RS–70 planes, we should be ready to marry the plane with a weapons system so that it can add to our offensive capabilities.

In brief, Mr. Chairman, I support the bill before us. Although we must examine every program to save every dime possible, let us also make certain that in the years ahead when the funds being spent now have become a part of our arsenal that there will be no regrets of our decisions of today.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. At the outset of your remarks you said this bill totaled $14,800 million. On page 3 of the report I read that the new total of this bill, H.R. 2440, is $15,856,391,000.

Mr. BATES. If the gentleman will excuse me, I meant to name that figure of $15,856 million plus and the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Does this figure include the proposed $363 million for the RS–70 program?

Mr. BATES. Yes, it is in there.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Osmers].

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Chairman, previous speakers have explained many parts of the bill before us (H.R. 2440). Understandably, there are sharp differences of opinion among us about what the size, character, and cost of the missile, the RS–70, and the manned bomber programs should be. Without questioning the overriding importance of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems, it is my purpose to remind my colleagues that the only actual and really likely warfare in the world today is typified by such combat as we have seen at the Bay of Pigs, in the mountains of India, and in the jungles and swamps of Asia and Africa. With a nuclear stalemate of sorts apparently in existence, this situation may continue for some years to come. That is why it seems necessary to call attention to a relatively minor, but vitally significant, part of the authorizations now under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, in a world fascinated by missiles, satellites, space exploration, and possible trips to the moon, how easy it is to ignore these real situations that confront our armed services throughout the world today. Let us ask ourselves what use could we make of nuclear missiles, for example, in southeast Asia, in Africa, in Cuba, or elsewhere in Latin America? It is now clear that it is Communist policy, for the present, at least, to use subversion, sabotage, staged uprisings, and rigged revolutions to advance toward their eternal goal of world domination. To deny them success with these methods we need a mobile flexible Army that can instantly meet these threats to our security wherever and whenever they appear. These Communist tactics give Army aircraft an entirely new dimension in our overall defense.

The House Armed Services Committee in this bill, H.R. 2440, is recommending approval of an authorization of $522.1 million for the procurement of aircraft for the Army.

Army aviation has always been an integral and vital part of the organization of the modern Army. Today, however, it is needed more than ever to enhance the mobility, firepower, flexibility, and command control of our ground combat forces. The growing integration of ground and air vehicles now in progress appears to be one of the most promising developments in bringing vastly increased strength to our ground combat ability. The modern mission of Army aviation is to insure prompt, sustained, and successful combat on land by providing aerial observation, airlift for troop movement to and about the immediate battlefield, rapid movement of supplies in the forward areas, aerial delivered firepower, command liaison and communication, and combat zone casualty evacuation.

Mr. Chairman, the Army must move more and more through the air if it is to gain the decisive battlefield mobility it requires to win. This relatively new dimension of ground force mobility uses the first few hundred feet above the earth's surface for its operations. This is also the space where the shells, bullets, and some short range missiles also fly. But this air mobility permits instantaneous reaction to the enemy through the rapid deployment of combat troops without regard to the restrictions of the terrain. This permits the commander in the field to literally lift the soldier out of the mud and swiftly move him to another location for maximum effectiveness.

The very obvious need for this mobility is reflected in the increased requirements for more Army aircraft and additional related personnel provided for in the bill before us. We must also replace obsolete and wornout aircraft.

A recent study of the Army's tactical mobility requirements indicates that this need for aerial mobility will continue to grow in the years ahead. While improved ground vehicles will also play an important role, many of them will be replaced in the foreseeable future by aerial vehicles for the simple reason that aircraft possess capabilities for certain Army tasks which are not available in ground vehicles. The use of Army aircraft in the present hostilities in southeast Asia is a good example. Fixed-wing light transport companies and helicopter units are supporting South Vietnamese forces there. Army aviation has already carried over one-quarter million troops and passengers and thousands of tons of combat supplies in South Vietnam. Enemy ground fire has resulted in only four of our helicopters being totally lost because for most flights the Army provides armed helicopters or other armed aircraft as escorts. Arming these air "vehicles" is an extension of the Army's policy of arming its ground combat vehicles.

The Armed Services Committee supports the increased requirements in Army aviation provided for in this bill and recommends approval of the authorization of $522.1 million for procurement of Army aircraft. For maximum Army effectiveness this authorization is essential and deserves our strongest support.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Gubser].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to match the eloquence and the logic of my colleague from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert], but I would like to pursue the same matter he spoke about so effectively a few moments ago. I shall confine my remarks to probably the most important phase of our military activity—research and development.

All of us know that to stand still in this modern atomic and nuclear age is to invite defeat and that to wait until an emergency is with us before developing the tools with which to meet that emergency is tantamount to national suicide.

Where would we be today had not Dr. Philip A. Abelson, together with Mr. Gunn, not drawn the plans for an atomic submarine even before Admiral Rickover came to the Bureau of Ships? Where would we be today if Wernher von Braun and some of his colleagues had not been evacuated from Peenemunde to give us a start in developing modern missiles?

Remember the old controversy that existed prior to World War II, when certain agencies of the U.S. Government were arguing bitterly over the advisability of developing air-cooled aircraft engines as opposed to liquid-cooled aircraft engines? Someone made the decision that we should develop both of them. That decision later proved to be fortunate as we found that our liquid-cooled P–40 fighter aircraft could not obtain enough elevation to fight the Japanese zeros over Guadalcanal. Fortunately we had planes with air-cooled engines to save the day, and regain the control of the air over Guadalcanal. Just suppose we had had a hardheaded, obstinate Research Department head at that time who said, "No, I have decided you are going to develop the liquid-cooled engine only." What might have happened? We would not have had control of the air over Guadalcanal. How long would it have taken, and how many additional thousands of American lives would it have cost to win the war?

Research and development is probably the most vital activity of the Defense Department. I have a great and deep respect for the intellect and the technical knowledge of Dr. Harold Brown. He is an able technician. But I was amazed to hear him, when questioned by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert], refuse to tell a committee of Congress the name of the four or five military men whose advice he had sought on the question of the RS–70. I wish I could interpret it otherwise—but to me that was outright defiance. At this point I became seriously concerned as to how decisions are made and how much the military requirement as expressed by the military man is actually considered in making research and development decisions.

Let me relate an incident which is relatively minor. Sometime a couple of years ago the Navy, for the Marine Corps, expressed a military requirement for an assault support helicopter, and the military requirement expressed was very, very specific. It was to have a payload capability of 1,200 pounds. It was to be small enough to fit aft of a destroyer so that the Navy could carry on its Dash program on its Fram destroyers and there were other specific requirements. A private company—and it matters not which company it was—spent $1.6 million of its own money to develop such an aircraft. The Navy and the Defense Department made the decision, however, that they would prefer a much heavier aircraft which cost about four times as much.

I am sure they made this decision for good reason, because the number of aircraft to be acquired was so small that it was better to go ahead with the heavier item already in production. So, I do not question the decision.

However, following the decision not to procure this particular new type of helicopter, I suggested to Dr. Harold Brown that since one branch of the service had expressed a specific military requirement for this particular type of aircraft, that it might be wise to carry on the research and development program so that if we had such a military requirement in the future, the aircraft would be ready. And, under date of June 16, 1962, Dr. Brown, who is a technical man and not a military man, wrote to me and he said that present helicopters will fill the military requirement for the assault support helicopter mission for the next decade.

Now, I want to know, do they teach clairvoyance at MIT? How can this purely technical man tell us what the military requirement is going to be for the next 10 years?

I questioned the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, General Colglazier, during the hearings. I asked him if the helicopter which was presently used in an assault support mission met the military requirement for the next decade. He said "I don't think that I could give you that assurance." Later he said, "And as we go along we may find that we have other requirements."

I questioned General Beach, who is Chief of Staff for Research and Development, and he indicated that the military "would be delighted" with a new development which would meet the military requirement at less money. Here are clear-cut statements of top military men admitting there might be such a requirement, but 35-year-old Dr. Harold Brown can tell us that the next decade does not require anything beyond what we have today. Is this type of thinking being applied in other areas and in major decisions?

I honestly and sincerely feel that military advice is being ignored and that civilians, without proper military experience and military background, are being arbitrary in their decisions and are superimposing those decisions on the long experience of tried and true military men.

I express the same concern, not as eloquently, but certainly as forthrightly, as the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert]. I certainly think this Congress should take a serious look at this situation so that we can have a defense policy which is the combined product of defense managerial ability and practical military knowledge.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to my very good and able friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bray].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, in my brief remarks I intend only to discuss the RS–70 program.

The question as to whether we go ahead with the development of the RS–70 weapons system involves far more than this specific program. As I pointed out in debate last year on this subject, among the other main issues at stake is the future of the manned aircraft in our Air Force. In my opinion there is no question but that Congress should authorize and appropriate adequate funds for our Air Force to continue the development of this important weapons system. Wisely, I think the Congress has for the last 2 years authorized and appropriated sufficient funds for the orderly development of the RS–70. It is no responsibility of Congress that the Department of Defense has refused to use these funds. The Defense Department, in addition to refusing to use the funds given to them for the development of the RS–70, also refused to build an additional wing of B–52 bombers although such construction was authorized and adequate funds were appropriated. So today all production of long-distance bombers has ceased and production lines have been dismantled.

No one today knows of a certainty whether the RS–70 ever will be needed. But the RS–70 is the result of the best minds and experience in our country in the field of the manned bomber. Those in our Air Force, those who have spent a lifetime learning the problems of air warfare and how to deal with those problems, those who are acquainted with the design, use and operation of manned aircraft, almost without exception believe that the RS–70 is necessary and will be well ahead of any other plane in this or any other country. The almost universal belief of the officers of our Air Force and our leading engineers and technicians in this field is that if we are to remain ahead of Russia in the air we must develop the RS–70 weapons system. For some years the United States has held a commanding lead in the development, production and operation of manned aircraft. Undoubtedly this superiority has contributed to the stopping of Russian aggression; how much none of us knows for sure.

It is disconcerting that the United States at this time is abandoning manned aircraft while Russia is building more planes and developing better planes. Despite our present lead in the field of manned aircraft, if the Soviets continue development and production and we, on the contrary, continue our failure to develop and manufacture planes, it is only a question of time until Russia is superior to us. It is merely a repetition of the fable of the tortoise and the hare—we will be the hare which stopped and Russia the tortoise which passes us.

I do not know whether we will ever need the additional B–52's or the RS–70; neither does Secretary McNamara or Dr. Brown, the Defense Department head of research and development. I do know that the fact that America remained preeminent in the ability to make conventional war, including manned aircraft, enabled us to secure the military and diplomatic triumph that we did in the Lebanon affair of July 1958. In the summer of 1958 Khrushchev was moving into the Near East and was backing his aggression with wild threats of destruction against the United States and the Western World. Russia has never been more threatening. Yet, the United States was able and willing to act and we did act. President Eisenhower moved troops by plane from Germany into Lebanon. We continued to move military personnel and equipment by air and sea. When Khrushchev saw that we had the determination and ability to resist Communist aggression, his tirade of hate and bitterness calmed. On July 24, just 9 days after we landed our first troops in Lebanon, Khrushchev attended a party at the Polish Embassy in Moscow where he visited the table of our Amassador Thompson and, in the most friendly manner, remained with our Ambassador for an hour and a half. It was a great victory for America—we had demonstrated our ability to resist aggression not only by nuclear war but by a conventional operation.

Please remember that if it had been some years earlier when we ceased the manufacture and development of manned aircraft, we would have been unable to act as we did in Lebanon. What if the United States had been inferior to Russia in manned aircraft? We would have been unable to act. We do not know what the results would have been if we had been weak in the field of manned aircraft.

Prior to the 1960 election, candidate John F. Kennedy criticized the mass retaliation policy of John Foster Dulles. Mr. Kennedy stated that the United States must not depend totally on mass destruction but must be able to handle "brush fire" wars throughout the world. Yet today we are moving in a pattern of military planning which, if followed to its conclusion, would leave us only the choice of visiting mass destruction on our enemy or doing nothing.

I want us to be able in the future to handle crises as we handled the Lebanon crisis of 1958.

Today we have in the Department of Defense certain persons to whom many refer as the "whiz kids." Please understand that I am not using this term to refer to the Secretary of Defense or the three service Secretaries. I do not want to speak disparagingly of those who are called "whiz kids." They are capable and I believe dedicated men. They certainly lack practical experience, but they are certain that they have the answers to all problems; they are certain that they could not make an error in judgment. These men have made war in their own mind an absolute science. No one will dispute the importance of science in the military field, but Mr. Chairman, history has proved that warfare is not an exact science. Through the centuries we have had those individuals, occasionally in uniform but usually not, who were certain that they had invented a weapon or plan that could insure military success. They placed all of their eggs in one basket, so to speak. They believe that they have taken the risk out of war. Many nations have fallen because their leaders' planned solution did not fit the war which actually took place.

One of the greatest dangers in military planning is to assume that you have arrived at a single perfect solution to the next military problem which will confront you. History is replete with such errors, some of them most serious. I well remember the early days of World War II. I was in the Pacific at that time, but not in the theater involved. I well remember a British officer who visited us and vividly described the failure of the operation in Burma. The British Army commander in Burma had decided that the Japanese tanks could not cross rice paddies, so no plan was made on the left flank to defend against a tank attack. The Japanese tanks could cross rice paddies and the British left flank crumbled. This failure to properly defend against the Japanese tanks was the principal reason the British Army was forced out of Burma.

I recall reading in 1938 about the brilliant plan that Maurice Gamalin had invented which would insure that France would be secure from attack. General Gamalin had decided that much of the action and planning of the French marshals of the past was in error. General Gamalin had a plan which would insure the safety of France—that plan was the Maginot line. Although he was in uniform, General Gamalin might well have been referred to as one of the "whiz kids" of that era.

I could discuss for an hour cases from history where military and political leaders have relied on some new, foolproof plan to insure victory. The problem has always been that no one can foretell what form or direction an enemy will take. War is not an exact science. The Secretary of Defense makes a very convincing defense of his policy. After listening to him, I am inclined to agree that he is right, that we will not need manned aircraft in the future. But I am not willing to put all our eggs in one basket. I am not willing to gamble that he is right. I am not willing to gamble with the security of this Nation.

I do not want to unduly continue this line of thinking, but I would like to tell a story which illustrates what I mean. In telling this story I must give credit to the great story teller, my colleague the gentleman from Florida, Billy Matthews.

Before the commencement of the Civil War, Mr. Sylvaneus Lee, of Georgia, in a speech advocating war against the North, said vehemently that the South could whip the Yankees with cornstalks. After the war, while he was making a speech as a candidate for public office in Georgia, a member of his audience took him to task, asking, "How can we trust your judgment when you told us

before the war we could whip the Yankees with cornstalks?" Mr. Sylvaneus Lee quickly retorted, "Yes, we could have; but those damn Yankees didn't use cornstalks."

None of us knows exactly from what direction and in what manner danger will approach us. We do not know the plan or the weapon that a potential enemy will use. Enemies of tomorrow may not use cornstalks. Before too radical a plan is proposed for our war of the future, it might be well for us to give more thought to the trained military men of the past. Let us not gamble away our security. Let us be ready for any eventuality.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for a member of my established fiscal responsibility endeavors, and record for conserving our human and natural resources, to discuss any program involving additional or alleged excessive expenditures. I would even support across the board reductions in most procurement and R. & D. areas, but I believe experience, honesty and the record should be reported and kept straight concerning the RS–70.

Based on a visit to Palmdale, Calif., November 29, 1962, where North American Aviation continues to develop this modern and sophisticated reconnaissance-strike manned system—at their own expense with the help of occasionally released funds appropriated by this body and held by the Secretary of Defense—I should like to say: In this area we should not hide behind the age-old word game, or play musical-chair games with semantics.

The aircraft portion of the RS–70 is ready to fly. The engines are mounted and breakthroughs have been made on the new principles necessary so the honeycombed skin and tanks can be sealed, and wings welded to absorb the mach 3 plus temperature of friction and strain in atmosphere of near-space. This first craft is ready to fly, and as each of its six engines has developed a higher percentage of thrust than expected, so has each component test revealed safety factors, and proper functioning, beyond highest expectation. One should recall that the flight date of December 1962, was set by the Pentagon slip-stick experts 4 plus years ago, and not by the actual producers. Such dates ultimately depend on funds, lack of interruption and scientific breakthroughs, now accomplished.

Having crawled through the entire structure, including the titanium covered extended neck of this "bird as though in flight," plus the crew compartment and the stainless steel after two-thirds of wing and body, I am enthusiastic about it capabilities; from that of loitering ability as a manned vehicle, to speeds beyond that of interceptor aircraft, and known missile or radar reacting anticraft capability. Now, Mr. Chairman, all concepts must cease as drawing board improvements at some stage, and go into actual prototype production. This is now a fact for the RS–70. It is just as unfair to report it as being under development—or in the drawing stage—as it is to depend on missiles; four out of the last six of which have misfired and been destroyed in most recent tests. I am convinced this plane will fly, will be evasive due to its speed, altitude and other capabilities, and further that the research and cost of this prototype has and will be of greatest value in other developments.

Think, Mr. Chairman, of the inertial factors and forward momentum plus directional glide capabilities of a warhead with fins, launched at mach 3 which exceeds muzzle velocity of a bullet—to say naught of its own inherent propellant and our ability to control its on-target ability. One must consider as a whole the RS–70, side sweep capabilities, and resolution radar—already developed—which could reconnoiter and strike with existing weapons, the entire United States of America in two transcontinental sweeps, or one round trip. The same applies to the North Atlantic Ocean in four sweeps, or two round trips. Imagine this strategic value in isolated ship hunts, and seizures, if for no other reason. I would like to emphasize the features of manned control, air alert, and missile strike—Hound Dog or GAM–2—plus speed, maneuverability, and recall as an all-out initial or postretaliatory missile checkup weapon. Remember we are planning for the future which involves total annihilatory possibilities.

The RS–70 is so fast it can be currently completely evasive while economical of fuel, at high altitudes. It can also be used at low level, based on the newly approved aerodynamic principle. When not loitering and presumably on a run, there is only 6 seconds between the sidesweep or forward squint of the resolution radar, not 3 minutes. However, even amateurs like myself can react to the magnificent portrayal of this electronic sweep and squint within the weapon, and perform the necessary reflex motion to get off a retaliatory—or clean up—strike within two seconds on repeated trials. It is capable of standoff reconnaissance and clean up strike from a safe distance and even in its aft quarters and vectors—where it has already overflown.

Gentlemen, it would appear to me that having invested $1.2 billion over many years—admittedly with repeated interruptions—that we should certainly invest $343 million more for the security of our country and the pipeline or follow-on development of this excellent craft, which is in being to the extent of full equipage; and adding at least the last two RS–70's to our Nation's inventory, resources, and armament. It is fact and not theory. It will require continued divergence of Russian follow-on and dilution of their defense capabilities. Most of all, it is our controlled answer to Russian missiles if in our will we are to await the first strike, and it will indeed be our freedom platform of 1964.

Fire the Department of Defense "whiz-kids," if you will, release the Arthur Sylvesters and the Yormolinskis' and good riddance; even change again the McCormack-Curtis amendment and reduce the power of the Secretary of Defense, but, gentlemen, you cannot in conscience eliminate this vital weapons system.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Clancy].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, although I believe the need for enactment of H.R. 2440 has been clearly indicated by Chairman Vinson and my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee, I would like to add a few words to what has already been said in support of this legislation.

The number and type of weapons authorized in this annual bill are naturally governed chiefly by the level of military preparedness the current world situation demands. The unswerving determination of those who direct the Communist conspiracy to attain their announced goals convincingly proves that we cannot risk letting down our guard. We must maintain a defense posture that is capable of meeting any crisis or emergency that may arise anywhere in the world. This need is dramatically illustrated by the Communist threat existing today only 90 miles from our shores.

The adversaries of freedom have made tremendous progress in the technology of mass destruction. We must, therefore, more than ever before in our Nation's history, have in our military inventory sufficient weapons and force to survive a massive nuclear attack and to deliver a decisive counterblow.

The Committee on Armed Services had conducted extensive hearings to determine the requirements of the military departments for new equipment and for continuing research. This bill is the result of those hearings, at which detailed presentations were made by our military chiefs and by key civilian officials of the Defense Establishment.

In this bill we are specifically authorizing research funds in addition to those for procurement. Well over $3 billion of the $15,856,391,000 expenditure authorized by H.R. 2440 is for research, development and related activities. This sum includes the committee amendment authorizing the investment of $363,700,000 for use in developing two additional airframes of the RS–70 bomber and supporting systems, designed to demonstrate this aircraft's value as a strategic weapons system. This is a wise amendment which I wholeheartedly endorse.

The committee has taken the position that our national defense effort, to be truly effective, must be based on a balanced and flexible military force—a force that can be employed at any time and at any place, either wholly or in part, to effectively counter any type of aggression, be it guerrilla warfare or nuclear attack. To that end, we have stressed the grave importance of not relying entirely on our missile capability for our military strength.

Manned strategic aircraft would greatly enhance operational flexibility by allowing recall of an attack or redirection, making possible greater control and discretion in the use of nuclear weapons, stepped-up airborne alerts and large-scale maneuvers, wartime assessment of target damage, location and destruction of mobile targets, a close matching of the weapon to the target and, if necessary, the use of very-high-yield warheads.

Those who would leave strategic bombers to die a slow death should not forget that the RS–70's strike power will be greatly enhanced by these extraordinary reconnaissance aids and by its potential in the area of communications.

I think it is important to note that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with one exception, supported the development of the RS–70 at a substantially higher level than that currently planned under the program of the Secretary of Defense.

To demonstrate the wisdom of this program I call to the attention of the Members of the House factual information with respect to the performance of the J–93 engine which will power the RS–70. Needless to say, there are many features of this engine which cannot be disclosed at this time for security reasons.

The J–93 engine is a lightweight afterburning turbojet which has been designed for sustained mach 3 cruise operation as well as for high takeoff thrust. It will operate in an environment in which temperatures vary from subzero at sea level to intense heat at mach 3 at an altitude of more than 70,000 feet. The extensive technological developments unique to the J–93 make it, I believe, the most outstanding turbojet product in the world today.

The J–93 has completed three initial qualification tests. Additional tests were conducted to qualify improved life, hardware and reliability. Although the engine has not yet been flown, it has successfully completed over 3,000 hours of engine operation, nearly 600 of which have been at simulated high Mach conditions. This includes development testing and altitude performance tests conducted at Arnold Engineering Development Center. In the altitude performance tests the airflow through and around the engine was heated to air vehicular temperatures of more than 550° F. Results of these tests clearly demonstrate that the engine has met or exceeds performance guarantees in terms of power output and fuel consumption.

A number of engines were delivered to North American Aviation during the period of June to August 1962. The J–93, with its breakthroughs and operating temperatures, performance and environmental capabilities, provides a stepping stone of technology for the next generation of air breathing propulsion systems. Additional improvements are being studied for potential applications for large subsonic cargo aircraft to very high mach turboramjet applications.

While we recognize the capabilities of the Secretary of Defense, we do think that he has erred in his decision with respect to the RS–70, and we sincerely hope that once again Congress will approve this legislation which would make it possible to proceed with development of the RS–70 bomber as a full weapons system.

The legislation before us today is consistent with maintenance of a military posture sufficient to deter aggression on the part of those who strive for world domination. The price of national security is high indeed, but it must be paid.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLANCY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, may I, on behalf of the Ohio delegation, congratulate the gentleman [Mr. CLANCY] on one of the most able speeches which has yet been made on this bill. We are very proud of the services he has rendered both in the Committee on Armed Services, and on the floor, in regard to this legislation. He has helped all of us by his very able presentation and explanation of the matter before us.

Mr. CLANCY. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 2440 and the committee amendments. The total authorizations for ships, planes, missiles, and research and development, in the amount of $15,856,391,000, is, of course, an enormous amount of money. I wish the state of the world were such that a much smaller amount could be adequate. It is not.

The hearings before the Armed Services Committee have convinced this Member that any lower ceiling for authorizations would not permit the adequate arming of this country to face the possible eventualities of the next year. I support these authorizations out of an abiding conviction that these steps must be taken.

It may be asked how I can support these authorizations and continue to cry for lower national expenditures. For I have repeatedly expressed my concern at the present size of our national debt, and at the planned deficit of nearly $12 billion for the fiscal 1964 budget. Continuous deficit financing can eventually bring us to national disaster as fully as can our enemies from outside.

I recognize that the appropriations under this authorization will constitute a share of the fiscal 1964 deficit, unless offset by cuts elsewhere.

I am especially mindful of the fact that this authorization contains $497,700,000 more than the Department of Defense has requested, $363,700,000 for development of two additional RS–70 airplanes with associated electronic gear and missiles, and $134 million for two additional hunter-killer type atomic submarines.

Just recently this Member voted against a supplemental appropriation of more than a half billion dollars for the Commodity Credit Corporation. I did so knowing we had to draw the line on expenditures, knowing we had to set priorities for spending. And I believe that the authorizations in this bill here today should receive No. 1 priority.

Much has already been said by the distinguished chairman and colleagues of the Committee on Armed Services with reference to the additional items contained in this bill, and with respect to the necessity for them.

I propose to add only this. Late last fall, I spent 2 weeks with the antisubmarine forces of the Navy. As has been pointed out, Soviet submarines numbering several times the size of the group with which Hitler started World War II constitute the main threat to our use of international sealanes, and present a growing missile threat to our continent.

Preparing to meet this threat, which is beginning to contain significant numbers of nuclear Russian submarines, is not a glamorous undertaking. Our antisubmarine forces attract little public attention. But they work long, difficult hours on tasks directly related to the survival of this country. They cannot do the job without modern weapons. One such vital weapon is the nuclear attack submarine.

Six such submarines next year are not enough—eight just barely fill the need.

The necessity is so great, I believe, that our desire for a balanced budget must in this case be subordinated to the need, and reductions in spending must be made in other areas of less urgency with respect to our survival.

The same may be said of the RS–70. The case for this airplane has been most ably presented by the chairman of our committee and others. We strongly believe that our country must have the option to build the RS–70 during the latter 1960's, if circumstances require it. Without these additional funds that option will not exist and the days of the strategic bomber will be limited to the service life of existing B–52's and B–58's.

The RS–70 concept not only offers us the prospect of a very advanced manned bomber, with highly sophisticated electronic equipment, but its development will rapidly advance the state of technology in airplanes, engines and navigational gear which can be applied to the construction of civilian supersonic airplanes for the next decade.

Mr. Chairman, big as the authorization is in the bill, I urge its passage. It constitutes less than one-third of the total proposed military budget, but a most important and vital part it is. I believe it may be possible to make some cuts elsewhere in appropriations for the Department of Defense and in other governmental areas, to not only offset the additional sums contained in this bill, but to make significant reductions in the overall budget costs for fiscal 1964.

Our military hardware, however, is no place to have a clearance sale.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FOREMAN].

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, too many times I believe we have been giving a blank check to the Department of Defense for any or everything they want or request. This is not good business management of either the taxpayer's money or of the establishment of the best or most effective military posture.

I am not convinced that we are getting our money's worth in our defense spending, particularly in the broad field of research, testing, and development. I am concerned that we do not have a more close coordination of the research, test, and development programs of the various services. It appears to me that there is considerable overlap of projects in the various services in this field of research, testing, and development.

Our very capable chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], has assured me, however, that he has appointed a special subcommittee to investigate this situation and will actively pursue an immediate program to initiate efficiencies not only in research, testing, and development but in all departments of defense spending. The Defense Department and the various military departments have given us this assurance, also.

Mr. Chairman, I will support this authorization, H.R. 2440, today, but this action in no manner indicates my willingness to support an appropriation bill if studies that are now underway, confirm my thinking that this amount of expenditure is unnecessary to maintain a strong military posture.

Now, briefly, I would like to address you on the question of the necessity of the additional appropriation for the RS–70, which appears to be the greatest point of disagreement on this bill. I am proud to be known as a conservative, watchful of the Federal taxpayers' dollars expended by this great body of the representatives of our people, but I do favor the extension of the RS–70 program.

I favor the additional appropriation for the development of the RS–70 and the accompanying weapons systems for three basic reasons, and I am going to put them to you simply.

First of all, it is a good investment. We have spent $1.3 billion developing three planes, and all we have is just a plane that will fly fast. Now, where I come from, in Texas, if you were in the drilling business and you went out and spent $1.3 billion to build a big substructure and derrick for drilling oil wells, you do not have much until you hook up the complete drilling system and get it running. By investing $1.2 billion in addition to the $1.3 billion we already have, we will not only get three rigs but five rigs ready to drill, complete with pumps, pits, draw works, and related necessary equipment. I say this is a wise investment. We have the substructure; we have the derricks, and now we need the equipment to make this thing work.

The second point is in the area of enemy defense spending. The effect which the development of the RS–70 weapons system would have on the enemy would be great. The current Soviet air defense system of Soviet interceptors, radar, and surface-to-air missiles would be so seriously degraded by the capabilities of the RS–70 as to become practically worthless. Those defenses could be penetrated beyond all doubt. What we are saying is we are going to put them on the defensive for once if we develop this RS–70, and let them do a little of this defense spending. Let them start developing some new interceptors, radar, and surface-to-air missiles and try to knock these things down. Make them go into deficit spending for defense for a change.

My third point is this: All members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with the exception of the new Chairman, supported the development of the RS–70. And I think they know more about what is going on than civilians do. It is recognized that there is some difference of opinion as to precisely what the Joint Chiefs of Staff supported.

But in the report Members will find that there is no doubt that the Joint Chiefs, without a single exception noted, supported the development of the RS–70 at a substantially higher level of development than that currently planned under the program of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, these are the three reasons why I favor the continued development of the RS–70. Personally, I would like to see us include the RS–70 program and the advanced killer subs in this bill, but do it by trimming in other areas so that we stay within, or below, the administration's request.

Mr. Chairman, as for me, I can see no logic whatever, in the thinking of the fuzzy-eyed negotiators and the lily-livered diplomats who propose we stop our arms buildup and turn our military equipment and forces over to a one-world U.N. force.

Mr. Chairman, I want no part of this give-in, no-win policy toward communism.

The development of this advanced arms superiority, including the RS–70, will assure the world that we are not now only the strongest Nation in the world, but that we also intend to stay the strongest Nation in the world, the strongest, most powerful Nation, not so other nations will fear us, but so that we may be respected to have the strength and the guts and the will to stand up for freedom here and around the world.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to be certain it is specifically understood that what we are considering here today is an authorization bill. Not one penny will be appropriated for expenditure if the House and subsequently the Senate enacts this bill as it is—not one penny.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill becomes law, then the Committee on Appropriations can and will take action on all of the items contained in the bill for fiscal year 1964, as well as numerous other items which will carry the Defense Department request up to the $52-billion-plus program that the President has recommended.

Then we have a third step: Even if the Congress appropriates the money, no Chief Executive under current interpretation has a mandatory obligation to spend it for any program or policy. So, this bill is the first in three steps that must be taken in the Congress and subsequently in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to confine my remaining remarks primarily to the committee amendment involving the RS–70. It is my intention to vote for this amendment for the reason that I believe it wise in an authorization bill for the executive branch of the Government to have ample leeway over and above what even they have programed for the next fiscal year.

As was indicated in the request by the President and by Mr. McNamara, there is no new authorization or funds in the fiscal 1964 request for the RS–70. Under current plans they will have carryover from fiscal 1963 of around $81 million, as I recall the figure. However, in this bill the committee is recommending an additional $373.7 million authorization. I see no harm whatsoever in this extra authorization being on the statute books.

Under no circumstances, however, do I want my last statement to indicate that I intend as a member of the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations to recommend or approve additional money of this magnitude in fiscal year 1964. I will make that determination as to the specific appropriation after we have concluded our hearings and considered the matter in the Subcommittee for Defense Appropriations. This will come 2 or 3 months from now. However I think it is wise to have a little leeway over and above what the President has recommended for authorization so that our committee and the Congress can have an opportunity if it wants to do so to go higher than the President and Secretary of Defense McNamara have proposed.

Mr. Chairman, there is an even more important point: Suppose the Congress did not authorize more than what the President recommended, and suppose that the Congress did not appropriate any more money than the President recommended, and then Congress adjourned? Come October or November, subsequent to adjournment, it is perfectly conceivable that circumstances might be such that the President and the Department of Defense would want to spend money for the RS–70 over and above the $81 million, which represents the current anticipated carryover of the authorization and appropriation. Unless we have an authorization for more than has been proposed they could not spend a penny more. But if we are wise enough to give them the extra leeway on the authorization, and even if we did not appropriate the extra money in the appropriation bill, there is a safety valve in the Appropriation Act. This, Mr. Chairman, this is the crux of the matter. For a number of years the Congress has included in the appropriation bill a provision known as the emergency fund. The Congress traditionally gives $150 million a year in emergency funds, not earmarked for any program, project or policy. It is for the President and the Secretary of Defense to use as they see fit to meet emergencies, to take care of breakthroughs, to handle any one of a multitude of problems which could not be foreseen when the budget was put together. In addition they have an extra $150 million of transfer authority in the emergency fund. So they have $300 million that can be utilized, providing they have additional authorization. But if you hamstring them authorizationwise then they cannot use the emergency fund to take care of the breakthroughs or problems relating thereto.

So, as I see the picture, it is perfectly sound to give a greater authorization providing we make no commitment at this time that money will be forthcoming in an equal amount. This can be decided subsequently when we consider the appropriation bill.

May I conclude by saying this. Unfortunately I was not on the floor when several of my colleagues, both Republican and Democratic, made some comments concerning the Secretary of Defense and his administration of this vast and important program. I know the members of this committee have had differences with the Secretary of Defense. May I say that I have had differences with the Secretary of Defense. And if you read the testimony, which will be forthcoming shortly from our Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Air Force you will find that we have had very serious differences, Mr. McNamara and I. On the other hand, I want to say without hesitation or qualification that in my judgment he is a most competent, conscientious, honorable, dedicated American citizen. We are extremely fortunate to have a man with those outstanding characteristics in the office of Secretary of Defense. Under no circumstances would I want these comments to be interpreted as an endorsement of all the recommendations or policies that he has submitted in the past or will for the future. I expect to differ with him many times. But such differences of opinion in no way detract from my admiration or respect for Bob McNamara. He is a fine, fine person doing a terribly tough job. It would be unfortunate for a man of this competence, this dedication and this patriotism to be pictured in the wrong light. I hope and trust, and I sincerely believe, that my colleagues who have spoken here today did not intend under any circumstances to create the wrong impression even though as members of the legislative branch they may differ and differ seriously with some of his recommendations.

In conclusion, despite my differences with the Secretary of Defense I believe he has handled a most difficult job commendably. I hope his decisions are sound because our future security rests on many of these judgments.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, yesterday in the discussion on this bill I was asked to state some specifics on ways in which we could save tax dollars in the procurement account of the Department of Defense. First I would like to say that I concur in the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. I believe that it is a good idea for us to include authorizing language in this bill, a broad enough umbrella, so that if there are any breakthroughs as far as the RS–70 is concerned, we will be able to go forward with this program while the Congress is not in session.

The RS–70 program and also the two attack submarines could have been funded within the $15.3 billion authorization request which was made by the President of the United States. The President requested a total overall figure of $15.3 billion for procurement and R.D.T. & E. The Committee on Armed Services has raised this amount to $15.8 billion. This increase is subject to serious criticism which I have of this piece of legislation. I do not believe that any real effort was made in drafting this bill to establish the correct priorities within the $15.3 billion authorizing request made by the President of the United States.

Let us look at this procurement budget of the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question that the procurement authorization in this bill can be cut by forcing the Defense Establishment to go to more competitive bidding. Less than 40 percent of the total defense procurement is awarded on a competitive price basis at the present time.

Over 30 percent of the total prime contract awards are done on a wasteful cost-plus-fixed-fee basis.

In the current fiscal year the Navy, on their own volition, struck from their shipbuilding program a nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate at a cost of almost $200 million.

The General Accounting Office is constantly forwarding to the Congress examples of gross waste in procurement and procurement methods in the Department of Defense. We all remember, for example, the episode of not too long ago, when the Air Force bought large numbers of firetrucks when the Army was maintaining a large number in excess of their needs and which could have been used by the Air Force.

It is not unusual for one service to procure an item on a noncompetitive high-cost basis while another service is procuring the same or a similar item on a competitive basis at a much lower cost. For example, here is a report showing Navy purchase of certain aircraft engine bearings on a noncompetitive basis from the aircraft engine manufacturer while at the same time the Air Force had advised the Navy that these items could be purchased competitively at the cost of about one-third less than the price the Navy proposed to pay.

The complex and vast armed services procurement regulations need careful monitorship to see that they assure the Government obtaining the lower price from efficient procedures. This is not always the case. For example, here is a report with reference to the procurement of certain radio sets by the Army in which the lower bidder was disqualified for a technical reason resulting in a higher cost to the Government. The bidder in this case was disqualified because he did not properly list use of some $14,000 worth of Government-owned property in his possession. The cost to the Government of awarding to the next producer was almost $200,000.

The Hébert subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee over the past several years has pointed out time and again, as has the House Appropriations Committee, the need for more competitive purchases of aircraft spares and spare parts. You will remember many of their classic examples of where the services were purchasing costly parts when ordinary hardware types would have sufficed. Fortunately, these investigations have resulted in some savings in this area, but there is much remaining to be done.

Careful monitorship of costs presented to the Government is not always the case and requires much attention. The Navy awarded contracts to Westinghouse for pumps and casings for nuclear submarines at prices totaling $8.7 million. Westinghouse subcontracted this to one of their own departments. Cost estimates prepared by the manufacturing department of Westinghouse indicated that prices $2.2 million lower than those accepted would have covered costs and afforded a profit at the rate of 10 percent.

Of necessity the services award contracts for vast amounts of common type items, such as motor generators. Proper review is not being made in all instances of the inventory of many of these items prior to new purchases. For example, the Army proposed to purchase certain generator sets in the amount of $6.3 million. Investigation by the General Accounting Office disclosed that in the Navy and Corps of Engineers inventory there were generators which could be used in lieu of this purchase. As a result, over $6 million of available generators were found in stock to meet this requirement.

Another report with reference to the procurement of aircraft tires for the Air Force and Navy points out that in 1 year $10 million could have been saved had the services followed competitive procurement for these tires as they had in the past.

Another report with reference to the procurement of AN/SPS 10 radar shows $3.9 million wasted under original sole-source Navy procurement. Under subsequent open competition, original Navy-negotiated price dropped from $40,000 per system price to $17,083 per system price. Under original sole-source procurement, 242 units were bought at $33,297 per system.

AN/SPS 10 radar: The Navy negotiated an original $40,000 per system price with DuMont and Sylvania on this procurement. This price subsequently fell to $17,083 per system when open competition was introduced, and Daystrom, Inc. won the contract. This represented a difference of 58 percent between high and low price. As examples, contract NObsr 52321 awarded a contract to Sylvania to produce 185 units at a price of $27,000 per system, or a total price of approximately $5 million. A subsequent award, NObsr 75399, was for 57 units at a total cost of $1,898,620 or $33,297 per unit. When Daystrom won its contract in open competition, the price dropped $17,083 per unit, at which time a Bureau of Ships civilian employee, Dean S. Young, indicated in an official report that the successful bidder could not make a profit on the item. Subsequent procurement found the price in the same general area under conditions of open competition, indicating that sole-source procurement cost the taxpayers millions.

Summary: Using the price of $33,297 per unit for a total of 242 units bought under sole-source procurement methods mentioned above, the taxpayers paid out a total of over $3.9 million more than necessary to buy this equipment, almost a 50-percent overall loss in this one instance. Even using the lowest sole-source price does little to brighten the picture, proving again that open competition serves the best interest of the taxpayer and prevents any possible duplicity by procurement agency employees.

Another report with reference to the procurement of AN/APS 88 airborne radar sets shows $561,000 wasted. Original sole-source transaction had estimated price of $32,000 per system. This was adjusted downwards to $30,000 for a total of 51 systems, costing $1,440,843. Subsequently, Navy advertised for 57 additional systems of same equipment. Under open competition, price became $17,247 per system for 57 systems for a total cost of $984,000. Thus, in first sole-source award, taxpayers lost a total of $561,000 in inflated prices.

In the procurement of AN/PDR 43 radiac sets shows $600,000 wasted needlessly. Electronic Products Co. of Mt. Vernon, N.Y., developed and produced 6 preproduction units and 44 production units for total award of $87,195.76. Three follow-on awards on sole-source basis purchased substantial quantities at prices ranging from $490 to $657. When open competition was introduced, the price fell to $247.20 and still later it dropped to $217.53. Cost was thus reduced by some 60 percent. Under sole-source, Navy purchased 1,500 units with average price of $600 per set for a total expenditure of almost $900,000. Under open competition, it was established that these same sets could have been purchased for a total price of about $325,000.

In the procurement of AN/WRT 1 and AN/WRT 2 radio sets shows some $15 million wasted. Sole-source contract was awarded to Westinghouse Electric to develop the radio set. Then Westinghouse was awarded contract to produce 430 units at unit cost of $29,725 for total contract price of $12.8 million. Second procurement awarded to Westinghouse under sole-source contract also. This time for 617 radios at unit cost of $19,200 with total cost of $12.1 million. Under third procurement pressure from industry forced open competition. Unit price fell to $10,497.52. Contract was awarded to Cosmos Industries, Inc.

It is ridiculous to state that in a procurement program as large as the one being discussed by the House today that there is no possibility of reducing these estimates. This is to say that the management of this vast organization is perfect, and that there is no room for improvement. Even the most partisan of people will admit this is not so. Continued improvement in this management of the defense procurement program will result in reductions in estimates such as we are considering today.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from Wisconsin in his remarks a moment ago indicated what he meant by the "fat" in the bill to which he referred yesterday. I am sure all of us share with him a desire to procure our necessary weapons of war at the lowest possible cost and to accomplish a maximum of efficiency in a defense procurement system.

Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss for a few minutes the problem of block obsolescence of the fleet. The Navy has displayed growing concern over this problem for the past several years and has repeatedly stressed the fact that we must have an adequate shipbuilding and conversion program if we are to maintain the combat effective Navy which is an absolute and fundamental requirement for our national survival.

This same concern, not surprisingly, has been felt and voiced by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. Indeed, his concern has become so great that last year he appointed a special subcommittee for the purpose of studying the composition of the fleet and the problems of block obsolescence of naval vessels.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] was appointed chairman of the subcommittee, and the other two members were Mr. BATES and myself.

The subcommittee issued a report which met with wholehearted agreement on the part of the full committee, and I call to your attention some very pertinent portions of that report quoted on pages 9 and 10 of the report which is before you today in support of H.R. 2440, the bill we are considering.

To put it mildly, the subcommittee report is not optimistic as to the future of our fleet. The evidence which we assembled caused a finding that our Navy is today headed toward block obsolescence—a block obsolescence that endangers our future.

This report states—and this was confirmed in hearings on the bill before us—that it is a statistical certainty—let me repeat that—a statistical certainty—that if we continue a shipbuilding program similar to that of the past few years, or indeed, at the rate of this year's program, or last year's program, our Navy will simply cease to exist as an effective military instrument.

The Navy is aware of this. The Secretary of Defense certainly should be aware of this. But in the last analysis, the responsibility lies with the Congress to determine the size and composition of our fleet and to provide the authorization and the funds to see that the fleet meets the needs of the country. The Navy, alone, cannot correct this situation—it can request ships of the Secretary of Defense, but if he says "No," that is final—and that is exactly what has happened.

We all realize that scientific and technological advances have had a revolutionary effect on ship design. These advances themselves accelerate the obsolescence of existing ships, but within the limits of funds and other practical considerations they must be incorporated in the new ships. We have authorized in previous programs many new ships designed to take advantage of these advances. Despite this, at the end of this fiscal year—21 years after the start of World War II—70 percent of the active fleet will be ships designed for that war.

We have authorized modernizations of these ships where it has been economically feasible to do so. These improvements have paid dividends in the form of an increased mid-period readiness posture but the weight, space and power requirements of new weapons make it either uneconomical or impractical to carry this modernization program beyond its presently projected scope.

The future holds little prospect for a reduction in the Navy's worldwide commitments which would in turn permit a significant reduction in the number of ships in the fleet. We are, therefore, faced with the problem of replacing large numbers of outdated ships at a time when responsiveness to present combat requirements and installation of complex weapons systems are required to meet increasing threats.

Our authorizations of the past few years have contributed to the modernization of the fleet. We have seen accelerated construction and deployment of the impressive Polaris weapons system, which represents a classic example of the combination of advanced developments in hull, propulsion, and weapons into a completely integrated weapons system. We have observed the superior performance of our growing fleet of nuclear attack submarines, and this past year operations of the nuclear powered surface ships *Enterprise, Long Beach,* and *Bainbridge,* have been most gratifying.

Despite these noteworthy signs of progress in fleet modernization, by 5 years from now, or 23 years after the close of World War II, when all the ships previously authorized, but currently undelivered, and those contained in this authorization will have joined the fleet, approximately 49 percent of fleet strength at that time will still be World War II products. We are making meager headway against the relentless erosion of combat effectiveness by the currents of age and technology. We cannot wait 23 years more for the complete modernization of the remaining half of the Navy if we are to maintain it as a meaningful arm of our foreign policy, and as an effective agency of national defense. The Armed Services Committee did accelerate somewhat the advances to be achieved in this year's program by writing into this authorization bill two more nuclear powered attack submarines than were contained in the defense budget request.

I do not want to paint too gloomy a picture—though heaven knows it is black enough. This year's bill does provide for substantial increases in our deterrent posture through the programing of six additional Polaris submarines and supporting ships and craft. It enhances our ASW capabilities through the programing of 8 nuclear attack submarines, 10 improved ocean escorts, and the fleet rehabilitation and modernization—FRAM—conversion of 19 World War II destroyers. It advances the combined antiair warfare and antisubmarine warfare capability of our strike forces through modernization of seven post-World War II destroyer types.

It also increases our amphibious strength through the construction of five ships and adds to our underway replenishment capabilities through both new construction and conversions. It increases our effectiveness in the field of counterinsurgency and paramilitary operations through the programing of six small, fast specially configured, motor gunboats designed for varied operations in shallow water, but also capable of operations in the open sea. It also provides for miscellaneous support through the programing of various support types. Included in these are three surveying ships which by gathering oceanographic environmental information will contribute to the effectiveness of future naval operations through increased knowledge of the oceans. Much of the data gathered also will be useful to other Government programs and to scientific research in various aspects of the national oceanographic research program.

At best, however, it is a lean program, actually an austere program. It has been slashed to urgent necessities and makes no real effort to forestall block obsolescence. Reluctantly I recommend its authorization as presented, with the added observation that with each year of just holding our own against the onrushing tide of obsolescence we are merely putting off the day when we will either have to enter upon a truly stupendous shipbuilding program or accept the realities of an obsolete fleet—a Navy incapable of carrying out its mission, unable to project the power and influence of the United States into the far corners of the world. I must point out that only through large near-future increases in authorizations and appropriations can we offset the past and present neglect of naval ship replacement. Taking into account the extent to which needed new ship construction has been deferred, and the very special problems involved in the modernization of the Navy, we may as well prepare ourselves for an extensive and costly program of shipbuilding, and the longer we put it off the more expensive it is ultimately going to be.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I want to compliment and commend the gentleman for bringing to the attention of the House a subject which I consider to be of the utmost importance.

I would like to ask a question or two.

As I understand from what the gentleman has said and from what I read in the report of the subcommittee last fall, as well as this report, the Navy would like to construct more ships or have an authorization to construct them than is presently provided?

Mr. HARDY. Yes. They asked for additional ships this year, but that was denied by the Department of Defense.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. It was suggested a minimum of 70 ships per year ought to be authorized over a period of 7 years?

Mr. HARDY. If we want a modern fleet, we would have to build at the rate of 70 ships per year.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. But according to a statement of the committee, even this would be a very conservative figure?

Mr. HARDY. That would be conservative.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. If we do not build more ships, and we reach the period when we will have to build a lot of them in a hurry, will they not cost more dollars than if we replaced them now?

Mr. HARDY. It would make awfully good sense to have a regular, steady flow of new ships coming in. We are converting ships as best we can, but we have reached the point where we have converted all we can economically. The only thing we have done is to put off the day when we will have to build new ones.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I heard a few minutes ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] outline three steps to be taken before the RS–70 could be a reality.

The Committee on Armed Services certainly acknowledges and approves the first two steps. That is, there will have to be an authorization by Congress; and, second, there will have to be an appropriation by the Congress through the Committee on Appropriations. However, it is not the position of our committee that the Executive has the right to deny the constitutional responsibility of the Congress of the United States to provide for the national defense. So it is not the position of our committee that the Executive has the right to repudiate duly enacted laws providing for an authorization and appropriation for the RS–70.

Let me state a few things about the RS–70.

First of all, I would like to say there are specific and sound reasons given in the report for the development of the extra two RS–70's. These are necessary to develop a weapons vehicle, otherwise we will have merely an experimental airplane which will not yet have weapons of value. If we obtain the two requested additions we will have the most effective and most outstanding reconnaissance vehicle in the armed services of any country. It will have air-to-ground missile strength. It will be able to cover preplanned targets and not yet precisely located targets. It will be able to cover mobile targets. It will be able to report back what it has seen. It would provide a cover under which so called limited or nonnuclear war could be waged. We all desire to obtain a limitation upon warfare if we can. Certainly nobody can desire war just for war's sake, and if we can limit warfare, so much the better, without destroying all of mankind.

The last point, made very effectively by the gentleman from Texas, is that this will require the Soviets to expend tremendous sums to try to provide antiaircraft defense against this new weapons system.

In the back part of the report on this bill there will be found some very antagonistic remarks in regard to the RS–70. It is said that it has taken 10 years to develop; but it is suggested we should embark upon some new program, which also might taken another 10 years. It is said in the report that the striking capabilities are available today that were not available 10 years ago. Of course that is so. It is also true the RS–70 today contemplates those striking capabilities. This is not a question of going back to what the RS–70 was in the blueprint stage 10 years ago.

Opponents entirely overlook the reconnaissance value of this important development in our technological development.

With the single exception of General Taylor, already discussed, the proposal for fiscal year 1964 has the united support of the leading military authorities in the U.S. Government. I want to stress that the service chiefs, after exhaustive study of all pertinent information, are of the opinion that the RS–70 program should be accelerated by construction of the two additional prototype aircraft with associated radar and missile work.

To the contrary, we have Secretary McNamara's recommendation that a great slowdown in the development program is warranted, partly because other means may be available to accomplish the mission of postattack reconnaissance on remaining targets, with subsequent strikes upon them.

If these other means will be available and are as vastly superior to the RS–70 as the Secretary seems to think, why spend another cent on the RS–70? Yet he proposes to spend $50 million of the extra $192 million provided by the Congress last year for a purpose in which he seems to have no faith.

I think we should question the so-called alternative means. The Armed Services Committee was given only the sketchiest of information about new reconnaissance and strike means which the Secretary hopes will be available. These promises about future weapons developments are simply promises—and I, for one, can make no judgment when I lack the information on which one must be based.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force Chiefs, however, have had access to the same material on which Secretary McNamara bases his promise. Their conclusion is directly contrary to his.

It seems to me highly dangerous to reject the opinion of the highest military authorities on the RS–70 program when we have not been given a good reason to reject it. In saying this I am in no way criticizing Secretary McNamara, whom I consider to be an able, dedicated American. No man has ever been a better Secretary of Defense than he.

Mr. Chairman, on another subject I would also call attention to the testimony of the distinguished Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. George W. Anderson, before the House Armed Services Committee on the indispensability of the manned aircraft for the foreseeable future. Admiral Anderson stated that the Navy considers manned aircraft indispensable to control of the seas and support the Armed Forces of the United States.

Within the past few months we have seen manned Naval Air Force fighters gather the vital low level aerial photography confirming the rapid Soviet military buildup in Cuba. In the same period, our long-range manned aircraft played a major role in successfully keeping Soviet submarines under continuous surveillance and discouraged them from establishing a base in Cuba at the height of this buildup. Likewise, when it became necessary to cut off the Soviet input of weapons into Cuba, Naval patrol aircraft performed a vital role in the quarantine. After the threat subsided, again the Navy's long-range Lockheed Orions confirmed the removal by ship of the Soviet missiles when onsite inspections were denied.

Naval air units based in my home State of Florida had a primary responsibility throughout the entire Cuban crisis and I want to take this occasion to deliver a special accolade to them. I am especially proud that units stationed in Jacksonville, in my own district, were personally complimented by President Kennedy for their fine performance.

In every major confrontation of the Soviets since Korea, manned Naval aircraft have moved quickly to secure localized control of the air giving encouragement to our friends and deterring aggression—in the Taiwan Straits, Lebanon, Indochina, the Dominican Republic, and Cuba.

The new naval aircraft requested for authorization in this year's appropriation act are expensive. However, their increased performance gives them the necessary combat capability to cope with the best a potential adversary can bring to bear against us during the time frame in which they will be operated. These aircraft are among the finest in the world, but their superior capability does not compensate for the numbers experience has shown to be required if our Navy is to carry out its mission. As the Soviet march of technology continues, so must the capability of our naval aircraft increase to cope with this threat. There is no painless and cheap solution to the rising costs of aviation through a reduction in numbers.

This is a very austere budget for manned naval aircraft and it is the sense of the committee that the authorization for 681 of these aircraft, of which 90 percent are combatant, will provide the minimum acceptable level of procurement.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, we are all aware of the vital role our Polaris submarines play in our national defense posture. The capabilities of this mobile, silent, invulnerable missile force are well known to you all. Today, however, I should like to point out the importance of their sister ships, the nuclear attack submarines, to the defense of our Nation.

Many of the exploits of these submarines have captured the imagination of the world in recent years. Since the first cruise on nuclear power by *Nautilus* in 1955, we have heard of the historic under-ice arctic cruises by *Nautilus*, *Skate*, *Sargo*, and *Seadragon*, the submerged navigation of the globe by *Triton*, and the performance of *Skipjack*, the fastest submarine in the world.

Each of these submarines is propelled by powerful, reliable, safe, nuclear powerplants unmatched by any other in the world, thanks to the brilliance, foresight, and dedication of Vice Admiral Rickover. The fact that these nuclear submarines have achieved a significant capability to accomplish their wartime mission—destruction of enemy ships, particularly submarines—is not so well known.

The Soviets are making a determined bid to challenge the free world's historic dominance at sea. The Soviets are racing to become a top-ranking maritime power and at the same time are continuing to expend a disproportionate amount of their resources in construction of modern submarines.

During World War II, U.S. submarines established a proud record in destruction of the enemy's mercantile fleet by accounting for well over one-half of tonnage destroyed. It can be anticipated that the submarine's effort in future conflicts will be equally effective if they are properly equipped to operate in a modern antisubmarine warfare environment. We have submarines with the capability to operate in any ocean area in the world in the *Thresher* class submarine.

The ability of these submarines and other antisubmarine forces to contain the Soviet submarine threat is of vital importance to us today. Since World War II, Soviet Russia has launched a concentrated submarine-building program which has resulted in an estimated force of over 400, the largest in peacetime history and larger than the German or United States forces during World War II which exacted tremendous losses. Included in this force are missile submarines capable of threatening the continental United States as well as long-range submarines capable of penetrating all vital sealanes and threatening our control of the sea. Most significant, however, are recent Soviet claims of large numbers of nuclear submarines in operation. Although the antisubmarine warfare capability of the U.S. Navy is far and away superior to any other in the world and is an effective system for combating the Soviet bloc diesel submarine threat, as proved during the Cuban crisis, the problem of containing large numbers of nuclear submarines in the event of war is a great one. Our modern nuclear submarines, exemplified by U.S.S. *Thresher*, promise to be most important members of the antisubmarine warfare team. *Thresher* is truly a formidable weapon. She is equipped with vastly improved sonars which permit detection of enemy submarines at great ranges. Her quiet nuclear propulsion plant permits her to utilize the submarine's primary advantage—that of stealth—yet permits the use of high continuous speeds when needed. She is capable of going deep into inner space to shield her from detection and attack and to take advantage of deep sound channels. She is equipped with acoustic torpedoes which are capable of successfully attacking a submarine even if it is running deep and quiet. By next year *Thresher* will be equipped with Subroc—a torpedo-tube-launched ballistic missile which will be effective against enemy submarines at ranges of many miles.

Thresher and her sister nuclear attack submarines have conducted numerous realistic wartime exercises to develop the tactics and weapons necessary to detect, classify, and kill both diesel and nuclear submarines. Some of these exercises have been operations in coordination with other antisubmarine warfare ships and aircraft. Others have been submarine versus submarine operations to simulate wartime operations in a hostile environment such as the enemy's home waters where only a submarine can operate. Other exercises have been conducted in the one ocean where only nuclear submarines can insure control of the sea—the arctic ice pack. Only this past summer, *Seadragon* and *Skate* conducted dog fights under the arctic ice pack. The importance of developing a capability to defend our Nation against attack from enemy submarines approaching from the arctic was vividly shown by recent photographs of a Soviet nuclear submarine at the North Pole.

Operations of our nuclear submarines to date offer convincing proof that these weapons systems are a most important member of our anti-submarine-warfare team. They are the only member of the team which can conduct anti-submarine-warfare operations in the enemy's own element, safe from the vagaries of surface disturbances of the sea. Additionally, the nuclear submarine will continue in its role as the Nation's most potent weapon if attrition of the enemy's mercantile fleet is required.

Their potential in these most vital missions is virtually unlimited provided we maintain our lead over the Soviets in numbers and in combat capability.

We must continue to recognize the unique capabilities of these marvelous weapon systems if we are to retain the free world's capability to operate freely at sea anywhere we choose. The free world is composed of maritime nations. Only by keeping our sealanes open will we be able to prosper and survive, and only by maintaining a modern submarine force incorporating our latest technological advances, will we be able to maintain control of the sea in times of conflict.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is imperative that every penny of the proposed $363,700,000 for the RS–70 bomber be allocated for the development of this most important project.

I believe it would be a dangerous step, both physically and psychologically, if the safety of the United States depended entirely upon the faultless operation of electronic equipment by completely disbanding our manned bomber system.

I am completely in accord and wholeheartedly agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the majority of his Armed Services Committee, and in fact, with the best military judgment available when they ask that "all reasonable doubt be removed in order to produce all the evidence that is needed upon which the Department of Defense and the Congress can base a rational decision as to whether or not RS–70's should be produced in quantity."

It is incumbent upon every Member of this House to insure the lives of all its citizens, so it is imperative that all doubts concerning the potentiality of the RS–70 be removed, in order that we may begin positive action regarding the destiny of these United States in relation to our dependence for survival on electronic missile systems.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, we have read and heard many statements of late about our budget problems, plus existing and predicted deficits. Many are clamoring for fiscal policies that will reduce these deficits and make an income tax cut possible. With this in mind, how can we possibly recommend an increase in spending of almost a half-billion dollars, that will do nothing but add to the deficit? Such a move is particularly strange when you realize that this half-billion is over and above the amount actually requested.

In fact, we have noted from the committee report that in every instance the committee accepted the exact amount requested on every item, without attempting to reduce a single dollar in spending. Then the half-billion dollars was added to it.

In raising this objection, I am not necessarily pointing to the specified increases listed by the committee. Rather, I object to the total figure, which, it seems to me, could well have been adjusted to a point where it could have at least stayed within the requested total. If the new programs are necessary, surely there are other areas where reductions can be made to accommodate the new programs, some of which must duplicate or supersede activities in the original request.

It is hoped that the Appropriations Committee will take a long, healthy look at the figures in this bill. I hope these figures are examined thoroughly to determine whether or not the increases, totaling half-a-billion dollars, are really necessary.

We have heard many expressions of late, by knowledgeable and reputable people, that it is going to be possible to make reductions in the expenditures proposed under the 1964 budget requests. However, the action we are contemplating today hardly appears to be following the frugal pattern thus outlined.

In light of these points, I feel it is necessary to oppose this authorization until such time as the Appropriations Committee has had a chance to explore all phases of the military procurement program in the interest of an adequate defense system that is commensurate with prudent and proper Government expenditures.

We must replace our talk of economy with action. If we approve this authorization today, we may indeed do nothing except lay the whip to an inflationary horse that is already running away at full speed. If we are ever going to control our galloping budgets, someone must get hold of the reins.

For these reasons, I hope the House will sustain actions that will limit this authorization at least to the original recommendation.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, as I see it, the RS–70 should be developed beyond transportation level to weapons carrier and missile-launching platform and whatever other military purpose it can fulfill. There must be no gap between our present manned bomber system and a future fully capable missile program. Even at worse, we must leave no stone unturned in new weapons and also protect our present investment in RS–70.

As to the total bill, I must vote for recommittal to cut 5 percent from procurement and 12½ percent from research, development, test, and evaluation because I feel there is considerable padding, waste and inefficiency that can be cut from the bill. My proof may be found in four GAO reports and numerous examples of sole-source contracts of cost-plus-fixed-fee nature where specific sums were lost through improper procedures. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] provided some very interesting, detailed information on the award of contracts when he pointed out the improper procedures which have resulted in increased cost wherein cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts were placed rather than contracts awarded through competitive bids.

Examples of these procedures are described in GAO reports on first,. Army generators purchase; second, Navy bearings; and, third, GSA aircraft tires. Other specific examples include the AN/SPS 10 radar $3.9 million overpayment, AN/APS 88 airborne radar $561,000, AN/PDR 43 radiac set $600,000, AN/WRT 1 and 2 radio sets $15 million. These sums were overpayment in prices between sole-source contracts and the lower prices of competitive bids; not known, however, are the untold amounts of those other contracts not awarded on competitive basis but awarded on cost plus fixed fee.

The 60 percent of contracts awarded without competitive bids cost us too much.

The views of Congressmen LAIRD and CURTIS include this material and suggestions to improve our contract award and reduction of spending to get more value per dollar expended.

As I see it, those for economy and fiscal responsibility must start with the authorization bill—rather than voting the authorization and waiting for the appropriation bill to stress fiscal responsibility. Too often at appropriation time we are told we must vote money for what was earlier authorized. Today, the recommittal cuts would not hurt our defense posture. On the contrary, we must zealously safeguard the expenditures and proper procedures. Our military strength is based on our economic strength. Fiscal responsibility is a must at all times.

Failing to take the responsible action outlined in the recommittal I could not consistently agree to final passage, and if the recommittal fails I shall vote against the bill. Under no circumstances does this mean I am opposed to military preparedness and these weapons. But I shall at the same time expect the greatest value received possible for every defense dollar.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I must, in good conscience, vote against the committee amendment which authorizes the expenditure of $363 million for two additional RS–70 aircraft. I want to make it perfectly clear that I do not oppose the manned bomber concept. Certainly I do not. Nor am I opposed to continuing the work on the RS–70 concept.

But let us face it. We have already spent over a billion dollars and still do not have an RS–70 which will fly. It will take an additional billion dollars plus to go ahead with the additional two requested by this amendment. It may well be that the concept is worth while but, until we know it is going to be successful—and we will know since the development of the three now authorized will continue—I am not willing to sacrifice $363 million of the taxpayers' money. The Air Force has not pushed for this money. The administration is opposed to spending this money at this time.

If I thought for one moment we were sacrificing even the smallest element of our national security I would not hesitate to authorize these funds but this is a project still in its development stage which has not been proven.

If, with three of these aircraft, we prove its feasibility and that it will make a substantial contribution to our national defense, then my vote will unhesitantly be a vote for two and more of this type aircraft.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I support the additional committee authorization of funds for the RS–70 program. The development of the RS–70 system as an inventory item of the Air Force is a matter of prime economic interest to my district because the testing will be accomplished at Edwards Air Force Flight Test Center. I want to make this clear because my support of the project is not based on any such narrow ground. It is my judgment that a program which has already merited the appropriation of over $1 billion should not be strangled slowly to death because the feasibility of certain components of it has not already been demonstrated. Aside from purely military values there are bound to be large benefits to commercial flying from development of an aircraft that can fly faster than a bullet and at altitudes in excess of 70,000 feet.

My main purpose in appearing here today is to comment on the Dyna-Soar program, which involves the development of a lift-type manned space vehicle and the appropriate booster to utilize it—in this instance the Titan III booster. Although this authorization bill contains some research and development authorizations for the Air Force it does not relate to the Dyna-Soar-Titan III program for the reason that at the moment it is not considered as an aircraft or missile system. As progress is made on it I think that it will be so considered. In any event omission from this bill does not denote a lack of progress. Funds for it are requested in the Air Force budget and I am hopeful that the Congress will approve that request.

Finally, I would like to point out that although the report which accompanies this bill specifically identifies certain projects for research and development, that listing is not exclusive. Other unlisted projects are covered by a general authorization of research and development funds which were supported by the military services before the committee. Included in such funds are funds for the Navy. I have a particular interest in this fact because the naval ordnance test station is in my district and they have some 200 projects in various postures of research and/or development.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1964 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

PROCUREMENT

Aircraft

For aircraft: For the Army, $522,100,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $1,958,700,000; for the Air Force, $3,559,000,000.

Missiles

For missiles: For the Army, $580,700,000; for the Navy, $1,107,300,000; for the Marine Corps, $14,700,000; for the Air Force, $2,177,000,000.

Naval vessels

For naval vessels: For the Navy, $2,444,000,000.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Aircraft

For aircraft: For the Army, $82,148,000; for the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $204,183,000; for the Air Force, $686,686,000 of which amount $363,700,000 is authorized only for research, development, and test of the RS–70.

Missiles

For missiles: For the Army, $576,601,000; for the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $590,133,000; for the Air Force, $1,060,132,000.

Naval vessels

For naval vessels: For the Navy, $293,008,000.

Mr. STRATTON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has not completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CURTIS. At what point may one move to strike out the last word?

The CHAIRMAN. The bill consists of but one section, and under the rule the entire bill must be read without interruption.

(The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 11, strike out "$2,310,000,000" and insert "$2,444,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could not reach some agreement as to time on this committee amendment, which involves two nuclear-type submarines classified as killer submarines.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I would make this point, that the Committee on Armed Services has had practically all the time in debate, and there are some of us that would like to have a few words to say about the general bill.

Mr. VINSON. I will be generous in the time, but I am just wondering if we could not reach some agreement.

Mr. CURTIS. Why not wait until we have a little debate, I suggest to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman have 10 minutes or 5 minutes or whatever time he wants, but let us do it in an orderly way and make progress.

Mr. CURTIS. That is all right, but this is an important bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that on the first amendment, on line 11, page 2, of the bill, debate shall not exceed 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. CURTIS. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know that everyone in this House is deeply concerned about the defense of our country and maintaining the preeminent position of the United States throughout the world.

However, very little has been said about one aspect of our position in this world today. We can very easily become a second-rate power, not through letting down on our military defense, but by letting down in our responsibilities in the fiscal area.

Permit me to say that it is not idle gossip to think that the dollar might be devalued. Indeed, if we continue on this course of deficit financing that can well come about. In fact, some advisers close to the President have already suggested that this might be the course. I say we have to get into the expenditure side of the budget. We have got to think in terms of what can we afford. Up to the present time there has been very little attention devoted to that in the debate. I might say that it has been very difficult to even follow what the Committee on Armed Services has presented to us. The some 1,300 pages of printed hearings are not even indexed so that the Members of the House can follow with some intelligence what might be in this bill. The entire time for debate has been absorbed by the members of this committee, with very little explanation to the Members of the House, I might state, in the way of where this money might be spent. The committee's written report deals with two areas of controversy both increasing the overall $15 billion authorization sought in this bill. What about the base $15 billion? We are distracted by the discussion over the $500 million increases. Permit me to relate this to our fiscal picture. We had an $81 billion expenditure rate the year before President Kennedy came into office. The first year he was in office that expenditure rate went up to $87 billion. This year it is going to be $94 or $95 billion. The President's projected expenditure rate for the next fiscal year is $99 billion. This is an $18 billion increase in the space of 3 years compared to—just as a comparison—the previous 6 years of an increase of $13 billion.

Mr. Chairman, the President's proposal for tax reductions—and heaven knows we need them because our tax structure is creating economic damage—must be in my judgment predicated upon expenditure reform. I have suggested that the expenditure rate must be kept to around $95 billion for the next 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, the only way we can look into the future is to see what the proposals are in this present budget containing requests for new obligational authority. This is not expenditure. This is an authorization bill paving the way for new obligational authority. New obligational authority requests under the 1964 budget are $107 billion. Here is where the amount of this particular bill we have before us would be included. If we are going to hold this expenditure line for the future, we must deal, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] pointed out, with all the three steps in the appropriations process. We must look at each step, the first step being authorization like this bill, then the new obligational authority, and then the expenditure rate. Let no one tell you here that the authorization to ask for new obligational authority we are talking about is money that is going to be spent largely in 1963 or 1964. It is projected on out into the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, nowhere in the committee report, I might say, does the committee give us the carryover obligational authority voted from previous years that is unspent and some not even obligated so that we might be able to get the entire picture. I know the total budget figure. There will be $87 billion of obligational carryover as of June 30 of this year of which the military share will be the largest item. Then add to the $87 billion carryover the President's request for $107 billion new obligational authority and you will have the figure of $194 billion of authority to spend the President will have for fiscal year 1964. It is only the President's statement that he will actually spend only $99 billion in fiscal year 1964 leaving a carryover of $95 billion on June 30, 1964. The Congress, once it has voted authorization and appropriation has no control over the expenditure rate; this is the prerogative of the Executive. So we, the Congress, must get into this aspect of the expenditures. If we are to control spending, consider aggregate levels and the priorities of the components we must do so on authorization bills, such as this one, as well as on the appropriation bills.

There is very little, I repeat, for the House to go on, contained in the committee report.

One cannot get into the committee hearings with any clarity because there is no index for the 1,300 pages it contains. However, fortunately, there have been some studies made of this area in particular by experts in this field; as expert, I might say, as the members of the Committee on Armed Services who have failed in this instance to take the rest of the Members of the House into their confidence. On the basis of the outside studies, done by Members of the House—if I am recognized for the purpose—I am going to offer a motion to recommit to cut this particular authority to spend, this authorization bill, by 5 percent in the procurement section, except for U.S. naval torpedoes, and by 12.5 percent in the research and development area. This will amount to a total cut of approximately $800 million. This will not cut the two committee amendments if adopted because under the rules of the House the motion to recommit with instructions cannot amend amendments.

Let me say to my colleagues that if in your judgment we must have Federal expenditure reform, now is the time and place to begin. It does no good to put off the day of reckoning to say let us do the cutting elsewhere, and at another time.

We can wait no longer. If we pursue the fiscal course we are pursuing—deficit financing on up to at least 1972 with an additional $75 billion of debt to market, the dollar will be devalued whatever may be our wishes. Then the United States will no longer be the preeminent nation in the world; we will no longer be the world's banker. We will take our place still powerful, but no longer preeminent or the master of our destiny, along with other nations which once had their day of preeminence.

Yes, we must talk in terms of military defense. But we must also talk in terms of economic strength from whence we derive our military strength.

We have been debating neither military strength nor sound budgets—only whether we should trust the judgment of a committee which shies away from debate and showing its studies and working papers whereby the House membership might evaluate the judgment.

A recommittal motion is the only recourse open to those of us who feel expenditure reform is vital to our national security. I am satisfied that this kind of discipline is necessary. There is plenty of time in the event this cut happens to be in error in any detail—and I do not like the across-the-board approach, but if this is in error in any detail although sound study reveals it is not, let me assure you that there is plenty of time to get into any detail of this matter to correct it. But if this Congress does not begin at this point, the beginning of the expenditure process to move in on the matter of this authority for new obligational authority, we have lost this first chance and all this talk against deficit financing and for balanced budgets will be idle.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this first amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this first amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the committee amendment. I am also going to support the committee's position on the RS–70. But during this debate we have heard a lot about the obsolescence of the fleet, about the RS–70, and about the two additional attack submarines. As I sat on the committee for weeks I heard of other programs that would be very desirable. All of this indicates that if you wanted to you could add several billion dollars to this authorization.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] for the honesty of his presentation. It is coincidental that he talked to the same matter to which I want to address myself, because I think the House should know, should have an honest presentation of what this bill actually does. We do not want to turn on the radio tomorrow and hear the minority leader claim that we are going to reduce the defense budget by $3 billion, because we have a situation to meet and I think the House will fulfill its responsibility in meeting our national security needs.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read a response to an inquiry directed to the Bureau of the Budget with respect to the effect of the new obligational authority and expenditures in 1964 of our committee action. I supported the committee. But I think we should be honest in what we do in the House and that the Members should know exactly what they are doing in the House.

The Director of the Budget advises:

> The committee, in reporting out this bill, recommended an increase of about a half a billion dollars above the amount requested by the President for authorization. Of this amount $367.7 million is for the RS–70. I am going to support this. I want to be honest with the House. But I also want the House to know exactly what it is doing so that they may take deliberate action.
>
> One hundred and thirty-four million dollars is for two additional nuclear-powered submarines. That is in the amendment that we are considering now and which I am going to support.
>
> Should this bill be enacted into law and Congress provide funds to finance these additions it would have the effect of adding half a billion dollars to new obligational authority in the President's 1964 budget and if these funds were fully used by the Department of Defense it would add $200 million to the expenditures estimated for 1964.
>
> It is our understanding—

And this is from the Bureau of the Budget—

> that the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services that considered H.R. 3006 has recommended that certain adjustments be made in the administration's bill as submitted to the Congress. The bill as proposed by the subcommittee would have the effect of adding $278.7 million to the annual cost of the legislation as proposed by the administration. If we assume the effective date of the pay increases will be October 1, 1963, the same date assumed in the 1964 budget, the more liberal provisions proposed by the subcommittee would increase the 1964 budget by $208 million in new obligational authority and $205 million in expenditures.
>
> However, it is our understanding that the subcommittee is proposing that the effective date of the bill be the first day of the month following enactment, rather than October 1, 1963. If the legislation were to become effective on July 1, 1963, NOA requirements would be increased by an additional $379 million and expenditures by $372 million.
>
> In summary, the total estimated effect of these additions could be to increase NOA requirements by $1,084.7 million, and budget expenditures and the deficit by $777 million as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	New obligational authority	Expended
RS–70 and nuclear submarines	497.7	200
Military pay:		
Effective Oct. 1, 1963	208.0	205
Addition if effective, July 1, 1963	379.0	372
Total	1,084.7	777

> Thus the enactment of this legislation in the form discussed above would constitute a major breach of the President's 1964 budget.
>
> Also, the additional expenditure effect of the subcommittee report on H.R. 3006 beyond the administration's proposal for military compensation increases would, if effective July 1, 1963, increase our balance-of-payments deficit in fiscal 1964 by $50 to $60 million.
>
> If I can be of further assistance, do not hesitate to call upon me.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> Kermit Gordon,
> *Director.*

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I think that yesterday an unfortunately partisan note was entered into the Record. Here is a statement by the distinguished minority leader. On page 4010, he asked:

> If the military posture and the situation of the United States in the world today is so much better than it was 2 or 3 years ago, why is it that the defense budget under Eisenhower was $40 billion a year, but now we have got to have $50 billion a year?

This is a very strange question. I submit that the reason the military posture of the United States is so good is that we have at long last faced up to our responsibilities and are spending the money it takes to do what has to be done.

Last year we spent, out of $94 billion, over $50 billion for defense, unanimously. We spent $3.5 billion for space, unanimously. We spent $5.5 billion for veterans' affairs, and I believe that was unanimous.

I will vote for this bill today, and I will not go home and bleat about the high rate of spending. It seems to me that those who support the spending programs most vigorously are the ones who wail the loudest about how high the cost of government is today. We act responsibly but we talk irresponsibly. I suppose that is better than the opposite situation.

If you want salted peanuts from the machine, you have to put in the penny and if we want adequate defense we simply must spend billions. We must say to the American people, "There are certain things that have to be done. If you want defense it costs billions of dollars." I believe the American people are mature enough and responsible enough to back us up on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Committee amendment: On page 2, line 17, strike out "$322,986,000" and insert "$686,686,000 of which amount $363,700,000 is authorized only for research, development, and test of the RS–70."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment relating to the RS–70's, which has been discussed very thoroughly. In view of the fact that there has been considerable discussion, and that practically all of the 4 hours was used in debating this matter, I think it would be proper now to limit debate. I do not want to be generous. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. STRATTON. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Stratton) there were—ayes 66, noes 91.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege the other day of listening to and seeing a very wonderful movie, "The Longest Day," which recounts the D-day operations on the coast of Normandy. Those of you who saw it may recall that about 12 hours before the invasion was to take place, the radio reported the reading of a poem which went something like this: "In the dolorous doldrums of spring, a leaf has fallen."

Or something like that which symbolized in code the fact that the invasion was about to start.

A few moments ago the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] took the well of the House and in code conveyed the message to his colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle that in spite of all the talk about reducing expenditures, and in spite of all the talk about cutting the Defense budget, it was perfectly okay with the leadership to vote for increasing the authorization bill because he was going to see to it that it would be cut in the Appropriations Committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we had a very eloquent talk here a moment ago by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert] who pointed out to the Members of this body, as he always does so eloquently, our basic responsibilities as Members of this legislative body. He said we cannot just rubberstamp the recommendations of the executive department. He said we have to exercise our responsibility. Well, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the height of irresponsibility to urge in a serious vein, whether it is in code or in any other way, that those who are opposed to excessive spending will receive some kind of dispensation here today if they vote for increasing military authorizations and just leave it up to the boys on the Committee on Appropriations to wield the meat ax later on. It seems to me our decision and our responsibility as Members of this House applies just as much to a consideration of an authorization bill as it does with reference to an appropriation bill. If we are going to discharge our duty and exercise our authority and fulfill our responsibility as Members of Congress, then we have to vote against unnecessary increases in authorization bills, just as much as we would do in the case of appropriation bills.

We are not against the exercise of responsibility by the Congress. As a matter of fact, the five members of the committee who filed additional views supported the earlier amendment to authorize two additional nuclear submarines because this is an expenditure which will result in an increased and more effective deterrent force and will increase our capability to deal with the Soviet threat.

The effectiveness of these submarines was demonstrated during the Cuban crisis. But we who oppose this RS–70 amendment are opposed to unnecessary spending for an aircraft that is not yet even able to fly, for an aircraft that is not wanted by the Air Force as a part of our basic strategic nuclear deterrent force, and for an aircraft that in order to be transferred into even an effective secondary and support weapons system still requires the development of sophisticated electronic gear that has not even yet been invented.

So I say to you that in that situation nothing surely is going to be harmed as to the defense of our Nation if we defer these additional expenditures for 1 more year. We still have $81 million available this year, after all, with which to work for further development of that gear. So let us defer these massive expenditures proposed in this amendment until next year when perhaps the fiscal situation will be a little bit better than it is at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude with one more comment. I have been a little disturbed by the references that have been made here to the Secretary of Defense, and I am glad that my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] came to his support a moment ago. We have talked for years in this body, after all, about having a Secretary of Defense who had the courage to make difficult decisions; and, incidentally, when you get into the field of defense all the decisions are difficult. We had a distinguished industrialist as Secretary of Defense a few years ago by the name of McElroy, who pleaded with the Congress to "hold his feet to the fire" so that he would have an incentive to make some of these difficult decisions. I think we can be grateful today that we have a Secretary of Defense who is not only willing to make decisions, but who has the courage when he makes the hard decisions to stick by them when the flak begins to fly. This Secretary of Defense of ours has the complete confidence of the President of the United States, and I think it ought to be clear that if you vote for the committee amendment here today you are voting against the President of the United States, you are voting against the administration, and you are voting to increase the very expenditures which the administration itself is trying to hold down.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I shall not take a good deal of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, it has just been brought to my attention that in a speech this forenoon before the Advertising Council, Secretary of Defense McNamara charged my criticism of his dictatorial methods as being irresponsible.

He admits to arbitrarily cutting the original budget requests of the respective services. Such cuts have been made by every Secretary of Defense but not arbitrarily. But when Secretary McNamara says that I, as ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee, am acting irresponsibly in restoring two items—the RS–70 bomber program and two additional killer submarines—he is saying in effect that our entire House Committee on Armed Services of 36 members is irresponsible.

This is committee action, not mine alone. This weapons procurement bill was reported out of our committee unanimously.

The Secretary of Defense apparently has not read the committee report on this bill and the reports of our committee on other matters under his jurisdiction.

In a choice between the military recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the arbitrary decisions of the Secretary of Defense, our committee abides by the considered judgment of the Joint Chiefs.

Our committee is opposed to having a single chief of staff in uniform. We are also opposed to having a single chief of staff in civilian attire. That is the role Secretary McNamara presumes to be rightfully his. And apparently anyone who disagrees with him—the Joint

Chiefs of Staff or the Armed Services Committee—is in his opinion irresponsible.

Both Democrats and Republicans on our committee object to his overruling and bypassing our Joint Chiefs on military matters affecting the security of this country. Both Democrats and Republicans on our committee object to his deliberately ignoring the will of Congress.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, frankly, I think neither my colleague from Illinois nor the Secretary of Defense need an advocate here to protect them. The discussion we have had here on this matter has generated a good deal of heat and very little light. Certainly those on the committee know the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] performs in a responsible manner as a Member of the House and as a member of the Armed Services Committee. I happen to be one of those who also believes that the Secretary of Defense is acting in a responsible manner, although in this particular instance I am in disagreement with the Secretary.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. It seems to me this thing should be put into perspective. We all appreciate the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but it was the Congress that gave the Secretary of Defense his authority. If he should not have any authority to recommend in the field of military procurement, we should take his power to make recommendations away from him and confine it to a military agency exclusively. I think it is up to the Congress to decide what to do with the recommendations of the administration. I think the Congress has the right to take the view of either the Joint Chiefs of Staff or of the Secretary. But I am certain that the Secretary has been acting within the province of his office when he made this recommendation.

Mr. PRICE. I agree with the gentleman.

I also think the gentleman from Illinois was acting in a responsible manner as a legislator as I am in opposing this particular decision on the part of the Secretary. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON] put it very well a moment ago when he said that this Congress for years was crying for a Secretary of Defense who had the courage to make difficult decisions. Now we have one. I have, in the Committee on Armed Services, heard compliments paid to the Secretary of Defense for his great ability and because of his courage in making decisions. The fact I disagree with him in this instance does not lower my estimate of his ability or capability or his patriotism.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I understand the gentleman fully supports the committee decision?

Mr. PRICE. That is correct, on both amendments, the two nuclear attack submarines and the RS–70. As a matter of fact, I would go further than the committee did. I would recommend a nuclear-powered aircraft project.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman has been on the committee for sometime?

Mr. PRICE. Yes, I have; for all but 1 year of the committee's existence.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman, I am sure, shares the confidence that we all have in the distinguished chairman of this committee?

Mr. PRICE. Yes; and every member of our committee does.

Mr. BOGGS. Would the gentleman say that the committee made a diligent study of the recommendations made by the administration?

Mr. PRICE. It certainly did. It studied the matter item by item for weeks.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman concluded that the administration had underestimated rather than overestimated the amount of money needed for the Defense Establishment?

Mr. PRICE. I would think so.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman supports the program which calls for an additional authorization of almost a half billion dollars?

Mr. PRICE. Yes, I support it, but the House should know exactly what the situation is.

Mr. BOGGS. Did I gather correctly that the Members on the Republican side supported it unanimously as well?

Mr. PRICE. It was a unanimous vote in committee on this legislation.

Mr. BOGGS. So that on the first major authorization bill to come before the House it is discovered that instead of the President being fiscally irresponsible, he has underestimated, according to this committee, by a half billion dollars. Is that correct?

Mr. PRICE. That appears to be the case, particularly in this instance.

Mr. BOGGS. Has the gentleman heard statements made by some Members of this body that the defense budget can be cut by $3 billion?

Mr. PRICE. I do not know of anyone who has sat in this House for the past month who has not heard them.

Mr. BOGGS. Did the gentleman hear the minority leader make that statement?

Mr. PRICE. Yes; I heard him, not only on the floor but in public speeches and public appearances on the radio and television.

Mr. BOGGS. There have been some reports in the press that in the consideration of the military pay bill, which I am happy to say I support—I think it is long overdue—the debate will be on its not being enough rather than being too much. In other words, an effort will be made to increase the amount requested by the President.

Mr. PRICE. I am not a member of that subcommittee, but I understand that the proposal of the committee would increase the estimate of the Department of Defense; yes. Like you, I am a stanch supporter of the military pay increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. Now, if this authorization is approved—and mind you, I am not being critical, because I have the highest regard for this committee, and I have worked very closely with a lot of members of the committee, particularly the chairman, and I know that he is anything but fiscally irresponsible——

Mr. PRICE. I say that the committee acted, in my opinion, in a very responsible manner.

Mr. BOGGS. But if we adopt this authorization and we come along with an increase in the authorization for military pay and then we talk about a reduction of $3 billion in defense, we would then have to reduce it $4 billion to come back to the original starting point.

Mr. PRICE. To do both, we will have to be magicians.

Mr. BOGGS. All this demonstrates the question of who is being fiscally irresponsible.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FOREMAN. Does the administration support these two amendments?

Mr. PRICE. No; the administration did not recommend them.

Mr. FOREMAN. Do they support it now?

Mr. PRICE. No; it does not support either amendment. I will say, however, certainly the Department of the Navy gave its blessing to the addition of two attack submarines. But we are not bound 100 percent to the recommendations of the administration. I stated at the outset that in my opinion the committee acted in a very responsible fashion, responsible manner, and I supported both amendments.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman from Louisiana, when he referred to this side of the House and the position that we will take on this bill, I think assumed a great deal by his comment that every Member on this side of the aisle is going to support this bill as reported out of the House Committee on Armed Services. I would like to state that there are a good many of us on this side of the aisle——

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to yield to any Member for a question but not for a speech.

Mr. LAIRD. Well, I thought the gentleman had yielded to the gentleman from Louisiana for a speech, and I thought his statement required an answer.

Mr. PRICE. I think the gentleman from Louisiana did a masterful job in questioning.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Would the gentleman be willing to express, with any degree of confidence, his opinion on whether or not if we did, this afternoon—as I hope we do not approve this amendment—but if we do, that the Committee on Appropriations will fund the money.

Mr. PRICE. Well, of course, I would not dare to speak for the Committee on Appropriations. I have trouble enough when I want some little item for my district.

Mr. Chairman, since the beginning of time every weapon has had its counterweapon of defense.

Undoubtedly, prior to the bow and arrow, there were no shields. Prior to the Gatling gun, or machinegun, troops moved in close compact order, but the rapid fire of the Gatling gun required the spread of these troops over a large area. The airplane in most recent times brought on the development of the antiaircraft gun; and as the airplane became faster and more sophisticated, so did the ground defenses.

The development of the RS–70 and its ultimate production, if such appeared to be the course the country should follow, would cost a great deal of money. What is not realized, however, is that it would cost the Soviet Union very much more money to counter the very existence of the RS–70.

This money would have to be spent by the Soviet Union, perhaps some $10 to $20 billion, to develop antiaircraft defenses to counter the threat of the RS–70. These defenses would include not only entirely new concepts in rocketry but a whole new family of fighter interceptor airplanes.

The antiaircraft capability of the Soviet Union today could not even begin to counter an airplane with the capabilities of the RS–70. The tremendous expenditures which it would cause the Soviet Union to make would have to be made, I want to make it entirely clear, regardless of whether the RS–70 ever was actually used. These expenditures would place a tremendous drain on the Soviet economy. Ultimately, it is entirely possible that some years after the RS–70 was a completed weapons system, the Soviets would develop some means of countering it. That has always been true with respect to any weapon—some counterweapon is finally found.

I do not mean to convey the impression that I would recommend the building of the RS–70 merely because it would cause the Soviet Union to spend vast sums of money to counter it. The RS–70 as an airplane can stand by itself and justify itself as a manned system of tremendous capability for our country. But I do not think that we should lose sight of this great collateral benefit which would flow from its very existence. The billions of dollars, the scientific effort, the consumption of goods, and the intensity of research and utilization of manpower which would be required to counter the RS–70 is an extremely valuable collateral benefit which would flow to the United States.

Keep the Soviets busy in this area and they will have neither the resources, the time, nor the funds to be developing other weapons which could be used against us.

Now I would like to make some reference to the question asked by the minority leader during debate on this bill yesterday and give him a very simple answer to his query. His question was: "If the military posture and the situation of the United States in the world today is so much better than it was 2 or 3 years ago, why is it that the defense budget under Eisenhower was $40 billion a year, but now we have got to have $50 billion a year?"

The answer is a simple one, which I am certain, the gentleman from Indiana understands.

Our military posture is much better than it was 2 or 3 years ago, and our defense is more balanced and flexible than it was 2 or 3 years ago.

This did not occur by accident. When President Kennedy was inaugurated, one of his first acts was to evaluate our capability to meet the challenge of both a conventional type of war and a nuclear war. President Kennedy decided at the beginning of his administration that it was necessary to have effective flexibility in military.

He found it necessary to increase the Defense budget. The results show in these improvements in our defense posture:

First. A 570-percent increase in our counterinsurgency forces.

Second. Increase in our general purpose forces from 11 to 16 Army combat divisions and provided air mobility to transport those divisions quickly to a threatened area.

Third. Increase in our tactical Air Force fighter wings from 16 to 21 to support and supply our ground forces and defend our operations.

Fourth. Advanced our Polaris submarine program by 18 months.

Fifth. Increased total number of strategic delivery vehicles 52 percent and increase in the number of planes on alert by 90 percent.

Sixth. Began a modernization of military airlift, providing jet transports for the first time and increasing numbers of aircraft.

Seventh. Stepped up modernization of Army.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, these facts provide an adequate answer to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I suppose in view of the fact that so many Members have made the statement that merely because they disagree with Secretary of Defense McNamara does not mean that they have any low regard for the man that I should say as one of the members who signed the statement of additional views that the mere fact that I disagree with the majority of the members of the Committee on Armed Services does not mean that I do not respect the competence and ability of the majority of the committee. I am in favor of H.R. 2440. I am opposed to any percentage cuts across the board as was proposed earlier this afternoon. I do not think that represents any intelligent way to effect economy. However, I do not feel that this House is justified in adopting this committee amendment adding $363 million and ultimately calling for better than $1 billion for two additional RS–70's. I think that many people mistakenly believe that those who are not in favor of this amendment are against the continuation of the manned bomber. May I take this opportunity to emphasize that the failure to go forward with two additional RS–70's does not mean the end of manned aircraft. Every member who signed the additional views recognized the indispensable need for manned bombers. We shall continue to have a need for manned aircraft for the foreseeable future. We must have, and we are planning manned reconnaissance aircraft for both strategic and tactical purposes. We must have and are planning manned fighter bombers in great quantity.

Furthermore, it is completely inaccurate and misleading to think of the RS–70 as a bomber in the conventional sense of the term. The RS–70 is not designed to drop bombs but, rather, to launch missiles. All agree that a strategic aircraft which drops gravity bombs will be of very little use in the 1970's.

Mr. Chairman, the issue is, therefore, not between bombers and missiles. The real controversy is between a particular kind of air-based missile-launching platform on the one hand and another type of missile-launching platform on the other hand; in other words, between land-based or sea-based platforms on the one hand and air-based platforms on the other hand.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that Secretary McNamara is right. The proposal just will not stand a cost-effectiveness analysis, particularly in view of the better than $300 billion debt which we now have and the tremendous deficit we face this year. This, I suggest to the members of the minority, is an excellent chance for the economy-minded Member to actually accomplish economy rather than merely talk about it.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret the turn that this debate has taken today. It is unfortunate that in a speech downtown today the first stone was cast and those of us on our side were forced to defend a personality whom we admire and respect and the majority was likewise put in the position of having to defend a personality whom they, too, admire and respect. It is unfortunate because the entire issue is, in my opinion, beside the point. The place to economize is in the bill that appropriates the money; the appropriation bill. I think that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] made a most persuasive and logical argument this afternoon, that the Committee on Appropriations must have a flexible area within which they can operate.

Insofar as cutting the budget overall is concerned, I regret very much that the question of military pay has been raised. This seems to signal an effort to display Republican efforts at economy as inconsistent with support by Armed Services Committee Republicans for a much needed increase in military pay. Such attempts are certainly not in the best interests of our underpaid military men. There will be numerous opportunities this year for economies to be voted without engaging in the false economy of underpaying our military men who are prohibited from any lobbying activity. I hope partisanship will not lead to the tired technique of asking questions like "Have you stopped beating your wife?" We Republicans can support a stronger national defense, and higher military pay and still economize. As we vote on appropriations bills the remainder of this year the Republican Party will write a record of real, not false economy.

Speaking of flexibility, if you will remember, a couple of years ago, there was the possibility, at least a temporary possibility, that we were going to terminate the Polaris program at the 29th submarine. I stood in the well of this House and argued that if we did not authorize 6 additional submarines in that bill a couple of years ago and because of the realities of long lead-time we would be forced into a Polaris missile gap, and there would be a gap between the delivery of the 29th boat and the 30th. I was voted down. But a very few months later the Department of Defense realized that we needed to continue the Polaris missile program through the 41st boat, and so they came back to this Congress through reprograming actions, and through subsequent authorizations the end strength proposed is now 41 boats. Fortunately the action was timely and the gap is slight. But the fact remains that there will be a delivery gap between the 29th Polaris boat and the 30th, because Congress would not authorize 6 additional Polaris submarines which the Navy did not have to build and the Appropriations Committee did not have to fund. And when the 29th submarine comes off the ways and you wait 3 months for the 30th, instead of 1 month, remember that it was the failure of the Congress to authorize and to give flexibility and a realistic ceiling on the building of Polaris boats which is responsible.

This argument applies today to the RS–70. It is my considered opinion that if you do not give us five RS–70 aircraft you might as well give us none because all you are doing with three is to develop a commercial airframe. That item would properly belong in an authorization for the Federal Aviation Agency as the development of a commercial airplane. We are interested in a military bill and in developing a military weapons system. That is what the fourth and the fifth planes are for.

So I urge you to be realistic. Give us five because if you do not, you might as well strike them all out and move the three RS–70's we are authorizing over into the budget for the FAA.

I stick with the committee. We went into this at great length. We were deliberate about it. Do not run the risk of building a gap into the manned aircraft program as we did in the Polaris program.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, we are in opposition to the amendment. May I say that with all of the argument that has gone on in favor of the committee amendment, I regret to say I have heard nothing thus far in the debate this afternoon that would persuade any of us to change our position. Rather, however, since the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations, I am more convinced than ever of the correctness of our position.

We are serving on a great legislative committee. It seems to me that when we come in with recommendations we should come in with recommendations for authorizations of moneys which will be seriously considered and acted upon soberly. It has been indicated here, and I think it is pretty obvious, that it is very doubtful that money will be appropriated. I would almost be willing to predict that if this bill passes today it will not be appropriated. Moreover, I certainly think that, unless there is some breakthrough which is not foreseeable in the immediate few months, it is doubtful whether, if appropriated, the money would be used.

I should like to confine my remaining remarks to rebuttal. There has been great discussion about an RS–70 weapons system—the fact that this is going to be a weapons system.

I should like to remind the members of the committee of what I said in reference to the Joint Chiefs of Staff the other day. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have taken a position on this, however, for quite different reasons and certainly not for a weapons system necessarily. I refer you to my colloquy with Admiral Anderson, which appears on pages 974–975 of the hearings and on page 4014 of the Congressional Record. Among other things, he made the following admission at the conclusion of our colloquy:

> Mr. Cohelan. Well, do you think it is better as a reconnaissance system or as a strategic retaliatory system?
>
> Admiral Anderson. [Deleted.]
>
> Mr. Cohelan. In other words, that is what your major——
>
> Admiral Anderson. That is my major concern.
>
> Mr. Cohelan. Your major concern with the B–70.
>
> And is that reflected in the Navy's request?
>
> Admiral Anderson. This is—I would like to make my position clear.
>
> The Chairman. That is a very important question. Answer that question, Admiral.
>
> Admiral Anderson. Sir?
>
> The Chairman. Answer his question, right on that point.
>
> Admiral Anderson. The Navy——
>
> Mr. Cohelan. You are asking for 700 aircraft this year and a good many of them are [deleted].
>
> The Chairman. That is right.
>
> Mr. Cohelan. You are interested in reconnaissance?
>
> Admiral Anderson. Oh, very definitely, yes, sir.
>
> The Chairman. That is right.
>
> Mr. Cohelan. Now Admiral, I don't want to put any words in your mouth, but is it fair for me to assume that in your judgment on the question at the time you made your decision, at the meeting of the Joint Chiefs, that your major interest in the system is in the [deleted] of the system, is that right?
>
> Admiral Anderson. That is correct.
>
> Mr. Cohelan. OK.

So I am suggesting to you here that each of the services no doubt had different reasons for taking the position they did in reference to this R. & D. program on the B–70 and RS–70.

Just a word on the fallibility of the Defense Department as opposed to the fallibility of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If we were going to rely on a system of logic, to say nothing of the Constitution, which may I say is inherent in a suggestion which was made by one of our distinguished colleagues, it seems to me there would be much involved, based on past history. For example, who is to resolve conflicts between the services over competing weapons systems? Are we to assume that because a uniformed officer makes a commitment to a system that such a judgment is infallible?

It has been indicated here by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], our chairman, and almost everybody that testified, and it hardly requires me at this juncture in the afternoon to point out, that we have undoubtedly the greatest Secretary of Defense in the history of this country. Moreover, may I say as a member of this committee and one who has been very close to the subject and who has tried to do his homework, that I can say the same thing about Dr. Brown. I think what we are doing in this day of exponential acceleration of weapons technology, where we must rely on science more and more in making decisions, this country needs excellence in every form. Mr. McNamara and Dr. Brown are men of excellence in their respective fields and this country can be proud and grateful they are in the public service.

When we get on this floor and make statements inadvertently or otherwise that cast reflections on such men I take strong exception to it.

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution provides and our long tradition firmly establishes the doctrine of civilian control. I do not think that a careful study of the facts will support the suggestion that the Joint Chiefs should make the sole decision on any weapons system. History has shown on repeated occasions, ranging from iron men and wooden ships to steam power and armored vessels, 75mm cannon against howitzer seige guns, the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac;* in fact through the whole history of military weaponry, the battle to change over

from one system to another has been met with violent repercussions and resistance.

No, Mr. Chairman, the matter of weapons systems is too important to be left to the admirals and generals. This is a matter for the Congress and the executive. I do not think that either the executive or the legislative branch has in any way been penurious in its allocation of our national resources for our national defense.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a superfluous and unneeded addition of $363 million to the bill before us and I urge that you strike it from the bill by voting against the amendment.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pike] referred to those of us who voted against the committee amendment on the RS–70 as the Fearful Five. I plead guilty. It was not easy for me as a new member of the committee to vote against my chairman, the respected gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] for whose limitless experience, well-deserved and excellent reputation, and demonstrated fairness in both today's debate and throughout the hearings, I have the highest regard.

But after attending 26 of the 27 posture hearings and listening to all of the testimony very carefully, I was constrained to conclude that a case had not been made for expanding the RS–70 program.

I have opposed in committee the recommended $363 million funds increase in fiscal year 1964 appropriations for additional developments related to the experimental B–70 aircraft. The committee proposal is that these funds should be utilized, together with additional funds to be appropriated in each of the next 4 to 5 years, to buy two additional B–70 aircraft equipped in a reconnaissance-strike configuration. It must be remembered that the total additional bill in years to come would amount to over $1 billion, according to present estimates, but the Secretary of the Air Force was frank and stated that costs generally run beyond estimates in an R. & D. program.

I do not believe that this increased expenditure can be justified at this time. We have heard that the basic development of the airframe is lagging, and that initial flights have been delayed. We have heard that funds are being spent for development of sensor equipment appropriate to the reconnaissance-strike mission. We have heard that alternate means of achieving the RS–70 mission are available, that these means have been evaluated as being much less expensive, and that they are in fact being implemented.

I would recommend to the House that the add-on for this purpose not be approved, but rather that the committee continue to keep informed of our progress in the development of the B–70 airframe, in sensor developments, and in the implementation of related systems so that, if necessary, appropriate action can be taken when all the returns are in.

I fully support the thesis that it is dangerous to assume that there is only a single way of starting or fighting a war, and that it is desirable that our deterrent force be flexible and have a clear strategic superiority over any possible opponents. I do not believe that a case has been made that the RS–70 would add significantly to our capabilities to satisfy these objectives. The administration's program is to implement a strong, secure missile force to complement our already very strong aircraft force.

The B–70 was initiated in study form approximately 10 years ago, long before either the Polaris or Minuteman programs were conceived. The RS–70 modification of the B–70 would not be fully operational until approximately 10 years in the future, long after Polaris and Minuteman are fully implemented.

I believe that a new manned strategic weapon system may be required to supplement the present manned aircraft and strategic missile forces. However, its design should complement the other strategic systems and recognize the changed environment that has resulted from the possession by both sides of protected and secure missile forces.

For these reasons I recommend that the RS–70 add-on not be approved.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEDZI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I just want to call to the attention of the House that the RS–70 was very, very thoroughly discussed and when the vote was taken, it was 32 for and 5 against and the vote to report the bill out of the committee was unanimous and 36 members voted to report the bill out. I want to make that statement at this time so that my colleagues will have that in mind when they hear these arguments that are being made at this time.

Mr. NEDZI. I must remind my colleague that I stated that in my preliminary remarks. The gentleman has correctly stated the situation. I voted against the amendment. However, I voted for the authorization and I will vote for the entire bill.

Mr. GAVIN. Are you going to vote for this amendment?

Mr. NEDZI. I will not vote for the amendment; no, sir.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I heard here this afternoon one of the great speeches that I have heard since I have been in this Congress, and I only wish I could climb the forensic heights that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert] climbed this afternoon. He made a magnificent speech. I do not agree with his conclusions but I certainly admire his ability.

He started out by saying that he took his position only after a great deal of soul searching. I want to observe that everybody knows that the five members of the Armed Service Committee who took a position in opposition to their chairman and to the senior members of the committee, did a lot of soul searching, too. I submit, however, that the soul searching which we did was measured against the background of the performance of the system and not against the personality of the Secretary.

We heard yesterday that the Secretary of Defense is an ambitious man, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if he would enlighten us as to what the end of these ambitions is, because, after all, the Secretary of Defense is a Republican, and if he has ambitions along certain lines I would like to know about it, because I might want to join in some of the critical remarks that are being made.

We heard from the gentleman from Louisiana that the record is replete with examples of men in civilian clothes overruling the military. We sit in civilian clothes here in this room, and we sat in civilian clothes in the committee. The military came in their uniforms. We sat and waited for the military to say that if they were going to have another $363 million extra to spend they would spend it on these two RS–70 aircraft this year, and we are still waiting for them to say that. The Joint Chiefs of Staff never said that.

No admiral said that if there was going to be an extra $363 million appropriated this is where they would spend it. The admirals said they would spend it on two attack submarines, and we listened to the admirals and that is where we put it—unanimously. The Army generals did not say that this is where they would spend the $363 million if they were going to get an extra $363 million to spend.

I call your attention to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina who talked about the fact that we are only building one combat aircraft. Actually we are building two combat aircraft today; we are building the F–105 and the F–110.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIKE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The gentleman does not want to tell us that the F–105 is a successful aircraft, does he?

Mr. PIKE. I certainly do.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I want to tell you——

Mr. PIKE. You are not going to tell me anything on my time. If you want to ask a question I will be delighted to answer it.

I certainly do mean to say that the F–105 is a successful aircraft.

But I say to you, I say if you are interested in manned planes, manned aircraft, these are fighter bombers. You could build 100 F–110's with the money which you are talking about for these two RS–70's. You could build 200 F–105's.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIKE. No, I am not going to yield. I am certain the gentleman wants to say something pleasant, but I still am not going to yield.

You could build both the F–105 and the F–110's, which are complete weapons systems; and do not let anybody tell you that even with the extra money you want to spend today it is going to make a complete weapons system out of the RS–70.

The chairman himself in his release when we passed this amendment said:

> This would constitute a major step toward aircraft with most of the characteristics and capabilities of a true combat aircraft.

We waited for the Air Force to come in and say that this is where they would spend $363 million. The Air Force itself never said this is where they would spend an extra $363 million. So we civilians have dictated to the Air Force. We have told them they must spend this amount for this purpose.

Under these circumstances, I think we would, to quote the magnificent language of the gentleman from Louisiana, "be abdicating our responsibilities to support this amendment."

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to state why I intend to vote against the committee amendment which adds $363 million to the bill's total authorization in order to provide for the construction of two additional B–70 bombers of the RS–70 configuration. The majority of members of the Armed Services Committee have added $363 million to the requested authorization of the Secretary of Defense. Actually the committee additions are greater when you add the $134 million for two additional "killer" submarines. But the fight has centered upon the RS–70 and here I am persuaded by the arguments made by five members of the Armed Services Committee against the additional amount. I have listened to the entire debate these 2 days, Mr. Chairman, read the committee reports and most of hearings.

I am not opposed to the concept of manned bombers. There is a specific need for manned bombers of the tactical type. B–52's and B–58's are presently being constructed. These aircraft now in production and other tactical aircraft planned for production will have massive striking capabilities not even contemplated 10 years ago when the B–70 was first considered. The B–70 was ordered for development in 1955. And yet today, 8 years later, no B–70 type aircraft has yet flown. Since then there has come into being the Titan, the Atlas, the Minuteman, and the Polaris missiles. At this moment these intercontinental ballistic missiles are operational and are rapidly taking over the major burden of our primary nuclear deterrent force.

It must be remembered that the RS–70 is to be used chiefly as an air launching site for nuclear warheaded missiles. But no one on the floor of this Chamber today or yesterday has argued that the B–70 will have greater, or even equal, accuracy, range, or invulnerability for this kind of strike capability over missiles. Manned strategic bombers are more vulnerable both on the ground and in the air than are missiles. They take longer to launch. They take longer to reach their targets. In proportion to the number launched, they are much less likely to get through to their targets than are missiles.

In the last analysis, Mr. Chairman, this question comes down to economics, for no one argues that the security of the country is in the slightest endangered without the $363 million over and above what the Secretary of Defense requested. This bill, including the $363 million, calls for an authorization of $15,358,691,000. The overall Department of Defense money request, without the $363 million, is $54 billion. This is the largest military budget in our history, and it represents over 55 percent of the total Federal budget. In the coming fiscal year we face a planned deficit of $12 billion. No one can safely predict when within the next 10 years the budget will be in balance. Where, then, shall we begin to make cuts? Here is the first big money bill before us in this Congress.

Here is a perfect example of where priorities for expenditures must be stated. As stated in the minority views on this issue: "In these circumstances, any proposal to increase defense expenditures must be subjected to a very rigid cost-effectiveness test. These Members point out further, and it has not been rebutted, that the $363 million is just the ante money. According to the Secretary of the Air Force, there will be needed beyond this initial funding from $1.2 to $1.5 billion.

As was pointed out in debate, if the Secretary of Defense had found it necessary to ask for this excess additional amount for the defense of the country he would not, in all likelihood, have put it in this area. It has been made clear, further, that not even the Air Force has said it would spend the $363 million on the B–70 if it had the money to spend. Actually, Mr. Chairman, there is no end to what could be spent in any number of weapons systems. Given a free hand, the separate service chiefs undoubtedly would double their total figures. This is one reason why, fortunately, we have civilian control over the military.

I would like to point out also, Mr. Chairman, that next week the Armed Forces Committee will bring to the floor of the House an armed services pay bill which is approximately $250 million over the amount requested by the Secretary of Defense. So here we go again. Add this to the $363 million over requested amounts in the present bill and you are well over one-half billion dollars in excess amounts over requests in this year's authorization alone. And let us remember, as I said a moment ago, that this is just the ante money. It commits us in the billions in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, under all these circumstances, and with the assurance that we do not in the slightest degree endanger the security of our country or our defense commitments abroad, if we cannot or will not cut Federal expenditures here and now, how in all honesty can we expect to make cuts elsewhere in the budget in amounts sufficient to bring the budget in even near balance?

The committee amendment, Mr. Chairman, should be defeated.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Committee on Armed Services, so I would like to take this time to ask the chairman a few questions.

We have been listening to the experts on the committee explain this bill for 2 days. I have heard some fine speeches. But would the chairman clear up a few points for me?

Am I to understand the Air Force has spent in excess of a billion dollars to produce an RS–70 bomber that does not have a weapons system, and as your report states:

> By no stretch of the imagination would the Secretary's program develop a fighting machine.

Is that what we are supposed to understand today?

Mr. VINSON. The report is absolutely correct in this respect. That is the very reason we are asking to continue this program. We will have spent almost $1,300 million, and we propose to spend $81 million more for the current low level program. But even after that expenditure is made, we will have only three prototype planes. We will to a great extent have wasted our money.

Mr. PUCINSKI. With no weapons system?

Mr. VINSON. With no weapons system in the first three planes. We will have spent $1,300 million, and what do we get in return? Very little.

Mr. PUCINSKI. In your report it is stated:

> It has also taken the position that with the development of the fourth and fifth prototypes, the supporting systems that would make it a weapons system would be simultaneously developed.

In the language of the amendment you have here $686 million is being authorized with $363,700,000 earmarked for research and development and tests of the RS–70 program.

Under the language of this amendment, what assurance do we have, even with this additional money, plus the approximately $1 billion more that will be needed later that you will develop a weapons system in these five aircraft? Under the language in your amendment, what assurance do we have that even with the additional money we still won't have five aircraft without a weapons system.

Mr. VINSON. No absolute assurance, of course. There is no absolute certainty in a field like thus—How can there be? But we're most optimistic.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But in the amendment, you do not earmark it specifically for research and development and testing of a weapons system, which the gentleman tells us the airplane does not have. You merely authorize for additional research and development and testing of the RS–70 program, in the language of this amendment. I would like to know what assurance we have when you are through with the expenditure of this money that we will actually have a weapons system in these RS–70 bombers?

Mr. VINSON. We have every reason to think we will be able to do it. And all of the scientists and all of the experts say it will be an outstanding weapons system.

Mr. PUCINSKI. There is nothing in this amendment as it is now before the House that will provide $363 million additional for development specifically of a weapons system, which is the very thing that the committee tells us it wants the money for.

Mr. VINSON. But the RS–70 is by its very name aimed at a weapons system. What else would be done but make a weapons system out of it?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Is that not what we voted on when we voted the original appropriation for this program?

Mr. VINSON. Yes, we voted for a program that would lead us to a weapons system. But they did not push the program the way they should have over in the Pentagon.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not want to do anything that would be in any way harmful to our defense system, but it seems to me, with this additional money here today, there is still no assurance that we are going to have a weapons system in these RS–70 bombers.

Mr. VINSON. Well, it is as sure as anything that science can develop. If we spend this money and bring in these two additional planes, they will be so equipped that they will constitute a weapons system. That is the objective of the whole thing.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Vinson) there were—ayes 118, noes 99.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Rivers of South Carolina and Mr. Stratton.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 134, noes 109.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take the time of the House at this hour; I am somewhat timid to comment on this bill because I am in no sense a military expert. I am not even a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. I was under the impression, Mr. Chairman, that under the request that I submitted to the Committee all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto had closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The request made by the gentleman from Georgia applied to the committee amendment, not to the bill.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the House for taking its time at this hour of the day, but I am concerned about an item in the bill which has to do with block obsolescence of naval ship construction. While I am not a military expert, I am interested in block obsolescence of ships. This stems from my service on the House Committee on Merchant Marine where we have had to deal with block obsolescence in our merchant fleet over a period of several years. I think history has demonstrated to the military the absolute and utter importance of seapower. The gentleman from New York awhile ago mentioned D–day. I want to say to you that D–day was delayed for a long period of time simply because the United States did not have seapower. As a matter of fact, the whole course of the war was delayed because we did not have seapower. I have never heard any military spokesman deny those statements. As a matter of fact, I am simply repeating what they said before our committee over the years.

Now, a strange thing has happened. The Russians have taken a leaf out of our book of experience and are expanding their seapower because they recognize the utter importance of it. They are in the midst of a naval and commercial ship construction program. I predict that at the end of 10 years, unless we do something about block obsolescense in the Navy the Russians will be the No. 1 seapower in the world.

I am not one to suggest that just because the Russians do something that we do that also. But I do want to point to the fact that they recognize the importance of seapower and we are neglecting it by not taking care of the problem we have now.

My interest stems from the national defense aspects, but it also stems from the dollar cost of a replacement program in the final analysis. The experience we have had in connection with the replacement of our obsolescent merchant vessels in World War II is that it cost us better than $10 billion in excess of what it should have.

In other words, our crash shipbuilding program cost us better than $14 billion. All the shipbuilding experts have told us that if we had had a regular program of ship construction and replacement it would have cost us only $4 billion. I say we will have the same experience if we let our naval ship obsolescence problem continue without doing anything about it. A crash shipbuilding program, toward which we are heading, will cost us many billions of more dollars than it would if we started to do something about the problem now.

Furthermore, any crash program of ship construction will not only cost additional money but many of the ships constructed under such a program will not be up to date when they are completed. This happened in World War I, when we had a crash shipbuilding program. When the war was over many hundreds of ships we built under the crash program ended up in the bays and the rivers, and there they rotted until they sank. They were never used. They were not up to date, and did not meet the needs of the time. They were prototype ships which did not meet the new requirements which arose with the passage of time.

I want to commend the committee for considering this problem, and I particularly want to commend the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy], who recognize the problem and have sought to do something about it. I am only sorry that the Defense Department does not. I am hopeful that the committee in its consideration of an authorization bill next year will recommend the construction of an adequate number of naval vessels to meet the obsolescence problem.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to commend the gentleman for what he has said, and point out that what took place in World War II had previously taken place in World War I. It is about time that we learned these lessons from our many wars.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Shelley, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2440) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 288, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on amendment No. 2.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the remaining amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report on the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Page 2, line 17, strike out "$322,986,000" and insert "$686,686,000 of which amount $363,700,000 is authorized only for research, development, and test of the RS–70."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 226, nays 179, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—226

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Albert
Alger
Andrews
Arends
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bray
Bromwell
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Bruce
Burke
Burkhalter
Byrne, Pa.
Carey
Celler
Chamberlain
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Cooley
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Devine
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Fogarty
Ford
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gathings
Gavin
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Hébert
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoffman
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Johansen
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Keith
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kunkel
Landrum
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDade
McIntire
McMillan
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Moss
Norblad
O'Neill
Osmers
Passman
Patman
Pepper
Philbin
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Purcell
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rich
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
St. George
St Germain
Saylor
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stubblefield
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Weaver
Weltner
Whalley
White
Whitener
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Winstead
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—179

Addabbo
Anderson
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ayres
Bass
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bow
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buckley
Burleson
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Cederberg
Chelf
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Curtis
Derounian
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dulski
Duncan
Edwards
Ellsworth
Fallon
Farbstein
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Flynt
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Garmatz
Gary
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Goodell
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Halleck
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Hoeven
Holland
Horan
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kastenmeier
Kelly
Keogh
Knox
Kornegay
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Leggett
Lindsay
Lloyd
McCulloch
McDowell
McFall
McLoskey
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mailliard
Matsunaga
May
Meader
Michel
Minshall
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nygaard
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
Ostertag
Pelly
Perkins
Pike
Pillion
Powell
Pucinski
Quie
Randall
Reifel
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St. Onge
Schneebeli
Senner
Shipley
Short
Siler
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staebler
Stratton
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Watts
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Wilson, Ind.
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NOT VOTING—29

Becker
Casey
Clausen
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Griffiths
Gurney
Healey
Kee
McClory
Madden
Matthews
Miller, N.Y.
Murray
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
Patten
Rains
Reuss
Riehlman
Roosevelt
Roybal
Sickles
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Teague, Tex.
Tupper
Walter
Wilson, Charles H.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Nix for, with Mr. Healey against.

Mr. Patten for, with Mr. Roybal against.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Daddario against.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois for, with Mr. Sickles against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mrs. Griffiths against.

Mr. Tupper for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Mr. Becker for, with Mr. Gurney against.

Mr. Rains for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Madden with Mr. Riehlman.

Mr. Casey with Mr. Clausen.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. McClory.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, earlier in today's debate I voted to strike the committee amendment which added $363 million unasked for funds in the case of the RS–70. I stated my reasons in full for doing so. I regret that our efforts failed. I am supporting also the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], which instructs the Committee on Armed Services to make an across-the-board cut on procurements and a 12-percent across-the-board cut on research and development. Excepted from these instructions are naval torpedoes. This motion, if carried, would cut about $800 million from this $15 billion bill.

Mr. Speaker, such a cut will not, in the least way, prejudice the armed might of America. The figures are based on solid research by minority members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Armed Services. This will squeeze the fat out of the Pentagon. In four separate reports, the General Accounting Office, an arm of the Congress, has pointed to specific instances of waste and duplication which add up to at least the figure we intend to save. Less than 50 percent of procurement is handled by competitive bidding on a group basis between the services. Various expert reports indicate that sums in the amount mentioned can be saved by changes in procedures alone, without cutting military hardware.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for the Congress to force some reforms and a little bit of austerity in the military complex of America.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CURTIS moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2440, to the Committee on Armed Services with instructions to report back forthwith the following amendments: On page 2, line 3, strike out "$522,100,000" and insert "$495,895,000".

On page 2, line 4, strike out "$1,958,700,000" and insert "$1,860,765,000".

On page 2, line 5, strike out "$3,559,000,000" and insert "$3,381,050,000".

On page 2, line 7, strike out "$580,700,000" and insert $551,665,000".

On page 2, line 8, strike out "$1,107,300,000" and insert "$1,051,935,000, of which amount $60,000,000 is authorized for the procurement of torpedoes".

On page 2, line 8, strike out "$14,700,000" and insert "$13,965,000".

On page 2, line 9, strike out "$2,177,000,000" and insert "$2,068,150,000".

On page 2, line 15, strike out "$82,148,000" and insert "$78,040,600".

On page 2, line 16, strike out "$204,183,000" and insert "$193,973,850".

On page 2, line 21, strike out "$576,601,000" and insert "$547,770,950".

On page 2, line 22, strike out "$590,133,000" and insert "$560,626,350".

On page 2, line 23, strike out "$1,060,132,000" and insert "$1,007,125,400".

On page 2, line 25, strike "$293,008,000" and insert "$278,357,600".

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CURTIS) there were—ayes 118, noes 201.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 149, nays 258, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 13]

YEAS—149

Abele
Adair
Alger
Anderson
Ashbrook
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Barry
Beermann
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bow
Brock
Bromwell
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Burton
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Cederberg
Chenoweth
Cleveland
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Derounian
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Ellsworth
Feighan
Findley
Ford
Foreman
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Pa.
Goodell
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hoeven
Hoffman
Horan
Horton
Hutchinson
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kilburn
King, N.Y.
Knox
Kunkel
Kyl
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Lloyd
McCulloch
McIntire
McLoskey
MacGregor
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
May
Meader
Michel
Milliken
Minshall
Moore
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Nelsen
Nygaard
O'Konski
Ostertag
Pelly
Pillion
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Ryan, N.Y.
St. George
Schadeberg
Schenck
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Snyder
Stinson
Taft
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wis.
Tollefson
Utt
Van Pelt
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Wydler
Wyman
Younger

NAYS—258

Abbitt
Abernethy
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Brooks
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Cohelan
Cooley
Corman
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kelly
Keogh
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Landrum
Lankford
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Matsunaga
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Passman
Patman
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Randall
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Ryan, Mich.
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Winstead
Wright
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—27

Becker
Casey
Clausen
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Griffiths
Gurney
Healey
Kee
McClory
Madden
Matthews
Miller, N.Y.
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
Patten
Rains
Reuss
Riehlman
Roosevelt
Roybal
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Teague, Tex.
Tupper
Walter
Wilson, Charles H.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Gurney for, with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois against.

Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Tupper against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Casey with Mr. Becker.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Clausen.

Mr. Nix with Mr. McClory.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Roybal.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Staggers.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Patten.

Mr. COLLIER and Mr. TOLLEFSON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; there were—yeas 374, nays 33, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—374

Abbitt
Abele
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Andrews
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Bromwell
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Bruce
Buckley
Burke
Burkhalter
Burleson
Burton
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cameron
Cannon
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clancy
Clark
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Doyle
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Finnegan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foreman
Forrester
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gill
Glenn
Gonzalez
Goodling
Grabowski
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Grover
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hanna
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kunkel
Kyl
Landrum
Lankford
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McIntire
McLoskey
McMillan
Macdonald
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Meader
Miller, Calif.
Milliken
Mills
Minish
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Norblad
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quillen
Randall
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rich
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts, Ala.
Roberts, Tex.
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Ryan, Mich.
Ryan, N.Y.
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Schenck
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sickles
Sikes
Siler
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Springer
Staebler
Stafford
Steed
Stephens
Stinson
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.

Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Van Pelt
Vinson
Waggonner
Wallhauser
Watson
Watts
Weaver
Weltner
Whalley
Wharton
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Winstead
Wright
Wydler
Wyman
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—33

Alger
Anderson
Bow
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Byrnes, Wis.
Curtis
Derounian
Ford
Goodell
Gross
Halleck
Horan
Jensen
Johansen
Laird
Langen
Lipscomb
MacGregor
Michel
Minshall
Mosher
Nelsen
Nygaard
O'Konski
Quie
Rumsfeld
St. George
Schadeberg
Schneebeli
Short
Westland
Wilson, Ind.

NOT VOTING—28

Becker
Casey
Clausen
Daddario
Davis, Tenn.
Griffiths
Gurney
Healey
Kee
McClory
Roosevelt
Madden
Matthews
Miller, N.Y.
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
Patten
Rains
Reuss
Riehlman
Roybal
Smith, Va.
Staggers
Teague, Tex.
Tupper
Walter
Wilson, Charles H.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Becker.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Clausen.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Gurney.
Mr. Nix with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Roybal.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Patten.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Staggers.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my disappointment in the House action taken on H.R. 2440, a $15.8 billion Armed Forces authorization bill for procurement, research, development, and other purposes.

This is an important bill, both in amount and nature. The total Federal budget request for fiscal year 1964 is $98.9 billion, and the total request for new obligational authority for the Department of Defense is $52.1 billion. This $15.8 billion authorization bill involves over 15 percent of the 1964 fiscal year budget requests for all planned expenditures for the Nation and over 30 percent of all defense budget requests for fiscal 1964.

No one, and certainly not this Member, would permit this Nation to cut corners on our national security. However, because we in the House of Representatives failed to meet our responsibilities, it was necessary for me, in good conscience and in the exercise of my independent judgment, to vote against this bill in the hope it would be returned to committee, trimmed of waste, and returned to the floor for passage. It is now my hope that the Appropriations Committee will give careful study and thought to ways in which the amounts might be reduced without endangering our defense posture.

While I have high respect for the Secretary of Defense and for the members of the Armed Services Committee, it is difficult to understand how, in a $15.8 billion bill, the Congress could accept each item as presented by the administration without a single cut and then add an additional $497 million.

I appreciate that the funds added were for the potentially valuable RS–70, which I believe in and opposed only because the administration has repeatedly said it would not use the funds even if authorized by Congress, and the vitally necessary two additional killer subs, which I supported. However, I am convinced that there is sufficient fat in the bill to accommodate these additions if necessary and still make substantial savings.

To be specific, the most obvious way to save on defense spending is to cut waste and improve procurement procedures. This was a poor bill because it failed to cut the waste in defense procurement; it failed to force an improvement in procedures which led to the corruption and waste in the recent Signal Corps scandal, to cite but one example; it failed to include recommendations to encourage competitive bids with a corresponding reduction in sole-source, negotiated, and cost-plus contracts.

We talk of economy. Yet by a vote of 374 to 33 the House rubber-stamped 15 percent of the Federal budget, and possibly the largest administration bill which will be before the Congress this year, without a single cut. Undoubtedly it was because defense spending is considered sacrosanct. National defense is sacrosanct, but waste in defense spending is not; and waste and inefficiency are always present in a $50-billion-plus operation. Instances of waste in defense spending are continuously being revealed by the General Accounting Office. A few examples are illustrated by the recent Sun-Times editorial of March 12, 1963, which I request permission to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about the fiscal situation in this country and the planned budget deficit of $11.9 billion. I believe our economy needs a tax cut to bring the now confiscatory tax structure in line with the needs of 1963. Furthermore, I would desire a tax cut without the administration's misnamed reforms which would do much to discourage the homeowner, to harm educational institutions, hospitals, and other charitable institutions.

However, unless the Congress carefully but firmly cuts at least the more obvious waste out of the proposed Federal budget, whether in agriculture, defense, NASA, and even the congressional budget, and with our gold-plated third office building and certain abuses by some individuals of counterpart funds we are not free from criticism, we will not have a tax cut.

The House must not fail to meet its responsibilities. Waste is a luxury we cannot afford. We must give up some of our sacred cows. The question before the 88th Congress is, "Will we meet this responsibility or will we talk one way and vote another?"

The editorial follows:

THE MIND REELS

The way of a Government agency with a dollar is a wondrous thing to behold—if you happen not to be a taxpayer.

The watchdog of the taxpayer's pocket, the General Accounting Office under Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, is the authority for the following brief notations of waste and general inefficiency in the stewardship of the taxpayer's money by the military.

Item: The project to build a nuclear-powered aircraft languished for 15 years at a total cost of $1 billion. No aircraft had been built when the program terminated.

The GAO did find that $17,147,000 had been spent to construct facilities that were used but little. Another $2,953,000 was spent for design and related work and never used. There were grave deficiencies in administration and a distinct lag in the making of vital decisions during the life of the program.

Item: In order to satisfy the Department of the Air Force the Defense Petroleum Supply Center negotiated eight contracts for petroleum storage in new dispersed and protected commercially-owned facilities.

Cost to the taxpayer: $10,300,000 more than if similar Government facilities had been used. There was no evidence that the Air Force had made any cost comparisons before granting the contracts.

Item: The Government incurred unnecessary costs of $5 million to rebuild unused deteriorated tracks for tanks and other vehicles because the Army had allowed these tracks to deteriorate in storage.

Item: The Corps of Engineers (Army) had spent $575,000 to purchase 925 25-horsepower outboard motors and had plans to buy another 553 25-horsepower outboard motors for $321,000. The Army had in depot stock at least 1,400 such motors that had never been used. The new purchases were intended to replace these unused motors.

President Kennedy has challenged those who criticize his budget to show where cuts can be made. It seems odd that he must ask. The GAO sends the President a copy of every one of its reports.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I wish to comment on my vote on H.R. 2440—the bill authorizing $15,856,390,000 for defense procurement and research projects.

I voted for continuation of the RS–70 manned-bomber program since I feel most strongly that this is vital to our strategic defense.

I very definitely believe that we must remain militarily strong; and although I have advocated—and shall continue to advocate—economy in government, I do not feel that we should economize to the point where we weaken our defenses in any way. In regard to H.R. 2440, however, I believe that it might be possible to cut the amount requested—which was in excess of the amount asked for by the administration—and still maintain our military strength at a level second to none. I, therefore, voted for recommittal of the bill for further study by the Committee on Armed Forces.

When this recommittal motion failed—and because of my respect for the judgment of the Committee on Armed Services—I accepted that committee's recommendation and voted for passage of H.R. 2440.

However, I want it understood that when I have the opportunity to vote on specific appropriations in the future, I intend to vote to cut expenditures where

I feel that such cuts are sound and will not result in impairment to our national security and well-being.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter including certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues will remember that on March 4, I was granted unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a detailed table concerning the projects of the United Nations Special Fund. That table listed Fund projects from the Fund's inception in May 1959 until May 1962.

In my continuing investigation of the Special Fund I have obtained details about the 42 new projects of the Fund for which approval was voted at a Governing Council meeting this January. I, therefore, now wish to insert in the RECORD a table listing these details. By combining the information in the March 4 table and the information in this table, Members of the House may determine easily the status of any and every project ever carried out by the Special Fund.

May I note that the 42 projects involve a total cost of $96,632,300 and a Special Fund contribution of $43,673,500. American taxpayers will want to notice that their 40 percent of that Fund contribution comes to $17,069,400.

Over the 4 years of its existence the Special Fund now has spent a total of $250,625,800 for some 286 projects around the world. It is interesting to see that the Food and Agriculture Organization, which plans to spend $1.2 million in Castro Cuba under a Fund grant of 1961, has administered by far the most projects of any U.N. agency. The FAO has participated in 113 projects.

I might point out again that the International Atomic Energy Agency has participated in only one project—that in Yugoslavia.

I am pleased to be able to inform the House that none of the 42 projects approved this year are in Communist-bloc nations. This will be of some relief to American taxpayers who are footing 40 percent of the Special Fund bill. However, let us not forget that under continuing projects started in earlier years the Special Fund still is involved in six projects in Communist Cuba, Communist Yugoslavia, and Communist Poland at a cost to the American taxpayer of $2,249,040.

The nations and territories represented in the 42 new Special Fund projects are: Afghanistan, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Ecuador, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, India, Iran, Jordan, Madagascar, Lebanon, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, South Korea, Senegal, Syria, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, UAR, Singapore, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

3. Costs of individual projects, January 1963

Project by country	Approved by governing council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Cost of projects (U.S. dollar equivalent)		
				Total	Special fund earmarkings [1]	Government counterpart contribution [1]
Afghanistan: Groundwater investigation	January 1963	U.N.	5	2,099,700	1,389,700	710,000
Argentina: Mineral survey in the Andean Cordillera	do	U.N.	4	2,410,900	1,166,900	1,244,000
Bolivia: Technological Research Institute, La Paz	do	U.N.	5	1,354,600	695,600	659,000
Brazil: Power development program for south central Brazil	do	IBRD	3	3,627,300	1,823,300	1,804,000
Ceylon: Improvement of oil handling facilities in the port of Colombo	do	IBRD	1½	133,000	111,000	22,000
Chile: Mineral resources survey of the Province of Coquimbo	do	U.N.	1½	805,100	507,100	298,000
China:						
Metal Industries Development Center, Kaohsiung	do	ILO	5	2,040,000	1,142,000	898,000
Comprehensive hydraulic development survey of the Choshui and Wu Basins.	do	U.N.	3	1,594,800	885,800	709,000
Colombia: School of Engineering, National University, Bogotá	do	UNESCO	5	1,743,100	604,100	1,139,000
Ecuador: Preinvestment studies on forestry development in the northwest	do	FAO	5	1,720,600	825,600	895,000
Gabon: Iron ore transport survey	do	IBRD	2	2,892,000	2,092,000	800,000
Ghana:						
Food research and development unit	do	FAO	5	1,880,800	880,800	1,000,000
Preparation of a master plan for water supply and sewerage	do	WHO	2	2,153,300	865,300	1,288,000
Greece: Training of technical teachers for vocational industrial schools	do	UNESCO	4	3,211,500	932,500	2,279,000
Guatemala: Preinvestment study on forestry development	do	FAO	5	1,660,200	767,200	893,000
Guinea: Improvement and expansion of rice cultivation in the coastal lowlands	do	FAO	5	1,818,100	1,147,100	671,000
India: Institute of Tropical Meteorology and International Meteorological Center.	do	WMO	3	2,003,500	873,500	1,130,000
Iran:						
Animal Husbandry Research Institute, Hyderabad	do	FAO	5	4,308,100	919,100	3,389,000
Pasture and fodder crop investigations unit, Karaj	do	FAO	5	2,570,800	626,800	1,944,000
Jordan: Training and demonstration in afforestation and forest management	do	FAO	4	797,400	507,400	290,000
Lebanon: Soil survey and related irrigation schemes	do	FAO	4	1,029,700	485,700	544,000
Madagascar: Educational Training and Research Institute, Tananarive	do	UNESCO	6	2,924,200	1,435,200	1,489,000
Mexico: National Agricultural Institute, Chapingo	do	FAO	4	4,846,300	1,714,300	3,132,000
Morocco: Integrated economic plan for agricultural development of the Sebou region.	do	FAO	3	4,449,000	1,246,000	3,203,000
Nicaragua: Mineral survey	do	U.N.	2½	1,093,500	738,500	355,000
Nigeria:						
Secondary School Teacher Training College, western region	do	UNESCO	5	3,583,700	1,170,700	2,413,000
Federal Civil Aviation Training Center, Kaduna	do	ICAO	5	3,698,000	1,691,000	2,007,000
Panama: Water resources survey of the Chiriqui and Chico River Basins	do	U.N.	2	509,600	418,600	91,000
Peru: School of Technology, National Engineering University, Lima	do	UNESCO	5	2,469,800	1,194,800	1,275,000
Republic of Korea: Soil fertility survey and soil research	do	FAO	5	2,486,000	896,000	1,590,000
Senegal: Mineral survey	do	U.N.	3	1,520,600	924,600	596,000
Syria: Training of civil engineers at the University of Damascus	do	UNESCO	5	3,777,100	832,100	2,945,000
Thailand: Paper and pulp material survey	do	FAO	3	769,300	557,300	212,000
Tunisia: Preparation of an integrated rural plan for central Tunisia	do	FAO	3	2,006,600	994,600	1,012,000
Turkey: Crop Research and Introduction Center, Izmir	do	FAO	5	2,054,200	1,221,200	833,000
United Arab Republic: Vegetable Improvement and Seed Production Research Center, Dokki.	do	FAO	5	1,169,900	551,900	618,000
Singapore: Light industries service unit	do	ILO	5	1,449,100	578,100	871,000
Uruguay: Animal production and grasslands program at the Alberto Boerger Agricultural Research Center, La Estanzuela.	do	FAO	5	2,282,800	1,100,800	1,182,000
Venezuela:						
Preinvestment survey on forestry development in Venezuelan Guiana	do	FAO	4	1,721,500	598,500	1,123,000
Training Center for Telecommunication Technicians, Caracas	do	ITU	4	4,878,100	1,110,100	3,768,000
The Americas: Caribbean fishery development project [2]	do	FAO	4	2,221,200	1,448,400	772,800
Asia: Asian Institute of Economic Development [3]	do	U.N.	5	4,259,300	3,536,300	723,000

---

[1] The Government's cash payments toward local operating costs are included under "Governing council earmarkings" and not under "Government counterpart contribution."

[2] Requesting governments: Dominican, Haiti, Jamaica, Trinidad, Surinam, Netherlands Antilles, British Guiana, Barbados, Antigua, St. Kitts and Cayman, and Puerto Rico.

[3] Requesting governments: Burma, Ceylon, China, Malaya, India, Indonesia, Japan, Philippines, South Korea, South Vietnam, Thailand, Hong Kong, Sarawak, and Singapore.

THE CUBAN PROBLEM

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, last night at the Statler Hilton, no less a spokesman for the administration than the Vice President publicly acknowledged that criticism of its failures in Cuban policy was hurting. The Vice President cried foul. He claimed that criticism of the Cuban situation threatens to paralyze the Government and weaken or destroy public confidence in the President.

The unhappy fact, Mr. Speaker, is that widespread lack of confidence in this administration's policy on Cuba exists throughout the country at this minute. This existing lack of confidence goes far beyond Cuban policy. But Cuba is perhaps the best and most recent example of this administration's misrepresentations, half-truths, and untruths to the American people.

It has gotten so we just do not know whether what is reported by the White House or the Department of Defense concerning pressing present issues is the whole truth. This is a tragedy of this administration's own creation. The situation was not developed by Republican criticism. This only helped bring it to view. It is the product of deliberate and intentional misconduct on the part of an administration that is so politically minded it would even play politics with the national survival.

But the Vice President last night did not confine his complaint of Republican criticism to the contention it was unpatriotic. He also raised the smokescreen of interference with separation of powers. He suggested that the problem was executive not legislative. He knows better.

Mr. Speaker, this administration is acutely sensitive to growing public awareness that the United States is in an increasingly difficult and dangerous situation because of blunders on the part of this Democrat administration. Its indecision and its abdication of the Monroe Doctrine have been interpreted by many people, some our friends, as calamitous and little short of cowardice in the face of Communist aggression in our own backyard.

Constructive public comment on these dismal facts is not partisan. It is not unpatriotic. Neither is its effects on government paralytic.

When such criticism includes positive recommendations to solve the immensely important Cuban problem by a specific recommended course of action it is in the best traditions of the doctrine of separation of powers. Such is the function of Congress. The floor of this great body is open to debate in depth should differences of opinion arise.

The immediate key to application of the Monroe Doctrine to the Cuban problem at this moment is the pressing need for on-site inspection of the island. The need to take a look in our own backyard to see what capacity for our destruction communism hides there. Beyond the immediate need for inspection lies the problem of a plebiscite for the Cuban people after a period of military government so that we can have smiles and freedom again on this once peace-loving island.

After all this it must become an essential concept of American foreign policy that this hemisphere will be kept free of communism even if it takes the promise or the use of American armed force to keep it free.

Mr. Speaker, the Vice President's speech last night is proof that the administration knows it is vulnerable; knows that we are in deep trouble because of its weakness. It seeks to still the voices of constructive criticism by crying foul. We accept the challenge. Those of us who believe deeply that our policy must show a new firmness and direction, dedicate ourselves to helpfulness rather than partisanship.

We do this because this issue is all important. It is indeed the issue of national survival. On this we know that, regardless of party, the people are with us. If this administration would mortgage the national survival on the altar of political expediency, then let us prove to America that the Republican Party will have no part of Democrat abandonment of principle and Democrat destruction of the Monroe Doctrine that is the record of the Kennedy administration to its everlasting shame.

H.R. 4831—A PLAN FOR FEDERAL AID TO HELP THE STATES SOLVE THEIR CRISIS IN CHARITY HOSPITALS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 4831. This legislation would amend the Hill-Burton Act to make more funds available for the exclusive purposes of helping States meet the mounting problem of providing adequate hospital care for their indigents who are recipients of public welfare payments.

This legislation has been suggested by Mr. Seymour Simon, of Chicago, who is president of the Cook County Board of Commissioners. Mr. Simon has recently been advised that the huge Cook County Hospital, which is under his jurisdiction, is threatened with the loss of accreditation if it fails to correct a serious problem of overcrowding which exists in the hospital today.

The people of Chicago and Cook County have just completed spending $35 million on a vast rehabilitation and modernization program in the Cook County Hospital. This hospital today stands as one of the outstanding institutions in the world of medical care and medical research. Only yesterday we read that the applications for internship at the Cook County Hospital far exceeded the number of interns the hospital can accept this year. This tremendous desire on the part of interns to complete their medical training at the Cook County Hospital demonstrates again what a fantastically high professional reputation this great hospital has.

However, Mr. Speaker, we have reached that point in Chicago and Cook County where the people of my community can no longer absorb the capital outlay necessary to expand the hospital's facilities in order to overcome the overcrowding.

I think it is only proper, therefore, that Mr. Simon should suggest that part of this responsibility be absorbed by the Federal Government. This is by no means a case of a local official reaching out to the Federal Government for assistance whenever a local community cannot meet its problems with its own resources.

Mr. Speaker, Seymour Simon is writing a tremendous record in Cook County as president of his county board. I wish to assure this House that he is not one of those individuals who call on the Federal Government for constant assistance. The people of Chicago and Cook County are fortunate to have Mr. Simon as president of the county board because of his thorough understanding and knowledge of the problems in our community. This House may be assured that if Mr. Simon has suggested some form of Federal assistance to meet the present crisis, it is only after carefully studying all other possible avenues of help at the local and State level. Surely his recommendation is based on the firm knowledge that this problem cannot be solved through local resources only.

It should be remembered, Mr. Speaker, that we are the most mobile nation in the world. In no other country do people move from one community to another as much as do our American citizens. This tremendous mobility creates vast problems, particularly for urban areas throughout America.

I am sure there is not a Member in this Congress who is not aware of the fact that with the exodus of America's rural residents into large urban areas, we now see the dilemma of 78 percent of the American population living in urban areas and only 22 percent residing in local communities. The movement off the farm continues, and with it the problems of urban areas mount. This, therefore, is the reason I have introduced this legislation today.

Under my proposal, Mr. Speaker, we would appropriate $150 million a year for the next 5 years to help the States meet this problem of providing hospital care to the indigent. My proposal would take the public charitable hospitals out of the present Hill-Burton Act and thus make available for distribution to the States assistance in the form of grants in aid to nonprofit hospitals the entire $150 million now included in the existing Hill-Burton Act.

The new appropriation of an additional $150 million a year for the next 5 years would be earmarked exclusively for construction of public eleemosynary hospitals. This $150 million annually would

be distributed among 50 States based on a formula of the number of public assistance recipients that they have in their respective States as compared to the total U.S. population of public welfare recipients.

This means that the State of Alabama, which has 204,000 recipients of public assistance, would receive slightly more than $4 million a year because that State's public welfare recipients constitute 2.74 percent of the Nation's total population receiving public assistance, which numbers 7,642,556.

At the conclusion of my remarks, I will list all of the 50 States and the amount of money they would receive annually. Under my bill, a State would decide how its allotment is to be distributed within the State.

For the purposes of this act, the term "general assistance" means money payments or medical care received by needy individuals under a program established by State law or by an ordinance of a political subdivision of a State but does not include any such payments or care received by any inmate of any public penal or correctional institution.

The number of individuals receiving general assistance in any State and in all the States shall be the average monthly number of such individuals for the most recent year for which satisfactory data, as determined by the Surgeon General, is available for all the States.

Illinois, which has 429,000 recipients of public assistance, would receive approximately $8½ million a year. Since more than half of these assistance recipients reside in Cook County, it is reasonable to assume that Cook County would receive at least one-half of the Federal allotment. Assuming this to be true, in the next 5 years Cook County would receive somewhere in the vicinity of $20 million in Federal assistance to meet its needs at the Cook County Hospital.

With the adoption of this program, the Cook County Board of Commissioners could proceed almost immediately to build a 600-bed addition at the Cook County Hospital, for a cost estimated at $24 million, which would then meet the demands of the Hospital Accreditation Committee.

My bill provides that Federal funds can be used to finance up to 90 percent of the cost of additions or improvements or even new eleemosynary hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly willing to support reductions in other Government spending to make funds for my proposal available. I believe this legislation is sound. We established long ago the principle in the Hill-Burton Act that the Federal Government should assist local communities in meeting their hospital needs. However, Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that by commingling the needs of our public nonprofit hospitals with our public eleemosynary hospitals, the $150 million now appropriated does not begin to meet the needs of our Nation's communities.

I firmly believe that by making the present Hill-Burton appropriation available entirely as grants-in-aid to our not-for-profit hospitals and then making an additional $150 million available exclusively as grants-in-aid to the States for meeting the needs of their public eleemosynary hospitals, we will strike a more realistic balance in helping communities of our Nation.

I invite my colleagues to join in cosponsoring this legislation. A copy of the bill is included at the conclusion of my remarks today.

Distribution of $150,000,000 proposed for Federal grants to States for construction of public hospitals based on distribution of average monthly number of recipients of public assistance, calendar year 1962

State	Average monthly number of recipients, calendar year 1962	Percent of U.S. total	Distribution of $150,000,000
Total	7,462.556	100.00	$150,000,000
Alabama	204,484	2.74	4,110,000
Alaska	6,409	.09	129,000
Arizona	59,287	.79	1,192,000
Arkansas	93,345	1.25	1,876,000
California	719,433	9.64	14,460,000
Colorado	96,100	1.29	1,932,000
Connecticut	69,033	.93	1,388,000
Delaware	13,469	.18	271,000
District of Columbia	29,984	.40	603.000
Florida	206,234	2.76	4,145,000
Georgia	190,402	2.55	3,827,000
Guam	1,203	.02	24,000
Hawaii	16,745	.22	337,000
Idaho	[1] 18,550	[1] .25	373,000
Illinois	429,366	5.75	8,630,000
Indiana	[1] 73,505	[1] .98	1,477,000
Iowa	83,570	1.12	1,680,000
Kansas	65,864	.88	1,324,000
Kentucky	154,197	2.07	3,099,000
Louisiana	248,245	3.33	4,990,000
Maine	45,155	.61	908,000
Maryland	78,525	1.05	1,578,000
Massachusetts	173,469	2.32	3,487,000
Michigan	320,554	4.29	6,443,000
Minnesota	116,662	1.56	2,345,000
Mississippi	177,019	2.37	3,558,000
Missouri	246,270	3.30	4,950,000
Montana	19,886	.27	400,000
Nebraska	32,371	.43	651,000
Nevada	7,750	.10	156,000
New Hampshire	12,344	.17	248,000
New Jersey	133,356	1.79	2,681,000
New Mexico	44,057	.59	886,000
New York	571,030	7.65	11,478,000
North Carolina	188,399	2.52	3,787,000
North Dakota	17,273	.23	347,000
Ohio	384,492	5.15	7,728,000
Oklahoma	188,378	2.52	3,786.000
Oregon	63,115	.85	1,269,000
Pennsylvania	428,768	5.75	8,618,000
Puerto Rico	290,571	3.89	5,841,000
Rhode Island	34,274	.46	689,000
South Carolina	76,870	1.03	1,545,000
South Dakota	20,943	.28	421,000
Tennessee	156,129	2.09	3,138,000
Texas	341,140	4.57	6,857,000
Utah	30,830	.41	620,000
Vermont	14,051	.19	282,000
Virgin Islands	2,065	.03	42,000
Virginia	71,395	.96	1,435.000
Washington	122,082	1.64	2,454,000
West Virginia	161,059	2.16	3,237,000
Wisconsin	104,749	1.40	2,105,000
Wyoming	8,100	.11	163,000

[1] Excludes recipients under general assistance program; State agency does not report these data. Each State's allotment would be altered slightly as the figures for Indiana and Idaho become available.

H.R. 4831

A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a special program for the construction, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of public eleemosynary hospitals

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 621 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291d) is amended by striking out "construction of public and other nonprofit hospitals" and inserting in lieu thereof "construction of public hospitals, other than public eleemosynary hospitals, and other nonprofit hospitals".

(b) Subsection (e) of section 631 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291a (e)) is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(e)" and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) the term 'public eleemosynary hospital' means any hospital owned or operated by a State or political subdivision of a State or any agency or instrumentality of a State or such a political subdivision in which all patients are treated and attended by physicians who treat or attend such patients without reimbursement or receive reimbursement therefor only from the public entity owning or operating such hospital."

(c) Subsection (k) of such section 631 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) In the case of any project for the construction of a public eleemosynary hospital which is approved after the effective date of this paragraph, the Federal share shall be up to 90 per centum of the cost of the construction of such project."

SEC. 2. (a) Title VI of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C., subchapter IV) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART I—CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC ELEEMOSYNARY HOSPITALS

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 671. In order to assist the States in carrying out the purposes of section 601(b) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $150,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and a like sum for each of the four succeeding fiscal years, for the construction of public eleemosynary hospitals.

"Allotments to States

"SEC. 672. (a) Each State for which a State plan has been submitted and approved under section 623 prior to or during a fiscal year shall be entitled for such year to an allotment of a sum bearing the same ratio to the amount appropriated pursuant to section 671 for such fiscal year as the number of individuals receiving general assistance in such State bears to the aggregate of individuals receiving general assistance in all the States.

"(b) For purposes of this section—

"(1) the term 'general assistance' means money payments or medical care received by needy individuals under a program established by State law or by an ordinance of a political subdivision of a State, but does not include any such payments or care received by an inmate of any public penal or correctional institution;

"(2) the number of individuals receiving general assistance in any State and in all the States shall be the average monthly number of such individuals for the most recent year for which satisfactory data, as determined by the Surgeon General, are available for all the States.

"Approval of projects

"SEC. 673. For each project for construction of a public eleemosynary hospital, there shall be submitted to the Surgeon General through the State agency (designated as provided in section 623(a)(1)) an application by the State or a political subdivision thereof. Such application shall set forth—

"(1) a description of the site for such project;

"(2) plans and specifications therefor in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Surgeon General under section 622(e);

"(3) reasonable assurance that title, as defined in section 631(j), to such site is or will be vested in the applicant or in the public entity which is to operate the hospital;

"(4) reasonable assurance that adequate financial support will be available for the construction of the project and for its maintenance and operation when completed; and

"(5) reasonable assurance that the rates of pay for laborers and mechanics engaged in construction of the project will be not less than the prevailing local wage rates for similar work as determined in accordance with Public Law 403 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 30, 1935, as amended.

The Surgeon General shall approve any such application if (A) sufficient funds to pay the Federal share of the cost of construction of such project are available from the allotment to the State made under section 672; (B) it has been approved and recommended by the State agency and is entitled to priority over other projects for the construction of public eleemosynary hospitals within the State in accordance with the regulations prescribed pursuant to section 622(d); and (C) such project is in conformity with the State plan approved under section 623. No application shall be disapproved until the Surgeon General has afforded the applicant an opportunity for a hearing.

"Payments

"SEC. 674. (a) Upon approving an application under this part, the Surgeon General shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury an amount equal to the Federal share of the estimated cost of construction of the project and designate the appropriation from which it is to be paid. Such certification shall provide for payments to the State. Upon certification by the State agency, based upon inspection by it, that work has been performed upon a project, or purchases have been made, in accordance with the approved plans and specifications, and that payment of an installment is due to the applicant, the Surgeon General shall certify such installment for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury; except that if the Surgeon General, after investigation or otherwise, has ground to believe that a default has occurred requiring action pursuant to section 632(a) he may, upon giving notice of hearing pursuant to such subsection, withhold certification pending action based on such hearing.

"(b) Amendment of any approved application shall be subject to approval in the same manner as an original application. Certification under subsection (a) may be amended, either upon approval of an amendment of the application or upon revision of the estimated cost of a project. An amended certification may direct that any additional payment be made from the applicable allotment for the fiscal year in which such amended certification is made.

"(c) The funds paid under this section for the construction of an approved project shall be used solely for carrying out such project as so approved."

(b) Clause (1) of subsection (f) of section 622 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 291e(f)(1)) is amended by striking out the comma immediately preceding "but" and all that follows through the word "group".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on July 1, 1963; except that such amendments, other than the amendment made by section 2(b) of this Act, shall not apply to any project for the construction of a public eleemosynary hospital, if an application with respect to such hospital was approved under section 625 of the Public Health Service Act before July 1, 1963.

RESIGNATION FROM AND APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

MARCH 13, 1963.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Office of the Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I deeply regret to advise you that I will not be able to serve as a delegate to the meeting of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group which will meet at Guanajuanto, Mexico, March 18–21, 1963.

Circumstances have arisen which make it necessary for me to remain in Washington during those days. I particularly regret such action because of my interest in Mexican-American affairs. I was looking forward with great anticipation to this third interparliamentary meeting.

Your kindness in designating me as a delegate is most appreciated. I hope that this necessary change of plans at this late date will not cause an inconvenience to you.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–420, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in the Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMERON] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR COLLEGE TUITION

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to permit tax deductions for college tuition and other educational expenses.

This proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code is one way in which the Federal Government can offer direct encouragement of higher education. Further, it can be accomplished without Federal control or regulation.

The costs of higher education in our country have risen sharply in recent years—well above the general cost index climb. Those who shoulder this burden—parents or students, themselves—are entitled to more equitable tax treatment.

Specifically, this bill will allow a taxpayer to deduct from gross income tuition and certain other educational expenses paid for his education, the education of his spouse, or any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning.

Laboratory, library, field study, enrollment, and other fees and charges, as well as the costs of the required textbooks will be deductible under the provisions of the bill. However, it will not permit a tax deduction for unrelated expenses such as room, board, and travel.

I urge Congress to pay particular attention to this area as it deliberates the many tax reduction and reform bills which will come before it in the days ahead.

PROBE OF U.S. INTERESTS SHIPPING TO CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I disclosed on the floor of the House late yesterday afternoon that a naturalized American citizen who has received some $32 million in U.S. Government-insured loans has a substantial interest in oversea companies which account for some 30 percent of all current non-Communist shipping to Communist Cuba.

This man's name is Manuel E. Kulukundis. He was naturalized on June 20, 1955, and lives in New York. As I stated earlier, he curiously obtained a fleet of surplus World War II U.S. vessels purchased under the Ship Sales Act of 1946 the same day he obtained U.S. citizenship; and purchase of the Government surplus vessels had been previously questioned because he was not an American citizen.

Since that time Kulukundis has received some $32 million in U.S. Government-insured loans which have helped underwrite his worldwide shipping operations.

In my remarks to the House yesterday I revealed that during the summer months of 1962, Kulukundis ships accounted for 10 percent of all free world shipping to Cuba, and that 12 of the 14 Kulukundis ships were tankers carrying vital Soviet cargos from parts inside the U.S.S.R.

From facts I included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last night accompanied by information now in my possession I firmly feel sufficient evidence now exists to initiate full investigation by appropriate committees of Congress into the entire operations of this citizen of convenience.

WELCOME TO ELGIN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 10, 1963, South Carolina's newest industry officially held open house on the occasion of the dedication of its new watch plant at Elgin, S.C., in Kershaw County, in my district. The public was invited.

In the Columbia (S.C.) State of Saturday, March 9, 1963, there appeared an almost full-page advertisement of invitation and I quote:

> Elgin National Watch Co. cordially invites you to attend the dedication of its new watch plant at Elgin [formerly Blaney] Sunday, March 10, 3 p.m. at the plant site [Kershaw County]. Program includes an open house and plant tour. Refreshments will be served. Bring the family this Sunday and meet Elgin, South Carolina's newest industry.

We are proud to have the Elgin National Watch Co. come to South Carolina. We welcome them with all the hospitality at our command, and we salute the great efforts of all those who made the plant a reality. We were privileged to have visiting us in South Carolina, on the occasion of the opening, the president and the chairman of the board, and three directors of Elgin National Watch Co., who headed the list of Elgin executives participating in the firm's plant dedication.

Henry M. Margolis, president and board chairman, attended with his lovely wife and son.

Among the directors who attended were William C. Croft, president, Pyle National Co.—a South Carolina native who has made good in the business world; A. Phillip Goldsmith, chairman of the board, Bates Fabrics, Inc.; and Charles F. Willis, Jr., president, Alaska Air Lines, Inc. In addition, eight members of the Elgin management of the company's general offices at Elgin, Ill., participated in the dedication. The Honorable John C. West, able senator of Kershaw County, S.C., was master of ceremonies. He introduced the Reverend Dean Clyde, pastor of the Blaney Baptist Church who gave the invocation. Then, appropriately, we had "The Star-Spangled Banner." There is nothing unusual about this; in South Carolina we put God first and the country next.

Then Senator West introduced the various platform guests including those I have already named who did us high honor by attending the dedication. He also introduced ex-Gov. Ernest F. Hollings, whose efforts in obtaining the plant were saluted by Senator West and others on the program. Senator STROM THURMOND was present to honor us with his presence. Then Senator West introduced President Henry M. Margolis, who made the dedication address.

It had been my hope that I would be able to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of the address of this great businessman, symbolic of the free enterprise system of this great Nation. Since I do not have the text, I will try to highlight the significant facts he brought out.

Of the 25 million watches sold in 1962 in the United States of America, only 1,250,000 were manufactured in the United States. Not only are we failing to produce for our own people, but we are letting imports take away from our people the possibility of jobs working in the watch factories of this Nation. Mr. Margolis significantly contrasted the production in Russia, where in 1961, the Russians produced 25 million watches, and took pride in the fact that they had developed that many technicians to do the intricate handwork necessary to assemble the watches.

He pointed out to us the problem involved in the import situation. Eighty percent of the cost of producing an Elgin watch, or any other American watch, is labor. We pay the highest prices in the world for labor, and we are proud of that fact, but we are competing with foreign manufacturers who pay as little as 30 cents an hour for their labor.

The courageous president of this company exhibited the magnificent courage which is typical of the management of his company. He stated that if his company was expendable, they were not going to cry about it, but they had to be convinced that it was in the best interest of the Nation. Meanwhile, he expressed the determination of his entire personnel to face the tasks and meet the challenges before them. They intend to put out the best watches in the world—and they will. They intend to integrate the National Elgin Watch Co. into any defense effort this country may make, and he told of the training of the fine people of the community of the work which they had to do.

He related the history of the Elgin plant coming to South Carolina. Less than 6 months before March 10, the ground had been broken, and on the occasion of the dedication, approximately 220 people were gainfully employed in the production of fine watches.

He saluted the fine people of Kershaw County, and the surrounding areas who have assimilated the training offered and are giving excellent effort in their new jobs at the plant. I am sure much of the credit for this is due Mr. A. H. Buhrow, plant manager, who was on the speakers' platform.

We were all inspired by the address of this fine businessman. He dedicated his plant to America, to usefulness for the purposes of this great country. I felt that we were listening to a big patriot of a patriotic organization.

Later he presented Gov. Donald S. Russell with a magnificent timepiece. Governor Russell responded to the dedication address in the fine fashion so characteristic of this brilliant new chief executive of South Carolina. He welcomed not only the Elgin plant, but all of its officials, to the warmth and hospitality of South Carolina, and told Mr. Margolis that we would consider him an honorary citizen of our great State, and presented to him a flag of the State of South Carolina to be flown over the new plant.

After the ceremony, Mr. Margolis made an appropriate reply. He then presented Senator John C. West with the first watch, a fitting tribute to the untiring efforts of Senator West in bringing the plant to South Carolina.

I think it significant that on the inside cover of the program, Mr. Margolis had also included a very timely statement. We quote from that statement:

> In 1864, the Elgin National Watch Co. was incorporated in Chicago and shortly thereafter its first plant was built in nearby Elgin, Ill. Since the first Elgin watch was delivered from the hands of its early craftsmen, Elgin timepieces have never ceased ticking away the seconds, counting the minutes and hours for millions of persons throughout the world. And during three wars, Elgin has contributed importantly to our Nation's defense as a producer of specialized timing mechanisms.
>
> Today, nearly 100 years later, Elgin is proud to dedicate its newest watch plant here in Elgin, S.C. This first phase of our operation here contains 72,000-square feet of space, and features the most advanced equipment, air conditioning and dehumidifying systems. Without doubt, it is the most modern and efficient watch assembly operation in the United States, and possibly the world.
>
> The role of Elgin in South Carolina is a most significant one in the company's plans to maintain and expand its preeminence in the watchmaking field in the United States. To the people who are the Elgin National Watch Co. in South Carolina, therefore, we look for the same skills and dedication that have characterized Elgin's long and successful history of fine watchmaking. We hope also that in the future plants serving other Elgin operations can be located here.
>
> As production of watches becomes a reality in South Carolina, we wish to extend our deepest appreciation for the outstanding cooperation and help from the many people and organizations who have made this new industry possible. We take great pride in becoming a member of your community and thank you for your warm welcome. And we look forward to a long and pleasant relationship with those who have worked so diligently on our behalf.

Also included in the statement was a news story released to the press on February 27, 1963, describing a significant Elgin contribution to U.S. space exploration activities. The news story is as follows:

> DOWNEY, CALIF.—The Elgin National Watch Co.'s Research and Development Division, Rolling Meadows, Ill., was selected by North American Aviation's Space and Information Systems Division to develop and build the unique timekeeping device for the Apollo command module. The device is an electronic metronome with an infallible sense of timing that will call the signals on board NASA's moon-bound Apollo spacecraft.
>
> The Apollo spacecraft, which is under the direction of NASA's manned-spacecraft center, Houston, Tex., is scheduled to take three Americans on a round trip to the moon for scientific research by 1970.
>
> The award to the Illinois firm was the 17th major selection by North American Aviation's Space and Information Systems Division, principal contractor for the Apollo command and service modules. The 17 companies have received awards totaling more than $128 million, and are located in 10 States.
>
> The electronic timekeeper will be to moon-bound astronauts what the automatic clock radio and electric timer are to the contemporary housewife.
>
> It will receive its synchronization from the on-board guidance and navigation computer. The computer solves a problem, then synchronizes the timekeeper to count cadence and send the signal to start or stop an operation.
>
> With a required flight and ground checkout operating life of about 2,000 hours, the space-age timepiece will be called upon to keep the spacecraft television, telemetry, and on-board test equipment synchronized.
>
> It will also provide clock pulses to the sequencer which will jettison the Apollo escape tower as the huge three-stage advanced Saturn C–V space vehicle breaks the magnetic bounds of earth.
>
> The electronic metronome will be a little black box about the size of a loaf of bread and will weigh less than 10 pounds. With the equivalent of 4,800 parts tucked away, some small as a pinhead, but none larger than a golf ball, the device will utilize the most recent developments in microminiature circuitry, recording for later analysis elapsed time between major events such as retrorocket firings.
>
> The robot timekeeper will have a redundancy (emergency backup feature) that will guarantee 1-million-to-1 odds against failure.
>
> Its passion for accuracy will be equaled only by the National Bureau of Standards,

with which the timekeeper will be synchronized before plug-in to the command module.

Senator West also introduced some of the ladies present: Mrs. Henry Margolis; South Carolina's first lady, Virginia Russell; Mrs. Robert W. Hemphill, and Mrs. Elizabeth Dixon; then Senator and Mrs. George McKeown, of Cherokee County, S.C., and Senator and Mrs. Dan Laney, of Lee County, S.C. Singled out in the audience were Commissioner Les Myers, of Kershaw County; E. T. Bowen, of Elgin; Howard Speaks, Ed Mitchell, and Frank Rector, of Camden, S.C., and E. C. Potter, mayor of Elgin. Time did not permit further introduction.

A crowd of 5,000 people attended the dedication. The benediction was given by the Reverend Milton McGuirt, pastor of the Elgin Methodist Church.

A silent host at the dedication was our own country. Through the magnificent efforts of the Area Redevelopment Administration of the Department of Commerce of the United States of America, a water system at Blaney, S.C., now Elgin, S.C., evolved from a dream to reality. As Senator West so gratuitously pointed out—without water we could not have hoped to have this magnificent plant. I salute the Area Redevelopment Administration, its helpful officials, its employees at the Washington level and in the Atlanta regional office, for their magnificent cooperation and help in getting water for Blaney. This is the kind of fruitfulness the Area Redevelopment Administration was designed to be a part of. Industry, investment, jobs, salaries, productivity, all a reality. And throughout all, the preservation and promotion of the free enterprise system that has made America great.

Like many others sitting on the platform on that beautiful Sunday afternoon, I could look out over the heads of the crowd and see in the distance the horizons which our eyesight limited us. I was too realistic to think that I could see beyond the horizon, or prophesy what might happen to us. I could only say a little prayer of thankfulness that we have people in industry like President Margolis and the people who came to do us honor in the dedication on that Sunday. I feel confident that with people of such caliber, together with the people of the locality who have made a magnificent stride in coming untrained from the farms and the homes, and learning the skilled talents of assembling watches.

After the ceremony a fine tour of the plant was arranged. Courtesy was the watchword and hospitality the order of the day.

It was a great day in South Carolina on Sunday.

Welcome, Elgin. We are happy to have you, proud of you, and we hope that in the future the great name of Elgin will be synonymous with the great name of the State of South Carolina.

CONSENSUS ON CUBA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, there exists today what I believe to be a rough consensus of opinion on one of the most vexing problems with which the United States has had to deal in recent years—I am referring to the Cuban situation. This consensus has been shaped and hammered out by means of public debate; very few other foreign policy or national security issues have been submitted to such an intensive interchange of ideas and evaluations as has the Cuban problem.

Public opinion and the governmental policymaking machinery have had sufficient exposure to this problem for the past 4 years to have sifted the wheat from the chaff of this debate; to have eliminated certain extreme or rash solutions; and to have observed the effects of various actions on the part of our Government on the viability of the Havana regime. This has helped to pare the Cuban debate to the bone, to the relevant heart of the matter. I believe that it is necessary at this time to initiate an evaluation of this consensus, with a view to measuring the pertinence of the steps toward solution which our Government has taken to date, and in order to provide the basis for recommendations for future steps to which I add my own views. The debate, in other words, must move with all responsibility forward into new areas of consideration.

The role of the loyal opposition has on occasion been called into question during this debate. Let us put this behind us permanently; what is involved is the security of the United States of America. In our concern for this, we are all united. I believe that constructive debate can and does serve a vital function in a democracy—that of exposing policy to public scrutiny, in which crucible a policy survives or falls on the combined interests of the American people.

It is in this crucible of lengthy public consideration and debate that a distinguishable consensus of opinion on the Cuban problem has been distilled. I am grateful to many of my distinguished colleagues in both bodies of this Congress for providing some of the more recent and valuable debating material which has served to finally sharpen and focus the public's appreciation of the Cuban problem, and to stimulate our National Government's responsibility in meeting that problem.

Let me turn now to what is my interpretation of this consensus of opinion about Cuba. First, there seems to be wide agreement on one fundamental issue. We want to settle the problem without invading Cuba, if it is humanly possible.

This feeling is tempered by another, equally strong: The problem must be solved. The United States cannot accept the continued presence of Soviet military power in the Western Hemisphere. Containment is not enough: Soviet troops in Cuba present an intolerable situation. This is true for many reasons, and people may differ on why they agree that this is so, but they do agree that there must be a withdrawal of Soviet forces from the island. The problem of how to do this, of course, is one which can be faced when we are in agreement, and the executive branch is in agreement, that it should be done.

This brings us to the third point of consensus on the Cuban problem. And that is that our Government has not found an effective policy of solving the Cuban problem so far. I am not going to go into criticism of specific points of policy. I simply mean to point out that Fidel Castro has been in power in Cuba for 4 years, and that there has been a Soviet military presence in Cuba for some time, and that this presence brought the world to the brink last October, and that it continues to menace hemispheric security, and that Cuba as a base for the training of saboteurs and agitators is increasing, not decreasing, the security of the American States. The consensus is that Cuba is an obvious problem to which we have not found a solution, obvious or otherwise.

Another point in this consensus is that if the Monroe Doctrine has been multilateralized as an instrument of hemispheric security, then it must serve as an instrument of our security as well as our neighbors.

It has been pointed out that if the doctrine was multilateralized it was in order to keep the United States from unilaterally invoking it according to its own interpretation. There are many who disagree with this opinion.

But there can be no legal question about the security treaties between the American States, including OAS. The Rio Treaty signed to circumvent the necessity to resort to the Monroe Doctrine, must, in its stead, provide for our security. Under this treaty we can invoke any kind of sanction, including military, in order to avoid a threat to the security of the American States. It is time all the American people realize that we have a solid legal basis for our firm insistence that the Soviet military establishment get out of Cuba.

In this respect, I should point out many have found sadly lacking the support for actions against the Castro regime on the part of the organization of American States. I am speaking now not only of precipitant military actions, but even the simple diplomatic, economic, and commercial sanctions provided for in the treaty. Some nations have not even broken off relations with the Castro regime, despite the missile crisis in October, and the Cuban embassies in these countries continue to serve as focal distribution points of propaganda and subversives, continue to provide means of traveling to Cuba for guerrilla training, and continue in general to dissipate and fragment the actions of those American States which are concerned about Cuban troublemaking. An honestly debatable question is: Has the administration exerted sufficient leadership, or sufficient pressure, to bring the members of the Organization of American States into agreement about sanctions on the Cuban espionage and sabotage center?

For myself, I feel we have been sorely lacking a policy on Cuba. I don't think the administration has really developed a clear policy about Cuba or the Western Hemisphere with respect to its freedom. I feel we must emphasize to all the peoples of the world that we have made no

commitments that prevent us from continuing the embargo—quarantine if you will—or from taking stronger action if it is essential to our security or to the peace and freedom of this hemisphere. The President should make it clear that his hands are completely untied as to quarantine or any action required for the security of this hemisphere. I feel we should have a powerful defense organization for the Caribbean States and Central America. I feel we should use every means at our command to curb shipments of goods to Cuba by our allies. And we have our own economic assistance program as a meaningful tool to end this sham. How ridiculous can we be to allow what is still going on daily to continue? Here we give economic assistance and maintain broad trade agreements with many countries which, in turn, assist Cuba's economy and strengthen Castro, often providing our own goods, our own machinery parts and replacements so vital to Castro's productivity. We should carry out our threat to withdraw our aid to the nations violating this basic principle of morality and justice. The President has this authority; he should use it.

I feel it is necessary to insist on the withdrawal of Soviet troops—to relieve this uncertainty which dominates our minds regarding the existence of vast Soviet troops and weapons which could strike at us or other vital points in the Western Hemisphere. I am convinced that if these Soviet forces are removed that they will take with them most of the weapons they brought there, thus removing the most potent tools Castroism has in this hemisphere. This brings me to another thought.

What on earth is this question of offensive or defensive threat? What difference does it make? The Soviets have not brought thousands of troops and millions of rubles worth of equipment into Cuba to bask in the Cuban sun. The important thing is that there is this huge Soviet military buildup in the Caribbean 90 miles from our shores—brazenly and defiantly dedicated to the subversion and the threat to security of our hemisphere. It does not matter if it is offensive or defensive. What does matter is that the Soviet buildup has turned Cuba into a base for subversion and terrorism throughout the hemisphere.

Castro, buttressed by this Soviet strength, makes no secret of his aims. "Ché" Guevara, his principal strategist said publicly just a few months ago that the Soviet Union from its Cuban base intends to use every means to spread its influence throughout Latin America, stimulating unrest and guerrilla warfare to weaken or topple neighboring governments. He emphasized that there is no solution but armed struggle to overthrow these governments. Guevara admitted that guerrillas in Paraguay, in Guatemala, Colombia, and Venezuela are already active in armed struggle and that guerrilla groups also have been inciting clashes in Nicaragua and Peru. What more do we need.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the Cuban problem is not a simple one, but I am convinced that it is a vital one to this Nation's security. My purpose today in bringing up these points has been to suggest that a rough sort of consensus has been arrived at about the Cuban problem, and that now, on the basis of, and operating within this consensus, we ought to turn the ongoing debate onto responsible measures to solve, or at least to reduce, the problem to acceptable dimensions.

Public concern over the Cuban imbroglio has assumed many forms and has covered a wide range of evaluations of the problem and possible avenues to explore toward its solution.

Toward this end I trust a bold policy will emanate, and I am confident that the whole country will unite behind whatever firm action the President recommends to remove this menace. Of course we should have a bipartisan policy. But, to paraphrase Senator Keating, bipartisanship does not mean blind man's buff. It means alert, open-minded support for actions the President takes in pursuit of U.S. objectives. When the President acts—whether successfully as in October, or unsuccessfully as at the Bay of Pigs—he can expect bipartisan backing with no recriminations. However, and I emphasize this, there must be a definite policy to expect bipartisan support. When there is no policy, except wait and see, then, all citizens, yes, and Members of Congress, have a responsibility to make their views known. I believe that continued expressions of American concern over the Soviet threat in our hemisphere are very much in the national interest. They can only strengthen the President's hand in dealing with the Soviets and convincing them that we are determined to put an end to their military activities in the Caribbean.

One such expression of concern has been forwarded to me recently by a group of young citizens from my native borough of Queens in New York. It is contained in a resolution adopted by the Queens County Young Republican Association of which Gordon L. Busching, of Kew Gardens, serves as president. The resolution was drafted by Z. Michael Szaz, Ph. D., a member of the graduate faculty of the History Department of St. John's University, a noted author of numerous books and scholarly articles, and a recent panelist at the International Political Science Association's congress in Paris.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the resolution at this point in the Record:

Resolution on the Cuban Situation Unanimously Passed by the Queens County Young Republican Association, February 27, 1963

Whereas the Soviet Union, by deployment of military forces, political subversion and economic domination, has established a hostile Communist base in the Western Hemisphere in Cuba in contravention of the Monroe Doctrine;

Whereas during the fall of 1962 offensive missile weapons were dispatched by the Soviet Union to Cuba and, though allegedy withdrawn the promise of a ground inspection of the dismantled bases was never implemented;

Whereas the Cuban Communist government and its Sino-Soviet and satellite experts and training personnel are actively engaged in subverting the political and social order of free countries in Latin America and are maintaining an excessive weapons arsenal;

Whereas the Communist rulers of the Cuban nation have established a totalitarian police regime against the wishes and interests of the Cuban people; and

Whereas the United States remains the main military, political and economic bulwark of free nations locked into a lethal struggle with international communism and has to act in its own and its allies' interests Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this committee recommends the following actions: The U.S. Government shall, by extending a short time limit, demand from the Cuban and Soviet Governments that a ground and air inspection of missile and air bases be permitted under the supervision of the Organization of American States.

If such a demand is not complied with, the U.S. Government should be forced to decree a complete embargo of all goods to Cuba by the ships of any nation and enforce it by all the means at our command, including if necessary the Armed Forces of the United States, and/or take any and all actions necessary to liquidate the Communist danger to the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I want to generally associate myself with the gentlemen who have been speaking out on this vital matter which is of such great interest to the American people. I have known Dr. Michael Szaz for many years and he brings a wide breadth of understanding to these subjects. I read with interest the resolution which has been incorporated into the Record by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] and I want to commend this fine group of young Republicans for their statement. Dr. Szaz is their inspirational leader.

Looking back to the statement by the President of the United States just before the 1962 election, I well recall the firmness of the President's position. His actions did not keep up with his words. In point six of his declaration he affirmed his intention to press the blockade of Cuba until adequate on-site inspection was accomplished. His abandonment of this position before such inspection was provided for has weakened our position throughout the world and certainly given wide latitude for action to Mr. Khrushchev who will not have to fear our strong words as long as Mr. Kennedy is in the White House.

I commend the gentleman for bringing this important message to the House of Representatives.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the Record on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DYNA-SOAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the House passed H.R. 2440, a bill to authorize for the fiscal year 1964 procurement, research, development, tests, and evaluation of aircraft missiles and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. During the 4 hours of general debate on that bill the only real controversy had to do with the RS–70, previously known as the B–70. A great deal of time was consumed in discussing that project and there was not sufficient time available to me to bring up a subject which I think is also of great importance to the whole defense posture.

A new controversy seems in the making. Yesterday the Washington Daily News carried a big headline to the effect that the United States may scratch Dyna-Soar. The article in this paper indicated that Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara may cancel the Air Force role in either Gemini or Dyna-Soar. For the information of the Members who are not acquainted with the various space projects, Gemini is a project to develop space rendezvous and docking techniques in orbit, using a two-man capsule. Dyna-Soar, which is also called the X–20A, is an Air Force project involving a manned, winged, glide reentry vehicle of orbital capability boosted by a Titan III launch vehicle. The Gemini is scheduled for flight tests beginning late this year and the Dyna-Soar is not scheduled for testing until 1965.

Mr. Speaker, the news item which appeared yesterday followed testimony made public by the House Armed Services Committee which indicated that Defense Secretary McNamara said he would not want to prejudge statements that have been made but his guess was that Gemini, as against Dyna-Soar, has a greater military potential for us. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, the question to be decided is as to whether to continue with Dyna-Soar or modify Gemini for military purposes. Secretary McNamara is quoted as saying each spacecraft could cost $800 million and before investing $1.6 billion the Government probably would make a choice between them.

My purpose in rising today is not to tell the House that Secretary McNamara is about to make a mistake. Far from it—I have considerable respect for Mr. McNamara. One time I told him when he appeared before the Merchant Marine Committee that if he wanted to cut down a military establishment in my district and if he could show me that it was no longer needed I would support him.

In this case of the Dyna-Soar, which is being developed in the congressional district adjoining mine, I would make the same statement. However, if I think the Secretary is wrong I will oppose him with equal directness. Especially I stress the matter of justification because when you are spending public funds and administering the public business you just do not make a decision and act without letting the people know why you make the decisions you do; or that is the way it should be.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I yield to my colleague from Washington, in whose district the Dyna-Soar is being developed.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] to say if he believes there are political considerations in awarding or cancellation of contracts.

Mr. PELLY. I would say to my colleague that yesterday in the general debate it was made abundantly clear by the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee that such a controversy is being looked into at the other end of the Capitol. Such influence or political consideration has been suspected.

I will say this too, I have a high regard for Secretary McNamara. Any political motivation in my judgment would not be of his deliberate doing. He is not such a man.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleague the public needs for facts and reassurance on this score.

For example, the President, while campaigning in support of Mayor Richardson Dilworth's candidacy for Governor of Pennsylvania last fall, speaking at the McKeesport, Pa., city hall on October 13, 1962, said:

> Working with Governor Lawrence since 1960, we have increased by 50 percent the number of prime defense contracts that come to Pennsylvania, job retraining, cleaning our rivers, area redevelopment, increasing our food supplies for those on relief—all these measures which can be brought about with a progressive, democratic Governor, working with all of us.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the President implied very pointedly that only by the election of a Democrat Governor could Pennsylvania expect to maintain or improve its present posture with respect to defense contracts.

It is known furthermore that all decisions on contract awards are channeled through the White House. Every award over $1 million, I have been told, goes to the White House and thereafter to someone for political advantage in making a public announcement.

The public knows this. The public also knows there was an inference that if the President's brother was elected to the Senate it would be good for Massachusetts in obtaining defense business.

I would defend Mr. McNamara himself but as for this administration no one has convinced the public that there are not political considerations in these matters.

When the next election comes around, questions of this nature will be raised. Rightly so, too. I imagine my colleague will remind his constituents of what has transpired. But I certainly hold Mr. McNamara blameless—unless someone shows to the contrary. I disagree with his reasons as to his decision on the TFX. It is a costly mistake to my mind.

As was said yesterday, Mr. McNamara is no military genius, but he is an executive and as such, of course, he will make honest blunders.

I do not want him to make any such wrong decision with regard to Dyna-Soar. That is why I am raising this issue today and writing into the Record what experts have testified regarding continuation of Dyna-Soar.

I certainly do not think Mr. McNamara is motivated by political consideration but somebody on the administration team that made this decision could have been politically motivated and I think that the public interest calls for more facts than have been revealed.

Mr. Speaker, when the question as to the possible striking of the Dyna-Soar program comes up there are some facts which I think Members of this House and the public should be given. For example, I think testimony of Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Jr., who is the Associate Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, before my Committee of Science and Astronautics on February 25, 1962, made certain things very clear insofar as the interest of science in connection with both the Dyna-Soar and the Gemini.

Let me cite what Dr. Seamans said in response to a question. I will read into the Record from the actual transcript. Mr. Hammill, a staff member of the Science and Astronautics Committee asked this question:

> Mr. Hammill. Well now there are reports in the press to the effect that in view of the NASA-Air Force Gemini agreement that the Dyna-Soar program is being reevaluated within Defense.
>
> Now the question is: Can Dyna-Soar and Gemini be distinguished as to objectives, because we understand Gemini to be looking toward maneuverability in space, rendezvous in docking and landing at a small preselected land site, which seems to me to be very similar to the objectives of Dyna-Soar.
>
> Mr. Seamans. Well, it is true that all major programs are always under review and consequently Dyna-Soar is being thoroughly evaluated.
>
> We in NASA feel that the two programs are complementary and not in conflict, one with another. We look to the Gemini to push forward the frontiers in space with space-type maneuvers, the kind you referred to. However, we feel the Dyna-Soar is an extremely important part of the national effort in order to better understand the problems of very high speed maneuver during reentry, large acceleration, large L/R lift-drag ratios. This is important in systems that may involve return from orbit on a prescribed orbit, rather—in the case of Gemini we can wait an extra orbit or two to come down when we want, in the case of the Dyna-Soar we would have the ability to come down without going around the earth several times to get in a favorable position.
>
> Also the Dyna-Soar is giving this country an opportunity to gain additional information on certain very important materials under very high temperature. It would be, we feel, a loss to the country if this program were cancelled.

Mr. Speaker, it is not possible, of course, to divorce defense and the peaceful exploration of space. Military authorities have made it very clear that a major breakthrough in space on the part of the Soviets could place the United States in a position of vulnerability which we have not occupied before. We would have a gap.

From the foregoing, Mr. Speaker, it will be clear that from a scientific point of view the Dyna-Soar program is considered important. As to the testimony indicating the position of the military service let me cite Lt. Gen. James Ferguson, Deputy Chief of Staff, Research and Development, U.S. Air Force. In appearing before the Committee of Science and Astronautics on March 1, 1963, in his statement on space posture General Ferguson said:

> Military patrol capabilities for the space region could provide oncall protection for U.S. space activities, both scientific and military, in event of hostile enemy actions in the space region. This objective includes: An improved detection and tracking system; a means of inspecting unidentified space devices; and a means of disabling hostile satellites, if this should be required in the national interest.
>
> And lastly, a system for continually monitoring such space phenomena as radiation and solar flares, the latter being essential for prolonged space operations.
>
> These, plus technical building blocks. The Air Force space program also includes elements which form the basic research and development building blocks for a military man in space program. Key elements of this group already in development are: the Titan III launching system, Dyna-Soar, and the Air Force participation in the Gemini program. And in this connection, I think I made it clear that the NASA/DOD agreement of this last month on a joint Gemini program was most certainly welcomed by the Air Force. Another key element we propose is a military test space station. The technologies represented by Gemini, a military test space station, Dyna-Soar, and Titan III are fundamental to any future manned military space capability.

In subsequent questions the testimony of General Ferguson as to the Air Force position on Dyna-Soar is clear.

I will read my own questions from the transcript:

> Mr. Pelly. Mr. Chairman, while we are on Dyna-Soar could I ask a question?
>
> Mr. Karth. Yes, sir, Mr. Pelly.
>
> Mr. Pelly. General, in the February 25 issue of Aviation Weekly, on page 26, there is an article that indicates that Dyna-Soar, the whole Dyna-Soar program, is under review and that there is an indication that it will be eliminated or greatly curtailed. Can you comment on that?
>
> General Ferguson. I have read the article. It is true that we are conducting a survey of the program and we are proposing in the next 2 weeks to present to the Secretary of Defense a detailed examination of Dyna-Soar and its technical objectives.
>
> Mr. Pelly. We had testimony in here when our counsel asked a question the other day from Dr. Robert Seamans, Jr., expressing, I would say, in highest terms the importance of that project. And I think this article in Aviation Weekly indicated maybe the Air Force wasn't willing to stand up and fight.
>
> General Ferguson. Well, I can assure you the Air Force does, has, and will stand up and fight for Dyna-Soar. We think it is a most critical part of the national space program.
>
> Mark you, I said "national," because Mr. Webb and Mr. Seamans and many other key officials of NASA are on record, recently and over the years, in full support of Dyna-Soar and its technical objectives.
>
> Mr. Karth. I think what Mr. Pelly had in mind was the ordering of the review by the Defense.
>
> General Ferguson. Of course this isn't the only system under review. They are all under review, and rightly so, and they continue.
>
> Mr. Pelly. It seems to me the General's statement indicated the importance of the Dyna-Soar, and when it was indicated that the Air Force was not going to stand up and fight, as it were, for this program, I was somewhat concerned in view of the importance that is attached to it by the Assistant Administrator of NASA.
>
> Mr. Karth. Whatever doubt the gentleman had in his mind as to the Air Force's intentions, obviously have now been cleared up.
>
> Mr. Pelly. I am happy to hear it.
>
> General Ferguson. I think it is worthwhile to add that we do this with the broadest base of the scientific community, Mr. Pelly. We are, I think, very fortunate to have a very strong scientific advisory board that provides continuing assistance to the Air Force and exercising technical and scientific judgments on the validity of the various programs that we are involved in or that we propose.
>
> I was present at the October review of the Dyna-Soar program by the aeronautics panel of our advisory panel. It is composed of 10 or 12 of the best known aerodynamicists in the country. So that we have plenty of scientific and technical backup to the judgments and positions that we feel we must sustain, particularly with respect to this program.
>
> Mr. Karth. Thank you, General.
>
> Mr. Chenoweth.
>
> Mr. Chenoweth. While on the subject of Dyna-Soar, I wonder, General, if you could give us just briefly the military importance of Dyna-Soar; what is Dyna-Soar, what is the project, why are you so concerned with it?
>
> General Ferguson. Yes, sir, I would be glad to.
>
> This is another in a series of experimental aircraft that is designed to explore the problems related to lifting body reentry from orbital speeds. It is the logical follow-on to the very, very successful X–15 program that is exploring lower altitudes and lower velocities, but we have already learned, sometime before we fly the first Dyna-Soar, has added greatly to our wealth of knowledge in structures, in materials, high-temperature materials and in structures that are designed to dissipate very high temperatures for long periods of time, and problems related to stability and control.
>
> Now, while very often a research program is pretty hard to define in all its payoffs, here is one that I think, as a follow-on to the X–15, will produce for us and for this Nation some very, very useful information in this particular area. It will apply to many other programs that we have in mind for the future, including the aerospace plane that I mentioned. It could apply to recoverable boosters that we are hoping for at some time in the future. It could apply to other winged vehicles of very high velocities that we are looking for a number of military missions. It could even apply to some commercial products, perhaps a supersonic transport. But all these are hard to define in detail. Yet, based on our previous experience we are certain, we know the information available to us today as a result of ground testing has provided us this information, and certainly, intuitively and based on our experience we can project that much more of real value to the Nation will come from this program.
>
> Mr. Chenoweth. Where are you with Dyna-Soar right now?
>
> General Ferguson. Dyna-Soar is in its third year of finding. It will fly—let me see if I have the dates here.
>
> Yes, the first unmanned flights is November of 1965.
>
> Mr. Chenoweth. Thank you.
>
> Mr. Karth. Are you finished?
>
> Mr. Chenoweth. Yes.
>
> Mr. Karth. General, are you at all familiar with NASA's M–2 concept, of which there was a picture in the newspaper last night, I believe, or at least within the last 24 hours or so? And if so, how does, this in your opinion, compare to Dyna-Soar? Is it duplicative, almost identical?
>
> General Ferguson. It is in a completely different region of exploration, so far as I know. I believe it is subsonic, relative low speed, isn't it? It is a wooden model for low-speed experimentation. I have only heard of it. I haven't read anything on it.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PELLY. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, the people in Seattle as well as from other parts of the country have become fearful that political influence plays a part in the awarding of Government contracts. I believe that the people in this country want assurance that Government contracts are going to be awarded to contractors strictly on a basis of technical superiority and cost of production.

Surely, during the elections of 1964, my constituents and the voters throughout this Nation will be very much aware of potential political influence in the awarding of Government contracts.

Mr. PELLY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Shriver].

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, press reports carried yesterday afternoon and this morning indicate that the Secretary of Defense is at long last prepared to "demonstrate that the award of the TFX contract not only was proper but definitely serves the national interest."

As you know this is a matter which is under investigation by a committee in the other body and concerns the awarding of a contract to the General Dynamics Corp., for the development and production of the F–111 fighter-bomber which will be a weapons system utilized by both the Air Force and the Navy.

I can only say that such an explanation by the Secretary on this contract award will be welcomed and is long overdue. It is unfortunate that the Secretary has waited until now to submit his statement when, as he points out, public confidence in the Pentagon has been shaken.

Last month I felt it necessary to take the floor of the House to discuss just how difficult it was for me to get a reply to an inquiry which I made on January 23, 1963, to the Secretary regarding the TFX decision.

This was a matter of extreme importance to the people of my district. Like most defense contract decisions, this had great economic impact upon Wichita and Kansas. If the Boeing Co., which submitted the lowest cost estimate, had been successful the TFX would have been assembled in Wichita.

When the contract was awarded to the Texas concern there were many allegations of political considerations which appeared in the national press and in nationally syndicated columns. My constituents asked me about those allegations in letters and in my conversations with them back in my district. It was natural, I thought, that I should ask the Office where the final decision on this large contract was made for information so that I could reply responsibly.

On February 26, 1963, I related on the floor of the House how it took a month to get a reply to my inquiry from the Department of Defense and I included in the Record the correspondence which I had from the Department.

The Department of Defense did not answer my inquiry regarding political allegations in the correspondence which I received from the Office of the Secretary on February 22, 1963. However, since my remarks on the floor I have received another communication from David E. McGiffert, Assistant to the Secretary for Legislative Affairs, in which he assured me that insinuations of political influence are completely without foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Secretary of Defense that public confidence in the Pentagon has been shaken. It has not been caused, however, by the investigation by the other body. It has been caused, in part, by the reluctance of the Department of Defense to answer head on the political allegations which have been made since the contract decision was made on November 26, 1962.

Another important factor in this controversy, which should not be overlooked by the Congress, is the fact that, evidently, the company with the lowest cost estimate did not get the contract.

It is most difficult to explain to the taxpayers why a competent firm with a long record of distinguished defense production does not get a contract when it submits costs which are at least $100 million below those of the contract recipient. At a time when we are striving for economy in Government expenditures and hoping to reduce the taxload of our citizens, the administration and the Congress should be especially accountable to the citizens for such decisions.

Mr. Speaker, defense is Government's biggest and most costly business. It is not bigger than the American people, however, and to earn public confidence our civilian and military leaders in the Defense Department must at all times be ready to fully justify their decisions to the people.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House of Representatives I hope will view this issue of the Dyna-Soar as something which touches on the national interest and is not a matter of mere local concern. As my colleague from Washington and the gentleman from Kansas so succinctly point out, the policy of cancellation of contracts and political aspects of awarding projects concern every employee of every defense contractor. This has to do with the confidence of each citizen in the Government. The Defense Department has a role in this issue which like Caesar's wife must be beyond suspicion.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain statements and other relevant material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN POLICY AND THE AMERICAN FARMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Libonati). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, foreign policy is, of course, associated primarily with problems and situations originating in foreign countries rather than problems of a domestic nature. The American public, therefore, is prone to appraise the success or failure of U.S. foreign policy in terms of our relations with the people of other countries. We know only too well how this relationship can change from hot to warm, to cold, and vice versa.

If such a basis for the formulation and execution of U.S. foreign policy were to be governed by these standards alone, then we would indeed be left naked to the massive assault of communism.

It is because our foreign policy is always based upon the welfare, peace, and security of the American people that it has a year-in-and-year-out continuity. The success of foreign policy must always depend upon the acceptance and support of the American people.

Two articles appearing in the Washington, D.C., Post are indicative of public support of our foreign policy as well as a clear view of the domestic problems which lie ahead in the formulation and execution of the U.S. foreign policy. The first article, entitled "Foreign Aid—Lack of Popular Support Is a Myth," by Roscoe Drummond, published Tuesday, March 12, 1963, and the second article, entitled "Farmer's Shadow Falls Over Europe," by Marquis Childs, published Wednesday, March 13, 1963, are submitted for the information of my colleagues:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 12, 1963]

Foreign Aid—Lack of Popular Support Is a Myth

(By Roscoe Drummond)

When Congress comes to vote on the foreign aid program, it ought to vote on the basis of fact, not on the basis of fiction.

The greatest fiction of all, to which President Kennedy has unintentionally made his own contribution, is that most American people are against it.

The opposite is the truth.

In his year-end TV interview the President, thinking that he was speaking with ingratiating candor, cited the foreign aid program as crucial despite the "fact" that it is a large burden not popularly supported.

This is not the fact.

The truth is that the foreign aid program is a relatively small burden (one-twentieth of the budget) and is popularly approved.

Here is the evidence.

A study of a whole sequence of findings of the Gallup polls from 1955 to 1963 shows that:

Popular support of the foreign aid program is at a high point for the entire 9-year period.

Today 58 percent of the American people record themselves as approving foreign aid, 30 percent oppose, and 12 percent are neither for nor against it.

There is no great variation between the different sections of the country: in the South 55 percent approve; East, 60 percent; Midwest, 58 percent; Far West, 59 percent.

Public backing of foreign aid is 7 percent higher than it was in 1958, 2 percent higher than in 1955.

In recent years, despite the appropriation of about $4 billion annually, popular support has not, as widely believed, been declining; voter approval has been going up and voter opposition has been going down.

Most of those who question foreign aid think that the appropriation is much higher than it is.

This, I think, gives a far different picture of American public opinion than the widespread myth that foreign aid is unpopular, even resented, by the great majority of the people.

The nearest thing to a national referendum is this 9-year sequence of Gallup polls. It shows that Mr. Kennedy has been making a mistake by talking about the unpopularity of the program. He should be talking about its popularity.

An examination of the exhaustive backup statistics and individual responses which lie behind the public reports of the Gallup findings justify these factual conclusions:

The principle of foreign aid is more strongly supported today than in 1958, and at least as strongly as any time since 1955

The percentage of people opposed to the principle of foreign aid has shown a drop of 3 percentage points since 1958; the number of people with no opinion has dropped 4 percent. This suggests that the principle of foreign aid continues to draw supporters rather than opponents.

Public support for foreign aid is highest among those who know more of the facts about the program. More than 40 percent of the people polled think the foreign aid appropriations represent 10 percent of the national budget instead of 5 percent. More than 80 percent did not know the approximate amount appropriated.

The humanitarian aspects of foreign aid have the greatest appeal to the American people. More than 65 percent of the pro-foreign aid comments of those polled gave the humanitarian reason as the basis of their support.

On the other hand more than 40 percent of those who were critical of the program were not opposed in principle—just felt it was not well administered.

Congress certainly ought to take a hard look on a country-by-country basis to determine for itself how well the program is being administered, and wherein foreign aid is being well or where badly utilized. I am not defending any particular level of appropriation. I am simply reporting that in approving the continuance of foreign aid Congress would be reflecting the judgment of the great majority of the American people.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 13, 1963]

Farmer's Shadow Falls Over Europe

(By Marquis Childs)

While hopefully the controversy within the Atlantic Alliance is still put in terms of a friendly debate, more and more it emerges as a contest of sheer power. A team of specialists has just left for Europe for the first preliminary soundings looking to the round of tariff negotiations due next year. Supposedly this Kennedy round will enable the United States to take full advantage of the liberalized trade act and broaden the current of commerce between the two sides of the Atlantic.

But long before this can happen, decisions may be reached within the European Economic Community that will close the door to any trade expansion. Farm products and farm prices are the great looming obstacle.

If the European farm bloc prevails and prices are fixed at the highest subsidized level of the German producer, with an external tariff wall keeping out American feed grains, the consequences are unforeseeeable. The pessimists say it will mean U.S. troops will leave Europe within 2 years or less. And beyond that is the sober shadow of a new isolationism. If President de Gaulle really wants to force the United States out and establish an independent Europe as a third force, agriculture is the surest way to achieve his end.

This was the kind of plain talk Walter Hallstein, head of the Commission of the European Community, heard from Secretary of Agriculture Freeman when he was in Washington last week. Speaking for his client, the American farmer, the Secretary spelled out in the bluntest language the relationship between farm exports and foreign policy.

He used, of course, the now-famous example of the chicken exports that have been cut back within the space of a few months by more than 60 percent. This was done by raising the import duty from 4½ cents a pound to 12½ cents. Thus precipitously American chicken raisers lost $50 million of a market that they had created through assembly-line techniques of growing and shipping.

The political rub, as Freeman underscored in his private talk with Hallstein, comes from the fact that this market has been developed primarily in Arkansas, Georgia, and several other Southern States. Those States are represented in the Senate by key committee chairmen who exercise extraordinary authority over America's foreign and defense policy. With the South turning against its traditional free trade policy, as a result of the growth of textile and other industry in that region, the blow to the chicken market can have serious repercussions.

But this is nothing as compared to the issue of feed grains that are the bulk of agricultural exports to Europe adding up to $1 to $1.5 billion a year. Under the complex system of variable levies agreed to among the six European countries making up the Common Market the commodity price for one must be the price for all. Should this price be set in the next few weeks at the high, subsidized German price, ultimately European tariffs will shut out American grains.

In France, where production costs and prices are much lower, the French farmer will see a bonanza ahead. The estimate here is that 6 million additional acres can be brought into wheat production. That would mean self-sufficiency for Europe and more—an overflow such as has long embarrassed the United States.

The basic fact is that the revolution in agriculture beginning in this country 20 years ago is only getting a start in Europe. The same methods will produce the same revolutionary results we have seen here—mountainous surpluses threatening the price structure and sending the farmer into the political arena to demand his fair share of the national income.

Freeman stressed to Hallstein the importance of getting a quantitative agreement on agricultural products until in the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations a more enduring formula can be achieved. Hallstein expressed the hope that the chicken market can be shared between Europe and the United States, with action taken to undo some of the damage that followed an abrupt tripling of the tariff.

One thing in all this is certain. The revolution in agriculture cannot be halted. European farmers are beginning to copy American assembly-line techniques in chicken raising. Tinkering between country and country or even between bloc and bloc on tariff rates and production quotas will not suffice. Northing short of a world food conference facing up to the new revolution and the paradox of surpluses in the face of hunger and want will get close to solving the riddle.

RHODE ISLAND HOSPITAL, PROVIDENCE, R.I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, today Rhode Island Hospital at Providence commemorates a century of service to meet the health needs of people in the community, and, in large measure, throughout the State of Rhode Island. It is a privilege for me to pay tribute to the spirit of dedication and the foresight that have shaped the small 70-bed general hospital founded on March 13, 1863, into the imposing medical center of today.

The 70 beds have grown to more than 670, and the services have expanded to include a children's hospital, rehabilitation facilities, care of the chronically ill, clinic services, medical—and especially cancer—research, and education. Thus, the hospital has adjusted to changing needs and kept pace with the progress of medical knowledge and techniques.

Its record of service to the community is an impressive one. Since it opened its doors, 693,520 patients have been cared for in the hospital and over 5 million visits have been made to its several clinics and ambulatory services. Last year alone, 20,620 patients were admitted for bed care and 40,915 received treatment in the emergency department.

Members of the hospital's medical and surgical staff, through research, have made important contributions to the advancement of medical science. In addition, the hospital has supplied postgraduate education and clinical training to 1,100 young physicians, of whom more than 300 are today caring for citizens throughout the State.

The Rhode Island Hospital School of Nursing, founded in 1882, has produced 3,248 well-educated and skilled professional nurses. Graduates of the school are now caring for the sick and injured in all parts of the State. More than 300 young women are now enrolled in the school.

But the past, for all its achievements, is but a forerunner of the future. And plans are in the making for the continuing development of new avenues of service. For example, through arrangements recently made with Brown University, Rhode Island Hospital now has the potential for meeting the needs of a modern, progressive medical school. This capability, together with the completion of facilities still under construction, will broaden the hospital's opportunities to serve the citizens of Rhode Island and to contribute to the advancement of medical science.

On the occasion of its 100th anniversary, therefore, I wish to commend the Rhode Island Hospital for its past accomplishments and to express my confidence in its readiness to meet the challenge of the future.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF PROGRAM AND SUBCOMMITTEES OF SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Evins] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege yesterday to make certain comments and observations to representatives of the press regarding the proposed work of the House Small Business Committee during the 88th Congress.

Most of the members of the committee were present and participated in this conference, which was attended by representatives of small business organizations as well as the press.

I wanted to announce the membership of the subcommittees as well as the program of the committee and, under unanimous consent, I include my statement and designation of subcommittees at this point in the Record.

Statement of Hon. Joe L. Evins, Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, Press Conference, March 12, 1963

At the outset, I wish to welcome you gentlemen of the press and thank you for coming to this conference.

During the 88th Congress, I believe you will find that our committee will be accentuating the positive, and by that I mean that we will be seeking to find affirmative methods to help small business in many ways instead of looking primarily for ways to punish big business. I am not opposed to big business as such—I am rather pro small business. Our committee will be working for ways to make sure that all small business concerns are given every chance to succeed and, if possible, to become big business.

It will be one of our objectives to help small business obtain a larger share of Government procurement and defense contracts. Over the years, this committee has been able to be of some helpfulness. During the past year, for instance, the share of Department of Defense prime contract awards given to small business was increased slightly. Regrettably, however, there was a decline in the percentage of both the civilian procurement awards and in the field of research and development. We want to see if this latter situation can be reversed and improved. A greater percentage of research and development contracts must be given to small business.

Another objective of our committee will be to find ways whereby adequate financing assistance can be made available to those small business concerns desiring to modernize their plants, to move to shopping centers, and to otherwise maintain, improve, or increase their competitive capacity, so as to be able to match the tempo of this modern, fast-moving era in which we live today.

It shall be one of the primary goals of our committee to concentrate during this session of Congress on finding ways to assist small business to increase its participation in foreign trade under the new trade expansion program.

Our committee will inquire into the effect which the Common Market is having upon the small businessmen in this country. Last year when Congress passed the Trade Expansion Act, there were dire predictions that many small businesses would fail or go into bankruptcy. As a consequence, the Congress included two provisions in the law. One of these provides for retraining those persons who become unemployed due to imports. The other permits subsidy payments to small business concerns that have been injured by the increased foreign competition.

These new provisions and policies of the trade expansion program are being implemented and have been in operation now for several months. Our committee proposes about 2 weeks from today—that is, on March 25 or 26—to hold the first of a series of hearings relating to various small business problems, including especially the effects of the trade expansion program on small business but embracing as well some of the other small business problems previously mentioned.

I want to advise you gentlemen that at these hearings we propose to hear from officials of the Small Business Administration, the Commerce Department, the Tariff Commission, and the State Department, as well as from representatives of various small business organizations and some of the owners of small business concerns.

Turning to another area, we see that about 650 small business investment companies have now been chartered and licensed. These companies provide a small business investment potential in excess of half a billion dollars, and they are now serving as a new source of equity capital. Our committee will want to examine into the efficiency of these investment companies and their usefulness. We will want to know whether or not they are performing as intended by the Congress.

I note in an article that appeared in a recent issue of the Harvard Business Review that under present arrangements a number of these small business investment companies claim that they cannot profitably make small loans or investments—that they must make these investments or loans in large amounts. It is thus possible that there still remains a gap in the financing resources to which small business may turn for help. Further amendments to the Small Business Investment Act may be necessary. Consideration will be given to see whether the act can be amended so as to make it profitable for the small business investment companies to grant more small loans to a greater number of small business concerns instead of a few big loans to a limited number of small business companies.

Our committee will be limited initially to four subcommittees this year; namely, a Subcommittee on Foundations, a Subcommittee on Procurement, a Subcommittee on Taxation, and a Subcommittee on Distribution. As additional small business problems arise, not covered by one of our four subcommittees, it is my plan that these matters will be handled either by the full committee or by designating a special subcommittee to handle the particular problem.

A listing of the subcommittees follows:

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, 88TH CONGRESS

Full committee and subcommittee assignments

The Honorable JOE L. EVINS, chairman of the full committee, and the Honorable WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, ranking minority member of the full committee, are ex officio members of each subcommittee.

Full committee

Small Business Administration and small business in foreign trade—Effect of European Economic Community on small business

Hon. JOE L. EVINS, chairman; Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN; Hon. ABRAHAM MULTER; Hon. TOM STEED; Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT; Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI; Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL; Hon. WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH; Hon. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.; Hon. WILLIAM H. AVERY; Hon. H. ALLEN SMITH; Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON; Hon. RALPH HARVEY.

Subcommittee No. 1

Foundations: Their impact on small business

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman; Hon. JOE L. EVINS; Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT; Hon. WILLIAM H. AVERY; Hon. RALPH HARVEY.

Subcommittee No. 2

Small business and Government procurement

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, chairman; Hon. TOM STEED; Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT; Hon. H. ALLEN SMITH; Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON.

Subcommittee No. 3

Taxation

Hon. TOM STEED, chairman; Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER; Hon. JOHN DINGELL; Hon. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.; Hon. HOWARD W. ROBISON.

Subcommittee No. 4

Distribution problems affecting small business

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, chairman; Hon. TOM STEED; Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI; Hon. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.; Hon. WILLIAM H. AVERY.

SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF HESS & CLARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to a company in my district in Ohio that is celebrating its 70th anniversary of making quality products in its service to American agriculture.

The company I refer to is Hess & Clark, a division of Richardson-Merrell, Inc., and makers of feed medications and animal health products.

Today's modern Hess & Clark plant in Ashland, Ohio, is a far cry from what it was in 1893 when the company came into being.

In those days, production and distribution were strictly a family affair—Gilbert Hess did the compounding and J. L. Clark did the selling. Their wives did the wrapping and packing. Both Hess and Clark were born in the rolling central Ohio farmland that surrounds Ashland.

The firm has shown exceptional growth in the 70 years since the partnership was formed for $300. Today, scientists at Hess & Clark's multimillion-dollar center are engaged in a wide variety of projects to unlock the secrets of nature, and to study all types of animal and poultry disease problems.

The research does not stop merely at the center, but spreads to dozens of State universities and experiment stations across the country in order that the company's products are tested under actual field conditions. In this manner, Hess & Clark is helping to insure that only the finest meats, eggs, and poultry reach America's dinner tables.

Hess & Clark, under the direction of its president, Dr. A. L. Andrews, is pioneering in the development of an entirely new and different class of drugs, called nitrofurans, derived from furfural, which is made from material in corn cobs and oat hulls.

Nitrofurans first came to attention in the wake of the Normandy invasion in World War II. Army doctors found that many infected wounds and burns failed to respond to treatment with any of the available antibiotics and sulfa drugs. The medics applied a furan compound, nitrofurazone, directly to the wounds and it provided rapid improvements and facilitated healing. Application for use in agriculture followed the end of World War II.

In all their years of use, scientists report that no significant bacterial resistance to the nitrofurans has developed.

Latest of the nitrofurans to score an important research success is Nidrafur. This drug, recently cleared for use by the Food and Drug Administration, is the result of 5 years of tests to find a multipurpose medication to combat poultry diseases.

On March 14, 1963, Hess & Clark introduced and explained Nidrafur to the scientists and industry representatives attending the Maryland Nutrition Conference in Washington, D.C.

I salute Hess & Clark for its many achievements and wish continued success to this fine firm in its future endeavors. I ask unanimous consent to include the following comprehensive report on this new drug.

The report follows:

NIDRAFUR, BROAD-SPECTRUM POULTRY FEED ADDITIVE, NOW CLEARED FOR USE

ASHLAND, OHIO.—A new drug application for Nidrafur, Hess & Clark's broad-spectrum nitrofuran feed additive for poultry, has been cleared for use by the Food and Drug Administration, and a food additive order has been published.

The announcement was made by Dr. A. L. Andrews, president and general manager of Hess & Clark, division of Richardson-Merrell, Inc., makers of feed medications and animal health products.

Nidrafur, which is the trade name for nihydrazone, has undergone extensive laboratory and field trials conducted by trained researchers over a 5-year period. The results of these tests show that Nidrafur is effective as a medication for broilers and replacement birds in combating several disease problems.

In the presence of air sac infection (CRD complex), Nidrafur reduces mortality and severity of infection, lowers condemnation rate and assists in maintaining weight gains and feed efficiency. Nidrafur also has proved effective for prevention of pullorum disease, fowl typhoid and paratyphoid (salmonellosis); blackhead (histomoniasis); and coccidiosis caused by *E. tenella*, *E. necatrix*, *E. maxima*, and *E. brunetti*.

Nidrafur can be fed to broilers throughout the growing period and to replacements from day-old to 14 weeks of age. Directions call for the use of nihydrazone at 100 grams per ton to complete ration. This is supplied by 1 pound of Nidrafur premix.

"As is typical with the nitrofurans, nihydrazone does not build up in body tissues," Dr. Andrews noted, "thus no withdrawal period will be necessary for poultrymen using Nidrafur medicated feed."

SAFETY AND TOXICITY OF NIDRAFUR

Tests of the new drug's safety and toxicity showed Nidrafur is well tolerated at higher than recommended use level.

In long-term toxicity tests scientists found Nidrafur does not adversely affect hatchability and fertility.

EFFECTIVENESS OF NIDRAFUR

1. CRD complex

Current USDA reports show CRD complex (air sac disease) to be the No. 1 cause of broiler condemnations. During 1961 nearly 16 million birds were condemned because of CRD.

Tests were conducted to determine the effect of the continuous feeding of Nidrafur upon the incidence of CRD complex and the condition involving the air sac which results in high dressing plant condemnations. In additon, growth rate and feed conversion were considered in evaluating the effectiveness of this compound.

In a 1,240-bird Georgia trial, birds receiving Nidrafur showed no condemnations due to airsacculitis. This compared with 2.8-percent condemnation for the unmedicated control group and 11.3-percent condemnations for a third group receiving a coccidiostat. Average weight was 3.69 for the Nidrafur group, 3.28 for the controls, and 3.21 for the birds on the coccidiostat. Feed conversion likewise favored Nidrafur—2.39 compared with 2.54 for the controls and 2.58 for the coccidiostat.

Point spread for the Nidrafur group was 130, compared with 74 for the unmedicated controls and 63 for the coccidiostat group.

2. Salmonellosis

In several battery tests, birds 2 and 3 weeks of age were experimentally infected with a broth culture of *S. gallinarum* (fowl typhoid). Half were placed on feed medicated with Nidrafur and half on the same basal ration, unmedicated.

In each of three tests, there were no deaths in the groups receiving Nidrafur. In comparison, deaths in the unmedicated control groups ran 25, 79, and 30 percent.

In several battery tests on *S. pullorum*, birds were inoculated with a broth culture of *S. pullorum* at 1 day of age. Half were immediately placed on Nidrafur medicated feed, and the other half on the same basal ration without medication. These tests, which ran 2 and 3 weeks, again demonstrated the efficacy of Nidrafur by improved weight gains and feed conversion, and reduced mortality. For example, there were 15 deaths in 1 control group of 20 birds infected with pullorum, as compared with 3 mortalities in the 20 birds receiving Nidrafur.

In battery tests for *S. typhimurium* (paratyphoid) eggs in the process of hatching were sprayed with a 24-hour-old broth culture of *S. typhimurium*, 1 day before the hatch was completed. Half of the birds were placed on Nidrafur medicated feed, and the other half received the same basal ration without medication. A significant reduction in the mortality rate was noted in those birds fed rations containing Nidrafur.

3. Blackhead

The incidence of blackhead or histomoniasis in broilers and replacement flocks is on the increase according to reports from diagnostic laboratories located where poultry rearing is concentrated. This is especially true of birds from 4 to 6 weeks of age.

Nidrafur has proved highly effective in preventing blackhead infection of chickens.

In tests by Dr. W. Malcolm Reid and associates at the University of Georgia, birds already on Nidrafur medicated feed were artificially infected with blackhead. Two weeks after infection all birds were slaughtered and examined for blackhead lesions.

Birds medicated with Nidrafur had a significantly lower lesion score than did the nonmedicated infected birds. The researchers noted that "since nihydrazone (Nidrafur) suppresses the heavier infections which result in weight loss, it appears probable that its use in large-scale broiler operations may result in better weight gains and feed conversion where blackhead disease is present."

They also noted, "if the drug is routinely used as a feed additive it should furnish protection against blackhead disease during the first and second months of age when the bird has the least natural resistance against this disease."

In one New England test, 2-week-old birds were fed Nidrafur for 7 days immediately following infection with blackhead, after which time all birds were slaughtered and examined for blackhead. No birds in the Nidrafur group showed infection. However, 19 out of 20 infected, nonmedicated control birds showed cecal infection and 13 out of the 20 showed liver infection.

4. Coccidiosis

Latest estimates of national losses due to coccidiosis place the figure at $40 million per year—despite the fact that feeding of a coccidiostat is standard in almost every flock. Nearly three-fourths of the total loss is due to morbidity—one-fourth from mortality.

Extensive field tests showed Nidrafur to be effective in the prevention of coccidiosis caused by *E. tenella*, *E. necatrix*, *E. maxima*, and *E. brunetti*.

Nidrafur successfully reduces mortality, improves gain, and allows development of immunity, which is important in replacements.

Nidrafur has been tested extensively under actual field conditions where its overall effectiveness in preventing these major poultry diseases has been amply demonstrated through better growth, feed conversion, livability and improved point spread. In a Delaware test 16,000 broilers receiving a feed containing a coccidiostat averaged 3.48 pounds with a 2.26 feed conversion and a point spread of 122. This compared with 11,000 birds on Nidrafur averaging 3.95 pounds on 2.37 feed conversion for a point spread of 158. Percent livability was the same for each group.

In another test a group of 18,300 birds on a coccidiostat showed 3.70 pounds weight, 2.37 feed conversion, 94 percent livability, and 133 point spread. The 13,700 birds receiving Nidrafur averaged 3.68 pounds, had a 2.23 feed conversion, a 99-percent livability, and a point spread of 145.

According to Dr. Andrews, the introduction of new Nidrafur represents the latest nitrofuran advancement by Hess & Clark designed to help poultrymen protect their flocks against many of the most serious diseases. It involves an important new concept in poultry medication—protect the bird, don't just treat the disease. Keep the bird healthy by preventing several diseases at once.

Nitrofurans are a unique class of drugs. Antibiotics, for instance, are properly defined as "chemical substances produced by micro-organisms which inhibit life." Nitrofurans are manmade chemicals, synthesized in the laboratory. They are chemical substances which kill micro-organisms, rather than merely slow them down. They act by interrupting an important step in the utilization of carbohydrates by disease-causing organisms, causing these organisms to literally starve to death.

In their years of use, scientists report that no significant bacterial resistance to the nitrofurans has developed.

RESIDUAL OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, since 1959, I have been fighting the import quotas on residual oil on the basis of the damaging effect these quotas have on the economy of New England and the eastern seaboard. This has been a long and tedious fight, Mr. Speaker, and as I suggested Monday it is just starting for me. I have not any intentions of letting it ride, so to speak, nor do I quit easily. This is against my nature, and there is no chance of a let-up. I was not impressed with statements by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], Monday, which attempted to becloud the issue. His attacks against the oil industry have nothing to do with the issue at stake. Larger and greater issues than partisanship or harking back to senseless arguments of another era are relevant to this issue. This is by no means a political issue, except insofar as the President has made it one. My colleague will remember, as I have been pointing out recently, that Senator Kennedy—the one now at 1600 Pennsylvania—supported the exact position that I did at that time. He joined with me—I will give my colleague from Ohio a copy of the letter if he wants one—to stop these quotas when the Eisenhower administration put them on. I was a freshman Member of Congress that year, and yet I stood against my own President. Freshmen are supposed to be seen, not heard—yet I had to defend my region in spite of any traditions.

What disturbs me most is the impression that I have been receiving in the last 2 or 3 weeks that the administration is attempting to walk on two sides of the street. Going back a bit, there was some careful wording in the Office of Emergency Planning report calling for a careful and meaningful relaxation of these import quotas. This was taken as a minor victory. The next encouraging sign was the visit of President Betancourt, of Venezuela, to this country. At that time I wired the President and asked him to dramatically lift these restrictions and help aid the sagging economy of Venezuela which exports 90 percent of crude and residual to this country. I was gratified a day later when I read the text of the joint communique between the two Presidents. Several specific points were made in this release.

The two Presidents reviewed the oil situation and recognized that "the United States has been Venezuela's largest market" and stated that were both confident that it would "continue to be on an expanding scale." They concluded that "Venezuela's position in the U.S. petroleum market is therefore a matter of continuing concern" to both Governments and that this position would be "recognized in the administration of the U.S. oil export program." The two leaders also agreed that there should be periodic exchanges of information and views at a technical level with the goal of "reaching better trade agreements" between the two countries and that they would "review in advance such substantive changes in the oil import program as the United States may contemplate in the future."

These were very definite signs of agreement, Mr. Speaker, and at the time I was convinced that the April 1st deadline for the Department of Interior report would end the restrictions.

Just a few days ago, however, the President met with Mine Workers President Boyle and "assured him" that the OEP recommendations "would not be made effective" until or unless further discussions were held with mine workers. I was, understandably, outraged by these reports and checked all over the city for confirmation. Mr. Boyle told my office that he had been quoted "exactly" and White House press officials refused to either confirm or deny the substance of the President's statements to Boyle.

All of this seemed a recapitulation to the coal magnets in this country.

I am not suggesting that the President is dutybound to his stand as a U.S. Senator, and I realize that he made a number of promises in 1960 to the various coal-producing States. I am simply asking for a pertinent review of the facts involved, and that he take into consideration the fact that condition of the New England economy is critical, and it is losing $30 million a year because these quotas prevent most of our hospitals, large apartment homes, schools, and industries from using the practical and inexpensive oil for heating.

What my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays] said Monday has no bearing on the issue. In fact, I am surprised that he would inject such extraneous matters into the discussion. For example, I have never talked about the outflow of gold, as he suggests I will. I refuse to make this an issue between oil and coal; in fact, there is an unholy alliance between the domestic oil producers and the coal barons. I do not know who would benefit from the lifted restrictions except the elderly patients in the New England seaboard hospitals, the children in the schools, and our poorer residents who cannot afford the expensive coal.

I would suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that he review the facts of the matter and then join the fight if he is so inclined. Surprisingly, I have heard little from him on this issue until yesterday. In passing, I might say that my homework on this subject has been intense for the last 5 years and that I would be happy to provide any background information that the gentleman desires. I must say that I am very sympathetic with the plight of the coal miners that he describes, and at the same time have figures showing that coal production was considerably up in 1962.

In fact, I would hope that a number of gentlemen in this House would begin seriously reviewing this issue. Thank you.

DECISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND TO FINANCE AGRICULTURAL PROJECT IN RED CUBA

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Johansen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, another highly responsible voice has been raised in the United States in protest against the recent incredible decision of the United Nations Special Fund to finance an agricultural development project in Red Cuba.

A news release under date of February 18, by Hon. Byron B. Gentry, national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, urges that this action be immediately repudiated by the American people and responsible Government officials.

I welcome this pronouncement by the head of this great organization of 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans—a pronouncement which curtly and properly rejects the sophistry of arguments that the United States, as a member of the U.N., is not thereby directly aiding a Sino-Soviet dominated Communist regime in Cuba, dedicated to the takeover of the Western Hemisphere and the conquest of the United States.

Commander Gentry has exceptional credentials when it comes to calling the shots regarding the Cuban situation.

In a press release last September 28, Commander Gentry called for an immediate naval blockade of Cuba—nearly a month before President Kennedy took this unfortunately short-lived action.

In this September 28 statement, which condemned the proposed Soviet "fishing port" as "outrageous," Commander Gentry offered the singularly prophetic warning that if the administration took no action, "the situation will be much worse next month than it is now."

In view of some recent objections by top administration officials to congressional and public criticism of national policies regarding Cuba—the latest by Vice President Johnson—I suggest that Commander Gentry's current protest on U.N. aid to Red Cuba can scarcely be characterized as either "irresponsible" or "partisan."

I commend his February 18 statement to the Congress and the American people:

> The United Nations proposal to proceed with support of Communist agricultural programs in Cuba is a deliberate affront to the principles of freedom and justice, which motivated its founding. It is highly improper and embarrassing for our Nation to continue supporting a U.N. agency that is giving assistance to a Red dictator, whose purpose is the destruction of our Nation and freedom throughout the Americas.
>
> What this really means is that the United Nations is embarking on a program to strengthen the bloody and oppressive Communist government of Cuba, thus strengthening a regime that is kept in power by the Russian expeditionary force in Cuba.
>
> The VFW is not persuaded by technical explanations that U.S. financial support will not be involved in helping Castro. Regardless of such assurances, the fact remains that the U.S. taxpayers are the major contributor to the kind of endeavor the U.N. is now undertaking in Red Cuba. Directly or indirectly, it will be the U.S. taxpayers who will be footing a major portion of the bill for supporting communism in Cuba under this U.N. project.
>
> It is truly shocking that the U.N., supposedly dedicated to the protection of freedom, is actively supporting an aggressive Red regime, virtually on the doorstep of the United States. The VFW urges that the U.S. Government take every possible step to prevent the United Nations from bolstering Castro and his Communist control of Cuba.
>
> Using U.N. funds and prestige to strengthen Castro's cruel Communist government places the U.N. in a position of deliberately aiding an avowed enenmy of the United States. It is this kind of action which creates grave doubts as to the wisdom of continued U.S. membership in the U.N.

U.S. TREASURY ACQUISITION OF HARD FOREIGN CURRENCY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, I placed in the Congressional Record an item from the Washington Post & Times Herald concerning "U.S. Treasury Acquisition of Hard Foreign Currency." This story alleged that the U.S. Treasury was trying to float short-term bonds to the French Government for the equivalent of $100 to $150 million.

The Wall Street Journal of March 12, 1963, carried a disturbing editorial about our balance of payments situation entitled "Ignorance or Intent?" Because the strength of the U.S. dollar is important not only to Americans but to the entire free world, I commend this editorial to my colleagues. It says:

Ignorance or Intent?

> Is it possible the Government's officials really do not understand the balance-of-payments problem?
>
> The question is asked in all seriousness, for there are few economic matters more serious than this continuing deficit. The yawning gap was $2.2 billion last year, almost as huge as the year before, and the consequent gold outflow was nearly $900 million, bringing America's gold stock to its lowest level in about a quarter of a century.
>
> All hope has been abandoned of ending the drain by the end of this year, as the administration had been promising. On the contrary, Treasury Secretary Dillon now warns of more gold losses and a continuing payments deficit. In a word, we are further than ever from halting this major source of nonconfidence in the dollar, this leakage which at the whim of foreigners could turn into a calamitous flood.
>
> And what, pray, is the Government doing about it?
>
> For one thing, Mr. Dillon says tax reduction plus persistent and firm expenditure control will bring improvement in the balance of payments. His thought on taxes appears to be that rate reductions will spur domestic investment and thus keep more capital at home. To that pious hope, about all that can be said now is, we'll see.
>
> The comment about expenditure control was perhaps a joke. It is hard to see how anyone could talk like that with a straight face in view of a Federal spending budget wildly out of control and a budget deficit deliberately planned to hit nearly $12 billion.
>
> Meantime the Government continues its piddling efforts to stanch the flow: Requiring foreign-aid money to be spent here, discouraging American tourist spending abroad and the like. The continuing payments-gold crisis is sufficient testimony to the inadequacy of these measures.

> Now the officials are considering a further gimmick which they think will finally turn the tide. This would be a deliberate boost in short-term interest rates to make them more attractive in relation to foreign rates; the short-term capital outgo is one of the administration's preferred whipping-boys for the payments trouble.
>
> A general move away from the prevailing easy-money policy would be a healthy development of itself, and even this limited tinkering might indeed stop some of the short-term capital movements. But the thinking behind the plan seems peculiar.
>
> The technique being discussed for boosting the rates is to have the Federal Reserve raise the discount rate from 3 percent to possibly 3.5 percent, as though that would automatically increase interest rates, and short-term ones in particular. Unaccompanied by other steps, it might or it might not; in the past such changes have usually followed or accompanied market rises rather than specifically causing them.
>
> As a part of this move, the United States would pressure Canada (hasn't the Government caused enough trouble there recently?) to lower its discount rate of 4 percent, in the hope of curbing the flow of short-term U.S. investment funds in that direction. This seems somewhat wishful; a spread between 3.5 and 4 percent is hardly great enough to matter much one way or another.
>
> In any case, this whole device, like all the others now in operation, is a good deal less than a frontal attack on the payments problem. Short-term capital is not the main cause of the deficit; in fact, the return on foreign investment about equals the investment outgo.
>
> The main cause is the Government's own excessive spending at home and abroad and its generally loose fiscal and monetary policies. It is as plain as can be that if the Government would ever get its financial house in order, the payments deficit and the dangerous gold drain could be made to disappear in quick time.
>
> If the Government does understand these simple facts, its refusal to take the required action is not easily explained. Whether the trouble is ignorance or intent, it is inexcusable behavior on the part of the guardians of the people's money.

SPORTS ANTIBRIBERY LEGISLATION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would make it a Federal offense to conspire, in interstate or foreign commerce, to influence by bribery the outcome of any sporting contest. It is identical to the bills introduced in the Senate by Senator Kenneth Keating, of New York, and in the House by Representative William McCulloch, of Ohio, ranking minority member of the House Judiciary Committee. The bill would apply the penalties of up to $5,000 and/or 10 years in prison to all who may be involved in such schemes. This would include players and officials, as well as gamblers and fixers. Although the Federal Government is granted authority over this subject matter, there is nothing in this bill that would in any way exclude or circumscribe the effect of any local law or the jurisdiction of any local authority over an offense over which it would have jurisdiction in the absence of this legislation.

Today, young American athletes are being subjected to steadily mounting pressures from gambling syndicates to "fix" games, "shave" points, and to turn competitive sports over to the patrons of organized crime. Although this is far from a new development on the American scene, it has increased markedly in recent years and threatens to totally undermine public confidence in all competitive sports.

There is no question but that the organized gambling and bookmaking syndicates are countrywide in the nature and scope of their activities. Further, there is no question but that the Federal Government has full jurisdictional power to act on statutory authority to assert its full strength against this outrageous condition. Enactment of this proposed legislation won't solve the problem, but it will provide our Federal law-enforcement officers with the legal machinery they have long needed to investigate and prosecute these unlawful activities. The leading athletic associations are solidly behind this legislation. They have long urged that action be taken to enact this proposal to improve the climate of athletic participation in the United States. I hope that the 88th Congress gives prompt and favorable consideration to this important legislation.

THE CREATION OF AN ADDITIONAL JUDICIAL DISTRICT IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Bob Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, having represented San Diego for more than 10 years, I am very much aware of the critical need for the creation of an additional judicial district. Such a requirement is essential to the proper and orderly processes of justice that, unfortunately, are suffering in our area today.

Accordingly, I have introduced the following bill today along with Congressman James B. Utt, 35th Congressional District, and Congressman Pat Martin, 38th Congressional District, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Our bills provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California. The services that can be provided by the approval of this legislation are most critically needed this year. Our county alone has had an estimated increase of over 134,689 people since 1960. The Federal community of the proposed judicial district, which incorporates the full length of the California-Mexico border as well as the international port of San Diego, has had an equal rise in activity involving the Federal Government. More people are crossing the border, more trade is conducted across the border, and more tonnage and passengers are passing through our port facilities.

The unprecedented growth of San Diego and Imperial Counties continues at a rate which I am sure during the present decade will equal or surpass the record of the decade of 1950–60 when our growth rate was 86 percent.

Federal litigation in our area continues to increase; San Diego today handles nearly as much Federal criminal court business as Los Angeles, and this discounts immigration cases, which as you know are most time consuming and are of a large quantity, particularly in our district.

The 25th custom collection district has the same borders as the proposed judicial district and is the largest narcotic and border egress and ingress district in the country.

Many of the services of a new judicial district are already being provided in San Diego so that the costs of implementing this legislation are at an estimated $46,750 per year. The San Diego County Bar Association has made a careful analysis of the additional salary and expense requirements, and they find that this figure would be more than made up through per diem, travel, telephone, and duplicate filing and other administrative costs that are today required because the district offices are located in Los Angeles, some 120 miles away.

This figure, of course, does not represent any of the actual savings that will result to the litigants themselves and their attorneys, which as you can imagine can be extensive when a 120-mile commute is involved.

Our area needs a new judicial district and needs it today. I urge favorable action on this legislation, which provides that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California.

COMMISSION TO REVIEW FEDERAL LAWS ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. St. Onge] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides for the creation of a commission to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of Government.

The Hatch Political Activities Act was enacted by Congress—Public Law 252 of the 76th Congress—back in 1939. Since then a period of 24 years has elapsed.

It was originally designed to remove employees in the Federal service and those in Government-financed State-Federal programs from the political arena. Its primary aim was to protect public employees from various pressures exerted upon them to engage in involuntary political activity.

In the 1930's our country was still struggling with the great depression and its aftereffects. One of the major causes leading to the adoption of the Hatch Act at the time was that, because of the desperate economic situation, many citizens had to accept employment with the Works Progress Administration and similar projects. It was felt by Congress then that the dependence of large numbers of individuals upon Federal funds for their income—inadequate as this income was—could be used as an unethical political tool to force their allegiance or support to one particular political party.

Nearly a quarter of a century has passed since enactment of the original Hatch Act. Administrations of both major political parties of the Nation have held the reins of power. We have suffered the anguish of World War II and the Korean war. We have experienced considerable economic and social upheaval. Even political thinking in our country has not been at a standstill; there has been much change and a greater public awakening to political problems.

Over the years, there have been those who advocated complete repeal of the Hatch Act. There are some who advocate that the law should be revised to allow a limited degree of political activity in the governmental structure. Others believe the act should be amended in a way to reflect the changes in our political attitudes of the times, but they are not certain how this can be achieved without endangering the merit principle upon which the whole civil service system is based.

True, there have been several amendments of a liberalizing nature since the law was enacted, but they were of minor importance and none of them has come to grips with the basic problem, namely, the participation or denial to millions of public employees of the right to share in the political activity of the Nation. The question still remains: What should be the status of Federal and other public employees in the political life of our country nearly a quarter of a century after passage of the Hatch Act? In line with that question it may also be asked whether any basic changes have occurred in our thinking which would warrant a completely new look at the problem?

The effect of the Hatch Act has been interpreted in some quarters as nothing less than the equivalent of disenfranchisement. The public employee exercises the privilege of casting his ballot and thus participating in the democratic process, but not much else. He cannot participate in political activity. He cannot be a candidate for office, not even for member of a board of education. He cannot even be an officer of any political organization. He cannot solicit support or financial aid for any candidate, or even solicit people to become candidates for public office. He cannot distribute campaign material, march in a political parade, sell tickets for a political dinner, or publish a letter or article in behalf of any political party or candidate.

At the same time, it is reasonable to expect that complete elimination of the Hatch Act could seriously damage the Federal civil service system which would once again fall prey to the spoils system. We want to retain the civil service system and improve upon it, but we also would like to make it possible for public employees to have greater opportunity to be more active politically without fear of loss of their Government jobs. At the present time, with the denial of all the activities enumerated above, public employees are treated as second-class citizens. This prompted a postal worker to urge recently that a campaign be undertaken "to restore civil rights to Federal workers."

I do not believe that it was the intention of Congress to relegate public employees to a position of second-class citizenship when the law was enacted 24 years ago. Nor do I believe that the practice of political privileges granted to all U.S. citizens can be denied under our Constitution to a large segment of our population simply because they are Government employees. In our free society, political freedom, political self-respect, and the freedom of expression are cherished possessions.

For these reasons, I believe that the Hatch Act has become outdated in our time and has proved to be harmful to millions of our citizens whom it deprives from exercising certain rights guaranteed them in the Constitution. A reappraisal of national policy regarding political activities of Government employees is definitely needed. I think it is high time to make such a reevaluation of the law and its applicability today in the light of changing events.

This is the purpose of the bill I am introducing today. It calls for the establishment of a bipartisan commission to review the Federal laws limiting political activity by Government employees. It is to be known as the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel and is to consist of 12 members. The members of the Commission are to be appointed as follows:

First. Four by the President, two from the executive branch of the Government, and two from private life.

Second. Four by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate, and two from private life.

Third. Four by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House, and two from private life.

The duties of the Commission, as defined in my bill, shall be to make a full and complete investigation and study of the Federal laws which limit or discourage the participation of Federal and State officers and employees in political activity with a view to determining the effect of such laws, the need for their revision or elimination, and an appraisal of the extent to which undesirable results might accrue from their repeal.

The Commission shall submit a comprehensive report, including its findings and recommendations, to the President and to Congress within 1 year after enactment of my bill and the Commission shall then cease to exist. In the fulfillment of the provisions of the act, the Commission shall be empowered to conduct hearings and issue subpenas.

In view of the fact that the life of the Commission is to extend only over the period of 1 year, I do not visualize any considerable expenditure. In fact, in order to keep all expenditures at a minimum, it is prescribed in the bill that members of the Commission who are Members of Congress or Government officials shall serve without compensation, while those from private life shall serve on a per diem basis of $50. The Commission shall have the authority to appoint such personnel as it deems advisable, but it is suggested in the bill that the services of Government agencies which can be helpful in the study may be requested by the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for a broad and impartial review of this very important but vexing problem. As now constituted and applied, the Hatch Act is outmoded, unjust, and unfair toward millions of our citizens who are loyal public servants, well educated and civic-minded persons. In the long run our country will be the loser and our democratic process will suffer if we continue to deny them the basic rights to which they are entitled. Government service should be a badge of honor and public trust, not a status of second-class citizenship.

MINE SAFETY

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a mine safety bill which will provide for Federal inspection of every underground coal mine in the United States. The amendment to Public Law 552, as contained in my bill, would benefit every coal miner and every coal operator in this country.

I am interested in mine safety and have seen what the passage of a Federal law for the inspection of mines can do. An industry which formerly numbered its fatalities in the thousands has reduced its death rate to less than 300. In 1962, 289 miners died, a far cry from what the death rate was once but still far too many.

The death and accident rate in the coal mines in America must be reduced further and I feel that one way to do it is to give Federal inspectors the right to close down any coal mine, large or small, when they find that danger of a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundations, man-trap or man-hoist accident exists.

Under the present Federal mine safety law, workers in No. 2 mines, those that employ 15 or more men, are well protected. That same protection should be extended to the workers in No. 1 mines, those employing less than 15 men.

There is no valid reason for giving Federal inspectors the right to close down a mine containing 15 or more employees when they find an eminent danger existing and refusing the same power to the same inspectors when, after inspection, they find an eminent danger existing in a mine that employs less than 15 men. There is no logic or excuse for such a distinction. I note for the record that in 1960, No. 1 mines had over 30 percent of the fatalities while producing 14 percent of our coal and in 1961 No. 1 mines had 34 percent of the fatalities in the coal industry while producing only 12 percent of our coal.

A Bill To Amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act So as To Provide Further for the Prevention of Accidents in Coal Mines

Be it enacted in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That Public Law 552, Eighty-second Congress, entitled "An Act to Amend Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to provide for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines," approved July 16, 1952 (ch. 877, 66 Stat. 692, 30 U.S.C. 471) be amended by striking out section 201(b) thereof.

RELIGIOUS EXPRESSION IN SCHOOLS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, last June, when the Supreme Court handed down its regrettable decision that the Constitution of the United States was placed in peril because a group of New York children voluntarily recited a 22-word nondenominational prayer, it seemed to me that the canons and criteria of validity in thought had dipped to a nadir never before reached in this land where freedom once found its most impregnable home.

Another year has almost passed and there is now every indication that this same Court is about to plumb new depths in their zeal to probe minutiae never envisioned by the framers of the Constitution.

To bolster their findings, the Justices perch upon pedicels of logic too slim to support even a whit of their proclaimings.

How, I now wonder, are we ever to answer the tidal wave of inquiries we will receive when the Court rules that the Lord's Prayer and the Bible are banned from our schools?

What can we tell our own children as to why we have done nothing to stop the Court from this pristine heresy?

Will it be sufficient for us to say, "The Court did it. We are blameless?" I, for one, do not believe we can evade the issue in that way.

Columnist William S. White has written brilliantly of the untenable position we are inexorably being pushed into by the Court.

I commend his editorial from the March 1 edition of the Washington Evening Star to each and every Member and I echo his plaintive inquiry: "Are beauty and gentleness and tenderness to be declared unconstitutional?"

Finally, I add my own query: "What are we here in the House going to do to stop what appears now to be an inevitable 'finding' of this Court?"

Religious Expression in Schools—Free Exercise of Belief Is Considered the True Issue in Argument

(By William S. White)

Another spring is to bring another bitter division within the Supreme Court—and within the United States—determining whether any chemical trace of religious feeling, however voluntary and nonsectarian, is to be allowed expression in the public schools of the United States.

The Court last June forbade as unconstitutional the voluntary recitation in New York schools of a 22-word nondenominational prayer prepared by the school authorities. Now it is to decide two other questions:

Will constitutional government be threatened if such of the children of Baltimore as may care to do so continue to open each school day with Bible reading and by repeating aloud the Lord's Prayer?

Will constitutional government be threatened if such of the children of Pennsylvania as may care to do so continue to open each school day by hearing a reading of 10 paragraphs from the Bible?

Sessions of the Supreme Court itself are opened with an invocation of God's blessing upon its work. Public officials, including the President, traditionally take oath upon the Bible. The national anthem—the one anthem of every man, woman, and child, whatever his religion or the lack of it—still recognizes the existence of God.

All this notwithstanding, however, the outlook is not too good for those schoolchildren who wish to participate in ceremonies acknowledging that divine mercy and divine justice still exist in an America of increasing materialism and private hopelessness.

For the arguments recently heard before the Justices on the Baltimore and Pennsylvania cases—which probably will be settled along in June—have strongly indicated that some at least intend to read the doctrine of "separation of church and state" in such a way as to permit God to be mentioned in the schoolhouses hereafter only under one's breath.

The first amendment to the Constitution declares, as to religion: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This is where the doctrine of separation arose. But surely the true issue here is not that someone is trying to make an "establishment of religion"—namely, to set up one state church superior to all others.

Surely the true issue involved here is involved in the latter half of that amendment, that forbidding interference with the free exercise of religion.

Any minority, including the ultimate minority of one pupil, has the undoubted right to refuse to participate in any religious exercise. This columnist, for one, would support such a right to the end. But does a minority have the right to forbid the majority such an exercise, if this be their faith and choice, on the extraordinary argument that if the majority do choose to pray, this somehow invades the rights of the minority? If so, what becomes of the second half of the first amendment?

If schoolchildren violate the Constitution by voluntary prayer acknowledging a Divine Being, what of singing the Star-Spangled Banner in school, having in mind its explicit acknowledgment that "In God we trust"?

Is respect for tradition itself to be declared unlawful, on the ground that some people reject tradition? If one child chooses to pray, does he really make "an establishment of religion"? How in God's name—if the expression may be pardoned—does he harm the child who does not wish to pray? Even if, as atheists claim in immeasurable sadness, faith is only a legend, is it in any way ugly? Are beauty and gentleness and tenderness also to be declared unconstitutional?

IMPACT OF CUBAN REFUGEES CAUSES PROBLEM OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to alleviate the conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment that exist and have existed in the district which I represent. Such conditions exist not only because of the usual reasons for unemployment but also because of the unusual economic distress and unemployment caused by the impact of approximately 150,000 refugees residing in this area who have fled the tyranny and oppression of the Communist government of Cuba. My bill will bring jobs and economic assistance to American citizens who, because of this unusual condition, find themselves unemployed and otherwise economically distressed.

Mr. Speaker, since the Castro Communist government of Cuba has enslaved the people of that unhappy country, approximately 200,000 persons have escaped the tyranny and oppression existing there and sought refuge in the United States.

The bulk of these people are in the Miami area. Despite the generous assistance of the Catholic church and others, our local citizens, individually, local governments and many voluntary agencies—it soon became obvious that the needs of these refugees could not be met solely out of local resources, no matter how willing the local citizens nor how desirable such a solution might be. I thereupon immediately urged recognition of the existence of the Cuban refugees and the problems caused thereby as being the primary responsibility of the Federal Government.

Two administrations and the Congress of the United States have generously responded to my requests to assist the people of the district which I represent in dealing with the problems, economic and otherwise, created by the Cuban refugees.

Today I must again ask my colleagues and advise the Nation that the people of Florida's Fourth District are in need of additional assistance as a result of approximately 150,000 Cuban refugees still residing in our midst. This has caused tremendous economic pressure since the refugees, very naturally, have tried to obtain and have been successful in obtaining employment. Much of this employment has been at reduced wages, tending to depress the labor market. Every refugee so employed has displaced an American normally employed so that in addition to many thousands of refugees who are unemployed, there are many thousands of Americans also unemployed.

The U.S. Department of Labor had long ago determined that there were a sufficient number of unemployed American citizens so as to qualify Dade County as a class D labor surplus market area. However, we have not been certified for assistance under Public Law 87–27, the Area Redevelopment Act specifically adopted by this body to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically distressed areas.

Mr. Speaker, since the fall of 1962 I have repeatedly requested the Department of Labor to certify that the unemployment condition in the district which I represent is sufficient to qualify the area under the Redevelopment Act. This has not yet been accomplished for a variety of reasons. Whatever the reason, the point is that we have not yet been so certified so as to be eligible for the employment and economic benefits which would be available to us under the Area Redevelopment Act.

The economic situation in Dade County is distressing. Total unemployment, both American and Cuban, is fantastically high. Citizens and refugees are in open competition for a limited number of jobs. Wages have tended to become depressed. Feelings are running high. The laboring classes, and particularly the Negro, have felt the brunt of this distress.

Mr. Speaker, the foreign policy of the United States is one of long standing and great tradition—down through history we are known as a sure haven from persecution and the upholders of individual rights and freedom. But it is this very foreign policy, in action, which has permitted these refugees—mothers, fathers, wives, and children—to escape tyranny, fear, and death and to seek refuge and security in the United States.

I have no quarrel with this policy nor does the overwhelming majority of the people in the district which I represent. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the American citizens who are directly affected as a result of this policy, and who are the citizens of the district I represent, are entitled to consideration in obtaining whatever Federal assistance can be made available.

Today's problem, therefore, Mr. Speaker, is to obtain additional unemployment and economic benefits for the American citizens in Florida's Fourth District, which I represent, who are without jobs and who are otherwise economically distressed. My bill, Mr. Speaker, would seek to provide employment opportunities by making the area which I represent eligible for benefits under the Area Redevelopment Act.

Mr. Speaker, I, of course, do not imply that no assistance has been rendered to the citizens of the district which I represent. I strongly supported this administration's program, now known as Public Law 87–658, the Public Works Acceleration Act. Because of the unemployment situation, the district which I represent has been certified as eligible to receive assistance under the Public Works Acceleration Act. Under this act we have thus far obtained several million dollars in approved programs. Under this act, which requires local participation, the district which I represent will secure approximately 5,600 additional man-months or 980,700 man-hours of employment. As long as the unemployment and economic distress exists in the district which I represent, we shall continue to request assistance and urge favorable consideration for approved projects under this very worthy program.

However, Mr. Speaker, the economic distress and unemployment in the Miami area arises not only from the usual sources, but also because of the tremendous number of refugees who are residing therein. Whether the refugee is employed or unemployed, his presence contributes directly to the economic distress and high unemployment of American citizens. It is this factor which my bill deals with. It is because of the persistence of these unusual factors that I have sought relief under Public Law 87–27, the Area Redevelopment Act.

I have also long sought relief under this law by administrative determination under existing criteria. Since the middle of last year, I have requested and urged repeatedly that in the criteria determination for Area Redevelopment Act eligibility, all unemployed shall be considered regardless of whether they are Americans or refugees. While the Department has had this matter before it all these many months, it has not yet been resolved.

I have urged today that immediate action be taken on this problem by the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare; Labor; and Commerce. I have directed the following letters to them, respectively:

MARCH 13, 1963.

Hon. ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I respectfully request and urge you to certify forthwith to the Secretary of Labor and to the Secretary of Commerce the number of Cuban refugees who are residing in Dade County, Fla. Such certifications should be based on the number of Cuban refugees who have been registered through the Cuban Refugee Center, less the number of Cuban refugees who have been certified by you as having been relocated out of the Dade County area.

I would appreciate also if you would forward your estimate as to the number of Cuban refugees who are residing in the Dade County area who have not been registered through the Cuban Refugee Center.

This urgent request is made because of the obvious economic impact which the residence of the Cuban refugees has created, specifically in unemployment.

I am of the opinion that the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Commerce, based on the certification, have the authority and discretion to immediately certify that this area qualifies under the Area Redevelopment Act, Public Law 87–27. Thus, qualifying under the act, the people of Dade County would be eligible for consideration to receive assistance in alleviating this problem of substantial and persistent unemployment.

I respectfully urge your prompt attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

DANTE B. FASCELL,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 13, 1963.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You are fully aware of the problem of unemployment in my area. I have been urging you since September of 1962 to furnish to the Secretary of Commerce the findings and statistical data required by law in order to make Dade County, Fla., eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act, and thus bringing relief in the way of jobs to the people of Dade County.

I am aware of the fact that you have been seeking to obtain statistical data with the cooperation of State agencies. All of this may be well and proper and in time you may accumulate the necessary statistics and data.

However, Mr. Secretary, I respectfully point out that many months have gone by; the unemployment situation in Dade County has worsened. The area has been classified as class D labor surplus market area, with a current rate of unemployment of 6.1 percent. This did not consider at all the unemployed Cuban refugee and I have consistently urged and requested that the Cuban refugee should be considered in the compilation of statistics and that when this is done, Dade County would be clearly eligible for the benefits under the Area Redevelopment Act.

I respectfully urge you, therefore, to certify forthwith to the Secretary of Commerce the finding that this area qualifies under the Area Redevelopment Act. It is my conviction that in view of the obvious facts of the aggravated unemployment situation in the Fourth District, caused by the impact of the Cuban refugees, without regard to whether the Cuban refugee is employed or unemployed, Dade County should qualify under the act.

You have the discretion to make that determination. I respectfully urge you to make that determination forthwith and to so certify to the Secretary of Commerce. I shall appreciate your prompt attention to this request.

Sincerely,

DANTE B. FASCELL,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 13, 1963.

Hon. LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I know that you are fully aware of the severe condition of unemployment which exists in Dade County, Fla. The Miami standard metropolitan area, embracing all and only Dade County, Fla., has had substantial unemployment for 5 years. The unemployment rate presently stands at 6.1 percent. The area has been classified as class D labor surplus market.

This determination, however, has not included unemployed Cuban refugees. The existence of the employed Cuban refugee as well as the unemployed Cuban refugee has seriously aggravated the unemployment condition in the Fourth District, which I represent. The rate of unemployment is probably closer to 13 percent. Certainly it is obvious that this is an intolerable situation for our citizens.

We have received substantial assistance under existing programs, such as the Public Works Acceleration Act. However, we have

not been declared qualified under the Area Redevelopment Act, Public Law 87–27.

In performance of your functions authorized by Public Law 87–27, the Area Redevelopment Act specifically enacted by the Congress to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment, I respectfully request you to determine forthwith, pursuant to the authority of that law, that the Miami standard metropolitan area is eligible immediately for area redevelopment assistance.

I see no reason why this determination cannot be made forthwith. Standard labor statistics pursuant to law are available for certification to you; in addition, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Department of Labor can certify immediately the number of Cuban refugees who are residing in the area. Whether the Cuban refugee is employed or unemployed is immaterial from an administrative standpoint in the determination of the question of substantial unemployment. Be that as it may, the certification of the number of Cuban refugees can be made forthwith to you by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and I have today called upon the Secretary to make such certification to you forthwith.

The Secretary of Labor can certify to you the total number of unemployed in this area and I have urged him today to certify this fact to you forthwith.

Mr. Secretary, I would not take this unprecedented action in urging this immediate request if I had not previously exhausted all administrative possibilities.

Recent events in the district which I represent point up the seriousness of the unemployment situation, particularly as it is aggravated by the impact of the Cuban refugees. Accordingly, I respectfully urge your immediate determination that Dade County, Fla., is eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act so that our unemployed workers will have the opportunity to obtain the employment which they seek.

Sincerely,

DANTE B. FASCELL,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion, as I have been since the passage of this act, that the area which I represent should be eligible under the terms, the spirit, and the intent of the Area Redevelopment Act, which was specifically adopted by the Congress to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in certain economically distressed areas.

Legislation which I today introduce goes one step further than the administrative action which I have been calling for, for so long. Congress has heretofore, at my request, recognized the problem of the Cuban refugees as one for national concern. This House, and I am grateful to each one of my colleagues, and this Congress have approved the authorizations and the appropriations for Health, Education, and Welfare and other costs for the care of the Cuban refugees. Without this program, the whole cost would fall on local resources which are already strained to the limit. I am now, today, again calling, urging, and requesting the sympathetic and favorable consideration of my colleagues in this legislative body to continue their recognition of the impact and economic distress caused by the residence of approximately 150,000 refugees in the district which I represent, and the adjoining one, as still of national concern. I call the problem again to the attention of this House because the problem has not yet been completely resolved. Severe unemployment still exists—almost 13 percent. There is considerable economic distress.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my bill would provide an additional criteria for eligibility under Public Law 87–27, the Area Redevelopment Act. This additional criteria would provide benefits to those areas wherein 50,000 or more Cuban refugees have resided for 1 of the 2 preceding calendar years. Such a fact would be certified by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who administers the Cuban refugee program, to the Secretary of Commerce, who administers the area redevelopment program. Under the bill we would also retain the criteria that the Secretary of Labor must determine and certify to the Secretary of Commerce that a condition of substantial unemployment has existed for the last 9 of the preceding 12 calendar months, which is a requirement now carried in the present public works acceleration law.

The exact language of the bill is as follows:

> A bill to amend section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act to provide that certain areas within the United States having a large number of Cuban refugees shall be designated as redevelopment areas
>
> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That subsection (a) of section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act (42 U.S.C. 2504) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Secretary shall also designate as 'redevelopment areas' those areas within the United States where the Secretary of Labor determines that a condition of substantial unemployment has existed for at least nine of the preceding twelve calendar months, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare certifies to the Secretary that the number of Cuban refugees residing in such areas has equalled 50,000 or more for one of the two preceding calendar years."

Mr. Speaker, for many years now the people of the district which I represent have willingly, courageously, and generously borne the brunt of the problems brought about by the approximately 150,000 non-American refugees living and working with us. We have been and are proud of the part which we have been called upon to play in the long-standing humane concepts of a free society, indicating to the refugees and to the world, proof of its concern for the dignity and the worth of an individual. This principle, among others, separates us clearly from the Communists or any other system which seeks to enslave mankind, and holds individual worth and dignity as secondary or even unnecessary. But, Mr. Speaker, in doing all this, we must also take every step to see to it that our own citizens receive assistance from our Government, particularly and especially when such assistance is within the spirit and intent of laws already enacted by this body, and when the causes which gave rise to the necessity for such assistance were not ones over which the citizens in the local area were responsible, but which causes were the direct responsibility of a policy of our Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the legislative committee having jurisdiction promptly consider this legislation. I respectfully submit that extensive hearings on this matter need not be held. The problem and the necessity are so obvious and so urgent that I respectfully request the chairman to grant priority consideration.

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT—A TRIBUTE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, Eleanor Roosevelt's death last November came as a sorrowful shock to a world which had come to love and admire her.

> There have been famous women known the world over for their profiles on coins of their images in light—

Wrote Archibald MacLeish—

> but the world know Eleanor Roosevelt by heart.

Indeed, her life, from beginning to end, was a living testament to the universal ideal of human love and kindness. She became the living symbol of the hopes and aspirations of millions of people in all parts of the world because they knew that she cared about them and understood their condition.

From the very first days in the White House until the end of her gallant life, Eleanor Roosevelt was never interested in personal fame or glory. Rather, she used her position and influence as a springboard for service to others. She always welcomed every opportunity to turn injustice toward justice, inhumanity toward humane consideration, selfishness toward generosity. She was unafraid to speak out for causes she felt were deserving regardless of how unpopular they might be. She rose above petty criticisms from narrow minds to become a crusader for human betterment in every dark corner she looked into.

Eleanor Roosevelt's concern for human misery and deprivation came not from books but from person-to-person contact. She never hesitated to involve herself personally with the unpleasant scenes of humans suffering from hunger or disease. Her travels, first throughout the depression-ridden United States in the early New Deal days, and later in the war-torn areas of the world, strengthened her conviction that a peaceful world could never be achieved on a lasting basis without a greater understanding between peoples.

> One curious thing—

Eleanor Roosevelt wrote in her autobiography—

> is that I have always seen life personally; that is, my interest or sympathy or indignation is not aroused by an abstract cause

but by the plight of a single person whom I have seen with my own eyes. It was the sight of a child dying of hunger that made the tragedy of hunger become of such overriding importance to me. Out of my response to an individual develops an awareness of a problem to the community, then to the country, and finally to the world. In each case my feeling of obligation to do something has stemmed from one individual and then widened and become applied to a broader area.

One of the secrets of Eleanor Roosevelt's triumph as a great humanitarian was, I think, her deep faith in people and what people working together can accomplish for world peace.

No single individual—

She believed—

and no single group has an exclusive claim to the American dream. But we have all * * * a single vision of what it is, not merely as a hope and an aspiration but as a way of life, which we can come ever closer to attaining in its ideal form if we keep shining and unsullied our purpose and our belief in its essential value.

Eleanor Roosevelt's love and compassion for all humankind will always be an inspiration and the light of her life will never be extinguished.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Charles H. Wilson (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 10 days, on account of official business in his district.

Mr. Healey (at the request of Mr. Rooney), for Wednesday, March 13, 1963, on account of illness.

Mrs. Kee (at the request of Mr. Albert), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Hall), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Conte (at the request of Mr. Hall), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Lipscomb, for 30 minutes, on March 14.

Mr. Cramer, for 30 minutes, on March 14.

Mr. Lindsay, for 60 minutes, on March 20.

Mr. Dent (at the request of Mr. Stratton), for 60 minutes on March 14, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Matsunaga (at the request of Mr. Stratton), for 60 minutes, on March 20.

Mr. Flood (at the request of Mr. Stratton), for 60 minutes, on March 27.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hall) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Morton.

Mr. Pillion.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Stratton) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Pucinski.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 14, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXCUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

544. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

545. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the law relating to material and necessary witnesses to crimes committed in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

546. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report providing information on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental or research work for the 6-month period ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. H.R. 950. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BASS:

H.R. 4815. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4816. A bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 4817. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for a mid-decade census of population, unemployment, and housing in 1965 and every 10 years thereafter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4818. A bill to amend section 25 of title 13, United States Code, relating to the duties of enumerators of the Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4819. A bill to amend section 131 of title 13, United States Code, so as to provide for the taking of economic censuses 1 year earlier starting in 1968; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4820. A bill to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 4821. A bill to establish, in the House of Representatives, the office of Delegate from the District of Columbia; to provide for the election of the Delegate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4822. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 4823. A bill to modify the flood control project for Rend Lake, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 4824. A bill to establish the Mount Rogers Wonderland in the Jefferson National Forest in Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 4825. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 4826. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 4827. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the highway use tax in the case of certain motor vehicles used primarily to haul unprocessed agricultural products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4828. A bill to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 4829. A bill to provide that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall construct a 500-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Albuquerque, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4830. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to revise the rates of disability and death pension authorized by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4831. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a special program for the construction, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of public eleemosynary hospitals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4832. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to require the marking of lumber and wood products to indicate to the ultimate purchaser in the United States the name of the country of origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4833. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 4834. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 4835. A bill to provide that Imperial and San Diego Counties in the State of California shall constitute a new and separate judicial district to be known as the southern district of California and to redesignate the present southern district of California as the central district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 4836. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Los Angeles County in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 4837. A bill to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 4838. A bill to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 4839. A bill for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 4840. A bill to provide standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals used by departments and agencies of the United States or by recipients of grants or contracts from the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 4841. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay fair value for improvements located on the railroad right-of-way owned by bona fide lessees or permittees; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 4842. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to extend the time of annual meetings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 4843. A bill to provide standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals used by departments and agencies of the United States or by recipients of grants or contracts from the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4844. A bill relating to the release of liability under bonds filed under section 44(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain installment obligations transmitted at death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 4845. A bill to create a commission to study Federal laws limiting political activity by officers and employees of government; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 4846. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Science and Technology; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 4847. A bill to amend section 312 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that poliomyelitis developing a 10-percent degree of disability within 1 year from the date of discharge of any veteran shall be held and considered to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4848. A bill to amend section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act to provide that certain areas within the United States having a large number of Cuban refugees shall be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4849. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4850. A bill to repeal the commodities clause in part I of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4851. A bill to amend section 902 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to penalties for falsification of records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 4852. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4853. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place certain natural amorphous graphite on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 4854. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and certain other educational expenses paid by him for the education of himself, his spouse, or any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 4855. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit schemes in interstate or foreign commerce to influence by bribery the outcome of sporting contests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 4856. A bill to provide for humane treatment of animals used in experiment and research by recipients of grants from the United States, and by agencies and instrumentalities of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4857. A bill to authorize the withholding from the pay of civilian employees of the United States the dues for membership in certain employee organizations, upon consent of employee; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.J. Res. 326. Joint resolution providing for a study by the Veterans' Administration into the problems of veterans who are elderly, chronically ill, or otherwise handicapped; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res. 327. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to set aside and proclaim an appropriate day in each year as Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution to favor the establishment of an international living museum of anthropology and ethnography; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. Res. 292. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 4858. A bill for the relief of Andriana K. Anagnostopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 4859. A bill for the relief of Avelino Gomez Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H.R. 4860. A bill to revive the office of General of the Armies of the United States and to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to such office; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 4861. A bill for the relief of David Dagan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4862. A bill for the relief of Kim Tricia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4863. A bill for the relief of Etsuko (Matsuo) McClellan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 4864. A bill for the relief of Sheila Marguerite Henderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H.R. 4865. A bill for the relief of Iren Almasi and Maria Almasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 4866. A bill to provide for the advancement of Hospitalman Chief Gerald Henry White, U.S. Navy (retired) to the grade of chief warrant pharmacist; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4867. A bill for the relief of Sun Young Choy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4868. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chieko Takagi McKinstry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 4869. A bill for the relief of Eugene McVaigh and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 4870. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Gardiner and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 4871. A bill for the relief of Glenn C. Deitz and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 4872. A bill for the relief of Emilio and Giulio Sibilio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 4873. A bill for the relief of Anthimos Halazonitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

68. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Clara V. Marshall and others, San Francisco, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to calling for the preservation of the Monroe Doctrine, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Congress Hoodwinked: The Billion-Dollar Boondoggle—U.S. Air Force and Atomic Energy Commission Waste $1.04 Billion on Studies Before Junking Impractical Nuclear Airplane Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, in a period of 10 years from March 1951, to March 1961, the U.S. Air Force and the Atomic Energy Commission were jointly engaged in feasibility and research studies aimed to produce a nuclear-powered airplane.

These Federal agencies wasted $1,040 million up to the time of the cancellation of the project in March 1961. During this time, and in spite of the lavish expenditures, no usable airplane frame, engine, nuclear powerplant, or military weapons system was developed under the program.

The $1,040 million expenditure is a total loss to the taxpayers of this country, except incidental theoretical knowledge with a minimal practical value. More tragic than this wastage of tax funds, is the fact that these funds represent a useless wastage of research, engineering, and technical talent and manpower. Research and engineering manpower to this extent had been diverted from projects that could have strengthened instead of weakened the relative military power of the United States to that of the Soviet.

During these 10 years, the emphasis, direction, and end purpose of this program had shifted and changed eight different times. The emphasis shifted from flight demonstration to applied research, to military weapons systems, to experimental no-flight program, to experimental flight program, to development for all-purpose military aircraft, to nuclear reactor shielding program, to research on nuclear reactor experiments.

During this whole period, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense had represented this project to the Congress as an urgent military weapons system. The Congress was misled and hoodwinked for 10 years concerning the actual purposes, the urgency, and the progress of this project.

After years of study, the Department of Defense, in another change of heart and mind, announced the specifications for this nebulous airplane to be: Speed, 400 to 600 miles per hour; altitude, 30,000 feet. At the same time, the United States already had the B–52 and the B–58 military bombers with the following capabilities: The B–52 with a speed of 600 miles per hour and an altitude of 35,000 feet; the B–58 with a speed of 1,300 miles per hour and an altitude of 50,000 feet.

For military purposes, this airplane was obsolete from the beginning to the end of the 10-year research project.

No military weapons system was ever seriously projected for this airplane by the Air Force, even if it could have been successfully developed and feasibly manufactured.

The General Accounting Office investigated, audited, and reported its findings on this fantastic nuclear airplane project. Comptroller General Joseph Campbell's recent report cited numerous deficiencies in purpose, direction, and management on the part of the military and atomic energy agencies which contributed to the astronomical costs and disappointing results.

The Comptroller General cited the following governmental management errors:

First. Various major facilities were constructed but never used for their intended purpose.

Second. Construction designs and plans were completed and paid for without ever being used.

Third. The Department of Defense failed to furnish timely direction and supervision of the contractors.

Fourth. The Department of Defense delayed for over 2 years in giving the Atomic Energy Commission a decision on a vital military aspect of the program.

Fifth. The Atomic Energy Commission extended a contract for producing yttrium oxide, 7 months beyond its need.

Sixth. A large negotiated contract was almost entirely subcontracted which pyramided overhead and profit costs for both prime contractor and subcontractor costs.

The prime contractors for the nuclear propulsion system were the General Electric Co. and Pratt & Whitney Division of the United Aircraft Corp.

General Electric was paid $527,384,000 under its contracts. Pratt & Whitney received $164,480,000.

The Comptroller General disclosed the following deficiencies and inefficiencies of the General Electric Co. under its contracts:

First. Ineffective equipment accountability;

Second. Physical inventories not taken regularly;

Third. Accumulation of stock outside storerooms;

Fourth. Uneconomical purchases;

Fifth. Deficiencies in accountability for certain inventories;

Sixth. Divided internal audit responsibility, thus precluding effective and comprehensive coverage of General Electric's nuclear airplane activities.

Seventh. Prompt corrective action not taken on internal audit findings;

Eighth. Accounting records did not segregate allowable and unallowable costs;

Ninth. Government audit services not utilized;

Tenth. Delay in suspending project;

Eleventh. Improper method for computing fixed fee.

The Comptroller General's review of operations of Pratt & Whitney Aircraft disclosed innumerable weaknesses in the financial and quantity controls over materials and supplies inventories, and a lack of formal accounting records to support the financial reports prepared by Pratt & Whitney.

GAO cited the following deficiencies in Pratt & Whitney's operations:

First. Physical inventories not taken regularly;

Second. Inadequate accountability for inventories;

Third. Stock records accessible to warehouse employees;

Fourth. Improper handling of requisitions;

Fifth. Absence of written procedures for inventories;

Sixth. Accumulation of excessive and obsolete inventories;

Seventh. Inadequate accounting records; and

Eighth. Prompt corrective action not taken on internal audit findings.

Mr. Speaker, the Comptroller General's revelation of this billion dollar boondoggle is a shocking example of the wastages that occur in our Federal system of administration. There are thousands of areas where sheer, clear wastages are going on.

There is no question in my mind that the 1964 budget could be reduced by from $5 to $10 billion by reasonable businesslike management in our executive and administrative agencies. This responsibility rests with the Chief Executive.

Congress cannot undertake to displace or to exercise detail supervision over the management and administrative responsibilities of the executive department.

Remarks of U.S. Congressman Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., to the Maryland Council of Farmer Cooperatives at Ellicott City, Md., on February 27, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following remarks by the Honorable Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., of Maryland, at Ellicott City, Md., February 27, 1963:

Remarks of U.S. Congressman Charles McC. Mathias to the Maryland Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Ellicott City, Md., February 27, 1963

In my remarks here today I shall not stress my longstanding interest in, and support of agricultural cooperatives. And, I will not try to give you any advice on how to operate your cooperatives so that they will be of even greater service to your members, for I know you are more expert in this field than I am. Nonetheless, I do appreciate your inviting me to share with you some thoughts I have on the future of agriculture.

There is an erroneous idea that there is an inevitable conflict between the interests of farmers and those of consumers. This idea is expressed most frequently by those who think that the prices of farm products should be pushed by Government action of one kind or another. I would agree that there is a conflict between excessive Government intervention in agriculture and the longrun interests of consumers.

But if we take a close look at the real interests of consumers and farmers there is no conflict. The idea that there is a conflict is obsolete.

Consumers have an interest in maintaining the kind of an efficient, freewheeling, vigorous, and productive agriculture that has emerged in the United States and which Maryland agriculture so well exemplifies.

That this kind of agriculture serves the interests of consumers is evidence by the steady decline in the cost of buying an adequate diet.

In 1940 the average U.S. family spent 40 percent of its income for food. In 1961 the average U.S. family spent 19.7 percent of its income for food. In fact, if it bought the same kinds and quantities of food in 1961 that it bought in 1935–39, it would only spend 14 percent of its income for food.

Consumers have upgraded their diets. They are buying more meat, poultry, dairy products, fruits, and vegetables than they did 20 to 25 years ago. They are buying more convenience foods; foods ready to cook and eat.

U.S. consumers have more income left for education, medical care, housing and recreation because of the efficiency of American farmers.

It may not always appear that the benefits of this efficiency of production are shared in equitably by farmers themselves. But despite the growing pains of the agricultural revolution, the American farmer is a proud, independent, and stable part of the American scene. Agriculture is not sick, it's not prostrate, although it is changing. The net worth of farmers on an overall basis and on an average per capita basis continues to grow annually.

American farmers today are able to provide their children with education, with medical care, with an opportunity in life as never before.

Of all industries, agriculture has been clearly demonstrated to be that industry which does poorest, from the standpoint of both farmers and consumers, when central, political management is substituted for the incentives of a free economy.

The idea that Government must get involved commodity by commodity in planning production, in controlling production, marketing, and pricing of farm products, is an antiquated, inefficient, and dangerous approach to the future of farmers, and to the interests of consumers as well.

I like to be able to quote the President of the United States—he is everyone's President. He told a recent press conference that:

"The free market is a decentralized regulator of our economic system. The free market is not only a more efficient decision maker than the wisest central planning body, but even more important, the free market keeps economic power widely dispersed."

I could only applaud the sentiment. If he could only persuade some of those Harvard faculty members in the White House that teachers should listen and learn like the rest of us. In particular, I could wish that he would tell Secretary of Agriculture Freeman of his rediscovery of the key economic principle that has made the American economy go.

I don't need to tell you about the impact of the cost-price squeeze in agriculture. But I do think I should take a minute to relate this to Government policy in the area of taxes and spending.

Farm costs, both production costs and the cost of marketing your products, continue to rise.

There is no mystery as to why this is so. Farm costs go up because of a variety of Government programs and policies.

Government spending is a major cost in all businesses and particularly in agriculture.

All Government expenditures must be paid for, either in taxes or in that most insidious of taxes, inflation.

Taxes go into the making of prices. Virtually every tax is eventually paid by the consumer of goods and services.

In a hundred hidden ways, taxes turn out to be costs and prices.

Every new or bigger spending program enacted by Congress means more costs, in taxes and in prices, to farmers and to other citizens.

Since farmers are the biggest consumers of goods and services on a per capita basis, they have a particularly heavy stake in Federal tax and spending programs. So anyone who tells you how much he loves farmers and how he wants to vote for things to help farmers, who then votes or works for a whole raft of new and bigger spending programs, is not really working for the interests of farmers. His concern for farmers' welfare is delusion and illusion, a lot of double-talk.

I am sure that you have a major interest in the European Common Market and how it is going to affect you as farmers and as marketeers of farm products. This is a major subject in itself so let me make just one brief comment.

The European Common Market is a fact of life. It may turn out to be one of the crucially important developments of history. When we look at the ECM we can only wish it well and hope that it will mature as a strong economic force and military ally against Communist imperialism. But we must also be concerned with respect to the impact of the trading practices of this economic unit on U.S. farmers and other exporters. The recent import fees established on poultry illustrates the seriousness of the problem.

Section 252 of the trade bill enacted by the Congress was specifically designed to deal with this problem. It provides that whenever a foreign country maintains nontariff trade restrictions or variable import fees which prevent the expansion of trade on a mutually advantageous basis, "the President shall * * * suspend, withdraw or prevent the application of benefits of trade agreements concessions to products of such country."

This is a tough policy. It was so intended by the Congress. It was intended as a means of giving our negotiators a means to prevent such harmful actions to U.S. farmers and other exporters as illustrated by the fence ECM has built around their poultry industry.

But this policy of the trade act is meaningless unless it is implemented. The Nation must look to the President and the State Department to implement the policy.

As yet, I have seen little indication that the policy will be forcefully and effectively implemented.

We must recognize that our Government has one major handicap in endeavoring to obtain acceptance of this policy by the ECM. This is our own Government farm policy.

The administration is busily engaged in preventing free market prices from functioning here in the United States. Consequently, when we insist that other countries should discard their protective policies we are negotiating from a position of weakness.

It is not exactly a strong bargaining position for us to tell others do as we tell you, not as we do.

It seems to me that Maryland agriculture has a great future. We have the advantages of an efficient agriculture and a nearness to the major markets of the United States.

It seems to me that this future will be best protected by building on the assets we have. These assets can be dissipated by centralized management of agricultural production and marketing which would curtail our efficiency and share our markets with areas less favored geographically.

In devising national policy relating to farm program we should copy success. With all its problems, those segments of U.S. agriculture which rely on the market as the major determinant of income and the major guide to investment, production and marketing, have a much more favorable outlook than those which have had the benefit of central planning and control.

A Tribute to the Honorable Clement J. Zablocki, Member of Congress From the Second District, Milwaukee, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 13, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my sincere pleasure to participate in a tribute to Congressman Clement J. Zablocki sponsored by the Department of Wisconsin, Polish Legion of American Veterans, in Milwaukee, Wis.

I am sure my colleagues will be happy to learn of the very high regard that the people of Milwaukee and, indeed, of Wisconsin have for our colleague from the Second District in Wisconsin.

Throughout the evening, it was evident that those participating in this tribute recognized Clem Zablocki's impressive contribution as a Member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs toward helping carve an effective foreign policy for the United States.

It would be difficult to fully describe Clem Zablocki's impressive contribution toward a better understanding by all Americans of the serious problems with which the free world is faced in Berlin, in Laos, in Vietnam, in the Soviet Union, in Red China, and in Latin America.

Clem Zablocki's wise judgment and penetrating counsel have been woven deep throughout all the great decisions in the difficult field of foreign relations and international affairs made by our Nation in the past decade. I was happy to bring to the people of Wisconsin a picture of how thoroughly Clem Zablocki is respected here in Congress on both sides of the aisle and yes, Mr. Speaker, in both Chambers of the Congress of the United States.

His wise counsel and great dedication to the cause of freedom are a source of inspiration to all of us here in Washington and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to have dwelled on this particular subject at greater length to those participating in this great tribute to CLEM ZABLOCKI.

It was particularly fitting that Governor Reynolds, of Wisconsin, would personally participate in the tribute to CLEM. The Governor joined the others present in extolling the impressive record of accomplishment that CLEM ZABLOCKI brings, not only to the people of his congressional district in Wisconsin, but yes, Mr. Speaker, to all the people of America.

It was with a deep sense of pride that I observed during this tribute to CLEM the abiding sense of purpose in the American cause that CLEM ZABLOCKI brings to this Congress and to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman ZABLOCKI was overwhelmed by the tribute paid him and the truly humble spirit of this great American was best reflected in his own remarks which concluded this very impressive banquet.

I should like to take this privilege to incorporate these remarks in the RECORD today because they so eloquently describe the greatness of our colleague from Wisconsin's Second Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman ZABLOCKI's remarks follow:

REMARKS OF ACCEPTANCE BY HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI AT A TESTIMONIAL DINNER GIVEN IN HIS HONOR BY THE DEPARTMENT OF WISCONSIN, POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN VETERANS, SUNDAY, MARCH 31, 1963

Congressman Pucinski, Governor Reynolds, Mr. Firmin, Mr. Borkowski, Commander Bieganowski, Department Commander Nedweski, Mrs. Wozniak, Mrs. Zalewski, Reverend Taterczynski, the Madrigal Singers of Alverno College, and friends, some of you may remember that recently there was an attempt to name a library for me. At the time, I said it didn't seem like a good idea since public buildings are usually named for deceased persons and I was not dead yet. Tonight I am not sure whether I am really still alive. Sitting here and listening to these tributes is a little like attending one's own funeral.

Seriously, I am sincerely happy to be alive and here to receive this honorary membership citation in the Polish Legion of American Veterans. It is an honor which will be remembered and cherished always.

I only wish my wife could have been here tonight to share in these warm and wonderful proceedings. Unfortunately she could not be present.

This tribute you have paid is not, I know, purely a personal one. It is a tribute to the office I hold as Representative to the Congress of the United States, the most powerful lawmaking body on the face of the earth. It is my privilege to hold this post by the grace of God and the unstinting hard work of my family, friends, and acquaintances, many of them here tonight. I know you will forgive a personal privilege, if I single out my mother and present her to you. I attribute much to her for what I am.

To you, my friends, belongs the real praise, for you have aided me without thought of gain or personal privilege. You have trusted that I would represent you in the Halls of Congress as you would want to be represented, and I hope that I have not betrayed your trust.

I am proud to accept this tribute because to me it signifies in a true sense the basic purpose of the PLAV. Your organization's efforts to promote good citizenship and Americanism are well known.

You honor me not as one of Polish ancestry or solely for having assisted Poland in some way, but to inspire and encourage others to seek service in Government and participate in Government. And that is as it should be. For while we are proud of our national backgrounds, we are prouder still to be Americans, citizens of one of history's great nations.

Our American way of life presupposes a pluralism of racial, national and religious backgrounds. We have a country which is truly unified in its diversities. To my mind it would indeed be a tragic day for our country if all Americans conformed to the same customs, manners and culture. We are not meant to be poured out of one mold.

It is a pleasure and privilege for me to work with Congressman ROMAN PUCINSKI in Congress, one of the most heterogeneous groups in our Nation. Congressmen are of varied national backgrounds, hold varied political, philosophical and religious beliefs. They come from all parts of our Nation. The interchange of ideas and wisdom which takes place on Capitol Hill is in no small measure due to the diverse backgrounds of our national representatives.

We can be proud that our country is a melting pot; that each national group has made its contribution to our life and culture. But the process is far from over. There is still much that can be contributed to America by all of us who are interested in preserving for posterity the traditions and culture of our native lands.

As members of the PLAV you have chosen not only to preserve the heritage of America, and attend to the welfare of your fellow veterans and our way of life, but also the glories and triumphs of Poland. The latter you are conveying to your children, and sharing with those who might otherwise never know about them. In doing this you are promoting Americanism just as if you were once again fighting for the freedoms we hold so dear.

Further you are engaged in promoting a better understanding of the real image of Poland and the people of that great nation. Your organization is dedicated: to the restoration of individual human dignity to the unfortunate enslaved brethren; you are dedicated to the liberation of Poland from Communist domination and you are determined that Poland will return to the family of free nations where she rightfully belongs, for Poland has contributed much to the development and culture of the West.

I am confident your work and the efforts of all understanding citizens of this great country of ours will not be in vain.

As a Christian nation, soon to commemorate its millenium of christendom, Poland will never succumb to the pressures and wiles of communism. Poland will be free. Her people will again rise and rejoice. Their voices will again glorify God in thanksgiving and in supplication that freedom shall be through all ages and forever theirs.

To this end not only your organization but all of us are committed. Ours is a great challenge. But our task is not insurmountable. May we be inspired with the zeal and dedication to fulfill our obligation.

In closing, may I again express my sincere gratitude to all of you.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father Joseph A. Baran, St. Michael's Church, Lansford, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Lord, Eternal God, by whose grace America is free and by whose inspiration we freely choose our government and, even during these highly crucial times, enjoy a flourishment of culture, spiritual creativity, and economic welfare, we beseech Thee, in Thy infinite goodness, to bless our President, our Congress, and the whole American people without regard to race, color, and creed.

Humbly we invoke Thee to look upon us mercifully as we daily pray for those countries of many millions of people which have contributed to the strength of America. Among these countries is Slovakia, a country in the heart of Europe, which today cannot freely commemorate the grand and significant anniversities of its own glorious history. Slovakia cannot commemorate, in a manner that is fitting and just to glorify, O Lord in the highest, Thy greatness, the year 863 when the saintly brothers Cyril and Methodius, the messengers of the holy Christian mission, came into the territory of Slovakia to spread the gospel of truth in a language intelligible to the people of that country. Therefore, do we gratefully recall this great Slovak anniversary and thank Thee, Lord Almighty, Lord of the strong and the weak, Lord of the great and small nations, that Thou hast granted us the grace to live to see this happy day.

We are also happy to recall, in this House of Representatives, the 24th anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Slovak nation by its duly elected representatives which happens to be this very day. Together with over 2 million Americans of Slovak descent we pray Thee, O merciful and just God, grant wisdom and courage to all free men and freedom-loving peoples, so that they might lend a helping hand to this worthy, long-suffering Christian country of the Slovak Nation to regain its liberty and freedom.

May all human malice disappear, may the forces of good, of right, and justice tear asunder the curtain of iron and steel and, under Thy protection, O God of mercy, may America and Slovakia flourish to Thy greater honor and glory. In the name of our Lord, who liveth and reigneth for all eternity. Amen.

Let us remember in a silent prayer Congressman CLYDE DOYLE.

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the majority leader if the gentleman can advise us as to the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois, Monday is Consent Calendar Day. There are also two suspensions: First, H.R. 4715, the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation; and, second, H.R. 2826, taxes, disposition of property.

Tuesday is the Private Calendar.

The program for Wednesday and the balance of the week will be announced later.

This is, of course, subject to the further reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced at any time later.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 18

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it appears that there will not be very much business next week; is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I have announced all the program that is ready for floor action next week, as of now. We may have further announcements sometime next week.

Mr. GROSS. We got up a pretty good head of steam yesterday and it was my hope that the leadership could keep the legislative machinery rolling, at least until the Easter recess, so that we could get out of here this year before October 13 or 15, or whatever the date was last year.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman will be satisfied when we will have finished this session that we will have enacted a very substantial amount of very important legislation.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman thinks we can get away sometime about August 1?

Mr. ALBERT. I hope so.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to do a little fishing this year, but unless Congress gets down to work I will again be deprived of that pleasure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDERS TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all special orders heretofore entered on behalf of Members for today be transferred to Monday next and be called first on the list of special orders for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, without establishing a precedent, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Speaker may extend his own remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of St. Patrick's Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is some historical doubt about the place and date of St. Patrick's birth. There is no doubt whatever about the charm and force of his saintly personality, the magnificence of his lifetime achievement, or the enthusiasm with which his feast day is celebrated in Ireland, and by those of Irish descent, as well as countless others, everywhere in the world.

People frequently announce, with an air of surprise, that St. Patrick was not an Irishman. Irish people know, and Catholics know, that St. Patrick was the Apostle of Ireland; and the apostle of a country, in common understanding, is someone who has come from outside into a country, bringing the faith, as St. Boniface to Germany, or St. Francis Xavier to the Indies. In many countries, a native-born saint is adopted as patron, and many other saints, elsewhere. Ireland, however, has so great a debt to St. Patrick, and so great a love for him, that his place as patron saint of Ireland is assured forever.

Young Patrick, taken captive by pirates, and sold into slavery in pagan Ireland, escaped and devoted the rest of his life to the task of redeeming his pagan masters from the slavery of heathen beliefs and of sin. He received his seminary training in the schools of Tours and Lerins, in France, was commissioned by Pope Celestine I to undertake the conversion of Ireland, and consecrated bishop in 442. Even within his own lifetime, he saw that pagan land on fire with the love of God, the love of Christian learning, and a flaming missionary zeal. Out of St. Patrick's example, his preaching, and the efforts of devoted students and holy bishops and priests under his direction, Ireland has acquired and maintained the character of a center of Christian intellectual development and Christian charity, and a prime supplier of Catholic teachers, missionaries, and priests to the rest of the world.

In accordance with Catholic custom, we celebrate on March 17 the occasion of St. Patrick's death, just 1,470 years ago, in the year 493. This was the day on which, according to our belief, he entered into the joys of Heaven, richly merited by his joyful acceptance of God's will for him, his brave and vigorous work for the cause of Christ, and his unfailing love for all of Christ's children.

It is more than the grass under the rain that keeps Ireland green today in the hearts of those that love her—it is the memory, forever green, of that devoted servant of God and lover of humanity, St. Patrick, the man of humility and force, of kindness and courage. Wherever you see, today, the glint of green of a shamrock, or of whatever plant or fabric may do temporary duty as a shamrock, you see a visible sign of the greenness of that memory—the glow of love for the great St. Patrick, and for the land he made a land of glory and beauty and holiness.

The influence of Christian Ireland has been strong in America from early days. Long before the Revolution, in 1737, the Charitable Irish Society was organized and brought into being on St. Patrick's Day, in Boston, to enable the Irish citizens of the town to aid "their poor and indigent countrymen." We have records of the celebration of St. Patrick's Day by the Irish troops maintained in the American Colonies before the Revolution. And St. Patrick's Day obtained a special local, as well as national, significance in 1776, when the British evacuated Boston, and the American troops under George Washington marched in to take possession. Thus our local patriotism, as residents of Boston, our State loyalty, and our national patriotism, are united, in the celebration of Evacuation Day, with honor to St. Patrick, symbol of the Irish ancestry and Catholic faith in which so many of us take pride.

In the early colonial days, we find in history men and women of Irish blood emigrating to the various Colonies of America as early as 1636. Through the decades and generations of colonial and constitutional government, sons and daughters of Ireland have come to America. Their descendants today in our country constitute countless millions of our citizens.

I think it can be said that those of Irish blood, in peace or in war, have been contributors to our progress, and more, have always responded to the service of our country.

As St. Patrick was the crusader for God and mankind in his day, so can we, during this trying period of the world's history, emulate the spirit of St. Patrick in our own lives.

By doing this we will be able to make our greatest contribution to God, country, and mankind.

And it is well that we pause on St. Patrick's Birthday to honor this saint of action, and in our own minds, reflect on the lessons we can learn from his spiritual and dynamic life—making us better persons—making us better Americans.

THE LATE HONORABLE CLYDE DOYLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Sheppard].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, as senior Representative from California, it is my unpleasant duty to announce to the House the passing of our dear friend and colleague Clyde Doyle of the 23d District of California.

The quality of the dedicated life and the invaluable work of Clyde Doyle is well known to every Member of this body in which he was serving with great distinction his country, his State, and his constituency.

His death takes from our midst a great American and an outstanding legislator. He was my close, personal friend—a friendship that I valued highly. Although the family and his circle of friends will miss him dearly, we all have the consolation of knowing that he has rendered his country great service and therein left a legacy that all of us could well emulate.

To his beloved wife, Lydia, his daughter, his grandchildren and the other family members, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to have Clyde Doyle's official biography inserted at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

A BRIEF BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF CONGRESSMAN CLYDE DOYLE, 23D DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

Congressman Clyde Doyle, of South Gate, Calif. (formerly of Long Beach), elected to the 79th, 81st, 82d, 83d, 84th, 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses. Now serving his 8th term—16th year. Member of two major committees: House Armed Services Committee and House Un-American Activities Committee.

District office: 2710 Zoe Forest, Huntington Park, Calif.

Washington office: 1030 New House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C., phone: Capitol 4–3121.

Residence: 8948–A State Street, South Gate, Calif.

FAMILY BACKGROUND

Birthplace, Oakland, Calif., of marriage of Thomas and Nettie Doyle. Youngest of large family of brothers and sisters. Mother was schoolteacher before marriage and father was successful blacksmith, horseshoer, racehorse owner, farrier (before the days of automobiles or "gasoline wagons.")

FORMAL EDUCATION

Elementary schools of Oakland, Calif., and Seattle, Wash. Los Angeles High School and Long Beach High School. President of student body, champion debater, manager of high school paper. Baseball team pitcher, studied correspondence extension law course and attended night classes. Graduated from the College of Law of the University of Southern California with LL.B. degree, 1917. College baseball team pitcher. Earned his own way through high school and college years by being student janitor for schoolrooms, selling and delivering newspapers, clerking in bookstore, serving legal processes from law office, delivering post office special delivery letters and Western Union messages, assistant at Long Beach YMCA, leader and director of summer camps for boys.

THIRTY YEARS' SUCCESSFUL LAW PRACTICE AND BUSINESS RECORD

Passed California Supreme Court examination a year before graduating from University of Southern California Law College in 1917 with degree of LL.B. Established very successful law practice in Long Beach and Los Angeles for 30 years before first being elected to 79th Congress in 1945. Legal counsel for superintendent of banks California. President, Long Beach Bar Association and member board of trustees. Member, Los Angeles Bar Judiciary Committee. Member, California State Bar Legislative Committee. Member, board of directors, California Bar Delegates, State Bar of California. Chairman, resolutions committee, California State Delegates Bar Convention. Trust counsel, National Bank. Vice president and director, First National City Bank, Long Beach, Calif. Admitted to practice before U.S. Supreme Court, October 14, 1931, Washington, D.C. Legal counsel, World War I of exemption boards on voluntary basis without pay. Member, California State Board of Education. Admitted to practice in Federal courts, 1917.

OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP OVER PERIOD OF MANY YEARS BEFORE ENTERING CONGRESS

In 1936 received unanimous award of meritorious citizenship plaque by vote of all the service clubs of Long Beach, Calif., as the most valuable and useful adult citizen in Long Beach. Twice elected by popular vote of the people as member, Board of Freeholders, Long Beach. President of board in 1921 to write Long Beach City charter. First member, Long Beach Kiwanis Club and organizing president. First president, Boy Scouts of America Council in Long Beach. Several years president of Long Beach tuberculosis stamp sales. Member, board of trustees and legal counsel, Adelaide Tichenor Hospital, School and Clinic for Crippled Children. Boys secretary, YMCA, Long Beach. Member, board of directors, Long Beach YMCA. Member, board of trustees, California Junior Republic, Chino. President, Long Beach Recreation Commission for 15 years without pay. First president, Long Beach Coordinating Council, 1934. First president, Long Beach Philharmonic Orchestra Association. Honorary member of National Recreation Association. Honorary member, California Conference of Social Work. Honorary member, Long Beach 20–30 Club. President, Long Beach Trojan Club (U.S.C.). President Abraham Lincoln Club, Long Beach, for several years. Member of Abraham Lincoln Group, Washington, D.C. Los Angeles County juvenile probation officer. Examiner of applicants for position of juvenile court probation officers, Los Angeles County, under Hon. Curtis D. Wilbur, distinguished judge juvenile court (later Secretary of Navy under President Hoover). Boys counselor and instructor in government and athletics, California Junior Republic, Chino, 1911–14; member, board of trustees since 1920. Recipient of honorary plaques, awards and decorations by several veterans organizations; member, South Gate Chamber of Commerce; Huntington Park, Downey and South Gate YMCA. Member of Moose and Eagles. Many years and currently listed in "Who's Who."

CLYDE DOYLE FAMILY

Clyde Doyle and Lydia Yeomans, Long Beach high school mate, one of three daughters of prominent pioneer Long Beach family, were happily married on March 21, 1914; will soon observe their 48th wedding anniversary at the Nation's Capital where Mrs. Doyle has helped Congressman Doyle all the 16 years he has already served in Congress. Children of marriage: Lydia Louise Doyle, deceased; 1st Lt. Clyde Doyle, Jr. (U.S. Army Air Force), who died on duty in 1945; Dorothy Grace Stanton, mother of two sons and whose husband is prominent school teacher, resides in Rolling Hills, Calif. All parents, brothers, and sisters of both Congressman and Mrs. Doyle are deceased.

ALREADY ELECTED BY POPULAR VOTE OF THE PEOPLE EIGHT TIMES AS MEMBER OF CONGRESS

Member of 79th, 81st, 82d, 83d, 84th, 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses. Twice accorded nomination by the voters of both Democratic and Republican Parties in the June primary elections under the California cross filing law which is no longer in effect. Reelected to 84th, 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses from the 23d district by over 70 percent of votes. Member of House Armed Services Committee and House Un-American Activities Committee. Chairman under both Democratic and Republican administrations of the Rules Committee of the House Un-American Activities Committee. Has also served on House Lobby Investigating Committee, Military Reserve Committee; has traveled extensively on congressional duties in the United States and foreign countries. Author of Doyle resolution, House Resolution 151, in 84th Congress, adopted unanimously, requiring at least two members of every investigative committee present at hearings—passed the House by unanimous vote. Author of Doyle bill, H.R. 8772, dealing with less than honorable discharges; appointed chairman of Special Subcommittee on Armed Services Committee and held public hearings on said bill. Said bill passed the House of Representatives August 5, 1957, by an overwhelming standing vote of 226 ayes to 8 nays. Author of Doyle bill, H.R. 1935, which passed the House unanimously dealing with less than honorable discharges. Author of Doyle bill, H.R. 9944, filed at the opening of the 87th Congress and which bill was referred to the House Committee on Un-American Activities of which Doyle is a member. Its purpose is to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States or any Communist-action organization in the United States whether the designation of Communist is part of the name of the organization or not. It declares it to be a criminal offense to belong to such organization and provides penalties for becoming or remaining a member of Communist-action organization and penalties for violation of the bill of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both, for each violation, and any organization which violates any provision of the bill shall be fined not more than $10,000 for each violation. It defines the meaning of the term Communist-action organization as one being under the direction and control of the world Communist movement. Has frequently presided over House of Representatives during debates and House proceedings by appointment of Hon. Sam Rayburn, late Speaker of House of Representatives. Has presided as congressional subcommittee chairman in many cities in United States and was chairman of Armed Services Special Subcommittee to proceed to Long Beach, Calif., to hold public hearings on the subject of subsidence at Long Beach Navy Shipyard and make report back to Congress. This was done. The essence of the Doyle Special Subcommittee report was adopted by the House and the

Senate, declaring their policies as to further appropriations for Long Beach Navy Shipyard and the subsidence problem. Has presided as subcommittee chairman of House Un-American Activities Committee in many American cities at public hearings involving subversion and subversive activities. Has traveled extensively in many foreign countries as official member of the House Armed Services Committee. Now serving his 16th year as a Member of the House of Representatives; and has earned what is recognized as very valuable seniority status on his major committees and on the floor of the House of Representatives.

CLYDE DOYLE RESIDENCE: ONE IN 23D DISTRICT AND ONE IN ARLINGTON, VA.

Congressman and Mrs. Doyle reside at 8949–A State Street, South Gate, where they lease a furnished apartment by the year. Congressman and Mrs. Doyle early purchased a suitable home for themselves at Arlington, Va., only 20 minutes by automobile, driving mostly along the beautiful Potomac River, from his home to his office on Capitol Hill in the New House Office Building, it being necessary for the Congressman to also have a home close by his Washington, D.C., office, as he is necessarily at the Nation's Capitol or working from the Nation's Capitol most of the time.

DOYLE ATTENDANCE ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Los Angeles Times, Tuesday, December 26, 1961, publicized that Congressman Clyde Doyle was 1 of only 3 California Congressmen and 1 of only 31 House Members with 100 percent voting records during the first session of the 87th Congress.

Speaker Sam Rayburn, twice as long the Speaker of the House of Representatives as any other man in the history of the U.S. Congress before his untimely decease wrote over his own signature about Congressman Clyde Doyle as follows:

"Clyde Doyle is one of the most effective men in his committees and also on the floor of the House of Representatives. He is able, he is honest, and he has the facility for expressing himself in such a way as to impress all the Members of the House with his knowledge of the subject in hand. I think Clyde is one of the very best men we have in the House of Representatives.

"We have shown our confidence in him in many ways."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle and I came to Congress together in the 79th Congress and formed a friendship that was a lasting one. I think it is an enviable thing that when a man passes on as has Clyde he leaves behind a reputation that no man can say he was ever injured by him or that he ever willingly injured any person. He was a Christian gentleman, a kindly, intelligent man, aggressive, and a loyal public servant. This Congress and the country will be the loser in his untimely passing.

Mrs. Miller and I extend to Mrs. Doyle and the family our sincerest sympathy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle was one of the finest friends I have ever had, one of the finest men I have ever known. I have known him well for 17 years. I have known him as a colleague in the House and on committee. I have known him as a great legislator. I have known him as the gentleman he was.

Clyde Doyle and I served together on the Select Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities in the 81st Congress, known as the Buchanan Committee. This was only a few years ago and Clyde's death reaffirms in my mind the frailty of life on this earth. I am now the sole surviving Democratic member of that committee.

Clyde Doyle had rare qualities. He was one of the fairest and most judicious men I have ever known. He insisted that the business of the House be handled according to the rules. He insisted on the rights of witnesses before committees.

He was soft spoken and gentle but inside this kind, considerate, and judicious man there was a deep resolve which, when principles were at stake, could be as hard and as resolute as steel.

There is an emptiness in this Chamber without Clyde Doyle. For 19 years he almost invariably sat in the same seat. He was practically always there by the table taking notes. He was perhaps the most attentive Member of the House. He kept personal notes day in and day out on the proceedings and activities of the House, putting down his own observations, his own comments, and establishing a chronology that could never be put into the official records of the House. Clyde had thousands of pages of notes. He often talked to me about this project. He had planned on his retirement to edit his papers and to put them into a usable form. This would have been an extraordinary document on the Congress. It would have been of extraordinary benefit to students. Those of us who participate in the day-to-day activities of this House know how difficult it is to get across the story of Congress. We know how cold and unconvinced even the best and most scholarly books on the subject generally leave us. In his notes Clyde has left a lasting memorial to the human side of the House, and an on-the-scene, day-to-day portrait of the type and character and skill of his colleagues, one by one. I hope that it will be possible for his priceless contribution to congressional history to be made available to Members, to schoolchildren, and to scholars interested in this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will excuse a personal reference. Shortly before the adjournment of the House last night, Clyde Doyle came to me and said he would like to have five extensions in the Congressional Record and asked if I would get the floor manager at the time of adjournment to obtain the order. I reached in my pocket and found that I had lost my pencil. He handed me this blue pencil and said, "I think the majority leader should be equipped with a pencil with the compliments of the gentleman from the 23d District of California." I thanked him and he said, "Here also is a red pencil which I use to indicate mistakes." This was my last conversation with Clyde Doyle. He may have made mistakes, but I would venture that his mistakes were as few as those of any among us. His attention to duty and detail, his respect for this House and for his colleagues, his character, his mind, his heart, combined to make his contribution a monument of public service. I was shocked beyond words to learn this morning of his passing. I have been told that he died in the calm serenity of sleep. What better evidence of a pure heart, of a noble character, or of a life fully and rightly lived do we need? He died composed and unafraid.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and his family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, my heart is very heavy today.

I have lost a good friend; the Congress has lost a very distinguished Member; and the Nation has lost a man who dedicated his life to the betterment of mankind.

Just yesterday, on the floor of this House, as we were debating issues that are vital to the security of our Nation, Mr. Doyle discussed with many of us some of the items that were in controversy. He wanted the Nation to have everything that was necessary for our defense.

On Monday, he spoke in behalf of the extension of the draft law. At that time he expressed concern about the number of young men who are physically disqualified from serving in the Armed Forces.

It seems somehow fitting that among Mr. Doyle's last official words on the floor of this House are words that demonstrated his sincere interest in the welfare of the young men of this Nation.

And now he has crossed to the other side of the river. The uncertainty of life was never more evident than in the sad news I received this morning concerning the loss of this fine man.

Mr. Doyle was a gentleman in every sense of the word, but more than that he was a Christian gentleman who was dedicated heart and soul to America.

He knew the cost of freedom, for he lost his only son in World War II. And his entire life was devoted to improving the lives of his fellow man and the American way of life.

He was a sincere man with a heart that overflowed with goodness; and a man who found time to be concerned for the oppressed and the downtrodden.

He was a man with a conscience and an unparalleled sense of integrity.

Mr. Doyle had been a member of the Armed Services Committee since the 81st Congress. During this period of time he successfully fulfilled all of the important duties that were assigned to him.

Every member of our Armed Forces has lost a champion.

On each of his letters, Mr. Doyle always put these words:

> Our beloved Nation deserves the best of whatever we are.

Mr. Doyle was an example of the best that the Nation has to offer.

I extend my sincerest sympathy to his family.

I hope they will be comforted in the knowledge that his contributions to the

Nation and to mankind will stand as a perpetual memorial to his accomplishments throughout the years that were allotted to him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. My dear friend, Clyde Doyle, was here yesterday; he is not with us today. It is most significant that yesterday a bill was acted upon and passed by this body that came out of the great Committee on Armed Services, of which he was a member for so many years. It can truly be said that Clyde died in the line of duty.

Clyde Doyle's memory will always live in the minds of those of us who knew him, whether in or out of Congress. No more dedicated Member ever served in the Congress of the United States than he. A great American, an outstanding legislator, a fine gentleman, Clyde Doyle was not only great but he was good. Possessed of an understanding mind, he symbolized everything that was noble, true, and fine in the life of humankind. How many times has he spoken to you and me who are here? And how often will we remember that fine sweet philosophical outlook of life that he had.

To me the most beautiful thing in the journey of life is to meet men and women with beautiful, good and understanding minds. Clyde Doyle possessed such a mind, an example that each and every one of us could follow.

He was a man who realized the dangers that confront our country in the world today, in this trying period of history. Clyde Doyle always stood for strength on the part of our Government. He recognized the evil mind and the intent of the Communists. He fought them with vigor. He recognized that the only force the Communists respect is what they fear—military strength and power on our part greater than the Soviet Union possesses. He recognized that the only level upon which negotiations could be had with the Soviet Union was on the level of the law of self-preservation; and every action, every thought, every voice on his part, every vote on his part concerning the national interest of our country and the improving of our position in the world was on the side of strength. How often has Clyde Doyle said to me:

> If I am going to err in judgment, I prefer to err on the side of strength, not weakness.

So while he is not with us today, the memory of Clyde Doyle will always linger in the minds of those who served with him.

To Mrs. Doyle and his daughter I extend my profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, this morning as I went to office the Capitol flag was at half-mast. A couple of words came to my mind: "Oh, no." I recognized that the half-masted flag indicated that another of our colleagues had passed to his reward.

I immediately called and learned it was my good, warm friend, Clyde Doyle.

This has left me, as it has many of his colleague in the House, with a heavy heart. I have had the privilege to serve with Clyde Doyle for many years. I got to know him well, not only as a man but as a legislator.

Clyde Doyle served as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, on which I have been privileged to serve. He was a truly diligent member, and always actively participated in the committee work. He was respected by his committee colleagues for his objective approach to all defense questions.

Clyde Doyle was a man outstanding in many respects—honorable, fair, just, and dependable—and, as has been said by the majority leader, he was a good man. That means so much when we really try to analyze what the word "good" means.

He was a great American, dedicated not only to his country but likewise to this House of Representatives which he loved. And the House of Representatives has had great affection for him. I looked upon him as a friend, and I am proud to have been Clyde Doyle's friend.

He leaves us at a time when men of his stature are needed in the Congress of the United States. He will be sorely missed, not only by those on the majority side but likewise by his many friends on this side of the aisle.

Only yesterday I had opportunity to visit with Clyde. I find it difficult to bring myself to the realization that he has now left us. I will miss him as you will.

I extend to his family my deepest sympathy, and in so doing I know I speak for each and every Member on this side of the aisle.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Shelley].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I first met Clyde Doyle in 1936, and from that personal meeting there grew a friendship which was warm and true. Clyde Doyle was all that everyone has said about him. He had fine qualities. He was a man with an understanding attitude; he was a man of forgiveness.

Clyde served as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities in this House, and I can recall several times when Clyde was attacked rather bitterly by those who opposed the committee and anyone connected with that committee.

At one particular time in southern California some years ago, I spoke to Clyde about this. He smiled and said, "Jack, they just do not understand. They are misguided."

I have never heard Clyde Doyle say an unkind word about those who attacked or disagreed with him. He was understanding, he was kind, he had real convictions. He was dedicated to his principles, to his family, and to his country.

It was my pleasure to consider Clyde Doyle as a friend.

All I can say now is, Let his example of life be a guide to all of us, and may his passing be a passage into the eternal life and perpetual peace.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Willis].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, we were shocked and dismayed with the loss of a distinguished public servant, a Member of this House, and for 12 years a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities—Clyde Doyle.

He was accustomed to close his letters with a most significant statement:

> Our beloved Nation deserves the best of whatever we are.

This was his philosophy and creed of living. I know no one of whom it could be more truthfully said that he gave his best to the service of his country.

In the many hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities in which I have participated with him, I have observed that he performed an incredible amount of work in preparation for the particular task ahead, that he was conscientious in the performance of his duties, and that he was kind and considerate. He never lost an opportunity to speak well of his native State, of which he has justly proud. As an able and effective legislator, and a colleague whose warmth of personality inspired all of those associated with him, he deserved and now receives, the plaudits of us all. He was truly a great and good man.

His life throughout has been an inspiration, and I am sure that to his wife and family his memory will ever remain as a benediction, and to them I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the issue of the Congressional Record which arrived in our offices this morning, there appeared an extension of remarks entered in the Record on yesterday.

In the mysterious ways of Providence, what was yesterday a routine incident today becomes a symbol and a remembrance of a distinguished and respected colleague, the Honorable Clyde Doyle.

In this particular insertion in the Record, our colleague from California included two resolutions supporting the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, of which Clyde had been a member for 12 years.

It was typical of Congressman Doyle's devotion to his Representative responsibilities and to the genuinely bipartisan character of his service on this committee that one of these resolutions had been adopted by the Downey Republican Women, Federated, and the other by Local Union 2058, United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO—both voicing full support of the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

As with his membership on the House Committee on Armed Services and all of his duties in this House, Congressman Doyle served capably, conscientiously, and devotedly.

Through my own association with Clyde on the House Un-American Activities Committee for more than 4 years, I know that he regarded this particular assignment as a stern, necessary and oft times distasteful duty. I suspect that by temperament it was extremely difficult for this friendly and kindly gentleman to accept the fact that there are men and women, nominally fellow citizens, dedicated to enmity to the United States and the American way of life, but Congressman Doyle accepted his responsibility without flinching, and I recall more than one occasion in which he severely and yet gently chided hostile and recalcitrant witnesses for accepting the benefits of citizenship and even invoking the protections of the Constitution while joining in the conspiracy seeking the violent overthrow of our Government.

I have been privileged to work particularly closely with Congressman Doyle as ranking minority member of the committee during the past few weeks when he was serving as its acting chairman. In this relationship he was always the soul of considerateness and courtesy. I am profoundly shocked and deeply grieved that he has so suddenly left us. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and the other members of his family and to his colleagues in the California delegation.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and this House have suffered another irreparable loss in the passing last night in his sleep of Clyde Doyle, our distinguished colleague from California. It was my privilege to serve with him since his assignment to the Committee on Armed Services and to break bread with him often.

In the intimacy of these associations I came to value deeply his friendship and endeavored to extend unhesitatingly my friendship to him.

Mr. Speaker, Clyde was a brave man. He had successfully fought off the effects of a serious illness recently and he did this without a word of complaint and with a determination which will always be an inspiration to those of us who had the privilege to know him.

Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle was a man who lived his daily life with a deep faith, ready to face his Maker.

My deepest and sincerest sympathy goes out to his family, to the countless friends who kept him in the Congress over these many years, and to the Members of his distinguished congressional delegation.

Clyde was a man who, as the gentleman has just said, placed the love of his country above his personal health. He was too busy in the pursuit of safeguarding the Nation's interests, that it is no wonder his health at last failed. Like a true soldier, he dedicated his life to his country. Those of us who have served with him will long cherish his memory.

Clyde Doyle was too busy with life's problems to realize—as Tennyson says—that:

Such a tide as moving seems asleep,
 Too full for sound and foam,
When that which drew out the boundless deep
 Turns again home.

My colleagues, Clyde Doyle has gone home.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow and shock that I learned of the sudden death of our colleague and my warm, personal friend, Clyde Doyle. He was a valued colleague and an effective and highly esteemed member of the California delegation. I shall miss him not only as a Member of this body, but as a good friend and a devout Christian who inspired others to become better disciples of Christianity.

Clyde Doyle was one of the kindest persons I have ever known; I never heard him make an unkind remark about anyone. As a legislator, he was extremely capable and was a hard and productive worker. He was a most conscientious Representative for the 23d District of California and kept in constant touch with his constituents by sending them personal messages. During his years in Congress, he must have sent thousands of these handwritten messages on cards and I know they will be greatly missed by the people of his district.

The Congress and the Nation have lost a truly patriotic and dedicated servant in the death of Clyde Doyle. Along with his many other friends, I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and family. I hope they will take some small consolation from knowing in what high regard we all held him, and that their grief is shared by each and everyone of us.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Horan].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege of serving with Clyde Doyle since the 79th Congress and I knew him well.

His life here among us was a benchmark of conduct, something for us all to remember when we may be soul searching regarding the ethics that should accompany personalities and actions of Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, he was kind, his integrity was beyond reproach, he was industrious. He worked for the best interests of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle had real vision.

Mrs. Horan and I join my colleagues here and Clyde's friends everywhere in extending our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and their daughter.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle was a man of many parts. He was also a man of great human insight. I will explain by telling something that he did a few years ago. A young boy from my area had come here as a page. One day this lad was walking through the tunnel and our colleage met him. Unbeknown to me, he sat down and wrote the mother of this boy one of the most thoughtful letters that I had ever had the privilege of reading.

This was reassuring to this lady. All of us have had some experience, I am sure, with youngsters who come here as page boys, some of them very young. The mothers are concerned and worried about them. Clyde had the human instinct of understanding just that sort of thing.

The lady who received that letter was so pleased that when she came to Washington to see her son, the first person she wanted to see was, of course, Congressman Clyde Doyle.

He was very active in so many fields of service; I am certain many of them have been mentioned. He worked with the Boy Scouts and other youth organizations. He had time enough to raise money to help crippled children and retarded children and join in the campaigns against diseases such as tuberculosis. He worked on recreational programs. He was active in his professional associations, such as the bar association and related legal activities. In addition to that he served as a member of a draft board. He found time for all kinds of things which meant that he gave of himself to other people.

The distinguished majority leader mentioned the meticulous diary which he kept here day by day. I used to sit by him sometimes and take a look at what he was putting down. All of us know the value of that sort of thing. My wife has called my attention to a series of articles which has been running in the Washington Post, I think, written by the wife of a distinguished former Member of this body who served here over 50 years ago. I have been reading that series because this lady recounts events about Members and their families which are so similar to events which occur today. I hope that this meticulously kept diary which Clyde Doyle kept will become a part of the history of this body and the history of our great country.

I know all of us join in extending sympathy to his loved ones. Someone has said that in the knowledge that "to live in hearts we leave behind, is not to die at all." I think that best describes our distinguished former colleague.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Gary].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle was a fine Christian gentleman. I know no one who better exemplified the teachings of the Master; and when you say that you have said all that can be said about any man, you have given to him the highest accolade of praise.

It was my privilege, only a month or two ago, to serve on a committee that nominated Clyde as vice president of our Thursday morning breakfast prayer group. He served in that group for many years with great distinction. He was a valuable member. This morning it was to attend the meeting of that group that his wife went to arouse him when she found that he had passed on.

May I say that his passing was in keeping with the even tenor of his life. I am certain that he was welcomed with the loud hosannas of the angelic choir as he passed through the portals this morning to that undiscovered land from whose bourne no traveler returns.

I pay my highest respect to him at this time and extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Hardy].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have enjoyed any intimate association with Clyde Doyle have had our lives enriched by that association. For a number of years I have been privileged to sit next to Clyde on the Committee on Armed Services. I think I have never known a man so considerate, so understanding and so kind. One of the highlights of my service in this Congress is that I have been privileged to look upon Clyde as a friend. He was a man of big heart, the kindest person I have ever known. Truly he was one of God's noblemen.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the news of Clyde Doyle's death leaves me personally stunned. Clyde is the second member of the California delegation with whom I have had a close and affectionate association to be taken from us during my time in this great body.

Upon arrival in the Congress in 1959 I was assigned to room 1028 in the New House Office Building, just two doors away from the office of Clyde Doyle. Because of our many common problems affecting the welfare of our State, we soon became very close personal friends. Our association was enriched in many other ways, through other activities in which we jointly participated, but particularly on the great House Committee on Armed Services on which we both served.

In the course of our friendship he treated me with the dignity and the respect of a peer and a colleague, but also with the sternness and the gentle affection of a father for his son.

Clyde was truly a gentleman. He was a gentle and a tender man. He was a man who, having lost a hero son, knew the agony of great personal loss and the heartsickness that accompanies it. In his quiet and effective way he too gave his own life for his country through his devoted service.

Clyde will be long remembered by all of us who loved him and had the privilege of serving with him. Mrs. Cohelan and I extend our deepest sympathies to his wife, daughter, and grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be appropriate at this point to read two poems which were particular favorites of Clyde's. The first, "A Congressman's Daily Prayer," was written by Clyde and his wife Lydia for their 1959 Christmas greeting. The second was written by Lydia Doyle for the 1962 Christmas season:

A Congressman's Daily Prayer

(By Congressman Clyde and Lydia Doyle)

As each new day, need of rededication, by me, brings
Give me, dear Lord,
An understanding heart for all mankind,
Clear thinking, to find the essential good,
Purpose, to find true goals, for lasting values,
Honesty, to hold and do what's right in Thy sight.
Humility, to know my weakness and mistakes,
Strength, to meet the increasing daily demands,
Recognition, to see the worth of a colleague's sincere plan.
Cooperation, with all who share this drive,
Confidence, to always press forward when the cause is just.
Independence, if needs be to stand alone, when my conscience says, "I must."
Gratitude, for this great privilege to serve my country and the world.
Spiritual, awareness of our Nation's pledge
"In God we trust."
And so, dear Lord,
I thank Thee for the bountiful blessing I and my loved ones have received
These dozen years and more that I have served in Congress.
I pledge, with grateful heart, my loyal service, that
Thy will shall come to pass
On earth as it is in heaven
And that
Enduring peace shall rule the hearts and deeds of all mankind.

Christmas 1962

(By Lydia Yeomans Doyle)

It's not the gifts; it's not the bustle;
It's not the excitement; nor is it the rustle
Of tissue, tinsel, and trappings;
It's not the mystery of folks about you.
But it is the belonging, the caring and sharing;
All the glad fellowship that fills the air.
It's the feeling of oneness, the spirit outreaching
For God is my Father, all men my brothers.
And Christmas means loving.
One day is a symbol;
But love is a blessing that lasts through the years.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith].

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have lost a close personal friend in the passing of Clyde Doyle. I wish to associate myself with all the fine remarks that have been made here today in tribute to the memory of Mr. Doyle, and to say that I know of no individual that I have known over the years I have known Mr. Doyle who is more deserving of these fine remarks that have been made here in tribute to his memory.

I first met Clyde some years ago, long before I came to Congress, in connection with some legal matters we had to discuss in California. At that time as a member of the bar I learned of the high respect and esteem the attorneys and the judges and the Bar Association of Los Angeles had for Mr. Doyle. Then when I came back here we became closer friends.

I certainly agree that there is no more able, honest, and pleasant individual that I have had the pleasure of associating with here than Clyde Doyle. He was well respected in California as he was in this body. He was esteemed as a great American because of the wonderful work he has done as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

As my colleagues, the gentlemen from California [Mr. Shelley and Mr. Sisk], and others have said, I have never heard Clyde Doyle make an unfriendly remark against a colleague or anyone else during the time I have known him. We have lost a fine colleague and an able Member of the House of Representatives.

Mrs. Smith joins me in expressing our sincere sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and their daughter.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret and sorrow that I rise to join in paying tribute to my late friend and colleague, Clyde Doyle, of California, a member of our Committee on Armed Services. It is difficult for me to realize he has left us because only yesterday when we were debating the legislation from our committee, Clyde was sitting in his accustomed seat alongside the table, and although the position which I took and the position which he took were different, I had occasion to consult with him several times during the day, and his advice and counsel were most helpful and were always given in a kindly and considerate way. In this sense his participation yesterday on his last day of service here was, I think, typical of the service he has always given in this body, a service which was devoted, a service which was informed, a service which was dedicated in its application to the questions before the House, and yet a service which was always rendered with kindly consideration and with a respect for the views and opinions of the other person.

The distinguished majority whip has referred to Clyde Doyle's diary. I had occasion yesterday to notice some of the insertions that he was making in it as the debate progressed. I would certainly agree with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] that it would be a great addition to the history of this body in the days to come if that diary could be published so that the American people might follow the deliberations of this body as seen through the eyes of the gentleman from California [Mr. Doyle].

I remember an example of the devotion and kindliness which have been referred to here so often today, when I first came to this body as a freshman Member. I remember Congressman Doyle taking several of us aside behind the rail and spending 10 or 15 minutes to describe to us some of the traditions of the House of Representatives and to counsel and to advise us as to how we might become effective legislators. It was a great thrill to me shortly thereafter to be assigned to the Committee on Armed Services where he was already a distinguished member and to be able to work with him on the measures relating to our national security.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Johansen] has already referred to the fact that although Congressman Doyle was a kindly and friendly person, he was nevertheless a very effective legislator. I recall serving on a subcommittee of which he was chairman. He proved himself to be a very effective, a very precise, and a very determined interrogator of witnesses before our committee, and he came up with a report that solved a complex and highly complicated question. In the same fashion Clyde Doyle served his country and this Congress as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Anyone who knew Clyde Doyle would know it was possible to hate communism with a deadly hatred, and to be devoted to exposing the Communist philosophy and the Communist conspiracy in every possible way, while at the same time respecting the rights and the freedoms of those individuals who might be appearing before that committee. If there ever was a man who leaned over backward to be kindly and considerate to all that man was Clyde Doyle. Certainly, he embodied the combination of a determination to root out both Communist and Fascist philosophies with that fundamental sense of fairness which is so much a part of our American heritage.

Reference has already been made to the fact that he lost a son in the last war and that that fact always was in his heart and in a very real way inspired much of his activity. Certainly we can regard his service to the country in this body and his quiet passing while he was still serving here, as typical of the same kind of dedicated service and the same kind of patriotic sacrifice for one's country that had been represented by his own son.

We who are in this body, could well be proud if our service here could ever in some small way match the dedication and devotion embodied by Clyde Doyle. Of him it can well and truly be said: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; enter thou now into the glory of thy Lord."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gavin].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that we record the passing of our very good friend and colleague, Clyde Doyle, of California.

I counted Clyde as my very dear friend. He was very conscientious in his work, deeply interested in all things that concerned the welfare of his State and Nation.

His lines of friendship extended to all elements of our social life. He was a man who contributed much to the life of the area in which he lived and the great State of California which he represented.

His service in the Congress won him deep respect and the great admiration and commendation of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

He was a very kindly, friendly man, always glad to see one, and always pleased when any act or deed of his added to the enrichment of our lives.

He had the highest concepts of citizenship; a firm believer in our American way of life with deep faith in the principles and ideals of our Government. It can be said of him that he was an outstanding Member of Congress and a great American.

In all his actions he moved with ease and courtesy and respected in others the qualities he possessed himself—sincerity of conviction and frankness of expression.

So today it is with a feeling of great sorrow that we in the House, who were privileged to serve with him, record his passing.

I shall always remember him for his many acts of kindness that indicated his friendship and good will toward me and all the Members of the House. I considered him one of my best friends.

I extend to his family my deepest and most sincere sympathy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Gubser].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a kinder man than Clyde Doyle has never lived, nor has one been more deeply respected.

The dictionary defines wisdom as "ability to judge soundly on facts as they relate to life."

Clyde Doyle was, then, the very essence of wisdom. His knowledge was great, and it was greater because he related it to life. Clyde Doyle loved life and he loved his fellow men. His every action, his total conduct, showed deep affection for humanity.

I was privileged to serve under his chairmanship on the Subcommittee To Investigate Military Discharges. Clyde Doyle's principle concern throughout those lengthy and exhaustive hearings was for the young man who was drafted at an early and tender age, committed an indiscretion and would be forced throughout his lifetime to endure the stigma of an undesirable discharge and the economic problems which go with it. Clyde Doyle's recommendations represented a wise compromise between the necessarily rigid requirements of military discipline and a delicate understanding of human frailty and dignity.

Clyde Doyle was sincerely dedicated to the service of his country. He viewed every issue with an open mind and in an entirely unbiased manner. He was always ready to listen to a colleague and give his advice when it was sought, and his advice invariably proved to be the course of wisdom. To me, Clyde Doyle was a perfect symbol of goodness, honesty, and fairness.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, while it would be difficult if not impossible to add anything to the tributes that have been expressed here today, I cannot let this opportunity pass without paying my respects to the man whom I have known for the last 14 years.

When I came to Congress, Clyde Doyle and I had a mutual friend, a former Missourian, who at that time was a client of his. It was through this mutual acquaintance that we became friends. This friendship and close association has grown throughout the years.

As has been stated before, we knew Clyde Doyle as a Christian gentleman, a man who was not only kind but most considerate. It has been said previously, but it will bear repeating; he is one of the few men I know of that I never heard say an unkind thing of another individual. He was a forgiving man, and as a previous speaker said, his interest in trying to be helpful to those who were in distress has been evidenced on many occasions.

As Clyde and I discussed the operation of Congress, many times he referred to the notes he made from day to day. I often told him that some day his notes would reflect what had actually happened here in Congress. As he and I discussed this matter, I always contended that our Congressional Record is not a true reflection of what actually occurs in the House, with the extensions, the revisions, the expunging, and the various changes that take place. But in those notes that Clyde Doyle made I think he reflects what actually happened here. He has recorded the important events, as well as some of the trivialities that have made this body the interesting forum which it has become. I would commend the suggestion of our majority leader, our majority whip and others who have indicated they would like to see a record made, for posterity to enjoy from the remarks that Clyde Doyle had recorded in those notes of his.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I say that in the loss of Clyde Doyle this House has lost one of its most valuable Members; his district has lost a conscientious, hard working and understanding Representative whose value I think was known to the people there, as indicated by the results of the last election. He told me that in the last election he received the largest majority he had ever received.

Mrs. Jones and I join in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Doyle, her daughter, and grandchildren, who have lost a kind father and grandfather whose memory will be kindly cherished throughout the years by all who were privileged to know Clyde Doyle.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Schadeberg].

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the news of the death of Clyde Doyle came to me as a shock as I listened to my radio on the way to my office this morning.

While it was not my privilege to have known Mr. Doyle over the years, our association with each other as members of the Committee on Un-American Activities gave me a profound insight into the character and spirit of this great American who was dedicated to the service of his people and the cause of freedom.

Beneath the calm exterior of genuine and warm humility was a child of God who knew the meaning of love for his fellow man; who had concern for the principles of justice and decency; respect for the dignity and rights of all men; and who possessed an unwavering determination to do what was right as God gave him to see and know that right.

He was kind to his colleagues and associates. He was kind to those he felt impelled by conviction to oppose.

I have been with him in hearings in which he displayed compassion and patience to witnesses that characterized maturity in judgment and character befitting of the true patriot and man of faith. Many times his compassion was returned by vituperation and contempt of the meanest sort. Yet uncouth men could not soil his dignity and stature.

I do not know the denomination of the church to which Mr. Doyle gave his loyalty and support. I suspect that it was secondary to the fact that he felt impelled to make his testimony as first of all a child of God. Indicative of his sincerity is this incident I relate to you which I am sure he never intended I should speak to others as being unusual or in any way a support of his own faith.

He told me shortly after I arrived in Congress that he tried to be present for the opening of the sessions of the House because he felt the need for the prayers offered by our good Chaplain. Mr. Doyle was present with regularity. Today's opening of this session was marked by his absence. Yet in a truer sense he was with us and will be with us to inspire each of us to greater dedication and to acceptance of our responsibilities as those entrusted with the sacred task of representing freemen.

It is impossible for me to say any profound words in his behalf. Nothing I could say on this floor today could add to the high esteem in which he was held by those who knew him intimately nor detract from the man who so nobly served among us. He has spoken with his own life in words more beautiful and meaningful than could come from the lips of those who were recipients of his friendship but could not comprehend the depth of character that made him so beloved.

This was his faith, expressed in the words of John Lickey McCreery:

There Is No Death

(By John Lickey McCreery)

There is no death! The stars go down
  To rise upon some other shore
And bright in heaven's jeweled crown
  They shine forevermore.

There is no death! The dust we tread
  Shall change beneath the summer showers
To golden grain, or mellow fruit,
  Or rainbow-tinted flowers.

There is no death! An angel form
  Walks o'er the earth with silent tread;
He bares our best loved ones away,
  And then we call them "dead."

Born unto that undying life,
  They leave us but to come again;
With joy we welcome them—the same
  Except in sin and pain.

And ever near us, though unseen
  The dear immortal spirit tread;
For all the boundless universe
  Is life—there are no dead!

May God richly bless the bereaved members of his family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Baldwin].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, as has been mentioned earlier, Clyde Doyle this year, at the beginning of this session of Congress, was elected vice president of the Thursday Morning House Prayer Breakfast Club. The fact that he was unanimously elected to that position by the 40 or 50 House Members who are in regular attendance at that Thursday morning breakfast meeting is an indication of the great trust that those Members placed in Clyde Doyle. He was a man of deep religious and moral convictions and a man of deep compassion. The people throughout the country look to the Members of Congress to provide leadership, to provide guidance for their youngsters to follow. In Clyde Doyle they had a person who met that test from every standpoint, and I am sure the high school and grammar school youngsters in his district who had occasion to meet Clyde Doyle or to know of his background and of his moral convictions could certainly pick him as a model and their parents would be proud of that decision. Those of us who came to Congress from California, as members of the California delegation, found that Clyde Doyle was one to whom we would automatically look for guidance. He was a man who gave equal guidance to people on this side of the aisle as well as on that side of the aisle, because to him there was no aisle.

There was in his view just what was right and what was wrong. He fought for what was right according to the high standards that he set for himself. Yet at the same time, despite those high standards, he did not look down on any man or any woman. He shared their problems with them and tried to work with them in solving these problems.

Mr. Speaker, my wife joins with me in extending our deepest sympathy to his widow and his family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rogers].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, we were all saddened with the passing of our colleague, Clyde Doyle.

It was not my privilege to serve with our distinguished Member on any committee. But shortly after I came to Congress I learned to know Clyde Doyle. He was typical of those from the West who have an open hand, a smiling and understanding manner. He was a humble man and he expressed himself for the benefit of all mankind.

Throughout his lifetime he had the privilege of visiting and living in my area. We discussed those times, we reminisced of the West and what contributions he had made. We understand and know that he was sympathetic to those ex-servicemen whom he felt had gotten a bad break in their lifetime.

Clyde Doyle knew many of my good friends in the congressional district which it is my privilege to represent. Each time that we adjourned and Congress reconvened Clyde Doyle always asked about his friends. He wanted to know how they were doing. That was the spirit of Clyde Doyle.

Mr. Speaker, we shall miss him in the coming years as he has contributed so much to this Nation, its patriotism and its well-being as a good American citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and the family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Chenoweth].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked and saddened this morning when I learned of the passing of our beloved colleague, Clyde Doyle. I had visited with him just a couple of days ago and he appeared to be in excellent health. I want to join in paying tribute to his memory. I also wish to extend my sympathy to our colleagues from California in this great loss which they have sustained.

Mr. Speaker, California has not alone sustained this loss, but the entire nation has suffered an irreparable loss. All of us are going to greatly miss Clyde and his cordial greetings.

Mr. Speaker, I have never known a more conscientious Member of this House or a harder worker than Clyde Doyle. He was anxious to serve his country to the utmost of his ability. I know it was a matter of great personal concern to him as to whether or not he was fully and adequately discharging his duties and responsibilities as a Member of this House.

We had mutual friends in Colorado, and we used to talk about them frequently. In fact, I seldom met Clyde without stopping for a visit.

I recall the strenuous efforts he made to get a bill passed which would assist those who had received military discharges which were other than honorable. Clyde felt that an injustice was being done in many of these cases, and that we owed these boys the obligation of trying to correct these discharges. I discussed this legislation with him many times and this was a matter close to his heart.

Mr. Speaker, I called upon Clyde for a personal favor not so long ago. He went out of his way to help me in a matter which meant nothing whatever to him or to his district. Clyde was a true Christian, and was always happy to extend a helping hand to others.

Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle was a faithful public servant and served his people well. It was a great privilege to have him as a friend and to work with him over the years. Mrs. Chenoweth joins with me in extending our sincere sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and the other members of the family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. McFall].

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, all of us have lost a fine friend in Clyde Doyle. Our country and the people of his district have lost an extraordinary Representative. Missing from the seat he always occupied will be one of the finest examples of what a Member should be and should do. He leaves a standard of ability, honesty, kindness, and gentleness for all of us to live by. As he certainly would have wished, he was with us, working for his beloved country until the very end, an end that came as gently and as easily and with the same dignity that he had lived his life. His customary chair is empty but we know he

now occupies another chair of honor alongside his Maker.

My wife joins me and all of his many friends in extending to his wonderful wife and family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. O'Hara].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my life has been enriched by my friendship with Clyde Doyle. When over the radio this morning I heard of his passing I was shocked and grieved.

I have listened to the tributes paid Clyde Doyle in this Chamber today and in every utterance has been a marked sincerity and the reflection of deep personal grief. To us all Clyde Doyle stood for the personification of the spirit of self-abnegation. We all sensed that he was never thinking of himself, but always of his mission on earth as he saw it and of his service to his God, his country, and his fellow man.

I do not think that Clyde Doyle ever thought a harsh or evil thing of another human being. Always he practiced charity and understanding. A year or two ago the committee on which he served, the Committee on Un-American Activities, had commissioned him to revise its rules. Clyde Doyle came to me several times as he did to others of his colleagues, saying, "Please go over this draft; if you can make any further suggestion to insure absolute fairness please give me that suggestion." I know how earnestly and conscientiously he worked on that task.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expression of deepest sympathy to his fine wife and to his daughter—and we all remember the great grief that was his and theirs when he lost his only son in World War II—and I wish also to join in expressing the faith that the soul of Clyde Doyle is now reunited with the Master whom he served with obedience, in thought and in deed, every day, every hour of his sojourn on earth. I can say no more. I am bowed with the grief that possesses me. This House has lost one of the noblest characters that ever served within its historic walls.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pirnie].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the tributes to which we have listened today have certainly come from the heart. The sudden death of our distinguished colleague from California is most assuredly a distinct loss to this House and the Nation.

As a fellow members of the Committee on Armed Services it has been my privilege to work with this fine man on a day-to-day basis and to observe at first hand his true character and ability.

Clyde Doyle served his district with complete dedication, bringing to his work a deep sense of personal concern. We affectionately recall his gentle manner, always expressive of a sincere consideration of others. His faithful attendance record is well known and attests his complete devotion to his task. Few Members have felt more keenly the responsibility which is ours in the Congress. He was proud of the trust placed in him by his people and he never betrayed that trust.

These fine qualities of mind and heart assure that this modest, kindly, and able public servant will be long and affectionately remembered. We extend to his fine family our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen].

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the House is indeed in sorrow today. We have suffered a great loss. Clyde Doyle genuinely loved his fellow man. I think that every man has experienced, the same as I, Clyde Doyle's extending a favor without even being asked. He loved so well that he wanted me to share his friends, so he would write those whom he knew in Montana and he wrote me copies to inform me of his writing them so that I would become acquainted with and share his dear friends who live in my State.

He not only would not hurt anyone, but no one ever heard him say an unkind thing of anyone. Clyde Doyle had a kind and generous word about everyone of whom he spoke. There was once an occasion when I said in his presence an unkind word about another man whom he knew. He did not rebuke me but he corrected me. He gave me an example of how to get along better, and I think he gave all the Members that kind of example. He would go the extra mile for everyone. He gave of himself always.

I liken him to Peter the Apostle. "Silver and gold have I none, but I give what I have. I give myself." Clyde Doyle did better than that, because what little silver and gold he had he shared that, too. He was so very Christian. He pleasantly forgave. He exhibited his forgiveness from a generous heart, a happy heart, and it was exhibited by his glowing, friendly countenance. Clyde is one of God's own, and he has gone home.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, we have all lost a true friend in the passing of Clyde Doyle. I was perhaps one of the last of our colleagues to visit with Clyde. We sat together at the same table with Mrs. Doyle last night at the American Legion banquet. He told us of his plans to celebrate his 50th wedding anniversary next year and of his future plans for the House prayer breakfast.

I left the table about 10 o'clock. There was no indication whatsoever of the possibility of his being called to leave on an earlier schedule. I left the table with the remark, "I'll see you at breakfast in the morning," and his cheery reply was, "I'll be there."

Clyde Doyle as a man, a husband, a father, and a colleague was a dedicated Christian gentleman in every sense of the word. Mrs. Younger joins me in expressing our deep sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and their family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Flynt].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from California in this tribute to the memory of a beloved friend, and an outstanding Member of this body, the Honorable Clyde Doyle, late a Representative from the State of California. With a feeling of profound sorrow and sadness this morning we heard the news of his untimely passing. Clyde Doyle was, indeed, an outstanding Member of this body. He was also a great American. He ably represented his State and district for nine terms.

It is particularly significant that our colleague, Clyde Doyle, was present on the floor of the House on yesterday during the proceedings in this body. His attendance record was one of which any Member would well be proud. He was present and cast his vote on the last rollcall taken in this body during his lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, it is equally significant that his plans for today would have included attendance at the regular Thursday morning prayer breakfast participated in by Members of the House of Representatives.

Clyde Doyle was by some standards what might have been termed a quiet man. Notwithstanding his quietness and serenity, he possessed a truly dynamic personality.

Clyde Doyle was an able Representative. He was a truly great and patriotic American. He was a real man in the finest sense of that word. He was also a Christian gentleman. His life was an inspiration to all who were privileged to come in contact with him, to know him, and to be associated with him, and to love him.

This body in which he served, his Nation and the State that he represented are better because of his participation and the contributions he made during a long and useful life.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Flynt and our family join in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and other members of his family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Utt].

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, once again one of our friends and colleagues has crossed the river that marks the boundary of that unknown shore. Clyde Doyle and I were very closely associated for more than 20 years before either one of us came to the Congress of the United States. He like myself was a native son of California. We shared many experiences and pleasures together. He truly was one of God's noblemen. He was sincere, he was honest, he was dedicated. I know that he will be happy in the reward to which he has gone. We had a very close relationship in the Congress and although we may have differed from time to time, there never was a time that that disagreement was not a reasonable disagreement and one which always had a happy ending.

Mrs. Utt joins me in extending to his wife and family our deepest sympathy.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Libonati].

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, the death of Clyde Doyle closed the career of a person who in his simplicity of understanding contributed much to the appreciation of those dedicated practices which many men feel through Americanism, a basic understanding of the common American in his acceptance of his patriotic devotion to his country.

Clyde Doyle was not an exhibitionist. We all know that he served on a committee that probably covers the most delicate area within which a legislative body can operate. Never has he personally been criticized for any practice on that committee; and it was a most difficult committee on which to serve. His service on that and other committees has contributed much to the acceptance of the procedures of the House of Representatives.

Clyde Doyle as a lawyer never placed his legal and professional abilities beyond the scope of human liberty. Clyde Doyle was a patriot because of the fact that he understood the force of Americanism that has contributed to the welfare of his fellow men. His service on the Subversives Committee, of which he was a member for so many years, indicated to him the purposes of the committee within the limitation of the legislative exactments of this body.

Clyde Doyle in his private life, in his civic life, stood up for and expounded the religious principles in which he believed and was active in his church, and was active at all times in combating and exposing the teachings of communism.

Few men in their lifetime have accumulated the thanks, the honor, and the respect that Clyde Doyle has in his native State of California. His civic activities brought him in contact with the most unfortunate, also with the youth and with the underprivileged. He actively participated in programs looking to the betterment and amelioration of the lot of unfortunate human beings. No greater service can a man give than to direct the destinies of the young, to bring to them an understanding of life's problems so they may be able to cope with the exigencies and necessities of life as it unfolds before them and lead them to an honorable manhood and womanhood. That is the service that Clyde Doyle gave to his fellow Americans in their youth in his community. He gracefully accepted the civic responsibilities that fall upon the man in public life, and the way he carried out those principles and responsibilities marks him as a man of possessive mind.

I am proud to have been associated with him, especially in the breakfast group. It was there we could appreciate his breadth of mind and his philosophy as reflected in his interpretation of Biblical quotations which stamp him as a man whom all Christians can respect. We know that he himself derived benefits from his reflection and study that made him a happy man in life.

To his lovely wife Lydia, to his daughter Dorothy, and to his grandsons, Dan-Doyle Stanton and Clyde Douglas, we extend our heartfelt sympathy. And I dedicate to his memory this poem:

The winds of fate have blown away
A kindly soul whose words did sway
In Halls of Congress e'en today
Those who treasure the American way.

To his family and friends in life I say that every member of the Illinois delegation extends his condolence on this sad day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer].

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, my life also has been enriched by the friendship of Clyde Doyle. Ours was a true friendship which, unlike that of many of you, began in adversity in 1950, when Clyde Doyle and I contested each other as the candidates of our respective parties for election to Congress from California's then 18th district. It was a spirited campaign, a campaign which brought us together on the same platform in personal combat, so to speak, on numerous occasions. On each of those occasions I found that I came off best, not because I won the arguments, far from that, but because Clyde Doyle gave me a little of himself on each occasion and taught me a little more of the way of true Americanism, true patriotism, devotion, and dedication, both to humanity and to our country.

At the end of that contest the score was close, a difference of some 1,850 votes out of 200,000. I stayed in California. Clyde came back to Washington again.

Two years later, following the 1950 reapportionment, the old 18th Congressional District of California became two new districts, one the 18th and the other the district which Clyde always and fondly referred to as "California's Great 23d District."

When I came to Congress in 1953, Clyde welcomed me as a brother and as a friend. He was as kind, helpful, and considerate as anyone could possibly be to a freshman Member of this Congress. But that kind of feeling toward one of his fellows, his helpfulness and consideration did not cease after a few months. It continued with me just as it has with each of our colleagues down through the years. I know that each and every one of us, and the thousands of people from every walk of life who knew, loved, and respected him, feels not only his own keen personal sense of loss and deprivation by Clyde's quiet passing, but also seeks to share the burden of greater loss that inescapably must bear so heavily upon his lovely widow, Lydia, and the surviving members of his family.

All of us today, I believe, can give thanks that we have been privileged to have been associated with Clyde Doyle, a man who loved and revered Abraham Lincoln and who strived in every way, during every day to emulate the fine qualities of that great American President.

My family joins me in this expression of our deep sense of loss, and our most reverent condolences to Mrs. Doyle and Clyde's family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Matthews].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in expressing sadness because of the passing of our beloved friend, Clyde Doyle.

References have already been made to his activities in connection with our weekly prayer meeting. I remember so well a talk he made to us some months ago in our prayer meeting. The challenge of that talk was a personal challenge to himself to live according of the tenets of Christianity. He in his successful efforts to lead a life of personal piety reminded me so much of another departed Christian colleague, the Honorable Percy Priest, of Tennessee.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, that Clyde Doyle, and men like Percy Priest, have inspired me since I have been in the Congress to endeavor to lead a life in accordance with high religious principles. I know of no man in the Congress who strived more successfully for personal piety than did Clyde Doyle. There was no sophistry in his makeup; there was no arrogance in his demeanor; there was no hatred in his heart. He was gentle; he was kind. The poet has said the evil that men do lives after them and that the good is often interred with their bones. I believe there was no evil in this man Clyde Doyle, and I believe we shall remember him only because of his noble personality. Each year in the House we have a debate on the activities of our committees. We hear comments, frequently critical, for example, of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. And, I remember time and time again I have said, in conversations with people, that if the citizens of America knew Clyde Doyle, who serves on the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I do not see how they could fail to have the high confidence in that committee that I personally do. He was fair; he was honorable in every decision that he made. I think in our democracy that it is not enough for men to be free and to be educated, but they must be good men, and of all of my colleagues in the Congress, I know of no one who was better than Clyde Doyle. He was a good man.

We, in Florida, Mr. Speaker, extend to the great State of California our profound sympathy because of your loss, and we pray that the blessings of divine providence be with the loved ones of our departed friend.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Bell].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, there is very little that I can add to what has already been said so sincerely and effectively about my good friend, Clyde Doyle. However, at the expense of being repetitious I would like to make a few comments about him.

Besides being an outstanding legislator, Clyde Doyle was a very friendly and understanding human being. Coming from my home State of California, Clyde's sincere affection for all Members extended across party lines. When I first arrived here in Washington in my freshman term, to meet the problems of a new life, Clyde Doyle was one of the first of my colleagues to put out a friendly hand. He was always ready and willing to answer my or any other new Member's questions and to make suggestions that would be helpful. He continued this very kind and sincere approach not only to all the Members, but

to the many problems that confront the House. Clyde always seemed to prefer the friendly, nonpartisan method of solving our problems.

My wife's and my heart go out to Clyde Doyle's family in their bereavement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I shall attempt to make the balance of my life better because Clyde Doyle lived.

It was reassuring to me, when I came here 2 years ago—my first term in this great and august body—to find this man, whenever I came to the opening of the House, here in his accustomed place. Then, at our Thursday morning prayer breakfast group it was further reassuring when on one occasion as our speaker, to have a witness for Christ stand before us, and, as that witness bare his heart and with tears streaming down his cheeks, to remind us that his trust was in God. I thought as I listened to him that if each of us, the 435 Members of this House, would be here when our Chaplain opened this great body's deliberations with prayer, what a great force it would be in the free world. Since his admonition to us of the Thursday morning prayer breakfast group that he needed to be here in the Chamber to get his strength for the day by the inspiration that comes from the words of the Chaplain, I have tried as diligently as possible to likewise be here on the opening of our sessions.

Mr. Speaker, he was a man who made one feel greater than he. This was a real heartening and reassuring attribute for another to greet one in this manner, especially as one who is in his first term in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, only last Thursday morning we were sitting by each other. I was given the privilege to give the talk at the prayer breakfast. In my presentation I related a saying among the Indian-Americans that went something like this:

> Great Spirit, grant that I may not criticize my neighbor until I have walked a mile in his moccasins.

Mr. Speaker, I think that statement could have been authored by our departed colleague, Clyde Doyle. Only yesterday he said, "I will see you tomorrow at the prayer breakfast." As I was dressing this morning, one of the things to which I looked forward was to be with him. Then while listening to the radio and TV it was announced that he had gone to join his fathers.

Mr. Speaker, last Thursday morning as he was with the rest of us paying for our breakfast, he pulled out some bright, shiny Lincoln head pennies. He said, "Ben, these are brandnew pennies that I got upstairs." He said, "Whenever a young man or a young woman writes to me, I put one of these brandnew pennies in the letter of reply and tell him or her that this comes from the greatest nation in the world, a God-fearing nation," and that he made other appropriate remarks with respect to the man whose image is imprinted on the penny.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest sympathy to the Members of the California delegation and to the family of this great person by whom I was privileged to be called a friend.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, after all of these beautiful tributes to our departed colleague, Clyde Doyle, one could very easily succumb to the admonition of Lord Lister, who said:

> When the lark sings on high, lesser birds cease their twittering lest they miss one miracle note.

But that does not satisfy those whose hearts are overflowing with the memory of Clyde Doyle, a man who always tempered justice with mercy and who only last week in walking from the Committee on Armed Services on which we both serve, put his hand on my arm and said "My estimation of you is that you are a gentleman."

I think perhaps I shall try to spend the rest of my years living up to this stimulus by a busy man; one who served his people, his family, his Congress and his fellow man on two committees and, as has been so well said here in our weekly prayer breakfast group.

I also was privileged to serve last year by appointment of the chairman of our Committee on Armed Services with Clyde on a special committee for the National Security Agency. I found him delving but understanding and always, as our Speaker has said, kindly. He was persistent and loyal; certainly a worthy adversary but a great teacher and a personable friend and counselor.

He died in the traces, truly just as much in the service of his country as did his departed son during World War II. He died with his boots on and as I used to be wont to advise some patients, " 'twere better to do than to lie down and wait."

Only last week he rendered yeoman service, in the absence of Tad Walter on the House Committee on Un-American Activities authorization and appropriation. Certainly he did the same yesterday on the procurement bill out of Committee on Armed Services.

As a doctor who has of necessity had more than his share, perhaps, of close brushes with death in the service, in the operating room and in the hospitals of our Nation, I am glad and thankful unto our Master that he passed away peacefully in his sleep. This is probably a just reward on earth for a man who has given so much and who grew out of convictions of his own soul. No man stands so tall as he who stoops to lift up a boy.

I know that our good Lord above will receive him and rest his soul forever in his embraceable bosom.

Mrs. Hall and I extend our sympathy to Mrs. Doyle, their daughter, the grandchildren and the bereaved.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Beermann].

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Speaker, when I heard on the television this morning that Congressman Clyde Doyle had left our midst several incidents flashed through my mind. I was not so fortunate as to have worked as closely as other Members with our departed colleague and so benefit from his wise experience. But I can pay personal tribute to his gentlemanly conduct and inborn sense of courtesy and graciousness. I entered the House of Representatives 2 years ago and was given the honor of delivering the George Washington Farewell Address on the anniversary of his birth. I confess that I approached my assignment with some trepidation. However, later that same day Clyde Doyle was gracious enough to telephone me and was very complimentary on my recitation. Perhaps this courtesy was only a minor act, Mr. Speaker, but I want to state that it endeared Mr. Doyle forever to me. It convinced me that he was one of the most sincere, genteel, and considerate men privileged to enter this great House of Representatives.

Mrs. Beermann and I extend our sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and the other members of the family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I shall not speak at length but I did want to make reference to an incident that happened a couple of days ago in this Chamber. I was not on the floor yesterday regularly and I did not see the late Clyde Doyle during the proceedings. But the day before when I entered the House he motioned me to his side as I came into the Chamber and he said, "George, I want you to be more regular in attendance at these Thursday morning prayer meetings at the Capitol." I pointed out that I had been at the national prayer breakfast at the Mayflower Hotel earlier in the year and that I had periodically attended the prayer breakfast on Thursday mornings at the Capitol. He said that that was all well and good but that he wanted me to be more regular in attendance. I promised to do so, and I shall keep my promise.

I point this little incident out because it gives an insight into the character and personality of our departed friend. The incident which I have described was typical of this wonderful man. I want to join in tribute to the memory of a man of such stature as Clyde Doyle.

Of course, through the years I had seen Clyde Doyle at his post of duty in the House of Representatives. We had many common interests in the field of national defense and we discussed these problems from time to time.

I shall not proceed further. I know many of the friends of the late Clyde Doyle will read this issue of the Record with a great deal of interest. It has been a privilege to join in tributes to the memory of this good man and to extend sympathy to his family left behind.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Harris].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I too am deeply grieved by the loss of our distinguished friend and colleague, Clyde Doyle, suddenly over the night. It has been my privilege and high honor to have served here in the House with Clyde

for almost 17 years. This is the beginning of our 17th year together.

I want to associate myself with the other Members in the high and appropriate tribute that has been paid to our friend today. Each of us could go on and out of our own experience relate many, many incidences such as have been related here today.

He did not have to write me a note or give me reference about a friend of mine that he saw in California, in his own district, or give me the names of the individuals and suggest that I write them, that they wanted to hear from me. There are so many of those details and little things in life which in my judgment really make up the living of an individual as a human being.

So we might emulate the life and character of Clyde Doyle. I shall miss him as I know other Members of this House miss him because of what he was and what he has meant to us.

Mrs. Harris and I join others in extending our deepest sympathies to Mrs. Doyle and the family in their bereavement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Corman].

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Clyde Doyle brings sorrow to each of us. He so aptly admonished us that our beloved Nation deserves the best of whatever we are and he inspired us by giving his best. It always seemed to me that he had another principle, that the men around him deserved kindness and love, and of these qualities he gave. I believe that, more than any man with whom I have worked, he followed the 11th commandment of our Lord.

My wife and I join in the expression of deepest sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and the family.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Philbin].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly shocked and deeply saddened by the untimely passing of my dear friend and beloved colleague, Congressman Clyde Doyle. His loss is truly an irreparable one.

Only yesterday, I talked with him, and he seemed to be in vigorous health. It is almost impossible to realize that he is gone.

Clyde Doyle was one of the outstanding Members of the House of Representatives and of our great Committee on Armed Services. I had the honor and distinction to serve with him for years. He was a member of Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on Armed Services. There was never a more diligent, more capable or more dedicated or conscientious man on our committee, nor was there ever a man who demonstrated such high qualities of personality and character in the House of Representatives.

A brilliant lawyer and an indefatigable worker, a trusted friend and counselor, Clyde Doyle distinguished himself greatly in this body and in our committee.

He was a man of great and unusual humility and exalted character. He was endowed with a lofty sense of honor and **a conscientiousness in his work, together with an almost incredible industry and painstaking application to duty.**

He served with a zeal and high purpose and a spirit of nobility that certainly has never been excelled in the history of this Congress. He was a man of forthright principles, humane, forward-looking, and just. His strong sense of justice and his great mind and heart prompted him always to strive with compassion and with extraordinary zeal to serve the ordinary people of his great district and of his State and our Nation. Clyde Doyle was devoted to human beings and to the cause of humanity and to the lofty purposes of government. He was resolute and unswerving in his patriotism and in his self-sacrificing willingness to labor, even at great cost to his own health and well-being, for the security and defense of our country, and for the broader, humane, social and economic policies and programs and the advancement of the cause of the people which were always so dear to his heart, and which were such a real part of his very being.

Mr. Speaker, I realize full well that mere words are quite inadequate to portray the depth of my personal sorrow at the passing of this fine public servant and dear friend, or to portray the very high quality of his unselfish service to our country and its people.

He will be sorely missed in our committee where he made such outstanding and memorable contributions.

His name will long be remembered in the Halls of this great legislative body where he so faithfully and so constructively served for such a long period of time with such outstanding distinction.

Mr. Speaker, to know Clyde Doyle was to respect, admire, and love him. The sincerity and nobility of his friendship and deep spiritual fellowship will ever be treasured by those of us who were fortunate enough to know him and work with him.

It is, indeed, with a very heavy heart that I join his dear, devoted wife, beloved family and his friends and constituents and colleagues in mourning his sorrowful demise.

To his cherished wife and family, I tender my most heartfelt sympathy in the great sorrow that has come to them. I hope and pray that this dear, loyal friend, this trusted counselor and illustrious colleague may find peace and rest in his Heavenly home.

We will miss him here in these historic Halls where he contributed so much to our work and to our country. His memory will long remain green and fresh with us as an inspiration. His gentle ways, his warm friendship and his spirit of devotion and dedication to great tasks, will long continue to guide us.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Randall].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from saying a word in eulogy about our departed colleague. Not far from where I am now standing, we sat and visited yesterday afternoon with our departed colleague during the debate on the military procurement bill. It was his preference to occupy the same seat **in this Chamber, and he usually was found in that seat. This was characteristic of his regularity in everything he did—regular in attendance and regular in his devotion to duty.**

At a time such as this when we look back and reflect on the characteristics of a friend who has departed, it is appropriate that we recall that he was both regular and punctual in everything he did, not only in his attendance of this body but also in his committee work. Only this morning I knew he must have been ill or that something was wrong, because we always passed in the hall, just before 10 o'clock, he going to his committee, and I going to mine. When I missed him this morning I felt at that time something was wrong that Clyde was not on his way to his committee.

Clyde Doyle was a man who believed in the proposition that in order to have friends one must be a friend. He was a friend to all of us and of great help to many of us. He had the habit of keeping notes, which few of us do, of the proceedings here on the floor. One could go to him and find out what had transpired in their absence or coming in late could get an accurate account from him of what had been missed. He was on the floor every minute of every session. I recall when we were all sweating out adjournment last year about the first of October he took it upon himself to try to cheer up some of us who felt we should be back home in the campaign; he tried to be helpful by saying: "We will be out of here this week, or at the latest in a few days." I suspect it was an effort to say this to try to keep us cheerful, because I suspect down deep in his heart he knew adjournment might not come as quickly as most of us preferred.

He was a man of great sincerity. Much can be said about him that is good.

He was a successful practicing lawyer and headed his own law firm. He had been elected to local office in his native State of California. He had been active in many civic enterprises including work for the Boy Scouts of America, hospitals for crippled children, the YMCA, and the California Philharmonic Orchestra Association. Not only was he active in the successful practice of law, but he had attained success in the field of banking. He told me of having once been accorded the nomination by the voters of both the Democratic and Republican Parties under the California crossfiling law, and in one election he had no opponent at all during the fall general election. But those were things that most of us did not know about unless there was a direct inquiry, because Clyde was not one to tell about his successes. He was a modest man, and he was a man who was always very careful to be certain that everything he said was not to even the slightest degree an exaggeration of fact.

Just this one further thought: It is so difficult to express words of consolation to the survivors of the departed. I am sure in this instance they have a great measure of consolation in the esteem in which his colleagues held him and the feeling that every Member who knew Clyde Doyle unanimously respected him.

May his good soul rest in peace.

To Mrs. Doyle and the daughter, my own family joins with me in this expression of our deepest sympathy.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I join in every tribute made here today to the memory of Clyde Doyle. No statement has been exaggerated in any way.

No finer, kinder American Christian gentleman ever lived.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle was a good, a sweet man. A dedicated public servant his motives were pure, his dedication to duty intense, and his patriotism of the highest. The House and our country have suffered a grievous loss. I extend my deepest sympathy to his bereaved loved ones.

Mr. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, to have one of our number taken from our midst by a Great Unseen Hand is, indeed, a great shock to all of us whether we had known the departed long or little. As a new Congressman from the home State of Clyde Doyle, I knew him only from brief acquaintance as a fine Christian gentleman. But I knew him by reputation as a great patriot for his outstanding work on the House Committee on Un-American Activities. His passing is a great loss to our Nation. I join with my colleagues in heartfelt condolences to Clyde Doyle's family, and I pray that God will comfort them as only He can.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I join in this tribute to our beloved colleague from California, who served his State and Nation so ably for so many years in this body.

Clyde Doyle was a dedicated public servant in the finest tradition of the House. He worked tirelessly in performance of his representative duties for the people of his district. He was conscientious and humble, a friend of all who were privileged to serve with him.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Un-American Activities, he rendered important service in strengthening our Nation against our enemies—both from outside and from within. Under his leadership the House adopted, in 1955, the Doyle resolution establishing standards of conduct for House committees in the protection of the rights of witnesses and improving committee procedures.

All of us will recall Clyde Doyle's motto, which appeared at the bottom of each letter he signed—"Our Beloved Nation Deserves the Best of Whatever We Are."

This simple, moving expression of faith and service symbolized Clyde's lifetime philosophy of public service at all levels of government. His long and distinguished record of service in State positions, in civic, legal, cultural, and philanthropic work is well known in Los Angeles County and throughout California.

We will miss Clyde—his example of dedicated service, his leadership, his cheerful smile, and genuine friendship. To his devoted wife, Lydia, and his family, Mrs. Holifield and I extend our sincere condolences in this time of sorrow.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in this tribute to our late colleague, Clyde Doyle, who was one of the most attentive and conscientious Members of the House. During my service here I came to know Clyde Doyle as the kind and considerate individual who has been described so accurately today.

His interests were broad and his understanding deep. Although we disagreed on certain issues, he understood that our disagreement was a matter of principle and not personal. He was often helpful to me in explaining the procedures of the House as he occupied his accustomed place and recorded in detail the course of debate. Clyde Doyle's daily presence on the floor will be missed by all of us. Mr. Speaker, I extend to Mrs. Doyle and her family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my deep sorrow at the passing last night of the late Honorable Clyde Doyle.

A man who served his district, his State, and his country for many years with dedication and devotion, Congressman Doyle was to us who served with him, above all, a gentleman, with all the virtues that the term implies. As he kept the quiet tenor of his ways, he was unfailing in his courtesy and a model of gentility.

Congressman Doyle distinguished himself both as second ranking member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and as a member of the Armed Services Committee. His presence on those committees and in this legislative body will be sorely missed.

My wife joins me in expressing deep sympathy to his widow and family. May they derive some small consolation from the knowledge that their loss is shared by his many friends.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, among the thousands of public officials whom I have known in my lifetime I have never known one of warmer heart than our beloved deceased colleague, Clyde Doyle. It was my privilege to sit next to him on the House Armed Services Committee, for many years, and it was my privilege to meet with him in a prayer group every Thursday morning ever since we came to Congress together in the 81st Congress, 1949. My wife and his wife were closely associated together in the 81st Club and are dear friends. Words are inadequate to express feelings as close and heartfelt as we all feel for Clyde Doyle. His statesmanship and leadership in his work in the House Armed Services Committee and in the Un-American Activities Committee will be a lasting memorial to him.

Mr. Speaker, only yesterday Clyde Doyle found something nice to say to me about something that I was trying to do. This was characteristic of what he always tried to do—find the good in everybody and try to increase it. All of us have lost a dear friend and the country has lost a great statesman. I am sure I speak for every Member of Congress when I express our deepest sympathy to his beloved widow and family.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I listened to the news of the passing this morning of our colleague and my neighbor from the 23d Congressional District of California.

Throughout his 14 years as a Member of the House of Representatives, Clyde Doyle has unswervingly fought for the kind of America he knew was best for us.

Not only in his own district, but throughout the Los Angeles area—and, in fact, the State of California—Congressman Doyle has stood out as portraying a man who has always been a credit to the Halls of Congress and to his family. Not once has the slightest impropriety marred his record, although his record of fighting communism made him many enemies who were constantly searching for something with which they might besmirch his fine name.

Clyde Doyle's unceasing efforts on the Committee on Un-American Activities are well known. During my 10-year acquaintanceship with him, I have always felt that we were both striving for the same end—a world of freemen, free of totalitarian or Communist dictatorship—although our paths appeared to be at cross purposes on some occasions.

I do not believe there are any among us who will be able to better Clyde Doyle's record of dedication, sincerity, and loyalty to the principles of democracy and the welfare of the United States.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my deep sorrow over the death of our esteemed colleague, Clyde Doyle. I pay tribute to him as a dedicated Congressman, a patriotic American, and a fine man.

Clyde Doyle was the very soul of kindness to me from the first day I came to this House and I took pleasure in having him as a dear friend. He was a man who gained preeminence not by chance and circumstance but by striving and great effort. He earned his own way through high school and college and went on to carve out a distinguished career as an attorney and in public service before winning election to Congress in 1944. As a Member of Congress, he constantly showed forth his heartfelt concern for the safety and security of our Nation and gave his great talents unstintingly to preserve the United States.

I am sure many Members remember with appreciation, as I do, the habit he had of being present on the floor at all times and taking careful, analytical notes on the proceedings. There have been many occasions when his willingness to share his notes has been helpful to me and other Members.

We shall miss Clyde Doyle. I want to express my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, all of us here in the House of Representatives are saddened by the sudden death of Clyde Doyle. The country, the Congress, and the people of his district particularly have suffered a deep loss. In the 31 years I have served in the Congress I have known few men who were as kind and gentle, as tolerant and understanding, so full of good will to all men as was Clyde Doyle. Yet there was an intelligent limit to his good will and tolerance. It was for this reason, his deep sense of patriotism and his abhorrence of what was evil and corrupt that he served for 12 years with such distinction on the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Clyde Doyle was proud of his native California, and took an active part in charity work, particularly as it pertained to the care and treatment of children.

As an attorney, Clyde Doyle was a stickler for perfection. Following graduation from the College of Law of the University of Southern California at Los Angeles in 1917, he was admitted to the bar at Long Beach, Calif.

Aside from serving on the Committee on Un-American Activities here in Congress, Clyde Doyle served with distinction with the House Armed Services Committee. Everyone knows in this great body his concern for the servicemen, and that he be properly protected in times of conflict.

The effects of war hit Clyde Doyle hard during the last world war as he lost a son, 1st Lt. Clyde Doyle, Jr., who was a member of the Air Force.

Our beloved colleague served on many other special committees of this great body, and each time that he was called on, he served with deep devotion and understanding.

Today I extend to his dear wife and other members of his family my deepest sympathy. A good friend and a great legislator has left this chamber, and we all will miss him deeply.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the State of California, the Congress, and the Nation have lost an outstanding citizen when our esteemed colleague, Clyde Doyle, died suddenly last night.

A Member of the Congress for 18 years, Clyde was foremost a patriot and a firm believer in the principles on which this great country of ours was founded. He placed a high value on the liberties granted the American people by the Founding Fathers.

Clyde served as second ranking majority member of the House Un-American Activities Committee and was a rugged opponent of communism. He was an active member of the committee, for he recognized communism as a real threat to his homeland. Similarly, he served with distinction on the House Armed Services Committee. His strength of character and ability will be deeply missed in the House of Representatives.

Not only was Clyde Doyle a colleague, but he was a good friend. As members of the California delegation, we shared the pride of those who called themselves "Californians,." Clyde was born in California, educated in California, married to a California girl, and has devoted his life to serving his State.

His endeavors in the public interest were numerous. To mention a few: He was first president of Boy Scout Council of Boy Scouts of America in Long Beach, Calif.; several years chairman of tuberculosis stamp sales; member board of directors of California Conference of Social Work; and honorary member of National Recreation Association. The people of California paid due recognition to this outstanding citizen by reelecting him to the 87th Congress by the largest majority he had ever received—over 93,000.

A devoted husband, Clyde was also a devoted father and grandfather. To his wife, his daughter, and his entire family, I extend my heartfelt and deepest sympathy.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle was my friend. What more can one man say about another man? He saw the good in all men. He exemplified in every respect a spirit of genuine friendliness. It did not take a new member long to become acquainted with the quiet and attentive gentleman who sat in a certain seat near the front on the Democratic side every day.

He spoke sincerely and in a brotherly manner to his colleagues. You did not sit beside him long until you were aware that he was a man of God, that he was a patriot, and that he loved his State and his people with a passion. His witness was unmistakably that of a devout, patriotic, and conscientious man who was very mindful of his high calling and grave responsibilities.

We shall all miss Clyde. I shall especially miss him. I join with my colleagues in expressing sincere and heartfelt condolences to his family and a prayerful hope that God might sustain them in this hour of sorrow.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was really stunned this morning when I found the flags here at the Capitol flying at half mast and then learned of the sudden and unexpected passing of my good friend and colleague, the Honorable Clyde Doyle, of California. I was shocked because it was only last night that Clyde and I attended the National American Legion dinner at the Sheraton Park Hotel and he appeared to be in excellent health.

I came to know Clyde Doyle well during his 17 years as a Member of this body, and considered it a privilege to call him my friend. He was a capable legislator and was held in the highest esteem and respect by all of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

At the time of his passing, Clyde was the ranking Member of the House Un-American Activities Committee. He worked hard to preserve this committee and led the fight against its abolition and attempted denial of funds. He was also a member of the Armed Services Committee and always took an active interest in veterans' affairs.

Congressman Doyle served his constituency, the State of California and the Nation with honor and distinction, and will be greatly missed by all.

To his dear wife and daughter, I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I learned of the passing of veteran legislator, adviser, and colleague, Clyde Doyle, of my home State of California. Clyde has not only rendered distinguished service to the California delegation, but also to the people of Los Angeles County, the State of California, and the Nation. The 23d District of California can be proud of the contributions their Representative in Congress has made toward a better Government and a better America.

During 20 years of Federal service, Congressman Doyle has risen to the first-ranking position of his party on the House Un-American Activities Committee, and likewise he has achieved a high position of respect on the Armed Services Committee.

As a new Member of the Congress, I found Clyde was interested in the new Member's problems. He was a sage adviser and assisted measurably in the orientation of many of the new Members from our State. The new Members of the California delegation have lost a valued friend.

Congressman Doyle lived a full life, competing until his last day on the floor of the House of Representatives. The Nation will not soon fill the void herein created.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and deeply distressed by the sudden death of our able colleague from California, Clyde Doyle. The fine tributes that have been paid him here today are well-deserved and true. It has been my privilege to serve with him on the House Armed Services Committee for many years and he was a valued member of the Subcommittee on Real Estate and Construction of which I am Chairman.

I have never known a more sincere Christian gentleman than Clyde Doyle, and neither have I ever known a more dedicated and loyal citizen. His contributions as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee are well known to us all and will, I am confident, have a lasting effect on the security of the country which he loved so well.

I join with the other Members of the House in extending deepest sympathy to his wife and his fine family in their great loss—a loss that is shared by all of us here in the Congress.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle and I began our service in this House on the same day and as a consequence of this and later close association in committee assignments I came to know him very well. Anyone who had the opportunity to work with him, quickly saw his fine character and dedication.

I have never known any Member of this great body more serious about his work than Clyde Doyle. I think my colleagues will agree with me that he spent every moment of his busy life working in behalf of others. The kind of legislation he supported most vigorously was that which he felt improved the welfare of his countrymen and gave greater guarantee of the security of his country.

A native Californian, he gave unselfishly of his talents to every program to better the community and State. He was most active in so many such projects it would require pages in this Record to set them down.

He was a distinguished lawyer whose ability was recognized to the extent he was frequently called on to serve in responsible positions where legal training was required. In committee work here in Congress his great experience in this field was apparent in his penetrating examination of the many and varied problems that commanded his interest.

Clyde Doyle was highly respected by all who knew him and I think the tribute paid to him this afternoon clearly shows the love of his colleagues for his gentleness, his religious fervor and his strength of character.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, like so many of my colleagues who are rising to pay tribute here today to the memory of Congressman Clyde Doyle, I too was deeply saddened by the news of the passing from our midst of this elder statesman and longtime Representative of the 24th District of California, both as a public servant and an American patriot in the finest tradition.

It has been my privilege to serve with Congressman Doyle only since 1959 when I came to Congress, and his quiet geniality and kindliness came through with genuineness and clarity.

Congressman Doyle had a breadth of human understanding that transcended his wide circle of friends and even the bounds of his constituency. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, he became the defender and protector of all GI's and sought with relentless diligence to secure the enactment of legislation which would permit the correction of military records where servicemen who had received less-than-honorable discharges, had proved themselves more than worthy of honorable civilian status.

I am confident that I speak for all who knew him when I say that he will be remembered with warmth and affection, and I know, too, that the absence of his kindly presence in this Chamber will be felt with equal keenness by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, all of us were shocked when we received word this morning that our colleague, Clyde Doyle, had died during the night.

I have known Clyde Doyle since I first came to Congress more than 12 years ago. I have had the pleasure of serving with him on the Armed Service Committee for more than 10 years. I have also had the pleasant and interesting experience of serving on subcommittees where Clyde was the chairman.

It was Clyde who, a few years ago, made the long and difficult fight to bring some fairness and relief to those unfortunate servicemen who had received military discharges that, while not dishonorable, did cast reflection on future years. These discharges were given without a formal court martial, and from a study of these cases it is evident that grave injustice had been done many of our ex-servicemen. Clyde fought for these unfortunate GI's in a most effective manner. He did not accomplish all that he set out to do because he could not get the legislation acted upon by the other body; yet because of the tireless work and dedication which Clyde demonstrated, great good has been accomplished not only for the GI's of today, but for years to come.

Our colleague was one of the kindest and most considerate men I have ever known. While Clyde was a fearless and vigorous warrior for those principles for which he believed, I have never known of him to say an unkind word to or about anyone.

He will be greatly missed and long remembered.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle's standard for a U.S. Congressman was expressed in a true story he related to me some 10 years ago.

When Mr. Doyle first sought the Democratic nomination in his southern California district, he was one of several candidates interviewed by a committee representing organized labor. As its final question to each man, the committee asked, "On being elected, would you like to become known as labor's spokesman on Capitol Hill?"

Clyde Doyle replied in the negative. He told the committee it was his conception of a Congressman's job to represent all elements of his district. He thus would not want to be a "spokesman" for labor, for business, for veterans, for teachers or for any other special interest.

"I went home that night heavy at heart," Mr. Doyle recalled. "I felt certain I would now be denied an endorsement that could be vital to my nomination."

It was a matter of some surprise, then, when the labor delegation returned early next day. Its members informed Mr. Doyle he was being endorsed for Congress. One of them added: "You were the only candidate we talked with who answered the key question correctly."

For 15 years, the House has been well served by the honesty and devotion of our fellow Californian, Clyde Doyle. I join scores of colleagues in mourning his loss.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of a good friend and neighbor who served California for many years in the House of Representatives. We all were shocked and saddened by the sudden passing of Congressman Clyde Doyle.

Our friend was a most dedicated and conscientious Representative and certainly was among the hardest working Members of this House. When I first came to Congress 4 years ago, one of my first impressions was of Clyde Doyle arriving at his office to study his mail and begin the day's work before many of us sat down to breakfast. For 4 years, I was priviledged to be a neighbor of Clyde Doyle in the Longworth House Office Building, his office being next to mine.

The people of California and the Nation have lost a faithful public servant. Clyde Doyle was active in his community all his life. His interest and leadership in community affairs dates back to high school days in Los Angeles when he was a champion debater, newspaper manager, president of the student body and still found time to be the high school baseball team's star pitcher.

Anyone who has earned his way through college and earned a law degree knows how difficult this can be, but Clyde Doyle was never afraid of work. He tried every job from delivering newspapers to being a janitor. He is an outstanding example of a man who has pulled himself up by the bootstraps and made a tremendous success of his life.

Clyde Doyle always gave of himself to his community and I think that the following summary of his community activities before his election to Congress indicate the great contributions he made:

In 1936 received unanimous award of meritorious citizenship plaque by vote of all the service clubs of Long Beach, Calif., as the most valuable and useful adult citizen in Long Beach; first member of Long Beach Kiwanis Club and organizing president; first president of Boy Scouts of America Council in Long Beach; several years president of Long Beach Tuberculosis stamp sales; member of the board of trustees and legal counsel, Adelaide Tichenor Hospital School and Clinic for Crippled Children; boys secretary, member, board of directors, Long Beach YMCA; member, board of trustees, California Junior Republic, Chino; president Long Beach Recreation Commission for 15 years without pay; first president, Long Beach Coordinating Council, 1934; first president, Long Beach Philharmonic Orchestra Association; honorary member of National Recreation Association; honorary member, California Conference of Social Work; honorary member, Long Beach 20–30 Club; president, Long Beach Trojan Club, U.S.C.; president, Abraham Lincoln Club, Long Beach, for several years; member of Abraham Lincoln Group, Washington, D.C.; Los Angeles juvenile probation officer; examiner of applications for positions of juvenile court probation officer, Los Angeles County, under honorable Curtis D. Wilbur, distinguished judge, juvenile court, later Secretary of Navy under President Hoover; boys counselor and instructor in government and athletics, California Junior Republic, Chino, 1911–14, member, board of trustees since 1920; recipient of honorary plaques, awards, and decorations by several veterans organizations; member, South Gate Chamber of Commerce; member, Huntingpark, Downey, and South Gate YMCA; member of Moose, Eagles; past and presently listed in Who's Who.

In Clyde Doyle's passing, the Nation, California, and his immediate congressional district have lost a very conscientious and dedicated Member of Congress.

Mrs. Johnson wishes to join me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and her daughter.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my friends from California and others in paying brief but sincere tribute to the memory of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California, Congressman Clyde Doyle. I am saddened indeed to hear of his passing.

Clyde Doyle was first elected to the 79th Congress and has rendered many years of outstanding service to our country. He was a great patriot, blessed with a good mind and dedicated to hard work and to the service of his district, State, and Nation.

In the passing of Congressman Doyle, the House has lost a distinguished Member and I have lost a personal friend. I want to extend an expression of my most sincere sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and to the members of his family. We shall all miss Clyde Doyle immensely.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened by the unexpected death of my friend, Clyde Doyle, long a Representative in Congress from the State of California. Clyde Doyle was one of the finest people I have ever known. He was sincere, studious, thoughtful, and deeply religious. Clyde Doyle was compassionate in his consideration of the problems of the people of his district and, indeed, of the problems of the people of the entire Nation. He was all-American in his thinking. He was an outstanding member of the Committee on Armed Services of the House. No one knew more about the cost of the defense of our country than did Congressman Doyle. His only son lost his life in the defense of this country in World War II. The defense of the United States was not a matter of partisan consideration with Clyde Doyle. One of the most stirring speeches I ever heard in this House was made by Clyde Doyle more than a dozen years ago. The title of his speech was "Don't Play Politics with Defense."

Clyde Doyle also was an outstanding member of the Committee on Un-American Activities. He likewise gave great attention to his duties and responsibilities as a member of that committee. He made an outstanding record there. Clyde Doyle loved America and its institutions.

Clyde Doyle, as a sort of hobby, kept daily notes on the proceedings of the House. These notes were to be made the basis of a book about the U.S. House of Representatives. He and I talked about his proposed book many times. We last discussed it here on the floor of the House on Monday of this week. On that occasion, he asked me to tell him what I considered to be my own greatest accomplishment in the 15 years I have served in Congress. I told him I was proudest of my authorship in the House of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Then we discussed what had been done under that act. Clyde Doyle told me he was asking the same question he asked me of other Congressmen.

As the Members know, not many good books have been written about the House. Clyde Doyle's book would have been a gold mine of information about the House of Representatives. I deeply regret that he cannot finish the book; at the same time, I would like to express the hope that his relatives, or other interested friends, consider publishing that part of the book that is ready for publication or can be easily made ready.

Clyde Doyle pursued his hobby of noting the proceedings of the House, and of commenting on those of great interest, with such diligence and with such self-discipline that I am sure the publication of his book would be enlightening and very helpful to students of the Congress and to those who serve here in the future.

Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle was a gentleman of the highest order. He was an outstanding and effective Member of the House. As a friend, I share the great loss which his family and other friends feel so acutely today.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in my opinion no man has more deserved to serve in this body than Clyde Doyle. Clyde Doyle lived to be of service to others. He loved his fellow man and he served him well. There was not an ounce of venom in him and he had a great store of good will, sympathy, and understanding. This body and the whole country share a great loss with his passing.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of both myself and my wife Martha, I wish to express our feeling of loss arising from the death of the Honorable Clyde Doyle, of California. At the same time I express my sympathy to his beloved family. Truly we share a great loss.

My acquaintanceship with our late beloved colleague began in Long Beach, Calif., in 1932. At the time I was a student at Long Beach Junior College and a member of the Hammurabi Pre-Legal Society. One of our guest speakers was Clyde Doyle, who was then only an active practicing attorney. He spoke to us about the flora of the semiarid mountains in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area. I mention this because it demonstrates the versatility of the man and reveals a significant aspect of his character. He loved the outdoors and was an avid naturalist and fisherman. He loved the outdoors because he wanted room and a lack of distraction to meditate upon his personality and problems and relationship to both God and man. He shared this experience with a son who was unfortunately killed during the war.

In the Congress and elsewhere the descriptive noun, "gentleman," is used in somewhat formal and perfunctory fashion with no particular effort to plumb its meaning or to properly identify the recipient of that description. The dictionary definition of "gentleman" is "A man of good breeding, kindness, courtesy, and honor; a man having worthy ideals and refinement of thought and action." Clyde Doyle certainly deserved this description. No higher compliment can be paid to him.

Clyde was soft spoken and courteous. I have spoken with him many times about many things, including political campaigns and controversial matters of government, and never once did he utter an unkind word about any other person. It was not in his nature to be unkind to anyone and very few of us can boast of this characteristic of a truly religious and humanitarian man. Politics and government and business would be less of a jungle if there were more men like Clyde engaged therein.

Mr. Doyle was a great man. He utilized his career as a Congressman solely for doing the greatest good for the greatest number without any thought of self-return or self-advancement. He will be missed by the Nation he loved so dearly.

Of him and others like him a poet has said:

> Lives of great men all remind us
> We can make our lives sublime,
> And, departing, leave behind us
> Footprints on the sands of time.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we have suffered a great loss because of the death of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable Clyde Doyle.

His service to his Nation and to his native State of California has been outstanding and of great benefit to all of us.

If there was one quality which Congressman Doyle possessed more than any other, I believe it was compassion. He understood his fellow humans, their wants, their needs, their dreams and their hopes. He had the remarkable ability of seeing the best in others and in understanding another person's point of view.

His citizenship was outstanding, and he followed up his words with constructive deeds. It is no accident that Congressman Doyle received so many awards for outstanding citizenship. He believed in being a good citizen in an active way, in wholehearted participation in efforts to improve the lot of those less fortunate than himself.

Because of the time that Clyde Doyle spent on this earth, our Nation and his native State are better places to live. He lived a full, rich life, a life filled to the brim with concern and compassion for those with whom he came in contact.

All of us will miss his wise words, his gentleness, his kindness, his understanding. It is a privilege to have known him and to have counted him as a friend.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I share the admiration that has been expressed here today for the late Clyde Doyle, of California. It was my good fortune to have known him quite well and to have been closely associated with him in many respects during his service here. I cannot think of a man with whom I have served who commanded such universal respect on the part of his fellow Members. He was courteous, forthright, sincere, dedicated and energetic.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and the family in their bereavement.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, many men who come to the Congress, or serve in the Senate of the United States, take pride in the fact that through some public work they are able to create, as it were, back in their own territory, a monument to their service in the Congress of the United States, service to their country. All of us like to think that posterity will do us honor for what we have done here, and the vanity which is a part of almost every personality I have known here is given so much satisfaction when we see a public building or other edifice with our name on it. But I think the real monuments that we build are the sermons that we preach with our lives.

When I heard the news about Clyde Doyle I was on the way from my room to the House Office Building. As I parked my car one of the policemen said to me, "It's too bad about Clyde Doyle, he was such a fine fellow." I hurried on to breakfast and a fellow Congressman from a State far removed said, "Clyde Doyle was a Christian gentleman." Later, an elevator boy made a remark to a group of us that, "Mr. Doyle was certainly a wonderful gentleman." I am sure that from the great beyond where good and fine men go, he must somehow know of the magnificent impression for good he made here with his life. He preached a sermon for good, for example, and for guidance. His monument is a living monument that will live on in the hearts and the minds of those of us who were privileged to know him—not just Congressmen and Senators, but people who worked in and around the Capitol regardless of their particular capacity or calling.

We often speak of a public servant as being dedicated. Clyde Doyle lived the word. He kept an hour by hour account of everything that happened here, and while he did not make many speeches, whenever he did talk, he was accurate and he was listened to.

Today is a day of sadness, for we have lost a friend; but today is also a day of gladness that we had the privilege of knowing him and I am sure I express the sentiments of the Members of the House of Representatives when I say that I am glad that Clyde Doyle lived. I am glad he lived because his life was good for the Nation, good for his district, good for his people and good for his many friends as a monument of integrity and example.

To his family, Mrs. Hemphill and I extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened this morning to hear the news of the death of my friend and respected colleague, the Honorable Clyde Doyle, of California.

For almost 20 years in the Congress, Clyde has served his country and his constituents well. He was a dedicated American who loved his country and cherished the goals of progressive and humanitarian legislation.

Clyde, as we all knew him, was a man of the highest character and integrity. He was a tireless worker with a sincere and ardent interest in the people of his district and of the Nation.

He was a modest and mild-mannered man. Even when he was the target for unfair criticism he was tolerant, and patient toward those who opposed him.

He reflected integrity on the Congress. The stature and memory of Clyde Doyle will stand as a monument to a noble and great man, and should serve as a deterrent to those who seek to incite the public against the Congress and discredit it as an institution and an instrument of the people in our democratic society.

To his beloved wife, Lydia, his daughter and grandchildren, Mrs. Rhodes and I express our deepest sympathy at their great loss. I join with all of my colleagues in sharing their grief and sorrow.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I join with the other Members in expressing my sorrow on the passing of Clyde Doyle.

While I have only known Clyde for the past 2½ months, I was fortunate enough to serve with him on the Committee on Un-American Activities and valued him as a personal friend as well as a colleague. Here in the House, on many occasions, Clyde invited me to sit with him during the sessions. As a freshman Congressman, I asked him to explain the various motions and activities here on the floor. Clyde not only answered my questions, but pointed out to me many other matters that he felt would help me in my service as a Congressman.

I discovered that he loved people and found some good in everyone. Words cannot express my sentiments to his loved ones in the sorrow that all of us felt at his passing. I will miss his counsel, the Nation will miss his service, and to his wife and family, I can only extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in expressing my sincerest and deepest sympathy to Mrs. Lydia Doyle on the passing of her husband, the Honorable Clyde Doyle, longtime Representative of California's 23d District.

I have known Clyde Doyle for a number of years and his death leaves a void that will be difficult if not impossible to fill. His long and illustrious career of public service to the people of the Los Angeles County and southern California area stands as a tribute to his qualities of integrity and devotion to principle.

Clyde Doyle's memory will serve us all as inspiration in the years ahead as an example of the kind of public servant we need in these difficult times.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as the years go by and our colleagues come and go, there are some with whom we feel a particular closeness. So it was with Clyde Doyle and me. I cannot tell you why and I doubt if he could either, but there was something about it that always drew us together. Perhaps an expression of the younger generation particularly fits the case. They would say "we clicked."

Times without number I have gone over to sit beside him in the place he habitually occupied. I used to marvel at his prolific note taking. I do not suppose any man in the Congress kept as copious a record of what went on here on the floor. I might add that I doubt that anyone among us had as good a record of attendance.

I cannot remember when Clyde was not here, faithful and attentive. It is significant that he carried this on right up through yesterday—the last day of his life. I shall miss him. We shall all miss him. My sympathy goes especially to his widow and the surviving members of his family. My sympathy, too, goes to his California colleagues who will miss him perhaps more than any of us.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn of our colleague Congressman Clyde Doyle's untimely passing when I arrived at my office this morning. I had an opportunity to have the pleasure of talking with Mr. Doyle yesterday concerning matters in connection with the Un-American Activities Committee where he so ably served as vice chairman. I want to join the delegation from California and the entire Congress in expressing my deepest sympathy to his family.

Certainly there was no member of Congress that was held in higher esteem than the late Congressman Clyde Doyle. I had the privilege and pleasure of getting acquainted with Congressman Doyle when his son who was serving as a pilot with the U.S. Air Force, located at Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, S.C., during World War II was killed. This young officer was on a reconnaissance flight over the ocean. He was within a mile of the airbase at Myrtle Beach when his plane made a nose dive and went out of control. The young officer and his plane crashed into the Atlantic Ocean and I do not believe his body was ever recovered. I do not think I have ever felt quite so bad as I did when Congressman Doyle arrived at Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, which is located in my district. Every effort had been made to locate his son, but all were unsuccessful.

The State of California and the Nation has lost one of its finest legislators, and we shall all remember how dedicated he was to his work as a Representative here in the National House of Representatives.

Again, I want to express my deepest sympathy to the members of the late Congressman Doyle's family.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle was a Christian gentleman. One of the best, down to earth, commonsense talks on Christian faith I ever heard anywhere was delivered by Clyde Doyle to the House Christian Breakfast Group. He attended regularly and always left a profound impression when he talked. His intense belief in Christianity and love of these United States made of him a bitter foe of atheistic communism.

Clyde Doyle believed the best way to fight communism was to fill the hearts and minds of our youth with Americanism.

I am glad I knew and associated with Clyde Doyle. He was a great American and dedicated to making this Congress the greatest institution on earth. We have lost a truly great man. Mrs. Dorn joins in my deepest sympathy to his wonderful and devoted family.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, California, the Congress, and our Nation have lost a dedicated public servant in the untimely passing of our colleague, Clyde Doyle, of California. His patience, courageous loyalty to his convictions, and his ever willingness to help others, were attributes we always admired. Even those who sometimes disagreed with some of his views respected his devotion to those principles in which he believed and by which he lived.

I shall remember him as the two of us, the day before his passing, walked down to the well of the House to vote—he to vote one way, I the opposite. We chatted as friends, and he, as the elder statesman he was, gave to me advice on many things concerning the welfare of our community. This was typical of the man: never to hate, never to be bitter, never to appear superior in wisdom, though he was a wise man.

Clyde Doyle was a friend to all of us, and he will be truly missed.

My deepest sympathy goes to the members of his family.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Grim Reaper stands at our elbow as a constant reminder that this life is uncertain and fleeting and that we are never sure when the call may come to each one of us.

Yesterday we joined with our departed colleague in the important work of this House and we saw him leave at the close of day in apparent health and strength. And then today we learned with grief and consternation of his untimely demise.

Passing this way but once it behooves all of us to have a bit more concern for the amenities as we meet, even casually, those who are our associates on this life's journey. In that particular, Clyde Doyle was truly one of this earth's noblemen and his qualities of greatness stem from an innate kindness and the traits of a gentleman. Our colleague and brother was a kind man, a gentle man, and withal a representative of the people who walked in the fear and admonition of the Lord.

As the vice president of our Christian fellowship group he led our meditations on occasion and demonstrated by his humble but nonetheless forceful witnessing that he had made his peace with his Maker and that his life would continue to be one of dedication in the service of the Nation and his fellow men. We who have passed through the dark valley know something of the heartbreak and anguish that now assail his loved ones and our sympathy goes out to his bereaved helpmate and the other members of his family with whom we are joined in mourning the passing of a great public servant, who was also a fine Christian gentleman.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, Representative Clyde Doyle was a close personal friend of mine. I shall miss Mr. Doyle not only because he was one of the kindest and most thoughtful of persons, but because he was a man dedicated to helping his fellow man.

Many of his family continue to live in my congressional district. I know most of them personally. To Mrs. Doyle and his daughter and to the other members of his family I extend my heartfelt sympathies.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, being only a freshman Member of this honorable body, I have not had the privilege of knowing Clyde Doyle as those who have already expressed their sentiments. Ours was only a casual acquaintanceship. But I do know that he was a supporter of statehood for Hawaii when we were knocking at the congressional doors for admission into the Union.

As a representative of Hawaii's grateful people, I join in grieving over the loss of Clyde Doyle, of whom it can aptly be said that he, too, like his son, gave up his life for love of his country and his fellow men.

While I fully realize that human words, no matter how sweet, cannot beguile Mrs. Doyle and her family from the great sorrow that must be theirs, I wish to add my expressions of sympathy and condolences to those already expressed. I do hope and pray that they will derive some comfort from the fact that there are many friends and beneficiaries of his handiwork who share in their immeasurable loss.

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, today our country, our State, and our Nation lost a real champion of democracy, with the sudden passing of our colleague, Clyde Doyle. Little did we realize that when he answered the rollcall on the floor yesterday that we were witnessing the final vote to be cast by this sincere, dedicated legislator. His 16 years were spent in devotion to what he felt was the right answer to the many legislative decisions that he faced. This record of accomplishment has left its mark of sincerity upon his contemporaries for time immemorial.

It has only been my privilege to serve with him for a short time on the Hill. Even though this is my first term my colleague Clyde Doyle has found the time to drop by my office and ask if there was any way in which he could be of assistance to me or my staff in helping us to get started with our future endeavors in representing the district.

This was the fabric of the man; he always had time for his fellow man.

Mrs. Burkhalter joins with me in expressing our heartfelt sympathy to his wife and daughter and her family in the loss of a devoted husband and father.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow that all of us who knew and served with our late colleague, Clyde Doyle, learned of his death.

He was a man of the most unswerving dedication to the concepts of Christianity and patriotism. I have served with him on the Armed Services Committee and have observed his unfailing devotion to duty, there and on the floor of the House of Representatives. Along with people the world over who are joined in the mutual goal of fighting communism I am acquainted with the outstanding work he did as acting chairman and longtime member of the Committee on Un-American Activities. In this work he never forgot that the dignity of man is priceless even to the most unfortunate among us.

May God comfort Mr. Doyle's family with the memory that he was a Christian, a gentleman and a patriot, and one with whom we in the House of Representatives were privileged in the highest sense to serve, a man whose special attributes will be deeply missed by us, and by freedom-loving people everywhere.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, love of family, love of country, complete dedication to its welfare, compassion for his fellow man; kindly, gentle, and always fair in his dealings with others. These were the distinguishing characteristics of a warm and humble human being whose presence will be sorely missed by all the Members of this body. Serving with Clyde Doyle was an experience of personal enrichment to all who shared the privilege. Much has been said here today attesting to the high regard in which he was held by the Members of the House of Representatives. Death at any time shocks those close to the person whose life ceases. But, Mr. Speaker, I know the members of Congressman Doyle's family can read our own personal expressions of sorrow and, from them, gain great pride that the one they loved so dearly was so universally esteemed. I join in expressing my sincerest sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and all the other members of our late colleague's family.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, nothing can quite compensate or fully console the Members of this House or the people of the country, for a loss so severe as the sudden and unexpected death on March 14 of our colleague Clyde Doyle, of California. Yet there was an aspect of Clyde Doyle's successful, fruitful, and effective life, that provides us all with some modicum of comfort in our bereavement. For Clyde Doyle had recognition and respect from the people he served for 17 years in this House as the Representative from the 23d District of California. Moreover, while his services were constant and distinctive and both the quality and the quantity of his effort for his district, for California, and for his country, were massive and rich in results, he had the satisfaction, through the years, of public appreciation.

Not only was he appreciated and admired by his constituents who nine times elected him to this House, but he knew the admiration and affection of his colleagues here; and the leadership held him in high esteem. So that as he moved among us to the very last, Clyde Doyle was rich in honors, in the respect of his colleagues, and in commendations from those who were close to him, the late Speaker Sam Rayburn for example, who on occasion evaluated as exemplary his sound and steady and unflagging workmanship as an American legislator.

For 17 years, as I know of my personal knowledge, he kept a daily diary of the doings of the Congress. This, it seems to me, could be an invaluable personal record, rich in observations, commentary, anecdotes. For Clyde Doyle had a feel for history and events and a sensitive appreciation of the characteristics of those around him and their reactions. I hope someday that his diary may become a public record, for inevitably it will throw the light of a fine imagination on the chronicle of our times in the House. Those of us who knew Clyde Doyle well, know also that the diary will have about it a kindliness and a sympathy for his fellow man that will cause hurt to no one should it ever achieve publication.

It may perhaps be said that those of us who were nearest to him knew him for qualities and accomplishments that cannot be found in reports and statements appearing as matters of routine in the Congressional Record. I, for one, especially regarded him highly for his services on legislative matters, affecting savings and loan problems and banking. He was an indefatiguable worker and had what some of our staff people like to call a knowledge in depth of the matters that came before him. When he discussed a problem of legislation that touched on the armed services, for example—he was a member of the committee—he was persuasive, articulate, informed, and sound.

Similarly, in his 12 years as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, he demonstrated an understanding of this profoundly controversial problem that revealed not only the importance of the committee and the need for it, but gave confidence to us all that its management, its reports, and its decisions, would meet high standards of justice. For Clyde Doyle was not only a first-class lawyer, he was also a person for whom justice and fairplay had absolute meanings. And many of us have already commented on his gentleness, his sensitive human feelings, and his broad tolerance. These qualities in our colleague made him an outstanding friend of a whole spectrum of public causes in which he was constantly and often brilliantly active: from the YMCA in his district to the California Philharmonic Orchestra Association, and from the Boy Scouts to the Kiwanis Club. The list of his affiliations make a column or more of fine print, and I think it can be said, that all of them felt the beneficent influence of his help, his counsel, and his leadership. No wonder that at one time the inter-allied Council of Service Clubs, of Long Beach, accorded him the Meritorious Citizenship Award as the most valuable and useful citizen.

That accolade, "most valuable and useful citizen," best sums up the superb career of Clyde Doyle. It is good to know that he knew he had the praise and approbation of his fellow man and that everywhere he was regarded with honor and affection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I was profoundly shocked and deeply grieved upon learning of the death of my colleague from California, the Honorable Clyde Doyle.

Those of us who had the privilege of knowing and working with him always respected his devotion to duty, the sincerity of his convictions, and his unceasing effort, as he explained it, "to find true goals for lasting values."

In his day-to-day relationships with people, Clyde Doyle always showed the understanding, patience, and humility that endeared him to so many of us. Moreover, though at times we disagreed on certain issues that arose in this distinguished House, I never found him to be disagreeable. His untimely passing is a great loss to California and the Nation. Perhaps we can find solace in the fact that the memory of our colleague and his accomplishments shall long remain, untouched by the forgetfulness of time.

Mrs. Roosevelt joins me in expressing sincere sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and the family.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, out of respect to our departed colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Doyle], I include a prayer in the Record.

This prayer which I offer, Mr. Speaker, was delivered in the House of Representatives on May 6, 1913, by the then Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D.D. It was offered on behalf of a deceased Member of Congress of that day and it has seemed to me it expresses in plain but very sincere words the emotion, sympathy and deep sense of loss which all Members of this body, some 50 years later, have experienced in connection with the death of our dear and honored colleague, Clyde Doyle.

The prayer I offer reads:

> We come to Thee, O God our heavenly Father, with hearts bowed in sorrow, because death, always mysterious and unbidden, has visited this congressional body and taken from its midst a Member who was peculiarly fitted by natural gifts, education, and experience to serve his people and his country. But Thou art God; Thou knowest the beginning and the end; Thou hast ordered all things, and Thou doest all things well. Comfort us, his people, the stricken wife and children, by the eternal faith revealed to the world in the life, death, and resurrection of the Christ who thus brought to light life and immortality in Thee.
>
> Swift to its close ebbs out life's little day;
> Earth's joys grow dim, its glories pass away;
> Change and decay in all around I see;
> O Thou who changest not, abide with me.
>
> Amen.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has suffered a great loss in the passing of our colleague, Clyde Doyle. To know Clyde Doyle was to love him. I have never met a more kindly or genuine person in my life.

During my first term in the Congress I was informed that there were no assigned seats in the House of Representatives. While this was true, Clyde Doyle had his own seat and everyone was aware of it. When the House was in session, he was nearly always sitting in it.

This kind and intelligent man displayed a devotion to duty that was an example to all of us. He possessed one of the finest attendance records in the House.

The thing that I shall remember most about Clyde Doyle is the counsel he gave me when I first came to the Congress 2 years ago on his practice of accumulating the Chaplain's prayers and sending them out to the ministers of the churches in his district. "Chaplain Braskamp says a wonderful prayer," Clyde informed me, "and I feel that the ministers in my district in California will find his prayers spiritual and helpful."

Clyde Doyle was a great Christian and a great American and a friend to all of us. I know that his presence in the House brought out the best in all of us just as his final words in letters to his constituents, "our beloved Nation deserves the best of whatever we are," attempted to bring out the best in them.

I extend to his family my profound sympathy in this hour of their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it was a saddening shock to learn of the passing of Clyde Doyle, of California. My office and his have been located on the same corridor for a number of years. Many times it has been my privilege to walk across to the House floor with him. Only a few days ago I stopped by and visited him in his new more spacious office suite which is on the back corner of the same corridor in the Longworth Building. He was quite proud of this new office and showed me through it, pointing out all of its advantageous points.

The first time I had ever known Clyde Doyle well was a few years ago when a congressional group visited the city of New York. It was a spring 2-day trip. We traveled with our families together by train. I came to know him and the members of his family on this New York tour. He was a kindly, genuine, and sincere man. I never heard him utter an unkind word about anyone. He was a dedicated public servant. He possessed humility, gentleness, and an even temper.

My sympathy goes out to his companion and helpmate and other members of his family. A true friend, he will be greatly missed by his colleagues on the floor of the House.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, Clyde Doyle was a truly noble man. He was a credit to this House, to his State, and to his Nation. All of us were honored to have been his colleagues. Clyde was too big for pettiness; he always had time for little acts of kindness and courtesy; and he went out of his way to help the new Members. Clyde Doyle had a deep belief in democracy and in the rights and freedoms of individual men. Democratic government works because of men like him.

I shall always remember this good man as a friend and as a fine public servant.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and character of our late colleague.

The **SPEAKER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 293

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Clyde Doyle, a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of 28 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The **SPEAKER.** The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. Sheppard, of California; Mr. Fisher, of Texas; Mr. Holifield, of California; Mr. George P. Miller, of California; Mr. Price, of Illinois; Mr. Willis, of Louisiana; Mr. Shelley, of California; Mr. Hagen, of California; Mr. Hosmer, of California; Mr. Moss, of California; Mr. Utt, of California; Mr. Bob Wilson, of California; Mr. Johansen, of Michigan; Mr. Roosevelt, of California; Mr. Sisk, of California; Mr. McFall, of California; Mr. Cohelan, of California; Mr. Corman, of California; Mr. George E. Brown, of California; Mr. Burkhalter, of California; Mr. Edwards, of California; Mr. Hanna, of California; Mr. Hawkins, of California; Mr. Leggett, of California; Mr. Martin, of California; Mr. Roybal, of California; Mr. Van Deerlin, of California; and Mr. Charles H. Wilson, of California.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 18, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

547. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report of the affairs of the Library of Congress, including the copyright business, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962; to the Committee on House Administration.

548. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

549. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 4874. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 4875. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for reform of personal and corporate income tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 4876. A bill to amend section 349(a)(10) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to loss of nationality by leaving or remaining outside of the United States to avoid services in the Armed Forces in time of war or during a period of national emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 4877. A bill to amend section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 4878. A bill to extend for 1 year the act relating to training teachers of the deaf and the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4879. A bill to amend the Library Services Act to increase the Federal assistance for the improvement of public libraries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4880. A bill to extend for 4 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, providing financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities, and to make certain other changes in such laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4881. A bill to extend for 1 year the present programs for training teachers of the deaf and the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to expand and improve Federal programs relating to the education of handicapped children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 4882. A bill to amend title II of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide for forgiveness of loans made under that title to students who subsequently engage in the practice of medicine, dentistry, or osteopathy in areas having a shortage of individuals engaged in such practice; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4883. A bill to amend section 3203 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that veterans entitled to pension who are being maintained in State homes shall receive pension at the rate of $30 per month; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 4884. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the furnishing of assistance to States providing contact offices for veterans where no Veterans' Administration contact office is available; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 4885. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act and the Temporary Extended Railroad Unemployment Insurance Benefits Act of 1961 to increase the creditable and taxable compensation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 4886. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 4887. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 4888. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit taxpayers who are severely disabled to deduct certain transportation expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 4889. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 4890. A bill to encourage local and State initiative in urban transit development and to preserve the status of privately owned local carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 4891. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to the retirement fund or that the individual be reimbursed; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 4892. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 4893. A bill relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4894. A bill to correct inequities with respect to the crediting of service of classified employees for step increase purposes in certain conversion actions under the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 4895. A bill to extend the feed grain program under terms which will give assurance of a fair price to farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 4896. A bill to establish a Commission to enforce antidiscrimination provisions in Government contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 4897. A bill to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 4898. A bill to extend the feed grain program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 4899. A bill to provide compensation for disability or death resulting from injury to employees in employments which expose employees to radioactive materiel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4900. A bill to provide for Federal assistance for the construction and expansion of public community junior colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 4901. A bill to revise the provisions of law relating to the methods by which amounts made available to the States pursuant to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 and title XII of the Social Security Act are to be restored to the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4902. A bill to provide financial assistance to the States to improve educational opportunities for migrant agricultural employees and their children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4903. A bill to amend the act establishing a Children's Bureau so as to assist States in providing for day-care services for children of migrant agricultural workers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4904. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4905. A bill to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4906. A bill to provide for the establishment of a council to be known as the National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4907. A bill to amend the Public Health Services Act so as to establish a program to assist farmers in providing adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm laborers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 4908. A bill to permit certain employees of a State or political subdivision thereof to elect coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, as self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 4909. A bill to exempt from income tax, annuities and pensions paid by the United States to its employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 4910. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer to deduct (as trade or business expenses) the expenses of travel, meals, and lodging while employed away from his regular place of abode; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4911. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the costs of education or training shall be deductible as trade or business expenses when incurred in order to obtain a new or better job, as well as when incurred in order to maintain existing skills, status, salary, or employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 4912. A bill to amend section 33 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4913. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 4914. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide for the use of counterpart funds for international agricultural conferences; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 4915. A bill to establish a Commission to enforce antidiscrimination provisions in Government contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4916. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON (by request):

H.R. 4917. A bill to provide members of the Yakima Tribes with full citizenship rights by extinguishing the tribal entity and vesting each tribal member with his equal cash share of the fair market value of all reservation assets of the Yakima Tribes in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4918. A bill to provide members of the Colville Confederated Tribes with full citizenship rights by extinguishing the tribal entity and vesting each tribal member with his equal cash share of the fair market value of all reservation assets of the Colville Confederated Tribes in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 4919. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H.R. 4920. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.J. Res. 328. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON: Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to the granting of the fee or such lesser interest in land to the State of Wyoming for the purpose of establishing a county or State youth training camp; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the payment of the bonded indebtedness and the special assessments of any property which the Federal Government acquires by condemnation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to immediately take the necessary steps to give the citizens of this Nation an opportunity by constitutional amendment to determine whether or not prayer shall be permitted in the public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to the provision of assurances to the Government of the United States of the payment of non-Federal costs by the State and its political subdivisions in federally approved water projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to favoring early development of the Pipestem Creek, near Jamestown, N. Dak., and urging the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to expedite completion of its investigations, and develop a favorable report, thereon; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4921. A bill for the relief of Anis Butros Sakhleh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 4922. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Munoz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 4923. A bill for the relief of David Gottlieb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 4924. A bill for the relief of Gordon W. Heritage, Sr., and Sara Martha Heritage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 4925. A bill for the relief of Ng Yee Fee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

Thursday, March 14, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Kenneth J. Sharp, canon, the Washington Cathedral, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O gracious Father, since it is of Thy mercy that another day is added to our lives, we here dedicate both our souls and bodies to Thee and Thy service. Grant, we beseech Thee, that this day may be to us one of healthful work and progress. Guide, we pray Thee, all those to whom Thou hast committed the government of this Nation. Grant at this time to the President of these United States, the Senate, and all others who are engaged in government, special gifts of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and strength, that, upholding what is right and following what is true, they may in their wisdom follow Thy holy will.

Kindle, we pray Thee, in the hearts of all men the true love of peace; and guide with Thy strong and peaceful wisdom those who take counsel for the nations of the earth. Guide them, we pray, into the way of justice and truth, and establish among them the peace which is the fruit of righteousness.

O blessed Lord God, who didst reveal Thyself to bring abundant life to all mankind, we pray Thee that all who here on earth possess the abundance of this world may desire it so keenly for others, that unjust conditions may become intolerable, and that all who love Thee may become rich in their concern for justice and equality toward all men. O Thou who hast created man in Thine own image, give all in authority the strength fearlessly to contend against evil, and to make no peace with oppression; and that we may reverently use our freedom, help us to employ it in the maintenance of justice among men in our country and all nations.

Grant us, O Lord, to pass this day in gladness and peace, without stumbling and without stain; that, reaching the eventide victorious over all temptation, we may praise Thee, the eternal God, who art blessed, and dost govern all things, world without end. Amen.

The grace of our Lord, Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost be with us all, evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 11, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–420, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Nix, Chairman, Mr. Montoya, Mr. McDowell, Mr. Zablocki, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Wright, Mr. Johnson of California, Mr. Whalley, Mr. Derwinski, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Norblad, and Mr. Springer as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group on the part of the House, for the meeting to be held in Guanajuato, Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–420, the Speaker had appointed Mr. Reifel of South Dakota, Mr. Morse of Massachusetts, and Mr. Cameron of California as members of the U.S. delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, on the part of the House, for the meeting to be held in the Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963, to fill the existing vacancies thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 39. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1948, as it relates to the appointment of the District of Columbia Armory Board;

H.R. 682. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties;

H.R. 1933. An act to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration;

H.R. 1935. An act to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 1937. An act to amend the act known as the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940;

H.R. 1982. An act to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved;

H.R. 2438. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2440. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2485. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended; and

H.R. 3537. An act to increase the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 39. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1948, as it relates to the appointment of the District of Columbia Armory Board;

H.R. 682. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to permit the appointment of new trustees in deeds of trust in the District of Columbia by agreement of the parties;

H.R. 1933. An act to amend the act of February 9, 1907, entitled "An act to define the term 'registered nurse' and to provide for the registration of nurses in the District of Columbia," as amended, with respect to the minimum age limitation for registration;

H.R. 1935. An act to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 1937. An act to amend the act known as the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, and the act known as the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia, approved October 3, 1940;

H.R. 1982. An act to amend section 10 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, so as to require reports of collisions in which motor vehicles are involved;

H.R. 2485. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make regulations to prevent and control the spread of communicable and preventable diseases," approved August 11, 1939, as amended; and

H.R. 3537. An act to increase the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia in civil actions; to change the names of the court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2438. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2440. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Upon request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces the appointment of Senator Talmadge, of Georgia, and Senator Williams, of Delaware, as negotiators under the Trade Expansion Act, pursuant to recommendations by the leadership and the chairman of the Finance Committee.

The Chair also announces the appointment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] as a member of the delegation on the part of the Senate, of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Guanajuato, Republic of Mexico, beginning on Monday, March 18, 1963, vice Mr. Williams of New Jersey, excused.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report of U.S. Soldiers' Home

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the U.S. Soldiers' Home, for the fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Authorization of Certain Construction at Military Installations

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Law Relating to Material and Necessary Witnesses to Crimes Committed in the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the law relating to material and necessary witnesses to crimes committed in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Audit Report on Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, for the period June 28, 1958, through September 1, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Examination of Unnecessary Costs Incurred by the Department of the Navy in the Procurement of Airborne Early Warning Search Radars

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of unnecessary costs incurred by the Department of the Navy in the procurement of airborne early warning search radars, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Laws Enacted by Legislature of Guam

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Sixth Guam Legislature 1962 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Library of Congress

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Library of Congress, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 12

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to establish a 'National Flag Week.'

"Whereas the flag of the United States is symbolic of that which is most cherished and desired by man—freedom; and

"Whereas the freedom represented by the American flag was hard won by our forefathers, and thus far preserved; and

"Whereas this symbol of freedom has been the inspiration and hope of the oppressed and persecuted of the world; and

"Whereas in these times of complacency, the people of the State, as well as of the Nation, would do well to pause and consider the meaning of the now taken for granted freedom symbolized by our flag: Now therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to do whatever is necessary to establish the 7-day period commencing with the first day of July of each year as National Flag Week, wherein the people of the Nation will be urged to display the American flag annually, each of these 7 days; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 11

"Joint resolution relative to a commemorative stamp honoring Hollywood's entertainment industry

"Whereas, for over half a century Hollywood has been famous as the center of the motion picture industry and, in more recent years, the center of the television, radio, and recording industries; and

"Whereas, film production, of which Hollywood is the world center, is not only a means of entertainment, but serves for the recordation of significant events, for the propagation of ideas, as a social medium of considerable importance, as a valid art form in its own right, and preserves the colorful history of the United States; and

"Whereas, the Hollywood Museum, as the archive of momentous films of national and international scope and the exhibition hall for modern, as well as historic, picture filming techniques, will be dedicated in Hollywood in June of 1964: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Postmaster General of the United States to provide for the issuance in June of 1964 of a commemorative stamp honoring Hollywood the "center of the entertainment industry"; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Postmaster General of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution W

"Concurrent resolution urging the U.S. Congress to provide for the payment of the bonded indebtedness and the special assessments of any property which the Federal Government acquires by condemnation

"Whereas when either the Federal Government or the State of North Dakota or any of its political subdivisions, exercises the power of eminent domain the bonded indebtedness and special assessments of the condemned property are assumed by the remaining property within the political subdivisions of which such condemned property is a part; and

"Whereas this imposes an inequitable and oftentimes burdensome financial obligation upon the remaining property; and

"Whereas North Dakota's 38th Legislative Assembly is presently considering legislation which would require the State agencies condemning property to pay the proportionate share of the bonded indebtedness and special assessments of any property acquired by condemnation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*, That the 38th Legislative Assembly hereby respectfully urges and requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation whereby the U.S. Government would pay the proportionate share of the bonded indebtedness and special assessments of any property which it acquires pursuant to its powers of eminent domain; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the U.S. Congress, and to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"Frank A. Wenstrom,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Howard F. Doherty,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"Stanley Saugstad,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Gerald F. Stair,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution relating to the provision of assurances to the Government of the United States of the payment of non-Federal costs by the State and its political subdivisions in federally approved water projects

"Whereas the Federal Water Supply Act of 1958 authorizes the inclusion of water supply storage in reservoirs constructed by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for present or anticipated future demand or need for municipal or industrial water, provided the Federal Government is reasonably assured by the States, political subdivisions, or local interests, that the water will be needed and that the non-Federal financial obligation for the water supply features will be fulfilled; and

"Whereas the State of North Dakota through the State water conservation commission is authorized to participate in works for the conservation, development, distribution, and utilization of its water resources; and

"Whereas affected local interests have requested and the State water conservation commission has recommended the inclusion of not less than 2,900 acre-feet of water supply storage in the Bowman-Haley Reservoir on the north fork of the Grand River in North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*, That in view of the ever-increasing demand and anticipated future need for water, the legislature hereby declares as its policy that conservation and storage of water supplies should be provided wherever and whenever feasible and practicable, and that it concurs in the request of local interests and the recommendation of the State water conservation commission for inclusion of the maximum water supply storage in the Bowman-Haley Reservoir project; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the legislature recognizes the non-Federal repayment obligations required in connection with providing water supply features in federally financed projects and hereby directs the State water conservation commission to make and supply such assurances relative thereto as may be required by and satisfactory to the Chief of Engineers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Chief of Engineers of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the chairmen of the U.S. Senate and House Appropriations Committees, and the Governor of North Dakota.

"Frank A. Wenstrom,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Howard F. Doherty,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"Stanley Saugstad,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Gerald F. Stair,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution R

"Concurrent resolution favoring early development of the Pipestem Creek, near Jamestown, N. Dak., and urging the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to expedite completion of its investigations, and develop a favorable report thereon

"Whereas increased public demand for more and improved water management requires the optimum development of our precious water resources for controlling floods, providing water supplies for municipal, industrial, agricultural, recreational, fish and wildlife and other purposes; and

"Whereas the Pipestem Creek, the major tributary of the James River in North Dakota, contributes up to 45 percent of the water during flooding of the James River below their confluence, offers an excellent opportunity for multiple-purpose use if properly developed and it will thereby enhance instead of impair property values in affected urban and rural areas; and

"Whereas further surveys and investigations for construction of a proposed dam and reservoir thereon, about 5 miles upstream from Jamestown, are continuing under the direction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in cooperation with other agencies: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*, That the 38th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota does hereby express its keen interest in, and endorsement of, the proposed development on the Pipestem Creek for the many beneficial purposes aforesaid, and urges the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to complete its work as expeditiously as possible in the hope that a favorable report thereon can be developed and authorizing legislation enacted in the near future; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit copies hereof to the Chief of Engineers, the Riverdale Area Office of Corps of Engineers, the President of the U.S. Senate and Speaker of U.S. House of Representatives, and the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"Frank A. Wenstrom,
"President of the Senate.
"Howard F. Doherty,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"Stanley Saugstad,
"Speaker of the House.
"Gerald F. Stair,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Resolution 18

"Whereas it is for the economic and industrial good of the State of Indiana that its land be used for productive purposes wherever feasible; and

"Whereas it appears that certain forces are inimical to the economic betterment of the State of Indiana in its proposed development; and

"Whereas the construction of a deepwater port on Lake Michigan within the territorial limits of the State of Indiana will benefit the economy and development of Indiana; and

"Whereas there are certain insidious elements at work to prevent the development of such deepwater port by the acquisition of land for the admirable but spurious purpose of creating a national park: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives, That it is the expressed policy of the State of Indiana, by the House of Representatives of the 93d General Assembly of said State, that land of said sovereign State situate within 25 miles of Lake Michigan shall not be ceded or surrendered to the United States of America or any other sovereign power whose intentions do not coincide with the best interests of the State of Indiana in the construction and development of a deepwater port on the shores of Lake Michigan in the area of Burns ditch.

"Charles W. Edwards,
"Representative."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record and appropriately referred, three resolutions adopted by the North Dakota State Legislature.

These resolutions are on subjects on which the North Dakota people have very strong views. These views, I believe, are very ably expressed in these resolutions.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolutions were appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution H

"Concurrent resolution urging the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to establish reasonable regulations in respect to the number and species of ducks that may be shot in North Dakota and also urging the United States to enter into an agreement with Mexico to prevent the wholesale slaughter of ducks in Mexico

"Whereas North Dakota raises and feeds more ducks than any other State, and several times more than are shot by State-licensed hunters; and

"Whereas the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior has imposed unreasonable restrictions respecting the number and species of ducks that may be taken during the hunting season, such restrictions in effect requiring the hunters to carry a duck identification book and field glasses in one hand and a gun in the other; and

"Whereas ducks migrating from Canada, and from North Dakota and other States of the United States, are being slaughtered in wholesale numbers in Mexico due to an absence of restrictions respecting duck hunting and the allowance of commercial duck hunting and trapping: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior establish reasonable regulations which would allow North Dakota hunters to take a greater number of species and ducks during the forthcoming hunting seasons; and be it further

"Resolved, That the United States enter into negotiations with Mexico in order to prevent the unreasonable slaughter in Mexico of ducks raised in Canada, and in North Dakota and other States of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the North Dakota State game and fish commissioner, the North Dakota delegation in Congress, and the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior at Washington, D.C.

"Frank A. Wenstorm,
"President of the Senate.
"Howard F. Doherty,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"Stanley Saugstad,
"Speaker of the House.
"Gerald F. Stair,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution R.R.

"Concurrent resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to immediately take the necessary steps to give to the citizens of this Nation an opportunity by constitutional amendment to determine whether or not prayer shall be permitted in the public schools.

"Whereas no civilization, no government, and no nation has ever existed, nor could they be possible, without a fundamental and profound recognition of and reverence for some authority, some ideal, some being, superior to the individual, which in our national heritage we have expressed as a belief in and dependence upon Almighty God; and

"Whereas our national tradition and heritage of public and civic prayer give purpose and meaning to our Union as a Nation, without which we could only suffer the anarchy or tyranny of the oppressed peoples in less enlightened parts of the world; and

"Whereas education may be a worthless thing if limited to merely the dissemination of factual information without the expression and understanding of ideas, ideals, theories, customs, and beliefs of other men, whether designated as being of a religious nature or by some other appellation; and

"Whereas none of the constitutional safeguards of individual rights and civil liberties of the citizens of these United States were designed or intended to prohibit prayer in the schools or in any other public place, so long as no citizen is coerced into a participation therein inconsistent with his own beliefs; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has had occasion upon June 25, 1962, in its decision rendered in the case of *Engel et al.* v. *Vitale et al.,* No. 468 upon the docket of its 1961 October term, to so construe our Constitution as to prohibit public prayer in public schools: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to immediately take the necessary steps to provide the citizens of this great Nation an opportunity to amend the U.S. Constitution to determine whether or not public prayer shall be permitted in the public schools of the several States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state shall forward copies of this resolution to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"Frank A. Wenstrom,
"President of the Senate.
"Howard F. Doherty,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"Stanley Saugstad,
"Speaker of the House.
"Gerald F. Stair,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the North Dakota Legislature, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

To the Committee on Public Works:

"House Concurrent Resolution L

"Concurrent resolution endorsing and supporting the construction of the proposed Pembilier Dam and Reservoir project and commending the agencies participating in its investigation and planning

"Whereas the proposed Pembilier Dam and Reservoir on the Pembina River, near Walhalla, N. Dak., is progressing to the point where a report thereon by the investigating agencies of both Canada and the United States can be expected before another session of the legislature; and

"Whereas the surveys, investigations, and studies so far made all indicate economic feasibility, that the construction thereof would insure control of flooding on the Pembina River, adequate municipal and industrial water supplies for several communities in both countries, also supplemental water for potential irrigable areas, and for other beneficial purposes; and

"Whereas the International Joint Commission has developed much time and study to this proposal and has individually and collectively toured the Pembina River Basin and inspected the various sites and areas involved in the proposed project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the 38th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota hereby reaffirms its wholehearted endorsement and support of the Pembilier Dam and Reservoir project aforesaid, commends the International Joint Commission and all the agencies of both Canada and the United States participating in the important investigative and planning activities for their faithful and conscientious devotion to their task and trusts that the definite report thereon will become available sometime during the next fiscal year; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies hereof be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States; Secretary of the Department of State; President of the U.S. Senate; Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; district engineer, St. Paul office of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation; Chairmen of the Canadian and United States Sections, International Joint Commission; Members of the North Dakota delegation in Congress; and the Governor of North Dakota.

"Stanley Saugstad,
"Speaker of the House.
"Gerald F. Stair,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"Frank A. Wenstrom,
"President of the Senate.
"Howard F. Doherty,
"Secretary of the Senate."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the State of North Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.)

APPOINTMENT OF VETERANS TO CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on February 28, 1963, a resolution was unanimously approved by Frank Stull Post No. 152, the American Legion, Department of Kansas, Ness City, Kans., in regard to the appointment of veterans to civil service positions.

During the past few months I have received many letters and resolutions from veterans and veteran organizations stating that veterans' preference was not followed in making appointments to positions in the Post Office Department, and it is my hope that this situation will be corrected.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of these remarks and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has developed a point preference system for veterans taking civil service examinations; and

Whereas this would indicate that the Congress intended to favor said veterans when applying for jobs in the field of civil service; and

Whereas the Post Office Department and other agencies coming under the civil service regulations have followed this policy; and

Whereas a situation has arisen in this community that would indicate appointments covered under civil service regulations are being made without considering the applicants' service in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas it is the belief of this post that such appointments should be made on the basis of ability and veterans' preferences and not on the basis of previous or current political activity: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this post take all necessary action to inform the citizens of the community as to the situation as pertains to the appointment of applicants in the field of civil service; and be it further

Resolved That this action be brought to the attention of all county committee members of all political parties in this area; and be it further

Resolved, That this action be brought to the attention of the U.S. Congressman from this district, the U.S. Senators from this State, and the district, State, and national levels of this organization.

Vern E. Cranston,
Commander.

Attest:

William D. Brackney,
Adjutant.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 2438. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 64).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution to print with illustrations "A Report on U.S. Foreign Operations in Africa," by Senator Allen J. Ellender (Rept. No. 65);

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document, with illustrations, a pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol," and to print additional copies thereof (Rept. No. 73);

S. Res. 72. Resolution to print as a Senate document a report on Colorado River storage project and participating projects, etc. (Rept. No. 74);

S. Res. 99. Resolution to print as a document, with additional copies, a compilation of materials relating to the history of the Committee on Banking and Currency (Rept. No. 77);

S. Res. 105. Resolution to print as a document a compilation of materials entitled "Summer Employment by College Students in the Federal Government—1961" (Rept. No. 75); and

S. Res. 106. Resolution to print additional copies of Senate Document No. 117, 84th Congress, relating to the Communist Party of the United States (Rept. No. 76).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments:

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?" (Rept. No. 70); and

S. Res. 56. Resolution to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States (Rept. No. 67).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without additional amendments:

S. Res. 29. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Commerce to make a study of certain matters under its jurisdiction (Rept. No. 71).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 212. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable (Rept. No. 68); and

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman (Rept. No. 69).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 1597. An act relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents (Rept. No. 72).

AUTHORIZATION FOR SALE OF CERTAIN CADMIUM—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original bill (S. 1089) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescirbed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and submitted a report (No. 66); which bill was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE TO TESTIFY IN THE CASE OF PENNSYLVANIA AGAINST BERMAN ET AL.—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] I report from the Committee on Government Operations an original resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 108) as follows:

Whereas, in the case of the *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* v. *Abraham Berman, Edward Walker, Joseph Hartsough, Joseph Grace, John Joseph Elco, Raymond Cohen,* and *Ben Lapensohn,* Bill of Indictment No. 520 of the September 1959 Session of the Court of Oyer and Terminer of Philadelphia County of said Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, subpoenas ad testificandum and duces tecum were issued upon the application of the District Attorney of Philadelphia County and addressed as follows:

"To George Kopecky, Joseph Unger, Herbert J. Rose, Jr., Edgar C. Parkhurst, Charles Wolfe, and George Martin, all of whom are former employees of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field; and directing them to bring with them all of their notes, memoranda, workpapers, and records compiled by them in connection with the above-named defendants and Local 107 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, which subpoenas are returnable on March 25, 1963, at 10 o'clock ante meridian"; and

Whereas said material is in the possession of and under the control of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, by virtue of section 5 of Senate Resolution 255 of the 86th Congress; and

Whereas by the privileges of the Senate of the United States, no document under the control and in the possession of the Senate of the United States can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession, but by its permission; and

Whereas by the privilege of the Senate and by Rule XXX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no document shall be withdrawn from its files except by the order of the Senate; and

Whereas information secured by staff employees of the Senate pursuant to their official duties as employees may not be revealed without the consent of the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That George Kopecky, Joseph Unger, Herbert J. Rose, Jr., Edgar C. Parkhurst, Charles Wolfe, and George Martin, former employees of the United States Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, are authorized to appear and testify at the time and place, and before the court named in the subpoenas ad testificandum and duces tecum before mentioned, or at any continued and subsequent proceedings thereof, and to take with them such documents and papers called for in said subpoenas for production

before said court where determined by the judge thereof to be material and relevant to the issues before him.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, there is presently pending in the court of quarter sessions, county of Philadelphia, Pa., a criminal action involving several individuals which is an outgrowth of an investigation conducted by the former Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field. This criminal action relates to persons identified with local No. 107 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters which is located in Philadelphia, Pa. As you know, under Senate Resolution 255 of the 86th Congress, the files of that select committee were transferred to the custody of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

The court in Philadelphia has issued subpenas requiring the testimony of several former employees of the Senate select committee and calling for the production of certain documents which are now part of the files of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. Under the privileges of the Senate, no document under the control and in the possession of the Senate can be taken from its possession except by its consent and no information secured by staff employees of the Senate pursuant to their official duties as employees may be revealed except by consent of the Senate.

Accordingly, the purpose of this resolution is to permit these several employees of the former select committee to testify before the court in Philadelphia County and in connection therewith to present certain documentary evidence now in the files of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

The resolution (S. Res. 108) was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

PERMISSION FOR A CERTAIN EMPLOYEE TO TESTIFY IN CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], I report from the Committee on Government Operations an original resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 109) as follows:

Whereas the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations has in its possession, by virtue of Senate Resolution 250, certain evidence pertaining to an investigation of operations of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and its relationship with various individuals and corporations, which investigation was conducted by the Subcommittee under authority granted in said Senate Resolution 250; and

Whereas the action of the Department of Agriculture in cancelling cotton allotments transferred from the State of Oklahoma to the State of Texas by Walker Roman Nose, Erma Calf Bearhead, Ada L. Davis and other persons is now under appeal and is pending before the Review Committee for Area of Venue XXXIV, State of Texas, in re application for review by Agriculture Incorporated, farm No. 5519, Pecos County, Tex., Fort Stockton, Tex.; and

Whereas the Department of Agriculture has requested the production of evidence in the possession of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations concerning this matter and has requested that Arthur G. Kaplan, Assistant Counsel of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, appear and testify; and

Whereas by the privileges of the Senate, no Member or Senate employee is authorized to produce Senate documents or to testify but by order of the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations is granted leave to permit the copying and presentation of certain evidence for examination in connection with the aforementioned proceedings, the evidence thereupon to be returned to the possession of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations; and be it further

Resolved, That Arthur G. Kaplan, an Assistant Counsel employed by the Senate, is authorized to appear and testify in the aforementioned proceedings.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, there is presently pending in Fort Stockton, Tex., a proceeding by the U.S. Department of Agriculture before the review committee for area of venue XXXIV of the State of Texas in regard to the application for review by Agriculture, Inc., Farm 5519, Pecos County, Tex.

This action relates to an appeal by several persons who transferred cotton allotments from the State of Oklahoma to the State of Texas by virtue of what has been ruled by the Department as a scheme or device. These allotments were canceled by the Department for these reasons and the action of the Department is now being contested before the review committee.

In connection with a recent investigation by the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, certain documents came into the possession of the subcommittee. The Department of Agriculture has requested that these documents be made available for the review proceedings to be conducted in Fort Stockton, Tex., and that Mr. Arthur G. Kaplan, assistant counsel, who acquired information during the course of his duties, germane to the review proceedings, be available to provide testimony.

By the privileges of the Senate no documents within control and possession of the Senate can be taken from the Senate without its consent. Likewise, information secured by staff employees of the Senate pursuant to their official duties as employees may not be revealed without the consent of the Senate.

The purpose of this resolution is to permit Mr. Arthur G. Kaplan to appear in Fort Stockton, Tex., before the review committee and to provide testimony, as well as to furnish documents in the possession of the subcommittee germane to the subject under review.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 109) was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

THE MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the committee have until midnight, March 28, to file its report on the bill, and that then the report be printed, together with minority and individual views. This bill will be under consideration by the Commerce Committee until midnight March 28.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT ENTITLED "1963 JOINT ECONOMIC REPORT"—MINORITY AND ADDITIONAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 78)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from the Joint Economic Committee, I submit a report entitled "1963 Joint Economic Report," which I ask may be printed, with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint economic report submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] may be printed together with minority views, and the additional views of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UTILIZATION OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS BY COMMITTEES IN CONNECTION WITH FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Committee on **Armed Services, the Select Committee on Small Business, and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by these committees in 1962 in connection with foreign travel.**

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Eugene J. McCarthy:											
Germany	Deutsche mark			358	89.50	442	110.50			800	200.00
Italy	Lira	306,605	493.64	174,469	281.09	597,070	961.42	127,129	204.70	1,205,273	1,940.85
Spain	Peseta	5,240	87.42	2,761	46.05	935	15.60	364	6.09	9,300	155.16
Switzerland	Franc	548.90	126.88	351	81.13	1295.20	299.38	304.90	70.48	2,500	577.87
Total			707.94		497.77		1,386.90		281.27		2,873.88

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	2,873.8

MARCH 14, 1963.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Richard B. Russell:											
France	New franc	235	47.96	201	41.02	5	1.02	193	39.38	634	129.38
Do	Dollar				7.93				10.58		18.51
Italy	Lira	34,410	55.41	10,755	17.32			8,853	13.93	54,018	86.66
Do	Dollar				5.48				.40		5.88
Lebanon	Lebanese pound	124.10	39.03	53.80	16.92			98	30.82	275.90	86.77
Do	Dollar				11.67				10.78		22.45
Egypt	Egyptian pound	2.5	5.75	6	13.80			3.5	8.05	12	27.60
Do	Dollar				2.72				3.22		5.94
Cyprus	Cyprus pound	6.5	18.29	2.8	7.90	1	2.81	2.4	6.76	12.7	35.76
Israel	Israeli pound	101.47	33.82	54.40	18.13	130.50	43.50	30	10.00	316.37	105.45
Do	Dollar				2.13				2.78		4.91
Jordan	Jordanian dinar					7.75	22.10			7.75	22.10
Spain	Peseta	4,078	67.96	2,297	38.28			950	15.83	7,325	122.07
Do	Dollar				10.70				1.63		12.33
United States							103.00				103.00
Senator E. L. Bartlett:											
Japan	Yen	28,000	80.00	39,297	109.16	(1)		26,800	78.78	94,300	267.94
Do	Dollar				15.93	(1)	221.47		14.26		251.66
William H. Darden:											
France	New franc	212	43.26	201	41.02	5	1.02	186	37.96	604	123.26
Do	Dollar				7.93				10.58		18.51
Italy	Lira	24,250	39.05	10,755	17.32			8,278	13.33	43,283	69.70
Do	Dollar				5.48				.40		5.88
Lebanon	Lebanese pound	87.35	27.45	53.80	16.92			32	10.07	173.15	54.44
Do	Dollar				11.67				10.78		22.45
Egypt	Egyptian pound.	2.5	5.75	6	13.80			1.5	3.45	10	23.00
Do	Dollar				2.72				3.22		5.94
Cyprus	Cyprus pound	6.7	18.86	2.7	7.61	1	2.81	2.4	6.76	12.8	36.04
Israel	Israeli pound	63.37	21.12	54.5	18.13	130.5	43.50	5	1.67	253.27	84.42
Do	Dollar				2.13				2.78		4.91
Jordan	Jordanian dinars					7.75	22.10			7.75	22.10
Spain	Peseta	2,859	47.65	2,322	38.70			679	11.32	5,860	97.67
Do	Dollar				10.70				1.63		12.33
United States	do						103.00				103.00
Total			551.36		513.22		566.33		361.15		1,992.06

[1] State Department purchased ticket and to date amount not reported to Washington, Mar. 8, 1963.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,394.36
Appropriated funds:	
Government department:	
Navy	346.04
Air Force	251.66
Total	1,992.06

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Armed Services, Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Ronald Friedenberg:											
Canada	U.S. dollar								5.50		5.50
England	do		23.27		30.18		3.33		16.17		72.95
Norway	do		11.24		16.25				5.78		33.27
Germany	do		10.05		23.05		3.69		16.14		52.93
Italy	do		6.08		7.75				8.44		22.27
France	do		23.07		27.83		.22		15.05		66.17
Ben J. Gilleas:											
England	do		31.50		50.00		4.00		30.50		116.00
Germany	do		7.50		23.22				41.22		71.94
Denmark	do		8.40		26.00		3.70		21.00		59.10
Italy	do		9.00		14.00		2.55		31.00		56.55
Spain	do		14.00		11.00				10.00		35.00
France	do		28.50		21.00		9.00		25.00		83.50
James T. Kendall:											
England	do		31.50		50.00		4.00		30.50		116.00
Germany	do		7.50		23.22				41.22		71.94
Denmark	do		8.40		26.00		3.70		21.00		59.10
Italy	do		9.00		14.00		2.55		31.00		56.55
Spain	do		14.00		11.00				10.00		35.00
France	do		28.50		21.00		9.00		25.00		83.50
Total			271.51		395.50		45.74		384.52		1,097.27

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Government department: Air Force	$1,097.27

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Richard J. Daschbach:											
Belgium	Franc	600	12.06	720	14.49					1,320	26.55
England	Pound	25.8	72.40	36.8	103.00	2.9	8.00	1.9	5.44	67	188.84
France	Franc	346.77	70.77	558.60	114.00	5,608	1,144.49	40.72	8.31	6,554.10	1,337.57
Germany	Mark	128	32.17	164	41.00	308	77.01			600	150.18
Italy	Lira	32,404	52.18	43,470	70.00	7,452	12.00	2,174	3.50	85,500	137.68
Netherlands	Guilder	34.8	9.69	50.3	14.00			15	4.17	100	27.86
Sweden	Krona	159.8	30.98	283.7	55.00	36.1	7.00	11.3	2.20	490	95.18
Daniel T. Coughlin:											
England	Pound	26/14	74.76	18	50.40	31	86.80	15	43.03	90/14	[1] 254.99
Belgium	Pound converted to franc.			4	11.20	18	50.40			22	61.60
Germany	Mark	202.44	50.61	192.48	48.00	383.24	95.81	330.04	82.50	1,013.68	[2] 276.92
Italy	Lira	84,672	141.12	43,200	72.00	31,200	52.00	20,928	24.74	180,000	289.86
France	New franc	555.85	111.17	180	36.00	50	10.00	154.15	30.83	940	[3] 188.00
William T. McInarnay:											
England	Pound	£31/2	88.24	£25	70.00	£62	173.74	£12	33.60	130/2	[4] 365.58
Germany	Deutsche mark	202.44	50.61	188.00	47.00	299.80	74.96	9.76	2.44	700.00	[5] 175.00
Italy	Lira	84,674	136.35	39,528	63.65	63,223	101.81	16,272	26.20	203,697	[6] 328.01
France	New franc	555.85	111.17	205	41.00	75	15.00	170	34.00	1,010.85	201.17
Neal D. Peterson: [7]											
Japan	Yen	40,320	112.00	30,240	84.00	720	2.00	1,835	5.10	73,115	[8] 203.10
Formosa	New Taiwan dollar.	2,400	60.00	1,040	26.00	160	4.00			3,600	90.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	229.40	40.00	97.50	17.00	23.10	4.03			350.00	61.03
Bangkok	Baht	1,146.75	55.00	364.88	17.50	44.87	2.14			1,556.50	74.64
Lebanon	Pound	143.28	48.00	41.79	14.00	5.98	2.00	10.20	3.44	201.25	67.44
Germany	Deutsche mark	576	144.00	180	45.00	64	16.00	15	3.75	835	208.75
Total			1,503.28		1,054.24		1,939.18		313.25		4,809.96

[1] Refunded: 13 pounds—$36.40. Have receipt from State Department.

[2] Refunded: 93 deutsche marks—$23. Have receipt from State Department.

[3] Refunded: 60 new francs—$12. Have receipt from State Department.

[4] Includes pounds converted to francs in Belgium. Have receipt for 20 pounds returned to State Department.

[5] Have receipt for 100 marks returned to State Department.

[6] Have receipt for 25,000 lire returned to State Department.

[7] Air travel purchased by the State Department from Pan American, payable in Dutch Guilders. American Dollar equivalent: $1,220.90.

[8] Mr. Peterson has receipt from State Department for 2,885 yen turned in upon his return to Washington, which amount has not yet been deducted from State Department figures.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	4,809.96

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business.

MARCH 1, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
C. Holifield,[1] New Zealand	Pound	8	22.66	5	13.60	3	9.08			16	45.34
C. Hosmer,[1] New Zealand	do	8	22.66	5	13.60	3	9.07			16	45.33
J. Westland: [1]											
Italy	Lira	92,100	148.31	55,256	88.98	27,628	44.49	9,215	14.84	184,199	296.62
Spain	Peseta	5,000	83.36	3,000	50.01	1,500	25.00	500	8.33	10,000	166.70
Switzerland	Swiss franc	556	128.56	334	77.14	445	102.83	55	12.86	1,390	321.39
W. F. Bennett:											
Greece	Drachma	754.70	25.15	600	20.00	470	15.65	700	23.35	2,524.70	84.15
Turkey	Turkish lira	242	26.87	160	17.77	180	20.00	93	10.30	675	74.94
Switzerland	Swiss franc	104	26.00	200	49.70	136	34.25	56	15.75	496	125.70
Italy	Lira	48,748	78.50	57,287	92.25	44,556	71.75	44,432	71.55	195,023	314.05
	Dutch guilder					3,048	[2] 846.60			3,048	846.60
	French franc					1,799	363.00			1,799	363.00
J. T. Conway:											
Greece	Drachma	2,925	97.42	1,755	58.50	877	29.33	293	9.75	5,850	195.00
Turkey	Turkish pound	125	13.88	75	8.33	38	4.18	12	1.38	250	27.77
Italy	Lira	31,050	50.00	18,630	30.00	9,315	15.00	3,105	5.00	62,100	100.00
France	French franc	472.04	96.34	283.21	57.80	141.60	28.90	47.20	9.65	944.05	192.69
Germany	Deutsche mark	400.00	100.20	240.00	60.10	120.00	30.05	40.00	10.00	800.00	200.35
	do					2,219.64	[2] 556.30			2,219.64	556.30
J. R. Newman, Belgium	Franc	2,667	53.34	3,900	78.00	750	15.00	458	9.16	7,775	155.50
	Deutsche mark					2,219.62	[2] 556.35			2,219.62	556.35
Total			973.25		715.78		2,776.83		201.92		4,667.78

[1] Military air transportation.

[2] Commercial air transportation.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	4,667.78

JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

MARCH 8, 1963.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY,
March 12, 1963.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: In accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, there is submitted herewith an itemized report showing the amounts in dollar equivalent values of foreign currencies expended by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in connection with official visits by members and staff to various installations abroad during the period from January 1, 1962, to December 31, 1962.

Transportation by commercial aircraft was used by the members and staff from the United States abroad and return. Counterpart funds were used in each of these cases as indicated on the attached form A. Military Air Transport was also used where indicated. The miscellaneous column in the report includes funds expended for diplomatic and protocol functions. It also includes telephone charges for committee purposes.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

William J. Hartigan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

By Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Edmund T. Pratt, Jr., of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ray H. Hemenway, of Minnesota, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Minnesota; and

Jack T. Stuart, of Mississippi, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Mississippi.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Richard D. Fitzgibbon, Jr., of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Missouri.

By Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert M. Morgenthau, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York.

By Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William J. Nealon, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Carl E. McGowan, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit; and

John W. Douglas, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on Commerce:

Paul J. Tierney, of Maryland, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Capt. James D. Craik, and Capt. Louis M. Thayer, Jr., for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard;

Frank S. Kapral, to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy;

Kenneth A. Cox, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission; and

James H. Blumer, and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Commerce:

Edgar F. Kaiser, of California, and sundry other persons, to be incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp.; and

Leo D. Welch, of New York, and Joseph V. Charyk, of California, to be incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corporation.

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works:

Brig. Gen. Robert F. Seedlock, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. ANDERSON subsequently said: Mr. President, under the provisions of section 302 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962, the President has nominated 14 men to be incorporators of that Corporation for which the Senate confirmation is required. The Commerce Committee has held hearings on this matter and has unanimously favorably reported these men to the Senate.

As in executive session, in accordance with the wishes of the members of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, of which I am chairman, and as previously discussed with the chairman and members of the Commerce Committee, I ask unanimous consent that these 14 nominees be referred to the Space Committee for further consideration.

I can assure the Senate that it is not the intention of the Space Committee to cause an undue delay in the confirmation of these nominations. The committee will consider and dispose of this matter in the quickest possible time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, I understand the nominations will go before the Space Committee for consideration.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. They go to both committees. This time they went to the Commerce Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1061. A bill to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers, and for other purposes; and

S. 1062. A bill to provide for strengthening and improving the national transportation system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bible, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Church, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McClellan, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Mechem, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mr. Mundt, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Smathers, Mr. Symington, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 1063. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1064. A bill to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity; and

S. 1065. A bill to amend section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 1066. A bill for the relief of the E. L. K. Oil Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1067. A bill to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit labor organizations representing guards to be admitted to certain affiliations of labor organizations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1068. A bill to make feed available at reduced prices for foundation herds of hogs in disaster areas; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1069. A bill for the relief of Angelos Michael Patelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Talmadge when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. Stennis, Mr. Aiken, and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 1070. A bill to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Eastland when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 1071. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the excise tax on table tennis tables, balls, nets, and paddles; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1072. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. Hartke):

S. 1073. A bill to authorize the construction of the Lafayette Reservoir in the State of Indiana for flood control, recreation, and related purposes; and

S. 1074. A bill to authorize the construction of the Big Pine Reservoir in the State of Indiana for flood control, recreation, and related purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bayh when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. Hart, Mr. Javits, Mr. Keating, and Mr. Humphrey):

S. 1075. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in the District of Columbia because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1076. A bill to amend the act of September 13, 1961, entitled "An act for the relief of Benjamin Schoenfeld"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1077. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act with respect to the compensation of hearing examiners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1078. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act;

S. 1079. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage in the District of Columbia;

S. 1080. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended;

S. 1081. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for compulsory school attendance, for the taking of a school census in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 4, 1925; and

S. 1082. A bill to establish in the Treasury a Correctional Industries Fund for the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1083. A bill to amend section 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to disallowance of deduction for certain travel and entertainment expenses; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Smathers when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. Smathers):

S. 1084. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a form of averaging for recovery of amounts received as damages for injury to crops through pollution of air, water or soil; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1085. A bill for the relief of Haralambos Foufas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1086. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain lands by the U.S. Government that have been flooded by the Ableman Dam and Whitewater Reservoir; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1087. A bill to provide for the establishment of cooperative outdoor recreation research centers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1088. A bill to revive the office of General of the Armies of the United States and to authorize the President to appoint General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to such office; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1089. A bill to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; placed on the calendar.

(See the reference to the above bill, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. Hart):

S. 1090. A bill to authorize the disposal of the property known as Ellis Island for purposes consistent with the public interest and welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BEALL (by request):

S. 1091. A bill to enable the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to aid the arts in ways similar to those in which the arts are aided by other cities of the United States, to provide competitions to encourage young Americans in the pursuit of excellence in the fine arts and to acquaint them with the best of our national cultural heritage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1092. A bill to provide retirement bene-

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

fits for certain U.S. Army officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. McClellan, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Williams of Delaware, Mr. Thurmond, Mr. Tower, Mr. Miller, and Mr. Dirksen):

S. 1093. A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bennett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1094. A bill to amend section 105(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax treatment of school teachers under wage continuation plans; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1095. A bill for the relief of Florentina Nuguid De Haberer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 1096. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Susanna Grum (Susanne Roth); and

S. 1097. A bill for the relief of Despina J. Sanios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1098. A bill for the relief of Fun Wat Hoy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1099. A bill relating to rate of postage on publications designed specifically for religious instruction classes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1100. A bill to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. Saltonstall (by request)):

S. 1101. A bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.J. Res. 59. Joint resolution to authorize the city of Galena, Ill., or an appropriate association or organization of the citizens thereof, to remove to Galena, Ill., the statue of Gen. John A. Rawlins located at Rawlins Park, Washington, District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dirksen when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNamara when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S.J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF CONGRESS ON CLOSING THE PANAMA CANAL TO CERTAIN TYPES OF CARGO

Mr. SCOTT submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that passage through the Panama Canal and use of any seaport facilities under the jurisdiction of the United States should be permanently denied to any vessel which, after the date of the adoption of this concurrent resolution, carries or attempts to carry to Cuba a cargo consisting in whole or in part of petroleum or petroleum products, or armaments or other materials of war; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That the President is requested to take such action as may be necessary to give effect to this concurrent resolution.

Mr. SCOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, I have submitted today a concurrent resolution that it is the sense of the Congress that passage through the Panama Canal and use of any seaport facilities under the jurisdiction of the United States should be permanently denied to any vessel which, after the date of the adoption of the resolution, carries or attempts to carry to Cuba a cargo consisting in whole or in part of petroleum or petroleum products, or armaments or other materials of war.

The resolution further requests that the President take such action as may be necessary to give effect to this resolution.

This resolution is an effort to provide the President with additional weapons to drive the Russians and their Communist hirelings out of Cuba.

The 1962 annual report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Company reports the following increases in Red trade:

> Showing a very impressive percentage increase for the year was the volume of cargo moving to Red China and Russia. Cargo movements to Red China totaled 877,000 long-tons for an increase of 600 percent and movements to Russia totaled, 344,000 long-tons for an increase of 48 percent. Sugar movements from Cuba accounted for the vast majority of this combined tonnage. In the return flow of cargo, Red China and Russia shipped 52,000 tons of cargo to Cuba.

The United States very properly stopped purchasing Cuban sugar in order to bring pressure upon the Cubans and thereby encourage the downfall of Fidel Castro. But Red China and Soviet Russia have been taking huge amounts of Cuban sugar in barter deals.

We know that some of that Red bloc trade has been in oil, and we know that oil feeds the Cuban war machine. The resolution I propose is an effort to arm the United States with additional weapons to stunt the growth of the Cuban war machine and to prevent the further arming and resupply of Soviet military forces in Cuba.

RESOLUTIONS

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN FORMER SENATE EMPLOYEES TO TESTIFY IN THE CASE OF PENNSYLVANIA AGAINST BERMAN ET AL.

Mr. JACKSON (for Mr. McClellan), from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 108) permitting certain former employees of the U.S. Senate to appear and testify in the case of Commonwealth of Pennsylvania against Berman et al., which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full where it appears under the heading "Reports of Committee.")

PERMISSION FOR A CERTAIN EMPLOYEE OF THE SENATE TO TESTIFY IN CERTAIN PROCEEDINGS

Mr. JACKSON (for Mr. McClellan), from the Committee on Government Operations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 109) permitting a certain employee of the Senate to appear and testify in certain proceedings, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full where it appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A TRANSLATION OF A BOOK ENTITLED "LARGE DAMS OF THE U.S.S.R.", WITH ILLUSTRATIONS AND AN EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Mr. MOSS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 110) to print as a Senate document a translation of a book entitled "Large Dams of the U.S.S.R.", with illustrations and an explanatory statement, which under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That there be printed as a Senate document a translation of the book "Large Dams of the U.S.S.R." prepared under the National Science Foundation translation, program, together with illustrations and an explanatory statement of Senator Frank E. Moss of Utah in connection therewith; and that there be printed an additional 500 copies of such document for the use of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE RELATIVE TO MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES WHILE THE SENATE IS IN SESSION

Mr. CHURCH (for himself, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Anderson, Mr. McGee, and Mr. Pastore) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 111) amending rule XXV of the standing rules relative to meetings of committees while the Senate is in session, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Church, which appears under a separate heading.)

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CLYDE DOYLE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. Kuchel) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 112) relative to the death of Representative Clyde Doyle, of California, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Engle, which appears under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills which have been requested by the administration. These measures, embodying the recommendations contained in the President's transportation message of April 1962 are, except for technical adjustments, identical to the proposals introduced and heard last year before both the Senate and House Commerce Committees.

This is major legislation, calling for a substantial modification of the existing Government regulatory pattern; a modification characterized in last year's message as "greater reliance on the forces of competition, less on the restraints of regulation." The central provision geared to this philosophy is one that would extend to the now fully regulated railroads, the agricultural and bulk commodity exemptions from controlled minimum rates available to highway and inland water carriers. Wisely, however, the letter of transmittal from the President also suggested, as an alternative, that—

> regulation might be applied in the areas presently exempt. I, therefore, renew my request that, in the interest of equality, one of these solutions be adopted.

Expeditious and effective decisions on these bills would be facilitated if the administration would also transmit to Congress the factual studies and underlying data on which the recommendations are based. It has been a perennial problem in the field of transportation legislation to subject value judgments and opinions to factual analysis because the facts have not been readily available. Prompt receipt of this information will enable not only prompter decisions, but better ones.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the President of the United States, and a letter from the Secretary of Commerce requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

S. 1061. A bill to exempt certain carriers from minimum rate regulation in the transportation of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and passengers, and for other purposes; and

S. 1062. A bill to provide for strengthening and improving the national transportation system, and for other purposes.

The letters presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

MARCH 5, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.
Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT (MR. SPEAKER): Although our Nation enjoys one of the most highly developed and diversified transportation systems in the world, it has been severely handicapped by laws and regulations which have failed to keep pace with advancing technology. In my message to the Congress last year, I pointed out that the basic objective of our transportation system must be to assure the availability of fast, safe, and economical transportation services needed in a growing and changing economy to move people and goods, without waste or discrimination, in response to private and public demands, at the lowest cost consistent with health, convenience, and national security. In that message I recommended a number of legislative steps to accomplish this purpose.

If action is not taken to establish a transportation policy consistent with the new demands upon the economy, we face serious problems of dislocation and deterioration in both the transportation industry and the economic life of the Nation which it affects. I urge that action be taken to establish such a policy.

Our objectives must be achieved, primarily, by continued reliance on unsubsidized, privately owned facilities, operating under the incentives of private profit and the checks of competition insofar as this is practicable. The law should provide a consistent and comprehensive framework of equal competitive opportunity that will achieve this objective at the lowest economic and social cost to the Nation. There must be equality of opportunity for all modes and for all passengers and shippers, without any special preferences. There should be maximum reliance on the forces of competition consistent with a continuing need for protection against destructive competition between forms of transportation or between competing carriers.

I am transmitting herewith, for the consideration of the Congress, draft legislation carrying out these principles, providing equality of opportunity among carriers, removing artificial barriers to the realization of the inherent advantages that each mode of transportation possesses, and assuring the protection of the antitrust laws against any destructive competition.

The most significant recommendation in my message of last year dealt with the inequality resulting from exempt transportation of bulk commodities by water and agricultural products by truck. All traffic, however, moving by railroad is fully regulated. I recommended that this inequality be corrected by removing minimum rate regulation from all transportation of bulk and agricultural commodities, but under the protection of existing laws against monopolistic and predatory trade practices applicable to business generally. In the alternative, appropriate regulation might be applied in the areas presently exempt, as I recommended in my message last year. I, therefore, renew my request that, in the interest of equality, one of these solutions be adopted.

I am also enclosing a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Commerce to me discussing legislation in greater detail. I urge that the Congress give prompt consideration to these proposals. I also recommend that legislation be enacted to make domestic truck air carriers ineligible for operative subsidies in the future, to require motor carriers and freight forwarders to pay reparations to shippers charged unlawfully high rates, to make motor carrier safety regulations applicable to private carriers, and to repeal the prohibition against rail carriers transporting commodities in which they have an interest.

These bills, if enacted, will represent a major accommodation to the present needs of the economy. They should strengthen our carriers, provide their users with a better and cheaper system of transportation, and help relieve the taxpayers of unnecessary burdens.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Submitted herewith are two proposed bills to implement certain recommendations contained in your message to the 87th Congress on April 5, 1962, concerning "The Transportation System of Our Nation." Both bills are consistent with the primary objective of that message to achieve a more efficient and economical national transportation system by placing greater reliance on competition. The first bill would reduce regulation by exempting from minimum-rate control carriers not presently exempt in the carriage of bulk commodities, agricultural and fishery products, and intercity passengers. The second bill would:

(a) Authorize and encourage common carriers to conduct experiments in rate simplification, freight classifications, and new services;

(b) Extend to all shippers and carriers the right to ship vehicles and containers by any mode at nondiscriminatory rates;

(c) Encourage the establishment of through service and joint rates by all combinations of modes and assure the reasonableness of such rates;

(d) Provide for cooperative enforcement of highway transportation regulation by the ICC and the States;

(e) Increase and extend the civil forfeiture penalties to violations of safety regulations and operations without authority;

(f) Require air carriers to pay reparations to shippers charged unlawfully high rates;

(g) Authorize simplification of Government transportation rates and procurement and greater flexibility in the use of motor vehicle common carriers for the transportation of mail; and

(h) Transfer the existing railroad loan guarantee program from the ICC to the Department of Commerce.

These bills are substantially the same as those introduced in the last Congress (S. 3242 and S. 3243; H.R. 11583 and H.R. 11584). The only changes are necessary technical corrections. In order to keep these bills in the same form as those on which extensive hearings have been held, we have not incorporated proposals which you recommended in your message last year which had previously been introduced in the Congress. It is recommended that you again endorse proposals to make domestic trunk air carriers ineligible for operating subsidies in the future, to require motor carriers and freight forwarders to pay reparations to shippers charged unlawfully high rates, to make motor carrier safety regulations applicable to private carriers, and to repeal the prohibition against rail carriers transporting commodities in which they have an interest.

As you have said, fundamental reforms in our national transportation policy are required now to achieve a fast, safe, and economical transportation system sufficient to meet our national economic and security objectives. Equality of opportunity for all forms of transportation is a keystone of this reform. Therefore, I recommend strongly that the Congress act favorably on these bills to strengthen and improve our national transportation system.

Respectfully yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES.

ADEQUACY OF NATIONAL RAILROAD FREIGHT CAR SUPPLY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 35 cosponsors, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which is designed to improve the railroad freight-car shortage. This measure has been requested by the Interstate Commerce Commission, a copy of whose "Justification" is included to explain the procedures and need for the bill.

In addition, I am appending a letter from the vice president and general manager of the Burlington Railroad pointing out some most current facts which should be considered.

Particularly at peak harvest time, the perennial railroad freight-car shortage has been particularly costly to both the railroads and the producers. This can be avoided by providing for economic incentive for a freight car to be returned to the owning railroad.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the vice president and general manager of the Burlington Railroad be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1063) to amend section 1 (14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight-car supply, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators), was

received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

This proposed bill would give effect to legislative recommendation No. 2 of the Interstate Commerce Commission as set forth on page 198 of its 76th annual report as follows:

We recommend that section 1(14) be amended to authorize the Commission to determine whether per diem charges for the use of railroad freight cars shall be computed on the basis of cost of ownership and maintenance, value of use, or upon such other basis or combination of bases as will, in its judgment, provide reasonable compensation to the owner, contribute to sound car service practices, and encourage the acquisition of an adequate national fleet of freight cars.

JUSTIFICATION

The purpose of the attached draft bill is to grant the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to prescribe per diem charges for the use of railroad freight cars on a basis that will provide an economic incentive to the railroads to acquire and maintain a supply of freight cars adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense.

The diminishing supply of railroad freight cars has been a matter of considerable concern to the Commission for many years. Despite the generally expanding economy of the country, the ownership of freight cars is now less than it was during World War II. As a result, critical shortages of varying duration and severity have occurred in almost every year during periods of peak loadings. Studies made in 1950 indicated that a total of 1,935,500 freight cars would be required by 1956 to meet the anticipated needs of shippers. As of January 1, 1956, however, freight-car ownership and control of class I railroads (including railroad-owned or controlled refrigerator cars) totaled only 1,774,614 cars. As of October 1, 1962, this figure had fallen to 1,626,281 cars.

In addition to inadequate car ownership, one of the greatest contributing factors to recurring freight-car shortages has been the failure of some carriers to utilize the existing fleet of equipment more efficiently. During periods of critical shortages the Commission has resorted to every means at its command to cope with the problem. Greatly stepped-up demurrage charges have helped to insure prompt loading and unloading by shippers and receivers. Such action is ineffectual, however, when the equipment is in the hands of the carrier.

A relatively high percentage of unserviceable or bad order cars over the last several years has also constituted an important factor in aggravating the freight-car shortage situation. Considering 5 percent of car ownership to represent a normal amount of unserviceable cars, the percentage for the years 1959–61 was 8.4, 7.1, and 9.2, respectively. Moreover, while the figure has declined somewhat to 8.6 as of January 1, 1962, and 8.3 as of October 1, 1962, this is the result of an increase in cars being retired as well as in cars being repaired. In this connection, it is noted that the percentage of unserviceable cars being held for heavy repairs (more than 20 man-hours) has increased from 5.6 of car ownership (not including railroad owned or controlled refrigerator cars) as of January 1, 1955, to 7.1 as of October 1, 1962.

Since the earning value of the average freight car greatly exceeds the current per diem charge of $2.88, some of the carriers have found it cheaper to pay the per diem or car rental charge than to own cars. These carriers, therefore, have no economic incentive to provide their fair share of an adequate car supply.

Some time ago the Commission attempted to take the profit out of "renting" equipment by imposing a penalty per diem charge which it believed would furnish a pecuniary spur to deficit railroads to acquire a sufficient number of cars to at least take care of their own loading obligations. (Increased Per Diem Charges on Freight Cars, 268 I.C.C. 659 (1947)). However, in *Palmer v. United States*, 73 F. Supp. 63 (1947), a three-judge district court set aside the Commission's order holding that it could not prescribe per diem charges for "regulatory" purposes. The effect of this decision has been construed as precluding the Commission from prescribing per diem charges which would produce a profit to the carrier owner, provide an incentive for car ownership, recognize the value of the use of freight cars, and require the acquisition and maintenance of a car supply adequate to meet the needs of commerce and of the national defense. While the Palmer case may not place the stringent limitations upon the Commission which some suggest, we believe that there is sufficient doubt in this respect that it should be made clear in the statute that the Commission has authority to establish per diem charges above the bare costs of ownership and at a level that would make the advantages of owning equipment more attractive.

If the advantages of owning equipment could be made more attractive, there should be a greater willingness on the part of every railroad to make its just and equitable contribution to the national freight car fleet. The draft bill proposes to accomplish this objective by amending section 1(14)(a) of the act so as to authorize the Commission in establishing a per diem charge for the use of freight cars to determine whether such charge should be computed upon the basis of the elements of ownership expense involved, including a fair return on value, or on elements reflecting the value of their use, or upon such other basis or combination of bases as, in the Commission's judgment, will provide reasonable compensation to the owner, contribute to sound car service practices, and encourage the acquisition of an adequate national supply of freight cars. In essence, the proposal would authorize the Commission to fix per diem charges which would motivate every railroad to maintain its ownership of freight cars at a level which will meet the needs of the shipping public during normal times and provide a reasonable supply during periods of emergency. Its enactment would thus overcome the effect of the decision in the Palmer case and would be of substantial assistance to the Commission in its efforts to alleviate the crippling economic effects of freight car shortages.

BURLINGTON LINES,
Chicago, Ill., March 4, 1963.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: When you reintroduce the per diem bill—identical to S. 886 last year—here is some late information which may be useful:

(1) The overall freight-car fleet is at its lowest level in more than 40 years, and each recent year, as well as each recent month, produces a new low. The earlier committee report contains earlier statistics, but the attached sheet shows for all freight cars (both owned and serviceable) and for boxcars (both owned and serviceable) the figures for January 1 of each year, 1958, through 1963, and for February 1, 1963.

(2) Extremely severe car shortages were suffered during the fall and early winter last year, and right now severe shortages of boxcars, for grain loading, exist quite generally in the West. In many areas this recent shortage has been accurately described as the "worst yet."

(3) If each railroad owned its share of needed freight cars, the debits and credits would offset each other, that is, the total amounts paid as rentals by car users would substantially equal the total amounts received by car owners. The Supreme Court, in effect, has expressed this conclusion. The facts do not accord with this theory. For many years the national per diem account has produced a net debit, ranging from $95.7 million in 1940 to $140.3 million in 1950, to $321.2 million in 1960, and to $344.3 million during 1961. Obviously, under these conditions, many roads do not own their fair share of the fleet. Stated otherwise, car rental has become increasingly more attractive than car ownership, with serious adverse effects upon the national car supply.

Cordially yours,

ELDON MARTIN,
Vice President and General Manager.

All freight cars

Date	*Ownership*	*Serviceable cars*
Jan. 1, 1958	1, 746, 684	1, 656, 791
Jan. 1, 1959	1, 725, 723	1, 577, 708
Jan. 1, 1960	1, 677, 965	1, 556, 602
Jan. 1, 1961	1, 661, 577	1, 505, 730
Jan. 1, 1962	1, 606, 696	1, 465, 568
Jan. 1, 1963	1, 552, 371	1, 427, 868
Feb. 1, 1963	1, 546, 951	1, 419, 887

Boxcars

Date	*Ownership*	*Serviceable boxcars*
Jan. 1, 1958	736, 442	701, 711
Jan. 1, 1959	722, 732	672, 011
Jan. 1, 1960	705, 738	655, 665
Jan. 1, 1961	692, 565	634, 561
Jan. 1, 1962	663, 762	610, 048
Jan. 1, 1963	637, 775	587, 960
Feb. 1, 1963	635, 051	584, 746

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I am pleased to join in the sponsorship of S. 1063. I do so in the hope that it will, in at least some measure, help to relieve the recurring crises in shortages of boxcars by prescribing bases and procedures whereby there will be charged a more fair and adequate compensation for use of freight cars.

We in the Midwest have become unhappily accustomed to too few cars during our harvest season. At one time last fall, it was estimated that some 8 or 9 million bushels of grain were piled on the ground in Nebraska, Iowa, Missouri, and Illinois.

We have become accustomed to it but we do not like it. Each year, we call for action to end this shameful shortage of boxcars, but each year the problem only worsens.

Now, the boxcar crisis has become almost a year-round event. This is because the Department of Agriculture has vastly aggravated the situation with massive shipments of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, some of them at the very height of the harvest season, and continuing through the winter.

I am informed that protests to the Secretary of Agriculture from the Interstate Commerce Commission are unheeded. This seems a strange attitude for an official allegedly concerned with the welfare of the Nation's farmers.

S. 1063 will help to alleviate the problem, but it will not be an overnight solution. The time has come for a concerted attack on this chronic condition by the shippers, the railroads, the Government agencies involved, and the Congress.

The number of dollars lost each year while grain spoils on the ground in the Midwest is incalculable. These lost dollars are paid by everyone: the farmer, the shipper, the taxpayer, and the consumer. It is sheer waste which is singularly out of place in a nation which takes great pride in the efficiency of its agriculture and its transportation system.

There is much that those of us with responsibility in this area can do:

First, the Congress by approving this bill and such additional legislation as is required, can discharge its obligation to give the administrative agencies the necessary tools to do the job.

Second, the Interstate Commerce Commission, by firm but fair application of service orders, can exercise its responsibility to check abuses of car use. In this connection, the Commission must devote adequate personnel to the job. It is discouraging to note that the Commission currently allots only 58 jobs to the car service section. Two years ago, this figure was 64. It was reduced to 63 with the transfer of 1 position to the public information program in the office of the Secretary. Presumably this is another evidence of the importance this administration attaches to managing the news—even the news concerning car shortages. In fiscal 1962, 2 more positions were dropped and last October, the car service section was notified that instead of the 64 positions it had requested, only 58 would be allotted, a further reduction of 3. For all I know, those three are also writing press releases.

Third, shippers and receivers of carload freight contribute to the shortage, by holding cars for an excessive length of time for loading or unloading. In effect, they use them for storage. This practice must be discontinued.

Fourth, the situation is complicated by the "assignment" of cars to certain industries. No accurate figures are available, but an educated guess by an expert in the field places the figure in excess of 20 percent of the supply. This has the effect of holding out of the general availability a fifth of the cars, placing the general shipping public at a distinct disadvantage with relation to special, favored industries.

Mr. President, none of these steps is being suggested for the first time. What is required now, in addition to approval of S. 1063, is a determination by all those concerned with this problem that it will be solved.

As a first step, the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission should call a conference of representatives of farmers, shippers, carriers, and the appropriate Federal agencies and insist on the development of a plan which will eliminate an unnecessary piece of economic nonsense which has precisely the same effect on the economy of the Nation as has a nationwide strike.

REDEFINING THE UNITS AND ESTABLISHING STANDARDS OF ELECTRICAL AND PHOTOMETRIC MEASUREMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, including a statement of the purpose and need for this proposed legislation, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1064) to amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement of purpose and need presented by Mr. Magnuson, are as follows:

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill "To amend the act redefining the units and establishing the standards of electrical and photometric measurements to provide that the candela shall be the unit of luminous intensity," and four copies of a Statement of Purpose and Need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
Luther H. Hodges,
Secretary of Commerce.

Statement of Purpose and Need

When the act redefining the units and establishing standards of electrical and photometric measurements was passed in 1950 the term "candle" was in general use to designate the unit of luminous intensity. The act therefore designated the candle as the statutory unit of intensity of light. Since 1950, however, the word "candela" has been increasingly used in place of candle. At the present time the term "candle" is obsolete in international usage and domestically the Council of Illuminating Engineering Society has approved use of the term "candela." Moreover, "candela" is the term used in the International Lighting Vocabulary. Because the term "candle" has been designated by statute, the National Bureau of Standards has, over the past several years, used this term when reporting values of luminous intensity domestically. However, when making such reports abroad the term "candela" has been used, as for example in reports to the International Bureau of Weights and Measures. The Department believes it is desirable under the circumstances to change the statutory designation to accord with international usage in the interest of simplifying and expediting the work of the Bureau of Standards.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 20b OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act. This bill is introduced at the request of the American Bar Association's Committee on Railroad Reorganizations and Readjustments and is similar to S. 2733, which I introduced in the 87th Congress. In fact, the only difference is that the new bill includes an amendment suggested by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The American Bar Association believes that in the light of experience under section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act, which was enacted in 1948, changes to increase its usefulness in effectuating the voluntary modification of railroad financial structures thereunder should be made so that (a) section 20b would be applicable not only to railroad corporations but to all carriers subject to paragraphs (2) to (11) of section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act, except motor carriers having annual gross operating revenues of less than $10 million; (b) the assent of the holders of 75 percent of the outstanding securities of each affected class now required under section 20b would be reduced to 66⅔ percent; (c) the Commission would be authorized, as it deems appropriate, to consolidate proceedings under 20b with merger proceedings under section 5(2) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1065) to amend section 20b of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

CORN PURCHASES BY HOG PRODUCERS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in the 1st session of the 87th Congress we passed a bill which amended section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to allow the sale of feed grains from CCC stocks at 75 percent of the support price, for maintenance of foundation herds of livestock in disaster areas. This relief is made available where the Secretary of Agriculture determines it necessary to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disasters.

At the present time some 70 counties in Georgia have been declared disaster areas by the Secretary, and, therefore, are eligible for this assistance. This means that livestock producers in these counties are eligible to buy corn from CCC stocks at approximately 99 cents per bushel for foundation herds of cattle, sheep, and goats.

It has now been brought to my attention that hog producers are not eligible for this relief. Therefore, hog producers in these counties must pay approximately $1.32 per bushel for the same corn.

Mr. President, I feel that this emergency program should be extended to hog producers, and I introduce a bill which would make this possible. I ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee; and I hope favorable action will be taken in the near future.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1068) to make feed available at reduced prices for foundation herds of hogs in disaster areas, introduced by Mr. Talmadge, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

FEDERAL GRANTS TO STATE AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself, and Senators Stennis, Edmondson, Aiken, and Young of North Dakota, a bill authorizing Federal grants to State agricultural experiment stations, on a matching basis, to help finance physical facilities as needed for effective conduct of adequate research programs.

In many instances, Federal and State research funds are utilized in providing qualified and efficient personnel to research specific farm problems. In too many of these instances the States have been unable to provide adequate physical facilities to fully utilize the talents of these research scientists.

This bill will authorize Federal assistance to the States as provided by the Congress to provide adequate facilities to obtain the optimum results from our research efforts. Its passage and funding will expedite research to solve many farm production problems. The solution of these problems will benefit the consumers of the Nation, as well as the farmers, who are doing such an excellent job of providing the food and fiber to feed and clothe our people and to support our foreign relations through donations and Public Law 480 sales.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1070) to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations, introduced by Mr. Eastland (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963." I ask unanimous consent that the bill and an analysis of it be printed in the Record at the end of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, this bill completes the introduction of legislation to carry out President Kennedy's program in the field of mental health and mental retardation.

I am pleased and proud to present this bill to the U.S. Senate. I first came to know intimately the problems of the mentally retarded when I served as Governor of Connecticut. I was deeply impressed not only with the seriousness of the problem, but also with the indomitable courage of the families who bear this burden. The parents of retarded children are humanity's finest.

Despite great advances in medical science, mental retardation continues as a major national health, social, and economic problem.

It affects twice as many individuals—over 5 million—as blindness, polio, cerebral palsy and rheumatic heart disease combined.

About 400,000 of the mentally retarded require constant care or supervision. Over 200,000 are cared for in residental institutions mostly at public expense.

States and localities spend over one-half billion dollars for care and services for the mentally retarded.

Several billions of economic output are lost because of the inability of the mentally retarded to fully achieve or produce in our complex society.

But worst of all is the untold human anguish and suffering which results from mental retardation. Whenever and wherever it strikes, it is a tragedy for the entire family.

An estimated 15 to 20 million people live in families in which there is a mentally retarded individual. The cost to families who care for 96 percent of the Nation's retarded children and adults cannot be measured in economic terms alone, great as this might be. The cost of treatment and care of a mentally retarded child can and often does exhaust a family's financial resources. But economic costs cannot compare with misery and frustration and realization that one's child will be incapable of living a normal life or fully contributing to his own well-being and to society in later life.

Recognizing this problem, the President has proposed a nine-point legislative program to prevent mental retardation and to help the mentally retarded lead more useful, more satisfying lives. In the President's words:

> This neglect must end if our Nation is to live up to its own standards of compassion and dignity and achieve the maximum use of its manpower.

The President's proposals include funds for the construction of mental retardation research centers and the construction of facilities for the care, treatment, and training of the mentally retarded. These proposals are embodied in the bills S. 755 and S. 756, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. Hill].

The proposals also include amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act which would provide Federal assistance for services to the mentally retarded and others whose vocational rehabilitation potential is difficult to determine. This also has been introduced in the form of S. 968 by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill].

In addition, the President has proposed training, research, and demonstration grants for improving the education of handicapped children and special grants for schools for special projects in slums and depressed areas. Both programs would give emphasis to the problem of mental retardation in these special education fields and are included in the administration's omnibus education bill (S. 580) introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and others.

Finally, the President has proposed:

First. Project grants to the States to plan for comprehensive State and community action on mental retardation.

Second. Project grants for comprehensive maternity care—including infant care after childbirth—for women in low-income groups among whom there is a high incidence of births of children who are mentally retarded. This would be a 5-year program of project grants in which the Federal share would be up to 75 percent. The program would be administered by the Children's Bureau, under a proposed amendment to the Social Security Act.

Third. An expansion of both the maternal and child health program, and the crippled children's program of the Children's Bureau from the current $25 million annually for each program to an ultimate $50 million annually, after 7 years. Under the President's budget for fiscal 1964, at least $1 million would be used specifically for mental retardation activities in these two programs.

Fourth, a new research program of the Children's Bureau authorizing grants, contracts, and jointly financed cooperative arrangements relating to maternal and child health and crippled children's services. Of the recommended first year appropriation of $2.1 million, it is expected that about $500,000 would be used for research in the field of mental retardation.

The bill I introduce today is designed to carry out these four proposals in the President's program.

The bill is identical to H.R. 3386 introduced by Representative Wilbur Mills. Its principal provisions were first recommended by the President's panel on mental retardation, whose work was carried on while I served as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is the administration's bill providing a necessary first step to initiate comprehensive planning by the States to make sure that needs and resources are carefully assessed and that programs for the retarded are given careful consideration throughout the Nation.

A healthy start in life should be the birthright of every child born in the United States. Unfortunately, this is not now the case. Despite the efforts already made by State and local health agencies in partnership with the Federal Government, there is much that still needs to be done to promote the health of mothers and their offspring so that these children may, insofar as humanly possible, be both physically and mentally fit; so that they may be, indeed, the Nation's greatest asset.

In order to accomplish this goal, the present programs for maternal and child health and for crippled children must be extended and improved, including clinical services for mentally retarded children, as provided in this bill. The great unmet needs for these services are steadily increasing because of the rising child population, rising costs of medical care, and changes in the practice of medicine and public health resulting from research findings. The results of research and the programs in modern medical practice should be more widely available, especially to mothers and children with critical needs.

Studies show that expectant mothers with low income often receive little or no prenatal care, frequently have complications of pregnancy, and are most likely to have premature babies who are particularly prone to brain damage and resultant mental retardation. These mothers and their babies constitute the vulnerable group in special need of care.

Programs for maternal and child health and crippled children's services will be more effective if they are accompanied by adequate programs, as proposed in this bill, for research directed toward the evaluation of services.

The problem of mental health and mental retardation can no longer be ignored. As the President said in his historic first message to Congress on this subject:

> This situation has been tolerated far too long. It has troubled our national conscience—but only as a problem unpleasant to mention, easy to postpone, and despairing of solution. * * * The time has come for a bold new approach.

The proposed legislation to deal with the problems of mental health and mental retardation now pending before Congress presents a great opportunity for this Nation to live up to its highest tradition of compassion for the less fortunate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1072) to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provision of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXHIBIT 1

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963".

INCREASE IN MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

SEC. 2. (a) The first sentence of section 501 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1960, the sum of $25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated: $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $40,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the succeeding fiscal year, $45,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the succeeding fiscal year, and $50,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and succeeding fiscal years."

(b) Subsection (a) (2) of section 502 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The Secretary shall allot one-half of the sum appropriated under section 501 for each fiscal year as follows: He shall allot to each State $70,000 and such part of the remainder of such one-half as he finds that the number of live births in such State bore to the total number of live births in the United States in the latest calendar year for which he has statistics."

(c) (1) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 502 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary shall also allot to the States (in addition to the allotments made under subsection (a)) the remaining one-half of the sum appropriated for each fiscal year under section 501."

(2) The second sentence of such subsection (b) is amended by striking out "Such sums" and "such sums" and inserting in lieu thereof "Such one-half" and "such one-half", respectively.

INCREASE IN CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S SERVICES

SEC. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 511 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1960, the sum of $25,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "the following sums are hereby authorized to be appropriated: $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $40,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the succeeding fiscal year, $45,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and the succeeding fiscal year, and $50,000,000 each for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and succeeding fiscal years".

(b) So much of subsection (a) (2) of section 512 of such Act as ends with "to the States" is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary shall allot one-half of the sum appropriated under section 511 for each fiscal year as follows: He shall allot to each State $70,000 and shall allot the remainder of such one-half to the States".

(c) (1) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 512 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary shall also allot to the States (in addition to the allotments made under subsection (a)) the remaining one-half of the sum appropriated for each fiscal year under section 511."

(2) The second sentence of such subsection (b) is amended by striking out "Such sums" and "such sums" and inserting in lieu thereof "Such one-half" and "such one-half", respectively.

PROJECT GRANTS

SEC. 4. Part 4 of title V of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"PART 4—GRANTS FOR SPECIAL MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE PROJECTS AND RESEARCH PROJECTS

"Special project grants for maternity and infant care

"SEC. 531. (a) In order to help reduce the incidence of mental retardation caused by complications associated with childbearing, there are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and $30,000,000 for each of the next three fiscal years, for grants to assist in meeting the cost of projects as provided in this section.

"(b) From the sums appropriated under subsection (a), the Secretary is authorized to make grants to the State health agency of any State and, with the consent of such agency in the case of a project in which such agency is unable or unwilling to participate, to the health agency of any political subdivision of the State, to pay not to exceed 75 per centum of the cost of any project for the provision of all necessary health care to prospective mothers (including, after childbirth, health care to mothers and their infants) who have or are likely to have conditions associated with childbearing which increase the hazards to the health of the mothers or their infants (including those which may cause physical or mental defects in the infants) and who are unlikely to receive all necessary health care because they are from low-income families or for other reasons.

"(c) Payment of grants under this section may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made underpayments or overpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine.

"Research projects relating to material and child health services and crippled children's services

"SEC. 532. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, such sums as the Congress may determine to enable the Secretary to make grants to or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning, and public or other nonprofit agencies and organizations engaged in research or in maternal and child health or crippled children's programs, and contracts with public or private agencies and organizations, and with individuals, engaged in research or in such programs, for research projects relating to maternal and child health services or crippled children's services which show promise of substantial contribution to the advancement thereof.

"(b) Payments of grants or under contracts or cooperative arrangements under this section may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made underpayments or overpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine."

MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING

SEC. 5. The Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XVII—GRANTS FOR PLANNING COMPREHENSIVE ACTION TO COMBAT MENTAL RETARDATION

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 1701. For the purpose of assisting the States (including the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa) to plan for and take other steps leading to comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,200,000.

"Grants to States

"SEC. 1702. The sums appropriated pursuant to section 1701 shall be available for grants to States by the Secretary during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and the succeeding fiscal year. Any such grants to a State may be used by it to determine what action is needed to combat mental retardation in the State and the resources available for this purpose, to develop public awareness of the mental retardation problem and of the need for combatting it, to coordinate State and local activities relating to the various aspects of mental retardation and its prevention, treatment, or amelioration, and to plan other activities leading to comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation.

"Applications

"SEC. 1703. In order to be eligible for grants under section 1702, a State must submit an application therefor which—

"(1) designates or establishes a single State agency as the sole agency for carrying out the purposes of this title;

"(2) indicates the manner in which provision will be made to assure full consideration of all aspects of services essential to planning for comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation, including services in the fields of education, employment, rehabilitation, welfare, health, and the law, and services provided through community programs for and institutions for the mentally retarded;

"(3) sets forth its plans for expenditure of such grants, which plans provide reasonable assurance of carrying out the purposes of this title;

"(4) provides for submission of a final report of the activities of the State agency in carrying out the purposes of this title, and for submission of such other reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary for carrying out the purposes of this title and for keeping such records and affording such access thereto as he may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

"(5) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for funds paid to the State under this title.

"Payments

"SEC. 1704. Payments of grants under this title may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made underpayments or overpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine."

MEANING OF "SECRETARY"

SEC. 6. As used in the amendments to the Social Security Act made by this Act, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

ANALYSIS OF MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Section 1. This act may be cited as the "Maternal and Child Health and Mental Retardation Planning Amendments of 1963."

INCREASE IN MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES

Section 2. The Social Security Act authorizes grants to State health agencies for services for promoting the health of mothers and children, especially in rural areas and in areas suffering from severe economic distress. The States must provide matching funds for one-half of the amount appropriated; the remainder is not matched and is distributed to the States on the basis of the financial need of each State for assistance in carrying out its State plan. The law now authorizes $25 million annually for these grants. This section would increase the amounts authorized for annual appropriation for maternal and child health services from the present $25 million to $30 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; $35 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; $40 million for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967; $45 million for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969; $50 million for the fiscal year 1970 and each year thereafter.

During the next fiscal year an estimated $500,000—part of the increased funds—would be expended on programs for the mentally retarded. This amount would increase in subsequent years.

The expansion of maternal and child health services provided for in this section would contribute to the reduction of infant and maternal mortality. States vary widely in rates of infant mortality (ranging from 19.6 to 41.6 per 1,000 live births) and in rates of maternal mortality (from 1.2 to 8.8 per 10,000 live births.) These rates could and should be reduced through application of measures such as maternal and child health services.

States would be in better position to keep pace with increased demands for these services as the child population continues to increase.

More mentally retarded children could be served through special diagnostic clinics for these children provided through State maternal and child health programs. In 1961 over 15,000 children, as compared with 12,000 in 1960, received services through these clinics. Despite this increase, applications for these services continued to exceed the resources of the clinics.

INCREASE IN CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Section 3. The Social Security Act authorizes grants to State crippled children's agencies for services for locating crippled children and for providing medical, surgical, corrective, and other services and care, and facilities for diagnosis, hospitalization, and aftercare for children who are crippled or who are suffering from conditions which lead to crippling. The States must provide matching funds for one-half of the amount appropriated; the remainder is not matched and is distributed to the States on the basis of the financial need of each State for assistance in carrying out its State plan. The law now authorizes $25 million annually for these grants. This section would increase the amounts authorized for annual appropriation for crippled children's services from the present $25 million to $30 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; $35 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965; $40 million for the fiscal years 1966 and 1967; $45 million for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969; $50 million for the fiscal year 1970 and each year thereafter.

During the next fiscal year an estimated $500,000—part of the increased funds—would be expended on programs for the mentally retarded. This amount would increase in subsequent years.

The increased funds under the proposal would encourage and assist States to keep pace with the following needed developments already underway in crippled children's programs:

1. Further broadening of the definition of "crippling" until all State crippled children's programs would serve children with any kind of handicapping condition or long-term illness.

2. The removal of unreasonable barriers to eligibility for services such as State requirements for court commitments or residence status.

3. Extension of the programs to urban areas.

4. The development of outpatient centers for handicapped children organized and staffed to provide the comprehensive services needed by children with all types of handicapping conditions, thus bringing together the services now being provided in many separate clinics.

5. The development of inpatient and outpatient facilities appropriate for adolescents.

7. The provision of special services for children who are both deaf and blind.

8. The development of demonstration centers for the early care of children with paraplegia and quadriplegia brought about by accident or disease.

PROJECT GRANTS

Section 4. The prevalence of mental retardation is higher in those population groups where maternity care is inadequate. The rate of premature births is higher among these groups, and the rate of mental retardation is substantially higher among premature infants than among full-term infants. Women who are most likely to have premature babies, with the resultant increased proportion of mentally retarded and brain-damaged children, are predominantly women in families with low incomes, who receive little or no prenatal care and who have complications of pregnancy. There are increasing numbers of women, especially in our larger cities, who are receiving inadequate maternity care. Complications of pregnancy are more prevalent among families with low income than in the rest of the population. For women with complications of pregnancy, it is of critical importance that good maternity care be provided during the prenatal period, labor, and after delivery. Their babies, especially if premature, will require intensive nursing care in hospitals.

This section authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out a 5-year program of grants to provide necessary health care to prospective mothers who are unlikely to receive all necessary health care because they are from families with low income or for other reasons. In addition to health care during pregnancy, the care would include, following childbirth, health care to mothers and their infants. The health care would be available particularly for prospective mothers who have or are likely to have conditions associated with childbearing which increase the hazards to the health of mothers or their babies, including those which may cause physical or mental defects in the infants.

The annual appropriation authorized for these grants would be $5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; $15 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and $30 million for each of the next 3 fiscal years.

The grants would be available to the State health agency or, with the consent of such agency, to the health agency of any political subdivision of the State. The grant would not exceed 75 percent of the cost of any projects.

This program would help to reduce the incidence of mental retardation caused by complications associated with childbearing. Of paramount importance would be efforts to decrease the number of premature births among which there are notable larger numbers of children born with handicapping conditions, including mental retardation.

The grants would enable health departments to provide comprehensive maternity care to selected high-risk patients and to improve greatly the quality and adequacy of care for these mothers and their babies by paying for their care in hospitals equipped and staffed to provide services of high quality for mothers suffering from complications of pregnancy.

This program would also increase the availability of prenatal clinics and bring them closer to the population served, so that patients could be seen earlier and complications recognized and treated in their early stages.

It would reduce overcrowding in the public hospitals.

It would contribute to increasing our knowledge of ways of reducing childhood disability that is related to damage during childbirth.

This section would also enable the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for research in maternal child health or crippled children's programs. They could be made to public and other nonprofit colleges and universities and public and other nonprofit agencies and organizations already engaged in this research. Contracts for this purpose could also be made with such groups and with other private research groups and individuals.

Congress would determine the sums to be used for this purpose.

The President's budget for 1964 includes $2.1 million for these purposes, of which an estimated $500,000 would be for work in the field of mental retardation.

Under its basic act of 1912, the Children's Bureau may conduct its own studies, but it does not have authority to make grants or enter into other cooperative financial arrangements for research studies.

A few research projects have been supported through the grants under the Social Security Act made to State agencies for maternal and child health and crippled children. While these programs are doing much to improve the health of mothers and children, they could be even more effective if accompanied by an adequate program of research directed toward the evaluation of program services and their improvement.

This proposal would enable the Children's Bureau to carry out more adequately its responsibilities in child health research, as complementary to and coordinated with the program of the National Institute of Child Growth and Human Development.

The research under this proposal would contribute to improving the development, management, and effectiveness of maternal and child health and crippled children's services throughout the country.

MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING

Section 5. Mental retardation has been a major national problem for many years. An estimated 5.4 million people in our population are mentally retarded in varying degrees. Of the 4.2 million children born each year, about 3 percent—at birth or later—will be classified as mentally retarded.

More than 4,000 of these new babies born every year, it is estimated, will be so profoundly retarded that they will be unable during their lives to take care of even their own basic needs. About 12,600 will suffer "moderate" retardation, remaining below the 7-year-old level of intellectual growth. The remaining 110,000 will be mildly retarded, able—as adults—to acquire limited job skills and achieve almost independent community living—if they are given special training and assistance.

In many ways, the mentally retarded require help throughout their lives—through childhood, adolescence, adulthood, and old age. Their special needs, which change according to the degree of retardation, include education, rehabilitation, employment, health, legal protection, family and residential care, and a variety of community services.

Community services generally take the form of diagnostic and clinical services, care in residential institutions, special education, vocational rehabilitation, and social services—such as professional work with parents' groups, casework, group work, and day care.

However, resources for the mentally retarded vary widely from State to State and among cities and communities within the States.

Only one-fourth of the mentally retarded children have access to special education. The waiting list for care in residential institutions grows longer. The 20,000 children who in 1960 were served by the 90 clinics in the country represent only a small fraction of the children who need this kind of help.

This section authorizes a one-time appropriation of $2.2 million for grants to assist States in developing plans for comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation.

The State plan would describe what action is needed, assess the resources available to meet that need, and define ways in which State and local activities may best be coordinated.

These grants would assist the States to work out a State plan which would assure full consideration of all aspects of services essential to planning for comprehensive State and community action to combat mental retardation.

The proposed grants to the States for planning in the field of mental retardation would have four primary objectives: To provide a means for encouraging all the States to initiate a systematic followup action on the report of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation; to enlist the support of the State Governors, top officials, and outstanding laymen in planning to meet present and future needs in the field of mental retardation; to enhance public awareness and understanding of the massiveness of the problem and of the resources and modern knowledge now at our disposal to combat it; and to foster the development and coordination of the mental retardation aspects of programs of education, rehabilitation, welfare, employment, health, civil rights protection, and recreation.

MEANING OF "SECRETARY"

Section 6. Defines the term "secretary."

BIG PINE AND LAFAYETTE RESERVOIRS ON TRIBUTARIES OF WABASH RIVER, IND.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce today bills to authorize the construction of Big Pine and Lafayette Reservoirs on tributaries of the Wabash River in Indiana. These projects received the approval of the division engineer earlier this week in an interim report submitted on the continuing study of the Wabash River Basin.

The news of the serious flooding in the headwaters of the Ohio River and its tributaries reminds us again of the need for adequate protection from the ravages of flooding. The reservoirs which would be authorized by these bills will make a significant contribution to the overall flood control program of the Wabash Basin. Through their construction, millions of dollars in damages may be saved, and the human misery attendant to the flooding will be relieved.

In addition to the flood control benefits, other benefits in conservation, recreation and water supply will be derived from the Lafayette and Big Pine Reservoirs.

The people of the Wabash Valley are vitally interested in the protection from flooding and in the complete development of their water resources. The construction of these reservoirs will be another step in the long struggle to achieve proper water resource development in the valley. I am hopeful that these bills may be considered and approved during this session of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. HARTKE), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

S. 1073. A bill to authorize the construction of the Lafayette Reservoir in the State of Indiana for flood control, recreation, and related purposes; and

S. 1074. A bill to authorize the construction of the Big Pine Reservoir in the State of Indiana for flood control, recreation, and related purposes.

A FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES ACT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators HART, KEATING, JAVITS, and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in the District of Columbia.

The bill, entitled the Fair Employment Practices Act, provides that it shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer to refuse to hire, or to discharge, or to discriminate in employment against any individual because of his race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; that it shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employment agency to fail, or to refuse to classify properly or refer for employment any individual for any like reason; and that it shall be an unlawful employment practice for a labor organization to cause or attempt to force an employer to discriminate against any individual.

The bill establishes a five-man Fair Employment Practices Commission for the District of Columbia to hear and dispose of all charges that fall within the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be allowed to lie on the table for 5 days, so that additional Senators who so desire may join as cosponsors; and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, the bill I introduce today deals with one of the most serious economic, social and moral problems facing this Nation at the present time.

I speak of the silent conspiracy of discrimination against persons of different racial, ethnic, religious, and national origins which exists in this country and in our Nation's Capital.

I am concerned today specifically with discrimination against minority racial groups in the District of Columbia in the area of employment; and with the multitude of social problems that follow in the wake of discriminatory employment practices, each of which may spell a human tragedy, a life consumed by crime or delinquency, a life corrupted by vice, by alcoholism, by poverty and human degradation.

As chairman of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, I have been told that there are thousands of young people in this city who are no longer in school, but who cannot obtain employment largely because of their color. And I have been told time and again that the inability to obtain work is one of the main causes of delinquency and crime among young members of the Negro population of this city.

How can a victim of job discrimination grow up as a constructive human being in this city, in the midst of a vital, dynamic, governmental complex that rewards hard work and effort, when from the day he first begins to understand the world around him, he must learn that he has failed already.

He learns to want the rewards of hard work and to live much like anyone else, yet he is at the same time denied the opportunity to achieve this. How can he be expected to train, to work, and to hope for a better future, for a good job, for the chance to raise and support a family, when he sees from examples all around him that no matter how hard he may work, how hard he may strive, he will not be given the chance

to put his training, his knowledge, and his skill to the test.

How can the average nonwhite young person in Washington, or in most other large American cities, compete and draw satisfaction from his studies in school when he knows that the nominal rewards available to white classmates are not available to him. They are not denied him because he is stupid or lazy or deficient in still other ways, but rather because the prejudiced majority has conspired against him.

Recent estimates made available to our committee regarding the Washington employment situation show that about 75 percent of the jobseekers at the U.S. Employment Service are nonwhite. At the same time, however, these estimates show that 75 percent of the available positions are open only to white applicants.

It is shocking to learn that from 80 to 100 percent of the jobs in various fields are not obtainable by nonwhite workers in this city. It is shocking to know that certain business establishments in need of employees will not hire colored persons, however qualified, even though there are no white applicants for the positions.

Recent estimates given to us show that in savings and loan companies, brokerage houses, title companies, and real estate and mortgage firms, there is an almost 100-percent exclusion of Negro employees. In banks, insurance companies, and most other clerical and semiprofessional positions, only 1 percent or less of the employees are Negroes. In public utilities there is a virtual total exclusion of male Negroes, and only about 5 percent of the female employees are colored. In the department stores, where perhaps the greatest progress has been made, only about 15 percent of the work force is colored.

A most important problem area in this respect is also that of skilled labor. Some labor leaders in Washington have worked diligently over the years to eliminate discrimination, and to improve the status of nonwhite workers. I want to particularly mention here Mr. J. C. Turner, president of the Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO, who has championed this cause in the face of many obstacles.

But ruthless segregation and exclusion of nonwhite craftsmen still persist. Even though the operating engineers are integrated to some extent, and although there exist two Negro locals for cement mixers and bricklayers, most colored persons are employed only as unskilled laborers. Even in the colored unions, some pay differential prevails, with nonwhite bricklayers, for example, receiving up to 35 cents per hour less than their white counterparts.

Furthermore, there is still a virtual 100-percent exclusion of colored craftsmen from almost all other unions. This is generally true of the electricians, the plumbers, the steamfitters, stonemasons, tile setters, glaziers, and sheetmetal workers. In these unions there are no Negro journeymen and no Negroes are admitted for apprenticeship training which leads to the journeyman status. We have been told that recently the carpenters have admitted one Negro to their apprenticeship training. While this is a commendable gesture, it does not materially reduce the discrimination problem.

In replying to a Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee questionnaire concerning youth employment, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia made the following statement:

> One of the outstanding shortages or needs in the youth employment field in Washington, D.C., is the opening up of apprenticeship and white collar job opportunities for Negroes. Also the lack of manufacturing industries here contributes to the problem. The majority of youths in the District of Columbia are Negroes (over 60 percent) and because of discriminatory hiring practices by employers, particularly in the work areas listed above, job opportunities for them are very few.

These examples show that nonwhite persons in the Nation's Capital from age 14 up are second-class citizens. The percentage unemployed among them is twice as large as the figures for the white population.

It is true that unemployment is a problem for a great number of young people and adults, regardless of race or ethnic origin. It is also true, as someone once noted in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post, that no group, no one race or religion, has a monopoly on misfortune.

All of this we recognize. But discrimination is not misfortune in the regular sense of the word. It is not something that depends on chance or circumstance. It is not something that depends on individual factors, on time factors, or even on social and economic conditions, such as wars, depressions, or the exhaustion of natural resources in a geographic region, all of which inadvertently affect large groups or segments of the population.

Discrimination is rather a deliberate process of singling out a group of the population for prejudicial treatment. And in its most vicious forms it is a categorical elimination of this group from participation in the free competition, in the opportunities, and in the rewards available to other Americans.

To the extent that such an unfair process affects youths across the country, it helps mold these youths into what has been called social dynamite, dangerously discarded and strewn around American towns and cities.

To the extent that these practices prevail in our Nation's Capital, they make this city a less effective showcase to the world than what it must be. And, because the District of Columbia is governed by Congress to a large degree, Congress must bear responsibility for the conditions which prevail here.

I will say, without fear of contradiction, that in spite of the numerous studies carried out regarding racial prejudice and discrimination, the amount of damage these attitudes and actions do to the country as a whole and to each and every person in it has never been and perhaps cannot be estimated. In terms of shattered national ideals, in terms of internal political strife on the race issue, in terms of social and economic waste in men lost to crime and idleness, in terms of our damaged relations with other nations, in terms of lost creativity in the arts and sciences, the price we pay for discrimination staggers the imagination.

We cannot afford to pay this price anywhere, but least of all can we pay it in the very heart of this country, the Nation's Capital.

We cannot allow young people to grow up in this city under the cloak of hopelessness; we cannot allow them to grow up with the knowledge that no matter how hard they may study and how diligently they may work they cannot become lawyers or doctors or skilled craftsmen for no other reason than the color of their skin.

If we allow these inequities to continue, we are consciously fostering crime and delinquency in Washington, because when a civilized person cannot find legitimate work in an urban society, he may in desperation turn to the law of the jungle—the law of force, of assault, and of burglary. In today's world a position in the labor force is so important to a person's concept of his own self-worth, that the continuous inability to obtain work is a morally destructive process. It is a process that destroys the personality, that distorts concepts of right and wrong, that destroys hope for a better future, which is the basic force of all life, the driving power of all human activity.

When I surveyed the crime and delinquency problem in Washington last year, I was told time and again that one of the most effective ways to control violence and vandalism in this city would be to increase employment opportunities for its inhabitants, both young and old. And particularly, work opportunities must be found for the minority group parents, long subjected to vicious discrimination, as well as for the younger generation, the members of which are only now beginning to experience the silent conspiracy directed against them.

I have said in the past that this city must symbolize the best of which our country is capable. I believe that our Nation's Capital must be an example to our own country and to nations the world over of the best we can offer in terms of equal employment opportunities, in terms of educational opportunities, in terms of humanitarian endeavors, and even in terms of crime prevention.

To achieve a part of these goals and to help wipe out the evil wrought upon us all by racial discrimination, I submit for proper reference a bill to establish a Fair Employment Practices Commission in the District of Columbia and to outlaw any discrimination in employment against anyone because of his or her race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

I have outlined the reasons why such legislation is necessary. Together with the proposal, I want to make a final comment regarding its purpose.

Some men, without laws to guide and restrain them, are prejudiced, discriminatory, and unjust; some will use any means to gain economic advantage. On the other hand, we have labor leaders in this city who want to see justice done. There are employers in Washington who would hire nonwhite workers, but who are helpless because of the informal rule of men in their respective fields of business. These men need a law to back them up. They need a law to protect them from their prejudiced fellows and to guard against retaliation, against censure, and against economic reprisal from others less responsible than they.

Twenty-four States have enacted such laws and numerous municipalities have passed ordinances with similar intent. Our need here is every bit as great and in some ways even greater.

I am happy to have the distinguished Senators HART, KEATING, and JAVITS as cosponsors of this measure, and I hope it will receive speedy and favorable consideration by this entire legislative body on whose shoulders lies the responsibility of governing our Nation's Capital.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1075) to prohibit discrimination in employment in the District of Columbia because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry, introduced by Mr. DODD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DODD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator permit me to join him as a cosponsor of the bill?

Mr. DODD. I am honored that the assistant majority leader should wish to cosponsor it. I am grateful to him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent that I may be listed as a cosponsor of the bill. I compliment the Senator on his leadership in this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am happy, once again, to join the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] in sponsoring this important legislation. The Senator and I have served together on the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, and in this capacity, we have firsthand knowledge of the correlation between unemployment and a rising crime rate. Youngsters who cannot find gainful employment all too often find diversion in delinquency.

The District of Columbia has a number of problems which complicate the job market. This is not an industrial city, and there are not many opportunities for unskilled workers. Many of our Washington unemployed, especially those who have recently arrived, have been poorly trained in segregated schools. To add to the dismal picture, vocational training is entirely inadequate, since it is not even offered, in most cases, until a child reaches senior high school. Anyone who has worked with these children knows that the problem must be met before 10th grade because by that time the hard core of the untrained have dropped out of school.

We recognize these impediments to increased employment opportunities, and neither minimize nor exaggerate them. Each problem must and will be solved by long-term planning and patient work. Some steps to solve the employment crisis, however, can be taken immediately. They do not require massive retraining, introduction of new industry, or an overhaul of the educational system. For example, the passage of a single statute—this bill, introduced by the Senator from Connecticut, myself, and other Senators—will go a long way toward alleviating the District's problems.

Putting aside for a moment the difficulties encountered by the unskilled worker in search of a job in Washington, D.C., let us consider the case of a young Negro who has finished high school, college, or even graduate school, and applies for a nongovernment job in this city. What obstacles does he face? None would deny that the color of his skin—notwithstanding all other qualifications—is his major impediment. As the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] has pointed out, savings and loan companies, brokerage houses, insurance companies, banks, public utilities and even distinguished law firms are virtually closed to him. This, unfortunately, is an across-the-board policy, applied to an entire race, not occasionally to an individual applicant.

Approximately 80 percent of the schoolchildren of this city are Negroes. I ask, in all sincerity, what does equality of opportunity in education mean to these children, if after graduation, there is no equality of job opportunity? How can we ask them to stay in school, to study and prepare themselves to be responsible citizens when we know in fact that even a Phi Beta Kappa key will not unlock the doors that are barred to them?

Last Thanksgiving, we were given a small sample of what could happen if racial inequality is allowed to continue in this city. It was not pleasant, and certainly the demonstration was inexcusable, but at least it was understandable. Intolerance will not long be tolerated—by Negroes, or by whites of good will. The Federal Government has gone a long way toward eliminating discrimination in employment but there are indeed "miles to go and promises to keep."

I am proud to say that New York was the first of 24 States to adopt a fair employment practices act, and its impact has been substantial. Contrary to the dire predictions of its opponents at the time adopted, it was quickly accepted, both by employers and by the public, and very few prosecutions under the law have been necessary.

We who are responsible for governing this city must take the important first step offered in this bill to make Washington truly the model city for all the Nation. I urge early hearings and prompt action by the Congress. Meanwhile, I exhort private sectors of our economy in this city to reconsider discriminatory hiring policies, to unlock the doors which have been barred to Negroes, and to give meaning to the promise of equal opportunity.

DISALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTIONS FOR CERTAIN TRAVEL AND ENTERTAINMENT EXPENSES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, at this time I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to disallowance of deductions for certain travel and entertainment expenses.

One of the provisions which the Congress enacted last year, as part of the Revenue Act of 1962, requires allocation of the costs of traveling expenses where the travel is for more than 1 week and the nonbusiness portion of the trip is more than 25 percent of the total time away from home. Where such an allocation is made, only expenses allocated to business would be allowed as deductions.

This allocation rule was intended to replace the so-called principal purpose test and the but-for rule of prior law. Under these rules, if the primary purpose of travel was to transact business, the travel costs would have been deductible; or, to state it another way, if the travel would not have been undertaken but for business reasons, the travel costs would have been deductible. These rules allowed deduction only for travel expenses. Personal living or family expenses incurred during a period of business travel were never deductible.

Under these tests, it made no difference that the employee, agent, or taxpayer might have derived some personal enjoyment out of the travel; if the trip was primarily business-oriented, the travel costs would have been deductible.

These seem to me to be sensible, practical, and responsible rules. Nonetheless, hastily and without proper consideration of the effects, Congress last year injected personal, nonbusiness elements and motivations into the calculation of deductible travel costs. Mr. President, I was a part of that procedure, inasmuch as I sat on the conference committee between the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee, where this provision was dealt with, although I am frank to say that I do not know exactly how it got into the law. This year, when we saw that it was included, none of the members of the committee was exactly sure how it got in.

I believe that if a clear business purpose for travel is established, the amount of tax deduction for the travel expense should not be made to depend upon the extent to which trip was also pleasurable. The proposed legislation is designed to restore the effectiveness of the principal-purpose test and the but-for rule, which were unwisely upset last year.

I do not condone abuses of tax deductions, nor do I believe that any Senator or Representative does.

The proposed measure would not permit abuse.

To the contrary, I am convinced that the principal-purpose test and the but-for rule of existing law are rational, logical, and workable tax rules.

The Internal Revenue Service has applied them vigorously for many years, and it should be permitted to continue to do so in the future.

On the other hand, the illogical consequences of the new allocation rule are absurd. Let me illustrate:

Corporation X spends $110 for a round-trip ticket to send an employee to Chicago, on a Monday, for 5 days of business conferences, including travel time. He signs a $1 million contract. It just happens that the employee's mother lives in Chicago, and the employee plans to spend 3 days there with her, following his business conferences. These days are Saturday, Sunday, and Monday. On Monday afternoon, just before the employee boards a jet for his return flight, his mother has a stroke, and the employee spends the next 2 weeks with her.

Under last year's amendment, corporation X is allowed to deduct only $25. Contrast this with the following example:

Corporation Y spent $110 for a round-trip ticket to send its employee to Chicago for a 1-day conference; and the employee would not have gone but for the conference. He signs a contract which results in a $100,000 loss to his corporation. Following the conference, the employee spends the next 6 days in riotous living in Chicago.

Under last year's amendment, corporation Y would be allowed to deduct the entire $110. I do not believe the distinction is justifiable.

Moreover, last year's amendment is irrational, in that it places a tax premium upon delay. By this, I mean that the more slowly a taxpayer or employee travels on a business journey, the greater will be the portion of the travel cost which is deductible.

Contrast the following situations for the same business purpose and to the same destination—one, involving travel by fast jet; and the other, travel by slow boat.

Corporation M sends an employee to London, for 2 days of business discussions. The flight takes 1 day each way. While in London, the employee takes 2 weeks vacation, to tour the Continent. Under last year's amendment, corporation M would be permitted to deduct four-eighteenths of the travel costs, or about 22 percent.

Corporation N, on the other hand, sends its employee to London, by boat, for the same 2 days of business discussions. The trip involves 5 days at sea, each way. This employee also takes a 2-week vacation, to tour the Continent with M's employee. Under last year's amendment, corporation N would be permitted to deduct twelve twenty-sixths of the travel costs, or nearly 50 percent.

By restoring the vitality of the but-for rule, as the proposed legislation contemplates, neither corporation M nor corporation N would be penalized through denial of a deduction for travel expenses incurred in legitimate business operations.

Let me make perfectly clear that neither the proposed legislation nor the law which would be restored by its enactment would allow deduction for any part of the travel expenses involved in the 2-week tour of the Continent. Such expenses are not business related, and should not be deductible to any extent.

I submit that the same commonsense analysis requires that business-related travel expenses not be disallowed as a deduction to any extent. The cost to corporation M and corporation N of getting their respective employees to the London conference should be fully allowable, without regard to whether their employees return home immediately upon completion of the business discussions. Likewise, the costs to corporation X, as well as that to corporation Y, of getting their respective employees to business conferences in Chicago should also be fully deductible.

In addition to deleting from the law this illogical, irrational, and arbitrary travel allocation rule, the proposal would also modify the substantiation provision of last year's act, by eliminating travel from the burdensome record—and receipt—keeping rules of the statute and from the even more burdensome regulations issued under that provision.

This, in my opinion, will remove much of the criticism of the existing regulations, by making receipt collecting unnecessary, except in the case of entertainment expenses amounting to more than $25. It also would restore the established rule of the Internal Revenue Service under which employees who travel for their employers on per diem, mileage, or fixed reimbursement arrangements, and who are required to render an adequate accounting to their employers, would be considered to have accounted also for tax purposes. Under this established rule, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue would continue to review employers' accounting procedures, for the purpose of determining whether they provide for an adequate accounting by employees.

I do not believe Congress intended to change the law as it applied to these employee-salesmen. In fact, both the Senate Finance Committee report and the report of the House Committee on Ways and Means made it emphatically clear that it did not so intend. These reports stated:

> For example, it may be provided that substantiation will not be required for traveling expenses, where such expenses (including the cost of meals and lodging) do not exceed prescribed minimum amounts. This will be of special benefit to employees whose per diem allowance while traveling is within limits established by the Secretary under this provision.

Notwithstanding this unambiguous expression of congressional intent, these per diem, and so forth, arrangements were blanketed in by the new substantiation regulations. In some cases, I am informed that the employee recordkeeping required by employers has tripled. Time spent in recordkeeping and receipt collecting is time lost from selling their companies' products. The proposed legislation would put these people back to work at their selling jobs, thereby spurring the economy.

Still another objectionable feature of last year's amendments would be corrected by the legislation. Under the substantiation regulations, issued in final form on December 27, 1962, amounts disallowed as a deduction, because of the travel-allocation rule, are required to be included in the income of the employee involved with the travel. This arbitrary requirement is completely contrary to the stated intent of the Senate Finance Committee and of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, when the reports of these committees stated that the provision did not affect the question of the includibility or excludibility of an item in the income of any individual. We were content with the existing law in that respect.

I feel confident that the Congress did not intend to create income for employees or independent contractors where there had been none before. Notwithstanding this clear expression of congressional intent, the Treasury regulation, issued under the provision which asks nothing more than recordkeeping, taxes employees and agents on the amount of travel expenses disallowed as a deduction to their employer or principal. Under the proposed legislation, such income would not be imputed to employees or agents.

Summarizing the proposed legislation, it deletes from the statute, the travel-allocation rule, and eliminates travel from the detailed substantiation requirements of the law and regulations. It does nothing more. It preserves the amendment of last year, denying a deduction for expenses for meals and lodging while in travel status which are lavish or extravagant. It does not affect in any manner whatsoever the tax treatment of expenses for gifts or entertainment.

Section 274 may require further attention by the Congress, to prevent wholesale closing of restaurants and widespread unemployment in the restaurant, entertainment, and hotel industries.

Factual data which I have received shows that business in these industries is off 18 to 30 percent, requiring many of them to retrench, with a loss of jobs in the category of waiters, entertainers, and other personnel, the net result.

There still exist in the businessman's mind apprehension and confusion as to just what will and what will not be allowed as legitimate business deductions.

It is my view that if this apprehension and confusion are not eliminated by the Internal Revenue Service, our entire economy will suffer. Congress cannot allow this to occur.

Thus, the decision as to whether further legislation will be required will, of course, depend on what is disclosed by the substantiation regulations which shortly will be issued by the Internal Revenue Service.

I hope Congress will act promptly and favorably on this proposed measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1083) to amend section 274 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to disallowance of deduction for certain travel and entertainment expenses, introduced by Mr. Smathers, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PREVENTION OF GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH FREE ENTERPRISE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prevent the Federal Government from engaging in activities in direct competition with private enterprise. It also establishes a carefully framed policy gradually to phase out and terminate existing Federal activities which compete with the free enterprise system. Joining with me in sponsoring the bill are the chairman and the ranking minority member, respectively, of the Government Operations Committee, Senator John L. McClellan and Senator Karl E. Mundt, who have pioneered in this field for years. Moreover, they are joined by the following Members of the Senate who have also demonstrated great leadership and support for the free enterprise system: Senators Harry Flood Byrd, John J. Williams, Strom Thurmond, and John G. Tower.

HOOVER COMMISSION STUDIES

One of the great achievements of the Hoover Commission was the effort it made in the field of eliminating Government activities which compete with private enterprise. The Bureau of the Budget in January 1955, February 1957, and September 1959, issued directives to carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in this area. As a result of this, much was accomplished during the Eisenhower years.

In President Eisenhower's last state of the Union address, he pointed out that during his administration "there has been a firm policy of reducing competition with private enterprise. This has resulted in discontinuance of some 2,000 commercial and industrial installations operated directly by Government agencies."

The policy stated by the Bureau of the Budget in 1955 was as follows:

> The general policy of the administration that the Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels. Exceptions to this policy shall be made by the head of an agency only where it is clearly demonstrated in each case that it is not in the public interest to procure such product or service from private enterprise.

GOVERNMENT COMPETITION INCREASING

While significant progress was made under these directives, not nearly enough was accomplished, I regret to say. Some new activities were undertaken that should not have been; others were continued that should have been terminated. Unfortunately, the present administration is not vigorously implementing the earlier policy directives. Rather than ending programs which compete with the free enterprise system, on balance this competition is being sharply increased. It was estimated in August of 1962 that the present administration has increased the Government's investment in activities that compete with private business by more than $2 billion.

CONGRESS SILENT

One of the reasons for this sharp increase is that there is no clearcut legislation firmly establishing the policy of the Federal Government in this area. The earlier Bureau of the Budget directives were welcome positive steps. But obviously they do not have the effect of law. The Federal agencies felt perfectly free to circumvent and even to defy these directives which can be withdrawn at any time and the degree to which they are enforced is dependent upon the wishes of the administration. For these reasons, I feel legislation is necessary and the bill I am introducing would clearly establish the policy of the Federal Government in this area.

ALLIES FAVOR FREE ENTERPRISE GROWTH

There are many who question the advisability of moving in this direction, who feel that our modern society requires more Government activity rather than less. In this connection, I think it is interesting to note the action taken by the Government of Western Germany during recent years. This Government, like many European governments, has had considerable experience with government control of production and distribution as distinguished from private control, and is now moving toward denationalization of industry.

For the past few years, the Government of Western Germany has been endeavoring to divest itself of many of its enterprises, including shipyards, steel mills, iron ore mines, and electricity generating stations. Since 1957, it has sold many enterprises, and has added virtually none at all.

One of the most dramatic recent moves in this area was the announcement in 1961 that the Government was offering the public a chance to buy stock in Volkswagen, the great automotive manufacturing company which until now has been owned by the Government.

It seems to me that one of the most dramatic facts to emerge during the postwar changes in the economies of the world is the fact that private enterprise is the most effective way of production. Because our own experience has shown this to be true, I feel that legislation guaranteeing private control of production and elimination of Government competition with private enterprise to the greatest possible extent would help to strengthen the economy. For these reasons, I urge passage of this bill.

BILL SUMMARY

Briefly, the bill declares that it is the policy of the Federal Government to encourage private competitive enterprise to the maximum extent consistent with national security and the public interest. It provides for the establishment of regulations governing establishment of new activities in this area, assuring that bureaus or agencies intending to establish such an activity must first obtain approval from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who must determine that the function cannot be performed by private enterprise without adversely affecting national security.

MASSIVE FEDERAL INVASION OF FREE ENTERPRISE

Strange as it may seem, nobody, whether in or out of Government, knows accurately just what competitive businesses Uncle Sam is engaged in, how much money has been invested in them, and how much it costs every year to run them.

The Hoover Commission's job of investigating Government's invasion of business was done with magnificent competence—but no one ever pretended that the facts and figures were complete.

The Budget Bureau studied the problem for more than 2 years and came up with a figure of more than 19,000 business installations—but frankly admitted that it had not reached the bottom of the pile.

Estimates of Government's capital investment in business operations range widely from $30 billion—no insignificant sum in itself—to 5 times that amount. I should not be surprised if it is actually even more than that.

As for costs of operation, the annual budget—as thick as the Washington telephone directory, but much less comprehensible—is not of the slightest help. The first lesson learned by a bureaucrat is to hide—himself, his job, his subordinates, and most of all his account books.

GREAT POTENTIAL SAVINGS AND REVENUES

It is obvious that a good deal of money could be saved by getting Government out of competitive busines. It is equally obvious that the tax take of the Treasury would be very considerably increased if the great amount of business now done by nontaxpaying Government plants were thrown to privately owned, taxpaying companies. And no jobs need be lost in the shiftover, for the Government workers would be needed to keep on doing what they are now doing.

The purpose of my bill is to get the Government out of business in direct competition with taxpaying companies—and to keep it out.

All receipts from the sale of Government businesses—and they should be a a very substantial amount—should be applied to the reduction of the national debt.

Taxes received from the proprietary companies that purchase these Government installations—and they should be in considerable amount—would, of course, be used to reduce the deficit with which we are now faced.

HELP BALANCE BUDGET

It is a program that should bring satisfaction to present administration fiscal planners, for it would provide new sources of tax revenue without adding to the burdens of present taxpayers. It should also bring some feeling of amelioration to the general public.

Unhappily, from the taxpayers' viewpoint, most of Government's businesses are highly competitive with private enterprise, and their advantages are both unfair and insurmountable. They operate with the people's money—yours and

mine—they are not expected to make a profit; many of them are not managed with even decent efficiency, and they share none of the burden of taxation that confiscates half of the earnings of privately owned competitors. Under Federal control there is little incentive to achieve efficiency in business-type activities since they do not have to compete in the market place and cost is no object.

FEDERAL SAVINGS, A MYTH

It is claimed by those who support virtually unlimited Federal competition against the free enterprise system that it is cheaper for the Government to do the job. However, in a vast majority of cases, this is just not true, since the purported lower Federal cost estimates are fictitious and misleading. This elementary fact was lucidly proclaimed by the Hoover Commission in the preface of its report on business enterprises which said:

> The Government business-type enterprises, except in a few instances, pay no taxes, and pay little or no interest on the capital invested; they seldom charge depreciation and frequently their directing personnel is not included on their payroll. Likewise, the fringe benefits of Government personnel in most instances are not included in their costs. Moreover, in addition to the fact that most of them pay no taxes, they deprive the Government of taxes which would otherwise be paid by private enterprise if it conducted these operations. Therefore, their claims of financial success are often wholly invalid; and, worse, with the advantages they receive from the Government, they are unfair competition.

EXAMPLES OF FEDERAL COMPETITION

Congressional investigations dating back to 1932 have listed more than 100 categories of business in which Government is engaged. Many of them were started, probably legitimately enough, to meet special emergencies of wartime—but when the wars were over, the businesses quietly kept going, regardless of the losses they incurred.

Thus various Government shipyards, which serviced 10,000 vessels in World War II, are still in full operation, though they service only a few hundred ships today.

Thus the Navy continues to build ships in Government yards, though by expert testimony they could be built for 15 to 28 percent less in private yards—at a saving of millions of dollars.

Thus the Defense Department continues to hang on to reserve plants which were built during World War II. Some of them have been sold at prices ranging from 10 to 30 cents on the dollar of original investment, whereupon they become valuable as sources of tax revenue. A year and a half ago Secretary McNamara directed that others be sold, but restrictions make them hard to move.

SOME PROGRESS MADE

True enough, there has been some progress in recent years' efforts to eliminate Government competition. The Mississippi Barge Line, continued for a generation of annual losses after World War I, was finally sold to a private company, in whose hands it became a profitmaking taxpayer. The synthetic rubber plants of World War II were finally sold to taxpaying companies. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was substantially dissolved. The coffee roasting plants of the three armed services, which would not drink the same brand of coffee—were sold. The Navy's paint factories were disposed of. The Defense Department got rid of its plant nurseries and a lot of its laundries, drycleaning plants and cobbler shops.

GOVERNMENT STILL COMPETING

But the PX stores still compete unfairly with taxpaying department stores. Government engineers compete unfairly with taxpaying engineering companies. Government printing plants do half a billion dollars' worth of business every year when much and perhaps all of it could be done by taxpaying plants. The Post Office continues to make its own mailbags and locks, and to run an unneeded postal savings bank. Military Air Transport competes unfairly with commercial airlines. Various services make wooden boxes in competition with companies that could make them better and cheaper—and pay taxes. Government operates warehouse space which should certainly be in private hands.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, which supposedly entered the fertilizer production business as an experiment, now sells $20 million worth annually, at less than cost. Now TVA wants to get into the coal mining business, after successfully getting into the steam power generating business.

The list is endless.

TIME TO ACT

And it is high time something was done to put a stop to this competitive waste of the people's money—and this loss of needed tax revenue.

The first step in the process of ending this unhappy situation is for the Congress to adopt a policy, a definite and positive policy—that Government should get out of business to the maximum extent possible, and stay out.

That is the purpose of the bill I am reintroducing. It is not an extreme bill. Rather it represents a moderate, workable, first step to accomplish this objective. It is the work product of years of detailed study by the Bureau of the Budget.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1093) to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Bennett (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

RATES OF POSTAGE ON PUBLICATIONS DESIGNED SPECIFICALLY FOR RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION CLASSES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to adjust second class postal rates payable by publications designed specifically for use in religious instruction classes. Public Law 87–793, which became effective on January 7, 1963, changed existing rates so that the classroom publications in question are unreasonably burdened and will become increasingly so as additional raises in the rates take effect.

Prior to January 7, 1963, all classroom publications were charged pound rates equal to 50 percent of the rate for publications generally with respect to the advertising portion of the publication and 60 percent of the rate for publications generally with respect to the nonadvertising portion. Minimum charge per piece was one-eighth of a cent.

Effective January 7, 1963, second class postage rates were increased and the basis for computing postage on classroom publications was changed. Now, classroom publications are required to pay postage equal to 60 percent of that paid by other publications.

The effect of this change has been to increase the minimum per piece charge for classroom publications from the one-eighth of a cent formerly paid, to a little over one-third of a cent for 1963, nearly one-half of a cent for 1964, and three-fifths of a cent thereafter. When the third installment of increases becomes effective on January 1, 1965, postage costs for classroom publications will have increased 480 percent.

Clearly, these rates are confiscatory, especially for classroom publications designed for religious instruction. These publications are in enough financial difficulties. The enormous increase of rates would put many of them out of business and thus deprive thousands of dedicated Sunday school teachers of valuable tools of instruction. My bill is meant to alleviate the burden upon these publications. It would not affect rates paid by classroom publications generally, and would not change pound rates for religious classroom publications. It would, however, lower the minimum charge per piece for the latter to fifteen one-hundredths of a cent during 1963, two-tenths of a cent during 1964, and twenty-five one-hundredths of a cent thereafter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at the end of my remarks and that it be allowed to lie on the table for 10 days so that Senators who wish to cosponsor the bill may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The bill (S. 1099) relating to rates of postage on publications designed specifically for religious instruction classes, introduced by Mr. Scott, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4359(b)(2) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The postage on classroom publications, other than those designed specifically for religious instruction classes, is 60 per centum of the postage computed in accordance with paragraph (1). In the case of classroom publications designed specifically for use in religious instruction classes the rates per pound shall be 60 per centum of the rates per pound specified in paragraph (1) and the minimum charge per piece shall be .15 of a cent if mailed prior to January 1, 1964, .2 of a cent if mailed during calendar year 1964, and .25 of a cent if mailed after December 31, 1964."

PROHIBITION OF IMPORTS OF FLAT GLASS FROM COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism. The increasingly large imports of window and sheet glass, glass louvers, and other flat glass products from Communist lands are posing a grave threat to the glass manufacturers of this Nation.

There should be prompt action to reduce or eliminate the threat. The administration has not acted, but I hope it will do so. Meanwhile, I am taking this legislative alternative to prevent further damage to American glass industry. My bill states that the President shall, as soon as practicable, take such measures as may be necessary to prevent the importation of these products.

I have been informed that today the United States has in effect no quantitative restrictions—import quotas—or other regulations in regard to imports of these glass products from Communist countries. Two of the countries involved, Poland and Yugoslavia, even enjoy the benefits of most-favored-nation treatment and the consequent applicability of reduced tariff rates. While the other Communist countries do not enjoy such treatment, nevertheless their state-owned industries ship glass into this country that sells at prices sometimes as much as 50 percent below the prices quoted in our very competitive domestic industry.

Mr. President, it is well knwn that Communist nations utilize economic activity for political purposes. Their export policies are not aimed primarily at raising the standard of living of their people but at damaging the economies of the free nations. Even if free nations levied 100-percent tariffs on Communist products, these goods would continue to be dumped where the effects on domestic industry would be most harmful.

At the present moment, Communist glass is being brought into selected markets, chiefly in New England, Florida, and the Gulf States. However, there are indications that such imports will spread and jeopardize other States along the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks there be inserted in the Record a table prepared by the Economics Division of the Legislative Reference Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the table will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1100) to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism, introduced by Mr. Scott, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The table presented by Mr. Scott is as follows:

Window glass imports from Communist countries, 1960, 1961, January–November, 1962

[Quantity in thousands of pounds; values in thousands of dollars]

Country	1960		1961		January–November 1962	
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
Czechoslovakia	14,534.8	287.5	13,445.6	404.0	13,090.7	354.3
East Germany	1,502.2	65.2	1,361.9	64.6	1,049.4	45.7
Poland	304.5	10.8	1.6	.4	1,824.5	65.4
Rumania			105.0	4.7	2,710.1	118.7
U.S.S.R.	2,816.0	77.8	10,491.0	432.0	17,006.6	603.6
Soviet bloc	19,157.5	441.2	25,405.1	905.8	35,661.3	1,187.7
Yugoslavia	166.2	8.7	46.5	4.0	648.8	27.0
Total	19,323.7	449.9	25,451.6	909.8	36,330.0	1,214.7

Note.—Due to rounding, detoil does not add to total.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. U.S. imports of merchandise for consumption: commodity by country of origin (Rept. FT 110) 1960, 1961, January–November 1962.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate these figures, which show the quantity and value of window glass imports from Communist countries for the most recent 3 years. They show the increasing danger which I want to eliminate by means of this bill.

I also ask unanimous consent that this bill remain on the table for 10 days so that any Senators wanting to cosponsor may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMOVAL OF STATUE OF GENERAL RAWLINS TO GALENA, ILL.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at 18th and E Streets, NW., the little park opposite the Interior Department Building is graced by a statue of Gen. John Aaron Rawlins. There has been introduced a bill which calls for the removal of the statue of General Rawlins to Wyoming, largely because he spent 1 night in camp somewhere in that State.

Mr. President, we in Illinois have some interest in General Rawlins. He was a native of Illinois, and was the chief aide to the then Commander in Chief, Ulysses S. Grant. Therefore, we believe it would be most appropriate that the statue be removed to Galena, Ill., the home of General Rawlins.

To that end, I introduce a joint resolution to authorize the city of Galena, or an appropriate association or organization of citizens thereof, to remove to Galena the statue of Gen. John A. Rawlins, now located in Rawlins Park, Washington, D.C.

In connection with the joint resolution, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a brief article which was published on March 11 in the Washington Daily News.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 59) to authorize the city of Galena, Ill., or an appropriate association or organization of the citizens thereof, to remove to Galena, Ill., the statue of Gen. John A. Rawlins located at Rawlins Park, Washington, D.C., introduced by Mr. Dirksen, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The article presented by Mr. Dirksen is as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of Monday, Mar. 11, 1963]

A Statuesque Battle

Gen. John Aaron Rawlins, shadowy though his past may be, has managed to stir up some heat between two U.S. Senators.

Senator Gale McGee, Democrat, of Wyoming, introduced a bill recently to move the Rawlins statue from Rawlins Park, opposite the Interior Department Building, 18th and E Streets NW., to Rawlins, Wyo., where the general is reputed to have stopped at a railroad camp one night.

Senator Vance Hartke, Democrat, of Indiana, has a constituent, Charles D. Rawlins, the great-nephew of the general who wants the statue either left in Washington, which the Government opposes, or moved to Illinois, the general's native State.

The bronze image of General Rawlins was cast in 1874. He was Grant's chief aide and later his Secretary of War.

Senator McGee is quite definite about his interest in the matter, stating, "We do not agree on this particular matter of legislation."

Senator Hartke has withheld comment until he hears from Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, concerning Senator McGee's bill.

Until the matter is settled, the general will just have to bear the Washington weather with the rest of us.

ACCEPTANCE BY THE UNITED STATES OF AN INSTRUMENT FOR THE AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization.

It was my pleasure and honor to participate in the 1962 ILO meeting in Geneva and I was one of the American

delegates who voted to adopt this resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, along with the accompanying letters of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Labor, be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and letters will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 60) providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization, introduced by Mr. McNamara, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The letters presented by Mr. McNamara are as follows:

February 15, 1963.

The Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate.

Dear Mr. Vice President: I submit herewith a proposed draft joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization adopted by the 46th session of the International Labor Conference which met at Geneva in June 1962. The proposed amendments would increase the size of the governing body of the organization from 40 to 48 members, to reflect the recent increase in membership of the organization, and would make certain related changes.

The purpose of the proposed joint resolution is to authorize the President to accept the instrument of amendment on behalf of the United States. The United States accepted membership in the ILO pursuant to joint resolution of Congress approved June 19, 1934 (43 Stat. 1182; 22 U.S.C. 271), and accepted the revised constitution of the ILO pursuant to joint resolution of Congress approved June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1151; 22 U.S.C. 271 note). Under Article 36 of the ILO constitution, amendments take effect when ratified or accepted by two-thirds of the members, including 5 of the 10 members of chief industrial importance.

I enclose a copy of the instrument of amendment, together with a letter from the Acting Secretary of Labor, dated September 13, 1962, stating the objectives of the proposed changes in the ILO constitution and the coordinated view of the Departments of Labor and Commerce on the desirability of accepting them. The Department of State joins in recommending that Congress by joint resolution authorize the President to accept the instrument of amendment.

The amendments would involve no increase in expenditures or other obligations on the part of the United States. The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to Congress for its consideration.

A similar communication is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

Dean Rusk.

U.S. Department of Labor,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, September 13, 1962.

The Honorable Dean Rusk,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: At its 46th session, the International Labor Conference adopted the Instrument for the Amendment of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization, a certified true copy of the authentic text of which is enclosed. The instrument was adopted by a vote of 309 for, none against, and one abstention. The United States supported this proposal in the governing body and the U.S. delegation voted unanimously for it in the conference.

The instrument of amendment would increase the size of the governing body of the International Labor Office from 40 to 48 members to reflect the growth and composition of the membership of the organization since 1954. At that time, when the governing body was last enlarged, 71 nations belonged to the organization. Today, the membership has increased to over a hundred countries, largely due to the admission of the newly independent, developing, and mainly agricultural countries of Africa.

The instrument would reflect this situation by making possible fuller representation in the government, employer, and worker groups in the governing body from all parts of the world. Of the 24 persons representing governments on the governing body, 10 will continue to be appointed by the members of chief industrial importance, and 14 will be appointed by the members selected for that purpose by the government delegates to the conference. The last sentence of paragraph 4 of article 7 of the constitution has been deleted on the ground that it has ceased to be justified in practice.

Consideration has been given by representatives of the Department of Commerce and the Department of Labor to submission of this instrument of amendment to both Houses of the Congress, since this Government's original acceptance of membership in the International Labor Organization was taken upon the authorization of the two Houses of Congress by joint resolution. It is the view of these departments that the instrument is completely satisfactory to this Government and that its early submission to both Houses of the Congress for acceptance would be highly desirable.

Considerable interest was taken by the newer nations in the adoption of this instrument. The United States played an active role both in the governing body and at the conference in its formulation and adoption. The next elections for the renewal of the governing body of the International Labor Office are to be held during the 47th session of the International Labor Conference, which will meet in June 1963, and another election will not be held for 3 years. Failure of the United States to accept the instrument of amendment without delay could create an adverse impression among the newer governments, particularly if the next governing body election could not be held in accordance with the amendments due to a lack of sufficient formal acceptances.

In evidence of good faith as one of the leading members of the organization, with the added responsibility as a state of chief industrial importance, it is recommended that early action be initiated to bring about acceptance by the United States of the instrument of amendment. This action would be consonant with the unanimous support given by the U.S. Government, employer, and worker delegates to the adoption of the amendment at the 1962 Conference.

Your early consideration of this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

W. Willard Wirtz,
Acting Secretary of Labor.

AMENDMENT OF SENATE RULE XXV, RELATING TO MEETING OF COMMITTEES WHILE SENATE IS IN SESSION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on January 9 of this year, our distinguished majority leader, as chairman of the Senate democratic conference, appointed an ad hoc committee of the conference to consider and recommend ways in which the business of the Senate may be expedited.

The committee has met a number of times, has considered various possibilities, and its chairman, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, has reported to the conference chairman, in part, as follows:

> Your committee recommends and urges the earliest possible consideration of S. Res. 89, an amendment of rule VIII of the standing rules of the Senate. This resolution was introduced February 19 by Senator Pastore and others.
>
> Your committee further recommends that urgent consideration be given a forthcoming resolution, of which Senator Church and other members of the ad hoc committee will be sponsors, to revise the rules to permit committees to sit during the morning hour without need of any special permission from the Senate, while applying the present rule, which requires special consent, to the Senate session following the close of the morning hour. The application of such a provision, along with the recommended rule of germaneness, would greatly expedite the disposal of legislative business and help to increase attendance at debate in the Senate Chamber at the same time. No limitation would be imposed on the right to extend debate.

My purpose now, Mr. President, is to submit for myself and Senators Monroney, Anderson, McGee, and Pastore, the second resolution mentioned above. It would amend rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate so as to render inapplicable to the Senate that provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which provides that no standing committee of the Senate shall sit, without special leave, while the Senate is in session. In lieu of this provision, it would require special leave of the Senate only in those instances when a standing committee desires to sit after the conclusion of the morning hour, or after the Senate has proceeded to the consideration of unfinished business. The intent of the proposed amendment is to free the time normally devoted to the morning hour for the work of the standing committees, in order to expedite the business of the Senate.

Mr. President, Senators are aware of the nature of the morning hour as it has developed in the Senate, and of the rules governing it. It serves a useful function, but I think it is self-evident that it is not a function which requires the attendance of Senators who do not have morning business to pursue, so long as no legislative business is taken up. Accordingly, we who sponsor this resolution believe that whatever considerations might justify a conditional prohibition against allowing committees to sit while legislative business is being transacted on the floor of the Senate have no application to the morning hour, and should be removed.

The benefits to be obtained by this modification of the rule are equally obvious. The time available for committee work would be significantly increased. The flow of work to the Senate calendar would be speeded, the time of

Senators and witnesses devoted to committee work would be more effectively utilized, and the remaining provisions of the rules designed to encourage the attendance of Senators in the Senate while its substantive work is underway would be emphasized by the removal of an extraneous and bothersome restriction.

I ask that the resolution may be printed in the Record, and that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 111) amending rule XXV of the standing rules relative to meetings of committees while the Senate is in session, submitted by Mr. Church (for himself and other Senators), was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"5. No standing committee shall sit without special leave while the Senate is in session after (1) the conclusion of the morning hour, or (2) the Senate has proceeded to the consideration of unfinished business, whichever is earlier."

Section 2. Section 134(c) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 shall not be applicable to standing committees of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS FOR THE ARMED FORCES—AMENDMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 843) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of W. Averell Harriman, of New York to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of six days of its receipt in the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of S. 143, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick] be added as a cosponsor.

S. 143, which was introduced on January 14, and cosponsored by the senior Senator from Montana, would authorize assumption by the various States of civil or criminal jurisdiction over cases arising on Indian reservations with the consent of the tribe involved, and permit gradual transfer of such jurisdiction to the States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of S. 468, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] be added as cosponsors.

S. 468, introduced on January 24 and cosponsored by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] would amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways in order to require the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for projects on the Federal aid highway systems for the purpose of protecting fish and wildlife and recreation resources.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, at the time I introduced Senate Resolution 48, which would create a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the name of the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] was omitted from the resolution inadvertently as a cosponsor. The Senator from Florida has been a consistent supporter of that work since 1951. I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the resolution the names of the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] be added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 48.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and concurrent resolution:

Authority of March 7, 1963:

S. 1012. A bill to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia: Mr. Talmadge.

S. 1029. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain inequities and restrictions and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds: Mr. Long of Missouri and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

Authority of February 28, 1963:

S. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution favoring observance on July 4 of each year by the ringing of bells throughout the United States, of the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence: Mr. Bayh, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Clark, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Javits, Mr. Keating, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McGee, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, and Mr. Scott.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Address delivered by him before the National Security Commission of the American Legion, in Washington, D.C., on March 14, 1963, dealing with the subject of direct and indirect assaults against the free enterprise system.

By Mr. BIBLE:

Address delivered by Senator Cannon before the Western Regional Quality Control Conference, at Las Vegas, Nev., on February 22, 1963.

By Mr. BAYH:

Address delivered by Senator Hartke before the District of Columbia Dental Society on March 11, 1963.

MISSILES IN CUBA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] is quoted by the news services today as saying that he and other Senators believe there may be as many as 40 intermediate range ballistic missiles in Cuban caves.

I suggest, Mr. President, that this a serious charge, coming as it does in the face of photographic evidence, produced by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara on February 6, showing that 42 missiles were shipped into Cuba and from Cuba back into the Soviet Union. Secretary McNamara also said that continued aerial reconaissance has shown that missile sites were bulldozed and remain inoperative, and that no further missiles have been shipped to Cuba.

Mr. President, to continue to play the missile numbers game in the face of these concrete facts is a dangerous and irresponsible political pastime in this nuclear age, when judgment dictates that unity, responsibility, and strength must be the cornerstone of our foreign policy.

It would appear to me, Mr. President, that some of our colleagues across the aisle seem to be dedicated to the task of shaping the image of the Republican Party into that of the "war party." If this be their purpose, I submit they are doing an admirable job.

But we reach a point where charges for charges' sake become, in fact, a threat to the effective foreign policy of a Nation.

Mr. President, if these charges are to be made, they should be backed by evidence. If the evidence is available, it should be brought forth as forcefully as the charges. If such evidence cannot be produced, those who persist in making these accusations should stop their efforts to mislead the American people by attempting to exploit the sensitive Cuba situation for political purposes.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE MOVES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it is the difficult task of government, in determining how it shall perform its services to the citizens, to draw the line between service and economy. I believe our Government has a very fine record in drawing that line to meet the total interests of the Nation. But on occasion, as in all human enterprises, we err on one side or the other.

Such, I believe, was the case when the Internal Revenue Service decided to shift many of the managerial and servicing functions of its office in Cheyenne to Denver, to effect purported economies of centralization. I realize that Wyoming has fewer than 400,000 people, and that we are continually doing things in bigger and better ways; nevertheless, the citizens of my State are deserving of consideration in this matter.

The Federal income tax, by its very nature, is a fairly personal thing. Those who have problems with their taxes—and it is not difficult to have such problems—can most easily explain their problems to a civil servant who is familiar with their way of life. There is no better way to understand the problems of an area than to live in it.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I do not believe it fair to require a citizen to travel an additional distance to another State, to obtain assistance in settling a tax question. The payment of taxes, even in support of the most equitable government, should be with the minimum of pain and discomfort.

The general taxpayers of Wyoming would suffer most by this move, but there would also be considerable suffering on the part of employees who would be required to move to another city. I realize that when one accepts Government service, one also accepts the chance that moves will be made.

However, in this case the move would be especially onerous because it is unjustified. The loss of capital in selling a home on a market that is at the moment unfortunately depressed, the loss of income for women employees who cannot leave husbands and families, and the loss of local income caused by the removal of several families, all combine to make real hardship for the employees involved, for the city of Cheyenne, and for the State of Wyoming.

Mr. President, in view of these facts, I have determined to oppose this move with all the resources at my command. I intend to carry my convictions to the Internal Revenue Service, and I would ask the support of the Members of this body in this cause.

I should like to see an immediate decision made on this matter. No one likes to live under a cloud of uncertainty; and nothing would be worse for the morale of these Federal employees than to be kept on pins and needles for months and months while these matters are discussed.

Mr. President, the proposed move is unfair and unnecessary. I propose that it be abandoned at once, and that these employees be relieved of their anxieties and returned to the service of the taxpayers of Wyoming.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Record three letters, which I have received in recent days, reflecting upon this situation.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cheyenne Chamber of Commerce,
Cheyenne, Wyo., March 11, 1963.
Hon. Gale W. McGee,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator McGee: You are undoubtedly aware of the proposed move of certain personnel from the Cheyenne Internal Revenue Service Office to Denver, Colo. The alleged reason for this move is economy. In itself, this is an admirable objective. However, I have been discussing the effects of this move with several Wyoming tax practitioners; and they are of the opinion that the removal of supervisory personnel to Denver will work to the detriment of the citizens of Wyoming.

Of course, there is an actual financial detriment involved in that several families will be moved from Cheyenne to Denver. However, the real detriment results from removal of the supervisory personnel. These are the people that handle the first appeal from the ruling of an agent. Therefore, future appeals will be made to people residing in Denver who have no knowledge of the cattle or oil business. The local practitioners inform me that this is not a "paper tiger." The second level appeal people are now in Denver and seem to have little understanding of Wyoming problems. In the past, Wyoming taxpayers have been able to receive fair treatment because the Internal Revenue Service people lived in this state and understood its problems. To quote one local tax man, "Some of our problems eventually rubbed off on them."

An additional effect probably will be the removal of certain agents from Casper to Cheyenne. While we are always glad to have these people, we do not want them at the expense of Wyoming taxpayers.

Finally, the end result of this move will be that all auditing functions will be concentrated in the bigger cities with all of the evils that come from centralization of government. The Wyoming taxpayer will no longer have any contact with the people who are auditing his return. Furthermore, it will then be necessary to travel to Denver to discuss a problem. If we are still a state, it would seem that we are entitled to be treated as one and retain some contact with those who are reviewing our tax problem.

The Cheyenne Chamber of Commerce believes that this is a serious problem and should be given immediate attention. Perhaps you will be able to learn the exact extent of the proposed move so that we will be able to more definitely pinpoint our objections.

Yours truly,

Paul B. Godfrey,
President.

N.A.I.R.E., Local Chapter 31,
Cheyenne, Wyo., March 11, 1963.
Senator Gale W. McGee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator McGee: On March 5, 1963, in a special message to all Internal Revenue Service employees, Commissioner Caplin announced certain changes in the field structure of the Internal Revenue Service. In brief, the New York region is to be absorbed by the Boston region; the Omaha region is to be absorbed by the Chicago region; certain districts are to be shifted from one region to another; 4 districts are to be absorbed into other districts in the same States; and 12 small districts which are now separate entities are to become modified districts, with much of their managerial and servicing functions shifted to an adjoining, larger district. The Cheyenne District, comprising the entire State of Wyoming, is to become a modified district, with Denver as its servicing district. Our purpose in writing to you is to inform you of the impact and effect of this change on the employees involved.

Most of the published information relates only to the few managerial and supervisory positions to be affected. The transfer of service functions, however, would also involve many other positions. Informed estimates indicate that from 35 to 45 families in Cheyenne are directly concerned, and that the reduction in local payroll would be in excess of $250,000 each year.

It is true that many of these people would be offered similar positions in other districts; however, many of them, such as married women, would not be able to move. Another real problem would be that most of those who could move would have to sell their homes in an already depressed real estate market.

The employees are not convinced that the change relating to small districts is wise. They believe that very little of the estimated $5 million annual saving relates to this part of the change, that it will result in a decrease in service to the taxpaying public, and that the impact on them personally is therefore not justifiable. Many of their comments are summarized in the attached copy of a letter to our National Executive Secretary. If you prefer, many of our employees would be happy to write to you direct, but we thought that incorporating their problems into one letter would save you time.

Secretary Dillon has recently postponed any implementation action until after he has reviewed the change in the light of the protests received. We hope that you will agree with our opinions and that you will do what you can in our behalf.

Very truly yours,

W. L. Vickers,
President, Local Chapter 31.

N.A.I.R.E. Local Chapter 31,
Cheyenne, Wyo., March 11, 1963.
Mr. George Bursach,
Executive Secretary, National Association of Internal Revenue Employees, Washington 5, D.C.

Dear Mr. Bursach: As you know, Commissioner Caplin's special message to all employees of March 5, 1963, announced certain modifications in the field structure of the Internal Revenue Service. Cheyenne, as 1 of the 12 small districts, is to be a modified district, with much of our staff and service support to be furnished by the Denver District. The purpose of this letter is to inform you of our local employees' reaction to this change. Copies are being furnished, together with cover letters containing additional information, to Senator McGee, Senator Simpson, Congressman Harrison, Governor Hansen, and Cheyenne Mayor Bill Nation.

Many, although by no means all, of our people's comments relate to personal problems and hardships which they envision, some because of individual circumstances and others related to the present economic situation in Cheyenne. Both kinds are included in the following summary, which I believe is a representative excerption. Most of the selected comments quoted were expressed, in varying forms, by several employees. I am summarizing them in one letter in order to give you a concise picture of the present morale problems here.

"Perhaps some of the regional offices and service centers could be advantageously combined, but it doesn't necessarily follow that the small district offices aren't performing a useful function in fully serving the communities and States in which they are located. Further, even though a reduction of management functions in the small districts might be justified, it would not follow that the servicing and support functions

> should be transferred in toto to larger districts. There would still be the same volume of work of this kind; the same number of employees would still be required to do this work; and its removal would decrease the effectiveness of the servicing and enforcement effort, as well as minimizing taxpayer assistance. Why, then, uproot or otherwise work personal hardships on the people who are now doing the work?"
>
> "How long can a modified district retain its entity? They're hiding their heads in the sand if they really do believe that we can operate as they tell us we will. I don't think they're telling us the whole story."
>
> "Service to the Wyoming taxpayers is bound to be reduced. Apparently all of the servicing functions are to be transferred to Denver."
>
> "Think of the effect of an annual quarter-million dollar reduction in payroll in our already depressed local economy."
>
> "Even though it will cost me money to move, as I know I must, I am not so much concerned about myself; I have lived with the concept of mobility for a long time. I am concerned about the impact on our married women who can't possibly move."
>
> "The general reaction is one of shock, of frustration, of disappointment, of disillusionment."
>
> "It's all happening so fast, and we have had no advance warning. Out of the clear blue sky, we are suddenly told that we will have to move. They say that they will exert every effort to help us. It seems to some of us that they haven't really considered what this means to those who can't move."
>
> "My job is one of those eliminated. I am a single woman, true, but I still have family responsibilities. I recently bought a home here to provide for my aged and invalid mother. To sell it on the present Cheyenne market would cost me money I can't afford."
>
> "Two or three years more work would see my family over the hump; by then our expenses for school, etc., would be reduced so that both my husband and I wouldn't have to work."
>
> "The lack of information is working a terrific hardship on my own and many other families. All personal plans for vacations, school, etc., for this year are affected."
>
> "How can they make so much ado about integrity and then pull a stunt like this?"
>
> "The people largely adversely affected are those in the modified districts. Why should the people in the servicing districts sit there undisturbed, and actually benefit from the change; why should not the positions they occupy be open to competition to displaced personnel?"
>
> "It's difficult to live with the feeling of insecurity. Most of us just don't know where we stand."
>
> "I recently moved here in good faith to accept a position in this district office. When I arrived, I bought a home for my family. I assume that I will be placed elsewhere, but the problem of providing a home for my family there is a very real one. I don't expect to sell my present home for anywhere near enough to realize my equity. In fact, I probably will lose it entirely. Where can I find enough money to make a down payment in a new town?"
>
> "I know of several recent instances where people leaving Cheyenne had to sell their homes at tremendous losses."
>
> "My husband is employed in Cheyenne. How can I move to 'follow the work' to another office?"
>
> "Most of the published information concerns the management officials to be transferred. Many more people, particularly lower-paid married women, won't be able to move. What about them?"
>
> "All this to save five million a year? Have they considered how much it will cost the families involved?"
>
> Unquestionably, we will lose much talent and experience because of employee belief that the Service has let them down. How do we regain our composure, our dignity, our esprit de corps—how long will it take for management to be accepted again by employees—how long will it take to regain our stature?
>
> These, of course, are initial reactions, and much of the evident despair can be attributed to what we hope is a lack of information. Mr. Paul Schuster, our local District Director, has committed himself to keeping our employees rapidly and fully informed, and has done an admirable job in this regard. Personal problems, however, would still exist, no matter how much information is disseminated, if the planned changes were put through in their entirety.
>
> Your Bulletin Board issue of March 6, 1963, relates to the proposed change, but the emphasis is entirely on the number of management people that may be involved. As we in the modified districts see it, however, this completely ignored the problems of those in lower echelons who, although they may be offered jobs in other locations, would be unable to move because of family responsibilities. In our district, there are the people who are most troubled.
>
> Many of our people think that this unprecedented and hasty tactical move was a serious error in employee relations. There is no question about the fact that employee morale has reached its lowest ebb. Some of our people have said that IRS is too insecure and that they will shop around for other positions.
>
> We have just been informed that Secretary Dillion has called for a review of the proposed change in the light of protests received and that he has also delayed any change until January 1, 1964. The employees are hoping for a quick decision, because they believe that this is just a short reprieve. Anxiety is at a high pitch during the interim, and the index of efficiency nosedives when decisions are in a study state. Whatever the decision, it would be better to know.
>
> In summary, then, we do not believe that the change as it relates to the modified districts would materially benefit the Service; we do believe that it would work serious hardships on our people.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> W. L. Vickers,
> *President, Local Chapter 31.*

BEEF PRICES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the State of Wyoming derives a large share of its income from the sale of livestock.

Indeed, the very mention of the name "Wyoming" connotes the same kind of image as it does in mentioning the name of the State of the distinguished Vice President and the President of this body—Texas. It brings to mind visions of vast herds of cattle, of mammoth cattle drives and colorful cowboys. And while the modern cowboy bears little resemblance to those now found on television, the importance of the western livestock industry has not changed.

It is therefore very disturbing to me, Mr. President, to watch the price of fat cattle sharply decline in recent months. In a free enterprise economy we are accustomed to price fluctuations but those that we have witnessed recently are of such a nature as to indicate that something more than supply and demand may be behind them.

In the last 60 to 70 days the price of fat cattle has dropped $7 a hundredweight. This means, Mr. President, that a Wyoming stockman who brings a 1,000-pound steer to market now receives $70 less for that animal than he did late in December. This is not a monetary loss that can be easily assumed and a continuation of this trend would spell economic disaster for many of my State's beef producers.

For several years the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee has had a specific interest in the administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act. As a member of this subcommittee I have been an advocate of a vigorous administration of that act. And I have suggested that an increase in operating funds was necessary. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Appropriations Committee has been generous in its support of my proposals and we have witnessed in recent years positive results of our concern that our laws in this area be completely and impartially enforced.

Mr. President, we cannot rest on our laurels. We in the Congress owe it to the Nation to protect the individual citizen from any unfair or illegal practices that may impinge upon his ability to earn his living. Therefore, I intend to take a very close look at this recent price drop. I intend to discover its affect upon the producer and the consumer and the reasons behind such a drastic change.

At this point I do not know what this investigation will turn up. But I intend to make its results known to this body. This matter is of vital importance to a great segment of the population and it is essential that we make certain that the rights of all concerned are fully protected.

TIME TO CONSIDER THE CONSUMER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, for a number of years import restrictions on residual fuel oil placed an increasingly heavy burden on the consumers of the entire east coast of the United States, which accounts for nearly two-thirds of the total U.S. consumption of residual fuel oil. Residual fuel oil supplies about a third of our industrial fuel needs, about 15 percent of all electric utility fuel needs and it heats the bulk of all apartment and public buildings along the east coast. In short, it is a vital commodity, particularly for the New England States and for New York.

Yet, Mr. President, under the arbitrary and clearly inadequate quota allocation for the year ending March 31, 1963, residual fuel oil suppliers report that supplies are nearly exhausted and that unless emergency help is provided no more residual fuel oil will be available until the new allocations are effective April 1. This presents a particularly serious problem because the exceptionally cold winter has required greater consumption than usual of oil stocks used for heating and to generate electricity.

Action is necessary to provide necessary additional supplies for this year and to insure that the same kind of shortage does not keep on occurring year after year, to the serious detriment of the east coast suppliers and all their consumers. It is clearly time for the Department of

the Interior to take a realistic stand on the matter.

In my judgment, there is no fair or legitimate reason why the millions of consumers in New York State and New England should be compelled to pay higher prices for such an important commodity as fuel oil merely at the whim of a few coal interests. Last year, as a result of similar shortages, the customers of the Long Island Lighting Co. had their bills upped because of oil shortages at this time of year. American shippers have had to pay more for the fuel oil they need than foreign vessels docked right beside them, whose bonded oil is not subject to import duties. The entire import quota system on residual oil is exactly the type of special interest protection that hurts millions of consumers and has the overall effect of hampering the industrial growth that is so important to this Nation.

Mr. President, I favor complete abolition of residual oil quotas over the next few years and the establishment of a genuinely competitive market for residual oil and other fuels on the east coast. Should this not be feasible at the moment, what is urgently required, is a meaningful relaxation of the present unnecessarily restrictive quota system. My colleague [Mr. Javits] and I have directed an urgent request to the President to review the entire program and to take a fair an equitable consideration of the needs of the consumers of this important product. The report submitted in the form of a memorandum for the President by the Office of Emergency Planning on February 13 makes it clear that present arrangements do not serve the genuine national interest. Residual fuel oil comes primarily from Venezuela, which is an integral member of the hemispheric defense system on which we depend. It is absurd to conduct a vast foreign-aid program under the Alliance for Progress for Venezuela and at the same time to deny to the Venezuelans the right to sell products we badly need in the United States.

Furthermore, it is wholly inconsistent to speak of tax reform, closing tax loopholes, and providing additional funds for consumer spending on the one hand while perpetuating a system of fuel regulations that hurts consumers, hampers industrial growth and benefits only a tiny minority of special interests. It is even more inconsistent to talk about the need for a faster rate of economic growth while maintaining a fuel policy that penalizes new factories or installations and makes it harder for the competitive suppliers of these facilities to provide fuel at a reasonable price.

Mr. President, it is important to take a broad view of this problem. National economic considerations and international policies are involved. The existing policy on residual fuel oil imports, as the Office of Emergency Planning has made very clear, no longer meets the economic needs of the great majority of those concerned. I sincerely hope the President will review this situation promptly and take action to encourage a meaningful relaxation of residual fuel imports, a relaxation which can redound to the benefit of millions of consumers and will help promote the economic growth we all desire.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include, following my remarks, the text of a telegram sent by Senator Javits and myself to the President yesterday.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> This wire concerns the imminent decision on residual fuel oil import quotas for the year beginning April 1, 1963.
>
> We believe that the report to you, released on February 13, 1963, by the Office of Emergency Planning, is convincing evidence of the unnecessary hardships caused by the quota system to the consumers of fuel oil in the United States—especially on the east coast. The report is also significant in that it establishes the irrelevance of the argument that residual fuel oil quotas are necessary for national security. Such considerations are clearly and properly put on a hemisphere-wide basis, and the issue of coal reserves and coal transportation facilities for domestic emergency purposes is finally put to rest. Therefore, we favor elimination of the residual fuel oil import quota system.
>
> However, should the optimum course of eliminating the system not be possible at this time, we urge the following steps:
>
> (1) "Meaningful" relaxation of the quota for next year.
>
> (2) Revision of the quota allocation system so that independent distributors of fuel oil and consumers may freely deal in this product within whatever overall national quota may be established.
>
> (3) At the minimum, institution of a system whereby additions to the overall national quota, urgently required by the installation of new facilities to service a growing population and expanding industry, may be distributed in a competitive manner; that is, by permitting new fuel oil consumers freedom of choice among suppliers by allocating to such installations or their fuel oil suppliers sufficient fuel oil to meet their specific needs.
>
> It is our view that the third suggestion would serve to prevent perpetuation of a noncompetitive system and could serve as an experiment in changing the administration of the entire quota system in line with the consumers' interest in competition among suppliers.
>
> We urgently request immediate action to bring about increased and competitively supplied amount of residual fuel oil to meet vital consumer needs.
>
> Jacob K. Javits,
> *U.S. Senate.*
> Kenneth B. Keating,
> *U.S. Senate.*

TOOLS FOR FREEDOM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a very impressive and energetic organization has been brought to my attention known as the Tools for Freedom. This private, nonprofit organization, which has been in operation for 2 years, was initiated by American businessmen concentrated mostly in the New York and New England areas. Under the very able and competent leadership of its executive director, Robert Murrow, it is now expanding into a nationwide program.

Mr. President, the purpose of Tools for Freedom is to assist schools in the emerging countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America by providing them with desperately needed training tools—tools which have become obsolete in American industry, having been replaced through technological improvements and automation. To date, various U.S. manufacturers have donated over 200 tons of equipment in response to the numerous requests submitted by foreign schools in 14 underdeveloped countries of the free world. Quite clearly, by their efforts, Tools for Freedom hopes to help these countries improve, increase, and expand their own industrial and agricultural productivity. In turn, this program offers advantages to U.S. manufacturers in the form of tax benefits in addition to providing oversea showcases for their products which in some instances may stimulate oversea contracts.

Mr. President, by donating the material upon which the emerging countries can build their economy, U.S. business is in fact running its own private and effective foreign aid effort. In the long run, by increasing the economic growth and stability of these countries, U.S. business can help combat the tide of communism.

FUTILE AND FOOLISH CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM SHOULD BE ENDED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, civil defense bureaucrats including those heading up the civil defense spending program in the Department of Defense continue in their efforts to dupe the American public into believing that we have an effective civil defense program.

In the midst of the Cuban crisis last October the planners doubled the number of potential shelter spaces, so-called, overnight. By simply using a mimeograph machine they lowered the suitable safety factor from 100 to 40—meaning one would supposedly be 40 times safer inside than out. Of course, it is highly problematical whether in a nuclear attack lives would be saved even if a person were 100 times safer in one of these spaces than out of it.

At any rate, signs were hurriedly put up indicating shelter areas—most of them after the crisis subsided. I suppose that the main purpose of these shelter signs was to soothe the anxiety of any worried citizen, as they certainly would serve no other worthwhile purpose.

For instance, a member of my staff reported to me that his apartment became a fallout shelter overnight. When he called local civil defense headquarters for information as to the nearest shelter for him and his family, he was told he was living in it. Signs were put up outside his door denoting his floor as a fallout shelter—one flight above ground level. It is as though the planners believe that merely by scattering shelter signs around public buildings, office buildings, and apartment houses they will somehow convince Americans they are safe in event of nuclear attack.

Although the Congress appropriated $208 million in 1961 and an additional $38 million in 1962 for marking and provisioning fallout shelters, when the crisis came most of them could not be found, were not marked, or were unusable. Only a handful were provisioned. Rations and medical kits on which millions of dollars had been spent were still stocked in Federal warehouses and arsenals. Since then some of these so-called shelters have been provisioned with distilled water, which will eventually deteriorate, and a commodity known as fallout shelter biscuits. For the latter, incidentally, bakeries throughout the Nation have received millions of dollars of taxpayers' money. I suppose that we can find some little consolation for this expenditure in the fact that in some small way our economy—or at least that of our bakers—was stimulated. That is the only good that could possibly result from this boondoggle.

Mr. President, in the Dayton Daily News, one of Ohio's great newspapers, there appeared on March 3, 1963, a column entitled "Shelterless Welcome To Join Our Cracker-Chewing Gang," by Jim Fain, the outstanding editor of that fine newspaper. It is an excellent example of perceptive journalistic reporting at its best. There is nothing so devastating to pomposity and the ridiculous as laughter.

Through the medium of serious humor Mr. Fain in a few words reveals the ludicrousness of the civil defense program. Through such responsible journalism those in charge of our civil defense effort will soon learn the truth of Lincoln's remark "you can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all of the time." I commend this column to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Shelterless Welcome To Join Our Cracker-Chewing Gang

The thing you need most in newspaper business we finally got: Our very own personally monogramed bomb shelter.

There are big yellow signs plastered all over us here at Fourth and Ludlow to convince the scoffers. Civil defense regards us as a port in storm, whatever the rest of you think. We are haven, sanctuary, Gibraltar (no cracks about last apes, please). We are nuclear fallout proof, however much radiation sickness we may contract from those 100-megaton letters to the editor you launch our way.

This is not a singular honor. There are 25 other public shelters hereabouts. The new public library is probably the safest—and there you have cultural riches during the 2 weeks you are supposed to keep your head down.

Hotels and motels are considered ideal because of the libations on deck there. We boast no saloon here at the Daily News, but the civil defense people have us awash with water.

In our basement right now there is water enough to keep 1,140 ordinary people afloat for 2 weeks. Walter Lippmann only knows how long that much water will last a newspaper crowd. As a general thing, we do not approve of adulterating whisky.

Anyway, we have 945 gallons of water downstairs in case you feel thirsty after the bomb drops. Furthermore, we have no pistols to keep you out. You're welcome to come in and heist a glass with us.

We also have some wheat flower biscuits that look like graham crackers and taste (it says here; this I have not market researched; we all have our principles) like animal crackers. Do they still make animal crackers?

The charm of these crackers, according to the CD again, is that they don't make you thirsty, so the water goes further. It probably also is true that they don't make you hungry, so the crackers go further.

Anyway, we have enough for 340 people for 2 weeks. I am not sure how many crackers that is, probably four or five dozen.

If you are big for crackers, relax. More are en route. We expect soon to be able to feed a multitude of 1,140 as many crackers as they can swing.

It also pleases us editorial types here on the third floor of the building (face it: The editorial syndrome by definition reflects paranoid certitude that it is the center of the universe) that the shelter signs point in our direction.

Civil defense says this is because the middle floors of a building are safest. We know better. Neither living nor dying by the sword, we can blithely absorb sticks, stones, and megatons in profusion. It's that ever-loving overkilling pen we sweat out. Just keep us out of the sharp-tongued, linguistic briar patch, Brer Fox. Then bombs agley.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, over $1 billion has already been wasted on civil defense. In the budget for 1964, $300 million is requested of which over $200 million is for shelter purposes. It is projected that over $543 million will be requested for shelter protection alone in each of the ensuing 4 fiscal years. As of yet, administration officials have failed to enunciate a clear, firm policy as to what our goals are insofar as civil defense is concerned. Last year we were asked for $700 million, this year $300 million. Where will it end?

Those favoring a massive fallout shelter building program have estimated that it will cost anywhere from $20 to $200 billion. Even then there is no guarantee that it will be effective. With extensive advances being made in rockets and nuclear technology, such a fallout shelter program would probably be obsolete before being completed. Unless we are prepared to embark on such a vast gamble and spend perhaps $200 billion of the taxpayer's money, we should carefully consider the wisdom of piecemeal appropriations amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars with no really effective purpose.

Mr. President, I desire at all times to support the administration when I can in good conscience do so. I am proud of the record being made by President Kennedy. I am proud of his firm, determined, resolute and unyielding policy toward Khrushchev and Castro's Cuba, which compelled Khrushchev to turn tail, withdraw his missiles and airplanes, and is now compelling him to withdraw his troops. However, I urge administration leaders to review present civil defense policy so that we in the Congress may be aware of the ultimate cost and of what will actually be accomplished. Until that is done, I for one, do not intend to vote for further expenditures of hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars for foolish and useless civil defense programs.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired. The senior Senator from Ohio may be recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional minute so that I may yield to my colleague.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the Senator from Ohio may proceed for 1 additional minute. The Senator yields to his colleague.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I express my concurrence with what my colleague has said about the plan for expending Federal money in the amounts mentioned for the building of shelters under civil defense. I think that the positions my colleague has taken in the past several years have been sound. No plan has been evolved.

I recall that as early as 1950 there was talk about spending $50 billion. What this will eventually lead to no one can foretell.

Mr. President, I subscribe to the views my colleague has expressed.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank my colleague.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CLYDE DOYLE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, by now the House has heard the tragic news about our colleague, the late Clyde Doyle, of California, who passed away only a few hours ago. All of us mourn his passing.

I had the pleasure of calling the late Representative Doyle my friend. For nearly 20 years he served his district, his State, and his country in the Congress of the United States. He was a dedicated public servant. He paid unswerving devotion to his country and to his country's needs.

The Nation has lost a valued public servant, and we have lost a very dear friend.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I should like to join in expressing sincere sorrow over the passing of Clyde Doyle. He was a fine man and a most conscientious Member of the other body. Only a week or two ago I saw Clyde and thought he looked not up to par, so I said, "Clyde, you ought to slow down a little bit." He said, "Well, that is a hard thing to do." That was typical of him.

He was one of the hardest working Members of the other body, sincerely dedicated to the interests of our country. His loss will be deeply felt in many areas. We will miss him here in the Congress and throughout the Nation. I extend to his family my sincere sympathy.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend from New York.

Mr ENGLE rose.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I now yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I deeply regret the death of my old and very dear friend, Clyde Doyle, who passed away very tragically and unexpectedly today.

He was elected to Congress by the 23d District of California nine times.

He was a very fine lawyer, a man with the strongest sense of civic responsibility, a dedicated public servant.

He was blessed, above all else, with a great love for people, and he had a very special quality of enthusiasm which never faded with the passing of the years.

I wish to quote what our great and beloved former Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn, said about Clyde Doyle:

> Clyde Doyle is one of the most effective men in his committees and also on the floor of the House of Representatives.
>
> He is able, he is honest, and he has the facility for expressing himself in such a way as to impress all the Members of the House with his knowledge of the subject in hand. I think Clyde is one of the very best men we have in the House of Representatives.
>
> We have shown our confidence in him in many ways.

Of course, Mr. President, that was true. The people of his district showed their confidence in him in many ways.

He received both the nomination of his own party and that of the Republican Party in 1952 and 1958. In the last election in which a Member of the Congress was permitted to cross-file on both tickets, he was the only Member of the House in southern California who had the distinction of being nominated by both parties. This was an unusual and a unique tribute.

His outstanding community leadership over a period of many years was recognized by his own community. In 1936 he received unanimously the award of the Meritorious Citizenship Plaque by a vote of all the service clubs in Long Beach, Calif., as the most valuable and useful adult citizen in Long Beach.

Clyde Doyle will be deeply missed by all of us who knew him so well. His services in the Congress of the United States were extremely valuable. Clyde Doyle believed there was no office in the land that equaled service in the Congress of the United States. He was proud of that service. He was proud of the great district which he represented.

His death is a loss not only to the State of California, but to the Congress of the United States and the American people.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis].

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I join my colleague in a word of tribute to our late colleague, Representative Doyle, of California. I came to know him well through our duties relating to the subject of the armed services and respected him and appreciated the great character he was.

One of the things that impressed me was his untiring interest in the youth of the Nation. He was always trying to get the country to take a step forward and open up opportunities and corrective measures for our young people. I join my colleague in expressing our sorrow at the news of his passing.

RED SKELTON—GREAT AMERICAN ENTERTAINER—RECEIVES NATIONAL BROTHERHOOD AWARD

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on Monday night in San Diego, the National Conference of Christians and Jews conferred its highest honor—the National Brotherhood Award—on a distinguished American, Red Skelton.

Millions of us, of course, know Red Skelton as one of the world's superb entertainers. Perhaps not all of us know of his great humanitarianism.

As the conference's citation pointed out, Red Skelton has made a "distinguished contribution to the advancement of good human relations among all people."

Red Skelton's infectious humor has done more than bring happiness to millions of his fellow Americans. He has pointed out our foibles, but always affectionately and gently, in the conviction that we are all brothers and sisters under the American flag—and could laugh at and with each other because we are free and equal, one as good as the next, regardless of origin, station, belief, or color.

Because of his love for his fellow American, he has always been willing to entertain, whether an audience was great or small.

Before entering the service in the Second World War he gave some 3,500 shows before GI audiences. As a member of the Armed Forces, he made countless appearances before audiences ranging from 1 to 20,000.

The number of times he has helped his fellow man—whether with his time, influence, or money—will never be accurately recorded. Red Skelton, moreover, would not want them recorded.

It will come as no surprise that Red Skelton is a deeply religious man.

His credo, in his own words, is:

> I believe we were all put here for a purpose—and I was put here to make people laugh. If it's good enough for the Man upstairs, it's good enough for me.

Red Skelton, indeed, is a true believer in the aims and purposes of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, which, in a few words, are: "The brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God."

I feel, and I am sure my colleagues and Americans everywhere will agree, that our beloved comedian with the shock of red hair and rubber face is a most fitting recipient of the National Brotherhood Award.

FLOOD CONTROL SYSTEM SAVED $205 MILLION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, toward January, the heavens suddenly began to open in the Sacramento Valley in my State of California. The downpour continued and gathered strength. A flood of vast proportions was in the making, driven by a gale. The runoff of water swept trees and cabins before it, as it hurtled toward the floor of the valley.

Had it not been for the effective and efficient system of dams, levees, and bypasses in the Sacramento Valley, flood damage would have wreaked a grievous toll.

The Army Corps of Engineers estimated that $205 million of destruction would have accompanied the torrent of rain except for the farflung, manmade flood control system in which the Federal Government played a crucially vital part. For the third time in the last 10 years, the giant Folsom Dam saved the Sacramento area from calamity. I salute the Federal Government, the Congress, and the Engineers, for the protection of life and property in my State, and for the splendid role which the National Government played. All this is discussed in an excellent article by Mr. Tom Arden appearing in the Sacramento Bee, Sunday, March 10, 1963.

I ask consent that the article appear in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Flood Control System Saved $205 Million

(By Tom Arden)

The Army Corps of Engineers figures dams, levees, and bypasses in the Sacramento Valley combined to prevent $205 million in damages during the violent storms of a few weeks ago.

Without this coordinated system of controls, the Sacramento River, according to a survey just completed, would have wrought damages totaling $160 million and $45 million in havoc would have been caused along the American River.

In the San Joaquin Valley, the Sacramento district office of the Army Engineers reports about $15 million in damages would have resulted from floods if dams had not been built to check riverflows.

Particularly dramatic, says Col. Herbert N. Turner, Chief of the Army Engineers Sacramento district, was the effectiveness of Folsom Dam and the north levee system from Carmichael Bluffs to the new State fair site in preventing the American River from overflowing to cause the type of flooding which occurred in 1950, before the dam and levee were constructed.

The stage was set for the flood control system to play its role in the Sacramento Valley when rain began pelting down January 29. First came 4 to 6 inches well spread over the watershed areas of the Feather, Yuba, and American Rivers.

Another 24 hours and the downpour was increased by another 6 to 8 inches with the prospect of more to come.

EFFECT OF RUNOFF

"As the storm moved in from the southwest, driven by gale wind against the frozen Sierra," reads a special report just completed by Clyde J. Gorman, chief of the technical liaison branch of the Army Engineers Sacramento district, "runoff climbed and brought with it trees, cabins, trailers, and butane tanks in the 2-mile drop to the valley floor.

"Mountain highways and railroads were washed out, communications knocked out.

"The Yuba broke all records with a flow of 150,000 cubic feet per second, 2,000 over the peak which contributed to the well remembered Yuba City disaster of 1955.

"The Feather peaked at 186,000 as against 203,000 in 1955, which shows the storm pattern tapering off to the north.

"But on the American the 1955 flow of 219,000 was topped by a flow of 240,000, second only to an estimated flow of 280,000 in the legendary flood of 1862."

SAFE PASSAGE

"Had there been no flood control system the lower Sacramento Valley would have been a shallow sea and the delta, plagued by high tides and heavy inflow, would have looked like an extension of Suisun Bay.

"Instead, channel capacities of the levee and bypass system were utilized to pass the flood safely through the valley. This is not to say there were no anxious moments. High velocity flows cut into the levee slopes below Nicolaus on the Feather, and upstream at Yuba City residents mindful of 1955 began to evacuate. But the levees, as they are supposed to do, contained the floods, provided people a place to stand and fight if need be, and to patrol the rivers.

"With only moderate flows above the latitude of Chico, the Sacramento River had no problems until its confluence with the combined Feather, Yuba, and Sutter bypass flows. It was here that Fremont weir picked up an overflow of 193,000 cubic feet per second and sent it down the Yolo bypass which can accommodate 377,000 cubic feet per second at this point."

SIMPLE ARITHMETIC

"Below this point the Sacramento main stem continued to carry 94,000 cubic feet per second. The channel capacity of the river at Sacramento is 110,000. Add 193,000 to 94,000 and you get 287,000.

"The difference between 287,000 and 110,000 river capacity leaves small speculation as to where the excess inflow of 177,000 from the north would have gone.

"Now consider the simultaneous threat from the east on the American. Add an inflow of 240,000 to a river that could stand only 17,000 more cubic feet per second at Sacramento.

"But Folsom Dam caught and restrained the American. The water began creeping up behind the spillway gates and it was time to use the leveed channel capacity below Folsom. This channel can take 115,000 cubic feet per second, so releases from Folsom were stepped up 10,000 per hour until they reached 110,000.

"ROOM FOR BOTH

"It will be remembered that the Sacramento main stem at its confluence with the American could now take only 17,000 more second feet. So the Sacramento weir was opened and 94,000 cubic feet per second was turned into Yolo bypass before the American could hit town.

"This left plenty of room for both rivers with 16,000 cubic feet per second to spare. The small remaining space behind Folsom left some room to maneuver had the storm continued.

"It was a smooth and efficient operation which did not escape carping from those who choose to live between the levees and those who do not understand.

"But it saved the town and the croplands between here and the bay."

ANSWER TO CRITICS

Some complaints were made that water was released too fast from behind Folsom Dam, which has a storage capacity of 1 million acre-feet.

But Federal officials pointed out the level of Folsom Lake jumped from 443,500 acre-feet to 835,000 acre-feet in a little more than 2 days.

Despite the need to maintain space for possible more heavy inflows, it was emphasized, the releases into the American downstream from the dam were less than, the project was designed for.

FEDERAL-STATE WATER RIGHTS—MUST THERE BE CONFLICT?—SPEECH BY SENATOR MOSS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, few areas in Federal-State relations have offered more resistance to settlement than the complex and controversial area of Federal-State water rights. The problem is national in scope, but it is especially troublesome in the semiarid regions of the West where every drop of water is precious, and where Federal ownership of millions of acres of land raises jurisdictional problems over the development, appropriation, and use of the water there.

Earlier this week in Los Angeles, Senator Frank E. Moss, of Utah, gave a comprehensive and challenging summary of the water rights question. The occasion was a water rights symposium at the annual midwinter conference of the National District Attorneys' Association, of which Senator Moss was formerly national president. I commend his excellent speech entitled "Federal-State Water Rights—Must There Be Conflict?" to all who are interested in water and the right to use it.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Federal-State Water Rights—Must There Be Conflict?

(Speech by Senator Frank E. Moss, of Utah, before annual Midwinter Conference of the National District Attorneys Association Los Angeles, Calif., March 11, 1963)

It is indeed an honor and a privilege to be with you here today to participate in this symposium on Federal-State water rights problems. Having been born and raised in the arid State of Utah, the importance of water is deeply ingrained in my consciousness. From the vantage point of membership on the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and as a member of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources during the period of its existence from 1959 to 1961, I have had considerable exposure to the problems of Federal-State conflict over water rights. Because of the importance of the problem, I believe there is no other problem area facing the Congress the outcome of which could have such a profound effect on the future of the Western States.

The issue was highlighted by the Select Committee on National Water Resources in its report to the Senate in January 1961. After a recitation of the basis for conflict, that committee called for broad objective inquiry into the problem, and for statesmanship of the highest caliber on the part of both the Congress and the States in the solution of the Federal-States water rights problem. The committee concluded its remarks on this subject with the words:

"A solution must be worked out, and worked out promptly, for the preservation of the historic pattern under which our people have grown great."

I was indeed pleased to hear from my old friend, Hal Kennedy, about the work he is doing, through his statewide Federal-State Water Rights Committee of the Feather River Project Association, to develop public understanding of the problems involved. For among the other findings of the select committee it was pointed out that the first and most important step toward getting anything done in the water field is the development of increased public awareness and understanding of the problems, of their effects on the Nation's economy, and the possible ways of solving them. I believe that a continuation of efforts along the lines that Hal has started may lay the groundwork for eventual success in our endeavor to work out an acceptable solution to these problems. I agree with him that the task ahead is not an easy one, and that it may be a year or more before the climate is favorable for seeking congressional action on legislation which will make a start on clarification of the problem.

SOURCE OF CONFLICT

Although widespread interest in the Federal-State water rights conflict has developed only in the last decade or so, the sources of conflict between Federal and State sovereignty have been building up over more than a century. These conflicts have been the subject of concern to water users and their lawyers for many decades, but it took a combination of circumstances, culminating in the Fallbrook case and the Supreme Court decision in the Pelton case, and other recent developments, to bring the conflict out in the open. A few brief comments as to the two sides of the controversy will be helpful in describing what we should try to do.

In support of the position held generally by the States, several Federal statutes enacted in the latter half of the 19th century, in connection with the disposition of portions of the public lands, led to the supposition that the United States had permanently transferred control over water rights to the States. I refer particularly to section 9 of the act of July 26, 1866, where the Congress specifically provided for upholding existing water rights, and that all patents to the public lands were to be subject to vested water rights; to section 17 of the act of July 9, 1870, which included a similar protection of vested water rights; and to the Desert Land Act of March 3, 1877, which provided that water rights were to depend on prior appropriation, and that surplus waters of the public lands were to be free for appropriation and use by the public, subject to existing rights.

Furthermore, in legislation admitting certain Western States to the Union, Congress accepted the State constitutions, which included provisions recognizing and confirming existing water rights, setting up procedures for acquiring water rights under State law, and in some instances specifically declaring State ownership or control of waters arising or flowing within the States concerned.

Several later Federal enactments also indicated that Congress was thinking in terms of State control of water rights. For example, section 8 of the Federal Reclamation Act of 1902 includes express provision that Federal activity in the field of reclamation was not to interfere with State laws relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation, or any vested right acquired thereunder, and the Secretary of the Interior was directed to proceed in conformity with State laws in carrying out the provisions of the Reclamation Act, thus implying, according to some students of the problem, a recognition of State sovereignty over the use of water for irrigation in the Western States.

Later, section 27 of the Federal Power Act, enacted by the Congress in 1920, states that that act was not to be construed as affecting or intending to affect or in any way to interfere with the laws of the respective States relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation or for municipal or other uses, or any vested right acquired therein.

Furthermore, the law required the applicant for license to furnish satisfactory evidence that he had complied with the requirements of the State or States within which the proposed project was to be located.

Another factor leading to more active conflict between Federal and State laws was the great expansion of Federal programs in the field of water resources in 1936, brought about by the congressional declaration of policy on flood control, in which that function was stated to be a proper activity of the Federal Government because of the adverse effects of floods on commerce between the States and on the national welfare.

Potential conflicts between Federal flood control activity in the Western States and State laws having become very apparent and very widespread in the first few years of operation under the 1936 Flood Control Act, Congress, in the 1944 Flood Control Act, declared its policy to recognize the interests and rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders. Congress also provided, in section 1(b) of the act, that the use of works authorized for navigation shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use of water in the 17 Western States. These provisions have been reiterated in each successive Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Authorization Act since that date, thus seeming to indicate a continuing willingness on the part of the Congress to relinquish the sovereignty of the United States over navigable waters in specific cases. The constitutional issue has not been finally settled in connection with these projects, however, because it is a well documented fact that one Congress cannot bind future congresses; thus, the waiver of navigation rights could be repealed at some future date.

A final, and the most recent Federal statute that I am going to mention in this context is the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of August 4, 1954. Section 4 of this act establishes, as one of the prerequisites for Federal assistance in watershed development, the requirement that local organizations or landowners acquire such water rights, pursuant to State law, as may be needed in the installation and operation of the works of improvement.

From the viewpoint of the laws which Congress has enacted, therefore, I think it could be said that there need be no conflict between Federal and State water rights. Congress has expressed itself in, and the President has signified concurrence by affixing his signature to, many statutes which to me at least make this abundantly clear.

In support of the Federal side of the controversy, however, it can be stated that none of the legislative enactments I have just mentioned made any effort to change Federal responsibilities in the field of commerce, nor was any reference made to their effect on Federal responsibilities in the fields of national defense and general welfare, or on the treatymaking powers of the President. To the contrary, the Congress on several occasions, going back to the latter years of the 19th century, has reaffirmed by statute the Federal sovereignty with respect to navigation.

The primary support for the Federal side appears to rest on certain Supreme Court decisions upholding Federal sovereignty against claimants of water rights under State laws. There seems to be agreement that among the most important of these are *United States* v. *Rio Grande Dam and Irrigation Co.*, decided in 1899, and *Winters* v. *United States*, decided in 1908, both of which made it clear that the sovereignty of the United States over waters needed under the commerce and the treatymaking clauses of the Constitution had not been broadly relinquished by any statutory enactments.

Several other court decisions and statutory enactments are worthy of mention in this necessarily brief discussion of the emerging conflicts between Federal and State sovereignty.

In one of these, *United States* v. *Appalachian Power Co.*, sometimes called the *New River* case, decided by the Supreme Court in 1940, the broad definition of navigable waters stated by Congress in section 3 of the Federal Power Act was broadened further by the Court's dictum that the tributaries of navigable streams also came under the commerce power. This had the effect of broadening greatly the navigation servitude.

Another court decision that has caused serious concern among western lawyers is a 1946 decision by the Supreme Court, the case of *First Iowa Electric Cooperative* v. *Federal Power Commission*, which made it clear that State laws governing the use or control of water of navigable streams were not applicable when they trespassed in a field also covered by Federal law.

A third decision I want to mention in this context is the one which has had the greatest influence in building up the Western States' concern over potential conflicts between Federal and State laws over water rights. I refer, of course, to *Federal Power Commission* v. *Oregon*, usually referred to as the *Pelton* case. In deciding this in 1955, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the supremacy of Federal jurisdiction over unappropriated, nonnavigable waters arising from or flowing over reserved lands. Soon after the *Pelton* case was decided, the fears of western water users were heightened by certain pleadings made by the Department of Justice in various lawsuits pending in the West over the water of certain streams, particularly the *Blue River* case in Colorado, and the *Hawthorne* case in Nevada. Pleadings by the Government in these cases, asserting paramount rights to water under the so-called reservation doctrine of the *Pelton* decision, led many westerners to fear that the United States proposed to take away, without compensation, existing water rights acquired under State law. This has been denied by the Department of Justice, although questions remain as to which water rights have been acquired under State law in such manner that there is no future challenge possible as to the existence of a valid property right.

Even before the Pelton case was decided, the actions of the Federal Government in the suit seeking adjudication of the waters of the Santa Marguerita River threw doubt on water rights obtained by appropriation under California law when the Federal Government was in a position to claim riparian rights. So much has been said about this suit, that I believe it inappropriate for me to add anything further, particularly since the suit is still pending in the U.S. District Court for Southern California. This case, *United States* v. *Fallbrook Irrigation District*, led to the first efforts to seek a legislative solution to the widening conflict.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION TO DATE

In the last decade, about 50 bills have been introduced in the House and Senate in an attempt to solve the Federal-States water rights controversy by legislation. It would take too much time, and, I am sure, would be repetitious of much that is being covered by other participants in this symposium, for me to list them all at this time. I think it is helpful, however, to point out the four principal types of bills which have been introduced. There have been, and are, a number of variations, but in general, the bills have all fallen within one of these general types.

The first type of bill, exemplified by S. 863 in the 84th and 85th Congress, the Barrett bill, would in essence relinquish Federal control over water in the West to the States. All waters, whether navigable or not, would be free for appropriation and would be subject to State control for all beneficial uses. The Federal Government would be required to proceed in conformity with State laws in the appropriation and use of water. The Federal Power Commission could only license hydroelectric power projects if previous approval of the State with respect to the use of the water had been obtained. It has been argued that the provisions of the bill are so broad that, if enacted, the Federal Government could engage in water resources development in the Western States only with the consent of the States involved.

A second type of bill is somewhat less drastic in its effect on Federal operations, but it does embody a comprehensive provision recognizing State control over water resources, including water on public lands of the United States. These bills are exemplified by S. 1416 of the 86th Congress, in the sponsorship of which I was joined by a number of other Senators. They would require the Federal Government and its licensees to appropriate and use water in compliance with State laws, and would prevent Federal acquisition of or interference with water rights except upon the payment of just compensation, unless the rights were acquired by purchase, exchange, gift, condemnation, or where water is available for acquisition upon proper application to a State for a right to water necessary for the conduct of an authorized Federal program.

A third group of bills covers a lot less ground than the others, being limited in effect to repealing the reservation doctrine of the Pelton decision. These bills, exemplified by S. 851 of the 86th Congress, would provide that the withdrawal or reservation of public lands shall not affect any right to use of water acquired pursuant to State law, either before or after the establishment of such withdrawal or reservation, nor the right of any State to exercise jurisdiction over water rights conferred by the act admitting such State into the Union, or the State's constitution.

A fourth general type of bill is exemplified by S. 2636 of the 87th Congress introduced by Senator Kuchel in September of 1961. This bill goes slightly beyond the third group of bills to provide that the use of water for navigation in the United States west of the 98th meridian would be subservient to any present and future beneficial consumptive uses, that all rights to the consumptive use of water claimed by the United States under the laws of any State shall be initiated and perfected in accordance with the procedure established by the laws of that State, and that any waters taken by the United States other than by agreement with the owner shall be taken by proceedings in eminent domain. So far no hearings have been held nor have views of any of the Federal agencies been obtained on the bill.

So far in this Congress, only one bill has been introduced, S. 101, by the junior Senator from Colorado. This bill incorporates the provisions of the "reservation" bill, prohibits taking of water under Federal authorization without just compensation for prior water rights, and requires the beneficiaries of any Federal project, license, loan, or grant to secure water rights under State law.

Senator Kuchel and I have discussed the possibility of introducing a water rights bill in this session, but are waiting for, among other things, the outcome of this conference so that any constructive suggestions that are advanced here can be considered.

In spite of my agreement with the philosophy behind most of these bills, I must confess that a realistic appraisal of the current situation leads me to the conclusion that there is little or no opportunity for any of these bills to become law at this time. The hearings records of the Congress are full of objections which have been raised by the agencies of the United States to the provisions contained in one or another of the bills. On only one occasion has there been indication that a certain type of legislation would be acceptable to the administration. This was reflected in the compromise bill worked out in 1958 and submitted to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee as a proposed repealer of the Pelton decision. However, this bill in the exact form agreed to by the executive branch of the Government, was never introduced. The modified bill that was introduced, the third group of bills that I mentioned earlier, was objected to by the Department of Justice because of the provision dealing with the right of a State to exercise jurisdiction over water rights conferred by the act admitting such State into the Union or such State's constitution. Last December a spokesman for the Department of Justice indicated that he believed the former administration bill went too far, too soon, in that it would disclaim federally reserved rights without there first being a determination of what is being disclaimed or its effect on present or future development programs.

ALTERNATIVES FOR FUTURE ACTION

In the solution of any problem, it is always worthwhile to examine the alternatives. What can we do now? The path of least resistance, of course, is to continue along the path that has been followed for the last few years—that is, to let the situation rock along the way it is, with water rights and interrelationships of Federal and State activities being decided on a case-by-case basis, while the Federal and State positions become even more entrenched. This, it seems to me, would serve to further entrench the Federal point of view, as the Court decisions more and more seem to favor the Federal position. I would question, however, whether we in the West can continue and grow in this fashion, unless we are willing to accept a continuously expanding and growing Federal role in the field of water, and a gradual deterioration of the position of the States and those dependent on water rights acquired under State law.

A second alternative is to support a detailed study in an objective manner of the issues. Such a course of action was recommended by President Eisenhower's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy in December of 1955, which called for a study to be made by the Federal Government in collaboration with State and local entities to determine the relationships between property rights to water and the social and economic development of the Nation and the local areas, and of the principles and criteria which should be incorporated into Federal, State, and local laws regarding rights to the appropriation and use of water that would assure its best and most effective use, while at the same time encouraging maximum participation by all parties concerned. No action was taken on this recommendation for the reason, I am told, that the late Senator Barrett felt that all the answers were already known, and that no study was needed.

A third alternative is to ignore the opposition of the Department of Justice and press and to enact legislation in this session of the Congress on the basis of our present knowledge. As I said before, I don't believe there is much likelihood that this course of action can be successful unless the issues could be presented with a lot more light and a lot less heat than has been the case heretofore.

This leads me to the fourth alternative, which is to carefully muster all the facts that we can, develop a bill that is supported by those facts, develop public support for that bill, and then press for its enactment. This, I believe, is the most practical of the alternatives I have suggested. The question then is what facts can be mustered that will convince Congress and the President, over the likely objections of some of the executive branch agencies, of the need for legislation now, and how shall we proceed.

First, I think we will have to obtain all the facts we can about specific instances where Federal action has resulted in the taking of water that was being used by others. I must confess that a rather detailed perusal of many articles on the subject of Federal-State conflict in water rights has failed to turn up many cases where actual damages can be shown. The few cases I have uncovered where actual damages due to loss of water seems to be demonstrated appear to be based on disputes over water rights acquired by the Federal Government by purchase or in other manner under State law. For example, *Hudspeth County Conservation and Reclamation District No. 1* v. *Robbins* (213 F. 2d 425) and *Elephant Butte Irrigation District* v. *Gatlin* (61 N.M. 58). While it is regrettable that both of these were dismissed because the United States could not be made a party to the suit, I am not at all sure of how those cases would have been decided if the dispute could have been tried on its merits. All too often, the cases cited most frequently are based on the loss of the potential development of a water right that has never been actually put to use. I think there is a real need for a detailed, objective study of all the cases that have come up where conflict between Federal and State laws over water rights is alleged, so that the issue can be presented to the Congress in a more easily understood way than it has been in the past.

Many of the State or local projects that are alleged to have been delayed by the Federal-State conflict have never reached the point of authorization by the State. It will be necessary for the sponsors of such projects alleged to be delayed by the Federal-State water rights conflict to come forward with plans, facts, and figures to support the claims that are made that projects are delayed.

Claims are made that the conflict is jeopardizing the entire California State water plan—that bond counsel may insist on a higher interest rate than otherwise if the water rights are clouded by potential Federal claims. My recollection is that the election at which the bond issue was validated in 1960 was a closely contested one. Care must be taken that the opponents of the project are not allowed to stir up the water rights issue so as to continue their opposition to the project in an undercover way. I do not think there is any evident reason why, on the basis of cases that have been decided, there should be any question raised as to the water rights for the California water project that could lead to a higher interest rate on the bonds. Admittedly, some of the pleadings made by the Justice Department, and frequently cited as causes for concern, perhaps could lead to trouble, but I don't believe that they have as yet been accepted by the courts.

Another area in which we must move carefully is in recognizing the effect of the legislation proposed on the multibillion-dollar Federal water resources development projects. We may be sure that no legislation can be enacted that jeopardizes the Government's investment in the navigation, flood control, irrigation, and hydroelectric power projects that have been constructed. In the latter two categories, I don't think there is much of a problem, as most of them in the West, at least, have been constructed under the Federal reclamation laws, with water rights perfected under State laws. The disputes which have come to the courts over compensation for water rights seem generally to have been decided in such a way as to provide for compensation. The matter of water rights, however, has not been as satisfactorily resolved in connection with navigation and flood control projects, and may prove more troublesome, in connection with projects authorized for those purposes. Another area which would appear to retain considerable potential for possible conflict is in connection with Federal fish and wildlife and recreation projects.

In the light of the very brief review that I have made of the situation, therefore, I must conclude that the evidence so far presented as to the Federal-State water rights conflict is somewhat less than conclusive, and that there is need for a more complete and more objective study of the whole problem than has yet been undertaken.

I would suggest that the study be undertaken jointly, by a commission with membership taken from the ranks of Congress, from the executive branch of the Government, the States, and from the public, the latter members, of course, to be from the West.

I realize this is not a new idea. I hesitate to suggest it because of the delay involved, and yet I sincerely believe there is a need for such a study before anything can be done by Congress to quiet the fears of the West. I will appreciate any views that are expressed through this symposium on this subject. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I pledge myself to do everything in my power to push on to a satisfactory conclusion in this controversial area.

PASSING OF AN ERA: DON ANDRES LUGO

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is with some sadness and regret that I rise to comment on the recent passing of a member of one of California's oldest families. The death of Andres Lugo at the age of 97 marks the close of an era. The end of a period of history which I believe gives nothing away to any other in its romance, charm, and, above all, graciousness.

The dashing figure of this last of the "Old Spanish Dons" typified the three generations of Lugos who lived under the four flags of California—Spanish, Mexican, Bear Flag, and, since 1850, that of the United States. The grandfather, Don Antonio Maria Lugo, was born in 1775 at Mission San Antonio de Padua. There he received the personal blessing of Father Junipero Serra.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 more minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Chair.

After serving in the army of the Spanish king, he received in 1813, by royal landgrant, 29,514 acres southeast of Los Angeles. To this Don Antonio gave the name Rancho San Antonio. In 1835 he added the Rancho Santa Ana del Chino and in 1842 the 37,000-acre Rancho San Bernardino to the family holdings.

Life in the southern California of that era was a pastoral one. Horsemanship was a fundamental skill and for the best riders, an art. Don Antonio enjoyed the reputation of being "the best horseman in all California in his day." It is said that he could ride days on his beautiful silver-mounted saddle without leaving his own land. His was a domain stretching from snow-capped peaks almost to the shores of the Pacific.

Don Antonio Maria Lugo contributed to the early development of southern California. In 1818, he adopted the first "Yankee" to come into the region—Joseph Chapman, "El Ingles"—incidentally, the first tourist to become a settler—and provided him with land and cattle. The traditional hospitality and openhandedness of the ranchos welcomed these immigrants. In 1851, Don Antonio sold the Rancho San Bernardino, which included the future sites of San Bernardino, Redlands, and Colton, to Mormon settlers from Salt Lake for $2 per acre. Rancho Santa Ana del Chino, he gave to his daughter and her Yankee husband.

When southern California became part of the United States he served as "alcalde"—mayor—of Los Angeles; and his word and his experience of 80 years did much to unscramble land titles, when he appeared as a witness before the U.S. Land Commission.

Don Vincente Lugo, the son of Don Antonio, also fitted the description of a dashing caballero of the ranchos. Writers of the period in fact referred to him as the "Beau Brummel of Los Angeles."

However, Don Vincente, while enjoying the gracious life of the times, continued the family's role of civic leadership. In 1840, he built the first 2-story adobe in the city, a building, which in 1867 he donated for the founding of St. Vincent's College. This small beginning has developed into one of southern California's leading educational institutions, Loyola University.

In 1850, Don Vicente Lugo built the family ranch, Rancho San Antonio. This is furnished in the fashion of the day using the works of Indian craftsmen as well as the best mementos from Europe. The first upright piano brought to California, purchased for 1,000 hides from a Yankee windjammer which had sailed around the Horn, still stands in the Lugo home today. To this adobe house Don Vicente retired to enjoy a way of life which a traveler described:

> No horses so fast, no cattle so fine, no land so fertile, no rancho more famous than the Rancho San Antonio. No family more prominent, no hospitality more welcome or freely partaken, no hacienda more lovely, happy, or prosperous than that of the Lugos.

Don Andres Lugo, who died recently, represented the third generation of this family. He inherited the family tradition for horsemanship and cattle raising. But his hobby always centered on the maintenance of the traditional appearance, style, and spirit of the old Spanish days. His figure, clad in the romantic costume of the early Spanish Californians with silver saddle and trappings, often entertained new immigrants to the Golden State with his fancy riding and roping feats.

Mr. President, I cannot help but feel sad at the passing of this last representative of that long-departed but fondly remembered way of life. The gallant figure of Andres Lugo passes from the California scene as we celebrate another milestone—California's new place as the first State in population. The thousands of acres once owned by the Lugos sustain many millions of these newcomers, and the long-lived history of this family becomes part of their heritage.

I thank the Chair.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CLYDE DOYLE, OF CALIFORNIA

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am through, unless a Senator wishes me to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the Senator from California yielded the floor.

Does the Senator from California desire to ask unanimous consent that he retain the floor while statements are being made about a deceased colleague?

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, does the Senate have official notification?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. As the Senator from California said a moment ago, there has been no official notification yet of the death of the Representative, but eulogies were started, and it is customary to recognize a colleague from the same State. Senators agree with this exception to the rule, sympathize with it, and are willing to recognize that the Senator may hold the floor, and he, in turn, may yield from time to time to other Senators to make statements. The Chair has been warned that he has not been following the rule. The Chair does not want to be subject to criticism for doing that. The Chair knows that if the request is made, it will not be objected to, and Senators have not been objecting. The Senator from California can hold the floor and yield for 3 minutes at a time. If he wants additional time, he can get it.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Chair. I ask unanimous consent, first of all, that any of our colleagues who desire to make statements in the RECORD on the lamentable passing of our colleague may be permitted to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks by our colleagues on the passing of Representative CLYDE DOYLE, with whom I served in the House for many years.

He was an outstanding Member of the House, and his useful work will be remembered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying my respects to a dear and wonderful friend who has now gone to his heavenly reward. I have known Representative CLYDE DOYLE for a long time. He was a fine and great Congressman from California. I was grieved to read in this morning's press that he passed away last night.

Representative DOYLE served his country faithfully. He served his State with outstanding ability and dedication. His life was one of compassionate service to his fellow men. I feel it a real loss to learn that he has passed on.

I extend to his loved ones, the members of his family, and to his friends the heartfelt sympathy and sincere condolences of both Mrs. Humphrey and myself. We were privileged to know Representative DOYLE for many years.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, CLYDE DOYLE was a Representative not only of his district in California, in the best sense of devoted service; he was also a man of conscience and courage.

It was my privilege to serve with him in the House for many years. I cherished a personal as well as an official friendship with him. I mourn his untimely passing earlier today.

This is said slowly, with a sense of memory for a good and great man. He worked as if he were to live forever. He lived as if he were to die tomorrow.

CHARLES HADEN ALLDREDGE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one who drank deeply from the draught of life and, at the same time, gave much to life, has passed from our midst. I shall miss Charles Haden Alldredge, whom I knew as a scholar, a good friend, and a delightful companion who carried on a lifelong love affair with the humanities.

Charley Alldredge had Southern liberal roots; his soft Alabama accent among Washington cosmopolites was a constant reminder of his birthplace, Montgomery. His father was the late Haden Alldredge, who served for many years on the Interstate Commerce Commission and was one of the great liberals of the South.

Charley's first and last love was writing. He was friend and confidant of some of Washington's best known columnists. A graduate of the University of Alabama, he first worked on the Alabama Journal in Montgomery. He brought his writing talents to politics in the first Senate campaign of the present senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and, after a decade of service with the Public Works Administration, hit the campaign trail again in 1948 with then Senator Alben Barkley in his ultimately successful campaign for the Vice Presidency.

My path and Charley's crossed during the years of my own campaigns for President and Vice President, in which he served as my press adviser. He was quiet and droll, always kind and gentlemanly. One of his hobbies was growing flowers and frequently when we were out on the campaign trail, he would worry about whether the aphids were getting on his roses and whether he ought to rush back and spray them.

His love of things beautiful was also reflected in another hobby, writing poetry. His hosts of friends in and out of Washington have thrilled to receive Christmas cards containing his own verse. Sometimes he would enclose other poems which—as he advised the recipient on one occasion—"have nothing to do with Christmas or the winter solstice but which the poet recommends to his friends as easy to memorize."

Mr. President, I have selected a few of Charley Alldredge's poems which I would like to place in the Record. They reveal far more eloquently than can I the richness of Charley's life, his gentle humor, and the many sides of his wonderful personality.

Silence

The silences of winter mark it more than
snow and cold;
The blood of life runs slower when the year
is old.
Silent does the fox run, hidden is the fly,
In secret lies the viper as the year goes by,
But what a joyful stirring from every living
thing
Will mount to shake the heavens in the
thunderclap of spring.

Masks

If I should know you for a thousand years
I would not see your face;
When I come close to you
You take off a mask,
But there is another there,
And another,
And another,
And finally the mask you swear is your face
Is most inscrutable of all.
I shall never see your face,
Nor you mine,
Nor, since it is unbearable,
You yours.

Magic

Old magic still lurks
In shadowed places—
Heavy with regret
The dark deceiver—
But what joy
When the old magician sees,
Stumbling toward him,
A young believer.

I ask unanimous consent that an article dealing with the life of Mr. Alldredge be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Charles H. Alldredge, Served Hill Officials

Charles Haden Alldredge, public relations adviser to many prominent New and Fair Deal figures including the late Vice President Alben Barkley and former Interior Secretary Oscar Chapman, died Sunday at Washington Hospital Center following a long illness. He resided at 617 North Carolina Avenue SE.

Mr. Alldredge received much attention when acting as press adviser to Senator Estes Kefauver, Democrat, of Tennessee, during the Senator's campaigns for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency.

Mr. Alldredge was born in Montgomery, Ala., in 1911. His father, the late Haden Alldredge, was for many years a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

After graduating from the University of Alabama, Mr. Alldredge began newspaper work on the Alabama Journal in Montgomery but soon turned to public relations. One of his first such enterprises was handling the first Senate campaign of his fellow townsman, Lister Hill.

In 1938, Mr. Alldredge entered Government service with the Public Works Administration. His service there encompassed many of the agency's projects and nearly every State. In 1948, he resigned from Interior to accompany Mr. Barkley, then a Senator, in his campaign for Vice President.

Mr. Alldredge also wrote poetry and was a knowing critic of the arts. He was a trustee of All Souls Unitarian Church during the ministry of the late A. Powell Davies.

A sister, Mrs. J. Allan Jones, of Montgomery, survives.

CHARLES BARTLETT OF THE CHATTANOOGA TIMES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the Nation's finest and best-known newspaper reporters, Mr. Charles Bartlett, recently changed jobs. After 17 years as the Washington correspondent for the Chattanooga Times, one of the great newspapers of our land, Charley will write a four-times-a-week syndicated column as a member of the Washington bureau of the Chicago Sun-Times. Fortunately for the readers of the Chattanoga Times, his new column will appear in that newspaper.

All of us who have known Charley wish him well in his new undertaking. I concur wholeheartedly in the statement of the publisher of the Chattanooga Times, Mr. Ben Hale Golden, that Charley's "balanced reporting of the news and his high personal integrity have always provided this newspaper with a written product commensurate with the national reputation of the Chattanooga Times for responsible journalism."

Charley won the Pulitzer Prize for outstanding national reporting for the year 1955 when he exposed a conflict of interest that led to the resignation of the late Harold E. Talbott as Secretary of the Air Force. His wide circle of friends in Washington—among them, the President—and his talent for earnestly seeking the truth have given him an understanding of Government that few men possess.

On leaving the Chattanooga Times, Charley Bartlett wrote an article entitled "Thoughts on Leaving a Wonderful Newspaper." It is one of the most touching things I have read in a long time.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, together with an editorial in the Chattanooga Times, be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Thoughts on Leaving a Wonderful Newspaper

(By Charles Bartlett)

Washington.—Just as it is never clear why a man would leave a wonderful wife, it is far from clear why a reporter would leave a wonderful newspaper.

Professional and marital compatibility are much akin to a man in that if he doesn't have one, he has only a faint hope of having the other. Women are more complex than newspapers but the essential elements of greatness are much the same in both—a character that combines instincts, understanding, and durability; a responsive personality, and a persistent sense of each day's obligations.

A man gets married for love and works for pay but when compatibility develops in both areas, the emotion seeps into the professional side just as the pay finds its way into the mechanics of marriage. It thus becomes possible to love a great newspaper.

A young man joining such a paper has only energy to offer against the riches made available to him. The distilled knowledge that he has brought from the university is like a drop of perfume in a horse barn as he applies it against his weathered mentors and their intricate insights into the ways of men. His past experiences pale into nothing against the vistas of life that open as he begins to wend his way, asking questions, about the city.

He finds that he has a glorious entry into the aspirations, schemes, and reminiscences of a wide range of men and women. He has been given license to summon their reactions in moments of crisis, to taste the wormwood of their defeats, to share the luminosity of their peaks of success, and to observe the reactions that attend their deaths.

His most delicate times arrive when he confronts their disputes as an observer who must seek confidence from both sides and establish, informally and in writing, the earnestness of his search for truth. In these tests, the young reporter derives his stamina and yardsticks from the character and traditions of his newspaper. His test becomes also a test of these traditions and of his editors and if all three fail, the public is badly armed and another small cancer is lodged in the culture.

The growing reporter has the uncomfortable sense at times that in choosing to become an observer instead of a participant, he has taken a protected course which permits him to know neither victory nor defeat. This is his cross but it is lightened by his claim to a part of the rightful evolution of the times and place in which he works.

He knows that he and his colleagues have been persistent in behalf of the pressures which make for right over wrong and for improvement. He feels that he can claim some pride in progress, in the human and physical blemishes that are driven from the scene, in the merit that is recognized and advanced, and in the problems that are met. He and his paper can rarely claim to have been a decisive force but they have the satisfaction, at least, of having worked to be constructive.

As he goes along, he will be charged with cynicism but such a philosophy does not exist on the staff of a strong and healthy newspaper. Cynicism is not the same as the swift recognition and repulsion that develops among newsmen against frauds who seek publicity or seek to avoid it. If reporters and their papers began to fall prey to such creatures, the public could be badly used by them. This again is where the character of the institution, and its ability to foster and sustain a clear eye in its employees, count so heavily.

Actually in every facet of his labors, a reporter is enhanced or hobbled by the character of his newspaper. He becomes in essence largely a reflection of this character. He takes his strength from it, when it is good, and his weaknesses, when it is bad. His best efforts are only a small atom of the composite strength and quality represented in a publication with strong traditions and intentions.

A man could not in good conscience leave a great wife. But a reporter can without remorse leave a great newspaper because he knows well that its greatness is durable and that if there is a loser, it is he.

Bartlett's New Role

During the 17 years he has represented this newspaper with distinction, most of that time as our Washington correspondent, Charles Bartlett has developed an acquaintanceship with newsmaking Americans such as few in the trade possess.

Now, as is announced today, he will devote full time to the national syndication

of his articles in a growing list of newspapers.

To this endeavor, Charley Bartlett will lend his great warmth as a person as well as his writing ability, drive, persistence, and broad field of contacts.

It is naturally with much regret that we see him leave us. But we consider ourselves fortunate to have kept him this long. A Pulitzer prizewinner, he has added to the Times' reputation in the Nation's Capital and elsewhere.

While continuing to carry his reports, we shall follow closely his work in the milieu of the bigtime syndicates.

His wide circle of friends and readers will join us, we know, in wishing Charley Bartlett all the best in his new venture.

THE NATIONAL RAILROAD FREIGHT CAR SUPPLY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise in support of legislation sponsored by the senior Senator from Washington, our distinguished chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee. I am gratified to note that many other Members of the Senate will join Senator Magnuson in the introduction of his legislation seeking to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply. Ever since coming to the Senate, I have cosponsored this legislation in prior Congresses and I have been pleased to appear before the Senate Commerce Committee in its behalf.

The railroad industry is plagued by a situation which becomes more acute each year. At this time, sufficient cars are not available in the grain producing areas of the Middle West to meet the demands for shipment of grain. On one railroad, the Burlington, operating in my State, the current car shortage is now 10,400 cars. In recent days, the newspapers in my State have written many stories pointing out the acuteness of the current problem.

When I appeared before the Senate Commerce Committee on June 8, 1959, testifying in behalf of identical legislation, I stated:

> I come from a section of the United States wherein our railroads have been more diligent in maintaining an adequate supply of rolling stock than prevails in other areas of the country. Yet, each year, during periods of peak car loadings, we are plagued with car shortages because cars owned by the western roads are in use on lines elsewhere. For many railroads it has become more economical to pay the existing per diem rate for use of another road's cars than to maintain an adequate supply of their own requirements. This is a situation which has existed for many years and it deserves solution.
>
> We know that, at the present time, railroad cars are being retired from service at a rate which exceeds the construction of new cars. This fact increases the need for enactment of the legislation being heard today by your committee. I urge favorable consideration of S. 1789 at the earliest opportunity.

In the meantime, the situation has worsened substantially. In 1959, the numbers of serviceable freight cars of all kinds were 1,577,708. As of February 1, 1963, the numbers of serviceable cars were 1,419,887. Meanwhile, the practice of certain roads to pay per diem in lieu of beefing up their freight car supply has increased in tempo. This is brought to light by the rise in payment for car rental from 1950 to the present time. In 1950, railroads throughout the country paid $140.3 million for car rental under the current per diem rate. In 1961, the amount paid for car rental under the current rate was $344.3 million. This clearly illustrates how certain roads who are prudent in their efforts to maintain adequate supply of freight cars are being severely penalized by management decisions of roads who do not desire to maintain an adequate supply of freight cars. Many Members of this body have been diligent in their efforts in recent years to bring about the equity which this matter deserves. We cannot temporize much longer and avoid the responsibility for taking necessary action. I earnestly hope that the Senate can proceed to the consideration of this bill within the very near future and that it will be enacted.

THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the American Political Science Association is no stranger on Capitol Hill. Most of us have become acquainted with the association and its important activities through one or more of the successful programs it sponsors. Best known perhaps is the highly regarded congressional fellowship program, which annually brings to Washington a group of deserving young political scientists and journalists for an inside look at the legislative process.

Those of us who have had congressional fellows working in our offices do not need to be reminded how beneficial this program has been both for the interns and Members of Congress. Besides the congressional fellowship program, the American Political Science Association sponsors a number of other activities of special interest to Members of Congress.

This year for the first time the association offered an orientation program for new Members of the other body. From all reports, this endeavor was highly successful in helping new Congressmen overcome some of the problems involved in organizing an efficient office operation. The association also assisted this year in the direction of the first William Randolph Hearst Foundation's Senate youth program. Under this program, two high school seniors from each of our 50 States, plus the District of Columbia, were brought to the Nation's Capital for a week to study our National Government. This program, too, was very successful.

Now the American Political Science Association is embarking on yet another worthwhile program of particular interest to Members of Congress. It is the congressional staff fellowship program, designed to improve the professional competence of staff members in both Houses of the Congress. The congressional staff fellowship program will permit selected House and Senate committee staff members, as well as assistants to Members of Congress, to study for periods of 6 months or 1 year at colleges and universities of their choice. The program is being financed under a grant from the Ford Foundation, which has assumed the costs of so many worthwhile educational, cultural, and social activities. I might add that the Ford Foundation also contributes a substantial part of the funds to finance the congressional fellowship program.

Mr. President, two of our colleagues, the assistant majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], and the assistant minority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], are members of the advisory committee for the 1963–64 congressional staff fellowship program. Other committee members include, from the other body, the assistant majority leader, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], and the assistant minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Arends]. Dr. Charles Hyneman, distinguished service professor at Indiana University, is chairman of the advisory committee, and Mr. Claude Hawley, chairman of the board of the American Growth Investment Co. of Washington, D.C., is a member of the committee.

The decision of the American Political Science Association to inaugurate the congressional staff fellowship program grew out of a long and active interest in congressional operations. While we all know of the many inservice training programs for executive agency personnel, there are few comparable opportunities for congressional staff members. The new fellowship program will help provide research opportunities for staff assistants of our committees and our offices and, at the same time, encourage further development of a permanent and more competent congressional staff system. I suggest, Mr. President, that this is a commendable goal—one which each of us can wholeheartedly support.

Details of the program's operation have been worked out in consultation with the advisory committee to insure that it will be consistent with the schedule and workload of the Congress. The American Political Science Association will conduct and administer the program, but staff fellows will plan and carry out their own study and research programs under the guidance of departmental chairmen and faculty advisers at the colleges and universities of their choice. I am told that the terms of the fellowship awards will be as flexible as possible to meet the study and research needs of individual congressional staff members.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the American Political Science Association for its continuing and constructive interest in the operations of the Congress. I am sure I speak for all of my colleagues when I say that we appreciate the efforts of the association to improve the internal machinery of Congress and to help the American people better understand the Congress and its operations. I especially want to thank Dr. Evron Kirkpatrick, executive director of the association, whose tireless efforts have made many of these worthwhile programs possible. He is ably assisted by Mr. Donald Tacheron, a 1961–62 congressional fellow who now serves as assistant director of the association.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a fact sheet explaining the American Political Science Association's congressional staff fellowship program be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The APSA Congressional Staff Fellowship Program

Advisory committee: Chairman, Charles Hyneman, distinguished service professor, Indiana University; Representative Leslie Arends; Representative Hale Boggs; Claude Hawley, chairman of the board, American Growth Investment Co., Washington, D.C.; Senator Hubert Humphrey; and Senator Thomas Kuchel.

Beginning this year, the American Political Science Association will award fellowships for university study and research to selected House and Senate office and congressional committee staff members. The purpose of this new congressional staff fellowship program is to improve the knowledge and skills of administrators and researchers, encouraging thereby the further development of a permanent and highly professional staff made up of the most expert and well educated personnel. The competition for the awards will be open to all professional congressional staff employees. Winners will undertake their study and research at the college or university of their choice.

Awards are planned in 1963–64 and in subsequent years in the following categories:

One-year fellowships carrying a maximum stipend of $14,000, including tuition and moving expenses.

Six-month fellowships carrying a maximum stipend of $8,000, including tuition and moving costs.

The total number of awards each year will depend somewhat on the number of qualified applicants in each category. Generally, however, six of the 1-year fellowships will be available, and these awards will be divided equally between House and Senate staff members. Similarly, six of the 6-month fellowships will be available, with two awards to be made in the Senate, four in the House.

The amount of the stipend in both categories will depend upon the award winner's level of professional development, study and research plans, and number of dependents.

Financed by a grant from the Ford Foundation, the congressional staff fellowship program will be conducted and administered by the association. Overall policy guidance will be provided by the House-Senate advisory committee.

PROGRAM SCHEDULE

For the first year of the congressional staff fellowship program, the application deadline is April 15, 1963. Selection of award winners is expected to be completed shortly thereafter. In subsequent years, the competition will be announced in mid-June, the application deadline will be November 1, and award winners will be notified in mid-January of the following year.

University residence requirements will be flexible, providing for adjustments to fit the needs of individual fellows. Generally, however, staff members holding the 6-month fellowship will be expected to be in residence at their respective universities for about one semester or its equivalent, beginning after Congress adjourns in the late summer 1963, and ending in January or early February 1964. Similarly, the 1-year fellowships will require university residence from mid-September to the end of May.

SELECTION OF WINNERS

Applications will be reviewed upon receipt by a three-member screening committee, members of which will be appointed in consultation with the bipartisan House-Senate advisory committee. The screening committee, established on a bipartisan basis, will be made up of a senior staff member from both the House and Senate and a political scientist. Selected applicants will be invited to appear before this committee. Upon completion of interviews with these candidates, the screening committee will draft a recommended list of winners and alternates for final review by the advisory committee.

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants must complete a standard biographical data form, provided by the association, and must list three references. A brief statement of the applicant's research and study interests and how these are related to his professional responsibilities and goals must accompany the application form. In addition, the applicant must submit a letter from his immediate superior containing assurances that (1) the applicant will be able to return to his position after completion of the fellowship, and (2) the applicant's study and research project is related to the professional responsibilities of his present position.

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION

The general criteria for selection will be superior academic training and/or professional experience. Preference will be given applicants who are between 25 and 40 years of age and who have had at least 3 years of experience in and are currently holding a congressional staff position.

STUDY PROGRAM PLANNING

Congressional staff fellows will plan and conduct their study program, under the guidance of departmental chairman and faculty advisers, on an individual basis. However, the association will be of assistance wherever necessary in arranging for these programs and in arranging for registration in the universities involved. Association representatives also will discuss the program with staff fellows and their faculty advisers periodically during the fellowship period.

FURTHER INFORMATION

Application forms and further information are available at the association, 1726 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 6, D.C.; telephone DU 7-8585.

PATRIOTISM AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF FORMAL EDUCATION

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I should like to bring to the attention of Senators an article by Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones entitled "Get New Text Books, America" that appeared in the March 11 issue of the Washington Star.

This article is a most timely and cogent treatise on a vitally important subject, the education and moral strengthening of our youth.

In graphic language Mr. Jones has pointed to the trend toward a downgrading of patriotism in our schools and he asks what has happened to the teachings of obeisance to the flag and to love of country which once was such an integral part of formal education.

I request unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Jones be published in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Get New Textbooks, America—Return to Standards of Old Is Urged; Patriotism, Heroism, Moral Teaching

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

If we can ever cure the asininities of the "looksay" method of teaching reading, which has condemned many hundreds of thousands of young Americans to word guessing, it will be time to start in on the content of grade school textbooks.

These beautifully printed and illustrated books include texts so remarkable for their dullness that it is little wonder young America can hardly wait to get back to TV. Most of them have been steamcleaned of every vestige of excitement, of inspiration, and romance.

There is no reference to God or religion. This is regarded as controversial. There is no story of war. If we don't think about it, maybe it will go away. There is nothing that would give rise to patriotism. How old fashioned.

I have before me a fifth grade reader, "Days and Deeds," published last year by Scott, Foresman & Co., and standard in many hundreds of American school systems.

With a puerile vocabulary it discusses such things as Uncle Lem's new outboard motor, John's lawn-mowing business, and how Wally, the bloodhound, helped Jerry, the police dog, find his missing bone.

I have also before me a reprint of McGuffey's Fifth Eclectic Reader published in 1879. Let's skip through the list of contents:

"The Relief of Lucknow, London Times. Battle of Blenheim by Southey. Sands of Dee by Charles Kingsley. An Old-Fashioned Girl by Louisa May Alcott. An account of a riot in the Massachusetts State Prison. Supposed speech of John Adams by Daniel Webster. Excerpts from the Virginians by Thackeray and from Hamlet. Dissertation on Roast Pig by Charles Lamb. A Frigate Chase in the English Channel by James Fenimore Cooper. The Boston Massacre by Bancroft. No Excellence Without Labor by William Wirt. Religion, the Only Basis of Society by William Channing."

Blood and thunder? Plenty of it. Heroism? Of course. Moral homilies? In profusion. Religious preachments? Unashamed. Patriotism? With pride. And in addition tough words and involved sentences that would flabbergast the fifth grader who has been brought up on the thin consomme of today's "Days and Deeds" series.

On June 20, 1961, Dr. Max Rafferty, school superintendent of La Canada, Calif., made a speech that caused a sensation and resulted in his election last fall as California Superintendent of Public Instruction over the dead bodies of the progressive educators. He asked: "What happened to patriotism?" and I quote:

"We have been so busy educating for 'life adjustment' that we forgot to educate for survival. Words that America had treasured as a rich legacy, that had sounded like trumpet calls above the clash of arms and the fury of debate, we allowed to fade from the classrooms.

"Liberty and Union, now and forever, one and inseparable * * *"

"We have met the enemy and they are ours * * *"

"Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

Search for these towering phrases in vain today in too many of our schools. The golden words are gone. Patriotism feeds on hero-worship and we decided to abolish heroes.

The quest for the Golden Fleece has been crowded out by the visit of Tom and Susan to the zoo. The deeds of the heroes before Troy are now passe, and the peregrinations of the local milkman as he wends his way among the stodgy streets of Blah City have taken over. Bobby and Betty pursue this insipid goal of a ride in the district garbage truck while the deathless ride of Paul Revere goes unsung.

For Roland at Roncesvalles we have substituted Muk-Muk the Eskimo boy. It is, I think, significant, that education during the past three decades has deliberately debunked the hero to make room for the jerk.

No wonder these heroless American kids often broke down before the Red brainwashers in the Korean prison camps. They had no points of reference. They had no understanding of the traditions of liberty. In many cases, the Communists were delighted that there was so little to erase. It was a cinch to unteach those who had never been taught.

In commenting on a modern sixth reader, "Bright Peaks," put out by Houghton Mifflin, Dr. Russell Kirk says: "With the exception of a poem by Sara Teasdale, another short poem by Robert Frost, and an autobiographical piece by John Muir, every selection is by a fourth- or fifth-grade writer."

Why? Could it be that the fifth and sixth grades can't read the classics as they did in the days of McGuffey? Could it be that the bankruptcy of the look-say method and the stubborn refusal of many school administrations to admit the error have required them to pretend that there is special virtue in extending kindergarten-style reading to the upper grades?

It's time America got a new set of textbooks. It's time we quit boring bright students to death with the banalities of John and Jane visiting the henhouse. It's time we put romance and courage and excitement and some frank moral indoctrination before our children in their most impressionable years.

We don't have to go back to McGuffey.

There's plenty of good writing. But let's give our children some literary taste, some ethical calories and patriotic vitamins.

To hell with these sawdust sandwiches.

STRIP MINING

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on March 7, 1963, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], and myself, I introduced a bill to provide for a study of strip surface mining operations in the United States to be made by the Secretary of the Interior, and for a report to Congress of the results of such study.

The States of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, and Tennessee are vitally concerned about strip mining. I have the pleasure today to report to the Senate that the Tennessee Valley Authority, in whose area strip mining has destroyed the fertility of much land, has taken the position that it will support the bill introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania, the Senator from Indiana, and me.

OHIO RIVER BASIN CLEAN STREAMS PROGRAM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am pleased to report that the Ohio River Basin clean streams program, carried out under the leadership of the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission—ORSANCO—has been selected by the American Society of Civil Engineers as the "Outstanding Civil Engineering Achievement of the Year" for the 1963 award. The award was announced recently by the society's board of direction at a meeting in Atlanta.

The clean streams program is a unique complex of municipal and industrial waste-treatment facilities which have been built throughout eight States in the Ohio Valley. The States—Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and West Virginia—established the commission in 1948 as a coordinating agency to control pollution and safeguard water quality. The chairman of the commission is Bern Wright, chief of the division of water resources for the State of West Virginia.

The record shows that 97 percent of the population on the main stem of the Ohio River now is served by sewage-treatment plants in operation or under construction. In 1948, only 1 percent of the population had such facilities.

Progress has been recorded by industries in the Ohio Valley, too. Eighty-five percent now are in compliance with at least basic control requirements.

Mr. President, I am especially pleased by this award and with the progress which has been made under this program, for it was in 1948, at the invitation of Governor Tuck, of Virginia, that I spoke to separate sessions of the Virginia Legislature, urging that Virginia become a member of the sanitation compact. Initially, the people living in the Ohio River watershed deep in the south of Virginia felt that the situation was of no concern to them, and Virginia refused to join the compact. Eventually, all the States in the basin became members, and the great good which has developed is now apparent.

Mr. President, this in no way implies that the job is done. There are still many obvious evidences of pollution because of continued delinquency on the part of some municipalities and industries, and incompetent or careless operation on the part of others.

However, the progress made in eliminating gross pollution has paved the way for introducing those refinements in control and practice that will insure for the Ohio Valley optimum utilization of water resources.

The annual ASCE award is based upon an engineering project which is rated by the judges as one that demonstrates the greatest engineering skills, offers the greatest contributions to engineering progress, and represents a definite service to mankind.

The announcement of the award brought this comment from Edward J. Cleary, ORSANCO's executive director and chief engineer:

> In harnessing the skills of the engineering profession to the great task of curbing water pollution, the people of the Ohio Valley have demonstrated that where there is a will, there is a way. Under the leadership of the eight States, more than a billion dollars has been invested since 1948, in the construction of municipal and industrial waste-control facilities. The sheer magnitude of the undertaking suggests the variety and competence of engineering talent that was enlisted for the biggest river clean-up job in the world. It is most gratifying, therefore, that the American Society of Civil Engineers should regard the Ohio Valley program as an outstanding achievement.

Headquarters of the commission are located in Cincinnati, Ohio.

The achievements in the Ohio River Valley reflect the great good that can be done by the States themselves when they vigorously and with firm purpose decide to solve a problem.

FRUITS OF THE LONGSHOREMEN'S PACT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the seeds sown in the recent "take it or else" longshoremen's pact with the east and gulf coast shipping industry are beginning to sprout. I call attention to headlines and articles appearing on two consecutive days, March 11 and March 12, in a leading financial and business publication. The March 11 headline reads: "Dock Strike Caused First Trade Deficit Since 1950; January Exports at 9-Year Low." The March 12 headline reads: "Steamship Lines To Boost Freight Rates to Latin America; Dockworker Pact Cited."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both articles be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 11, 1963]

Dock Strike Caused First Trade Deficit Since 1950—January Exports at 9-Year Low

Washington.—The dock strike in January caused the United States to suffer its first negative trade balance in more than 12 years, the Census Bureau reported.

The agency said seasonally adjusted exports plunged to $982.1 million in January, down 47 percent from December and the lowest for any month since March 1954. Exports ran $111.1 million below January's imports, which were 20 percent below December's volume because of the tieup of ports on the east and gulf coasts.

Not since October 1950 have U.S. imports exceeded exports. The usual surplus of export earnings over import expenditures is relied on to partially offset this country's outlays abroad.

The dock strike started December 23 and ended January 25. Government trade experts expect figures for both exports and imports for February to show a sharp rise when published a month from now.

During the strike, exports and imports continued only along the west coast and overland between Canada and Mexico. The Census Bureau said its figures probably overstated the impact of the east and gulf coast port tieup on exports compared with imports.

For one thing, longshoremen were able to start unloading waiting ships on January 26 and had 6 days to recoup part of the month's import total. But officials said there was little time left in January to reload these ships with U.S. exports.

Also, Census officials said, exports compared unfavorably with imports because of the way they're counted. Imports are tallied when Government statisticians receive notice of merchandise arrivals, whether the goods are actually unloaded or not. Thus some of January's reported imports actually remained unloaded on ships waiting in the ports. Exports, in contrast, are counted only when an outbound ship leaves the harbor.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 12, 1963]

STEAMSHIP LINES TO BOOST FREIGHT RATES TO LATIN AMERICA — DOCKWORKER PACT CITED

NEW YORK.—Steamship general cargo freight rates from U.S. Atlantic and gulf coast ports to Latin American ports are expected to be raised sharply in June and July. The recent contract settlement with the Longshoremen's Union was blamed for the expected rise.

C. D. Marshall, chairman of the Associated Latin American Freight Conference, and of the individual conferences that comprise the organization, said one unit has already notified the Federal Maritime Commission of a freight rate increase and that others will follow shortly.

A conference is a voluntary organization of steamship lines, offering regular service between two areas, which charge identical rates for their services. Mr. Marshall said about 15 to 18 lines will be affected by the rate increases, which might produce up to 10 percent more revenue for the lines.

REVENUE TO RISE 15 TO 18 PERCENT

The first to announce an increase is the U.S. Atlantic and Gulf-Venezuela and Netherlands Antilles Conference. Mr. Marshall said the new rates for this conference, which will take effect June 10, will produce about 15 to 18 percent more revenue for the carriers.

He said increases planned by the other conferences would be more moderate because the other conferences had made rate increases periodically in recent years and "endeavored to keep up with ever-increasing costs." He said the Venezuelan and Netherlands Antilles Conference is making its first general increase in rates since 1955.

The four steamship lines belonging to the Venezuelan Conference are Alcoa Steamahip Co., subsidiary of Aluminum Co. of America, Grace Line, subsidiary of W. R. Grace & Co., Lykes Bros. Steamship Co., and Royal Netherlands Steamship Co. An associate member is the Venezuelan Government's Venezuelan Line.

In addition to the Venezuelan Conference tariff proposals, six individual steamship lines have proposed rate increases of about 5 to 10 percent since the dock strike ended, a Federal Maritime Commission spokesman said.

The six lines are West Wind African Lines, Thorden Lines, Finn Lines, Scandinavia America Lines, Moore-McCormack Lines (whose application applies only to the Danish trade), and America-Europe Line. The spokesman also said that west coast of Italy-North Atlantic Freight Conference had notified the Commission it was studying a rate increase but had made no formal rate filing as yet.

Mr. Marshall said no northbound rate increases are anticipated from the Latin American ports to U.S. Atlantic and gulf ports because most of the traffic is southbound. "Practically no cargo comes from places like Jamaica, Haiti, Santo Domingo, Venezeula, and Panama, except for certain specific commodities like coffee or bananas," he said.

Conferences planning to raise their rates include those shipping from the U.S. Atlantic and gulf ports to the west coast of Central America; west coast of South America; Jamaica; east coast of Colombia; the Leeward and Windward Islands and the Guianas. He said ship operators belonging to the Panama conference were also considering rate increases.

Mr. Marshall said the principal reason rates are being raised is "the increased cost to carriers because of the costly settlement of the recent longshore strike." A 5-week strike by the International Longshoremen's Association on Atlantic and gulf coasts ended January 26.

SOME RELUCTANT TO ACT

Some conference groups, however, expressed reluctance to announce new rate increases because of strong competition from independent or nonconference steamship lines.

A spokesman for the Far East Conference said members haven't decided whether they will increase rates. "There certainly is justification for an increase," he said, "but one of the main reasons for not raising them is strong independent competition."

A. J. Pasch, chairman of the North Atlantic to European ports conference groups, said, "We're effectively stopped from raising our rates because of nonconference competition. Despite the fact that a number of our rates are on a noncompensatory basis, they're still being cut by the independent operators."

A spokesman for the conference serving ship operators from the United States to India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and Burma, said there has been no discussion on increasing freight rates.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on January 18, on the floor of the Senate, I commented on the dockworkers' strike, deploring the fact that our laws were inadequate to deal with this very serious situation, which, in the words of the President of the United States, was described as "doing intolerable injury to the national welfare" and "as disrupting vital free-world commerce." The impact of the strike was felt throughout the Nation, including inland Ohio. This situation was much in evidence as the strike was materially responsible for our 9-year low in exports, as described in the foregoing article.

Mr. President, I do not want to be repetitious, but, in my opinion, what I said on the floor of the Senate on January 18 should be repeated today in light of these two recent developments resulting from this strike and the provisions in the pact. I ask unanimous consent that a portion of my statement made on January 18 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in spite of the President's statement concerning the "intolerable injury to the national welfare," neither he nor any existing public agency is able to do anything about it. Thus, we have a situation in which the Longshoremen's Union, through its network of operations and reciprocal services rendered by other unions, has paralyzed the shipping facilities sailing on the high seas along the east and gulf coasts of the United States. International commerce is at a standstill. The Government is unable to do anything about it.

Can we tolerate power of that type, possessed by a union, resulting in damage to the economy of the country and creating "intolerable injury to the national welfare"?

It is hard to believe, yet it is true, that the small segment of our economy represented by the Longshoremen's Union is able to exercise a power greater than that vested in the President of the United States or now capable of being exercised by the people. Yet it is true; the Longshoremen's Union is a government within the Government. It has made the decision that no ships shall sail upon the high seas; yet nothing can be done about it.

So we have an empire within an empire. This union, engaged in work connected with transportation, is the empire within our society; and, whether we like it or not, under present law we must concede that it is all powerful.

The power to substantially and, if so determined, to completely destroy the transportation facilities of our country should not be permitted to exist in the hands of anyone. Excessive power makes tyrants out of persons possessed initially of the most compassionate attitudes; by power bad men are made worse; by power, good men frequently become bad. When allowed to be exercised without restraint, power is taken away from the people as a whole, and is vested in a few. I quote the words of Lord Acton:

"All power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

In this work stoppage by concerted action, the unions have set up a wall against the importation and exportation of any goods affecting our welfare and the economy. It has done so through a monopolistic control of the docks on the east and the gulf coasts, achieved through the working arrangements of the different unions and through monopolistic control impeding the free flow of trade.

Under the laws, the business managements of our country are comprehensively regulated. These laws are intended to prevent all monopolistic practices and restraints of trade. Operators of businesses have, under the laws prohibiting monopolies, been prosecuted and sent to jail; yet, unions connected with transportation are suffered to tie up the country by monopolistic practices and restraints of trade which the antitrust laws prohibit to business.

If there came before the Senate a bill proposing to give to the President of the United States the powers now possessed by persons in charge of the transportation labor unions, I would vigorously oppose it on the floor of the Senate, both by way of argument and by way of vote. If, by some extraordinary circumstance a similar power were sought to be placed in me, either as a citizen or a Senator, I would vigorously reject it as being inimical to the interest of my country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I now refer to the headlines and article: "Steamship Lines To Boost Freight Rates to Latin America—Dockworker Pact Cited." On February 19, I spoke on the floor of the Senate commenting on the longshoremen's strike settlement. In my remarks, I referred to the subject of confirmation of Christian A. Herter for Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, who, in reply to my question concerning whether or not in the development of foreign trade it would become important to keep ourselves in a competitive position with the world markets, said that it was definitely so; that if we are to sell in the markets of the world, it is necessary that our prices be of a nature that will permit us to compete with other countries.

Mr. President, this proposed boost in steamship lines' freight rates attributed to provisions in the dockworkers' pact, as described in the foregoing article, will make it even more difficult for U.S. industry to compete in the world markets.

Referring to the provisions in the pact, on February 19, I said:

What bothers me is that if the average increase in the longshoremen's agreement is 8.8 percent, will that become the guideline in demands made by the workers in the shipyards, on the docks of the inland lakes, and on the ships sailing under the U.S. flag on the high seas? Will it become the guideline in the steel industry and in the railroad industry? If it does, if 8.8 percent

is to be the guideline, what is our ultimate destination?

Mr. President, the answer is clear. The seeds have sprouted, and we are now beginning to taste the fruit, bitter as it may be. On Monday of this week, I joined with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] as cosponsor of S. 287, placing the transport industries under the antitrust laws. This is an extremely important piece of proposed legislation and should be enacted by Congress and signed by the President.

GRADUAL TERMINATION OF FARM CONTROLS AND SUBSIDIES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I have introduced a proposal, Senate Joint Resolution 52, which would require the Secretary of Agriculture to submit to Congress proposals for the gradual termination of Federal farm controls and subsidies. Last year, in the course of debate on the agriculture bill, I offered an identical measure as an amendment. Of course, my amendment was rejected; but, at the same time, it did generate some constructive thought and discussion. Let me reiterate that I did not propose the termination of farm controls and subsidies, but merely proposed that the Secretary of Agriculture study the problem and make suggestions for gradual termination, such suggestions requiring affirmative action by the Congress. I am well aware that the sudden removal of Federal farm programs would knock the props out from under many agriculture enterprises which have been planned in consideration of existing programs. But I have long contended that a great many professional, full-time farmers and ranchers do not desire Federal controls and subsidies. I have today received a letter from one such farmer, Mr. Clark Wood, which I shall presently place in the RECORD. It typifies the independent, free-enterprise spirit of the farmers in my State.

Mr. President, having reintroduced my agriculture resolution, I should like to announce that I shall again submit it as an amendment when farm legislation comes along. I am hopeful that we shall take up this debate where we left off last year, and shall make progress toward the enactment of this or similar legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Wood's letter printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. JOHN TOWER,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TOWER: Just a few days past I received the attached notice of 1963 wheat yield payment from the Department of Agriculture. I have my two farms rented out and, at first, I did not know what the heck this money was for. I contacted my renter and found out.

Well, it seems that he had some of this small acreage frozen out and simply plowed it up. Along came the inspector and he turned in the data that we did not plant what we are allowed to plant. So, therefore, the "Great White Father in Washington" sends along the "vote purchasing" money.

I am not too darn smart, but it is not difficult for me to multiply this little $13.44 check by a few million and see where some of my tax money is going.

It was my pleasure to watch and listen to Senator DIRKSEN and Representative HALLECK on TV February 3, 1963, on the "Meet the Press" program. They were sanely talking about cutting expenses all the way across in Washington and I think that such damnable giveaway programs as represented by this little check I am sending is a darn good place to begin. Believe you me, the farmers I know do not want the Government in the farming business. Senator, the boys at the local ASC offices actually go out and beg farmers and ranchers to accept this and that giveaway deal from their offices. They have (not recently because I turned them down flat) pleaded with me to go in on all sorts of conservation programs, telling me how much the Government (me and 188 million others) will pay me.

Now I firmly believe in conservation of land and water and, in that this ranch belongs to me, I further believe that it is my responsibility to care for it like I would my family, etc. In fact, I have done quite extensive conservation work on my property here in Crosby County. I did this on my own expense and did not ask the Government for help. Even so, due to some mesquite work I did in 1958, I had to go clear to the Appellate Division of the IRS in order to make such expense stand up on my tax return for that year. Mind you, that was on work that the Government will pay money for if a landowner will ask for it, but the IRS didn't want me to do it on my own hook. Besides the approximately $13,000 I spent in killing mesquite, it cost me $1,500 attorney fees (plus traveling expenses for him) just to retain the right to do for myself what the Government wants to do. Had I gone the giveaway route it would have cost the taxpayers several thousand dollars, but I prefer to be independent and, incidentally, to run my own business without some little "pip squeak" fresh out of college coming over here and telling me how to run my cattle on land that "they" have assisted on. Again, I say that I am not endowed with all the brains, but I do think that I am, by virtue of years of experience on this land, more capable of determining what is good for my land and what is not more than a bunch of boys that have learned their farming and ranching out of a book. If it were not for the fact that we are forced into a farm program and they have to come over and measure acreages, etc., I wouldn't even allow them on my place. May the Lord help us if Washington gets into the cattle industry like it has in the farming business.

Now, as to the President's proposed tax cut and increased expenses—I haven't much comment other than that it simply doesn't make any sense. It is plain idiotic and I trust that you and others can muster enough help to knock such a plan right in the head.

I would like for you to take the $13.44 check which I have endorsed and send it to the Republican National Committee and I wish that all farmers and ranchers would take all such checks and do the same with them. Maybe we could bust that mess in that manner.

Sincerely yours,

CLARK WOOD.

ADDRESSES BY VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON IN FLORIDA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it was a great pleasure to the people of Florida to have with us at the March 11 ceremonies commemorating the 400th anniversary of St. Augustine, Fla., as the first settlement in the New World, the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

While in Florida, and prior to the commemoration ceremony, the Vice President received an honorary degree from Jacksonville University, at Jacksonville, Fla. All of us were proud to be present on the occasion when that honor was conferred upon the Vice President. Those of us who were with him, including Senator HOLLAND and Congressman MATTHEWS, will long remember his words, the encouragement he imparted to the people, and the affection the audiences displayed for him.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech the Vice President delivered at Jacksonville University, and also the one he delivered at the dinner commemorating the 400th anniversary of St. Augustine, Fla., be printed in the body of the RECORD.

Both of these excellent speeches certainly deserve to be read by every thinking American.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, JACKSONVILLE UNIVERSITY, JACKSONVILLE, FLA., MARCH 11, 1963

President Johnson, members of the faculty, young Americans, I am most grateful—and most proud—for this honor you accord to me and to the national office in which I am privileged to serve.

Your remarks, President Johnson, were most generous. While it would be ungracious for me to deny kinship, under the circumstances this hardly seems the appropriate moment to claim a family relationship. Our Johnson-to-Johnson exchange program may be subject to some misinterpretation—but I am delighted to be the beneficiary.

I could not feel more at home than I do on your campus. It was from a new and small institution of higher learning that I received my degree. When I hear men ask, "What value is a small school?" I am always tempted to reply with that wise and often-quoted answer, "What value is a baby?"

We are at the beginning of the golden age of higher education in our country. Our national needs cannot be met by the facilities or the faculties now in existence. In the next 10 years we must build as many college classrooms and dormitories as were built in the last 200 years. We must by 1970 graduate half again as many physicians as are produced today—more than double the output of Ph. D.'s in engineering, mathematics, and the sciences, and we must triple our graduate enrollments in these fields.

If our country is to survive and if our cause is to succeed, Americans in this decade must undertake a commitment to higher education without parallel in world history. As Thomas Jefferson once said, "If you expect a nation to be ignorant and free, you will expect what never was and never will be."

The effort made here is effort which must be emulated and duplicated in many other communities and in all the States. We are what we are today, as a Nation, because of the longstanding commitment of our resources to education. As early as 1787, the Northwest Ordinance set aside 1 lot in every 10 in the Northwest Territory for the maintenance of education. One hundred years ago, in 1862, we established the program for land-grant colleges. The total land donated by our national Government for educational purposes is four times the area of New York State.

Today, we are investing 3 to 3.5 percent of our annual national product in education.

This is much—but we cannot be content that it is enough. The Soviet Union invests more than twice as much on a relative basis.

At the beginning of the 1950's, we were graduating 19,600 students in physical sciences. At the beginning of the 1960's graduates in these fields had dropped to 17,400—a decline of more than 10 percent. The same pattern has occurred in the biological sciences, in engineering and in other fields. Ten years ago, we unquestionably were turning out twice as many scientists as the Soviet. Today, the Russians are producing twice as many as we are.

We cannot safely dismiss these facts or disregard the implications. Our Nation's prime resource is its youth. We are permitting a waste of that resource which is intolerable for a nation as rich, as strong and as responsible as ours.

About 1 million students are currently quitting high school before graduating. Of the top 10 percent of the high school graduating classes, 100,000 are not continuing on to college. Forty percent of those who enter college drop out before graduation.

A nation as rightfully concerned as ours with the visible erosion of its beaches and shorelines, of its topsoil and trees, of its natural resources and its gold reserves, cannot afford to be indifferent to the less visible but far more serious erosion and waste of its single most precious asset—the asset of young minds.

In a very real sense, the measure of a nation is its attitude toward its own youth. We must live by that standard. We cannot be unconcerned or indifferent that 700,000 boys and girls between the ages of 16 and 21 are unable to find work—or that nearly 1 out of 5 of the unemployed in our country is under the age of 21.

We cannot be indifferent or unconcerned that many of the hardships created by this transitional period in our national economy are falling disproportionately upon the young. That is the essence of the point I especially want to make here today.

We have in our Nation now an uncommon need and demand for educated minds. Much of the focus of industry, labor, and Government is directed to fulfillment of these needs. But there is another set of needs and demands of which less is heard. Those are the demands for the assumption of uncommon responsibilities by those who enjoy the benefits of our educational process.

Never before has a full education promised so much to the individual materially. Sixty percent of the families of college graduates now enjoy income in excess of $10,000 annually. But families of the elementary and high school dropouts are concentrated at the other end of the income scale. Our society is rewarding educated men and women monetarily as no other society has ever done. In return for this, educated men and women must surely reward this society with a new sense of responsibility and dedication.

That is the challenge—the lifelong challenge—presented to each of you enrolled here.

What are those responsibilities and obligations you face? I believe they are these:

First, you assume an obligation for continuing individual growth. Emerson once said, "The things taught in colleges and schools are not an education, but the means of education." When you leave this campus, you will enter a world of continuing change. Your continued personal growth will be as vital to your country as the initial knowledge with which you depart this university. You may some day be graduates, but you must never cease to be students because America will cease to lead when its generations cease to learn.

Second, as educated men and women, you will bear the obligation and responsibility of full participation in the national life. Education would be the enemy rather than the ally of our way of life if the products of our educational processes should exclude themselves from such full participation as an intellectual elite. Where national power derives from the consent of the governed, those who enjoy the best of education must participate in the political processes by which that consent is given or withheld. Your preparation and specialization in the academic disciplines must expand rather than contract your contribution to the broad disciplines of citizenship in a democracy.

Third, educated men and women must bear a special sense of obligation to preserve our heritage. The essence of our Nation's strength—the essence of our freedom—is the fact that our people have always had a capacity and a will to unite, to support a national interest above partisan interest or regional interest, or other interests. The debates and arguments of philosophical partisanship are intriguing on every campus. But if we extend the hard and fast divisions of such campus differences into our society as a whole, we shall weaken an indispensable strength of our system. Educated citizens must be the rallying leadership for national unity rather than the focal point of national divisions. As has been said, "When great questions end, little parties begin." The great questions of America are national questions, not partisan issues and it is to the Nation, not to parties, that educated men must always owe their first and ultimate allegiance.

Fourth and finally, there is for young people of America today—those who receive the benefits of higher education—a compelling obligation of service. Your generation will know leisure as no generation before has known it. That gift will be an endowment for good only if the leisure is used for the service of others, rather than the service of self. The security won by faithful endeavors as a student will be satisfying only as it is used to relieve the insecurities of others less fortunate, less able, and less learned.

This point cannot be given too much emphasis. Thirty years ago this week, in a time of deep despair and insecurity, a great President told Americans, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself." Today, that is still true. Our Nation stands strong and upright in the world. Our arms are strong, our resources are strong, our cause is the strongest. We can only fall by allowing ourselves to be paralyzed by fears from within. It has been wisely said that "The habit of doing one's duty drives away fear."

Those among us who are most fearful today are, very often, those least occupied with performing duties on behalf of others. Mark Twain once gave the advice, "Make it a point to do something every day that you don't want to do. This is the Golden Rule for acquiring the habit of doing your duty without pain."

Capabilities acquired on this campus—and the other fine campuses of the land—will be lost if, in the life beyond college years, there is not a dedication to duty and the experience of performing duty which helps to build a better world for all. If, as we may justly hope, your generation is spared the duty of the battlefield, you will be privileged to take up the greater duties and greater burdens of the fields of peace—at home and throughout the world.

We are building a new economy in our land. This east coast of Florida plays a mighty role in the future. The grime and grimness of earlier times is giving way to new patterns of industry, commerce, and higher values of human worth and aspirations. But as our pace forward accelerates, many are left behind. These must not be forgotten, and if we forget them, their neglect will some day shake the ladder on which we all climb.

The poor, the sick, the unschooled, and untrained are still with us at home as in the world. Men and women who acquire the wealth of higher education must use that wealth to help enrich and improve the lives of the people to whom it is denied.

Our Nation needs you now where you are. But the Nation's need of your talents and your abilities and your conscience will not end when your work here is completed. Your own service to freedom—your own fulfillment of the treasure of your heritage—will begin then as you assume the special obligations and responsibilities which educated men and women must bear in a society such as ours.

In this century—and in this decade—the tide is running with us. Nearly 200 years ago in the Federalist Papers, Madison and Hamilton said of their generation that it had "accomplished a revolution which has no parallel in the annals of human society." That revolution—of which we are heirs—still runs in this world. That revolution of freedom is still the strongest force upon our century. That revolution is destined to win the struggles of this century.

No generation of students has enjoyed the prospect you enjoy or the dimensions of attainment and accomplishment which are open now before you. You can reach the full dimensions of that future as you contribute your individual effort to assuming the obligations and responsibilities of the community of freemen. I envy you what the future holds for you—and I wish each of you well in all your labors as participants in the building of a better world of peace, justice, and freedom for all.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT THE DINNER COMMEMORATING 400TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA.

We have had a wonderful day in Florida. I am most grateful to you for your invitation—and for the opportunity to participate today in these significant and memorable ceremonies.

Coming from the particular part of the United States that I do, it is especially satisfying to me to be here for this meeting tonight. The Colorado River of Texas—which traverses the congressional district which I first represented—served historically as something of a meeting point for the Spanish and Anglo-Saxon cultures in the Southwest.

Much of my life has been spent in contact with the living vestiges of that Spanish heritage. My first job after college was as teacher and principal in a Spanish-speaking school. My association with descendants of our Spanish heritage has been intimate and my friendship for them and affection toward them has been warm and rewarding all my life.

Under these personal circumstances, it is especially gratifying to me to have this part in your efforts here to remind the Nation of the rich endowment our culture has received—and the great debt our history owes—to the explorers and settlers from Spain, who opened the New World.

Many of our historians and history books have emphasized the Anglo-Saxon heritage of our country, treating as a mere incident the influence upon us of the other veins which transfused the heritage of the Old World into the bloodstream of the New. This exclusion of other heritages misrepresents the feelings of our people—and contributes at times to misunderstandings abroad.

If we of this country have taken our language, our law, portions of our system, and other components of our life from the Anglo-Saxon heritage, we have also taken into our culture and our values and our national characteristics much that is important to us from virtually all the cultures of Europe.

Our own warmth toward our friends of Europe is universal and nonselective as our national policies of the postwar years have surely demonstrated. The feelings that the United States is preferential or prejudiced in its interests and affections among the peoples of all of Europe are feelings which originate among those who choose to see what does not exist to be seen and choose to feel what there is no basis for feeling.

In these times, we of the United States—like responsible peoples in all the lands of the West—are focusing our efforts and our resources on the future. We guide our policies and our purposes by the faith that wise efforts today can build a better tomorrow—a tomorrow of peace and justice and freedom for men everywhere. The future is not always clear. The coming of tomorrow seems sometimes to be uncertain. But the men who came from the Old World to open and explore and build the New World endowed us with an heritage of faith.

In efforts such as this St. Augustine restoration, we honor that special legacy. For certainly no American can come here and see the restoration of the first city on the North American mainland without appreciating anew how great was the faith of the men who landed on these shores 450 years ago.

From these shores we are reaching for new worlds. We need both the faith and vision of those earlier times to guide us forward. I can think of nothing more appropriate than that travelers can come to this coast to see the launching site of America's venture in the age of space and to have the privilege of seeing at St. Augustine this site where the age of freedom itself was launched in North America.

I think that the local leadership here and in Florida responsible for initiating this project deserves the special congratulations and gratitude of the Nation. The Quadricentennial Commission brought into being today is an expression on the part of the Nation of that support for your own enterprise and vision in redeeming this hidden asset which has so long been neglected and disused.

Tonight at this meeting we are privileged to extend the scope of participation in this program. The Ambassador from Spain and other representatives of his Government in Madrid are here both to break ground for a new permanent Spanish Exhibit and Cultural Center and to associate Spain itself in this historic undertaking.

Mr. Ambassador and Mr. Minister, on behalf of the people of the United States, it is my very high privilege to extend to your Government this invitation to join with us in this memorable and inspiring effort to recreate this monument. In part, it is in recognition of the contribution which men of your country made to the foundations of our own country and to the opening of a new dimension of freedom for mankind on this earth.

DEATH OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is with a sense of deep personal sorrow that I announce the death of former Representative William Blackney, of Flint, Mich. He died this morning, at age 86. He came to Washington in the 74th Congress, and served, as I recall, eight terms from the 6th Michigan District. He was an outstanding legislator. I wish to take this account of his passing, and I extend to his family my condolences and sympathy.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to make some observations with respect to the fuel oil import quotas upon which the President is about to make a decision. The quotas are meaningful and important to the eastern seaboard and other parts of the country, and involve critical issues of foreign policy and foreign trade, especially insofar as they affect our relations with Venezuela.

I make reference to the fact that the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, Edward A. McDermott, reported to the President on February 13 that a great and meaningful relaxation of controls on the import of residual fuel oil was recommended. I also point to the fact that it has been rumored in the press that this year a lesser relaxation of those quotas will be made than was made last year. It is anticipated that it will be less than 12 percent of the figure which was last year's increase.

I point out that, according to the press reports, stocks of fuel oil in many parts of our country are at a dangerously low level, partly because of the cold winter, but largely because the imports allowed during the last year were not large enough.

I urge the President of the United States to subordinate any considerations which would induce him to do other than what is absolutely essential to the domestic economic policy and the foreign policy of the United States in terms of the liberalization of this quota. I point out that as much as I sympathize with those from coal regions and the domestic producers of fuel oil who may desire that the quotas be held down to the minimum, the conclusion of Mr. McDermott contained in his report is as follows:

> Cutting residual fuel oil imports would be of marginal assistance to the domestic coal mining industry unless such reductions were to levels which would impose inordinate burdens on consumers and on the operation of the economy.

Then another part states:

> The combination of decreased demand and dramatically increased productivity accompanied by some important geographic shifts has already caused important economic and social burdens. There is a basic governmental responsibility to cope with those difficulties through specific domestic programs.

Those quotations are contained on page 36 of Mr. McDermott's report.

So we would not do the coal industry very much good by adhering to present import limits. Although we might try to do it good, we would only be cutting off our noses to spite our faces, and we would do great harm to a large section of our economy.

Our stocks are at an inordinately low level. We are inadequately supplying the quota allocations for those who need them because of the installation of new facilities. For example, one power station in the city of New York alone requires an increase in the quota of about 50,000 barrels of oil per day.

So my colleague the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I have joined in representations to the President, which have been made a part of the RECORD, calling for "meaningful" relaxation of the quotas—the very word used by Mr. McDermott—for the next year, and a revision of the quota allocation system to give independent distributors of fuel oil and their consumers an opportunity to deal in the product, and at the minimum, the institution of a system whereby additions to the overall national quota, which are urgently required, may be distributed in a competitive manner.

I think those request are very reasonable. The President, with an understanding of his problems, must look at this question—especially in view of the finding that it cannot possibly be the way to cope with the problems of the domestic coal mining industry—in a way which is best suited to serve the economy of our Nation and foreign policy of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BAYH in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope very much that the President will make that kind of decision, and that we shall have, at the very least, a liberalization of the quota equal to that of last year—I deeply believe that the needs exceed that amount—but that we shall certainly have no diminution over what was done last year.

RESIDUAL FUEL OIL IMPORT QUOTAS AND CONTROLS SHOULD BE STABILIZED BUT COMPROMISE ORDER IS ANTICIPATED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the controversial subject of foreign residual fuel oil has been a much debated one in recent weeks. It is a fact well known by my colleagues that I am an advocate of tighter controls on imports of this waste product of foreign refineries than the administration has been ordering.

These views have been communicated in considerable detail to the President of the United States and I have several times discussed the subject in this forum.

Yesterday I received from the Special Assistant to the President, Hon. Lawrence F. O'Brien, a message from which I quote:

> DEAR SENATOR: The time is approaching when the final decision of the President with respect to the future of the program of import controls on residual fuel oil will be made and announced.
>
> Your correspondence with the President, particularly your letters of February 13 and 28, together with your statements on the Senate floor with respect to this problem, have, I believe, made a substantial contribution to clarify the several issues involved.
>
> I feel sure that the President's final decision will reflect the vital interest of the coal industry that you have so ably delineated.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
> *Special Assistant to the President.*

Also on yesterday, I released a statement of my estimate of the impending residual oil import control order expected this week from the Department of the Interior, in which it was said that all signs point toward a compromise order to be effective April 1 which will authorize import quota levels appreciably higher than my recommendation for stabilizing imports at the 1962 levels.

But I added that I am confident that the domestic coal and petroleum industries are going to attain vastly more protection against foreign residual oil competition than that which was recommended by the Office of Emergency Planning in a recent memorandum to the President. In the OEP document the President was urged to relax residual oil import controls. In fact, the implication was clear that OEP really was recommending a phasing out of the residual quota system.

When the OEP report was released, I immediately supported the positions of the coal producers, coal labor, the coal-carrying railroads, and independent petroleum groups that a decontrolling of residual oil imports would not be in either the best national economic interest or the national security interest and would definitely be detrimental to basic domestic fuels industries and domestic employment.

It is my belief that decisions to be announced for the administration by the Secretary of the Interior later this week will provide less increase in residual oil import quotas than that asked by east coast interests, residual oil marketers, the international integrated oil company producers, and by the President of Venezuela on the occasion of his recent visit.

I anticipate, however, that the Interior Secretary's order will announce residual import quota increases at levels above those which we of the coal economy areas had hoped would obtain.

Accordingly, neither the proponents of decontrols nor the advocates of tighter controls are likely to score what can be claimed to be a victory in this almost continuous controversy.

I do feel, however, that those of us who object to increasing penetration of domestic fuels' markets by foreign residual fuel oils, with Government sanction and by Government edict, have sustained the recognition of such valid points as these:

The import control program is necessary in the national security interest.

Domestic economic interests are inseparable from national security requirements.

There is proper reason for the domestic fuels industries to insist that they and the transportation modes involved should not be subjected to competition from foreign residual oil in quantities in excess of a fair share of participation in American demand for energy fuels. Accordingly, I anticipate that there will be built into the residual oil import quota levels and into control regulations a formula embracing a ratio between availability and demand requirements that will be more equitable than heretofore.

Although it is objectionable to me that a foreign product of the nature of residual oil receives what amounts to an allocation of a noncompetitive area of fuel market demand, while our domestic fuels must compete with each other for the balance, I sense a larger degree of willingness to recognize that the foreign fuel should not henceforth be permitted to usurp unreasonable shares of the domestic market. Foreign residual oil, dumped at predatory prices, gradually has diminished the competitiveness and the availability of domestic residuals and has disrupted the domestic coal market. A limit on the degree of disruption is essential, and I have reason to hope it will be built into the new orders to be released by the Secretary of the Interior. If so limited, the quota system will achieve a greater degree of stability than has prevailed during the past 2 or 3 years.

Such stability is a vital component in the ability of the coal industry, the coal-carrying railroads and related industries to anticipate more accurately their probable position in the fuels markets of the east coast.

On the basis of information available, I am hopeful that the residual oil import control program to be announced will apply for the duration of this administration, rather than merely on an annual basis. If so, then the coal industry and related industries will be able to plan responsibly for the future without fear of their projections being upset by periodic increases in residual fuel imports.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the time to solve the problems regarding Federal aid to education which have so far blocked the progress of legislation in the Congress is running out, and serious consequences to our youth on all levels of schooling may be anticipated unless programs are able to get underway this year to expand our educational facilities, raise standards of instruction and assist worthy students. The education "gap" in terms of the skilled manpower needed by our country is becoming more and more difficult to close with each year that goes by without a Federal aid program. The legislation before this Congress will go far toward meeting the situation created by our expanding school population and rapidly rising costs and I believe it should receive priority consideration.

Some of the issues and problems respecting aid to education are dealt with in a special number of the quarterly published by the Carnegie Corp. of New York. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article entitled "Education and Politics," published by the quarterly, January 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION AND POLITICS

There are some perfectly decent words that nice Americans seldom use together in the same phrase. "Education" and "politics" are two of them. While each word is quite all right on its own (although education is considered to be superior because it is "spiritual" while politics is "crass"), the two in combination seem to conjure up images of graft, corruption, and even "propagandizing."

Actually, the notion that politics and education should not have anything to do with each other is based on a misunderstanding both of politics and of the role of education in a democracy and how that role is determined. And the idea that they do not have anything to do with each other flies in the face of the facts.

Public education is paid for by public funds, and public funds are raised, and allocated, through the political process. Through this process, the community—as small as the township, as large as the Nation—decides both the total amount it is prepared to spend for a host of public benefits, and how the total amount will be split up among them all. In short, the political forum is where the citizenry fights about the things it cares about; it is where the public assigns priorities and establishes its values in rank order.

Not everyone comprehends this trading out of interests in the political marketplace. This is one reason why many political decisions do not in fact reflect accurately the most widely held public values but do often reflect those of "interests" which understand the political process very well indeed. In these cases, where does the fault lie except with those who are either too lazy or too naive to press the case effectively for their own interests?

For the basic importance of the inseparability of politics and education is not the fact that public money supports public education but what that fact represents: that the education of its youth is a primary interest of the Nation. And the Nation has many legitimate concerns—for defense, health, highways, and welfare, as well as education. The equitable allocation of resources in support of these interests is an extraordinarily intricate—and political—business.

Good education costs good money. And public education costs public money. Where it will come from, how it will be distributed, for what it will be used—these are important and complicated problems of public policy.

For there are many forces which influence the extent of public support for public education. Social, political, and organizational factors, as well as economic, play powerful roles. Increased understanding of these roles should help in the formulation of policies that will strengthen public education in the years ahead. With this objective in view, Carnegie Corp. several years ago made a few grants for studies of some of the issues involved in the financing of public education. Most of the studies are now completed.

The Syracuse University Press is publishing, in a series called "The Economics and Politics of Public Education," 12 monographs which were prepared under the general direction of Professor Jesse Burkhead of the department of economics. Four of them were released last month: "Schoolmen and Politics: A Study of State Aid to Education in the Northeast," by Stephen K. Bailey, Richard T. Frost, Paul E. Marsh, and Robert C. Wood; "Government and the Suburban School," by Roscoe C. Martin; National Politics and Federal Aid to Education, by Frank J. Munger and Richard F. Fenno, Jr.; and "Issues in Federal Aid to Education," by Sidney C. Sufrin.[1]

A study somewhat similar to that of Bailey et. al., dealing with three Midwestern States, will be published in the summer by Alfred A. Knopf under the title "State Politics and the Public Schools: An Exploratory Analysis." The study was made by Nicholas A. Masters, Robert H. Salisbury, and Thomas H. Eliot, under a grant to Washington University.

"Tax Credits and Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations," by James A. Maxwell, professor of economics at Clark University, has been published by the Brookings Institution. Although the title may not make immediately clear the book's relevance to public education, it has decided relevance, for it is an exploration of some formulas for providing general purpose assistance to the States without stimulating Federal control.

Finally, a grant to the National Bureau of Economic Research has resulted in, among other things, a paper by Gary S. Becker called "Investment in Human Capital," and a conference of economists on that subject. They provide some new theories about the financial returns from investments in human beings and their education.

THE BACKGROUND—AND THE FUTURE

The cost of supporting the Nation's public elementary and secondary schools will continue to rise over the entire foreseeable future. The increase is inescapable because of the sheer numbers of pupils alone, because of the schools that must be built to house them and the teachers who must be paid to teach them. In short, the cost will continue to rise even without regard to improving the quality of education: without regard to the possible value of lowering the student-teacher ratio, for example, or of raising teachers' salaries, or of making widespread use of new teaching equipment.

Even now, and even in the rich States, there are many school districts with vast gaps between needs and resources. And although the tax effort of the poor States is generally greater than that of the rich ones, the average level of education support in those States falls far short of what is customarily regarded as adequate. As for the total national picture, James B. Conant estimated that by 1958 the educational deficit—the difference between what was spent and what should have been spent for the public schools—was from $7 to $48 billion per year.

Several years ago, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund's special panel on education estimated that by 1967 the schools and colleges would require double the funds they spent in 1957. No matter what the amount turns out to be, where is it to come from?

At the moment, the costs of public education are spread among three levels of government—local, State, and national—with the largest proportion coming from local sources and a very small proportion from Federal. In 1960, all but 4.4 percent of the funds came from State and local governments.

The important fact is, however, that State and local revenue structure as they are now utilized for the support of public education are inadequate for the financial tasks ahead. These revenue systems are rigid, based largely on sales and property taxes which are notorious for their slowness to reflect real increases in wealth and income. Thus they cannot produce sufficient revenues for supporting education and other activities—unless taxes are raised very substantially. And this most States and communities are loath to do.

The Federal Government has a tax advantage over State and local governments because its tax structure is more elastic. Since the vast majority of Federal revenue comes from taxes on personal and corporate income, increases in economic activity bring an automatic and immediate increase in Federal revenues. But there are many eager claimants for these extra dollars, and in addition a bitterly divisive political conflict surrounds the issue of Federal aid to education.

To sum up, educational interests, thus far denied effective access to the Federal coffers, find themselves in increasingly keen competition for scarce resources in the towns and States—resources which will become relatively more scarce as time goes on unless some major (and highly unlikely) tax reforms are made.

On this gloomy note, we turn now to some of the issues involved in Federal aid to education and the history of the struggle to get that aid, since, according to Munger and Fenno of the Syracuse study, "the Federal Government constitutes what is probably the last major untapped source of revenue for public school education in this country."

One of the major political issues of the day revolves around Federal aid to education. Tradition in the United States has held that education is primarily a local responsibility, and most people seem to believe that the question now is whether the Federal Government should or should not provide funds for the public schools.

The only trouble with this phrasing of the question is that it is inaccurate. The Federal Government does now give financial support to public education, and it has often done so for more than 100 years; in fact, endowments of land were given to the States for educational purposes as far back as 1785. Since then, a number of grants have been made for limited and specific purposes, but no long-term, general Federal aid program has ever been initiated. It is such general aid that proponents of Federal aid seek and have sought in many sessions of the Congress for 94 years. Since 1945, educational legislation of one sort or another has been pending almost continuously.

Although many bills have passed one or the other House of Congress, none has ever passed both during the same session. Several times bills have seemed to be on the verge of passage only to be struck down, under circumstances that prompted one observer to say that the measures are politically accident prone.

The reasons for their high mortality rate are analyzed by Munger and Fenno, both of whom are political scientists, in their fast-moving history of Federal aid legislation. (One of the great virtues of the Syracuse monographs, at least of those thus far available, is that they are written in a style that is clear, interesting, and straightforward and, on appropriate occasion, humorous.) Many different problems have swamped Federal aid; in fact, the most important barrier to passage has been the multiplicity of issues itself.

"The struggle over Federal aid has not been a single conflict, but rather a multiplicity of controversies only loosely related to one another," write Munger and Fenno. "The situation might be compared to a better-than-three-ring circus, although, in view of the tactics at times employed, a multiple barroom brawl might make a more apt analogy."

THE MAJOR ISSUES

Race, religion, Federal control of education, division of the spoils among the States, the purposes for which aid should be given—each of these issues has figured as an effective deterrent to passage since the beginning of Federal aid legislation. But whereas in the past one issue, or a combination of two or three, has been sufficient to block legislation, now all of them are involved in the controversy, which leads the authors to take an extremely dim view of the possibilities of early passage of general aid.

It is generally understood, for example, that the southern States are among those in direst need of outside funds for education. Yet the fear that any Federal aid bill, no matter how worded, will eventually be used as a lever for speeding desegregation has nullified hopes for substantial support from the South. Hence the votes must come from the populous States of the North and West—but there, especially in the Northeast, the religious question becomes important. Until 1945 the position of Roman Catholic spokesmen was one of opposition to any Federal aid; since then, however, they have held that such aid is acceptable—but if, and only if, parochial schools are somehow included. It was on this issue that President Kennedy's legislation came to grief in the last session of Congress.

Many people have feared that Federal aid would lead to undesirable forms of control over the content of education—the worst of their fears being that political figures or parties could use the educational system for ideological indoctrination. These fears persist among some people although virtually all advocates of aid, within and without the Government, have specifically denied the wish to control or even to influence education.

Another problem has to do with the type of formula that would be used in making grants. Attempts to equalize educational opportunity among the States pose political problems for legislators from the rich States which would, in effect, be giving more than they would get.

Finally, the issue of what the aid should be used for has divided even the supporters of Federal action. Some want aid only for school construction; others would permit use of the funds for teachers' salaries also. And this issue has begun to resolve itself along partisan lines, with Democrats favoring aid for both purposes, Republicans aid only for construction.

PROPONENTS AND OPPONENTS

One of the problems in pushing legislation has been that although widespread public opinion favors Federal aid, it is only mildly interested in it; it is not a hot vote-getting issue. Masters and his colleagues find the same phenomenon at the State level and remark that, although everybody is for the schools, legislators who champion the cause feel that they make little political hay out of their efforts.

In the presence of wide public support and the absence of loud public noise for legislation, the burden of pushing it has of course fallen (as it does on every issue really) on the particular groups interested in the subject and the allies they are able to rally within the Government.

Historically, the major outside proponents of Federal aid have included educators working through their organizations (primarily the National Education Association), women's groups, and labor. Opposed have been the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Legion, and, until 1945, Catholic groups. And although the Catholic position has changed, it in effect still serves as a deterrent because the only condition under which most church spokesmen are willing to see aid given is unacceptable to most of the proponents, quite apart from the constitutional question involved.

Munger and Fenno's account does not leave one with much respect for the political savvy of the outside proponents, of whom one of their critics (who was also for Federal aid) said: "The vast majority of the supporters of the principle of Federal aid have adhered to a policy which has been vacillating in principle, opportunistic in tactics, and fatal in practice." The savage remark was made in 1945, and things haven't changed much since then, according to the authors.

---

[1] Syracuse University Press, $1.75 each. To be published in February are "Cost and Quality in Public Education," by Harold F. Clark; "Federal Aid to Science Education: Two Programs," by Paul E. Marsh and Ross A. Gortner; "State and Local Taxes for Public Education," by Jesse Burkhead; and "Administering the National Defense Education Act," by Sidney C. Sufrin. In April the final four will be published: "Aid for Federally Affected Public Schools," by I. M. Labovitz; "Suburban Power Structures and Public Education," by Warner Bloomberg, Jr., and Morris Sunshine; "Social and Economic Factors in Spending for Public Education," by Jerry Miner; and "Education Price and Quantity Indexes," by William Wasserman.

The supporters have employed strategies ranging from the making of numerous compromises (although refusing to compromise in some instances where it might have paid off), to logrolling, to proposing wildly divergent sums from one year to the next. Munger and Fenno cite "The Very Modest Proposal," or the "16th of a loaf approach," which has failed presumably because it is totally transparent (everyone knows what happens once the camel's nose is allowed into the tent); and "The Outrageous Proposal," probably put forward on the premise that a plea for so much money would surely elicit at least a little.

THE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT

As for the situation in the White House and on Capitol Hill, Munger and Fenno point out that until the inauguration of President Kennedy no Chief Executive gave strong leadership for Federal aid. And in spite of the President's deep commitment, in the last session of Congress it was quite apparent that he believed that certain of his foreign policy legislation was of more critical importance and must be pushed at the expense of some domestic bills, including the education bill. Given the state of the world, Munger and Fenno speculate that this priority problem is likely to continue.

Because of the lack of Presidential interest until now, aid to education has been treated almost exclusively as a decision to be made by Congress. Strong efforts have been made to enlist bipartisan support for it—efforts which were greatly enhanced by the late Senator Robert A. Taft's conversion to the Federal aid cause in the 1940's. Until his death he remained one of the most persuasive and influential Senate spokesmen for it. Bipartisanship can cut both ways, however, and Democrats and Republicans have formed more efficient coalitions against than for Federal aid.

THE ISSUE OF FEDERAL CONTROL

One major point that the history of Federal aid legislation over the past 100 years proves, say Munger and Fenno, is the importance of social crisis in encouraging Government action. Virtually all Federal legislation for education has been a reaction to real or imagined crises of one kind or another rather than the outgrowth of a coherent philosophy with respect to the Federal Government's interest or lack of interest in education as such. Hence the grants that have been made were for specific purposes, to meet perceived needs.

This leads to a paradox. Many people question the propriety of general aid because they fear it would lead to undue Federal control or influence over education. Yet what little legislation has so far received approval is of precisely the sort that does influence education because, among other things, of its emphasis on certain fields; for example, vocational education in the law passed in 1917, science and languages in the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Many observers believe that since general aid is unlikely to be enacted soon, the Federal Government will inevitably make further grants for specific purposes on which it is easier to get political consensus. (Russia's sputnik got more Federal money for education than all America's educators have been able to get for it.) The question of Federal control might be considered in terms of whether the integrity of the public schools will be better protected through aid which the State could use for a general strengthening of the system, or through acts of Congress passed in response to political pressures from within or without.

Thus far, at any rate, most proponents of general aid have been as vehement as their opponents in denouncing the evils of Federal control. But as Sidney Sufrin points out in his monograph, throughout the entire recent congressional debate "the meaning of Federal control, and of the alternatives to Federal control, or the relation of such control to the ideals of excellence, or to the facts of public need, were simply ignored."

Although he believes that the fear that the Federal Government will dominate public education is completely unfounded, he says that "the assertion of a national interest in public elementary and secondary education requires something more than the provision of funds. A national interest implies and requires national goals standards with sufficient flexibility to be reasonably harmonious with State and local goals and standards." He urges much closer cooperation among professional educators, and the participation of Federal agencies, in the effort to improve national standards.

"Federal money is undoubtedly significant," he writes; "but of greater significance are ideas, organizations, and programs."

FISCAL FORMULAS

If the Federal Government were to decide to ease the States' financial burdens in financing education, there are two major administrative methods by which it might do so. One would be for it to give the States revenues which it has collected, under any of several possible formulas. It might make flat grants, based for example on the number of school children in a given State; or grants designed to equalize educational opportunity among the States; or incentive grants to stimulate greater State effort or other actions.

The other way, funds would not actually change hands, so to speak, but the Federal Government could allow tax credits or deductions which would have the effect of increasing the States' revenues without increasing the total amount of taxes individuals pay.

In his book, James Maxwell explores this latter type, largely through an analysis of what has happened under the two major tax credit plans the United States has used so far, for death taxes and unemployment insurance. He concludes that the tax credit has several desirable features, in that it can be used to advance tax coordination and reform, and it provides financial resources for State governments without the risk of increased Federal control. The weakness, however, is that tax credits do not provide for equalization, and they tend to be inflexible. Maxwell suggests that "since Federal objectives are manifold, there will be no inconsistency in using several devices (including tax credits and deductions, unconditional grants, and conditional grants) during the coming years to ease the financial burden of State and local governments."

Thus far, however, the burden of supporting public education rests upon the local and State governments.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the most critical problems affecting public schools today is the alarmingly high dropout rate of students who do not intend to go on to college. Any situation which finds hundreds of thousands of young people without jobs and without working skills of any kind is potentially explosive, and the increasing rate of juvenile delinquency throughout the Nation is one of the alarming symptoms of this illness in our social and educational systems. Present programs of Federal aid to vocational education, which have been in existence for almost half a century, are hopelessly inadequate to cope with the problem and stand in need of drastic overhauling to meet the needs of today. And manpower retraining programs, important as they are, cannot hope to cope adequately with the unemployment problem as long as untrained and unskilled youths who drop out of school keep filling up the reservoir beneath the surface. We cannot retrain a youth who has had no training to begin with, nor can we deal with the problem by sending a relatively minor number of them into the woods for 6 months in a revival of the old CCC camps.

Some indication of the need for a nationwide vocational education program and the problems that are involved is provided in a special study of the problem which has just been released. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a study of vocational education in the United States entitled "The Forgotten Youth," prepared by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee, March 4, 1963.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"THE FORGOTTEN YOUTH"—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES—PART 1

INTRODUCTION

"Ignorance and illiteracy, unskilled workers and school dropouts—these and other failures in our educational system have bred failures in our social and economic system: juvenile delinquency, unemployment and chronic dependency."

Thus does the administration rationalize its demand on Congress for a $5.3 billion Federal aid-to-education program.

Facts indicate precisely the opposite to be true, i.e., failures in our social and economic system have bred failures in our educational system. And the basic failure of public-education today has been the systematic refusal to acknowledge—in all of our major urban areas of population—social and economic changes that have been going on during the past four decades.

We have witnessed a massing in urban centers of youths whose background, heritage, and living standards challenge the social environment in which they now live. The academic program which met the needs of an urban community 25 years ago no longer meets the basic needs of that community today. Yet, the curriculum is still static in concept. The result has been the loss of old skills; new ones, needed to meet changing industrial patterns, are not taught.

Unemployment among the young is rising and will continue to rise unless major changes in our educational system are brought about to meet these changed social and economic conditions.

The Democratic administration's school aid proposals fail completely to face up to these basic changes and to provide even a semblance of a solution.

We recognize the need for a higher degree of skill and training in our colleges and graduate schools and encourage efforts—both private and public—to provide the quality instruction needed at these levels.

The administration's message, however, continues to place its primary emphasis on "glamour" aspects of education leading to the college entrance examinations. It endorses, in effect, trends already observed in American education to classify all other educational courses as being just a shade lower in dignity than the academic course.

This and succeeding studies are aimed at examining the needs of the 80 percent of our school-age population who will enter the work force without a college degree.

All Americans willing to work should have the opportunity to look forward to earnings that will enable them to establish a home and to rear a family in decency and dignity. As they lead productive and useful lives they contribute to the growth of America.

Theirs are the problems largely ignored in the administration's school message.

THE PROBLEM FOR YOUTH

In urban areas unemployment, particularly among the young, is rising. Chances of the urban youth, who has just graduated from high school or who has dropped out of school, finding his first job are lessened by the influx of rural youths who can no longer look forward to on-farm employment. In the past 5 years, on-farm job opportunities have fallen off by 800,000—and these youths have had to turn to the cities for a livelihood.

During these same 5 years, the net increase in job opportunities has risen by an estimated 1.5 million. Despite this increase, the young, unskilled worker finds it more and more difficult to get a job because he is unskilled.

The principal increase in job openings is in the service category, ranging from sales clerks to skilled computer mechanics. There is a growing demand for every type of skill in this broad area.

The American education system, as it is now constituted, does not provide the vast majority of high school graduates or school dropouts with these skills. Many may profit from academic studies but they should also be taught how to repair a TV set, operate an office machine, handle a cash register in a supermarket, maintain a building, or other skills necessary to get a job.

The Labor Department estimates that the demand for these and other skills will increase 150 percent by 1975 while the demand for the unskilled worker will decline by some 50 percent.

Our public schools are the obvious place where the needed skills could be acquired. Salable skills are not being taught to enough graduates and to even fewer dropouts.

A decade ago the high school graduate or school dropout could reasonably expect to find a job in some phase of industry. This annual addition to the work force was partially absorbed in this type of industry or on the farm. This situation no longer prevails. Today he is more likely to find himself an unemployment statistic than a productive worker.

In 1960, for instance, 700,000 16-to-19-year-olds who were not in school were unemployed. This constituted 15.5 percent of the 16-to-17-year-olds and 14.1 percent of the 18-to-19-year-olds as compared with the 6.8 percent of the adult work force unemployed.

While unemployment statistics for the young continue grim, an ironic paradox has developed. There is a growing problem among employers who are looking for skilled help but who cannot find it. These employment opportunities are not in the low-pay field, according to a recently published survey.

For instance, butchers in one New York meat wholesale house are earning $10,000 a year.

A skilled cook—not necessarily a chef—can expect to earn between $10,000 and $12,000 in many New York restaurants and aboard American ocean liners. Skilled kitchen help of any kind is hard to find and consequently draws good pay.

American furniture manufacturers are increasingly turning to Europe to find skilled help because too few cabinetmakers are entering the work force in this country.

Skilled sheet metal workers are at a premium in most urban centers.

An apprentice draftsman with no experience starts at $80 a week in Chicago. Similar wage scales are found in other major American cities.

Landscape gardners, cosmetologists, cartographers, TV repairmen, plumbers, electricians, appliance repairmen, mechanics, and many types of sales people can start at nearly $5,000 a year including overtime.

A Chicago auto mechanics union official reports that a body-and-fender man can expect to earn $10,000 a year in almost any garage but adds that his local cannot supply enough men to meet the needs.

A spot check of classified ads in one major Chicago newspaper for Sunday, February 24, 1963, showed a demand for 5,042 skilled workers. Like situations prevail in other urban centers.

Businessmen throughout the country tell the same story; there just aren't enough skilled workers being added to our labor force each year to meet their needs. In some extreme cases this has resulted in business failure.

American luxury liners are fighting a losing battle with their European competitors partly because they cannot match the skilled service offered by the European lines.

During the past 5 years, 3,500,000 new jobs have been created, primarily in the service category. As every new shopping center is built, literally hundreds of new jobs are created, ranging from parking lot attendants through sales personnel to skilled mechanics and artisans. These jobs are in addition to those already existing in the community.

The Labor Department estimates that during the decade ahead demand for skilled workers will increase by 150 percent. If this projection is borne out it will mean that another 13.5 million such jobs will be created. But each of these jobs will demand more acquired skill.

Our educational system should and must be the source for these skills. As it is geared today—in its static adherence to curriculums of the past which no longer meet the demands of today and the future—it is not qualified to meet this challenge.

THE OVERLOOKED ANSWERS

A partial solution to the problems of unemployed youth as well as those of the employer looking for skilled or semiskilled help does exist within our educational system—the vocational or technical school—but it has been neglected and ignored. In some cases it almost seems that our school administrators have taken the attitude that if they don't look maybe these schools will go away.

While vocational education is not offered as an absolute solution to all of our social and economic problems, it should be more vigorously pushed, better administered, and more fully financed.

During the past year, the American taxpayer, through local, State, and Federal taxation, paid a total public school bill of $18.1 billion. Of this, $5.6 billion was for secondary (high school) education. Only $254 million, or 4.5 percent, of this secondary school budget was spent on vocational education; 4½ percent of the budget was spent to supply the kind of skills needed by the 80 percent of our school population who will enter the labor force without a college education.

Although $254 million is a sizable amount of money, it must be remembered that this is divided among the 50 States and among the 9.6 million high school students who form the 80 percent. This averages out to about $28 spent for each of these pupils. This hardly seems adequate.

On a national scale this, in effect, amounts to no vocational education at all.

There are, of course, examples of fine programs producing excellent results. One such oasis is the city of Milwaukee, Wis., which spends $4.8 million annually to train some 18,000 youths in all types of vocational and technical skills. An interesting side effect of the Milwaukee effort should be cited. In Milwaukee the high school dropout rate is 5.5 percent compared to the highest high school dropout rate in the country—40 percent. The city of New York has recognized the need and has established some excellent vocational schools. Undoubtedly, they should be expanded in scope and amount of expenditures.[1]

In contrast, the city of Philadelphia, four times larger than Milwaukee, spends only one-seventeenth as much annually ($280,000).

Another glaring contrast to Milwaukee is Washington, D.C. In the National Capital the crime rate is climbing rapidly, juvenile delinquency has reached the crisis point, school dropouts constitute a major problem, youth unemployment ranks high as a source of concern, and welfare rolls are bulging. In this city, the budget for vocational education is less than 4 percent of the total school budget.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

In this area of education the Federal role is historic, dating back more than 100 years. The first Land-Grant College Act was a demonstration of the Government's faith in a system of academic and vocational education and a demonstration of the concern the Government held that those who work with their hands be trained properly to perform their tasks with skill and stature in the community.

In 1917 this concept was broadened by the Smith-Hughes Act to include high schools. Congress after Congress since then—regardless of the party in power—extended and broadened this basic law.

In 1961 the administration called together a panel of experts to study vocational education needs. Headed by Chicago school Supt. Benjamin C. Willis, the panel reported back a year later, in November 1962.

The experts agreed there is a deepseated need for added vocational and technical courses and that the need will increase during the years ahead. They recommended an immediate start and set a price tag of $400 million.

Yet, in its school message the administration came up with the figure of $73 million. A study of the complex problems facing young people today—and the society into which they must fit—indicates that perhaps the experts, not the administration, were on the right track.

ATTITUDES MUST CHANGE

More than financial assistance is needed. There must be a fundamental change in the attitude toward vocational education on the part of school boards, school administrators, and the general public.

The glamorous aspects of education are emphasized. Most of our money and time is spent providing an increasingly excellent background for the few who will graduate from college, ignoring the fact that this type of schooling is not solving the problems of the vast majority to prepare them for a useful career. Many of them sit and fidget through class after class until they reach the legal age limit when the truant officer no longer holds power over them—and they drop out. Meanwhile, they have become problems for the school administrator.

---

[1] A survey is currently being made of the 50 State programs, how they are financed and administered, and how well they are working. When results are complete enough to provide some idea of successes and failures, they will be compiled in a further study.

In most school systems the machine shop, the woodworking lathes, and the garage equipment are relegated to the basement, or worse, to obsolete schools which no longer are considered good enough to house academic classrooms.

Little, if any new equipment is bought. Not enough well-trained teachers are hired.

Vocational courses have been given a second-class status and a stigma attached to those taking them. Whether we like to admit it or not, facts indicate that too often administrators use vocational schools as dumping grounds for the unruly and the problem children. The vocational school becomes, in effect, a reformatory without bars. It is little wonder that many parents object strenuously to their children taking part in such programs.

Glance through any report on school problems and almost invariably—as in the case with the administration's school message—the emphasis is on the academic program. That school message devoted four whole paragraphs of a 13-page message to vocational education.

To achieve a really adequate vocational program will, then, require some fundamental changes in attitude among school officials, teachers, and the general public. The dignity of those attending vocational schools or taking vocational courses must be reaffirmed. A society cannot exist where no one is supposed to get his hands dirty.

Closer attention to this problem by community and national news media and by local and national civic organizations might help in bringing about this necessary attitude change.

Because such a program is designed to fill an educational vacuum for the vast majority of students, greater emphasis on finances must be accompanied by greater interest on the part of school administrators.

Such a program must be long-range in character. Lack of spectacular immediate results would not mean failure since appreciable results cannot be expected for at least 4 years, perhaps not even that soon.

A well-rounded vocational program should include a greater degree of on-the-job training in cooperation with unions and business but under the supervision of school officials. Such a program would have a twofold benefit. It would enhance the value of classroom learning with actual experience and it also would provide students with much-needed dollar earnings.

It must be remembered that in many of our urban centers families depend on their children's earnings to maintain themselves. If the students can bring home the needed money with pride, it not only points to a better future for them, it starts the family itself on the road to rehabilitation, another possible side effect of a well-grounded vocational program.

Such a program cannot be achieved in this country by spending 4 percent of the budget or 4 percent of the administrator's time.

Schools by themselves cannot solve the problem of juvenile delinquency. This is a problem for the home, the church, and law enforcement authorities as well as for the educator. Schools by themselves cannot provide jobs for the jobless or hope for those desperate young men and women who have looked but who cannot find dignified employment.

OTHER PROGRAMS QUESTIONED

In addition to its message on education, the administration has sent to the Congress this year requests for other types of youth programs. These include the Youth Conservation Corps and the local area youth employment program. The administration is obviously, through these programs, turning away from education for a solution to problems which it knows exist.

Even if approved by the Congress, these programs would only postpone for a year or two the impact of the employment problem on the young people and the Nation. These programs offer no real training or skill-acquisition opportunities. They are, in simplest terms, a new form of dole, a new form of burying our heads in the sand.

The young men and women who participate would find themselves, upon emerging, still without the necessary skills to meet modern job requirements. They would soon become once again among the unemployed.

OBSTACLES

There are obstacles to the creation of a truly effective vocational education program.

1. The attitude of the administration, of school boards, school officials, teachers, and the public must change. Their apathy and even hostility mitigate against a sound program and must be changed before effective steps can be taken.

2. Teachers in the academic field would undoubtedly object to a changed emphasis. After all, their jobs are at stake in this. If more emphasis were placed on learning the needed skills, more technically trained teachers and fewer academicians might be needed. Their unions and associations also could be expected to object.

3. School administrators would find it difficult to hire the properly trained vocational teachers needed in such an expanded program. Because the program in the past has been so small, teachers' colleges have either ignored it or placed upon it the same lack of emphasis as the school boards. Unless the public is properly informed, it will never overcome its apathy and provide the necessary support needed to encourage forward-looking school administrators to adopt the proper programs.

4. Initial union resistance might occur. As long as the skilled labor market is limited, union members will draw high wages and overtime pay and some union leaders might adopt the shortsighted policy of limiting the labor supply. Obviously, however, as the number of skilled earning union members increases, the unions themselves are improved and the union movement is strengthened. With the decline and near disappearance of the apprentice system, it may well be that vocational schools offer the major manpower pool from which future trade union members are drawn.

Of these factors, the most important is the attitude of the Government, school officials, and the public.

Public school education is valuable to the extent it prepares children to become useful citizens. If our American educational system is to meet this challenge and fulfill its responsibility, there must be a fundamental change in attitude and approach.

If our educational system does not meet this basic responsibility to all of our children, then regardless of how many billions we spend, we have failed the next generation.

THE MEANING OF FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday in an address before the Advertising Council, President Kennedy delivered a coldly realistic analysis of this Nation's economic history during the past two decades. The President's remarks demonstrate how economic decisions made during 1957 have resulted in 6 years of growing unemployment, rising budget deficits, worsening balance of payments, and increasing under-capacity operations.

As President Kennedy noted, in the decade prior to July 1957, unemployment had barely exceeded 4 percent. Since 1957, it has remained above 5 percent. And February saw unemployment rise to 6.1 percent.

In the decade prior to 1957, business fixed investment averaged almost 11 percent of total output. Since that time, it has declined to under 9 percent.

In the earlier decade the gross national product had expanded at the rate of almost 4 percent annually. The past 6 years have witnessed a total growth rate of barely 3 percent annually. Moreover, the balance-of-payments gap became a serious matter of concern after 1957.

The President noted that our total economy is currently functioning at $30 to $40 billion below capacity. I believe this figure is a most conservative estimate of our so-called production gap. I have received impressively documented estimates that our economy is currently functioning $70 to $80 billion below capacity. But whichever estimate you accept as more accurate, the resulting loss in jobs, wages, capital investment, and consumer products is tragic.

The President has presented this country and the Congress with the economic facts of life. He has, so to speak, laid it on the line. Can we afford to continue this record of partial economic fulfillment? Can we be satisfied with this squandering of our productive resources? Will we permit this country to slowly slip into another serious recession? These are questions every Member of Congress must ask himself.

Mr. President, in asking these questions we should also understand the term "fiscal responsibility" in terms of our obligation to foster an economy capable of restoring 4.9 million unemployed Americans to productive labors. We have the responsibility to foster a strong domestic economy that inspires confidence among foreign investors, thereby providing the basis for improving the balance-of-payments gap. We have the responsibility to bring this country's economy to a growth rate in excess of 4 percent annually. That is what we might call "fiscal responsibility." We have the responsibility to erase the $70 to $80 billion gap between our actual national production and our economic potential.

I suggest that for once we should define fiscal responsibility in terms of jobs, investments, wages, products, and growth, and not limit ourselves to the single criterion of the Federal Government's administrative budget. Our decisions regarding the Federal budget touch only one factor among many that eventually will determine the true extent of our fiscal responsibility.

Will Congress provide a fiscally responsible tax structure that will stimulate rather than depress our economy? Will Congress appropriate funds in a manner that reflects the needs of our modern, technologically sophisticated society, such as funds for mass transportation facilities, urban housing, and health and educational facilities? Will the Congress provide a realistic debt ceiling that recognizes that the actual debt burden

is steadily declining in proportion to the rising gross national product?

Each of these questions will be decided by Congress this year. It is my sincere hope that Congress will act in this fiscally responsible fashion. For if we do, the entire economy will reflect the wisdom of our decisions and millions of Americans will be eternally grateful.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from President Kennedy's address to the Advertising Council be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that two editorials from the Washington Post, "The Tax-Cut Opposition" and "Reduction and Reform," also be printed in the Record. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that a thought-provoking letter from Leon Keyserling, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, as published by the Washington Post, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpts, editorial, and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 14, 1963]

Partial Text of Kennedy Speech

The first 2 months of the 88th Congress have been dominated by discussions of fiscal and economic policy—and the next several months may well be dominated by these topics. In the last 100 years, questions of economic policy have become as complex to the layman as questions of space and military technology. Free soil, free silver, and free trade, for example, were basically easier to understand than the balance of payments, the tools of debt management and the application of countercyclical forces. Today every problem has several alternative solutions, and every answer raises several questions. I am more than ever convinced of the words once uttered by George Bernard Shaw: "If all economists were laid end to end, they still would not reach a conclusion."

FAMILIAR QUESTIONS

Three familiar questions of fiscal policy must be decided by the Congress:

1. The limit on the national debt;
2. The size of the Federal budget; and
3. The desirability and extent of Federal tax reduction.

All three of these questions have faced the legislative and executive branches before—and we have an obligation to learn the lessons of history if we do not wish to relive it. Economic history—specifically the history of 1957–60, which produced two recessions from which the economy never wholly recovered—clearly warns us now that the wrong answer to each of these three questions would spell downturn and disaster for the American economy as a whole.

I do not speak as a partisan. The errors of a Republican administration and a Democratic Congress during those crucial years have been previously acknowledged by members of both parties. I do not review them now to gain political advantage in hindsight but to gain a greater degree of foresight on the same problems that face us now. I do not intend to assess the blame for the past—but we shall all be deserving of blame if we do not learn its lessons for the future.

HARSH RESULTS

The Federal Government—and I shall speak here not of any one party or branch of Government, but the Government as a whole—decided in 1957 to keep the debt limit unrealistically low, to cut back and stretch out budget expenditures, to tighten monetary policy and to reject all efforts at tax reduction. The harsh results of those decisions are still with us.

In the decade previous to July 1957 unemployment had barely exceeded 4 percent. In the 64 months since those decisions, it has remained above 5 percent.

In the earlier decade, business fixed investment averaged nearly 11 percent of total output—it has since that time fallen steadily to roughly 9 percent today.

In the previous decade, our total output of goods and services, measured in constant prices, had increased at the rate of nearly 4 percent a year. Since mid-1957, the rate of increase has been limited to 3 percent.

All three of these decisions were taken in the name of fiscal responsibility. But if that high-sounding label is intended to refer primarily to budget and balance of payments surpluses, it was a name taken in vain.

STRONG ECONOMY

The preceding 11 fiscal years had produced seven cash surpluses in the Federal budget, for a net cash surplus of $20 billion. The succeeding fiscal years produced one surplus and five deficits, including the greatest peacetime deficit of all time in fiscal 1959, for a net cash deficit of $30 billion. Had the economy been operating at full employment, there would have been no deficit at all.

The balance-of-payments problem became a problem only after the mid-1957 decisions, with a total deficit of $11.2 billion during the next three calendar years and a gold loss of more than $5 billion during the same period. The fact that short-term interest rates had been increased 40 percent in 1955 and 1957 did not help to stem the tide. As the OECD said last December:

"Confidence in the dollar depends in good part on a strong domestic economy; it is unlikely to be fostered for any length of time by policies that keep the level of activity low."

Unfortunately, the size of the deficits in our Federal budget and our international accounts led the Government in 1959 to adopt even more restrictive fiscal and monetary policies. The Federal cash budget during the first quarter 1959 was operating at the level of a $17 billion deficit at annual rates. By the third quarter, this had become a $2 billion deficit—and by the second quarter of the next year, 1960, a surplus of $7 billion. These figures are from Arthur Burns, who served my predecessor as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and who calls this "one of the very sharpest shifts of Federal finance in our Nation's history."

At the same time, Dr. Burns pointed out, economic expansion was curbed by a tightening of both short- and long-term credit—long-term rates, in fact, "advanced faster than during a comparable stage of any business cycle during the past hundred years."

The result was another recession, more unemployment, more unused capacity, and another incomplete recovery. Today output is $30 to $40 billion below our productive capacity. The rate of unemployment has risen to 6.1 percent of those actively seeking work. Corporate investment last year was—for the first time in any nonrecession year since the war—below the level of gross retained earnings. And business spending on new plant and equipment was at a lower level than it was in 1957.

SAME DECISIONS

Now, in 1963, the Government is once again faced with these same decisions. I hope we will bear in mind the lessons of history. I hope we will remember the editorial in Business Week magazine, June 28, 1958, which pointed out the effects of an unrealistic debt ceiling and a harmful slash in expenditures:

"In the second half of 1957 the debt ceiling forced the administration to cut back programs needed for long-term national security. And the resulting slash in defense expenditures was an important contributing cause of the recession."

An unrealistic debt ceiling or budget cut today would also cause a slowdown in contracts, a stretchout in payments, a cash drain on business, and ultimately another recession. Instead of balancing the budget, it would produce a budget deficit far greater than the temporary addition to the deficit that will come from tax reduction. Let us remember that the $12.4 billion deficit of fiscal year 1959 was the result of a recession which wiped out what had originally been estimated to be a surplus of $466 million.

REALISTIC CEILING

This administration is not asking for an unlimited debt ceiling, but a realistic one which will still keep the actual debt burden—as measured by its proportion of gross national product—steadily declining.

We are not asking for uncontrolled budget increases, but for a prudent budget which, contrary to the trend at all levels of Government, actually reduces civilian expenditures below their level of the previous year, a feat which has occurred only four times in the last 15 years.

And we are not asking for an unprecedented tax cut, but for a program which will add only $2.7 billion to the next budget deficit. Certainly it is clear that, if we slide into another recession, the deficit without a tax cut will be far larger than the projected deficit we face with a tax cut.

So I am hopeful that the lessons of history will be remembered by us all—by those of us in the administration and the Congress, and those in this audience who are leaders of opinion in the business community.

"The great advantage of Americans," wrote De Tocqueville in 1835, "consists in their being able to commit faults which they may afterward repair." To this I would add the fact that the great advantage of hindsight consists of our applying its lessons by way of foresight. If this Nation can apply the lessons and repair the faults of the last 5 years—if we can stick to the facts and cast out falsehoods and, above all, distinguish clearly between facts and falsehoods—then, surely, this great country can achieve the full fruits of greatness which today remain beyond our reach.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 25, 1963]

The Tax-Cut Opposition

Although a parade of expert witnesses has passed before the Joint Economic Committee and the House Committee on Ways and Means, not one of the opponents of the principle of tax reduction has come up with a rounded and analytical counterargument. Since a vital issue is at stake, this failure to subject the principles of contemporary fiscal policy to serious intellectual scrutiny is indeed regrettable. What are the principal objections to a tax cut? Several loosely connected strands of the opposition's case can be extracted from the testimony of the various witnesses.

Prof. Dan Throop Smith of Harvard University, gave voice to a fear of inflation and balance-of-payments difficulties when he declared that an enlargement of the present fiscal deficit would constitute "a dangerous gamble with the country's currency and basic well-being." But the fear of inflation at this time is hardly well grounded. The trend of wholesale prices has been level or declining slightly since 1959, and with considerable excess capacity in most sectors of economic activity and effective foreign competition, it is not likely that the stimulus of a tax cut will generate inflationary pressures.

Nor can a great deal of weight be attached to the argument that a cut would significantly enlarge the international balance-of-payments deficit through an upsurge of imports. Such a threat could become serious only if a recession, affecting all or most of our oversea partners were to occur. And even in that eventuality, it is probable that the inflow of foreign capital funds would offset the decline of U.S. exports. It is noteworthy on this score that Per Jacobbsen, the respected Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, supports the tax reduction and appropriate monetary measures in order to withstand what he describes as the "deflationary tendencies in the present period."

A second and more sophisticated objection is directed to the proposition that the bulk of the tax relief should go to individuals rather than the corporate enterprises. Most of these critics favor a reduction in the very high personal income-tax brackets, but they would extend the bulk of the tax relief—if any—to corporations on the ground that it will stimulate investment. But this view overlooks the fact that the American economy has been saddled with considerable excess capacity since 1957. The ratio of cash flow—retained profits plus depreciation allowances—to outlays for new plant and equipment has risen in most sectors, and it is therefore doubtful that corporate tax relief alone would provide a significant stimulus to economy activity. Consumers are fickle creatures, but the available evidence seems to indicate that the bulk of any tax reduction would soon be spent. And when pressures are created by a rise in the volume of consumer expenditures, efforts will be made to increase productive capacity through capital investment.

The success of this chain of reactions, of course, hinges on the maintenance of business confidence. But despite a distaste for fiscal deficits and rising Government expenditures, there is little evidence of a serious deterioration in the longrun optimism that has characterized business thinking in the postwar period.

There is also the view that most of the current unemployment is structural and cannot be reduced by a rise in the volume of economic activity. But evidence to support this pessimistic proposition has yet to be produced.

Most of the objections to a tax cut are based upon groundless fears, dubious historical analogies and doubtful hypotheses concerning the determinants of investment. Perhaps a strong case against a tax cut can be made, but thus far the critics have been far from articulate.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Feb. 26, 1963]

Reduction and Reform

The Symposium on Economic Growth conducted by the American Bankers Association Monday, may have regrouped the national consensus gathered behind the drive for tax reduction at this session of Congress. President Kennedy, in his address and in his answers to questions, made it clear that tax reduction at this session of Congress is, in his view, essential to economic growth, even if it can be achieved only by the sacrifice of some individual proposals for tax reform. The economists and bankers who participated in the symposium exhibited differing opinions on the relation between tax policies and growth, on the other means of inducing rapid growth and even on the importance of short-run growth itself but they disclosed an almost unanimous belief that existing rates of taxation on personal incomes and corporate incomes are a drag on the economy.

The symposium has had the most desirable effect of putting the debate on the tax bill back into an intellectual framework and divesting it of many of the political overtones that, in recent weeks, have almost drowned out the essential issue.

The President's forceful statement made its own unique contribution to getting the dialog onto the track again. He had the right answers to all the conventional objections to the tax bill. He was able to put into its proper perspective the debate over the deficit. He made the most convincing argument to persuade every reasonable listener that the choice is not between a large deficit and no deficit but is, on the contrary, between a large deficit and a larger deficit—between the deficit that will exist if taxes are reduced and the greater deficit that will develop if the economy stagnates, growth rate declines, unemployment increases and tax revenues decline.

The President made a double case for lowering the existing tax rates. He made a case that ought to convince those who believe a large deficit is the thing to be avoided and he made a case to convince those who believe in tax reduction for its economic effect. There is a temptation to say that the consensus behind tax reduction never would have been shaken if the administration had not mingled tax reduction and tax reform. If it was damaging to mingle the two purposes, and this newspaper has thought it damaging, that damage now has been largely repaired by the President's emphasis on the growth and antirecession purposes of tax reduction. This, it is clear, is what he believes is essential at this session of Congress. In the end, the President may have been tactically correct to combine both objectives. The exercise has demonstrated that the objections to this course were not purely theoretical or imaginary. There is as little agreement on the need for and the kind of tax reform required as there is general agreement on the need for and the kind of tax reduction needed.

The tax bill, after a perilous few weeks of confusion and disarray among the advocates of tax reduction, can now be put on the road to enactment by separating the reductions in rates from the reforms of structure. The administration made an honest effort to get all of its proposals, but it is clear now that the President will be content to get through the provisions that have to do with the country's ability to cope with its central economic problem of achieving a sustained economic growth.

For a Tax Cut

Your editorial of February 25 admirably disposes of the opposition to tax cuts. I believe we need big tax cuts now. But this does not justify the predisposition of some to regard as obstructionists those who question the proposals now before the Congress. Experience during the New Deal should have taught us that the notion that any kind of action is better than no action led to some erroneous and wasteful programs, and frustrated anything approximating full recovery until the advent of World War II.

I submit that the current tax program needs drastic change. Tax reduction of even $7 or $8 billion in the first year, with the reforms deferred, would do much more good than a complex medley of reductions and reforms spread out over 3 years, with a gross value of $13 billion and a net value of $10 billion.

Whether or not the reforms are deferred, and especially if they are, the distribution of the tax cuts should concentrate much more heavily than proposed by the administration in the middle- and low-income groups. Your editorial properly refers to the large amount of excess capacity since 1957, the high "cash flow" and the effect which a rising volume of consumer expenditure would have upon capital investment. Under current and foreseeable conditions, the excessively large amounts which the current tax proposals allocate to investment stimulus, through corporate tax reduction, and through personal rate reductions for those who have and invest relatively large portions of their income, would be substantially wasted.

But the main defect in the current tax proposals is external rather than internal. Your editorial is entirely correct in rejecting the viewpoint that most of the current unemployment is "structural" (i.e., due to maladjustments in the available labor force). Nonetheless, most of the unemployment can be taken up only by profound changes in the structure of demand, granted that aggregate demand must be increased.

Tax reduction scattered among millions of families will add to their spending for traditional types of products, and may add some to investment in producers' facilities for such products. But the new technology and automation are advancing so rapidly that there is very little chance for much more employment in these more or less conventional areas, even if production and distribution rise considerably.

The automobile industry has been producing recently at a higher rate than in 1955, but with several hundred thousand fewer employees. The changes in the structure of demand required to create 12½ million net additional jobs within a decade call for vast expansion of housing and urban renewal, improvements in mass transportation, enormously enlarged educational and health services and facilities, etc. These all call for combined private and public efforts entirely apart from tax reduction, including large increases in Federal domestic spending.

So when the administration commits itself to a freeze on domestic public spending for several years ahead, as a quid pro quo for a questionable compound of tax reduction, thus doing violence to the valid cry raised over the years by so many, ranging all the way from the Rockefeller reports to J. K. Galbraith, it turns its back on what is essential if our basic needs are to be met, and if the economic growth and employment performance in the years ahead is to average any better than during the past decade.

Leon H. Keyserling.

Washington.

FAIR HOUSING ORDINANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week District Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner indicated that the Board of Commissioners would soon decide whether to issue an order banning housing discrimination in the District of Columbia.

This announcement by Mr. Tobriner is heartening news. The time for action to deal with housing discrimination in Washington is long overdue.

Last September, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights after a 2-day hearing, extensive investigation, and a careful report, unanimously recommended that Washington adopt a fair housing regulation to prohibit racial and religious discrimination. The report received overwhelmingly favorable response from the District of Columbia community.

In November, a group of eminent Washingtonians, the District of Columbia Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, which includes representatives of banking, real estate, industry, the church and civic affairs, urged that the Board of Commissioners issue a fair housing regulation. Since then dozens of organizations and hundreds of individuals have added their voices to the plea for fair housing action in the District of Columbia.

If the citizens of Washington want a fair housing law, why has action been so long in coming? It has been suggested that there was legal doubt about the authority of the Commissioners to act.

However, the Corporation Counsel of the District has advised the Commissioners that they are authorized under their police powers to issue fair housing regulations.

The Corporation Counsel also indicated that as a prerequisite of issuing such regulation, the Commissioners should find as a fact "that any such condition of discrimination results or is likely to result in danger to the lives, limbs, health, comfort, quiet, or property of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia."

This requirement was not an onerous one and on November 30 and December 3, 1962, the District Commissioners held public hearings to determine whether there was a need for regulations to provide for nondiscriminatory use of housing facilities. Citizens were asked to furnish information which would enable the Commissioners to determine whether discriminatory housing practices had given rise to a situation where regulation is necessary "to protect lives, limbs, health, comfort, and quiet of all persons and all property in the District."

Representatives of more than 60 neighborhood, civic, religious, business, and fraternal groups, as well as Government officials and citizens speaking for themselves as individuals, submitted oral or written testimony in the course of the hearings. The overwhelming majority of these witnesses testified to the crucial need for fair housing regulations in our Nation's Capital.

Some of the testimony dramatically underlines the President's recent admonition that in looking at Washington we should direct our gaze beyond the broad boulevards, parks, and public monuments. The Commissioners heard testimony that reveals another Washington, D.C., a city whose residents live in a racially defined ghetto five times more crowded than the area where white residents are free to live. It is a city where the number of infant deaths in the Negro ghetto is five times as great as within the white areas; where reported cases of tuberculosis are two and a half times more numerous; where those with one-half the income of their fellow citizens pay out a much greater percentage of that smaller income for housing—housing which is markedly inferior.

And that other Washington is a city where criminal offenses and juvenile referrals are double the figure for the white areas. As a Negro lawyer who has lived in Washington for 35 years said at the hearings:

> Deprivation means rebelling. Separate areas of residence can create strained relations between different groups of people, but unequal separate areas of residence are potentially dangerous not only to these groups of people themselves but to the very system in which they live.

More than one civic leader testified to the damage to mental health and comfort resulting from segregated housing and the conditions it engenders.

Evidence was cited to support a housing official's statement that—

> Negro communities in the central city slums are developing into a kind of social and economic limbo from which there will be no escape.

Mr. President, if the District Commissioners needed evidence of the fact that housing discrimination endangers the "lives, limbs, health, comfort, quiet or property of the inhabitants of the District of Columbia," they received it in abundant quantity at that hearing. If they wanted proof that discrimination results in racial tensions and violence, they needed to look no further than the causes of the Thanksgiving Day riot at District of Columbia Stadium.

If they desired corroboration of the demoralizing and degrading effects of racial ghettoes, they need only take a walk around our city. In my opinion there is no legal or factual impediment to a regulation prohibiting discrimination in housing.

Washington, sometimes called the first city of the free world, will not be fully free itself as long as those who praise the city and those who condemn it refuse to recognize the harsh realities of its split personality. As long as housing in Washington remains segregated, and many of the resulting problems are blamed on secondary or irrelevant causes, our Nation's Capital will remain a segregated city—one part free metropolis, one part ghetto.

Mr. President, it is time for Washington to join the growing list of cities that have acted to guarantee equal opportunity in housing for all their citizens.

I do not urge the District Commissioners to follow my beliefs in this matter any more than they should follow the beliefs of those opposed to a fair housing order. I only hope that the Commissioners will determine the needs and wishes of the people of the District and then act accordingly.

President Kennedy has said that when racial discrimination persists in Washington:

> It sometimes constitutes a personal affront to the diplomats of sovereign nations and always reflects upon our ability as a Nation to live up to our constitutional ideals. Washington should provide an example of our worthiest profession and best practices, both for the Nation and the world.

If the District Commissioners follow the dictates of their consciences, and act in accordance with the needs and interests of the citizens of Washington, we will take a long step toward that goal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution of the District of Columbia Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. This resolution was approved prior to President Kennedy's Executive order barring discrimination in federally assisted housing and should be read in that light.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution of the District of Columbia Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

We commend the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for its forthright report on housing in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. We support the Commission's findings and recommendations.

We favor the issuing of both a Presidential Executive order requiring equal housing opportunity in governmentally financed or assisted housing and a Board of Commissioners' regulation prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin in the sale, rental or financing of housing accommodations within the District of Columbia. As the Commission has said, the problem of housing discrimination in Washington is metropolitan in scope. The response to this must also be of a metropolitan character. Therefore, action by the President and as well as by the District of Columbia Commission is needed if there is to be a total solution to our housing problems.

We call upon the President and the Board of Commissioners to issue an Executive order and a regulation respectively in regard to housing discrimination, and to put both the Executive order and the regulation into effect at the earliest possible moment.

More than a month has passed since the report of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission was submitted. In this time a number of responsible organizations of the District have spoken out in favor of such a regulation. The overwhelming public demand for action warrants an immediate response.

The fair housing regulation, to be effective, must contain administrative remedies rather than relying solely on criminal penalties. We urge the utilization of an administrative agency with authority to conciliate and mediate and with power to obtain appropriate relief, along the lines suggested by the Commission, if conciliation and mediation fail.

The objective of this committee is to make metropolitan Washington a model area in which our large nonwhite population lives in equality and friendliness with the rest of the community. The proposed order and District of Columbia regulation will go a long way toward that goal.

The District of Columbia Advisory Committee to the Commission on Civil Rights: Dr. Duncan Howlett, Chairman, Minister of All Souls Church; The Reverend E. Franklin Jackson, Vice Chairman, President of District of Columbia Chapter of National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; James M. Lambie, Jr., Secretary, Assistant Executive Director of CARE, Inc.; Paul R. Dean, Dean of Georgetown University School of Law; Patricia R. Harris, Associate Dean of Students, Howard University; George E. C. Hayes, Attorney at Law; Frank J. Luchs,[1] Executive Vice President, Shannon & Luchs Co.; Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., Attorney at Law; Ben D. Segal, Director of Education, International Union of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO; Sterling Tucker, Executive Director, Washington Urban League, Inc.; Henry Kellog Willard II, Banker-Treasurer, American Security & Trust Co.; J. Hillman Zahn, Vice President, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Washington.

---

[1] Mr. Frank Luchs made the following separate statement: "While I agree in principle with the resolution of the committee I am satisfied that a fair housing regulation should be issued by the District of Columbia Commissioners simultaneously with, or subsequent to, the issuance of a Presidential Executive order, or not at all."

USE OF SENATE AUDITORIUM TO SHOW CERTAIN DOCUMENTARY FILMS AND SO FORTH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for some time I have been concerned with the need for the American public to gain a greater understanding of the role Congress plays in the American system of government.

The average American citizen is primarily concerned with events of his personal life. He has little opportunity to become familiar with other considerations such as the operations of Congress which are, to him, highly marginal in importance. This situation is natural, proper, and to be expected.

But ultimately the strength of our democratic system is dependent to some extent on the appreciation and understanding the average citizen has of the machinery of democracy. Congress surely is a vital cog in that machinery.

Each year millions of Americans travel to Washington, D.C., to observe the Federal Government in operation and to view the more picturesque sections of this city. Most visitors include a trip to Capitol Hill as part of their Washington excursion. The guides stationed in the Capitol rotunda perform a valuable service by providing an interesting and enlightening tour of the Capitol itself. The emphasis of this tour rests with the architectural and historical aspects of Congress and the Capitol. Many Senators find time in their busy schedules to meet their constituents and explain the workings of Congress for them.

As an ex-teacher and a practicing politician, I know the value of direct exposure in awakening a person's interest in any subject—even Congress. It is our responsibility to provide the most meaningful and complete explanation possible of the workings of Congress for every visitor to Capitol Hill.

In order to introduce our constituents to the operations of Congress in a more effective manner, I propose that the Senate auditorium, room G–308 in the New Senate Office Building, be used to show documentary films on a regular, free-of-charge basis. These films would concentrate on describing the role and operations of Congress.

As my colleagues know, the Senate auditorium is not used frequently. Most of the time it sits locked and vacant. I am willing to wager that many Members of Congress have never had occasion even to see the room. However, it is a fine auditorium with excellent acoustics, seats, lighting and it is highly suitable for motion pictures. There are available several excellent movies outlining the work of Congress. I specifically know of one such series containing eight 30-minute films produced by the National Educational Television and Radio Center and titled "From Capitol Hill: Party Government and the U.S. Congress." Contained in this series are such films as "The Role of Congress," "The Senate and House of Representatives," "Congress and the President," and "Congress as a Means of Democratic Government: A Summary."

My proposal is very simple. On a regular schedule provide screenings of one or more of these documentary, nonpartisan films on the workings of Congress. The movies would be shown on a free-of-charge basis. Each Senate and House office would receive a schedule of times when the films would be run, and constituents would attend at a convenient time. If the auditorium were needed for official Senate business, the films would be suspended for that period of time, or held in another location.

I also suggest the U.S. Capitol Historical Society as the ideal body to assume the sponsorship of this service. The U.S. Capitol Historical Society is dedicated to public enlightenment as to the importance of Congress in American Government, both in historic and contemporary sense. As a vice president of the society, I know it is absolutely nonpartisan in its activities, and therefore could serve as the ideal body to select the films to be shown. I intend to pass this suggestion along to Representative Fred Schwengel, president of the society, and a Member of Congress vitally concerned with the importance of instilling in every American citizen a basic understanding of and appreciation for our democratic system of Government. I am indeed hopeful that the U.S. Capitol Historical Society will be able to assume the responsibility for this project.

Eventually a movie written specifically for the job of introducing visitors to Congress could be produced. As many Senators know, visitors to Williamsburg are treated to an outstanding color film on the American revolution that vividly brings to life their later tour of this historic American shrine. A similar film outlining both the history and contemporary activities of Congress would greatly assist in informing American citizens—and foreign visitors as well—about the activities of the legislative branch of Government.

Perhaps the U.S. Capitol Historical Society would also assume this longer range project. As a vice president of this society, I know that such a film is under active consideration once the new guide book on the Capitol has been published. Perhaps the society could collaborate with an outside group such as the National Education and Television and Radio Center in producing this special introductory film on Congress.

Mr. President, in order to implement this proposal I am forwarding my ideas to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Rules and Administration Committee, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], who is now in the Chamber. The need for such a program of public education is obvious. The means for accomplishing this objective appear to be at hand. I sincerely hope prompt action will be possible on this proposal.

NUCLEAR SUBMARINE CONSTRUCTION AWARDS ON COMPETITIVE BASIS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, last month Mr. Armond G. Satalino of Eliot, Maine, wrote me a very interesting letter in which he charged first, that the award of nuclear ballistic missile submarine building contracts was under the influence of politics; second, that the Kittery Naval Shipyard was not "getting it;" third, that the Electric Boat Co., of Groton, Conn., was getting "all, or at least a goodly number, of Polaris submarine construction contracts"; fourth, that private shipyards were getting too many construction awards; and fifth, that the Senators and Congressmen from New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Maine should join together to do something about the situation.

Upon receiving his letter, I had copies of it made and wrote President Kennedy, Secretary of Defense McNamara, and Secretary of the Navy Korth asking them for reports on the issues Mr. Satalino raised in his letter, a copy which I enclosed in my request to them.

I did so because I had observed in my reply to Mr. Satalino:

> I have no evidence that politics controls the award of submarine construction contracts, although I must confess that it was only last year that I was the victim of partisan politics when the Kennedy administration refused to give me information on the award of the nuclear submarine to the Kittery Naval Shipyard. You may recall that I requested such information both before and after the Kennedy administration gave it to Democratic Senator Muskie but that the Kennedy administration refused to give me the information that it had given Senator Muskie. You may recall my protest against such "two bit" politics and the several editorials in the Portland papers condemning me for making such a protest.
>
> In view of your point about politics controlling the construction awards, I have had copies made of your letter and have sent the copies to President Kennedy, Secretary of Defense McNamara, and Secretary of the Navy Korth, asking them for reports on the matter since it is they, not I, who control the selection of the construction awards and they are of the opposite political party.

Since Mr. Satalino raised the issue of alleged political influence, I further observed to him:

> In that connection, I would point out that Massachusetts holds more political power on this matter about which you write in that not only is the President of the United States from Massachusetts but so is the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Representative John W. McCormack, and the junior Senator from Massachusetts is the brother of the President.
>
> You may have noted recently in the Portsmouth papers that Senator Cotton and I joined in an appeal to President Kennedy and Speaker McCormack to keep their 1960 campaign promises made 2½ years ago to order pay equalization for the Kittery Naval Shipyard workers.

I asked Mr. Satalino to give me any specific evidence that he had in support of his charge that the submarine awards were made on the basis of politics. I made that request to him in my letter of February 8, 1963. He has not responded to my letter and my request.

On behalf of the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Navy, my letters to them were answered by Assistant Secretary of the Navy Kenneth E. BeLieu by letter dated February 20, 1963, and a copy of which I sent to Mr. Satalino on February 21, 1963, the day I received the BeLieu letter.

In his letter, Secretary BeLieu stated that—

> 1. The submarine construction awards were not made on the basis of politics but rather on a competitive basis;
> 2. The Electric Boat Co. had won its construction awards on a competitive basis; and
> 3. In the past 5 calendar years, employment at the Kittery-Portsmouth Naval Shipyard increased by more than 2,100, while total employment at all of our naval shipyards, including Kittery-Portsmouth, decreased by approximately 800.

Because this is a matter of interest to the three States of Maine, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of Secretary BeLieu be placed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of the Navy,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1963.

Hon. Margaret Chase Smith,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Senator: In your letters of February 8, 1963, to the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Navy you requested information with respect to questions raised by Mr. Arnold G. Satalino, of Eliot, Maine. In a letter to you, Mr. Satalino indicated that politics influence the award or assignment of Polaris submarine construction projects, and asked why "all, or at least a goodly number, of Polaris submarine construction contracts seem to go to Electric Boat Co., in Groton, Conn."

As you probably know, the private shipbuilding industry for many years has been suffering from a scarcity of commercial shipwork. It has been the Navy's practice to award the major part of its new ship construction projects to private yards in keeping with their experience and capabilities. Although allocation of ship construction projects has been necessary in order to meet the urgent requirements of the Polaris submarine program, and to broaden the competitive base, this work usually is awarded on a competitive basis. It is not surprising that the Electric Boat Division, General Dynamics Corp., of Groton, Conn., should have been successful in obtaining a large portion of the Navy's submarine construction work, in view of the firm's long experience in submarine construction. I would like to assure you that factors such as the foregoing, rather than political conditions, influence our decisions as to who receives ship construction projects.

The Navy is fully aware of the excellent capabilities of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, mentioned by Mr. Satalino, for Polaris submarine construction. This is evidenced by the substantial workload now underway there, which includes construction of the auxiliary submarine *Dolphin* (AGSS–555), nuclear submarine *Jack* (SSN–605), and Polaris submarines *John Adams* (SSBN–620), and *Nathanael Greene* (SSBN–636). Portsmouth is also converting the *Albacore* (AGSS–569), and has been assigned construction of the as yet unnamed SSN–646. Also, it should be reassuring to know that in the past 5 calendar years employment at Portsmouth increased by more than 2,100, while total employment at all of our naval shipyards, including Portsmouth, decreased by approximately 800.

I assure you that the Navy will continue to give earnest and thorough consideration to the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in the assignment of naval shipwork.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth E. BeLieu,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy
(Installations and Logistics).

IMPACT OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Peace Corps has had a tremendous impact upon the free world and especially those nations that have received volunteers. But the impact of those volunteers has not yet had its full affect upon the United States. This will come when these Peace Corps members begin to return to this country and to establish themselves in new careers. By the very nature of the Peace Corps many volunteers have been teaching in many areas of the globe and will undoubtedly consider teaching careers when they return.

A very interesting article regarding the impact of the Peace Corps on the American educational scene was written by its director, Sargent Shriver, in the March issue of the National Educational Association Journal. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

When Peace Corps Teachers Return

(By Sargent Shriver, Director, Peace Corps)

This summer, almost 500 Americans who have been teaching overseas with the Peace Corps for 2 years will return to the United States. Will many of these Peace Corps volunteers pursue teaching careers here at home? How will their experience affect their attitude toward teachers and the teaching profession? What influence will these returned Peace Corps volunteers and those that will follow them exert on American education?

These are questions I'm frequently asked by American educators. They want to know the results of sending experienced teachers and college graduates (many without professional preparation) to teach in developing nations. The answers are beginning to emerge.

Education dominates Peace Corps work. Almost two-thirds of the more than 5,000 volunteers now serving are working in this field. Since the Peace Corps acts in response to requests from developing nations, we feel this indicates the significance these countries attach to advancing their education programs.

Some volunteers, we find, arrive at important insights about teaching and learning. Carol Byrnes, age 25, a Peace Corps teachers' aid in the Philippines from Duquesne, Pa., says:

"Our rewards in a project like this come from the satisfaction in seeing a child's face light up when he has learned to pronounce a new word properly. We have had to learn, and must continue to learn, how to be sustained by this kind of gratification.

"Only time and the future will tell if our efforts in the Philippines have been successful. Many of us have had to grow up and mature to the point of doing a job where we sometimes can see no material results of our efforts."

Another of our volunteers who is serving in the Philippines is David Szanton, 24, a native New Yorker. Here is how he describes his life as a teacher for the Peace Corps:

"Another fellow and I have a house of our own in the town of Numancia in the Province of Aklan.

"It is constructed mostly of bamboo and nipa palm, and has a living room, kitchen, pantry, and bath. The floors are split bamboo, and the house in general is quite airy, light, and comfortable. As far as I'm concerned, all this talk about the great discomforts the volunteers are putting up with is just so much hogwash.

"Most of our waking hours are spent one way or another working in or through the schools. The Bureau of Public Schools requested that we work largely in the fields of second language (English) teaching and science.

"Like most of the other volunteers, I've spent most of my time working with the teachers. I help them develop their lesson plans, teach them the general science they are to teach their classes, show them how to do science demonstrations, and pass along second-language teaching techniques we learned at Penn State and the training center here.

"When the new school year begins in June, I am going to stop spending so much time with the teachers and put in several hours a week working on remedial English with a small group of the slower students and on advanced science programs with about a dozen of the brighter kids who are more likely to go on to high school.

"Here you are given a position of leadership and great respect within a community. Quite clearly, there are already indications that these 2 years in the Philippines will be one of the most valuable and educational experiences of my life."

We feel, as does Szanton, that the time spent in the Peace Corps is an educational experience. For instance, Newell Flather, a volunteer teacher in Winneba, Ghana, got a chance to change the curriculum—an opportunity that would rarely come to a teacher in the United States. As Flather tells it:

"I consider my supreme achievement of the term to be the reorientation of the school's history program from British to West African. This job was left entirely up to me, and it involved a good deal of reading and study in order to find the right books for the students and the right syllabus for the teacher."

Flather, like other volunteers, assumes many additional responsibilities. He teaches English to the upper forms, is a form master, an entertainment master, and a debating union master.

Flather's latest project has been to help enlarge the school library, which had only 30 books when he arrived. Flather wrote his brother, his church, his high school, and various social groups in Massachusetts. The first 1,000 books arrived recently, and more are on their way.

Roger Hamilton, of Arlington, Va., who taught in Halfassini, Ghana, feels that many of the returning volunteers who have been teaching will want to teach in the United States but that those whose only teaching experience has been in the Peace Corps may be discouraged by the problems of certification.

The returning volunteers are going to be eager to get into their careers as fast as possible. Some, but not all, may have the patience or motivation to complete certification requirements for teaching. Responsibility falls on all of us to encourage these young people to stay in teaching.

According to Hamilton, "The volunteers are interested in getting into meaningful teaching situations quickly because they have been doing this overseas."

I am happy to say that some leading educators agree with Hamilton about the value of the teaching experience gained overseas by Peace Corps volunteers with bachelor's degrees.

Dean John Monro, of Harvard College, says, "Two years in the Peace Corps today can be as significant as a Rhodes scholarship."

George Makechnie, dean of Boston University's Sargent College, says: "I encourage my students to think of Peace Corps service. The Peace Corps will have a general salutary effect on education in this country."

Recognizing the value of the Peace Corps experience overseas and the possibility that many of the returning volunteers may want to teach in the United States, some State boards of education are studying ways in which volunteers may receive recognition for their oversea teaching experience and how to help them meet certification requirements on their return.

One specific example is California, where Carl Larson, head of teacher certification for the California State Board of Education, feels that with their special preparation and experience the Peace Corps teachers normally can come back and directly start teaching in California.

"If the volunteers have been teaching satisfactorily in organized schools, and we can verify the fact, we will count the oversea teaching in lieu of the required student teaching," he says.

Dr. Larson adds that appropriate credit given by universities for the volunteers' training program would be accepted by the State as credit toward the number of education hours required for a teaching certificate.

We are very appreciative at the Peace Corps for the invaluable cooperation given us by schools and colleges throughout the country and by the American Association of School Administrators. For instance, school systems around the Nation are granting 2-year leaves of absence to teachers who join the Peace Corps. New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Kansas City, Los Angeles, and Denver are a few of the major cities that have granted leaves, and scores of smaller school systems have taken similar action.

Georgetown University has set up graduate and undergraduate scholarships and Michigan State University has set up graduate assistantships for returning volunteers. Ohio University will award educational credits for teaching done overseas in teaching projects in the West Cameroons, sponsored by the Peace Corps and administered by the university, for those who are working toward teacher certification in Ohio. It will also give some credit for correspondence courses completed by the volunteers during their Peace Corps assignment.

Plans are underway at the University of Pittsburgh; New Mexico State University; and the State University College of Education at New Paltz, New York, to give similar credit. Like plans are under consideration at Syracuse University.

Even the volunteers who will not go into teaching on their return will, I feel, bring back with them greater understanding of the worth of a good system of education. For example, Jack Magri, who is teaching in Mogadiscio, Somalia, says:

"One thing is certain about my experience here. I'll return to the United States with a greater appreciation for our teachers and the teaching profession.

"While we are students, teachers are taken for granted. After we finish school, they are often forgotten. You can be sure I won't forget them now—I realize what an important contribution they are making."

Opportunities for teachers are now available in several projects, training for which is slated to begin in the spring or summer. The new projects are in Malaya, North Borneo/Sarawak, Thailand, Barbados, Ethiopia, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Philippines, Ghana, Nigeria, Nyasaland, Colombia, and Indonesia.

PROGRESS IN MISSOURI

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, we are very proud in Missouri of the progress that has been made in recognition of individual merit regardless of race, creed, or color. In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from one of the outstanding Negro newspapers of the Nation, the Kansas City Call, from its issue of March 1, 1963, entitled "Integration in Our Schools."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEGRATION IN OUR SCHOOLS

Schools in the area are giving evidence that they are becoming truly integrated. Students are being rated and judged according to their individual merit rather than being limited because of their race, creed, or color as in days of yesteryear.

Two cases in point will illustrate the change in attitude in our schools.

The University of Kansas City, which a little more than a decade ago did not even admit Negroes as students, last Sunday sent a team of four top students to New York to compete in the nationwide television program, "College Bowl."

One of the four—and the captain—is Elbert Hayes, Jr., a Negro. The KCU team won and will return to the program next Sunday in New York. Hayes and his teammates proved themselves well informed on a variety of subjects, including literature, philosophy, science and history. They were just four boys pulling for their school.

At the William Chrisman High School in Independence, Mo., a Negro girl recently was chosen as the Valentine Queen of the school. She was crowned at a sweetheart dance attended by members of the basketball team, their dates, and other students.

Not so many years ago, Chrisman High had an all-white student body with Negro students of Independence going to a separate (but not equal) school. Now all of that is changed, thanks to the U.S. Supreme Court. At long last, our students are being measured according to their individual ability and worth with the color of their skin being merely incidental.

DUCK HUNTING IN MEXICO

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on March 4 I inserted in the RECORD a short account from the Washington Star of a hunting trip in which General Eisenhower participated in Mexico last month.

I have received a letter from Mr. Charles S. Jones of Los Angeles, Calif., who was a member of the hunting party with General Eisenhower. Mr. Jones points out that the newspaper account of the birds killed was in error. In order that the facts about the incident be available to Members of Congress and the public, I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *March 8, 1963.*

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: I have just read your remarks published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 4, 1963, page 3477, regarding General Eisenhower's participation in a hunting party at Culiacan, Mexico, on Saturday, February 23, 1963.

Inasmuch as you could not have been aware of the gross inaccuracy of the news story which you placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I feel sure you would like to have the facts in the matter.

The facts, Senator FULBRIGHT, are these:

If the newspaper article had said that "The Eisenhower Party Shoots 75 Birds," instead of "Eisenhower Shoots 75 Birds," it would have been a more nearly correct headline. Actually, the total number of birds was 60.

Including my own, there were six guns in a party of about 20 people, both Mexican and United States citizens. While General Eisenhower is an excellent shot, he did not take his limit of 20 birds, and the shooting party finished the day with half of a legal Mexican limit.

The laws of the Republic of Mexico, and I enclose them for your convenience, permit a hunter to shoot 20 birds on Saturdays and Sundays, and 10 birds on week days. I refer you to the first two items on page 3 of the enclosed Caza Temporado 1962–63 published by the Mexican Government, and for your convenience, the translation of these two items follow:

"SECTION OF BIRDS

"*Species and open hunting season and authorized game limit*

"Duck family—Migratory ducks throughout the Republic: From November 1 to February 28, 10-bag limit per day or in possession from Monday through Friday, and 20-bag limit Saturday and Sunday.

"Ducks, nonmigratory, of the gulf and Pacific coasts of Mexico: From December 1 to March 31, 10-bag limit per day or in possession from Monday through Friday, 20-bag limit Saturday and Sunday."

I call your attention to the fact that the Mexican people have a duck of their own which their law describes as "resident duck," and which is not migratory, and these ducks, for the most part, made up the hunting party's bag. There were very few migratory ducks in the area, and, so far as I know, the mallard does not migrate so far south.

The Eisenhower party went to Mexico as guests of the Mexican Government and were entertained in Culiacan by as fine a group of people as one can meet anywhere in the world.

You will be interested to know that over 2,500 Mexican people came to the airport hoping to see and pay their respects to General Eisenhower. Thus, his visit to Mexico had a real significance in furthering the relationship of the two countries. Wherever he turned high praise was expressed for his participation in the people-to-people movement.

Since you deemed this news story important enough to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I feel sure you will appreciate these facts and that you would be the first to want to correct the RECORD.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES S. JONES.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am particularly grateful to the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for placing in the RECORD the letter he has received from Mr. Charles Jones, of Los Angeles. His letter sets forth the facts and clearly demonstrates the regrettable error of the newspaper account of General Eisenhower's pleasure trip into Mexico.

I need hardly add that all his life General Eisenhower has been dedicated to conservation and conservation practices. I deprecate exceedingly the inaccuracy of the news story.

IN COMMEMORATION OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Taras Shevchenko, the national poet of the Ukraine, is a relatively unknown literary figure in the West, but he ranks among the greatest of the Slavic poets—on the level of Pushkin, in the view of some critics. The fact that he wrote almost all of his poetry in the Ukrainian language is at once the reason for his

obscurity and one of the chief contributions for which he is remembered today. For he was the first modern writer who was purely and thoroughly Ukrainian, and he gave much impetus to the development of a native Ukrainian language and literature. His poems were intensely patriotic, expressing the trials and the aspirations of the Ukrainian people throughout their history.

Shevchenko's life itself was filled with suffering. At the age of 24 he was released from serfdom, but 9 years later Czar Nicholas I, had him arrested because of his liberal, democratic ideas. He was condemned to serve as a common soldier in a remote area of eastern Russia, far from his beloved Ukraine. Even after his release 10 years later, Shevchenko never again enjoyed complete personal freedom, and he died one day after his 47th birthday—in the same year that saw the emancipation of the serfs by Czar Alexander II, of Russia.

At one point during his imprisonment Shevchenko wrote these despairing lines:

> I shall not leave the slightest trace
> Upon our glorious Ukraine,
> Our land, but not as ours known.

Time has disproven this prophecy, for his life and writings have played a great role in shaping the Ukrainian national spirit and culture. The ideals to which Shevchenko stubbornly clung—national self-determination and democratic rule—remain a guiding light today for Ukrainians and other oppressed nationalities of Eastern Europe.

ST. LOUIS, RIVER TOWN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the importance of water transportation to the city of St. Louis, the entire State of Missouri, and, indeed, all of the surrounding area that is served by boats and barges plying the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, is laid out most graphically in a St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial entitled "St. Louis, River Town," published February 25.

St. Louis is a river town today, just as it has been from its beginning. Lying as it does on the mighty Mississippi River and near the confluence of the Missouri River, St. Louis is a natural transshipment center for goods and wares destined for areas that lie at all points of the compass from her.

It is for this reason that St. Louis has long been known as the gateway to the West. That will be the central theme of the St. Louis bicentennial, which the city will celebrate in 1964 and 1965, as well as the inspiring gateway arch in the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial on the riverfront.

While the riverfront today may not be as colorful as it was around the turn of the century when steamboats lined the riverfront for 20 blocks, its volume of traffic has multiplied many times. Today, one tug moves a string of barges that carry more freight than the combined capacity of all that 20 blocks of steamboats. The importance of St. Louis as a river port has increased many fold.

The Post-Dispatch article sounds a call to protect, use and expand this great port. That point is well taken—and well supported by the facts recited in the article, which I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LOUIS, RIVER TOWN

A million and a half tons of petroleum products annually go out of the greater St. Louis industrial complex by water. A quarter of a million tons of iron ore mined in Peru and Venezuela come upriver by barge from New Orleans, along with 165,000 tons of scrap iron from Minneapolis, for the steel mills; and 440,000 tons of finished steel and tinplate move in and out. Of the $200 million worth of grain moving out, a large and increasing part goes by way of the Mississippi River, much of it to be reloaded into oceangoing vessels for export to Holland, Germany, France, England, Japan, India, and Latin American countries. Ten million tons of coal move out, nearly half of it by water.

These figures indicate only part of what it means to St. Louis that it is a major center of the Nation for water as well as for rail, truck, pipeline and air transportation of freight. Water transport is a major mainstay of heavy industries here. Its low cost strengthens their competitive position and enlarges their market area—in coal, for example, 42 percent of the delivered cost nationally consists of transportation charges.

What the river means to St. Louis is presently a matter of more than usual concern because of proposals by the Kennedy administration to deregulate most of the traffic of the railroads, which would enable them to cut rates to destructively low levels and possibly drive their competitors from the inland waterways.

So it is a pertinent time to take stock of what low-cost water-freight transportation means to the industrial life and development of our area as part of an integrated transport system.

Many of us whose lives are directly affected by it are little if any aware of the teeming traffic of our waterfront—the quantities of superphosphate barged in from Florida, sulphur from Texas and Louisiana, fluorspar from Mexico, refined sugar from Louisiana, raw sugar from Mexico and the Philippines, barbed wire from Japan, semifinished steel from Belgium, Japan and Germany; the large and growing traffic outbound in chemicals, one of our major industries; the tinplate for our can factories, another principal enterprise.

St. Louis is headquarters of two of the largest common carrier barge lines in the country, Mississippi Valley and Federal, each carrying freight over some 4,000 miles of waterways—with regular service to Minneapolis, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Omaha, New Orleans, Chattanooga, Mobile, Birmingham, Fort Myers, Brownsville, and other ports. Here is situated the largest builder of towboats in the United States, the St. Louis Shipbuilding & Steel Co.

Water transport has not only provided low-cost freight hauling on its own account but has also through its competition been the most effective single means of obtaining favorable freight rates. It is credited with reducing rail rates on coal from St. Louis by some 25 percent. It has been a large factor in the success of the Granite City Steel Co., now the 14th largest steel producer in the Nation, enabling it to compete as far away as Baton Rouge with steel mills at Birmingham, several hundred miles closer to the market—and bringing down rail rates on the haul by nearly a third.

The asset of low-cost water transportation affects our future as vitally as it has affected our present, if not more so. This is best demonstrated in coal and steel.

Southern Illinois, across the river from St. Louis, contains what is said to be the largest known deposit of low-cost steam coal east of the Rocky Mountains. Until fairly recent years the railroads enjoyed a virtual monopoly on coal haulage and transportation costs were high. Many mines in the area were forced to close. Coal mining was almost defunct when water transport revived a measure of activity. Today an estimated 65 percent of the coal mined there goes out by water.

But the area looks to still further waterway development to realize the potentials of its coal resources by means of the proposed Kaskaskia River and Big Muddy Creek navigation channels and associated projects.

This development would be linked with the large iron ore deposit discovered in recent years 70 miles southwest of St. Louis at Pea Ridge, near Sullivan, which the St. Joseph Lead Co. and the Bethlehem Steel Corp. are jointly preparing to develop.

The proximity of these deposits to enormous coal reserves for use in manufacture into steel creates a remarkably rich opportunity for both eastern Missouri and southern Illinois to reap an industrial development which could be very large indeed—and its realization depends on low-cost water transportation.

St. Louis is not only a river town, it is a two-river town.

It was founded because it was on the Mississippi and near the Missouri.

Because it was a river town, it became the Gateway to the West, as our magnificent arch in the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial on the riverfront will signify.

It thrived until around the turn of the century on the river trade.

But though St. Louis may have lost some consciousness of the linkage of its destiny with the Meeting of Waters, celebrated in Carl Milles'-memorable statuary, the link has continued and has become more important to us than ever before.

A single towboat now pushes barges containing more cargo than could have been carried by all the steamboats that once lined our waterfront for 20 blocks.

St. Louis and the industrial complex around it in two States reap an indispensable advantage from the Mississippi, mightier today than ever. It is essential to our future progress to protect that advantage from impairment, and to utilize and extend it.

MAYOR WAGNER'S COMMITTEE ON JOB ADVANCEMENT FOR MINORITY GROUPS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, last year Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York City, set up a unique program to open thousands of jobs in executive, professional, and skilled classifications to New York City's Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and other minority groups. The program was initiated in August through the formation of the mayor's committee on job advancement.

Recently the committee made its preliminary report. The study points out that the portrait of America as presented through national advertising media is inadvertently distorted by the exclusion of Negroes, Puerto Ricans and other minority groups from advertising layouts. Such distortion creates a serious impediment to job advancement since minority group members, confronted with an image of life in which only certain majority group whites are successful, lose the ambition to acquire the skills necessary for advancement in employment. The committee winds up its report with some practical suggestions for improving the situation.

I commend and congratulate the mayor's committee for pursuing a much neglected aspect of the problem of job discrimination. I think Mayor Wagner's program is worthy of nationwide support and adoption.

I ask unanimous consent that a release dated February 21, 1963, reviewing the committee's report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Mayor Robert F. Wagner's committee on job advancement submitted today (Thursday) to Mayor Wagner its preliminary findings of a study into the portrayal in television shows, TV commercials and other mass media advertising of Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and members of other minority groups as part of the everyday life of America.
>
> The committee, headed by Theodore W. Kheel and James J. McFadden, reported that its study to date confirms its original observation that a general absence of such portrayal in national advertising has resulted in a distorted image of the United States.
>
> The committee reported also that it had found encouraging signs that the situation can be improved. An analysis of replies to a letter sent on December 6 by Mr. Kheel and Acting Labor Commissioner McFadden to 106 of the Nation's major industrial, business, and advertising companies with headquarters in New York City showed widespread support in principle for the committee's goal of integrating the minority groups into the advertising image of America at work, at play, and as consumers.
>
> Several executives of large concerns replied that they would restudy their positions and seek to remedy the situation.
>
> The report cited as an example of excellent cooperation the action of a major air line which reviewed and discussed the committee's suggestions and then approved an advertising layout in which Negro figures are readily identifiable. The committee called this especially significant since its own survey of all issues of four leading national magazines of general circulation had showed only two instances during 1962 of use of Negro models in major advertisements.
>
> Other recent instances of enlightened action by advertisers included regular employment of a Negro girl model on a daily television network show, and the showing in a general circulation magazine of a well-known Negro entertainer endorsing a popular beverage.
>
> While citing several favorable signs, the committee stated that general correction of the situation would be neither quick nor easy. It said one of the problems was the expressed belief of some manufacturers that an advertising layout representative of, and acceptable to, consumers in some parts of the country might not be acceptable in areas with a different population constituency and might result in lowered sales. The report suggested that satisfactory sales results by the pioneers in the desired forms of advertising could be used to persuade hesitant advertisers of their efficacy.
>
> The committee said it would hold meetings, industry by industry, with national business and industry groups in an effort to resolve specific problems. It will also conduct informational and educational campaigns.
>
> Another area in which the committee reported good chances for a favorable breakthrough was in the relation between advertisers and their advertising agencies. There was a tendency among several of the advertising agencies to whom the letter was sent to disclaim responsibility. These agencies replied, in effect, that they acted only on instructions of their clients and had no voice in policy.
>
> The report pointed out, however, that several large advertisers, including clients of agencies that had disclaimed public responsibility, said they customarily left such matters to the advertising agencies. The results of their promise to explore with their agencies all the implications of portraying Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and representatives of other minorities as part of the American scene will be watched, the committee said.
>
> The committee on job advancement has declared that the general exclusion, whether by design or inadvertently, of Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and other minority groups from television commercials and other mass advertising media has created a serious impediment to their job advancement. It maintains that such exclusion stultifies the ambition of many members of these groups to train themselves for jobs throughout business and industry in which most current advertising appears to suggest that there is no place for them.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THOMAS G. MASARYK, 1850–1937

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in honor of Thomas G. Masaryk, the great Czech statesman who was born 113 years ago last week.

Thomas Masaryk was a rare combination of liberal philosopher and man of action. As a political leader and statesman he put into practice the ideas which he had earlier developed as a writer, teacher, and editor. In this respect and in many others he resembled one of our own very greatest Presidents—President Woodrow Wilson.

Masaryk's ideas were first translated into political reality in 1900, when his followers established the so-called Realist Party, the program of which was based on the principles set forth in Masaryk's early writings. In 1902 he gave the first series of Crane lectures at the University of Chicago, thus emphasizing the bond that has always existed between Americans and those Europeans who have struggled for national and cultural independence. Reelected to Parliament in 1907 as a candidate of the Realist Party, Masaryk launched a series of critical investigations of corruption in the Dual Monarchy which ruled Austria-Hungary. These sensational attacks on the Hapsburgs naturally made him unpopular in imperial Vienna, but they earned him a reputation abroad as a courageous champion of public morality and honest diplomacy.

Early in World War I he escaped from Austria and conducted a political and propagandist campaign abroad on behalf of Czechoslovak independence. In 1916 a central revolutionary committee—the Czechoslovak National Council—was formed with Masaryk as its president. During the remainder of the war he worked in England, Russia, and the United States for the cause of Czechoslovak independence. His efforts culminated in 1918 when the United States and the Allied Powers recognized his national council as the de facto government of the future Czechoslovak state. That same year he was elected president of the new Czechoslovak Republic and was reelected in 1927 and 1934. On Masaryk's resignation in 1935, Eduard Benes was chosen by the people to carry on the Masaryk tradition. Two years later Thomas Masaryk was dead, mourned by the nation he had created.

The tragic events of World War II and the postwar period have destroyed the liberal democracy which Masaryk brought to life in Czechoslovakia. But the alien Communist rule has eliminated only the external political reality; it is unable to break the Czechoslovak people's inner spirit of freedom and democracy, which Masaryk's life and works personified. That is the enduring heritage of this great philosopher-statesman.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE ROBERT A. LINN

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Robert A. Linn, managing editor of the Cincinnati Post-Times Star, died Monday morning, March 11, 1963. He was 58. He had been managing editor of the Post-Times Star since 1945. He had undergone surgery 2 weeks ago.

Prior to becoming managing editor of the Cincinnati Post-Times Star, he was first makeup editor and city editor. He was well known throughout the Middle West as one of the most congenial of persons and most efficient and accomplished as an editor.

He is a native of Wheeling, W. Va. His first newspaper job was with the Wheeling News. He went from there to the Akron Times-Press and to the Cincinnati Post in 1938.

Until his final illness which was hepatitis, he was rarely out of touch with the operation of his paper. Although he was from West Virginia, he has many friends in Brown and Adams Counties in southeastern Ohio where most of his family still lives.

He is survived by his wife, Rita, whom he married in Akron in 1931, and three children, Robert A., Jr., of Detroit; James W. of Los Angeles, and Miss Mary Linn, who lives at home.

The funeral services are being held today—Thursday—in Cincinnati.

This man's dedication to his newspaper work was second only to that of his children and his family. I mention this because these children are all grown and well educated and he saw them through.

His operation for hepatitis was 2 weeks ago, he was expected to recover and on the road to recovery when an unexpected turn took his life.

MANAGEMENT OF NEWS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a few days ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some questions which the U.S. News & World Report had proposed to ask of me. They had called to say they were asking a series of questions of a

number of Senators and would like to put the questions to me. I, in turn, requested the questions to be put in writing, and when I saw them I was convinced they were "loaded" questions. I ask unanimous consent that the questions given to me by U.S. News & World Report be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Subsequently, both U.S. News & World Report and some Members of the other body protested that the questions were not loaded and those of us who thought they were were being misled.

But now in the March 18 issue of U.S. News & World Report there is an article called, "Why Congress Doesn't Give J.F.K. What He Wants." On the right-hand column of the two-page spread, sure enough U.S. News gives the answers to their loaded questions.

Mr. President, one merely need read this box and compare what U.S. News & World Report says is the opinion of Congressmen with the loaded questions they asked, to see quite clearly that the purpose of their questions was largely to denigrate the President and his program. I ask unanimous consent that this box, entitled "As Congressmen Size Up Kennedy's Problems," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks and be compared with the original list of questions.

There has been a great deal of talk about managed news. I think, without question, here is an example of managed news on the part of one member of the news media.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> 1. Why is President Kennedy, as a Democrat, able to exert so little influence over a House and Senate that have majorities heavily Democratic?
>
> 2. White House messages and ideas go to Congress and seem to disappear. As far as anyone can see they generate no response out in the country. Why?
>
> 3. Has the President failed to get into tune with the mood of the country?
>
> 4. Is there a feeling that the President's plans do not command wide support among the voters?
>
> 5. Is there distrust of the White House advisers who generate ideas and write messages?
>
> 6. Has the President, himself, lacked some element of leadership and ability to create confidence and attract loyalty?
>
> 7. Or: Are many Members of Congress simply wary about the political future and willing to trust their own political judgment more than that of the President?

AS CONGRESSMEN SIZE UP KENNEDY'S PROBLEMS

> (NOTE.—A survey of scores of Senators and House Members turns up these explanations of why Congress balks at much of the President's program.)
>
> Mood of the country: Little demand from voters for change. No sense of urgency in Congress for action on Kennedy bills.
>
> Divided Democrats: Lack of a real, working majority for liberal causes. Strong coalition of Republicans and conservative Democrats.
>
> Little pressure from the top: No hard-driving leadership in Congress to force action on the Kennedy program.
>
> "Scatter shot" program: Say many Members of Congress. The President asks for too much, sends up too many messages, gets Congress and the country confused.
>
> Kennedy advisers: Sometimes criticized as "impractical theorists" who can't sell their ideas to Congress.
>
> Mr. Kennedy himself: Personally popular, but hasn't convinced some older heads in Congress that he knows answers better than they do.
>
> Politics: Few Democrats feel they must ride President's coattails to get reelected.
>
> Still, some Congressmen warn: Don't underestimate President Kennedy. He got a good many bills out of the 87th Congress, and may yet do better with the 88th Congress than anybody now expects. It's too early to be sure, these Congressmen say.

LIVESTOCK PRICE DROP CRITICAL TO AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, a critically serious problem has developed in the livestock industry which has major consequences for the agricultural economy of America.

Since the first of the year prices on cattle and hogs have skidded drastically and experts in the field advise me that no relief from the situation is likely before early or midsummer.

Market analysts are frankly puzzled at the suddenness and sharpness of the break. There are many suggestions as to the cause, ranging from the unusually cold winter which kept housewives from the market on many days, to the newspaper and dock strikes. No doubt these and other factors were in some part responsible.

But the cold weather is ended; so is the dock strike—and hopefully the newspaper strike—will soon be ended.

I believe we must look past these causes to find a more substantial explanation for the current difficulty.

Since the end of World War II, when U.S. imports of beef totaled 127 million pounds annually, our imports have climbed to well over a billion pounds a year. Clearly, this factor has a significant effect on the price of livestock prices in America.

Mr. President, last May a persuasive case was made in this Chamber on behalf of the domestic cotton textile industry. The serious plight of the industry was impressively documented by a number of Senators who provided us with facts and figures on unemployment, the number of mills shut down, and the towns that were withering away because the cotton textile industry was in serious trouble.

As a result, the Senate gave to the President of the United States broad new authority to protect the industry by the imposition of quotas on textile products as to those countries who would not voluntarily agree to import quotas.

Many of us were sympathetic to the problem of the industry and felt that it was entitled to this degree of protection against foreign competition.

But we also felt that the authority proposed for the President should be broadened. Specifically, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and I joined in sponsoring an amendment which would extend the proposed Presidential authority to include agricultural products and particularly, livestock.

We failed in that attempt, largely because the administration opposed our effort. But throughout the debate, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 6, pages 8522–8544, will be found repeated assurances of Members on both sides of the aisle that at the appropriate time, there would be support for the same kind of assistance to the other agricultural commodities as that extended to the cotton textile industry.

The time for a serious consideration of the problems of the livestock industry is now. We must explore such solutions as the development of a flexible system of tariffs, or import quotas, which will provide for short-term changes in harmony with market conditions and prevent long-term depressions of prices.

There are those who will unfurl the old banner of "free trade" and charge that this is protectionism. Mr. President, free trade is a two-way street; it cannot be practiced unilaterally. Recent developments by the European Common Market with respect to agricultural commodities have placed the American farmer in a position of economic disadvantage.

The problem is a serious one for U.S. agriculture, and it typifies one of the things most seriously wrong with this Government's approach to trade matters: It is based on consideration of foreign policy instead of upon economic considerations.

Surely our long and disillusioning experience with foreign aid has convinced us of the folly of confusing these two instruments of national policy. For this reason, I urge less reliance on the Department of State and its negotiators, and more on the Foreign Agricultural Service where farm products are concerned.

In short, Mr. President, so far as the farmer is concerned, he wants more reciprocity in "reciprocal" trade agreements. He wants the same protection that those in the industrial sector of the economy have including the cotton textile industry. The American farmer is not afraid of competition; he never has been. But he does have a right to insist that the rules be the same for both sides involved in any trading agreement.

The responsibility is squarely on the administration. Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 provides, follows:

> The President is authorized to negotiate agreements with foreign governments in an effort to limit the export to the United States of agricultural commodities or products.

The next move is up to the administration. It appears that no additional legislation is required. But if it is, I trust that those Senators who last year were so concerned about cotton, will come forward to support with equal enthusiasm a solution to the present difficulties of the livestock industry.

MORALE OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, one of our greatest problems in our Foreign Service today is to restore the morale and esprit de corps to what it once was.

This does not mean a continuous process of enlargement and of diffusion which is what the Foreign Service has undergone ever since the War Manpower Act of 1946. If this act had been fully and properly implemented at the time in the spirit in which it was written, I believe that many of the future reorganizations that the Foreign Service has undergone since would not have been necessary. But the War Manpower Act was not implemented as it should have been, and, as a result, the Foreign Service has been progressively enlarged and emasculated.

Now to my mind our problem is the unscrambling of the omelet of Wristonization, of putting the round pegs back in the round holes, the square pegs in the square holes. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an article by William P. Cochran, Jr., which appeared in the Foreign Service Journal of March 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRD-RATE DIPLOMACY

(By William P. Cochran, Jr.)

At the end of World War II, we were within inches of having the best Foreign Service in the world. That is not just one man's opinion; it is confirmed by two dependable criteria: Foreign diplomats had begun freely to concede the proficiency of their American professional colleagues—and what better yardstick is there than the judgments of one's professional fellows?—and other countries had begun to copy our methods.

Our Foreign Service was best because it had the best system for selecting the most qualified among applicants for entry; the best system of performance evaluation; the best and most impartial system of promotion on the basis of proven merit; and an effective system for the selection-out and retirement of its deadwood.

This is no longer true. In the intervening years the quality of our Service has been diluted, its finest principles have been breached, and its pride and morale have been seriously damaged. Today we have probably the largest, best-paid third-rate service in the world.

It is painful to have to say this. I have devoted over 30 years of my life to the Foreign Service, and it has more than repaid my efforts. It hurts to report in public the criticisms which are current in private. Yet it must be said. I have discussed my views with numerous senior diplomats, ambassadors and others of long experience, and they differ only in their assessment of the extent of the damage, and of how long it will take to repair the injury.

To trace the process of deterioration we must go back to the end of World War II. There had been no adequate introduction of new blood during the war years, when recruitment was suspended. To help perform the new and greatly expanded functions arising out of the war effort—control of strategic materials, identification of traders with the enemy, trade controls, press, radio and cultural activities—a new mechanism, the Foreign Service Auxiliary, was created. After the war it became apparent that many of these wartime functions would have to be continued. But precisely because there had been no recruiting for several years, the Foreign Service was not prepared to handled these added responsibilities.

After V-J Day, an attempt was made to alleviate these deficiencies by admitting men and women of the Armed Forces through special examinations—the juniors at class 6, the more senior members at the grades to which their age, experience, and qualifications entitled them. Many of our finest present-day officers came from these sources. Unfortunately there were not enough of them. Recruitment was resumed also, but once more the intake of officers was inadequate, due to budgetary restrictions and personnel ceilings. This failure to renew the tree adequately at the roots is responsible for many of the subsequent vicissitudes of the Service.

The long series of adversities which followed had two primary root causes; a plague of unstable management and a plethora of administrators. In the 11 years between 1944 and 1956, there were eight different chief administrators, and as many reorganizations. Almost without exception, each left things worse. Yet administrators proliferated, and by asserting their authority over the allocation of funds, by controlling organization, and by bringing to heel anyone who challenged their actions, they took control. With power, they began to resent the existenc of a body, the Foreign Service, not subject to their fiat.

Thus decisions began to be taken which, in the judgment of the Foreign Service, undermined its entire program of recruitment and promotion, supposedly based on competence and merit.

The first of these alarming developments was the resignation of the Chief of the Division of Foreign Service Personnel in protest at unwarranted interference in his operations. Then control over both departmental and Foreign Service personnel was combined in one administrator, and the chief of foreign personnel became the subordinate of a man without, as the Wriston committee later phrased it, "familiarity with the oversea operations of the Foreign Service." Similarly, the position of the Director General was removed from the direct chain of command, and he was relegated on the organizational charts to the position he occupies today—that of a separate adviser on policy to the deputy under secretary for administration.

A third blow fell when the Executive Director of the Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service was forced out, and the board of examiners lost its independent status, being relegated to a position well down the administrative ladder.

Meanwhile, the inflow of new officers had again been interrupted by a 2-year moratorium on appointments at the entering level. This meant not only that the tree was starved by lack of feeding at the roots; it meant that young men and women who had passed the examinations had to wait over 2 years for appointment. Naturally, many became discouraged and found other uses for their talents. Word went around among university students that there was no use looking forward to a career in the Foreign Service, and many qualified young people who might have taken the examinations chose not to do so.

The amalgamation program undertaken on the recommendation of the Hoover Commission did little or nothing to relieve the personnel shortage. Despite considerable pressure, including the threat that if you didn't amalgamate you would not be promoted and might not hold your present job, less than 700 of the more than 10,000 Department employees applied for the 1,500 jobs that had been reclassified as requiring experience in the field, and only 450 appeared for the oral examinations. (Some 55 percent qualified under the greatly reduced standards.) In practice, amalgamation did not add one officer to the existing number; it only changed certain titles, from departmental or staff or reserve to Foreign Service officer.

The Foreign Service hoped that the change of administration in 1953 would bring it a new and happier administrative deal. Instead, it was shocked, in its first meeting with the new Secretary, by his demand for positive loyalty, which disclosed a tragic unawareness that the Foreign Service has always been dedicated to the execution of the policies of the U.S. Government, regardless of which party was in power.

Concurrently, Foreign Service morale was being dealt a heavy blow through the unsubstantiated charges of Senator McCarthy. The blow came not so much from the attacks as from the fact that nobody in the entire departmental hierarchy, under two administrations, had courage enough to stand up to Senator McCarthy and challenge him to produce his evidence. Trained to silence, the Service felt it had no vocal champion, no stout defender.

It is impossible to measure the harm done to our professional diplomacy by the security officers who were introduced at this time. Officers of unimpeachable integrity were revolted by their sneaky prying, and by the assumption that everyone was under suspicion. These "security" measures never uncovered a spy, but they did cost us the services of a number of our most intelligent, perceptive and astute officers.

In response to the growing consciousness that the Foreign Service did indeed need expansion and improvement, the Acting Secretary of State appointed a special committee to make recommendations on personnel policies. It took its name from its chairman, Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president of Brown University. Once more a surge of hope swept through the Foreign Service. Once more these hopes were to be disappointed.

The committee announced that it would hold no hearings. Experienced career men who had asked to be heard were ignored. Respected officers who had been asked to serve as consultants were not consulted. Recommendations made by chiefs of mission abroad, both career and noncareer, in response to an invitation from the committee, were rejected.

The first thing the Wriston committee did was to accept as premises the very assumptions which the amalgamation program had proven wrong: (1) that everyone in Washington wanted to serve abroad; and (2) that everyone in Washington was automatically qualified to do a good job in the foreign field. It then compounded these errors by making additional incorrect assumptions:

1. It urged that examination procedures "should rest primarily upon the candidate's record of experience and accomplishment." This presumed—incorrectly—that dependable records of experience and accomplishment existed for departmental employees.

2. The committee assumed that knowledge of foreign languages was unimportant. The report said: "If a candidate is otherwise well qualified, it should be enough for him to express his willingness, when assigned abroad, to make good his language deficiency." Is willingness, which may or may not be accompanied by ability, adequate for any purpose? Is it enough for a man to promise to start to learn a language after he has been assigned abroad? If language is important, he should know it before he arrives at his post; otherwise he will spend his 2 to 4 years learning the language, and then be transferred to another linguistic area.

3. A third assumption was that there is nothing to diplomacy; anyone can do it. (How else can one interpret the principle that anyone in Washington with an "acceptable" record is eligible for appointment to the career officer service?) I disagree. Good diplomacy requires certain educational tools, and certain personal characteristics. Its practices and methods are not beyond comprehension; any intelligent person can learn them—in 20 years or so of experience. But they are not acquired overnight or by osmosis.

Like the amalgamation program that preceded it, the integration program assumed

that anyone doing a good job in the Department could do an equally good one abroad. In many cases this was true. But in many others the assumption was false. The particular skills essential in Washington may have no great utility in a foreign country. A research specialist may do an outstanding job in the Department, operating with scholarly thoroughness and detachment, and an almost complete withdrawal from society outside the office. In Washington his being a recluse is merely an eccentricity. But would he be useful at establishing close relations with the people of another country? Let us assume that his specialty is the jurisprudence of Saudi Arabia. He is invaluable in Washington. But send him abroad? Where? Saudi Arabia, presumably. Does he speak the language? Can he and his wife stand the heat? Will he observe the niceties of Arab customs? He has always been a thinker, a contemplator; can he operate actively, can he persuade? And after his 2-year tour in Jidda, where do you send him?

The principle works also in reverse: who takes his place in research while he is gone? The Foreign Service officer with field experience is not qualified to do the expert's job in Washington. Even if he has served in Saudi Arabia, he does not have the encyclopedic knowledge of the legal system possessed by his predecessor. Two fish are now out of the water, two pegs are in the wrong holes, and nobody benefits.

It is hardly necessary here to discuss the superficiality of the examinations under Wristonization. After all, if you are going to coerce over a thousand people into the Foreign Service, you cannot subject them to an examination which may demonstrate that a fairly large proportion of them do not have the educational qualifications, the personal suitability, or even in some cases the desire to serve abroad. It is important, though, to remember that the candidate was not required to establish his qualifications for service abroad. A candidate was presumed eligible unless someone alleged otherwise; and the burden of proof was then to be on the challenger, not on the candidate.

Wristonization brought into the Foreign Service a large number of specialist officers with splendid qualifications and backgrounds. It also brought in a large number who were not qualified in any foreign language. And it transferred into the Foreign Service three other groups: the failures, the timid, and the unwilling.

By "failures" I mean those who had previously failed the Foreign Service examinations. "Timid" refers to those who had declined to take the oral examinations during the earlier amalgamation program, for fear they would not pass. The third group comprises those who never wanted to be in the Foreign Service, who had avoided amalgamation, and who now accepted integration reluctantly because the alternatives were to surrender their job rights or transfer to other agencies.

The net result of all these ill conceived, incompletely digested and abruptly imposed changes in the principles applying to the Foreign Service is that what we now have is scarcely recognizable as a career service. It has been debilitated by the forcible injection of mediocrity. Its pride and esprit de corps have been damaged by the McCarthy attacks and the absurd security measures that followed. Its basic principles have been repeatedly breached. If by a career service we mean one where officers enter at the bottom, we now have one where nearly two-thirds did not enter at the bottom. If by career service we mean one where entrance is attained only through difficult and highly selective examinations, we now have the situation where almost half took no examination worthy of the name. If we assume promotion from within on the basis of demonstrated merit, even this is questionable, if only because the standards will have to be lowered, since you cannot heartlessly select out hundreds of unqualified people who were practically forced into the Foreign Service under Wristonization. In brief we have watered down the quality of our diplomacy—and the important characteristic of effective diplomacy is precisely its quality.

What, then, needs to be done? What steps are necessary to correct the errors we have made?

First, we must make up our collective mind as to what we want and need. There must be general acceptance of the principle that the only kind of diplomacy which America can afford today is the best. This means best in quality, not largest in quantity.

Second, we must realize that four things are necessary if we are to have the best diplomats we can produce: Careful initial selection, appropriate training, varied experience in both types of work and geographical areas, and adequate rewards. (The reference is not just to pecuniary rewards, although these are important; but even more to the intangibles of public and official support. The intangibles can have even greater effect on the morale and esprit de corps and effectiveness of a career service than monetary remuneration.)

As for careful initial selection, we must attract and recruit some of our best young brains (and above all, retain them). We must refresh the personnel tree at its roots, annually. Nothing must be permitted to interfere with this, neither war nor depression.

The induction of new officers should be by carefully selective examination, and should largely take place at the lowest rung of the ladder, in order that the recruits may be given the necessary training and varied experience before reaching the top ranks. There should also be provision for the lateral entry, at any step on the promotional ladder, of men who have proved their competence in other fields; but this privilege must be subject to two restrictions: First, such transfers must always be subject to a truly effective, comprehensive oral examination to ascertain the candidate's complete suitability; and second, there must be a legal restriction on the number of such transfers. This is necessary to keep the Foreign Service apolitical and to prevent a reversion to the spoils system. This limitation might well follow the lines of the former administrative rule: transfers into any class in any year should not exceed 10 percent of the number of officers already in that class. Additionally, this sort of restriction would prevent any such infusion of inexperience and incompetence as resulted from the Wriston program.

The selection process for younger officers should continue to be by means of written, oral, and physical examinations. These must include a detailed examination into the candidate's background, personality and character—that goes without saying.

A second step essential to the revitalization of the Foreign Service is the restoration of the prestige, importance and above all the independence of the Board of Examiners. It must be rescued from its present obscurity in the administrative machinery. Its procedures must always be above suspicion, and its methods must be the very best that proven modern testing techniques can evolve. It must be made legally immune to the kinds of improper pressures to which it was subjected a few years ago.

A third necessary step also involves the internal organization of the Department of State. The Office of Personnel must once more be given authority and independence. At present, it is a subsidiary body in the administrative machinery—and therefore subject to all the usual bureaucratic procedures and restrictions. It has nothing in common with administrative matters (costs of operations, procedures, cryptography, preparation of regulations, etc.) and should stand on its own feet. It must be separated from its present subordination to purely administrative functions and officials.

Once the authority, prestige, and independence of the Office of Personnel have been restored, arrangements must be made for a considerable improvement in the handling of personnel matters. There is a large body of opinion holding that there are far too many people handling transfers, assignments, and promotions—causing delays, confusion, and conflicts. There must be improved methods of consulting officers as to their work preferences, and as to the geographical areas in which they wish to serve. Some steps have already been taken to improve the means of consultation with officers about their records of performance, through the career counseling staff; but much more needs to be done. Officers can perform their best work only if they can discuss their problems and aspirations effectively with the superiors who control their destinies.

Measures must be adopted (if this has not already been done) to insure the inviolability of personnel records; and I can see no reason why the officers of the Foreign Service (who after all are those most intimately concerned) should not be told in specific detail what these measures are.

There must be more rigorous selection out of the unfit, and this system must apply even, and perhaps above all, to the very highest levels.

Thought must also be given to the installation of some type of formal discipline. The Service has grown to such dimensions that informal methods are no longer adequate. There is no present means of ascertaining guilt or innocence other than by investigation by an inspector. There is no punishment for infractions of law or regulations between the drastic penalty of dismissal, including the bringing of formal charges, or letting the culprit quietly resign, on the one hand, and a reprimand and an unfavorable notation in the efficiency records, on the other. Whatever the method, more discipline is necessary; and officers must expect to be sent where they are needed, and to be rigorously weeded out if they fail to live up to the high standards of the Service.

Not only does the Foreign Service officer corps need reinvigoration; the staff corps should be restored to its former independent identity, morale and effectiveness. It is as wasteful to devote the time and energies of carefully selected career diplomats to housekeeping chores—communication, supply, etc.—as it is to assign experts in these fields to political or economic reporting.

Careful thought must be given to the suggestions that the personnel of AID and USIA be "integrated" or "amalgamated" with the Foreign Service. Both organizations perform functions essential to our national interests abroad. Both contain many excellent people, who would be welcome additions to any organization. But it will be necessary to insure—by careful selection and examinations—that only the best of these people enter the career Foreign Service, if unification is determined upon.

One final step needs to be taken to prevent abuses: There should be a high-level inquiry into the state and morale of our professional diplomacy, about once every 5 years. The knowledge that the record would be examined and errors exposed would tend to reduce the number of errors. The knowledge that complaints would receive an impartial outside hearing would act to preclude errors of omission or commission. It seems certain that a great many of the abuses committed in recent years would have been avoided, or at least would have received far more serious consideration beforehand, had it been clear that the facts would soon become public, or would be reviewed for an assessment of responsibility. The existence of such a Review Board would serve another useful purpose: it would discourage—and if necessary correct—any tendency for the Foreign Service to become a law unto itself. A periodic review of its performance and needs would not only prevent the Service from becoming ingrown; it would disarm those of its critics who persistently make this charge against it.

The Review Board might be appointed every 5 years, by the President, and should include one or two Members of each House of Congress. The Board should devote enough time to a review of previous legislation and experience to form a basis for its study of current conditions and needs. It should insist on freedom of access to opinion in, and a free expression of views by, the Foreign Service itself. The Board should avoid drastic one-time measures of the kind that destroy the organization they are intended to improve; it should avoid the other pitfalls which caused the Wriston committee to diagnose the illnesses correctly, and then propose precisely the wrong remedies.

Such a board will not necessarily guarantee a top-grade, fully effective Foreign Service. But if assured in advance of the interest and support of a public opinion determined to have the best diplomacy human ingenuity can provide, such a periodic formal review of the Foreign Service's performance and needs would both prevent abuses and correct those which might have crept in. It would improve morale and reduce unthinking and uninformed criticism. It would help to keep the organization active, vital, and alive. And it would contribute greatly to the goal of a service made up not of a great number of average diplomats but of the very best—the most intelligent, perceptive, and experienced—that education, evaluation, and experience can produce.

THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate a most interesting statistical report on the number of Peace Corps applicants throughout the United States who have taken the Peace Corps placement test.

As cosponsor of the bill to establish the Peace Corps, I have followed closely its manifold successes and accomplishments.

As of January 17, 1963, 17,533 persons have taken the examination. Actually, this figure is somewhat short of the actual number of applicants, for in the early days of the Corps, examination records were not kept. It is estimated that about 3,500 persons took the test in this early period, thereby bringing the total figure to approximately 21,033. This means that computed on the basis of the 1960 census, one out of every 5,473 Americans over age 18 showed enough interest in the Corps to take the examination.

To my mind, this is indeed a disappointing figure and reflection on our youth. I would have thought there would have been more of a spirit of adventure in the young. Here a young man or woman has the opportunity to see a new nation, learn a new language, live an adventurous new life, with all expenses paid and at the end of 2 years, to be discharged with an $1,800 kitty. Obviously, there are many reasons why many individuals are not able to take advantage of this opportunity, but it is, I think, a sad reflection that so very, very few do.

It is my strong hope that in the future more and more men and women throughout our Nation will volunteer to join the Peace Corps. This unique opportunity to contribute, afforded to all qualified public-spirited Americans, has captured the imagination and hearts of peoples throughout the world.

I know that many of my colleagues in the Senate join me in the sincere hope that the Peace Corps will continue to operate effectively and that its successes will multiply still further in the years to come.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a State-by-State breakdown of the distribution of test applicants.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Tally of Peace Corps examinees by State of legal residence[1]

Alabama	205
Alaska	25
Arizona	144
Arkansas	114
California	2,320
Colorado	328
Connecticut	314
Delaware	42
District of Columbia	158
Florida	501
Georgia	201
Hawaii	54
Idaho	78
Illinois	1,027
Indiana	324
Iowa	316
Kansas	209
Kentucky	163
Louisiana	186
Maine	90
Maryland	246
Massachusetts	690
Michigan	741
Minnesota	426
Mississippi	77
Missouri	359
Montana	100
Nebraska	128
Nevada	36
New Hampshire	96
New Jersey	584
New Mexico	101
New York	1,843
North Carolina	268
North Dakota	94
Ohio	825
Oklahoma	178
Oregon	267
Pennsylvania	999
Rhode Island	75
South Carolina	89
South Dakota	72
Tennessee	209
Texas	644
Utah	104
Vermont	67
Virginia	228
Washington	347
West Virginia	97
Wisconsin	465
Wyoming	41
Total U.S. residents	17,295
Residents outside United States	238
Grand total	17,533

[1] Accurate as of Jan. 17, 1963.

THE INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the International Rescue Committee has had a long and honorable record looking after refugees from political persecution. For the first half of its life, it looked after the refugees from Nazi and Fascist abuses. And, for the last half of its life, it has been succoring refugees from communism.

The same philosophy has continued to apply through the years, though, because totalitarianism, no matter whether guised under the garb of the Third Reich or the Communist International, has the same total objectives and persecutes its victims in the same absolute way.

Sevellon Brown, a most able and fine newspaperman, has written an excellent piece in the Providence Journal, with which he and his father have been long concerned, on the public record of the IRC.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the Record Mr. Brown's article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Proud Record of the IRC

(By Sevellon Brown)

I've just been invited by the distinguished theologian, Reinhold Niebuhr, to become a sponsor of the International Rescue Committee's 30th Anniversary Year. Before replying, I read up a bit on the IRC's history, aims and activities, and what I learned was so fascinating that I thought it might interest some of you, too.

The 30-year mark stretches back to the advent of Hitler and his Nazis to political power in Germany. Rightly suspecting that Fascist persecution would send thousands of decent Germans fleeing into exile, a small group of private American citizens organized in 1933 the International Relief Association. For 8 long years, this agency provided vital help to people on the run from the Nazis.

Then came World War II and, in 1940, the fall of France. This presented a particular problem, because France had been the main haven for European exiles. But the terms of the armistice dictated to the French by the Nazis required the former to "surrender on demand" those who had fled from totalitarian rule, especially leaders in various fields of democratic life.

To try to deal with this problem, a new organization came into being, again the creation of a group of private American citizens. They named it the Emergency Rescue Committee, and in the next 2 years, in the face of ferocious odds, they managed to smuggle out of Vichy France more than 1,000 of Europe's most prominent leaders, intellectuals and artists.

The two groups merged in 1942 to form what is today the IRC. During the balance of the war, the IRC continued to help anti-Fascist refugees who had managed to make their way to Allied or neutral nations. With the return of peace, the committee shifted gears, as it were. The job now became twofold; first, to help thousands of displaced persons—war prisoners, forced laborers, expellees and refugees—to find new homes in the United States and other countries; second, to assist other exiles especially those of demonstrated leadership ability, to return to Germany, Austria and Italy to help rebuild their shattered societies.

People in the IRC might have supposed about this time that their work was nearing its finish. But no, far from it. As Dr. Niebuhr writes in his letter of invitation:

"It is a commentary of our times that the IRC—originally founded as a temporary committee to cope with a specific emergency—has by necessity become a permanent and significant institution. Rather than

diminishing, the number and extent of totalitarian states has risen sharply since 1933. In turn, what was once a trickle of exiles has swollen to flood proportions—since 1945, more than 10 million men and women have fled the Communist States alone."

In response, here are a few of the things the IRC has accomplished in that period:

After the Communist takeover in Czechoslovakia, a new wave of refugees from the Soviet satellites rolled across the frontiers. The IRC organized an Iron Curtain refugee campaign to provide emergency help for thousands of these unfortunates along an arc sweeping all the way from Sweden to Turkey.

When Moscow threatened to take West Berlin by force in 1950, the IRC arranged shipment of millions of pounds of milk, butter and cheese to the people of the beleaguered free city. Mayor Reuter credited this effort as giving a tremendous psychological lift to the West Berliners.

Aware that hundreds of thousands of people still remained in DP camps, and that among them were more than 8,000 of the "ablest, best trained men and women of Europe—a forgotten elite," the IRC launched a Resettlement Compaign for Exiled Professionals. In 2 years, this project had found new homes for some 1,700 professionals who, with their families, totaled 3,227 persons.

Perhaps the IRC's most famous performance came in the wake of the bloody and tragic Hungarian uprising in 1956. In 2 years' time, the organization collected nearly $3 million in cash and goods for the aid and resettlement of about 200,000 Hungarian refugees.

But the IRC has not by any means confined its work to Europe. It provided notable assistance to many of the almost 1 million Vietnamese who fled from the Communist north after their country had been partitioned. It has labored hard to ease the almost insoluble refugee problem in Hong Kong, partly through direct aid in that city, and partly by resettling Chinese exiles in Taiwan, Brazil, Canada, and the United States.

And, of course, Cuba. The IRC has helped 20 percent of the 200,000 Cubans who have reached this country since the Castro revolution took on its current character, and it has resettled about one-fourth of the 40,000 Cubans who have vacated the Greater Miami area. Today, the IRC concentrates its main effort on helping Cubans in this country, and expects to do so until their nation regains its liberty.

All in all, I'd say a record to be pretty proud of. I imagine you can guess what answer I returned to Dr. Niebuhr.

SENATOR YARBOROUGH PROTESTS PROPOSED INCREASE IN TELEPHONE RATES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have formally petitioned the Federal Communications Commission to suspend a proposed telephone rate plan that brings about an increase in 82 percent of all person-to-person calls in the United States, and would also increase rates on leased wires to newspapers.

The FCC has announced a plan whereby rates on telephone calls would be changed in two ways:

First, the phone companies would reduce rates between 9 p.m. and 4:30 a.m. on station-to-station interstate calls, and second, the telephone companies would increase rates on all person-to-person calls up to 800 miles from the point of origin.

I am opposed to the part of this rate change that would result in an increase in all person-to-person calls up to 800 miles. It is my belief that the telephone companies should be allowed to go ahead with their voluntary experimental rate reduction on station-to-station "after 9" calls at night, but that the public and the FCC should have time to further study the impact of the proposed increase in all person-to-person calls up to 800 miles.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this time my letter of petition to the Federal Communications Commission, which explains my views more fully.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

March 13, 1963.

Re petition for suspension of a new telephone tariff schedule on person-to-person calls

Federal Communications Commission,
Washington, D.C.
(Attention: Common Carrier Bureau).

Gentlemen: In compliance with the requirements of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and supplementing the oral request made to Chairman Minow and other Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission in open hearing held before the Subcommittee on Communications of the Committee on Commerce of the U.S. Senate on the 27th day of February, 1963, I, Ralph W. Yarborough, U.S. Senator representing the State of Texas, do hereby petition for suspension of that portion of Tariff FCC No. 132 hereinafter described.

It is my understanding that Tariff FCC No. 132 provides for revisions in rates applicable to interstate message toll telephone service between points in the U.S. mainland. These revisions make effective the rate changes announced by the Federal Communications Commission in its Public Notice No. 30790, dated January 29, 1963. This tariff basically covers two classes of long-distance telephone service: (1) a decrease in station-to-station rates between 9 p.m. and 4:30 a.m. (all such rates countrywide are to be a flat rate of $1 or less for the first 3 minutes); (2) an increase in all person-to-person rates at all hours of the day up to 800 miles.

Representations have been made by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. as to the amount of reduction in charges to the public on an annual basis as a result of the decrease in station-to-station rates between 9 p.m. and 4:30 a.m. and the resulting loss of revenue to the telephone companies, but it appears that these representations have been based on past traffic figures under the old rates. It is reasonable to assume that the decrease in rates may well double or triple the amount of long-distance calls between 9 p.m. and 4:30 a.m. resulting not in a net loss of revenue to the telephone companies, but in an increase of net revenue.

These two adjustments of rates, it appears to me have been tied together as a package deal with the reduction in station-to-station rates from 9 p.m. to 4:30 a.m. acting as the sugar coating in which the increase in person-to-person rates up to 800 miles is to be made palatable to the consuming public. The increase in person-to-person rates would include 82 percent of all person-to-person long-distance calls in the United States.

Accordingly, I do hereby petition for suspension of that portion of the new tariff schedule which provides for increases in person-to-person rates up to 800 miles for a period of 12 calendar months beginning with the effective date to the tariff schedule, April 4, 1963, in order that we may first have available the benefit of the experience of the telephone companies under the reduction in station-to-station rates before burdening the telephone consumer with increases in rates on 82 percent of all person-to-person long-distance calls in the United States.

I do not request any delay in the telephone company's experimental voluntary reduction of the station-to-station calls between 9 p.m. and 4:30 a.m. I think they should have this opportunity to test that reduction.

Respectfully submitted.

Ralph W. Yarborough.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point FCC Public Notice 30790 dated January 29, 1963, and captioned "FCC Announces Plan for Reduced Nighttime Interstate Telephone Rates of $1 or Less to any Point Within Continental United States" and an article from Editor and Publisher of February 23, 1963, captioned "Press Protest Halts Phone Rate Increase."

There being no objection, the notice and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Federal Communications Commission public notice, Jan. 29, 1963]

FCC Announces Plan for Reduced Nighttime Interstate Telephone Rates of $1 or Less to Any Point Within Continental United States

The FCC announced today that the Bell Telephone Cos. will submit tariffs designed to become effective about April 1, 1963, proposing a major change in interstate station-to-station interstate call within the time period from 9 p.m. to 4:30 a.m. can be made between any two points within the continental United States for $1 or less. For example, an after 9 p.m. call from Washington to the west coast will cost $1. The lowest rate now for such a call is $1.75 after 6 p.m. The after-9 reduced rates are designed to encourage telephone users to take advantage of the technological improvements in telephone plans introduced by the Bell system in recent years, much of which is engineered for peak daytime usage.

At the same time the after-9 reductions become effective, changes designed to adjust rate structures involving small increases of 5 or 10 cents in person-to-person calls up to 800 miles will be placed into effect. Person-to-person calls at these shorter distances have not borne their proportionate share of the cost of furnishing such services, and these minor increases will help to correct this inequity as well as the disparity where it exists between interstate and intrastate rates. Based upon 1962 traffic volumes, it is estimated that the proposed new rates would have resulted in a reduction of approximately $55 million in revenues from the introduction of the new after 9 p.m. station-to-station rates, and an increase of $25 million in revenue from the small increases in person-to-person rates, giving a net annual savings to the public of about $30 million.

The changes in rate structures are being submitted in connection with the current analysis of the Bell System's construction plans and financial requirements under the Commission's continuing surveillance of the company's operation. During this recent review, the Commission received the views of a number of outstanding authorities in economics and finance as well as consultants in the regulatory field in addition to the views of company officials. In connection with this review, the Commission requested that a study be made looking toward the possible adoption of an after-9 plan.

The Bell System is undertaking an expanded construction program of $3.2 billion for 1963. It also plans extensive research activities designed to further improve its service to the public. These activities will contribute importantly to our Nation's economic growth. It is recognized that in order to do this, the company's earnings must be maintained at adequate levels. The Commission is of the view that the overall effect of the changes announced today will result in substantial savings to the public in telephone rates while permitting the company to maintain a level of earnings on investment within the range realized by it since the last rate reduction in 1959.

The public has shared promptly in the benefits flowing from advancements in telephone technology under the Commission's continuing surveillance method of ratemaking. In 1940, a station-to-station call from the east coast to the west coast after 9 p.m. cost $4.25, as compared to the new rate of $1. Overall, interstate telephone rates today are 19 percent below the levels of 1940.

Action by the Commission over the past 4 years has resulted in substantial savings to the public in telephone rates while at the same time permitting the company to maintain adequate earnings. In 1959, interstate telephone rates were reduced by $50 million. Again in 1962, through the adoption of new separations procedures, an equivalent reduction of interstate revenues of $46 million was effected enabling 41 States to reduce intrastate rates by $40 million, and during 1961 and 1962, the prices of Western Electric products sold to Bell System Cos. were reduced by $70 million on an annual basis.

A schedule attached shows a comparison of initial period rates on routes selected for illustrative purposes.

Comparison of initial period rates—Selected routes

	Person to person			Station to station		
	Airline-miles	Day	Night	Day	6 to 9 p.m.	9 p.m. to 4:30 a.m.[1]
Chicago to Detroit	238	$1.30	$1.10	$0.85	$0.65	$0.60
Minneapolis to Omaha	292	1.45	1.20	.95	.70	.60
Baltimore to Cleveland	308	1.50	1.25	1.00	.75	.60
Boston to Washington	398	1.70	1.40	1.15	.85	.65
Portland, Oreg., to San Francisco	541	1.90	1.60	1.30	1.00	.65
Nashville to Washington	565	2.00	1.70	1.35	1.05	.65
Raleigh to St. Louis	659	2.05	1.75	1.40	1.10	.70
Chicago to New York	711	2.20	1.90	1.45	1.15	.70
Chicago to New Orleans	835	2.25	1.95	1.50	1.20	.75
Los Angeles to Seattle	981	2.40	2.05	1.55	1.20	.75
Boston to Miami	1,251	2.65	2.25	1.70	1.30	.80
Dallas to New York	1,369	2.85	2.45	1.80	1.40	.90
Boston to Denver	1,770	3.10	2.65	1.95	1.50	.90
Philadelphia to Salt Lake City	1,928	3.30	2.85	2.10	1.65	1.00
San Francisco to Washington	2,412	3.50	3.00	2.25	1.75	1.00

[1] Reductions start at 221 airline-miles.

[From Editor & Publisher, Feb. 23, 1963]

Press Protest Halts Phone Rate Increase

The plan to increase rates for telephone services on May 1 has been deferred.

Rosel M. Hyde, Acting Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, told a Senate committee February 18 that "further consideration" would be given to petitions of interested parties.

The American Newspaper Publishers Association and United Press International are asking for reconsideration of increases that would affect news services. The Associated Press planned to file data as part of the ANPA brief.

SOME RELIEF POSSIBLE

With the FCC under a hail of senatorial criticism, Mr. Hyde declared there was "no intent to drive out newspapers," and some relief may yet be worked out for publications.

With a few modifications, the FCC ruling made final the Commission's 1961 interim decision in a 7-year investigation of leased line rates of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and Western Union. At that time A.T. & T. estimated the new rates would increase costs to the press by 19 percent, to commercial customers by 2.1 percent, and decrease costs to government users by 7.8 percent. The final prescribed rates would increase press costs more than 150 percent in some cases.

In issuing its final decision on January 29 the FCC said it would consider any evidence which indicated the increased rates "would significantly impair the widespread dissemination of news information."

BODY BLOW TO PAPERS

Senator A. S. **Mike Monroney**, Democrat, of Oklahoma, said the FCC plan to hike rates $4,012,000 for private or leased teleprinter circuits would be a "body blow to many small newspapers."

Senator **Ralph Yarborough**, Democrat, of Texas, questioned the FCC proposal to raise rates an estimated $25 million a year by hiking the cost by 5 to 10 cents of person-to-person phone calls under distances of 800 miles.

Senator **Monroney** said the increased wire cost burdens threatened to drive out of business the small and county seat newspapers, which he called the backbone of American journalism.

Instead of charging a paper for the time it uses a leased wire, he said the FCC plan would force the paper to pay for a full 24 hours for a private line, whether it used it round the clock or not.

"There is no other utility that I know of that charges 24 hours," Senator **Monroney** said. "A newspaper that uses power to run the presses only pays for the electricity used, not on a 24-hour basis."

American Telephone & Telegraph Co., which leases the wires, has criticized the plan as discriminatory.

PERSON-TO-PERSON HIKE

Senator **Yarborough** centered his attack on the plan to boost person-to-person rates. He questioned an FCC press release of January 29 describing it as "small increases" in calls up to 800 miles.

The same release highlighted the Commission's decision for a major change in long-distance rates, or the so-called after-9 rate. Under it, station-to-station calls between 9 p.m. and 4:30 a.m. can be made anywhere in the United States—from New York to San Francisco—for $1. It becomes effective April 1 at an estimated cost to A.T. & T. of $55 million.

Senator **Yarborough** said a 10-cent increase on a 50-cent person-to-person call from Washington to Baltimore amounted to a 20-percent increase—"and I don't call that a small increase."

FIGURES SUBMITTED

Mr. Hyde said the Commission asked for full cost, traffic and accounting figures from A.T. & T., and based its decision for the proposed April 1 rate hike on these. "We had no reason," he added, "to doubt the validity of the statements."

The committee chairman, Senator **John O. Pastore**, Democrat, of Rhode Island, suggested that Mr. Hyde return for additional questioning at a later date and "come prepared to quiet once and for all, if you can," the continuous inferences that A.T. & T. dominates the FCC.

WALL STREET JOURNAL PRINTS ABLE ARTICLES ON OCEANOGRAPHY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in this age of science in which we live, one of the least known and least publicized of scientific fields is that of oceanography. We might say that, of all science, oceanography will always whet man's thirst for knowledge rather than quench it.

Texas is proud that the Department of Oceanography and Meteorology of A. & M. College, College Station, Tex., is one of the outstanding institutions in the United States, and perhaps in the world today, in this comparatively new field of inquiry.

Edwin A. Roberts, Jr., has written a series of four very informative articles concerning oceanography which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on March 5, 7, 8, and 12, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that these four articles be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Science of the Sea—Political Problems Lie in Wake of Oceanography's Advance

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

The oceanographer's science occupies a peculiar place in man's investigation of the physical world. Lacking the smoke and fire of rocketry, it has attracted little popular attention, yet its promises right now equal or exceed those of space exploration. We know the ocean is a cornucopia and we know how to tap it, while outer space is almost entirely a question mark—a fascinating question mark, but a question mark no less.

Consider that the ocean (there is really only one) covers 70.8 percent of the earth's surface, that scientific cultivation of marine life could feed the world population for decades to come, that the mineral wealth in sea water and on and beneath the ocean floor is all but beyond imagining, that the chemical and physical energy of the sea is a limitless source of power, that the ocean is a great control board by which man can direct the weather and change climates, and that realization of this potential is being delayed not by scientific problems, nor entirely by engineering ones, but by the lack of an international treaty fixing each nation's share of the world ocean.

Except for the concept of the 3-mile limit, the seas belong to everybody, which is the same as saying they belong to nobody. The idea that a nation's sovereignty extends but 3 miles beyond its shores is an anachronism, stemming from a long-ago British admiral's desire to sail that close to the coast of France. It makes little sense today and certainly fish have never taken it very seriously. The result is an international free-for-all that discourages any one country from cultivating the resources in a large area of the ocean, because any other country would be free to poach upon the preserve.

Nor is the absence of the broad-scale international agreement something affecting futuristic possibilities only. In recent years Britain and Iceland have exchanged gunfire at sea over fishing rights. France just sent a warship to the South Atlantic to back up its fishing vessels in that country's present dispute with Brazil over lobster grounds, and there is sporadic controversy over the dumping of radioactive wastes in ocean trenches (a leaky atomic waste container could contaminate fish, and therefore people, thousands of miles from the dumping spot.)

A leader in the movement to establish jurisdiction over the use of the sea is Columbus O'Donnell Iselin, founder (in 1930) of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution on Cape Cod and a kind of youthful elder statesman among oceanographers. In 1960 he appeared before a body of the United Nations to state the case for such an international agreement and got nowhere. He believes, moreover, that such a treaty will probably be a long time coming because the affluent nations of the northern hemisphere simply don't have to look to the sea for resources yet.

In other areas of the world, however, especially in poor, unstable South Asia, cultivation of the ocean would be a boon. But there the problems become even more complicated. Without any cultivation at all, for instance, the Indian Ocean (currently the site of a massive international oceanographic research program) is teeming with life, but Indians are not remarkably skilled fishermen. Moreover, the traditional Indian problem of moving food from the coastal areas to the interior gets particularly pungent when the cargo is fish.

Until the middle of the last century, sailors went down to the sea extraordinarily ignorant of their element. Aside from a general knowledge of the trade winds and the storm rookeries of the world, the early 19th century seaman had little understanding of the ocean's patterns. Then an American naval officer, Matthew Fontaine Maury, prepared elaborate (for that day) charts after supplying ship captains with special log books in which to record the behavior of winds and currents. This led to a highly successful international conference in Brussels in 1853 and a major step toward a concerted oceanographic program was taken.

A VOYAGE OF DISCOVERY

In 1872 England's famous scientific club, the Royal Society, persuaded the British Government to outfit a three-masted corvette, *Challenger*, for a round-the-world oceanographic expedition. The *Challenger* cruised 3½ years and covered almost 69,000 miles, netting along the way countless species of plants and animals from a variety of depths. It was on this voyage that scientists discovered what is still believed to be the deepest part of the ocean, the Marianas Trench in the western Pacific.

The Marianas Trench, recently plumbed by Jacques Picard and Navy Lt. Don Walsh in the bathyscaphe *Trieste*, is 36,000 feet deep. In other words—and a hole this deep deserves an illustration—if Mount Everest were dropped into the trench, the Empire State Building fixed on top of it, the Eiffel Tower mounted on top of that, and the Seattle Space Needle stuck on top of the Eiffel Tower, the latest atomic submarine would be unable to dive deep enough to reach the top of the Space Needle. And at the bottom of the trench, where pressure is measured by hundreds of tons, Picard and Walsh discovered life, including a fish resembling the common sole.

Although the discoveries of the *Challenger* voyage exceeded all expectations, the science it sought to advance was still in its infancy. After all, before Maury and the *Challenger* almost nothing was known of the oceans (the main water bodies were named Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian by international consent only in 1845). It has only been during the last three decades that oceanographers have added markedly to what was known after the *Challenger* cruise, and it's only been since the end of World War II that scientists have had the instruments, and the money, to draw apart the waves for a close look below.

FEDERAL SPENDING RISES

Several universities have departments or subdepartments devoted to marine studies, but most of the work has been done by Woods Hole and by the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in California. The Federal Government, for all its participating agencies, has given increased support to oceanographic research—$103.7 million in fiscal 1962 with $123.8 million budgeted for the current fiscal year. Mr. Kennedy's new budget would boost oceanography appropriations to $155.9 million. Some 90 percent of privately operated Woods Hole's budget is accounted for by Government contracts. There are many reasons, mostly military, why the Government wants to know more about the ocean and the ocean floor, especially in the era of the missile-firing submarine.

The peaceful implications of manipulating the sea, however, are far more dramatic than the military possibilities. One example is Columbus Iselin's proposal for the Gulf of St. Lawrence, a body of water which separates Newfoundland from the Canadian mainland and serves as the gateway to the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The upper layer of water in the gulf is fresh, cold, and without a great abundance of marine life. The lower layer is warm, salty, and teeming with marine nutrients (plankton and the progressively larger creatures attracted to it in the food chain). What would happen if the warm, fertile bottom water were continuously pumped to the surface?

Mr. Iselin believes the results would include keeping the gulf free of ice throughout the year (the seaway presently shuts down when ice makes it impassable in winter), vastly increasing the catches of fishermen, and improving Newfoundland's climate, which could stand some improving.

Before anything like this is done, scientists will study the plan carefully because, while the engineering job involved is relatively simple, they want to be sure such manipulation would be self-healing, that conditions would revert to normal without any unwanted effects if the plan, once put into operation, were discontinued.

RUSSIANS TALK OF EXPLOSIONS

Here again the problem of international agreements arises, because while a climatic change might benefit one country it could easily worsen the climate of another. The Russians have talked about using nuclear explosions to clear ice from frozen northern ports and even of creating new inland seas. A serious disturbance of the Arctic icepacks, however, could raise the level of the ocean and, in some low-lying areas, have catastrophic consequences.

So if man is to manipulate the ocean he must do it with an eye on the global weal. Considering the record of attempts at universal cooperation among nations, there's no reason to believe such an enlightened covenant will be achieved soon. But the scientists already know how to improve weather, climate, geography, and the world supply of resources if the legal and political questions can be solved.

Joseph Conrad wrote: "The sea never changes, and its works, for all the talk of men, are wrapped in mystery."

True. But the wrappings are beginning to come off.

Davy Jones' Larder—Primitive Fishing Methods Leave It All but Untouched

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

The business of obtaining food from the sea is, in A.D. 1963, at about where the business of obtaining food from the land was many thousands of years ago.

The catching of fish and other edible marine life is largely a matter of hunting, rather than farming, and no one should have to be reminded today of how superior scientific farming is to hit-or-miss hunting. The bulging grain storehouses and the herds of fat, grain-fed cattle in the American West leave no doubt that enlightened cultivation and harvesting is infinitely more productive than taking to the woods with a shotgun.

Yet it is the shotgun method that commercial fishermen around the world have used for centuries and, with very few exceptions, they don't seem able or willing to change their methods. There are many reasons for this static situation, and they involve hoary traditions, marketing problems and international politics—not necessarily in that order.

The basic pattern of land cultivation is one that is pretty well understood by everyone who has either sown a wheat field or planted geraniums in an apartment house window box. But the growth of life in the sea is less well known and yet, because of its implications, it is well worth knowing about.

"GRASS OF THE SEA"

As life perhaps once began on this planet, life in the sea begins with yellow-brown algae called diatoms. This "grass of the sea" is the food of the smallest marine animals, the one-celled protozoa referred to en masse as plankton. Small fish (and some whales, too) eat the plankton and are in turn eaten by successively larger fish. By manipulating this process, by farming the sea, man could quite easily increase many times the population of food fish and the size of the fisherman's catches.

He could do this in a number of ways, all depending on some international treaty establishing jurisdiction over broad areas of the ocean.

Let us suppose, for instance, that U.S. fishermen decided to farm a 10,000-square-mile section of the sea off Cape Cod. First the area would be fenced in, either electronically or by means of perforated air hoses on the ocean floor which would send constant streams of bubbles to the surface. In theory the bubbles, or electronic impulses, would keep the fish being cultivated fenced in and easily harvested. If the fish were thus detained, their growth could be stimulated both by pumping up plankton-rich water from lower levels and by fertilizing the water from the surface.

By periodic dragging of nets the area could be weeded; that is, the so-called trash fish (fish of relatively little use to man) could be removed, thereby leaving the marine nutrients for the food fish.

Such farming of the sea is entirely feasible, according to Columbus Iselin, founder of the Woods Hole (Mass.) Oceanographic Institution, but the initial expense would hardly be justified if the developers were not given an internationally recognized claim to the area under cultivation. This promises to remain a big hitch.

But the concept itself has in small ways been practiced for a long time. In some parts of Southeast Asia, for instance, native rice growers stock their fields with baby carp and, when they drain the fields to harvest the rice, they also pick up a good catch of flopping, mature carp.

While farming the open sea would require a more sophisticated approach, the engineering problems are as nothing compared with other problems peculiar to the commercial fishing industry.

Commercial fishing in the United States is not a booming business. With the notable exception of the west coast tuna canneries and the southern shrimp industry, American fishing fleets generally find a limited market.

While Americans will apparently eat tuna fish, shrimp and lobster in heroic amounts, they have little taste for many kinds of fish that are plentiful off our shores. One such fish is herring, and obviously if the return a fishing boat can get for herring is inadequate, very few boats will pursue it.

Nobody can blame the fisherman for this. But there are some causes for the industry's difficulties that can indeed be blamed on the fishermen. In New England, for example, the crews of fishing trawlers get the receipts for 60 percent of the catch while the boat's owner gets only 40 percent. This arrangement is a throwback to olden days and has little relation to the economic facts of life in 1963. Its most serious consequence is that it discourages the fishing fleet operators from buying new boats and equipment to make their business more efficient.

An important exception is found in the fleets that go after menhaden, an oily member of the herring family that's used for animal feed and fertilizer. The crews of menhaden boats, because their industry is relatively young, work on a salary basis along with a percentage of the catch. As a result, the menhaden fleets have a much better time of it economically than do their counterparts hunting food fish.

It is not overstating the case, moreover, to say that commercial fishermen as a rule treat new ideas with extraordinary caution.

Take, for example, the New England fishermen who are the inheritors of a long and romantic seafaring tradition. When they were told by oceanographers that there was money to be made by using modern methods to catch tuna off Cape Cod, they showed little enthusiasm.

A TUNA BOAT'S TAKE

Oceanographer Iselin responded by inviting a west coast tuna boat to make a trip through the Panama Canal to Cape Cod and catch itself some big ones. The resourceful west coast fishermen agreed and, for 5 days' work last summer, each man in the crew made $6,000. Next summer, not surprisingly, a whole fleet of west coast boats is expected.

There is another instance of opportunity that thus far east coast fishermen have ignored. One of the most precious products of the sea, pound for pound, is shrimp. Oceanographers pointed out to Boston fishermen that the waters off the coast of Maine are crawling with a cold water variety of the crustacean, and that they might be marketed at a good profit.

The fishermen discounted the advice. Everybody prefers shrimp from the Gulf of Mexico, they said. The water off Maine is so deep they'd have to outfit their boats with heavier equipment. And anyway, cold-water shrimp tend to spoil quickly, perhaps even before the hauls could be delivered to the Boston dock.

Scientists told the fishermen that Americans preferred southern shrimp because that is the only kind they knew, that a relatively small investment in new equipment might return handsome dividends.

Even if we did it, replied the fishermen, the shrimp would spoil on our decks. Why not boil the shrimp on board as soon as they are caught? suggested an oceanographer.

We are fishermen, not cooks, was the answer.

The tuna and shrimp incidents are not reported here to make a case against New England fishing crews. Rather these attitudes merely exemplify the mental torpor of much of the world's commercial fisheries, with the important exception of Russia. The Russians have the biggest, most modern fishing boats on the sea with a range permitting them to sail where they please. Some of the Soviet vessels are floating canneries. Many Russian fishing boats are known to perform military functions as well.

That the United States lacks a fishing fleet to rival Russia's, of course, should be kept in perspective. Thanks to the ingenuity of American farmers and the good offices of the U.S. Agriculture Department, we have far more food in this country than our population requires. There has been no strong impetus to go after fish. In Russia, where food is less abundant, herring, and sturgeon are not just a Friday night change of pace.

ROLE OF THE SCHOOLS

It should be mentioned here that U.S. farm surpluses stem, too, from the research of the scientific community. Many colleges and universities operate their own farms on which new methods are tested—the successful ones being recommended to farmers. The schools doing research on seafood, unfortunately, are reluctant to operate their own fisheries because, they claim, they would be competing with the commercial fishermen who are having a hard enough time as it is.

The imbalance of the food supply around the world is often explained by citing poor soil (for field crops) in the tropics and the plant-killing cold in polar climes. But science is equipped today to deal with these problems. Soil chemists and mechanical engineers have the knowledge to vastly increase food production on land and sea.

What all this means is that modern man need not tolerate widespread deprivation because of technological or biological helplessness. The means are known to cultivate much of the three-quarters of the earth's land surface that is practically uninhabited, and these deserts, and frozen wastes and tangled jungles may yet be put to work.

Meanwhile the sea abounds with food enough to feed the world, but the initiative lies with man.

MARINE MINING—UNDERSEA DEPOSITS OF MINERALS AWAIT RESOURCEFUL ENGINEERS

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

The wealth of nations derives from the bounty of the earth and the ways that bounty is used. In the 150 years since the beginning of the industrial revolution man has learned something about husbanding natural resources, but still the demands of modern technology have steadily reduced underground reserves of minerals and organic fuels.

Therefore, it's hardly surprising that American industrialists and military men look rather longingly at the world ocean whose 335 million cubic miles of water hold a greater supply of minerals than do all the mines and quarries of the continents.

Nor does the mineral treasure of the ocean end with the components of sea water. On the ocean floor, in most places at substantial depths, are vast scatterings of nodules—rocklike chunks that are rich in manganese and iron. And below the ocean floor, in the continental shelves that flank the U.S. coasts, are reserves expected one day to yield 20 billion barrels of crude oil and 150 billion cubic feet of natural gas.

Pumping oil and gas from beneath the sea is no great trick, providing the water is relatively shallow. Drilling rigs are familiar sights in the Gulf of Mexico, off the coasts of Texas and Louisiana.

Extracting salt from salt water is easily done by simple evaporation; the main aim, of course, usually is to get fresh water. Today, the practice has become relatively sophisticated, recovering at the same time such chemicals as sodium phosphate, potassium chloride and magnesium chloride. Another byproduct of the process is bromine. But although the composition of sea water has triggered a lot of wide-eyed speculation about its possibilities as an inexhaustible mineral source, there is a very big hitch. Magnesium, a metal of relatively great abundance in the sea, is present in concentrations of about one-tenth of 1 percent whereas average rock or soil contains about 40 times as much.

ECONOMICS AND ENGINEERING

The eventual large-scale mining of sea water depends on two factors: The continued availability of economic concentrations of minerals on land and the development of sufficient supplies of cheap power to extract minerals from sea water at lower and lower cost.

As a matter of scientific knowledge, the metal-rich nodules that dot millions of square miles of the oceans' floor are there for the grabbing. As a matter of engineering knowledge, the inaccessibility of most of the nodules makes that grabbing presently uneconomic.

Dr. Edward D. Goldberg of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in California has reported the nodules, which may range in size from that of a potato to a chunk 3 feet in diameter, have a mineral content made up of, on the average, 20 percent manganese, 15 percent iron and fractional amounts of nickel, cobalt, and copper. Nodules have been found, however, with far higher concentrations of these minerals.

While most of the nodules lie in the deep recesses of the ocean floor, great quantities have been found between Tahiti and Hawaii at depths of less than a mile. John L. Mero, research engineer for the University of California Department of Mineral Technology, believes mining these minerals is entirely economic.

Mr. Mero visualizes a massive pumping system, which he calls a giant vacuum cleaner, to do the job. But it remains for someone to put up the money to build the elaborate device and test it before its feasibility can be judged. Right now, many oceanographers are skeptical.

Regarding the resources beneath the continental shelves, man has made major strides in recent years in exploiting them. Currently an attempt is underway to poke a hole through the earth's crust to the mantle to see what's there. Named Project Mohole, the attempt is being made in the continental shelf off the coast of Central America because the crust is thinner there than it is on the continent proper.

Although Project Mohole is described as a pure-science enterprise, the techniques devised for sampling the earth's mantle from a floating platform on the surface of the sea could eventually be of aid to oil drillers and miners of the ocean floor.

One element not always mentioned in connection with schemes for making the sea give up its minerals is phosphorus, an element indispensable to all types of life. Man gets most of his phosphorus from plants but in many places the plants have a hard time getting it from phosphorus-poor soil. Moreover, 3,500,000 tons of phosphorus are washed into the sea every year.

THE OCEAN'S SEDIMENT

Because of this phosphorus loss to the sea, thought is being given to digging the element from the sediment on the ocean bottom. This sediment is a layer of varying thickness composed of the remains of marine life and the dust that filters down from the surface. Mr. Mero has calculated that aside from phosphorus, there is enough copper and aluminum in the sediment to last a million years at the present rate of consumption. Again the problem is one of engineering.

In view of this problem, the engineering feats of such creatures as the little oyster are interesting. The oyster, in the process of pumping thousands of gallons of sea water through itself, extracts minerals, such as phosphorous and copper, and concentrates them in its body.

One of the several problems known to man but not to oysters is that of establishing

legal ownership of the resources in the deep ocean basins (resources in or on the continental shelves are recognized as belonging to the coastal country). Abundant as the manganese nodules are, for instance, they are not so abundant that they can be regarded as oxygen in the air or the dissolved salt in the sea. National proprietorships may eventually have to be established.

Unlike research currently being conducted in the field of marine life, research into the location and concentration of deep-sea mineral deposits will probably not lead to important economic developments soon. With necessity absent, invention remains unborn.

But dwindling deposits on land and the growing needs of an expanding technology and population make it likely that the minerals of the deep will one day be put to work.

MURKY BATTLEFIELD—UNITED STATES MARSHALS DETERRENTS, DEFENSES FAR BELOW THE SEA

(By Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

On the October night when President Kennedy announced America's determination to eliminate the Cuban missile threat, it is likely that a U.S. nuclear submarine lay beneath the billows of the Baltic Sea, laden with weaponry capable of destroying 16 Soviet cities the size of Moscow. And because it was poised exactly where it was, it remained entirely invisible to the submarine-detection equipment of the Russian fleet.

We don't know all this for sure because U.S. atomic submarines operate under the utmost secrecy. But when we understand something of what such a submarine can do and when we know some of the open secrets of the ocean, a glance at the map suggests some of the areas where a Polaris sub might be expected to lurk in time of crisis. And from the depths of the Baltic, Polaris missiles would be within range of every major city in European Russia.

But the trick for a nuclear submarine is not just to be in position to do the most damage with its 16 missiles. It must also avoid detection and possible destruction itself, and from this need has developed an intensive Government-sponsored campaign to survey the ocean and the ocean floor.

The hypothetical submarine mentioned above, for instance, had found a hiding place in the sea, a pocket of warm water surrounded by cold water. Because sea water is a poor conductor of heat, the pocket of warm water lay surrounded by cold water without mixing with it.

Now, it is one of the countless phenomena of the sea that submarine-detection signals will be deflected at the meeting place of warm and cold water layers. Therefore, a sub lying in the right spot would be invisible to the enemy. This was known during World War II but it has only been in recent years that both the United States and Russia have been attempting to chart these warm water pockets in the strategic areas of the ocean.

Navy submarines and surface ships plus vessels operated by private oceanographic institutions are equipped with devices known as bathythermographs for determining the water temperature at various depths. It's known that Russian subs are similarly equipped and it's likely that the huge Soviet fishing fleet has heard of the technique.

NAVY'S FUTURE

Enormous as is the job of charting water temperatures in the vast, ever-shifting ocean, it is just one phase of oceanographic research being carried on for military purposes. It is somewhat ironic to recall that shortly after World War II, when Air Force jets first became a common sight in the sky, there was talk of greatly reducing the size of the Navy. Of what use, the question went, is a relatively sluggish armada when jets and missiles are hurtling across continents in minutes?

Yet there is growing evidence today that the Navy, especially the undersea Navy, will provide one of the most formidable deterrents for years to come.

To appreciate the reasons for this it is necessary to appreciate the Polaris-type submarine itself. This craft can twice circumnavigate the globe without refueling and can stay submerged for months. It can dive to depths of almost 1,000 feet and move under water at better than 35 knots (the exact figures are classified but those are probably useful estimates).

Naturally, for a missile-carrying submarine it's essential that the skipper know exactly where he is at all times; otherwise, he would never dare fire a missile.

There are two principal ways that the navigator of an atomic sub calculates his position. One is with the use of an inertial guidance system, similar to the devices that keep missiles on course. This electronic behemoth records every movement of the vessel from the time it leaves port. The other navigational means is a remarkable sextant that takes star sightings through the periscope. Between these two instruments, the position of a sub—even after many weeks submerged—can be figured with great accuracy.

Still, scientists are trying to do better, and they must seek improvements without resort to radio transmission which would expose the craft to the enemy. Therefore a large-scale effort is being made to chart the earth's magnetic and gravitational forces beneath the sea. Magnetic and gravity readings vary from place to place due to the irregular shape of the earth and the varying densities of rocks beneath the ocean floor. If the necessary data were in hand, it would be possible for a submarine to simply check its magnetometer and gravimeter against the figures on its charts and it would know exactly where it was.

This system, however, is likely to remain in the research stage for some time, chiefly because of the enormity of the job of taking magnetic and gravity readings over thousands of square miles of ocean.

Another area of great interest to the Navy is the topography of the ocean floor which, in most places beyond the Continental Shelf, is a succession of mountains and trenches. Such undersea landmarks could be of great value to nuclear submarines; this may explain why charts of the ocean floor showing contour lines within 5 miles of each other are classified.

Exactly what the Navy has in mind for the ocean bottom is secret, although one well-informed civilian scientist says it has some interesting things cooking. There is talk of missile bases on the floor of the sea, undersea caves for use as submarine depots and hideouts, and various other futuristic possibilities. Oceanographers, however, tend to relegate such ideas to the science fiction bin and just chuckle when popular magazines report them as imminent.

A submarine's greatest asset is its secrecy of movement. When one considers that it took American and British frigates, submarines, and airplanes almost a week to find the hijacked Portuguese liner *Santa Maria* 2 years ago—even though the big surface ship's position was roughly known before the search began—one begins to understand how difficult it is to track down enemy submarines. And the best way to do it is still through the use of sound, with advanced sonar-hydrophone systems picking up the noise a moving submarine must inevitably make.

THE ATOM SUB'S ROAR

Water, of course, is an extraordinary sound conductor. It's so good that a small explosion set off beneath the sea near Australia was picked up clearly by oceanographers in Bermuda. Columbus Iselin, of Woods Hole (Mass.) Oceanographic Institution, claims that a pistol shot fired at the right depth can be heard at the other side of the ocean. So when an atomic submarine is slipping through the water at high speed, it emits a steady roar—despite the many improvements made by the Navy to muffle it—and is therefore detectable.

Along with reducing the noise a submarine makes, the Navy is also studying the behavior patterns of sound at various depths. The submariners themselves have learned to distinguish the sound of another sub from the natural sounds of the sea.

The Soviet Union, with the largest submarine fleet in the world (well over 400 vessels), is believed to permanently station about 125 undersea craft in the North Atlantic. Thus, the U.S. Navy is faced with the formidable job of finding and tracking them. This will probably be done in the future with a kind of underwater radar device known as Artemis, which is actually a mammoth sonar machine. Artemis sends out, below the surface and over vast distances, electronic sounds similar to the lower notes on a piano. A long string of hydrophones, scattered throughout the Atlantic, picks up these sounds when they are reflected off any large object, and relays them via underwater cables to a 76-foot tower off Bermuda.

The tower, which is known as Argus Island and which stands atop an extinct volcano, receives the signals and feeds them into computing machines. When the system is fully developed, scientists will be able to distinguish sound bounced off a whale's belly from sound bounced off a hostile sub.

RUSSIA PUSHES OWN SYSTEMS

The Russians, to be sure, are also at work on submarine detection systems, but there is some evidence that they are far behind the U.S. in this department.

In the future, too, is the Navy's highly classified Project Caesar, which involves placing scores of hydrophones all around the North American Continent. One responsible civilian source said such devices can detect an enemy submarine within a range of 500 miles. This is enormously important because modern depth charges and modern torpedoes are immensely effective against undersea craft—nuclear depth charges can destroy a sub several thousands of yards away, and homing torpedoes, working on sonic, thermal or magnetic principles, are said to be errorproof.

Thus has man taken his genius for war and weapons beneath the sea. But amid the nuclear submarines, the underwater missiles, and the network of hydrophones, there are natural resources that defy calculation—more food than the world could eat, more minerals than two worlds could use.

The ocean now awaits the pleasure of man.

COSTLY RESULTS OF KENNEDY-FREEMAN FEED GRAINS PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last year the Federal Government paid the American farmers nearly $700 million to retire approximately 20 million acres of corn and other feed grains from production. At the same time under another program they paid the American farmers over $200 million to subsidize the purchase of lime and fertilizer in order to increase the productive capacity of the remaining acres cultivated.

Today I wish to call the attention of the Senate to two very costly results of this contradictory and extravagant Kennedy-Freeman feed grains program.

First. In addition to the payments made to the American farmers we now find that the administration has paid over $1 million to the wholesale seed dealers handling seed corn and sorghum seed to compensate them for the profit which they lost as a result of the reduced sales of seed corn and sorghum seed. Last year these payments totaled $1,413,193.42 and ranged as high as $20,000 each to some of the major seed companies.

Presumably these payments were made on the basis that as the Government paid the farmers to reduce their feed grain acreage there would be reduced sales of seed for the remaining acreage.

Of course once this principle is adopted I suppose the fertilizer companies could by the same line of reasoning claim compensation from the Federal Government for the reduced sale of fertilizer, the farm equipment manufacturers and dealers would have a claim against the Government for profits lost as the result of the sale of less farm equipment, local farm labor could file a claim for less jobs, and local merchants, bankers, and so forth, could all come in and claim compensatory payments as a result of the reduced volume of business due to acreage curtailment. Yes, if this principle is extended, everybody will get a free ride on the Kennedy-Freeman gravy train except the taxpayers.

The fact that the administration, after having once approved this New Frontier program and after having paid out over a million dollars, has decided to abandon the program for next year, does not eliminate the danger of such programs. Nor does the fact that last year was an election year when the doors of the Treasury were wide open remain without significance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a list of these payments to seed dealers, broken down by States.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State	Corn	Sorghum
Alabama	$31,293.00	
Florida	1,234.50	
Georgia	18,391.50	
Illinois	327,726.05	$22.80
Indiana	164,237.18	
Iowa	197,598.49	7,972.20
Kansas	8,272.50	33,724.12
Kentucky	19,185.00	
Louisiana	23,134.50	
Massachusetts	1,875.00	
Minnesota	42,304.50	
Mississippi	3,778.50	
Missouri	57,109.08	820.80
Nebraska	55,725.59	41,010.68
New York	10,350.00	
North Carolina	33,474.00	
Ohio	78,696.10	
Pennsylvania	5,650.05	
South Dakota	2,215.50	
Tennessee	8,781.00	
Texas	25,128.00	148,070.28
Virginia	14,242.50	
Wisconsin	61,170.00	
Total	1,181,572.54	231,620.88

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. Second, Mr. President, there was another fantastic result of this absurd Kennedy-Freeman feed grains program—a program based on the principle that someone should be paid to do nothing.

In an earlier report, I mentioned the Farmers Investment Co., in Arizona, as having collected $94,092.30 from the Government in 1961 as its payment not to cultivate all its lands. Today, I call attention to the remarkably easy way it found to make money fast on the New Frontier.

This company rented 582.3 acres from the State of Arizona—Maricopa County—at an average cost of $3 per acre, or less than $1,800. The U.S. Department of Agriculture, through the ASC state committee, then contracted to pay the company $37.90 per acre, or a total of $22,069.17, not to cultivate the same acreage. This represented a net profit of over $20,000 merely to act as an agent between the State of Arizona and the Federal Government.

In Pinal County, Ariz., the Farmers Investment Co. rented three tracts from the State of 81 acres, 37.6 acres, and 37.6 acres, respectively, for which it paid the State of Arizona an average of $4.50 per acre.

The Federal Government then contracted to pay the company $41.30 per acre not to cultivate the 81 acres, $43.20 per acre not to cultivate one of the tracts of 37.6 acres, and $51.70 per acre not to cultivate the other tract of 37.6 acres.

The result was that on this second deal, involving the 156.2 acres which the Farmers Investment Co. rented from the State of Arizona—Pinal County—the company paid the State around $700, and then collected a total of $6,913.54 from the Federal Government not to cultivate the same acreage. This represented a net profit of approximately $6,200.

On the two transactions the Farmers Investment Co. made an easy profit of over $26,500 on land which it was renting from the State of Arizona for less than $2,500.

There is nothing to indicate that these two transactions are isolated cases, nor is there any evidence to show how widespread this practice may be. But these two examples do show what can happen under a farm program that is designed, not on the basis of how it will benefit the conditions of the American farmer, but, rather, on the basis of how it will affect election results.

I have checked with officials of the State of Arizona, and they have confirmed the rental payments referred to above; and as confirmation of the payments made by the Federal Government on the same acreage, I ask unanimous consent that a letter signed by Mr. H. D. Godfrey, Administrator of the Agriculture Stabilization Conservation Service, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

November 28, 1962.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reply to your letter of August 20, in which you requested information regarding payments made under the 1961 feed grain program to the Farmers Investment Co. of Tucson, Arizona.

The Arizona ASC State Committee has advised us that the company in question did not divert any acreage of federally owned land in 1961; however, the following acreages of State-owned land were diverted under the 1961 feed grain program in the State:

County	Acres diverted	Payment rate per acre
Maricopa	582.3	$37.90
Pinal	81.0	41.30
Do	37.6	43.20
Do	37.6	51.70

Program regulations for the 1961 feed grain program with respect to establishing payment rates where public-owned land is involved are as follows:

"The rate of payment under the program with respect to land which is leased or rented on a cash rent basis and which is owned by the Federal Government or by a State, a political subdivision or any agency thereof and which is otherwise eligible for participation in the program shall not exceed a fair payment rate as determined by the county committee. Such payment rate shall be the actual cash rent per acre of the land adjusted to take into account the quality of the acres which the producer designates as diverted when compared with the total acres rented, and the services performed and improvements made at the lessee's expense which are in addition to rent. A payment in excess of the cash rent may only be made if approved by a representative of the State committee."

If we can be of further service in this matter, please call on us.

Sincerely yours,

H. D. GODFREY,
Administrator.

REDUCTION OF TRADE BARRIERS AND SUPPORT OF NATO

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there appears in today's newspapers reports on and excerpts from two speeches on the nature and future of the western alliance, one by Dean Acheson, and the other by the Ambassador from France, Mr. Herve Alphand.

Mr. Acheson does not, as we know, hold any position in the U.S. Government. He is a partner in a law firm which has many international clients.

While I find much to agree with in Mr. Acheson's remarks, I also find what I think is a rather pathetic hope that President de Gaulle does not mean what he says, and that, even if he does, his obstructions to the Atlantic alliance can somehow be overcome.

Mr. Acheson is, in my opinion, indulging in a pipedream when he assumes that the United States, Britain, and the five Common Market countries other than France, can reduce trade barriers among them without the help of France, and even in face of her objections.

The fact is that in addition to France, West Germany and the Netherlands are also raising trade barriers against the United States. One of the principal objectives of the Common Market as it is emerging is the provision of a sheltered market for the farmers of the member countries. French farmers hope to benefit the most; but so do the others. Barriers are already being raised against American poultry, fruit, and flour. More barriers against wheat products and feed grains will follow.

Agricultural exports to these countries account for about one-third of all American exports to them. Not just France, but several Common Market countries are seeking to curb just as much as possible the entry of those U.S. commodities.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD two articles on this subject from the western edition of the Christian Science Monitor of March 6. One is entitled "European Progress Curtails Import Needs." The other is entitled "U.S. Poultry Crisis Trails Hallstein Talks."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EUROPEAN PROGRESS CURTAILS IMPORT NEEDS

(By John Allan May)

LONDON.—Can the United States expect now to increase its agricultural trade with Europe?

Well, Europe's import requirements of wheat this year are likely to be considerably lower than last year.

Coarse-grain import requirements are expected to be somewhat lower.

Trade in dairy products is expected to meet some further difficulties.

A contraction of egg production is likely.

Europe's imports of beef, veal, and pig meat very likely will decrease further.

Production and consumption, and trade in poultry meat, however, continues to expand.

Thus does the secretariat of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe sum up the market situation in European agriculture and the outlook for short-term trade.

CROP ESTIMATED

The total 1962 European grain crop excluding that of the Soviet Union is estimated at about 164 million tons, about 8 percent more than in the previous year.

In the U.S.S.R. the crop reached a record level of 147,400,000 tons, about 10 million tons more than in the previous year.

Wheat production in Western Europe is estimated to be 11 million tons higher than in 1961. Relatively large quantities of this are likely to be used for animal feeding.

With regard to coarse grains a reduction of the maize crop has been offset by a big barley crop.

The problems of the butter market remained unsolved in 1962, the Economic Commission for Europe reports.

The application of quotas in the London market stabilized prices but left some countries with large unsold stocks. These have increased in spite of an increase in butter consumption in a number of countries.

Trade in cheese and milk powder cannot be expected to absorb much more milk, the Economic Commission for Europe adds. An increase in milk production in Western Europe at the same time can be expected to add further to the difficulties of the market in dairy products.

The two salient features of the European egg market in recent years, the Economic Commission for Europe goes on, have been: (1) the familiar phenomenon of overcompensation of supply in response to price changes and, (2) the decline of West German imports for the third successive year.

Low egg prices during the hatching season this year could lead to a restriction of the number of eggs incubated and to a subsequent contraction of production in the 1962–63 season, it is said.

DANGERS SIGHTED

Consumption of meat has risen in all parts of Europe as a result of rising income, the Economic Commission for Europe declares. In line with this tendency meat production has also expanded. Europe's production has been increasing more rapidly than its consumption. Europe has expanded its own meat exports, particularly to the United States.

In Eastern Europe increased numbers of livestock in nearly all countries in 1962 points to a further increase in meat production there, too.

Production and consumption of poultry meat both continued to expand in 1962, the Economic Commission for Europe concludes. Falling prices have led to increased consumption and thus increased production. Technical improvements have raised productivity, but "a painful readjustment is still ahead for many traditional producers—particularly for those who produce poultry meat as a byproduct of egg production."

The big importing market has been West Germany. This dependence on a single market has been "fraught with dangers in the long run" for exporters. Moreover, although German imports may remain high the pattern of the trade "may be influenced by the new regulations of the European Economic Community (the European Common Market)."

Apart from that change—of great significance of course to the United States, which is seeking to expand its exports of agricultural products—the Economic Commission for Europe sees no sign that the expansion of production and consumption in Europe will come to a halt in the near future.

U.S. POULTRY CRISIS TRAILS HALLSTEIN TALKS

(By Robert R. Brunn)

WASHINGTON.—Walter Hallstein, President of the European Common Market, has started a round of talks here, and from President Kennedy on down he keeps hearing about chickens.

The current chicken crisis involves a domestic poultry surplus of gigantic size. It is being built up by a 12.5 percent per pound tariff slapped on American poultry by the Common Market countries last July.

President Kennedy spent 45 minutes with Mr. Hallstein Monday, and Mr. Kennedy hastened to bring up chickens.

So far Washington's officialdom doesn't seem to be quite sure what to do about the chicken surplus. It mounts every day.

But officials in their Hallstein talks are even more concerned about American agriculture's European Market generally. If the European Economic Community goes ahead with its plans, in the spring the Common Market will fix common import restrictions on wheat and feed grains.

QUESTION LOOMS

Overall, the Department of Agriculture believes that if the French and German farm lobbies are able to win out in the six-nation market, protective tariffs can well cut back American crop exports to Europe by 30 percent.

More than 30 percent of American exports to Europe are foodstuffs. It is figured that if half of this is lost, everything remaining constant, the U.S. healthy favorable trade balance could be turned into a deficit.

As it now is, the American international balance-of-payments condition is touch and go. This is why the Hallstein talks about poultry and the possible spring tariffs have a tone of urgency about them.

The administration is deeply anxious about the possible political repercussions of all this. If European tariffs continue to rise, then the traditional struggle between the free traders and the protectionists would have greater meaning.

But if grains are shut out of the EEC, then the administration actually might have a farm revolt on its hands, the congressional farm bloc could get much more hard to control in its voting, and the big farm organizations might demand retaliatory tariffs.

NO SOLUTION REPORTED

During the Hallstein visit the Common Market president will be asked if he actually expects the grain tariffs to come into effect this spring, now the Common Market is in an uncertain state following the De Gaulle break with its colleagues over British entry.

A delay of at least a year may be in the works, before the grain tariffs are implemented. The administration hope is that by then at least the beginning of a proposed series of international commodity cartels would have appeared that would insure the United States a certain share in the European farm market.

After the Kennedy meeting Mr. Hallstein hurried down the street to the Department of Agriculture where he met Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman. They talked turkey (and chickens).

No solution came out publicly, and it is agreed that little advance was made behind the doors, either.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I direct to Mr. Acheson's attention these sentences:

> Overall, the Department of Agriculture believes that if the French and German farm lobbies are able to win out in the six-nation market, protective tariffs can well cut back American crop exports to Europe by 30 percent. More than 30 percent of American exports to Europe are foodstuffs. It is figured that if half of this is lost, everything remaining constant, the U.S. healthy favorable trade balance could be turned into a deficit.
>
> As it is now, the American international balance-of-payments condition is touch and go.

Mr. President, let me say that I would be very much interested to find that Mr. Acheson represents a single farm producer or farm organization, in connection with any of his international law practice. But I represent a State which has a great stake in whether the foreign policy of the United States is to be one that sells short the American farmer. Let me make very clear—as I tried to do from this desk on January 16—that I do not intend to support a foreign policy, either by the Kennedy administration or by any other administration, that sells short American farmers. So far as I am concerned, I have voted for the last dollar to buttress Europe at the expense of the American taxpayers. It is undeniable—let me say to Mr. Acheson or to others who are following the line of his speech of yesterday—that today the NATO countries are in a better monetary position than is the United States to carry their full share of the burdens and the cost of NATO. I repeat that if De Gaulle wants to go it alone, I invite him to take a long walk. So far as I am concerned, I will not support a foreign economic program by this Government that causes the American taxpayers to pour more millions of dollars into the economy of the Common Market countries, while they follow a policy of exclusion to American farm products.

Mr. Acheson espouses the complacent dogma that our present defense policy in Europe must be continued because it is right; but he says nothing of how it is to be paid for. I say that a defense policy which requires a continued drain on the American taxpayers, for the benefit of nations perfectly able to pay much more toward it themselves, is not right, and it should not be tolerated. The nations that are "putting the squeeze" on American farm goods are not worried about whether we maintain our conventional forces in Europe. Probably they believe there are enough policymakers in the United States gullible enough to follow the Acheson line that the United States is a bottomless pit of gold and greenbacks, and that we shall pay any price they ask just to keep our troops on their soil.

Mr. Alphand makes very much the same totally mistaken assumption.

Let me say to the French Ambassador that we welcome his exercise of his right of free speech while holding his diplomatic post in this country; but let me also make clear to the French Ambassador and to any other ambassador who exercises the precious right of free speech on the platforms in America that we have the right to reply when we think their speeches are as unfortunate and as unsound as, in my opinion, was the speech made yesterday in California by the French Ambassador.

The French Ambassador brags of the favorable condition of France's balance of payments, but he neglects to say that it is being achieved at American expense. He brags of the defense expenditure by France, but neglects to mention that France is failing seriously to meet her obligations to NATO.

From the floor of the Senate today I say to the French Ambassador, "Where are French troops in NATO? Why has not France supported NATO with uniformed men in accord with the rightful burden that France ought to maintain in the support of NATO?

The United States has been maintaining in Europe our full commitment to NATO, closer to a state of complete combat-readiness than the forces of any other member. France is not an equal partner in NATO by her own decision, not ours, because it is President de Gaulle's decision to keep French forces under his own command that should be under NATO command.

I am flatly opposed to a continued American subsidy to France through NATO. I am even more opposed to it in light of the Common Market exclusion of American farm commodities, which proves to me that the member countries have little interest in whether the United States remains in Europe or not.

If it is good enough for the European members of NATO to put half-filled divisions under its command with the pledge to fill them when and if a crisis comes, then it is good enough for us, too.

Mr. President, it is about time that we started doing it.

American taxpayers have been plucked long enough for the support of European defenses. The time has come for the United States to make clear to the NATO countries that they must pay their full share—not half their share or less—in the defense and support of NATO. The Congress of the United States and the Kennedy administration aré about to hear from the American people in ever-increasing tempo in opposition to further waste of money in Europe in support of NATO colleagues who are not willing to join in an equal support of freedom in the free world.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS LEAGUE CONFERENCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a letter from Mr. LeRoy Graymer, executive secretary of the Oregon High School International Relations League; and a memorandum on the league's recent conference.

There being no objection, the letter and the memorandum were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Oregon High School International Relations League, University of Oregon,
Eugene, Oreg., March 1, 1963.

Senator Wayne Morse,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: We wish to sincerely thank you for your participation in the 16th Annual International Relations League Conference. The insights which you brought to the 600 participants at this meeting contributed greatly to their understanding of the implications of the social and economic revolutions being attempted by the Alliance for Progress program. As always, you succeeded in inspiring and educating the people attending this conference.

We are particularly grateful for your informal remarks at the advisor's luncheon. Not only did this stimulate considerable thought among the teachers present, it also helped the IRL executive committee in selecting a conference topic for next year. Although not specifically formulated, it will deal with some aspect of European unity or disunity.

I wish to indicate what a pleasant experience it was for me to meet and talk with you during your attendance at this conference.

The Institute of International Studies and the Oregon Education Association appreciate the continuous support you have given to the International Relations League over the years of its existence.

Since there was some conversation at the advisor's luncheon concerning the possibility of your placing some information on the International Relations League in the Congressional Record, I am enclosing some information on the league and this year's conference.

Thank you again for the time and energy that you have devoted to our program.

Sincerely yours,

LeRoy Graymer,
Executive Secretary.

Résumé of International Relations League Activities and the 1963 Conference "Revista de la Alianza Para el Progreso" ("Review of the Alliance Progress"). This was the topic for the Oregon High School International Relations League conference held on February 7–9, 1963, at the University of Oregon. This meeting culminated a year-long study of the Alliance for Progress by the members of International Relations Clubs in 65 high schools throughout the State of Oregon.

The league, now in its 16th consecutive year of operation, is a jointly sponsored endeavor of the University of Oregon's institute of international studies and oversea administration and the International Relations Committee of the Oregon Education Association.

Its principal purpose is to promote an active interest in international relations among high school students and to provide a framework within which these interested students can effectively broaden their understanding of the issues and problems of this field. Coordinators of the program are members of the Oregon Education Association-International Relations League executive committee, including Mr. Lawrence Page, chairman, Lebanon; Mr. Ray Conlon, Portland; Mr. Paul Davis, Dallas; Mr. Gareth Goddard, Portland; Mr. Clyde McLain, Philomath; Mr. Arthur Motz, Myrtle Point; Miss Lois Rice, Cottage Grove; Mrs. Betty Roberts, Portland; Miss Fern Trull, Grants Pass; Mr. Patrick Maney, Oregon Education Association consultant; Mr. Leroy Graymer, executive secretary; and Dr. Robert Loring Allen, University of Oregon consultant. Staff includes Mr. Robert L. Curry, Jr., graduate assistant, and Mrs. Thelma Aman, administrative assistant.

In 65 of the high schools throughout the State, organized International Relations Clubs participate in the league program and engage in a variety of activities designed to improve relations among the people in Oregon communities and those in foreign nations.

Each fall the Institute of International Studies prepares a "Study Guide" for the students on a topic of vital concern in the area of international affairs. For the 1962-63 school year, the study guide was titled, "Review of the Alliance for Progress." Dr. Paul S. Holbo, assistant professor of history at the University of Oregon, wrote "Latin America: Problems and Progress" as a background paper for this study guide. The paper provides a comprehensive background on the geographical, historical, social, political and economic factors that have current impact on developments in Latin America. It also gives a foundation for understanding United States-Latin American relations.

The guide also contains a list of study questions, an extensive bibliography of books and periodicals pertaining to the issues to be discussed, and as well, the format for the annual conference. The publication, printed by the Oregon Education Association, was sent with other materials to each International Relations Club in the State, and some clubs in southwest Washington. Schools in which no clubs have yet been organized also received a copy. Other materials sent included copies of the Charter of Punta del Este which also contained discussion on the specific provisions in the Charter, studies which had been prepared for congressional committees dealing with questions pertinent to the Alliance, and several other valuable materials published by the Pan American Union.

The conference held during February or March each year provides an opportunity for some members of each club to participate in a program of discussion sessions and to hear prominent speakers who have special competence in the topic under discussion. Topics for these conferences in past years have included such issues as "Disarmament, the United Nations, and Problems of Emerging Countries."

The 1963 conference was patterned after a special meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council at the ministerial level. It was at such a meeting in August 1961, that the Charter of Punta del Este was signed giving approval to the "Alianza Para el Progreso." Since each year a meeting of this body is held for the purpose of reviewing the progress made under the Alliance, a model of these meetings provides an excellent format for the international relations league program. Five hundred high school students and 75 teachers participated in this conference.

Schools gathering at this year's conference represented 20 member countries of the Alliance plus a delegation speaking in behalf of Cuba. Country assignments were made early in the school year to allow the several schools representing a single country to meet for caucus meetings. Assignments were made as follows:

Argentina: Centennial (Gresham), Gresham, Reynolds (Troutdale).

Bolivia: Benson (Portland), Grant (Portland).

Brazil: Ashland Crater (Central Point), Medford.

Chile: Marshall (Portland).

Colombia: Hudson's Bay (Vancouver), Providence Academy (Vancouver).

Costa Rica: Forest Grove, Sherwood.

Cuba: Cleveland (Portland), Lincoln (Portland).

Dominican Republic: Franklin (Portland), Roosevelt (Portland), St. Mary's Academy (Portland).

Educador: Albany, Corvallis, Lebanon, Central (Independence).

Guatemala: McMinnville, West Linn.

Haiti: Douglas (Winston), Powers, Roseburg.

Honduras: North Salem, South Salem.

Mexico: Grants Pass, Riddle.

Nicaragua: Dallas, Stayton.

Panama: Clackamas (Milwaukie), Lake Oswego.

Paraguay: Marshfield (Coos Bay), Myrtle Point, North Bend.

Peru: Bend, Klamath Falls, Lakeview.

El Salvador: Astoria, Scappoose, St. Helens.

United States: North Eugene, South Eugene.

Uruguay: Cottage Grove, Springfield.

Venezuela: Beaverton, Woodrow Wilson (Portland), Tigard.

In addition, Sunset High School of Beaverton, Estacada High School, and The Dalles High School attended the conference as observers since their clubs were newly formed this year. The conference deviated from the actual Inter-American Economic and Social Council meeting in that a delegation representing Cuba was allowed to attend the conference. Those students representing Cuba helped to give voice to some inescapable forces operating in the Latin American scene. However, they were not allowed to vote in any proceedings at the meetings.

Committees of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council meeting at the conference represented a breakdown of the principal programs proposed by the Alliance for Progress. Every country had at least one representative on each committee and each of the committees was chaired by a high school student. Committee chairmen included:

Agrarian reform: Steve Talbot, Beaverton; Randy Grant, Grant (Portland).

Industrial development: Carrie L. Walters, North Salem; Larry Gordon, Cleveland (Portland).

National development plan: Ken Birrell, South Salem; John Collins, North Eugene.

Fiscal and monetary reform: Ashro Wilson, Lincoln (Portland); Doug Dralle, Cottage Grove.

Social improvement: Larry Sutton, Lebanon; Janet Mathieson, St. Francis (Eugene).

Trade and commodity policy: Dick Solomon, Lincoln (Portland); Jim Sterling, Dallas.

Economic integration: Lisa Nickerson, South Eugene; Jenny Lou Thompson, Crater.

External assistance: Karen Krebs, Grants Pass; Bill Meyer, Tigard.

Graduate students from the university sat in on the committee meetings to serve as resource people and to help in the formulation of resolutions. Serving as resource aids at the meetings were Robert Arellanes, Tony Ternent, Dave Bradwell, Al Gutowsky, Al Wheeler, Al Escobar, Bill Kerby, Cal DePass, and Jim Zinser, all of the economics department; Ron Sheck and Bill Hanneson, geography; Jim Hutter, Bryan Downes, and Jim Molineu, political science; Winston Cox, history; and Lee Donnell, international studies.

Each committee discussed a list of proposed resolutions. Two examples of the types of resolutions considered are—

1. Whereas agrarian reform will result in new landowners who probably will not be well informed on agricultural techniques and who will need expert advice.

Recommends to the governments of the member states the following alternative recommendations: (a) to seek basic technical knowledge from experts from the more economically advanced societies as a basic course of action, or (b) to concentrate on developing agricultural colleges in each member state, thereby developing its own agricultural experts.

A resolution discussed by committees on national development planning was—

2. Whereas many countries in Latin America do not have a trained and efficient civil service; and

Whereas this seriously handicaps the functioning of developmental planning and administration, as well as increasing the cost of government.

Recommends that Alliance for Progress funds be withheld from those countries where the above applies until plans have been submitted to establish a civil service based on merit.

(A list of resolutions considered at committee sessions is included at the end of this article.)

Those resolutions passing in the committees were then referred to plenary sessions. Individual committees designated two delegates to present each proposed resolution in the plenary sessions—one speaking for, and one against the resolution. (A list of the resolutions referred from the committees to the plenary sessions is also included at the end of this article.)

This year's conference was highlighted by two internationally known speakers. Senator Wayne Morse, chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, addressed the entire conference at the opening session, citing the implications of the Alliance for Progress for the future of United States-Latin American relations. Dr. William Sanders, Assistant Secretary General of the Organization of American States, spoke the following day on the complexities of the Alliance and the functions performed by various organs of the Pan American Union in programs to implement the Alliance.

Dr. Val Lorwin, professor of history at the university, spoke on the issue of Western European unity at the luncheon held for club advisers. Speaker at the Friday banquet was Dr. Robert Loring Allen, associate professor in the Department of Economics at the University, who addressed his remarks to the "Enemies of Mankind: Fear, Ignorance, and Poverty."

In addition to the students' activities directly related with the Alliance, delegates elected officers for the coming year. Angus Duncan, Medford, received the president's gavel from outgoing President John Brown, Riddle. The vice presidency went to Jim Mater, Corvallis, who suceeded Bob Gaskell, also of Corvallis. Kathy Hughes, South Eugene, turned her record book over to newly elected Secretary Carol Page, Lebanon. Taking over Emily Evans', of Cleveland, duties as historian was Cathy Candland, Bend.

Twenty-seven American field service exchange students attended the conference. These students, their native countries, and the schools they are now attending are listed below:

Henry Mannuchi, Argentina, Albany.

Ali Saner, Turkey, Ashland.

Gonul Akagunduz, Turkey, Astoria.

Ersin Meric, Turkey, Benson.

Francisco Pinto, Brazil, Centennial.

Yoshiko Akahori, Japan, Cleveland.

Ilker Atsuyak, Turkey, Cottage Grove.

Alicia de los Santos, Argentina, Granta Pass.

Enrico Demola, Italy, Gresham.

Dagmar Henry, West Germany, Klamath Falls.

Kathren Koini, Greece, Lake Oswego.

Sami Guren, Turkey, Lebanon.

Luis Simmonds Matamala, Chile, Lincoln.

Azizah Yahya, Malaya, Medford.

Handewatini Nogoesman, Indonesia, North Bend.

Jose Rafael Gitirrez, Colombia, North Eugene.

Lisette Juarez, Guatemala, Providence Academy.

Lena Erickson, Sweden, St. Helens.

Michele Farish, South Africa, Scappoose.

Jolena Moneleoni, Italy, Sherwood.

Yolanda Arrata, Ecuador, South Eugene.

Bjorn Person, Sweden, South Salem.

Grace LaMonica, Italy, Stayton.

Ilona Pollhammer, Austria, Tigard.

Mette Schwartz, Denmark, Woodrow Wilson.

Louise Costille, Chile, Roseburg.

Ina Boeij, Netherlands, Florence.

At the conclusion of each year's conference, awards are made to the three schools judged to have the most outstanding international relations programs. The winners are selected from among those clubs demonstrating the most rigorous participation in the year-long study program and the annual conference. Clubs are also judged on the basis of contribution to improved understanding and relations between their own communities and those in other countries.

RESOLUTIONS CONSIDERED AT THE 1963 MODEL INTER-AMERICAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Resolutions considered in committees reflect the thoroughness with which the delegates at the International Relations League Conference studied Latin American problems.

Resolutions presented to the committees on agrarian reform

1. Whereas the ownership of agricultural land is unevenly distributed in many areas of Latin America, many large land holdings are inefficiently managed.

Recommends that in view of this inequity and inefficiency, Latin American governments undertake a program of redistributing land ownership in smaller units to more people.

2. Whereas there is a pressing problem in food production and food distribution in Latin America, and any steps toward agrarian reform must take into account the possible effects on food production.

Recommends that any land reform take in account the possible economic benefits from the large-scale agricultural units so far as they can raise more capital, employ more machinery, and use better skills, thus resulting in a larger food supply than with many smaller units.

3. Whereas new landowners will need credit to finance their new undertaking, and up to the present, such credit to small farmers has been meager and inadequate.

Recommends to member governments, that banking and credit systems be revised to the extent that any bank director, who has an economic interest in any large-scale agricultural unit, be requested to act in accordance with the farmer and not himself.

4. Whereas few new landowners can afford agricultural equipment needed for efficient production of foodstuffs.

Recommends that Latin American governments make such equipment available to farmers on a communal basis; that is, the sharing of equipment which is public property.

5. Whereas only a small proportion of arable land is in use; and

Whereas Latin America needs the food production to conserve foreign exchange.

Recommends that some segments of the agricultural population be subsidized to effectuate resettlement.

Industrial development committees resolutions considered

1. Whereas many industries such as transportation, communication, banking, housing, et cetera, call for public industrial development.

Recommends to urge the governments of the member states to establish governmental agencies to either administer and control several of these functions, or to stimulate private activity in these fields through subsidies, land grants, and other incentives.

2. Whereas extensive capital investment is needed to promote basic industrial development in most Latin American countries, without initial impetus from foreign sources, further capital accumulation and investment will not be forthcoming.

Recommends that foreign capital investments be encouraged in Latin American countries through the policies of the domestic governments involved. Tax exemptions for foreign investors would be an example of such a policy.

3. Whereas capital-goods industries are the most important long range means for the economic development of a country.

Recommends that such industries be guided by governmental economic planning until the time when the economy is so developed that the economic decisions involved in the production of capital goods can be made in a free market. Private enterprise should be encouraged in certain sectors of the economy; however, some regulation should be implemented to assure rational economic development.

4. Whereas the resources possessed by each country in Latin America are less than those needed to satisfy all the economic needs of the peoples of each country.

Recommends (a) that through the complete and free exercise of private initiative, unrestricted by government activity, the most rational use of such resources will come about. (b) In view of this, governments should not involve themselves in industrial development, but should limit their activities to protect free enterprise and private property rights.

Resolutions in the field of national development planning

1. Whereas development planning is a complex task for which few Latin Americans are prepared and no facilities are available in these countries for specialized training.

Recommends that funds be provided by the United States for training in development planning.

2. Whereas the majority of foreign investment in Latin America has been in extractive industries.

Recommends (a) that governments of individual Latin American countries study the success of the Venezuelan experience and/or (b) that more native personnel be recruited for engineering and executive positions, and that at such point when a cadre of native personnel exist capable of operating the concern, local ownership be allowed to increase.

3. Whereas the issues involved in coordinating the development of the industrial and agricultural potential of a country are very complex and the political pressures upon the government are very great whenever a system of priorities for development is devised.

Recommends that each nation establish a national planning commission responsible to the chief executive and isolated from the legislative body.

4. Whereas statistical data concerning the population, resources, and economy in general are vital to development planning.

Recommends that each of the Latin American countries establish government bureaus for gathering the census and other necessary data.

Fiscal and monetary reform resolutions

1. Whereas tax laws exempt many institutions and individuals with considerable wealth, tax collections in many member countries are impeded by tax loopholes, evasion and tax dodging.

Recommends (a) that sweeping tax reforms be instituted where necessary; (b) that, through such reform, tax laws will not be made by a legislative body controlled by, or subject to the influence of large economic units which benefit from a lax tax collection system.

2. Whereas the major portion of government revenues is collected from taxes on consumption, (e.g. sales tax); and,

Whereas these taxes are regressive.

Recommends to the member governments, that a progressive income tax, supplemented by a business property tax be created and strictly enforced in order to secure the needed tax revenues.

3. Whereas those individuals in member countries who accrue income often invest their income in industrialized countries or deposit their earnings in the banking system of such developed countries, causing a drain on the capital available to the domestic economy.

Recommends (a) that Latin American countries impose high taxes on interest and dividends earned from foreign investments; (b) that governments of member countries pressure investors to invest their earnings in domestic industries.

4. Whereas chronic inflation in several member countries discourages investment (domestic and foreign).

Recommends (a) that an austerity program be adopted in order to arrest the inflation; (b) that the austerity program include price controls on basic essential commodities, wage controls, and control of foreign exchange for those engaged in international trade.

Discussion on social improvement

1. Whereas there is widespread illiteracy in Latin America; and,

Whereas a requisite of economic development is the attainment of a certain level of education.

Recommends (a) that initially, education be given a high priority by all republics having more than 50 percent illiterate population; (b) that personnel be recruited from developed areas to teach in Latin American schools; (c) that a program designed to wipe out illiteracy from the southern hemisphere in 5 years be developed.

2. Whereas education is a powerful means of transmitting the goals of the government.

Recommends that all education be placed under the direction of the state.

3. Whereas scientific and technical training is lacking in Latin America, and,

Whereas the process of development will demand greater amounts of individuals with this type of training.

Recommends that institutes for training said personnel be established in Argentina, Costa Rica, Honduras, Peru, and Venezuela.

4. Whereas the population in Latin America is growing at a rate close to 3 percent; and,

Whereas these countries are not self-sufficient in food production.

Recommends that governments should place high priority on regulating population growth by means amenable to their traditional, cultural and religious values.

Committees on trade and commodity policy

1. Whereas the Common Market is establishing uniformly higher tariffs on goods produced by other than its own members.

Recommends that OAS form a commission to bargain collectively with the Common Market for a favorable trade arrangement on commodities produced in Latin American countries.

2. Whereas the prices of basic commodities such as those produced by member countries tend to fluctuate greatly.

Recommends (a) that the industrialized countries maintain stable import prices on goods produced in Latin American countries; (b) that the industrialized countries maintain an adequate market for the goods of member countries; (c) that an Inter-American board be established to establish recommended production quotas and minimum prices on export commodities.

3. Whereas many member countries are to a great degree dependent on foreign sale of one basic commodity which may be subject to violent fluctuation in price and quantity demanded.

Recommends (a) to the governments of member countries, that incentives to develop other sectors of the economy which might prove successful in world trade; (b) such incentives might include subsidies or tax concessions.

4. Whereas most of the foreign exchange earned by Latin American republics comes from the sale of a single crop.

Recommends that the United States reduce the tariffs on manufactured goods so that Latin American producers of these goods may find markets outside their domestic markets which are needed for efficient operation of manufacturing in Latin America.

Resolutions presented to Committee on Economic Integration

1. Whereas Central American nations have taken the initiative in attempting to integrate their economies; and

Whereas this will tend to make the allocation of resources more efficient in this region; and

Whereas transportation is a problem for these countries.

Recommends that the Inter-American Development Bank give top priority to intercountry roads as against intra-country; and further,

Recommends that goods moving over these roads be duty-free.

2. Whereas 80 percent of the foreign exchange earned by Central American nations comes from the export of two crops (coffee and bananas); and

Whereas these crops are susceptible to wide price variation.

Recommends that efforts for diversification be encouraged and financially supported with funds from the Alliance, irrespective of efficiency considerations.

3. Whereas the existing Latin American Free Trade Area is limited to only a small number of the nations in the area, animosity may develop between members and nonmembers which could further hamper the interregional economic development.

Recommends that all members of the Organization of American States participate in a conference for the purpose of revising the Treaty of Montevideo to bring about a free trade zone for the entire Latin American area.

Resolutions considered by committees on external assistance

1. Whereas external assistance for the purpose of developing the economies of Latin American countries will inevitably bring with it some form of external control, and no amount of foreign aid will prove adequate to sustain long-range development plans.

Recommends that the members of the Organization of American States establish conformable tax expenditures and monetary policies toward the end of increasing the amount of public and private capital sources from within their own countries, and that

these countries consult the International Monetary Fund for recommendations on these procedures.

2. Whereas foreign aid that is predicated upon fulfilling certain contingencies set by an external power is a violation of the autonomy of a sovereign nation.

Recommends that all members of the Alliance for Progress set up a board of experts made up entirely of their own citizens, to draw up reform recommendations considered appropriate for each individual nation, and that nations providing the assistance accept these recomemndations as adequate contingencies for granting aid.

3. Whereas several member countries are in great need of external assistance from the more developed countries; and

Whereas such assistance may be in the nature of a public grant or loan, or private funds.

Recommends that member country governments encourage private foreign investment through the enactment of legislation protecting such investment from nationalization.

Sixteen resolutions were referred from committees for consideration in the plenary sessions.

Resolutions referred from agrarian reform committees:

1. Whereas the ownership of agricultural land is unevenly distributed in many areas of Latin America, and many large land holdings are inefficiently managed.

Recommends that in view of this inequity and inefficiency, Latin American governments undertake a program of redistributing land ownership in smaller units to more people with consideration for efficiency and adequate compensation for landholders.

2. Whereas few new landowners can afford agricultural equipment needed for efficient production of foodstuffs.

Recommends that Latin American governments make such equipment available to farmers on a communal basis; that is, the sharing of equipment which is public property. The necessary funds shall be made available by the Organization of American States.

Industrial development committees resolutions referred

1. Whereas extensive capital investment is needed to promote basic industrial development in most Latin American countries, without initial impetus from foreign sources, further capital accumulation and investment will not be forthcoming.

Recommends that foreign capital investments be encouraged in Latin American countries through the policies of the domestic governments involved. Tax exemptions for foreign investors would be an example of such a policy.

2. Whereas in the modern world, economic advancement is generally synonymous with industrialization;

Whereas the Latin American countries for the most part have sufficient resources to establish basic capital goods industries; and

Whereas the establishment of organizations such as the Latin American Free Trade Area and the Central American trade group has attempted to assure even the smallest countries of adequate markets for basic capital goods.

Recommends that the natural resources of the countries be utilized as much as possible to establish capital goods industries, that the establishment of these industries be limited exclusively to private or public enterprises of the native countries, and that notwithstanding the above, aid be accepted, regardless of political ideology, from any country wishing to help in the establishment of these industries.

ADDRESS BY MAYOR WAGNER, OF NEW YORK, AT MEETING OF FEDERATION OF PROTESTANT WELFARE AGENCIES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the address delivered by Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, at the annual meeting of the Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies, in New York City, on February 26.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Mayor Robert F. Wagner at Annual Meeting Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies

I am glad to be at this gathering sponsored by the Federation of Protestant Social Welfare Agencies. I consider this organization to be one of the finest in the field. It is an outstanding illustration of what might be called—in sociological terminology—positive volunteerism; or to put it in plain English, it is a major social force doing many good works, supported by the concerted good will of a great number of private individuals acting through their voluntary organizations. This federation has consistently supported and encouraged the Government in the discharge of its responsibilities, without seeking to evade or unload any part of its own.

I salute the fine attitude of this organization. I have long known it, respected it and appreciated the good works it has performed and the leadership it has provided in the social work field. And not so incidentally, the praises of the federation are persistently sung to me by our eminent commissioner of welfare, Jim Dumpson.

It has been widely noted by foreign observers, beginning with the Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, 125 years ago, that one of the peculiar things about Americans is—and always has been—their penchant for forming and joining voluntary organizations, clubs, lodges and associations, of every kind, to achieve their personal, social or political purposes. No question about it, we Americans are joiners by habit and inclination.

We Americans look to our voluntary organizations to do what needs to be done even before we look to government. And when we think of government, our first inclination is to depend on—and complain to—local government. This, too, is an American characteristic. It reflects our history.

It reflects our belief in democracy and, above all, our unlimited faith in our own powers.

In 1932, at practically the peak of the depression, with 16 million unemployed, all State and local governments in the entire Nation spent a combined total of $444 million on public welfare. Even that figure was three times the amount spent in 1927. But in 1960, State and local governments spent $4,250 million on public welfare—an increase of 1,000 percent over 1932.

Once upon a time, of course, private expenditures for public welfare—it was called philanthropy in those days—were much greater than public expenditures. Today, the balance has completely shifted. Thirty years ago, public welfare was conceived largely in terms of caring for the hungry, meeting the emergency needs of the jobless and the destitute, and providing a modicum of care for needy children, needy aged and the needy sick. In rough outline, that was about the size of it.

By today there has been an explosive expansion of services, along with an explosive change in our public welfare concepts. By now, public welfare has been institutionalized. The idea of it and the necessity of it have been generally agreed to. Indeed, the foundations and premises of public welfare are only rarely attacked. This is to the good—except for one thing. Some of these premises are not being as closely inspected by analytical and sympathetic minds as perhaps they should be.

In fact, the city's social and human problems are growing beneath our eyes and under our hands. Today, we are discovering that we have in our midst a group of people who might be called the permanently poor. It is an unpleasant fact, but it is a fact that we have third generation welfare families in New York City. Many of them are so psychologically disadvantaged, bruised, and frustrated by their attempts to climb the walls of the well, that they have resigned themselves to life at its bottom, as did their parents—and in some cases, their grandparents.

All 1-day-old babies in New York City theoretically have the same potential for fulfillment and happiness. Yet it is a sad fact that something immediately divides many of these children into pigeonholes marked "probable success" and "probable failure" before they finish grammar school. In the Bedford-Stuyvesant area, for example, we have found that some children are already two grades behind by the time they get to the fifth grade. And in seven of the city high schools with predominantly nonwhite student bodies, we have found that the percentage of dropouts by graduation time runs from 33 percent to 60 percent. That simply means that as many as three out of five entering students drop out before they get their high school diplomas.

As Dr. James B. Conant has pointed out, this is "social dynamite." But it is also economic disaster for New York City; here in this city, by the end of this decade, we foresee a 20-percent increase in professional and technical manpower needs, along with a 19-percent decrease in manual and unskilled jobs. We will need more skilled workers. More and more of the unskilled will fall into the pool of the jobless, the aimless, the hopeless.

We must do whatever we can, whatever is necessary, to end this perpetuation of poverty. And this is just one problem out of many that have become apparent in the light of 1963.

Of course, I could cite our Welfare Department statistics on intake and case load to show how many individuals are being handled, how many children, how many adults, how many aged. I could cite all the varied and comprehensive services we perform—from vocational retraining of the jobless to tenant training in public housing. I could also cite figures showing how many social workers, case workers, supervisors, homemakers, and inspectors we now have on the job.

Within the framework of present practices, procedures, methods, and concepts, we can and should congratulate ourselves and point with pride to the level of the services we provide for the needy, the disadvantaged, the young, the aged, the week, the helpless, and homeless, the maladjusted, and the unskilled.

But we also need to ask ourselves from time to time: Where are we going? What basic headway have we made against our problems? How much can social welfare contribute to a solution of these problems? What beneficial effects have our welfare programs had upon the social fabric of our community? While we are surely helping some individuals, what is happening to those who are not being helped? Are we strengthening the indigenous forces in the community? Are we raising or improving the level? Has our public welfare machinery retained the flexibility it needs? Is there not a tendency to become so involved with the internal problems of public welfare that our communications with the actual people involved have become somewhat strained?

I am aware that a Moreland Commission, a special high-level review commission established under the terms of the Moreland Act, has just completed a study of the administration of welfare in New York State. I am proud to say that New York City's administration of welfare has come off very well in this report. Our procedures for detecting and discouraging chiselers and cheaters were noted and commended. I am pleased and satisfied that this is so. There goes another exploded myth in the welfare field.

But neither this Moreland Commission report nor any other I have seen really asked the deep, fundamental and searching questions I am suggesting.

I have suggested questions, but I have not given the answers. I do not pretend to know the answers. That is the trouble. I don't think any of us really know the answers.

We do know that to resolve our present problems, we need many, many more social services than we now provide. We need a substantial number of new and major measures by the Federal and State governments—on the economic, educational, and social welfare fronts. Most of the needed measures are well known. All of them are controversial, too, to put it mildly. Yet somehow we must secure the consensus that is necessary to obtain their enactment.

As far as the capacity of our own city government to do much more than it is already doing, I must tell you frankly that we have reached a point where I must ask you, and we must all ask ourselves: where is the city government going to get the money to pay for the additional services that we need?

Today, it looks as though, for the next fiscal year, we will face a gap of more than $200 million between the revenues we can expect to receive and the expenditures we will be called upon to make. And this is a most conservative estimate. I don't yet have the final figures. We shall have to bridge this gap, because we are forbidden by our State constitution from operating at a deficit. The decision must be made whether to curtail our essential services or raise new revenues by local taxation. There is no other answer. Moreover, I must emphasize that our need for services will continue to expand in the years immediately ahead, while our present sources of revenue carry no such promise.

I do not say that our first object must be to reduce the money we spend on welfare, but we do need to determine whether the amount we now spend is being spent as effectively as possible, and whether we might not save some here and spend more there, and in so doing, make real headway against real problems.

For this reason, as well as many others, we must examine and reexamine our approach and commitments in the field of public welfare. In this process of examination and reexamination, I look to the private and voluntary agencies for help, counsel, and wisdom. I look to them to help supply the leadership. May the day never come when the leadership in social welfare is considered to be solely or even primarily in the hands of government.

Frequent reference is made to the partnership between public and voluntary agencies. I know that Commissioner Dumpson made a major address last year in support of such a relationship. I subscribe to that relationship, with all my heart. I go one step further. I say that whereas at one time there was a necessary shift of emphasis from voluntary agencies to public welfare agencies, today great and increasing emphasis must now be given to the role of the voluntary agencies. I hasten to add that I do not look to the voluntary agencies for significantly increased financial expenditures but rather to the greatly increased use of their human resources, of their experience.

I have said it before, and I say it again today, that we will need to draw more and more from the indigenous resources of the community and of the neighborhood, from its internal resources. The word is mobilization, and more and more there must be a recognition that the community must supply part of the manpower to meet the totality of community needs and services. There is not enough money in anybody's treasury to pay for all that we need.

We must learn how to mobilize both the active and latent forces within the various neighborhoods and communities. Public welfare must cease to be solely or even principally the concern of professional social workers. It must become everybody's business.

Our entire city must be brought to feel the sense of immediate relationship with and concern for the new elements recently added to our city. All who need help must be helped. And this includes those whose chief need is to be needed. Above all, we must reverse the process whereby, in recent years, urban living—which is supposed to be the height of civilized living—has been stripped, in many respects, of both its urbanity and humanity.

The spirit of the jungle, rather than of civilized society, has entered into the central core of the city. Different population groups regard each other often suspiciously, sometimes even fearfully across the wasteland of noncommunication and misunderstanding of each other's problems and capacities.

All this must be remedied. All this can be remedied. All this shall be remedied, if all of us will work together with good will, with dedication, and with a total absence of prejudice and preconception.

We have the will to succeed. We must succeed.

PENTAGON ACTIVITIES AND TFX HEARINGS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in view of the high public interest in the current hearings by the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee into the award of the TFX fighter-bomber airplane contract, I wish to bring to attention as a matter of public record the statement of the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The Senator's statement was issued yesterday and deals with certain aspects of statements made to the committee by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Arthur Sylvester.

Mr. President, I request that the statement of the senior Senator from South Dakota be made a part of this RECORD, and also that his statement be followed by the appropriate portions of testimony delivered by Mr. Sylvester before the subcommittee.

There being no objection, the statement and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MUNDT'S STATEMENT ON PENTAGON ACTIVITIES AND TFX HEARINGS

In view of the one-two punch which the Pentagon threw at our Senate Investigations Subcommittee over the weekend and the complete failure of Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester yesterday to support with any evidence whatsoever his charges or complaints, it seems to me a few observations may be in order from the position of the minority members of this committee.

Obviously neither the committee policies and procedures nor the objects of our investigation can be determined by a minority which is outnumbered precisely two to one on the committee and far more than that in staff selections. However, I want to make it emphatically clear that the minority is supporting this investigation 100 percent; that we have no complaints concerning the fairness and the objectivity of the investigation; that we deplore the in-fighting which has developed between the Democrats in charge of the Pentagon and those in charge of this investigation; and that we reaffirm our complete confidence in Chairman McCLELLAN and our conviction that all members of this committee are conducting this investigation without any of the preconceived attitudes attributed to certain members by spokesmen for the Pentagon.

In fact, speaking as the ranking Republican member of the Committee, I think it is time the Pentagon began directing its time and its efforts to downgrading Castro, Cuba, and communism rather than to downgrading the committees on Capitol Hill.

The Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, says the committee, by its investigation, is undermining the confidence of the people in the military. Nothing could be further from the fact—actually we have been inquiring into reasons why the civilian heads of the Pentagon have vetoed the decisions of the military and imposed their own contrary judgments over the performance and cost recommendations of the military. We still are unprepared to say who was right but it should be clear to all that it is not our committee which challenged the military judgments. Rather it was the civilian Pentagon leadership which rejected their unanimous decisions. Whether such action is likely to increase or undermine public confidence in our military leaders is not for me to say.

President Kennedy himself served as a member of our committee when we were investigating labor racketeering in America. His brother, the Attorney General, served as our chief counsel. Both of them should, therefore, share with me full confidence in the objectivity of Chairman McCLELLAN and our committee procedures. Rather than remaining silent while the Pentagon guns are trained on Capitol Hill, I would suggest the President and the Attorney General reassure the Pentagon and the public that the McClellan committee operates on a "let the chips fall where they will" formula and that it is not comprised of members who employ their political or personal preferences in conducting an investigation. I suggest the White House utilize its influence to issue a "cease-fire order" on the innuendos, insinuations and insults emanating from the Pentagon. If they are designed as an attempt to destroy public confidence in the McClellan committee I am convinced they will fail.

TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR SYLVESTER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sylvester, will you give us your name and your official position, please, sir.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. On yesterday, I received a letter from you. I present to you a copy of the letter and ask you to identify it, please, sir.

(Document handed to witness.)

Mr. SYLVESTER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wrote that letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Let the letter be printed in the record at this point.

(The letter referred to follows:)

"MARCH 11, 1963.

"DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry that recent comments by me in response to newsmen's questions concerning the TFX hearing have been interpreted to mean the Defense Department does not believe the committee is conducting a fair hearing.

"I am well aware of the committee's outstanding reputation for the way it conducts hearings and also your own reputation in this respect. As a reporter who has covered other hearings conducted by you, I have firsthand experience of the committee's method of operation. I have every expectation that the tradition of fairness the committee has established will prevail in the current hearing.

"What has concerned me is the fact that the hearings up to now have produced a fragmentary and confused report to the public. At times it appears the questioning has resulted in a one-sided view of the issues involved.

"Perhaps this is the inevitable result of closed-door proceedings with an attenuated transcript made available twice daily. I am sure when the committee has concluded its inquiry and all the facts are in, it will become clear on an objective basis that the right decision on the TFX contract was made.

"Sincerely,

"ARTHUR SYLVESTER."

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, that letter was written as a followup, I believe, to a press conference you had last Friday. Is that right?

Mr. SYLVESTER. We have every day at 12 o'clock, Senator, a briefing for newsmen, at which on certain occasions we have news to give out and on all occasions I submit myself for questions to the newsmen. There was such a meeting, as usual, on last Friday at 12 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. I hand you herewith what purports to be excerpts, at least, from that news conference, your briefing of the press on that day. I will ask you to examine it and state if you identify it as such.

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator, I gave Mr. Adlerman my copy, and I think it was properly numbered. This runs 21, 22, 23, 24——

Mr. ADLERMAN. It has been hurriedly copied for the Senators.

Mr. SYLVESTER. This isn't it, sir.

Mr. ADLERMAN. He only brought one copy with him. We had asked that they bring several copies.

Mr. SYLVESTER. That is not the one, Senator. It has a page out.

The CHAIRMAN. I was mistaken.

Without objection, then, this one can be stricken from the record.

Mr. ADLERMAN. What happened was he brought one copy and I am trying to make copies for the Senators. This ties it up. The copy he brought we are making duplicates of. I had asked for sufficient copies to distribute to each of the Senators. I also asked for the tape recording, itself. Mr. Sylvester stated that the man who was handling it was ill and they will have it down later. However, I understand that the tape recording of the press conference is delivered to Mr. Alderson's company and a transcript is made directly from the tape recording.

The CHAIRMAN. The only purpose of it is to have it before us so we could predicate questions upon it and for the purpose of accuracy.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Mr. Chairman, a tape is made——

The CHAIRMAN. You have no other copy of it?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have given my copy of the transcript to the counsel. A tape is made every day and that tape goes to the Alderson Reporting Co. They then make one transcript for us. The transcript that we get and that I turned over is the original and only one made by the company, not by us.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sure that is accurate.

Mr. SYLVESTER. The only thing I wanted it before us was for accuracy. But we will proceed.

Mr. ADLERMAN. Page 21 is missing here, but I think that one is complete.

Senator MUNDT. This one stops in the middle of the sentence.

Mr. ALDERMAN. Here is a copy. The only pages we are concerned with are from 20 to 26.

The CHAIRMAN. I present to you now, Mr. Secretary, what purports to be the copy that you turned over to the staff of your press conference last Friday. I will ask you to examine it and state if you identify it as such.

(Document handed to the witness.)

Mr. SYLVESTER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, all the pages are here. This is the transcript.

Senator MUNDT. How many pages are there altogether?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator, there are 28 pages.

Senator MUNDT. Then I have all but one page.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Of which only a few pages relate to this matter.

Senator MUNDT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well. This document may be made an exhibit, Exhibit No. 41, for reference, and the part of it on pages 21 through 27 that may be pertinent to the line of questions that will follow may be inserted in the record at this point.

(The press briefing referred to follows:)

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Well, I expect to have some. I would only say you are getting a lot of figures out of this committee after the fact. They have obtained figures which did bear and were not available at the time, and were not under consideration at the time. I think that will come out very clearly when both Mr. Zuckert, Mr. Korth, and Mr. McNamara testify. And as I read the testimony, it sounds to me as if I were reading the counsel for Boeing.

"Question. Could we get any of these figures that are correct?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. What figures did you have in mind?

"Question. Well, specifically——

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I hope to have lots of figures.

"Question. For instance, nothing has ever been clearly stated by the Defense Department as to the comparative costs of the bid figures of the two companies. We have never seen what the Boeing figure was or what the General Dynamics figure is.

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Well, from what I see coming out of the committee, the Boeing figures vary.

"Question. It was released out of the committee, a whole table, which was read into the record.

"Question. This happens to be the Defense Department which let the contract. I have not seen any figure come from the Defense Department. What I am asking you——

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Well, you haven't seen any witness from the Defense Department at the top level.

"Question. Well, I am asking whether we can get those figures or not. I haven't seen the——

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I will be glad to let you see them when we are going to release them.

"Question. And I am also interested in some of the performance characteristics of the several competing versions which we haven't seen, and which I understand——

"Mr SYLVESTER. Now, wait a second. We are not quite sure what you mean by several competing versions.

"Question. Well, there are two versions.

"Mr. SYLVESTER. In the final selection, there are two versions, the Boeing version and the General Dynamics. Now, what are you interested in? I will try and get it for you. What are you interested in?

"Question. In the final performance characteristics estimated for the——

Mr. SYLVESTER. You mean the final, the fourth and final evaluation?

"Question. Right. This would be helpful.

"Question. Art, did I understand you correctly to say that there are figures being made available to the committee that were not available to Mr. Zuckert?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. There are recomputations being made, where the committee has gone out and gotten recomputations of its own, which did not figure at all in the decision.

"Question. From Boeing?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I don't know where the committee got them other than what I can read in the transcript.

"Question. Apparently the committee investigators had gone out——

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Mr. Gillet, one of the committee investigators, was the expert witness yesterday in the figures.

"Question. But there is certain data there in the committee's records which is clear that Mr. McNamara, Mr. Zuckert, and Mr. Korth had not seen before.

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I am talking about figures that have been introduced by the committee which they have gone out and gotten, the figures have been recomputed, both in the service and apparently by the company. I don't even know what I can read——

"Question. To follow up on Lloyd's question, is there any plan here to release any data from here, or information, in advance of Mr. Zuckert's or Mr. McNamara's or Mr. Korth's testimony?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Yes, I have some plans.

"Question. Is this in advance of their testimony?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I hope so.

"Question. Arthur, are you saying here on these figures being released after the fact, and so forth, are you indicating that perhaps there was some dirty work afoot, that these figures might have been known at the time, but somebody deliberately withheld them, or——

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I am not saying anything. I am just trying to state what is in the transcript and is the fact.

"Question. Are these figures accurate?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I don't know. I am not an expert in the figures. I doubt that the committee investigators are, either.

"Question. Art, could you also as part of this problem discuss the question of whether the raw scores, whatever they were, which were cited in the memorandum issued last Saturday for release on Sunday night at 6:30, whether the raw score is a proper basis for comparison?

"Mr. SYLVESTER. I don't know what you mean by raw score, and I am certainly not going to make a statement off the top of my head here without having the figures before me, and I am not an expert in the figures.

"Question. Well, the term was used in your memo.

"Well, on what basis was the raw score computed? Can't we know that? I mean you are trying to prove something by this release, but you don't tell us what the raw score is. We want to know.

"Mr. SYLVESTER. It isn't that I don't tell you. It is because I do not have here in front of me the raw scores and I am not qualified, nor is anybody in this room qualified, to go into the question of raw scores at this time. The record will show in due time, and I trust it will show before that, if there is any question about raw scores. Obviously, by the very character of the words 'raw scores,' you are dealing with something that depends on what point of view you approach it.

"Question. Or who made the ground rules for the scoring, yes.

"Mr. SYLVESTER. Well, there were 220-some officers involved in the evaluation. Not all of them were unanimous. Neither were the two services unanimous. So this isn't quite as simple as it appears. And obviously you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee in which there are various Senators with State self-interest in where the contract goes. So far there is only one Senator I have seen on the committee, Senator MUSKIE, who hasn't got an interest in it.

"Question. Do you have any rough feel for when you might be able to turn some of this stuff loose?

"Mr. Sylvester. Sooner rather than later.

"Question. Like the latter part of next week?

"Mr. Sylvester. Oh, no, I won't be waiting that long. I hope to very shortly.

"Question. Saturday?

"Mr. Sylvester. It just depends on how fast I can digest and get my hands on this. News is what we are interested in. We don't want it managed. All right, we will manage to hold it until Monday.

"Question. On the National Guardsmen, can we put in a query concerning the other 47 states that haven't been considered?

"Mr. Sylvester. I can tell you right now that there were no members of the National Guard, and you can go down the list. in the operation.

"Question. In or out of uniform?

"Mr. Sylvester. In or out of uniform, on or off duty.

"Question. There must be something here. Say that again, Arthur. There must be something in the wording.

"Mr. Sylvester. I am not being subtle in any sense of the word. I am just saying that there were no members of the National Guard, and you can go down the list.

"Question. Who took part in any phase of the Bay of Pigs operation. Is that what you are saying?

"Mr. Sylvester. I didn't say that.

"Question. There is the key word, combat.

"Mr. Sylvester. Well, it was a combat, wasn't it? It was a combat and I am talking——

"Question. There was a training period before that.

"Mr. Sylvester. I don't know anything about the training period. I am talking about the combat operation. You asked me if there were any National Guardsmen, and I am saying that outside of the State of Alabama, and I am—you can look at the records of the four fellows. Whether they were in the National Guard or not, I don't know, but you can look and see. But I know as to the others there were none who took part in the combat operation.

"Question. Other than those four, then, you are categorically denying anything elese.

"Mr Sylvester. Yes.

"Question. Well, how far does the combat zone extend?

"Mr. Sylvester. I am talking about flying operations.

"Question. Seriously.

"Mr. Sylvester. I am very serious.

"Question. These Alabama fellows were not actually in the combat zone. They were not getting shot at. They crashed apparently for other reasons. And I think it has been said in any event, there was no American air cover in the combat zone.

"Mr. Sylvester. As I understand the question that is being asked, the first thing I responded to was Governor Faubus' statement that there were members of the Arkansas National Guard who flew combat operation. The answer to that is there were none."

The Chairman. That was not presented to the staff until this morning, was it?

Mr. Sylvester. I brought it up with me this morning.

The Chairman. Just this morning.

Mr. Sylvester. That is correct.

The Chairman. I am trying to find the pertinent part of it.

Mr. Sylvester. I think it begins on 20 or 21 at the bottom of the page.

The Chairman. Mr. Secretary, I find on page 25 a question and answer as follows:

"Question. Or who made the ground rules for the scoring. Yes.

"Mr. Sylvester. Well, there were 220-some officers involved in the evaluation. Not all of them were unanimous. Neither were the two services unanimous. So this isn't quite as simple as it appears."

I call your specific attention to the following sentence:

"And obviously you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee in which there are various Senators with State self-interest in where the contract goes. So far there is only one Senator I have seen on the committee, Senator Muskie, who hasn't got an interest in it."

Mr. Secretary, I wanted to ask you about that. I am not at all disturbed about your statement that: "Obviously you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee." I am not concerned with that part of the statement.

But I would like primarily to know—well, I say I am not concerned about, I mean you are entitled to have any opinion like that that you may wish to retain. You have written a letter saying that you were sorry, that it may have been misinterpreted. But you do say that, "A number of the various Senators have a State self-interest in where the contract goes."

I wanted, in view of that having been published, to ascertain if Arkansas does have any such interest, because if it has, I do not know about it, and if it doesn't have, I want the record corrected.

I don't want that in the record, that I might be influenced in my rendering a decision by the fact that my State has some interest as a State in where the contract goes. If Arkansas has such interest, I want the record to reflect it. If it doesn't have such interest of a nature where such motives could be ascribed to me from that standpoint, I would like the record to show that.

So, if you will, just tell us what you had in mind with respect to Arkansas in making that statement.

Mr. Sylvester. Mr. Chairman, you will notice in the transcript I made no reference to any Senator, his fairness, no discussion of fairness, there isn't any word about anybody's being fair or unfair. I did state what seemed to be a fact, that this is not a court of law, nor is any other senatorial hearing. It is a very important function of our Government and does very fine work. That was the point I was making, and that was what I was really addressing my letter to you about. But there seemed to be a confusion in some of the reports about this distinction between a court of law which renders or gives a traditional rendering and an important committee which has a Senate inquiry, there is a real distinction.

I made no reference whatsoever to any Senator's fairness or any suggestion about it. I think it is on the record that there are some Senators who have natural and correct interest in the contract going to their State. If I were a Senator, I would be out struggling as hard as I could for my State. And I would not expect, if I were on a committee, to change my view since I already believed in my case. That is what I was talking about. I know of no interest that the State of Arkansas has in it.

(Senator Jackson and Senator Symington entered the room.)

The Chairman. Sir?

Mr. Sylvester. I know of no interest that the State of Arkansas has in it.

The Chairman. That is all I am interested in. Your view as to whether there would be a judicious rendering of opinion by the committee is not of any great concern to me. I would be concerned if you felt that the committee would be motivated by anything other than proper considerations, but the thing is, I want the record clear as to Arkansas. If there is anything or any contract or anything that Arkansas, as far as you know, would be calculated or expected to receive as any benefit from the contract going to either Boeing or General Dynamics, I would like to have it placed on the record.

Mr. Sylvester. I don't know that there are any subcontracts in the State of Arkansas, and I know the main contract is not.

The Chairman. Then would you include in your statement when you say, "So far there is only one Senator I have seen on the committee, Senator Muskie, who has not got an interest in it." Would you include any other Senators on the committee, or would you exclude all of the others except Senator Muskie?

Mr. Sylvester. I think that I said so far from a truncated transcript what is going on, and I have not made a critical analysis of the transcript. I read it as quickly as possible to see the sort of questions the newsmen are going to come to us with, and I simply meant from what I read in the transcript up to that time, which was last Friday, that Senator Muskie's questioning, and I don't know anything more about it than what I read, his questioning seemed to me to be in an effort to keep the thing, so far as the Defense Department was concerned, in a larger frame of reference than some of the other questions seemed to be. This is an impression I have. This is only an impression.

The Chairman. All I want to do is to get the record straight. You say Arkansas, so far as you know, has no interest in the contract either way. Insofar as it is getting any subcontracts or furnishing any materials or anything. So far as you know, it has no connection with either contractor?

Mr. Sylvester. No, sir. As a matter of fact——

The Chairman. Either Boeing or General Dynamics.

Mr. Sylvester. Mr. Chairman, in the first book of testimony I looked at page 86. You yourself qualified some of the questioning by the counsel, as I read the testimony quickly, seeming to get some factors in which gave a more balanced approach than the questioning at that point seemed to indicate. So I would certainly include you in that.

The Chairman. Well, would you not agree that one reading a press report of your comments at this press conference, if one read, "And obviously you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee in which there are various Senators with State self-interest in where the contract goes," and then read further, "So far there is only one Senator I have seen on the committee, Senator Muskie, who hasn't got an interest in it"—wouldn't that imply to you that the person making such a statement to convey the impression that all of the other Senators except Senator Muskie, did have such a State interest in it?

Mr. Sylvester. No, it would not, because I would not put any such version on it, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. It is hard for me to see how any other interpretation could be given it. I want you to understand, I am not sensitive. I simply want to clear up the record so far as Arkansas is concerned. I did not know of any interest it had in it, and I wanted the record to be clear as to that.

As to any further implication in it, if such is interpreted and read out of it, I am not particularly concerned.

All right, are there any other questions?

Senator Mundt. Mr. Chairman, I would like to relay the same question to Mr. Sylvester. On this basis, it isn't so much what interpretation you place on the language, "Obviously you hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee in which there are various Senators with State self-interest in where the contract goes. So far there is only one Senator I have seen on the committee, Senator Muskie, who has not got any interest in it."

It isn't so much your interpretation of that, our ours, but the fact that the press generally has certainly interpreted it as meaning that you felt that only Senator Muskie came from a State which did not have an interest in it.

So I wanted to direct the same question to you, first of all, concerning South Dakota. Have you any good news or anything about any of these contracts that might involve South Dakota?

Mr. Sylvester. I am hopeful I will have for you, Senator, but I can't hold out anything more than that. I have no evidence.

Senator Mundt. I don't know of any subcontractor, and I don't know of any major contractor in the State which has any remote interest in the TFX, and I was shocked when I found that I was included among those who came from States which did have a self-interest. If you have got some secret information, don't withhold it, and I would like to know what it is.

Mr. Sylvester. Unfortunately I am not an expert in this field, Senator. I would only read to you the sort of thing that is disturbing. For instance, in the Chicago Daily News on the 4th of March, Mr. Jim McCartney, whom I know, wrote as follows, and this is the thing that disturbs me and has disturbed me. He writes as follows:

"Senate investigators have come to the conclusion"—that means that they have made up their minds in this, a judgment has been made—"that the Defense Department signed a $6.5 billion fighter plane contract for a second-rate airplane. They believe the plane that was rejected by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara in a 'highly unusual' bidding procedure, is better than the plane that McNamara purchased."

Now, this to my mind is the important part:

"As one investigator put it"—and this is a quotation—"If the Russians could build the plane that was rejected, they could shoot down the fleet of planes that the United States is planning to build."

This is attributed to an investigator of this committee.

Now, you read this, and you read the beginning, a conclusion has already been made, and it certainly leaves me with questions in my mind. And, Mr. Chairman, the United Press in what they said was an interview with you, quoted you as saying, "poor judgment had been used," in a quotation, and the case is hardly in.

The Chairman. Mr. Sylvester, may I say to you, if there was not a question raised as to poor judgment, inefficiency, extravagance, or some other question before us, if that were not true, we would not be investigating. These questions are raised somewhat like a complaint in court. You file these or charges are made, or there is information that indicates this may have happened or may not have happened, and the purpose of an inquiry is to ascertain. I have never said positively. I don't know yet. I am trying to reserve a decision until we get all of the evidence. Some evidence so far indicates poor judgment has been used, and if we stopped with the evidence as of now, I would so conclude. But we are in a hearing, and we can't put on all of the evidence in one day. We have to take it as we can and then weigh it all at the end.

I have entered into hearings where I may have been under an impression, not an irrevocable conclusion, but under an impression that possibly this is the situation or that is the situation, and after hearing all of the testimony I may have changed my mind about it. I got the full information. That is the purpose of this. I want to say to you, and I say it for the record, and I say it for the entire Pentagon and everybody else in it, I have no desire on earth to do anything here except get the facts. Over and over again I have said here in this committee, with the representative of the Defense Department present, if there are any figures, or if there are any documents, or if there is any evidence that you have that will throw light on this, that the committee does not have, and particularly any that sustains the actions taken by the Defense Department in this matter, we want to get it in the record. I can't get it all in in one day.

Mr. Sylvester. No, Mr. Chairman, I have covered your hearings, and I know your fairness, and it was hard for me to believe that UP story, because it did not sound like you.

The Chairman. The papers don't always quote us accurately, and they don't always put the qualification that we may express at the time.

Mr. Sylvester. It does not sound like you.

The Chairman. I don't remember that particular incident, but whatever I said, I meant it at the time in the context that I have given you. I am sure you know that.

Now, you have here, we are not quoting here from what the press asked in interrogating you, and we are not quoting from what the press published, so much as from what you say you actually said.

Senator Mundt. I was relating my questions at the moment to South Dakota, and we have gotten off on a digression. May I have from you categorically, Mr. Sylvester, an answer now as to whether you know of any contract or subcontract involving South Dakota insofar as this investigation is concerned?

Mr. Sylvester. No, I don't have any knowledge of that.

Senator Mundt. Senator Curtis expected to be here, so I think I should ask you the same question with respect to Nebraska.

Mr. Sylvester. I have no first-hand information on Nebraska.

Senator Mundt. Have you any second-hand information?

Mr. Sylvester. Yes, but I wouldn't be prepared to talk about that under oath. I think the answer should be I have no evidence.

Senator Mundt. You have no evidence. All right.

Now, you say on page 21, "I have read the testimony. It sounds to me as if I were reading the counsel for Boeing."

I wish you would elaborate on that. I am not talking about newspaper stories, but what you read in the transcript.

Mr. Sylvester. What I read in the transcript.

Again, this is an impression. I have the impression that you come out of this, as you read this, that the Boeing plane should have been the choice, because it is a wonderful choice, and I find just from what I read very little material balancing that on what motivated and what the choices were of the Secretary of Defense.

Senator Mundt. You realize, Mr. Sylvester, up until now most of the time has been spent in interrogating Pentagon witnesses, two colonels who were on the evaluation team, and we have been checking on the figures which they have presented. It is not the committee's fault that the figures up to now seem to indicate that Boeing was a better plane, and it is not the committee's fault that the figures up to now indicate that General Dynamics was the more expensive plane. So on the basis of the facts they gave us as to questions trying to arrive at their basis for making their determination, obviously we have to relate our questions to the evidence, and I don't see why you should attribute improper motives or prejudices to the committee because we were confronted with the evidence which, on the face of it, seemed to favor the Boeing proposition. We are trying to find out how they built up the figures, what was behind them. The chairman has said, I have said, and other members of the committee have said, that these very competent colonels, who made splendid witnesses, may I say, were asked if they had any evidence that indicated somewhere along the line General Dynamics was cheaper or better. We asked them to stick it in.

You found that, if you read the transcript as carefully as you say, that the invitation was there. And how in the face of that you can say it sounds like we were counsel for Boeing perplexes me. It needs some explanation, it seems to me.

Mr. Sylvester. I think you and I are exactly on the same ground, that only the Boeing story has been brought in. The Defense Department people who initiated this contract—I think inevitably, as I suggested in my letter, if we proceed from this basis down at the bottom, where the people do not know necessarily what the purpose was, rather than at the top, you probably come out with this sort of thing. I think you said the same thing, that the only side so far has been the Boeing side. From the Defense Department point of view, it seems to me that we are dealing with national defense.

Senator Mundt. That is right, because at any time the Defense Department has submitted some valid evidence, we have put it in. We put in a letter by Secretary Zukert. It wasn't our fault that the letter was improperly stated and the figures were inaccurate and the facts were wrong and he had to write a second letter apologizing for the first one. That wasn't our fault.

Secretary McNamara has said he would like to present an affidavit without being questioned, because he has other duties. That is a bit unusual, but we think it is fair. We will have him back some other time for questioning. We are just trying to find out the facts and we have to pick up the story as presented to us by the Government witnesses.

These are not our witnesses. We don't run the Air Force; we don't run the evaluation board. They are your witnesses. So I don't think you should attack us because the evidence they present has been, up until now, detrimental to General Dynamics and preferential to Boeing.

I would like to ask you this question: You have been quoted in the press as saying or you concluded generally in the press that you believed that Government has the inherent right to lie to the people.

Mr. Sylvester. This I have never said.

Senator Mundt. No, I said you have seen it in the press. I am not questioning you about that, except I want to be sure that if you hold that position you don't carry it to the point that it would involve your testimony under oath to this committee. You wouldn't hold that position, I am sure, and we could rely on what you are telling us.

Mr. Sylvester. There is rather an insult implied in that.

Senator Mundt. Not at all. If you said that statement, I want to be sure. If you have not said the statement—I have read it in the press many, many times.

Mr. Sylvester. I am not clear of the relationship of your question to when I take an oath.

Senator Mundt. The question is that if you believe that Government has a right to lie to the people, you are speaking as a Government witness, I want to be sure that you don't carry that philosophy to the point of testifying before us under oath.

Mr. Sylvester. Senator, you are making a quotation to me which you attribute to nobody, some faceless accuser which you are using, and you have not qouted anything I have said.

Senator Mundt. If I have not, if you said you did not make it, that is one thing. I have read it a dozen times in the paper that you made that statement. I am not quarreling with you about that point of view at this time.

Mr. Sylvester. Obviously no Government information program can be based on lies. It must always be based on truthful facts.

But when any nation is faced with nuclear disaster, throughout history, and I conceive of our Government to be the people, because they determine the Government which is their Government, and they get rid of it when it doesn't suit them, at certain times when you are faced with life and death of your Nation, you do not tell all the facts to your enemy. I am sure you are not suggesting that you could want to tell the Russians all the facts, all the facts they would want to know, of Cuba, or, for instance, after this Government was attacked at Pearl Harbor that we should have then told the Japanese the extent of the damage. I am sure you don't mean that. That is what I am talking about only.

Senator MUNDT. I am not suggesting anything. I am not even quarreling with you if you made the statement. But if you want to know my opinion, I certainly do not believe the Government has a right to lie to the people. I think withholding certain information is one thing in times of a crisis, but to deliberately lie to the people, I think is something else.

Mr. SYLVESTER. The Government does not have a right to lie to the people, but it does have a right in facing an enemy, if information is not accurate and is intended to mislead the enemy, I think that any people will support their government in not putting out information that is going to help the enemy. And, if necessary, misleading them.

I noticed only recently General Eisenhower on a television program expressed this very same idea. I am sure you would not suggest that you would put out to the Communists in the sort of situation we had in Cuba, information which would help them.

Senator MUNDT. As I say, I am not suggesting anything. I am simply basing the question on what has been said many times in the press. If you have stated it, as you have said here, for the press, it has not been reported to me. Maybe this is a good opportunity for you to get across exactly what you had in mind in view of the fact that I am sure, Mr. Sylvester, you have read what I have read, attributed to you the fact that you said the Government has the inherent right to lie to the people. This is not the first time you have heard of it.

Mr. SYLVESTER. No. As the chairman said a while ago in relation to a quotation to him, not all quotations in the papers are correct.

Senator MUNDT. I have just one other question.

We don't have page 28 of the transcript. I don't know what was in that.

The CHAIRMAN. Here it is.

(Senator CURTIS entered the room.)

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator, I think you have every page in the original that I brought.

Senator MUNDT. It wasn't your fault. You gave us the pages, but I don't have it in the duplication.

Have you any other criticism now that you want to ventilate concerning the conduct of this committee? If so, I would like to have you do it now instead of at the press conference at noon.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Well, reserving my right to do that, I have nothing further to say. As I said, I do not regard, and I don't think it can be read by any fair reporter, that I was criticizing any Senator personally in any way or suggesting he was unfair. If you will notice, I state very clearly this is not—I think it is quite clear in there.

Senator MUNDT. I can't go along with that. Maybe Senator MUSKIE can feel that way about it, but I don't see how anyone else can feel that way about it.

Senator JACKSON. Are you really serious about this, Mr. Sylvester?

Senator MUNDT. You say here: "And obviously, you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee," except MUSKIE. Now, you haven't named any of those Senators yet that have a self-interest. You have eliminated three, MCCLELLAN, CURTIS, and MUNDT, and I will watch with interest how many others you eliminate from this blanket attack.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator, I would like the record to show that I did not say anything about any Senator's self-interest.

Senator MUNDT. State interest.

Mr. SYLVESTER. That is an entirely different thing.

Senator MUNDT. No, it is pretty close to a Senator's self-interest.

Senator JACKSON. State self-interest is what you said.

Mr. SYLVESTER. From my point of view, the Senator's duty obviously, having covered the Senate for many years, must represent his own people, his own State, and this seems to me completely legitimate. This is what seems to me to be completely misrepresented in what I said.

Senator MUNDT. I am not questioning the legitimacy, but I can see if you had this whole committee stacked from a State that wanted the contract or got the contract, or didn't get involved in the contract, that would be one thing. But at least for three of us you have no evidence that we have any State self-interest; that is correct. OK.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, before we ask others to question you, before I yield to them, will you state with respect to the State of North Carolina, Senator ERVIN's State, and he is a member of the committee, and also the State of New Hampshire, since Senator MCINTYRE is a member of the committee, and Senator BREWSTER, of Maryland, who is a member of the committee? Senator MCINTYRE and Senator BREWSTER are new members of the committee, but I believe they came on the committee the day or the day before the committee started the hearings.

Since we have questioned or interrogated you about the others, and they are not present, I think we ought to make the record clear with respect to them. Do you know of any contracts or interest in the State of North Carolina?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I know of none in North Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of any in New Hampshire?

Mr. SYLVESTER. There may be subcontracts going to some of those other States. I would have to check with people who know.

Senator CURTIS. Will the Senator yield at that point?

The CHAIRMAN. One moment.

How about Senator BREWSTER of Maryland? Anything in Maryland?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have no firsthand knowledge of any of those.

The CHAIRMAN. Then your statement did not apply, I assume, to all of those you have named.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Not unless there are subcontracts that I do not know of, which may be. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator CURTIS.

Senator CURTIS. I will just ask one question: Isn't it true that the subcontractors' interest in many situations were unaffected regardless of whether General Dynamics or Boeing got the contract?

Mr. SYLVESTER. It may well be, Senator. I am not an expert in this field.

Senator CURTIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know about New York? Senator JAVITS is not here.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Yes, I think there is an interest in Long Island. I think Grumman is.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not asking that with any implication.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am not making it.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not asking with any implication that it would influence Senator JAVITS, but I think in fairness to him we ought to ask. I don't think Senator JAVITS would be influenced by that, if he thought that the Government's interest was in the other contractor. I don't think he would.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I wouldn't impute anything to any Senator. I think that is the difference, though, between a court of law and a Senate hearing. Were these things in a court of law, I think people then, of course, would remove themselves from a hearing, in a court of law. I don't think you would expect Senators to do it; I don't think they should do it. But that is the difference I was trying to make, between a court of law and a Senate hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. I suppose every Member of Congress has an interest in Government because he pays taxes, and you might say he has an interest from a tax standpoint as well as from getting some business in his State, to have it both ways.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I quite agree with you. I wasn't suggesting otherwise. Here they may be trying to break the contract, though, and I think that is a little different.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to make this record clear with you, so far as I am concerned. Your freedom of speech and your right to say and your right to conclusions, and your thinking that possibly somebody might be influenced, or that they could not render a judicious opinion or conclusion, that is all right. That is your individual right. I reserve the right to myself, and I accord it to you just as freely as I take it for my own purposes. But I wanted to get clear whether Arkansas really had any interest that you knew of, and I thought that might, of course have the record made clear as to the other States, the other Senators.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Mr. Senator, may I merely say that I do not regard I have any right to cast any aspersion on any member of any committee. I have not exercised that right nor used it. I think I do have a right to state the facts. But I cast no aspersion on anybody.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be a different interpretation, I think, of this language, then. I said if you thought the committee would not be able because of some reason to render a judicious opinion about it, that is your right to say it. I am not quarreling with that. I only wanted to get the record straight as to whether there was a basis for that where my State and I were involved.

Senator Jackson.

Senator JACKSON. We come to a State that does have an interest, the State of Washington, headquarters for the Boeing Co. I want to ask you, Mr. Sylvester, do you think I have been unfair in these hearings?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have not read enough of your cross-examination to really have any opinion.

Senator JACKSON. How did you really come to the conclusion that you came to in the statement that you made to the press?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I said I have the impression, having read the transcript casually and quickly in order to meet the news queries, of exactly what I said before, Senator, that so far the basic Defense point of view and the Defense aims in this as established by the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Defense Secretary and the services, have not come forth in this hearing.

Senator JACKSON. Let me ask you, sir, did you ever make a request to this committee for information that should be submitted to it to carry out what you have in mind? Did you or any of your associates?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am not the proper official to do that anyway, Senator. I would not be the one who would make that request. But certainly I would——

Senator JACKSON. Well, isn't it a fact that no such request has been made?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Mr. McNamara, I think, made one over the weekend last Saturday, and I am very anxious that that should be made.

Senator JACKSON. Hasn't that request been honored?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I believe the chairman announced last night that he would so honor the request.

The CHAIRMAN. I announced it, yes, and I understand that we were somewhat expecting the statement to be read today, this morning, but it is not. I understand that it is in the process of preparation. Again I say to you that the committee will receive that under its rules whenever the Secretary wishes to present it.

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Sylvester, wouldn't it have been wiser to defer the comments that you made until you were sure that the statements that you had given the press were not borne out by the facts?

Mr. SYLVESTER. Senator, I deferred any comment for more than 10 days in answering questions of newsmen, on what do we have to say to the charges coming out of the committee. Again I read you this one. "As one investigator puts it, if the Russians could build a plane that was rejected, they could shoot down the fleet of planes that the United States is planning to build."

The story begins, and Jim McCartney is an excellent reporter, "Senate investigators have come to the conclusion"——

The CHAIRMAN. Is that a quote?

Mr. SYLVESTER. That is an attribution without a quote in it.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not a quote?

Mr. SYLVESTER. It is Mr. McCartney's reporting of a conversation with Senate investigators. "Senate investigators have come to the conclusion that the Defense Department signed a $6.5 billion contract for 'a second-rate airplane.' "

The CHAIRMAN. That is a conclusion quoted by the press.

Mr. ADLERMAN. Who is that attributed to?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not a quote of any individual.

Mr. SYLVESTER. He has: "As one investigator put it, if the Russians could build a plane that was rejected, they could shoot down the fleet of planes that the United States is planning to build."

This is attributed to one of the investigators of the committee.

It goes on. I will be glad to read the rest of it.

"This is the heart of the fantastic story that the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, headed by Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, is attempting to prove in secret hearings."

The CHAIRMAN. Said what?

Mr. SYLVESTER. "Is attempting to prove."

The CHAIRMAN. That is a reporter's writing.

Senator JACKSON. Do you really want us to manage the way they write in their stories? Is that what you are suggesting or asking?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I know Mr. McCartney, and I am satisfied that he talked to people here and in fact he assured me that he did.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I think that you know enough about this. People talk about this as "If this is a fact," "if this other situation prevails or is established as a fact, such conclusion might be justified."

Mr. SYLVESTER. It may very well be.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not know; in the course of these things the press asks many things, but here you are giving a press conference and making these statements. And apparently this statement was somewhat gratuitously made and not in answer specifically to a question.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I think you have to go back, Mr. Chairman, for 10 days and some of the questions that were asked not at the press briefings.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I think we withheld any comment.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not concerned about your impression, particularly, or your wanting or your desire to criticize the record or your implication, but I wanted to get at the basis upon which the criticism was premised, insofar as it related to my statement and to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me a statement like that is very damaging to our defense, and suggested to the Russians that the Defense Department of the United States is buying a plane that they can shoot down. I just can't see any good from that.

The CHAIRMAN. You are complaining about a statement somewhere in the press. We are asking you about your statement, if you had any justification for making the statement, and to cast that aspersion on the Senator from Arkansas. That is what I am asking about, on the basis of what you said you premised it on.

Did you have any such basis?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I explained that to you.

Senator JACKSON. How can you complain about other former colleagues in the press, about what they are writing, when you have admitted before this committee that the statement that you made to the press was not correct?

Mr. SYLVESTER. First off, Senator, I don't think I am complaining about any of my colleagues. I have said nothing in complaint against any of my colleagues.

Senator JACKSON. You said, or you referred to their article and the conclusion that they may have come to, and how can you really complain based on your own statement that you now admit was wrong?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am a little mixed up.

Senator JACKSON. Or are you denying it?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I am a bit mixed up in what you are saying.

Senator JACKSON. Let me read this, and is this statement true or false, and are you standing by it and I want to ask you, and I quote directly from the tape, as I understand it, has been printed:

"And obviously, you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee in which there are various Senators with State self-interest in which the contract goes."

Is that statement correct or isn't it correct?

Mr. SYLVESTER. The statement is correct.

Senator JACKSON. Do you stand on that statement?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I made the statement and it shows in the record, Senator.

Senator JACKSON. Well, are you still saying this is true, despite your testimony here this morning?

Mr. SYLVESTER. My testimony has been, Senator, that I make a distinction, and a very clear one, between a judicial rendering in a court of law and a Senate committee investigation. I did not cast any aspersion on the fair-mindedness of any member of that committee in that transcript. I did make a distinction between a court of law.

Senator JACKSON. Well, you are applying this statement to the Senators then on this committee, were you not? What were you applying it to?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I was applying it to the fact that we are dealing here with two great contestants. A contract has been let, and an effort is being made by the disgruntled losers to knock the contract down.

Senator JACKSON. Now wait a minute, just get something clear, sir. The Boeing Co. never asked for this hearing. Do you understand that? I asked for it. They did not ask me.

Now what information do you have that they have asked for this investigation?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I have no suggestion, and I have never made any.

Senator JACKSON. You are just making one, you said a disgruntled loser in effect asked for it.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I did not say "asked for it."

Senator JACKSON. Well, then, read the transcript.

(The above proceedings were read by the reporter.)

Senator JACKSON. Will you explain what effort is being made by the disgruntled loser?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I will simply have to refer you, Senator, to my impression that I got from the testimony to date. I would say from my reading it, only one side has been put in.

Senator JACKSON. That isn't what I said. You just got through saying that an effort is being made by a disgruntled loser to knock this contract down. Back that statement up.

Mr. SYLVESTER. It is a judgment on my part.

Senator JACKSON. What is your evidence?

Mr. SYLVESTER. From reading the transcript to date.

Senator JACKSON. Has the Boeing Co. testified in here?

Mr. SYLVESTER. No; but all of the testimony has been on the beauties of their plane, and knowing that I can read it has been the other.

Senator JACKSON. Now, wait a minute. Does it come from Boeing?

The CHAIRMAN. The second exhibit we put in was the justification.

Senator JACKSON. From the Department of Defense. Now state where in any part that you can refer to in this transcript indicates that this stems from the Boeing Co.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I haven't suggested that it stems from the Boeing Co.

Senator JACKSON. You said that it is an effort on the part of the disgruntled loser. I think this all brings out something, that you are a little careless with words. This is where you get in trouble, Mr. Sylvester. This isn't the first time.

I would like to have an answer to that question.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I would like to make reference here to some notes I have.

Senator JACKSON. All right.

Mr. SYLVESTER. Again I am not an expert in this field and I don't pretend to be. I have read the transcript. I notice in the very first book that a Mr. Stack, whom I don't know from anyone else, I know he was offered as an expert in this field. I think the testimony shows that he said he had not seen the last two versions of the design competition.

Senator JACKSON. Do you know who Mr. Stack is?

Mr. SYLVESTER. I see in the testimony he is offered as an expert in the field.

Senator JACKSON. You had better do your homework. Mr. Stack, as the testimony brought out, is practically "Mr. TFX," as I understand it.

Mr. ADLERMAN. He was the expert for NASA who was loaned to the Air Force as their expert, and he was attached to the source selection board as the expert on TFX from the NASA organization.

Senator JACKSON. As a matter of fact, he had been with the original National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics dating back to the late twenties, and then went with NASA. He twice won the Collier Award, Mr. Sylvester,

Now, I get back to my question. You referred to the effort on the part of a disgruntled loser, or whatever the exact quote was, and you see, again you make these statements and you don't have anything to back them up. You are in here complaining about news stories when you admit now that you did not intend what you said. I gather you are saying this. I don't know whether you are or not, and you wonder why your colleagues write a news story based on the statement you made.

This is not the first time you have had this trouble, and I would not be in here complaining about your other colleagues in the press, sir.

Mr. SYLVESTER. I don't think that there is anything in the record in which I have.

Senator Jackson. That is all I have.

Senator Muskie. I suppose I ought to defend myself here this morning. At the very least I ought to try to find out how I can get a piece of this contract in my State.

The Chairman. Apparently from what I learn now, I have overlooked or neglected to put forth any effort heretofore.

Senator Muskie. We have been neglecting our duties.

I would like to say, I think at least the comment from me is due, that I have no questions for the witness, but it has been my privilege to serve on this committee for almost 5 years, now, and it has always been my impression, despite the fact that we have had to hear controversial matters from time to time, that it is the objective of the chairman and of this committee to find the truth about any matter or any issue that comes before it. And despite the fact that from time to time I have held different views about some of these matters than other members of the committee, I have never been under the impression that any member of the committee seems to be anything but objective and fair in his search for the truth.

I suppose I ought to consider it a compliment that my purity has been held up to public view, but this has been done in a way to cast discredit upon my colleagues, and to the extent that it does, I think it casts discredit on me, because we have been a team now for these years, and I have been proud to serve on the committee.

I must say, Mr. Sylvester, I think whatever may have been your intention, and you have tried to clarify that this morning, that it is most unfortunate that the statement should have been made. I am confident that out of the hearings by this committee the truth will emerge, and an objective judgment will be achieved. If the judgment to be made by this group is discredited in advance, then this is a disservice to everybody involved. including the Department of Defense.

I hope that out of this testimony this morning, it will be clear that it did not intend this discredit, whatever your words may have suggested, and obviously they suggest different things to different members of the committee.

So I hope that this hearing will clarify it in order that we may continue these hearings in a climate which is objective, and which is devoid of recrimination and that is conclusive to the development of the truth. I am sure that that is the committee's objective.

Senator Curtis. I have been informed that in answer to a question as to whether or not the junior Senator from Nebraska now has had any state of self-interest in this issue, you replied that you had no firsthand knowledge of such. Is that correct?

Mr. Sylvester. That is correct.

Senator Curtis. What secondhand knowledge do you have?

Mr. Sylvester. I have no second-hand knowledge, and I am not an expert in this contract business at all, Senator.

Senator Curtis. So a more correct statement would have been that you had no such knowledge, rather than limiting it to firsthand knowledge, which might imply that you had some knowledge.

Mr. Sylvester. No implication was intended.

Senator Curtis. Now, do you believe that the military authorities all of the way from the evaluation board through the selection board, the individuals and the generals and admirals through which this selection passed, and the Air Force Council and Admiral Anderson and General LeMay, were any of them motivated by any State self-interest or any interest of any kind?

Mr. Sylvester. Certainly not.

Senator Curtis. Would you regard them as "losers" in this?

Mr. Sylvester. Certainly not, in the sense of a conflict, of course not.

Senator Curtis. The position you have taken is in contradiction of all of the military individuals and groups, is it not?

Mr. Sylvester. I don't think that I understand your question.

Senator Curtis. Well, you have been critical of this investigation, as I understand it, because you contended that it is supporting the military authorities.

Mr. Sylvester. I think what I said and what I have intended to say is that the material coming out so far is largely and almost completely against the decision made by Mr. McNamara, and Mr. Gilpatric, the service secretaries, and there has been nothing of their statements so far. I think this is probably inevitable in the way the witnesses are put on. As a consequence, Mr. McNamara has to be heard. What I have said is not different from what Mr. Gilpatric said on the "Meet the Press" program or what Mr. McNamara said in his letter, that the picture that has come out is certainly not an overall picture that the people are getting, and it certainly has distortions in it from our point of view.

Senator Curtis. What are those distortions?

Mr. Sylvester. I have not said anything different from what they are saying.

Senator Curtis. What are the distortions?

Mr. Sylvester. Well, I think one of the distortions is that the General Dynamics plane is more expensive or would be more expensive, tremendously more expensive than the other plane. I am, again, not an expert in this field. I am not prepared to argue the case. I leave that to the Secretary of Defense.

Senator Curtis. Is that a distortion?

Mr. Sylvester. I think it will appear in the end that it is; yes. I think you can't tell until all of the evidence is in, and I think after Mr. McNamara appears, I think the thing will get in a better balance than it is now, and I would withhold any comment. I am not qualified to talk about it, but I think a better balance will come out after he appears. A very much better balance.

Senator Curtis. Now, as to your statement that it was a distortion to imply that the Boeing product was less expensive; I wish you would give us some facts and figures to prove that.

Mr. Sylvester. As I say, Senator, I am not an expert on it and I am not prepared to argue the case, and it is not in my field whatsoever. With Mr. McNamara's statement coming and with him and others coming, I will leave it entirely to them. I said I don't think that you can——

Senator Curtis. But you don't leave it to them. You told us right here this morning that there were distortions.

Mr. Sylvester. I think that there are up to date.

Senator Curtis. Now, name the next one.

Mr. Sylvester. I think I will rest on that one.

Senator Curtis. Oh, no, you said distortions. You did not make it singular.

Mr. Sylvester. I did not say—I said that the picture coming out by reason of the fact that it is fragmentary, and it comes out twice a day, and inevitably there is material for various reasons, for security reasons, not in the transcript, and can't be, the fact that the newsmen have to report and are reporting a very important thing on a "trigger" basis, which any man covering this has to do, that you do not get a balanced overall picture of what the Department and the Secretary of Defense, and the deputy were trying to do in this contract. That is all I have said.

Senator Curtis. Name some more distortions.

Mr. Sylvester. In the picture that is coming out?

Senator Curtis. Yes, name them.

Mr. Sylvester. I would say the idea that the boards were unanimous throughout probably will be shown to be a distortion.

The Chairman. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. Sylvester. I am not competent to argue this case, and I am not making any——

The Chairman. Will you yield there? Do you really mean "distortions", or do you mean "divergent opinions", differences of opinion, where one might have one opinion and one another.

Mr. Sylvester. I am talking about the reports in the press.

The Chairman. Do you mean that the word "distortion" is a proper term for it?

Mr. Sylvester. I think that the picture being presented, not by the committee, but by the reports on the basis of the testimony, is distorted in the sense that if you drew a picture of it, it would be this way, and I don't think it is a rectangular picture.

The Chairman. Would that mean the press is distorting it? You said not as presented by the committee.

Mr. Sylvester. On the basis of the evidence, their reading of it, since it is fragmentary, and since it is incomplete, and since it has not been presented, I think that you get this sort of a picture.

The Chairman. If the Senator will yield further, you speak of it being fragmentary. Would you not say that the record, placing in the record the memorandum of Secretary Zuckert of November 21, signed by Secretary McNamara, and Secretary Korth and Zuckert, present the other side of the picture, and that that has gone out to the public? There is stated in this presumably the reasons why, in making comparisons, the reasons why the General Dynamics Co. was selected over Boeing.

Now, we can't put everything in the record in one day, but don't you think that putting this in the record immediately in the beginning of the hearings was to put somewhat in perspective the issue, and the issues and the facts in controversy, so that the committee could proceed to examine them?

Mr. Sylvester. Mr. Chairman, I think that the way you would normally—not from the committee point of view, and I am not taking any statement on your decision, but it was the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary who initiated the idea of the TFX in this contract. It would seem to me that you would start with them, and see what they were attempting to do, and then you would find out where they failed to do it.

This way, it has not happened this way. You start not saying "you," but the fact of the matter is we start at the bottom here, and gradually work up, and you therefore don't get at the start the overall picture which the Defense Department was aiming at, and what their overall intent was.

The Chairman. You say we should have had the Secretary of Defense on the stand first?

Mr. Sylvester. I am not making any comment of what you should or should not have done. I am simply saying that to my mind, in watching these things, that the overall picture, the basic reasons, are known to the men at the top, and not to the men at the bottom.

The Chairman. I don't want to belabor this. I just want to ask you one or two other questions.

I may say this for the record, I was informed, through the staff and through the liaison man for the Defense Department, that the Secretaries did not want to go on first. They wanted us to present it and they wanted to come on last.

I thought, in arranging the schedule of witnesses up until the day or two ago that I had arranged it, insofar as they were concerned, to accommodate them, that they would come on last, so they could refute and explain any testimony that had been given.

I have always, since I have been chairman of this committee, any time a Cabinet official—and even others representing agencies of Government, the heads of Government—felt that anything was being presented here that they wanted to correct or that they wanted to comment on or testify about, they have been welcome, they have been received, first, last, in the middle, wherever they wanted to come. That certainly would be true in this instance. I have promptly accorded the Secretary, Secretary McNamara, the opportunity that he made to present an affidavit, a statement, which he proposes will put the thing in what he terms proper perspective. He would be here testifying today, if it were convenient for him. We do not want, and have never tried, to suppress anything. I have tried to lean over backward in trying to get the truth. That is what we are going to seek to do.

Again, I want to assure you that your opinion, your expression of opinion that you don't believe the committee will be judicious or something, gives me no concern except when it is based on a false premise or on an erroneous premise. That is the only thing I wanted to clear up, so far as I was concerned.

Here is one other thing I wish you would help us with a little, since this statement has gone out to the press. You say on page 21:

"Well, I expect to have some"—talking about some figures.

"I would only say you are getting a lot of figures out of this committee after the fact."

I don't know what you mean by figures after the fact. I suppose that would be we are going out and making some new figures. I don't understand the meaning of that. I want you to explain that. You say "They have obtained," meaning the committee, "which did not bear and were not available at the time and were not under consideration at the time."

I think you should explain that, what figures we are getting. We are not getting any figures that I know of from the Defense Department. What figures do you have in mind that we are taking that were not available at the time?

Mr. Sylvester. As I recall, Mr. Gilleas testified on figures, and my recollection is, and also I was advised by some of our people who read that testimony, that he brought in what he called recomputations.

The Chairman. On what?

Mr. Sylvester. On apparently certain figures, on costs figures, as I understand. There were some recomputations that were not the figures used at the time the decision was made.

The Chairman. I don't know that I understand fully what you mean.

Mr. Sylvester. I beg your pardon?

The Chairman. Do you mean we have made some calculations, the committee staff has?

Mr. Sylvester. I think Mr. Gilleas testified on figures involved in the contract. Reading this quickly——

The Chairman. Reading what?

Mr. Sylvester. Reading the testimony. I believe he said in there since the time the contract had been let, recomputations had been made.

The Chairman. Recomputations had been made?

Mr. Sylvester. That is as I recall his testimony.

The Chairman. Well, is that true?

Mr. Sylvester. I don't know whether it is true or not.

The Chairman. What is wrong with it if they were made, to check on errors?

Mr. Sylvester. Nothing wrong with it, other than if there were such recomputations, they were not the figures on which the decision was based.

The Chairman. Would you say, then, the figures that were considered and upon which the decision was made were correct figures?

Mr. Sylvester. I am not an expert in this field, Mr. Chairman, I haven't any idea. I presume they were, yes.

The Chairman. The point is all of this is simply that the committee is not getting the facts or we are using figures that were not facts and not pertinent to the consideration or in consideration of the contract at the time the award was made. If we are using any figures here that are not figures from the records of the Pentagon, what it had, I don't know what they would be, unless they would be a compilation or finding of errors in the figures that were used then.

Mr. Sylvester. I wouldn't know either.

Mr. Adlerman. May I straighten out one more thing.

Mr. Gilleas testified as to the commonality figures quoted in the memorandum of November 21, 1962, signed by Secretary Korth and Secretary Zuckert and Secretary McNamara, where he cited the commonality figure was 85 percent and 60 percent. The record, both of General Dynamics Co. and the Defense Department show that these figures are not accurate, and so Mr. Gilleas testified. He testified that the figure of 85 percent attributed to General Dynamics was, in truth, in one part, 80 percent and in other part 83 and some fraction.

Am I correct on that, Mr. Gilleas?

Mr. Gilleas. That is correct.

Mr. Adlerman. These are not figures after the fact. They are not recomputations. These are the actual figures which were incorrectly stated in the memorandum.

Now as to the figure of 60 percent, if they used the figure of 85 percent in Mr. Zuckert's memorandum, then you have to include in that certain items which were called similar but not identical. If you are going to use 85 percent in one company, General Dynamics, call it 85 percent common, if you are going to use the same rule on Boeing, you would have to include the similar but not identical there, and that would make it 80 percent instead of 60 percent.

Those are the figures that Mr. Gilleas brought out. These are the official figures in the Defense Department's memorandum, and they come right out of the books of the General Dynamics Co. They were available to the Defense Department and Mr. Zuckert. Your implication that any of these figures come after the fact is not true.

Mr. Sylvester. I think probably if you look at the comparison by weight it was 92 percent for General Dynamics.

Mr. Adlerman. I don't know what it is by weight, but I can find out for you, and if that is the case, maybe it ought to be looked at that way.

Mr. Sylvester. I am sure if you have followed this, you must have come across that figure.

Mr. Adlerman. Have you read all the testimony in this hearing?

Mr. Sylvester. No, I have not.

Mr. Adlerman. And still you feel free that you can criticize the figures in this without reading all of the testimony?

Mr. Sylvester. I am simply saying as I read the testimony there are different figures in there than I am aware of.

Mr. Adlerman. And you are able to criticize the facts brought before the committee without reading the testimony, that we are presenting a one-sided picture without reading the testimony?

Mr. Sylvester. In my own mind I am clear when new figures are brought in after the decision was made, if such figures were.

Mr. Adlerman. Are your conclusions based upon fact or are they based upon prejudice?

Mr. Sylvester. Well, of course, I think the proper decision was made.

Mr. Adlerman. Are they based upon the facts that you read in the testimony?

Mr. Sylvester. If it is prejudice, then I am certainly guilty of being prejudiced. I think the right decision was made and when the full facts are——

Mr. Adlerman. I am not asking you that. I am asking are your conclusions based upon the testimony or upon your prejudice.

Mr. Sylvester. No; my conclusions, I think, will be verified when the full testimony comes out. They are not based on a partial presentation.

The Chairman. He said he did not read the testimony when he made these statements.

Would you say the figures that you are referring to are not accurate or not correct?

Mr. Sylvester. No, I did not say that. I said my reading of that indicated——

The Chairman. Were they before the fact or after the fact? You don't say they are not correct?

Mr. Sylvester. No, I have no knowledge that they are not correct at all. I have not suggested that. I am only saying, Mr. Chairman, I think when the full facts come out that a lot more material will be shown, that the thing will be in much better perspective, and that the committee will be led as Fortune Magazine was, to a decision that the right decision was made.

The Chairman. Mr. Secretary, I may say that you may be correct. We may come to that conclusion, despite the fact that one or two States may have a little interest in it. I think it is possible for this committee to render a judicious opinion. I don't agree with you on that, though I respect your right to disagree.

Mr. Sylvester. I have such high regard for this committee and its fairness that the facts will lead them to the conclusion that the Secretary of Defense was right.

The Chairman. But that does not answer the question, when you say that you think it is going to come out all right. Frankly, I hope it does. There is no pleasure, I get no pleasure out of these investigations. I hope everything is right, with the crossing of every "t" and the dotting of every "i." But we have a duty to perform here, and I am simply trying to do that, and that is all.

Mr. Sylvester. I respect this committee very highly.

The Chairman. These statements that tend to reflect upon the committee are not calculated to be helpful. I may say that in all candor. But, again, I wanted for the record whether you premised your statement insofar as it applied to the Senator from Arkansas, whether you premised it upon fact, and whether the statement you premised it upon was correct.

Mr. Sylvester. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate that. You, I am sure, will grant me that in the job that I have, that when I see quotations from investigators, "If the Russians could build a plane that was rejected, they could shoot down the fleet of planes that the United States is planning to build"——

The Chairman. Mr. Sylvester, I am not here to defend some reporter, what his error may have been, or anything else. You never took that up with me before. You never inquired whether it was accurate or true. You simply picked that up. I don't know now whether a reporter correctly reported that or not. We are not talking here about you, about what some reporter said. We are talking about what you said and gave to the press.

I don't know anything about the accuracy of that statement. I doubt that it is accurate. I don't mean by that that reporters deliberately disorted it, but in conversations often you use some illustration and some interpretation is made of it which may not be the interpretation actually intended, as you say about yours. You say you did not intend this to reflect upon anybody.

Mr. Sylvester. Jim McCartney told me that this is an accurate representation.

The Chairman. If you want to take that and rely on that, all right. Yours is accurate, and you could not draw any other conclusion from your statements here that you gave to the press, except that you intended to reflect on this committee.

Now, I have been patient and you keep insisting on that. You know that the statement you gave was intended to reflect on this committee, don't you?

Mr. Sylvester. No, not at all.

The Chairman. Well, it did, and you know that it did, don't you?

Mr. Sylvester. No, I don't think it did in any way.

The Chairman. You don't think it did?

(At this point Senator Javits entered the room.)

Senator Mundt. Mr. Chairman, I have to go to another meeting, but I have one question on procedure.

These hearings have been held in executive session. The question was raised this morning as to whether this particular one, since it deals with what the public reaction is to the hearings, should be open to the press, I thought it should be. The majority of the committee thought otherwise.

You heard the Chairman's statement at the beginning, however, that he hoped he could release this to the press immediately at the conclusion of the hearings. I certainly hope so, too, so my question to you, Mr. Sylvester, is this: Is there anything in today's hearing that you want to withhold from the press, or is it all right with you if the entire transcript is released to the press, as I think it should be.

Mr. Sylvester. It is quite all right. As I indicated at the beginning, I had no objection at the start of these hearings to having it open.

Senator Mundt. No, we had a committee rule. You are willing to make the full transcript available to the press as soon as possible?

Mr. Sylvester. I see no reason why not.

Senator Mundt. Thank you.

Senator Curtis. When I yielded, I had asked you to name the distortions. You named one. You named the costs.

Now name the others.

Mr. Sylvester. I think that in the stories that have come out, and the reports of the meeting, it has not been made clear that the Boeing plane relies upon procedures and materials that, so far, are apparently not proved, and that they will require, according to the Defense Department's point of view, a great deal of experimental work that will increase the costs.

It seems to me this is for the Secretary of Defense. I am not the expert on this whatsoever, Senator.

(At this point Senator Mundt left the room.)

Senator Curtis. I ask you to name another distortion. Will you read the answer, Mr. Reporter?

(Record read by the reporter.)

Senator Curtis. Do you regard that as a distortion?

Mr. Sylvester. I do, yes. Not that I——

Senator Curtis. Do you imply by that that either plane has been built and proven?

Mr. Sylvester. Senator, I am not an expert on the planes, and I am not qualified to discuss the planes.

Senator Curtis. But you do all the time.

Mr. Sylvester. I am simply discussing it from the point of view of what I understand from the Defense Department. I am not the expert on it.

Senator Curtis. You understand that that is a distortion. Who told you that in the Defense Department?

Mr. Sylvester. This is my judgment in reading the material that has come out.

Senator Curtis. You just got through saying that you were relying on the Defense Department.

Mr. Sylvester. Not as to the general——

Senator Curtis. Who in the Defense Department regards it as a distortion that the public were advised that the Boeing product had not been proven when the facts are that neither plane has been built and flown.

(At this point Senator McClellan left the room.)

Senator Curtis. Who in the Defense Department contends that is a distortion?

Mr. Sylvester. The distortions, Senator, are that the whole story has not come out, and this does not give a full and balanced picture of the issues involved.

Senator Curtis. You can't expect that to stand. Suppose a given witness testifies truthfully about a detail with which he is familiar. The fact that he does not know about all the other details that might be involved—is his testimony a distortion?

Mr. Sylvester. The fact, Senator, that you start with details and try to build up a picture, rather than with the overall picture, and then go into the details, that would be, by technique, at least, a distortion, until you get away down to the end of the line.

Senator Curtis. I can't agree that either of the two you have named are distortions. I do not think they would support the facts. But what other distortions do you identify?

Mr. Sylvester. I have no further ones to discuss, Senator.

Senator Curtis. I did not ask you if you wanted to discuss them. I want to discuss them. What further ones do you have.

Mr. Sylvester. I haven't any.

Senator Curtis. Has anyone besides the members of this committee had any State self-interests in this controversy?

Mr. Sylvester. It may well be. I don't know of anybody.

Senator Curtis. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Muskie (presiding). Senator Javits?

Senator Javits. Mr. Sylvester——

Mr. Sylvester. Good morning, Senator.

Senator Javits. I have noted your statement with considerable interest. I have been a trial lawyer long enough to know that sometimes the most careful witness says things he wished he had not said. I gather this was an untoward statement on your part, the statement about the committee, self-interest, and so forth.

Mr. Sylvester. I did not get the word.

Senator Javits. An untoward statement. You wish you had not made it, whatever may be the merits of it.

Mr. Sylvester. I certainly wish that the point I was trying to make had been made clearly enough so that no Senator here would feel that I was trying to reflect on his fairness, because I think it is quite clear through that that I did not discuss fairness in any way.

Senator Javits. Would you tell me—had you finished?

Mr. Sylvester. And I did feel that since this is a question of a contract which has been decided upon, any action, I would assume, going to that must be intended to break the contract. All the ramifications of such a complicated matter as is being investigated here, and, of course, very properly investigated here, are not the same as a court of law. That is the point I was trying to make.

Senator Javits. You are clear that we have no judicial function in this matter?

Mr. Sylvester. Correct.

Senator Javits. And even if a major found, and perhaps even all of us found, that this contract was improper, unwise, should never have been made, that nothing could be done about it if the Defense Department did not want to do it unless there was showing of fraud, which I gather has not even been mentioned and should not be.

Mr. Sylvester. That was my point.

Senator Javits. In view of the fact that there is Grumman in my State, for instance, which you mentioned, I might have an interest in the fact that it would be a great idea if New York could get some business. I hasten to affirm to you that I have that much of an interest.

Mr. Sylvester. Senator, I testified that if I were a Senator, I would work very hard to get every contract. I don't raise any question about it. I respect every Senator's right and I am sure duty to do that. That seems to me basic in our system, in our way of life.

Senator Javits. I will tell you, Mr. Sylvester, for myself, that I am well aware of these pressures. I don't believe they would affect my judgment as to what I would finally determine, which I think will have the paramount desire to serve our Nation's interest that best. I really feel, in all sincerity, that that is true of every other Member, including our distinguished colleague from Washington, who is a very good personal friend of mine.

Mr. Sylvester. I am sure.

Senator Javits. I would be the first to affirm, and he does not have to say a word, that he would feel the same way. If it were the country or the State of Washington, there would be no question about that. I do think it was most unfortunate, because people don't analyze and scrutinize these things carefully as to what you mean by a judicial finding, and the fact that the committee could not make one anyhow. There was an implication, I must say, that our interests of our State would override our interest in our country.

I would think, Mr. Sylvester, because I would like to be constructive, that what I am concerned about is that these peripheral issues, like what you say, may tend to cloud the public understanding of what is going on here and how important it is, and what the evaluation and weight are to be given to the advisory conclusions of the facts to the people.

(At this point Senator McClellan entered the room.)

Senator Javits. I would hope, and I express this hope to you, that you will take an opportunity, perhaps as a result of this hearing, to place this matter in a complete focus in the sense of only to be sure that such factual recommendations we may make or points of view that we may express may be properly evaluated, whatever may be the concern of our States, and express the confidence of a high Government official that he feels, and I am sure you do, that our patriotism for our Nation is far superior, as it must be, to any devotion which we have to the interests of our States.

I would feel that, though I assume by implication that I am one of those people concerned with this question of interests. I would hope very much that after thinking it through, it takes a big man to say when he is wrong, and I think you were wrong in this, considering how the public would receive it. I would hope that you would help us all to put it in focus in the interests of the country, not in any of our own personal interests.

I think my reputation and that of Senator Jackson and others will stand up to this matter very adequately, and I think that is true of all my colleagues.

Mr. Sylvester. That was the purpose of my letter to the chairman yesterday, Senator Javits. I, of course, too, am an interested party, in that I feel very strongly, as a representative of the Defense Department, that the proper judgment was made, and I don't make any pretense at all that I am dispassionate about it at this point. I am interested. I think the Secretary and the top officials made the right decision. I think the facts, when they come fully out, will confirm that. I think we would not have been in such a difficult position as we are today had the story been told from the overall to begin with, one, that a TFX plane would increase our capability; two, that it would create a great safety; and three, that in the fourth evaluation report, the military judgment was that either plane would do the job. Therefore, it then became a matter of judgment on the part of the constituted authorities, and it is this that I think is at stake. I think what is at stake is a civilian judgment which, under the setup of the law, and the Defense Department, must always be a civilian judgment. Had this started from that way, I think the overall picture would have been quite clear and quite in focus. And then testimony would have then either shown that the top people did not testify correctly; they overlooked certain things; they made a bad decision; but building it up bit by bit at every point from the beginning makes it very difficult to give that overall picture.

Senator Javits. Mr. Sylvester, do you feel that your statement in any way changed that situation, that is, your statement that is being referred to here, the statement that "Obviously you will hardly get a judicial rendering by a committee in which there are various Senators with State self-interest in where the contract goes?"

Do you think your statement helped to accomplish the very thing that you want to accomplish, which is to see that all the facts come out on a balanced way?

Mr. Sylvester. If it had any effect, I would hope that it would make newsmen covering the hearing, reading the truncated and fragmentary twice-a-day reports, to hold in suspension a little bit any final conclusions and keep in mind that these witnesses, most of whom have appeared so far, have not had access to the basic decisionmaking and are not aware of the factors which motivated the decisionmakers.

Senator Jackson. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Senator Javits. Certainly.

Senator Jackson. Mr. Sylvester, we all make mistakes. I make a lot of mistakes, I am sure, every day. I know I make them at least every other day. I hesitate to offer you any advice, but I must say that I think we could have saved virtually this whole morning's session if you had come in here and said, "I erred. I made a mistake, and I am sorry." That is all you would have needed to have said. You failed to do that. This is the reason you are having difficulty this time. This is why you have had trouble in the past.

I have always found that it is hard for all of us to admit error, but I must comment that I don't think you have helped the situation here this morning by getting yourself deeply involved in matters that you admit now you have no knowledge about. If you had just come in and admitted that you had made a mistake, that would be it.

We are mortals. We are fallible. I am not infallible. I admit I make mistakes. I merely observe to you for what it is worth that if you had come in and just admitted error, this session would have been over in about 15 minutes. So here we are, and it is now 12:10.

I want to compliment my colleague from New York for his advice and counsel to you, but I am afraid that none of this has had its effect.

Senator Javits. Mr. Sylvester, may I ask you another question?

Of course, as I indicated, I couldn't join more sincerely with Senator Jackson. I think that is the simple and best way to do this, and I think it is deserving. I would even like to see you give such observations as you may feel advised to give on reconsideration as to the main points about Senators. The fact is that we do have State interests, but that all of our lives are lived in meeting those very blandishments. Generally speaking, I think, I depict the Senate in totality, and it represents on the whole a small fact, certainly very much smaller than is indicated by your statement which implants, I think, in the public mind, a confirmation of a suspicion which is undeserved in most cases, in the overwhelming majority of cases.

Perhaps I might just terminate my questioning of you by just asking you whether you consider that you are an expert witness, able to testify on the merits or demerits, either from the point of view of the facts and figures, or from the point of view of the policy of civilian versus military control of the final placements of these contracts?

Do you feel you are the man to testify on those two issues in respect to these contracts?

Mr. Sylvester. No, Senator. I am amazed that I was called to testify, because I am not an expert.

Senator Javits. I would like to join with Senator Jackson in the great display of bipartisanship, of which we have had the virtue before, and urge you either now or deliberately when we are through, that you really owe it to yourself and to this controversy, which will be much better off unencumbered by any such conclusion by a high official of the Department of Defense, to clear the record by saying, as Senator Jackson and I have both tried to say to you, we all do it, I do, he does, some more frequently than others, but that is not material.

It was too bad it was misunderstood. Perhaps you projected what you had in mind inartistically. It had better just be off the record, withdrawn, properly apologized for, and the sooner forgotten the better.

Mr. Sylvester. Senator Javits, I am happy to repeat my letter to the Senator, to the chairman. I am deeply sorry for any remarks of mine that reflected in any way on any member of this committee in any form whatsoever. I am happy to repeat that. I would not in any way reflect on them, and I tried not to reflect on them.

I find from the reaction of the Senators that I was not successful in that, and that I have apparently caused you the sort of pain that I had no intention of doing. I have covered the Congress too long not to know that there is no basis for reflection on any person individually. I accept your judgment that the message did not come clear. I was not reflecting on anybody's integrity or fairness. In fact, the question never came up. It was never discussed. Some of the stories written have used the word "fairness," that I had doubted this group could be fair. I have never had such a doubt, nor have I implied it.

Senator Javits. Mr. Sylvester, may I say to you that I am not hurt or upset, I never was by this statement, and that I feel completely capable of making a dispassionate evaluation of the situation, notwithstanding the interest of my State and notwithstanding the statement which you have made.

I don't feel my judgment would be colored at all. I feel calm, serene, full of loving kindness for all mankind. I just thought it would be good for the country for that remark, as it were, to be stricken so that it would not color the public judgment as to the ultimate results of our findings in this investigation.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Curtis. Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman. Senator Curtis?

Senator Curtis. Mr. Witness, are you familiar with a document called "Memorandum for the Record," dated November 21, 1962, signed by the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Defense, in reference to this matter?

Mr. Sylvester. Is that the November 21 memorandum?

Senator Curtis. Yes.

Mr. Sylvester. I have read the memorandum; yes, Senator.

Senator Curtis. I believe that is identified as exhibit 2. That is exhibit 2. The record indicates that this was presented the first day of the hearings. You would accept that to be a fact?

Mr. Sylvester. Certainly.

Senator Curtis. I have understood you to say that this investigation should have begun with the total picture and then proceeded to the details, and if we started out with details that was wrong.

Mr. Sylvester. I made no value judgment, Senator. I said that trying to be descriptive, I thought if it had been done that way certain results which are unhappy from our point of view might not have followed. I made no suggestion that it should have been.

Senator Curtis. That led me to this question. Here this statement of the Secretary of Defense, Air Force, and Navy which was introduced into the record the first day of the hearings sets forth their reasons.

Now, I ask you to give this committee now any other reasons not mentioned in here, in this exhibit 2, why this contract should not have been awarded to Boeing.

Mr. Sylvester. Senator, I have no competency in this matter whatsoever. I think this is the question that will take up unquestionably with the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary. I have no competency in this field.

Senator Curtis. Is it your statement, then, that exhibit No. 2 does not fully set forth the reasons?

Mr. Sylvester. I make no comment on the statement and characterize it in anyway whatsoever, Senator.

Senator Curtis. But you have. You have. You have criticized the procedure of this committee for not getting the reasons for the Department's decision at the very first of the hearings. Here is what purports to be them, in Exhibit 2, and my question is quite simple: Are there other reasons not set forth in here?

Mr. Sylvester. I haven't any idea, Senator, and I am not a competent person to respond to that question, unfortunately I do not know. I would assume that Mr. McNamara and Mr. Gilpatric will have their own statements to make, and I can't foreshadow them in any way.

Senator Curtis. Then when you said that this committee, or said in essence that this committee proceeded in a wrongful manner by not getting the total picture first, you did not know what you were talking about, is that correct?

Mr. Sylvester. No, I would not say that. I think what I have said is the same as Mr. Gilpatric said Monday, and the same as the Secretary of Defense said in his letter to you.

Senator Curtis. What was that?

Mr. Sylvester. That as the picture has come out, it has come out in fragmentary form and it has not given the overall picture, and I think that that is inevitable.

Senator Curtis. Of course you have not been content with that. Here today you have made accusations of distortions.

Mr. Sylvester. No, I made no accusation. I think it is inevitable.

Senator Curtis. Well, the record will speak for itself.

Mr. Sylvester. I would like to make the record clear that if you analyze the news stories throughout the country, that the picture presented on the basis of the testimony that has come out, is not the picture that we think it is, in the Defense Department.

Senator **Curtis**. Well, the record will speak for itself. I did not put the word "distortion" in your mouth.

I will ask you one thing that maybe you are qualified to answer because all you need to know is how to read a calendar.

When do you say that the decision was made?

Mr. **Sylvester**. I have no first-hand knowledge when it was made.

Senator **Curtis**. Do you have any second-hand knowledge?

Mr. **Sylvester**. No.

Senator **Curtis**. Do you have any knowledge at all of when it was made?

Mr. **Sylvester**. None of which I could testify under oath.

Senator **Curtis**. Well, then, you have some knowledge.

Mr. **Sylvester**. I have no knowledge.

Senator **Curtis**. Do you have any information?

Mr. **Sylvester**. No, I have not.

Senator **Curtis**. What do you mean by implying that some information has come to you but which you can not testify to under oath?

Mr. **Sylvester**. No, I have seen stories that the decision was made at various times, and that is my only knowledge of it.

Senator **Curtis**. Where did you see those stories?

Mr. **Sylvester**. In the press.

Senator **Curtis**. Have you any other information, not based upon the press?

Mr. **Sylvester**. I have no first-hand knowledge of what day or when the decision was made.

Senator **Curtis**. This document of the 21st, of November 1962, would imply it was made some time before the document was written.

Mr. **Sylvester**. I beg your pardon, sir.

Senator **Curtis**. This document, exhibit 2, a literal reading of it would indicate that the decision was made some time before the decision was made, because the next to the last paragraph said "The final considerations stem from the fact," and so on.

I have nothing further.

The **Chairman**. Is there anything further?

Thank you very much, Mr. Sylvester. We appreciate your presence and we are glad to have your testimony.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

TO PROVIDE FOR MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 15, Senate Resolution 107.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The **Legislative Clerk**. A resolution (S. Res. 107) providing for Members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the resolution be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 107) was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. **Hayden**, of Arizona; Mr. **Jordan**, of North Carolina; and Mr. **Scott**, of Pennsylvania.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. **Jordan**, of North Carolina; Mr. **Pell**, of Rhode Island; Mr. **Clark**, of Pennsylvania; Mr. **Cooper**, of Kentucky; and Mr. **Scott**, of Pennsylvania.

STUDY BY COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICAL AND SPACE SCIENCES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 16, Senate Resolution 74.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The **Legislative Clerk**. A resolution (S. Res. 74) authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences to make a study of matters pertaining to aeronautical and space activities of Federal departments and agencies, which had been reported from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without additional amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, with amendments, on page 2, line 4, after the word "from", to insert "March 1", and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$90,000" and insert "$82,500"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

Sec. 2. (a) For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, inclusive, to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable, (2) employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants, and (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency of the Government concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.

(b) The minority is authorized to select one person for appointment as an assistant or consultant, and the person so selected shall be appointed. No assistant or consultant may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $1,600 the annual gross rate of compensation of any person so selected by the minority.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $82,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 17), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 74) authorizing the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to investigate the aeronautical and space activities of the Federal departments and agencies, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without additional amendments, and recommend that the resolution as amended be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 74 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $82,500 by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of "any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations."

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962:

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Aeronautical and Space Sciences: Aeronautical and space activities of the Federal departments and agencies.	$225,000	$88,695.19	------------	
	135,000	39,717.70	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 45.
	90,000	48,977.49	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 234.

The purposes of the resolution are more fully detailed in a letter to Senator B. **Everett Jordan**, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator **Clinton P. Anderson**, chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, which letter (with accompanying budget and statement of expenditures during the last session) is as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Aeronautical
and Space Sciences,
March 1, 1963.

Hon. B. **Everett Jordan**,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee has unanimously reported out Senate Resolution 74, with amendments, on February 28, 1963, which has been referred to your committee.

This resolution would authorize an expenditure not to exceed $82,500 by the committee for the period beginning March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964. The two amendments made by the committee reflect the suggestions made by the Rules Committee that (1) the total amount originally requested should be reduced by one-twelfth, and (2) that the period under which the resolution would operate begin with March 1, instead of February 1.

This resolution, which substantially conforms to the suggested draft for resolutions of this nature, would permit the committee to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the aeronautical and space activities of departments and agencies of the United States, including such activities which are peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

In compliance with Senate Resolution 77 of the 79th Congress, there is also enclosed in duplicate a budget breakdown with respect to the use of these funds.

The amounts set forth in the budget breakdown are based in part on last year's activities by the committee with estimations projected for this calendar year. During the past year the committee has, under Senate Resolution 234, done a considerable volume of work. It has, for example, published or is in the process of printing five reports encompassing a broad spectrum in the space field. These reports involve studies concerning communications satellites, meteorological satellites, space activities of the U.S.S.R., as well as a study and report on the international organization for outer space.

While the amount that was expended during the past year did not reach the total amount authorized, we felt that inasmuch as this committee was a fairly new committee, we should make more of a general survey to create a foundation from which to pinpoint our activities for 1963. Last year, Senator Kerr, as chairman of the Space Committee, stated that the amounts of money expended pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 234, would be carefully supervised. As the new chairman of the Senate Space Committee, I would like to agree completely with this statement. As the attached report of expenditures indicates, nearly $24,000 of the $90,000 authorized under Senate Resolution 234, will be returned unexpended. At least $3,000 of this expenditure has been expended pursuant to Senate Resolution 88 of the 88th Congress, so that except for the present circumstances, the committee would have returned approximately $28,000.

The committee would like to point out that its activities involve matters that are technical in nature requiring the use of expert technical consultants in order that the committee can be properly informed to carry out its duties under its legislative jurisdiction. Because of the highly knowledgeable and competent employees required in this area, we are requesting this year the same, salary ceilings as last year in order to attract and retain this caliber of employees.

In view of our experience during the past 2 years, we believe that there is a great deal more that should be done in order to acquaint committee members and the public with our overall space and aeronautical problems. Having in mind the rapidly expanded efforts of this Nation and others, as evidenced by the proposed budget for NASA of nearly $6 billion for the next fiscal year, there is a constant and continuing requirement that we keep abreast of activities enumerated in the resolution. We believe that the enclosed budget reflects a realistic approach to accompany this undertaking.

Should the Rules and Administration Committee feel that it needs additional information in connection with their consideration of this resolution, I would be pleased to personally appear before the committee in order to answer any questions which its members might have.

Sincerely yours,
Clinton P. Anderson,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base per annum	Base per annum	Gross monthly	Gross 12 months	Gross 11 months
STAFF						
Staff member	1	$8,000	$17,230.10	$1,435.84	$17,230.10	$15,794.26
Do	1	7,380	16,064.19	1,338.68	16,064.19	14,725.51
Clerk	4	2,640	6,475.75	539.64	25,903.00	23,744.42
Total						54,264.19
ADMINISTRATIVE						
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)						446.16
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)						3,527.14
Contribution to employees Federal employees' group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)						187.11
Reimbursable payments to agencies						17,874.87
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)						4,583.30
Stationery, office supplies						458.33
Communications (telephone, telegraph)						916.67
Newspapers, magazines, documents						242.23
Total						28,235.81
Grand total						82,500.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 74, $82,500.

Funds approved by Committee on Rules and Administration, $82,500.

Actual and estimated expenditures under S. Res. 234

	Authorized	Actually expended through Jan. 31, 1963
Salaries	$55,324.61	$32,719.13
Contributions to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382)	486.72	[1] (138.65)
Contributions to civil service retirement funds (6½ percent of total salaries paid)	3,596.11	[1] (740.99)
Contributions to employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000)	197.64	[1] (90.05)
Reimbursable payments to agencies and consultants	20,000.00	23,993.39
Travel	3,000.00	4,777.82
Hearings	2,000.00	------------
Witness fees, expenses	2,000.00	------------
Stationery, office supplies, postage	1,000.00	674.29
Communications (telephone and telegraph)	1,500.00	------------
Newspapers, magazines, documents	500.00	------------
Contingent fund	394.92	------------
Total	90,000.00	62,164.63

[1] Items in parentheses included in salaries total.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION, OPERATION, AND ENFORCEMENT OF INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 34, Senate Resolution 62. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. **Dirksen**] wants to offer some comment on it and, I believe, an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The **Legislative Clerk**. A resolution (S. Res. 62) to investigate the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$360,000" and insert "$333,880"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections

134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, insofar as they relate to the authority of the committee, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of (1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended; (2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and (3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organization controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $333,880, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, there was a disparity between the amount carried in the resolution and that inserted in the report. I think the committee has agreed that the item on page 3, in italics, $333,880, is the correct amount.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the figure of $333,880 in the printed resolution is a typographical error. The figure of $310,880 specified in the report is the correct amount reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration. However, at the request of the minority leader and the chairman of the committee involved, I will offer no objection to the consideration by the Senate of the $333,880 figure carried in the printed resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there agreement on the amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the amount is carried in the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 2, line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment on page 3, line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 35), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 62) authorizing an investigation of the administration of the national security law and matters relating to espionage, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the resolution as amended be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 62 as amended, would authorize the expenditure of $310,880 by the Committee on the Judiciary for the continuance of its standing Subcommittee on Internal Security from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to make a complete and continuing study and investigation of—

(1) the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended;

(2) the administration, operation, and enforcement of other laws relating to espionage, sabotage, and the protection of the internal security of the United States; and

(3) the extent, nature, and effect of subversive activities in the United States, its territories and possessions, including, but not limited to, espionage, sabotage, and infiltration by persons who are or may be under the domination of the foreign government or organizations controlling the world Communist movement or any other movement seeking to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Internal security	$645,000	$564,283.62		
	300,000 20,000	285,545.84	Jan. 31, 1961 Sept. 15, 1961	S. Res. 49 S. Res. 201
	325,000	278,737.78	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 264

Senate Resolution 62 as referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration would have authorized the expenditure of $360,000 for the 12-month period from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, an amount $35,000 in excess of that authorized by the Senate for the same purpose during the last session of Congress.

At its meeting on March 6, 1963, the Committee on Rules and Administration amended Senate Resolution 62 by effecting the following reductions:

(1) A reduction of the requested amount by $25,000, to conform it more nearly to the corresponding 1962 authorization; and

(2) A further reduction of the requested amount by one-twelfth of that portion of the reduced amount representing salaries and employee benefits, to compensate for funds made available to the committee during February 1963 by Senate Resolution 88, agreed to February 19, 1963.

By this action the Committee on Rules and Administration reduced the amount specified in Senate Resolution 62 as referred by $49,120—from $360,000 to $310,880.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, was action taken on Calendar No. 34?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution was agreed to without amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which action was taken.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RESOLUTION OVER TO TUESDAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think it is agreed that on the resolution dealing with antitrust monopoly, by agreement with the chairman of the subcommittee, it will go over until next Tuesday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was the understanding.

SEVEN MORE STATES RATIFY ANTI-POLL TAX AMENDMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] had indicated to a number of Senators earlier today that he had a statement to make at about this hour. I would suggest that the Senator from Florida might proceed now. Then we could go back to the calendar call.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished acting majority leader.

Mr. President, I am happy to announce to the Senate that seven more States have ratified the antipoll tax amendment to the Constitution which would eliminate the prerequisite that a poll tax or any other tax be a requirement for voting in a Federal election.

The 7 new or additional States, Mr. President, are Idaho, Hawaii, New Mexico, Utah, Minnesota, North Dakota, and Colorado, bringing to 20 the total number of States which have ratified this important amendment to date.

Thus, Mr. President, we are past the halfway mark—20 of the 38 States required by the Constitution having ratified the amendment. It is my expectation that we will receive favorable news in the next few days from several additional States whose legislatures are presently meeting.

Mr. President, I wish to express my profound appreciation to the Senators who represent the seven additional States which have ratified the amendment, which I have mentioned.

I am informed that the Legislature of the State of Idaho ratified the amendment on March 8, the Idaho Senate by a vote of 35 to 1, and the Idaho House by a vote of 55 to 2. I wish to express my grateful thanks to both Senators Church and Jordan who have vigorously supported this amendment to the Constitution and each of whom recommended ratification by their legislature.

I am especially pleased, Mr. President, that our 50th State, Hawaii, represented so ably by my distinguished friends, Senator Fong and Senator Inouye, ratified the amendment on March 6 when the Hawaii House approved the Hawaii Senate concurrent resolution endorsing the amendment, but I do not have the votes by which the action was taken.

It is interesting to note that the Congressional Record for Monday of this week, March 11, which was distributed the following date, March 12, contained on page 3855 Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1 of the Hawaii General Assembly which ratified the proposed amendment to the Constitution. This is interesting to me because that date, March 12, was the fourth anniversary of the date that the Congress passed the enabling legislation authorizing the admission of the Territory of Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union.

I salute and congratulate both of the distinguished Senators from Hawaii for their strong support of the amendment which I am discussing, and also upon Hawaii's having attained its fourth anniversary as a new State.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii. I have expressed what I feel in my heart, namely great gratitude toward the 50th State for this being the first resolution which was adopted by the legislature of that State now in session, and for the very active support which the two Senators, sitting on opposite sides of the aisle, have given to the amendment in their State legislature.

Mr. FONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida. I should like to express my deepest appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida for his very kind remarks toward my colleague and me and toward the people of Hawaii. I thank him for reporting to the Senate the ratification of the proposed 24th amendment to the Constitution of the United States by the Second Legislature of the State of Hawaii.

I congratulate him for the effective leadership he has rendered over the past 14 years in painstakingly guiding to passage the joint resolution on the poll-tax. I was most happy to join with my friend, the diligent Senator from Florida in cosponsoring the measure which has just been ratified by my State.

It is indeed a happy coincidence that ratification by the State Legislature of Hawaii should occur during the fourth anniversary of the month in which the U.S. Congress approved the Statehood Act of Hawaii. It seems somehow symbolic of the aloha spirit which has prevailed between the Congress and our Island State during these years.

I may say that in my opinion one of the greatest exponents of the aloha spirit is the senior Senator from Florida. He has certainly proven himself a firm and faithful friend of Hawaii. He helped us to attain statehood and he has helped us in many significant ways since that momentous day in March 1959. He supported establishment of the East-West Center in Hawaii and in the Appropriations Committee supported the necessary funds to get this fine institution under way. He was a key figure in the establishment of a Department of Commerce field office in Hawaii to assist Islanders in their export-import trade. I have always found the senior Senator from Florida to be most sympathetic to the needs of the people of Hawaii.

It is a kind of poetic justice that the people of Hawaii should reciprocate through their State legislature by ratifying the poll tax amendment to the Constitution which the distinguished Senator from Florida sponsored.

May I also say that I am extremely well pleased that Hawaii may be the 17th State to ratify the amendment on the basis of incomplete data filed with the National Archives and Records. The State of Hawaii would have undoubtedly been the first to ratify the amendment, if the legislature had been in session on September 14, 1962, when the amendment was submitted by the General Services Administration to the Governors of the 50 States; for Hawaii is rightfully proud of its tradition of national leadership in the field of civil rights.

I am proud to affirm the language of the concurrent resolution of the Hawaii State Legislature, which has thus acted to preserve the great traditions nurtured and passed on by our forefathers in ratifying this amendment.

No poll tax should abridge the right to vote. Yet, this archaic system of restricting the right to vote in the imposition of an artificial barrier still survives in five States of the Union.

By encouraging wider voter participation in the election of Federal officials, the amendment is an important contribution to good government. Our faithfulness to the precepts and principles contained in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and our standards of decency and justice impels legislative bodies of all States in their present or ensuing sessions to discard speedily the poll tax as an obstacle to democracy.

Mr. President, inasmuch as the text of the resolution of the Hawaii State Legislature is printed in the Congressional Record of Senate proceedings for Monday, March 11, I shall not ask that it be duplicated here.

I thank the distinguished Senator for his very kind remarks and for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I am highly appreciative of the kind and generous statement of the Senator from Hawaii. He and his colleague from Hawaii have been untiring in their efforts in this matter.

Mr. President, the State of New Mexico ratified the amendment on March 5, 1963, the vote in the New Mexico Senate being 18 to 10 and in the New Mexico House, 63 to 0. I express my sincere appreciation to Senators Anderson and Mechem, both of whom so ably represent that great State and have taken such a dedicated interest in ratification of the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want the Senator from Florida to know that the people of my State have felt that the Senator from Florida and those who have supported him have been correct in their position. Our State legislature has approved the amendment. I have had requests from members of the State legislature to express their appreciation to him for having had the matter brought before them for ratification.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his gracious remarks.

The Legislature of the State of Utah approved the amendment on February 20, the vote in the Utah Senate being 23 to 0 and in the Utah House, 51 to 4. Mr. President, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my distinguished colleagues, Senators Bennett and Moss, who ably represent the State of Utah and who have vigorously supported the submission and ratification of this important amendment.

The fifth new State to ratify the amendment is Minnesota. The house approved the amendment on February 19 and the Minnesota Senate, February 27, the Governor officially certifying the legislature's action to the General Services Administration on March 6. I express my deep appreciation to both of the able Senators from Minnesota—Senator Humphrey and Senator McCarthy—both of whom, this year and last year, worked so hard to obtain this most gratifying action.

The sixth new or additional State ratifying the anti-poll-tax amendment is North Dakota, which is ably represented in this body by my distinguished friends, Senators Young and Burdick. I understand that the Senate of North Dakota took affirmative action on its resolution on February 25 by a vote of 27 to 20, the North Dakota House completing necessary action by that State by a vote of 77 to 29 on March 12.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend and colleague from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I am very happy that my State of North Dakota saw fit to approve the joint resolution. I believe this is meaningful civil rights legislation. The opposition in North Dakota was based largely on the issue of States' rights. I may point out that it is a rather conservative Republican legislature that adopted the joint resolution. We are all grateful to the Senator from Florida for the work he has done on the joint resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend from North Dakota for these gracious words. I do not believe that any Senators were confronted by a more difficult situation in their States than were the Senators from North Dakota in connection with this subject. I am sure that ratification would not have been accomplished in that good State but for the strong efforts of the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] and the distinguished junior Senator from that State [Mr. Burdick].

Likewise, Mr. President, it should be noted that in this case, as in four other cases reported today, the Senators representing those States come from different parties, from opposite sides of the aisle. We have again illustrated in the most perfect way the fact that the support for this amendment has been from the beginning bipartisan, and it is still bipartisan; furthermore, that the Senate as a whole has regarded this matter as not at all more closely connected with one party than with the other. I very strongly thank my distinguished friend the senior Senator from North Dakota.

The seventh and last additional State is Colorado. I was informed late yesterday that both houses of the Colorado Legislature have acted affirmatively upon the resolution ratifying the amendment but as yet, I do not have the dates or the votes by which either house ratified. I wish to express my warm appreciation to my distinguished colleagues representing the State of Colorado, Senators Allott and Dominick, for their support in obtaining ratification by their good State of the anti-poll-tax amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very happy to yield to my friend the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Florida for his congratulations to the Colorado Legislature on the ratification of the anti-poll-tax amendment. In our new leadership in both the Governor's office and in both houses of our State legislature, prompt action has been taken to solve many pressing problems confronting our State. I am happy indeed that approval has been given to the anti-poll-tax amendment. Such approval was included in the overall program.

I am happy to say that my senior colleague [Mr. Allott] and I had an opportunity to urge this action on the State legislature. However, we well know that the support and enthusiasm of the various States in favor of the joint resolution can be attributed to the untiring efforts of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Colorado is most gracious. However, I know perfectly well, and so do the other Senators, as well as the American public, that without the followthrough which has been evidenced so clearly in this matter by Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle in behalf of strongly supporting ratification of the amendment in their State legislatures, we would not have had these 20 ratifications. Certainly that is true with respect to the State of Colorado. I warmly thank the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado and his colleague for their untiring work in this matter.

Mr. INOUYE subsequently said: Mr. President, I am most grateful for the kind words of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] in commending the State of Hawaii for ratifying the anti-poll-tax amendment. I assure the distinguished Senator from Florida that the people of Hawaii were proud and privileged to support the great constitutional amendment. The final ratification of the Holland anti-poll-tax amendment to the Constitution will be a great and significant step toward achieving a true and living democracy for the people of our Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I want to express my very deep appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii for the kind words he has spoken relative to the anti-poll-tax amendment and to say for the record that he has been most active, most diligent, and most helpful in having this matter considered by and approved and ratified by the legislature of his State of Hawaii as one of their first items, I believe, as Joint Resolution 1.

May I say it seems to me that we Senators and citizens generally who come from States that have been in the Union very much longer could very profitably look at the record of our 50th State with reference to its recognition of the responsibility of voters.

In their very first election, their voting record surpassed any that I have seen recorded for any other State in the Union in any other election. I may have missed some, but that election showed that 92 percent of the registered electors of the State voted for the candidates in that election.

In the recent action in approving the proposed constitutional amendment on a priority basis, due to the efforts of our two friends the Senators from Hawaii, and of the Governor, the people of the State again have shown an appreciation for the right, the responsibility, and the privilege of voting and for the preservation of that right and for the making of the exercise of voting as nearly a universal matter among our citizens as possible.

So I pay tribute to the fine work of my friends from Hawaii. I am going to point out to the citizens of my own State—in fact, I have already called it to their attention in various appearances in my own State—that here is a lesson we could learn from the citizens of a new State, the people of which have shown in great measure appreciation of their privilege and responsibility of voting, because it is only when citizens vote almost unanimously that we get the full expression of the people of any State.

Before I take my seat I should like to discuss briefly one point, brought out by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] and by other Senators who have talked with me during the course of my remarks, to the effect that some members of State legislatures have objected to the amendment because they believe it is an infringement upon States rights.

To the contrary, an amendment of this type, submitted to the jury of the States, and requiring, first, approval by two-thirds of the membership of each body of Congress, and later approval by three-fourths of the States, is the finest and highest recognition of the rights of the several States that is found in the Constitution.

The right of a State to have a fundamental matter of this kind submitted to the jury of all the States is one of its most precious rights under the Federal Constitution. It is in recognition, rather than in violation, of that principle that this matter is submitted as a constitutional amendment, where there is no question at all about its validity or about its having to be the expression of a great majority of the people of the States and of the Nation before it can become controlling.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I commend the distinquished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] upon his message today and upon his dedication, persistence, and hard work in bringing about, first of all, the adoption by Congress of the constitutional amendment to outlaw the poll tax, and then his followup of the many State legislatures, working with his colleagues in the Senate and in the other body, to encourage prompt action by the State legislatures to eliminate the requirement of a poll tax in order to exercise the franchise.

This is a very important constitutional amendment. As I understand, 22 States have now ratified it. Ratification by 38 States is needed to make the amendment a part of the U.S. Constitution. I am hopeful that this year—if not this year, then by next year—the required number of 38 States will have acted affirmatively to place the amendment in the Constitution.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO INVESTIGATE CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 17, Senate Resolution 75.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 75) authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to national defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without further amendment.

The amendments of the Committee on Armed Services are as follows:

On page 2, line 22, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$190,000" and insert $175,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections

134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

"(1) common defense generally;

"(2) the War Department and the Military Establishment generally;

"(3) the Navy Department and the Naval Establishment generally;

"(4) soldiers and sailors' homes;

"(5) pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces;

"(6) selective service;

"(7) size and composition of the Army and Navy;

"(8) forts, arsenals, military reservations, and navy yards;

"(9) ammunition depots;

"(10) maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including the administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone;

"(11) conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves;

"(12) strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense;

"(13) aeronautical and space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

"Sec. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

"Sec. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $175,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement which may affect this and subsequent resolutions which are to be considered.

We are again engaged, as we have been yearly, in providing funds with which to operate special committees. I call attention to the fact that the Senate is about to consider 23 resolutions which have been actually reported and 2 more resolutions which are at the desk, making a total of 25 so-called money resolutions.

With the exception of two or three, these resolutions refer to special committees which have been created by the standing committees. The total amount of these 25 requests aggregates $4,200,333. Actually, the amount should be $4,582,182.

About a month ago it was necessary for the Senate to adopt a continuing resolution to permit the use of funds with which to pay the staffs of those subcommittees through the month of February. If we consider that the 25 resolutions provide funds on a 12-month basis, it will be noted that the increase for carrying on the work of the subcommittees amounts to $132,682.

Considering this, I do not want the Senate to overlook the fact that although the amounts provided in a few of the resolutions have been reduced somewhat—the overall picture as to the 25 resolutions shows an increase over last year of $132,682. Therefore, the total amount provided by the 25 resolutions for this year, on a 12-month basis, is $4,582,182, compared with $4,449,500 last year.

I am glad that up to now, I have detected that no new subcommittees are in the process of formation. However, I wish to emphasize that these subcommittees still thrive and are still loaded down with many employees—actually, with many more employees than are on the staffs of the regular standing committees.

As all Senators know, each standing committee is entitled to employ 10 persons—6 clericals and 4 specialists—by the Reorganization Act of 1946.

At the close of business December 31, 1961, the number of employees of the special committees was 314, as compared with about 150 employees of the regular standing committees.

As of December 31, 1962, the number of employees of special committees had increased to 338. In large measure, that increase accounts for the pressing need for space which has faced the Senate in the past, and is once again facing the Senate today.

I can well remember the time, several years ago, when some of us were opposed to the construction of a new Senate Office Building. We knew it would be quite expensive. We also felt that if it were necessary to obtain more space in order to provide accommodations for Senators from the larger States, that space probably could be obtained by an extension of the east wing of the Capitol itself. I argued for that position for several years, but I was defeated, and we ended by constructing not only a new Senate Office Building, but also an extension of the east front of the Capitol.

Today, not only are all the offices which were provided in the New Senate Office Building occupied; not only are all the offices in the Capitol extension occupied; but every nook and corner in the Old Senate Office Building which can possibly house anybody has been utilized. The number of offices which are set aside principally for committee work in the Capitol and the two Senate Office Buildings total 358. Of that number, 106 offices are occupied by the employees of the subcommittees. Of course, many of those employees also occupy some of the rooms which are assigned to the regular standing committees.

Thus, much of the space which is now being occupied in the Capitol and the two Senate Office Buildings is being occupied by employees of the subcommittees. If this practice is continued, I foresee a time in the near future when the Senate may be compelled to have more facilities constructed for its employees. When the New Senate Office Building was constructed, many persons felt that it would suffice for many years to come. But all the space in that building is now occupied, and it will be very difficult to remove the committees and their employees after they have been stationed there.

Mr. President, I also wish to say a few words regarding the amounts appropriated in recent Congresses for this special work—that is, the work done by subcommittees created by the standing committees and also the work done by special committees created by the Senate itself. During the 87th Congress, there was authorized for all committees—that is, for the standing committees, the special committees, and the subcommittees of the various standing committees—$9,355,500 for these special inquiries and investigations; and at least $10,000 was authorized for routine expenditures. In other words as all of us know, under the Reorganization Act, each committee is allowed a certain amount. The amount for routine expenditures during the 87th Congress was $283,000.

As I said, the amount authorized for the inquiries was $9,355,000.

This amount shows a decrease of almost $1 million from the corresponding amount allowed during the 86th Congress. I tried to find how that decrease came about. In examining the expenditures of the various committees, we notice that during the 86th Congress the Commerce Committee spent considerably more money than that committee spent during the 87th Congress. That was partly due because of the investigations it made in regard to railroad rates, air travel rates, and so forth. The committee used a little less than $500,000 during the 87th Congress, as compared to the $913,000-plus it used during the 86th Congress.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs spent considerably less under the able leadership of my good friend, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson]. Prior to his tenure as chairman, the committee spent approximately $435,000 to $450,000 annually; but during the last Congress, only $177,000 was spent by the committee.

The same is true of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Its investigations during the 87th Congress required much less than was required by its investigations during the 86th Congress.

However, when we consider the average performance of the committees, without considering the special investigations to which I have referred, we find that the amounts spent have increased, and no saving has been made.

I was very hopeful that the Committee on Rules and Administration would attempt to make some cuts in the amounts allowed for these investigations, and thus would reduce somewhat the payrolls. It is my judgment that when we try to reduce the amounts appropriated for the various departments, we stand in a bad position if we do not reduce the amounts spent by our own committees. It seems to me that most of these committees, and particularly the Internal Security Subcommittee could reduce their expenditures.

Nevertheless, for many, many years, they have had a growing number of employees. I believe that savings can be made as to that subcommittee and to a number of other subcommittees.

I expect to ask questions about practically all these resolutions as the calendar is called, and particularly in regard to the Subcommittee To Study Juvenile Delinquency. That subcommittee was established years ago, in the hope that its work could be completed within a year, and given a budget of approximately $75,000. But up to now we have spent well over $1 million on it. To my way of thinking, very little good, if any, has been accomplished by the expenditure of that huge sum of money.

So, Mr. President, as I have said, as each resolution is called up I expect to ask some questions about the work done by the subcommittees and about what is in the offing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, a summary of table 1 in the Senate inquiries and investigations brochure which was presented to the Senate today.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Summary*

Committee	87th Congress		86th Congress		85th Congress	
	Authorized	Expended	Authorized	Expended	Authorized	Expended
All committees	$9,638,500.00	$6,838,310.96	$10,758,231.37	$7,839,298.44	$8,283,830.08	$5,916,015.68
Routine expenditures	283,000.00	215,059.62	300,000.00	214,389.96	320,000.00	210,475.89
Inquiries and investigations	9,355,500.00	6,623,251.34	10,458,231.37	7,624,908.48	7,963,830.08	5,705,539.79
Standing committees	9,268,500.00	6,532,779.93	9,228,520.00	6,718,396.24	6,660,541.45	4,397,126.65
Routine expenditures	283,000.00	215,059.62	300,000.00	214,389.96	320,000.00	210,475.89
Inquiries and investigations	8,985,500.00	6,317,720.31	8,928,520.00	6,504,006.28	6,340,541.45	4,186,650.76
Aeronautical and Space Sciences	235,000.00	94,474.57	10,000.00	6,781.00	10,000.00	90.10
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	5,779.38	10,000.00	6,781.00	10,000.00	90.10
Inquiries and investigations	225,000.00	88,695.19				
Agriculture and Forestry	10,000.00	8,237.61	25,000.00	15,489.14	25,000.00	13,543.71
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	8,237.61	25,000.00	15,489.14	25,000.00	13,543.71
Inquiries and investigations						
Appropriations	826,000.00	170,715.12	810,000.00	238,687.94	805,000.00	138,947.88
Routine expenditures	66,000.00	57,011.47	50,000.00	39,514.55	45,000.00	35,137.89
Inquiries and investigations	760,000.00	113,703.65	760,000.00	199,173.39	760,000.00	103,809.99
Armed Services	575,000.00	433,666.56	400,000.00	322,516.87	412,000.00	250,627.80
Routine expenditures	20,000.00	16,141.99	20,000.00	11,394.75	20,000.00	16,049.27
Inquiries and investigations	555,000.00	417,524.57	380,000.00	311,122.12	392,000.00	234,578.53
Banking and Currency	384,000.00	330,514.82	350,000.00	283,285.75	360,000.00	278,312.84
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	8,562.96	10,000.00	9,098.47	10,000.00	9,009.86
Inquiries and investigations	374,000.00	321,951.86	340,000.00	274,187.28	350,000.00	269,302.98
Commerce	650,000.00	469,823.40	1,161,020.00	913,664.15	635,000.00	393,889.75
Routine expenditures	20,000.00	14,917.09	20,000.00	15,326.18	10,000.00	8,242.21
Inquiries and investigations	630,000.00	454,906.31	1,141,020.00	898,337.97	625,000.00	385,647.54
District of Columbia	10,000.00	5,631.29	10,000.00	4,354.48	10,000.00	5,330.44
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	5,631.29	10,000.00	4,354.48	10,000.00	5,330.44
Inquiries and investigations						
Finance	22,000.00	14,597.71	10,000.00	5,491.56	20,000.00	12,922.38
Routine expenditures	22,000.00	14,957.71	10,000.00	5,491.56	20,000.00	12,922.38
Inquiries and investigations						
Foreign Relations	380,000.00	222,438.44	705,000.00	484,807.65	629,000.00	146,751.85
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	9,958.18	20,000.00	19,819.29	40,000.00	27,320.73
Inquiries and investigations	37,000.00	212,480.26	685,000.00	464,988.36	589,000.00	119,431.12
Government Operations	1,270,000.00	1,065,223.22	915,000.00	693,004.62	450,000.00	418,584.43
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	4,427.57	20,000.00	8,469.34	10,000.00	5,376.11
Inquiries and investigations	1,260,000.00	1,060,795.65	895,000.00	684,535.28	440,000.00	413,208.32
Interior and Insular Affairs	280,000.00	177,999.94	450,000.00	435,387.04	398,750.00	389,662.04
Routine expenditures	20,000.00	19,766.59	30,000.00	26,586.19	30,000.00	25,566.88
Inquiries and investigations	260,000.00	158,233.35	420,000.00	408,800.85	368,750.00	364,095.16
Judiciary	3,541,500.00	2,880,192.64	3,192,500.00	2,585,334.33	2,188,291.45	1,821,792.19
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	9,976.33	10,000.00	5,817.41	20,000.00	7,762.86
Inquiries and investigations	3,531,500.00	2,870,216.31	3,182,500.00	2,579,516.92	2,168,291.45	1,814,029.33
Labor and Public Welfare	145,000.00	120,019.90	265,000.00	214,292.46	20,000.00	16,741.40
Routine expenditures	25,000.00	18,663.23	25,000.00	24,057.26	20,000.00	16,741.40
Inquiries and investigations	120,000.00	101,356.67	240,000.00	190,235.20		
Post Office and Civil Service	160,000.00	126,191.67	175,000.00	123,617.84	120,000.00	92,144.54
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	8,242.76	10,000.00	9,613.24	20,000.00	15,617.38
Inquiries and investigations	150,000.00	117,948.91	165,000.00	114,004.60	100,000.00	76,527.16
Public Works	260,000.00	100,293.39	260,000.00	58,014.71	160,000.00	97,417.53
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	4,834.93	10,000.00	3,558.58	10,000.00	25.00
Inquiries and investigations	250,000.00	95,458.46	250,000.00	54,456.13	150,000.00	97,392.53
Standing committees—Continued						
Rules and Administration	$260,000.00	$100,117.06	$245,000.00	$117,957.57	$220,000.00	$129,650.37
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	2,411.96	10,000.00	3,992.25	10,000.00	3,384.83
Inquiries and investigations	250,000.00	97,705.10	235,000.00	113,965.32	210,000.00	126,265.54
Small Business (Select) [1]	260,000.00	212,642.59	245,000.00	215,709.13	197,500.00	190,717.40
Routine expenditures	10,000.00	5,898.57	10,000.00	5,026.27	10,000.00	8,354.84
Inquiries and investigations	250,000.00	206,744.02	235,000.00	210,682.86	187,500.00	182,362.56
Joint committees [2]			280,000.00	266,833.64	130,000.00	78,888.10
Economic			200,000.00	192,173.80		
Washington Metropolitan Problems			80,000.00	74,659.84	130,000.00	78,888.10
Select committees [2]			1,114,711.37	755,141.92	1,298,288.63	1,297,418.76
Labor-Management			789,711.37	663,854.05	1,298,288.63	1,297,418.76
National Water Resources			325,000.00	91,287.87		
Small Business.[1]						
Special committees [2]	370,000.00	305,531.03	135,000.00	98,926.64	195,000.00	142,582.17
Aging	370,000.00	305,531.03				
Astronautics and Space Exploration					50,000.00	30,090.75
Foreign Aid Program					75,000.00	68,217.74
Political Activities, Lobbying, and Campaign Contributions					60,000.00	44,273.68
Preservation of Senate Memorabilia			10,000.00	35.10	10,000.00	
Unemployment Problems			125,000.00	98,891.54		

TABLE 1.—*Summary*—Continued

[1] For the purposes of this compilation the Select Committee on Small Business, because of the nature of its organization and the duration of its authority, is included with the standing committees of the Senate, even though it lacks legislative jurisdiction.

[2] All funds shown for joint, select, and special committees are in the category "inquiries and investigations."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely wish to express the view that the proposals to make a general cut in expenditures will be decided by the action we take on the proposals which will be made by the Senator from Louisiana. If we do not reduce our own expenditures, we shall be defenseless in our efforts to try to cut the expenditures of the other branches of the Government. So, in my opinion, the action to be taken today by the Senate will be determinative of this issue, about which so much has been said—in other words, that if there is to be tax reduction, there must be, accompanying it, a reduction of expenditures.

I think Parkinson's disease—or whatever is the economic term for this situation—has been characteristic of the topsy-turvy growth of these departments, and I believe something must be done about this situation.

So I shall give support to the Senator from Louisiana in the fight he is making on this issue.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, growing concern in the United States over annual increases in the total budget and in deficit spending has been expressed in all corners of this Nation.

Among those who have voiced their concern are Members of Congress, including the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] who now has the floor and has been kind enough to yield to me.

Yet, the Congress itself is contributing to the overall problem by voting larger sums each year to meet operating expenses.

On the Senate side, the appropriations which are approved for the use of committees and subcommitteees grow generally larger in every succeeding Congress.

Naturally, enough money must be appropriated for each committee to permit the proper processing, study, and reporting of proposed legislation referred according to jurisdiction.

However, some effort ought to be made by the legislative branch, which has the power to cut the amount of the national budget, to show restraint in the use of money for its own purposes.

If we are to begin our efforts to reduce annual spending, we ought, for the sake of our integrity, to begin to do it here in the Senate.

For that reason, Mr. President, I attempted to reduce by approximately 10 percent the appropriations requested by committees which asked for substantial increases over the amounts allowed them last year. I feel sure that each committee so affected will not be hampered in performing its normal functions, and the saving to the Senate will be sufficient to demonstrate an honest intent to economize in its own backyard.

For the benefit of committee chairmen who would be affected by the application of my motion, I say that it will not preclude them from returning at a later time before the Committee on Rules and Administration—or, at least, it is not my intention to preclude them from doing so—if they actually require additional funds. But I believe it will be helpful to everyone if we take a second look at the expenditures being made and if we begin to do some economizing right now.

It is my hope that the Senate will support my thoughts and efforts in connection with this matter; and I thank the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for his support.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am glad to hear that an effort was made before the committee to cut back the proposed expenses. Evidently my good friend did not succeed too well, because the increase involved in the same 25 subcommittee resolutions over what was authorized last year is $132,682. I am hopeful that other Senators will join me, my good friend from Nevada, and my good friend from Ohio in curtailing the proposed expenses.

I wish to make one further observation. Let us not forget that the amount of money of which we are now speaking is money which would be spent for the special committees only. Let us not forget that, in addition, every standing committee has available $142,500 in order to meet the ordinary routine expenditures of those committees. What is proposed is the expenditure of extra or additional money.

As I said a while ago, the amount of this extra money has been increasing year by year. Over the past 15 years, in order that we might conduct certain investigations the amount allotted has increased from about $140,000 or $200,000 per year to an amount now in excess of $4 million.

I point out also that the amount of which I am now speaking would not include the printing of the reports which would be made by the various subcommittees. I was unable to obtain the exact amount of that cost, but it would amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars.

That should be added to what we are spending merely to hold hearings and to pay those who serve the various subcommittees.

I hope that at a future time I shall be able to obtain that information and present it to the Senate. I was unable to get it because I was told that it would require much more than a couple of days or even a week to find out exactly the amount of money that is spent for printing the reports of the various subcommittees.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. As a new member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I should like to support in general what my friend from Louisiana has said. I wish particularly to commend the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon] for the action he took in attempting, at least, to hold down the proposed increase in some of the committee appropriations.

The business of subcommittees, in my opinion, requires the careful scrutiny of the Committee on Rules and Administration. As the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] has said, the number of employees on subcommittees presently exceeds the total number of employees for full committees as authorized by the Reorganization Act.

Another aspect of the problem which I hope will be looked into before too long is the overlapping jurisdiction of committees. The subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee which deals with antitrust investigations and legislation has 44 employees. That subcommittee proposes to make an investigation of the procedures in the Common Market which might affect the trade and commerce of the United States, and particularly that portion of it which comes within the antitrust laws and regulation of monopoly. I have no doubt that within the broad grant of authority to the Judiciary Committee, that subcommittee is entitled to make such an investigation. As a new member of the Committee on Rules and Administration I had not intended to object to that particular request, but I find, on examining the rules, that an investigation of the same subject; namely, the monopoly characteristics of the Common Market, could have been undertaken by the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Foreign Relations, or the Committee on Commerce, just as reasonably as by the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

I make those few comments now—and I thank my friend for yielding—because they emphasize to me one more area in which senatorial reorganization is badly needed, and that has to do with the entire committee structure, the overlapping jurisdiction of committees, the proliferation of such committees, and the requests for appropriations, which in my opinion are treated on a somewhat helter-skelter basis. I congratulate my friend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] for raising the question again, as he has done so often in the past, and also to congratulate my colleague the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon] for the interest that he has taken in this subject and for the very keen efforts I know he will make to bring this problem under control.

Mr. President, as I understand, the pending resolution is Senate Resolution 75.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amount requested under Senate Resolution 75 is $175,000. As I understand, from that amount would be deducted the appropriations for 1 month—the month of February—but no effort has been made to reduce the amount from last year's appropriation. The appropriation for last year was $190,000; the appropriation for this year is $175,000, which is an appropriation for an 11-month period.

When my good friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] finishes his statement, I desire to offer an amendment which would cut back the sum which the resolution would authorize.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on the subject of money for special committees and staffs, I am generally in accord with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. Over a period of years his effort to cut the amounts which would be authorized by the resolutions has proven very discouraging and quite futile. Even though a cut may be adopted at one point in the procedure, somehow the amount is restored. Another resolution comes before the Committee on Rules and Administration a few months later, and no real saving results.

The money is the result and not the cause. The cause is too many committees. The Reorganization Act that went into effect in 1946 had as one of its basic purposes a reduction in the number of committees. That has been circumvented by giving to subcommittees separate identity, separate staffs, separate amounts of space in the two Senate Office Buildings and in the Capitol.

I wish to point out that this is a problem we cannot solve by a broadside attack. There are some committees which never make requests for money from the contingent fund.

The Senate Committee on Finance had as heavy a load of proposed legislation to consider in the last Congress as had any other committee. It has no subcommittees, as such. It has no special assignment of rooms. It did not request money from the contingent fund.

I would not say that there is a desire in every Senator's breast to be a chairman of a committee. I would not say that it is necessary for a Senator to be a chairman of a committee for the news media of the country to find out he is doing something. I would not say that if someone is only a good Senator, attending committee meetings, asking questions, reading the hearings, that that Senator would be denied his full share of publicity.

I would not say those things—but, Mr. President, I have thought about them.

One of our problems is that too many people have been desirous of heading subcommittees to do something. The result is that we do not have sufficient space. Mr. President, as of now there are Senators who do not have their own rooms contiguous to each other, we are so crowded for space. These buildings are so filled by staffs of subcommittees it is sometimes difficult to go up and down the corridors.

What has been the result? The result has been that when a committee has a staff of 20, or 25, or 30, the members cannot keep up with what the staff is doing. Pretty soon my friends on the minority come in to say, "If this thing is going to go on, and if there are to be 30 staff members digging up stuff and sending out questionnaires and making studies, we must have 4 or 5 people to keep up with them to find out what is going on, so that they can tell us."

There is no reasonable answer to that argument.

Pretty soon there will be such a volume of committee studies, reports, inquiries, and hearings going on that we shall find it necessary to increase the number of staff members in our own offices. So we shall need more staff to find out what some other staff is doing.

The result will be that the legislative body will cease to be a body of Members deliberating on broad national issues. It is fast becoming a legislative bureaucracy, with the legislative factfinding and determination being done on a staff level.

These are fine individuals. They are worthy individuals. I do not question their competence. I merely point out that there are so many of them we cannot keep track of what they are doing, and not one of them has ever been elected to the position he holds.

Under our system of government the people expect us to legislate, not to be administrative officers who run a huge bureau.

Frequently my constituents get in touch with me and point out that they have received questionnaires on some fancy stationery from a subcommittee or a special committee, or from this or that, asking a lot of things about their business. I pick up my telephone. I try to find out about it. I ask, "Did the committee ever authorize such a study?" I get the answer, "It has not. This has been a staff project."

There is prying into the affairs of our citizens, in regard to private information, trade secrets, and everything else. This place is crawling with individuals imbued with the idea that the Government knows best, that we could regulate everything, that we should get all the information, that we should decide how people shall conduct their businesses, and how they shall spend their old age and their youth and all the years in between.

Again I point out that it is rather unwise and dangerous to make these accusations generally, and I do not do so.

If I may have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] I believe my memory is correct when I say that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which the Senator is the chairman, has not made a request for additional staff over the years.

Mr. ELLENDER. It has not. The committee does not need more technical people on the staff. Of course, that means a lot more work for the chairman.

Mr. CURTIS. We have a very able chairman.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are many good members on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Since I have been chairman of the committee I believe there has been only one request for additional money. The committee got $25,000, which was to enable it to investigate the CCC. The remainder of the work has been done by our committee staff.

Mr. CURTIS. The point is that the more staff we employ the less time Members will have for their real duties. Someone must give the administrative time necessary to run this bureaucracy. Someone must read what the staff has prepared.

I pay tribute once more to the distinguished American who heads the Senate Committee on Finance, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. That committee has a tremendous load, covering a wide jurisdiction including controversial matters, yet the committee does not have subcommittees filling up the buildings.

Let us consider that a little. Suppose there were subcommittees of the Senate Committee on Finance; and that a subcommittee on excise taxes was holding hearings in San Francisco, while a subcommittee on corporate taxes was holding hearings in Atlanta, and while some other subcommittee was holding hearings on the taxes on small businessmen in Chicago or some other place. That would keep our economy in such a state of turmoil that no one would have any idea what the taxes really were or what was the tax program.

The point I wish to make, Mr. President, is that the Congress should not be a propaganda agency for more government, for promoting ideas to build up an appetite and a demand in the country for more programs which the people back home have not thought about and do not want. That serves no lawful purpose.

As to the resolution now under consideration, the Committee on Armed Services has a very heavy load. I have no way of knowing about all the intricate problems involved. I believe there is a clash going on between the military and civilian heads in the Pentagon. I think the work of our Armed Services Committee is of supreme importance. After all, if the security of our country does not head the list of things the Congress must consider, I cannot make a list.

So I am not going to single out the resolution which is now pending for any chastisement of a committee, but I wish to say that the Committee on Rules and Administration cannot do anything about the problem until the committees themselves do something. I ask, Senators, "Did you ever see a piece of proposed legislation defeated when no one appeared to oppose it?"

The Committee on Rules and Administration holds a hearing and the chairman and the ranking member and other Senators all appear. It is said, "We want to do this. We want to save the people. We want to do their thinking for them. We want to pry into their affairs. Give us this."

No one appears in opposition. In addition to those who appear, it is not unusual for a member of the Rules Committee to get a telephone call or some other communication saying, "We are interested in this."

The point I am interested in making is, Are we running a bureaucracy in which Senators are administrative people and legislation is handled by the unelected, and are we confining our efforts to those things which are essential for the security and survival of this country, as well as the payment of debts?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments have not yet been stated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to propose my amendment to Senate Resolution 75.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to have the clerk state the first amendment.

The legislative clerk read the amendment on page 2, line 22, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 3, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$190,000" and insert "$175,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on page 3, line 12, I offer an amendment to that amendment. I propose that the figure "$175,000" be reduced to "$150,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 3, line 12, strike out "$175,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$150,000."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I suggest the vote taken on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana be recorded by the yeas and nays. I seek support for that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll to determine if a quorum is present.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment to the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the resolution (S. Res. 75) to which an amendment is proposed to reduce the amount requested, provides funds for the operations of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. I ask the indulgence of the Senate. I ask the Chair to maintain order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Inouye in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. STENNIS. This is a matter of some consequence. The resolution provides the operating expense money for the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, which last year had a resolution of like nature for $190,000. The resolution approved for this year by both the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Rules and Administration provides for $175,000 for an 11-month period, which is, in corresponding figures, the same amount as allowed for last year.

Last year the subcommittee failed to use between $30,000 and $40,000 of these funds. I will explain briefly the operations of the committee. First I should like to give the membership of the subcommittee. It is composed of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. Smith], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater]. I have the privilege of being its chairman.

We have a normal staff of six men and four secretaries. That is our staff at the moment. However, we have just employed, on a temporary basis, an additional man who is versed with reference to matters and proposals regarding the band on nuclear testing. It is a matter that we have gotten into in connection with the military program.

We had last year, at one time, a peak of 19 people. We conducted an investigation with reference to the so-called muzzling of the military. None of that money for last year was used in paying traveling expenses—not a dollar of it—of any member of the subcommittee or any other expense in connection with its operations. There was something like three or four thousand dollars spent in connection with travel for staff members, which is a relatively small amount.

The subcommittee operates for the Armed Services Committee, which, considers a budget of around $50 billion a year.

Several members of the subcommittee also serve on the Appropriations Committee. We bring to these operations of the subcommittee several matters of some magnitude for primary consideration, and follow up in some cases, matters that really arise in the Appropriations Committee, with reference to military matters. This whole matter is scrutinized by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell]. I can assure the Senate that it is given individual attention by the chairman, and that the cost of operating any subcommittee with which the Senator from Georgia is connected, whenever he approves it, is very much the rock-bottom figure.

We expect to operate this year just as frugally as we operated last year. I cannot tell, and no one can tell, what we may get into, and how quickly an investigation will have to be made or how necessary it will become to increase the number of our staff. This we do on a reimbursable basis with men from the General Accounting Office, who are trained in this kind of work. There is no favoritism shown with respect to this matter. These are men who are already trained.

Incidentally, there has been only one man who has been added to the staff in the last 2 or 3 years, since I have been chairman, who had not already served on it. These are professional men, who have been there for years. We get them on a temporary basis. We have two men now from the General Accounting Office, and they are doing excellent work. We do not want to be stripped down just because we have been frugal and thrifty. We do not want to strip down to the last bottom dollar and not be given any discretion, or no running room of any kind, and forced to decide what we shall take up and investigate only after we have come here to get more money.

We receive dozens of interesting letters during the course of the consideration of any particular matter in this body, inquiring about the military program. We are able quickly to run down and give the answer immediately. Perhaps a staff member can do it, or a staff member can get the information out quickly.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as a member of Senate Preparedness Subcommittee I have watched its operations under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis]. To this subcommittee in effect is assigned by the chairman of the full committee, the senior Senator from Georgia, the job of being the watchdog of the full committee.

In my opinion, this subcommittee is one of the most important committees functioning in the Senate today. As the able Senator from Mississippi has pointed out, its prime mission is to watch over military procurement and operations which involve more than $52 billion a year. At least that is the figure this year. The subcommittee conducts extremely important investigations, some are going on right now. We are conducting an investigation of the facts with respect to Cuba. We also have an investigation going on with respect to the techniques incident to the proposed nuclear test cessation ban. In addition if any Member of the Senate or possibly a constitutent of any Member of this body has a request or a complaint, it generally ends up as a problem for this Military Preparedness Subcommittee.

I say in all sincerity to the Senator from Mississippi that I have been in the Senate for some years, and during all that time I have never seen a subcommittee operate with more light and less heat than his subcommittee.

As the chairman pointed out, there has been only one member added to the staff since he took over the chairmanship. In itself this is a great tribute to the wisdom and efficency and economy-minded aspect of the way he has handled the work of the committee. The amount he now requests is considerably less than one one-thousandth of 1 percent of what the military is asking for. Surely, we can afford to have one subcommittee in the Senate operating with the primary mission of investigating just where the largest portion of the taxpayer's dollar goes, whether these vast sums are really needed, and whether they are being utilized in the best interest of the people.

I hope that my able friend, the Senator from Louisiana, will give consideration to these observations. At the same time, I wish him to know that I join him and other Members of the Senate in recognition of the fact this problem of subcommittees is one that should be given very serious attention by the Senate. Obviously, in some cases it would seem to be getting out of hand. I do feel, however, that if there is any exception which proves the rule, the modest request of the Preparedness Subcommittee is the exception. I hope not one cent considered necessary by one of the ablest Members of this body, the Senator from Mississippi, will be taken from this subcommittee at this time.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Missouri. He lends a great deal of his time and valuable counsel to the operation of this subcommittee. I am delighted publicly to thank him for his assistance.

I should like to make a correction. The total amount allowed last year for the subcommittee really came to $220,000, because with reference to the so-called muzzling hearing which was conducted, there was an added amount credited over to the subcommittee of $30,000. We conducted an investigation which cost more than that, but we used the regular staff.

I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in the main I am in complete accord with the position taken by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Louisiana. I serve as chairman of a subcommittee appointed by him, which has never asked for a dollar, which has never asked for an office, and which thoroughly approves of his principle of handling the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry so as to avoid that course whenever possible.

I serve as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and I can make the same comment with reference to that particular subcommittee. But I believe we would be penny wise and pound foolish if, in the pending matter, we cut off $25,000 of the amount requested for the operations of this subcommittee. In my own State there is more concern at present about one of the subject matters being examined by this able subcommittee than there is about any other one thing in our Government, and that is the question of what is the Soviet buildup, and what is the Cuban buildup of arms in the Republic of Cuba, what is our posture in respect to our ability effectively and completely to meet that threat in every respect?

I would feel that I was ignoring the hundreds of letters from the good citizens of my State, who have expressed great interest in this particular investigation relative to Cuba, if I assumed to challenge the judgment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], and the judgment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan] and his associates, who so ably handle the Committee on Rules and Administration—and I believe this is their first report which is attempted to be corrected on the floor. I would feel that I was, indeed, penny wise and pound foolish if I stood here and opposed such an array of judgment in a situation so important as this, and insisted on cutting $25,000 from their year's allowance for investigating the many important subjects, which they must investigate, particularly the one subject which I have just mentioned.

I congratulate the able Senator from Mississippi upon his heading of that investigation. As he knows, I have furnished him, from my own files, certain material bearing on that subject, and I shall continue to do so. We are intensely interested in having him press to the very end the question of just what has been built up in Cuba, and in resolving the confusion which exists throughout our country, especially in the State which I represent, in part, and which is so close to the Republic of Cuba.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida. I point out in connection with the Cuban matter—and it is a large matter—that, very fortunately, we have been able to conduct the investigation so far with the staff we already have. But as we go further into the question—and we expect to have the problem under surveillance for some time, because it is not an "overnight" proposition—we want to have a little freedom to be able to employ, on a reimbursable basis, personnel from the General Accounting Office to make quick investigations which may become necessary.

I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am very happy that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi corrected the Record to show that the Committee on Rules and Administration authorized $220,000 for the subcommittee last year, during the second session of the 87th Congress. During that period, we conducted extensive investigations. Of the total amount authorized, the committee expended, in the 12-month period, approximately $160,000. Congress last year authorized a 7-percent pay increase and certain additional benefits. So if the committee spent on the same basis this year as it spent last year, taking into account the salary increases, it would spend roughly $175,000.

I do not attempt to apply the formula I previously stated was applied in the committee—and I generally support the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], for the very reason that this committee requested this year a total of $45,000 less than it requested during the second session of the 87th Congress.

I think this shows the high degree of responsibility which the committee through its distinguished chairman, is exercising and the close attention the committee is paying to the expenditure of funds. I, for one, hope that the Senate will not unduly penalize this committee, which, to me, has taken a step in right direction, so far as economy is concerned, and which is performing important work in connection with the preparedness of the United States, an area which involves by far the greatest percentage of expenditure of our defense dollar.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield, that I may ask a question of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do the Senator's figures show that there are committees which have asked for increases in funds, thus bringing them into a category different from the one occupied by the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. CANNON. It is true that a number of committees or subcommittees requested increases in the funds for their operations this year. Some of the increases were modest and resulted from the increases in pay for which Congress voted last year. In those instances, I did not attempt to apply my formula. But, as I previously stated, when a subcommittee requested additional money in an amount which was much in excess of the amount necessitated by reason of the pay increases and the additional benefits voted by Congress, I attempted to apply a reduction of 10 percent to the total amount requested, if it did not bring the amount below the amount requested last year, plus the additional funds necessitated by the pay increase.

As I stated heretofore, this subcommittee requested $45,000 less for this year than the Senate authorized during the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for his explanation. That $45,000 would be approximately a 22½ percent reduction from the amount provided last year.

I should like to say one further word for the benefit of Senators who have recently entered the Chamber. I deeply appreciate the helpfulness of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], not only on this subject, but on others, as well. He does splendid work for the country and for the Senate. However, I feel that in this instance he did not, perhaps, have an opportunity to give sufficient time to follow through with these figures and see what a large percentage reduction this committee has already taken compared with the amount which it actually spent last year.

It so happens that Senators who are members of this subcommittee from the other side of the aisle are not in the Chamber at the moment. However, I can assure the Senate that the resolution has the support of the Republican members of the subcommittee. I wish that at least one of them were here now.

I trust that the Senate will sustain the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to say that I recognize the position of our good friend, the Senator from Mississippi, in connection with the pending proposal; but I join the Senator from Louisiana in urging adoption of this amendment.

At this time much is being said about the necessity to cut the Federal budget. Although I recognize that this item is a very small one in comparison with the overall $98 billion budget, nevertheless we must begin somewhere; and if we in Congress are not willing to start tightening the purse strings and controlling our own expenditures in the legislative branch we shall not be very effective in the future in reducing the expenditures of the executive branch. The only way we shall trim the budget is by recognizing that there are no sacred items in it, either as it affects the Members of Congress, our own committees, or any of the agencies in the executive branch.

I shall support the Ellender amendment to cut this appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] to the committee amendment on page 3, line 12.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, of course, I have complete confidence in my good friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis]. I know that, as chairman of the subcommittee, he will continue to conduct hearings of that subcommittee as he has in the past. He has indicated that the committee will be so conducted under his able leadership.

Although last year $220,000 was appropriated to operate the subcommittee, only $145,680 of that amount was used. My amendment does not provide for only the $145,000 that the subcommittee used last year for the 12 months, but $150,000 for 11 months.

As was stated a while ago, if any subcommittee becomes in dire need of additional funds, I would be the last to deny the granting of such funds. Since the subcommittee spent but $145,000 in 12 months last year, it strikes me that for 11 months the committee could certainly do a good job with the $150,000 which would be provided under my amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. In order that the Record may be straight, I direct the attention of the Senator to the fact that the report of expenditures for last year submitted by the Preparedness Subcommittee covers only an 11-month period—to the end of December—so that his figure of $145,680.33 is only for 11 months and not for 12 months. If the Senator would add a one-twelfth pro rata to that amount, it would come roughly, in round figures, to $160,000. That amount would be exclusive of the 7-percent increase, plus the payments to agencies, which was approved by the Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I did not take that into consideration. I was informed that the amount was for the full 12 months. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to modify my amendment by changing the figure of $150,000 to $162,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to have the request restated.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment would provide $162,000 for a period of 11 months in contrast to $160,000 for 11 months last year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER: Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understand, the proposal would modify the $25,000 reduction that the Senator from Louisiana had proposed earlier.

That would make a great deal of difference on this particular vote. The subcommittee is a very important one. I had not intended to get involved in this particular debate, but the proposed reduction of $12,500 might do about as much damage to the work of the committee as would a reduction of $25,000.

I should like to have the chairman of the subcommittee, who has done such an admirable job, and one to whom we owe a great debt for his faithful and loyal service, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] make his own decision on the matter. It seems to me that if we are going to tamper with the limited amount of money to be authorized for a subcommittee considering a $50 billion defense budget, we might get ourselves into serious trouble. It is my view that the subcommittee is not overstaffed or overfinanced. In fact, I think taxpayers might well ask the question, "Why is the Congress of the United States not taking a greater interest in a budget item of $50 billion for defense?" I do not believe that the Pentagon is that good. They can make mistakes of more than $175,000 by dropping a decimal point—and they have made such mistakes.

I think the Senator from Mississippi should be very careful.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I will answer his question.

The figure in the resolution, as approved by the committee, is already at the rock bottom of the amount which will be actually needed under all foreseeable circumstances. My judgment is that we shall have to ask for additional sums to take care of matters which are partly contemplated now.

As I pointed out to the Senate heretofore, we do not carry a large staff. We have access to the General Accounting Office, which has paid investigators we can obtain on a reimbursable basis. At present, as an illustration, we are confronted with the Cuban problem, which could take a new turn at any time. Certainly I would not wish to see this trimmed down to the bare bones in the midst of that, by shaving the amount a few thousand dollars.

We stand on the minimum figure, which has been presented, and I hope that the Senate will sustain our recommendation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it not a fact that the amount the Senator is asking is the same as the amount asked last year, insofar as the particular work of the committee is concerned?

Mr. STENNIS. We had an additional sum last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. But that was for another subject.

Mr. STENNIS. No. It was for the same committee and the same staff, except for one additional member.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I remember the situation, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] desired an investigation. That is why the $30,000 was added.

Mr. STENNIS. The Preparedness Subcommittee, plus the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] as an additional member, conducted that investigation, for which the $30,000 was allowed, but that did not pay for all of it. We were eligible to spend our own money for it, so we had that as an added expense.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was informed that, of the $30,000 especially appropriated for the investigation, some $15,000 or $16,000 was spent.

As I said a while ago, the amount which the Senator would receive under the proposed appropriation would give him $162,000 for 11 months, while the expenditures for the 12 months of last year were approximately $160,000, using round figures.

I believe the Senator would have ample funds.

As I said a while ago, if perchance there should be a need for more, I am sure the Senate would grant it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I do not see how we could be expected to plan for our program, if we are circumscribed by the latitude of a few thousand dollars in relation to military defense. I hope the Senate will not trim the amount.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CURTIS. I did not rise for the purpose of making objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a unanimous consent request pending.

Mr. CURTIS. I do not know what the unanimous-consent request involves, but reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I retreat from nothing that I said about the number of subcommittees and the abuses which are arising and the injury being done to the Senate of the United States.

However, I shall not support the amendment to cut. I said in my statement a few minutes ago that this was not a problem which could be resolved by a broadside.

I also said, with reference to the pending resolution, that if anything had a prior claim on us it was the defense and security of this Republic. Not only is that a matter of priority, but also it is the opinion of the junior Senator from Nebraska that not all the facts are being told or have been told to the American people or to the Congress about Cuba and Castro and a great many other vital points in regard to the security and defense of this country.

I am also of the opinion that civilian influences in the Pentagon are thwarting the efforts of dedicated men who are in a position to guide the defense of this country.

I think this is one case in which the Senate is justified in granting the amount requested. I also think we have a responsibility to support this committee.

I do not do this easily, Mr. President. It is not easy for me to vote against an amendment to cut anything. I think this resolution involves the security of our country, and I shall oppose the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Presiding Officer state, for the information of the Senate, what is the unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has made a unanimous-consent request that he be permitted to modify the amendment to provide that the figure of $150,000, as it appears on page 3, line 12, be changed to $162,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I gather that the net effect of the modification, if consent is granted, would be that the amendment would propose to cut the amount allowed to the committee by $12,500.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By $13,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. By $13,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make an inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. The amendment would then still be pending, would it not, in a different form?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, which heard the testimony from representatives of the Committee on Armed Services, including the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], as was pointed out awhile ago by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], I wish to say that we heard every request which came before us for money, which included the entire list of resolutions to come before the Senate this afternoon, including the pending resolution.

The chairman of each one of the committees came before us, along with the ranking member on the minority side, and in addition there was the endorsement from the main committee. The Armed Services Committee unanimously endorsed the request.

The Committee on Rules and Administration considered what the chairmen of the committees said they needed. We were not in a position to say, "You do not need this secretary; you do not need that secretary; you do not need something else."

Information was given to us, which we took at face value. The amounts in five or six of the resolutions were reduced.

In each case when there was additional money asked, compared to last year, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], made his motion, which was carried.

It is the position of the chairman of the committee that the resolutions ought to be agreed to in exactly the amounts provided by the committee, for the simple reason that the committee heard every single request and had information with respect to each request. We had no information stating that the amounts should be either less or more.

I am as much in favor of economy as any other Senator. I should like to see that obtained.

As my able colleague from Nebraska said a while ago, if anything is to be done about reducing the costs for the subcommittees, it will have to be done by the chairmen of the committees or by the committees themselves. The Committee on Rules and Administration cannot and should not take it upon itself to reduce what is asked by a committee, when information is shown that that is what is needed.

I have no way of knowing what the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] needs with respect to this particular committee, involved in the resolution the Senate is now debating. I took the information furnished by them at face value. I believe they need every bit of the money for which they have asked. I expect to support that, and I expect to support the other resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Louisiana; so, without objection, the request is granted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first let me make inquiry: Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So the Senate is confronted with a yea-and-nay vote on a $13,000 cut?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I trust the yeas and nays may be withdrawn on this amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I asked the distinguished Senator to yield further in order to have the yea-and-nay vote withdrawn, and I do so on the basis of the presentation that has been made and the fiscal facts applicable to this committee. I do so also on the basis of my faith that the men who are heading this committee are attempting to exercise economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to having the order for the yea-and-nay order withdrawn? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I note that with the greatest impunity we will spend $10 million for an airplane and think nothing of it. Yet we do hassle a little about an item of $175,000 which embraces every activity prescribed in the rule under which the Armed Services Committee has been created. It embraces everything in the common defense. It embraces the Army and the Navy. It now embraces matters that stem from the Cuban situation. It embraces our security. And what a minimum amount it is when all things are said and done.

I think we have that much money to spend for this purpose, when we look over some of the other committees—and those of which I am a member, as a matter of fact—for which larger amounts have been authorized. This is an important field, with the world so full of fever. In fact, if I were doing anything, I think I would rather increase the moneys involved, rather than reduce them.

I say one other thing: Every Member of the Senate knows what a frugal and high-spirited public servant JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi, is. He husbands the funds. He makes every dollar do double duty. I think the country can be assured that, for the money which is involved here, it will result in a good survey and a good investigation that will be at once instructive and objective.

I trust the amount reported by the committee will be agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad the request for the yeas and nays has been withdrawn. I hope the next step will be the withdrawal of any proposed cut in the amount asked for by the subcommittee. I think nobody in this Chamber has stood more than I do for cutting the budget in the past, and I will in the future, but there is such a thing as being pennywise and pound foolish.

I happen to be a member of this subcommittee. I have served on many subcommittees, but I have never served on one that has had a more efficient chairman or one that is doing more admirable service for our country. At the present time we are delving into the whole question of Cuba. We are going into the question of the intelligence services. We are concerned with proposals for disarmament and activities in that direction. We confer constantly with leaders of the military services.

Mr. President, I know every subcommittee that does investigating work thinks its work is the most valuable to the Senate, but I can think of no subcommittee in this body that is performing a more needed and valuable task than this subcommittee.

Instead of seeking to cut the amount requested, I would vote for an increase. I can assure the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that there is no subcommittee in this body whose funds are watched more carefully. It is staffed very economically. The staff works admirably and the committee works efficiently under the capable leadership of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

I hope the Senator from Louisiana, whose frugality I admire, will direct his frugal gun at some other measure that will accomplish some good, and not do harm to this country by this cut.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for a vote, and I yield the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arizona will stay around, he is going to hear the same argument made by the chairman of every subcommittee.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have heard them before. I have heard them from the Senator's own lips. I think I have voted with the Senator on 90 percent of his proposals to cut items out of the budget, but this is one that it is not wise to cut.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor and ask for a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], as modified, to the committee amendment on page 3, line 12.

The amendment, as modified, to the amendment, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on agreeing to its resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 75) authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate certain matters relating to the national defense, and providing additional funds therefor, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without additional amendments, and recommend that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 75, as amended, would authorize the expenditure of $175,000 by the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters within its jurisdiction as specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. The funds would be utilized principally by the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee for the purposes of overseeing the common defense and surveying the policies of the Department of Defense insofar as they affect the security of the Nation.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Armed Services: Preparedness	$440,000.00	$323,123.49		
	190,000	177,443.16	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 43.
	30,000		Sept. 23, 1961	S. Res. 215.
	220,000	145,680.33	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 270.

The purposes of the resolution are more fully detailed in a letter to Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, which letter (with accompanying budget) is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
February 25, 1963.

Hon. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It will be appreciated if the Committee on Rules and Administration will give prompt consideration to approval of Senate Resolution 75, which has been approved unanimously by the Senate Committee on Armed Services. This resolution provides spending authority to the committee or any authorized subcommittee, during the 11-month period March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, for the examination, investigation, and study of matters within the jurisdiction of the committee, as specified in rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. Resolutions similar to this have been approved by the Senate during each session of the last six Congresses, except that they have usually been submitted and approved on an annual basis.

The total authorization requested by the committee under this resolution is $175,000, which is $45,000 less than the amount approved on an annual basis for each of the last 2 years. Copies of the proposed budget are being submitted along with copies of the resolution. These funds will be used for the continued operation of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, which, as you know, is an investigative arm of the Committee on Armed Service. The functions of the subcommittee include the responsibility of maintaining surveillance over policies, operations, and expenditures relating to the National Defense Establishment.

The committee feels that the Preparedness Investigation Subcommittee made significant and valuable contributions last year. The subcommittee is now engaged in a number of extensive studies and reviews of major aspects of our defense program. I feel that these and other matters programed for investigation by the subcommittee more than justify its continued existence.

Sincerely,

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel	1	$8,000	$17,230.10	$1,435.84	$15,794.24
Professional staff members	4	6,000	13,469.14	1,122.42	49,386.48
Professional staff member	1	5,580	12,679.33	1,056.61	11,622.71
Do	1	5,100	11,757.41	979.78	10,777.58
Administrative and clerical:					
Clerical assistant	1	2,640	6,475.75	539.64	5,936.04
Do	1	2,400	5,955.67	496.30	5,459.30
Clerical assistants	2	2,340	5,825.64	485.47	10,680.34
Do	2	2,280	5,695.63	474.63	10,441.86
Total					120,098.55
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					966.68
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					7,806.41
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					403.92
Reimbursable payments to agencies					9,908.75
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					9,450.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					3,744.60
Witness fees, expenses					2,224.30
Stationery, office supplies					707.84
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					338.95
Newspapers, magazines, documents					150.00
Contingent fund					7,400.00
Consultants and staff advisers					11,800.00
Total					84,901.45
Grand total					175,000.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 75, $175,000.

Funds approved by Committee on Rules and Administration, $175,000.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO MAKE A STUDY OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL STOCKPILING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 18, Senate Resolution 79.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 79) to authorize a study by the Committee on Armed Services on strategic and critical stockpiling, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an additional amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committees on Armed Services and Rules and Administration, as follows:

The amendment of the Committee on Armed Services was on page 2, line 4, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March".

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was on page 2, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$6,500" and insert "$10,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services, or its Subcommittee on the National Stockpile and Naval Petroleum Reserves, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the acquisition, storage, and disposal of strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to May 1, 1963, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand, this sum of money is to close out the work of this committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I shall be happy to answer in the absence of the chairman. I am a member of the committee. The money is to close out the work of the committee. The hearings have been completed. Last year the committee had in the neighborhood of $115,000 authorized. Our request here is for $10,000 to complete the report. This will cover the majority representation and the minority representation for the conclusion of the report only. The business of the committee, except for finalizing the report, has been concluded.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell me why the amount of the resolution has been changed from $6,500 to $10,000?

Mr. CANNON. Yes. The original request was for $6,500 to cover the majority representation, and there was unintentionally omitted provision for the minority representation which is needed in connection with finalizing the report. That was the reason for the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO MAKE CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 19, Senate Resolution 14.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BREWSTER in the chair). The resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 14) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain investigations, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without additional amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment, on page 2, line 12, after the word "from", to strike out "February 1" and insert "March 1".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to ascertain how the amount asked for last year contrasts to the request for this year. Has any effort been made to reduce the amount?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the amount authorized last year was $80,000. This year it is $91,000. The increase is explained in this way: We allowed 7 percent to take care of the pay increase that was voted by the Congress. Then we allowed an increase of $5,000 to take care of an unusual situation. We had been using a man who was retired as editorial and printing on the staff; therefore, we had to pay only a part of his salary. At the end of last year he finally retired and now we must pay the full salary for his replacement. That accounts for the $5,000 increase.

Mr. ELLENDER. The same number of employees is involved?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The same number of employees exactly. We are having to pay about $5,000 more to one of them by reason of the change I just explained.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the Committee is providing for that increase in pay?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is this request for a staff engaged in all phases and jurisdictions of the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. It reinforces the general staff of the committee.

Mr. CURTIS. This does not deal with housing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; it covers all the work of the committee except housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed," it is proposed to strike out "$86,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$83,700."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement in support of Senate Resolution 14.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

Senate Resolution 14 would authorize the Banking and Currency Committee to spend up to $83,700 to investigate a number of subjects within the jurisdiction of the committee—everything but public and private housing which is covered by Senate Resolution 15—during the 11 months from March 11, 1963 to January 31, 1964.

The resolution covers the same number of employees as did Senate Resolution 233 in the last session of Congress. The budget form sets forth the expenditures for 12 months at $91,000. This is an increase from the $80,000 covered by Senate Resolution 233 for two reasons: first, an increase of $6,000, or approximately 7 percent, to cover last year's pay raise; and second, an increase of $5,000 by reason of the fact that the former editorial clerk had been receiving a substantial part of his salary in the form of retirement income while the committee's new editorial clerk will receive his full salary from the committee in accordance with the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee. This $91,000 figure was reduced by one-twelfth of the salaries and related expenses by reason of the adoption of Senate Resolution 88 covering salaries for February 1963.

During the present session of Congress the committee expects to devote considerable attention to problems in the field of securities and financial institutions. As you may know, the Securities and Exchange Commission is filing a report in April showing the result of a 2-year study of the securities business. In addition, as the result of the studies of financial institutions by the Commission on Money and Credit and a number of governmental and trade associations, a great many proposals have been made to revise the laws relating to financial institutions of all sorts. It is impossible to tell at the present time how much work may result from these or other aspects of the committee's jurisdiction. Our experience has been, however, that every year some substantial new matter arises.

Accordingly, the Banking and Currency Committee, without objection, approved Senate Resolution 14. The Committee on Rules and Administration has also approved this resolution, and I, therefore, ask that it be adopted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended. The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) banking and currency generally;

(2) financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) deposit insurance;

(4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(5) economic stabilization, production and mobilization;

(6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(7) prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(8) securities and exchange regulation;

(9) credit problems of small business; and

(10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $83,700, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 20), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 14) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make a complete study of certain matters within its jurisdiction, and providing additional funds therefor, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without additional amendments and recommend that the resolution as amended be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 14 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $83,700 by the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) Banking and currency generally;

(2) Financial aid to commerce and industry;

(3) Deposit insurance;

(4) The Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;

(5) Economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;

(6) Valuation and revaluation of the dollar;

(7) Prices of commodities, rents, and services;

(8) Securities and exchange regulations;

(9) Credit problems of small business; and

(10) International finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962:

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Banking and Currency: General	$160,000.00	$147,322.55		
	80,000.00	76,647.70	Feb. 13, 1961	S. Res. 44.
	80,000.00	70,674.85	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 233.

Additional information relative to the purposes of Senate Resolution 14 is contained in the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency (S. Rept. 10, 88th Cong. 1st sess.) and in a letter to Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which letter (with accompanying budget) is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
February 28, 1963.

Hon. B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Banking and Currency Committee has agreed to report Senate Resolution 14, introduced on January 14, 1963, by myself and Senator BENNETT.

In view of the passage of Senate Resolution 88 on February 19 this resolution has been amended to cover the 11 months from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964. The enclosed budget form shows the expenses for the full year originally contemplated at $91,000, but the amount shown in the resolution has been reduced from this figure to $83,700 to eliminate one-twelfth of the salaries and related contributions shown in the budget.

Senate Resolution 14 would authorize this committee or any of its duly authorized subcommittees to employ on a temporary basis, such technical, clerical, and other assistance as may be necessary to investigate and make studies of a number of matters within the jurisdiction of the committee.

For a number of years resolutions similar to this have been approved for this committee on an annual basis. We have introduced and reported this resolution because of our need to retain additional personnel as we have done for the past several years to supplement the permanent staff and to cover other expenses incident to our committee responsibilities.

The workload of the committee in dealing with legislative matters which recur year after year is extremely heavy. Experience has shown that we must anticipate during each session some special study or legislation making it necessary to employ additional staff and to incur additional expenses.

It is difficult at this time to predict with any degree of precision the legislative and investigative activities which the committee will undertake this year. However, there are areas within our jurisdiction which can be expected to call for greater attention than usual.

For example, the committee expects to receive by April 3 the report of the Securities and Exchange Commission on the year-long study of the securities business undertaken by it under Public Law 87-196. This report can be expected to cover such matters as securities exchanges, over-the-counter markets and unlisted securities, and many other aspects of the securities business.

The committee also expects to receive during the coming year many legislative and administrative proposals relating to financial institutions as a result of the report of the Commission on Money and Credit and the many supplementary governmental and industry recommendations following the Commission's report.

In addition to its legislative responsibilities, the committee can expect, in the course of the coming session, to receive requests from Senators, either formally or informally, to make special studies of various problems in the economic field. While these studies may never reach the stage of formal hearings or investigations, they do require a great deal of staff work. Increased attention which problems of monetary policy are receiving creates an additional burden on the staff.

Of the $80,000 authorized for the last 12-month period under Senate Resolution 233, expenditures through January 31, 1963, amounted to $76,147.35, leaving a balance of $3,852.65. This, of course, does not include the amount spent in February under Senate Resolution 88 which authorized an additional $2,500 in order to cover salaries in February.

I enclose a copy of Senate Resolution 14. It is in the usual form prescribed by the sample resolutions, except that section 3, requiring that findings and recommendations be reported by the expiration of the resolution, is omitted.

I enclose the completed standardized budget form showing expenses for a 12-month period totaling $91,000. The budget calls for no additional staff personnel, and the amounts for committee expenses other than salaries have been left unchanged from last year. The amount shown in the budget form has been increased from the $80,000 authorized last year to $91,000 for two reasons: (1) the pay increase of 7 percent effective in 1962 increased the salaries of continuing personnel, and (2) the committee's editorial clerk, who had received a partial salary from the committee in addition to a civil service annuity, retired and is being replaced by an editorial clerk, all of whose salary will be paid by the committee, in accordance with the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee (S. Rept. 1835, 85th Cong., 2d sess., p. 5).

By reason of the adoption of Senate Resolution 88 and the consequent reduction of the period covered by Senate Resolution 14 from 12 months to 11 months, approximately one-twelfth of the salaries and related contributions shown in the budget form ($87,228.86), or $7,300, has been subtracted from the total amount shown in the budget form, and the resolution has been amended to provide funds in the amount of $83,700.

Sincerely yours,

A. Willis Robertson,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Assistant counsel	1	$5,460	$12,453.66	$1,037.80	$12,453.66
Do	1	4,980	11,509.18	959.09	11,509.18
Editorial and research:					
Research director (economist)	1	8,460	18,095.12	1,507.93	18,095.12
Staff member	1	8,000	17,230.10	1,435.84	17,230.10
Do	1	4,740	11,012.73	917.73	11,012.73
Administrative and clerical: Assistant clerk (record)	1	4,680	10,888.64	907.38	10,888.64
Total					81,189.43
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					486.72
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					5,277.81
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					275.40
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					1,700.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					1,100.00
Witness fees, expenses					300.00
Stationery, office supplies					125.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					200.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					175.00
Contingent fund					171.14
Total					9,810.57
Grand total					91,000.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 14, $91,000.

Funds reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency for an 11-month period, and approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $83,700.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Clyde Doyle, late a Representative from the State of California, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO INVESTIGATE MATTERS PERTAINING TO PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOUSING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 20, Senate Resolution 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 15) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters pertaining to public and private housing, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without additional amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 1, to strike out "February 1, 1963," and insert "March 1, 1963," and on line 20 to strike out "$115,000," and insert "$106,000," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $106,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Chief Clerk. On page 2, line 1, after the word "from", it is proposed to strike out "February 1, 1963" and to insert in lieu thereof "March 1, 1963."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk. On page 2, line 20, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "$115,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$106,000".

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, on page 2, line 20, to strike out the figure "$106,000" and to insert in lieu thereof the figure "$95,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment. I shall vote against the resolution. This is one thing we can do without. Housing is a private matter under our economic system. Investigations as to where people live have continued for a long time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to be heard on this question. The amount represents exactly what we had last year, plus 7 percent, to take care of increases in salary, minus one month's pay, which was carried over under the special resolution adopted a short time ago. There is no other increase whatever. We have the same number of employees. We have seven employees. In proportion to the amount of work done and the responsibility of the subcommittee, this is one of the most modest and moderate and frugal subcommittees of Congress.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I was startled a moment ago when the Senator from Nebraska said that housing was a private matter. I wonder whether my friend from Alabama remembers what percentage of the housing built in this country last year required some form of government aid through VA or FHA, or was built as the result of some government aid.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would say that it comes to about 50 percent.

Mr. CLARK. About half of all the housing built in this country requires some kind of government aid. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. I am a member of the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Alabama. I can testify from personal experience that every nickel of the amount requested is required.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Government's commitments and tangible liabilities with respect to housing now approximate $100 billion.

This is not primarily an investigating subcommittee, as such, although it is charged with the responsibility of keeping an eye on the massive program underway. Our subcommittee does this with continuous studies. In addition, we hold hearings and handle the many pieces of legislation that are reported. We report bills to the full Committee on Banking and Currency. This appropriation is a very low premium to pay on the amount of insurance resulting from having this watchdog subcommittee to look at the housing programs. I do not believe it would be in the national interest to cut it by 10 percent. I am opposed to the amendment, and I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate it was my privilege to do a great deal of work on committees with respect to housing. I took a great deal of interest in the subject. This subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency has been in existence for many years. I cannot for the life of me see what can be accomplished by continually looking into housing and investigating housing. Certainly the subcommittee cannot go any further than it has in the past in looking into housing design. I understand a great deal of that was done in the past.

However, the subcommittee always finds something to do. I believe that here is an opportunity to reduce the amount by 10 percent, the amount that my friend from Nevada said he had tried to obtain in the full committee by way of a cut. The effect of my amendment is simply to cut the amount back by 10 percent. I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Did the Senator from Nevada attempt to get this request reduced by 10 percent in committee?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator from Nevada did not attempt it in this particular instance, as was previously stated. The application of my formula was only against increases which involve more than a 7 percent increase over last year to cover salaries plus commitments to agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment on page 2, line 20.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana that we must start cutting these expenditures. This is a very nominal amount which we are asking to cut.

Otherwise we will be adopting a formula that will approve a 7 to 10 percent increase for the congressional branch; then we would have no argument against granting similar increases to the executive agencies. That would mean an increase of from $7 to $9 billion in total expenditures.

If we are going to cut expenses, we should start at home. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The chief clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What is the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] to the committee amendment to section 4, on page 2, of Senate Resolution 15, to reduce the amount from $106,000 to $95,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll, to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What was the ruling of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent the order for the quorum call has been rescinded.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, before the Senate votes on the amendment, I should like to make one more statement. As chairman of the committee, I said previously that we heard the chairman of every subcommittee, and representatives of the majority and the minority. We considered every request with the greatest of care. Our committee reported favorably every resolution. I hope the amendment will be rejected. Such a vote would uphold the committee in reporting the resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I point out to my good friend, the Senator from North Carolina, that my amendment would provide more money than the committee spent last year.

For a period of 12 months last year the committee spent $92,000. If the resolution as amended is agreed to, the expenditure of $95,000 for 11 months will be authorized. Ample funds will be available. I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we could argue the question for a long time, but I point out that no committee operates within as close a limitation as does the committee for which an appropriation is now being considered. We cannot predict exactly the amount which the subcommittee would require in any particular year. There is a great deal of variation in our work. For example, the subcommittee is now studying the FHA foreclosure program. There have been complaints about certain programs going bad. We have sent investigators to Houston, Fort Worth, Los Angeles, and other areas. Last year we had none of that to do.

Mr. President, we ask for the same amount of money that we had available last year, plus 7 percent, minus a pro rata share for one month, which was provided in the resolution agreed to in February. That is exactly the amount of money the committee allowed us. I challenge anyone to show that any committee has operated more carefully and more frugally than has this subcommittee. I do not believe that it is in our national interest for us to agree to the amendment. I hope that it will be rejected.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment on page 2, line 20. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ABBOTT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 61, as follows:

[No. 26 Leg.]

YEAS—18

Aiken
Boggs
Byrd, Va
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Ellender
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Kuchel
Lausche
Mechem
Miller
Prouty
Simpson
Thurmond
Williams, Del.

NAYS—61

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Engle
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordon, Idaho
Keating
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Young, N Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—21

Allott
Dirksen
Dominick
Edmondson
Ervin
Goldwater
Hart
Hartke
Kefauver
Kennedy
Magnuson
McClellan
Morton
Mundt
Neuberger
Pastore
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Talmadge
Yarborough

So Mr. ELLENDER'S amendment to the committee amendment to section 4, on page 2 of Senate Resolution 15, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 15), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $106,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 15) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate matters pertaining to public and private housing, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without additional amendments and recommend that the resolution as amended be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution 15 as amended would authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Congress			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Banking and Currency: Housing	$214,000	$174,629.31		
	107,000	89,944.10	Feb. 13, 1961	S. Res. 25.
	107,000	84,685.21	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 244.

USE OF FORCE BY METROPOLITAN POLICE IN APPREHENSION OF A FELON

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I rise to commend the new evidence in the Metropolitan Police of a willingness to enforce a law that has long been on our statute books, namely, the duty of a police officer to use force, if necessary, in the apprehension of a known felon. Robbery, by force, has always been a felony in all of the States and also in the District of Columbia, but unfortunately in recent years it has become more prevalent in the District of Columbia than in any other city in the United States.

There have been two major contributing factors to that unenviable crime record for our National Capital: First, a substantial percentage of robbers in the District are not apprehended; and second, District courts have been notoriously lenient in the punishments they have meted out to convicted felons. As I have indicated, it is the duty of every police officer to shoot, if necessary, to apprehend a known felon who has refused to obey a command to halt. Why is it that so many robbers in the District have refused to halt when commanded by a police officer to do so? The answer is simply this: They are under the impression that if any policeman in the District shoots a Negro, the Washington Post will criticize the policeman, if it does not actually ask for his dismissal from the police force.

The editorial in the Washington Post of today entitled, "Sudden Death," is a typical example of that attitude. A Negro with a long criminal record robbed, by force, in broad daylight, a young pregnant woman.

While the editorial's heart was bleeding for the felon who had committed robbery by force, and was shot by an officer because he refused to halt when the officer sought to apprehend him, not one salty tear was shed for the young woman who might have been caused a miscarriage because of her horrible experience. But, for the Negro criminal, the Washington Post editor said he "was a victim not alone of police efficiency but of community neglect." The police efficiency of course related to the way police in all of our cities except the District of Columbia have been enforcing the law with respect to the arrest of known felons.

Of course, all honorable men regret the needless waste of human possibilities which this incident reflects and the tragedy of such a violent death. And all honorable men will, of course, regret the shock and peril to the victim of the robbery.

The criminal's record seems to make it clear that he did not take advantage of whatever talent, whatever ability, he may have had. The Post blames the criminal's failure to make anything useful of himself on "community neglect" and the fact that he "was a product of this city's slums." I do not think this conclusion is either necessary or correct.

I have spent much time in the District during the past 30 years and have been familiar with District conditions ever since I served at Fort Myer in World War I. The slums in the District 30 years ago were far worse than any we have had since the lavish expenditure on public housing and urban renewal, totaling about $32 million. Thirty years ago, the crime rate in the District was below the national average; now it is about the highest. Thirty years ago, when schools were segregated and only about 20 percent of the pupils were nonwhite, the District schools were rated as among the best in the Nation. Now, integrated, and about 80 percent nonwhite, the District schools are rated about the poorest in the Nation. In the rate of illegitimate births, of syphilis, and in many other undesirable trends, the District can put in a claim for rating above the national average.

So, Mr. President, regardless of the bleeding heart of the Post editor for District felons who may get killed resisting arrest, I give thanks that the Metropolitan Police have at long last acted like the police in all other big cities in the apprehension of felons who attempt to escape arrest.

AUTHORITY FOR THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO MAKE CERTAIN STUDIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, so that the Senate may proceed with a little dispatch, I announce that it is my understanding that on the next resolution, which was reported only today, and which is the resolution relating to the Commerce Committee, Senate Resolution 29, there may be a request for a yea-and-nay vote. I put Senators on notice that, if they will remain in the Chamber, I am sure our objective can be accomplished very shortly.

This resolution is not on the calendar. I refer to Senate Resolution 29.

I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 29.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What number on the calendar is it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not on the calendar. It was reported today from the Committee on Rules and Administration. It involves a rather substantial amount. I wanted to bring it before the Senate while a large number of Senators were present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 29) authorizing the Committee on Commerce to make a study of certain matters under its jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "February 1, 1963" and insert in lieu thereof "March 1, 1963."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 8, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to insert the figure "$330,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the figure on line 8, page 3, be changed from "$330,000" to "$297,000." That will make a 10-percent reduction.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, this resolution can be carried over for one week in order to have a study made by the Committee on Rules and Administration. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] appeared before the committee and offered a thorough explanation of why this amount was needed. The Committee on Commerce expects to take care of considerably more work than it did last year. We did not change the figure of $330,000 for 11 months. It is the same amount that was contained in the resolution as it was brought to our comittee. The amount would include the 7 percent pay increase. The committee approved the resolution unanimously, and we recommend that it be agreed to as reported by the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the record shows that last year the Senate provided $315,000 for the use of this subcommittee. During the 12 months of last year and out of that amount $228,411 was spent.

The amendment that I propose would reduce the entire amount which is included in the bill by 10 percent. Should the amendment be adopted, it would mean that the committee would have for expenditures during 11 months of the year, $297,000. That is $71,000 more than was spent last year for the 12 months. It is my belief that this is a good place to make a cut. I hope the Senate will sustain my position.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. What subcommittee does this refer to? The resolution is not on the calendar, and we have been unable to find out.

Mr. ELLENDER. This is for investigations by the whole committee. As I pointed out, the full committee has $144,500 to spend, aside from the amount requested here.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in committee I offered an amendment to reduce the amount that was asked for. In addition to the employees of the regular committee, there were 19 employees on the temporary list. The Senator from Louisiana has correctly pointed out that for 11 months there was spent $208,000 and for 12 months there was spent $228,000. With the allowance of $297,000, there will be $70,000 more than is needed if we use last year's expenditures as a standard for determining what will be spent in this year.

Some new work will come to the Committee on Commerce. The President's recommendation for a change in the control of rates and the control of utilities is one of them. I respectfully submit to the Senate that with 19 employees on the temporary list, and with the employees on the regular list, we have more than we need, and there is no need to say, because of the new work, that we might need $70,000 more.

Let me say to Senators who are talking about reducing the budget—and I heard various figures cited in the past 2 weeks—that today we are challenged to cut our own expenditures. I say to Senators that if we do not have nerve enough to cut these expenditures, we should throw overboard any boast that we may make about any contemplated cut in the budget which would come from the various departments of the administrative branch of the Government. We cannot treat the administration differently than we propose to treat ourselves. We cannot indulge in extravagant expenditures in our own divisions and then cry aloud to the people of the country what we are going to do about the $98,800 million budget.

I respectfully suggest that if we do not clean our own house we should not talk about cutting the budget later with respect to the administration's requests.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I regret that the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], is unavoidably absent at this moment. It is a trifle curious that it should fall to the ranking minority member of the Commerce Committee to present to the Senate in his absence and in his behalf a few facts that I believe should be taken into consideration before passing on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to reduce the allowance for the committee.

In the first place, I believe that my record for fighting for economy is about as consistent and strong as that of any other Member of the Senate. I do not want any rule applied to anybody downtown or to any other committee of the Senate which is not applied here or not applied to my committee, and there are no additional employees for the minority, or any particular thing for the minority specified in this resolution.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], for whom I have profound respect and regard, and who is a stalwart fighter for his principles now and always, if my recollection serves me correctly, was the only Member on the committee who, when the time came, after careful discussion, to vote on this amount, opposed it.

I have sometimes observed, as I believe other Members have observed also, that there is a tendency downtown to try to spend all the money that is appropriated, because it is sometimes feared by the bureaus and departments, who in complete sincerity do not want their work neglected, that if they return some money to the Treasury, the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate will decide that they do not need as much the next time. Therefore, it seems a better system to spend all they get, because if they do not spend all of it, it will somehow or other militate against them. I believe that a great amount of money is spent in this Government on that principle.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the chairman of the committee, has an enviable record in returning every year during his chairmanship of this committee a substantial amount of the appropriation that has been allocated to the Committee on Commerce. When he feels it is necessary to have a reasonable amount for the activities of the committee in the coming year, he should not be penalized because of his faithfulness in returning money not needed.

The crux of the situation is that under the purview of the Commerce Committee are many judicial and quasi-judicial activities of the Government. Many Senators who have served on it realize that under its tent are an amazing number of Government activities. It falls to the lot of the Committee on Commerce and its subcommittees to supervise and observe the activities and the expenditures of many independent agencies of the Federal Government. Let me mention just a few of them. The Federal Communications Commission is a key regulatory agency. In 1963 it spent more than $14 million. Its employees numbered 1,400.

The Federal Power Commission comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce. That Commission spent $10 million in fiscal 1963, and employed 1,178 persons.

The committee's jurisdiction includes the manifold activities of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which spent $23 million in fiscal 1963, and employed 2,500 persons.

I could go down the whole list, mentioning the Martime Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Trade Commission and others. There are 8 administrative agencies which had in fiscal 1963 combined expenditures of $1,219 million, and which had more than 56,000 employees. It is the responsibility of the Committee on Commerce to supervise their expenditures, legislate their functions, and watch their operations.

In reply to the very pertinent observation of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], I should say that if we are to secure economy in Government, the first thing that must be done is to make certain that the committees of Congress and especially of the Senate, are properly equipped to follow through and to exert economy in the executive departments and agencies. Any Senator who has served here for a few years has, I believe, walked through the departments and agencies and has seen, in room after room after room, numerous employees, not all of whom were very busy. The departments and agencies have all the personnel they need. They are staffed, overstaffed, and superstaffed.

But up here, on Capitol Hill, the Senate is comprised of only 100 Members who serve a population of 180 million. We have the responsibility and try our best to see to it that the Government is conducted carefully, frugally, and effectively. Yet there are those who carp about the authorization of a few thousand dollars which probably will not be spent anyway.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. Of course; I am always glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have been requested to attend a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations, at which some guests are present. I should like to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on this question, if the Senator will permit me to make that request.

Mr. COTTON. Certainly; provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in the coming year some very important recommendations of the President of the United States will fall within the purview of the Committee on Commerce. Probably one of the most difficult, complex, and controversial issues that will be before the 88th Congress will be the question of transportation. The President has made certain recommendations concerning a reduction of control or a reduction of regulation of transportation in this country. This involves every railroad, motor carrier, and airline in the United States. The President has also made recommendations which involve the merchant marine. I point out that this legislation could have major effect on the whole. The transportation industry of this country—a $100 billion industry.

Furthermore, Congress will be considering this year the mass transportation problem, the proposal to solve the commuter problem in the cities of the country, and the part the Federal Government will play in it. It is absolutely inevitable that the Committee on Commerce, through its subcommittees and special committees, will have to deal with those problems. They will require expert assistance. In addition, problems affecting the entire communications industry, include satellite communications, and a host of other matters come before this committee.

I submit that the record of the distinguished Senator from Washington, the chairman of the committee, is such that the Senate can trust him not to expend a single dollar uselessly or needlessly.

I could speak at greater length, although I shall not do so, discussing the activities in which the Committee on Commerce will engage. Before I finish, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. As a rather junior member of the Committee on Commerce, I have a very special interest in the subject.

First, I congratulate the Senator from New Hampshire for stating the case

factually, and stating it so well. Congress is coming under increasing criticism from the public and the press. In some quarters it is said that Congress is not doing its job; some say the job is becoming too big for us. I do not subscribe to that opinion. I notice that it is being stated with increasing frequency that the executive department has become so vast and overwhelming that Congress no longer is in a position to "ride herd" on it, as it were.

As the Senator from New Hampshire has stated so factually, the Committee on Commerce has a great responsibility. To discharge that responsibility effectively, the committee, as well as the executive departments, must have trained technicians and professional staff personnel, not only for day-to-day operations, but for special studies, as well. It must have in its service persons who are knowledgeable and expert in their fields.

The Senator from New Hampshire has alluded to the vast areas of responsibility which fall within the purview of the Committee on Commerce. He referred to transportation. The Subcommittee on Air Transportation, headed by the able senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] has jurisdiction of a field of transportation which requires close supervision. Surface transportation in all forms, including the vast merchant marine, fall within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce, as do the Coast Guard, the Federal Power Commission, and various other regulatory agencies. These examples merely begin to denote the areas in which the committee moves, as it fulfills its legislative functions and other duties.

I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from New Hampshire that the country and the Senate can very well trust the chairman of the committee, the able Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], to spend effectively and carefully the money which is granted to the committee. If all the money is not required, the chairman can be relied upon to return the sums which are not used. He will not spend money which is not absolutely needed. I think it would be a disservice to the public if the Committee on Commerce were not granted all the money which is required to do the very essential work which is entrusted to it.

I thank the Senator from New Hampshire, my fellow committee member, for providing me this opportunity to express my opinion on a subject which is of such great importance.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. President, at this time I remind Senators that the question of the consolidation and merger of railroads and airlines is a new problem which has not previously been dealt with in the committee. In view of this record, I sincerely hope this modest amount, to be used by a committee headed by a Senator who has such an excellent record of faithfulness and of using only what is necessary, will be given to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] to the committee amendment on page 3, in line 8, of Senate Resolution 29—namely, to strike out $330,000 and insert $297,000.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson]. If the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senators from Colorado [Mr. Allott and Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Morton], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Pearson] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 15, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 27 Leg.]

YEAS—15

Aiken
Boggs
Byrd, Va
Carlson
Curtis
Ellender
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordon, Idaho
Lausche
Mechem
Miller
Simpson
Williams, Del.

NAYS—58

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Engle
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kuchel
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Moss
Muskie
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—27

Allott
Dirksen
Dominick
Edmondson
Ervin
Goldwater
Hart
Hartke
Kefauver
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McClellan
McGovern
Morton
Mundt
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Talmadge
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. Ellender's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. At the appropriate place in the resolution, it is proposed to add the following language:

> Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Commerce of the Senate and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.
>
> That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Secretary of the Senate and shall be open to public inspection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall be brief.

The amendment is the same as those offered in the House of Representatives under date of January 31 to various resolutions to provide funds for its committees. The House amendments offered at that time were intended to safeguard expenditure of committee funds and to require a detailed accounting. I believe that we in the Senate have a similar responsibility. We owe it to the taxpayers to make sure that all our expenditures are in line and are open for inspection. The amendment is copied verbatim from the House-approved amendments.

The House is to be complimented for the action which it has taken in this connection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the understanding of the distinguished Senator from Delaware that, so far as amounts spent are concerned, the amendment would apply the same limits and standards on counterpart funds that are now applied with respect to dollars?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; it would provide the same per diem allowance as is available to the executive branch. In addition, it would require a detailed accounting, open for inspection.

Mr. CURTIS. But the amendment relates to the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. The amendment would put the expenditure of counterpart funds under such restrictions. Some are under the impression that the counterpart funds are not of any use. That is far from true; most of these counterpart funds are convertible into dollars. They can certainly be used by the Federal Government. As the Secretary of the Treasury has pointed out, counterpart funds are the property of the American taxpayers and should be spent with the same degree of prudence as are any other funds. It is my understanding that similar amendments were approved practically unanimously by the House of Representatives to their money resolutions.

I think the Senate should do no less than approve this amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I promised to yield first to the Senator from New Hampshire. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Delaware a question. I feel that the amendment would apply a perfectly fair, legitimate and reasonable rule, I would in no way be embarrassed by it. But I should like to know whether the Senator from Delaware is singling out the Committee on Commerce for his proposed restriction. I wonder whether the Senator will see to it that the same amendment is offered to the authorizations for other committees and subcommittees whose members may have occasion to travel outside the United States. If he does not intend to do so, I for one would feel that the amendment would reflect on a committee which, to my knowledge, has had a fine record in the use of counterpart funds. I would resent having the Committee on Commerce selected for the proposed action. If the Senator intends to treat every committee and subcommittee in the same way, I am all for the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from New Hampshire had made a very good point. I have no intention of casting any reflection on this particular committee. I intend to offer a similar amendment to all of the resolutions which deal with travel by any congressional committee. This amendment will be offered in connection with all such resolutions considered here today.

I did not offer the amendment with respect to those resolutions which deal with matters 100 percent within this country because the amendment deals with the question of expenditure of foreign currencies used in connection with foreign travel.

But I will promise that the amendment will be offered to all similar resolutions which deal with foreign travel. No committee is being singled out.

Mr. COTTON. Can the Senator also give me some information as to what other committees he believes use the foreign currencies? I should like to know exactly which resolutions for which committees are involved, and to which resolutions the amendment will be offered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would not wish to give the Senator an answer at this moment and claim it to be all inclusive since there are many resolutions on the calendar and I could miss one, though I do not intend to miss one. To be specific, I notice that the next resolution which is to be considered is the one relating to work by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have already told the chairman of the committee that I intend to offer a similar amendment to that resolution.

Then there is another resolution which will come before the Senate which deals with Judiciary Committee funds for a proposed antitrust investigation in Europe. The amendment will be offered to that resolution.

The amendment will be offered to any of the resolutions for any of the committees which involve travel outside this country. It is my intention to be all inclusive. To make sure I do not miss one I would appreciate it if the Senator from New Hampshire would help me watch. I can assure the Senator that it is my desire to offer the amendment with respect to all of them. That is my intention. It would be most unfair to single out any committee, and I certainly would not single out the Commerce Committee.

Mr. COTTON. I asked the Senator from Delaware to consider the fact that there are committees of the Senate which, very properly, because of the nature of their jurisdiction, have access to travel and subsistence not available, for example, to members of the Commerce Committee.

I refer, for instance, to the Committee on Armed Services, the members of which, very properly, on official business frequently travel in planes of the Air Force and are furnished with a good deal of subsistence.

I have no knowledge of this, but I presume that members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are very properly entertained many times at embassies and consulates. By "entertained" I do not mean to refer to parties; I mean they actually are quartered in such buildings.

I say again that I think the Senator is correct in principle. I have no idea of opposing his amendment. However, when one considers the entire field, I sometimes wonder how we can ever expect the people of the United States to trust the U.S. Senate and to trust us, if we do not have confidence in ourselves. I sometimes wonder if a great deal of damage is not done to the influence and prestige of this body in which we serve and of which we are justly proud by such a constant attempt to do something which indicates that somebody has his nose in the public trough.

This is not a question of travel. It is a question of the dignity of the Senate and the dignity of its committees.

So far as the Senator from New Hampshire is concerned, I am perfectly willing to support the amendment, which I know is offered sincerely by the Senator from Delaware, for it is characteristic of his meticulous regard for the integrity of himself and of all his colleagues.

However, if the amendment is agreed to, no matter how hard we try to do otherwise, we will draw distinctions as among the committees in the Senate. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. Does the Senator intend to offer the amendment with respect to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, and all other committees authorizing foreign travel.

Mr. COTTON. That is interesting. Does the Senator intend to offer any amendment to prevent members of the Committee on Armed Services from having meals and subsistence furnished to them while they are abroad?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if a Member of Congress is traveling by transportation furnished to him by the U.S. Government and if he is fed and housed by the U.S. Government at one of its embassies he would not collect the subsistence payment. Why should he? Certainly he would not be entitled to dual allowances.

The Senator from New Hampshire has suggested that we "cover the waterfront" by making this one amendment cover all committees. I would be willing to suggest the absence of a quorum and then join the Senator in drafting an amendment broad enough to cover all committees. That would be a quick way to solve the whole problem.

Mr. COTTON. I say to the Senator from Delaware that I would not join in the offering of the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh; I thought that was what the Senator wished to do.

Mr. COTTON. No; I do not. I happen to have enough confidence in every Member of the Senate on both sides of the aisle that I am not going to offer any amendments to put them on some subsistence basis, which I believe the Senator's amendment seeks to do. I have no objection to the Senator from Delaware offering the amendment. I have no objection to it being done to me. I recognize that the distinguished Senator is doing this with the utmost of sincerity.

I dislike to see the Senate take a leaf out of the book of the other body. I may be violating the rules by mentioning the other body. It is a wonderful body. Many of us served in it and are proud of our service there. However, merely because such a provision was offered somewhere else is not proof that we must accept it.

There are distinguished men serving as chairmen of the committees of the Senate. I can say this with propriety, because unfortunately not one of them is a Republican. They are all Democrats. Everyone knows that the Democrats are fundamentally honest, and every chairman in this body, so far as I know, is a man of complete and unimpeachable integrity.

However, if it is advisable to establish some safeguard of this kind, that will be prefectly fine, and I am willing to vote for it.

I think, before the Senator plunges in too deeply, before he puts every Member of the Senate in such a position that if he votes against the amendment the word will go out to the country that he is afraid to vote for it because he wants a big, lush traveling account, the Senator should weigh very carefully the rather delicate and intricate situation which is presented when one deals with the Armed Services Committee, with the Appropriations Committee, and with other committees which have access to subsistence allowances which some of the committees do not have.

I wish to ask the Senator a question about his amendment. The Senator knows I am speaking in the best possible spirit, for I have great admiration for him. If the Senator's amendment were adopted, could I, as a member of the Commerce Committee, concerning which it is being offered, if I wished to travel somewhere and have available certain funds, get the chairman of the committee—and he certainly ought to do it, in view of my stalwart defense of his budget this afternoon—to put me on his expense account, so that I could spend any amount I wanted of the committee funds, so long as I did not use counterpart funds? Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. There would be an accounting of all the Senator spent filed with the Chairman and these expenditures would be limited to the same per diem allowances as provided for the executive branch.

Mr. COTTON. How many dollars a day could I spend to live abroad?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The same amount the Senator and I allow for any member of the executive branch under similar travel arrangements.

Mr. COTTON. How much is that?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not have the exact figures available, but I would say it would be the same allowance as provided on a per diem basis for members of the executive branch. Why should it be any more? Also, the amendment provides for an itemized accounting of expenditures by each member. Congress passed a bill last year which required that every American businessman who wanted to deduct any amount of his expenses from his tax return had to itemize his accounts carefully and submit such report to the Treasury Department. That does not mean we distrust the taxpayers, but that is a law. Why should Members of Congress be subject to any less restrictions?

I merely say that in fairness, I think the rules should be applied to all.

Do not forget that as Members of Congress traveling abroad we would be spending the taxpayers' money. The businessman is spending his own. This is all the more reason why we should be willing to limit our expenditures and render an accurate accounting. Certainly we should be willing to abide by the same rules we lay down for the executive branch and all other taxpayers.

Mr. COTTON. So far as accounting is concerned, the Senator is quite correct. So far as the committee is concerned, every Senator is required to account for every cent he spends.

I thank the Senator for his courtesy. I am perfectly willing that this rule shall apply to the Commerce Committee. and I shall expect the Senator to offer such a proposal with respect to every committee of the Senate whose members have occasion to travel abroad.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is my intention. I thank the Senator for his support of the amendment. If he wishes to cosponsor it I shall be glad to have him as a cosponsor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he sits down?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am in thorough sympathy with what the Senator is attempting to do. He knows I have discussed this subject with him. Some time ago the Senator from Mississippi probably had about as good a proposal as any when he offered to place the allowance on a flat per diem basis, without complications.

It seems to me that the Senator ought to do one of two things: Either put such a provision in the foreign aid bill or some other legislative measure, or else let it be a legislative measure, on which there would be a conference between the House and the Senate, so there would be uniformity and so there would be a law which had been signed by the President. I wish very much that he would not proceed in this piecemeal manner, but would seek to have such a provision adopted in a way that would make it a binding law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the Senator's remarks. I offered this provision as an amendment to the Foreign Aid Act a few years ago, and if I recall correctly the Senator from Alabama supported it. The bill went to the House, and the provision was changed somewhat in conference. I regretted this modification, but I did thank the committee, for bringing back what they were able to obtain from the conference. I agree that the additional provisions suggested here today would be better if they were general law, but we are dealing today with money for the Senate committees. When the Senator speaks of making the application of the provision uniform, I point out that such a broad proposal may be subject to be a point of order. Today we are dealing with Senate expenditures only.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We cannot do it. That is the fatal defect in the proposal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Except that the House has already acted on the proposal. Our action would have the result of making it uniform for both Houses.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The House has acted on it. A bill is coming to the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. The House passed its money resolutions on January 31. It included such a provision in its resolutions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I had understood that the House had passed a separate resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There has been a broader resolution introduced.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think there is a great deal of merit in what the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] has said about the differences among the different committees.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I make a point of order that this is an effort to amend the law while the Senate is considering a simple resolution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it is my understanding this is a restriction on an appropriation, and therefore it seems to me the amendment is in order.

I hope the Senate will at least take this necessary step to guarantee an accurate accounting of our expenditures as Members of Congress. Certainly the limits on such expenditures as provided in this amendment are in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule. Under the practice of the Senate, resolutions are not used for the purpose of legislative enactment. That is done by a bill or joint resolution. This amendment in effect makes certain action in order, notwithstanding the provisions of any law in conflict with it, and therefore it is not in order under Senate procedure.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was about to join in raising the point of order. I want the RECORD to show that I was seeking recognition in order to raise the point of order. I think the point the Senator from Delaware is raising should be in bill form or resolution form and be referred to the appropriate committee for study and hearings.

I am well aware of the fact that this proposal is supposed to have great political sex appeal, but, so far as I am concerned, it is a barren proposal.

I think we ought to take a look at the practice that prevails in the Senate. I happen to be a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I am advised that every dollar of counterpart fund expenditures is reported to the Foreign Relations Committee and is reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

I speak on this subject on the basis of a little experience, because several years ago the Senator from Oregon set a precedent in the Foreign Relations Committee. In one of the official trips of the Foreign Relations Committee I found that in many counterpart countries many of our ambassadors, ministers, or attachés had been out of representation money for months before our Senate delegation reached the particular country. Nevertheless, the visitation of the delegation had greatly increased the cost of the embassies, consulates, or attachés.

My first experience with this problem was in Madras, India, where the supreme court of that state of India made clear to our consul general that it would be agreeable if there were a state dinner for the visiting congressional delegation. I am sure no Senator is surprised when I tell him that it was expected that the expense of the dinner would be paid by the consulate. It was an important dinner so far as our foreign relations in India were concerned.

When I discovered that that very expensive dinner was to be paid for out of the pocket of the consul general, I drew on the counterpart funds, for I could do so, and the consul general could not.

In my judgment, that expenditure was money well spent in behalf of furthering our foreign relations in that state.

I reported it to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and I was advised at that time that this was the precedent case; that there was no record of such a thing ever having been done before by a member of the committee.

That was not the only time on the trip that I did it. I drew on counterpart funds in consultation with our ambassadorial or consulate staff, and I drew on them when I realized that they were expected to spend representation funds in behalf of this visiting congressional delegation, but that they did not have any funds. I want to state for the record that at no time did any member of our Foreign Service ever intimate to me that I might use my authority to draw on those funds. In fact, in some instances there were some protests from them.

They were apparently afraid that if I did it, they might find themselves in a position in which they would have to explain to the State Department how it came about. I made it clear that I was acting on my own responsibility. I rendered a value judgment as to whether or not the expenditure of those counterpart funds for official functions—and these were the only times that I drew on such funds—would be in the best interest of my country.

Let me add that in my judgment there should be more drawing on counterpart funds, and not less. In my judgment, there are great sums of counterpart funds in "cold storage" in many areas where counterpart funds exist that ought to be spent in the interest of strengthening American foreign policy in those countries. The test is the test of accounting. That is the test, and not a prohibition which prevents the expenditure of funds. That is why I hope the Senator from Delaware will introduce his amendment as a bill or submit it as a resolution, so that we can make a record on it, and so that we can find out under what terms and circumstances the funds should be spent. To limit it to a per diem basis does not make good sense.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. After I have finished my argument, I will be glad to yield. I believe we should make a careful study of the use of counterpart funds. The Senator's resolution or bill could lead to such a study. However, there has developed around these precincts the idea that drawing on counterpart funds by visiting senatorial delegations in various countries involves some kind of shady practice.

Of course, if a Member buys pearl necklaces or diamond rings or material goods for his personal use, no one would deplore it more than would the Senator from Oregon, and no one would more enthusiastically support a prohibition against it. I know some charges are made along that line, and there may be some abuses in this regard, to the effect that counterpart funds have been used for personal aggrandizement of a Member of Congress.

I am also satisfied that such cases are so few and the exceptions are so de minimis that it is unfortunate that the entire Congress should be smeared with regard to the expenditure of counterpart funds.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, let me say that in my judgment we have not spent the counterpart funds that ought to be spent. They ought to be spent in carrying out the foreign policy of this country. If an official delegation of Congress in carrying out the purposes of its mission finds that it will be in the best interest of our foreign policy to draw on counterpart funds, I do not want any prohibition written into the law that will deny to that delegation the right to draw on counterpart funds.

No one will go father than I in requiring a detailed minutiae accounting, in regard to expenditure of counterpart funds. However, I will not support a resolution which would prohibit a Member of Congress from drawing on counterpart funds if in his judgment the funds should be drawn upon in carrying out the purpose of his official mission.

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I point out to the Senator from Oregon—as I am sure he as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations will recall—that the first amendment which I offered, a couple of years ago, did not deal with per diem allowances but was based on the theory that an accurate and public accounting would prevent abuse. Such an itemized accounting, open for public inspection, would solve the purpose the Senator from Oregon has in mind. The full committee supported that proposal. However, it was changed, to my regret, in conference. The Senator from Alabama, who was in charge of the conference, did the best he could. If we could obtain a detailed and public accounting of the expenditures of all dollars and/or counterpart funds it would go far toward correcting any abuse. I assure the Senator that a resolution to accomplish that will again be submitted, and it will be submitted at a time when it will not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. MORSE. I have made my case, and the Senator from Delaware has made his case. On the basis of the resolution that he will submit, we can proceed with the hearings that I believe should be held on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 29) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) interstate commerce generally;

(2) foreign commerce generally;

(3) maritime matters;

(4) interoceanic canals;

(5) transportation policy;

(6) domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;

(7) communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites;

(8) Federal power matters;

(9) civil aeronautics;

(10) fisheries and wildlife;

(11) marine sciences; and

(12) Weather Bureau operations and planning, including the use of weather satellites.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963 to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $330,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committe.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 71), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Investigations by the Committee on Commerce

The Committee on Rules and Administration to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 29) authorizing the Committee on Commerce to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction, and providing additional funds therefor, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without additional amendment and recommend that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to by the Senate.

Senate Resolution No. 29 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $330,000 by the Committee on Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963 to January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

1. Interstate commerce generally;
2. Foreign commerce generally;
3. Maritime matters;
4. Interoceanic canals;
5. Transportation policy;
6. Domestic surface transportation, including pipelines;
7. Communications, including a complete review of national and international telecommunications and the use of communications satellites;
8. Federal power matters;
9. Civil aeronautics;
10. Fisheries and wildlife;
11. Marine sciences; and
12. Weather Bureau operations and planning, including the use of weather satellites.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Congress			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Commerce: General	$630,000	$154,906.31		
	315,000	246,493.11	Feb. 13, 1961	S. Res. 74.
	315,000	208,413.20	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 251.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO CONTINUE STUDY OF ACTIVITIES OF NONDIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIVES OF FOREIGN PRINCIPALS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 26.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 26) authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to continue its study of the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 2, line 1, after the word "party", to insert "or any other foreign principal,"; in line 12, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$48,600"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to continue its study of the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals including, without limitation, foreign governments, foreign political parties, and individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, organizations or other combinations of individuals, whether foreign or domestic, acting in the place of, or in the interests of, or on behalf of a foreign government or foreign political party, or any other foreign principal, tending or intended to influence the foreign or domestic policies or interests of the United States.

Sec. 2. The committee is further authorized under sections 134 and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to give thorough consideration to existing and proposed legislation relating to the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals, as aforesaid, and to make such recommendations with respect thereto as may be found by it to be appropriate.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee is authorized from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate; (3) to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (4) to take such testimony; (5) to employ, upon a temporary basis, such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (6) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government as it deems advisable.

Sec. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution which shall not exceed $48,600 for the period ending January 31, 1964, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Sec. 5. The committee shall complete its study and submit to the Senate not later than January 31, 1964, such results of the study herein authorized together with such recommendations as to existing or proposed legislation as herein authorized as may be found by it to be appropriate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the resolution deals with the present investigation on lobbying activities as it relates to lobbyists for foreign countries. That investigation is now underway. The request is for $48,600. This is a very important study and inquiry, and the amount will therefore be required, according to the information that was presented to the committee. I understood there was very good documentation for the request in committee.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, it was thoroughly justified.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, we provided last year $50,000. I am wondering why only $6,686.70 was spent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Last year we got started on the investigation, but the investigation is now in full swing. I recognize that the investigation was in progress most of last year, but I am talking now in terms of staff and activity. If there is any money left, it will be returned. No one will put the money in his pocket or run away with it. It will go back into the Treasury.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It is never drawn unless it is spent.

Mr. ELLENDER. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] said that with $50,000 last year he would be able to complete the investigation. Does the Senator confirm that fact, that if we provide $48,600 for the remaining 11 months, the committee will be able to do that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not at all sure about it. I would not want to make that statement. I do not know how far this investigation will go. Some people are of the opinion that this is an investigation of very great importance. I have the utmost confidence in the chairman of the committee. I do not know of any Senator who more jealously guards the dollar or more fully and comprehensively conducts a hearing than the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright]. The amount he asks is well deserved.

Mr. ELLENDER. This is a new committee, and that is why I suggested last year that there be a limitation. I was under the impression that the Senator from Arkansas said that he thought $50,000 would be sufficient. I may be in error.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe I recall that the Senator from Arkansas said that. However, the truth is that this investigation has revealed a considerable amount of activity which the committee believes ought to be investigated. Any money that is not needed will not be drawn on or expended. The committee has a very small staff.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I believe that the committee barely got into this subject last year. It did not get into it very deeply, at any rate. It is now getting into a great many situations that it did not realize existed before, and it is believed that this study will last for several months, perhaps for the remainder of the year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I said earlier that I would offer my amendment to this resolution as well as several others on the calendar. However, in view of the fact that the point of order has been made and sustained by the Chair that such an amendment is not in order at this time I will not offer the amendment now. I will wait for the appropriate time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 22), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 26 as amended would authorize the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to expend not to exceed $48,600 from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to continue its study of the activities of nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals including, without limitation, foreign governments, foreign political parties, and individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, organizations, or other combinations of individuals, whether foreign or domestic, acting in the place of, or in the interests of, or on behalf of a foreign government or foreign political party, tending or intended to influence the foreign or domestic policies or interests of the United States.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Congress			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Foreign Relations: Activities of nondiplomatic foreign principals	$50,000.00	$6,686.79		
	50,000.00	6,686.79	July 12, 1962	S. Res. 362.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that the subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 26 was reduced $1,400, from $50,000 to $48,600.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

An additional amendment adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration, at the request of the Committee on Foreign Relations is as follows:

On page 2, line 1, after the word "party,", insert "or any other foreign principal,".

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO INVESTIGATE MATTERS PERTAINING TO FOREIGN POLICIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 22, Senate Resolution 25.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The **Legislative Clerk.** A resolution (S. Res. 25) authorizing the committee on Foreign Relations to examine, investigate, and make studies of matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$143,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make complete studies of any and all matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; (3) to hold such hearings, to take such testimony, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; and (4) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government, as the committee deems advisable.

Sec. 3. In the conduct of its studies the committee may use the experience, knowledge, and advice of private organizations, schools, institutions, and individuals in its discretion, and it is authorized to divide the work of the studies among such individuals, groups and institutions as it may deem appropriate and may enter into contracts for this purpose.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $143,000 for the period ending January 31, 1964, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The amount requested by the Committee on Foreign Relations was reduced by the amount it received last year, and 7 percent was then applied to that amount. So the committee then recommended that the resolution be adopted as reported. The committee asked for $10,000 less than it received last year, and we took $7,000 more from that amount.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does that amount to about 10 percent less than was received last year?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It is $17,000 less than the committee received last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is about 10 percent?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That is correct.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 25), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 23), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 25, as amended, would authorize the expenditure of $143,000 by the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from

March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to examine, investigate, and make complete studies of any and all matters pertaining to the foreign policies of the United States and their administration."

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Congress			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Foreign Relations: U.S. foreign policy	$320,000	$205,793.47		
	160,000 160,000	98,523.16 107,270.31	Jan. 31, 1961 Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 41. S. Res. 246.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 25 was reduced $7,000, from $150,000 to $143,000.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO MAKE STUDIES OF OPERATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 23, Senate Resolution 17.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The resolution will be stated by title.

The **Legislative Clerk.** A resolution (S. Res. 17) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "February" and insert "March"; on page 2, line 20, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; on page 3, line 12, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; on page 4, line 21, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; and on page 5, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$490,000.00" and insert "$458,300"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and in accordance with is jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government, including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government; and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public: *Provided*, That in carrying out the duties herein set forth, the inquiries of this committee shall not be deemed limited to the records, functions, and operations of the particular branch of the Government under inquiry, and may extend to the records and activities of persons, corporations, or other entities dealing with or affecting that particular branch of the Government.

Sec. 2. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, to conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been, engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups of organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Sec. 3. The Committee on Government Operations or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is further authorized and directed from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, to make a full and complete study and investigation of syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identity of the persons, firms or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, methods, techniques, and technicalities are being used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise; and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce; and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities. Nothing contained in this resolution shall affect or impair the exercise by the Committee on the Judiciary or by the Committee on Commerce of any power, or the discharge by such committee of any duty, conferred or imposed upon it by the Standing Rules of the Senate or by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

Sec. 4. The Committee on Government Operations or any of its duly authorized subcommittees shall report to the Senate by January 31, 1964, and shall, if deemed appropriate, include in its report specific legislative recommendations.

Sec. 5. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized, as it deems necessary and appropriate, to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony, either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (8) with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel as it deems advisable; and, further, with the consent of other committees or subcommittees to work in conjunction with and utilize their staffs, as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the committee: *Provided further*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee.

Sec. 6. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $458,300, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, can the chairman of the committee or some other Senator tell us how much more money is included in the resolution for this year's operation than was provided last year?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. My recollection is that the amount provided for this year is $10,000 less than was provided last year. I am now informed that that is a correct statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. Last year, as I see the figures before me, the Senate appropriated $500,000. Of that sum, the amount of $452,000 was spent over a period of 12 months. The committee is now asking for $458,000 for 11 months. It seems to me that the amount asked for is about $18,000 more than the committee received last year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The chairman of the committee will give the details, but again I should like to say that this is an investigation committee.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I so understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. All of the money being asked for will not necessarily be expended; but the chairman of the committee, in a very detailed analysis presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration, according to his conversation with me, felt that the request that he made of the Committee on Rules and Administration was a relatively conservative, well-documented request.

Last year the committee returned $48,418. It may very well be that the committee will return a substantial sum this year, as well. But this investigating committee is too important not to have it properly staffed and not to have the funds which are necessary to conduct the work which Senator McClellan's committee undertakes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not question that at all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was merely trying to show that the moneys which are now to be provided are in excess of the amount which was provided last year.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not have the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The committee actually spent its entire appropriation last year. The amount shown there was the amount spent through December, and we have continued the authority through February. The committee spent all the money which was appropriated to it last year.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was over a period of more than 12 months.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It was 13 months.

Mr. ELLENDER. So it is proposed to provide them, for 11 months, more money than was provided for 12 months last year. That is the point I am making.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. We have provided only $458,000. Last year the committee received $500,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; but this amount is for 11 months.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. We reduced the amount by $31,200.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have pointed out that last year, for 12 months, $452,000 was spent.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. No; the committee spent more than that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then the information which was furnished by the committee is in error. It is bound to be in error, because from the investigation made at that time, which I placed in the Record, as appears on page 22 of this document, the amount of money appropriated last year was $500,000, and over a period of 11 months $412,033 was spent. Am I correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. If we add 10 percent of that amount for another month, it would amount, in round figures, to $41,000. Adding $41,000 to $412,000 makes a total of $453,000 which was spent for 12 months last year.

It is proposed to provide $458,800 for 11 months for this year. So we are providing, in that particular, more money on a yearly basis than was provided last year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Except for one thing: In January of this year the committee spent much more money than it spent in December. It did not have enough money to continue through February, so it was necessary to secure an additional appropriation to operate through February. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. The committee's spending in January was greater than it had been in other months. The amount of money which is now sought is the best calculation that the chairman, the committee, and the staff could outline in order to complete the undertaking of the work which is scheduled.

Mr. ELLENDER. How was the extra money obtained?

Mr. HUMPHREY. By a resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean the continuing resolution?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The continuing resolution—Senate Resolution 88.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand that the committee received more than $500,000 for 12 months of last year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator should know that we had $500,000 for 12 months, but the amount for the 13th month was covered by the continuing resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. But last year the committee started spending its money in February. In other words, in each year the amount for January is included in the previous year's appropriation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. We start in February and continue through the following January 31.

Mr. ELLENDER. But this year, through a continuing resolution, an appropriation was made for February. Do I correctly understand that the extra money was obtained in February?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The committee did not spend the entire $500,000. Some of it was left over. They spent that and got $15,000 extra for February, if my recollection of the figures is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I still contend—and I think I am correct—that the amount of money which is being made available for 11 months is more than the amount which was provided for last year. That is the point I am making.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is my view that the amount of money made available for the coming 11 months is more than the amount made available for 12 months of last year; but it is the amount which is being requested because of the amount of work which the committee has outlined. I cannot imagine how anyone could feel that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has not done a good job and does not need money.

Why has the committee asked for additional funds a little later under a special resolution, when we can now authorize the money and have it available? It will not be put into Senator McClellan's pocket, in case he happens to need a little extra spending money during the days ahead. But it will be there for him to draw on, and it will be drawn on only in the form of vouchers which are filed against that fund. That is all there is to it. It would not make any difference if we appropriated $700,000; only the amount of money which will be needed will be drawn. These resolutions are authorizations for withdrawals. The chairmen of the committees will conduct the investigations.

Let us assume that something happened which would require a doubling of the committee's staff. The Senate would authorize that action. Let us assume that some unbelievable graft were found in a particular department of the Government and that it was necessary to increase the activities of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The amount of spending would have to be increased.

All we are doing in these resolutions is putting a ceiling on the amounts of authorizations, saying that the committees cannot draw more than they are authorized to draw. If they need more money and can justify it, they can request it of the Senate and will get it. If they cannot justify it in terms of the work proposed to be done, they will not get additional funds.

These authorizations do not mean that committees are being rewarded for not being frugal. The committees will get only what they can justify spending in accordance with the terms of the programs they submit.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. One of the investigations I think the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations will conduct this year, according to what was developed in the hearings, will be the use of narcotics by juveniles. This is becoming an acute problem in the United States. It is a situation which the committee will investigate thoroughly.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Committee on the Judiciary has a special subcommittee which is studying juvenile delinquency. My point is that there are many duplications in these fields.

If that is what the subcommittee is going to do, it will be a duplication of what other subcommittees are doing. Of course the fields are green, if there is a desire to investigate everything. But as will be shown in a few minutes, there is a special committee of the Judiciary Committee for the purpose of doing what the distinguished Senator from North Carolina is now requesting; and the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee is doing the same thing. So this would be just duplication.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the committee report states, on page 9:

> The subcommittee staff currently has underway three major preliminary inquiries in addition to the continued surveillance of work stoppages in national defense facilities hereinbefore discussed.
>
> 1. A study of an award by the Department of Defense of a contract for the development and production of a supersonic airplane designated as the TFX, to be used by the Air Force and the Navy.

I am sure Senators have heard about that.

I read further from the report:

> 2. A broad inquiry into narcotics: This will encompass (1) a study of illicit narcotics traffic from both a national and international standpoint; (2) distribution of narcotics in the United States; (3) the relationship of organized crime to the distribution of illicit narcotics; and (4) dangerous drugs, particularly as to their ready accessibility to juveniles and more effective controls at the manufacturing source.
>
> 3. Sports bribery: Based on a recommendation made by the subcommittee in its 1962 report on gambling and organized crime, the staff is inquiring into bribery of athletes by organized gamblers to influence the outcome of sports contests. Preliminary work indicates interstate ramifications in this area, suggesting the need of Federal legislation.

Some Senator may think some of these items should not be handled by this subcommittee; but this is the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Committee on Government Operations; and I believe the subcommittee should be properly staffed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 17, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 24), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Senate Resolution 17 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $458,300 by the Committee on Government Operations for the continued operation of its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964:
>
> "(1) To make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operation of all branches of the Government, including the possible existence of fraud, misfeasance, malfeasance, collusion, mismanagement, incompetence, corrupt or unethical practices, waste, extravagance, conflicts of interest, and the improper expenditure of Government funds in transactions, contracts, and activities of the Government or of Government officials and employees and any and all such improper practices between Government personnel and corporations, individuals, companies, or persons affiliated therewith, doing business with the Government, and the compliance or noncompliance of such corporations, companies, or individuals or other entities with the rules, regulations, and laws governing the various governmental agencies and its relationships with the public;
>
> "(2) To conduct an investigation and study of the extent to which criminal or other improper practices or activities are, or have been engaged in in the field of labor-management relations or in groups or organizations of employees or employers, to the detriment of interests of the public, employers, or employees, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect such interests against the occurrence of such practices or activities; and
>
> "(3) To make a full and complete study and investigation of syndicated or organized crime which may operate in or otherwise utilize the facilities of interstate or international commerce in furtherance of any transactions which are in violation of the law of the United States or of the State in which the transactions occur, and, if so, the manner and extent to which, and the identify of the persons, firms, or corporations, or other entities by whom such utilization is being made, what facilities, devices, methods, techniques, and technicalities are being used or employed, and whether or not organized crime utilizes such interstate facilities or otherwise operates in interstate commerce for the development of corrupting influences in violation of the law of the United States or the laws of any State, and further, to study and investigate the manner in which and the extent to which persons engaged in organized criminal activities have infiltrated into lawful business enterprise, and to study the adequacy of Federal laws to prevent the operations of organized crime in interstate or international commerce, and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States in order to protect the public against the occurrences of such practices or activities."

PROVISION OF FUNDS FOR STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO INTERAGENCY COORDINATION, ECONOMY, AND EFFICIENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 24, Senate Resolution 27, to provide funds for the study of matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 27) to provide funds for the study of matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$95,000" and insert "$88,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

> *Resolved*, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency.
>
> Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the department or agencies of the Government.
>
> Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.
>
> Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $88,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations is requesting $95,000, through the pending resolution. This is $5,000 more than last year, but is less than the 7-percent rise in employee salaries.

The subcommittee now has nine members. It formerly had six members.

FOUR MAJOR ISSUES

It has been active on no fewer than four major issues and a number of minor ones. The major fronts have included:

First. Interagency coordination of Federal drug policies.

Second. Coordination of Federal scientific research policies.

Third. Coordination of international technical assistance programs.

Fourth. Coordination of Federal information policies.

Next week, we are resuming our drug hearings.

OVER $150 MILLION IN DRUG EXPENDITURES

We are going to find out more facts on why various agencies of the U.S. Government spent over $150 million for support of drug research, for conduct of drug regulation and for purchases of drugs—without consulting one another.

This is not just a matter of economizing; it is a matter of protecting the health of the American people.

CALENDAR NO. 24, SENATE RESOLUTION 27

I should like to point out several instances where the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee has saved the taxpayers of the United States sums which are many times larger than the amount which we are requesting today:

(1) ENDING WASTE IN "BURIED" DEFENSE REPORTS

As a result of this subcommittee's efforts, the Department of Defense has suddenly discovered literally hundreds of thousands of research reports prepared by one or more of the individual services—the Army, Navy, or Air Force—which were never before made available to the other services.

In a single major Air Force research installation, no less than 100,000 reports were discovered which had never been circulated to the rest of the Defense Department.

The cost of any one of these reports may have been $5,000, $100,000, or more.

In some fields, the cost runs far larger.

The fact of the matter is that the Defense Department has received on a central basis only around one out of every five reports prepared by prime contractors.

No one knows the investment which the taxpayers made for the research and development which went into the reports which have been buried in one of the military services.

(2) NEW PUBLICATION OF CENTRAL INDEXING OF NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH GRANTS

As a result of this subcommittee's efforts, the National Institutes of Health have for the first time published a Central index of over 13,500 extramural grants, involving around one-fourth of a billion dollars.

Never before have the researchers of this country had available in published form a handy summary of research now in progress.

Never before could a researcher, before deciding on his own project, check with a guide so as to make certain that the same project or something fairly similar to it was not already being done elsewhere.

This is the first such publication and I am glad to say that it is going to be put on magnetic computer tape so that it can be maintained currently henceforth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 25); explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Res. 27) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make a study of interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency, and providing additional funds therefor, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments, and recommend that the resolution as amended be agreed to by the Senate.
>
> Senate Resolution 27 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $88,000 by the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to interagency coordination, economy, and efficiency."

AUTHORITY TO STUDY INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND STATES AND MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 45, to authorize a study of intergovernmental relationships.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 45) authorizing a study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 5, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out $115,000" and insert "$97,290"; so as to make the resolution read:

> *Resolved,* That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by subsection 1(g)(2)(D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, including an evaluation of studies, reports, and recommendations made thereon and submitted to the Congress by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 86–380, approved by the President on September 24, 1959.
>
> SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.
>
> SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.
>
> SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $97,290, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask some questions. I understand that this subcommittee was a new one last year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amount requested was $40,000; and I understand that the subcommittee spent approximately $21,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Maine is the chairman of the subcommittee, and he is familiar with the details.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand the subcommittee is now asking for $97,290, for 11 months. Why is the increase requested?

Mr. MUSKIE. The original request last year was for $40,000, which was to cover a period of operations of 5 months. We tried to estimate it as accurately as we could. The resolution was approved by the Senate on July 12, 1962. We undertook the staffing of the committee, and we completed much of it about Labor Day, and worked for approximately 5 months. However, the staffing really was not completed until October.

The actual expenditures during the 5-month period ending January 31, 1963, were in excess of the figures set forth in the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. They amounted to $21,000-plus, did they?

Mr. MUSKIE. The actual cash balance as of January 31, 1963, was $15,057.07.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that the amount which remained from the $40,000?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes. So we spent approximately $25,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. What did the subcommittee do with the $25,000? Did it begin hearings of any kind?

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes, we held hearings. If the Senator from Louisiana will refer to report No. 26, on page 3 he will find that the nature of the activities we undertook at that time is spelled out. I shall be glad to review them briefly now.

First of all, our activities in that period fell into three categories. In the first place, several bills in the intergovernmental field, which were referred to the subcommittee, had been pending in the full committee, but had not been attended to, because no subcommittee for the purpose of studying them had been available. That had been the case for the last 4 years in the committee. Largely because no subcommittee had been specifically assigned to that area, such legislative measures had been referred from time to time to ad hoc subcommittees.

One of the reasons for the establishment of the subcommittee was to provide a forum in which to consider such proposed legislation.

The principal measure on which we held hearings last fall had to do with the disposition of Ellis Island, which has been surplus, as the Senator probably

knows, since 1954 or 1955. The executive agencies have been struggling with that problem over much of that time. Many proposals for the disposition of the island have been advanced, but there has not been a meeting of the minds in regard to the question of what to do with it. So we held those hearings last fall, and invited testimony by those who had proposals to make regarding the disposition of the island. At the hearings we heard from all persons who had proposals to make in regard to the disposition of the island. We learned that the disposition of the island is clearly in the interest of many millions of Americans, who regard it as a national shrine, and would like to see it disposed of in a way which will fit in with that situation.

It was also our purpose to pinpoint the proposals in the intergovernmental field, in accordance with the mandate of the committee. We did two things to implement that mandate of the committee: First, during the fall we held hearings to which we invited witnesses from all levels of government to express their views on the nature of the problems confronting us in the intergovernmental field. I think those hearings were very worthwhile and constructive, and I have the reports here.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator from Maine been adding new fields in which to investigate, since the original resolution was adopted?

Mr. MUSKIE. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. How long will this investigation continue?

Mr. MUSKIE. The subcommittee is set up as a permanent subcommittee to deal with problems in this field.

Mr. ELLENDER. So it would be another permanent subcommittee, with no end to it?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the budget for this—shall I say—new subcommittee, which the Senator from Maine says will be another permanent subcommittee.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 26) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Staff director	1	$7,680	$16,628.34	$1,385.69	$16,628.34
Chief consultant	1	7,140	15,612.88	1,301.07	15,612.88
Editorial and research: Research assistants	2	6,840	15,048.73	1,254.06	15,048.73
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	4,320	10,116.37	843.03	10,116.37
Assistant chief clerk	1	3,360	8,036.03	669.66	8,036.03
Assistant clerk (secretary to director)	1	2,460	6,085.68	507.14	6,085.68
Assistant clerk (file)	1	2,460	6,085.68	507.14	6,085.68
Total	8	34,260	77,613.71	6,467.79	77,613.71
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86–382, effective July 1, 1960)					648.96
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					5,044.89
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					268.92
Reimbursable payments to agencies					15,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					10,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					3,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					500.00
Stationery, office supplies					750.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					1,500.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					500.00
Contingent fund					173.52
Total					37,386.29
Grand total					115,000.00

> Funds requested, Senate Resolution 45, $115,000.
>
> Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $97,290.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 45), as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY OF CERTAIN ASPECTS OF NATIONAL SECURITY OPERATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 26, Senate Resolution 13, to study certain aspects of national security operations.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 13) to study certain aspects of national security operations, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "February" and insert "March"; on page 2, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; and on page 3, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$110,000" and insert "$92,250"; so as to make the resolution read:

> *Resolved,* That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Government Operations, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:
>
> (1) the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;
>
> (2) the capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents, and skills; and
>
> (3) legislative and other proposals or means to improve these methods and processes.
>
> SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized—
>
> (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable;
>
> (2) to employ upon a temporary basis and fix the compensation of technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority of the committee is authorized at its discretion to select one employee for appointment; and
>
> (3) with the prior consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize on a reimbursable basis the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any department or agency of the Government.
>
> SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $92,250, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that the committee is comparatively new?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The committee is the successor of another committee, but the work of the committee has been the same for at least 4 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is the main purpose of the committee?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The purpose of the committee for some time has been to carry on a study of the executive branch offices that relate to national security and the improvement of the machinery for decisionmaking in the executive branch on national security matters. In the report I think the effectiveness of the committee is stated quite succinctly. The report states:

> The purpose is to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:
>
> (1) The effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;
>
> (2) The capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents, and skills; and
>
> (3) Legislative and other proposals or means to improve these methods and processes.

Actually the committee has done some outstanding work. I think the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who is chairman of the committee, has, with his committee and staff, produced some very important proposals, many of which have already been adopted in the executive branch, for the improvement of our national security machinery. I might add that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is a member of the Committee on Armed Services and also the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Therefore he finds himself in an enviable position, because he is so intimately acquainted with the security program for the country.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is there any conflict between the work done by that committee and the Preparedness Subcommittee, which is headed by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not think so.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee would have to do with security. I cannot understand it. In my opinion, it is another duplication.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can assure the Senator from Louisiana it is not a duplication. It is complementary, but not duplicating.

Mr. ELLENDER. It operates in the same field, however.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the same field.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 13) as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 27), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 13 as amended would authorize the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to expend not to exceed $92,250 from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to make studies as to the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches and functions of the Government with particular reference to:

(1) The effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems;

(2) The capacity of present national security staffing, methods, and processes to make full use of the Nation's resources of knowledge, talents, and skills; and

(3) Legislative and other proposals or means to improve these methods and processes.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Government Operations: National security operations	$70,000	$27,709.27		
	70,000	27,709.27	May 17, 1962	S. Res. 332

Senate Resolution 13 as referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration would have authorized the expenditure of $110,000 for the 12-month period from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, an amount of $40,000 in excess of that authorized by the Senate for the same purpose during the last session of Congress.

At its meeting on March 6, 1963, the Committee on Rules and Administration amended Senate Resolution 13 by effecting the following reductions:

(1) A reduction of the requested amount by 10 percent, to conform it more nearly to the corresponding 1962 authorization; and

(2) A further reduction of the requested amount by one-twelfth of that portion of the reduced amount representing salaries and employee benefits, to compensate for funds made available to the committee during February 1963 by Senate Resolution 88, agreed to February 19, 1963.

By this action the Committee on Rules and Administration reduced the amount specified in Senate Resolution 13 as referred by $17,750—from $110,000 to $92,250.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

Additional information relative to the proposed inquiry is contained in a letter to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations of the Committee on Government Operations, which letter (with accompanying budget) is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
January 15, 1963.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to Senate Resolution 13, 88th Congress, 1st session, which was introduced in the Senate on January 14, 1963, requesting funds for studies as to the effectiveness of present national security methods, staffing, and processes as tested against the requirements imposed by the rapidly mounting complexity of national security problems. The requested funds would cover the period from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964. Prior to submitting this resolution to the Senate, it was reported favorably by the Committee on Government Operations.

Attached hereto is an estimated budget for the period. It is estimated under this budget that it will require $110,000 to carry on the inquiry during the present year.

As you know, the Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations is now studying the administration of national security at home and in the field with a view to making findings and proposals for improvement where appropriate.

The subcommittee, which began its inquiry in May last year, has devoted the initial period of its activities to a thorough and careful analysis of the basic problems in its study, in order to lay a sound foundation for hearings.

To date, we have held more than 300 discussions with present and former Government officials, military leaders, and expert students of national security operations. These consultations have ranged from talks with Cabinet officers of this and previous administrations to discussions with officials in the middle and lower echelons of the Government.

In addition, members of the staff have taken a firsthand look at the staffing and operations of U.S. missions and military establishments in Asia and Europe.

The discussions held and on-the-spot inquiries made have resulted in a great many thought-provoking and helpful ideas.

The staff is preparing a number of background studies in cooperation with the Legislative Reference Service and the executive branch. Two of these, "Selected Papers" relating to the administration of foreign and defense affairs, and "A Bibliography" on the administration of national security have been printed.

An initial staff study analyzing the basic issues to be explored in hearings is in an advanced stage of preparation.

I am pleased to report that of the $70,000 authorized for the subcommittee for the 8½-month period ending January 31, 1963, we expect to return approximately $30,000 to the Senate contingent fund. This saving reflects the fact that we were able to obtain the services of our chief consultant and research assistant on a part-time basis and operate the subcommittee during this first phase with only one administrative staff.

During the coming period of accelerated activity, including hearings, we shall need to budget additionally for a secretary, and for further research assistance.

Beginning next month, we plan to hold a major set of hearings which will continue through the present session. These hearings will bring the best minds of our country to bear upon the basic issues of administration of national security.

We expect that a series of specific findings and recommendations relating to national security staffing and operations will emerge from our studies and hearings.

The executive branch has extended its cooperation to the subcommittee.

As you know, my colleagues and I are approaching the problems before us in a nonpartisan and professional way.

The study is being made by the Government Operations Committee in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, providing that the committee shall have the duty of—

* * * * *

B. studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency;

C. evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

I shall be available to give the committee any further information desired.

Thanking you for your cooperation and with kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senator, Chairman, Subcommittee on National Security Staffing and Operations.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Staff director	1	$8,040	$17,305.31	$1,442.10	$17,305.31
Chief consultant	1	8,040	17,305.31	1,442.10	17,305.31
Consultants, including the consultant to the minority	4-6				28,000.00
Editorial and research: Research assistants	2	3,720	9,579.42	798.28	9,579.42
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	2,760	6,735.82	561.31	6,735.82
Stenographer	1	2,400	5,955.67	496.30	5,955.67
Total					84,881.53
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					450.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					5,525.00
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					315.00
Reimbursable payments to agencies					5,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					4,500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					5,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					2,000.00
Stationery, office supplies					700.00
Communications, (telephone, telegraph)					1,300.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					250.00
Contingent fund					78.47
Total					25,118.47
Grand total					110,000.00

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $92,250.

AUTHORITY AND EXPENDITURES FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO INVESTIGATE MATTERS WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 27, Senate Resolution 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 16) authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate certain matters within its jurisdiction and authorizing certain expenditures therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 1, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to Indian affairs; irrigation and reclamation; minerals, materials, and fuels; public lands; and territories and insular affairs.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, last year the committee spent $67,000. I notice that no effort was made by the Committee on Rules and Administration to cut back the requested $100,000, although a full month has gone by.

I offer an amendment that, on page 2, line 16, the figure "$100,000" be made "$90,000", so that the amount requested will be in keeping with what the committee requested, that is, on a 12-month basis. Since the remaining time is only 11 months, it seems to me that a 10 percent cut would give the committee the amount requested for operations of the committee within the next 11 months.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana in the absence of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. I hope that the recommendation of the Committee on Rules and Administration will be followed.

Briefly, I point out that the amount proposed represents a very sizable reduction in the amounts that have been spent over the years by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is a realistic budget. It is a request that has been decreased from $135,000, which was the total amount authorized in three resolutions by the committee at the last session, to $100,000. That reduction in itself represents a saving of $35,000. the $100,000 figure does not reflect specifically the 7-percent salary increase voted by the Congress last year. This amount was absorbed within the $100,000. In addition the committee will require these funds to accomplish a number of very important investigations relating to matters within our jurisdiction. The amount is very realistic, and I hope that the recommendation of the Committee on Rules and Administration will be followed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I stated in the early part of the afternoon, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the committee has shown quite a reduction in the amount that was formerly appropriated for the operation of that subcommittee. It strikes me that since the request for $100,000 covered a period of 12 months, and the committee will operate only 11 months under the appropriation, it would certainly be in order to reduce the appropriation 10 percent so that the committee would receive for 11 months what it would have received for 12 months had the $100,000 been made available.

Mr. BIBLE. As my friend, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana knows, we have a new chairman of the Interior Committee—the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

After he became chairman, which event followed the submission of the original budget by the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Washington appointed a new professional staff member to the committee. His salary was not included in the first budget.

Among other things, the committee plans to investigate the public land problems of the entire United States, which is a large and complex field. We have yet to make a final disposition of our fuels study. Although a year ago an appropriation of $25,000 was secured for this fuels study, I am advised that only about half of that amount was used.

There was an additional appropriation of $10,000, to study resource revenues, none of which was used. The work relating to this study will be absorbed by our staff and the cost will be absorbed within the $100,000 requested.

Over the period of an entire year the total turnback was approximately $47,000 out of a total authorized of $135,000. So I can assure my friend from Louisiana that if the funds are not needed, they will certainly be turned back.

Mr. President, I hope that the amendment is rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res 16) as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 28—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 16, as amended, would authorize the expenditure of $100,000 by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to Indian affairs; irrigation and reclamation; minerals, materials, and fuels; public lands; and territories and insular affairs.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Con.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Interior and Insular Affairs: General	$200,000.00	$145,727.91		
	100,000.00 100,000.00	84,582.61 61,145.30	Jan. 31, 1961 Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 47. S. Res. 242.

Senate Resolution 16 as referred would have authorized the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to expend not to exceed $100,000 from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964. In view of the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, agreed to February 19, 1963, which continued the authority for all Senate investigations through February 1963, the Committee on Rules and Administration has reduced the investigative authority contained in Senate Resolution 16 to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963. However, the committee has in effect increased the expenditure authorization by $7,000 by approving for an 11-month period the amount of $100,000 originally stipulated for a full year.

This action was taken at the request of Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, newly elected chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Senator JACKSON's statement before the Senate Rules Committee justifying his request (with accompanying revised budget) is as follows:

"Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I have a brief statement in regard to Senate Resolution 16, the money resolution to support investigations for the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

"The committee's budget, which was submitted under my predecessor this past January, called for a total sum of $100,000. Pursuant to your committee's announced policy you have reduced this amount by $7,000 since it is an 11-month budget, leaving a total of $93,000.

"However, I would like to request to your committee that the amount of $100,000 be retained for the utilization of the Interior Committee for the rest of the budgeted year. My reason for requesting this is threefold:

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Special counsel	3	$7,680	$16,628.34	$1,385.69	$49,885.02
Investigator	1	6,960	15,274.41	1,272.86	15,274.41
Do	1	4,080	9,596.30	799.69	9,596.30
Administrative and clerical:					
Stenographer	1	2,820	6,865.81	572.15	6,865.81
Do	1	2,580	6,345.74	528.81	6,345.74
Total					(87,967.28)
Minus 1/12 for 11-month budget, total					80,636.62
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)				$295.72	
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)				5,717.87	
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)				278.04	
Minus 1/12 for 11-month budget					5,767.33
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					7,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					3,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					
Stationery, office supplies					1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					1,000.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					200.00
Contingent fund					1,396.05
Total					19,363.38
Grand total					100,000.00

"During last year the committee had the benefit of an additional resolution (S. Res. 269) which was utilized for a study of fuels and energy. We spent approximately $12,500 of the $25,000 allotted under this resolution. Our regular investigation resolution (S. Res. 242) for $100,000 was thereby lightened by this amount. This year the committee may have further work in completing our fuels study and report, but I have not asked for an additional resolution. I intend to absorb any expenditures from Senate Resolution 16.

"Secondly, the committee's budget request under Senate Resolution 16 did not reflect the 7-percent increase in employees' salaries which went into effect last October.

"Thirdly, an additional professional staff member has been retained by me since I became chairman of the committee and since the budget was submitted by my predecessor. I would like to point out to the committee that at present this is the only person I have hired, and in order to adequately cover this additional cost I request that the full amount of $100,000 be retained under Senate Resolution 16.

"I have prepared a new budget based upon my present request of the committee, and I would now like to submit it for the committee's consideration."

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 16, $100,000.

Funds approved by Committee on Rules and Administration, $100,000.

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 28, Senate Resolution 55.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 55) to study administrative practice and procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 2, line 4, after the word "from", to strike out "March", and in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$120,000" and insert "$110,600", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practice and procedure within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $110,600 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 29), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 55 as amended would authorize expenditure of $110,600 by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting through its Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to make a full and complete study and investigation of administrative practice and procedure within the departments and agencies of the United States in the exercise of their rulemaking, licensing, and adjudicatory functions, including a study of the effectiveness of the Administrative Procedure Act, with a view to determining whether additional legislation is required to provide for the fair, impartial, and effective performance of such functions."

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Administrative practice and procedure	$230,000	$127,263.95		
	115,000 115,000	68,400.98 58,862.97	Jan. 31, 1961 Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 51. S. Res. 256.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 55 was reduced $9,400, from $120,000 to $110,600.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

AUTHORITY TO STUDY MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 29, Senate Resolution 57.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 57) authorizing a study of matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments on page 1, line 9, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$51,500" and insert "$54,423," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its activities and findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $54,423, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 30), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 57, as amended, would authorize the expenditure of $54,423 by the Committee on the Judiciary, through its Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional amendments.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Constitutional amendments	$81,000.00	$68,386.62		
	32,500.00 48,500.00	28,610.21 39,776.41	Jan. 31, 1961 Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 59. S. Res. 259.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a

12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 57 was reduced $3,700—from $51,500 to $47,800—and the legislative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

At its meeting on March 6, 1963, the committee increased the latter amount to $54,423 to provide $6,623 (11-month basis) for a clerical assistant to the minority.

INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. **HUMPHREY**. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 30, Senate Resolution 58.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 58) to investigate matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$165,000" and insert "$152,300", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $152,300, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, I have carefully examined this subject and I think an amendment to the resolution is required, unless we are given some better idea than we have been given as to the way in which the funds will be administered.

Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], a very distinguished Member of the Senate, who is chairman of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, is necessarily absent today; and I am satisfied that he is necessarily absent. I regret that in his absence I must raise a question which he might settle himself, as the chairman of the subcommittee in the absence of a rule of the subcommittee.

Mr. **JOHNSTON**. Mr. President——

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, I am not quite prepared to yield.

Therefore, I make this statement in advance. Should the managers of this measure on the floor feel that they would rather consider it tomorrow, or some other day, certainly I would have no objection to that.

Mr. President, I wish to state the point I have in mind. I have examined very carefully the proposed agenda of the subcommittee, which seeks the not inconsiderable sum of $165,000 reduced to $152,300.

I understand—and I am quite sure this is correct—that this is a very able subcommittee, which certainly has a very distinguished lawyer as its chairman. I understand the subcommittee has a good staff.

Yet, as we look over the work which the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights proposes to do we find the following matters will be considered by it: First, the constitutional rights of the American Indian.

I am very deeply solicitous of the constitutional rights of the American Indian, but I point out that one of the very critical areas of constitutional rights is quite excluded from everything the committee is going to do.

I shall read the list, so that my colleagues can understand what this is all about.

The subcommittee will consider the constitutional rights of the American Indian. Then it will consider the constitutional rights of military personnel. Then it will consider the constitutional rights of the mentally ill. Then it will consider constitutional rights in the administration of criminal justice. It will consider constitutional rights regarding citizenship, and also regarding the right to counsel, primarily in Federal criminal trials.

All those matters are important, Mr. President, but I do not believe that they are superior in importance to the constitutional rights of Americans who are denied those rights on the basis of racial discrimination in respect to schools, or in respect to voting, or in respect to places of public accommodation, or in respect to any one of a dozen other areas covered by the 27 legislative recommendations to the Congress by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission in its last comprehensive reports in 1961.

Mr. President, obviously a proposal which is of a substantive legislative character, on such a measure as is pending, which has been ruled by the Presiding Officer to be a measure for the appropriation of money, would not be in order, and I would not offer it, ordinarily. But, Mr. President, if the chairman of the subcommittee has laid this down as his subcommittee's agenda, before the Senate votes on the money for that agenda, I see no reason why we should not open up the possibility that the agenda perhaps might be improved at the behest of the full committee or of the subcommittee itself.

I therefore have in mind offering an amendment on page 1 at line 8 of the resolution, which would read as follows:

Provided, however, That the committee or such duly authorized subcommittee shall determine the matters to be studied by majority vote.

If the committee had a rule which so provided, or if the chairman of the committee would assure the Senate that the administration of the work of the committee, the selection of matters to be studied, their priority or order, or anything else of this nature, would be committed to a vote of the committee itself, there would be no need for any such amendment or for any such action by the Senate. That is why I suggest that if there is no particular desire to deal with the matter at this moment, in the absence of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], I would be perfectly willing to postpone any action I have in mind until such time as the Senator is available.

Mr. **SMATHERS**. Mr. President, I apologize for the fact that I did not hear all the able Senator from New York was saying. Did the Senator say that he was willing not to take action until some subsequent date with respect to the amendment?

Mr. **JAVITS**. I think, if the Senate is to act on the resolution, it would be necessary to act on the amendment. If it is the disposition of the Senators in charge of the measure on the floor to put the resolution over for a day, that is satisfactory to me.

Mr. **SMATHERS**. Does the Senator know whether the Senator from North Carolina will be present tomorrow?

Mr. **JAVITS**. I do not know. As I stated, I did not have any idea in advance that he would not be present, but he is not, and I think it is the sort of thing he ought to consider.

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **JAVITS**. I yield.

Mr. **KEATING**. I make the suggestion that the resolution relating to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary has already been put over until Tuesday because of the necessary absence of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver]. Perhaps this resolution also should be put over until the same day.

Mr. **SMATHERS**. It is apparently the disposition of Senators, as I take a little temperature reading, to have the able Senator from New York proceed to offer his amendment at this particular time, and to have the Senate make some disposition of it.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Very well. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 1, line 8, it is proposed to strike out the period and to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided, however*, That the committee or such duly authorized subcommittee shall determine the matters to be studied by majority vote."

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, as I said before, I offer the amendment because of the way in which the agenda is set up to justify the amount of money which the Senate is asked to appropriate and the specification which is made as to the items which would be investigated or the matters which would be considered by the subcommittee; these exclude, it seems to me, one of the most critical issues before the Nation regarding constitutional rights.

In the absence of any assurance whatever on that score—that at least the subcommittee itself, by a majority vote, could determine priority in the selection of matters to be studied—I should be derelict in my duty if I sat silent while the money was voted to the subcommittee which is charged with that particular responsibility and made no effort whatever, in the absence of any assurance by any member of the subcommittee or of the committee, to at least open up the proposal to the possibility that this critically important issue of constitutional rights which is called civil rights might be considered.

I do not think that the amount of money proposed to be provided the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee is exorbitant or out of line. I am completely in favor of voting for it. I shall be happy to vote for it. I raise no issue whatever as to the finances.

I raise only the issue that, from the report which accompanies the measure, it is very clear that the fundamental constitutional rights of the great body of Americans are not scheduled to be considered, although there are serious charges—including the charges of a commission of the Federal Government itself, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission—that such rights are being denied. When we look at the specification of what the subcommittee is supposed to deal with in respect to constitutional rights, we find there is no mention whatever of the prospect of taking up this subject.

I cannot compel, nor could even the Senate compel, the subcommittee to consider something which it did not want to consider; but at least we could open up the possibility that, if a majority of the subcommittee, or the full committee, desired it to be done, at least it would be done.

That is all my amendment proposes to do. Indeed, I respectfully submit that it is the kind of amendment as to which any committee chairman or subcommittee chairman could readily say, "Well, that is not necessary at all. I fully intend, if there is any difference in my committee as to priorities or as to particular matters which will be subject to my subcommittee, to submit it to a majority vote of the committee."

In that case I would withdraw the amendment. I have no desire to press for an amendment, provided that assurance is available, but obviously it is not; nor is there any desire to defer the matter until the chairman himself decided whether he would wish to give such assurance.

As this is final action in the Senate, I have no alternative but to press the point. That is the reason for which I submit the amendment. I hope it will have the favorable consideration of the Senate, as indeed I think it must, in good conscience and in good faith.

I challenge any Member of the Senate, whether he is from the North or from the South, in good conscience to say that the civil rights issue is not one of the major constitutional questions before us and that he could in fairness and decency vote $152,300 to a subcommittee which does not even carry that item on its agenda.

Mr. President, let us grow up, and let us be adult. The notion of the Senate as a great club is fine if we deal with the problems of the country.

My concern is as follows, and I shall always try to maintain it: I make no criticism of any Member of the Senate whatsoever, but we must do our duty. We cannot sit around with our hands folded while the things being done determine the course that the Congress shall take for the next 2 years. This resolution is one of the things being done which have such an effect. It is one of the doors being closed. It is not one of the most important doors. We could do something about civil rights if we wanted to, if, as we know, an adequate majority, sometimes two-thirds, decided to do it. But this is a door by means of which these rights could and should be considered, and to sit by and let it ride because one wants to be a good fellow and does not want to raise any question about the matter, when the most hotly controverted civil rights question in the United States is omitted from the matters this subcommittee tells the Senate, in its own report, it is going to take up, is not my idea of being a good Senator of the United States.

That is why, in the absence of any other assurance—in the absence even of agreement to let the resolution go over until next Tuesday—I felt it my duty to seek a vote on the amendment. For the information of the Senate, I shall seek a yea-and-nay vote, if I can get one.

Mr. **EASTLAND**. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] has been chairman of this subcommittee for a number of years. I have heard an undercover attack, a devious attack, on his character and integrity tonight. That is what it means. No one has ever questioned the way he conducted that subcommittee. No one has ever accused him of sitting on or squatting on or holding up a bill.

I am not trying to get my name in the newspapers, but nobody has ever done that. He has been a responsible subcommittee chairman, and I do not think a subcommittee can be run from the floor of the U.S. Senate. We must rely upon the integrity of the committee chairman.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] has certainly met all the tests. He is a great lawyer. He has made an able chairman of that subcommittee. I do not think anybody, in his wildest dreams, even if he had a shot of opium, could say he attempted to sit on anything.

I think the resolution should be adopted.

Mr. **JAVITS**. Mr. President, in reponse to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, I cannot allow the matter to be placed upon that basis, nor would I permit the Senator from Mississippi by his speech to wish it on me. I am not questioning the integrity of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] at all. On the contrary, I have the greatest faith in him. I want the matter to go over for a day or so in order that he can be here and explain what he plans to do with the subcommittee and the agenda and the matters it is to take up—about which, incidentally, the Senator from Mississippi has said absolutely nothing.

So I think my good faith, in regard to the integrity and distinction of the chairman of the subcommittee, who is a very honored Member of this body, is completely unimpaired. As a matter of fact, I ask the opportunity to put it over until Tuesday, as another resolution for a subcommittee was put over. Let the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] be here. Let him express himself on these matters. I shall be delighted to have that done, and I hope it will not be necessary to press the amendment. In the absence of that assurance, I do not see any reason why I should be talked out of it or that the Senate should be talked out of it on the assertion that it impugns the reputation or standing of the Senator from North Carolina. It does no such thing. It is clear that it does not do that.

Let us understand exactly what the fundamental problem here is. It is that it is extremely difficult to get any consideration in the Judiciary Committee of matters of this character. The Judiciary Committee considers civil rights bills only when we, by action in the Senate, compel a report by a day certain, and even then, if my memory serves me correctly, they have come back without taking a position pro or con. We understand what the situation is with respect to civil rights legislation. So when we have an opportunity to do something in trying to open up, as it were, the door for consideration of matters in the subcommittee, it seems to me, in all decency, we ought to do it.

We know too well the history and the background; for example, the situation which exists on a motion to take up civil rights legislation. For that reason, I am attempting to amend the resolution.

I respectfully submit it does not represent impugning in any manner whatever the dignity or standing or capacity of the chairman of the subcommittee. Indeed, I here affirm what I have said many times before. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] is one of the most distinguished and able men to serve in the Senate, a man of the highest integrity and standing.

We are talking about matters which the subcommittee will consider, the basis upon which those matters may be determined, by whom they will be determined, and about the absence of the Senator from North Carolina. He is being denied the opportunity to express himself on this subject, which, in my opinion, he should be asked to do and permitted to do in all deference to his dignity and standing, by the fact that it is insisted that this resolution be dealt with tonight.

I think it is a great mistake to have it dealt with tonight. I have no choice, in view of the way matters stand, but to offer the amendment. There is nothing else I can do about it. The only way to change or to have a hope of changing the way in which these matters will be submitted to the subcommittee, in view of the way we are being asked to act on this matter tonight, is by my offering the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is a fairminded man. I am recollecting now from my memory, and I may be in error; the Senator is knowledgeable enough so that if I am in error he will correct me. It is my recollection that when the literacy test voting bill was before us in the last Congress, it was referred to the subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin]. It is my further recollection that at that time it was stated by the Senator from North Carolina that, even though civil rights bills had been referred to his committee, none of those who had introduced those civil rights bills had asked for hearings up to that time. He was asked on that occasion if he would hold hearings on the literacy test voting bill. He said he would, and he did.

I may say that this subcommittee, to my knowledge, only this past week, on the initiative of the Senator from North Carolina, held a meeting with Indian groups relative to civil rights affecting that part of our population.

Therefore, I would hope most sincerely that the Senator from New York would not press for a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment, because I believe that if he will go back in his memory he will recall—and this is subject to correction—that at any time when a civil rights bill was introduced which had been referred to that subcommittee, hearings were held if the person who introduced the bill requested hearings. Am I correct?

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to agree with the Senator from Montana, for whom I have the deepest affection. However, I must call attention to the fact that that very question was controverted on the floor by none other than my colleague from New York.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I did not recall that.

Mr. JAVITS. The same question was raised by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin]. I recall, however, that the matter was controverted by my colleague from New York, specifically and directly, according to my recollection. He is on the floor. If I am in error, the Senator from New York will correct me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator's word is good enough for me.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The difficulty which those of us who are interested in this field have is that there is no disposition on the part of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary to report on civil rights bills whether or not they are referred by the main committee to this particular subcommittee for consideration. That is something which some of us have suffered from over the years. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] takes a different view in this field from the view taken by some of the rest of us. He may have a certain reluctance to refer bills on civil rights to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, but the real problem is getting action on these measures whether or not they are referred.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. What bills is the Senator speaking about?

Mr. KEATING. I am speaking about the package of civil rights bills.

Mr. EASTLAND. What bills is the Senator talking about?

Mr. KEATING. There are none this year that I know of.

Mr. EASTLAND. Before that. The Senator said that the Senator from Mississippi had a reluctance, if I understood the Senator correctly, to refer bills to the subcommittee. Is that correct?

Mr. KEATING. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. All right. What bills? What are those bills?

Mr. KEATING. I hope the reluctance——

Mr. EASTLAND. Wait a minute. I challenge the accuracy of the statement the Senator has made. What are the bills?

Mr. KEATING. Do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senior Senator from New York has the floor. He has yielded to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. If the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, will give assurance that civil rights bills will be immediately referred to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights and given proper consideration, that may dispose of the matter before us.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know; but the truth is that that has always been the policy.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask for the regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. KEATING. The distinguished Senator from North Carolina last year indicated that he had not scheduled hearings on civil rights measures because none had been requested by the sponsors of the bills. I pointed out, at that time, that I had urged the subcommittee to give a higher priority to civil rights legislation on many occasions. Subsequently I addressed a letter to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which reads, in part, as follows:

> Thank you for sending me a copy of the draft of the annual report of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.
>
> I have reviewed the report, and it has my approval as a summary of the subcommittee's work to date.
>
> As the report notes, 15 civil rights bills were referred to the subcommittee in 1961. Except for three of these bills relating to the life of the Civil Rights Commission, the subcommittee has not conducted any hearings on this legislation. As you know, I have requested at several of our meetings that civil rights legislation be given a higher priority in the work of the subcommittee. In view of the colloquy on the Senate floor the other day, I would like to reiterate for the record my particular desire for early hearings on the following bills which I have either sponsored or cosponsored:
>
> S. 480 (literacy), S. 481 (civil injunctive suits), S. 482 (enforcement of 14th amendment), S. 484 (school assistance), S. 1254 (protection of Armed Forces), S. 1255 (conspiracies) and S. 1256 (antilynching).

Later in the session, we did have hearings and did report a bill dealing with voting rights, but despite my request there were no other hearings, to the best of my recollection, on the other bills.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. If the package of bills which may be introduced this year——

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Senator wish me to yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield, but first I have yielded to my colleague from New York.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thought the Senator had yielded to me.

Mr. KEATING. Regardless of the practice last year, if the Senator from Mississippi will give us assurance that civil rights bills will be promptly referred to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, it will then be up to the members of the subcommittee to obtain hearings and action on these bills in the subcommittee. In my judgment, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina would hold hearings on these bills whether or not he agreed with them.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I wish to make this statement. Any implication that the Senator from Mississippi has not speedily referred bills is not borne out by the record. That is an inaccurate statement. The only assurance that I must give to anyone is that I will do my duty as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, without fear or favor of anyone. Any implication that I have not done my duty in the past by referring bills as they should be referred is utterly false. The record bears me out.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is always important to cut through obscurities. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi says he will do his duty as he sees it. That is all right. We all understand that. That may be consistent with the way the Senator from Mississippi does or does not feel he must run his office. Then my very distinguished colleague in the Senate, the majority leader, says that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] said he would grant hearings on any bill that was referred to him. I heard him say that. There was some dispute about that.

However, even laying that aside, we are granting money in this resolution, not for the consideration of particular bills, but we are granting more than $150,000 for certain investigations in the constitutional rights field. That is what this money is for. These investigations are spelled out for us specifically. I should like to read them again. They are:

The constitutional rights of the American Indian. The constitutional rights of military personnel. The rights of the mentally ill. Constitutional rights and the administration of criminal justice. Citizenship. Right to counsel.

I say that we cannot ask for a substantial sum of money from Congress for a Constitutional Rights Subcommittee which is telling us in advance that it is not going to consider the question of the denial of rights under the 14th and 15th amendments, especially with the record of the Civil Rights Commission before us, and with a report before us, which I recently put into the Record, from the Civil Rights Commission's advisory committee in the State of Mississippi itself, which indicated the most widespread and flagrant violations of the 14th and 15th amendments.

Again I say——

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I will yield in a minute.

Mr. EASTLAND. I would like to say——

Mr. JAVITS. I ask the Senator to let me finish my statement.

Mr. EASTLAND. I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought he had yielded to me.

Mr. JAVITS. The question always comes up, Shall we just sit silently by and say nothing? That is always a question of degree. It seems to me that where it is so very clear that there is no intention of considering what many of us here believe to be some of the most fundamental questions of constitutional rights in the country, it is our duty to rise and try to do something about it. In the only way open to me, I have tried to do that. I now yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have been challenged that bills were not promptly referred to subcommittees. Here is docket No. 572, S. 1254, Senators Humphrey, Burdick, Cannon, and others. March 8, 1961. Referred on March 10, 1961.

Docket No. 573, S. 1255, Humphrey, Burdick, Douglas, and others. March 8. Referred March 10, 1961.

Here is another one. This deals with the denial of certain rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes. Introduced by Senators Humphrey, Allott, Burdick, and others, on March 8, 1962. Referred on March 10, 1962.

Here is another one. Referred to the subcommittee, not to the committee. Docket No. 575, S. 1257, to indefinitely extend the Civil Rights Commission. It was introduced on March 8, and referred on March 10.

That is what the record is.

Mr. JAVITS. I have the calendar of the Committee on the Judiciary before me, and it does indicate a considerable number of references, which does not mean, by any means, that all the bills were referred. I think it bears somewhat upon the controversy which existed last year, when the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] indicated that he granted a hearing on any bill on which a hearing was requested, because there are a good many bills, for example, as to which my colleague from New York [Mr. Keating] was himself responsible for requesting action. That was the reason for the controversy, which occurred at that time, as to whether that had actually been the practice of the subcommittee.

I have before me one document, the report of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights for the 1st session of the 87th Congress, which relates to that issue. On page 18, the report reads:

> During the session there were referred to the subcommittee 15 bills dealing with the further preservation and protection of the constitutional rights of all persons within the United States. Of these bills the subcommittee considered and acted upon three bills to extend the operation of the Commission on Civil Rights.

I point that out merely to show the small number, out of the total volume of these bills which were submitted to the subcommittee, that were acted upon. However, I think these arguments are not germane to this money resolution. Whatever may be the pros and cons on that issue, as they have been discussed here, what is germane to this money resolution is that we be told what investigations will be conducted under it.

It is very clear, from a reading of these specifications, that there is not included any consideration of what we call civil rights.

Therefore, I respectfully submit that the job which the subcommittee should be doing will not be done. They tell us so themselves. It is for that reason that, at the very least, I wished at least to open the question to a majority of the subcommittee as to what matters they would consider. Perhaps in its good judgment the majority of the subcommittee would decide that they wanted to consider civil rights issues, in which case that should be done. In any case, the door should not be clanged shut, as would be done if the Senate acted on the resolution today without discussion.

Mr. EASTLAND. I call attention to docket No. 1613, S. 2750, introduced by Messrs. Mansfield and Dirksen, on January 30, 1962, which is the bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means.

That bill was referred to the committee on January 31, 1962. It was referred to the subcommittee automatically on the day following its introduction.

Mr. JOHNSTON. To keep the record straight, I think the Senator should read the paragraph just preceding what he read. He will find that it goes into other questions besides those he mentioned. It reads:

> The proposed agenda for this session includes studies of vital areas of constitutional law which stand in need of examination by Congress. At the present rate of expense, the proposed budget should permit the subcommittee, in addition to dealing with legislation referred to it, to continue or initiate work on the following subjects.

Then the report states what the Senator has read to the Senate, showing that that will be done after we have gone into the other questions in regard to civil rights.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry I cannot agree with that interpretation. Certainly in the absence of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] we are lashed to the words which are in the report; and the report, it seems to me, makes it very clear that, as it says:

> At the present rate of expense, the proposed budget should permit the subcommittee, in addition to dealing with legislation referred to it, to continue or initiate work on the following subjects.

It is very clear to me, at least, that the design of this request details what subjects will be considered, in addition to dealing with proposed legislation referred to the subcommittee. In regard to legislation, again, we get into the controversy as to what is referred to the subcommittee, when it is referred, and whether, even if it is referred, it will be considered.

The important point is that this money is requested principally for study. But the studies do not include the study of the question of constitutional rights known as civil rights.

What am I trying to do about that? I am not trying to write in a charge or a direction to the subcommittee to consider that question. I am only trying to keep that door open by giving the majority of the subcommittee the right to have that subject studied, if it chooses to do so. It seems to me that this is an extremely mild approach to the problem, but at least it is something which might have some basis in the intention of the Senate in voting this money.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. As the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, I should like to say that the chairman of the subcommittee has held executive meetings and that the subcommittee has, from time to time, considered bills which are before it. If a majority of the subcommittee will vote for the consideration of and hearings on any of the so-called civil rights bills to which the Senator from New York refers, they will be held.

I assure the Senator from New York that meetings are held. The majority of the committee are the ones who determine whether meetings shall be held. I suggest to the Senator from New York that there have been, so far as I know—I stand correction at the hands of the clerk of the committee—no requests filed for hearings on the bills which were referred to the subcommittee. There were no requests for hearings.

I further suggest that the administration was somewhat laggard in suggesting that these bills even be introduced and considered. Based upon the message which came to Congress a little earlier this session, I assume that the attitude has changed somewhat. But I venture to say that the type of amendment which the Senator from New York suggests for this resolution will be of no effect and of no avail to get the job done which he seeks to have done.

Mr. JAVITS. That is the reason why I said when I began that I hoped this question would be deferred until the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] could say what the Senator from Nebraska has said as to the past and as to the future concerning the role which will be played by the committee under this appropriation which is requested. Unfortunately, that opportunity is being denied, so all the extrapolation which any of us might indulge in as to what the chairman may or may not do with the subcommittee's money for the next 2 years is, I respectfully submit, not dispositive.

The fact is that the specifications of this report do not include any investigation of any such matters as I have described.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. On that score, it is true that there are five or six items of that type listed on the agenda, but the money is being allowed for the purpose of maintaining a staff and conducting hearings on bills which are referred to the committee, including civil rights bills, and by procedures which are provided in the subcommittee. Whenever there is a majority vote to take up a bill, that is the bill on which hearings are scheduled and hearings are had. But in the absence of any plain desire on the part of either the introducer of the bill or any group of Senators interested in it, of course there will not be any hearings. All of us know that many bills are introduced on which it is not expected that any hearings will be held, nor are hearings desired to be held. It is on that basis that the subcommittee acts.

Mr. JAVITS. I cannot accept that statement; I am sorry. I was here and heard challenged the indication by Senator Ervin last year that he granted a hearing on any civil rights bill when requested to do so. A request was made by my colleague from New York [Mr. Keating]. I do not wish to embarrass the Senator from New York, because he is a member of the subcommittee. I shall not ask him any questions. I will state of my own knowledge that this question was challenged.

Various Senators, including the Senator from New York, are sponsors of a half a dozen bills which were referred to this very subcommittee, bills upon which no hearings have been held.

It simply taxes my credibility—I speak personally—to assume that no request was made for hearings on the most obvious civil rights bill before the subcommittee, where all that was necessary, according to what has been said, was to ask for hearings and hearings would be granted. I simply think that that would really be impugning the good faith of so many of us who have introduced civil rights bills. It is simply inconceivable to me.

This is the only chance we will have to take action of this kind, so I have offered a most mild amendment. It would open up the procedure to provide the very thing which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] says took place. In the absence of the chairman of the subcommittee to give us that assurance, and the unwillingness to put this resolution over for 2 or 3 days, as was done in the case of another subcommittee resolution, just for that purpose alone I wish to get his assurance.

Mr. President, I do not think that is the way Senators should act with each other; and if for no other reason, we should vote on this matter tonight, on the Record. Let us test that out and find out why this particular resolution must be singled out tonight, and must be voted on tonight, and cannot be put over until Tuesday. Why not put it over, in the absence of the subcommittee chairman? I think this demands a record vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, neither do I see why this resolution should be singled out by the Senator from New York. I do not contest the credibility of any Senator. I certainly would take the word of the Senator from Nebraska, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, as to the procedure followed, when he says that whenever a majority of the subcommittee seeks to hold a hearing on a bill introduced by a Member, a hearing is held.

Let me corroborate what the Senator from Nebraska has said—namely, that bills which have been introduced have gone to that committee and to other committees, and the sponsors of those bills have never asked for hearings. That is the way such things work in this body, and I think we might as well recognize that fact. It is not a matter of personalities, or a matter of having the word of one Senator attacked. It is a matter of fact, and we cannot gainsay it.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee has stated that when bills on civil rights are referred to that committee, he will refer them to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to make this statement: The clerk of the committee has instructions immediately to refer every bill to the appropriate subcommittee; and the records bear out that they have been so referred—not just civil rights bills, but all the bills which go to the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee now has stated again that the bills which are introduced and are referred to the Judiciary Committee are to be immediately referred to the appropriate subcommittees. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct in all instances.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well. And the Senator from Nebraska has said, as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, that whenever a majority of that subcommittee desires to hold a hearing on such a bill, a hearing will be held.

I hope this will be taken into consideration by the Senator from New York, so that we can settle this question, and can proceed with our business.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I will take the assurance of the majority leader and I will take the assurance of the chairman of the committee, because they are the ones who are vested with the authority.

So far as the Senator from Nebraska is concerned, after all he has to rely upon what took place before. He does not run the subcommittee, and I would not wish to tax him with that responsibility or to ask of him anything which in my heart I knew he could not do or say.

Both the assurances by the majority leader and the chairman of the committee are satisfactory to me. They are, first, that bills referred to the Judiciary Committee will be automatically and promptly referred to the appropriate subcommittees; second, that the practice of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee will be to grant a hearing on referred bills on the request of the sponsor or the cosponsor. If I have those assurances, I will withdraw this amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me make the matter plain. I am not making any commitment or promise to the Senator from New York. I am simply stating a fact, namely, that the clerk of the committee has instructions immediately to refer every bill which goes to the committee to the appropriate subcommittee. That has been the policy in the past, and it is going to be the policy in the future; and I do not want the Senator from New York to get on the floor and leave the impression that he has dragged some concession from the Senator from Mississippi, because he has not. What has happened in the past will happen in the future, namely, the clerk has instructions immediately to refer every bill; and that is going to prevail in the future as it has in the past; and no one has dragged any concession from the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say that I am sure that was not the intention of the Senator from New York. But he has requested assurance of what has, in fact, been the operation in the committee in the past in regard to the reference of bills to the appropriate subcommittees; and on that we have the word of the Senator from Nebraska, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee—and I trust him completely—that whenever a majority of the subcommittee seeks a hearing, one is held.

So I think the requests of the Senator from New York have been met.

Mr. EASTLAND. I repeat that the clerk of the committee has instructions to carry on in the future as he has in the past.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is all the Senator from New York wants to know; and no one is saying that anything has been dragged out of the Senator from Mississippi, but only that the policy which has been followed in the past will continue to be followed.

Mr. JAVITS. But the point that is missing is whether there will be a hearing on a bill which is referred. Let us assume that what has been stated will be done. I am not dragging any concession out of any Senator; that is not at all my purpose. We can just proceed to vote on this matter.

I appreciate the reluctance of the Senate to get into a rollcall vote at 10 minutes after 7 in the evening.

But the problem which is not covered is this: The statement which it is alleged the chairman of the subcommittee has made—he is absent at this time—is that if the sponsor of a civil rights measure—which is automatically referred, according to the practice of the committee, as explained by the Senator from Mississippi, to the subcommittee—requests a hearing, it is represented here that the chairman of the subcommittee will grant one. If that is going to continue to be the practice, I think we have to have that statement from some Senator who can make that statement of fact; and, in my judgment, the only Senators now present who can do that are either the majority leader—not that he has the direct authority, but I would be perfectly willing to accept that assurance from him—or the chairman of the committee; and all of us heard the statement that the chairman of the committee will not make such a statement; and the majority leader will decide as to precisely what he wishes to do. In the absence of that, I do not feel that in good conscience I can abandon the little struggle we have had here.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will allow me to do so, I will take that responsibility and will give him my assurance, and I do it on behalf of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I should like to point out that the Senator from New York stated that if the sponsor of the bill states to the chairman of the subcommittee that he wishes to have a hearing held on the bill, a hearing will be held on it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, no.

Mr. HRUSKA. But that is my understanding of what the Senator from New York said.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then he has changed his tune, because he said "a majority of the committee."

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes, that is my understanding. But the different statement does not coincide with what I heard stated. I did not hear the majority leader make such a statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I said "on the basis of a majority."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to make the matter crystal clear. It was represented that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin] said last year—and I regret his absence—that when a sponsor requested a hearing, he gave him one. I think I understand the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and the majority leader. If the assurance which the majority leader is willing to give is that when a sponsor requests a hearing, and if the request is approved by a majority of the subcommittee, a hearing will be held, I would only ask one other assurance, and that is the assurance that the question would be promptly submitted to the subcommittee.

If that is given, then I am perfectly content, and I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. On the subject of obtaining a hearing, there would be a majority vote of the subcommittee. I would not countenance any other course. I do not believe that any chairman of a subcommittee is so autocratical or dictatorial as to take action on his own. I would be willing to join the majority leader in such assurance.

Mr. JAVITS. And the request of the sponsor would be promptly submitted to the subcommittee?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am not chairman of the subcommittee. I could not do it.

Mr. JAVITS. That is just the point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We must trust our colleagues. There is not a committee to which I could go with a bill, the chairman of which committee would not grant me a hearing. What the committee would do for me on my measure it would do for other Senators on any other measure.

Mr. HRUSKA. At the request of a Senator who had introduced a bill that the bill be considered by the subcommittee and a vote taken, I am willing to give assurance that such a motion would be made. I do not know that it would be passed, but at least I would be willing to make the motion if no other Senator would.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I believe the Senator would agree that there has never been an occasion when a member of a subcommittee made a motion in the committee to take up a bill, the majority voted to take it up, and it was not taken up.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, unfortunately, we are speaking in the absence of the subcommittee chairman. I am perfectly willing to accept the assurance of the majority leader precisely as he stated it, that is, that if a sponsor of a bill referred to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights requests a hearing—and we have the statement that the practice in the past of automatic referral will continue—and if a majority of the subcommittee sustains that request, the Senator will get a hearing. That is all fine, provided that there is added to the statement that the question for the majority of the subcommittee will be promptly submitted to the subcommittee. It seems to me that is inherent in what we are talking about.

If the question is not submitted, the majority may never get an opportunity to decide whether it does or does not wish to grant a hearing. I know that the majority leader is not the chairman of the subcommittee, but I trust him completely. With the majority leader's assurance that he will use his best efforts to that effect, I shall withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I will make that promise.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 31), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 58 as amended would authorize the expenditure of $152,300 by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting through its Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to constitutional rights."

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Constitutional rights	$280,000	$231,119.92		
	140,000	113,940.26	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 53.
	140,000	117,179.66	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 260.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 58 was reduced $12,700, from $165,000 to $152,300.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

The purposes of the resolution are detailed in a letter from Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, to Senator James O. Eastland, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and letter of transmittal from Senator Eastland to Senator Mike Mansfield, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, are as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary.

Re Senate Resolution 58.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am enclosing the budget approved by the Committee on the Judiciary for work of the standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights for the period February 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964. The committee authorized reporting of an original resolution, Senate Resolution 58, to provide the amount of $165,000 for the work of the subcommittee during the period February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964.

Also enclosed for the information of the Committee on Rules and Administration in considering the resolution is a letter to me from the subcommittee chairman summarizing the proposed program for the subcommittee.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,
James O. Eastland,
Chairman.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights,
January 24, 1963.

Hon. James O. Eastland,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The members of the standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights have approved the following program and budget for the subcommittee during the 1st session of the 88th Congress. As subcommittee chairman, I should therefore like to submit these plans, with a draft resolution, for the consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The new resolution which we are submitting proposes a sum of $165,000 (an increase of $25,000 over the amount authorized last year) to cover legal, investigative, and administrative expenses anticipated by the subcommittee in its study of matters pertaining to constitutional rights during the period from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964.

It is my belief that the increased appropriation is amply justified in light of the salary increase given to Senate employees and the corresponding increase in the subcommittee's contribution to the various employees benefit programs, in light of the subcommittee's activities during the past year as described in our annual report, in view of our proposed agenda for this session, and the increasing work of the subcommittee.

During the first 6 months of the past year two lawyers were assigned to the subcommittee by the Richardson Foundation. These lawyers, in their congressional internship capacity, performed, for the most part, the duties of assistant staff counsel. The foundation discontinued this program in July and salaries for these two positions have since that time, been paid by the subcommittee.

During the last Congress, especially during the second session, the subcommittee found itself faced with an ever-increasing number of complaints, inquiries, and requests for information and assistance from other Members of Congress. Last year the subcommittee received over 2,500 actual complaints, an increase of 68 percent over the year before. In all over 10,000 pieces of correspondence left the subcommittee office during 1962.

Also during the past session the subcommittee conducted 16 days of public hearings to consider three bills concerning literacy tests; a bill to protect the rights of the mentally ill in the District of Columbia, the constitutional rights of the American Indian, and the constitutional rights of military personnel. In addition to these hearings, a number of staff conferences were held and field trips made by representatives of the subcommittee in furtherance of various studies.

The proposed agenda for this session includes studies of vital areas of constitutional law which stand in need of examination by Congress. At the present rate of expenses, the proposed budget should permit the subcommittee, in addition to dealing with legislation referred to it, to continue or initiate work on the following subjects:

(1) The constitutional rights of the American Indian.—The subcommittee began its study of this long-neglected area of law 2 years ago. The study will continue to encompass a review of laws and regulations affecting Indian citizens; the administration of law for Indians by Federal, State, and tribal governments; and the status of constitutional rights under the tribal court system. The subcommittee survey should be completed this year, and legislation in this area, already is contemplated.

(2) The constitutional rights of military personnel.—Thousands of complaints have been received and analyzed, and initial hearings have been completed on the subcommittee's study. In addition, staff conferences have been held with representatives of the various services, military personnel, attorneys specializing in military law, and innumerable other interested parties. The subcommittee's investigation continues to focus on the extent to which due process of law is being observed in the Armed Forces. Special emphasis is being given to the administration of the Uniform Code of Military Justice and to administrative discharge.

(3) The rights of the mentally ill.—Although the subcommittee's broad study of this area of the law has been completed, current developments are under constant review. During the last session several of the subcommittee members cosponsored legislation to better protect the rights of those alleged to be mentally ill in the District of Columbia. Although other pressing business of the Senate precluded our holding more than 1 day of hearings, legislation is being drafted for this session at which time further hearings are in order.

(4) Constitutional rights and the administration of criminal justice.—Preliminary work is continuing in an effort to determine how effectively constitutional rights are protected in Federal criminal trials. The study is concentrating on the operation of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, and deals with such problems as venue, bail, arrest and interrogation, double jeopardy, discovery procedures, and search and seizure.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal:					
Counsel and staff director	1	$8,040	$17,305.31	$1,442.10	$17,305.31
Minority counsel	1	6,720	14,823.08	1,235.25	14,823.08
Counsel	2	4,080	9,596.30	799.69	19,192.60
Assistant counsel	2	3,300	7,906.00	658.83	15,812.00
Editorial and research:					
Professional staff member	1	4,140	9,726.31	810.52	9,726.31
Do	2	3,720	8,816.15	734.67	17,632.30
Research assistant	2	2,220	5,565.59	463.79	11,131.18
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	3,720	8,816.15	734.67	8,816.15
Secretary	2	3,420	8,166.04	680.50	16,332.08
Do	2	2,280	5,695.63	474.64	11,391.26
Total					142,162.27
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86–382)					1,296.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					9,240.55
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					479.52
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					4,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					3,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					2,500.00
Stationery, office supplies					1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					700.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					500.00
Contingent					121.66
Total					22,837.73 142,162.37
Grand total					165,000.00

(5) Citizenship.—The rights, privileges, and duties of American citizenship and the issues arising through loss of citizenship and citizenship rights is another subject which the subcommittee is continuing to study.

(6) Right to counsel.—In addition to its continuing interest in and survey of the right to counsel in Federal criminal trials, the subcommittee is making an investigation of the right to counsel before various Federal agencies. This study, given impetus by several complaints, includes both direct and indirect restrictions on this basic right by regulatory agencies.

In all of these areas, it is the subcommittee's intention to determine the need for remedial legislation and to recommend it where necessary, to further protect constitutional guarantees. In view of the importance to every citizen of the subcommittee's work on these problems, I request on behalf of the subcommittee that our program and budget for 1963 be approved.

With all kind wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
Sam J. Ervin, Jr.,
Chairman.

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 58, $165,000.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $152,300.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 58), as amended, was agreed to.

GOVERNMENT CHARTERS, HOLIDAYS, AND CELEBRATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 31, Senate Resolution 59.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 59) to consider matters pertaining to Government charters, holidays, and celebrations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 1, line 9, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$7,500" and insert "$7,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to consider all matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $7,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report—No. 32—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 59 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $7,000 by the Committee on the Judiciary from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, for the consideration of all matters pertaining to Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations. The funds would be utilized to provide the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations with required clerical assistance.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Federal charters, holidays, and celebrations	$15,000	$12,011.83		
	7,500 7,500	6,202.20 5,809.63	Feb. 13, 1961 Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 75. S. Res. 261.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Commission on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 59 was reduced $500, from $7,500 to $7,000.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

The purposes of the resolution are specified in a letter from Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, to Senator James O. Eastland, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and letter of transmittal from Senator Eastland to Senator Mike Mansfield, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, are as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
January 24, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 59.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am enclosing copy of an original resolution for the standing Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, which today was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary.

During the 1st session of the 87th Congress, Senate Resolution 75, agreed to February 13, 1961, appropriated the sum of $7,500 for the operation of this subcommittee due to the fact that the number of legislative proposals referred had increased to such an extent that the activities of this subcommittee required the services of a clerical assistant. The Committee on the Judiciary, therefore, approved the sum of $7,500 in order to afford one clerical assistant.

In the 2d session of the 87th Congress, Senate Resolution 261, agreed to by the Senate on February 7, 1962, granted the sum of $7,500 for the activities of the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, for that session.

The committee has decided that it is necessary to provide the same sum to this subcommittee in order to afford a clerical assistant to assist the subcommittee during the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

I believe it most appropriate that this resolution to provide modest funds for the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, should be approved by the Senate at an early date.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
James O. Eastland,
Chairman.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
January 24, 1963.

Hon. James O. Eastland,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: During the 2d session of the 87th Congress, Senate Resolution 261, agreed to February 7, 1962, appropriated the sum of $7,500 for the operation of the standing Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations.

On the basis of the subcommittee's activities of the past year, I urge favorable consideration of an original resolution appropriating $7,500 for the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, for the 1st session of the 88th Congress. I deem it most appropriate that this resolution be speedily approved.

With kindest regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
Everett McKinley Dirksen.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Administrative and clerical: Clerk	1	$2,700	$6,605.79	$550.48	$6,605.79
Total	1				6,605.79
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					47.28
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					429.78
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					22.80
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					394.65
Total					894.21
Grand total					7,500.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 59, $7,500.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $7,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY AND EXAMINATION OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 32, Senate Resolution 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 61) to study and examine the Federal judicial system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 4, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$92,200"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a study and examination of the administration, practice and procedures of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Federal courts in the just and expeditious adjudication of the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis professional, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of departments and agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $92,200, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 33—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 61 as amended would authorize the Committee on the Judiciary to expend not to exceed $92,200 from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to conduct a study and examination of the administration, practice, and procedures of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Federal courts in the just and expeditious adjudication of the cases, controversies, and other matters which may be brought before them.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Federal judicial system	$190,000.00	$102,740.96		
	100,000.00	56,022.87	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 56.
	90,000.00	46,718.09	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 262.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis: A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance.

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 61 was reduced $7,800, from $100,000 to $92,200.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

Additional information relative to the proposed inquiry is contained in a letter to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, transmitting a letter from Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, which letters (with accompanying budget) are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 24, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 61.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on the Judiciary today ordered reported an original resolution authorizing funds for the operation of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, which is conducting a study of the Federal judicial system. This resolution proposes that the amount of $100,000 be allocated for the conduct of business for the budget period 1963–64.

The types of studies being conducted by this subcommittee have been of great value in producing results of a beneficial nature to the Federal courts in the problems confronting them. The Committee on the Judiciary is in agreement with the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, that the studies and inquiries should be continued. A letter to me from him outlining the proposed areas of concentration for this session is enclosed for your information.

Also, for your further information and consideration, please find enclosed copies of the proposed resolution and budget request for 1963–64. It is sincerely hoped that these

requests will meet with your approval and that of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMPROVEMENTS IN JUDICIAL MACHINERY,
January 21, 1963.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery presents herewith the attached budget and the proposed resolution requesting the sum of $100,000 for the study and examination of the administration, practice, and procedures of the Federal judicial system with a view to determining the legislation, if any, which may be necessary or desirable in order to increase the efficiency of the Federal courts in the conduct of business brought before them.

The subcommittee during 1962 had 30 legislative bills pending before it dealing with the various phases of judicial administration and procedures of the Federal courts; 11 of these bills were reported by the subcommittee, and 19 were undisposed of at the end of the session. Two days of intensive hearings were held on one of the bills reported, whereat members of the judiciary appeared and offered their views as to the merit of the legislation.

The various judicial circuits have issued invitations to the members and staff of the subcommittee to visit these circuits to obtain from the judges firsthand information as to the needs of their courts. Such field studies have been initiated and others are planned for the near future. The quality of information received and the enthusiastic cooperation of the judges and court personnel have made this method of inquiry most effective.

The judicial conferences and committees have been most helpful in assisting the subcommittee in its efforts and staff representatives have participated in several meetings of these groups during the past year.

By reason of careful handling of funds, certain unanticipated savings in staff expenses and vacancies, the subcommittee has not expended the full amount appropriated last year, and the sum of approximately $40,000 will be returned to the contingent fund of the Senate at the expiration of Senate Resolution 262, on January 31, 1963.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Committee on the Judiciary act favorably on this budget request of $100,000 for 1963–64.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel	1	$8,040	$17,305.31	$1,442.10	$17,305.31
Assistant counsel	1	7,380	16,064.19	1,338.68	16,064.19
Investigator	2	4,140	9,726.31	810.52	19,452.62
Minority counsel	1	7,260	15,838.54	1,319.87	15,838.54
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	3,420	8,166.04	680.50	8,166.04
Stenographer	2	2,280	5,695.63	474.63	11,391.26
Total	8				88,217.96
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					375.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					5,727.02
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					221.40
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					3,000.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					1,000.00
Witness fees, expenses					300.00
Stationery, office supplies					400.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					400.00
Contingent fund					358.62
Total					11,423.42
Grand total					100,000.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 61, $100,000.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $92,200.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, Senate Resolution 60.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 60) to study matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$135,000" and insert "$124,200"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $124,200, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Calendar No. 34, Senate Resolution 62, was agreed to earlier today.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 35, Senate Resolution 63.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 63) to investigate juvenile delinquency.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, is this the resolution relating to a Committee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I withdraw that resolution for a moment. We will take up some other resolutions so that we may move along a little more rapidly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 36, Senate Resolution 64.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 64) to investigate national penitentiaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and inspect national penitentiaries.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 37), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 64 as amended would continue until January 31, 1964, the study being made of national penitentiaries by the Committee on the Judiciary, and authorize expenditures in the amount of $5,000 therefor.

The investigative authority contained in the resolution was amended to conform to the 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963, being stipulated for all resolutions of this type.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: National penitentiaries	$10,000	$1,023.50		
	5,000 5,000	 1,023.50	Jan. 31, 1961 Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 57. S. Res. 266.

The purposes of the resolution are more fully stated in a letter to Senator Mike Mansfield, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, from Senator James O. Eastland, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) is as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
January 25, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 64.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Mansfield: I am enclosing a copy of an original resolution and a budget for the standing Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, which has been approved by the committee.

The standing Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries has been in existence since the 80th Congress. While its needs have always been modest, as is shown by the fact that appropriations for it have ranged between $5,000 and $8,600 during its existence, its effectiveness in building morale among inmates and administrative personnel in our Federal penal institutions has been considerable. The subcommittee affords the personnel of our Federal penal institutions an opportunity to bring their problems in regard to discipline, food, health, and recreation for inmates directly to the attention of the Senate. It further provides Members of the Senate an opportunity to speak directly to inmates and to hear any grievances which the inmates may feel they have. The subcommittee believes that this has been a factor in deterring riots, attempted escapes, and the like, as it provides a real opportunity for inmates to tell their stories to an outside observer. It is gratifying to the subcommittee that since its establishment no serious riot has occurred at any Federal penal institution.

The subcommittee has incurred no expenditures for staff personnel during the past session, and the proposed budget which is submitted for the present session does not anticipate any expenditures for staff. The modest appropriation which has been recommended by the committee is designed to provide only for travel, hearings including reporters' fees, witnesses' fees, and incidental expenses.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
James O. Eastland,
Chairman.

Budget

Staff expenses	None
Administrative:	
Travel	$3,500
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)	1,000
Witnesses' fees, expenses, communications, supplies, incidental expenses	500
Total expenses	5,000

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 64, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

EXAMINATION AND REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE PATENT OFFICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 37, Senate Resolution 65.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 65) to examine and review the administration of the Patent Office.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, line 11, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$115,800"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $115,800, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report—No. 38—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 65 as amended would authorize the expenditure of $115,800 by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting through its Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964—"to conduct a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and a complete examination and review of the statutes relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights."

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorization are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Patents, trademarks, copyrights	$255,000.00	$155,523.14		
	135,000.00 120,000.00	84,087.42 71,435.72	Jan. 31, 1961 Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 55. S. Res. 267.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month, through February 28, 1963, the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis: "A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 65 was reduced $9,200, from $125,000 to $115,800.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

Additional information relative to the purposes of the resolution is contained in a letter from Senator John L. McClellan, chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, to Senator James O. Eastland, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and letter of transmittal from Senator Eastland to Senator Mike Mansfield, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, are as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
January 23, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 65.

Hon. Mike Mansfield,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am enclosing the budget which was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary at its meeting on Thursday, January 24, 1963, for the work of the standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights.

The committee authorized the reporting to the Senate of an original resolution (S. Res. 65) to provide the amount of $125,000 for the work of the subcommittee for the period from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964.

The program of the subcommittee is fully set for in a letter to me from Hon. John L. McClellan, chairman of the subcommittee. I am forwarding this letter to you, herewith, with the proposed budget, for the information of the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration at its forthcoming meeting.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely,
James O. Eastland,
Chairman.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Subcommittee on Patents,
Trademarks, and Copyrights,
January 23, 1963.

Hon. James O. Eastland,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: During the 2d session of the 87th Congress, Senate Resolution 267, agreed to February 7, 1962, appropriated the sum of $120,000 for the operation of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights for the examination and review of the administration of the Patent Office and the laws relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights. Upon the basis of the work of the subcommittee in 1962, and planned operations for 1963, I urge the appropriation of $125,000 to continue the subcommittee during the period February 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964.

One of the most important matters presently under consideration by the subcommittee is legislation to establish a uniform Government patent policy. The need for a decision by the Congress as to the nature of a Government patent policy is made clear by the rapid rise of research expenditures by the various Federal agencies. A recent survey by the National Science Foundation discloses that the Federal Government plans to obligate $14.7 billion for research and development during the 1963 fiscal year. This is an increase of $3.5 billion—or 31 percent—over the $11.2 billion spent for the same purpose during fiscal 1962. Of the $14.7 billion to be obligated for research and development in fiscal 1963, $7.4 billion (estimate), will go to the Department of Defense—an agency which has no statutory policy for the disposition of rights in the inventions arising from such expenditures. The subcommittee has carefully considered a number of proposals as to a uniform patent policy and hopes to report during the first session of the present Congress, legislation to establish a uniform policy which will both protect the public interest and be equitable to Government contractors.

The subcommittee in recent years has had occasion to view with concern the critical situation facing the U.S. Patent Office. During the past year the subcommittee published the Patent Office Management Survey, which makes recommendations to improve Patent Office procedures in many areas previously studied by this subcommittee.

Another subject which currently is occupying the attention of the subcommittee is the question of whether Patent Office fees are adequate in relation to the current expenses of the Office. While the operating costs of the Patent Office have substantially increased in the past decade, and show promise of continued increase in the future, the basic fees of the Patent Office have not been changed since 1932. During the 2d session of the 87th Congress, the subcommittee favorably reported legislation to revise the fee structure of the Patent Office and it is anticipated that similar legislation will be considered during the current session of the Congress.

Progress was made during 1962 on preliminary measures leading to a general revision of the copyright laws. It is anticipated that during the 88th Congress the subcommittee will devote considerable attention to study and hearings on copyright revision legislation.

The subcommittee also is engaged in investigating the practical effects of the patent contracting practices of the various Government departments and agencies and whether inventions and technical information arising out of Government-financed research are being reported in all areas. In addition, the subcommittee is considering an investigation to determine whether additional legislation is required to protect inventors from misleading advertising by unqualified and/or

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Chief counsel	1	$8,040	$17,305.31	$1,442.10	$17,305.31
Special counsel	1	8,040	17,305.31	1,442.10	17,305.31
Assistant counsel	1	5,700	12,904.99	1,057.41	12,904.99
Do	1	4,680	10,888.64	907.38	10,888.64
Do	1	3,360	8,036.03	669.66	8,036.03
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	5,880	13,243.46	1,103.62	13,243.46
Assistant clerk	1	3,360	8,036.03	669.66	8,036.03
Secretary	2	3,120	7,515.94	626.32	15,031.88
Total	9				102,751.65
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					730.08
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					6,678.85
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					349.92
Reimbursable payments to agencies					2,000.00
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					4,500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					4,500.00
Witness fees, expenses					1,500.00
Stationery, office supplies					500.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					200.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					300.00
Contingent fund					989.50
Total					22,248.35
Grand total					125,000.00

unscrupulous persons who seek to exploit the development of their inventions. The subcommittee also has other miscellaneous patent, trademark, and copyright matters under consideration and study.

By reason of careful handling of funds and certain vacancies on the staff, the subcommittee has not expended the full amount appropriated during the 2d session of the 87th Congress, and the sum of approximately $42,000 will, at the expiration of the resolution on January 31, 1963, be returned to the contingent fund of the Senate. Accompanying this letter is a report of the subcommittee's expenditures for the period February 1, 1962, through January 31, 1963.

A copy of the annual report of the subcommittee will be made available to anyone who is interested in a more detailed account of the subcommittee's work during the past year. On behalf of the subcommittee, I urge approval of the attached budget.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Subcommittee Chairman.

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 65, $125,000.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $115,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS CREATED BY FLOW OF ESCAPEES AND REFUGEES FROM COMMUNISTIC TYRANNY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 38, Senate Resolution 66.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 66) to investigate problems created by flow of escapees and refugees from Communistic tyranny.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 1, line 11, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$87,500" and insert "$81,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate. and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the problems created by the flow of escapees and refugees from Communist tyranny.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ on a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $81,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate by vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 39), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 66 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $81,000 by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting through its Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, to continue from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, its inquiry into difficulties created by the flow of refugees and escapees from Communist tyranny.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962.

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Refugees and escapees	$137,500.00	$104,954.58		
	50,000	37,539.79	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 50.
	75,000 12,500	67,414.79	Feb. 22, 1962 Oct. 2, 1962	S. Res. 293. S. Res. 406.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis:

"A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance."

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 66 was reduced $6,500, from $87,500 to $81,000.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

The purposes of the resolution are more fully stated in a letter from Senator PHILIP A. HART, chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and letter of transmittal from Senator EASTLAND to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, is as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 25, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 66.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: I am enclosing the budget which was approved by the Committee on the Judiciary at its meeting on January 24, 1963, for the work of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees.

The committee authorized the reporting to the Senate of an original resolution, Senate Resolution 66, to provide the amount of $87,500 for the work of the subcommittee from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964.

The program of the subcommittee is fully set forth in a letter to me from Hon. PHILIP A. HART, chairman of the subcommittee. I am forwarding this letter to you herewith with the proposed budget for the information of the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration at its forthcoming meeting.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH ESCAPEES AND REFUGEES,
January 23, 1963.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is the recommended budget for the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees for the period beginning February 1, 1963, and extending through January 31, 1964, and also a suggested draft of the new resolution for the subcommittee. The suggested language of this draft is identical with the current resolution.

The subcommittee continues to approach its work with the firm conviction that the moral and political considerations attending the refugee problems, make it incumbent upon the United States to help ameliorate these problems and seek out a reasonable solution. A major portion of the subcommittee's work during the past year has concerned the Cuban refugee problem in this country. Considerable attention was also given to the Chinese refugee problem in Hong Kong and Macao, and the operations of the U.S. escapee program.

A full statement of these activities and those planned for the coming year is included in the subcommittee's annual report. A special report on the Chinese refugee problem is in preparation. It is my belief that the subcommittee's work provides useful information to the American people, but especially to the members of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate in their consideration of legislative matters pertaining to refugee problems.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP A. HART,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
General counsel or staff director	1	$8,040	$17,305.31	$1,442.10	$17,305.31
Chief counsel	1	7,260	15,838.54	1,319.87	15,838.54
Assistant chief counsel	1	7,260	15,838.54	1,319.87	15,838.54
Editorial and research: Research director	1	4,620	10,764.52	897.04	10,764.52
Administrative and clerical:					
Chief clerk	1	3,480	8,296.07	691.33	8,296.07
Assistant clerk (record)	1	2,100	5,305.58	442.13	5,305.58
Total					73,348.56
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					392.16
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					4,767.66
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					258.24
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					2,500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					1,500.00
Witness fees, expenses					2,500.00
Stationery, office supplies					1,000.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					800.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					300.00
Contingent fund					133.38
Total					14,151.44
Grand total					87,500.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 66, $87,500.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $81,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

STUDY OF REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF STATUTES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 39, Senate Resolution 67.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 67) to study revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 1, line 10, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$27,700"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That if more than one counsel is employed, the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $27,700, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 40), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 67 as amended would authorize the expenditure of $27,700 by the Committee on the Judiciary, through its Subcommittee on Revision and Codification, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962:

Committee and purpose	87th Congress			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Revision and codification (U.S. Statutes)	$52,000	$12,494.88		
	26,000	5,786.96	Jan. 31, 1961	S. Res. 54.
	26,000	6,707.92	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 257.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis: A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance.

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 67 was reduced $2,300, from $30,000 to $27,700.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

The purposes of the resolution are more fully detailed in a letter from Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., chairman of the Subcommittee on Revision and Codification, to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and letter of transmittal from Senator EASTLAND to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 25, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 67.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am enclosing the budget approved by the Committee on the Judiciary for work of the standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification for the period February 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964. The committee authorized reporting of an original resolution, Senate Resolution 67, to provide the amount of $30,000 for the work of the subcommittee during the period February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964. The amount agreed to is $4,000 in addition to the amount approved last year. This is requested primarily to take care of the pay raises in the recent pay bill.

Also enclosed for the information of the Committee on Rules and Administration in considering the resolution is a letter to me from the subcommittee chairman summarizing the proposed program for the subcommittee.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 19, 1963.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The standing Subcommittee on Revision and Codification has approved the following program and budget for the subcommittee's activities during the 1st session of the 88th Congress. As chairman of the subcommittee I take pleasure in submitting these plans for the draft resolution for the favorable consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution for the 1st session of the 88th Congress which is being submitted for the proposed budget of $30,000 to cover legal and administrative expenses anticipated by the subcommittee during the period February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, is enclosed. The amount set forth is $4,000 in excess of the subcommittee budget for the 2d session of the 87th Congress. This increase is primarily made in order to take care of the various pay raises and contributions necessitated by the passing of the pay raise bill in the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

During the 2d session of the 87th Congress revision and codification matters were referred to the subcommittee from the House of Representatives. All bills referred to the subcommittee were processed and referred to the Senate. They eventually were enacted and became public laws. These bills were as follows:

H.R. 10431: To revise, codify, and enact title 37 of the United States Code, entitled, "Pay and Allowances of the Uniformed Services." Passed by the Senate on August 20, 1962, and signed by the President on September 7, 1962. Public Law 87–649.

H.R. 10432: To amend title 39, United States Code, to codify certain recent public laws relating to the postal service and to improve the code. Passed by the Senate on August 20, 1962, and signed by the President on September 7, 1962. Public Law 87–646.

H.R. 10433: To amend title 10, United States Code, to codify recent military laws, and to improve the code. Passed by the Senate on August 20, 1962. Signed by the President on September 7, 1962. Public Law 87–651.

H.R. 10931: To revise and codify the general and permanent laws relating to and in force in the Canal Zone and to enact the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes. Passed by the Senate on August 20, 1962. Signed by the President on October 18, 1962. Public Law 87–845.

Although the subcommittee budget for the 2d session of the 87th Congress was $26,000, there was only expended in the work of the subcommittee in processing all of the above bills, less than $9,000. It is anticipated that on January 31, 1963, there will be returned to the contingent fund of the Senate approximately $17,000.

The subcommittee is enabled to return such a substantial portion of its appropriation for last year simply because the subcommittee did not have a subcommittee counsel during most of the year, and the chairman of the subcommittee neglected other important matters in order to do a portion of the work which would otherwise be done by the counsel himself, and called upon overworked members of the full Judiciary Committee staff and his own personal staff to assist him in so doing. The subcommittee has now employed a counsel because of its conviction that it is unwise for the chairman to neglect other matters to do work properly belonging to the office of counsel, and because it is unjust for the chairman to ask overworked members of the full Judiciary Committee or his own personal staff to do such work, and because the work of codification of the laws is most exacting in nature and requires the services of a highly expert legal craftsman.

As you are aware, various titles of the United States Code have been codified in previous Congresses and an examination of the titles of the code will reveal the great importance of these codifications. It is anticipated that before the work of the subcommittee is completed that all of the titles of the United States Code will be codified as well as other special revisions and codifications.

It is impossible to overmagnify the importance of the codification bills handled by the subcommittee. These bills bring together under proper titles and categories the laws enacted in times past by the Congress, and require the checking and rechecking of the prior laws in their original form as well as in subsequent codifications. When codification bills are enacted and approved they become law instead of prima facie evidence of the law. For this reason, it is absolutely essential that they be accurate in all details—a thing which necessitates most exacting labor.

This work is so detailed that it oftentimes takes 3 or 4 years to codify a particular title. It can readily be seen that a project of this magnitude must carry a cutoff date for the laws which are to be taken care of by a so-called cleanup bill. The element of time then enters into the picture for the reason that when the bill has received approval of the House and has been sent to the Senate it almost of necessity must be passed in that Congress or the entire work on that legislation is for naught and must be commenced again in the next succeeding Congress. This causes a great deal of waste in the matter of time and expense. It also means that a great amount of work must be taken on faith because without a staff the Committee on the Judiciary does not have the facilities to recheck 4 or 5 years of work within a single session. When this is realized, it becomes apparent why a staff for this most important legislative function be provided for this subcommittee.

The subcommittee anticipates that during this session of the Congress several codifications will be referred to the subcommittee, and will probably include the following:

Part II of the District of Columbia Code;

The Uniform Commercial Code in the District of Columbia; and

Title 5 of the United States Code.

With all kind wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Revision and Codification.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative: Chief counsel and staff director	1	$8,040	$17,305.31	$1,442.10	$17,305.31
Administrative and clerical: Stenographer	1	3,600	8,556.11	713.00	8,556.11
Total					25,861.42
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86–382, effective July 1, 1960)					162.24
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					1,680.99
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					87.48
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					840.69
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					819.22
Witness fees, expenses					150.00
Stationery, office supplies					100.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					100.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					50.00
Contingent fund					147.96
Total					4,138.58
Grand total					30,000.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 67, $30,000.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $27,700.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 40, Senate Resolution 68.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 68) to investigate the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 1, line 11, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 19, after the word "exceed", to

strike out "$60,000" and insert "$55,400"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to conduct a further examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, and consider proposed legislation affecting said Acts.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; and (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $55,400, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 41), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 68 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $55,400 to enable the Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act of the Committee on the Judiciary from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to conduct hearings, conferences, and discussions and to reach areas of agreement in various matters with the executive branch.

The following table indicates funds authorized by the Senate during the 87th Congress for the same purpose. Committee expenditures pursuant to such authorizations are shown through December 31, 1962:

Committee and purpose	87th Cong.			
	Amount		Date	Authority
	Authorized	Expended		
Judiciary: Trading With the Enemy Act	$90,000.00	$71,756.92		
	45,000.00	38,202.31	Feb. 13, 1961	S. Res. 60.
	45,000.00	33,554.61	Feb. 7, 1962	S. Res. 268.

Due to the delay in the organization of the Senate and in order that its subcommittees could meet their February payrolls, the Senate on February 19, 1963, approved Senate Resolution 88, which continued for 1 month—through February 28, 1963—the investigative and expenditure authorizations granted to Senate committees during the 87th Congress, 2d session, and in certain instances provided additional funds for the purpose.

Since most of the resolutions which would authorize inquiries and investigations during the present session had already been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration prior to the adoption of Senate Resolution 88, and consequently were on a 12-month basis, the committee at its meeting on February 27, 1963, adopted the following formula to reduce each such request to an 11-month basis: A reduction by one-twelfth of that portion of the total request representing salaries and agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance.

On this basis the expenditure authorization contained in Senate Resolution 68 was reduced $4,600, from $60,000 to $55,400.

The investigative authority was correspondingly reduced to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963.

Additional information relative to Senate Resolution 68 is set forth in a letter from Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, chairman of the subcommittee, to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, which letter (with accompanying budget) and Senator EASTLAND's letter of transmittal to Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, former chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, are as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
January 24, 1963.

Re Senate Resolution 68.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on the Judiciary today ordered reported an original resolution providing funds for a continuation of the study, examination, and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act and the War Claims Act of 1948.

This work has been carried on since the 2d session of the 82d Congress by the Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act. Under the provisions of Senate Resolution 268, agreed to February 7, 1962, the authority for the study will expire on January 31, 1963. The new resolution proposes a budget of $60,000 for the period ending January 31, 1964. The reasons for the request are detailed in the attached letter from the chairman of the subcommittee.

The subcommittee's work has greatly increased due to the enactment last year of various comprehensive amendments to both the Trading With the Enemy Act and the War Claims Act of 1948.

With respect to the amendments to the War Claims Act, an entirely new and broad program was inaugurated for the payment of the claims of American citizens for losses suffered during World War II. An estimated 35,000 claimants are involved, with claims approximating $300 million. In the interest of these many claimants and the amount of funds involved it is extremely important that the subcommittee closely watch this new program.

Amendments were adopted last year to the Trading With the Enemy Act which (1) permit the sale of General Aniline & Film Corp.; (2) authorize the use of $500,000 of the vested assets funds in the rehabilitation and resettlement in the United States of certain persecutees; (3) divest to the former individual owner certain properties now held by the Attorney General; and (4) close out the administration of vested assets consisting of copyrights, trademarks, and motion picture film.

All of these new programs will require additional review and examination by the subcommittee. Particularly with reference to the authority to sell General Aniline, the committee wants to be kept currently apprised of all developments in the sale and the settlement of the litigation. A sale of the asset could eventualy increase the war claims fund, or it could create a substantial liability on the American taxpayers should the Swiss prevail in their suit and the courts determine a fair market price to be in excess of the sale price. The chairman of the subcommittee assures me that he is to be kept advised by the Attorney General on all aspects of this case.

In addition to the letter from the chairman of the subcommittee, there is enclosed for your information the proposed budget for the coming year. It is sincerely hoped that these requests will meet with the approval of your committee.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON THE
JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON
TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT,
January 15, 1963.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: The examinations and reviews assigned to be performed by the Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy Act have been successively continued from the 2d session of the 82d Congress until January 31, 1963. For the period covered by Senate Resolution 268, which expires January 31, 1963, $45,000 was authorized, of which approximately $7,000 will be returned as unexpended balance. A new resolution proposing that the work of the subcommittee continue until January 31, 1963, would authorize the expenditure of $60,000.

Under the authority of our resolution the subcommittee is concerned with the operation of the War Claims Act of 1948, as administered by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States. In this respect, the responsibilities of the Commission—and thus of the subcommittee—have greatly increased following the enactment in the last session of the 87th Congress of amendments to the War Claims Act. These amendments are the first comprehensive legislation dealing with the claims of American citizens arising out of World War II. It is estimated that some 35,000 American citizens hold claims coming under the provisions of these amendments. It is further estimated that approximately $300 million will be required in the payment of the claims.

Many of the amendments added to the War Claims Act last year did not have the benefit of committee study or recommendation; consequently, the subcommittee should watch very carefully the effect of these amendments on the war claims fund and on the claims of our citizens. It has already been necessary to pass corrective legislation because of the inadequacy of one of the adopted amendments which was offered from the floor.

When the amendments were adopted to the War Claims Act last year, the Committee on Conference recommended that the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission make a study to arrive at an estimate of the amount of claims that would be involved in legislation to include late nationals as eligible claimants for war damages. The subcommittee will want to follow this study in considering new amendments to embrace this group of claimants.

The Commission has not received an appropriation for the newly authorized claims program, but such an appropriation is expected this session. Presently the Commission is in the process of formulating rules and procedures for the handling of the claims. It is extremely important that the subcommittee watch this operation in the interest of the Congress and the numerous American citizens involved.

It should be pointed out that the war claims amendments enacted last year carry no directive or authority for the Commission to report to the Congress on its activities under the new program. In view of this, it is all the more important for the subcommittee to currently review and examine the Commission's operation under the new amendments.

The subcommittee will observe the new procedures, conduct inquiries, and study individual claims to determine whether the handling of the claims is in accordance with the intent of the Congress. The subcommittee is presently drafting legislation to provide judicial review of the Commission's decisions, since under present procedure there is no appeal.

The subcommittee is charged with the examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act, which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice. This act is concerned with the blocking, vesting, and liquidation of assets seized from our enemies during and after World War II.

The review and investigative work of the subcommittee has tremendously increased with the enactment of several amendments to the Trading With the Enemy Act during the previous session of the Congress. One such amendment which places additional responsibility on the subcommittee is the provision authorizing a sale of the General Aniline & Film Corp., the largest single vested asset, valued at approximately $200 million. Title to this asset has been in litigation for a number of years and the new amendment could conceivably add more years to the case. In any event—sale or further litigation—there is urgent necessity for the Congress to be kept currently advised of all developments concerning this valuable asset in which every taxpayer of the country has an interest.

This corporation, presently valued at approximately $200 million, continues to expand and develop new products. For the first 9 months of 1962 sales amounted to $135,034,000, an increase of 11.5 percent over the first 9 months of 1961. Net income for the first 9 months amounted to $6,754,000, or 57.1 percent higher than the same period in 1961.

The interest of our Government in General Aniline belongs to every taxpayer of our country. Furthermore, there is a potential liability if Interhandel subsequently prevails in their suit and a fair market value is determined by the courts which exceeds the sale price received by the Attorney General.

Because of these considerations and the amount of money involved, it is most important that the subcommittee continue to watch closely the activities and developments. Following the enactment of the sale amendment, I requested that the Attorney General keep me advised of all developments in the General Aniline case. I have received the Attorney General's reply in which he assured me that the subcommittee would be fully informed in this matter.

Another amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act adopted last year authorizes the use of $500,000 of the vested assets funds by designated organizations in the rehabilitation and resettlement of persecuted persons. The subcommittee will need to observe the operation of this new program, which is administered by the Department of Justice.

Further amendments to the Trading With the Enemy Act accepted last year authorize the divestiture of certain rights and interests of individuals in estates, trusts, insurance policies, annuities, remainders, pensions, workmen's compensation, and veterans' benefits vested under this act after December 17, 1941, which have not vested in possession or become payable to the Attorney General prior to December 31, 1961. A number of individual claimants are affected by this amendment and it is the subcommittee's intention to follow closely the policies and procedures for carrying out the divestiture.

Still further new amendments authorize the divestiture of certain interests in copyrights and trademarks which were vested by the Attorney General. The purpose of these amendments is to close out this phase of the work of the Department since the revenue from the properties is steadily decreasing and would eventually be below the cost of administering the program. The subcommittee will maintain close contact with the closing out of this operation.

In addition to the new legislation, the Department has pending several suits involving the Trading With the Enemy Act. Further, the Department is charged with the blocking and administering of property in the United States owned by the governments or nationals of Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania.

No extensive hearings are planned by the subcommittee at this time. However, it is felt that some executive hearings may be necessary in order to have the benefit of the agencies' feelings on the operation of the new programs and on some suggested legislation.

In conducting this work, the subcommittee seeks the assistance of a counsel, minority counsel, clerk, assistant clerk, and a stenographer.

It has always been my policy to operate as economically as possible, and I can assure you that I will continue to do so. I trust the committee will act favorably on our budget request for $60,000 for the coming year.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Olin D. Johnston,
Chairman.

Budget

Position	Number	Base salary (per annum)	Gross salary (per annum)	Monthly salary (gross)	Total for period of budget (gross)
STAFF					
Legal and investigative:					
Counsel	1	$8,040	$17,305.31	$1,442.10	$17,305.31
Special counsel (minority)	1	7,200	15,725.71	1,310.47	15,725.71
Administrative and clerical:					
Clerk	1	3,420	8,166.04	680.50	8,166.04
Assistant clerk	1	1,920	4,915.49	409.62	4,915.49
Stenographer	1	2,640	6,475.75	539.64	6,475.75
Total	5				52,588.30
ADMINISTRATIVE					
Contribution to employees health benefit programs (Public Law 86-382, effective July 1, 1960)					200.00
Contribution to civil service retirement fund (6½ percent of total salaries paid)					3,418.24
Contribution to employees Federal employees group life insurance (27 cents per month per $1,000 coverage)					178.20
Travel (inclusive of field investigations)					500.00
Hearings (inclusive of reporters' fees)					500.00
Witness fees, expenses					100.00
Stationery, office supplies					400.00
Communications (telephone, telegraph)					300.00
Newspapers, magazines, documents					50.00
Contingent fund					1,765.26
Total					7,411.70
Grand total					60,000.00

Funds requested, Senate Resolution 68, $60,000.

Funds approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, $55,400.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, am I correct in saying that this is a subcommittee which was supposed to conclude its work last year?

Mr. JOHNSTON. We hoped to conclude our work last year, but I will state what happened. A bill which was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary would give a right to adjudicate all claims. There was a challenge. They did not merely adjudicate, but put in facts of other claims which were at the time under consideration, such as selling General Aniline, which was estimated to be worth approximately $200 million. That being so, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] asked that a staff member representing the minority be appointed to the committee to help keep the committee behind it and to see that the investigation was carried out, and also to straighten out some of the laws that were passed last year concerning which some mistakes were made. For that reason a little extra appropriation was made in order to bring to the committee an employee representing the minority,

Mr. ELLENDER. Since this committee was to complete its work last year, and since it submitted to the Senate recommendations, are we to understand that until the Senate acts the committee will remain active?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think we shall have to be certain somebody is watching this matter. The Senator will see in the newspapers and in some of the columns before long a great deal about this particular transaction.

Personally, I do not think the Senate wants to turn it absolutely loose at this time. I do not know whether work will be completed this year or next year. I cannot say exactly. The Senator could ask the Department of Justice about that. That Department probably could tell us more.

I hope we can complete the work this year. We hoped to get it done last year. We would have finished, so far as we were concerned, if they had left out General Aniline & Film and also adjudicated the claim and brought it back for approval.

I think both the Democrats and Republicans on the committee will support me unanimously in that statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 68), as amended, was agreed to.

FUNDS FOR ADDITIONAL STAFF FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 41.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 95) to provide funds for additional staff for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report—No. 42—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

This resolution would authorize the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, seven additional professional staff members, and nine additional clerical assistants, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 95) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to employ one additional assistant chief clerk, seven additional professional staff members, and nine additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202(e), as amended, by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO STUDY MATTERS PERTAINING TO MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 42.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 22) authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to examine, investigate, and study matters pertaining to migratory labor which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration without additional amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 22).

The amendments of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are as follows:

On page 2, line 9, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$68,750"; so as to make the resolution read:

"*Resolved,* That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to migratory labor including, but not limited to, such problems as (a) the wages of migratory workers, their working conditions, transportation facilities, housing, health, and educational opportunities for migrants and their children, (b) the nature of and the relationships between the programs of the Federal Government and the programs of State and local governments and the activities of private organizations dealing with the problems of migratory workers and (c) the degree of additional Federal action necessary in this area.

"Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

"Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

"Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $68,750, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report—No. 43—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 22 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $68,750 by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to migratory labor including, but not limited to, such problems as (a) the wages of migratory workers, their working conditions, transportation facilities, housing, health, and educational opportunities for migrants and their children; (b) the nature of and the relationships between the programs of the Federal Government and the programs of State and local governments and the activities of private organizations dealing with the problems of migratory workers; and (c) the degree of additional Federal action necessary in this area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 22), as amended, was agreed to.

CLERICAL ASSISTANCE FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 43.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 20) authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ additional clerical assistance which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 20) which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is as follows:

In line 2, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to employ one additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 44—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 20, as amended, would authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to continue through January 31, 1964, the employment of one additional clerical assistant. Such clerical assistant would be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at a rate of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

The amendment by the Committee on Rules and Administration would reduce to an 11-month period commencing March 1, 1963, the authority of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to employ an additional clerical assistant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 20), as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE TO INVESTIGATE POSTAL SERVICE AND CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 44.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 18) authorizing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to investigate the postal service and civil service system which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service without amendment and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 18) which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration are as follows:

On page 2, line 17, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$69,500"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to examine, investigate, and conduct such studies as may be deemed necessary with respect to any and all aspects of—

(1) the administration of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) the quality and frequency of mail service rendered the public, (b) the operation of the postal establishment with maximum efficiency and economy, (c) modernization of facilities, and (d) parcel post;

(2) the civil service system, including but not limited to (a) steps necessary to improve the merit system, (b) the administration of the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, (c) dual compensation within the Federal service, (d) executive pay, (e) administration of the health and life insurance programs, and (f) operation of the retirement program.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $69,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 45), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 18 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $69,500 by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the administration of the postal service, particularly with respect to (a) the quality and frequency of mail service rendered the public, (b) the operation of the Postal Establishment with maximum efficiency and economy, (c) modernization of facilities, and (d) parcel post; and

(2) the civil service system, including but not limited to (a) steps necessary to improve the merit system, (b) the administration of the postal service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962, (c) dual compensation within the Federal service, (d) executive pay, (e) administration of the health and life insurance programs, and (f) operation of the retirement program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 18), as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE CERTAIN MATTERS BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 12) authorizing the Committee on Public Works to investigate certain matters which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works without amendment, and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 12), which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments.

The amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration are as follows:

On page 2, line 5, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$118,100"; so as to make the resolution read:

"*Resolved,* That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to flood control, navigation, rivers and harbors, roads and highways, water pollution, public buildings, and all features of water resource development.

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

"SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

"SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $118,100, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report—No. 46—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 12 as amended would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $118,100 by the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to employ on a temporary basis such additional personnel as the committee deems advisable to carry out its functions during the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 12), as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION TO MAKE EXPENDITURES AND TO EMPLOY TEMPORARY PERSONNEL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 46.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 73) authorizing the Committee on Rules and Administration to make expenditures and to employ temporary personnel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 73), which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 5, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$65,000" and insert "$59,800"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

(1) the election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;
(2) corrupt practices;
(3) contested elections;
(4) credentials and qualifications;
(5) Federal elections generally; and
(6) Presidential succession.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this resolution the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $59,800, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 47), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 73, as amended, would authorize the expenditure of not to exceed $59,800 by the Committee on Rules and Administration, or by its standing Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters within its jurisdiction as specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, including—

(1) The election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress;
(2) Corrupt practices;
(3) Contested elections;
(4) Credentials and qualifications;
(5) Federal elections generally; and
(6) Presidential succession.

The jurisdiction of the subcommittee is very broad and includes all measures which propose amendments or modifications to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended; the Hatch Act, 1939; and the Soldier's Vote Act. Also within the subcommittee's jurisdiction are the seating of newly elected U.S. Senators, the comprehensive problem of campaign financing, and all other matters relating to Federal candidates and Federal elections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 73), as amended, was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS TO MAKE STUDY OF AMERICAN SMALL AND INDEPENDENT BUSINESS PROBLEMS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 47.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 49) authorizing the Select Committee on Small Business to make a study of American small and independent business problems.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 49) which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 1, line 11, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 2, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$135,000" and insert "$116,090"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by S. Res. 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, and S. Res. 272, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $116,090, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 48), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 49 as amended would authorize the expenditure of $116,090 by the Select Committee on Small Business from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, there has been a cutback of nearly 10 percent on this item.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I discussed this with the Senator earlier today, when the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was present. There has been a reduction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 49), as amended, was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF DURATION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING THROUGH JANUARY 31, 1964

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 48.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 23) extending the Special Committee on Aging through January 31, 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 23) which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 2, line 17, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; on page 3, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$213,000" and insert "$200,400", and in the same line, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Special Committee on Aging established by S. Res. 33, Eighty-seventh Congress, agreed to on February 13, 1961, as amended and supplemented, is hereby extended through January 31, 1964.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of such committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of any and all matters pertaining to problems of older people, including but not limited to, problems of maintaining health, of assuring adequate income, of finding employment, of engaging in productive and rewarding activity, of securing proper housing, and, when necessary, care or assistance. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee, and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

Sec. 3. The said committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

Sec. 4. A majority of the members of the committee or any subcommittee thereof shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 5. For purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to employ on a temporary basis from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, such technical, clerical, or other assistants, experts, and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee and with the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, employ on a reimbursable basis such executive branch personnel, as it deems advisable.

Sec. 6. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $200,400 from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Sec. 7. The committee shall report the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on January 31, 1964.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report—No. 49—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Special Committee on Aging was established by Senate Resolution 33, 87th Congress, agreed to February 13, 1961. It was authorized to continue and expand the scope of the work in which the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, had been engaged during the previous 2 years. Senate Resolution 111, 87th Congress, agreed to March 22, 1961, increased the membership of the special committee from 9 to 21.

Under Senate Resolution 33 the special committee was authorized to expend not to exceed $150,000 through January 31, 1962. Senate Resolution 204, agreed to September 15, 1961, authorized it to make additional expenditures not to exceed $35,000 through the same date. Senate Resolution 238 of the 87th Congress, agreed to February 7, 1962, continued the authority of the special committee until January 31, 1963, and provided an additional $185,000.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the pending resolution provides for the extension of the life of the Special Committee on Aging through January 31, 1964, with a reasonable and economical budget of $200,400.

I am very pleased to note that the Rules and Administration Committee favorably reported the sum requested, and I sincerely trust that the Senate will also act promptly and favorably on this resolution.

The Special Committee on Aging, as we know, is comprised of 21 members; 14 Democrats and 7 Republicans, and is the second largest committee in the Senate.

The committee staff is composed of 11 members, of which 4 are in the category of professional staff members, and 5 in the category of secretaries and clerical help serving the majority, while one professional staff member and 1 clerk serve the minority. The resolution contained a request for an additional two members to be provided for the minority. The committee itself has no objection because of the wide scope of the work of the committee in dealing with the problems of elderly citizens.

The committee, though not a legislative one, serves a useful purpose as a forum in which the various problems of our elderly citizens can be heard and from which recommendations can be made to appropriate legislative committees.

Today in America, there are some 17½ million people 65 years of age and over. As each day passes, 1,000 are added to these ranks.

In the category of those 60 and over, there is the sum total of 25 million. If we move this age bracket down just a little lower to 56, there is a total of 38 million.

The problems of senior citizens are not related solely to those 65 and over. Difficulties begin occurring after an individual has attained the age of 40, and subsequently finds that he is without employment. Today such a person experiences considerable difficulty in obtaining gainful employment to provide income necessary to take care of his family.

Without doubt this committee has done, and is doing a most important job in alerting the country to the complexity of the problems of senior citizens, and in exploring ways in which they might be either resolved or ameliorated.

These problems are many, and are often interrelated. They include:

Problems of employment for those 40 and over.

Low incomes that characterize far too many of our elderly, particularly women who have outlived their husbands.

Lack of suitable housing or rentals for which the elderly can afford to pay.

Difficulties which confront those involuntarily forced to move by virtue of the construction of necessary public works projects.

Problems involving health and nursing home care.

The problem of assessing the extent of responsibility in this field insofar as the Federal, State, and local units of government are concerned.

High cost of living on fixed incomes.

Maximum utilization of skills and experience of elderly citizens in making their contribution to this great country, as well as making their lives in retirement years worth while.

Many Senators will recall that many hearings were held in the various parts of the country over the last 2 years. Some of these were held in Florida; others in Pennsylvania, California, Missouri, Idaho, Washington, and other places. A great deal of invaluable factual information was obtained, which can guide us in seeking sound, effective, and adequate solution to many of the more urgent problems of our senior citizens.

There is no question in my mind but that this committee is doing a job in the public interest. Its extension, with this modest budget, most certainly is warranted.

I sincerely trust that the Senate will not hesitate in continuing its activities for another year, and will favorably act on the pending resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 23), as amended, was agreed to.

PARTICIPATION OF UNITED STATES IN WEST VIRGINIA CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 49.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 4) to provide for the actual participation of the United States in the West Virginia Centennial Celebration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 4), which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the joint resolution of June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 204; Public Law 86–508) is hereby amended by adding the following sections immediately after section 3 thereof:

"Sec. 4. The Secretary of Commerce is further authorized to provide for actual participation of the United States in the celebration.

"Sec. 5. In connection with such participation, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to: (a) incur such expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, including but not limited to expenditures involved in the selection, purchase, rental, construction, and other acquisition of exhibits and materials and equipment therefor and the actual display thereof, and including but not limited to related expenditures for costs of transportation, insurance, installation, safekeeping, maintenance, and operation, rental of space, and dismantling; all without regard to the provisions of Revised Statutes 3709 (41 U.S.C. 5); (b) accept any gifts, loans, or donations of money, property, or services for use in carrying out the provisions of this Act; (c) procure services as authorized by the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem; and (d) appoint, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, such persons as he deems to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $100,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 50), explaining the purposes of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed resolution is to provide for the actual participation of the United States in the West Virginia centennial celebration.

STATEMENT

In the 2d session of the 87th Congress, Senate Joint Resolution 213, an identical resolution, was reported by this committee to the Senate on September 25, 1962, and passed the Senate on September 26, 1962, and was referred to the House Judiciary Committee. However, due to the fact that it was late in the session, that committee was unable to take action on the resolution.

The act of June 11, 1960, by joint resolution, provided for participation by the United States in the West Virginia centennial celebration, to be held in 1963 at various locations in the State of West Virginia.

That enacting legislation also provided for the Secretary of Commerce to cooperate with the West Virginia Centennial Commission in the planning of the celebration, and was further authorized to conduct a study to determine the manner in which, and the extent to which, the United States shall be a participant in and exhibitor at the celebration.

This joint resolution would provide for the actual participation by the United States through the Secretary of Commerce in the celebration.

The Secretary of Commerce would be authorized to incur such expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution, including expenditures involved in the selection, purchase, rental, construction, and other acquisition of exhibits and materials and equipment, and the actual display thereof, to accept any gifts, loans, or donations of money, property, or services for use in carrying out the provisions of this act, and to appoint such persons as he may feel necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The resolution authorizes an appropriation not to exceed $100,000 to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] and I, as well as the members of our delegation in the House of Representatives from West Virginia, are appreciative of the action just taken in this body on Senate Joint Resolution 4. The citizens of our State are carrying forward many and varied informative and interesting programs in this year during our centennial celebration. It is appropriate that the United States as a whole join West Virginia in this significant effort.

INVESTIGATION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] for being so patient. He has been with us all day, waiting for the resolution in which he is especially interested to be considered. I refer to Calendar No. 35, Senate Resolution 63.

Mr. DODD. I thank the distinguished acting majority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 35.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 63) to investigate juvenile delinquency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion by the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 63), which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with amendments, on page 2, line 7, after the word "from", to strike out "February" and insert "March", and on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$188,000" and insert "$173,300"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from March 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation, as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $173,300, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the rereport—No. 36—explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 63 as amended would authorize the expenditure of $173,300 by the Committee on the Judiciary, through its Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, from March 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics."

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to say a few words concerning the resolution before us—to continue the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

I want to emphasize that, for several years now, juvenile delinquency, or youthful criminality, has been perhaps the No. 1 social problem facing this Nation.

In small towns, and large cities alike, in rural areas, and in huge metropolitan agglomerations, every day a number of young people begin a course that may lead to the court, to the training school, to the reformatory, or ultimately to the penitentiary for adult felons.

Between the years 1948 and 1956, the number of juvenile cases appearing in courts doubled in number, while the court age population grew by only some 19 percent. We saw in 1956 more than 500,000 youth cases brought before juvenile courts throughout the land. By

1957, this number had grown to over 600,000, and by 1958 to 700,000. Another increase raised the national court case load close to 800,000 cases in 1959, and substantially above this figure in 1960.

Only the last year for which figures are available, the year 1961, showed a slight 1 percent drop in nationwide delinquency cases coming before the juvenile judges. But this decline, encouraging as it may be, is too small to indicate a trend. The total number of young people who are today contaminated and infected with delinquency still runs into hundreds of thousands. These are significant numbers with a significant meaning. To understand what these figures mean, you must never forget that we are talking here about human beings.

These are children and teenagers who, in a few years of their young lives, have already acquired a past, but who often do not have a future.

To understand what these figures mean, we must recognize that each of them represents a human tragedy.

We must understand that each of them symbolizes the failure of a young man or woman, the failure of a parent or a family, the failure of a teacher, of a clergyman, and, ultimately, the failure of society itself.

These figures do not account for every young person who breaks the law. These figures do not even account for all juveniles arrested by the police.

The statistics we receive from one source or another are crude indications of the growth and spread of this disease we call juvenile delinquency.

The statistics only indicate the symptoms of the disease.

The germs, the causes, and the reasons why young children and teenagers commit crimes are not found in statistical reports.

These reasons are found, rather, in the homes where parents are immoral, selfish, or uninterested; in homes where parents are ill informed and ignorant altogether; in homes where parents are poverty stricken and unfortunate.

The reasons for delinquency are found in the schools that are overcrowded and lack teachers, in school programs that cannot engage the interests of children, in educational systems that have lost respect in the eyes of children because they are not respected by adults.

The reasons for delinquency are found in our economic institutions, in the factories, the department stores, the shops and service establishments which are the most efficient, the richest, the most prosperous in the world, but which are unable to provide employment to a million boys and girls who walk the streets looking for a job, desperately trying to find a legitimate place in life.

And, finally, the reasons for delinquency are found in the minds and the acts of men; men who for profit have built a trade in narcotics and other dangerous drugs and who have found young children easy victims; men who for profit are willing to corrupt young minds with pornographic publications; men who indiscriminately sell guns through the mail to children of all ages; men who, without regard for the young and weak, are dedicated to selfish goals through corruptive means at any price.

The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee is the only legislative body in either House of Congress that has as its basic interest the elimination of the juvenile delinquency problem in America.

The subcommittee has attempted through its reports to tell the American people of the dangers facing the younger generation. The subcommittee has acted upon legislative measures to protect youth from these corruptions, and it has searched for the basic causes, for the contributory conditions, and for control measures to stop the growth of delinquency.

I believe that the subcommittee has carried out the investigations and the studies that enable us to see where we stand today in relation to delinquency.

During the 87th Congress, the subcommittee acted upon 10 legislative proposals. Three of these have become law, and two others were passed by the Senate.

I have proposed to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], that this subcommittee be continued so that we can follow through with some of the legislation which we could not get out last year.

I have proposed also that there are several fields in which new study is indicated.

Delinquency will not be overcome by any one law or by any one program. Nor will it be eradicated by fighting the symptoms of the disease only. It has become evident that in fighting delinquency, we must fight the basic causes, the "behind the scene" factors, the hidden viruses.

Because lawbreaking by young men and women represents a growing hazard to the entire country, I have proposed that the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee be continued. I have proposed also that in its scope as a legislative body the subcommittee deal with the following areas during the year 1963:

First, legislative proposals to facilitate the treatment and curing of narcotic addicts. The subcommittee's investigations and hearings have shown that, besides the necessity to stop narcotics and other dangerous drugs from circulating through the country and from being brought into the country, it is imperative to cut down the demand for the drugs by rehabilitating those presently dependent on them. Significant changes are needed in the existing drug laws. The Federal Narcotics Control Act of 1956 will have to be modified, since it is felt that this law hampers rehabilitation by requiring long mandatory sentences for drug users and by forbidding release of such offenders on probation or parole.

Additional new legislation is also necessary to stop the illegal commerce in barbiturate and amphetamine drugs. Earlier in this session I introduced two bills to help control this new menace to young people. The subcommittee staff is presently studying questionnaire returns from over 250 police and other State, Federal, and local officials regarding the extent of their local problems and the proposed solutions.

Second, we will study the conditions prevailing in juvenile correctional institutions. It has been brought to the attention of the subcommittee that detention centers, training schools and reformatories for young offenders are greatly overcrowded. Some institutions house twice the optimum number of inmates. These conditions hamper rehabilitation. They are conducive to rioting even in institutions for girls. They incite attempts to escape and they endanger both the institutional personnel and the inmates. On several occasions correctional officers have been killed or permanently injured by escaping inmates.

These things must not be allowed to continue. At their best, institutions are questionable rehabilitative tools. But when they are crowded, when they are understaffed, and when they cannot supply specialized treatment, then such institutions become vicious traps for young boys and girls. They become cages where inestimable damage is done to the morale, to the sense of self-worth, and to the sense of human dignity of young people imprisoned in them. We must seek ways to relieve these pressures. And we must make youth institutions serve the purpose for which they were created—correction and rehabilitation.

Thirdly, I have proposed that the subcommittee look at the policies, procedures, and products of the motion picture industry. In our last year's study of television, the findings showed that network competition for ratings and audiences creates shows often permeated with themes of excessive sex and violence. Subcommittee investigators have discovered that motion pictures may also capitalize on such excesses as exemplified by certain programs shown in drive-in movies, specifically for young audiences.

Fourth, there is need to probe into certain interstate practices of placing minor children for adoption or for permanent free care. It has been brought to our attention that black market baby brokers induce expectant mothers to travel across State lines to, in effect, sell their babies to the highest bidder. Such transactions can have tragic consequences for the baby, for the mother, and often for the prospective parents as well. The subcommittee will consider legislation requiring Federal, State, or local governmental agencies to maintain closer control over adoption procedures.

The fifth area we plan to study relates to inadequate educational facilities, school dropouts, and youth unemployment.

Repeatedly, public officials connected with courts, with schools, and with other youth-serving agencies have claimed that the inability to maintain young people in schools and the unemployment they face after leaving school make them highly susceptible to crime and delinquency.

As chairman of this subcommittee, I was happy to cosponsor with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] the Youth Employment Act. However, we feel that additional legislation is necessary to relieve the pressures on youth

created by inadequate educational programs and facilities on the one hand and by unemployment and idleness on the other hand.

Another problem of concern to us has been the continuous traffic in obscene, pornographic material. The Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee was instrumental in enacting Public Law 85–796, designed to close loopholes in the pornography laws and to facilitate prosecution of transgressors of these laws. Today we find that new loopholes have been created, that new kinds of publications have appeared designed to evade the laws. Such magazines as Eros and Liaison are offered through the mail to even 12-year-old children. I think it is proper that we devise means to protect children from such attempted corruption and exploitation.

Already in this session the subcommitte has begun to conduct hearings regarding a similar problem, the illegal and irresponsible sale and distribution of handguns to mental defectives, criminals, and juveniles.

Finally, the subcommittee plans to take a closer look at crime and delinquency in our Nation's Capital. All the problems I have discussed are found here in one degree or another. By solving some of them through legislation or other measures, we will have found ways to deal with these problems in other parts of the country as well. Congress is directly responsible for this city and Congress is responsible to the entire country for the conditions which prevail here.

Generally, the subcommittee will follow new findings relative to delinquency control produced in the universities and colleges throughout the Nation. It will follow the progress made by governmental and private programs set up under the new law, 87–274, which gives $30 million annually to States and nonprofit organizations for carrying out delinquency control projects and for testing new methods. The next few years may decide whether the increased efforts on all levels of society are effective in solving youth crime or whether entirely new trails must be blazed to finally conquer this affliction of American youth.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution to continue the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee be considered favorably and that it obtain speedy passage.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this subcommittee, as I have pointed out on many occasions, was created 10 or 12 years ago. The Senator who proposed the creation of the subcommittee indicated that the first amount provided, which aggregated $75,000 would be sufficient to complete the hearings in regard to juvenile delinquency.

This subcommittee, like almost all others, has been renewed from year to year. Instead of a cost of $75,000, which the original proposer of the resolution stated would be the amount required to hold the hearings, we have now spent well over $1 million, and still are going strong.

It seems that the more hearings held, the more the Senate goes into the problem, the worse the problem seems to become.

I cannot see any good which arises from this. To me it is money absolutely wasted.

The place to fight juvenile delinquency is not in the committee room or in the hearing room. It is in the church and in the home. It is in the woodshed.

Hearings and committees will not solve the problem. The money we have provided for the juvenile delinquency subcommittee has not solved the problem, or begun to solve it. The money we are making available today will not solve it. If anything, the publicity resulting from its hearings and investigations may make the problem worse.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I shall be very brief and shall add only a word. As a member of this subcommittee I cannot sit silent without commending the chairman of the subcommittee for the very diligent work he has done in this field.

I point out that there are few more serious domestic problems in this country than the terrible problem of juvenile delinquency in our large metropolitan areas.

The chairman has set forth an agenda of hearings and subjects to be investigated. It is imperative, if we are to give the kind of attention to this subject which it deserves, that we appropriate the funds the subcommittee needs for its work.

I sincerely hope that this relatively modest request by the chairman of the subcommittee will be confirmed and approved by this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 63), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of these proceedings on the so-called money resolutions, a tabulation showing action thereon by the Committee on Rules and Administration and other pertinent data.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Action by the Committee on Rules and Administration on Senate resolutions authorizing inquiries and investigations during the 88th Congress, 1st session

Unless indicated by *italic type* (and explained by footnote), all reductions in requested amounts represent 1/12 [1] of that portion of the annual budget for salaries and employee benefits [2] to compensate for amounts authorized for February 1963 by S. Res. 88, 88th Cong., agreed to Feb. 19, 1963

Resolution No.	Committee and purpose	Amount requested		Amount authorized last session	Difference	Action by Senate Rules Committee			Resolution No.
		12-month basis	11-month basis			Reduction of—	Increase of—	Amount approved	
S. Res. 74	Aeronautical and Space Sciences		$82,500	$90,000	−$7,500			$82,500	S. Res. 74
	Armed Services:								
S. Res. 75	Preparedness		175,000	220,000	−45,000			175,000	S. Res. 75
S. Res. 79	Stockpiling		6,500	115,000	−108,500		[3] *$3,500*	10,000	S. Res. 79
	Banking and Currency:								
S. Res. 14	General		83,700	[4a] 80,000	+3,700			83,700	S. Res. 14
S. Res. 15	Housing		106,000	107,000	−1,000			106,000	S. Res. 15
S. Res. 29	Commerce		330,000	315,000	+15,000			330,000	S. Res. 29
	Foreign Relations:								
S. Res. 26	Nondiplomatic representatives of foreign principals	$50,000		50,000		$1,400		48,600	S. Res. 26
S. Res. 25	U.S. foreign policy	150,000		160,000	−10,000	7,000		143,000	S. Res. 25
	Government Operations:								
S. Res. 17	General	490,000		[4b] 500,000	−10,000	31,700		458,300	S. Res. 17
S. Res. 27	Interagency coordination, etc	95,000		[4c] 90,000	+5,000	7,000		88,000	S. Res. 27
S. Res. 45	Intergovernmental relations	115,000		40,000	+75,000	[5] *17,710*		97,290	S. Res. 45
S. Res. 13	National security problems	110,000		70,000	+40,000	[6] *17,750*		92,250	S. Res. 13
S. Res. 16	Interior and Insular Affairs	100,000		100,000				100,000	S. Res. 16
	Judiciary:								
S. Res. 55	Administrative practice and procedure	120,000		115,000	+5,000	9,400		110,600	S. Res. 55
S. Res. 56	Antitrust and monopoly	535,000		[4d] 450,000	+85,000	[7] *91,750*		443,250	S. Res. 56
S. Res. 57	Constitutional amendments	51,500		[4e] 48,500	+3,000		[8] *$2,923*	54,423	S. Res. 57
S. Res. 58	Constitutional rights	165,000		[4f] 140,000	+25,000	12,700		152,300	S. Res. 58
S. Res. 59	Federal charters, etc	7,500		7,500		500		7,000	S. Res. 59
S. Res. 61	Federal judicial system	100,000		90,000	+10,000	7,800		92,200	S. Res. 60
S. Res. 60	Immigration and naturalization	135,000		[4g] 125,000	+10,000	10,800		124,200	S. Res. 61

See footnotes at end of table.

Action by the Committee on Rules and Administration on Senate resolutions authorizing inquiries and investigations during the 88th Congress, 1st session—Continued

Unless indicated by *italic type* (and explained by footnote), all reductions in requested amounts represent 1/12 [1] of that portion of the annual budget for salaries and employee benefits [2] to compensate for amounts authorized for February 1963 by S. Res. 88, 88th Cong., agreed to Feb. 19, 1963

Resolution No.	Committee and purpose	Amount requested		Amount authorized last session	Difference	Action by Senate Rules Committee			Resolution No.
		12-month basis	11-month basis			Reduction of—	Increase of—	Amount approved	
	Judiciary—Continued								
S. Res. 62	Internal security	$360,000		[4b] $325,000	+$35,000	[9] *$49,120*		$310,880	S. Res. 62
S. Res. 63	Juvenile delinquency	188,000		[4i] 198,000	−10,000	14,700		173,300	S. Res. 63
S. Res. 64	National penitentiaries	5,000		5,000				5,000	S. Res. 64
S. Res. 65	Patents, trademarks, copyrights	125,000		120,000	+5,000	9,200		115,800	S. Res. 65
S. Res. 66	Refugees and escapees	87,500		87,500		6,500		81,000	S. Res. 66
S. Res. 67	Revision and codification	30,000		26,000	+4,000	2,300		27,700	S. Res. 67
S. Res. 68	Trading With the Enemy Act	60,000		45,000	+15,000	4,600		55,400	S. Res. 68
	Labor and Public Welfare:								
S. Res. 95	Additional staff members		(10)						S. Res. 95
S. Res. 22	Migratory labor		$68,750	[4j] 70,000	−1,250			68,750	S. Res. 22
	Post Office and Civil Service:								
S. Res. 20	Additional clerical assistant	(11)							S. Res. 20
S. Res. 18	General	75,000		[4k] 75,000		5,500		69,500	S. Res. 18
S. Res. 12	Public Works	125,000		125,000		6,900		118,100	S. Res. 12
S. Res. 73	Rules and Administration (Privileges and Elections)	65,000		150,000	−85,000	5,200		59,800	S. Res. 73
S. Res. 49	Small Business (select)	135,000		125,000	+10,000	[12] *18,910*		116,090	S. Res. 49
S. Res. 23	Aging (special)	213,000		185,000	+28,000	12,600		200,400	S. Res. 23
	Total (as of Mar. 13, 1963)	4,544,950		4,419,500	+95,450	351,040	$6,423	4,200,333	

---

[1] To nearest multiple of $100 (downward).

[2] Includes agency contributions to employee retirement, health benefits, and group life insurance.

[3] Increased $3,500 at request of chairman and ranking minority member of subcommittee to provide compensation for minority counsel.

[4] Increase through Feb. 28, 1963, by S. Res. 88; [a] $2,500; [b] $15,000; [c] $5,500; [d] $23,000; [e] $2,000; [f] $2,000; [g] $10,000; [h] $20,000; [i] $15,000; [j] $6,200; [k] $2,000. Total, $103,200.

[5] Initial request of $115,000 for 12 months reduced by $11,500 (10 percent) to $103,500 for 12 months. Latter amount adjusted to 11-month basis by further reduction of $6,210 (1/12 of salaries and employee benefits of *reduced* gross), leaving $97,290 approved by committee.

[6] Initial request of $110,000 for 12 months reduced by $11,000 (10 percent) to $99,000 for 12 months. Latter amount adjusted to 11-month basis by further reduction of $6,750 (1/12 of salaries and employees benefits of *reduced* gross), leaving $92,250 approved by committee.

[7] Initial request of $535,000 for 12 months reduced by $53,500 (10 percent) to $481,500 for 12 months. Latter amount adjusted to 11-month basis by further reduction of $38,250 (1/12 of salaries and employee benefits of *reduced* gross), leaving $443,250 approved by committee.

[8] Initial request of $51,500 reduced by $3,700 to $47,800 for 11 months by regular formula. At request of ranking minority member of subcommittee $6,623 ($7,225) less 1/12 was added to provide for a minority clerk.

[9] Initial request of $360,000 for 12 months reduced by $25,000 to $335,000 for 12 months. Latter amount adjusted to 11-month basis by further reduction of $24,120 (1/12 of salaries and employee benefits of *reduced* gross), leaving $310,880 approved by committee.

[10] S. Res. 95 would authorize the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare from Mar. 1, 1963, through Jan. 31, 1964, to employ 1 additional assistant chief clerk, 7 additional professional staff members, and 9 additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman.

[11] S. Res. 20 would authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service from Mar. 1, 1963, through Jan. 31, 1964, to employ 1 additional clerical assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at a rate of compensation to be fixed by the chairman.

[12] Initial request of $135,000 for 12 months reduced by $10,000 to $125,000 for 12 months. Latter amount adjusted to 11-month basis by further reduction of $8,910 (1/12 of salaries and employee benefits of *reduced* gross), leaving $116,090 approved by committee.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I rise to inquire of the distinguished acting majority leader what information he can give us as to the expected program tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the acting minority leader.

It is expected that the Senate will complete action on bills on the calendar tomorrow. The remaining bills are private bills, all cleared by the minority and majority. There are no such bills on the calendar to which there is objection.

Then the Senate will take up the draft bill.

Mr. CURTIS. The act for the extension of selective service?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The extension of selective service; yes. I am hopeful that bill may be passed without a yea-and-nay vote, because many of our colleagues are absent. I do not believe it involves any controversy. It is quite important that the bill be acted upon.

Then there are some speeches which several of our colleagues have said they wished to make.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Could those of us who will be necessarily absent tomorrow have an assurance that if a yea-and-nay vote should be ordered it would go over until Monday or Tuesday?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should say so. If there is to be a yea-and-nay vote on it, we should permit every Member of the Senate to be back. After tomorrow, it is our intention to adjourn over until Tuesday, so that the Senator may have that assurance also. I am hopeful the measure can be passed without rollcall, because there is no controversy over it.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. There are a number of printing resolutions. I wonder if they could be taken up tonight. It is very important to have them acted on early.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I would like to have them taken up. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] has been waiting patiently. He must leave tonight. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] also has been waiting.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS AND SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REPORTED EARLIER TODAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today Senate Resolutions 72, 99, 105, 106, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 14 were reported favorably, without amendment, from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS ENTITLED "SUMMER EMPLOYMENT BY COLLEGE STUDENTS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—1961"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 105.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 105) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document a compilation of materials entitled "Summer Employment by College Students in the Federal Government—1961", prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress; and there shall be printed six thousand two hundred additional copies of such Senate document for the use of the Members of the Senate.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION OF MATERIALS RELATING TO THE HISTORY OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 99.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 99) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document a compilation of materials relating to the history of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, in connection with its fiftieth anniversary (1913–1963); and that there be printed for the use of that committee one thousand additional copies of such document.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE "SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS," ETC.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 72.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 72) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document the "Sixth Annual Report on the Status of the Colorado River Storage Project and Participating Projects," and "General Principles to Govern, and Operating Criteria for, Glen Canyon Reservoir (Lake Powell) and Lake Mead During the Lake Powell Filling Period", prepared by the Department of the Interior, with an introductory statement.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR CAPITOL"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, the pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol"; and that three hundred and twenty-three thousand five hundred additional copies shall be printed, of which one hundred and three thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate and two hundred and twenty thousand five hundred copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

ADDITIONAL PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 117, "THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, WHAT IT IS, HOW IT WORKS—A HANDBOOK FOR AMERICANS"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 106.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 106) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed seven thousand additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 117, of the Eighty-fourth Congress, second session, entitled "The Communist Party of the United States of America, What It Is, How It Works—A Handbook for Americans", compiled by the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate.

COMMENDATION OF SENATOR JORDAN, OF NORTH CAROLINA, AND STAFF OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan] leaves the Chamber, I wish personally to express the gratitude of both the majority and the minority for the wonderful attention which he has given today to the resolutions which have been considered, as the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I know of the many hours of hearings that were held on these resolutions and the great amount of detail that was presented. We are all indebted to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

He has been diligent and on guard, so to speak, in answering any and all questions. I personally appreciate it and I thank him on behalf of the entire Senate.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I am exceedingly grateful to the Senator from Minnesota. I appreciate his kind words. As the Senator well knows, the committee held hearings on every one of these resolutions, and we brought forth as good answers as I think could be produced. It has been a pleasure to work with the Senator in getting the resolutions agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in addition, I wish to commend the staff, particularly Gordon F. Harrison, staff director; Hugh Q. Alexander, chief counsel, and John P. Coder, editorial and printing assistant.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The staff has rendered excellent service in working with us and getting the resolutions drafted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We are grateful to the staff.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. We are indeed grateful to the staff.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield now to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller].

TAX PROPOSALS AND THE ECONOMY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the President has been warning that, if his tax program is not adopted, we might have a recession. There are many of us who feel that his tax program, calling for a net tax cut of $2.7 billion for fiscal 1964, will have very little effect in heading off a recession, much less getting the economy moving again. It is likely that the $2.7 billion additional purchasing power which his tax cut is intended to produce will be offset by an increase in State and local taxes being voted throughout the United States this year. In addition, there are many who believe that the $12 billion deficit which he has proposed will produce inflation which will shrink the purchasing power of our money by $2.7 billion or more, thus leaving us on a treadmill.

However, quite apart from the subject of taxes, I believe the President should be warned that we will indeed have a recession if our basic industry of agriculture does not improve its position. There cannot be a healthy industrial economy unless there is a healthy agriculture. And the fact is, Mr. President, that contrary to glowing reports of the Secretary of Agriculture, there has been no real improvement in agriculture. Farm prices declined 1 percent during the month ended February 15. The farm price level remained at 78 percent of parity, compared with 80 percent a year ago. There has been a serious decline in livestock prices. Hog prices at the end of February were at a 3-year low. Prices of fat cattle are below any period since August of 1961, and the February prices were the lowest of any February level in 6 years.

It will not do for the Department of Agriculture to explain that the reason for the severe break in cattle prices is that there is a larger cattle population this year. We have a larger human population to feed, too. Moreover, the feed grain price-depressing activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation—selling off abnormally large amounts of stored grain—naturally depress livestock prices. Such activities should stop.

The severe east coast maritime strike and the prolonged newspaper strike in New York City have had a highly detrimental impact on the demand for choice beef from the Midwest. And we view with apprehension the discussions now being conducted in the Common Market over tariff policy with respect to export shipments of beef, pork, rice, and soybean oil from the United States. Recent discriminatory action by the Common Market against our poultry exports will destroy a $50 million annual poultry export business unless this administration takes prompt retaliatory action against Common Market imports into this country and forces the Common Market to remove its discriminatory duties. Failure of the administration to act will be an open invitation to the Common Market to take similar action against beef and other agricultural exports from this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Record at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Farm Price Index Off 1 Percent" appearing in the March 1 issue of the Des Moines Register; and two articles appearing in the Stockman's Journal for Saturday, March 2, 1963, one entitled "Hog Prices End February at 3-Year Low," and the other entitled "Fed Cattle Sell at Lowest February Level in 6 Years."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Des Moines Register, Mar. 1, 1963]

FARM PRICE INDEX OFF 1 PERCENT

Washington, D.C.—Farm product prices declined 1 percent during the month ended February 15.

Reporting this Thursday, the Agriculture Department said lower prices for cattle and hogs were primarily responsible. Partially offsetting this were increases for oranges, chickens, eggs, and corn.

BELOW 1962

The mid-February price level was about 0.25 percent below a year earlier.

Prices paid by farmers in mid-February for goods and services used in production and in family living did not change from a month earlier, holding at a record level set in mid-January.

The farm price level remained at 78 percent of the parity price goal of farm programs.' This compared with 80 percent of parity a year ago and the record high of 123 percent set in October 1946.

The Department said meat animals, other than sheep, declined 5 percent between mid-January and mid-February. Poultry and egg prices advanced 3 percent, fruit 5 percent, and feed grains 3 percent. Dairy products declined 1 percent during the month.

The general level of prices received by farmers in mid-February was at 242 percent of the 1910–14 base average, compared with 244 percent in mid-January, 243 percent in mid-February last year, and the record high of 313 percent set in February 1951.

COST INDEX

The level of prices paid by farmers in mid-February was at 311 percent of the 1910–14 average, the same as a month earlier. A year ago these prices were at 305 percent of the base average.

Average prices received by farmers for important products in mid-February compared with mid-January and the mid-February parity prices, respectively, included:

	Mid-February	Mid-January	Parity
Wheat, bushel	$2.04	$2.01	$2.49
Rye, bushel	.978	.909	1.42
Rice, rough, 100 pounds	5.18	5.27	6.44
Corn, bushel	1.06	1.03	1.59
Oats, bushel	.654	.645	.849
Barley, bushel	.91	.896	1.25
Sorghum grain, 100 pounds	1.70	1.68	2.49
Hay, baled, ton	29.69	22.30	26.60
Cotton, upland, pound	.2969	.3007	.4031
Cottonseed, ton	48.50	48.20	62.50
Soybeans, bushel	2.50	2.41	3.01
Peanuts, pound	.112	.112	.14
Flaxseed, bushel	2.79	2.75	3.89
Potatoes, 100 pounds	1.61	1.54	2.29
Apples, bushel	2.58	2.51	3.07
Grapefruit, box	.71	1.04	1.15
Oranges, box	2.21	1.72	2.86
Hogs, 100 pounds	14.80	15.40	22.40
Beef cattle, 100 pounds	20.40	21.60	24.00
Calves, 100 pounds	23.00	25.60	27.00
Sheep, 100 pounds	6.43	6.43	7.87
Lambs, 100 pounds	17.60	18.20	24.50
Butterfat, pound	.587	.589	.774
Milk, wholesale, 100 pounds	4.15	4.20	5.35
Chickens, live, pound	.153	.141	.238
Turkeys, live, pound	.222	.221	.336
Eggs, dozen	.373	.365	.482
Wool, pound	.47	.454	.778

HOG PRICES END FEBRUARY AT 3-YEAR LOW—BUTCHERS OFF 75 CENTS TO $1, TOP DIPS TO $15.25 LATE IN MONTH; SOWS 50 TO 75 CENTS LOWER

Despite decreased supplies from January and a fairly orderly marketing pattern during February, a bearish price trend dominated much of last month's trade on hogs at Omaha and losses amounted to 75 cents to $1 on butchers while sow prices wound up 50 to 75 cents under January's closing figures. The break dropped late prices to the lowest level here in 3 years.

Reports from around the wholesale dressed meat circuit indicated that pork loin prices finished a month of up-and-down trading at $1.50 lower levels on a sharp late break while other cuts were mostly $1 off for the period.

Receipts of hogs at Omaha during February totaled 256,372 as against 314,871 for January and fell considerably short of every month since September. In February of last year 240,664 head arrived.

Supplies last month included a wide range of weight and overall quality was usually pretty good. During the latter half of the period heavy butcher arrivals dwindled slightly while light and medium weights were offered more freely.

Sows made up about 9 percent of February's run. That figure was right in line with the preceding month's sow percent and was otherwise the shortest for any month since last March.

WEIGHTS AVERAGE LIGHTER

The average weight of all hogs marketed at Omaha during February was around 255 pounds. This figure was 5 to 8 pounds under the all-hog average weights for the preceding 3 months but was more or less in line with average hog weights here for the past few years.

Early in February prices on most 200–300-pound butchers ranged from $14.25 to $16.50. On the first market day of the month a couple hundred strictly choice around 225-pounders reached $16.75 to set the months' peak. Before mid-February most butchers that scaled around 250 pounds cleared at $15.50 to $16.

During the last half of the period 200–300-pound butchers found outlet largely at $13.75 to $15.75 levels, While the top occasionally reached $16 the best light butchers turned at $15.25 to $15.35 on the final rounds. The inside price was the lowest daily top here since March 1, 1960. Popular late-month prices on butchers that averaged around 250 pounds were $14.50 to $15.

Most sows offered at Omaha in February ranged in weight from 300 to 600 pounds and they cashed from $12.50 to $14.75. However, no sows were quoted above $14 toward the close.

FED CATTLE SELL AT LOWEST FEBRUARY LEVEL IN 6 YEARS—PRICES ARE BELOW ANY PERIOD SINCE AUGUST OF 1961 ON BREAK OF MAINLY $1 TO $1.50, SOME BIG STEERS OFF $2; MOST COWS STEADY; FEEDERS DIP

The break in prices which settled on the fed cattle trade late in 1962 and prevailed all through January continued last month to drop prices to the lowest February level since 1957.

A continuing lower trade on dressed beef carcasses at wholesale outleta was a major factor in keeping prices on the decline. The month's setback of $1 to $1.50 on most steers and heifers with some weightier steers off as much as $2 left closing prices at the lowest level for any period since August of 1961.

A late rally erased an earlier decline on cows and they finished February on a mostly steady basis although some better beef offerings were as much as 50 cents over the close of January.

The declining cornfed market had a bearish effect on stocker and feeder trading but even so, the market held up fairly well on desirable quality lighterweight replacement stock but most fleshier offerings shared in the setback on grainfeds.

RECEIPTS MODERATE

The break on cornfeds continued even though receipts were moderate but they were frequently rather poorly distributed during a week's period. Arrivals last month, at 142,513, were the smallest in 4 years and the second lightest in 10 years for comparable periods. The run for the same month a year ago totaled 147,767 head.

Good to Choice offerings usually made up the big end of the grainfed supply. Average weights on steers ran above the comparable time a year ago and offerings averaging upwards from 1,150 pounds were generally the hardest to move with weight in late trading often having more of an influence on final prices than quality.

While the volume of fed steers and yearlings selling at $24 and above in late trading was rather small, early in the period a fair showing ranged upward to the month's peak of $26. It took a pretty good load of fat heifers to beat $23.50 on closing rounds but earlier in the month a modest showing reached $25 and above with a part load of 963-pounders and a load of 1,070-pounders at the $26 mark.

At midmonth it was hard to pass $15 on beef cows and most low grades sold down from $12.50 to $13. At the close, Choice beef cows sold to $16 with odd head to $16.50 and cutters cashed up to $14.

STEER CALVES $34

Trade on stockers and feeders was often on a catch-as-catch-can basis. Most Good to Choice yearling stockers and lightweight feeder steers moved at $24 to $27.50 with a load of Choice 537-pounders at $28.50. Good to Choice fleshy feeders scaling around 800 pounds and up moved mainly at $22.50 to $24 but a load of Choice 1,000-pound grainfeds moved the feeder route at $24.65.

Choice yearling stock heifers brought $25 to $26.25 with the latter price on 543-pounders and other sales ranging down from $23 to $23.25.

Good to Choice stock steer calves brought $28 to $33 with a part load of Choice 391-pounders at $34, highest since January. It was also the highest on steer calves since 1959 for February.

Good to Choice stock heifers went out mainly at $26 to $29 and a shipment of Choice 143-pounders brought $30 which was also the highest since early January and was a 4-year February high.

Odd bunches of Medium to Good stock cows brought $13 to $15.25 and early in the period a shipment of young cows on the heiferette order moved at $19.

SHOULD THE GOVERNMENT LIE?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 1, pages 899 through 903, appear excerpts from remarks by Mr. Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, delivered at the Sigma Delta Chi dinner in New York City on December 6, 1962, as taped by the American Broadcasting Co. and transcribed by the American Newspaper Publishers Association. These were inserted in the RECORD by unanimous consent of the Senate at the request of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. Sylvester is quoted as saying:

> It's inherent in [a] government's right, if necessary, to lie to save itself when it's going up into a nuclear war. This seems to me basic—basic.

Here we have a statement by one of the administration's top spokesmen that really means this: If Mr. Sylvester or someone else in authority in the administration reaches a conclusion, in his own mind, that such action is "necessary," then he, as a representative of the Government, should lie.

Needless to say, this is a very dangerous statement of policy, and it has, no doubt, contributed greatly to the concern of the American people over whether or not the spokesmen for this administration in general, and Mr. Sylvester in particular, are giving out the facts on Cuba and other problems of vital concern to our Nation.

What prompts me to refer to these remarks by Mr. Sylvester is the testimony by Mr. Sylvester Tuesday before the Government Operations Committee of the Senate. In response to a question from the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], Mr. Sylvester said:

> The Government does not have a right to lie to the people, but it does have a right in facing an enemy, if information is not accurate and is intended to mislead the enemy. I think that any people will support their government in not putting out information that is going to help the enemy. And, if necessary, misleading them.

Apparently last December 6, Mr. Sylvester believed that a government has an inherent right to lie. Tuesday he said it only has a right to put out misleading information, but not to lie. Now all of us wonder how Mr. Sylvester draws a line between lying and being misleading. And we are concerned over having someone like Mr. Sylvester make a judgment over the circumstances under which lying or being misleading is to be undertaken. Apparently, from his remarks last December, he was of opinion that the confrontation in Cuba last fall constituted "going up into a nuclear war." This is some more of that "eyeball to eyeball" talk which unnecessarily and unjustifiably frightened the American people. Let me say, Mr. President, that I believe spokesmen for this administration have done a grave disservice to the American people in unduly frightening them over the Cuban confrontation. We were prepared, all right. But we were not anywhere near close to a nuclear war. And the reason we were not is because Mr. Khrushchev was not anywhere near to committing suicide.

The Cuban confrontation was simply another example of how, if we stand firm against Communist aggression and make it clear that further aggression will not be to the advantage of the Communists because of our power and our resolve, there will be no war—least of all a nuclear war.

The statements Mr. Sylvester has been making reveal an attitude of extreme pragmatism—following the philosophy that the end justifies the means. This is the philosophy expounded by Premier Khrushchev. It is not the philosophy which characterizes the American way of life. I think that the sooner the President finds another Assistant Secretary of Defense to replace Mr. Sylvester, the better it will be for all of us, including the administration.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CLYDE DOYLE, OF CALIFORNIA

The Chair laid before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which was read as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE, a Representative from the State of California.
>
> *Resolved*, That a committee of twenty-eight Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.
>
> *Resolved*, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.
>
> *Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.
>
> *Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.
>
> Attest:
>
> RALPH R. ROBERTS,
> *Clerk*.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. KUCHEL] I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 112) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, late a Representative from the State of California.
>
> *Resolved*, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.
>
> *Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.
>
> *Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the second resolving clause of the resolution, the Chair appoints the two Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. ENGLE] as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Representative DOYLE.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, in order, beginning with Calendar No. 50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOM WAH YOOK

The bill (S. 92) for the relief of Hom Wah Yook (also known as Hom Bok Heung), was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hom Wah Yook (also known as Hom Bok Heung) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

PURIFICACION SIAT

The bill (S. 97) for the relief of Purificacion Siat was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Purificacion Siat shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

YOUNG WAI

The bill (S. 208) for the relief of Young Wai, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Young Wai shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

HAROLD AND SYLVIA FREDA KARRO AND CHILDREN

The bill (S. 234) for the relief of Harold and Sylvia Freda Karro and their three children, Allan Karro, Jennifer Karro, and Michelle Karro, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Harold and Sylvia Freda Karro and their three minor children, Allan Karro, Jennifer Karro, and Michelle Karro, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

STANISLAW BIALOGLOWSKI

The bill (S. 436) for the relief of Stanislaw Bialoglowski, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stanislaw Bialoglowski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

PANAGIOTA MAKRIS

The bill (S. 506) for the relief of Panagiota Makris, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Panagiota Makris may be classified as an eligible orphan within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act and a petition may be filed by Mrs. Yianoula Makris, a citizen of the United States, in behalf of the said Panagiota Makris pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans.

ANTONIO GUTIERREZ FERNANDEZ

The bill (S. 574) for the relief of Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ROSWITHA SEIB

The bill (S. 596) for the relief of Roswitha Seib, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Roswitha Seib may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That unless the said Roswitha Seib is eligible for medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further,* That the exemption granted herein shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

RONALD WHITING

The bill (S. 688) for the relief of Ronald Whiting, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ronald Whiting may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act: *And provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

MICHELINA LANNI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 193) for the relief of Michelina Lanni which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, after line 11, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (I) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Michelina Lanni may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act: *And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ISABEL LORETTA ALLEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 195) for the relief of Isabel Loretta Allen which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments on page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "Isabel" and insert "Izabel", and in line 11, after the word "Act", to insert a colon and "*And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Izabel Loretta Allen may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act: *And provided further,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Izabel Loretta Allen."

HO KOON CHEW

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 421) for the relief of Ho Koon Chew which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "Act", to strike out "Ho Koon Chew" and insert "Koon Chew Ho", and in line 11, after the word "said", to strike out "Ho Koon Chew" and insert "Koon Chew Ho"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Ho Yee, a deceased United States citizen, shall be deemed to have resided in the United States prior to July 9, 1913, within the meaning of section 1993 of the Act of February 10, 1855 (Rev. Stat. 1878).

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the said Act, Koon Chew Ho shall be held and considered to be the natural-born son of the said Ho Yee, and shall be further held and considered to have been a United States citizen at all times since July 9, 1913: *Provided,* That the said Koon Chew Ho enters the United States for permanent residence within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Koon Chew Ho."

KRYSTYNA RATAJ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 635) for the relief of Krystyna Rataj which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 5, after the name "Krystyna", to strike out "Rataj" and insert "Ratay"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (28) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Krystyna Ratay may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act. This Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Krystyna Ratay."

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT—WHAT IS IT? HOW DOES IT FUNCTION?"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, which was reported this morning and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) to authorize the printing as a House document of the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government—What Is It? How Does It Function?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments, on page 1, line 2, after the word "That", to strike out "(a)"; in line 6, after the word "a", to strike out "House" and insert "Senate"; in line 8, after the word "Function", to strike out "In addition to the usual number there shall be printed two thousand copies for use and distribution by each Member of Congress"; and after line 10, to strike out:

"(b) As used in this concurrent resolution the term 'Member of Congress' includes a Member of the Senate, a Member of the House of Representatives, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico." and insert a semicolon and "and that there shall be printed one million eighty-four thousand additional copies of such document, of which two hundred and six thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and eight hundred and seventy-eight thousand copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) was agreed to.

TO PRINT, WITH ILLUSTRATIONS, "A REPORT ON U.S. FOREIGN OPERATIONS IN AFRICA," BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 29, which was reported this morning and is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) to print, with illustrations, the report of U.S. Foreign Operations in Africa, by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document, a report entitled "A Report on United States Foreign Operations in Africa," submitted by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and that four thousand additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

FIFTEENTH ANNUAL ARTHUR S. FLEMMING AWARDS PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the downtown chapter of the District of Columbia Junior Chamber of Commerce has completed its 15th annual Arthur S. Flemming Awards program. This program is conducted in cooperation with the Potomac Electric Power Co., the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., and the Washington Gas Light Co.

The Arthur S. Flemming Awards program was established to honor outstanding young men in the Federal Government and to recognize exceptionally meritorious work, to attract top-caliber young men to Government service; to encourage high standards of performance and to enhance appreciation of Government service and the opportunities and responsibilities that it presents. For the 15th annual program, over 90 Government agencies were invited to submit nominations for the awards. The Flemming Commission, under the chairmanship of Charles A. Dukes, Jr. narrowed the nominees to 21 men. The panel of judges, who chose the 10 finalists, was headed by the Honorable Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, and included Oscar Berry, vice president and general counsel of the Washington Gas Light Co.; Louis Johnson, senior partner, Steptoe & Johnson, and former Secretary of Defense; Richard Norris, president of the Riggs National Bank; Charles E. Phillips, president of Equitable Life Insurance Co. and president of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade; and C. R. Smith, president of American Airlines. The Senator from Minnesota also was privileged to serve on the panel of judges. The following winners were selected:

Lawrence Lewis Kavanau, Defense Research and Engineering.

Kevin T. Maroney, Department of Justice.

N. Thompson Powers, Department of Labor.

George Stevens, Jr., U.S. Information Agency.

John Robinson Wilkins, Agency for International Development.

Edgar Maurice Cortright, Jr., National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Norman Joseph Doctor, Department of the Army.

Charles M. Herzfeld, Department of Defense.

George Michael Low, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Joseph Francis Saunders, Department of the Navy.

Our country is indeed fortunate in possessing a Government career service which attracts these exceptionally talented young men and in having public-spirited organizations which have voluntarily established this program to recognize and honor them.

The Flemming Award winners, the downtown chapter of the junior chamber of commerce, and the cosponsors of this fine program are to be congratulated for their outstanding contribution to the Federal service.

I ask unanimous consent that the information relating to the outstanding service performed by the Flemming Award winners be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING 15TH ANNUAL AWARD WINNERS

ADMINISTRATIVE

Lawrence Lewis Kavanau, defense research and engineering: Dr. Kavanau's office is the focal point for the research and development aspects of the military space program and coordination with NASA and other agencies involved in the national space program. He served as Deputy Director and leader of the Department of Defense delegation on the Large Launch Vehicle Planning Group which provided the blueprint for the launch vehicles used in the National Manned Lunar Landing program.

Kevin T. Maroney, Department of Justice: Mr. Maroney has personally argued eight cases before the Supreme Court and five cases before various U.S. Courts of Appeal. The celebrated Rudolph Abel espionage case and the Supreme Court ruling requiring the Communist Party to register with the Attorney General are among his successes, "attributable almost entirely to the vigor, competence, experience, and mature judgment of Mr. Maroney."

N. Thompson Powers, Department of Labor: Mr. Powers had primary responsibility for organizing and coordinating the assistance program for workers adversely affected by the Trade Expansion Act. This program provides retraining, special unemployment compensation, and relocation allowances. "His outstanding performance contributed immeasurably to * * * this significant program for the protection of * * * workers * * * affected by trade and tariff concessions." He was also responsible for planning, coordinating and carrying out the White House Regional Conferences on Youth.

George Stevens, Jr., U.S. Information Agency: Mr. Stevens has the primary responsibility in the U.S. Government for worldwide projection of America's image through motion pictures. The USIA-produced movies of Mrs. Kennedy's visits to India and Pakistan have received international acclaim. He has established an intern program for developing new USIA motion picture production supervisors and was chairman of the U.S. delegation at the Cannes and Venice Film Festivals.

John Robinson Wilkins, Agency for International Development: Since May 1962, Mr. Wilkins has served as Acting General Counsel and is responsible for establishing, directing and coordinating all legal services for AID. He was personally responsible for providing legal continuity in creating AID and terminating the International Cooperation Administration. Mr. Wilkins' role has been extraordinarily vital and influential in shaping in a legal way the course and conduct of the foreign-aid program.

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL

Edgar Maurice Cortright, Jr., National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Mr. Cortright shares with the Director the responsibility for planning and directing NASA's unmanned scientific space exploration programs. He led the conception and establishment of the Mariner program, carrying it through to successful flight operation. In addition, he carries management responsibility for the lunar and planetary programs, the geophysics and astronomy scientific satellite programs, the space bioscience programs, and light and medium launch vehicle programs.

Norman Joseph Doctor, Department of the Army: As a research and development supervisor in the microminiaturization branch, Mr. Doctor has pioneered in electronic miniaturization, scoring breakthroughs of major importance to military, space and industrial programs. His revolutionary two-dimensional packaging techniques for hearing aids received nationwide recognition. Recent contributions have been electronic circuitry for short-wave receivers, a clock for man-portable range finders, and a presettable automatic timer.

Charles M. Herzfeld, Department of Defense: Dr. Herzfeld is responsible for directing, planning, and coordinating the entire ARPA ballistic missile defense effort (Project Defender). His analysis of the complex technical, political, economic, and strategic factors of the program has produced important modifications in related military research and development programs and major changes in strategic weapons programs. Dr. Herzfeld's contributions have produced significantly more effective U.S. military posture.

George Michael Low, National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Mr. Low is responsible for development of manned spacecraft and management of manned space flight operations including Projects Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo. He was chairman of the select committee which performed the original studies leading to the manned lunar landing program. This program, now under his direction, is the next achievement of major significance to be attained in space.

Joseph Francis Saunders, Department of the Navy: As one of his programs in basic medical and dental research, Dr. Saunders established collaborative research programs with Britain and the Netherlands toward dealing with blood shortages during disasters. Under his direction, a process for indefinite stockpiling of human blood has been developed which will not only improve medical care and save millions of dollars annually, but has far-reaching implications for other medical research breakthroughs such as grafting of organs, preservation of tissues, and control of aging.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative Doyle, of California, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 11 a.m.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 15, 1963, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 14, 1963:

Department of State

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

In the Marine Corps

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Maj. Gen. Charles H. Hayes, U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

Department of the Navy

Rear Adm. William A. Brockett, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

IN THE NAVY

Adm. Robert L. Dennison, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having designated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Vice Adm. David L. McDonald, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

Having designated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. William E. Gentner, Jr., U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Assaults Against the Free Enterprise System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it was my honor and pleasure to address the National Security Commission of the American Legion this morning at the Statler Hotel. I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech by U.S. Senator Barry Goldwater, Republican, of Arizona, Before the National Security Commission of the American Legion, March 14, 1963, Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.

Washington in his Farewell Address warned that our form of government could be attacked and destroyed through means other than a direct assault. I believe his words of warning could be appropriately directed to many of the activities which we find our society engaged in today. I am thinking of things like the direct and indirect assaults being made against the free enterprise system, like the downgrading of our military system and its leaders, like the great unrealistic push for disarmament at any cost.

Today I should like to direct my remarks to what is taking place in the field of military development and disarmament. This is an area of great concern and importance to the America people because it directly affects the present and continued security of our Nation in a time of mortal conflict with an enemy which has sworn to destroy us. It also is an area which is growing so complex so fast that it must be studied constantly by all Americans interested in the defense and extension of freedom throughout the world.

And let me state at the very outset my fear that the course we are presently embarked upon is in the direction of unilateral disarmament.

On April 18, 1962, President Kennedy at a press conference said "the United States has today tabled at Geneva an outline of every basic provision of a treaty of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world." This document should receive far more consideration and study than it has been given by the people of this country. Here is a sweeping, all-inclusive proposal for disarmament that had not been discussed with the interested Members of Congress, but which has the possibilities of reducing the U.S. ability to wage war at all levels to an impossibly weak position. At the time, no one took this document too seriously, and for a variety of reasons. To begin with, it was regarded more in the line of a propaganda gesture designed to show the world that we were more desirous of disarmament and lasting peace than were the Russians. It also was felt to be a document that the Soviets would never agree to, and, therefore completely meaningless. Another factor was the assurance from administration spokesmen that any agreement reached at Geneva would have to be ratified by the U.S. Senate.

It never occurred to any of us, I am afraid, that the mere offering of this proposal at Geneva, containing as it did specific steps looking to the eventual disbandment of national armies and their replacement by a United Nations peace force, was in itself a moral commitment of a sort. And I don't believe anyone in his wildest dreams ever considered the possibility that the three-stage disarmment plan tabled at Geneva might provide the framework for unilateral moves by the United States to try and reverse the trend toward greater weapons systems.

Now I won't burden you with the entire wording of this document here today. But I must mention what to me is the salient point in the first stage of the American disarmament proposal, because it is in this area that we find the United States seemingly hellbent on accomplishment without benefit of Russian reciprocity. The point I have reference to calls for a reduction in the inventory of vehicles capable of delivering nuclear weapons. Either by accident or design, we seem to be proceeding with this objective through administrative orders from the Pentagon. Consider, for a minute, the decisions that have been announced since this program for disarmament was presented at Geneva. The RS–70 has been abandoned, Skybolt has been dropped, manned bombers are being phased out, Nike-Zeus is being delayed, the Dyna-Soar program is being reexamined for possible junking.

I believe it is very important at this stage in our development if all of us would rework our thinking on the subject of disarmament. What does the word really mean? To most people, I suspect, it means the actual doing away with arms, and to those of us who have lived through periods of actual disarmament the association is with the sinking of vessels, the destruction of guns and tanks and other weapons, etc. But I believe now we must understand that disarmament can be accomplished under present conditions by the simple expedient of not providing new military equipment, particularly in the fields of vehicles capable of carrying nuclear weapons; by slowing down research and development; by not pushing nuclear tests as fast as does the enemy.

This position of mine might seem incongruous to you because it can accurately be argued that we are spending more for defense this year than ever before; we are building up our long-neglected conventional forces and we are adding heavily to tactical aviation. So I believe it is necessary, to explain why, I believe, we present the picture of a nation trying to perform the hazardous and difficult task of going in two directions at the same time.

There are those in Government who realize that strength and the willingness to use it are the only deterrents to war, but there are others who believe that we must push disarmament no matter what concessions we must make to get the job done. I suspect that these opposing forces are contesting for supremacy in the development of policy and implementing action.

Let me point out that up to a few days ago it was abundantly clear that the civilians in the Pentagon were against the manned bomber and consistently fought any plans for extending its life beyond 1970 when the B–52's are due to be completely phased out. But just this week we learn that the Secretary of Defense, under congressional prodding, is showing some interest in the development of a long-range reconnaissance strike vehicle and has suggested to the Air Force that recommendations be made.

This is good news because it indicates that the Secretary may finally have come to realize that we must be superior in all areas of military capability or risk failure in our efforts to preserve peace and extend freedom. The reluctance of the Pentagon to push for development and production of the RS–70 program—even though all study groups in the Pentagon have recommended it and Congress has voted the necessary funds—has been a contributing factor in my conclusion that we are engaged in unilateral disarmament. And I am therefore happy to recognize what may be a change in attitude on the part of the Secretary of Defense and hope that he will not perform on this as he did in the case of Skybolt and completely reverse his field in the space of 1 year.

Now speaking of Skybolt, the air-to-ground missile that the British had been counting on, let me quote you what the President of the United States had to say about it on March 28, 1961, in a message to Congress. He said, "Another type of missile less likely to be completely eliminated by enemy attack is the air-to-ground missile carried by a plane that can be off the ground before an attack commences * * * its successful development and production may extend the useful life of our bombers in the missile age."

As you all know, this important concept, emphasized by the President in March of 1961, was abandoned at Nassau without any consultation, so far as I can determine, with the Air Force or with our NATO allies other than Great Britain.

This audience might well ask, "Is it important?" Well, I can tell you that the majority of the military people, and I believe that includes a majority of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, think it is just as important today as it was in March of 1961. And, we might heed what the Russians are saying. An article distributed by the Soviet news agency Tass on February 21 of this year claimed the Russians have "supersonic rocket-carrying aircraft capable of striking enemy [United States] targets without entering their zone of antiaircraft defense."

It is important for us here to understand that the Skybolt would have done two important things: It would have insured man's place in the air and it would have given our Air Force and the Royal Air Force of Great Britain a weapon with which the enemy could be attacked from 360 degrees instead of the very few known degrees that ICBM's must travel, thus compounding his defense problem. This, like the RS–70, constituted a vehicle which could carry nuclear weapons. And it was abandoned on the basis of some mysterious computations arrived at by the civilian Pentagon.

We now get into the important area of space and I believe that from now on in speaking of what we formerly called air power, we must substitute the phrase aerospace power. The argument we hear most often these days from those in official position who see space development only along peaceful lines is that there is no call for man in space even though they will admit that there can be military uses of space.

Until recently our one official concession to the military possibilities of space was the Dyna-Soar program for manned spacecraft projects. This program called for the development of a piloted spacecraft which could be lifted into orbit by a Titan III rocket and glide back to earth on wings. To my way of thinking, it would add an important new dimension to the defense system and one that we can rest assured the Russians are at this very moment attempting to master. But the latest reports gleaned from the Defense Secretary's testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, indicate that this important program may become the price of a new missile-armed bomber to follow the B–52. In other words, according to the press reports, if the Pentagon authorizes a new manned bomber it may cancel the Dyna-Soar.

This, of course, is no answer at all to the heavy criticism the Defense Department has been running into on Capitol Hill. The demand being raised in Congress for adequate defense is not subject to barter, or the trading of one weapons system for another. It is rather a demand for more defense options, for an overall defense program that will provide us with a maximum of flexibility. This demand is for manned bombers as well as spacecraft. It does not downgrade the Pentagon's preoccupation with conventional Armed Forces, but sees these as an integral and important part of the whole.

Dyna-Soar is one of the oldest concepts for orbiting man. It could and should have been accomplished by the United States years ago. But now that it is on the verge of development, it must not be abandoned in favor of any other project. I must say from reading the papers I am completely puzzled by the Defense Secretary's reasoning. He seems to be telling us that Dyna-Soar can be canceled if we proceed to modify the Gemini for military purposes. Now this might sound reasonable enough to the layman, but it makes no sense to the military man. Dyna-Soar is a military project, planned that way from the very first. Gemini, which is a two-man spacecraft like the present one-man Mercury, is a nonmilitary project being developed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The problems and the time involved in suddenly adapting a patently civilian space project into a military program would be enormous. And the question arises of whether we have the time. The question also arises as to whether the adaptation of Gemini into a military spacecraft is practical enough to cause us to drop the Dyna-Soar.

Now if Pentagon cancels Dyna-Soar, as it did Skybolt, and then later changes signals on the development of new manned bombers again, the Air Force will have had it once and for all. Then aerospace superiority will pass unquestionably into the hands of the Russians.

If there is one thing we can say for sure about the Pentagon these days it is that U.S. military thinkers—with their slide rules, their electronic computers and their blinking lights—can change their minds faster about more important matters than any other group of planners in the world. They certainly change too fast for our allies to keep up, and I believe that we can find that the reason for much of the disarray in the Atlantic Community today is traceable directly to the Pentagon's inability to make up its mind on what weapons systems are best for the defense of the free world. We began with Skybolt, then switched to Polaris submarines, then switched to Polaris-carrying surface ships. We began with the RS–70, formerly known as the B–70, then switched to an all-missile concept, and now we appear to be getting back to the manned bomber idea. And as I have just pointed out, we began with Dyna-Soar and are now talking about junking that for a souped-up Gemini. What comes next, I can't tell you. I don't think even the Pentagon's latest model of UNIVAC has the answers as of this minute.

But I can tell you this, one of the simplest ways for this Nation to disarm itself is to keep changing our minds every year about military concepts and weapons systems while the Russians push ahead with a single-minded purpose of becoming supreme in all military spheres and dimensions.

While I have reported some encouraging signs that perhaps the Pentagon is getting back to the idea of a new manned bomber to carry on after the B–52 this is by no means certain. And I don't know how you can tell for sure in the light of all the contradictory information emanating from the Pentagon these days. But I suggest that if the Pentagon thinkers are still holding to the idea of placing our strategic reliance on missiles when today's nuclear strike power finds the men and bombers of SAC responsible for about 90 percent of our ability, then I suggest we are traveling down a very dangerous road. Someone once said, "If you can't command it, you can't control it; if you can't control it, it is useless in modern warfare." This being the case, I can think of no weapon with less commandability and controllability than a missile already launched. On the other hand, the manned aircraft is completely commandable and controllable and presents the enemy with the gigantic problem of defending himself from all sectors—not just one.

Included in our inventory of missiles are Polaris submarines and yet today after abandoning Skybolt, to the utter dismay of the British, we are suggesting that surface ships carry Polaris and that our NATO allies provide themselves with these weapons. The question that comes to mind here is why the United States doesn't cut back its own submarine program in favor of a mix of submarines and the less-expensive surface ships if it considers these latter good enough for NATO. If the surface ship is not good enough for the United States, why is it being sold to NATO?

Of course, no one can quarrel with the mixed concept in weapons and weapon carriers, but one can quarrel rather violently with the idea of placing all of our offensive and defensive eggs in the nose cone.

Who or what, for example, is going to tell our Commander in Chief what targets were hit and what targets were missed on enemy soil unless it be the eyes and voice of a man in an aircraft. Certainly, the enemy is not going to cable us that we missed such-and-such a target and hit others. Extend this argument out into space. If the enemy has, as they claim they have, a missile-carrying satellite, how can we expect to disarm it by seeing space only as an area to be pursued for peaceful purposes? Man has a place in space and I hope it does not require a Russian man in a weapons-carrying spacecraft to prove it to us in sputnik fashion.

Now on the nuclear test ban negotiations we have heard a great deal of talk about the Russian offer to accept three on-site inspections a year. President Kennedy hailed this as encouraging. Other administration spokesmen have interpreted it as a breakthrough insisting that it meant the Soviets had finally accepted the principle of on-site inspections. However, a man in position to know the truth of this—Arthur H. Dean, former chief U.S. disarmament negotiator—recently told a luncheon of the American Association for the United Nations that the Soviet limit would make any test ban agreement "absolutely unworkable." He went on to say that three inspections is like having three wheels on a car and that the Soviet offer does not represent a concession of any kind.

Another argument we hear frequently from disarmament enthusiasts is that our failing to detect Soviet underground tests would run no risk because nothing important could be gained through such low-yield experiments. However, Mr. Dean had something to say about that, too. He said that it is possible to carry out underground anti-missile-missile tests as well as neutron bomb tests if the neutron bomb is ever developed. This is precisely the argument used by Senator Dodd in his thorough-going and thought-provoking discourse on the dangers of the concessions we have been making at Geneva.

It is my firm conviction that when we begin concentrating on only what we in the United States can do to lessen the threat of nuclear escalation, we begin to think and act in terms of unilateral disarmament. Our primary concern in the military field should always be with enemy capabilities and enemy intentions. It does us absolutely no good at all to think in terms of disarmament unless our yearning and our desire is reciprocated by the forces which have sworn to destroy us. And we have no reason to believe that the Soviets are engaging in anything but a propaganda marathon at Geneva.

They haven't made one single move that would justify our belief that they want disarmament at this time under any terms. And even if they did sign an agreement with us, what assurance would we have that the terms of such an agreement would be honored? It could, and undoubtedly would, be broken at the first moment when a Soviet advantage could be gained. If we have learned anything at all from our experience in dealing with the Russians it is that they cannot be trusted in any sphere of East-West activity and certainly not in the military sphere.

So I believe we should stop thinking in terms of disarmament and start concentrating on what the Soviets are doing in the military field. There is no doubt at all that while the talking goes on at Geneva and we offer one set of concessions after another the Russians are proceeding at top speed and with great determination in all armament areas. They are probing the military possibilities of space. They are concentrating on new and wider military options. They are improving their military capabilities in all spheres and placing their main dependence on the manned bomber. They aren't stinting on the development of missiles. They are going ahead with all types. But they are keeping their manned bombers too because this increases their flexibility and adds an important option to their military capabilities.

Overall, the Russians are continuing to apply science and technology to military purposes with huge research and development programs. And from these flow a rapid progression of military systems from invention to operational inventory. Let me emphasize, there is absolutely no evidence of any kind that the Soviets are cutting down the number of their existing weapons systems, as we are, or that they are withholding the development of new systems.

Let me remind you that for all the decisions and counterdecisions coming out of the Defense Department these days; for all the talk we hear about the efficiency and competence of the Secretary of Defense; for all the money we are expending for military purposes, not one new weapons system has been proposed under the present administration. All the activity we see and hear about today is directed toward the shifting of concepts and weapons systems proposed and started under the Eisenhower and Truman administrations.

This is not only stagnation but it is also disarmament. Inertia in defense matters, compounded by indecision and constantly changing concepts, is the same as spotting our enemy an advantage, a running start, if you please, for the final confrontation.

In closing, let me say that man has come through thousands of years of development in warfare, from bare fists to nuclear weapons. Each offensive has been met with a defense as I am certain the nuclear threat will be. Man, who became master of the rivers became the master of Asia; man, who dominated the land masses and the means of controlling it, then dominated the early world. Then came man's domination of the seas, first in the Mediterranean, then on the oceans. Then came man's control of the air as we know it today and as every expert whom I have ever heard speak on the subject has said in one way or another, "He who controls space will control the world."

Those who feel that the risk of nuclear war is more real than the risk of not being strong can only see another engagement where triggers are pulled resulting immediately in all-out nuclear war. They obviously don't agree with the President who has said that he wants something between embarrassment and holocaust. These people fail to recognize that we have been witnessing a world engaged in many shooting wars ever since World War II and there has been no escalation. This has been true because, first, I am convinced that neither side ever wants to escalate to the ICBM or MRBM stage, and, second, our vast superiority in methods of delivery have driven the hard facts of war home to the enemy. We must keep them and develop new vehicles to replace them.

Forty-fourth Anniversary of the Founding of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, the American Legion will celebrate the 44th anniversary of its birth. Founded in Paris, France, at the historic caucus of delegates from the First American Expeditionary Force on March 15, 1919, the American Legion has grown from its 463 founding officers and men to an outstanding organization of more than 2½ million legionnaires. These legionnaires represent veterans from three wars: World War I; World War II, and the Korean war.

The largest veterans organization in all history, the American Legion has enjoyed a consistent record of dedication to, and pursuit of, the American ideal. Its continuing goal has been to keep America always American. It is therefore fitting to take this opportunity to congratulate the American Legion on its impressive record of achievement, dedication, and integrity.

So that all may know of the high ideals set forth for the Legion by its founders in March 1919, I would like to recite a portion of the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion:

> For God and country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes: to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order; to foster and perpetuate a 100 percent Americanism; to preserve the memories and incidents of our associations in the great wars; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy; to consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness.

Mr. Speaker, no greater compliment can be paid, I think, than to state that the American Legion has lived up to the high standards it set for itself 44 years ago. I join with the Legion's many friends all over the world in offering my deepest congratulations on the anniversary of its founding and on the outstanding record it has established. I am proud to be a member of this great veterans' organization.

St. Patrick's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. CONTE. On Sunday, Mr. Speaker, we celebrate again the great feast day of St. Patrick. Wherever men gather on this day, there will be good will. Although St. Patrick belongs to the sons of Erin, his feast has assumed the spirit of universality.

It has been almost 1,500 years since St. Patrick first set foot on Irish soil. The faith he planted there prospered and grew during the Middle Ages, and Ireland was a source of culture and missionary activity throughout Europe.

According to the calendar, it is not yet spring on St. Patrick's Day, and therein lies fair warning. But there is a kind of spring in St. Patrick's Day—for the green which stands for Ireland, which is indeed a fair land, can also

stand for the spring of joy and gladness which fills every Irish heart on this day.

It is my hope that the faith in God and the joy in life which our Irish brothers have always possessed in such abundance continue to light the world and bring hope and gladness in the most troubled times.

A New and Interesting Development in America's Space Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today to place before my colleagues in the House of Representatives certain information as to a new and interesting development in America's space program. The Science and Astronautics Committee is presently holding hearings on this development. Although this matter has been discussed at considerable length in the New England press, I am not sure that all are fully informed on it.

Members of the House will recall that when President Kennedy, 2 years ago, recommended expansion and acceleration of the national space program he described it as part of "the battle that is going on around the world between freedom and tryanny—the battle for men's minds." He made it clear to the Congress that a difficult, expensive, and comprehensive program, in space sciences and technology, would be necessary. In this connection he stated:

> This decision demands a major national commitment of scientific and technical manpower, material and facilities, and the possibility of their diversion from other important activities where they are already thinly spread.

This continues to be the problem of the space program. It is absolutely essential that the appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration be utilized to develop and support a wide range of programs of scientific investigation and development.

There are, of course, many facets to the scientific, research, and development work of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, each part of which must be permitted to proceed and accelerate to the extent possible in harmony, one with the others. In some cases, NASA has been able to build on known technology or to accelerate programs of research and development that had already been instituted. For example, it was able to expand on the talents available from the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. It was able to integrate into its program certain of the work of the Army Ballistics Missile Agency, under Dr. Wernher von Braun, at Huntsville, Ala., the Vanguard team from the Naval Research Laboratory, and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory which had been under Army contract. NASA has been able to integrate the work of these separate teams and on them to build sound and forward looking space programs in the aeronautical and propulsion fields.

However, a less satisfactory foundation has existed with respect to electronics and its related physics disciplines and capabilities. It became obvious that some extraordinary steps were necessary to keep that phase of the space sciences in pace with the rest of the program. The major importance of electronics components, technology, and instrumentation, in all space endeavors, made it doubly necessary to broaden NASA's space electronics research base as rapidly as possible.

An extensive study of the best way to approach this problem was inaugurated; various approaches were explored, such as the possibility of establishing electronic research systems and development groups at one or more of NASA's existing centers, the establishment of a fairly large electronics research subcenter at an existing NASA installation, the use of the talents of other governmental electronics laboratories, the establishment of a private laboratory as an affiliate of a major university or foundation, and the desirability of establishing a new NASA center as an entity with the necessary facilities.

After most careful analysis, it was decided that the most effective solution, consistent with all other problems, was to establish a new research center, specifically devoted to research in electronics and related physics disciplines. This would permit a concentration of research talent in one place; it would avoid conflicts between development missions and research efforts in other fields, and by providing a variety of research facilities available under a singleness of direction it was felt that there would be a rapid development of a critical mass of electronics research data. I wish to point out this center is for research and not for development of hardware or for production of electronic components or subsystems. The results of its research will be available to all. It should be a factor in the growth of electronic and related industries. There are estimates that about three-fourths of the cost of spacecraft goes for electronics, yet at present, members of the industrial community undertaking spacecraft contracts spend no more than 5 percent of their resources for electronic research.

This decision having been made, further studies were made as to the proper location of such a facility. This included consideration of a host of criteria, including the availability of adequate utilities and services, including power, water, communications, and sanitary facilities, the proximity of institutions of higher scientific and engineering education, not only as a basis for the interchange of ideas but at which facilities could be provided for additional study by members of the research center's staff. Other considerations involved the need for the new center to be located in an industrial community in which interests with similar technical work were available. It was essential, because of the proposed size of the center, to be sure that the new installation would have available to it satisfactory community facilities such as housing, recreation, schools, and colleges, and a variety of transportation services would be available for both long and short distances.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, after most careful consideration, has decided that the best place to locate the electronics research center is in the Greater Boston area It has recommended that such action be taken and it is my understanding that the President's budget includes initial funds for the acquisition of land, site development, and planning for such a facility

A total of $8.5 million has been recommended for this purpose in the fiscal year 1964. Five million dollars is budgeted for the acquisition of land, site development, and planning of the research center, and $3.5 million for personnel costs and for the operation of the installation. As now conceived, the center will involve a capital investment of approximately $50 million in buildings and facilities and a gradual growth of personnel assigned thereto to the level of 2,000 people.

As I understand it, an interim step in the planning of this great institution is being taken prior to the actual congressional decision through the establishment of an electronics research task group, temporarily attached to the Office of Advanced Research and Technology and composed of personnel located both at headquarters in Washington and at the northeastern office in Cambridge.

On behalf of myself and the entire Massachusetts delegation, I should like to commend the foresight, vision, and decision of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in this matter, and to commend to my colleagues on the Committee on Science and Astronautics and on the Appropriations Committee the early consideration of the authorization and appropriation actions necessary to initiate this very important phase of America's space effort.

Quality Control: Key to Survival of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALAN BIBLE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the subject of "quality control as a key to industrial survival" raises a subject vital to our economy and to the national security.

Recently, my colleague, Senator Howard W. Cannon, addressed the Western Quality Control Conference on methods and techniques which could be employed to secure economies and greater proficiency in both industrial and defense production. His remarks have been well received by industry and should be of interest to the Nation as a whole.

I ask unanimous consent to have Senator CANNON's speech printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUALITY CONTROL: KEY TO SURVIVAL OF THE UNITED STATES

(Speech of Senator HOWARD W. CANNON, of Nevada, before the Western Regional Quality Control Conference, Las Vegas, February 22, 1963)

Ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor to be with you today and to address this conference which has under consideration the subject, "Quality Control as a Key to Industrial Survival."

As the process of technological change moves inevitably forward, quality control has become a vital key to the future. Quality control, or, in the words of Dr. Robert Seamans, associate director of the National Aeronautics Space Agency, the "assurance that men and equipment will do what they are supposed to do at the right time and for the right period of time, in every phase of long and complicated operations," is vital both to civilian industrial processes and to the defense of our country.

In a sense, therefore, survival of the United States in this turbulent world, depends upon proper quality control, or reliability.

Our technological society has already embarked upon the industrial revolution characterized by the word "automation." Automation is, as you know, the process of controlling operations through mechanical or electronic devices, with little or no human assistance. These operations may control industrial production, manipulate, and solve and retrieve information.

Consequently quality control is of the utmost importance to the operation of automated processes, and in turn, facilitates the development and refinement of further automated operations. As automation gains momentum, quality control will grow in significance.

In my remarks today I would like to pose the question of whether we have true and reliable quality control and just how much of what we hear about is for show and how much of this important effort is actually producing results. I am informed that America spends up to $10 billion a year for military maintenance and repair. Certainly much of this vast expenditure of taxpayers' money is justified, but it is the shrinking of this multibillion-dollar figure that is the end result of quality control. And it is my interest as a Senator and a member of the Armed Services Committee to do everything I can to assure that quality control not be given a lot of lipservice and very little attention. Such gatherings as this can go a long way toward getting the objectives of our common purpose.

Let me cite just one example of automation and reliability testing. A completely automated 110-foot production line, designed and operated by one of the largest electrical products companies in the United States, produces film strip resistors. The production line is a highly coordinated system in which a digital computer calls all the signals. Automated equipment deposits a carbon coating on a ceramic core, sputters on gold terminations, attaches caps and leads, spirals the carbon to value, encapsulates the resistor in a protective shell, tests at three different points for quality, marks appropriate values on the resistor, and finally packs the components for shipping.

At no point in this entire process is a human operator involved. Human error, poor judgment, inattention, and fatigue have been eliminated as possible causes of defective components.

Furthermore, an automatic performance or "quality control" test checks each resistor for leakage of its protective shell. The units are immersed in a hot bath and any leakage, indicated by air bubbles, is detected by a photoelectric cell. Should the resistor fail this leakage test, the component is automatically discarded by the machine.

Although the electronics industry is still in its infancy in the development of automated production lines, because of the increasing emphasis upon reliability, other automated lines will doubtless be designed to produce the hundreds of components which make up every piece of electronic equipment.

The process of automation is revolutionizing many other industries, as well.

No mention of automation can fail to ask the question, "Is this new technological development a blessing or a curse?"

If handled through intelligent business and Federal programs, I am confident that automation will prove a boon to mankind. Greater production of goods and services, both military and civilian, increased productivity and lower costs, shorter hours, widened opportunities for education, and upgrading of skills. These and many other benefits can accrue to our society from proper use of automation. In short, a higher standard of living for all, as evidenced by an ever-expanding real gross national product, could result from automation.

Without a strong and growing economy, geared to maximization of production and consumption, this country cannot meet its vital international and domestic commitments and emerge victorious in its role of defender of the free world.

To repeat, as our economy evolves into a sophisticated automated society, greater and greater emphasis will be placed on the central theme of this conference—quality control.

Turning now to the interrelated spheres of defense operations and space exploration, here again the keystone is "quality control" or "reliability." The efficient functioning of conventional armaments, and missiles and space vehicles as well, depends upon "quality control." In fact, with the current emphasis upon missile and spacecraft programs, "quality control" looms larger and larger in significance, for the cost of today's complex space vehicles and weaponry has reached an alltime high. Recently someone aptly quipped, "When you have a malfunction in space, you can't pull into Joe's garage."

We in Congress have often thought that it would be better not to have the equipment at all, than to have it and not be able to use it when we need it. We should be able not only to detect errors, but to prevent them before they are made. I am looking to this society to develop methods and techniques to improve quality and to keep up with technological advances.

The challenge of "quality control" or reliability is succinctly stated by a recent editorial in the magazine Aviation Week, as follows:

"The problem of achieving 100 percent reliability in space exploration vehicles is difficult enough, but the problem becomes even more acute when the space age moves as it will shortly—into operational satellite systems for weather reporting, navigation, reconnaissance, and communications. For in these systems, a single minor component failure in a single satellite could disrupt the functioning of the entire system for the interval it would take to fire a replacement vehicle into proper orbit. This would prove to be an extremely expensive process if the failure rate reached as high as the statistical rate now generally acceptable in high 'quality control' industries."

Ladies and gentlemen, perhaps a word or two concerning the dimensions of our defense and space exploration programs will further emphasize the need for the highest possible standards of "quality control." Estimates place defense spending during fiscal year 1963 at $48.3 billion; it will certainly be higher in fiscal year 1964. Potentially the most expensive single aspect of the defense program, its expenditures on space systems, only, are currently costing about $2 billion a year.

In addition, nonmilitary space programs are costing approximately $3.6 billion during fiscal year 1963 and will doubtless rise in the next fiscal year.

Unfortunately, these huge expenditures to make America invincible are a necessity in a world constantly threatened by war.

As President Kennedy declared in his current state of the Union message to Congress, "Until the world can develop a reliable system of international security, the free peoples have no choice but to keep their arms nearby.

"This country, therefore, continues to require the best defense in the world. This means, unfortunately, a rising defense budget. It means the expenditure of more than $15 billion this year on nuclear weapons systems alone. * * *

"But it also means improved air and missile defenses."

Models of missiles and space vehicles of the future stagger the imagination. Although our space program has already produced modern wonders, who knows what the future will bring? Battles in outer space are by no means beyond the realm of possibility. Let there be no mistake about it. That nation which controls outer space, controls our planet, earth.

Although the United States and the Soviet Union recently concluded an agreement on peaceful uses of space and are negotiating for further agreements, nevertheless we must be vigilant. Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell L. Gilpatric warned last June, "We are very conscious of the need, however, for taking out * * * certain technological insurance, be it cost support or a share of the national objective of peaceful use of outer space. We have had some sad experiences, obviously, in reaching agreements with the Soviets on nuclear test bans and other such objectives for the benefit of mankind. And we want to be prepared, and we don't want to be caught by surprise if any hostile use of space should occur."

Therefore, with the steady advance of the space age with all of its military implications, our lives quite literally depend upon the concept under discussion at this conference—"quality control."

Perhaps we can one day soon find the answer to the question posed for all of us, and that is, that we never have time enough to build things right the first time, but we always find time to build things again when they are not right.

What happens when "quality control" is a success? What happens when quality control fails? Let me illustrate by a few examples.

One major element of U.S. nuclear power is the Minuteman ICBM. Why? Because it has proved to be a sure-fire missile. Extreme accuracy, high reliability, and relatively low cost are the chief design characteristics of the Air Force's Minuteman ICBM. To achieve the high reliability requirements of this missile, special reliability programs were instituted at each of the component manufacturers.

Similarly, the Mariner II Venus probe established a new landmark in the scientific exploration of the solar system. Preliminary results from one of the Mariner instruments, a magnetometer, indicate that substantial and useful information was obtained as the spacecraft triumphantly raced past Venus on December 14, 1962.

Without "quality control," these delicate instruments on Mariner II could never successfully transmit data to recording instruments manned by anxious scientists here on earth.

Failures due to lack of proper "quality control" are costly. For instance, the premature end of the useful life of the orbiting solar observatory early in June 1962, was a good example of why the highest possible standards of reliability or quality assurance must be demanded of industrial contractors. OSO was intended to provide a wide variety of solar data during an orbital life of 6 months, as an early step in our "man on the moon" project. Instead, a relatively minor mechanical malfunction deprived the entire complex satellite of all of its useful functions at the end of 11 weeks.

In spite of the failure of this first OSO, the lunar project, or Project Apollo, is continuing full speed ahead in an attempt to beat the Russians to the moon.

Furthermore, one of our foremost submarine experts recently charged that industry has fallen dangerously short of meeting the exacting technological standards of the nuclear age.

He said, "Not just the complicated gear but also the conventional components of nuclear plants are frequently flawed by faulty welding and casting due to ineffective quality control and failure to follow specifications. Delivery and performance of these conventional items have been less reliable than of the nuclear reactors themselves." For example, "In the case of steel castings, we often have to order two to three times as many as we need because we have so much trouble obtaining satisfactory ones."

Officials of the Defense Department believe that the performance of defense contractors would improve greatly if there were stiffer penalties for slipshod work and higher rewards for jobs well done.

Realizing that reliability or quality control is now a matter of major national concern, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency instituted last year a new program designed to assure the desired quality of space systems. I am sure that you are all far more conversant with the technical aspects of this program than I am. However, the basic program may be summarized as follows:

(1) It shall be NASA policy to utilize every practical means of assuring high quality of space systems. In order to accomplish this objective, quality assurance requirements shall be placed contractually on space system contractors and subcontractors by NASA installations.

(2) Assuring satisfactory contractor performance in developing and maintaining the quality of space systems and their parts is the responsibility of the cognizant installation, assisted by Government inspection agencies to the extent determined advantageous by the NASA installation.

As the significance of "quality control" deepens, the need for scientists and engineers who specialize in the techniques of such control likewise increases.

However, shortages of talented, highly trained scientists and engineers threaten the achievement of vital national goals. The President's Science Advisory Committee warns that "unless remedial action is taken promptly, future needs for superior mathematicians and physical scientists will seriously outstrip supply." The report commented on the challenge of military security and space explorations as follows:

"Extensive and sophisticated research and development serve as critical elements of a modern national defense effort which increasingly depends upon highly complex systems and diversified military capabilities."

Achievement of national goals in space creates an extraordinary new demand for scientific and technological manpower. The highly complex nature of space projects, compressed time scales, and need for high reliability require especially perceptive and able technical management, the best in engineering, and for the future, new advances in science.

To meet burgeoning needs for engineers, mathematicians, and specialists in the physical sciences, now often abbreviated EMP, the President's committee recommends a vastly expanded program of Federal, State, and private financial aid to graduate students in these fields. Furthermore, existing centers of excellence in "EMP" and encouragement of the establishment of new centers specializing in these areas should be included in such a broad educational program.

I heartily concur that this program of aid to EMP, which is embodied in a legislative program recently submitted by the President to the Congress, should be enacted during this session. I would like to see much more done in the field of science and engineering education.

As the committee report states, "The relationship of science and engineering to our vital national commitments is such that we cannot postpone the start of a vigorous, and ambitious national program to accelerate EMP graduate training. The Federal Government must immediately take the initiative, the leadership, and the central responsibility for supporting this effort."

To sum up, quality control is literally the key to survival of the United States. The complex and accelerated technological advances produced by automation demand an unprecedented level of reliability of performance in civilian industry. "Quality control," or reliability, in turn, paves the way for further development of automated processes.

If properly utilized, automation can produce enough goods and services to enable this Nation to meet easily its international commitments, while achieving at the same time, its domestic goals of a decent standard of living for all.

In the area of defense operations and space exploration, "quality control" is assuming ever greater importance.

We are dealing with a problem which does not only involve the "quality control" experts at your plants, it also includes designers, purchasing agents, and production planners. All of these people have to be motivated to do it right the first time through the application of what some of you in the trade call "meticulous attention to grubby detail." But the goal is well worth the effort when we consider that there would be few if any failures at Cape Canaveral with really ironclad "quality control." And when we realize that we are not pushing the state of the art too fast but too often we assume that "quality control" exists where, in truth, it does not.

Although conventional weapons are by no means relegated to the past, the new space age with all the military implications of missiles and spacecraft, likewise places a premium on "quality control."

To insure higher standards of "quality control," the Defense Department suggests greater rewards for excellent performance by contractors and NASA has instituted a "quality control" program as an integral part of its contract procedures.

Finally, we are threatened by shortages of scientific manpower so necessary to the carrying out of "quality control" programs. To remedy this dire situation, further governmental and private programs are needed to strengthen higher education in EMP.

Let me close with the following quotation, again from Dr. Seamans, "We are engaged in a tremendous scientific and technological effort to carry out our accelerated national program. After the brains, the skills, and the industrial resources have been marshaled, the key to success still lies in the reliability * * *" or, in the words of today's program, "quality control."

Proposed Legislation To Alleviate the Shortage of Physicians and Dentists in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have, during this session, introduced three bills to help alleviate the critical shortage of physicians and dentists in the United States by providing Federal funds for medical and dental school construction, operating expenses, and scholarships.

Today I am introducing further legislation with the same objective of increasing our Nation's supply of doctors and dentists. Specifically, I propose to amend title II of the 1958 National Defense Education Act to provide for forgiveness of loans for students who subsequently practice medicine, dentistry, or osteopathy in geographical areas determined by State health authorities to have a shortage of individuals in such practice.

The National Defense Education Act already provides that up to 50 percent of loans plus interest may be forgiven if the borrower becomes a full-time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school. The loans may be canceled at a rate of 10 percent for each year of teaching service.

This provision was prompted by a critical shortage of trained teachers. Surely our Nation faces a no less critical shortage of health personnel, for we will need 15,000 additional doctors and a similar number of dentists by 1975.

What have we, as legislators, done about the dearth of doctors and dentists? Thus far we have placed very few marks on the legislative scoresheet. We have not yet acted favorably upon proposals that my colleagues and I have made to provide Federal assistance for the construction of badly needed medical, dental, and public health educational facilities. Nor has any Federal helping hand been extended to medical and dental schools in meeting their ever-mounting operating expenses. Nor has Congress acted favorably upon legislation which I have repeatedly introduced to provide for scholarships for medical and dental students.

Meanwhile, the shortage of these scarce personnel resources has become all the more serious with the decline—for the fifth consecutive year—in the number of medical school applicants.

The financial problems faced by these students—and I will use students of medicine as an example—have become increasingly insurmountable. Studies by the Association of American Medical

Colleges and the National Opinion Research Center in 1959 reveal that the medical student is indeed the "poor man" of the student world.

The proof is striking. A medical student's education—excluding living expenses—costs more than twice that of a graduate student in arts and science. The average direct cost to the medical student is about $1,000 a year or $4,000 in 4 years. In contrast, the educational expenses of the arts and science graduate student average only $450 a year or $1,800 for a 4-year program of Ph. D. training. Adding living expenses, the average 4-year expense to a medical student exceeds $11,000.

The difference in stipend income of these two groups is equally appalling. The average medical student receives $500 a year or $2,000 in stipends in 4 years; the average graduate student in arts and science receives $2,000 per year or $8,000 over a 4-year period.

Moreover, 47 percent of the medical students in 1959 had obtained loans, whereas only 9 percent of the graduate students had to borrow money to meet their educational or living expenses. The average dollar value of the loans to medical students was $3,900, while the average loan to the graduate student was $2,500. Thus more than five times as many medical students as graduate students had plunged themselves into debt.

The study further reveals that almost four times as many medical students received help from their families as did arts and science graduate students. Yet there was no evidence that the parents of medical students were in a higher income group. The answer given by the graduate students was simply that they did not receive support from their parents because they did not need any support from them.

The financial problems of medical students with wives and families—62 percent of the 1959 graduating class were married and 54 percent of them had one or more children—are even more acute.

Meanwhile, the tuitions charged by medical schools have risen at a phenomenal rate. Between 1934 and 1963, private medical school tuitions increased 202 percent, public school nonresident tuitions rose 161 percent, and resident tuitions rose 145 percent.

While the costs of a medical education progressively rise, the resources available to the medical student in meeting expenses progressively decline.

Faced with this serious situation, I propose that the national defense student loan program be modified so that 25 percent of the unpaid loan plus interest be forgiven for each complete year that an individual practices medicine, dentistry, or osteopathy in areas determined by State health authorities to have a shortage of such practitioners.

This amendment would have three important effects. First, it would remove the sharp edge from medical and dental student indebtedness which in 1959 averaged $4,258 per student for medical students alone. Of the 6,799 medical students who graduated in 1959, over half the class was in debt, and one-third had loan liabilities directly related to their medical education. Yet, unlike graduate students, these students faced a year of internship, and many faced 1 or more years of residency training before they could begin actual medical practice.

I have often pointed out that a number of Federal agencies such as the Office of Education, National Science Foundation, and Atomic Energy Commission provide not only loan but also scholarship and fellowship assistance to Ph. D. candidates in the basic sciences and engineering. Small wonder that these fields are becoming increasingly attractive to young people trying to decide upon a career.

The second effect of my amendment would be to help alleviate physician and dentist shortages in areas where shortages are most serious; in particular, the rural areas of the United States.

For the past 20 years, the New England, North Atlantic, and Pacific regions of the United States have retained high ratios of physicians to population, while the South Central, North Central, and Mountain States have continued to have the lowest ratios.

In 1957 a total of 33 States were below the U.S. average in the ratio of non-Federal physicians to population. In view of the fact that our population has continued to increase while the number of graduating physicians has not, there is good reason to believe that the situation existing in 1957 is even more serious today.

The original intent of the National Defense Education Act which authorized the national defense student loan program, was "to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation" and "to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States."

Thus the third—and perhaps most important—effect of the amendment I propose would be to bring the national defense student loan program into closer conformity to these stated objectives which reflect not only the intent of the National Defense Education Act, but also the best interests of our Nation.

Urban Mass Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I have today sponsored the urban mass transportation bill so that I can be counted as one who is strongly supporting the administration bill, which provides $500 million in matching grants over a 3-year period to help State and local governments improve mass transit facilities.

A conference on transportation was held in the northeast section of Philadelphia, which is in my district. Local transportation problems were considered at the meeting, which was attended by civic leaders and city officials. Panel members who participated are connected with the Passenger Service Improvement Corp., Penjerdel, and Penn Jersey Transportation Study.

On March 4 the Honorable James H. J. Tate, mayor of Philadelphia, appeared before the House Committee on Banking and Currency as an official representative of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. Mayor Tate said he supported the mass transit bill "because I believe it offers an opportunity of providing adequate public transportation through regional agreements with private operations."

While some witnesses before the committee called the proposed legislation very conservative, requiring substantial local initiative and participation, it is an important step in the right direction. The enactment of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963 will materially aid the development of the city of Philadelphia and other great urban centers in our country.

Community Junior Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish a 5-year program of Federal assistance to the States for construction and expansion of public community junior colleges.

My bill is similar to a bill I introduced in the last session of the Congress and with H.R. 1575, which Mr. ULLMAN, of Oregon, introduced last January 19.

The modest program of Federal assistance for public community colleges provided in my bill will help combat the twin problems of the increasing need for technically trained manpower and the rising costs of college education. The high costs of college education prevents millions of bright youngsters from attending college. This problem and the absence of college facilities in many communities causes an unfortunate loss of brainpower which could be saved by establishing easily accessible and inexpensive public community colleges.

My bill provides for $200 million annually over a 5-year period for grants to the States for construction and expansion of public community colleges. Half of the yearly appropriation would be divided equally among the States. The remaining one-half would be apportioned among the States on the basis of their relative school enrollment compared to total school enrollment of all States.

The program will be administered by the U.S. Commissioner of Education in cooperation with the various State boards or commissioners of education. Federal assistance will be contingent upon acceptable State plans for constructing and expanding public junior colleges in communities needing and desiring such institutions.

Construction of public junior colleges will make higher education available at

low cost to the student and at moderate cost to society. There is a great need for these colleges, particularly in areas such as I represent.

Just as importantly, an expanded nationwide system of public community colleges can serve a diversity of purposes crucial for our increasingly technical economy. They provide 2-year programs of technical, scientific, and managerial training for those not desiring to attend a full 4-year college course. They also permit students desiring to complete 4-year courses to begin their education more inexpensively near home.

The investment required by this program is truly insignificant compared to the returns it will provide our society.

Need for Congressional Emphasis on Farm Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEC G. OLSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. OLSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to extend the feed grain program under terms which will give assurance of fair prices to farmers. Testimony has been presented to the Livestock and Feed Grain Subcommittee, of which I am a member, pointing out the success of the voluntary feed grain programs enacted by Congress for the years 1961 and 1962.

Present indications are that farmers will again sign up in larger than anticipated numbers for the feed grain program enacted for 1963. There is no dispute that our burdensome surplus feed grain stocks have been greatly reduced under these programs. In fact, testimony has been presented which would indicate that by the end of the 1963 marketing year, our feed grain stocks will be down to the point of providing only a safe carryover.

I make these remarks to point out the success of the programs passed by Congress to reduce the surplus. These programs, as we all know, were voluntary and to have been successful they required the cooperation of farmers. Farmers did cooperate and their income was substantially increased. Now, however, when stocks are reaching the point where they are not out of proportion to being adequate, I believe that Congress should be reminded that farmers are still receiving far less than their fair share of our national income.

It seems to be very evident that whenever our Nation has felt that need to call for increased production or decreased production, the farmer has always cooperated with congressional direction.

I believe very strongly that Congress should not now turn its back on the continued need of economic justice for our agricultural economy and I am in receipt of documented proof every day that much must yet be done to further improve farm income. The small businessmen in my district fully realize that the mere elimination of farmers is no solution to the less-frequent ring of the cash register. He is well aware that it is the total agricultural income of his trade area that counts, not how many farmers bring that income to town.

Mr. Speaker, I as well as the farmers I represent are well aware of the serious problems confronting our Nation. We believe that in order for the agricultural community to best be able to help solve these problems agriculture must be prosperous.

St. Patrick's Day Has Special Memory for All in Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech which I delivered to the Shamrock Society of North Providence, R.I., at Bouffard Council Hall, on March 10, 1963:

ST. PATRICK'S DAY HAS SPECIAL MEMORY FOR ALL IN RHODE ISLAND

(Remarks of U.S. Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY at annual celebration of Shamrock Society of North Providence at Bouffard Council Hall, North Providence, R.I., March 10, 1963)

I am happy to be with the Shamrock Society of North Providence tonight and to join in honoring the memory of Ireland's great St. Patrick on the eve of his approaching feast day.

For most of us the history of Ireland and the Irish race does not begin until the coming of St. Patrick to the Emerald Isle. It is difficult for any of us to even think of Ireland, or to speak about its past, its present, or its future, without at the same time thinking and speaking of its patron saint. It is quite appropriate and necessary that we of Irish birth or ancestry never cease to commemorate his feast day with gatherings such as this of the Shamrock Society of North Providence. It is the one and only time in all the year that we pause to recall the values of our Irish heritage, a noble heritage which has contributed so much to the mainstream of our own American way of life.

In a true sense we share the memory of St. Patrick and the celebration of his feast day with many others of differing races and nationalities for the simple reason that his character and his contributions to Christian civilization are such as to command a universal respect and admiration. This probably accounts for the fact that the patron saint of Ireland is not only honored in many other lands but also he is claimed as a native son by a number of nations extending from the Baltic Sea to the Mediterranean. As you know, the exact place of his birth has never been precisely determined. Some say that Patrick came to Ireland from the sunny shores of Italy or Spain; others say that he was born in the rocky uplands of Scotland or a lonely village on the French Normandy coast; some other authorities claim that he was really brought to Ireland from the Scandinavian area as a young galley slave on one of the Viking ships which frequently raided communities along the shoreline of Ireland. Perhaps it is not too important for us to know the exact origin of St. Patrick. The important thing is that we know that he brought the doctrine of the Christian gospel to pagan Ireland and achieved a victory there which has never been lost despite the erosion of the centuries on the spirit of man since those ancient days. His impact on the Irish mind and spirit has never been destroyed. Moreover, the peaceful force of Christian idealism which he implanted in the hearts and minds of the men and women of Ireland has produced a harvest of tremendous good in all quarters of the globe right up until the present time.

The tide of saints and scholars who have ventured forth from the green hills and dales of Ireland to other lands has resulted in innumerable achievements for the cause of Christian civilization both yesterday and today. No other country of comparable size in the history of the world has done so much for the cause of Christianity, and it all began with the planting of the seeds of faith by St. Patrick himself.

The religious nature of St. Patrick's Day requires that the first and most important of our recollections is that of the spiritual heritage which we derive from our Irish ancestry. However, as a direct result of adherence to the true concepts of Christianity, the Irish came to love and cherish freedom and liberty and to despise oppression and bigotry with such vehemence as to be willing to sacrifice their lives and fortunes in a persistent struggle to achieve and maintain these virtues for themselves and for others. Indeed, it can be said that the persecution and oppression of Ireland in the years gone by has been a most significance factor in the development of liberty and free government in various parts of the world.

For example, the earliest record we have of Irishmen in the United States coming together to pay homage to St. Patrick practically coincides with the movement for freedom and independence in the American Colonies. In 1771, at the city of Philadelphia, an organization which numbered both Protestants and Catholics of Irish birth or descent was founded and dedicated "to the memory of Ireland's patron saint." Many of them were later identified with the Revolutionary Army of Gen. George Washington—one of them, Stephen Moylan, became the trusted aide-de-camp to Washington himself. Other Irishmen were signers of the Declaration of Independence and were early participants in the Continental Congress. The contribution of the Irish to the foundation and the advance of this country is too well known to require any long recitation.

Their persecution in their homeland was due, as we know, chiefly to the reason of their loyal adherence to the faith of their fathers. The denial of this basic human freedom in Ireland resulted in a tremendous migration of Irishmen either through their free choice or by virtue of compulsion to many other lands on the European, North and South American continents, and even as far as the continent of Australia. Wherever they went the men and women of Ireland brought to their new homes love of their religion, love of ideals of freedom and liberty, and a hatred of oppression and tyranny. This is why Chile honors a Bernardo O'Higgins as its great liberator, France, a Marshal McMahon, America, a John Barry, Australia, a Sir Charles Duffy, and Newfoundland, a Michael O'Gorman—all sons of Ireland who were dedicated to the cause of freedom in their adopted countries.

We can all take pride in the fact that the names of countless Irishmen are found in the records of the early struggles of this country for its independence as well as its successive wars to maintain it. Of course, we are equally proud of the contribution in the arts and sciences which men of Irish birth or ancestry have made to the development and progress of the United States. I believe, however, that there is a special affinity between the characteristic Irish quality of stubborn insistence upon freedom and liberty, upon the right of freedom of worship, and the great historic tradition of our own State of Rhode Island of which we are all so proud and yet, at times, we may tend to forget. This State was founded on principles of liberty for which Irishmen were struggling and dying in Erin's Isle at the very time that Roger Williams, fleeing from puritanical oppression in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, erected his banner of freedom at what he called the Providence Plantations. He was banished for having dared to express the very thoughts of religious freedom and liberty in his sermons and writings which, if adopted in the British Isles, would have spared the people of Ireland from the fire and sword of the invading armies of Cromwell which were occurring at that very time. It is interesting to note that Roger Williams spoke out with equal vigor against the persecution of the Irish in Ireland as he did against the persecution of the Huguenots in France and the Indians in America.

In short, he spoke a language which the Irish could understand and support; he expressed a doctrine which would have meant salvation instead of ruination for the tiny nation of Ireland in his own day. While we know that he found no Irishmen awaiting him here on his long, hazardous flight from Massachusetts, who can say that a leprechaun or banshee did not help to guide him safely through the wilderness?

In keeping with the Christian concepts of charity, however, it is interesting to note that in 1676 when a great deal of suffering resulted from the Indian wars in New England, a public subscription was undertaken in and around Dublin, Ireland, to send a ship loaded with oatmeal, wheat, malt, butter, and cheese to relieve the critical needs of the early New England settlers. Most of this relief went to the Plymouth Colony. This is known as the "Irish donation of 1676" and is referred to in the "New England Historical General Register" as well as in the "Reports of the Rhode Island Historical Society." This is a remarkable demonstration of the application of the true Irish spirit of forgiveness.

It is well, also, to remember that the famous battle of Rhode Island which was fought near Newport in 1778 was successfully accomplished by forces of the Revolutionary Army under the command of the great New England Irishman, John Sullivan. There are many other interesting contributions to the early foundations of this State in which the names of men of Ireland are prominent. I would like to think that the Irish were particularly at home in this area because of the principles upon which the State was founded and Saint Patrick's Day should be the brighter and the happier for that very reason in the land of Roger Williams.

Recently, I came across an interesting connection between Ireland and the early State of Rhode Island which I would like to share with you. It is found in an early history of Brown University published in Providence in 1867 by a librarian of the university, Mr. Guild. In recounting the history of the foundation of this famous institution, originally called the College of Rhode Island, and setting forth the difficulties encountered in adopting its remarkably liberal charter which guarantees educational opportunities to persons of all religious faiths, the author told the story of the Reverend Morgan Edwards who in 1767, was commissioned to solicit funds for the foundation and endowment of the college.

He was authorized to seek them in England and Ireland to which he sailed that year. In order to allay any doubt as to his honesty, Dr. Edwards gave a meticulous account of all his receipts together with the names and residences of his benefactors. It is a remarkable fact that a large part of the contributions for the founding of this Baptist institution came from the cities of Cork and Dublin. As a matter of fact, the contributions from Dublin were greater than from any other area in the British Isles, except from the city of London. It is apparent that the concepts of freedom and liberty contemplated by the founders of the university struck a responsive chord in the hearts of many Irishmen.

High on the list of these early benefactors of Brown University are Mary Murphy, Frances McCarty, William Harrington, Mrs. Luke Kelly, John Reilly, Mary McMaster, John Armstrong, Joseph Dunn, and William Mitchell. Others on the Reverend Edwards list were Mathew O'Dwyer, Francis Allin, William Lawton, Humphrey Crowley, James Ellis, James Aikin, John Lyons, Abe Lane, Richard White, Robert Moore, Rachel Connors, William McGowan, James Martin, Thomas Read, Thomas King, Rebecka Gibbons, William Hunt, Nathaniel Mackey, Dr. Samuel McCormick, William Mitchell, James Moody, and James Brennan.

These contributions from Ireland together with those from England were placed in a special fund by the officers of the university with the requirement that the "interest thereof should forever go to pay the salary of the President."

So, from College Hill to Newport back to the Massachusetts border, St. Patrick's Day should be a day of special memory for all of us in Rhode Island. Let us never forget our heritage and let us not forget to give our thanks for the blessings of freedom and liberty which every son of Ireland has found awaiting him here in this great State of Rhode Island.

Address by Senator Hartke Before the District of Columbia Dental Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BIRCH E. BAYH
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the remarks of Senator VANCE HARTKE made before the District of Columbia Dental Society on March 11, 1963.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is probably true that you at one time or another have had a personal experience which brought out your instinct of self-preservation. For example, a serious personal sickness, combat in war, serious financial difficulties, or personal challenges. My purpose today is to think in terms of your self-preservation and how it is tied to our Nation.

First, we will review Khrushchev as a dictator; second, we will consider Stalin and Khrushchev; third, we will see that Khrushchev is a dictator and must be treated as one; fourth, we will recognize that dictators and thereby Khrushchev are real failures to humanity; fifth, we will try to bring out your self-preservation by recognizing that although dictators are dangerous, that our self-preservation is dependent on something more than merely defeating dictators.

In these days, it is frequent that there are wild exaggerations, at least in statements of some individuals, concerning the role of Khrushchev.

Frequently, many individuals seem to think that there is something remarkably different about this man. Let's look at him for a moment.

He is a dictator. He is pursuing a goal with a relentlessness, and sometimes pettiness. Khrushchev is, certainly, a man to be concerned with in this world today, mainly because of where he is in a position of importance. Therefore, we would have to admit that he is an important man.

But the fact that he is important does not make him immune to the emotions and weaknesses of less important men. He is subject to jealousy, to wounded pride, certainly to the desire for publicity. He is ambitious to the extent that he is interested in always attempting to disprove any inferiority he might have. He is revengeful. He has a tendency to close the door on those with whom he disagrees, and he certainly disagrees with enough people as is evident by those who have been banished from high place in his government.

Indeed, the passion and the temperament, and the drive, which raised this man to the heights which he has today, tend to intensify and to magnify his own personal failings. But in all of this, let us not be unmindful that these emotions are going to affect our future and mold history. In Russia, there is nothing new to see a man such as Khrushchev in a position of dictatorship. The Russian people have really never known any government except dictatorial leadership.

Stalin, for example, is probably going to be recognized as one of the most powerful dictators that the world has ever known. Stalin was, in many ways, what Khrushchev would like to be, today. Stalin certainly had determination. He had fire and glamor. He was a master at deception. He was capable of zig-zagging in major policy. He was always accessible to the persons that he wanted to be accessible to. He was always able to outmaneuver those who worked around him.

Stalin always supervised the little things. This left the impression that he was very personal in his approach.

Stalin wanted to be associated in the eyes of his people with Lenin because Lenin led the spirit of the revolution. Early, in the revolutionary days of course, it was always Lenin and Trotsky. Stalin wanted it to be Lenin and Stalin. So, Stalin managed to eliminate Trotsky and thus it was Stalin and Lenin. Then on Stalin's death Khrushchev wanted to replace Stalin with himself. Khrushchev wanted it to be Lenin and Khrushchev. Then the pattern is practically the same. Stalin, in his day, insisted that every mention of Trotsky's name, in a favorable light, had to be stamped out. Today, Khrushchev insists that every mention of Stalin's name in a favorable light must be stamped out. Stalin had all of Trotsky's pictures destroyed. Now Khrushchev has had all of Stalin's pictures destroyed. Stalin had the Soviet history and books revised and republished in order to completely take Trotsky out of the books, or to otherwise blacken his role. Now Khrushchev has had the histories and books revised in order to take Stalin out of them or to blacken his role. Under Stalin, the authors wrote the histories of the Red army without praising Trotsky's name once, even though Trotsky was the organizer of the Red army and the first Bolshevik War Commissar. Now Khrushchev is having the histories rewritten to show that he was the real military leader of the army in World War II.

Stalin left the impression that it was he who always stood by the side of Lenin, not Trotsky. Now Khrushchev indicates that it

is his ideas which are similar to Lenin, and not Stalin. Stalin, in his day, had to be hailed as the source of all good, the originator of all good ideas, the father of every successful enterprise. Now it is Khrushchev who must be hailed as the source of all good in Russia. Khrushchev now insists he is the originator of all the ideas and he is the father of every successful enterprise.

What this all adds up to is—Stalin was a dictator; Khrushchev is a dictator. We must treat them in every way as any democracy must treat a dictator. To be misled into believing that Khrushchev is not really a dictator would be self-deception.

However, it is also evident that even dictators sometimes have good goals. Just as in Stalin's time, there was a definite desire to create generally better economic conditions. He was interested in building more factories and harnessing the power of the Soviet Union. So today, Khrushchev, too, is interested in doing those things which make the country stronger because only in this way is a dictator able to continue his own personal dictatorship. What probably is more important to them as dictators is that it builds their own personal glorification.

Thus, no matter what Khrushchev ultimately was, when his power as a dictator is threatened, you can expect him to act basically as Stalin acted, using fear, lies, and murder. Every dictator usually ends up using these same weapons.

I need not remind you of the possibility of war. Usually, the cause of the war is long in the making, but really short in breaking. To make matters worse we have found out that dictators are always very dangerous for individuals, dangerous for their countries, and dangerous for world peace.

One thing, above all, that we should by this time know, is that dictators have taught us to treasure freedom above everything else.

The experience of all dictatorships has been that without freedom there can be no full stomachs. There can be no economic security without civil rights. For what good is a job when the secret police can take you out of it, or when you can be arrested without a charge and sentenced to jail or death without a trial. Remember, that citizens of a dictatorship want most of all to be free. Furthermore, nobody except the dictator ever likes a dictatorship.

The dictatorships of the past make us love democracy more and more. But then, the question arises—how much do we really love democracy?

You could answer: We fought World War I, then World War II, for democracy—two major wars in a generation.

In spite of this we now must face the question, Will there be world war III? Do people really learn from past experience? Have we learned from the mistakes we have made in the past? Those mistakes which have cost millions of people their homes and their lives. Has this really opened up our eyes? Just how did we get into those two terrible wars? How can we avoid another of the same kind.

These, really, are the questions which we should be answering—or at least, we should be asking them.

These questions and their answers are more important than whether or not some individual remains in office. It is more important than talking about our rights to certain territory. It is more important than even local markets or the world markets. Certainly it is more important than money.

There are some obvious facts. First, some of the basic causes of friction between nations continue without much abatement; second, there is general economic maladjustment in many parts of the world; third, there certainly is racial animosity; fourth, there are social injustices existing in almost all areas of the world.

These poisons were not caused by communism. These were the poisons which produced World War I. These were the poisons which produced World War II. Furthermore, these are the poisons which could easily produce world war III.

Even though dictators may start wars, their chances for success depend on the existance of these poisons. In my opinion, Hitler could not have succeeded to have overrun Europe if it had been a healthy Europe. Nor could Mussolini have taken Ethiopia if it had been a healthy Ethiopia.

The real difficulty was with the basic foundations of these countries when the dictators started their wars. Now, what is it that Khrushchev or Mao Tse-tung have to offer that Hitler didn't offer, or Mussolini didn't offer, other than murder, slavery, fear, and hunger. They offer no solutions. They will not eliminate the international poison.

The Chinese are starving. There is a shortage of coal in Prague, in Czechoslovakia today. In every Communist country the farmers have failed in their efforts to produce enough to feed their people.

Certainly Khrushchev is not in the position to offer anything of a positive nature. He has not been able to give his people real freedom so let's mark him down as scoring a zero. He's flunked the course.

In other words, Khrushchev has demonstrated that he cannot give any proof that communism can build anything for human needs.

Yet, dictators have won victories. Since this is true, this is proof enough that there is something more needed in this world than what we have so far offered. Dictators have not cured any of the human problems of the world; but equally true they are not the sole cause of the world's troubles.

If governments are going to be indifferent to the cruel suffering of millions of their own flesh and blood, then we certainly can expect that the poisons for more wars are already with us.

We seem to be capable of spending billions of dollars in order to prepare for war, to prepare for destruction. But we scream and fail in any way, to take positive action to wipe out our slums here at home; to meet the real challenge in the field of education; to meet the problems of continued long-term unemployment; to treat humans as equals.

First of all, we are going to have to be capable of convincing our own people that we believe in real freedom in the field of civil rights, economic rights, and human rights.

We are going to have to convince our own country and the world that we are determined to fight the battle against hunger; to take action against poverty; to provide the opportunity for every individual in our land and the rest of the world to secure food, housing, and an opportunity to live in decency and real freedom.

No one will be able to guarantee these rights for any length of time. It will take continuous action.

The world wants something new and something better. Now is the time for us, as a free society, to provide that type of intelligent, intellectual leadership which can give the world something new and something better. We can make their dreams come true; we can help to make this world a place where peoples homes are places of hope, where prayers for freedom and peace can mean something real.

For, after all, it is not alone the dream of every American, but it is humanity's dream—the dream of all people—that there be freedom, peace, and plenty. The world's people want rather simple things—personal items such as decency, honesty, loyalty to friends, goodness, and the respect for human life. These are the things which are scorned in dictatorship.

They were scorned by Stalin. They were scorned by Hitler. They were scorned by Mussolini, and they are scorned by Khrushchev.

Even though we in this country may have, at times, dulled the spirit of revolt and searching; let us remember that under dictatorships such as Khrushchev, they have crushed the spirit of revolt and searching, more important they also crush the right to protest and the right to think. In a real free society, the spirit of revolt, the spirit of searching and the right to protest and the right to think must be guaranteed.

We have seen that communism has failed the society of the world. Some say we must make a choice between freedom or a full stomach.

We know that no dictatorship has ever given freedom or a full stomach.

But in the free society, we can have ideas. We can make ideas live. We can make ideas work. We can also have full stomachs.

This is the spirit of democracy. This is the spirit which can destroy war, destroy depression, can destroy racial feuds, can end slums and can end unemployment.

Some men have this vision. Some men want to carry out the action to make the vision a reality. To some this may seem like sacrifice, but to me this seems like the greatest opportunity that man will ever have—namely, to serve his fellow man for the glory of God.

On the Washington Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter entitled "On the Washington Scene":

ON THE WASHINGTON SCENE

MAGNA CARTA FOR THE AGED

While the Nation's news media properly highlighted the announcement of President Kennedy's proposal for hospital insurance for retired persons they pretty much ignored the rest of his far-ranging plan to bring our growing ranks of old people back into the mainstream of our community life. To me the idea of putting to use the talents and the experience of our senior citizens is at least as significant a proposal as providing for their physical well-being.

The administration's hospital insurance for the aged proposal, introduced as H.R. 3920 by Congressman CECIL KING and as S. 880 by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, represents an improvement over previous bills as might be expected when legislation has been under long consideration.

As President Kennedy pointed out in his special message, the financing of health care costs for the aged is becoming an increasingly serious problem not only for individuals but also for local communities and States which are reluctantly being saddled with those costs after individuals exhaust their savings and sell their assets to pay hospital and doctor bills. At present there are 17½ million people over 65 years and the number increases by 1,000 a day until by 1980 there will be 25 million. Medical costs for retired people are skyrocketing well beyond their current ability to pay. Only 10 to 15 percent of such costs are covered by private insurance. Three-fourths of all retired people over 65 have incomes of less than $2,000 a year, much of which comes out of public benefit programs because in fact 12.5 million receive social security benefits and another 2¼ million are on public assistance.

The administration sees its plan to provide social insurance financing for hospital and nursing care as a sound conservative way to keep the mounting costs of serious illness for retirees from being shifted to local real estate and/or personal property taxes. State and local governments are already suffering from insufficient revenues and pressures to provide facilities and services for a growing population.

The new King-Anderson bill would provide:

Eligibility: Insurance to defray for practically all persons past 65 the cost of inpatient hospital, outpatient hospital diagnostic, skilled nursing home, and home health care. Cost for those receiving social security will be paid from a new fund in the system while that for other persons will be paid from the Federal Treasury.

Scope and duration: Inpatient hospital services paid for either, (a) up to 45 days with no deductible; (b) up to 90 days with a deductible of $10 a day for the first 9 days—with a minimum of $20—or (c) up to 180 days with a deductible equal to 2½ days' average hospital care;

Skilled nursing home services: Up to 180 days furnished in nursing facilities affiliated with hospitals.

Outpatient hospital diagnostic services: As required subject to $20 deductible, when furnished during 30-day period.

Home health services: Up to 240 visits during calendar year by therapists or health aids for recovering patients.

No Government interference: Patients would be free to choose their own physician and accredited hospital.

Private groups: Blue Cross or other organizations chosen by hospitals to represent them can have delegated to them certain responsibilities in administering the act.

Private health insurance: The act would provide that private health insurance will be encouraged to develop supplementary insurance protection for the aged.

Financing: All costs paid for social security beneficiaries would be financed through increases in contribution rates of one-fourth of 1 percent for employers and employees and four-tenths of 1 percent for the self-employed. Maximum annual earnings subject to tax would be raised from $4,800 to $5,200 beginning with 1965. Cost of benefits for other beneficiaries will be paid from the general fund in a transition period until practically everyone can qualify for social security coverage.

Tax benefits: Proposed tax reductions in 1963 are especially planned to ease burdens for people over 65. A $300 tax credit would be substituted for the extra exemption and retirement income credit to reduce the present unfairness in taxation of income from different sources. It is estimated by 1965 about 3.4 million persons 65 years and over will pay $470 million less in Federal income taxes.

Improved economic security: Raising the maximum taxable wage base for computing benefits from $4,800 to $5,200 will make it possible to raise maximum monthly benefits for a worker from $127 to $134 and for a family from $254 to $268.

Increased employment opportunities: In his message President Kennedy pointed out, "Denial of employment opportunity to older persons is a personal tragedy. It is also a national extravagance, wasteful of human resources. No economy can reach its maximum productivity while failing to use the skills, talents, and experience of willing workers."

It disturbs me that in recent years our economy has lost its vigor and failed to provide jobs for millions of young workers and forced the early retirement of older workers. I am gratified over this emphasis given to finding ways to stimulate our economy.

Looking to the day when all willing workers can have jobs, the President recommends that the Federal civilian agencies review current policies and practices regarding the employment of older workers, looking toward the better use of their skills and experience. Private employers are invited to do the same.

The President further recommends that the Federal-State Employment Service strengthen its counselling and placement services and give special attention to the employment of older workers.

In addition the President recommends that the manpower development and training and the area redevelopment programs give special attention to the training of older workers in their communities. New ways will also be sought to find out what jobs elderly men and women may want to do part-time in their own neighborhoods. Some suggested activities would be school lunch hour relief, child care in centers for working mothers, home care for invalids, assistance in schools, vocational training and programs to prevent juvenile delinquency.

Also, a proposed National Service Corps contemplates the enlistment of elderly people with special abilities in volunteer service programs in their communities.

The broad scope of the President's program for elderly citizens illustrates the practical idealism of the administration. In setting it forth to Congress President Kennedy was mindful of historian Toynbee's observation that a society's quality and durability can best be measured "by the respect and care given its elderly citizens."

I am confident that history will record that our society was not found wanting because our country, true to its tradition of humane consideration, did in our day adopt a health, economic and social program which adequately meets the physical and spiritual needs of our citizens in the golden years of their lives.

FORT SNELLING INSURANCE CENTER

In the past weeks the Veterans' Administration in Washington has been putting the final touches on plans to transfer the VA insurance activities of the Denver Office to Fort Snelling. By June 30 it is expected that the augmented facilities at Fort Snelling will handle 2 million GI life insurance policies representing $13.5 billion worth of protection to veterans and their families in 28 States of the West, Midwest, and the South.

The consolidation of activities at Fort Snelling was due largely to the economic and efficient performance of the staff there which is under the direction of Manager John Murphy. I was pleased to participate at various stages in the decisionmaking process on the transfer.

MODERNIZATION OF THE ST. PAUL POST OFFICE AND CUSTOMHOUSE

During the month, I announced that the General Services Administration was initiating plans to modernize the St. Paul Post Office and Customhouse Building on Kellogg Boulevard.

The existing building will be upgraded to bring it into conformity with the new addition. Construction on the annex at the rear of the building for the Post Office Department is proceeding but not without some problems.

I was notified recently that GSA has substantiated my charge that substandard ventilation ductwork was being installed. The faulty sheetmetal work is being replaced with the materials which the specifications require. Certainly the Government is entitled to receive full value for money spent on such projects.

JUNIOR ROTC

In swift reaction to the Defense Department's proposal to abolish Junior ROTC in the Nation's secondary schools, Congressman F. Edward Hébert, of the House Armed Services Committee, introduced H.R. 4444 to extend the program permanently. During hearings on March 6 and 7 a DOD assistant secretary announced that it was planned to continue Junior ROTC for at least another year.

I have been advised that Mr. Hébert plans to push for the enactment of his bill to put Junior ROTC on a permanent basis so DOD cannot alter it at whim.

This matter is of great interest to the many parents of Cretin High School boys who have written to me asking that the program be continued.

Safety Standards for Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, in 1961, the latest year for which figures are available, over 100,000 Federal employees suffered work-related injuries. Compensation for these injuries represented a new liability to the Federal Government in excess of $35 million. When we add the untold cost in human suffering to the fact that the liability incurred each year represents only a portion of the actual expenditures by the Federal Government as compensation for these injuries, we realize that this is a situation which deserves our most urgent attention.

As Congressman-at-Large from Maryland, a State in which more than 86,000 employees of the Federal Government work, in addition to the thousands of Marylanders that work in the District of Columbia for the Federal Government, I have interest in improving the existing safety practices.

There are presently no existing minimum safety standards which apply to all Federal agencies. With approximately 54 different Federal agencies responsible, under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, for the safety of the Federal employee at the workplace, there are over 50 different types of safety programs.

With over 50 agencies responsible for individual safety programs, there presently exists much duplication of effort in the way of publications, training, inspections, and requests for financial support for safety personnel. There is no agency or coordinating body which has the authority to see that overall objectives are set, that minimum Government-wide safety standards are developed and put into effect. Although the Department of Labor promotes cooperation and coordination of the Federal safety effort, through the Federal Safety Council, it does not have authority to really develop and coordinate an effective Federal safety program.

My bill amending section 33(c) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act would accomplish the following things:

First. It would require the head of each Federal agency to establish a safety program in conformity with the standards, programs, and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor.

Second. It would give the Secretary of Labor authority to develop, promulgate and promote minimum safety standards for Federal employees.

Third. It would provide for surveys and investigations of injury cases which would provide useful data for individual agencies to use in controlling injuries to their employees.

Fourth. It would provide a means for coordinating and collecting the information and data developed by each Federal agency and making it available for all to use thus preventing duplication of effort.

Fifth. It would provide an advisory staff of technicians for those agencies wishing to initiate or improve their safety efforts.

Sixth. It would provide a Federal safety advisory committee which would include representatives from both labor and management and thus insure a more closely knitted joint labor and management effort toward improving the safety record.

Seventh. It would provide resources for training and education of Federal advisory personnel in order to upgrade the safety know-how of those responsible for the safety of employees.

It is imperative that something be done to better coordinate the Federal efforts in accident prevention. It is imperative that minimum Federal safety standards be developed and that every Federal agency be required to meet them. Amending section 33(c) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act would establish the coordination and direction needed. It would reduce the danger experienced by Federal employees exposed to various hazards and save tax dollars.

Address by the Honorable Edmund S. Muskie, of Maine, Before Buffalo Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 10, our great city of Buffalo, N.Y., was highly honored by the presence of the distinguished Senator from Maine, the Honorable Edmund S. Muskie.

Senator Muskie was invited to Buffalo to address a joint dinner meeting sponsored by the Professional & Businessmen's Association, Inc., the Advocates Club of Buffalo, and the Medical Arts Society, and chaired by Mr. Eugene V. Buczkowski.

In the afternoon I was privileged to join a large delegation to meet Senator Muskie at the Buffalo International Airport. Immediately thereafter a reception was held in his honor at a local hotel.

In the evening, Senator Muskie was the principal speaker at the dinner, and his speech was very well received. He was introduced by Mr. John Aszkler, the former mayor of Lackawanna, N.Y., and the keys to Buffalo and Lackawanna were presented to him by Mayors Chester Kowal and John C. Ogarek respectively.

I am pleased to insert Senator Muskie's speech into the Congressional Record. His speech follows:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE EDMUND S. MUSKIE, OF MAINE, BEFORE BUFFALO GROUP

Never before in history has mankind had before it as great a promise for its fulfillment as we have today.

We are on the threshold of unbelievable development of our human and natural resources, and we can see on the horizon the control of disease, the eradication of poverty and misery, and a general uplifting of the standard of living throughout the world.

At the same time, however, mankind faces the gravest threat to its survival in history. We live in an age of crisis, and the threat of a nuclear holocaust is constantly with us.

This paradox derives primarily from the political situation which now exists in the world. Driven by the highest form of stimulation—a threat to national survival—the United States and the Soviet Union have, since World War II, made fantastic advances in science and technology and we are continually discovering—as a byproduct to the race for survival—ways and means to alleviate human misery.

This priority is, of course, due to necessity, not to choice. We all hope for the day when real peace will prevail, and national disputes are determined under the rule of law. Until that day arrives, however, we must maintain our defenses.

In assessing the worldwide struggle in which we are now engaged, many in the free world are, it seems to me, unduly pessimistic. Lately, we have been hearing and reading about the Communist threat to Cuba almost to the exclusion of other areas of conflict and crisis. While I would not for a moment attempt to minimize the gravity of the situation in Cuba, I would like, for a few moments, to try to assess the conflict to date in a broader historical perspective.

Let us set the stage.

The world is divided roughly into three groups: The Western democracies, centered around the United States and the NATO nations; the Communist bloc, centered around the Soviet Union and Red China; and the large group of so-called uncommitted nations.

The tensions which now grip the world derive from two principal sources.

First is the conflict which has arisen as a result of the policy of world domination openly advocated by the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc. Standing out against the Communist drive for world domination is the free world, led by the United States. Our objective is a peaceful world of independent nations free to choose their own system of government.

The second major source of world tension is the explosion of nationalism and the accompanying drive for improved living standards in the new and undeveloped countries.

The two forces are, of course, interwoven. For example, a major part of the Communist blueprint for domination includes taking advantage of the instability of uncommitted and undeveloped nations.

These, then, are the broad outlines of the world today.

Let me now make it clear that what I have to say about the future of communism is speculation, not fact; possibility not certainty. I claim no special crystal ball in world affairs. But I do think that sufficient evidence is available to suggest that communism has reached the high tide of its expansion and is starting to recede.

What is that evidence?

First, I believe, that, as a theory, communism has proven to be wrong. Marxist theory holds that communism must succeed because capitalism is doomed to destroy itself. Marx believed that capitalism must fail because it could only widen the gap between the rich and the poor, and that the oppressed would inevitably rise and overthrow the wealthy few.

The economists of the 19th century formed the basis for Marx's theory. They held that the ultimate and the only goal of a capitalist society was the accumulation of wealth in a competitive economy. It follows logically that a society geared to maximum profit in a competitive economy is forced to reduce wages as far as possible in order to increase profits. Marx simply carried this one step further and said that eventually wages for the masses would get so low and profits for the few would get so high, that an explosion would inevitably occur.

But Marx was wrong because he never considered the possibility that capitalism might be able to adapt itself to changing conditions. Essentially this has been brought about because the Western democracies possessed the framework—a free and openly elected government—within which to make peaceful changes, and because far-sighted businessmen, trade union leaders, and economists have seen that a more equitable distribution of wealth was to the advantage of all concerned.

This was dramatically illustrated in January 1914, when Henry Ford first announced the $5 day. Prior to that, American wages rarely exceeded $2.80 for a 9-hour day. Ford—a most practical man—revolutionized economic theory by voluntarily raising employees' wages to $5 for an 8-hour day. This was, of course, directly contrary to accepted economic theory of the 19th century. It destroyed the foundation of Marxism.

Ford saw that by raising his wages above the mere subsistence level, he was making his workers customers also. This simple but revolutionary thought has made the American workingman the world's greatest consumer, and has raised American living standards to a degree unprecedented in history.

Thus, we see, that by its willingness to adapt, voluntarily, to changing economic circumstances, while retaining the basic concepts of private property and the profit motive, American capitalism has clearly demonstrated the fallacy of communism as a theory.

To be sure, labor and capital are in conflict in this country. To be sure, there has been violence. But it is largely a controlled conflict with a common objective, and few, if any, would dream of major class warfare here. In fact, it is here, in the heart of capitalism, that the classless society has been most nearly achieved. And we have, at the same time, retained intact our political freedoms, for we know that economic freedom and political freedom are bound together in such fashion that the loss of one generally leads to the loss of the other.

Not only has communism failed in theory; it has failed in practice.

Marx foresaw communism as the final stage in the development of nations, coming after the violent destruction of capitalism. In fact, as we have seen, communism developed originally in those countries which had never experienced a capitalistic society. They have used communism primarily as a method to achieve rapid industrialization. That is, in fact, communism's major appeal today to the undeveloped countries.

And though the Communist dictatorship has succeeded in transforming the Soviet Union into an industrialized society, it has done so at such a high cost in all other fields that it must be considered as a failure.

Consider Soviet agriculture. Abolition of private property, removal of the profit incentive, and forced collectivization have resulted in catastrophy after catastrophy in agriculture. Millions of farmers have been murdered in the process of enforcing collectivization. In the United States, farmworkers comprise 10 percent of our national labor force, and they have produced food in such abundance that disposal of our surplus has become one of our major domestic problems. By contrast, farmworkers comprise almost half of the Russian labor force, and theirs is a constant struggle to meet the national needs. We are all familiar with the results of the imposition of Communist theories upon Chinese agriculture, where each year has brought that country closer to the horrible prospect of widespread famine. And the problem persists in other Communist countries as well, such as East Germany and Yugoslavia. Nowhere in the Communist world is the agriculture problem one of surplus.

And, of course, the most important field where the failure of communism is evidence is in the field of political liberty and individual freedoms. The application of Marxist theories has required, in every Communist state, a completely closed society, fearful of new ideas and open interchange with other nations, afraid to permit its people to know what is going on. Each Communist country has been supervised by that 20th century testimonial to man's humanity—the secret police and the systematic use of terror.

All that Soviet Russia has demonstrated is that a large modern nation, rich in resources, can rapidly develop its industrial potential by giving to that development absolute priority over all competing claims. This can be done only by repressing political and economic freedom for the individual, and that is what the Soviets have done.

These first two pieces of evidence of the decline of communism—its theory and in fact—lead to a third: that communism has spent itself as an inspirational ideology which gripped men's hearts and minds completely. We are all familiar with the portrait of a dedicated Communist—subjugating his entire life to what he considered to be an ideal. That portrait is less common today than it was 30 or even 10 years ago.

In 1917, communism was a theory. In the 1930's it was an experiment. Today, it is a fact. And it is much more difficult to inspire with facts—unpleasant facts at that—than it is to do so with theories and experiments.

Inside the Communist bloc there have been increasing signs of tension and dissatisfaction with the monolithic state. The Polish and Yugoslav Communist Governments are under constant pressure from their people for more freedom. Khrushchev's destalinization program is not just a rejection of the rule of his predecessor, it is an indictment of the system itself.

In the underdeveloped countries, originally attracted by Communist promises of rapid economic development, we see increasing disillusionment and the rejection of Communist domination. This has happened, for example, in the African countries of Guinea and Algeria.

The really remarkable thing about the Communist effort in the uncommitted portion of the world has been its failure. On the surface communism offers quick and simple solutions which have great appeal for the illiterate and poverty stricken. Democracy, on the other hand, is an exacting form of government because it requires an active, educated people. The concepts of individual liberty are not easy to impart to people who have never had them. Nevertheless, slow as it is, we are making some progress, while communism's failure is more evident.

A fourth reason for its decline is the growing split within the Communist bloc itself.

For many years, the Communists and we in the West harbored an illusion of Communist countries as a single, monolithic group whose interests were identical. That illusion has now been shattered. The Communist bloc has emerged as a group of nations bound by force to a common ideology, but with divergent national interests. The most dramatic example, of course, is the growing split between Russia and China.

This split traces back many years. In the 1920's and 1930's, when the Chinese Communists were fighting for their very survival against the then superior forces of Chiang Kai-shek, Stalin repeatedly based his decisions upon what was good for Russia, not upon what was good for the Chinese Communists. Thus, when Stalin's principal foreign policy aim in the Far East was to create a strong China to act as a buffer between Russia and her traditional enemy, Japan, Stalin did not hesitate to sacrifice the Chinese Communists. Mao-Tse-tung was one of the first to learn this painful lesson. Whatever their personal beliefs about communism, Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev have been united in subjugating purely Communist interest to Russian interests when the two conflicted. Perhaps the best example of this was the Hitler-Stalin pact of 1939.

We must, however, retain our sense of perspective about this split. As serious as their differences are, Red China and the Soviet Union have much more in common. Aside from their mutual distrust, their principal difference at this time is one of methods, not goals. Both believe in the eventual destruction of the capitalist countries, but the Chinese Communists believe unswervingly in achieving this goal by forcible means, even if it involves total nuclear war. In fact, one of the most disturbing signs arising out of the arguments between the two is the apparent ignorance of the Chinese Communist leaders concerning the possible effects of total war. The Soviets believe no less in the ultimate goal of world domination, but they think the way to do it is by subversion and victory in the economic sphere. To the Chinese, the Russians advocate a soft line.

But let us not delude ourselves that they differ as to their goals. A complete split may come, but there is insufficient evidence to support such a proposition at this time.

My final reason for believing that communism is on the decline is the determination of the Western democracies to resist Communist aggression.

The Cuban crisis of last fall comes quickly to mind. It is more dramatic than previous confrontations because weapons continue to get bigger and more dangerous, but it is in reality one of a series of encounters in which resolve and determination have forced a Communist withdrawal.

Shortly after World War II, Stalin attempted to press the advantage he had gained by virtue of America's rapid demobilization and the continued presence of the Red army throughout Eastern Europe. He attempted to penetrate Iran, Turkey, and Greece. In each case the attempt was met with resolve, particularly in Greece where the fighting was brief but bloody. In each case, the Soviets failed, thanks to the Truman Point Four Plan. Soviet efforts to subvert the European countries were thwarted by the Marshall Plan and the formation of NATO.

In 1948, Stalin attempted to blockade Berlin, and again Western resolve turned a possible Soviet victory into a stunning defeat for communism.

The attempted Communist thrust into South Korea was contained because President Truman had the courage and foresight to commit American forces to the effort.

And even today, we are continuing the costly, difficult, yet necessary task of repulsing Communist aggression throughout Asia.

In addition to these defensive measures designed to contain Communist expansion, we are continuing our positive program of assistance to the undeveloped countries.

Our mutual security program, which helps us by helping others, directs foreign aid into productive channels.

In the past 8 years we have given $17 billion in surplus foods to the hungry and needy throughout the world, in a gesture of generosity unmatched in history.

The Peace Corps is another example of affirmative and imaginative action which demonstrates the kind of idealistic commitment which is possible in a free society.

These then are some of the reasons why I think that we may be seeing the beginning of the decline of communism. It is really an inefficient and inhumane system for operating a government.

But we must remain ever vigilant. It is a tragic fact of history that mankind has experienced only 220 years of peace in almost 3,500 years of recorded civilization. And the Second World War demonstrated anew that war will come to those who seek to avoid it at any cost. Only by maintaining our strength and our sense of justice will we persevere.

We must rely upon our own strengths and our own deeds in insuring liberty for our children. The Cuban crisis of 1962 provided us with a dramatic illustration of our strength properly utilized to achieve a desirable goal.

Foreseeing the possible decline of communism is no reason for a reduction of effort on our part. Real progress is never made by sitting back and hoping that your opponent will stumble. Indeed, one major reason for the decline of communism is our own strength and fortitude. A major relaxation of these by the United States would inevitably result in success by the Communists in their quest for world domination.

Destiny has placed into American hands the burden of carrying for all humanity the torch of liberty in these perilous times. I am confident that those hands are sufficient to meet the task.

Feed Grain Program Costs Illinois Livestock Producers $70 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, 90 days of the Kennedy-Freeman feed grain program has cost Illinois livestock producers at least $70 million.

Secretary Freeman's policy of driving down corn prices through Government sales in order to get a good signup under the program, encouraged overproduction of livestock, and is responsible for the recent drop in prices.

Hog prices today are at the lowest point in 3 years, and cattle at the lowest in 18 months.

A 9.8-percent drop has occurred in Illinois hog prices and 10.5 in beef cattle since November. Average hogs dropped from $16.40 per hundredweight in November to $14.80 in February, while cattle declined from $23.70 to $21.20.

This price drop cost Illinois hog raisers $21.9 million and cattle raisers $47.3 million.

I base my calculation on a January 1 livestock inventory of 7,894,000 hogs worth $223,400,000 and 3,470,000 cattle worth $450,620,000.

The loss estimate is on the conservative side because part of the decline had already occurred by January 1, and dairy cows, also adversely affected, were excluded in the figures.

Even before the feed grain program was first enacted in 1961, livestock people were informed that it would be Government policy to keep market price of corn from rising. This was practically an insurance policy against feed prices going up, and consequently livestock numbers were increased.

The price received by American farmers for corn has declined slightly each of the last 3 years, and last year averaged $0.998—just under a dollar a bushel, as indicated by this table:

Corn—Monthly price received by farmers

[Per bushel]

	Calendar years				
	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963
January	$1.02	$0.979	$0.963	$0.951	$1.03
February	1.04	.995	1.00	.956	1.06
March	1.06	.999	1.01	.968	------
April	1.13	1.05	.945	.988	------
May	1.15	1.07	1.02	1.03	------
June	1.16	1.08	1.03	1.03	------
July	1.13	1.09	1.05	1.04	------
August	1.13	1.07	1.04	1.02	------
September	1.09	1.06	1.04	1.04	------
October	.990	.991	1.02	1.02	------
November	.982	.866	.938	.938	------
December	.959	.911	.947	1.00	------
Simple average	1.07	1.01	1.00	.998	------

Source: USDA.

Invocation by Very Rev. Joseph Baran, V.F.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives was honored today to have the Very Reverend Joseph Baran, V.F., pastor of St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church in Lansford, Pa., deliver the daily invocation. I am particularly pleased because Father Baran resided in Sheppton, Pa., in my congressional district, for over 20 years before assuming his present position at St. Michael's.

I am sure we all join in Father Baran's prayer for our respected colleague, CLYDE DOYLE, whose death today has saddened the Congress.

Father Baran also called our attention to the fact that today, March 14, 1963, marks the 24th anniversary of the proclamation of Slovak independence which was made on March 14, 1939.

I join Father Baran in commemorating this important anniversary. All Americans are justly concerned over the fate of more than 4 million Slovaks who are presently living under Communist dictatorship in their homeland. The more than 2 million Americans of Slovak origin who have made such a great contribution to our cultural, social, and economic life have a special interest in this day of commemoration. They can be assured that the Congress of the United States and all Americans join them in working for the day when freedom and justice and peace will reign throughout the world.

Investigative Arrests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the text of a letter which I have today sent off to Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner, president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1963.

Hon. WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Please accept, for yourself and your fellow commissioners, my very sincere appreciation for the courage and tact with which you handled a very delicate situation in connection with standing firmly behind your order that investigative arrests in the District of Columbia must cease.

You and your fellow Commissioners have taken the same oath as Members of the Congress to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. This you are doing in accordance with the dictates of your conscience based on the legal advice upon which you are entitled to rely.

You have acted in the best traditions of our country. Our Constitution very properly requires that the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of our Government be independent of each other. That means that no group of Congressmen, whether acting as a committee or part of a committee, have any right to direct the members of the executive department of Government in the fulfillment of their duties. The constitutional process provides for such directives only by act of Congress, which means the due and proper enactment of a law. The fact that the Congress has been too slow in correcting defects in the criminal law as it applies in the District of Columbia is neither reason nor excuse for countenancing further violation of the constitutional rights of American citizens.

This is not a shedding of tears for criminals. This is insisting on protection of the rights of the innocent.

It is indeed strange that in enforcing the Federal criminal law outside of the District of Columbia and in enforcing the criminal law in each of the 50 States, the enforcement and prosecuting authorities are not hampered because they are prohibited from making so-called investigative arrests in the manner and to the extent that has heretofore prevailed in the District of Columbia.

Once again, my hearty congratulations go forward to you.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
Member of Congress.

Critics of the Administration's Cuban Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I sense in recent days and I hope that I am perceptive, at least in this incidence, a tendency on the part of some but unfortunately not all critics of this administration's Cuban policies to be influenced more by fact, logic, and honesty than by fantasy. It was so blatantly obvious that the criticism of even some of the more responsible leaders of the opposition which we have heard lately was based on rumor passed to them by prejudiced and unreliable sources and nurtured by political opportunism.

It is encouraging to note that perhaps some have seen the error of their ways and have cause to realize that the kind of reckless criticism that has been so prevalent in the past is damaging to the security of the United States and hampers actions that might lead in a reasonable time to a peaceful solution of the Cuba problem.

But a great amount of damage has already been done by those who insist on making Cuba a political bogeyman in the hope that they might scare a few more votes into their camp.

The language and cliche of the reckless critic is so often more appealing to those who may have feelings on an issue but are largely uninformed. The flamboyant lexicon and emotional appeal are the weapons employed to overcome reason and truth.

The politically motivated critic has succeeded in influencing the thinking of many citizens and has, therefore, to a degree undermined confidence in the Presidency. How well these critics have succeeded was impressed upon me yesterday when I saw that the delicate problem of Cuba, which can be solved by no political party but only by a nation united, was the subject of an automobile bumper sticker bearing the flippant remark: "Don't worry they're still 90 miles away."

I am alleged to have a fair sense of humor, but I failed to see anything funny in this remark. To me it was merely further evidence that irresponsible political leaders have succeeded in making a matter of grave national security a partisan issue. They seek not a solution to this difficult problem, they hope for prolonging the controversy until 1964.

We do not by any means seek to shut off sound and reasoned criticism of the administration's actions with respect to Cuba. My concern is that the wild and reckless accusations of some members of the opposition wash over the more thoughtful and tempered criticism that contributes to, rather than impedes actions aimed at achieving a peaceful solution of the crisis in the Caribbean.

President Kennedy leaves shortly to travel to Costa Rica to meet with the heads of Latin American countries for a full discussion of the crisis in the Caribbean and South America and it is important that he leave for that crucial meeting with full bipartisan support.

The influence of the United States can be brought to bear at this meeting only if the President speaks with the united backing of the people of this country.

Those who for mere political gain seek to thwart this goal work against the best interests of the United States and a peaceful solution to the Cuba crisis.

Tribute to St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, we pause today to pay a tribute to St. Patrick, and to the land which has spread around the world the ideals to which he devoted his life. We pay tribute, too, to those of Irish birth or blood in our own America, both those who toiled in the past, to bring America to the prosperity and strength that are hers today, and to those who stand today bravely facing the future with Irish stubbornness and Irish resilience.

There are many speeches being made today, and each St. Parick's Day, to celebrate the qualities of the Irish people, and their contribution to the building of our America. But I make no apology for adding one more to the number. I owe it to myself, as well as to the glory of St. Patrick and the credit of the Irish in America, to stand forth and let it be known that I am grateful to St. Patrick for his heroic example and devotion to the Gospel, to the land of Ireland for her myth and magic, her laughter and valor, her human friendliness and her agelong endurance. I owe it to myself, too, to make it clear that I appreciate the great part men and women of Irish blood have played in the history of America, and in every phase of our life.

Through many long years, the Irish in America, coming as penniless refugees from poverty and starvation, from political oppression and religious restrictions, were largely confined to laboring jobs. It was they who built many of the railroads of America, the roads and canals, the ditches and sewers. But while they were laboring at these tasks, with long hours and low pay, they built more than the physical roadways and railways and waterways of our land. A greater contribution than their work in steel and asphalt and stone and brick was the warmth and sparkle they brought to American life, the ability to bounce back at adversity with a witty comment and a new effort, and the affection of family relationships, friendships, and love of man and woman. The power of Irish eloquence, and the sweetness of Irish song, especially as rendered by our magnificent Irish tenors and sopranos, has almost persuaded us that there is something distinctively Irish about a man's love for his mother, or a young man's fondness for a girl. From the caustic wit and jovial humor of Finley Peter Dunne, and the lyric love and patriotic enthusiasm of George M. Cohan, the nature of Americanism has become tinted with a most becoming hue of green. Therefore, on St. Patrick's Day, Americans of every race and national origin join with the Irish in paying joyful tribute to the great saint, and to the land to which he brought the great gift of faith.

Address by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the text of an excellent address by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy to the Civil Rights Committee of the New York City Central Labor Council, AFL–CIO.

The address, which was delivered on March 9, follows:

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT F. KENNEDY TO THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMITTEE, NEW YORK CITY CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL, AFL–CIO, MARCH 9, 1963

I suppose it is inevitable that most of us are nearsighted about national problems. We are able to focus on them only as they apply close to home and we find it difficult to see how they affect people in other fields and other States. One of the curious things I have found since becoming Attorney General, however, is that when it comes to civil rights, we very quickly become farsighted. We are quite ready to point accusing fingers at the South and are easily outraged by a Little Rock, by the beating of freedom riders, or by a Meredith case. Yet we respond to discrimination right around us with blank and uncomprehending stares. The attitude is "the other fellow is wrong" and the more wrong he is, the more that automatically puts us on the side of the angels.

There is no question that segregation in the South is socially, politically, and morally wrong. But there is deep-seated segregation in the North, also, and it is just as wrong. Racial discrimination is a national, not a regional problem, and it cannot be solved simply by individual instances of Federal action on behalf of freedom riders or a single college student. The solution requires the hearts, the voices, the minds, and the muscle of individuals and organizations all over the country, public and private. The President said last week, in his civil rights message:

"The cruel disease of discrimination knows no sectional or State boundaries. The continuing attack on this problem must be equally broad."

I am particularly pleased to be with you here today because labor, and especially groups like yours, historically have been committed to social justice and social action. For years, unions have been in the forefront of efforts toward equal opportunity for all workers and all citizens.

Last year, Mr. Van Arsdale's local 3 provided an example of such leadership by including 200 Negroes and Puerto Ricans among its 1,000 new apprentices. The New York Council of Painters also has opened its apprenticeship program to Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

In the past few months, 122 international unions, representing more than 10 million workers have joined with the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and pledged themselves to union programs for fair practices. The dual seniority problem is the subject of wide and serious attention by labor. Segregated locals are fast disappearing. Indeed, probably at no time in the long history of the American labor movement have so many union leaders given such deep and effective attention to the problem of providing equal opportunity for all, regardless of race.

DISCRIMINATION IN LABOR MOVEMENT

Yet we would be dishonest with ourselves if we did not admit that some discrimination continues to exist within the labor movement—and by no means only in the South. I am thinking, for example, of a particularly ironic situation that exists right now in Washington. Howard University, a distinguished Negro institution, is building a new gymnasium. At least four of the building trades locals involved, however, have no Negroes working on the project. For that matter, these locals have only a handful of Negro members or apprentices.

The fundamental responsibility for solving problems like this is that of labor itself. Your group and others like it do a great deal to help. The Government also has a responsibility in this field: the work of the Vice President and the Equal Employment Committee is well known to you and the President has directed me to seek legal techniques, rules, and procedures to deal with such discrimination.

But there is a more fundamental responsibility for both you in the labor movement and for us in Government. We are as firmly opposed to discrimination in voting, education, and other fields as we are to discrimination in unions. It is in order to help the Nation act more effectively against discrimination that the President last week sent Congress a special message on civil rights. The administration's program includes three legislative proposals, concerning voting, education, and assistance to areas and organizations undertaking desegregation.

The first and most important bill deals with voting. The people's vote is the people's voice and when some people cannot vote they cannot effectively speak against injustice and deprivation of other rights.

It's like the story told at the time the 19th amendment was being voted on by the

States. A decided antifeminist complained to his Congressman: "Can't you do something to stop them scarecrow suffragettes from voting?" The Congressman replied, "You mean my charming constituents of the fairer sex?"

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

We have worked very hard under existing law seeking to guarantee the right to vote to all citizens. The Department of Justice has filed 35 voting suits, 25 of them in this administration, challenging discrimination or threats in southern counties against Negro registration applicants. But this is a painfully slow way of providing what is, after all, the fundamental right of citizenship. There remain more than 20 counties in the South where less than 15 percent of the eligible Negroes are registered.

Even where we have brought suit, the cases require extremely detailed preparation. In our suit in Montgomery County, Ala., for example, it was necessary to analyze 36,000 pages of voter applications and to subpena 185 witnesses for the trial. Such suits each require the total attention of 4 to 6 of the 40 lawyers in our Civil Rights Division for several months.

It often takes many more months before Negroes finally can register and vote. In Ouachita Parish, La., for example, the Department filed suit in July 1961. Although 24,000 out of the 40,000 eligible whites were registered to vote, only 725 of the 16,000 eligible Negroes were registered. Another 5,000 Negroes had, in fact, been purged from the voting rolls.

In the 33 months since we brought the suit, a special election for Congress has passed. A general election has passed. And still not even the date for trial has been set. It may well be 1964 before we finally secure a decision and Negroes can register and vote freely.

This is neither an extreme nor an isolated case. There is a real and immediate need for speeding up the process.

PREFERENCE TO VOTING SUITS

We are asking Congress, therefore, to authorize that voting suits be given preference on court dockets and tried in an expedited manner. This parallels the laws of many States which give priority to election suits in an effort to resolve them before the election is over and the chance to vote wiped out.

Even if cases can be expedited, there still will be a timelag between the filing of a suit and the issuance of orders against further discrimination. Therefore, we have asked Congress to provide for the appointment of temporary Federal referees to determine the qualifications of registration applicants during the time voting suits are pending in court.

In addition to the need for speed in guaranteeing the right to vote, there also is a great need for insuring fairness in determining who is qualified to vote.

Some Southern States use the literacy test to make this determination. As a result, barely literate whites, coached by the registrar, often are registered. Meanwhile, Negroes—like a National Science Foundation graduate student from Cornell, or teachers with advanced degrees—arbitrarily are declared illiterate and thus ineligible to vote.

Other States have used the constitutional interpretation test. Applicants must copy and explain sections of the Federal or State constitutions. Negroes often are required to copy and interpret long, archaic sections of a State constitution, or are required to explain what "due process" means, to a registrar who knows no law.

Whites, meanwhile, copy such provisions as, "There shall be no imprisonment for debt." One white gentleman, who was registered, interpreted that section in these words:

"I think that a Neogroe Should Have 8 years in college Be for voting Be couse He dont under Stand."

DOUBLE BURDEN OF INJUSTICE

We should reflect on such examples more in sadness than in irony, because they demonstrate the double burden of injustice inflicted on the Negro. Not only is he prevented from registering and voting, but the method of doing so is a grotesquely unfair test.

There's an acid joke about the Negro who attempted to register in a southern county. The registrar asked him to copy and interpret the 14th amendment. He did so, brilliantly. "All right, if you're so smart," the registrar said, "recite the Gettysburg Address from memory." The Negro did. "OK, give us the second inaugural speech." Again the Negro came through beautifully. Finally, the registrar pulled a Chinese newspaper out of his desk and asked, "Can you read this?"

"That's easy," said the Negro. "It says, 'No Negroes are going to vote in this State this year'."

We are asking Congress in our proposed voting measure to prohibit specifically the use of different tests or standards for different registration applicants. And we have asked that completion of the sixth grade should be regarded as evidence that an applicant is literate.

We also are asking Congress for two other pieces of legislation, both stemming from a need for assistance as well as enforcement. Our experience has demonstrated that people want to obey the law. In the field of education, for example, the violence last fall at the University of Mississippi should not overshadow the fact that 60 southern school districts were desegregated last year—peacefully and without fanfare. In many cases the Department of Justice assisted through informal consultations.

ASSISTANCE IN SCHOOL INTEGRATION

Communities in the South not only want to obey the law, but they want and need assistance in doing so. One of the laws we seek would establish in the Office of Education a program of technical and financial assistance to communities in the process of integrating their schools.

Such a program would help such school districts profit from the lessons of others—such as Atlanta, where public and private bodies combined with great success in 1961 to desegregate schools without incident. Many communities lack the background and resources required to minimize tensions both outside and inside the schools and to assure the maintenance and improvement of educational standards.

We have applied the same principle of providing information in our third legislative proposal, for the extension and expansion of the Commission on Civil Rights. Not only community governments, but many organizations, both public and private, both in the North and the South, can benefit substantially from expert guidance and information about how others have handled integration problems.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

The Civil Rights Commission has the background and ability to satisfy this need and the President consequently has recommended that it be authorized to serve as a national civil rights clearinghouse—providing information, and technical guidance to any requesting agency.

Combined with continued effort under existing laws and policies, this, then is the administration's civil rights program. There are those who say this program does not go far enough. It is true that there is other civil rights legislation which might be introduced, such as a bill seeking authority for the Government to initiate school desegregation suits. But I would say to these critics that it is perfectly simple to introduce and support bills that have no chance of passage. But to do so would endanger measures that do have a chance. These critics have no responsibility for action. It is the aim of this administration to seek action and progress, not merely talk and headlines.

Further, let it be clear that this civil rights program is only that—a program. To sit back and wait for progress to come just because somebody in Washington has asked for new laws is as starry-eyed as waiting for the day labor minstrels once described when "the mills are made of marble and the machines are made of gold."

It took courage and effort for the labor movement to achieve the economic standards it enjoys today. It will take the same kind of effort to achieve the social ideals we profess in the field of civil rights.

We stand not only for labor or the Negro or minority groups, but for the ideal of freedom and dignity which underlies our society.

I come here today to call on you for your efforts on behalf of the administration's program. I come to ask you to speak out and act as a body. I ask you to go back to your internationals, your locals, and your communities to seek their support, both for this program and for its aim.

"Race discrimination," the President said in his civil rights message, "hampers our economic growth by preventing the maximum development and utilization of our manpower. It hampers our world leadership by contradicting at home the message we preach abroad. It mars the atmosphere of a united and classless society in which thia Nation rose to greatness. It increases the costs of public welfare, crime, delinquency, and disorder. Above all, it is wrong."

Feast of St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, coming from New York City which shelters so many sons of Erin, I would like to take this opportunity to say a few words in commemoration of the feast of St. Patrick, which is being observed this coming Sunday, March 17.

It has been said that true statesmanship is the art of changing a nation from what it is into what it ought to be. With this definition in mind I would like to present the brief history of a man seldom referred to as a statesman, yet, within that definition, must be considered one of the greatest statesmen of all times. Without bloodshed and without revolution this gentle, God-fearing soul did change a nation from a conglomeration of violent, pagan clans into a God-loving people whose culture was a beacon to the world throughout the Dark Ages; whose unfaltering faith we have all admired; whose sparkling, perspective humor we have all enjoyed.

I refer, of course, to the people of Ireland and to their holy, venerable apostle, St. Patrick, whose feast day, March 17, is celebrated throughout the world.

St. Patrick's birthdate and birthplace are unknown. It is possible that he was born in France but more probable that he was born in Scotland, near the banks of the River Clyde. His father was Calpurnius and his mother was Conchessa, a near relative of St. Martin of Tours.

Raiders from the Irish coast captured St. Patrick at the age of 16 and carried him away in slavery to northern Ireland where he served King Milcho for 6 years. In nakedness, hardship and hunger he tended sheep and swine on the bleak, cold mountains of Antrim. Even in hardship St. Patrick learned to love the soft Irish countryside with its crags and brooks, its misty moors and rolling greenhills. He dearly loved the Irish people and readily adopted their gentle ways while rejecting their pagan customs.

St. Patrick returned to his homeland at the age of 22 after escaping from Irish slavery. For the next 20 years he lived a life of penance, prayer, and study in preparation for the return to his beloved Ireland.

The mission of preaching to Ireland was given St. Patrick by Pope Celestine, following the saint's consecration, in 432, to be Bishop of Armagh. On Holy Saturday of the following year St. Patrick gathered his followers on the Hill of Slane to celebrate the great Feast of Easter. Great bonfires were built, the Paschal torch was lit and St. Patrick preached on the Mystery of the Resurrection, as is Catholic custom.

On the nearby Hill of Tara was King Leaghairie (Leary) a warrior king blessed with a fiery red beard and cursed with a roaring black temper. He was celebrating a pagan feast, also with bonfires, as was the Irish custom. King Leaghairie had given orders that no bonfires were to be enkindled until after those on the Hill of Tara were lit. When the fires of St. Patrick were reported to him his anger was a madness itself. The king set out in a royal rage, intending to put St. Patrick and his followers to the mighty sword of Gaelic wrath.

The encounter between the gentle saint and the mad king is a high point in Irish history and, as such, has been improved upon in almost all accounts. It is true that there were several trials between the saint and the druids of the king; in every instance the druids were defeated.

The winning of Ireland began with the defeat of King Leaghairie, for, in defeat he had to admit to the divine nature of St. Patrick's mission and was forced to permit the saint to preach the Gospel throughout the land. This was not a simple matter for, in his own words, St. Patrick ran a continual risk of "ambushes and plots, daily expecting a violent death, or to be robbed, or reduced to slavery." Fear of death or bodily harm did nothing to stop St. Patrick in his work.

We know little of St. Patrick's last illness except that he died at the monastery of Saul in eastern Ulster after almost a century on this earth. For 12 days his sacred remains were reverently visited by a grateful nation, and then St. Patrick was lovingly laid to rest in Downpatrick.

In observance of this feast day I take great pride and pleasure in sincerely inviting all Americans, of all descents and religious persuasions, to join in thanking God for the gifts of faith and love, brought to us by the great St. Patrick.

Address by the Honorable William L. Springer, of Illinois, Before District of Columbia Federation of Citizens' Associations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday evening, March 9, Congressman WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, Republican, of Illinois, made a speech before the Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia, at their annual dinner at the Mayflower Hotel.

I was present on this occasion. Many of the remarks Congressman SPRINGER made on that occasion are pertinent to the welfare of the District of Columbia and I feel sure that my colleagues, as well as the general public, would be happy to know what he said.

Mr. Speaker, I herewith append Congressman SPRINGER's speech in full.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE WILLIAM L. SPRINGER OF ILLINOIS BEFORE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FEDERATION OF CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen of the Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia, it is not without a certain degree of reluctance that I speak to you this evening. Not that I am reluctant to be here this evening—it is a pleasure to be here, and an honor to have been asked to speak to you.

I am reminded of the story of little Tommy, seated on his father's lap, thumbing through the pages of an illustrated Bible—and suddenly coming upon a picture of Daniel about to enter the lion's den. Tommy was truly perplexed for the picture portrayed Daniel wreathed in smiles. "Dad," Tommy said, "I don't quite understand this picture. Here is Daniel about to enter the lion's den—and he seems quite happy about it." "Well, son," came the reply, "That's probably because he realizes that when the feasting's over he won't be called upon to say anything."

I knew when I came here this evening that I would be called upon to say something—and that degree of reluctance to which I referred has no reference to the Daniel in the story.

Again I'm reminded of the same little Tommy, this time in school, and being asked to add two and two. "Four," Tommy promptly replied. "That's pretty good," said the teacher. Said Tommy—"pretty good, heck; that's perfect."

Tommy had the problem and the answer. I have the problem. I should say problems. But not the answers, and from that stems the reluctance.

Since I first started my service on the House Committee on the District of Columbia, the problems of the District have been increasingly impressed upon me. And the problems are many, from home rule and judicial reform to education and housing. From public safety and protection to transportation and welfare.

The District Commissioners' legislative program for the 1963 legislative year, submitted to the Congress last month, runs the entire gamut. Some of their proposals undoubtedly will pass the Congress. Others will fail. Still others probably will not even be considered in committee.

It would obviously be impossible, to discuss in one evening, all of the problems which confront the District and the District Committee. It will be impossible to discuss any one of them in the depth necessary to do it justice.

But this evening I would like to discuss briefly—hit the highlights—of three of those problems: housing, education, and transportation.

Dr. Carl F. Hansen, superintendent of schools, in a report issued just last month to the Board of Education, said that the aim—of education—is to furnish the education currently needed to produce citizens capable of coping effectively with the problems of modern living. "District school authorities have not been able to achieve this goal in the past; they are not even close to attaining this aim at the present time; and the accomplishment of such an end cannot possibly become a reality in the foreseeable future without much improvement in fiscal support by the District Board of Commissioners and the Congress of the United States."

Dr. Hansen told the Board of Education that even though the situation in the school system were static, achieving the goals of modern education in the District would be formidable, but that the problems are compounded by a school population that has increased on the average, some 3,000 children annually, and which will increase, during the next decade, an average of 4,000 children annually.

"Building needs have plagued the school system as far back as anyone now connected with the administration can remember. No matter what standard of measurement one uses, the conclusion is the same, the District of Columbia Public School System does not have a sufficient space of good quality or bad, at the present time. No plans heretofore in contemplation will remedy this situation by the end of the present decade."

Obsolescense of buildings is a serious factor at the elementary school level. Of the 133 elementary school buildings that were occupied by pupils for instructional purposes on October 18, 1962, 53 will be 60 or more years old if still in use during the 1968–69 school year, the final year of the currently planned District public works program. It must not be taken as a flat declaration of policy that any school building 60 or more years old must be replaced, but rather that each building should be considered individually. Some might be of continued use without imposing educational handicaps on the children who used them, but, with few exceptions, these buildings will be inadequate for a complete educational program and should be replaced by 1968–69.

Pointing up the need for new school buildings, let me say that the District school population will increase from a projected 137,400 for the 1963–64 school year to a projected 163,000 for the school year 1968–69, an increase of approximately 18 percent.

To meet the demands of this growing school population, the Board of Education has proposed a 6-year building program which will have a considerable ameliorative effect at the four school levels. It must be remembered that this latest version of the Board's building program has not yet been approved by the Commissioners: in fact, a public hearing was not held by the Commissioners until November 1962. A

substantial part of the proposed construction has been disapproved by the Commissioners. Furthermore, the details of such a program are always tentative. From year to year, the Board's proposals represent the best estimate of the needs and the most effective solution of the problems of space shortages deemed possible at the time the revised program is offered for approval. Changes in circumstances that were not reasonably foreseeable at the time the plan was drafted require periodic review and amendment. Since the drafting of this section of this study began, the budget office of the District of Columbia has presented to the Commissioners its recommendations for action on the 1964 items in the Board's suggested program. The budget office not only recommended deletion of some very important items, but it postponed final approval of all remaining projects—except equipment money for five projects now in some stage of construction—until a revenue measure is passed by Congress to provide funds for capital outlay.

So there is the problem, money from the Congress. But even with the money the solution is not so easy.

Let me turn now to the National Capital Housing Authority.

According to the Office of Urban Renewal, public works construction during the next 5 years will force nearly 11,000 families to move from their homes. Some 30,000 to 40,000 individuals will be affected in this displacement.

NCHA requested approval by the Board of Commissioners for five sites for some urgently needed housing for low-income families. Mr. Walter E. Washington, NCHA executive director, told the Commissioners: "I realize that the proposed extension of the public housing supply will only provide for about 5,000 to 6,000 of the 30,000 to 40,000 persons to be displaced. To some this is not enough; to some it is too much. Nevertheless, we appear here today to tell the city that these sites are all we have been able to locate after years of conscientious searching."

The sites were approved by the Commissioners, and the matter is now before the Public Housing Administration for its approval. If approval is received here, 5,000 to 6,000 persons in the low-income group will receive adequate housing.

However, the report generally paints a bleak and dismal picture of the immediate future for housing low-income groups. As of September 30, 1962, a total of 7,543 families were on the NCHA waiting list, requiring housing of from one to six bedrooms. And to this figure must be added the balance of the 11,000 families to be displaced during the next 5 years. However, the experience with displaced families in the southwest urban renewal area indicates that approximately one-third of these families went into public housing which could reduce the figure of 11,000 to a figure of between 3,000 and 4,000. But this would still give us a figure of some 10,000 to 11,000 families in need of adequate housing.

And adding to the frustrations of many of those seeking the housing is the fact that, particularly in the multiple-bedroom area, some families have had to wait 8 to 10 years before they were placed.

NCHA gives us this picture of its ability to place families in public housing due to monthly turnover: 12 one-bedroom units per month; 41 two-bedroom units per month; 18 three-bedroom units per month; 5 four-bedroom units per month; 2 five-bedroom units per month; and just 1 six-bedroom unit each 6 months.

As of the end of last September the authority had exactly 24 vacant units of all sizes. This means that of the 7,543 families on the waiting list as of that date, 24 had some immediate prospect of receiving a home. As of January 31, 1963, that figure stood at 7,323 families.

Compounding NCHA's problems is the fact that it is limited by law to activities within the District, some 70 square miles. Of this land, 65 percent is earmarked for purposes other than residential. A 1956 rezoning study of the District of Columbia showed that 56.6 percent of the District's land area was at that time held in public and quasi-public ownership. Only 23.2 percent of the total land area was utilized for residential purposes, and only 3 percent was vacant.

The NCHA has examined over 42 sites comprising hundreds of acres in various sections of the city, and this search produced just the five usable sites for which it requested approval.

The inescapable facts are these: (1) development within the District of Columbia has virtually eliminated the vacant tracts which in earlier days would have been available for the Authority's use; and (2), because of increased land and building values, the costs of acquiring and clearing slums have risen so as to severely limit the construction of the low-density housing which the authority so urgently needs.

The Authority states it must continue to explore every new method and technique of extending the housing supply; acquisition and use of existing properties, spot clearance and construction, and utilization of public lands not urgently needed for other high-priority uses, and an accelerated use of scattered site development.

However, this latter approach—scattered site development—has come under considerable fire. Property owners say it downgrades their property. NCHA says it does not; that, in fact, it increases property values. I am not going to presume to say whether it does, or does not. I am giving this to you as an example of the controversy we face, in addition to the problem of money.

Again, there is the problem, but not the solution.

Finally, let us take a look at transportation in the District. And here, again we have controversy—controversy between the District Highway Department and the National Capital Transportation Agency which was established by Congress in 1960 to prepare a transportation program for the Metropolitan Washington area and, subject to congressional approval, to construct and provide for the operation of mass transit facilities.

The region's transportation problem springs from the fact that the population is rapidly expanding and that most people working downtown have no satisfactory alternative to using their automobiles. The result is serious congestion of streets and highways, a condition which will become steadily worse unless decided improvements are made in transportation facilities. In 1960, Metropolitan Washington had a population of 2.2 million. It is expected to have a population of 3.6 million in 1980, an increase of 66 percent, and it will continue to grow after that.

Virtually all of this growth is taking place outside of the District itself. However, the primary trouble spot today is the Washington downtown area, which is, and will continue to be by far the region's largest employment center. While the number of persons traveling to or through the downtown area in the peak hours will be a declining proportion of all trips made in the region as the region grows outward, the total number of trips to and through downtown will grow sharply. In 1955 some 176,000 persons wanted to travel to or through the downtown area during the peak hour; by 1980 this number is expected to be as high as 254,000, an increase of 44 percent. This growth will occur in part because of an increase in downtown employment, which by 1980 is expected to be 17 percent greater than in 1955. The substantial increase in downtown trips is also attributable to the fact that there will be a steady increase in movements from one side of the downtown area to another. This increase in crosstown travel has been a pattern in every major urban area.

A number of plans have been advanced to meet Washington's future transportation needs. One would call for an all-highway system with improved bus service. Another calls for a minimum highway program—only those highways already built, under construction, or heavily committed—plus a regional rapid transit system. A third, the Highway Department's 1959 plan, calls for a very large highway network and a small rapid transit system. NCTA's plan calls for a sizable highway network, though not as large as that proposed in the 1959 plan, improved bus service, and a rail rapid transit system reaching from downtown Washington into the suburbs.

Any and all of these transportation plans would affect the agencies about which I have already spoken, the Board of Education and the National Capital Housing Authority. Any extension of Washington's highways would increase the number of displaced families, throwing a further load on NCHA. And NCHA would almost be forced to locate these displaced families in other areas of the city, adding to the planning woes of the Board of Education.

Also a cause for concern is the fact that, while the population of the Washington metropolitan area has been increasing rapidly, the population of Washington itself has declined. Middle- and upper-income families are moving out of the city into the suburbs, leaving a preponderance of low-income families in the District. Thus, while the needs of the District's population are increasing, the tax base is decreasing.

I could hardly speak on the problems confronting the District of Columbia without at least mentioning the National Capital Planning Commission, the Central Planning Agency for the Federal and District Governments, within the National Capital region. It is, according to the National Capital Planning Act of 1952, charged with the duty "to plan the appropriate and orderly development and redevelopment of the National Capital and the conservation of the important natural and historical features thereof."

It is going to have a busy time. It affects, and is affected by, nearly every other agency that has to do with the District of Columbia and the Metropolitan Washington area. For instance, it will have to hammer out differences in the National Capital Transit Association transportation plan and that of the highway department's 1959 plan, although the final decision must be made by the Congress.

To finalize, let me recapitulate. The magic number of the District of Columbia is three, more and better schools, improved highways and transportation, and adequate housing and neighborhood rehabilitation. Even with these three stones in the arch there can be no solid support for the future without a keystone. The keystone in this arch is planning. Without planning none of these three vital areas can succeed.

In modern urban planning, yearly cash and long-term credit are the two ingredients for success. Unless the District of Columbia can look forward to reasonable annual outlays and adequate long-term credit, nothing can be accomplished.

The President's plan for a Federal payment equal to taxes is a start in the right direction. With this anticipated increase in the budget of the District, long-term credit is in order.

The Congress this year ought to vote a payment equal to what industry would pay back home in taxes in every Congressman's congressional district. We on Capitol Hill should not be asking local taxpayers to pay the Federal Government's share of what it ought to be paying for the space we take from the tax rolls.

A payment equal to taxes is a fair Federal contribution. It is what every other municipality would be demanding if the Federal Government were located in that community. Most States now are making such a payment. In my home community of Champaign-Urbana, Ill., the State of Illinois is making a payment in lieu of taxes for community services for the space and buildings of the University of Illinois in the Champaign-Urbana community.

The District of Columbia is growing at a rapid rate, far beyond anything anticipated 18 years ago at the end of World War II. It will take a crash program to keep us on an even keel, with 3,000 more spaces needed next year in the school system, a complete complex of highways and bridges and a further rehabilitation of worn-out neighborhoods and increased modern housing, all pressing for attention.

The hour is late but it is not too late. We can do the job in the next 5 to 10 years if the Congress acts this year. The climate is right and we ought to get on with the job.

Groups such as yours, with groups within groups, each attacking certain problems, common, related, or entirely unrelated, working to seek ultimate solutions to those problems, are of immeasurable help. Your studies of our problems, the counseling and advice contained in your petitions to the various governmental agencies of the District—and to the Congress—are of great help and importance to those of us who must make the final decisions. Through your efforts we are able to gain clearer pictures of the problems; and are thereby better enabled to come up with the right answers.

Little Tommy came up with a pretty good, I mean perfect, answer to his problem.

I hope that we in the Congress may be able to do the same.

A Tribute to St. Patrick and the Irish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the few occasions each year we can depend on unanimity of opinion from both sides of the aisle is that happy time we put aside our legislative calendars and pay proper tribute to the land of St. Patrick and her distinguished sons.

We are familiar with the inspiring role the patron saint of Ireland played in the history of the Western World. We are equally aware of the great role played by the people of Ireland in America's early history, and the continuing contributions made to our Nation by their descendants.

It has been said that "Ireland gives England her soldiers, her generals, too." In America, we can say that. But we can say much more, for in every profession, business or industry, in every scholastic, artistic or athletic endeavor there are names of sons of Erin at the top. So, too, in the three branches of our Federal Government—in the Court to the east of this Chamber, in the house a few blocks to the west and here in our Speaker's chair, distinguished sons of Erin sit.

In honoring the patron saint and the nation of Ireland, we express our affection and gratitude toward the people of Ireland for giving so much to the character and strength of our beloved Nation. Americans of all ethnic derivations shall never forget the contributions Irish-Americans have made to the general welfare of America.

Tribute to St. Patrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today as the Members entered the chamber they received a green carnation in observance of the great patron saint of Ireland, St. Patrick. The boutonniere for each Member was presented, as in past years, under the auspices of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of America. The Ancient Order of Hibernians, founded in 1836, is a fraternal and social organization with some 700 local groups whose members are descendents of Hibernia, and dedicated to preserving ancient Irish lore and traditions. May I take this opportunity to pay tribute to members of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America and express my appreciation for their contribution today.

Mr. Speaker, on St. Patrick's Day we delight to do honor to the memory of the great St. Patrick, apostle, bishop, and patron saint of Ireland. In the celebrations and speeches that mark the day, we are accustomed to praise the land and people of Ireland, to mark those qualities in the Irish character that seem most worthy of emulation and esteem. We speak, too, of the Irish who have given their lives or shed their blood in the defense of our country, and of the Irish who, in civilian pursuits, have contributed to the well-being, the entertainment, and the intellectual and artistic development of our people. Often, on this occasion, we call attention to the moral vigor and stamina which St. Patrick exhibited in his life, and instilled in his disciples, and we point out the need for these stalwart virtues in the perilous and inspiring circumstances that surround us today.

But I think it is well, sometimes, to go right to the heart of the matter, and speak simply of the life and character of St. Patrick, the brave, good man, and the devoted servant of God. Draw all good lessons you will from his life—they will be the more effective when accompanied by an appreciation of the man himself: his humility and simplicity, his audacity, his unwavering faith and shining virtue, hs untiring service to Christ and His Church, and his kind and friendly approach to his fellow man.

We know Patrick in his own writings, from which both the events of his life and the character of the man appear in clarity and completeness. Let scholars dispute as they will about the place and time of his birth, and the date of his coming to Ireland. These are factual historical points of some importance, I admit, but they pale into insignificance before the importance of the man's life and character, and the magnificence of his achievement.

I urge all who have not done so, to read for themselves St. Patrick's account of his life, called his Confession, and his letter to the savage chieftain, Coroticus. You know, of course, the outlines of his story—how he was captured in his youth by what we should now call pirates, and sold into slavery in the pagan land of Ireland; how he escaped from his slavery through guidance vouchsafed him in a vision, and wandered long in the unsettled territories of what is now northern France; how a voice urged him to return to Ireland, to spread the Christian faith among the pagans who had been his masters; and how, by daring and persistence, ingenuity, and devotion, he succeeded at last in making Ireland the Christian nation she has ever since remained. The charm of Irish wit and humor, the play of Irish fancy and the sublimity of Irish poetic imagination, the charm of Irish song and the dash of Irish courage, and the ingratiating quality of Irish blarney—all these qualities may well have existed among the Irish people before ever St. Patrick set foot upon their strand, whether as captive or as missionary and bishop. But each of these qualities found high and spectacular expression in the character of St. Patrick, as it appears from his own writings, and each of these qualities, as it appears in the Irish and those of Irish descent today, is warmed and colored by the Christian fervor that imbued the whole life and nature of the Saint, and constituted his gift to Ireland and his claim to our grateful remembrance.

Inter-Media Discipline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most vital links in the chain of representative government in this country is that of our mass media. Gone are the days when a Member of Congress could hope, by going from stump to stump, to reach his constituents with reports of what had occurred in Washington and on what his views were of major issues. To some extent congressional newsletters have taken a part of this burden, but still the major share of it rests on our mass media to report back to the people what is happening and what positions their representatives have taken on important issues.

I have been very critical of the media in their failure to discharge this duty as they should. I believe this vital link in representative government is a weak one. I am encouraged, however, by the interest which I have found among many of the professionals in the media who are worried about this failure as well, for they realize that the principal discipline must be exercised in the media themselves.

An interesting inter-media discipline has been developed by Steve Fentress of television station KMOX in St. Louis. Mr. Fentress has a biweekly program, "KMOX–TV Views the Press," in which he reviews the newspapers and news magazines of recent date to help point up the issues and their treatment. With this program he helps the people of the St. Louis viewing area become more aware of the points of controversy in the news and how the printed media succeed or fail in giving the people a true picture of the news.

This discipline is an excellent technique and Mr. Fentress deserves credit for his part in initiating and developing it. I believe it is a constructive effort in promoting sound and strong representative government.

Farmers Home Administration Should Have $800,000 Increase From Appropriations Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Farmers Home Administration is, in my opinion, one of the great workhorse agencies of the Federal Government, and by this characterization I mean nothing derogatory. The image springs to mind because FHA carries a tremendous burden; it was maltreated under the Republican administration, but its spirit has never faltered regardless of callous beatings and skimpy fare. Senator HUMPHREY, in a speech on the floor of the Senate recently, set forth the unpleasant statistics of neglect during the Benson years, underlined with the Senator's customary vivid prose. There is little I can add to these facts, but it has been my experience that knowledge can be acquired in two very general ways; by actively gathering information and by introspection. During my schooldays in east Texas I learned something about the origin of our country; what kind of people we Americans are, and the history of other great civilizations. Meditating about the Farmers Home Administration in this context, I am aware of a great truth—our country was won and was held by the small farmer and the small rancher both serviced by the small merchant and the smalltown banker; the family farm was indeed the wellspring of historical America. We hear about the hard-core Communist, the dedicated, imbued, fanatic Communist; is there a hard-core American? Yes, I believe so, and he is typically found on the family farm just as much a fanatic, if you will, and just as dedicated to his American way of life—imbued with Americanism. I know that the smalltown banker has now diminished in numbers, that in many cases his function is diffused and lost in our economic maze. I know that the small farmer is now being serviced for his banking needs by the Farmers Home Administration; or, not being serviced he joins the urban unemployed, and thus begins our decay.

I know that the Farmers Home Administration is not just a workhorse agency plodding a bureaucratic path, as the Benson administration saw it—occasionally lunging ahead by fits and starts overburdened with budget-starved programs, but a vital movement, kept alive by the men and women of FHA who daily work beyond their strength because they are also fighting for a cause. It is time to give proper sinews to this agency; to give proper recognition to FHA's function, which is a basis of our economy; and proper recognition to FHS's guardianship of the family farm, which is a basis of our culture. I recommend to the Appropriations Committee that at least $800,000 be provided to the Farmers Home Administration for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Tribute to Erin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, March 17 is the day when Irishmen all over the world gather to celebrate and pay tribute to Erin.

As an American of Irish ancestry, I join in the tribute. I want first to admit a lack of talent in giving true and worthy expression to a people to whom the world owes so much; to a people who ask for so little; and to a people who receive so little.

Maybe I should iterate the path of Irish history and call to mind the Kings of Tara's Hill, or Brian Boru and the Battle of Clontarf. Maybe I should talk of the Book of the Kells, the Cells of the Monks, and the learning of the scholars of old. A prayerful tribute could be paid to the memory of Patrick, Bridget, Malachy, and many more. All this I could do. Maybe I should dwell upon the sweetness of the land of Ireland, the brilliance of her emerald cloak, the stark beauty of the isles, the sad splendor of the gloaming upon her evening hills, the lilt of her gay little rivers and the peaceful stillness of her lakes, the rugged coasts, and the ever-sounding seas about her. Or listen to her poets, her philosophers, her scholars, her men and women of wit and charm, her bards and her minstrels. Or tell anew the myths and the fancies, the tales and the Come-All-Ye's, the annals of olden times, and rhapsodies of the blind walkers of the roads. Or glory in the tenacity which preserved the faith of our fathers, the holiness of martyred priest and nun, or saint, and humble laborer. And might we not join in spirit with the pilgrims wending their way to Mellray and Knock and Croagh Patrick?

I could dwell upon the priceless substantial contributions that the Irish have brought to these shores of our beloved America and the part they have played in every field of endeavor which has been for the development and permanence of this great Nation. Irish names come to mind from every decade of our history and from every quarter of the land—and from every bit of hallowed ground, far flung throughout the world, wherein rest the bodies of our heroic American dead.

No, in this space age—when nations are looked to for what they will do to preserve our way of life and our civilization—let us not forget what we already owe to the people of Ireland.

I do not want to dwell on the riches of memory alone, but I want to recall that the treasury of Ireland has been indeed heavily drawn upon for the endowment of Western civilization. It must never be forgotten that when darkness engulfed the minds and hearts of men, and the lamps of learning were blown out by the fierce winds of barbarian invasion and shattered by ignorance, the only light, besides the Beacon of the Holy Faith, that the eyes of man could see and finally take bearings by was the single, strong flame which was nourished and kept alive on that little green isle set in the vastness of the ocean waters. So powerful was this flame, and zealous its monastic guardians, that no assault could cause it to flicker or sink, and it burns today in every achievement of the Western World that is good, and true, and beautiful, and it casts its challenging brilliance even upon the farflung steppes and tundras of Russia. And it will burn forever, because it is fed with the oil of truth and kindled with the breath of belief in God, His justice, His wisdom, His mercy, and His love. Ireland, I am sure, can again be called upon to preserve Western civilization even if she must go it alone.

Connecticut Bill Proposes Ombudsman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the interest that I and many others have expressed in the possibility of adapting the Scandinavian ombudsman to the American political scene is paralleled by proposals to use the institution on the State level.

Ralph Nader, of Winsted, Conn., who has had a long interest in the use of the ombudsman in this country, has called to my attention a bill to establish an ombudsman that has been introduced in the Connecticut General Assembly.

Although the office, as I envision it, would be quite different on the Federal level—the ombudsman would be an agent of Congress ready to handle professionally constituents' problems referred to him by Members of Congress—I believe the key provisions of the State bill may be of interest to many legislators.

The bill provides that the main function of the ombudsman shall be to investigate any decision or act done or omitted by any of the State departments or agencies. He may investigate on a complaint or on his own initiative. If he decides that the act was unreasonable, unjust discriminatory or just wrong, he can make a public report of his opinion and send recommendations to the errant department. If no remedial action is taken, he can refer the matter to the Governor and the general assembly.

E Pluribus Unum et Erin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of their 1963 commemoration of the Feast of St. Patrick I was privileged to address the National Democratic Club in New York on the matter of current legislation. As a testament to the patient and silent suffering of the members of the Nation's oldest political club I ask to extend my address as follows:

E Pluribus Unum et Erin

I am profoundly honored to be called to address you in the 130th year of the oldest political club in America. And I commend you for your audacious courage in selecting for your St. Patrick's night speaker an Irish-Catholic-Brooklyn-Democrat. Within the last century, for one of my ilk to speak his mind at the corner of 38th Street and Madison Avenue would invite a fallout of vegetables, masonry, and lumber on the heads of the audience. Therefore on the premise that some APA's or plug-uglies from the five points may be still lurking in the neighborhood and recognizing the fact that you have been 90 days without newspapers I shall deal with the news from our great Capitol and the relatively inocuous topic of citizenship and statehood.

On Tuesday, March 12, by a vote of 377 to 21 the House of Representatives voted to extend honorary citizenship to an Englishman, Sir Winston Churchill. Without abnegation I admit that this descendant of the Galway herring chokers took the Queen's shilling and voted in favor of Sir Winston's cause. However, since the record will not show it, let history recount that my eminent and most distinguished colleague, Representative John J. Rooney and I were the last two into the well of the House to cast our votes. We delayed in order to hold common counsel as members of the AOH on the merits of the prospective citizen. I am proud to state that we resolved the question on the affirmative side by giving due consideration to the fact as documented by our boro historian, Jamie Kelley, that Sir Winston's mother, Jenny Jerome, once resided in a south Brooklyn brownstone. Reasoning with that clarity of perception and appreciation of the true and fair which is characteristic of Mr. Rooney (and myself to a lesser degree) we concluded that such residence was in a sense a purification and a credential sufficient to validate the admission of her offspring.

However, since the conference of dual citizenship on her most illustrious soldier-statesman will be an immeasurable boon to Britain's pride and posture I suggest that it is timely and proper for the Congress to address itself to a related and compensatory matter affecting the Republic of Eire.

Noting the imminence of the feast of St. Patrick and sensitive to any possible slight to the land of my forbears, by the admission of America's newest prospective citizen I have drafted legislation to extend honorary and voluntary status to Ireland as our 51st State.

I am hopeful that my resolution will receive early and favorable consideration since I expect that it will be referred to the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs of which I am a member. More significantly the chairman of that committee is the great statemaker, the distinguished Representative Leo O'Brien, of Albany. And I am now privileged to reveal that Chairman O'Brien and the rest of the membership have unanimously voted to admit me to the august and exclusive "Society To Admit Ireland as the 51st State" in recognition of my advocacy in behalf of this legislation. In order that no unkind critic may accuse us of perfidy as a secret society I am at liberty to disclose that in addition to Chairman O'Baien and myself the membership of our illustrious society includes that Honolulu Harp, the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, the Honorable Daniel K. Inouye. Let no one doubt that the great Senator is an authentic and legitimate descendent of Kathleen Ni Hoolihan. So Irish is he that his ancestors took care to move the "O" to the middle of his name where it could never be disturbed by the anglicization of either the prefix or the suffix.

In a solemn conclave of our trinitarian society it was agreed that consideration of Erin as our 51st State is long past due. In fact it was suggested that it perhaps should have been either 49th or 50th since it is only 3,825 miles from Washington or New York to Dublin and 5,164 miles to Honolulu and 3,059 miles to Juneau, Alaska. However it was concluded that no ground has been lost since Alaska has had the good judgment to elect as its first Governor an icy Gael, William A. Egan, while Hawaii has similarly displayed good sense in its choice of two fine chief executives in succession named: William Francis Quinn and John A. Burns.

The society duly noted that O'Brien, the great statemaker, had exhibited characteristic enlightenment in bringing such an intelligent electorate into the Union.

With his gifted management in the House and the brilliant sponsorship of the good Senator in the upper body there is good reason to expect that the land of the orchid and pineapple and the isle of the potato and the shamrock will be linked in confederation.

I urge that the implications of this union are most appetizing. A postprandial draught of potcheen, the distillate of the potato, to create a mellow Irish mist would be followed on the morn by pineapple squeezins to lift the fog and Dublin dew.

I hasten to add at this point, to avoid diplomatic involvement that this proposed legislation has not been cleared with the White House although little trouble is expected from that quarter if one can rely on grassroots reports from Wexford.

By the same token I assure the great Republic of Eire that I have no intent to demean its status as equal to any nation on the face of the earth in its dignity and sovereignty by an offer of voluntary statehood. My desire to effect greater union between two of the world's great democracies is animated by recognition that the Irish contribution to the size and quality of our population and the glowing pages of our history is so vast that it deserves most singular treatment.

Beginning with the discovery of America there may be some dispute as to when and by whom it was first explored but there can be no doubt that the Irish had a hand in it. Some say the first immigrant was St. Brendan of Clonfert who is said to have found Greater Ireland as this continent was then known in the sixth century A.D.—eight centuries before Columbus. But most Irishmen are reluctant to contest this point. Not only are we mindful of the Italian vote and the present composition of the New York City Board of Estimate but we are unwilling to admit that we had possession of the land for over a thousand years before electing an Irish President. It is the better part of conciliation to agree that the Genoese explorer discovered this great land but he was guided by the expert seamanship of Rice De Galvey, of Galway, his navigator who would have landed in New York instead of San Salvador if he had his own way but he was outvoted.

As the Irish are not disposed to make much of their role in discovery, so too our innate modesty leads us to deprecate our role in the settlement of this great Nation. As Randolph Cabot Rooney replied to Lowell Wendell Maguire when he was asked about the order of his arrival in America—"We came over on the second boat. We sent the servants ahead on the *Mayflower*."

As there can be no question of discovery, so can there be none as to the Irish motivation of our fight for independence.

Now, not only did the Irish indulge in the great sport of firing on the Redcoats in the War of Independence, but they had a hand in the inciting to rebellion.

Four of the signers of the Declaration of Independence were born in Ireland: Col. James Smith, George Taylor, Edward Rutledge, and Matthew Thornton.

Five others had Irish parents or grandparents, and the most famous signer of all, John Hancock, owed his corolliographic signature to the penmanship taught by an Irish schoolmaster.

In all the wars this Nation has fought for liberty, union, and democracy it may be said that we won because God and right were on our side; but it didn't hurt to have the Irish with us.

The Father of this country well knew this, for on the 17th of March 1776 General Washington paid tribute to his Irish troops by making the watchword "St. Patrick."

In 1779 a committee of the British House of Commons went on a junket to find out the cause of the revolution. They asked Joseph Galloway, a loyalist, "What were the troops in the Service of the Congress composed of? Were they native, or were the greatest part of them English, Scotch, or Irish?"

Said Galloway: "I can answer that question with precision. They were scarcely one-fourth native, one-half Irish, the other fourth English or Scotch."

And when the surrender of Lord Cornwallis was announced to Parliament, Lord Mountjoy said, "England has lost America through the exertion of Irish immigrants."

Just as hard as the Irish fought in the Revolution to divide Britain from the Colonies, they fought in the Civil War both to preserve the Union and to defend the South.

It may be truly said that the side with the most Irish won the war. And on the side of Union it was the Irish brigade, largely from New York, which led the fray.

Perhaps the greatest tribute to the Irish brigade at Fredericksburg came from an unexpected source—the correspondent of the by no means pro-Irish Times of London. He wrote:

"To the Irish division was principally committed the desperate task of bursting out of the town of Fredericksburg and forming under the withering fire of the Confederate batteries to attack Marye's Heights towering immediately in front.

"Never at Fontenoy, Albuera, or at Waterloo was more undaunted courage displayed by the sons of Erin than in those six frantic dashes which they delivered against the almost impregnable position of their foe.

"* * * After witnessing the gallantry and devotion exhibited by his (Meagher's) troops and viewing the hillsides, for acres strewn with their corpses as thick as autumnal leaves, the spectator can remember nothing but the desperate courage and regret that it was not exhibited in a holier cause. That any mortal men could have carried the position before which they were wantonly sacrificed, defended as it was, it seems to me idle for a moment to believe. But the bodies which lie in dense masses 40 yards off the muzzles of Colonel Walton's (Confederate) guns are the best evidence of what manner of men they were who pressed on to death with the dauntlessness of a race which has gained glory on a thousand battlefields and never more richly deserved it than at the foot of Marye's Heights on the 13th day of December 1862."

Quite often, Irish troops faced one another on the battlefield. A number of Irish companies were among the Confederates who turned back the Irish brigade before Marye's Heights. Later at Petersburg Irish soldiers on both sides called an unofficial truce.

Someone asked if there were any Limerick men present. "Enough to take care of the whole of County Cork," came the reply.

The Gael fought so well during the Civil War because he possessed the "Irish edge." In addition to his piece (and he was as good with the stock as the sight), he bore into battle his great sense of humor. Stories circulated by the hundreds during the Civil War.

There was the story of the Irish soldier who asked his commanding officer for a furlough. He explained that his wife was sick and there was no one to look out for the children. "Pat," said the officer, "that's very strange, for the chaplain has a letter from your wife asking us not to send you home. She says every time you go home on leave you get drunk and frighten the children." "Faith," said Pat, "there's two of the most splendid liars in the army in this room. I was never married in me life."

Likewise the story of the Irishman carrying a comrade suffering with a leg wound to a first-aid station. Unknown to him a cannon ball took the man's head off while he was carrying him. When the Irishman reached the station and dumped the corpse down on a cot someone pointed out to him that it lacked a head. "Why, the deceivin' creature" he said. "He told me it was his leg that was botherin' him."

We best sum up the saga of the Irish in the fight for America's freedom, union, and democracy when we refer to the list of those who have won the Nation's highest decoration—the Congressional Medal of Honor. The greatest name is Murphy—21 in all, with the Kellys on their heels—18 heroes strong. And nestled there among them, sleeping with the brave, the list records a Carey. Hugh himself—sergeant of Company "E", 82d New York Infantry—Civil War—born in Ireland. Enough to swell a man's chest to bursting when you note that among the foreign born who hold the medal, Ireland with her handful of 4 million souls has won more than twice as many as any other nation who sent men here to help.

But lest we speak too much of fighting which is more a hobby than an aim, look to the feats of Irishmen who forged this land so strong.

Despite the claims of Russia as to who invented what, there's no question that the Irish have done as much as most.

Undoubtedly the first guided missile was the haverstraw hand grenade first found at the end of a Gaelic arm.

And you'd have no hat on your head but for Cavanagh of Danbury, nor heels on your shoes save for Humphrey O'Sullivan.

Robert Fulton dreamed of steamboats at an Irish father's knee, and Mr. Holland and his submarine is a credit to the race. Louis Sullivan sketched the skyscraper, Crimmins built it, and McDonald dug the subways and canals. Marcus Daly found our copper. John MacKay the Comstock silver and William Shoney O'Brien had a hand in gold.

But it is in song and story that the Irish best excel. Victor Herbert and Eugene O'Neill and a regiment behind them much too long to tell.

So with our last word on labor we'll rest the Irish case—from Meany to Maguire—the father of Labor Day—the work of Gaelic leaders gave the union man his say.

Especially do I urge the support of voluntary and honorary statehood for Ireland by the members of this great New York audience and National Democratic Club. Only in this way can we heal a painful wound on the corpus of New York politics as invented by the boys of the spartan band, of the five points, and the sixth ward.

In 1853 New York elected to the Congress "the one and only Mike Walsh" an inveterate foe of privilege. He served the cause of the common man and also several terms for libel. He spoke in the Congress for the minimum wage, and fought the waste of public funds and the extension of slavery. Defeated for reelection by "Honest John" Kelly he foresaw the danger of the Bolshevik Revolution and tried to induce the czar to buy ships for the Russian navy from one of his friends in Constantinople. Coming back to New York he visited the watering places on Broadway to take the pulse of the electorate and nothing else. He expired one night stretched prone on the streets of his city beloved. There are those unkind wags who would have you believe that he fell there in stupor when the truth is that his love of New York and the United States was so strong he tried to hug the earth to his bosom in his dying embrace.

Now he is laid to rest in the Greenwood cemetery which lies in the 15th district of Brooklyn which I am privileged to represent.

The grievous wound of which I speak is that Congressman, patriot, defender of the rights of man though he was—Mike Walsh never became a citizen. How thus can he rest easy in his grave—and that in Brooklyn.

This legislation I suggest in its retroactive effect would not only put Mike to rest—but in truth by our action of Tuesday, Walsh would walk with Sir Winston—for the good of them both.

Finally, I will recognize that there are as many Sons of Zion in the audience tonight as there are Sons of Erin. I therefore suggest that this other great and free country which lies along the Jordan should one day receive similar treatment. To that end I would urge that it note the precedent of Ireland in demonstrating that brotherhood which is the highest order of democracy. Since the Dubliners have shown the way by electing that great Hebrew Hibernian Lord Mayor Briscoe as their city executive it would be a stroke of sheer enlightenment to herald an Irishman as mayor of Tel Aviv.

Then truly we could say from Honolulu to Dublin to Haifa—aloha, sogarth aroon and shalom alechem—E pluribus unum et Erin.

Jefferson County Citizenship Tour Represents Best in American Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, if from time to time we become a little stale in our attitudes and perspectives, we have only to look at the situations which face us through the eyes of the young. I have just had such an opportunity due to the visit of a splendid group of young citizens from my home county, Jefferson County, Ala., who were here at the Capitol today—March 14, 1963. This group, comprising one outstanding junior from each high school in our county, is the Jefferson County Citizenship Tour, and this marks the 17th annual visit of the tour to our Nation's Capital and to other historical points on the eastern seaboard.

The Jefferson County Citizenship Tour has over the years been organized and directed by Mrs. Alyce Walker, the very efficient and competent associate editor of the Birmingham News.

These young men and women, selected on the basis of their scholastic achievements, their interest in current affairs, and their consistent good character, trace, on their tour, the early history of our great Nation. One of their first stops is at Williamsburg, Va., a famous seat of colonial government in America, and vital source of the spirit of independence which was subsequently proclaimed for our people. The group then went to Philadelphia to view the spot where our Declaration of Independence was adopted and where the Liberty Bell rang out, its clarion call reaching into the souls of men all over the world to kindle everywhere the urge for freedom and representative government. Next, the citizenship tour proceeded to New York, where George Washington took the oath of office as first President of the United States 174 years ago next month. While there, the group visited the United Nations, first lasting organization to be established for the promotion and maintenance of world peace.

This week, the group came to Washington to spend most of their time and it is well and good that they should do so. It is here that representative government was nurtured and made meaningful so that, today, Washington, D.C., capital of the United States, is also the capital of the free world.

These young men and women from Jefferson County, Ala., are truly going to be leaders of the next generation. The respect in which they hold our American heritage and the enthusiasm they show for our representative system of democracy has demonstrated to me that the next generation is well preparing itself to take over the reins of the chariot of freedom and democracy which is making its way across the world and the ages.

I am pleased to report that one of the big thrills for each of these boys and girls was an opportunity to preside momentarily over the House of Representatives, though the House was not in session, by sitting in the Speaker's chair. As is customary, they each made a wish at this point and I know that their wishes, one and all, related to their keen desire to see the American brand of democracy and freedom expand and flourish. Another great treat for the group was to have lunch with the Alabama Congressional Delegation and to meet and hear those who are their Representatives here in Congress.

I wanted to record the visit of this outstanding group by giving the House an account of their short stay with us. I insert herewith the names of these splendid young citizens, of whom I am so proud, as well as the names of their parents, and the schools they represent:

Mr. Tommy Brock, son of Mr. and Mrs. John E. Brock, 118 Meadow Lane, Trussville, Ala., Hewitt-Trussville High School.

Mr. Herbert Kyle Hedrick, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. H. K. Hedrick, 1804 Dartmouth Avenue, Bessemer, Ala., Bessemer High School.

Mr. Frank Y. Johnson, son of Mrs. A. Reddus Johnson, 452 Tupelo Way, Birmingham, Ala., John Carroll High School.

Mr. Dwight Lee, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Lee, Route 1, Box 130, Gardendale, Ala., Mortimer Jordan High School.

Mr. Coleman Lollar, son of Mr. and Mrs. Brownie Lollar, Route 2, Quinton, Ala., West Jefferson High School.

Mr. Charles Michael Stanberry, son of Mr. and Mrs. C. B. Stanberry, 113 Stratford Road, Birmingham, Ala., Shades Valley High School.

Mr. Joe Wright, son of Mr. Joe Wright, Route 1, Adger, Ala., Oak Grove High School.

Mr. Wade Lehmon Roberts, son of Mrs. H. H. Roberts, 49 Graymont Avenue, Birmingham, Ala., Glenn High School.

Mr. Charles Henry, son of Mr. William E. Henry, 1105 Linthicum Street, Tarrant, Ala., Tarrant High School.

Mr. Dennis Oran Freeman, son of Mr. and Mrs. J. Hershall Freeman, 3014 Pearson Avenue SW., Birmingham, Ala., West End High School.

Mr. Wayne McIntyre, son of Mrs. C. P. Sticher, Grove Hill, Ala., McNeel School.

Mr. Leland Douglas Maddox, son of Mr. J. D. Maddox, Route 3, Box 59, Bessemer, Ala., McAdory High School.

Miss Anna Lu Nichols, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Chris Nichols, 8104 First Avenue, South, Birmingham, Ala., Banks High School.

Miss Joyce Moseley, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. S. W. Moseley, 3304 Avenue S, Ensley, Ala., Ensley High School.

Miss Tiajuana Virginia Lazenby, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Lazenby, 2800 Wesley Avenue, Birmingham, Ala., Jones Valley High School.

Miss Lynn Oaks, daughter of Mrs. Walter H. Oaks, 1001 Heflin Avenue, Birmingham, Ala., Phillips High School.

Miss Jenny Larkin, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. N. C. Larkin, 1209 Concord Avenue, Birmingham, Ala., Ramsay High School.

Miss Patricia Alford, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. A. W. Alford, 8205 10th Avenue, South, Birmingham, Ala., Woodlawn High School.

Miss Karen Monroe, daughter of Mrs. Angie Monroe, 1300 35th Street, West, Birmingham, Ala., Fairfield High School.

Miss Linda Pettey, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. W. G. Pettey, Jr., Lakewood Estates, Bessemer, Ala., Brooke Hill School.

Miss Cheryl McCord, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. L. B. McCord, 1005 Southridge Drive, Birmingham, Ala., Misses Howard School.

Miss Ann McCarn, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. D. W. McCarn, Warrior, Ala., Warrior High School.

Miss Pam Sparks, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Charles B. Sparks, Warrior, Ala., Warrior High School.

Miss Carol Griffis, daughter of Mr. George Griffis, Route 15, Box 216, Birmingham, Ala., Minor High School.

Miss Sylvia Ann Lindsay, daughter of Mr. John W. Lindsay, Route 1, Box 71, Graysville, Ala., Corner High School.

Miss Cherry Louise Skinner, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph W. Skinner, 142 Kenilworth Road, Bessemer, Ala., Hueytown High School.

Miss Diane McKinnon, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. W. R. McKinnon, 433 North 29th Street, Leeds, Ala., Leeds High School.

PART 4

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 109—PART 4

MARCH 15, 1963, TO APRIL 3, 1963
(PAGES 4307 TO 5658)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1963

J
11
.R
V.109
pt. 4

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

Friday, March 15, 1963

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

Msgr. Bela Varga, chairman, the Hungarian Committee, New York, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, Almighty Father, Thou hast made this day, the ides of March, forever memorable to the people of Hungary. Thou gavest strength to them on March 15, 1848, to rise as one man in the struggle for freedom, as Thou didst aid them in 1956.

Freedom is the greatest treasure Thou hast given to man; and now this great treasure of mankind is being threatened with annihilation. Throughout the world, evil forces are destroying the happiness of nations who succumb to this diabolical power, even though free individuals are ready to fight this evil to death. Strengthen in the hour of temptation those who are suffering in the fight for freedom. Lend, O Lord, Thy guiding hands to the spiritual leader of Thy Hungarian nation, that he may fulfill his national and universal mission.

The Hungarian people have shed rivers of blood for liberty. Grant, O Lord, that their sacrifices alleviate their sufferings under the yoke of the cruel oppressor. As I am praying to Thee, O Almighty God, here in this great hall of freedom, I implore Thee to strengthen the Nation, Thy blessed people of America, that has become the leader of this struggle for freedom.

Give them, O Lord, Thy never-ending succor to their President, to their Senate and Congress, that they may never falter in their brave endeavors to secure the final victory of freedom throughout the world for Thy greater glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 14, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 4374) to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 4374) to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Humphrey, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States, submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. HRUSKA (for Mr. Eastland), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. Vearle Payne, of New Mexico, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William J. Hartigan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection——

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in the committee I did not object to the nomination of Mr. Hartigan, nor do I object now. But I believe the Record should show that on August 3, 1961, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee held hearings on the nomination of William J. Hartigan to be Assistant Postmaster General for the Bureau of Transportation. The committee reported favorably his nomination to the Senate on August 3, and the Senate confirmed his nomination on August 4, 1961.

On March 3, 1962, Mr. Hartigan resigned as Assistant Postmaster General for Transportation, to return to his State of Massachusetts to engage in a political campaign. After the election, he returned to Washington, and the President resubmitted his nomination for the same job as Assistant Postmaster General for Transportation.

On March 13, 1963, this nomination was again before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee for approval. Again the committee has reported it favorably to the Senate.

In the committee, I did not object to his nomination, nor am I objecting now. But I do think the Record should show that in less than 8 months after confirmation, Mr. Hartigan resigned from the Post Office Department, to actively engage in a State political campaign, and that after the campaign was over, he asked to be reconfirmed by the Senate.

I do not think it is good Government policy for a man to come in and serve a little while, and then have the idea that he can leave, and can manage a political campaign, and subsequently can return and can get his job back.

As I stated at our committee meeting, I am not very happy about this procedure, and I hope it is not a precedent; but I am not going to raise an objection to confirmation of this nomination. Such a practice as is here indicated, if carried out extensively, would not lend itself to good government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The clerk will proceed to state the other nominations on the Executive Calendar, under the new reports.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edmund T. Pratt, Jr., of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Justice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul J. Tierney, of Maryland, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1969.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Robert F. Seedlock, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Central Intelligence Agency Act Amendments of 1963

A letter from the Acting Director, Central Intelligence Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report of Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc.

A letter from the National Quartermaster, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Employment of Aliens in a Scientific or Technical Capacity

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Review of Ineffective Repair Parts Support for Combat and Combat-Support Vehicles by Army Tank-Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of ineffective repair parts support for combat and combat-support vehicles by the Army Tank-Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich., dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Relief of Certain Employees of the Foreign Service

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Extension of Commission on Civil Rights

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights as an agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report Under Manpower Development and Training Act

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report under the Manpower Development and Training Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 19

"Joint resolution relative to Edwards Air Force Base

"Whereas the State of California contains within its boundaries Edwards Air Force Base, an existing Government-owned facility, adequate in size and almost fully developed as a ground recovery station for orbital space vehicles, over which astronauts in the X–15 rocket plane have been launched more than 50 miles into space and returned; and

"Whereas the weather at this location provides more nearly perfect visibility than any other spot in the continental United States, having visibility in excess of 10 miles and a ceiling higher than 10,000 feet 94 percent of the time, and being absolutely clear more than 60 percent of the time; and

"Whereas, the existing facilities at Edwards Air Force Base include the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Flight Research Center and the Air Force Astronaut Training Center, with more than $250 million worth of complementary, NASA and Air Force buildings, radar, radio telemetry, computer and modular display equipment; and

"Whereas Edwards Air Force Base contains nearly 400 square miles of flat and moderately hilly uninhabited land, with several thousand square miles of sparsely inhabited land adjoining to the east and north, over which air traffic is restricted; and

"Whereas Edwards Air Force Base and its NASA installation are only 90 miles from Goldstone Radar Tracking Station (one of the best in the world), only 150 miles from Vandenberg Air Force Base and the Pacific Missile Range, and are less than 100 miles from three major universities and NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory, and only 100 miles from the highly skilled labor pool and sophisticated research and test facilities of the Los Angeles aerospace complex; and

"Whereas Edwards Air Force Base is only 3 degrees north of the 32.5-degree inclination of the Mercury flight orbits and is at the same time well away from international boundaries, providing adequate security in case of secret payloads: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States and all Federal agencies with jurisdiction in the matter to designate, actuate, and further develop Edwards Air Force Base as the primary U.S. space vehicle ground recovery station; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to the establishment of a new national cemetery

"Whereas the Fort Rosecrans National Cemetery is the only national cemetery in southern California; and

"Whereas there being an average of 15 interments for each working day, available space for interments is diminishing at an alarming rate; and

"Whereas it is, and will continue to be, traditionally proper to provide fitting memorial cemeteries for the interment of deceased veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States and for their eligible dependents, as is now evidenced by the memorial cemeteries now in existence; and

"Whereas in the area which contains the counties of San Diego, Riverside, Orange, Imperial and San Bernardino, State of California, there resides a population composed of an extremely high percentage of veterans, as compared to other sections of the United States; and

"Whereas in 1945, the office of the Quartermaster General, Department of the Army, recommended to the then Congress that a new national cemetery of an adequate size be established in the San Diego area, and if and when legislation is enacted, steps be taken toward the selection of a site and acquisition of the necessary property on which to establish a national cemetery: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery of an adequate size on U.S. Government-owned property at former Camp Elliott Naval Reservation, now declared excess to the General Services Administration, or at another suitable location on U.S. Government-owned property; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], I present a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which would eliminate the capital gains on the sale of timber and urging the congressional delegation from South Carolina to oppose, with all the strength at their disposal, the passage of such a measure. I ask that this concurrent resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 196

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which would eliminate the capital gains on the sale of timber and urging the congressional delegation from South Carolina to oppose, with all the strength at their disposal, the passage of such a measure

Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina has been informed that a portion of the tax program of the President of the United States includes the elimination of capital gains on the sale of timber; and

Whereas this information has caused the general assembly and a large segment of the population of the State great concern in view of the fact that timber and forest products generally constitute the No. 1 farm crop of the State; and

Whereas the enacting into law the President's proposal will most certainly affect the economy of the State very adversely; and

Whereas the general assembly notes that many less advantageous crops of this State have, through recent years, been shifted to forests and that thousands of acres of land formerly planted in less productive crops are now planted in vast forests resulting in great financial gain; and

Whereas the members of the general assembly believe that any effort to saddle this new industry of the State with an additional tax burden would serve to greatly discourage the further advancement of this most important crop: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memoralized to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which proposes the elimination of the capital gains of the sale of timber; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the congressional delegation from South Carolina are urged to oppose with all the strength at their command the enactment of this legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in the Congress and to each member of the congressional delegation from South Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS ON UTILIZATION OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS BY COMMITTEES IN CONNECTION WITH FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the reports of the Committees on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, Appropriations, and Foreign Relations concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by these committees in 1962 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Young, Stephen:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	439.56	109.89	487.00	121.75	80.00	20.00	100.00	25.00	1,106.56	276.64
Italy	Lira	38,191.50	61.50	39,278.25	63.25	----------	----------	15,525.00	25.00	92,994.75	149.75
France	Franc	362.90	74.06	445.9	91.00	98.00	20.00	98.00	20.00	1,004.80	205.06
Spain	Peseta	2,151.05	36.44	3,459.17	58.60	----------	----------	590.30	10.00	6,200.52	105.04
Austria	Schilling	2,314.80	90.00	4,243.80	165.00	----------	----------	941.35	36.60	7,499.95	291.60
Galloway, Eilene:[1]											
Austria	do	2,315	90.00	2,624	102.00	1,286	50.00	775	30.16	7,000	272.16
Germany	Deutsche mark	----------	----------	----------	----------	5,154.8	1,288.70	----------	----------	5,154.8	1,288.70
Cannon, Howard:											
Switzerland	Swiss franc	196	45.50	175	40.00	35	8.00	44.00	10.00	450.00	103.50
Do	Deutsche mark	----------	----------	----------	----------	2,356.49	590.60	----------	----------	2,356.49	590.60
Total	----------	----------	507.39	----------	641.60	----------	1,977.30	----------	156.76	----------	3,283.05

[1] Included Bulgaria.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	3,283.05

Clinton P. Anderson,
Chairman, Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Mar. 13, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Gordon Allott:											
Switzerland	Swiss franc	73.70	16.96	63	14.51	21.80	5.02	13.30	3.07	171.80	39.56
France	New franc	260.40	53.12	163.15	33.28			303.45	61.97	727	148.37
Italy	Lira			41,216	66.37	164,862	265.48	22,784	36.69	228,862	368.54
Germany	Deutsche mark					4,392.19	1,100.80			4,392.19	1,100.80
Total			70.08		114.16		1,371.30		101.73		1,657.27
Senator Allen J. Ellender:											
Spain	Peseta									2,365	[1] 39.25
Morocco	Dirham (franc)									81.15	[1] 16.20
Guinea	Franc									3,275	[1] 13.40
Ghana	Pound									3-8-2	[1] 9.52
Nigeria	do									67.7	[1] 188.58
Republic of South Africa	Rupee									70	[1] 98.70
Egypt	Egyptian pound									17.200	[1] 39.56
Libya (Benghazi)	Libyan pound									5.12	[1] 14.33
Tripoli (Libya)	do									29.95	[1] 83.86
France	New franc									119.20	[1] 24.33
Do	do						1,481.80			7,260.90	[2] 1,481.80
Total							1,481.80				2,009.53
Senator Roman L. Hruska:											
United States: Hawaii	Dollar		249.40		102.86		790.68		73.25		1,216.19
Tokyo	do				9.89				8.84		18.73
Tokyo Crown Province	Yen	9,762	27.34	6,115	17.13			14,123	39.56	30,000	84.03
Okinawa	Dollar		1.50		3.50				5.00		10.00
Taipei	do		10.20		.89		1.50		2.97		15.56
Hong Kong	do		7.03		10.25		7.50		10.87		35.65
Vietnam	do				1.25						1.25
Vietnam Crown province	Piaster	2,020.20	28.25	579	8.09			300.40	4.20	2,899.60	40.54
Republic of Philippines	Dollar		19.27		14.93		3.50		48.22		85.92
Guam	do		2.00		3.94				.25		6.19
Kwajalein	do				5.94				4.05		9.99
Total			344.99		178.67		803.18		197.21		1,524.05
Senator Hubert Humphrey and administrative assistant:											
Venezuela	U.S. dollar		240.00		117.50		50.00		35.00		442.50
Panama	do		32.70		23.50		7.50		5.00		68.70
Costa Rica	do		88.20		48.00		12.00		15.00		163.20
El Salvador	do		27.00		23.50				5.50		56.00
Honduras	do		28.36		21.25		5.35		7.25		62.21
Guatemala	do		75.00		41.00		20.00		13.50		149.50
Mexico	Peso	4,937.50	395.00	2,509.75	200.75	1,312.50	105.00	240.62	19.25	9,000.37	720.00
Do	U.S. dollar				21.50				11.74		33.24
Total			886.26		497.00		199.85		112.24		1,695.35
Senator Estes Kefauver: France	New franc	1,068.20	218.00	1,151.50	235.00	294.00	60.00	122.50	25.00	2,636.20	538.00
Total			218.00		235.00		60.00		25.00		538.00
Senator Thomas H. Kuchel:											
Germany	Deutsche mark	129.17	32.37	339.63	85.12	89.93	22.54	281.97	70.67	840.70	210.70
Italy	Lira	33,170	53.41	20,797	33.49	90,398	145.67	10,000	16.10	154,365	248.57
The Azores, Germany, Spain, and Italy.	U.S. dollar										121.74
Total			85.78		118.61		168.11		86.77		581.01
Senator Gale W. McGee:											
French Oceania	U.S. dollar		17.54		17.28		3.66		38.61		77.01
American Samoa	do						1.50		1.66		3.16
Fiji Islands	do		3.08		4.06				9.38		16.52
New Guinea	do		11.17		9.11		11.13		3.68		35.09
Indonesia	do		39.72		20.73		4.91		25.49		90.85
Malaya	Malayan dollar			203.02	66.86	72.51	23.88	14.50	4.78	290.03	95.52
Do	U.S. dollar		21.54		14.16		5.04		25.49		66.23
Cambodia	Rial	1,128	32.38	2,506	71.94	5,136	147.48	1,080	27.91	9,850	279.71
Do	U.S. dollar		21.35		29.92		2.68		17.06		71.01
Vietnam	Piaster	2,046	28.08	2,728	37.44	3,136	43.64	2,115	28.53	10,025	137.69
Do	U.S. dollar		41.10		3.08				17.70		61.88
Philippines	Peso			490.55	126.37	173.10	43.16	132.32	33.03	795.97	202.56
Do	U.S. dollar		22.00		18.32		.75		41.75		82.82
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	261	45.44	569	99.12	282	46.73	342	56.93	1,454	248.22
Do	U.S. dollar		29.46		35.11				15.42		79.99
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar	508	12.72	660	16.54	787	19.72	585	14.62	2,540	63.60
Do	U.S. dollar		18.75		5.02				3.85		27.62
Okinawa	do		1.50		5.37						6.87
Korea	Hwan			2,109	16.32	1,974	15.26	2,732	21.05	68.16	52.63
Do	U.S. dollar								3.33		3.33
Japan	Yen	21,660	86.16	22,863	90.95	37,750	151.05	7,583	30.52	89,856	358.68
Do	U.S. dollar		40.92		22.60		1.40		11.05		75.97
Total			472.91		710.30		521.99		431.84		2,137.04
Senator Milton R. Young:											
United States	Dollar						251.35				251.35
Puerto Rico	do		168.00		170.13		3.00		50.08		391.21
Haiti	do		24.00		37.95				22.50		84.45
Guantanamo Bay	do				5.00						5.00
Total			192.00		213.08		254.35		72.58		732.01

See footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Patricia M. Byrne:											
United States	Dollar						251.35				251.35
Puerto Rico	do		136.00		55.87		3.00		32.53		227.40
Haiti	do		24.00		22.00				23.09		69.09
Guantanamo Bay	do				4.85						4.85
Total			160.00		82.72		254.35		55.62		552.69
Sebastino J. Castro:											
France	New franc	459.75	93.83	341.63	69.72	41.65	8.50	56.94	11.62	900	183.67
Yugoslavia	Dinar	16,360	21.81	8,201	10.93	937	1.25	1,835	2.45	27,333	36.44
Egypt	Egyptian pound	38.26	91.44	10.48	25.05	1.73	4.13	4.53	10.83	55	131.45
Israel	Israeli pound	344.54	114.84	117.50	39.17	29	9.67	32.29	10.76	523.33	174.44
Turkey	Turkish lira	555.27	61.69	239.94	26.66	214.62	23.85	28.50	3.17	1,038.33	115.37
Pakistan	Rupee	91.33	19.35	107.38	22.75	9.44	2.00	25.18	5.33	233.33	49.44
India	do	473.27	100.27	342.20	72.50			44.15	9.35	859.62	182.12
Indonesia	Rupiah	827	2.33	1,486	4.19			235	.67	2,548	7.19
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	151.94	26.66	59.09	10.37	14.24	2.50	4.43	.78	229.70	40.30
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,052	23.38	187.53	4.17			373.80	8.31	1,613	35.86
Japan	Yen	36,156	100.43	24,660	68.50	3,000	8.33	6,611	18.37	70,427	195.63
Korea	Hwan	23,863	18.36	16,406	12.62			3,900	3.00	44,169	33.98
France (airline ticket)	New franc					328.30	67.00			328.30	[3] 67.00
Yugoslavia (airline ticket)	Dinar					1,334,662	1,779.50			1,334,662	[4] 1,779.50
India (airline ticket)	Rupee					3,314	695.95			3,314	[5] 695.95
Total			674.39		366.63		2,602.68		84.64		3,728.34
Paul J. Cotter:											
Spain	Peseta	3,082.25	51.50	2,214	36.99	344	5.75	209	3.50	5,850	97.74
France	New franc	459.75	93.83	341.63	69.72	41.65	8.50	56.94	11.62	900	183.67
Yugoslavia	Dinar	16,360	21.81	8,201	10.93	937	1.25	1,835	2.45	27,333	36.44
Austria	Schilling	563.82	21.69	123.77	4.76			62.40	2.40	750	28.85
Italy	Lira	47,360	75.10	20,309	32.64	6,531	10.50	4,074	6.55	77,625	124.79
Greece	Drachma	897	29.90	532	17.75	94	3.15	151	5.03	1,675	55.83
Egypt	Egyptian pound.	38.26	91.44	10.48	25.05	1.73	4.13	4.53	10.83	55	131.45
Israel	Israeli pound	344.54	114.84	117.50	39.17	29	9.67	32.29	10.76	523.33	174.44
Turkey	Turkish lira	555.27	61.69	239.94	26.66	214.62	23.85	28.50	3.17	1,038.33	115.37
Pakistan	Rupee	91.33	19.35	107.38	22.75	9.44	2.00	25.18	5.33	233.33	49.44
India	do	473.27	100.27	342.20	72.50			44.15	9.35	859.62	182.12
Indonesia	Rupiah	827	2.33	1,486	4.19			235	.67	2,548	7.19
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	151.94	26.66	59.09	10.37	14.24	2.50	4.43	.78	229.70	40.30
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,052	23.38	187.53	4.17			373.80	8.31	1,613	35.86
Japan	Yen	36,156	100.43	24,660	68.50	3,000	8.33	6,611	18.37	70,427	195.63
Korea	Hwan	23,863	18.36	16,406	12.62			3,900	3.00	44,169	33.98
Dollar expenses in foreign countries.	U.S. dollar				25.50				30.50		56.00
Germany	Deutsche mark					8,972.96	2,243.24			8,972.96	2,243.24
Total			852.58		484.27		2,322.87		132.62		3,792.34
Franklin B. Dryden:											
French Oceania	U.S. dollar		12.21		27.93		2.83		32.87		75.84
American Samoa	do						1.50		.83		2.33
Fiji Islands	do		3.18		1.52				7.36		12.06
New Guinea	do		9.92		9.11		11.13		2.98		33.14
Indonesia	do		39.72		27.17		4.91		29.49		101.29
Malaya	Malayan dollar			232.24	76.48	93.65	30.84	12.20	4.05	338.09	119.37
Do	U.S. dollar		21.55		12.80		5.54		25.68		65.57
Cambodia	Rial	1,128	32.38	2,819	80.95	4,235	121.65	1,365	39.75	9,547	274.73
Do	U.S. dollar		46.12		31.29		2.68		17.06		97.15
Vietnam	Piaster	1,309	18.00	2,728	37.50	935	15.00	1,752	24.50	6,724	95.00
Do	U.S. dollar		24.66		27.39		3.89		14.70		70.64
Philippines	Peso			165.44	41.36	202.76	50.69	37.44	9.36	405.64	101.41
Do	U.S. dollar		18.85		26.38				22.91		68.14
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	162	28.80	449	78.34	136	22.67	204	34.13	951	163.94
Do	U.S. dollar		53.04		16.68		.11		18.98		88.81
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	614	15.38	736	18.44	982	24.59	736	18.44	3,068	76.85
Do	U.S. dollar		13.75		4.01				3.74		21.50
Okinawa	U.S. dollar		1.50						4.57		6.07
Korea	Hwan			1,999	15.44	1,874	14.88	2,375	18.33	6,248	48.65
Do	U.S. dollar		4.00		2.50				3.63		10.13
Japan	Yen	19,994	79.54	26,658	106.05	34,250	137.91	7,000	28.37	87,902	351.87
Do	U.S. dollar		40.92		24.09		4.49		35.32		104.82
Total			463.52		665.43		455.31		397.05		1,981.31
Stephen Kurzman:											
Germany	Dollar		21.70		13.22		41.80		2.52		79.24
Switzerland	do		17.81		8.66		27.70				54.17
Italy	do		39.75		32.14		109.30				181.19
France	do		28.70		30.68		60.40		8.19		127.97
Belgium	do		14.78		3.46		7.00				25.24
United States	do						218.00				218.00
Total			122.74		88.16		464.20		10.71		685.81
James Minotto:											
United States	Dollar				21.25		99.50		19.00		139.75
France	New franc	1,210	246.00	713	145.50	222	45.00	260	53.50	2,405	490.00
Belgium	Belgium franc	2,000	40.00	1,800	36.00	900	18.00	500	10.00	5,200	104.00
Luxembourg	do	650	13.00	900	18.00	700	14.00	250	5.00	2,500	50.00
Netherlands	Florin	120	43.00	92	33.00	31	11.00	34	12.00	277	99.00
Germany	Deutsche mark	81	221.00	640	160.00	[6] 8,081.56	2,145.29	406	59.60	10,514.56	2,585.79
Denmark	Danish kroner	598	88.00	490	72.00	240	36.00	210	30.00	1,527	226.00
Sweden	Swedish kroner	225	45.00	225	45.00	79	15.00	65	13.00	594	118.00
Norway	Norwegian kroner.	90	12.60	88	12.30	15	2.10	57	8.00	250	35.00

See footnotes at end of table.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
James Minotto—Continued											
Great Britain	English pound	26-16-0	75.00	22-10-0	60.00	16-2-8	45.00	5-14-0	16.00	71-2-8	196.00
Portugal	Escudo	1,995	70.00	1,110	60.00	685	24.00	741	26.00	5,133	180.00
Spain	Peseta	1,560	26.00	1,620	27.00	1,080	18.00	1,020	17.00	5,280	88.00
Italy	Italian lira	187,810	303.00	137,760	223.00	145,390	234.50	58,500	94.50	529,460	855.00
Do	U.S. dollar						14.00		4.00		18.00
Greece	Drachma	2,940	98.00	2,530	84.00	1,470	49.00	1,020	34.00	7,960	265.00
Turkey	Turkish lira	1,026	113.00	882	97.00	492	54.00	362	40.00	2,762	304.00
Lebanon	Lebanese pound.	216	70.00	144	48.00	75	25.00	60	20.00	495	163.00
United Arab Republic	Egyptian pound.	21	48.00	15.60	36.00	9.50	21.80	7.90	18.20	54	124.00
Austria	Schilling	3,120	120.00	2,392	92.00	1,560	60.00	702	27.00	7,774	299.00
Switzerland	Swiss franc	297.50	70.00	195.50	46.00	85	19.00	68	16.00	646	151.00
Yugoslavia	Dinar	9,000	12.00	7,500	10.00	[1] 134,850	[1] 180.00	2,500	3.50	153,850	205.50
Total			1,713.60		1,326.05		3,130.19		526.20		6,696.01
Mary L. Vaughan:											
Spain	Peseta	3,082.25	51.50	2,214	36.99	314	5.75	209	3.50	5,850	97.74
France	New franc	459.75	93.83	341.63	69.72	41.65	8.50	56.94	11.62	900	183.67
Yugoslavia	Dinar	16,360	21.81	8,201	10.93	937	1.25	1,835	2.45	27,333	36.44
Austria	Schilling	563.82	21.69	123.77	4.76			62.40	2.40	750	28.85
Italy	Lira	47,360	75.10	20,309	32.64	6,531	10.50	4,074	6.55	77,625	124.79
Greece	Drachma	897	29.90	532	17.75	94	3.15	151	5.03	1,675	55.83
Egypt	Egyptian pound.	38.26	91.44	10.48	25.05	1.73	4.13	4.53	10.83	55	131.45
Israel	Israeli pound	344.54	114.84	117.50	39.17	29	9.67	32.29	10.76	523.33	174.44
Turkey	Turkish lira	555.27	61.69	239.94	26.66	214.62	23.85	28.50	3.17	1,038.33	115.37
Pakistan	Rupee	91.33	19.35	107.38	22.75	9.44	2.00	25.18	5.33	233.33	49.44
India	do	473.27	100.27	342.20	72.50			44.15	9.35	859.62	182.12
Indonesia	Rupiah	827	2.33	1,486	4.19			235	.67	2,548	7.19
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	151.94	26.66	59.09	10.37	14.24	2.50	4.43	.78	229.70	40.30
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	1,052	23.38	187.53	4.17			373.80	8.31	1,613	35.86
Japan	Yen	36,156	100.43	24,660	68.50	3,000	8.33	6,611	18.37	70,427	195.63
Korea	Hwan	23,863	18.36	16,406	12.62			3,900	3.00	44,169	33.98
Dollar expenses in foreign countries	U.S. dollar				25.50				30.50		56.00
Germany (airline ticket)	Deutsche mark					8,972.96	2,243.24			8,972.96	2,243.24
Total			852.58		484.27		2,322.87		132.62		3,792.34
Group expenses: [8]											
Malaya	Malayan dollar			67.40	21.90					67.40	21.90
Cambodia	Rial	1,820	52.00	5,705	163.20	4,305	123.41	1,404	41.39	13,234	380.00
Vietnam	Piaster	1,952	24.00	12,817	168.15	743	10.60	3,160	42.75	18,672	245.50
Philippines	Peso	137.85	36.00	987.20	259.30	133.80	33.70	1,321.96	342.99	2,580.81	671.99
Do	U.S. dollar		12.00		28.00						40.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	412	67.40	1,773	290.54	224	37.28	1,580	259.58	3,989	654.80
Japan	Yen	10,261	41.60	31,258	125.10	17,250	68.90	49,196	194.40	107,965	430.00
Total			233.00		1,056.19		273.89		881.11		2,444.19

[1] Includes lodging, meals, miscellaneous and transportation.

[2] Transportation.

[3] Transportation: Paris to Belgrade.

[4] Transportation: Yugoslavia to Indonesia, via United Arab Republic, Israel, Turkey, Pakistan, India, Indonesia, and return to Frankfurt, Germany.

[5] Difference in ticket cost to permit travel from Indonesia to Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan, Korea, and return to Frankfurt, Germany, via Washington, D.C.

[6] Of which 7,609.56 deutsche marks for airline tickets for 2 trips.

[7] Airline tickets.

[8] Represents group expenses of trip of Senators McGee, Church, Moss, staff member Franklin B. Dryden, and departmental escort officers.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	28,312.46
Appropriated funds:	
Government department:	4,989.26
Department of Defense	1,245.60
Department of State	
Total	34,547.32

Carl Hayden, *Chairman.*

Mar. 11, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, U.S. Group, Interparliamentary Union, Rome, Italy, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jennings Randolph: Italy	U.S. dollar		113.00		37.67		655.24		47.48		853.39
Gordon Allott: Italy	do		13.33		8.00				23.20		44.53
Geo. B. Galloway:											
Italy	do		86.50		119.99		677.22		79.90		963.61
England	do		10.00		3.50						13.50
Total			222.83		169.16		1,332.46		150.58		1,875.03

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Other (22 U.S.C. 276a)	$1,875.03

J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mar. 13, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Senate delegation, Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group Conference, May 14–24, 1962, Washington, D.C., New York, and Los Angeles, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Clair Engle: United States	U.S. dollar		65.65				323.49				389.14
Thomas Kuchel: United States	do		178.85								178.85
Delegation staff:											
Joe Gonzales: United States	do		124.41		33.15		214.60		6.55		378.71
Milrae Jensen: United States	do		166.75		21.40		226.35		52.90		467.40
Arthur Kuhl: United States	do		199.52				[1] 388.20		20.00		607.72
Delegation expenses	do		280.38						180.00		460.38
Darrell St. Claire: United States	do		203.62		43.70		[2] 265.70		55.21		568.23
Delegation expenses	do		366.67		4,231.84		875.68		3,751.03		9,225.22
Total			1,585.85		4,330.09		2,294.02		4,065.62		12,275.65

[1] $43.12 of this amount rebated and placed on deposit to Mexico-United States accounts.

[2] $33.33 of this amount rebated and deposited to Mexico-United States accounts.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Public Law 86-420	$12,275.65

J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mar. 14, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Senate delegation, 6th meeting of Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, Canada, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
George Aiken: Canada	U.S. dollar		40.85		1.85						42.70
Maurine Neuberger: Canada	do		39.00		3.85				.90		43.75
Claiborne Pell: Canada	do		58.00		13.21				36.53		107.74
Roman Hruska: Canada	do		71.50		7.75				7.72		86.97
Pat McNamara: Canada	do		52.50		10.71						63.21
Delegation staff:											
Lola Pierotti	do		33.00		1.35				.15		34.50
John Newhouse	do		30.00		25.12				5.25		60.37
Milrae Jenson	do		48.00		21.66		2.30		7.65		79.61
Delegation Expenses:											
Baggage handling									27.50		27.50
Food en route and official reception					230.50						230.50
Total			372.85		316.00		2.30		85.70		776.85

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds: Other (Public Law 86-42)	776.85
Total	776.85

George D. Aiken,
Chairman, Senate Delegation.

Mar. 13, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Senate delegation, United States, British, and Canada, Parliamentary Conference, Bermuda, British West Indies, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John Sparkman: Bermuda	Pound			42-12	120.55	1	2.83			43-12	123.38
	Deutsche mark					246.76	62.00			246.76	62.00
Claiborne Pell: Bermuda	Pound	27-6-6	77.10	35	99.05					62-6-6	176.15
Carl Marcey: Bermuda	do	40-13-3	114.80	100	283.00			3-3-10	9.00	143-17-1	406.80
Darrell St. Claire: Bermuda	do	20-4-6	57.03	19-4	54.14					39-8-6	111.17
	U.S. dollars				76.00		9.00		15.00		100.00
Delegation costs:											
Official receptions, luncheons, rentals				51-4-3	144.42			2	5.66	53-4-3	150.08
Taxis, tips						3-7-11	9.58			3-7-11	9.58
Gratuities, airport and baggage costs								25-5	71.20	52-5	71.20
Total			248.93		777.16		83.41		100.86		1,210.36

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,110.36
Appropriated funds: S. Res. 246 (87th Cong. 2d session)	100.00
Total	1,210.36

J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mar. 13, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Senate delegation, 8th NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Fulbright, J. W.:											
France	U.S. dollar		113.88		196.08		26.50		48.81		385.27
Netherlands	Guilder					11,335	371.60				371.60
Byrd, Harry F.: France	U.S. dollar		89.45		25.34				15.00		129.79
Kefauver, Estes: France	do		128.69		242.29		20.00		43.92		434.90
Smathers, George A.: France	do		68.33		72.11		10.50		20.20		171.14
Randolph, Jennings: France	do		122.07		111.81		39.50		15.72		289.10
Cannon, Howard: France	do		125.69		174.66		19.97		39.62		359.94
McCarthy, Eugene J.: France	do		134.96		197.71		40.00		68.63		441.30
Capehart, Homer: France	do		126.53		191.06		45.00		111.86		474.45
Hickenlooper, Bourke B.: France	do		20.24		30.50		5.50		14.00		70.24
Mundt, Karl E.: France	do		121.46		116.42		202.23		26.52		466.63
Kuchel, Thomas H.: France	do		166.81		157.63		22.00		30.97		377.41
Cooper, John Sherman: France	do		130.71		68.91						199.62
Javits, Jacob K.: France	do		270.01		109.35		43.79		63.89		487.04
Marcy, Carl: France	do		81.56		139.83		25.50		105.57		352.46
Tillman, Seth: France	do		60.73		105.94		21.80		28.07		216.54
Jensen, Milrae E.: France	do		122.42		75.02		86.65		10.82		294.91
Saffer, Penelope:											
France	do						12.46				
Netherlands	Guilder		60.73		57.90	1,040.80	289.50		11.81		432.40
Drakert, Marcelle: France	U.S. dollar		131.60		163.30		18.50		29.19		342.59
Conlon, Jack: France	do		60.73		182.85		45.00		96.57		385.15
Blitz, Herbert: France	do		138.32		149.82		88.00		32.76		408.90
Delegation expenses:											
Official luncheons and receptions, France.	do				246.51						246.51
Office and conference room rental and supplies, France.	do								678.14		678.14
Gratuities, France	do								51.02		51.02
Transportation, France	do						94.36				94.36
Overtime for Embassy personnel, France.	do								233.47		233.47
Total			2,274.92		2,815.04		1,528.36		1,776.56		8,394.88

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	661.10
Appropriated funds: Public Law 84-689	7,733.78
Total	8,394.88

J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman, U.S. Senate Delegation, Eighth NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

Mar. 11, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Senate delegation to attend 8th Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Harrison A. Williams, Jr.:											
Nigeria	U.S. dollar				39.00				9.00		48.00
Turkey	Lira	195.50	21.72	162.50	18.06			109.50	21.16	467.50	60.94
Greece	Drachma	422	14.07	472	15.73			192	6.40	1,086	36.20
Denmark	Kroner	220	31.88	134.55	19.49			46.95	6.80	401.50	58.17
Germany	Deutsche mark			64	16.00					64	16.00
Do	do		4.00		1.70				10.50		16.20
United States	U.S. dollar						42.50		14.00		56.50
Quentin N. Burdick:											
Nigeria	do				35.00				13.00		48.00
Do	Pound			2	5.60	3	8.40			5	14.00
Turkey	Lira	195.50	21.72	167	16.33			93.65	10.41	456.15	48.46
Greece	Drachma	422	14.07	444	14.80			423	14.10	1,289	42.97
Denmark	Kroner	220	31.88	176.40	25.57					396.40	57.45
Germany	Deutsche mark			64	16.00					64	16.00
Do	do		4.00				4.40		6.00		14.40
United States	U.S. dollar						183.26		8.00		191.26
Wallace B. Edgerton: Nigeria	Pound			4-15	13.30			3-10	9.80	8-5	23.10
Do	U.S. dollar				14.00				2.00		16.00
Turkey	Lira	161	17.88	156	17.33			112.90	12.54	429.90	47.75
Greece	Drachma	272	9.07	183	6.10			40	1.34	495	16.51
Denmark	Kroner	150	21.74	130.95	18.82			27.45	3.98	308.40	44.54
Germany	Deutsche mark			63	15.75			17	4.25	80.00	20.00
Do	U.S. dollar		4.00		8.50						12.50
United States	do						4.40		12.50		16.90
Arthur M. Kuhl:											
Nigeria	do				16.00						16.00
Turkey	Lira	161	17.88	145	16.11			62.35	6.91	368.35	40.90
Greece	Drachma	272	9.07	216	7.19					488	16.26
Denmark	Kroner	150	21.74	142	20.58			121.30	17.54	413.30	59.86
Germany	Deutsche mark			78	19.50			11	2.75	89	22.25
Do	U.S. dollar		4.00		1.30				4.70		10.00
United States	do						5.20		53.35		58.55
Delegation expenses:											
Ambassador's reception, Nigeria	Pound			75	210.00					75	210.00
Official meals, Nigeria	do			14	39.20					14	39.20
Transportation, Nigeria	do					3	8.40			3	8.40

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Senate delegation to attend 8th Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Gratuities, Nigeria	do							4	11.20	4	11.20
Consul general's reception, Turkey	Lira			782.42	86.93					782.42	86.93
Official meals, Turkey	do			608	67.55					608	67.55
Transportation, Turkey	do					111	12.33			111	12.33
Gratuities, Turkey	do							100	11.11	100	11.11
Postage, Turkey	do							56	6.23	56	6.23
Communications, Turkey	do							882	99.12	882	99.12
Ambassador's reception, Greece	Drachma			1,050	35.00					1,050	35.00
Conference room rental, Greece	do							1,338	44.60	1,338	44.60
Overtime, Embassy drivers, Greece.	do					3,000	100.00			3,000	100.00
Official meals, Greece	do			3,196	106.37					3,196	106.37
Communications, Greece	do							2,268	75.60	2,268	75.60
Gratuities, Greece	do							450	15.00	450	15.00
Postage, Greece	do							90	3.00	90	3.00
Official meals, Denmark	Kroner			449.26	65.11					449.26	65.11
Communications, Denmark	do							542.65	78.55	542.65	78.55
Transportation, Denmark	do					199.65	28.93			199.65	28.93
Gratuities, Denmark	do							120	17.39	120	17.39
Official meals, Germany	Deutsche mark			251.92	62.98					251.92	62.98
Communications, Germany	do							230	57.60	230	57.60
Transportation, Germany	do					90	23.00			90	23.00
Gratuities, Germany	do							45	11.25	45	11.25
Total			248.72		1,070.90		420.82		681.68		2,422.12

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	1,917.81
Appropriated funds:	
S. Res. 379 (87th Cong.)	504.31
Government Department (identify each): Department of Navy	531.89
Total	2,954.01

J. W. Fulbright,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mar. 14, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Senate delegation, 51st Conference, Interparliamentary Union, Brasilia, Brazil, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
A. Willis Robertson:											
Mexico	U.S. dollar		33.62		39.35				3.08		76.05
Peru	do		24.19		49.48						73.67
Argentina	do		30.06		22.55				.14		52.75
Brazil	do		116.11		169.20		3.22		53.82		342.35
Trinidad	do		10.53						1.60		12.13
Herman Talmadge:											
Mexico	do		48.03		9.16				5.60		62.79
Peru	do		29.20		8.00						37.20
Argentina	do		35.07		37.25				19.16		91.48
Brazil	do		96.38		128.63		1.77		23.42		250.20
Trinidad	do		16.05		30.36				1.60		48.01
Strom Thurmond:											
Brazil	do		58.06		25.01				12.70		95.77
Trinidad	do		11.03						1.10		12.13
Oren Long:											
Mexico	do		39.63		30.80				.24		70.67
Peru	do		35.38		29.00						64.98
Argentina	do		35.07		13.53				1.26		49.86
Brazil	do		96.38		109.11				46.77		252.26
Trinidad	do		16.05						1.60		17.65
Maurice J. Murphy, Jr.:											
Mexico	do		48.03		41.27				50.11		139.41
Peru	do		28.33		42.20				12.00		82.53
Argentina	do		35.07		55.51				9.01		99.59
Brazil	do		96.38		216.62		3.22		89.58		405.80
Trinidad	do		16.05		3.96				1.60		21.61
Ralph Yarborough:											
Mexico	do		48.03		15.13				21.84		85.00
Peru	do		29.30		40.00		1.80		28.00		99.10
Argentina	do		35.07		72.02		4.39		39.61		151.09
Brazil	do		101.60		175.37		10.23		146.99		434.19
Trinidad	do		16.04		11.07				1.60		28.71
George B. Galloway:											
Mexico	do		48.03		49.93		1.70		6.00		105.66
Peru	do		42.07		54.20				3.00		99.27
Argentina	do		35.07		69.73		2.80		7.46		115.06
Brazil	do		97.62		151.75		1.61		24.56		275.54
Trinidad	do		16.05		12.50				1.60		30.15
Elizabeth Bond:											
Mexico	do		42.03		9.97				.08		52.08
Peru	do		20.13		13.92						34.05
Argentina	do		31.15		3.60				.03		34.78
Brazil	do		71.10		88.91		10.24		28.04		198.29
Trinidad	do		11.03		.80				1.21		13.04

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Senate delegation, 51st Conference, Interparliamentary Union, Brasilia, Brazil, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging: Foreign currency	Lodging: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Meals: Foreign currency	Meals: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Miscellaneous: Foreign currency	Miscellaneous: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Eleanor Thurmond:											
Mexico	do		42.03						.12		42.15
Peru	do		20.16								20.16
Argentina	do		30.06		4.71				.11		34.88
Brazil	do		71.10		9.38				5.61		86.09
Trinidad	do		11.03						1.10		12.13
Pat M. Holt:											
Mexico	do						7.08		8.48		15.56
Do	Peso	525	42.03	2,049	164.04	116	9.28	54.75	4.22	2,744.75	219.57
Peru	U.S. dollar						2.00		12.50		14.50
Do	Sol	602.60	24.10	1,585	63.40	50	2.00	25	10.00	2,262.60	99.50
Argentina	U.S. dollar				9.89		7.00		18.00		34.89
Do	Peso	4,104	30.06	23,387.30	171.25	7,500	54.94	5,342	39.12	40,333.30	295.37
Brazil	U.S. dollar				11.00		13.30		24.75		49.05
Do	Cruzeiro	46,950	75.72	91,407.50	147.42	11,830	19.08	19,222	31.00	169,409.50	[1] 273.22
Trinidad	U.S. dollar		11.03		11.95		2.84		1.10		26.92
Darrell St. Claire:											
Mexico	U.S. dollar								15.25		15.25
Do	Peso	525	42.03	239.50	19.16			1	.08	765.50	61.27
Peru	U.S. dollar								8.00		8.00
Do	Sol	472.10	18.88							472.10	18.88
Argentina	Peso	4,104	30.06	4,937.50	36.16			276	2.02	9,317.50	68.24
Brazil	U.S. dollar								12.45		12.45
Do	Cruzeiro	46,950	81.86	60,326.40	115.26	1,900	3.72	42,531	84.06	151,707.40	284.90
Trinidad	U.S. dollar		11.03		8.79				5.55		25.37
United States	do						9.00				9.00
Delegation expenses:											
Mexico	Peso			3,710	296.97	837.50	67.05	6,471.50	518.13	11,019	882.15
Peru	Sol			4,064.57	151.39	2,474	92.31	810.25	30.23	7,348.82	273.93
Argentina	Peso			106,868.55	782.00	8,500	62.24	12,862.30	94.22	128,230.85	938.46
Brazil	U.S. dollar				2,323.76		1,569.35		125.80		4,018.91
Do	Cruzeiro	2,500	5.43	261,215	570.03	90,714	197.20	511,373.40	1,111.68	1,018,509.40	1,884.34
Trinidad	U.S. dollar				42.96						42.96
Total			2,145.54		6,770.10		2,159.37		2,807.99		13,883.00

[1] $20 of this sum rebated to the U.S. Treasury.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	5,299.83
Appropriated funds: 22 U.S.C. 276a	8,583.17
Total	13,883.00

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Interparliamentary Union Group.

MAR. 14, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging: Foreign currency	Lodging: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Meals: Foreign currency	Meals: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Miscellaneous: Foreign currency	Miscellaneous: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
J. W. Fulbright:											
Germany	Deutsche mark							50.00	12.50	50.00	12.50
Italy	Lira	27,000.00	43.20	55,000.00	88.00	1,000.00	1.60	7,000.00	11.20	90,000.00	141.00
Homer E. Capehart:											
France	Franc	276.20	56.38	260.50	53.15	3,435.88	701.20	170.00	34.60	4,142.58	845.33
Italy	Lira	51,762.00	83.49	80,243.00	129.41	31,000.00	50.00	25,946.00	41.85	188,951.00	304.75
Bourke B. Hickenlooper:											
Uruguay	Peso			266	24.17	99	9.00	50	4.55	415	37.72
France	U.S. dollar		20.24		30.50		5.50		14.00		70.24
Wayne Morse: Uruguay	Peso			1,055	91.78	260	23.74	703	64.20	1,968	179.72
Bourke B. Hickenlooper:[1]											
Greece	Drachma	2,000	66.66	853	28.44					2,853	95.10
Turkey	Pound	950	105.55	300	33.00			120	13.33	1,370	151.88
Egypt	do	36.9	85.00	14.9	34.00			3.5	8.10	57	127.10
Lebanon	do					332.50	110.50			332.50	110.50
Pakistan	Rupee					210	44.53			210	44.53
India	do	500	100.00	220	44.40	200	40.00	80.35	16.00	1,000.35	200.40
Burma	Kyat							171	36.30	171	36.30
Thailand	Baht	2,800	135.60	1,800	87.10			1,595	77.00	6,195	299.70
Hong Kong	Dollar	1,918	336.50	970	170.20	114	20.00	998	175.00	4,000	701.70
Japan	Yen	60,000	166.66	25,000	69.40					85,000	236.06
Netherlands	Guilder					6,568	1,827.64				1,827.64
Frank Church:											
French Oceania	Dollar		17.44		13.75		7.52		36.61		75.32
American Samoa	do						1.50		1.66		3.16
Fiji Islands	do		3.18		4.06				9.38		16.62
New Guinea	do		11.17		9.11		11.13		3.68		35.09
Indonesia	do		39.72		21.21		4.91		36.74		102.58
Malaya	Malaya dollar			172.79	56.91	66.41	21.89	26.58	8.76	265.83	87.56
Do	U.S. dollar		21.33		14.66		5.56		29.72		71.27
Cambodia	Rial	980	27.58	2,660	75.85	4,805	137.91	1,155	33.43	9,600	274.77
Do	U.S. dollar		21.35		29.92		2.68		17.06		71.01
Vietnam	Piastre	2,291	31.50	3,437	47.25	3,139	43.25	349	13.00	9,216	135.00
Do	U.S. dollar		24.66		1.58				26.43		52.67
Philippines	Peso			136.60	34.85	168.10	42.43	72.12	18.80	376.82	96.08
Do	U.S. dollar		22.00		18.17		.75		34.62		75.54
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	205	35.89	463	80.76	169	28.79	78	13.65	915	159.09
Do	U.S. dollar		29.46		23.86		.11		17.98		71.41

[1] $435 of Senator Hickenlooper's total rebated to the U.S. Treasury on account of personal expenses.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging: Foreign currency	Lodging: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Meals: Foreign currency	Meals: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Transportation: Foreign currency	Transportation: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Miscellaneous: Foreign currency	Miscellaneous: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Total: Foreign currency	Total: U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Frank Church—Continued											
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar.	560	14.02	560	14.02	827	20.72	486	12.19	2,433	60.95
Do	U.S. dollar		17.50		4.39				3.74		25.63
Okinawa	do		1.50		4.57				11.18		17.25
Korea	Won			2,306	17.81	21,147	16.58	3,499	27.02	7,952	61.41
Do	U.S. dollar		4.00		2.65				3.33		9.98
Japan	Yen	21,984	87.45	21,983	87.46	34,750	139.51	8,750	35.86	87,467	350.28
Do	U.S. dollar		40.92		21.31		1.40		11.05		74.68
Carl Marcy:											
Netherlands	Guilder					6,568	1,827.64			6,568	1,827.64
Egypt	Pound	40	92.00	23	52.90			12	27.60	75	172.50
Lebanon	do					332.50	110.50			332.50	110.50
Pakistan	Rupee					210	44.53			210	44.53
India	do	275	55.00	195	37.00	266	53.20	33	6.60	769	151.80
Burma	Kyat			100	21.23			111	23.50	211	44.73
Thailand	Baht	2,700	130.75	2,400	116.22	2,255	152.22	2,595	125.13	9,950	524.32
Hong Kong		1,079	190.52							1,079	190.52
Japan	Yen	27,754	77.09	21,246	59.01			2,246	6.24	51,246	142.34
Henry F. Holthusen: The Netherlands.	Guilder					7,281.02	2,025.88			7,281.02	2,025.88
Pat M. Holt:											
Uruguay	Peso	1,500	136.98	1,841	168.12	994	90.77	665	60.73	5,000	456.60
Peru	Sole	193.60	7.01	300	10.86	170	6.15	136.40	4.94	800	28.96
Colombia	Peso					7,918	934.94			7,918	934.94
Mexico	do	400	32.00	721	57.68	41.30	3.30	366.70	29.34	1,529	122.32
The Virgin Islands, Venezuela, Panama, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Guatemala, Mexico, and the United States.	U.S. dollar		129.32		166.84		61.38		52.57		410.11
Seth Tillman:											
Germany	Deutsche mark							244	61.00	244	61.00
Italy	Lira	37,200	60.00	38,000	61.29	2,000	3.22	12,800	20.64	90,000	145.15
	U.S. dollar						6.00				6.00
Austria	Schilling	706.55	28.26	900.45	36.01	293	11.72			1,900	75.99
U.S.S.R.	U.S. dollar		48.78		80.50		59.72				189.00
Poland	Zloty	402	16.99	375	15.38					777	32.37
Hungary	U.S. dollar		7.50		24.15				11.75		43.40
United Kingdom	Pound	3-8-9	9.62	8-11-3	23.97					12	33.59
	U.S. dollar						6.00		2.00		8.00
Netherlands	Guilder					2,058.97	572.89			2,058.97	572.89
	U.S. dollar		49.00		31.50				3.50		84.00
Washington, D.C., to New York, and en route.	do						7.90		24.60		32.50
Total			2,720.77		2,430.36		9,298.31		1,374.66		15,824.10

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	15,824.10
Department of Defense	702.21
Total	16,526.31

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

MAR. 14, 1963.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1102. A bill for the relief of Joao Andre Senos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 1103. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to treat wholesale distributors of automobile glass as manufacturers for purposes of the tax on automobile parts and accessories; and

S. 1104. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit small mutual insurance companies and life insurance companies to be taxed on certain bond discount like other taxpayers; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1105. A bill for the relief of the Kauders-Steuber Co., and Max N. Tobias and the Max N. Tobias Bag Co., Inc.; and

S. 1106. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Juan Peralta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the second abovementioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S.1107. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit vertically integrated companies from engaging in discriminatory practices against independent producers and distributors; and

S. 1108. A bill to require certain companies engaged in dual distribution to disclose separate annual operating data on each of their establishments which compete with independent customers of such companies in the sale and industrial use of their products; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the last two abovementioned bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 1109. A bill to amend the Submerged Lands Act to establish the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending three marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico and providing for the ownership and use of the submerged lands, improvements, minerals, and natural resources within said boundaries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1110. A bill to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of the Army, Navy, and Air Force in Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 1111. A bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a Water Resources Council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1112. A bill for the relief of Nicola Tamborra; and

S. 1113. A bill for the relief of Stamatis Zeris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1114. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income tax exemption for an individual who is a full-time student at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1115. A bill to provide for loan insurance on loans to students in higher education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF HEARING ON "SPACE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS," 87TH CONGRESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business one thousand additional copies of its hearings of August 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, and 11, 1961, Eighty-seventh Congress, entitled "Space Satellite Communications".

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT, WITH ADDITIONAL COPIES, A REPORT ON THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS 1963, BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 113); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document a report entitled "A Report on the Alliance for Progress 1963", submitted by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations and that seven thousand additional copies be printed for the use of those committees.

QUALIFICATIONS OF CERTAIN NOMINEES FOR ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. Robertson) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 114) relating to qualifications of certain nominees for Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Stennis, which appears under a separate heading.)

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 1105 TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 115); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1105) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Kauders-Steuber Company, and Max N. Tobias and the Max N. Tobias Bag Company, Incorporated", now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants.

CAPITAL GAINS TREATMENT ON MARKET PROFITS REALIZED BY INSURANCE COMPANIES FROM STATE AND MUNICIPAL BONDS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit small mutual insurance companies and life insurance companies to be taxed on certain bond discount like other taxpayers. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, at this point, an explanation of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1104) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit small mutual insurance companies and life insurance companies to be taxed on certain bond discount like other taxpayers, introduced by Mr. Long of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The explanation presented by Mr. Long of Louisiana is as follows:

Explanation of Amendment Providing Capital Gains Treatment on Market Profits Realized by Insurance Companies From State and Municipal Bonds

The bill eliminates the required accrual of market discount on municipal bonds purchased at less than par value by small mutual fire and casualty insurance companies and life insurance companies. For tax years after December 31, 1962, these taxpayers alone are required to accrue yearly a ratable portion of the difference between the cost of a bond and its par value under sections 818(b)(1) and 822(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The enactment of the Revenue Act of 1962 gave mutual fire and casualty insurance companies having gross income in excess of $500,000 capital gains treatment on market profits realized from discount on both taxable and tax-exempt bonds for tax years after 1962. This is explained in the Senate Finance Committee report on the 1962 act as follows:

"Under the bill, as passed by the House and approved by your committee, the rules applicable to mutual fire and casualty companies accruing market discount on bonds are changed. Under present law all mutual fire and casualty companies (and life insurance companies) are required to accrue each year a ratable portion of market discount on bonds and pay tax thereon at ordinary income tax rates (Rev. Rul. 60–210; 1960–1 CB 38). Stock fire and casualty insurance companies, on the other hand, are not required to accrue such discount but when the bond is sold or redeemed they are required to pay tax on the amount of gain resulting from market discount at capital gains rates (if the bond is held for more than 6 months). Since under the general rule of the bill the starting point in computing 'mutual insurance company taxable income' is the gross income computed as if the taxpayer were a stock company, the effect is to treat market discount on bonds for mutual companies, other than the small companies taxable on investment income only, as it is treated by the stock companies." (Pp. 61 and 62, S. Rept. No. 1881, 87th Cong., 2d sess.)

All other taxpayers treat gains realized from market discount on bonds as capital gains subject to tax when the bond is sold or redeemed. The elimination of the required accrual of market discount on municipal bonds for small mutual fire and casualty companies and life insurance companies will similarly allow these taxpayers to treat their market profits as capital gains.

This bill is limited to discount on municipal bonds and does not also apply to discount on taxable bonds as did the 1962 act amendments for medium and large mutual fire and casualty companies. While there is no reason for not eventually allowing capital gains treatment on market profits from bond discount on taxable bonds, the allowance of such treatment is needed immediately for discount on municipal bonds to avoid litigation which will be costly both to taxpayers and the Government.

This litigation will inevitably result from taxpayers challenging the correctness of Revenue Ruling 60–210 which was issued by the Internal Revenue Service in 1960. In this ruling, the Internal Revenue Service for years after 1960 held that discount placed on municipal bonds by broker-dealers was not interest which was tax exempt but was market profit, taxable at ordinary income tax rates and which was to be accrued ratably by mutual fire and casualty and life insurance companies.

From 1942, when the corresponding 1939 Code provisions of sections 818(b)(1) and 822(d)(2) requiring the accrual of bond discount as interest were first enacted, until the issuance of Revenue Ruling 60–210 in 1960, mutual fire and casualty insurance companies and life insurance companies treated discount on municipal bonds as interest which was exempt from tax. The applicable regulations and tax return forms were not in conflict with this industrywide understanding and treatment.

Revenue Ruling 60–210, however, stated that the position of the Internal Revenue Service was governed by early rulings applicable to other taxpayers who were not required to accrue discount as interest. These early rulings held that the only discount on municipal bonds which was to be considered tax-exempt interest was discount actually placed on the bond by the issuing municipality or State. The application of these early rulings to other taxpayers is that if the discount is not tax-exempt interest, it is market profit subject to capital gains taxes when the bond is sold or redeemed. The application of these rulings to mutual fire and casualty insurance companies and life insurance companies is that if the discount is not tax-exempt interest, it is ratably accrued as taxable interest.

Revenue Ruling 60–210 applies to years beginning after 1960. Undoubtedly affected taxpayers will litigate the correctness of the ruling on the basis that since they are required to accrue all discount as interest, rules applicable to other taxpayers who are not required to accrue discount do not apply, and, therfore, any municipal bond discount which is accruable is tax-exempt interest.

The issue of differentiating between bond discount which is properly interest and bond discount which is properly market profit has always been a troublesome one for the courts to resolve. In this respect the denial by the U.S. Supreme Court of the taxpayer's petition for certiorari on March 5, 1963, from the decision of the Court of Appeal for the Fifth Circuit in *U.S. v. Harrison, et al.* (5th Cir., 1962, 304 F. 2d 835) should be noted. The effect of the denial of certiorari here was to resolve an almost 20 year conflict between the courts of appeal on a bond discount question affecting taxable bonds. Litigation of the correctness of Revenue Ruling 60–210 would start again litigation similar to that which has just been closed by denial of certiorari in the Harrison case.

The enactment of this bill would avoid such litigation by allowing capital gains treatment for bond discount on municipal bonds which does not qualify as tax-exempt interest under Revenue Ruling 60–210 and the early rulings applicable to other taxpayers who are not required to accrue bond discount. By not requiring life insurance companies and mutual fire and casualty insurance companies to accrue market discount on municipal bonds, these companies are placed in the same position as all other taxpayers with respect to bond discount which is tax-exempt interest and bond discount which is market profit. The proposed legislation would deny mutual fire and casualty insurance companies and life insurance companies the right to treat any bond discount on municipal bonds as tax-exempt interest which such right is not available to other taxpayers. At the same time, the legislation would allow such insurance companies to treat municipal bond discount which is not exempt interest as capital gains when the bond is sold or redeemed, the same treatment accorded all other taxpayers.

The bill is made applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960, the effective date of Revenue Ruling 60–210. This gives the same treatment of municipal bond discount to all mutual fire and casualty companies and to life insurance companies that mutual companies having gross income of over $500,000 were given by the 1962 Revenue Act for years after December 31, 1962. The bill is necessarily retroactive in order to achieve full correlation with the effective date of Revenue Ruling 60–210.

DUAL DISTRIBUTION AND FAIRPLAY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am today reintroducing, for appropriate reference, two bills that I sponsored in the 87th Congress. One is entitled the "Dual Distribution Reporting Act." The other is entitled the "Antitrust Vertical Integration Amendments."

I stated at the time of my prior introduction of this proposed legislation—Congressional Record, volume 107, part 16, page 21407—that I was not "wedded" to this proposed legislation. That is still true. However, I do believe that public hearings on these two bills by the appropriate legislative committee—presumably the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee—would serve a useful purpose in furthering the understanding of the Congress, the public, and the business community of the problems with which the bills are concerned.

The Antitrust Vertical Integration Amendments I reintroduce today is a bill in all respects identical to S. 2641 of the 87th Congress. The Dual Distribution Reporting Act I am reintroducing today is in all respects but one identical to S. 2640 of the 87th Congress. The one change in the elimination in the definitions section, in section 2(h), of the grey area for businesses between $5 million and $2 million of annual net sales. In the version introduced today, the indicator is fixed at $3 million, with no grey area. The general idea of the proposed Dual Distribution Reporting Act is that companies engaged in dual distribution should disclose publicly certain information on each of their establishments that competes with independent customers, so that the antitrust agencies and the public can form a judgment on whether the captive operation is being subsidized as a loss operation for predatory and monopolistic purposes.

The idea of section 2(h) is that a company of very small size could hardly succeed in predatory and monopolistic efforts even if it wanted to, so such companies might as well be exempted from the reporting, unless someone with an interest in the matter can carry the burden of proof that the company's operations do in fact affect and threaten competition. In the first version of this bill there was a rebuttable presumption that any company having between $2 and $5 million a year in sales could not significantly affect commerce by its dual distribution practices and was therefore to be exempt from making the reports called for by the bill. The presumption was to be conclusive as to companies with under $2 million a year in sales. In the new version, the presumption is to exist but be rebuttable for companies with $3 million or less in annual sales.

Undoubtedly, there are many other revisions and amendments that should be made in these bills before they are enacted into law, if, indeed, they ever are or should be enacted into law. I reiterate that my purpose in introducing them is not so much to press earnestly for passage of these particular bills, but rather to provide a focus for an enlarged and enlightening discussion of the problems of dual distribution.

As the Senate Small Business Committee said in its 12th annual report:

> It is * * * incumbent upon the small business supporters of this legislation to produce evidence that the problem is, indeed, as severe as they averred, and that these bills will help to solve it, not only in their own, but in the national interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point the statement of the Senate Small Business Committee in its 12th annual report with reference to these two bills. It is an excellent brief summary of the provisions of the legislation and an indication of the problem area in the distribution system with which these bills are intended to deal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record as requested.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Long of Louisiana, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1107. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit vertically integrated companies from engaging in discriminatory practices against independent producers and distributors; and

S. 1108. A bill to require certain companies engaged in dual distribution to disclose separate annual operating data on each of their establishments which compete with independent customers of such companies in the sale and industrial use of their products.

The statement presented by Mr. Long of Louisiana is as follows:

Excerpt From the 12th Annual Report of the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, Senate Report 1491, 87th Congress, 1st Session, Pages 31–35

C. DUAL DISTRIBUTION

Dual distribution, a term applied to competition by vertically integrated producers with their own fabricator, wholesaler, and retailer customers, has been the subject of study and concern by your committee for several years. As early as 1953, dual distribution in the automotive tire industry was noted in a staff report [1] and became the subject of hearings [2] conducted by Senator Humphrey's Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Fair Trade Practices [3] in 1959. Senator Russell B. Long's Subcommittee on Monopoly held hearings [4] in 1958 which dealt, in substantial part, with dual distribution in the flat-glass industry, and the full committee issued a report [5] thereon in 1959. In addition, the committee has had extensive correspondence and numerous staff-level conferences with small businessmen who complained of dual distribution and vertical integration problems in a number of other industries. The committee has been consulted on this subject within the past 2 years by representatives of, at least, the following classifications of independent small business: Manufacturers of aluminum siding, manufacturers of wire rope, assorted steel product fabricators, paint retailers, zinc die-cast alloyers, shoe retailers, and gasoline retailers. Glass and tire dealers have continued to urge remedial legislation.

On September 26, 1961, Senator Long of Louisiana introduced two bills which he described as "a conscientious effort to deal constructively with (these) most vexing problems." [6] The bills are S. 2641, the "Antitrust Vertical Integration Amendments of 1962," and S. 2640, the "Dual Distribution Reporting Act of 1962." The were introduced as a legislative "package" under the heading, "Dual Distribution and Fair Play." [7]

1. S. 2641, 87th Congress, 1st session

The basic premise of the first [8] of Senator Long's two bills, as he explained them to the Senate upon introduction "* * * is that it is harmful to competition and also unfair for producers to charge their own captive plants and stores lower prices than they charge independent customer plants and stores which compete horizontally with the captives. The purpose of (the bill) is to make such discriminations unlawful." [9]

Senator Long acknowledged that this basic premise and purpose were shared with H.R. 2729, 86th Congress (often referred to as the Bentley equal pricing bill) which was the subject of hearings by a House subcommittee in 1959; [10] but he pointed out that

---

[1] Committee print, "Problems of Independent Tire Dealers," staff report to the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, 83d Cong., 1st sess., July 27, 1953.

[2] Hearings, "Dual Distribution in the Automotive Tire Industry, 1959," Senate Select Committee on Small Business, 86th Cong., 1st sess., June 17, 18, 19, 1959, pt. 1; id., 86th Cong., 2d sess., Dec. 31, 1959, pt. 2 (supplemental materials).

[3] In January 1961, the name of this subcommittee was changed to Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Marketing Practices.

[4] Hearings, "Competitive Problems of Independent Flat-Glass Dealers" (dual distribution), Senate Select Committee on Small Business, 85th Cong., 2d sess., July 30 and 31, and Oct. 9 and 10, 1958.

[5] S. Rept. No. 1015, "Studies of Dual Distribution: The Flat-Glass Industry," 86th Cong., 1st sess., Dec. 31, 1959.

[6] Congressional Record, volume 107, part 16, page 21409.

[7] Id., pp. 20205–20208. Reprints are available from this committee.

[8] The bill identified by Senator Long in his explanatory statement as his "first" bill was unfortunately given the higher number by the bill clerk.

[9] Congressional Record, volume 107, part 16, page 21409.

[10] Hearings on H.R. 2729 before the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959).

S. 2641, 87th Congress, differs from H.R. 2729, 86th Congress, in these respects:

(a) The Bentley bill would have made price discrimination by a producer in favor of its captive stores and against its independent customers an "unfair method of competition in commerce * * * within the meaning of section 5" of the Federal Trade Commission Act. The Long bill would ban such discriminations by an amendment of the Clayton Act, applying to them the rationale and explicit prohibitions of the Robinson-Patman amendments to the act.

(b) The Bentley bill would have applied only to those establishments of a producer which operate in the field of retail distribution. The Long bill would apply not only to retailing but also to those captive establishments of a producer which compete with the producer's independent customers in wholesaling and secondary manufacturing or processing operations.

(c) The Bentley bill would have gone a step further than would the Long bill, in that the former would have attempted to regulate the level of prices charged by direct-selling manufacturers to consumer customers, without the intermediary services of a captive wholesale or retail distribution establishment, while the latter would not. Senator Long stated:

"I recognize the problem with which Mr. Bentley was concerned in that provision of his bill, but, I reiterate, my bill would not attempt to legislate a floor under any price charged by any seller to a consumer. In those situations where it is practicable for a consumer to buy direct from a maker's factory, without any middlemen whatsoever, that would seem to me to be the course which prudence, economy, and efficiency dictate be taken, and I see no reason for Congress to interfere in the process by which demand and supply considerations establish price in such transactions.

"But in those situations in which a producer first induces an independent distributor or manufacturer to make an investment in plant, equipment, inventory, and time in order to carry out a certain function with regard to the producer's product, then turns around and sets up his own store or plant to perform the identical function, in direct competition with the independent, it seems to me to be simple equity and sensible economic regulation to require the producer to treat his captive and his customer alike. If the Robinson-Patman Act makes sense, then this does, too."[11]

(d) An additional provision of S. 2641, not contained in the Bentley bill, would require producers, in times of short supply brought about by strikes or fires or other causes beyond a producer's control, not to cut down supplies to independent customers unless supplies to captive competitors of those customers were reduced in the same proportion.

2. S. 2640, 87th Congress, 1st session

Senator Long's second bill, the "Dual Distribution Reporting Act of 1962," is intended, according to its sponsor "* * * to meet one of the most telling and forceful of the criticisms of the Bentley bill which were offered by the Federal Trade Commission at the 1959 hearings."[12]

The Commission had pointed out to the House Commerce Subcommittee that enactment of the bill would be "* * * without meaningful consequences. * * * A manufacturer could deliver to its own retail outlets at the same price at which deliveries are made to other retailers, but the manufacturer-owned retail outlet could resell at a low markup which no independent retailer could meet."[13]

Acknowledging the accuracy of this observation, Senator Long stated that this was "* * * precisely the point which is most often and most loudly decried by independent small businessmen who are suddenly confronted by competition from their suppliers.

"* * * * *

"The theory of my Dual Distribution Reporting Act is that, if a producer influences independent small businessmen to make an investment in the product of that producer, then decides to jeopardize the independent's investment by competing with him, the producer owes the independent a duty, in equity and fairness, to operate the captive establishment on the basis of a separate profit on its own function, not as a no-profit operation subsidized by other functions of the company. The purpose of my reporting bill is to require companies engaged in dual distribution to make public certain operating data on each product and each establishment that is involved in the dual distribution process. The bill would not require a dual distributor to adhere to any particular level of prices or markup or to make any specified profit at any level of operation. It would require that information be disclosed by which competitors, consumers, and the agencies that administer the antitrust laws could discern whether a particular product or a particular establishment were being utilized, not for separate profit but as a tool of power for purposes of monopolization.

3. Summary and recommendation

Vertical integration is a growing trend and is coming to be widely recognized and accepted, by large and small business alike, as a means—often legitimate, logical, and even necessary—to more efficient and economical operations in today's vigorously competitive markets. But vertical integration by smaller businesses, whether forward from manufacturing or backward from distribution activities, is practicable, if at all, only through contractual relationships with other independent businesses, while big businesses, with vast capital resources, are able to establish or acquire and carry on integrated operations under a common ownership.

It is indisputable that the antitrust laws seriously limit the extent and flexibility of vertical integration by contract; but many practices, including the most blatant sort of price discriminations, which are forbidden to the small-business contract-integrator are quite lawfully available to the big-business ownership-integrator.[14] Your committee believes that, under conditions of perfect (if now somewhat visionary) justice and equity, the law should deal evenly and equally with that mode of vertical integration available to small business—contract integration—and the mode which, in the nature of things, is available only to big business—ownership integration. But this is a goal more easily stated than attained. Those who accept the goal as desirable and practical will differ on the approach and methods to be pursued—and some reasonable men and friends of small business will reject the goal itself. One approach might be to loose some of the shackles on contract integration; and consideration might be given to restraints on ownership integration more nearly comparable to those now applicable to contract integration. The Long bills embody such an approach. S. 2641 would simply make the Robinson-Patman prohibitions against price discriminations among horizontally competing customers of a seller, which now are one limitation on the freedom of maneuver of contract integration systems, equally and identically applicable as limitations on ownership integration systems. S. 2640 would not extend to ownership integration systems the stern law that is imposed by the natural laws of the market on contract integration systems: that each establishment make a profit on its own functional operation or close. But the bill would draw the contract and ownership integration systems a step closer to competitive parity by removing the veil of secrecy from operations of ownership-integration establishments at low profit, no profit, or a loss.

Your committee agrees with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Monopoly that the problem and these legislative proposals deserve—and recommends that they receive—close scrutiny, including public hearings, by the Senate Judiciary Committee, to which they have been referred. Your committee notes with pleasure that Senator Kefauver's Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly has indicated that such hearings will be held. At that time it will be incumbent upon the small-business supporters of this legislation to produce evidence that the problem is, indeed, as severe as they have averred, and that these bills will help to solve it, not only in their own but in the national interest.

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING ACT OF 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and Senators Kuchel, Metcalf, and Engle, a proposed Water Resources Planning Act and request that it lie on the desk for 3 days to permit any Senators who desire to do so to cosponsor it.

There is already pending S. 2, a water resources research bill. This bill, which deals with river basin planning, should not be confused with the research measure.

The original draft of the bill I now introduce was sent to Congress by President Kennedy on July 13, 1961. On the following day it was introduced and became S. 2246 of the 87th Congress.

On July 26, and again on August 16, 1961, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works held joint hearings on the President's proposal.

At that time, the Interstate Conference on Water Problems of the Council of State Governments had not completed a survey of State views on the proposed planning bill. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee consequently held a further hearing on the message on March 2, 1962. The interstate conference then presented an extensive redraft of the proposed legislation. Some felt that the revisions would amount to a surrender of Federal prerogatives in the water field, to which there was considerable objection. Some members despaired of ever being able to reconcile State and Federal views and achieving comprehensive planning of the Nation's major river basins by the Federal Government and the States. I hope that this is now on the way to being done.

---

[11] Congressional Record, volume 107, part 16, pages 21409–10.

[12] Id. at 20208.

[13] Statement of Hon. Earl W. Kintner, chairman, Federal Trade Commission, hearings, op. cit., supra, note 31, at p. 69.

[14] For an exhaustive review of existing law on this point, together with penetrating discussion of the thorny questions of business management and public policy that arise thereunder, see: Kessler and Stern, "Competition, Contract, and Vertical Integration," 69 Yale Law Journal 1 (1959). At p. 116, the authors, note: "In addition to the antitrust laws, the laws regulating pricing significantly affect ownership and contract as vertical integration devices. The form of integration adopted—contract or ownership—may vary considerably the impact of such legislation on the integrated firms. For example, the principal statute—sec. 2 of the Robinson-Patman Act, which forbids price discrimination—is applicable only to contractual relationships."

The bill was originally proposed by President Kennedy in response to recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources:

The first recommendation of the select committee read:

> 1. The Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should prepare and keep up to date plans for comprehensive water development and management for all major river basins of the United States. Such plans should take into account the prospective demands for all purposes served through water development giving full recognition to non-revenue-yielding purposes such as streamflow regulation, outdoor recreation, and preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, and keeping in mind the ultimate need for optimum development of all water resources. All practicable means of meeting demands should be considered. The executive branch is requested to submit plans to the Congress in January 1962, for undertaking and completing such studies in all basins by 1970. Once prepared, the reports should be brought up to date periodically. Reports on individual projects submitted to the Congress for authorization should specify how the project fits into the comprehensive long-range program, and the range of alternative purposes that might be served by the resources needed for the recommended projects.

The second recommendation of the select committee was for a 10-year program of aid to States to stimulate more active participation by the States in planning, development, and management of our water resources. A minimum program of $5 million annually in grants to the States for 10 years—the funds to be matched by the States—was recommended.

The fourth recommendation of the select committee was for preparation of a biennial assessment of the water supply-demand outlook for each of the water resource regions of the Nation. The executive branch was requested to submit the first such report during January 1963.

The President's water resources planning proposal was designed to meet all three of the recommendations I have summarized.

Title I of the bill authorized the establishment of a Federal Water Resources Council composed of the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, Army, and Health, Education, and Welfare. It is to be the Council's functions to coordinate Federal river basin planning operations and to prepare the biennial supply-demand assessment, as well as to review basin plans when completed.

Title II of the President's bill was a proposal to authorize him to establish river basin planning commissions which would include representatives of affected States appointed by the President. Governors were extended the privilege of nominating persons for appointment as State representatives.

The bill was and is a nonpartisan proposal. To illustrate this fact, I point out that this title, title II, recommended to the Congress by President Kennedy, was first transmitted to us as a separate bill by the Eisenhower administration on January 16, 1961. In his last budget message to the Congress, President Eisenhower discussed the need for coordinated planning of water resources to assure optimum development. Subsequently, on January 16, 1961, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, then Mr. Maurice H. Stans, transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, a draft bill to implement President Eisenhower's recommendation by authoriz[illegible] Presidential establishment of the river basin planning commissions. It was that draft bill which subsequently became title II of President Kennedy's bill.

Title III of President Kennedy's water resources planning measure provided for the 10 year, $5 million matching fund for water resources planning by the States which the Select Committee on National Water Resources recommended. The title is essentially identical to measures which both the late Senator Robert S. Kerr and I introduced in the 87th Congress.

President Kennedy continues to urge the enactment of legislation to achieve optimum river basin planning and development. In his budget message in January, the President said:

> Major emphasis is being given within the Federal Government to coordinated planning of river basin development and research on water resources. In addition, legislation is again recommended to provide for comprehensive and coordinated water resources planning by Federal and State agencies and to authorize limited grants to strengthen State planning.

There has been little or no opposition to titles I and III of the President's bill, providing for the establishment of a Federal Water Resources Council composed of four Secretaries whose departments have major water resource programs, and authorizing State aid. They have been little changed in the revision I have just introduced.

Opposition to the other title of the bill, title II, has been directed at the nature and mechanics for establishing the individual river basin planning commissions rather than at the basic idea of creating commissions or getting at the planning job.

The President proposed, as his predecessor had proposed, that the commissions be established and appointed by the Federal Chief Executive when one or more States in a basin requested the establishment of a commission.

The States objected, among other things, to establishment of a river basin planning commission at the request of only one State; they contended that two-thirds of the States involved should participate in any such request before a commission could be established.

The States objected also to appointment of the States representatives on the commissions by the President, and the consequent Federal nature of the commissions; they insisted on the right to appoint their own representatives who would have no master but the State that each represented.

The States also sought language which would recognize their primary interest in water resources.

The matter of State versus Federal rights in water resources is a dispute nearly as old as our Nation itself. It is still unsettled. States and the Federal Government have argued about it, carried lawsuits to the Supreme Court about it, and made it an issue in political campaigns. Few Congresses in recent decades have failed to have hearings on bills proposing a settlement. None has been enacted.

During the hearings on the President's planning bill last year, I challenged one of the witnesses to name an instance where this longstanding dispute has actually held up a water project. The instance is yet to be cited.

At my direction, a revision of the Water Resources Planning Act has been worked out with the representatives of the Interstate Conference on Water Problems of the Council of State Governments which is intended to preserve the status quo in regard to water rights; to let the debate over State versus Federal rights proceed without any disturbance whatsoever, but at the same time to let State and Federal planners proceed to work out together much-needed, comprehensive development plans.

The revision, which is the bill I have just introduced, proceeds on the basis of two fundamentals, stated in the bill.

First, that nothing in the act is to be construed as either expanding or diminishing either Federal or State jurisdiction, responsibilities or rights in respect to water.

Second, it is recognized that in any instance where necessary agreement cannot be reached on the establishment of a river basin planning commission under the provisions of the act, the Federal Government may, if it considers such planning needed, proceed itself by any of the conventional, alternative methods now followed, or in a new and proper way, to plan for the development of a river which is of Federal concern. Similarly, if a Federal-State commission set up under the provisions of the bill should disagree and be unable to report a development plan, other means of planning could be substituted.

As revised, the bill provides that a river basin planning commission may be established by the President when the Federal Water Resources Council and one-half the States involved agree to it. The President will appoint a chairman. Representatives will be appointed by

Federal agencies concerned. The American section of any international commission which may be involved will also have a representative. The States will appoint their own representatives to the commissions. Any interstate compact compact commission involved may name its own representative.

To assure that neither Federal nor States rights will be overridden in the planning, the revised bill provides that there shall be two and only two votes in each commission. The chairman, appointed by the President, will cast one vote for the Federal agencies. The vice chairman, elected by the State representatives, will cast one vote at the instruction of the States.

Planning thus must be either by agreement or by the presentation of alternative plans to the President and Congress, and to the States involved. Planning decisions will not become a matter of whether the Federal Government or the States have the most representatives on a particular commission. It will be by agreement, or the final decision will be referred to the governments involved. If a commission is entirely unable to agree on a plan, then another means of planning will have to be substituted.

To those of us in political life, where issues are all finally settled by vote, this arrangement for equal Federal-State voting may appear impractical. Stalemates are not impossible. But they are not likely, for the planning process is one of arriving at a consensus based on facts—of devising engineering works and management plans for water which will yield the greatest benefits to the area involved. If studies are done thoroughly, then the facts make the decisions—not philosophical points of view. Both the differing nature of the planning process from the political process, and our experiences with planning commissions in the past, are assurance that stalemates will be rare and, if they occur, the alternatives can be submitted in the final report of a commission and the choice can be made by the Congress and the States involved.

The commissions will be entities of themselves—not Federal commissions or State commissions, but Federal-State partnerships with individual identity much as Interstate Compact Commissions are entities in their own right.

Copy of the draft of the bill has been submitted to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, chaired by Mr. Frank Bane and including Senators MUNDT, ERVIN, and MUSKIE from this body, for it could become a significant new pattern for Federal-State relationships in more than the water resources planning field. A report on the proposal is expected from that Commission.

Observers for the executive branch of the Government have been present at all meetings between the committee staff and representatives of the State governments. The measure as revised will now be sent to the executive agencies for their review and recommendations. There will be further hearings. Doubtless we will have suggestions for further revision, and suggestions to restore the original Federal nature of the commissions.

To the extremists in the State-Federal water rights issue, who would prefer to waste our water resources than to concede a drop of authority or jurisdiction to their antagonist, I would like to say they are hopelessly behind the times.

The Federal Government has responsibilities and authorities in the water field, and so do the States. And we cannot do comprehensive water resources planning without involving both State and Federal prerogatives. Water within a river basin cannot be separated into "State water" and "Federal water" which are planned separately.

I have not heard it contended yet that States cannot regulate withdrawals of ground water under non-Federal lands within their borders. It is admitted that in many water-short areas of the Nation we must have conjunctive surface water and ground water management if we are to have comprehensive management for optimum benefits. Translated into political terms, that means we are also going to have to have conjunctive Federal-State planning and management of water resources, or we will fall far short of the optimum benefit goals that we seek.

Here in the Congress of the United States we legislate in very much the same fashion as is proposed in the new, revised river basin planning commissions. The House and the Senate either agree on legislation, or there is no legislation. As total entities, the House of Representatives has one voice and the Senate has one voice in this Congress.

Sometimes we fume considerably about it, but almost every year we pass necessary appropriations and get the other essential legislation passed. In my judgment, the Federal-State water commissions, realizing the necessity for water planning, also will get the job done. Their task will be much more of an engineering nature, with fewer philosophical and political issues to resolve, than the decisions we manage to make regularly between the House and Senate.

There is assurance that State governments will vigorously support the measure as revised.

The Interstate Conference on Water Problems of the Council of State Governments, meeting in Chicago in December, approved the nearly-completed work of the consulting group and directed their representatives to "continue * * * their work aiming toward passage of a bill."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the conference resolution printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE INTERSTATE CONFERENCE ON WATER PROBLEMS OF THE COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS IN REGARD TO FEDERAL-STATE WATER RESOURCES PLANNING

Whereas the Interstate Conference on Water Problems, by resolution at previous annual meetings has urged coordination of and financial support for Federal and State water resources planning; and

Whereas there was considered in the 87th Congress legislation to provide for water resources planning on a comprehensive and coordinated basis; and

Whereas the executive and policy committees by direction of the conference at its last annual meeting conferred with staff representatives of the appropriate committees of Congress and relevant Federal agencies in an effort to evolve amendments to such legislation that would more nearly reflect the views of the States; and

Whereas at this meeting the conference received a report on these consultations indicating that progress is being made in implementing the policies set forth in the resolution adopted at the last annual meeting: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive and policy committees be authorized and directed to continue along the lines of their work during the past year aiming toward passage of a bill that will conform to the above policies.

Mr. ANDERSON. Subsequent to the interstate conference's annual meeting in Chicago, the revised bill was completed and I have received a hearty endorsement of it from Dr. Garland Hershey, chairman. I request unanimous consent to have Dr. Hershey's letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERSTATE CONFERENCE ON
WATER PROBLEMS,
Chicago, Ill., January 22, 1963.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: I am enclosing a copy of the water resources planning bill introduced by you in the 87th Congress as S. 2246, with suggested revisions which have been worked out in conferences between the policy and executive committees of the Interstate Conference on Water Problems and Mr. Benton J. Stong of your staff.

The bill as revised is one we believe to be acceptable to the States. In title II, it provides for genuine Federal-State river basin commissions to serve as the principal agencies to coordinate Federal, State, interstate and local plans for the development of water and related land resources in the areas they would serve. Elsewhere in the bill changes have been made to carry out this concept. With respect to titles I and III, on the other hand, we have made relatively fewer changes. The attached measure, or one similar to it, is one that the Interstate Conference on Water Problems will support with enthusiasm.

On behalf of the Interstate Conference on Water Problems, I wish to thank you for your courtesy in giving the conference, and through it the States, an opportunity to present its views on this very important matter. I should also like to thank you for having made available to us the services of Mr. Stong. His knowledge and advise were very useful to us.

Yours very truly,
H. GARLAND HERSHEY,
Chairman.

Mr. ANDERSON. Conservation Commissioner Harold Wilm, of New York State, who is chairman of the interstate conference's policy committee, has also written that "I shall do all that I can to urge that the States support" the revised bill. He declares the revision an excellent bill. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Wilm's letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERSTATE CONFERENCE ON
WATER PROBLEMS,
Albany, N.Y., January 18, 1963.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: I have been informed by Dr. Garland Hershey, chairman of the Interstate Conference on Water Problems, that he has sent you a copy of the water resources planning bill as it has been revised by the policy and executive committee of the conference in consultations with your staff.

As the chairman of the policy committee, both last year and this, I have attended almost every meeting of the State officials with Mr. Benton J. Stong of your staff at which the revised measure was hammered out. In my view, the amended bill is an excellent one. I shall do all I can to urge that the States support it.

Thank you very much for making it possible for the Interstate Conference on Water Problems to take part in the revision of the bill. I can assure you that the policy committee will continue to cooperate with you and the committee in your further consideration of this legislation.

Yours very truly,
H. G. WILM,
Chairman.

Mr. ANDERSON. Upon completion of the revision of the President's bill, it was submitted to Theodore M. Schad, who served as staff director of the Select Committee on National Water Resources. Mr. Schad has written:

> In accordance with your instructions, I looked at the bill from the viewpoint of whether it would be an adequate vehicle for carrying out the first, second, and fourth recommendations of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources.
>
> My general reaction is that the bill would be adequate for the purpose desired.

Mr. Schad raised questions and suggested revisions to further improve the bill which have been adopted, or will be considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs as the measure is studied.

It is my hope that hearings can be held at an early date.

If we can enact river basin planning legislation during the present Congress, we will have accomplished a feat which has been more than a half century in the making.

As I have pointed out before, the first recommendation for comprehensive planning of the river basins of America for optimum development was made in 1908 by President Theodore Roosevelt's National Waterways Commission.

In the intervening 55 years we have, with the single exception of the Tennessee Valley, done our planning mostly in bits and pieces as the exigencies of the occasion required.

We now face shortages of water of good quality in many areas of the Nation. Perhaps we can now finally tackle this much-needed work on a nationwide basis.

In closing these remarks, I want to express my appreciation to the State people who have worked patiently and persistently on the revised draft.

They include Sam Thompson of Senator EASTLAND's staff, who is also chairman of his State's water board and was chairman of the Interstate Conference on Water Resources during the year 1962. Sam was a regular participant in working sessions.

Mr. Harold Wilm, the New York State conservation commissioner who is the interstate conference's policy committee chairman, commuted from Albany to attend nearly every meeting. We are indebted to Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York for having made Mr. Wilm's participation possible. Mr. Wilm has been a constructive force at all times.

Also, Mr. Charles Schwan and Mitchell Wendell of the staff of the Council of State Governments here in Washington, who have made major contributions to the work.

Mr. Sid McFarland of the House Interior Committee, Mr. Henry Caulfield and Mr. E. D. Eaton of the Interior Department have been present from time to time.

Finally, Mr. President, for myself and other members of the Select Committee on National Water Resources, which completed its work and went out of business 2 years ago, I want to express appreciation to President John F. Kennedy for following up and keeping before Congress and the country the urgency of meeting our water problems.

Although the President comes from a State where water shortages are not so acute as they are in my own Southwest, he demonstrates an awareness of the crucial problems of each of the regions of this Nation by pressing for water legislation, and for wise management of our natural resources of every kind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the proposed Water Resources Planning Act which I have just introduced so it will be available to Members considering cosponsorship.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Mexico.

The bill (S. 1111) to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources throughout the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a Water Resources Council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Water Resources Planning Act of 1963".

STATEMENT OF POLICY

SEC. 2. In order to meet the rapidly expanding demands for water throughout the Nation, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the conservation, development, and utilization of the water and related land resources of the United States shall be planned on a comprehensive and coordinated basis with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, and others concerned.

EFFECT ON EXISTING LAWS

SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(a) to expand or diminish either Federal or State jurisdiction, responsibility, or rights in the field of water resources planning, development, or control; nor to displace, supersede, or limit the jurisdiction of responsibility of any legally established joint or common agency of two or more States, or of two or more States and the Federal Government; nor to limit the authority of Congress to authorize and fund projects; nor to limit the use of other mechanisms, if preferred by the participating governmental units, in the water resources field;

(b) as superseding, modifying, or repealing existing laws applicable to the various Federal agencies which are authorized to develop or participate in the development of water and related land resources, or to exercise licensing or regulatory functions in relation thereto; nor to affect the jurisdiction, powers, or prerogatives of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, or of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

SEC. 101. There is hereby established a Water Resources Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") which shall be composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Chairman of the Council shall request the heads of other agencies to participate with the Council when matters affecting their responsibilities are considered by the Council. The Chairman of the Council shall be designated by the President.

SEC. 102. The Council shall—

(a) maintain a continuing study and prepare a biennial assessment of the adequacy of supplies of water necessary to meet the water requirements in each water resource region in the United States and the national interest therein, and

(b) maintain a continuing study of the relation of regional or river basin plans and programs to the requirements of larger regions of the Nation and of the adequacy of administrative and statutory means for the coordination of the water and related land resources policies and programs of the several Federal agencies; it shall appraise the adequacy of existing and proposed policies and programs to meet such requirements; and it shall make recommendations to the President with respect to Federal policies and programs.

SEC. 103. The Council shall establish, with the approval of the President, principles, standards, and procedures for Federal participants in the preparation of comprehensive regional or river basin plans and for the formulation and evaluation of Federal water resources projects.

SEC. 104. Upon receipt of a plan or revision thereof from any river basin commission under the provisions of section 204(a)(3) of this Act, the Council shall review the plan or revision with special regard to—

(1) the efficacy of such plan or revision in achieving optimum use of the water and related land resources in the area involved;

(2) the effect of the plan on the achievement of other programs for the development of agricultural, energy, industrial, recreational, fish and wildlife, and other resources of the entire Nation;

(3) the contributions which such plan or revision will make in obtaining the Nation's economic and social goals.

Based on such review the Council shall—

(4) recommend such modifications in such plan or revision as it deems desirable in the national interest; and

(5) transmit such plan or revision, including its recommendations and the views, comments, and recommendations with respect to such plan or revision submitted by any Federal agency, Governor, interstate commission, or United States section of an international commission, to the President for his review and transmittal to the Congress with his recommendations in regard to authorization of Federal projects.

Sec. 105. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Council may: (1) Hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable; (2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary; (3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States; (4) employ such personnel as it deems advisable, including a staff director at civil service grade 18; (5) place one position, in addition to the staff director, above the level of grade GS–15, subject to the standards and procedures of section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, but in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grades by such section; (6) procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals; (7) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; and (8) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.

(b) Any member of the Council is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by the Council that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

(c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of the Council may be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

(d) Upon request of the Council, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized (1) to furnish to the Council such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with such Council on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(e) The Council shall be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditures of funds.

TITLE II—RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS

Creation of commissions

Sec. 201. (a) The President is authorized to declare the establishment of a river basin water resources commission upon request therefor by the Council, or request addressed to the Council by a State within which all or part of the basin or basins concerned are located if the request by the Council or by a State (1) defines the region, river basin, or group of related river basins for which a commission is requested, (2) is made in writing by the Governor or in such manner as State law may provide, or by the Council, and (3) is concurred in by the Council and by not less than one-half of the States within which portions of the basin or basins concerned are located. Such concurrences shall be in writing. Whenever, within a reasonable time, sufficient concurrences by States are not obtained to effectuate a request of the Council that a commission be established, the Council may find that the national interest requires: coordinated and comprehensive planning in the region, river basin or group of river basins with respect to which it has made a request and shall, in the event of such finding, recommend to the President an alternative means of accomplishing such planning.

(b) Each such commission for a region, river basin, or group of river basins shall—

(1) serve as the principal agency for the coordination of Federal, State, interstate, and local plans for the development of water and related land resources in its region, river basin, or group of river basins;

(2) prepare and keep up to date a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan for Federal, State, interstate, and local development of water and related land resources;

(3) recommend long-range schedules of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data and for investigation, planning, and construction of projects; and

(4) foster and undertake such studies of water and related land resources problems in its region, river basin, or group of river basins as are necessary in the preparation of the plan described in clause (2) of this subsection.

Membership of commissions

Sec. 202. Each river basin commission shall be composed of members appointed as follows:

(a) A chairman appointed by the President who shall also serve as chairman and coordinating officer of the Federal members of the commission and who shall represent the Federal Government in Federal-State relations of the commission and who shall not, during the period of his service on the commission, hold any other position as an officer or employee of the United States, but a retired commissioned officer of one of the services mentioned in the Career Compensation Act of 1949 may be appointed chairman without prejudice to his retired status and may receive the compensation payable under section 206(c) of this Act in addition to his retired pay, provided that the combined rate shall not exceed the applicable maximum rate or rates set forth in such section for the chairman;

(b) One member from each Federal department or independent agency determined by the President to have a substantial interest in the work to be undertaken by the commission, such member to be appointed by the head of such department or independent agency and to serve as the representative of such department or independent agency;

(c) One member from each State which lies wholly or partially within the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which the commission is established, and the appointment of each such member shall be made in accordance with the laws of the State which he represents. In the absence of governing provisions of State law, such State members shall be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the Governor.

(d) One member appointed by any interstate agency created by an interstate compact to which the consent of Congress has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is created.

(e) When deemed appropriate by the President, one member, who shall be appointed by the President, from the United States section of any international commission created by a treaty to which the consent of the Senate has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is established.

Organization of commissions

Sec. 203. (a) Each river basin commission shall organize for the performance of its functions within ninety days after the President shall have declared the establishment of such commission, subject to the availability of funds for carrying on its work. A commission shall terminate upon agreement of the council and not less than one-half of the States composing the commission. Upon such termination, all property, assets, and records of the commission shall thereafter be turned over to such agencies of the United States and the participating States as shall be appropriate in the circumstances: *Provided*, That studies, data and other materials useful in water resource planning to any of the participants shall be kept freely available to all such participants.

(b) State members of each commission shall elect a vice chairman, who shall serve also as chairman and coordinating officer of the State members of the commission and who shall represent the State governments in Federal-State relations on the commission.

(c) Vacancies in a commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointments were made: *Provided*, That the chairman and vice-chairman may designate alternates to act for them during temporary absences.

(d) At such time as voting is considered necessary in conducting the business of a commission, the voting shall be only by the the chairman, acting in behalf of the Federal members, and by the vice-chairman, upon instruction from the State member.

Duties of the commissions

Sec. 204. (a) Each river basin commission shall—

(1) engage in such activities and make such studies and investigations as are necessary and desirable in carrying out the policy set forth in section 2 of this Act and in accomplishing the purposes set forth in section 201(b) of this Act:

(2) submit to the council and the Governor of each participating State a report on its work at least once each year. Such report shall be transmitted through the President to the Congress. After such transmission, copies of any such report shall be sent to the heads of such Federal, State, interstate, and international agencies as the President or the Governors of the participating States may direct;

(3) submit to the Council for transmission to the President and by him to the Congress, and the Governors and the legislatures of the participating States a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan, and any major necessary revisions thereof, for water and related land resources development in the region, river basin, or group of river basins for which such commission was established. Before the commission submits such a plan or major revision to the Council, it shall transmit the proposed plan or revision to the head of each Federal department or agency, the Governor of each State, and each interstate agency, from which a member of the commission has been appointed, and to the head of the United States section of any international commission if the plan or revision deals with a boundary water or a river crossing a boundary, or any tributary flowing into such boundary water or river, over which the international commission has jurisdiction or for which it has responsibility. Each

such department and agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall have ninety days from the date of the receipt of the proposed plan or revision to report its views, comments, and recommendations to the commission. The commission may modify the plan or revision after considering the reports so submitted. The views, comments, and recommendations submitted by each Federal department or agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall be transmitted to the Council with the plan or revision.

(4) submit to the Council at the time of submitting such plan, any recommendations it may have for continuing the functions of the commission and for implementing the plan, including means of keeping the plan up to date.

Powers and administrative provisions of the commissions

Sec. 205. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, each river basin commission may: (1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable; (2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary; (3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States; (4) employ and compensate such personnel as it deems advisable, including consultants at rates not to exceed $100 per diem; (5) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or the United States, or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency; (6) make arrangements, including contracts, with any participating government for inclusion in a suitable retirement and employee benefit system of such of its personnel as may not be eligible for or continuing in another governmental retirement or employee benefit system, or otherwise provide for such coverage of its personnel; (7) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; and (8)) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.

(b) The chairman of a river basin commission, or any member of such commission designated by the chairman thereof for the purpose, is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by the commission that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

(c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of each river basin commission shall be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

(d) Upon request of the chairman of any river basin commission, or any member or employee of such commission designated by the chairman thereof for the purpose, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized (1) to furnish to such commission such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with such commission on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(e) The chairman of each river basin commission shall be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed by such commission, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditures of funds available to such commission. In carrying out the provisions of this subsection, the chairman shall be governed by the general policies of such commission with respect to the work to be accomplished by it and the timing thereof.

Compensation of commission members

Sec. 206. (a) Any member of a river basin commission appointed pursuant to section 202 (b) and (e) of this Act, shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of his membership on the commission, but shall continue to receive, from appropriations made for the agency from which he is appointed, the salary of his regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the commission.

(b) Members of a commission, appointed pursuant to section 202 (c) and (d) of this Act, shall each receive such compensation as may be provided by the States or the interstate agency respectively, which they represent.

(c) The per annum compensation of the chairman of each river basin commission shall be determined by the President, but when employed on a full-time annual basis shall not exceed the maximum scheduled rate for grade GS–18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; or when engaged in the performance of the commission's duties on an intermittent basis such compensation shall be not more than $100 per day and shall not exceed $12,000 in any year.

Sec. 207. (a)Each commission shall prepare a budget annually and transmit it to the Council and the States. Estimates of proposed appropriations from the Federal Government to finance each commission shall be included in the budget estimates submitted by the Council under the Budgeting and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended. The Chairman and the State members shall negotiate an appropriate amount to be furnished by each State as that State's share in financing the commission. The Federal appropriation requested by the commission each year shall be the total of the commission's budget for the year less amounts paid by the States during the twelve months ending the preceding June 30. Funds received from the States shall be deposited in the commission's account in the Treasury of the United States.

(b) A commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions appropriations, donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials, and services from any State or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or intergovernmental agency, and may receive, utilize and dispose of the same.

(c) The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The receipts and disbursements shall be audited by a qualified public accountant who, where practicable, shall be licensed or certified by a regulatory body of a State, and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

(d) The accounts of the commission shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection by such agency, representative, or representatives of the jurisdictions which appropriate funds to the commission.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING GRANT AUTHORIZATION

Sec. 301. In recognition of the need for increased participation by the States if the planning and other activities authorized by this Act are to be effective, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Council for the next fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for the nine succeeding fiscal years thereafter, $5,000,000 in each such year for grants to States to assist them in developing comprehensive water resources plans and in participating in the development of the comprehensive water resources plans authorized in title II of this Act.

Allotments

Sec. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year the Council shall from time to time make allotments to the States, in accordance with its regulations on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the land area, (3) the need for comprehensive water resources planning programs, and (4) the financial need of the respective States. For the purposes of this section the population of the States shall be determined on the basis of the latest estimates available from the Department of Commerce and the land area of the States shall be determined on the basis of the official records of the United States Geological Survey.

(b) From each State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year the Council shall pay to such State an amount equal to its Federal share (as determined under section 305) of the cost of carrying out its State program approved under section 303, including the cost of training personnel for carrying out such program and the cost of administering such program.

State programs

Sec. 303. The Council shall approve any program for comprehensive water resources planning which is submitted by a State, if such program—

(1) provides for comprehensive planning with respect to intrastate or interstate water resources or both in such State to meet the needs for water and water related activities taking into account prospective demands for all purposes served through or affected by water resources development, with adequate provision for coordination with all Federal and State agencies having responsibilities in such fields;

(2) designates a State agency (hereinafter referred to as the "State agency") to administer the program;

(3) provides that the State agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Council from time to time reasonably requires to carry out its functions under this title;

(4) sets forth the procedure to be followed in carrying out the State program and in administering such program; and

(5) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the program.

The Council shall not disapprove any program without first giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering such program.

Review

Sec. 304. Whenever the Council after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State agency finds that—

(a) the program submitted by such State and approved under section 303 has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement of such section; or

(b) in the administration of the program there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement, the Council shall notify such agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this title until it is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until the Council is so satisfied, it shall make no further payments to such State under this title.

Federal share

Sec. 305. (a) The Federal share for any State shall be 100 per centum of the cost of carrying out its approved program less that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of such State bears to the per capita income of the entire United States, except that (1) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66⅔ per centum or less than 33⅓ per centum, and (2) the Federal share for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be 66⅔ per centum: *Provided*, That in no event shall the Federal share exceed a State's allotment under section 302.

(b) The Federal shares shall be promulgated by the Council on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of the States and of the entire United States for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. The first such promulgation shall be conclusive for the first fiscal year for which payments are made under the provisions of this title and the succeeding fiscal year, and a promulgation shall thereafter be made for each succeeding two years and shall be conclusive for such years.

Payments

Sec. 306. The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to this title shall be as follows:

(1) The Council shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by it, estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of this title for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Council may find necessary.

(2) The Council shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by it for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which it finds that its estimate of the amount to be paid such State for any prior period under this title was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State for such prior period under this title. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, in such installments as the Council may determine.

Definition

Sec. 307. For the purpose of this title the term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

Authorization of appropriations

Sec. 401. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of titles I and II and the administration of title III.

Rules and regulations

Sec. 402. The Council is authorized to make such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary or appropriate for carrying out those provisions of this Act which are administered by it.

Delegation of functions

Sec. 403. The Council is authorized to delegate to any member or employee of the Council, its administrative functions under section 105 and the detailed administration of the grant program under title III.

Utilization of personnel

Sec. 404. The Council may, with the consent of the head of any other department or agency of the United States, utilize such officers and employees of such agency as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Employee benefits

Sec. 405. The Civil Service Commission of the United States is authorized to contract with any commission established under section 201 of this Act for coverage of the river basin commission's employees in the employee benefit programs of the Federal Government, as provided in section 205(a) (6) of this Act.

EXTRA $600 TAX EXEMPTION FOR STUDENTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would, if enacted, provide an additional income tax exemption for an individual who is a full-time student in an institution of higher education.

In this age of rockets and missiles, of progress and constant hurry, it is becoming more and more important that we have a well-educated citizenry. There is a crying demand for technicians and specialists of all kinds and less and less of a place in our work force for the unskilled and untrained worker.

At a time when our society is demanding more and more educated people, the costs of college education are rising. In its report on S. 1241, the higher education bill which was before the Senate last year, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare pointed out that college "tuition and fee charges alone have increased 86 percent in the past decade and promise to increase still further;" that "during the past school year, the average expense incurred by a student living away from home was $1,650 per year." The committee said that each year, "between 60,000 and 100,000 high school graduates in the top 20 to 30 percent of their class fail to go on to college for this reason." This, in my estimation, is a very real loss to America, and we should do something about it.

The extra $600 tax exemption for which my bill provides would aid ambitious young people and would make a college education possible for many who otherwise would not be able to afford college. I do not believe we can afford to do less for our young people than to offer them every possible opportunity for an education. Therefore, I am hopeful that every consideration will be given to my proposal and that ultimately favorable action will be taken on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1114) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income tax exemption for an individual who is a full-time student at an institution of higher education, introduced by Mr. Hartke, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

LOANS TO STUDENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, 2 years ago, I first introduced a bill to provide Government guarantees on loans to students for higher education. This year, I was pleased to note, President Kennedy endorsed this idea and made it a part of his message on better schools and schooling for our Nation. I, therefore, introduce a bill for this purpose, for appropriate reference.

In essence, this measure would set up a system of loan insurance for needy youngsters in colleges and universities. It would be similar in nature to the highly successful Federal Housing Administration system. If the FHA was successful in promoting homeownership without outlay of large sums of Federal money, so can this school insurance loan program be successful in putting college within the reach of more of our talented young people.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1115) to provide for loan insurance on loans to students in higher education, introduced by Mr. Hartke, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

STRIP MINING—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] have asked that they be permitted to become cosponsors of the strip milling bill (S. 1013), which I introduced on the 7th of this month. I ask unanimous consent that on the next printing of the bill, the names of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] may be added.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF BERNARD M. DECKER TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, March 22, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Bernard M. Decker, of Illinois, to be U.S. District Judge, Northern District of Illinois, recess appointment.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], and myself.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. HARTKE:

Address entitled "Challenge to Americans," delivered by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson before the National Advertising Council, in Washington, D.C., on March 12, 1963.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

Address on the budget, delivered by Senator Hartke before a dinner group at the Brookings Institution, in Washington, D.C., on March 11, 1963.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF THE DRAFT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 63, House bill 2438, to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 2438) to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the bill which is before the Senate for consideration involves a 4-year extension of five separate provisions of law, all of which relate to maintaining the strength and health of the U.S. Armed Forces.

The following provisions of law would be extended for a period of 4 years:

First, the authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces;

Second, the authority to issue selective service calls for physicians and dentists;

Third, the suspension of permanent limitations on the active-duty strength of the Armed Forces;

Fourth, the authority to pay a quarters allowance to all enlisted members of the Armed Forces with dependents; and

Fifth, the authority for special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians.

REGULAR DRAFT

Perhaps the most significant objective of the bill is the extension of authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces. Unless extended, this authority would expire on July 1 of this year. The pending bill contemplates a 4-year extension until July 1, 1967.

Under existing conditions, draft calls are relatively low. In the fiscal year 1962, the number of men inducted totaled 157,500. About 76,000 inductees will be required during the fiscal year 1963, this being a relatively low replacement year. For the 4-year period from 1964 through 1967, the estimate is that in the absence of any unforeseen contingency, the inductions will average about 90,000 a year.

These figures should not mislead one to believe that the authority to induct is unimportant to the procurement of the necessary manpower for our Armed Forces. Beyond the number inducted each year, about 400,000 persons volunteer for enlistment in one of the many programs available throughout the Department of Defense. All the manpower authorities I know recognize that the existence of the draft causes many of these enlistments. The indirect effect of the draft is not limited to voluntary enlistments by noncommissioned members of the Armed Forces. The draft also encourages participation in the ROTC programs, enrollment in officer candidate schools, and applications for direct appointment of officers from civilian life.

While at the moment the Army is the only military service that requires inductees, elimination of the draft would drastically affect the manpower situation in all the other Armed Forces. Ending the draft not only would adversely affect the active duty strength of the Armed Forces, but also it would seriously reduce the strength of our Reserve forces.

The draft has been continuously in effect since 1940, except for the period of March 1947 to June of 1948. In this hiatus the strength of the Armed Forces dropped to about 1,384,000 at a time when the desired strength was slightly more than 2 million. I think this experience is clear evidence that we cannot safely rely on purely voluntary service to maintain the strength of our Armed Forces.

I believe no thoughtful person would seriously contend that existing law and its administration are perfectly equitable or are completely free of injustices. Only a system involving universal service would be completely nondiscriminatory. I would remind the Senate, however, that our existing system for selection and induction is the product of many years of experience, that it is administered largely by unpaid volunteers at the local level, and that no one has yet proposed a substitute that would be practical, effective, or more fair, and that would supply the military establishments with the necessary personnel.

It has been suggested in some quarters that the extension of this law should be for a period of only 2 years, and that a commission or a study group should be appointed to examine other ways of procuring military manpower. In my opinion this approach only temporizes with a serious subject. The law has been extended for a period of 4 years consistently since 1951. This does not mean, of course, that a 4-year extension is an inviolable requirement, but an extension of this duration does provide a sound basis for planning and it does not mislead the few persons who may be trying to evade military service into thinking that by postponing a decision they may completely escape liability.

Nor does the proposal for a study commission have a great deal of appeal for me. I know this is an era of commissions, boards, factfinding groups, and panels. The mere naming of a group for further study provides no easy solution for difficult problems, however, and if anyone has a workable alternative to the draft he has not yet communicated the details of this substitute to the Committee on Armed Services.

The committee report contains a summary of the major features of the existing Selective Service procedures. I shall not discuss these features in detail. I do wish to point out, though, that a young man may select almost any point between his reaching the age of 18½ and the age of 26 for the performance of his military service. Some persons have urged that since the average age of induction is between 22 and 23, and that since relatively few persons are being inducted, the maximum age of liability should be reduced. Reduction of the maximum age of liability would cause some year groups not to bear their normal share of service, and also it would compress the period within which a young man must make a decision. If the existing ages of liability prolong one young man's uncertainty about service, they also permit many other young men to elect the time that is the least inconvenient to them for the performance of their service. Some young men prefer to discharge their obligation before undertaking further schooling, and others choose to postpone service until after their formal education is complete. "Option" is a popular word in the defense lexicon of today and this system certainly provides abundant options, not only in connection with the age for service, but also in connection with the branch of service or the program that is most suited to an individual's personal preference.

Neither do I believe that the Selective Service System is as inequitable as it has been alleged to be by its critics. An analysis of manpower statistics shows that of the persons who are not performing military service, the two largest categories are fathers and those who are not qualified for physical or mental reasons, or for both. About 6 out of every 10 young men who reached age 26 last year had performed military service, or were in the process of discharging their obligation. About 3 out of 10 had been found unfit for service. The remaining 1 out of the 10 was either a father or had received a statutory deferment because of his occupation.

Some religious groups have earnestly suggested that the draft should be ended. I do not question their good faith, but I am utterly unable to understand their reasoning. If we are not militarily strong the chances are that we would be conquered by a system that does not believe in God and that discourages religious worship. Until the Communists show some of the religious characteristics that we are urged to demonstrate by those who would end the draft, termination of Selective Service would tend to suppress a religious point of view instead of promoting it.

In summary, Mr. President, I think the need for extending the draft is unquestionable.

SUSPENSION OF STRENGTH LIMITATIONS

Section 2 of the bill would continue a suspension of several limitations on the personnel strength of the Armed Forces.

Under the permanent ceilings the strength of the Army is limited to 837,000, the Air Force 502,000, and the Navy to 500,000. The strengths of these services on December 31, 1962, were:

Army	952,000
Navy	581,000
Air Force	863,000

Thus it is obvious that unless section 2 of the bill is approved on July 1 of this year the Army would have to reduce its strength by 115,000, the Navy would have to lose 81,000 enlisted members and a proportionate number of officers, and the Air Force reduction in strength would be 361,000. Obviously the permanent ceilings cannot realistically be imposed at this time and the suspension must be continued.

DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT

Section 3 of the bill contemplates continuation of the authority for paying quarters allowances to enlisted members in the lower pay grades.

There is no permanent authority for the payment of quarters allowances to members of the Armed Forces in the lower pay grades because the peacetime policy of the military services prohibits the enlistment or reenlistment of members of the lower three pay grades and part of the fourth pay grade if these members have dependents. This peacetime policy has been modified continuously since 1950 and it seems that it will be necessary to continue to encourage service by persons in the power pay grades even though they have dependents.

Under the Dependents Assistance Act, the quarters allowances that are payable to enlisted members in pay grades E–1 through E–4—with 4 years or less of service—vary from $55.20 a month to $105 a month for those with three or more dependents. To receive these allowances a member must have in effect an allotment payable to his dependents in an amount equal to these allowances, plus $40 of his pay. If this law is not extended enlisted members in these grades would be entitled to a quarters allowance of only $45 a month, irrespective of the number of their dependents. Termination of this authority clearly would create a financial hardship for these persons.

SELECTIVE INDUCTION FOR PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS

Section 4 of the bill would continue authority for the President to levy special calls for medical and dental officers and allied specialists and to order physicians and dentists who are members of Reserve components to active duty for 24 months if they had not already served on active duty for at least 1 year.

Despite some special inducements for physicians and dentists, the Department of Defense has been unable to recruit enough Regular doctors and dentists to meet the needs of the Armed Forces. For this reason it is necessary to provide for the temporary service of a sufficient number of doctors and dentists to bridge the gap between the number of Regulars and the requirements of the Armed Forces.

Persons deferred under the Universal Military Training and Service Act remain liable for induction until they reach the age of 35. Since most physicians and dentists are deferred to continue their professional education, they incur a liability for induction until age 35. A 1957 act authorized the President to levy special calls for medical and dental officers and allied specialists and to order physicians and dentists in the Reserve components to active duty. The combination of these authorities normally results in acceptance of Reserve commissions by physicians and dentists, who are ordered to active duty after completion of their training. These authorities would expire on July 1, 1963, and this bill would extend the authorities for another 4 years, until July 1, 1967.

If these special authorities were permitted to expire, the number of physicians and dentists on active duty unquestionably would be reduced to unacceptable levels.

SPECIAL PAY FOR PHYSICIANS, DENTISTS, AND VETERINARIANS

As an inducement to the procurement of more physicians and dentists for active military service and to make military medical compensation more competitive with civilian incomes by persons with similar experience, a system of special pay for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians has been in effect for several years. The amount of this special pay is graduated in accordance with length of service. Medical and dental officers with less than 2 years of active duty receive special pay of $100 a month; those with 2 to 6 years of service receive $150 monthly; those with 6 to 10 years of service receive $200 a month, and those with more than 10 years of service receive $250 a month. Veterinarians receive $100 of special pay a month, irrespective of their length of service.

If section 5 of the bill were not enacted, physicians, dentists, and veterinarians entering on active duty after July 1, 1963, would not receive this special pay, although those officers in these categories who entered on active duty before July 1, 1963, would continue to receive special pay. Since the military services continue to need more officers in these categories, the authority for special pay should be continued.

Mr. President, that concludes my remarks on the bill. The bill is one of the more important items in the legislative program of the Department of Defense this year.

Mr. President, I believe that the committee report on the bill explains each provision of the bill in detail. The program has been operational for a number of years. The extension of the bill is of vital importance to the maintenance of our defense posture as well as to maintain the program of the Department of Defense even for this year. I hope the bill will be passed unanimously.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, today the harsh necessities of the cold war require that Congress take action to extend the compulsory draft law for another period. I think all of us are satisfied that the large manpower requirements of our Armed Forces at their present levels of strength require a form of compulsion to encourage enlistments as well as make up any other needed personnel. These are the hard facts of the cold war; our forces are required around the world in varying degrees of hardships and discomfort to combat aggression by a determined foe. Some of them are fighting; all of them are ready to fight. This is the price we must pay to maintain freedom, and this this country is determined to do.

But although we recognize the necessity of this program for induction into the Armed Forces, most of us are not unmindful of the inequities it causes to many of our youth who must carry this burden of defending freedom for all of us. Only around one-half of the young men subject to the draft ever serve a substantial period of military duty. Their contemporaries forge ahead in the competitive race of civilian life. I am satisfied that the various combinations of requirements of the armed services and the exemption policies of the Selective Service System are administered on a fair basis, but these various policies, justified as they may be by other goals of necessity, still result in the overall inequity by which one young man is required to serve while another is not. I know many Senators share my concern that this Nation is not doing enough to redress this inequity that our national policy places on so many men.

To correct this inequity, 39 of us are cosponsoring S. 5 the cold war GI bill. We hope through this plan to repay in some way the young men who served for the time, effort, and courage demanded of them to defend freedom. We propose educational and training allowances and home loan guarantees for these veterans to help them catch up with their contemporaries who were allowed to stay in civilian life. Almost all of these young men consider it an honor to serve their country, and would be reluctant to insist that the Government owes any special obligation to them, but we who create the inequity by setting the policies do feel the necessity for providing an adequate compensation for their sacrifices.

So as we vote to extend the draft for another 4 years, let it not be said that we are insensitive to the needs of the cold war veteran. It is my expectation to bring to the floor of the Senate this session the cold war GI bill. In this way, before many weeks pass, we can demonstrate to the youth of the country that the draft laws do not operate as an arbitrary capricious roulette wheel which penalizes some but not others. We shall provide adequate recognition and compensation for the burden that our young veterans have carried for all of us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 2438) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK subsequently said: Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was necessarily absent from the Chamber earlier in the day when the Draft Extension Act was passed. His staff has asked me to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from Oregon, indicating that he desires to be recorded against the extension of the draft. He

is necessarily absent, inasmuch as he is joining the President on his trip to Costa Rica.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the Senator from Oregon be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WAYNE MORSE IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 2438

> It is with real regret that I am asking to be recorded against extension of the draft. Had I been present today, instead of on my way to Mexico and Costa Rica, I would have offered a substitute amendment, extending the draft for a 2-year period, rather than for 4 years.
>
> I offered such an amendment in 1959. It was my hope and expectation that during those 2 years, manpower studies would be undertaken that would produce alternatives to selective service as a means of assuring adequate manpower for the Armed Forces. That year, the congressional critics of the waste of manpower under selective service were "sweet talked" by both the executive branch and the Armed Services Committee with pledges that steps would be taken to review manpower policies. Senator CASE of South Dakota offered an amendment on the Senate floor which I supported, to set up a civilian commission to do this job. We were told that such a commission was not needed, because the Armed Services Committee of the Senate was going to appoint a subcommittee to conduct continuing studies of the utilization of military manpower.
>
> That was sufficient to defeat the 2-year extension, with its proposed manpower study.
>
> So far as I know, that was the end of the matter. If any studies were ever made, their results are not apparent. Not a thing has been done; not a change for the better has been made. Selective service remains just as discriminatory in its selection as before, and just as unfair to the young men of the Nation. For the injustices it works upon American citizens, the Congress must bear heavy responsibility.
>
> But it is first of all the responsibility of the Pentagon to provide an efficient means of acquiring essential manpower. It is an astonishing thing to me that in a Pentagon building bulging with the so-called whiz kids and slide-rule minds that pride themselves on industrial efficiency, we must still stagger along with a rickety, wasteful, and completely unfair method of filling the ranks of the Army.
>
> Why, I ask Mr. McNamara, has not the same attention gone into the human component of your Department that apparently goes into your decisions relating to weapons systems? Does not American industry require efficient use of people just as much as efficient use of machinery, or in this case, of weapons and supplies? Is it possible, Mr. Secretary, that manpower utilization has a low level of priority simply because with the draft in effect, it is possible to bring in however many men are needed without regard to efficiency?
>
> In the last 4 years, I have seen absolutely nothing to restore my confidence that the draft law is really needed. It remains the manpower crutch of the Army alone, not the Air Force, the Navy, or the Marine Corps. The Pentagon can always come to Congress with extensive proof that a substantial pay raise is needed, as it is doing again this year. But where are the studies that will eliminate the criticisms of the inefficient use of drafted men by the Army that were voiced by the Cordiner report and by many other reports?
>
> I submit that I know something about "featherbedding" and "work rules" in industry, and I think it is about time the Secretary of Defense provided some real "work rules" for the Army in the interest of efficiency, as well as in the interest of the young men who are now subject to the lottery of selective service.
>
> Since there is no opportunity to vote for a 2-year extension with a manpower review, I therefore cast my vote against another 4 years of selective service.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. STENNIS obtained the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is the Senate in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senate now returns to the morning hour, does it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Is the Senator from Mississippi recognized?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Is not the Senate in the morning hour?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is, for the moment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the floor with the understanding that I will be recognized at the conclusion of the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WHAT GOES ON?—BAY OF PIGS INCIDENT

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am fully aware that the problem of a Soviet military presence in Cuba and what to do about it far outweighs past mistakes and what really happened at the Bay of Pigs. I am also aware of the fact that only the administration can provide the action and the answers required to meet the current threat to freedom in the Western Hemisphere. But I certainly do not agree with the administration spokesmen who argue that because we have a danger-fraught situation existing 90 miles off the southern coast of America we must declare a complete moratorium on all discussion of one of the blackest episodes in American history. As I have pointed out before on this floor, it was not the Republicans or the critics of the New Frontier who reopened the public discussion of the Bay of Pigs fiasco—rather, it was reopened by the Attorney General of the United States, who enjoys the unique status of being the President's brother and one of the three men appointed by the President to conduct an official postmortem on the ill-fated invasion attempt in April of 1961.

Since the Attorney General saw fit to reopen this discussion by providing a selected group of reporters with his personal version, I believe those interested in the full and truthful facts attendant to the Bay of Pigs incident have both the right and the duty to demand an accurate accounting to the public.

Mr. President, I am confident that it will do no good for those in official positions to keep telling us that we should stop talking about the Bay of Pigs or the Cuba story. The reason is—and we have only to look at the daily newspaper to understand this—that the American people will not stop talking about it. And all the exhortations of the Vice President and majority leader will not stop them or the opposition. To them, the administration's supersecret attitude on this official failure has become something in the nature of a "whodunit" which they want solved.

Mr. President, I am again forced to ask "What goes on?" Why cannot the American people be given a complete, unvarnished version of the events that occurred back in April of 1961? Why must we keep getting the details of those events piecemeal from obscure sources? Why must we go constantly to the newspapers and the magazines for more enlightenment?

In this connection, I recommend to the Senate some required reading. My reference is to an article in the March 18 issue of U.S. News & World Report entitled "Bay of Pigs: The Curtain Is Lifting."

Now, Mr. President, this magazine has had a record of accuracy and consistency in the reporting of emergent facts concerning the Bay of Pigs. And for that reason, I believe some of the statements made in this article should be answered by the administration. They suggest a much heavier American involvement in the Cuban invasion attempt than any of us heretofore have suspected. Some of the disclosures I have never seen before in any official or unofficial statement or any printed versions of the Bay of Pigs episode. For example, let me quote some of the statements made in this article:

> For 2 years, the official story in Washington has been that the attempt to overthrow Fidel Castro in 1961 was an all-Cuban affair. But it is clear now that many Americans took part in it, and that U.S. forces were poised, ready to join in.
>
> U.S. Navy jets, their identifying insignia painted out, were lined up on airstrips at Key West, Fla., within easy striking distance of the Bay of Pigs. They never got the signal to go.
>
> A U.S. aircraft carrier, jets ready on her flight deck, was on station near Cuba. Other American jets were in the air almost constantly, patrolling just off the invasion beaches.
>
> In the days just before the 1961 invasion, American frogmen swam to the landing beaches and carefully charted them for the infantry assault that was to follow. These men were civilians under contract to the invaders. All had been underwater-demolition experts in the U.S. Armed Forces at one time.
>
> On D-day—April 17—one American frogman was with the Cuban underwater teams that went ashore ahead of the invasion. This American was in a rubber boat that was caught by chance in the headlights of one of Castro's jeeps. He was able to escape and get back to the mother ship, standing offshore.
>
> At least one American is known to have piloted a planeload of Cuban paratroopers from a staging base in Nicaragua to the point where they were dropped back of the

beaches. En route to Cuba, they flew low over the American aircraft carrier so the Cubans could see the jets positioned on her deck.

On the second day of the invasion—April 18—three American airmen flew over the invasion beach. Two, a pilot and a copilot, were in a C–54 transport plane that dropped ammunition to the invaders. The third was pilot of a B–26 bomber, trying to support the invading troops with attacks on Castro's forces.

On at least one occasion, Castro's jets bearing down on an invasion transport veered off when U.S. Navy fighters came on the scene, not far offshore.

It was on the last day—April 19—that four Americans were killed in two B–26 bombers over Cuba. Three other Americans did not reach the target area.

Long before the actual attack, American volunteers were working with the Cubans at their secret training base in Guatemala. Gradually, the full scope of their activities is coming to light.

Mr. President, if this report be true in part or full, I believe the administration owes it to the American people to give us a full and complete rundown on just what occurred at the Bay of Pigs. In light of the Attorney General's insistence that no American air cover was ever planned for the Cuban invaders, it would help to know what, if the report is true, was the meaning of the Navy jets with their insignia painted out? Why was an aircraft carrier standing by with her jets ready, if the report is true? What were the Cuban invaders led to believe about American support? These questions have been begging for answers too long. The American people have a right to know.

I ask unanimous consent to have the U.S. News & World Report article reprinted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Bay of Pigs: The Curtain Is Lifting

(Note.—That clamp of secrecy on what happened at the Bay of Pigs in April 1961, just will not stay put. Information keeps leaking out. Now it shows: Americans were in far deeper than officials admit. And U.S. air power was ready to go on a moment's notice.)

More and more details are breaking through the curtain of secrecy to show how deeply Americans were involved in the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba.

For 2 years, the official story in Washington has been that the attempt to overthrow Fidel Castro in 1961 was an all-Cuban affair. But it is clear now that many Americans took part in it, and that U.S. forces were poised, ready to join in.

U.S. Navy jets, their identifying insignia painted out, were lined up on airstrips at Key West, Fla., within easy striking distance of the Bay of Pigs. They never got the signal to go.

A U.S. aircraft carrier, jets ready on her flight decks, was on station near Cuba. Other American jets were in the air almost constantly, patrolling just off the invasion beaches.

American frogmen scouted the beaches in advance of the attack. American combat veterans flew B–26 bombers into the battle zone and piloted planes carrying Cuban paratroopers who were dropped in advance of infantrymen.

None of these men were members of the regular U.S. Armed Forces, although several were Air National Guardsmen. All were volunteers. But after word got out that four American pilots died in combat at the Bay of Pigs, President Kennedy said this at his news conference on March 6:

"Let me just say about these four men: They were serving their country."

How United States helped: These details can now be told.

In the days just before the 1961 invasion, American frogmen swam to the landing beaches and carefully charted them for the infantry assault that was to follow. These men were civilians under contract to the invaders. All had been underwater-demolition experts in the U.S. Armed Forces at one time.

On D-Day—April 17—one American frogman was with the Cuban underwater teams that went ashore ahead of the invasion. This American was in a rubber boat that was caught, by chance, in the headlights of one of Castro's jeeps. He was able to escape and get back to the mother ship, standing offshore.

At least one American is known to have piloted a planeload of Cuban paratroopers from a staging base in Nicaragua to the point where they were dropped back of the beaches. En route to Cuba, they flew low over an American aircraft carrier so the Cubans could see the jets positioned on her deck.

On the second day—April 18—three American airmen flew over the invasion beach. Two, a pilot and copilot, were in a C–54 transport plane that dropped ammunition to the invaders. The third was pilot of a B–26 bomber, trying to support the invading troops with attacks on Castro's forces.

On at least one occasion, Castro jets bearing down on an invasion transport veered off when U.S. Navy fighters came on the scene not far offshore.

It was on the last day—April 19—that four Americans were killed in two B–26 bombers over Cuba. Three other Americans did not reach the target area.

Long before the actual attack, American volunteers were working with the Cubans at their secret training base in Guatemala. Gradually, the full scope of their activities is coming to light.

U.S. B–26 pilots hired: On March 7, 1963, the Chicago Sun-Times reported that Air National Guard pilots from Alabama, Arkansas, and Virginia, "were offered $2,500 a month by the Central Intelligence Agency to take part in the Cuban Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961." The newspaper said pilots from the three States were "sought out because the Guard units of those States were the last to fly the B–26 bombers used in the invasion. The World War II bomber was retired from the State units in 1959."

The Chicago American identified Brig. Gen. George Reid Doster of the Alabama Air National Guard as tactical commander of the anti-Castro force. General Doster refused to confirm or deny the report, but indicated he would like to tell his story to a congressional committee. He said: "I wish they would call me and let me put my feet on a desk and talk for about 8 hours."

It had been reported earlier by U.S. News & World Report that at least 18 American airmen went to Guatemala to train Cuban pilots of the B–26 bomber fleet that the invaders had assembled. These men were recruited for combat duty. Later their orders were changed, limiting them to the role of instructors. But when things started to go wrong at the Bay of Pigs, those who wanted to were permitted to go on combat missions. At least 10, maybe more, did so.

There still is no public report by the administration on how many Americans were involved in the invasion, or what they did. But gradually, after 2 years of silence, some of those Americans are beginning to tell their experiences. And as their accounts are pieced together, the curtain of secrecy is lifting from the Bay of Pigs.

WASHINGTON VOGUE OF PLANNED PERMANENT DEFICITS

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, on February 21, the Wall Street Journal contained a very interesting article about the current "Washington vogue of planned permanent deficits." This article points out an interesting fact which many may have overlooked in the present controversy being waged on the Federal level about the budget. That fact is simply this: Considerable importance is still attached on the State and local levels to budget balancing.

The people more closely connected with the State and local budgets, Mr. President, are the ones who are much closer to the people than any of us here in the Congress of the United States.

This excellent article continues by pointing out, however, that there still is considerable concern in the Congress about the Federal deficit way of life. And I believe there is no Member of Congress more concerned with this present situation than Tom Curtis, of Missouri, ranking Republican member of the Joint Economics Committee.

Representative Curtis is a man who is outrightly proud of his Puritan ethics, and he has remained close enough to his constituents in Missouri to know that his people—and people throughout the country—will not be taken in by the New Frontier's so-called new economy talk.

As a member of the Joint Economic Committee myself, I can personally attest to the ability and dedication of our conscientious ranking minority member. All of us bow to his knowledge at one time or another, and I deem it a privilege to serve with Representative Curtis on the Joint Economic Committee. I particularly would commend him on his questioning of witnesses in our recent hearings.

This Wall Street Journal article brings out clearly Mr. Curtis' opinion about what will happen to the economy and the budget if the administration's plans are followed, as well as other interesting facts so important to all of us today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the body of the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Of Minds and Budgets

A curious thing about the Washington vogue of planned permanent deficits is that it is still not accepted by a number of other governmental entities in managing their own affairs.

No matter how much phoniness may go into some State and local budget-balancing acts, considerable importance is nonetheless attached to the principle. The giants of California and New York, which sometimes seem to be racing each other in spending as well as population, try to keep up the appearance of balanced books. Even New York City does so; an unplanned deficit is regarded as a fiscal crisis.

This suggests that State and local politicians, closer to the people than Washington's "new" economists are, realize the voters wouldn't care for a different policy. The politicians themselves would doubtless feel

guilty about deliberately planning big deficits year in and year out. So it is a bit puzzling why what is considered sound policy and politics in certain important governmental units is flouted by the biggest of all.

Actually, plenty of concern can be found in Congress, as in the country, about the Federal deficit way of life. Perhaps as a result, even some administration spokesmen are beginning to sound a little defensive about it—which may or may not be an encouraging sign.

Budget Director Kermit Gordon, for one, told the House Ways and Means Committee that the current hope is to achieve a balanced budget in the fiscal period beginning 3 years from this summer. That's a good way off, but at least the man mentioned the possibility.

With that in mind, Mr. Gordon said any tax cuts should be accompanied by efforts to hold down the Government's spending for purposes other than defense and space.

Savings could be made, he indicated, through such means as switching from direct Government loans to private credit whenever possible and generally lowering Government costs and raising efficiency through better management. In addition, of course, the tax cuts themselves are supposed to stimulate the economy so that it will produce much bigger Federal revenues from the lower rates.

If all this is how the Government proposes to balance the budget in some remote future, we fear it adds up to a feeble effort.

Even if some savings attempts were made, and pursued diligently, they could not offset deficits estimated at nearly $9 billion in this fiscal year and nearly $12 billion in the next and Heaven knows what thereafter. And the hope of stimulation through tax cuts, which must deepen deficits initially at least, is hardly enhanced by the complexity and lethargic pace of the proposed program.

No wonder Representative Curtis, of Missouri, told Mr. Gordon he thinks administration economy talk "isn't going to be believed by the people"; the administration's first 3 fiscal years will have seen a spending rise of around $17 billion. With rising spending and lower taxes, Mr. Curtis estimated the budget couldn't be balanced until fiscal 1972. For all we know, that may be unduly optimistic.

It certainly can't be balanced until the administration gives convincing proof of abandoning its fetish of deficits of indefinite duration. Almost everybody else in the country knows that running constantly in the red, whether in a family, a business, a local or a national government, is a policy of folly.

As the International Monetary Fund's managing director, Per Jacobsson, put it, the notion that there should be permanently unbalanced budgets strikes him as "the emanation of permanently unbalanced minds."

Balancing the budget is necessary not for the sake of appearance but for the sake of the integrity of the Nation's financial foundations. In Washington as elsewhere, integrity is the key to all. It is the key the people and the Congress must persuade the Government to find.

WALTER LIPPMANN TELLS "THE STORY OF THE CONGO"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have the privilege of bringing to the attention of Senators a most perceptive article by Mr. Walter Lippmann, entitled "The Story of the Congo." The article appeared in the March 4 issue of Newsweek. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks. The article should serve to remind us of the troubled past of the Congo as well as of the tremendous efforts which are required in order to put this richly endowed African country on the road to ordered progress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, speaking in an entirely different context—and for the purpose of discrediting U.S. policy in Europe—Pravda of March 11 called Walter Lippmann the "dean of Washington journalism" and conceded that he is a "man who is not customarily given to hyperbole." While rejecting the purpose for which these words are used, I agree wholeheartedly with this apt description of an outstanding American commentator.

The fact is, Mr. President, that in the Newsweek article referred to, Mr. Lippmann has accurately traced the difficulties which beset the Congo immediately following Belgium's grant of independence in 1960. He also makes the very important point that President Eisenhower suggested that Patrice Lumumba turn for assistance to the United Nations rather than rely upon the intervention of American troops to save the Congo from a complete breakdown of law and order. Let those who still question the wisdom of our Congo policy remember that the United Nations has done us the inestimable service of preventing a direct United States-Soviet confrontation in the Congo. It forestalled a situation in which Americans would have performed police functions in the heart of Africa. Either course might have entailed disastrous consequences. In retrospect, as in 1960, I am heartily thankful that the former President of the United States took his wise decision.

Finally, Walter Lippmann gives a brief but telling account of the vital technical and educational services being performed by U.N. and Belgian personnel in the Congo today. We must remember that the Congo today needs first, educated citizens; second, competent and trained administrators; third, engineers and technicians to solve the manifold problems of disrupted or nonexistent public services; fourth, a buoyant economy and a market for the rich natural resources of the country; fifth, and finally, the firmest of links with Western Europe.

In this connection, the Belgians have an all-important role to play. I am pleased to note that they are playing this role—both in their own interests and in the interests of a viable Congo. Not all Belgian businessmen have horns on their heads. Even the mighty Union Miniere is not the archenemy that it was frequently depicted during the Katangan secession. Honesty compels us to recognize that the Congo and Belgium have organic ties which should bind them for years to come. I am glad that Walter Lippmann has indicated the importance of this new relationship between a former colony and its former colonial rulers. I am pleased that he has stressed the role of the U.N. in helping the Congo through the hard days that lie ahead.

Exhibit I

Walter Lippmann on the Story of the Congo

No one in our time is likely to be happy about the Congo. For it presents a problem which has no quick and obvious solution. What the U.N. has done in the Congo and what the United States has done in the U.N. can be judged properly only if we begin with the basic fact—that the Congo is a large, rich, independent state which is not now prepared to govern itself without outside help.

When people say that the U.N. did not originally contemplate any such large military and technical operation, they are quite right. The authors of the charter in 1945 did not foresee the situation of the Congo in 1960 or what would happen when the old colonial empires were liquidated. There was, as I recall it, a vague assumption that the colonies would be liberated eventually after the imperial rulers had educated them for self-government, as the British had done in India and the Americans in the Philippines. Insofar as any thought was given to the problem, this was to be the model for the liberation of the other colonies.

But in fact the Belgians did not follow that model in the Congo, and the Portuguese are not following it now in what is probably a second Congo—namely, Angola. The controlling fact in the Congo is that it received political independence without adequate preparation.

There was no university in the Congo until 1954, and only a handful of Congolese received European university training. When independence came in 1960 there were only about 30 Congolese university graduates. As late as 1958, only about 18,000 Congolese, out of a population of over 13 million, were attending academic secondary schools. The Belgians prided themselves on the primary and vocational education and the health services of the Congo. It was not an idle boast to say that the Belgian Congo was a showcase colony. But a colony and only a colony it was until the day it was liberated.

Too much, too soon: Naturally we ask ourselves whether independence could not have been delayed. The Belgian Government did not think so. After the riots in Léopoldville in January 1959, the Belgians accepted the idea of eventual independence. Then, under the pressure of the Congolese leaders, Belgium conceded independence for June 30, 1960. This was, of course, much too soon. For there were almost no safety valves, that is to say preparatory steps for independence.

The crucial event occurred 6 days after independence when the uneducated Congolese troops mutinied against their Belgian officers. The mutiny was followed by atrocities, by the flight of Europeans and by the occupation of the key cities by Belgian paratroopers against the wishes of the Central Government. It was in this chaos that the Congo Government appealed to the United States for troops.

President Eisenhower's reply to this appeal was decisive for the whole future. He declined to send American troops and he advised the Congolese to appeal to the United Nations. That is how the U.N. got into the Congo in the first place.

The U.N. was not pushed into the Congo by the Afro-Asian bloc. President Eisenhower did not turn to the U.N. because he was starry eyed about the U.N. and about the Congo but because the only alternative was American intervention. That, considering all of our other involvements all over the world, would have been, to say the least, imprudent. And to have done nothing would have virtually guaranteed the Russians an invitation to help force out the unwanted Belgians.

The education gap: This background is essential to anyone who wishes to think clearly and fairly about what has been done in the Congo and what will have to be done. The story shows that, with the end of the secession of Katanga, the problem of the Congo is the lack of officials, military officers, technicians, and teachers. Until that lack is made up by the education of the Congolese, which will take at least a generation, many positions in public and private services will have to be filled by outsiders and some authority outside the Congo will have to help maintain law and order.

That is the job which the U.N. and the Belgians have already begun, and it should go forward rapidly now that the civil war is over. Some 2,000 Congolese are in U.N.-sponsored training programs. The U.N. has provided a thousand foreign teachers and technical experts, and Belgium is giving the services of 2,000 trained people—teachers, doctors, agricultural experts. Altogether 40,000 Belgians are in the Congo, mostly in business, helping to develop the country.

If the U.N. can provide the authority and protection the Congo needs, keeping the services of the foreigners and providing the additional technical help necessary for its development, it will have a success which could not have been achieved by any other authority in the whole world.

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the date of March 13 Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, our representative at the United Nations, appeared before the Subcommittee on International Organizations of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The chairman of the meeting was the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. The meeting was very well attended by members of the full committee.

Adlai Stevenson gave to us a complete and comprehensive report of the 17th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and the role of our country in that session.

The report by Ambassador Stevenson is one which I think ought to be read by every Member of the Senate. Indeed, the entire transcript of the hearing, which is far more detailed than the prepared statement by the Ambassador, should be "must" reading for every Member of Congress, and for every interested citizen.

Adlai Stevenson described the work of the United Nations in very measured and careful terms, neither exaggerating its importance nor underplaying its significance.

The report by Ambassador Stevenson, particularly as it relates to the peacekeeping functions of the United Nations is to my mind very worthwhile reading and of great importance to every Member of the Senate, for we are all concerned about our international relations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement by Mr. Stevenson may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, MARCH 13, 1963

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the United Nations is a big subject—one which can be approached from many points of view. From one point of view it is a symbol of the aspirations of most of humanity for peace, decency, and human dignity. From another point of view it is an institution of 110 members pioneering the arts of parliamentary diplomacy on a near-universal level. From still another, it is a very large operating mechanism performing such varied activities as stopping a war, spraying tropical villages with DDT to combat malaria, and drafting a convention on some aspect of human rights. There is even a point of view—albeit a narrow one—from which the United Nations appears to be the symbol of wicked one-worldness, a sinister threat to the national sovereignty, and a joint convention of international do-gooders and bobby-soxers.

So like a novelist approaching some universal theme, anyone preparing to say or write something about the United Nations must somehow come to grips with his material, determine his point of view, decide where to focus—what to put in and what to leave out. In the process, many arbitrary choices must be made.

My arbitrary choice for this occasion—which I hope will meet with your approval—is to focus briefly but sharply on this question: how and to what extent does our membership in the United Nations serve the foreign policy interests of the United States of America? Or, more crudely, what's in it for us?

I make no apology to the most sensitive supporter of the United Nations for phrasing it that way. After all, if the very considerable effort and time and money which we have invested in the United Nations has not been a good investment from the U.S. point of view, then we should say so and behave accordingly—as, I feel sure, every other Member does.

I shall try to test this question of what's in it for us against two criteria: first against the record of the 17th General Assembly which had just over 100 items on its agenda; and second, against the roles of the U.N. in two of the greatest crises of recent history—the collapse of the Congo and the discovery of Soviet missile bases in Cuba. These are tough tests: one covers a virtual compendium of the on-going problems which beset the modern world; the other raises specific issues of peace and war in specific areas at specific times.

But before coming to these two tests of how well or how badly our membership in the U.N. serves the national interest, it is worthwhile to pose a prior test: is the United Nations relevant to the real world of the second half of the 20th century? For if the United Nations does not reflect the real world, it is unlikely to be able to do anything useful about it.

What then are the dominant factors that make the real world what it is in the second half of the 20th century? I think we can limit ourselves to brief mention of five dominant facts of life in our tumultuous times?

First is the great confrontation which goes under the name of the East-West conflict or the cold war—and the nuclear arms race which is its most dangerous manifestation. This has brought into conflict two sets of ideas about the value of human dignity which cannot be bridged philosophically. It also has brought into conflict two great and powerful nations whose national differences must be bridged politically if either is to survive. The proceedings of the United Nations consistently reflect both aspects of this so-called East-West confrontation.

The second factor dominating contemporary history is the revolutionary wave of national independence which, in an incredibly short period, has brought political independence to nearly one billion people, leaving less than 2 percent of the former colonial peoples in dependent status—an historic convulsion which perhaps offered communism its greatest opportunity to absorb vast areas of the world. The United Nations itself administered a number of these changes from dependent to independent status and is deeply involved with the difficult and emotional final stage of liquidating the old colonial system and the race problems embedded in it.

The third factor is the so-called revolution of rising expectations, which has put a spotlight on the glaring gap between the material conditions of the rich minority and the poor majority among the world's peoples. Some 85 percent of the entire staffs of the U.N. system is occupied with the first systematic effort at international cooperation in the field of economic and social affairs—certainly one of the great phenomena of contemporary times.

Fourth is the fantastic pace of discovery and invention—which romps ahead oblivious to the political and social consequences and which makes the demands for a decent life for all a practical proposition for the first time in history. The United Nations is concerned increasingly with the complex and little-understood problems of how to transfer effectively science and technology from one cultural setting to another.

Fifth is the fitful emergence of a restless, teeming, volatile, frequently quarrelsome open society of nation-states—a society of enormous diversity of cultures, races and political, economic, and social systems. The United Nations is, of course, the institutional center of this open international society—partly the cause and partly the result of the forces which impel an inter-dependent world into more intimate association on an expanding agenda of political and human problems.

If these are the principal factors which mold our times—the cold war, the liquidation of colonialism, the pervasive demand for a better material way of life, the thundering impact of science, and the emergence of a vast, new open society on the international plans—then we must conclude that the United Nations is indeed relevant to these times—that it is part and parcel of the contemporary scene. And being relevant, it is theoretically in a position to be effective.

Let us come, then, to the question of how effective from our point of view. What's in it for us? How—as the most recent example—does the record of the 17th General Assembly stand the test?

I said a moment ago that the agenda of the 17th General Assembly was a virtual compendium of the on-going problems of the modern world.

Listen to this list of trouble spots and sore spots: the Congo, the Gaza Strip, southern Rhodesia, southwest Africa, the Portuguese African territories, Kashmir, Yemen, west New Guinea, and the Arab refugee camps.

Mark this string of contentious issues: Chinese representation, North Korea, Hungary, colonialism, troika, and sovereignty over natural resources.

Consider this list of universal concerns: disarmament, nuclear testing, outer space, world food, world trade, world science, and the training of manpower for economic and social development.

All of these issues, in one form or another, came before the United Nations for some kind of action during the 17th General Assembly, even if each one did not appear formally on the Assembly's agenda. Many of them are among the most complex, the most intractable, the most ancient troubles of the human race. And many come to the United Nations as a court of last resort—because nobody else has been able to cope with them at all.

Obviously, the United Nations did not solve all, or many, of these problems; but it worked on them. On a few it took conclusive action; on some it made progress, and on others it did not.

We have made full reports on the record of the 17th General Assembly—item by item and vote by vote; I shall not take your time to repeat the record. The point to be made is simply this: the U.S. view was the majority view in over 80 percent of the 40 key votes cast in committees and full Assembly. On several issues we abstained, and on two extreme resolutions recommending sanctions against member states we voted against the majority.

This is the measure of the extent to which our membership in the United Nations served the foreign policy interests of the United States across the spectrum of issues represented by the agenda of the 17th General Assembly.

Meanwhile, the impact of the twin crises in the Caribbean and the Himalayas raised our credit—and our credibility; had the opposite effect on the stock of the Soviet Union; improved Western Hemisphere solidarity; activated the members from NATO; and gave pause to those who tend to equate the bona fides of the United States and the Soviet Union.

I am not saying for one moment that the 17th General Assembly—or any other meeting or organ of the United Nations—was the handmaiden of the Department of State. I am not even saying that there were no disappointments or no cause for apprehension: for example, we expect continuing fireworks over the hard core cases in the remnants of European empires, and we are most gravely concerned at the lack of evidence of financial responsibility on the part of all too many members. But I am saying, most emphatically, that in no case was U.S. interest damaged, in most cases our objectives were furthered in a positive fashion, and in other cases we have reason to hope for a better result on another day. In short, it was very much in our national interest to be there, paying our considerable share of the cost and exercising our considerable share of the leadership.

The political problems before the General Assembly tend to be those anguished issues which have roots in the past and drag on from year to year—so hardy or so virulent that sometimes our best efforts succeed only in keeping them from going from bad to worse.

But now I should like to discuss, if I may, two crises which had sudden beginnings, which directly and immediately involved the United Nations, and which now seem to be ended—at least in the form in which they arose. I refer to those most dangerous events which raised the dire threat of great power confrontation—and thus of war—in the Congo and the Caribbean. The point is to ask in each case whether the role of the United Nations in these crises served the foreign policy interests of the United States.

What were our aims in the Congo affair? Our aims in the Congo are the same as our aims for all of tropical Africa. They are quite simple to state: to help create an area of truly free and independent African states, safe from external aggression or subversion, working out their own destinies in their own way, cooperating with each other and with those who wish to help in their overwhelming task of progressive modernization. In the Congo, as elsewhere, this requires national unity and a reasonable degree of political stability.

Contrasted to this, the collapse of the Congo in its first week of nationhood offered these sudden prospects: national disunity, political chaos, civil disorder, social disintegration, and external penetration—prospects made to order for Communist exploitation. And because of this, the ultimate prospect for the Congo was for the forces of the nuclear powers to find themselves face to face in the heart of central Africa in the infancy of independence—about as messy and dangerous a state of affairs as one can imagine.

The story of the struggle of the United Nations—with unflagging support from this country—to bring order out of chaos in the Congo is too well known to members of this committee to review it here. I am all too conscious of every bit and every kind of criticism that has been leveled against this operation; and it has been of every kind—from honest doubts about the legal basis for U.N. action to purple propaganda and outrageous lies. I also will state that in this unprecedented, almost fantastic operation, some decisions were not perfectly coordinated, some operations were not fully efficient, some judgments were not later justified, and a few actions were not excusable. My point is neither to tabulate the accomplishments nor to count the mistakes.

My point is, rather, to look at the results and state that, as of today, civil war has been replaced by national unity, political chaos has been replaced by reasonable prospects for political stability, total disorder has been replaced by order, social disintegration has been replaced by an evolving program for social progress, and the scavengers have been sent home packing. None of this is yet guaranteed to be permanent. But this is what has happened in the Congo; this is what the United States wanted to happen in the Congo; and it could not have happened under any other auspices than that of the United Nations.

It therefore is difficult—indeed it is impossible—to avoid the conclusion that the foreign policy interests of the United States have been served well by the United Nations performance in the Congo crisis—and this, of course, would have been out of the question without our membership and our full support. I know no way of putting a dollar value on the restoration of peace in central Africa.

The U.N. role in the Congo was, of course, an extremely large operational task, involving nearly 20,000 troops from 21 nations, supported by a massive airlift, and by hundreds of civilian technicians recruited through a dozen international agencies.

The U.N. role in the Cuban crisis was entirely different. Actually, the U.N. had three roles in the Cuban crisis—two of which were played out while the third was frustrated but nonetheless useful to us. Because the naval quarantine of Cuba was the first dramatic move in that crisis, and because of the critical part played by the Organization of American States, it is easy to forget how the United Nations fitted into the pattern of these supercharged days when the world stood at the edge of the abyss in late October.

You will remember, of course, that the President called into play at one stroke all the available instruments of diplomatic action—U.S. military power, the Organization of American States, the United Nations, and an appeal to public opinion around the world.

The first role of the United Nations was to serve as a world forum where the facts could be laid on the table. When the Security Council met in emergency session, I was able to present the U.S. case not only to the members of that Council, but to all other members of the United Nations who crowded the tense room, as well as to the press and microphones and the cameras which carried our story to our own public and to every corner of the world reached by the mass media of today. Our case was right; our case was thoroughly documented; and our case was vastly strengthened as it unfolded before the bar of world opinion in the Security Council of the U.N.—the only bar of universal public opinion there is. Just how much this revelation of Soviet deceit and recklessness shocked the innocent bystanders in the cold war, I can't guess. Nor, of course, can I estimate how much this blow to confidence in Russia's word and influence among the new nations contributed to Mr. Khrushchev's decision to pull out quickly and make the best of a bad mistake.

The second role of the United Nations—or, more precisely, of the Secretary General of the United Nations—was that of third party to the issue. At a critical moment—when the nuclear powers seemed to be set on a collision course—the Secretary General's intervention led to the diversion of the Soviet ships headed for Cuba and interception by our Navy. This was an indispensable first step in the peaceful resolution of the Cuban crisis. The mere existence of an impartial office which could perform such a service in the middle of the night at such a time, is no small asset to the human race.

The third role of the United Nations in the Cuban crisis—the one which could not be played out—was that of an international inspector ready and willing to go at once to Cuba to verify the removal of the missiles. As we all know, Castro refused a United Nations presence on Cuban soil—and so prevented a quicker and a cleaner liquidation of the crisis. But the fact is that at the height of the most dangerous crisis of the postwar world, Chairman Khrushchev agreed—even proposed—an international inspection team under United Nations auspices, a proposal to which we could quickly agree and which became part of the formula for disengagement between the United States and Soviet heads of state. And Castro's refusal of U.N. inspection converted a quarrel between the Soviet Union and the United States into a defiance of the United Nations by Cuba.

Finally, and I won't detain you longer on this subject, the United Nations provided a site where Mr. McCloy and I could meet with Mr. Kuznetsov and the Soviet negotiators for those long weeks to conclude the transaction.

Mr. Chairman, I should not care to speculate on how or when the Cuban crisis might have been resolved—or whether it could have been resolved—without the United Nations. But I do say that the United Nations played a large part in a complex exercise in diplomatic action which averted the threat of thermonuclear war; and for this I think we can thank our stars.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have put the record of the United Nations at the 17th General Assembly, during the Congo crisis, and during the Cuban crisis, to the test; and we have seen that, in very large measure, the performance of the U.N. served well the foreign policy interests of the United States. There was, indeed, much in it for us.

But I should prefer, in the end, not to read that record as though it were a score board on which victories and defeats are recorded. I prefer to avoid the specious habit of treating the course of human affairs—even the massive conflicts in world affairs—like some sporting event which ends when the timekeeper blows his whistle.

The real world of international politics is not that simple. We are dealing with fitful tides of history which ebb and flow. We are wrestling often with problems which, when solved in their immediate forms, promptly give rise to new forms and new problems—as witness the case of the Congo today.

We can, of course, say with assurance that, in this case or that, our policies prevailed and our objectives were gained. We can point to objective proof of progress here and there. We can show that unfriendly moves X and Y were defeated or diverted—and that in all of these cases the United Nations had a useful part to play.

But to form mature judgments as to the real value of the United Nations to the interests of the United States, it seems to me that we must raise alternatives—that we must ask questions which challenge the imagination to say what might have happened if the United Nations had not been there at all. For example:

Would the Communists have fared better or worse in their efforts to divert the independence movement into a Communist mold—their supreme opportunity to extend power—if the United Nations had not existed?

Would the prospects of peace be better or worse—in Iran, in Greece, in Korea, in Kashmir, in the Middle East, in the Western Pacific, in central Africa—if there had been no United Nations during the past decade and a half?

Would U.S. foreign policy interests in the Congo and the Caribbean have been served better or worse without a United Nations during the past few months?

Could the United States put its ideas, its beliefs, its policies before the watching world more—or less—effectively if the United Nations did not exist?

I shall not attempt to speculate on these alternatives for, it seems to me, the questions answer themselves.

But I should like to conclude my remarks with a few comments about the position of those who favor the United Nations in principle but want to withdraw or restrict our support on those relatively few occasions when the United States finds itself in a minority position.

The basic point here, of course, is that the United States does not own or control the United Nations. We are no more and no less than the most influential of the 110 members. If we were less we would be failing to exert the influence of freedom's leader; if we were more we would destroy the effectiveness of the U.N., which depends precisely on the fact that it is not an arm of the United States or of any other government, but a truly international organization—no better or worse than the agreements which can be reached by the controlling majorities of its members.

Before such agreements are reached—or not reached—debate and negotiation bare differences and reveal similarities which frequently lead to accommodation and compromise. And I ask: Is this not the heart of the democratic method? Is this not the parliamentary system in action? Is this not our own idea of how we are most likely to make more wise decisions than foolish ones—how the weak are most likely to be protected from the strong—how the will of the majority and the rights of the minority can both find expression without injustice to either?

The answer to these questions is "Yes." And if we were to pick up our marbles and go home whenever there is a disappointment, we would not only destroy the effectiveness of the U.N. but would abandon hope that nations can work out their problems most of the time by the same methods by which conflicting interests get resolved within democratic nations and communities. This would deny on the international level the principles, methods, and techniques which we swear by on the national and local levels.

Even faith in our kind of institutions would not, however, be enough to justify support for the United Nations if it worked against us. But this dilemma does not exist, and the record proves it. The fact is that the story of the last General Assembly—when the U.S. position was the majority position better than four times out of five—is the standard story of succeeding Assemblies over the past decade and a half. The fact is that in 17 years the Soviet Union has never once succeeded in building a majority for any proposition of substance against the opposition of the United States. And the fact is that in 17 years the United States has never felt obliged to exercise the veto in the Security Council to protect its interest, and the Soviet Union has vetoed 100 times.

That's the record and there is a fundamental reason for it. The reason should be recalled frequently—for in this fact lies one of our greatest assets in the world today: The fact that the foreign policy interests of the United States are generally in harmony with the foreign policy interests of all nations which want to see a peaceful community of independent states working together, by free choice, to improve the lot of humanity. And since the majority of the nations of the world shares this goal, the majority consistently sides with the United States—or we side with them, depending on your point of view—when the roll is called and the yeas and nays are counted. It's as simple as that.

But let us take a couple of blemishes in the record and the performance of the U.N. and its members—the kind of blemishes that lead some of our people who favor the U.N. in principle to want to restrict it in practice.

First, take a case where the United States could not agree with a majority of the decisionmaking group in a U.N. agency. A recent case was the decision of the United Nations Special Fund to help finance an agricultural research project in Cuba. We objected to that project and still do. Yet the whole story is that out of 288 projects assisted by that fund, in the course of its existence, we approved of 287. So we face a choice: should we retaliate by withholding or limiting our support for an agency which we invented, which has allocated 97 percent of its funds to nations which we ourselves are aiding, and which represents an economical way for the United States to contribute to the decade of development because in 1 out of 288 instances we were unable to persuade a majority that our view was the correct one?

Let me refer also to a situation which seems to agitate some of our people—the fact that the Soviet Union does not make the voluntary contributions which it is well able to make to such programs as technical assistance, the Special Fund, malaria eradication, the world food program, and so forth. Their delinquency is deplorable but understandable from their point of view. These programs do not serve Communist ends; on the contrary. So it is hardly surprising that the Soviet Union makes little or no voluntary contributions to agencies whose work cuts straight across their own objectives. But should we support these programs less because they fail to win applause from the Kremlin?

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I rather suspect that the Soviet Union and other Communist countries will tend to participate—and contribute—somewhat more in the work of these agencies in the years to come. There is some evidence of that already. And I think that the reason is clear. The policy of self-ostracism from the specialized agencies has not worked well for the Soviet Union, even though it has made life with them a bit easier for us.

If this in fact happens, it will raise some day-to-day problems for us but, in my view, it also will raise problems for them and opportunities for us. For while the so-called Communist states operate more or less closed societies at home, once they step out into a United Nations forum they enter an open society.

In an open forum, over a period of time, ideology becomes transparent, dogma wears this and becomes tiresome, and the myth of the magical solution evaporates slowly in the free air of a marketplace of ideas. There is contention in all this; there is frustration and the stuff of headlines; there is danger that the fearful and the insecure will want to withdraw from the free interplay of conflicting ideas and concepts and terminology—especially if, now and again, things do not go exactly the way we would like them to.

Yet it is we who do best in the open forum—for this is our natural habitat. And if we have the nerve to go ahead—if we have the stomach for the test of the open society—if we have the courage to build even that which is not perfect from our point of view—I can foresee nothing but a more meaningful dialog coming out of it, a gradual erosion of tension, and finally the dominance of a set of ideas which are better—and better able to stand the test—than the Marxist ideas as revealed to his successors.

All this would require, on our part, a degree of responsibility, of restraint, of maturity, and of political sophistication which never before has been demanded of a democratic public and its elected representatives. It will not be easy and it will not be without temporary disappointments; but I, for one, have no doubt of the outcome—for this, too, would serve and serve well the foreign policy interests of the United States of America.

"THE VIEW FROM THE HIGHWAY"—SENATOR NEUBERGER STATES THE NEED FOR BILLBOARD CONTROL

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it is indeed a pleasure to ask unanimous consent to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article by my colleague Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER of Oregon, entitled "The View from the Highway" which was published in the March 1963 issue of Country Beautiful.

Senator NEUBERGER's article details the fight for adequate billboard control legislation. It was a pleasure to work with her in the previous session of Congress in enacting legislation to extend for 2 years the period in which the States might elect to participate in billboard controls in the Federal National Defense Interstate Highway System. To date 17 States, including Kentucky and Oregon, have billboard control legislation and the States will receive a bonus of one-half of 1 percent for such controls. I note that the present law permitting States to participate in this program expires on July 1, 1963, and I know that numerous State legislatures are presently considering their States' participation.

Senator NEUBERGER writes in her article:

> To erase the harsh picture of an America with an automobile-based economy that disregards esthetics is the objective of all billboard control legislation. We have learned that "a thing of beauty" is not a joy forever and the words of one of our great ballads may become meaningless unless we hurry.
>
> That ballad sings of "purple mountain majesties above the fruited plain," and I like to think of schoolchildren throughout our land joining in that paean and to know that as they take to the open road they will find the land they sing of stretching out from every town and city.

Mr. President, I salute the junior Senator from Oregon for her fine article which I commend to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VIEW FROM THE HIGHWAY—AMERICA'S NEWEST ROADS ARE IN DANGER OF BECOMING CORRIDORS LINED WITH BILLBOARDS IF THE STATES DO NOT SOON TAKE ADVANTAGE OF FEDERAL LAW

(By MAURINE B. NEUBERGER)

(NOTE.—MAURINE B. NEUBERGER was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1960 to fill the unexpired term of her husband, the late Senator Richard L. Neuberger. She was reelected recently and serves as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

Since the vast Interstate Highway System was inaugurated by Congress in 1956, 17 States have taken advantage of a special provision of the Federal-Aid Highway Act which gives additional money to those States which meet specified standards for control of billboards along their roadways. During the current legislative sessions it is hoped that even more will take action to qualify for this bonus award before the provision expires in June 1963.

To start with, it must be realized that it is the motorist's money which makes the billboard of value. If the highway were not there, the sign would not be worth a Continental dollar. The highway, paid for by the motorist with his various taxes, makes valuable the signboard which the motorist is forced to look at while traveling through the land. Surely our Federal and State Governments owe it to the touring public to keep the magnificent American outdoors from being scarred and marred by a vast jungle of billboards. But the signboard companies can lobby individual legislators whether at the State capitol or Washington, D.C., while there is no one to lobby for the motoring public except the Congress itself.

The first great travelers across our continent were Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, whom President Jefferson sent forth almost 160 years ago to see what lay beyond the Missouri River, which was then the limit of man's horizon.

Meriwether Lewis, who had been President Jefferson's private secretary, sent fabulous reports about what is now Oregon—its swift rivers, high mountains, deep harbors and riches in timber and pelts.

Captain Lewis wrote in his diary on Sunday, May 26, 1805, the day he glimpsed the highest mountain range in his native land: "I beheld the Rocky Mountains for the first time. * * * While I viewed these mountains I felt a secret pleasure."

Many areas of our country, whether mountain or prairie, lake or desert, make this enduring impression on residents and visitors alike, for nature covers all her works with a subtle quality that evokes a deep response in man.

It was to preserve a portion of that untouched and untrammeled America that Congress enacted in 1956 a $41 billion Federal-Aid Highway Act and this began a new era of highway transportation. Streams of asphalt and concrete are pouring over the land and will eventually connect every corner of the country with modern, fast roads. A total of 41,000 miles of this network will constitute the National Interstate and Defense Highway System. This is a system of high-speed, limited-access, almost wholly four-lane separated roads, which will carry the bulk of the long-distance automobile and bus travel throughout our country.

The construction of these thousands of miles of new highways gives us two choices: The opportunity to preserve the esthetic as well as the merely economic values of travel throughout our America, or the opportunity to provide valuable roadside accommodations for lanes of billboards.

The new highways, once built, will not be relocated in this generation. Unless we give thought now to the question of what the motorist is to see, as he cruises through the fields and forests and mountains and prairies of America, we know that it will be what he sees along other highways today: signs and billboards.

To put controls on certain advertising signs along the Interstate Highway System, the bonus award system was created after Congress passed a bill which was offered in January 1957 by my late husband, Senator Richard L. Neuberger. The bill also aimed at encouraging similar controls on lands adjacent to the national system.

Under this bill the Secretary of Commerce was directed to prepare a set of standard limitations on the erection of billboards to carry out a national policy of protecting scenic beauty as well as traffic safety along the Interstate System.

These standards are really recommendations and advisory for highways which are built on land under the control of the States. The bill does not force any State to accept these standards, if the government of the State does not want to do so. However, if the State complies with these standards and excludes commercial advertising billboards along its new, limited-access interstate highways, it will receive a bonus of one-half of 1 percent of the roadbuilding moneys allocated to the State.

The standards themselves are to restrict signs within 650 feet of the right-of-way of the interstate highway to those necessary for highway information and directions, those advertising properties for sale adjacent to the highway and those advertising services to the motorist on premises which are adjacent to the highway.

The billboard industry failed to impress the Congress with the argument that it is performing a public service by preventing lazy motorists from falling asleep at the wheel, hypnotized by the natural scenery and the road. The industry's view seemed to imply that if the billboards were not there the driver might doze at the wheel because he would have nothing to look at except the spectacle of sky and mountain or lake and forest and waving fields of grain.

The billboard control bill specified that those States wishing to take advantage of the bonus provision must do so by July 1, 1961. At the urging of many roadside beautification groups and garden clubs, Congress later extended this deadline to July 1, 1963, so that more State legislatures could pass laws to meet the standards of the bills. It is doubtful, however, that Congress will again extend the bonus offer and many States will be without roadside protection unless they act immediately.

Though Oregon is one of the States which has met the standards promulgated by the Department of Commerce, this control measure applies to only 220 miles in the entire road system of over 10,000 miles in this Western State of large vistas and great open spaces. Civic-minded citizens, outdoor enthusiasts, and progressive State legislators were not satisfied with this meager effort and the State legislature saw the need to create a Scenic Area Commission to protect other highways and roadside areas from the inexorable encroachment of disfiguring billboards—billboards that seemed to creep across the land in competition with the creeping sand dunes along the Oregon coast.

In the legislative act, "scenic area" is defined as an area adjacent to a highway, within a park or having "a view of unusual natural beauty." To determine these areas a Commission was created having members representing varied interests such as labor, outdoor advertising and roadside services, as well as members from motor clubs and the motoring public.

There has been no harsh ban against all billboards, either in the Federal act or the Oregon law; rather there has been a realistic recognition of the need for protection—protection that will enhance the value of the land through which the roadway passes by making attractive routes to beckon the tourist and traveler.

But the work of the Commission is fraught with frustrations and despair, as were the Members of Congress in setting up these desirable standards. Organized lobbies are at work constantly to throttle the legislatures, to influence the community, to present an extremely distorted picture of what a world without billboards would be like.

Those who scoff at Government interference in our way of life should ask themselves what the condition of our landscape would be if Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot had not called for Government preserves for our seemingly endless miles of standing timber. Some of the beauties of our waterfalls and national parks would not be here. If only ancient Lebanon had had a wise ruler to preserve the dense stands of the cedar that covered that land in Biblical days.

It is altogether fitting that the Congress and the States accept the principle of roadside protection and of preservation of scenic beauty in America through which a modern, efficient, high-speed Interstate Highway System will link this farflung Nation.

As we become more a nation of urban living, it is even more essential that we preserve some of America's natural beauty in our daily lives. The growth of the highway system, the development of storage dams creating lakes for boating and the reawakening of interest in our wilderness areas have created a whole new industry. Family trailers, small boats that can be easily transported behind the family car, convenience foods to take by pack into the high country—all these are taking the city family on a new trek 160 years after Lewis and Clark.

The highway protection legislation is still not "controlled" by faraway Washington. It has that magic phrase "States' rights" and leaves the choice entirely to the various State governments by offering assistance to those who wish to act. Ninety percent of the financing of the Interstate Highway System is done by the Federal Government. Is it unreasonable to protect this vast public investment by a slight additional offer of financial assistance to States which elect under their own State laws to safeguard roadside scenery along these new highways?

The limited-access nature of these transcontinental routes has been accepted by Congress without controversy although this has denied direct highway frontage to roadside businesses such as motels and restaurants. Should a special exception exist to permit one single roadside business—the billboard business of America—the privilege of direct access to travelers?

When the billboard control feature of the highway bill was debated in Congress, the opposition hurled the threat of "stifling private enterprise," yet it was pointed out that for many years outdoor signs have been effectively regulated in places extremely attractive to tourists, such as Hawaii, Alaska, and Switzerland.

The Federal Government is not a behemoth, wishing to exterminate an element of the business community—the outdoor advertising business. The State governments which have already accepted the bonus from the Federal Government for regulating signboards have provided for some outdoor advertising.

Few people would propose prohibiting billboards everywhere. In fact, there are many places in the cities and in the midst of industrial developments where they do not seem out of place. Reasonable people do not object to outdoor advertising but they do object to it where it obstructs the scenic view or creates a traffic hazard. They accept the fact that signboards are here to stay.

From Maine to Oregon, I have seen evidence that the States are beginning to appreciate the resource that their highway system provides by their planting of trees, flowering shrubs and local native flora in the divider strips. At the exits there are beautifully landscaped areas covered with a variety of blooms from the raucous Scotchbroom in Oregon to the delicate pink azalea in Virginia.

This has led to an appreciation of the need for a respite for the traveler who welcomes, for safety as well as enjoyment after a day of driving, an attractive roadside rest and picnic area. At the turnoffs there may be established directional signs advising the motorist where to find food, lodging, and fuel in the area.

Day in and day out, every American is assailed by advertising from the moment he hears the morning news broadcast until he puts down his evening paper. Would it be such a sacrifice to let him escape even briefly when he takes to the open road to travel across the open country—the country which has fields and streams as well as factories and shacks that we have learned to describe as "America the beautiful?"

It isn't just the modern-day outdoor enthusiast who has taken up the cudgel for control of signboards. Mark Twain wrote of his experience in Switzerland in "A Tramp Abroad" in 1880:

"I was sitting on a bench inspecting, with strong interest, a noble monolith * * * a monolith not shaped by man, by Nature's free great hand—a massy pyramidal rock 80 feet high, devised by Nature 10 million years ago against the day when a man worthy of it should need it for his monument.

"It is said that 2 years ago a stranger let himself down from the top of it with ropes and pulleys, and painted all over it, in the big blue letters * * * these words: 'Buy Sun stove polish, try Benzaline for the blood.'

"He was captured, and it turned out that he was an American. Upon his trial the judge said to him:

"'You are from a land where any insolent that wants to is privileged to profane and insult Nature, and, through her, Nature's God, if by so doing he can put a sordid penny in his pocket. But here the case is different. Because you are a foreigner and ignorant, I will make your sentence light; if you were a native, I would deal strenuously with you. Hear and obey—you will immediately remove every trace of your offensive work * * * you will pay a fine of 10,000 francs; you will suffer 2 years' imprisonment at hard labor; you will then be horsewhipped, tarred and feathered, deprived of your ears, ridden on a rail to the confines of the canton and banished forever. The severest penalties are omitted in your case—not as a grace to you, but to that great republic which had the misfortune to give you birth.'"

To erase the harsh picture of an America with an automobile-based economy that disregards esthetics is the objective of all billboard control legislation. We have learned that "a thing of beauty" is not a joy forever and the words of one of our great ballads may become meaningless unless we hurry.

That ballad sings of "purple mountain majesties above the fruited plain," and I like to think of schoolchildren throughout our land joining in that paean and to know that as they take to the open road they will find the land they sing of stretching out from every town and city.

PROTECTION OF POLICE OFFICERS FROM RECKLESS AND IRRESPONSIBLE CHARGES

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "The Case of CORE and Officer Klimecke," published in the Washington Daily News of March 15, 1963. The editorial relates to the case of Officer Klimecke, who fatally shot a man who, after committing a felony, refused to obey the command to halt. The editorial comments on a telegram signed by Julius W. Hobson, president of the Committee on Racial Equality, and sent to the press.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE OF CORE AND OFFICER KLIMECKE

We have a few comments to make on the following telegram, signed "Julius W. Hobson, president" which the District of Columbia Commissioners received from CORE (Committee on Racial Equality), with copies sent to the newspapers by CORE.

"Murder of James Wall by untrained rookie policeman establishes need for immediate action to protect citizens of 10th precinct from police brutality. Officer Giles mentioned too frequently recently in connection with brutality and trigger-happy rookies should not be given guns before completing training. CORE demands new captain, lieutenants, and sergeants in 10th precinct, thorough investigation of brutality charges against policemen, and training program on relations with public. CORE suggests that both investigation and training program be conducted by persons not connected with police department. Also suggest thorough tests of emotional stability for recruits and periodically for all police."

Only one James Wall has been shot here. Only one policeman shot him. His name is Officer Frank Klimecke. (There was no "Officer Giles" involved.)

It seems to us that CORE and its officials are, quite likely, open for a suit of criminal libel. Officer Klimecke was doing his duty. CORE publicly calls it murder.

Policemen, it seems to us, should have the same protection from reckless and unproved charges as has the ordinary citizen, and have the same recourse to the courts when libeled.

The facts on record show Officer Klimecke fatally shot a man who, after committing a felony, refused to obey the command to halt. Colored witnesses support the policeman.

CORE goes on to refer to "trigger-happy rookies." Insofar as this might be supposed to refer to Officer Klimecke, we checked and learned that he served in France with the Army's military police for 3 years.

Nobody hates trigger-happy policemen more than we do. We hate them as much as we hate trigger-happy stickup men, or muggers who throttle peaceful citizens, or gangs (no matter how young they are) that beat people to death, or cowardly lifelong criminals—such as the one Officer Klimecke nailed—who ruthlessly attack defenseless women on the city's streets.

We hate them whether they are white or Negro, or whether their victims are white or Negro.

We'd like to think CORE shares our feelings, but we don't know.

We do know we don't share CORE's feelings about Officer Klimecke. Rather than denouncing him as a murderer, we think he deserves—if not a medal—at least a citation for doing his duty.

Neither do we share CORE's suggestion that the training of policemen should be done by persons not connected with the Police Department. That's about as silly a notion as we've heard in some time.

CORE suggests there should be tests of emotional stability for recruits and, periodically, for all police. This is a good idea, but we thought we'd already heard of it somewhere. So we checked with the Police Department. CORE might be interested to know that this is already being done, and has been for years, by a trained psychiatrist.

Perhaps some of CORE's officials could profitably take similar tests for emotional stability, or lack of.

Racially oriented champions of less rigorous police safeguards for Washington overlook the fact that the respectable, law-abiding colored citizens are endangered as much or more than white citizens by a tiny tribe of almost hopelessly uncivilized brutes who can best be described as urban Mau Maus. This minuscule fraction of the city's population circulates in and out of our courts and jails, and causes nearly all the violent crime.

The great body of colored Washingtonians is, as is demonstrated every day, made up of upright, decent and law-abiding citizens. They suffer, along with the rest of us, from the depredations of this small group of habitually lawless primitives which can only be controlled by force.

The statistics to back these facts up are well known and easily proved. Rather than face them, CORE suggests another cat-hauling of the Police Department.

In the present instance, which has so exercised CORE, the criminal, shot down while fleeing after committing an outrageous robbery, turned out to have a record as long as your arm.

We suggest that rather than another investigation of the Police Department, the incident indicates there should be an investigation of the parole system which returns career predators, with jail terms still uncompleted, to the city's streets where they resume preying on defenseless citizens.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until Tuesday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

QUALIFICATIONS OF SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, twice before—in 1956 and 1957—I submitted resolutions which would have required that at least one of each two successive nominations confirmed by the Senate for Associate Justice of the Supreme Court should have had at least 10 years of prior judicial service for confirmation. I am resubmitting the same resolution at this time, being all the more persuaded that the adoption of and adherence to such a resolution would be in the interest of a better judiciary at the highest level, and consequently the best interests of the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that, out of order, I may submit the resolution for myself and for the Senator from Virginia

[Mr. ROBERTSON], and that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 114) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That from and after the date of adoption of this resolution, at least one of each two successive nominees confirmed by the Senate for the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court shall, at the time of the confirmation, have had at least ten years of judicial service. For the purpose of this paragraph, "judicial service" means service as a justice of the United States (as defined in section 451 of title 28, United States Code), a judge of a court of appeals or district court, or a justice or judge of the highest court of a State or of any other State court having general jurisdiction.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, of the Justices now sitting on the Court, three Associate Justices have been regularly appointed since, on February 18, 1957, I last submitted the resolution, and at that time another, Mr. Justice Brennan, was sitting under a recess appointment. The three Justices in question are Mr. Justice Stewart, who received an interim appointment on October 14, 1958, and a permanent appointment on May 7, 1959; Mr. Justice White, who was appointed on April 12, 1962; and Mr. Justice Goldberg, who was appointed on September 28, 1962. Five years is the total of prior judicial experience for Mr. Justice Stewart, Mr. Justice Goldberg, and Mr. Justice White; and all of it is concentrated in Mr. Justice Stewart, who sat on the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit from June 1, 1954 to May 15, 1959. Apart from Mr. Justice Black's service on a minor rung of the judicial ladder—police court in Birmingham, Ala., 1910–11—the total prior judicial experience of the nine justices now sitting is only 14 years, consisting of 8 years for Mr. Justice Brennan, 5 years for Mr. Justice Stewart, and 1 year for Mr. Justice Harlan. As I have stated, Mr. Justice Brennan was sitting on the Court when I last submitted the resolution, and after that was permanently appointed on March 21, 1957.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SIMPSON. The junior Senator from Wyoming joined with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] on a bill, S. 222, which states that "no person shall be appointed to the office of Chief Justice of the United States or to the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court unless, at the time of his appointment, he has had at least 5 years of judicial service."

The resolution of the Senator from Virginia would require that at least one of each two successive nominees have judicial experience. Does not the Senator feel that the Supreme Court would be materially strengthened if all the Justices had at least 5 or 10 years of judicial experience?

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly agree with the Senator from Wyoming and think it would strengthen the Court and would serve the very purpose the Senator from Mississippi here has in mind. The resolution of the Senator from Mississippi takes a different approach to the matter of trying to bring more prior judicial experience to the personnel of the Court.

Mr. SIMPSON. Let me say that the Senator from Wyoming agrees wholeheartedly with the approach of the Senator from Mississippi. I was just wondering about the reason for leaving out the requirement that one out of the two successive nominees have such experience.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his support and his inquiry. The question has been raised as to whether or not a statute requiring prior judicial practice would be valid under the Constitution. A serious constitutional question has been raised on that point. Also, if there were a requirement of judicial experience for all the nominees, a considerable part of the talent of the Nation in that profession would be excluded.

Now, as a start, as a beginning point, and also as a simple way of getting at the problem by a Senate resolution, the Senator from Mississippi has proposed that we just announce in advance, under the advise and consent clause of the Constitution, that in passing on these nominations at least one out of two will have to have had 10 years of judicial experience; otherwise, the nominations just will not be confirmed. It will not refer to any individual. The Senate, under its constitutional responsibility of advice and consent, will merely be announcing a rule in advance.

The Senator from Mississippi thinks that would be a salutary start toward a reform that is overdue and also be another assertion by the Senate, for the legislative branch of the Government, not only of its power but of its responsibility of looking into this matter in advance.

I thank the Senator very much for his fine support. I hope he pursues his bill further.

Resuming with my prepared remarks, I deem it necessary that some qualifications of judicial experience should be a requisite for at least one-half of the nominees for this post and because in recent years such experience has not been considered of prime importance by those persons who advise the President on his selection of nominees. In respect of what I consider to be the prime ingredient for service on the Supreme Court, namely, experience on the bench, I believe that this highest of tribunals has been sadly neglected in the past 30 years or so and that the Nation has greatly been the loser thereby. In our tripartite system of Government, with each branch complementing the other, distinctions perhaps should not be drawn as to the comparative importance of its various branches. Yet the Supreme Court authority is so vast and far reaching with its power to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional that it may be said in a sense that it is the most important segment of Government; in so many cases, it is the final arbiter, the last word. Yet, it is this branch of Government which has a total of only 14 years' prior judicial experience, all of it distributed among only three Justices although all nine sit on cases of vital consequence to the 188 million people of this country.

Mr. President, this expression of opinion on my part constitutes no attack on any particular Justice.

I am bringing to the attention of the Congress and to the attention of the country a serious defect in the functioning of our system of government.

It is interesting to compare the previous judicial experience of the present members of the Court, at the time of their appointment, with that of judges appointed through the years. Since John Jay was appointed as the first Chief Justice in 1790, there have been 98 judges appointed to the Court, including 14 Chief Justices.

From 1790 until 1900, 58 judges were appointed, and only 19 of them had no prior judicial experience. In the years from 1900 to 1932, 20 judges were appointed, with the majority—11 of them—with previous judicial experience. But in recent years, from 1932 until the present time, those appointed without prior judicial experience have outnumbered those with such experience 12 to 8. Unfortunately, we now have only 3 judges on the Court who possessed prior judicial experience at the time of their appointment. This is not a healthy trend.

At my request, the American Law Section of the Library of Congress has compiled a list of all the Chief Justices and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, including a reference to the prior judicial experience of those who possess such experience, and I think the Senate will be interested in this list. I request unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHIEF JUSTICES, SUPREME COURT SERVICE, AND PRIOR JUDICIAL SERVICE

John Jay, 1790–96, chief justice, New York, Supreme Court, 1776–79.

John Rutledge, 1795–95 (4 mos.), chief justice, Supreme Court, South Carolina, 1791–95.

Oliver Ellsworth, 1796–1800, judge, Governor's Council, Connecticut (Supreme Court of Errors), Colonial, 1780–85, judge, Supreme Court, Connecticut, 1785–89.

John Marshall, 1801–35, none found.

Roger Brooke Taney, 1836–64, none found.

Salmon Portland Chase, 1864–73, none found.

Morrison Remick Waite, 1874–88, none found.

Melville Weston Fuller, 1888–1910, none found.

Edward Douglas White, 1910–21, justice, Louisiana Supreme Court, 1879–80.

William Howard Taft, 1921–30, judge, Supreme Court, Ohio, 1887–93, judge, Federal Circuit Court, Sixth Circuit, 1892–1900.

Charles Evans Hughes, 1930–41, none found.

Harlan Fiske Stone, 1941–46, none found.

Frederick Moore Vinson, 1946–53, Associate Justice, U.S. Court of Appeals, 1938–43, D.C.

Earl Warren, 1953 to present, none found.

ASSOCIATE COURT SERVICE, AND PRIOR JUDICIAL SERVICE

John Rutledge, 1790–91, chief justice, Supreme Court, South Carolina, 1791–95.

William Cushing, 1790–1810, probation judge, Lincoln County, Maine (Colonial) 1760–72, judge, Superior Court, Massachusetts (Colonial) 1772–75, judge, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachusetts, 1775–77, chief justice, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachusetts, 1777–89.

James Wilson, 1789–98, none found.

John Blair, 1789–96, general court, Virginia (Colonial) 1778–86; judge, high court of chancery, Va. (Colonial) 1780; judge, Virginia First Court of Appeals, 1780–1789.

James Iredell, 1790–99, superior court judge, North Carolina (Colonial) 1777–78.

Thomas Johnson, 1792-93, chief judge, general court, Maryland. (Colonial) 1790–91.

William Paterson, 1793–1806, none found.

Samuel Chase, 1796–1811, chief judge, criminal court, Baltimore, Md. (Colonial) 1788; chief judge, general court, Maryland, 1791.

Bushrod Washington, 1799–1829, none found.

Alfred Moore, 1800–04, judge, superior court, North Carolina, 1798-99.

William Johnson, 1804–34, judge, court of common pleas, 1798–1804.

Henry Brockholst Livingston, 1807–23, judge, Supreme Court of New York, 1802–06.

Thomas Todd, 1807–26, judge, Court of Appeals, Kentucky, 1801–06; chief justice, Court of Appeals, Kentucky, 1806–07.

Gabriel Duvall, 1811–35, none found.

Joseph Story, 1811–45, none found.

Smith Thompson, 1823–43, associate justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1802–14; chief justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1814–19.

Robert Trimble, 1826–28, judge, Court of Appeals, Kentucky, 1807–09; Federal district judgeship, Kentucky, 1817–26.

John McLean, 1830–61, judge, Supreme Court, Ohio, 1861–22.

Henry Baldwin, 1830–44, none found.

James Moore Wayne, 1835–67, judge, Superior Court, Georgia, 1824–29.

Philip Pendleton Barbour, 1836–41, judge, general court, Virginia, 1825–27; judge, U.S. District Court, Eastern, Virginia, 1830–36.

John Catron, 1837–65, judge, Supreme Court of Errors and Appeals (then court of last resort), Tennessee, 1824–31.

John McKinely, 1837–52, none found.

Peter Vivian Daniel, 1842–60, judge, U.S. district court, Virginia, 1836–41.

Samuel Nelson, 1845–72, judge, 6th circuit, New York, 1823–31; associate justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1831–45.

Levi Woodbury, 1845–51, judge, New Hampshire Superior Court, 1817–23 (6 years).

Robert Cooper Grier, 1846–70, presiding judge, district court, Allegheny County, Pa., 1833–46.

Benjamin Robbins Curtis, 1851–57, none found.

John Archibald Campbell, 1853–61, none found.

Nathan Clifford, 1858–81, none found.

Noah Haynes Swayne, 1862–81, none found.

Samuel Freeman Miller, 1862–90, justice of the peace, Barbourville, Ky., (date?).

David Davis, 1862–77, judge, 8th judicial district, Illinois, 1848–62.

Stephen Johnson Field, 1863–97, justice, Supreme Court, California, 1857–63.

William Strong, 1870–80, judge, Supreme Court, Pennsylvania, 1857–68.

Joseph P. Bradley, 1870–92, none found.

Ward Hunt, 1873–82, New York Court of Appeals, 1865–73.

John Marshall Harlan, 1877–1911, judge, county court, Franklin County, Ky., 1858–59.

William Burnham Woods, 1880–87, judge, U.S. Circuit Court, Fifth Circuit, 1869–80.

Stanley Matthews, 1881–89, judge, court of common pleas, Hamilton County, Ohio, 1851, judge, superior court, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1863–65.

Horace Gray, 1881–1902, justice, Supreme Judicial Court, Massachusetts, 1864–81.

Samuel Blatchford, 1882–93, district judge, New York, second district, 1867–73; circuit judge, second judicial district, 1873–82.

Lucius Quintas C. Lamar, 1888–93, none found.

David Josiah Brewer, 1889–1910, commissioner, Federal circuit court, district of Kansas, 1861–62; judge, probation and criminal courts, Leavenworth County, Kans., 1862–65; judge, first judicial district of Kansas, 1865–69; Supreme Court of Kansas, 1870–84; Federal circuit court, eighth district, 1884–89.

Henry Billings Brown, 1891–1906, circuit judge, Wayne County, Mich., 1868–(?); U.S. judge, eastern district, Michigan, 1875–90.

George Shiras, Jr., 1892–1903, none found.

Howard Edmunds Jackson, 1893–95, circuit court, sixth circuit, 1886–91; presiding judge, circuit court, appeals, 6th circuit, 1891–93.

Edward Douglas White, 1894–1910, justice, Louisiana Supreme Court, 1879–80.

Rufus Wheeler Peckham, 1896–1909, justice, Supreme Court, New York, 1883–86; Court of Appeals, New York, 1886–96.

Joseph McKenna, 1898–1925, judge, Circuit Court, Ninth Circuit, 1892–97.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, 1902–32, associate judge, superior judicial court, Massachusetts, 1883–1889; chief justice, superior judicial court, Massachusetts, 1889–1902.

Rufus William Ray, 1903–22, judge, court of common pleas, 1886–89; U.S. Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, 1899–1903.

William Henry Moody, 1906–10, none found.

Horace Harmon Lurton, 1910–14, justice, Supreme Court, Tennessee, 1886–93; U.S. Circuit Court appeals judge, Sixth Circuit, 1893–1909.

Charles Evans Hughes, 1910–16, none found.

Willis Van Devanter, 1910–37, chief justice, Supreme Court, Wyoming, 1889–90; U.S. Circuit judge, Eighth Circuit, 1903–10.

Joseph Rucker Lamar, 1911–16, associate justice, Supreme Court, Georgia, 1906–08.

Mahlon Pitney, 1912–22, associate justice, New Jersey Supreme Court, 1901–08.

James Clark McReynolds, 1914–41, none found.

Louis Dembitz Brandeis, 1916–39, none found.

John Hessin Clarke, 1916–22, U.S. District judge, North District of Ohio, 1914–16.

George Sutherland, 1922–38, none found.

Pierce Butler, 1923–39, none found.

Edward Terry Sanford, 1923–30, judge, U.S. District Court, Middle and Eastern District, Tennessee, 1908–23.

Harlan Fiske Stone, 1925–41, none found.

Owen Josephus Roberts, 1930–45, none found.

Benjamin Nathan Cardozo, 1932–38, judge, Supreme Court, New York, 1914; associate judge, Court of Appeals, New York, 1914–32.

Hugo Lafayette Black, 1937 to present, police judge, Birmingham, Ala., 1910–11.

Stanley Forman Reed, 1938–57, none found.

Felix Frankfurter, 1939–62, none found.

William Orville Douglas, 1939 to present, none found.

Frank Murphy, 1940–49, judge, recorders court, Detroit, Mich., 1923–30.

James Francis Byrnes, 1941–42, none found.

Robert Houghwout Jackson, 1941–54, none found.

Wiley Blount Rutledge, 1943–49, U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia, 1939–43.

Harold Hitz Burton, 1945–58, none found.

Thomas Campbell Clark, 1949 to present, none found.

Sherman Minton, 1949–56, Circuit Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit, 1941–49.

John Marshall Harlan, 1955 to present, U.S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, 1954–55.

William J. Brennan, Jr., 1956 to present, superior court judge, New Jersey, 1949–50; appellate division judge, 1950–52; justice, Supreme Court, New Jersey, 1952–56.

Charles E. Whittaker, 1957–62, U.S. District Court, Western District of Missouri, 1954–56; Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit, 1956–57.

Potter Stewart, 1959 to present, Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit, 1954–58.

Byron R. White, 1962 to present, none found.

Arthur J. Goldberg, 1962 to present, none found.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am fully cognizant, of course, that there are a number of examples of fine and outstanding Justices of the Supreme Court who enjoyed no prior judicial experience. Among these were Chief Justice Marshall, Chief Justice Hughes, and Mr. Justice Brandeis, and there are others.

This resolution, of course, gives a President latitude for the appointment of such men so there can be no dispute on that aspect of the case, but there are powerfully persuasive reasons, policy reasons and others, which commend the principle that there is no substitute for judicial experience in the other high callings.

John Locke said in his Essay Concerning Human Understanding:

> No man's knowledge here can go beyond his experience.

And Patrick Henry, speaking in the Virginia House of Delegates on March 23, 1775, said:

> I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience.

Mr. President, a seasoned Justice is not created overnight. Judicial maturity is attained only after long years of painstaking study, research and analysis. This experience should be gained under conditions where his aberrations and his deviations from the law will be brought forcefully home in reversals by higher courts. He will be ready for Olympus only after he has felt the bolts from the high places. He should not be placed in a position where his errors will be perpetuated on the books for years to come. A judicial approach is the result of years of development; it is the essence of self-restraint.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I warmly commend my distinguished colleague from Mississippi upon his able discussion of a most vital issue.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I heard him say, and I want to repeat it in order to emphasize it, that—

> This experience—

Referring to previous experience as a judge—

> should be gained under conditions where his aberrations and his deviations from the law will be brought forcefully home in reversals by higher courts.

Do we not often speak of a man having a judicial temperament?

Mr. STENNIS. Certainly.

Mr. ROBERTSON. A judicial temperament, as I construe it, is a temperament by which a judge, when he hears the evidence, will evaluate it calmly and dispassionately, and when he seeks to apply that evidence, he will apply it to the law as it is written, and not as it would be if he had written the law. Is that not judicial temperament?

Mr. STENNIS. That is a very excellent definition of it. It has been illustrated that such a temperament can be gained only by experience.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is correct. The Senator from Mississippi graduated in law from Thomas Jefferson's university, and made Phi Beta Kappa there. I graduated in law from what is now Richmond University, and made Phi Beta Kappa. But I think he will agree that neither he nor I were lawyers until we had had experience. We knew the theory of the law and the holdings in a few cases like Marbury against Madison, and the rule in Shelley's case, and things like that, but we had to get out under the spreading chestnut tree and before a justice of the peace, and then before a jury, before we were lawyers.

Mr. STENNIS. That is where real legal knowledge starts.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Therefore, last year I was happy to join in the resolution of my colleague providing that one out of two successive nominees to the Supreme Court should have 10 years experience. There is only a total of 14 years prior judicial experience among the members of the Supreme Court at the present time.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have seen some appropriate statistics, speaking of the self-restraint that occurs out of respect for the law as it was written, and not as that person would have written it if he had had his free way.

Ever since President Roosevelt had Senator Ashurst introduce in this body in 1937 a bill to pack the Supreme Court on the ground that it was composed of what one might call reactionary fossils who could not interpret the Constitution in terms of 20th century conditions, the Supreme Court has overruled previous decisions of the Court 36 times, whereas previous to that time the Court in all the history of our Nation, from 1789 down to 1935, had made such overrulings only 26 times.

Mr. STENNIS. Those are striking figures. I am glad the Senator brought them out, with that dividing line, because the Senator from Mississippi had a dividing line at 1932, which is another basis, but it was in 1937 when these overrulings and reversals really started picking up, for the reasons that the Senator has given.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The reason the Senator from Virginia has paid so much attention to the dividing line of 1937 is that he has always contended that the general welfare clause was a limitation upon the powers specifically delegated; that these powers must be exercised, as Jefferson and Madison had held, for the general welfare, and that they cannot hold out a sugar plum to some little town or some selected groups.

When President Roosevelt got on the neck of the Court about the NRA decisions, and about the decision that he could not put a processing tax on wheat and distribute it to the farmers because they were in violation of the 10th amendment, along comes the Supreme Court in Helvering against Davis, in 1937, and nullified the 10th amendment so far as any limitation on spending is concerned. They said in substance, "The general welfare clause gives us the power to spend for anything we please."

We used to go through the formality of putting a preamble on a bill, providing, "Whereas, the general welfare will be promoted," and so forth, and then the resolving clause. We do not bother with that any more. We just spend for anything we please. That is the reason the Senator from Virginia has paid so much attention to the fact that the Supreme Court as now constituted has no regard whatever for what those who wrote the Constitution said it meant, and has no regard for all of the great justices, from John Marshall on down, and for the 10th amendment, as being a part of the Constitution.

I warmly commend the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his contribution. The Senator from Virginia is one of the great constitutional lawyers of his generation and is an able and experienced Senator.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Would not the Senator from Mississippi agree that the appointments to the Supreme Court over the past 30 years, at least, were based more on the principle of repayment of political obligations than upon any judicial experience of the appointees?

Mr. STENNIS. That has certainly been the case as to many of them, most unfortunately. It is partly the Senate's fault, I think, because it had not vigorously maintained its prerogatives and its clear responsibilities.

Mr. SIMPSON. I cannot agree with the Senator more.

Mr. STENNIS. Historically, until the last 30 years or so, the most effective check on the Supreme Court has been its own self-restraint. In the rumbles of dissenting justices since that time may be perceived their understanding within the court that the bounds of self-restraint have been violated time after time.

Mr. President, in that connection and on that subject, I quote from the Conference of the Chief Justices of the State Supreme Courts, at the convention held on August 23, 1958, at which convention they passed by a vote of 36 to 8 the following report, paragraph 5 of which I shall read, with emphasis:

> 5. That this conference hereby respectfully urges that the Supreme Court of the United States, in exercising the great powers confided to it for the determination of questions as to the allocation and extent of National and State powers, respectively, and as to the validity under the Federal Constitution of the exercise of powers reserved to the States, exercise one of the greatest of all judicial powers—the power of judicial self-restraint—by recognizing and giving effect to the difference between that which, on the one hand, the Constitution may prescribe or permit, and that which, on the other, a majority of the Supreme Court, as from time to time constituted, may deem desirable or undesirable, to the end that our system of Federalism may continue to function with and through the preservation of local self-government.

That paragraph 5 is a notable landmark. It was adopted almost unanimously by the Conference of Chief Justices of the State Supreme Courts, at a critical time in our history. I believe that this resolution has done a great deal of good. However, alone it is not enough, persuasive as it is. What we need here, in this form, to pass on a very practical part of these selections, is a new start, a new approach, and a new formula, whereby these men are chosen.

I emphasize that I am not attacking any one of these Justices. I am not attacking the judicial branch of the Government, which I believe is the most important branch, and which can and will finally be restored.

Mr. President, may we have order? Conditions are almost intolerable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their seats.

Mr. STENNIS. A new start is necessary. What I propose is a constitutional way and a logical way to make that start. If we do not take some action in this direction, I believe it will come from some other source, and in the years to come could come in a violent form.

Located as it is at the very apex of Government with its vast power to strike down State and congressional laws and any and all parts of State constitutions requires that men selected to fill its numbers be the best qualified in the United States. Certainly the best qualification is experience in the same type of work, experience enabling the Justice to distill and refine the conflicting positions presented, experience that insulates against deep-set philosophy springing from representation of special groups, experience that provides the buffer between political affiliation and juridical determination.

What then are the constitutional provisions with respect to the Senate in respect to the process of appointment?

The Constitution provides in article II, section 2, that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur, and he shall nominate, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law or in the heads of departments."

In the earliest days of our history, George Washington solicited advice on his appointments and considered recommendations at great length before making his nominations to fill positions. With the growth of the two-party system in our country, however, the Senate's advice to the Executive in regard to nominations has been a totally neglected constitutional obligation. The function is now performed apparently by the Department of Justice or the Attorney General of the United States, himself an appointee of the President. It is indeed curious that this constitutional duty of the Senate should have, through neglect, crossed the line of the separation of powers and devolved to the Department of Justice—or the Attorney General—the chief litigant in our Federal courts. Add to this the power in the Attorney General to recommend appointment of sitting judges to higher courts and the enormity of our withdrawal from our duty becomes all the more apparent.

The phrase "advice and consent" is not a new or novel concept, nor was it original at the time it was written into the Constitution. While its origin may be obscure, former Senator Pepper, of Pennsylvania, in his oral argument before the Supreme Court in *Myers* v. *U.S.* (272 U.S. 52, 1926) traced this important phrase back to 758 A.D. when he said:

> The story, in English constitutional history, of the phrase "advice and consent" is coincident with the whole story of the rise and development of English parliamentary government. I find the phrase first used back in the eighth century, 759, when a Northumbrian king does such and such things with the "advice and consent" of his wise men. It comes down through Magna Carta. It comes down through all the ages. And when in 1787 it became necessary, as between those who were championing a strong executive and those who were championing the legislature, to find a middle ground, it was provided, in the language of old English law, that such-and-such things should be done by the President "with the advice and consent" of the Senate.

In America, I find that it was used in the second charter of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, in 1691.

Records of the Constitutional Convention indicate that when the question of the appointive power was considered, an impressive group of delegates, including Benjamin Franklin, of Pennsylvania, urged that the Senate should have this sole responsibility. Alexander Hamilton, the great Federalist, although insisting upon executive nominative power, suggested that the Senate should have the power of rejecting or approving a nomination made by the President.

It was, however, Delegate Gorham, of Massachusetts, who, after pointing out that this method had been in use in his Commonwealth for 140 years, was successful in having "advice and consent" inserted in our Constitution, as it remains today.

"Consent" may well have been the power which Hamilton sought to have conferred on the Senate. It implies and means a concurrence of will or agreement. Hearings preceding confirmation usually determine whether consent to the appointment will be given or withheld.

However, no action is normally taken by the Senate to advise the Executive prior to the nomination of a particular person to fill a vacancy in a constitutional office.

After a nominee has been selected and his name is sent to the Senate with the prestige and power of the President of the United States committed to him, and with the power of the party to which the President belongs usually committed to him, unless there is some flaw in the character of the nominee, his nomination, as a practical proposition, is not rejected. The question no longer is, does the nominee have the basic qualifications of a judicial mind? Or does he have the proper background of experience as a judge? Those questions have fallen by the wayside by the time the nomination has reached the floor of the Senate. The primary consideration then deals with other points.

We know that as a practical matter many times, unfortunately, promises seem to be made far in advance, based upon other contingencies; and the happening of intervening events then decides when the actual nomination shall be made.

A system has been developed which is far removed from the Constitution. A system has been adopted which is dangerous to follow. My resolution, simple as it is, would bring us back on the right track.

This I suggest can and should be done by action of the Senate, and I am today submitting a resolution to set forth and prescribe the minimum qualifications which the Senate would apply in confirming future appointments.

Mr. President, for emphasis, I point out that this device in no way interferes with the discretion of the President in making his selection but is, in essence, a restraint upon the future discretion of the Senate in its unique function of conformation.

Other qualifications may occur to Senators and, while more restrictive criteria than mere professional experience may be the subject of debate on their merits, I feel that by the use of the Senate resolution our constitutional duty to provide a lawful and helpful guide to the President, regardless of who he may be, is one method of returning to the spirit and letter of our Constitution. My resolution is as follows:

> *Resolved*, That from and after the date of adoption of this resolution, at least one of each two successive nominees confirmed by the Senate for the office of Associate Justice of the Supreme Court shall, at the time of the confirmation, have had at least ten years of judicial service. For the purpose of this paragraph, "judicial service" means service as a justice of the United States (as defined in sec. 451 of title 28, U.S.C.), a judge of a court of appeals or district court, or a justice or judge of the highest court of a State or of any other State court having general jurisdiction.

Mr. President, had this standard of selection obtained for the last 25 years, I doubt that we would have heard of paramount rights which produced, instanter, a new Constitution law doctrine in the submerged and tidal land cases; I doubt that we would have seen the finger of scorn pointed judicially at judicial precedent and contemporaneous legislative construction in order to open a new area of Federal power in locally maintained public schools throughout the country. I doubt whether many other changes which have suddenly been made because the Court changed its mind would have occurred.

The results of the present selection of Judges are well known. A constitutional revolution has taken place in the last 30 years or so as is illustrated by the number of cases in which the Supreme Court had overruled prior decisions of the same Court. From 1789 until 1932, 27 such cases had been overruled. Since 1932, through 1962, 39 such cases have been overruled. These are all cases in which the Supreme Court expressly overruled its prior decision.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of those cases be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(1) *Hudson* v. *Guestier* (1810) 6 Cr. 281, 285; (2) *The Genessee Chief* (1815) 12 How. 433, 456; (3) *Gazzam* v. *Phillip's Lessee* (1858) 20 How. 372, 377–378; (4) *Mason* v. *Eldred* (1868) 6 Wall. 231, 238; (5) *Hornbuckle* v. *Toombs* (1874) 18 Wall. 648, 652–653; (6) *Railway Co.* v. *McShane* (1874) 22 Wall. 444; (7) *County of Cass* v. *Johnston* (1877) 95 U.S. 360; (8) *Fairfield* v. *County of Gallatin* (1879) 100 U.S. 47; (9) *Tilghman* v. *Proctor* (1880) 102 U.S. 707; (10) *U.S.* v. *Phelps* (1883) 107 U.S. 320, 323; (11) *Kountze* v. *Omaha Hotel Co.* (1883) 107 U.S. 378, 387; (12) *Morgan* v. *U.S.* (1885) 113 U.S. 476, 496; (13) *Leloup* v. *Port of Mobile* (1888) 127 U.S. 640, 647; (14) *Leisy* v. *Hardin* (1890) 135 U.S. 100, 118; (15) *Brenham* v. *German-American Bank* (1892) 144 U.S. 173, 187; (16) *Roberts* v. *Lewis* (1894) 153 U.S. 367, 377; (17) *Garland* v. *Washington* (1914) 232 U.S. 642, 646; (18) *U.S.* v. *Nice* (1916) 241 U.S. 591, 601; (19) *Rosen* v. *U.S.* (1918) 245 U.S. 467, 470; (20) *Boston Store* v. *American Graphophone Co.* (1918) 246 U.S. 8, 25; and *Motion Picture Co.* v. *Universal Plan Co.* (1917) 243 U.S. 502, 518; (21) *Terral* v. *Burke Construction Co.* (1922) 257 U.S. 529, 533; (22) *Lee* v. *Chesapeake and Ohio Ry. Co.* (1923) 260 U.S. 653, 659; (23) *Alpha Cement Co.* v. *Massachusetts* (1925) 268 U.S. 203, 218; (24) *Gleason* v. *Seaboard Air Line Ry. Co.* (1929) 278 U.S. 349, 357; (25) *Farmers Loan Co.* v. *Minnesota* (1930) 280 U.S. 204, 209; (26) *East Ohio Gas Co.* v. *Tax Commission* (1931) 283 U.S. 465, 472; (27) *Chicago and E.I.R. Co.* v. *Commission* (1932) 284 U.S. 296; (28) *New York ex rel. Northern Finance Corp.* v. *Lynch* (1933) 290 U.S. 601; (29) *Funk* v. *U.S.* (1933); (30) *West Coast Hotel Co.* v. *Parrish* (1937) 300 U. S. 379; (31) *Helvering* v. *Producers Corp.* (1938) 303 U.S. 376; (32) *Erie R. Co.* v. *Tompkins* (1938) 304 U.S. 64, 69, 79; (33) *Graves* v. *N.Y. ex rel. O'Keefe* (1939) 306 U.S. 466; (34) *O'Malley* v. *Woodrough* (1939) 307 U.S. 277; (35) *Madden* v. *Kentucky* (1940) 309 U.S. 83; (36) *Helvering* v. *Hallock* (1940) 309 U.S. 106; (37) *U.S.* v. *Darby* (1941) 312 U.S. 100; (38) *U.S.* v. *Chicago, M. St. P. and P.R. Co.* (1941) 312 U.S. 592; (39) *Nye* v. *U.S.* (1941) 313 U.S. 33; (40) *California* v. *Thompson* (1941) 313 U.S. 109; (41) *Olsen* v. *Nebraska* (1941) 313 U.S. 236; (42) *Alabama* v. *King and Boozer* (1941) 314 U.S. 1; (43) *State Tax Commission* v. *Aldrich* (1942) 316 U.S. 174; (44) *Williams* v. *North Carolina* (1942) 317 U.S. 287; (45) *Brady* v. *Roosevelt S.S. Co.* (1943) 317 U.S. 575; (46) *Jones* v. *Opelika* (1943) 319 U.S. 103 (reargument); (47) *Board of Education* v. *Barnette* (1943) 319 U.S. 624; (48) *Smith* v. *Allwright* (1944) 321 U.S. 649; (49) *Girouard* v. *U.S.* (1946) 328 U.S. 61; (50) *Angel* v. *Burlington* (1947) 330 U.S. 183; (51) *Lincoln Union* v. *Northwestern* (1949) 335 U.S. 525; (52) *Commissioner* v. *Church* (1949) 335 U.S. 632, 637; (53) *Oklahoma Tax Commission* v. *Texas Co.* (1949) 336 U.S. 342; (54) *Cosmopolitan Co.* v. *McAllister* (1949) 337 U.S. 783; (55) *U.S.* v. *Rabinowitz* (1950) 339 U.S. 56, 66, 65; (56) *Joseph Burstyn Inc.*, v. *Wilson* (1952) 343 U.S. 495, 502; (57) *Brown* v. *Board of Education* (1954) 347 U.S. 483, 491, 494–495; (58) *Reid* v. *Covert* (1957) 354 U.S. 1; (59) *Vanderbilt* v. *Vanderbilt* (1957) 354 U.S. 416, 419; (60) *Ladner* v. *U.S.* (1958) 358 U.S. 169 (on rehearing); (61) *S.S. Monrosa* v. *Carbon Black, Inc.* (1959) 359 U.S. 180; (62) *U.S.* v. *Raines* (1960) 362 U.S. 17, 27; (63) *Elkins* v. *U.S.* (1960) 364 U.S. 206, 210, 212–213, 283; (64) *James* v. *U.S.* (1961) 366 U.S. 213, 215, 221, 223, 241; (65) *Mapp* v. *Ohio* (1961) 366 U.S.; (66) *Gladden Company* v. *Zdanok* (1962) 370 U.S. 530, 542, 585.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in addition, Congress has in the 30-year span between 1931 and 1961 enacted 27 specific pieces of legislation to nullify Supreme Court decisions to correct the mischief wrought by the decisions of the Court.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of the decisions in questions and their nullifying acts.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. *Milliken* v. *United States*, 283 U.S. 15 (1931) (gifts in contemplation of death; estate tax). Nullifying acts: 46 Stat. 1516 (1931); 74 C.R. 7078–7079; 7198–7199 (1931).

2. *Kessler* v. *Strecker*, 307 U.S. 22 (1939) (deportation of alien Communists). Nullifying acts: 54 Stat. 670, 673, sec. 22 (1940).

3. *U.S.* v. *Underwriters Assn.*, 322 U.S. 533 (1944) (Federal regulation of insurance companies). Nullifying acts: 59 Stat. 33 (1945); 15 U.S.C. 1011–1015.

4. *Brooklyn Bank* v. *O'Neil*, 324 U.S. 697 (1945). Nullifying act: 61 Stat. 84 (1947).

Schulte Co. v. *Gangi*, 328 U.S. 108 (1946). Nullifying acts: 61 Stat. 84 (1947); 63 Stat. 910, 920 (1949).

Anderson v. *Mt. Clemens Pottery Co.*, 328 U.S. 680 (1946) (portal-to-portal pay under FLSA). Nullifying acts: 61 Stat. 84 (1947); 63 Stat. 910, 920 (1949).

5. *Packard Co.* v. *Labor Board*, 330 U.S. 485 (1947) (foreman and supervisory employees entitled as a class to bargain collectively under NLRA). Nullifying acts: 61 Stat. 136, 137, sec. 2 (1947); 29 U.S.C. 152(3).

6. *United States* v. *Silk*, 337 U.S. 704 (1947) ("employees" for purpose of social security employment tax). Nullifying acts: 62 Stat. 438 (1948); 26 U.S.C. 3121(d), 3306(i).

7. *Taucey* v. *N.Y. Life Ins. Co.*, 314 U.S. 118 (1941) (Federal courts forbidden to stay in personam proceeding in a State court embracing a cause already litigated in Federal tribunal). Nullifying acts: 62 Stat. 869, 968 (1948); 28 U.S.C. 2283. (See H. Rept. No. 308; 80th Cong., 1st sess., pp. A 181–182 (1947).)

8. *Dobson* v. *Commissioner*, 320 U.S. 489 (1943) (nonreviewability of certain Tax Court determinations). Nullifying acts: 62 Stat. 869, 991 sec. 36 (1948); 26 U.S.C. 7482(a).

9. *United States* v. *Wyoming*, 331 U.S. 440 (1947) (rejection of State's claim of title in certain school lands included in a Federal petroleum reserve). Nullifying act: 62 Stat. 1233 (1948).

10. *Bay Ridge Co.* v. *Aaron*, 334 U.S. 446 (1948) (payment of overtime on overtime under FLSA). Nullifying acts: 63 Stat. 446 (1949); 29 U.S.C. 207(d).

11. *Comm'r* v. *Estate of Church*, 335 U.S. 632 (1949); *Estate of Spiegel* v. *Comm'r*, 335 U.S. 701 (1949) (estate tax). Nullifying acts; 63 Stat. 891, 894, sec. 7 (1949); 26 U.S.C. 2035–2037.

12, *Martino* v. *Mich. Window Cleaning Co.*, 327 U.S. 172 (1946) (coverage under FLSA of local window-washing contractor whose customers manufactured goods shipped in interstate); *Roland Co.* v. *Walling*, 326 U.S. 657 (1946) (covering under FLSA of local electrical contractor who serviced nearby industrial establishments); *Farmers Irrigation Co.* v. *McComb*, 337 U.S. 755 (1949) (covering under FLSA a farmers' irrigation cooperative). Nullifying acts: 63 Stat. 910, 911, 917 (1949); 29 U.S.C. 203j, 213(a) (2, 6).

13. *Commissioner* v. *Smith*, 324 U.S. 177 (1945) (compensation through exercise of stock option-taxability). Nullifying acts: 64 Stat. 906, 942, sec. 218 (1950); 26 U.S.C. 421.

14. *Commissioner* v. *Korrell*, 339 U.S. 619 (1950) (amortization of bond premium-taxability). Nullifying acts: 64 Stat. 906, 941, sec. 217 (1950); 26 U.S.C. 171(b)(1).

15. *Wong Yang Sung* v. *McGrath*, 339 U.S. 33 (1950) (application of Administrative Procedure Act to deportation of aliens). Nullifying act: 64 Stat. 1044, 1048 (1950).

16. *Commissioner* v. *Tower*, 327 U.S. 280 (1946); *Lusthaus* v. *Commissioner*, 327 U.S. 293 (1946); *Commissioner* v. *Culbertson*, 337 U.S. 733 (1949) (taxation of family partnerships). Nullifying acts: 65 Stat. 452, 511, sec. 340 (1951); 26 U.S.C. 704.

17. *Wilmotte Park Dist.* v. *Campbell*, 338 U.S. 411 (1949) (amusement tax). Nullifying acts: 65 Stat. 453, 519, sec. 402 (1951); 26 U.S.C. 4233(a)(4).

18. *Bindczyck* v. *Finucane*, 342 U.S. 76 (1951) (Nationality Act precludes State courts from annulling their own naturalization). Nullifying act: 66 Stat. 163, 262, sec. 340(j).

19. *Cline* v. *Kaplan*, 323 U.S. 97 (1944) (party against whose property a trustee in bankruptcy had asserted a claim is competent to withdraw from summary jurisdiction of bankruptcy court at any time before judgment). Nullifying acts: 66 Stat. 420–421, sec. 2 (1952); 11 U.S.C. 11(a) (7) (see S. Rept. 1395; 83d Cong., 2d sess., p. 3 (1952)).

20. *Schwegmann Bros.* v. *Calvert Corp.*, 341 U.S. 384 (1951) (inapplicability of Federal fair trade law to nonsigners of resale price maintenance contracts). Nullifying acts: 66 Stat. 631 (1952); 15 U.S.C. 45(a).

21. *United States* v. *California*, 332 U.S. 19 (1947); *United States* v. *Louisiana*, 339 U.S. 699 (1950); *United States* v. *Texas*, 339 U.S. 707 (1950) (Federal dominion over offshore oil (submerged lands)). Nullifying acts: 67 Stat. 29 (1953); 43 U.S.C. 1301–1314.

22. *United States* v. *Cardiff*, 344 U.S. 19 (1952) (inspections under Pure Food Drug and Cosmetic Act). Nullifying acts: 67 Stat. 476 (1953); 21 U.S.C. 374.

23. *Power Comm'n* v. *East Ohio Gas Co.*, 338 U.S. 464 (1950) (regulation of distributors of natural gas selling exclusively to local consumers in one State). Nullifying acts: 68 Stat. 36 (1954; 15 U.S.C. 717(c).

24. *United States* v. *Wunderlich*, 342 U.S. 98 (1951) (nonreviewability of Government contracts having finality clauses). Nullifying acts: 68 Stat. 81 (1954); 41 U.S.C. 321–322.

25. *Phillips Petroleum Co.* v. *Wisconsin*, 347 U.S. 672 (1954) (Federal regulations of rates of facilities used in production and gathering of natural gas). Nullifying acts: Natural gas bill of 1956 (vetoed) 102 C.R. 2897 (1956); H. Rept. No. 992 on H.R. 6645; 84th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 1 (1955).

26. *Maritime Board* v. *Isbrandtsen Co.*, 356 U.S. 481 (1958) (dual shipping rate contracts unlawful). Nullifying acts: 72 Stat. 574 (1958), 75 Stat. 762 (1961), 46 U.S.C. 812, 813b.

27. *Guss* v. *Utah Labor Board*, 353 U.S. 1, 15 n. 7 (1957) etc. (no man's land; State courts and agencies precluded from asserting jurisdiction over labor disputes as to which NLRB had declined to cede or to assert jurisdiction). Nullifying acts: 73 Stat. 519, 541, sec. 701 (1959); 29 U.S.C. 164.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, for the foregoing compilations of cases I am indebted to the American Law Section of the Library of Congress.

Mr. President, what are we to conclude from the constitutional upheaval that has taken place? Are we to conclude that superior wisdom has inhered in the Justices of recent vintage, as compared with those sitting during the first 143 years or so of the Court? Granting that the Constitution is a living, breathing organ which allows for growth and has the vitality to be accommodated to the changing times is one thing; discarding the learning or pretty much of all the learning that has previously prevailed is another thing. I think it may fairly be stated that there is not contempt alone for all that has gone before but an excessive devotion to doctrines imported from extralegal domain that is responsible for this legal revolution. Certainly a proper reverence for the accumulated knowledge and wisdom of the centuries does not comport with what has been taking place on the Court.

When the proper domain of the law is invaded by social theories and hypotheses that have no legitimate claim to recognition, sound legal doctrine suffers thereby and the foundations of a hallowed judicial system begin to totter.

But if we honor the admirable method of the common law and restore it, we could be on our way back to restoring the legal system that has served us so well. This was the Anglo-Saxon legal system described by the judge in John Galsworthy's play, "Justice," as a "majestic edifice, sheltering all of us, each stone of which rests on another."

Let us not substitute sand for stone in our highest legal edifice. Rather, by this single proposal, let us supply the stone of judicial experience.

I emphasize again that this is no attack on the Court as such, nor is it an attempt to discredit any member of the Court. This is a plea for recognition of time-honored and time-tested values of judicial experience and judicial maturity in at least one-half of the nominees to the highest Court of the land.

Further, it is a plea that the U.S. Senate shall forthwith return to its constitutional duty and power of giving advice in the choice of the nominees before they are nominated. This can be done in advance without reference to any individual and without embarrassment to any President. The Senate in the exercise of its constitutional power should announce that at least one of each two successive nominees confirmed by the Senate for Associate Justice of the Supreme Court shall have at least 10 years' prior judicial experience. This would be a salutary start, and other steps could follow.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

DAIRY LEGISLATION HEARINGS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in the past 5 years the Congress has enacted laws modifying our programs on wheat, corn, and other feed grains, and also our cotton and rice programs. But somehow we have failed to modify the milk or dairy legislation which we now have on the statute books, notwithstanding the fact that the dairy program is one of the most costly programs we have.

Mr. President, beginning on next Monday morning, the Committee on

Agriculture and Forestry will hold hearings on proposed dairy legislation. It is my hope that at the conclusion of the hearings, the committee will be able to recommend legislation for improvements in our current dairy programs. I have invited representatives of the various dairy and milk producer organizations to give testimony. I am hopeful they will be able to make some constructive suggestions toward developing a means of adequately supporting the income of milk producers, without the recurrent accumulation of excessive quantities of dairy products by the Government, at a high cost, as has been the case under the present law.

The dairy price-support program has been one of the most costly programs administered by the Department of Agriculture. The realized losses by the Goverment on this program over the past 10 years have exceeded $2.5 billion. Milk is an important commodity, and I realize that these expenditures have represented only about 5 percent of the income received by milk producers; but this is still a very costly program.

Two years ago, major dairy organizations were urging that the price-support level for milk be increased because producers incomes were too low. No one disputed the fact that dairy farm income was low; and in the Congress there was strong bipartisan support for increasing the support level above the $3.22 per hundredweight level which prevailed at that time. The Secretary of Agriculture, in good faith, granted an increase to $3.40 per hundredweight for the 1961–62 marketing year.

Without any means of keeping milk supplies in check, the Commodity Credit Corporation purchases of surplus dairy products began to rise. They rose both as a result of increasing milk production and an inopportune decline in milk consumption. Commodity Credit Corporation purchases of dairy products doubled, and Government expenditure for dairy price support increased from less than $300 million to over $600 million in a year's time. As a result, it was necessary to lower the support level again to the minimum support level permitted by the law; and, even so, it appears that we shall continue to spend in the neighborhood of $500 million a year.

In the last few months, milk production has fallen off slightly from the levels of a year ago; but at this early date we cannot be assured that it is the beginning of any sustained downward trend in production.

With slightly lower beef prices in prospect for the coming year, it is unlikely that there will be any great reduction in cow numbers; and with just an average increase in productivity, milk production will set a new record in the coming year, leaving little possibility that the surplus problem will disappear.

One of the biggest problems in developing new dairy legislation is that we really have separate programs, one for fluid milk and one for manufacturing milk. Neither of these programs is adequate to keep us from getting into surplus problems.

While we usually speak of the dairy problem in terms of the surpluses of manufactured dairy products acquired under the dairy price-support program, the milk-marketing-order program, which started 30 years ago, under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, certainly has been a contributing factor. This program was established in the early 1930's to deal with the serious problems of pricing fluid milk around metropolitan markets.

It is impossible for a fluid milk market to operate without having some amount of milk in excess of what is needed for bottling purposes. Both milk production and milk demand change seasonally, and even from day to day. Because of this, it is necessary to have a reserve of at least 10 to 15 percent, to assure that the market will have an adequate supply of milk for fluid use. When the reserve is not needed, it is diverted to other uses. Before the days of Federal orders, farmers found that the presence of this reserve supply tended to result in lower and lower prices for their fluid milk, because there was no orderly way of keeping the reserve supply separated from the milk used in the higher valued uses. Thus, the price for all milk would tend to drop toward the surplus price. This was an intolerable situation, because milk for fluid use must be of the very highest quality, produced on farms where an exceptional degree of sanitation is maintained, and requiring high capital investments in the best of milk handling and cooling equipment.

To remedy their problems, farmers first resorted to collective bargaining through cooperative associations, attempting to price the milk used for fluid purposes separately from the reserve supplies. But these collective-bargaining arrangements were only partially effective, because a minority of the producers or handlers could disrupt the agreement by taking advantage of those who were bearing the responsibility for handling the reserve supplies. These arrangements broke down almost completely in the early years of the depression of the 1930's.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 authorized licenses and agreements to regulate the handling of milk. This early authority was designed primarily to permit enforcement of the arrangements which had previously been developed by the cooperative. Later, however, this authority was spelled out in greater detail by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, under which our present Federal milk marketing orders are operated.

The main point I want to make is that these Federal orders were established to provide for the orderly marketing of fluid milk, geared to the markets needs. They were not designed to encourage the production of surplus milk. The important thing they were to accomplish was to permit the carrying of the small quantity of reserve supply which is so necessary to the efficient operation of a market, without allowing this reserve supply to set the price for the whole market.

The marketing orders accomplish this by providing, for fluid milk, a minimum price, commensurate with the higher cost of producing milk, which will meet fluid milk quality requirements. They set a separate minimum price for the reserve supplies consistent with the manufacturing uses to which they are put. It was never intended that these pricing arrangements should be used to encourage the marketing of ever-increasing amounts of surplus milk.

As the early program has grown, so has the amount of surplus associated with these markets. Since 1940 the number of markets covered by Federal orders has increased from 17 to 83. The amount of milk regulated under these orders has increased from less than 20 percent to almost 50 percent of all the milk marketed in the United States. Over the same period, the percentage of Federal order milk used for manufacturing purposes has increased from less than 30 percent to almost 40 percent. In some of the larger markets the amount of milk used for manufacturing purposes exceeds the milk used for fluid purposes. For example, in the Chicago market only 39 percent, and in the New York-New Jersey market 49 percent was used in class I in 1962, that is, for direct consumption.

If the milk supplies in the Federal order markets had been held to the original objective of supplying the fluid needs of the markets plus a reasonable reserve, the large dairy surplus would not be as great as it is today. Excess milk in three of our largest milk-marketing orders alone is greater than the amount of milk represented by the surplus products purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation this past year. Of course, I do not mean to imply that these three markets alone are responsible for the large Government purchases, but surely they did contribute much.

One of the bills which will be considered at the hearings next week is a bill I introduced last August and again this session. This bill requires that each Federal milk-marketing order contain provisions under which the Secretary would determine the amount of milk necessary to meet the fluid requirements for the market, including necessary reserves. When a market's supply of milk is in excess of this necessary quantity, each producer will receive an allotment representing his share of the market's necessary fluid and reserve requirements. I want to emphasize that my bill does not in any way change the existing procedures for setting the minimum prices paid for fluid milk and the necessary market reserves. In other words, the intent of my bill is to assure farmers a good price for the milk produced to meet the needs of the market. I repeat, the farmer would get a good price for the milk produced within his allotment. However, the payment he receives for any milk which he markets in excess of his allotment shall be fixed at a level sufficiently below the manufacturing price to discourage his production and marketing of this excess. This might be 50 cents, a dollar, or $2 lower than the manufacturing price, depending on the market. In any event, it must be low enough to discourage the production of surplus milk.

I should like to make it clear that my bill in no way affects the minimum class price paid by the handler, but only affects the manner in which the producer shares in the total amount paid by the handlers. The handler would continue to pay whatever the minimum class price might be, but the producer would receive only the discouraging price for the milk produced in excess of his allotment. The balance of the handler's payment for that milk would go into the pool to enhance the amount paid the producers for their allotment milk. For instance, let us assume that the minimum price for milk used for fluid purposes is now $6 per hundredweight and the minimum price for milk used for manufacturing purposes is $3 per hundredweight, and that about half of the milk is used for each purpose. The producer in such case now receives a blend price of about $4.50 per hundredweight; that is, the average paid by handlers. Under the present law, as the proportion of milk going into manufacturing use increases, this blend price becomes lower and lower. The price goes down whether the farmer tries to keep production within reasonable limits or not.

Under my bill the handler would continue to pay $6 for milk for fluid consumption and $3 for milk for manufacturing use. But the producer would receive a price below $3—for example, $2—for his excess milk. For his allotment milk, he would receive in this example a blend consisting of the average of first, the market's requirements for fluid use multiplied by $6; second, the market's reserve requirement multiplied by $3, and third, the amount of excess milk delivered to the market multiplied by $1—the difference between the amount paid to the producer for excess milk and the amount paid into the pool by the handler. This would take the producer off the treadmill he is now on, where he must continue to increase his production above market requirements in order to maintain his gross income at the same level. As each producer reduced his production toward his allotment, his return per hundredweight would increase. If any producer wanted to increase production without regard to market demand, he would hurt only himself. He would not lower his neighbor's price. In fact, his excess production would tend to increase the price of the producer who was trying to maintain production at a fair level. By giving farmers an incentive to reduce production, the bill would help to bring supplies down to the market requirements.

Apparently these provisions sound severe to some. However, the objective of my bill is exactly what the objective of the act has always been, that is, to provide a good price for milk needed to meet fluid requirements, including the reserves necessary thereto. I believe that producers in Federal-order markets would be better off under this type of program than they are at present. Today they are producing substantial quantities of surplus in excess of what can be justified for operation of the milk markets. These surpluses dilute their returns from the class I market and drag the average price down. I believe a base plan of the type I suggested would be effective in reducing these surpluses, and as it did so, it would reward those dairy farmers who had reduced their production. There is no logic whatsoever in encouraging the production of $3 milk in an area where producers need $5 to $6 to cover the cost of producing milk.

I can see how this approach may appear severe to producers in those markets where surpluses have grown far beyond the level that can be justified as a necessary operating service. Some consideration may have to be given to permitting these markets to adjust at a reasonable rate over a period of time. I hope that this will be fully explored at the hearings and that constructive suggestions for meeting this problem will be forthcoming. I am convinced that we can no longer tolerate the carrying of excessive surpluses in these markets if this program is to survive and do the job for dairy farmers which it was intended to do.

Dairying is the only major segment of American agriculture which has had the benefit of continued price support and market stabilization and yet has not faced the responsibility of keeping its production system in check. It would appear to me that producers and their representatives should assume this responsibility in light of the adverse criticism the program is now receiving. Over the past 2 years I have heard repeated reports of milk markets where the surplus was so great that good wholesome milk had to be dumped. The milk marketing orders are a wonderful instrument through which producers can develop a marketing system tailored to each individual market's unique problems. It would be unfortunate if this system collapsed because producers failed to recognize the need for making changes in their program as problems such as these arise. They have an opportunity at this point to support legislation which would correct these problems and put this system back in good working order.

My bill also provides for discretionary price support for manufacturing milk and butterfat at zero to 90 percent of parity.

Price support for milk, as we know it today, originated with the Agricultural Act of 1949. Before that, from 1938 through 1941, loans had been made to the Dairy Products Marketing Association to buy butter at prices specified by Commodity Credit Corporation. Prices were not to exceed 75 percent of the current parity price. With the advent of wartime shortages of fats and oils, a price support announcement was made on April 3, 1941. This was done to encourage increased production. Subsequent similar announcements were made under the so-called Steagall amendment which expired December 31, 1948. The Agricultural Act of 1948 provided price support for the next year, following which the Agricultural Act of 1949 became effective.

The support level under the Agricultural Act of 1949 is directed to assuring an adequate supply and has been made available through purchases of products. Dairy supports have never been intended to encourage excess production, nor to change in any way the objective of milk pricing under fluid milk marketing orders.

The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act was placed on the statute books in 1937. In effect, this law reenacted the marketing order provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 with certain important amendments. This act forms the basis for the many milk marketing orders now in effect.

The Agricultural Act of 1949 providing for price supports for manufacturing milk and butterfat was enacted in 1949. Since that enactment there have been no major revisions of either law as regards milk.

It is not that the Congress has not been aware of the many shortcomings which have become increasingly evident in these laws as time has passed.

Under these laws, and including the school milk program, the Government has spent a total of $3.5 billion since 1953. About $3 billion was spent directly in supporting the price of milk, while about $500 million was spent for the school milk program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point table 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Proxmire in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Table 1.—*Annual net expenditures for dairy programs, fiscal years 1954–62*

[In millions]

Fiscal year	CCC net expenditures [1]	Military and veterans' milk program [2]	Sec. 32 expenditures [3]	Total (excluding special milk)	Special school milk	Grand total
1953–54	$400.6	----------	$74.0	$474.6	----------	$474.6
1954–55	221.0	$1.0	24.4	246.4	$17.2	263.6
1955–56	218.0	7.3	39.0	264.3	45.8	310.1
1956–57	206.0	16.4	75.6	298.0	60.4	358.4
1957–58	195.4	30.4	123.7	349.5	66.3	415.8
1958–59	99.3	23.0	106.2	228.5	74.2	302.7
1959–60	149.9	23.6	35.1	208.6	80.5	289.1
1960–61	170.4	25.3	82.1	277.8	84.3	362.1
1961–62	529.9	25.9	47.1	602.9	88.5	691.4
Total	2,190.5	152.9	607.2	2,950.6	517.2	3,467.8

[1] CCC purchase and other costs (processing, repackaging, transportation, storage, and handling), less proceeds from sales (including sales to sec. 32).

[2] CCC reimbursements to military agencies, Veterans' Administration, and other participants.

[3] Sec. 32 expenditures for purchases from CCC and direct purchases in the market.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Government has been required to purchase a total of 2.6 billion pounds of butter, 1.7 billion pounds of American cheese, and about 9 billion pounds of dry milk which was produced in excess of market needs. And, notwithstanding the tremendous efforts to dispose of this surplus, as of December 31, 1962, the Department of Agriculture still had about 294 million pounds of butter, 63 million pounds of cheese, and about one-half billion pounds of dry milk.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point table 2.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Table 2.—*Dairy products: U.S. Department of Agriculture price support purchases, foreign and domestic utilization, and uncommitted stocks, cumulative 1949–62*

[In million pounds]

CCC activity	Butter	American cheese	Nonfat dry milk
CCC purchases, net	2,622.6	1,743.8	8,970.0
CCC utilization:			
Domestic	1,665.7	905.7	1,956.6
Foreign sales	152.9	134.4	2,014.3
Transfers and donations	509.7	640.5	4,485.1
Total, foreign	662.6	774.9	6,499.4
Total, utilization	2,328.3	1,680.6	8,456.0
CCC uncommitted stocks, Dec. 31, 1962	294.3	63.2	514.0

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, last year alone the Government spent $602.9 million supporting the price of milk, plus $88.5 million for the school milk program.

As I see it, the Congress must come to grips with this problem. It cannot any longer be ignored because the industry representatives cannot agree on a new program.

In the past, when laws relating to other commodities have developed weaknesses, Congress has seen fit to act. And yet in the case of milk, which is the most costly program of all, there has been no action. This is intolerable. There must be a change. For if there is not, the taxpayers of this country may well demand that the entire program be sacked.

Now, the bill which I have introduced provides a basic framework for the development of a sound, healthy, and prosperous dairy industry, and certainly one that will be less costly to the Government.

I want it clearly understood, and I want to emphasize, that this legislation is not designed to lower the income of dairy farmers. Rather, it is designed to correct the inequities and shortcomings of the present law.

For example, it will in no way—and I repeat—positively in no way will it lower the price received by farmers for the very wholesome milk produced for use in fluid form by the consumers of this country. This milk is produced under the highest and strictest of sanitary requirements at a very high cost to farmers. Producers must receive a good price for this milk. And under my bill they will.

My bill will not in any way curtail the production of milk which is required for fulfilling the needs of the fluid markets. As a matter of fact, it will encourage farmers to gauge their production to fully meet market needs. My aim is only to discourage the production of unneeded milk—milk that is produced in excess of market needs. This excess milk is giving both the farmers and the Government problems. This is the milk that is costing the Government money.

My bill is not designed to penalize those farmers who produce for the manufacturing markets. In my estimation, proper corrections in the market order areas will minimize the problems in the manufacturing milk areas. In addition, proper correction now of deficiencies in the price support program will preserve that program for the manufacturing milk producer. As a result, both parts of the milk industry will benefit and enjoy a prosperous future.

OUR CASTRO FIXATION VERSUS THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, last Friday the distinguished majority leader [Mr. Mansfield], one of the wisest and most thoughtful Members of the Senate, warned against irresponsible discussion of American foreign policy and especially the Cuban question. The Senator from Montana expressed the view that "much of the discussion of Cuba by Members of the Congress is not helping this Nation; it is hurting it. We have indeed had discussions of Cuba," said the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], "but a discussion steeped in politics, panic, and perversion of fact."

Recognizing that the late Republican Senator from Michigan, Arthur Vandenberg, offered the Nation a classic example of constructive bipartisanship during the critical years after World War II, the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield] quoted Senator Vandenberg's warning to the Senate:

> Only in those instances in which the Senate can be sure of a complete command of all the essential information prerequisite to an intelligent decision, should it take the terrific chance of muddying the international waters by some sort of premature and ill-advised expressions of its advice to the Executive.

As a freshman Senator, Mr. President, I have been reluctant to add my voice to the current clamor over Cuba and Castro. I wholeheartedly endorse the majority leader's warning that on this and other foreign policy issues, no Senator should speak his mind until he has though through the consequences of his words.

But keeping in mind the counsel of Senator Vandenberg and the majority leader, I am constrained to speak out against what seems to me to be a dangerous fixation on Castro that is not worthy of this great Nation. I submit that we have become so involved in charges and countercharges about our Cuban policy that we have come close to losing sight of the real interests of the Nation in the hemisphere. We have ignored the biblical warning against straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel.

I have often wondered why the wily Khrushchev would invest so heavily in both capital and personnel in the kind of risky enterprise which Fidel Castro is frantically trying to establish in Cuba. If his purpose was to enhance the influence of Castro and Castroism in the hemisphere, he must be bitterly disappointed with the results, for the Castro-Khrushchev embrace has had the opposite effect. By turning his revolution over to Moscow, Castro has sacrificed much of his appeal to revolutionary leaders and followers in other Latin American States. No thoughtful observer of Latin American affairs has failed to note the decline of Castro's influence in the hemisphere since his marriage to the Kremlin.

But if Mr. Khrushchev's purpose was to create in Castro a gadfly designed to divert the attention of the United States from the real dangers and challenges of Latin America, then he must indeed feel that his investment has paid off handsomely. For each day brings some mighty blast at Castro from a highly placed American politician or commentator.

Meanwhile, the basic dangers to our security in the hemisphere—the economic, political, and social ills of Latin America—continue to fester. The United States has atomic bombs in its security arsenal, but on the side of insecurity we have a smouldering blockbuster on our doorstep to the south which makes Mr. Castro appear like a mouse trying to bring down an elephant.

I refer to the 200 million people of Latin America who occupy a vast land, potentially rich and fruitful but actually beset by misery, sickness, injustice, illiteracy, malnutrition, and misrule. It is a continent cursed by a social system that concentrates enormous wealth in the hands of the few and consigns the many to lives of desperate poverty. But make no mistake about it, powerful social forces are stirring to the south of us. Latin America is in a state of ferment; it is, as one observer put it, "dynamite on our doorstep."

Neither Fidel Castro nor Nikita Khrushchev nor international communism is at the base of this explosive situation. They are the exploiters and the would-be beneficiaries of the tensions and illness which threaten the security of the hemisphere, but they are not the fundamental factors. They are effects rather than causes.

Castro climbed to power over the carcass of a decadent political and social system which he shrewdly exploited, but which he did not create. The appeal of Castroism and communism in other parts of the hemisphere springs from the same corruption and social injustice which paved the way for the collapse of Batista and the triumph of Castro.

The real bombshells of Latin America are fused to the following conditions:

First, 2 percent of the people of the continent own more than half of all its wealth and land while most of the remainder of the people live in hopeless poverty.

Second, 80 percent of the people dwell in miserable shacks or huts.

Third, illiteracy grips well over half the population.

Fourth, more than 50 percent of the people suffer from hunger and disease and most of them will never in their lifetimes see a doctor, nurse, dentist, or pharmacist.

Fifth, most of the peasants live under primitive feudal conditions with no hope for land ownership, reasonable credit, or escape to a better life.

Sixth, several key countries depend on one-crop economies afflicted by depressed commodity prices.

Seventh, most governments are weakened by unjust tax structures, excessive military budgets designed to keep the people under control, bad land ownership and utilization, and indifference to shocking social problems.

Eighth, a population growth rate several times faster than the production of goods and services exists in several Latin American countries.

Two years ago, at the request of the President, I led a food-for-peace mission to Latin America which took us to northeast Brazil. In this benighted section of the largest and most populous nation of Latin America our mission came face to face with the real challenge to the hemisphere. There we saw the wretched life of Brazil's 27 million peasants who are trying to survive in the feudal, drought-stricken sections of the northeast. There we saw the miserable mud huts, the total absence of sanitation facilities, the villages devoid of doctors, teachers, and adequate water and food.

We saw, too, Fidel Castro's counterpart and alter-ego, Francisco Juliao, the flaming peasant leader, urging his wretched followers to seize the land and destroy the suppressors.

I ask the Senate to consider the real problems that confront us in this area. Is it Juliao or Castro? Or is it the unstable, frightful conditions on which they thrive?

It may very well be that in the long view of history, the Castros and the Juliaos for all their mischief and violence, will have indirectly performed some service in that they have forced us to give closer attention to our neighbors to the south. Likewise, they have confronted the ruling classes of Latin America with a stern choice between making long overdue reforms or seeing themselves swept aside in a series of violent Castro-type revolutions. Sometimes the hand of providence moves in strange ways. There can be no mistaking the fact that much of Castro's appeal to the oppressed rests on the knowledge that his presence has forced every government in the hemisphere to take a new and more searching look at the crying needs of the great masses of human beings.

The real issue, it seems to me, turns upon the question of whether or not the people can overturn an unjust social order through a peaceful democratic revolution, or whether they will do it by a violent Communist-led upheaval.

The Alliance for Progress is a mutual effort to raise standards of living through the painstaking, often frustrating, method of democratic reform and constructive economic development.

The Communists call for a quick upheaval that promises a new day through Marxist shortcuts Castro-style.

The Alliance for Progress will test the patience and toughness of all of us who believe in its promise. It does not appeal to the politician who wants a quick headline and a fast answer.

It is far easier to make loud speeches against an irritable, bearded dictator than to face the tough and sometimes painful tasks of making the Alliance for Progress work.

I suggest that we have had too many who are willing to shed the blood of our soldiers in an invasion of Cuba, and not enough courageous and thoughtful men giving their attention to the real problems confronting the Alianza.

We have too many self-styled experts telling the President the inside dope from their private intelligence sources and not enough expert analysis of depressed-commodity prices, rural credit problems, land reform, and population pressures.

We have had too many postmortems over the ill-conceived Bay of Pigs invasion, which might have damaged our standing in the hemisphere more if it had succeeded through American military intervention, than it did as a miserable flop. We had no more legal right to undertake air cover or any other military aggression against Cuba than the Russians would have in invading Turkey. We have offensive nuclear weapons, not 90 miles from Russian territory, but in Turkey on the Soviet border, capable of pulverizing Russian cities in a matter of minutes.

The Cuban invasion, originally conceived in the previous administration, was a tragic mistake both in conception and execution for which President Kennedy has bravely taken the blame. Why compound the error by probing the ruins of a mistaken venture and then calling for a repeat performance?

I applaud President Kennedy's policy of wisdom and restraint since the Bay of Pigs fiasco. He has been firm and courageous in resisting the clamor of the warhawks.

Last October he rejected the counsels of those who called for a naval blockade before we knew the nature of the Russian arms shipments. The President also rejected the strong advice of those who favored an immediate air strike against Cuba. By waiting until he had positive proof of the Soviet-Cuban offensive missile threat before invoking a naval sanction, the President won unanimous support for his action from our Western allies and the countries of Latin America. He forced Khrushchev to back down, but he did it without war. He has since resisted those who have shouted for blood and battle and blockades.

Perhaps this is why for the first time the American people have indicated in a current Gallup poll that they have greater confidence in the capacity of the Democratic administration to preserve peace than they do in the opposition spokesmen. In another recent Gallup poll the American public registered its overwhelming opposition to an invasion of Cuba. The people understand better than some political figures that such an effort misses the real nature of the challenge before us.

The President put it this way:

> I think the big dangers to Latin America—are the very difficult, and in some cases, desperate conditions in the countries themselves—unrelated to Cuba.

He has cited political and economic injustice, poor housing, illiteracy, and inadequate commodity prices as the big dangers to the security and well-being of the hemisphere.

As the President has said these are problems which must be faced and solved in the main by the people of Latin America. But he has also proclaimed our willingness to help.

Hence, the hopeful and inspiring promise of the Alliance for Progress.

Hence, the Peace Corps units which through the dedication and idealism of American youth are bringing new hope and pride to the villages of Latin America.

Hence, an expanded food-for-peace program which among other accomplishments is now providing a nutritious meal daily to 8½ million Latin American schoolchildren and to 5½ million babies and pregnant mothers.

Hence, the U.S. medical teams that are developing in Central America.

Hence, the growing exchange of students and teachers between the universities of North and South America.

These are the tools of hope and life and strength with which America is fighting the truly significant battles of the hemisphere. This is our best answer to communism and Castroism.

It is not yet clear that the ruling groups of Latin America are aroused sufficiently to their responsibilities to make the Alliance succeed on a broad scale. Nor is it clear that we have grasped fully the nature and scope of the leadership demands that are upon us as a great and powerful nation.

I earnestly hope that we will not dissipate our energies in a senseless fixation on Castro. Our mission is to point the way to a better life for the hemisphere and, indeed, for all mankind.

I conclude on this additional note, Mr. President: we dare not let our preoccupation with Mr. Castro and other irritants abroad blind us to our domestic responsibilities. If America is to fulfill its promise both at home and around the globe, we must move ahead on vital domestic fronts. We have a gigantic agricultural plant to be nurtured and stabilized; we are faced with the necessity of creating new job, educational and recreational opportunities for our young people; and older citizens are confronted by rising medical and hospital costs; we need to consider seriously the relationship of our tax and fiscal policies to a sluggish national economy—these and many other mounting challenges call for clear minds and steadfast spirits.

It is no longer possible to separate America's domestic health from our position in world affairs.

Let us then move forward with a courage and prudence commensurate with our traditions and our responsibility as a great nation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I congratulate the Senator from South Dakota on what I believe is his maiden speech. Is it not?

Mr. McGOVERN. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. It seems to me that the Senator from South Dakota has briefly, tersely, and very ably indeed allied himself with the Presidential party in the Senate. I am sure this will be a source of substantial comfort to the White House. I particularly like to commend my friend from South Dakota for his very able analysis of our Cuban policy, which I support as strongly as he does, for his able defense and his statement of hope for the future, for the Alliance for Progress, which I also support, as he does, and for his short and penetrating analysis, at the conclusion of his speech, of the major domestic issues which confront our country.

In the 7 years that I have had the privilege of serving in the Senate I do not believe that I have ever had the pleasure of listening to such an able maiden speech as that delivered by my friend from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his very kind and generous remarks.

Mr. McGOVERN subsequently said:

Mr. President, in relation to my remarks made a few minutes ago about the Alliance for Progress, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record two articles written by Roscoe Drummond which were published recently in the Washington Post. One article relates to the general attitude of the American people toward foreign assistance; the other details some of the advances made by the Alliance for Progress.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Lack of Popular Support Is a Myth

When Congress comes to vote on the foreign aid program, it ought to vote on the basis of fact, not on the basis of fiction.

The greatest fiction of all, to which President Kennedy has unintentially made his own contribution, is that most American people are against it.

The opposite is the truth.

In his year-end TV interview, the President, thinking that he was speaking with ingratiating candor, cited the foreign aid program as crucial despite the "fact" that it is a large burden not popularly supported.

This is not the fact.

The truth is that the foreign aid program is a relatively small burden, one-twentieth of the budget, and is popularly approved.

Here is the evidence:

A study of a whole sequence of findings of the Gallup polls from 1955 to 1963 shows that:

Popular support of the foreign aid program is at a high point for the entire 9-year period.

Today 58 percent of the American people record themselves as approving foreign aid, 30 percent oppose, and 12 percent are neither for nor against it.

There is no great variation between the different sections of the country: in the South 55 percent approve; East, 60 percent; Midwest, 58 percent; Far West, 59 percent.

Public backing of foreign aid is 7 percent higher than it was in 1958, 2 percent higher than in 1955.

In recent years, despite the appropriation of about $4 billion annually, popular support has not, as widely believed, been declining; voter approval has been going up and voter opposition has been going down.

Most of those who question foreign aid think that the appropriation is much higher than it is.

This, I think, gives a far different picture of American public opinion than the widespread myth that foreign aid is unpopular, even resented, by the great majority of the people.

The nearest thing to a national referendum is this 9-year sequence of Gallup polls. It shows that Mr. Kennedy has been making a mistake by talking about the unpopularity of the program. He should be talking about its popularity.

An examination of the exhaustive backup statistics and individual responses which lie behind the public reports of the Gallup findings justify these factual conclusions:

The principle of foreign aid is more strongly supported today than in 1958, and at least as strongly as any time since 1955.

The percentage of people opposed to the principle of foreign aid has shown a drop of 3 percentage points since 1958; the number of people with no opinion has dropped 4 percent. This suggests that the principle of foreign aid continues to draw supporters rather than opponents.

Public support for foreign aid is highest among those who know more of the facts about the program. More than 40 percent of the people polled think the foreign aid appropriations represent 10 percent of the national budget instead of 5 percent. More than 80 percent did not know the approximate amount appropriated.

The humanitarian aspects of foreign aid have the greatest appeal to the American people. More than 65 percent of the pro-foreign aid comments of those polled gave the humanitarian reason as the basis of their support.

On the other hand more than 40 percent of those who were critical of the program were not opposed in principle—just felt it was not well administered.

Congress certainly ought to take a hard look on a country-by-country basis to determine for itself how well the program is being administered, and wherein foreign aid is being well or where badly utilized. I am not defending any particular level of appropriation. I am simply reporting that in approving the continuance of foreign aid Congress would be reflecting the judgment of the great majority of the American people.

Latin Reds Are Disheartened

Latin American Communists are becoming downright disillusioned—and disheartened—by the Alliance for Progress. It isn't failing adequately. For them it is succeeding too well.

While some of its supporters in the United States, who expected it to perform miracles overnight, are disappointed that the Alliance hasn't gotten off the ground faster, its Communist opponents are finding to their dismay that it has gotten off the ground too well for their comfort.

I am not suggesting that the first year's work of the 10-year Alliance for Progress has alone thrown the Communists on the defensive. It has helped, visibly helped. The Communists are most on the defensive where the Alliance has been most active. Here is some of the evidence:

In most of the Latin-American countries, notably in Venezuela and the Dominican Republic, the Communists are abandoning nearly all effort at peaceful persuasion and turning to violence and subversion as the only means of attaining their ends. They can't win converts from people who see even modest progress in the present, hope in the future.

The Latin American Communists are continuing to lose their influence in the labor movement where they thought their prospects were best. Today the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions in South America embraces 8 million workers; the Red-dominated labor organization, not over one million.

Through Alliance aid 37 U.S. universities are now working with 57 Latin institutions in 18 countries to improve education. There is already evidence of a trend away from longtime Communist control of the universities in Central America.

All the ravages of a long-outdated economic system cannot be repaired in 12 months or 12 years, but the evidence is now sufficient to report that the Alliance is making a sturdy and steady beginning—and can succeed.

Here are some of the things that are right with the Alliance for Progress and show that, after an understandably slow beginning, more can be expected:

Fourteen Latin-American countries have either passed new and tighter tax legislation or improved their tax collections; in seven of these countries the reforms are on a major scale.

The Alliance is pursuing a rational and constructive course on agrarian reform. It is not promoting a casual, ineffective program of just cutting up large estates. It is promoting a modernizing of agriculture. Venezuela has succeeded in resetting nearly 60,000 farm families. Since last spring hundreds of families in the Dominican Republic have been resettled. In Chile, Colombia, Bolivia and elsewhere, similar programs are getting under way.

The Alliance is enlisting new financing for Latin America from Western Europe and from Japan and is carrying forward a positive campaign to attract more and essential investments by U.S. private business with guarantees against the risk of expropriation, inconvertibility and war.

I am not relying merely on Government figures to justify the report that the Alliance for Progress is beginning to make itself felt, is starting to pay dividends. The latest report on "Latin-American Business" from the Chase Manhattan Bank cites economic progress in Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru and Venezuela as improving and encouraging. No wishful thinking from that source.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Latin American Communists would breathe a sign of relief if we would give it up.

RATIFICATION OF ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to announce that two additional States have ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment which is presently being considered by the legislatures of the respective States of the Union. The two new States are Washington and Vermont, bringing to 22 the total number of States which have ratified the amendment.

I was informed late yesterday by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], that the House of the Washington Legislature on February 26, 1963, approved the amendment unanimously by a vote of 95 to 0, and that the Senate on yesterday, March 14, also approved the amendment unanimously by a vote of 44 to 0. I salute both of my friends from Washington, Senators Magnuson and his distinguished colleague, Senator Jackson, each of whom not only cosponsored my resolution in the 87th Congress which proposed submission of the amendment to the States but vigorously supported its approval by the Senate and then followed through aggressively to obtain its ratification by the legislature of their State.

Mr. President, it is most interesting to note for the record that when Senator Magnuson was a Member of the House of Representatives in the State of Washington in 1933, just 30 years ago, he introduced and vigorously supported a memorial in the Washington Legislature aimed at removing the poll tax as a requirement for voting, in an effort to start a movement whereby those States which had the poll tax requirement would eliminate it.

I believe that at the time there were 11 States in which a poll tax or other tax was a requirement for voting in Federal elections. I warmly congratulate Senator Magnuson for his long-time interest and effective leadership in this field.

The House of the Vermont Legislature only this morning ratified the amendment on final reading of the enabling resolution which it passed yesterday by a vote of 157 to 63, the Vermont Senate having previously ratified the amendment on February 6 by a unanimous voice vote.

I am greatly indebted to my good friend, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], for this encouraging information and to both Senator Aiken and his distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty], each of whom have shown their dedicated interest in this movement toward eliminating the poll tax or any other tax as a requirement for voting in Federal elections by their support and cosponsorship in the Senate last year and by their aggressive and constructive work this year with the Vermont Legislature.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to explain the Vermont situation in a little more detail. The Senate of the Vermont Legislature unanimously approved this constitutional amendment many weeks ago—I believe on February 6. It was then referred to the house. There was some opposition in the house from an organization which does not believe in this constitutional amendment. It was successful in postponing action on it.

Yesterday there was a vote in the Vermont House with the result which has just been stated by the senior Senator from Florida, 157 to 63. That vote, however, permitted the amendment to be brought before the House for a third reading today. It is my understanding that the amendment passed the Vermont House without opposition this morning; that there was no vote recorded against it, although I expect there were a few members who were still against it. Nevertheless, they were completely ineffective.

I wish to say something more. The senior Senator from Florida has referred to the work of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], which started more than 30 years ago. It is my understanding that 26 years ago, in 1937, when the senior Senator was a member of his State's senate, he started to work toward the same objective in the Florida Legislature. I think that now, when his objective seems fair to be accomplished, we ought really to respect the long years of effort which have been devoted by the senior Senator from Florida to making it possible for all people to vote for President, Vice President, and Federal officials without making the payment of a poll tax a condition for their voting.

The senior Senator from Florida has performed an outstanding service, even if it is taking well over 25 years to accomplish it, and his goal is now in sight. I know the satisfaction he must feel that what he foresaw years ago as a necessary change in the Constitution is now on the way to accomplishment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the more than kind statement made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I am not ready, as we say in the South, to throw up my hat yet, because we still have 16 more States to go. But we are hoping for ratification by those additional 16 States at a relatively early date. We are working toward that end, just as the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] and his distinguished colleague [Mr. Prouty] have worked so effectively in securing the action of the Vermont Legislature, which was completed just this morning.

I do not believe we would have had success with the Vermont Legislature had it not been for the determination, persistence, and continued efforts of the distinguished Senators from Vermont. I salute them upon their success.

Mr. AIKEN. My only regret is that Vermont was not the third State. It could not possibly have been the first or second, because the Vermont Legislature was not in session at that time. I regret that Vermont had to be the 21st or 22d, instead of the 3d State, which it could have been had the Vermont House not been delayed in reaching a final vote on the question. However, I am much gratified to report that the amendment passed the Vermont House on third reading this morning without opposition, as I understand.

Mr. HOLLAND. In completing my statement, I am not surprised to find that there are determined and persistent people in Vermont. We have seen evidence of the fact that Vermont produces that breed of sons. I am glad that by their continued effort the two Senators from Vermont have been able to persuade some of their fellow citizens in Vermont to a better solution and conclusion than seemed to have been possible just a few days ago.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I wish to state my concurrence in the views expressed by the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] about my distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. Holland], who is the author of the constitutional amendment. Had it not been for his tenacity, determination, and strong belief that this was a forward and progressive step, even among the Southern States, as well as throughout the United States, toward giving the people greater voting privileges, the objective would not be so near accomplishment.

As my colleague has said, he is not yet prepared to throw up his hat. There is still some ground to be covered. However, I am satisfied that he and others who believe with him in this endeavor will see to it that it is accomplished, and that finally we shall have in Florida the proud realization that one of our most distinguished sons is the author of a constitutional amendment. There are only 22 constitutional amendments now. I do not know exactly in what States they originated. But I believe that very few States have the honor of having had represent them those who were in point of fact the authors of such a useful, beneficial constitutional amendment as I know the one which has been introduced by my colleague from Florida will be.

I join with the able Senator from Vermont in his expression of commendation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am most grateful to my colleague from Florida for his kind words.

Since he came to the Senate, which I believe was in January 1951, he has been a cosponsor and coauthor of this amendment since almost the first day, in every session of the Senate, and in every Congress since that time. If there be any credit eventually, he is entitled to a full share of it.

WASHINGTON POST SERIES DESCRIBES INDIAN PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on Monday of this week I called the attention of the Senate to the first two installments of an excellent series of articles by Mr. Aubrey A. Graves currenly appearing in the Washington Post. Mr. Graves has given us a superb account of some of the basic problems, achievements, and prospects of the Oglala Sioux Indians of South Dakota.

These articles in effect are a description of the Indian problem as a whole. I strongly urge the Members of Congress and others interested in this most important field to read Mr. Graves' articles thoughtfully.

I ask unanimous consent that the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth installments of these articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 12, 1963]

NEW DAY ON THE RESERVATION, III—OGLALA SIOUX FIGHT POVERTY AND DISEASE

(By Aubrey Graves)

Now that the emphasis has shifted from resettlement to reservation improvement, are Indians still so miserably housed that they have been dying from the extreme cold of this bitter winter?

In a nation burdened with food surpluses, can it be that American Indians are starving to death, or even going hungry?

The answers to these two questions were among the objectives of my recent 4-day visit to the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in southwestern South Dakota. Here live the Oglala Sioux, one of the largest and most poverty-stricken Indian communities in the Nation.

To the first question, the answer is yes. As for the second, some Indians are going hungry at times but it is not due to lack of a food distribution program.

Because of exposure, improper diet, and unsanitary conditions, the infant mortality at Pine Ridge is shockingly high—44 deaths per 1,000 live births. This compares with a mortality rate of 26 among non-Indian babies throughout the Nation. But even this high rate is an improvement over that for 1954, when 66 out of every 1,000 Indian infants died before reaching the age of 1.

The average age of Indians at death is 42; the country's non-Indians live to an average age of 62.

The incidence of tuberculosis among Indians, though still high (285 per 100,000 population in 1961) has dropped from 600 per 100,000 in 1954. Ten years ago tuberculosis was the chief cause of Indian deaths. Today it ranks ninth.

Here the comparison with the disease's incidence among all other races in the Nation is striking. For them the figure was 62 in 1954; it is only 37 today.

At Pine Ridge during 1961, the principal causes of death were influenza and pneumonia. Heart diseases were second. In third place were accidents—many resulting from operation of unsafe automobiles and driving while under the influence of alcohol.

Cancer was killer No. 4.

Next come dysentery and diarrhea, which are directly attributable to the lack of sanitation. The Indians at Pine Ridge (except for those moving into 51 new public housing units) have no water systems; water is hauled from wells in cans and buckets and, because of the hardships of carrying it, often from considerable distances, water is not used freely. Human wastes are disposed of, for the greater part, in primitive privies or directly onto the ground.

Trachoma (an infection of the eye which can cause blindness) is common. Measles and whooping cough are prominent killers.

Projects are under way to improve conditions in the village of Pine Ridge. Under the Sanitary Facilities Act, Public Law 8–6121, $295,000 has been made available for a water supply system and $240,000 for a sewage disposal project, both designed to accommodate 440 homes.

Individual running-water-and-sink-units, from well to kitchen, are being planned for four reservation communities: Kyle, Manderson, Allen, and Wakpamni Lake. At Calico a $18,500 project, nearing completion, will provide about a dozen families with a central water supply.

At the Pine Ridge Hospital, the U.S. Public Health Service staff consists of 8 physicians, 19 registered nurses, 13 practical nurses and a ward clerk. Working in field clinics are four PHS nurses, two practical nurses, three dentists, and one nutritionist.

"Pneumonia is our greatest difficulty," said Dr. James Morphis, a young North Carolinian who has been the resident pediatrician for 6 years. The hospital has a capacity of 48 beds but more than 70 filled beds were jammed in rooms and corridors the day I was there.

"And there's lots of ear trouble," Dr. Morphis continued. "Babies are brought in with visibly infected ears. Mothers seem to regard this as a normal condition. It is hard to make them understand that such neglect can lead to deafness, meningitis, and other diseases—and sometimes death.

"Children are brought in with arms and legs full of running sores."

He reported a great incidence of rickets: "The Indian mothers breast feed their babies until they are 3, in the mistaken belief they cannot get pregnant as long as their babies are nursing. Then, at 3, the babies are put on bottles until they are 4 or 5 years old. Milk is not a complete diet; a great many children become anemic."

Because of the enormous scope of their job, trying to protect the health of 8,303 human beings, the doctors and nurses often feel frustrated.

"But there are also rewards," Dr. Morphis said. "A little peanut will come in here, undernourished, full of sores and shriveled up. In a couple of weeks we have him fattened up and his mother takes him home."

The discouraging thing is that in many, many instances, "in a few more weeks the child is back here again."

Sometimes, because of lack of transportation or gumbolike roads, mothers cannot get their babies to the hospital for several days after they become acutely ill. At other times sheer neglect is to blame. "They'll leave their kids in the rattletrap autos outside a bar in cold weather. And they will go away from home, leaving 6-year-old babysitters in charge."

Unwed mothers present a disheartening, continuing problem. "For an unmarried woman to have four or five children by as many fathers is not unusual," Dr. Morphis said. "In cases where the mothers show both desire and ability to take care of their babies, they are left with them." Otherwise, they are placed in foster homes both on and off the reservation.

Six babies of unwed mothers were at the hospital, up for adoption, the day I was there.

"We have just about run out of foster homes," said Dr. Morphis.

Under a project conducted by the child welfare league, some children are sent to two adoption agencies in New York City and one in Delaware.

On the subject of food, Indian Commissioner Philleo Nash recently said: "If any American Indians are starving, it is because someone isn't doing his job."

The Oglala Sioux Tribe operates a surplus commodity program in cooperation with the South Dakota Department of Public Instruction.

During my visit, I saw surplus foods (real butter, dry milk, lard, cheese, rice, beans, flour, cornmeal, peanut butter, rolled oats, and chopped meat) being doled out on a ration basis that seemed liberal. In fiscal 1962 the wholesale value of such commodities distributed on Pine Ridge was $327,567.

But there are two difficulties.

The food is made available once a month, and some families tend to gorge for the first 2 or 3 weeks—going hungry for 10 days or so as a result.

The second cause of whatever hunger exists is the fact that surplus food is not always eaten by the recipients.

Bartering food is strictly forbidden, under pain of being cut off the dole list. Nevertheless, surplus food does find its way to off-reservation bars where a 3-pound head of the finest cheese may go for a six-pack of beer or a bottle of cheap wine.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 13, 1963]

NEW DAY ON THE RESERVATION, IV—LIQUOR IS BIG PROBLEM OF SIOUX, HARD-DRINKING HUNTERS OF OLD

(By Aubrey Graves)

The repeal by Congress in 1953 of the law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors to Indians anywhere under any circumstances created new problems on the great majority of reservations.

A notable exception was the Pueblos of New Mexico, who were mostly farmers. After the white man came in, there was not a breakdown in their culture comparable with that suffered by most of the tribes.

The Pueblos kept right on farming. Today, excessive drinking among them is not the problem it is on, say, the Oglala Sioux Reservation in South Dakota.

In the old way of life, the Sioux women performed the labor; the males provided the meat and fought. When the buffalo herds were killed off, their role of hunter also ended. The warriors no longer had a part to play in the economy of the tribe.

IDLENESS ENCOURAGED

For more than a generation after the Sioux wars of the 1870's, the Federal Government encouraged idleness and dependence through a ration system. At regular intervals, heads of families received handouts of food and clothing. The ration system was sharply reduced after 1910 and it had closed down entirely by 1930.

Seeking an escape from depressing realities, the more desperate Sioux (and their brothers on most other reservations) turned to the bottle. As one observer put it: "When a Sioux drinks, he drinks hard."

After 1953, the sale of liquor to an Indian off the reservation in a wet State was no longer illegal. On the reservations, the various Indian tribes had the option of keeping absolute prohibition or letting liquor in, but in such a way as not to violate State laws. In other words, liquor could not be sold to Indians on a reservation in a dry State.

In 1954, the Oglala Sioux men and women of voting age voted in the ratio of 11 to 7 to retain prohibition within the boundaries of their reservation although in adjoining areas of South Dakota and Nebraska intoxicating beverages were and are legally sold.

CONSPICUOUS MINORITY

Any faithful account of conditions on the Oglala Sioux Reservation must make it clear that alcoholism is a serious problem there. The offenders, to be sure, are a minority—but a conspicuous one.

Sit through a morning in the tribal court presided over by Chief Judge John Richard and you find that 95 percent of all the cases he and his associate judges hear stem from liquor, with drunk driving the chief offense.

Those convicted are fined $50 and jailed for 30 days. "And it doesn't do them a damn bit of good," declared Richard, himself half Indian and an influential member of the tribe. "Turn them loose and within a week they're right back in here."

Church membership is high at Pine Ridge. Of the members, about half are Roman Catholics (the Black Robes, as he called the early missionaries, were invited to establish a mission by Chief Red Cloud in 1888). The others who are affiliated with churches are Episcopalians, Presbyterians and Seventh-Day Adventists, in that order.

Many Indians are teetotalers; a notable example being Dick Whirlwind Horse, the tribal president. His predecessor, Johnson Holy Rock, also was an abstainer. Generally, the tribal members, whether they themselves drink or not, insist on electing to high tribal office only men known for their sobriety.

The churches teach moderation and a small alcoholics chapter is at work on the reservation. Despite their conscientious efforts, however, there is much drunkenness.

Bring up the subject, as I did, with welfare workers, ministers, Bureau of Indian Affairs personnel, doctors and tribal leaders and all acknowledge the magnitude of the problem and discuss it freely.

Over and over you hear that the Indian gets drunk because he is unbearably frustrated, pitifully poor, miserably housed, jobless, bored stiff and simply not equipped to deal with conditions of life he must face.

Despite prohibition in the village of Pine Ridge, one does not have to be exceptionally resourceful to find a bootlegger nearby.

OASIS 2 MILES AWAY

On 2 miles south of the reservation, across the Nebraska line, is the community of White Clay, where bars—and sometimes lawlessness—flourish. The prudent stranger does not linger around this sordid oasis after dark.

Here whisky-craving Indians come in their $50 jalopies (some without brakes, mirrrors, lights or horns) and get tanked up. Some, I was told by a tribesman, tend to revert to savagery when very drunk.

In the bars at White Clay the Indian is served drinks as long as his ability to pay or barter holds out. Nebraska police, according to reservation residents, do not go into the bars and intercede to keep a South Dakota Indian from drinking too much.

But usually, 'tis said, they are not far away when the unfortunate staggers, or is thrown, out. He is tossed into jail, held there until his $50 fine is paid and then released—unless his friends manage to hustle him back onto the reservation ahead of the gendarmes.

TWO THOUSAND MILES OF HIGHWAYS

Once on the reservation, his risk of arrest decreases. Here there are 2,000 miles of highways many of them all but impassable at times, and only 14 officers (7 tribal officers and 7 furnished by the BIA) to patrol them.

There is growing sentiment at Pine Ridge for legalizing, and taxing, liquor sales in tribally controlled stores—as a means of keeping the inherent problems (including the Indian money Nebraska collects in fines) on the reservation where they could be "better controlled."

Among leaders who hold this view is Father John Bryde, principal of the Holy Rosary Mission, where 546 Indian children live and study for 9 months a year.

"Legalized, controlled whisky sales would be better," insists Father Bryde, "than having drunk-driving hazards strung out, as they now are, over many miles of public highways."

"The Indian," the priest continued, "has no tradition of social drinking. He doesn't take a couple of martinis before dinner and leave it at that. He drinks until the bottle is empty. Provided with an opportunity to drink at home, perhaps after the novelty of it had worn off, he would learn to control his drinking."

Father Bryde also stressed the financial advantages: "The Indians would get their liquor for about one-fourth the price they now pay and it would be better to have the $50 fines remain on the reservation where they could help build homes for orphans and the aged, rather than benefit the coffers of Nebraska."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 14, 1963]

NEW DAY ON THE RESERVATION, V—INDIANS BLAME ALLOTMENT ACT FOR THEIR ECONOMIC WOES

(By Aubrey Graves)

For their sorry economic plight today, Indian tribes of the Midwest and Northwest blame the General Allotment Act of 1887. Under it, surplus tribal lands were allotted to individual Indians and held in trust for them by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Individual Indians, beginning in 1902, had the right to sell their holdings if the original allottee had died and if the Interior Secretary approved the sale as being in the Indian's best interest. Later, only the Secretary's approval was needed.

If the Secretary disapproved, the Indian still had the right to petition Congress and, as a result, many private bills were passed conveying to specific Indians the right to dispose of their lands.

The net result has been to enable white cattlemen and farmers to acquire ownership of a substantial, if not a major, portion of the land on many reservations.

The case of the Oglala Sioux Indian Reservation at Pine Ridge, S. Dak., is illustrative. Today 45 percent of its area is held by white owners and more than 75 percent of all the land of the original reservation is either owned, or being used, by non-Indians.

Originally, the Oglala Sioux Reservation contained 2,721,597 acres; it has been whittled to 1,525,835, much of which is leased to non-Indians.

Particularly in the Southwest, notably New Mexico and Arizona, there was strong tribal resistance to individual allotments, and there the reservations as originally established have remained in tribal control.

But on reservations where allotments were made, substantial land losses occurred in successive waves. One came around 1910 when, in the case of the Oglala Sioux, most of the good farmland, on the eastern end of the reservation, was sold off to white settlers.

There were more losses in the 1920's. These came to a halt in 1934 after passage by Congress of the Indian Reorganization Act "to conserve and develop Indian lands and resources." Interior Secretary Harold Ickes flatly refused to sanction further transfers to non-Indians. Because of successful pressure by grass-hungry Western stockmen, and Indians who wanted to sell, land sales were resumed in 1948.

After many tracts of choice grazing land had passed out of Indian ownership, sales to non-Indians came to a halt in the late 1950's with the gradual abandonment of termination policies.

Since 1959 the Federal Government has assisted the tribes financially to enable them to purchase key tracts of land when individual Indians put them up for sale.

Under the present program, purchases are made by the tribe with money available from the Indian Revolving Loan Fund. This tribal enterprise operates at a profit and over a period of years the Federal loans will be repaid. Meantime, the lands are being used for the economic development of the Indian community.

Ninety percent of the money Indians received for the land they sold to white men was quickly spent—without lasting benefit to the Indians who sold it. Some who have disposed of all their land now exist precariously, largely as recipients of welfare programs.

During the years when resettlement of Indians off the reservation was the big idea, there was no consistent, continuing program to help the Indians use their lands.

Again, the experience of the Oglala Sioux is typical. A recent BIA survey shows that, of their 1,900 family units, only 126 graze their own cattle on their own acreage or on land leased from other Indians.

Another 450 families lease range and farm land, mostly to non-Indians who pay them $15.50 to $20.50 per head per year.

Income from unit leases for 1962 distributed by BIA as of last December amounted to $873,608 ($579,909 from grazing fees, $287,538 from farm land rentals and $6,161 from hay permits). This averages out to $1,941 for the year for each of the land-leasing families.

On permanent, year-round relief are 246 family groups. Some Indians are on BIA's payroll or work in the village of Pine Ridge. The remainder, except for the 224 heads of families who tie fishhooks for Wright & McGill, live mostly by part-time, seasonal work off the reservation, supplemented by relief payments during idle months.

The Oglala Sioux had no experience as cattlemen or farmers. Actually, it would have been impossible for a family to make a living off its holdings. Allotments were 160 acres. From 24 to 26 acres of South Dakota grazing land are required to support 1 cow. The natural thing was to lease the holdings to white cattlemen who were big operators.

No allotments were made after 1934.

Today the Oglala Sioux Tribe holds 362,144 acres; allotments in trust to 4,573 Indians amount to 1,163,691 acres. Of the allotments, about three-fourths are in heirship (multiple ownership).

Responding to an invitation extended by President Kennedy during his campaign for election, the Oglala Sioux presented BIA with a proposed land reform program. Its gist was that their remaining land base must be retained and developed in Indian ownership, "so that the Oglala Sioux people will always have a home."

Formation of a Domestic Peace Corps would be provided for in legislation now before Congress. Already, the tribe has invited the Corps to send volunteers to Pine Ridge to instruct Indians in, among other things, land use and management, including irrigation farming. Pine Ridge has been given first priority.

The corpsmen will also assist in developing self-help housing, day care centers for children and recreation programs. The tribal council envisions the extended presence of corpsmen as embodying the person-to-person service pattern so long sought by concerned Indian leaders.

The tribe, working with the Realty Branch of BIA, is already embarked upon a program to consolidate various undivided inherited interests of Indians into contiguous tracts.

The method is to trade scattered and fragmentary heirship holdings to the tribe in exchange for a single usable entity of equal size or value that can be managed according to needs and desires of a single individual, rather than the often conflicting interests of many heirs.

There are only 577 tracts in which there are more than 15 heirs. There are only an additional 900 tracts in which there are more than 5 heirs.

Clearing these tracts of heirship status and exchanging them for consolidated tracts has the virtue of requiring no exchange of money. And it would greatly reduce the BIA's administrative workload in managing allotments.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 15, 1963]

NEW DAY ON THE RESERVATION, VI—1962 LAW SPARKS SIOUX ADVANCE

(By Aubrey Graves)

A special law sponsored by Senator LEE METCALF, Democrat of Montana, and passed by Congress last year, amended the Accelerated Public Works Act so as to make American Indians eligible for Federal help in developing their homelands, on the same basis as any other American community.

This legislation reflects the conviction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Congress that earlier resettlement policies had failed. Today the accent is on improving living conditions on the reservations and providing vocational education, both on and off the tribal preserves, to fit Indians for jobs wherever they may be found.

The first South Dakota community, Indian or non-Indian, to apply for help under the act was the Oglala Sioux. They came up with plans for a $200,000 municipal center in the village of Pine Ridge, for smaller community buildings in five outlying areas, each to cost about $35,000 and for a $45,000 youth camp.

The Pine Ridge building would include a tribal council meeting room, a bowling alley, a gymnasium suitable for basketball games and dances, and a kitchen to be used by homemakers' clubs.

NEW PLAYGROUND

Tribe plans also call for enlisting the aid of the Domestic Peace Corps in setting up a complete recreational program for adolescents and young adults now sadly lacking, based on the municipal centers.

An Oglala Sioux project, already authorized, is the $300,000 Felix S. Cohen Memorial Home for the Aged, named after the attorney who formerly represented the tribe in Washington.

It will have 21 rooms accommodating 42 persons. (No Sioux voluntarily lives alone.) Funds have been obtained through the Public Housing Administration. Old-age pensions received by occupants will pay for their room and board, with margins left for other necessities.

All these plans grew out of a self-appraisal that tribal officials conducted about 5 years ago. They found that of the 1,900 or so families on Pine Ridge, which is typical of other reservations, not more than one-third were economically and socially well adjusted.

The remaining two-thirds constituted a chronic problem of poverty, disease, and social maladjustment reflected in broken homes, alcoholism, and a disturbing crime rate.

ASSISTANCE FROM BUREAU

Assistance and improvement programs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, other than welfare grants, covered principally (1) education, (2) business loans, particularly to put tribal members in the cattle business, and (3) relocation.

Valuable as far as they went, these helped only the fairly well adjusted people. They made little dent on the two-thirds who were poorly adjusted. These were the people who dropped out of school and those who did complete school but were unable to find anything useful to do with their education.

These were also the people who failed if they were set up in the cattle business and those who failed in relocation.

The one-third group was being helped to move closer to complete adjustment to the general American culture. But the two-thirds were falling further behind.

Social rules of the older Indian culture, they found, were discarded as the younger generation rejected its parents. But nothing took their place. The Indian youths were rootless and aimless.

PILOT PROGRAM PROPOSED

The tribe drew up plans for reservation improvement and moved to put them into effect. The Oglala Sioux proposed that a pilot program be initiated on their reservation, designed to create a healthier climate for human development by providing a better economic foundation.

Leslie Towle, BIA superintendent at Pine Ridge, was, and is, uniformly well liked, trusted, and respected. The tribal council unanimously adopted a resolution of appreciation of his work. His presence, it argued, made the situation at Pine Ridge ideal for a cooperative venture by the tribe and the Bureau.

The program moved forward. Although some skeptics argued that industries would not locate on the reservation, Wright & McGill fishhook plants did move in and are operating at a profit.

Plans for further economic development are on the drawing board. The tribe is particularly interested in developing recreational opportunities on the reservation and attracting tourists.

TRIBE WANTS MOTEL

The Black Hills interest many tourists. Some would like to stay on the Pine Ridge Reservation, it was felt, if adequate facilities were available for them. So the tribe wants to build a motel and furnish Indian guides to take visitors on horseback through the Badlands, which lie within the reservation.

In Pine Ridge village it proposes to create additional job opportunities. In the works are plans for a motel there, also a supermarket, a barber and beauty shop, a bakery, laundry, and restaurant. Virtually all reservation shopping is now done in Nebraska towns, at great inconvenience and travel costs.

SECRETARY McNAMARA DESERVES SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S BACKERS IN SENATE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this morning's newspapers carry an attack by the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] on the action of the Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, in connection with the award of a contract for the so-called TFX all-purpose warplane to General Dynamics Corp.

I support the Secretary of Defense. In my opinion, the chief of any Government agency is entitled to a presumption that he acts in the public interest. The supporters of President Kennedy—and I count myself one—should be slow, indeed, to condemn Secretary of Defense McNamara for the decision he made in the TFX case. This is particularly true in the light of the vast experience of the Secretary in the field of procurement, both when he was a top executive of the Ford Motor Co. and since he has become Secretary of Defense.

I suggest that civilian control over the military is at stake in the TFX case. Our law and our practices require that the Secretary of Defense, not Air Force, or Navy officers, is entitled, in our democracy, to make the final decision in a case like the present one.

We should be constantly on guard against the efforts of the military-industrial complex in this country to force on us their views as to defense expenditures.

In my judgment, President Eisenhower was clearly right when he warned the country against the danger of domination by this powerful establishment. Mr. President, all the establishments in the world are not in the U.S. Senate; there are some outside it.

All of us are aware of service divisiveness. For years the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force have tended to go their separate ways. Now the Secretary of Defense makes a decision which, in his opinion, will give us one all-purpose tactical warplane for the Navy and the Air Force, in the least time, at the least risk, and with the least cost. I, for one, will be slow, indeed, to disagree with him. From where I sit, it looks as though the Secretary is right.

Surely, he was correct in his instructions to his subordinates that the proposed plane should first, satisfy both the Navy and the Air Force that they would get a significantly improved warplane; second, provide minimum divergence from a one-plane concept; and, third, provide realistic cost estimates.

Secretary McNamara tells us that his decision will save the taxpayers $1 billion.

Even in a day when we are spending $1 billion a day for our defense program, this is a not insignificant sum. Secretary McNamara chose General Dynamics Corp. over the Boeing Co., because the latter company's proposal "simply did not meet the fundamental requirement of minum divergence from a common design" and, in the long run, would cost the taxpayers more money.

Mr. President, I hope the Presidential party in the Senate will rally behind the President's Secretary of Defense.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a very able news article, published yesterday in the Washington Post, under the byline of John G. Norris, outlining Secretary McNamara's stand before the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 14, 1963]

TFX AWARD BEST, McNAMARA SAYS—DEFENDS CHOICE OF GENERAL DYNAMICS

(By John G. Norris)

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara said yesterday that he had chosen General Dynamics Corp. to develop the all-purpose TFX warplane because he felt it could do the job in the least time, at the least risk and at the least cost.

He told Congress in a detailed statement that a purportedly lower bid by the rival Boeing Co. was based on unreliable cost estimates and, in effect, contemplated building two separate airplanes for the Air Force and Navy.

CITES $1 BILLION SAVING

McNamara made it very clear that throughout the long competition he had insisted on the Air Force and Navy developing one tactical fighter—suitable for land and carrier use with minimum changes—because it should save the Nation $1 billion.

Selection of the Boeing proposal, he said, would have evaporated the prospects of such a saving.

The Defense Secretary sent his lengthy chronicle of the TFX program to the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee to be read by an aide. He had protested that the American people were getting a wrong and harmful impression of the matter and of Pentagon chiefs by the piecemeal evidence produced before the subcommittee.

DISCREPANCIES SEEN

Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the group, issued a

statement at the same time, declaring that there were discrepancies between McNamara's statement and other facts before the subcommittee, including an earlier Pentagon memorandum submitted for the record.

"Testimony of Defense Department witnesses," declared McCLELLAN, "shows that the Government evaluated Boeing's design as superior in operational capacity in that it had a 1,100-mile greater ferry range, more than 50 percent greater weapon-carrying capability, and the ability to land at low speeds on carrier flight decks and short airstrips."

McCLELLAN said McNamara will be called later for cross-examination on this, or evidence that the Boeing cost estimates were lower, and on some errors brought out about the cost estimates that the Secretary did not discuss.

At the same time, the Senate group released some earlier testimony given in a closed session by George Spangenberg, a Navy aircraft evaluation expert, who said that McNamara had dictated what the requirements for the TFX should be. He said the Navy feels the final TFX design is satisfactory, but declared that separate airplanes would be better for both services.

"We do not think that they fully meet the operational requirements initially established by the Navy, and we do not think they meet the combined requirements of the Air Force and the Navy," said Spangenberg. "And we know they do not meet the initial requirements established by the Secretary of Defense."

POORER PLANE SEEN

The many changes made in the designs submitted by both General Dynamics and Boeing over the long competition, the Navy evaluation expert said, will produce a "poorer" plane than the one originally demanded. Boeing's design comes closer to the original specifications, he added.

McNamara's statement conceded that Navy and Air Force officers always seek the "ultimate" in performance. But he said this does not take into consideration either the overall cost involved, or the risk of delays if advanced designs prove difficult to perfect.

"I decided to select General Dynamics as the development contractor," he declared, "since I concluded that it was best qualified to design the most effective airplane that could be produced at the least cost, in the least time, to meet our military requirements."

He added that "it should be unnecessary to add that no other considerations entered into my judgment."

The Defense Chief also stressed the fact that he was charged by the President to build the military forces required by the Nation, without regard to arbitrary budget ceilings, but that he also has been instructed to get such forces at the lowest possible cost.

TRIED TO CUT COSTS

In accordance with these instructions, McNamara said, he has been trying to cut the tremendous cost of developing new weapons by refusing to accept unrealistically optimistic cost estimates and two systems where one would do.

When he became Secretary 2 years ago, McNamara said, both the Air Force and Navy planned to develop a new tactical fighter plane. But, he went on, he became convinced that one such fighter could be developed that would meet both services' needs.

Most people in both services, he admitted, "said it couldn't be done," and even after 8 months of mutual discussions, reported to him in August 1961, that developing a single plane to meet the requirements of both "was not technically feasible."

McNamara said this attitude, "based on years of going separate ways," was "understandable" but not a "realistic approach" considering advances in technology. He declared he decided that it was feasible and so insisted over the next 14 months until the two services agreed on a single program.

A source selection board made up of people from both forces was created to review manufacturers' designs, assisted by a 235-man evaluation group of Air Force and Navy experts. Their successive recommendations were reviewed by the regular staffs and weapons commands of the services.

McNamara recounted in detail what the recommendations were at each level in four successive evaluations made of a series of design proposals submitted by the manufacturers.

His account made it plain that statements on Capitol Hill that on four separate occasions the evaluation board recommended Boeing were inaccurate. On the first go-around neither the Boeing plan nor General Dynamic proposal was found suitable, but the board did recommend that Boeing be allowed to go ahead alone with new "design definitions" because its ideas seemed more promising.

But the Air Force Systems Command proposed that both contractors come up with new studies and this was approved. New proposals were submitted April 2, 1962, but the Navy staff took the position, he said, that neither plane would suit its needs and recommended to Navy Secretary Fred Korth that the plan to develop a joint fighter be abandoned.

NEW PROPOSALS ASKED

However, this was rejected and new proposals called for. This time, Navy evaluation experts again ruled that neither met Navy needs. But both Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Air Force Chief of Staff, and Adm. George W. Anderson, Chief of Naval Operations, recommended that Boeing alone be allowed to come up with new designs.

At this point, McNamara said, he concluded that not only were neither contractors meeting Navy requirements, but that his "primary goal" of developing one airplane was "not accepted or not fully understood" by the Navy and Air Force.

Therefore, for the fourth and last design proposal, Boeing and General Dynamics were given firm new instructions of what was wanted. They must:

Satisfy both the Navy and Air Force that they would get a "significantly" improved plane.

Provide "minimum divergence" from the one-airplane concept.

Provide realistic cost estimates.

When the fourth evaluation report was presented, approved by LeMay and Anderson, McNamara said, both the General Dynamics and Boeing designs were held to be "acceptable" with some further development. But, the Secretary added, the report "did not choose as between the contractors" because the advantages and disadvantages of each came out "very close."

His own review of the proposals, McNamara said, convinced him that the Boeing proposal was far inferior to General Dynamics on the second and third criteria he had laid down.

FUNDAMENTAL REQUIREMENT

"Boeing simply did not meet the fundamental requirement of minimum divergence from a common design," he declared. "No amount of peripheral technical argument should be permitted to obscure this central and crucial fact."

Boeing was still proposing what amounted to two airplanes, the Secretary said.

Furthermore, the Boeing plan called for some "technically risky" innovations in design to achieve better performance, including the use of titanium and untried engine thrust reversers to slow down in flight or in landing. The General Dynamics proposal, he said, followed more conventional lines.

While the new Boeing features were not "insuperable obstacles," McNamara said, they introduced problems that the company's cost estimates and development schedule did not allow for.

He said that Boeing, experienced only in building big bombers and transports, "simply did not understand the complexities" of supersonic fighters, as did General Dynamics and its affiliate, Grumman, long time fighter manufacturers.

In deciding the issue, McNamara concluded, he had to "balance the promises held out by competing contractors, against the hopes and aspirations of military officers and the limiting realities of economics and technology."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Although at one time when I served on the Armed Services Committee, I undertook to find out something about defense costs, I know nothing whatever about the technical facts in dispute between the Boeing Co. and the General Dynamics Corp. I do believe, however, that we should recognize that whenever someone states what he bid on a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract, the bid is absolutely meaningless, because he does not have to produce the article for that amount. The actual cost would have to be estimated by the person responsible for negotiating this contract; and the Senator from Pennsylvania well knows that these cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts—different from a contract on which one bids a specific price—are mere estimates of the cost, and sometimes the estimate can be 100 percent wrong.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his contribution.

SECURITIES HELD BY SENATOR CLARK

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it will be recalled that last year I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of my financial holdings. I did so because I felt then, and I feel strongly now, that across the country there is widespread criticism of Senators, on the ground that too often we have a conflict of interest with respect to votes which we may be called upon to cast, both in committee and on the floor of the Senate.

A number of other Senators have also filed, for the public record, statements of their financial holdings. I commend them for doing so, and I hope the number will grow as time goes on.

Clearly, Mr. President, with respect to conflict of interest we impose on the executive branch higher standards than those we impose on ourselves. It may well be that in due course we should pass a conflict-of-interest law applying to ourselves and to the Members of the other body. But certainly a first step would be complete public disclosure of what our financial interests are, so that it may be determined whether, when we vote, we are violating the principle of a conflict-of-interest situation.

There have been a few changes in my list of holdings since my last statement appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I have brought it up to date; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Mr. President, I add the footnote that the oil royalties paid to me by the Humble Oil & Refining Co. on wells drilled on my family property in Louisiana are the principal source of my income outside my Senate salary.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF SECURITIES HELD BY SENATOR JOSEPH S. CLARK, OF PENNSYLVANIA, JANUARY 1, 1963

COMMON STOCKS

American Telephone & Telegraph: 100 shares.
Armstrong Cork: 160 shares.
Avery Island, Inc.: 800 shares.
First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Co.: 490 shares.
Franklin Life Insurance Co.: 55 shares.
Insurance Co. of North America: 100 shares.
International Business Machines: 19 shares.
Johns-Manville: 150 shares.
Oxford Paper Co.: 300 shares.
Pepsi-Cola Co.: 100 shares.
Rohm & Haas Co.: 91 shares.
Scott Paper Co.: 12 shares.
Sel-Rex Corp.: 100 shares.

PREFERRED STOCK

Newmont Mining Corp., 4-percent cumulative preferred: 150 shares.

BONDS

Allegh Co., Pennsylvania Peoples Rd. Bond: 15M.
Ambler jt. high school auth., Montgomery County, Pa.: 5M.
Bethlehem School Dist. Counties of Northampton & Lehigh: 2M.
City of Philadelphia, Pa., loan of July 8, 1929: 10M.
City of Philadelphia, Pa., loan of August 4, 1949: 15M.
City of Lebanon, Pa., 2.30 percent gen. obligation imp.: 10M.
Com. Pennsylvania Turnpike rev. ref. and ext. bonds: 4M.
Cumberland Co. inst. dist. gen. obl. series of 1959: 15M.
Gettysburg School Authority Adams County, Pa., sch. rev.: 5M.
Haverford twp. school dist. auth. Pennsylvania: 5M.
Pennsylvania State Public School Building Auth. 3½ percent: 5M.
Radnor twp. school dist. auth., Delaware County, Pa.: 5M.
State hwy and bridge auth. of Com. Pennsylvania 2½ percent: 10M.
State hwy. and bridge auth. of Com. Pennsylvania 3½ percent: 10M.
West Coshen sewer auth. Pennsylvania 3 percent: 5M.

MISCELLANEOUS

Bayhil fund.
Oil royalties paid by Humble Oil & Refining Co. on wells drilled on Clark family property at Avery Island, La.

POPULATION GROWTH, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it has often been said that the two most critical problems confronting the world today are the imminent danger, in which we live, of having our civilization destroyed by a nuclear holocaust resulting from war between the United States and Soviet Russia. This is the first problem. The second is the undeniable fact that two out of every three human beings will go to bed hungry tonight. The latter fact places in high order of priority the problem of population control. This is a controversial subject and one on which, in my opinion, our Government has been slow to speak out.

However, I have before me two statements made earlier this year, before the United Nations, by Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, in Committee II of the United Nations—that is to say, the Economic and Financial Committee—during the course of the debate on the item "Population growth and economic development." I believe these statements indicate a somewhat new policy on behalf of the United States in this controversial area. I commend our Government for moving forward in this area; and I commend Mr. Gardner, as our spokesman.

I call particular attention to the summary of the U.S. policy which appears near the end of the first statement; and I ask unanimous consent that the two statements and the summary be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statements and the summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POPULATION GROWTH, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(Following are two statements made by Richard N. Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, in Committee II (Economic and Financial) during debate on the item "Population growth and economic development," together with the text of a resolution adopted in plenary session on December 18.)

STATEMENT OF DECEMBER 10

The United States welcomes the initiative of the cosponsors of the resolution now before us[1] in drawing further attention to the subject of population growth and its relation to economic development. This is a subject of transcendent importance for the United Nations and all its members.

There are today some 3 billion people in the world. It required hundreds of thousands of years, from the beginning of life on earth to the beginning of this century to reach 1½ billion. Within the last 60 years we have doubled that number. According to United Nations estimates we will double that number again to 6 billion by the end of this century.

It is obvious from these statistics that the world's population is not merely growing in absolute numbers. The rate of population growth has increased at an extraordinary pace. The annual growth rate has doubled from 1 percent in 1945—itself an unprecedented high in world history—to 2 percent today. It is expected to go even higher. But even if the present rate of growth of world population is maintained at its present level, the numbers we have to contemplate are staggering.

Whether the growth of world population continues at its present rate, whether a reduction in that rate is brought about by increases in the death rate or decreases in the birth rate, and whether, to reduce the birth rate, measures are found which are consistent with the economic, cultural, ethical, and religious circumstances of the members of the United Nations—these are all questions of paramount importance.

The resolution before us is entitled "Population Growth and Economic Development." The United States agrees with the sponsors of this resolution that the impact of population growth on economic development and of economic development on population growth is a subject deserving of increased attention. Our governments are pledged under articles 55 and 56 of the charter to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the United Nations for the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations—including higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development; solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

In the opinion of my Government progress toward these high aims of the United Nations Charter cannot be measured merely by increases in gross national product. The object of economic development is the welfare and dignity of the individual human being. We must concern ourselves, not with aggregate statistics, but with progress made in assuring each person a full and satisfactory life—adequate levels of personal consumption, including food and housing, health and education, and also satisfaction of those political, cultural, and spiritual needs that are fundamental to all men.

If the condition of the individual, and not gross statistics, is to be the measure of our progress, then it is absolutely essential that we be concerned with population trends. Population changes are one of the most important single factors determining our progress or lack of progress toward the high aims of the United Nations Charter. So long as we are concerned with the quality of life we have no choice but to be concerned with the quantity of life.

Experience of California

We believe these statements are true not just for some but for all nations. My own country, blessed though it is with abundant resources and high living standards, recognizes the fundamental importance of the population factor in its efforts at economic and social development.

Within the United States our local, State, and Federal governments are all devoting attention to population trends as part of their planning for the improvement of individual welfare. This is true in areas of great wealth as well as in areas less fortunately endowed. For example, California, a region which has one of the highest living standards in the entire world, has been obliged to pay increasing attention to population trends. The total population of the State, now something over 17 million, is increasing at an average annual rate of about 3.8 percent. It has approximately doubled its population every 20 years over the past century. About 60 percent of the present growth results from migrations; natural increase adds almost 250,000 new residents annually out of the total annual growth of about 600,000 persons.

Three aspects of California's rapid population growth are shared with other regions of the United States and with other countries of the world. First, it involves large-scale internal migration—the movement of about a third of a million people annually from other parts of the Nation—rather than international migration. Second, population gains are concentrated in the urban areas, which account for about 90 percent of the growth, so that 86.4 percent of the State population was reported as urban in the 1960 census. Third, the high growth rate has posed many problems for government—the need for more schools, highways, and hospitals, for example, must be considered in terms of the ability to finance construction and operation—and there must be more jobs to provide employment needed to support the new residents.

---

[1] U.N. doc. A/C.2/L.657 and L.709.

Faced with these problems, the State government has turned to the analysis of its current population and projected gains as a basis for planning its programs for action. It is also examining the social and economic implications of rapid growth rates in order to employ its human and material resources most effectively in the future. Because an adequate water supply is vital to continued growth, the State is engaged in a multibillion-dollar project of dams, reservoirs, and canals, the largest State-financed water project ever undertaken in the United States. A master plan for higher education has been prepared and accepted, and planning for highway needs over the next two decades is well advanced. And a comprehensive study of the economic basis for future growth and development is now underway.

The California experience demonstrates the importance of continued study and analysis of population growth at every level of economic development. The population of the United States as a whole is growing at about 1.7 percent a year—somewhat below the world average—with no foreseeable end in sight. We have come to recognize that this growth has both advantages and disadvantages and that we cannot fail to take account of it in seeking a better life for our citizens, specifically in planning for such things as medical care, education, conservation of natural resources, recreation areas, public housing, and urban transportation.

Population problems of developing countries

Population trends are clearly important for high-income countries in the advanced stages of economic development. As many speakers in this debate have already indicated, population questions may be even more significant for countries in an earlier stage of economic development.

There are at least two reasons why this is so:

In the the first place, the rate of population growth in a great many less developed countries is much higher than in developed countries—about 70 percent higher on the average. In many less developed countries the rate of population growth exceeds 3 percent a year. About 80 percent of the one-half-billion growth in world population in the last decade took place in the less developed areas. In the years ahead the highest rates of growth will continue to be in these areas. It is estimated, for example, that, if present rates of growth were to continue, between now and the year 2000 the population of North America would grow from 200 to 300 million, while the population of South and Middle America would grow from some 200 to 600 million.

This extraordinary differential in the rates of growth between more developed and less developed countries reflects some important differences in historical experience. In the countries that are now more developed the effect of improved medical and public-health services came only gradually over many years, while in the case of the newly developing countries these services have recently developed very rapidly with decisive and overwhelming impact. Furthermore, the gradual effect of improved health services in the case of more developed countries came simultaneously with industrialization and rapidly rising living standards which tended to reduce the birth rate and slow the rate of population growth. However, in the case of the newly developing countries, modern medicine and public health have not only hit all at once; they have hit before industrialization and rising living standards have had the effect—as has been the case in many countries—of reducing the rate of population growth.

Thus, while all countries are concerned with population trends, the population problems of the newly developing countries are of a new and different order from those encountered now or in the past by the more developed countries. For there is little immediate prospect that the factors which reduced the rate of population growth in developed regions such as Europe will take effect in the less developed countries in the immediate future.

In the second place, rapid population growth is obviously of greater concern to countries in an earlier stage of economic development. The problem for developed countries is to increase already relatively high per capita income levels and to devote increasing portions of already large national savings to services such as medical care, health, and housing. But less developed countries whose economy is at the subsistence level may be able to save little or nothing at existing income levels for improvements in social infrastructure.

It is all many of the developing countries can do to enlarge the total economic product as fast as the added people. Yet they have not merely to provide additional facilities for increased population but to create new and adequate facilities for the existing population as well.

For newly developing countries the problem of population growth is not, as some people think, the problem of avoiding starvation or finding standing room. It is the problem of finding sufficient savings after current consumption needs are met to assure a tolerable rate of progress toward modernization and higher standards of living based on self-sustaining economic growth. In some of the world's poorest areas population increase is outpacing the increase in gross national product. As a result there are no resources available for capital formation and no increases in living standards. The prospect is for more and more people to share less and less income.

Just 1 year ago the General Assembly set as its goal for the United Nations Development Decade the attainment by 1970 of an annual growth rate of 5 percent a year in aggregate national income in each of the developing countries. The achievement of this goal will require enormous efforts. It has been estimated that in the decade of the 1950's the developing countries overall had a growth rate of 3 percent a year and a population growth of 2 percent a year, with annual per capita increases in income of 1 percent a year. Making the generally accepted assumption of a capital-output ratio of 3 to 1, these countries will have to increase their savings and investment from 9 to 15 percent in order to achieve the goals of the Development Decade. This is obviously a formidable task at present levels of population growth.

Assuming that the goals of the Development Decade are achieved, prospective increases in population will greatly dilute the impact of overall increases in income on individual levels of welfare. For example, gradual progress toward the 5 percent annual growth goal during the Development Decade would by the end of this decade increase a $100 per capita income to $123 in a country with a 2 percent rate of population growth and to $111 in a country with a 3 percent rate of population growth.

Obviously there is much that we do not know about the relationship of population trends to economic and social development. But from an examination of these and other facts one conclusion seems inescapable—that in certain less-developed countries it may be virtually impossible at the present time, even with maximum external assistance and maximum self-help, to bring about a rate of economic growth which will provide the rate of improvement in individual living standards which the country seeks to attain and which, more fundamentally, is essential to the exercise of the individual's human faculties.

Summary of U.S. policy

These are facts which the members of the United Nations must take into account in considering the subject now before us. Let me turn now from these facts to define the policies of my Government on this important question. I can summarize these policies as follows:

1. The United States is concerned about the social consequences of its own population trends and is devoting attention to them.

2. The United States wants to know more, and help others to know more, about population trends in less developed countries where present levels of population growth may constitute a major obstacle to the realization of goals of human economic and social development.

3. The United States would oppose any effort to dictate to any country the means to be employed in dealing with its population problem. The population policy of any country must be determined by that country and that country alone.

4. While the United States will not suggest to any other government what its attitudes or policies should be as they relate to population or the adoption of specific measures in its implementation, the United States believes that obstacles should not be placed in the way of other governments which, in the light of their own economic needs and cultural and religious values, seek solutions to their population problems. While we will not advocate any specific policy regarding population growth to another country, we can help other countries, upon request, to find potential sources of information and assistance on ways and means of dealing with population problems.

5. The United States believes that there is a great need for additional knowledge on population matters. There is a need for more information about the actual size and composition of existing populations and about future population trends—and both private organizations and governments as well as international organizations can help to provide it. There is a need for more facts about alternative methods of family planning that are consistent with different economic, social, cultural, and religious circumstances. There is a need for more facts about the impact of economic and social development on population trends and of population trends on economic and social development.

6. The United States believes that the United Nations and its affiliated agencies can have a significant role to play in the population field. My Government has actively supported the demographic work of the United Nations from the very early days of the organization and wishes to commend particularly the Population Commission, the Population Branch of the Bureau of Social Affairs, the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, the Economic Commission for Latin America, the Economic Commission for Africa, and the Regional Demographic Research and Training Centers for their excellent work. It is the hope of the United States that these valuable efforts will be substantially expanded.

Role of the United Nations

Let me close with more specific observations about the role of the United Nations. The United States believes that member countries should be able to obtain from the United Nations and its agencies such assistance as they may need and request in connection with their efforts to deal with their population problems. We believe that the United Nations should focus its efforts on three areas: first, the encouraging and assisting of member governments to obtain factual information on the demographic aspects of their economic and social development; second, the training of nationals of members for demographic work; and third, the promotion of full and responsible discussion of population problems.

In the area of demographic information there is much that remains to be done. The demographic section of the Secretariat was downgraded from a division to a branch in the Secretary-General's 1955 reorganization and its staff substantially reduced. It is time to consider whether the resources being devoted to this subject in the Secretariat are adequate to the needs. We should also consider ways to strengthen the demographic staffs of the regional economic commissions. The commissions are in a particularly good position to extend effective assistance to member governments in the context of the problems of particular regions.

In the field of demographic training much more should be done to train nationals of member governments so that they may acquire the demographic information on which to base sound economic plans. This would include the training of people in census taking, in the making of population projections, and in analyzing the economic and social consequences of demographic statistics. We welcome the establishment by the United Nations of regional demographic research and training centers in Bombay, Santiago, and Cairo and would support the establishment of further centers if they were desired by the countries concerned.

In the field of discussion the United States will continue to play an active role in the work of the Population Commission and the regional commissions of the United Nations. Moreover we look forward with great interest to the Asian population conference scheduled for 1963 and the world population conference later on.

With experience in these forms of collaboration, the needs of individual countries and the present and potential resources of the United Nations would become better known and future collaboration more fruitful.

These, in sum, are the views of the United States on population growth and economic development. We consider the resolution now before the committee to be broadly consistent with these views. We are, accordingly, prepared to give it our support.

STATEMENT OF DECEMBER 13

The United States wishes to explain its affirmative votes on the first and second amendments submitted by France, Gabon, Lebanon, Liberia, and Spain.[2] In our view these amendments did not constitute significant changes in the substance of the resolution, and we have supported them in the interest of accommodating the views of the widest possible number of members.

The United States also wishes to explain its abstaining vote on the third amendment submitted by France, Gabon, Lebanon, Liberia, and Spain to delete operative paragraph 6 of the resolution on population growth and economic development.

In the opinion of the United States, operative paragraph 6 does not add or subtract from the authority which the United Nations already possesses as a result of resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Economic and Social Council concerning the granting of technical assistance upon request to member nations. In our view, the paragraph is therefore superfluous.

While the United States believes that the authority to lend technical assistance in all aspects of population problems already exists, we also believe, as I stated earlier in the general debate, that assistance by the United Nations should emphasize those three areas in which there appears to be broad agreement among members, namely, the encouraging and assisting of member governments to obtain factual information on the demographic aspects of their economic and social development; the training of nationals of members for demographic work; and the promotion of full and responsible discussion of population problems.

It was in the light of these considerations that the United States decided to abstain on the amendment to delete operative paragraph 6.

The United States wishes to explain its votes on the various parts of operative paragraph 6 of the resolution. The United States voted for the phrase "as well as other aspects" because it believes that the United Nations should assist members who wish help in obtaining basic data and carrying out essential studies in all aspects of their economic and social development. The United States abstained on the phrase "and that the United Nations give technical assistance, as requested by governments, for national projects and programs dealing with the problems of population" for the same reasons it abstained on the amendment to delete operative paragraph 6.

The United States voted for the resolution as a whole because of the importance we attach to the relation between population growth and economic development and because we regard the resolution as broadly consistent with the views of the United States as put forward in our intervention during the general debate.

The text of the resolution[3] follows:

"The General Assembly,

"Considering that rapid economic and social progress in the developing countries is dependent, not the least, upon the ability of these countries to provide their peoples with education, a fair standard of living and the possibility for productive work,

"Considering further that economic and social development and population policies are closely interrelated and may be carried out simultaneously to secure maximum benefits,

"Recognizing that the health and welfare of the family is of paramount importance, not only for obvious humanitarian reasons, but also with regard to economic development and social progress, and that the health and welfare of the family require special attention in areas with a relatively high rate of population growth,

"Recognizing further that it is the responsibility of each Government to decide its own policies and devise its own programmes of action for dealing with the problems of population and economic and social progress,

"Reminding States Members of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies that according to recent census results the effective population increase during the last decade has been particularly high in many low-income less developed countries,

"Reminding Member States that in formulating their economic and social policies it is useful to take into account the latest relevant facts on the interrelationship of population growth and economic and social development and that the forthcoming World Population Conference and the Asian Population Conference might throw new light on the importance of this problem, especially for the developing countries,

"Recalling General Assembly resolution 1217 (XII), which, inter alia, invites Member States, particularly the developing countries, to follow as closely as possible the interrelationships existing between economic and population changes, and requests the Secretary-General to ensure the coordination of the activities of the United Nations in the demographic and economic fields,

"Recalling Economic and Social Council resolution 820 (XXXI) which contains provisions aiming at intensified efforts to ensure international cooperation in the evaluation, analysis, and utilization of population census results and related data, particularly in the less developed countries, and which requests the Secretary-General to explore the possibilities of increasing the amounts of technical assistance funds which may be made available for these activities,

"Recognizing that further studies and research are necessary to fill the gaps in our knowledge about the causes and consequences of demographic trends, particularly in the less developed countries,

"Recognizing that removals of large national groups to other countries may give rise to ethnical, political, emotional and economic difficulties.

"1. Notes with appreciation the report of the Acting Secretary-General, entitled "The United Nations Development Decade, Proposals for Action"[4] which, inter alia, refers to the interrelationship between population growth and economic and social development;

"2. Expresses its appreciation of the work on population problems which has up to now been carried out under the guidance of the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council;

"3. Requests the Secretary-General to conduct an inquiry among the Governments of States Members of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies concerning the particular problems confronting them as a result of the reciprocal action of economic development and population changes;

"4. Recommends that the Economic and Social Council in co-operation with the specialized agencies, the regional economic commissions and the Population Commission, and taking into account the results of the inquiry referred to in paragraph 3 above, intensify its studies and research on the interrelationship of population growth and economic and social development, with particular reference to the needs of the developing countries for investment in health and educational facilities within the framework of their general development programmes;

"5. Further recommends that the Economic and Social Council report on its findings to the General Assembly not later than at its nineteenth session;

"6. Endorses the view of the Population Commission[5] that the United Nations should encourage and assist the Governments, especially of the less developed countries, in obtaining basic data and carrying out essential studies of the demographic aspects, as well as other aspects, of their economic and social development problems;

"7. Recommends that the second World Population Conference pay special attention to the interrelationships of population growth with economic and social development, particularly in countries that are less developed, and that efforts be made to obtain the fullest possible participation in the Conference by experts from such countries."

TENNESSEE RIVER BASIN WATER POLLUTION

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, Hon. Frank G. Clement, Governor of Tennessee, delivered a very able address in Nashville, Tenn., on March 4, 1963, on the occasion of the meeting of the Tennessee River Basin Water Pollution Control Compact. The Governor spoke of the problems arising from the pollution of our streams. His able analysis and treatment of the subject is of sufficient significance that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD so that many more people may read his remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF GOV. FRANK G. CLEMENT

It is my privilege and pleasure as Governor of the host State to extend greetings and a warm welcome to the distinguished representatives of our sister States who have convened with us here in Nashville for the purpose of organizing and initiating the Tennessee River Basin Water Pollution Control Commission.

Within our time the Tennessee River has become known throughout the world if for no other reason as the river which is the scene of operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

With the control of water in the main channel of the Tennessee and the development of adjacent lands and resources of the basin, changes have taken place which scarcely could have been imagined 25 or 30 years ago.

The magnitude of these changes almost tax the ability to comprehend. Freight movements on the Tennessee rose from 32 million ton-miles in 1933 to nearly 2½ billion ton-miles per year at the present time.

Private investment in Tennessee River waterfront industrial plants and terminals has amounted to about $875 million since 1933.

These factors contributed to the rise in personal income within the Tennessee Valley region which is today nine times as great as it was in 1933 and the rate of increase has far outdistanced the growth of the Nation in general.

Much or most of this spectacular growth is based, in one way or another, on the waters of the Tennessee and its tributaries.

In the future, economic growth is going to depend to a greater degree, rather than a lesser degree, on the availability of water and the quality of that water.

Almost every branch of manufacturing activity today uses more water than it did a few years or a few decades ago.

Also, as new products and new processes are developed the quality of water necessary to make them successful becomes more important and purification processes necessary to rid the water of pollutants become more expensive and exacting.

While the industrial growth was taking place along the Tennessee still other things were happening involving a great many people and the public interest generally.

The people turned to these manmade lakes and to the controlled-flow streams of the tributaries to enjoy the great new recreation resource.

Today there are 13 State parks located on the lakes of the Tennessee River system.

Supplementing these are 33 county parks and 32 municipal parks.

In less elaborate, more decentralized and convenient locations are 413 public access areas where the people without cost or obstacle can have access to the lakes, may launch their boats, spread their picnic lunches, and enjoy the waterfront.

In addition, there are wildlife refuges, national parks, national forests, many camps and clubs located on the lakes and literally thousands of residences bearing some relation to the lakes.

The investment in recreation facilities along the shore of the lakes on the Tennessee and its tributaries now represents approximately $150 million.

The use of the recreation facilities has grown tremendously—presently representing 50-million visitor-days a year and if the waters remain usable, this visitation may double or triple in the next 10 or 15 years.

Perhaps I should emphasize what I have just said—"if the waters remain usable."

We have no desire to see the dead hand of pollution strangle either the industrial or the recreation use of these waters so precious to our several States.

Both uses are needed for the full development of our economy and for the enjoyment of our people.

Both industrial and recreational uses can continue to grow if pollution is controlled and the water is always left in good condition satisfactory for the reasonable use of the next downstream user.

We are happy to announce that during the past 15 years—a period of unprecedented industrial development and urban population growth in Tennessee—we have actually achieved a net reduction in the amount of pollution going into the surface waters of this State.

This means that the people of this State have actually improved the quality of the water leaving Tennessee, near Chattanooga, and flowing into and across northern Alabama and becoming part of the water resources of Alabama and Mississippi.

Similarly, the waters flowing out of Tennessee and across western Kentucky, in Kentucky Lake, are improved or are less hazardous than was the case 15 years ago.

It is our intention that this process shall continue and it is our determination that our actions and pollution arising in this State will not contaminate and render unusable the waters which we are exporting in our streams to our neighboring States.

But we cannot do the job alone.

We are conscious of the sovereignty of the State of Tennessee.

In such a posture we can do no other than respect the sovereignty of other States.

We cannot, and we do not wish to, exercise controls within the boundaries of other States.

However, water obeys the law of gravity and flows downhill without regard to State lines and the territories of the several States.

If we at some future date poured hurtful pollution onto our neighboring States they, under present circumstances, would have scant hope of relief except through appeal to the Federal Government for assistance.

This course of action we do not relish, for this inevitably undermines the sovereignty and the responsibility of the several States and yields to the central government still another area of responsibility which it is not necessary that we yield.

The way is still open for cooperation among the seven States represented in the Tennessee watershed.

This program of cooperation can be effectively and predictably carried out through the channels of an interstate compact.

Beginning almost 10 years ago, the then Governors of these seven States appointed delegates to meet together and to work out the draft of a mutually acceptable and thoroughly workable interstate compact. Tennessee was proud to ratify that compact in 1955, thus, placing this State on record as ready to engage responsibly in a joint effort with neighboring States in controlling pollution in the Tennessee and its tributaries.

As their respective legislatures met Mississippi and Kentucky added their ratification actions.

The consent of Congress was given in Public Law 85–734.

We are now assembled to organize the Tennessee River Basin Water Pollution Control Commission which will be made up of the appropriate delegation of three members from each of the ratified States selected in the manner prescribed in each State by its act of ratification.

We are pleased that representatives of other eligible States are present on this occasion so that they may add their voices in an advisory capacity and thus help in launching a course of action in which they have confidence and will, we hope, soon participate officially.

We recognize that there have been legal or procedural obstacles in the way of ratification by some of the eligible States, at least until recently.

We trust that these have been or will be overcome and we look forward to early ratification by all of the States and anticipate a truly joint regional effort in this great undertaking.

OIL STACKS PRESIDENTIAL SURVEY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I intend to speak on the actions of some of the leading administrators in the Federal Government relating to the oil industry. Before I start, I wish to make it clear that I have the greatest respect and admiration for those in the oil industry. They have made a contribution to our society and Nation—a contribution in terms of our economy, employment, and standard of living. In no sense should the remarks that I make be deemed as critical of the hundreds of thousands of fine people in that great and important industry.

At the same time, I think it is appropriate to place the subject in context and point out that there is no industry which has greater political power, greater influence and, at times, dominating influence than the oil industry has.

Perhaps most conspicuous and most frequently discussed is the tax power the industry has and the tax favoritism which it enjoys. Of course, the industry does develop and exploit a national resource. Much of that resource is on federally owned land. Some of it is on State land. In addition, the industry has vast international influence. In the past some distinguished Senators have pointed out that in at least one administration, and I suspect in many, whenever the oil industry caught cold, the administration sneezed.

The oil industry has a great influence throughout America in education, with newspapers, and with many service organizations of various kinds.

FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS FOR OIL PUBLIC RELATIONS

The API, an important trade organization in the industry, has estimated that the industry has spent about $50 million a year in public relations. The industry influences the Government in many ways. One is through political contributions. In my own State of Wisconsin, I doubt if we produce a gallon of oil. Yet it is usual for candidates for Federal office, at least, to show contributions from leading figures in the oil industry from Texas, California, and many other States.

Few people realize that this is such a vast and profitable industry that its members actually operate—or at least did in 1953, the most recent year for which figures are available—more aircraft than all the airlines do. They use the aircraft in many ways. For example, in the State which I represent, aircraft are used to transport political figures. It is a very flattering gesture and service on the part of members of that industry.

---

[2] U.N. doc. A/C.2/L.709/Rev. 2.

[3] U.N. doc. A/C.2/L.657, as revised; adopted in plenary session on Dec. 18 by a vote of 69 (U.S.) to 0, with 27 abstentions. In a separate vote (34 to 34, with 32 abstentions (U.S.)) the following phrase was deleted at the end of operative paragraph 6: "* * * and that the United Nations give technical assistance, as requested by Governments, for national projects and programmes dealing with the problems of population."

[4] U.N. doc. E/3613.

[5] U.N. doc. E/3451, paragraph 15.

Usually the oil industry gets what it wants; and, in the judgment of many people, sometimes what oil wants is not in the public interest.

OIL NAMES GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATORS

The fundamental way in which the oil industry has achieved its aims is not merely through getting the legislators it wants—although it is quite successful in that regard—but in influencing appointments to top policymaking positions in our Government.

One conspicuous recent example is that of a very able and distinguished man who is now Governor of a great State. John Connally was appointed Secretary of the Navy at a time when he was executor of one of the largest private oil estates in the world. Of course, the Navy buys all the oil for all the armed services. That position is a position of great influence and benefit for the oil industry.

Another example was the appointment of Lawrence O'Connor, confirmation of which I also opposed. Mr. O'Connor spent his lifetime in the oil industry and was the first oil lobbyist in history appointed to the Federal Power Commission, which, of course, has great power and influence over the kind of prices the oil industry can charge.

One appointment which I felt particularly strong about and protested vigorously on the floor of the Senate was that of John M. Kelly. It is about John Kelly that I wish to speak briefly today. John Kelly was appointed 2 years ago as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Minerals. In that capacity he supervises the Bureau of Mines, the Geological Survey, the Oil Import Administration, the Office of Mineral Exploration, the Office of Oil and Gas, and the Office of Geography.

Also in this connection I want to discuss the policies and actions of Jerome O'Brien. Mr. O'Brien was appointed the head of the Office of Oil and Gas. In this capacity he does the following:

He provides staff advice and assistance to the Assistant Secretary in the development, coordination, and management of oil and gas programs and functions which are assigned to the Department by the President or by the Congress.

Secondly, Mr. O'Brien provides leadership in obtaining coordination and unification of oil and gas policies and related administrative activities of all Federal agencies, and he enlists their cooperation to assure adequate development, distribution, and utilization of petroleum and gas resources and facilities to meet civilian, industrial, and military requirements in time of peace or national emergency.

In the third place, Mr. O'Brien serves as the principal channel of communication between the Federal Government and the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, State regulatory bodies, and the petroleum and gas industries.

Both Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Kelly have long, long records—virtually lifetime records—in the oil industry.

PRO-OIL FIX

What I should like to discuss this afternoon is the action on the part of Mr. Kelly and Mr. O'Brien which I would term to be action to perpetrate a "pro-oil fix" of a Presidentially requested oil survey. I refer to the Interior Department's representation on a study to be made jointly with the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, which is made up of representatives of oil-producing States.

Secretary Kelly held millions of dollars worth of oil properties, at the time of his appointment and even after he was appointed to his position to be a public referee over the Nation's oil and gas programs.

This statement was contested yesterday, apparently by those associated with Mr. Kelly, and the Washington Post this morning indicated that Mr. Kelly had disposed of his oil holdings. This was an issue which came up at the time Mr. Kelly was appointed. I discussed that on the floor at the time, and I pointed out that the disposition of the oil holdings by Mr. Kelly was not as it might seem.

In his testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, before appointment, Mr. Kelly said:

> I will sell all my stockholdings in oil and mining companies.
>
> * * * * *
>
> In regard to any Federal leases, wells on Federal lands, overrides and payments, I will set up a trust and transfer all such interests to a trustee who will sell all such interests. Any such interests which the trustee has been unable to sell he will convey to the Elk Oil Co.
>
> I will resign as president of the Elk Oil Co. and make an irrevocable gift to my minor children of all the stock that I own in this company pursuant to the Gift to Minors Act of New Mexico.
>
> I intend to maintain my current operations on State and fee lands.

It was on the basis of this statement that members of the committee seemed to conclude that Mr. Kelly had disposed of his oil holdings and that there was no conflict of interest. Technically, there was none. Technically, Mr. Kelly complied with the law. He complied with the precise requirements in the law. He disposed of his holdings of properties and interests on Federal lands.

Of course, in his position as Assistant Secretary of the Interior, he would have direct jurisdiction over the Federal lands.

What he held on to is quite interesting. Later in his testimony before the committee he said:

> Senator, I do not believe that I will continue to operate my properties. I do not intend to continue to operate my properties. I will hold ownership of them. But the actual operations would be carried on by other people.

He also said:

> I am divesting myself of probably 50 percent or better of my properties in order to place myself in the position in which I feel that I can assume the duties of my office with complete impartiality toward the decisions that I might make as Assistant Secretary. As you understand, I operate as an individual——

And so forth.

Mr. President, if Mr. Kelly was disposing of 50 percent of his holdings, and they were described in the hearings as being very great, for Mr. Kelly held millions of dollars worth of property—he was obviously holding on to 50 percent of his holdings, or nearly 50 percent of his holdings. He still owns oil land. He still has an interest in the oil industry amounting to millions of dollars.

While this may not be a direct and immediate legal conflict, I submit the fact is that he is still involved, or that he was at the time of his nomination. There has been no evidence whatsoever that, after making the statement to the committee, he subsequently divested himself of any of his holdings. It seems he is still involved in substantial oil holdings.

Mr. President, Mr. Jerome O'Brien, who became Kelly's prime assistant on oil matters, came to the job from the vice presidency of the Humble Oil Co. and a lifetime in the oil industry. I feel now—as I felt at the time that these appointments of pro-oil men were made—that they put the American consumer at a gross disadvantage.

HOW OIL INDUSTRY IS "CASHING IN"

Now the oil industry is really cashing in. The most powerful special interest group in Government—the oil crowd—is making sure that the findings of this oil survey, which is an oil survey requested by the President of the United States, will be in its interest.

In a memorandum written by Allen Calvert, Jr., a member of the Interstate Compact Commission, reporting on a conversation with Secretary Kelly and O'Brien, it is clear that this oil duo is intent on confining the Interior Department's representation in the oil survey largely to themselves.

In addition, Secretary Kelly would load the Compact Commission—which is supposed to be making the investigation—with men like Texas Gov. John Connally, described by Secretary Kelly as "primarily from the oil industry." He is indeed. In fact, he is executor of one of the largest private oil estates in the world. He gets a very large proportion of his income—almost all of his income—from this estate.

The Calvert memo reveals the arrogant contempt Secretary Kelly feels toward the Interior Department career officials not connected with the oil industry. Secretary Kelly characterizes these officials as "Red-Hot Bureaucrats."

Why? Because, as might be expected, they have a far different view of Federal responsibility toward the oil industry from that of Secretary Kelly or Mr. O'Brien.

Secretary Kelly's conduct should be a supreme example to the Senate of the vital importance of insisting on an absence of conflict of interest as a prime prerequisite in approving Presidential nominations.

Mr. President, I wish to read and discuss the memorandum which brought to

the attention of the country the plans and programs of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for the oil industry.

THE CALVERT MEMORANDUM

This is a memorandum written by Mr. Allen Calvert, Jr., the Oklahoma representative on the Interstate Oil Compact Commission. These are Mr. Calvert's notes of the conference with Assistant Secretary John Kelly and Jerome O'Brien in their offices in Washington on February 12—in other words, notes concerning his conversation with the two men in the top policy positions in our Government dealing with the oil industry.

This memorandum has been published in the "Oil Daily." The memorandum has been attacked. To some extent it has been disowned. But I think that the frankness and straightforwardness of this memorandum speaks for itself.

Without implying any hidden, ulterior motives or Machiavellian attitudes on the part of anyone, it seems to me it is very difficult to read this memorandum, which has been published, without recognizing what Mr. Kelly and Mr. O'Brien are up to.

The memorandum is a brief memorandum, and I will read the text of it:

> On this date Lawrence Alley, executive secretary of Interstate Compact, and I called upon Messrs. Kelly and O'Brien as a follow-up to a request made by Governor Welsh, chairman of the Interstate Compact, at the executive committee meeting held Monday, February 4, in Oklahoma City.
>
> Governor Welsh had taken note of John Kelly's inability to meet with the compact on that date and had designated Mr. Alley and myself to determine the subject matter that had caused Mr. Kelly to make the appointment in the first place.
>
> Mr. Kelly commenced our interview with the statement that a year-end cabinet report or summary of various departments' activities had been presented to the President and that as a result thereof a directive from the President had been given to Mr. Kelly to implement a study of Federal-State relations as they pertained to oil and gas production and related matters.

In other words, this was a directive from the President, a Presidentially requested and directed survey.

Reading from the memorandum:

> Mr. Kelly further amplified the objectives as being an interest of his Department, of the President, and of the Government in making domestic oil as competitive as it possibly could be with foreign oil. He offered as one of the reasons from which the directive resulted the explanation that the domestic producers had gone to the Government for foreign import controls and that for that reason and others certain elements of the Government took the position and believed that they should know more as to what the various States were doing to bring uniformity to regulations, assure conservation, complying with the Connally hot oil act, etc. Mr. Kelly used, I believe, the term that there were some "red hot bureaucrats," chiefly career people, who had nurtured the idea—as we have always known—that the domestic production of oil and gas should be federally controlled or at least more than it is now.
>
> Mr. Kelly stressed that it was his intense desire to present these thoughts to the proper officials of the compact with as full an explanation as possible and with every precaution being taken so as not to cause alarm. He indicated that if a working group were jointly established that he thought that it should be small as to both sides and he inferred that he and Jerry O'Brien, his chief assistant, and other top level people in the Interior, if necessary—as opposed to career men—would represent their half of the group.

In other words, the position taken by Mr. Kelly at the conference was that the representation of the Interior Department should be primarily by himself, as one who had been in the oil industry all his life, who has heavy investments in the oil industry, and Mr. O'Brien, who was formerly with the Humble Oil Co., and a man who also had an oil industry viewpoint. The memorandum continues:

> After some discussion, Mr. Alley and I told them that we would report our conversation to Governor Welsh on the presumption that the matter would then be referred to members of the compact's executive committee for further consideration. In our discussion it was mutually assumed that Gov. Jack Campbell might have the most continuous cognizance and knowledge of activities which might be covered by such a study (rather than an investigation), however, Gov. John Connally also might have such knowledge, they both being primarily from the oil industry. Secretary Kelly stressed that he was not a hurry-up or haste-makes-waste man and that while he was under the stern directive to get started, he did not want the beginning to be of a character that would alarm people. He stated that he would await word from Governor Welsh and that some time after the first of March he would be available at the convenience of Governor Welsh either to visit him at Indianapolis or to confer with him in Washington preliminary to setting up the working group. He assumed that Governor Welsh would wish to process the suggestion with various parties to the compact and repeated that we should take all time necessary to do so. Mr. Alley and I did not compare our immediate reactions to the conference inasmuch as we both had traveling or other appointments, but Mr. Alley did comment to me that the conference results and purposes were much more important than he had assumed and despite his long background with the compact, I believe he was considerably surprised.

Before I read the last paragraph of the memorandum, let me say it is surprising that these gentlemen should be so concerned about the study of the Compact Commission. It is surprising that they felt that somehow, some way, it might be a threat to the oil industry; that if the so-called bureaucrats who had no financial interest in the oil industry, who were appointed for the public interest, and who had no ax to grind, were represented on the Commission, and it was viewed as an investigation commission, the oil industry might be in for some trouble. How sensitive Mr. Kelly is about what the Oil Compact Commission does; how it contributes to the economic advantage and profits of the oil industry; how, conversely, it might lead to higher prices for the consumer and, in the lack of competition, into a monopoly position, is disclosed in the second paragraph. I am again reading from the memorandum:

> Secretary Kelly, in referring to the bureaucrats, mentioned the fact that the Department of Justice had had many very critical reports of the compact and he further stated that an individual who represented the Department at the last executive committee meeting was one of those who was critical of the compact and would like more Federal intervention. This point is obviously pertinent and important in view of the necessity of renewing the compact's life every 4 years, such renewal being considered at this time by a bill introduced by U.S. Senator CLINTON ANDERSON.

Mr. President, let us take a look at the compact and what the compact amounted to, what it did, what its responsibility has been, and what its influence has been.

What I have done is secure these reports from the Attorney General's office. I called the Attorney General's office and secured every report on the compact commission made by the Attorney General.

Before I discuss these reports, however, I want to read from an excellent book by Robert Engler in which he discusses the commission. Engler, frankly, has been a critic of the oil industry, but a scholarly critic. He has said this in his book:

> Nominally an organization of State officials, the commission is under the constant surveillance of the oil companies who have always recognized it as an instrument for forestalling Federal regulation. In past years oil companies have flown State members to the meetings, and the natural gas industry has footed banquet bills. The technique is more sophisticated today, although as usual the industry's vast private airplane fleet remains one of the significant ways the industry has for flattering and serving modestly paid political and administrative personnel at all levels.

SENATOR WHERRY'S CHARGES OF PRICE FIXING

Mr. President, when this commission was in its early operation, a distinguished Senator, now deceased, and a very conservative man, a man who was a great friend of American business and free enterprise, Kenneth Wherry, discussed the way the Commission operates and the way the oil industry operates, in very telling language, which I shall quote from briefly.

First, Mr. Engler said in his book:

> Potential oil States are fitted into this system by conservation (market demand) laws introduced even before oil is found. After the late Senator Kenneth Wherry, Republican, of Nebraska, never noted for his hostility to business investigated this entire operation, he suggested that the President should suspend the Connally Act because of its use to create shortage and maintain price. Concluded his Small Business Committee: "There is a mechanism controlling the production of crude oil to market demand that operates as smoothly as the finest watch."
>
> Currently much of big oil favors the use of State power to force recalcitrant producers to cooperate in the joint operation of fields. This has merit as a conservation measure.
>
> It also reveals oil's willingness to use Government coercion when convenient, raising intriguing questions as to the industry's presumed commitment to the competitive system. (In the early thirties, the head of Standard of New Jersey even proposed that the Government operate the flowing east Texas fields on a unitized basis.)
>
> The industry is always careful to supply appropriate agencies of the Federal Government with a steady stream of temporary suitable personnel.

ATTORNEY GENERAL IN 4-YEAR DEFAULT ON REPORT

When I talked to the Justice Department they gave me very shocking information this morning. They said that the Attorney General has been in default of the law for 4 years in failing to meet the requirement of annual reports of the interstate compact. In other words, since 1959 the Attorney General has not filed a single report, although the law requires him to file a report each year. The resolution as adopted in 1959 clearly required this annual report.

I asked the Justice Department why it had not complied with the law. The Justice Department, far from being critical of the oil compact or having an ax to grind said that the Department is in default because it is the feeling of the Department of Justice that the Compact Commission has not been an instrument of monopoly or price fixing; that, there is monopoly resulting from the power of, a few dominant companies which enjoy a vertically integrated domination, including pipeline control. This gives them the ability to fix prices.

They tell me that the reports were discontinued when Robert Bicks was head of the division. That was in the Eisenhower administration under Attorney General Rogers. No one has been on it since, and the reports have never been resumed.

Anyone who feels that these reports of the Attorney General might have been critical can get some idea of Mr. Kelly's ideas of criticism by considering a few excerpts from these reports. The very first report by the Attorney General said this:

> The ultimate purpose for which the report requirement was enacted seems clear: To provide the Congress with an informed judgment by the Attorney General on the competitive effects of the system by which oil production is regulated.
>
> That article of the compact states:
>
> "It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations."
>
> In this article, the interstate agreement sets forth clearly the "* * * purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the physical waste thereof."
>
> Article V also undeniably embraces the additional purpose of opposing price stabilization or monopolization, although this purpose is stated indirectly by the express withholding of authority under the compact to achieve such ends.

Mr. President, Congress set this up because Congress was concerned with the very real possibility that in the guise of conservation and preventing improper exploitation, the compact commission might act to fix prices and raise profits of the oil industry and to penalize, of course, the consuming public.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe the Senator does recognize, does he not, that there is a real problem in the petroleum industry, in that production should not become in surplus to the extent that it exceeds the amount of aboveground storage for the production? After all, the oil is located in underground reservoirs, in the first instance. It will stay there for a thousand years or longer. If we take it above ground, it will evaporate, or, if we do not have enough storage facilities, there is no alternative but to have it in overflow tanks, and in that way eventually contaminate the streams.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. I think it is absolutely right that with this kind of resource it is necessary to have some kind of regulation of production, the kind that Texas has, and the kind, I presume, that Louisiana has.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Louisiana has much better regulation than Texas.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I know that in Texas they regulate the oil flow so that at the present time they are pumping about 8 or 9 days a month, or have that amount of production.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Unfortunately, in Texas the production of oil is regulated by the railroad commissioners, and they, in turn, must run for office. Therefore in Texas a great number of wells, particularly the older wells—and I would hope not their better wells, but a great number of the wells—are not under any regulation at all, and they can produce as much as they can pump out.

In Louisiana every producing well is under control. It is only by control and prorating how much each producer can bring to the surface that any equitable way can be arranged so that the production will not completely exceed the market for the problem; not only exceed it, but greatly exceed the amount of storage available above ground.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana is making my point very well. He is right; there has to be that kind of regulation. There has to be Government regulation. What I am saying is that this regulation should be dispassionate, objective regulation, in the public interest. It should not be guided primarily by people with a vested interest in the oil industry, or people who are motivated by their own holdings in the oil industry, and obviously are suspect of having an interest in maximizing profits in the oil industry, which might contradict the interest of the consumers and of all the citizens, who want to preserve a great resource.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The regulation in Louisiana is by the conservation commissioner. So far as I know, the conservation commissioner has no interest in oil production.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am sure he does not.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe that State law may require that he should not have an interest in oil production.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think it should.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Generally speaking, however, these conservation commissioners in Louisiana have tended to favor the small producer as against the interest of the large producer. They have tended to favor the fellow who has a small well that might be able to produce only 8 or 10 barrels a day as against the larger wells, owned by large companies, that could produce, perhaps, 500 barrels a day without pumping.

As it is, Louisiana is entitled to about 10 percent of the market. I would imagine that Louisiana would produce a great deal more than that if we were permitted to produce to capacity. The difficulty is that it is completely within the capacity of the oil producers of Louisiana and of other States to greatly exceed the demands for the product in the country. Therefore, about the only way to pace production, so that it does not exceed the capacity to use and store, particularly above ground, is to regulate the rate at which it is produced.

I cannot see that there is any special interest involved here in working out some system in each State under which each State would undertake to keep its production at a certain percentage of its capacity to produce. I know of no other way it could be worked out, unless the Federal Government wanted to step into the field.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator is right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. And unless the Federal Government wanted to regulate a great many things which more logically is a local function.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe, as I continue, the Senator from Louisiana will see that the argument which I am making is not that such an arrangement is unnecessary or undesirable; but that this kind of regulation does involve some very serious problems as far as the oil consumer is concerned, and that the administration should be objective and should not be colored by those who have a vested interest in protecting only the private oil industry.

The industry needs protection, and very careful consideration. It should be protected. It is a vital industry. What I am trying to say is that that is exactly what the Attorney General did in a very dispassionate way. I think the Attorney General should be criticized for not having lived up to the letter of the law or for not coming to Congress and asking for relief, or for not filing a report, or not filing at least a pro forma report. He files no report at all.

As I proceed, the Senator will see how carefully the Attorney General approached this. I am not talking about the present Attorney General, but about the Attorney General in the Eisenhower administration. I am pointing out how carefully he approached this matter to make sure that no one would be harmed and no prejudice would result against the oil industry or against anyone in the oil industry. In the light of all this, criticism by Mr. Kelly of the Attorney General as being too zealous and too much interested in Government regulation, is, to me, very shocking

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator has made some reference to the fact that a number of oil companies possess airplanes. Of course, he is correct in that statement. The oil industry does possess a large number of airplanes. I hope he will keep in mind that in many instances these planes are essential in the conduct of the oil industry's business.

I have in mind one company, for example, which is more in the construction of pipelines, than it is in the production of oil. They try to train each of their foremen to go to his job flying a little amphibious airplane. It is much cheaper to have the man at home at night and then fly a small airplane which can land on a lagoon or lake or canal in Louisiana.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is no question about it. The Senator is making an excellent correction of what I have said.

I think it is essential in the industry. It is a very useful tool which the industry employs for its technical work and exploration.

The point I wish to make and emphasize is that this is a vast, powerful, rich industry. I think the point is dramatized when we consider that it has more planes than all the airlines combined. I am sure that the planes are used overwhelmingly for immediate business purposes. But the fact is that they are also used to assist politicians. I have seen that practice followed in my State, and I know it is followed elsewhere.

This industry has an enormous interest in securing the right kind of representation in Washington, not only from the oil-producing States, but also from the nonoil-producing States. This is one of the instruments which it uses to assist, and I have called attention to it in passing. But certainly the Senator from Louisiana is correct in stating that that is not the main reason for maintaining so large a fleet of airplanes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The great majority of the planes to which the Senator is referring are small, light aircraft. Of course, there is a substantial number of executive planes; but I believe that most of the planes to which the Senator is referring are small light aircraft, designed to fly into hard-to-reach places, such as some of the locations in Louisiana which the planes reach on pontoons, where there is no road available to reach the place at all.

One of the big aircraft, such as a jet plane, probably costs more than the price of two or three hundred of the kinds of planes to which the Senator is, in part, referring. I am sure the Senator realizes that the great majority of the planes are very small ones.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. President, I continue to read from the first report of the Attorney General, issued under the 1955 resolution:

> To read the words of the joint resolution at face value, with no regard to the long history of Congressional concern, would seem to limit inquiry to the conservation activity directly authorized and carried out "* * * under the provisions of the compact * * *," thereby apparently excluding any consideration of price stabilization or monopolization. Those problems, however, have been the Congress' chief concern.
>
> The purpose of the statute, as disclosed in the legislative history, is to secure a consideration by the Attorney General of the ultimate effect on the industry of the whole regulatory operation, in which the States, the Compact, and the Federal Government all play a part. The relevant legislative history includes not only consideration of this particular provision by Congress. It includes, as well, the long history of the part which the Congress has played in conservation of oil and gas, and the concern it has long displayed over the effects of conservation measures on competition in the petroleum industry.

The report goes on to say:

> When the compact was brought before the Congress for renewal in 1955, the Senate amended the consenting resolution. The amendment required an annual report by the Attorney General whether the activities of the States had "remained within the purpose of such compact," and whether such activities had "* * * resulted in the stabilizing or fixing of prices of oil or gas, the creation of perpetuation of any monopoly, or the promotion of any regimentation in the production of oil or gas * * *." Before the House committee, certain objections to the report requirement were raised on behalf of the Attorney General. The committee recommended that the report provision be amended into its present form, and the proposed amendment was adopted.

Further, the report states:

> Accommodating these considerations to the language of the statute, I conclude that the report requirement directs (1) an examination of the petroleum industry to determine if it evidences the exiatence of anticompetitive practices, including monopolization and price stabilization, and (2) a determination whether any such practices result from this regulatory system. This would, in my opinion, meet the primary concern of the Congress without requiring any investigation or determination of the motives or purposes of the actions of State agencies.
>
> This consideration of the "results" of the operation of the regulatory system on industry practices finds support in the legislative history of the report requirement. As the provision was first added in the Senate, it required a report on whether the activities related to the compact "have resulted' 'in price fixing, monopoly or regimentation, a clear direction to consider the industrial results, and not the object or motive of State action.

Then, I read one more brief excerpt:

> Accordingly, it would appear that the statutory requirement for reports calls for an inquiry into the practicea and organization of the oil production industry. That inquiry must ascertain whether price-fixing or monopolistic practices have grown around the production limitations adopted for conservation purposes, regardless of whether or not such practices involve a violation of present law, or are an intended or an accidental result of the regulatory system. Only on the basis of such an inquiry can an informed conclusion be made as to the competitive effect of the pattern of regulatory action.

That was the purpose of this investigation by the Attorney General, required by Congress, and very carefully handled by the Attorney General to make certain that there was no prejudice against the oil industry, or particularly the Compact Commission, made by representatives of the oil-producing States.

ATTORNEY GENERAL CONCLUDES MONOPOLY, BUT NOT BY COMPACT

In the last report, the conclusion is generally favorable to the oil compact. It is not completely favorable to the industry; it is critical to some extent, but in a very mild way. I read from page 61 of the fourth report of the Attorney General:

> Analysis of crude oil prices shows a stability coincident with the beginnings of conservation.

This was the conclusion after 4 years of analysis.

> But stabilization of supply was the necessary and intended result of the Federal action approving and implementing State prorationing under the Connally "Hot Oil" Act. With that aid and approval, State prorationing operated to curtail the amount of excess oil available to disturb the market by wide local or national price swings. At the same time, price history shows that the price responded to economic pressures, both upward and downward, before the war. Thereafter, the record shows crude oil prices rising steadily, rather unrelated to increasing supply or economic changes.

The report concluded that there was an upward bias, an upward trend, in oil prices from World War II on, as the conservation commissions began to work together to control the available supply of oil.

I shall now read from two of the most pertinent additional observations:

> For this phenomenon there is little evidence that State action is responsible. State regulatory bodies normally do not collect price data in connection with their determinations on permissible production.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The pipeline system was capable of absorbing temporary local cuts by resort to unregulated sources of supply. No "shortage" of oil created by State action could be held responsible for any price movement. Considering the complex and varying bases of decision faced by each of the State agencies, and the constant pressure of local producers to be allowed the fullest share of production, the task of prorating to achieve a desired price level would be virtually impossible.

These are the concluding observations by Attorney General William P. Rogers:

> A different problem, however, is posed by the present pattern of pipeline ownership and operation. Only one possible pipeline connection is usually available to a well, and, considering its cost, is likely to endure for the life of the well. The economies of size in trunkline operation logically impel building one large diameter line to a field or area, sufficient to carry anticipated production and therefore preclusive of economical operation of other lines.
>
> The position of each pipeline owner is greatly magnified by reciprocal use of pipelines among the select group of integrated companies owning pipelines. Logical and efficient operation of pipelines as a transportation system urges cooperation between lines and avoidance of duplication and cross-hauling. But the pipeline system is more than a transport agency, it is the crude oil market. And cooperative use of pipelines has a grave potential for control of crude oil markets.
>
> Antitrust litigation can perhaps deal with particular cases of pipeline abuse. But the problem is more far-reaching, covering the broad spectrum of this industry's transportation and buying operations, and singularly suited to legislative action. Precise definition of the problem requires compulsory process to insure complete information; and any policy decision on the appropriate solution seems best suited to legislative determination.

Mr. President, in the light of the Attorney General's reports which by law, according to the Attorney General's Office, are still required and are, in fact, in default for 4 years—ever since 1959 there has been no report—in view of the moderation, so far as the conduct of the Commission is concerned, what in the world is Assistant Secretary Kelly afraid of? What are these red-hot bureaucrats or officials in the Department of Justice up to, in view of the fact that these are the only reports which have been made, and no others have been made for 3½ or 4 years.

It seems to me that the memorandum disclosing the position of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior is most significant, because the Assistant Secretary of the Interior and the head of the Office of Oil and Gas take the position that even this kind of mild, hesitant, reluctant inquiry by the Department of Justice is not proper, they do not want it, and they feel that it is likely to prejudice the oil industry.

ARROGANCE OF OIL-ORIENTED OFFICIALS

I think this is an obvious commentary on the enormous influence the oil industry now has in the Department of the Interior, in our administration, with those who are responsible for regulating the oil industry; and I think it is also an obvious commentary on the arrogance of the oil industry and the great need, in my judgment, that we have these reports.

The Department of Justice did indicate that, as of 1959, it concluded that the Interstate Oil Compact Commission was not being used to fix prices—at least, not in a way which the Department of Justice felt was a violation of the antimonopoly laws. However, I can see no reason why there should not be a continuing report to Congress in view of the real temptation for the Commissioners and for the States—in view of their great power and in view of the authority the Federal Government has given them—to fix the flow of oil from the oilfields, as the Senator from Louisiana has set forth so well.

We have a responsibility to the consumers of the country to make sure that this enormous power over the most profitable industry in the United States is not used to exploit the consumers. The fact that we have not had a single report—and that this is in violation of the law—on this matter from the Office of the Attorney General in 4 years indicates to me how urgently we need more concern for the consumers.

SENATE SHOULD INSIST ON REPORTS

I would think that at the time when the life of the Compact Commission comes up for renewal, this year, in connection with the joint resolution which I understand the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] has introduced, and which will come before Congress this year, Congress should give very careful consideration to insisting on obtaining a regular report from the Department of Justice on the possibilities of using the Compact Commission as a means of fixing prices, establishing prices, and pushing prices up. The Attorney General did conclude that prices have been moving one way, since 1946, and that is up.

VITAL IMPORTANCE OF CONFIRMING OFFICIALS FREE OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr. President, I should like to conclude this part of my presentation this afternoon by saying that I think all Senators should be aware of what this revelation really means. We confirmed the nomination of John M. Kelly as Assistant Secretary of the Interior in charge of minerals—the top policy position in regard to oil—with full knowledge not only that Mr. Kelly had spent a lifetime in the oil industry, but also that he had millions of dollars of interest in State and private oil lands and that he said he would hold on to them, and also—as I have said—Mr. Jerome O'Brien, the head of the office of oil and gas—spent a lifetime in the oil industry, most recently in the Humble Oil Co., as vice president.

If we are to have a detached attitude in the public interest on the part of high-policy officials—indeed, I think we should on their part have a zealous attitude in the public interest—obviously we should not have in the top position, with the duty of representing the public viewpoint, one whose interest obviously is very often against the public interest and in his own personal interest.

DEFICIT SPENDING NO SOLUTION TO LAGGING ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, throughout the country the President of the United States has been criticized—and our mail indicates it very plainly—for being irresponsible in regard to the proposed budget and the deficit. Although I disagree with the President in this area, I think the attention of the Senate and the attention of the country should be called to the fact that the President is much more conservative in this respect than are many of his critics and many businessmen. In fact, a majority of the Democratic members of the Joint Economic Committee, excluding this Senator, asked for a larger deficit, and all of the Republican members did likewise. Republicans asked for a slight cutback in spending; but the cutback they proposed adds up—according to the spokesman for the minority members, Representative Curtis, of Missouri—to a larger deficit than the one which would result from the budget the President has proposed for 1964. I think the people of the country should realize this fact. I have been one who has criticized the President for his tax-cut proposal; but, Mr. President, after all, we find that on the Joint Economic Committee, which is supposed to be the chief congressional committee on economic policy, the minority members, as well as the majority members, argue that the President has proposed too small a deficit, not too large a deficit.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin has analyzed the proposal of the Governor of New York in this regard, as to how it would compare.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have not precisely analyzed the proposals of the Governor of New York. It is true that he advocated a reduction of spending. However, I do believe that his proposal comes very close to the position taken by the minority members of the Joint Economic Committee. The difficulty with the position of the Governor of New York is that he does not specify how much the cut in spending should be. He does not indicate what spending should be cut. He uses the term "low priority programs." Of course, everyone is against "low priority programs." But there is no specification. The Governor has asked for a bigger tax cut than has President Kennedy. I am talking about the proposed tax cut the first year, the tax cut which would affect the coming budget. He has asked for a bigger tax cut, and unless he can do a better job of suggesting ways to reduce spending than he has done in New York State, or than his Republican colleagues have done in the Congress of the United States—the House or the Senate—he will end with a bigger deficit than President Kennedy has.

Mr. President, one of the outstanding businessmen-statesman in our country is the distinguished Frazer Wilde, who is chairman of the Connecticut General Life Insurance Co. He was head of the Commission on Money and Credit appointed by President Kennedy, I believe—a very able, fine, and distinguished man. But Mr. Wilde, who speaks with great ability, perspicacity, and knowledge of finance, and as a spokesman of the financial community, also has asked for a far bigger tax cut, and what would amount to a much bigger deficit, the first year at least, than President Kennedy has asked for.

I make that statement in preface to remarks I should like to make in criticizing the proposal for a tax cut and a proposal for increasing our deficit.

MAJORITY RIGHT ON MONETARY POLICY—WRONG ON TAX POLICY

I was the one Democratic member of the Joint Economic Committee who filed individual views dissenting from the majority report. I wish to make clear that I support the majority of the committee on monetary policy. I consider it the finest statement of Government policy in the monetary field that I have read for a long time. It is brilliant. It is absolutely correct. I earnestly hope that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Reserve Board, who establish our monetary policy, will read the report with the greatest of care. It is based upon the best monetary advice the Joint Economic Committee could get.

THE CASE AGAINST A TAX CUT NOW

Mr. President, I should like to discuss now the case against a tax cut.

OVERWHELMING DRIVE FOR TAX CUT

All Americans, of course, desire relief from the heavy burden of taxes they must bear to support our Government.

A tax cut now is powerfully supported by the President, leading business organizations, top labor groups, a heavy consensus of economists, and many of the most influential opinion-leading commentators.

TAX CUT NOT RESPONSIBLE

But I submit that tax reduction under the following conditions is not responsible in a period of relative prosperity in the economy:

First. The current deficit is expected to approach $9 billion.

Second. The administration plans to ask for an initial increase in spending of about $4.5 billion. Based on past experience, Congress is more likely to increase than to decrease the President's initial spending proposals.

Third. The national debt exceeds $300 billion. It is greater than the national debt of all other nations in the world combined. Service costs on the debt are already $10 billion.

Fourth. The tax cut would increase the size of the deficit, the national debt, and the burden of servicing the debt.

TAX CUT SURE TO INCREASE DEFICIT AND NATIONAL DEBT

The easy assumption has been made by many administration witnesses that the tax cut, far from deepening the deficit, eventually would reduce it and, in fact, is the surest way to a balanced budget.

This is almost certainly wrong.

Calculations based on the whole sweep of witnesses appearing before the committee show that the longrun net loss of revenues flowing from the $10 billion tax cut would be between $1 and $6⅔ billion.

The most typical assumptions on the multiplier effect of the tax cut by witnesses before the committee were that it would be between 2 and 2½. In other words, that a $10 billion tax cut would increase the gross national product by $20 to $25 billion.

The consensus was clear that monetary restraint of the kind the Nation's money managers told the committee they expected to practice would reduce this multiplier. One monetary expert estimated that such a monetary policy would probably result in a multiplier of 1½, or a $15 billion increase in the gross national product from a $10 billion tax cut. All things considered, a multiplier of 2 or a $20 billion gross national product increase from a $10 billion tax cut would seem to be as reasonable a guess as any.

What would such an increase in the gross national product flowing from such a tax cut mean to ultimate Federal revenues?

Here again the expert witnesses differed. Dr. Arthur Burns, of Columbia University, and former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, estimated it would be about one-sixth. His estimate is confirmed by relating Federal tax revenues to the size of the gross national product. The relationship is about one-sixth.

On the basis of such an estimate, the net loss from a $10 billion tax cut allowing for a $3⅓ billion increase in revenues would be $6⅔ billion.

On the other hand the Council of Economic Advisers testified that the Federal tax recovery from increased gross national product is 30 percent. Even on this cheery basis, Government revenues would increase only $6 billion as a result of the $10 billion tax cut and the net loss would be $4 billion.

Even if we take the most optimistic multiplier assumptions of the Council: that the multiplier is 3 and that a $10 billion tax cut will increase the gross national product by $30 billion, and apply the optimistic Council 30-percent figure for Federal tax recovery, the total recovery of revenues would still be $9 billion and the net loss would be $1 billion. The Council has suggested that the multiplier may be somewhat higher than 2 because of induced investment through the so-called accelerator principle. They have, however, wisely refrained from estimating the quantity of this additional amount since, with the present high levels of excess capacity, it seems doubtful that any additional investment will be encouraged by the tax reduction.

The conclusion that the kind of sharp across-the-board tax reduction recommended by the President would result in an eventual as well as an immediate tax loss is borne out by economic analysis as well as by commonsense.

ADMINISTRATION RELIES ON STIMULATION FROM DEFICIT

Argument by administration witnesses for a tax cut has been made primarily on the grounds that it would increase demand in the economy, and that with unemployment close to 6 percent and plant utilization at 82 percent, the economy needs a surging demand.

Indeed, most administration witnesses frankly see little difference in economic impact between a reduction in Federal taxes and an increase in Federal spending. Both, in their view, would increase demand. Both would do so by increasing the Federal deficit.

The theoretical result: As the deficit increases, the Government puts more into the economy in demand—spending—than it takes out in taxing.

DEFICITS HAVE NOT BROUGHT SOUND ECONOMIC GROWTH IN THE PAST

Will deficits in fact stimulate sound long-term growth? Our recent history has plenty to say about the answer to this question.

In the past 32 years this Nation has become thoroughly experienced in Federal deficits. Deficits have been a continuous way of life for our National Goverment almost throughout this period. These deficits have been so immense that the national debt has exploded twentyfold since 1930: from $16 billion to over $300 billion.

With this experience, this Nation should be expert on the stimulative effect of deficits on the economy. What has been the result?

Except in World War II when deficits were astronomical, there is no evidence that continuous deficits have promoted economic growth. The evidence is all to the contrary.

The biggest growth in peacetime Federal debt, for example, was in the decade of the 1930's and in the period since 1957. The 1930's period was characterized by disastrous economic stagnation and record unemployment, coinciding with 10 years of such heavy deficits that they would be equivalent to $20 billion annually today. From 1957 to date, Federal deficits have averaged a heavy $6 billion per year. And yet, economic growth has been the slow-moving despair of current economists during this very period.

Advocates of the deficit route point to the impressive economic progress in Europe during the past decade to support the deficit stimulus theory. The economic situation in European countries during the past 10 years is so vastly different from ours—particularly in terms of demand—that the comparison is not a valid one.

But even here what does the record show? The industrial star of Europe, Germany, enjoying a mammoth 92-percent growth in industrial production in the 8 years between 1953 and 1961 (most recent year for which figures are available) compared to 20 percent in this country; but its deficit averaged 0.1 percent of gross national product during this period compared to an average deficit of 0.4 percent of gross national product in the United States. In terms of gross national product, Germany had one-fourth the deficit and four times the growth of this country.

This is not to argue that deficits retard growth. It is to argue that in a $550 billion economy, even the $12 billion deficit programed by the administration is swamped by the impact of private economic forces.

DEFICIT FOR GROWTH: A RADICAL DEPARTURE

Until this year, 1963, the President had contended that deficits might be necessary public policy in periods of recession. But on the upturn of the cycle, the Federal Government should run a surplus and over the business cycle balance the budget.

But now we are asked to follow a radically new theory. The deliberate deepening of the deficit this year is not planned for the purpose of overcoming a recession. Indeed, the President talked of 22 months of uninterrupted recovery in his state of the Union message. The planned deficit is billed for the purpose of promoting long-term growth.

But sound long-term growth can no more be based on the deficit gimmick than on any other easy panacea. Growth of an individual, a family, or a nation depends on the hard, long work of many years, on the sacrifices and forbearance required for education, the gradual development of skills, and the painful processes of research.

The preeminent economic success of America has been based squarely on individual self-reliance, with minimum Government participation and maximum individual freedom and incentive. Indeed, the starkest economic difference in the world today is between the economic stagnation of Communist collective economies and the dynamism of free Western economies.

SOUND TAX CUT REQUIRES SPENDING CUT FIRST

All of this suggests that the right prescription should indeed be a tax cut to free the economy's productive force from the burden of Government taxes but unless Federal spending is reduced—at least to keep pace with the reduction in Federal taxes—the reduced burden is a mirage.

Tax reduction with increased Government spending gives the impression of a lighter Government burden. But the lessened tax burden when spending is increased is then quickly translated into higher prices and an evaporation of the increased purchasing power of the tax cut. The taxpayer's aftertax income may be higher. But his income buys no more.

The sure inflationary impact of a tax cut this year was freely conceded in the hearings by such an eminent authority as Professor Duesenberry of Harvard. No enonomist disputed it.

SPENDING CAN BE CUT

If a tax cut with increased spending is not the answer, can, as a matter of practical fact, spending be reduced or at least stabilized without sacrificing major goals of this Nation such as national defense, space exploration, and indeed the development of skills through education on which long-term growth must be based?

Can spending be wisely reduced? It can indeed.

Although the President implied that spending other than defense, space, and interest will remain the same in 1964 as in the current fiscal year, the fact is that this spending will increase by more than $2 billion.

DOMESTIC SPENDING TO CLIMB $2 BILLION THIS YEAR

This year's budget by various bookkeeping transactions conceals the real increase in spending in the domestic sector.

The reason the $2 billion increase doesn't show up is because the administration plans to sell $700 million of the cotton surplus, $423 million of Export-Import Bank holdings, $315 million of Federal National Mortgage Association and Federal Housing Authority mortgages, $300 million in Commodity Credit Corporation loans, $150 million in farm housing loans, and $150 million in college housing loans. This total of $2 billion of liquidated assets will be used to offset increased spending in almost every department of Government.

GOVERNMENT SALE OF HOME MORTGAGES SURE TO SLOW DOWN RECOVERY

The administration's announced intention of selling $315 million of Federal National Mortgage Association and Federal Housing Authority mortgages during the coming year is sure to tend to drive up interest rates for home buyers.

The Budget Director told the committee at the hearings that the general impact on interest rates would not be significant because in the absence of the sale of mortgages the administration would be required to sell other Federal securities—presumably Treasury securities—to finance the deficit.

But the impact of the sale of such a large amount of mortgages could be quite different from the effect of selling a similar amount of Treasury securities. Interest rates on Treasury securities have only a secondary effect on mortgage rates. Some Government experts have testified to the committee the effect is relatively unimportant.

There can be no question, however, that the sale of more than $300 million of home mortgages by the Government will have a definite tendency to drive up interest rates.

If interest rates on home mortgages do indeed rise, unemployment would be sure to increase.

The biggest cost in home buying is interest. A rise in mortgage interest rates will surely reduce home construction. Home construction contributes directly and heavily to employment. Any cutback in home starts would seriously retard economic recovery.

Government sale of $300 million of mortgages could significantly reduce whatever expansionary effect the tax cut might have on the economy.

BIG INCREASES IN GOVERNMENT PAYROLLS

Let us consider the surest index of expanded spending: The Defense Department is the only department of Government which will actually reduce the number of its employees in the coming fiscal year. Every other department, without exception, will increase its employees in the coming budget year. Here are a few examples: Agriculture by a whopping 5,000, or 4 percent; Treasury by 4,000, or 5 percent; Interior by 4,000, or 6 percent; Health, Education, and Welfare by 6,000, or 7½ percent; General Services Administration by 3,000, or 9 percent; Commerce by 3,500, or 11 percent; and Labor by 1,300, or 14 percent. All of these increases will come in a single year—next year.

Asked about this sharp increase in employees in the coming year when they appeared before the committee, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and others all told the committee the increase was the result of new programs the Congress had passed.

But the Secretary of Commerce was most revealing when asked to defend the huge 11-percent increase in 1 year in personnel in his Department. He said that if he were given a free hand to reduce or eliminate old programs he could, in fact, reduce personnel by 10 percent and operate a better Department.

The Secretary of Commerce wisely pointed to the failure of the administration and Congress alike to look with critical scrutiny to economy in old programs which have developed powerful bureaucratic and often special interest support but no longer serve our national interest.

EXTRAVAGANT SUBSIDIES TO SPECIAL INTERESTS

The explosive expansion of some of the older programs with the hell-bent support of special interest shows how extravagantly generous with the taxpayer's money Congress has become when it teams up with subsidy-seeking interests.

For instance, just since 1957—to the coming year's 1964 budget—Federal spending for water transportation subsidy to shipbuilders has leaped from $365 to $677 million or 85 percent—these figures only include direct expenditure subsidies; in addition, the water transportation industry obtains substantial hidden subsidies in the form of preferential tax treatment—subsidies to privately owned commercial aviation have zoomed from $219 to $885 million, or fourfold; and promotion of business from $127 to $617 million, or an incredible fivefold.

Reducing entrenched, special-interest-supported spending is one of the toughest jobs of Government. It will become even tougher as "the establishment" persuades the Congress and the American people to accept the theory that larger Federal deficits fed alike by tax cuts and/or increased Government spending would lead to sound long-term growth.

But the theory is wrong. In fact, reduction of unjustified Government spending not only will not hurt economic expansion, it will help it. Wasteful Government spending diverts resources of skilled men and scarce material from constructive private uses. As the Government's massive purchasing power moves in, prices move up. The eventual burden on the taxpayer is sure and heavy.

SOME DOMESTIC SPENDING ESSENTIAL

This is not to say that all Government spending can only be an anchor that private enterprise must drag along—far from it. Spending that encourages manpower training, vocational education, industrial research, contributes to the very essence of a growing economy.

The tough job of Government is to adopt and advance the programs that will, in fact, advance the economy as well as to eradicate the programs that burden it.

There is no question in this Senator's mind, however, that in every phase of Government activity, including defense and space, spending can be reduced an aggregate of billions below the President's requests, possibly to a level permitting a sound tax cut.

ECONOMISTS FAIL TO PROVE TAX CUT WILL WORK

The case for the proposed tax cut, timed to coincide with both a present deficit and increased spending, and calculated to deepen the deficit, has not been made. It has not been made in these respects:

RECORD OF PREVIOUS TAX CUTS

First. The tax cut may have little or no stimulative effect on the economy. After only four of the nine tax cuts in the past 40 years did business significantly improve. There were times it actually got worse. This does not prove the so-called stimulative multiplier did not appear; it does show it can be washed out by other factors. This would seem to be almost certain for the $2.7 billion net tax cut proposed for the first tax cut year in this $550 billion economy.

Even the ultimate $10 billion net tax cut would seem to be likely to be washed out. For this ultimate grand total would amount to less than 2 percent of the gross national product. During the thirties, deficits that averaged more than twice this—4 percent—of the gross national product seemed to have little effect on economic growth.

MONETARY RESTRAINT WILL WEAKEN TAX CUT STIMULATION

Second. Any substantial stimulative effect of the tax cut would almost certainly be sharply cut and perhaps even destroyed by the restraining effect of

monetary policy. The country's top monetary authorities, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, both told the committee that they expected interest rates would be likely to rise if the economy moved ahead in 1963 and 1964. In view of the monetary power of these gentlemen, it is almost a sure thing that this expectation will be translated into reality. Interest rates will go up. Monetary authorities have publicly indicated that they will raise interest rates on savings bonds to 4 percent within the next year.

Monetary authorities appearing before the committee, other than the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, universally agreed that rising interest rates would slow down economic expansion. Dr. Meltzer, of Carnegie Tech, argued that the stimulative effect—multiplier—of the tax cut would depend almost entirely on the degree of monetary tightness.

The virtual certainty of this monetary tightness will surely develop for two reasons: (a) a policy of raising interest rates is regarded as the prime weapon for diminishing the adverse effect of the tax cut on the balance of payments; (b) rising interest rates are accepted as the ready tool to try to forestall the inflationary effect of the tax cut.

The majority report, in my view, does an excellent job of describing the problems of monetary policy with which we will be concerned in the months to come. Moreover, it indicates clearly the weaknesses in some of the monetary policies followed during the last few years. I wish to be specifically on record in support of the monetary section of the majority report.

TIGHT MONETARY POLICY WILL NOT IMPROVE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS POSITION

Incidentally, the preponderance of evidence from the joint committee's hearings last August and this year suggests that interest rate differentials can have only secondary effects on the balance of payments through influencing capital flows. Harverford Professor Philip Bell and Federal Reserve Economist Robert Gemmill have made the only available studies of the effect of interest rate differentials on capital flows and they have found the effect is far less significant than speculation and of far lesser significance than previously supposed. Neither of these studies was contradicted by any other studies that were brought to the attention of the committee, although witnesses appearing before the committee were systematically challenged to show any evidence to contradict the Bell and Gemmill studies.

This means the Government's monetary policy will be restrictive, will tend to counteract any stimulative effect of the tax cut, largely because of a false assumption—now exploded—that interest rates must be higher in this country to stem capital flows from this country overseas.

As for using rising interest rates to forestall the inflationary effect of the tax cuts, the principal architect of this policy, Chairman William Martin of the Federal Reserve Board, himself indicated that the policy would have only moderate effect in restraining rising prices. And yet this policy of monetary restraint to raise interest rates is the widely accepted answer to whatever inflation may develop in the future: not reduced Government spending, not increased taxes. Both are regarded as politically impossible.

The basic economic design—increased Government spending and lower taxes to stimulate the economy and rising interest rates to stabilize prices—is likely to lead to a cruelly oppressive debt burden as rising deficits are matched by rising interest rates required to service the heavier national debt.

What is worse, it means an economy-wide restraining force, slowing down homebuilding—where interest is the biggest cost—small business borrowing, and generally shifting a heavier burden to such debtor groups as farmers and consumers.

CASE FOR CORPORATE TAX CUT NOT MADE

Third. The heaviest and most consistent support for the tax cut came from those who argued that it was necessary to stimulate investment. No witnesses contradicted the alleged wisdom of such a tax cut. Almost all argued it was desirable to promote economic growth in the economy.

And yet the case for such a tax cut this year seems to be even weaker than it has been in the recent past. Let us review the record:

In 1954 the Nation enjoyed its last major tax cut. It was generally agreed that the prime beneficiaries of that tax cut were corporations. That tax cut was said to have been designed to stimulate investment in view of both its individual impact—most of the benefits went to persons in investment income brackets—and its large corporate reduction.

Now, 9 years later, the Congress is asked to make another sizable corporate tax reduction. One distinguished Senator remarked as the committee hearing opened that the 1954 tax cut seems to have had a long-term adverse effect on the economy because it stimulated investment between 1955 and 1957 to such an extent that the economy has been characterized by idle investment facilities, overbuilt plant capacity, unemployment, and slow growth ever since.

Just last year investment was stimulated by two additional tax reductions. First, depreciation guidelines were revised to provide the equivalent of a $1.5 billion stimulant to investment—and relief to corporations.

Secondly, the investment credit was rifle shot into corporate taxation to provide a specific and high-powered stimulus to investment through a 7-percent tax credit for every dollar of investment made.

The argument for further stimulation by tax cut is feeble indeed in view of these facts: First, the overwhelming preponderance of recent tax reduction on the side of stimulating investment; second, cash earnings in 1961 exceeded investment by a record absolute amount of $18½ billion and a record of 62 percent; third, although later figures are not available, cash earnings have been soaring since then while plant and equipment outlays have been about the same. The result: corporations have never been in a better cash position to invest in plant and equipment.

All the tax-incentive stimulation of the past seems to have done little to move business investment in plant and equipment ahead. In view of the recency of the 1962 corporate tax reductions, it would seem to be wiser to give these "investment stimulants" a chance to work rather than to hit again in a time of deficit spending with another "trickle down" investment tax cut.

MANY GROUPS HURT BY TAX CUT

Finally, there are many groups in the American society who would be hurt, not helped, by this tax cut.

FUTURE TAXPAYER BURDENED

The preeminent victim, of course, is the future taxpayer. As Dr. James Buchanan, chairman of the Economics Department of the University of Virginia, has written, the inevitable tendency of the politician is to spend for the present voter, reduce taxes for the present taxpayer, and mitigate the consequences by raising interest rates, thereby passing the whole burden to the future taxpayer. When Congress's economic experts on this committee, to whom Congress must look for advice, contend that such a policy is sound economics as well as effective short-run politics, the combination may be all but irresistible.

FARMER HIT

Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman testified for the tax cut but conceded that a substantial majority of America's farmers owe no income tax. Obviously for these farmers—who make a heavy investment of work, property, risk, and efficiency in their farms—the tax cut is meaningless. No one argues that America will buy or consume more food because of the tax cut. To the extent the tax cut sparks inflation and forces increased interest rates—and it seems certain to do both—the farmer is sure to be hit and hurt, and badly.

LITTLE BENEFIT TO UNEMPLOYED

Above all, this planned tax-cut deficit has been justified in the name of the unemployed. But the tough question that this Senator has encountered in talking to unemployed in Wisconsin is, "What good is a tax cut to an unemployed man with no income? He doesn't pay any taxes now. He doesn't need a tax cut. He needs a job."

An answer that the tax cut may stimulate the economy to provide more jobs is, as the previous analysis suggests, far from perfect.

It is especially ironic for the three groups which the Secretary of Labor told the committee form a disproportionately heavy part of the unemployed: the high school dropout; the unskilled; the minority groups. According to the testimony of the Secretary of Labor, each of these groups suffers not 6-percent unemployment but more than 12-percent unemployment.

Tax cuts will not begin to solve the problems of high school dropouts, unable to get jobs because of inadequate education and low or zero skills. Tax cuts will do little to knock down the prejudice barriers barring the minority groups from employment.

Few of the unskilled are likely to win jobs because of the tax cut. Their barrier is their lack of skill in an automating, technologically changing society. These people need training. A tax cut to solve their problem seems as heartless and stupid as Marie Antoinette's "Let 'em eat cake," for starving Parisians.

The unemployed in these groups will enjoy little benefit in income with a tax cut. They pay no Federal income tax; nor is it likely to help them get jobs.

To the extent the deficit drives up interest rates, these people who are likely to be debtors will suffer. To the extent the deficit drives up prices, they will all be hurt as consumers.

OLD PEOPLE HIT HARDEST

Of all groups in America, the hardest hit by this tax cut-sparked deficit will be the retired old people.

On February 15, 1963, the Treasury Department released a fact sheet showing that of the 18 million Americans 65 years old and over, 14½ million, or 80 percent, have such low incomes that they pay no Federal income tax now.

So 80 percent of the older people could not possibly receive any benefit from an income tax cut. Since the overwhelming majority of the 20 percent of oldsters who do pay income taxes pay very little, the benefit would in aggregate be very small indeed.

On the other hand, many of these older people are debtors. The rising interest rates which seem to be the certain concomitant of the income tax cut will come out of their already pitifully inadequate incomes. Rising prices—a likely companion of any Federal deficit stimulation of the economy—would likewise diminish what little they could buy with the income they have.

PROPOSED TAX CUT REGRESSIVE

Administration witnesses have contended that the proposed tax cut is a progressive one which will give low-income groups the greatest benefit. This is simply not true.

The following table shows the benefits to various economic groups from the personal income tax cuts—including the progressive reforms recommended by the administration. This table shows a precisely opposite effect from the table usually shown by the administration. This is because the administration table shows the percentage reduction of the income tax paid by persons in each income bracket. Because persons in high-income brackets of course pay higher income taxes, the administration table suggests the tax cut would be progressive.

Income	Federal income tax	Other taxes [1]	Total tax before cut	Total tax after cut	Percent reduction
$3,000	$60	$600	$660	$614	7
$5,000	420	1,000	1,420	1,296	8
$10,000	1,372	1,500	2,872	2,568	10
$15,000	2,616	1,700	4,316	3,776	13
$20,000	4,124	1,900	6,024	5,182	14

[1] Property (or imputed rent), sales, excise, auto, etc.

That the tax cut is, in fact, regressive, is demonstrated in the above table which shows the percentage reduction in all taxes paid that results from the administration recommendations. Because all Federal taxpayers pay heavy State and local taxes in addition to Federal taxes, this table shows a far more accurate picture of what actually happens to the taxpayer's total liability.

The impact of the President's tax proposal on various income groups was dramatically shown in a table submitted to the committee by Dr. Leon Keyserling. This table eloquently dramatizes the regressive effect of the proposed tax cut.

President's proposed tax structure in 1965 compared with present structure (1962), at various tax levels (for married couple with 2 children)

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	
Taxable income level	Present tax [1]	Present income after tax	Proposed tax [2]	Proposed income after tax	Percent tax reduction	Percent increase in after-tax income	Percent tax to income	
							Present	Proposed
$3,000	$60	$2,940	0	$3,000	100.0	2.0	2.0	0
$5,000	420	4,580	$280	4,720	33.3	3.1	8.4	5.6
$7,500	877	6,623	663	6,837	24.4	3.2	11.7	8.8
$10,000	1,372	8,628	1,068	8,932	22.2	3.5	13.7	10.7
$15,000	2,486	12,514	2,076	12,924	16.5	3.3	16.6	13.8
$25,000	5,318	19,682	4,605	20,395	13.4	3.6	21.3	18.4
$35,000	9,037	25,963	7,814	27,186	13.5	4.7	25.8	22.3
$50,000	15,976	34,024	13,837	36,163	13.4	6.3	32.0	27.7
$100,000	44,724	55,276	38,542	61,458	13.8	11.2	44.7	38.5
$200,000	115,224	84,776	95,072	104,928	17.5	23.8	57.6	47.5

[1] Assuming 10 percent deduction for taxes, interest, contributions, medical, etc.

[2] Assuming President's proposal, as revised by Dillon's testimony, of $400 minimum deduction for married couple and $100 for each child; 10 percent for incomes between $6,000 and $10,000; $10,000 flat deduction between $1,000 and $20,000; and 5 percent deduction for $20,000 and up.

Actual slight deviations from these workable assumptions would not in the slightest change the general import of the analysis.

Because tens of millions of American adults earn so little income that they pay no Federal income taxes, it is obvious that a significant share of our citizens will get no benefit but will almost certainly have to pay higher interest rates because of the tax cut and, very possibly, higher prices.

TAX CUT WORSENS ADVERSE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Witnesses were systematically asked what effect the proposed tax cut would have on the balance of payments.

It was generally conceded that the tax cut would worsen our balance of payments because the main thrust of the cut is to increase demand in the consumer sector. This would mean that purchases of imports would rise sharply.

On the other hand, far from reducing American prices to enable us to sell more abroad and increase exports, this tax cut, as Professor Duesenberry properly pointed out in the hearings, will certainly, inevitably, tend to increase prices and reduce our exports.

So the proposed tax cut would worsen our balance of payments by first, increasing imports and second, decreasing exports.

HEAVY COST OF TAX CUT FAILURE

Administration witnesses argued that if the tax cut fails to stimulate the economy as advertised, little has been lost. This is emphatically not true. If this highly questionable gamble, this radical new departure from American fiscal policy, is adopted and fails, the consequences will be serious indeed.

First. The already heavy national debt will be even more burdensome.

Second. Our present progressive income tax system will have been seriously jeopardized with little real political prospect of restoring it. It is hard to imagine a more difficult political task than increasing taxes back to their present rate once Congress cuts them. The alternative frankly advocated by Dr. Burns and other witnesses: a national sales tax. In the judgment of this Senator, this would be a first-class economic disaster as well as a gross injustice.

Third. Our antirecession ammunition—the real justification for a tax cut—will have been used up, leaving us far less equipped to cope with economic adversity.

Fourth. Our balance of payments will have been worsened both because imports will have been increased relative to exports and because the great American economy will have failed to respond to the prime economic prescription of its President and suffered a growing deficit.

Fifth. The most essential ingredient in economic success for a free nation—public confidence—will have been severely and needlessly damaged because of the failure of a highly advertised prime economic policy of our Government.

Sixth. The essential ingredient for discipline in Federal spending—that tax relief depends on spending reduction—will have been lost. This adverse consequence is even more sure to follow if the tax-cut prescription succeeds than if it fails.

And, in the long run, this may be the most serious threat of all in the tax-cut-for-a-deficit philosophy. For once the conviction takes hold that economic prosperity can be firmly based on deficit financing then the incentive to spending discipline will be lost and the trend to bigger and bigger government that is the consequence of unrestrained spending could become irresistible.

DOVER EDITORIAL COMMENDS LAUSCHE STRIP-MINING BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio is know by all of us to be an outstanding example of prudent and thoughtful conservatism. He is a man who is opposed to excessive Government spending. I think that the proposed legislation he has introduced also shows he has a wider conservative viewpoint. He is deeply concerned with what may happen to our resources, and is anxious to fight and fight hard to preserve our resources for future generations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very fine editorial published in the Daily Reporter of Dover, Ohio, which discusses the bill introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], as to regulating strip mining, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There has been much discussion recently, and no little amount of controversy, over strip-mining operations. Most of the criticism has been aimed at operators who have not engaged in restoration after stripping a given area.

An Ohio law requires strip operators to post bonds to assure they will try to put the land back into decent shape. But the law admittedly lacks sharp teeth and those fighting for backfills maintain that too many strippers are simply ignoring the law.

Generally speaking, strip-mining control has been viewed as a problem for individual States, because they must contend with the yawning canyons, which are hazardous for man and animal alike; the sulfur water, which contaminates springs and streams, and the disrupted land which, for the most part, is useless except reforestation, even when it is put back into some semblance of order.

But last Wednesday Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, of Ohio, involved the Federal Government in surface mining when he introduced a bill calling for the Secretary of the Interior to make a study of strip and surface coal operations and report back to Congress.

Admitting the economic benefits of strip mining, Senator LAUSCHE also deplored the fact that such operations have "destroyed all other usefulness of the land and has left abominable, grotesque scars."

The Senator further charged that in his home State of Ohio, where he served as Governor, "there are large areas where, as a result of stripping operations, public highways have suffered severe damage by reason of slippage; streams, lakes, and wells have been polluted; wildlife cover has been destroyed; and, finally, the entire areas themselves have been abandoned as unproductive and virtual wasteland. The future economy of these areas is seriously threatened."

Senator LAUSCHE cited Ohio's current strip-mine reclamation law as having been helpful in land restoration but added: "I've always felt it should have required more strict conservation measures."

The senior Buckeye Senator said he feels "Congress should determine in what manner and in what degree it would have responsibility in helping to restore to usefulness these ever-growing numbers of acres of desolation."

If Congress eventually enacts a reclamation law governing coal-stripping operations, the taxpayers will foot the bill for its administration. Considering that only 35 cents of every tax dollar sent to Washington comes back, it would be far less expensive for Ohioans if the general assembly would wake up and amend the Buckeye laws covering reclamation. A well-teethed law would put the burden on the strip miners and not the taxpayers.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PROXMIRE BEFORE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE WITH RESPECT TO FOREST PRODUCTS LABORATORY, MADISON, WIS.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have a statement which I made this morning before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations relating to the urgent need for an appropriation for the Forest Products Laboratory of Madison, Wis., printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE BEFORE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. Chairman, I welcome this opportunity to appear in support of a $3.8-million appropriation for a badly needed addition at the Forest Products Laboratory of Madison, Wis.

Last year this committee recognized the vital importance of the project and recommended an appropriation of $380,000 to carry out the planning stage of the Laboratory's expansion program. The Senate stood behind this recommendation, but the House cut it back in conference to $200,000, or just enough to cover the costs of the most essential planning.

I am happy to report that this initial appropriation has been used wisely. After careful screening and negotiation, two firms have been chosen to design and engineer the highly-specialized, 170,000-square-foot addition to the Laboratory's crowded, 30-year-old plant. Within a year the blueprints will be completed and the project will be ready for its long-overdue groundbreaking on 12 acres of adjacent land donated by the University of Wisconsin.

To carry out the program smoothly and economically, construction funds must be appropriated now. This will allow bidding for the construction job to take place next spring, when a buyer's market for construction services is expected. Waiting until next year to make this grant will almost certainly postpone construction until the summer months, a time when the building trade is normally operating at near-maximum capacity.

Mr. Chairman, the existing condition of the Forest Products Laboratory plant, its keystone role in the wood products industry, and the industry's significance in our national economy all point up the necessity of making this requested investment of Federal funds. The laboratory plant is simply substandard for the work that now goes on in it.

This work is universally acclaimed as the finest and most extensive in the world today, and it is a tribute to the Laboratory's excellent staff that so much has been done for so long in so little space. But talking to scientists, technicians, and administrators has convinced me that the miracle of the forest products research cannot continue under conditions as they now exist at the Laboratory.

Even without considering the many new avenues of research which are closed off for lack of adequate facilities, there are several older projects which cannot be fully developed for the simple and exasperating reason that the present structure cannot adequately contain them.

Among these I would cite as a critical example the case of high-speed paper formation. Here is an area which is on the verge of a real breakthrough, one which industry is anxiously awaiting because it would unfold new vistas for the use of secondary-quality hardwoods. To achieve this breakthrough, extensive experiments with new processing machinery are required.

Only the Laboratory can do this in a manner which will benefit the entire paper and pulp industry, yet the present laboratory building has neither the space nor the modern load-bearing requirements to support the necessary equipment. As a result, further progress toward perfection of this process and the consequent stimulation of a multimillion dollar industry, must await congressional approval of these construction funds.

In 1961, the wood products industry provided direct employment for more than 1.1 million people—over 7 percent of the total manufacturing labor force. In the same year the value of all forest products after shipment was $25 billion, or roughly 5 percent of the Nation's gross national product. Of this amount, only $1 billion is attributable to the value of the raw materials; of the remaining added value, a great percentage can be traced to processes and techniques which originated at the Forest Products Laboratory.

Here is an industry which ranks sixth in terms of employment and eighth in terms of value added in the hierarchy of the American economy. Yet, public and private expenditures on research now average only a pitiful 0.35 percent of its annual contribution to gross national product, while the national average in all manufacturing industries is 2.5 percent—higher by a factor of 7.

Back in 1957, the President's Commission on Industrial Uses of Agricultural Products pinpointed this deficiency as an urgent one and recommended a more than fourfold expansion in Forest Products Laboratory research. In outlining a 10-year program during which funds for research would be increased over $1 million in each year, this bipartisan Commission estimated that the resulting ratio of research expenditures to product value would still be worse than the 1957 figure. From this it is clear that the Commission's recommendations represented the absolute minimum in intelligent research planning.

But today—6 years later and at a time when industrial research commands an unprecedented priority in our economy—the Forest Products Laboratory is confined to a building which has been unimproved during the entire 30-year period since it was constructed. And I want to emphasize that approval of this construction appropriation of $3.8 million would fall far short of meeting the Presidential Commission's 1957 recommendations.

Because we failed to heed the Commission's warning, the wood products industry has come in for some rough sledding. A sure indication that research has not kept pace with economic realities is the mounting level of foreign competition. In 1961, for example, exports of lumber and wood products dropped 12 percent from 1960, while imports rose a full 8.3 percent.

This unfavorable trend in our pattern of trade reflects rising costs of production here at home. The cost of harvesting and sawing raw timber has alone risen four times faster in the last decade than the general wholesale price index. This cost-price squeeze has meant that many stands of second-quality timber in the midcontinent forest regions are simply not being cut to allowable or desirable limits, and many other stands are being sold at very depressed stump prices. The result is that Government revenues from sales of forest land stumpage are substantially reduced for lack of new cost-saving processes in the industry and new methods of wood resource utilization.

Of all the uses to which $3.8 million of Government funds could be put perhaps no other would pay off so quickly in the form of direct returns. The 1957 Presidential Commission report I referred to a moment ago states that for every $1 invested in the Forest Products Laboratory, $70 has come back to the Federal Government by way of resulting tax revenues.

There is still another return on investment which the Forest Products Laboratory yields to the Federal Government, one which is even more direct than the revenues resulting from the Laboratory's research. The Government, by virtue of its ownership of forest lands, is the major supplier of the wood products industry's raw materials. Recently about one-fifth of the annual cuttings in the country have been from Government-owned and managed lands. And Government holdings are greater than this would indicate; they comprise 45 percent of the national wood resources at the stump. The value of these holdings is directly related to the value of the products which can be made from them. This in turn is immediately dependent on the development of new uses and new techniques of manufacture. And that is the mission of the Forest Products Laboratory, one which it alone can perform for an industry whose small enterprises account for 60 percent of the boardfeet produced.

I would like to submit several exhibits for the record which expand on my statement today and indicate some of the many significant contributions which the Laboratory has made in the past, as well as promising projects for future research. I am confident that the committee will give this request for construction funds the close and favorable attention it deserves, just as it last year treated the appropriation for planning expenses.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Wisconsin has the smallest amount of Federal spending per capita, I believe, of any State in the Union. I know Wisconsin has the smallest number of Federal employees per capita of any State in the Nation.

This Forest Products Laboratory is one of the few Federal installations in Wisconsin. The installation has paid for itself many times. A Presidential commission in 1957 estimated that for every dollar spent in the research institute in Madison, the Federal Government has received $70 in direct tax revenues back, because of the enormous benefits which the Forest Product Laboratory research has been able to develop for our economy.

I think it would be a real disservice if the appropriation were delayed, because this money will return itself to the Federal Government many, many times in research, which is desperately needed.

I think we have grossly neglected our industrial research in this country, while concentrating on necessary space research and defense research.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RELAXATION OF CONTROLS ON RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I find very little good news for the people of Maine in the announcement today of the so-called relaxation of controls on residual oil imports.

I fear that it will actually falsely raise the hopes of the people of Maine who have been going through a very severe winter. Recently the president of the United Mine Workers in emerging from a conference with President Kennedy announced that President Kennedy had given him assurance that there would be no meaningful relaxation of restrictions against residual oil imports.

A close examination of the announcement today reveals that such assurance has been carried out and that this does not constitute a meaningful relaxation of existing restrictions against residual oil imports.

What was reported in the Washington Post yesterday by reporter Julius Duscha is proved true today by the announcement. I quote excerpts from his article:

> The hottest international oil issue facing the White House reportedly has been resolved largely in favor of domestic economic and political considerations.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Last month Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, recommended to President Kennedy that the administration undertake "a careful and meaningful relaxation" of the controls.
>
> Despite this recommendation, the White House was reported yesterday to have decided to permit a smaller increase in imports than it allowed in the last year.
>
> The decision represents a significant victory for the coal industry and for domestic oil producers.

The announcement today establishes Mr. Duscha's accurate prereporting for the increase is smaller than it was last year and "the decision represents a significant victory for the coal industry and for domestic oil producers."

In that victory for the coal producers and domestic oil producers—like the Texas oil millionaires—the decision is a significant defeat for the people of Maine and for the little consumers. For the gain of the Texas oil millionaires by the Kennedy decision is a loss by the man in the street and the woman in the home in Maine.

As the United Mine Workers president reported the other day on President Kennedy's assurances of no meaningful relaxation of the restrictions, so today the truth of his report is confirmed by the announcement of the fact that the small increase is even smaller than it was last year. In other words, as far as the people of Maine are concerned the trend is not forward with vigor—the President has not made a meaningful relaxation.

I do not think that it is an exaggeration to say that today's announcement and the grandiose claims made in connection with it are dangerously close to constituting "false and misleading advertising" creating false hopes and designed to make things seem what they are, in reality, not.

The most charitable thing that can be said about today's announcement is that it is "too little and too late"—too little since it is even less of an increase than what we received a year ago—and too late since it comes just a week before the official end of winter, and highest heating oil prices, when the need for the residual oil was at its greatest.

This pattern is getting old and worn out as far as Maine is concerned. In connection with this matter, there is an excellent editorial in the March 8, 1963, issue of the Bangor Daily News. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

More Like the Horse and Buggy Days

> Senator Margaret Chase Smith had some pungent and pertinent criticism to make of the New Frontier administration at the recent monthly meeting of the Maine delegation in Congress.
>
> The Kennedy administration, she declared, devotes too much time to talk and studies, and too little to action. For this reason, she declined to join the delegation in sending another appeal to the President for the removal of quotas on residual oil imports.
>
> "I don't think a letter from the delegation amounts to a row of pins," she told her colleagues. "I think a pattern has developed. The President talks about oil, textiles, and equalizing the pay for shipyard workers at Kittery. First, there's a study, then a report, then a letter. What good does a study do? It's a case of too much words and too little action."
>
> Unfortunately for the State of Maine, what Senator Smith says is all too true. The administration continues to dawdle over restricting textile imports that are hurting Maine and other textile States. It does nothing about lifting oil import quotas which are adding some $30 million annually to New England's fuel bill, though Kennedy himself urged just such action when he was serving Massachusetts as a U.S. Senator. Equalization of shipyard pay is another perennial and unresolved issue.
>
> Of course, it is an old bureaucratic custom to stall when a matter is controversial. But for an administration that rode into office on a campaign stressing vigor and action, the New Frontier is uncommonly prone to balking and shying. It needs spurs—and perhaps a burr or two under the saddle.

THE FLOODS IN KENTUCKY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, today I introduced before the Senate Public Works Committee, resolutions directing the Corps of Engineers to review its reports of survey on flood protection facilities for the Kentucky, Upper Cumberland, and Big Sandy Rivers, taking into consideration the extensive damage caused in these valleys by floods in the last few days. The last resolutions for the survey of the Big Sandy and Kentucky Rivers were introduced by Senator Earle Clements and myself in 1953–54. The last such survey on the Upper Cumberland River, that is above Cumberland Falls, was introduced by me in 1957.

The purpose of the three resolutions which I have introduced today is to enable the Corps of Engineers to determine whether additional reservoirs and local flood-protection facilities in the three valleys can now meet the cost-benefit ratio required by the Corps of Engineers, under law, by reason of the additional information of great damage caused by the flood which has just ravaged these valleys. Specifically, one purpose is to have the corps reexamine the following sites which were previously studied:

Kentucky River Valley: Line Fork Reservoir site above Hazard, Ky., and Lothair, Ky., which suffered great flood damage.

Walker's Creek Reservoir site in Lee County.

Hazard and Lothair, for local flood protection facilities.

Upper Cumberland River: Martin's Fork Reservoir site above Harlan, Ky.; Cumberland, Ky., and Harlan, Ky., for local flood protection; Barbourville, Ky., and Pineville, Ky., to determine if height of flood walls should be increased and walls should be strengthened.

Big Sandy: Paint Creek Reservoir site, to protect Paintsville; Pond Creek Reservoir site on Tug Fork branch of Big Sandy; Beaver Creek, channeling and deepening to protect Martin, Ky.

While I have named these specific sites, my resolution would also authorize the Corps of Engineers to determine if other reservoir sites and local flood protection facilities, such as flood walls, cutoffs, and channel improvement, would provide adequate protection.

I point out that several of the reservoir and local flood protection sites I have specified were studied by the Corps of Engineers under the authority of the surveys which Senator Clements and I introduced, but that it was found by the Corps of Engineers—on the basis of information available from past floods—that construction could not be approved, because they did not meet the cost-benefit ratio required by law. I believe that the new evidence of damage caused by the present flood will provide the Corps of Engineers with facts which could bring the cost-benefit ratio of some of the additional projects within the requirements of the law, and make them eligible for approval and construction.

I have talked to officials of the Corps of Engineers, and they have told me that my resolutions providing authority to them to study additional flood protection in the three river valleys would be useful.

I have also written today to the President and to Mr. Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, asking that the Corps of Engineers be requested to provide to the Bureau of the Budget a statement of its highest capabilities in terms of appropriations to speed up the construction of Fishtrap Reservoir on the Big Sandy, presently under construction; to increase its funds for preconstruction engineering at Carr Fork; to provide funds for preconstruction engineering at Laurel River; and for funds to initiate construction of Cave Run Reservoir on the Licking River. These are the only projects which are ready for appropriations. I believe that funds can be added to speed up the completion of these projects by at least 1 year. Funds are now available to complete construction of the local flood protection project at Carbon.

The Kentucky, upper Cumberland, Big Sandy, and Licking Rivers have been swept by floods for almost 100 years, and many of them have been recorded by the Corps of Engineers. The people of these areas have suffered property losses running into the millions of dollars. The 1957 flood caused damage in the Kentucky River Valley alone on the order of $10 million. Further, these floods deter and prevent the economic improvement of eastern Kentucky which, unfortunately, has been designated as an area of substantial and persistent unemployment. And most tragic, many lives have been lost in the floods which have swept these valleys.

Within the last 10 years, the Congress has initiated the first substantial efforts to give flood protection to eastern Kentucky. On the Big Sandy River, Fishtrap, Pound, and Flannagan Reservoirs are under construction, and Prestonsburg has been provided partial local flood protection. On the Kentucky River, Buckhorn Reservoir has been completed and local flood protection provided at Jackson. Funds are in the present budget for the preconstruction work at Carrs Fork Reservoir; Booneville Reservoir had been previously authorized.

On the upper Cumberland River floodwalls have been constructed at Pineville and Barbourville, and funds are now available to complete construction of flood protection projects for Corbin. All preconstruction work has been completed at Laurel for Laurel Reservoir, and it is ready for construction appropriations. Funds are included in the 1964 budget to complete the survey of Rock Castle Reservoir. We are urging the authorization of Devils Jump Reservoir.

All of this has been done since 1953, but full protection for these valleys must be provided.

As a member of the Senate Public Works Committee, I will urge a speedy review by the Corps of Engineers of projects which can give the best possible protection to these valleys; and as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee for Public Works, I will urge the increase of appropriations for projects under construction, and projects ready for construction during this session of the Congress.

The members of our Kentucky delegation in the House and Senate, of both parties, have worked together to secure flood protection for eastern Kentucky, as well as other sections of Kentucky, and we will continue to do so in the future.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McGOVERN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, before this week ends I believe there should be placed in the Congressional Record a very fine piece of political writing which appeared in last Sunday's Washington Star, on March 10, 1963, under the caption "McGovern's Political Unorthodoxy." The article was written by George W. Oakes, a contributing writer in the Washington Star.

It is a fine piece of political interpretation, as well as narrative writing and historical writing, about the reorganization of the Democratic Party in South Dakota under the leadership of the present occupant of the chair [Mr. McGovern in the chair], who was inspired by Adlai Stevenson in 1952 to give up a position he held, as a Ph. D., of a professorship in a college and to get out into every day politics; and how his long organizational effort revitalized the Democratic Party in South Dakota and placed him in the Senate, and gave great impetus for better government in his State.

I congratulate the Senator from South Dakota for his great contribution to better government in America and the two-party development in his State and to greater participation by many of the young people in his State in politics, as well as widespread participation by many groups in his State who theretofore had been quiescent.

I am proud to serve in this body with one who has contributed so much to the revitalization of governmental activity and to the political life in his own State.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed with my remarks at this point in the Record. I regret that the accompanying fine photograph cannot be printed under the rules.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

McGovern's Political Unorthodoxy

(By George W. Oakes)

> The South Dakota election which sent George McGovern to the U.S. Senate last fall was one of the most unusual in the State's history for many reasons.
>
> In the first place, his victory by 597 votes out of more than 250,000 cast wasn't determined until completion of an official recount on December 6. It was the first recount in South Dakota in 26 years.
>
> In second place, Mr. McGovern almost singlehandedly built up the party that barely elected him. In 10 years the 40-year-old former history professor at Dakota Wesleyan University completely revitalized the Democratic Party in a traditionally Republican State by working at the grassroots.
>
> "The job was really a one-man show," he said the other day in his Senate office. "I raised the money to pay my salary as executive secretary of the party and had no paid help at all. I spent long, hard days and nights traveling throughout the entire State.
>
> "As a professor of history and government (Senator McGovern took a Ph. D. degree in history at Northwestern under Prof. Arthur S. Link, Princeton historian and editor of the Woodrow Wilson papers) I naturally was interested in politics. Adlai Stevenson's 1952 campaign inspired me to take an active part myself. The fact that Adlai plunged so vigorously into the political battle made me want to help him. While I was teaching political science, I wrote a series of semihistorical articles for the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Daily Republic tracing the record of the political parties. These articles caught the attention of the youthful Democratic State chairman who then asked me to work full time on the reorganization of the party which was in such a low state that there was no competition for leadership.

The Slate of 1954

> "Therefore the organization, such as it was, gave me a free hand. I developed a list of candidates and in 1954 we were able for the first time in years to offer the voters a full Democratic slate for county, State, and National office.
>
> "At least once a week, I issued a press release on some State problem. Either I took issue with the Republicans or we offered a positive proposal. In 1955 I gave serious thought to becoming a candidate myself and began to take on a heavy speaking schedule, addressing meetings of Chambers of Commerce, Kiwanis, church groups, PTA's, etc., and spoke five or six times a week throughout the entire year.
>
> "In January 1956, I announced my candidacy for Congress and resigned as executive secretary of the party. No one in South

Dakota history ever campaigned more intensively. I made as many as 10 or 12 appearances a day in that many different towns and went to every village in the eastern half of the State.

"We won, not only because of hard work and good party organization, but also because many Republicans realized that a two-party structure was in the best interests of the State. Competition improved each party and meant that South Dakota's representatives in Congress would be more responsive to the State's needs."

At the completion of his second term in the House, where he fought vigorously for agricultural reform, Mr. McGovern decided in 1960 to enter the senatorial contest against Senator Karl Mundt. He was defeated in a Nixon statewide landslide carrying the entire Republican ticket. Observers attributed his defeat largely to voter uneasiness over the prospects of a Catholic President. Whereas Mr. Nixon won by 50,347 votes, Senator Mundt received only 14,920 more votes than Mr. McGovern.

FOOD-FOR-PEACE JOB

For 2 years Mr. McGovern served as Director of Food-for-Peace in the Kennedy administration. He expanded the school lunch program so that 37 million youngsters in 80 countries are now fed with U.S. surplus farm products. He also started the plan for use of surplus grain in paying workers in developing countries.

The official canvass of the November senatorial election gave Mr. McGovern a 100-vote lead (128,581 to 128,481) over Republican Senator Joe Bottum who had been appointed to fill the unexpired term after Senator Francis Case's death last summer. Confident he could overturn the result, Mr. Bottum demanded a recount. Then the McGovern organization had to train its staff, mostly lawyers working on a voluntary basis, on procedures to be used. Recount schools were formed and a handbook was prepared. In each county a recount board, composed of the county judge and one member of each political party, undertook the task of checking each ballot in 94 percent of the State's precincts. In some counties the recount, which started November 26, lasted more than a week.

The board did not find any fraud but did discover many cases of ballots with identifying marks which are illegal in South Dakota.

A native South Dakotan, Senator McGovern is the son of a Methodist minister, an early settler in the State. After working his way through public school and Dakota Wesleyan University, he distinguished himself as a bomber pilot in World War II and received the DFC while serving with the 15th Air Force in Italy.

A six-footer, he is known among his colleagues on the Hill for his "quiet strength." As one of them remarked, "he doesn't push hard but he doesn't give ground either." One prominent Republican Congressman, who worked with the new Senator, recalls that he was a "civilized, self-effecting Member who expressed his views effectively and always was constructive."

APPRAISED BY A COLLEAGUE

"George is a shy person," commented a liberal House Democrat.

"He seems to shrink from the rough and tumble of politics. George will have influence in the Senate by winning gradually the confidence and respect of the other Members but it will take time."

During the recent fight over the Senate rules, Senator McGovern cast his vote with those Senators supporting the Anderson resolution which would have killed the filibuster by either a majority or three-fifths vote of the Senate.

Senator McGovern, though he may be shy and have a disarming manner, isn't afraid of tackling tough issues. He was the only Senator in this session to request assignment to the Agriculture Committee, which he received as well as Interior. A quarter century ago Agriculture was considered one of the most desirable posts.

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, a native South Dakotan, an old friend of McGovern's and an important influence in his political career, commented recently that "George is a patient man which I am not. He is geared temperamentally to the legislative process which many outstanding Senators are not. He is strong mentally and morally."

George McGovern comes to the Senate acclimated to the political and social life of Washington which is very important. The hardest period in a new Senator's life is the first 2 years because most new Senators are lost among the important people who crowd the Washington scene. But George has broad horizons—from Spink County, S. Dak., to New Delhi, India. He understands the world with which Congress must deal.

As Senator McGovern sees the task confronting him and the other freshman Senators, one quality "we will desperately need is a sense of history."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I join with the able Senator from Texas in extending congratulations to the Senator from South Dakota on what he has accomplished. I congratulate also the people of the State of South Dakota for the great wisdom and judgment they exercised in sending him here as a U.S. Senator, where they will be most effectively served and represented by him.

I might say further that I understand that the present occupant of the chair made his maiden speech in the Senate today. He picked a most appropriate subject to talk about, because the junior Senator from Florida, in 1951, when he made his maiden speech, talked about Latin America. The able Senator from South Dakota has made his maiden speech on the same subject.

I listened with great interest to his speech. It was excellently done. I agree with most of his conclusions, though not with all of them. I now have him as a captive audience, and he will have to listen to my speech. It is possible that I may be able to convince him. At any rate, I join the Senator from Texas in congratulating the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his remarks, and I join him in congratulating the able and distinguished Senator from South Dakota and in congratulating the people of South Dakota for their good judgment. I desire to congratulate both the Senator from Florida and the Senator from South Dakota on making their maiden speeches on the subject of Latin America. Having been reared in a State that adjoins Latin America, and having lived for 3½ years in El Paso, Tex., at a border point, I assure both Senators that the subject has not been exhausted, and probably will not be in the lifetime of the three of us. I again congratulate the Senator from South Dakota.

PROPOSED NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in recent weeks we have heard some inaccurate and premature criticism of the proposed National Service Corps. Many of its critics did not have a clear idea of what the Service Corps would and would not do. Recently, George Kentera, a fine reporter for the Newark News, interviewed David L. Hackett, a special assistant to the Attorney General's office who played an important role in the planning of the Service Corps.

One important point made by Mr. Hackett when asked what control the Federal Government would have over Service Corps projects was:

> Control and supervision would be in the hands of the local community or the agency. There would be no people from Washington telling them what to do. This would be a locally supervised and initiated program. The volunteers would be under local supervision.

The rest of the forthright interview will provide my colleagues with a clear idea of how the proposed Service Corps will work. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article and interview be included in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the article and interview were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On the Record—Domestic Corps Seen "Conscience"

(By George Kentera)

Washington.—The major purpose of the proposed National Service Corps is to stimulate the American conscience about the vast problem of underprivileged Americans.

In the view of David L. Hackett, special assistant to Attorney General Robert Kennedy, the domestic corps is intended as an example, a catalyst, that would motivate millions of Americans to voluntary service in meeting grave community problems.

Hackett, 36, is Executive Director of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, and he played a leading role in setting up the proposed program for a domestic corps of full-time volunteers who would work for a year in problem areas.

INTERVIEWED BY NEWS

His comments on the National Service Corps, which under President Kennedy's proposals would reach a maximum size of 5,000 volunteers in 3 years, were made in a copyrighted "On the Record" interview with the Newark News, Detroit News, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and Washington Star.

Hackett stressed that the domestic corps—operating in the same spirit of Peace Corps volunteers overseas—would work on locally supervised and locally initiated programs, and upon invitation by local agencies and institutions. An exception would be on Federal reservations, such as Indian lands; another might be work with migratory labor groups that cross State boundaries in their travel.

During preliminary studies on the advisability of a domestic corps, Hackett said, suggested programs were submitted by more than 40 localities.

"We expect a great many more requests once the program has passed Congress, many more requests than we can supply," he said. He added later, "we are not pretending this is going to solve all of these problems, but we think it is going to highlight them."

Hackett said he thought it would be more difficult to recruit volunteers into the domestic corps than had been the case in the Peace Corps. Serving in problem areas of the United States, he said, would not be considered as glamorous as serving overseas, and in some areas the work would be more difficult.

EXPECTS LOCAL ACTION

The domestic corps would have to be careful, he said, that its recruits recognized the temptations of working in big cities. At the same time, he thought that domestic volunteers might be shocked at some conditions they might encounter.

"Many of us live in very comfortable circumstances," Hackett said, "and do not know the plight of the migratory worker or the Indian, or the Negro in Harlem. I think that is a role the catalyst is going to play."

He expressed the hope that the National Service Corps would, besides stimulating Americans to voluntary service on community problems, lead the individual States and communities to establish their own counterparts of the corps.

There are about 35 million volunteer workers in the United States now, Hackett said, but many more are needed, and the President's call on citizens "to serve their country will be the catalyst needed to get people who have talent and resources, who do not now involve themselves in community problems."

National Service Corps Would Give United States an Example

(Following is the transcript of an "On the Record" interview with David L. Hackett, special assistant to the Attorney General, copyright 1963 by the Newark News, Detroit News, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and Washington Star.)

Question. Mr. Hackett, the President has now proposed to Congress a National Service Corps and you, among others, were instrumental in shaping up the program. Could you tell us briefly what the National Service Corps is, how it is different from the regular Peace Corps and what its members will do?

Mr. Hackett. Basically, the National Service Corps is conceived as an instrument by which a small group of people who give a year of their time will serve in locally initiated projects in this country.

The major purpose of the program would be to serve as an example. It is hoped that men and women serving full time in the corps would motivate many more Americans to serve in their local communities on a part-time basis.

Question. How large a corps do you envisage?

Mr. Hackett. The recommendation that went to the President recommended not more than 5,000 at the maximum. This would be built up over a period of perhaps 3 years.

Question. Then the program would end?

Mr. Hackett. I think it would continue; we would hope it would continue.

Question. Why not then have this program start on a local basis, rather than having a Federal group like the National Service Corps?

Mr. Hackett. Well, there are approximately 35 million volunteers now in the country, and we feel that there is a need for many more. We feel that a certain amount of the prestige of the President in the call to serve their country will be the catalyst needed to get people who have talent and resources, who do not now involve themselves in community problems.

Question. Would the first National Service Corps workers go to work on a Federal reservation or in a Federal hospital, or would they start right in at the local community level?

Mr. Hackett. I think they would start right at the local community level. There are areas where some people think the Federal Government has more direct responsibilities, such as the Indian problem, and perhaps migratory labor. But during the study, we asked some local communities to develop model programs to see how they would use people, and we received over 40. We expect a great many more requests once the program has passed Congress, many more requests than we can supply.

Question. Where are some of these cities and States?

Mr. Hackett. We had models from New York, Chicago, a migratory labor camp in California, several of the Indian reservations, and mental hospital plans in Massachusetts.

Question. Those five would be where you would probably start?

Mr. Hackett. Well, they might be. There was no promise given.

Question. If there are 35 million volunteers already at work in this country, why do you think recruiting 5,000 federally paid people to assist them will have a big impact on the amount of volunteer work that is done?

Mr. Hackett. Well, that is a good question. We would hope that these programs, developed at the local level, would be in the areas of greatest need. We would hope the programs would get more and more of the citizens within the community to concern themselves with the problems in the areas of greatest need.

For example, in Massachusetts young people from Harvard and Radcliffe work in mental hospitals. What these hospitals want to do now is to expand it statewide, and to attract young people from the colleges throughout Massachusetts. They would request, say, 30 to 40 corps people who would really act as agents to involve more and more young people from the colleges. There are in this country many examples of this. We are not at all critical of the volunteers who now serve. We just think that there need to be many more.

Question. If this is designed essentially as a catalyst process would it not be better to have professionally trained people go in and form the nucleus?

Mr. Hackett. That is the problem. There are just not enough professionals.

Question. The Federal Government could not recruit 5,000 professionals?

Mr. Hackett. I think that it could, but the cost would be great. We say that volunteers are one method by which this manpower shortage can be met. We are not pretending this is going to solve all of these problems, but we think it is going to highlight them.

Question. How costly will this effort be?

Mr. Hackett. We have no definite figures, but the estimates for 1,000 volunteers run between $4 million and $6 million. The final cost will depend upon what the local contribution might be and what termination pay the corps volunteers might receive. The Peace Corps volunteers get $75 a month, and there is a question of whether these will get the same.

Question. On recruitment, you sent out 22,000 questionnaires to college students, and 18,000 to elderly persons. Can you give us a breakdown of their replies?

Mr. Hackett. They are still coming in. Of the ones we have received, the majority has shown a great deal of interest. I think recruiting is going to be a problem. I think it will be much more difficult to recruit in the domestic corps than the overseas Peace Corps.

Question. Why is that?

Mr. Hackett. I think it is not as glamorous as serving in a foreign country. In some ways, the work there will be much more difficult than overseas. The temptations of working in the big cities are there, and we are going to have to be very careful in making sure that we get people who realize this.

The 60 Peace Corps people who trained in New York for Colombia, South America, came from middle-class backgrounds. I think that they were appalled by the conditions they found in the slum areas in which they worked.

Some of them said, "why send us to South America?" They didn't really realize that these conditions existed in this country, 20 people in a room, with rats, and this type of thing. So we think it is going to be very much more difficult.

Question. What kinds of people are you looking for?

Mr. Hackett. We know there is considerable interest among young people in college. There has been tremendous interest on the part of old people, retired people. I think these are two places where recruits could come from, but we would also hope there would be people in between who would give up a year to help. For example, the Attorney General is working with 20 young businessmen from around the country. I think there would be a variety of skills, from all types of backgrounds.

Question. Well, would the National Service Corps people be working in their own hometown or will you be assigning midwesterns to New York, or New Yorkers to the South?

Mr. Hackett. Probably they would not work in their hometown, but in other parts of the country.

Question. How would they live?

Mr. Hackett. They would live in the area in which they go to work. If they worked in a mental hospital, they would live there.

Question. And the Government would pay them enough for their room and board?

Mr. Hackett. That is right.

Question. And subsistence?

Mr. Hackett. Yes. We estimate between $6 and $8 a day, depending on the area. It would be on a par with the people with whom they are working.

Question. Do you anticipate any opposition in Congress from those Members who might be opposed to having Negroes and whites working together in, say, a depressed southern area?

Mr. Hackett. I would hope not. The key to the whole thing is that this would be on invitation only. The local community would have to decide whether they would want these corps people.

Question. You wouldn't likely have a corps of volunteers in some parts of Mississippi, would you?

Mr. Hackett. This would be up to the people in Mississippi. When you are talking about 3,000 to 5,000 people, obviously they can't be everywhere. We would hope that cities or States would set up their own counterparts, and begin to move into similar areas. Many of us live in very comfortable circumstances, and do not know the plight of the migratory worker or the Indian, or the Negro in Harlem. I think that is a role the catalyst is going to play.

Question. Will the Federal Government have any control over these projects?

Mr. Hackett. I think that there would be some basic criteria established. Then I think the control and supervision would be in the hands of the local community or the agency. There would be no people from Washington telling them what to do. This would be a locally supervised and initiated program. The volunteers would be under local supervision.

Question. What, if any, safeguards are there to prevent the National Service Corps volunteers from being used as political workers at campaign time?

Mr. Hackett. Well, I would doubt whether an application would get through if this was the intent. It is not anticipated that any of these people would be used as political workers.

Question. Would they be barred from any political activity?

Mr. Hackett. I think so. I would assume so; yes.

Question. Will those volunteers be permitted to work on projects that are sponsored by religious organizations?

Mr. Hackett. I think it is a difficult question to answer, but I think it would depend upon the job that the applicant wants to do, regardless of who it is, and the amount of support from the local community.

Question. But there is no flat ban against a project that is inspired by some religious organization?

Mr. Hackett. It would depend on the project. The intent is not to further an agency's aims or ambitions, but to give service and try to help in these various problem areas.

Question. Would it be permissible for a National Service Corps volunteer assigned, for example, to a migratory worker camp to lobby for improved housing or better schooling or higher pay?

Mr. Hackett. I doubt whether these people would be sent in to do that. This would be under the complete control of the local community. If they did not follow or behave according to the plan, there would be no question that they would be removed.

DOES FEDERAL AID MEAN FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the most perisistent fears in the debate over Federal aid to education is the fear of eventual control of education and the imposition of restraints on academic freedom.

Mr. McGeorge Bundy, now special assistant to the President and formerly dean of the faculty at Harvard University, is especially well qualified to discuss this important question.

He has seen Federal aid to education in action from both sides of the fence, and last fall in a speech to the American Council on Education, he said:

> I will say flatly that American higher learning is more and not less free and strong because of Federal funds.

After pointing out the self-evident fact that Federal support has been extraordinarily productive and helped make possible levels of educational achievement that would have been impossible without Federal assistance, Mr. Bundy makes the point that—

> Freedom is the opportunity to act as well as the absence of restraint. Without Federal money our scientists would not have been free, in the most precise sense of the word, to do what they have done in the last 15 years.

He then goes on to make the quite cogent observation that—

> Nearly all the money which supports higher education in this country carries with it some risk of limitation upon the freedom of academic life, and the record of the Federal dollar does not suffer by comparison with any other major source of funds. In the best of our institutions, the Federal dollar has been, on the average, as good as any other—always excepting the wholly unrestricted gift. In American academic life as a whole the qualitative rating of Federal money would in my considered conviction be better than that of any other major class of income.

Mr. President, I think Mr. Bundy has given a penetrating speech, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Blessing That Is Federal Aid

(By McGeorge Bundy)

Of propositions which in my judgment have been demonstrated beyond doubt, two are of high importance. The first is that Federal investment in the higher learning has been extraordinarily productive, both for the national security and for the quality of our civilization. The second is that the processes of this investment have on the whole been such as to enhance the freedom and independent strength of American colleges and universities.

The productivity of Federal investment in higher education is probably a notion that needs little demonstration in this audience. Whether we consider the principal immediate objectives of advancing the Nation's defense and improving the Nation's health—or the wider issue of the quality and quantity of American science, we can say quite frankly that without the Federal Government our present levels of achievement would be impossible. This proposition is self-evident to responsible scientists, responsible university administrators, responsible Government officials, and responsible members of leading committees of Congress. Its self-evidence is the primary cause of the very rapid curve of growth in Federal support for science and technology. Within this proposition there can be many questions and reservations, but its essential and sweeping validity is clear.

The second proposition is equally plain, at least in my judgment, but I recognize that it needs more argument. We are so accustomed to a nervous suspicion of "Federal control" that it is not easy to accept the notion that the Federal dollar may in fact be a reinforcement of freedom. So let us look at the facts.

Let me at once recognize that the general proposition is subject to substantial reservations and qualifications. There are many, and there is no better place to become acquainted with them than to serve as dean at a place like Harvard where the faculty has a cantankerous habit of independence. I know about the problem of project support, the problem of paperwork, the problem of the undersupported field of inquiry, the problem of badly designed fellowship or loan programs, the problems of oaths and affidavits, and above all, the problem of the internal hemorrhage which can be created by Federal money which does not meet overhead costs. These are all real problems, and unless he has changed since I used to work for him, President Pusey will have said some sharp things about them earlier.

FEDERAL DOLLARS PRODUCE FREEDOM

But all of these weaknesses can be repaired, and progress is being made on most of them. And neither singly nor in combination do they outbalance the overwhelming positive effects of Federal money. I will say flatly that American higher learning is more and not less free and strong because of Federal funds.

There are a number of ways of demonstrating this proposition, but I content myself with three. The first is quite simple: it is that freedom is the opportunity to act as well as the absence of restraint. Without Federal money our scientists would not have been free, in the most precise sense of the word, to do what they have done in the last 15 years. It is no good to talk about academic freedom when antiquated laboratories, inadequate instruments, and overcrowded teaching schedules make serious inquiry impossible. When it is not given under crippling limitations and restrictions, money is quite simply an instrument of freedom, in the universities as elsewhere in life. This is a point so obvious that we frequently forget it.

My second supporting argument is comparative in form. My claim is simply that nearly all the money which supports higher education in this country carries with it some risk of limitation upon the freedom of academic life, and that the record of the Federal dollar does not suffer by comparison with any other major source of funds.

All of us know that the national academic budget, on the income side, is a many-colored mixture of funds from a wide variety of sources: from tuition, from legislative appropriations, from annual gifts, from endowments, from contracts, from foundations, from Government, from alumni, from church and state, from industry and individuals. We also know, although we don't always admit it, that almost every one of these sources of funds carries with it the hazard that it may limit our freedom of action. It is a standard pleasantry in our private gatherings that members of public universities should speak in envious tones to their colleagues in private colleges of the beauty of life without a State legislature to placate, and when this joke is trotted out the man from the private college is likely to reply by offering to match his five most critical alumni against any legislative committee in the country. All of us here know that suspicion of the principles of academic freedom is endemic among legislatures and alumni. It is endemic—seldom dominant, but always present—and the freedom of American higher learning as a whole cannot be measured by the unusual independence of action of a few colleges and universities with strong traditions.

FEDERAL GRANTS BEYOND CRITICISM

Even when we leave aside the cruder forms of attack upon freedom of inquiry, there is little reason to single out the Federal dollar for criticism. An unbalanced allocation of resources is more characteristic of alumni than of Government agencies, and the overadministered grant was invented by the large private foundations long before the Government became a significant force in academic life. Indeed, my own experience as an academic administrator leads me to the view that on balance the Federal Government makes its grants and signs its contracts with a better perception of the real needs of the higher learning than one can find, on the average, in the major private foundations.

When we look at the overall pattern of higher education, the record of the Federal dollar is still less open to comparative attack. The Federal dollar has not been used, as State dollars have been, to support whole departments and majors in subjects that don't belong at the college or university level. The Federal dollar has not been used, as private gifts have been, for overly luxurious athletic facilities that are reminiscent more of the country club than of the academy. The Federal dollar has not been used for the subsidy of athletes or the construction of pretentious and egocentric memorial buildings. In the best of our institutions, the Federal dollar has been, on the average, as good as any other—always excepting the wholly unrestricted gift. In American academic life as a whole the qualitative rating of Federal money would in my considered conviction be better than that of any other major class of income.

My third claim for the quality of Federal money is that the decisions by which it is allocated are made by processes more nearly fitted to the great tradition of academic life than is the case with any other major source of funds. Within the broad lines of authorizations laid down by statute, what governs the decisions of the Federal Government on the whole is the collective judgment of outstanding members of the academic community itself. Statutory provisions may not be perfect, but the Congress has encouraged intelligent administrative interpretation, and

in practice the qualitative performance of Federal money has been set by the judgment and taste of Federal administrators in seeking and using the counsel of qualified academic men. On balance that judgment has been excellent.

I emphasize this point because it is one of cardinal importance for the future of relations between government and universities. The greatest single safeguard for this relationship is the interplay of thought and decision of large numbers of individuals with proper professional qualifications on both sides of the line. This principle is embodied historically in the statute which established the National Academy of Sciences. It was followed in practice during the extraordinary events of the Second World War, when the Federal Government and the academic community first worked at full pressure together. This is a meeting of academic administrators and as a former member of that club I recognize and even share the feeling many of you must have, that real wisdom and judgment in academic budgeting belongs to the president, or at least to the dean. The institution in which I myself was an administrator has a tradition of quite highhanded and centralized executive behavior—and it has not suffered, on balance, as a consequence. Yet the fact is, and we all know this too, that executive energy in academic administration always depends for its effectiveness on a most intensive process of consultation and consensus. Our colleges and universities serve best when they serve in their own way, under processes that meet their own requirements. The most serious mistake a lay granting body can make is to try to decide for itself how a given objective can be met by academic institutions. In some statutory provisions and in some administrative practices the Federal Government has certainly made this mistake—but—again on balance—its major granting agencies have followed a very different and much more constructive course.

ABANDON FEAR OF FEDERAL AID

Assuming that you are not in violent revolt against the argument so far, we now have two propositions: First, Federal money has repaid its cost production in most important ways; second, it has been a reinforcement of the freedom of the higher learning. From these conclusions it should follow that the traditional fear and hostility to Federal aid to higher education would be abandoned—and certainly there has been some progress in this direction. The anguished prophecies of earlier decades are heard less often—and from less respectable sources. One incidental benefit has been that representatives of private colleges, as their annual accounts begin to show large admixtures of Federal money, have somewhat muted the warnings against the low standards and political pressure of public institutions with which they have too often sought to attract private funds.

But much remains to be done. Too much of our time is still spent—even in speeches like this one—in arguing a case which, at least among ourselves, we should have learned to take for granted. Too many of us are acting still as if Federal participation in the higher learning were still an uncertain experiment, instead of the stable and growing reality which it is. And this is what I mean by my somewhat foolish title: [1] generalized hostility to Federal money is as senseless as tilting at a windmill. The windmill is here to stay, and it is no man's enemy. Indeed this whole business of Federal money in higher education represents a constructive partnership which benefits both sides—and I will press my title just a bit further—to suggest that the analogy of the windmill can be applied in two quite contrasting ways, both of them fitting to the case.

A windmill, as you know, and as Don Quixote did not, is a peaceful agency for making wind do work. The wind may blow from many directions, but a well-designed windmill gets results in terms of grain ground. So it is with a well-designed university. It exists to advance learning and the winds of financial support—whatever their course—are caught and turned to the university's purpose. So it is also with a soundly conceived program of Federal aid: Such a program also can be seen as a windmill—in which the university's winnowing breezes provide the force that serves the program's purpose. The analogies are labored, I fear—but in this clumsy way they both hold true. This is what has been demonstrated conclusively in the last 20 years—and this is what we must take for granted as we examine the real issues of the present and future.

But what we take for granted we should also never fail to preach. Nothing is plainer about the partnership between Government and the higher learning than the simple fact that most Americans are deeply unaware of it. That is not a healthy situation, for over the long run we will not, as citizens, support with taxes what we do not understand. This is not the place for a study of the unusual pattern of circumstance, which has produced the curious present situation—there is nothing discreditable about it—nor has it been done in any secretive way. The people's Representatives in Congress have followed the whole process closely—and for those who have followed it closely this has been a fine example of responsible government in action. But the ordinary citizen really has not followed it at all, and in the universities and colleges we have not done nearly enough to tell him about it. This is a mistake, for in the American governmental process it is the immediate beneficiary of Federal activity whose job it is to assure public understanding that the benefits he receives are in the public interest. It is not enough to persuade ourselves, in private discussion, that the help we get is deeply in the public interest. The taxpayer deserves explanation, acknowledgment, and thanks. He has every right to an understanding pride in the degree to which he is himself a partner in one of the most productive and effective activities in all our great society, and if he does not feel that pride, the fault is ours.

The partnership exists; it is productive; it needs our energetic and continuous defense. So far so good. But what can we do to improve it? Each of us I am sure can think of a dozen immediate and concrete answers to that question—but let me offer instead a few more general comments.

First, I think we need to give constant attention to all the multiplicity of details which affect our relationship. It is all well and good to make sweeping statements such as those I have already offered, but these statements stand or fall on what is actually done in a hundred different programs. The Government, most fortunately, presents not one but many faces to the university world, and if at any given moment the best face is very beautiful, the worst is likely to be quite a mess—and it may even have effects like those of Medusa. Law by law, program by program, office by office, and even case by case we must ourselves police the partnership. I have already indicated my belief that a critically important role in these matters belongs to the qualified scholars in each relevant field, but you who are responsible to the wider public, as heads of institutions, cannot safely leave this labor to your scholars alone. The same hazards and necessities which justify alert and active central administration within our universities demand your attention in the relation between your institution and the Government: Cliques can form in the process of counsel to Washington as readily as in a closed and self-satisfied university department. And the intrusion of unhealthy influence from the donor is not always resisted by professors with special interests; like bad alumni and misguided legislatures, Washington bureaucrats require the vigilance of administrations as well as faculties. I well remember myself, from my years at Harvard, how often along the battleground of negotiation with Government agencies it was the quite unscholarly administrative officer in charge of contracts, and not the high-minded and learned professor in search of funds, who maintained the true principles of academic autonomy. And on the rare, but real, occasion in which Federal assistance becomes excessively generous, it is unfortunately very unlikely that the immediate beneficiaries will complain. Someone else should, and I think administrators are nominated.

Our responsibility is still more clear in a second field: The prevention—or repair—of imbalances in American learning which may be created—quite unintentionally—by Federal programs. I am not an alarmist on this point—there are very learned men whom I hold in great affection who seem to me just plain wrong in their fear of the rise of science. Nevertheless it seems certain to me that the general welfare does require us to be watchful against distortions. And my own conviction is that the best single remedy is to seek for ways of gradually expanding the flow of Federal money so that it works for the reinforcement of the higher learning as a whole. This can be done, I believe, without any loss of effectiveness in meeting the particular and legitimately urgent purposes which have inspired existing programs. But we will have to help.

To do this job and others, I believe, we will have to show, individually and collectively, a new level of attention to this whole problem. So my third recommendation is that we must do much more, in the future, in our Washington work. Until now, you know, the Federal dollar has been badly underprivileged in its share of attention from high-level academic administrators. To put it quite bluntly, most of us have simply let the money roll in, contenting ourselves from time to time with well bred complaints about bureaucrats or less well bred sneers when too much money seemed to be going to someone else. We are beginning to do better, but there is a lot still to be done.

And that brings me to my last and most important point. The case for higher education—and for its partnership with the Federal Government—is not merely a matter of our common interest in technical progress, or in the national defense, or in medical research. It is not merely a matter of the evident need for improved facilites, the obligation to open doors for young people, or the honorable race for space. It is not even a matter merely of the health and strength of the higher learning as a whole. What is going on here is a great adventure in the purpose and performance of a free people. We have built great private institutions—small and large. We have developed magnificent State universities, and we are going to have more of them. In the last 20 years it has become plain that this whole vast enterprise requires—and is required for—the interest of the Nation as a whole. This is a cause for care, and for attention to detail, for new organization and effort, for explanation and for advocacy. But it is also a cause for pride and hope. For what has been accomplished so far proves beyond doubt that there is good for all America in this new partnership. Surely it is our responsibility—and our urgent duty—to see to it that what is done continues to be good—gets better—that what needs to be done gets more and wider understanding—and that the larger meaning of this high achievement of our Federal democracy is understood and recognized. This great chapter of accomplishment, properly understood and properly sustained, can be a major reinforcement to our whole society—as a demonstration of effective action for high purposes. It is time for us to speak and work a whole lot harder to this end, so that the winds may blow, the windmills work—and all of us be proud.

---

[1] "Of Winds and Windmills: Free Universities and Public Policy."—Editor.

PROBLEMS OF URBAN GROWTH

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we are all pretty much aware of the tremendous population growth and changes that are taking place in the major metropolitan areas of the country, but we have badly ignored the problems that have arisen and neglected ways of coping with them, so that we might achieve the best possible living environment for the vast majority of the American people who are urban and suburban dwellers.

A most interesting article on this subject recently appeared in the Jersey Journal, February 4, written by Dr. Stanley Worton, of Jersey City State College.

After describing the implications of downtown deterioration, suburban sprawl, and traffic congestion, Dr. Worton suggests that our metropolitan areas consider reviving "the old natural corridor-type development that came with the railroads in the last century" as a way of shaping a more satisfying environment for all.

While obviously no one solution will meet the almost infinite variety of needs and desires of our urban areas across the country, this pattern of development certainly warrants very careful study.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BROADER REGIONAL APPROACH WILL HELP SOLVE URBAN BLIGHT—JCSC PROFESSOR CONSIDERS "SPREAD CITY" PROBLEM

(By Dr. Stanley N. Worton)

The bulldozers are busy. The countryside is being subdivided into larger and larger plots for ranch-style, split-level, and colonial homes. Shopping centers are springing up like mushrooms. Industry is spreading out in all directions along the highways or on scattered sites.

Meanwhile, urban blight continues to spread. The problems of congestion, dirt, noise, air pollution, and lack of parking and play space are on the increase. There is an exodus from the older cities of families with children.

Does this mean that the great metropolis of which we are a part is on the way out, fated to extinction like the dinosaur or the dodo bird?

Will the entire region soon become a sprawling mass of continuous residential and industrial development without 1 inch of open space?

Will our central cities be left to the old couples, the single people, the wealthy, the very poor, and to minority groups who are not welcome elsewhere?

The answer to all these questions must be an emphatic "No."

The New York metropolitan area is the greatest region in the Nation, if not in the entire world. It is unsurpassed as a center of industry, commerce and finance, of entertainment and culture, of education, and, yes, of living as well.

More than 16 million persons—1 out of every 11 Americans—live here. They inhabit 22 counties in 3 States; 9 of the counties—our own Hudson is 1 of them—are in New Jersey.

How can this region change the direction of its development and avoid its fate? It can do so only when we the people who live and work in it recognize what will be happening to us and then decide to do something about it.

But first we must see how we got to be the way we are.

Basic to any human settlement are the opportunities for jobs present in the area. The New York metropolitan region got its start as a port of entry for people and for goods. It continued to grow, not only because it developed into a great port, but because of the forms of economic activity that developed out of its role in commerce.

In addition to light and heavy industry and all forms of transport, there are concentrated here the financial community, the printing trades, advertising, public relations, and management experts, designers, wholesale and retail centers, nonprofit corporations and foundations, health and welfare leadership, cultural and entertainment facilities, and a host of specialized services.

Such an economic mix requires a tremendous reservoir of manpower, skills, and talent. The residents of this region provide these qualities to a degree unmatched anywhere in the world.

So concentrated are the enterprises involved that one-third of the more than 6½ million jobs are in lower Manhattan. Another one-third are in the harbor band—the rest of the core area—in cities like Jersey City, Bayonne, Kearny, Hoboken, Weehawken, Union City, West New York, and North Bergen. One-fifth are in the inner ring of suburbs, and the remainder in the outer ring, or hinterland.

However, in recent years there has been an outward movement of jobs. The trend has been to go suburban. Industry has found that the time factor is more important than the distance factor and it has been locating along the highways or in industrial parks. Here they establish themselves on large tracts of land in sprawling, one-story plants with plenty of parking space. Acreage is cheap and taxes are low—at first.

The movement to the suburbs got its start at the end of World War II because of the pent-up demand for housing and the fact that it was cheaper to buy a house in the suburbs under a veterans' or FHA mortgage than to rent an apartment in the city.

But it was more than just a matter of economics. Suburbia became a form of status and a choice of a way of life—open space, grass and trees, a big backyard, community life, small local government, good schools, and low taxes.

Many of those who rushed into suburban life soon found that although each had more space in his backyard, he also had space to cover to reach his destination—the job, stores, and other facilities. Hence the two-car family and the need to chauffeur the children around from activity to activity. As more people moved to the suburbs, the countryside was pushed farther and farther away. In addition, the price tags on homes rose rapidly.

With the need for more schools, sidewalks, sewers, and new services, taxes shot sky-high. Taking care of home and lawn became almost a second job. Direct personal contacts proved to be no more effective in influencing local government than the energetic civic organization with know-how in the city.

If this is the way things are now, what does the future hold for us? What will the metropolitan region be like 25 years from now?

The Regional Plan Association, a nonprofit civic organization engaged in research on the development of the metropolitan area, has made a number of projections on the region's growth. It is estimated that by 1985 the population of the 22-county area will increase from 16 million to 22 million, an addition equal to the present populations of Chicago and Philadelphia combined. The increase will be the largest of any 25-year period in our history, even including the years of heavy immigration early in the century.

As for the kind of residential development that is taking place outside our cities and will continue to develop if present trends continue, Regional Plan Association has coined a phrase to describe it: "spread-city."

It is a sparsely settled, homogenized Los Angeles. It is not a true city because it lacks centers. It is not a suburb because it is not attached to a central city. Nor is it truly rural, for it is loosely covered with houses and urban facilities.

There will be no "downtown" where shops, restaurants, movies, and specialized services are concentrated. The pulse and excitement, the variety, the culture that has attracted man to the city throughout history will be gone.

The effects of spread-city will not be felt only by those who live in it, but by all the inhabitants of the metropolitan region. Traffic congestion and travel time will continue to mount. Although factories may move farther out in the hinterland, their workers will not follow because they won't be able to afford the new one-family houses on large lots. It will be the executive-professional classes who will move out, but their jobs will continue to be in the core areas. This will result in a form of reverse commuting.

As Mason Gross, president of Rutgers University, has so aptly put it: "The greatest evil that we face is not the slum or even the inextricable traffic jam, but rather an emptiness or meaninglessness of our day-to-day existence. A tremendous amount of time which could be lived through and enjoyed has been thrown carelessly away on utterly meaningless experiences—most of them behind the wheel of the automobile. I suggest to you further that meaninglessness is a malignant disease. If we allow it to feed on 2 hours of our day, it will soon begin to spread to the rest.

What is bringing about the development of spread-city? Do the people of the metropolitan region prefer this mode of living? If we can find a cause, perhaps a solution will follow.

The answers to these questions can be found in the fact that the vacant land now being subdivided for housing is zoned at an average of two-thirds of an acre for a one-family house. This land is found in about 200 towns in the metropolitan area with an average population of 10,000 each.

The main reason for this policy is local taxes. Bigger lots mean fewer houses, fewer houses mean less families and fewer children, fewer children means fewer schools, fewer schools mean less taxes. Apartment building and industry would help, but they cause a loss of prestige.

What is at the heart of the problem, then, is the best use of land—new land to be developed and the reuse of old land.

A workable solution to the problems of the region already exists. What needs to be done is to revive the old natural corridor-type of development that came with the railroads in the last century. As the railroads fanned out in different directions from the major cities into the countryside, towns sprang up along the way spaced like beads on a chain. If this pattern were repeated again, we would have commercial centers and industrial

clusters springing up around train stations and highway interchanges. Here, too, would be most of the apartment houses. Spreading out from these centers probably would be garden apartments and attached houses; further out would be one-family houses on small lots; still further one-family houses on large lots.

The alternative to building the region around exclusive automobile travel would be investment in a much faster and cheaper commuter rail service. The railroads are losing money on their commuter lines and seem most willing to abandon them. A public agency could supervise the region's rail network as a whole and fit it to total needs. It could set standards and fares and provide higher speed, up-to-date equipment, frequent service, and more convenient stops and transfers.

A loop system or network of rapid transit facilities connecting cities and inner suburbs and in turn linked to the outer towns by express buses or existing rail lines would provide a logical pattern for the industrial and residential development of the future. A start has been made with the port authority's takeover of the Hudson and Manhattan lines. But this is just a beginning.

All these programs would have a direct effect upon improving the core cities. But specific action must also be taken along the following lines to make urban life more attractive:

1. Dramatically increase State aid for low- and middle-income housing and for improved schools.
2. Revamp taxation so that high-rise apartment houses (the potential slums of tomorrow) are not the sole form of urban renewal. Congestion is bad for family life.
3. Encourage individual home improvement; do not discourage it by penalizing the owner with a higher assessment when he makes improvements.
4. Spread public housing into the suburbs, rather than raise the density of the core cities.
5. Recognize that a city is more than just a mass of buildings. Families, especially new arrivals, need training and education in group living and civic responsibility.
6. Allow minority groups, whose purchasing power has risen meteorically in recent years, to make their contribution to urban living.

No metropolitan area in the world can offer more than this one. Whether we allow it to get out of joint or make use of the technology and planning at our disposal to improve conditions depends on how many people care and how much they care.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, were it not for the fact that it comes 10 years too late, I would be most gratified by the unprecedented interest expressed in this body in the conduct of our foreign relations with Latin America—particularly Cuba—and our newly developed attention to the political and economic conditions existing on that continent.

PRESENT INTEREST IN CUBA

There used to be whole weeks, indeed months, when no word concerning the aspirations and needs of our Latin neighbors was spoken in the Congress. Sometimes years would go by without any tangible action being taken by this body to alleviate the problems in Latin America, or to enable those people to better solve their own problems. Latin America was not in vogue then. Headlines proclaiming what a prominent American statesman or ordinary Member of Congress said about South America did not come easily in those days. Now it seems the whole Nation, including those—or perhaps I should say especially those—who were most quiet then talk of little but the southern continent. There has been a change in interest and focus. What brought about the change? It was the admission of Communist adherence by a man, named Fidel Castro, who followed the typical pattern of shouting for liberty and democracy, while totally crushing the Cuban people and burying their once bright aspirations for a better life in an improved democracy.

I hope that after the present danger exemplified by Castro's Cuba has ceased to exist—and one day it will, for I fully believe the Cubans will again one day be free—our interest in the welfare of our Latin neighbors will continue.

I hope that we will not quickly forget these dangerous and unhappy days, but will forever be mindful that our own Nation's security and well-being are inextricably bound up with that of Cuba and our Latin neighbors to the south.

One of my deepest convictions is that in today's world, where jet-powered airplanes, missiles, and rocketry pull us ever closer physically, our dependence on and need for each other grow proportionately. The two continents of this Western Hemisphere are indissolubly bound together. Like the legendary Siamese twins, one cannot maintain a viable existence without the other. Recognition of this fact by the Congress is a necessary step in insuring that our own Nation's future remains economically and politically secure.

SMATHERS' LONG-STANDING INTEREST IN LATIN AMERICA

It was with this in mind that, over the past 12 years, I spoke more than 170 times in the Senate—sometimes briefly, often at length—trying to call attention to the progressive deterioration in our relations with Latin America from that time in World War II, when we collaborated closely with them in joint efforts to stop the Nazis.

I recall, shortly after reaching the Senate in 1951, warning, I believe in my first speech on this Senate floor of our indifference to our Latin neighbors, and urging our Government to increase its economic assistance to the countries of Central and South America. When the Foreign Relations Committee in August of that year proposed to reduce even the small amount of technical assistance proposed by the administration for Latin America, I told the Senate:

> It seems to me that we must not lose sight of our own security, which means of course the well-being and welfare of the entire Western Hemisphere. Above all, we should remember who our friends are. One of the great errors for us to make would be to forget these people who not only are in our own neighborhood, but with whom we have had friendly and beneficial relations for many years.

In July 1954, in another effort to direct our thinking southward, I warned of the Communist threat in that area by saying: "We must assist the anti-Communist forces in Latin America to eliminate the conditions of poverty and illiteracy in which the seeds of communism blossom and flourish. The time for action is now."

With administration and congressional apathy continuing, I declared in June 1956, that "today the Soviet Union is moving into Latin America in an attempt to fill the vacuum we have left there."

Our national leaders in those days were apparently acting on the premise that the good neighbor policy, enunciated and started in the mid-1930's, would somehow work in the 1950's, even though we as a nation did no more about it than, from time to time, make a speech calculated to assuage their feelings, but nothing more.

And so, while the United States with generosity and good will unparalleled in world history granted or loaned over $85 billion to foreign countries around the globe during the years 1947–60, the 21 nations of Latin America—our neighbors, our friends, with 180 million people and with the fastest growing population on the face of the globe—received on the average less than one-fourth of 1 percent of this $85 billion total.

FIDEL CASTRO COMES TO POWER

Fidel Castro's coming to power in January 1959 was the beginning of the change in attitude.

We all remember that in the early months of 1959 Castro was the most heroic figure in all the hemisphere in the eyes of the general public. He was the modern Robin Hood, or, more appropriately, a Cuban "Zapata," the legendary hill fighter who fought always against tyranny.

Here was that type of man, it was said, who could revitalize the Latin American nations, who could and would throw off the shackles of inequity and oppression, who would give the people dignity and self-respect, who could operate a government like our own—one of, by, and for the people.

However, Mr. President, there were some of us who never believed this propaganda.

On January 17, 1959, 2 weeks after he came into power, I stated on a television program:

> I reserve judgment on the quality of his (Castro's) ambition, his capacity to administer the affairs of Cuba, his understanding of democracy and his judgment and tolerance.

I questioned if "the people of Cuba have improved their position by merely the change of governments."

These were unhappy and unpleasant days for me—unhappy because I saw communism taking a foothold in the Caribbean with the unwitting assistance and unstinting applause of many here in our own country; unpleasant because my opposition to Castro won for me the disapproval of not only a large portion of my constituents, but virtually all of the press.

During the first week in January 1959, following Batista's flight but before Castro had completed his triumphal march from the Sierra Maestra, I was so concerned about this youthful Caesar, and the danger he constituted to his own people and to the hemisphere, that I made special calls to Assistant Secretary of State Roy Rubottom. I urged him, and subsequently Secretary of State Herter, not to recognize any government set up by Castro until that government had held at least one free election.

I shall never forget being advised by Mr. Rubottom that the American public demanded recognition of Castro's regime, and this recognition was blithely given on January 7. My records reflect that 2 days later, on January 9, Mr. Rubottom and I had further discussion about Castro in my office, and on January 11 I met with a State Department delegation in still further discussion of the subject of Castro, communism, and Cuba. However, the act had been done and frankly met with overwhelming approval.

I took a trip around Central and South America from January 19 until February 10, 1959, and wherever I went in my talks with labor leaders, clergymen, government officials, and others, there was quiet but nonetheless great apprehension as to the quality of Castro's intentions.

I remember well my personal dismay when Castro was invited to address the American Society of Newspaper Editors here in Washington in April 1959. I recall that he subsequently was invited and did appear before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

The chairman was kind enough to invite me to listen in, and I particularly remember the general warmth with which Fidel Castro was received. I endeavored to ask him a few questions, but had little success as he realized I had some doubts about him. When I kept asking him when he was going to have an election, I recall he responded that "the people of Cuba don't want an election." When I pressed him further on the question of elections, he said, "I might have one in 3 or 4 years."

Despite his ominous statements, support for him was so overwhelming that I began to have doubt in my own judgment about this man.

According to my files, that very day after his appearance before the Foreign Relations Committee, I stated in a written press release that—

> Serious trouble is brewing in the Caribbean area. The source of danger is centered in Cuba, a country which historically has always been our friend. Cuba could easily become a prisoner of the Reds. Fidel Castro, during a meeting today with several Senators, told me that elections in Cuba were 3 or 4 years away. That is not very heartening news. I asked him about his anti-American statements and he denied having made them.

I went on to say:

> It is clear that he has not yet learned you can't play ball with the Communists for he has them peppered throughout his government.

In early April 1959, even more disturbing news began to come. Because I had expressed doubt about Castro, others who had doubt began to call me about their concern. I received two cablegrams from the President of Haiti expressing fear over an anticipated invasion from Cuba. I came to the Senate floor and stated:

> The President of Haiti appealed to me for help by cablegram to help forestall an invasion of his country. I sent today, April 17, 1959, a telegram to Dr. Jose Mora, Secretary-General of the OAS, urging that he take immediate action to set up a voluntary police force to keep the peace in Latin America. I suggested this police patrol be made up of the 21 member states of the OAS including the United States. We have to relieve tension in the Caribbean and put a halt to Communist troublemaking. An inter-American police force could do the job but we don't have much time to act.

It was shortly after this warning of April 17, specifically on April 24, that Castro sent against the Republic of Panama an invasion force that he had permitted to be organized and trained in Cuba. Even after this act of aggression, I don't recall any concern having been expressed by any of the Senators or news commentators who are so loudly and persistently talking today. I do recall the late Senator from New Hampshire, Styles Bridges, talking about the danger of Fidel Castro to Central and South America, and all he got for his trouble was criticism.

However, there began to be some ripple of criticism of Castro in May of 1959 when he confiscated the property and assets of 117 companies, the bulk of which were American-owned. I recall at that time making a statement to the press and on television that we should not sit idly by—that the confiscation of American property should not be ignored and that immediate and effective steps should be taken to stop it.

A month later, in June 1959, the State Department began for the first time to express some concern about Castro's acts and specifically about the need of having adequate compensation paid to those Americans who had lost their property.

On May 26, 1959, I offered, on the floor of the Senate, amendments to the Mutual Security Act which were designed to create an Inter-American Police Force, and Inter-American Court of Justice. No action was taken by the committee to which referred.

On the 31st of May 1959, after Fidel Castro and his Communist cohorts had, through executions and the use of raw power, subdued all resistence in Cuba, he again turned his eyes toward new conquests and launched an invasion of the country of Nicaragua.

That invasion was successfully turned back and incontrovertible evidence was obtained by the defenders of Nicaragua, proving beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the invasion had been financed, organized, and launched by Castro from the Island of Cuba. So far as I have been able to ascertain there was no protest or outcry about the invasion of Nicaragua by the State Department or anyone else in position of authority.

I again emphasize that there were very few people in that particular time, the summer of 1959, who were interested in clipping the wings of Fidel Castro.

He still had the bulk of the American people's support. He still had many newsmen lyrically writing about him as a great revolutionary, despite the fact that his drumhead courts-martial had executed close to 600 of his fellow countrymen—including some who had fought alongside him in the hills against Batista—and despite the fact that he had completely flouted the rights of U.S. citizens and property owners and had launched invasions of Panama and Nicaragua.

On June 14 and June 20, 1959, invasion forces organized in Cuba were directed against Santo Domingo. These were stopped and, from the sketchy reports, it appeared that every member of that expeditionary force from Cuba was exterminated. Once again, sufficient evidence was recovered from the bodies of the invaders to establish that these forces were sent on their mission by Fidel Castro and the Communists.

On October 13, 1959, the little country of Haiti was invaded, again by forces from the Island of Cuba, and again under the direction of Castro's Communists. This invasion was again defeated by Haitians who had been trained in military tactics by a detachment of 50 U.S. Marines.

On October 26 Castro, becoming ever more arrogant and contemptible in his conduct toward the United States and his neighbors in this hemisphere, and feeling ever more secure in his relationship with the Communists, accused the United States of aggression.

He reestablished his drumhead military courts and began to summarily execute political prisoners without recognition of any of the elementary personal rights whatsoever. As of this date it was estimated the Castro regime had executed over 500 people. Later the total was to reach well over 1,000.

In January 1960 and through the early part of February I made another trip to the Central and South American countries and upon my return I outlined in a Senate speech on February 24 an eight-point program calculated to limit the activities of Castro's Communists in Central and South America.

Among other things, I asked that we turn over to the OAS all the information which the FBI, CIA, and our other intelligence agencies had in their files on communism in Cuba and Castro's connection with it.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover had at this time—and long before—a dossier on Castro and his Communist connections that should have convinced the most ardent fan of Castro in the State Department, of his allegiance to communism, but I doubt if they ever asked for this information or saw it.

In that speech, I urged the United States to urge the OAS to act. I said the United States should not act unilaterally. I suggested that the OAS should examine the possibility of imposing economic sanctions on Cuba. I also said that "Castro has now identified himself for what he is— a man who, if not himself a Communist, is certainly doing the work of the Communists with the direct help of the Communists."

On March 5, 1960, Castro accused the United States of complicity in the explosion of a munitions ship in the Havana Harbor which killed hundreds of people.

On March 25 in a TV interview I said "I deeply regret the administration's return of Ambassador Bonsal to Cuba" from where he had been withdrawn on January 21, and I pointed out that this move would be mistaken by the people of Latin America.

I had visited in my office with Ambassador Bonsal prior to his return. I suggested to him that he not return, arguing that it would appear in the minds of many of our friends in Latin America that, in fact, we wanted to see the government of Fidel Castro succeed and that his action would be interpreted as endorsement of Castro's actions. Bonsal said the decision was not his to make.

Again I took the matter up with the State Department and other officials without any success, for Ambassador Bonsal was returned.

It was because of this action that I said in the television interview mentioned above, that "even though we claim in our press and elsewhere about our desire to get rid of dictators, it would appear that we are standing behind this dictator."

At this particular time I recall distinctly having a visit with Secretary Christian Herter, for whom I personally have great affection and respect, and asking him to withdraw Mr. Bonsal for the second time as Ambassador to Cuba.

I pointed out that "Che" Guevara, who was at that time the head of the National Bank of Cuba, in a recent speech in Havana had five times said that the Soviet Union was the best friend Cuba ever had.

None of my warnings seemed to convince anyone. Shortly thereafter in a TV program I said:

> For many, many years this administration has talked about the appeasement they thought had gone on in the Far East and other areas of the globe—they made a great to-do about the statement that they would under no conditions appease—that they would stand strong in the face of the Communist movement. But in this particular instance I think we have some sickening appeasement.

On April 7, 1960, I made another general speech on the floor of the Senate in which I recommended a six-point program to strengthen ties between the United States and Latin America.

On May 23, 1960, Castro seized U.S. oil refineries and said they would be required in order to process Russian crude oil.

On May 27, 1960, the U.S. State Department announced that the U.S. economic aid program to Cuba, which had been running between $150,000 and $200,000 a year, would be terminated on December 1, 1960.

It was further announced that the U.S. military aid which was at that time consisting of training Cuban air cadets in Texas would be terminated in June of 1960.

I praised President Eisenhower on this action and I said:

> I am glad that the President has now taken a realistic and sensible position with respect to the Communist-dominated Castro government. It has never made sense to me to have our Government giving aid and comfort to another government which is openly vilifying us and our way of life.

I went on to say that—

> I hope that those who have up to now sought a continuation of a very partial and preferential sugar legislation as it pertains to Cuba will be willing to reevaluate their position to revise the legislation in a realistic and up-to-date manner.

Shortly thereafter on May 28, 1960, I introduced a bill revoking Cuba's preferential sugar quota and distributing it to five friendly Latin-American countries which never up to that time shared in the U.S. sugar market.

I said:

> We are permitting Cuba to sell into the United States over 3 million tons of sugar on which we are giving her a premium price of over 6 cents per pound—3 cents over the world price. This means Cuba gets $390 million a year from the U.S. housewife. That money, I presume, would be used to further entrench the pro-Communist government and propagandize the Cuban people against the United States and for the Soviet Union.

On June 11, 1960, Castro seized U.S. owned Havana Hotel and Nacional Hotel.

On June 30, 1960, on the floor of the Senate, I urged the establishment again of the hemisphere police force to preserve the peace and security of this hemisphere against the menace of communism and also expressed support of the administration's protest to the OAS of Castro's campaign of lies and slander against the United States.

On July 13, 1960, I again urged the recall of our Ambassador Bonsal and reaffirmation of our treaty rights to Guantanamo Bay, and the placing of the case of Cuba and its control by the Communists before the OAS.

On August 10, 1960, in a public statement, I urged U.S. agencies, particularly the border patrol—Immigration and Naturalization Service—to cease harassing Cuban exiles operating from Florida in their efforts to open lines of communication with democratic forces inside Cuba.

On August 12, 1960, I wrote a letter to President Eisenhower in which I proposed that consideration be given to withdrawing preferential tariff treatment to the Cuban Government in connection with all imports, particularly with respect to sugar, fruit, and vegetables.

I also suggested that the United States impound payments for any commodities received from Cuba and hold until such times as concessions were made with respect to U.S. interests, since Castro had seen fit to prevent American dollars paid for U.S. commodities sold in Cuba from getting out of the country.

On August 31, 1960, after the close of the conference of the OAS in San Jose, Costa Rica, I issued a statement in which I criticized strongly the State Department's support of the watered-down, milk-toast, slap-on-the-wrist type of condemnation of international Communists.

It will be remembered that even with Secretary Herter as our representative at that meeting, the conference did not have the forthrightness to mention the name of Fidel Castro or the Communist government of Cuba. I called it then, "a diplomatic defeat of the first magnitude."

On the floor of the Senate I noted that the San Jose Conference called for the overthrow of the government of Trujillo but refused even to mention the government of Fidel Castro. I went on to say that the Dominican government "is a government we surely do not approve of; its leadership is undemocratic and dictatorial"; but I asked, "Is there any doubt concerning the real threat to our freedom today?" "It, of course, is communism, and where is the fountainhead of international communism in Latin America today? Not in the Dominican Republic, but in the Communist government of Fidel Castro, and every informed person knows it, and most will admit it."

I asked in that speech:

> Who is it in the State Department or in the administration who believes that the 30-year-old government of the Dominican Republic is a greater threat to the freedom of the Western Hemisphere than the Communist government of Cuba?
>
> Who is it that really believes that the government of the Dominican Republic needed to be ostracized and expelled, but that the government of Cuba should go along threatening freedom without even so much as a verbal spanking?

In that speech I said that—

> The administration has failed in its leadership because it was unable to cause our friends in the hemisphere to see the difference between an ancient, static, expiring, nonexportable dictatorship and a new, inflammatory, virulent, belligerent, expanding military dictatorship of the Communist variety that is working hand in glove with Khrushchev and Red China.

I asked, "Can fairminded men call this result a great victory?" "I warn my friends in Latin America that Castro's communism aims to destroy them."

I closed the speech by saying:

> We must stop deluding our friends in Latin America and stop deceiving ourselves into a sense of false security by adopting pious declarations, which dismay the Communists not at all. We stand on the thin edge of disaster. This is no place for the timorous. This is no time for listening to those who do not realize or refuse to admit we are now in the throes of a tremendous struggle between the free world and the Communist world.
>
> We must stop penalizing those nations who have befriended us. We must take our position as firmly and defiantly as the Communists have taken theirs—and we must encourage every nation and all peoples everywhere to take their stand with us and make their choice for freedom now—or the world will have no choice at all.

On September 21, 1960, I again called on the Government to bring Ambassador Bonsal home; I asked it to ban shipments to Cuba of U.S. machinery or equipment or replacement parts, and to start increasing our long-range broadcasts from the United States to Cuba.

On November 15, 1960, I urged Secretary Herter to call for a plenary session of the OAS to investigate the threat of Castro's communism to this hemisphere and for the United States to assume the leadership for the formation of an Inter-American Police Force.

On January 7, 1961, I wrote a letter to outgoing Secretary Herter and incoming Secretary of State Dean Rusk urging the banning of all Cuban imports to the United States in order to put an economic squeeze on Castro's government and try to bring it down. There was criticism of this by some Florida industries who depended upon Cuban products, but I felt the situation called for such action.

On February 15, 1961, after the change of administration, in another speech on the Senate floor, I said:

> The time has come for action in the Cuban situation. We should adopt an economic embargo calculated to bring Castro to his knees and the Cuban people to freedom.

BAY OF PIGS

On April 17, 1961, we remember, less than 4 months after this administration had come into office, an attack was launched by a group of 1,500 Cubans who had been trained in the far reaches of Guatemala under the supervision of military experts recruited in the United States.

This plan for the invasion at the Bay of Pigs had not been some new development of the new administration because we know that, as a matter of fact, these men were gathered together and sent to Guatemala for training in 1960, before the change of administration.

From my own personal knowledge I know that these men had been held and trained for so long a time in Guatemala and other Central American countries that most of them had become discouraged, and some had left the ranks in their belief that the U.S. Government would never permit them to try to win back freedom for their own country.

Here in the United States there was great concern as to what determination should be made with respect to these Cuban invasion forces. This occurred prior to the beginning of the invasion. Should they be returned to the United States and dispersed, or should they be permitted to make the effort to free their own homeland?

While I was not consulted officially about this matter, my opinion was asked for by some people in lower echelons of the Government, and it was my judgment that the men should be permitted to make the effort to free their country, for they would never be happy until they had made this noble effort; but, of course, it should be made only after sound military judgment had been obtained that the endeavor had some chance of success.

Everyone now knows of the enormous miscalculations and mistakes that were made.

I think the President, whose final decision it was, did the right thing when he assumed the full responsibility for the fiasco. This was the manful and courageous thing to do. But the fact remains that there was considerable misjudgment on the part of many agencies and persons who had a part in the decision. No one man—be he even the President of the United States—can make correct judgments when he is proceeding from inadequate information.

The Bay of Pigs is now sad history. Had it succeeded, Cuba would have been free and our problems would have been lessened to a great extent, although, of course, not totally eliminated.

Some, it is now revealed, counseled against the invasion before it occurred. I thought, and still think, the "Go" signal was the correct one, based on the facts then available.

I never did subscribe to, nor do I now, the theory that the Latins would be appalled by our impetuosity or by our show of strength. Latins like leadership and strength; they always have, and they always will.

They have a history of 400 years of respecting, admiring, and looking up to strong leadership. That is why they still continue to admire strong leadership.

Everyone has 20-20 rear vision.

That judgment on the Bay of Pigs can be debated a long time. But surely the man who gave the word "Go; rescue your homeland; defeat and overthrow the Communists" cannot now in fairness have it even suggested that he is timorous or afraid of action. Couple this with the acts of October 1962, his quarantine, his confrontation with Khrushchev, and no man can fairly say that this President is not always prepared to act.

But to continue with the chronology, before discussing broader concepts, on June 21, 1961, shortly after Castro's May 1 declaration of Cuba as a Socialist, or Communist state, and some 2 months after the catastrophe at the Bay of Pigs, I again warned that "to hope Castro communism will wither away and die on the vine is both woolheaded and dangerous. Western Hemisphere nations must act now to expel Castro before he wins his race with time."

On July 20, 1961, in a speech on the Senate floor I urged U.S. recognition of the Cuban Government-in-exile and the creation of an Inter-American Military Force again.

I continued to urge on this administration the placing of an import embargo on trade with Castro, and I was highly gratified when on February 3, 1962, this administration took such action. Thereafter, the many millions of dollars which they had been receiving in trade were denied to them, and conditions were obviously made worse for Fidel Castro.

In a Florida speech on May 3, 1962, I stated that "Castro continued to work full throttle against the hemisphere's free nations," pointing out that Cuba has set up subversive schools, indoctrination centers, and propaganda classrooms to instruct teachers, students, intellectuals, political leaders, and revolutionaries from all over Latin America. I said:

> The plan is to send these Communist-indoctrinated people back to their homelands and set them to work subverting their countries with the hoped-for Communist takeovers scheduled 1, 5 or even 10 years from now.

On June 18, 1962, I called for the establishment of a four-point program designed to make the policy of the United States toward Latin America, as I said, "one of realism and not romanticism."

I recommended the welding of our economic program in Latin America with our political goals; the establishment of an Under Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs reporting directly to the President; and again called for recognition of a Cuban Government-in-exile, stating, "We are going to have to meet this Red challenge with determination, and I am confident we will do so."

On September 5, 1962, I made this statement:

> The presence in Cuba of 5,000 so-called technicians from the Soviet bloc makes even more compelling the need for an inter-American Police force to back up inter-hemispheric treaties based on the Monroe Doctrine which pledges to keep communism out of this hemisphere.

In addition, I urged, as I have time and again in the past, that the United States recognize and support a democratic Cuban Government-in-exile, whose first purpose is the liberation of the Cuban people from Communist tyranny. I said:

> Such a free Cuban regime could openly receive support from the United States towards the accomplishment of this goal and the eventual restoration of their liberties to oppressed Cuban citizens.

On September 18, 1962, I introduced in the Senate two resolutions. One called for recognition of the Cuban Government-in-exile and the other supporting establishment of an inter-American military alliance.

Mr. President, some people may wonder why I have gone to such lengths to recite the record in such detail.

My answer is that I am trying to point out, among other things, why this problem of Cuba is not now and never has been the problem of a single political party, but instead, is the problem of both parties and all Americans. It is the problem of the Nation as a whole.

It goes without saying that so far as removing Castro and the Communists from Cuba is concerned, it would have been considerably easier to have done it in 1959 or 1960 than it would have been in 1961 or 1962, or than it will be in 1963 or 1964.

For the Island has been continuously fortified and militarized, and more and more modern and sophisticated weapons have been emplaced.

But no programs were developed in 1959 or 1960; and in January 1961, at the change of administrations, the outgoing one merely passed along the growing problem of Cuba to the incoming Administration, as one passes a very hot potato from his own hand to that of his unsuspecting dinner partner.

I have recited some—and only some—of the instances when I spoke in the Senate and elsewhere in 1961 and 1962, calling the attention of this administration to the need for developing a program having for its ultimate goal the freedom of Cuba. While I have yet to learn of a long-range program, this administration did put into effect, in 1961, the economic embargo which had as its result the denial to Castro of the use of many millions of dollars which he had previously realized each year from trade with this country.

The administration also diligently exercised pressure in an effort to get other allies to stop trading with Castro's Cuba. In this endeavor, the administration was moderately successful.

The administration did, in 1961, initiate a meeting of all the members of

the Organization of American States at Punta del Este, in Chile, and did succeed in getting three-fourths of the nations of the hemisphere—for the first time—to strongly condemn Fidel Castro and his brand of communism in Cuba.

That was the first time that such a specific resolution had ever been gotten from the Organization of American States. Since that time, several other minor measures have been adopted, looking toward making life more difficult for the Communists in Cuba; but the problem of communism in Cuba remains and constantly grows.

Mr. President, Cuba is a serious problem equaling in importance, in my judgment, any that we have in Europe or in southeast Asia or anywhere else in the world. It cannot be swept under the rug, ignored, or minimized; and I do not believe that anyone, or any government, is today trying to do that, because all recognize now the total seriousness of the problem of Cuba.

It is a problem that, if not handled correctly, could quickly lead to nuclear war. It is a problem that may lead to the involvement of the United States and its allies in a bloody conventional war. It is fraught with peril of most every kind; and certainly, therefore, it should not be discussed or debated in partisan terms.

Our Nation's future and the future of the free world are too important to become topics of partisan discussion. At the same time, they are important enough to deserve and bear discussion by troubled and conscientious men and women who are sincerely seeking solutions.

The problem of Cuba, therefore, deserves the best nonpartisan attention of all of our minds in the best and highest tradition of Americans who are earnestly concerned about the future of our country.

RUSSIAN TROOP BUILDUP

Mr. President, in September 1962, while many of us were campaigning, we began to see in the press and to hear over the radio reports about the now-famed buildup of Russian offensive missiles and bombers.

I must say that prior to that time, on many visits in and out of Miami, where the refugee colony makes its headquarters, I had been advised by Cuban refugee friends that they thought missiles were being erected in Cuba. Some gave me handmade maps depicting the location of the alleged missiles; others wrote letters describing them; others merely poured into my ears their suspicions and fears.

I turned over every scrap of this information to the Central Intelligence Agency, where I thought it should go for proper examination and evaluation.

However, Mr. President, it is eminently clear that prior to October 14, the day when the "picture" was finally obtained of missiles actually on site, there was really no hard, provable evidence on hand, not the kind of certain and demonstrable evidence on which a great and responsible nation could act.

There were circumstances and there was considerable talk on the part of refugees regarding a missile buildup; and to me it was apparent that this word was getting to the CIA and to our intelligence outfits for the U–2 flights, which all through the summer had been occurring on a basis of two every month, and which were stepped up to four a month in September.

In September, there were flights on September 5, 17, 26, and 29; in October there were flights on the 5th and the 7th, and, of course, on the 14th. None produced any evidence of the missiles, although the reports continued to come in, and many people began to believe the missiles were there, even though no photograph had shown them. Then, I think, some adjustments began to be made even prior to October 14, although I have no exact knowledge of this. In any event, the overflight of October 14 showed the missiles.

Thereafter, the President of the United States called off his speaking trip, returned to Washington, met with the heads of the CIA, the Defense and the State Departments, and others, and, after great soul searching, evolved a program as to what would be done.

All of us know now that the congressional leadership on both sides was called back to Washington, prior to the President's speech on October 22.

The President announced to those of us gathered at the White House what had developed in Cuba; and, after discussion, he stated what he intended to do. There was comment with respect to additional steps which some of those present thought should be taken. However, the President fully and satisfactorily explained why he felt it was more correct to pursue the course upon which he had determined.

Everyone there, publicly or privately, I am sure, pledged his support to the President and the course of action which the President outlined for the Nation to follow.

I am sure that everyone of us was greatly moved and deeply concerned as the President delivered his magnificent message, in which he clearly pointed out that there would be no toleration of Communist offensive missiles or bombers in Cuba; that the offensive missiles had to be removed; that if any of them was launched at the United States or at our neighbors, the United States would fire back—not at Cuba, but at the source of the problem, the Soviet Union.

I am sure that all of us recall vividly with what great apprehension and concern we lived in the next few hours and the next few days. And as the build-up of our manpower and might in south Florida and the Caribbean speeded up, I am sure we all recall with what final consummate relief we heard the announcement that Mr. Khrushchev had, in effect, backed down; that he had agreed to the withdrawal of the offensive weapons.

We truly, as the Bible says, "walked through the valley of the shadow" and emerged unscathed.

Mr. Khrushchev did not wish, at this time at least, to start a war over Cuba, for he agreed to back his missiles and bombers out of Cuba, which must have been humiliating and awkward for him. While we did not get the on-site inspection asked for, because of Castro's intransigence, nevertheless the Communists permitted our planes to fly at low altitudes over the missile sites, without gunfire being directed at them, and permitted inspection by our airplanes and our surface ships of the missiles and bombers being returned to the Soviet Union.

It is also worthy of note that today our planes are daily flying low and high over Cuba, for inspection purposes; and none of the very effective antiaircraft weapons—the SAM, the SA–2, and others which have great efficiency—have been fired at our planes. Mr. Khrushchev realized that the President was and is ready to go to any extremity to get those offensive weapons—a threat to U.S. security—removed from Cuba, and, furthermore, that he had to be satisfied that they were removed. That is why the Communists have permitted the flights every day over Cuba, to observe what is happening with respect to missiles, troop concentrations, and removals. No shot has been fired at our photographic planes, and none will be fired, because the President has made it crystal clear he will not permit it without instant retaliation.

Mr. Khrushchev, having also agreed to withdraw some of the 17,000 troops remaining in Cuba after the missiles and bombers left, is now in process of doing that. How many have left, I do not know. But State Department sources indicate that some 2,500 have left, and also even some of the units of the four armored groups that were there.

I was pleased to note in the March 9 issue of the Washington Star, however, that Mr. Antoly Dobrynin, Soviet Foreign Minister, stated that a substantial pullout would be completed by mid-March, as Mr. Khrushchev had promised. I am certain that President Kennedy is exerting all the influence he can to see to it that all the Russian forces are withdrawn from the island.

It is interesting to see what some people—now that the critical danger has receded—have chosen to criticize. When the President, in late October, held our national and individual destinies in his hands, few voices were heard; almost everyone was breathless while the President spoke clearly and firmly. I, for one, did not have much to say, and I do not recall that anyone did.

Now, however, there are loud cries and criticisms of an intelligence gap between September and October, of interagency confusion, over concessions made or imagined, and so forth. But the important thing to remember is that the President when confronted with the actual direct threat to the security of the United States acted with consummate courage and skill to protect our national interest. He acted in accord with the highest traditions of American statesmanship and successfully eliminated a threat of monstrous proportions to our national existence.

Because the Constitution of the United States puts into the hands of the executive branch of the Government—or the President of the United States—the final authority and responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs, I think he should be permitted without personal harrassment or political attack to proceed along this logical line of getting Soviet troops removed from Cuba, for I would challenge anyone to suggest that there is a more useful course of action looking toward the total solution of the problem of Cuba than that of removing the troops and technicians of the Soviet Union from Cuba.

But, Mr. President, what of the future? What are our long-range goals?

Certainly, they are to see Cuba freed. But do we have a program or a plan of action? If the President has, of course he does not have to tell it to anyone. I have not heard of any plan, and I think if we are to free Cuba and keep the respect of our Latin neighbors we have to have a plan or a program which we can logically follow to a final and happy solution of a free Cuba.

Now I would like to offer a program, or plan of action, but before doing so I want to make it clear I speak only for myself. I speak only for the junior Senator from Florida. I have not cleared this speech with anyone. This voice is speaking only for me.

In the past I have recommended all sorts of programs of action. I have talked about a combination of measures, embargoes, quarantines, economic measures, political measures, propaganda measures, diplomatic measures, and others. But at no time have I recommended that the United States declare war on Cuba or act unilaterally with our own military force.

Since the buildup of weapons and men in Cuba last fall by the Soviets, the situation has changed. We now have a new dimension to consider, the possibility of direct confrontation of Soviet troops and United States troops.

Furthermore, in the light of the enormous amount of military equipment put into Cuba, we have a much more difficult situation to deal with than we did in 1960 or 1961.

When we talk about strong measures today, particularly when we imply force even though we may not say it, we are in reality talking about a direct confrontation of the military forces of the United States with the military forces of the Soviet Union, unless we first are successful in getting these forces out of Cuba. Such a confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States forces we have not had thus far in our history.

During the Korean war, while we fought the Red Chinese and undoubtedly many Soviets, nevertheless they operated clandestinely under color of the North Koreans and/or Red Chinese. However, so long as the Soviet military troops remain in Cuba, the prospects of escalating action in Cuba into total war are infinitely greater because any unilateral action against Cuba, or even action led by U.S. forces puts, for the first time, U.S. military forces in direct confrontation with those of the Soviet Union.

As stated, I think this adds a new dimension of danger to our already difficult problem.

I do not go so far as to say that we should never act, or that we should not proceed, even if some of the military of the Soviet Union stay there. I would emphasize, however, that the solution to the problem of Cuba, which means the elimination of communism from Cuba, is infinitely easier without the Soviet forces there. I say that their removal will diminish greatly the prospects of whatever action is finally taken in Cuba escalating into a total world and nuclear war. It has been the consideration of this problem, the gravity of it, the enormity of it, the complexity of it, which has made me feel that the President is on the right track in first getting removed from Cuba the offensive missiles and bombers and, thereafter, insisting upon the removal of the Soviet personnel.

Furthermore, we must keep in mind that today, when we suggest further action, either in the form of a blockade or a raid, this involves the use of force. And force, of course, means war. It might be limited and small—or it might be unlimited and staggering in its consequences. When we embark on a blockade of an island like Cuba, for it to be effective the blockader must make up his mind he may have to go to the length of shooting and sinking a surface ship as one starts into Cuba with supplies and personnel, or of shooting down an aircraft which is loaded with supplies and personnel.

In any event, the act of shooting a plane or a ship is an act of war and, as the President said in his last news conference, any such action on our part will probably call up an immediate response.

Furthermore, let us be sure when we talk of force and war we know what we are talking about. This use of force, this war we are talking about, is not a cold war waged in the daily press and over the conference tables. It is not a war of words in which our Secretary of Defense corrects the blusterings of the Soviet Defense Minister on the number of operative U.S. missiles or the size of our thermonuclear bombs. Not even a guerrilla war in which railroad bridges are destroyed and crops burned or sugar mills sabotaged.

We are talking about a war in which troops storm a beachhead, where platoons are sent to knock out a bunker, a war in which villages are destroyed by artillery fire, a war in which lives would be lost and men maimed and crippled for life, a war which could well leave fatherless thousands of children.

There may be some who think that now is the time for war. Some who advocate, rather glibly, that American forces turn quickly on Castro's Cuba—and get the job over with. It may come to that, but everyone should know exactly what they are talking about. I hope they have given thought to not just the phrases but the consequences as well.

How many American troops, for example, would be required to die in order to land a large effective fighting force on an island which has 150 coastal defense missiles and operational sites for most of them? These missiles can reach troop ships 40 miles out. How many troops, landing craft, and even transports could be sent to the bottom of the Caribbean by a dozen operative missile launching torpedo boats, whose launch range is 15 miles, which the Cubans now have?

How many aircraft would be lost in attaining air superiority over a small island with 500 surface to antiaircraft missiles and defended by 100 Migs, over 40 of them capable of matching our F–104 Starfighter in performance and all piloted, we must presume, by skilled aviators and directed by 200 modern radars?

How many soldiers would be lost in subduing a force of some 75,000 regular and, we must presume, fanatically indoctrinated troops, fighting on their home ground, and backed by at least 100,000 militiamen and 100,000 home guard troops?

They are fully equipped with tanks, field artillery pieces, antitank guns and other modern weapons. They are a formidable force and would be operating defensively, taking a tremendous toll of any liberating force.

Once a beachhead for the liberating force was established how long would the battle for the island take?

How many casualties, American casualties, would it cost to subdue Cuba?

I have no access to contingency plans but we hear figures such as a month and 100,000 casualties. I gather that our military planners see no quick, glorious charge up San Juan Hill now. Rather they envision a long, grueling, and bloody war waged in the most exhausting and savage tradition of the 20th century world wars.

And would the war for the liberation of Cuba remain limited?

I challenge anyone to say he knows. We can carry on some logical speculation. It might be a war confined to the island of Cuba and the waters surrounding it.

Or it might be a war which precipitates a Soviet move into Berlin with all that implies. Or action in Cuba might precipitate full-scale conflict in southeast Asia, particularly South Vietnam or Laos.

Or how do we know that the war to liberate Cuba will not really touch off the total thermonuclear conflict which each of us prays daily will not occur. Soviet Defense Minister Malinovsky says it will. Can we assume he does not mean it?

Our Defense Secretary has said we will defend Berlin—with nuclear bombs if necessary—and I am sure every man in this Chamber approves this stand and knows that Mr. McNamara spoke for the President when he said it. We know the United States means it, that we will defend West Berlin and if necessary with nuclear weapons.

Malinovsky has said essentially the same thing about Cuba. Can we be certain he does not mean what he said?

Can we be as certain that he does not mean it as we are certain that Secretary McNamara does?

I do not know. To take action which could imperil the national existence on the basis of a pleasant and encouraging assumption would be one of the greatest gambles in history. I believe that it is within the context of real and violent warfare that the calls for a blockade or an all-out assault on Cuba must be evaluated. Well, if war is the final answer, if any Member of this Chamber feels it is worth it at this point in order to clear Russian troops from Cuba, he is in the right place to call for it.

As we all know, Congress has the right to declare war on Russia, on Cuba, and the first step is for one of the Members of the body to submit a resolution declaring the existence of a state of war. This has not yet been done, and I do not think it will be done any time soon.

However, while the consequences of any meaningful action are extremely grave, we must nevertheless not be frightened out of doing our duty or living up to our traditions of fighting for freedom.

As we look at the present situation and talk about it with some appreciation of what we are talking about, let us not fail to offer solutions, if we think we have them, but let us make whatever suggestions we have in the realization that the problem is a bipartisan matter and that if we become totally involved, bullets do not merely pick out Democrats or Republicans. Neither red-blooded Americans nor bullets know partisanship.

In this context of understanding, without political motivations and only in an effort to be helpful to the President of the United States, who, of course, has to make the final decision for all in this Nation on matters of this character, I would like for the next few minutes to discuss the situation as it exists today, and what I think we may have to do in the future, and why.

I think we must first settle in our minds whether or not this Nation can long abide Fidel Castro and communism in Cuba.

I know that there is a small body of opinion that would say because Cuba is now too dangerous for us to fool with, therefore, we should do nothing about it except ignore it and hope it goes away.

I am not one of those who subscribe to that theory of hoping it will go away. For hope has yet to remove a Communist dictatorship anywhere in the world.

Tightly controlled police states do not wither on the vine. I do not believe the Communists will surrender merely because we hope they will.

There are others who subscribe to the containment theory as the policy to follow under present circumstances—the easiest policy to follow. Containment is the recognition of the status quo within a country, while at the same time restricting its overt actions outside its borders. However, the danger from Cuba today does not lie solely in the fact that it may attack over the border a neighbor country. We are pledged to and we can easily stop that.

The danger in a continuing Communist government in Cuba, even though contained within Cuba's physical boundaries, lies in that Cuba will continue as it is now, the fountainhead of subversion, propaganda, and training. We can stop the exportation of its troops to other lands, but we cannot stop the exportation of its ideas, its propaganda, its training of subversives.

Millions of tons of literature depart Cuba for other Central and South American countries every month. Propaganda broadcasts to Central and South America have been increased in the last 18 months from 80 hours a week to over 150 hours.

John McCone, Director of the CIA, admitted recently, and it was made public, that some 1,500 revolutionaries from other Central and South American countries trained in Cuba last year. This type of activity is almost impossible to stop, short of extirpating the Communist government itself.

However, the greatest danger of a "contained" but "continuing" Cuba under communism is that it negates and renders ineffective our long-range program of helping our Latin American neighbors through the Alliance for Progress.

As we all know, Alianza Para el Progreso is a program calculated to build up the economy, the standards of living, and the literacy of the people, through economic and technical aid from the United States, while simultaneously effecting tax, land and social reform from within.

It envisions the expenditure of U.S. funds in the neighborhood of close to $1 billion each year for 10 years. For this noble purpose, however, Mr. President, Latin America needs 90 percent more funds than this. It was reasoned that these additional large sums would be supplied from two sources: First, the country itself; and second, private capital. However, neither of these two sources is available if communism remains in Cuba.

As the Alliance was planned, 80 percent of the contribution was to be made by the Latins themselves, both through their governments and through private investment. However, with local governments, such as Venezuela, expending their time and energies in building up their armed forces, staying busy putting down Cuban instigated riots, spending their money and energies on day-to-day existence, the deep economic and social problems will never get either the attention or the money which their solution require.

And private investment, either of Latin American or United States origin, is obviously going to look for more stable and secure markets, even if the interest rate is not as high as it currently is in Latin America. A corporate executive is not going to put his stockholders' money into an area where it might be confiscated without any reimbursement, as was done in Cuba, nor is a private individual going to invest his savings in a land which may fall under a Communist influence at any given moment.

As an example, the flow of new U.S. private investment in South America has plummeted in recent years. In 1957 U.S. citizens and businesses put $1,164 million in direct investment into the area. By 1961 direct new investment had dropped to only $141 million, a drop of more than 70 percent. This figure comes from the Bureau of International Commerce of the Department of Commerce.

Government sources estimate that when the 1962 totals are finally calculated they will show a flow back to the United States of more than $10 million. In other words, more U.S. private capital was pulled out than was put into Latin America in 1962.

In the case of needed private investment from Latin sources themselves, the situation appears equally critical.

Because of the threat of a Communist-type dictatorship in most every country of South America, local capital is fleeing in enormous amounts out of Latin America into banks and investment in Switzerland, Great Britain, the United States, and even Hong Kong.

The Alliance for Progress is the most realistic, long-term attempt we have ever made to help the Latin American nations out of the cycle of poverty, ignorance, and illness, in which for centuries they have been caught. It must not fail if we are to keep the countries to the south of us in the column of the free world. Yet there can be no doubt that the continued existence of Castro's Cuba insures its eventual failure. Because the Alliance, operating by itself does not have the money to do the job, because the U.S. Treasury cannot fill the vacuum caused by the fear of investment on the part of outside private capital and the flight of local capital.

This means, Mr. President, that Fidel Castro and communism must go before we can get moving on the big job of realizing the aims and ambitions of the Alliance for Progress.

How then can we get Castro and communism out of Cuba? I see only two alternatives.

First, we can, through various sources, attempt to foster an internal defection and uprising against Castro—in effect, turn Castro's own weapons back on him. This has some appeal primarily because it looks easy, but the lessons learned from East Germany and Hungary cause some pessimism. A rebellion against a tightly controlled police state is not likely to succeed.

No doubt there are in Cuba huge numbers of people among the military, the campesinos, the laborers, and, in fact, among all groups and classes, who are praying for the demise of Castro and the Communists. But in a land under communism, overridden with informers, and disciplined by brutal secret police, the organization and execution of a revolt or mass defection is an infinitely difficult thing. Perhaps it could be successful in Cuba, but being realistic rather than romantic, we should not count on it.

It seems to me in searching for a plan of attack, we must face up to the fact that there is no easy or inexpensive short-run solution to the problem of Castro and communism. There was in 1959. It might have still been easy in 1960, but no longer.

Realizing the problem of Castro and communism will not be solved overnight, I suggest putting into action a long-range plan which envisions only ultimately, and, in the final analysis, if need be, the use of force in order to get rid of Fidel Castro.

However, if it comes to force, the program envisions Latins and Cubans, who believe in freedom, leading that force against the Latin Communists of Fidel Castro. In other words, the program envisions Latins-for-freedom versus Latins-for-dictatorship.

After all, the problems posed by Castro are greatest with respect to the Latin American nations, and as such it is the Latin nations which should begin to bear an increasing responsibility for bringing about a solution.

More specifically, communism has established its hemispheric fortress in Cuba and, in the final analysis, it should be, and can be the Cubans who assume the leadership in what will have to be of necessity a joint undertaking.

The value of turning to the Latins to provide the leadership and most of the manpower required to do the job, returns the problem to its proper place as a Western Hemisphere problem, to be handled within the framework of already existing treaties and agreements entered into by all the Western Hemisphere countries.

Furthermore, there is no sense in purposely bringing about a situation in which Mr. Khrushchev, already ignominiously removing his missiles from Cuba, is required once again to either back down or fight, because of direct confrontation with our troops, or a specific challenge from us.

I do not know, and I do not believe anyone does, just how far Mr. Khrushchev believes he can back up before he destroys his own position, with his ally the belligerent Chinese Reds, or with his own military leaders within the Soviet Union.

I see no point in plotting a course at this time that does not afford Mr. Khrushchev a door through which he can move to avoid confrontation with us, if he wants to. This program which I shall suggest, in which the action taken is called for and lead by Cubans and Latins, in some measure avoids the confrontation and thereby lessens the possibility that, if and when force comes into use, the encounter will escalate into total war or nuclear war.

If the Cubans and other freedom-loving Latins are to take charge of the Castro problem, there must be a rallying point for them, a central body which can focus and direct their efforts. I see no group which can do this, which can speak in the name of all the Cuban people, except a fully constituted Government-in-exile which is recognized by us and other hemispheric nations. We should acknowledge its power to make treaties, conduct foreign relations, borrow money, establish armed forces, and enter into all activities of a regularly constituted government. As I understand it, from international lawyers dealing regularly with such matters, our recognition of an exile government would be preceded by withdrawal of recognition of the present regime.

The only argument I have heard against such a government-in-exile is, How will it be formed when all the exiles are divided as to who or what group will lead it?

First, I am certain that any government selected by the Government of the United States and announced as the exile Government of Cuba will, in fact, be the Government-in-exile. However, there is a more democratic method of procedure if our officials want to follow it.

The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service and Refugee Committee have the names and addresses of every refugee in the United States and Puerto Rico. Why not send each one a ballot, asking him or her to write their first, second, or third choices down—sort of like an absentee ballot here in all our States of the United States.

It would be relatively simple to carry out a poll by mail and under the supervision of a group of prominent exiled Cuban jurists, in which each exiled Cuban adult is asked for a free expression of who should head an exile Government. No doubt, there would be some errors and duplication—this is inevitable—but it would provide a consensus and would give support to the man or men who finally act as the Government-in-exile.

Once it was established who the Cuban people had selected to lead the fight to free their homeland, U.S. recognition should be immediate.

This would emphasize to the other hemispheric nations that the efforts of free Cubans to expunge communism from Cuba have our full support and lead to recognition of the exile Government by other hemispheric nations.

Moreover, there are nations in Latin America which would act as host to the Government-in-exile. I will not bring about their subjection to pressure and harassment by mentioning their names here. But they have made it clear that they would allow a Cuban Government-in-exile to operate from their soil.

I am not suggesting that the Government-in-exile be the government which takes over the power of Cuba once the freedom of the Cuban homeland has been regained. On the contrary, it should be understood that the Cuban Government in exile maintains our recognition only so long as it takes to free Cuba and, thereafter, hold a democratic election on Cuban soil with all the people of Cuba participating.

Once formed and established, the Cuban Government, under the Rio Treaty of 1947, the Caracas Agreement of 1954, the Punte del Este agreements of 1961, and, in fact, the basic provisions of the Organization of American States, could call upon all the nations of the Western Hemisphere for military and financial assistance. And under those provisions we and the other nations are legally and/or normally obliged to help. With this military equipment, they could begin to tighten the noose on Fidel Castro.

The Cuban Government-in-exile would itself be able to, with the use of PT boats and other craft acquired from throughout the hemisphere, place a selective type blockade on the Island of Cuba, cutting off the supply of oil and other essential supplies needed for Castro's armed forces.

Simultaneously, it could foster defection within Cuba by providing arms and munitions to those who would turn against Castro. This, I submit, is the only realistic course to follow for those who rely on the defection from within alternative. Help from outside Cuba is needed, and Cubans could supply it all.

Propaganda barrages could be established with Cubans talking to Cubans. The Government-in-exile could ask and insist, under the treaties, that all Latin American nations which had not already done so, close their shores to Castro's embassies. This would stop most of the subversive propaganda now flowing out of Cuba. The Cuban Government, acting in the name of freedom, could ask that all trade with Castro be stopped. They can ask this cooperation from all members of the OAS, whereas the United States which is, technically, not directly involved, could not.

Cubans could easily smuggle goods to the underground in Cuba without having to run the gauntlet of the U.S. Immigration and Border Patrol officials, who now stop them and defeat their major efforts.

There is a good chance that such an exile Government, supported and supplied by all the nations of the Western Hemisphere, could nourish sufficient defection within Cuba to topple Castro, and, of course, that is to be desired.

But, if in the final analysis it were needed, that exile Government could undertake the liberation of its home by the force of arms. As a member of the OAS, and under the provision of the treaties of Rio and Caracas this Government could call on other-member nations for whatever assistance would be required—including arms—to bring about a successful conclusion to their efforts. Under the commitments imposed on the United States and the other hemispheric nations by longstanding treaties, we would be legally bound and acting within the dictates of our international obligations in answering the Cuban exile Government's request for help.

Surely, we and the other nations of the Western Hemisphere would respond, just as we responded to the call of the English and French in World Wars I and II. We would respond because we believe in freedom and the right of self-determination, and it is just as precious and dead in this hemisphere as in the Continent of Europe or the far away reaches of southeast Asia.

The proposal is not a roadmap to utopia. Liberation of Cuba by forces directed by a government-in-exile is a long-range prospect. There would have to be a time-consuming buildup of governmental organizations, operating funds, and troops. The problems would be large.

But similar problems have been faced before and overcome. There is more to bind together the various groups of Cuban exiles than there is to divide them. And the promise of realistic help in returning to a free homeland would be a powerful lever in bringing about pressure in the direction of unity.

Properly organized and motivated, I feel that it could take effective action. I believe that people by the hundreds of

thousands on the Latin American continent—from the humblest campesinos to chiefs of state would realize that this Government was acting for all of them and would make common cause with it. Tens of thousands of young men from all over the continent would, I believe, join the ranks of its fighting forces. This exile-Government could provide a living illustration that the battle cry of freedom still rings clearest in the human heart.

A Cuba Government-in-exile is the force which, acting on behalf of and in the name of the Cuban people, can bring about the liberation of their island. This is the group which can properly take any and all action necessary to successfully wage a war of liberation.

Once communism and Castroism are eliminated in Cuba the United States must continue its interest in Latin America. We must continue our program of long-range assistance to enable the Latin governments to bring about a better life for their people. We must reform our thinking and remember that we exist side by side, interdependent, whether communism threatens or not.

Mr. President, I said early in my remarks that I believe one day Cubans will again enjoy the blessings of liberty, freedom, and self-government. No member of this body wants more than I to see that day come and to hasten its approach.

I have today presented a plan which I think can free Cuba. I feel it is a sensible and logical course of action and commend it to those who are searching for ways to free Cuba and drive communism from the hemisphere. In the final analysis the President of the United States makes the final judgment—the ultimate decision, as to what will be this Nation's course of operation. I am sure he is prayerfully considering all proposals suggested as to what course to follow. Whatever his decision I intend to support the President in whatever action he takes. I know that all citizens and patriots will do likewise.

SENATE SHOULD INVESTIGATE THREATENED CHANGES IN IRS FIELD STRUCTURE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, since the Secretary of the Treasury announced the proposed changes in the field structure of the Internal Revenue Service on March 5, a number of Senators have voiced deep concern. Let me say that I fully share this concern. The cogent reasons supporting such protests merit the careful attention of those responsible in the administration for the proposals.

Apart from the political implications involved in the proposed changes, they would have a drastic effect on a substantial number of Nebraskans, most of whom have served the Internal Revenue Service faithfully for many years. Certainly the same would be true in the other affected areas.

In order to give Commissioner Caplin an opportunity to justify his proposals, I requested specific information about the claimed savings.

I had thought that my letter did not impose unusual demands on the Commissioner, because the high level ad hoc Committee on Resources Utilization which he appointed early in 1962 to study revisions was to have its recommendations available by December 1962. However, apparently I raised some questions that this "high level" committee had not considered because, as of this time, the Commissioner has not replied.

Thus, I think it is appropriate to discuss the matter here.

The Commissioner's claim that he can accomplish a $5 million annual savings without reducing the service to the taxpayer is attractive. However, there is serious doubt that it can be accomplished.

Further doubt has been cast on the proposals by the Secretary of the Treasury who, upon encountering opposition, announced to the press that action would be deferred until he has had more time to review the plans.

However welcome this decision is, it will not settle the question. The time for review has passed.

According to a letter sent to all Internal Revenue Service employees, the recommendations of the Committee on Resources Utilization were in the hands of the Treasury Department officials prior to February 7 of this year. Hence, the Secretary has had a whole month to review the program.

If a further review is to occur, I strongly recommend that the Secretary get together with his Commissioner, because the Commissioner continues to act as if he does not intend to change his plans.

It is important that there be a complete investigation of the proposals by the Senate Finance Committee. Otherwise, the plan may be fully implemented while we are still awaiting a report from the Secretary. Such an investigation would, among other things, scrutinize the inconsistencies that manifest themselves in the Commissioner's proposals.

Consider first the case of Omaha, with which I am most familiar. By January 1, 1964, the Commissioner intends to reduce the present Omaha staff of 297 to 83. He has indicated that he will try to reduce the adverse impact on these people as much as possible. He has reaffirmed this position in a recent statement to the press, and a member of his staff advised my office that those who wished to remain in the Service will be retained for at least 2 years at the same GS rating whether their position is downgraded or not.

Mr. President, I do not know how the Department can incur the expense of moving employees and their families, maintain them at the same salary until after the 1964 presidential election, and still accomplish a net savings.

Furthermore, the Commissioner indicated that most of the officials and employees whose positions will be eliminated have risen to their present positions by doing their work well and have experience and skill that the Internal Revenue Service does not want to lose. Nevertheless, he indicated that he expects to lose some of their positions.

While Commissioner Caplin is in the process of eliminating skillful and experienced personnel the President is proposing to increase the number of Internal Revenue Service employees from an estimated 60,300 in fiscal year 1963 to 64,086 by the end of fiscal 1964. Obviously, if the President sees a need for increasing the present personnel level in the Internal Revenue Service by approximately 3,700, then certainly he must also feel the need to replace the employees that will be lost through the proposed changes. The replacement of long time skillful and experienced personnel with new and inexperienced personel does not seem to me to be consistent with the President's goal of obtaining a lean, fit, and efficient establishment.

When the Internal Revenue Service was reorganized in 1952, two primary objectives were to decentralize service to taxpayers and restore integrity and public confidence where it was lacking.

The proposed plan is hardly consistent with the sound objective of decentralizing service to the taxpayers. On the contrary, Omaha, which is the most nearly central location that could be obtained for all the various States in the present region, is being eliminated in favor of Chicago. Chicago, on the other hand, is at the extreme eastern edge of the proposed region. It is difficult to visualize how the Commissioner expects to accomplish a savings by this move when he is obviously increasing the cost of employee travel within the region?

Furthermore, in an attempt to justify the move from New York to Boston, the argument has been advanced that it will place the regional office closer to the Automatic Data Processing Center at Lawrence, Mass. If this is the reason for the New York move, then how can the Omaha move be justified? Under the present regional structure, the ADP service center is scheduled for Kansas City, Mo., just 175 miles from Omaha. If the regional office is moved to Chicago, the ADP center will be 500 miles away.

In his fiscal 1962 report, Commissioner Caplin referred to the "blue ribbon" program which was launched by the Service in 1956 for the purpose of increasing the caliber and productivity of its work force. The Commissioner noted that—

> Since that time the Service has been conducting vigorous college recruitment campaigns to attract top-quality applicants to enter revenue employment, and, at the same time, has provided training to enhance employees' ability to perform at the full-working level.

According to the report—

> These recruitments and training programs have been geared into well-developed career programs designed to encourage top-caliber people to stay in the Service and assure their orderly progression to more responsible positions. Through its "blue ribbon" program, the Service has been advanced to the forefront as one of the most progressive agencies in the Federal service.

Commissioner Caplin notes in his yearend report that he has followed the "blue ribbon" recruitment program. Nevertheless, he now proposes changes which will undermine his program for recruiting top-caliber people. The insecurity of working for a service which eliminates top-caliber personnel after many years of service could hardly be encouraging to young college recruits.

The obvious political implications involved in transferring the New York regional office to Boston have been adequately discussed by my colleagues in this Chamber. At first it appeared that the elimination of the Omaha office in favor of the Chicago office was done so that the proponents of the changes could answer their critics by referring to the elimination of not one, but two, regional offices. However, one could wonder whether the favor granted to Chicago is not as politically bold as the favor granted to Boston. These moves are hardly designed to restore public confidence in the service, one of the prime objectives of the 1952 reorganization.

Mr. President, since the changes were announced, I have received many letters protesting the changes and calling for congressional investigation and further study. Unless there is a clear statement from either the Secretary of the Treasury or the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that implementation of these plans is suspended, it is my hope, Mr. President, that the Senate Finance Committee will call for an accounting of these disturbing and unfortunate proposals at the earliest possible time.

SALUTE TO "CAP" SANDERS AND THE NEBRASKA STATE SAFETY PATROL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the mobility of Americans is one of the phenomena of our times. Faster than we can build superhighways up and down and across our States, cars and trucks fill the lanes from shoulder to median strip. This striking similarity to a river at floodtide once prompted a friend of mine to describe Highway 30 as "running bankfull."

Unnerving as this situation may be to the ordinary traveler, it would be completely unmanageable except for a largely unappreciated group of young men whose job it is to protect life and limb and property along the roadways, America's 50 State highway patrols.

I am reminded of the exceptional quality of their work by the recent announcement of the retirement of Col. C. J. "Cap" Sanders, one of the original members of the Nebraska Safety Patrol after over 25 years of service in that organization. He will leave his post on June 13 of this year, having reached mandatory retirement age.

Colonel Sanders was 1 of the 14 members of the original force of 44 men still in Nebraska's 25-year-old patrol. He is its third commander, a position he assumed in 1941.

It has been my pleasure to know and work with him throughout that period. He is one of the most dedicated and loyal public officials I have ever known. No department of Nebraska's State government can surpass the record of the patrol under his inspiring leadership. No agency is more respected by the public it serves.

Mr. President, as sentinels of law, order, and peace, our State patrolmen undergo hardships and often risk their lives to protect the lives and property of our citizens. Too frequently their activities are taken for granted and go largely unnoticed.

The fact that States have delegated local police powers to counties, cities, and townships has not impaired their authority to exercise their primary police responsibilities whenever situations have arisen which have demanded such action. In response to such a demand, the formation of State police forces began in the early 1800's, but not until the first half of this century did the movement spread to all the States.

The genesis of the present State police was in the Texas Rangers, recruited in 1835 as a border patrol. They were followed in 1865 by Massachusetts where a few State constables were appointed and were given police power to be exercised in the rural areas. Connecticut followed suit in 1903 with a small State police force patterned along the lines of the force in Massachusetts.

In 1905, with the organization of the Pennsylvania State Constabulary the first really authentic State police department came into existence, thus introducing a new idea in State police systems. Its purpose was to provide an executive arm for the State, to assist in handling disturbed conditions in the coal fields, and to provide protection in the rural areas that were without adequate law enforcement agencies. From the beginning the Pennsylvania State Constabulary operated as a uniformed and mounted force.

The rapid rise of rural crime and the universal use of the automobile, with its attendant problems of crime and traffic, led to the development of similar State police organizations within all the States during the first half of this century.

In Nebraska the State Safety Patrol was established in 1937. Its motto, "pro bono publico," "For the good of the public," has been and continues to be the basis for its every activity. During the 26 years of its operation, the force has grown from the original 44 patrolmen to 209. The highest standards of personnel selection and training have been maintained, which with the use of the latest technical equipment, have combined to provide the citizens of Nebraska with quick and efficient law enforcement. This is a commendable and admirable reflection on Colonel Sanders and his predecessors, R. F. Weller, and R. T. Schrien.

Because of the effective and high-quality work of the Nebraska State Safety Patrol, the traffic death rate has been kept well below the national average. In 1960, Nebraska's death rate per hundred million vehicle miles was 4.3, while the average rate in the United States was 5.3. This figure also represents a new low from the 12.8 death rate which prevailed in 1937 when the Nebraska State Safety Patrol came into being.

The activities of State patrolmen in Nebraska as well as in other States range from rescue work in the wake of violent storms and floods, to the apprehension of dangerous criminals; from courteously helping a traveler change a tire, to directing, controlling, and patrolling traffic. The State police movement has built a fine tradition of courageous service and unselfish devotion to duty.

A patrolman's working conditions are far from the best. Owing to the large areas which must be protected, he is subject to the demands of his job day and night. In the face of difficult working conditions, he remains a symbol of courtesy and willing helpfulness.

For the past quarter of a century, the Nebraska Safety Patrol has been "Cap" Sanders' life. While there are many who will agree with the Hastings Tribune which observed editorially that his mandatory retirement at 60 is "a terrific waste of manpower," there are none who will not wish him Godspeed and congratulate him on a difficult job commendably done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD stories on Colonel Sanders' retirement, taken from the February 17 editions of the Lincoln Journal & Star and the Omaha World-Herald, together with an editorial from the February 25 edition of the Hastings Daily Tribune.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hastings (Nebr.) Daily Tribune, Feb. 25, 1963]

Colonel Sanders' Motive in Adding 80 Men to the Nebraska Patrol Is To Save Lives

"If the patrol is given a sufficient number of men, we'll put a terrific dent in the number of people killed last year," Col. C. J. Sanders, director of Nebraska's State Safety Patrol, told the members of the legislature's budget committee. Colonel Sanders asked the committee to approve an expenditure of $2,250,000 a year for support of the patrol during the 1963–65 biennium which starts next July 1.

When Colonel Sanders, several months ago, proposed increasing the patrol by 80 as a means of reducing the State's traffic death toll there were many critics. Some of them contended that Colonel Sanders, like so many other directors of public agencies, was merely trying to add to his own prestige by having more patrolmen under his command.

That statement wasn't true then and it isn't true now. The patrol commander has just made public the knowledge that because of age he is being forced to retire from duty next June. This in itself is a terrific waste of manpower, because there are few men who have his experience in traffic enforcement work. He will be only 60 years of age. In a great majority of instances mandatory retirement age is 65.

Colonel Sanders made a strong case in behalf of his request for an increase in the number of patrolmen.

For example, he pointed out that although there are 209 patrolmen, 17 are involved in administrative work leaving 176 for patrolling highways. But these men can't work 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The result is there are 63 men to cover the vast highway system of the State.

Is it any wonder that you can drive halfway across the State without seeing a single patrolman. Besides their patrol duties the men have to check on stolen cars, overweight trucks, remove articles from the highway, and assist motorists.

Before the end of this year, according to promises from the State highway department, another segment of the Interstate

Highway will be open. This will require more patrolmen. It is expected that by 1970 the entire 400-mile Interstate will be completed. This will add to the load of the patrol.

If Colonel Sanders says a larger patrol can put a "terrific dent" in the State's highway death toll he should be believed. He isn't going to gain anything from such action personally except the satisfaction of saving some lives, and that is the thing he has been most concerned with in the 26 years he has been a member of the patrol.

His is the only concrete suggestion made by any State official for reducing Nebraska's staggering highway death toll. Four hundred were killed in 1962 alone. This is a tremendous waste.

Experience of other States has demonstrated that strict law enforcement does help to reduce highway accidents and fatalities. There is no reason it won't in Nebraska.

Unless the plea of Colonel Sanders is approved by the legislature they will have only themselves to blame if the State's highway death toll isn't reduced. They have been given the solution and it is now their responsibility.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World Herald, Feb. 17, 1963]

Safety Patrol Chief Planning To Retire Effective June 13

The retirement of Col. C. J. Sanders as Chief of the Nebraska Safety Patrol on June 13 was announced indirectly Saturday in the letter of Mrs. Helen Greene in which she informed Governor Morrison of her immediate resignation as State Traffic Safety Coordinator.

"Colonel Sanders' retirement date has been common knowledge and I am assuming he is retiring, although I've not discussed a successor with him," Governor Morrison said.

Colonel Sanders confirmed his retirement plans Saturday night.

"Under our law it is mandatory that you retire on your 60th birthday and June 13 is it," Colonel Sanders said.

"I haven't been making much of an issue about it."

In her letter, Mrs. Greene recommended that the Governor appoint Capt. O. H. Witt to succeed Colonel Sanders.

Captain Witt "has done a truly outstanding job as head of the patrol's training and education program," Mrs. Greene said.

Colonel Sanders, 59, is 1 of the 14 members of the original force of 44 men still in the 25-year-old patrol. He was in the gasoline and oil business in Beatrice, Nebr., before joining the patrol. He was named chief in 1941, taking over from R. T. Schrien. The first chief was R. F. (Bub) Weller, onetime Nebraska football great.

In leaving her nonpaid position, Mrs. Greene recommended that the Governor appoint Thomas P. Ryan, chief of the accident records bureau, as her successor.

She said Mr. Ryan is "capable, thoroughly devoted to the cause of traffic safety, and highly qualified for the job."

In resigning, Mrs. Greene, mother of five, said "my first responsibility belongs to my family."

A native of Lincoln, she is the wife of William H. Greene, assistant manager of accounting at the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. plant, Lincoln. The family lives at Greenwood.

During World War II she worked for the Office of War Information in San Francisco, Calif. She was a reporter on the Lincoln Journal from 1945 to 1947.

She was Nebraska publicity chairman of the Citizens for Kennedy organization during the presidential election. She was appointed January 26, 1961, to coordinate a State safety program.

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Journal & Star, Feb. 17, 1963]

Sanders Retirement Date Set; Successor Speculated

June 13 has been set as retirement day for Col. C. J. Sanders, chief of the Nebraska Safety Patrol. Setting of the date touched off speculation as to his successor.

One name mentioned is that of Capt. O. H. Witt. It was advanced Saturday by Mrs. William H. Greene of Greenwod as she disclosed her own resignation as Gov. Frank Morrison's traffic safety coordinator.

Another well-informed source indicated that Capt. Dan Casey also should be considered among the leading candidates for the patrol's leadership.

In accepting Mrs. Greene's resignation Gov. Frank Morrison said her recommendaions would be considered, but this was not interpreted as a commitment.

The Governor was in Grand Island Saturday night for a Democratic Party meeting, as was his chief administrative assistant, Norman Otto.

Reached there by telephone, Otto said he was positive Governor Morrison has not yet decided on a successor for Colonel Sanders, and indicated it would be some time before the decision is made.

Colonel Sanders, whose retirement is mandatory by age—he will be 60 on June 13, said he has three or four recommendations about his successor, but he said he has not yet discussed them with Governor Morrison. Colonel Sanders did not divulge who his recommendations to the Governor will be.

Captain Witt of Lincoln is the patrol's safety education and training chief.

Captain Casey, also of Lincoln, is commander of the patrol's headquarters troop here.

Like Colonel Sanders, both men have been with the patrol since it was established in 1937.

It was considered probable that Colonel Sanders' successor would be from among the patrol's ranks.

In addition to Captains Witt and Casey, other topmen in the patrol, and all captains are:

Vern Byler, H. F. Nash, M. T. Doyle, and W. P. Simon, all of Lincoln; D. R. Shearer of Omaha; E. L. Schottler of Norfolk; M. J. Wiley of Grand Island; and H. D. Robinson of North Platte.

Colonel Sanders, of 4531 South 43d, has been with the patrol since it was organized November 22, 1937.

The colonel started to work in Lincoln that year as a trooper. In 1938, he worked 4 months in Norfolk, then returned to Lincoln in 1939 and was made a sergeant.

In 1940, he was promoted to lieutenant and was then sent to Fort Crook, where he worked during construction of the bomber plant there.

In 1941, Sanders returned to Lincoln, was promoted to colonel, and named head of the patrol.

When the patrol was organized it had 44 members. Today it has 210.

Colonel Sanders and his wife, Maude, have two daughters—Patricia, of Lincoln, and Mrs. Joan Ketterer, of Scottsdale, Ariz., and two grandsons, C. J., and Bill, ages 4 and 7.

In announcing her resignation, Mrs. Greene also recommended that Tom Ryan, chief of the State accident records bureau, be her own successor.

Mrs. Greene said her first responsibility belongs with her family. She has been an unpaid volunteer in the coordinator's post.

Morrison commented that the State was deeply indebted to Mrs. Greene.

Mrs. Greene said Ryan was capable and thoroughly devoted to the cause of traffic safety and is highly qualified for the job.

Noting the Governor has committed himself to establishing an office of director of safety, she wrote, "This is one of Nebraska's most pressing needs. The State of Nebraska will be much better off with a paid, full-time, well-qualified safety director than with the sporadic though well-meaning services of a volunteer worker."

Mrs. Greene said her only unfinished business is with the driver education bill and "the momentum we have already gained may carry it through."

Regarding Colonel Sanders' retirement, she urged that the line of succession should be kept within the organization.

Although Captain Witt is a Republican, she told the Governor, "I say that the patrol is above politics, and should be kept that way."

Captain Witt, she said, has done an outstanding job heading the patrol's training and education program.

"The breakthrough in the field of traffic safety will be accomplished not by something dramatic but by diligence, attention to detail, coordination, and the assurance that there is something that can be done," Mrs. Greene said.

"Maybe the new team of Ryan, Witt, and Morrison will accomplish just that."

NEED FOR IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, research and development programs of the Federal Government have grown in the past two decades out of all proportion to any other segment of the national budget.

And they are threatening to outgrow our ability to manage them intelligently.

Just before World War II, the Government spent a mere $75 million on science and technology. The figure proposed in the 1964 budget is just under $15 billion.

This means that where a dollar was spent in 1940, there will be $200 spent in 1964.

No one argues with the need for intensive programs of science, research, and technology. We still have vast frontiers to conquer. No one wants to put a price tag on the cure for cancer or the common cold or heart disease. No one fails to recognize the literal life-or-death seriousness of maintaining our military strength. No one underestimates the importance of our programs in space.

That is not the point. The point is whether the Congress is intelligently providing ample funds for all these efforts and whether the money is being spent in the most effective way.

There is strong reason to believe that the answer is "No" to both questions.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I can testify that we do not have a sound basis for making the decisions which each year confront us and I am more than reasonably certain that those who administer the science and technology programs in the Government are seized with similar misgivings.

The fact is, as Dean Don K. Price of the Graduate School of Public Administration at Harvard University has said:

> Science has become the major establishment in the American political system; the only set of institutions for which tax funds are appropriated almost on faith.

Or, as Dr. Mortimer Taube, an eminent specialist in the field of Government research, told the Senate Committee on Government Operations last July:

> Science in our time is more properly described as "big science" [which] makes necessary a reexamination of our administration of science.

Dr. Taube was testifying in behalf of a bill to create a Commission of Science and Technology. A similar bill, S. 816, was approved by the Senate on March 8 of this year.

For some reason, difficult for me to understand, administration spokesmen have been opposed to this legislation. The printed hearings on previous bills of this type show that time after time the committee chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], sought to pin down the administration witnesses as to the reason for their lack of enthusiasm about the bill. About the best answer he got was that we should wait and see how the newly formed Federal Council on Science and Technology worked out. Wait, they said. Wait and see.

Mr. President, the bill, S. 816, passed by the Senate last week, proposes no revolutionary change in our research and development programs. It simply calls for a Hoover-type commission which will undertake a comprehensive review of these programs and recommend to the President and the Congress what action, if any is indicated.

One scarcely needs such a commission to sense that something is terribly wrong. The papers with discouraging frequency report on mismanagement and questionable practices under the name of research. On Sunday, March 3, the Washington Post carried an article concerning the National Institutes of Health, which said in part:

> The first sharp reaction in Congress to its own prodigality with the NIH research budget came only last year in two biting reports of a House Government Operations Subcommittee headed by Representative L. H. FOUNTAIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, and an unsuccessful move in the Senate to hold down NIH appropriations to the level requested by the Kennedy administration.
>
> The nub of the Fountain committee's indictment was its conclusion that "Congress has been overzealous in appropriating money for health research."
>
> "The conclusion is inescapable," the report continued, "from a study of NIH's loose administrative practices, that the pressure for spending increasingly large appropriations has kept NIH from giving adequate attention to basic management problems."
>
> The committee found that grant funds were used last year to buy more than $1 million in office equipment and furniture, to pay travel bills totaling $7.5 million (of which 15 percent was for trips abroad) and to bolster salaries of researchers above regular institutional scales.
>
> In one case the Fountain group found that an NIH adviser collected a double salary of $145.98 a day as an Institutes consultant and as head of a research firm financed primarily by NIH grants. NIH put his company in business, equipped it, and also paid a profit, the committee found.
>
> In another instance, $3,500 in grant funds, intended by law to foster medical research, were used to hire a Spanish ballet group at a professional conference in Washington.
>
> A current example, not developed from the Fountain committee's files but which has raised eyebrows on Capitol Hill, is a 2-year, $74,000 planning grant to a Columbia University professor of public health research to outline a history of American medical research, with emphasis on the history of NIH.
>
> This summer the researcher plans a 6- or 7-week trip to Europe with his grant funds to study at close hand medical research in Scandinavia, France, and England. Next month the National Mental Health Advisory Council of NIH will act on his application for a new 5-year grant to advance the history project.
>
> Such cases as these, while not typical, help to explain the growing unrest in Congress over whether the Institutes' ballooning grant program hasn't become a runaway proposition.
>
> The grant system is one of the principal targets of NIH's congressional critics. This year nearly $700 million will funnel through the grant program to universities and other non-Federal institutions, equivalent roughly to 80 cents out of every NIH dollar.
>
> Institutes officials defend the system as a model of nonbureaucratic management of scientific enterprise, although under recent congressional prodding they have acknowledged that the funnel has sprung some leaks.
>
> Deciding where these hundreds of millions of dollars go is the job of 46 NIH study sections in the various fields of medical science. A study section is a body of scientists sitting on a large body of money, upon which some members have ultimate designs.
>
> Not infrequently the committees find themselves faced with grant requests from fellow committee members. In such cases it is up to the applicant to step out of the room and thus, symbolically at least, to purge the committee of conflicts of interest.
>
> The great system is not without its critics among medical men. Louis Lasagna, associate professor of medicine at Johns Hopkins University and author of "The Doctor's Dilemma," made this observation about the system in his book.
>
> "Once appointed to a study section, a scientist is eligible to become a full-fledged participant in the game of musical chairs played by a small minority of the country's researchers. One finds certain people moving from section to section, section to council, governmental to nongovernmental advisory bodies."
>
> And 2 years ago, Dr. Freddy Homburger, Cambridge, Mass., cancer specialist and NIH grantee himself, charged at a closed appropriation hearing that the study section system has "led to formation of an oligarchy of scientists inside NIH who hold power over the majority of scientists who are on the outside."
>
> He appealed for an independent study of the problem. But getting independent opinion, Congress has discovered, is itself a problem in the area of medical research.

It occurs to me, Mr. President, that we in the Congress, together with the public generally, have the seriously mistaken notion that any problem can be solved simply by drenching it with money, as one douses a fire with a bucket of water.

This, of course, is not the case, and the history of the medical grants to the National Institutes of Health is proof. Because of its embarrassing oversupply of congressional generosity, the NIH has been forced to find ways to spend its money. European trips and ballet dancers aside, those charged with spending our largess, have been forced to make grants to less-than-first-rate scientists who, understandably, do less-than-first-rate work.

The real limitation, in many cases, is not money, but men. There is just so much that can be profitably done. We have actually promoted research in some pretty dubious areas because we insisted that the money be spent.

These were funds appropriated, as Dean Price said, "on faith."

There is not available to the Congress the professional assistance necessary to make the kind of decision we must make in appropriating these funds. I have asked the General Accounting Office, which serves the Congress so well in overseeing many Government programs, whether it is capable of providing this scientific assistance. The answer was no.

Mr. President, in its report to the Senate on an earlier version of S. 816, the Government Operations Committee said:

> The inevitable conclusion was reached that it is the desire of the present administration to continue to center within the Executive Office of the President all control over civilian science operations. Unless legislative action is taken by the Congress to establish some medium through which reliable information and supporting technical data is made available to Congress by officials who are responsive to its needs, the committees of the Congress will continue to be denied access to facts and reliable information necessary to the legislative process in establishing policies in the fields of science and technology. Under the present policy, Congress is denied access to such information through the appointment of officials in the Executive Office of the President and Presidential advisory groups composed of the leading scientists and engineers throughout the country. These appointees are responsible only to the President and the field is preempted insofar as the Congress is concerned in its efforts to obtain reliable and factual information which is essential to the legislative branch if it is to perform its normal constitutional functions.
>
> It is the conclusion of this committee, therefore, regardless of the recommendations of administration spokesmen, that there is a real need for a bipartisan commission to study the problems relating to the proposed establishment of a department of science and technology in order that the Congress may have access to officials who are responsive to its requirements, and provided with the necessary information to effect an equitable solution to the present problems relating to Federal science programs as may be determined by the President and the Congress.
>
> As an essential first step in achieving these objectives, the committee recommends the enactment of S. 1851, so that the Congress and the President may have the benefit of the recommendations of qualified experts in the fields of science, engineering, and technology, upon which appropriate legislative action, directed toward the improvement of Federal science programs and operations, may be taken.

Mr. President, it is possible that the Senate may have the idea that my concern is limited to the Public Health Service, the Defense Department, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. On the contrary, I am equally disturbed about the $187 million in research funds sought by the Department of Agriculture, the $122 million by the Department of the Interior, the $105 million for the Department of Commerce.

And I am concerned about the overlapping of medical and health-related research among the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Defense Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and the National Science Foundation, no one of which is proposing to spend less than $25 million in this one category, in all $1.2 billion.

I wonder about the dozen-odd agencies who are working on meteorological research. Are they working together, at cross purposes, or do they overlap? Frankly, Mr. President, I do not know. And the present scheme offers little hope that I, or anyone else in the Congress, is likely to find out.

The same thing could be said of oceanography, where the Departments of Commerce, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, and Treasury are cooperating—or is it competing—with the AEC, the National Science Foundation, and the Smithsonian Institution.

Conversations with people knowledgable in this field indicate, Mr. President, that the administration may be changing its mind about opposing the Hoover-type commission. I certainly hope so. This Nation badly needs a Commission on Science and Technology. And the Congress needs it, if it is not to lose altogether, its control over some $15 billion of the people's money.

It is my earnest hope that the measure dealing with this subject will be enacted into law at an early date.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 1963

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn, in accordance with the previous order, until Tuesday, March 19, at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Tuesday, March 19, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 15, 1963:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287 and 3188:

To be second lieutenant

Solomon, Eckwood H., Jr.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

Andrews, Raymond G., O95706.
Benson, Richard D., O96733.
Benson, Roger R., O96945.
Davis, Don M., O96752.
Harvell, Kenneth E., O96482.
Kenney, Donald R., O96766.
Naumann, Walter E., O93285.
Paquette, Edward H., O93336.
Peters, Shelton V., O96845.
Raley, Michael D., O96713.
Sasai, Calvin Y., O96793.
Shafer, Harold S., O96799.
Snow, Edward F., Jr., O97038.
Zebarth, Roger L., O95251.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Tilden, Carol J., L617.

The following named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be major

Dolson, James F. (MSC), O78646.

To be first lieutenant

Miles, Peter D. (MSC), O82806.
Murphy, Joseph H., Jr. (MSC), O88852.

To be second lieutenant

Griffith, Ronald H., O94755.

The following named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be captains

Bender, William J., O4010103.
Boehme, James A., O4071580.
Clancy, John D. S., O4031447.
Darden, Fred A., O4005660.
Doniphan, Vernon G., O4031454.
Ellis, Warren H., O1886083.
Farrell, James J., Jr., O4030755.
Fiesler, Robert J., O1688674.
George, Donald B., O954038.
Giese, William, O4031461.
Gordon, Robert L., Jr., O1890693.
Hamner, Charles T., O1882319.
Hayes, Aldric M., O2003436.
Hendrickx, Edward J., O2265134.
Howard, Lonnie T., O4012706.
Hussey, Donald P., O4074825.
Jorgensen, Norman E., O4011136.
Kells, Robert A., O4006152.
Kunkel, Edwin R., O4028024.
Labrozzi, Anthony, O1884156.
Lewis, Glenn W., O1885295.
Lillis, Francis X., O4038850.
Lundquist, Donald C., O4031492.
Mason, Phillip H., O4010512.
Mattson, Melvin R., O4038412.
McKee, Jona, O4002128.
Morley, Thomas L., O4006932.
Oswald, Philip L., O1889761.
Phillips, Fred E., Jr., O4031251.
Rathburn, Thomas K., O982444.
Schmale, William O., O4062844.
Shattuck, William M., O67369.
Thompson, Roy M., O4031267.
Wagner, Rudy J., O1941158.
Wells, Lester H., O4036537.
Wilson, Charles F., O4033524.

To be first lieutenants

Balberde, Alexander, Jr., O5702833.
Blair, John C., O5300468.
Bradshaw, Charles W., O5303336.
Brokaw, Francis L., O5502898.
Cook, Donald M., O5402276.
Courts, Philip E., O5304308.
Davis, Kenneth M., Jr., O5405239.
Downs, George M., Jr., O5304434.
Gordon, Jack T., O5202481.
Gordon, Thomas J., O5509754.
Grove, Robert N., O5201664.
Hankins, James A., O5402245.
Heaton, Harold K., O5306089.
Hoagland, Jackson, Jr., O5702174.
Johnson, Henry O., III, O5301980.
Kannady, Donald R., O5401342.
Lynch, David J., O5005864.
McNamara, Vincent E., O5301995.
Miller, Sheron W., O5702077.
Molthen, Theodore J., O5703405.
Ogden, George C., Jr., O5303341.
Peate, Laurence R., O5502182.
Phelan, Frank J., O5307263.
Riley, Larry L., O5307398.
Schuler, William D., O5308488.
Scott, John O., O5300938.
Simmons, Jerry W., O5402253.
Stokes, Orville P., O5210280.
Wallace, Woodrow W., Jr., O5308383.

To be second lieutenants

Aldrich, Harold B., III, O5005427.
Carver, William G., O2304695.
Denny, James B., O5305854.
Farley, George P., O5008694.
Hyde, Thomas A., III, O5211064.
Johnson, Ben A., O5208369.
Johnson, Lidge O. J., O5310897.
Liewert, Karl H., O5512379.
Medley, Thomas J., O5312452.
Moody, Robert D., O5705324.
Powers, Gary R., O5410369.
Reynolds, William E., O5211918.
Robertson, Robert S., O2305421.
Robison, Thomas W., O5311649.
Schaffler, Albert B., O5706744.
Scott, Kenneth G., O5512697.
Sturdivant, Clifford R., O5403785.
Tierney, James L., O5706407.
Wenz, Henry F., O5008630.

The following named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3291, 3292, 3293, and 3294:

To be major, Medical Corps

Greene, Calvin E., O1892614.

To be major, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Hagopian, Jacob, O1685608.

To be captain, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Street, Dorothy R., J100214.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Foley, Mary A., N901824.
Locke, Ruth A., N902283.
McCausland, Muriel J., N805331.
Mizelle, Anne S., N900286.

To be captains, Chaplain

Lucky, Carl E. L., Jr., O4055590.
McCullagh, John P., O2297095.
Moskowitz, Seymour, O2289163.

To be captain, Dental Corps

Neaverth, Elmer J., Jr., O5200548.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Bright, Fred, Jr., O2296259.
Trail, Sebert L., O2293243.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Abramson, Ira J., O5703184.
Corby, Donald G., O5500683.
Culp, Neil W., O5004726.
Ledbetter, René B., O5312588.
Metzger, Marshall T., O4001077.
Olson, Hardin E., O5209206.
Rowland, Wade R., O4044895.
Seaton, Robert W., O5312890.
Spaulding, Harry S., Jr., O2300368.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Castleman, Glynna K., N2293584.
Heer, Edith J., N5407165.
McLoughlin, Audre J., N2291953.
Scheerer, Marjorie J., N2291750.

To be first lieutenants, Chaplain

Prout, Gordon R., O4055973.
Reswik, George V., O5501018.
Van Meter, James W., Jr., O5407892.
Wilson, David L., O4070544.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Barringer, Michael L., O5306862.
Burr, Donald C., O5408347.
Caras, Thomas S., O2309200.
Choolitch, Melvin P., O2309201.
Davis, Robert N., O2309252.
Harshaw, William G., Jr., O5205790.
Hays, Leonard L., O5703767.
Kaplan, Gerald, O2305166.
Mani, Carl J., O2309231.

Ruymann, Frederick B., O2305313.
Schwindt, Robert R., O2309244.
Severance, Richard C., O2305674.
Sills, Theron G., O5502463.
Slaughter, Robert L., O2309247.
Smith, Henry I., O2305597.
Smith, Samuel G., O2305429.
Stephenson, Jackie D., O5402462.
Volpe, Joseph A., O2309207.
Waldron, Frank D., O2309256.
Wills, William R., Jr., O5305310.

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Blachly, Carol A., N5411463.
Saunders, Martha E., N5707201.

The following named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Bradford, Jackie E.
Carlson, Ronald O. J.
Cottman, Robert E. L.
Greene, James W.
Hanson, Larry L.
Hardgrave, Newt L.
Hula, Roger P., II
Johnson, Vernon E., Jr.
Lawrence, Frank M.
Morgan, John W., Jr.
Mortensen, Eugene P.
Nadig, Carroll C.
Olson, Jimmy L.
Redden, William L., Jr.
Starr, Gerald R.
Trader, Michael W.
Vorpahl, Kenneth W.
Watts, Stephen S.
Zigarmi, Andrea, III

The following named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Adler, Kenneth H.
Ahrens, Alfred J.
Allen, Harold F.
Anastas, John M.
Andersen, Ronald J.
Anderson, Carlton L.
Anderson, Randall J.
Andre, David J.
Appuzzio, Louis R.
Armstrong, William B., Jr.
Arrington, Theron R.
Atkins, George M., Jr.
Aubuchon, James M.
Aufdemberge, Robert L.
Baker, Alfred W.
Barrett, Paul S.
Barrick, Charles R.
Barylski, James E.
Baumann, Bruce W.
Beaupre, Christopher A.
Bell, Clarence D., Jr.
Bennett, Jerry C.
Bishop, Alexius O.
Bitter, David D.
Bleam, William D.
Blevens, Andrew
Bolden, Frank A.
Brandon, Lawson W., Jr.
Brant, Arthur
Brown, Elwyn L.
Brown, Harvey E.
Brown, Russell W.
Brunel, Pierre E.
Bryant, Earl W.
Brysen, Frank D.
Buchanan, Samuel J.
Buchly, Howard L.
Buelow, Edward H., Jr.
Buffardi, Louis N., Jr.
Buffington, John D.
Bunting, Josiah, III
Butler, Alvin L.
Byrd, Robert L.
Caldwell, Marion L., Jr.
Carlile, Thomas R.
Carlson, Paul D.
Cawley, Thomas J.
Chaney, Martin L.
Chien, Kenneth
Clark, Francis M., Jr.
Clark, James F.
Clark, Robert L.
Clifford, David M.
Cloud, Earl W.
Clouse, Charles L.
Cone, Fred M., Jr.
Conrad, Robert S.
Conti, Thomas L.
Conwell, Gary K.
Cook, Stephen W.
Coonfield, Derrill G.
Cosby, James W.
Creasy, Joseph L.
Crisp, William G.
Cronise, Ronald V.
Cummings, Peter M.
Cunningham, Frank, III
David, James R.
Davis, Harley C.
Davis, James L., Jr.
Day, Doel D.
DeHayes, Daniel W., Jr.
Demarest, Alfred A., Jr.
Denmon, James L.
Diamond, Richard J.
Dobras, Victor E., II
Dodge, Ira D., III
Drake, Francis D.
Drescher, Donald R.
Dysart, James E.
Edgerly, David E.
Elfried, Gary
Eilbeck, Edward L.
Emrath, John P.
Eschweiler, Leonard W.
Estes, James F., Jr.
Ewers, Rayburn O.
Fenwick, Victor J., Jr.
Flynn, Michael J.
Fore, Calvin R.
Forrest, Harold R.
Forrester, Philip R.
Fortner, John P.
Foster, Edward T., Jr.
Frasche, Robert M.
Freeman, Lawrence W.
Fried, Page G., III
Fulford, Ernest L.
Fulmer, Frank E.
Fygi, Eric J.
Gaddis, Thomas W.
Garner, Bruce C.
Garvais, Richard A.
Gee, Bobby J.
Geoghegan, John L.
Gillespie, James J., Jr.
Glantz, David M.
Godfrey, Thomas G.
Goetz, Robert C.
Gold, John E., Jr.
Goldberg, Sherwood D.
Goodridge, Clair L.
Gorman, Francis J.
Gragg, Robert L.
Graning, Harald M., Jr.
Graves, Harold R.
Graves, Scott A.
Green, Harry G., Jr.
Gregory, Stephen E., Jr.
Griffin, James A.
Grimsley, Turner E.
Gross, Graham L.
Gruber, Lewis A.
Gulstrand, Rudolph E., Jr.
Gurecki, John J., Jr.
Gustafson, Melvyn D.
Hacker, Gary L.
Hagman, J. Michael
Hall, Robert C.
Hamm, Michael R.
Hancock, Louis A.
Hansen, Albert, III
Hanson, Charles T.
Hardt, Jerome D.
Harrison, James M.
Harvey, John R.
Haselton, Mark B.
Hayes, William G., III
Heinig, William J.
Hendriks, Warren K., Jr.
Hinkle, Carl V., Jr.
Hitchcock, Gary
Hocevar, August E.
Hoebeke, Terrall A.
Hoffecker, Wilmer A., Jr.
Hoggard, Patrick L.
Holland, Michael C.
Holtry, Preston W.
Homan, Richard P.
Hubing, James N.
Huff, Keith M.
Iannarino, Thomas E.
Ippolito, Peter J.
Irwin, Arthur E.
Jackson, Ernest R.
Jacobs, Paul A.
Jandras, John S.
Jeffress, Edwin B.
Jenkins, Kenneth E.
Jennings, Logan R.
Jessen, Otto W.
Jones, James M.
Jordan, Kenneth M.
Keath, Medford E., Jr.
Keim, David W.
Kemp, Tommy W.
Kessel, Mark
Kindred, Jon D.
Kinker, James L.
Kjelson, Martin A., III
Klein, James W.
Kneedler, Harry L., III
Koga, Malcolm T.
Kohler, Mark H.
Kramer, Charles H. R.
Kramer, William J.
Krannawitter, James C., Jr.
Kraus, Kenneth L.
Krewson, David S., Jr.
Kripowicz, Robert S.
Kubek, Donald R.
Kuypers, John C.
Lackman, Albert L.
Lacy, John J., Jr.
La Forge, William G.
Lanahan, George W.
La Rocco, Angelo A.
Lawhon, Edward H.
Ledwin, Norman A., Jr.
Leigh, Fredric H.
Lenhart, Michael E.
Letson, Laurence R.
Liberti, Joseph C.
Lineweaver, Robert N., III
Little, John H.
Little, Joseph R.
Locker, William J.
Loop, Carlos A., Jr.
Lorenzo, William E., Jr.
Luther, Herbert H.
Lychmanenko, Eugene
Mack, Victor A.
Mackey, David R.
Mandagaran, Gilbert F.
Mansi, Leo J., Jr.
Marchant, Robert D.
Marcy, Richard C., Jr.
Martin, Gerald A.
Maslinski, Donald R.
Mayberry, Robert L.
McCarley, Michael M.
McDevitt, Coleman J., Jr.
McDonald, Daniel W., Jr.
McFarlane, Thomas C.
McGinnis, James J., Jr.
McGrath, Vincent A.
McIntyre, Peter E.
McKee, David L.
McLeod, Joel E., Jr.
McLoughlin, Robert E.
Melin, Jeffrey N.
Meyer, James F.
Meyers, Jerrold B.
Miller, Henderson I.
Miller, William G.
Minor, Gary L.
Mitchell, Charles M.
Mitchell, William F.
Modarelli, Robert O.
Montgomery, William A.
Mooney, Philip D.
Morrison, Fred K.
Mueller, Paul G.
Nanney, Joe W.
Necessary, Kenneth A. J.
Nevers, David G.
Noble, Donald H.
Noto, Samuel R.
O'Laughlin, Michael F.
Oldfield, John F.
Olds, William K. S.
Olson, Walter E., Jr.
O'Malley, Thomas E.
Ostovich, Rudolph, III
Pacelli, Joseph A.
Pansze, Arthur J., Jr.
Parkin, Curtis W.
Pastore, Joseph M., Jr.
Patterson, Daniel J.
Piechocki, John R.
Pilsch, Martin C., Jr.
Pitts, Willard C.
Plaxe, Jack R.
Pocreva, Michael A.
Pond, David W.
Powell, William E.
Powers, George E.
Przybylski, Robert J.
Reid, John F.
Renaud, Timothy J.
Rendeiro, Antonio C.
Reynolds, Roger D.
Riccobono, James C.
Rice, Richard E.
Richter, Otto, Jr.
Riley, William W.
Roark, Stanley L.
Robins, David S.
Robinson, James A.
Robison, Donald R.
Ross, Norman E., Jr.
Rust, David H.
Ryan, Kevin M.
Sagerser, Roy P.
Salzer, James R.
Sander, Lawrence W.
Sasaki, Raymond N.
Savage, George N., III
Savells, Jerald O.
Schmidt, Lawrence G.
Schuetze, Irving P.
Schwartz, William W.
Scott, William W.
Sitter, Laurance F.
Skender, Louis E.
Skierkowski, Paul
Skinrood, Norman A., Jr.
Smallwood, Edward K.
Smith, Freddie G.
Smith, Gardner W.
Snetzer, Michael A.
Snook, Larry
Spessard, Richard L.
Spring, Michael C.
Sprinkle, Edgar E., III
Standley, Warren R.
Stanley, Douglas S.
Steele, Charles T.
Stephens, Jeffrey L.
Sterrett, John D., III
Stocks, Robert B.
Strauss, Robert E., Jr.
Strock, Arthur H., II
Swarthout, John E.
Taft, John M.
Takata, Alvin M.
Talbott, Charlie Y., Jr.
Talley, Thomas A.
Tateyama, Joseph T.
Terry, Millard D.
Thomas, Michael T.
Tilelli, John H., Jr.
Trainer, Charles D.
Trotter, Kenneth E.
Troxler, Robert C.
Tucker, James E.
Urban, Gerald G.
Uyenoyama, Dennis H.
Valencia, Romolo
Vande Hei, Thomas F.
Vanderploog, Paul J.
Venokur, Steven M.
Verstegen, Keith J.
Vittas, George P.
Vlasak, Walter R.
Wagner, Dale N.
Wall, Thomas F.
Wallace, Terrence M.
Walsh, William F., Jr.
Walstad, George H.
Walton, Charles M.
Ward, Stephen R.
Waters, John K., Jr.
Watson, Charles H., III
Wells, William A.
Whipple, Robert E.
White, Perry S.
Whitley, Bobby
Wicks, John R.
Williams, Gomer R.
Williams, William J.
Wilson, John C., Jr.
Wilson, Leslie E.
Wojciechowski, John J.
Womack, Charles H.
Wood, Samuel E.
Worthington, Douglas L.
Wykle, Kenneth R.
Yoshimura, John P.
Younger, William E., Jr.
Yurachek, John P.
Zeltner, Richard L.
Zentis, Joseph J.
Zinni, Gabriel J.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 15, 1963:

Post Office Department

William J. Hartigan, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

Department of the Army

Edmund T. Pratt, Jr., of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Department of Justice

John W. Douglas, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

U.S. Attorneys

Richard D. Fitzgibbon, Jr., of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Missouri for the term of 4 years.

Robert M. Morgenthau, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York for the term of 4 years.

U.S. Marshals

Ray H. Hemenway, of Minnesota, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Minnesota for a term of 4 years.

Jack T. Stuart, of Mississippi, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Mississippi for the term of 4 years.

U.S. District Judge

William J. Nealon, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

U.S. Circuit Judge

Carl E. McGowan, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit.

Federal Communications Commission

Kenneth A. Cox, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1956.

Kenneth A. Cox, of Washington, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1963.

Interstate Commerce Commission

Paul J. Tierney, of Maryland, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term of 7 years expiring December 31, 1969.

U.S. Coast Guard

The following U.S. Coast Guard officers for promotion to the permanent rank indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be rear admirals

Capt. James D. Craik.
Capt. Louis M. Thayer, Jr.

The following-named person to be a member of the permanent commissioned teaching staff of the Academy as an instructor with the permanent grade indicated:

To be lieutenant

Frank S. Kapral.

Coast and Geodetic Survey

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grades indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenants

James H. Blumer
Charles W. Mathisson
Bruce I. Williams
Archibald J. Patrick
R. Lawrence Swanson
James Collins
George A. Maul
Robert A. Trauschke
Ralph J. Land

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Archibald J. Patrick
R. Lawrence Swanson
James Collins
George A. Maul
Robert A. Trauschke
Ralph J. Land
Francis D. Moran
Robert E. Lushene
John W. Bricker
Donald J. Florwick
Charles K. Paul
Dee E. Kimbell
Dewaine Seets
Andrew Tczap
Sigmund R. Petersen

To be ensigns

Kenneth V. Marovich
Edward P. Cline
Jeffrey G. Carlen
David L. Des Jardins,
Norment A. Barnes, Jr

Mississippi River Commission

Brig. Gen. Robert F. Seedlock, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37; 33 U.S.C. 642).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Vice President's "Challenge to Americans"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
of
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 15, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on March 12, 1963, the Vice President of the United States, Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, spoke before the National Advertising Council at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D.C.

His remarks were titled "Challenge to Americans."

His remarks are so brilliantly eloquent that they deserve the attention, not only of those members of the National Advertising Council who heard the Vice President personlly, but of the Members of the Senate, and Americans everywhere.

In his prepared text, Vice President Johnson said:

> As a nation, we are challenged. As individuals, we are summoned—summoned to understand the struggle we face and to be a part of our Nation's response to the tests of these times.

Since I have been a member of this Senate I have had the honor of serving with the Vice President, not only since he has been Vice President, but when he was the majority leader of the Senate. When he was summoned, I know personally he has searched for the answers which would keep "America free and the home of the brave." But whatever position of service to America he has held, the Vice President, has been, to paraphrase his words, in this order, a free man, an American, the Vice President of the United States, and a Democrat. He has never been partisan at a time when the need called for a patriot.

Because he is a patriot and a statesman, and because he is a Democrat, last and always, he is able to bring to the country leadership for Americans in his speech to the National Advertising Council which is so worthy of us all. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Challenge to Americans

(Address by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, National Advertising Council dinner, Presidential Room, Statler Hotel, Washington, D.C., March 12, 1963)

On this occasion, others of the administration have spoken of the programs and policies by which our Government seeks to meet the challenges to our system. For my part, I want to speak of our system itself, and of the challenge it presents to us for maintaining the effective and responsible functioning of our Government.

Whatever our programs, whatever our policies, if our country is to succeed, if our cause is to prevail, if the challenge to Americans is to be met, our political system, the system by which we govern ourselves, must function effectively and responsibly.

I wish that I might objectively say that such is now the case, beyond all doubt. But no honest observer, no matter what his persuasian, could be entirely content with the performance of our political system at this period of our history.

In the arena of national public affairs, we are debating more and resolving less. On issue after issue, our energies are exerted more to frustrate answers than to find them. Inaction is exalted by many as a greater virtue than decision. If we are not defaulting our basic national responsibilities, the question does arise whether we may not be forfeiting or compromising valuable national opportunities.

I do not believe that any discussion of our national programs, policies, and purposes would be complete without a full and frank acknowledgment of this problem, its causes, and its extensive implications.

Let me say that my interest in this is the product of my own experience, service, and convictions. The office I now hold is the one constitutional office which exists solely to assure the orderly and effective functioning of our system. Before becoming Vice President of the United States, I was, as leader of the majority party in the Senate, confronted with unique responsibilities for helping to maintain the functioning of our system during the longest period of divided party responsibility in our Nation's history.

This is a subject with which I have lived closely, and about which I feel strongly. While I intend to speak candidly in these remarks, I mean only to speak constructively, remembering that I am a free man, an American, the Vice President of the United States, and a Democrat, in that order, only and always.

Your council is now engaged in an effective and intelligent campaign to bring home the "challenge to Americans." I congratulate you on the quality and contribution of that effort.

As a Nation, we are challenged.

As individuals, we are summoned—summoned to understand the struggle we face and to be a part of our Nation's response to the tests of these times.

But I believe both our understanding and our response begin with a clear understanding of our Nation's position in the world. Challenged as we are, we still do not live in an America besieged, an America beset, an America grimly imperiled.

The vital truth of this last half of the 20th century is that while we are challenged, we are also the challengers, challenging all the oppressors and oppressions of humankind.

Since time began, the weak have been at the mercy of the strong; the peaceful have been the prey of the aggressor; the vanquished have been victimized by the victors; the poverty of the world's masses has been of concern only to the poor themselves. Disease has been the concern only of the sick. Human despair and deprivation have mattered only to the despairing and deprived.

We of America has been the first to challenge this age-old order of human affairs and we have challenged it successfully. We have demonstrated that men can be strong without being selfish, can become powerful without becoming unprincipled, can be victors without being vandals, can be saviors without being spoilsmen.

The fruits of this are many.

Of the 50 nations which have gained their independence in the postwar years, not one has chosen to ally with the Communist tyranny.

Nations which have warred against one another for centuries have in these times joined together in mutual alliances and binding friendships.

The example of the political and economic unity of our 50 States is reshaping the future of virtually every continent where men are free.

We can with good cause believe that a new age is coming in the affairs of man, and we can with sure knowledge know that it is an age which had its beginnings and takes its inspiration from these shores.

It is against this standard that we must today, and always, test and measure the performance of our system. It is not enough for our system merely to guard the present, although that it must surely do. It is imperative that our system continue to challenge the future.

This imperative is more than any other the special burden of this period of our national affairs and public policy. We have over the past 20 years committed our national resources and our national efforts to programs which have succeeded. Because of that success, not because of failure, as some would have it, we must now respond to new conditions and new challenges with new programs.

Because containment of Communist aggression did succeed in Europe and the Middle East and Southeast Asia, we are now faced with the Communist effort to escape that containment by penetrating into the Western Hemisphere.

Because economic assistance did succeed in the Atlantic community, we must now deal with upright allies instead of prostrate friends.

Because independence fashioned after our own example did succeed in Asia and Africa, we must at the United Nations hear many more voices, the voices of men speaking for themselves, as we do, instead of being spoken for by others.

By every measure, the tide runs with us. But if "the winds and waves are always on the side of the ablest navigators," we must at this period adjust our sails to hold true to our course. That is the clear and compelling necessity of our public policy at home as abroad.

But we can question, in fact we must question, whether our system is now functioning effectively and responsibly to accomplish this.

In the sum of our national experience, success is the predominant reality, success domestically, success internationally. Mistakes have been made. But we stand virtually alone as a nation which has never experienced a mistake fatal to its national existence, integrity or independence. Yet, despite this record, the predominant theme of our public discussions of national policy is talk of failure rather than success. Our system is disgorging much afterthought about what we should not have done and offering little forethought about what can be done.

In this context, the example of Cuba is obvious. But it is a fitting commentary on the problem that most of the discussion on Cuba has obscured two essential points:

First, that our system cannot function effectively if it is paralyzed by irresponsible conflicts which tear down confidence in our system; and

Second, that our system cannot function responsibly if we disregard the purpose and importance of the constitutional concept of the separation of powers among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of Government.

On these matters, I speak from intimate personal experience. During the period to which I have referred, when I served as majority leader of the Senate, the majority position in Congress was held by one party, the executive position was held by another party. Such a division could not have occurred or have been tolerated in any other government, representative or totalitarian.

What was impressed indelibly upon me during that period was that either party or both parties had the power then to bring the functioning of our system to a halt, and, in so doing, to collapse the strength as well as the hope of the cause of freedom. Furthermore, in that same situation, those same consequences could have come had the congressional majority sought to transgress and usurp the powers of the Executive.

I do not recall these circumstances to give or claim any partisan credit. It required the patriotism of two parties, not one, for divided government to work at all. My purpose is to make these points:

1. In the design of our system irresponsible partisanship, and irresponsible partisanship alone, holds the power of paralyzing and immobilizing our Government.

2. Our Constitution did not base itself upon the concept of an opposition party with the sole duty to oppose. On the contrary, our system is based on a concept of the duty to decide by full and thoughtful debate, and our system will not function if that duty is defaulted.

3. In parliamentary systems, issues make the election calendar. In our system, election calendars make the issues the partisans. Thus, we must seek to avoid the hazard that the issues we debate will be false or obsolete or worse.

4. When we allow the constitutional separation of powers between legislative and executive to fall into disarray, we invite the serious danger of the subversion of our system. There must be no back door to the American Government in its dealings with foreign governments or nationals or we will not long be masters of our own house. Under our Constitution, the Executive and only the Executive speaks for and acts for this Nation in relations abroad—and no partisan cause can justify disregard of this standard.

5. Finally, I would make the point that if our system is to function successfully, the central focus of partisan attack cannot continue to be the people's confidence in the institution of the Presidency of the United States.

No head of state in the world bears more responsibility than the President of this Nation, yet none has less free exercise of authority. As an individual, he is subject to law. His vetoes can be overridden. His appointments can be rejected. He is Commander in Chief but he cannot raise armies and fleets on his own authority. These provisions are in the Constitution and we would not have it otherwise. They are legitimate and based upon the studied consideration of men of wisdom.

But beyond the Constitution, there has grown up in our times an inordinate preoccupation with frustrating the Chief Executive, thwarting his recommendations, controlling his course by weakening or destroying the public confidence in him. Beyond the parties themselves, this is an activity indulged by many effective segments of our society, business and labor, races and religions, regions and States. And it has made little difference whether the President has been Republican or Democrat, Dwight Eisenhower or John F. Kennedy.

I am a partisan. I have practiced my partisanship with enthusiasm in proper partisan seasons. But I have never, and will never, seek to destroy before the Nation or the world the confidence of free men in the institution upon whom the success of freedom's cause must depend.

I speak as I do tonight because, as I have said, it is imperative that our system challenge the future.

If we are to succeed in the future as we have in the past, we must in many realms of public policy cease to do what there is no longer need for us to be doing and begin to do what we should already have done.

We must not permit partisanship to paralyze us.

We must not permit conservatism defined 40 years ago or liberalism defined 30 years ago to prevent us from defining for ourselves the progressiveness, prudence and patriotism required for these times today.

We must not permit the search for failures to lead us away from the exploitation of our successes.

We must not permit the valid purpose of preventing a single office from becoming too powerful to be perverted so that we cause the whole Nation to become too powerless.

We must not allow the separation of powers within our system to be subverted and thus invite the subversion of our freedoms as well.

The tides of these times run with us. That revolution of freedom which began on these shores still challenges and changes the world. The challenge to Americans is to understand how great and how successful is their cause, and that they serve that cause by being patriots before they are partisans.

In partisanship, as in patriotism, there must be standards by which responsible men abide. If patriotism knows no season, partisanship must never forget its season. America will not be served by a perpetual and unending campaign for power between its partisans who contest with each other for the seizure of power rather than the resolution of issues.

In our policies, foreign and domestic, this is a time for reform.

It is no less a time for reform in our politics, and in those free institutions through which our system functions. This is important work and vital work for us all, and none is more important now. For if a house divided against itself cannot stand, a system contending against itself for the sake of contention alone cannot succeed.

The thoughts I have expressed here tonight are not new with me. They are thoughts that I have expressed when I was the Democratic leader under a Republican President. The same thoughts, I believe, are valid now that we have a Democratic President and must always be valid.

There is a legitimate role for partisanship in our society. We must and should have partisanship because issues must be debated, must be discussed from all points of view, if they are to be resolved.

The danger—and this I say to my colleagues of both parties is that we will debate issues not to solve the problems of our country but solely to solve the problems of the next election. The danger is compounded when we debate just to find areas of disagreement and to ignore the areas of agreement.

I have always sought the areas of agreement. Without such an effort, our society cannot long endure because we live under government by consent and unless we know what we consent to, effective government is impossible.

As patriotic Americans, let us seek out the areas of agreement upon which we can preserve our freedoms. Let us debate those issues upon which we disagree with dignity, with candor, and with the objective of finding a solution.

On that bedrock, our freedoms will endure. The united voice of free men will solve not only the problems of the next election but the problems of the next generation and the words "liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable" will remain a living reality for all time.

The Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL B. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 15, 1963

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is easy to get excited over Federal expenditures, the national debt, and this country's unbalanced budget.

It is very difficult, however, to explain these problems so that they can be understood by most of the people. I believe there was delivered recently a speech which did a great deal toward explaining these problems and toward attempting to eliminate much of the emotionalism tied up with them.

This was the very interesting speech delivered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] on March 11, before a dinner group at the Brookings Institution. As a good explanation of some of the basic facts which have to do with this Government's fiscal policies, I recommend the address by Senator HARTKE and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HARTKE DISCUSSES BUDGET IN BROOKINGS INSTITUTION APPEARANCE

Let's do away with the budget. After all, it is the subject of plenty of adverse comment. After all, as some claim, it is out of control, out of date, and out of balance.

Then let's do away with the Federal debt. After all, as some claim, the Federal debt is too high, dangerous, a burden on us, a millstone around our children's necks.

To you experts, this may sound like a lot of tomfoolery. Yet to most Americans, this is what they hear and some believe about Federal fiscal affairs. I am sure each of you recognizes these slogans for what they are worth. But of all the affairs of Government the matter of fiscal affairs is least susceptible to slogans. It is a matter of simple bookkeeping and difficult economics. It is difficult to explain in simple terms.

We are a big country with awesome responsibilities and tremendous obligations. The budget is an estimate of what these responsibilities and obligations are costing.

In estimating the budget we attempt to judge the future economic conditions using past conditions as guidelines. What are some of these basic past facts and conditions? We have now had about 2 years since the last recession trough. During this time the gross national product rose $61 billion; personal income increased by $43 billion, and corporate profits increased by $11 billion. These figures are quite remarkable for a period of about 24 months and in general language would be called times of prosperity. Output of steel mills is on the rise at its highest level since April of 1962. The auto industry is on the verge of near record sales, and auto sales last year were generally exceptionally great. The first 20 days of February ran far ahead of a year ago and are not far under the level of February 1955, the year of recordmaking sales. Retail sales are very brisk, following a record year. Although unemployment is a nagging problem, the truth is that employment is at an alltime high.

Yet, the President has complained about a lagging economy and business is complaining about a profit squeeze, what they want is more "pep" in the prosperous times we are having.

The cynics might easily look at the condition of our business and economy and say: "Can't you ever be satisfied?"

The truth is that the rate of growth in the United States has been good but it should have been better. More than that, the growth in 1962 was slower than in 1961 and there is no reason to expect it to accelerate in 1963. Therefore it is deemed desirable to stimulate the economy.

One method of stimulation is a tax cut. In considering enactment of a tax cut, it is necessary to give an estimate of some future economic conditions. Let's look at the future. The prosperity of the past 2 years is probably going to continue. The gross national product reached an all-time high of $554 billion in the calendar year of 1962, more important, the fourth quarter of 1962 brought the gross national product to an annual rate of $562 billion. It will probably go close to $580 billion in 1963. Here again, if we follow the reasoning of the cautious cynics, the question would again be proper: "Can't you ever be satisfied?"

In the field of corporate profits it is expected that we will reach still more recordbreaking heights by increasing another $2 billion. Personal income is expected to increase by about $20 billion. These almost staggering prosperous figures are enough to warm the breasts of all even the gloom and doom prophets.

The truth, as I see it, is in a very simple proposition: "Times are good."

Now that times are good, why should we have a budget with a deficit? Well, in fact the choice this year is really not a deficit with a tax cut or a deficit without a tax cut. The fact is there will be a deficit either way. Now for the sake of the partisans, those of the Eisenhower years must first meet two basic facts:

1. The Eisenhower years produced a deficit of over $22 billion for 8 years, and no peacetime deficit has ever exceeded the one Eisenhower had in 1959 in the amount of approximately $13 billion.

2. Congress cut the budgets of President Eisenhower by $20 billion. If this had not been done we would have had a total deficit of over $42 billion for the 8 Eisenhower years.

Now to calm the waters in regard to all expenditures, it is normal that Congress usually cuts the budget submitted by the President. This statement is true, although the wisdom of such action is frequently challenged.

The fact that times are good and that we are going to have a deficit point up a truism, the Nation which leads the world is going to have excellent times in order to continue our role as world leader. The proposed budget, submitted by President Kennedy, recognizes this international responsibility. In this budget the following costs of Government are increased:

1. Defense expenditures are proposed to be increased by $2.4 billion.

2. Space expenditures are proposed to be increased by $1.8 billion.

3. Interest costs will be up $900 million. All other costs combined are proposed to be less than last year.

With this background I would like to briefly approach some of the more common questions concerning our fiscal policy for next year.

IS GOVERNMENT SPENDING GOING OUT OF CONTROL?

All levels of Government have been subject to sharp pressures for increased expenditures during the postwar period as our population has grown, as wages and prices have risen, and as demands for improved governmental services have expanded. Since 1948, State and local government expenditures have more than trebled and Federal expenditures for nondefense purposes, including a rapidly expanding level of grants-in-aid to State and local governments, have only doubled. The Federal Government has also borne a sharply increased burden in the areas of national defense, international affairs, and space.

However, the economy has been growing at a slightly faster percentage rate than Government spending. As a result, Federal budget expenditures today bear about the same relationship to gross national product (total value of all goods and services produced in this country in 1 year) as they did in the latter 1950's:

Ratio of Federal budget expenditures to GNP

Fiscal year:	*Percent*
1955	17.1
1956	16.2
1957	15.9
1958	16.2
1959	17.2
1963 (estimate)	16.7

Apart from defense, space, and interest, budget expenditures between 1961 and 1964 will increase less than they did between 1958 and 1961.

WHAT ABOUT INCREASING FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT?

Since the war, civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government has grown less rapidly than the population and much less rapidly than State and local government employment:

[In millions]

Calendar year	U.S. population	State and local government employment	Federal civilian employment in executive branch
1948	146.6	3.8	2.0
1962	186.6	6.8	2.5
Percent increase	27	79	25

One force making for increased employment is simply the steady increase in our population, which puts an added burden on many programs. At the end of 1964, civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government will be 189,000 higher than it was a decade earlier; yet the percentage increase in Government employment over this period will be less than the percentage increase in population.

Federal civilian employment under the 1964 budget provides for the same number of people to serve every 100 persons in our populations as was true when the present administration took office, a smaller ratio than prevailed 10 years ago.

Federal civilian employment is actually lower today than it was in 1952, while State and local government employment over the same period has increased 67 percent.

CAN WE EVER HOPE TO ACHIEVE A BALANCED BUDGET UNDER PRESENT POLICIES?

Yes, there is always hope. Realistically, the experience of the past generation shows that as long as we are operating under a restrictive tax program there is little hope to achieve a balanced budget. The present tax policy is based on war taxes.

It is restrictive. We should remove the wartime tax shackles. Then the law of supply and demand could again operate more closely to normal. This would increase purchasing power, increase production, reduce unemployment and increase profits. The net result would be an expanded economy, a greater prosperity, increased tax revenue, and a balanced budget.

SHOULDN'T ANY TAX REDUCTION BE OFFSET BY A CUT IN EXPENDITURES?

In the first place, Congress will more than likely cut the amount proposed in the President's budget. But to merely cut expenditures without considering the consequences would be plain stupid. Cutting expenditures is a desirable aim of all government. But you cannot increase our Army and cut the cost; you can't go half way to the moon; you can't default on our Government debts; you can't cut generalities, you have to be specific. Little attention need be given to the individual who speaks of general reduction in expenditures unless they are specific.

WON'T THE DEFICIT OF NEARLY $12 BILLION ANTICIPATED FOR FISCAL YEAR 1964 TEND TO CAUSE INFLATION?

Under present economic conditions there need be little fear that the President's tax program and the deficit for fiscal year 1964 will tend to cause inflation. The law of supply and demand are such that inflation comes only when there is full employment and full production. Today, there is still unemployment and unused production facilities.

IS IT A GOOD POLICY TO PROPOSE A REDUCTION IN TAXES WHEN THE BUDGET IS ALREADY IN DEFICIT?

As I have previously said, our choice today is not between a tax cut and a balanced budget. Rather our choice is between chronic deficits resulting from chronic slack in the economy, on the one hand, and transitional deficits temporarily enlarged by tax revision designed to promote full employment, thus increasing revenues and making possible an ultimately balanced budget.

CAN WE AFFORD A FURTHER INCREASE IN THE PUBLIC DEBT?

Whether measured by the total size of the debt or by annual interest payments, the Federal debt is becoming a progressively lighter burden on the economy:

Calendar year	Federal debt end of year (billions)	Percent of GNP	Annual interest payments (billions)	Percent of GNP
1947	$256.9	100.6	$5.0	2.1
1952	267.4	77.1	6.1	1.8
1957	274.9	62.1	7.6	1.7
1962	303.5	54.8	9.6	1.7

The public debt as a proportion of our gross national product will fall to 53 percent of the gross national product in fiscal 1964, compared to 57 percent when this administration took office. Last year the total increase in the Federal debt was only 2 percent, compared to an 8 percent increase in the gross debt of State and local governments. Taking a longer view, the Federal debt today is only 13 percent higher than it was in 1946, while State and local debt increased over 360 percent and private debt by 300 percent.

MY CONCLUSION

We are a leader in the world. We are a growing nation. We have an unfilled destiny. By bold action, clear thinking, and high hopes we will be able to lead in a manner which makes us all proud.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 18, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Corinthians 4: 8: *We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed but not in despair.*

Almighty God, may our President, our Speaker, and the Members of this legislative body daily seek to impart from their lofty places of leadership the blessings of encouragement and hope to struggling humanity.

May noble principles and purposes permeate their minds and hearts, constraining them to contribute the best they have of wisdom and energy in loyal and loving service to our country and all mankind.

Grant them the inspiration and courage to believe that the very stars in their courses are fighting for and with them as they strive with might and main to steer the Ship of State, during these perilous times, into deeper and wider channels.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 14, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2438. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a resolution, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 112

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE, late a Representative from the State of California.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 92. An act for the relief of Hom Wah Yook (also known as Hom Bok Heung);

S. 97. An act for the relief of Purificacion Siat;

S. 193. An act for the relief of Michelina Lanni;

S. 195. An act for the relief of Izabel Loretta Allen;

S. 208. An act for the relief of Young Wai;

S. 234. An act for the relief of Harold and Sylvia Freda Karro and their three minor children, Allan Karro, Jennifer Karro, and Michelle Karro;

S. 421. An act for the relief of Koon Chew Ho;

S. 436. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Bialoglowski;

S. 506. An act for the relief of Panagiota Makris;

S. 574. An act for the relief of Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez;

S. 596. An act for the relief of Roswitha Seib;

S. 635. An act for the relief of Krystyna Ratay;

S. 688. An act for the relief of Ronald Whiting;

S.J. Res. 4. Joint resolution to provide for the actual participation of the United States in the West Virginia centennial celebration;

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document, with illustrations, a pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol," and to print additional copies thereof;

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a Senate document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?"; and

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution to print with illustrations "A Report on U.S. Foreign Operations in Africa," by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to chapter 5, section 243, Public Law 87–794, has recommended Mr. TALMADGE and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware to be members of the U.S. delegation for trade negotiations.

The message also announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1, Public Law 86–420, has appointed Mr. MCGOVERN to be a member of the U.S. group of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Guanajuato, Republic of Mexico, vice Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, resigned.

THE LATE WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I announce to my colleagues the death last Thursday of William W. Blackney, who represented Michigan's Sixth District in the House during the 74th and the 76th through the 82d Congresses. I know Mr. Blackney has many friends here who served with him during his years of service to our Nation who will be saddened by this news.

My first recollection of Congressman Blackney, or "Uncle Bill," as I have affectionately called him, was during my college days when I visited his congressional office. I have always felt indebted to Mr. Blackney for his warm welcome, and his instilling in me a deep interest in the legislative affairs of our country.

I have valued his friendship through the years. Since I have been a Member of Congress, Mr. Blackney has offered me his assistance on numerous occasions and frequently accompanied me about our district which he knew so well. I have always appreciated his sage advice and looked forward to seeing him whenever I visited Flint.

Mr. Blackney was born in Clio, Mich., which is part of the district he represented for 16 years. He moved to Flint when a young man in 1905 and began his public service as Genesee County clerk. After his graduation from the law school at the University of Michigan and his admission to the bar in 1912, he commenced law practice in Flint and the very next year served as assistant prosecuting attorney for the county. He was a member of the Flint School Board for 10

years, a member of the Republican State Central Committee for 5 years, and a teacher in the General Motors Co. technical night school for 16 years.

As a member of the House Naval Affairs Committee and later the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. Blackney contributed immeasurably to the vital work of these committees during the eventful World War II and Korean war years. He was an able and determined legislator and his outstanding service was recognized by his being returned to Congress term after term.

Although it has been over 10 years since Mr. Blackney voluntarily retired from Congress, I know with what warm regard and esteem he was held by those who knew him then because of the frequent inquiries I have continued to receive about his health and well-being.

He was a fine man, a gracious man, a man of integrity who commanded deep respect, dedicated to the welfare of those he served.

We have lost a distinguished patriot who was noted not only throughout his district and the State of Michigan, but throughout the country for the diligence and honor with which he served his Nation.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join other Members in expressing deep regret over the death of William Blackney, of Flint, Mich., a former colleague of ours. Bill Blackney was a Member of the House of Representatives when I first came here and I never met a more friendly or kindly man. He always had time to offer sound advice and words of wisdom to the newly elected and less experienced Members. He served with distinction on the House Armed Services Committee and was one of the ablest Members of this body on military matters. I wish to extend my condolences to all of his family.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and character of the late William W. Blackney.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

WEST VIRGINIA AND EASTERN KENTUCKY FLOODS

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House no doubt have read the reports of the flood situation in West Virginia and eastern Kentucky. The muck and misery are almost unbelievable. I spent last weekend in this area, and I would only urge, when the opportunity comes to make appropriations for such dams as the Justice Dam on the Guyandotte River and the East Lynn and Beech Fork Dams on Twelve Pole Creek and other necessary projects to prevent such destruction in the future, that the Congress will support these projects up to the capability of the Corps of Army Engineers. We cannot stand any more of this human misery on top of economic misery in the valleys of West Virginia and Kentucky.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD BILL

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as one of the supporters of a number of Hawaiian statehood bills, including the one that finally granted statehood to the beautiful islands, I certainly wish to join in extending felicitations and congratulations on the fourth anniversary of the signing of the Hawaiian statehood bill. I also wish to send greetings to my many friends in the islands where I have spent many happy days in the past.

AMENDING THE RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House resolution that would amend the rules of the House so as to require that in the future those who put in bills must indicate thereon an estimate of the cost of the bill in Federal funds should it be enacted. I believe that such a requirement would be a healthy caution to the sponsors of many proposals that, on their face, are politically attractive but are at the same time fiscally irresponsible.

Not only is this desirable, but I am sure that it is no imposition upon a bill's sponsor to require that he tell us what he thinks his proposal will cost the taxpayer. My resolution also calls for the bill's sponsor to indicate if no cost will be involved.

I am sure it will come as a shock to many sponsors of a wide range of legislative proposals to find out how much they will cost should they become law. The fact that the cost of a particular proposal may be so high as to be a caution is a desirable yellow light in this body where so many proposals are unsound and unnecessary.

It is imperative that our great country conserve its economic strength to meet the stresses that are bound to be involved in future emergencies. This proposal to put a price tag on House bills would be a constructive step in the direction of achieving a greater degree of commonsense in the legislative process.

EXPERIMENT TO REDUCE TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of this body an interesting experiment that is being conducted in Indiana to reduce traffic accidents.

This experiment consists of placing a small light with a 21-candlepower bulb on the front center of motor vehicles to burn during daylight driving. This experiment is being sponsored by the Indianapolis Star and has produced some interesting results.

Results of this experiment show that the daylight burning light has reduced the accident rate by 15 percent.

This program of keeping a small light burning on the front of a vehicle during daylight driving is both inexpensive and simple. Before we discard such a plan because of its simplicity we must remember that possibly the greatest single improvement in reducing traffic accidents was painting a line down the center of our highways.

The Greyhound Lines showed a 15-percent drop in accidents after installing these daylight burning lights. The Indianapolis Star is placing a daylight burning light on its 75 staff cars and trucks. The same applies to many businesses in Indianapolis and to city and State vehicles.

The Indianapolis Star is certainly to be congratulated on its important and effective efforts toward reducing our catastrophic traffic carnage.

SEDITION

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress, I authored the bill which became Public Law 87–369. The effect of that legislation was to extend the reach of chapter 37, title 18, United States Code—relating to espionage—to acts committed by U.S. citizens overseas. Before passage of Public Law 87–369, application of the espionage statute was limited to the United States, the admiralty, and maritime jurisdiction of the United States and the high seas. As limited, it failed to cover such acts of espionage as those committed in the Scarbeck case.

This year, I have introduced H.R. 4897 which, if enacted, will have precisely the same effect with reference to the wartime sedition statute, 18 U.S.C. 2388. That statute makes it a criminal offense, punishable by a fine of not more than $10,000 and/or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, for a person during time of war to make a false report designed to interfere with the operation of the Armed Forces, or to attempt to cause mutiny, or to obstruct the military enlistment service, or to conspire with another person to commit such acts. Under section 2391 of title 18, the provisions of section 2388 will remain in full force and effect "until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950," unless sooner terminated by Congress.

The justification for this legislation parallels that under which Public Law 87–369 was enacted. By reason of our military, diplomatic, and commercial commitments around the world, American citizens are traveling in or resident in every quarter of the globe. The same is true of aliens who have been admitted to the United States as permanent residents in preparation for naturalization. Under the sedition statute as now written, they would be immune to prosecution for any seditious act which they might commit on foreign soil.

Wherever such an act is committed, it is directly injurious to the United States, and the Supreme Court has already decided in the case of *U.S.* v. *Bowman*, 260 U.S. 94, that regardless of the place committed, such acts can be punished if they fall within the jurisdiction of the statute. All that remains is for the Congress to broaden the jurisdiction of the sedition statute as H.R. 4897 provides.

I can foresee no substantial opposition to this legislation, and I earnestly trust that action can be expedited at this session of Congress.

THE DRIFT TOWARD SOFT MONEY

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the March 1963 issue of the magazine Realty and Rental Register entitled "The Drift Toward Soft Money":

THE DRIFT TOWARD SOFT MONEY

When Franklin Roosevelt became President, the national debt was around $25 billion. At that time, Fort Knox held about $35 billion in gold. The United States of America owed nothing to foreign countries. The English economist Keynes then entered the area of influence in Washington, D.C. and deficit spending started in a decisive way. Both Republican and Democratic administrations succumbed to the Keynes doctrine that a government is not subject to the same fiscal rules that apply to an individual or a business, in short, that deficit spending is wholesome. The Manchester Guardian, which largely reflects the Keynesian code, in an editorial of January 31, 1963, says this: "Millions of solid American citizens still believe that it is possible for a nation to spend itself into disaster." The implication is clear that followers of Keynes do not believe it is possible for a nation to spend itself into disaster. Many American economists have now embraced this philosophy with the result that the last three administrations have lifted the debt to $300 billion, and within 2 years it appears it will rise to $320 billion. The argument that we owe it to ourselves no longer is valid, because our goldpile is down to $15 billion and we owe Europeans $20 billion, leaving us with little or no gold backing to our currency. Everyone who owns a home, a banking account, or an interest in a business, should be acutely aware of this situation. Unless policies are reversed more heavy inflation is inevitable. To argue otherwise is to say that the nabobs of the new arithmetic are going to be able to expunge the facts of life.

HENRY BRODERICK.

MOTHER SETON BEATIFIED

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the eyes of the entire world turned to a simple building at Emmitsburg, Md. The "stone house" where Elizabeth Seton founded the Sisters of Charity. The focus through which this worldwide attention came to a secluded shrine in Maryland was through the magnificent, age-old ceremony in Rome when Mother Seton was beatified at the Vatican in a service conducted by Pope John XXIII.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans can be proud of this unique honor which has come to one of our own native daughters. All Americans can seek to exemplify in their own lives the charity and virtue of Mother Seton which have been recalled and published to the world in yesterday's ceremony in St. Peter's.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on this side of the aisle as well as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have expressed deep interest in this event. It is a privilege and an honor to call it to the attention of the Congress.

An evaluation of Mother Seton's work by the editors of the Baltimore Sun speaks of the "manifold ways" in which her influence continues to benefit Americans.

The editorial of today is appended:

BLESSED MOTHER SETON

The beatification of the first native-born citizen of the United States, baptized in the Episcopal Church, the granddaughter of an Episcopal clergyman, comes in a year when continents and communions alike are drawing closer together. Americans and Europeans, Christians of all persuasions and members of other religious groups look more to the things that join them and less to old divisions. Yet the present always roots in the past and Blessed Mother Seton's work began in a community which even in that earlier day was various and outwardlooking.

To consider that work, the testing time that preceded it and its brevity in terms of years is to appreciate all over again what human excellence and religious inspiration are. Elizabeth Ann Bayley, born into an old and wealthy New York family, was 3 when her mother died and a troubled childhood followed. At 23, the mother of two children, she became responsible for the six minor children of her father-in-law upon his death. Her husband died when she was 29, having lost his fortune and leaving her with five children of their own.

Two years later she entered the Catholic Church; 3 years after that she moved into the small house on Paca Street, Baltimore, where she launched the first American parochial school and in 1809 she and four associates organized the American Sisters of Charity. She had been a Catholic only 4 years and she had less than a dozen years before her death, but she left an order which planted schools, colleges, hospitals, orphanages across the whole face of America and through which her influence lives today in manifold ways and not least in the new comity among believers.

CENTRAL WISCONSIN TELEVISION, INC.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the Federal Communications Commission or Charles J. Frederick, hearing examiner, at the new Post Office Building, Pennsylvania Avenue and 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C., to testify on March 20, 1963, at 10 a.m., in the matter of Central Wisconsin Television, Inc., Federal Communications Commission docket No. 14933–14934. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF CENTRAL WISCONSIN TELEVISION, INC., ET AL.—DOCKET NO. 14933–14934

The President of the United States of America to ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, *Greeting:*

You are hereby commanded under penalty of law to be and appear in your proper person before the Federal Communications Commission or Charles J. Frederick, hearing examiner, New Post Office Building, Pennsylvania Avenue and 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C., on March 20, 1963, at 10 o'clock a.m., then and there to testify on behalf of Wisconsin Citizens' Committee for Educational Television, Inc., in the above-entitled cause now pending before this Commission.

By order of the Federal Communications Commission, this 8th day of March 1963.

CHARLES J. FREDERICK,
Hearing Examiner.

CENTRAL AMERICA READY FOR U.S. LEADERSHIP ON CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the President stated in his press conference of March 6:

> I think we have indicated very clearly that what we feel is the wisest policy is the isolation of communism in this hemisphere.

This policy of isolation should have ready acceptance at the conference of Central American leaders meeting this week in Costa Rica with the President and congressional representatives. It is at this meeting that we have an excellent opportunity to provide the basis for action to isolate Cuba by the Organization of American States. It is in Central America that cries for firm, positive U.S. leadership in providing this action are loudest.

I urge again that the United States take the first step of leadership by closing its seaports to nations allowing their ships to trade with Cuba. Then this Government should suggest the following steps to the OAS for adoption by the nations of this hemisphere:

First. Close the seaports of this hemisphere to ships trading with Cuba.

Second. Close the airports of this hemisphere to airlines with flights to Cuba.

Third. Ban movement of Castro agents and propaganda throughout the hemisphere.

Fourth. Ban relay of telecommunications messages to and from Cuba.

Fifth. Freeze all Cuban Government funds now on deposit in Latin American financial institutions.

Adoption of these steps would place Cuba in solitary confinement in this hemisphere. From events of recent weeks, it has become clear that we are faced with a master plan for subversion of continental proportions. I urge that this Government press for positive multilateral action to isolate Cuba at the current conferences in Central America.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS HAVING SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY OF DEAFNESS IN BOTH EARS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 199) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

STATUTORY AWARD FOR APHONIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 214) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to point out that there is a report from the Bureau of the Budget in reference to this bill and to the previous bill. The Bureau of the Budget in these two reports does object to the approval of the two legislative proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection and ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF "MUSTERING-OUT PAYMENTS" SECTION OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 200) to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) The table of chapters immediately before chapters 1 and 31 of title 38, United States Code, are each amended by striking out

"43. Mustering-Out Payments------- 2101".

(c) Subsection (c) of section 12 of the Act entitled "An Act to consolidate into one Act all of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration", approved September 2, 1958 (Public Law 85–857), is repealed.

SEC. 2. This Act shall take effect as of January 31, 1965.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 200 will repeal the obsolete mustering-out pay provisions of existing law effective January 31, 1965. Mustering-out pay was authorized by the Korean GI bill for active service in the Armed Forces between June 27, 1950, and January 31, 1955, for all ranks up to and including captain.

Like other readjustment programs established by the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, mustering-out payments were intended to aid persons who served during the Korean conflict in the transition to civil life. Consistent with this purpose, it was designed to be a temporary program.

Inasmuch as the program has long since served its purpose, H.R. 200 will repeal the authority to make mustering-out payments. The date of repeal, January 31, 1965, is the date on which all provisions of the so-called Korean GI bill except the loan guaranty program will terminate. I urge its passage.

NEW MODIFIED LIFE PLAN FOR NSLI POLICYHOLDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 220) to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR DIRECTORS AND CHIEFS OF STAFF AT VA MEDICAL INSTALLATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 228) to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of directors and chiefs of staff of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, last year when the general Federal employees pay increase bill was enacted by Congress there was contained therein legislation dealing with directors of veterans' facilities. I understand this bill would repeal certain provisions of the law passed last year when the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service handled the legislation. I am not sure what the justification for the repeal of the law passed only last year may be; therefore, I want time to consult with the chairman and the members of the committee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

WAIVER OF INDEBTEDNESS TO UNITED STATES IN CERTAIN CASES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 242) to amend section 1820 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make inquiry to find out the extent to which this waiver may be granted.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill would permit waiver of recovery from veterans or their spouses of any indebtedness owed the United States resulting from payment of loan guaranty claims or from default of direct loans under circumstances in which there has been default on the loan and loss of the property and the default arose out of compelling reasons without fault on the part of the veteran or where collection of the indebtedness would otherwise work a severe hardship upon him.

The existing law provides that the Administrator may pay, compromise, waive, or otherwise dispose of claims of the

United States incident to the veterans' loan program. But the Veterans' Administration is officially requesting the enactment of this legislation in order to provide for more equitable settlements to veterans who come within the general meaning of the terms of the legislation. The Veterans' Administration believes that administrative action granting total forgiveness of indebtedness would, on the basis of hardship, be questionable without the specific authority which this legislation would provide.

The Veterans' Administration believes that the resulting financial loss to the Government would be small and that any increase in administrative cost would not be significant.

An identical bill passed the House in the 87th Congress but failed of approval in the other body.

Mr. FORD. Would the gentleman from Tennessee indicate whether there is a limit on the amount that may be waived?

Mr. EVERETT. There is no limit other than set by the law. Each case will be decided on its merits.

Mr. FORD. Would the gentleman indicate the amounts that we are talking about on these loans?

Mr. EVERETT. $15,000 is the maximum direct loan and $7,500 on guaranteed loans.

Mr. FORD. Is there not an equity against which the Government can proceed in these cases to make itself whole?

Mr. EVERETT. Yes, there is.

Mr. FORD. In other words, these cases arise where the equity that was supposed to exist for the protection of the Government was insufficient; is that correct?

Mr. EVERETT. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. And now the Government proceeds against the individual veterans; is that correct?

Mr. EVERETT. That is right.

Mr. FORD. In other words, this proposal would give the Veterans' Administration authority to waive the collection?

Mr. EVERETT. That is correct in cases of special hardship.

Mr. Speaker, the following is data concerning guaranteed, insured, and direct loan programs which I submit for the information of my colleagues:

DATA CONCERNING GUARANTEED, INSURED, AND DIRECT LOAN PROGRAMS AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1962 (CUMULATIVE BASIS)

Number of VA guaranteed or insured loans: 6,206,729.

Principal amount of VA guaranteed or insured loans: $54,654,052,953.

Number of direct loans made: 216,472.

Principal amount of direct loans made: $1,876,284,319.

Average amount of VA guaranteed or insured loans: $8,806.

Average amount of direct loans: $8,668.

Number of claims paid—guaranteed or insured loans: 122,386.

Claims paid as a percent of loans closed: 1.97 percent.

Number of direct loans foreclosed or voluntarily conveyed: 2,651.

Foreclosures and voluntary conveyances as a percent of direct loans made: 1.41 percent.

Principal amount of veterans' debts established—guaranteed and insured loans: $91,050,090.

Principal amount of veterans' debts collected—guaranteed and insured loans: $22,210,385.

Principal balance of veterans' debts, uncollected—guaranteed and insured loans: $68,839,705.[1]

Principal amount of veterans' debts established—direct loans: $1,037,063.

Principal amount of veterans' debts collected—direct loans: $92,630.

Principal balance of veterans' debts uncollected—direct loans: $944,443.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to call the attention of the House to a number of cases which have been brought to the attention of our committee and which presented the background for bringing this bill to the House. We have had a number of direct and guaranteed loans in which the veteran has sold his property and the property has since changed hands four, five, or six times. The veteran may even have moved out of the area. The Government has found it necessary to foreclose and in reselling the property is not able to realize the full amount of the outstanding indebtedness. Under the law, when the original veteran purchaser has not been relieved of liability he is held responsible and the Government tries to recover from him. Other cases have been called to our attention in which the veteran is without fault. This is particularly true in areas that have been devastated by floods throughout the country. If a home on which a loan has been made and on which the security was good is suddenly wiped out by a tornado, flood, or in some other manner not covered by insurance, the Veterans' Administration has no choice now but to proceed against the veteran. The purpose of this bill is to allow the Veterans' Administration in cases of this nature to waive the collection procedure if recovery would create severe hardship on the veteran.

The existing law provides that the Administrator of Veterans' Administration may pay, compromise, waive, or otherwise dispose of claims of the United States incident to the veterans' loan program. Although the authority of the Veterans' Administrator to waive or release claims in connection with the loan assistance program is cast in broad terms, the Veterans' Administration believes that total forgiveness of the indebtedness could not be granted on the basis of financial hardship without specific legislative indication. In actual practice, the only cases in which the indebtedness is waived in its entirety are those relatively few in which it is determined that the Government was at fault. This has not prevented appropriate compromises which, in some instances, involve a relatively small payment on the outstanding indebtedness. The enactment of this bill will not permit general waiver of the indebtedness where action would be contrary to the purpose of the loan program, but would arm the Administrator with authority to forgive an indebtedness in cases where the veteran was without fault and collection would otherwise work a severe hardship upon the veteran.

The Veterans' Administration has indicated that the financial loss to the Government would be small and that any increase in administrative cost would not be significant.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1820(a)(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding after the semicolon the following: "and the authority to waive or release claims may include partial or total waiver of payment by the veteran, or his spouse, following default and loss of the property where the Administrator determines that the default arose out of compelling reasons without fault on the part of the veteran or that collection of the indebtedness would otherwise work a severe hardship upon the veteran;".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABLED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 243) to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to call to the attention of the House that this measure and also the following measure are opposed by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

---

[1] $12.8 million of the principal balance of veterans' debts remaining in the guaranteed and insured programs and $74,240 of the principal balance remaining in the direct loan program have been charged off since the liability of the obligors has been terminated by discharge in bankruptcy, through compromise, etc. Continuing efforts to collect on the outstanding balances of the indebtedness owed the Government are made by the VA, GAO, and the Department of Justice. In addition, interest totaling slightly over $1 million has been collected on veterans' debts established in the guaranteed and insured programs through Dec. 31, 1962, and $4,600 in the direct loan program. Current collections on veterans' debts in the guaranteed and insured programs are running at a rate of about $3 million per annum plus interest of about $122,000. Collections on veterans' debts in the direct loan program are about $20,000 principal and $1,300 interest per annum. We have no data identifying administrative costs allocable to collection of veterans' debts arising out of the GI loan program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PARAPLEGIC HOUSING PROGRAM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 248) to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain blind veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of a lower extremity.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

HOSPITALIZATION IN PHILIPPINES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 249) to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs several questions concerning this legislation?

According to the information which I have, our Government built a hospital in the Philippines with 722 beds, a memorial hospital in Manila. It was dedicated and opened in 1955. Information I have indicates that the average daily patient load in the hospital phase of the program in the fiscal year 1960 was 211; but this patient load dropped to 166 in the fiscal year 1962. Do these figures indicate that in the fiscal year 1962 we had only 166 patients in this hospital when the hospital had a bed capacity of 722?

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. EVERETT. The figures the gentleman has cited apply only to service-connected patients. These patients are service-connected veterans of the commonwealth army of the Philippines who served with U.S. forces in World War II.

Mr. FORD. How many non-service-connected do we have occupying beds in that hospital?

Mr. EVERETT. Those are the Philippine veterans or Philippine citizens and are paid for by the Philippine Government. They total 184. We pay $4.96 per diem for 229 service-connected U.S. veterans.

Mr. FORD. How many occupied beds are there in this hospital?

Mr. EVERETT. Approximately 500. I believe the average daily patient load, from all sources, is 577.

Mr. FORD. And they are Americans?

Mr. EVERETT. Two hundred and twenty-nine are U.S. citizens, the balance are citizens of the Philippines.

Mr. FORD. Veterans?

Mr. EVERETT. Veterans and some civilians of the Philippines, yes.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I would say further to the gentleman from Michigan that this bill provides for the continuation of an existing temporary program. In the case of service-connected Philippine veterans we set a limit on it of $500,000 for any one fiscal year in the next 5-year period and it is expected to be less than $2 million for the entire 5 years.

It is quite true that all of the facilities of this hospital are not required for service-connected veterans of the commonwealth army. The figures the gentleman from Tennessee mentioned are accurate. But those rooms and those facilities which are not required for service-connected people are of no concern to us under this bill and are the responsibility of the Philippine Government.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe the gentleman got a complete answer to his question. I would like to know whether Philippine civilians are being treated in this hospital.

Mr. EVERETT. If the Philippine Government pays the bill, the answer is yes.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. ADAIR. There are certain research programs carried on in this hospital which would involve civilians. Furthermore, in answer to the gentleman from Iowa if there are beds which are not used by service-connected or non-service-connected Philippine veterans the Philippine Government has the right to use them for civilians and to pay for such services.

Mr. FORD. As I understand this program, following World War II the U.S. Government built this 722-bed hospital in Manila.

Mr. ADAIR. That is correct. At a cost of between $9 and $10 million. I believe it was $9.4 million to be exact.

Mr. FORD. We paid the whole shot, so to speak. At the time this legislation authorizing and appropriating for the construction of this hospital was enacted into law was it contemplated that we were to continue to have an annual subsidy for the operation and maintenance of the hospital?

Mr. ADAIR. It was for a temporary period required to take care of the service-connected cases. No permanent figure was agreed upon. As the gentleman himself has pointed out, the number is decreasing.

Mr. FORD. Why do you have to have this extended now? At least I gathered the implication from the original authorization that at the end of that existing period of time it was expected that the Philippine Government would take over the duty and the responsibility.

Mr. ADAIR. I would say to the gentleman, if he would yield, that this is a 5-year extension and not an extension without limit. These men were involved in fighting with American forces under U.S. control. We in the United States had a stake, obviously, in the outcome of that fighting and in the welfare of these injured individuals.

We have an obligation to these service-connected commonwealth soldiers who served with U.S. Armed Forces during World War II.

Mr. FORD. Is it not fair to say that since we as a Government provided them with a 722-bed hospital and have paid x dollars annually up until the expiration of current law, that we have paid a fair amount in this regard for the valiant, valorous services rendered by these individuals?

Mr. ADAIR. It can be said that we have paid a fair amount. However, when this is measured and compared with our expenditures elsewhere in the world, which run into the billions of dollars, for people who have not fought for our flag, we should not end this program at this time.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me because I had the privilege of being in Manila and representing along with others this Congress and this Government at the time the hospital was turned over to the Magsaysay government in the Philippines. I can tell my colleagues of the House from that experience at that time and from observation of the reaction of the people at that dedication there is nothing we have done in the Phillippines since World War II which has scored such an impressive victory in good will and appreciation among the people of the Far East as this hospital.

The gentleman from Indiana has correctly stated the understanding that it was our commitment to help with the expenses of the hospital in caring for the service-connected disabled over a period of time necessary to accomplish an orderly transfer of responsibility to the Philippine Government.

There may be differences as to how long the time may be, but I can assure the gentleman nothing we are doing in the Philippines today is doing more for the American image and for appreciation of American policy than our policy of assisting in the care of those veterans who fought alongside our troops in liberation of the Philippines.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I have listened to this colloquy with great interest. It has been said here that we received great benefits because of the Filipinos who assisted us in winning the war. That is true. I am sure there is no one in this House or in America, to my knowledge, who does not feel a great appreciation for the Philippine people. But it must be said that the

Filipinos had no greater case in World War II than did the United States. Certainly had we not won that war in which our American fighting men played a major part, the Philippine Government today would be in the hands of someone else besides the Filipinos.

We built this hospital. We spent over $9 million to build it. I was very much in favor of that expenditure, but certainly we have discharged our responsibility. We have shown our appreciation to our great Philippine friends by the act which this Government did for those great people.

Mr. Speaker, I see no reason at this time, especially when we have this distressing fiscal picture facing us today, to spend more money for this purpose in the Philippine Islands. Certainly the Philippine people and the Philippine Government are better able to pay this bill than are the people of the United States under the present fiscal condition of our Treasury.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

DESIGN OF U.S. FLAG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1048) providing for the design of the flag of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 1 and 2 of title 4, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"§ 1. Flag; design

"The flag of the United States shall have thirteen horizontal stripes of the same width, alternate red and white, with a union consisting of as many white stars on a field of blue as there are States in the Union.

"§ 2. Same; additional stars; dimensions

"(a) Whenever a new State is admitted to the Union, the President shall cause a plan to be made setting forth the positions of the stars in the union of the flag. He shall also cause to be fixed the proportionate dimensions of the constituent parts of the flag.

"(b) The addition of each new star to the union of the flag shall take effect on the 4th day of July next succeeding the admission of a new State.

"(c) All flags of the United States on hand on the 4th day of July next succeeding the admission of a new State may be continued in use until unserviceable, but all flags manufactured for use after that date should conform to the design and specifications adopted pursuant to this section."

Sec. 2. Items 1 and 2 of the chapter analysis of chapter 1 of title 4 are amended to read as follows:

"Flag; design.

"Same; additional stars; dimensions."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING FEDERAL REGISTER ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2837) to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish someone would give us a few words of explanation of which this bill purports to do.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIS. This bill would authorize the committee of the Federal Register to do away with expensive and presently mandatory production of pocket supplements in producing the Code of Federal Regulations. It would substantially cut down the cost of supplements at the end of each year and save money.

If the gentleman will permit me, for instance, I hold in my hand a volume of the Code of Federal Regulations. As we pass an act of Congress, it has to be administered. Regulations are proposed by the agencies and put in the Federal Register and finally these are codified and the Code of Federal Regulations comes into being. Then there are supplements from time to time. Under present law, as a supplement comes out, it has to be put in a pocket slot manufactured into each particular volume. That is expensive. The practice with reference to the United States Code, for instance—and we have some 50 volumes of those—instead of having 50 pocket supplements annually after each edition, we have 1 or 2 volumes of supplements of all the titles of the code. That is all this bill would do. It would save money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with the assurance of the gentleman from Louisiana that this will save the Government money, I hasten to withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11 of the Federal Register Act, as amended (44 U.S.C. 311), is further amended as follows:

(a) By amending subsections (b), (c), and (d) thereof to read as follows:

"(b) Any codification published pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be printed and bound in permanent form and shall be designated as the 'Code of Federal Regulations.' The Committee shall regulate the binding of the printed codifications into separate books with a view to practical usefulness and economical manufacture. Each book shall contain an explanation of its coverage and such other aids to users as the Committee may require or authorize. A general index to the entire Code of Federal Regulations shall be separately printed and bound.

"(c) The Committee shall regulate the supplementation and the collation and republication of the printed codifications with a view to keeping the Code of Federal Regulations as current as practicable: *Provided*, That each book shall be either supplemented or collated and republished at least once each calendar year.

"(d) The Office of the Federal Register shall prepare and publish the codifications, supplements, collations, and indexes authorized by this section."

(b) By substituting a new subsection (g) to read as follows:

"(g) Nothing in this section shall be construed to require codification of the text of Presidential documents published and periodically compiled in supplements to title 3 of the Code of Federal Regulations."

Sec. 2. Section 11 of the Federal Register Act, as amended by the first section of this Act, shall apply to the Code of Federal Regulations previously authorized and published as well as to future publications made pursuant to that section as so amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE GRAND VALLEY WATER USERS' ASSOCIATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2821) to authorize modification of the repayment contract with the Grand Valley Water Users' Association.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, pursuant to subsection 8(i) of the Act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), to modify the contractual obligation of the Grand Valley Water Users' Association (1) by deducting from such obligation the unaccrued construction charges in the amount of $109,158.19 against one thousand three hundred sixty-six and two-tenths acres originally classified as productive and now reclassified as permanently unproductive; (2) by crediting to the next annual installment from the Grand Valley Water Users' Association due to the United States under its contract of January 25, 1945, after enactment of this Act, the sum of $4,531.93, which represents construction charges paid by the association on one hundred twenty-three and six-tenths acres of land in canceled farm units included in the above acreage.

With the following committee amendment: Page 2, line 2, strike out "January 25, 1945" and insert "January 27, 1945."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RENEWAL OF CERTAIN WATER SUPPLY CONTRACTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 131) to provide for the renewal of certain municipal, domestic, and industrial water supply contracts entered into under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DISPOSAL OF CADMIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 307) authorizing the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this bill is something of a pilot piece of legislation in the field of stockpile disposal and that the committee report in connection with this bill contains a number of conditions and guidelines associated with the disposal which are not stated in the bill itself. I take this time for the purpose of making a little legislative history on the floor in connection with it. And, in the second place, to ask the committee whether they have received assurances that both the General Services Administration and the Office of Emergency Planning will follow the guidelines that are set forth in the report on pages 8 and 9 thereof.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I might say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that first of all I do not agree that the bill itself is a pilot bill, because there have been many such bills enacted by the Congress.

Perhaps the committee did go much further in the language in the report after obtaining from the General Services Administration the fact that they were in agreement with the same objectives that the committee itself was trying to attain and that the assurances in the report represent something that the committee—both the subcommittee which handled this legislation and the full Committee on Armed Services—could certainly continue to support and back up.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I certainly want to express my appreciation as chairman of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for the care with which the committee has outlined in its report certain points essential to the protection of the domestic industry from disruption of domestic markets. Those points, incidentally, occur in the final two paragraphs on page 8 of the report, and several paragraphs on page 9 of the report.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those paragraphs headed by the phrase "Disposal Plan" be made a part of the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

The notice of disposal published by the Administrator of General Services in the Federal Register simply indicates that the initial offering of cadmium will be 300,000 pounds with subsequent offerings scheduled at intervals of not less than 60 days.

The committee questioned representatives of the General Services Administration as to more specific details of the proposed disposal action. The committee learned that GSA proposed to initially dispose of 150,000 pounds of cadmium in an unrestricted sale on the world market. This unrestricted sale would establish the so-called world market or upset price. This offering would be open to both big and small business concerns, both domestic and foreign buyers, and the lowest price accepted by the Government on this unrestricted offering would constitute the new market price. This new market price would then be utilized as a benchmark in subsequent offerings of cadmium by GSA. GSA then proposed to offer the balance of the initial offering of 300,000 pounds or 150,000 pounds in a restricted sale. This restricted sale would be a set-aside for domestic small business concerns who would be permitted an opportunity to purchase this commodity in 1-ton lots on a competitive sealed bid basis. The committee had no quarrel with this initial offering of 300,000 pounds of cadmium since it would enable GSA to accomplish two objectives:

(1) To ascertain the fair and going market price for cadmium which would, in turn, insure the highest return to U.S. taxpayers for this commodity; and

(2) To insure that half of the initial offering of cadmium would be allocated to small business to alleviate the existing domestic scarcity of this commodity.

The committee was not satisfied, however, that the allocation of 150,000 pounds of cadmium to small business would completely satisfy the requirements for the domestic economy and, therefore, was of the opinion that the balance of 1,700,000 pounds of cadmium be restricted to the domestic market. Therefore, the committee wishes the Administrator of General Services to restrict the balance of this cadmium disposal to the domestic market by limiting its sale to domestic purchasers willing to pay not less than the current market or upset price for this commodity. Such purchasers would be required to certify that the cadmium being purchased will be used solely for consumption in the United States.

The committee understands that in the event the cadmium market becomes unstable and the so-called upset price or new market price is no longer an accurate reflection of the current market price for cadmium, the General Services Administrator would then proceed to establish a new upset or market price by making another unrestricted offering of cadmium. The new market price thus obtained would then again be used as a benchmark for subsequent restricted offerings of cadmium to the domestic market.

In summary, the committee is not adding any restrictive language to H.R. 307 which will inhibit or complicate the disposal of cadmium by the Administrator of General Services. However, the committee is recommending congressional approval of the proposed disposal action with the understanding that the safeguards inherent in the disposal plan as outlined above will be observed.

As indicated, the proposed disposal action should result in approximately 1,850,000 pounds of cadmium being made available to the domestic market while at the same time insuring the highest return for this commodity to the American taxpayer.

The committee wishes to emphasize its interest in the progress of this disposal action and will insist that the Administrator of General Services provide the committee with periodic reports as to the progress of the individual offerings and their effect on the cadmium market. In the event the executive branch fails to observe the recommendations of this committee, it may then be necessary to incorporate in future disposal authority restrictive language relating to the manner and circumstances of future disposal actions.

THE CONCERN OF INDUSTRY WITH FUTURE DISPOSAL ACTIONS

The Congress is well aware that the national stockpile includes huge quantities of materials now considered excess to our requirements. It is evident that it is in the national interest that these materials be disposed of as soon as possible with, however, a minimum disruption of regular commercial markets.

Representatives of industry have indicated their deep and serious concern over the fact that no adequate machinery presently exists within the executive branch to provide industry with an opportunity to discuss with the executive branch details of individual disposal actions. The committee is sympathetic to this concern of industry and is, therefore, happy to note that the President of the United States on January 30 approved a recommendation of his Executive Stockpile Committee relating to this specific problem.

Recommendation No. 12 (a) and (b) of the Executive Stockpile Committee relates to development of disposal programs. The committee subscribes unanimously to these recommendations and urges its implementation at the earliest possible time. The Committee on Armed Services believes that early implementation of this recommendation including committees in consultation with industrial representatives, will provide an assurance to industry that stockpile disposal actions contemplated by the Federal Government will not adversely affect regular commercial markets.

The recommendation together with the views of the Office of Emergency Planning on this matter are as follows:

Executive Office of the President,
Office of Emergency Planning,
Office of the Director,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1963.

Hon. Philip J. Philbin,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 2, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: In response to questions raised by your counsel, Mr. Frank M. Slatinshek, I am setting forth the position of the Office of Emergency Planning with respect to consultation with interested parties in connection with future disposal plans.

The Executive Stockpile Committee recognized the desirability of consultation with interested parties in connection with the development of long-range disposal programs, and included recommendations on this subject in its report to the President. The President has approved those recommendations. Appropriate consultation with interested parties will thus become a regular part of the development of future long-range disposal programs.

In the interim period, pending the development of long-range disposal programs, it is the intention of this Office, when directing that new disposal plans be developed, to provide that there will be appropriate consultation with interested parties as a part of the procedure of developing the plans.

Sincerely,

Edward A. McDermott.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for his statement in this regard.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other point that is not covered by the language which appears on pages 8 and 9 with which we have had some conversation. The distinguished and able Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, Mr. McDermott, in his letter to our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Philbin], stated that existing laws governing exportation of materials should provide assurance that any sales of this material abroad would be confined to use in countries in the free world.

I would like to be assured that that understanding has also been had on this point with the General Services Administration by the committee.

Mr. PRICE. If the gentleman will yield, it has. May I point out to the gentleman some effective and reassuring language which appears at the bottom of page 9 of the committee report, and which states better than I can in my own words the feeling of the members of the committee and expresses their determination to follow this matter very closely:

> The committee wishes to emphasize its interest in the progress of this disposal action and will insist that the Administrator of General Services provide the committee with periodic reports as to the progress of the individual offerings and their effect on the cadmium market. In the event the executive branch fails to observe the recommendations of this committee, it may then be necessary to incorporate in future disposal authority restrictive language relating to the manner and circumstances of future disposal actions.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am wondering why it is impossible to write the guidelines into the bill. Congress for so many years has been delegating authority to various boards, bureaus, and commissions without sufficient guidelines and very little attention is paid to them.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the bill can embody the safeguards that have been discussed here by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. UTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I might say that actually the restrictive language that applies to this particular bill is contained in the basic law, and we have assurance from the General Services Administration that this basic language will be followed by the General Services Administration in this particular disposal.

We have passed many bills such as this. I felt and the committee felt that it was not necessary to repeat this language in each one of the bills that we act upon in our subcommittee.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois, but we are constantly faced with the fact that they do not live up to some of the laws.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the full committee and Subcommittee No. 2 of this House Armed Services Committee, I am anxious to associate myself with the intent and purpose of the legislation made here on the floor by our colleagues from Oklahoma and Illinois.

It was crystal clear to the members of the committee that this is, in fact, a test case; and as my colleague on the committee has so well read into the RECORD from the last sentence, page 9, of Committee Report No. 87 on H.R. 307, we expect to write such restrictive legislation into plans for future disposals, if the will of this House is again circumvented.

Mr. Speaker, we have been assured this report and the legislation here made would be honored by the executive branch disposing agency, GSA. The industry and the producers who have kept the consumers supplied even though on a rationed basis lately have suggested three amendments. I wish the RECORD to show that if the above is true they are better off; as we are here incorporating these five principles:

First. Domestic preference after the first sale, to establish a new market price.

Second. Allotments in times and fraction lots of the 2 million surplus pounds calculated to be sold, without upsetting the market.

Third. The new market price is expected to be initially between $1.95 and $2.10 per pound in usable form and/or usually distributed to consumers, although no floors are established as such.

Fourth. Arrangements in being per Federal directive will be implemented to incorporate business and producer representatives in committees to consult with the disposing agency, GSA, on the most mutual, beneficial, and protected ways to handle such disposal of surplus.

Fifth. That reports will be made to the committee periodically, which means after each parcel is offered for disposal and/or actual bid sales by GSA.

Mr. Speaker, we shall be watching and waiting expectantly, and with hope.

RELEASING RIGHT IN CERTAIN STREETS IN HEYBURN, IDAHO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1087), to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HARDING] I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

LANDS TO COLORADO RIVER COMMISSION, NEVADA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 277) to amend the act of April 22, 1960, relative to the transfer of certain public lands to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of April 22, 1960 (74 Stat. 74) is amended as follows:

(1) In section 2, strike out "five years" and insert in lieu thereof "ten years"; and

(2) In section 3, strike out "five-year period" and insert in lieu thereof "ten-year period".

(3) In section 4(a), strike out "The Commission, within three years of the effective date of this Act shall submit to the Secretary a proposed plan of development" and insert in lieu thereof "The Commission, within three years after receipt from the Secretary of the Interior of an appraisal of the property involved as of the effective date of this Act, shall submit to the Secretary a proposed plan of development".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, through page 2, line 6, strike out all of paragraph (3) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(3) In section 4(a), strike out "three years" and insert in lieu thereof "eight years".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEALING THE PITTMAN ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1892) to repeal the act of October 22, 1919 (41 Stat. 293; 43 U.S.C. 351–355, 357–360).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, subject to any valid rights and obligations existing on the date of approval of this Act, the Act of October 22, 1919 (41 Stat. 293; 43 U.S.C. 351–355, 357–360), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after line 6, add a new section to read as follows:

SEC. 2. Any valid application for permit under that Act, on file with the Secretary of the Interior on the effective date of this Act, may be processed in the same manner as if this Act had not been enacted.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TENURE FOR JUDGES, U.S. DISTRICT COURT, PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2844) to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 134 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The district judges shall hold office during good behavior."

SEC. 2. The first paragraph of section 373 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,".

SEC. 3. The second paragraph of section 451 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,".

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this section to sections 134 and 373 of title 28, United States Code, shall not affect the tenure of office or right to continue to receive salary after resignation, retirement, or failure of reappointment of any district judge for the district of Puerto Rico who is in office on the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATUS OF RETIRED CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2835) to clarify the status of circuit and district judges retired from regular active service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (b) of section 43 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each court of appeals shall consist of the circuit judges of the circuit in regular active service. The circuit justice and justices or judges designated or assigned shall also be competent to sit as judges of the court."

(b) Paragraph (c) of section 46 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Cases and controversies shall be heard and determined by a court or division of not more than three judges, unless a hearing or rehearing before the court in banc is ordered by a majority of the circuit judges of the circuit who are in regular active service. A court in banc shall consist of all circuit judges in regular active service. A circuit judge of the circuit who has retired from regular active service shall also be competent to sit as a judge of the court in banc in the rehearing of a case or controversy if he sat in the court or division at the original hearing thereof."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (b) of section 132 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each district court shall consist of the district judge or judges for the district in regular active service. Justices or judges designated or assigned shall be competent to sit as judges of the court."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 332 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "The chief judge of each circuit shall call, at least twice in each year and at such places as he may designate, a council of the circuit judges for the circuit, in regular active service, at which he shall preside."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL COURTS IN CONTINUOUS SESSION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2845) to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court, and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting judicial business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right, what is proposed here?

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. TOLL. Merely to modernize the practice as recommended by the Judicial Conference.

Mr. GROSS. This means that the Federal courts will be open at all times; is that the story?

Mr. TOLL. It will be open at all times so that the transaction of business shall not be hampered. There is no cost involved in this particular bill.

Mr. GROSS. The Federal judges will still take vacations but will work harder? Is that the story?

Mr. TOLL. I think this will encourage them to work harder.

Mr. GROSS. This will encourage them to work harder?

Mr. TOLL. I think so.

Mr. GROSS. And "justice delayed is justice denied" will be overcome under this plan of making the judges work harder?

Mr. TOLL. I hope so.

Mr. GROSS. I hope so, too. Is this one of the reasons why the caseloads have piled up in the past?

Mr. TOLL. No, it is not.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 138, 139, 140, and 141 of title 28, United States Code, be amended to read as follows:

"§ 138. Terms abolished

"The district court shall not hold formal terms.

"§ 139. Times for holding regular sessions

"The times for commencing regular sessions of the district court for transacting judicial business at the places fixed by this chapter shall be determined by the rules or orders of the court. Such rules or orders may provide that at one or more of such places the court shall be in continuous session for such purposes on all business days throughout the year. At other places a session of the court shall continue for such purposes until terminated by order of final adjournment or by commencement of the next regular session at the same place.

"§ 140. Adjournment

"(a) Any district court may, by order made anywhere within its district, adjourn or, with the consent of the judicial council of the circuit, pretermit any regular session of court for insufficient business or other good cause.

"(b) If the judge of a district court is unable to attend and unable to make an order of adjournment, the clerk may adjourn the court to the next regular session or to any earlier day which he may determine.

"§ 141. Special sessions; places; notice

"Special sessions of the district court may be held at such places in the district as the nature of the business may require, and upon such notice as the court orders.

"Any business may be transacted at a special session which might be transacted at a regular session."

SEC. 2. Sections 452 and 1869 of title 28, United States Code, and sections 3288 and 3289 of title 18, United States Code, are each amended by striking out the word "term" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the word "session" and the catchline to section 452 is amended by striking out the word "terms" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "expiration of sessions".

SEC. 3. (a) Items 138, 139, and 141 in the analysis of chapter 5 of title 28, United States Code, immediately preceding section 81, are amended to read as follows:

"138. Terms abolished.

"139. Times for holding regular sessions.

"141. Special sessions; places; notice."

(b) Item 452 in the analysis of chapter 21 of title 28, United States Code, immediately preceding section 451, is amended to read as follows:

"452. Courts always open; power unrestricted by expiration of sessions."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCORPORATING SCIENCE SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 824) to incorporate Science Service, Inc., for the purpose indicated by Public Law 85–875.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) Wallace R. Brode, District of Columbia; Douglas Whitaker, New York, New York; William W. Rubey, Los Angeles, California; Harlow Shapley, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Philip Bard, Baltimore, Maryland; Henry Allen Moe, New York, New York; Leonard Carmichael, District of Columbia; John R. Dunning, New York, New York; Benjamin H. Willier, Baltimore, Maryland; Michael J. Ogden, Providence, Rhode Island; Ralph B. Curry, Flint, Michigan; O. W. Riegel, Lexington, Virginia; Ludwell Denny, District of Columbia; Charles E. Scripps, Cincinnati, Ohio; and Edward J. Meeman, Memphis, Tennessee, and their successors are created and declared to be a body corporate of the District of Columbia by the name of Science Service, Incorporated (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation"), and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained. The corporation is hereby declared to be the corporation whose chartering by the Congress was contemplated in the first section of the Act of September 2, 1958, entitled "An Act to require the Commissioner of Education to encourage, foster, and assist in the establishment of clubs for boys and girls especially interested in science".

(b) The tenure of the persons named in subsection (a) of this section, and the election of their successors, shall be in accordance with the bylaws of the corporation.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 2. The persons named in the first section of this Act are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with this Act, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

PURPOSES AND OBJECTS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The purposes of the corporation shall be to—

(1) develop an interest in science on the part of the young people of America,

(2) provide an opportunity for the exchange of scientific information and ideas among members of the clubs,

(3) encourage the promotion of science fairs at which members of the club may display their scientific works and projects, and

(4) develop an awareness of the satisfaction to be derived through a career devoted to science.

POWERS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 4. The corporation shall have power—

(1) to conduct, operate, and furnish press service for the collection, preparation, distribution, and sale of scientific matter and information, current events, and fundamental conceptions or topics of interest to general readers, to newspapers, periodicals, journals, magazines, educational institutions, and government;

(2) to print, publish, and distribute books, documents, journals, newspapers, proofsheets, or parts thereof;

(3) to organize and conduct lectures, symposia, conferences, and meetings for the presentation and discussion of scientific information, discoveries, and theories: and to arrange for the presentation of scientific matters by the use of motion picture films and other forms of photography;

(4) to maintain an information and reference bureau and library and to furnish a science service to libraries, newspapers, journals, periodicals, individuals, educational institutions, and governments;

(5) to receive, hold, and administer personal and real property received by gift or purchase and to acquire such property as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the corporation;

(6) to receive moneys from time to time by way of income and to authorize and provide for the payment of expenses properly incurred in the management and operation of the corporation;

(7) to acquire, and pay for in cash, obligations of this corporation or otherwise, the goodwill, rights, assets, and property, and to undertake or assume the whole or any part of the obligations or liabilities of any person, firm, association, or corporation;

(8) to acquire, hold, use, sell, assign, lease, grant license in respect of, mortgage, or otherwise dispose of, letters patent of the United States or any foreign corporation, patent rights, licenses and privileges, inventions, improvements and processes, copyrights, trademarks and trade names, relating to or useful in connection with any business of this corporation;

(9) to guarantee, purchase, hold, sell, assign, transfer, mortgage, pledge, or otherwise dispose of shares of the capital stock of, or any bonds, securities, or evidence of indebtedness created by any other corporation or corporations organized under the laws of any State, county, nation, or government, and while the owner thereof, to exercise all the rights, powers, and privileges of ownership;

(10) to issue bonds, debentures, or obligations of this corporation from time to time, for any of the objects or purposes of the corporation and to secure the same by mortgage, pledge, deed of trust, or otherwise;

(11) to have one or more offices; to carry on all or any of its operations and business and to purchase or otherwise acquire, hold, own, mortgage, sell, convey, or otherwise dispose of real and personal property of every class and description in any of the States, districts, territories, or colonies of the United States, and in any and all foreign countries, subject to the laws of such State, district, territory, colony, or country; and

(12) in general, to carry on any other business in connection with the foregoing, whether manufacturing or otherwise, and to do any or all of the things hereinbefore set forth in the same extent as natural persons might or could do.

It is hereby expressly provided that the foregoing enumeration of specific powers shall not be held to limit or restrict the powers of the corporation.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE; TERRITORIAL SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES; RESIDENT AGENT

SEC. 5. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in Washington, District of Columbia, or in such other place as may later be determined by the board of directors, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place and may be conducted throughout the various States and possessions of the United States.

(b) The corporation shall maintain at all times in the District of Columbia a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation, and notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 6. (a) The corporation shall have no capital stock. The number of members of the corporation shall be fifteen, five of whom shall be elected annually by the members for a period of three years and for the five memberships one nomination shall be made annually upon request of the corporation by each of the following:

(1) The American Association for the Advancement of Science.

(2) The National Academy of Sciences.

(3) The National Research Council.

(4) Such body representing the journalistic profession as may be from time to time designated by the board of trustees.

(5) E. W. Scripps or his representatives, administrators, or executors.

(b) The method of application and acceptance, or rejection and expulsion from membership, and the conduct of the members, dues, assessments, and other qualifications, except as above, shall be governed and controlled by the bylaws.

(c) Fees for membership and dues and assessments from members shall be fixed, levied, assessed, and collected as the corporation, by its bylaws, rules, and assessments, together with fines or penalties, imposed upon the members of the corporation, shall be adopted to furthering the purposes for which the corporation is formed.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

SEC. 7. (a) In furtherance and not in limitation of the powers conferred by this Act, the governing board of the corporation shall consist of a board of fifteen trustees, each of whom shall be a member of the corporation, which said board of trustees is hereby expressly authorized:

(1) To make and alter the bylaws of the corporation; to authorize and cause to be executed mortgages and liens upon the real and personal property of this corporation.

(2) If the bylaws so provide, to designate two or more of its members to constitute an executive committee, which committee shall for the time being, as provided in a resolution of the board of trustees, or in the bylaws of the corporation, have and exercise all or any of the powers of the board of trustees in the management of the business and affairs of the corporation and have power to authorize the seal of the corporation to be affixed to all papers which may require it.

(b) The corporation may in its bylaws confer powers upon its trustees in addition to the foregoing and in addition to the powers and authorities expressly conferred upon them by statute.

(c) Both members and trustees shall have power, if the bylaws so provide, to hold their meetings and to have one or more offices within or without the District of Columbia and to keep the books of the corporation, subject to the provisions of the statutes, outside of the District of Columbia at such places as may be from time to time designated by the board of trustees.

DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME OR ASSETS TO MEMBERS; LOANS

SEC. 8. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any of its members, directors, or officers as such, or be distributable to any of them during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of compensation to officers of the corporation in amounts approved by the board of directors of the corporation.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its officers, directors, or employees. Any director, who votes for or assents to the making of a loan or advance to an officer, director, or employee of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such a loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

SEC. 9. The corporation, and its officers and directors as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for public office.

LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

SEC. 10. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

PROHIBITION AGAINST ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

SEC. 11. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock or to declare or pay any dividends.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 12. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of directors, and committees having any authority under the board of directors; and it shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS; REPORT TO CONGRESS

SEC. 13. (a) The financial transactions shall be audited annually by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held

by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the Congress not later than March 1 of each year. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a verification by the person or persons conducting the audit of statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and application of funds. Such report shall not be printed as a public document.

USE OF ASSETS UPON DISSOLUTION OR LIQUIDATION

SEC. 14. Upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, after discharge or satisfaction, of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets, if any, of the corporation shall be distributed in accordance with the determination of the board of directors of the corporation and in compliance with the constitution and bylaws of the corporation and all Federal and State laws applicable thereto.

ACQUISITION OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES OF EXISTING CORPORATION

SEC. 15. The corporation may acquire the assets of Science Service, Incorporated, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, upon discharge or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all of the liabilities of such corporation and upon complying with all laws of the State of Delaware applicable thereto.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL

SEC. 16. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 11, strike out the first sentence in section 13(a) and insert the following:

> The accounts of the corporation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States.

On page 11, strike out lines 17 through 23, and on page 12 strike out lines 1 and 2, and insert the following:

> (b) A report of such audit shall be submitted to the Congress of the United States not later than 6 months following the close of the fiscal year for which the audit was made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements as are necessary to present fairly the corporation's assets and liabilities, surplus or deficit with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, supplemented in reasonable detail by a statement of the corporation's income and expenses during the year including the results of any trading, manufacturing, publishing, or other commercial-type endeavor carried on by the corporation, together with the independent auditor's opinion of those statements. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, Science Service, Inc., is a nonprofit, privately supported institution controlled by a board of trustees representing in equal number the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the National Research Council, the National Academy of Sciences, the journalistic profession and the Scripps Estate which provided the original endowment.

The organization, which would be incorporated in H.R. 824, has been continuously serving teachers and pupils in a broadening school-centered science program for youth since 1941 through Science Clubs of America, the National Science Talent Search, State Science Talent Searches and the National Science Fair International. These programs now operate under direct teacher auspices and supervision in 50 States, the District of Columbia, all possessions of the United States, and in scores of friendly nations.

The objective of Science Service programs is to help teachers encourage increased interest in science in all students, not simply to influence careers or to provide further motivation and experiences for those planning work in scientific endeavors. It is based on the concept that the more familiar all people are with the rewards and disappointments of challenging research, the greater will be their understanding of the problems this Nation's scientists face.

At this time I insert a statement by Gordon B. Fister, associated editor of the Morning Call, Allentown, Pa., and chairman of the National Science Fair-International Advisory Council, in support of H.R. 824, "a bill to incorporate Science Service, Inc., for the purposes indicated by Public Law 85–875":

> On behalf of the 208 regional high school science fairs affiliated with the 1962 National Science Fair-International, it is my privilege to support H.R. 824, a bill to incorporate Science Service, Inc. for the purposes indicated by Public Law 85–875, and to urge that you recommend it for approval by the House of Representatives.
>
> This bill is identical to H.R. 11711 which the House of Representatives of the 87th Congress approved June 18, 1962, on the recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary.
>
> My endorsement is both personal and in accord with the action of more than 300 teachers and other sponsors of 208 regional science fairs at their meeting May 2, 1962, at the 13th Annual National Science Fair-International in Seattle, Wash. With but one dissenting vote, this group adopted resolutions asking that if the Congress charter any group to stimulate the interest of young people in science under the terms of Public Law 85–875 the group be Science Service Inc. of Washington, D.C.
>
> The resolutions originated with the Advisory Council of the National Science Fair-International and were in no way prompted by Science Service Inc., its staff or its board of trustees. They were the result of certain reports that interests within the U.S. Office of Education were preparing to ask the Congress to charter a new organization in which the Office of Education would undertake the establishment and direction of programs similar to those which Science Service, Inc., the National Science Teachers Association and others have been developing voluntarily over a period of 22 years. These disturbing rumors now have been substantiated by draft proposals suggesting two members of the staff of the U.S. Office of Education among the incorporators of a new organization and calling for the national adviser and executive secretary to be staff members of the U.S. Office of Education appointed by the Commissioner.
>
> We believe that H.R. 824, providing a Federal charter for the long active and widely accepted Science Service, Inc., is the most effective, economical and sound means of implementing Public Law 85–875 for the following reasons:
>
> 1. Science Service, Inc., is a nonprofit, privately supported institution incorporated in the State of Delaware and controlled by a board of trustees representing in equal number the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the National Research Council, the National Academy of Sciences, the journalism profession and the Scripps Estate which provided its original endowment. These trustees are the incorporators listed in section 1 of H.R. 824.
>
> 2. Science Service, Inc., has been continually serving teachers and pupils in a broadening school-centered science program for youth since 1941 through Science Clubs of America, the National Science Talent Search, State Science Talent Searches, and the National Science Fair-International. These programs now operate under direct teacher auspices and supervision in 50 States, the District of Columbia, all possessions of the United States, and in scores of friendly nations.
>
> During the last school term (1961–62) 19,929 science clubs in 18,781 public, private and parochial schools in 50 states and the District of Columbia were affiliated with Science Clubs of America. They had a total membership of 437,010 pupils. In addition there were 128 affiliated clubs in high schools in the Canal Zone, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and 359 in some 50 foreign countries. Science Service, Inc., provided the sponsoring teachers with appropriate guides, program plans and other literature without charge. There are no fees, dues or affiliation charges. Costs of the program are paid by Science Service, Inc., from its other income supplemented for several years by a nominal grant from the National Science Foundation.
>
> During the last school term, 3,559 seniors in 1,296 public and parochial high schools in 50 States and the District of Columbia completed entries in the 21st National Science Talent Search which provided $34,250 in scholarships and awards for 40 seniors planning careers in science. The funds for the program and the awards are provided by the Westinghouse Educational Foundation.
>
> Through arrangement with Science Clubs of America, science talent searches were conducted in 41 States and the District of Columbia.
>
> During the last school year, 947,502 pupils in junior and senior high schools developed science projects for the 208 regional science fairs affiliated with the 13th annual National Science Fair-International. These projects came from several thousand schools in 45 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Japan, Canada, Western Germany, France and Italy. Regional fairs pay affiliation fees ranging from $100 to $300 and are required by contract to pay the traveling and living costs of the two students each is permitted to send to the national fair. There are no other costs to regional fairs. There are no charges or fees for students. Total fees collected from regional fairs affiliated with the 1961 National Science Fair-International were $30,100. Science Service added $14,832 of its own funds to cover the total cost of $44,932. The approximate cost of the affiliated regional fairs was $625,600 of which 95.5 percent came from industries, business concerns, colleges, professional groups, and civic organizations. Business and industry does not control the policies of any of these

regional fairs. Control is for the most part vested in high school and college teachers.

3. The programs Science Service offers and for which it provides guides and other materials are used and implemented at the discretion of individual schools and science teachers. Where they are used they supplement classroom and laboratory work and offer incentives for individual effort beyond normal requirements. The work nearly 1 million pupils did this year in developing science fair projects is one example. The 3,559 research papers they wrote for the talent search programs is another.

4. Science Service Inc., offers its youth programs to all public, private, and parochial schools through their own teachers but makes no effort to impose them on any. Classroom teachers control and direct the programs they elect to use and implement them according to the needs, the aptitudes, and the interest of their pupils and the activities of their schools. The assistance and support they receive from other scientists, from scientific organizations, from business and industry, and community groups is at their own request and within the limits schools and teachers determine.

5. The objective of Science Service programs is to help teachers encourage increased interest in science in all students, not simply to influence careers or to provide further motivation and experiences for those planning work in scientific endeavors. It is based on the concept that the more familiar all people are with the rewards and disappointments of challenging research, the greater will be their understanding of the problems this Nation's scientists face. The programs are, therefore, open to all students regardless of the careers they anticipate. They are not only for future scientists.

6. Affiliation with Science Clubs of America is not a requisite for participation in science fairs or science talent searches nor is it a barrier to active membership in any other groups. Science Service recognizes the distinct contributions of such programs as Future Scientists of America, sponsored by the National Science Teachers Association, JETS and the Berg Foundation and welcomes the opportunity to work with these groups and others of similar caliber in many schools. The most avid science students are active in all the programs offered in their schools. The Federal charter H.R. 824 proposes to grant Science Service would not alter these relationships or interfere with any existing organizations.

7. Through Science Clubs of America, Science Talent Searches and the National Science Fair-International, Science Service has convincingly demonstrated its ability to join teachers in effectively stimulating a broader interest of the Nation's youth in science and scientific pursuits. It has helped science teachers win the aid and cooperation of scientists, scientific organizations, colleges and universities, professional groups and business and industry for both their classroom and extracurricular teaching programs. Among those joining them in the National Science Fair-International are the U.S. Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the American Pharmaceutical Association, the American Chemical Society, the American Institute of Biological Sciences, the American Society for Microbiology, the Entomological Society of America, the National Pest Control Association, the Optical Society of America, the Society of Women Engineers.

8. Science Service is the only organization in the United States that makes available to all schools a program offering so many opportunities and challenges in science to so many pupils. There are no comparable national programs in any other secondary school field.

9. These programs are for the most part privately financed. H.R. 824 carries no request for appropriations of tax funds and asks no Federal services.

10. We believe the scope and extent of the programs offered by Science Service, Inc., adequately and completely fulfill the intent of the Congress of the United States expressed in Public Law 85–875.

The National Science Fair-International Advisory Council is opposed to chartering a new organization to promote these cocurricular science activities among the Nation's youth because:

1. The existing structure, including the activities successfully sponsored by Science Service, Inc., already offer programs most science teachers have found to be adequate, satisfactory and helpful to them and to their pupils. If teachers or administrators find revisions or additions desirable, they can be accomplished within the framework of the present organization.

2. Chartering by the Congress of any new organization to engage in parallel activities would result in confusion, duplications and misunderstandings in local schools and at broader levels. This would weaken rather than strengthen the laudable objectives of Public Law 85–875.

The Council, on whose behalf these arguments are being presented, is convinced that the soundest and most effective means of implementing Public Law 85–875 is by strengthening Science Service, Inc. by granting it the Federal charter proposed in H.R. 824. This would considerably enhance its prestige and help strengthen sound programs that constantly are proving their effectiveness across the Nation. We most earnestly urge your support for this measure.

Respectfully submitted,
GORDON B. FISTER,
Chairman, National Science Fair-International Advisory Council.

I certify that I am not a member of the staff or board of trustees of Science Service, Inc., or of any agency or board of the Government of the United States of America.

GORDON B. FISTER.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, Science Service is the only organization in the United States that makes available to all schools a program offering so many opportunities and challenges in science to so many pupils. There are no comparable national programs in any other secondary school field.

Science Service does recognize the distinct contributions of such programs as Young Scientists of America, sponsored by the National Science Teachers Association, the Junior Engineering Technical Society, and the 4–H Clubs, and welcomes the opportunity to work with these groups and others of similar caliber in many schools. The most avid science students are active in all the programs offered in their schools. The Federal charter H.R. 824 proposed to grant Science Service would not alter these relationships or interfere with any existing organizations.

Through its youth programs, Science Service has convincingly demonstrated its ability to join teachers in effectively stimulating a broader interest of the Nation's youth in science and scientific pursuits. It has helped science teachers win the aid and cooperation of scientists, scientific organizations, colleges and universities, professional groups and business and industry for both their classroom and extracurricular teaching programs.

H.R. 824 providing a Federal charter for the long active and widely accepted Science Service, Inc., is the most effective, economical, and sound means of implementing Public Law 85–875.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CRIMINAL OFFENSES NOT COMMITTED IN ANY DISTRICT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2842) to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3238 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3238. Offenses not committed in any district

"The trial of all offenses begun or committed upon the high seas, or elsewhere out of the jurisdiction of any particular State or district, shall be in the district in which the offender, or any one of two or more joint offenders, is arrested or is first brought; but if such offender or offenders are not so arrested or brought into any district, an indictment or information may be filed in the district of the last known residence of the offender or of any one of two or more joint offenders, or if no such residence is known the indictment or information may be filed in the District of Columbia."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXAMINATION OF ATTORNEY FEES IN BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2833) to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in view of the very substantial increase in the number of bankruptcies that are taking place in this day of alleged moving forward with great vigor, I am glad to see this legislation before the House to regulate the fees paid to attorneys in bankruptcy cases. I simply want to state my approval of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) is amended to read as follows:

"d. If a debtor shall, directly or indirectly, in contemplation of the filing of a petition by or against him, pay money or transfer property to an attorney at law, for services rendered or to be rendered, the transaction may be examined by the court on its own motion or shall be examined by the court on petition of the trustee or any creditor and shall be held valid only to the extent of a reasonable amount to be determined by the court, and the excess may be recovered by the trustee for the benefit of the estate.

"If, whether before or after filing, a debtor shall agree orally or in writing to pay money or transfer property to an attorney at law after the filing, the transaction may be examined by the court on its own motion or shall be examined by the court on petition of the bankrupt made prior to discharge and shall be held valid only to the extent of a reasonable amount to be determined by the court, and any excess obligation shall be canceled, or if excess payment or transfer has been made, returned to the bankrupt."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPOSIT OF FUNDS OF BANKRUPTS' ESTATES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2849) to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That clause (2) of the first paragraph of section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 75(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) deposit all money received by them in designated depositories initially in demand deposits; and subsequently, if authorized by the court, in interest-bearing savings deposits, time certificates of deposit, or time deposits-open account;".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCORPORATING THE ELEANOR ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL FOUNDATION, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4715) to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we might have a brief explanation of this bill.

Mr. FORRESTER. I do not know whether I can make it so very brief or not.

Mr. GROSS. I am acquainted with the original legislation that was introduced. It is my understanding, and I did not have an opportunity to go through this bill as carefully as I might like, that it is a vastly different bill than that which was originally offered in this session of Congress. Perhaps the gentleman can satisfy my curiosity about the bill if he has the answers to a few questions.

I should like to ask him if it is still possible to carry on a campaign of promotion of social welfare under this bill. Are there any restrictions that have been placed upon that feature of the original bill?

Mr. FORRESTER. I am delighted to answer that question. The gentleman is evidently referring to the original bill known as H.R. 2. That bill was before the subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am chairman. After consideration of that bill, the present bill we have before us is the culmination of the work of the subcommittee, approved by the full committee.

On the particular question the gentleman has asked, I am glad to report that it was the opinion of the subcommittee, that has had quite a bit of experience in dealing with Federal charters, that the word "social" should be stricken and the word "economic" inserted in lieu thereof. I believe that is the question about which the gentleman asked me.

Mr. GROSS. What about the provision in the original bill, if I recall it correctly, that this foundation could carry on a campaign of promotion for the United Nations? Has that been taken care of in this bill?

Mr. FORRESTER. I am happy to report to the gentleman that while H.R. 2 did contain a stipulation that the major portion of the powers would not be dealing with politics, our subcommittee found out a long time ago that any organization chartered by this Congress should be expressly prohibited from engaging in politics. As you will find, in this particular bill, there is an express provision to that effect and it is identical with the language that was used with reference to the American Legion, the VFW, and other organizations and, by the way, is the same language as is now contained in the science bill which was passed here by this body a few minutes ago.

Mr. GROSS. Then do I understand there is an express provision in the pending legislation which restricts this corporation, or whatever you want to call it, from engaging in political campaigning and influencing legislation?

Mr. FORRESTER. That is correct. That is stated on lines 19 through 23 of page 7 of H.R. 4715, the bill now under consideration.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any cost whatsoever to the taxpayers of this country now or does the gentleman from Georgia think there may be in the future any cost to the taxpayers for the support of this corporation?

Mr. FORRESTER. No, there is no cost to the Government at this time or contemplated in the future. As a matter of fact, I think the gentleman might be interested in this, there was a provision in the legislation originally that this corporation would be permitted to solicit funds for an indefinite period. At the insistence of the son of Mrs. Roosevelt, our colleague, Mr. James Roosevelt, he asked us to limit this solicitation of funds until January 1, 1965, giving as his reason the fact that he believed his mother would want a cutoff date so far as the solicitation of funds are concerned.

Mr. GROSS. If this bill is approved by the House, I hope the gentleman from Georgia will assure us it would be unacceptable to him if it is amended so as to take out any substantial part of the restrictions that the Committee on the Judiciary has, in my opinion, wisely inserted in this legislation.

Mr. FORRESTER. I would say to the gentleman, everything has been done in this bill and everything put into this bill that through experience of Subcommittee No. 4, who has handled numerous bills, of this kind has felt it is wise and expedient to put into this kind of legislation. I want to remind the gentleman and the House there are many purposes for which the States can grant charters. In most instances, probably the States should do it because the States have fuller laws regulating the granting of charters and more explicit statutory authority to deprive a person or persons of a charter which we do not have. Of course the Congress has the right to revoke charters. But we feel that from the very nature of things, we have to be quite careful as to the type of charter legislation that we bring to the floor. I think I can tell the gentleman that Subcommittee No. 4 and the House Committee on the Judiciary will in this case and in all other cases insist that any provision putting the corporation in politics will not be consented to and that any provision of this bill which would give to any corporation rights which really should be handled or disposed of by the Government itself and through the machinery of the Government will not be permitted by us to remain in this bill. At least that is my opinion that that would be the case.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like clarification with regard to the political aspects of this bill. The gentleman from Iowa referred to the United Nations. I notice in reading the bill that section 10 provides the corporation and its officers and directors shall not contribute to or participate directly or indirectly in any local or national political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation. But it does not refer to any international organization. I wonder if there might be some enlightenment or clarification on that point.

Mr. FORRESTER. Let me say to the gentleman that point has never been raised with us before. I have thought that when we say they are not engaged in political activity that we mean it. I think that is reinforced by the original bill, H.R. 2, if the gentleman will look at it.

Mr. PELLY. Would you call this political activity if it were designed to influence action in the United Nations? Or would you call that international politics?

Mr. FORRESTER. I think it would be the same thing, in my humble judgment. The gentleman will recall that language was stricken out of that particular bill with regard to teaching of certain matters. If the gentleman and the House are interested in knowing what the actual powers are now, they will be found on page 3 beginning with line 10 and ending with line 16. Let me call the gentleman's attention specifically to the words "more particularly" on line 14.

An amendment will be offered as part of this bill striking out the words "more particularly" and substituting for them the words "to wit" and a colon. In other words, "the relief of the poor and distressed and the underprivileged; promotion of economic welfare; and the promotion of public health." They are the powers that would be granted to the corporation under this bill.

Mr. PELLY. Would the gentleman amplify a little further as to whether or not this would cover, for example, UNESCO organizations?

Mr. FORRESTER. So far as political aspects are concerned I would think so. We have tried to deal with this as we did with the American Legion, VFW, and other patriotic organizations.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORRESTER. Let me say that the preponderating reason the subcommittee had in this legislation was the desire to give a Federal charter because of the objectives of the proposed organization, and to carry out the wishes of Mrs. Roosevelt in that respect. I think that was the preponderating reason so far as the granting of this charter is concerned; and I note with pleasure that the son of Mrs. Roosevelt is nodding approval of what I said.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Eleanor Roosevelt was a great woman. The very mention of her name evokes in millions of people around the world memories of a woman who tirelessly worked for all humanity. Her heart had no boundaries; it embraced the lowly, the sick, the poor, the oppressed.

In her way, she was the symbol of one of our greatest traditions, for no country, in all history, has proven its inate generosity, its warmth, and concern for the needy and oppressed as has the United States. We are a much maligned people. Again and again we are accused of being a materialistic country. Eleanor Roosevelt gave lie to that accusation and, in her person, embodied the humanitarian ideals that run like a strong current throughout all of our history.

Therefore, it is well that her ideals be perpetuated by the Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation Memorial, Inc. In giving a Federal charter to this group, we not only pay homage to this First Lady but, in a sense, we help keep alive the true image of our country. Far better than a statue, far better than a piece of stone, or a slab of marble, would be a living monument dedicated to the purposes to which Eleanor Roosevelt gave of her strength, her mind, and her heart. It is a simple incorporation bill—it asks for no money, it asks only that we give to this organization the dignity of Federal incorporation. This is little enough that Congress can do to honor the manner of life Eleanor Roosevelt lived.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following persons designated by the President of the United States of America:

The Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, New York, New York, as Chairman;
Miss Marian Anderson, Danbury, Connecticut;
Robert S. Benjamin, New York, New York;
William Benton, Southport, Connecticut;
Doctor Ralph J. Bunche, New York, New York;
Henry Crown, Chicago, Illinois;
David Dubinsky, New York, New York;
Myer Feldman, Washington, District of Columbia;
Mrs. Ruth Field, New York, New York;
Raymond Firestone, Akron, Ohio;
Arnold Grant, New York, New York;
Arthur Hanisch, Pasadena, California;
Doctor John R. Heller, New York, New York;
Mrs. Audrey Hess, New York, New York;
Mrs. Anna Rosenberg Hoffman, New York, New York;
Mrs. Trude Lash, New York, New York;
Mrs. Mary Lasker, New York, New York;
Herbert Lehman, New York, New York;
Archibald MacLeish, Conway, Massachusetts;
Doctor Charles Mayo, Rochester, Minnesota;
John J. McCloy, Washington, District of Columbia;
George Meany, Washington, District of Columbia;
Mrs. Agnes Meyer, Washington, District of Columbia;
Walter P. Reuther, Detroit, Michigan;
Dore Schary, New York, New York;
Herman Steinkraus, Westport, Connecticut;

and their successors are created and declared to be a body corporate in the District of Columbia by the name of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Incorporated (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation"), and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

Sec. 2. A majority of the persons named in the first section of this Act are hereby authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of bylaws, not inconsistent with this Act, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

Sec. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be exclusively charitable and educational. It shall devote itself to continuing certain major interests to which Eleanor Roosevelt dedicated her life, more particularly, the relief of the poor and distressed and the underprivileged; promotion of economic welfare; and the promotion of public health.

CORPORATE POWERS

Sec. 4. The corporation shall have power—

(1) to sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(2) to adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;

(3) to choose such officers, managers, agents, and employees as the business of the corporation may from time to time require;

(4) to adopt, amend, and alter its bylaws, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State in which the corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

(5) to solicit, prior to January 1, 1965, and to accept, receive, hold, invest, reinvest, and to use, administer, expend and otherwise dispose of, in the sole and absolute discretion of the board of trustees, gifts, legacies, bequests, devises, grants, funds, money and property of every kind and description, and to apply the income and principal thereof exclusively for the purposes of the corporation by such agencies and means as shall, from time to time, be found appropriate therefor, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limited or controlling the ownership of property by a corporation operating in such State;

(6) to contract and be contracted with;

(7) to transfer, convey, lease, sublease, encumber, and otherwise alienate real, personal, or mixed property;

(8) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, deed of trust, pledge, or otherwise, subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal and State laws; and

(9) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the objects and purposes of the corporation.

MEMBERSHIP

Sec. 5. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall, except as provided in this Act, be determined as the bylaws of the corporation may provide.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES: COMPOSITION, RESPONSIBILITIES

Sec. 6. (a) Upon the enactment of this Act the membership of the initial board of trustees of the corporation shall consist of the persons named in the first section of this Act and such additional persons, if any, as shall be appointed by the President of the United States of America.

(b) Thereafter, the board of trustees of the corporation shall be selected in such manner (including the filling of vacancies), and shall serve for such term as may be prescribed in the bylaws of the corporation.

(c) The board of trustees shall be the governing board of the corporation, and a quorum thereof shall be responsible for the general policies and program of the corporation and for the control of all funds of the corporation. The board of trustees may appoint committees which shall have and exercise such powers as may be prescribed in the bylaws or by resolution of the board of trustees, and which may be all of the powers of the board of trustees.

OFFICERS: ELECTION AND DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Sec. 7. (a) The officers of the corporation shall be a chairman, a secretary, and a treasurer, and such other officers as may be provided in the bylaws.

(b) The officers of the corporation shall be elected in such manner and for such terms and with such duties as may be prescribed in the bylaws of the corporation.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE, SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES; RESIDENT AGENT

Sec. 8. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in Washington, District of Columbia, or in such other place as may be later determined by the board of trustees, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place, but may be conducted throughout the territory of the United States, and in the discretion of the board of trustees elsewhere in the world.

(b) The corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation; and notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME OR ASSETS TO MEMBERS; LOANS TO OFFICERS, TRUSTEES, OR EMPLOYEES

Sec. 9. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any of its members, trustees, or officers as such, or be distributable to any of them during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual necessary expenses in amounts approved by the board of trustees of the corporation.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its officers, trustees, or employees. Any trustee who votes for or assents to the making of a loan or advance to a member, officer, trustee, or employee of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such a loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

Sec. 10. The corporation and its officers and directors as such shall not contribute to or participate in, directly or indirectly, local or national political activity or in any manner attempt to influence legislation.

LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

Sec. 11. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

PROHIBITION AGAINST ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

Sec. 12. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock or to declare or pay any dividends.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

Sec. 13. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of trustees, and committees having authority under the board of trustees, and it shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

Sec. 14. (a) The accounts of the corporation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the President of the United States and to the Congress not later than six months following the close of the fiscal year for which the audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements as are necessary to present fairly the corporation's assets and liabilities surplus or deficit with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, supplemented in reasonable detail by a statement of the corporation's income and expenses during the year including the results of any trading, manufacturing, publishing, or other commercial-type endeavor carried on by the corporation, together with the independent auditor's opinion of those statements. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

USE OF NAME

Sec. 15. The corporation shall have the sole and exclusive right to the name the "Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Incorporated", and to have and to use in carrying out its purposes, distinctive insignia, emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases, as may be required in the furtherance of its functions. No powers or privileges hereby granted shall, however, interfere or conflict with established or vested rights.

USE OF ASSETS ON DISSOLUTION OR LIQUIDATION

Sec. 16. Upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, after discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets if any, of the corporation shall be distributed only in furtherance of the purposes of the corporation to one or more organizations organized and operated exclusively for charitable and educational purposes within the meaning of the Internal Revenue Code.

ACQUISITION OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES OF EXISTING COMMITTEE

Sec. 17. The corporation may acquire the assets of the Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation Committee, an unincorporated association formed in anticipation of the present incorporation upon discharging or satisfactorily providing for the payment and discharge of all of the liabilities of such committee.

ANNUAL REPORT

Sec. 18. The corporation shall report annually to the President of the United States and to the Congress concerning its proceedings and activities for the preceding calendar year. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHAPTER

Sec. 19. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER: The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 16, strike out "more particularly" and insert "To-wit:".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the Record on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to support H.R. 4715 to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation. This bill is similar to H.R. 4673 which I sponsored. The enactment of this legislation is a positive way in which the Congress can testify to the valiant leadership and constant inspiration which Mrs. Roosevelt gave our Nation and the United Nations. It is a way in which we can further the goals to which Mrs. Roosevelt dedicated her life.

Mr. Speaker, I have a 2-hour special order for March 27 at which time I have invited all Members of the House to join me in paying tribute to the ideals and life of Eleanor Roosevelt.

Today we have the opportunity to vote for the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation which will prove a fitting tribute to the work and ideals of Mrs. Roosevelt.

No doubt all Members are familiar with the efforts which have led to the establishment of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation. You will remember that shortly after Mrs. Roosevelt's death President Kennedy called a meeting of distinguished persons who were interested in a meaningful tribute to our First Lady emeritus. Under the chairmanship of the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, meetings were held which resulted in the formation of the foundation. The stated purpose of the foundation bears testimony to the honored name which it will carry. The purpose reads:

> The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be exclusively charitable and educational. It shall devote itself to continuing certain major interests to which Eleanor Roosevelt dedicated her life, more particularly, the relief of the poor and distressed and the underprivileged; promotion of economic welfare; and the promotion of public health.

Mr. Speaker, clearly the purposes of the foundation embrace a philosophy which centers upon the worth and dignity of all individuals.

Mr. Speaker, in a world which has yet to solve the problems of poverty, misery, and want, and find the way to a just and lasting peace, the voice of Eleanor Roosevelt was a voice of reason and hope. She spoke out against injustice and for freedom. She spoke out of a deep understanding of the fundamental principles of our free and democratic society. She dared to espouse the unpopular when she was convinced of the rightness of the cause.

The progress and development of our Nation and of the free world are enhanced by individuals such as Eleanor Roosevelt. Let us enact legislation which will perpetuate her good works and set into motion the activities of a foundation which will bear the honored and loved name of Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, Vivian Gordon, of the Library of Congress, has expressed in an original poem a thought which I believe indicates something of the national loss of Mrs. Roosevelt but yet indicates the directions she left for the future:

Would that I could know another
Quite as strong:
Yet from the seeds that she has sown
Among the mighty throng,
I know that there will come
Leaders: strong and new
To take up the work yet undone
The work that she would do.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the President's Commission on the Status of Women at its last meeting endorsed the purpose and aims of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation. Mrs. Roosevelt in her usual brilliant and compassionate fashion was chairman of the President's Status of Women Commission at the time of her death. I, as a member of the Commission, was honored at being asked to serve on the Commission whose work she so ably directed.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I want to place in the body of the Record the Commission's statement on the foundation:

> Members of the President's Commission on the Status of Women welcome the creation of the Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation. Initiated by President Kennedy and chaired by Adlai Stevenson, the foundation is dedicated to continue and extend the great good Mrs. Roosevelt did throughout her life.
>
> The foundation's work in the fields of human rights and dignity, world peace, health research and social development will follow the principal areas of Mrs. Roosevelt's interests, which are also, we believe, the principal challenges facing the world.
>
> The Commission endorses the purpose for which the foundation was created: to coordinate private efforts to make meaningful and lasting the tangible memorials to Mrs. Roosevelt. Thus we hope all individuals, groups and organizations dedicated to such worthwhile aims will consult with the foundation and, where feasible, will coordinate their efforts with it.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Weltner] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, on this day the House will soon pass the bill to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc. I think it appropriate, then, that others throughout the Nation might have the opportunity of enjoying a splendid article written by Miss Helen Bullard, of Atlanta, and published in a recent edition of Plumb, a publication of the Associated Plumbing Contractors of Georgia:

A Tribute to a Lady

(By Helen Bullard)

To try to pay tribute to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt is to be reminded of the inadequacy of words. Because there are no words to rightfully and accurately assess or capture the essence of this truly great lady. At most one can only hope to imprison under glass some of the impressions, some of the remembrances of this woman who became in her own lifetime, and in ours, a symbol of the human spirit. Perhaps in the word "human" lies some of the essence, for Mrs. Roosevelt was a person to whom the word human meant not human frailty but strength. All the qualities of warmth, compassion, humor, and acceptance of one's self and one's fellow man * * * these are the qualities which Mrs. Roosevelt ascribed as "human."

Perhaps a certain blitheness was another attribute, a certain philosophy of "this is right, so let's do this because it is right." At the age of 72 a reporter asked her what her philosophy was and she replied, "Well, life has to be lived, that's all."

More than any person in our history she pushed back boundaries, pushed back horizons, so that imaginary state and country boundaries were removed, and horizons were enlarged to include the world. She brought a certain perspective to the world; she made survival seem a very worthwhile project to pursue.

She was no ivory tower philosopher. Philosophy was translated into action on the premise that if something was important enough to be disturbed about, it was important enough to do something about. She moved in the area of action quietly and efficiently. "Better to light a candle than to curse the darkness" was something she subscribed to heartily, but whenever possible she efficiently chose a rather large candle.

She knew thousands of people: the great, the near great, the rich and the poor, and no person she ever met failed to respond to the impact of her charm, her warmth and her naturalness.

Perhaps the nearest approach to an appropriate tribute that can be paid Mrs. Roosevelt is to quote the words of St. Francis (words which she loved so much that she requested they be read at her funeral). People who knew her long and well, feel that these words were indeed the words she lived by.

"Lord, make me an instrument of your peace.
Where there is hatred, let me sow love;
Where there is injury, pardon.
Where there is discord, union.
Where there is doubt, faith.
Where there is despair, hope.
Where there is darkness, joy.
O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console;
To be understood as to understand;
To be loved as to love;
For it is in the giving that we receive;
It is in the pardoning that we are pardoned.
And it is in dying that we are born to eternal life."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

TAXATION OF CERTAIN DISPOSITIONS OF PROPERTY MADE PURSUANT TO ORDERS ENFORCING ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2826) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of dispositions of property—other than stock—pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part IX of subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to distributions pursuant to orders enforcing antitrust laws) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 1112. Disposition of Property (Other Than Stock) to Effectuate Antitrust Policies

"(a) Nonrecognition of Gain.—If property (other than stock) is sold or exchanged as the result of judgment, decree, or other order (or the threat or imminence thereof while the proceeding is pending) of a court or of a commission or board authorized to enforce compliance in a suit or other proceeding brought by the United States or such commission or board under the Sherman Act (26 Stat. 209; 15 U.S.C. 1–7), or the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 730; 15 U.S.C. 12–27), such sale or exchange shall be treated as an involuntary conversion of such property within the meaning of section 1033.

"(b) Exceptions.—Subsection (a) shall not apply—

"(1) to any sale or exchange which is in pursuance of a plan having as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income tax; and

"(2) to any sale or exchange of property occurring after the date of the enactment of this section, unless the judgment, decree, or other order includes a finding by the court, or by the commission or board, that the disposition of such property is required because of acts with respect to which, at the time of such acts, there was no substantial reason for believing that such acts would involve a violation of the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act.

"(c) Other Limitations.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) The purchase of other property shall not be treated as satisfying the requirements of section 1033 unless—

"(A) the Attorney General of the United States, if the proceeding described in subsection (a) was instituted by the Attorney General, or

"(B) the commission or board, if the proceeding described in subsection (a) was instituted by such commission or board, certifies that such purchase is not inconsistent with the terms of the judgment, decree, or order referred to in subsection (a), is not inconsistent with the Sherman Act, and is not inconsistent with the Clayton Act.

"(2) The purchase of stock for the purpose of replacing the property described in subsection (a) of this section shall not be treated as satisfying the requirements of section 1033.

"(3) In applying section 1033, the determination as to whether other property is similar or related in service or use to the property sold or exchanged shall be made without regard to section 1033(g)."

(b) The table of sections for such part IX is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 1112. Disposition of property (other than stock) to effectuate antitrust policies."

Sec. 2. (a) Section 1112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as added by the first section of this Act) shall apply only with respect to amounts received after December 31, 1960.

(b) In the case of amounts received after December 31, 1960, with respect to a sale or exchange described in section 1112(a) of such Code which occurred on or before such date, section 1112 of such Code shall be applied as if the sale or exchange occurred on January 1, 1961, and section 1033 of such Code shall be applied with the following modifications:

(1) In determining the amount realized upon such sale or exchange, there shall be taken into account only amounts received after December 31, 1960. The gain taken into account shall be that portion of the gain which is properly allocable to amounts realized after December 31, 1960.

(2) The period specified in section 1033 (a)(3)(B) shall be treated as beginning on January 1, 1961, and ending on December 31, 1963.

(3) The time for making the election referred to in section 1033(a)(3)(A) shall not expire before the close of the 90th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, this bill which has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means is the same bill, except for a minor date change, that was passed by the House on September 17, 1962. The bill deals with the taxation of the proceeds from the sale or exchange of property other than stock where such sale is pursuant to an antitrust proceeding.

Under the present law, it might happen that a taxpayer would be required as a result of proceedings instituted under the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act to dispose of certain business properties, but under the spirit of those acts, he would not be prevented from buying new property that would serve to keep him in the same business but would not be a violation of the antimonopoly statutes. Under the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act, for example, a taxpayer might be required to sell a store or a hotel in one city because he already has too many stores or hotels there, but there may be no reason for preventing him from using the proceeds to buy or build a store in a new city.

The present tax law imposes a rather harsh result in this situation. Frequently, the sale of the old store or hotel will be at a price above the adjusted basis. This is the consequence of inflation in recent years. Under the tax law, despite the involuntary nature of this sale, that gain is subject to tax, and the taxpayer only has reduced proceeds available to acquire the replacement property. In a number of other situations, a taxpayer who is forced to sell property is permitted to postpone recognition of taxable gain. This is not an exemption from tax, but simply a deferral. This nonrecognition provision applies where property is sold, for example, in obedience to orders from the Securities and Exchange Commission or to effectuate certain policies of the Federal Communications Commission. The bill would extend a similar treatment to sales which are the result of a judgment, or decree or other order of a court, commission, or board in a proceeding brought under the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act.

The legislation applies with respect to amounts received by the taxpayer after December 31, 1960. It is made clear that the nonrecognition of gain applies only where these proceeds are reinvested in similar property where the acquisition of the new property is not inconsistent with the basic antitrust order and is not inconsistent with the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act. The amount of gain not recognized is subtracted from the cost of the replacement property in determining the adjusted basis of the replacement property for tax purposes.

It is also provided that for sales or exchanges of property on or after date of enactment, the new provisions will apply only if the basic antitrust order includes a finding that the sale of the property is required under circumstances where the taxpayer had no substantial reason at the time for believing a violation of the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act was involved. This is consistent with the general principles under which the Congress has allowed nonrecognition of gain for sales. It denies the nonrecognition where the taxpayer knowingly violated the law.

The legislation now before the House has certain similarities in general intent to the legislation enacted last year dealing with certain distributions of stock pursuant to antitrust orders, the legislation concerned particularly with the divestiture imposed on the Du Pont Co. on its holdings of General Motor stock. The basic intent of both pieces of legislation is to improve the application of the antitrust statutes by removing the tax penalties on individuals involved. This legislation does not serve to provide tax favors. It only removes tax penalties.

Furthermore, it does not remove any penalties on particular acts that might be contained within the antitrust statutes. It does appear to be unreasonable, however, to impose tax penalties over and above the provisions contained in the antitrust statutes themselves. Certainly these tax consequences were not intended when the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act were passed by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill passed the House last September, on the 17th of September, as far as I know, there were no dissenting votes. There were some comments by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis]. However, I think I am accurately describing his position when I say he did not oppose the principle of this bill but felt that we should have provisions on the books that would take care of all situations in general.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I believe this House passed the bill under suspension of the rules, but there was a minority report filed last year by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis].

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman from Missouri filed a minority report. I do not recall whether or not the gentleman voted against the bill. I did not mean to imply the bill passed unanimously, but it was passed under suspension of the rules by voice vote.

After it passed the House of Representatives, the bill was reported by the Finance Committee of the other body and, as far as I have been able to ascertain, there were no minority views filed in the other body.

On February 4, 1963, the Committee on Ways and Means reported the bill, and it was unanimously reported.

Last year the bill was sponsored by myself, by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Brien], and the gentleman from Illinois, a former distinguished Member and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. Mason].

The bill seeks to give in the case of civil—and I emphasize the word "civil"—antitrust proceedings the same treatment that is now accorded in other cases involving the involuntary disposition of property in carrying out public policy. I could give many instances.

For example, the Federal Communications Commission, when it enters a decree requiring a given person to divest himself or a corporation itself of given television or radio properties, or whatever other properties might be involved, no tax consequences follow as an immediate result. This is all spelled out in the report on the bill.

It will be noted there that the same applies in similar cases including the SEC. Similar situations also arise under the Bank Holding Company Act.

This is not a question of tax reduction or of tax forgiveness. It is a question of tax deferment. It takes cognizance of a situation which may come about in the law through no fault of the particular parties involved, and it permits the reinvestment of these funds in similar properties where the law is not in question.

That, basically, is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. The report of the committee does not include the statements filed by the Treasury Department or the Justice Department in regard to this particular piece of legislation. It is my understanding that both the Treasury and the Justice Department have filed adverse reports on this particular piece of legislation; is that correct?

Mr. BOGGS. They did last year. We did not receive formal reports this year. But, their reports were adverse last time. Basically this involves antitrust policy. Justice, as I recall, wants to study this and come up with possibly a general, overall approach.

Mr. LAIRD. Now, this particular piece of legislation will help the Hilton hotel chain tax problem resulting from the sale of the Mayflower Hotel here in Washington as well as some other properties outside of the city?

Mr. BOGGS. I am informed it will apply to any organization or group that will qualify under the terms of the legislation. I am informed that the Hilton hotel people do qualify.

Mr. LAIRD. Under the interpretation of this bill, if it does become law, the taxpayer will have to prove good faith; is that correct?

Mr. BOGGS. Positively. Under this proposal he has to prove good faith.

Mr. LAIRD. But not retroactively?

Mr. BOGGS. This applies only in a civil case. It has no application in a criminal case, and many people associated with these cases, who are interested in the enforcement of antitrust laws, for instance, the former head of that section of the Justice Department, Mr. Bicks, feel that this type of legislation will actually facilitate the enforcement of antitrust laws.

Mr. LAIRD. I understand the gentleman is referring to cases now and in the future. The only taxpayer interested in the retroactive provisions of this legislation would be the Hilton hotel corporation chain; is that not correct?

Mr. BOGGS. As far as I know, the only retroactive effect has to do with certain installments paid in 1961 so in that respect it is retroactive. The filing date for 1962 is not yet here.

Mr. LAIRD. Now, it just seems to me when we consider legislation like this under suspension—and I object to the procedure of considering legislation like this under suspension this early in the session—we have an adverse report from the Justice Department, an adverse report from the Treasury Department, and yet we bring this bill up under suspension where the provisions cannot even be amended on the floor of the House. Certainly, the gentleman from Louisiana has made a good case so far as the future is concerned, so far as being able to use good faith in the determination of the tax liability in the future. I object to this procedure of using suspension today to consider a bill which has the opposition of the Justice Department and the Treasury Department and not giving the House an opportunity to work its will as far as amendments are concerned here on the floor.

Mr. BOGGS. As the gentleman knows, I would say that generally the bills reported by the Committee on Ways and Means either come with a closed rule, which does not allow amendments on the floor, or sometimes the chairman calls them up under unanimous consent, because of the preferential status enjoyed by the committee, or sometimes by suspension. Suspension is not unusual.

Mr. LAIRD. Even under unanimous consent procedure or on the Consent Calendar we could consider amendments to this bill, but we cannot under this particular procedure. This bill should be considered under regular procedures and not under suspension of the House rules.

Mr. BOGGS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, but I would say that the bill passed the House last year, and the only reason the bill was not finally passed last year was that it was not reported by the committee in the other body until nearly the adjournment of the Congress. As far as I am able to ascertain in that body there was no opposition to the bill. But, it just came up too late in the session.

Now, this bill has strict limitations that must be met before it can apply.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the Record the debate which occurred last year on September 17, which gives a very succinct statement which was made by the former minority ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason]. I would like to have all of the debate and the discussion included in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the Congressional Record, Sept. 17, 1962]

TAXATION OF CERTAIN DISPOSITIONS OF PROPERTY

Mr. Boggs. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 8846) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of distributions of stock and dispositions of property made pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws, with committee amendments as printed in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) part IX of subchapter O of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to distributions pursuant to orders enforcing antitrust laws) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 1112. DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY (OTHER THAN STOCK) TO EFFECTUATE ANTITRUST POLICIES.

" '(a) NONRECOGNITION OF GAIN.—If property (other than stock) is sold or exchanged as the result of a judgment, decree, or other order (or the threat or imminence thereof while the proceeding is pending) of a court or of a commission or board authorized to enforce compliance in a suit or other proceeding brought by the United States or such commission or board under the Sherman Act (26 Stat. 209; 15 U.S.C. 1–7), or the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 730; 15 U.S.C. 12–27), such sale or exchange shall be treated as an involuntary conversion of such property within the meaning of section 1033.

" '(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply—

" '(1) to any sale or exchange which is in pursuance of a plan having as one of its principal purposes the avoidance of Federal income tax; and

" '(2) to any sale or exchange of property occurring after the date of the enactment of this section, unless the judgment, decree, or other order includes a finding by the court, or by the commission or board, that the disposition of such property is required because of acts with respect to which, at the time of such acts, there was no substantial reason for believing that such acts would involve a violation of the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act.

" '(c) OTHER LIMITATIONS.—For purposes of this section—

" '(1) The purchase of other property shall not be treated as satisfying the requirements of section 1033 unless—

" '(A) the Attorney General of the United States, if the proceeding described in subsection (a) was instituted by the Attorney General, or

" '(B) the commission or board, if the proceeding described in subsection (a) was instituted by such commission or board, certifies that such purchase is not inconsistent with the terms of the judgment, decree, or order referred to in subsection (a), is not inconsistent with the Sherman Act, and is not inconsistent with the Clayton Act.

" '(2) The purchase of stock for the purpose of replacing the property described in subsection (a) of this section shall not be treated as satisfying the requirements of section 1033.

" '(3) In applying section 1033, the determination as to whether other property is similar or related in service or use to the property sold or exchanged shall be made without regard to section 1033(g).'

"(b) The table of sections for such part IX is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

" '1112. Disposition of property (other than stock) to effectuate antitrust policies.'

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 1112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as added by the first section of this Act) shall apply only with respect to amounts received after December 31, 1960.

"(b) In the case of amounts received after December 31, 1960, with respect to a sale or exchange described in section 1112(a) of such Code which occurred on or before such date, section 1112 of such Code shall be applied as if the sale or exchange occurred on January 1, 1961, and section 1033 of such Code shall be applied with the following modifications:

"(1) In determining the amount realized upon such sale or exchange, there shall be taken into account only amounts received after December 31, 1960. The gain taken into account shall be that portion of the gain which is properly allocable to amounts realized after December 31, 1960.

"(2) The period specified in section 1033 (a)(3)(B) shall be treated as beginning on January 1, 1961, and ending on December 31, 1962.

"(3) The time for making the election referred to in section 1033(a)(3)(A) shall not expire before the close of the ninetieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act."

The Speaker pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. Curtis of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The Speaker pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The Speaker pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. Boggs. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I trust that we will not have to consume all of the time which has been allocated. This bill can be explained rather simply, I think. What it seeks to do is to put antitrust suits of a civil nature in the same category that we have put other similar matters in the law. For instance, under existing law if an order is entered by the Securities and Exchange Commission having to do with the disposition of utility holdings, let us say, that does not result in any tax incident. Or, if an order is issued under an order of the Federal Communications Commission, this too does not result in a tax incident. Or, there is the well-known case of eminent domain where the government, whether it be State, municipal, or Federal, takes a piece of property for the public good, this does not result in a tax incident.

Mr. Speaker, there are many other examples. The case of a fire is the best example about which I can think. If your building burns down and you collect the insurance policy, then the tax incident transfers itself to the new property. Basically, this is what this bill seeks to do.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will agree to the proposal now pending before it, as amended.

Mr. Keogh. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Boggs. I shall be very happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Keogh. First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], that I am delighated to join with the gentleman in urging favorable

action on this bill. But, permit me to make this statement and ask the gentleman if he agrees with it: In the first place, this applies only to civil antitrust actions?

Mr. Boggs. That is eminently correct.

Mr. Keogh. And in the second place it requires that the proceeds of the divestiture be invested in income-producing properties of the same or similar nature?

Mr. Boggs. Subject to the approval of whatever agency prosecuted the civil action.

Mr. Keogh. Precisely. Now, is it not a fact that it has been noted officially that courts are reluctant to enter civil antitrust decrees where the divestiture order would result in a heavy tax impact?

Mr. Boggs. That is quite correct. That is the main purpose of this legislation.

Mr. Keogh. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

(Mr. Keogh asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Keogh. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for H.R. 8846. This bill merely extends present law governing involuntary conversions to the disposal of assets under the antitrust laws.

When the Government steps in to break up an existing business enterprise, Congress has been conscious of the rights of the owner in such cases.

For example, the dissolution by the Securities and Exchange Commission of public utility holding companies is tax free. The distribution under a Federal Reserve Board order of nonbanking assets of a bank holding company is tax free. The proceeds realized from the sale of a radio or television station at the order of the Federal Communications Commission may be reinvested in another station without recognition of tax. And, last year tax relief was given to the stockholders of the Du Pont Co. when they received General Motors stock pursuant to an antitrust decree.

I understand that in civil cases arising under the antitrust laws, courts are often reluctant to order the breakup of enterprises because of the heavy tax penalties attached. This bill would remove that stumbling block from antitrust enforcement. At hearings on this bill, Herbert A. Bergson, Esq., the former head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, testified that legislation of this character was necessary because of the reluctance of courts to order divestiture because of the heavy tax consequences. This sentiment was echoed by many other witnesses.

I submit that the principle of involuntary conversion as applied in the tax laws should be extended to divestitures of property under the antitrust laws.

The Supreme Court has held that the remedy of divestiture in antitrust cases is equitable in nature and not punitive.

I further submit, in all fairness, that an antitrust defendant should be permitted to reinvest the proceeds from forced dispositions in other business assets without the recognition of gain as provided for in this bill.

Mr. King of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Boggs. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. King of California. Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to state that I, too, favor the enactment of the bill

Mr. Boggs. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

(Mr. Boggs asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Boggs. Mr. Speaker, the bill which the Committee on Ways and Means has reported to the House, H.R. 8846, deals with property other than stock which is disposed of as a result of antitrust proceedings. The bill does not provide tax reduction, merely tax postponement. It provides in the specific cases covered that the taxpayer should be able to readjust his holdings in a way consistent with the antitrust laws without the added burden of a current capital gains tax.

At the present time, there are various provisions in the Internal Revenue Code which provide this sort of deferred tax treatment where the taxpayer is compelled to divest himself of property. The basic provision on which the present bill is modeled deals with property involuntarily converted, for example, as a result of fire or catastrophe. The taxpayer is not taxable on the insurance proceeds even though these might involve a gain. The amount of this gain not recognized is, however, subtracted from the cost of the replacement property in determining its basis for tax purposes. Thus, the gain would ultimately be taxable if the replacement property is sold or if the replacement property is not sold the adjustment will involve smaller depreciation deductions and more ordinary income.

This involuntary conversion treatment is allowed under present law for certain dispositions of property in obedience to orders of the Securities and Exchange Commission. It is also provided for certain sales to effectuate the policies of the Federal Communications Commission. In general, the Congress has allowed this involuntary conversion treatment where the taxpayer was not in a position to know that he would sometime later be required to sell a particular piece of property. This, however, is frequently the case in antitrust legislation. The specific meaning of the Sherman and Clayton Acts has developed considerably in the court interpretation.

Under the committee bill, involuntary conversion treatment is provided for the disposition of property as a result of an antitrust judgment, decree or order, or threat thereof. Two very important restrictions are laid down, however. Ordinarily in the area of involuntary conversions the law requires the taxpayer to buy similar replacement property in order to qualify for the tax deferral. In this case, because of the antitrust problem, it is required that the body instituting the antitrust action must certify that the purpose of replacement property is not inconsistent with the terms of the antitrust order and not inconsistent with the Sherman or Clayton Acts. The other safeguard in the bill provides that for future application there must be a finding by the body issuing the order that the disposition of property is required because of action which at the time the taxpayer had no substantial reason to believe would involve a violation of the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act.

The tax laws should try to operate in a neutral fashion with respect to property transfers resulting from the application of antitrust law in relatively unpredictable cases. The tax law should not impose harsh penalties on these transfers of property nor should they result in any unexpected tax benefit. This result is achieved by the present bill.

(Mr. Herlong (at the request of Mr. Boggs) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. Herlong. Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the bill, H.R. 8846, which has been reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

This bill is a fair solution to an important problem in the development of a reasonable antitrust program.

As is well known, the Sherman-Clayton Acts have been subject to a great deal of reexamination in the courts since they were first placed on the statute books. Partly this has involved finding further meaning in the language of the laws and partly it has resulted from judicial revision of other concepts, such as the scope of interstate commerce. The result is that business firms frequently do not have reason to anticipate that particular property acquisitions will ultimately be held to be in violation of these antitrust laws.

In circumstances such as this, the bill simply provides some tax deferral if property must be sold because of an antitrust order. The taxpayer is not required to report the gain on that sale provided he reinvests the proceeds in similar property, the acquisition of which is consistent with the antitrust order.

The cost of the new property is reduced for tax purposes by the amount of gain that was not recognized at the time of the original forced disposition. This means that there will be no net tax forgiveness. Actually, in a great number of cases the reduction of basis on the new property will result in lower depreciation deductions and consequently more ordinary income. This treatment of deferral on the gain will come into operation only where the disposition of the property was required under an antitrust law and in future cases it will be required also that the basic order finds that the taxpayer, at the time of acquiring the property involved in the antitrust order, had no substantial reason for believing that his acquisition would involve a violation of the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act.

The concept of tax adjustment following an antitrust order was approved by the Congress in connection with the bill that was passed last year dealing with the divestiture of General Motors stock by the Du Pont Co. Like the Du Pont bill, the present bill is not intended to reduce the tax liability in the long run but to permit a reasonable adjustment by the taxpayer to the developments in antitrust law. I believe the current bill is completely sound and deserves the support of this House.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have minority views that were filed with H.R. 8846. Due possibly to some misunderstanding—I think that is what it was—these views were not printed with the report of the committee and so the Members of the House may have been unaware that there are minority views. They are available here in the well. They are not lengthy and I am going to read them because this, in essence, is the reason I am opposing the bill.

I opposed H.R. 8847, commonly called the Du Pont Antitrust Divestiture Act, because it was special legislation and not general law applicable to any antitrust divestiture where criminality was not involved.

For the same reason I oppose the present bill, H.R. 8846, although it clearly is more general than the Du Pont bill

This bill could be amended to make it general law, and good law, by eliminating its restriction to property other than stock and making it applicable to all property and by vesting the power of determining alternative tax treatments of the sale or transfer of divested property in the court, commission, or board hearing the matter.

How the property which must be divested is to be treated for tax purposes is very much a part of the economic aspects of the decree of divestiture ordered by the tribunal. Certainly the tribunal would be more prone to decree divestitures in noncriminal cases if it has more discretion over the economic penalty to be imposed. The tax incident can be the major part of the economic penalty and if the court has no discretion in making this penalty conform to the nature of the case it might be reluctant to enter a decree in the first place.

Above all, we should have government by law and not by men. As I said in the Du Pont case neither the Congress nor its Committee on Ways and Means is the proper forum to weigh the equities of these antitrust divestiture cases. Nor is the executive branch of the Government the proper forum to grant relief to one and deny it to another. Both the legislative and executive branches of the Government are politically motivated, and properly so. Who gets relief or does not get relief should not be a matter of political action.

This is a judicial matter and the Congress should write its laws to make it clear that the judiciary is the proper forum in which to seek relief.

At the time the Du Pont case came up I made some remarks on the floor of the House to the effect that we were probably going to have the Hilton Hotel case come up. And I can predict that there will be other cases that will come along. These are noncriminal antitrust cases. Actually, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House would be a better forum to evaluate this matter, in many respects—in fact, in all respects except for the tax feature—than the Committee on Ways and Means. We are talking about the economic impact of whether or not to give a company the benefit of the capital gains treatment concerning whatever they may have made on their investment, which they must divest themselves of, or whether it will be treated as ordinary income.

The court in the Du Pont case or the Hilton Hotel case or any of these cases has to go into some depth in determining how the divestiture can be effected under any circumstances so that it will minimize the economic impact. Indeed, the Du Pont divestiture, as I understand, is going to take place over a period of years.

I am not going to make much of a fuss about this bill because I happen to think there are equities in the Hilton Hotel case, just as I said I thought there were proper equities in the Du Pont case. In fact, in many respects I was more sympathetic to the Du Pont case because there the divestiture came because of the court's undoing something that happened as long ago as 1920. In the Hilton case, there is not that kind of equity. On the other hand, this particular bill has the merit that it is considerably broader than the Du Pont bill and does cover a great many instances that might occur in many divestiture suits. In that respect it recommends itself in a better way than the Du Pont case did.

I think it is advisable for the Committee on Ways and Means to desist from writing this kind of special legislation, particularly when good general legislation looks like it can be written, and thus we would remove ourselves from the position of being a special forum before which these cases are tried.

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Curtis of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman states his position very well; namely, that what he prefers is broad general legislation that will eliminate this problem, which is a very definite problem. As the law now stands, it restricts the courts in their finding of whether there has been a violation of the antitrust laws because of the potential severity of the penalty resulting from the violation of the law.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin. I do think the gentleman might point out that in the attempts we have had within the committee to look at this on a broader base we have had extreme difficulty getting the Department of Justice to come to some kind of agreement as to what should be done on a general basis. They agree, generally speaking, that something should be done, but there is a constant conflict among themselves as to what should be done. I think the House should know that.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri. I think the gentleman has made an accurate statement. In fact, our difficulty in the Committee on Ways and Means was that the Department of Justice had not made up its mind. But I think it behooves our committee in this instance and the Congress in general to go ahead if they see a proper course open to them. This problem is before us. As has been emphasized by the gentleman from Louisiana, this relates to noncriminal divestiture cases. These are cases where the court has held there is a violation, but no criminal action is involved. It is simply an economic attempt to carry out the proper intent of the antitrust laws. These are, in effect, civil cases, and we are discussing an economic problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Boggs. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois, the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mason], who is the coauthor of this legislation, be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The Speaker pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. Mason. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, that the bill before the House, H.R. 8846, is good legislation. This bill does not provide tax reduction. It merely says that under narrow circumstances the sale of property and the acquisition of replacement property because of an antitrust order will not be the occasion for collecting Federal tax. The tax liability potential, so to speak, will be left precisely where it was.

The treatment provided under this bill is consistent with sound tax principles. If an investor loses his factory by fire or flood and uses his insurance proceeds to buy a new factory, the tax law does not recognize this occasion as an appropriate time to collect capital gains tax even though in a technical sense his insurance proceeds might have exceeded the cost of his first factory. He will end up in substantially the same position if he reinvests the insurance money in a new factory. The law requires that the amount of any gain which is not recognized in a situation must be subtracted from the cost of the new property in determining its basis for depreciation or for future sale so, as a longrun matter, there is no tax reduction. The question is simply when is the tax payable and it is reasonable to answer this question by trying to collect the tax when we would have collected it if there had been no fire.

This is all the present bill does. It provides this same kind of treatment that we provide for a taxpayer who lost his property due to a fire. It provides this treatment where the property that the taxpayer holds must be sold in compliance with an antitrust order and it is made applicable to future cases where the court finds that the taxpayer did not, in effect, deliberately violate the antitrust laws.

My colleagues have ample reason to know that very few people can predict the kind of decisions that will be reached in the courts. This has been very much the case in the antitrust field where the courts have done more legislating than the Congress. This is a good bill and it deserves the support of the House.

Mr. Boggs. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Brien], who is ill but who seems to be happily recovering, may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The Speaker pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. O'Brien of Illinois' remarks will appear hereafter in the Record.]

The Speaker pro tempore. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 8846, as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of dispositions of property (other than stock) pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOGGS. Surely; I would be glad to yield.

Mr. LINDSAY. If the Department of Justice was opposed to the bill in the last Congress, what were the grounds of the opposition? I noted that the gentleman stated——

Mr. BOGGS. Well, the Department of Justice also opposed the so-called Du Pont bill.

Mr. LINDSAY. That is correct.

Mr. BOGGS. We passed that bill a little earlier than this bill.

Mr. LINDSAY. If the gentleman will yield further, the reason I asked the question is that earlier the gentleman said that the Department of Justice had indicated that this bill would facilitate the antitrust laws rather than hamper them.

Mr. BOGGS. If I said that, I gave the wrong impression. I said that the former head of that Department, Mr. Bicks, in testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means, said that many judges in these civil matters—mind you, these are civil actions, and it has nothing to do with any criminal violations—are reluctant to give a decree to the Department because they say this is going to put the parties in a tax situation that they never anticipated. This really becomes an added penalty. That is what the bill really does.

Mr. LINDSAY. I understand, but I just was trying to say——

Mr. BOGGS. It is similar to the SEC and other situations. The SEC entered some decrees in my own area where they required some of the utilities to dispose of their various holdings. They did that, but there was no immediate tax impact as a result of that; not at all.

Mr. LINDSAY. The question I have is this: Can the gentleman tell us the grounds upon which the Department of Justice addressed itself in opposition to the bill?

Mr. BOGGS. They said the same thing that they said in the Du Pont situation—that they wanted to study this entire area looking toward general overall recommendations.

With all due respect to them, they can study this for a long time as you know. We take the position that the committee has studied it very carefully and has come to the conclusion that this involves equity and justice in the tax structure while at the same time fully protecting our antitrust policy. It is just that simple. There is nothing complex about it.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] asked about the Hilton Hotel——

Mr. LINDSAY. I am not arguing with the gentleman. I am just trying to find out some of the facts with respect to this matter.

Mr. BOGGS. Yes; surely.

Mr. LINDSAY. If the gentleman will yield further, I gather that there are no reports in this Congress on this matter? Were reports requested?

Mr. BOGGS. No. I will explain exactly what we did. We called up early in the session in the Ways and Means Committee all the bills that had been reported to the House of Representatives in the last session and did not become law and considered them in the committee. Most of them have already repassed by unanimous consent, but because of the fact that the gentleman from Missouri had filed a minority report and had made some observations on the floor last September, I requested that this bill be put on suspension rather than unanimous consent so that everyone could have a chance to discuss it if they wanted to do so.

Mr. LINDSAY. If the gentleman will yield further, the Treasury Department was in opposition to this bill in the last Congress. Is it safe to say that they are in opposition to this bill in this Congress?

Mr. BOGGS. As far as I know they are.

Mr. LINDSAY. What is the amount of tax money that would be lost?

Mr. BOGGS. It is a very small amount.

Mr. LINDSAY. Can the gentleman guess at how much it is?

Mr. BOGGS. We have an expression in the Committee on Ways and Means, which is "negligible," but that might not be appropriate in this instance.

Mr. LINDSAY. Could the gentleman guess at it in round figures?

Mr. BOGGS. There are only two installments I think that are covered in the Hilton situation—I would say it would be very small. But let me say this: There will probably be other cases involved so that it could amount to some millions of dollars. My answer is that this must be approved formally by the Department of Justice so as to be in accord with their antitrust policy before anything can happen along this line.

I also refer the gentleman to the report, page 3, the third paragraph, which sets forth some of the various criteria that the parties involved have to meet in order to qualify for this treatment.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. Surely.

Mr. LAIRD. So far as the retroactive provisions of the bill are concerned, are any other concerns involved?

Mr. BOGGS. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. LAIRD. It is just the Hilton Corp. that would be involved?

Mr. BOGGS. I say "not to my knowledge." I do not recall any at the moment but as you can see from the provisions it is possible.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman asked a few minutes ago unanimous consent to insert in the Record certain remarks of the various individuals with reference to the bill——

Mr. BOGGS. I meant to insert all the debate. It is very short, including the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LAIRD. I wonder if the gentleman would object to including the reports, filed with his committee, of the Treasury Department and the Justice Department.

Mr. BOGGS. I would not have any objection at all.

Mr. LAIRD. I think it would be helpful.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I include that in my unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The material follows:

Treasury Department,
Washington, September 27, 1962.

Hon. Harry F. Byrd,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This is in response to your request for this Department's views on H.R. 8846 relating to divestitures of property other than stock pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws.

H.R. 8846 would add to the Internal Revenue Code a new section 1112 which would, at election of the taxpayer, treat a sale or exchange of property, other than stock, pursuant to certain antitrust decrees as an involuntary conversion of property entitled to the nonrecognition of gain provisions of section 1033 of the code. If, therefore, as a result of an antitrust judgment, decree, or other order, property were exchanged for other property similar or related in service or use or were sold and the proceeds reinvested in such other property, gain on the sale or exchange would not be recognized. However, section 1112 would not apply if one of the principal purposes of such sale or exchange were the avoidance of Federal income tax.

Proposed section 1112 and the relating amendments are similar to the provisions contained in H.R. 8126 in the 86th Congress and are also similar in purpose to H.R. 7628 in the 85th Congress. The enactment of the latter was opposed by the Treasury Department in a report submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means on July 24, 1957. This report noted that special relief measures are objectionable in the absence of overriding considerations of general policy and the Treasury Department was unaware of any considerations which would justify any special tax relief for this type of antitrust divestiture.

In a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means dated September 14, 1961, this Department opposed the enactment of this bill. That letter cited certain technical defects in the bill which have since been removed. However, this Department also stated certain basic objections to the bill which are still applicable.

The bill would apply to the divestiture by the Hilton Hotel Corp. of certain depreciable property which it disposed of in 1956 in accordance with an antitrust divestiture decree. The sales which occurred in that case were made on the installment basis, and the bill would apply to the income which has already been received since December 31, 1960.

On February 6, 1956, the Hilton Hotel Corp. entered into a consent decree requiring the corporation to divest itself of the Jefferson Hotel in St. Louis, the Mayflower Hotel in Washington and either the Hotel Roosevelt or the Hotel New Yorker in New York City. From information submitted by representatives of the Hilton Hotel Corp. we understand that during 1955 and 1956 the corporation sold the above-mentioned hotels (including the stock of a subsidiary corporation which owns the Hotel Roosevelt). At the end of 1960, approximately 30 percent of the total consideration received from these sales remains unpaid and was represented by installment notes which will be collected periodically through the year 1966. We are informed that the Hilton Hotel Corp. sold these installment obligations in 1961, and therefore the entire amount of the gain realized on the disposition of these hotels has already been recognized.

Information made available to us by the Department of Justice on March 19, 1962, indicates that insofar as the Department of Justice is able to ascertain, none of the cases presently pending in its Antitrust Division in which divestiture is sought would result in the application of the bill. It appears, therefore, that at this time the only known application of the bill is the 1956 divestiture by the Hilton Hotel Corp.

It should be noted that the sale of the depreciable property in that case was subject to capital gains rates (and that would normally be the case with respect to a sale of business property under a divestiture decree). Hence, the gain from such a sale, under existing law, is taxed at a rate of only 25 percent. Furthermore, the sale was a 10-year installment sale subject to the installment method of reporting provided in section 453 of the code. Thus, the tax on the gain was spread out over the period during which the proceeds were received. The Department believes, therefore, that existing law provides ample relief in the case of a sale of business property under the antitrust laws.

It is true that with respect to the so-called Du Pont legislation (Public Law 87–403) this Department took the view that it did not object to that relief legislation if Congress believed that the equities of the situation justified such relief. Those equities included the protection of 800,000 stockholders of General Motors Corp. (which corporation had not been found in violation of the antitrust laws), as well as protection against an adverse impact upon the stock market generally due to the divestiture of stock acquired many years ago under circumstances which did not then appear to involve any violation of antitrust laws. An additional consideration was the antitrust advantage obtained in this case if the divestiture was achieved within 3 years, as opposed to the anticipated period of 10 years in the absence of legislation. Moreover, in the Du Pont case the relief accorded permitted what would otherwise have been ordinary income to be treated generally as capital gains, whereas in the Hilton case, as indicated above, capital gains treatment is already accorded under existing law. Finally, the Du Pont legislation, which did not confer any tax relief on the Du Pont Co. itself, was entirely prospective in application.

No equities comparable to those involved in the Du Pont case are present here. The hotels which were sold by the Hilton Hotel Corp. had been acquired by it in 1954, shortly prior to the institution of antitrust proceedings in 1955. (The requirement in the bill that there be a finding that the divestiture is required because of acts with respect to which "there was no substantial reason for believing that such acts would involve a violation of the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act" applies only to divestitures occurring after date of enactment, and does not apply to the Hilton Hotel case.) If the sale of the hotels resulted in any adverse impact on the market value of the stock of the Hilton Hotel Corp. (which is listed on the New York and Pacific Coast Stock Exchanges), presumably this impact occured in 1955 and 1956, when the hotels were sold and the tax consequences were established. Granting retroactive tax relief now would provide a windfall not only to the corporation and its shareholders generally, but particularly to those shareholders who acquired their stock since 1956. The Hilton Hotel case involves no aspect of improving the enforcement of antitrust divestiture, since the divestiture was successfully completed several years ago under the rules of existing tax law. Moreover, the Department of Justice, in its report on H.R. 8846 to the Committee on Ways and Means, stated that no useful antitrust purpose would be served by the bill.

Finally, it should be noted that the bill is retroactive not only because it changes the tax consequences of sales occurring several years ago, but also because it changes the character of payments already received by the Hilton Hotel Corp. after December 31, 1960.

For the above reasons, the Department opposes the enactment of the bill.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY S. SURREY,
Assistant Secretary.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., September 12, 1961.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to the request by the committee on September 7, 1961, for the views of the Department of Justice concerning H.R. 8846.

Essentially, H.R. 8846 provides that whenever property is sold or exchanged solely as the result of an antitrust decree, such sale or exchange shall, at the election of the taxpayer, be treated as an involuntary conversion of property within the meaning of section 1033 of the Internal Revenue Code.

H.R. 8846 is substantially the same as section 2 of H.R. 7348 which was the subject of letters from the Department to your Committee dated July 19, 1961, and August 1, 1961. H.R. 8846, however, differs from H.R. 7348 in that it applies to all property sold or exchanged as the result of an antitrust order whereas H.R. 7348 applies to property other than stock or securities. Also, the effective dates of the two bills differ. While both bills would be retroactive in application, H.R. 8846 would apply with respect to amounts received after December 31, 1960, irrespective of the time of the sale or exchange whereas H.R. 7348 would apply only with respect to sales or exchanges in taxable years ending after December 31, 1955.

The Department of Justice has carefully considered H.R. 8846 and similar proposed legislation in the light of the Hilton Hotel company divestiture. The Hilton Hotel company, under the terms of a consent decree was required to dispose of certain hotel properties which this Department concluded Hilton had acquired in violation of the Clayton Act. The sales were for a profit, the proceeds to be received on an installment basis. Applying H.R. 8846, the proceeds received by Hilton after December 31, 1960, would be treated as on an involuntary conversion of property within the meaning of section 1033 and, if these proceeds are reinvested within the provision of H.R. 8846, they will not be subject to capital gains tax. Thus, H.R. 8846, unlike many of the other bills before the committee, would apply to the corporation and not to the stockholders.

As we have indicated previously, we cannot say that general legislation along the lines of H.R. 8846 would serve any useful antitrust purpose. It may even tend to reward antitrust violators in certain cases. Accordingly, the Department does not recommend enactment of H.R. 8846.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

BYRON R. WHITE,
Deputy Attorney General.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In view of the controversy over tax reduction, tax matters of all kinds, it seems more than passing strange that there is no report from the Justice Department or the Treasury contained in the report accompanying this bill.

Mr. BOGGS. I am glad to try to clear up the gentleman's understanding, because it is not passing strange. I said just a moment ago that the committee called up all of the bills that the committee had reported out and that the House had passed which did not become law last year, and, none of the reports from the various Government agencies were included in any of those bills as we called them up. The committee does not generally ever put departmental reports in its committee reports; there was nothing strange about it because, as I have said to the gentleman from Wisconsin, as far as I am concerned, I am very happy to have these reports included right now. We always have them on the floor with us if they have been submitted.

Mr. GROSS. That scarcely helps us today when we are being called upon to vote on this bill.

Mr. BOGGS. I told the gentleman that the Departments were opposed to the bill and if the gentleman wants to oppose it that is his business. But I want to make it clear that this is not tax reduction.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 2826?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 35, noes 27.

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

HISTORIC SITES ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on August 21, 1935, the Historic Sites Act became law.

Its purpose was to designate and register historic landmarks possessing exceptional value in commemorating and illustrating the history of the United States. The responsibility for carrying out the provisions of the act rests with the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior.

Last week it was my privilege and pleasure to participate in appropriate ceremonies when the former Carlisle Indian School, now the U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pa., received this recognition. This site represents something unique in the history of the world.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the proceedings may be recorded for posterity, I ask unanimous consent to have the remarks made in connection with this event made a part of the RECORD at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The remarks are as follows:

REMARKS BY MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM F. TRAIN AT PRESENTATION CEREMONY, NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK PLAQUE AND CERTIFICATE, CARLISLE INDIAN SCHOOL, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA.

Congressman Goodling, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: as commanding general of Carlisle Barracks it affords me the greatest pleasure to welcome you to this historic Army post for the presentation of the plaque and certificate officially designating the Carlisle Indian School as a Registered National Historical Landmark.

Under the provisions of the Historic Sites Act passed by the Congress of the United States in 1935, the Secretary of the Interior was directed to make a survey of the historic sites of the United States "for the purpose of determining which possess exceptional value as commemorating or illustrating the history of the United States."

A program for the registry of such landmarks was initiated by the National Park Service some years ago, and on July 3, 1961, the commanding general of Carlisle Barracks was notified that the Carlisle Indian School had been designated as such a site.

We are here today for the presentation of the plaque and certificate officially marking this designation.

As you are all aware, this post is one of the oldest active Army installations in the Nation, with a history going back to the year 1757 when Colonel Stanwix, and a reinforced battalion of the Royal American Regiment, first established a camp just northeast of the town of Carlisle at the site of what is now Carlisle Barracks.

In the years since this first occupancy, Carlisle Barracks has served the Nation well, in both peace and war, beginning with the French and Indian Wars, the American Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, World War II, and now in the so-called cold war.

The post is particularly notable as having been the home at one time or another of almost every branch school in the Army.

This educational role was climaxed by the location here in 1951 of the reestablished Army War College.

But Carlisle Barracks is equally proud of another educational chapter in its history of service to the Nation—namely, the 39-year period from 1879 until 1918 when it served as the home of the Indian Industrial School, commonly referred to as the Carlisle Indian School.

The inspiration for the establishment of the school came from Lt. Richard H. Pratt, who believed the only solution to the Indian problem was to sever his tribal connection by teaching him to speak, act, and think like a civilized man.

As superintendent of the Indian School at Carlisle Barracks for 25 years, from its founding in 1879 until 1904, Lieutenant Pratt, later General Pratt, raised the school to a level of eminence for which it acquired a just measure of fame.

The registering of the Carlisle Indian School as a national historic landmark gives due recognition to the important role of the school and this site in the cultural history of the United States.

One of the objectives of the Army's historical program is to insure that, where eligible, all historic landmarks at active Army installations are designated as such.

It is with the greatest pleasure, therefore, that we serve as host to what is in truth a community gathering.

For we have with us on the platform and in the audience, many individuals and representatives of many organizations who have demonstrated through the years, by both word and deed, their own profound interest in the history of this area generally, including the notable chapter provided by the Indian School.

We are particularly pleased that you could be with us.

One of those who has shown a special interest in the event we commemorate today is the distinguished Congressman from the 19th District of Pennsylvania.

He contributed greatly toward the attainment of the designation of the Carlisle Indian School as a registered national historic landmark, and we are honored that he has been able to take time from his very busy schedule to be here today.

I am very happy to be able to introduce the Honorable GEORGE A. GOODLING.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN GOODLING AT DEDICATION OF CARLISLE BARRACKS AS NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK, THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 1963

General Train has made an excellent statement concerning this historic site and has pointed out the long and glorious history the Army has had here. This site stands for something unique in the history of the world. When our country was first settled there were differences between the Indians and ourselves. It was the Army that went out to fight. The Army and the Indian fought each other during the formative years of our country's history, and yet today we remember this site as a symbol of the Army reaching out to help these people whom it once fought. Among those interested in helping the Indian was General Pratt, founder of Carlisle Indian School. General Pratt was a very interesting person with a distinguished military career. At the outbreak of the Civil War he enlisted in the 9th Indiana Infantry and served until 1865. Receiving a commission in the Regular Army during 1867, he served against the Cheyenne, Comanche, and Kiowa Indians. During his 8 years of fighting the Indians, General Pratt was a commander of Indian scouts. This provided him with an excellent insight into their mind and character. During his service career General Pratt was placed in charge of some Indian prisoners of war being held at St. Augustine, Fla. These prisoners were some of the most savage of all Indian warriors, yet within months they were attending school and making and selling curios under General Pratt's instructions. Here was a man who recently had been fighting these selfsame people, yet now his faith in them is almost incredible.

A very interesting story is told about the general and his Indian prisoners. While he was in charge of the prisoners, he requested permission for them to guard themselves. The reaction of his superiors was not favorable. However, he managed to convince everyone that these Indian prisoners should indeed be allowed to guard themselves and they were issued weapons. This took place only 4 months after these warriors had arrived at St. Augustine. So General Pratt armed them and they provided their own 24-hour-a-day guard.

After his experiences with the Indian prisoners, their ability to work, and in fact their happiness at being given work and opportunities to learn, the school idea was conceived by General Pratt. He felt that the future of the American Indian lay in the education of his young. Consequently, a long drawn-out campaign was begun with the War Department and anyone else who would listen, requesting space, materials, staff, and other things necessary to or organize a school for Indian children.

In 1879, General Hancock, in command of the Department of the East, approved a request by General Pratt to use Carlisle Barracks as an Indian school. Subsequently, the Congress passed an act approved July 31, 1882, authorizing the use of vacant posts and barracks for Indian schools, "so long as they may not be required for military occupation." Under this law, of course, the military could request return of any installation needed at some future date. This then was the genesis of the Carlisle Indian School. What was once a cluster of buildings used as an ordnance base by the Continental Army during the Revolutionary War and later as a cavalry barracks, is now to become a school to educate those we fought.

To say this was a startling innovation, would be stating it mildly. The destruction of Custer's command had not been forgotten. Chief Joseph's retreat was even more recent, yet they came to learn.

The first to arrive were Sioux, coming with long hair, painted faces, their bodies wrapped in decorated blankets. One can imagine the sensation caused by the influx of strange people into a quiet and peaceful community.

The school was organized with two large farms and shops where courses in engineering, blacksmithing, painting, masonry, carpentry, printing, domestic sciences, nursing, and home econmics were taught. A very unusual program referred to as "outings," was used quite effectively. This program placed Indian students in non-Indian homes where they worked for their keep and lived as a member of the family, sometimes simply attending the local public school along with the other children of the family. This was excellent for the Indian, giving him an opportunity to really learn all about the white man's culture by living with him. In addition, it helped cement the relationship between Indian and non-Indian by letting the white man have the opportunity to live with and understand the Indian. This could well have been the inspiration for current student exchange programs.

It was quite natural for the Indians, being out-of-doors people, to participate and excel in sports. For many years Carlisle had one of the greatest football teams in the country and furnished several competitors to the Olympic games. The Carlisle students were not only excellent at sports but they had an enviable record for clean sportsmanship and gentlemanly conduct. Jim Thorpe of this school was the prime example of this. Considered by many as one of the world's greatest all-round athletes, Charles "Big Chief" Bender was another outstanding graduate. He was the leading pitcher of the American League in 1910–11 and later in 1914. After his playing career he became the coach at the U.S. Naval Academy.

One cannot do justice to all, but Alex Arcasa was among the best. When he was not running with the ball he was throwing terrific blocks for Jim Thorpe. I would be most inconsiderate if I did not pay tribute to one of the greatest coaches who ever lived. To Glenn "Pop" Warner goes the credit of molding what was probably the rawest group of rookies ever assembled on one field into some of the greatest teams of all time.

In 1918 the Army needed this location for a hospital and the school was closed. Actually it did not do a disservice to the Indian, since many of the students had joined the services, enrollment was low, and it had served its purpose. This school had been and still is the guiding light in Indian education.

Now the U.S. Park Service has declared the Carlisle Indian School a national historical landmark. It is a landmark that will forever point out the joining of our two cultures in settling this great country. A landmark that will remind us that here was a pioneer of a school system unique in our country and the world. This is a truly historic location, not only in its traditions and memories but because it was the laboratory that provided our Indians with the possibility of demonstrating their capabilities. It is also a landmark which reminds us that a man who dedicated his life to our Armed Forces, fought in many battles, yet still maintained his humanitarian attitudes and led our enemy to peace.

General Train, I congratulate you, your staff, and all who serve here for the recognition this installation receives today. One year ago similar recognition came to parts of another outstanding institution in this area, Dickinson College.

What we do here today is further evidence of the bond between two races, as represented by the Carlisle Indian School.

REMARKS BY FRANK E. MASTLAND, JR., MEMBER, ADVISORY BOARD, NATIONAL PARKS, HISTORICAL SITES, BUILDINGS, AND MONUMENTS, AT PRESENTATION CEREMONY, NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK PLAQUE AND CERTIFICATION, CARLISLE BARRACKS, MARCH 14, 1963

I count it a signal honor to participate in this ceremony. As a citizen proud of historic Carlisle and as a longtime member and Chairman of the National Park Service Advisory Board, I find it doubly pleasing to take part in the designation of the old Carlisle Indian School as a registered national historic landmark. There are other reasons for my gratification that this honor is mine. They are significant only to me but on me they left a lasting imprint. I refer to those Indian massacres in which I participated as a youth. Each week we members of the Dickinson football team scrimmaged with the Indians. Those were friendly occasions. Once each year we played them for keeps. Those occasions were not exactly friendly. Memory, however, is a wonderful thing. I have forgotten all the gory details of those massacres and recall only the friendships that developed during the other 51 weeks in the year. Since then my semiannual extended visits with the Navajos on their reservation have resulted in the development of many friendships and of increasing respect for those whom I first learned to admire here on the field of battle.

But it was different in the days following the Civil War. Then, like an unwelcome weed in a thriving garden, the Indian was regarded as a bothersome individual in a growing America. Indeed, to many he was a pesky red man, the only good Indian a dead Indian. There were a few compassionate people, however, who, recognizing wrongs committed and experiencing remorse, felt an obligation to aid the Indian, to help him adjust to the new world so suddenly forced upon him.

Brig. Gen. Richard H. Pratt ranks as an understanding and benign friend of the Indians. He had fought against the redskin warriors in the West but around 1875 he became involved in an effort to educate an Indian prisoner. This undertaking led him into his life's work. With a vision that went beyond just teaching Army captives, Pratt conceived of a school for Indians, one that would not be on a reservation. He requested and gained permission to use the barracks at Carlisle and there established the first nonreservation Federal Indian school.

With Pratt leading them, the initial Indian students arrived at the Carlisle Barracks on October 6, 1879. What a strange sight it must have been when 82 Sioux entered this onetime frontier town, especially since the Indians wore their tribal regalia. Three years later Congress formally authorized the school, which tradition-breaking institution continued to train Indians until 1918. General Pratt remained the head of the school for 25 years, shepherding some 5,000 Indian boys and girls through it by the time of his retirement in 1904.

The students left the Carlisle Indian School much better equipped to exist in an alien culture. That was Pratt's aim. Many Indians first had to learn English, but when they had they could then be given academic and vocational training. Ultimately, the student's education could include the first 2 years of high school and some teacher training; a goodly number went on to college.

Pratt's school and its methods did not escape criticism. Individuals, both within the Federal Government and without, decried his work, but there is no doubt that the school remained a noble chapter in American relations with the Indians.

As we all know, the students excelled in athletics. The school's team forged amazing triumphs, humbling many larger, richer and better known institutions. To this day Jim Thorpe's feats excite universal admiration. Prodigious athletic achievements have preserved a memory on the part of many who have never realized the deeper meaning of the Carlisle Indian school.

Several buildings at the Carlisle barracks are tangible reminders of the school. The commandant of the Army War College lives in the house occupied by Pratt. It dates from 1821. The structure was the only building on the post to escape destruction when the Confederates set every other building to the torch during the Gettysburg campaign of 1863. Thorpe Hall, erected with money raised by pupils of the school and private contributions, remains a gymnasium. The Coren apartment, built in 1863, served as a girls dormitory. Armstrong Hall, quarters No. 2, and Washington Hall are also inheritances from the Indian school.

These buildings testify to the exceptional nature and historical importance of the Carlisle Indian School. Like the mute stones of a fallen Greek temple, they help us to recall a meaningful moment in history.

Since 1957 the National Park Service has been conducting the national survey of historic sites and buildings, seeking to identify the exceptionally valuable survivals of our past that merit the Nation's recognition. Historians, archeologists and architects are combining their efforts to study America's prehistory and history, carefully investigating literally thousands of sites and buildings in order to determine which of them deserve national recognition. As the survey progresses, its findings will be published. The service expects that published volumes will be useful and interesting to the ever-increasing ranks of those citizens whose appreciation directly or indirectly helps to preserve our historical heritage.

The establishment of a registry of national historic landmarks is another prime objective of the national survey of historic sites and buildings. With the aid of a consulting committee of specialists, and wth the guidance of its National Advisory Board, the National Park Service and the Secretary of the Interior carefully select historic sites of exceptional value for this registry. By means of the registry, the Federal Government formally recognizes the outstanding significance of certain historic sites and buildings by the issuance of an official certificate and, if desired, a bronze plaque. Such notable historic sites as the Maryland Statehouse in Annapolis, where Gen. George Washington surrendered his commission after the American Revolution; Nassau Hall, at Princeton University, in which building the Second Continental Congress met, Faneuil Hall; in Boston, where patriots stimulated revolt against British tyranny have either been or soon will be issued certificates as registered national historic landmarks. The plaque and certificate, we hope, will help to create a tie between the owners of registered national historic landmarks and the National Park Service. "All our past acclaims our future" and it is hoped that all our efforts to honor the past will complement each other as we move into the future.

Those sites and buildings already on the register of national historic landmarks are joined by a worthy companion today. No one can deny the significance of the Carlisle Indian School and of the part it played in the development of a national awareness of universal brotherhood. It was an early indication of a budding sense of responsibility for the welfare of our fellow man. It was a great step forward in the field of racial relations. It was a practical effort to rectify a wrong.

General Train, on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, and the Director of the National Park Service, Conrad L. Wirth, I am happy to present to you the bronze plaque that commemorates the occasion and this certificate which reads: "The Carlisle Indian School of Pennsylvania is hereby designated a registered national historic landmark under the provision of the Historic Sites Act, August 21, 1935. This site possesses exceptional value in commemorating and illustrating the history of the United States of America."

General Train's Closing Remarks

It is with a deep sense of personal satisfaction and pride that I accept this plaque and certificate on behalf of Carlisle Barracks and the U.S. Army.

While no final determination has been made as to the most suitable location for mounting this plaque and displaying the certificate, we receive this marker and official registration in trust to commemorate the location of the Carlisle Indian School at this installation.

It is our hope that in time it will be possible to provide here at Carlisle Barracks an appropriate facility for a museum to preserve and display mementos and memorabilia of the Indian Industrial School.

This plaque and this certificate support this objective.

This concludes our presentation ceremony, and I want to thank all of you for being here today.

We are honored by your presence and hope that this occasion will long live in your memory.

I will ask Chaplain Malanowski to give the benediction.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA—THEIR JOINT TASKS IN A CHANGING ERA

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, March 16, I was privileged to address a convention of the Liberal Party International at Baden-Baden, Germany. Attending the conference were representatives of the Liberal Parties of Great Britain and Canada, the Venstre Party of Denmark, the Free Democratic Party of the Federal Republic of Germany, and of other liberal parties from some 10 European countries. A partial text of my remarks, "Europe and North America—Their Joint Tasks in a Changing Era," follows:

Although American liberals and European liberals share a name, the name sometimes means somewhat different things. In full awareness of the difference, I am nonetheless delighted to be with you on this occasion and to share in the continuing search for political wisdom represented by this Congress. For the truth is that while our two kinds of liberalism have diverged dramatically in the past on domestic issues, American liberals and European liberals think alike internationally.

One example will suffice. In the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration, the principal legislative achievement of the New Frontier was the trade bill authorizing the United States to negotiate tariffs downward, and, in unfortunately rather special circumstances, to negotiate some of them all the way down to zero. Liberal American thought was therefore concentrated on free trade—the same free trade that is one of the pillars of Adam Smith's classical liberal economics. This new American enthusiasm for free trade reminds me of Mark Twain and his father. At 16, you will recall, Mark Twain was certain his father had no idea what made the world go round. At 21, he reported, he was amazed at how much the old man had learned in 5 years. Well, we Americans are amazed at how much you Europeans have learned in the last 5 years.

Right now, on the edge of spring 1963, is an urgent time for liberals to talk together. For during this last winter it has become clear that cooperation between the United States and Europe to provide for each other's security and economic advancement, as parts of the free world community, can no longer be taken for granted.

The Common Market shows a tendency to make the Six not a pattern for the future for all free nations, but rather a protected area from which the partners turn self-satisfied and indifferent faces to the world. More dramatically, President de Gaulle has for the time being vetoed the entry of the United Kingdom into the Common Market.

Worst of all, at just this moment, the forces leading the free world toward greater unity seem to have lost their momentum. Disillusion has led many to consider again the wisdom of cultivating their own gardens.

Bearing in mind that I am in no sense a spokesman of the Government of the United States, I shall talk about three aspects of this crisis:

1. What the goals of free world liberals ought to be;

2. The nature of current threats to those goals; and

3. How such threats can be met.

Our goal is and must be nothing less than a free world community of both the industrialized and the developing nations, dedicated to economic and social progress, to human welfare and happiness. In that community, the industrialized countries—Western Europe, the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Australia, Japan and perhaps others—will join their efforts to bring about full employment and rapid growth in each of them, to remove trade barriers between themselves and with the developing countries, and to create a mechanism of international exchange and payments which will avoid crises and permit each country to pursue policies leading to full employment. As partners in progress, the developing countries will find in the industrialized countries growing export markets and an energizing source of public and private capital.

The readiness of my country to devote itself to this goal was stated very clearly last July 4 by President Kennedy. Speaking in Philadelphia, the city where the American Declaration of Independence was signed almost two centuries ago, he announced that the United States is now ready to subscribe to a new "declaration of interdependence."

The President described the massive power for good that can flow from a partnership between Europe and America in the building of the free world community. He said:

"We can assist the developing nations to throw off the yoke of poverty. We can balance our worldwide trade and payments at the highest possible level of growth. We can mount a deterrent powerful enough to prevent all aggression. And ultimately we can help achieve a world of law and free choice, banishing the world of war and coercion.

"For the partnership * * * would not look inward only, preoccupied with its own welfare and advancement. It would look outward to cooperation with all nations in meeting their common concerns. It would serve as a nucleus for the eventual union of all free men—those who are now free and those who vow some day to be free."

Europe and America, by themselves, do not make a world. A free world community is the only policy compatible with the two great revolutions of this century. I speak of the revolution in human communications, and of the revolution of rising expectations of the developing nations.

We have made enormous advances in the transmission of information and in the transportation of people and goods. We have so tied the world together that it is no longer necessary or reasonable to divide it according to groupings largely based on geography. The telestar satellite, which has already permitted direct television transmissions between our continents, and the space vehicles orbiting the earth, are harbingers of even more spectacular advances. We can fly from Frankfurt to New York to New Delhi by jet in not much longer than the time needed to drive a few hundred miles. So we must expand our view and our world relationships. Europe, in short, is no longer a unit of the world isolated by geography.

Then there is the second revolution. It used to be that the way to talk to Asia or Africa or the Middle East was through London or Paris or Brussels. Now one deals directly.

Another aspect of this revolution is the determination of the developing peoples to make progress. They just don't believe that poverty is inevitable. And so the poor of the free world cause trouble for the rich, and demand attention.

For all these reasons, the scope of the community with which we must concern ourselves is as broad as the free world. It cannot be confined to just Europe, or just the United States, or just the Atlantic Powers. What about Australia, or even just the West (what about Japan)?

America, in its pursuit of the goal of a free world community, has placed much emphasis on its relations with Europe. At first, this was fully justified.

After the war, the United States devoted its efforts to the rebuilding of Europe. We invented the Marshall plan to help Europe to its feet. At the same time, we encouraged the formation of European regional institutions: the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the Council of Europe, the Coal-Steel Community, Euratom. All of these continental institutions achieved their logical development in the Common Market of France, Italy, Germany, and the Benelux countries.

Seen in the immediate postwar period, the evolution of the Common Market is wholly good. Against the historical background of three great wars across the Rhine, the Common Market helped to bind together France and Germany. The new arrangement opened mass markets to the participating countries and gave each of them the spur of competition.

In this same postwar period, the United States also took steps to insure that the enterprise developing in Europe was not a parochial one, but one aimed at a community of free peoples all over the world. In 1945, the conference at Bretton Woods saw the foundation laid for a universal monetary order. In 1948, again at American initiative, the nations of the free world established the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the GATT which provies the multilateral tariff-cutting procedures vital to free world unity. Then, in the early 1950's, the United States extended the benefits of the Marshall plan to the developing peoples of the free world through the point 4 program. In that same period, too, the United States and other industrialized countries for the first time adopted national policies of full employment.

Now we face serious threats to the realization of a free-world community. These threats stem, I believe from a continuation in one-sided concentration on the organization of Europe—by both Europeans and Americans—long after the time in which it was justified. The threats stem from a confusion of ends and means.

Against the hopeful background of postwar cooperation, for Americans and Europeans alike, General De Gaulle's veto of the British entry into the Common Market fell like a thunderbolt from a blue sky. If we had looked hard, however, we would have seen that the sky was not so blue. Clouds of particularism, and especially of European particularism, have been gathering for some years. The French veto is by no means an isolated sign of that particularism. The French leader has also expressed a fervent desire for an independent nuclear striking force, despite the additional risk to the peace of the world, despite the huge investment such a force entails.

The six of the Common Market has grown increasingly protectionist. As the Common Market steadily approaches its own goal of a completely free exchange within the market, its tariff walls against the outside world become increasingly formidable, increasingly less likely to be dismantled by the will of its members. The very success of the Common Market imperils one larger goal of free world community.

If these protectionist tendencies in the Common Market countries continue unchecked, we Americans know too well where they will lead. We know because we have been there. They lead to isolationism, and we have been there. In the twenties, following World War I, we Americans, behind a similar wall of protectionism, deluded ourselves that we had opted out of the community of mankind. We thought that we could raise our tariffs at just the time when the free world needed freer trade.

We soon found out that our resignation from the human race had not been accepted.

These protectionist tendencies lead also to recession and we have, all of us, been there.

If the Common Market continues on its present, protectionist course, and if the other nations of Europe and the New World do nothing, it is easy to predict we shall all be there again.

This need not happen. What is called for above all else is to sort out again in our own minds what are ends and what are means. As I have pointed out, it is clear that the Common Market was first conceived as a step along the road to a free world community. If, as I believe, much of our trouble today comes from general acceptance of the halfway house of the Common Market as our journey's end, it is a mistake readily corrected.

The Common Market is precisely such a halfway house. Since the free world itself is endangered by the exclusiveness of the Common Market, clearly the Common Market must be deemphasized. It must be replaced as the center of our thought and attention by the original, wider goal of a free world community. In this, I emphasize, there is more than ample scope for a vital, expanding, outward-looking Europe.

The task for America and Europe, and particularly for liberals on both continents, is to direct our policies and efforts once again toward our real goal. What then are the specific actions that are needed?

In trade, the United States must take the lead in bargaining down tariffs on a multilateral most-favored-nation basis, for the benefit of the whole free world. As a starter, I hope that my country will rather promptly amend the dominant-supplier clause of President Kennedy's Trade Expansion Act, thus permitting down-to-zero bargaining on a wide range of industrial products even though the United Kingdom is not in the Common Market. Under the existing law, the President of the United States is authorized to bargain tariffs down to zero on only two items, margarine and aircraft.

In the last session of Congress, Senator Paul Douglas and I jointly introduced an amendment to allow zero bargaining on some 26 major categories of goods regardless of the fate of Britain's application. It did not appear in the legislation as passed into law. Senator Douglas and I have reintroduced our amendment. The Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress only this week strongly urged its enactment.

Moreover, negotiations for freer trade should come sooner rather than later. I would be less than frank if I did not acknowledge that some Americans became so bemused with the idea of Britain's entry into the Common Market that they have not yet really recovered from the shock of the Gaullist rejection. They propose, vaguely, that all negotiations be put off until 1964, when presumably the position of Britain will have been clarified. Again I can promise you my personal participation in the fight for immediate tariff-eliminating negotiations. And I feel confident that more Members of the American Congress will share my views now that the rejection of Britain has left the widely hailed Trade Expansion Act of 1962 largely a collection of conditional clauses.

Under the GATT, an America bargaining with the Common Market countries under the most-favored-nation procedure will help all the rest of the free world, especially the developing nations which need outlets for their manufactured products. The other five countries of the Common Market must make an all-out effort to bring France into agreement with this course.

Next, in the field of full employment, both the United Kingdom and the United States have lagged far behind the standard the West has wisely set for itself. One reason for this lag is clear enough, at least in America. The fear is that expansion at home will damsge our currency abroad. But the answer to that fear is available, too, in recent history. What is needed is an international agreement akin to the European payments union of the last decade. Through such an instrument, our currencies would be protected abroad; and the corresponding relaxation at home would permit the effective pursuit of full employment policies.

The whole field of aid to the developing countries needs joint review and new efforts by the industrialized countries. To date there has been much too little coordination and continuity. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development has made a beginning in the necessary coordination of all our foreign-aid efforts. This good beginning needs to be followed up thoroughly.

Clearly, at this moment, in trade and aid, in international payments and in our mutual defense, there is much that needs discussion and change. I suggest that what we need is a free world summit meeting to commence action in all these areas. Ministers concerned with technical problems are not likely to think very big. What is needed is people like Macmillan and Adenauer and Kennedy and Fanfani and the others—including De Gaulle, if he wants to come.

Only in steadfast devotion to the overall goal of a free-world community can we nations of the free world avoid shaking ourselves apart over momentary but severe problems such as who can join the Common Market, and when; such as who shall have nuclear weapons, and under what conditions. As the focus shifts to the free-world community, the U.S. nuclear deterrent will perhaps again be viewed as the free world's deterrent, as it has been and is in fact. It is the spirit of a new self-assertive nationalism, a new inward-looking European parochialism that looks to new national and European nuclear forces, reckless of the dangers and the cost. It is the same mischievous spirit in economics that rejects the opportunities that the creation of a free-world community offers.

In this winter now ending, I need not remind you, we saw our unity suddenly in jeopardy on questions of nuclear weapons and membership in the Common Market. Other hard problems that will test us lie ahead. If we are not fortified with strong attachment to joint goals, we shall be unable to meet the challenge.

The advance toward the free world community that I urge as the proper concern of liberals need not be manifested initially in any new governmental structures of organizations or in any subordination of the sovereignties of the member countries. Existing political machinery—like the GATT for trade, the International Monetary Fund for payments, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development for growth and aid—can do the job for a long time to come.

Indeed, more elaborate political machinery might do more harm than good. Far better, let parliamentarians—not just ministers—from the industrial countries of the free world meet from time to time to debate trade or payments or growth or aid. This would give to these free-world leaders the opportunity to think and speak in a larger frame than that of their normal activities. Thinking of my own country, I can testify that the former State legislator who comes to Washington is privileged not least in the vision of the whole American reality he can have as a Member of Congress. The same experience can take place on the level of the whole free world.

But the pattern of development of these meetings of legislators should not be predetermined. Instead, supranational political institutions should be allowed to evolve from progress in economic and social cooperation.

Right now is the time for America and Europe to get back upon the road to a free world community. We need to stop crying the blues over the rejection of Britain by the Common Market.

To speak candidly, much of the Europe that is the Common Market is ruled by old men, endlessly reluctant to transfer their power to the next generation. When that transfer is made, conditions are bound to be confused. It would be well if the path of future world cooperation is clearly laid out while the present stability endures, for there is a predictable term set upon that stability by life itself.

There is another reason why we should act now to form a free world community, rather than dawdle for decades. The vision of a world community that has most insistently been offered the developing world in the past decade is not that of a free world community. It is, instead, the apocalyptic vision of one Communist world. Right now, we see before us signs of deep disagreement between the Russian and the Chinese Communist centers of power. We shall prove ourselves unworthy if we fail to take advantage of the opportunity presented by the cracking of the Russo-Chinese monolith. Now is the time for our side to erect the standard of a world community based on freedom and dedicated to joint action in aid and trade and payments and growth.

How can the people of the free industrialized nations be persuaded to support a renewed, revitalized program for the community of the free world? Such a program can win the support it needs because the industrial nations involved are democracies. The citizens of 20th century democracies are receptive to programs in which the interdependence of domestic policy and foreign policy is clear and apparent. This political principle has been demonstrated in the United States in the almost universal support given the Peace Corps, with its unexpected but logical coupling of foreign aid with a remedy for the problem of youthful apathy at home; and in the same broad support given the Trade Expansion Act, with its linking of trade abroad and the problem of lagging growth at home.

Similarly, the concept of a free world community would have its charms for the voters of the industrialized democracies. They would, I believe, be able to see the connection between a joint effort for aid and trade and payments and growth abroad, and activity at home which could bring the pleasures of prosperity and the blessings of peace.

A final word on the task of persuasion: I can think of no task more noble to engage, for the years ahead, the energies of persons and parties everywhere who call themselves liberal—that ancient name which means above all "free"—than the task of directing men's vision toward the world community of the free.

THIRD REPORT TO THE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE BY ITS COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR TESING

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

• Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Conference Committee on Nuclear Testing continues to monitor developments in its jurisdiction. Based on recent testimony to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Nuclear Testing Committee has issued its third report as follows:

THIRD REPORT TO THE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE BY ITS COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR TESTING

Your committee has carefully examined testimony on technical and other aspects of the nuclear test ban problem heard by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy during the period March 5–11, 1963. Witnesses include Defense Department scientists and representatives of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Based on their testimony, we submit to you our third report.

I

The administration is drafting and proposes to offer the Soviet Union a revised test ban treaty proposal in the very near future. A portion of the terms of the new draft were revealed, including the following features of special interest:

1. Detection of underground events: Primary reliance will be on a network of seismic stations operated outside the U.S.S.R., principally by the United States and Britain. Hopefully the system will be backed up by: (a) data furnished by the Soviets from their own seismic stations; and, (b) information gathered by three to seven unmanned, "black box" seismic stations inside the Iron Curtain.

2. Identification of underground events: The seismic network will be expected to identify from ordinary earthquakes such suspicious earth tremors as would become candidates for onsite inspection. Some 400 such earthquakes occur annually in the U.S.S.R. These are shocks producing early signals "equivalent to a 3 kiloton or larger underground explosion in alluvium formations." Some number of underground manifestations of lesser magnitude may be detected, but capability to identify them as possible cheat test rather than earthquakes will be essentially zero.

3. Location of suspicious underground events: The network also will be depended upon to supply seismic data of sufficient discrimination to locate any suspicious events requiring onsite inspection within an area smaller than 200 square miles.

4. Onsite inspections: Not more than seven onsite inspections will be permitted per year of the Soviet Union's entire 8½ million square miles. These will be subject to the following conditions and limitations: (a) readings from at least four different stations must be produced which have detected the event, identified it as a possible, and firmly located it within a radius of less than 10 miles; (b) areas subject to onsite inspection shall be elliptical in form and total not more than approximately 193 square miles in size; (c) locations specified by the U.S.S.R. as military areas shall be totally excluded from the onsite inspection privilege; and (d) inspections parties shall be limited in size to approximately 14 people, of whom not more than 10 may be American or British, the remainder being neutrals.

II

The administration's witnesses argued that the above-described verification system will, in fact, deter the Soviets from cheat testing to develop nuclear weapons which could affect the military balance between communism and the West.

Whenever questions by Joint Committee members cast practical doubts on the system's alleged capability to deter, the witnesses consistently took refuge in secrecy. They hinted the United States has, or will have, classified seismic stations which cannot be discussed publicly and inferred these would back up the unclassified ones, and together they would safely deter cheating.

On the final day of the hearings, the classified station roadblock was bypassed by a line of technical questioning disclosing the inherent physical limitations on any seismic stations, classified or unclassified, to spot cheating when a cheater goes about it intelligently.

These limitations on detection, identification, and location capabilities of all seismic stations are imposed by the background noise present everywhere in the earth. Its effect on seismographs is like static on radios—signals must be considerably stronger than the background noise, otherwise they are drowned out.

Under questioning, the scientists admitted detection and location of underground

events require signals at least twice the size of this seismic background noise. Before one can begin to identify, or distinguish underground explosions from earthquakes, the scientists admitted signals 10 to 20 times the background noise must be recorded.

With these admissions on public record, the scientists next were questioned about the actual size of seismic signals created by underground cheat shots of 3-kiloton yield equivalents and smaller. At the distances from the Soviet Union which we can install seismic stations, these turn out to be so small they are not subject to verification at all.

This testimony makes it unnecessary for this report to discuss the doubts and weaknesses of the administration's verification scheme against sneak tests large enough to be spotted—because it reveals an area of undetectable cheating—a big hole in the new treaty draft—through which the Russians clandestinely can prepare a nuclear Pearl Harbor without any fear whatever of being caught.

III

The big hole

The big hole is simply underground tests far enough inside Soviet borders to produce seismic signals outside those borders smaller in size that the 3-kiloton seismic signal threshold of nondetectability.

This can be done either by limiting actual explosions to less than 3 kilotons, or, if larger ones are desired, firing them in an underground cavity. This "decouples" blast from surrounding earth, thereby shrinking the size of the earth signal to a level below the threshold.

Tests under these conditions—just 620 miles (1,000 km.)—inside the Soviet border cannot be detected outside the Iron Curtain. By the time signals reach the Iron Curtain, they are small enough to be drowned out by the earth's normal seismic background noise. If by chance detection should occur, the impossible job of identifying suspicious events among thousands of small earthquake signals of comparable size still will hide the cheater inside the big hole.

IV

Now, what kind of clandestine weapon development can be carried on in the big hole with no risk of getting caught?

The AEC's Director of Military Applications, Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, told the Joint Committee exactly what secret nuclear weapons can be developed surreptitiously in the undetectable big hole. These are: (1) All tactical nuclear weapons of interest to the military; and (2) a "substantial fraction" of strategic nuclear weapons of interest to the military.

Left out of the big hole is only the meager "unsubstantial fraction" of strategic weapons which cannot be scaled up from low-yield underground cheating. These are the superyield H-bombs the Soviets already have developed anyway.

Inside the big hole is the entire remaining broad spectrum of nuclear weapons—including even the pure fusion neutron bomb.

As an indication of the spectrum of developments "of interest to the military," Betts said "approximately one-half" of all U.S. underground tests in Nevada—even without any need to mask detection—are made precisely in this low-yield range of undetectability.

V

If President Kennedy carries out his intention to offer the Russians the new treaty draft with its big hole it will be tantamount to offering to stop all significant U.S. nuclear weapons developments and, as a practical matter, simply trust the Soviets to keep their promise to do likewise.

Up to the present moment our Nation has distrusted Communist promises sufficiently to spend over 50 million defense dollars a year to forestall communism's aggressive design for world domination.

Yet the President of the United States now is on the verge of trusting a Communist promise not to develop secretly a superior nuclear weapon's arsenal for use, on some future day, to back up a brutal "surrender or die" ultimatum to complete that grand design.

The President's fuzzy-thinking disarmament advisers tell him this "sign now—pay later in blood" treaty draft is "less risky" than no treaty at all. This they tell him notwithstanding the prospect that the delayed payment well may be fulfillment of Khrushchev's promise "to bury" us.

VI

The danger point of no return in the Geneva negotiations is swiftly approaching.

If an enforceable test-ban treaty would—and this is quite possible—help evolve a less risky world than the one in which we now exist, why must Mr. Kennedy throw away the chance to achieve an enforceable treaty by offering any unenforceable treaty—one with a big hole in it?

We respectfully urge the President to shake off his fuzzy-thinking advisors—to regain the initiative at Geneva—to preserve the opportunity to conclude an enforceable test-ban treaty.

Specifically respecting the upcoming new treaty draft your committee strongly recommends provision be added for the following: Fully manned seismic detection stations inside the Soviet Union in sufficient numbers and at all locations required to close the big hole.

When this is done then, and then only, will it become less than academic to review the adequacy or inadequacy of the proposed treaty draft's other provisions supposed to deter cheating by the Communists.

CRAIG HOSMER,
Chairman.
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
WILLIAM E. MILLER,
MELVIN R. LAIRD,
CHARLES E. GOODELL,

Ex officio:

CHARLES A. HALLECK.
JOHN W. BYRNES.
GERALD R. FORD.

A UNITED NATIONS FISH STORY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, for the last several weeks I have been fishing into the murky mysteries of the United Nations Special Fund. May I say that I have found an ocean of confusion despite a firm hand at the helm.

The confusion has developed faster and faster as my angling into the operation of the Special Fund has continued, and the particular confusion about which I advise the House today is over and above the amazing contributions to Communist nations by this Fund about which I have talked here at length—this Fund the American taxpayers subsidize 40 percent.

Throughout my investigation of the Special Fund I have been spontaneously assured by various United Nations officials that—contrary to popular opinion—the United States of America has, indeed, received aid from the United Nations. In each case the officials cited aid that is said to have involved a Chinese expert who counseled American rice farmers on how to grow fish in their paddies.

But details about this piscatorial paddy project—when, where, how much—have been few and far between. Neither the U.N. nor the American executive branch has adequately explained it.

My colleagues, I find that the submerged truth of the matter is that the United States in fact paid the Chinese expert for his services.

Is that not a wonderful way to get aid? Just pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, I have addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Interior asking him to provide the Congress immediately with the amount of the salary American taxpayers paid this Chinese expert. The project apparently was carried out at the request of and under the direction of that Department's Fish and Wildlife Service.

Whether the Chinese expert's advice was worth it we cannot yet say, since we do not know where his project is and since we do not know what we paid for this U.N. aid. As a sample of the advice he rendered, I can offer the following:

> In their wild state they (the fish in the rice paddies) only spawn when they are happy. Our problem is how to make them happy in captivity. We might have to feed them special vitamins, make sure they get their calories and even give them hormone injections to make them more peppy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point at issue here is not the merit of this fish-and-rice project, be the fish happy or sad; nor is the point the merit of the United Nations as an organization.

The point is that news management knows no national boundary. News management flourishes also in international pastures, and apparently in the best of fishing circles.

The point is that U.N. officials have knowingly told fuzzy half-truths in an attempt to reassure the American taxpayers who, although burdened with a deficit budget of their own, pay heavily to the United Nations to keep it financially solvent.

My colleagues, it is for the American taxpayers to decide how heavily they wish to subsidize the United Nations' myriad programs. My purpose here—and I can guarantee this House that it will be a continuing purpose—is to see to it that the American taxpayers have the straight truth upon which to base their decision.

Until the U.N. develops more built-in checks and audits upon itself, it is up to the American Congress to audit U.N. actions and U.N. facts for the American people. Perhaps we should turn the General Accounting Office loose for a complete audit of the United Nations' aid projects. The U.N. has hundreds of projects going on all over the world. I certainly hope they have better information about the others than they do about the aid project for the United States.

Let me briefly illustrate the confusion I found surrounding just this one U.N. aid project.

I have been told by the United Nations Information Center here in Washington that this rice-fish project was conducted in Kansas—a startling revelation since Kansas has no rice paddies.

Also, I have been told by way of the New York office of the U.N.'s Food and Agriculture Organization that this project was not in Kansas but in Arkansas.

Then, I read for myself in "World Without Want," a book written recently by Mr. Paul Hoffman who is manager of the U.N. Special Fund, that this project is not in Kansas and not in Arkansas but in Louisiana.

Later the information center here advised me that the Kansas-Arkansas mixup was caused by the pronunciation of a Swedish secretary on a long-distance telephone call.

Still later, in response to a letter from me, Mr. Hoffman, a dedicated and talented American who is now an international civil servant, wrote to me that his book contained a "regrettable mistake." But he neglected to correct that mistake and to locate the project in any State.

And we still do not know where it is, or was, or how much we paid for the U.N. aid.

Since American taxpayers apparently contributed the expert's salary for this lost, strayed, or stolen project, I thought we at least ought to know what State of our Union benefited. So, last Friday, I issued through the press an appeal for help from the amateur sleuths and detectives of the great American midlands.

I asked for their help in solving "the case of the fish in the rice paddies," an international intrigue that now has defied solution by the massive bureaucracies of the United States and the United Nations. The best hope, if we are to confirm the veracity of the United Nations is a quick response to this challenge by the many and able American mystery fans.

I have appealed to them to apply their magnifying glasses in the vicinity of Topeka, Little Rock, Baton Rouge, Schenectady—who can tell where this piscatorial-paddy will turn up next?

I have asked these sleuths to look for fish even though the spring bass season is not yet open in their area; to look for a mysterious Chinese expert, perhaps wearing a light-blue U.N. helmet; to be alert for white jeeps loaded down with goldfish bowls.

I am anxiously awaiting word from the Secretary of the Interior, from the United Nations, or from any of the amateur fish-hunters. And, I will report promptly to the House just as soon as the slippery evidence of the U.N.'s unique aid to the United States has been hooked and landed.

CASTRO COMMUNIST SUBVERSION IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a subcommittee report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs has completed its report resulting from recent hearings into Castro Communist subversion in the Western Hemisphere.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I believe the hearings and this report will prove of great value in focusing the attention of the American people and other friends of the inter-American system on the Communist subversive threat to the Americas.

This report contains subcommittee findings and recommendations growing out of testimony given by members of the executive branch and by other authorities in Latin American affairs. The members of the subcommittee, Democrat and Republican alike, have conscientiously worked toward keeping the hearings on the high level of national interest. I believe this contribution is reflected in the responsible, objective nature of the report.

It is to be hoped that the subcommittee's efforts will serve to aid our Government and our friends and allies throughout the hemisphere in the continuing fight to eliminate the threat of communism to the inter-American system.

The report follows:

CASTRO COMMUNIST SUBVERSION IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

On February 18, 1963, the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs began exploratory hearings intended to (1) probe the nature and extent of the Communist subversive threat to the hemisphere in the light of recent developments in Cuba and throughout Latin America; (2) inform the American people of the danger of this threat to our national and hemispheric security; and (3) explore possible legislative or other means to spur U.S. action toward curbing and ultimately eliminating Communist subversion in the Americas.

In the weeks following, the subcommittee heard testimony from officials of the executive branch, as well as other witnesses having knowledge of conditions prevailing in Latin America. Mindful of national security interests, the subcommittee heard pertinent testimony from some witnesses in closed session. Release of portions of such closed session testimony was made through the subcommittee by the witnesses themselves, only after their examination of transcripts for security purposes.

The subcommittee's special interest in Communist activity in the hemisphere is of long standing. History, geography, and traditional bonds of friendship are ample reason for the concern of the American people, and their elected representatives, in the plight of the Cuban people. These hearings, however, were specifically aimed at gathering information concerning Communist use of Cuba as an island base for subversive aggression in the Americas. The urgency of this threat to our hemispheric security was spelled out in detail in testimony before the subcommittee.

As a result, the subcommittee is more than ever convinced of the need to inform and alert the American people to the nature of Communist designs and operations in Latin America.

THE GROWTH OF COMMUNISM IN LATIN AMERICA

As noted at the outset of the subcommittee's hearings, these designs and operations antedate the coming to power of Fidel Castro in Cuba. Latin America has been a target for Communist conquest since the early 1920's, when the Third Communist International (Comintern) initiated a program to organize and coordinate Communist political and organizational activities in Central and South American nations. Comintern agents, operating under orders from Moscow, were active during this early period in recruiting and training Latin American party leaders. The Confederación Sindical, a Moscow-controlled labor organization, was another instrument of Communist efforts to create a Soviet Latin America. By 1929, the First Conference of the Latin American Communist Parties was held in Buenos Aires, drawing delegates from 14 of the 20 Latin American nations.

From this nucleus, the Communist movement in Latin America grew rapidly in the 1930's and 1940's. The global depression spurred Communist organizational efforts among workers. Communist-controlled labor unions and hemispherewide labor associations served as the center of expanding party operations throughout the area. Moscow's control over party activities throughout Latin America was complete and thorough, acting through centralized command posts in Uruguay, Mexico, and Cuba. Montevideo served as command headquarters for South America, Mexico City for Central America, and Havana for the Caribbean area.

By the end of World War II, the Latin American Communist movement was flourishing and its party organizations operated openly in virtually every country in the hemisphere. The Communists were represented in nine national congresses, had at least three members in the Chilean Cabinet, and were influential on lower levels of government in several other nations.

The first Communist government established in the Americas came to power through the election of Jacobo Arbenz in Guatemala in 1951. The Communists dominated the Arbenz government, establishing effective control over the country's labor and peasant organizations. However, the Guatemalan regular military establishment's resistance to Communist subversion resulted in the overthrow of the Arbenz regime by anti-Communist liberation forces in 1954.

In the late 1950's a number of Latin American nations which had broken diplomatic ties with Russia and Soviet bloc countries renewed them. Although Communist Party membership in Central and South America was relatively small, the party's influence could be discerned in the activities of many other political, labor, and student groups. Anti-U.S. propaganda remained the consistent theme of Communist and Communist-line groups throughout Latin America.

With the coming to power of Fidel Castro in Cuba, in 1959, the existence of an operational base in the heart of the Americas brought a grave new dimension to the Communist threat to the inter-American system.

From its inception the Castro regime has sought to export revolution to other countries of the hemisphere. Direct military efforts, in the form of small rebel force landings in Nicaragua, Panama, the Dominican Republic, and Haiti, failed in 1959. Cuba rapidly became a base for subversion and guerrilla training, as well as propaganda campaigns aimed at the overthrow of existing Latin American governments.

By 1960, Soviet and outside Communist influence and control over the Castro revolutionary apparatus had become obvious, thus clearly violating the Monroe Doctrine and all inter-American agreements affecting the security of the United States and the other nations of the Western Hemisphere. In December 1961, when the Cuban dictator proclaimed his allegiance to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, his appeal to indigenous

non-Communist elements in Latin America diminished, but the campaign to export revolution by subversive aggression was intensified.

This campaign continues to be carried out by three basic means: (1) the exploitation of nationalist and ultraleftist groups; (2) the dissemination of propaganda; and (3) intensive ideological indoctrination and the development of antigovernment forces through guerrilla training.

EXPLOITATION OF NATIONALIST AND ULTRALEFTIST GROUPS

Castro has stepped up his campaign to exploit indigenous nationalist and ultraleftist movements in behalf of his own subversive aims in Latin America. Infiltration of political, social, and economic movements remains a primary Communist tactic in carrying out subversive activities in the various nations of the hemisphere. The Arbenz regime's failure to successfully infiltrate and subvert the Guatemalan regular military establishment led to its downfall. Evidence submitted to the subcommittee indicates that Communist strategy now recognizes the need to undermine and infiltrate the military of target nations wherever possible.

DISSEMINATION OF PROPAGANDA

Propaganda is an important arm of the Communist subversive apparatus in Latin America. Tons of Communist literature, featuring antigovernment and "hate America" themes, are shipped to entry points throughout the region. Such material, along with funds for subversive operations, is often transmitted through Cuban Embassies in countries maintaining diplomatic relations with Havana. In countries where Cuba has no diplomatic relations, dissemination is effected by Castroite or Communist groups. Much of this material is aimed at students, from the university to grade school levels.

The principal direct and mass audience medium in Cuba to carry subversive propaganda to Latin America is shortwave radio. The Castro regime inaugurated an international broadcasting service, Radio Havana, on May 1, 1961, which has increased its broadcast time to a total of 266½ hours a week. The total Communist effort, including the Cuban, Soviet, European satellite, and Chinese shortwave broadcasts, is 415 hours per week. The Cuban broadcasts concentrate for the most part on the Latin American scene, making great claims about Cuba's progress and denouncing the United States. Time is regularly allotted on Radio Havana to groups of foreign nationals residing in Cuba such as the so-called Peruvian Anti-Imperialist Movement, the Honduran Liberation Movement, the Guatemalan Information Committee, and the Dominican Liberation Movement. All of these broadcasts incite their listeners to revolt against their present governments. In the aftermath of the missile crisis, the Cuban broadcasts have grown increasingly explicit in their attempts to incite violence.

INTENSIVE IDEOLOGICAL INDOCTRINATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF ANTIGOVERNMENT FORCES THROUGH GUERRILLA TRAINING

Testimony given the subcommittee by top intelligence officials of the United States established that from 1,000 to 1,500 Latin Americans traveled to Cuba last year for ideological and paramilitary training. The number of trainees is increasing in 1963. Some graduates of such Cuban training return to their homelands to foment disorder and chaos aimed at the ultimate overthrow of legitimate democratic governments. Others remain behind to receive more intensive training and to form the nucleus of military units which can be returned to their respective homelands at the appropriate time to lead a "liberation army." Operating under a facade of nationalism, these trainees represent a Communist revolutionary cadre for the establishment of other Castro-type regimes in the hemisphere.

In effect, this Cuban-based program for revolution constitutes more than subversive activities as that term is generally defined. The program is so extensive in concept and execution as to be branded subversive "aggression," a modern totalitarian form of warfare against the nations of the free world.

CURRENT U.S. POLICY

Current U.S. policy regarding efforts to meet this threat was enunciated by Assistant Secretary of State Edwin M. Martin in testimony before the subcommittee. Said Mr. Martin: "Without being complacent, we in the United States can derive certain satisfaction that as a result of actions of the United States and other American governments, working individually and collectively, some headway is being made to reduce the influence and capabilities of Cuba and the bloc and in controlling local subversive activities of all kinds in each country. Current U.S. actions may be summarized as reducing the appeal and capabilities of the Cuban regime, spreading knowledge of what a Castro Communist regime does for a people's freedom and well-being, providing equipment and training to Latin American military and police forces to deal with riots and guerrilla actions, working through the OAS to stimulate individual and collective action on the problem, and through the Alliance for Progress helping our partners attack the basic discontent on which subversion feeds."

While the value of this policy must be judged by future events, the subcommittee makes the following findings and recommendations regarding the current status of Communist subversive aggression in the Western Hemisphere:

FINDINGS

I

Although the inter-American collective security system is prepared to meet the possibility of open military aggression by Communist forces against nations of the hemisphere, no plan for collective action against Communist subversive aggression has been put into effect.

Since the Korean conflict, subversive aggression rather than traditional military aggression has been the primary instrument of Communist expansionist strategy in the cold war. Subversive aggression against Latin American nations follows the pattern of Communist aggression in other parts of the world.

The traditional concept that "subversion remains primarily the task of each government to handle in accordance with its own laws and resources"[1] hampers collective action in meeting the primary Communist threat to hemispheric security. Moreover, "the security machinery of the inter-American system was originally conceived to deal primarily with forms of direct aggression,"[2] and the nations of the hemisphere have been slow to device new collective security arrangements to meet subtle forms of aggression.

Castro Communist subversive aggression in Latin America is an integral part of Communist global strategy. In January 1963, Fidel Castro acknowledged the international nature of this subversive offensive as follows: "The liberating movement is fighting in Angola, in Vietnam, in Latin America, and this fight needs all the united forces of the Socialist camp."[3]

II

Communist potential for aggression cannot be measured solely in terms of regular military forces or offensive capabilities. The fact that Casto Communist forces in Cuba are incapable without outside assistance of mounting successfully a traditional military offensive blow in the hemisphere does not minimize the Communist threat to inter-American security.

Strategic concepts and traditional diplomatic and military definitions of terms such as "aggression" and "offensive" are misleading standards by which to assess the threat of subversion. Emphasis on such words and definitions and on Castro Communist conventional military capabilities tend to blur policy and public understanding of the seriousness of subversive aggression.

Since 1959, Communists have stepped up "the tactics of infiltration, popular front action and insurgency * * * with a marked shift toward more violence"[4] in Latin America. The threat such tactics pose to hemispheric security cannot be measured only in terms of conventional military capabilities.

III

Since the primary thrust of the Communist offensive in Latin America is paramilitary, relying on force and violence, economic aid alone cannot cope with immediate threats of subversive aggression. In fact, the success of the Alliance for Progress or any other long-range economic aid program for the region is dependent on reducing and finally eliminating the threat of subversive aggression to the hemisphere.

As Assistant Secretary Martin testified, "The Alliance was not undertaken as a response to Castro,"[5] and it cannot be considered as an adequate response to the immediate threat of Castro Communist subversion.

So long as Castro Communists conduct subversive operations in the hemisphere, the Alliance for Progress will be "a constant object of their scorn and attacks."[5]

Success of the Alliance and hemispheric plans for the economic and social development of Latin America will be endangered by continuing Castro Communist efforts to increase the political tensions and dangers of the region. Hence, long-range economic and political plans must be complemented by immediate steps to meet the threat of subversive aggression.

IV

In the absence of a clear and unified hemispheric policy dealing with the threat of Castro Communist subversion, some member nations of the Organization of American States have not devised effective internal methods of controlling subversive traffic in and through their territories. Whether due to failure to recognize the danger posed by Castro communism, or for other reasons, this situation endangers the security of all nations of the hemisphere.

Although ample provision for hemispheric cooperation in dealing with subversion exists through inter-American agreements, no clear collective plans have emerged to implement the words of Bogotá, Rio, Caracas, and Punta del Este with decisive action.

Internal methods of dealing with the Castro Communist threat vary from country to country. The difficulties of controlling clandestine subversive operations and traffic are great "even for governments with the most elaborate security machinery."[6]

These difficulties are further complicated by the failure of some member nations of the

---

[1] Testimony of Ambassador deLesseps S. Morrison, hearings, p. 199.

[2] Testimony of Ambassador deLesseps S. Morrison, hearings, p. 196.

[3] Fidel Castro quoted, the Washington Star, Jan. 16, 1963.

[4] Testimony of Assistant Secretary of State Edwin M. Martin, hearings, p. 5.

[5] Testimony of Assistant Secretary of State Edwin M. Martin, hearings, p. 23.

[6] Testimony of Assistant Secretary of State Edwin M. Martin, hearings, p. 22.

Organization of American States to deal with subversive traffic. For example, Mexico remains a "neutral ground," to all intents and purposes, for Castro Communist traffic and travel in the Americas. Internal policies permitting such subversive traffic weaken inter-American treaty obligations and endanger the security of the hemisphere.

V

Communist Cuba's dependence on the Soviet Union is complete. The Castro Communist movement, although claiming to represent indigenous Latin American interest and aspirations, is in fact controlled and operated by trained professional agents from the Soviet bloc. The Soviet Union must be held accountable for such subversive aggression in the Americas.

The Castro regime is a wholly dependent Soviet satellite and Castro communism is the instrument of Soviet aspirations for the Americas. Thus, subversive aggression emanating from Cuba is Soviet-directed and represents a "far more sophisticated, more covert, and more deadly"[7] effort than the hastily organized and ill-conceived raids conducted by Castroites during the early months of the regime.

International Soviet agents, experts in the field of revolutionary propaganda, terrorist tactics, and guerrilla warfare, are operating schools for violence in Cuba, training and indoctrinating Latin American subversives. The Soviet Union as well as its Cuban puppet regime must bear the responsibility and consequences for subversive attacks on nations of the Western Hemisphere.

VI

Training of guerrillas and terrorists at Cuban camps is on the increase. At these camps, experts in subversive warfare are organizing the cadre for an "alliance for violence" that will send agents trained in sabotage, espionage, and revolutionary techniques throughout Latin America. At present, Castro Communist assistance to these cadres takes the form of funds, guidance, and technical assistance.

"In many ways, Cuba under Castro is the Latin version of the old Comintern, inciting, abetting, and sustaining revolution wherever it will flourish."[8]

Undisputed evidence exists that "Fidel Castro is spurring and supporting the efforts of Communists and other revolutionary elements to overthrow and seize control of the governments in Latin America."[8]

Toward this end, from 1,000 to 1,500 persons from other Latin American countries made the pilgrimage to Cuba during 1962 to receive ideological indoctrination and guerrilla training. Additional thousands are traveling the route to Havana this year. To date, training emphasis has been on acquiring weaponry from "the enemy," i.e., government arsenals, but Castro arms shipments to other Latin American countries can be expected to increase if needed to further revolution.

Castro Cuba has furnished financing for subversive operations throughout the hemisphere, and tons of Communist propaganda material are shipped from Cuba for dissemination throughout Latin America. Some of this material is detected and destroyed by customs officials of target nations, but substantial amounts get through to the people.

VII

Venezuela is the primary target for Cuban-based Communist subversive aggression.

Castro Cuba has provided training in subversive warfare to more nationals from Venezuela than from any other country. An estimated 200-plus Venezuelans received such training in Cuba during 1962. Although "the Communists have not demonstrated the ability to stand up to the armed forces, or seize and hold government buildings,"[9] increased terrorist activity in Venezuela poses one of the most immediate Communist threats to any country in the hemisphere.

Creation in 1962 of the so-called Armed Forces of National Liberation (FALN) is the result of a unification of command to coordinate Castro Communist subversive activities in Venezuela.

VIII

Purported differences between Soviet and Chinese branches of international communism have had no discernible effect on the increased intensity or course of Communist subversive aggression in the hemisphere. Violent overthrow of existing governments remains the unified aim of Communist forces in Latin America.

"To date the Latin American Communist Parties seem to have been reluctant either to admit the existence of basic differences between the U.S.S.R. and Communist China or to take sides even when the differences are admitted."[10]

There is no reason to believe that purported ideological differences in the Communist camp have affected or altered Cuba's role as communism's spearhead in the Americas.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I

In accord with the joint resolution of Congress, October 3, 1962, section (a), immediate steps should be taken by the United States to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of the hemisphere.

The joint resolution of Congress, October 3, 1962, declared U.S. determination to take whatever steps are necessary to prevent the extension of Castro communism to other parts of the hemisphere by aggressive or subversive activities.

The distinction between aggressive and subversive activities is without significance. Subversive activities, as conducted by Communist forces in the world today, represent as certain a form of aggression as direct military aggression.

On October 22, 1962, President Kennedy responded to the Soviet missile buildup in Cuba in accord with section (b) of the congressional determination of October 3. Section (b) declared U.S. determination to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States * * *.

It is recommended that the threat posed by the aggressive capability of Castro Communist subversion be dealt with by whatever means may be necessary in the security interests of the United States and all the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

II

The United States should be prepared to act with military force, if needed, in response to the request for help and assistance of any nation of the hemisphere in danger of being overthrown by Castro Communist subversive aggression. This recommendation is in no way to be considered as a substitute for or a bar to unilateral action by the United States in defense of its own security.

The United States must be prepared to do in our own hemisphere what we are willing to do in other parts of the world in defense of freedom. Certainly the sacrifices of Korea and Vietnam would be futile if Communist tyranny were to be allowed to extend its power by force and violence over nations of the Americas.

In compliance with solemn treaty obligations, the United States, along with other nations of the hemisphere, must make clear our intention to act not only in our own defense but in the interests of collective security and for the defense of the nations of the inter-American system.

III

Every effort must be made by the United States to assure collective action by the Organization of American States, and by OAS member states individually, toward the curbing of Castro Communist subversive activities and traffic in the hemisphere.

Failure of any nation of the hemisphere to curb subversive activities and traffic within its borders endangers all the nations of the inter-American system. The chain of hemispheric security is only as strong as its weakest link.

The United States, as leader of the hemisphere's defense, must seek early implementation of strict national policies to control and eliminate the flow of Communist traffic between Cuba and other countries of the hemisphere.

IV

The United States should seek the complete diplomatic and economic quarantine of Communist Cuba by other nations of the hemisphere.

Recognizing the aggressive nature of Cuban-based subversion, the United States should exert efforts to quarantine the aggressor by means of diplomatic and economic sanctions applied by nations of the hemisphere. The Declaration of Punta del Este furnishes ample legal basis for the complete ostracism of the Castro regime from diplomatic and economic contacts with other American states. Recent months have established even more clearly that the Castro regime is not the legitimate representative of the people of Cuba, but is a mere instrument of international communism.

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT BY HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

I believe no reference to the situation in Latin America can be made without calling attention to the fact that U.S. aid must be based upon long-range economic and political reforms dealing with the rampant economic and social underdevelopment, which will lead to freedom of the individual and representative governments.

LEONARD FARBSTEIN.

NEW YORK.

---

[7] Statement of Hon. John A. McCone, Director, CIA, p. 65.

[8] Statement of Hon. John A. McCone, Director, CIA, p. 63.

[9] Statement of Hon. John A. McCone, Director, CIA, p. 64.

[10] Testimony of Assistant Secretary of State Edwin M. Martin, hearings, p. 9.

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE ADAIR-HICKENLOOPER AMENDMENT TO THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in the last session of the Congress this body amended the Foreign Assistance Act to provide that aid be suspended to those countries that expropriated American-owned property without prompt and adequate compensation. My purpose today is to advise the House on the effectiveness of the so-called Adair-Hickenlooper amendment since its enactment and approval on August 1, 1962.

HISTORY OF AMENDMENT

As you know, there was, in the early part of 1962, an expropriation of

International Telephone & Telegraph holdings by the Brazilian State, Rio Grande do Sul. Although these holdings had been recently valued at over $7 million, the State Governor offered only $400,000 as full and just compensation. As a matter of further importance, we recall that nearly 3 years earlier this same State had taken over properties belonging to the American & Foreign Power Corp. No compensation had been received by the company and expropriation proceedings had been stalled for a year and a half.

During April, May, and June, 1962, just at the time we were considering in committee the foreign aid bill, Ceylon took over 83 gasoline stations and other properties belonging to 2 American oil companies, Esso Standard Eastern, Inc., and Caltex Ceylon, Ltd.

In view of these expropriations, coupled with the increasing tendency toward nationalization of public utilities and other industries by many of the countries receiving U.S. aid, I felt that some protection should be afforded American citizens and businesses in countries throughout the world. Therefore, I proposed in the Committee on Foreign Affairs amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act to cut off aid to those countries that took over property of U.S. citizens and failed to provide adequate compensation promptly. Some action was taken in the committee, but I felt that we had not given adequate protection. Hence, when this section was further considered on the floor on July 11, 1962, I offered additional amendments that were adopted by the House and which changed the section in three principal respects:

First. A retroactive feature was added which made the requirements applicable to expropriations on or after January 1, 1962.

Second. The authority of the President to allow aid to continue to countries that had expropriated U.S.-owned properties when he found it in the national interest was deleted.

Third. Provision was added that the requirements of the section could not be waived by the use of any other authority available under the act.

The Senate bill (S. 2996) also included a provision prepared by Senator HICKENLOOPER against expropriation of American-owned property similar in requirements though not in language to section 620(e) as it passed the House. In conference the Senate agreed to the House language with two minor amendments. The first specified that appropriate steps to be taken "may include arbitration"; the second qualified "obligations" of the expropriating country toward the U.S. citizens or entities as obligations "under international law."

The language as it now appears in the act reads:

> (e) The President shall suspend assistance to the government of any country to which assistance is provided under this Act when the government of such country or any governmental agency or subdivision within such country on or after January 1, 1962—
>
> (1) has nationalized or expropriated or seized ownership or control of property owned by any United States citizen or by any corporation, partnership, or association not less than 50 per centum beneficially owned by United States citizens, or
>
> (2) has imposed or enforced discriminatory taxes or other exactions, or restrictive maintenance or operational conditions, which have the effect of nationalizing, expropriating, or otherwise seizing ownership or control of property so owned,
>
> and such country, government agency or government subdivision fails within a reasonable time (not more than six months after such action or after the date of enactment of this subsection, whichever is later) to take appropriate steps, which may include arbitration, to discharge its obligations under international law toward such citizen or entity, including equitable and speedy compensation for such property in convertible foreign exchange, as required by international law, or fails to take steps designed to provide relief from such taxes, exactions, or conditions, as the case may be, and such suspension shall continue until he is satisfied that appropriate steps are being taken and no other provision of this Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection.

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROVISION

Mr. Speaker, it is extremely difficult to assess acurately the effect that this amendment has had in the past few months toward encouraging settlement by Brazil or discouraging expropriation by others. However, I am certain that it has been powerful and salutary in the case of the expropriation of I.T. & T.'s properties. For example, a satisfactory agreement has been reached between the Government of Brazil and I.T. & T. Instead of the $400,000 as initially proposed by the State of Rio Grande do Sul as full and just payment, I.T. & T. will receive $7.3 million which is more closely related to the actual value of their holdings. One-half of the settlement was allowed to be repatriated in dollars and the remainder is to be reinvested locally by I.T. & T. in Standard Electrica S. A., its wholly owned Brazilian manufacturing subsidiary. I understand that this settlement is satisfactory to I.T. & T.

In the case of American and Foreign Power Corp.'s expropriation problem settlement has not been reached. I am informed, however, that the company and the Brazilian Government are moving toward agreement with respect to the company's Brazilian holdings and that the company considers progress to be satisfactory.

ASSISTANCE SUSPENDED

On February 8, 1963, the Department of State suspended development loans and technical assistance to Ceylon. From my study of the record, the determination made to suspend aid in this case was entirely warranted by the facts. No mutually satisfactory negotiations were going on which might be considered appropriate steps under the law. The Ceylon Petroleum Act, authority for the expropriation, did not provide satisfactory procedures for arriving at a fair compensation, the means of payment, or currency of payment. Ceylon's history on the expropriation issue generally, as well as their bargaining posture on this expropriation, in that no offer was made nor would they agree to arbitration, fully justified the suspension. The Department is to be commended for this forthright action. Food-for-peace programs are being continued, as well as training abroad for some 57 Ceylonese being financed from development grants under the Foreign Aid Act. The requirements of section 620(e) do not extend to food-for-peace assistance under Public Law 480. However, that section does apply to training assistance with development grants; therefore, the failure of the Government of Ceylon to act will require the speedy termination of these training programs.

In addition to those expropriations I have just enumerated, I am aware of several instances where countries enacting agrarian reform measures which were expropriatory in nature have been heavily influenced by the requirements of 620(e). When advised of the effect of this section as it would apply to them should they move under such agrarian reform law, either changes were made in the law or changes are being requested of the legislature.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that the enactment of these requirements by the Congress was a good thing. It furnishes a weapon with which the Department can protect American business interests, and, I believe, its effective implementation can very much serve the Department's interests. Amendments may be desirable, however, and they will be considered in connection with the foreign aid bill this year. We were told repeatedly that the Alliance for Progress and similar programs could not succeed without the flow of large amounts of private capital. This will be encouraged and made possible by the passage and application of the Adair-Hickenlooper amendment.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND GOVERNMENT STATISTICS—COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S REPORT POINTS TO SAVINGS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS BY PURCHASING RATHER THAN LEASING ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Florida). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss the possibility of saving the taxpayers and the Federal Government $150 million over the next 5 years and $100 million each year thereafter. This is the appealing prospect pointed out in Comptroller General Campbell's March 6, 1963, report to the Congress entitled "Study of Financial Advantages of Purchasing Over Leasing of Electronic Data Processing Equipment in the Federal Government."

I am sure that every Member of Congress has read, heard about, or has some knowledge of electronic data processing equipment. Sometimes these machines are referred to as electronic brains, sometimes robots and monsters, or just plain computers. Their abilities are phenomenal. They consume prodigious amounts of raw data, digest them in short periods of time, and print the results with extreme rapidity. They can perform tasks which were heretofore impossible. They will do everything but think, and indeed progress is being made in this direction. Companion machines now are being built to read the printed page while others are being developed to react to the spoken word.

Mr. Speaker, back in the 86th Congress, the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, under the able chairmanship of our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Lesinski], began studying the problems related to mass data processing equipment of the Federal agencies. Later, in the 87th Congress, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Henderson], who succeeded the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Lesinski] as chairman of the subcommittee, continued the surveillance of the Federal Government's use of electronic data processing equipment. The subcommittee held hearings on the subject, issued reports and releases, and attempted to contribute to the efficiency with which the machines are utilized. As the new chairman of this important subcommittee, I intend to continue this work.

Now, one of the problems which our subcommittee raised back in 1959 was that many Federal agencies were leasing rather than purchasing these costly computers. At that time, we urged both the General Accounting Office and the Bureau of the Budget to go into this matter because we suspected that the Federal Government was wasting millions of dollars each year in machine rentals. In the early days, some manufacturers would sell their machines, others would not. They would furnish them by lease only. As a consequence, large numbers of electronic data processing systems were leased by the Federal Government, and agencies became accustomed to the leasing arrangement.

At the present time, however, manufacturers will sell their systems. They will sell them outright or they will lease them with the option to purchase. They will rent their systems if the users wish to engage the equipment on that basis.

Federal Government agencies have not responded quickly to the possibilities of purchase. They seem to feel that it is more convenient to rent; that the rental arrangement is more favorable in that they can replace old machines with new ones almost at will; that renting avoids the maintenance problem and that congressional appropriations for rental are more easily obtained than for purchase.

In the earlier stages of development these attitudes may have been justified, but as stabilization has been introduced into the manufacture and utilization of electronic data processing systems, Federal agencies can now be more selective about whether they purchase or rent.

As General Campbell pointed out, progress in converting to purchase has been slow. This is in spite of guidelines issued by the Bureau of the Budget describing the circumstances under which electronic data systems should be purchased and the circumstances under which they should be leased.

I said at the beginning of my remarks that by purchasing electronic data processing systems the Federal Government stands to save $150 million in 5 years and $100 million each year thereafter. In order to accomplish this objective General Campbell recommends basic changes in the Government's overall management system. He states:

> Decisions as to the financial advantages of purchasing will have to be made from the standpoint of the Government as a whole, and not primarily from the standpoint of individual using agencies as has been the practice in the past. In addition, more attention needs to be given to obtaining complete utilization of the equipment acquired. We believe that the only practical way in which this kind of coordinated management can achieve the financial savings cited is through the establishment of a small, high-placed central management office in the executive branch of the Government. Accordingly, we are recommending to the President of the United States that he establish such an office in his organization.

General Campbell recommends further that the heads of all using departments and agencies "arrange for a prompt and complete reappraisal of their current plans to lease data processing equipment and take such action as is possible to realize the financial savings that may be available from purchasing such equipment and fully utilizing it."

I am wholly in accord with General Campbell's proposal and hope that the President will act favorably upon the establishment of the office that General Campbell recommends.

In order that we may start realizing savings immediately through the purchase of electronic data processing equipment, I am directing a letter today to the Director of the Budget emphasizing the importance of immediate action. I am requesting the Bureau of the Budget to act promptly regarding General Campbell's recommendation that departments and agencies reappraise their plans to lease electronic data processing equipment with a view to saving funds by switching to the purchase arrangement. The Bureau of the Budget is being requested also to keep our subcommittee fully and promptly informed of the progress the departments and agencies make in their review.

Before closing these remarks, I want to commend General Campbell and the General Accounting Office for this splendid report. Once again, the General Accounting Office lives up to its title of "watchdog of the public purse."

FLOW OF AMERICAN GOODS AND KNOW-HOW TO SOVIET BLOC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, last year following recommendations of the House Select Committee on Export Control, the Congress by near-unanimous vote provided strengthening amendments to the Export Control Act to stem the flow of American goods and know-how to the Soviet bloc. My remarks today are to report on some of the serious developments since that time and to emphasize the need for continued congressional attention to this problem.

The administration of the Export Control Act is a matter of great concern to all Members of the House because of the importance of the program to our national security. I would like to discuss with the House various instances of where export licenses have been granted which I believe are completely at variance with the expressed intent of Congress.

On February 21, 1963, the Department of Commerce issued a license authorizing the shipment to Communist Yugoslavia of $3,692,000 worth of rolling mill machine parts that will be installed in a steel mill in Jesenice, Yugoslavia.

The license, which had been applied for on January 31, 1963, only 3 weeks earlier, covers equipment and spare parts for a combination blooming, slabbing, and plate mill. This type of mill which is used to reduce steel ingots to intermediary sizes and shapes before further processing into steel plates, rails, wheels, sheets, skelp—which is used in the manufacture of pipe such as oil pipes—bars, tubes, rods, and a variety of other items. Obviously such equipment is essential to the manufacture of many strategic goods.

On February 25, 1963, a few days after the license for the rolling mill equipment was granted, a license was granted by the Commerce Department to authorize shipment to Yugoslavia of a 7,000-horsepower electric motor, two 600-horsepower electric motors, and special purpose controls and parts valued at $685,120 for this same rolling mill at Jesenice, Yugoslavia. This license was also applied for on January 31, 1963.

According to the Department of Commerce, the products of this mill are to be used in the machine building and ship construction industries.

Incredibly, these purchases are being financed through credit extended to Yugoslavia by the Export-Import Bank, which extended credit totaling $13,591,862 for the Jesenice steel facility in Yugoslavia. Of this total, $6,217,436 is scheduled for procurement of the equipment I have just discussed and other items which will require validated licenses from the Department of Commerce.

In response to my request to the Department of Commerce for comment on the issuance of these licenses, in view of the amendments to the Export Control Act enacted in 1962, the Department of Commerce advised that the application for the equipment was approved in accordance with the U.S. policy to encourage the development of economic ties between Yugoslavia and the free world through the maintenance of normal business relations. In carrying out this policy, which helps maintain Yugoslav independence against Soviet pressure, we permit Yugoslavia to purchase commodities from the United States subject to safeguards similar to those governing exports to free world countries.

The Commerce Department's statement seems to indicate that the floodgates on exports to Yugoslavia are completely open and that we are accommodating Tito's so-called independent

communism. I simply do not believe there is such an animal as independent communism.

Why should the United States build up Yugoslav industry when all indications are to the effect that Yugoslavia and the U.S.S.R. are drawing closer together all the time? In view of the relationship between Yugoslavia, U.S.S.R., and other Communist nations, I do not see how it can be seriously contended that Yugoslavia is not part of the Soviet bloc and I do not accept this determination.

There was an exchange of visits last year between Soviet President Brezhnev and Premier Tito. According to statements put out at that time Yugoslavia and the U.S.S.R. were reported to hold identical or similar views on international affairs.

Yugoslavia has been engaging in shipping and trade with Cuba, which certainly is contrary to our national interest.

Yugoslavia and the U.S.S.R. are currently engaged in a large scale trade agreement, which is to double for 1963 the total amount of trade between those two nations as compared with 1960.

According to information presented to the Select Committee on Export Control last year by the Department of State, commodities listed for delivery to the U.S.S.R. by Yugoslavia under the original trade agreement, signed in March 1961, are as follows: Cables, lead, ferrous and nonferrous industries products, chemical industry products, various industrial equipment and machinery, footwear, furniture, knitted articles of wool, cold-storage installations for commercial firms, food preparation equipment, electrical equipment, universal drying plants, complete installations for processing fruit and vegetables, and power transformers. Also called for were 16 tankers, of 25,000 gross tons each, 9 tramp steamers of 10,000 tons each, and 3,500 tank cars.

The March 1961 agreement has been modified by subsequent protocols. Commodities covered in a July 8, 1962, protocol are oceangoing ships, rail tank cars, steel pipe, nonferrous plates, lead, mercury, rubber products, chemicals, furniture, and others. This protocol reduced the amount of oceangoing ships to be produced by Yugoslavia for the U.S.S.R. to nine 20,000-ton tankers and five 12,000-ton freighters.

The Department of State advised the select committee concerning the subsequent agreement on the vessels:

> Delivery is scheduled for 1965, but there is some question whether even these new planned levels will be met since Yugoslav shipyards have all the hard currency business they can handle and the Soviets need larger tankers than the Yugoslavs can produce.

It would certainly appear in view of the loan for the steel rolling mill and the sale of steel mill equipment to Yugoslavia for use in ship construction that we are doing our best to assure that Yugoslavia is able to deliver these vessels on time.

How is the U.S.S.R.-Yugoslav trade program going? Interesting comment is provided on U.S.S.R.-Yugoslav trade expansion in the Soviet magazine Vneshnyaya Torgovlya—Foreign Trade—as reported in a January 17, 1963, Tass radio broadcast which stated:

> The U.S.S.R. now occupies a leading place—between 46 and 98 percent—as a buyer of Yugoslav exports of caustic and calcinated soda, polyvinyl raw materials, leather, woolen fabrics, footwear, cable goods, transformers, and other important goods. The overall volume of mutual deliveries in 1963 will amount to 162 million rubles, or about $180 million, which is almost double Soviet-Yugoslav trade in 1961. The magazine emphasizes that trade between the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia is based on the principles of complete equality and mutual interest. This policy of the U.S.S.R. contrasts with the discriminating trade policy of the Common Market countries, which are also trading partners of Yugoslavia.
>
> It is pointed out in the article that the forms of Soviet-Yugoslav scientific-technological cooperation are multiplying. Since December 1955, Soviet organizations have received 242 series of technological documentation from Yugoslavia. During that period, 265 Soviet specialists in various economic fields have visited Yugoslavia. The Soviet contribution to this cooperation has been in the form of technical documentation on 342 subjects. Among other things, blueprints of modern metal-cutting machine tools and documentation on the production of cameras, refrigerators, and presses have been sent to Yugoslavia.
>
> Economic cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia will increase each year, the magazine stresses.

Yugoslav supplying of ships to the U.S.S.R. is very significant in view of the fact that the U.S.S.R. is currently working on a massive maritime buildup. Currently it is about midway in a 7-year plan which by 1965 is to provide it with a merchant fleet double the size of the one it had in 1960. It is reported that this plan is to be succeeded by a 5-year plan to provide a fleet in 1970 three times the 1960 level, and that its programed goal for 1980 is a fleet five or six times that of 1960.

Many Members of the House may have had an opportunity to read the report on the Soviet economic offensive in Western Europe by a special study mission to Europe comprised of members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who certainly are knowledgeable about this serious problem. Included in the special study mission were Representatives Edna F. Kelly, of New York; Harris B. McDowell, Jr., of Delaware; Chester E. Merrow, of New Hampshire; Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., of New Jersey; and Robert R. Barry, of New York.

The report was filed with the House on February 7, 1963, during the time the applications for the licenses in question were pending before the Commerce Department.

The report comments critically on the lack of coordinated policy in the West to face up to the challenge of the Soviet economic offensive. As part of the overall problem, the committee cited the seriousness of the Soviet oil offensive.

The committee's comments are very pertinent to what I am discussing here today, and I am setting forth a portion of those comments. At page 6 of the report, the study mission states:

> One more factor has an important bearing on the Soviet Union's ability to intensify its oil offensive; namely, improvement and expansion of Soviet transportation facilities. In this respect, the Soviet pipeline system, and the enlargement of the Soviet tanker fleet, are of particular significance.
>
> The current 7-year plan calls for the construction of 10,500 kilometers of petroleum pipeline and 16,000 kilometers of gasline. The petroleum pipelines now under construction which are of most significance from the Western point of view are the Urals-Volga-Leningrad pipeline; the Comecon pipeline system from the Urals-Volga oilfields to the European satellites and the Baltic ports of Ventspils and Klaipeda; and the Stalingrad-Tikhorestsk-Tuapse and Tikhorestsk-Novorossiysk pipeline to the Black Sea. These pipelines have military as well as economic implications and will enable the Soviet Union to deliver oil economically to export terminals on the Baltic and the Black Seas.
>
> Concurrently, the Soviet Union is rapidly expanding its oil tanker fleet. As of September 1, 1962, U.S.S.R.-flag vessels reported in petroleum service represented deadweight tonnage of 1,219,800. On the same date, orders for new construction in the Soviet bloc yards totaled 23 ships with a combined capacity of 641,400 deadweight tons. Simultaneously, the Soviet Union's orders for new construction in Japan, Italy, Finland, and Yugoslavia totaled 51 ships with a capacity of 1,253,000 deadweight tons. It is obvious that the delivery of these vessels will greatly assist the bloc in its oil offensive.

As is noted, the study mission concluded, with regard to delivery of new ships to the U.S.S.R.:

> It is obvious that the delivery of these vessels will greatly assist the bloc in its oil offensive.

Yet, only 14 days after this report was filed with Congress, the Commerce Department licensed shipment to Yugoslavia of steel rolling mill equipment to be placed in a new $13.59 million steel mill in Yugoslavia being constructed through an Export-Import Bank loan, when, in the words of the Commerce Department itself:

> The products of this mill are to be used in the machine building and ship construction industries.

It does not seem to me there can be any other conclusion but that the authorization for the shipment of these commodities to Yugoslavia will contribute greatly to the economic and military buildup of the Soviet bloc.

I have on various occasions over recent months requested the Department of Commerce to comment on its issuance of licenses in view of the amendments to the Export Control Act and in each case the Department at least went through the motions of providing assurances that in its view the issuance of the particular license in question would not be detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States. Following is a typical comment along these lines:

> With respect to Section 3(a) of the Export Control Act of 1949 as amended by Public Law 515, 87th Congress, we do not consider that this export makes a significant contribution to the military or economic potential of * * * which would prove detrimental to the national security and welfare of the United States.

Significantly, no such assurance, to the effect that it would not be contrary to our national security and welfare, was provided by the Commerce Department concerning the licenses to ship to Yugoslavia the rolling mill equipment.

It will also be remembered that the Department of Commerce advised that we permit Yugoslavia to purchase commodities from the United States subject to safeguards similar to those governing exports to free world countries. One of the major problems in the field of export control discussed by the Select Committee on Export Control was the problem of postshipment followup of licensed goods to determine that they are not illegally diverted or transshipped. The select committee found that we definitely have access to more sources to check on illegal diversion or transshipments in connection with friendly countries than with Soviet bloc countries. The following, on this point, is from the select committee's report:

> The committee heard testimony that to a large degree our Government has to rely on the assurances of those Communist governments that commodities imported will be utilized according to the stated end use specified in the application for a validated license. This is an important consideration in authorizing shipments to the Soviet bloc countries, as there appears to be no reasonable means of verifying that commodities or end products thereof will not be diverted to Communist China, North Korea, and North Vietnam, the latter countries being under a total embargo.
>
> This is even a more important consideration in connection with shipments to Poland, treated as a member of the bloc but, until recently, permitted to import more freely than other Iron Curtain countries, and Yugoslavia, treated essentially as a friendly nation.

I do not see how the Department can say that these commodities licensed for export to Yugoslavia are subject to safeguards similar to those governing exports to free world countries. We do not have similar safeguards in the case of Communist countries and the Commerce Department assurances in this regard amount to so many words with but little validity.

There are many other examples of licenses issued to ship goods to Yugoslavia besides the steel rolling mill equipment which in my view are contrary to our welfare and security.

On February 19 the Department issued 12 licenses authorizing shipment of $2,028,015 in copper scrap to Yugoslavia. In response to my inquiry about these licenses I was advised that the Yugoslavian Government reported it would be used basically for conversion into copper sulphate for use as in agricultural spray. It is of interest to note that according to information presented to the Select Committee on Export Control, among the commodities supplied by Yugoslavia to the U.S.S.R. were copper rods, copper plates, and copper tubes and pipes. All these of course are important in the manufacture of many strategic commodities.

Following is a partial list of some of the licenses granted to authorize shipments from the United States to Yugoslavia just since the first of the year:

January 2: Industrial instrument, $850.

January 7: Semiconductors, $540; electronic computer, $1,695; land type communications equipment, $1,082; semiconductors, $1,279; industrial instruments, $2,041; industrial furnace, $3,689.

January 14: Semiconductors, $240; electronic components, $142; electron tubes, $100; electron tubes, $288; resistors, $105; industrial instrument parts, $397; construction machinery parts, $25,329.

January 17: Borates, $22,394.

January 18: Construction machinery parts, $3,607; electronic physical properties testing and inspecting machines and parts, $1,610; electrical testing instruments, $210; industrial instruments and parts, $231; electronic computer and related equipment, $9,936; electron tubes, $576.

January 21: Electron tubes, $8,926; information processing machines and parts, $1,850.

January 22: Semiconductors, $118; borates, $22,394; electron tubes, $286; semiconductors, $117; semiconductors, $559.

January 23: Industrial instruments and parts, $1,208; geophysical equipment parts, $4,197; electrical testing instrument parts, $902; semiconductors, $456.

January 25: Special-purpose vehicles parts, $46,064; petroleum and natural gas field production equipment and parts, $869; electrical quantity indicating instruments, $315; electrical testing instruments parts, $460; copper cable, $242.

January 28: Electrical testing instruments and parts, $3,839; construction machinery parts, $2,138; electrical quantity indicating instruments, $3,088; electrical testing instruments and parts, $3,675; geophysical equipment parts, $1,552; petroleum drilling and production equipment parts, $4,816.

January 29: Coaxial cable, $395; electron tubes, $435; electronic computer, $250; video tape recorders and parts, $72,670.

January 30: Construction machinery parts, $1,937; construction machinery parts, $1,087; borate, $6,583; synthetic rubber, $6,270.

February 1: Synthetic rubber, $16,650.

February 5: Electrical testing instruments, $300; waveform measuring instruments and parts, $1,375.

February 6: Industrial instruments and parts, $882; electrical testing instruments, $1,007; semiconductors, $459.

February 7: Electron tubes, $317; petroleum drilling and production equipment parts, $8,480.

February 8: Waveform measuring instruments, $9,790; electrical testing instrument parts, $5,085.

February 11: Petroleum field production equipment and parts, $2,747; coaxial cable, $315; semiconductors, $260.

February 12: Pulse generators, $642; transformer parts, $450; electrical testing instrument parts, $117; copper cable, $515; construction machinery parts, $6,781; electron tubes, $102.

February 19: Copper scrap, $142,450; copper acrap $235,718; copper scrap, $232,808; copper scrap, $258,958; copper scrap, $135,975; copper scrap, $195,635; copper scrap, $186,247; copper scrap, $290,735; copper scrap, $174,583; copper scrap, $58,146; copper scrap, $58,240; copper scrap, $58,520.

February 20: Semiconductors, $1,455; scientific and professional instruments, $454; waveform measuring instrument, $3,099; industrial instruments and parts, $413; construction machinery, $54,682; construction machinery, $106,758; electronic physical properties testing and products testing and inspecting machines and parts, $600; quartz crystals, $1,368.

February 21: Rolling mill machine parts, $3,692,600; copper alloy wire, insulated, $160; diamond grinding wheels, $295; electron tubes, $128; coaxial cable, $114.

February 25: Electrical testing instruments, $589; communication wire, $360; semiconductors, $1,678; crystalline silicon, $160; electronic physical properties testing equipment, $317; semiconductors, $689; electric motors, $450,000; special-purpose controls and parts, $235,120.

March 1: Semiconductors, $206; construction machinery parts, $3,560; construction machinery parts, $14,367; industrial instrument parts, $3,280; electron tubes, $3,182; physical properties testing equipment, $346; electronic equipment, $143.

March 4: Industrial instrument parts, $675; pumps, $485; aircraft parts, $4,992; synthetic resins, $1,452; waveform measuring instruments, $3,280; electrical testing instrument parts, $2,451; signal generator, $1,175; electronic testing instrument, $405; waveform measuring instrument, $920.

March 5: Semiconductors, $800; petroleum drilling and production equipment, $1,447; geophysical equipment parts, $865; waveform measuring instrument, $1,625; borates, $14,400; electrical testing instrument parts, $150; borates, $1,166; electrical testing instrument parts, $830; waveform measuring instrument, $1,625; electrical testing instrument parts, $220; electrical testing instrument parts, $791; waveform measuring instruments, $1,365.

March 6: Construction machinery parts, $3,187; semiconductors, $366; electron tubes, $349; semiconductors, $311; electron tubes, $640; electronic physical properties testing equipment and parts, $392; synthetic rubber, $41,005.

March 7: Pipe valves, $127; inductors, $126; synthetic rubber, $232,144; electron tubes, $298; electron tubes, $128; electron tubes, $122.

I do not mean to give the impression that it is only the export licenses authorized to ship goods to Yugoslavia which are of great concern. There are many other examples.

On February 4 of this year the Department granted a license to authorize shipment of $460,000 worth of synthetic rubber to Czechoslovakia. The Department advises that the synthetic rubber was for use in manufacturing tires.

In response to my further inquiry as to exactly what type of tires the synthetic rubber might be used for, the Department speculated on what type of tires can be constructed with the kind of synthetic rubber in question and the Acting Director of the Office of Export Control advised that "I regret that explicit answers to your questions are not available." It is difficult to know how we can have a meaningful export control program if the specific use of items we license for shipment is not known.

Late last August, the Department issued a license authorizing shipment to East Germany of what was described as "indicating, recording, and/or controlling instruments and parts, for use in air conditioning." Upon inquiring, I was advised that the equipment—instruments to indicate and control temperature and humidity—was licensed for use on 23 fishing trawlers being built in East Germany for the U.S.S.R. to equip the trawlers with, of all things, sauna baths for the officers and crew. Sauna baths are described as steam baths followed by sudden cooling. The Department stated that the instruments would permit the use of steam-generating facilities aboard ship "for sauna purposes in contrast to the less sophisticated sauna installations usually found ashore."

While it is hard to verify the story about the sauna baths, which I find exceedingly difficult to believe, it seems appropriate to mention that heat- and humidity-control instruments are very important on instrument-laden ships such as Soviet fishing trawlers, which are known to be prowling all corners of the globe collecting data and intelligence.

I am setting forth also a list of some of the licenses granted to authorize shipment of goods to other Communist nations since the first of the year:

January 2: Molybdenite concentrates, $92,400, Poland; technical data, no value, U.S.S.R.

January 3: Crude sulfur, $280,350, Czechoslovakia; industrial oil burners, $22,929, Rumania.

January 7: Chemical specialty, $13, Hungary; compressors for refrigeration-type freezers, $85, U.S.S.R.; electrical quantity recording instrument, $4,964, Hungary; electrical apparatus and parts, $6, Czechoslovakia; electrical machinery parts, $22, Czechoslovakia; synthetic rubber manufactures, $7, Czechoslovakia; chemical specialty, $36; Hungary; chemical specialty, $16, Hungary.

January 14: Optical measuring instruments, $3,144, Czechoslovakia; paper pulp machine parts, $222, Hungary.

January 16: Glass forming machine parts, $32,870, Poland.

January 18: Spectrum measuring instruments, $400, Czechoslovakia; technical data erection, installation, maintenance, and operation of a wire rod mill, no value, U.S.S.R.; electronic detection instrument, $540, Germany; insecticides, $365,093, Cuba (authorized in connection with the prisoner release agreement by the Cuban Families Committee); insecticides, $563,864, Cuba (authorized in connection with the prisoner release agreement by the Cuban Families Committee.)

January 21: Thermostat, $45, Czechoslovakia; raw cotton, Mexican origin, $612,328, U.S.S.R.; spectrum measuring instrument, $1,646, Poland; electric industrial heating units and devices and parts, $65, Czechoslovakia.

January 22: Industrial chemicals, $24,802, Hungary; industrial chemicals, $30,750, Hungary; physical properties testing equipment and parts, $2,006, Hungary; physical properties testing equipment and parts, $3,205, Czechoslovakia; indicating, recording and/or controlling instruments, $6,287, Rumania; industrial sewing machine parts, $577, Czechoslovakia; shoe machinery and parts, $788, Hungary.

January 23: Biochemicals for laboratory use, $129, U.S.S.R.

January 24: Spectrum measuring instrument, $465, Poland.

January 28: Navigational instruments and parts, $100, Cuba (authorized in connection with the prisoner release agreement by the Cuban Families Committee).

January 29: Petroleum products, $17,250, Poland; electron tube parts, $3,930, Hungary; preamplifier, $115, Czechoslovakia; printing apparatus and parts, $11,276, Czechoslovakia; scientific and professional instruments, $4,129, Poland; film developer, $17, U.S.S.R.; metering pump parts, $693, U.S.S.R.

January 30: Technical data, no value, Rumania.

January 31: Glass bottle forming machine parts, $1,355, Czechoslovakia; tractor disk plow, $835, Rumania; scientific and professional instruments apparatus and parts, $5,485, Poland.

February 1: Rayon filament tire cord fabric, $391,375; U.S.S.R.; synthetic resin, $13, Rumania; automatic control, $36, Czechoslovakia; technical data, no value, U.S.S.R.; insecticides, $220,000, Cuba (authorized in connection with the prisoner release agreement by the Cuban Families Committee.)

February 4: Synthetic rubber, $460,000, Czechoslovakia.

February 5: Scientific and professional instruments, $1,650, Hungary; organic rubber compounding agents, $900, Czechoslovakia; synthetic resin, $145, Rumania; carbon steel tape, $197, Poland; scientific and professional instruments apparatus supplies and parts, $42,335, Poland.

February 6: Crude sulfur, $125,575, Czechoslovakia; coal tar and other cyclic rubber compound agents, $147,400, U.S.S.R.

February 7: Synthetic resin, $1,736, Rumania; industrial chemicals, $16,755, Hungary; electronic computer, $1,545, Czechoslovakia; self-contained commercial type refrigerators and freezers, $2,156, U.S.S.R.

February 8: Gasoline engine parts, $1,862, Bulgaria; paper pulp machine parts, $2,190, Czechoslovakia; synthetic resin, $540, Poland; automotive replacement parts $40, Czechoslovakia; industrial chemicals, $4,136, Hungary; scientific and professional equipment, $896, Hungary; paper pulp machine parts, $784, U.S.S.R.; commercial automobiles and truck parts, $149, Czechoslovakia; tires and tubes, $61, Czechoslovakia.

February 11: Mexican raw cotton, $70,850, Czechoslovakia; Mexican raw cotton, $259,200, Czechoslovakia; Mexican raw cotton, $60,627, Czechoslovakia; Mexican raw cotton, $68,750, Czechoslovakia; semiconductors, $107, Poland.

February 12: Paper pulp machine parts, $1,606, U.S.S.R.; microfilms, exposed and film holders, $524, Hungary; pneumatic portable metalworking tools, $17,367, Poland; physical properties testing machine, $1,100, U.S.S.R.; automotive replacement parts, $48, U.S.S.R.; truck cab air conditioner and compressor and parts, $804, U.S.S.R.; nonmilitary watercraft parts, $420, Hungary; chemical reagents for laboratory use, $184, Czechoslovakia.

February 14: Precision boring machine, $1,410, Poland.

February 20: Industrial chemicals, $15, Hungary; hybrid grain sorghum seed, $5,705, Rumania; reagent chemicals for laboratory use, $32, Hungary; synthetic resin, $39, Rumania; disinfectants, $114, East Germany; cellulose powder, $16, Czechoslovakia.

February 21: Metalworking machines, $7,986, Hungary; metalworking machines, $12,181, Hungary; industrial sewing machine parts, $1,869, Hungary; rolling mill machine parts, $2,925, Rumania; molybdenum wire, $66,500, U.S.S.R.; chemical specialty compounds, $19,965, Hungary; electric motors, $4,400, U.S.S.R.; iron and steel staplex staples, $3,710, U.S.S.R.

February 25: Electrical testing instruments, $150, U.S.S.R.; air conditioning and mechanical refrigeration equipment, $532, Rumania; petroleum coke, $300,000, U.S.S.R.; refrigeration equipment parts, $45, Rumania; graphite powder, $240, Hungary; petroleum products, $111, Rumania.

March 1: Scientific and professional instruments, $562, Hungary; automotive replacement parts, $26, U.S.S.R.; rubber manufactures, $17, Czechoslovakia; air conditioner part, $15, U.S.S.R.; technical data, no value, U.S.S.R.

March 4: Gas engine parts, $45, Rumania; industrial chemicals, $115,000, Czechoslovakia; card punching machine parts, $106, Czechoslovakia; insecticides, $1,030, U.S.S.R.; herbicides, $1,175, U.S.S.R.; motion picture studio equipment, $79, Czechoslovakia.

March 5: Industrial instruments, $17,917, Czechoslovakia; industrial instruments, $3,300, Rumania; herbicides, $35,100, U.S.S.R.; herbicides, $1,250, U.S.S.R.; moldboard tractor plow, $1,475, Rumania; biochemical for laboratory research, $2,267, Czechoslovakia.

March 6: Insecticide, $900, U.S.S.R.; herbicides, $620, U.S.S.R.; insecticides, $148, U.S.S.R.; aluminum wire, $45, Hungary.

March 7: Motion picture studio equipment, $163, Hungary; industrial instruments and parts, $14,082, Rumania; technical data, no value, Rumania; technical data, no value, Hungary; technical data, no value, U.S.S.R.; industrial chemicals, $99,000, U.S.S.R.; carbon black, $227, Czechoslovakia; disinfectants, $725, U.S.S.R.; metal cutting tools, $375, Hungary; herbicides, $1,550, U.S.S.R.; technical data, no value, Bulgaria.

(In those cases where technical data is licensed for shipment and "no value" is indicated, this does not mean that the data is of no value. Rather no specific value has been placed on it by the Commerce Department, allegedly because of difficulties encountered in assessing the value of technical data. The actual value could range from relatively small amounts to many thousands of dollars.)

The foregoing outlines only certain of the activities of the export control program which I feel indicate that the program is being administered contrary to the best interests of the United States.

All pretense seems to be gone that any meaningful controls apply in the case of Yugoslavia, as the Department of Commerce seems to be saying that licenses should be issued to ship to Yugoslavia practically on par, if not on par, with exports to the free world. Many of the items shipped undoubtedly find their way in one form or another to other Soviet-bloc countries including the U.S.S.R. and Cuba.

Many exports of strategic goods are being authorized for shipment directly to other Soviet-bloc nations, as is noted from the list I have presented here today. Our control over these items is practically nil. We must simply take their word as to what they intend to do with the materials. For all we know, items we are selling the Communists are used to build Soviet missiles or armament for Castro. Certainly it helps to build up their economies which in turn supports their military potential.

The amendment to the Export Control Act approved by Congress last year provides that the significance of exports to the economic buildup as well as the military buildup of Communist nations must be taken into consideration in the granting of export licenses.

I believe it is very important for the House to recreate the Select Committee on Export Control for the 88th Congress. The Congress must keep a close watch on this program and I would urge the membership of the House to support resolutions other Members of the House and I have introduced providing for a Select Committee on Export Control. There is no time to waste.

CUBA—COSTA RICAN CONFERENCE AVOIDS SUBJECT IF UNITED STATES HAS ITS WAY—U.S. ACTIVE LEADERSHIP IS FIRM—LONG-RANGE ANTI-CASTRO COMMUNISM POLICY NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on a number of occasions I have taken the floor of this House feeling deep concern with regard to the administration's policy concerning Cuba, recognizing the threat it offers now and has offered for some time, not only the threat of Communist subversion emanating from Cuba to other Latin American countries but as a matter of fact as late as last Thursday as it relates to Communist subversion through Cuba by way of the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City, even in the United States.

OPEN DOOR OF SUBVERSION TO CUBA THROUGH MEXICO UNDERRATED

I brought out in the RECORD last Thursday the fact that some 73 American citizens, citizens of the United States, had used the open door subversive route through Mexico City, the Cuban Embassy therein to gain admission to Cuba to conduct—some of them at least—subversive activities and who knows, perhaps, to attend even subversive training schools. I put this information in the RECORD and it was interesting to me that Mr. McCone when he appeared before the Selden subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs did not see fit to bring out these facts that this subversive activity that many have evidenced concern about, at which time Mr. McCone said about 1,000 to 1,500 "Latin American citizens" had visited Cuba and had received subversive training during the period of 1962.

Mr. McCone failed to include in his discussion with the committee, apparently, the list of or number of Americans, U.S. citizens as well as Latins, who had gone to Cuba during 1962, including the 4-month period in 1962, which I discussed in the RECORD of Friday. As a matter of fact, on a very cursory examination of the list which I turned over to the House Un-American Activities Committee, it was found that at least two of them had Communist backgrounds, established through the records of the House Un-American Activities Committee; and, as a matter of fact, one of them went to Cuba for the purpose of attending the Congress of Women of America, a Communist meeting in Cuba in July of 1962.

I learned subsequently that three additional U.S. citizens visited Cuba during a similar period in 1962, and one in late 1961, all of whom likewise had a Communist background and this likewise was properly established.

So we see a rather interesting and startling situation, and I imagine a situation that is questioned by other nations of Latin America when we insist upon those nations trying to close this open door, whereas in the United States similar visitations are taking place.

I call this to the attention of the House Un-American Activities Committee. The names after being properly checked, should be submitted to the Justice Department for proper prosecution.

I put in the RECORD the statute involved, title 8 of the United States Code, which is also title 215 of the Walter-McCarran Immigration and Naturalization Acts, which makes the visitation by a U.S. citizen to Cuba at this time against the law. This is an international emergency situation, so declared in the Korean war and still carrying over, and the State Department having advised as of January 1961 that any visitation was against the law and subject to prosecution resulting in a $5,000 fine or 5 years in jail, or both. Why have none of these persons been prosecuted?

As a matter of fact, some of these are very blatant in their activities of going to and coming from Cuba through the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City. This, of course, results from the fact that Mexico is one of five Latin American countries that continue to recognize the Castro regime. The other countries are Bolivia, Chile, Brazil, and Uruguay. As a matter of fact, Brazil continues to carry on active trade with Moscow and with Russia itself; and, as a further matter of fact, it is well known that the present negotiations for a very substantial loan through AID is for the purpose of building the economy of Brazil so that it can increase its trade with Communist Russia. This I intend to discuss in just a few minutes.

The fact of the matter is that because Mexico continues to recognize the Castro Red regime in Cuba this door remains open for the flow of subversives even from the United States as well as from other places. As a matter of fact a list that has been submitted to me, that I believe to be authoritative and that I have checked and rechecked many times, indicates that there is a more substantial flow of Latin Americans for subversive purposes than even Mr. McCone indicated going to Cuba through the Cuban Embassy in Mexico City. This is the list I have in hand. I do not intend to include the names in the RECORD. This is the list that was submitted to the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House for its investigation.

There was during this same 4-month period in 1962 a total of 2,840 passages to and from Cuba, and understand this is only a 4-month period in 1962. Certainly a visitation by any or all of these people would give them at least the opportunity to participate in subversive activities if they saw fit to do so and if an equal number gained passage during the other 8 months this would bring the figure of passages to over 8,500 and the opportunity for subversive activities to relate to far more than the 1,000-1,500 figure cited by Mr. McCone before the Selden subcommittee.

Through the Cuban Embassy in Mexico there are included 235 passages from Russia and its satellite nations.

This list by countries follows:

From:

Argentina	149
Brazil	79
Bolivia	32
Colombia	21
Costa Rica	52
Cuba	565
Canada	49
Chile	173
Ecuador	49
El Salvador	66
United States	77
Guatemala	64
Honduras	110
Mexico	362
Nicaragua	10
Panama	29
Paraguay	14
Peru	46
Dominican Republic	2
Uruguay	78
Russia and satellites	235
From undetermined nationality	381
Other countries outside this hemisphere	161
Total	2,840

This raises the question of whether or not this influx of trainees and those engaged in subversive activities in 1962 is not far greater than the 1,000 to 1,500 as was suggested by the distinguished Director of Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. McCone. I put this in the RECORD because I feel in doing so it is a public service, and it is my duty and responsibility to do so.

CONCERN OVER CUBA CONTINUES—SUBJECT NEEDS OPEN DISCUSSION

I am one who is concerned about the constant, at least recently, lambasting of anyone in public office who has anything to say about Cuba at the present time in relation to policies concerning Cuba. So far as I am concerned, an American citizen, let alone a public official, has a duty so long as Castro and communism remains in Cuba to do what he can to see that the administration establishes and carries out a long-range and firm policy of getting rid of Castro and communism in Cuba; and, in addition, making sure that there is not an infiltration of communism or subversion from Cuba, and that major military personnel and weapons are imported further—as well as "offensive" weapons—not returned to Cuba in place of those which may or may not have been taken from Cuba as result of the too hastily lifted quarantine last October.

I think it is and has been the duty of every Member of Congress to do all in his power in helping to firm up a firm anti-Communist Cuban policy, not only this year but in previous years.

I quote Winston Churchill in answer to the Democratic big guns trying to stifle all discussion of the Cuban mess and the need for firm action—

> Still, if you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival.
>
> There may even be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish than live as slaves.

I could point to the RECORD, when I took the floor of the House and made remarks on the subject of Cuba, calling for action concerning Cuba, and calling for a peaceful blockade, which is exactly what the administration put into effect in October, making that request long before the blockade took place.

I call the attention of the Members of the House to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 108, part 17, page 23010. I had previously addressed to the administration a number of recommendations. As a matter of fact, a letter to me from Fred G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State, in answer to a number of recommendations made by me February 3, 1962, was dated March 10, 1962, in reply to my letter asking for consideration of those recommendations made on a constructive basis as the result of information of military buildup that had not only come to my attention but to the attention of other Members of the House as well.

In those recommendations I suggested that the United States Government consider—this is February 3, 1962—such

things as recognition and support of a free non-Communist Cuban government in exile.

What was the answer of the administration? Of course I make that proposal again today. My objective today is to set out proposals that deserve continuous consideration and putting into effect by the administration of a free non-Communist government in exile. That is one of the recommendations.

What did the administration reply to that request? I am speaking as of their letter of March 10, 1962, in reply to mine of February 3, 1962:

> The recognition of a government in Cuba in exile at this time is not in the national interest of the Government of the United States, because neither the Government of Switzerland nor any other government could then represent the U.S. interests before the Castro regime.

I thought we had withdrawn recognition of the Cuban Castro government. Now, continuing:

> Were a government-in-exile formed, and should the United States recognize such a government, the United States would have to look to that government and not to the Castro government for the fulfillment of Cuban obligations.

What obligations? We had withdrawn recognition. And I cited this in the RECORD of October 10, 1962, and prior thereto, as evidence of the fuzzy thinking of the State Department as it relates to dealing with the Communist Castro threat in Cuba.

I further recommended—and this is February 3, 1962—the prevention of further shipping of heavy war materiel by the Sino-Soviet bloc to Cuba. This was October 10, 1962. And, in reply the State Department said:

> Underlying an announcement, such as you suggest, that the United States will not permit the shipment of war materiel to Cuba by the Sino-Soviet bloc is, of course, the intention to insure that the terms of the announcement are fulfilled.

Using the same old kernel that is now being repeated again, that blockade means war, and nobody is proposing a blockade, nobody is proposing war, but I was proposing that which finally resulted; that is, a quarantine or peaceful blockade.

I brought out that there was a some 4.5 to 5 million U.S. dollar leakage through the payrolls at the Guantanamo base to Castro, and I see one of those Members of this House that recently visited Guantanamo made the same statement just a few weeks ago and wondered why this door of American dollars could not be closed. I asked that question, too—on February 3, 1962.

I also suggested that aid to Latin American countries under the Alliance for Progress program be cut off if assistance was given to Castro. Here was the reply, and I repeat it now:

> To withhold our assistance would in many instances further weaken the very nations that for the above-mentioned reasons find that it is politically unfeasible at this time to undertake steps such as sanctions, against the Communist Cuban Government.

So, this was March 10, 1962. The State Department policy was not to withdraw aid or, as a matter of fact, not to take effective steps to discourage other Latin American countries from doing business with Castro-Communist Cuba. These were recommendations I made many months ago, and I could point to other places in the RECORD where I, for one, was calling for action relating to Cuba.

CUBAN ISSUE DOWNGRADED AT COSTA RICAN CONFERENCE

Today I want to discuss a couple of other matters relating to this overall question. No. 1 is the present Costa Rican Conference, and it is rather disturbing to me that the Cuban question is being downgraded by the United States. I have just read on the UPI wire service the President's remarks as he landed in San Jose at the airport, and I noticed a lack of reference with respect to Cuba and the Communist menace in this hemisphere, which again substantiates the statement emanating out of the State Department previously that Cuba and Communist subversion was not to be the top subject of discussion in Costa Rica at this conference of Central American States. It is also interesting to me that Mexico is left out of the Central American Conference. Mexico is where one of our principal problems exists, being one of the nations that continues to recognize Cuba and through which this flow of subversives continues through the Cuban Embassy is Mexico City. What happens is that a person who goes to Mexico, be it from the United States or any Latin American country, goes to the Cuban Embassy, and if they pass the standards set down, they get a separate visa unattached to their passport to enter Cuba and come back to Mexico and then to go back to their home country without the evidence of their Cuban visit on their home document. In that way this visa does not appear as a permanent record on the passport or visa papers of the person involved, the traveler.

Therefore, when that person, be he a citizen of the United States, comes back to the United States, it does not appear on the face of his transport papers—his visa or passport—that he had been to Cuba. This, incidentally, as I understand it, is a violation of international custom if not international law let alone U.S. law.

Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that going to Cuba at all at this time by a U.S. citizen without the permission of the U.S. Government is a crime.

I am particularly disturbed that the Cuban situation and the long-range answers to it, some of which could easily be carved out at the Costa Rican conference, is being played down rather than played up purposely by the United States—in a forum where firm action could easily emanate—because, after all, most of these small countries were actually invaded by Castro bands early in 1961 and their concern is natural.

SUBJECTS ON COMBATING CUBA'S COMMUNISM THAT SHOULD BE DISCUSSED AT COSTA RICA

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion such matters as these should properly and of necessity be discussed at the Central American-Costa Rican conference: For instance, first, how the large uninhabited coastal regions of Central America—and I have had the privilege of visiting many of them—can be protected against weapon drops and subversive activities by Cuban communism.

Second, how all Central American nations can act in concert if any one is threatened by overthrow by force by the Communists.

Third, how the flow of subversion to and from Cuba can be stopped at their borders as well as through the Cuban Embassy in Mexico.

Fourth, how these nations can encourage other nations to withdraw recognition and impose an economic quarantine in Cuba.

Fifth, what programs should be followed on Alliance for Progress funds for nations that do not join in this effort. And, of course, it is my opinion that such funds should be withheld.

Sixth, give an assurance to these nations that U.S. military assistance to fight threatening communism is available to those nations on the call of the free government of those nations.

In my opinion all of these subjects should not only be discussed, but they should have top priority and should be resolved upon at the Costa Rican conference. A failure to come to grips or to make plans for these actions will foredoom the Costa Rican conference to utter failure in meeting the clear and present dangers of communism, which is the most serious challenge of this decade in this hemisphere.

FURTHER STEPS TO COMBAT COMMUNISM IN THIS HEMISPHERE

Mr. Speaker, another subject upon which I wanted to touch briefly, relating also to Cuba, is this report recently issued by the Selden Committee in which some very interesting, factual findings are made, and in which there are some rather obvious omissions. Let me outline some additional steps—in addition to those which I have already suggested—which I feel the administration should seriously consider in meeting this Communist challenge emanating from Cuba.

The report itself says that certain economic and diplomatic quarantines should be put into effect by all Latin American countries in this hemisphere.

Of course, the report does not indicate how they should be implemented. I have suggested that economic aid should be withheld from countries which do not show an inclination to so implement them. That, obviously, brings up the question with respect to this open-door policy and the quickest way to close that open door of subversion is for Mexico to withdraw recognition of Cuba and thus close the Cuban Embassy and also stop doing business with Cuba. Withdrawal of recognition of Cuba by Bolivia, Uruguay, Brazil, Mexico, and Chile should be demanded as a condition for Alliance for Progress funds.

Then, we get specifically to Brazil and how it can contribute to putting an end to subversion within its own country. There have been some very interesting disclosures concerning that of recent date. The secretary sent to this country to negotiate on behalf of Brazil, the Brazilian Minister of Finance, San Tiago Dantes, made a number of statements before he left Brazil concerning what his intentions were as they relate to the Brazilian loan that he was attempting to negotiate in this country, and these are not small loans. He is asking for an addition of some $84 million to the $553 million in U.S. aid which was given Brazil since 1951 and, according to the best information available, to obtain a postponement of the $450 million Brazil has to date to pay to the United States this year on its debts. When the minister left Rio de Janeiro on February 20 of this year, this is what was reported by the United Press International:

> Rio de Janeiro.—Brazil is about to sign a long-term $160 million a year trade agreement with the Russians as part of a 3-year plan the United States will be asked to help finance, it was reported today.
>
> Government sources said they do not expect the United States to press for curbs on Iron Curtain trade which will be approximately doubled by the new agreement and may increase to as much as $300 million a year by 1965.

I read that sentence again:

> Government sources said they do not expect the United States to press for curbs on Iron Curtain trade which will be approximately doubled by the new agreement and may increase to as much as $300 million a year by 1965.
>
> A mission headed by Finance Minister San Tiago Dantas is to leave soon for Washington to seek liberalized terms on existing loans and $1.5 billion in new U.S. loans and investments over the 3-year period.

Likewise, in the Evening Star of March 11, as a result of an interview with Finance Minister Dantas this was reported:

> Brazil's Finance Minister said today that part of the financial help he is seeking here would be used to develop trade with all countries—including Russia.
>
> Francisco San Tiago Dantas made that statement to newsmen after conferring at the White House with President Kennedy.
>
> Mr. Dantas, a former Foreign Minister for his government who voted against the expulsion of Cuba from the Organization of American States, said of his talk with Mr. Kennedy:
>
> "I think it was a very interesting conversation and I hope that my visit will be helpful for the mutual understanding between our countries. We had a general picture of the situation and before I leave for Brazil we will have a new talk."
>
> A reporter asked whether "some of this loan you are seeking from the United States" would be used to help develop trade with Russia. No, Mr. Dantas replied, "with all the countries."
>
> "Including Russia?" he was asked.
>
> "Including Russia," he replied.
>
> Mr. Dantas is reported to be hoping to persuade the United States to add some $84 million to the $553 million in U.S. aid given Brazil since 1951, and to obtain a postponement of the $450 million Brazil is due to pay to the United States this year on its debts.
>
> He said that in his talk with Mr. Kennedy there was mention of a visit to Brazil. No date has been fixed he said, but Mr. Kennedy confirmed that it would be this year.

I made a specific request through Mr. Moscoso's office as late as last Saturday that I be informed concerning the requests that had been made by Brazil as to loans and aid and also what was being discussed with regard to trade with Russia—that is between Russia and Brazil; and it is going on now, there is no question about it. I was denied any information other than that negotiations are underway with Brazil. There is no question that the improvement of the economy of Brazil through these loans would have the effect of putting Brazil in a better position to have greater trade with the Soviet Union. I called the attention of the Department of State through Mr. Moscoso's office that according to reports Brazil has earmarked $1½ million for developing trade, including trade with Soviet Russia, and that a large portion of this sum will come from U.S. aid if the request of Goulart's nearly bankrupt administration is fulfilled.

Although the facts surrounding Brazil's request for U.S. aid, as well as how this money will be spent, can be read in the Rio press, the State Department has refused to release this same information to the people who are going to foot the bill—the American taxpayers.

I personally spoke on Saturday with a Mr. Romano in the State Department office of Teodoro Moscoso, regional assistant administrator for Latin America. Although he informed me active negotiations for a loan to Brazil are under way in Washington, he refused to give me information concerning the total amount under consideration and how it will be spent.

In light of the State Department's charges of Communist infiltration in the Government of Brazil, I am asking that no further U.S. loans be made to Senor Goulart's government until the Communists are cleaned out of it, until we receive assurances that our aid dollar will not be used to finance Brazilian trade with Russia and until Brazil follows the lead of the majority of the Latin American nations and withdraws recognition of Castro's Cuba.

I am also asking the State Department to lift the veil of secrecy surrounding this loan so that the American people will be as informed as the Brazilian people are concerning how our tax dollars will be spent.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARSHA. Can the gentleman advise whether or not the State Department has lifted the veil of secrecy around this loan?

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to my distinguished friend from Ohio that it has not, except to the extent that I read again on the UPI wires this morning that despite protests, a loan for $4 million has been announced to Brazil to be used in the State of Guanabara, through a local Brazilian development bank, through the aid loan program, to develop small and medium businesses in the State of Guanabara, and is to be repaid in 15 years.

That is the only answer I have gotten, to the effect that they do not think that securing any assurances from Brazil that would aid in fighting Castro communism in this hemisphere economically and politically, as well as the withdrawal of doing business and stopping them from handling business with Soviet Russia, should be a requirement for this or any other loan.

Mr. HARSHA. I have been trying for about 2 weeks to ferret out this information from the State Department, concerning this so-called negotiation with Brazil. On March 4 of this year I wrote the Secretary of State asking him who was responsible for the State Department's position in this, wanting to know why the State Department would even entertain any negotiations with a country, Brazil or any country, for that matter, to use the money of the American taxpayers to finance an expansion of Communist trade with that country. I have asked for the names of those people responsible for any such policy and as yet have not received an answer of any kind from that Department, although I have written them on a number of occasions subsequent to that letter and have received replies to my letters. Apparently we are not to be advised of the conditions of this loan or the terms or under what circumstances it is to be made. Apparently there are going to be no strings attached to it, and it will be used to finance Red trade. I do not think the American taxpayer wants his money used for any such purpose.

Mr. CRAMER. I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly. I appreciate the contribution the gentleman from Ohio has made relating to the trade of Brazil with Soviet Russia, and his effort to get the State Department to make information available. I have joined in that effort.

Of course, the State Department recently, as is contained in the Selden committee report, specifically accepted responsibility for the assertion that Communist infiltration in Brazil exists, and the extent of that infiltration, which is quite substantial. It seems to me now that the Selden subcommittee report is now being made public this should give all the more reason to the State Department as justification for demanding that anti-Communist and anti-Castro anticommunistic action be taken economically and politically by Brazil.

In further substantiation of this fact, that there is a substantial buildup of communism in Brazil, interestingly enough The Worker, the Communist newspaper in this country, on Sunday March 17, reports on this.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this and other articles in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The articles referred to are as follows:

[From the Worker, Mar. 17, 1963]

Brazil's Communist Party's Strength Doubles in 2 Years, Says Carlos Prestes

(By Art Shields)

Moscow.—Big changes are coming in Brazil, and the Brazilian Communist Party is much in this changing picture. Its strength has doubled since 1960, says Luis Carlos Prestes, the party's general secretary

The membership of the progressive peasant unions has expanded from 50,000, 2 years ago, to 600,000 today. The movement for peace, which is the party's central/issue, has made great advances.

I met Prestes when he talked to a group of correspondents during a short visit to Moscow.

* * * * *

Prestes gave us many details of the rising strength of the people's forces. Thus the Communist Party's ties with the militant working class of Brazil have grown much stronger since the late 1950's.

The student movement is rapidly growing. It is led by Communists in alliance with members of the Catholic youth.

"The influence of the Communist Party and other democratic groups is rising in the ranks of the Brazilian Army," said Prestes who used to be an army Colonel himself.

* * * * *

But socialism, he said, cannot be prevented. He proudly declared, "We Brazilians are fighting to become the second people in Latin America to open the door to socialism."

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, further, the Red Continental Congress is being held in Rio March 28 as reported in the press; including prominent Brazilians who are to participate such as Luis Carlos Prestes, Secretary General of the outlawed Brazilian Communist Party; Gen. Luiz Gonzaga de Oliveira Leite, president of the Brazilian Association of Reserve Officers; Francisco Juliao, a federal deputy and founder-president of the Castroist Peasants League; Dante Pelicani, president of the National Federation of Industrial Workers; Almino Afonso, Minister of Labor in President Goulart's cabinet and leader of Goulart's Brazilian Labor Party in the federal chamber; Clodsmith Riani, a Labor Ministry functionary and chief of labor's general strike command; Mario Shemberg, a well-known Sao Paulo physicist; and Roberto Morena, a political commissar with the Communist forces in the Spanish civil war.

The complete article follows:

Secrecy Shrouds Aim of Rio Red Congress

(By Julian Hartt)

Rio de Janeiro.—The second Communist-inspired Continental Congress of Solidarity with Cuba is scheduled to be convened here March 28.

The first such Congress, 2 years ago in Mexico City, is widely regarded as having brought about violent efforts to subvert the Governments of Venezuela and Peru, and with organizing leftists agitation in Panama and Puerto Rico.

Just what the delegates hope to accomplish in the 3-day meeting this year has become the subject of broad speculation among security officials and political observers in Rio.

Most of the experts are keeping their guesses to themselves, however, chiefly because the current Sino-Soviet ideological schism makes it difficult to forecast events in the Communist world.

A possible reflection of this rift is the fact that leaders of the Rio Congress have drawn up two lists of purported sponsors.

Carlos Lacerda, the anti-Communist Governor of Guanabara state, of which this convention city is the capital. He hopes the Congress will embarrass the administration of President Joao Goulart.

It was Lacerda's State department of public security that came into possession of the two sponsor lists, which were made available to this reporter.

These lists were taken from the luggage of Luis Carlos Prestes, secretary general of the outlawed Brazilian Communist Party, as he departed recently on a trip to Havana, Prague, and Moscow. (While the party is barred from taking an active role in Brazilian politics, membership in the party is not a crime.)

The lists show some duplication, but the principal name on both appears to be that of Gen. Luiz Gonzaga de Oliveira Leite, president of the Brazilian Association of Reserve Officers. His name appears first on one list and second on what appears to be the original invitation, after that of Francisco Juliao, a Federal deputy and founder-president of the Castroist Peasants League in the economically depressed northeast.

Both Juliao and the Communist functionary Prestes have been issuing radical statements from Havana recently. Juliao, following the line laid down in Peiping, has insisted that violence and armed struggle against democratic governments must be the Communist course. Prestes, however, has spoken out for the Moscow line of coexistence.

The so-called Juliao list of sponsors, according to Governor Lacerda's department of public security, includes the names of Dante Pelicani, president of the National Federation of Industrial Workers, and Almino Afonso, Minister of Labor in President Goulart's Cabinet and leader of Goulart's Brazilian Labor Party in the Federal chamber.

The second, or General Leite list, carries the names of Clodsmith Riani, a Labor Ministry functionary and chief of labor's general strike command; Mario Shemberg, a well-known São Paulo physicist, and Roberto Morena, who, according to Lacerda, served as a political commissar with Communist forces in the Spanish Civil War.

Speculation on the Congress' goals has centered mainly on documents accompanying the two lists of sponsors.

The Juliao list was accompanied by a letter that thunders: "Once more Cuba is threatened with armed invasion." Papers taken along with the other list are much milder in tone, proposing a program covering:

1. Self-determination and nonintervention.
2. Solidarity with the Cuban people.
3. National sovereignty and emancipation.
4. Imperialism's policy of world domination.

These documents promised participation in the Congress by labor unions, women's groups, cultural, youth and political organizations, but held out no promise of funds for delegates' travel, food or lodging.

Some observers hopefully expect a violent split between the Peiping-oriented and Moscow-oriented factions.

Mr. Speaker, I think this, together with State Department remarks, clearly establishes the Communist buildup in Brazil.

It further leads to the obvious conclusion that any additional foreign aid money going to Brazil should be conditioned upon withdrawal of recognition of Cuba by Brazil and affirmative efforts to rid the country of the Communist influence.

ACTIONS TO COMBAT COMMUNISM IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Thus, to summarize these remarks, and in making constructive suggestions as to how to combat the Castro and Communist menace in this hemisphere short of war on a constructive basis, I recommend that the U.S. Government consider the following actions:

First. That Cuba and the methods of combating communism in this hemisphere be made a primary topic of discussion at the Costa Rican Conference, including discussions of first, how the relatively uninhabited coastal regions of Central America can be protected against weapon drops and subversion activities from Cuba; second, how all Central American nations can act in concert if anyone is threatened by the overthrow by force by Communists; third, how the flow of subversives to and from Cuba can be stopped at their borders, as well as through Mexico; fourth, how these nations can encourage other nations to withdraw recognition and impose an economic quarantine on Cuba; fifth, how these nations can encourage and join in the withholding of Alliance for Progress funds for nations that do not become a part of this effort to rid the hemisphere of Castro and communism; and sixth, to provide adequate assurance to these nations that U.S. military assistance to fight communism will be made available to the free governments of these nations.

Second. That the U.S. policy should be to require withdrawal of recognition of and doing business with Castro and the Communists on the part of all Latin American recipients of Alliance for Progress funds, including the five countries that still recognize and do business with the Communists; namely, Mexico, Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, and Uruguay.

Third. The forming and implementation of strong national policies on the part of all Latin American nations to control and eliminate the flow of Communist traffic and arms from Cuba or other Communist countries to Latin America.

Fourth. The establishment of an effective trade ban by the United States, banning the use of U.S. ports by any company doing business with Cuba or by any government that has jurisdiction over those ships doing business with Cuba. The present piecemeal ban is full of loopholes restricting only individual ships from using U.S. ports that also do business with Cuba.

Fifth. The recognition of a free non-Communist government in exile to strengthen all the refugee efforts so that these efforts can have optimum effects, both externally and internally, in upsetting Castro and communism.

Sixth. Advising the Communist nations that this country does not intend to permit the continued shipment of heavy war materiel or personnel to Cuba or the transshipment of Communist subversion and/or arms to other Latin American nations, or to permit Cuba to remain as a Communist threat and that the continuation of these efforts will obviously result in a reinstatement of a quarantine.

Seventh. Volunteering military support to any Latin American country that is threatened with Communist overthrow.

Eighth. That an immediate protest to Mexico should be made by the United States against the use of Mexican territory by the Cuban Embassy for the assignment of visas and for the actual passage of United States and Latin American citizens to Cuba for subversion activities, demanding that this open door to subversion be closed;

Ninth. Securing the support of the Organization of American States for this long-range planned program, short of war, to rid the hemisphere of Castro and communism; and

Tenth. The United States should firmly state that no funds will be contributed to any fund or program of the United Nations by the United States if any of those funds are used to give aid and assistance to the Castro regime.

Many of these constructive suggestions were made months ago by me. I repeat them and add to them today, hoping that this constructive approach, providing for a sound long-range planned program to rid this hemisphere of communism, will receive serious consideration and will be put into effect.

I refuse to accept any coexistence with Castro and communism in this hemisphere doctrine as a replacement of the the Monroe Doctrine. Our ultimate objective as expressed in my resolution, House Joint Resolution 277, should be to rid the hemisphere of communism in Cuba and elsewhere as our basic policy and the steps to accomplish this will of necessity follow.

AN EXERCISE IN FUTILITY

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, in light of recent developments concerning Brazil's efforts to secure additional U.S. loans and grants, I feel it imperative to put the facts in their proper perspective and to again call my colleagues' attention to this situation.

Mr. Speaker, as early as February 20, 1963, an announcement, presumably from the Brazilian Government, was issued from Rio de Janeiro stating that Brazil was about to sign a long-term $160-million-a-year trade agreement with the Russians as part of a 3-year plan the United States would be asked to help finance. The announcement further stated:

> Government sources said they do not expect the United States to press for curbs on Iron Curtain trade which will be approximately doubled by the new agreement and may increase to as much as $300 million a year by 1965.

A Brazilian delegation, headed by Finance Minister San Tiago Dantas, was scheduled to visit with U.S. officials on March 4, 1963, for the purpose of negotiating these long-term loans. This meeting, for some unexplained reason, was postponed.

The reports vary as to just how much money Brazil is requesting, however, the Brazilian Government owes the United States some $630 million in short-term obligations which Dr. Dantas is attempting to defer payment on until some future date. In addition, he is asking for approximately $400 million in additional loans this year and another $400 million for next year. This adds up to the tidy little sum of nearly $1.5 billion. Over the years, we have sent the Brazilian Government more than $2¼ billion in the form of loans and grants, so you see, Mr. Speaker, we have not exactly been stingy with our Latin American friends.

Mr. Speaker, on March 4, I wrote to Secretary of State Rusk and asked him for an explanation as to why this Government would entertain the thought of loaning any sum to Brazil, or any other country for that matter, to develop trade with Russia. As yet, I have not been provided with any answer of any kind, although I have subsequently written the State Department on other matters and have received replies. Apparently, the State Department feels we are not entitled to know the answer to this question. Efforts have been made to determine just how much this loan will amount to, for what purposes, what repayment methods, and other pertinent information that we all should know, but as of this date, we have been kept in the dark or rather denied this information.

On March 11, Mr. Dantas did visit with U.S. officials and he visited with the President, himself. It was after this visit with President Kennedy, that Mr. Dantas, in response to a question by a reporter, admitted that part of this U.S. loan would be used to help finance trade with Russia. Now, the Brazilian Embassy, in a release on March 16, stated that none of the money being sought by Mr. Dantas would be used to develop trade with the Soviet Union. In that same release, it stated that apparently Mr. Dantas misunderstood the question when he said that part of the money would be used to help develop trade with Russia. It was explained by associates of Mr. Dantas that he apparently thought that the reporter was asking him if Brazil would do business with the Soviet Union and it was to this purported question that Dantas said, "Yes."

But, Mr. Speaker, let me restate the exact conversation so that my colleagues can draw their own conclusions. In my humble opinion, the question is very clear and one would have extreme difficulty in misunderstanding it. The question and conversation were as follows: A reporter asked, "whether some of this loan you are seeking from the United States would be used to help develop trade with Russia?"

"The money will be used to promote trade with many countries," Dantas said.

"Including Russia?" he was asked.

"Yes, Russia," he replied.

This conversation was reported in the Columbus Dispatch, March 12, 1963. It was heard by some 11 or 12 other reporters and reported in other leading newspapers throughout the country. Mrs. Jessie Buscher, a leading Washington reporter for the Columbus Dispatch asked the question. Mrs. Buscher is a highly respected newspaper lady and of unquestioned integrity.

Now, this question does not leave much room for misunderstanding. Add to this, some other pertinent facts and one cannot help but arrive at the same conclusion that I did. That is, that this loan will be used in part at least to develop Red trade unless we can put some strings on it. Here are these additional facts:

A news article appearing in the Baltimore Sun, March 8, reported that Brazil would soon begin trade talks with four other members of the Red bloc—Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia. In fact, the Hungarian mission has already been in Brazil and it hopes to increase its trade from $7 million per year to $40 million and Poland, at the last report, is scheduled to arrive in Brazil tomorrow.

Mr. Dantas met in an off-the-record session with a subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and admitted again that Brazil would expand its trade with the Communist bloc. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Brazilian Bulletin of March 1, 1963, a publication issued by the Brazilian Government Trade Bureau states unequivocally that Brazil hopes to expand her trade with the Soviet bloc countries.

From the many news releases issued by both this Government and the Brazilian Government that Brazil is practically bankrupt, has spiraling inflation and must have this money to put her financial house in order, one draws the obvious conclusion that at least part of these U.S. tax dollars will be used to enhance Communist trade. To say that this money would not find its way into Red trade, is like saying you are going to pour a glass of cream off the top of a bottle of homogenized milk. It cannot be done.

To help Brazil or any other country expand or enhance Communist trade is beyond my comprehension, it is ridiculous and blatantly points out the futility of our foreign policy. During these days when we are so concerned with Communist expansion in the Western Hemisphere, when the administration is calling for $11 billion of the taxpayers' money to help Latin America stave off communism, why would the State Department even consider any such negotiation? We are spending and have spent billions of dollars to help other nations combat communism, we are sacrificing American lives in Vietnam to combat communism, we just passed a $15.8 billion military construction bill designed to protect this Nation from communism, our State Department officials have just publicly announced that this Government stands ready to give military help to any Latin American government threatened with a Communist takeover. Why then, in the name of commonsense, would we enter into any agreement that would enhance Red trade?

The expansion of Red trade is a very effective cold war weapon, it not only aids the economic structure of the Red governments, but helps expand their military posture and makes these other countries dependent upon the Russians for much of their economic existence. It completely nullifies the advantage, if any, of making these vast U.S. expenditures to combat communism. Expansion of Red trade will be eventually reflected in the loss of U.S. markets and aggravation of our own balance-of-payments problem and will certainly add to our unemployment dilemma. This muddled thinking by persons in the State Department, this desire to support both sides of any issue at the same time, has led to the chaos and confusion that swirls about our foreign policy. It is time to call a halt to this exercise in futility. Whether the loan to Brazil is for $1.5 billion, $400 million or $1, makes no difference. The American taxpayer does not want his money spent with the right hand to combat communism and with the left hand to enhance communism and Communist trade.

The Russians have already established some 84 so-called friendship stations throughout Latin America. They have completed their takeover of Cuba and are now in the process of taking over Haiti; this is being started by sending a trade mission into Haiti. On March 13, a Czechoslovakian commercial mission arrived in Haiti to start negotiating with Haiti. Thirty-year credits to build up industry are being offered by the Reds. Here again, the same old pattern is being followed as was followed in Cuba—trade missions are sent in, then technicians and advisers and next, soldiers.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, to finance the expansion of Red trade with any country is foolhardy and only builds up the economic and military posture of the Reds, enabling them to expand the growth of communism throughout the world.

It is time to call a halt to this idiotic practice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as if the foregoing were not enough to call a halt to this nonsense, look at these facts.

Mr. Dantas, the gentleman trying to negotiate this loan, was the same gentleman who advocated a soft policy toward Cuba at the Punta del Este meeting last year and voted against ousting Cuba from the inter-American States system.

Brazil still officially recognizes Castro's Cuba and is today carrying on trade with Castro.

The State Department has revealed that the Communists have infiltrated the Brazilian Government, the Brazilian labor unions, and Brazilian youth movements.

The Brazilian Government has not as yet made settlements with all the U.S. firms it has expropriated property from, although the foreign aid bill unequivocally states that no aid shall be given any country until such settlements are made.

Furthermore, other American firms are being harrassed by the Brazilian Government and Francisco Juliao, leftist leader in Brazil declared on March 10, that, "if the United States invades Cuba, we will sabotage North American properties in Brazil."

It is reliably reported that Brazil will host the second Communist-inspired Continental Congress of Solidarity with Cuba on March 28. The first such congress, 2 years ago in Mexico City, is widely regarded as having brought about violent efforts to subvert the Governments of Venezuela and Peru and with organizing leftist agitation in Panama and Puerto Rico.

Under all these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it would seem little enough to ask that American tax dollars not be granted or loaned to Brazil until she has removed the Communists at least from the ranks of government, that all U.S. citizens be reimbursed for property expropriated by Brazil, and that infallible assurances be given the United States that none of our money will be used to enhance Communist trade.

TARIFF RELIEF A HOAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in the House to discuss that part of the Tariff Expansion Act dealing with assistance for displaced workers. Recently the U.S. Department of Labor issued the following memorandum contained in an official booklet. I quote from the booklet:

> ### ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS UNDER THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962
>
> (Note.—This pamphlet discusses the eligibility of totally unemployed workers, but you may apply for a readjustment allowance or training if you are working only part time for your company because of an increase in imports, provided that increase was the result of a trade concession.)
>
> The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 provides adjustment assistance to workers who are laid off or working only part time because of increased imports resulting from trade concessions.
>
> This pamphlet explains how workers may apply for assistance and the kind of assistance they may receive.
>
> Your company has laid off a number of its workers, including you. The layoff is caused by an increase in imported products like those made by your company. If this increase was the result of a trade concession, you may apply for a readjustment allowance, training, job relocation assistance, all of the above.
>
> Before you may receive assistance, the U.S. Tariff Commission must find that your unemployment is due to increased imports resulting from a trade concession but immediately following your layoff, inform your local employment security office that you wish to apply for adjustment assistance under the Trade Expansion Act.
>
> This is important so that your right to apply for assistance is protected.
>
> You satisfy all of the following:
>
> Your layoff, the result of a trade concession, began after the Trade Expansion Act became law, October 11, 1962;
>
> You worked for any employer or employers for 18 months out of the 3 years preceding your layoff;
>
> You worked for any employer or employers adversely affected by imports for 6 months out of the year preceding your layoff;
>
> You are available for work (or enrolled in an approved training program);
>
> You are not disqualified under your State unemployment insurance law.
>
> #### DETERMINATIONS BY THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION
>
> A group of workers adversely affected by imports may petition the U.S. Tariff Commission for a determination covering (I) their individual company (or a subdivision of their company), or (II) their entire industry.
>
> #### I. YOUR COMPANY (OR SUBDIVISION)
>
> To determine whether you are eligible to apply for trade adjustment assistance, your union representatives, or anyone you authorize to represent you, must petition the U.S. Tariff Commission on your behalf. The Commission will determine whether the layoff at your company resulted from an increase in imports caused by a trade concession and will report its findings to the President.
>
> The President may then certify that the unemployment workers of your company are eligible to apply for adjustment assistance. His certification will specify the date that import-affected unemployment began.
>
> NOTE.—If you continued working at the time a group of your fellow workers petitioned the Tariff Commission, but you were laid off at a later date, apply for assistance immediately. It will not be necessary for your representative to petition the Tariff Commission a second time within 2 years.
>
> #### II. YOUR INDUSTRY
>
> A recognized union, firm, trade association, or other representative of an industry may petition the Tariff Commission for tariff adjustment. In this case the Commission will determine whether increased imports resulting from a trade concession are adversely affecting your entire industry. Its findings will be reported to the President.
>
> The President may then authorize groups of unemployed workers in your industry to request the Secretary of Labor for a determination of eligibility so they may apply for trade adjustment assistance.
>
> When the Secretary receives a group's petition, he will determine whether their unemployment was caused by increased imports which the Tariff Commission found to be adversely affecting their industry.
>
> If the Secretary finds that the group's unemployment results from increased imports, he will certify that these workers are eligible to apply for trade adjustment assistance. His certification will specify the date their import-affected unemployment began.
>
> (NOTE.—If you continued working at the time a group of workers in your industry requested the Secretary of Labor for assistance, but you were laid off at a later date, apply for assistance immediately. It will not be necessary for your representative to ask the Secretary for another determination within 2 years.)
>
> To help you get a job, your State employment security agency will make testing and counseling available to you to see if there is a suitable training course for you.
>
> Your local employment security office will find out whether training may result in a new job for you at the company you were working for.
>
> If a suitable training program will make it possible for you to go back to the company you worked for, it will be offered to you. Or you may be offered training for a job with another company or industry.
>
> If you refuse or discontinue training without good cause, cash allowances will be discontinued until you enter or resume training.
>
> During your training period, you will be entitled to cash allowances and if training facilities are not within commuting distance of your home, you may be entitled to (a) an allowance up to 10 cents a mile to defray transportation expenses, and (b) a subsistence allowance up to $5 a day.
>
> You may receive 65 percent of your average weekly wage but not more than 65 percent of the national average weekly wage in manufacturing industries ($96.72 in October 1962).
>
> Deduct from this amount (a) any unemployment insurance payments you receive for the same week, and (b) 50 percent of any wages you receive for the same week.
>
> (NOTE.—Your allowance may not exceed an amount which, when added to your unemployment insurance and any wages you receive, brings all three to more than 75 percent of your average weekly wage.)

You may receive a relocation allowance if you satisfy all of the following:

You are the head of a family;

You cannot find employment where you live;

You have a genuine job offer in another area;

You wish to make the move.

The relocation allowance covers the expenses of the move, and also provides a lump-sum payment of 2½ times the average weekly manufacturing wage.

HOW LONG WILL YOU RECEIVE READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES?

For no more than 52 weeks unless the Secretary of Labor approves an additional 26 weeks to assist you to complete an approved training course or you were 60 years of age at the time you were laid off, in which case you may receive an additional 13 weeks of allowances. (You cannot draw both additional allowances.)

IS THERE A TIME LIMIT FOR DRAWING ALLOWANCES?

Yes. No allowance will be paid for any week of unemployment which begins 2 years after your last import-affected layoff. No additional allowance will be paid for any week of unemployment which begins 3 years after your last import-affected layoff.

And the number of weeks you can receive cash allowances will be reduced by the number of weeks you have received State unemployment insurance following your layoff; training allowances under another Federal law following your layoff.

Mr. Speaker, I call this to your attention simply because my prediction of last year has been proven by the very first case to come before the Tariff Commission for relief and assistance to displaced workers.

The first test case concerns the lead and zinc miners. After taking the testimony the Tariff Commission refused the plea of these workers for relief pursuant to the provisions of the Tariff Expansion Act and the directive from the Department of Labor. The background information and statistics on this industry can be found in the printed hearings of the Committee on Impact of Imports on American Employment—the committee I was privileged to chair during the 87th Congress.

The case of the lead and zinc miners is no different than that of thousands of other workers in other industries. I feel that all appeals under this section of the act for assistance will meet the same fate before the Tariff Commission. It can hardly be otherwise. We find a rather strange set of circumstances when we study the problems of imports and injury sustained by both industry and labor insofar as seeking relief under the act. The Board of Appeals, in this case is, of course, the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission has jurisdiction in the matter of establishing the rates of tariffs and quotas, therefore, if injury is claimed they are compelled to deny that injury had been caused by refusing assistance or admit that the tariff rates and quotas were wrong in the first place.

It appears rather odd that the sentencing judge in this case handles the appeals. It is much like placing the fox in charge of the henhouse—or even worse—letting the doctor be his own undertaker. He can bury his mistakes.

The case of the lead and zinc miners can well set the pattern for rejection all along the line of all pleas of injured workmen. The Department of Labor specifically states that workers will be displaced and the act prescribes assistance for such workers. The question is, how do they get this assistance?

It is my prediction that unless this Congress sets up a separate tribunal to act on the appeals of these workers that no assistance will be forthcoming. Therefore, the promise which was held out to labor of relief under the act may well turn out to be a well planned hoax. Before the end of the trade story is told, all labor will find that their support of the trade bill on the promise of compensation for lost jobs was a bad bargain.

If the Congress intends to give aid and relief to injured workers and industries, a court of appeals will have to be set up.

The case of the lead and zinc miners is a case in point. When is a man's job taken by imports? How do you measure the impact of imports upon employment?

The best method, of course, is to measure the consumption against domestic production. Yesterday the miners were working; our consumption of lead and zinc was X tonnage. Today our consumption is X plus, our production X minus; thus a surplus stockpile and the miners are out of work. When a nation is consuming more than it produces, imports must be providing the difference between production and consumption. When a nation's consumption is equal to its domestic production and imports create a surplus of a given commodity, then injury to both the industry and the workers follows. The best proof of injury is a relief or unemployment check.

When the trade bill was being acted upon by the Congress we were told by Secretary Hodges that as many as 6 million jobs would be created by our expanded trade. The then Secretary of Labor promised us 5 million jobs and Charles Percy of Bell & Howell went all the way to 15 million jobs created by exports.

Slogans, promises, pie in the sky smoke writing may fool the people for a while but the realities of life have a way of turning aside the shrouds of double talk and presenting the stark, naked truth in the form of growing, chronic unemployment.

If De Gaulle allows the Trade Expansion Act to be put into full operation in the next year this Nation as well as the Common Market will suffer an economic depression.

A few of us warned this House and pointed out the facts of life.

I said then and I repeat now: "No nation can survive in a free-for-all trade war if its economy is based upon a high cost plateau unless it has legislation or international covenants to protect its cost of production, its tax structure, and its built-in costs of essential services."

My studies as chairman of the committee studying the impact of imports on employment convinced me beyond a doubt that we could make and keep friends only by trading fairly and not by trading freely.

I pointed out that tariffs, as such, represent only one consideration in the trade agreements. The restraints on trade take many forms.

At this very moment, even while the workers in the lead and zinc mining fields are being denied relief, as outlined in the Trade Expansion Act, many other industries are feeling the pressure of increased imports.

I refuse to dignify the export-import trade venture as a competitive transaction.

Competition plays a minor part in the world trade picture. Even the Adam Smith theory of free trade never envisioned competition between nations producing and selling like products.

In fact, the opposite was true. Adam Smith's theory was based upon producing certain products exclusively and not competitively.

The day all nations can produce for themselves all of their needs in any specific item or product, that is the day free trade becomes a death rattle in the high-cost nation.

The import-export balances for 1962 prove this beyond a doubt. Even in the field of agriculture when we balance sales against purchases this Nation is operating a deficit trade balance.

The latest report shows a $5 billion export volume while imports of all farm products will be over $4 billion.

Simple arithmetic and free trade apologists would show a $1 billion trade balance in our favor. However, it is not what it appears to be.

Closer examination shows that there is a great difference between what we export and what we get paid for.

We exported $5 billion worth, however, we actually gave away $1,600 million worth of farm products under the food-for-peace program.

This leaves $3,400 million in export sales. In this sum there are hundreds of millions of dollars worth of subsidized products such as wheat and cotton which costs the American taxpayers 48 cents a bushel and $42.50 a bale on every sale made in world trade. How much was sold for counterpart or noncollectible foreign currency has not been announced.

However, in our imports of $4 billion there are no gifts or concessions, most of these imports outside of tropical fruits, sugar, and some specialty products displace American farm products and farm jobs.

This is particularly true in the imports of beef and beef products.

In the year just closed, this Nation imported 970 million pounds of beef and beef products, an increase of 41 percent over the previous year. The imports of mutton jumped over 100 percent to a total of 67 million pounds. The same is true in greater or lesser degrees in mushrooms, heavy creams, cheeses, and in the truck garden products such as onions, tomatoes, carrots, and so forth. The net acreage lost in the trade balance between exports and imports in beef alone is over 40 million acres idled by imports.

This Congress has before it at this time a bill calling for a 7½-percent tariff on bread.

One wonders how any free trader can vote for a tariff on the staff of life. The

main argument in favor of free trade is based upon open competition between all nations and giving the consumer the benefit of low-cost products. Will he vote to raise the price of bread to the low-income families while at the same time allow the free importation of products not essential to the physical well-being of our peoples. My guess is he will, if the bread imports affect his district.

The plain and simple truth of the matter is, that when you scratch a free trader he bleeds like a protectionist if the needle you use comes from his own pocket.

People everywhere fight for self-survival; nations are people.

We have not heard the last or the saddest words in the matter of farm products. When the EEC finally sets its agricultural policy we will pay for everything we sell in the Common Market. I said pay and that is what I mean. We will be buying our own subsidized farm products at retail prices and selling at wholesale in the world market.

In fact, until we get closer to an equalized economy with the necessary free immigration between nations we will only be able to sell products in world competition that we subsidize.

There are some who believe it is better to pay farmers and workers out of taxes to produce surplus goods to give away in foreign countries, or to sell below costs rather than to recognize the folly of a free trade, open-door policy for a high cost, high economy nation.

This Nation's trade policy can be likened to General Motors getting into a price war with Ford, selling the Cadillac against the Falcon based upon selling price and volume, while ignoring costs of production. They would sell more Cadillacs, but General Motors would go broke in the end.

If you think this is farfetched, examine the case of stainless steel.

Recently I introduced legislation calling for an amendment to the Tariff Act to close a loophole which is causing a serious disruption in the domestic production of stainless steel. The attached memorandum covers the contents of the legislation and its purposes.

This is a very serious matter because of a veto by GATT of the tariff schedules, included in last year's Tariff Classification Act of 1962, which would have closed this loophole, but since the GATT veto in October, this act of Congress has not been put into effect, thereby creating a situation which has become acute.

Because of the discovery of a loophole by the Japanese in the spring of 1960, imports on stainless steel in 1959 totaled $14,000. In 1960, when the loophole was discovered, it jumped to $257,000, and in the first 11 months of 1962, $5,518,000.

Specifically, stainless steel carries a duty of 14½ cents per pound but by manipulation of the loophole interpretation, the Japanese—with their cheap labor—polish one side of a sheet of stainless steel, and come in under paragraph No. 309–1001 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and thereby paying a duty of only 1¼ cents a pound up until 1960 in an ad valorem equivalent to less than 3 percent. This subterfuge was not employed by any exporters to the United States, but since the Japanese steel complex has grown to a surplus production unit, they are seeking any and all means to dump their surplus into the United States.

This is not an attack against free trade as such. This is a move intended to preserve the jobs fast disappearing in the steel industry of the United States.

The following memorandum is designed to bring to your attention a serious import problem facing U.S. producers of stainless steel and their employees and to urge remedial legislation which would eliminate threat of substantial economic injury to domestic firms.

The legislation we recommend is in the nature of a technical amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930, it would neither conflict with present foreign trade agreements nor interfere with trade expansion goals. It would merely close a disturbing loophole.

TARIFF LOOPHOLE

The appropriate duty rate on stainless steel sheets is at least 14 percent ad valorem. Stainless steel sheets which are polished, however, enter under paragraph 309–1001, Tariff Act of 1930, at a duty rate of 1¼ cents per pound, a figure which, based on recent import values may be expressed at 2.9 percent in ad valorem equivalent. The average value of imports of this item is 42 cents per pound.

These contrasting duty rates can be outlined, as follows:

	Specific duty per pound (cents)	Ad valorem rate (percent)
A. 1. Plates and sheets, not specifically provided for (par. 304)		9½
2. Additional duty based on alloy content of stainless steel (par. 305)		[1] 4
3. Total	5.94	14½
B. Plates and sheets, polished, planished, or glanced, total	1¼	2.9

[1] Plus 1 percent additional.

There is no justification for such a discrepancy in effective duty rate: Stainless steel sheets properly dutiable at 14 percent, are subject to a duty of less than 3 percent simply as a result of the polishing process. Ironically, since polishing necessitates greater labor content and commensurately increases the competitive labor cost advantage of foreign over U.S. stainless steel sheet, the process should militate in favor of a higher rather than a lower import duty.

The history of paragraph 309 of the Tariff Act of 1930 explains its illogical impact. Tariff provision for "sheets and plates of iron or steel, polished, planished, or glanced, by whatever name designated" as found in 309 has existed with only minor changes since 1883. Stainless steel, however, is of comparatively recent commercial importance, not being in production in significant quantities until well after World War I. It is apparent that the provision was intended to apply only to high-tonnage carbon steel. This duty, when applied to substantially higher value stainless steel sheets, however, presents the opportunity for tariff evasion. The apparent discovery of this loophole in 1960 creates the present serious problem.

INCREASE IN IMPORTS

As a result of the discovery of the discrepancy, the importation of stainless steel sheets and plates has increased by more than 1,000 percent since 1960, a rate of increase which far exceeds any precedent. The level of importation itself, even assuming stabilization of the increase rate, threatens serious injury to domestic producers of stainless steel.

The import situation is clearly revealed by the following chart:

Imports—schedule A No. 6039700[1]

	Pounds	Value
1955	32,755	$19,102
1956	30,478	18,881
1957	32,574	31,168
1958	42,952	11,020
1959	15,650	14,251
1960	736,746	257,160
1961	1,872,909	814,059
1962 (11 months)	14,056,178	5,518,943

[1] "Sheets or plates of iron or steel, polished, planished, or glanced." Over 90 percent of this total is comprised of stainless steel.

Source: Bureau of Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Japan is by far the greatest source of these polished steel sheets, accounting for well over 90 percent of the imports during the first 10 months of 1962. Japan's share of imports under paragraph 309 during the month of October 1962 alone was 1,493,018 pounds, a figure which exceeds the all-nation total for the entire period from 1955 through 1960. Foreign competition of this nature threatens immediate injury to the U.S. industry. It is inexcusable that the threat is greatly enlarged by an obvious tariff loophole.

THE ANOMALY HAS BEEN RECOGNIZED BY THE TARIFF COMMISSION

Acting under legislative mandate, the Tariff Commission has recently completed a series of tariff schedules which collate and simplify the U.S. tariff structure. In cognizance of the anomaly, the Commission would correct it by classifying plates and sheets in a single category, thereby eliminating the illogical result in accordance with the standards of the Customs Simplification Act of 1954. Congress authorized the proclamation of the Tariff Schedules early last year in the Tariff Classification Act of 1962 when the President implements this act the schedules will have the force of law.

Unfortunately, by reason of the difficulty of conforming the schedules to trade agreements, the proclamation has been delayed. As the matter is dependent upon successful negotiation with principal foreign nations, there is no way in which domestic stainless steel producers can know when this loophole will be closed.

LEGISLATION NECESSARY

Corrective legislation is the only solution which will effectively prevent the continuation of injury. Such legislation would provide for the deletion of the reference to polished, planished or glanced plates or sheets from paragraph

309. No tariff adjustment, or other adjustment, assistance relief, may be sought, since polished, planished or glanced sheets have never been the subject of a trade agreement.

There is ample precedent for legislation to correct an inequity of this sort. See Public Law 749, 83d Congress; Public Law 454, 85th Congress. Furthermore, the proposed amendment would not constitute a discriminatory duty against foreign suppliers—the current import duty on polished stainless steel sheets is 15 percent ad valorem in Japan itself.

In conclusion the industry is certain that it was not and is not the intent of Congress to permit an obvious loophole in tariff structure to imperil the continued existence of a viable segment of domestic industry.

It might be interesting to read an official publication of the Japanese Metal Bulletin dealing with this subject on stainless steel. I want to quote the exact newspaper story headed "Relieving News to Stainless Steel Mills, Exporters":

> Increase in import tariff on the imported polished stainless steel sheets by the United States is strongly indicated to be postponed again up to the 1st of January 1964.
>
> It was once reported that the current 4 percent import tariff applied to polished stainless sheets would be raised to 15 percent from the beginning of this year, with the postponement announcement made up to the end of February.
>
> Since then, in the light of GATT Convention and of the American fiscal year which is to begin on the 1st of July, the raised tariff would be enforced beginning the 1st of July; it came to be widely believed, but now the postponement up to 1964 is announced, maybe by the pressure of the U.S. importers to the Congress, and much to the relief of Japanese stainless suppliers and mills.

As a Member of this Congress I object vigorously to the implication in this Japanese news item that the Congress of the United States and/or administrative agencies of the Government have been lobbied by the powerful, rich importers' lobby into denying relief to an industry that, according to its own statements in letters and telegrams in my files, can be completely eliminated as a producing industry in the United States. It would be interesting if Congress would take time to investigate the entire import-export lobby and its efforts to measure and influence upon the Congress of the United States. Time does not permit a tabulation of the industries and businesses that have contacted me and other Members of Congress on the serious injury to the American economy already being felt even though the full impact of the Tariff Expansion Act has not been felt. This is due, of course, to the action of President de Gaulle in his rejection of British entrance into the Common Market. It is my humble opinion that what De Gaulle was aiming at was not so much a rejection of Great Britain but, in fact, a rejection of the American Trade Expansion Act which, in effect, could well destroy much of the economic growth of the Common Market, if we could dump agricultural products and capital goods in which we still maintain a production and cost advantage through our subsidy payments.

The move by De Gaulle is strictly an economic move intended to protect France's industries and workers.

Within the past week, the following newspaper item appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer which I quote, in part:

> ### TEXTILE PLANT IN LENNI CLOSING, EMPLOYS 260
>
> Yorkshire Worsted Mills, Inc., announced Saturday it is closing its textile plant in Lenni, near Chester, which employs some 260 persons.
>
> The 50-year-old plant will be sold at public auction on Tuesday, said John B. Lomas, Jr., secretary-treasurer, who announced the closing.
>
> ### SECOND IN 2 DAYS
>
> Yorkshire thus becomes the second major Delaware County industrial employer in 2 days to announce that it is shutting down.
>
> General Steel Industries, Inc., said on Friday it is closing its steel casting plant at Eddystone which employs some 900 persons.
>
> Lomas said Yorkshire has been losing money the past 7 years because of cheap textiles imported from foreign countries. Business has slumped about 60 percent during the period, he said.
>
> At one time Yorkshire operated a second mill in Chester. Together, the two mills had a peak payroll of 700 persons.
>
> ### UNION PROTEST
>
> Benjamin Norwitch, business agent for Local 178 of the Textile Workers Union, complained that the United States is not protecting its textile industry through tariffs.
>
> "The Japanese weaver works for 14 and 15 cents an hour," Norwitch said, "ours for $2.25 and $2.30. In 1962, the United States imported 81 percent more textile products than it did in 1961."

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering how these workers will be able to prove injury—perhaps the best proof is that they are out of work.

Just touching on a few of the items, I would like to quote a recent Wall Street Journal article which bears out my statement:

> ### VANADIUM CORP. PUTS 1962 LOSS OVER $1 MILLION, BLAMES SOVIET DUMPING—NET INVENTORY WRITEDOWNS DUE TO CHROME ORE IMPORTS WERE $989,000, FIRM HAD PROFIT IN 1961
>
> NEW YORK.—Vanadium Corp. of America expects to report a loss slightly in excess of $1 million last year, mostly because of inventory writedowns required by Russian dumping of chrome ore, G. La Monte Weissenburger, president and chairman, said in an interview.
>
> In 1961, the producer of ferroalloys and uranium earned $271,540, or 6 cents a common share.
>
> Mr. Weissenburger said the sharply increased imports of low-priced Russian chrome ore began late last year. The yearend inventory adjustments totaled $989,000 net after Federal income tax credits, he added.
>
> Before the inventory writedown, the 1962 loss was about $80,000 after depreciation and depletion charges of $2,744,388, the executive stated. The company had reported a 9-month loss of $125,037, indicating an operating profit of about $45,000 in the fourth quarter.
>
> Sales last year dropped to $49,744,000 from $53,647,338 in 1961, Mr. Weissenburger said.
>
> Besides Russian dumping of chrome ore on the U.S. market, Mr. Weissenburger blamed Vanadium's deficit last year on a number of other factors. They included: A decline during most of 1962 in production of stainless and other alloy steels that use ferroallys; inventory reduction by steel producers and consumers, which lowered demand for ferroalloys; accelerated imports of such alloys into an already depressed U.S. market; and "virtual chaos in the domestic ferroalloy price structure, which has continued into 1963."
>
> To counteract present adverse conditions in ferroalloy markets, Mr. Weissenburger said, Vanadium late last year began a cost-cutting program that included replacement and modernization of low-efficiency furnaces, improvement in processes and cutbacks in administrative expenses and payrolls.
>
> Mr. Weissenburger said Vanadium's financial position continued strong. Current assets at yearend were about $30 million and current liabilities about $5.7 million.

Mr. Speaker, the American ferromanganese industry made a statement on February 1, which I would like to quote at this time:

> The American ferroalloy industry generally, and ferromanganese producers specifically, face an acute and steadily increasing threat from imports. (This presentation is concerned with standard or high-carbon ferromanganese exclusively.)
>
> We will attempt to demonstrate in these pages that the ferromanganese industry has already been seriously affected by subsidized foreign competitions—much of it shipped from behind preclusive tariff barriers raised by several foreign producers.
>
> Since there is no known substitute for manganese in the manufacture of steel and since our country has virtually no reserves of recoverable metallurgical ore, we must import over 99 percent of such requirements from abroad. For this reason the U.S. Government has acquired over 9 million tons of crude manganese ore as a strategic reserve.
>
> To the extent that imports jeopardize ferromanganese smelting capacity, so do they compromise the value of the stockpile and the strategic potential of the American steel industry.
>
> The American ferromanganese industry feels quite capable of meeting equitable foreign competition. It cannot, however, be expected to meet subsidized competition. We have endeavored to demonstrate here that we do face this type of import competition.
>
> We feel that this condition should and can be rectified by Presidential decree or action of the Adjustment Assistance Advisory Board as established by the Trade Expansion Act.
>
> ### DEFINITION AND IMPORTANCE OF FERROMANGANESE
>
> Each ton of steel produced in the United States requires an average of 13 pounds of the element manganese. No suitable substitute for manganese in steel production is known. The alloy ferromanganese is the most common vehicle by which this metal is added to steel. Standard or high carbon ferromanganese, the most generally used addition agent, is an alloy consisting of 74 to 82 percent manganese, 6.5–7.5 percent carbon with the balance principally iron. Manganese functions as a scavenger, removing certain impurities as iron is refined into steel. Manganese also imparts toughness, hardenability and hardness to steel, making possible rolling or forging without tearing or cracking.
>
> On the strength of the role which ferromanganese plays in the production of steel and by reason of the fact that the United States has little or no economically recoverable ores of manganese, the U.S. Government has accumulated in the national stockpile over 9 million tons of metallurgical grade manganese ore. This ore would, in time of emergency, have to be converted into alloy before it could be used. To the extent that this country's capacity to convert this stockpile into alloy is restricted, so is the value of the stockpile diminished.
>
> The American ferroalloy industry is confronted with a rising tide of imports, to the extent that the welfare of the industry itself is in jeopardy and the Nation faces an unhealthy degree of dependence on foreign producers.
>
> ### IMPACT OF IMPORTS
>
> For the first time since the start of World War I, imported ferromanganese has become a significant factor in the American market. The reasons why this should be and how it is possible are discussed in subsequent paragraphs.
>
> The strategic effects of this were touched upon in the preceding paragraphs. Some of the specific or local results are equally significant.
>
> We have seen the number of men employed directly in the manufacture of ferromanganese fall from 5,200, or more, during the 1957–60 period to an estimated 3,500 or less, currently. We may assume that for each man employed directly, there is another man—coal miner, coke oven worker, quarryman, etc.—indirectly employed. Thus, in a span of 4 years, we have seen over 3,000 men lose their jobs. During this period total ferromanganese consumption has been relatively stable. The decrease in production is reflective of imports.
>
> During this same period one independent producer of ferromanganese has been forced to cease production entirely. Eleven producers remain. Of these, two are integrated steel manufacturers. Of the remaining nine, two, at least, are reported to be in financial difficulties and none is winning profits commensurate with investments.
>
> A substantial proportion of American-made ferromanganese is produced in electric furnaces. To obtain low cost power, electric furnace operators must sign long term demand contracts. With their markets dwindling, some producers may deem it imprudent to renew such contracts. This may well have the effect of eliminating entirely one or more such producers.
>
> ### PATTERNS OF IMPORTS
>
> The impact of imported ferromanganese must be viewed in the context of the markets available. Steel producers representing approximately 47 percent of total U.S. ingot ton capacity produce their own ferromanganese, leaving 53 percent of the U.S. steel industry as comprising the effective or available market. Figure I shows the proportions of the available market supplied by foreign sources during the past 10 years.
>
> Imports 1957, 7.7 percent of U.S. market.
>
> Imports 1962, 33 percent of U.S. market.
>
> An analysis of these figures would indicate an established practice either premeditated or inadvertent on the part of foreign producers whereby the U.S. market has become a relief valve for their own surpluses.
>
> Alloy smelting capacity is more readily installed than integrated steel production facilities. It has been the policy in several countries abroad to install such facilities in anticipation of eventually requiring them to support planned increases of domestic steel production—but in anticipation of such needs, to export their product to the most accessible market—the United States. We have seen this in the case of India and South Africa.
>
> Also implicit in these figures is the evidence that the U.S. market has become a convenient outlet for surplus production of ferromanganese by established steel producing areas. Imports of ferromanganese into the United States reflect the demands of foreign local market. As the initial industrial impetus of the EEC and its complementary Iron and Steel Community diminished, Western Europe turned to the United States as an outlet which would permit continued economic operation of furnaces that might otherwise have been forced to lower production, thereby increasing their costs.
>
> This pattern shows that when U.S. requirements are greatest, and, therefore, capacity to absorb is highest, the least imported ferromanganese is offered. As steel production falls in the United States (and reflectively abroad) a maximum effort is made to sell in this market. A case in point was 1957. That year, when both the United States and Western European steel producers were operating at record levels, ferromanganese imports reached a 10-year low. In 1962, when the United States and most foreign steel industries were depressed, imports into the United States reached an alltime high—with every indication of continuation into 1963 unless remedial steps are taken.
>
> ### IMPORT ENVIRONMENT
>
> In the preceding paragraphs we have discussed the general pattern which imports have followed as well as motives inspiring this trade. It is revealing to examine some of the conditions which make this possible.
>
> #### *Comparative tariffs*
>
> The following nations have supplied the bulk of imported ferromanganese to the United States: India, France, Republic of South Africa, Japan, West Germany, Yugoslavia, Norway, and Canada.
>
> Generally these nations are shipping from behind protective tariff barriers of their own. It is interesting to note that several of these—signatories of GATT Agreements—have imposed modest import tariffs conformable with such agreements but have imposed on top of these virtually preclusive sales taxes which bar imports as effectively as duties. A case in point is France which has imposed a 3-percent ad valorem duty plus 25-percent ad valorem sales tax plus 2-percent ad valorem of total customs charges.
>
> Figure III (not printed) shows that with the exception of Chile and West Germany, ore is entered free into the ferromanganese exporting nations (Chile has a marginal, generally uneconomic manganese mining industry which is protected effectively by the very high import duty on ore. The nominal duty levied by West Germany is too small to have any significant impact on costs of production). With duty-free ore, such import duties as may be levied against ferromanganese become net figures—reflecting the true degree of protection.
>
> The United States follows the incongruous policy of levying duty on ore—constituting an unavoidable cost of production. The tariff on imported ferromanganese is offset to the extent that American producers pay duty on ore. For example—manganese ore pays an import duty of one-fourth cent per pound of contained manganese. Ferromanganese pays a duty of five-eighths cent per pound of contained manganese. The result is a net protection for domestic producers of approximately $6.30 per long ton or about 3 percent of current market price.
>
> American producers suffer a significant disadvantage in this regard as compared to foreign competition.
>
> #### *Comparative costs*
>
> We have reason to believe that certain countries are offering ferromanganese at prices below their actual costs.
>
> As an example—Yugoslavia has offered standard ferromanganese at $120 per long ton c.i.f. Northeast U.S. ports (with rumors of even lower prices) enabling east coast steel manufacturers to purchase at $75–$80 per ton below domestic prices.
>
> Yugoslavia has no domestic source of ore of any consequence, nor does it have sufficient fuel for its own needs as witnessed by heavy shipments from the United States in recent years and recently announced purchase of 3 million tons of coal from U.S.S.R. We therefore, have a basis for estimating its costs of production. Figure IV (not printed) illustrates hypothetical costs in Yugoslavia for both electric and blast furnace-produced alloy. We feel that these estimates are objective—although no data are available as to wage rates, labor productivity or internal rail and handling costs. Figure IV demonstrates that $120 does not reflect true costs. Our estimates of $116.19 to $126.05 per ton delivered do not include repair and maintenance, furnace lining, overhead, commissions (this material is being offered by brokers), internal transportation costs or profits. (From the analyses of the Yugoslavian ferromanganese we assume it to be an electric furnace product.) We maintain that this is subsidized competition or sales at less than its fair value, constituting dumping as defined by the Antidumping Act. (Antidumping Act, as amended, Aug. 14, 1958, sec. 201(a).)
>
> India has become an important source of ferromanganese in this market, where this alloy is offered at prices $30–$40 below domestic prices. The Indian alloy industry admits to sales of ferromanganese at prices below cost and has appealed to the Indian Government to increase domestic prices paid by the Indian steel industry to offset such losses sustained.
>
> To the best of our knowledge, Italy has given up ferromanganese production, since it has found it cheaper to import its requirements—presumably from the same sources importing to the U.S. current market quotations f.o.t. Milan show prices of $169–$180 per metric ton. This would indicate that foreign producers are supplying the Italian market at higher prices than ferromanganese is being sold by these same producers in the United States.
>
> Governmental or quasi-official practices serve to obscure the picture still further. Centralized control or manufacturing cartels—illegal in the United States—are commonplace abroad. Japan imports its ore from the same source as does the United States. Short of solid fuel, it is a large buyer of U.S. coal and coke. Hydroelectric power is in short supply—necessitating periodic curtailment of electric furnace operations when rainfall is low, yet it continues to sell in this country at $40–$50 below domestic prices. The alloy industry is intricately interrelated with the Japanese iron and steel industry and no authentic data on domestic alloy prices are available. We must assume that without any obvious cost advantage (other than labor, which represents less than 20 percent of production costs) interindustry subsidies of some nature must be employed to make these prices possible. The West German alloy industry feels as we do.
>
> In summary, we contend that much of the ferromanganese offered on the American market enjoys artificial advantages against which domestic producers cannot compete.
>
> ### SUGGESTED REMEDIES
>
> We have attempted here to demonstrate the problems confronting our industry and the probable effects that the continuation of present policies might have. With the aim of resolving these problems and assuring our country of a continued vigorous ferroalloy industry—while at the same time recognizing the position of our allies—we propose the following as possible solutions:
>
> #### *I. Removal of duty on ore from non-Communist sources*
>
> The United States has no economic metallurgical manganese ore reserves. Less than 1 percent of the country's requirements are domestically produced. Over 30 years of tariff protection has failed to develop any significant production. The present duty of one-fourth cent per pound of contained manganese adds approximately $4.20 per long

ton to the cost of ferromanganese. At current rates it generates $5 million or less in revenues—far less than would result from corporate and individual income taxes if production was at a consistently economic level.

We feel that this is an onerous and unrewarding tariff which should promptly be removed.

II. Imposition of realistic duty on imported ferromanganese

If manganese ore was admitted duty free, the existing duty of ferromanganese (five-eighths of a cent per pound of contained manganese) would result in net protection of approximately $10.50 per gross ton (assuming ferromanganese containing 75 percent Mn). This would represent about 5 percent of the domestic market price. Even this we consider to be gravely inadequate in view of the distortions implicit in the offering price of foreign material.

It is our contention that a duty of $40–$50 per long ton is supported by the evidence submitted and would conform to the protective tariffs, or equivalent taxes imposed by the exporting countries themselves.

III. Imposition of absolute quotas

In the 10 years—1952 through 1961, foreign sources supplied an average of 7.5 percent of total U.S. industrial consumption of ferromanganese (621,000 tons out of 8,268,000) or the equivalent to 14.2 percent of the available market. This period covers extremes in levels of steel production and may thus be regarded as a fair statistical base.

Mr. Speaker, the above story of the ferromanganese industry is only the beginning if the Tariff Expansion Act is put into effect. I have faith in the Congress of the United States and in the President of the United States in that I do not believe when the chips are down, the American economy, the American defense effort, and the American free-enterprise system, including the jobs of workers, will be sacrificed in a profiteering venture which is disguised under the name of free trade. Trade is a commercial venture and all history has proven this. Although trade can be used to benefit all nations, it must be based on sound economics. This is not necessarily true however, when this Nation or any nation decides to give aid to needy peoples. However, this should not be considered as trade but should be considered for what it is—namely: Relief, assistance, or perhaps in a broad sense, a diplomatic maneuver we cannot long continue. To have industry by industry, product by product, undermined or eliminated for diplomatic gains which are neither lasting nor are they, in many cases, sincere. On November 30, I received a copy of a letter concerning an item that to many would seem insignificant insofar as its impact upon the American economy is concerned. However, when all these items are put together they add up to the largest actual unemployment since the great depression. This letter follows:

NOVEMBER 30, 1962.

Mr. FRANK W. CASTIGLIONE,
Executive Vice President, Western Growers Association, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR FRANK: For the past 3 years we have discontinued handling California cello carrots beginning with the month of July up to the end of November for the reason that we were forced out of this business due to the Canadian situation.

We have seen daily arrivals of carrots from Canada commencing with the later part of July up to and including December, I understand that Canadian carrots arrived in this country without duty, which has compelled many growers in California to quit the summer deal. I must say that prior to this situation, we handled from two to five cars weekly during this period, however, we are now handling none. Our principal supplier has been the Merrill Packing Co. from whom we had two cars this month. We have a good portion of the second car still on hand selling around 50 to 75 crates per day at $4.50, whereas our trade are buying Canadian carrots from $3 to $3.25. The irony of this is that most of the trade to whom we sell are service wholesalers and they in turn purchase these Canadian carrots and sell to the retail trade at prices at which we are trying to sell California carrots; so you can see the long range of profit made on these Canadian carrots.

It is my opinion that if your association in conjunction with the Texas association, as well as the united association combine their efforts to do something through Washington to have duties placed on these Canadian carrots, it would be a great help to all of us during the summer months. No doubt you are aware of the fact that Hereford, Tex., are also factors during the summer months and for this reason their association would be very much interested as they have recently been delaying their Rio Grande Valley crops to arrive at the end of the year or at the beginning of the new year due to this Canadian situation.

We know that Canada is a good customer of this country, but duties are paid to the Canadian Government on all shipments that go into Canada and there is no reason why we should not have the same situation on carrots coming into the States from Canada. I feel certain that this would help us a great deal as well as the growers and shippers in California by making available to us this carrot business during the period mentioned.

I have taken this matter up with Mr. Don Ward and he is preparing a letter addressed to Mr. Alan Rains with a copy to you as well as a copy to the Texas association. I have recently spoken to Mr. Vale Mayes, who was the former president of the Texas association, and he informed me that they had taken this up with Washington, who stated that due to the tremendous amount of business the United States receives from Canada is one of the reasons that they could not place a duty on Canadian carrots coming with three associations working collectively and meeting together at the coming convention in Los Angeles, we might be able to make some headway and possibly something can be done.

I feel sure that our local association will more than help and do everything possible to do something about it so that we can at least help ourself to stay in business, as you know, from year in to year out we seem to be always losing a commodity or two for one reason or another.

I will appreciate hearing from you.

Yours very truly,
M. & C. PRODUCE CO., INC.

Copies to Mr. Joseph Gheen, sales manager, Merrill Packing Co., Box 659, Salinas, Calif.; Mr. Frank Condello, P. & R. Brokerage Co., Box 655, Salinas, Calif.; Mr. Alan T. Rains, executive vice president, United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.; Vale Mayes & Co., Box 968, Edinburg, Tex.; Comer Produce Co., Box 1608, Phoenix, Ariz.; Mr. John Gillardi, care of Gillson Brokerage Co., 12 East Gabilan Street, Salinas, Calif.

Mr. Speaker, the story of carrots can be duplicated many times with tomatoes, mushrooms, watermelons, and in fact, much of our truck garden products have been displaced by imports. When we talk of farm products we seem to have a mental block after we get beyond wheat, cotton, sugar, and tobacco. Many of the millions of unemployed in the cities can trace their unemployment to displacement of farm products. I have stated before and I want to repeat, that trade—whether domestic or international—is a commercial venture with its prime mover being profit.

I would like to quote from an official publication of the organization known as International Traders:

WORLD TRADE IS A TWO-WAY STREET

Unlike domestic business, world trade provides double profits. You have your choice of thousands of attractive bargains for import from abroad. And for export you can sell products made in your country that are needed overseas. Opportunities for fantastic profits are unlimited. Some I.T. members specialize on one branch of the business. But many make money both ways. Mellinger instructs you in import as well as export. You take no risk in investigating these romantic and profitable fields. Mail your inspection request today.

Earnestly,
B. L. MELLLINGER, Jr.,
President.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress will be remiss in its duties if it fails to set up a watchdog committee pursuant to a resolution I introduced in order that Congress may measure the impact of the Tariff Expansion Act upon the employment and industrial well being of our country. No amount of sloganizing or theorizing can displace the simple but proven fact: production will flow to the low cost areas and trade will flow to the high income areas. We are a high cost production economy with a high income creating purchasing power, but unless we purchase our own high cost products, we will soon be a high cost production area with a low income. As proof of this, allow me to introduce into the RECORD the following article entitled "Taking Pay Cuts To Save Jobs":

TAKING PAY CUTS TO SAVE JOBS

Wage and fringe benefit cuts exceeding 60 cents an hour are sweeping through southern plants of Chicago-based meatpacking chains—with union blessings.

Members of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen (AFL–CIO) and the unaffiliated National Brotherhood of Packinghouse Workers have taken the cuts in an effort to stave off plant closings. Their weekly wage is now 20 to 30 percent below its former level of $100 to $125, union officials say.

One union—the United Packinghouse, Food & Allied Workers (AFL–CIO)—has held out against this trend. It has rejected the cuts with a blast against company threats to shut down plants.

MEMPHIS CLOSING

In the most recent phase of this development, Wilson & Co., closed the Memphis plant it had operated for 12 years. Some 350 UPWA members and 110 salaried employees lost their jobs.

Company officials explained the closing on the ground that Wilson's labor costs in Memphis were up to 80 cents an hour higher than those of its competitors in the area. Its rate for common labor was $2.41 an hour plus 65 cents in fringe benefits; its average wage was $2.63 an hour, the company said.

Among the competitive plants figuring in Wilson's calculations was the one that started

the wage-cut trend. On July 30, Armour & Co. announced that it would close its Memphis plant—under contract with the Meat Cutters—within 90 days unless the workers accepted cuts.

A year's grace: To avoid this, and to win a guarantee that the plant would operate at least through August 1963 the workers: Took a 15-cent-an-hour pay cut; gave up 8 paid holidays; eliminated an escalator clause tied to the cost-of-living index; gave up a night-shift premium of 12 cents an hour, a 50-cent clothing allowance, and penalty overtime pay for Saturdays and Sundays—except when those are the 6th and 7th workdays in a week; lowered the starting rate to $1.25 an hour; eliminated the 4th week of paid vacation for workers with 20 years of service, canceled meal allowance, and established waiting periods for sick benefits.

Bitter choice: In all, nearly 1,600 packinghouse workers have taken pay cuts in recent months, union officials estimate. In addition to the 470 at Armour's Memphis plant, these included 500 members of the Meat Cutters at Swift & Co.'s Moultrie (Ga.) plant, 400 members of the Meat Cutters at Swift's Nashville plant, and 200 members of the National Brotherhood of Packinghouse Workers at Swift's San Antonio plant.

"It was a choice between scrapping the plants and scrapping the contract—we chose to scrap the contract," says one union official.

Negotiations for cuts are underway at Swift's Montgomery (Ala.), Jackson (Miss.), and Ocala (Fla.) plants, which employ a total of 285 Meat Cutters members, and at Swift's Fort Worth plant, which employs 1,000 National Brotherhood of Packinghouse Workers members.

Unimpressed: Swift has warned its 300 workers in Atlanta that unless they authorize cuts of 60 to 65 cents an hour in labor costs, it will shut down the plant March 2. The workers have voted three times to reject the company's demand.

Their union, the UPWA, backs them strongly. UPWA President Ralph Helstein has charged that the companies are demanding cuts despite the fact that "they are operating at a very substantial profit level and are not in any financial straits."

In UPWA's view, the wage-cut drive is essentially an attempt to restore the North-South pay differential that existed in the industry 20 years ago—and to do it on a plant-by-plant basis without regard to the contract, which runs through August 31, 1964.

"The basic weapon is the threat to close the plant," Helstein says. "The workers are told, in effect, that the price of continued employment at the plant will be their acceptance of an abandonment of key provisions of the master agreement as applied to their plant. Either they accept less than what was agreed upon or they lose their jobs."

The wage-cutting pattern obviously will feed on any success it is permitted to achieve, Helstein adds. Moreover, he says, the successful use of threats to shut plants down unless wages are lowered "can encourage a pattern of similar action in other industries."

People's choice: Russell E. Dresser, who heads the packinghouse division of the Meat Cutters, says the decision to accept lower wages and poorer working conditions was "the toughest choice I ever had to make in my life." He emphasizes that the union will not allow the pattern to spread to northern plants.

"We didn't want those southern plants to shut down," says Dresser. "The employees were practically insisting that the local union officers do something to keep their jobs. Wherever any adjustment was made, it was done on a secret ballot vote by the membership—and about 99 percent of the people showed up to vote."

No roses: packing chain officials dispute Helstein's contention that the wage-cutting drive was designed to force down wages despite a rosy profit picture.

Mr. Speaker, my memory goes back to the years immediately preceding the great depression of 1929. What you have just read about, forced pay cuts in the face of a lowered consumption, was the prime factor in breaking the back of the American economy. The free traders have led the American people to believe that it was the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act that caused the great depression, yet the record shows the Smoot-Hawley Act did not go into effect until 2 years after the 1929 crash. I do not advocate a return to high tariffs as such; I do advocate however, a return to economic sanity and protection for American jobs. Without jobs there is no prosperity possible in an industrial complex, and this is an industrial complex.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, exactly 4 years ago the President of the United States signed Senate bill 50 of the 86th Congress, admitting Hawaii into the Union as the 50th State.

It is with a sense of deep gratitude and a feeling of great pride that I address this august House, as a Representative of the people of Hawaii, and as one of its freshman Members, for it was this House which first approved a statehood bill for Hawaii as early as 1947, paving the way for the final approval by both bodies of the Congress 12 years later.

For more than half a century the people of Hawaii had knocked on the congressional door seeking admission. Twenty-two congressional investigations were held. The results exhaustively cover 57 subjects, ranging from "Agriculture" to "War Record." More than 6,300 printed pages, available in the Library of Congress, record the hearings held and the committee reports made. These include the record of 128 days of hearings and the testimonies of more than 700 witnesses. Thirty-nine Members of Congress visited Hawaii as investigating committees. The last four of these congressional committees overwhelmingly recommended immediate statehood for Hawaii, and I am happy to be serving now with those who served on those committees.

On March 11, 1959, the Senate approved the Hawaii statehood bill by a vote of 76 to 15, and on March 12, 1959, at 3:04 p.m., this great body voted 323 to 89 to admit Hawaii into the Union of States.

How well I remember that momentous occasion. The Hawaii Territorial Legislature was then in session, and I was serving as the majority leader of its house of representatives. We were in direct telephone communication with the Honorable John A. Burns, then our Delegate to Congress, who was relaying to us over an amplifier system a blow-by-blow description of the activities on the floor of this House.

When the final vote was announced, there was a deafening cheer which must have imperceptibly raised the rafters of Iolani Palace. But only momentarily, for a strange quiet suddenly fell upon the tumultous crowd, and all present joined in prayer with heads bowed, some on their knees, many in tears, to thank God and to ask Him for His divine guidance in our new and heavier responsibility.

It was on March 18, 4 years ago today, Mr. Speaker, that President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed the Hawaii statehood bill into law, with only one regrettable note: the man who had successfully maneuvered the bill through both the Senate and the House, the Honorable John A. Burns, had not been invited to witness the signing.

There were many who worked and sacrificed for Hawaii's statehood cause and who passed away before they could enjoy the fruits of their labor—men like Samuel Wilder King and Joseph R. Farrington, both former Delegates to the Congress who lived and died for Hawaii.

History will record that Hawaii became a part of the United States in a unique way. It was not by war or military occupation or by economic conquest or colonial exploitation. Hawaii became identified with the United States by an assimilation of the political and social ideals of America.

The first contacts between Americans and Hawaiians in the first half of the 19th century gave rise in Hawaiians to a profound tendency to identify themselves with the ideas of individual rights and liberties and representative government. Indeed, it was only 20 years after the first Christian missionaries from New England came to our islands that the Hawaiian people adopted their first constitution, which was modeled after the Constitution of the United States. This was in 1840, and as early as 1854 the Hawaiian people expressed their overwhelming desire to be annexed to this country. Gentlemen, I think that these facts are especially remarkable considering that the people of Hawaii at that time were almost entirely of Polynesian origin. Is it not a fact worth meditating on that the tie which binds the people of Hawaii to the United States is not that of race or history, nor that of force or economic exploitation, but that of ideals freely accepted?

Some time after the adoption of their first constitution, the Hawaiian people changed their form of government from constitutional monarchy to a republic, and in 1898, by Joint Resolution 55 of the 55th Congress, Hawaii was made a territory of the United States.

Between 1903 and 1959, the legislature of the territory of Hawaii petitioned Congress for statehood no fewer than 17 times. The first hearings in Congress on Hawaiian statehood were held by the House Subcommittee on Territories in 1935. The House passed a statehood bill in 1947, and again in 1950. The House, in 1953, and the Senate, in 1954, passed the Hawaii-Alaska Enabling Act, but never both Houses in the same term, until March 1959. As to Hawaii's readiness for statehood, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported on February 11, 1959, that, "The committee members are convinced that the Nation could take in no more responsible partner than Hawaii."

The people of Hawaii are demonstrating right now the truth of that observation, for they are proving that they can make significant contributions to the United States, both in their financial support of the Federal Government and in their production of goods and services. Indeed, in just the few years between 1959 and 1961, per capita income in Hawaii—not counting income of Federal military and civilian employees—increased by $289 and surpassed the national average. In 1959, per capita income in Hawaii was $2,118, while the national average was $2,160. In 1961, per capita income in Hawaii was $2,407, while the national average had climbed only to $2,263. During the same period, Federal tax revenues from all sources in Hawaii increased tremendously. In 1959 Hawaii contributed a little more than $175 million to the United States, and in 1961, over $242 million.

The basis of the Hawaiian economy is agricultural, and most of the manufacturing industries are engaged in processing foodstuffs, of which sugar and pineapple are the most important. Processed sugar and pineapple each account for about one-third of the value of Hawaiian manufactured products. The rate of increase in productive activity in Hawaii in the years since the beginning of statehood may be indicated by the increase in sugar production. In 1959, Hawaii produced 974,632 tons of sugar worth $131 million, and in 1961, 1,092,481 tons worth $144.9 million. Other important products of Hawaii are fish, dairy products, beef, fruits, and vegetables, poultry and eggs, hogs, and coffee.

The untapped mineral and timber resources of Hawaii give promise of a flourishing economy in the future if properly developed. It has been reported that Hawaii has at least 600 million tons of rich bauxite, which could provide our country with a 100-year supply of aluminum. Hawaii also has a supply of titanium which is yet to be exploited. Timber is a great possibility. The garment manufacturing industry has expanded sizably.

The fastest growth has been in the tourist industry. With Hawaii no longer a "foreign" country, its blue and sunny skies, lovely white beaches, and rolling surf which provides wonderful surfing and swimming, attract an ever-increasing number of visitors from the mainland. Jet transportation, improved luxury ships, and new hotel accommodations facilitate tourism. Tourism has increased remarkably just in the short period of statehood. In 1959, 243,216 visitors spent $109 million in Hawaii; and in 1961, 319,071 visitors spent $137 million.

As a State, Hawaii continues to be as Mark Twain described it, "the loveliest fleet of islands anchored in any ocean." Its eternal-spring climate, its swaying palm trees and lovely hula maidens beckon to its shores peoples from all parts of the world. Statehood fortunately has not changed this.

What has changed is the stronger awareness with which the people of Hawaii have assumed their responsibilities as full-fledged American citizens. They fully realize that Hawaii today represents the westernmost outpost of the American New Frontier, that it must serve as a bridge between the East and West for international cooperation for world peace.

Much has been written about Hawaii by anthropologists and sociologists, poets, and romanticists. All agree that Hawaii is the showcase of American democracy for all the world to see. There out in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, peoples of diverse cultures, have proven beyond a doubt that they can live together and work together in harmony and in concert toward their own social, political, economic, and cultural betterment. They have proven by actual experiment that the ideals of Americanism can and will work.

It is for us here in the Congress of the United States to appreciate this truth. The people of Hawaii have proven to be one of our greatest assets in our struggle to maintain our friendship with the Afro-Asian nations. We must exploit the offerings of this new State to the fullest. Its East-West center is proving as one of the best investments in peace we have made in a long time—we must continue its support. As a training ground for the Peace Corps it has proven itself beyond expectations.

In order that we as a nation may further benefit from our latest partnership we need to establish in Hawaii a diplomatic school for Americans who will be representing us in Asia. We must also look to the establishment of a free port and international trade complex in Hawaii to promote free intercourse among nations of the great Pacific basin.

We must avail ourselves of the benefits to be derived from the ideal geographic location of the 50th State and the unique character and qualifications of its citizenry.

As their representative to Congress I ask that you use Hawaii and its people to advance this Nation's cause for world peace and freedom from want and fear.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] for his very eloquent oration commemorating the fourth anniversary of the signing of the bill which gave statehood to Hawaii. I am pleased to advise the gentleman that it was my honor to work with the distinguished delegate from Hawaii to the Congress at that time, the present Governor of Hawaii, the Honorable John A. Burns, in the great fight he made to give Hawaii full membership in the American Union.

The gentleman has not overdrawn the qualities of the great State he represents. Its people, its land, its climate, its vegetation, all make for one of the most beautiful and one of the most attractive spots in all the world. It has been aptly termed the Pearl of the Pacific, the Crossroads of the Pacific, and its attractions acclaimed in many other ways. It is the furthest outpost of the American Union today, one of the great States. Despite its location 2,000 miles west of the mainland of the United States, Hawaii is an integral part of our country. On this fourth anniversary of the signing of her enabling legislation we all take pride in the fact that Hawaii now has official status in the Union of American States. We are glad to claim her as a sister State. Above all else we salute the happy and wonderful people of Hawaii where the brotherhood of man, without reference to race, creed, or national origin, has become a model for all the world.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his remarks.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Hawaii on his fine speech today in observance of the fourth anniversary of the signing of the act that brought his State into the Union. I happen to have been one of those who had the opportunity to vote for all four of the statehood measures that were considered, involving Hawaii, starting back in 1947. It was my pleasure to have had the opportunity to work with the last Delegate from the territory of Hawaii and now the present Governor of the great State of Hawaii, the Honorable John Burns.

Mr. Speaker, when we think back over the years and the admission of the different States, Hawaii today is closer in travel time than Illinois was at the time of its admission to statehood. I think one of the obstacles in the way of earlier admission of the new States of Hawaii and Alaska in the years we had the measures under discussion in the House was always the contention that they were too far away from the National Capital. But, when you think that you in Hawaii and our colleagues in Alaska are closer today in travel time than Illinois was upon its admission to statehood, you can readily see how the world has changed. It is a great pleasure for me to have the opportunity to sit here this afternoon and hear you in your maiden speech as one of the earliest Representatives of this new State speak in observance of its fourth anniversary.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his remarks.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to join in acknowledging the very splendid speech which I understand is the maiden speech in the House of our colleague from Hawaii. I certainly also appreciate his generosity and fairness in acknowledging the role which had been played in behalf of statehood for Hawaii by the very distinguished Governor of that State, John Burns, during the period of his service here as Delegate from that Territory. I have had the opportunity now to serve with a number of Representatives from the then Territory of Hawaii, now the State of Hawaii, and I think one contribution of that great people which the modesty of the gentleman in the well has precluded his mentioning has been the fact that Hawaii has sent some splendid citizens, some splendid Americans to represent her in this body.

Certainly, the gentleman in the well of the House and his able colleagues in the Congress are fine examples of American leadership, and it is a pleasure to serve with them in this body.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. I would like to join with the gentleman from Hawaii and the other Members who have already spoken in commemorating the fourth anniversary of Hawaii's admission to statehood. I want to commend the gentleman for taking this time today and I want through him to congratulate the great State of Hawaii on the accomplishments that have taken place during the 4 years which have elapsed since Hawaii became the 50th member of our Union.

Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to have become a Member of this body just shortly before that event took place and so to have been able to cast my vote to admit Hawaii as the 50th State.

Of course, my acquaintance with the great State of Hawaii goes back to my wartime service. I well remember on my way back to the United States after the conclusion of World War II arriving in Honolulu and Pearl Harbor for the first time, and realizing then that although we were still many miles from the continental United States, we had really come home when we reached Hawaii. It seemed to me then, and I have felt very strongly ever since, that Hawaii was and ought properly legally to be declared a full-fledged member of the United States. It was indeed a privilege to me as a Member of this body to have had a small share in bringing that about more than 13 years later.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to commend the gentleman in the well of the House for the distinguished service he has already rendered in this body and for the very able way in which he has filled the gap created in our membership by the election of his predecessor, former Congressman DANIEL INOUYE, to the other body, the Senate of the United States. As one of two Members of the House, outside of the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] who have had some opportunity to become acquainted with the Japanese language as a result of World War II duties, and as one who had the privilege of serving during the war with a number of Americans of Japanese ancestry, I would like to pay special tribute to those fine Americans of Japanese ancestry who are residents of Hawaii. I think the gentleman's own service in the Armed Forces of the United States, and now his service here in this body, have underlined for all of us to see the tremendous contribution which Americans of Japanese ancestry have made and are making to the strength of our country and the great contributions which they made to our success in World War II.

Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished majority leader has already said, Hawaii is a living example of the ideals of the brotherhood of man, and its example should go far in stamping out prejudice from our midst. Nothing has done more to promote this kind of mutual regard than the great service rendered in this body by Senator INOUYE, the first American of Japanese ancestry to serve in Congress and now by the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

I want to commend the gentleman, and to express my conviction that on the basis of his service here to date in this body he will certainly be a great and distinguished Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Hawaii on his very fine statement marking the anniversary of Hawaii's admission into the Union. I can well remember in several of our national political conventions the debate that went on about including provisions for Hawaiian statehood. Both of the major political parties of this country included such provision in their 1948 and 1952 political platforms, to provide statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, I well remember the leadership of Joe Farrington and Betty Farrington as well as John Burns in this particular area. They appeared at the major political conventions and saw that provisions were made in both of the party platforms for Hawaii's admission to the Union.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to commend the gentleman for having this special observance today to mark this as the fourth anniversary of this fine, new State of Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to commend, from this side of the aisle, the gentleman in the well of the House [Mr. MATSUNAGA], from Hawaii; who has so wisely taken this time and who has spoken so beautifully about our "cross-roads of the Pacific," those lovely isles, and who has also made his maiden speech on the floor of the House in such an eloquent manner today. I recently read at some length a story of the melding of the people of different creeds and beliefs from all over the world, as indeed they have come from all over the world into the United States of America as a whole, to become effective citizens in this new State of ours, 4 years ago today. Like the gentleman I was not here to vote with this particular group for our 49th and 50th statehood, but I want him to know that, having spent a long time there—several times during the war, and the first vacation I can ever recall in 1951—I did come back and speak to various chambers of commerce in the interest of statehood for our happy and delightful island people at that time. And then, your last territorial Governor and first Governor under statehood the Honorable Mr. Quinn, was from my home State of Missouri, where his mother presently resides. So I feel twice blessed in recognizing Governor Quinn and in welcoming this State, on its fourth anniversary, now that it has proved good citizenship to our other 49.

In addition, I would like the gentleman to know that my only daughter and my son-in-law and grandchildren are in his State, where he does his Army internship at Tripler General Hospital, and they enjoy it very much.

I am not sure that I would agree in complete detail with every one of his conclusions about what schools—diplomatic—should be established there and how we should branch out to worldwide diplomacy. But certainly this would be a good jumping-off point and, as he so well stated, it has proved itself to be the bastion of the Pacific; it is the crossroad and aided and abetted militarywise—as far as peace-loving people are concerned—by our other holdings in the protectorates of the rest of the Pacific further on west and south, will serve us well if we exercise our will and remain ever alert.

Certainly if all of the individuals who make up this happy, delightful, beautiful, pleasant, even-temperatured group of islands in the midst of the Pacific will cling to their loving character and their dignity and their honor it will be even a greater State than it has proved itself during these 4 years. I am happy to be here during these days.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. If the gentleman will permit me to ask him a question, he is not of the mind that Governor Quinn is still our Governor?

Mr. HALL. Oh, no. I was there last December when their new Governor was inaugurated. I miss no opportunity to go back to Hawaii, especially since my family is there.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. We are enlightened now and have a Democratic Governor.

Mr. HALL. I felt sure the gentleman would bring that in, and want him to know I was not privileged to attend the ceremony.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from Missouri. I think that the gentleman from Hawaii is to be commended for bringing to the attention of the House the significant occasion which is marked by this anniversary.

I hope he will convey to the people of the State of Hawaii the very warm feeling which all of the people of America have for their fellow citizens in the islands, and particularly their congratulations upon the successful completion of the first years of statehood. As one of the original States, Maryland extends her best wishes.

The people of Hawaii are to be congratulated on the very high standards they set in sending representatives to both Houses of the Congress. I have had the greatest personal esteem for those who have come here from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much this opportunity to join with my distinguished colleague from the State of Hawaii on this occasion, the fourth anniversary of statehood for California's next-door neighbor. I am particularly appreciative of it because in at least some small way I had the opportunity to work for statehood for that territory for quite a number of years. As my good friend and colleague from Hawaii knows, I served on the committee which brought out the legislation which finally made it possible for Hawaii to take its place with its sister States.

I remember very vividly the visit which I had an opportunity to make to his great State, at that time a territory, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien]. The gentleman remembers the occasion. That occasion was called for by certain charges which had occurred here on the floor as to the possibility of communism in that territory. It was the purpose of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'Brien] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Berry], and myself, who accompanied him on that special mission, to determine whether or not such charges were true. Of course, I was both happy and grateful to discover that there was no question of there being any truth to the charges. There were perhaps fewer Communists in Hawaii and in that area than in almost any other area of our great country.

The hearings which we held on each of the islands which compose the great State of Hawaii proved beyond any question of a doubt in our mind that the overwhelming majority of the people on those islands were honest, law-abiding, sincere Americans dedicated to the principles of democracy and freedom to which we here on the mainland are dedicated.

As I look back now it gives me a great deal of happiness to have had an opportunity to make such a report at that time on the floor of the House and, as I say, to have had some small part in bringing about statehood for the gentleman's great State.

So today I am most happy to join with the gentleman and to extend again my congratulations to him because I know the great work he did. Of course, having been a close personal friend of Jack Burns, your present Governor, I know the great work he did in bringing about the final confirmation of statehood for the people of your area. I only hope and trust that I may in the near future have an opportunity again to visit with the wonderful people whom the gentleman is privileged to represent here today.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. I rise to join in this tribute to the great State of Hawaii, and I do it with affection as well as admiration. Alaska and Hawaii were partners in the race for statehood. Had Alaska not moved ahead a little faster than was expected, Alaska would have been the 50th State. We are proud to be the 49th State.

My great personal admiration for the people of Hawaii stems from my close contact with many fine citizens of that beautiful State during the stage when the issue of statehood was being fought and when the spokesmen from Hawaii, including the Honorable John Burns, then delegate, now Governor, were working closely with Alaskans to carry out the project of attaining statehood for both Territories. Both of us were trying to come in together, as occurred when Arizona and New Mexico were admitted as companion States, you might say, in 1912.

My great admiration goes to the people of Hawaii for sending Dan Inouye, who, as the first Member of the House of Representatives from Hawaii, proved so able and so popular.

I also extend my compliments to Senator Oren Long, from your great State, whom we from Alaska came to know with appreciation and respect; and Senator Hiram L. Fong, another top-notch personality whom you folks sent to the Senate. Personally, I am very proud to have all of you from Hawaii here as my colleagues but I am a bit jealous that Hawaii has already achieved its second Representative here in the House, Hawaii having attained a population of some 600,000 and over. Of course, Alaska now has that goal as its next congressional increase.

In closing I wish to say that in the short span of time since I have gotten acquainted with my distinguished colleagues, Spark M. Matsunaga and Thomas P. Gill, I have another occasion to compliment the people of Hawaii upon the high quality of their representation. Having said that, I want to thank you for yielding and affording me the opportunity of commemorating Hawaii's statehood.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDING. I am very proud to join the gentleman from Hawaii in paying tribute to his fine State on the fourth anniversary of its statehood. I believe the quotation the gentleman referred to from Mark Twain referring to Hawaii as "the loveliest fleet of islands anchored in any ocean" is one of the greatest tributes that could be paid to any State regarding its physical beauty. The thousands of Americans from the continental United States as well as people from all over the world who choose Hawaii as a vacation place would certainly add a hearty amen and readily agree that in no other place in the world is the traveler welcomed as enthusiastically and treated to such a wonderful contrast in both scenery and people as he is in Hawaii. It is these contrasts which make Hawaii our greatest showcase for democracy at work. Here East and West come together on these islands and live in peace and harmony.

I am especially proud too that the church of which I am a member, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints has chosen Hawaii for the establishment of one of our temples. It is certainly a beautiful edifice and is frequented by Hawaiian church members who add much to our church and to its educational system. Annually hundreds of Hawaiian students come to the mainland to attend Brigham Young University which is also my own alma mater. They make a real contribution scholastically, as well as to the social life and culture of this fine institution.

During the last Congress, I was privileged to have Dan Inouye as my colleague on the House Committee on Agriculture. Senator Inouye, then Congressman Inouye—did a masterful job in representing your fine State. I am pleased that my friend, Congressman Matsunaga, who is in the well, has replaced him on the House Committee on Agriculture. The people of Hawaii did themselves proud when they elected him and Congressman Gill to represent their fine State and its wonderful people. It is therefore with great pride that I join the two distinguished gentlemen from Hawaii and my colleagues in the House of Representatives to pay tribute to the State of Hawaii on the fourth anniversary of her statehood.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I well know the contributions that the gentleman's church has made to Hawaii, and I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii, my colleague [Mr. Gill].

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I join my colleague, Representative Matsunaga in observing this day. I think the action of the Congress and of the President in enacting the statehood admission bill deserves a lot more than the perfunctory attention that we can give it today. However, all we can do here is to merely outline briefly what has happened in Hawaii since statehood and to thank all of you for your help in making us the 50th State of the Union. Here are a few highlights of what has happened in Hawaii since the passage of the statehood act in 1959:

First, we have passed and implemented our Government Reorganization Act. It was my privilege to be associated with the State Legislature in Hawaii during this transitional period, and with this bill which reduced our 80-some departments and bureaus to 18.

We passed a bill to replace the jurisdiction of the Federal Government in the antitrust field. We now have one of the foremost antitrust laws in the country today, drawn from the best of the laws of the various States which preceded us in this Union.

We have passed the first statewide Greenbelt law in the history of this country. There are, of course, some in Hawaii who do not agree with this legislation and we are still fighting the battle in the legislature.

We have passed, I believe, the first comprehensive disaster relief act in the 50 States.

We have established the East-West Center under powers granted to us by action of this Congress at about the time statehood was granted to Hawaii.

I think all of these things indicate that we are moving toward the goals that were set up by you in the Congress for our new State.

I would like to mention just one major, overriding accomplishment of statehood. Those of us who live in the center of the Pacific are perhaps more sensitive to the political winds that blow from the shores of Asia than those who live on the eastern seaboard. I think it is fair to say that the admission of Hawaii to equal status with the other 49 States of this Union constitutes the greatest blow ever struck against the Communist Parties of the various Asian countries. The propaganda advantage that they were able to maintain prior to statehood—that the United States preached democracy but did not practice it, particularly in areas where there were large ethnic groups whose forefathers came from Asia—has been completely destroyed and we hear no more of it.

I think it well to dwell on this point in a little more detail. I know that the opposition to, as well as the support for Hawaiian statehood in Congress was in some measure based on the ethnic diversity of our people. I know that many people wanted Hawaii to become a State in order to make the point at home and abroad that we have made. There were others who had reservations.

I do not want to enter upon a long dissertation of the sociological and political impact of the various ethnic groups in Hawaii. I merely want to mention an example of what has happened. I can couch this example in terms understandable by all who are in active political life. I can state without danger of contradiction that had Congressman Matsunaga been dependent wholly upon the vote of citizens of oriental extraction he would not be here today. I can also say with a great deal of certainty that had I been mainly dependent on the votes of those of caucasian ancestry I would not be here today either.

Democracy is working in Hawaii, and will continue to work. You may be sure, Mr. Speaker, that our State of Hawaii will always pull its oar.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his splendid remarks.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, among the first group of bills I introduced when I became a Member of Congress was one to give statehood to Hawaii. I am proud to have been a sponsor of this legislation and I am equally proud today of the many fine contributions Hawaii has made to our great country.

The Hawaiians have been immersed in American traditions since 1820, and aspire to the highest principles of democracy. As I learned for myself when I visited this beautiful island a few years ago, they are a sincere and devoted people. Today, 4 years after their admission to the Union as the 50th State, the Hawaiians remain steadfast and true Americans in every sense of the word.

I salute the people of Hawaii, and wish them continued aloha.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago today, March 18, 1959, the President signed into law S. 50, "An act to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union." It was the culmination of a 40-year struggle by the islanders for full parity with their fellow citizens of the mainland.

Although 85 percent of the people of Hawaii had been citizens of the United States ever since passage of the Organic Act in 1900, they could not vote in national elections and, indeed, were not permitted even to vote for their own Governor. Yet, even as you and I, they were subject to Federal taxation. This discrimination was a constant irritant, but it never diminished the fierce pride of the islanders in their Americanism; and it even more obviously did not affect their eagerness to defend a flag that failed to carry their own star.

Since 1903 the Hawaiian Legislature had petitioned Congress for statehood a score of times; and from 1920 to 1959, more than half a hundred bills providing for statehood had been introduced in successive Congresses. In 1950 the Hawaiian people approved a proposed State constitution by more than a 3-to-1 majority.

As for loyalty and patriotism, no group of Americans has ever surpassed the Hawaiian record in World War II.

I cite the outstanding military record of my colleague and the Senator from Hawaii, Daniel K. Inouye, who is the recipient of the Purple Heart and the Distinguished Service Cross.

The "go for broke" Japanese-Americans who fought in Europe wrote one of the most brilliant pages in all American military annuals. Of the approximately 10,000 men who were in combat, 4,500 received Purple Hearts. More importantly, their wounds and their deaths were not in vain: they were victorious in battle and they captured the hearts of all Americans.

Gratitude, of course, was not a primary factor in the granting of statehood. Hawaii itself had so much to offer the United States. The strategic importance of the islands has long been obvious. And as the "melting pot that really melts," Hawaii is a constant inspiration to all men of good will. The 50th star flashes a message that all Americans must forever heed.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of genuine pleasure that I take this opportunity to salute the State of Hawaii on the fourth anniversary of its attaining the rank of statehood in the American Union.

The history of Hawaii is a long and noble one. The roots of her multiracial population are to be found on many continents and in many eras. Today, Hawaii's over 600,000 people trace their ancestry to the majority of the racial lines of this world.

If we have considered America the melting pot of Europe, we must now consider Hawaii, and through her, America also, truly the melting pot of the world. It is a high tribute to the growth potential of the greatest democracy in the world, and to the vitality of democratic institutions, that an island State thousands of miles from the continental shore, and composed of races other than those which dominate that continental shore, should be welcomed with open arms into that Union of the brave and the free.

The admission of Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union is dramatic evidence that the theories of our forefathers have continued to nourish and renew themselves for nearly 200 years. They are equal and adaptable to the present difficult times and are fully capable of meeting the challenges posed by the threat of communism in the 2d half of the 20th century.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the Members from the new State of Hawaii and to extend my congratulations to the fine people of that beautiful area of our Nation on the celebration of the fourth anniversary of the signing of the statehood bill. As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which took a leading role in the struggle for statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, I watched the political developments in the two territories with more than casual interest. When I came to Congress in 1949 both territories were pressing for legislation to achieve their statehood goals. Needless to say, I was delighted when their efforts were brought to fruition. Among those who have left their mark in their achievement are the Honorable John A. Burns, present Governor of Hawaii, without whose understanding of the problems involved, in my opinion, the goal would never have been reached, and the late Honorable Joseph R. Farrington. Both of these territorial Delegates worked long and tirelessly in winning congressional support and confidence in their cause. Their efforts were aided by former Delegate Elizabeth Farrington. Behind the scenes, loyal and faithful statehood backers, former territorial Governor and former U.S. Senator Oren E. Long, Riley B. Allen, Lorrin P. Thurston, Jan Jabulka, K. C. Leebrick, and George McLean, helped tremendously in preparing the legislation out of which the Statehood Act grew. I salute them as well as the thousands of others who gave their moral and financial support to making statehood a reality.

The excellent representation that was sent to the Congress indicates the caliber of the citizens who worked so diligently to obtain this coveted goal.

I can hardly imagine how a more able, dedicated, and cosmopolitan delegation could be sent to represent our 50th State in Congress; Senators Fong and Inouye and Representatives Matsunaga and Gill—each of whom is a capable and effective leader in his own right. Each adds distinction to our legislative bodies. I commend the voters of Hawaii for sending these gentlemen to Washington and for placing Governor Burns and Lt. Gov. William Richardson in office. The pattern of successful administration has been set. I am confident Hawaii will continue to elect officials who will lead the State to a successful future.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from Arizona, which was for 47 years the baby State of the Union, I am most happy to note the fourth anniversary of statehood for Hawaii, that gem among all islands, which has contributed so much to our economy, culture, and sheer pleasure.

It is also most pleasant to note the high quality of statesmen this island paradise has produced. Their reputations gather respect and honor daily, and we are fortunate in this Congress to be associated with such a fine delegation.

May Hawaii continue to grow and prosper under the status and honor of being the 50th State of our great Union.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to offer warm congratulations to the citizens of the great State of Hawaii on this, the fourth anniversary of the signing of the bill granting statehood to Hawaii. Since that day Hawaii has grown and prospered, amplifying its unique contribution to our Union. I wish Hawaii well, and am confident that the years ahead will bring even far greater achievement and renown.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining with my two colleagues from Hawaii, the Honorable Spark M. Matsunaga and the Honorable Thomas P. Gill, in commemorating the fourth anniversary of the signing of the bill granting Hawaii its status as the 50th State of the Union.

Ever since my election to Congress in 1948, I have supported statehood for Hawaii. In this effort I was closely associated with the former Delegate from Hawaii, the Honorable John A. Burns, who is now Governor of this new great State.

Hawaii has become a beautiful addition to the Union, justly famed for its climate, its harmonious interracial relations, its distinguished representation in the Congress, and its contribution to American understanding of the increasingly important cultures of the Orient. I salute the Aloha State on its fourth anniversary.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, for many years my native California was the outermost frontier in America's push westward. Today we have relinquished that honor to the truly New Frontier State of Hawaii.

In both the fire of war and in the pursuits of peacetime, the people of Hawaii richly earned their statehood. Their islands remain a strategically important outpost against attack upon the continental United States. As a crossroads in what Senator Engle has called the great "Pacific Lake," these islands offer a rich potential for America's trade future.

Hawaii's fourth birthday is an occasion for all of us to celebrate.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to join with my colleagues in saluting our great State of Hawaii which is observing the fourth anniversary of the signing of the bill by the President granting Hawaii its status as the 50th State of the Union. Sixty years after the Hawaiian Islands were annexed to the United States of America, the Congress answered Hawaii's call for admission to the Union.

Hawaii is known as an island paradise; its diverse topography, wonderful climate, rolling surf, spectacular scenery, all combine to attract many millions of visitors each year. Tourism is the island's second leading industry; agriculture leads. The people of Hawaii are modern and progressive. Their industry and outstanding capabilities are responsible for the expanding economy of the islands, high percentage of labor force employed, increased construction and manufacturing. Health conditions are excellent. Their public school system is exemplary and there is a high ratio of high school graduates who continue study in college or special training schools. Here, as in America, many groups of people with a variety of racial and religious backgrounds have learned to work together and to live in harmony.

The people of Hawaii share our ideals, love of freedom and democracy. We note that the State of Hawaii is among the first 20 States to approve the proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution outlawing the poll tax as a qualification for voting in Federal elections. This is a true indication of its firm belief in equality, and this applies not only to voting rights but to equality of opportunity in all aspects of its community affairs.

We are grateful to Hawaii for the help she is giving us in our national and international programs. We rely upon her as a bridge between the mainland United States and the vast area of Asia and the Pacific which contains more than one-half of the world's population. We know that the people of Hawaii will perform the big task assigned to it, to help those other nations understand America.

Hawaii is referred to as the Pacific showcase of America's economic and political democracy and living evidence of Ameria's brotherhood with all peoples. We are proud to have Hawaii as a full partner in our Nation's continuing efforts to achieve a world which recognizes the inherent dignity and equality of man.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a fourth anniversary is often symbolized by the combination of fruits and flowers. This is a particularly apt symbol for the lush and beautiful islands we salute today.

Four years ago today the President of the United States signed the Hawaiian Statehood Act. In doing so, he not only fulfilled the dream of some half-million Hawaiian-Americans, but also demonstrated to our own people and to the world that we are still faithful to vital American traditions.

For the patient people of Hawaii, that act brought to a successful conclusion a long, determined, and righteous campaign for first-class citizenship. They had proved their readiness for such a status in many ways, including patriotic service in three wars. The Statehood Act granted to them a position they had clearly earned and deserved.

Many a nay-sayer in this country fought against that act with all sorts of groundless arguments: geographic, racial, and ideological. They refused to recognize, among other things, that Hawaii provided still another example of how different racial groups could live together amicably. Hawaii has by now effectively proved that all the arguments used against statehood were without foundation. This is not to say that all of the State's problems are solved. But which State's are? Hawaii's splendid record during the past 4 years demonstrates beyond question that the fears of the timid were wisely overridden when Congress passed the Statehood Act.

By admitting Hawaii as our 50th State we also provided the world with another and significant illustration of the fact that the United States remains anticolonial in deed as well as in word. We proved that the spirit of the Northwest Ordinance, with its emphasis upon the welfare of the lands we govern rather than upon their exploitation, is still dear to us. And we demonstrated that we have not abandoned the melting-pot tradition that is still one of the prime sources of America's strength and greatness.

Not the least of the rewards the House of Representatives has reaped from the Hawaiian Act is the presence in this body of two distinguished Representatives from our newest State. To them and to the people they represent, I extend my best wishes for a happy birthday and a bright future.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in cemmemorating the fourth anniversary of the signing of the bill by the President granting Hawaii its status as the 50th State of the Union. The distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga] is to be commended for giving us an opportunity to express our sentiments on this notable occasion.

Four years ago, when this body was considering legislation to give Hawaii statehood, I stated that there could be no doubt that the people of Hawaii would prove to be loyal citizens of such a new State and loyal citizens of the United States. It was apparent even then that the energies and talents of the people of Hawaii, and the resources of their territory, would provide a definite asset to our great Nation.

The 4 years which have elapsed amply confirm that our faith in Hawaii and its people was not misplaced. Indeed, the efforts of our island citizens have far exceeded the expectations of even the most ardent advocates of Hawaii statehood.

Moreover, Hawaii stands as a reminder to the world that the United States has no colonial ambitions. Instead of extracting tribute from an island possession, we have joined it to us in order that, united as 50 States, together we may find renewed strength and community of purpose.

The methods used by Soviet Russia to bring the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia into the U.S.S.R. contrast sharply with the procedures by which Hawaii became a State. On the one hand we see brutal aggression and a complete disregard for national self-determination. On the other, we note freely chosen, democratically achieved unity.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my voice in this chorus of praise for the State of Hawaii. May its future hold continued prosperity and progress.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been moved by the eloquence and the sincere sentiment in the remarks of my distinguished colleague and friend, the Honorable Spark M. Matsunaga. The fame as an orator of the first order of the gentleman from Hawaii had preceded his swearing in as a Member of this historic body, and, Mr. Speaker, in his maiden speech in this Chamber, and on a most historic occasion, he has lived up to his reputation.

We are happy and proud to have him as our colleague and the House indeed is enriched by the presence of both Mr. Matsunaga and Mr. Gill. I congratulate the people of Hawaii on their rare good judgment in the selection of statesmen of such ability and such dedication. They are worthy successors of the Honorable Daniel K. Inouye who endeared himself to all his colleagues in the House and is now serving his State and the Nation in the other body. I would be remiss if I did not mention the Honorable John Burns who during his service with us as a Delegate from Hawaii was a vital factor in the attainment of Hawaiian statehood. It is a source of pleasure to us all that former Delegate Burns is now the Governor of the great and proud State of Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, many of the States of our Union, powerful and mighty States, in my boyhood were still serving their apprenticeships as territories. With the attainment of statehood all expanded and grew and became strong and indispensable parts of our imperishable Union. I count among the priceless opportunities given me by my congressional service that I had been permitted to work, to speak, and to vote in several Congresses for statehood for Hawaii and for Alaska. This is a heritage that I am proud to hand down to my children, to their children and to those of my blood in all the generations to come.

I am thrilled today with a sentiment of patriotism, of pride in my country and faith in its future, on this fourth anniversary of the statehood of Hawaii and the remarks of my colleagues in observance thereof; my warmest congratulations to the people of Hawaii on the magnificent manner in which they have responded to the challenge of statehood.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving on the House Interior Committee when Hawaii was at long last accepted into the Union, after knocking at the door for half a century; and so had the privilege of supporting her statehood, both in committee and on the floor.

Hawaii's loyalty had been demonstrated in two World Wars and the Korean conflict, during the latter of which the then Territory of Hawaii had a higher casualty per population rate than any State. We are all familiar with the magnificent record of men from Hawaii during the Second World War; every present member of the Hawaiian Democratic congressional delegation to Congress saw action in that war. Mr. Gill fought in the bitter campaigns in the Pacific theater; Mr. Matsunaga was a member of the renowned 100th Infantry Battalion in Italy, and the junior Senator from Hawaii, whom we learned to respect so much before his sojourn to the other side of this Hill, is a much decorated veteran of the famed 442d Regiment.

Mr. Speaker, I was therefore greatly honored to be privileged to have some small part in the successful passage of Hawaii Statehood, and am very pleased to be able to join the able Congressmen from Hawaii in tribute on this fourth anniversary of the signing of the statehood bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga], in observing the fourth anniversary of the signing of the bill passed by the Congress which granted statehood to Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union.

This is a memorable event for the people of Hawaii in their long and eventful history. It is also a memorable event in the history of the United States.

The people of the beautiful State of Hawaii have moved with great progress in the transition from a territory to a State. They should certainly be commended for the successful way in which this transition has been achieved.

Those of us who had the privilege of voting for the legislation giving the status of statehood to Hawaii may be assured that our support has been justified by the events of the past 4 years.

I should like to take this opportunity to extend my best wishes to the wonderful people of Hawaii and their great Governor, the Honorable John A. Burns, who, more than anyone else, was responsible for Hawaii becoming a State of the Union.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii, spoke eloquently of our beautiful 50th State on the fourth anniversary of the signing of the bill which gave statehood to Hawaii, and I am honored to be able to add my few words of celebration.

The commemoration of the fourth anniversary of the Hawaiian Statehood Act is the time to recognize Hawaii as a unique revelation of what American democracy means. In Hawaii, we see not only a realization of the democratic ideal that people of different religions can cooperate in self-government on the basis of deeply inculcated respect for the rights of the individual person. We see also that this democratic consensus makes it possible for people of quite different races to cooperate in representative self-government, and to live and work together in a remarkable unity of spirit. The success of Hawaiian-American democracy is a triumph of the democratic idea over causes of division which elsewhere have set man against man.

Hawaii comprises an unusual diversity of religions. Protestant congregations number over 400; there are 115 Catholic churches; and more than 100 Buddhist temples in the State. On Oahu, the most populous of the Hawaiian Islands, of persons 20 years and older, 39 percent are Protestant, 27.6 percent are Catholic, 15.8 percent are Buddhist, 2.7 percent are Mormon, and smaller percentages adhere to some other religion or to none. Despite religious diversity, Hawaiians are united in the democratic idea.

There is likewise a wide diversity of ethnic groups in the State. Of the 1960 population of 632,772, 31.96 percent are Caucasian, 32.15 percent are Japanese, 10.91 percent are Filipino, 6.04 percent are Chinese, and 18.94 percent are of some other racial origin. Certainly no other State in the Union is made up of people of such differing racial backgrounds, and yet her sister States could well view Hawaii as an example of interracial justice and good will. Indeed, the Hawaii Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in its 1961 report on civil rights in education, housing, voting, public accommodations, transportation, the administration of justice, and Government employment stated that—

> The Hawaii Advisory Committee has had no requests of any kind for action or assistance in the field of civil rights; and * * * the committee knows of no instance in Hawaii which calls for enforcement of any laws on civil rights; and * * * the committee knows of no areas in the field of civil rights that require enactment of Federal or State laws insofar as Hawaii is concerned.

Hawaii serves not only as a model for her sister States, but also mirrors for all of the peoples of Asia crushed under the tyranny of communism the possibility of popular self-government based on interpersonal respect without regard to race and creed. Hawaii's fulfillment of this possibility proves the value of the democratic idea.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to express, on behalf of the citizens of the State of Connecticut and myself, our great pleasure and pride on the occasion of the 4th anniversary of the admission of Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union.

It is indeed with warm feelings of gratification and genuine satisfaction that the people of Connecticut are able to point to Hawaii as a sister State. Like Connecticut, Hawaii has brought together people of many different ethnic and religious backgrounds living happily and prosperously together in one of the most liberal and progressive States of the Union. Unlike Connecticut, which had a rather homogeneous Anglo-Saxon tradition, the forefathers of the Hawaiian nation were Polynesian kings, but the people of both States have consistently demonstrated over the years the same industriousness, liberalism, respect for law, order and gradual evolution, combined with the inner strength and stability in times of peace or war to assimilate people of every race and creed into a powerful force for the common good. These sterling qualities have combined to make our federation of sovereign States the most amazing nation the world has ever known.

And so I feel honored and privileged as a Representative of one of the first and oldest States of the Union to extend our greetings on this happy occasion to the newest State and to add our heartfelt hopes of peace, prosperity, and happiness to the State and people of Hawaii.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

MIGRATORY LABOR PROBELM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Rogers of Florida). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the 87th Congress I introduced a number of bills directed at the migratory labor problem. Only one measure was enacted into law—Public Law 87–692, which provides grants for public health clinics for migrants—and the plight of migratory laborers remains very largely unchanged. I have introduced a package of bills that aim at specific, continuing and remediable evils. The conditions under which many thousands of migratory laborers must work represent a dark corner of our society that we can no longer afford to neglect.

How very bad these conditions are has been made clear beyond doubt in several recent investigations. No one who watched "Harvest of Shame" on television could fail to be deeply distressed that American citizens should live under such conditions. Those who have read Dale Wright's series of articles in the New York World Telegram and Sun will know that our Government has not so far been able to protect migrant laborers from 14-hour days at unbelievably low wages; from cheating and exploitation at every turn; from a life of squalor, filth, and even danger. The investigations of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor have established that the great majority of migrant workers are excluded from the benefits and protections other Americans have long since come to take for granted.

The position of the migrant laborer in American society is highly anomalous. By definition he is a transient, a man whose occupation prevents him from forming stable ties with any one community. Nobody's constituent, he is also no one's responsibility. At the same time his extreme mobility throws unusual burdens on those who attempt to provide for his needs. Special arrangements must be made to adapt community facilities to the needs of the migrant worker. To take but one example, there is an inherent conflict between the demands of the average school system and the transitory character of the migrant's work.

For all these reasons, the migratory labor problem has become a problem with which the Federal Government must cope. No one State, unaided, can reasonably be expected to assume responsibility for the working and living conditions of laborers whose occupation requires them to move on to another State every few weeks. The bills I am sponsoring would, if passed, bring badly needed Federal assistance to the migrants themselves and to the State governments.

The first measure (H.R. 4902) would provide the States with financial assistance to improve the educational opportunities of migrant workers and their children. As I have already pointed out, many local communities have great difficulty in making education available for their permanent residents and are unable to bear financially the seasonal burden of migratory workers' children. Since the illiteracy rate is high among adult migratory workers, this bill contains further provisions for adult education.

The second bill (H.R. 4903) would establish day-care services for children of migratory farmworkers. This measure would aid parents who at present must somehow supervise their children while at work. It would also relieve growers of the safety and efficiency problems created by the presence of young nonworking children in the fields. Thus, like most of the other bills in the package, this bill would benefit both employees and employers. It would authorize $750,000 for matching grants to States to establish and operate the day-care centers.

The third measure, H.R. 4904 regulates the employment of children in agriculture. It does not restrict the employment of children working for their parents on a home farm, but it does amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to the children of migrant laborers. It also authorizes the Secretary of Labor to issue regulations barring children below age 18 from working on particularly hazardous farm operations.

The fourth bill, H.R. 4905, is intended to correct some of the serious abuses that have shown up in every investigation of the migratory labor problem. It establishes a registration system for crew leaders, defined for the purposes of this bill as those middlemen between the workers and growers who recruit 10 or more migrants for interstate agricultural employment. All such crew leaders would be required to register with the Secretary of Labor, and their licenses would be refused or revoked for such violations incident to their activities as, first, lying to workers about wages, hours, and working conditions; second, breaching agreements with the growers; third, breaching agreements with the migrant workers; and fourth, being convicted under a State or Federal law related to gambling, prostitution, alcoholic liquors, or narcotics.

The next measure, H.R. 4906, is intended to bring existing knowledge about the conditions of migratory labor to bear upon the problem of devising policies for their improvement. Under the terms of the bill the President would appoint a National Advisory Council on Migratory Labor, to consist of 15 members drawn from among State officials, private citizens, farmers, and from the migratory laborers themselves. This council would be expected to advise the President and Congress about the functioning of laws, regulations, programs, and policies related to migrant worker problems. It would also have the task of analyzing specific problems and making recommendations for future policies and programs.

Finally, I propose a bill (H.R. 4907) to alleviate the extensive health problems created among migrants by grossly inadequate sanitation facilities. This bill would recognize the Federal Government's part in maintaining the general health of the community by providing $2 million annually to farmers, associations, and other appropriate parties to assist in the construction or renovation of sanitation facilities used by migratory farm families. In addition, it contains provision for surveys by States lacking adequate data regarding the need for sanitation facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of migratory labor have been a matter of public concern for over 30 years. In the interval there have been many investigations of the problem, but little has actually been done. Senator Harrison Williams, of New Jersey, has taken the leadership in focusing public attention on the need for corrective legislation. His Subcommittee on Migratory Labor has developed a comprehensive approach which is embodied in the measures I have outlined. These measures represent a first step toward a solution of the migratory labor problems. I believe now is the time for Congress to act.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand vocational education opportunities for the people of this Nation.

Cited as the Vocational Education Act of 1963, this legislation embodies the recommendations of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, an advisory group appointed in late 1961 at the request of President Kennedy. The panel was charged by the President to review and evaluate the current National Vocational Education Acts and make recommendations for improving and redirecting the program.

Under the chairmanship of Dr. Benjamin C. Willis, general superintendent of schools, Chicago, Ill., this lay group

worked for a year in fashioning its report "Education for a Changing World of Work."

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate these outstanding citizens who devoted considerable time and energy to this very important project. At this point I want the Record to show a list of their names:

Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education, October 1961 to November 1962

Benjamin C. Willis, Chairman, Chicago, Ill.
Mary C. Bingham, Louisville, Ky.
Charles F. Carroll, Raleigh, N.C.
Fred T. Corleto, Philadelphia, Pa.
Ernest H. Dean, American Fork, Utah.
Mark Ellingson, Rochester, N.Y.
Margaret C. Ells, Springfield, Mass.
Charles W. Engelhard, Newark, N.J.
Edward B. Evans, Prairie View, Tex.
Henry A. Gonzales, Santa Fe, N. Mex.
Francis A. Gregory, Washington, D.C.
Floyd D. Johnson, York, S.C.
Helen R. LeBaron, Ames, Iowa.
William B. Logan, Columbus, Ohio.
Charles E. Odell, Detroit, Mich.
James G. Patton, Denver, Colo.
J. B. Perky, Stillwater, Okla.
Thomas H. Quigley, Atlanta, Ga.
Helen R. Radke, Port Angeles, Wash.
Peter T. Schoemann, Washington, D.C.
Paul H. Sheats, Los Angeles, Calif.
Dael Wolfle, Washington, D.C.

Official representatives: Hyman H. Bookbinder, U.S. Department of Commerce; E. T. York, Jr., U.S. Department of Agriculture; Seymour Wolfbein, U.S. Department of Labor.

Staff: J. Chester Swanson, George L. Brandon, Mary P. Allen.

Mr. Speaker, in drafting this bill, I have had the benefit of the recommendations of the Panel of Consultants as well as the help and advice of vocational educators in my own State of Kentucky. The assistant State superintendent of schools, James L. Patton, has assisted me greatly in the writing of this legislation. I believe that this bill is in keeping with the needs of the day as seen by the Panel of Consultants as well as by vocational educators.

In the 1960's it is estimated that 8 out of 10 of the youngsters now in elementary school must receive preparation for occupations other than the professional occupations which require 4 or more years of college. In other words, 8 out of every 10 children now in the elementary schools will not complete 4 years of college. Mr. Speaker, this fact challenges our vision and imagination as never before. Especially is this true in view of the fact that the number of unskilled jobs is rapidly decreasing. More and more of the work of the world is demanding highly skilled and well-trained individuals. If our public schools are to underwrite this challenge, we must provide more and improved opportunities for our students through vocational education.

In addition to the vast numbers who will need vocational training at the high school level, there continues to be an increasing need for vocational education at the post high school level. Vocational education now prepares the highly skilled technician who supports the engineer and scientist of our Defense Establishment.

Vocational education will also be called upon to furnish training and retraining for thousands of workers who will be displaced by automation and technological change.

There is a crying need, Mr. Speaker, in our great urban centers to find some way to meet the needs of thousands of youngsters who are standing on the street corner with nothing to do. We are told that 7½ million youngsters will drop out of school in the decade of the 1960's. We use many terms to describe them; disadvantaged, culturally deprived, and so on. These people need special programs of vocational education. I happen to believe that vocational educators are especially well adapted to helping these youngsters, but they cannot do so with present resources.

At this point, I wish to briefly outline the provisions of my bill:

Title I authorizes for vocational education $73 million for fiscal year 1964, $175 million for fiscal year 1965, $250 million for fiscal year 1966, $340 million for fiscal year 1967, for fiscal year 1968 and for each fiscal year thereafter such sums as Congress may determine.

After reserving 5 percent of the total appropriation to be used for special projects, the Commission allots the funds to the States on a formula derived by taking into account the relative population and per capita income of each State.

The funds may be used to provide vocational education for persons attending high school; for full-time students who have completed high school; for persons who need training or retraining to improve occupational competencies; for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that require programs specially adapted to their needs; for construction of area vocational education program facilities; for supporting services, such as research, administration and supervision; teacher training and instructional materials to assure excellence in all vocational programs.

The State, as under the other Vocational Education Acts will submit a plan setting forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in administering the program.

Title II of the bill will establish a work assistance program for students who are enrolled full time in area vocational education programs and who need the earnings from such employment in order to pursue vocational courses.

The bill authorizes an appropriation of $1 million for this purpose, to be apportioned to the States that enter into agreements with the Commissioner for the purpose of establishing work-study programs. The States will pay one-half the cost of the program, and a student may receive up to $700 per year to help defray expenses of schooling. The student may not work more than 15 hours per week; must be enrolled as a full-time student, and must be capable, in the opinion of school authorities, of maintaining good standing in school while employed.

Title III of my bill provides for insured loans to students enrolled in area vocational education programs. It authorizes $5 million the first year—and up to $10 million any fiscal year thereafter. To receive a loan, a student must be enrolled full-time in an area vocational education program. The loan is to be made by note or written agreement, without security and endorsement; repayment of the principal amount is to be made over a 10-year period, with interest on the unpaid balance to be paid at a yearly rate—not to exceed the maximum rate as prescribed and defined by the Commissioner by or pursuant to regulation.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, will build on the foundation laid by the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917. It provides for cooperation of governments at all levels, and takes full advantage of the Federal-State-local relationships in vocational education, that has worked so well over the years. It places the administrative responsibility for the program with the State boards for vocational education where it rightly belongs.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on General Education, of which it is my privilege to be chairman, will hold hearings next week on this and other bills relating to vocational education. We plan to work intensively until a bill is perfected and brought to the floor of this House.

I know of no matter before the Congress today that is of greater importance. Without a well-prepared and skilled work force, this Nation cannot maintain its position of world leadership. I submit to the Members of this body the wonderful record of vocational education in this country. Since the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, the dedicated administrators and teachers, who have made this program work, have helped literally thousands of people to prepare for work and find jobs. Through the public school system vocational education has helped to open wider the door of opportunity. To all who would sermonize about the "American way of life," I ask them to consider the vocational education programs that have given to so many the opportunity to help themselves by making it possible to find a place in the work of the world.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT S. McNAMARA

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, if one reads only the newspaper headlines this past week, he is likely to get the impression that everybody is mad at our Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara.

I rise in an effort to correct the record, and to make it clear that there are many of us in this body who admire Mr. McNamara and who feel he is doing an outstanding job in the Pentagon. And I make this statement as one member of the Committee on Armed Services who has not always found himself in agreement with the Secretary over the past 2 years. But I think we ought to get the record into some kind of perspective here.

After all, Mr. Speaker, on the first test vote in the House of Representatives, it ought to be noted that this House came within a mere 47 votes of supporting Secretary McNamara's position on the RS–70 aircraft in spite of the fact that the fight for the Secretary's position was led by five relatively junior members of the Committee on Armed Services, and despite the fact that in order to support the Secretary's position on this controversial matter Members of the House had to record themselves in opposition to the distinguished and much-beloved dean of the House, the venerable gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the chairman of the great Committee on Armed Services.

To keep the record straight, it should also be noted that the substantial minority supporting Mr. McNamara's position on the RS–70 included the minority floor leader of the House, the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations and a number of other committee chairmen in this body as well.

Mr. Speaker, in the past few days, we have heard a great deal about the investigation underway in the other body into the ultimate award of a contract for the controversial interservice fighter, the TFX. Within the past few days I believe every Member of the House has received a copy of Secretary McNamara's statement to the Senate investigating subcommittee on the TFX. I hope Members will take the time to read this remarkable statement, because I believe it dramatically demonstrates why Mr. McNamara is a great Secretary of Defense, as well as why he has recently become the focus of considerable criticism both inside and outside of Congress.

We have heard a lot about Mr. McNamara being a walking computer. Just take a look at that TFX statement. Here is no computer; here is no dense, cloudy, unintelligible statistician. Instead, here is a plain, direct, simple, and eloquent exposition of some of the reasoning processes that today go into making the hard decisions over in the Defense Department. Here is no mumbo-jumbo. Here is a clear argument stated in words that even a high school student could understand, so simple as to appear to be as easy as falling off a log, and yet eloquently and powerfully convincing. The Secretary's statement is a masterful job of making a difficult subject understandable and clear. And few, I think can really find it possible to quarrel with his conclusion once you take the trouble to follow his arguments step by step. It is easy to be unintelligible; it takes real ability to be clear.

Mr. Speaker, where have the Secretary's troubles with Congress come from? Mostly from his determination to save money in our Defense Department, and not just to talk about saving money. Anybody can add on expenses to the defense budget. The real hard job is to try to hold the line against apparently attractive but nevertheless unnecessary additions to our defense budget. Year after year we have talked about holding the line against unnecessary expenditures and about saving money in the Pentagon. But until Mr. McNamara arrived this talk was largely just talk. Now we have a man who takes these pledges seriously; and in a very real degree, the extent of his vocal opposition is a measure of his success in effecting the economies all of us profess to admire.

After all, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense is not expected to win a popularity contest. He is expected to do a job—to build the military forces we need to preserve our security without reference to any arbitrary budget ceiling; and to resist all attempts to increase these forces over and beyond that point.

That Mr. McNamara has carried out that assignment is demonstrated by the fact that the Defense budget this year is substantially higher today that it was 2 years ago, so he has strengthened our defenses without being limited by any arbitrary budget ceiling. It is also demonstrated by the amazing diplomatic victory which our country won last October during the Cuban crisis when the Soviet Union, in spite of years of boastful rocket rattling by its defense leaders, peremptorily backed down when finally confronted with an unambiguous challenge by superior American combat forces. Let us not forget Secretary McNamara's role in that victory.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially disturbed by the charges which have been made both on and off this floor, that Secretary McNamara is somehow a dictator in the Defense Department and that, contrary to the will of Congress, he has become a kind of civilian single Chief of Staff of our armed services. In my humble judgment, Mr. Speaker, this charge is not only sheer nonsense, but it also happens to be self-contradictory.

I will take second place to no one in this House in my opposition to a single Chief of Staff. I have frequently spoken out on this floor against such a concept. But the whole point of the opposition to a uniformed single Chief of Staff, Mr. Speaker, is that we do not believe that any single uniformed officer ought to be running the armed services. But no one in his right mind would suggest that these three armed services should therefore not be run under one single mechanism of control. Obviously there must be a single overall mechanism of control; but our American tradition has been that this overall control should be civilian and not military. We have that overall top civilian control in the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. Does anybody seriously suggest that the Commander in Chief should not really run these three armed services? Does anybody seriously suggest that our uniformed military officers should have more to say about the operations of our Army, Navy, and Air Force than the President of the United States, no matter what his experience in uniform may have been?

Well, Mr. Speaker, under the law, the Secretary of Defense is the direct representative of the President of the United States. It would make no more sense to have three separate independent leaders of the Defense Department than it would be to have three separate independent leaders running the Treasury Department or the Interior Department or the State Department.

The fact of the matter is that we have a unified Department of Defense under the law and that is the very reason we do not need any single uniformed Chief of Staff. Mr. McNamara has gotten into trouble in certain quarters precisely because he has taken his assignment seriously in this regard, and has indeed provided unified civilian leadership to the Department of Defense, under the overall direction of the President of the United States. As long as that integrated leadership is being supplied we do not need any single Chief of Staff. But let that leadership falter, let the Secretary of Defense refuse to meet his heavy responsibilities because he is afraid somebody might get mad at him, and then we might indeed find the drive for a single uniformed Chief of Staff irresistible.

Mr. Speaker, I for one am glad that we have in Secretary McNamara a man who is more interested in getting a job done than he is in winning a popularity contest. And I am sure that in the long run the people of the United States will be a whole lot happier in having a man in charge of our Nation's defenses who manages to come up with most of the right answers, even though he ruffles a lot of congressional fur in the process, than they would be in having a genial and affable blackslapper who is tremendously popular on Capitol Hill and in the corridors of the Pentagon but who puts off the difficult day-of-reckoning decisions for someone else to make, later on when perhaps it is already too late for them to count.

Only the other day Mr. Speaker, this House broke precedent by voting honorary American citizenship to Winston Churchill because of his monumental contribution to the defense of freedom in World War II. But in doing so I wonder how many people remember that until the difficult days of 1940 Winston Churchill would never have won any popularity contest among the British people. He preached a hard and unpopular doctrine of preparedness during the roaring 1920's and the 1930's; and for his pains he was relegated to the back benches of his party in Parliament. In all those dark days of political unpopularity, Sir Winston had just one thing to sustain him: he was right even though he was unpopular. And he goes down in history today as a great leader, Mr. Speaker, with the special and unprecedented accolade of honorary American citizenship, because he had the courage and the fortitude to stick to his guns in spite of all the pressures of political unpopularity.

As Adm. Ernest J. King is reported to have said when he assumed top command of the U.S. Navy in the dark days immediately after Pearl Harbor, "When the going gets tough they call in the so-and-so's."

In today's crisis-ridden world, Mr. Speaker, the going we face—in Cuba, in Berlin, in Vietnam—could hardly be tougher. I for one am glad that we have in charge of our Defense Department in such difficult times a man who does not hesitate to make the tough decisions even though some here in this House, and elsewhere, are all too ready to pin on him the label of "so-and-so." It never fazed Admiral King, and I do not think it will faze Mr. McNamara either.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a thoughtful article by Mr. Thomas O'Neill which appeared in the Baltimore Sun of March 15, 1963.

The article follows:

POLITICS AND PEOPLE

(By Thomas O'Neill)

STERNEST TEST

WASHINGTON.—Over the period of his 2 years in office Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara has engaged a full range of challengers and is unmarked from any of the encounters, although he would do well to stay out of any popularity contests at the Pentagon or on Capitol Hill.

Most of his troubles have arisen from a literal reading of the terms of the law combining the separate military services into a single department, terms that specifically set up civilian control over the generals and admirals. Most of his seven predecessors found themselves maneuvered out of control and into the position of mediator between the rival services, and one who tried to impose the letter of the statute was driven to a mental breakdown and suicide. Mr. McNamara has stolidly pushed ahead and shows no sign of any kind of breakdown. Behind his bookish mien there is a resolute resistance to being pushed around.

The dispute that now engages him, over the choice of an all-purpose plane for use by both Navy and Air Force, is much the most significant of his career in the Washington cockpit. It pits him against the military-industrial colossus against which General Eisenhower hoisted warning signals 3 days before leaving the White House. And this time, because of the sum involved, it is more vital than ever to Mr. McNamara that his judgment stand the test of subsequent experience. That sum, running at least to $5½ billion, is greater than the entire cost of the whole Federal Government in the first year (1933) of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who is thought of as a big spender.

Against him are arrayed, and impatient to set up the shout of "I told you so," the overruled military men who remain unreconciled to the theory that a civilian should direct their affairs, and their carefully cultivated partisans in Congress.

The military is constrained to private utterance of its angriest observations regarding the secretarial competence, but its sense of frustration has been adequately conveyed to Capitol Hill where it has stoked a heated uproar. A Democratic solon calls for amending the law to take away some of the Secretary's current authority and indicates an attempt to compel him to spend unwanted funds voted by Congress—an undertaking with scant prospect of winning approval at the White House.

It is improbable that Mr. McNamara looks with disesteem upon Congress, as one affronted lawmaker contends, as an unnecessary evil. Closer to the mark, it appears, is the taunt of the House Republican whip, LESLIE ARENDS, that the Secretary has set himself up as a civilian dictator over the military, a dictator who knows all the answers.

The McNamara position is that he has to know all the answers because it is he who has to make the hard decisions, unless they are to be shunted to the White House. To get the answers, and speedily, he employs computers, an array of civilian aids made up of lawyers, scientists and management specialists free from the professional prejudices of West Point and Annapolis (referred to collectively and scornfully by the unhappy brass as the "whiz kids"), and a rigid system of deadlines for decisions on lower levels. Mr. McNamara is firmly committed to a minimum of hesitation over decisions, no matter how difficult.

Upon receiving the invitation to take over the grinding job from President-elect Kennedy, a choice that required giving up $400,000 a year as president of the Ford Motor Co. for the Government's $25,000, he mediated only 5 days before giving his answer: "I think I can handle it, Mr. President."

Against footdragging and condemnation, the latter both journalistic and congressional, the Secretary has the look of a man neither awed nor deterred. His independence was displayed early when he calmly vetoed White House proposals for appointments at the Pentagon.

Just as coolly he has discarded pet projects advanced by the admirals and generals, supported by the conviction that they appropriately argue for the interests of their service while it is his function to look at a larger picture. This embraces the needs of the armed services as presented by the service commanders, cost considerations for the long haul, and the diplomatic effect of American military policy.

Following these guidelines he has been brusque and abrasive, but at the same time has accomplished a considerable measure of the integration of the Armed Forces contemplated when the Department of Defense was established and successfully resisted by the separate services until the arrival of "McNamara's Band." Along the way he has achieved recognition from friend and critic as the strong man of the Cabinet, a Cabinet whose strength curiously rests upon men who never sought elective office—Rusk, Dillon, Robert Kennedy—and consequently are objects of suspicion in the elected ranks of Congress.

CONGRESSIONAL STAFF FELLOWSHIPS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the American Political Science Association, sponsors of the congressional fellowship program which brings a number of young reporters and political scientists to Washington for a year's work and learning as members of congressional staffs, has recently announced a new program which deserves the attention of Members of Congress and their staffs. It is a program of fellowships for congressional staff members, offering them a chance to broaden their horizons educationally.

Similar programs of mid-service training are common in the fields of education, civil service, and industry. The American Political Science Association is to be commended for offering this opportunity to congressional staff personnel as well.

In summary, the program offers a limited number of 1-year and 6-month fellowships open to congressional staff members both in individual Members' offices and those on committee staffs. These are offered to permit personalized residence university study for those staff members interested in study and research. It would help in the effort to develop the caliber of professional staff personnel which are so necessary for the continued improvement of the functions of the Congress.

As I understand it, notices of this program are being sent to each congressional office. I would urge each of my colleagues to give this program full consideration for it offers real benefits to the Congress.

POLITICAL SCIENTISTS ENDORSE MINORITY STAFFING

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a news release.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in connection with our fight for adequate minority staffing, we are encouraged to have the support of recognized political scientists. Members of the House and Senate, as well as the press, will want to give careful study and attention to the thoughtful findings of this responsible group of political scientists.

The Republican House conference subcommittee on increased minority staffing welcomes these comments and suggestions in this area of study. The subcommittee is grateful for the time and effort which went into the study.

A copy of the news release which I made today, which carries the statement of the political scientists, follows:

POLITICAL SCIENTISTS ENDORSE MINORITY STAFFING

Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, Republican, of Iowa, chairman of the Republican conference subcommittee on increased minority staffing, today announced the appointment of a number of leading political scientists as consultants to the Republican conference subcommittee.

In announcing the appointments, Congressman SCHWENGEL said, "My colleagues and I feel that we have not had the opportunity before to make adequate use of the professional political scientists who have studied our problems and have many useful ideas to offer us. It is my hope that the appointment of these consultants will aid us in our exploration of new ideas and programs to make Congress, especially the minority, more effective over the coming months."

The political scientists appointed are Dr. Robert J. Huckshorn, Bethesda, Md.; Dr. Brownlee S. Corrin, Goucher College, Baltimore; Dr. George Carey, Georgetown University; and Dr. Russell Ross, University of Iowa.

In announcing the appointments, Congressman SCHWENGEL also released a statement regarding minority staffing which the political scientists prepared for his subcommittee—CURTIS, of Missouri; RHODES of Arizona; LINDSAY, and GOODELL, of New York; SCHENCK, of Ohio; and GRIFFIN, of Michigan.

The full text of the statement follows:

POLITICAL SCIENTISTS STATEMENT ON MINORITY STAFFING

"The committee staff function at the congressional level is not being fulfilled. And a failure to do so is not only unfair, but it is a threat to the traditions of representative government. Responsibility for this condition falls upon the Democratic Party leadership in Congress.

"To deny the minority in Congress access to adequate representation on committee staffs eliminates the opportunity for a minority to act responsibly after a careful examination of the problems under consideration. Congressmen, in this difficult and complex period of our history, require access to data and evaluation in those subject areas to which they are given responsibility as committee members. It is obvious that this work cannot be placed regularly with their own office staff which have functions very different from those of a committee. It is obvious, in light of policy formulation patterns at all levela of Government, that the adversarial technique of law and politics in this country requires a personal relationship in which a Congressman can develop confidence with the professional staff members. This is why, of course, the President has a high degree of control over his White House staff, as well as at many policymaking levels in the executive departments.

"Some have argued that an increase in minority staffing of congressional committees would jeopardize the recent professionalization of these staffs. We do not believe that this is true. There is no reason why such professionalization cannot take place in a bipartisan framework. What is needed are professional staff members separately responsible to the majority and the minority. The demand that a substantially larger portion of the professional staff be responsible to the minority members is wholly reasonable and within the best democratic traditions.

"Congressional committee staff members are not intended to serve the same function as staff members in the Legislative Reference Service. Nor should they. The committee staff must possess high levels of competence. It is equally important, however, that there exist mutual confidence between the Congressmen and the staff members. This confidence is not possible when a minority party, be it Democrat or Republican (and there is always the possibility of reversal of role), does not have access to adequate and qualified professional staff members of its own selection.

"The existing position is more than unfortunate; it is a subtle denial of freedom of effective speech, of which Congress as a body purports to be justly proud. It hinders reasoned debate that alone can lead to just solution of legislative problems. It prevents the minority from carrying out its major democratic function of knowledgeable criticism.

"The country cannot afford gamesmanship or petty, cheap politics at the congressional level. Yet, we are witnessing an outstanding example of partisan pettiness in the denial to the minority in Congress the right to exercise its legislative function by refusing to grant it necesasry staff support."

Dr. Robert J. Huckshorn.
Dr. Howard Penniman.
Dr. Franklin Burdette.
Dr. Brownlee S. Corrin.
Dr. George Carey.
Dr. Russell Ross.

INCREASED INSURANCE PROTECTION FOR BANK DEPOSITORS AND SAVINGS ASSOCIATION SHAREHOLDERS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago this Nation's banking system came to the end of decades of disgracefully numerous bank failures. After the bank holiday, the Government took decisive steps to reconstruct the financial institutions that are fundamental to modern business and to representative government. One of the great steps in building a new and stronger financial system was the creation of nationwide insurance protection for depositors in commercial banks, and later for shareholders in savings and loan associations. The success of the financial legislation is apparent to anyone who remembers or studies the differences between the years before 1933 and the present. Of the many improvements, I bring to your consideration only the fact that in 1962 not a single insured bank failed, while in the 4 years 1930–33, before deposit insurance, failures totaled in excess of 9,000.

I have introduced two bills which will add further to the confidence of depositors and shareholders in their banks and savings associations, and insure that in the rare case of failure the losses to depositors and to the community will be minimal. My bills propose to increase protection of each account from $10,000 to $25,000, establishing a range of protection that reflects the growing magnitudes of savings and of personal income. My bills propose to protect each account up to five times the amount covered for commercial bank depositors when the FDIC began operations on a permanent basis in 1935. Per capita personal income soon will equal five times as much as in 1935. Bank deposits total about four times as much as in 1935.

The increased upper limit on insurance protection will prove economical both to depositors and to banks, because it will diminish the necessity for setting up a number of accounts in order to achieve full protection for a depositor who has accumulated more than $10,000.

Bank accounts and savings association shares both would become more attractive, because of the increased safety offered for substantial amounts held in these forms of savings.

The increased protection, according to both FDIC and Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, would not require increase in the insurance fees. Both Corporations now hold ample reserves against any possible losses.

RESEAL ORDER HITS FAMILY FARMER

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the Nation, and in my native State of Minnesota in particular, are being penalized once more. I refer to the announcement by the Department of Agriculture that the Government is not going to reseal 1959 and 1960 oats and barley or 1961 soybeans stored on individual farms. It amounts to another case of shortchanging the farmer by not permitting him to participate in the grain storage program for these respective years.

We do a lot of talking about helping the smaller farm operator to survive, but orders of this type further decrease the potential of such farms. This is the second year in a row where commercial grain storage companies have been given the nod over American farmers. If our farm population is to survive, it must be given greater consideration.

I have written the Department of Agriculture protesting this action. I pointed out that many of our Minnesota counties are now considered as feed grains depressed because of adverse growing conditions over the past 2 years. Under the assistance program, Commodity Credit Corporation stocks are made available to hard-hit farmers. This means that grains stored on family farms should be readily available in the area where such stocks might be needed.

Almost one-third of the barley, oats, and soybeans stored in the United States in the years affected by the new order are stored in Minnesota, on family farms. This means that Minnesota farmers will be deprived of almost a million dollars in storage revenues this next year. This money could have been of great assistance to these farmers, whose cash receipts last year were down 1.6 percent from 1961.

Farmers ought to be given the opportunity to participate in the storage of these crops, especially when you consider that our farmers have provided a great service to the Commodity Credit Corporation by providing and investing in storage space.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NEED RESPONSIBLE APPROACH

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, an incident of last week involving a law enforcement officer and a purse snatcher suspect, has provoked comment from individuals, civic organizations, and the press alike. The variance in viewpoint is well illustrated by the editorials and news articles, which, under unanimous consent, I will include in the Record following my remarks.

Although this involves a single incident, it reflects the growing need for greater understanding and cooperation among the diversified elements making up the District of Columbia population.

For some time now I have concerned myself with the problems and potentials of this sometimes-great city. I do not view the time that I have spent as having been taken at the expense of my own district, but rather in furtherance of a duty imposed on all of us in this body by the Constitution. In each of the past three Congresses, I have submitted a bill

to grant the District of Columbia a reasonable degree of home rule, and I have actively campaigned for its consideration and passage.

This year I have submitted a bill which would bring the District of Columbia within the aid to federally impacted areas program, a move which would provide the District with sorely needed funds for education. I have proposed a study of the possible use of Howard University to expand the program of college level and graduate education for residents of the District, and the training of teachers for the public schools. As a member of the Joint Economic Committee, I have joined in the minority views on the President's Economic Report, calling for increased efforts to train school dropouts and provide adult vocational and technical education programs in expanded form. I was among the first to call on the President to implement his promise to outlaw discrimination in the sale of particular housing units.

Yet the need for something more basic than the material changes I have outlined is nowhere more graphically pointed out that in the incident of last week involving the shooting of a suspected purse snatcher by a District policeman, and the reactions that followed. Hardly had the news of the shooting become known than the Congress of Racial Equality—CORE—chapter in the District shot off a telegram which branded the affair as "murder" and used it in an attempt to prove wholesale claims of police brutality and incompetence.

It is unfortunate, to say the least, that an organization which prides itself in protecting civil liberties should so callously ignore the right of a policeman to a fair and impartial examination of his case without "trial by newspaper" prior to a hearing. In fact, the suspect had been warned to stop, and had in fact been hit with a nightstick without slowing down, as four witnesses and another policeman testified at the coroner's jury which returned a verdict that the officer had acted in line of duty.

This reaction, however, is a prime example of the increasing lack of responsibility on the part of organizations who hold themselves out to be representatives of the underprivileged, particularly of the Negro race. I have personally spoken with many of our Negro citizens from varying walks of life, and I believe that CORE, the Urban League, and others may be out of touch with their own constituency. Any Negro is well aware that he can be a victim of antisocial behavior, and he is also aware that the police are in fact handicapped by rigid regulations, lenient judges, and the pressure of a sincere but misguided element of the public.

No doubt there is some correlation between poverty, lack of education, narrow job opportunities, poor housing, and crime. There is no guarantee however, that improvement in such conditions, which should be and will be forthcoming, will eliminate the problem entirely. My own district ranges from industry, to suburb, to agriculture, and in general is blessed with economic and social stability. Yet figures show an increase in juvenile crimes.

I am convinced that there is a need for increased discipline and deterrent. As the president of the National District Attorneys Association has observed, it is not necessarily the severity of the punishment, but the certainty of it. The District Police have performed well under trying conditions, and I do not think that the place to start in molding community responsibility and respect for the law is the tearing down of police force morale and dignity.

There is no more justification for using the police as a scapegoat for the ills of the society at large than there is for ignoring the needs and blaming everything on the Negro race. There is justification for increasing the effectiveness of the police and increasing the protection of the people. One spokesman for a group critical of the police has been quoted as saying that in light of the Wall case, "I would be afraid to run for a bus now." The majority of citizens, of whatever race, would probably have said that in light of the Wall case, "I would be afraid to get off of a bus now."

The 10-year record of crime with little punishment or rehabilitation of the purse snatcher suspect indicates a need in both directions. I would suggest that if those who are so critical of the results, spent more time in voluntary activity, helping the returned parolee, and increasing the respect for law and order and those who administer the same, this incident might not have occurred.

I do not ask anyone to discontinue his efforts towards improving the conditions of society, for that is furthest from my thoughts. The incident of last week pointedly indicates, however, that if certain groups within the District do not curtail their irresponsible approach to social problems, the prospects for cooperation and understanding among our citizens will be greatly undermined.

The editorials and articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 13, 1963]

District of Columbia Rookie Policeman Kills Ex-Convict Fleeing From Scene of Purse Snatching

(By Walter Gold)

A rookie Washington policeman yesterday shot and killed an ex-convict who was running from the scene of a daylight purse snatching on a busy Northwest street.

One bullet, fired by Pvt. Frank A. Klimecke, 24, instantly killed the fleeing suspect, identified by police as James Calvin Wall, 21, of the 1400 block of Swann Street NW.

The fatal shooting took place in the 1400 block of Fairmont Street NW. about 5 p.m. as scores of pedestrians and motorists watched the climax of a four-block foot chase.

Wall, according to police, had a criminal record dating back to when he was 11 years old. He had been released from the National Training School, where he was serving time for larceny, just 8 weeks ago.

Private Klimecke only recently had qualified with his service revolver. Officials said he joined the Metropolitan Police force last September but had never had an opportunity to attend the department training school. For the past several months, newly recruited policemen have been put on the streets in some assignments with only brief training to replace seasoned officers for the fight against increasing crime.

INQUEST TOMORROW

The young officer was released in technical custody of his commanding officer, Capt. Albert B. Clark of the 10th precinct and has been assigned to duty in the station house temporarily, pending an inquest at the morgue tomorrow.

Police Inspector Lawrence A. Hartnett said the dead youth was identified by Mrs. Barbara J. Hileman, 18, as the man who grabbed her pocketbook about 5 p.m. as she walked in the 1600 block of Euclid street NW.

Mrs. Hileman, a clerk-typist at the Navy Department's Bureau of Weapons, was still shaking when she gave her account of the incident.

"I had just gotten off a bus at 16th and Euclid Streets and way on my way to my apartment at 2518 17th Street when I heard footsteps directly behind me," Mrs. Hileman said.

FLEES WITH PURSE

Mrs. Hileman said she was in front of 1631 Euclid Street when a man suddenly grabbed her purse from under her right arm. Holding onto the straps of the large pocketbook, Mrs. Hileman said she wheeled on her assailant, who was wearing khaki clothing and carrying a pillowcase full of wet laundry.

The man wrenched the purse away from her and fled back toward 16th Street.

Mrs. Hileman, who said she is expecting a baby in 3 months, chased the man west on Euclid Street, then north on Mozart Place for a block, then west again on Fuller Street until her "legs gave out" at 16th Street.

"I screamed for someone to stop him, but not one person stood in his way," Mrs. Hileman said. "When I couldn't run anymore, I leaned up against a tree, but no one offered to help me, even though it was the height of the evening rush hour and the streets were crowded with cars and people."

At this point, two policemen, who had been stationed outside the Spanish Embassy at 16th and Fuller Streets prior to a diplomatic reception, observed the chase and heard the woman scream that she had been robbed.

The officer who was assigned to guard the front of the Embassy, Pvt. Clifton O. Gill, 27, started chasing the robbery suspect east on Fuller Street.

As the policeman raced past the rear of the Embassy, he yelled for his partner, Private Klimecke, to join the chase.

At the dead end of Fuller Street, just east of 15th Street, the man fled through a yard and a parking lot and raced onto Fairmont Street, still carrying his sack of wet laundry, with the two policemen several paces behind him.

The suspect slipped and fell to the pavement in the 1400 block of Fairmont Street as he attempted to dodge between parked automobiles, the two policemen said.

Private Klimecke said he also fell to the street at the same point. As the robbery suspect scrambled to his feet and attempted to retrace his steps, he somehow managed to get between the two policemen.

Private Gill said he lunged for the suspect and struck him on the head with his night stick. The suspect shook off the blow and kept running, the policemen said.

At this point, Private Klimecke, who had regained his footing, said he drew his service revolver from his holster and again ordered the suspect to halt. When the man kept running Private Klimecke said he fired one shot from the .38-caliber weapon and the suspect fell to the sidewalk in front of 1451 Fairmont Street, where he later died.

The bullet struck Wall in the back of his head and came out his right eye, Inspector Hartnett said.

During the chase, the suspect dropped the purse, the police said. However, it was recovered intact by a 14-year-old boy, who turned it over to police officials.

Police records revealed that Wall was first arrested for stealing in 1953. The youth's juvenile records show that he also was charged with petty larceny and vandalism 2 years later when he was 13.

ARRESTED AGAIN

In September 1958, when Wall was 16, he was found guilty of breaking into a home in a fashionable section of the eighth precinct and sentenced to serve more than 4 years at the National Training School for Boys.

While on parole from National Training School in 1961, he was again arrested for housebreaking. Wall was sentenced to an additional 18 months for that offense.

Again on parole, he was arrested on a larceny charge in November 1962, and sentenced to serve 90 days. He was released from National Training School on January 7 this year, less than 1 month before his 21st birthday.

Police records indicate that the youth was living with his father at the Swann Street address prior to yesterday's incident.

Private Gill joined the Department last August, the inspector said.

Meanwhile, the Washington chapter of the Congress on Racial Equality sent a telegram of protest against the shooting to several officials, reading in part:

"Murder of James Wall by untrained rookie policeman establishes need for immediate action to protect citizens of 10th precinct from police brutality. CORE demands new captain, lieutenants, and sergeants in 10th precinct, thorough investigation of brutality charges against policemen, and training program on relations with public."

The telegram, signed by Julius Hobson, president of the Washington chapter, also suggested the investigation be conducted by persons not connected with the Police Department. It suggested a test of stability of all police recruits and periodically of all policemen.

The telegram was sent to Charles A. Horsky, Presidential Assistant on District Affairs; Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner and Clyde Ferguson, counsel of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 14, 1963]

SUDDEN DEATH

A 21-year-old man who snatched a purse from a young woman was shot and killed by a rookie police officer on Tuesday. It is true that the young man had a very bad reputation, having been in trouble with the law since he was 11 years old. It is also true that he was in flight after having committed an ugly crime and after having been told to halt by the pursuing policemen. Nevertheless, the snuffing out of a human life is in itself, no matter what the provocation, an awesome and terrible thing. It is, in a sense, a failure of law enforcement which must anguish the policemen whose arms achieve this summary result and the community which arms them. The policeman who has to choose between allowing a guilty man to get away and allowing him to die has to make a dreadful choice.

The dead man—he had barely reached his majority—was a victim not alone of police efficiency but of community neglect. He was a product of this city's slums, of its juvenile facilities, of its schools and of its correctional institutions. He was an outcast, an enemy of society, from early boyhood. But he was not born bad; he became bad. The community needs to know why. For it is breeding such boys—such men, if you prefer—far faster than its police can shoot them down.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Mar. 15, 1963]

THE CASE OF CORE AND OFFICER KLIMECKE

We have a few comments to make on the following telegram, signed "Julius W. Hobson, president" which the District of Columbia Commissioners received from CORE (Committee on Racial Equality), with copies sent to the newspapers by CORE:

"Murder of James Wall by untrained rookie policeman establishes need for immediate action to protect citizens of 10th precinct from police brutality. Officer Giles mentioned too frequently recently in connection with brutality and trigger-happy rookies should not be given guns before completing training. CORE demands new captain, lieutenants, and sergeants in 10th precinct, thorough investigation of brutality charges against policemen, and training program on relations with public. CORE suggests that both investigation and training program be conducted by persons not connected with police department. Also suggest thorough tests of emotional stability for recruits and periodically for all police."

Only one James Wall has been shot here. Only one policeman shot him. His name is Officer Frank Klimecke. (There was no "Officer Giles" involved.)

It seems to us that CORE and its officials are, quite likely, open for a suit of criminal libel. Officer Klimecke was doing his duty. CORE publicly calls it murder.

Policemen, it seems to us, should have the same protection from reckless and unproved charges as has the ordinary citizen, and have the same recourse to the courts when libeled.

The facts on record show Officer Klimecke fatally shot a man who, after committing a felony, refused to obey the command to halt. Colored witnesses support the policeman.

CORE goes on to refer to "trigger-happy rookies." Insofar as this might be supposed to refer to Officer Klimecke, we checked and learned that he served in France with the Army's military police for 3 years.

Nobody hates trigger-happy policemen more than we do. We hate them as much as we hate trigger-happy stickup men, or muggers who throttle peaceful citizens, or gangs (no matter how young they are) that beat people to death, or cowardly lifelong criminals—such as the one Officer Klimecke nailed—who ruthlessly attack defenseless women on the city's streets.

We hate them whether they are white or Negro, or whether their victims are white or Negro.

We'd like to think CORE shares our feelings, but we don't know.

We do know we don't share CORE's feelings about Officer Klimecke. Rather than denouncing him as a murderer, we think he deserves—if not a medal—at least a citation for doing his duty.

Neither do we share CORE's suggestion that the training of policemen should be done by persons not connected with the Police Department. That's about as silly a notion as we've heard in some time.

CORE suggests there should be tests of emotional stability for recruits and, periodically, for all police. This is a good idea, but we thought we'd already heard of it somewhere. So we checked with the Police Department. CORE might be interested to know that this is already being done, and has been for years, by a trained psychiatrist.

Perhaps some of CORE's officials could profitably take similar tests for emotional stability, or lack of.

Racially oriented champions of less rigorous police safeguards for Washington overlook the fact that the respectable, law abiding colored citizens are endangered as much or more than white citizens by a tiny tribe of almost hopelessly uncivilized brutes who can best be described as urban Mau Maus. This minuscule fraction of the city's population circulates in and out of our courts and jails, and causes nearly all the violent crime.

The great body of colored Washingtonians is, as is demonstrated every day, made up of upright, decent, and law-abiding citizens. They suffer, along with the rest of us, from the depredations of this small group of habitually lawless primitives which can only be controlled by force.

The statistics to back these facts up are well known and easily proved. Rather than face them, CORE suggests another cat-hauling of the Police Department.

In the present instance, which has so exercised CORE, the criminal, shot down while fleeing after committing an outrageous robbery, turned out to have a record as long as your arm.

We suggest that rather than another investigation of the Police Department, the incident indicates there should be an investigation of the parole system which returns career predators, with jail terms still uncompleted, to the city's streets where they resume preying on defenseless citizens.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Mar. 15, 1963]

INQUEST IN PURSE-SNATCHER'S DEATH—SHOOTING BY OFFICER HELD JUSTIFIED

(By Cordelia Ruffin)

It took a District Coroner's jury about 25 minutes yesterday to decide that Rookie Pvt. Frank Klimecke, 23, shot and killed a fleeing purse snatcher Tuesday in line of duty.

Witnesses and Pvt. Clifton O. Gill, 27, who took part in the chase, told the story for him. Both policemen were stationed at the Spanish Embassy where a fashion show was in progress when a man ran up the street with a young woman behind him "waving her arms and screaming hysterically" Private Gill said. The officers joined the chase.

HALT

Private Gill said he called "halt" three times as they ran 6 blocks, and he believed Private Klimecke called out twice.

Four witnesses also testified they heard the policeman call out. One woman said she was at a third floor window.

"I ran my shade up, and poked my head out. I could see it all," she said.

She saw the man run by, she said, and yelled at him, "Mister, please stop running." She said she heard the officer, Private Klimecke say, "I'm going to shoot."

"I didn't see how he could shoot from such a long distance," she said.

Shot in the head, James Calvin Wall, 21, colored, fell dead on Fairmont Street NW., near 16th Street.

SILENT

The family of the victim of 1415 Swann Street NW., refused to talk to reporters. One woman relative held her head in her hands, another rocked slowly back and forth. A woman undertaker sat with the family at this inquest and comforted the sobbing woman.

The victim of the purse snatching, 18-year-old Barbara Hileman, who is 6 months pregnant, told the coroner's jury she chased Wall for several blocks before police took over for her.

She told reporters she felt no ill effects but wouldn't do it again.

"We've been having a pretty hard time making a go of it." She added, "the bills had all been paid. The $54 in my purse was all the money we were to live on for the rest of the week. And to think of him taking it made me hysterical."

She said she's been frightened ever since. An anonymous phone caller the other night asked her, "are you the lady that's responsible for the colored boy's death?" and then hung up. It sounded like a young girl, she said.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 16, 1963]

SHOOTING BY PATROLMAN STIRS CLASHING OPINIONS

The District Commissioners were confronted yesterday with strongly opposed views on the fatal shooting of a purse-snatching suspect by a policeman Tuesday.

The officer's action was described as courageous by two organizations but two others requested a full investigation of the incident.

The policeman, Pvt. Frank Klimecke, was defended by a Virginia Senator and the Metropolitan Washington Citizen's Crime Commission, which commended the rookie officer for "prompt and courageous assistance * * * rendered to a victim of crime."

Democratic Senator ROBERTSON said every policeman had a duty to shoot, if necessary, to stop a felon who has refused to honor a command to halt.

The two groups which asked Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner for an investigation are the District branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Washington Urban League.

TOBRINER RETICENT

The Rev. E. Franklin Jackson, president of the District NAACP, said after a closed conference with Mr. Tobriner yesterday that "we told him that the community was alarmed and disturbed about the apparent trigger-happiness of some policemen."

Mr. Tobriner declined to say anything after the closed meeting except that he would "make a determination later as to what, if anything, should be done."

Also present at the meeting in addition to the Rev. Jackson were Sterling Tucker, executive director of the Washington Urban League; Frank Reeves, an attorney for the NAACP, and the Rev. Edward Hailes, the new executive secretary of the District NAACP.

One of the shootings Mr. Jackson and the others protested was the killing Tuesday of James C. Wall.

"We feel no rookie should be allowed to earn his spurs by killing a citizen," said Mr. Jackson.

The other incident discussed at the meeting with Mr. Tobriner was the shooting and wounding of George E. Wheeler recently on Independence Avenue when an off-duty police officer was trying to make an arrest for a traffic violation.

Mr. Tucker said after the meeting with Mr. Tobriner that because of the Wall case "I would be afraid to run for a bus now. I think the whole situation is deplorable."

POLICE ASSAILED

Mr. Jackson said that in the Wall shooting the policeman had no opportunity to get a description of the suspect "but just shot at a man he saw running."

Mr. Reeves said that police here are "prosecutor, judge and executioner."

Mr. Jackson also protested that in the Wall case "no warning shot was fired and the policeman aimed to kill. He could have shot the man in the leg instead of the head."

A coroner's inquest ruled that the shooting of Wall was justifiable homicide.

Mr. Jackson said he told Mr. Tobriner that he felt that an investigation of these shootings should be conducted by persons not connected with the police department.

Mr. Reeves said that there is just as much justification for an independent probe of the shootings as there was for an investigation by a special committee of the riot at District Stadium on Thanksgiving Day.

Private Klimecke, a rookie policeman assigned to the 10th Precinct, shot Wall, a 21-year-old ex-convict, late Tuesday in the 1400 block of Fairmont Street, NW. Wall had been pointed out by a pregnant woman as the man who took her purse. He was trying to elude two policemen when he was shot.

Robert E. McLaughlin, crime commission president, said his group unanimously adopted a resolution noting with concern the criticism of Private Klimecke for performance of his duty. His pursuit of the suspected criminal as well as his aid to the victim was his duty, the resolution maintained.

Senator ROBERTSON deplored the "bleeding hearts" for the felon who had committed robbery by force while not one salty tear was shed for the young white woman who might have been caused a miscarriage because of her horrible experience.

He disputed conclusions of some critics that Wall's life was the result of community neglect and the city's slums.

Slums here 30 years ago were far worse than now, Senator ROBERTSON said, but the crime rate then was below the national average. The rate now is about the highest, he claimed.

A foe of integration in the schools, Senator ROBERTSON added: "Thirty years ago, when schools were segregated and only about 20 percent of the pupils were nonwhite, the District schools were rated as among the best in the Nation. Now, integrated, and about 80 percent nonwhite, the District schools are rated about the poorest in the Nation."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Mar. 17, 1963]

POLICE SHOOTING

The fatal shooting by a white police officer of a 21-year-old Negro purse snatcher—a distressing thing—has led to a disturbing clash of sentiment in this community.

In an irresponsible statement, CORE has accused the policeman of murder. Some individual comments, also irresponsible in our opinion, have been to the effect that "a rookie policeman should not be allowed to earn his spurs by killing a citizen," that the police in Washington are "prosecutor, judge, and executioner," and that it is dangerous in this city even to run for a bus.

On the other side, the Citizens' Crime Commission has commended the officer for doing his duty. And a coroner's jury, which included one Negro member, has held that the shooting was a "justifiable homicide."

In this situation, there should be a look at the facts. The purse snatching occurred at 5 o'clock in the afternoon at 16th and Euclid Streets. If a woman, or any citizen, is not safe at that hour and at that spot, where can safety be found in this city? The purse snatcher, with a record dating back to age 11, knew that the police were pursuing him and knew why they were pursuing him. One of the two officers in the chase had hit him with his nightstick without slowing him down. Certainly it cannot be said that the criminal was unwarned. Even so, we think that a warning shot should have been fired, and that thereafter the effort should have been to wound and bring down the fleeing man without killing him. There is, of course, no evidence that the police officer fired with an intent to kill.

Another question is of real concern to every law-abiding citizen, white or colored, in this crime-ridden city. Those in the criminal element, be they white or colored, are no respectors of race. They ply their trade—murder, rape, robbery, mugging, purse snatching, and whatever—without any regard to the color of their victim's skin. No one is safe and no one could hope to be safe if what is essentially racist propaganda should serve to handcuff the police. A police revolver or any other weapon should be used with judgment and restraint. But the mere fact that a felon can outrun a policeman does not mean that he is entitled to commit his crime and go free. Any one of us may be his next victim.

THE LATE HONORABLE CLYDE DOYLE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McINTIRE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our colleague Clyde Doyle brought sadness to all of us who have had the privilege of serving with him in the House of Representatives.

I shall always remember him as one deeply dedicated to his work, his country, and his God. He was one of the kindest persons I have ever known.

As Clyde Doyle was a man of great faith, so did he constantly work for the protection of our country against communism. He also was devoted to helping our young people gain an understanding not only of the privileges of American citizenship but the responsibilities as well. And the precepts he advanced for good citizenship were always supported by good example.

Clyde Doyle's passing leaves a real void, but we can be consoled by the fact that he left us a rich store of pleasant memories.

Mrs. McIntire joins me in expressing deep sympathy to Mrs. Doyle and members of the family.

U.S. LOAN TO BRAZIL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the Brazilian Embassy has issued a release that it does not intend to use any part of the U.S. loans it is seeking to expand Red trade and further states, "any forthcoming American credits to Brazil will be used exclusively to finance the importation of U.S. goods and services and for repayment of commitments to U.S. creditors." If this is an accurate statement of the purposes of these loans, then, Mr. Speaker, I submit that all that is necessary is for the U.S. Treasury to certify to the Brazilian Government that it has X number of dollars to its credit. The Brazilian Government, in turn, can certify to the U.S. Treasury the names and amounts of the American firms and American creditors it wishes paid by these loans.

Then, the U.S. Treasury can issue vouchers to those firms in the stated amounts. This will, in turn, meet the publicly declared purposes of the Brazilian loan efforts and also assure the American taxpayer that his money will not be used to finance or develop Red trade.

AN AMENDMENT TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

New York [Mr. Horton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced an amendment to the social security law. This bill will raise the outside earnings a retired person may have without losing social security benefits.

Certain unjust limitations on outside income in the present social security law should be removed. They penalize the initiative of those drawing these benefits and foster inequitable treatment among beneficiaries.

By adopting the sliding ceiling on outside earnings which is in this bill, Congress can assure greater fairness to our retired citizens. I feel persons receiving minimum social security pensions are entitled to the same maximum income as all others in their classification.

Under the provisions of this amendment, there will be a combined pension-outside earnings ceiling. This liberalized earnings limitation will end discrimination among social security beneficiaries drawing pensions in various amounts by varying the outside earnings limit proportionately.

I have urged Congress to make this improvement in the social security program.

POLICE INVESTIGATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMillan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia yesterday reaffirmed their order placing into effect, as of March 15, 1963, a regulation severely limiting the operation of the police in their investigation of crime in the District.

This action was taken despite the resolution approved by an overwhelming vote of the House District Committee on March 7, 1963, requesting the Commissioners to rescind such order and proposed regulations implementing the same in order that the Congress might consider legislation already introduced as well as proposals of the Commissioners themselves which have not yet reached the committee for consideration.

Regardless of the action taken by the Commissioners, the Congress must itself bear the responsibility for the results of these drastic changes in law enforcement procedures which have been in effect in the District of Columbia and in practically all other States and jurisdictions for many years.

Not only did the House District Committee request orderly legislative procedures, but the position of the committee was concurred in by the Citizens Crime Commission of Metropolitan Washington, of which Hon. Robert E. McLaughlin, former Commissioner of the District of Columbia, is President.

Similar expressions were also made by William K. Norwood, chairman of the public protection committee of the Metropolitan Board of Trade; by James A. Willey, president, Federation of Citizens Associations; by James G. Ellis, president, Chevy Chase Citizens Association; by the Daughters of the American Revolution; and several other citizens associations in the District of Columbia.

Representations have been made that the position of the House committee is in support of unconstitutional procedures regarding the apprehension and arrest of criminals. Nothing could be further from the fact. No member of the House committee holds any such position. The contention that the District of Columbia police and, for that matter, police in other States and jurisdictions operate unconstitutionally, is premised upon the judgment of a small group after a study of limited scope, and does not conform with the House committee study of the law generally throughout the country and the constitutionality thereof.

Since the House District Committee is trying to give preference to legislation to curb crime in the District of Columbia, we regret we do not have the full support of the Commissioners in this regard. We feel that anything that the Congress or the Commissioners do to show the criminals that we are not solidly behind the law enforcement officials is certain to lead to additional crime or to hinder the police in their solution thereof.

Our committee intends to pursue as rapidly as possible the problem presented, conducting hearings to develop legislative procedures consistent with the responsibility imposed on the Congress by the Constitution and in conformity with constitutional provisions protecting the rights of all citizens. The committee is even now awaiting reports from the Commissioners and from the Department of Justice, on various proposed measures dealing with the crime situation in the District and which bills the committee hopes to present to Congress as its recommendations for curbing crime in the District and in support of the law enforcement officials in their terrific job.

The resolution of the House committee, the telegrams from the groups referred to, and the order of the Commissioners, I have included herewith along with my remarks:

U.S. House of Representatives,
Committee on the District of Columbia.

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives, sitting in executive session, respectfully requests the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to rescind their instructions to the Metropolitan Police Department to cease or stop all arrests for investigation, effective March 15, 1963, if in fact such instructions have been issued, and to withhold any further action on the same and on any proposed regulations in lieu thereof pending consideration by the 88th Congress of legislation relating thereto; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution as approved by the House Committee on the District of Columbia be delivered forthwith to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and to the Attorney General, Department of Justice.

March 7, 1963.

Washington, D.C., *March 11, 1963.*

Hon. John L. McMillan,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Copy of telegram sent to Hon. Walter N. Tobriner:

"In view of the fact that the District proposed crime legislation has not yet reached the Congress Citizens Crime Commission urges Board of Commissioners to delay effective date of its order terminating arrests for investigation to allow the Congress a reasonable opportunity to act."

Robert E. McLaughlin,
President, Citizens Crime Commission of Metropolitan Washington.

Washington, D.C., *March 11, 1963.*

Hon. John L. McMillan,
Chairman, House District Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Herewith copy of telegram sent to Hon. Walter N. Tobriner, Washington, D.C.:

"Representing the Public Protection Committee of the Metropolitan Board of Trade I strongly urge you to rescind the order discontinuing investigated arrest until such time as suitable remedial legislation is enacted. The citizens of the District are entitled to such protection."

William K. Norwood,
Chairman, Public Protection Committee.

Washington, D.C., *March 12, 1963.*

Congressman John L. McMillan,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Following telegram just sent to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C.

"Gentlemen: Understand you are considering investigative arrest ban this morning. We hope you will delay imposition of the ban until corrective legislation can be enacted. A few more weeks under a system in effect for years certainly can be justified by the serious consequences attendant upon a complete ban of such procedures."

James A. Willey,
President, Federation of Citizens Associations.

March 11, 1963.

Mr. Walter N. Tobriner,
President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, District Building, Washington, D.C.:

Pending the enactment by Congress of appropriate corrective legislation, you are respectfully urged to rescind the order which discontinued investigative arrests in the District of Columbia.

James G. Ellis,
President, Chevy Chase Citizens Association.

Same telegram to Brig. Gen. Frederick J. Clarke, Engineer Commissioner, District of Columbia, District Building, Washington, D.C.; and Commissioner John B. Duncan, District of Columbia, District Building, Washington, D.C.

Order No. 63–581

Government of the
District of Columbia,
Executive Office,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1963.

Subject: Police manual (arrests for investigation)—Amended Metropolitan Police Department

Ordered: That, effective at 12:01 a.m. on March 15, 1963, sections 8 and 10, chapter

XXXIII of the Police Manual are amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. Any member of the police force may legally arrest without a warrant in the following cases:

"(a) When a felony has been committed or when the officer has reason to believe that a felony has been committed, whether in his presence or not, and the officer in good faith has reasonable grounds for believing from facts within his knowledge or from facts communicated to him by a reliable informant that the person to be arrested has committed the felony.

"(b) For breaches of the peace, such as assaults and batteries, affrays, riots, unlawful assemblies, and forcible entry and detainer, committed in his presence, and for all violations of municipal ordinances or police regulations when committed in the presence or view of the officer.

"A vague belief in the officer's mind, suggested by his own thoughts, is, under no circumstances, probable cause. There should be reasonable grounds for suspicion, supported by circumstances sufficient to warrant a cautious man to believe that the party is guilty of the offense. Arrests shall not be made for investigation.

Sec. 10. A police officer may legally break and enter a building to make an arrest without a warrant where all of the following circumstances exist:

"(a) When a felony has been committed or when he has probable cause to believe that a felony has been committed; and

"(b) When he has probable cause to believe that the person believed to have committed the felony is within the building involved; and

"(c) After he has identified himself, stated the nature of his business, demanded entrance and entrance has been refused; and

"(d) Where the circumstances of the case are such that to attempt to secure a warrant would, in all probability, enable the person believed to have committed the felony to flee and prevent the officer from making the arrest. In all cases where it is possible for the officer to secure a warrant he should do so before attempting to break and enter and arrest without a warrant."

By order of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

F. L. Timmons, Jr.,
Acting Secretary to the Board.

OUR NATION'S YOUTH

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in his message on our Nation's youth, President Kennedy quoted the great British statesman of the last century, Benjamin Disraeli, who said:

> The youth of a nation are the trustees of posterity.

No statement could better describe the important national investment which the youth of America represent.

Although the United States is a land of unparalleled opportunity for all, we are presently faced with a problem which has far-reaching implications for the youth of this country and for all our citizens. A large percentage of our young people not attending school are unemployed. In addition to the economic aspect of this situation, I need not point out that idleness is a prime cause of juvenile delinquency and its related evils.

Consider the case of the high school dropout who fails to find gainful employment. Young and restless, time hangs heavily on his hands. Without the motivation of school or a worthwhile job, he finds himself hopelessly adrift in a prosperous society which seems to be holding him back from the realization of his goals and the accomplishment of his ambitions.

It is not difficult to understand the reason why such young people succumb to juvenile delinquency. Lacking any real incentive to contribute to the welfare of the community and harboring feelings of bitterness toward society, the unemployed youth frequently turns to crime. What a waste of human resources and potential. Unlike the older person who may take unemployment as a bad break and do everything possible to find another job, young people are easily discouraged, since they have no previous experience on which to base an optimistic attitude and lack sufficient maturity to accept the situation and try to improve on it.

The Youth Employment Act of 1963 will give new hope to these young citizens. The provisions of this bill—the creation of a Youth Conservation Corps and the establishment of a program for local area youth employment in community service—will go a long way toward improving the employment status of American youth.

HE'S JUST DOING HIS JOB

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ryan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, over in the Pentagon we have, what I believe, the best Secretary of Defense that this country has ever had.

Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara is doing his best in a job that exposes him to criticism and verbal tongue lashings from all sides. He has been denounced by members of the military, by some Members of Congress, as well as by some segments of industry.

Mr. McNamara was brought to Washington to do a job. He is doing exactly what he was brought here to do; he is establishing civilian control over the officers; he has made decisions which were not in accordance with the wishes of Pentagon officers and, in many instances, with Members of Congress. In a few words, he is the manager of the Pentagon.

Because of these sharp attacks upon the Secretary of Defense, I would like to bring to your attention an editorial which appeared in the Detroit News on Friday, March 15, 1963. This is a well-written piece in defense of Secretary McNamara and I hope that the Members of this House will take the time to read it fully.

The editorial follows:

In Defense of McNamara—He's Just Doing His Job

Robert McNamara is generally regarded as one of the most effective Secretaries of Defense—if not the most effective—the United States ever has had. Yet in recent weeks he has been subjected in increasingly sharp attacks. Why?

It is because what he has done and is doing irritates the politicians, the Pentagon brass, and even some defense industries.

One reason McNamara irritates these critics is that he is applyiug to the Defense Department the same principles he brought to his civilian job as president of the Ford Motor Co. He emphasizes efficiency and economy. He demands plans that will lead to the results he wants. He insists that defense production meet the same high standards required of successful civilian production.

Another reason is that McNamara has introduced a flexible defense policy under which the U.S. arsenal contains weapons suited for the kind of response required to meet any number of challenges from the Communist world. These changes in policy necessarily require American weapons and emphasis sharply different from those in effect under President Eisenhower. Such changes upset those accustomed to traditional weapons and traditional plans for response.

In addition, McNamara is a kind of human computer who has such a quick and broad grasp of the problems that confront the Defense Department that he does not suffer gladly the uninformed, the politically minded and the special interest representatives who challenge him. His personality, like his mind, is razor sharp.

Currently McNamara is feuding with many Congressmen over the controversial TFX fighter-bomber plane contract, over funds for the RS–70 experimental bomber and over the number of nuclear submarines the Nation needs. The House overrode McNamara's objections Wednesday to add $363.7 million to the defense authorization bill for two additional RS–70 warplanes and $134 million for two additional nuclear submarines.

In doing so, however, the House let itself in for the kind of an attack that McNamara made on Representative Arends, Republican, of Illinois, the Republican whip. McNamara pointed out that Arends was the ranking Republican on the committee that added $1.1 billion to the defense budget—and the Republicans at the same time are calling for a $5 billion cut in the defense budget.

As McNamara said in reply to his critics, some "dictation" is necessary in order to keep military spending below levels demanded by the Pentagon, by some Republicans, by some Democrats, and by the companies involved. McNamara conceded that he had cut $14 billion from the requests of the three services, and then added rather plaintively: "If I don't do it, who's going to do it?" Obviously not Congress, in view of the boost it gave the defense budget Wednesday.

A better public relations program obviously would help McNamara. He would have looked better in the TFX plane dispute, for example, if he had given his explanation for the controversial contract before the investigating committee got into the case. But some Congressmen obviously are trying to make McNamara look bad. And they're getting pressure from defense industries back home and information from Pentagon brass still engaged in interservice rivalries.

What is happening is that McNamara is being criticized for doing his job, which is to run the Pentagon. He's being criticized for doing exactly what other Secretaries of Defense were criticized for not doing. Naturally he's being subjected to abuse and attack by those who don't like his approach. But we think he's still serving the American public extremely well even if the politicians, the military brass, and the defense industries dislike many of his decisions.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT PROGRAM IN HAGERSTOWN, MD.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, certain charges have been made concerning the Area Redevelopment Administration's job retraining program in Hagerstown, Md. These charges do not quite square with the facts in the case, and for this reason I am taking this opportunity to clarify the record.

Mack Trucks, Inc., moved from Plainfield, N.J., to Hagerstown in 1961. The company had made its decision to relocate and had completed the arrangements before the Area Redevelopment Act was passed by the Congress.

After the Area Redevelopment Act became law, and funds were made available for the program, an application was filed for a program to retrain jobless workers as machine tool operators for the Mack plant in Hagerstown.

Since this was a clear case of a relocation of industry, both Area Redevelopment Administration and the Department of Labor refused to approve a job retraining program citing the act's very clear bar against using Federal funds for a relocating industry.

On January 4, 1962, a training program was approved for 120 machine tool operators in Hagerstown, and on January 11, 1962, a program for training 25 machine tool operators in nearby Cumberland was approved. Subsequently a program for another 25 in Cumberland was approved on October 5, and for 60 more in Hagerstown on November 5.

In each case, the proposal contained adequate supporting data to show that vacancies in these skills existed in other firms in Hagerstown and Cumberland. It was on the ground of a demonstrable need for machine tool operators by employers other than Mack Truck that the projects were approved.

A check of the records shows that, through an error, 15 of the 120 graduates of the first grade at Hagerstown were referred to Mack Truck. As soon as this situation came to the attention of officials in Washington, the Hagerstown Employment Service Office was reminded of the bar against aiding relocating industries, and no future referrals were made to Mack. The Cumberland office at no time referred graduates to Mack Truck.

It is my understanding that a total of about 60 of the 230 workers retrained in Hagerstown and Cumberland courses are now, in fact, working for Mack. But it should be emphasized that only 15 were referred there—and this through inadvertance.

Although the remainder of the retrainees have been referred to other plants in the Hagerstown and Cumberland areas, it should be borne in mind that we live in a free society. The Government cannot compel people to go to work at certain specified companies, nor can it bar them from working at other specified companies. It is a fact of life that Mack Truck advertises its employment opportunities throughout the area. It is also a fact of life that Mack offers wages that are as much as 70 cents an hour higher than those of other companies in the area, which makes employment at that plant extremely attractive.

In no sense, however, can it be said that through its retraining programs in Hagerstown and Cumberland, the Area Redevelopment Administration subsidized Mack's relocation from New Jersey to Maryland. To the contrary, it engaged in retraining for a demonstrable need in other plants—some of which had lost their skilled operators to Mack. After the retraining was completed, people exercised their inherent right to a freedom of choice. The Area Redevelopment Administration cannot possibly be held accountable for this.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Celler (at the request of Mr. Ryan of New York), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Ryan of New York, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Lindsay, for 30 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. Perkins (at the request of Mr. Matsunaga), for 20 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Schwengel (at the request of Mr. Hall), for 40 minutes, on March 21, 1963.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. Frances P. Bolton and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Hosmer in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Collier and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Willis in two instances.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hall and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Alger.

Mr. Jensen.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Matsunaga) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Keogh.

Mr. Patman in two instances.

Mr. Flood in two instances.

Mr. Burkhalter.

SENATE BILLS, JOINT RESOLUTION, AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 92. An act for the relief of Hom Wah Yook (also known as Hom Bok Heung); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 97. An act for the relief of Purificacion Siat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 193. An act for the relief of Michelina Lanni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 195. An act for the relief of Izabel Loretta Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 208. An act for the relief of Young Wai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 234. An act for the relief of Harold and Sylvia Freda Karro and their three minor children Allan Karro, Jennifer Karro, and Michelle Karro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 421. An act for the relief of Koon Chew Ho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 436. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Bialoglowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 506. An act for the relief of Panagiota Makris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 574. An act for the relief of Antonio Gutierrez Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 596. An act for the relief of Roswitha Seib; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 635. An act for the relief of Krystyna Ratay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 688. An act for the relief of Ronald Whiting; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Con. 4. Joint resolution to provide for the actual participation of the United States in the West Virginia centennial celebration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document, with illustrations, a pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol," and to print additional copies thereof; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a Senate document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government: What Is It? How Does It Function?"; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution to print with illustrations "A report on U.S. Foreign Operations in Africa," by Senator Allen J. Ellender; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 19, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1962, TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submitted the following report for printing in the Congressional Record pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85–804:

Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1963.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: There is transmitted herewith a report on the extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense, of the U.S. Coast Guard for the calendar year 1962. This report is submitted to comply with the provisions of Public Law 85–804.

Sincerely yours,
A. E. Weatherbee,
Administrative Assistant Secretary.

(Enclosure.)

Extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense (Public Law 85–804)—Treasury, Coast Guard; from Jan. 1, 1962, to Dec. 31, 1962

Type of action	Actions approved			Actions denied	
	Number	Amount claimed or requested	Amount approved	Number	Amount claimed or requested
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
1. Actions involving specific dollar cost:					
a. Amendments without consideration					
b. Correction of mistakes				1	$71,125.09
c. Formalization of informal commitments					
d. Other (specify by type)					
2. Actions not involving specific dollar cost:					
a. Amendments without consideration					
b. Contingent liabilities					
c. Advance payments					
d. Disposition of nonseverable property					
e. Other (specify by type)					

Remarks: Coast Guard—No actions were approved for calendar year 1962.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

550. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed appropriations for the fiscal year 1963 involving increases of $30 million for Housing and Home Finance Agency and $34,000 for the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure; a decrease of $59,275,000 for the Veterans' Administration; and a proposed provision for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 82); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

551. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1964 involving decreases in the amount of $50 million for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and $1,117,000 for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 83); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

552. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Acting Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated February 8, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, authorized by section 101 of the 1962 River and Harbor Act, on the addition of hydroelectric generating facilities at the authorized Holt lock and dam, Black Warrior River, Ala. (H. Doc. No. 84); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

553. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the Secretary of Agriculture on the 1962 soil bank conservation reserve program, pursuant to section 108c of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1832(c)); to the Committee on Agriculture.

554. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

555. A letter from the Acting Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

556. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report on operations under part B of title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–415), pursuant to section 309(b) of the act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

557. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of administrative functions of the Department of Occupations and Professions, District of Columbia Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

558. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on ineffective repair parts support for combat and combat-support vehicles, by the Army Tank-Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

559. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

560. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that petitions for intervention be filed not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues in the Federal Register"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

561. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relating to the Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory of the Bureau of Mines at Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1962, pursuant to the act of March 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 85); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

562. A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

563. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights as an agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

564. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a regulation promulgated by the Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard which amends CFR 171.10–20 regarding the renewal of numbers issued by the Coast Guard under the Federal Boating Act of 1958 (46 U.S.C. 527); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

565. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 1(c)(ii) of the act of August 14, 1962 (76 Stat. 382); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

566. A letter from the National Quartermaster, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., transmitting annual reports relating to the activities of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. for 1962, pursuant to Public Law 85–530; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER:

H.R. 4926. A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 4927. A bill to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid compliance with certain support orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4928. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit the use of social security records to aid in locating runaway parents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 4929. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 4930. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 4931. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce," approved August 2, 1956; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 4932. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to make it unlawful for any employer to require any employee to agree to assign patents to him as a condition of employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 4933. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp, the central figure of which will be the likeness of the now extinct Michigan grayling fish, after which the town of Grayling, Mich., was named; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 4934. A bill to establish a national sinking fund to be used to reduce the national debt; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 4935. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit the discrimination in employment against individuals on account of their age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4936. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4937. A bill to provide that primary elections and runoff primary elections for nomination of candidates for the House of Representatives shall be held on the same day throughout the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4938. A bill to protect the public health by regulating the manufacture, compounding, processing, distribution, and possession of habit forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4939. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4940. A bill to provide for the construction of a 500-bed general medical and surgical Veterans' Administration hospital at or near Evansville, Ind.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4941. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit an individual to waive his rights to receive benefits thereunder in order to preserve his right to receive benefits under other laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4942. A bill to increase from $10,000 to $25,000 the maximum amount of a deposit which may be insured under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4943. A bill to increase from $10,000 to $25,000 the maximum amount for which a member of a savings and loan association may be insured under title IV of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4944. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees enagaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 4945. A bill to repeal one paragraph of section 105(c) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1961; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 4946. A bill to amend the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959, to provide for reimbursement of transportation expenses for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H.R. 4947. A bill to provide for judicial review of administrative findings of the Secretary of Labor under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and chapter 23 (Federal Unemployment Tax Act) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4948. A bill to amend section 203 of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain Canadian tourist transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 4949. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 4950. A bill to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the North Loup Division, Nebr., of the Missouri River Basis project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 4951. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid for tuition, fees, or services to certain public and private institutions of higher education or for occupational training or retraining; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 4952. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 4953. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 4954. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operations of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 4955. A bill to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand the vocational education opportunities in the Nation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4956. A bill to direct the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review reports on the Kentucky River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4957. A bill to provide for suspension or revocation of the license of real estate brokers in the District of Columbia who engage in discriminatory practices on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry in the sale or leasing of housing; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 4958. A bill to eliminate racial and religious discrimination in housing in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 4959. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize local area youth employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 4960. A bill to amend the act of September 30, 1950, to authorize the reconstruction and permanent repair of bridges damaged or destroyed in major disasters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 4961. A bill to amend section 3101 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that the proceeds of veterans' insurance policies shall be exempt from estate taxation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 4962. A bill to provide retirement benefits for certain U.S. Army officers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4963. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Graff House site for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 4964. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.J. Res. 329. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States with other nations or international bodies in programs for the exploration and utilization of space; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 294. Resolution relating to the clerk hire allowance of Members of the House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H. Res. 295. Resolution to amend clause 4 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that introduced bills include an estimate of cost, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON: Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior with reference to the killing of animals within the boundaries of Yellowstone National Park, by park rangers; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama: Senate Joint Resolution No. 3, of the Senate of the State of Alabama, petitioning the Congress of the United States to defeat and reject the extreme and harmful changes in timber taxation proposed by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon to the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives on February 6, 1963; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to when a person has been either acquitted or convicted, on the merits of an offense against any State or territory of the United States, he may be prosecuted by the U.S. Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the establishment of a new national cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation extending the 3(b)2 classification of federally connected students under Public Law 874, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States

relative to ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging passage of legislation to amend the Reclamation Act and any other laws or rules, to waive the application of the land limitation clause in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that a public hearing be held in the county seat of each county affected before any final decision is made to establish dams, wildlife preserves, migratory bird refuges or parks; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of amending the Constitution of the United States to provide for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, prohibiting States from denying a citizen the right to vote through imposition of a poll tax; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which would eliminate the capital gains on the sale of timber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the present inadequacy in Public Law 874 "in lieu" funds with respect to that money which could be obtained by local governing units on a taxable basis; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 4965. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H.R. 4966. A bill for the relief of Erskine C. McCreery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4967. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Rose Colandro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 4968. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis D. Macheras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4969. A bill for the relief of Theodore Christopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 4970. A bill for the relief of Despina Kouloumoundras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 4971. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irene F. Lamey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 4972. A bill for the relief of Robert E. McKee General Contractor Inc., and Kaufman & Broad Building Co., a joint venture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4973. A bill for the relief of Abraham Abboud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 4974. A bill for the relief of Miss Hsiang-Ling Shao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4975. A bill for the relief of Kwong You Huey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.R. 4976. A bill for the relief of John T. Halloran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4977. A bill for the relief of Constantine P. Kostopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4978. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Karafotias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 4979. A bill for the relief of Joseph and Almeda Comolli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 4980. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Felicisima B. Dumlao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 4981. A bill for the relief of Farid Selim Tawfik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 4982. A bill for the relief of Truman W. Maltby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4983. A bill for the relief of Napoleon Elocre Magadia and his wife, Milagros De Guzman Magadia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4984. A bill for the relief of Maria B. Barreda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4985. A bill for the relief of Josefina Evangelista Blanco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 4986. A bill for the relief of Carleton R. McQuown, Thomas A. Pruett, and James E. Rowles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

69. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Ruby G. Bridwell and others, Spring Valley, Calif., relative to stating that if a Federal aid-to-education bill is passed, that aid should go to all American children regardless of what school they attend; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Opinion Poll Results, 22d Congressional District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1963

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 weeks I have received over 16,000 replies to my 1963 opinion poll. This questionnaire is mailed annually to each family of registered voters in the 22d Congressional District of Ohio shortly after the convening of each session of the Congress.

May I express my continuing gratitude to each person who replied to this poll for his interest in his Government and in the many important issues that face the present session of the Congress. It is only through the expression of the views of our constituents that the Congress can get the feel of the grassroots sentiment of the American public. The results of this poll should be of particular interest to the Congress because of the nearly equal number of registered Republicans and Democrats who reside in this district, with the balance of the residents maintaining an independent political status.

There appears to be strong sentiment in favor of a reduction in Federal income taxes with 74 percent of the replies to a question on this subject approving a tax cut, 21 percent opposing a tax cut, and 6 percent having no opinion. There is an even greater sentiment favoring a corresponding, or substantial reduction in Federal spending, with people basing their opinion undoubtedly on the fact that if there is to be a tax cut it will have to be one earned by the taxpayers through a cutback in Federal expenditures. Favoring such reduction in Federal spending were 75 percent of the replies, while 10 percent were opposed, and 15 percent had no opinion. A strong reaction was received in letters from many homeowners who strenuously object to any tax revision program that will not allow them to take full credit on their income tax return for real estate taxes, interest payments on their home mortgages, and contributions to charitable causes.

The steadily declining interest in a Federal health care plan tied in with the social security system was further emphasized by a 50-percent vote opposing the social security health care approach, 37 percent favoring it, and 13 percent having no opinion. The trend of thinking on this subject as reflected in these polls over the past 4 years is as follows:

[In percent]

Year	Yes	No	No opinion
1960	60.3	32.0	7.7
1961	58.0	35.0	7.0
1962	55.3	40.1	4.6
1963	37.0	50.0	13.0

This trend away from a program of health care under the social security system, does not, however, indicate a rejection on the part of a majority of people of the need for some assistance on the part of the Federal Government to help our aged in meeting the constantly increasing costs of hospital and medical care. There appears to be a realization that there are other and better ways this can be accomplished as suggested by the 41 percent favorable response to the question setting forth a program of voluntary health insurance with the Federal Government providing an income tax credit up to $150 per year for each taxpayer over 65 years of age to cover the cost of the premium for such health insurance. It is hoped that the administration and the Congress will give serious study to this type of approach to alleviate the costly burden of health care borne by our senior citizens.

It was especially interesting to see the strong support for legislation I have introduced to permit a taxpayer to deduct from his income tax the cost of college tuition and educational expense, or that of his dependents. This legislation, if enacted, would be of substantial benefit to higher education, to families who are trying to provide a college education for their children, and would not be in conflict with the constitutional provision establishing the separation of church and state.

Those who are familiar with and have supported the efforts of the House Committee on Un-American Activities will be heartened to know of the strong support the work of this committee is receiving from the general public. The continuation of this committee was approved by 73 percent of the replies, opposed by only 14 percent, with 13 percent of the people expressing no opinion. The residents of the 22d District will be interested in learning that the Congress has recently approved the budget for the continued work of this committee by a vote of 385 to 20.

The growing sentiment that Congress must take some positive action in the field of labor-management relations is clearly reflected in the opinions of residents of my district who support compulsory arbitration in nationwide strikes by a favorable vote of 74 percent, with 18 percent opposed, and 8 percent having no opinion. An equally strong vote in favor of including labor unions under the type of antitrust laws now governing industry is shown with 75 percent of the replies approving of such legislation, 10 percent opposing, and 15 percent having no opinion.

Although most Members of Congress receive a great amount of mail opposing military and economic aid to foreign countries it is enlightening to know that the greater weight of opinion favors continuation of this program as one of our main forces in combating the spread of communism. In favor of this program were 53 percent of the replies, 33 percent opposed it, and 14 percent had no opinion. It is apparent also that many of those favoring foreign aid expect the Congress to review carefully every part of this program in the hope of reducing aid wherever possible, and phasing it out, or completely stopping aid, if it is determined the national interests of the United States are not being furthered.

The people of our metropolitan areas, such as Cleveland, are awakening to the need for some action on the part of the Federal Government to assist our youth, from the ages of 16 to 21 years, who either voluntarily or by force of economic necessity, drop out of school. With the high rate of unemployment—at present over 6 percent of our working force—it is difficult for these young, unskilled people to obtain work, and consequently we are plagued with increasing problems of delinquency and crime. The creation of a Youth Conservation Corps to give employment to many of these young people was approved by 66 percent of the replies, while 24 percent opposed it, and 10 percent had no opinion.

The complete results of this poll follow:

[In percent]

Do you favor or oppose—	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
1. Taxes:			
(a) The proposed income tax reduction of approximately $13,500,000,000 over the next 3 years	73	21	6
(b) A corresponding reduction in Federal spending	75	10	15
2. Medical care:			
(a) A compulsory health-care plan financed through the social security system	37	50	13
(b) A voluntary private health insurance program with the Federal Government providing an income tax credit up to $150 per year toward the cost of the premium for each taxpayer	41	32	27
(c) No further Federal participation in the health-care field	32	30	38
(d) Participation by the State of Ohio in the existing Federal Kerr-Mills health care program covering persons in low income brackets	36	27	37
3. Education:			
(a) An income tax deduction of the cost of college tuition and educational expenses of a taxpayer or his dependents	73	18	9
(b) Federal assistance to needy States for public school construction	46	39	15
(c) Federal aid to colleges and universities for construction of classrooms, laboratories, and research facilities	46	39	15
4. Communism: Continuation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities	73	14	13
5. Labor:			
(a) A Federal compulsory arbitration law to resolve labor-management differences when it is determined that the national interest is affected by a nationwide strike	74	18	8
(b) Including labor unions under antitrust laws	75	10	15
6. Social security: Amending the social security law to permit continuation of benefits to children between the ages of 18 and 21 while they remain in school	68	23	9
7. Veterans: Legislation to grant GI educational benefits to peacetime servicemen	45	43	12
8. Foreign affairs: Continuation of our military and economic aid program to friendly nations	53	33	14
9. Mass transit: A Federal program to assist cities in establishing and maintaining mass transit systems	27	59	14
10. Domestic Peace Corps: The establishment of a domestic Peace Corps	37	45	18
11. Youth Corps: The creation of a Youth Corps to give employment to unskilled youth between the ages of 16 to 21 years	66	24	10
12. National debt limit: An increase in the present national debt limit of $308,000,000,000 to permit financing of a tax cut and any new domestic programs	28	58	14

Undetectable Nuclear Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter to the editor appearing in the Washington Post on March 13 so the vital information it contains may have wider dissemination:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 13, 1963]

Tests Beyond Detection

On the nuclear test ban issue you gave a generous 27 column inches to James Newman's rambling emotional outburst in defense of Deputy Disarmament Administrator Adrian S. Fisher and against Senator Dodd and myself.

At this writing you have given not even a fraction of an inch to startling factual testimony to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy by Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, the AEC's Director of Military Applications. Betts revealed the big hole, even in the administration's upcoming new treaty draft, through which the Soviets can drive clandestinely to nuclear weapons superiority.

Let Mr. Newman, your editorialists, and reporters quibble if they must over effectiveness of identification, location, and onsite inspection of detectable events which might be nuclear tests.

But why not also let your readers in on the fact there exists a very vital low-yield range of cheat testing—single shots or an entire series—which cannot be detected at all?

These are shots below a 3 kiloton yield equivalent in alluvium regarding which Dr. Frank Press told the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, March 7, detection capability is very close to zero.

This is a testing range in which the administration proposes to forgo wholly any and all U.S. developments and, as a practical matter, simply trust the Soviets to keep their word not to carry on undetectable tests to develop secretly nuclear weapons of vast military significance.

These are the significant weapons General Betts authoritatively declared could be clandestinely tested and secretly developed in the undetectable area freely open to surreptitious activity:

Relatively low-yield weapons of the tactical type.

Extrapolation from events as small as 1 kiloton up to much higher yield battlefield tactical weapons with such confidence as not to require proof testing.

At least one-half of all tactical weapons of all yields and types of interest of the military, also with such confidence as not to require proof testing.

A substantial fraction of all large-yield strategic weapons of interest, by the simple expedient of testing in underground cavities which muffle explosions down below the 3-kiloton yield equivalent for seismic nondetection purposes.

General Betts added, as an indication of what kind of weapons development is of interest, that about 50 percent of actual U.S. underground testing in Nevada is precisely in the low, undetectable kiloton range.

Only last Wednesday President Kennedy told the Nation "we would not accept a test ban which did not give us every insurance that we could detect a series of tests underground." Yet the upcoming treaty draft being prepared by Adrian Fisher and others proposes to do exactly that. The incontrovertible result is a gap of inconsistency between the administration's words and deeds.

It is little wonder that Americans observing the administration's test ban disarray, including Senator Dodd and myself, are deeply concerned with its incredible inability to match oratory with action.

This is particularly true when President Kennedy's words of March 2, 1962, are recalled announcing resumption of U.S. nuclear tests at that time. These included the following:

"A nation which is refraining from tests obviously cannot match the gains of a nation conducting tests."

"We know enough now about broken negotiations, secret preparations and the advantages gained from a long test series never to offer again an uninspected moratorium."

Those who may, somehow, become aware of General Betts' testimony, may feel as I do about the President's words of a year ago. Namely, they hardly can be erased by the unabrasive conclusions of such practitioners of "nuclear gapsmanship" as Messrs. Fisher, Newman, et al., that cheat testing in the "big hole" for surreptitious nuclear development really doesn't matter at all.

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress, California.

WASHINGTON.

Public Opinion Poll of the Honorable Harold R. Collier, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I take the privilege of reporting to my colleagues in the House of Representatives the results of a very extensive public opinion poll recently completed in the 10th Congressional District of Illinois which I have the honor of representing.

My questionnaires were mailed to 68,000 homes throughout the 29 towns, cities, and villages, in the seven townships in Illinois' 10th District covering the west suburban and north suburban areas of Cook County. The poll was conducted by mail and drew a record-breaking response notwithstanding the fact that the participants had to provide the postage to return their completed questionnaires to my Washington office. A total of 18,853 were returned for a 27.7-percent response. This substantially exceeded the highest previous response to questionnaires which I mailed in the 85th, 86th, and 87th sessions of Congress.

I call particular attention to the fact that 83 percent of the residents of my district favor a tax cut only along with a cut in Federal spending.

This is particularly significant because I think it reflects a nationwide concern on the part of the majority of the American people with consistent budget deficits. I also direct the attention of my colleagues to the fact that 73 percent of the respondents favor sharp reductions in the foreign aid program while 17 percent oppose such cuts and 10 percent indicate that they had no opinion on this issue. Eighty-eight percent of those responding oppose any aid to nations with Communist governments while but 3 percent registered approval of this practice.

The results of this questionnaire follow:

[Total returns, 18,853]

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Proposed tax cut:			
(a) Favor only along with cut in Federal spending?	83	10	7
(b) Favor regardless of budget deficit?	18	61	21
2. Federal aid to education:			
(a) To public schools only?	42	47	11
(b) Both public and private schools?	29	59	12
(c) Federal college loan program?	54	33	13
3. Foreign aid program:			
(a) Maintain at present levels?	20	63	17
(b) Reduced sharply?	73	17	10
(c) Aid to nations with Communist governments?	3	88	9
4. Medical care for aged:			
(a) Under the social security program?	35	56	9
(b) Tax allowance for private insurance?	61	23	16
5. Domestic Peace Corps: (a) For its establishment?	39	55	6
6. Department of Urban Affairs and Housing: (a) For its establishment?	24	68	8
7. Military draft:			
(a) Maintain at present 24 months?	52	28	20
(b) Reduced to 18 months?	41	34	26
8. Military pay increased: (a) For proposed 15 percent increase?	51	42	7

Costa Rica Meeting and the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is scheduled to attend the forthcoming meeting of the Presidents of the Central American States and Panama at San Jose, Costa Rica. It is assumed that matters of vital concern to those countries and our own Nation will be discussed. It is likely that one of these subjects will be the Panama Canal.

Over a period of many years our Government has made concession and concession to Panama, and all without any realistic compensatory or reciprocal benefits to our country. Moreover, the rights, power, and authority of the United States concerning the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the canal have been steadily impaired.

Here, Mr. Speaker, I would stress that whatever weakens the authority of the United States in these regards hurts Panama and the five Central American countries as well. It is to be hoped that the President will meet any proposals which may further our treaty rights concerning the canal with a rocklike stand for our own interests.

The time is certainly overripe for a forthright and openly proclaimed reaffirmation of our treaty rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal, accompanied by the declaration by our Government that what serves the best interests of the canal also serves the best interests of the countries of the Isthmian region and for the entire free world as well. The approaching meeting should supply an appropriate occasion for such declaration.

The American people, Mr. Speaker, are now viewing the Costa Rica meeting with deep concern.

Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, many of us who supported H.R. 10 over the years before its enactment, have been concerned over the lack of speed displayed by the Treasury and Internal Revenue Service in promulgating regulations to implement the Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act of 1962.

Although this delay may be justified, in view of the many complexities of the statute, nevertheless the lack of guidelines has held back many interested private funding media from putting plans on the market.

However, there have been indications that a breakthrough has come even in advance of the Treasury regulations. Last week I attended a press conference at which the Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co. of Washington, D.C., announced that its plan is going on the market immediately. VALIC President John D. Marsh explained that he feels this plan will comply with the Treasury regulations, whatever they may be.

This first insured H.R. 10 retirement plan combines the features of a variable annuity and a fixed dollar annuity, with complete flexibility designed to fit the needs of every individual. Under this unique equity-funded retirement plan, the purchaser may select any range of benefits from a 100-percent variable annuity to a 100-percent fixed-dollar annuity.

It has these plus factors:

First. Simplicity—the buyer need not be concerned with the complexities generally associated with pension and retirement plans.

Second. Additional benefits—the buyer has the option of including such benefits as life and disability coverage in the annuity contracts at special premium rates. The participating employees of the self-employed individual also will be able to purchase these additional coverages if they wish.

Third. Group coverage—VALIC will write this plan on a group basis as well as on an individual basis and therefore it can be geared to fit the needs of associations of self-employed individuals—at lower group premium rates.

The Power To Not Tax Like the Power To Tax Is the Power To Destroy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, like many Members of Congress I have become deeply concerned about a recent proposal which is contrary to the basic policy of our Government, and which will materially increase Federal expenditures and decrease Federal taxes.

With an anticipated budget deficit of almost $12 billion for fiscal year 1964 and with substantial budget deficits anticipated in future years, it becomes vitally important that our Government encourage in every way possible new investment by taxpaying business.

The electric utility industry in fiscal year 1962 paid $2,680 million in local, State, and Federal taxes. That industry's annual investment in new plant and equipment of about $3½ billion is approximately 10 percent of the total annual investment in new plant and equipment by all American business.

The present administration says that its policy is to encourage taxpaying American business to invest more money in new property and thereby create new taxes. The administration's policy in connection with the taxpaying utility industry appears to me to be exactly the opposite and to be one of destruction instead of one of creation.

The most serious deterrents that I have seen to new investment by any business are the recently proposed regulations of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture regarding rights-of-way for electric power transmission lines.

These regulations, among other things, provide:

First. That the Secretary can refuse to issue a transmission line right-of-way permit if he believes that the proposed line is not in accordance with the Federal power marketing policy. This, in short, means that he could deny a permit to build an investor-owned taxpaying line in order to make it necessary that a Federal tax-free line be built.

Second. If a permit is issued it is to contain a provision giving the Interior Department the right to utilize the excess capacity of the line, to transmit power to any Federal customer. This would place the Interior Department in a position to take away present customers and future customers of taxpaying utilities, thereby reducing the future investment of those taxpaying utilities in generation, transmission, and distribution facilities.

In my judgment these regulations are not only wrong in principle but they make the Interior and Agriculture Departments a dictator in connection with the use of the transmission facilities of the investor-owned utilities when those utilities are directly in competition with the Interior Department electric power sales program.

Unless the Interior and Agriculture Departments decide against the issuance of these transmission lines right-of-way regulations, I strongly believe that Congress should take some very direct and affirmative action in this connection to reduce Federal expenses in connection with the Federal power program and to encourage the creation of new taxpaying facilities.

Tribute to Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian of U.S. House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, 1963, Lewis Deschler had served the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States 35 years as its Parliamentarian. On March 4, 1963, this House duly celebrated the event here in this Chamber, with the passage of a resolution—unanimously—that did Parliamentarian Deschler a high, appropriate and immensely deserved honor. This resolution—House Resolution 274—expressed the thanks and appreciation of the House for what the resolution called Parliamentarian Deschler's "wise and impartial advice to the Speaker and Members" and for his "exceptional contribution to the operation of its rules."

This pertinent and official language in the resolution has very considerable implications and we in the House, especially those of us who have served here a long time, know precisely what the correct and meaningful phrases of the resolution mean. The words "wise" and "impartial" could hardly be improved upon and I can vouch for their precision because I, too, happen to have toiled in this Chamber since 1928, and I am fully aware that parliamentary impartiality and wisdom can be the lubricating medium that explains efficient and correct parliamentary practices. All this, as I have witnessed Mr. Deschler's service at close hand, attests to a judicial temperament, a punctilious dedication to the essential subtleties of orderly procedure, that again and again has won him, certainly from me, the highest order of respect and confidence.

What I would like to point out today is that Lew Deschler's service over these three and one-half decades has been a remarkable contribution as much to the country as to the several Speakers and the House Members who have served here, and who so constantly and exhaustively availed themselves of his talents and his knowledge. It is not enough to say that he enjoys an extraordinary mastery, as the tips of his fingers, of the infinite minutiae of parliamentary law. This happens to be his basic and—for this House—his indispensable tool, for the guidance that governs our tasks here. But over and above this knowledge and the immediacy of his judgment we recognize the quality of the man. This is an essentially inherited factor and all his own. It could not have been grafted onto his intellect from any of the good and distinguished schools he attended in Ohio or here in Washington.

In this quality of the man I emphasize especially the element of character, without which I doubt he could have maneuvered his way successfully among the strong and sometimes overwhelming personalities that again and again occupied this Chamber. He has a force of personality which is persuasive and decisive and restrained without being at all obtrusive, and which is never lacking in respect for the dignity of those who depend upon him for consultation, advice, judgment, and knowledge. He has again and again, almost constantly in the work-a-day affairs of this House, demonstrated a genius for understanding the political and personal problems of his distinguished clients, helping always, without abdicating by one jot or tittle the sacred precincts of his impartiality. He has been the diplomat extraordinary who, more than most diplomats, has always been clear and informative, and so diligently devoted to what is right and just, irrespective of rank or position, that the highest and the most powerful, as well as the humblest, have honored him for his integrity.

President Kennedy wrote to Parliamentarian Deschler emphasizing his "unique and vital role in the life and work of the House of Representatives." Vice-President Lyndon B. Johnson has

been quoted in this Chamber for his high opinion of Mr. Deschler, and, of course, the late Sam Rayburn, as we have been told, spoke of him as "a big brain man." To the encomiums of these very great leaders of our time, and to the excellent expressions of appreciation that have already been uttered in this Chamber, I add my own brief tribute to one of our mostly unsung heroes of the parliamentary system. For, Mr. Deschler and his performance is to the efficient operation of this House what grammar is to the correct employment of language—an indispensable discipline.

As a Member of Congress and as a citizen I extend to Lewis Deschler my compliments, my respect and my gratitude.

National Rice Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress from one of the major rice-producing States, I am pleased to call attention to the observance of National Rice Week now under way.

Rice is produced in greater abundance than any other food and it has been the principal—frequently the sole—sustenance for half the people of the world for thousands of years. It is produced on every continent, in every hemisphere and in practically every country. The U.S. rice industry customarily participates in 15 to 20 percent of world trade in rice.

Rice was brought to the United States in 1694 by a ship, en route from Madagascar to England, which was blown off its course during a storm and forced to land at Charleston, S.C., for repairs. When the ship had been made ready to continue on its voyage the captain gave the Governor of the colony a small parcel of rough rice, from which enough rice was soon grown to supply South Carolina and neighboring colonies. From South Carolina production moved to Louisiana, then to other States. Today rice is produced in 13 States, with the major production in Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, and California.

Rice, the energy food, is relatively low in price but high in nutriment. It is a favorite with housewives because it is easy to prepare, economical, tasty, and versatile—it goes well with any meal, almost any dish.

In celebration of National Rice Week, March 17 to 23, an extensive advertising campaign is being conducted in news media. Newspaper and magazine food editors all over the United States are being provided with rice recipe material and photographs to be used in giving the public detailed information concerning the importance and value of this vital food. The advertising is being done by private brand distributors and by the Rice Council, a national organization of the rice industry for promoting domestic consumption, supported by voluntary contributions from all rice growers and millers.

Also active in the interest of the rice industry is the Rice Millers' Association, a nonstock, nonprofit, incorporated trade association of the rice milling industry. Organized in 1899, it is composed of a majority of the commercial rice mills of the United States, and is headed by Mr. J. P. Gaines as executive vice president, with headquarters in Washington. For a great many years, until his retirement, Mr. William M. Reid, who has done so much for the welfare and development of the rice industry, served as president.

The Rice Millers' Association has announced that in observance of National Rice Week, the rice industry will sponsor a free serving of a rice dish to all persons who dine at the restaurants and cafeterias at the U.S. Capitol on Wednesday, March 20. There will be table notices announcing that the rice is being provided with the compliments of rice growers, millers and Members of Congress from the rice growing States, each of which will be named. I am happy to join with my colleagues from these States in extending a hearty invitation to all Capitol diners to share in this treat.

Disaster Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to place in the Record a telegram I recently received from the Smith, Kline & French Laboratories, Philadelphia, which offered to replace all uninsured Smith, Kline & French medicinal supplies that were damaged or destroyed as a result of the recent disaster in Alabama caused by the floods.

This is an instance of cooperation that can only be accomplished in a democracy where each one is interested in the health and welfare of his neighbor:

Hon. Kenneth A. Roberts,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Smith Kline & French Laboratories expresses deep sympathy for the citizens of Alabama whose lives have been tragically disrupted by the disaster of the recent floods. My company stands ready to help as best it can the process of recovery to normal conditions. We have arranged through the Alabama Pharmaceutical Association to replace at no cost uninsured SK&F medicinal products which have been damaged or destroyed by the floods. We hope our aid will be of economic benefit to the pharmacies affected and of genuine service to all citizens of your State who require our products for their good health.

Walter A. Munns,
President, Smith Kline & French Laboratories.

I would also like to place at this point in the Record my reply to Mr. Munns, expressing my thanks for the assistance rendered by his laboratories:

> Thank you so much for the wonderful display of cooperation and interest your laboratories have shown in rendering assistance to those affected by the disaster caused by the recent floods and tornados. I know I apeak for all Alabamians affected and this is indeed a noble gesture on your part. I want to commend you and your company as well as the Alabama Pharmaceutical Association for your efforts in replacing these uninsured drugs at no cost.
>
> Kenneth A. Roberts,
> *Member of Congress.*

Statement of Hon. Everett G. Burkhalter, Member of Congress, Before the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, March 18, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement delivered by me before the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, March 18, 1963:

Statement of Hon. Everett G. Burkhalter Before the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the House Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, March 18, 1963

The No. 1 problem in America today, I feel, is air pollution. Some sections of the country refer to it as smog, but regardless of what it is called it is a daily detriment, a serious daily detriment, to the health and welfare of each and every community in the land.

Certain of the scientists and air pollution experts and some health authorities try to say that this problem is confined to parts of California and a few of the other large metropolitan areas. However, I have also discussed the problem of air pollution with many other individuals who feel that they are as well qualified to speak about the problems as any other authorities; and this latter group is of the opinion that air pollution is fast becoming the No. 1 problem in the Nation.

Physicians and health authorities have long held that air pollution is certainly a contributing factor, and perhaps one of the major causes, of lung cancer, heart ailments, asthma, tuberculosis, and other respiratory ailments.

The general public is still skeptical about what is really causing smog, or air pollution. Most experts still insist that the automobile, rather the motor vehicles, contribute in excess of 60 percent of all the pollutants and irritants which are discharged into the atmosphere. The other factors which constitute the remaining 40 percent are spread out in smaller percentages. The following are some of these sources of air pollution: Petroleum refineries, steel mills, chemical plants, rubber processing and finishing establishments, foundries, electroplating plants, open dumps and even the municipally-owned incinerators and a host of unlisted and unnamed industrial processing plants. Air pollution is also contributed to by each little community restaurant, each open burning of trash and leaves; in Los Angeles all backyard incinerators were outlawed because of the solid pollutants carried into the air each day.

The first conclusion a person was apt to jump to was if you didn't see smoke or dust, no air pollution was occurring. However, because of the intensive research and public educational programs presented today concerning the many reasons for the pollution of air the public has become well aware that it is for the most part, the unseen vapors and chemicals which react one with the other to cause one's eyes to water and burn and to cause terrific pains and discomfort in breathing to some individuals.

It has been pointed out that local, city, county, and even State laws are not the answer. Why? Because today there are thousands of individuals who commute to and from their daily occupations or businesses who may travel well over 50 miles a day, and these people may cross and recross many local, county, and even State boundaries during the day. It is easy to see that these local ordinances which attempt to control air pollution are meaningless, because the moving, fleeting pollutants are carried out and beyond the local boundaries of their origin by the changing wind and weather patterns. The same rule naturally applies to the tourist, as well as to the commuter.

In the face of ordinary facts such as these it is imperative for any control which is to be really effective to originate at the Federal level.

Today there are four or five different devices which have been tested and proven effective for the control of motor vehicle exhaust by the State of California Air Pollution Control Board. These have also been tested by the automobile manufacturers. These devices may be installed on automobiles at the factory as standard equipment, and should be, if we really intend to combat this vital problem in America today.

Unfortunately these devices will cost the consumer money; but the comfort and contribution to the well-being, of not only the consumer and his family, but to every citizen in the Nation, far overrides the expenditure. These devices, I refer to, would cost approximately $7 or more, or up to as much as $150, the more costly device being a permanent type which would not have to be periodically replaced or recorded, as in the case of some of the less expensive ones.

In regard to the other 40 percent of air contamination, the control of the pollutants from the small and large industrial establishments is a factor which can be a financial drain on companies which are still paying interest and prinicpal on original loans, and will be for the next 10 to 20 years. A large portion of these new industrial plants have been started and established in the last 15 to 18 years, and a high percentage of the owners are veterans who received their initial loan from the Small Business Administration.

In talking to many of these individual owners, I have found, that although they are encumbered with present financial obligations they would be more than willing to seek further loans which would make it possible for them to install air pollution control devices on any and all processes they employ which are presently contaminating the atmosphere, if such loans would be made available from the Government agencies at a low-interest rate.

It is not the desire of any of us advocating the enforcement of controls of air pollution to harass or close down any of our industrial, commercial, or any firms which are contributing to the economic well-being of our country. However, this is a two-way street and the public health is of the first importance. Due to this dual involvement, and to the ready cooperation of many of the firms to install devices to control the emission of pollutants from their establishments, I believe that those of us in the legislative branches of the Federal Government are obligated to make low-interest loans available to this group because of the very important contributions to the welfare and health of the Nation this control of air pollution would be.

I therefore urge all members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to weigh the responsibilities involved in the interest of public health and urge that Mr. Roberts' bill, H.R. 4415, be supported and passed by this committee.

Thank you so much for the time allocated to me for the presentation of my remarks dealing with this subject.

Were Our Turkish Missile Bases Bargained Away During the Cuban Crisis?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a constituent has sent me a portion of the transcript of a broadcast on October 27, 1962, over station KPFA in Berkeley, Calif., by Reporter John Cooper. I submit that portion herewith:

> This is a copy of a message sent to Acting Secretary U Thant by Chairman Khrushchev of the Soviet Union:
>
> "You were concerned about the fact that we helped Cuba with weapons with the aim of strengthening its defense capacity, but Turkey is located next to us and sentinels walk and look at each other. You have located in Turkey destructive rockets literally next to us, at our side. We agree to remove these weapons from Cuba which you regard as offensive weapons. We agree to do this and to state in the United Nations this commitment. Your representative will make a statement to the effect that the United States, on its part, bearing in mind the anxieties and concern of the Soviet States, will evacuate its analogous weapons from Turkey. Let us reach an understanding what time you and we need to put this into effect."
>
> Khrushchev said he thought it would not be difficult to get Cuba and Turkey to agree to permit United Nations inspection teams on their territory to police the dismantling of rocket bases.

Mr. Speaker, this was just 5 days after President Kennedy announced his quarantine against the shipment of offensive weapons to Cuba. It was undoubtedly at the time of intensive and delicate negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

In light of the subsequent decision by the Kennedy administration to remove missile bases from Turkey, the message to U Thant from Khrushchev, if it was in fact sent, raises very serious and basic questions. It definitely points to the distinct possibility that the Kennedy administration did agree to withdrawing our Turkish bases in exchange for the Russian agreement to remove its missiles from Cuba.

This is a question that the administration should forthrightly answer. No American would object to removing our bases for military reasons but we would certainly object to being bluffed into such action by the boss of the Communist world.

Were our Turkish bases bargained away during the Cuban crisis?

Unveiling of Portrait of Hon. Emanuel Celler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 12, in the committee room of the Committee on the Judiciary, a portrait of our chairman, EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, was unveiled. Present were your distinguished self, the distinguished minority leader, members of the Committee on the Judiciary, about 50 Members of the House together with the family of Mr. CELLER and his dear friends. This was the culmination of months of preparation. In September of last year, a Celler Portrait Committee was organized, of which Representatives FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, Republican, of Ohio, and RICHARD H. POFF, Republican, of Virginia, and myself undertook gladly the task of securing contributions for the painting of the portrait and appropriate ceremonies.

We believed that under the chairmanship of EMANUEL CELLER this committee had made a valuable contribution to the course of free government and felt that his 40 years of experience in the House and over a decade as chairman, added to the qualities of scholarship, warmth, and understanding, called for this tribute before our colleagues of the House, before his family and friends. Mr. MCCULLOCH and myself, reflecting the bipartisanship spirit of this committee, were honored by having this opportunity to express our admiration and esteem for MANNIE CELLER. His reply to our remarks, I believe, are such that they reflect the character and quality of this man and will underline and explain why the members of this committee feel as they do about him, and so I wish, at this point, to insert MANNIE CELLER's statement at the ceremony of the presentation of his portrait to the Committee on the Judiciary:

STATEMENT OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK, AT THE UNVEILING OF A PORTRAIT IN HIS HONOR

I thank you for this moment. A lifetime gathers only a few moments of this kind. Here, with my family, my dear wife, daughters and son-in-law, my friends, my colleagues, I feel that all the strands of my life have been woven together, and I am moved and humble and proud and grateful, and do not know where one emotion begins

and the other ends. I would be less than candid if I did not say the words uttered of me warm the cockles of my heart.

In the first sitting for this portrait, after Mr. Margulies had made but a few strokes on the canvas, I began to see, much to my amazement, the resemblance emerge. It was like being recreated. At first, I was as restive as a colt in a saddle but after awhile I ceased flouncing. I believe it was Cromwell who said to his artist, "Paint everything including the warts." Mr. Margulies has painted, in a way, a biography. He has reflected the qualities of character, the shades of personality, in short, a painted biography. "How can you do this," I asked, "with only a few strokes?" He replied, "In those strokes lie 40 years of work." And so I feel as if 40 years of my work in Congress symbolized in this moment.

If any man has reason for gratitude, I am that man. I have been privileged to sit as chairman of this committee for more than a decade, and I say without reservation that a finer group of men exists nowhere. We have debated, and argued, and questioned in the best tradition of a free society. Never has any member discarded the basic courtesies nor the willingness to listen. The work we have done together has created for each man his own passport to immortality. It is my prayer that my portrait and that of Judge Sumners, and portraits of other chairmen who will come after me, will look down upon a like group of men who, in honor and in graciousness, have followed their concessions and disciplined their minds so that they can bequeath to their people a just and enduring and a free government.

Thank you everybody.

Panama Canal: Congress Must Act To Prevent Threatened Liquidation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the forthcoming meeting in San Jose, Costa Rica, March 18–20, which will be attended by the Presidents of the Central American Republics and the President of the United States, has again focused attention on the Caribbean situation in which the Panama Canal is the key element. It was, therefore, with much gratification that I noted the introduction by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], of House Concurrent Resolution 105, which aims to clarify the present confused understanding of the U.S. sovereign rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

In this connection, it will be recalled by those Members who were present in the House on February 2, 1960, that this body adopted by the vote of 381 to 12 House Concurrent Resolution 459, 86th Congress, which, in effect, was aimed at preventing the display of the Panama flag in the Canal Zone.

Within a matter of days, after the adjournment of that session, and as predicted by me in an address to this body, this specific evidence of the will of the Congress as regards the Panama Canal was ignored by the President in Executive order on September 17, 1960, directing the display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone territory at one spot. Instead of meeting the situation, this surrender merely led to more demands as shown by the subsequent authorization by the executive of the wide display of the Panama flag in the territory, which even includes one at the Canal Zone administration building.

Such formal displays of the Panama flags in the Canal Zone are not harmless gestures but symbols of weakness on the part of the officials responsible for what amounts to deliberate collaboration with those who would subvert the sovereign rights, power, and authority over the canal enterprise. Such treaty obligations and responsibilities, for some time, have been verging toward liquidation through the process of piecemeal surrenders.

Mr. Speaker, I would emphasize what I have often said that where there is responsibility there must be authority; otherwise there will be chaos. The process of liquidation has now gone so far that if the Panama Canal is to be saved, it must be rescued by the Congress of the United States.

To this end, I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 113, which is identical with House Concurrent Resolution 105, introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The indicated resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 113

Whereas the United States, under the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 with Panama, acquired complete and exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone in perpetuity for construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

Whereas all jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama over the Canal Zone ceased on exchange or ratifications of the 1903 treaty on February 26, 1904; and

Whereas since that time the United States has continuously exercised exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal; and

Whereas where responsibility is imposed there must be given for its effectuation adequate authority; and with respect to the Panama Canal the treaty of 1903 so provided; and

Whereas the United States has fully and effectively discharged all its treaty obligations with respect to the Panama Canal and the only legitimate interest that Panama can have in the sovereignty of the Canal Zone is one of reversionary character that can never become operative unless the United States should abandon the canal enterprise; and

Whereas the policy of the United States since President Hayes' message to the Congress on March 8, 1880, has been for an interoceanic canal "under American control," that is to say, under the control of the United States; and

Whereas the grant by Panama to the United States of exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone for the aforesaid purposes was an absolute, indispensable condition precedent to the great task undertaken by the United States in the construction and perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal, for the benefit of the entire world; and for which rights, the United States has paid the Republic of Panama the full indemnity and annuities agreed upon by the two nations; and

Whereas, on February 2, 1960, the House of Representatives in the Eighty-sixth Congress, by an overwhelming vote, approved H. Con. Res. 459, favorably reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as follows:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that any variation in the traditional interpretation of the treaties of 1903, 1936, and 1955 between the United States and the Republic of Panama, with special reference to matters concerning territorial sovereignty shall be made only pursuant to treaty."

Whereas, because of continuing claims of sovereignty over the Canal Zone by Panama which, if granted, would liquidate United States control of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone, a further declaration by the Eighty-eighth Congress is deemed necessary and timely: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (1) the United States, under treaty provisions, constitutionally acquired and holds, in perpetuity, exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection; and

(2) That there can be no just claim by the Republic of Panama for the exercise of any sovereignty of whatever character over the Canal Zone so long as the United States discharges its duties and obligations with respect to the canal; and

(3) That the formal display of any official flag over the Canal Zone other than that of the United States is violative of law, treaty, international usage, and the historic canal policy of the United States as fully upheld by its highest courts and administrative officials; and will lead to confusion and chaos in the administration of the Panama Canal enterprise.

(4) That the provisions of H. Con. Res. 459, Eighty-sixth Congress, are reiterated and reemphasized.

Administration Test Ban Proposals Blueprint for National Suicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, during early March pertinent terms of a new test ban treaty offer soon to be made to the Russians by the Kennedy administration were revealed to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. These proposals contain the seeds of a potential nuclear Pearl Harbor. They amount to blueprints for a U.S. suicide weapon or a Soviet murder weapon, depending only upon which side of the Iron Curtain they are viewed from.

The proposed treaty's elaborate on-site inspection provisions need not be discussed because they are utterly meaningless. This is because the treaty's contemplated machinery to spot test cheating is so inadequate that suspicion of monitors will never be aroused and no on-site inspectors ever will be dispatched.

Disarmament Agency and State Department advisors have censored data and withheld from President Kennedy scientific evidence proving there is a big hole for Soviet test cheating in these upcoming proposals.

This evidence definitely exists and is ignored completely by these officials who also are trying to keep it from the public. A well-organized campaign of distortion and half-truths is being carried on aimed at brainwashing the American public into meek submission to a disastrous agreement-for-agreement's sake cave-in in the form of drastically scaled down treaty demands incorporated in these new proposals. The latter have already been drafted. They merely await a propitious time at Geneva to be given as an official offer to Communist negotiators.

The well-organized campaign I refer to is carried on by statements and letters to the editors of key newspapers over names of well-known personalities who want an effective test ban treaty, but who have not been informed of the facts proving administration proposals will result only in an ineffective treaty—one which stops all U.S. weapons progress while simply trusting an unpoliced Soviet promise not to continue theirs secretly and attain the nuclear weapons superiority needed to back up a surrender-or-die ultimatum.

Facts establishing the "big hole" for Soviet cheating in these proposals were placed on public record by Atomic Energy Commission and Defense Department expert witnesses during the above mentioned joint committee hearings March 5 to 12.

Rather than face them, admit errors in judgment and mistakes in evaluation, the Presidential advisors on the test ban question stubbornly have refused to budge from dangerous positions which undermine the very foundation of national defense against communism's drive to achieve world domination and bury the United States as part of the process.

It must never be forgotten that these people are part of the same crew which so badly misjudged the Bay of Pigs situation that disaster followed. In the present instance the magnitude of disaster which could follow only a few years of clandestine, one-sided Soviet nuclear progress is infinitely greater.

Only demands by an aware, aroused American public can reverse the administration's sure-lose test ban strategy of gradual nuclear self-mutilation. In the end that strategy will bring a terrifying rain of H-bombs on America if we choose not to surrender when the ultimatum is hurled. Only if we demand and get an effective test ban treaty—one which stops nuclear progress equally on both sides of the Iron Curtain—might the risks our country faces in the nuclear war be somewhat reduced.

The indisputable facts which establish the existence of the "big hole," brought to light during the joint committee's hearings were these:

First. Disarmament Agency witnesses testified that both current Anglo-United States proposals, and new ones, already drafted and soon to be offered to the Soviets, will rely on seismic observatories outside the Soviet Union to discover underground cheat testing inside its borders. Only a token number, nine, of unreliable, delayed reporting, tamperprone unmanned and, as yet uninvented, "black box" devices will be demanded for placement inside the U.S.S.R.

Second. The Defense Department's top seismologist, Dr. Carl Romney, testified that the capability of seismographs to record intelligible data is physically limited by natural earth background noise which occurs everywhere. Its effect on seismographs, wherever located, is similar to static on a short wave radio—unless a seismic signal is larger and stronger than background noise, it is simply unintelligible.

Seismic signals double the background noise level are needed to "detect" seismic disturbances, whether they be created by man or by nature. Signals 10 to 20 times the background noise level must be recorded to be able to "distinguish" unnatural seismic events in the U.S.S.R. from the many hundreds of similar-sized earthquakes which occur there annually.

Recording signals big enough to make this distinction is the key to arousing the suspicion of monitors and of setting a treaty's onsite inspection machinery into motion. This is where the "big hole" comes in.

Although the earth's normal background noise averages about 15 millimicrons in signal size—the common flu virus is 60 millimicrons in diameter—by combining quiet locations with electronic and mechanical suppression, it is claimed that some seismic observatories might be installed with background noise levels approaching only 1 millimicron.

Assuming this is possible, then 10 millimicron seismic signals created by a series of cheat tests would be detectably recorded along with similar-sized earthquakes. However, they still would be too small to be distinguished from those earthquakes and, therefore, would not be identified as originating from cheat tests.

The key to arousing suspicion and dispatching onsite inspectors would be missing. Cheating would be undiscoverable by the administration's proposed seismic monitoring network. Very significant underground nuclear tests could be carried on in the over 2½-million-square-mile area of the interior of the U.S.S.R., which lies 500 to 600 miles inside its borders, without discovery from the outside.

This is because Soviet scientists can keep seismic signals from clandestine test in the "big hole" smaller than 10 millimicrons in size as they travel outside their country's borders by the following means: First, holding yields down below 3 kilotons and testing in formations like alluvium which transmit seismic waves poorly; second, testing in underground cavities which "decouple" explosive shock from surrounding earth and drastically reduce the seismic signal; or, third, a combination of the foregoing.

Third, the AEC's Director of Military Applications, Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, U.S. Army, testified that the entire spectrum of nuclear weapons of military interest, except very large yield super H–bombs which the Soviets already have anyway, can be perfected by tests carried out under these conditions of undiscoverability. As an indication of where military interest lies, General Betts revealed that even without a need for secrecy approximately one-half of U.S. underground tests in Nevada are carried on precisely at these very low, undiscoverable yields.

These are the facts of record. These are the facts which establish the "big hole" for clandestine, undiscoverable cheating through which the Soviets could sneak undetected to gain overwhelming nuclear weapons superiority. These are the facts which must be faced if nuclear test ban negotiations are to be carried on with the realism American citizens demand of their Government.

It is little wonder the Americans are unwilling to trust an unpoliced promise by the Soviet Government not to sneak through the "big hole." Less than half a year ago that same Government was caught redhanded while sneaking nuclear rockets into Cuba. Americans distrust communism enough to spend willingly over $50 billion a year to forestall its threat of world domination. They have a right to insist the "big hole" be closed. The present state of the seismic art indicates it only can be closed by returning to demands for adequate numbers of manned seismic observatories inside the Soviet Union.

Even the most ardent test ban proponents should join in vigorously demanding closure of the "big hole." They seek to reduce the risks the U.S. faces in today's nuclear world with a test ban treaty. But it is only by an effective treaty—one which inhibits nuclear progress to the same degree on both sides of the Iron Curtain which might have any chance of doing so.

An ineffective treaty only would serve to exchange whatever risks exist from continued unrestrained testing for the obvious risks involved in stopping nuclear weapons progress on our side, while providing opportunity for the other side to proceed with it surreptitiously and achieve the military superiority needed to back up a "surrender or die" ultimatum.

Discussing what may or may not be effective treaty terms, however, must not divert attention from an even more imperative inquiry. It is the basic question of whether or not even an effective treaty actually will, on balance, reduce the risks we face. Under it the Soviet Government still could keep topflight Soviet scientists secretly at work in Iron Curtain laboratories for many years devising the weapons which would give it nuclear superiority. Whereupon that government could wantonly abrogate the treaty and provide those scientists sudden opportunity to test their work.

Mr. Foster, Director of the Disarmament Agency, states this risk of surprise abrogation can be minimized by a U.S. policy of maintaining our laboratories and continuing our readiness for testing.

Yet, on March 2, 1962, discussing such a possibility, President Kennedy stated:

> But in actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep topflight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly, and found it impossible of execution.

The survival of the United States well could depend on widespread informed public discussion to ascertain which of these gentlemen is correct.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of March 16, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, March 16, 1963)

EXTENSION OF DRAFT LAW

The first of several key bills voted on in the House this week was House Resolution 2438 to extend the draft law for an additional 4 years. It passed by a vote of 387 to 3. Although I voted for the extension I raised several pertinent questions. The bill had five purposes: (1) to extend the authority to induct individuals into the Armed Forces from the present termination date of July 1, 1963 to July 1, 1967, a period of 4 years; (2) to extend the suspension on strength limitations of the Armed Forces for 4 years; (3) to extend the Dependents Assistance Act, the law under which E–1's, E–2's, E–3's, and E–4's with 4 years of service or less are entitled to increased allowances, because of dependents, for 4 years; (4) to extend the so-called doctor's draft law for 4 years; (5) to extend for 4 years the authority to grant special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians who are ordered to active duty before July 1967. Under the Universal Military Training and Service Act there are six categories in class 1–A, men available for induction in order: (1) delinquents; (2) volunteers; (3) men between 19 and 26 who are nonfathers; (4) men between 19 and 26 who are fathers; (5) men over 26 years of age; (6) men between 18½ and 19 years of age.

In raising questions during debate on the bill I said: "We are disrupting our youth and their education. * * * We are affecting many civilian programs and certainly the educational institutions in our country. We are taking 90 percent men who will be noncombatant and do not need to have A–1 physical condition. Take these men who are driving staff cars. They are to be drafted to do what? Drive cars? Be PX salesmen, clerks, warehousemen, cooks, and countless other services? We need to get the best men we can and use their civilian skills. These jobs can be done as civilians. Why take a man out of civilian life and make him do something he would do as a civilian. Has the committee gone into why the Seabee technique was disbanded? In World War II the Seabees did an outstanding job. They wrote a proud chapter in the history of our Nation and we could do worse than to give qualified civilians now the same great opportunity to serve their country. In this way many noncombatant jobs could be done by civilians instead of drafting men to do these operations."

U.S. CITIZENSHIP FOR WINSTON CHURCHILL

A bill to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States (H.R. 4374), passed 377 to 21 with ALGER against. In voting against this bill I give quarter to none in my admiration and respect for the greatness of Winston Churchill and his place in history. I do not believe that citizenship can be given as an award. I do not believe in degrees of citizenship, but rather in all citizens enjoying the same advantages and responsibilities, including taking part in their government and sharing as a taxpayer in the cost of such government. I, too, would quickly bestow any appropriate honor on Winston Churchill in appreciation for his courage, wisdom, and leadership of the free world.

MILITARY HARDWARE

The bill known as the "military hardware" measure (H.R. 2440) is to authorize appropriations during fiscal 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. The measure authorized $1.7 billion for the Army; $6.6 billion for the Navy and Marine Corps; $7.4 billion for the Air Force. It would buy 3,000 planes; 6,000 missiles; 43 new ships; and $3.4 billion for research. This was the first major opportunity in this session to make a sizable cut in President Kennedy's recordbreaking budget. Instead the House increased the President's request by $363,700. Voting on this measure was in three phases: (1) To increase the amount requested for the development of the RS–70 bomber and to increase from six to eight the authority for additional "killer" submarines (2) a motion to recommit the bill with instructions to trim 5 percent from the overall procurement budget (with the exception of the amount for the "killer" subs) and 12.5 percent from the research and development budget (with the exception of the RS–70 bomber item) (3) final passage of the bill.

I voted for the increase in the RS–70 program because, as I stated in debate, "the RS–70 should be developed beyond transportation level to weapons carrier and missile-launching platform and whatever other military purposes it can fulfill. There must be no gap between our present manned bomber system and a future fully capable missile program. Even at worst, we must leave no stone unturned in new weapons and also protect our present investment in RS–70." I support the increase in killer subs for the obvious reason that we must maintain defensive and offensive superiority. On the motion to recommit to make overall cuts, I voted "Yes." When this motion failed, I voted against the entire bill, stating on the floor: "Failing to take the responsible action outlined in the recommittal, I could not consistently agree to final passage. * * * Under no circumstances does this mean I am opposed to military preparedness and these weapons. But I shall at the same time expect the greatest value received for every defense dollar spent."

Very important observations were made by Congressman MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin, a member of the Armed Services Committee, who said in part: "The Secretary of Defense in testimony before the committee stated he feels by better management in the procurement area alone over $2½ billion could be saved." Congressman LAIRD pointed out the improper procedures resulted in increased costs wherein cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts were placed rather than contracts awarded through competitive bids. Several examples from GAO reports included the AN/SPS 10 radar $3.9 million overpayment, AN/APS 88 airborne radar $561,000, AN/PDR 43 radiac set $600,000, AN/WRT 1 and 2 radio sets $15 million. I believe the time to stop such reckless spending procedures is in the authorization bill. When Congress passes an authorization with the excuse that we can trim later in the appropriation bill, we are kidding the people because when the appropriation bill comes down we will be told we have to pass it because we have already authorized it.

THE M'NAMARA MONARCHY

Important in the debate on the military bill was the recognition by several Congressmen, including Democrats, of the autocratic rule of the Department of Defense by Secretary of Defense McNamara. A devastating article by Hanson W. Baldwin in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post, states: "Mr. McNamara is the first and foremost trying to make the armed services speak with one voice and attempting to reduce greatly or eliminate altogether interservice competition. * * * Mr. McNamara has pressured the Joint Chiefs of Staff to sign written statements testifying to Congress that the administration's defense budget is adequate. He has censored, deleted, and altered statements to Congress by the Chiefs of the services and their Secretaries. He has downgraded, ignored, bypassed, or overruled the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff." In the debate on the military bill Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana, a Democrat, asked: "If Congress itself will meet its responsibilities in the discharge of its duty under the Constitution to raise and maintain an Army and Navy or whether the Congress is prepared to continue its abdication of authority and failure to discharge its responsibilities." Congressman HÉBERT, in a resounding speech said: "In my 23 years here and 21 years association with the Armed Forces of this country, I have never seen the morale of the Pentagon at such a low ebb." It is time Congress and the American people demand a return to constitutional government with its separation of powers.

Quote of the week on Cuba (from the hearings on H.R. 2440):

"Mr. WILSON. Let me ask you bluntly: Do you think the Monroe Doctrine has been violated?

"Secretary MCNAMARA. I don't personally believe it has, but this is a question for the State Department to answer and for the lawyers to answer, and not for me."

Farmers Home Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I recently wrote to the Honorable Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in which I called to his attention the reasons why, in my opinion, Farmers Home Administration must be provided with additional funds for administering its increased workload:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1963.

Hon. KERMIT GORDON,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. GORDON: It has very recently come to my attention that the gradual attrition of private credit sources available to farmers in northeast Texas has now reached a point where something has got to be done. The responsible Federal agency in this field is the Farmers Home Administration. The purpose of this letter is to tell you that in my opinion FHA must increase their lending capability and augment their staff, otherwise they cannot assume the added burden. The reluctance or inability of private credit institutions to provide farm credit has been obvious for many years, not only in loans made to farmers by State and National banks but also in loans made by various production credit association over the State of Texas.

Farmers' Home has extended the effectiveness of their available funds by using their loan authorizations to pay interest and depreciation to prior lien holders of essential livestock and farm equipment, in an attempt to encourage private institutions to continue their line of credit rather than require refinancing by FHA. Even this has not offset the trend. Bank officials in northeast Texas will tell you:

1. The percent of agricultural loans made compared to other purpose loans has declined in the past 10 years from 50 percent to 20 percent. Even though there has been a decline in the number of farmers in this area, it has not been as rapid as the decline in agricultural credit.

2. Less than 10 percent of agricultural loans are made to young farmers, in spite of the fact that the average age of bank customers who farm is between 55 and 65. Because of this trend it is extremely difficult for young farmers to obtain credit sufficient to enable them to become successfully established.

3. Farmers who have repaid their indebtedness to Farmers Home experience great difficulty in returning to private sources of credit. Even though their assets have been increased considerably and they are free of debt, these farmers cannot obtain a relatively small loan for annual operating expenses.

4. Statutory loan limits and other legal limitations are not contributing factors toward the policies of credit institutions in making fewer agricultural loans.

5. Individual comments:

"The number of our agricultural loans, including part-time operators who are fully employed and own only a few head of cattle, is around 400 to 450. This compares with around 1,000 loans some 10 years ago. The average age of the families financed by our bank is around 60 to 65 years. Only a very few young farmers are being financed by the bank, and most of these farmers have other income."

"We have approximately 150 agricultural loans, and about 90 percent of these are combination crop and livestock operations. The average age of the farm families being financed is around 50 years. There is little need of a farming operation of such size as to require a line of credit in excess of $6,000 or $7,000. We are financing no young farm families who conduct a full-time farming operation. The young farm families that we do finance are fully employed and have considerable nonfarm income. These operators usually have only a few head of cattle."

"Our bank is financing some 500 farm families, with an average loan of around $2,000. The average age of these families is a little over 65 years. The bank's experience in farm credit is very disappointing. In fact, agricultural losses have almost offset all the profits made by other departments of the bank. The number of farm loans made has declined some 40 to 50 percent in the last 10 years. The trend is toward larger and fewer operators and farmers who have other sources of income."

"This bank is financing some 189 farm loans; about five are young farm families. The percent of loans made to farmers in 1951 was 53 percent while the percentage of loans made to farmers in 1962 was 21 percent. We have had no loss on farm loans during the last 3 years but we are not interested in financing farmers and ranchers."

"Agricultural loans made by this bank decreased 40 to 50 percent during the last 10 years. The types of farming operations have changed and most of those being financed have nonfarm employment. Practically no loans at all are being made to assist young farmers to become established in the farming business. Only a very few large crop farmers are being financed. We are reluctant to finance cotton."

"It appears that most of this bank's customers are livestock and combination farmers. Our bank is not making agricultural loans for cropping operations, and we have made only a few loans to new young farmers. These young families are mostly going into livestock operations with nonfarm income."

"Ten years ago 75 percent of the loans made by this bank were agricultural loans and about 80 percent of those were to crop farmers. Today about 60 percent of the loans are farm loans, and practically none of the operators are straight crop farmers. Nearly all are livestock operators. The average age of the farm families being financed by this bank is from 55 to 65 years. We only make small farm loans, and very few loans are being made to young farm families."

"Ten years ago 85 percent of the loans made by our bank were agricultural loans. Of these approximately 60 percent were crop farmers. Today only about 25 percent are agricultural loans, and only 10 percent are crop loans. Agricultural loans in this area are getting larger as the need for operating credit increases each year. Farm families are getting fewer in number."

"This bank finances mostly cattle operations. It finances very few young farmers, and all of these have nonfarm income. We are reluctant to finance cropping operations, and we do not like to make farm loans unless the farm operator has nonfarm income of at least $2,400 or more annually. Even then, the average loan is from $400 to $1,500. Most of the families receiving this credit are from 55 to 60 years of age."

"We make few farm loans and those farm loans being financed are very small operators with outside income. We do not believe cropping operations are sound and consequently we make practically no crop loans."

"I have referred some of my customers to FHA due to the bank's inability to continue providing credit to them, then, after their operations have been reestablished on a sound basis, they have returned to this bank for their credit needs. Most of our farm loans are to older people, and the operators are getting larger in size and fewer in number. Most of our loans are for dairy and livestock enterprises, and we have practically no crop loans."

"The banks in this area are making fewer and fewer agricultural loans each year. Very few crop farmers are being financed by the banks. Many farmera, mostly tenants, are quitting because of lack of adequate financing. Larger amounts of credit are needed each year to conduct a sound farming program because of the need to carry out improved farming practices such as increased use of fertilizers, insect control, etc. Consequently, an increasing number of farms are becoming idle because of the lack of operators. These farm lands are being purchased by larger operators and are being made into much larger farming units. These larger units are producing less agricultural income because of the change from cropping programs to livestock programs. The decrease of this income and the lack of people formerly engaged in crop farming operations are having an adverse economic influence on the local communities. Many of the farm families that have left could have stayed and conducted sound farming programs had they been able to receive adequate credit with FHA supervisory assistance that would enable them to carry out the necessary changes in farm management due to the advance in agricultural technology now needed to carry out a profitable farm operation."

"The present 'cost-price squeeze' being experienced by farmers will require longer repayment periods than are presently being extended by most private credit institutions. The banks are handicapped in providing the additional needed credit due to a lack of trained personnel necessary in servicing farm loans. The amount of annual credit needed by the average farmer has almost doubled in the last 10 years. This is due to the necessity for farmera to producer higher yields of crops in order to maintain an adequate volume of income which includes increased costs for fertilizer, insecticides, labor, machinery, repair."

"FHA may be the only source of future agricultural credit. Many good crop farmers are rejected for bank loans. I do not believe the banks are making loans that they could or should make. The trend is toward fewer agricultural loans in most banks. I know of many family-type farm operators that could not get adequate credit from private sources at the present time."

"There has been a change away from row to crop production due to the reluctance of the banks to provide this type of credit. A change from row crop production to livestock is not the answer now, nor is it the answer in the future to the adverse direction the rural economy is now taking; production credit is only assuming risks that any bank would take in making agricultural loans and, therefore, do not provide any additional credit to offset this trend toward fewer agricultural loans."

"A great number of our farmers are of the age where they cannot get a job, and not old enough to draw social security, they are at the crossroads of life. Unless they can get help from some source to farm, I do not know what some of them will do. Most of the farmers would quit if they could get anything to do. I have noticed that as soon as a farmer can draw his social security, he is out of the farming business. But, something is going to have to be provided for that man until he can retire. We do not have any young men that are starting their career farming. Something must be wrong with the setup when no young men want to farm."

I am especially concerned regarding this trend in private credit since it is requiring a tremendous increase in the responsibility of the Farmers Home Administration to supplement private credit without adequate personnel to staff their local and State offices, personnel that are needed effectively to meet the increased credit demands of eligible farmers and ranchers. Since the present appropriation for administering the FHA program is insufficient, it was recently necessary for the agency to terminate the employment of 27 county office personnel; this is in spite of the fact that at the present time FHA has loaned in Texas $11 million more than for the same period a year ago. Another indication of approaching crisis is the increasing number of applications received by FHA for credit assistance which has caused a rapidly increasing loan volume.

During the 1961 fiscal year, FHA in Texas loaned $48 million for all types of loans, both initial and subsequent. In the 1962 fiscal year, they loaned $60 million in Texas. In fiscal 1962 over 9,000 applications for initial assistance were received. If adequate funds are available there will be a tremendous increase in both the number of applications and the funds needed to meet the farm operating costs of sound family farming operations. Of the over 9,000 applications for new or initial assistance that were received, 4,500 new or initial loans of all types were made. This ratio discloses that FHA has made diligent efforts to provide credit assistance only to those families who have a reasonable chance of success and who can be profitably reestablished in farming operations.

As previously stated, FHA found it necessary to restrict the use of loan funds for refinancing purposes only to cases of absolute necessity to enable the farmer to continue an otherwise sound operation. Despite FHA's careful efforts to reduce loan funds for this purpose, it was necessary this year to use $2.3 million in contrast to the $1.9 million used in the 1961 fiscal year.

It is clear to me that the need for the services provided by the Farmers' Home Administration is expanding at a tremendous rate. It is also apparent that unless there is an immediate increase in available funds for administering this increased workload, individual farm families will be seriously and adversely affected, as will the entire rural economy.

I will very much appreciate your comments on this situation as I have described it in this letter.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Sincererly yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, the might of them that put their trust in Thee, amid all the subtle dangers that beset us, we bow daily at this altar of prayer, lest we be tempted by the fatal folly of attempting to rely upon our own strength. In a world whose uncertainty we share about so many things, we are sure of no light but Thine, no refuge from the beating storm but in Thee.

Our faith seems but a tiny thing; but just as through the smallest window streams the light of a vast and distant sun, so Thou, whose light fills all, canst flood the shadowed rooms of all our being—areas which are dark only because we shut Thee out.

With all that saddens and perplexes in this tortured yet splendid day, give us who toil at its tasks an inner radiance, humbly glad that in a world that lieth in darkness, we are called to be heralds of Thy light which even now is gilding the dawn.

We ask it in the name of the Master who bids us to let our light shine. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 15, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 200. An act to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code;

H.R. 277. An act to amend the act of April 22, 1960, relative to the transfer of certain public lands to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada;

H.R. 824. An act to incorporate Science Service, Inc., for the purposes indicated by Public Law 85–875;

H.R. 1048. An act providing for the design of the flag of the United States;

H.R. 1892. An act to repeal the act of October 22, 1919 (41 Stat. 293; 43 U.S.C. 351–355, 357–360);

H.R. 2821. An act to authorize modification of the repayment contract with the Grand Valley Water Users' Association;

H.R. 2833. An act to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding;

H.R. 2835. An act to clarify the status of circuit and district judges retired from regular active service;

H.R. 2837. An act to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311);

H.R. 2842. An act to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code;

H.R. 2844. An act to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have;

H.R. 2845. An act to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting judicial business;

H.R. 2849. An act to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act; and

H.R. 4715. An act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 2438) to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 200. An act to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 277. An act to amend the act of April 22, 1960, relative to the transfer of certain public lands to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada;

H.R. 1892. An act to repeal the act of October 22, 1919 (41 Stat. 293; 43 U.S.C. 351–355, 357–360); and

H.R. 2821. An act to authorize modification of the repayment contract with the Grand Valley Water Users' Association; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 824. An act to incorporate Science Service, Inc., for the purposes indicated by Public Law 85–875;

H.R. 1048. An act providing for the design of the flag of the United States;

H.R. 2833. An act to amend subdivision d of section 60 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 96d) so as to give the court authority on its own motion to reexamine attorney fees paid or to be paid in a bankruptcy proceeding;

H.R. 2835. An act to clarify the status of circuit and district judges retired from regular active service;

H.R. 2837. An act to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311);

H.R. 2842. An act to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code;

H.R. 2844. An act to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have;

H.R. 2845. An act to provide that the district courts shall be always open for certain purposes, to abolish terms of court and to regulate the sessions of the courts for transacting judicial business;

H.R. 2849. An act to amend section 47 of the Bankruptcy Act; and

H.R. 4715. An act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN FACILITIES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed construction relating to the national program of aeronautical and space activities at the University of Minnesota; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

REPORT ON SOIL BANK CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the 1962 soil bank conservation reserve program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

A letter from the Chief, National Guard Bureau, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Area Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act, Public Law 87–27, 87th Congress, 1st session (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Amendment of Section 309(e) of Communications Act of 1934, Relating to Filing of Certain Petitions

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that petitions for intervention be filed not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues in the Federal Register (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Regulation of the Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a regulation promulgated by the Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard, regarding the renewal of numbers issued by the Coast Guard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Federal Airport Act, To Extend the Time for Making Grants Thereunder

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Review of Administrative Functions, Department of Occupations and Professions, District of Columbia Government

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of administrative functions, Department of Occupations and Professions, District of Columbia government, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Activities of, Expenditures by, and Donations to the Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, S. Dak.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory of the Bureau of Mines, at Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment of Section 2 of Atomic Energy Act of 1954

A letter from the Acting Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution

"Whereas the capital gains tax treatment of timber under the Internal Revenue Code has been the major factor responsible for the vast progress of Alabama in forest management and the growth of forest resources during the past half century; and

"Whereas the substantial elimination of capital gains treatment for the owners of forest lands would constitute the most severe setback in this generation to the continued growth of the forest products industry; and

"Whereas the jobs of thousands of employees and many hundreds of communities are affected by the forest industries of Alabama and are jeopardized by the proposed elimination of capital gains treatment of timber: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of Alabama (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Legislature of the State of Alabama petition the Congress of the United States to defeat and reject the extreme and harmful changes in timber taxation proposed by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon to the Ways and Means Committee of the Federal House of Representatives on February 6, 1963; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the U.S. Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Alabama be requested to use their full power and influence in defeating the proposed change; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Clerks of both Houses of the Federal Congress and to each of the U.S. Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Alabama.

"Attest:

"J. E. Speight,
"*Secretary of Senate.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Resolution 180

"Resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to eliminate the inequity of the two-price system of cotton cost.

"Whereas on September 6, 1962, the President of the United States, following the Tariff Commission's rejection of the Department of Agriculture's recommendation for an import fee of 8½ cents a pound on the raw cotton content of textile imports to offset the difference between the price of raw American cotton to foreign mills and the price which American mills are required to pay for the same cotton, stated the following:

" 'Thus, the inequity of the two-price system of cotton costs remains as a unique burden upon the American textile industry, for which a solution must be found in the near future.

" 'I am, therefore, requesting the Department of Agriculture to give immediate attention to the formulation of a domestic program that would eliminate this inequity. I am also instructing all other departments and offices of the executive branch to cooperate fully to this end. Such a program will undoubtedly require enabling legislation'; and

"Whereas in his farm message of January 31, 1963, the President stated:

" 'A healthy, growing cotton industry is vital to the strength and prosperity of our Nation. Over a million persons are engaged in producing our cotton crop. Another million and a half are employed in converting the raw cotton into consumer items. Additional millions supply goods and services to this industry. Cotton exports contribute significantly to our balance-of-payments position.

" 'Our cotton industry—both producers and mills—is confronted with many problems which it alone cannot resolve. Because domestic prices are much higher than those of foreign producers, our cotton mills must pay substantially more for cotton than their off-shore competitors. Domestic cotton textile products are being displaced not only by substitute fibers in consumer products but also by increased cotton imports. Cotton exports are sharply lower.

" 'Loss of markets for U.S. cotton increases surplus stocks held by the CCC, causes higher and higher Government costs, and reduces the cotton farmer's income'; and

"Whereas the textile industry in Georgia is and has been the backbone of the economy of our State, directly employing almost 100,000 persons making it the largest single industrial employer in the State; and

"Whereas many additional thousands of Georgians are employed in supplying services and goods to the textile industry and hundreds of thousands more are dependent on it for a livelihood; and

"Whereas these imports of foreign cotton textiles and the unjust inequity of the two-price system for cotton have created a situation that seriously threatens the entire economy of our State and Nation and are responsible for the loss of hundreds of thousands of textile jobs, curtailment of the hours worked in the textile industry, and the closing of many textile plants; and

"Whereas it is acknowledged that the welfare of all Georgians is vitally dependent on a healthy, growing textile industry: Be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*:

"Section 1. That the Georgia General Assembly implores the President and the Congress of the United States to take whatever steps are necessary to make American cotton available to American purchasers at the same price American cotton is made available to foreign purchasers.

"Sec. 2. That the cotton textile manufacturing industry of Georgia be invited to place an appropriate exhibit on the third floor of the State Capitol which will present tangible evidence of the discrimination from which American textile mills and their employees are suffering. And the secretary of state is hereby authorized and instructed to place same in a conspicuous place on the third floor of the State Capitol.

"Sec. 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

"Sec. 4. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President and the Congress of the United States; the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, State, Labor, and Treasury, and the Georgia congressional delegation.

"Read and adopted in the house, March 1, 1963.

"Glenn W. Ellard,
"*Clerk.*

"Read and adopted in the senate, March 4, 1963.

"George D. Stewart,
"*Secretary.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 15

"Joint memorial to the Congress and executive branch of the Federal Government requesting that a public hearing be held in the county seat of each county affected before any final decision is made to establish dams, wildlife preserves, migratory bird refuges or parks

"Whereas when dams, wildlife preserves, migratory bird refuges or parks are created by the Federal Government, the same often requires and includes the taking of large areas of private lands, and Federal and State lands leased and used by private individuals; that these lands when so taken may be restricted so as not to allow livestock grazing, timber harvesting, and other multiple uses, and by reason thereof the use is restricted or denied to the former owner or lessee; that this results in detriment to the operator, as

well as economic jeopardy to nearby communities when the acreage is large and the communities are dependent on livestock or other products derived from multiple uses; and

"Whereas said lands often contain water historically used for livestock watering and other related purposes, and said water is necessary during periods of drought and may be the only water supply available within many miles for ordinary use; and

"Whereas the loss of hay land not only would result in a drastic devaluation of the remaining ranch land, but would in many cases force the rancher to cease operations; and

"Whereas present multiple-use operations provide a continuing source of income to the communities and a needed tax base for local government; and

"Whereas it is illogical that persons far removed from the area should arrive at an administrative decision or enact a decision into law without complete information on how a change would affect the local area; and

"Whereas the Federal Government should not take land for said purposes when communities or entire counties will suffer undue harm or economic injury: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana*, That the Congress and executive branch of the Federal Government be requested to hold public hearings in the county seat of each county affected whenever a dam, wildlife preserve, migratory bird refuge, or park is proposed to afford those persons most vitally affected a chance to make their desires known before any administrative decision is made or law passed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be forwarded by the secretary of the State of Montana to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, to the Honorable Mike J. Mansfield and the Honorable Lee Metcalf, U.S. Senators from Montana, to the Honorable James F. Battin and the Honorable Arnold H. Olsen, Congressmen from Montana, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers of the United States."

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

"House Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Mike Mansfield and Honorable Lee Metcalf, Senators from the State of Montana; to the Honorable James Battin and the Honorable Arnold H. Olsen, Representatives from the State of Montana; to the Secretary of the Interior and to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, urging the passage of legislation to amend the Reclamation Act and any other laws or rules, to waive the application of the land limitation clause in the State of Montana

"Whereas the Reclamation Act of 1902 applied primarily to public lands; and

"Whereas in an effort to limit the application of this act to family sized farms, the maximum holding of land in a single ownership was fixed at 160 acres or less; and

"Whereas the present reclamation laws requiring acreage limitation are based on outmoded, half-century-old farming methods of the walking plow and horse team days; and

"Whereas the present farm acreage that one operator can handle is two to five times the amount that could be handled at the time the reclamation laws were passed in 1902; and

"Whereas the gross income has not kept pace with the total acres that one operator can handle; and

"Whereas present acreage limitations will not permit farmers in the State of Montana to own sufficient crop acreage to give them full employment and a gross income sufficient to maintain the standard of living generally provided in farm areas of the humid or subhumid regions; and

"Whereas since the passage of the original Reclamation Act in 1902, it has been amended to include furnishing supplemental waters to lands already irrigated; and

"Whereas in order to establish a realistic family sized farm in Montana, the acreage allowed in a single holding may be determined by the Bureau of Reclamation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana:*

"1. That the land limitation provisions of the Reclamation Act, and any other laws and rules, be waived and not applied in the State of Montana; recognize the difference in types of farming and crop production and provide for flexibility in acreage found to be needed for farm units.

"2. That such legislation provide for relaxation of the acreage limitation provisions as to supplemental water supply projects for established farming areas.

"3. That any legislation amending the land limitation provisions shall not be retroactively applied to areas now exempt from such land limitation provisions; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the President of the Senate of the United States; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; and to the Honorable Mike Mansfield and the Honorable Lee Metcalf, Senators from Montana; and the Honorable Arnold H. Olsen, and the Honorable James Battin, Representatives in the Congress from Montana; to the Secretary of the Interior; and to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Resolution 13

"Joint resolution of the senate and house of representatives petitioning the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of amending the Constitution to provide for the election of the President and Vice President in a manner fair and just to the people of the United States unless Congress shall have sooner submitted such an amendment

"Whereas under the Constitution of the United States presidential and vice presidential electors in the several States are now elected on a statewide basis, and each State is entitled to as many electors as it has Senators and Representatives in Congress; and

"Whereas the presidential and vice presidential electors who receive a plurality of the popular vote in a particular State become entitled to cast the total number of electoral votes allocated to that State irrespective of how many votes may have been cast for electors of the opposition candidates; and

"Whereas this method of electing the President and Vice President is unfair and unjust in that it does not reflect the minority votes cast; and

"Whereas the need for a change has been recognized by Members of Congress on numerous occasions through the introduction of various proposals to change the electoral college system by amending the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana*, That application is hereby made to Congress under article V of the Constitution of the United States to call a convention to propose an article of amendment to the Constitution providing for a fair and just division of the electoral votes within the States in the election of the President and Vice President; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That if and when Congress shall have proposed such an article of amendment this application for a convention shall be deemed withdrawn and shall no longer have any force and effect; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this secretary of state is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, to each member of the Montana congressional delegation, and to the legislatures of each of the several States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Joint Memorial 11

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas, Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress, as amended, authorize payments to school districts in lieu of Federal taxes; and

"Whereas, of the total land area in Idaho, 64.1 percent is federally owned, nontaxable property; and

"Whereas in 1962, applications for Public Law 874 funds were made on behalf of an average daily attendance of 13,456 students, or 8.62 percent of the total number of students attending public school, in 52 of Idaho's school districts, located in 32 of the 44 counties; and

"Whereas in some school districts of our State a large percentage (in some as high as 75 percent) of the students in attendance are children whose parents live or work on Federal property, and the funds received from the Federal Government are essential to the adequate operation of such schools; and

"Whereas unless extended, said laws will expire on June 30, 1963, thereby drastically reducing the funds available for school purposes in many of the school districts, and severally curtailing the operation of many of the schools in this State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring)*, That we must respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to proceed at the earliest possible date to enact legislation extending the 3(b)1 and 3(b)2 classification of federally connected students under Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress, without any change of percentage for qualification by school districts and without any change of percentage of allowable per capita costs, and extending the 5(a)2 classification of federally connected students under Public Law 815 of the 81st Congress, without any changes of percentage qualification requirement or percentage of payment for average State cost of school facility construction; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"Passed the house on the first day of March 1963.

"Pete T. Cenarrusa,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Passed the senate on the fifth day of March 1963.

"W. E. Drevlow,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"Robert H. Remaklus,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution

"Whereas certain acts are offenses against both the U.S. Government, and the various States and subdivisions thereof; and

"Whereas under present laws a person who commits any act which is an offense against the U.S. Government and against a State and who is prosecuted for the offense by the State and either acquitted or convicted on the merits may be prosecuted by the U.S. Government; and

"Whereas it is believed that a prosecution by the U.S. Government after such acquittal or conviction by a State is unjust and contrary to the constitutional guarantees against double jeopardy: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 64th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas* (*the senate concurring therein*),

"Section 1. That the 64th General Assembly of Arkansas hereby respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing that when a person has been either acquitted or convicted, on the merits, of an offense against any State or territory of the United States such acquittal or conviction shall be a bar to prosecution for an offense against the United States when the offenses committed against the State or territory and against the United States were committed in the same course of conduct and are of the same character.

"Sec. 2. That the secretary of state of the State of Arkansas is hereby directed to send certified copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the U.S. Congress and to each Member of the Arkansas delegation in the U.S. Congress."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Senate joint resolution ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

"Whereas the 87th Congress of the United States has passed a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors; and

"Whereas this joint resolution passed the Senate of the United States on March 27, 1962, and passed the House of Representatives of the United States on July 27, 1962, and now has been submitted to a vote of the States; and

"Whereas the State of Maryland wishes to ratify this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States, viz:

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" 'Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation': Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Maryland*, That the foregoing proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States is ratified by the State of Maryland to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Governor of the State of Maryland is requested to forward authentic copies of this resolution, under the great seal of the State of Maryland, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution Z

"Concurrent resolution for the ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, prohibiting States from denying a citizen the right to vote through imposition of a poll tax

"Whereas the 87th Congress of the United States of America, at its 2d session, in both Houses, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, has made the following proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to-wit:

" 'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

" '*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" ' "Article —

" ' "Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" ' "Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." ': Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota* (*the House of Representatives concurring therein*), That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be and the same is hereby ratified by the 38th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution shall be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Administrator of General Services, Washington, D.C., to the President of the Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"Whereas there are many areas throughout the State of Washington where a large part of the population consists of people employed on Federal enterprises which persons and their children must be provided with schools and other services at the local level of government which must be paid for by the local school district, towns, cities, or counties; and

"Whereas the properties and installations where these people are employed are not on the tax rolls and, therefore, are not subjected to local taxes; and

"Whereas the Federal Government partially compensates for this deficiency by paying an amount in lieu of tax known as Public Law 874 funds, which funds do not reflect the potential taxes available were these Federal properties and installations to appear upon the tax rolls; and

"Whereas those funds derived from Public Law 874 are in the nature of and were intended for money in lieu of local taxes and were not intended as any type of reimbursement to the State and are not paid in lieu of any State tax; and

"Whereas the honorable Governor of this State has recommended a procedure in the distribution of Public Law 874 funds which would deprive local governing units of moneys due them in lieu of local taxes with a consequent detriment to local school districts, cities, towns, and counties; and

"Whereas it would appear that continued attempts to deprive local governing bodies of Public Law 874 funds are at hand, whether such attempts be in the guise of construing such funds as State funds, or otherwise; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives*, That this body address itself to the honorable Governor of the State and request that Public Law 874 funds be directed to and reserved for their intended use, as moneys in lieu of local taxes, and that such moneys and every part thereof go to such local units of government; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this body call to the attention of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States the present inadequacy in the Public Law 874 in-lieu funds with respect to that money which could be obtained by local governing units on a taxable basis; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That this body express its legislative intent that any public body of whatever nature using local services and exempt from taxation on its properties should pay in-lieu funds equal to the property taxes lost, to insure that continued development of our local units of government so necessary for an economically sound and progressive State; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Governor of the State of Washington, and to each member of the Washington delegation in the U.S. Congress and to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the U.S. Congress.

"Attest:

"S. R. Holcomb,
"*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*"

OREGON LEGISLATURE URGES LARGER SHIPPING LOCKS AT BONNEVILLE DAM

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregon Legislature has recently adopted House Joint Memorial 18, urging Congress to appropriate funds to widen the shipping locks at Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River, so as to coincide with the size of shipping locks at the Dalles and McNary Dams. The Columbia River is a great artery of commerce, and the narrow width of the shipping locks at the Bonneville Dam impedes the flow of larger vessels. It makes good commonsense to have the shipping locks at Bonneville correspond in size to the more recently constructed locks at the Dalles and McNary Dams.

House Joint Memorial 18 of the Oregon Legislature was sponsored personally by State Representative Don McKinnis, of Summerville, who represents Union and Wallowa Counties and is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Livestock of the Oregon House of Representatives, and by 26 other Oregon State senators and representatives.

In behalf of my senior colleague, who is presently in Central America with President Kennedy, and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record House Joint Memorial 18 of the Oregon Legislature.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Columbia River is the main navigation artery for Astoria, Portland, The Dalles, and other communities in the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas an uninterrupted flow of commerce on the Columbia River is of vital importance to the economic development of the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas the shipping locks at Bonneville Dam are less in width than those at the upstream dams on the Columbia River: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to appropriate sufficient funds to widen the shipping locks at Bonneville Dam on the Columbia River so as to conform with the width of the shipping locks at The Dalles Dam and McNary Dam and thereby provide for an uninterrupted flow of commerce on the Columbia River.

2. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF VERMONT LEGISLATURE ON MAPLE SIRUP IMPORTS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the domestic maple sirup industry in my State of Vermont and in other producing States is becoming more hard pressed these days due to the unfair tariff differential favoring importation of sirup produced in Canada. Canadians are the closest neighbors to many of the people of Vermont, and they have consistently been good neighbors, one with the other. I am sure that they shall continue to live and work together in close harmony and to be of mutual assistance with common problems.

The difference in tariff charges levied by our two countries on maple sirup weights the competitive advantage heavily in favor of Canadian producers. This is through no fault of the Canadian producers. It is the fault of our tariff situation, which imposes a tariff of only about 4 percent ad valorem equivalent on Canadian maple imports as against the tariff of 17½ percent ad valorem which Canada levies against maple imports from the United States.

Vermont's delegation in Congress has been working on the problem through liaison with Ambassador Herter, the President's foreign trade representative. In addition, I have asked the Tariff Commission to look into the matter, and I have written to Chairman Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee asking that that committee consider this tariff problem in its legislative program for this year.

I earnestly hope that something will be done to relieve this pressing problem.

On February 28, 1963, House Joint Resolution 20, a joint resolution of the Vermont Legislature was approved. That legislation focuses attention on this problem.

Since the only remedy available is through the Federal Government in its trade relations with Canada, I think the Congress should be aware of the gravity of the situation as recognized by the Vermont Legislature.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Joint Resolution 20 of the Vermont Legislature, approved February 28, 1963, be included at this point in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas the devaluation of Canadian currency, discriminatory comparative tariffs and the continuing rapid increase in Canadian maple imports have created an unfair competitive situation adversely affecting the Vermont maple industry; and

Whereas we appreciate and are sympathetic with the difficult situation which exists in the Dominion of Canada and while we wish to do everything possible to maintain and enhance the best friendly relationship between the United States and our great neighbor to the north, we believe the attempts to attain these objectives have been very adverse to our maple industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the Vermont General Assembly respectfully request the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Honorable Christian A. Herter, in charge of tariff negotations under the Trade Development Act of 1962, to take appropriate action to relieve that situation; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully suggest that appropriate action might be an increase of the U.S. tariff on maple imports from 01.5 cents a pound to 17½ percent ad valorem to match the corresponding Canadian tariff; or a quota on imports of not more than 10 million pounds annually, or both; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the U.S. Tariff Commission, Hon. Christian A. Herter, Hon. George D. Aiken, Hon. Winston L. Prouty, and Hon. Robert T. Stafford.

Approved February 28, 1963.

Howard E. Armstrong,
Secretary of State.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of the Senate a concurrent resolution adopted by the South Carolina General Assembly requesting the Congress to reject that portion of the proposed tax revision submitted to the Congress by the President of the United States which would require those persons who itemize deductions to subtract 5 percent of the adjusted gross income from the total amount of their itemized deductions.

Mr. President, in this connection I send to the desk this concurrent resolution and ask that it be printed in the Record in full on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond].

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Concurrent Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Reject That Portion of the Proposed Tax Revision Submitted to the Congress by the President of the United States Which Would Require Those Persons Who Itemize Deductions To Subtract 5 Percent of the Adjusted Gross Income From the Total Amount of Their Itemized Deductions and To Request Members of the Congressional Delegation From South Carolina To Oppose This Measure With All the Force at Their Disposal

Whereas the general assembly has been informed that the President of the United States has proposed a revision of the income tax laws of the United States which would require those persons who itemize deductions in their tax returns to subtract 5 percent of the adjusted gross income from the total amount of their itemized deductions; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that this would seriously curtail worthwhile contributions to churches, religious orders, and charitable institutions generally which look to contributions for the major portion of their livelihood; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that this proposal should be opposed and should not become a part of the tax laws of this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, the senate concurring, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to reject the proposal of the President of the United States to revise the income tax laws of this country by requiring those persons who itemize their deductions in their tax returns to subtract 5 percent of the adjusted gross income from the total amount of their itemized deduction; and be it further

Resolved, That the congressional delegation from South Carolina is earnestly requested to oppose the enactment into law of this proposal with all the strength at their disposal; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the presiding officers of the two Houses of Congress and to each Member of the congressional delegation from South Carolina.

Inez Watson,
Clerk of the House.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

WANTON KILLING OF ELK IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate a joint memorial which was passed by the Wyoming State Legislature which memorializes the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior to pass such laws and prescribe such regulations as necessary to prohibit the wanton killing of elk in Yellowstone National Park and to permit the State of Wyoming to trap and transplant the animals to other areas within the boundaries of the State of Wyoming. This memorial expresses the feeling of the people of Wyoming. It expresses the will of all of those people who believe in preserving the spirit of Yellowstone National Park. The people of Wyoming are proud of the national park and they want to preserve that part of the country for the enjoyment of people. They want to conserve its present condition and they want to preserve the wild birds and animals that are so abundant in our beautiful State.

For many years the people of Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho have been requesting that the Secretary of the Interior prohibit the needless slaughter of the majestic elk residing in the northern part of the great Yellowstone Park. For many years we encouraged the National Park Service to institute a program of trapping and transplanting these animals, but every year we have been rebuffed and rejected.

In the winter of 1961–62 the slaughter of elk in the northern Yellowstone elk herd reached a ridiculous point when the Secretary of the Interior and the head of the National Park Service again ordered the killing of our elk—4,309 elk were slaughtered. There was a tremendous uproar of public indignation against the Secretary and the head of the National Park Service. But again this year the will of the people was ignored, and on January 16 the slaughter of the elk was resumed. On January 22 in a letter to Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, and I stated in part as follows:

> Mr. Secretary, the slaughter of the animals in Yellowstone Park is a disgraceful chapter in the history of the National Park Service. It has been done in a ruthless and arrogant manner without resort to the thinking of the Game and Fish Commission of either Wyoming or Montana. It has been pursued in a dictatorial manner, careless of the interest of the people in this region. If allowed to continue, we will live to see the extermination of the Wapiti as well as other wild animals.

On January 23 I introduced in the Senate of the United States a bill, S. 451, which would prohibit the destruction of wild birds and animals in Yellowstone National Park when purposes of the killing is to control their number. My purpose in introducing this bill was to put on the books a law which would clearly spell out the intentions of the people of this country who would like to conserve these great game animals.

In spite of violent objections by the Governor of the State of Wyoming, myself, and many, many other interested persons, the slaughter of the elk continued. Four hundred and four elk were killed this winter, not counting the elk killed for biological research, which I advocate. On January 31, Secretary Udall announced that the Park Rangers had stopped shooting the elk in Yellowstone National Park, except for laboratory purposes, and that a very successful program of trapping and transplanting these animals had been started.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee reserve the right to object?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I did not hear the unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator asked for additional time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Wyoming is granted. The Senator from Wyoming may proceed.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I commend the Secretary for this decision and I think that it is a great milestone in the management of our game animals in the great national park systems. This trapping and transplanting program that we have been advocating for so long, and which has been recently adopted, is a conservation measure that has many advocates. I think the Secretary showed wisdom and judgment, because if this continued abuse of killing our natural resources were to continue we would have no elk, and Yellowstone National Park would lose one of its great attractions.

Mr. President, the Governor of the State of Wyoming, Clifford P. Hansen, signed on February 13, 1963, a joint memorial which has passed both the House and the Senate of the Wyoming State Legislature asking that appropriate action be taken to prohibit the killing of our great elk herds. It is my hope that the Congress will take the appropriate action to permanently stop the slaughter of our elk as requested by the Wyoming State Legislature by passing my bill, S. 451. I ask for unanimous consent that this memorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENROLLED JOINT MEMORIAL 22, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 37TH STATE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WYOMING

A joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Interior with reference to the killing of animals within the boundaries of Yellowstone National Park, by Park Rangers

Whereas the animals that range within the boundaries of Yellowstone National Park in the State of Wyoming constitute a part of the natural resources of Wyoming; and

Whereas the natural resources of the State of Wyoming should be utilized to the greatest good of the people of the State of Wyoming and of the United States of America; and

Whereas the slaughter of over 4,500 head of elk in the past 2 years in Yellowstone National Park by the park rangers was a gross waste of an important natural resource as aforesaid; and

Whereas better methods of control of these resources than those now being utilized by the National Park Service are available: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate of such legislature concurring), That the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Interior be and are hereby memorialized to pass such laws and prescribe such regulations as necessary to prohibit the wanton killing of elk by the park rangers in Yellowstone National Park as has been the practice in the past and permit the State of Wyoming to trap and transplant the animals to other areas within the boundaries of the State of Wyoming and if trapping and transplanting practices do not give the necessary reductions, to permit the hunting of such animals in remote areas of the park; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Interior, U.S. Senator GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator MILWARD L. SIMPSON, and Representative in Congress, WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

Approved 9:23 p.m., February 13, 1963.

CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
Governor.
CHARLES G. IRWIN,
President of the Senate.
MARLIN T. KURTZ,
Speaker of the House.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on March 6, 1963, at a meeting of the Broome County Federation of Labor in Binghamton, N.Y., on behalf of 15,000 workers and members, the federation adopted a resolution initiated by the United Brewery Workers Union, AFL–CIO, calling for Congress to permit the expiration of certain excise taxes upon the scheduled date of June 30, 1963.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE U.S. CONGRESS TO ALLOW THE AUTOMATIC RATE REDUCTION ON CERTAIN EXCISE TAX RATES

Whereas Federal excise taxes were substantially increased to the war tax rate on many manufactured items by the Revenue Act of 1943, 1945, and 1947; and

Whereas these rates were even further increased by the Revenue Act of 1951 for the purpose of a temporary Korean wartime emergency; and

Whereas all excise rates were reduced to prewar tax rates by the Excise Reduction Act of 1954, with the exception of alcoholic beverages, gasoline, diesel fuel, cigarettes, and motor vehicle chassis, which products continued to be taxed at the highest rate, but were scheduled for automatic reduction on March 31, 1955; and

Whereas the Revenue Acts of 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1961 continued to postpone the automatic reduction on these items; and

Whereas the Revenue Act of 1962 once more postponed the rate reduction date on these selected items from January 1, 1962, through June 30, 1963; and

Whereas the wartime emergency which occasioned the imposition of the additional excise on these selected items now no longer exists; and

Whereas war tax rates are so high as to substantially reduce sales in a peacetime market; and

Whereas the execessive taxation of these selected products has restricted wages and job opportunities for organized labor in the particular industries manufacturing these goods, and has prevented business expansion in these businesses because they could

not keep pace with less highly taxed items: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Broome County Federation of Labor, 261 Water Street, Binghamton, N.Y., representing 15,000 workers and members, hereby goes on record as favoring the reduction of these oppressive excises and respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to permit these war tax rates to expire on the scheduled date of June 30, 1963.

Adopted at meeting on March 6, 1963.

EDWARD J. MANGAN,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ENGLE, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 1035. A bill to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87–346, relating to dual rate contracts (Rept. No. 79).

REPORT ENTITLED "CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS" — INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 80)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to submit the annual report entitled "Constitutional Amendments," pursuant to Senate Resolution 259, 87th Congress, 2d session, as extended, together with the individual views of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report together with the individual views be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS (S. REPT. NO. 81)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, I am submitting a report on the activities of the committee and its subcommittees in the 87th Congress.

The report also includes an appendix on the organization and operations of the Congress, consisting of an evaluation of the effect of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative branch of the Government. This analysis of the basic Legislative Reorganization Act is considered to be especially timely, in view of the many suggestions which have been made to change the rules of the Senate in the present Congress. The recommendations made at the time this study was originally made, in the 82d Congress, are as applicable today as in 1951 when the committee held lengthy hearings and conducted extensive studies on this subject.

In view of the very comprehensive nature of this study, it is doubtful whether any commission or joint committee would be able to develop any new proposal which was not advanced or recommended by witnesses who testified at these hearings. Because of the increased interest in this subject at this time, and the fact that the hearings and the supporting data relating thereo have been out of print for 10 years, they are included in this report as an appendix. It is believed that the information contained herein will be invaluable in assisting the Congress in any proposed changes in its organization and operation and in the legislative process which Members may deem appropriate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1116. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide coach bodies shall not be subject to the manufacturers' excise tax on motor vehicles; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1117. A bill to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights as an agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1118. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic petroleum-based detergents manufactured in the United States or imported into the United States comply with certain standards of decomposability; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD) (by request):

S. 1119. A bill relating to rights-of-way on the Crow Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1120. A bill for the relief of Cathryn A. Giesener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 1121. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Accelerated Public Works Act (Public Law 87–657); to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. GRUENING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 1122. A bill relating to the exchange of certain lands between the town of Powell, Wyo., and the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. SIMPSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho):

S. 1123. A bill to provide for the construction of the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHURCH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 1124. A bill to extend and strengthen the Federal air pollution control program; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON):

S. 1125. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of Nevada to statehood; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 1126. A bill to impose additional duties on excess imports of certain live animals, meats, and meat products; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1127. A bill for the relief of Louis Sirota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1128. A bill for the relief of Jean Ener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. DOMINICK):

S. 1129. A bill for the relief of Thomas B. Bollers and Earlene Bollers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1130. A bill to provide that private aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada or Mexico without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON) (by request):

S. 1131. A bill for the relief of the estate of J. S. Barrett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1132. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct, in cooperation with the States and interested Federal agencies, a development survey of the recreational resources of the Golden Circle of National Parks and Monument and associated scenic, recreation, and Indian areas in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MOSS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON (by request):

S. 1133. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER) (by request):

S. 1134. A bill to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT):

S. 1135. A bill to make clear that fishermen's organizations, regardless of their technical legal status, have a voice in the exvessel sale of fish or other aquatic products on which the livelihood of their members depends; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1136. A bill relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1137. A bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. Jackson):

S. 1138. A bill to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission not to approve or authorize, until December 31, 1964, the consolidation or merger of carriers by railroad subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio (by request):

S. 1139. A bill to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Young of Ohio when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1140. A bill to authorize a grant for carrying out a project of construction for the expansion of the facilities of the Washington Hospital Center in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1141. A bill for the relief of Stefan Copilu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1142. A bill to provide for the adoption of a perpetual calendar; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HART (for himself and Mr. McNamara):

S. 1143. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 1144. A bill to change from 2 years to 1 year the waiting period for promotion to steps 5, 6, and 7 for postal employees above level 6 of the postal field service schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1145. A bill to provide Federal assistance to State and local police forces through projects to develop and demonstrate more effective techniques and practices of law enforcement; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1146. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ayako Matsumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (by request):

S. 1147. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Randolph when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1148. A bill to amend the law relating to material and necessary witnesses to crime committed in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1149. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose L. Cabezon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1150. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to erect a monument at Fort Cumberland, Allegany County, Md., in honor of George Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1151. A bill relating to the taxable status of sales prior to September 1, 1955, of tubes for use in the production of certain component parts of television receiving sets; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF:

S.J. Res. 62. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of the Members of the House of Representatives shall be 4 years, and the term of office of Senators shall be 8 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Metcalf when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S.J. Res. 63. Joint resolution to provide that Members of Congress shall be limited to per diem allowances and necessary transportation costs in connection with travel outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

SUPERVISION OF FREEDOM IN THE BALTIC STATES

Mr. LAUSCHE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33); which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the Soviet Union has occupied, by force of arms, the countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and deprived such countries of their independence; and

Whereas an unparalleled system of political oppression and tyranny has been established in such countries; and

Whereas, by deportations and dispersion of the native population to the wastes of Siberia, and by mass colonization, the Soviet Union threatens complete extermination of of these peoples; and

Whereas, despite such treatment, the spirit of the citizens of such countries is not broken and they remain overwhelmingly anti-Communist; and

Whereas the desire of the citizens of such countries for national freedom remains unabated; and

Whereas the United States of America has never recognized the occupation of the Baltic States and their incorporation into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and continues to maintain diplomatic relations with representatives of the former free governments of these countries; and

Whereas there exists a strong and undivided world opinion to eliminate all remnants of imperialism and colonialism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is hereby requested to take such action as may be necessary to bring before the United Nations for its consideration the question of the suppression of freedom in the Baltic States, and a resolution declaring that—

(a) the Soviet Union shall withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from the Baltic States;

(b) the Soviet Union shall return all citizens of the Baltic States to their homelands from places of deportation in Siberia, and dispersion in prisons and slave labor camps;

(c) persons guilty of crimes against the peoples of the Baltic States be punished; and

(d) the United Nations should conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under the direct supervision of the United Nations to establish as quickly as possible legal democratic government for those countries.

EXTENSION OF LIFE OF COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend for an additional 4 years, the life of the Commission on Civil Rights. This bill would also broaden the scope of the functions and work of the Commission.

This legislative proposal carries out one of the recommendations of the President, contained in his historic Civil Rights Message to the Congress on February 28, 1963.

The bill was transmitted to the Vice President by the Chairman of the Commission on Civil Rights, a man who has given distinguished service in this position, and a noted citizen of the State of Michigan, Dr. John A. Hannah.

Mr. President, this is a high priority item for this session of the Congress. I am hopeful that the Committee on the Judiciary will give this bill its early consideration; and, as a member of that committee, I shall urge that this be done.

All of us who have followed the distinguished work of the Commission and its staff know of the important contributions the reports and hearings of this Commission have made to a better understanding, in all parts of the Nation, of the critical job of protecting the constitutional civil rights of our citizens.

In a sense, this Commission has been able to do what neither the Congress nor the formal departments of the executive branch have accomplished—namely, the throwing of a public spotlight on the undone job of insuring the civil rights of all Americans.

It is now in order to give the Commission a new and broadened charter and additional time in which to continue its present work and to undertake new assignments.

I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the President's civil rights message dealing with expanding and extending the work of the Commission on Civil Rights, the letter from Commission Chairman John Hannah to the Vice President, and the text of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be held at the desk until the end of business on Friday, March 22, so that other Senators who may wish to join in its sponsorship may have an opportunity to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the excerpt, letter, and bill will be printed in the Record, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The bill (S. 1117) to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights as an agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Hart, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Commission on Civil Rights Amendments Act of 1963."

Sec. 2. Section 102 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975a) is amended to read as follows:

"RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMISSION, HEARINGS

"Sec. 102. (a) The Chairman or one designated by him to act as Chairman at a hearing of the Commission shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the hearing.

"(b) A copy of the Commission's rules shall be made available to the witness before the Commission.

"(c) Witnesses at the hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights.

"(d) The Chairman or Acting Chairman may punish breaches of order and decorum and unprofessional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings.

"(e) If the Commission determines that evidence or testimony at any hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, it shall (1) receive such evidence or testimony or summary of such evidence or testimony in executive session; and in the event the Commission determines that such evidence or testimony shall be given at a public session, then it shall (2) afford such person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and (3) receive and dispose of requests from such person to subpena additional witnesses.

"(f) Except as provided in sections 102 and 105(f) of this Act, the Chairman shall receive and the Commission shall dispose of requests to subpena additional witnesses.

"(g) No evidence or testimony or summary of evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the Commission. Whoever releases or uses in public without the consent of the Commission such evidence or testimony taken in executive session shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned for not more than one year.

"(h) In the discretion of the Commission, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent sworn statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The Commission is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearings.

"(i) Upon payment of the cost thereof, a witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Commission.

"(j) A witness attending any session of the Commission shall receive $6 for each day's attendance and for the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the same, and 10 cents per mile for going from and returning to his place of residence. Witnesses who attend at points so far removed from their respective residences as to prohibit return thereto from day to day shall be entitled to an additional allowance of $10 per day for expenses of subsistence, including the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the place of attendance. Mileage payments shall be tendered to the witness upon service of a subpena issued on behalf of the Commission or any subcommittee thereof.

"(k) The Commission shall not issue any subpena for the attendance and testimony of witnesses or for the production of written or other matter which would require the presence of the party subpenaed at a hearing to be held outside of the State wherein the witness is found or resides or is domiciled or transacts business, or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process except that, in any event, the Commission may issue subpenas for the the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of written or other matter at a hearing held within 50 miles of the place where the witness is found or resides or is domiciled or transacts business or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process."

Sec. 3. Section 103(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975b(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 103. (a) Each member of the Commission who is not otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall receive the sum of $75 per day for each day spent in the work of the Commission, shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2)."

Sec. 4. Section 103(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975b(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each member of the Commission who is otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work of the Commission shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with the provisions of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 835–42)."

Sec. 5. Section 104 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975) is amended to read as follows:

"DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

"Sec. 104. (a) The Commission shall—

"(1) investigate allegations in writing under oath or affirmation that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of their right to vote and have that vote counted by reason of their color, race, religion, or national origin; which writing, under oath or affirmation, shall set forth the facts upon which such belief or beliefs are based;

"(2) study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution;

"(3) appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to equal protection of the laws under the Constitution, and

"(4) serve as a national clearinghouse for information, and provide advice and technical assistance to Government agencies, communities, industries, organizations, or individuals, in respect to equal protection of the laws, including but not limited to the fields of voting, education, housing, employment, the use of public facilities, transportation, and the administration of justice.

The Commission may, for such periods as it deems necessary, concentrate the performance of its duties on those specified in either paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) and may further concentrate the performance of its duties under any of such paragraphs on one or more aspects of the duties imposed therein.

"(b) The Commission shall submit interim reports to the President and to the Congress at such times as either the Commission or the President shall deem desirable, and shall submit to the President and to the Congress a final and comprehensive report of its activities, findings, and recommendations not later than September 30, 1967.

"(c) Sixty days after the submission of its final report and recommendations the Commission shall cease to exist."

Sec. 6. (a) Section 105(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975(a)) is amended by striking out in the last sentence thereof "$50 per diem" and inserting in lieu thereof "$75 per diem."

Sec. 7. Section 105(g) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975d(g)) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena, any district court of the United States or the United States court of any Territory or possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or is domiciled or transacts business, or has appointed an agent for receipt of service of process, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a subcommittee thereof, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof."

Sec. 8. Section 105 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975d) as amended by section 401 of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (42 U.S.C. 1975d(h)) is amended by adding a new subsection at the end to read as follows:

"(i) The Commission shall have the power to make such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

The excerpt and letter presented by Mr. Hart are as follows:

Excerpts From February 28, 1963, Message From President of the United States to the Congress—House Document No. 75

III. EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF THE COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The Commission on Civil Rights, established by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, has been in operation for more than 5 years and is scheduled to expire on November 30, 1963. During this time it has fulfilled its statutory mandate by investigating deprivations of the right to vote and denials of equal protection of the laws in education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice. The Commission's reports and recommendations have provided the basis for remedial action both by Congress and the executive branch.

There are, of course, many areas of denials of rights yet to be fully investigated. But the Commission is now in a position to provide even more useful service to the Nation. As more communities evidence a willingness to face frankly their problems of racial discrimination, there is an increasing need for expert guidance and assistance in devising workable programs for civil rights progress. Agencies of State and local government, industry, labor, and community organizations, when faced with problems of segregation and racial tensions, all can benefit from information about how these problems have been solved in the past. The opportunity to seek an experienced and sympathetic forum on a voluntary basis can often open channels of communication between contending parties and help bring about the conditions necessary for orderly progress. And the use of public hearings—to contribute to public knowledge of the requirements of the Constitution and national policy—can create in these communities the atmosphere of understanding which is indispensable to peaceful and permanent solutions to racial problems.

The Federal Civil Rights Commission has the experience and capability to make a significant contribution toward achieving these objectives. It has advised the executive branch not only about desirable policy changes but about the administrative techniques needed to make these changes effective. If, however, the Commission is to perform these additional services effectively, changes in its authorizing statute are necessary and it should be placed on a more stable and more permanent basis. A proposal that the Commission be made a permanent body would be a pessimistic prediction that our problems will never be solved. On the other hand, to let the experience and knowledge gathered by the Commission go to waste, by allowing it to expire, or by extending its life only for another 2 years with no change in responsibility, would ignore the very real contribution this agency can make toward meeting our racial problems. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress authorize the Civil Rights Commission to serve as a national civil rights clearing house providing information, advice, and technical assistance to any requesting agency, private or public; that in order to fulfill these new responsibilities, the Commission be authorized to concentrate its activities upon those problems within the scope of its statute which most need attention; and that the life of the Commission be extended for a term of at least 4 more years.

IV. EMPLOYMENT

Racial discrimination in employment is especially injurious both to its victims and to the national economy. It results in a great waste of human resources and creates serious community problems. It is, moreover, inconsistent with the democratic principle that no man should be denied employment commensurate with his abilities because of his race or creed or ancestry.

The President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, reconstituted by Executive order in early 1961, has, under the leadership of the Vice President, taken significant steps to eliminate racial discrimination by those who do business with the Government. Hundreds of companies, covering 17 million jobs, have agreed to stringent nondiscriminatory provisions now standard in all Government contracts. One hundred and four industrial concerns—including most of the Nation's major employers—have in addition signed agreements calling for an affirmative attack on discrimination in employment; and 117 labor unions, representing about 85 percent of the membership of the AFL–CIO, have signed similar agreements with the Committee. Comprehensive compliance machinery has been instituted to enforce these agreements. The Committee has received over 1,300 complaints in 2 years—more than in the entire 7½ years of the Committee's prior existence—and has achieved corrective action on 72 percent of the cases handled, a heartening and unprecedented record. Significant results have been achieved in placing Negroes with contractors who previously employed whites only, and in the elevation of Negroes to a far higher proportion of professional, technical, and supervisory jobs. Let me repeat my assurances that these provisions in Government contracts and the voluntary nondiscrimination agreements will be carefully monitored and strictly enforced.

In addition, the Federal Government, as an employer, has continued to pursue a policy of nondiscrimination in its employment and promotion programs. Negro high school and college graduates are now being intensively sought out and recruited. A policy of not distinguishing on grounds of race is not limited to the appointment of distinguished Negroes—although they have in fact been appointed to a record number of high policymaking, judicial, and administrative posts. There has also been a significant increase in the number of Negroes employed in the middle and upper grades of the career Federal service. In jobs paying $4,500 to $10,000 annually, for example, there was an increase of 20 percent in the number of Negroes during the year ending June 30, 1962—over three times the rate of increase for all employees in those grades during the year. Career civil servants will continue to be employed and promoted on the basis of merit, and not color, in every agency of the Federal Government, including all regional and local offices.

This Government has also adopted a new Executive policy with respect to the organization of its employees. As part of this policy, only those Federal employee labor organizations that do not discriminate on grounds of race or color will be recognized.

Outside of Government employment, the National Labor Relations Board is now considering cases involving charges of racial discrimination against a number of union locals. I have directed the Department of Justice to participate in these cases and to urge the National Labor Relations Board to take appropriate action against racial discrimination in unions. It is my hope that administrative action and litigation will make unnecessary the enactment of legislation with respect to union discrimination.

V. PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

No act is more contrary to the spirit of our democracy and Constitution—or more rightfully resented by a Negro citizen who seeks only equal treatment—than the barring of that citizen from restaurants, hotels, theaters, recreational areas, and other public accommodations and facilities.

Wherever possible, this administration has dealt sternly with such acts. In 1961, the Justice Department and the Interstate Commerce Commission successfully took action to bring an end to discrimination in rail and bus facilities. In 1962, the 15 airports still maintaining segregated facilities were persuaded to change their practices, 13 voluntarily and 2 others after the Department of Justice brought legal action. As a result of these steps, systematic segregation in interstate transportation has virtually ceased to exist. No doubt isolated instances of discrimination in transportation terminals, restaurants, restrooms, and other facilities will continue to crop up, but any such discrimination will be dealt with promptly.

In addition, restaurants and public facilities in buildings leased by the Federal Government have been opened up to all Federal employees in areas where previously they had been segregated. The General Services Administration no longer contracts for the lease of space in office buildings unless such facilities are available to all Federal employees without regard to race. This move has taken place without fanfare and practically without incident; and full equality of facilities will continue to be made available to all Federal employees in every State.

National parks, forests, and other recreation areas—and the District of Columbia Stadium—are open to all without regard to race. Meetings sponsored by the Federal Government or addressed by Federal appointees are held in hotels and halls which do not practice discrimination or segregation. The Department of Justice has asked the Supreme Court to reverse the convictions of Negroes arrested for seeking to use public accommodations; and took action both through the courts and the use of Federal marshals to protect those who were testing the desegregation of transportation facilities.

In these and other ways, the Federal Government will continue to encourage and support action by State and local communities, and by private entrepreneurs, to assure all members of the public equal access to all public accommodations. A country with a colorblind constitution, and with no castes or classes among its citizens, cannot afford to do less.

VI. OTHER USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

The basic standard of nondiscrimination—which I earlier stated has now been applied by the executive branch to every area of its activity—affects other programs not listed above:

Although President Truman ordered the armed services of this country desegregated in 1948, it was necessary in 1962 to bar segregation formally and specifically in the Army and Air Force Reserves and in the training of all civil defense workers.

A new Executive order on housing, as unanimously recommended by the Civil Rights Commission in 1959, prohibits discrimination in the sale, lease, or use of housing owned or constructed in the future by the Federal Government or guaranteed under the FHA, VA, and Farmers Home Administration program. With regard to existing property owned or financed through the Federal Government, the departments and agencies are directed to take every appropriate action to promote the termination of discriminatory practices that may exist. A President's Committee on Equal Housing Opportunity was created by the order to implement its provisions.

A Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces has been established to investigate and make recommendations regarding the treatment of minority groups, with special emphasis on off-base problems.

The U.S. Coast Guard Academy now has Negro students for the first time in its 87 years of existence.

The Department of Justice has increased its prosecution of police brutality cases—many of them in Northern States—and is assisting State and local police departments in meeting this problem.

State employee merit systems operating programs financed with Federal funds are now prohibited from discriminating on the basis of race or color.

The Justice Department is challenging the constitutionality of the separate but equal provisions which permit hospitals constructed with Federal funds to discriminate racially in the location of patients and the acceptance of doctors.

In short, the executive branch of the Federal Government, under this administration and in all of its activities, now stands squarely behind the principle of equal opportunity, without segregation or discrimination, in the employment of Federal funds, facilities, and personnel. All officials at every level are charged with the responsibility of implementing this principle; and a formal interdepartmental action group, under White House chairmanship, oversees this effort and follows through on each directive. For the first time, the full force of Federal executive authority is being exerted in the battle against race discrimination.

CONCLUSION

The various steps which have been undertaken or which are proposed in this message do not constitute a final answer to the problems of race discrimination in this country. They do constitute a list of priorities—steps which can be taken by the executive branch and measures which can be enacted by the 88th Congress. Other measures directed toward these same goals will be favorably commented on and supported, as they have in the past; and they will be signed, if enacted into law.

In addition, it is my hope that this message will lend encouragement to those State and local governments, and to private organizations, corporations, and individuals, who share my concern over the gap between our precepts and our practices. This is an effort in which every individual who asks what he can do for his country should be able and willing to take part. It is important, for example, for private citizens and local governments to support the State Department's effort to end the discriminatory treatment suffered by too many foreign diplomats, students, and visitors to this country. But it is not enough to treat those from other lands with equality and dignity—the same treatment must be afforded to every American citizen.

The program outlined in this message should not provide the occasion for sectional bitterness. No State or section of this Nation can pretend a self-righteous role, for every area has its own civil rights problems.

Nor should the basic elements of this program be imperiled by partisanship. The proposals put forth are consistent with the platforms of both parties and with the positions of their leaders. Inevitably there will be disagreement about means and strategy. But I would hope that on issues of constitutional rights and freedom, as in matters affecting our national security, there is a fundamental unity among us that will survive partisan debate over particular issues.

The centennial of the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation is an occasion for celebration, for a sober assessment of our failures, and for rededication to the goals of freedom. Surely there could be no more meaningful observance of the centennial than the enactment of effective civil rights legislation and the continuation of effective Executive action.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 28, 1963.*

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1963

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of the Commission on Civil Rights, I respectfully transmit herewith copies of a legislative proposal for extending the life of the Commission.

The proposed legislation would, inter alia, extend the Commission for 4 years, authorize it to serve as a national clearinghouse to provide civil rights information and technical assistance to requesting agencies, and permit the Commission to concentrate its activities upon those problems within the scope of its statute which most need attention. The provisions of the draft bill implement the portion entitled "Extension and Expansion of the Commission on Civil Rights" of President Kennedy's message on civil rights, delivered to the Congress on February 28, 1963.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that enactment of this draft bill would be in accord with the program of the President.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN A. HANNAH,
Chairman.

LET US TRY TO DO AS MUCH FOR THE FOLKS AT HOME AS FOR THOSE ABROAD; LET US GET THE U.S. ECONOMY MOVING; LET US TACKLE OUR MOUNTING UNEMPLOYMENT REALISTICALLY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks and that the bill lie at the desk until the close of business on March 28 so as to give those of my colleagues who wish to do so an opportunity to cosponsor this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; will lie at the desk as requested; and, without objection, will be printed as requested.

(See exhibit I.)

The bill (S. 1121) to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Accelerated Public Works Act (Public Law 87–658) introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I believe that my introduction of this bill will not come as a surprise.

On April 25, 1962, when S. 2965 was reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works, of which I am a member, I filed separate views in which I clearly predicted that the sum authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of the bill—$900 million—was insufficient to do the job.

Mr. President, I wish I could stand here today and admit that my prediction was wrong—that the amount authorized to be appropriated had been sufficient—and that the serious pockets of chronic unemployment throughout the Nation had been eradicated or significantly decreased.

Eleven months ago, in my separate views, I stated:

> However, the amount is, in my opinion, hardly sufficient to meet the economic strain now being experienced in certain areas of the Nation.

At that time, I referred to my proposed amendment to raise the amount authorized to be appropriated to less than half the amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance—namely $2,645 million.

I stated at that time, Mr. President:

> In my humble opinion, no situation is more tragic than that of men and women unemployed who wish to work and cannot find it. In my humble opinion, no situation is more paradoxical than that this wealthiest country on earth, which has poured out $100 billion in the last decade and a half to help foreign countries, and proposes to spend even greater sums in the future for the same purpose, cannot meet its primary obligation to its own people.
>
> I am merely proposing, by this amendment, to offer a fraction—for the relief of economic distress and the creation of employment for our fellow Americans—of what we have been doing or are asked to do—and will doubtless continue to do—in far larger measure for inhabitants of 100 foreign countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my separate views to S. 2965 be printed in full at the conclusion of these remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit II.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it may be that my suggested amendment focused attention on the insufficiency of the amount authorized to be appropriated and was instrumental in increasing that amount from $600 million to $900 million. But even that amount has not proven to be sufficient.

On March 7, the Department of Labor reported that the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate in February increased to 6.1 percent of the civilian labor force. This was up from 5.8 percent in January, despite the fact that customarily there is little change in the unemployment rate from January to February. The February 1962 rate was 5.6 percent.

This means, Mr. President, that in February 1963, 4,918,000—nearly 5 million—men and women were seeking employment and could not find it.

This continued chronic unemployment cannot be permitted to endure. The time has come for a massive effort to make taxpayers out of these tax consumers. They seek work. Let us give them work.

I said last year it was no time for half-measures.

It is even less a time for half-measures this year.

Consider, Mr. President, what continued unemployment does to a man and his family. Continued want and deprivation do not reaffirm a man's faith in the strength of our economic system.

And yet, Mr. President, that system is strong—as strong as it ever was. Our problem is to take sufficiently energetic steps at the correct time. Let us not do too little too late.

I cannot help but feel, Mr. President, that we did just that last year. Who can say what the results would now be if, last year, we had authorized the appropriation of three times the amount authorized under the Accelerated Public Works Program? How many of the nearly 5 million unemployed today would now be gainfully employed? How many of this nearly 5 million unemployed would today be taxpayers instead of tax consumers? How many of the families of these men and women would today have been able to hold their heads high and say that their fathers or mothers were gainfully employed and they were not dependent on handouts?

Mr. President, we will not be able to meet a serious unemployment problem with half-measures, or with quarter-measures. We tried it last year and it did not work.

Now one of the arguments advanced last year against my proposal to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the accelerated public works measure was that the States could not possibly spend all that money.

In an effort to prove this argument fallacious, I wrote all the States having areas of chronic unemployment asking how much could be spent on worthwhile public works projects.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alaska may have 5 more minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, when I reported to the Senate on May 17, 1962, on the responses received up to that date—only 12 States—fewer than one-fourth of the total number—indicated that they could use $1,566 million.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my remarks on that date and some of the exhibits inserted in the Congressional Record at that time, be inserted in the Congressional Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit III.)

Mr. GRUENING. I stated at that time:

> The question which each and every one of us must ask himself is this: Am I prepared to give to the unemployed of the depressed areas of Gadsden, Ala.; Anchorage, Alaska; Camden, Ark.; Modesto, Calif.; Bristol, Conn.; Carrollton, Ga.; Cairo-Metropolis, Ill.; Evansville, Ind.; Pittsburg, Kans.; Paducah, Ky.; Hammond, La.; Biddeford-Sanford, Maine; Cumberland, Md.; Lowell, Mass.; Detroit, Mich.; Duluth, Minn.; Washington, Mo.; Butte, Mont.; Atlantic City, N.J.; Schenectady, N.Y.; Fayetteville, N.C.; Portsmouth-Chillicothe, Ohio; Muskogee, Okla.; Altoona, Pa.; Providence, R.I.; Conway, S.C.; Greenville, Tenn.; Laredo, Tex.; Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Va.; Aberdeen, Wash.; Charleston, W. Va.; and La Crosse, Wis., the same opportunity that has been given to the unemployed in Sudan to work on a highway construction project involving 1.8 million American dollars, or the unemployed in Yemen to work on a highway construction project involving 3 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Republic of China to work on the Ku-Kwan hydroelectric project involving 2.5 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Philippines to work on a port facilities and harbor improvement project involving 3.2 million American dollars?
>
> For myself the answer is abundantly clear. If I am expected to take care of the unemployed abroad with American dollars, then I can do no less than take care of the unemployed here at home first and just as adequately.

I am again today addressing to the Governors of all the States having serious pockets of chronic unemployment, a letter requesting the information as to the public works projects ready to go upon which unemployed men and women can be put to work.

At the appropriate time, I shall report to the Senate Committee on Public Works and to the Senate the results of this inquiry.

But I have no doubt at all that we shall find that there can be spent on useful, needed public works projects, throughout the land, more than the sum of $2,645 million which I propose to authorize to be appropriated for the accelerated public works program. In view of the $900 million already authorized, this is only an increase of $1,745 million.

As a matter of fact, the Honorable William L. Batt, Jr., Administrator, Area Redevelopment Administration, at a press conference on February 8, 1963, stated that at the end of January, the backlog of applications for funds for projects expected to meet program standards was $1,069 million. In addition, new projects were coming in at the rate of $300 million every month or $3,600 million per year.

It is not, therefore, a question of whether the money can be well spent in putting American unemployed men and women to work. The worthy projects exist. The necessary projects exist.

The question is: Are we willing to make the effort to get America rolling—to give America the shot in the arm it needs to get it rolling—to make an all-out effort to stimulate the American economy at the level required to drastically reduce these pockets of chronic unemployment?

For myself, I can only see an affirmative answer.

For myself, I can say only that when one considers what we are doing in the way of assisting the economies of countries abroad, there can be no question about our doing at least as much here at home for our own unemployed—for our chronically unemployed.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Congressional Record at the conclusion of my remarks excerpts from Mr. Batt's press conference and a list of unemployed percentages.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit IV.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my amendment expresses the amount authorized as the equivalent authorized to be appropriated for the following economic foreign aid purposes:

	Million
Sec. 202: Development loan fund	$1,500
Sec. 212: Development grants	380
Sec. 402: Supporting assistance	465
Sec. 451(a): Contingency fund	300
Total	2,645

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for an additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I have drafted my amendment in this fashion, Mr. President, rather than expressing the sum in figures, because I desire to call attention to the fact that we are granting this same sum—and indeed more in various other ways—to aid the economies of foreign countries—to reduce the unemployment problem in foreign countries—and that we literally cannot afford to continue to do that unless we do at least as much for the unemployed here at home.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to commend the Senator on his initiative, and I wish to assure the Senator that a number of his colleagues, as he well knows, have joined in reexamining the entire accelerated public works program. The President has submitted a supplemental request of $500 million under last year's authorization, which is sorely needed. In fact, the local communities have set aside by bond issue the necessary funds for local community cooperation, as prescribed by law. I am convinced that we could well use a substantially larger sum of money, at least double what we did last year, for the accelerated public works program, to meet the necessities of existing projects which are already funded and already prepared and already designed by the local jurisdictions.

I assure the Senator that he will have my cooperation. I know that I can expect from him the same kind of cooperation, as we meet together shortly to get at the new program of accelerated public works.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. No Member of the Senate has been more concerned about the unemployment problem, this tragic situation which is not a mere statistic but affects the lives and happiness and welfare of millions of Americans, or has shown more concern about getting the economy moving again, than the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota.

Exhibit I

A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Accelerated Public Works Act (Public Law 87–658)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 87–658 (76 Stat. 541), approved Sept. 14, 1962, is hereby amended by striking out the words "the sums of $900,000,000" in section 3(b), thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 402, and 451(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended."

Exhibit II

Separate Views of Mr. Gruening

I voted to report favorably S. 2965 providing for both a standby program of public works and an immediate program of public works for which an appropriation of $600 million was authorized.

It is my belief that much more than the authorized $600 million is needed and could usefully be used to put the unemployed back to work.

In a statement distributed to the members of the Public Works Committee, I stated:

"On March 27, 1962, the able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, introduced an amendment to S. 2965, a bill to provide standby authority to accelerate public works programs of the Federal Government and State and local public

bodies. The amendment would authorize the appropriation of $600 million for an immediate public works program.

"I commend the Senator from New Mexico for his foresight in submitting such an amendment.

"However, the amount is, in my opinion, hardly sufficient to meet the economic strain now being experienced in certain areas of the Nation.

"Accordingly, I now offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, raising the amount authorized to be appropriated for a program of immediate public works to the same amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance.

"It does seem to me that we should be willing to spend at least as much at home to take care of our own economically distressed areas as we are willing to spend abroad for aiding foreign economically distressed areas.

"My amendment does not, I admit, do equal justice as between foreign and domestic programs. Under the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, only one appropriation is authorized, namely, the sum of $600 million. Under my amendment, the limit of this onetime appropriation would be raised to the limit authorized in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the Development Loan Fund (sec. 202), the development grants and technical cooperation (sec. 212), supporting assistance (sec. 402), and contingency fund (sec. 451). Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1962 and the 4 succeeding fiscal years the total sum of $7.5 billion. My proposal is much more modest. In setting the limit to the amount that would be authorized for our immediate public works program, I have used only the figure of $1.5 billion—the amount authorized for the fiscal year 1963 only.

"My amendment would increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the immediate public works program to $2,645 million, computed as follows:

	Millions
"Sec. 202—Development Loan Fund	$1,500
Sec. 212—Development grants	380
Sec. 401—Supporting assistance	465
Sec. 451—Contingency fund	300
Total	2,645

"In proposing this increase in the amount authorized to be appropriated, I have used only the authorizations contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. I have not considered the amounts of U.S. funds made available abroad through such lending agencies as the World Bank, Export-Import Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, etc. Billions of American dollars have been and are being channeled abroad through these agencies. In many cases, the so-called loans are not loans at all but grants.

"In my humble opinion, no situation is more tragic than that of men and women unemployed who wish to work and cannot find it. In my humble opinion, no situation is more paradoxical than that this wealthiest country on earth, which has poured out $100 billion in the last decade and a half to help foreign countries, and proposes to spend even greater sums in the future for the same purpose, cannot meet its primary obligation to its own people.

"I am merely proposing, by this amendment, to offer a fraction—for the relief of economic distress and the creation of employment for our fellow Americans—of what we have been doing or are asked to do—and will doubtless continue to do—in far larger measure for inhabitants of 100 foreign countries.

"My amendment is as follows:

"On page 2, line 24, delete the words 'the sum of $600,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended'."

In order to insure prompt action on this vitally needed measure by the Senate, I did not press my amendment in committee but must reserve my position on the amount authorized for an immediate program of public works when this bill is considered in the Senate.

Exhibit III

Let Us Just Once Do at Least Half as Much for the Folks at Home as for Those in Foreign Lands

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 2965—the emergency public works bill—which it is my intention to call up at the appropriate time.

The amendment is simple.

It raises the amounts authorized to be appropriated for emergency public works from $600 million to "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202—for the fiscal year 1963—212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961." Those are the exact words of my proposed amendment. However, in order that my colleagues may have the amendment before them in customary form, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Presiding Officer. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, I have previously served notice of my intention to offer this amendment in my individual views in the committee's report on S. 2965. I ask unanimous consent that those views be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, my amendment seeks only to place our domestic program for alleviating unemployment in a position of equality with what we are doing abroad. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, even if my amendment is adopted—and I sincerely trust that it will be—there still will not be equality.

The amendment which I propose would raise the maximum authorized to be appropriated for the program of emergency public works from $600 million to $2,645 million computed as follows:

Sec. 202—Development Loan Fund (for fiscal year 1963 only)	$1,500,000,000
Sec. 212—Development grants	380,000,000
Sec. 401—Supporting assistance	465,000,000
Sec. 451—Contingency fund	300,000,000
Total	2,645,000,000

Actually the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, authorizes the appropriation of much more than $2,645 million for foreign economic aid. Actually, for the 5 fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1963, section 202 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 authorizes the appropriation of $1,500 million for each of these fiscal years or a total of $7,500 million for the five.

Thus, even with the adoption of my amendment, there would be authorized to be appropriated for this "one shot" program of emergency public works to help our own unemployed only about one-third of the amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic aid under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

I wish to make it crystal clear that my amendment does not affect or apply to the standby provisions of S. 2965. Actually, it can be said that my amendment moves up the $2 billion authorized for a program of standby public works to the emergency program and says in effect that emergency intended to be met by the standby program is upon us now.

And, considering the all too many pockets of depression of the United States, that is by no means an exaggeration.

We cannot accurately judge the human misery stalking our land by looking at the overall rate of unemployment.

During the week ending April 28, 1962, insured unemployment in Nome, Alaska, was 33.5 percent. It was no comfort to the unemployed worker in Nome to know that the national rate of insured unemployment during the same week was 4.3 percent.

The unemployed worker in Fairbanks—insured unemployment rate 17.9 percent—could derive little comfort from the fact that the Congress was talking about standby public works when things get worse.

How much worse must it get, Mr. President, before the Congress acts to relieve to the extent possible unemployment in the numerous pockets throughout the Nation?

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks a table, prepared by my office, of unemployment in Alaska for the week ending April 28, 1962. These figures have been derived from the Labor Market Bulletin issued by the Alaska Department of Labor.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, this is no time to stand by. This is a time for bold, decisive action. In my opinion, nothing can be more heartrending than a man—a husband and a father—who cannot find work to support himself and family even though, week after week after week, he trudges wearily from door to door seeking such work. It is distressing for single men with no family responsibilities.

Dr. Kenneth Galbraith has written an excellent book entitled "Our Affluent Society" showing that more people in the United States are now living at a higher standard than ever before. I agree with the picture he has drawn in his book and I am happy that it is so.

But in rejoicing at the greater affluence of more and more of our people, let us not overlook the almost one-fourth of our Nation who are living in abject poverty without hope for the future or for their children's future unless prompt and intelligent measures are taken at once. The plight of these 40 million Americans is graphically pictured in a recent book by Mr. Michael Harrington, entitled "The Other America," published by Macmillan Co. this year. I commend it highly to my colleagues for it brings to our attention forcefully the need for immediate action—and action on a scale commensurate with the size of the problem.

As long as this problem exists for some 40 million Americans it is our inescapable duty to face it and to eliminate it as far as it is humanly possible. Our obligation to these Americans, in my judgment, supersedes aid for impoverished people in other lands. Moreover we shall be able to help these people in foreign countries all the betted if we raise our own living standards and put an end to the costly wastes of chronic unemployment.

In this—the richest of all lands—such a situation cannot and should not be tolerated.

Nor should we meet an emergency situation with halfway measures. We should not delude the people of the Nation. We must bring to bear on a solution of this problem all the resources that are needed. To do less is little better than doing nothing at all. To do less would be to disappoint millions of unemployed men and women throughout the country who are looking to Congress for action now.

According to the report from the Area Redevelopment Agency of the Department of Commerce as of May 1, 1962, 933 areas in the United States are designated as eligible to take part in the area redevelopment program. These are divided as follows: 148 urban-industrial areas; 735 rural and small labor markets; and 50 Indian reservations.

These areas have a population of 34.7 million people and a labor force of 13.2 million. Of the latter 1.4 million are unemployed. Thus these areas have 19 percent of the Nation's population and 19 percent of the Nation's labor force, but they have 31 percent of the unemployed of the country.

Now what is proposed to meet the persistent high rate of unemployment of these 933 areas throughout the Nation?

It is proposed in S. 2965 to authorize the appropriation of $2 billion for a program of public works on a standby basis, usable only if the total unemployment in the Nation rises to a predetermined figure. In addition, it is proposed to authorize the appropriation of an additional $600 million for an emergency, immediate public works program. This sum averages about $600 for each man and woman unemployed in these designated areas, assuming the entire amount is spent on wages, which, of course, will not be the case.

My amendment would quadruple that sum.

That quadrupled sum would be much more realistic considering the magnitude and the urgency of the problem.

I wish to make it absolutely clear that my proposal would not take a single penny from the foreign aid program. It merely uses the particular wording to point up the fact that we would be spending on this one-shot, emergency program here at home far less than we are spending abroad for economic aid.

The foreign aid program would continue as now authorized and the money appropriated for that program would remain intact, if Congress approves.

I know that the question will be raised: Can the sum you propose to spend on public works within 27 months actually be spent by the States economically and efficiently within that period of time.

It should be raised, and answered, because I do not want to propose anything here that would lead to wasteful expenditure of Federal funds. I know that none of my colleagues want to do so either.

But I do know that along with me many of my colleagues are concerned that we do enough to meet the problems of persistent unemployment in the 933 designated areas throughout the country.

In order to obtain the answer, I wired the Governors of the 50 States of the Nation and asked them the question and asked them to be specific in their replies. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my telegram to the Governors of the States be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, I have to date received replies from the Governors of only 12 States who have indicated that they are ready to go with public works projects totaling $1.6 billion.

I also ask unanimous consent that the detailed replies received from the Governors of these States be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, let no one here delude himself.

We shall either spend this $2,645 million on constructive investments in the future economic strength of the United States—in schools, hospitals, roads, sewer and water works, dams, airports and the like—or we shall spend that and much more in the next 27 months and in the years to come in unemployment compensation and in welfare payments, and suffer the loss of tax revenue which fuller employment will generate.

We cannot long neglect our own resources—human and natural—while building the resources of foreign nations. At stake is not our willingness to continue to aid the less developed countries, at stake is our ability to continue without at the same time renewing our own strength.

We can renew that strength by a program of public investments of the magnitude which I propose by my amendment.

In the years 1955–61, we have granted to foreign nations, for foreign economic aid projects of exactly the same type as would be constructed under my amendment, millions upon millions of American dollars.

Can we afford to do less for our own people at a time when many of the areas of our nation are so hard pressed?

Can we afford to do less for the unemployed of the United States when we are doing so much for the unemployed and others abroad?

As one reads about the flight of capital from Latin America one cannot but compare the lack of faith of the rich of those nations with the abiding faith of our unemployed who are willing to pitch in and work but lack only the opportunity to work.

I ask, Mr. President, for an additional $2 billion to give our own citizens the same chance that we have given and are giving to the citizens of other lands.

The question which each and every one of us must ask himself is this: Am I prepared to give to the unemployed of the depressed areas of Gadsden, Ala.; Anchorage, Alaska; Camden, Ark.; Modesto, Calif.; Bristol, Conn.; Carrollton, Ga.; Cairo-Metropolis, Ill.; Evansville, Ind.; Pittsburg, Kans.; Paducah, Ky.; Hammond, La.; Biddeford-Sanford, Maine; Cumberland, Md.; Lowell, Mass.; Detroit, Mich.; Duluth, Minn.; Washington, Mo.; Butte, Mont.; Atlantic City, N.J.; Schenectady, N.Y.; Fayetteville, N.C.; Portsmouth-Chillicothe, Ohio; Muskogee, Okla.; Altoona, Pa.; Providence, R.I.; Conway, S.C.; Greeneville, Tenn.; Laredo, Tex.; Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Va.; Aberdeen, Wash.; Charleston, W. Va.; and La Crosse, Wis., the same opportunity that has been given to the unemployed in Sudan to work on a highway construction project involving 1.8 million American dollars, or the unemployed in Yemen to work on a highway construction project involving 3 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Republic of China to work on the Ku Kwan hydroelectric project involving 2.5 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Philippines to work on a port facilities and harbor improvement project involving 3.2 million American dollars.

For myself, Mr. President, the answer is abundantly clear. If I am expected to take care of the unemployed abroad with American dollars then I can do no less than take care of the unemployed here at home first and just as adequately.

Mr. President, to date I have received replies from Governors of the following States giving the amounts which they could use for public works which could be completed in 27 months:

State:	Amount
Alabama	$50, 500, 000
Alaska	64, 184, 400
California	183, 000, 000
Colorado	20, 926, 000
Connecticut	28, 545, 000
Hawaii	24, 111, 912
Maryland	92, 590, 000
Michigan	639, 000, 000
Nevada	4, 968, 000
Ohio	329, 259, 645
Washington	40, 000, 000
West Virginia	89, 155, 950

It is obvious from even this response that in all the States at least four times the amount of funds which I propose could be spent on useful public works projects to relieve unemployment in areas of chronic unemployment.

My proposal is really a very modest one considering the need.

Exhibit 1

On page 10, line 2, and on page 11, line 1, delete the words "the sum of $600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended".

Exhibit 2

Separate Views of Mr. Gruening

I voted to report favorably S. 2965 providing for both a standby program of public works and an immediate program of public works for which an appropriation of $600 million was authorized.

It is my belief that much more than the authorized $600 million is needed and could usefully be used to put the unemployed back to work.

In a statement distributed to the members of the Public Works Committee, I stated:

"On March 27, 1962, the able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, introduced an amendment to S. 2965, a bill to provide standby authority to accelerate public works programs of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies. The amendment would authorize the appropriation of $600 million for an immediate public works program.

"I commend the Senator from New Mexico for his foresight in submitting such an amendment.

"However, the amount is, in my opinion, hardly sufficient to meet the economic strain now being experienced in certain areas of the Nation.

"Accordingly, I now offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, raising the amount authorized to be appropriated for a program of immediate public works to the same amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance.

"It does seem to me that we should be willing to spend at least as much at home to take care of our own economically distressed areas as we are willing to spend abroad for aiding foreign economically distressed areas.

"My amendment does not, I admit, do equal justice as between foreign and domestic programs. Under the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, only one appropriation is authorized, namely, the sum of $600 million. Under my amendment, the limit of this one-time appropriation would be raised to the limit authorized in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the Development Loan Fund (sec. 202), the development grants and technical cooperation (sec. 212), supporting assistance (sec. 402), and contingency fund (sec. 451). Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1962 and the 4 succeeding fiscal years the total sum of $7.5 billion. My proposal is much more modest. In setting the limit to the amount that would be authorized for our immediate public works program, I have used only the figure of $1.5 billion—the amount authorized for the fiscal year 1963 only.

"My amendment would increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the immediate public works program to $2,645 million, computed as follows:

Sec. 202—Development Loan Fund	$1, 500, 000, 000
Sec. 212—Development grants	380, 000, 000
Sec. 401—Supporting assistance	465, 000, 000
Sec. 451—Contingency fund	300, 000, 000
Total	2, 645, 000, 000

"In proposing this increase in the amount authorized to be appropriated, I have used only the authorizations contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. I have not considered the amounts of U.S. funds made available abroad through such lending agencies as the World Bank, Export-Import Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, etc. Billions of American dollars have been and are being channeled abroad through these agencies. In many cases, the so-called loans are not loans at all but grants.

"In my humble opinion, no situation is more tragic than that of men and women unemployed who wish to work and cannot find it. In my humble opinion, no situation is more paradoxical than that this wealthiest country on earth, which has poured out $100 billion in the last decade and a half to help foreign countries, and proposes to spend even greater sums in the future for the same purpose, cannot meet its primary obligation to its own people.

"I am merely proposing, by this amendment, to offer a fraction for the relief of economic distress and the creation of employment for our fellow Americans of what we have been doing or are asked to do—and will doubtless continue to do—in far larger measure for inhabitants of 100 foreign countries.

"My amendment is as follows:

"On page 2, line 24, delete the words 'the sum of $600,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended'."

In order to insure prompt action on this vitally needed measure by the Senate, I did not press my amendment in committee but must reserve my position on the amount authorized for an immediate program of public works when this bill is considered in the Senate.

Ernest Gruening.

Exhibit 3

Private industry insured unemployment rates by administrative area and industry

By administrative area	This week (Apr. 28, 1962)		Last week (Apr. 21, 1962)		Year ago (Apr. 29, 1961)	
	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]
State	5, 322	16. 2	5, 699	17. 4	6, 500	19. 9
Anchorage	3, 005	16. 7	3, 198	17. 8	3, 315	18. 4
Fairbanks	1, 220	17. 9	1, 322	19. 3	1, 664	27. 6
Juneau	282	10. 5	294	10. 9	328	11. 5
Ketchikan	276	10. 3	302	11. 3	500	15. 9
Nome	177	33. 5	201	38. 0	207	33. 3
Petersburg	274	34. 7	297	37. 6	312	40. 9
Sitka	88	7. 2	85	7. 0	165	13. 8

By industry	This week (Apr. 28, 1962)		Last week (Apr. 21, 1962)		Year ago (Apr. 29, 1961)	
	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]	Weeks claimed	IUR [1]
Total	5, 322	16. 2	5, 699	17. 4	5, 600	19. 9
Mining	201	17. 4	257	22. 3	310	27. 6
Construction	2, 044	45. 0	2, 238	49. 3	2, 706	46. 6
Manufacturing	1, 035	19. 7	985	18. 8	1, 232	21. 5
Transportation and utilities	462	6. 6	542	7. 7	502	8. 3
Trade	503	6. 2	571	7. 0	627	8. 3
Finance	56	3. 7	51	3. 4	80	5. 7
Service and other	1, 021	19. 8	1, 055	20. 5	1, 043	21. 0

[1] Insured unemployment rate.

Exhibit 4

April 18, 1962.

Senate Public Works Committee today reported emergency public works bill authorizing appropriation of $600 million for one-shot effort for public works projects in economically distressed areas. As member of committee, I expressed concern that sum authorized was totally inadequate to meet Nation's needs. Would appreciate your writing me as soon as possible giving me as much information as possible concerning public works projects in economically distressed areas of your State which could be completed in 27 months, giving estimated costs and man-hours of work which would be provided.

Exhibit 5

State of Alaska,
Juneau, May 2, 1962.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: We have gathered the following information from the Alaska Department of Public Works.

Of the approximately $388,812,748 listed as capital improvement needs for the next 6 years, approximately $99 million would be paid for by the State of Alaska, exclusive of any Federal moneys made available under Federal grant-in-aid programs. A summary of this $388,812,748 program is set forth on page 8 of the attached document, "A Capital Improvement Program for the State of Alaska, 1962–68." Projects which are to be financed in whole or part from State or local funds are summarized on pages 11 through 17.

As you can see, we have a considerable inventory of buildings, structures and improvements that should be built. We do not have a great many projects ready to be advertised at this time, but we should be able to add to the list fairly quickly providing that we can obtain Housing and Home Finance Agency advances for advance planning and providing that the various bonding proposals pass. With the incentive provided by a public works act, such as S. 2965, the State could prepare a number of the more uncomplicated projects, such as classroom additions to State-operated schools, small State-operated schools for contract, and make application for Housing and Home Finance Agency planning advances and grants for the more extensive projects. Actually, we are now working on a number of applications for HHFA advances and grants for the planning and design of a number of State-operated schools and various facilities at the University of Alaska.

Accordingly, the following list of projects which are designed, are being designed, or will be designed in next year, very substantially understates our ability to utilize S. 2965 in carrying out the purpose of that act. In this connection, I should note that the capital improvement program is a conservative document. In preparing the capital improvement program many needed projects were deleted to hold the program within the State's ability to finance.

The projects which probably most nearly qualify for immediate consideration under a standby public works act are:

1. The International Airport Terminal buildings projects at Anchorage and Fairbanks, representing a value of $3.8 million and $1.8 million, respectively, are fully complete and ready for bidding.

2. Projects which are now in the planning stage with design completion anticipated before August of this year are Salcha Elementary School ($160,000), Eagle River School addition ($288,000) Soldotna School addition ($183,000), and Glen Allen refrigeration and foundation ($55,000). Funds for these projects have been provided under the 1962–63 State education budget. The total for these schools is $686,000.

3. At present, three applications are being prepared for submittal to the Housing and Home Finance Agency for an "Advance for Public Works Planning." If approved, funds would be available to complete architectural-engineering design for the Ninilchik School addition ($400,000), the Metlakatla Elementary School ($600,000), and the Fort Yukon School addition ($260,000). Approximately 5 months will be required before these projects would be "set to go." The total for these schools is $1,260,000.

4. The following schools might be ready for contract this year if the $5 million bond issue for State operated schools passes:

Ambler School	$55,000
Eagle River (further classroom addition)	52,000
Delta Junction	516,000
Homer	554,000
Tanana	252,000
North Kenai	554,000
Sterling	150,000
Chugiak High School	1,200,000
McGrath	78,000
Brown's Ct	160,000
Fortuna Ledge	78,000
Total	3,649,000

NOTE.—The legislature appropriated $75,000 for planning and design for Chugiak High School. Some preliminary work has already been done on this project.

5. The vocational school at Nome, although funded under a $1,500,000 general obligation bond authorization, is another project which could qualify. Final plans could be completed within 5 months.

6. If the $7,200,000 bonding program for the University of Alaska passes, money will be available for the construction of an addition to the engineering and physical sciences building, a biological sciences and renewable resources building, completion of the university's new heating plant, and other related facilities.

7. Invitations to bid on the construction of fire and crash stations at the Anchorage and Fairbanks International Airports, approximately $180,000 each will be advertised this June.

8. A $160,000 addition to the Miner and Minerals Building in Anchorage may be erected in the 1963 construction season.

9. Proposed water and harbors projects scheduled for the 1962 and 1963 construction seasons which are not yet under contract are:

Angoon, docks	$50,000
Cordova, floats	50,000
Craig, dock	40,000
Douglas, floats	45,000
Homer, floats	65,000
Hydaburg, dock	25,000
Hyder, float	7,500
Klawock, dock approach	40,000
Kodiak, floats	30,000
Ninilchik, floats	23,000
Seldovia, floats	65,000
Seward, floats	46,000
Valdez, floats	38,000
Wrangell, floats	31,000
Total	555,500

NOTE.—Considerable work has been done on some of the foregoing projects or is now underway. Since this work is already contracted out, it is not reflected in the above estimated cost figures. Other projects which are now under contract are also not reflected.

10. The following bush airfields are programed for construction in the 1962 and 1963 construction seasons:

New Stuyahok	$15,000
Alitak	50,000
Anvik	15,000
Buckland	10,000
Chevak	15,000
Circle City	7,500
Egegik	20,000
False Pass	10,000
Goodnews	10,000
Holikachuk	15,000
Kasaan	5,000
Koliganek	10,000
Koyukuk	$15,000
McCarthy	49,000
Metlakatla	5,000
Nulato	25,000
Ouzinkie	30,000
Pilot Point	15,000
Quinhagak	5,000
Russian Mission	15,000
Shakeluk	7,400
Shungnak	10,000
Stebbins-St. Michael	10,000
Tanunak	15,000
Togiak	10,000
Total	393,900

I have omitted mention of projects planned for our annual $37 to $40 million Federal aid highway program and the Federal aid airport program. I gather that these programs will not be affected by the proposed standby public works act.

If I can supplement any of this information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

GARY THURLOW,
Executive Assistant.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *May 7, 1962.*

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

In reply to your telegram of April 18, it is estimated that the State of California could initiate and accelerate $183 million in public works projects and complete them within a period of 27 months. These projects would utilize an estimated 18 million man-hours of labor at the job site.

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of California.

OLYMPIA, WASH., *May 2, 1962.*

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Review of public works of our State indicates that nearly $400 million would be needed for the completion of the total public works projects contemplated in the next 3 to 4 years in economically distressed areas when limited to projects believed to have a completion date within a 27-month period. The total would amount approximately to $40 million. This latter figure would represent specific items such as buildings, utilities, etc. The larger figure given would include such items as dam completion, the canal possibility, atomic generation of electric power, and steam generation coal plants.

ALBERT D. ROSELLINI,
Governor of Washington.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Carson City, April 27, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Public Works Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am happy to supply the information you requested in your recent telegram regarding the emergency public works bill.

The accompanying data, compiled by our department of highways, relates to roadway construction contemplated or underway in the counties of Lincoln and Mineral, the two Nevada counties officially recognized by the Federal Government as depressed under the area redevelopment program.

I trust the enclosed data provides you with the information you desire. If I can be of any further service, please let me know.

Cordially,

GRANT SAWYER,
Governor.

Road contracts to be completed within approximately the next 27 months, Lincoln and Mineral Counties, Nev.

	Estimated construction cost	Estimated man-hours
Lincoln County:		
Project S-544(10) U.S. 93 from 14 miles southeast to 1 mile north of Alamo (15 miles)	$1,600,000	150,000
Project S-544(9) U.S. 93 from 14 miles to 22 miles southeast of Alamo (8 miles)	700,000	63,000
Project F-008-1(3) SR 25, from 2d St. to 6th St. in Panaca (0.5 mile)	70,000	7,000
Subtotal	2,370,000	220,000
Mineral County:		
Project F-004-1(3) U.S. 6 from 8.6 miles east of California-Nevada State line to 3.5 miles east of Basalt (6.7 miles) (construction underway)	948,000	86,000
Project F-004-1(4) U.S. 6 from California-Nevada State line to 8.6 miles east (8.6 miles) (construction underway)	1,100,000	99,000
Project S-525(1) FAS 525 from Nevada-Scheelite mine north to U.S. 50 (19.1 miles) (25 percent of this project in Mineral County)	550,000	52,000
Subtotal	2,598,000	237,000
Grand total	4,968,000	457,000

STATE OF COLORADO
Denver, April 27, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: In response to your telegram of April 18, we are enclosing a list of public works projects in Colorado redevelopment areas that reportedly could be initiated and completed in 27 months subject to availability of funds.

This information was accumulated through contact with various city and county officials and State agencies.

We are not entirely familiar with the criteria for eligibility to participate under the terms of the proposed legislation or with the legislative definition of public works. We have not, therefore, attempted to evaluate whether or not all of the listed projects could qualify for assistance under the proposed legislation.

We were not able to obtain an assessment of the man-hours of work which would be provided by the projects as engineering studies are not available in connection with most of the proposals.

Very truly yours,

STEVE MCNICHOLS.

List of public works projects in redevelopment areas that could be initiated and completed in 27 months if funds were available as reported by various city and county officials and projects listed by the game and fish department

Area		Description	Estimated cost
County	City		
Alamosa		Water service to East Alamosa	$250,000
		Community youth center	200,000
		Addition to county courthouse	150,000
		Storm sewer and curb and gutter for East Alamosa	50,000
		Dike and river work on Rio Grande through city of Alamosa	50,000
		Total	700,000
	Alamosa	Paving city streets	386,000
		Extending airport runway	40,000
		New water well, mains, and extensions	100,000
		Enlarge sewer lagoons	50,000
		Storm sewer, South Alamosa	60,000
		Sanitary sewer system; new major trunkline	330,000
		Total	966,000
		Total, Alamosa County	1,666,000
Clear Creek		Georgetown Reservoir	360,000
	Idaho Springs	Short wave communication system for city and county	8,000
		City street paving	75,000
		Sewage disposal plant	20,000
		Total	103,000
	Georgetown	Sewage disposal plant and collection system	100,000
		Develop Georgetown Lake as recreational area	225,000
		Rebuild water distribution system	100,000
		Total	425,000
		Total, Clear Creek County	888,000
Conejos		No county projects reported	
	Antonito	75 low-cost dwellings for transient workers	400,000
		Waterline	60,000
		Sewer system	180,000
		Total	640,000
	La Jara	No projects reported	
		Total, Conejos County	640,000
Costilla		County courthouse and jail	225,000
		County shops	100,000
		Fort Garland community building	35,000
		Hospital addition	50,000
		San Luis Water and Sanitation District sewage system	(1)
		Total	410,000
	Blanca	Water and sanitation system	(1)
		Total, Costilla County	410,000
Gilpin		Improvement, Corona Pass Rd	225,000
	Blackhawk	Water system and sewage disposal plant	75,000
	Central City	Water system and sewage disposal plant	100,000
		Recreational development, park, etc	25,000
		Total	125,000
		Total, Gilpin County	425,000
Huerfano		County courthouse and jail	1,000,000
		Surfacing county roads to ski and other scenic areas	239,000
		Acquisition and development of irrigation system for development of recreational facilities for Huerfano-Cucharas area.	3,000,000
		Waterfowl development	110,000
		Total	4,349,000
	La Veta	Expansion of sewer collection system and disposal plant	40,000
		Water filter plaut	65,000
		Total	105,000
	Walsenburg	Sewage disposal plant	158,000
		Street paving, curbs, gutters, and storm sewer system	500,000
		Rebuilding and extending waterlines	100,000
		Purchase and install watermeters	108,000
		Extension of sewerlines	42,000
		Rebuilding electric distribution system and expanding electric production facilities	1,500,000
		City park recreational area	50,000
		Mine museum	18,000
		Senior high school	750,000
		Total	3,226,000
		Total, Huerfano County	7,680,000

[1] No estimate.

List of public works projects in redevelopment areas that could be initiated and completed in 27 months if funds were available as reported by various city and county officials and projects listed by the game and fish department—Continued

Area		Description	Estimated cost
County	City		
Las Animas		Grade and pave Cucharas Pass for 12 miles	$1,000,000
		Construction of 2-mile connecting roads between 2 State highways	40,000
		Recreational development at fairgrounds	50,000
		Pave connecting road from Aguilar to Highway 111	200,000
		Develop mountain recreation area	100,000
		Enlargement of North Lake	100,000
		Enlargement of Monument Lake	200,000
		Alkali Creek Reservoir	100,000
		New road construction, North Fork, Purgatoire River	50,000
		Total	1,840,000
	Aguilar	Filter plant and water distribution system	200,000
	Cokedale	Pave streets	50,000
		Water distribution and storage	300,000
		Total	350,000
	Trinidad	New sewage lines and disposal plant	627,000
		Animas St. Bridge over Purgatoire River	230,000
		Rebuild water distribution system and water storage facilities	2,230,000
		Curb and gutter and paving	1,500,000
		Garbage, refuse, and disposal	40,000
		Police and fire building	200,000
		Development of Monument Lake Recreational Area	2,000,000
		Total	6,827,000
		Total, Las Animas County	9,217,000
		Grand total	20,926,000

THE STATE OF OHIO,
Columbus, April 27, 1962.

The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Mr. E. S. Preston, director of highways, has estimated that in the 20 counties which have been declared as distressed areas, that his department could have the capacity to develop plans and complete $250 million worth of highway construction projects in the next 27 months. There is now under construction in the same area 102 miles of highways estimated to cost $79,797,000. He further estimates that the $250 million highway construction program would generate 28 million man-hours of work.

This area, I think, will be benefited immeasurably by the improvement of the highway situation which I think contributes very largely to the chronic depression that exists. If it is difficult to move man and materials into a community, then this community does not lend itself to industrial or economic development. Other programs can be of assistance, but there is no program that can be more helpful and is as basic as is the improvement of the manner of transportation.

I have asked our director of public works to also report on the necessities of this area with reference to public works generally and, as soon as those figures are available, we will make them available to you.

With all best personal wishes to you, I am,

Sincerely,

MICHAEL V. DISALLE,
Governor.

Ohio Department of Natural Resources—Public works projects for economic distressed areas in Ohio

Project	Description	County	Total cost	Labor, man-hours	Department's priority	Annual economic benefits	Remarks
Ohio Brush Creek Reservoir	Recreation and water supply	Adams	$3,530,700	321,920	3	$3,000,000	Construction plans needed.
Brush Creek and Shawnee State Forests.	Timber stand improvement, roads and trails, structures.	do	442,060	268,350	1	(1)	
Trimble water system	Village distribution system	Athens	60,000	4,081	1	5,000	Plans complete.
Strouds Run State Park development.	Buildings, water and sewer, camping, swimming beach, roads and parking docks and ramps, reforestation.	do	600,000	50,000	3	50,000	Estimate 10,000 annual increase park attendance. Dow Lake in this park is an attraction which far exceeds facilities available.
Waterloo, Gifford, and Athens Park State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails, structures	do	74,011	45,260	1	(1)	
Belmont Lake	Road relocation	Belmont	205,000	17,083	1		Plans complete.
Barkcamp State Park	Buildings, water and sewer, roads and parking, docks and ramps, reforestation, camping, picnic areas.	do	700,000	58,000	3	500,000	New park with lake ready for filling except for road relocation. Would serve transient trade using Interstate 70.
White Oak Reservoir	Recreation and water supply	Brown	3,106,783	121,872	3	1,500,000	Construction plans needed.
Stonelick State Park development	Camping area	Clermont	250,000	20,833	1	150,000	Construction plans complete.
Salt Fork Reservoir	Water supply and recreation	Guernsey	2,157,600	206,757	1	4,000,000	Construction plans complete. Includes road relocation and land needed.
Hocking State Park development	Camping area	Hocking	257,000	21,417	1	100,000	Plans complete.
Hocking and Tar Hollow State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	244,215	138,650	1	(1)	
Richland Furnace State Forest	do	Jackson	426,000	252,000	1	(1)	
Dean State Forest	TSI, roads and trails	Lawrence	48,500	30,000	1	(1)	
Forked Run State Park development	Camping area	Meigs	70,000	5,833	1	50,000	Do.
	Buildings, roads and parking, reforestation.	do	75,000	6,000	3		
Shade River State Forest	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	94,825	41,370	1	(1)	
Burr Oak State Park development	Camping area	Morgan	110,000	9,167	1	75,000	Do.
Wolf Run Reservoir	Water supply and recreation	Noble	577,830	48,153	2	500,000	Need construction plans.
Pike State Forest	TSI, roads and trails structures	Pike	416,800	243,900	1	(1)	
Ross County Lake	Recreation	Ross	400,000	25,000	1	50,000	Feasibility report being completed.
Scioto Trail and Tar Hollow State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	526,600	329,300	1	(1)	
Shawnee Recreational Area	Construct 3 impoundments and reconstruct another for recreation.	Scioto	506,933	42,245	2	150,000	Need construction plans.
Shawnee and Brush Creek State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	1,322,400	813,900	1	(1)	

See footnote at end of table.

Ohio Department of Natural Resources—Public works projects for economic distressed areas in Ohio—Continued

Project	Description	County	Total cost	Labor, man-hours	Department's priority	Annual economic benefits	Remarks
Lake Hope State Park development	Camping area	Vinton	$86,000	7,167	1	$150,000	Plans complete.
	Cabins, water and sewer, swimming pool, roads and parking.	do	1,300,000	108,000	3	320,000	Estimate of 64,000 annual increase in park attendance.
Wheelabout Reservoir	Recreational impoundment	do	130,000	6,667	2	150,000	Construction plans needed.
Zaleski and Tar Hollow State Forests	TSI, roads and trails, structures	do	533,343	320,225	1	(1)	
Muskingum River locks and dams	Repairs to locks and dams 1 to 8, inclusive for recreation and commerce.	Washington	677,870	56,489	1	233,000	Construction plans needed. Preliminary design on No. 6 completed.
	Fishermen's access and boat ramps at 8 lock and dam pools.	do	20,000	2,000	1	48,000	These facilities would accommodate 16,000 fishermen per year.
Total			18,855,645	3,582,369			

[1] The improvement of the timber stands on State forests will not result in immediate financial returns to the community except for the wages paid to local workers; however, ample benefits will be enjoyed in future years. Timber stand improvement includes tree planting, pruning crop trees, thinning dense stands, and removal of cull trees and vines. The increases in value to the remaining stand will result from more rapid growth and higher quality timber. Under Ohio conditions, this improvement will often double the volume of wood produced. The cutting and fabricating of the raw materials will support local industries and attract new users of wood to these dependable sources of supply. Recreational benefits will accrue also. Wild land under intensive forest management produces maximum populations of wildlife.

OHIO

Project cost summary by counties

Adams	$136,050
Athens	19,280,700
Belmont	989,630
Brown	114,080
Clermont	61,050
Gallia	7,597,360
Guernsey	3,268,563
Highland	19,080
Hocking	1,460,860
Jackson	19,080
Lawrence	101,360
Meigs	536,360
Monroe	19,080
Morgan	903,360
Noble	229,080
Pike	81,080
Portage	17,517,223
Ross	137,080
Scioto	2,580,360
Vinton	972,050
Washington	557,510
Southeast Ohio	3,823,709
Total	60,404,705

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
Lansing, April 19, 1962.

The Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The Senate Public Works Committee's approval of President Kennedy's $2.6 billion public works program to combat unemployment is encouraging. With 268,000 workers, 9.2 percent of our labor force, currently unemployed in our State, we feel the need of this legislation is eminent.

You ask for information concerning Michigan's ability to participate in the $600 million immediate effect provision of the program.

We currently have 53 areas in our State that qualify under this legislation as area redevelopment or eligible labor surplus areas. In an analysis I recently conducted, I found that we are ready to embark upon capital improvement programs totaling $639 million that would provide approximately 60,000 man-years of employment. These figures were developed only from those projects in Michigan that can meet the limitations of the $600 million proposal. They constitute, if anything, an understatement of the volume of activity that could be started in Michigan without delay.

While we have not projected our figures to a period longer than 12 months, it is our belief that the backlog of public works projects that could be initiated at the present time in Michigan would certainly absorb any extension of the time and financial limits, of the program.

Concerning the time duration of the project, I urged the House Public Works Committee to grant a flexible time limit for project duration. Due to weather conditions in Michigan, a limit of 12 months would prohibit the initiation of some public works projects that might otherwise qualify.

My statement to the House Committee on Public Works contains a detailed breakdown of the type of projects we could initiate in Michigan. I am enclosing a copy of this statement for your information.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. SWAINSON,
Governor.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, April 26, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The following is a list of public works projects as requested in your telegram of April 18:

Anaonia area:	
Ansonia-Derby flood control project	$6,000,000
Street and road reclassification project	250,000
Sewage disposal plant	1,000,000
Additional recreational facilities	100,000
Reconstruction of Route 34 in Derby from 3d Street to A Street	200,000
Reconstruction of 0.2 mile of Route 115 and railroad underpass, Maple Street to Broad Street, town of Seymour	1,000,000
Reconstruction of 1.5 miles of Route 115 in Derby and Ansonia from Route 34 to Colburn Street	800,000
Bristol area:	
City hall (Bristol)	1,630,000
Civic center (Bristol)	450,000
Fire station (Bristol)	250,000
City streets (Bristol)	2,000,000
Sewage treatment plant (Bristol)	2,535,000
Airport (town of Plymouth)	500,000
Industrial park (town of Plymouth)	500,000
Construction of truck climbing lane on Route 69, Bristol	205,000
Widening approximately 1 mile of Route 6, Bristol, in Jerome Avenue vicinity	250,000
Extension of truck climbing lane on Route 6 in Plymouth from end of 1962 construction to vicinity of Todd Hollow Road	100,000
Correcting sight line on Route 6, in Plymouth, in the vicinity of Orchard and Kellogg Streets	150,000
Danielson (town of Killingly) area:	
Sewer treatment plant and pumping station (Killingly)	$800,000
Town dump and incinerator (Killingly and Putnam jointly)	700,000
Downtown renewal project (Killingly)	3,000,000
Town roads drainage and repair (Killingly)	100,000
Sewage facilities and disposal (Plainfield)	500,000
Recreational project	150,000
Correction of sight line on Route 169 1 mile south of Brooklyn town line	75,000
Reconstruction of 1.2 miles of Route 171 from Thompson town line to Quinebaug River	400,000
Reconstruction of 2.6 miles of Route 169 in Pomfret and Woodstock from Route 44 to Route 171	700,000
Reconstruction of Maple Street, Killingly, from Route 6 to Route 101	375,000
Reconstruction of Route 12 south of Route 6 underpass	200,000
Reconstruction of Route 12 in Putnam and Thompson from 300 feet south of Route 12 to 0.5 mile north of Route 193	4,500,000
Resurfacing of Main Street, Killingly	100,000

The estimated cost of the above-listed projects is $28,545,000 including $19,865,000 in local projects and $8,680,000 in State highway department projects.

Sincerely,

JOHN DEMPSEY,
Governor.

STATE OF MARYLAND,
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
Annapolis, Md., April 25, 1962.

The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Governor Tawes has asked me to reply to your telegram of April 18 regarding possible public works projects in persistent labor surplus areas of Maryland.

To date we have been able to learn of 23 projects in such areas whose total cost is estimated at approximately $92,590,000. It is estimated that total man-hours would exceed 15,600,000.

The single most expensive project would be the relocation of U.S. Route 40 as a 4-lane highway for a distance of 112 miles from Hancock, Md., to Washington County, Pa.

This would traverse five labor surplus counties. The estimated construction cost for the entire highway, exclusive of right-of-way acquisition, is $84,400,000 providing an estimated 15,275,000 man-hours of work.

The most critical Allegany County project is the construction of a new Pinto Bridge and improvement of the road from the bridge to U.S. 220. The existing bridge is wholly inadequate for the movement of employees to and from the Allegany Ballistics Laboratory and efficient delivery of some materials to the plant. The estimated cost for this project is $1 million involving 100,000 man-hours.

There are at least four projects in Washington County including the proposed North-East Highway at a cost of $400,000 and 75,000 man-hours. A new water transmission main from Williamsport to Hagerstown would cost $1,450,000. There is no estimate of the number of man-hours. A project involving sewer system extensions in Hagerstown and other Washington County towns would cost $3,500,000. Again there is no estimate of man-hours. Sewer and water main extensions and highway improvements to a proposed industrial park would cost $670,000. The number of man-hours is unknown at this time. The total cost of these Washington County projects is $6,020,000. Man-hours were computed for only one of the four projects; i.e., 75,000 man-hours.

Seventeen projects for the city of Cambridge in Dorchester County were proposed and a tabulation is enclosed. The total cost is $1,070,000 involving 196,800 man-hours.

We are also endeavoring to uncover other appropriate projects and will forward details next week.

I hope this information will be useful and please wire or phone if additional details are required.

Cordially,

Robert M. Sparks,
Chief, Business and Industrial Development.

City of Cambridge, Md.—List of projects which could be completed in 27 months

No. and name of project	Approximate cost	Approximate labor-hours
1. Improvements to Race St	$19,000	4,000
2. Streets and utilities, Plaza Park, part 1	18,500	4,000
3. Improvements to Maryland Ave	12,000	3,200
4. Extension of Goodwill Ave	13,500	3,500
5. Streets and utilities, Parkside subdivision	33,000	6,000
6. Sewage pumping station, Stone Boundary Development	20,000	3,800
7. Bozarth Farms area, drainage	33,000	6,000
8. Improvements to sewage system, Jimson Rd	33,000	6,000
9. Repair shop and garage, public works department	9,000	2,400
10. Sewer, storm water separation, Fairmount Ave	70,000	12,000
11. Improvements to Leonards Lane	80,000	14,000
12. Drainage improvements, Dorchester Ave	24,000	4,300
13. Drainage improvements, Phillips Ave., Robbins St	30,000	5,400
14. Sludge disposal units, sewage treatment plant	200,000	40,000
15. Improvements to water distribution system	340,000	58,000
16. Woods road to wire cloth intercepting sewer	100,000	18,000
17. New 1,000,000 gallons per day well	35,000	6,200
Total	1,070,000	196,800

STATE OF ALABAMA,
DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS,
Montgomery, April 23, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: At the request of Governor Patterson, I am pleased to furnish the information requested in your telegram of April 18, 1962, regarding emergency public works which might be completed in Alabama in 27 months.

Both the State highway department and the State conservation department, which would be largely responsible for emergency public works, made estimates and plans sometime ago. Engineering has been completed and it is believed all projects could be commenced within 6 months.

The following estimates, in broad categories, cover proposed projects in those areas declared economically depressed:

County roads and bridges	$3,500,000
State highways	8,000,000
Interstate highways	20,000,000
Reforestation, water, and wildlife conservation, State parks, fire control	19,000,000
Total	50,500,000
Man-hours are estimated as:	
Highway and roads	3,000,000
Conservation projects	6,000,000
Total	9,000,000

The Governor is in agreement that the suggested authorization would be very inadequate, particularly, if such funds are allocated to the States on the usual pro rata basis.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH R. WILLIAMS,
Director of Industrial Relations.

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA,
Charleston, May 3, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This will acknowledge receipt of your telegram of April 18, 1962, concerning proposed public works projects in West Virginia.

I would first like to inform you of the situation with regard to public works projects in West Virginia and to give you some information relative to specific projects which could be accomplished under the proposed program.

At the present time, the State of West Virginia has a public works program based on the aid to dependent children of the unemployed program. We have elected to participate in this program with a stipulation that each recipient who receives assistance will work for that assistance. As of March 30, 12,600 men were employed under this program. As you know, this program is financed by both the Federal and State Governments on a matching basis, the State paying 30 percent of the cost and the Federal Government paying 70 percent.

One shortcoming of this program is that only individuals who are married with dependent children qualify. No employment is made available under this program for individuals who are not married or individuals who are married and have no children or whose children are grown.

Three million dollars in State funds have been appropriated for the coming fiscal year for emergency employment. I may, as chief executive, use these funds to match any Federal funds which may become available for the relief of unemployment. This, of course, means that should the aid to dependent children of the unemployed program be continued at the Federal level, these funds may be used for participation in that program.

It is my underatanding that the public works plan proposed by President Kennedy will make Federal money available to various State and local governmental units on a 50–50 matching basis. I would like to strongly urge that consideration be given to a more favorable matching ratio in favor of State and local governments.

A program with a 90-percent Federal, 10-percent State matching ratio would provide employment for approximately 7,000 to 12,000 persons. As only $3 million are available in State funds for matching purposes, a 50–50 matching ratio would only provide employment for 1,500 to 2,400 persons. These figures assume expenditures for material and equipment of 20 to 50 percent.

Enclosed you will find proposed projects from our State department of natural resources and from our State road commission. I would like to emphasize that these projects are only a sample of those projects which can be undertaken and completed within 27 months under this program and which would qualify under the rules and regulations of such program. It is anticipated that many projects at the community level, both county and municipal, would be submitted for accomplishment.

Again let me express my desire that Federal money be made available at less cost to the States.

I sincerely hope that this information meets your needs and that you will give every consideration possible to the suggestions which I have outlined. If I may assist you in any way or provide any additional information, do not hesitate to contact me at any time.

Yours truly,

W. W. BARRON,
Governor.

STATE OF HAWAII,
Honolulu, May 2, 1962.

The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator from Alaska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: This is in reply to your recent cablegram wherein you requested information on public works projects which could be completed during the next 27 months in our economically distressed area (Hawaii County). The attached tabulation gives information on gross construction costs by major types of functions and the estimated number of man-hours needed to complete the projects. These represent projects which are currently authorized or those for which authorization begins on July 1, 1962, for the new fiscal year. It is estimated that all of these will be completed during the 27-month time period you cited.

I have not seen a copy of the proposed emergency public works bill. Hence, it is not possible to say if all projects included in this tabulation would be eligible for financial assistance. As you know, highways and airports now receive Federal grants. Perhaps these projects would not be eligible for further aid. It would also be of value to know if such financial assistance would be in the form of interest-free loans or grants. The mechanics of the proposed bill may affect an area's willingness to participate in the program.

Hawaii's public works program for the coming fiscal year is the largest in our history. Part of the reason for this scale of State public works is to stabilize our employment situation. However, all of us recognize that public works construction alone will not solve our Nation's unemployment problem. Increased public works construction is only one tool of many that must be

utilized to spur the growth of our economy. The Area Redevelopment Act and the program of retraining unemployed persons are examples of other actions that will help. Some areas will continue to suffer chronic unemployment until new economic activities are introduced. The private sector of the Nation's economy must maintain a vigorous growth if public efforts to solve unemployment are to be successful. Thus, any public works program should be accompanied by vigorous efforts to encourage and promote increased employment through new permanent job opportunities.

I hope this provides you with the information you need. However, if I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. QUINN,
Governor of Hawaii.

Authorized State public works located in economically distressed areas of the State of Hawaii (Hawaii County only)

I. Public works division (miscellaneous public buildings and the State's share of a sewage treatment plant):	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$1,351,412
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	122,184
II. Airports division:	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$3,500,000
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	320,000
III. Harbors division:	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$3,855,000
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	617,000
IV. Highways division:	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$14,427,500
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	1,978,000
V. Land and natural resources department (land development, parks, water develoment, forestry, fish and game):	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$976,000
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	136,500
Total estimated contion costs	$24,111,912
Total estimated man-hours of work	3,173,684

EXHIBIT IV

PRESS CONFERENCE OF HON. WILLIAM L. BATT, JR., ADMINISTRATOR, AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BATT. Now in terms of numbers the area redevelopment areas comprise about 1,000 counties in the United States, and in terms of numbers again the blue areas or the areas that are in only for public works comprise only 100. But these are much bigger cities, by and large. There are about the same number in the blue areas as there are in all the red areas.

The arithmetic works out a little something like this—let me see if I can recall it. In the areas taken together, these red areas and the blue areas, we have about a third of the country's population, about a third of the country's labor force, and over half of the country's unemployment. They are, of course, the areas of longtime labor surplus, the ones we work with, the coal towns, the textile towns, the iron towns, the Great Lakes, the lumber towns, Pacific Northwest, Indian reservations in the Southwest, and the cotton textile towns in the Southeast. You know the economics of them.

Now over 2,900 projects representing $361 million of Federal funds and an estimated $125 million more of State and local funds—because you remember the communities have got to match this 50–50—$361 million of Federal funds and an estimated $125 million more of State and local funds are in various stages. Some are actually underway, some are being planned, some are just in the process of approval.

Approximately 580,000 man-months of direct employment will be generated by all these projects with the same number of man-months of additional employment based on the normal ratio of direct to indirect labor on public works projects.

Now of the total, Federal agencies are using $110 million of this total $361 million for direct Federal projects for such purposes as conservation work in our national forests and wildlife ranges, medical and sanitary facilities on Indian reservations, modernization and extension of small post offices, and other authorized public works.

That is about 30 percent of the funds that have been allocated to Federal agencies who do their own construction substantially. That, of course, is 100 percent Federal.

The agencies we are talking about are the Forest Service, the Agriculture Department, the Bureau of Indian Affairs of Interior, several others in Interior; Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers.

The largest, Paul, are Interior and Agriculture?

Mr. SOUTHWICK. Yes.

Mr. BATT. Now the larger share, the 70-percent share, $251 million, has been earmarked for State and local projects. You see, the Congress said to give priority to the stuff that comes out of the communities, and this has been committed for waterworkers and water pollution control, for sewers, streets, hospitals, libraries, for police and fire stations, for public buildings, and many other types of needed community facilities for which communities put up matching funds.

About 50 percent of all the applications to CFA over here, Community Facilities Administration, are for sewer and water lines. I personally never realized how many communities didn't have any sewer lines or any water lines.

The response from local governments has been gratifyingly quick, demonstrating the strong desire of local communities to alleviate unemployment, and to get these public works built.

Our latest available figures, at the end of January, disclosed the following applications, expected to meet program standards, are on hand: Over in HHFA, CFA, $724 million. This is the backlog. This we haven't gotten to yet. HEW—and this is administered by the Public Health Service, waste treatment works $218 million, and hospitals $127 million, for a total backlog of $1.069 million.

And let me say parenthetically—this isn't in the printed statement—they are coming in at the rate of about $300 million every month.

Is that a fair statement, Paul?

The President is sending to Congress, sent to Congress yesterday a supplemental appropriation of $500 million to carry on this program. This sum was forecast in the 1964 budget recently transmitted to the Congress, and will exhaust the $900 million authorized in the accelerated Public Works Act.

It is clear, therefore, that there are already on hand more than enough applications for Federal and local projects to use up the funds authorized by the Congress for this program. Accordingly, the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are suspending the accelerated public works program except for those especially hard-hit areas which have already been allowed matching ratios in excess of 50 percent. This is a relative handful of areas, about 20 percent of the total, where the unemployment is so severe that Congress directed us to provide matching ratios higher than 50 percent, going up to a total of 75 percent.

While applications from all areas will continue to be accepted and dated as to time of receipt, they will receive no further processing unless they are located in the hardest hit areas referred to previously.

Status of APW projects approved, by type of project, as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

State	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months on-site employment
Alabama	41	$4,254	7,028
Alaska	16	2,699	1,928
Arizona	15	2,935	4,192
Arkansas	60	1,274	2,542
California	62	6,916	8,732
Colorado	16	1,630	2,362
Connecticut	19	1,602	2,412
Delaware	2	93	223
Florida	25	3,099	5,407
Georgia	36	4,012	4,981
Hawaii	1	134	1,752
Idaho	37	2,367	2,645
Illinois	49	3,234	5,331
Indiana	25	1,758	3,413
Kansas	3	115	193
Kentucky	61	4,629	8,486
Louisiana	29	6,126	14,055
Maine	1	360	432
Maryland	3	158	583
Massachusetts	15	4,036	5,946
Michigan	111	15,814	20,952
Minnesota	41	4,196	6,230
Mississippi	27	2,302	5,611
Missouri	65	4,254	4,784
Montana	31	1,616	2,573
Nebraska	5	596	827
Nevada	2	200	276
New Hampshire	3	420	528
New Jersey	20	8,632	13,869
New Mexico	57	3,347	4,256
New York	28	6,284	7,130
North Carolina	46	3,032	5,370
North Dakota	2	275	528
Ohio	32	6,097	8,816
Oklahoma	23	3,430	7,944
Oregon	36	3,357	4,220
Pennsylvania	80	15,829	20,757
Rhode Island	6	2,786	2,196
South Carolina	20	1,400	1,524
South Dakota	3	650	1,104
Tennessee	32	5,538	14,112
Texas	27	2,627	4,808
Utah	34	1,211	1,746
Vermont	1	366	878
Virginia	11	100	209
Washington	46	4,144	3,281
West Virginia	56	6,017	5,365
Wisconsin	37	1,110	2,812
Wyoming	8	384	382
Puerto Rico	10	721	607
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

Status of APW projects approved, by agency and bureau, as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

Agency and bureau	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months on-site employment
Agriculture: Forest Service	741	$14,961	21,192
Army: Corps of Engineers	55	9,392	10,304
Commerce: Bureau of Public Roads	34	8,141	5,436
Health, Education, and Welfare: Public Health Service	181	40,004	56,951

Status of APW projects approved, by agency and bureau, as of Dec. 15, 1962—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

Agency and bureau	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months on-site employment
Housing and Home Finance Agency: Community Facilities Administration	352	72,969	118,383
Interior:			
Bureau of Land Management	11	1,972	2,784
Bureau of Indian Affairs	19	5,701	9,984
National Park Service	10	1,736	5,310
Commercial Fisheries	1	380	540
Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	12	2,910	5,454
Total, Interior	53	12,699	24,072
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

Status of APW projects approved, by type of area, as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

Area	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months onsite employment
5(a)	340	$51,088	67,599
5(b)	809	49,771	76,607
5(br)	20	5,310	9,296
LS	247	51,997	82,836
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

Status of APW projects approved by States as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

Type	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months on site employment
Construction and improvements:			
Hospital and health facilities	72	$21,639	31,598
Administrative building	47	12,627	19,774
All other buildings	44	5,340	6,914
Road and streets	261	20,965	24,171
Airports	5	1,374	2,448
Water, sewage facilities and other utilities	192	41,661	70,416
Waste treatment works	113	19,503	27,562
Recreational facilities	50	9,337	15,667
Water resources projects	15	3,355	3,626
Fish and wildlife facilities	9	2,180	4,662
All other construction	234	7,766	9,010
Repairs: All types of repairs	170	7,100	9,809
Conservation measures: All types of conservation	204	5,329	10,681
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

EXCHANGE OF LANDS BETWEEN POWELL, WYO., AND THE PRESBYTERIAN RETIREMENT FACILITIES CORP.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would permit the exchange of certain lands between the town of Powell, Wyo., and the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp. This bill will remove impediments to the transfer of these lands. This organization, the Presbyterian Retirement Facilties Corp., intends to build a retirement home in the town of Powell, which will cost approximately $1 million. The junior Senator from Wyoming feels that the Senate and the Federal Government should do all that can be done to encourage private citizens and organizations to engage in this type of activity and development.

This retirement home will serve both the States of Wyoming and Montana.

I compliment the citizens of the town of Powell for their public spirit and for their desire to help serve the needs of their people and the people of that general area.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be referred to the proper committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1122) relating to the exchange of certain lands between the town of Powell, Wyo., and the Presbyterian Retirement Facilties Corp., introduced by Mr. Simpson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LOWER TETON RECLAMATION PROJECT, IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and for my colleague, the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], a bill to authorize construction of the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project, in Idaho.

The principal engineering feature of this project is a dam and reservoir at the Fremont site on the Teton River, a tributary of the Snake, in the high country of eastern Idaho. It includes also a pumping plant, a powerplant, transmission facilities, canals and water distribution facilities, ground water development, and related works.

The public purposes to be served by the project include river regulation and flood control, the irrigation of arid and semiarid lands in the upper Snake River Valley, the incidental generation of hydroelectric power, the conservation and development of fish and wildlife and the enhancement of recreation opportunities.

The dam itself would be an earthfill structure, 310 feet high, 2,500 feet in crest length. It would impound 315,000 acre-feet of water, of which 200,000 acre-feet would be active capacity. It is proposed to provide supplemental irrigation water to 114,400 acres of land presently under cultivation with a short water supply, and to irrigate 37,000 acres of land presently under dry land cultivation. The electric generating facilities are relatively modest, consisting of 22,000 kilowatts installed capacity, with most of this allocated to pumping and other project uses. Facilities to develop fish and wildlife resources, and to provide basic recreation facilities have been developed in cooperation with the appropriate State and Federal agencies, and are included in the project plan. Effectiveness of storage in the proposed Fremont Reservoir for flood control on the Teton River, the lower Henry's Fork, and on the Snake River below the mouth of Henry's Fork has been carefully appraised by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. President, the project has one striking feature which will be of interest to the Senate. It is almost entirely free from controversy. Idaho irrigators have long favored storage projects near the headwaters of our major river system. This is such a project. The value of the flood control features has been demonstrated by a series of losses on the Teton, Henry's Fork, and the Snake, which Corps of Engineers' studies show to be preventable only by a project of the type here proposed; local flood control works are not feasible in the areas affected. Fish and wildlife interests have been carefully protected in the project plan, and conservationists support it. The power features of the project are not controversial. In short, this is a project which clearly meets the needs of all major groups in the area, and it enjoys their full support. The principal difficulties in bringing it to the point of authorization have been largely technical, involving careful search for a location and a plan which would best serve the several purposes contemplated. These have now been resolved.

I offer the authorizing legislation with full confidence that the project proposed will stand up under the careful scrutiny it should have, in committee and in the Senate, and in the hope that it will be authorized during this session of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague [Mr. Church] in sponsoring this bill, which would authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project in Idaho. As my colleague just pointed out, this project has wide support throughout Idaho. Indicative of this wide support is the fact that both houses of the State legislature recently passed a memorial endorsing this project by a unanimous vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Memorial 3 of the Idaho State Legislature be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the senate joint memorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 3 of the Legislature of the State of Idaho

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 37th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

Whereas what is known as the Lower Teton project, situated in the County of Fremont, State of Idaho, and included in the recent comprehensive study of the Snake River by the United States Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers is highly essential to the uninterrupted growth and stability of Idaho agriculture; the economic benefits thereby accumulating to this great State particularly and the United States generally being many times greater than the cost of this project; and

Whereas the waters of the Teton River constitute a significant portion of the irrigation supplies available to eastern Idaho and, indeed, all of the Snake River Area and are therefore an important part of the water resource which is the foundation of our economic and industrial strength; and

Whereas if the irrigated farms of Idaho are to be maintained as secure units and survive in this technological age of specialized agriculture and its associated high operating costs, it is imperative that our present storage reservoirs be supplemented with new facilities to store the high water near its source, thereby further eliminating the danger of drought and its attendant hardships in all of the irrigated areas of the Snake River; and

Whereas each succeeding board of county commissioners has, since the creation of Madison and Fremont Counties, been confronted with the serious annual problem of the wild, ravaging Teton River, all of which conditions would be eliminated through the construction of said project; and

Whereas even in years of mild snowfall in the watershed, the Teton River can be depended upon to provide at least several weeks of round-the-clock effort to protect private and public property from the flood water of the Teton. Madison County maintains 11 bridges across the Teton, 2 with steel spans, 3 reinforced concrete and 6 lumber bridges. Many times, serious damage to these structures has resulted from the uncontrollable destructive force of the flooding Teton. The bridges blocked by ice jams and the normal debris of high water become dams—forcing the floodwaters out onto surrounding farming lands destroying its productive capacity for 1, 2, or 3 years. The Idaho State Highway Department maintains four bridges across the Teton within the boundaries of Fremont and Madison Counties and the Union Pacific Railroad system has three. Each of these bridges has, in the past, been the source of serious trouble and great maintenance expense because of the uncontrolled flooding Teton; and

Whereas each year, almost without exception, many square miles south and west of Teton City lie underwater as a result of the Teton flooding, and frequently private homes and storage facilities are jeopardized. Because of the slow and meandering course of the Teton it is impossible to predict where it will strike next; and

Whereas eastern Idaho counties maintain hundreds of miles of oil road—not including State or Federal highways—the foundations become sponge-like under the saturation of floodwaters so that even light loads break the mat into thousands of pieces making complete resurfacing necessary; and

Whereas the benefits of flood control, irrigation and associated economic expansion has justified consideration by the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Army Engineers and our recommendation for construction of the Lower Teton Reservoir without delay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to give early consideration to and construction of the Lower Teton Reservoir with the least possible delay; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Army Engineers and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the United States.

W. E. Drevlow,
President of the Senate.
Pete T. Cenarrusa,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, most of the large and important multiple-purpose dams on the principal rivers of the Northwest have already been constructed. Now it is important that we turn to the building of the smaller dams on the tributaries and feeder streams of the major rivers. If the Congress approves the construction of this dam on the Lower Teton, we will be doing much to stabilize our watersheds and protect to the fullest extent multiple uses of our downstream water. By the proper programing and development of our upper watersheds, we are not only helping the economy of those people in the local areas immediately concerned, but we are also protecting the economy of those who depend on the mainstream.

This type of operation—building smaller dams and reservoirs on the tributaries and feeder streams—is never as glamorous and spectacular as the building of the high dams with their beautiful big lakes which spread for miles. But they may be even more important in full resource development.

This particular project is in the proper place to demonstrate multiple purpose—flood control, irrigation, power, and recreation—and the fact that the local people are spontaneous in their approval indicates they believe this project at this site will give them the maximum benefits.

It pleases me very much to know that we in Idaho are now on the way to meeting the problem of stabilizing our watersheds by planning projects such as this. This is a step in the right direction, and I trust that the Congress will give speedy consideration to this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1123) to provide for the construction of the Lower Teton division of the Teton Basin Federal reclamation project, Idaho, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Church, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF NEVADA STATEHOOD

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, next year will mark the 100th anniversary of Nevada's statehood. In keeping with the spirit of this notable occasion, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to strike and furnish to the Nevada Centennial Commission 20,000 silver medals.

At a later date, Mr. President, I shall speak in more detail on the remarkable history of my native State. At this time, however, I deem it appropriate to point out that Nevada entered the Union during a time of great conflict. Less than a year after its admission as the 36th State, the war between the States had ended, and the great President who made possible that statehood was the victim of an assassin's bullet.

Out of this modest beginning, Mr. President, grew a State that has enriched our Nation in manifold ways. From the fabulous mines of the Comstock Lode in Virginia City poured gold and silver that provided the needed stimulus for the burgeoning of San Francisco as the metropolis of the West. That same Virginia City also provided the Nation with one of its most brilliant scientists. I refer to Albert Michelson, the renowned physicist who developed techniques for measuring the speed of light, and was the first American to receive the Nobel Prize for Science, in 1907. And it was Albert Michelson's brother, Charles, a highly competent newspaperman, who gained fame as President Franklin Roosevelt's chief press strategist.

Mark Twain began his newspaper career on the Territorial Enterprise in Virginia City, having come west with his brother Orion, who was Nevada's territorial secretary of state.

Nevada's history is peopled with many luminaries, but the growth and its progress can be measured more by those nameless individuals who had an undimmed faith in their State's future and worked accordingly toward a goal of greater progress for the generations that were to follow.

Ours is a glorious history, Mr. President, and I am sure that passage of this measure providing special medals for Nevada's centennial will contribute materially to the observance that is being planned for 1964.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1125) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of Nevada to statehood, introduced by Mr. Bible (for himself and Mr. Cannon), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

GOLDEN CIRCLE DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a development survey of the recreation resources of the magnificent Golden Circle area which surrounds the four corners area of Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico. The survey would be made in cooperation with the Governors of the four States and the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and appropriate State, local, and Indian agencies.

At present, separate Federal and State agencies are making isolated plans for the development of this area. I feel it is time that a program be devised for overall, related development of the area, so that both Federal and State agencies, as well as private enterprise and local tourist and recreation groups in the various communities, can work more closely together. We need to assess the present situation and future needs so that all can begin to move toward a common goal.

This area is famous as the only place in our country where four States touch. More important, it is without question the most spectacular area of erosional grandeur in America. Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall named it "the Golden Circle" after he and I traveled it on foot, by boat, and by helicopter in the summer of 1961. He observed at that time that it "included the greatest concentration of scenic wonders to be found in the country, if not in the world." I am sure that anyone who has seen even part of the rainbow and sunset-hued canyons, majestic spires and weird erosion formations, deep gorges, rivers, mountains, deserts, and prehistoric Indian ruins of the Golden Circle will agree.

At the present, over 80 percent of the land is in Federal or trusteeship ownership, and there are five separate Federal agencies which have land management responsibilities in the area—the National Park Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Bureau of Reclamation. At least four of these five have major programs for the construction of highways, roads, and trails within the region, in addition to the Bureau of Public Roads, and State and county road construction agencies of the four States. Eight of the fifteen counties in the immediate Golden Circle area have been classified as low-income counties for purposes of the Area Redevelopment Act.

A major objective of the survey would be to study efforts now underway to establish easier public access to the national parks and monuments and to the associated scenic, recreation, and Indian areas of the four States. Recommendations would be made for additional roads or trails which must be built if the area is to be provided with the network of roads it must eventually have. Our aim should be to provide easy access not only to each of the scenic areas, but between them, so that a visitor to one of the Golden Circle attractions will be encouraged to go on and see others, and to stay in the area for several days.

Additionally, the study would be aimed at finding ways and means of stimulating economic development of the region through increased tourism and recreation activities. To do this we need an inventory of present resources and facilities, which, tied in with the inventory of present roads and the recommendations for future ones, will point the way for coordinated development by Government and private agencies, and by private capital. For example, the survey should serve as a guide for private investors who want to develop tourist accommodations, and other commercial enterprises to serve the greatly increased tourist trade expected in the area.

Within the Circle are 16 national parks and monuments, and just outside within an easy drive are 8 others. My own state has Bryce and Zion National Parks and Arches, Capitol Reef, Cedar Breaks, Natural Bridges, and Rainbow Bridge National Monuments. Part of Hovenweep National Monument straddles the Utah-Colorado line. Canyonlands National Park, which I am proposing in S. 27, lies in the heart of the Circle in southeastern Utah's colorful landscape.

In Colorado, Mesa Verde National Park lies within the Circle, and the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument is not far outside. Aztec Ruins, Chaco Canyon, and El Morro National Monuments are located in New Mexico. Arizona's portion of the Circle contains the famed Grand Canyon National Park and Canyon de Chelly, Navajo, Wupatki, Pipe Spring, and Sunset Crater National Monuments.

In addition to the scenic wonders, an integral part of the appeal of the area comes from the Indian culture there—which ranges from the modern to the prehistoric. The present-day Navajo and Hopi Indian Reservations constitute a substantial portion of the land area of the Circle itself. The culture of the early cliffdwellers is preserved at Mesa Verde, and in the pueblo country of New Mexico to the east. Still further back in time, some of the earliest Indian pictographs are visible in Canyonlands and elsewhere—irreplaceable relics of a culture and a way of life which flourished in this region more than 800 years ago.

As if all of this were not enough, the miracle of modern engineering is creating in the very center of the area the great Lake Powell Reservoir which is backing up behind the Glen Canyon Dam. The left diversion tunnel of the dam was closed only last Wednesday, and it is expected that by midsummer Lake Powell will be 150 miles long, and reach a point above Hite, Utah. This heralds the beginning of boating and other year-round recreation on a great manmade lake which will eventually exceed 65 square miles in area.

The entire Golden Circle area, which sweeps across four States, possesses a unique unity, arising from the very vastness of time and space. It is a geographic, economic, and social entity, and it is to the recognition of this unity that my bill is addressed.

My fellow members on the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will recall the economic study of the proposed Canyonlands National Park by the University of Utah. This survey will draw heavily on the material developed in the university study—expanding and implementing it as necessary. That study, you will remember, indicates that the establishment of Canyonlands, as proposed by my bill, could attract half a million tourists each year to the State of Utah. In reference to the Golden Circle concept, the reports point out that the proposed Canyonlands National Park would be greatly benefited if the public came to think in terms of a more or less unified area offering an enormously diversified range of recreation sites. Conversely, I venture to say that all existing parks and monuments would benefit from the establishment of Canyonlands as would associated State, local, or private facilities. It is clear, therefore, that the opportunities for economic advancement in the 15-county area of the 4 States would be further enhanced by the comprehensive and coordinated development of the Golden Circle concept.

In order to give at least a surface indication of the vast economic potential of regional park and recreation development, I should like to refer again to the University of Utah's economic study. Between 1951 and 1961, the year in which the study was conducted, the number of visitors to national parks and monuments of the Golden Circle grew at an average rate of 7 percent a year. In 1961, nearly 3 million people passed through the 15-county area and stayed anywhere from a few hours to more than a week. They bought food, lodging, personal services, and gasoline in an amount estimated to be in excess of $28 million, thus generating $7.7 million indirect personal income to retailers and employees. Based on the assumption that the Glen Canyon Recreation Area and the Canyonlands National Park are completed, university economists estimate that over 15 million people will visit the Golden Circle in another 25 years. Expenditures of these visitors could, by that time, be as much as $169 million a year.

Now the reliability of these estimates can be assessed only after the passage of time. I feel, however, that if time proves the estimates wrong, the estimate will have been made on the conservative side. In 1962, for example, 3,142,000 visitors traveled to the Golden Circle's national parks and monuments. This represents better than a 9-percent increase over 1961's attendance figure of 2,877,000 people. The largest numerical increase occurred at Grand Canyon National Park where nearly 200,000 more people visited in 1962 than the year before.

I believe the evidence at hand clearly indicates that optimum long-run economic benefits will accrue to the 15-county area only through the protection and orderly development of the Golden Circle's most valuable asset—the remarkable unique quality of the scenic resources. Since careful study is a prerequisite in any development plan, I am asking that $150,000 be appropriated to finance this first step.

On March 11, this body passed S. 20, the enabling legislation for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, which points up the national need—and support—for coordinated recreation planning among Federal and State agencies. The bill I am introducing today is in harmony with S. 20—and I presume that the survey would be conducted by that Bureau.

But I emphasize that this would be a survey of and by an area—a survey in which the States and local agencies would cooperate and would have full opportunity to make recommendations. Likewise, its purpose is not only to help State and Federal agencies to direct their planning toward a common goal, but to point out opportunities for private capital in the area, and to promote the economic development of the cities and

towns which lie within the circle and in its associated areas.

The success of any plans that may be recommended by the study will depend to a considerable degree on the cooperation and initiative of private interests.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1132) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct, in cooperation with the States and interested Federal agencies, a development survey of the recreational resources of the Golden Circle of National Parks and Monument and associated scenic, recreation and Indian areas in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Utah, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF FISHERY MARKETING ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Fishery Marketing Act.

On April 2, 1962, in the 87th Congress, Senator BARTLETT joined with me in the introduction of legislation that warranted the attention of the Congress and all who have concern for the welfare of our fishing industry. Hearings were held in Seattle, Ketchikan, Petersburg, Anchorage, Dillingham, and Kodiak on October 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and November 8, 1962. From these hearings came this decision to reintroduce an amended version of that bill, S. 3093, an act to make clear that fishermen's organizations, regardless of their technical legal status, have a voice in the ex vessel sale of fish or other aquatic products on which the livelihood of their members depends.

Today's proposal has for its broad purpose the establishment of a sound economics relationship between fishermen, fish dealers, and canners—a relationship beneficial to the further development of the fishing industry and of service to the public interest.

This bill would amend the Fisheries Marketing Act of 1934, an act originally designed to provide fishermen as primary producers with the right of self-association for cooperative improvement of their conditions. The amendment seeks to bring the Marketing Act up to date by relating it to the practical problems that presently cloud the rights of fishermen to associate themselves together, whether in unions or cooperatives, and collectively bargain for a fair return on the fish harvested by their labors at sea.

The need for this legislation has grown steadily more urgent during recent years. The reasons are complex but generally boil down to a single major consideration. As a result of antitrust actions and Federal Trade Commission rulings, many fishermen find themselves in what amounts to a legal no man's land when it comes to bargaining collectively with fish buyers over the conditions and price under which they will deliver their fish. Likewise the buyers, be they dealers or canners, cannot engage in group bargaining with fishermen.

Many harmful results flow from this unusual condition. First and foremost is that fishermen and buyers, often at the height of the harvesting season, have disagreements over the price of fish. Unable to bargain out their differences around a table, they engage in a constant and sometimes lengthy bickering. Meanwhile, all suffer losses; fishery management and conservation deteriorates; needed technological improvements fail to materialize and an important basic industry slips steadily backward.

The existing unstable relationships did not arise overnight, nor are they the product of any particular group or governmental agency. The problem arose primarily because of the peculiar circumstances of the industry itself, because of the unique status of the fisherman as a sort of combination producer-worker-independent entrepreneur. In short, fishermen simply do not fit into the legal patterns created for other groups.

Undoubtedly, there is no quick prescription to produce stable relationships in the fishing industry. However, the Marketing Act does appear to offer the most constructive possibilities. It has already been relied upon extensively and can best be adapted to the special characteristics of the industry. What would seem to be in order is that the Marketing Act be amended to clearly establish the legal right of all fishermen to organize into associations of their own choosing, unions or cooperatives, and the reciprocal right of such associations and buyers or associations of buyers to engage in collective bargaining over fish prices or other methods of compensation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1135) to make clear that fishermen's organizations, regardless of their technical legal status, have a voice in the ex vessel sale of fish or other aquatic products on which the livelihood of their members depends, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

USE OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD RECORDS AND TESTIMONY OF BOARD PERSONNEL REGARDING AIRCRAFT ACCIDENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board relating to the bill, and a statement of the purpose and need for the proposal be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1136) relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, D.C., February 27, 1963.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Civil Aeronautics Board recommends to the Congress for its consideration the enclosed draft of a proposed bill relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents.

The Board has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the transmission of the draft bill to the Congress from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN S. BOYD,
Chairman.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION—A BILL "RELATING TO THE USE OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD RECORDS AND TESTIMONY OF BOARD PERSONNEL REGARDING AIRCRAFT ACCIDENTS"

Pursuant to sections 701 and 702 of the Federal Aviation Act, the Civil Aeronautics Board is charged with responsibility for investigating and determining the probable cause of accidents involving civil aircraft, and making reports concerning such accidents. This function is discharged in large measure by investigators employed by the Board's Bureau of Safety. Written reports are prepared by these investigators as to all accidents investigated by them, which embody their factual observations and conclusions. These reports are submitted to the Board and form the basis for the Board's accident reports.

Section 701 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 continues a provision of the Civil Aeronautics Act prohibiting the introduction in evidence in liability litigation cases of Board reports relating to the investigation of the accidents involved in such litigation. Since such Board reports would in any event be ruled inadmissible under the law of evidence upon objection of any opposing party, the congressional purpose in absolutely excluding them clearly is to protect the integrity of the Board's accident investigation function by preventing involvement thereof in liability litigation. The statute as now worded, however, does not literally cover expert opinion evidence given by way of live testimony of Board accident investigation personnel. Yet in some jurisdictions expert testimony is compellable by subpena.

In an effort to provide assistance to private litigants where necessary for the purpose of establishing the facts concerning a particular accident, and at the same time to avoid undue interference with its duties and functions, the Board, under authority of its rulemaking powers (Federal Aviation Act, secs. 204, 701, 49 U.S.C. 1324, 1441), has promulgated regulations governing the disclosure of information relating to accidents and the appearance of its investigators as witnesses. These regulations, in brief, provide for the disclosure of the factual observations of investigators and the withholding from disclosure of their expert conclusions and opinions. Accident investigators may testify, preferable by deposition, only as to facts observed by them, and then only after permission has been granted by the Board upon a showing that the factual information is not readily available from any other source. Investigators also are prohibited from producing Board records except where authorized by the Board. These regulations and their bases were the subject of detailed discussion in *Universal Airlines* v. *Eastern Air Lines*, 188 F. 2d 993, and apparently were regarded by the court as reasonable. The court there held that the courts ordinarily should receive the deposition of a Board investigator rather than require his personal attendance and that opinion evidence should not be required. The court stated, however (188 F. 2d at pp. 999, 1000): "That in any case where the CAB investigator is the sole source of evidence reasonably available to the parties, with regard to the precise position and condition of aircraft after a disaster, we deem it to be incumbent upon the Civil Aeronautics Authority to make his testimony available by deposition or in person; if the deposition is not forthcoming or is insufficient, the court has power to order his personal attendance."

The procedures and principles enunciated in the Universal case provide a basis whereby both private and public interests may be safeguarded. Under those procedures, no private litigant will be denied factual testimony essential to establishing his case. At the same time, requests for testimony of accident investigators are kept to a minimum since, in most cases, the physical facts relating to an accident are not in dispute, and investigators are desired as witnesses primarily for the purpose of providing expert testimony. Moreover, advance requests for permission to take an investigator's deposition or for his appearance in court permit a scheduling of duties so that minimum interference results to the Board's functions. However, the Board's regulations often are overlooked or ignored, and subpenas are served upon investigators without prior resort to the procedures established by the Board's regulations.

The Board therefore proposes legislation which, in a form binding on all courts, (1) prohibits expert opinion testimony by the Board's accident investigation personnel in liability litigation; and (2) restricts factual testimony to cases where factual evidence is not reasonably available from other sources.

Comparison With Existing Law: Title VII—Aircraft Accident Investigation Accidents Involving Civil Aircraft—Use of Board Records and Testimony of Board Personnel as Evidence

Section 701. (e) No part of any report or reports of the Board relating to any accident or the investigation thereof, shall be admitted as evidence or used in any suit or action for damages growing out of any matter mentioned in such report or reports. Members or employees of the Board who have directly engaged in the investigation of an aircraft accident shall not give expert or opinion testimony concerning such accidents in any such suit or action. Factual testimony of Board personnel on matters observed in accident investigation shall be required only where the Board initially, or the court before which such suit or action is pending, determines that the evidence is not reasonably available by other means. Unless otherwise authorized by the court, such factual testimony shall be taken only by deposition upon oral examination or written interrogatories, pursuant to regulations issued by the Board.

OREGON DUNES NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, an Oregon Dunes National Seashore comprised of some 42,000 acres of Oregon's spectacular coastline, including adjacent forested slopes and fresh water lakes, would be established under a bill which I now introduce.

The proposed Oregon Dunes Seashore, which I visited last week with the esteemed Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, would extend south from the mouth of the Siuslaw River for about 40 miles. In addition to the magnificent beach area, the boundaries would include all or parts of 14 lakes. Most of the land area involved is presently in Federal, county, or State ownership. Acquisition costs, will be relatively modest, in my opinion.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that the bill I am introducing today is substantially different from the bill I introduced in the 87th Congress. This new version excludes from boundaries of the new national park unit the highly developed residential and summer home sections of Woahink and Siltcoos Lakes. Moreover, this new bill prohibits the Secretary of Interior from acquiring improved residential property by condemnation. Property of this type within the boundaries of the national seashore can only be acquired by exchange, purchase, or donation.

I also wish to point out that the new proposal will permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters within the Oregon Dunes National Seashore, in accordance with laws of the State of Oregon.

Mr. President, in my opinion this new legislation will give Oregon and the Nation a seashore area of unparalleled beauty, with proper protection for its scenic, scientific, and recreation values. During our visit to the area, last week, Secretary Udall reaffirmed the administration's hopes for establishing the new national seashore.

Aside from its scientific and scenic significance nationally, the Oregon Dunes are of vast importance to the economy of my State. This area has great recreation potential. Present and future generations need expanded outdoor facilities for relaxation and for the enjoyment of nature. Through Federal park development, Oregon would have another magnet for bringing tourist dollars to our economy, thereby creating new payrolls and income. An economic study by Dr. Granville Jensen, chairman of the department of national resources, at Oregon State University, shows that tourist business in the Oregon coast area alone would increase $18 million annually in the years after an Oregon Dunes National Seashore Park is developed.

In redrafting this legislation, I have endeavored to meet all of the various points of view that have been expressed, and, in the process, to make certain that we shall protect an important scenic and recreational resource, while at the same time promoting both economic growth and stability in this important area along the Pacific coast.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1137) to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes, introduced by Mrs. Neuberger, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, at this point will the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BIBLE. I wish to commend the Senator from Oregon for her great interest in the Oregon Dunes National Seashore. I realize that her interest in it is of long standing, just as the interest in it of her late, great husband, was also of long standing.

I do not recall the exact statistics; but certainly we have all too few miles of national seashores in the United States. Of course, the first was Cape Hatteras; the second was Cape Cod National Seashore, in the State represented by the distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. Kennedy]; the third was at Point Reyes, on the Pacific Coast; and the fourth was at Padre Island, on the Gulf of Mexico.

I hope we shall move forward in this direction, because very, very few miles of our national seashore are left for the development of projects such as this.

I assure the distinguished Senator from Oregon that as chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, which is chargeable with the consideration of measures relating to lake, seashore, and park problems, we shall do our very best to schedule an early hearing on the bill she is introducing; and I commend her very highly for her great interest in this area.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Nevada, who has long taken a great interest in the matter of establishing these seashore parks. He has referred to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], and to the Cape Cod National Seashore. I am reminded of the fact that after the Cape Cod National Seashore was established, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] sent out a delightful Christmas card, that year, with a picture of the dunes on Cape Cod, and under the picture was the caption "Massachusetts' Gift to the Nation." I chided the Senator from Massachusetts a little about that, and said I thought the caption should have been, "The Nation's Gift to Massachusetts," because the Cape Cod National Seashore is of such great value to the Nation and to the State in which that park is located.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to associate myself with the purpose of the Senator from Oregon and the remarks of the Senator from Nevada. This Oregon Dunes Seashore is a magnificent project, and I hope it will be included in our national seashores, as an important addition to those created by the 86th Congress. I concur with the comments of the Senator from Oregon, and I shall be glad to support this project.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Alaska.

DISAPPROVAL OF RAILROAD MERGERS UNTIL DECEMBER 31, 1964

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce on behalf of Senator Jackson and myself, for appropriate reference, a bill which would provide that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall not approve any railroad mergers until December 31, 1964. This measure should settle the problems of committee jurisdiction that came into question when a bill, S. 942, designed for the same purpose but amending the Clayton Act, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. The goal of the bill introduced today—as it is of S. 942—is to delay approval by the Commission of pending mergers or consolidations of railroads until such time as there can be a review of the criteria by which these mergers are judged.

The jurisdiction and authority of the Committee on the Judiciary and of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly to investigate mergers or consolidations in any industry which affect the public interest is not questioned. However, it is the earnest belief of the Committee on Commerce that any proposed alteration or amendment of the transportation laws should be given primary consideration by our committee. Section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act sets the standards for railroad mergers—the criteria to be applied and the procedures to be followed by the ICC in passing upon applications for consolidation or merger. This section is not separate or divorced from the rest of the Interstate Commerce Act, but is an intrinsic part of the whole spectrum of transportation legislation.

Consideration of this bill is particularly timely in view of the Report of the Interagency Committee on Transport Mergers released by the White House on March 6, 1963. The report, an executive document, listed 10 criteria "which should be pursued in the evaluation of proposed mergers in order to determine whether they are in the public interest." These standards are advisory only in their application by the agency charged with examining and deciding pending cases since the Interstate Commerce Commission is independent of the executive branch.

It, therefore, becomes the duty of Congress and, more particularly, of the Commerce Committees of Congress, to decide whether these criteria should be specifically applied.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1138) to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission not to approve or authorize, until December 31, 1964, the consolidation or merger of carriers by railroad subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, introduced by Mr. Magnuson (for himself and Mr. Jackson), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPEAL OF PORTION OF SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1943

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942—56 Stat. 990, 999—as amended, and for other purposes, together with a letter to the President of the Senate from Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Jr., Acting Administrator of the General Services Administration, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and the letter from Mr. Knott appear at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1139) to repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Young of Ohio, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second paragraph under the heading "Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration" in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943 (56 Stat. 990 at 999), as amended by the act of October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 930), is amended by striking out all beginning with "*Provided further,* That effective on the date of this enactment" down through "without exchange of funds."

The letter presented by Mr. Young of Ohio is as follows:

General Services Administration,
Washington, D.C., January 9, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There is transmitted herewith for referral to the appropriate committee, a draft bill prepared by this agency "To repeal a portion of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, approved October 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 990, 999), as amended, and for other purposes."

This proposal is part of the legislative program of General Services Administration for 1963.

The language to be repealed constitutes section 317 of title 40 of the United States Code, which relates generally to the purchase and installation of air-conditioning equipment in Government-owned or leased buildings in the District of Columbia, and reads as follows:

"All electric fans, water-cooling units and air-conditioning equipment procured by a Federal activity, except Government-owned corporations, and which are now, or may hereafter be, installed in Government-owned or leased buildings in the District of Columbia and area adjacent thereto, operated by the Administrator of General Services, shall be and remain in the custody and under the control of said Administrator without exchange of funds and irrespective of the appropriations from which such items were procured or the source from which they were obtained, and existing appropriations or, unless specifically so provided, future appropriations, other than appropriations to the Administrator of General Services, shall not be available for the purchase or installation of the equipment enumerated herein in such buildings, such restrictions shall not apply, however, to ventilating and temperature and humidity control equipment for special laboratory, scientific, and research purposes, the cost of the purchase and installation of which may be borne from the appropriations of the particular Federal agency utilizing such equipment, but such installations shall be subject to approval by the General Services Administration and subsequent to its installation the equipment shall be maintained and operated by the General Services Administration and shall remain under the custody and control of such Administration without exchange of funds."

This act has been the subject of much misinterpretation and misunderstanding on the part of the tenant agencies and has been the source of friction between representatives of General Services Administration and other agencies for the reasons stated below. The need for this act has long since run its course, since regulations issued pursuant to title II of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, require General Services Administration's approval of air-conditioning equipment in buildings operated by it and provide for the installation to be made by General Services Administration on a reimbursable basis.

In this age of mechanization air conditioning has become almost a necessity, largely because of the requirement therefor in the installation and operation of electronic data processing and other heat-emitting or constant temperature machines. General Services Administration cannot possibly foresee and budget for air conditioning essential to the operation of such machines, which may be installed at any time. Under the present law we can accept reimbursement for air conditioning and similar equipment in the District of Columbia only if it is determined to be for special laboratory, scientific, and research purposes, language so vague as to make the determination extremely difficult in many instances, but at the same time too narrow to cover many purposes for which electronic data-processing equipment is now being used.

In addition, the present trend toward block-type building design and the use of interior space in other types of buildings create a particular problem when heat-emitting equipment is used in nonventilated space. The normal design does not provide sufficient cooling to compensate for process equipment necessitating supplemental air-conditioning equipment, the need for which General Services Administration cannot anticipate. Unless we are permitted to accept reimbursement for this equipment, it may render the space unusable for the purposes intended.

The entire subject of reimbursement from the various departments and agencies which General Services Administration services has recently undergone a thorough analysis and a series of guidelines have been established which are more than adequate to cover the problem of accepting reimbursement for air conditioning in the District of Columbia.

For the reasons stated above, prompt and favorable consideration of the enclosed draft bill is recommended.

Enactment of this legislation will not increase the budgetary requirements of the General Services Administration.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
Lawson B. Knott, Jr.,
Acting Administrator.

A BILL TO REPEAL A PORTION OF THE SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1943, APPROVED OCTOBER 26, 1942 (56 STAT. 990, 999), AS AMENDED, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second paragraph under the heading "Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration" in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943 (56 Stat. 990 at 999), as amended by the act of October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 930), is amended by striking out all beginning with "*Provided further,* That effective on the date of this enactment" down through "without exchange of funds."

NATIONAL LAKESHORE AT PICTURED ROCKS, MICH.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a new bill for the establishment of a national lakeshore at Pictured Rocks, in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

This area was one of three on the shoreline of the Great Lakes which the National Park Service selected as worthy of Federal investment as units of the national park system.

Since Senator McNAMARA and I introduced the first Pictured Rocks bill in 1961, we have held numerous conferences with property owners in the area, with representatives on the National Park Service, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. We believe we have evolved a bill which will help meet the outdoor recreation needs of the Nation while at the same time preserving the rights of property owners and contributing to the economy of the area.

The bill which we introduce today embodies the following features:

It establishes a national lakeshore of aproximately 67,000 acres on the south shore of Lake Superior, stretching from Munising to Grand Marais;

It creates an "inland buffer zone," back from the shoreline but within the boundaries of the lakeshore. Within this inland buffer zone, property would remain in private ownership, first, if it is improved property; second, if it is being used for timber production on a sustained yield basis; or, third, if it is being used currently and since December 31, 1962, for commercial purposes which do not impair the attractiveness of the area;

It proposes a boundary line for the inland buffer zone in accordance with the recommendations worked out in cooperation with the largest property owner in the lakeshore—Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co. A somewhat different line, drawn at our request by the National Park Service, produces an inland buffer zone of about 6,000 fewer acres. We have asked the Michigan Conservation Department to work with Park Service and Cleveland-Cliffs representatives to reach a mutually satisfactory buffer zone line. All parties have agreed to explore this adjustment;

It provides that any determination as to whether lands within the inland buffer zone are being managed on a sustained yield basis shall be the sole responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Forest Service;

It permits hunting and fishing within the lakeshore in accordance with the laws of Michigan;

It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to continue to lease cottages or hunting lodges, which were under lease on December 31, 1962, for a period of 25 years or for the life of the lessee;

It directs the Secretary to prepare and implement a land and water use management plan in the lakeshore, including specifically a scenic shoreline drive;

It protects homeowners in the right of use and occupancy of their property for residential purposes for 25 years or life, and permanently have ownership if located in the inland buffer zone.

In drafting this new Pictured Rocks bill, every effort has been made to meet the economic needs of the area, to protect the rights of large and small property owners, and yet to make possible a national lakeshore which will be of sufficient size and quality to merit national recognition.

While we believe this bill accomplishes these objectives in large measure, we look forward to continuing suggestions for its improvement. We will request a hearing to be held in the Upper Peninsula this year, in order that we may have the benefit of the recommendations of all concerned.

The Department of the Interior has promised that an economic study will be available on this proposal in the very near future. All who see the benefits such a lakeshore development will bring to Michigan's Upper Peninsula look forward to this analysis.

The description of the "inland buffer zone" contained in section 9 of the new bill is that suggested in conferences with Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co.

The description of the boundary line for the "inland buffer zone" prepared by the National Park Service at my request is as follows:

INNER BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED PICTURED ROCKS NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Since the smallest land division as depicted on the inner boundary line map is 1/64 section or approximately 10 acres, a simplified narrative method has been devised to describe and locate the boundary at any point within a given full section. Each section is considered to be composed of 64 equal parts by dividing the linear distances of the north-south and the east-west section lines into eight equal parts and projecting a perpendicular line from each point on a given section line to the opposite section line. Therefore, each change of direction within a section is at a right angle to the preceding course and runs in the stated direction a linear distance expressed in eighths or multiples of eighths of a section line. Also at the beginning point of each range or township, the point is described in relation to either a section corner or a corner of a subdivision of the section and italicized. As stated previously the smallest subdivision used is 1/64 of a section or a quarter-quarter-quarter section.

RANGE 14 WEST, TOWNSHIP 49N, ALGER COUNTY, MICHIGAN

Section 11: Beginning at a point at the *northeast corner* of the *southeast quarter southeast quarter,* thence west ½, thence south ¼ to the south section line;

Section 14: Continuing south ¼, thence west ⅛, thence south ¾ to south section line, thence west ⅛ along south section line;

Section 23: Thence south ⅝, thence west ¼ to west section line;

Section 22: Continuing west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ⅛, thence south ¼ to south section line, thence west ⅛ along south section line;

Section 27: Thence south ⅛, thence west ⅛, thence west ⅛, thence west ⅜ to west section line;

Section 28: Continuing west ⅜, thence north ¼ to north section line;

Section 21: Continuing north full section to north section line;

Section 16: Continuing north ¼, thence west ⅓, thence north ⅛ thence west ¼, thence north ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line;

Section 7: Continuing west ½, thence north ⅛, thence west ½ to west section line;

Section 18: Continuing west ½, thence north ⅛, thence west ¼, thence north ⅛, thence west ¼, to west section line, thence north ⅛ along west section line to the northwest section corner.

RANGE 15 WEST, TOWNSHIP 49 NORTH

Section 12: Proceeding from the *southeast section corner* and running west ¼ along south section line, thence north ⅛, thence west ¼, thence north ⅛, thence west ¼, thence north ¼, thence west ¼ to west section line;

Section 11: Continuing west full section to the west section line, thence south ½ along the west section line to the southwest section corner;

Section 10: Thence west full section to the southwest section corner;

Section 16: Thence south ⅝ along the east section line, thence west ¾, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line, thence south ¼ to southwest section corner;

Section 20: Thence west ½ along north section line, thence south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line; thence south ¼ along west section line;

Section 19: Thence west ⅜, thence south ¼, thence west ⅜, thence south ⅛ to south section line, thence west ¼ along south section line to southwest section corner.

RANGE 16 WEST, TOWNSHIP 49 NORTH

Section 25: Proceeding from the *northeast section corner* and running south ⅛ along east section line, thence west ¼, thence south ⅜, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅜ to south section line, thence west ⅛ along south section line;

Section 36: Thence south ½, thence west ⅛ to west section line, thence south ¼ along west section line;

Section 35: Thence west ¼, thence south ¼ to south section line, thence west ⅛ along south section line.

RANGE 16 WEST, TOWNSHIP 48 NORTH

Section 2: Proceeding from a point at the *northwest corner* of the *northeast quarter northwest quarter northeast quarter* and running south or full section to the south section line;

Section 11: Continuing south of full section to the south section line, thence west ⅛ along south section line;

Section 14: Thence south ¼, thence west ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence section lines, thence south ⅛ along west section line;

Section 15: Thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛ to the south section line, thence west ¼ along the south section line to the southwest section corner.

Section 21: Thence south ⅛ along east section line, thence west ⅜, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west

⅛, thence south ¼, thence west ⅛, thence south ⅛, thence west ⅛ to the west section line, thence south ⅛ along west section line;

Section 20: Thence west ¼, thence south ⅛ to south section line, thence west ¼ along south section line;

Section 29: Thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line;

Section 30: Continuing west ½, thence south ½, thence west ½ to west section line.

RANGE 17 WEST, TOWNSHIP 48 NORTH

Section 25: Proceeding from the *northeast corner* of the *southeast quarter southeast quarter* and running west ¼, thence north ¾ to north section line;

Section 24: Continuing north ¼, thence west ¼, thence north ¼, thence west ½ to west section line, thence north ½ along west section line to northwest section corner;

Section 14: Thence west ¼ along south section line, thence north ⅛, thence west ⅛, thence north ⅛, thence west ⅝ to west section line, thence south ⅛ along west section line;

Section 15: Thence west ¼, thence south ⅛ to south section line; thence west ¼ along south section line;

Section 22: Thence south ⅛, thence west ½ to west section line, thence south ⅛ along west section line;

Section 21: Thence west ⅛, thence south ⅜, thence west ⅛, thence south ⅜ to south section line, thence west ⅛ along south section line;

Section 28: Thence south ½, thence west ⅛, thence south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line, thence south ⅛ along west section line to the southwest section corner;

Section 32: Thence west ¼ along north section line, thence south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ½ to west section line, thence south ⅛ along west section line;

Section 31: Thence west full section to west section line, thence north ⅛ along west section line.

RANGE 18 WEST, TOWNSHIP 48 NORTH

Section 36: Proceeding from the *southeast corner* of the *northeast quarter southeast quarter northeast quarter* and running west ½, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line, thence south ⅛ along west section line.

Section 35: Thence west ¼, thence south ¼ to south section line;

RANGE 18 WEST, TOWNSHIP 7 NORTH

Section 2: Proceeding from the *northwest corner* of the *northeast quarter northeast quarter* and continuing south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south ½, thence west ⅛, thence south ¼ to the south section line;

Section 11: Continuing south a full section to the south section line;

Section 14: Continuing south a full section to the south section line, thence west ⅜ along the south section line to the southwest section corner;

Section 15: Continuing west ½ along the south section line, thence north ⅜, thence west ½ to the west section line, thence north ⅛ along the west section line;

Section 16: Thence west ¾, thence south ¼, thence west ¼ to the west section line, thence south ¼ along the west section line to the southwest section corner;

Section 20: Thence west ⅛ along the north section line, thence south ¼, thence west ⅛, thence south ½, thence west ¼, thence south ¼ to south section line, thence west ¼ along the south section line.

Section 29: Thence south ¼, thence west ⅛, thence south ⅛, thence west ⅛ to west section line, thence south ⅛ along west section line;

Section 30: Thence west ¼, thence south ½ to the south section line;

Section 31: Continuing south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅝, thence west ¼, thence south 1,220 feet more or less to the north right-of-way of State Highway M–94, thence west ¼ along north right-of-way of State Highway M–94 to west section line, thence north along the west section line to the northeast corner of the Joseph Hiedzwiecki property (all of the named properties and lot numbers mentioned herein are depicted on the map of the city of Munising that was compiled and drawn by Edwin Swan, engineer.

RANGE 19 WEST TOWNSHIP 47 NORTH

Proceeding from the *northeast corner* of the Miedzwiecki property and running westerly along the northern boundary of said property to the northwest corner of said property, thence due west 750 feet more or less, thence due north 200 feet more or less to the southwest corner of C. C. I. Co. property, thence due west along the property line bounded on the south by Joseph Kolbush property and on the north by C. C. I. Co.'s property to the north-south quarter section line, thence north along the north-south quarter section line to the south side of Sand Point Road, an extension of Munising Street, thence northward and eastward along the eastern right-of-way of the Sand Point Road to a point of intersection with the southeast projection of the north-east lot line of lot 22, Sand Point Addition, thence northwestward along the southeast projection and northeast property line of said lot 22, Sand Point Addition to a point on the mean waterline on the easterly shore of South Bay (Grand Island Bay), thence running westward for a distance of one-quarter of a mile to a point in South Bay one-quarter of a mile offshore and westward of the said mean waterline on the easterly shore of South Bay. Said point falling on the offshore boundary line described in bill S. 3364, May 29, 1962, thence turning and running generally northward along said offshore boundary line stated in said bill back to point of beginning of the inner boundary.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; but, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1143) to establish in the State of Michigan the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and Mr. McNAMARA), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for the benefit, inspiration, education, recreational use, and enjoyment of the public a significant portion of the diminishing shoreline of the United States and its related geographic and scientific features, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to take appropriate action, as herein provided, to establish in the State of Michigan the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore.

SEC. 2. The area described as follows is hereby designated for establishment as the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore.

Beginning at a point in the city of Munising, Michigan, in section 36, lot 3, township 47 north, range 19 west, at the southeast corner of Sand Point Addition lot 1;

thence westward along the southerly line of the Sand Point Addition lot 1 to a point on the mean waterline on the easterly shore of South Bay (Grand Island Bay);

thence running westward for a distance of one-quarter of a mile to a point in South Bay one-quarter of a mile offshore and westward of the said mean waterline on the easterly shore of South Bay;

thence turning and running generally northward and eastward along a line in South Bay, Grand Island Harbor, and Lake Superior one-quarter of a mile offshore of and parallel with the mean waterline on the shores of South Bay, Grand Island Harbor, and Lake Superior within township 47 north, range 19, 18 west; township 48 north, range 18, 17, 16 west; township 49 north, range 16, 15, 14 west, a distance of approximately 39 miles to a point in Lake Superior one-quarter of a mile offshore and northward of a point on the mean waterline on the southerly shore of Lake Superior on the north-south quarter section line of fractional section 1, township 49 north, range 14 west;

thence running one-quarter of a mile southward to the said point on the mean waterline on the southerly shore of Lake Superior and continuing southward along the north-south quarter section lines of fractional section 1 and section 12, said township and range, to the southeast corner of northeast quarter northwest quarter, said section 12;

thence westward along the north one-sixteenth latitudinal section line to the southwest corner of the northwest quarter northwest quarter, said section 12;

thence southward along west section lines of said section 12 and section 13, said township and range, to a point 400 feet northward of the southwest corner of said section 13;

thence eastward along a line 400 feet northward of and parallel with the south section line of said section 13 to a point on the east section line of said section 13 at State Highway M77;

thence southward along the east section lines of said section 13 and section 24, said township and range, to a point 400 feet southward of the northeast corner of said section 24 at State Highway M77;

thence westward along a line 400 feet southward and parallel with the north section lines of said section 24 and section 23, said township and range, to a point on the north-south quarter section line of said section 23;

thence southward along the north-south quarter section line to the south quarter section corner of said section 23;

thence westward along the south section line of said section 23 to the northeast corner section 27, said township and range;

thence southward along the east section line said section 27 to the southeast corner of northeast quarter southeast quarter said section 27;

thence westward along the south one-sixteenth latitudinal section lines of said section 27 and sections 28 and 29, said township and range, to the north-south quarter section line of said section 29 at the southwest corner of the northwest quarter southeast quarter, said section 29;

thence northward on the north-south quarter section line to the south quarter section corner section 20, said township and range;

thence westward along the south section lines sections 20 and 19, said township and range, to the southeast corner section 24, township 49 north, range 15 west, and continuing westward along the south section lines, said section 24 and sections 23, 22, and 21 to the northeast corner section 29, said township and range;

thence southward along the east section lines said section 29 and section 32, said township and range, and continuing southward along the east section lines sections 5 and 8, township 48 north, range 15 west, to the east quarter section corner said section 8;

thence westward along the east-west quarter section lines of said section 8 and section 7 to the west quarter section corner said section 7, said township and range;

thence northward along the west section lines said section 7 and section 6, said township and range, to the east quarter section corner section 1, township 48 north, range 16 west;

thence westward along the east-west quarter section line of said section 1 to the east quarter section corner section 2, said township and range;

thence southward along the east section lines said section 2 and sections 11 and 14 to the east quarter section corner said section 14, said township and range;

thence westward along the east-west quarter section line to the southwest corner of southeast quarter northwest quarter of said section 14;

thence southward along the west one-sixteenth meridional section lines of said section 14 and section 23, said township and range, to the southeast corner of northwest quarter northwest quarter said section 23;

thence westward along the north one-sixteenth latitudinal section lines of said section 23 and section 22, said township and range, to the east section line of section 21, said township and range;

thence southward along the east section line of said section 21 to the southeast section corner;

thence westward along the south section line of section 21 to the northeast corner of section 29, said township and range;

thence southward along the east section line of said section 29 to the east quarter section corner;

thence westward along the east-west quarter section lines of said section 29 and section 30 to the center of said section 30, said township and range;

thence southward along the north-south quarter section line of said section 30 to Adams Trail CO 637;

thence running southwestward along Adams Trail CO 637 to an intersection with the south section line section 1, township 47 north, range 17 west;

thence westward along the south section lines said section 1 and sections 2 and 3 to the northeast corner section 9, said township and range;

thence southward along the east section lines of said section 9 and section 16 to the east quarter section corner, said section 16, said township and range;

thence westward along the east-west quarter section lines said section 16 and section 17 to the west quarter section corner said section 17, said township and range;

thence northward along the west section line of said section 17 to the southeast corner section 7, said township and range;

thence westward along the south section lines of said section 7, said township and range, and sections 12 and 11, township 47 north, range 18 west, to the northeast corner of the northwest quarter northeast quarter section 14, said township and range;

thence southward along the east one-sixteenth meridional lines of said section 14 and sections 23, 26, and 35 to the southeast corner of the southwest quarter southeast quarter said section 35, said township and range, at State Highway M94;

thence westward along the south section line of said section 35 to the southwest section corner at State Highway M94;

thence northward along the west section lines of said section 35 and section 26 to the southeast corner section 22, said township and range;

thence westward along the south section line of said section 22 to the south quarter section corner;

thence northward along the north-south quarter section line of said section 22 to the section center;

thence westward along the east-west quarter section lines of said section 22 and section 21 to the east quarter section corner section 20, said township and range;

thence southward along the east section line of said section 20 to the southeast section corner;

thence westward along the south section line of said section 20 to the north quarter section corner of section 29, said township and range;

thence southward along the north-south quarter section line of said section 29 to the south quarter section corner;

thence westward along the south section line of said section 29 to the northeast corner of section 31, said township and range;

thence southward along the east section line of said section 31 to State Highway M94;

thence running generally westward and southward along State Highway M94 to the southeast corner of section 36, township 47 north, range 19 west;

thence westward along State Highway M94 in section 36, said township and range, to the southeasterly corner of the city of Munising parcel of land (bounded in part by Bullivant Street and State Highway M94);

thence leaving State Highway M94 and running generally northward along the easterly lines of the said city of Munising parcel of land to its northerly corner on the easterly line of Bullivant Street;

thence northward along the said easterly line of Bullivant Street to a point of intersection with the northerly line of Salem Street (paper street);

thence westward along the said northerly line of Salem Street to a point of intersection with the easterly line of Sand Point Road;

thence generally northward and eastward along the said easterly line of Sand Point Road to a point on the southerly line of Sand Point Addition lot 1 produced eastward;

thence westward crossing Sand Point Road along the said southerly line of Sand Point Addition lot 1 produced eastward back to the point of beginning, the said southeast corner of Sand Point Addition lot 1.

Sec. 3. As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act and following the acquisition by the Secretary of an acreage within the boundaries of the area which in his opinion is efficiently administrable for the purposes of this Act, he shall establish the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register.

Sec. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore Advisory Commission. Said commission shall terminate ten years after the date the lakeshore is established pursuant to this Act.

(b) The commission shall be composed of five members, each appointed for a term of two years by the Secretary, as follows:

(1) Two members to be appointed from recommendations made by the county in which the lakeshore is situated;

(2) Two members to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Michigan; and

(3) One member to be designated by the Secretary.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be chairman. Any vacancy in the commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Members of the commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the chairman.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall, from time to time, consult with the commission with respect to the matters relating to the development of the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore.

Sec. 5. In administering the lakeshore the Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on lands and waters under his jurisdiction in accordance with the laws of Michigan. The Secretary, with the approval of the Michigan Department of Conservation, may designate zones and establish periods where and when no hunting shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment. The Secretary shall, after consultation with such department, issue regulations, consistent with this section, as he may determine necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. The Secretary shall enter into agreement with the Michigan Department of Conservation providing for concurrent jurisdiction over the enforcement of the applicable hunting and fishing laws of Michigan.

Sec. 6. (a) The administration, protection, and development of the Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore shall be exercised by the Secretary, subject to the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), as amended and supplemented, relating to the areas administered and supervised by the Secretary through the National Park Service; except that authority otherwise available to the Secretary for the conservation and management of natural resources may be utilized to the extent he finds such authority will further the purposes of this Act.

(b) In the administration, protection and development of the lakeshore, the Secretary shall prepare and implement a land and water use management plan, which shall include specific provision for—

(1) development of facilities to provide the benefits of public recreation, including a scenic shoreline drive;

(2) protection of scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment; and

(3) such protection, management, and utilization (subject to the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of this Act) of renewable natural resources, including forage and forest products, as in the judgment of the Secretary is consistent with, and does not significantly impair public recreation and protection of scenic, scientific, and historic features contributing to public enjoyment.

Sec. 7. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as prohibiting any governmental jurisdiction in the State of Michigan from assessing taxes upon any interest in real estate retained under the provisions of section 11 of this Act to the owner of such interest.

Sec. 8. (a) The Secretary is authorized, subject to the limitations, conditions, and restrictions imposed by this Act, to acquire the land, water, and other property, and improvements thereon, and any interests therein (including easements) within the boundary described in section 2 of this Act by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, transfer from any Federal agency, exchange, or condemnation; except that such authority to acquire by condemnation shall be exercised only in the manner and to the extent specifically authorized in this Act.

(b) In exercising his authority to acquire property under this Act, the Secretary shall give immediate and careful consideration to any offer made by an individual owning property within the lakeshore to sell such property to the Secretary. In considering any such offer, the Secretary shall take into consideration any hardship to the owner which might result from any undue delay in acquiring his property.

(c) Any property or interests therein, owned by the State of Michigan, or any political subdivisions thereof, may be acquired only with the concurrence of such owner. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any Federal property located within such

---

area may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for use by him in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(d) The Secretary shall make every reasonable effort to acquire property through negotiation and purchase. Where agreement is not reached and condemnation proceedings are filed, the owner of such property shall be paid the fair market value thereof as determined in such proceedings.

(e) In any case where the owner and the United States agree, the power of condemnation may, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, be used as a means of acquiring a clear and marketable title, free of any and all encumbrances.

(f) In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to non-Federal property located within the area designated for inclusion, and convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary within such area. Properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in value: *Provided*, That the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged. The Secretary shall report to the Congress on every exchange carried out under the authority of this Act within thirty days from its consummation, and each such report shall include a statement of the value of the properties involved and of any case in which equalization payments are made or received.

Sec. 9. (a) The area hereinafter described in subsection (b) of this section is hereby established as an inland buffer zone in order to stabilize and protect the existing character and uses of the lands, waters, and other properties within such zone for the purpose of preserving the setting of the shoreline and lakes, protecting the watersheds and streams, and providing for the fullest economic utilization of the renewable resources through sustained yield timber management and other resource management compatible with the purposes of this Act.

(b) As used in this Act, the term "inland buffer zone" means that part of the lakeshore situated south of the following described boundary; consisting of approximately 47,000 acres:

RANGE 14 WEST, TOWNSHIP 49 NORTH, ALGER COUNTY, MICHIGAN

Section 1: Beginning at a point on the mean waterline on the southerly shore of Lake Superior on the north-south quarter section line of fractional section 1, township 49 north, range 14 west; thence south along north-south quarter section line to the south section line;

Section 12: Thence south ¼, thence west ½ to west section line;

Section 11: Thence south ½, thence west ½, thence south ¼ to south section line;

Section 14: Thence south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south ¾ to south section line, thence west ¼ to southwest section corner;

Section 22: Thence south ¾, thence west ⅛, thence south ⅛, thence west ⅛, thence south ¼, thence west ⅛, thence south ¼, thence west ⅜, thence south ⅛ to south section line;

Section 27: Continuing south ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line;

Section 28: Continuing west ⅛, thence north ⅛ to north section line;

Section 21: Continuing north full section to north section line;

Section 16: Thence west ¼, thence north ¼, thence west ⅛, thence north ⅛, thence west ¼, thence north ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line;

Section 17: Thence north ¼, thence west full section to west section line;

Section 18: Continuing west ½, thence north ¼ to north section line;

Section 7: Thence west ½ to southwest section corner.

RANGE 15 WEST, TOWNSHIP 49 NORTH

Section 12: Proceeding from the southeast section corner and running west ¼ along south section line, thence north ⅛, thence west ¼, thence north ⅜, thence west ½ to west section line; thence north ¼;

Section 11: Thence west full section to west section line, thence south ¾ to southwest section corner;

Section 10: Thence west full section to southwest section corner;

Section 16: Thence south ½, thence west ¾, thence south ¼, thence west ¼ to west section line;

Section 17: Continuing west ¼, thence south ¼ to south section line, thence west ¼;

Section 20: Thence south ¼, thence west ½ to west section line;

Section 19: Thence south ¼, thence west ½, thence south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line, thence south ⅛ to southwest section corner.

RANGE 16 WEST, TOWNSHIP 49 NORTH

Section 25: Proceeding from the northeast section corner south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ½, thence south ¼, thence west ¼ to west section line; thence south ¼;

Section 26: Thence west ½, thence south ¼ to south section line, thence west ½ to southwest section corner;

Section 34: Thence south ½, thence west ½, thence south ½ to south section line.

RANGE 16 WEST, TOWNSHIP 48 NORTH

Section 3: Proceeding from the northeast corner of the northwest quarter and running south full section to south section line;

Section 10: Continuing south full section to south section line, thence east ½ section to southeast section corner;

Section 15: Thence south ½, thence west ⅛, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛ to south section line, thence west ⅛ to southwest section corner;

Section 21: Thence south ⅛, thence west ⅜, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ⅛, thence south ¼, thence west ⅛, thence south ⅛, thence west ⅛ to west section line;

Section 20: Continuing west ⅛, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛ to south section line, thence west ⅝ to southwest section corner;

Section 19: Continuing west ½, thence north full section to north section line;

Section 18: Continuing north ½, thence west ½ to west section line.

RANGE 17 WEST, TOWNSHIP 48 NORTH

Section 13: Proceeding from the southeast corner of the northeast quarter and running west full section to west section line;

Section 14: Continuing west full section to west section line, thence south ⅜;

Section 15: Thence west ¼, thence south ⅛ to south section line, thence west ¾ to southwest section corner;

Section 21: Thence south ¼, thence west ⅛, thence south ⅜, thence west ⅛, thence south ⅜ to south section line, thence west ¼;

Section 28: Thence south ½, thence west ½ to west section line, thence south ½ to southwest section corner;

Section 29: Thence west ¼, thence north full section to north section line, thence east ¼ to northeast section corner;

Section 20: Thence north ½, thence west full section to west section line, thence south ½ section to southwest section corner;

Section 30: Thence west ½, thence south ½, thence west ¼, thence south ¼, thence west ¼ to west section line, thence south ½ to southwest section corner.

RANGE 18 WEST, TOWNSHIP 48 NORTH

Section 36: Proceeding from the northeast section corner and running west ¼, thence south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼, thence south ⅛, thence west ¼ to west section line, thence south ⅛;

Section 35: Thence west ⅛, thence south ⅛, thence west ⅛, thence south ¼ to south section line.

RANGE 18 WEST, TOWNSHIP 47 NORTH

Section 2: Proceeding from the northwest corner of the northeast quarter northeast quarter and continuing south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south ½, thence west ⅛, thence south ¼ to south section line, thence west ⅜ to southwest section corner;

Section 10: Thence south full section to southeast section corner;

Section 15: Continuing south ½, thence west ½, thence north ½ to north section line;

Section 10: Continuing north ½, thence west ½ to west section line, thence south ½ to southwest section corner;

Section 16: Continuing south ½, thence west ¾, thence south ¼, thence west ¼ to west section line, thence south ⅛;

Section 17: Thence west ¼, thence south ⅛ to south section line;

Section 20: Continuing south ⅜, thence west ⅛, thence south ⅛, thence west ⅛, thence south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south ¼ to south section line, thence west ¼ to southwest section corner;

Section 30: Continuing west ¼, thence south full section to south section line, thence west ½;

Section 31: Thence south ¼, thence west ¼ to west section line, thence south ¼, thence east ½, thence south ¼, thence west ¼, thence south 1220 feet more or less to the north right-of-way to State Highway M–94, thence west ¼ along north right-of-way of State Highway M–94 to west section line, thence north along the west section line to the northeast corner of the Joseph Niedzwiecki property (all of the named properties and lot numbers mentioned herein are depicted on the map of the city of Munising that was compiled and drawn by Edwin Swan, engineer).

RANGE 19 WEST, TOWNSHIP 47 NORTH

Proceeding from the northeast corner of the Niedzwiecki property and running westerly along the northern boundary of said property to the northwest corner of said property, thence due west 750 feet more or less, thence due north 200 feet more or less to the southeast corner of C.C.I. Company property, thence due west along the property line bounded on the south by Joseph Kolbush property and on the north by C.C.I. Company's property to the north-south quarter section line, thence north along the north-south quarter section line to the south side of Sand Point Road, an extension of Munising Street, thence northward and eastward along the eastern right-of-way of the Sand Point Road to a point of intersection with the southeast projection of the northeast lot line of lot 22, Sand Point Addition, thence northwestward along the southeast projection and northeast property line of said lot 22, Sand Point Addition, to a point on the mean waterline on the easterly shore of South Bay (Grand Island Bay), thence running westward for a distance of one-quarter of a mile to a point in South Bay one quarter of a mile offshore and westward of the said mean waterline on the easterly shore of South Bay. Said point falling on the offshore boundary line described in Bill S. 3364, May 29, 1962, thence turning and running generally northward along said offshore boundary line stated in said bill back to point of beginning of the inner boundary, at the point on the mean waterline on the southerly shore of Lake Superior on the north-south quarter section line of fractional section 1, township 49 north, range 14 west.

Sec. 10. (a) The Secretary shall be prohibited from acquiring by condemnation any (1) improved property within the inland buffer zone, or (2) property within the inland buffer zone during all times when such property is being used (A) for the growing and harvesting of timber on a sustained yield basis, or (B) for commercial purposes, if such commercial purposes are the same such purposes for which such property was being used on December 31, 1962, so long as the use thereof would further the purposes of this Act and such use does not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the lakeshore.

(b) "Sustained yield" in the growing and harvesting of timber as used in this Act shall mean management of the land for timber production neither more nor less stringent than the management imposed on publically owned national forest lands of comparable management classification. Any determination as to whether such property is being so managed for purposes of this Act shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the United States Forest Service.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the United States Forest Service, shall consult with and provide technical assistance to any property owner within the inland buffer zone who requests assistance for the purpose of managing his land for sustained yield timber production.

(d) As used in this Act, the term "improved property" shall mean any one-family dwelling on which construction was begun before December 31, 1962, together with so much of the land on which the dwelling is situated (such land being in the same ownership as the dwelling) as shall be reasonably necessary for the enjoyment of the dwelling.

Sec. 11. (a) Any owner or owners of improved property on the date of its acquisition by the Secretary may, as a condition to such acquisition, retain, for a term of not to exceed twenty-five years, or for a term ending at the death of such owner or owners, the right of use and occupancy of such property for any residential purpose which is not incompatible with the purposes of this Act or which does not impair the usefulness and attractiveness of the area designated for inclusion. The Secretary shall pay to the owner the value of the property on the date of such acquisition, less the value on such date of the right retained by the owner. Where any such owner retains a right of use and occupancy as herein provided, such right during its existence may be conveyed or leased for noncommercial residential purposes in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(b) Any deed or other instrument used to transfer title to property, with respect to which a right of use and occupancy is retained under this section, shall provide that such property shall not be used for any purpose which is incompatible with purposes of this Act, or which impairs the usefulness and attractiveness of the lakeshore and if it should be so used, the Secretary shall have authority to terminate such right. In the event the Secretary exercises his power of termination under this subsection he shall pay to the owner of the right terminated an amount equal to the value of that portion of such right which remained unexpired on the date of such termination.

(c) Any land acquired by the Secretary under this Act on which there is situated a cottage or hunting lodge which, on December 31, 1962, was under lease to any lessee or lessees shall, if such lease is in effect on the date such land is so acquired, be acquired by the Secretary subject to such lease and the right of such lessee or lessees to continue using the property covered by such lease in accordance with the provisions thereof. Upon the expiration of such lease, the Secretary shall have the authority to enter into a lease with such lessee or lessees authorizing them to continue using such cottage or lodge (as the case may be) for a term of not to exceed twenty-five years, or for a term ending at the death of such lessee or lessees, subject to such conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary.

Sec. 12. The Secretary shall, at the request of any township or county in or adjacent to the lakeshore affected by this Act, assist and consult with the appropriate officers and employees of such township or county in establishing zoning bylaws. Such assistance may include payments to the county or township for technical aid.

Sec. 13. The Secretary shall furnish to any interested person requesting the same, a certificate indicating, with respect to any property which the Secretary has been prohibited from acquiring by condemnation in accordance with provisions of this Act, that such authority is prohibited and the reasons therefor.

Sec. 14. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL POLICE FORCES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide Federal assistance to State and local police forces through projects to develop and demonstrate more effective techniques and practices of law enforcement.

One of the findings of the Civil Rights Commission, reported to Congress in 1961, was that the professional level of many State and local police forces is alarmingly low. This situation is due, in part, the Commission found, to ineffective recruit selection standards and ineffective and inadequate training.

The Commission recommended that Congress authorize Federal assistance to police departments who undertake the development of more effective recruit selection standards, training programs in scientific crime detection and in constitutional rights and human relations, college-level schools of police administration, and scholarship programs for police officers.

Last year I introduced a bill, S. 2984, to carry out this recommendation. The issue of improving the quality of our police forces at every level of government is one which transcends the relationship this may well have to civil rights problems. And the mail which I have received in support of the bill bears this out.

Among those expressing favorable interest in this proposal have been the following:

The board of officers and staff of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Mr. James E. Bassett, deputy commissioner, Department of Public Safety, Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Hon. George E. McNally, mayor, city of Mobile, Ala.

Chief Clarence M. Kelley, Police Department, Kansas City, Mo.

Hon. George Edwards, commissioner, Department of Police, Detroit, Mich.

Col. William E. Binder, chief of police, Louisville, Ky.

Col. E. C. Hale, chief of police, Lexington, Ky.

Chief Richard H. Quehl, Police Department, Fort Thomas, Ky.

Col. Curtis Brostron, chief of police, St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. Bernard R. Caldwell, director, Northwestern University Traffic Institute.

Mr. A. F. Brandstatter, chairman, School of Police Administration and Public Safety, Michigan State University.

Prof. John I. Griffin, the police science program, City College of New York.

Dean Joseph D. Lohman, School of Criminology, University of California, Berkeley.

Col. David McCandless, director, Southern Police Institute, Louisville, Ky.

Mr. Harold R. Sullivan, secretary-treasurer, Metropolitan Police Academy of Michigan, Detroit, Mich.

Members of the faculty of the Department of Political Science, Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich.

The correspondence which I have had has evidenced interest in Federal assistance for a variety of projects and programs—the establishment of programs in constitutional rights and human relations both in police departments and in schools of police administration; the need for research to establish recruit selection standards; the development of a centrally administered and regionally conducted State program of police training; research to develop curriculums for training programs; the development of a system for providing better communication and cooperation among law enforcement agencies; the establishment of a training program to service several suburban communities.

Mr. President, the bill which I introduce today has, I believe, been improved in several respects over S. 2984.

Some legitimate concern has been expressed that Federal funds would be doled out rather indiscriminately to local police departments and that the Federal Government would thereby preempt an area of historical and appropriate local responsibility.

The more specific language of the bill I introduce today makes clear that the purpose of this legislation is to provide Federal assistance to worthwhile programs and projects which will develop or demonstrate education, recruitment, or training practices which can then in turn be profitably employed by other police departments and training organizations.

Mr. President, I want to emphasize that I introduce this bill today in the firm belief that local law enforcement is and must remain a matter of local responsibility and control.

Also, the new bill provides that public and private nonprofit organizations engaged in police education or training, as well as State and local governments, would be eligible to apply for Federal assistance.

Mr. President, I believe the bill introduced today provides a highly desirable and appropriate way for the Federal Government to assist in efforts initiated

at State and local levels to raise the professional quality of our police forces. I am very hopeful that this Congress will take favorable action on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1145) to provide Federal assistance to State and local police forces through projects to develop and demonstrate more effective techniques and practices of law enforcement, introduced by Mr. Hart, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SYSTEM OF ROADS AND TRAILS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, by request, I introduce and send to the desk a bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes.

The language of the proposed bill is similar to that contained in S. 3231, which was introduced by Senator Chavez, by request, on May 1 1962, and on which no action was taken.

The declared purpose of the bill is to allow for the provision of an adequate system of roads within and near national forests for timber management and harvesting and recreation.

The bill would give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to grant easements for road rights-of-way over land under his control. Permits of a revocable nature can now be issued, but these are not always acceptable where the Department of Agriculture is seeking permanent rights-of-way over privately owned lands. The bill would provide for the termination or cancellation of easements granted by the Department of Agriculture where there is a period of 5 years of nonuse.

Many of the roads of the forest development road system have been and will be required to be built by purchasers of national forest timber. At the present time, purchasers can be required to construct only the standard of road that is needed for each particular sale. The cost of this type road is amortized from stumpage or unit rates. In many instances a higher standard road may be desirable for general usage. The bill would permit the construction of a higher standard road, and provides that the purchaser will not be required to pay that part of the road costs necessary to meet higher standards. This additional cost would be paid for out of appropriated funds.

The bill would also authorize the inclusion in sale contracts of provisions for amortization of road costs through the retention by the purchaser of an appropriate amount of the stumpage or unit rates until the cost had been amortized. If after harvesting is completed, the road had not been completely amortized the purchaser would be compensated from the stumpage or unit rates paid.

The bill also provides for an arrangement whereby the roads may be maintained by requiring the users to deposit sufficient funds to enable the Forest Service to perform the work. At present the Forest Service has authority to require the user to perform maintenance and reconstruction; however, there is no provision in existing law which requires that a deposit be made.

Also Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter on this subject from the Secretary of Agriculture to the President of the Senate and the text of the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1147) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes, introduce by Mr. Randolph, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds and declares that the construction and maintenance of an adequate system of roads and trails within and near the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service is essential if increasing demands for timber, recreation, and other uses of such lands are to be met; that the existence of such a system would have the effect, among other things, of increasing the value of timber and other resources tributary to such roads; and that such a system is essential to enable the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) to provide for intensive use, protection, development, and management of these lands under principles of multiple use and sustained yield of products and services.

Sec. 2. The Secretary is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, subject to the provisions of this Act, to grant permanent or temporary easements for specified periods or otherwise for road rights-of-way (1) over national forest lands and other lands administered by the Forest Service, and (2) over any other related lands with respect to which the Department of Agriculture has rights under the terms of the grant to it.

Sec. 3. An easement granted under this Act may be terminated by consent of the owner of the easement, by condemnation, or after a five-year period of nonuse the Secretary may, if he finds the owner has abandoned the easement, make a determination to cancel it. Before the Secretary may cancel an easement for nonuse the owner of such easement must be notified of the determination to cancel and be given, upon his request made within sixty days after receipt of the notice, a hearing in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be issued by the Secretary.

Sec. 4. The Secretary is authorized to provide for the acquisition, construction, and maintenance of forest development roads within and near the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service in locations and according to specifications which will permit maximum economy in harvesting timber from such lands tributary to such roads and at the same time meet the requirements for protection, development and management thereof, and for utilization of the other resources thereof. Financing of such roads may be accomplished (1) by the Secretary utilizing appropriated funds, (2) by requirements on purchasers of national forest timber and other products, including provisions for amortization of road costs in contracts, (3) by cooperative financing with other public agencies and with private agencies or persons, or (4) by a combination of these methods: *Provided,* That where roads of a higher standard than that needed in the harvesting and removal of the timber and other products from lands tributary thereto are to be constructed, the purchasers of national forest timber and other products shall not be required to bear that part of the costs necessary to meet such higher standard and the Secretary is authorized to make such arrangements to this end as may be appropriate.

Sec. 5. Copies of all instruments affecting permanent interests in land executed pursuant to this Act shall be recorded in each county where the lands are located. Copies of all instruments affecting interests in lands reserved from the public domain shall be furnished to the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 6. The Secretary may require the user or users of a road under the control of the Forest Service, including purchasers of Government timber and other products, to maintain such roads in a satisfactory condition commensurate with the particular use requirements of each. Such maintenance to be borne by each user shall be proportionate to total use. The Secretary may also require the user or users of such a road to reconstruct the same when such reconstruction is determined to be necessary to accommodate such use. If such maintenance or reconstruction cannot be so provided or if the Secretary determines that maintenance or reconstruction by a user would not be practical, then the Secretary may require that sufficient funds be deposited by the user to provide his portion of such total maintenance or reconstruction. Deposits made to cover the maintenance or reconstruction of roads are hereby made available until expended to cover the cost to the United States of accomplishing the purposes for which deposited: *Provided,* That deposits received for work on adjacent and overlapping areas may be combined when it is the most practicable and efficient manner of performing the work, and cost thereof may be determined by estimates: *And provided further,* That unexpended balances upon accomplishment of the purpose for which deposited shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts or refunded.

Sec. 7. Whenever the agreement under which the United States has obtained for the use of, or in connection with, the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service a right-of-way or easement for a road or an existing road or the right to use an existing road provides for delayed payments to the Government's grantor, any fees or other collections received by the Secretary for the use of the road may be placed in a fund to be available for making payments to the grantor.

The letter presented by Mr. Randolph is as follows:

Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C., January 10, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate.

Dear Mr. President: Transmitted herewith for the consideration of the Congress is a draft bill "To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests, and for other purposes."

This Department recommends enactment of the draft bill.

The draft bill is designed to provide to the Secretary of Agriculture certain authorities that are urgently needed and which will be of material aid in constructing and maintaining an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service. It specifically would—

1. Set forth findings and declarations of the Congress that the construction and maintenance of an adequate system of roads

and trails within and near the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service is essential to provide for intensive use, protection, and management of such lands under principles of multiple use and sustained yield of products and services.

2. Authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant permanent or temporary easements for specified periods or otherwise for road rights-of-way over national forest lands and other lands administered by the Forest Service and over any other related lands with respect to which the Department of Agriculture has rights under the terms of the grant to it.

3. Provide for termination of easements so granted with provision that if cancellation is to be for nonuse the owner must be notified and, if he so requests, be given a hearing in accordance with rules and regulations of the Secretary.

4. Authorize the Secretary to provide for the acquisition, construction, and maintenance of forest development roads, within and near the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service, of maximum economy in harvesting timber and at the same time meet the needs for other protection, management, and utilization purposes (a) with appropriated funds, (b) by requirements on purchasers of national forest timber and other products with provisions for amortization of road costs, (c) by cooperation with public and private agencies or persons, or (d) by a combination of these methods. Where roads of a higher standard than that needed in harvesting timber and other products are to be constructed, purchasers of national forest timber and other products would not be required to bear any part of the cost necessary to meet such higher standard and the Secretary would be authorized to make appropriate arrangements to this end.

5. Direct that all instruments affecting permament interests in land executed pursuant to the bill would be recorded in the county records and copies of all affecting lands reserved from the public domain would be furnished to the Secretary of the Interior.

6. Authorize the Secretary to require users of the roads under the control of the Forest Service, including purchasers of Government timber and other products, to maintain such roads in a satisfactory condition commensurate with the particular use requirements. The maintenance to be borne by each user would be proportionate to total use. The Secretary would also be authorized to require users of such roads to reconstruct the same where such reconstruction is needed to accommodate the use. If the required maintenance or reconstruction could not be provided by the user or if the Secretary determined that maintenance or reconstruction by the user would not be practical, the Secretary would be authorized to require the deposit of sufficient funds for such purpose. Deposits made to cover maintenance or reconstruction of roads would go into a fund and would be available until expended to cover the cost of accomplishing the work. Pooling of deposits for work on adjacent and overlapping areas and the use of estimates to determine the cost of performing the work with such deposits would be authorized. Unexpended balances upon accomplishment of the work would be transferred to miscellaneous receipts or refunded as appropriate.

7. Provide that where the agreement under which the United States obtained its rights as to a road provides for delayed payments, any fees or collections for the use of such a road could be placed in a fund to pay the Government's grantor.

There are administered by the Forest Service 154 national forests, 18 national grasslands, and other administrative units, comprising about 186 million acres of land in 44 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

An adequate system of forest development roads and trails connecting with forest highways and other highways is essential to proper management and beneficial use of the lands comprising the national forest system and their resources. The presence or absence of transportation facilities has a direct and controlling influence on all phases of forest land management and utilization. This fact determines the volume of timber that can be marketed, the size, duration, and distribution of timber sales within working circles, and the level of salvage cuttings. It is also a major factor in the level of use made of the recreation, wildlife, and forage resources of these lands. We strongly feel it is essential that an adequate system of forest roads and trails be developed and maintained to serve these lands if they are to provide their proper share to the well-being of the Nation.

As of June 30, 1961, there were in the forest development road and trail system about 179,200 miles of roads, and 106,600 miles of trails. It is estimated that the system of forest development roads and trails which will ultimately be needed in order for the national forests to provide on a sustained-yield basis the fullest practicable amount of products and services from their timber, watershed, range, recreation, and wildlife resources will be comprised of about 542,000 miles of forest development roads and about 80,000 miles of trails.

The development program for the national forests which President Kennedy submitted to the Congress on September 21, 1961, proposed for the 10-year period 1963–72 the construction and reconstruction of about 79,400 miles of multipurpose roads and 8,000 miles of trails in addition to supplemental work on roads to be constructed by purchasers of national forest timber and other products.

In order to provide and maintain such an adequate system of forest development roads and trails, it is necessary to have not only the funds to finance them, but also authority to facilitate and make possible effective arrangements for the installation and maintenance of the roads and trails.

In a great many instances, national forest lands are intermingled with lands in one or more non-Federal ownerships. The road or trail system needed in the particular area is one which will serve both the national forest land and the land in non-Federal ownership. Authority which would enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make satisfactory arrangements for the construction and maintenance of roads in these circumstances is one of the keys to the installation and maintenance of a system of roads and trails to adequately serve the national forests.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that the enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.
Secretary.

(Enclosure.)

A BILL TO ENABLE THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO CONSTRUCT AND MAINTAIN AN ADEQUATE SYSTEM OF ROADS AND TRAILS FOR THE NATIONAL FORESTS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds and declares that the construction and maintenance of an adequate system of roads and trails within and near the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service is essential if increasing demands for timber, recreation, and other uses of such lands are to be met; that the existence of such a system would the effect, among other things, of increasing the value of timber and other resources tributary to such roads; and that such a system is essential to enable the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) to provide for intensive use, protection, development, and management of these lands under principles of multiple use and sustained yield of products and services.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, subject to the provisions of this Act, to grant permanent or temporary easements for specified periods or otherwise for road rights-of-way (1) over national forest lands and other lands administered by the Forest Service, and (2) over any other related lands with respect to which the Department of Agriculture has rights under the terms of the grant to it.

SEC. 3. An easement granted under this Act may be terminated by consent of the owner of the easement, by condemnation, or after a five-year period of nonuse the Secretary may, if he finds the owner has abandoned the easement, make a determination to cancel it. Before the Secretary may cancel an easement for nonuse the owner of such easement must be notified of the determination to cancel and be given, upon his request made within sixty days after receipt of the notice, a hearing in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be issued by the Secretary.

SEC. 4. The Secretary is authorized to provide for the acquisition, construction, and maintenance of forest development roads within and near the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service in locations and according to specifications which will permit maximum economy in harvesting timber from such lands tributary to such roads and at the same time meet the requirements for protection, development and management thereof, and for utilization of the other resources thereof. Financing of such roads may be accomplished (1) by the Secretary utilizing appropriated funds, (2) by requirements on purchasers of national forest timber and other products, including provisions for amortization of road costs in contracts, (3) by cooperative financing with other public agencies and with private agencies or persons, or (4) by a combination of these methods: *Provided*, That where roads of a higher standard than that needed in the harvesting and removal of the timber and other products from lands tributary thereto are to be constructed, the purchasers of national forest timber and other products shall not be required to bear that part of the costs necessary to meet such higher standard and the Secretary is authorized to make such arrangements to this end as may be appropriate.

SEC. 5. Copies of all instruments affecting permanent interests in land executed pursuant to this Act shall be recorded in each county where the lands are located. Copies of all instruments affecting interests in lands reserved from the public domain shall be furnished to the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 6. The Secretary may require the user or users of a road under the control of the Forest Service, including purchasers of Government timber and other products, to maintain such roads in a satisfactory condition commensurate with the particular use requirements of each. Such maintenance to be borne by each user shall be proportionate to total use. The Secretary may also require the user or users of such a road to reconstruct the same when such reconstruction is determined to be necessary to accommodate such use. If such maintenance or reconstruction cannot be so provided or if the Secretary determines that maintenance or

reconstruction by a user would not be practical, then the Secretary may require that sufficient funds be deposited by the user to provide his portion of such total maintenance or reconstruction. Deposits made to cover the maintenance or reconstruction of roads are hereby made available until expended to cover the cost to the United States of accomplishing the purposes for which deposited: *Provided*, That deposits received for work on adjacent and overlapping areas may be combined when it is the most practicable and efficient manner of performing the work, and cost thereof may be determined by estimates: *And provided further*, That unexpended balances upon accomplishment of the purpose for which deposited shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts or refunded.

SEC. 7. Whenever the agreement under which the United States has obtained for the use of, or in connection with, the national forests and other lands administered by the Forest Service a right-of-way or easement for a road or an existing road or the right to use an existing road provides for delayed payments to the Government's grantor, any fees or other collections received by the Secretary for the use of the road may be placed in a fund to be available for making payments to the grantor.

TV TUBE MANUFACTURERS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to eliminate an unintended pyramiding of taxes in connection with the purchase of taxable tubes by a manufacturer of nontaxable tuners for inclusion in television sets which are taxable. This should bring relief to certain manufacturers for a period between November 1, 1950, and December 31, 1954.

Last year the Senate passed such a provision late in the session. It was dropped during a conference with Members of the House owing to a misunderstanding. This misunderstanding has been cleared up, Mr. President, and there is every reason to believe the House would approve such a measure in this session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1151) relating to the taxable status of sales prior to September 1, 1955, of tubes for use in the production of certain component parts of television receiving sets, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERMS OF SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to extend to 4 years the terms of Members of the House of Representatives, and to 8 years the terms of Senators.

The arguments in favor of this amendment to our Constitution are most persuasive. This is not a partisan proposal; it is a measure designed to strengthen our democratic processes and to make our National Government more sensitive to the wishes of its citizens.

As the distinguished political scientist and student of government, Stephen K. Bailey, has written:

> The constitutional provisions for staggered elections are a significant cause of the pullings and haulings in our National Government.

My amendment, Mr. President, would remove one obstacle to efficient and responsible National Government, by eliminating the so-called off-year election of U.S. Senators and Representatives.

Adoption of this constitutional amendment would represent a big step toward reducing much of the needless—and sometimes destructive—partisan bickering that has characterized our National Government when the executive branch is controlled by one political party and the legislative branch by the other.

Under this amendment, when fully operative, candidates seeking election to the House of Representatives and to the Senate—except in special circumstances—would run only in presidential election years.

Mr. President, when the people of this Nation go to the polls, to elect a presidential candidate on the basis of a program he and his party have promised to implement, they should have an opportunity to vote for Senators and Representatives who will support that program.

Past experience indicates that election of a new Congress only in presidential election years would, in all probably, mean control of the executive and legislative branches of our National Government by the same party. If a President had in both Houses of Congress dependable majorities identified with his program, it would be much easier for the electorate to judge the performance of the party in power.

If the in-party failed to meet its commitments, the electorate could unmistakably fix the responsibility, and could vote the President and his congressional supporters out of office at the next election. But the in-party would have a full 4 years in which to fulfill its campaign pledges before going again to the voters for an expression of confidence.

The arguments in support of lengthening the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives are familiar to all of us. Those of us who have served in the House as Representatives of two-party districts need not be reminded how difficult it is to become familiar with the legislative process and to become competent legislators when the next election is "just around the corner."

In recent years, Mr. President, it has become increasingly difficult to pass needed legislation through the other House. One of the reasons for this, I believe, is the preoccupation of House Members—especially the newer ones from two-party districts—with their reelection. A Representative is sent to Congress to give his constituency a voice in its relations with the Federal Government; but he also is expected to be a legislator—to understand the legislative process and to participate effectively in it. Under the present 2-year term, a new Representative finds it extremely difficult to become an effective legislator before the time when he must face the electorate for a judgment on his performance. A 4-year term would give a Member of the House an opportunity to make a record before seeking a vote of confidence from his constituents.

I believe this amendment deserves the serious consideration of this Congress. I recognize that it would represent a departure from our time-tested election laws; but times are changing, and we must change with them. The international and domestic challenges facing our Nation today and in the years ahead demand a responsible and responsive Congress. Adoption of this amendment would be a step in the direction of making the Congress more sensitive to the needs of our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, a section from "The Condition of Our National Political Parties," by Stephen K. Bailey, and the text of the joint resolution proposing the constitutional amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and excerpt will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 62) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives shall be 4 years, and the term of office of Senators shall be 8 years, introduced by Mr. METCALF, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen by the people of the several States and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The term of office of Representatives shall be four years; except that the term of office of Representatives elected for terms commencing on January 3 of any year following the ratification of this article but preceding the first election to which this section applies, shall be two years.

"SEC. 2. The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Subject to sections 3 and 4 of this article, the term of office of Senators shall be eight years; except that the term of office of Senators elected for terms commencing on January third of any year following the ratification of this article but preceding the first election to which this section applies, shall be six years.

"Sec. 3. Senators elected to the Senate for terms commencing on January 3 of the year commencing after the expiration of two years after the first election to which sections 1 and 2 of this article apply shall be divided into two classes. There shall be assigned to the first class any such Senator who is from a State which is then represented in the Senate by a Member whose term expires on January 3 of the year commencing after the expiration of eight years after the first election to which sections 1 and 2 of this article apply. There shall be assigned to the second class any such Senator who is from a State which is then represented in the Senate by a Member whose term expires prior to the said January 3 date. The term of office of Senators assigned to the first class shall be two years. The term of office of Senators assigned to the second class shall be six years.

"Sec. 4. The offices of Senators from any State admitted to the Union after the ratification of this article shall be divided by lot into two classes immediately after the Senate shall be assembled in consequence of the first election of Senators from such State. The term of office of the Senator assigned to the first class shall terminate on January 3 of the year following the first election, occurring after the election of such Senator, at which electors for the offices of President and Vice President are elected. The term of office of the Senator assigned to the second class shall terminate on January 3 of the year following a second election, occurring after the election of such Senator, at which electors for the offices of President and Vice President are elected.

"Sec. 5. Sections 1 and 2 of this article shall first apply in the case of Representatives and Senators who are elected for terms commencing on January third of the year following the first election, occurring more than six months after the ratification of this article, at which electors for the offices of President and Vice President are elected.

"Sec. 6. The first sentence of section 2 of article I, the first three sentences of section 3 of article I, and the first two sentences of article XVII are hereby repealed.

"Sec. 7. This article shall not be so construed as to affect the election or term of any Senator or Representative elected before it becomes valid as part of the Constitution.

"Sec. 8. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from he date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

The excerpt presented by Mr. Metcalf is, as follows:

Excerpt From Article "Congressional Terms," by Stephen K. Bailey

The constitutional provisions for staggered elections are a significant cause of the pullings and haulings in our National Government. It is equally clear that a 2-year term for the House is too short to turn a freshman Member into an effective legislator or to avoid the harassing and expensive responsibilities of perpetual campaigning. The last election and the next election are often an indistinguishable blur. Furthermore, if a truly competitive two-party system should develop across the Nation, there will be more frequent alternation of victorious candidates between the parties, thus shortening the tenure of any one Congressman.

A 4-year term for the House, if it coincides with the presidential term, should have a number of important effects. Under normal conditions, it would insure the same political complexion for the House as the President's. It would reduce the continuous campaign and constituency pressures which a 2-year term almost inevitably fosters. It would give Congressmen sufficient time to learn their trade and to make a substantial contribution to public life.

Also, if an 8-year term were provided for Members of the Senate (half of them coming up for election every 4 years at the same time as the Presidency), the likelihood that the President would have a working majority in both Houses would be overwhelming. At the same time, the conservative utility of overlapping terms would be maintained with only a slight modification in the constitutional wish for continuity.

Enhancing the possibility of one-party control of the Government would enhance the possibility of substantial governmental power and would unmistakably fix responsibility for governmental policy.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of February 28, 1963:

S. 942. A bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to give effect to the operation of the provisions of that section applicable to certain railroad consolidations and mergers until December 31, 1964, and for other purposes: Mr. Gruening.

Authority of March 15, 1963:

S. 1111. A bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a Water Resources Council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning: Mr. Eastland, Mr. Hart, and Mr. Moss.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from California [Mr. Engle] may be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 30, a measure to broaden the legislative authority of the Select Committee on Small Business.

I also ask unanimous consent that on the next printing of the resolution the name of the junior Senator from California [Mr. Engle] may be added to the list of those Senators who are cosponsoring the measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON PACIFIC NORTHWEST POWER GENERATION—S. 1007

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has scheduled a public hearing for April 2 and 3 on S. 1007, a bill relating to Pacific Northwest power generation.

The hearing will begin at 10 a.m. on April 2 and will be held in our committee hearing room in the New Senate Office Building.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addressed, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Editorial, "Skidding on Oil," from March 16, 1963 issue of the Washington Post, and his answer in letter to the editor, together with quotes from and comments on news articles reporting Interior Department's March 15 residual oil import control order.

Excerpts from proceedings at 14th annual State of the Nation Dinner of the Specialized Business Press of America, held February 7, 1963, at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

Statement regarding the closure of the Glen Canyon Dam.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RUSSELL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on January 12, 1963, the Houston Post, of Houston, Tex., published an article entitled "Senator Russell: An Institution." The article was written by Jack Valenti. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the Record, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Jan. 12, 1963]

Senator Russell: An Institution

(By Jack Valenti)

His name is Richard Brevard Russell, and to many students of American Government he is an institution, sturdy, wise, and irreplaceable.

Richard Russell is the senior Senator from the State of Georgia. On this day, January 12, 1963, he celebrates 30 years in the U.S. Senate. Save one, he will have served longer than any current Member. At 32 he was the youngest Governor ever elected in Georgia. On January 12, 1933, at the age of 34, he began his remarkable career in the Senate.

To those in whose care repose the responsibility and the guardianship of the American dream, Richard Russell is a unique and singular man.

Much of this regard comes from an appreciation of Senator Russell in his role as the embodiment of the Senate's classic constitutional tradition. The Senator understands the Senate. (The severest criticism he can lay onto another Senator is: "He doesn't understand the Senate.") He knows its moods and its dignity. He guards its honor. He nourishes its heritage.

Sometimes his votes on specific issues are in the coloration of his State and his section of the country. On those votes there are many who argue and differ with him.

But the total pattern of his behavior as a U.S. Senator is a legacy that never swerves from the history of the Senate as a structure undiminished by time, undisturbed by the moment, unbudgable in crisis and controversy.

The opposition, wherever it is and whoever it is, respects Richard Russell. On rules and parliamentary procedure he is an expert (a description the Senator might wave away as extravagant). He is a student and a fighter. He would be at home with Webster, Calhoun, and Clay. Madison would enjoy his talk. And Andrew Jackson might cuss him and trust him, at the same time.

In the brutish world of politics, he remains a scholarly warrior, who delights in Aristotle as much as he does the news columns of the Washington Post, though for widely varying reasons.

There are those who say Richard Russell is an anachronism, the leader of a lost cause. Perhaps. None of us is clearly correct on the assessment of victory. History has a

way of distorting tomorrow what is so surely in focus today.

But Senator Richard Russell in the views of many others is a gentle, tough, gifted, humane man who understands the brevity of triumph and defeat and who with good humor and grace accepts both.

OUR HERITAGE—A BLESSING AND AN OBLIGATION

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on November 12, 1962, I was privileged to speak in Richmond, Va., at the National Convention of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, upon the subject "Our Heritage—A Blessing and an Obligation." In my remarks, I undertook to describe the precious heritage we have received as Americans and the obligation which rests upon us to preserve it for our children and our children's children. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks be printed at this point in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Heritage—A Blessing and an Obligation

In my remarks on this occasion, I forego discussion of the transient issues of the hour. I prefer to consider with you fundamental principles which must be preserved if the America we know and love is to endure.

1. OUR HERITAGE

As Americans, each of us can assert with the Psalmist of old: "The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage."

These words of the Psalmist suggest the subject of my remarks: "Our Heritage—A Blessing and an Obligation."

We received our heritage in trust for ourselves and our children and our children's children from all those men and women, both great and small, whose blood, sweat, tears, and prayers made the America we know and love a living reality.

Our heritage is liberty. While liberty has blossomed in our land, love of liberty did not have its origin here. It was brought hither by courageous men and women from the British Isles, the vine-clad hills of France, and the Palatinate of Germany, who craved above all the things of earth, the economic freedom, the political freedom, and the religious freedom denied to them by the tyrannical rulers of the Old World.

Since so many men now appear so anxious to swap the reality of human liberty for the mirage of economic security, it would be well if we would pause a moment, and ponder the choice our ancestors made when they forsook the comparative security of the Old World for the terrifying insecurity of the New. It was not without many pangs of regret that they turned their backs for all time upon the scenes of their childhood, the graves of their beloved dead, and the comparative security of the then civilized world, and journeyed in tiny barks across a boisterous ocean to establish homes for themselves and their children and their children's children in what was then a perilous wilderness in a new and strange land.

Why did they do this? Why did they exchange the comparative security of the Old World for the terrifying insecurity of the New? The answer is simply this and nothing more: They believed that only the slave, who depends upon a master for the bread of bondage, is really secure; and they knew that only the self-reliant soul, who spurns security for opportunity, is truly free. For this reason, they chose liberty rather than security.

Liberty reveals herself in a threefold guise as economic liberty, political liberty, and religious liberty. Let us consider her attributes in each of these aspects.

2. ECONOMIC LIBERTY

The brave men and women, who brought the love of liberty to these shores, did not learn economics sitting at the feet of those who promise "abundance for all by robbing Selected Peter to pay for Collective Paul." They acquired their knowledge the hard way. Their teachers were despotic governments, which robbed them of the fruits of their labor by confiscatory taxation, and in that way reduced them to the status of economic slaves.

The valiant folk who made America great had the hardihood to accept the economic truths plainly visible to all persons who possess the capacity and willingness to meet reality face to face.

They knew that earth yields nothing to man except the products of his own labor. They knew that Adam's curse is an unchanging and unchangeable law of life: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground." They knew that man has but one choice in respect to this immutable economic fact, and that such choice is simply this: Whether the bread which he must eat in the sweat of his face shall be the bread of freedom or the bread of bondage. They knew this unalterable decree of the Creator of the universe: Free men cannot be induced to produce things of value unless they are permitted to retain a fair share of the fruits of their labor for themselves and their families.

They knew, moreover, that man can be free only if he is willing to accept the responsibility for his own life which is inseparable from liberty.

3. POLITICAL LIBERTY

The political philosophy of the Founding Fathers is readily understood if one bears in mind the historical fact that the Thirteen Original States—Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Virginia—became self-governing commonwealths 12 years before the United States had its legal birth.

The representatives of the people of these States met in constitutional convention, and framed State constitutions. These men were conversant with the story of the long and bitter struggle of the English-speaking race for some substantial measure of dignity and freedom for the individual. They loved liberty and loathed tyranny, and were convinced that government itself would have to be compelled by fundamental law to respect the inherent rights of the individual if freedom were to be preserved and oppression were to be prevented. In consequence, they inserted in the constitutions of the States declarations of rights designed to protect citizens from the States.

It was no accident that the first words incorporated in the constitutions of the Original States were declarations to the effect "that all political power is vested in and derived from the people" and "that the people of * * * (the States) * * * ought to have the sole and exclusive right of regulating the internal government and police thereof." The writers of the organic laws of the States placed these declarations in first place in their constitutions because the political concepts embodied in such declarations occupied first place in their hearts and minds. They had much cause for assigning prime importance to their beliefs in the sovereignty of the people and the rights of the States to local self-rule. They had suffered many things at the hands of a government far removed from the people.

The consciousness of early Americans that liberty is inevitably imperiled by a government far removed from the people finds further example in their implacable insistence upon the insertion of the first 10 amendments in the Federal Constitution. These amendments guarantee the personal and property rights of the individual, and declare that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

The ancient beliefs that all political power is vested in and derived from the people and that the States ought to have the right to regulate their internal affairs are as valid today as they were when the Declaration of Independence was signed and the Constitution of the United States was ratified.

4. RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

The most heart-rending story of history is that of man's struggle against civil and ecclesiastical tyranny for the simple privilege of bowing his own knees before his own God in his own way. As Chief Justice Walter P. Stacy of the North Carolina Supreme Court so well declared in one of the great judicial opinions of all time, "men contend more furiously over the road to heaven, which they cannot see, than over their visible walks on earth," and history records "the tragic fact that men have gone to war and cut each other's throats because they could not agree as to what was to become of them after their throats were cut."

The men and women who gave liberty to America were devout souls. They had learned some of the sorrowful facts of the spiritual life of man in the bitter crucible of experience. Most of them dissented from the doctrines and usages of the churches established by law in the lands of their origins. They were denied the right to worship God in their own ways. They were compelled to pay tithes for the support and propagation of religious opinions which they disbelieved. They had their marriages annulled and their children adjudged illegitimate for daring to speak their marriage vows before ministers of their own faiths rather than before clergymen of the established churches.

But these cruel oppressions merely steeled their convictions that religion is a private matter between man and his God; that no human authority should undertake to control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that "to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical."

For these reasons, our ancestors staked the very existence of America as a free nation upon the principle that "all men have a natural and unalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences," and the corollary that this natural and unalienable right can be secured only by keeping the hands of the state out of religion and the hands of religion off the state.

5. A BLESSING AND A WARNING

Courageous men and women built America with "strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands." They gave us a great country dedicated to the proposition that men "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, the enjoyment of the fruits of their own labor, and the pursuit of happiness." They gave us this land with the knowledge, however, that God grants freedom only to those who love it and are always ready to guard and defend it; and they left us the solemn warning that "a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty."

They bequeathed this warning to us because they had read the history of the long and bitter struggle of man for some substantial measure of dignity and freedom for the individual, and had found this shocking but everlasting truth inscribed upon each page of that history: Government itself is the deadliest foe of liberty.

This tragic truth was well expressed a third of a century ago by a great statesman and Virginian, Woodrow Wilson. He said: "Liberty has never come from the government. Liberty has always come from the subjects of it. The history of liberty is a history of resistance. The history of liberty is a history of limitations of governmental power, not the increase of it."

8. OUR OBLIGATION

Let us ponder these words of Wilson. Let us recur with frequency to fundamental principles. Let us preserve for ourselves and our posterity our goodly heritage—economic liberty, political liberty, and religious liberty. This is our obligation. We must perform it. As Americans, we cannot do otherwise.

FISCAL POLICY AND THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on March 13, President Kennedy delivered an address to the 19th Conference of the Advertising Council. His remarks dealt with fiscal policy and its relationship to the state of the Nation's economy.

What the Federal Government has done or failed to do in the past, on debt limitation, on the size of the Federal budget, and on Federal taxes, has had a major impact on the avoidance or precipitation of recessions. Fiscal policies, for example, did much to take a moderate prosperity and turn it into a recession in 1959. Fiscal policies helped to convert an estimated $500 million budgetary surplus into a peacetime record budgetary deficit of $12 billion in the same year.

What we do as we face these issues in the present Congress, similarly, will have profound bearing on the Nation's economic health now and in the months ahead. In a legislative sense, the President has done what he can. He has made his fiscal proposals to the Congress. He believes that the tax cut he advocates and the policies on the budget and debt limitation which he suggests will forestall a recession. With all due respect, may I say that the President's proposals are modest. The fact is that in some areas of this country—including my State of Rhode Island—the people suffer economic recession and an intolerable rate of unemployment. And, more and more, the entire country is likely to slide into the same situation if we continue to dawdle on these essential fiscal questions.

The President has asked for legislative action on debt limitation, on the budget, and on taxes. He has spelled out the kind of action he believes desirable. He has advanced cogent reasons—historical reasons and economic reasons—for his position. He has stressed the urgency of these matters if we are to avoid further economic slippage. At this point it is largely up to Congress—not to the President—to decide by fiscal policies whether to stimulate the economy or permit it to stagnate. It seems to me that it is high time that we in the Congress begin to face this issue. It is not enough that we speak individually on these questions, whether in support of the President's proposals or in opposition. Here I desire personally to interpolate my own strong belief and hope that the administration should stand firm on its tax reform proposals, and that we in the Congress should approve them.

It is not enough that committees in their own good time mull over these questions. We need to begin to consider them in the Congress as a whole. If we do not, the responsibility will rest with us—not with the President—for the consequences to the people of the Nation, for the unemployment which is already bad and is likely to grow worse, and for the continued sluggishness of business. We can oppose the President's proposals. We can support them. We can modify them. The one thing we cannot do, in good faith, is to ignore the President's warning. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address previously referred to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE 19TH WASHINGTON CONFERENCE OF THE ADVERTISING COUNCIL, DISTRICT RED CROSS BUILDING

Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Secretary, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MCNAMARA, I want to express my appreciation to you for your many services in the public interest during the past months. The Advertising Council has been of inestimable value to us in attempting to advance the public interest on projects, savings bonds, particularly the Peace Corps, and a number of other projects.

I have been particularly appreciative to your efforts, that of your executive secretary of the Advertising Council for his very constant assistance to us in the early days and also your support for it represents a very admirable facet of American life, and your service also represents a very strong indication of your devotion to your country and we are very grateful to you, and I want you to know that.

I unfortunately picked as a topic to discuss one that you have heard talked about by experts, so I move into this minefield with some degree of hesitancy.

The only reason I want to say just a very few words about our economy is that in spite of the strong feeling of many that the Federal Government should mind its own business, whatever that may be, and stay out of business' businesses, the fact is, when things go bad the chicken comes to roost on the President's house. Mr. Herbert Hoover was, we know in legend, responsible for all of the difficulties of 1929. President Truman bore responsibility for the 1949 recession. President Eisenhower was blamed for the recessions in 1954, 1958, and 1960. When the stock market had its difficulties last spring, I got a good many letters.

I receive no mail thanking me and expressing admiration for my economic wisdom when the market goes up, but when it goes down we all know who is wrong. Therefore, that being true, recognizing that the President of the United States and the Government will be responsible if we have economic difficulties, it seems to me that we have some right to present proposals which may lessen those economic difficulties.

We have some right, really, to be listened to. We are attempting to avoid those hazards which will inevitably be blamed upon us when they finally come, and people do look to Washington in all kinds of ways when difficulty comes across the country. It is also true of business and economic difficulties. So the matters we are now discussing, and the proposals we have made in regard to the budget, Federal expenditures, and the tax cut, are all representing our efforts to avoid the difficulties which, if they come, will inevitably be blamed upon the President of the United States.

The first 2 months of the 88th Congress have been dominated by discussions of fiscal and economic policy and the next several months will be dominated by the same facts. I think that is very wise. We are attempting to do something new, and that is to talk about a tax cut at a time when we have a deficit, and at a time when we have relatively good times, even though a disturbingly high rate of unemployment, so we are talking about, in a sense, something new, and it is appropriate that we talk about it in detail; and it is necessary that we get some understanding across the country of what we are trying to do because it is important and it does represent a change in previous policies enunciated by the U.S. Government.

The fact is, of course, these questions are all highly technical. To explain the difference between a family budget and the U.S. budget, to explain why we believe it difficult, if not impossible, and certainly unwise, to attempt to secure a balanced budget this year, which we believe would put us into a recession, which we believe would unbalance the budget, these are highly sophisticated questions, far more sophisticated than those questions which occupied our attention during the 19th century of free silver, trade, and all the rest. Balance of payments and the cyclical problems and debt management are all far more complicated and every solution raises new questions.

Three familiar questions of fiscal policy must be decided by the Congress:

The limit on the national debt.

The size of the Federal budget.

The desirability and extent of Federal tax reduction.

All three of these questions have faced legislative and executive branches before, and we have an obligation to learn the lessons of history if we do not wish to relive it.

In front of the Archives Building there is a statue, and under it is says "The past is prologue." Not necessarily, and it is because we do not wish to relive the past, because we do not wish to regard the past as necessarily a prologue in the 1960's that we have attempted to put forward our proposals.

Economic history, specifically the history of 1957–60, which produced two recessions from which the whole economy has never fully recovered, clearly warns us now that the wrong answers to each of these three questions would spell downturn for the American economy as a whole.

I do not speak as a partisan. The errors of a Republican administration and a Democratic Congress during these crucial years have been acknowledged by members of both parties. I do not review them now to gain political advantage in hindsight, but to gain a greater degree of foresight on the same problems that face our country at this time. I do not intend to assess the blame for the past. There is enough to go around for everyone. But we shall all be deserving of blame, we shall all be deserving of blame if we do not learn its lessons for the future.

The Federal Government, and I shall speak here not of any one party or branch of the Government, but the Government as a whole decided in 1957 to keep the debt limit unrealistically low, to cut back and stretch out budget expenditures, to tighten monetary policy, and to reject all efforts at tax reduction. The harsh results of those decisions are still with us.

In the decade previous to July 1957, unemployment had rarely exceeded 4 percent. In the 64 months since those decisions, it has remained above 5 percent.

In the earlier decade, business fixed investment averaged nearly 11 percent of total output. It has since that time fallen steadily to roughly 9 percent today.

In the previous decade, our total output of goods and services, measured in constant prices, had increased at the rate of nearly 4 percent a year. Since mid-1957 the rate of increase has been limited to 3 percent.

All three of these decisions were taken in the name of fiscal responsibility. But if that high-sounding label is intended to refer to budget and balance-of-payments surpluses, it was a name taken in vain.

The preceding 11 fiscal years had produced seven cash surpluses in the Federal budget, for a net cash surplus of $20 billion. The 6 succeeding fiscal years produced one surplus and five deficits, including the greatest peacetime deficit of all in fiscal 1959, for a net cash deficit of $30 billion. Had the economy been operating at full employment, there would have been no deficit.

The balance-of-payments problem became a problem only after mid-1957, with a total deficit of $11.2 billion during the next 3 calendar years and a gold loss of more than $5 billion during the same period. The fact that short-term interest rates had been increased 40 percent in 1955 and 1957 did not help to stem this balance-of-payments tide. As the OECD said last December:

"Confidence in the dollar depends in good part on a strong domestic economy; it is unlikely to be fostered for any length of time by policies that keep the level of activity low."

Unfortunately, the size of the deficits in our Federal budget and our international accounts led the Government in 1959 to adopt even more restrictive fiscal and monetary policies. The Federal cash budget during the first quarter of 1959 was operating at the level of $17 billion deficit at annual rates. By the third quarter, this had become a $2 billion deficit, and by the second quarter of the next year, 1960, a surplus of $7 billion. These figures are from Arthur Burns, who served my predecessor as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and who call this, and I quote, "one of the very sharpest shifts of Federal finance in our Nation's history."

At the same time, Dr. Burns pointed out, economic expansion was curbed by a tightening of both short-term and long-term credit. Long-term rates, in fact, "advanced faster," and I quote him, "than during a comparable stage of any business cycle during the past hundred years."

The result was another recession, more unemployment, more unused capacity, and another incomplete recovery. Today's output is $30 to $40 billion below our productive capacity. The rate of unemployment has risen to 6.1 percent of those actively seeking work. Corporate investment last year was—for the first time in any nonrecession year since the war—below the level of gross retained earnings. And business spending on new plant and equipment was at a lower level than it was in 1957.

Now, in 1963, the Government once again is faced with these same decisions. I hope we will bear in mind the lessons of history. I hope we will remember the editorial in Business Week magazine, June 28, 1958, which pointed out the effects of an unrealistic debt ceiling and a harmful slash in expenditures, and I quote them:

"In the second half of 1957, the debt ceiling forced the administration to cut back programs needed for long-term national security. And," they said and I quote, "the resulting slash in defense expenditures was an important contributing cause of the recession."

An unrealistic debt ceiling or budget cut today would also cause a slowdown in contracts, a stretchout in payments, a cash drain on business, and ultimately another recession. Instead of balancing the budget, it would produce a budget deficit far greater than the temporary addition to the deficit that will come from a tax reduction. Let us remember that the $12.4 billion deficit of fiscal year 1959 was the result of a recession which wiped out what had originally been conceived of as a surplus of $500 million.

This administration is not asking for an unlimited debt ceiling, but a realistic one which will still keep the actual debt burden as measured by a percentage of our gross national product steadily declining. As you know, it has declined for 120 percent of our gross national product, 17 or 18 years ago, to 54 percent today, and will continue to decline both as a percentage of our population per capita and as a percentage of our gross national product.

We are not asking for uncontrolled budget increases, but for a prudent budget which, contrary to all trends in Government, both local and State, actually reduces civilian expenditures below their level of last year, a feat which has occurred only four times in the last 15 years, a hard defense budget which, interestingly enough, was increased by half a billion dollars yesterday in the House of Representatives. And we are not asking for an unprecedented tax cut because, while the total amount of the tax cut in calendar months beginning in July would take place over a period of 18 months for the fiscal year, it will result in a $2.7 billion loss in this fiscal year.

Certainly it is clear that if we slide into another recession, the deficit without a tax cut will be far larger than the projected deficit we face with a tax cut. It seems to me that the logic of our problem and the past is so clearly before us that I sometimes find it difficult to understand why so many members of the business community who live with these problems day by day, who have lived through the last 20 years, are so reluctant to accept what are obviously the facts of life in our economy.

In addition, as you know, we are pouring into the labor market every year, at the very time when automation is becoming most sophisticated, millions of people who are looking for work. In 1960, 2.6 million Americans reached 18. In 1965, it will be 3.8 million reaching 18, which is this tremendous increase as a result of the war-baby boom of people looking for work in the 1960's.

So we have all of these things coming to a climax in 1960, automation, an increase in those in the labor market, and Number 3, a slow growth in our economy. That is what we are faced with in these years. I am hopeful that the lessons of history will be learned by us all, in and out of Washington, by those of us in the administration, and the Congress, and by all of you.

"The great advantage of Americans," wrote de Tocqueville in 1835, "The great advantage of Americans consists in their being able to commit faults which they may afterwards repair." To this I would add the fact that the great advantage of hindsight consists of our applying its lessons by way of foresight. If this Nation can apply the lessons and repair the faults of the last 5 years, if we can stick to the facts and cast out those things which really don't apply to the situation, then surely this country can reach its goals, and upon reaching its goals depends the security of the free world.

Thank you.

SOVIET DISCRIMINATION AGAINST RUSSIAN JEWS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a news report from Moscow today discloses that Jews in the U.S.S.R. will again not be able to obtain matzoth for the Passover this year. For the second year, state bakeries, the only ones permitted to operate in the Soviet Union, will not supply the religious ceremonial wafers for the Passover. The news report adds that the chief rabbi of the only synagogue in Moscow told his congregation last Saturday that a new request had been rejected by the Soviet authorities. These same authorities have also refused to allow Soviet Jews to import matzoth for the religious observance this year as they did last year. At that time I acted on behalf of a group of American matzoth bakers who had volunteered to ship a planeload of matzoth to the Soviet Union in time for observance of the Passover.

This is a direct attack on the part of the Communists against Jewish religious practices, and it gives further credence to the charge so hotly denied by Chairman Khrushchev himself of discrimination by Soviet officials.

Chairman Khrushchev owes the world an explanation for this and other attacks on Russian Jews. The hundreds of words used by Khrushchev in his speech on March 8 to describe his attitude toward Jews and to deny the existence of a Jewish problem in the U.S.S.R. do not explain the repressive actions of the Soviet Government against Jews. The Soviet Union's action should be protested and an accounting demanded.

There has been international protest in these matters as well. I draw attention to the fact that at the meeting of the United Nations General Assembly Social Committee, on November 1, 1962, the Australian delegate, acting on the instructions of his government, specifically singled out Soviet discrimination against Jews during the committee's debate on manifestations of racial prejudice and national and religious intolerance. The Russians again hotly denied that that was so. But the Australian delegate stuck by his guns, and the record fully bears him out. I hope the protest of the world will again be directed at the Soviet Union for this act of discrimination, again shown by acts rather than speeches, which flies directly in the face of the position taken by Chairman Khrushchev in his speech of March 8.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notation of the Australian initiative and intervention that I have described and the news article to which I have referred, datelined Moscow, March 18, entitled "Soviet Forbids Making Matzoh in Red Bakeries."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERVENTIONS—AUSTRALIA'S INITIATIVE

International concern over the situation of Jews in the U.S.S.R. has been expressed in a number of interventions at the U.N. and in direct representations to the Soviet authorities. At the United Nations General Assembly Social Committee on November 1, 1962, the Australian delegate, acting on the instructions of his Government, specifically singled out Soviet discrimination against Jews during the Committee's debate on manifestations of racial prejudice and national religious intolerance.

Mr. White said that there had been violent and inflammatory examples of anti-Jewish conduct in a number of countries in recent years. "I feel that I must also mention specifically the fact that Jewish communities throughout the world have expressed concern at the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union," he added.

The Australian accusation in the General Assembly's 110-nation Social Committee touched off a series of sharp East-West exchanges. Vigorously denying the anti-Semitism charge, the Soviet Union characterized Australia's statement as "filthy calumnies" and referred to "rank racism" in the United States.

Mr. White cited official Soviet criticism directed against the Jews, restriction of Jewish religious observances, and action taken against individual Jews.

He referred specifically to the Soviet ban on the public baking of unleavened bread for the 1962 Passover observance and the unduly high proportion of Jews sentenced to death recently for economic offenses in the Soviet Union.

"Should the U.S.S.R. find difficulty in according Soviet Jewry full freedom to practice their religion, it should, we believe, permit them to leave the country," he added. "Indeed it has a moral obligation to do so under article 13, paragraph 2, of the universal declaration of human rights, which says: 'Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.' "

Exercising the right of reply, Mrs. T. N. Nikolayeva of the Soviet Union charged that Australia's accusation was a Western attempt to denigrate her country and distract attention from the racial discrimination imposed by colonialism.

"In the Soviet Union," she asserted, "there is no discrimination against Jews or any other nationality or group."

She cited statistics to show that Jews held a high proportion of professional, artistic, and political positions in the Soviet Union.

When Mrs. Ronald Tree of the United States asked why Soviet passports identified Jews by religion, a Soviet spokesman asked why "armed forces" were needed to enroll a Negro in the University of Mississippi.

"You are sitting in a glasshouse yourself," the Soviet spokesman remarked.

Earlier in the week, the Israel permanent representative at the U.N., Mr. Michael Comay, had indirectly referred to Soviet Jewry when he asked the United Nations to condemn and seek an end to cultural discrimination which deprived a people of the freedom to "maintain their distinctive language, literature, and traditions" and used Jews as "scapegoats for economic difficulties." It is painful, he said, for Israel to state that a large section of the Jewish people had been singled out for such discrimination "in a land which officially recognizes the identity of each ethnic, national, and religious group within its borders—including the Jewish group, the members of which are formally described in their documents of identity as being Jewish in nationality.

"As a religious group, too, this community is deprived of the prerogatives which are still extended to other faiths, such as the production of sacred books and articles, the training of clerics and contact between the different local communities within the country, or between them and the Jewish communities elsewhere.

"In brief, the Jewish community of that country has been tragically cut off from its own rich religious and cultural heritage, as well as from its Jewish brethren in the rest of the world. Their helplessness is aggravated by the growing (though by no means original) trend to find Jewish scapegoats for economic difficulties."

TRADE UNION MEMORANDUM

Another intervention was the circulation recently of a memorandum among all members of the U.N. by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions which asserted that discrimination against Jews is "part and parcel of government policy in the Soviet Union." It called for a sweeping investigation of "government-instigated anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union."

The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, which has consultative status on the U.N. Economic and Social Council, demands an investigation and report similar to that which dealt with forced labor in Soviet Russia and eventually led to a U.N. convention on forced labor. Its representative, Mr. Irving Brown, attacked the "ever-expanding program of Soviet anti-Semitism, aided, abetted, encouraged, and legalized by the Soviet Government."

While the Soviet Union is "preaching the virtues of peaceful coexistence," the trade union memorandum states, it is engaged "in a program against a large defenseless minority of its citizenry which can only be characterized as cultural and spiritual genocide."

The 5,000-word International Confederation of Free Trade Unions memorandum points out that while Soviet Jews are officially considered as a nationality and are listed as such on their identification papers, they are "officially deprived of the fundamental rights accorded to nationalities in the Soviet Union."

"All Jewish newspapers, publishing houses, literary journals, repertory theaters and dramatic schools, cultural-communal associations, literary, and cultural research institutions, schools and other means of instruction in and perpetuation of Jewish cultural and historic traditions have been forcibly liquidated since 1948," the memorandum states.

"Not only are the Jews allowed no schools, they are not even allowed classes in Yiddish or Hebrew in general schools, or, for that matter, classes on Jewish history and culture in Russian."

WORLD PROTESTANTS INQUIRE

In New York on September 18, 1962, a six-man delegation of the Protestant World Council of Churches, which had returned from an official visit to the Soviet Union, said that they had questioned Soviet officials about the position of Judaism in the U.S.S.R. Leader and chief spokesman for the group was the Reverend Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, the executive head of the United Presbyterian Church of America, former president of the World Council of Churches and chairman of the council's standing committee on Soviet religious affairs.

Dr. Blake stated that, in response to the delegation's expression of concern about the Jews, Soviet officials denied the existence of any problem, but nevertheless promised to look into it.

This is the first time that such a high-level Christian group has raised the problem of Soviet Jews with Kremlin officials. The significance of the delegation's intervention is emphasized by the fact that the World Council of Churches has developed increasingly close relations during the past year with Soviet ecclesiastical bodies. Last December, at its international conference in New Delhi, the council accepted the Russian Orthodox Church, the U.S.S.R.'s leading denomination, as a full-fledged member. And this past August, the council's executive committee recommended acceptance of applications for membership from five more Soviet church groups: the Georgian Orthodox Church, the Armenian Apostolic Church, the Baptists, the Lutheran Church of Latvia, and the Lutheran Church of Estonia.

This prerogative of maintaining close relations and contact with coreligionists abroad is one of the many denied to Soviet Jews.

Dr. Blake added that the delegation had visited the one remaining synagogue in Odessa, where before the Revolution several score synagogues had thrived. He described the Odessa Synagogue as dreadfully rundown and in desperate need of repair and paint. Even this synagogue, in a city with a Jewish population of some 100,000, lacks a rabbi.

In general, Dr. Blake noted that, though the Soviet Government has stepped up its propaganda campaigns against all religions, it has not resorted to "administrative measures against the Christian churches. This stands in marked contrast to the harsh administrative steps taken against Judaism in the past year. In addition to the ban on matzoth-baking and the virtual closure of the Yeshiva, these measures have included the deposition of synagogue presidents in six major cities, and the trial and lengthy prison terms meted out to Gedalia Pechersky and other Jewish religious leaders in Leningrad and Moscow last October."

COLORED PEOPLE'S ASSOCIATION ASK CLEMENCY

A request that the Soviet authorities extend clemency to 15 people in the Soviet Union sentenced to die for economic offenses, at least 12 of whom were Jews, was made in April 1962, by the National Association of Colored People. The chairman of the association, Mr. S. G. Spollswood, wrote to the Soviet Ambassador in Washington, Mr. Anatoli F. Dobrynin, that: "Representing, as it does, a group which has long suffered the troubles of discrimination and segregation, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People considers with increasing concern the fate of Soviet Jewry. The shocking events of recent weeks within the Soviet Union have brought the situation to a pass which forces us to speak out in protest."

The letter points out that many of these sentenced to death by shooting "received their sentences for offenses committed at a time when the law did not call for capital punishment. In at least three cases a lesser penalty, meted out upon conviction, was increased to capital punishment on appeal by the prosecution after enactment of the death penalty decree. Most of the convicted are denied the right to appeal. These savage practices represent an unfortunate retrogression in Soviet law as well as new and disturbing indications of anti-Semitic persecution."

The letter asked for clemency and for commutation of the death sentences.

OTHER INTERVENTIONS

In May the International League for the Rights of Man sent an appeal, signed by 223 leading Americans, to the U.N. Secretary General U Thant asking him to intercede over the death sentences.

Some other interventions were: An appeal on August 12, 1962, the 10th anniversary of the murder of 26 leading Soviet-Jewish intellectuals, by the 7 leading Jewish organizations in America calling for the restoration to Soviet Jews of "the full right to their own cultural life." The appeal declared that: "Official Soviet practice today continues the Stalin policy of depriving Soviet Jewry of continuity with its past and free expression in the present. The terror is gone, but the policy extinguishing every spark of Jewish consciousness and identity continues."

Under Soviet Premier Khrushchev, the organizations said, "the policy of cultural extinction remains essentially unaltered. There is no school, nor even a classroom, where a Jewish child may learn something of Yiddish or Hebrew language and literature. There does not even exist the opportunity for Jewish parents to have their children instructed in Jewish history and culture through the medium of the Russian language."

The statement concluded:

"Ten years after their execution, there is no way, except for public apology and full rehabilitation, that reparation can be made to the slain writers. But there is a way for the Soviet Government to rectify its crime

against Soviet Jewry: To reverse this policy and to restore to Soviet Jews the full right to their own cultural life."

Signers of the statement were Dr. Joachim Prinz, president, American Jewish Congress; Label Katz, president, B'nai B'rith; Adolph Held, national chairman, Jewish Labor Committee; Theodore Brooks, national commander, Jewish War Veterans; Lewis Weinstein, chairman, National Community Relations Advisory Council; Rabbi David Hill, president, National Council of Young Israel, and Rabbi Israel Moshowitz, president, New York Board of Rabbis.

On July 15, the president of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, Sir Barnett Janner, appealed for mitigation of the severe sentences meted out to Jews in the Soviet Union charged with economic offenses, and asked the Soviet Government to conduct "a campaign of enlightenment against anti-Semitism in the U.S.S.R."

On June 24, 1962, the Central Conference of American Rabbis deplored the "unique discrimination and persecution" of Jews and Judaism in the U.S.S.R. They said that Soviet authorities were attempting to "liquidate religious and cultural Judaism and to assimilate Russian Jews by coercion."

An American assemblyman, Bentley Kassal, asked the U.S. Mission at the U.N. to demand U.N. action on behalf of Soviet Jews in May 1962. He said that on a visit to the U.S.S.R. in December 1961, he had noted the disruption of Jewish communities, despite denials by Soviet officials.

In June 1962, 40 American and Canadian trade union leaders condemned anti-Jewish excesses in the U.S.S.R. A resolution passed by the meeting in Pennsylvania critized death sentences for so-called economic crimes, and the second-class treatment accorded to Soviet Jews in every facet of Soviet life."

Soviet Forbids Making Matzoh in Red Bakeries

Moscow, March 18.—Jews in the Soviet Union have been told again this year that state-operated bakeries will not supply them with traditional matzoh bread for Passover ceremonies next month.

Yehuda Leb-Levin, chief rabbi of the only synagogue in Moscow, told his congregation last Saturday that a new request had been turned down and that if they wanted matzoh this year they would have to bake it at home.

Last year was the first time the state bakeries have refused to supply matzoh in Moscow and Leningrad. Matzoh supplies have been cut off in a growing number of provincial Soviet cities over the last 5 or 6 years, however, and the policy now is understood to be nationwide.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection.? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article which appeared in the winter 1962–63 issue of American Judaism entitled "The Dilemma of Soviet Jewry," written by Rabbi Judah Cahn, spiritual leader of the Metropolitan Synagogue of New York City.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Dilemma of Soviet Jewry

(By Rabbi Judah Cahn)

One of the tragic results of recent developments in the Soviet Union is the dilemma which now faces the 3 million Jews in that nation. The roots of the dilemma are deep and complicated. It begins with the fact that within the Soviet Union, Jews are regarded not as a religious body but as a national minority. This was not always true. During the early years after the revolution, the Soviet Government had denied this status to the Jews.

The reversal of this decision was based ostensibly on the four-point definition of a nationality as promulgated by Stalin. He said that a nation or ethnic group should possess four characteristics: A common land, a common language, a common culture, and common economic interests. Within the framework of this definition it would have been logically impossible to give the Jewish population of the Soviet Union the label of a national group.

Biro-Bidjan, a region in East Siberia, was established as an autonomous Jewish Republic. This was an attempt by Soviet authorities to make the Jews in the Soviet Union conform to their definition. Of the approximately 20,000 Jewish inhabitants who were there during the early days, over 11,000 had left by 1934.

This so-called Jewish Republic turned out to be an admitted failure. All the other republics had been created on the same lands already occupied by the people who were designated as citizens of that republic. The situation with the Jews was quite different. A piece of land in Siberia which did not even have a trace of previous Jewish occupation was turned into a Jewish "homeland." The fact that the Jews of the Soviet Union were located in the great cities of Western Russia and played a very important part in the cultural and economic life of the country, made no difference. Did the Soviet authorities seriously expect these thousands of teachers, scientists, poets, actors, and musicians to leave the cultural centers of the U.S.S.R. and migrate to Biro-Bidjan?

The results of these actions were inevitable. The Jews became a national minority group within the Soviet Union without possessing any of the advantages of such a designation. When choices were made for national posts in the many areas of Soviet life, the Jews could be designated only after all others who were citizens of that particular republic had been given the opportunity. The only place where it was possible for a Jew to receive preference over others would have been in Biro-Bidjan and in this barren spot there existed none of the institutions which permitted such participation. This also applied to college admission, professional training, and opportunities, which all depend on national identity.

Thus, the Jews became subject to the whims of the dictator. When Stalin thought it desirable, he utilized a literal interpretation of the law. When he thought it expedient, he utilized a loose interpretation.

During the life of Stalin, academic life was circumscribed by political expediency. The best of the Soviet academicians were harnessed to justify and rationalize the policies of the state. With the elimination of Stalin, this academic straitjacket was, for a time, loosened and matters heretofore forbidden for discussion were now brought into the open. At a meeting with Prof. Alexi Leondyev, a member of the Presidium of the Academy of Special Sciences and chairman of the Department of Psychology at the University of Moscow, and Prof. Fidore Savatkin, vice director of the Institute of National Schools and professor of methods of teaching language in the professional school, this subject was first raised by me in the summer of 1956. Neither professor made any serious attempt to justify the designation of Jews as a national minority. In the course of the discussion, I pointed out that in my contacts with Jewish university students, musicians, and government officials who were under the age of 35, I had found that they had either no knowledge or a sparse knowledge of Yiddish, which was supposed to be a national language for Soviet Jewry.

I indicated to Professor Savatkin that though he had organized schools and staffs for the teaching of approximately fifty languages, there were neither teachers nor texts for the teaching of Yiddish. A call was immediately put in to the Lenin Library and this point was confirmed. Though there were texts in Yiddish concerned with the teaching of other subjects, there wasn't a single text dealing with the teaching of Yiddish. As far as Hebrew was concerned, both men refused to recognize it as a spoken tongue and referred to it as a language of prayer which was the concern and responsibility of the Jewish religious community. They claimed that they would neither help nor hinder such activities. When it was further charged that Jews were not permitted to create prayerbooks for the teaching of the language, this fact was attributed to the disinterest of Jews themselves; a common excuse among Soviet officials. Finally, both professors suggested that this was a vastly complicated question and that the complete assimilation of Soviet Jewry would be the desirable goal. Upon further discussion they admitted that the Jewish national group alone seemed superfluous in the eyes of the Soviet authorities.

The matter was then pursued with Prof. Ivan Podekhin, director of the Institute of Ethnology at the University of Moscow. This institute is responsible for the designation of national identities. After many hours of argument, it was finally divulged that the subject of Jewish identity was just then coming before the Institute of Ethnology for restudy. However, the research and discussions had not yet reached the stage where they could be made public. The latest information on this subject which we have been able to secure from the Soviet Union, indicates that the problem of Jewish identity is now very much alive in Soviet academic circles.

This creates the dilemma for Soviet Jewry: whether to be or not to be a nationality. If national identity is taken from them, all that will be left will be a religious identity. In view of the fact that only a small minority of Soviet Jewry maintains identity with the synagogue and that members of this minority, for the most part, are well advanced in years, it would mean the virtual disappearance by assimilation of this vast segment of world Jewry. Hitler destroyed 6 million Jews. The Soviet Union is suggesting to 3 million more the possibility of mass cultural suicide. The other alternative is to seek to maintain Soviet Jewry as a national minority. This would mean the continuance of certain disabilities, and perhaps an intensification of the current anti-Semitic wave now prevalent in the Soviet Union. But it would make possible the maintenance of identity for these 3 million people and the hope for their eventual freedom. These millions of Jews also recognize that even cultural and religious suicide may not necessarily destroy the virus of anti-Semitism. Among those who were liquidated in the Stalin purges were many men and women who had not only relinquished their Jewish heritage, but had become the enemies of those who insisted on retaining it.

No other Jew in the world can make this decision for Soviet Jewry. Of course, it may be that Soviet Jewry will have little voice in determining its own destiny. But where shall they, as a community, apply the little strength that they may have?

NATIONAL WILDLIFE WEEK—MARCH 17 TO 23, 1963

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues that this week is National Wildlife Week throughout the Nation.

Held during the first week of spring every year since first proclaimed by President Roosevelt in 1938, National Wildlife Week has served to focus public attention on the importance of conserving our natural resources and to spotlight specific conservation problems through the years. This year the Wildlife Week's theme is "Chemical Pesticides Are Poison—Handle With Care."

This theme is especially appropriate this year in view of the nationwide impact which has been made recently by Rachel Carson's controversial book, "Silent Spring," which has detailed how man has abused and misused chemical pesticides in his attempt to control insects and other pests. The issues raised by Miss Carson's book have stressed general agreement that steps should be taken to acquaint the public with the potential dangers and hazards involved in the use of these chemical pesticides. With the protection of the public and our Nation's heritage of abundant fish and wildlife in mind, the National Wildlife Federation-sponsored Wildlife Week has devoted itself to this important educational task.

WOOLEN TEXTILE IMPORTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the question of imports of woolen manufactures and their effect on the U.S. industry has again become a matter of public and governmental concern. The President's Cabinet Committee on Textiles met recently on this problem and the President has promised an answer to a group of distinguished colleagues from wool producing and wool textile manufacturing States on what action, if any, will be taken.

There has been much dispute, however, concerning the actual facts regarding imports and the performance of the domestic industry. This is because of the great difficulties in obtaining, analyzing and evaluating statistical material both on an overall and category-by-category basis. The U.S. industry contends that imports represent something like 20 percent of domestic consumption of wool products. Importer groups dispute this figure and contend that the statistical basis for the computation is erroneous. The U.S. industry points to a rising trend of imports. Importer groups emphasize the greatly expanded domestic consumption of woolen products, the firm market for such goods, and the satisfactory performance of the domestic industry.

Mr. President, last year the Congress passed the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which provides the machinery for evaluating such claims and testing out the arguments and facts submitted by opposing interests before an independent tribunal, the U.S. Tariff Commission. My investigation of the statistical material submitted to me by various groups has convinced me that this is a case for which the machinery set up by the Trade Act could well be used.

The press reports that the Cabinet committee has recommended to the President that a section 332 investigation or an escape-clause investigation by the Tariff Commission be initiated. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of these reports but would endorse such a course of action on the following grounds:

First. Contradictory and incomplete data relating to woolen textile imports and their effect on domestic industry should be evaluated and fully brought to light by the agency created by Congress for this very purpose.

Second. Governmental responsibility to the consumer, who would bear the brunt of increased import restrictions in terms of prices, requires that a full and impartial investigation be conducted before any such restrictions are put into effect.

Mr. President, for the information of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point both the public statement of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers and the letter to the President from the wool products group. I believe that the obvious differences in the data and arguments presented by these two interests clearly indicate the need for an informed judgment in the consumer interest.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC STATEMENT BY EDWIN WILKINSON, PRESIDENT NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOOL MANUFACTURERS, FEBRUARY 14, 1963

President Kennedy's Cabinet Textile Advisory Committee could not give him worse advice than that reported in the press today. According to these reports, it has suggested that the President order still another study of the wool textile-apparel import crisis.

The Cabinet Committee, in our view, is asking the President of the United States to close his eyes to the grave peril he long has recognized and to draw back on administration commitments to limit imports of wool products which in 1962 soared to record levels. For example, imports of woven wool cloth rose to about 65 million square yards in 1962 compared with 42,921,000 in 1961. Imports of cloth in the form of apparel were equal to 20 million yards. The combined total, 85 million square yards, was equal to about 18 percent of U.S. production of woven wool apparel cloth.

The import crisis confronting the industry did not spring up overnight. It has been developing with increasing and virtually uninterrupted virulence since the filling of the war-created void in world supply of wool textiles in consequence of the unwise and unwarranted negotiated slashes in the wool product tariff schedule.

President Kennedy formally recognized the intolerable textile import situation in May of 1961 in announcing a special program for all textiles, declaring then that it was "time for action." Clearly, he did not mean 1963 or 1964 or perhaps later. He said: "I believe it is time for action."

Since that time the administration has moved forward only on cotton textiles. All this time, however, the wool textile industry has had continuing assurances from highest officials that its problem was recognized and was to be promptly dealt with once the cotton program was operative, which it now is.

For the Cabinet Committee now to suggest that a known cancer be investigated to see if it exists is the height of futility, a disservice to the President and to the Nation. For this defense-essential industry, such a course of action could only mean accelerated liquidation with all its attendant evils, with which we are all too familiar. Since 1947 the woolen and worsted industry has suffered a severe contraction: woolen and worsted spinning spindles have declined by 65 percent, and looms by 58 percent; some 98,000 jobs have been lost, and about 300 mills have gone out of business. Imports have contributed substantially to this decline.

Industry must and does rely on the President's earnestness. Industry relies on the President to reject the Cabinet Committee's recommendation for another study. A study would be totally inconsistent with administration declarations.

Available on request are additional copies of this statement and the accompanying record of administration commitments on wool textile import limitations.

THE RECORD OF ADMINISTRATION COMMITMENTS ON WOOL TEXTILE IMPORT LIMITATIONS, FEBRUARY 1963

May 2, 1961, President Kennedy announces seven-point textile program, and point 6 said:

"I have directed the Department of State to arrange for calling an early conference of the principal textile exporting and importing countries. This conference will seek an international understanding which will provide a basis for trade that will avoid undue disruption of established industries."

May 4, 1961, Hickman Price, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic Affairs, in speech at annual meeting of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers:

"As this evidence [on the import situation] mounted, those of us who were new to Government became increasingly amazed that such a situation should have ever been permitted to exist. And it became equally clear that if the accelerated rate of imports in all segments of your industry were to continue at a rate comparable to that of the last 2 years, your industry would be faced with virtual extinction * * *. We cannot totally shut off imports * * *. But what is possible by two of the means mentioned by the President [in his seven-point program] is a reasonable control, and from there on the job is yours."

June 30, 1961, President Kennedy in letter to Congressman CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia:

"It should be borne in mind that the contemplated [cotton textile] negotiations are designed as one of a series of efforts to assist the textile industry. Our objective is to assist the industry to overcome all of the handicaps which it faces. The State Department is being instructed to get the best possible relief, not only for cotton, but for other fibers."

January 1962, Lawrence F. O'Brien, special assistant to President Kennedy, in identical letters to Senator PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, and to Congressman VINSON:

"After the conclusion of the permanent [cotton] textile agreement, the problems of the wool and manmade fiber industries will certainly be attacked."

February 26, 1962, President Kennedy in letter to Congressman VINSON:

"I have also requested the Departments involved to implement my program for the wool, manmade fiber and silk divisions of the industry. Almost all of the points in the program announced on May 2, 1961, apply equally to each of these."

May 10, 1962, Hickman Price, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic Affairs, in a speech at annual meeting of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers;

"The President's Cabinet Textile Committee last Monday appointed a three-man ad hoc committee to consider and report upon as rapidly as possible the implementation of the President's seven-point program relating to textile products manufactured from fibers other than cotton. There are * * * numerous roads down which Government can go to be of great and material help to this industry, applicable not only to the domestic

front, but more importantly in the international with respect to imports. It is our desire to attempt to translate these into action at the earliest possible moment."

August 7, 1962, Myer Feldman, Deputy Special Counsel to President Kennedy, in letter to National Association of Wool Manufacturers:

"The President, under his seven-point program for textiles * * * has expressed his concern about the importation of all textiles, including those made of wool and manmade fibers, and indicated his determination to take steps to deal effectively with these imports. This concern of the President and his determination to see that these imports do not exceed reasonable levels continue unchanged and are the subject of planning and consideration now underway in this Government. Limitation of textile imports to prevent market disruption is an essential element of administration policy. We intend to implement this policy with regard to all textiles, and particularly to prevent market disruption such as would result from an increase over current levels of imports."

August 28, 1962, Secretary of Commerce Luther W. Hodges in letter to Congressman F. BRADFORD MORSE, Republican, of Massachusetts:

"We are determined that imports of wool textile products will not be permitted to exceed current levels and we will take all necessary steps to prevent this."

December 11, 1962, W. Michael Blumenthal, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and chairman, U.S. Delegation to International Wool Study Group, London:

"There is in this program [President Kennedy's seven-point textile program] in fact, a commitment by the President to the industry that * * * the administration will not permit excessively large imports or rapidly rising imports, which have a disruptive effect, effectively to destroy the stability and the survival of all sectors of this [the textile] industry."

January 18, 1963, a Washington press dispatch:

"A group of Senators from wool and wool textile States said they received assurances from President Kennedy today that 'something will be done' to restrict imports on wool products. Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, told newsmen * * * that the President promised to propose within a month measures to limit such imports."

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICAN
IMPORTERS, INC.,
WOOL PRODUCTS GROUP,
New York, N.Y., February 11, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Wool Products Group is a representative organization of U.S. firms importing and distributing wool yarns, woolen fabrics, wool blends, and wool apparel, including knitwear. It is a commodity group affiliated with the National Council of American Importers, Inc. Its members import articles from the United Kingdom, Italy, Japan, France, West Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Spain, Eire, Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Norway, Austria, Switzerland, Israel, Argentina, Uruguay, Australia, and Hong Kong.

We are deeply disturbed by reports in the press that the domestic wool manufacturing and clothing industries are intensifying their efforts for the imposition of quotas on the imports of wool products of every kind.

Our concern has been increased by reports in the press stating that 6 Senators visited the White House on January 18 to request a quota treatment for imported woolen textiles similar to that now imposed on cotton textiles. According to these reports, the Senators were told that this problem is receiving active consideration, and that if they returned to the White House in 30 days, they would receive an answer to their request.

These reports create the impression, both in this country and abroad, that the administration is planning to institute quantitative restrictions on all kinds of imported wool products soon.

There are many aspects of the present situation that must be studied and placed in proper perspective. We, therefore, respectfully urge that the U.S. Tariff Commission be directed to make an immediate investigation under section 332(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and furnish the President with the information specified in subdivisions (3), (4), (5), and (6) of that subsection without delay.

The statement has been made that competitive imports of wool products amount to 20 percent of domestic consumption. Importers of wool products say this figure is very much exaggerated, and that the correct figure will be found to be between 6 and 7 percent. In this connection, we understand that in some European countries the ratio of imports to domestic consumption is very high. The figures we have are: 57 percent for the United Kingdom; 46 percent for West Germany; and 79 percent for the Netherlands. Yet, none of these countries propose to restrict their imports of wool products by quotas or other nontariff measures.

A thorough investigation by the Tariff Commission will disclose the full facts—now not available—with respect to (1) the percentage of our imports to domestic consumption, and (2) the reasons why the domestic wool manufacturing industry has not kept pace with other domestic industries since 1955. Some domestic mills have merged with other mills, and by more efficient methods and technological changes, including automation, have decreased the number of spindles required to produce the same amount of material, and yet this decrease in spindles is often attributed to import competition.

Where these mergers have occurred, no one knows how the large textile firms are progressing financially because it is almost impossible to segregate the profits of the woolen division from the overall earnings. On the other hand, there are smaller, closely held companies that do not issue financial reports. Only the Tariff Commission can ascertain the general condition of the domestic industry by securing detailed information through its questionnaire procedure.

Another important factor is the introduction of manmade fibers. The popularity of mixtures of synthetic fibers and wool in fabrics used in clothing manufacturing is significant.

In general, we wish to point out that imported wool products similar or comparable to domestic products are not necessarily competitive, because for many imported materials and articles the pattern, style, design, and finish are important factors.

Among other considerations that should be taken into account are the following:

1. Many types of yarns, woolen fabrics, and apparel articles included in the overall statistics of U.S. imports are specialties of a kind not adaptable to domestic production. For example, yarns, fabrics, and apparel of camel's hair, alpaca, angora, vicuna, and llama, as well as expensive handmade knitted fabrics and church goods. Included in this category are specialties which are of distinctive design or pattern, including a variety of imported fabrics made with short-length warps that cannot be produced economically by the domestic industry. To limit the importation of specialties that are not produced to any extent in the United States by quotas would seriously affect our domestic cloth and garment manufacturers who use such yarns and fabrics; the American wholesalers and retailers who sell finished articles made therefrom; and would further deprive the American consumer of his freedom of choice.

2. Over the years, the importation of specialty apparel articles designed and created abroad, particularly in the United Kingdom, France, Italy, West Germany, and Austria, has furnished the domestic industry with style and fashion incentives that otherwise would have been lacking. For example, domestic industry has profited by exploiting the "London Look," "Italian Influence," "Austrian Ski Look," etc. Fashion articles with new design and style ideas are imported constantly, and are often copied to become popular mass-production items for the domestic industry.

3. The American textile industry is well equipped to meet the requirements of the average American consumer, whose numbers comprise the largest segment of our population. It is chiefly in the upper and lower levels of income where imports fill consumers' needs. The finer imported fabrics are in demand by the more affluent consumer, while lower priced imported textiles supply the consumer in the low-income classes with the type of products he needs and can afford. Actually, the degree of head-on competition is far smaller than claimed by domestic producers.

4. It is unrealistic to assume that imported fabrics and apparel replace the domestic product. Every retailer will confirm the fact that luxury wool imports furnish extra sales that could not be made if such imports were not available. At the same time, lower priced imported goods and articles account for additional retail sales that mean profitable volume. If imports were to be restricted, the effect on these merchants, many of whom are small businessmen, would be a serious matter.

5. In a preliminary examination of the statistics of increased imports, we find that in the past few years there has been a notable increase in the imports of wool fabrics and finished wool manufacturers, chiefly from Italy, and an increase in wool apparel, chiefly from Hong Kong. The main reason for these increases has been the production of new-style fabrics made from reused and reprocessed wool at reasonable prices, which has re-created an entirely new market in the United States. Furthermore, the new European fabrics made from reused and reprocessed wool have been exported to Hong Kong for the manufacture of clothing. The interesting fact is that the raw materials used in the production of these wool fabrics and finished wool manufacturers have been exported from the United States to the European countries.

6. Another factor of importance is the lack of a sufficient domestic supply of raw clothing wool, and the fact that a major portion of the supply needed by our domestic producers of yarns must be imported, and is subject to a comparatively high duty rate. Not one of the countries that export wool yarns, wool fabrics, and wool apparel to the United States imposes a customs duty upon its necessary imports of raw wool.

7. The U.S. clothing industry has just completed a survey of European markets to explore the potential for increased exports of textiles and apparel from the United States. A special mission, sponsored by the American Institute of Men's and Boys' Wear, in cooperation with the Department of Commerce, recently made a month's tour of European industrial centers and reported that there is an encouraging outlook for expanded exports of American apparel to many European markets. This mission was the first U.S. trade mission ever organized and financed by any domestic industry. It consisted of eight members, and included the principals of some of the leading American clothing

manufacturers. The members of the mission were recently honored at a special ceremony by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, received a citation from Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, and received a congratulatory letter from you. If the United States now imposes import quotas on wool apparel, there is sure to be reaction in these European countries that might well destroy the export potential found by this mission and other manufacturers in our clothing industry.

8. It must be remembered that the United States did impose a tariff quota from October 1, 1956, to December 31, 1960, on imports of wool fabrics. As tariff quotas are not allocated, there was a speeding up of shipments wherever possible to avoid payment of higher duty rates. This not only caused an uneven flow of goods and extra warehouse expenses, but there was always uncertainty as to just when the annual quota at lower duties would be filled. Users of imported fabrics could not, under the circumstances, maintain normal purchasing procedures. Difficulties also arose because countries exporting staple materials that were produced and shipped on a year-round basis had an undue advantage over countries producing specialty fabrics of a seasonal nature. The hardships caused by this quota system eventually led to the negotiation of an increase in the duty rate and the abolition of quotas on January 1, 1961. To revert to wool product quotas at this time would surely result in vigorous protests from exporting countries, particularly in view of the fact that a higher duty is now in effect as a substitute for the previous quantitative restrictions on imports.

9. The present level of duty rates on wool yarns, woolen fabrics, and wool apparel is still very high, and affords an adequate measure of protection to the domestic industry.

10. The Trade Expansion Act of 1962 has been hailed by countries of the free world as a forward-looking step in the direction of liberalized trade policies, and the prospects for the reduction of nontariff barriers of all kinds under that act seem encouraging. It must be borne in mind that most of the nations exporting wool products to the United States are importing more from our country than they export to us, and are just as concerned with their unfavorable balances of trade as we are about our overall unfavorable balance of payments. During the consideration of the act by the Congress last year, there was a recognition of the need for the elimination of nontariff restrictions in various countries abroad that confront U.S. exporters.

11. In the Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers, submitted to you on January 14, 1963, and transmitted to the Congress with your Economic Report, it was stated:

"Quantitative restrictions, prohibitive import duties and subsidies are out of place in the world which both the United States and other industrial nations are trying to build. They do not meet the long-run needs of producers and consumers in these developed countries; they restrict mutually advantageous trade; and they are unfair handicaps to the developing countries in other continents."

The annual report also referred to the 5-year cotton textile agreement, and said:

"Ultimately, of course, the general objective of U.S. foreign economic policy is a trading world free of quantitative restrictions."

12. Quantitative restrictions of imports, either by absolute quotas or by tariff quotas, and restrictions of imports in any country by any other nontariff measures, is the most severe form of a trade barrier. In practice, controls by quotas require governmental supervision, involve the share-of-the-market concept, and arbitrary decisions. Our own recent experience with the arrangement regarding international trade in cotton textiles has demonstrated how unsatisfactory this sort of restriction can be. Under that arrangement, it has been necessary for the Cabinet Textile Advisory Committee to decide, from time to time, to prohibit completely the importation of certain categories of cotton yarns, textile fabrics, and cotton textile apparel produced in certain countries, usually on a retroactive basis, and always without providing a reasonable grace period for the importer to clear shipments en route to the United States at that time. These sudden actions upset import operations.

The imposition of new quotas on wool yarns, fabrics, and apparel, following the present restrictions on cotton textiles and cotton textile products, will certainly lead our friends abroad to conclude that the next step will be similar restrictions on manmade fibers and products made therefrom, and then on silk, and eventually to nontextile products. This would, indeed, be an unfortunate turn of events.

While this letter contains some of the reasons for the objections of our wool products group to the imposition of quotas or other new restrictions on imports of wool products, the early investigation by the Tariff Commission which we suggest will give importers a fair opportunity to present further factual and technical information and our views at the public hearings that should be held by the Commission during its investigation. We are prepared to do this.

Respectfully submitted,
WOOL PRODUCTS GROUP,
By S. P. NEUMANN, *Chairman.*

THE NEW ARMY OF UNEMPLOYED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is no more serious domestic problem facing our Nation today than the unemployment problem. The unemployment rate stands at 6.1 percent today—substantially more than this Nation can tolerate. It is a complex issue, with no easy solutions. One of the most perceptive discussions of the problem was published last week in the Rochester, N.Y., Times-Union and other Gannett newspapers. This series of articles was written by Jack W. Germond, of the Times-Union's Washington bureau, and will be of interest to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent to have the series printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

There being no objection, the series of articles was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW ARMY OF UNEMPLOYED—OLDER WORKERS, DROPOUTS MAKE UP HARD CORE

(The first in a five-part series)

(By Jack W. Germond)

WASHINGTON.—At 49, Charles Thompson is, as he puts it, "eating entirely too many beans and not enough meat."

He has not had a steady job for more than 6 months, and his prospects are poor. He sets out each morning carrying a burden of despair and a newspaper folded to the "help wanted" advertisements.

Thompson, a former freight handler, in Inkster, Mich., is one of a growing number of Americans who may never work regularly again unless there is a genuine improvement in the economy—or a war.

He is one of the losers in the formless competition for a dwindling supply of jobs that require little or no skill.

Many of those in Thompson's situation are too old to have much hope of finding a job that will put an occasional steak on the supper table. A few are too lazy and a few too stupid.

But the most common handicap among the hard core of unemployed, which Charles Thompson shares, is a lack of education and training. His fellows include many youths who have just decided that school is not worth the candle as well as the weary elders who set an example for them by quitting a generation or two ago.

The unemployed represent the most serious domestic problem facing the Kennedy administration. The recognition of this lies behind the President's decision to give his tax program a priority before Congress that sets it in a class by itself.

At a recent news conference, President Kennedy said:

"If we don't have the tax cut, it—substantially, in my opinion—increases the chance of a recession, which will increase unemployment, which will increase the size of our deficit. So that is what it comes down to. And I think that with the record we have had in the last 5 years of over 5-percent unemployment, two recessions, I think the important thing for us to do is prevent another one."

The unemployed also represent a political hazard for the President next year.

The almost 5 million jobless are too scattered and inarticulate to make an effective lobby here. But their potential is better gaged when we realize they outnumber the populations of States like Connecticut, Wisconsin, or Minnesota.

The stickiness of the unemployment problem probably has been demonstrated most clearly by the flagging of the administration's optimism over its ability to deal with it.

Early in 1961 New Frontier economists were predicting that a 4-percent unemployment rate could be achieved in 1962. But just a year ago this was revised when the President's Council of Economic Advisers said 4 percent would be "a feasible interim goal for mid-1963."

Today, with unemployment at more than 6 percent, the target date has become late 1964 or 1965, and the predictions no longer seem to carry the same conviction.

Perhaps the best indication of the situation is the fact that 4 percent is a goal at all. The figure for normal joblessness traditionally was 3 percent until the last few years.

Underlying the change of attitude among many economists is the realization that since 1957 unemployment has not behaved at all as it should.

For one thing, it has become a persistent problem even in some of the most prosperous communities, pushing welfare costs even higher. For another, the rate no longer varies closely with such other economic indicators as industrial production, personal income, the factory workweek and the business investment index.

One key problem is long-term unemployment, which the Government defines as that lasting 15 weeks or longer.

Ten years ago there were fewer than 200,000 workers who had been out that long. But by 1956, a "good" year for the economy as a whole, the average had risen to 533,000. It reached a peak of 1.8 million during the 1960–61 recession and last year—a year of recovery—averaged 1.1 million.

Those off the job more than 26 weeks, the usual maximum period for payment of unemployment insurance benefits, rose from fewer than 100,000 a decade ago to 600,000 during the 1962 recovery.

Perhaps the most frightening and puzzling factor has been the rising floor of unemployment during periods of prosperity. In the major postwar economic cycles, recovery periods have been growing steadily shorter and less successful in restoring workers to their jobs.

After the 1948–49 recession reached its low point, the recovery lasted 45 months and cut the unemployment rate to 2.7 percent.

After the next recession, the recovery ran 35 months and unemployment fell back to 4.2 percent.

And after the 1957–58 recession, the recovery lasted only 25 months and unemployment fell only to 5.1 percent.

The 1960–61 recession now has been over officially for 24 months and unemployment refuses to drop below 5½ percent. There is even some suspicion that the peak of this latest recovery already has been reached, but no one knows because key points in economic cycles do not become apparent until several months after they have been passed.

The special change in the situation in the last 5 years can be measured by two comparisons:

Unemployment averaged 4.2 percent from 1947 to 1957 but more than 6 percent since that time.

The average duration of unemployment has risen from 10.3 weeks in 1947–57 to 14.3 weeks in the last 5 years.

None of these statistics tell the complete story, however.

They do not measure the premature retirements of men in their late fifties and early sixties who dropped out of the labor force when it became apparent their quest was useless.

Nor do the figures reflect accurately the in-and-outers who don't show up in long-term statistics because they have managed to sandwich in an occasional 2 or 3 weeks of work before being put out on the street again.

Charles Thompson is a case in point. In the 28 weeks since he lost his regular job, he has managed 7 weeks of work—1 or 2 at a time—plus about 9 days of casual labor on odd jobs. He has been on and off the welfare rolls twice.

Finally, the unemployment rates do not reflect the so-called underemployed—that is, those on part-time schedules because they can't find full-time jobs and those in jobs below their capability.

Last year there were 2.3 million workers on part time for economic reasons, including 1.1 million who ordinarily work full time.

The hard core of jobless is, as might be expected, heavily weighted with workers with the poorest chance for helping themselves and the greatest potential for becoming public charges.

Negroes, for example, make up 28.7 percent of those out of work more than 6 months although they represent only 10.8 percent of the labor force.

Those who tend to minimize the unemployment problem because they fear the cures that may be offered contend that it is not as serious as it appears. They say it includes many "fringe" workers—youngsters who never have held jobs, married women contributing a second income to their homes, and workers over 65.

But Bureau of Labor Statistics studies don't bear this out. They show that the fringe groups make up only a slightly greater proportion of the unemployed than they do of the work force.

In fact, most of those who make up the hard core—like Charles Thompson, who has three children—are married men with families.

TWO TRENDS WILL SWELL SURPLUS OF LABOR

(The second in a five-part series)

(By Jack W. Germond)

WASHINGTON.—The Nation's stubborn unemployment problem is threatening to get a great deal worse before it gets any better.

While the economy is limping forward, creating new jobs in dribs and drabs, two counter trends that will add to the labor surplus are careening along with increasing momentum.

One is the mechanization of industry that is wiping out jobs on all sides.

The other is the swelling of the labor force as the postwar baby crop moves out of the classrooms and into the job market.

Unless there is a dramatic quickening of the economy's pace, these trends may become so dominant that unemployment levels that were the high points of recessions just a few years ago will become what will be considered normal in the years ahead.

Young people are entering the labor force at a rate 40 percent faster during the 1960's than they did during the 1950's. In 1970, some 3.8 million youngsters will reach 18, compared to 2.6 million in 1960.

The result: The economy must produce 13½ million new jobs in this decade just to keep pace with the growth in the labor force, without cutting into the backlog of 4 million already out of work.

To this can be added whatever job losses result from mechanization and gains in productivity. According to one labor department analysis, this might amount to another 200,000 a year.

In short, the economy will be challenged to produce 25,000 to 30,000 new jobs a week when it has not even been able to add 15,000.

In the last 5 years the net gains and losses in the private sector of the economy have just about canceled one another out. New full-time jobs in trade, finance, insurance, real estate and service industries have been largely offset by losses in agriculture, mining, construction, manufacturing, transportation, and utilities.

What increases there have been in full-time employment can be traced almost completely to the rise in Government payrolls—particularly the schools.

The elimination of jobs in the private sector can be charged to several factors. One is changes in consumer patterns, such as the swing from railroad to air travel. Another is the problem of foreign competition.

But the key has been the growing efficiency of industry and the production of more goods with less labor through automation.

(Automation has two definitions: In the strict sense, the term applies only to advanced, self-correcting mechanized systems. But in the sense now more generally accepted, it applies to any major technological improvement.)

Just how much automation will mean in the years ahead is impossible to forecast with any accuracy. Computers can guide rockets into space, collect eggs, and operate machine tools, but they can't predict their own future impact.

Some indication can be gained, however, from the record of the past. Industrial productivity—in output per man-hour of labor—has risen 50 percent since 1947.

A ton of steel is being produced with only two-thirds the labor required in 1951. Bakeries are wrapping 7,000 loaves of bread an hour with two men, compared to 4,000 with seven men just a few years ago. Payroll computers are doing the work of 28 office workers.

Moreover, the evidence suggests that automation's pace will be accelerated. John Diebold, a management consultant recognized as a leading authority on the subject, has estimated a tripling or quadrupling of the number of computers in operation between 1961 and 1965.

A top executive of one of the world's largest corporations put it this way:

"Of course we're responsible for jobs being eliminated. Every time we put in a new machine, it suggests other steps we can take.

"There's no question but that it will speed up."

The cumulative possibilities are demonstrated by one of the classic examples of early automation—the establishment of an automatic line for engine blocks at the Ford Motor Co.'s Cleveland plant in 1952.

A Harvard economist, James R. Bright, who studied the line reported later: "In four research visits * * * over an 18-month period, the cylinder block line never appeared the same twice. Always there were changes in machinery that had taken place since the last visit."

Perhaps more important than opinions or case histories, however, is the overwhelming logic that argues for faster mechanization.

Automation offers dramatic savings to some firms. A chemical company reports savings of $50,000 to $150,000 a year from instruments costing $10,000 to $15,000. A plastics firm saves $33,000 a year from automatic controls costing $24,500. And a power company saves $400,000 a year by using a $100,000 computer to plan the distribution of its load.

American industries are under continuing pressure to take such steps if they are to compete with others at home and abroad. In foreign trade particularly, there is a compelling need to reduce unit costs.

And finally, in many industries management feels pressures—real or imagined—to lessen its dependence on its workers and union leadership.

For all of this, industry groups generally try to discourage the notion that automation is eliminating jobs.

The National Association of Manufacturers, for example, contends that productivity has been rising at an average rate of only 2.6 percent a year recently, compared to 2.4 percent for the entire period since 1900.

What the National Association of Manufacturers doesn't say is that the impact of the recent increases is much greater because demand for products has not been keeping pace or running ahead, as it had been earlier.

Industry also argues that normal turnover usually prevents layoffs from automation.

"We have an attrition rate of about half of 1 percent a month, or 6 percent a year, through normal things—deaths, retirements, quits," one executive reported, "we certainly aren't going to increase our productivity that fast."

The other side of this coin is that the eliminated jobs are not filled by the new entrants to the labor force who in other times would have replaced those who die, retire, or quit.

The central argument made for automation is that it creates as many jobs as it abolishes. The theory is that, in the long run, mechanization will mean largely a shift from blue-collar to white-collar jobs.

This trend already is quite pronounced, but there are two flaws in the theory.

First, the number of workers added in the offices is not likely to match the number dropped in the plants. In the last 5 years, manufacturing industries have added 335,000 nonproduction workers to the payrolls while cutting their production forces by 969,000.

Second, the same workers are not involved in most cases. Few production workers are qualified for white-collar work and many are considered too lacking in education or too old to train.

Perhaps the most authoritative word on the automation-jobs relationship has come from Thomas J. Watson, president of International Business Machines Corp., the giant of the computer industry.

In a statement to a congressional committee during the last recession, Watson said:

"We can't argue that technological change and automation are not labor saving processes. Of course they are. They do cause displacement of people. In fact, to do so is one of their major purposes. They may also upgrade people or increase the prosperity of an industry so that more are employed.

Nevertheless, we do have more unemployment that we can tolerate today and some of it has come from technological change and automation."

Costly, Often Unrewarding—Creating Jobs With Cash

(The third in a five-part series)

(By Jack W. Germond)

WASHINGTON.—The Kennedy administration is learning that creating jobs with cash is an expensive and often unrewarding business.

That, in effect, is the method the administration has been using in two major efforts—the area redevelopment and accelerated public works programs—to reduce unemployment.

Both programs are essentially attempts to relieve the most painful symptoms of the unemployment disease—chronically depressed areas—without striking at the causes.

The consensus of analysts representing labor, management, and the administration seems to be that the redevelopment program has not yet proved its effectiveness.

Since the program began in mid-1961, unemployment has been reduced no more, and perhaps less, than could be expected from the upward trend of the economy. Two years after the turning point of the 1960–61 recession, the rate remains above 6 percent.

"Of course it's a popular idea," one Labor Department official said. "We're handing out money and that's always popular."

Both programs have some political value, for they convey an impression of concern on the parts of both Congress and the administration.

The 4-year $394 million redevelopment program provides loans to both industry and local government, $75 million in outright grants for public facilities, planning assistance and some retraining of workers.

It is designed to help communities improve their competitive positions in the struggle for new industry and to stimulate activity in the industry already there.

Its principal flaw seems to be that it has come at a time when the economy as a whole is sluggish. The result, critics say, is that the gains of one community are likely to represent losses to another rather than net additions to the industrial base.

Beyond this, there is reason to doubt whether the most seriously depressed areas—the classic horrible examples of West Virginia and western Pennsylvania—can attract industry with any lures.

Some industries are wary of them, said a top executive of one big company:

"Most of the young people are leaving places like that, and you don't want to start out with an old work force. It doesn't pay."

Whatever its merits, the redevelopment program has been a costly one. So far, the Area Redevelopment Administration has approved 648 projects involving $92 million in loans and grants and 33,000 jobs. This amounts to something more than $2,800 a job created or saved.

And there is some question whether the ARA's estimates of the number of jobs will prove accurate in the long run. One company that received a loan of more than $500,000 and is listed for more than 200 jobs told a reporter that its peak employment probably won't exceed 100 workers, many of whose jobs will be seasonal.

The ARA program seems to have become a particularly rich lode for planners and consultants. So far, 151 technical assistance grants totaling more than $5 million have been made. They include such typical items as:

Sixty thousand dollars to a planning firm to study development of tourist resources in the northern Berkshire area of Massachusetts; $9,000 to a planner to study economic desirability of modernizing and expanding a Charleston, W. Va., airport; $20,000 to study ways of using a Dunkirk, N.Y., plant being closed.

The accelerated public works program, which was approved by Congress last fall, is much simpler. It finances the projects of Federal agencies such as the Post Office Department and Corps of Engineers and offers Federal grants to localities for things such as sewers, hospitals, water systems and public buildings.

After only 5 months, more than $360 million of the $400 million appropriated last fall has been earmarked, so the administration is seeking another $500 million this year.

The allocations to date include $110 million for 1,800 wholly Federal projects and $250 million for 1,100 federally-aided projects. The latter is being supplemented by about $25 million in local funds.

The ARA, which also administers this program, estimates that the total $485 million outlay will provide 580,000 man-months of direct labor plus perhaps the same amount in secondary work.

The direct labor is the equivalent of a year's work for 48,000 persons, which means that the cost per job per year amounts to about $10,000.

In sum, using the most optimistic estimates, the two programs are affecting fewer than 100,000 jobs at a time when nearly 5 million are unemployed.

This has led economists to two conclusions: First, that the programs are too small to act as an important stimulus to the economy; second, that programs large enough to do the job would be prohibitively expensive.

The Unemployment Problem—Retraining Has Its Value, but It Has Drawbacks, Too

(The fourth in a five-part series)

(By Jack W. Germond)

WASHINGTON.—In Hammonton, N.J., 22 migrant workers are going to school 4 hours a day to learn to operate and repair farm machinery.

When they have completed the 16-week course, they hope to find jobs that will last the year around and put an end to the ups and downs of their days as seasonal blueberry pickers and sweet potato diggers.

The one thing they can be sure of is that they will have a competitive advantage over other pickers when year-round jobs do appear.

The 22 farmworkers are going to school under what is generally considered to be the Kennedy administration's most promising approach to the unemployment problem—the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The Hammonton program probably is not typical of the hundreds of retraining courses now being conducted under the manpower act and the earlier Area Redevelopment Act for some 38,000 workers across the Nation.

THE WORKER GETS MORE TO SELL

But it does illustrate both the value and the severe limitations of the program.

Retraining gives a worker more to sell to prospective employers, equips him for more than the strongback jobs that mechanization is eliminating so rapidly.

Essentially, it is a matching program designed to give the unemployed the skills that are in short supply in their community even during periods of extreme labor surplus. In Hammonton, for example, laborers who can fix a tractor are a rarity.

But, at best, the program is a small one that by itself can do little to cut into the Nation's backlog of 4 million unemployed. In the longrun its effectiveness will hinge on the state of economy and the chances offered the retrained for using the skills they have acquired.

In the Hammonton case, the trainees' prospects will depend on how many farmers can afford year-around help.

The 3-year $435 million program was set up with an original goal of training 400,000 workers. This year, however, no more than 50,000 are expected to begin courses, and there is serious doubt that the goal will even be approached.

The program has several major obstacles to overcome before it can become a significant force in combating unemployment.

One is the reluctance of many workers to take training courses unless certain they will lead to better jobs.

"We've got people here making $6,000 a year and signing their check with an 'X'," one manufacturing executive reported. "It's hard to convince them that they need to know more than this until they've been laid off for an awfully long time."

Worker immobility is frequently a barrier to matching skills and openings. Many of the unemployed have homes they cannot or will not sell and close community or family ties they will not loosen. Some cling to the hope that things will improve and they will be able to regain their seniority and return to their old jobs and pension rights.

MAJOR BARRIER—IT'S ILLITERACY

But the most serious barrier is illiteracy and, in some cases, an apparent lack of capacity to learn even the simplest skills. The examples are legion:

Item: The Detroit Public Welfare Commission studied 761 heads of families on relief with a view toward giving them aptitude tests for 23 occupational specialties requiring moderate skills. It found 216 unqualified even to take the aptitude tests and 299 others unable to qualify for training in any of the 23 lines.

Item: In one of the classic early retraining ventures at the State level, the Connecticut Labor Department studied the records of 3,500 job applicants and selected 2,143 for interviews. Of these, 589 were chosen for tests for possible training as machinists. The results: 201 failed to take the tests. Of those who took them, only 140 qualified for training and 43 of these either failed to show up or dropped out within a week. Finally, 84 of the original pool of 3,500 completed the courses.

Item: In Chicago, the Cook County Department of Public Aid studied 680 able bodied welfare recipients and found more than half of them to be functionally illiterate, although only 6.6 percent had failed to finish the fifth grade—the level that is supposed to signify literacy.

The manpower act makes no provision for basic education as part of the retraining program, but it does include a "research" section that is being employed as a device to experiment with the three R's.

The principal test is being conducted at Norfolk, Va., where 100 illiterate former shipyard workers are being given basic education along with training as mechanics, metalworkers, bricklayers and maintenance men.

In some other areas informal arrangements have been made with State authorities to provide help. At Hammonton, for example, the trainees—half of whom are Spanish speaking—are being given 3 hours a week of basic English after their regular classes.

Most of the training, however, is directed at spreading mechanical skills. Among the most common are courses for welders, stenographers, automobile mechanics, machine operators, practical nurses, electronics technicians and draftsmen.

NO SURE-FIRE LIFETIME JOBS

In a few instances, workers are being schooled in skills that automation is likely to replace in a few years—machine tool work, for example.

But Seymour Wolfbein, Director of the Labor Department's office of manpower, automation and training, says:

"We can't run this program by trying to outguess automation and only training for sure-fire, lifetime jobs. There are no sure-fire, lifetime jobs anymore. If we can train a man so he can hold a job for a couple of years, that's worth doing. Maybe we'll have to train him again later on."

Other courses—such as those for bank tellers and officer workers—have been criticized on the ground that the Government is offering training that employers would provide and traditionally have provided themselves.

There is no question this is true in many cases. When the economy is expanding, industry is quite willing to train its own workers to meet rising demand.

As one New Jersey executive put it:

"If we have orders piling up, we'll train the people to fill them. We certainly won't let the business get away."

The supporters of the Government role contend, however, that many of the businesses needing skilled help now are too small to risk big investments in retraining when the economy is advancing as slowly as it is now.

The proof of the pudding, they say, is the fact that more than 80 percent of those completing the training courses are moving into jobs in their new specialties.

POTENTIAL SHOWN BY OTHER PROGRAMS

This figure may be slightly inflated by a tendency in these early stages of the program to choose the cream of the possible trainees. More than half of the first groups, for example, were high school graduates.

But the experience of other similar programs demonstrates a strong potential for retraining.

In Sweden, where retraining has been going on so long it has won general acceptance in the work force, the Government annually trains and places the equivalent of 250,000 American workers.

Several States that beat the Federal Government to the punch also have been successful. A study of one of these programs, in Massachusetts, found that training program graduates' annual earnings increased four times as fast as those of untrained workers, largely because they were able to hold steady jobs.

Ignition the Hope: Kennedy Relying on Tax Cut Program To Solve Job Issue

(By Jack W. Germond)

(The last in a five-part series)

WASHINGTON.—The Kennedy administration is relying heavily on a form of spontaneous combustion in the economy to solve the unemployment problem.

If it does not, both the President and Congress can expect intense pressure for the 35-hour week that organized labor insists is needed to spread what work is available among the unemployed.

President Kennedy is hoping to create this combustion with his 3-year $10.3 billion tax reduction plan.

The theory is that the $8 to $9 billion that will be added to disposable consumer income will increase demand enough to encourage industry to put more people to work, thus increasing demand and requiring still more workers.

INSTANT CUT CAN'T BE EXPECTED

But the magnitude of the problem is such that we can't expect an immediate or dramatic reduction in the unemployment rate, which stands at 6.1 percent now and averaged 5.6 percent last year.

The Council of Economic Advisers estimates that the gross national product must rise $20 billion—or about 3.5 percent—this year just to keep the jobless rate at the 1962 level.

To cut unemployment even 1 percent this year, the gross national product would have to rise 6.5 percent; to reach the full employment goal of 4 percent unemployment, 8 to 9 percent.

Neither of these is a practical possibility, which is why the administration now is talking about 1965—and, privately at least, 1966 or 1967—as the target date for the 4-percent rate.

Neither management nor labor is satisfied with the administration's plan.

INDUSTRY'S CHIEF COMPLAINT

Industry's principal criticism is that the program puts too much emphasis on raising consumer income and not enough on encouraging capital investment.

The National Association of Manufacturers points out, for example, that in the last 5 years of "chronic sluggishness," spending for plant and equipment has risen only 1 percent and corporate profits after taxes only 17 percent, while the gross national product has risen 25 percent, consumer income 24 percent, consumer spending 25 percent and Government spending 40 percent.

"This record on its face would cause us to doubt that either increased consumer purchasing or Government expenditures holds the key to our growth problem," the National Association of Manufacturers told a congressional hearing recently.

Administration economists concede that capital investment has been lagging, particularly last year. But they contend the President's tax program is a balanced one that offers enough incentives to business to increase capital spending.

One of these is a reduction in the corporate tax rate from 52 to 47 percent. Another is a reduction in the top individual income tax rate from 91 to 65 percent, which the administration contends will promote investment in stocks by the well-to-do.

ORGANIZED LABOR ALSO WANTS CHANGES

The criticism of the Kennedy plan from organized labor probably will prove more significant in the long run because unions carry a much bigger stick politically.

Labor does not really have a serious quarrel with the tax proposals, although it would prefer that the reductions be concentrated more in the lower income brackets.

The unions' chief complaint is that the tax reduction does not promise enough relief to the unemployment problem. The indispensable ingredient, labor says, is the shorter workweek.

As a starting point, the AFL–CIO is demanding a statutory 35-hour week and a statutory requirement that double time be paid for overtime rather than the time and a half now required.

Union economists contend that a cut even to 37.5 hours for the 40-odd million nonfarm wage and salary workers would create 2.7 million new jobs. In manufacturing alone, they say, a 5-hour cut could add more than 2 million jobs.

Union officials concede that these are theoretical figures that could not be achieved because of "structural factors" such as the fact that many of the jobless don't live where the new jobs would open up or couldn't qualify for them if they did.

But they also point out that a spreading of the work last year to bring in even 1.1 million of the unemployed would have hit the administration's 4 percent full employment goal.

Administration officials believe that a reduced workweek without reduction in pay, which the unions demand, would be inflationary and would weaken the Nation's capacity for industrial competition.

Moreover, many administration and management economists contend that the short workweek would not actually spread the work. They say that industry would prefer to pay even doubletime rather than pay more in fringe benefits to more employees.

The overtime question is a crucial one because it has been mounting rapidly. In fact, more than 7 percent of the Nation's manufacturing production is being done on time-and-a-half.

Prospects for any of labor's proposals for spreading the work—including longer paid vacations, early retirements and special severance pay for displaced workers—will depend on how the unemployment rate behaves in the next year.

WHOSE LANDS ARE THESE?

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I invite the Senate's attention to an article by Mr. Raymond Moley in the March 11 issue of Newsweek magazine.

This article, entitled "Whose Lands Are These?" looks with great candor at the issues involved in the Federal plan to tie all Government agencies together electrically to form a nationwide, Government-manipulated power grid.

Mr. Moley notes that the present Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture, in their control over vast areas of land in the 11 Western States, are making a most ambitious attempt to commandeer "wheeling" privileges over privately owned company transmission lines as an element of this high voltage grand design.

My own State—Wyoming—can hardly justify its "Equality State" sobriquet in this regard because the Federal Government owns outright 51.6 percent of our land area. This gives the Government a massive lever with which to coerce private power companies that must seek easements from the bureaus to build lines over this federally manipulated land—a situation which places the "Equality State" on the short end of the State and Federal equality ratio and places the interests of private power at the caprice of two Federal agencies.

In short, the private power companies are seeking to build a house to which the Federal Government demands the right of entry as a building prerequisite.

Mr. President, as Columnist Moley notes, generating and transmitting electrical power is a vital industry in the Western States, but it is an industry which will be forced to importune the Government for the right of existence if Congress continues to allow the bureaus to make economic weapons of the public domain. These lands belong to the people, not the Federal bureaus.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Moley's salient remarks on this issue printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whose Lands Are These?

(By Raymond Moley)

An almost unbelievable proportion of the land in the 11 Western States (excluding in this context Hawaii and Alaska) is owned by the United States. For the most part the custody and care of these Federal areas have been vested in the Departments of Interior and Agriculture.

In the areas in those States not owned by the United States, a large population lives, owns land, produces goods, and carries on commerce. One of the vital industries there generates and transmits power. In recent years the investor-owned companies have been building and planning transmission lines to serve their customers more efficiently. Obviously, such transmission lines must pass over public lands. For such easements and rights-of-way, they pay to the Federal Treasury.

In those States there are also large Federal hydroelectric generating facilities. Through slick bookkeeping practices a large subsidy is involved. Since this administration has taken over, the Interior Department has vigorously promoted the idea of transmission lines to connect the various Federal agencies. This is in line with a master plan, well publicized by the Interior Department, to tie into one vast grid all Federal agencies from coast to coast. Such a monopoly of electric power would move all industry far along toward a "socialized" Nation.

PIGGYBACK POWER

Since the early 1930's, zealous proponents of public power, notably the late Secretary Ickes, have been waging a cold war against the privately owned companies in the West. Even under the Eisenhower administration's policy of partnership, the Interior bureaucracy carried on this fight with the strong support of Members of the Senate and House. Under Secretary Stewart Udall, the drive has been accelerated.

In December 1962, the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, through their authority over public lands, proposed a plan to hitchhike Federal power over privately owned lines. A series of proposed regulations were issued which would compel privately owned companies to transmit or "wheel" public power over their lines whenever it was determined that there would be excess capacity. Also, a regulation has been proposed to withhold permission to build lines over public lands when such operations would be in conflict with the Federal marketing program. Since these regulations would be imposed arbitrarily by the two secretaries and since there is no such thing as a "Federal marketing program," vigorous protests have been made by the companies concerned and by Members of Congress from that region.

NO PRIORITIES

The regulations were planned to go into effect on March 15 unless Congress should decree otherwise. Senate hearings were scheduled for February but have been postponed. Senators ALLOTT and DOMINICK, of Colorado have demanded regional hearings on these regulations.

Regulations such as these were imposed in 1948 at a time when the policies of Secretary Ickes still prevailed in the Interior Department. But under the more cooperative policies of the Eisenhower administration these were rescinded in 1954.

The issue, it would seem, comes down to this: both privately owned and Federal generating facilities are designed for the service of the people of those States. They must of necessity serve the same kind of customers. In fact, there is nothing essentially private about an electric utility except ownership. It is under regulation by State and Federal laws to see that its service is fair and that its prices are not excessive.

The proposed regulations would, however, establish a priority of authority in the Federal Government. Moreover, the public lands are not owned by the bureaucracy but by the people of the United States. To compel the owners of these transmission lines to transmit Federal power or to subject the building of new lines to the arbitrary discretion of the Federal Government would, in effect, be violations of primary rights of property. And this without due process of law. There should be no priorities in the public service.

FEDERAL DEFICIT SPENDING

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the things that is giving great concern to my constituents is the ever-increasing Federal budget and deficit spending with the resultant inflation and rising costs of almost everything that people have to buy.

There has been a constant increase in the demands for new spending programs on both the State and National level. Far too many people seem to look upon Federal programs only as ones of assistance—not realizing that they themselves are going to have to pay for them.

Almost every American family has to do without many things they would like to have and need. Families deny themselves many things because of insufficient funds. The Federal budget is no different than the family budget. No family or organization can spend beyond its means without some disastrous effects.

Mr. President, one of the most meaningful and down-to-earth letters I have read on this subject comes from a good constituent in Grand Forks, N. Dak. The author, Mrs. Dunn, I think very effectively states the case of the average family members of which oftentimes have to hold down several jobs in order to make ends meet.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have her letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.,
> *March 12, 1963.*
>
> DEAR SIR: Just how much longer are you people in Federal Government going to go on penalizing the common, ordinary American citizen for working at one, two, or more jobs, in order to make a living rather than accept unemployment compensation or welfare aid? Surely all of the people in Government can't be so stupid that they can't see they have made liars, cheats, and lazy bums out of millions of Americans with these two laws, to say nothing of what you have done to the rest of us with your unfair, outdated, personal income tax laws. In all of your investigations I have never heard of you investigating abuses of the unemployment compensation and welfare aid. It would seem that you have half of the people working to support the other half and it's about time something was done about it. If you ever bothered to take a poll of the working mothers you would find that they are working because after taxes and insurance are deducted from their husbands' checks there isn't enough left to meet the current bills. These are the people who strive every day of their life to get ahead and have a better life, the people who spend their money if they have any left to spend.
>
> Oh yes, progress has been made and the American housewife has lots of timesaving devices but let us not forget that most housewives and mothers of today must also be painters, plumbers, electricians, carpenters, besides holding down a part-time job outside of the home. Sure, we are taking jobs away from professionals, but what else are we to do when you don't leave us enough money to hire these jobs done? In other words, your personal income tax laws and Government spending are to blame for all our country's problems such as unemployment, poor economy, and even juvenile delinquency. If you people bothered to figure it out they all tie in together. Your Internal Revenue Service is a nightmare with Mortimer as the dictator.
>
> You have taken our life's blood and given it to others long enough. I still believe that charity begins at home. Most of us find great happiness and contentment in giving but it would be nice if we were allowed to choose to whom we wished to give part of the time.
>
> My definition of a liberal is a man who tells you to live conservatively so he can spend your money liberally. My advice to him is to mind his own business.
>
> I am sending this letter to you, Senator, as I believe you are trying to do your best for the people of North Dakota. I would only wish that the people who really deserve this letter might read it.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> MRS. J. DUNN.

THE ENEMY'S NAME IS KHRUSHCHEV—NOT KENNEDY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am taking it upon myself to perform some surgery on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. I am going to direct my efforts toward removal of a cancerous growth which may have been planted in the minds of some of my constituents in Utah by a vicious little pamphlet called "Has Cuba Been Abandoned to Communism?" The author is W. Cleon Skousen, and the booklet was sent to me compliments of the Citizen's Information Committee of Salt Lake City, which I suspect is a front for the John Birch Society.

What disturbs me about this little booklet is that it goes far beyond the usual distortions contained in this type of material. Playing upon the real concern of every loyal American citizen over the serious stakes involved in the Cuban problem, this booklet strikes at the very roots of our form of representative democracy. It implies that the President of the United States has betrayed and lied to the American people, and irony of ironies, it uses the words of a Communist to prove its point.

President Kennedy had made two commitments to Khrushchev which Cuban freedom fighters could scarcely believe:

First, a personal guarantee by the President that the United States would not attempt to liberate Cuba.

Second, a personal guarantee by the President that the United States would not allow any other Western Hemisphere country to liberate Cuba.

Both of those statements, as we all know, are completely, unequivocally, yes, outrageously false. But what is really galling about this poisonous little pamphlet is that it goes on and cites as proof for these statements, a letter from Soviet Premier Khrushchev which was published in the New York Times on October 29, 1962. The booklet states that the Khrushchev letter was in reply to Kennedy's secret letter to Khrushchev 2 days earlier.

Thus, Mr. President, the American people are asked to believe that their President had deceived them, and to prove it we are given the word of the No. 1 Communist in the world, Mr. Khrushchev. The American people were asked to believe in the Premier of

the Soviet Union, not the President of the United States, despite the fact that America was passing through an intense period of danger at that very moment.

Any of my constituents unfortunate enough to have read this little booklet might have been misled—for sure enough, there was a quote from the New York Times of October 29, giving a portion of Khrushchev's answer to Kennedy's so-called secret letter of 2 days earlier. But how cruel and deceitful this booklet is, Mr. President. There, in the New York Times of October 29, on the very same page, not 2 inches away from the text of Mr. Khrushchev's letter, was the text of our President's letter. What utterly galling, lying hypocrisy this represents. Mr. Khrushchev, being a good Communist, distorted and exaggerated the President's letter in his reply, pretending that he understood the President to say one thing when the President clearly said another. Mr. Khrushchev, being a Communist, can be expected to lie and distort. But who are these self-appointed saviors of the American people who lie to the people and distort the position of our President in the name of patriotism? I am ashamed that this document was printed in Salt Lake City.

The President wrote to Mr. Khrushchev, and I will quote from the New York Times, October 29, 1962, and from the very same page on which Mr. Skousen found the Communists' reply to the President's so-called "secret letter." I quote from the secret letter:

> 1. You would agree to remove these weapons systems from Cuba under appropriate United Nations observation and supervision; and undertake with suitable safeguards, to halt the further introduction of such weapons systems into Cuba.
>
> 2. We, on our part, would agree—upon the establishment of adequate arrangements through the United Nations to insure the carrying out and continuation of these commitments—(a) to remove the quarantine measures now in effect and (b) to give assurances against an invasion of Cuba. I am confident that the other nations of the Western Hemisphere would be prepared to do likewise.

Now to anyone who understands English, this is quite clear. If you do X, we will do Y. But we all know that the Russians never did allow inspection and observation in Cuba, and we all know that the President has stated, and the Secretary of State has stated, that since the Soviets did not fulfill their obligations, we were not, and are not under any obligation whatsoever to undertake either of our contingent commitments.

But what disturbs me still is the question—why did the author and the publishers of this disgraceful example of yellow journalism deliberately deceive the Americans at whom this booklet is directed—citing the words of Communist Dictator Khrushchev to back up false charges against our President? Why did they state that Kennedy's letter was secret, and therefore did not cite it—although the letter was on the very same page of the same issue of the New York Times of October 29, 1962? Why did they want the American people to believe a Communist but not their own President?

The answer is very clear to me, and that is why I was so disturbed when I read this booklet. Its clear purpose is to undermine the confidence of the American people in their own form of democratic, freely elected, representative government. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, in his book "Masters of Deceit," written to warn Americans of the dangers of communism says on page 312:

> Too often I have seen cases where loyal and patriotic but misguided Americans have thought that they were fighting communism by slapping the label of Red or Communist on anybody who happened to be different from them or to have ideas with which they did not agree.
>
> Smears, character assassination, and the scattering of irresponsible charges have no place in this Nation. They create division, suspicion, and distrust among loyal Americans—just what the Communists want—and hinder rather than aid the fight against communism.

I would like to believe that Mr. Skousen and the perpetrators of this pamphlet are merely "loyal and patriotic but misguided Americans." But their deceit is so calculated, their methods are so purposeful, and their objectives are so obvious that I find it difficult to forgive this booklet as merely "misguided." For my part, I will continue to do everything in my power to see that such cancerous ideas are not planted in the minds of Utah people, and if planted, are ruthlessly exposed to the light of truth in all their falseness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. Because I have dealt herein with the Cuban lie, I do not overlook the vicious, if tired, old charge that "a certain body of powerful policymakers who serve in the State Department and the White House" are steering the United States into socialism and communism. The indefensible tactic of quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD without identifying which of the 100 Senators or 435 Congressmen made the insert or even whether that person uttered the words or placed in the RECORD a newspaper clipping or a speech by some notorious or obscure person, should discredit the whole pamphlet.

Nor do I ignore the 15 incidents, many of them so patently and deliberately false. I just feel sick inside to note this calculated and vicious effort to destroy our democracy by destroying the confidence of our people in their leaders. Why? Why?

Mr. President, on another subject, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I call attention to the fact that the morning hour was conceivably designed to permit Senators to be recognized at 3-minute intervals. The time has run for more than 25 minutes without a Republican Member being recognized.

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

FRUITS OF CUBA TRIUMPH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, after having read with such rising ire the Skousen pamphlet, "Has Cuba Been Abandoned to Communism?" it was refreshing to pick up the Washington Post on Sunday morning and see the sane, factual article on Cuba written by the able president of the Post, Philip L. Graham. I hope it will be read carefully by every "armchair warrior" who insists that we must get the Castro regime out of Cuba no matter how we do it.

Mr. Graham gives a masterful account of how President Kennedy has tuned out the irresponsible demands of his self-styled critics, and turned his back on both proponents of armed invasion and of near appeasement, to restore faith in the maturity and sense of partnership with South America now infusing U.S. policy. He further reports that the Cuban exiles in the Caribbean, who are in touch with their compatriots in their homeland, know that the Cuban people do not want their country liberated by the United States or by any other outside force, and are resolute in their determination to see Cuba liberated by Cubans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled "Partisan Brawling Squanders Fruits of Cuba Triumph," written by Philip L. Graham, and published in the Washington Post of March 17, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTISAN BRAWLING SQUANDERS FRUITS OF CUBA TRIUMPH

(By Philip L. Graham)

> SAN JUAN, P.R.—The fruits of America's greatest cold war triumph are being recklessly squandered by the partisan brawling over Cuba.
>
> The triumph came on Sunday morning, last October 28, when Chairman Khrushchev announced the surrender of the Soviet missile systems in Cuba. Considering Khrushchev's usual prose style, the announcement was an epic of unambiguous brevity. The missile systems would be taken down and this would be certified by the U.N.
>
> This came less than 6 days after the President's tough TV speech. Thus Mr. Kennedy forced the Soviet Union to agree to "disarmament with inspection," a reversal of years and years of obstinate Soviet rhetoric.
>
> The ensuing reaction is enough to drive toward near despair any observer of our two-party system. Here was an indisputable example of the U.S. Government working soundly, sensibly, sagely under crisis conditions. The President turned his back alike on proponents of armed invasion and proponents of near appeasement.
>
> The United States speedily gathered around Miami an array of armed power that could have bounced Castro all the way to the South Pole. While this big stick was being created, the President practiced the sort of intensively skilled diplomacy that alone can find an option different from nuclear warfare or surrender.
>
> A single instance showed the value of instructed and informed reflex action. That

was the President's preemptory refusal to consider any trade involving our Turkish bases—and this despite a widespread affliction of weak-kneed jitters on the part of many in and out of Government.

A THROWBACK TO KIPLING

One who visits the Caribbean area, even briefly, cannot help being appalled by the cacophony of abuse and jingoism that has come out of the United States on the heels of the President's success.

First came a caterwauling over the relatively ineffective Soviet bomber contingent, that remained briefly in Cuba. Next came a blather of criticisms of the U.S. intelligence system—either naively amateur in nature or viciously reckless of U.S. security if the sources happened to hold any responsible positions in our security organization.

Finally, there have come the trumpeting swivel-chair warriors, stirred by blurred recollections of Kipling's days, who demand such belligerent acts as blockades. It is surprising that Mr. Nixon could so quickly parole himself from his self-announced sentence of long-term silence. It is appropriate, however, that he selected the setting of Mr. Jack Paar's program for the announcement of what in other circumstances would have constituted a grave demand for acts of war.

Seen from the Caribbean area, Mr. Kennedy's victory over the Cuban missiles is not diluted by these strangely motivated domestic attacks. The Kennedy policy has established, for the last Latin doubter, Castro's suppliant role as a Communist satellite. And by refusing to bring Castro down by the brute force of Yankee arms, Mr. Kennedy has restored faith in the maturity and sense of partnership with South America now infusing U.S. policy.

"RESCUE" ISN'T THE ANSWER

The Cuban exiles in the Caribbean area have fairly easy and constant communication with Cuba. They know that dissatisfaction with Castro is constantly growing. But they also know that within Cuba there is little desire to be "rescued" from Castro by Yankee arms, only to be returned to the chaos of corruption existing before Castro's tyranny.

"The people of Cuba," a leading exile said, "have done more fundamental political thinking in the past 4 years than in the preceding 50 years." And the Cuban people are reported as wanting not merely an overthrow of Castro, but the creation of a new governmental system that will permit Cubans, by themselves, to find a democratic destiny.

Cubans of this school of thought are horrified by the bellicosity of a Nixon They are depressed by the partisan speeches in the United States which indicate that we should resume a benevolent guardianship over Cuba.

Those Cubans who engaged in the early planning of the Bay of Pigs fiasco still remember the callous ideas of superiority held by CIA officials. "The first thing I was asked by the CIA officer in charge," say a leading Cuban exile, "was to state my attitude toward restoration of the King Ranch properties."

These exiles—predominantly young professional men of moderately liberal and democratic leanings—are determined that Castro will be overthrown from within Cuba. They have no interest in a Guatemala type coup d'etat directed by the CIA—or any other outside organization.

They are seeking financial support without strings. And support is just beginning to come, in trickles, from among the exiles themselves and from other Caribbean democratic forces. This is aid without any strings, without any commitments aside from the moral assurance of these men that Cuba shall be freed of communism and freed of corruption.

TOPSY-TURVY SETTING

From the United States, these exiles and their working colleagues now in Cuba will welcome only a form of support for which we have little governmental experience. They do not want the large-scale, massively supervised support that has been America's method in South Korea and South Vietnam.

For in Cuba the tables are turned about topsy-turvy from the usual cold war setting. Here Castro occupies the place of Syngman Rhee or Diem—an unpopular leader propped by massive support of a major power. And in Cuba it is the Communist bloc, for once, that is trying to prop an unpopular government with an expensive supply line running across thousands of oceanic miles.

The anti-Castro resistance that is already abuilding takes heart from the lessons of other areas. These Cubans know that 500,000 French soldiers, including the ruthless professionals of the Foreign Legion, could not conquer the relatively weak bands of native Algerian rebels. They know how large a threat to massive U.S. efforts a few thousand well-trained and dedicated Vietcong Communists have become. They know that ours is an age when force can impose an unpopular dictatorship only when it is as totally overwhelming as the Soviet divisions in East Germany.

The greatest U.S. aid to the free Cuban movement will not come from military action against Castro. The sort of action recommended by Mr. Nixon smacks so much of Yankee imperialism that in the final analysis it could only help Castro.

The major things needed from U.S. policy are already coming forth under President Kennedy. His firm and courageous elimination of the Soviet missiles, and his subsequent actions, have prevented the Communists from turning Cuba into a satellite firmly held by Soviet might.

CLASSIC REVOLUTIONARIES

The responsibility for the final downfall of Castro lies with the people of Cuba. They are now just beginning the gathering of their forces, inside Cuba and among the exiles in the Caribbean area and on the U.S. mainland.

The young men who today are forming these revolutionary forces of freedom are not prominent on our TV screens or in our press photographs. And they are revolutionaries—in the classic sense—not merely opponents of Castro but opponents of his betrayal of the revolution which Cuba under Batista and his predecessors had so long needed.

They are gathering now, and have been for 15 months since their morale began recovering from the almost fatal defeat of the Bay of Pigs. They are resolute in their determination to see Cuba liberated by Cubans. They are not merely wary of, but in fact openly hostile toward, the sort of U.S. support that would make them American satellites.

This is the dominant characteristic of the new Cuban democratic revolutionary movement. It is a characteristic which will never be understood by CIA officers who ask for promises about the future fate of the King Ranch or other U.S. investments in Cuba.

In the final analysis, these Cuban freedom forces are poised to fight the only kind of "war of liberation" that the free world can countenance. Their guerrilla tactics will be frankly imitative of Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh. But their political strategy will be drawn from the experience of Washington and Franklin and Jefferson. For their war will not be aimed to establish a U.S. hegemony but rather to create a new free land.

SUCCOR THAT FAILED

The extent of the determination of the Cuban liberation movement can be shown by a recent poignant example.

Still in Castro's torturing jails, untouched by any ransom effort of Mr. Donovan, are thousands of anti-Castro Cubans. A small group of anti-Communist leaders has been held together under maximum security conditions by Castro. The group, of 25 or so, is composed of men and women sentenced to prison terms averaging 30 years, and they have been tortured and starved since their arrest.

Four months ago the Cuban liberation movement inside Cuba succeeded in infiltrating the military guarding the prison, the inside prison guards, and officials at a nearby landing spot. Conditions were established that gave favorable odds for the success of a "smash and grab" raid by a small landing force of 40 men.

All that was needed by way of outside help was a single fast ship—large enough to put 40 armed men ashore and then take aboard the 25 rescued prisoners.

Weeks were spent in attempts to get a boat. A genteel smuggler with anti-Castro leanings seemed close to offering an appropriate vessel. Then negotiations fell through.

The next week, the 25 suffering prisoners were moved inland to a new heavily guarded prison in the interior of Cuba. Castro regularly moves his more important prisoners as a security safeguard. The chance for rescue had passed.

PATIENT—TO A POINT

Among the prisoners, very ill and perhaps even dying, are a man and a woman each of whom is engaged to an exile leader in the United States. But even under such extreme personal stress, the liberation force leaders refused to seek out CIA aid.

"We shall have to wait," one of the exiles said recently, "even if we wait a long time. For this time Cuba must be freed by Cubans who are responsible only to their fellow Cubans. We are pledged to create democracy and self-respect where before Castro we knew only chaos and corruption—and now we have only Communist tyranny. We shall wait. But not forever. Our forces are beginning to gather. And our revolution shall succeed—a revolution for democracy but nevertheless a revolution, and not just a counterrevolution against Castro."

The young man of 38 who said this is brave. He is a well-educated professional with a graduate degree from a U.S. university. He is physically fit beyond even the rigors of a 50-mile hike. He was a leader of the underground against Batista. He supported Castro until the Communist domination became apparent. Then he headed a major part of the anti-Castro underground.

He seemed, to this observer, another impressive example of those courageous resisters of tyranny who have made up some of the best men or our times. He seemed an omen—a working, living omen—of hope for the triumph of freedom.

THE UNIT SYSTEM OF VOTING AND POLITICAL EQUALITY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in my opinion, the Supreme Court yesterday handed down a decision which may be as far reaching as any which it has ever issued in connection with the American political scene. I applaud the Court on the reasons advanced for making its decision and suggest it apply the same reasoning to unit voting in our electoral college.

This particular decision involves the so-called unit rule system of voting in the State of Georgia, about which I know very little; but the philosophy which impelled the Court to rule as it

did, and the reasons given by the Court for its decision, it seems to me, raise a great question on the constitutionality of the use of the unit system in casting and counting votes in the national electoral college system by which we report and tabulate the votes cast in our presidential elections.

I call attention to an editorial entitled "One Person, One Vote," published in the Washington Post this morning. The editorial sets this question forth rather clearly. Strangely and curiously, whoever wrote the editorial for the Washington Post had a myopic viewpoint. He evidently kept one eye closed, because he neglected to relate the reasoning which applied to the unit rule in Georgia to the same type of unit rule which prevails in the tabulation of votes in the electoral college system of America generally under the existing system of bloc voting or unit voting. Under this system we operate with a winner-take-all formula in which there is no equality and very little similarity in the voting weight or power of the votes cast by individual citizens in their choice of President of the United States. Actually, in some States individual voters speak with 12 to 15 times the power and influence of equally well qualified voters in other States.

The arguments advanced in the editorial, supported by the decision of the Court, clearly point out the inequity of any system which gives preferential treatment to one class of voters in America. In the decision, Justice Douglas asked:

> How can one person be given twice or 10 times the voting power of another person in a statewide election merely because he lives in a rural area or because he lives in the smallest rural county?

The editorial states:

> Surely equality in the voting booth, so far as that can be attained, is a principle that must command respect.

Let us relate that Supreme Court reasoning to our most important election, the election of the President of the United States, in which the unit vote prevails from the standpoint of our electoral college. For example, the District of Columbia has only 3 votes in the electoral college, as do the States of Alaska, Delaware, Wyoming, Nevada, and Vermont. Those States might be classified as "Very Little Orphan Annie States," so far as voting for President is concerned. Their 3 little votes must be compared with the more than 40 votes of the States of California and New York. This would not be unjust nor unfair except for the fact that under the prevailing system of unit voting or bloc voting in the electoral college each individual voting citizen in fact actually casts the full strength of the electoral votes awarded his own State. Thus in reality a citizen of Delaware votes 3 times for President whereas his neighbor in New York State votes more than 40 times for President. Thus a glaring disparity exists in what Justice Douglas referred to as the voting power of individual citizens.

Then there are a number of States whose citizens might be called "steerage class citizens." The votes of citizens in the "steerage class" States count less than 10 percent, individually, compared with those of the voters of California, and New York, to mention our two largest States. The States in the "steerage class" are Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, and Utah. In those States the individual voter has less than 10 percent as much impact in his choice of President as does the individual voter in one of the major States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the entire editorial published in today's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE PERSON, ONE VOTE

The concept of political equality advanced another long step forward yesterday when the Supreme Court upset Georgia's county unit system in a sweeping opinion. In the nomination of candidates, at least, the Court laid down a flat and unmistakable principle—"One person, one vote." Though Justice Douglas, in the majority opinion, warned that the decision in this case has no bearing on the apportionment issues still before the Court, it certainly carries American law significantly further along the road to greater equality at the polls.

To our way of thinking, the logic of the majority is conclusive. Indeed, only Justice Harlan dissented. The other eight Members of the Court could find no semblance of "equal protection of the law" in Georgia's outrageous discrimination against urban voters. The vice of the county unit system, which was used for the nomination of candidates for U.S. Senator, Governor and various other States offices, is well illustrated by the fact that it gave one resident in Echols County the same influence upon the nomination of candidates that it gave to 99 residents of Fulton County. This is not democracy or representative government but the reverse. It is true that Georgia revised the system when it came under sharp attack, but some of the taint of invidious discrimination remained.

Justice Douglas noted that if the State law gave greater weight to white votes than to Negro votes, or to male votes than to female votes, "none could successfully contend that the discrimination was allowable. How then," he asked, "can one person be given twice or 10 times the voting power of another person in a statewide election merely because he lives in a rural area or because he lives in the smallest rural county?" Surely equality in the voting booth, so far as that can be attained, is a principle that must command respect.

The Court wisely repudiated the device that had been invented by the district court to measure the constitutionality of the Georgia system. The lower court had held against any county as exists in the electoral college which theoretically chooses the President of the United States. The Supreme Court saw no virtue in the analogy. The Federal electoral system reflects a compromise between the large and small States. It has no bearing whatever upon the relations between voters within a State.

The Court recognized once more that the States do have control over the qualifications of voters. "But once the class of voters is chosen and their qualifications specified," the opinion concluded, "we see no constitutional way by which equality of voting power may be evaded." It is heartening to have a basic principle so emphatically undergirded.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, if the Supreme Court would consider the operation and implications of the unit rule in the Federal electoral college system, it must, with consistency, rule that it also is unconstitutional, so far as the utilization of the unit rule on a State-by-State basis is concerned. Actually under existing practices we have no "first-class voting citizens" in this country except for the voters in California and New York.

I suggest that the Senate at this session of Congress pass Senate Joint Resolution 12, which provides for an equal voting opportunity and equal voting authority for every American citizen, regardless of where he lives. This would eliminate the unit rule and would provide a national election for President, instead of a sectional selection method of voting for President, such as prevails in America today. It would retain the electoral college and the total voting strength of every State, but it would eliminate the evils and injustices which have developed as a consequence of the unit voting procedures which distort the voting weight of ballots cast by individual citizens and which serve no useful purpose.

ELECTION OF SEIJI HORIUCHI TO COLORADO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the people of Colorado have once again exhibited their basic belief in a fundamental concept of this country; namely, recognition of ability in an individual regardless of race, creed, or color. I refer to the recent election of my very good friend, Mr. Seiji Horiuchi, of Brighton, Colo., to the Colorado House of Representatives. To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Horiuchi is the first Japanese-American to be elected to a State legislature in the continental United States. While the great State of Hawaii led the field in this respect in Congress, it remained for the people of Colorado to take the initiative for such an achievement on the mainland.

Seiji Horiuchi was born in Auburn, Wash., October 14, 1924, but has lived in Colorado for 36 years. He is a graduate of the Brighton, Colo., High School and of Colorado State University with a major study in horticulture. He also attended the University of Minnesota Institute of Agriculture for advanced graduate work.

From 1942 to 1944 he was in the U.S. Army—technical sergeant—and was an interpreter at general headquarters in Manila and Tokyo.

After his election to the Colorado General Assembly, he resigned as president of Agriculture Consultants in Brighton, and is now a farm management consultant and farm appraiser.

Mr. Horiuchi is a past president of the Colorado Jaycees; past vice president of the U.S. Jaycees; past president of the Brighton Jaycees, and in 1954 received the Jaycee Distinguished Service Award. He is a member of the Brighton Chamber of Commerce, American Society of Farm Managers, and a board member of the Brighton Methodist Church.

He is married to a most attractive lady, the former Kay Imamura, of California, and they have three fine sons; Paul, 12; John, 10; and James, 7.

I wish to commend, first, Mr. Horiuchi for his hard work and high ideals and his tremendous campaign; secondly, the Republican Party of Colorado for its endorsement of Mr. Horiuchi; and finally, but of most importance, the citizens of Adams County, Colo., for their wisdom in electing such a dedicated gentleman.

I also wish to thank Mrs. Jane Harper, editor of the Colorado Trumpet and Public Ledger, for sending me her editorial on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Colorado First

It turned out that Colorado made history during the last election and although it's kind of nice for the rest of us, Seiji Horiuchi thinks its all a bunch of nonsense.

Seiji, who is an agricultural consultant from Brighton with a highly commendable and recognized civic service behind him, is the Republican representative from Adams County. Seiji is also the first American of Japanese extraction (or Japanese-American; we forgot to ask because it didn't seem very important) to be elected to a State legislature in the continental United States. (Hawaii isn't continental United States.)

Seiji wouldn't have mentioned it, but we were inquiring about a speech Governor Love is going to make to the Japanese-American Association on February 23—a statewide meeting—and it developed that the association is going to honor Seiji at the same time. Seiji thinks to have the Governor is enough for one evening.

Furthermore, in some pretty colorful, but discreet, language, Seiji lets it be known that this "first" is something he'd just as soon someone else had.

We probably could have looked into this "first" and discovered it ourselves but, as we said to Seiji, it seems quite natural for Colorado to be the State to elect a Japanese-American, first or last. People in Colorado look at ability, not color or ancestors and when you have a candidate with the proven ability of Seiji, naturally you elect him.

But the thing about it all that made us rush home to tell the children was what Seiji said:

"I didn't get here (the house of representatives) because I'm a Japanese-American. I got here because I went out and worked like a fool to get elected. (He did, too.) You can't legislate anyone into success—we all have to go out and earn it. That's one reason I'm a Republican; Republicans go out and work for what they want. They don't sit around and wait for someone to legislate them into their goals.

"Anyone could have been the first Japanese-American to get elected. It just happened to be me."

We're proud of Seiji—the Adams County representative—and we're proud of his voters for electing a good man. We're proud that Colorado can claim this "first."

Somehow, it makes us feel a little bigger and a little bit better to know we live in a State which does something important not because of any ulterior motives, but because it's the logical thing to do.

U.S. SENATE YOUTH PROGRAM

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this distinguished body has already heard much praise bestowed on a program created by Resolution No. 324, known today as the U.S. Senate youth program.

We have heard praise of the William Randolph Hearst Foundation and of the American Political Science Association for the fine contribution these two organizations made in making the inaugural program for these young American high school leaders a success here in Washington.

All of us are aware of the results of this program; but I wish to take a few minutes to inform the Senate of the prologue of this important Senate activity.

Very few of us know that the original concept came from the late distinguished Senator from Kansas, Andrew F. Schoeppel. It was on May 16, 1961, during a luncheon in the Senate dining room, that he asked Randolph A. Hearst, a trustee of the Hearst Foundation, "How can we help change the impressions that many of our youth have about politicans and the science of politics?"

At that time, Mr Hearst and his associates outlined to the Senator a program that eventually was used as the basis of what we know as the U.S. Senate youth program, and Senator Schoeppel was assured by Mr. Hearst that he would continue to help in the development and research.

Subsequent meetings were held with the late Senator Schoeppel and the former Senator from Indiana, Homer E. Capehart.

Following the untimely death of Senator Schoeppel, the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] moved into the breach and authored resolution No. 324, which also was sponsored by Senators Mansfield, Dirksen, and Humphrey.

It was Randy Hearst who cleared the way on one phase of the resolution, which stated, in part—"if such a program can be satisfactorily arranged and completely supported by private funds with no expense to the Federal Government"—when he appeared before the Senate Rules Committee on May 9, 1962, by assuring the members of the committee that if the Senators wanted this program, the trustees of the William Randolph Hearst Foundation, under the direction of the U.S. Senate, would supply the funds for its operation.

At this time I wish to pay tribute to Randolph A. Hearst, the one person who I feel was responsible, more than anyone else, for getting this program underway. He encouraged the Hearst trustees to support the idea. He gave leadership to those of us on the Senate advisory committee and to the staff who worked so hard in not only getting the program underway but also in seeing it through to its completion. He was a great inspiration to the young people who came to Washington, representing each State throughout the country. I only wish we had time to read some of the letters we have received from these outstanding young Americans.

Mr. Hearst, in his efforts, showed a magnificient way for a foundation to cooperate with the Federal Government in this indoctrination internship program for these teenagers.

I, for one, am looking forward to next year's crop of students; and I sincerely hope the William Randolph Hearst Foundation will help us with its grant for the program next year.

THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF PIONEER FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, last Thursday marked the 60th anniversary of five Federal reclamation projects, including the Newlands project, in the State of Nevada.

Significantly, this project bears the name of one of Nevada's most illustrious Senators, the Honorable Francis G. Newlands, whose unflagging interest in behalf of conservation helped bring irrigation to many arid sections of the Western United States.

Work began on the project in 1903; and an area which was formerly classed as desert land, with only 20,000 acres under cultivation, and with an uncertain water supply, has been transformed into a fertile area by a project which conserves and diverts water from the Truckee-Carson Rivers to irrigate nearly 72,000 acres.

The Newlands project, from the time of its completion through 1961, produced almost $90 million worth of crops—the production of 1961 totaling $3 million.

Prior to entering the U.S. Senate, Francis G. Newlands served with distinction for 8 years in the House of Representatives. It was during his career there that he vigorously attacked the problem of national conservation of the water of the West and the reclamation of its vast valleys of arid, but fertile, Government lands.

The late great Senator Key Pittman, of Nevada, in eulogizing Senator Newlands, following his death in 1917, recalled his colleague's persistent efforts in behalf of reclamation. Senator Pittman declared:

> The policy was then considered by almost the entire membership of Congress as an utopian dream of most radical and impracticable State socialism, unworthy, even, of the gentle ridicule of profound and distinguished statesmen. Conservation had not then become the stepping-stone for statesmen and the football for fools. Its dawn was not visible except to the few farsighted statesmen. Day by day, and month by month, his unanswerable logic and persuasiveness pleas fell upon unlistening ears. Session after session he saw his legislative provisions silently and contemptuously brushed aside. Yet for 10 years in the House of Representatives he persisted in his untiring efforts, and with that fortitude, patience, and faith that is so rare in legislators and that so peculiarly characterized our deceased colleague slowly but surely he won the country to his views and after 10 years of unceasing labor Congress passed the Newlands national reclamation act.
>
> This law has transformed hundreds of thousands of acres of desert land into blooming, productive fields; has made happy homes for thousands of citizens, and enriched his State and the Nation. Senator Newlands has many splendid acts of statesmanship to his credit, yet this alone will cause his name to live in the hearts of the West and upon the pages of his country's history.

Shortly after assuming his seat in the House of Representatives, Senator Newlands launched a campaign of educating the public mind to the national importance of irrigation. Aided by a group of western colleagues, he kept this question prominently before the people, in the debates of Congress, in public addresses, and in magazine and newspaper articles.

He introduced numerous bills for specific projects for each of the rivers of Nevada, and finally evolved the plan of a comprehensive bill embracing the entire arid region, which provided a revolving reclamation fund from the sale of public lands, to be applied to the construction of reclamation works. Compensation to the fund was made by the sale of water rights, in installments running over a period of years, with the money thus restored to the fund being used for new projects. This plan was hailed as a solution of the reclamation question by all of the friends of irrigation, and was incorporated in the Reclamation Act which finally was passed by Congress.

As we pause to observe this important anniversary of the pioneer Federal reclamation project, it seems only fitting that we salute the memory of Francis G. Newlands. It was through his vision, dedication, and energy that reclamation received its initial impetus, and today stands as the lifeblood of the great West.

DR. PAUL A. MILLER AN OUTSTANDING WEST VIRGINIAN

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a distinguished West Virginian who views his work as a tremendous challenge, as well as a great opportunity to accomplish lasting benefits for his State and for the Nation. Dr. Paul A. Miller, president of West Virginia University, typifies the best in the American tradition.

Dr. Miller is dedicated to the proposition that West Virginia University must not only offer the very best educational opportunities, but must also use its classrooms, its laboratories, and the brainpower of its students and faculty to help West Virginia and neighboring Appalachian areas achieve greater economic development and growth.

This outstanding educator and public servant holds to the premise that the development of human resources must go hand in hand with the development of natural resources, that the new frontiers of today and tomorrow for the Appalachian region are in the region itself, and that we must find new and productive ways by which to develop and wisely use our abundant natural wealth.

An account of Dr. Miller's career amply testifies to why he was unanimously chosen by the board of governors of West Virginia University to succeed Dr. Elvis J. Stahr as president, after the latter was nominated by President John F. Kennedy to be Secretary of the Army, in January 1961.

A brief résumé of Dr. Miller's career appeared in the March 10, 1963, State magazine section of the Charleston (W. Va.) Sunday Gazette-Mail. I ask unanimous consent to have this sketch of Dr. Miller's career printed in the Record so that all may better understand why we West Virginians are proud of the president of West Virginia University.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Famous West Virginian

Although Dr. Paul A. Miller, president of West Virginia University, was born in East Liverpool, Ohio, March 22, 1917, he spent his early childhood in Chester, W. Va., and considers himself a West Virginian. His parents were Harry A. and Mamie E. Miller.

As a youth, Paul Miller was serious and dependable. His goal was to become a county agricultural agent, but, since he did not live on a farm, he feared that his chances were not too good. He enrolled in the 4-H movement and conscientiously sought to win blue ribbons on his projects which included 4 years of forestry, 3 years of poultry, 2 years of potatoes and 1 year of corn.

In 1933 and 1935 he won the 4-H scholarship for his poultry project and received his 4-H pin in 1934. He served as president of his 4-H club for 2 years; he was camp vespers chairman and camp assembly program chairman at the county 4-H camp in 1934.

In 1935 he was valedictorian of his graduating class at W. E. Wells High School in Newell, W. Va.

He enrolled in West Virginia University School of Agriculture with a major in animal husbandry and a minor in agricultural chemistry. At the university he was a student assistant in biochemistry, member of the university boxing team, and waited on tables at the Sigma Nu fraternity house. It was a tight schedule.

"I had to cut boxing practice short," he said, "to get to my job. But the coach didn't mind. I got in some valuable roadwork."

Apparently the roadwork was effective, because he wound up as captain of the boxing team, chancellor of Alpha Zeta, the honorary agricultural fraternity, and was named to Mountain, the ranking honorary organization for university men.

From 1939 to 1942, Paul Miller got to be what he had long wanted to be: county agricultural agent for Ritchie and Nicholas counties. At the outbreak of World War II, he was called to active duty and served as a first lieutenant in the Air Transport Command in South America, north and central Africa, and India.

"The constant traveling interested me in the social science and anthropology fields," Miller said. After his release from active duty, he enrolled at Michigan State University under the GI bill for graduate work in those two new fields of interest.

He was granted an M.A. in 1947 and joined the faculty at MSU as an assistant professor. From 1950 to 1953 he was chairman of a 2-year health study dealing with hospital, local health departments, and consumer-sponsored prepayment plan developments. In 1952 he was staff officer of the rural health panel of the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation.

In January 1953, MSU promoted him to associate professor of sociology and anthropology and in May of the same year, when he was granted his Ph. D. in those fields, made him a full professor. Sixteen months later, in October 1954, he was named deputy director of the MSU Cooperative Extension Service—a post he held only until April of the next year—when he was named director.

In February 1959, he was named vice president of off-campus education at MSU and in June of the same year was given the job of provost, the chief academic officer of both on- and off-campus education.

On November 6, 1961, the WVU board of governors unanimously picked him to succeed Dr. Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., as president of the university.

In making the announcement, Forrest H. Kirkpatrick, president of the University board of governors, said:

"Dr. Miller was the unanimous choice of the board of governors and we are delighted that he has accepted. He is a highly respected scholar, with high-level administrative experience and he has a sincere and dedicated interest in this State and in West Virginia University."

He is married to the former Catherine Spiker, of Harrisville, and they have a daughter, Paula, and a son, Thomas.

FOR A RECONSIDERATION OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY: A WORD FOR GENERAL DE GAULLE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, rapidly changing events call imperatively for the reconsideration of our foreign policy. In recent weeks President de Gaulle has become the target of much hasty criticism, and this has tended to obscure the great and memorable services he has rendered to the cause of world freedom during and since World War II, to the stabilization of government in France, and to the ending of French colonialism—all achievements of such magnitude that they bespeak for him reasoned and judicious consideration now and hereafter of his more recent actions and utterances. In any event, let us never forget, whatever may be ephemeral differences of opinion, our long and close association with France, stanch supporter of the American people in the days of our struggle for independence, our ally in two great World Wars, when Americans and Frenchmen fought, bled and died side by side for the perpetuation of liberty.

I do not propose to go at length at this time into the ramifications of President de Gaulle's recent declarations of policy and purpose. But they may briefly be summarized to point to the fact that he feels that Europe is now able to maintain and defend itself and no longer needs the massive U.S. aid which our country has extended both financially and materially to Western Europe. Critics of General de Gaulle have been saying, with an overtone of reproach, that our financial aid to France has exceeded $9 billion—the largest sum advanced to any country.

President de Gaulle's view would appear to be that this very aid, and other factors leading to France's economic recovery and prosperity, now enable France to stand on its own feet and assume, in large part, with the help of other European nations, the responsibilities for European defense which the United States has been carrying principally.

Well, what is so wrong with that? General de Gaulle may prove to be mistaken. He may be unduly optimistic. But why not give this new and important orientation full consideration? If our armed forces are no longer needed in Europe, will that not, among other things, help our balance-of-payment problems which require solution? Was it ever intended that the stationing of our troops overseas would be permanent?

Are there not great advantages in having the nations of Western Europe assume greater responsibilities for their own security? These matters deserve full reflection and well-considered appraisal by our Government and our people.

In this connection, an excellent article entitled "Reconsidering Our Foreign Policy, by Louis J. Halle, was published in the March 23 issue of the New Republic. It is highly pertinent at this juncture. I ask that it be printed at the conclusion of my remarks, and I recommend its reading to my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

RECONSIDERING OUR FOREIGN POLICY

(By Louis J. Halle)

In the New Republic of February 23 I observed that our present foreign policy had been designed in the late 1940's to meet a situation that no longer existed. It had been addressed to an emergency. It had been our response to the general alarm at the helplessness of European nations that lay prostrate in the path of an expanding Soviet Union. What the United States then undertook to do, on a crash basis, was to stabilize the situation by containing the Soviet Union with its own strength while restoring the strength of the West Europeans.

Today this has been largely accomplished. The West Europeans are back on their feet, their strength and self-confidence restored. The situation has been stabilized, something like the old European equilibrium of power has been reestablished. Today, then, the alarm of 15 years ago has passed away; no one in West Europe lives, any more, in daily expectation of the Red army's arrival. It is in these new circumstances that General de Gaulle, in the name of France and as the would-be spokesman of a restored Europe, has challenged the American presence on the Continent. He has denounced the notion that Europe should continue indefinitely to depend on the United States for its security. Specifically, he has rejected the NATO alliance as an indefinitely continuing arrangement.

By thus bringing his fist down on the whole postwar system, constructed under American leadership, he has made inescapable a reconsideration of American policy, a reconsideration that was overdue anyway. Two months after his stroke, however, there is no sign that such a reconsideration is as yet underway.

The fact that it should be so slow to get underway is understandable. Our Government and public alike are the prisoners of the past. They are psychologically committed to the basic conceptions on which they have been acting for 15 years, so that it hardly occurs to them that those conceptions, themselves, not just the tactics based upon them, should be the subject of reconsideration. Like all governments, our own is staffed by technicians, men of action, rather than men of vision, and to tacticians reconsideration means the reconsideration of tactics rather than the reexamination of fundamentals. It is easy to imagine the various staffs preparing papers, today, on possible moves for getting around General de Gaulle, for making NATO work in the face of his opposition. It is harder to picture them addressing themselves to the question whether there is any further use in NATO. But this is one of the questions that now has to be considered, if only because there can be no NATO without France. (There might be something called NATO, but it would be quite different.)

At this moment no one can realistically propose a new American foreign policy ready for immediate use. There will first have to be a great deal of purposeful exploration on the international scene, exploration out of which a new policy would emerge over months and perhaps years. But the exploration would have to be purposeful, it would have to have certain clear ends in view. What I offer here is merely an outline of some fundamentals that suggest the direction of exploration.

First of all, we should remind ourselves that the defense of Europe is the concern of Europeans primarily, and only secondarily a concern of ours. To the extent that the Europeans can make their own defense they must do so, and we ought indeed to refuse to do more than supplement their best efforts to the extent that they had, by common consent, to be supplemented. There is no sense, for example, in our keeping almost six divisions in Europe (to two each for France, Belgium, and the Netherlands) simply because we think the defense of the Europeans requires more divisions than they think it does. They must themselves be the judges, in the first instance, of how much military force they need to defend themselves, since it is their own survival that is immediately at stake.

Back numbers of the New Republic would show that I have consistently urged the need for us Americans to defend Berlin, even to the point of limited war. But this has not been because Berlin, in itself, has any strategic relevance to the defense of the United States. It has been simply because we were saddled with this obligation, to our German allies especially, and so completely saddled with it that a failure to meet it would have represented a betrayal and would have had the most far-reaching consequences. We ought, however, to prefer not to have the obligation at all. It has been an unspeakable burden for us, involving us in the greatest risks we have had to face since the war—indeed, the greatest risks in our national history—taking us uncomfortably close to the brink of a nuclear holocaust on occasion. For 15 years it has hung over us like a sword of Damocles, and we have seen no prospect of getting out from under. It is not too much to say that, to meet our obligation in Berlin, we have put our own cities to the hazard. Now, if General de Gaulle and Chancellor Adenauer and other Europeans see any prospect of being able to relieve us of this obligation, we ought surely to let them know how profoundly welcome such a relief would be.

One may ask why points so obvious need making at all. But they do need making simply because we, more than any other nation, have a way of becoming psychologically committed to undertakings for which there are no rational grounds. Beginning in 1900, for example, tempted purely by the opportunity to make a grand gesture, we committed ourselves to the territorial and administrative integrity of China—even though no national interest of ours whatever was involved. Quixotically, we committed ourselves to protecting the Chinese from their increasingly powerful Japanese neighbor; and that senseless commitment, from which we tried too late to escape, finally led to Pearl Harbor and the Pacific war of 1941–45. Again, at the beginning of the 1920's we made it a major objective of our policy to get the Japanese forces out of Siberia, even though we had less than no reason to perform such a service for Lenin's new Russia. It is in the light of this record that we would, I think, be quite capable of urging our continued participation in the defense of Berlin on the West Germans and the other Europeans, bargaining with them for the acceptance of that participation, paying them for it in effect.

If this seems bizarre when stated so plainly, we should look at our record on foreign aid. From the beginning of the point 4 program we have urged our aid upon underdeveloped countries, frequently putting them under the greatest pressure to accept it when they didn't want it. Instead of their being suitors to us, we have been suitors to them for the acceptance of our aid, and this has given them the bargaining power, which should have been ours, to set the condtions. In the light of this record it is far from implausible that, having come to regard the defense of Europe as a primarily American objective, we should plead with the Europeans to support us in its realization.

SOLDIERS NOT INTRUDERS

The first exploration that I would propose, then, is not an exploration of the means by which we can sweeten the prospect of our continued presence in Europe, and of our participation in Europe's defense, so as to keep or regain the acceptance of Europeans who are turning away from us. I would not propose that we explore with the West Germans or the French, for example, what better offer they might accept from us in return for allowing us to continue playing the leading role in their defense. I would, rather, propose that we explore with the Europeans the possibility of a program designed gradually to relieve us of that burden. We should make it clear that we would be happy if they felt that they could get along, now that they have recovered their strength, with fewer American ground forces in Europe. We should make it clear that we would be happy if they could put themselves in a position to take over from us the defense of the gallant West Berliners.

There need be no bluff, no intellectual dishonesty, in taking this line, even though we foresaw that it would produce immediate alarm at the prospect of our pulling out. There is no doubt that it would indeed produce such alarm; but, whether it did or not, the atmosphere would immediately be cleared so that the realities became visible once more. If, as is hardly conceivable in present circumstances, the Europeans showed themselves glad to have us go, it would be proper for us to go. But if, on the other hand, it aroused European alarm, it would bring out the real requirements of the situation.

We have an obligation, and if the Europeans should plead with us to stay with them, to remain on the barricades in Berlin and elsewhere, then we should not refuse them. We should merely ask that, in return, we be received with courtesy and respect, as soldiers answering their call rather than as intruders. If they did not want us we would go; but if they did want us they would have to play their part with us and accord us the common provisions of hospitality. This means that we would not be proper objects for their economic or political warfare.

The great dilemma in taking such an approach, I shall be told, lies in the problem of nuclear deterrence. If we are prepared to have them relieve us of the burden of their defense, then we must be prepared to have them develop their own nuclear armaments. But this is a choice that they have anyway, as the British and French have amply demonstrated. If they think they can produce their own effective deterrents to the Soviet nuclear threat (and, despite brave official statements, few of them do), then they will feel that they no longer need depend on ours. Immediately, we shall be relieved of the commitment to retaliate on the Soviet Union for any Soviet strikes at Paris or Rome, at Brussels or Bonn; our own cities will no longer be subject to sacrifice for the defense of European cities.

If, on the contrary, they feel that they must still have the protection of the American deterrent, then they will have to face certain simple limitations pertaining, not so much to our policy as to reality itself. They will have to face the fact that they cannot all have pushbuttons of their own with which to set our deterrent off. They will have to face the fact that they cannot each have an absolute veto on its use. If they protest that this places them before an intolerable dilemma, then we can only say that it is their dilemma, rather than ours, and they will have to resolve it as seems to them best. If they say they cannot trust us, then our reply must be that they are free not to.

I think it likely that, faced with such an attitude on our part the great preponderance of European opinion would favor the risks involved in trusting us and the restraints involved in providing hospitality. In the face of such an attitude on our part, I think General de Gaulle, who has now offered his France as an alternative to our leadership, would find his initiative ill received. But the choice would be that of the Europeans, and if they did decide to flock to his standard, that would immediately relieve us of responsibilities greater than any nation before us has ever borne, responsibilities that we accepted in darker days without joy, and that we had discharged with honor up to the moment when we were at last acquitted of them.

I do not advocate isolationism. On the contrary, I think the future of mankind depends on a drawing together of our nations until the frontiers between them have become largely academic. Nothing would be more counterproductive of this, however, than for us to insist that others accept our embrace. The best chances for the continued development of the Atlantic Community, specifically, lies in our clear willingness to accept the alternative.

IRELAND'S ROLE IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is the season to honor St. Patrick. Of course, this year St. Patrick's Day came on Sunday. Since Congress was not in session, it was not possible at that time to make a brief statement with reference to the great patron saint.

I am happy to bring to the attention of my colleagues the continuing interest of modern Ireland in promoting collaboration among nations through education, science, and culture.

Since the days of their missionaries who brought education and culture to the continent of Europe, the Irish have extended these activities to every continent of the world, taking care to preserve the national cultures and independence of new nations in the process.

The fact that half the world's children still receive no formal schooling, moved the Irish to set up an international educational exchange of persons. Although it is unlikely that any country is doing all that it might in this regard, it is a fact that the small country of Ireland is, voluntarily and without the urge of material gain, making a very serious effort to remedy the deplorable situation of these untaught children.

A recent survey for UNESCO found some 1,500 qualified Irish teachers working, at all levels of education, in the continent of Africa. This amounts to one teacher in Africa for every 2,000 persons of Ireland's population. In addition, they have a significant number of teachers in Asia, Oceania, and the Americas.

To encourage greater participation in this good work, the Irish Government introduced a scheme 2 years ago whereby lay teachers, primary, secondary, and technical, on their return home, receive credit for salary purposes for teaching service performed in the newly independent countries. Also, of some 10,000 students in Irish universities, about 1,000 come from Africa and Asia, and this, despite an acute problem of maintaining adequate financing for space and facilities.

I think it is well to note that many countries are helping in this great program of what we call foreign aid. It is not entirely a burden imposed upon the American people alone. I make these brief remarks today about Ireland to point out once again that countries with very limited financial resources are undertaking great responsibility.

We can all be proud of these figures which indicate the continuing concern of the Irish people with education—not only as a national problem, but as a world problem.

I salute the Republic of Ireland for their magnanimous outlook. It is a caution to the more affluent. May God prosper and bless their progress in good measure.

AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, three items have recently come to my attention which effectively illustrate the need for a substantial expansion of our annual investments in higher education.

First. I have received the 1963 legislative proposal of the American Council on Education, "A Federal Program To Develop Higher Education as a National Resource." This proposal is an eloquent plea for increased Federal financial support of higher education in both public and private nonprofit institutions.

I hope every Senator who has attempted to assess the present status and to predict future needs of our institutions of higher learning will agree on the need for increased Federal financial support. There are substantial areas of agreement between these proposals outlined by the American Council on Education and President Kennedy's program contained in the National Education Improvement Act of 1963. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this vital legislation.

Second. I bring to the attention of the Senate an address by Harry A. Bullis, director and former chairman of General Mills, delivered at the University of Akron, December 12, 1962, entitled "Increased Corporate Aid for Higher Education as a Sound Business Investment." Mr. Bullis concisely states the need for, and the wisdom of, a rapid increase in voluntary business investment in higher education. As Mr. Bullis notes, "business can carry no wiser insurance and can make no sounder investment than to increase corporate aid for higher education and to increase it now."

This is true for business. It is certainly no less true for the Nation as a whole. We must invest and invest now in substantial amounts in the soundest of all investments, the education of our young people.

These two excellent statements illustrate a frequently overlooked fact: this is not a question of public versus private investment, or Federal versus State funds for higher education. The magnitude of the problems facing higher education today demands increased responses from every source, both public and private, Federal and State.

In our proper concern for providing more adequate financing of higher education in the United States, we must never lose sight of the absolute necessity of preserving the basic freedoms of our universities and colleges, both public and private. I use the word "freedom" in the sense of developing all aspects of a university curriculum without detriment to other subjects. The greater emphasis in recent years on science, engineering, technology, and foreign languages in higher education has detracted from certain other areas of the humanities and social sciences in terms of attracting better students, teachers and financial support.

In a recent issue of the Phi Delta Kappan magazine, Dr. Raymond C. Gibson, professor of higher education, Indiana University, presents a thoughtful analysis of this situation together with a plan for promoting integrated support of higher education. I commend it to my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these three documents be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHER EDUCATION AS A NATIONAL RESOURCE

American higher education is a priceless asset fundamental to the national purpose. It cannot be spoken of simply in terms of the value of buildings and equipment, the total number of persons served, the teachers involved, or the research performed. The Nation's colleges and junior colleges, universities, research institutes, and professional schools are all of these things, but something more. Broadly conceived, higher education constitutes a precious national resource essential to the achievement of great national goals and to the achievement of worthy aspirations of individual citizens. It is a resource also in the sense that, given favorable conditions, it is as capable of self-renewal as is a properly conserved forest.

As students, young men and women look to colleges and universities to help them fulfill their aspirations. Parents look to these institutions to help them realize the ambitions they have for their children. More significantly, the American people look to colleges and universities for a continuing supply of increasingly capable citizens. They expect institutions of higher education—especially universities and their associated professional schools—to explore new fields of knowledge and to apply this knowledge to the problems of business and industry, human development, and government.

Nor is it the American people alone who place a high value on their institutions of higher education. The governments and peoples of emerging nations are turning more and more for advice and assistance to our colleges and universities. There can be little doubt that American higher education must help meet the expectations not just of the Nation, but of the world as well.

Like any other resource, colleges and universities must be used wisely lest they be exploited and their values diminished. Thus far, American higher education has served without substantial impairment of its teaching and research functions. But as we approach the 1970's, it is quite clear that colleges and universities will be subject to pressures that could weaken their usefulness as national resources. To prevent such a possibility, and to develop further higher education's strength as a resource for the future, action must be taken now. Appropriate action involves individual citizens and private philanthropy, but it also involves local, State, and national governments.

The heaviest pressure on our colleges and universities—and one certain to increase—is the steadily rising number of persons who want to enter college. Not only are there vastly more individuals in the college-age group, but also more of them find it necessary and desirable to get a higher education.

Opening enrollment for the current academic year (4,175,000 in fall of 1962) shows a 17-percent increase over 1960, the start of the present decade. By 1965, it is estimated that the figure will have increased 46 percent over 1960. An opening enrollment of almost 7 million is projected for 1970—an increase of 94 percent over 1960.[1] To meet this situation, institutions of higher education, even with the most effective use of the staff and plant they now have, must enlarge their faculties and expand classroom and student housing facilities.

In addition, though more difficult to measure, the pressure of new knowledge on colleges and universities requires new (and expensive) research facilities and equipment. Our Nation cannot afford to let its institutions fall behind in the search for new and better knowledge. To move ahead, we must expand and strengthen graduate education, including postdoctoral study, for the purpose of advancing knowledge of all kinds as well as for advancing learning on all levels. Throughout our educational system, in brief, we shall have to do a bigger and a better job. Achieving this objective will be costly; falling short of it will be even costlier.

The American Council on Education believes that the problems confronting higher education transcend state and local concerns, and thus have become an urgent national concern. We believe that, to maintain and develop higher education as a national resource, the Federal Government must supplement other sources of support. The Federal Government should do this, not to aid higher education, but to meet a national obligation to conserve and strengthen a national resource.

The council therefore proposes a broad program of Federal action to help expand and improve American higher education.

Although American higher education is unified in purpose, it is varied in its forms. We can think of it as a single entity when visualizing the impact of enrollment increases and sensing the obligation this places upon colleges and universities. But this concept of unity blurs the variety and complexity which must be considered in formulating a viable program. Such a program should meet the needs of institutions ranging in complexity from small colleges to large universities comprising many divisions and professional schools, in size from a few hundred students to many thousands, and in control from private to public.

The council believes it is well within the capacity of the American people, acting through their elected representatives in Congress and in response to leadership from the President, to implement a program of adequate support for higher education as a national resource.

This assertion, we are aware, proposes the use of Federal funds for private institutions as an integral part of the American system of higher education. This is nothing new, however, in either principle or practice. Historically, the Congress and the Federal Government have drawn no line of demarcation between public and private institutions of higher education when utilizing them in the national interest. The Federal Government has repeatedly called upon both public and private institutions to perform research and to serve as training centers for military officers. The Federal Government has provided grants to both public and private institutions for construction of research facilities. The Federal Government has granted funds to both public and private institutions for graduate education under the National Defense Education Act. In these and other ways, ample precedent exists for a program designed to develop both public and private institutions of higher education as a vital national resource.

For more than a hundred years the United States has supported and taken pride in a dual system of higher education which affords our youth the freedom to choose how and where they are to pursue their advanced learning. The American Council on Education believes in the soundness of this educational tradition and urges the American people, through their Federal Government, to support and develop it to meet the Nation's growing needs.

The proposals here set forth were recommended by the American Council's Commission on Federal Relations, and approved by the council's board of directors. By its nature, higher education is diverse and comprises institutions of many different traditions and views. As may be expected there are individual differences of opinion. Nevertheless, our recommendations represent a thoughtful consensus of representatives of all segments of American higher education. They take into account the views of the council's 1,000 member institutions and 175 member organizations.

The council recognizes the need also to strengthen elementary and secondary education and believes that the Federal Government has significant responsibilities on those levels. The American Council on Education, however, represents higher education. Our proposals are concerned accordingly with the need to strengthen colleges and universities.

THE PROPOSALS

I. Physical facilities

The Federal Government should take appropriate steps to assist colleges and universities in the construction of physical facilities for instruction, research, and student housing.

Instructional facilities: The council believes the need justifies a commitment by the Federal Government averaging $1 billion annually for a program of matching grants and low-interest loans for construction of academic facilities in both public and private institutions.[2]

Classrooms, laboratories, and libraries are essential to any soundly conceived academic program. The institution which overcrowds these facilities or tries to make do with obsolete facilities risks serious impairment of the quality of its academic program.

Research facilities: Federal agencies which support research in colleges and universities should be authorized and encouraged to provide appropriate support for construction of the physical facilities and for acquisition of the equipment required for such research. Additional appropriations should be provided as needed for these purposes.

Student housing: The basic legislative authorization of $300 million annually for the college housing-loan program runs until 1965. The Government is urged to make full use of its authority to make college-housing loans and, if the demand for loans should exceed available funds, to seek additional lending authority.

II. Faculty

The Federal Government should expand programs that will help to increase the supply of college teachers and improve the quality of instruction and research in colleges and universities.

Supply of college teachers: Two principal sources of Federal support for individuals enrolled in graduate programs which would qualify them for college teaching are the National Science Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The programs of these agencies are restricted for the most part to the natural sciences. Moreover, they are directed primarily to research and only incidentally to college teaching. The NSF and NASA fellowship programs should be expanded as the number of qualified candidates increases. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that expansion of these programs does not necessarily insure that the participants will go into college teaching rather than research.

The quality of college education also depends on an adequate supply of well-prepared teachers in disciplines other than the sciences, for example, in English, history, political science, and economics. The Federal Government should support expansion of graduate education in such a way as to redress the present imbalance in favor of science, and to encourage the preparation of college teachers in many, instead of few, fields of learning.

The only Federal program specifically intended to increase the supply of college teachers in fields other than science is that authorized in title IV of the National Defense Education Act, supplemented by NDEA title VI scholarships to prepare researchers and teachers in modern foreign languages not commonly taught in the United States. To make the National Defense Education Act a more effective instrument for adding to the supply of college teachers, it should be amended as follows:

1. Increase the total number of fellowships available under NDEA from 1,500 to 5,000, distributed in these categories: (a) Up to 2,000 in the existing "new or expanded" category; (b) up to 2,000 in programs of graduate instruction in institutions which can make a major contribution toward meeting the pressing need for college teachers; (c) up to 1,000 1-year awards for college teachers who are within a year of completing the requirements for the doctorate.

2. Provide each institution a flat grant of $3,000 a year for each graduate student enrolled under the NDEA fellowship program with the stipulation that the institution waive all tuition and other fees (other than room and board) normally required of graduate students.

---

[1] The conservative estimates of the U.S. Office of Education reflect the general increase in population aged 18–21, and assume that the present ratio of 38 college students per hundred in the 18–21 age group will rise to 48 per hundred by 1970. The increase in enrollment is not a temporary "bulge," but a more permanent increase which will require even greater expansion in the 1970–80 decade. The 18–21 age group in 1980 (already born and approaching kindergarten) will be approximately 3 million larger than the equivalent group in 1970.

[2] The magnitude of what the Federal commitment should be is suggested by the projections of facilities needs published by the U.S. Office of Education in 1962 as chapter 11 of Economics of Higher Education. These projections show an average annual cost of construction for needed facilities of $2.21 billion in the years between 1961 and 1975. Average annual expenditures for construction are now approximately $1.25 billion. This rate can be sustained only if all present and anticipated sources of institutional financing of facilities are fully utilized.

Another estimate of the probable magnitude of the required Federal commitment is found in the results of a November 1960 survey of council membership. Reports from 582 institutions, representing about half of total student enrollment at that time, indicated that, over a 5-year period, they would expect to request a total of $2.9 billion under a program of grants and loans. Of this amount, it was anticipated that about $2.1 billion, or 72 percent, would be for grants, and $800 million, or 28 percent, would be for loans.

Improvement of quality of instruction: A prime factor in the improvement of academic instruction obviously is the improvement of faculty competence. In the scientific field, Federal programs presently afford faculty members opportunities for postdoctoral research as well as for carrying out research projects on their own campuses. Similar benefits to teachers in fields other than the natural sciences should be provided through amendments to the National Defense Education Act.

New legislation to support the operation of college and university libraries would also reinforce faculty research and scholarship. In many scholarly disciplines the library is a major research facility, comparable in importance to the laboratory.

The program suggested above for 1,000 1-year NDEA fellowships for college teachers within a year of completing the doctorate would add to the supply of fully qualified college teachers and, because it is directed to persons already in college teaching, would improve the competence of these persons.

In addition, the NDEA institutes in modern foreign language should be extended to college teachers of modern language without any distinction between teachers from public and private institutions. These modern language institutes should be authorized to include the teaching of English.

Finally, there should be increased use of existing legislative authority for exchanges of faculty members with foreign countries and for grants to actual and prospective college teachers to study abroad. The council believes that Federal agencies administering these programs should consult with the academic community in developing fresh approaches that will win support for needed and substantial increases in appropriations for international educational exchanges.

III. Students

There is need for appropriate Federal action to lower the financial barriers to higher education for qualified students.

The predicted enrollment increase of 2.8 million students between 1962–63 and 1970–71 places a high priority on the need for academic facilities and college teachers. Realization that enrollments will rise by one-fourth between 1962 and 1965 alone emphasizes the urgency of this need. Without adequate facilities and qualified teachers, our colleges and universities will have to resort to expedients detrimental to educational quality. Thus the council believes first priority should go to Federal programs designed to assure the coming generation of college students of classrooms, laboratories, and libraries in which to learn, and qualified persons to teach them.

All evidence indicates that charges to students for tuition, fees, and room and board in both public and private institutions are continuing to rise sharply. This upward trend in costs has forced the student, his family, and the institution to plan more realistically the share of the cost that should be borne by grant assistance, loans, and student employment. But dangers lie ahead, since a study of trends also indicates that scholarships and institutional loan funds, even when augmented by Federal loan funds available under the NDEA, are not keeping pace either with the increase in number of students or with the upward cost trend. Furthermore, while the loan program of the NDEA has helped many families in the middle-income brackets, qualified students from the very-low-income levels are finding it more and more difficult to finance a college education.[3]

With NDEA assistance, State programs of testing and counseling, with special emphasis on early identification of talented students, have either been initiated or expanded. But it is not enough to identify the talented student who comes from a low-income family unless some hope of grant assistance can be offered by the time he must make the decision to go to college. In short, if equality of educational opportunity is to be more than an abstract slogan, the Federal Government must help colleges and universities provide grant assistance as well as loan assistance to able but needy students.

Student loans: The ceiling of $250,000 on Federal contributions to any one institutional loan fund should be removed so that institutions may request funds in proportion to the predictable demand for them. The NDEA student loan program should be made a permanent program, with the Federal capital contributions granted to the institutions as permanent revolving loan funds. From time to time additional appropriations should then be made for grants to institutions to reimburse them for the portion of loans forgiven for recipients who entered teaching, to meet the needs resulting from increasing enrollments, and to establish loan funds for institutions new to the program.

As a matter of equity to student borrowers, the 50-percent forgiveness of loans should be extended to all teaching, including college teaching in recognized public and private, nonprofit institutions of education.

Student grant assistance: With due regard to the priority needs for a Federal program of assistance for construction of academic facilities and for expansion of the NDEA fellowship program for training college teachers, a new Federal program of 4-year undergraduate scholarships should be provided to supplement the NDEA student loan program. This scholarship or grant assistance program should have as its primary objective the seeking out and assisting of students of academic promise and great financial need.

International student exchanges: In the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, Congress recognized the need to increase the number of undergraduate and graduate student exchanges with foreign countries and to provide special services to foreign students enrolled in American colleges and universities. Congress should appropriate adequate funds to support these programs realistically if international exchanges of students are to be extended effectively to emerging nations, and if the foreign student is to obtain maximum benefit from study in an American institution.

IV. Other proposals and considerations

The focus of Federal action to sustain and develop American higher education as a national resource must be on programs to assist institutions to meet the demand for better higher education for an increasing number of students. Thus the construction of academic facilities and the recruitment and preparation of qualified college teachers must have first priority for the academic community, and should have first priority in the thinking of Congress and the Executive. The need for more student financial assistance holds a second priority.

The council will continue to support other proposals for Federal action in the field of higher education. The list below is by no means inclusive, but among the proposals for which the council intends to provide appropriate support are these:

Federal assistance for construction of teaching facilities in medicine, dentistry, and other health professions.

Payment of full costs of federally sponsored research.

Equitable reimbursement to colleges and universities for expenses incurred in providing facilities and instruction for ROTC units.

Federal assistance to programs for college-level technician education.

Extension of the urban renewal program with annual authorizations sufficient to maintain benefits to the colleges and universities at least at current levels.

Amendments to the NDEA (a) to authorize preparation of persons to teach English as a second language, (b) to permit institutions and agencies undertaking NDEA-supported research to publish the results of such research, and (c) to authorize guidance institutes for training college student personnel workers.

Implementation of international agreements providing for tariff-free importation of books and scientific equipment.

Appropriations for Federal educational programs commensurate with the known demands for such programs. Particular emphasis will be placed on adequate appropriations for the salaries and expenses of the Office of Education, for the program of the National Defense Education Act, for the National Science Foundation, for grants in support of educational television, and for international educational exchanges.

In the interest of providing better coordination and focus for Federal programs in support of education, the American Council on Education believes there should be appropriate revision of Federal organization and administration to strengthen the U.S. Office of Education, and to bring the U.S. Commissioner of Education into a closer relationship with the President.

In addition the Council is convinced that the Federal Government has an immediate responsibility to assess all of its present relationships with higher education and to take such steps as may be necessary to make these relationships more conducive to the long-term strengthening of the Nation's educational resources. In such an endeavor the Council pledges its full cooperation and assistance.

THE URGENT NEED FOR DECISION

On December 15, 1962, President Logan Wilson of the American Council wrote the President of the United States: "The crisis long predicted in the capacity of our institutions to meet the demands upon them is no longer something in the future. It is now."

It takes time to enact new Federal legislation and then to get it into effective operation. It also takes times to plan and then to build new buildings, and to complete the graduate education of a college teacher. Prompt action in the first session of the 88th Congress might result in a few new instructional buildings ready for use in the middle of the academic year 1963–64 and many more ready for use at the beginning of the 1964–65 academic year. The full effect, however, of a new Federal program for construction of academic facilities would not be felt until 1965–66 and beyond.

Similarly, assuming that Congress acts promptly in its 1963 session, expanded graduate programs for training college teachers would not make a significant difference in the supply of college teachers until 1965 and after.

The crisis cannot be averted, but it can be met without resorting to hastily devised crash programs. The decision lies both with Congress and with the President and his advisers. The American Council on Education is convinced that it speaks not only for organized higher education but for a much broader American consenus when it asserts that the opportunity for quality education beyond the high school should be widened and deepened through Federal action. With wise and effective Federal assistance, higher education can be maintained as an important national resource for generations to come.

---

[3] The statements in this paragraph are based on "Financial Aid to the Undergraduate: Issues and Implications," by Elmer D. West, to be published by the American Council on Education.

Increased Corporate Aid for Higher Education as a Sound Business Investment

(By Harry A. Bullis)

The University of Akron occupies a unique position as one of the foremost educational institutions of our country, and its distinguished president, Dr. Norman P. Auburn, is one of America's top educators. I have had the privilege during the past several years of being closely associated with Dr. Auburn as a fellow member of the Board of Directors of the Council for Financial Aid to Education. For a period of 7½ months beginning August 1, 1957, Dr. Auburn was borrowed from the University of Akron and served with great distinction as Acting President of the Council. During that period, Dr. Auburn brought an invigorating and fresh vision to the important work of this group. As a director and a member of the executive committee, he continues to give the Council the great benefits of his advice and leadership.

This is the date when the University of Akron is celebrating its annual founders day. The convocation this morning and the ceremonies held in connection with the anniversary of the founding of this outstanding university, whose record is a fine one indeed, were very impressive.

I would be remiss if I did not also record my appreciation of the performance of the great industries of Akron, including that which has made your city so well known as the rubber capital of the world. The accomplishments of the tire industry epitomize the industrial record of America. The high quality of the product, the record of high wages, and the great contributions of the industry to an advancing America are the envy of us all.

ADVANCES THROUGH EDUCATION AND CAPITAL

At this luncheon, Dr. Auburn has asked me to speak on the general topic of increased corporate aid for higher education as a sound business investment.

Corporations, corporate management, and boards of directors of corporations have as their central task the development of their manufacturing activities, the distribution of their products, and the achievement of a progressively higher place in their industries—goals which can only be realized with an efficient and educated work force. The heads of every corporation are also interested in the enlargement of the productivity of the entire economy so that markets are expanded for the corporation itself in a profitable way. This results in a gain to the corporation itself by making available superior resources for use in profitable production.

In business, many questions have been raised as to the contributions to our advances toward the better life from labor—including management—and from machines—including all forms of capital. This problem of dividing the contribution of the skilled and resourceful machine and the skilled and resourceful man has recently been studied with well-informed and well-grounded results.

One such study was made by Prof. Theodore W. Schultze, of the University of Chicago. Dr. Schultze, in his presidential address to the members of the American Economic Association in 1960, said that his investigation brought him to the finding that capital in the United States could account for and be credited with no more than 50 percent of the rise in productivity in the United States since 1900. He came to the tentative conclusion that educational advances probably accounted for most of the remaining 50 percent of the total advance in our productivity in the last 60 years.

Hence, we see the importance to business of investing in education equally with investing in additional capital—in expanding, training, stretching men's minds as much as enlarging, expanding, and adding to man's machines.

THE "EDUCATED" MACHINE

Let me give an example. The purchase price of a good computer would be about $1 million. I inquired as to its weight. This was reported to me as 2 tons. So we can say a computer machine costs $500,000 a ton. This works out at $250 a pound or more than 12 times the present new high price of silver at $20 a pound. In fact, the price per pound for the computer machine may well and properly be compared with the price of gold because it is much closer to that price than to the lower levels of silver. The price today for a pound of gold is $560.

Now, reverting to the computer cost of $500,000 per ton, we may ask: What is the intrinsic worth of the machine? Well, perhaps about $500, and were it all of mere metal, it would not be worth more than $50 per ton as scrap.

The price of the computer is high, but not because it has a high intrinsic value. The price is high because there is far more of man's brains and education in the computer than there is metal or all natural resources. Our challenge is, through education, to increase the efficiency of man's mind. The development of his brain is the finest type of investment business can make.

Clearly, as we move up in education, we move up very greatly the power, capacity, intricacy, and functions our machines can perform. Here we see man's educational attainments advancing productivity right before our eyes.

When man wants to use more capital, he does not try to use a dozen shovels or four wheelbarrows. He calls upon his inventive and educational talents to make far more productive progress than that. So the enormous gains that computers and other intricate machines make possible are far more the result of educational advances than the result of ownership of natural resources or the use of labor as "toil."

UNIVERSITY AND BUSINESS EDUCATION

The development of modern industrial research laboratories and their remarkable equivalence to college and university laboratories testify to the belief business has in education. As a matter of fact, there are numerous instances of large corporations locating their facilities so as to be close to university talent. The bay area in California is an instance in point, with the Stanford Research Institute and the Radiation Laboratory of the University of California. The only difference is where the college and university education ceases and education conducted by business should start. "University" as a word tends to connote "universal," and that may give us a clue as to the allocation of corporate gifts as between the college or university and the corporation's own educational plant, more commonly called a research laboratory.

Business is dependent, particularly in this technological age, on the educated men and women who are the products of universities and colleges, and corporate voluntary contributions to higher education are helping to create a supply of these human intellectual capital goods who are so essential to business well-being.

EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND INCOME

There is quite another way in which we can see the hard financial gains which come to us from education. This way is to calculate in employment and reduced unemployment the economic gains of education.

According to the Department of Labor, a high school graduate will earn, in his or her lifetime, $46,000 more than those who fail to graduate. A college graduate will earn $170,000 more. The Ph. D. apparently will earn so much more that we now have high-quality men's suits labeled the Ph. D. brand, strictly highgrade. In the old days, we had what might best have been described as Tarzan of the Apes brands.

The record of unemployment confirms the same story. In a recent study, the Department of Labor found that only 1.1 percent of our skilled and educated labor was unemployed, while 9.9 percent of our unskilled and uneducated labor was unemployed. Because so many have seniority, only 3 percent of the married men were unemployed, and because they lack seniority, no less than 15.4 percent of teenagers wanting jobs were unemployed.

The final figure, which is almost disastrous, is furnished by former President James B. Conant of Harvard, who has been giving education and its studies his most remarkable talent and energy. He reports that in two large cities, in their slum areas, and with the slum areas having populations of around 250,000 only about 41 percent of the young people between 18 and 22 years in age were in school or at work. Here is the greatest single fester we have in our country. Dr. Conant characterizes it as "social dynamite."

Equally alarming is the fact that in 1965 the number of persons reaching age 18 will, in that single year and every year for 17 years thereafter, increase by 1 million more than are reaching the age 18 each year until 1965. This means that in the next 17 years there will be added 17 million more to the labor force than have been added in the last 17 years.

Now we see two opportunities for corporate leadership and for giving to education as well.

First, if we can induce, in every manner possible, all young people to complete the maximum education and if we can provide facilities for their education, facilities that will attract them to go as far as possible, we shall raise the income level for the entire community. If 1 million more finish high school than are doing so now, we shall raise the income from them by $46 billion. For every 100,000 more we can put through college, their lifetime contribution to the Nation's income will be $17 billion.

With the very large number in about 2 years needing a high quality education, businessmen must give every form of help to expanding our educational facilities, incentives, and assistance to students. The young may not become informed about all of these matters, but every businessman, because of his position and advantages, should understand this greatest domestic need of all in our Nation. We must not leave all leadership here even to our educational leaders, let alone our municipal and State public authorities. We must educate taxpayer groups and the electorate as a whole. To borrow the words of Daniel Webster, the need "is instantaneous, overwhelming, and not admitting of delay." Two years is indeed a short time because it takes approximately that long to build the needed new high school, and a longer time for the needed new college science laboratory.

Now my friends in business will ask: "Yes, but can we afford the program you outline?"

That question can be answered quickly. We cannot afford not to see to it that our educational facilities are very greatly strengthened in 1963 and 1964, because if we do we shall have a different kind of country than we businessmen will like. We must see to it that both our high schools and junior colleges are better equipped to take care of preparatory work for the hordes of young people who will begin reaching college age in only 2½ years. Above that, we must plan educational facilities for the training of those who finish high school, do not go on to college, but yet need further training to be equipped to keep up with today's rapidly forward-moving technology. Those facilities must be both in our schools and in our factories and offices. To know the needs ahead now and not to prepare for them at once is negligence of the first and most dangerous order.

Because of the new Common Market, there is now added need for a higher level of education in this country for economic survival in competition with Western Europe.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT OF EDUCATION TODAY

The Council for Financial Aid to Education has pointed out that higher education is financed from just three sources: Taxes: from various levels of Federal, State, and local governments; earnings: tuition, auxiliary enterprises, investments, etc.; gifts: corporate, alumni, other individual, foundation, church, etc.; and that while corporate voluntary support to higher education is increasing, it is not increasing fast enough.

According to survey reports of the Council for Financial Aid to Education, industry, in 1950–51, gave colleges and universities $43 million, and much of this was for highly restricted projects. The council now estimates that corporate support of higher education will total $200 million in 1962. While this represents $4 million a week—$800,000 every working day—we need, not $200 million annually, but at least $500 million. Twelve different corporations contributed more than $1 million each in 1960, and increasing parts of this are for general purposes. But we need, not 35,000 corporations making contributions to higher education, but 235,000. The base of business donors to higher education must be widened.

At present, there is too much of a spread among the companies that already have aid-to-education programs. Less than 1 percent of the 35,000 corporations now voluntarily supporting higher education contribute more than 50 percent of the money.

The University of Akron has been getting increased corporate support during last few years, especially from corporations who are members of Akron University Associates, many of which are represented at this luncheon.

According to the council, foundations in 1960–61 gave American colleges and universities more than $195 million, an increase of almost 300 percent in 6 years.

Nonalumni individuals contributed $180 million in 1960–61, an increase of 250 percent, 2½ times, in the past 6 years.

The American Alumni Council reports that in 1961, alumni gave their alma maters $209 million. This is an increase of 300 percent over the $53 million contributed as recently as 1953. The alumni of the University of Akron are increasing their contributions each year.

The Council for Financial Aid to Education estimates that by 1970 at least one-fifth of the total cost of higher education, or over $2 billion a year, will come from gifts from corporations, alumni, other individuals, foundations, labor unions, churches, etc.

The Cleveland plan, proposed by a group of Cleveland businessmen, is to relate corporate support of higher education to corporate earnings, and for all corporations starting where they are now to contribute within 3 years 1 percent of earnings before taxes to higher education. Thirty Cleveland companies, with current aggregate earnings of approximately $250 million annually, have joined and agreed to follow the plan. It is hoped that more corporations will follow suit; however, the important thing is for every corporation to do what it can and do it now.

THE FUTURE

Certainly, business can carry no wiser insurance and can make no sounder investment than to increase their corporate aid for higher education and to increase it now. Someone has said, "The future will be decided, not in outer space but in inner space, the space between the ears." In this era of unparalleled change and challenge, there is almost universal agreement on the necessity of an educated world citizenry. We are beginning to realize that the future belongs to the educated man. With him, we may be able to save ourselves. Without him, we cannot.

In our competitive struggle with Communist Russia, education is the greatest weapon in our favor. Our other great weapon is the industrial system of the United States. Both are extremely well exemplified here in Akron.

May I be permitted to recall the simple timeworn aphorism: "Knowledge is power." Let business assume leadership for patriotic as well as selfish motives by contributing to that power. It is my hope that the University of Akron will continue to prosper from its close association with industry here.

[From Phi Delta Kappa magazine, January 1963]

A Scheme for Integrated Support of Higher Education—A Student of Higher Education in America and Europe Finds in Britain Clues to a More Rational and Effective System of Support for U.S. Colleges

(By Raymond C. Gibson)

(NOTE.—Mr. Gibson (Alpha 2608) is professor of higher education at Indiana University. On sabbatical leave last spring, he studied higher education in several European countries, including England. In 1960 he directed a statewide survey of higher education in Iowa. This year he is chairman of a panel for a similar study in Missouri.)

There is an organizational and administrative hiatus in the support of higher education in the United States that borders on anarchy. It could become the graveyard of the American idea of infinite variety in advanced learning. There has been no clear plan for the support of higher education which would not compromise its integrity both with respect to content and control.

The scheme presented here is predicated upon a few basic facts and principles:

1. It is important to preserve the private as well as the public sector of higher education.

2. Public support can be used to preserve or to destroy private colleges.

3. Massive Federal support of private universities, particularly five or six of the best known ones, is a fact that must be recognized. Moreover, we must realize that over 95 percent of research grants are in the sciences and technology.

4. No clear voice speaks out for higher education in the United States. In fact, more than 100 national organizations with their hundreds of regional and State counterparts confuse rather than clarify the policy question.

5. The Federal Government will continue to support higher education, but it must contribute part of the support for the total program rather than all of the support for parts of the program. The humanities and social sciences have been particularly ignored in Federal support at a time when they may be the key to survival.

6. Approximately 75 percent of all accredited colleges and universities participate in at least one of the Federal programs.

Higher education is linked with the social, economic, political, and military position of the United States as a world power. For this reason, the policy of governments at all levels has been to increase opportunities for higher education not only in proportion to an increasing population but, more significantly, in accordance with increasing percentages of college-age students actually in attendance.

The growing sophistication or tolerance among religious groups (apparently not so well known to the National Education Association and the 88th Congress) is certain to accelerate Federal support to both public and private colleges. There is no other equitable solution to the problems posed by burgeoning enrollments and rising costs.

Congress has been inclined to determine policy at the top and to make appropriations for higher education on the basis of that policy rather than upon the basis of intelligent consideration of needs expressed by governing boards, administrators, and faculties of the colleges and universities. This is a trend which should be reversed.

Each national crisis in higher education is approached without any long-range plan. The vacuum created by the lack of policy is an invitation for some national authority to solve the problem because of the availability of Federal funds. Educational objectives, policy, programs, curriculums, research activities, and determination of financial needs can and should originate with faculties, administrators, and governing boards alert to the place of higher education in a dynamic society. Financing should be by State and National Governments—because this is the only solution.

THE TAKEOVER BY MONEYCHANGERS

In recent years a profession of fund raisers has grown up in the university field which is destined to take over not only the administration of higher education but the whole academic program if the present scheme is continued. This group is reaching for power through a combination of clever administrative techniques, Madison Avenue salesmanship, and the inexhaustible expense account. College presidents get by on expense accounts that make them look like peasants by comparison. Staffs of 35 to 60 people working in the area of propaganda and fund raising are virtually the rule rather than the exception among many of the larger private universities. One university reports a budget of $800,000 for its public relations and development office alone in the year 1960–61. This invasion of higher education by Madison Avenue hucksters has developed because of the virtual absence of any organized scheme for supporting our public and private institutions.

Foundations have sprung up in such numbers that many institutions find it necessary to name at least one full-time employee to develop contacts with these sources of funds. Grants coming from foundations have infinitely more strings attached to them than the grants made, for example, by the British Treasury to the universities of Great Britain, as we shall see later in this paper. Boards of directors of foundations are eclipsing boards of trustees for colleges and universities in determining general policy.

Administrative personnel, public relations and development offices, and other bureaucratic establishments in the United States are absolutely astounding in the proportion of the higher education budget they consume compared with the cost of maintaining the University Grants Committee which secures 75 percent of the budget of British universities.

This situation, together with America's desire to keep the control of education decentralized, form the backdrop and the rationale for the scheme herein proposed. Another aspect of the rationale is that almost every State is concerned with the coordination of public higher education, and in some cases of all higher education, in order to approach this increasingly complex problem with the maximum utilization of limited resources.

SCHEME FOR COORDINATION

The scheme I propose for coordination would include a Council on Higher Education in each of the 50 States. The number of members could vary from 15 to 25, depending upon the size of the State, the number of educational institutions, and enrollments. Membership on the council should be drawn from the academic disciplines and professions—including the humanities, natural sciences, social sciences, medicine, engineering, education—and should also include representatives of the business, industrial, and agricultural society in which higher education operates. The academicians on the committee would be drawn from both public and private colleges and universities of the State. Distinguished professors and possibly certain deans of colleges would be included, but central administrators, who would present budgetary requests to the council, would be excluded.

University staff members should make up approximately 60 percent of the membership of the council, which would be a coordinating agency, not a governing body. Governing boards of colleges and universities would continue their existing functions. The coordinating function requires the best judgment of professionals from the sciences, humanities, social sciences, professions, business, and industry. With the exception of a research staff, located on the campus of one of the universities, the members should serve without pay except necessary travel expenses.

Academic members of the council in each State would be nominated by the presidents operating as a group. Other members should be selected from among the leading citizens of the State. All appointments would be made by the Governor, subject to the approval of the legislature. In case of a 15-member council, the Governor would appoint 3 members every 2 years to serve 10-year terms.

Budgetary requests from all accredited colleges and universities, after consideration and approval by the governing boards, would be submitted to this council. Requests would indicate programs to be supported, costs, and sources of income, including tuition, fees, grants, and endowments, which would decrease the contribution from the State and Federal governments. The chairman and executive secretary of the council would be responsible for submitting a coordinated budget to appropriate State officials. Certain designated presidents representing all the college presidents of the State would be called upon to appear before legislative committees in order to interpret and justify statewide programs.

Each State legislature would make an appropriation based upon gross income and college enrollment of the State compared with other States. State appropriations could be made on a biennial basis and reflect short-range needs and changes in educational costs.

The 50 executive secretaries of the State councils on higher education would form the U.S. Grants Committee for Higher Education and would present a quinquennial request to the Bureau of the Budget to supplement institutional and State legislative funds in each State. The Federal appropriation would be made on a 5-year basis and would be in proportion to college enrollments and the ability of States to pay for higher education. Federal Government grants would go directly to the Council on Higher Education of each State for distribution to the institutions.

It would be necessary to maintain a research staff in Washington which would serve as a secretariat for the 50 State councils in the preparation of the quinquennial grants. The Washington staff would be a research and service agency, not a control or governing agency.

The secretariat operating in each State would engage in institutional research involving costs, facilities, personnel, enrollments, program development, and coordination. Each legislature should require a constant study of costs at different levels of higher education in order to approach the problem of appropriations objectively and without discrimination against any institution.

This scheme for managing the support of higher education is based upon observations of the disastrous results of centralized ministerial systems of support and control in Asia and Latin America, but more importantly upon the results of national support and local institutional control and freedom in Australia, New Zealand, and Great Britain.

The following analysis of why the British system has succeeded in keeping support and control separated is presented as the frame of reference for the proposed scheme for the United States.

THE BRITISH UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMITTEE

The British Government initiated the University Grants Committee in 1919. It is composed of 19 members, appointed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who also appoints the executive secretary with the approval of the Prime Minister.

The paid staff of the University Grants Committee is small—a chairman, secretary, an assistant secretary, and clerical personnel. The chairman is the only full-time member of the committee. University Grants Committee has no official connection with the Ministry of Education, although a representative of the Ministry attends all meetings of the committee to provide desirable liaison. In 1961–62, the total secretariat included only 40 people, and the budget for the London headquarters of this important staff came to only $168,000 per year.

The members of the University Grants Committee, other than the chairman and executive secretary, are honorary workers. In 1962, the members included two local school administrators, four college administrators, seven professors, and six business and industrial leaders. Vice chancellors of the universities are not appointed to the committee. They appear before it to present their quinquennial budgetary requests.

Grants are made to the universities (23 universities and 2 university colleges in 1961–62) on a quinquennial basis. These 25 institutions are the only degree-granting universities and colleges in Great Britain. They enrolled approximately 110,000 students (less than 3 percent of college-age youth) in 1962. All other colleges, including technical and teachers colleges, submit their budgetary requests to the Ministry of Education. They enroll about 150,000 students.

The functions of University Grants Committee, as announced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1946, were to assist, in consultation with universities and other bodies concerned, in the preparation and execution of such plans for the development of universities as may from time to time be required in order to insure that they are fully adequate to national needs. The British Government regards the universities as indispensable to the cultural, economic, and political life of the nation. This policy demands coordinated planning without centralized control.

University Grants Committee has the policy of beginning visits to each university about the middle of the quinquennium. The objective is to have at least one-half of the committee visit each university. It took 108 days to carry out this task in preparation for the 1962–67 budget.

By the end of the fourth year of each quinquennium, all requests, with supporting statistics, are submitted to University Grants Committee by the various universities. These requests include new programs as well as recurring operations.

Requests are studied, evaluated, and consolidated by University Grants Committee and then submitted to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. In March preceding the end of the quinquennium, the Government announces the grants for the 5-year period beginning the first of August. Following this announcement, University Grants Committee has the responsibility of making an equitable distribution of the total funds among the institutions involved.

Wihin the limitations imposed by the amount of grant to a university, there is internal freedom for the faculty and administration to proceed with their own plans for the next quinquennium. The exception to this would be in the case of funds earmarked for a special purpose by the treasury or by the universities in their original requests. Since the end of World War II there have been earmarked grants, especially in sciences, technology, agriculture, and Oriental studies.

Following the allocation of the quinquennial grants, the secretariat devotes its time to various problems confronting higher education. For example, during the quinquennium ending July 31, 1962, University Grants Committee, in cooperation with the vice chancellors, sponsored studies that eventuated in a recommendation to the Government that six new universities be established during the period 1962–67.

As late as 1939, University Grants Committee funds granted to the universities amounted to only $5,300,000, or 2,250,000 pounds. By 1961–62, grants amounted to $210 million, or 75 million pounds, and provided about 70 percent of the operating budgets and 95 percent of the building funds for British universities. The enormous increase during the 1939–62 period was considerably out of proportion to the increase in student population, which grew from 50,000 to about 110,000.

Beginning in the fall of 1962, every university student in Great Britain receives government support for his education. Even the son of a wealthy family receives 50 pounds, after which the means test is applied. Capable students from very poor families receive complete support for their university education.

WHY UNIVERSITY GRANTS SYSTEM SUCCEEDS

Traditions within the Government and within the universities have tended to work to the advantage of the university grants system. Many of the leaders in Government and the universities were friends as undergraduate students. Although various members of the Grants Committee are known to their peers among university professors and administrators, there is no evidence that any member of the committee uses his position to represent his own university in a partisan way.

Individuals within Government, the universities themselves, the Ministry of Education, and leaders in the British society share a common interest in maintaining their universities at a high standard; they regard their position as a great public trust to preserve freedom in the universities.

It apparently has never occurred to the English that local government could be better than National Government. Why should it? Any student of public administration knows that no one level of government (local, state, or national) has a monopoly on virtue in any nation. This being the case, it has not occurred to university officials or to leaders in British society that universities are threatened by drawing most of their financial supports from the British treasury.

The tradition of the British in permitting employees to advance in terms of competencies and growth rather than in terms of the size of bureaucracy which one develops and

supervises has set a precedent for limiting the control of University Grants Committee over the universities. The executive secretary and the chairman of the University Grants Committee regard themselves and their organization as an important service agency for the universities in securing Government support, by representing the universities to the Government, by serving as catalyst to bring about greater interaction between the universities and British society, and by serving as a buffer between the support and control of British universities.

One of the most unique aspects of British Government and universities is the fact that status is not synonymous with power. The civil servant is inducted into the Government on the basis of his ability to perform a specific task and to grow in stature as a Government servant. The vice chancellor, dean, or professor in a university does not gain status in terms of the number of people whom he supervises. The drive to build up large bureaucracies and to control groups of people, so characteristic of other governments, has not become a characteristic of British Government in general or of the universities. The professor gets his status largely on the basis of competence in his field of specialization. Even if he becomes master of a house at Cambridge or vice chancellor of the university, these positions do not carry tremendous power. The absence of power as an index of status has been a psychological factor in limiting the authority of the government over the universities. When there is no tangible reward for the possession of power, it becomes less attractive to officials in Government and in education.

Most of the key officials of the British Government are graduates of the universities. They do not hesitate to defend the integrity and freedom of universities to pursue their objectives without interference from Government officials. The Public Accounts Committee of Parliament has demanded the right to probe more deeply the use of university funds. It is generally known that the Chancellor of the Exchequer and other prominent members of the Government, in such cases, come to the rescue of the universities and assist them in maintaining a greater degree of fiscal independence than any other agency of the Government.

There exists among Government officials and in the universities, as well as in British society at large, a determination to maintain the freedom and integrity of British universities. This is one of the most dynamic forces in Western civilization. Freedom to pursue the truth, to do research and freely to exchange ideas are characteristic of British universities which have been shared generously with scholars from all over the world, including those who have come from British colonies. Participation of colonial scholars in a free university society contributed significantly to the disintegration of the British Empire and to the establishment of the British Commonwealth.

The center of power in the university is with the faculties. They elect the vice chancellor and limit his term of office to 2 years. If the power for directing the affairs of the university is with the faculties, it cannot be located in London nor with any other level of government. It is not uncommon in many situations and many countries to proclaim the academic integrity, responsibility, and freedom of faculties, and then to have curricular developments of the most grave consequences handed down from departments of the Central Government or space agencies bent upon accelerating research in a certain direction, even though the long-range objectives of the university and the nation may be seriously impaired by such expediency. When this happens, the faculties and administrators do not control the university.

IMPLICATIONS OF UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMITTEE FOR THE UNITED STATES

Most Americans who have made a careful study of the university grants system have concluded that, while it has been a successful scheme for supporting higher education in Great Britain, it would not work in America.

One of Henry Wriston's professors at Lawrence College used to contend that anything that worked east of the Alleghenies would not work in the Middle West. So it is that many Americans in higher education conclude that success of the University Grants Committee system in England is proof positive that it would not work in America.

The question whether a university grants committee could function in the United States hinges upon whether administrators, faculty, boards of control, and officials in State and national governments can develop the intellectual and administration sophistication to work together without power struggles; can accept the theory that the survival of democratic processes hinges upon keeping the control of research, teaching, and learning within our universities even though 50 percent of the budget for U.S. higher education may be provided by the Federal Government.

Jacques Barzun has said: "England is a business civilization, the first industrial power, and once the world's greatest banker; yet despite its diminished financial strength its subsidy of learning is through a council of professionals not responsible to bureaucrats. . . . All students deemed of superior ability are put through the university at government expense. Scholarships are an honor and a full release from irrelevant drudgery."[1]

If no such system or modification thereof will work in the United States, there are causes more basic than the differences in the size of the two countries, number and size of the universities, availability of higher education, and size of budgets.

We must ask ourselves questions which bear on the fundamental reasons for the success of the university grants system in Great Britain:

1. Are we determined to keep our universities free?

2. Do we have the courage to cushion them against politics and temporary emergencies?

3. Will Government officials support freedom and integrity within the universities of America?

4. Can officials in Government and in higher education learn to trust one another?

5. Is it possible for us to recognize the fact that no level of Government has a monopoly on virtue?

6. Is it possible to develop in the U.S. Government and in universities a system which rewards individuals upon the basis of their competence rather than upon the basis of their power?

7. Is it possible to bypass the bureaucracies of Washington, D.C., and to go directly to the U.S. Treasury with requests for grants based upon careful research by civil servants and educators whose status does not depend upon the control of the expenditure of such funds?

In administering Federal funds for higher education, we have been acting as if the United States were the size of Rhode Island. Universities under the University Grants Committee enroll fewer students than the colleges and universities in the State of Indiana, but the British Government adheres to decentralized control as if the country were the size of the United States. If this principle is valid in a nation that is smaller geographically than many of the 50 American States, then only administrative and educational ineptness could ever persuade the people of the United States to adopt any policy for higher education based upon centralization of control in Washington.

RAILROAD MERGERS—REFERRAL OF BILL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, about 2 weeks ago, on behalf of several other Senators and myself, I introduced S. 942, a bill to amend the Clayton Act to bring about a limited, temporary moratorium on railroad mergers.

I was advised that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] might wish to make a motion to refer the bill to some committee other than the Committee on the Judiciary, to wit, the Committee on Commerce, so that I asked that the bill lie on the desk and not be referred until the Senator from Illinois could be present.

The matter was brought up in the Judiciary Committee, and the consensus of the Judiciary Committee was that that committee should claim jurisdiction of the bill, inasmuch as all Clayton Act questions are referred to the Judiciary Committee, but that the Judiciary Committee would immediately ask the Committee on Commerce for its advice and counsel in connection with the proposal, hoping that it might get such counsel within about 60 days.

Since that time, on a number of occasions, I have conferred with the Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. He has also introduced, or will introduce, a rail merger moratorium bill. I do not know its contents, but I understand that it is to be an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act. That bill, I understand, will be referred to the Committee on Commerce, so that that committee has the same subject matter before it.

I feel that the rail merger moratorium based on antitrust standards is a Judiciary matter. A similar bill, S. 3097, was referred to the Judiciary Committee last year. Railroads are included in the Clayton Act. They are in the Celler-Kefauver amendment to the Clayton Act, which is section 7, to a limited extent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a very brief memorandum prepared by one of the senior attorneys of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, Mr. Winslow Turner, which shows the antitrust and merger problems in connection with the bill.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE JURISDICTION OF RAIL MERGER MORATORIUM BILL (S. 942) INTRODUCED BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

(Summary of basic reasons for jurisdiction in Judiciary Committee)

1. An almost identical bill, S. 3097, was introduced by Senator KEFAUVER last year and it was referred to the Judiciary Committee. It was cosponsored by the majority leader, the assistant majority leader, and 11

---

[1] Jacques Brazun, "The House of Intellect," New York: Harper & Bros., 1957, p. 202.

other Senators. Some 9 days of hearings were held on the bill, and it was voted upon favorably by a majority of the members of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, but did not reach final action by the Judiciary Committee. The subcommittee has recently issued a report entitled "The Railroad Merger Problem" which deals with much of the issues to which this proposed legislation is directed. Hence, the Judiciary Committee and its Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee have a background of jurisdiction and concern over railroad merger moratorium legislation.

2. The proposed legislation seeks only to halt approval of those rail mergers which would substantially lessen competition or tend to monopoly. It is related to antitrust issues arising out of proposed rail mergers. Such issues involve not only the destruction of competition and the development of monopolies in the transportation industry, but also the possible anticompetitive effects upon shippers and areas of the country which are engaged in manufacturing, agriculture, and other nonregulated industries.

3. The consideration of the bill is properly within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary since that committee and its Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee are authorized to make studies and investigations of unlawful restraints and monopolies wherever found.

4. The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee had in its program for 1962, and has again in its program for 1963, as approved by a majority of the committee, an inquiry into transportation mergers, including railroad mergers.

5. The history of the Clayton Act and railroad mergers makes this type of bill properly referred to Judiciary.

(a) Rail mergers were originally determined under Sherman and Clayton Act standards—Judiciary.

(b) In 1920, Congress immunized such mergers from the antitrust laws where the ICC approval conformed to plans for competition and maintained existing routes and channels of trade.

(c) In 1940, the immunization was continued, where new public interest criteria were satisfied, and where the ICC was to consider, but not be bound by antitrust standards.

(d) Today, the size and impact of the rail mergers raise the question—should Congress take back this antitrust immunity, altogether—or should it give a limited antitrust immunity based upon special standards—or should the ICC be permitted to create rail monopolies without restraint. Again, this is an antitrust issue of great importance.

(e) Rail mergers and concentration in the rail industry cannot be isolated from concentration in other American industries, regulated and unregulated—an antitrust problem.

6. The Clayton Act contains special sections directed to railroad antitrust issues aside from the immunity proviso in section 7.

(a) Section 11 (15 U.S.C. 21) provides for the Interstate Commerce Commission to bring its own action for violations of the Robinson-Patman Act, the Kefauver-Celler Antimerger Act, the exclusive dealing and tying section, and the interlocking directorate section of the Clayton Act, and the Attorney General is permitted to intervene and appear to prosecute these antitrust matters before the Commission.

(b) Section 10 (15 U.S.C. 20) makes it illegal, subject to a fine or imprisonment, or both, for any common carrier to have commercial dealings with any other corporation which is interlocked by directorships or other official positions, unless such dealings shall be done by competitive bidding prescribed by rules of the Interstate Commerce Commission. This is an antitrust statute.

(c) Section 4 (15 U.S.C. 14) gives private parties the right to sue for treble the amount of damages arising from violations of these antitrust laws.

All these bills—antitrust in nature—but directly relating to railroads and the Interstate Commerce Commission were considered by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

7. There is no better expertise on antitrust implications than the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and the Judiciary. This is why the bill should go to the Judiciary Committee.

E. Winslow Turner,
Assistant Counsel, Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I made the point, when the distinguished Senator from Tennessee introduced his bill, that, very properly speaking, under rule XXV, it was my opinion the bill ought to be referred to the Commerce Committee. I cherish that opinion notwithstanding the fact that in the last Congress the Judiciary Committee heard 27 witnesses for a period of 9 days on a similar measure.

I observe that the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee [Mr. Magnuson] has filed what for all practical purposes is an identical bill, which provides for a complete freeze on all railroad mergers until the 31st of December 1963. That is the essence of the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver].

Mr. President, now there is identic subject matter reposing in two standing committees of the Senate.

I have no objection. That will be perfectly all right. I fear, however, that if we do not mind our knitting a little with respect to the jurisdiction of the standing committees we shall get into difficulties.

I am of the opinion that there is another bill on which long hearings have been held, as to which many witnesses have been heard, notwithstanding the fact that it is a bill to amend the Clayton Act, which, properly speaking, ought to be in that committee. Sooner or later we shall have a problem with respect to committee jurisdiction.

I am going to be attentive to it, insofar as it relates to the committees on which I serve, because I want the integrity of the jurisdiction of every standing committee to be properly observed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to reply briefly.

The bill which was introduced last year, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, was substantially the same as the bill introduced this year, to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act. It would not provide a complete freeze on railroad mergers, and is not intended to do so. It would make provision with respect to any railroad with assets of more than $200 million; that when the merger would substantially lessen competition or create a monopoly it would be frozen, unless it were clearly established that such an acquisition was necessary and essential to the maintenance of adequate railroad transportation facilities.

The bill is clearly an antitrust bill and is properly an amendment to the Clayton Act. Railroads have always been under the Clayton Act. They have been to a limited extent taken out from under the jurisdiction of the Clayton Act, but there is still jurisdiction over them; so I think the bill properly should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator asking that the bill introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No. I am only asking that the bill I introduced S. 942 be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I merely make an observation, because of the fact that the chairman of the Commerce Committee [Mr. Magnuson] is absent from the Chamber, and I happen to be present in order to make remarks on another subject.

This question was a matter of great discussion before our committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to say in that connection that I advised the Senator from Washington several days ago, and again today, that the matter would be brought up today. He had no desire to comment.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that. I merely wish to have the Record receive the benefit of my observations as to the colloquy which has transpired between the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Illinois.

It is true that questions of mergers fall under the Clayton Act, but they also involve transportation problems. The Commerce Committee has jurisdiction over the ICC, which will hear the matter on the question of mergers. Therefore, there may be concurrent jurisdiction. I think it ought to be resolved in a very businesslike way. There is no need for two committees to work on the same problem. I think it is a question of both committees getting together and working out the problem. The idea that one committee will assume exclusive jurisdiction, and perhaps say to the other committee that it will listen to its advice, does not involve concurrent jurisdiction, and I think the Commerce Committee is very sensitive about that.

I thought the Record should have the benefit of that observation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Rhode Island has had to say. Either at the beginning or in the end certainly it would be quite agreeable with me for the matter to be referred to the Commerce Committee for its consideration. Of course, the Commerce Committee has a similar bill to consider. I am sure we can work out the matter so that there will not be double work.

Mr. PASTORE. I understood that a similar bill was introduced because the

committees could not get together as to which committee should have jurisdiction. I am merely saying I think it is a bad precedent to get into the business of duplication. It can be avoided. It should be avoided. For the benefit of the taxpayers, I hope that the chairmen of the two committees can get together and work out the matter of jurisdiction.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, if he has the floor?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know if I have the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, if I have the floor, I will yield to the Senator from Rhode Island so that he may yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this matter was discussed in the full Committee on the Judiciary, which took an entirely sympathetic and compassionate attitude toward it. The committee decided to retain jurisdiction and to permit the other committee, for about 60 days, to deal with it and then to advise us according to its lights and according to its wisdom.

Mr. PASTORE. But the exclusive and final jurisdiction, as I understand the Senator from Illinois, is to remain in the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. That is exactly what the Commerce Committee resents.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know.

Mr. PASTORE. That is exactly the observation I am making on the floor of the Senate. If anybody wishes to have me simplify it further, I shall be glad to do so.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (S. 942) to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act to give effect to the operation of the provisions of that section applicable to certain railroad consolidations and mergers until December 31, 1964, and for other purposes, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CITATION BY THE EXPERIMENT IN INTERNATIONAL LIVING TO ROBERT SARGENT SHRIVER, JR.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on March 8 ceremonies were held at St. Thomas in the Virgin Islands recognizing the completion of the preparation of a Peace Corps group which will work in Gabon. At that time the Experiment in International Living, with headquarters at Putney, Vt., presented to Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., its fifth annual citation.

Mr. Shriver was one of the early participants in the program of the Experiment in International Living. Now, as we all know, he is the head of the Peace Corps.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a copy of the citation which was presented to Mr. Shriver, and also a copy of the resolution adopted by the board of trustees of the Experiment in International Living on October 23, 1956.

There being no objection, the citation and resolution were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fifth Annual Citation Presented by the Experiment in International Living to Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr.

If, as you have publicly affirmed, your three Experiment experiences have meant as much to you in preparing you to deal humanely and intelligently across international borders as your 4 years at your beloved alma mater, the Experiment is proud of the part it has played in shaping the career of one of the Nation's youngest, ablest, most distinguished public servants.

The wisdom, the imagination, the sheer genius for leadership are yours; they have brought you richly merited recognition in business, religious, civic, educational, and philanthropic affairs.

The deep sensitivity to the needs and aspirations of others, and an awareness of the urgency to understand their minds and hearts, so well expressed in your own paraphrase: "He who knows but one culture, doesn't even know that one well"; and so brilliantly translated into your administration of the Peace Corps—these, we choose to believe, if not imparted—were at least sharpened and deepened and developed in you through your association with the institution whose ideals your career has so eminently reflected.

For epitomizing in your character and in your personal and professional life the finest traditions of an exemplary Experimenter: humility, adaptability, warm humanity, and deep integrity—we salute you as one whose life reflects through your accomplishments your responsible membership in the family of nations.

Gordon Boyce,
President.

Resolution Adopted by the Board of Trustees, the Experiment in International Living, Putney, Vt., October 23, 1956

For a quarter of a century, the Experiment in International Living has dedicated itself to the principle that individuals of varied cultures can learn to know, respect, and understand one another best within the close comradeship of the family circle. Its participants have "adopted" new parents, sons, daughters, sisters and brothers in many ways, under many circumstances on four of the earth's continents. In 18 languages, Experimenters have faced the direct personal challenge of submerging their own cultural background and participating actively in the life of a second home, a second family, another nation.

Thousands of people have tried the Experiment way. Most have met and overcome successfully the problems inherent in every Experiment in International Living. All have returned to their home country with a new awareness and appreciation of the way of life of their second family, with a deeper insight into their own capabilities and limitations. Through their experiences, the organization in whose program they participated, has likewise broadened in its knowledge and understanding of the problems incident to peoples talking to peoples.

One of the most important lessons which we have had to learn, although we are frequently prone to forget it, is that our Experimenters represent only a portion of the international person-to-person encounters which are the essence of our philosophy and program. Whenever a human being leaves his own way of life behind him and for a month, a year, or a lifetime attempts to adapt himself to a new environment to make new friends, there is an experiment in international living. His success is in direct proportion to the way he goes about it.

Occasionally an individual is so outstandingly successful in his person-to-person relations, and so adroit at leading others to follow his footsteps, that his experiment is an example and an inspiration to us all. The Experiment, as well as those whom it serves, is particularly conscious of the inspirational debt which we owe to such leaders on the contemporary scene.

It is to acknowledge this debt, to honor those whose lives reflect their responsible membership in the family of nations, whose deeds have set an extraordinary example at the people-to-people level, that we propose this recognition. It will be given by the Experiment in International Living, on an annual basis subject to the discretion of the board of trustees, to those individuals who, in our opinion, have so succeeded in their own personal experiments that they have made a significant and lasting contribution by dramatizing the virtues of sharing the problems, joys, and responsibilities of belonging to a family group which transcends all frontiers.

AMERICA'S GREATEST COLD WAR TRIUMPH

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, America's greatest cold war triumph has come as a result of President Kennedy's firm, determined, resolute, and unyielding action toward Castro and Khrushchev last October.

The objective of the Kennedy administration is not only to overthrow Fidel Castro, who appears to be a dope addict, as some Cuban exiles have claimed. Our task goes beyond that. We should eradicate Marxist teachings from the minds of Cuban children, compel all Russian army officers and personnel to follow their missiles back home to the Soviet Union, and then, by radio broadcasts in Spanish and using other means, weaken Soviet influence and destroy Castroism. Let us face it. Castro's Cuba is a problem for our country with the support of the Organization of American States. It is the problem of every Western Hemisphere nation from Canada to the Straits of Magellan. Communism grows where dictators flourish and where public officials are arrogant, corrupt, and unscrupulous, and keep the mass of their people hungry, helpless, poverty stricken, without hope, living in squalor and misery, permitting the few to enrich themselves as did Trujillo in the Dominican Republic, Batista in Cuba, and Jimenez in Venezuela.

Mr. President, except for the satellite countries in Eastern Europe taken over by the force of Russian power, communism has not made any gains whatever in the world except where the people have been oppressed and hopeless.

We Americans have reason to be thankful that photographs taken from our U–2 planes flying over Cuba proved the presence of this aggressive buildup last October and that our President acted immediately with great vigor, resolution, and courage.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Nelson in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. It is a matter of pride to us that Khrushchev turned tail and withdrew those offensive missiles without the necessity for spilling American blood. The crisis there has subsided, despite the yelping of some individuals, such as former Vice President Nixon, who recently charged that President Kennedy blundered by failing to provide air cover for the Bay of Pigs invasion. In 1959 and 1960, when Castro expropriated the property of American individuals and corporations, such as that of the Gulf Oil Co. to the tune of $5 million without compensation except for a promissory note with no interest for a number of years, he was exceedingly silent. Now, this Monday morning quarterback is a war hawk.

Despite our triumph of last October, we must follow through. Castro's communism cannot be tolerated anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. The Kennedy Doctrine supplements and strengthens our Monroe Doctrine, and is isolating Castro's Cuba.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a fine article entitled "Partisan Brawling Squanders Fruits of Cuba Triumph," written by Philip L. Graham, president of the Washington Post, which appeared in the Washington Post last Sunday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Partisan Brawling Squanders Fruits of Cuba Triumph

(By Philip L. Graham)

San Juan, P.R.—The fruits of America's greatest cold war triumph are being recklessly squandered by the partisan brawling over Cuba.

The triumph came on Sunday morning, last October 28, when Chairman Khrushchev announced the surrender of the Soviet missile systems in Cuba. Considering Khrushchev's usual prose style, the announcement was an epic of unambiguous brevity. The missile systems would be taken down and this would be certified by the United Nations.

This came less than 6 days after the President's tough TV speech. Thus Mr. Kennedy forced the Soviet Union to agree to "disarmament with inspection," a reversal of years and years of obstinate Soviet rhetoric.

The ensuing reaction is enough to drive toward near despair any observer of our two-party system. Here was an indisputable example of the U.S. Government working soundly, sensibly, sagely under crisis conditions. The President turned his back alike on proponents of armed invasion and proponents of near appeasement.

The United States speedily gathered around Miami an array of armed power that could have bounced Castro all the way to the South Pole. While this "big stick" was being created, the President practiced the sort of intensively skilled diplomacy that alone can find an option different from nuclear warfare or surrender.

A single instance showed the value of instructed and informed reflex action. That was the President's peremptory refusal to consider any trade involving our Turkish bases—and this despite a widespread affliction of weak-kneed jitters on the part of many in and out of Government.

A THROWBACK TO KIPLING

One who visits the Caribbean area, even briefly, cannot help being appalled by the cacophony of abuse and jingoism that has come out of the United States on the heels of the President's success.

First came a caterwauling over the relatively ineffective Soviet bomber contingent, that remained briefly in Cuba. Next came a blather of criticisms of the U.S. intelligence system—either naively amateur in nature or viciously reckless of U.S. security if the sources happened to hold any responsible positions in our security organization.

Finally, there have come the trumpeting swivel-chair warriors, stirred by blurred recollections of Kipling's days, who demand such belligerent acts as blockades. It is surprising that Mr. Nixon could so quickly parole himself from his self-announced sentence of long-term silence. It is appropriate, however, that he selected the setting of Mr. Jack Paar's program for the announcement of what in other circumstances would have constituted a grave demand for acts of war.

Seen from the Caribbean area, Mr. Kennedy's victory over the Cuban missiles is not diluted by these strangely motivated domestic attacks. The Kennedy policy has established, for the last Latin doubter, Castro's suppliant role as a Communist satellite. And by refusing to bring Castro down by the brute force of Yankee arms, Mr. Kennedy has restored faith in the maturity and sense of partnership with South America now infusing U.S. policy.

"RESCUE" ISN'T THE ANSWER

The Cuban exiles in the Caribbean area have fairly easy and constant communication with Cuba. They know that dissatisfaction with Castro is constantly growing. But they also know that within Cuba there is litle desire to be "rescued" from Castro by Yankee arms, only to be returned to the chaos of corruption existing before Castro's tyranny.

"The people of Cuba," a leading exile said, "have done more fundamental political thinking in the past 4 years than in the preceding 50 years." And the Cuban people are reported as wanting not merely an overthrow of Castro, but the creation of a new governmental system that will permit Cubans, by themselves, to find a democratic destiny.

Cubans of this school of thought are horrified by the bellicosity of a Nixon. They are depressed by the partisan speeches in the United States which indicate that we should reassume a benevolent guardianship over Cuba.

Those Cubans who engaged in the early planning of the Bay of Pigs fiasco still remember the callous ideas of superiority held by CIA officials. "The first thing I was asked by the CIA officer in charge," says a leading Cuban exile, "was to state my attitude toward restoration of the King Ranch properties."

These exiles—predominantly young professional men of moderately liberal and democratic leanings—are determined that Castro will be overthrown from within Cuba. They have no interest in a Guatemala-type coup d'etat directed by the CIA—or any other outside organization.

They are seeking financial support without strings. And support is just beginning to come, in trickles, from among the exiles themselves and from other Caribbean democratic forces. This is aid without any strings, without any commitments aside from the moral assurance of these men that Cuba shall be freed of communism and freed of corruption.

TOPSY-TURVY SETTING

From the United States, these exiles and their working colleagues now in Cuba will welcome only a form of support for which we have little governmental experience. They do not want the large-scale, massively supervised support that has been America's method in South Korea and South Vietnam.

For in Cuba the tables are turned about topsy-turvy from the usual cold war setting. Here Castro occupies the place of Syngman Rhee or Diem—an unpopular leader propped by massive support of a major power. And in Cuba it is the Communist bloc, for once, that is trying to prop an unpopular government with an expensive supply line running across thousands of oceanic miles.

The anti-Castro resistance that is already abuilding takes heart from the lessons of other areas. These Cubans know that 500,000 French soldiers, including the ruthless professionals of the Foreign Legion, could not conquer the relatively weak bands of native Algerian rebels. They know how large a threat to massive United States efforts a few thousand well-trained and dedicated Viet-Cong Communists have become. They know that ours is an age when force can impose an unpopular dictatorship only when it is as totally overwhelming as the Soviet divisions in East Germany.

The greatest U.S. aid to the free Cuban movement will not come from military action against Castro. The sort of action recommended by Mr. Nixon smacks so much of Yankee imperialism that in the final analysis it could only help Castro.

The major things needed from U.S. policy are already coming forth under President Kennedy. His firm and courageous elimination of the Soviet missiles, and his subsequent actions, have prevented the Communists from turning Cuba into a satellite firmly held by Soviet might.

CLASSIC REVOLUTIONARIES

The responsibility for the final downfall of Castro lies with the people of Cuba. They are now just beginning the gathering of their forces, inside Cuba and among the exiles in the Caribbean area and on the U.S. mainland.

The young men who today are forming these revolutionary forces of freedom are not prominent on our TV screens or in our press photographs. And they are revolutionaries—in the classic sense—not merely opponents of Castro but opponents of his betrayal of the revolution which Cuba under Batista and his predecessors had so long needed.

They are gathering now, and have been for 15 months since their morale began recovering from the almost fatal defeat of the Bay of Pigs. They are resolute in their determination to see Cuba liberated by Cubans. They are not merely wary of, but in fact openly hostile toward, the sort of U.S. support that would make them American satellites.

This is the dominant characteristic of the new Cuban democratic revolutionary movement. It is a characteristic which will never be understood by CIA officers who ask for promises about the future fate of the King Ranch or other U.S. investments in Cuba.

In the final analysis, these Cuban freedom forces are poised to fight the only kind of "war of liberation" that the free world can countenance. Their guerrilla tactics will be frankly imitative of Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh. But their political strategy will be drawn from the experience of Washington and Franklin and Jefferson. For their war will not be aimed to establish a U.S. hegemony but rather to create a new free land.

SUCCOR THAT FAILED

The extent of the determination of the Cuban liberation movement can be shown by a recent poignant example.

Still in Castro's torturing jails, untouched by any ransom effort of Mr. Donovan, are thousands of anti-Castro Cubans. A small group of anti-Communist leaders has been held together under maximum security conditions by Castro. The group, of 25 or so, is composed of men and women sentenced to prison terms averaging 30 years, and they have been tortured and starved since their arrest.

Four months ago the Cuban liberation movement inside Cuba succeeded in infiltrating the military guarding the prison, the inside prison guards and officials at a nearby landing spot. Conditions were established that gave favorable odds for the success of a "smash and grab" raid by a small landing force of 40 men.

All that was needed by way of outside help was a single fast ship—large enough to put 40 armed men ashore and then take aboard the 25 rescued prisoners.

Weeks were spent in attempts to get a boat. A genteel smuggler with anti-Castro leanings seemed close to offering an appropriate vessel. Then negotiations fell through.

The next week, the 25 suffering prisoners were moved inland to a new heavily guarded prison in the interior of Cuba. Castro regularly moves his more important prisoners as a security safeguard. The chance for rescue had passed.

PATIENT—TO A POINT

Among the prisoners, very ill and perhaps even dying, are a man and a woman each of whom is engaged to an exile leader in the United States. But even under such extreme personal stress, the liberation force leaders refused to seek out CIA aid.

"We shall have to wait," one of the exiles said recently, "even if we wait a long time. For this time Cuba must be freed by Cubans who are responsible only to their fellow Cubans. We are pledged to create democracy and self-respect where before Castro we knew only chaos and corruption—and now we have only Communist tyranny. We shall wait. But not forever. Our forces are beginning to gather. And our revolution shall succeed—a revolution for democracy but nevertheless a revolution, and not just a counterrevolution against Castro."

The young man of 38 who said this is brave. He is a well-educated professional with a graduate degree from a U.S. university. He is physically fit beyond even the rigors of a 50-mile hike. He was a leader of the underground against Batista. He supported Castro until the Communist domination became apparent. Then he headed a major part of the anti-Castro underground.

He seemed, to this observer, another impressive example of those courageous resisters of tyranny who have made up some of the best men of our times. He seemed an omen—a working, living omen—of hope for the triumph of freedom.

MANAGED NEWS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, recently I received in the mail from California a clipping of a column by that distinguished columnist of the Los Angeles Times and one of the most highly respected and regarded members of the Washington press corps, Bill Henry.

By coincidence his column was on the same day and the same subject as a radio broadcast that I made over station WGAN in Portland—on March 10, 1963, and on the subject of managed news. A further similarity exists in that we separately took the view that management of news was nothing new—that the only basic difference now was one of degree, of the ultimate lengths developed by the Kennedy administration of releasing all good news through party spokesmen and thus making it appear the party in power was the only one doing anything for the people.

Our separate expressions had a further similarity in that we referred to the managed news administration of the Department of Defense and specifically on contract award announcements. I went into a little more detail and illustrated how the Kennedy administration was making Gilbert and Sullivan comic opera characters out of the legislative liaison officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and making them look like old-time comedy movie "Keystone Kops" with their synchronized-watch, split-second timing delivery of contract award notices, hours and sometimes days, after such awards had been publicly announced by the favored Democratic Senators and were already in the newspapers.

A basic difference in our expressions was in my observation that perhaps all of us were guilty of managing news—even reporters some times—and that it depended on which side of the table we sat as to our reaction.

Because I believe the Members of this body would be interested in the similar comments that distinguished columnist Bill Henry and I made on the subject of managed news from Maine to California—he in his newspaper and I on a radio broadcast—on the same day, I ask unanimous consent that my broadcast of that day and his column of March 10, 1963, be printed in the body of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the broadcast and column were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Smith's Congressional Report, WGAN, Portland, Maine, March 10, 1963

Several days ago a member of the staff of this station made a long distance call to my office requesting a statement from me on the subject of "managed news." At the time I was in the closed session of the Senate Armed Services Committee at which the Secretary of Defense was giving classified information on our military posture and on the state of our national defense and national security.

Since that session lasted until a very late hour, it was too late by the time that I returned to my office to call back and give a statement. So I thought that on the next broadcast that I did for WGAN I would discuss the subject of managed news.

As you may have read or heard, managed news is a subject that has been very much in the news recently. For example, the Washington correspondent of WGAN and the Portland papers asked the President about the matter at a press conference. I don't think the President was very kind or courteous to her in his response.

After all, she was only asking a question that many, many people both in the press and in the public had been asking. She was entitled to a dignified answer—just as the public was entitled to the right to know. Instead the President did not answer her question but brought forth a tidal wave of laughter.

Her question was quite legitimate because the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs some weeks ago announced that the Department of Defense had a policy of managed news during the Cuban crisis—and indicated that part of that managed news was to withhold news and to make discriminating selection of what news was to be given to the public in the time of a crisis affecting the national security.

An objective view on the matter of managed news is not easily attained. Instead most of us are only human and consequently are subjective on a subject like this. We do not look at it in a detached manner. Instead we are prejudiced and inclined to view it in terms of how managed news affects us individually.

For example, during the 1960 presidential campaign, John F. Kennedy attacked the Eisenhower administration repeatedly on what he alleged to be inexcusable secrecy in Government, and thus on managed news without calling it that. For example at Mount Clemens, Mich., on October 26, 1960, he said, "I believe that the American people in 1960 are entitled to the truth, the truth with the bark off, the facts of the matter." Yet, he didn't practice as President what he preached as a candidate. Instead now he is practicing managed news.

Republicans certainly feel that the Kennedy administration has a very brazen managed news policy. It is no secret that the Kennedy administration gives the various awards and grants notices first to the Democratic Senators and Congressmen.

For example, the established Kennedy administration pattern of the Housing and Home Finance Agency with respect to Maine on such matters as area redevelopment projects, gives the notice to the Democratic Senator 2 days before the official release day. Then 24 hours, or a day later, they give the notice to me. Thus, the Democratic Senator is able to make an announcement a day before the Agency notifies me—and thus, the readers of the Maine newspapers get the notice even before I do. And thus, it is such a farce and a mockery to make the release date 2 days after the Democratic Senator has already been notified and made the announcement.

As a Republican, who is thus discriminated against, I would call this managed news—managed to give the erroneous impression to the people of Maine that it was the Democratic Senator who obtained such projects for Maine, when the truth is that no one person has made such an achievement.

But to some Democrats, this is not managed news but rather what they dismiss as a political fact of life.

Such were their comments when last year I denounced the news treatment by the Kennedy administration on the notice on the nuclear submarine award to the Kittery Naval Shipyard. I asked for the information 2 days before it was given by the White House to Maine's Democratic Senator but the Navy and the administration refused to give me the information.

When the Democratic Senator obtained the information 2 days later and his announcement was flashed over the facilities of the wire press services, I again asked for the information and again the Navy and the administration refused to give me the information even though it had already been publicly announced by the Democratic Senator and they informed me that they could not give me that information until 3 hours later.

How ridiculous could they get? I would call this managed news—managed in favor of the Democratic Senator and against me. Yet, to the Democratic Senator it was not managed news as he dismissed it as merely a political fact of life and asserted that the same thing had been done under the Eisenhower administration.

As far as I am concerned, this was not true of the Eisenhower administration for I did not receive such advance notice—but instead the Eisenhower administration scrupulously made it a point for military officers to give simultaneous notice to all members of a congressional delegation alike, whether they be Republican or Democrat, of defense construction awards to their States. They even went to the extent of synchronizing their watches so that they would call or enter the various offices of the then five members of the Maine congressional delegation on the same split second.

The same synchronized-watch, split-second timing operation of the military officers on notice to Members of Congress is still in effect. But now it is ludicrous since the Democratic Senator in the Maine congressional delegation receives notices from the White House many hours, or even a day or two, before the military officer marches in his office or calls his office on the telephone on the matter—and his announcement has been published in the Maine newspapers even before the military officer delivers the official notice.

I would call this "managed news"—and I say that it is "managed" to the point of being ridiculous—of making the military officers comical and looking like characters in a Gilbert and Sullivan comic opera—of having them run around like oldtime movie comedy "Keystone Kops."

I asked the Secretary of Defense about this—and he gave a very weak answer with the claim that this had been started by the Eisenhower administration. It is true that the split second timing notice had been—but the big difference is that such had been the first notice to everyone, regardless of political party—for the White House under Eisenhower did not favor Maine Republicans with advance notice like Kennedy does the Democrats.

This weak excuse of the Secretary of Defense and the "political facts of life" assertion of some Maine Democrats are examples of what the dean of Washington columnists and commentators, Arthur Krock of the New York Times and long time friend of the Kennedys, recently wrote on the subject of managed news by the Kennedy administration.

He wrote that one of the standard practices of the Kennedy managed news policy was to blame the Eisenhower administration when challenged on an unpopular matter such as I have been relating. I quote Mr. Krock's exact words of "Executive decisions sure to be unpopular are explained as in line with or compelled by policies adopted by the Eisenhower administration."

On one occasion I obtained information on a defense contract award to a Maine concern by going directly to people involved in the matter and asking for the status. I did not get it from the White House nor from the Pentagon. I was able to make the announcement—but because I did, such was apparently considered a crime by the Kennedy administration and I learned from friends that investigations were conducted to determine from whom I received the information. They were not content with one—instead they had two investigations—one by the Army Inspector General and the second by Army Intelligence.

Apparently it was all right for the Navy Department to refuse to give me information on the nuclear submarine award even after it had been announced by the Democratic Senator—but yet it was such a crime for me to get information and announced it first on the Army construction award, that not one, but two, investigations were ordered to try to find out how I did it.

This, I would say, was a part of the managed news policy of the Kennedy administration—trying to keep Republicans from being able to get the information—in line with refusing Republicans the information when requested by Republicans—frightening and intimidating people from giving such information to anyone but Democrats. This, I would say, was attempting to manage news. Others would not. Others might try to dismiss it as merely "political facts of life."

In other words, in trying to be objective on this matter, let me again observe that the concept of, and the reaction to, managed news depends upon which side of the table you are sitting and how it affects you—to your advantage or disadvantage. I think all of us are guilty to some extent of some "managed news."

For example, the Washington correspondent of WGAN and the Portland newspapers, who asked the President the very question on "managed news" at his press conference and to whom he was not kind in answering, shook hands with me at the reception line at a reception given by Representative and Mrs. McIntire—and yet when she reported in the newspapers on that reception as to those persons who attended the reception she listed all members of the Maine congressional delegation but me—thus managing to give the impression that I did not attend the reception even though she saw me there, called me by name and shook hands with me. Whether intended or not, it managed to give the impression to some that either Representative and Mrs. McIntire had not invited me or I had not extended the courtesy of attending.

From my side of the table that was managed news. From her side perhaps it was not. The same was true with respect to her story in which she stated flatly that the September 1962 Maine congressional delegation meeting was not held because of hard feeling between Senator SMITH and Senator MUSKIE—which was not true because I walked over to Senator MUSKIE's office for the September meeting—and which, even though refuted by both Senator MUSKIE and myself with incontrovertible proof, she refused to correct. That I certainly would call managed news.

Recently a representative of the Gannett Publishing Co., by which the Washington correspondent of WGAN and the Portland papers is employed, gave a private reception in his private suite at the Statler Hotel in Washington. The Washington correspondent wrote a news story stating that I had been invited to the private reception but was unable to attend. The truth was that I was not invited to the private reception and was the only member of the Maine congressional delegation not invited to the private reception.

Perhaps I am prejudiced in viewing this as managed news—but one thing is very certain—it was untruthful and managed to give a false impression just as did her stories on the McIntire reception and the canceled September 1962 delegation meeting.

Now I would not deny that I, too, am guilty of managed news for there certainly are times when I do not send press releases to those reporters who have repeatedly written false stories about me. I feel it is too risky to do so. But in that management, I do not discriminate against the newspapers represented by any reporter who may have written so many false stories about me that I feel that reporter is too unreliable to send all press releases to.

To avoid discriminating against the newspapers represented by that reporter, I make it a point to send the press releases to the Associated Press and the United Press International as they also cover for the same newspapers.

As I say, it depends upon which side of the table you sit on how you view managed news.

MANAGED NEWS IS NOT REALLY NEW

(By Bill Henry)

The continuing ruckus over managed news (release or withholding of information at the whim of the administration) is connected by most people with the trouble in Cuba. That was the occasion for Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester's discussion of "news as a weapon." Long before this happened, however, there was management of the news by the administration but it had to do with politics rather than with the national defense. This was the grand old custom—it has been used for years but never to the ultimate lengths developed by the Kennedy administration—of releasing all good news through party spokesmen and thus making it appear the party in power was the only one doing anything for the people. Thus, whenever a contract of any kind which would bring a measure of prosperity to a certain State was awarded, the administration would slip the glad tidings to the highest ranking party member of that State and let him announce it. In the case of Massachusetts for instance, everything is announced through Senator TEDDY KENNEDY and if you didn't know the details you'd think Republican Senator SALTONSTALL was asleep at the switch while TEDDY personally had arranged for the Pilgrim Fathers to land at Plymouth Rock and had been responsible for everything good that has happened to the Bay State ever since. Republican Senator MARGARET SMITH, at the moment, is giving the Pentagon a hard time because it withholds such military announcements from her until the White House announces them through Democratic Senator MUSKIE. Mrs. SMITH rates high on the Senate Armed Services Committee and is in a position to make it more than a little tough on the admirals and generals if they don't play ball with her.

SHE CAN MAKE SOME REAL TROUBLE

The particular incident which roused the Hell-hath-no-fury instinct in Mrs. SMITH concerned a contract to build a submarine in a Maine shipyard. She got wind of it, called the Pentagon to ask about it, and was given a runaround if not an outright denial. A couple of days later Senator MUSKIE, who is the junior Senator, was told about the award by the White House and he announced it with a great flourish. This did not sit very well with the lady from Maine. But on still another occasion she heard about a similar award and made the announcement before the White House slipped the glad tidings to MUSKIE. She found out that the Pentagon immediately started two investigations to see who had slipped up. "Apparently," Mrs. SMITH remarked acidly to Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, "it was all right for the White House to give the information to the junior Senator (MUSKIE) and the Navy to deny such information to me. But when I got it first it apparently was a crime." Pentagon authorities, who depend on Senator SMITH for appropriations and promotions, are all shook up over the hostility roused by partisan politics.

IT'S AWFUL TO BE IGNORED

Not everybody takes news problems too seriously. One Washington reporter noted that Senator THRUSTON MORTON, Republican, of Kentucky, pointed out in a recent speech that President Kennedy has bawled out six newspapermen for certain stories, that three administration officials have threatened to sue newspapermen, that Robert Kennedy has bawled out four reporters, that the FBI quizzed six reporters, that Pentagon security officers had quizzed three reporters, Pierre Salinger has quarreled with a dozen correspondents, White House aid Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., called one columnist "an idiot" and that even Ethel Kennedy denounced a reporter for a swimming pool story. In addition to which some reporters have been "given the freeze" by the White House. With mock mourning, MORTON remarked "None of these things have happened to me—where did I go wrong?"

NEHEMKIS REFLECTIONS ON THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most brilliant and provocative analyses of the Alliance for Progress which I have yet seen is an address by Peter R. Nehemkis, Jr., delivered on February 21 to the Phi Beta Kappa Association in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Nehemkis, who is the Washington legal counsel for the Whirlpool Corp., is one of the Nation's most experienced students of Latin American affairs. He combines an astute knowledge of the political, economic and psychological factors which condition the reaction of our Latin American neighbors to the Alliance with an informed appreciation of the political difficulties that beset the Alliance in Washington. I have been informed by an American officer at our Embassy in Mexico City that a group of Mexican university students who visited the United States recently were more favorably challenged by a discussion session with Mr. Nehemkis than by any other experience during their visit to our country.

Mr. Nehemkis argues, and I think most convincingly, that the basic weakness in the promise of the Alliance to build a better social and economic structure in Latin America is that to date it has failed to enlist broad support among the people. The Alianza has thus far been a series of discussions and actions between governments and technical experts. What is needed, he contends, is an increased participation in the goals of the Alliance for Progress on the part of groups who constitute the decisive centers of opinion outside of government—the involvement and participation which I urge is as broad as the sources of public opinion itself. For it is public opinion to which the Alliance must address itself, rather than to governments and their technicians, if it is to be a successful enterprise.

Mr. Nehemkis gives strong support to a recent proposal by Mr. Felipe Herrera, President of the Inter-American Development Bank, which would create a "parliament of the hemisphere" backstopped by an OEEC-type commission to generate and channel widespread political and moral involvement in the Alliance.

Mr. President, I think we all know that whatever success with democracy we have enjoyed in the United States stems from the involvement of ordinary people in the democratic process. The Alliance for Progress is basically a democratic experiment which seeks to execute by peaceful, cooperative effort a major social revolution.

I strongly urge my colleagues in the Congress and those in the executive branch who have primary responsibility for our foreign relations to read Mr. Nehemkis' analysis with great care.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(By Peter R. Nehemkis, Jr.)

I

Throughout the long history of the Phi Beta Kappa Society (of whose select company I am proud to be a member) there has been consistent adherence to the oldest governing principle of the community of scholars: in a democratic society the interchange of diverse ideas must remain unhampered. In this vital interplay, the Phi Beta Kappa Society has sought to insure that dialog does not become monolog and that thinking is not relegated to dogma. In this spirit, I would ask you to consider some reflections of mine on the Alliance for Progress.

This now world-famous slogan was first minted at Harvard University in December 1960, at a meeting of members of the U.S. international business community and a number of distinguished representatives of the academic community.[1] It burst over the world in President Kennedy's celebrated inaugural address. Although stamped in the United States of America, the underlying philosophy of the Alliance for Progress is distinctly Latin American. The grand design for this inter-American partnership was first propounded in 1959 by Juscelino Kubitschek, former President of Brazil, in his Operacão Pan Americana. In 1960, at a hemisphere conference held at Bogotá, a coherent philosophy to meet Latin America's social problems was embodied in a continental doctrine through the act of Bogotá.

Alliance for Progress might have remained merely a cleverly contrived catch-phrase or slogan. As a U.S. Senator, John F. Kennedy had not shown any special interest in Latin America. His knowledge of the area was probably as limited as that of the average citizen. Yet he sensed instinctively that Latin America—as he was later to phrase it—was "the most critical area in the world today."[2] In the Presidential hands the phrase became the keystone in the arch of a new U.S. policy for Latin America. Subsequently filled out with conceptual flesh and bone[3] the Alliance for Progress was to become the most significant U.S. pronouncement affecting Latin America since the Monroe Doctrine placed the New World out of bounds for the (former) European colonial powers.

At the outset, let us be clear that, in its original conception (the operative words here are original conception), the Alliance for Progress was not designed to be another conventional foreign aid program utilizing the conventional tools of foreign aid—money, men, and materials. What was originally proposed under the Alliance for Progress was unprecedented and without parallel in the experience of the Western World. In essence, the U.S. Government offered to underwrite a social revolution for Latin America. The reforms were to run the gamut of change in better land use and distribution, more and better housing, more and better education, collection of taxes, elimination of corruption in government, reduction in the waste of overblown armies, increasing the rate of savings and economic growth, narrowing the gap between the rich and the poor. They were expected, as Ambassador Stevenson has said, "to take the bold, brave, difficult steps" to achieve peaceably and democratically the reforms which historically had been accomplished through a revolution of blood and violence.

Roughly, for a year and a half following the promulgation of the Alliance for Progress, they sat on their hands and we floundered in a swamp of bureaucratic organization. The great hopes and high expectations engendered by the President's speeches were not realized. Disillusionment, cynicism, frustration, and resentment like a blanket of wet fog enveloped the islands of intellectual interest throughout the continent. Indeed, the Alliance for Progress become the butt of jokes and a term of derision. The fortunes of the Alliance were in the dead season of its despair.

Two years after its birth the fog is beginning to lift. At long last patches of clear sky are visible. New opportunities beckon for the Alliance. But I venture to suggest that fate will not knock twice at our door if we fail to heed the lessons to be learned from the painful experience of the recent past.

In essaying the role of an amateur historian a caveat is in order. As Lytton Strachey—an eminent historian—once wrote, "ignorance is the first requisite of the historian, ignorance which simplifies and clarifies, which selects and omits." Strachey's irony is a useful reminder to the student of Latin American affairs who seeks for the thread of order and meaning in the tangled skein of Latin America's history, politics, and cultural heritage.

II

The constellation of reforms embedded in the Alliance for Progress were not actionable either immediately or through the democratic processes for a number and for a variety of reasons. Some of our expectations were grounded in illusions with respect to Latin America. Some tenets of our belief were politically unrealistic. Organizationally, the New Frontier was simply lacking in the requisite skill for managing a social revolution of the magnitude to which it had committed itself. In some situations luck deserted us.

I suspect that the root of our difficulty lay in a fundamental misconception regarding Latin America—a misconception which the principal architects of the Alliance unwittingly perpetrated as a result of their European experience with the Marshall Plan. This misconception was to look upon Latin America as a continental community in the same way as Marshall Plan Europe was regarded as a community of shared interests, possessed of a common heritage and with the instinct for a collective sense of responsibility. As Prof. John Plank reminds us, "this community does not exist" in Latin America.[4] Moreover, there is a profound difference between the motivation for reconstruction (Europe's problem in 1947) and the motivation for reform (Latin America's problem in the sixties). The Ernest Bevans, the Paul-Henri Spaaks, the Robert Schumans, the Jean Monnets were able to furnish the political drive for reconstruction. They were assisted powerfully by the Paul Hoffman-Averill Harriman axis which insisted upon a continental response to General Marshall's offer of aid.

The same kind of leverage for reform was not operative in the summer of 1961 following the first Punta del Este conference where the representatives of Latin America committed their countries to the principles of the Alliance for Progress. On the contrary, something resembling a shock effect was recorded on the hemispheric seismograph as the implications of the Charter of Punta del Este began to register on Latin America's traditional centers of power.

Latin America's land-owning aristocracy is probably one of the most unique institutions in the Western World. Despite countless revolutions, civil wars and changes in the palace, they have managed for 200 years to hold on to their land, much of their power and to all of their social prestige. In this century their ranks have been increased by the new moneyed class who have acquired land as a status symbol (and, incidentally, as a hedge against inflation). This Oligarquía, although it possesses the capacity for survival, does not resemble, for instance, the English Tories who as early as the 19th century instinctively recognized the significance of Macaulay's warning that to preserve you must reform; and who in the first half of the 20th century were able to capture the British Labor Party's welfare state and make it their own. Latin America's conservative class, on the other hand, reacted to the Alliance for Progress with psychotic fear. Having always enjoyed the friendship of U.S. diplomacy, they felt betrayed by the reformist thrust of the Alliance, particularly its emphasis on land reform. Since the shortest route to Washington is Moscow, they cried "communism;" and passed the word to their legislative mercenaries to prepare for a rear guard action.

---

[1] "Alliance for Progress, a Program of Inter-American Partnership" (a statement developed at a conference on Dec. 19, 1960, Faculty Club at Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.).

[2] Press Conference, Feb. 8, 1963. For the transcript, see, the Washington Post (Feb. 9, 1963) at p. 10.

[3] See, address to the assembled Latin American diplomats at the White House on Mar. 13, 1961.

[4] Daedalus (October 1962) 804.

There were, however, still other elements which blunted the purposes of the Alliance. A formidable deterrent was—and is—anti-Americanism. Like an ocean current it runs deep and wide through the southern half of the continent. Its presence renders suspect virtually anything emanating from the Colossus of the North. Anti-Americanism destroys the possibility of the leaders of the left of center parties in appealing to their followers for support of the Alliance. Juan Bosch, the new President-elect of the Dominican Republic, illustrates the point. As passionate a democrat as will be found in the hemisphere, Bosch conducted an extraordinarily literate and sane campaign. But never once did he speak of the Alliance for Progress to the campesinos or the obreros. To have done so would have been the political kiss of death. Yet, it is upon leaders such as Juan Bosch that the Alliance for Progress must depend. This is the paradox of the Alliance.

In the intellectual circles of Latin America the Alliance was greeted with skepticism. For many, there remained the unanswered question: Does the Alliance for Progress represent a commitment of the heart? For still others the Alliance had the smell of another cold war gambit: Washington's answer to Castro and the Castro revolution.

As a personality, the new President had not yet been able to identify himself with Latin America's people as Franklin Roosevelt had succeeded with the radiance of his own personality and his Good Neighbor Policy. Then came the Bay of Pigs. Since nothing fails quite like failure, in Latin American eyes the United States appeared to be adrift in a sea of indecision: cynicism toward the Alliance became universal.

But there were even more fundamental difficulties. Washington's policymakers had assumed that the big countries—Mexico, Brazil and Argentina—would carry the torch for the Alliance. Mexico, however, is wrapped in a mystical cocoon of nonintervention. Mexicans believe that, as the senior member in the hemisphere's revolutionary business, it has nothing to learn from any revolutionaries and especially from the New Frontier. It is simply not interested in the Alliance for Progress. As a Minister once informed me the Alliance is an interesting gimmick which could help Mexico with its balance of payments. That was all.

Since the flight from the Presidency by Jânio Quadros, Brazil has for all practical purposes been without a functioning government. Its own financial chaos has been so deep that Brazil was in no position to act as a tutor for the Alliance.

The military seizure of power in Argentina under a thinly disguised civilian regime completed the political and economic bankruptcy of the nation begun by Perón. Argentina was unable to provide leadership for itself let alone for its neighbors.

Another implied assumption by Washington was the existence of a sufficiently broad base of representative, popular democracy which could overcome the resistance to reform from the traditional, conservative centers of power. Aside from Muñoz Marin of Puerto Rico, Figueres of Costa Rica, and Betancourt of Venezuela the democratic leaders of the political left lacked effective political power. The parties of the Democratic left do not have a broad base of middle class support. Acción Democrática and APRA, for instance, have been unable to attract the support of the urban groups described as middle in Caracas and Lima. The parties of the democratic left of center find their strength in the rural areas, not in the cities. Chile's Socialist Party in the recent parliamentary elections returned only one deputy with some 4,300 votes in the Santiago area (which has almost 2 million inhabitants) while Salvadore Allende, the leader of the Marxist coalition, FRAP, scored a decisive victory in the Valparaiso-Aconcagua area which has been traditionally a rural, conservative stronghold. This same pattern repeats itself elsewhere in Latin America: Left-wing strength is diminishing among the urban middle sectors, but it is increasing among the peasants.

Latin America's middle groups are not hell bent for reform: they are essentially conformist: they are emotionally identified with the institutional status quo. They want a bigger slice of the pie. But they do not believe that upsetting the applecart is the way to get it. Could it be that our policymakers have hitched their reform cart to the wrong horse? Should they not look for leadership and support of the Alliance to Latin America's forgotten men—the peasants and the non-Communist intellectuals?

There is need to reexamine whether the parties of the Democratic left (the chosen instruments for implementing the Alliance for Progress) are capable of communicating the need for social change and of formulating the programs to identify social change within the context of the originally inspired Alianza.

Throughout Latin America (especially among its youth who constitute 35 percent of the population) the concept of democracy is suspect, if it is not, indeed, a dirty word. Democracy has been so debased by its mouthing at the lips of dictatorship as to have lost its value as sound currency. The paramount political challenge in Latin America is how to channel the energies and interests of its youth into democratic habits within the context of the original conception of the Alliance for Progress.

I should like to turn now briefly to what many regard as the organizational deficiency of the Alliance. Here, I believe, we ourselves misunderstood our own trumpet call. President Kennedy signaled for an Alliance. This term is commonly understood to mean joint effort, joint responsibilities, mutual involvement—in short, a partnership. But the organizational response was not commensurate with Mr. Kennedy's own vision. The Alliance became another area box in a foreign aid structure. It soon lapsed into a U.S. assistance granting agency which spent half its capital on emergency transfusions for balance-of-payments crises.

The Alliance succeeded only in lighting a spark. It must ignite into a flame or die ignominiously. As presently constituted the Alliance cannot envelop the people of Latin America in a "consumming fire or a flood of light." Because of its focus on governments and technicians the Alliance has been unable to reach the broader stratum of public opinion. Geared to a bureaucratic machinery (which communicates only with its counterpart in other governments) the Alliance can neither reach the people nor involve them in its goals. And without a sense of mutual involvement, without a sense of shared participation by the ordinary people, the Alliance is only a brooding omnipresence in the sky.

III

I spoke earlier of encouraging signs on the horizon. Although most of these omens may be no bigger than cloud puffs their cumulative impact is, nevertheless, significant. I would list them as follows:

1. The ministerial and technical meeting last October at Mexico City to review the progress of the Alliance for Progress. Without becoming euphoric over the results of the interchange of views which took place at Mexico City, there was, nevertheless, discernible for the first time since the Alliance was enunciated a sense of solidarity, an urge for cooperation and feeling for collective responsibility. These meetings revealed clearly a sense of commitment to the Alliance for Progress.

2. A realization on the part of responsible hemisphere leaders that a greater emphasis must be placed on the political orientation and direction of the Alliance which has heretofore been mainly technical. This pervading view has led to the appointment of former Presidents Lleras Camargo of Colombia and Juscelino Kubitschek of Brazil as a committee to reappraise, among other things, the adequacy of the existing Alliance mechanism in achieving this objective.

3. The highly successful outcome of the first democratic elections in 38 years in the Dominican Republic last December has buoyed democratic hopes throughout the continent. That these elections were held at all is due to the unflinching determination of three very great patriots: Dr. Rafael F. Bonelly (President of the Council of State); Don Antonio Bonilla-Atiles (Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs); and Sr. Donald Reid (Member of the Council of State). Out of the depth of its sickness and misery Argentina could still offer several thousand schoolteachers to the hemisphere. Tiny Costa Rica continues to be a beacon light of democracy. In Washington, its Ambassador, Gonzalo Facio, as President of the Council of the Organization of American States, provides a dynamic leadership. Puerto Rico, under the wise statesmanship of Don Luis Muñoz Marin, demonstrates that political democracy and economic prosperity can be achieved in partnership with the United States. These and other examples which might be cited are all plus signs and cannot be ignored.

4. Washington is itself, I believe, keenly aware that the Alliance must be restructured. For the Washington policymakers it is no longer a question of whether there should be a change, but only what kind of change.

5. Finally, and most importantly, the American success in meeting the Soviet Union's missile thrust in Cuba has provided the United States with its most favorable image and its highest moral authority in Latin America in a generation.

Now these are not fixed assets. They are intangibles. They can evaporate. Their intrinsic value can be exploited only if we seize the opportunity which they have provided by proceeding with swift and reassuring action to revitalize the Alliance for Progress.

Before venturing to suggest what ought to be done may I say, first, what I believe must not be done.

Tinkering with or rejiggering of the existing setup of the Alliance won't do. Latin America is in no mood to buy any half-baked U.S. apple pie full of high sounding but empty rhetoric. Latin America, if I sense her mood correctly, is ready to follow decisive and determined leadership, the kind of leadership it witnessed (and followed) at last October's United States-Soviet confrontation over Cuba.

IV

Any new implementing machinery must have as its cardinal objective the restoration of President Kennedy's original conception of the Alliance for Progress—an alliance of inter-American partners with joint responsibilities and mutual obligations. Because Latin Americans are not Anglo-Americans they can be expected to subscribe with enthusiasm to a structure which embodies both poetry and power, which dramatizes their own high destiny and has the bold sweep of Bolivarian prophecy.

Thoughtful Latin American leaders share the conviction of the European political leadership—or at least the overwhelming majority of Europe's political leaders—that the day of national sovereignty is finished. Just as it has been apparent that the European nation-state no longer made political sense, there has been increasing awareness in this hemisphere that Latin America's nation-states have outgrown their usefulness. Indeed, the bulk of Latin America's political units are more analogous to the Greek city-state than to the modern nation-state. As such, in the 20th century they are political museum pieces. The movement for a Central American Common Market and the broader grouping of a Latin American Free Trade Association are the contemporary responses to this felt need for the sovereignty of the community.

Unless my impressions deceive me, Latin America's responsible democratic leaders are now prepared to join in the first great step in erecting a political underpinning for the new sovereignty of the community.

An imaginative and practical proposal for accomplishing this objective was advanced recently by one of Latin America's most gifted and respected leaders, Felipe Herrera, President of the Inter-American Development Bank. Dr. Herrera proposes a Parliament of the Hemisphere.[5] Such a hemispheric parliament is needed, President Herrera says, "to give proper expression to the broad public opinion of our hemisphere" rather than to "governments and experts" as is now the case. Dr. Herrera suggests that the Parliament of the Hemisphere could "become a forum for interpreting the major currents of ideas in Latin America and evaluating hemisphere policy by democratic discussion and debate." Delegates to the Parliament of the Hemisphere could properly concern themselves, Dr. Herrera believes, with such matters "as the orientation of economic relations among our countries, our collective relationship to other regional groups, and our concepts of integrated economic development." In short, the Parliament of the Hemisphere could become the opinion maker and the opinion moulder for converting the Alliance for Progress into a reality.

In addition to political representation from the national legislatures of North, Central and South America (as proposed by President Herrera), the Parliament might also have functional representation from the trade unions, the universities, private industry and other groups from North, Central and South America. So as to prevent the Parliament of the Hemisphere from becoming a mere debating society it could be vested with authority for approving the social and economic development plans for which international and U.S. financial assistance under the Alliance for Progress is required. In a word, the international public and private lending agencies would begin to look to the Hemisphere Parliament as the "guarantor," so to speak, of individual or regional economic development plans.

To provide the hemisphere parliament with technical support there should be attached to it an OEEC-type commission located in one of the Latin American capitals and composed of Ministers of the partners of the Alliance for Progress. Observers from the international agencies such as the OAS, the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America and the Inter-American Development Bank would be attached to this commission. The commission could delegate appropriate tasks to these international organs. Also attached to the commission would be representatives from the (European) Development Assistance Group as well as Japan. Inter-American advisory bodies of private business and of the trade unions should also be associated with the commission. For its initial technical support and as a nucleus of its own eventual secretariat, the commission could draw upon the Committee of Nine.[6]

The commission would funnel its recommendations to the hemisphere parliament on such priority measures as (1) development of commodity stabilization arrangements to stem declining earnings as an immediate goal as well as to provide incentives for crop diversification as a long-term goal; (2) programs for gaining greater access for Latin American products in the mass markets of Europe and the United States; (3) development of an Inter-American policy to stimulate private investment, both domestic and foreign; and (4) measures to strengthen the Alliance's emphasis on social development.

V

From all that has been heretofore said you have gathered that the thrust of my contention is the compelling need for a greater involvement and for an increased participation in the goals of the Alliance for Progress on the part of groups who constitute the decisive centers of opinion outside of government. You have gathered, too, that the spectrum of involvement and participation which I urge is as broad as the sources of public opinion itself. For it is public opinion to which the Alliance must address itself, rather than to governments and their technicians, if it is to be a successful enterprise.

It will, of course, be argued by the legion of the timid men (who call themselves political pragmatists) that the proposals for a parliament of the hemisphere and an OEEC-type commission are too visionary; that they are not practical and realistic targets. May I remind you, first, that the proposal for a parliament of the hemisphere comes from a Latin American banker in whom the leading bankers of Europe and of the United States have imposed their confidence through the flotation of many millions of dollars of bonds of the Inter-American Development Bank. And, secondly, may I remind you that the proposal for the OEEC-type commission carries the endorsement of U.S. businessmen with international operating responsibilities who are scarcely the types given to impracticable flights of fancy.

VI

I venture to suggest that in the ensuing weeks what this country does—or fails to do—with respect to revitalizing the Alliance for Progress will have greater consequences for our future than the policy decisions which are determined for any of the other strategic world areas. For Latin America—to repeat President Kennedy's own words—is "the most critical area in the world today." Although the full meaning and all of the implications of the Gaullist explosion in Europe are as yet difficult to assess, one thing, however, seems clear: General de Gaulle has rung down the curtain on the Pax Americana. For us it is the fin du siècle of being Europe's banker and defender. He may well have provided us with one of history's great blessings in disguise: an occasion to rethink and to reshape national policy so as to conform with the actualities of power confrontation. For it is no longer the new Europe, but our own New World, where the writ of destiny summons.

CONCLUDING ARTICLE IN SIOUX INDIAN SERIES

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Washington Post of March 17 carries the final article in an excellent series dealing with the problems of the Sioux Indians of South Dakota, written by Mr. Aubrey Graves. Previously, I have had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the earlier articles in this superb series.

I think that Mr. Graves has rendered a most valuable service in giving us a thoughtful and carefully prepared analysis of some of the significant gains and also the unsolved problems of the American Indian. While the series centers on the Oglala Sioux Reservation at Pine Ridge, S. Dak., much of what Mr. Graves reports applies to American Indians as a whole.

I am certain that Mr. Richard Whirlwind Horse, chairman of the Oglala Sioux Tribe, his predecessor, Mr. Johnson Holy Rock, the superintendent of the reservation, Mr. Leslie P. Towle, as well as Mr. Richard Schifter, Washington attorney for the tribe who has provided such brilliant counsel to his clients—these and many other members and friends of the Oglala Sioux have been especially appreciative of this very splendid reporting achievement by Mr. Graves.

I ask unanimous consent that this seventh and final installation in the series be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW DAY ON THE RESERVATION—VII: U.S. SPENDS MILLIONS ON INDIAN WELFARE

(By Aubrey Graves, staff reporter)

The question is asked: Why hasn't it been possible to assimilate the Indians into our society as readily as the Irish, Italians, Greeks and other races?

The 1880 census showed 225,000 Indians in the United States, all on reservations. In 1960, there were 552,000—285,000 on reservations, 267,000 off. Many of the latter group have adjusted to the white man's culture; others live as outcasts in shantytowns near big cities.

Those who have not found their way into the melting pot of American life are, to some extent, still hostile.

Why? "Because they were here first," is the answer given by Indian Commissioner Philleo Nash. "The other races came here because they wanted to leave their homeland and go to some other place. They wanted a change. They had a choice.

"No Indian had this choice. The white man moved in on him and conquered him. We may think of the Indian as living on reservations. In his view, he is living on his native soil.

---

[5] "Inter-American Institutions: An Appraisal," an address delivered before the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce, Miami, Fla., Jan. 23, 1963.

[6] See "Revitalizing the Alliance for Progress," statement developed at a conference at Harvard University, Dec. 15, 1962, by a group from the U.S. international business and academic communities. (See OAS press release E–1/63, Jan. 3, 1963.)

CAPACITY FOR SURVIVAL

"He had a way of life that suited him and he has been holding his own as best he could, ever since. He feels he can survive only be clinging to what were his beliefs, his customs. He has shown a remarkable capacity for survival."

Something that occurred at the end of a congressional hearing on a South Dakota reservation reveals the attitude of some diehard fullbloods. As a matter of protocol, an old chief was asked to speak. He did so, in Sioux. Then, in pantomime, he jabbed his hand down into his pants pocket. The audience howled.

Representative A. L. Miller, Republican, of Nevada, presiding, asked the interpreter to explain the pocket business and the laughter. "He says you are here to stuff what belongs to Indians in your pockets."

Miller told the grandson of Chief Red Cloud he had made a serious charge. "Do you mean to say," he asked, "that I and the other Congressmen here are taking something that belongs to you?"

"Are you getting your salaries from across the ocean?" the old chief asked. The Indians howled again.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PAYS

In any event, 70 years have passed since the Indian wars ended and the Federal Government still is spending $258 million a year in their behalf.

In fiscal 1963, the budget of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is $193 million. Of this, $113 million is being spent on Indian education and cost of schools.

The Public Health Service is spending $65 million on Indian health programs.

The cost of general assistance and other services supplied by the States is substantial. In fiscal 1962, for instance, it amounted to $508,000 on the Oglala Sioux Reservation at Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

Consider further the situation at this reservation, which is typical of others. Of a total 1962 school enrollment of 3,289 Pine Ridge children, ages 6 to 18, 57 percent are in Federal schools, 15 percent in 2 mission schools, and 28 percent in State-operated public schools (at BIA expense).

BURDENS TO STATE

Another 204 students, under 6 and over 18, are attending all types of schools, including 56 in colleges and universities and 22 in non-Bureau vocational institutions.

Only a small portion of the $258 million a year spent by Federal agencies on the reservations would represent a saving of tax money, should Indian programs on reservations be abolished.

Richard Schifter, who represents the Oglala Sioux in Washington, explains it this way: "If you terminate Federal assistance, you would shift a great many responsibilities to sparsely settled States which do not have the facilities nor the money to meet them.

"When it comes to such help as education, roads, law and order, you would be throwing the whole burden, in the case of the Oglala Sioux, on South Dakota. Indians are U.S. citizens and are entitled to free education. As State citizens, they are entitled also to police protection and to highways. You can be certain South Dakota would insist on Federal help, should it be faced with these demands.

"The major service that would be cut out entirely by termination is the medical service. Indians are about a generation behind the rest of the population, healthwise. Cut off the Federal health services and you would be cutting off something that is helping them close the gap."

At Pine Ridge the BIA operates 1 boarding school (for high school students) and 6 consolidated day schools which have replaced 36 1-room schools. These serve 2,038 students.

All the Bureau schools conducted summer programs for 1,085 children: classes in remedial reading and other academic work; educational trips; recreational activities; arts and crafts and camping. Adult educational units served 12 reservation communities. On-the-job training was given to 731 persons in the Wright & McGill fishhook plants.

"The dark side of the school picture," said BIA Superintendent Leslie P. Towle, "is that 65 percent of the pupils drop out by the 10th grade." For this, he blamed "lack of interest on the part of parents, bad home conditions and lack of a place to study."

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

In the last 5 years, adult vocational training equipped 245 individuals with special job skills. Enrollees were helped to find jobs—sometimes in South Dakota but more often in urban industrial areas—and helped to adjust to these new communities.

During the same period, 270 individuals and their families (718 persons in all) were assisted in moving to off-reservation locations and finding immediate employment. They also received financial help, where needed, and counseling services during the adjustment period.

Most of the building construction carried on by the BIA at Pine Ridge is that of school facilities and buildings related to these plants. Work was completed last month on the new $1,063,070 Manderson School and utilities to service it. This modern structure has eight classrooms, a multipurpose room, kitchen, shop, home economics classrooms, offices, and showers.

A dining hall and kitchen, added to the boarding school, is nearing completion at a cost of $327,000. Three classrooms and a garage for schoolbuses were added to the day school at Oglala. Also built were two 2-bedroom houses and one 3-bedroom house. Cost: $163,000.

Currently the reservation is benefiting under the accelerated public works program by a $183,000 project providing for grading and surfacing of reservation roads, control of soil erosion and improving soil productivity. This work will require 26 man-years of employment.

These are just examples of the current nationwide programs for reservations. Looking back to where they were 6 or 7 years ago, the Oglala Sioux are encouraged to tackle the huge problems that still lie ahead. They learned that goals which are still to be achieved can be achieved, if heart and muscle and mind are applied with sufficient determination.

For much of their recent progress the Oglala Sioux give credit to the enlightened guidance of Schifter. They only wish they had another building to name for him.

TAX REFORM AND THE BUDGET

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, more and more it is beginning to look as if the administration's program for tax cuts and tax reform is floundering. Even top officials cannot seem to agree on just what kind of a program is needed—whether or not we should have a tax cut with reform—a tax cut without reform—whether or not we will have a recession or a depression—whether or not we will have more or less unemployed.

These questions and more like them are bothering our country, Mr. President. The citizens of our country are deeply concerned. They want leadership.

Fortunately, Mr. President, leadership in this field is available from a number of persons, among them Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement on tax reform and the budget by Governor Rockefeller be made a part of my remarks at this point. I commend this statement to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for reading, for study, and for action.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER

In the 1960 presidential campaign, a key issue was the acceleration of the Nation's economic growth in order to provide more jobs for a growing population.

Senator John F. Kennedy, as the Democratic candidate for President, promised in that campaign "to get the Nation moving again," setting as his goal a 5-percent annual growth rate and reduction of the rate of unemployment to 4 percent.

During the first 2 years of his administration, President Kennedy sought to achieve this goal almost exclusively through pumping up purchasing power by increased deficit spending.

This program did not work. The growth rate has not been accelerated and the rate of unemployment was back up to 6.1 percent last month.

Faced with this failure, the administration has presented a new program combining tax cuts and so-called tax reforms with further increases in deficit spending.

This program is likewise doomed to failure because it does not have the basic elements to achieve accelerated economic growth and in net effect is only a more expensive version of the administration deficit-spending approach which already has failed.

Its main focus is on further pumping up of purchasing power while giving only lip service to basic tax incentives for economic expansion. It ignores the factors which make for confidence and hope in the economic future of America.

Full public discussion of this issue is vital. I therefore present the following analysis of the economic situation and an alternative five-point economic program to meet it:

I. THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROMISES AND THE RESULTS

(a) The Kennedy administration entered on its first term with great confidence that it could get the American economy moving again.

1. It promised to break the Nation out of the pattern of slow growth which had persisted since the end of 1956—a growth trend of 2½ percent per annum as against a 4 percent per annum growth trend in the first postwar decade.

2. It promised that as a result of accelerated growth, the rate of unemployment would be reduced from 6½ percent in early 1961 to 4 percent by the middle of 1963.

3. It promised in its first economic report that its policies would lift gross national product from the then annual rate of $501 billion in the first quarter of 1961 to $570 billion in 1962.

(b) The administration's initial economic program to achieve these goals was based almost exclusively on the theory that prosperity and more jobs could be achieved by pumping up purchasing power through increased Federal spending.

1. The administration pushed up the annual rate of Federal cash spending including social security from $100 billion in the first quarter of 1961 to $117 billion in the fourth quarter of last year. This is an increase of 17 percent in 2 years—a massive dose of spending.

Over half of the increase was in nondefense programs—defense spending went up $8 billion while nondefense spending was increased by $9 billion.

2. As a result, the cash budget, which had shown a surplus of $800 million in fiscal 1960, was turned into a deficit of $2.3 billion in 1961 and $5.8 billion in 1962 and an estimated deficit of $8.3 billion for 1963.

(c) Despite this massive increase in deficit spending, the Kennedy administration did not deliver on its promises.

1. The promised increase in our national economic growth rate has not been achieved.

2. Gross national product for 1962 fell $16 billion short of the administration's prediction.

3. Unemployment averaged 5.6 percent last year and it already has risen to 6.1 percent in February of this year—a long way from the promised goal of 4 percent. Thus, many workers displaced by automation, many unskilled workers, and many of our younger people are looking for jobs.

II. THE ADMINISTRATION'S NEW PROGRAM AND ITS PROSPECTS

(a) Faced with the failure of its economic policies to generate full prosperity and vigorous growth in the first 2 years, the administration announced early this year that it was embarking on a new economic program. The President has recommended:

1. A 3-year program to reduce corporate and individual income tax rates.

2. A variety of so-called tax reforms—the effect of which is to offset part of the tax cut.

3. An increase in cash spending of $5¾ billion from fiscal 1963 to fiscal 1964.

4. A cash budget deficit of at least $10.3 billion for fiscal 1964. Under this program, according to Secretary Dillon, deficit spending will continue at least until 1967.

(b) As the details of the new approach became known, it looked more and more like the same old thing—another attempt to achieve prosperity by pumping up purchasing power through deficit spending—while paying only lip service to tax incentives for genuine economic growth.

1. While purporting to cut corporation taxes by 5 percentage points to stimulate new investment, the administration proposed to spread this out over 3 years and at the same time accelerate corporate tax collections. The net effect of this would actually be to increase corporate tax payments by the equivalent of 4 percentage points to an effective rate of 56 percent in 1964. Cuts below the prevailing rate of 52 percent would be delayed until 1966, and the full reduction to 47 percent would be delayed until 1969. This would retard added investment instead of stimulating it now.

2. Individual income tax cuts would be spread over 3 years and their impact on increased investment and consumer spending thereby diluted.

3. The impact of most of the so-called tax reforms is definitely repressive. As an example, one of the tax reforms proposed, limiting deductions by excluding the first 5 percent of gross income would increase rather than reduce inequities in the tax system for 25 million individual income taxpayers who file itemized deductions.

It would strike a sharp blow at homeowners and support of churches, charities and other institutions. This proposal has undermined confidence that the Government intends to keep its long-standing commitments to the very group in our society which is economically most creative, and thereby has an adverse effect on the climate for economic growth.

III. WHY THE NEW PROGRAM WILL FAIL TO ACHIEVE ITS STATED GOALS

(a) The basic fault of the administration's approach is its failure to understand the forces underlying growth.

1. The missing element for growth is the provision of effective incentives to modernize and develop our productive plant and equipment.

2. This is shown by the record in the period from 1957 to 1962—the 5 years of slow economic advance (about 2½ percent per annum). One will find that during this period:

A. Consumer expenditures went up $72 billion—an average annual growth of 4.6 percent.

B. Government spending for goods and services increased $30.5 billion—an average annual growth of 6.2 percent.

C. Investment in new plant and equipment increased by less than half a billion dollars—an average annual increase of only three-tenths of 1 percent.

3. Thus it is clear that the place in which our economy has lagged during this period has been in the crucially important item of business investment in new plant and equipment.

A. Such investment ran to a bit less than $37 billion in 1957 and a bit more than $37 billion in 1962—an almost infinitesimal average annual growth of three-tenths of 1 percent whereas it needed to be at least 4 percent to have brought investment to $45 billion by 1962—the rate needed to achieve an adequate growth economy performance.

B. This lag in the growth rate of investment capital was importantly caused by the squeeze on profits which characterized the period from 1957 through 1962. The impact of rising costs with stable prices and high taxes squeezed profit margins at least 15 percent. This effectively reduced the incentive to make new investments.

C. The resulting failure of investment to move ahead after 1957 is by far the most important explanation of the lag in the economy's overall growth rate. It also goes far to explain the unemployment problem because much of our unemployment and short hours of work are found in the heavy goods production areas of the country.

D. A program that provided genuine and immediate incentives for increase in lagging investment in new plant and equipment would stimulate a dynamic upward thrust to the economy's growth trend across the board. Seemingly, the administration's failure to recognize and provide for this incentive stems from a prevalent notion that not even the prospect of rejuvenated profits would induce large plant and equipment expenditures in the face of "overcapacity." That this is a misconception is attested by the following considerations:

(1) The concept of capacity has meaning only in terms of existing demand at given price levels.

(2) Available data on capacities are very inexact, and there is evidence that these capacities are importantly overstated.

(3) Plant and equipment investment itself increases demand as well as providing the means for meeting it. Expenditure in this field creates jobs, pays wages, and proliferates orders for materials and components that fan out through the economy and create further demand.

(4) Most current plant and equipment investment goes for modernization rather than for increased capacity. This cuts costs and prices, and expands demand in terms of the volume of goods that can be bought with any given dollar volume of consumer spending.

(5) By making American industry more competitive in terms of lower production costs, we can preserve more of our own markets at home and expand our exports. The result will be increased employment in the United States.

(6) Finally, an important portion of new investment, particularly under improved business profit prospects, would go into research and development. This is the core ingredient in new product development which, in turn, generates a whole series of new demands of which the consuming public is unaware until the new products are available.

4. There is a sharp distinction between tax cuts aimed at providing greater incentive for investment and tax cuts that are chiefly designed to increase deficit spending as a pump-priming device.

The administration's program purports to be the former but in actual fact it is hard to avoid the conclusion that it was designed to be the latter.

The confidence-shattering impart of this confusion in aim is certain to negate the effect of any genuine incentive inducement that the "new" program purports to offer.

5. Confidence is an imperative ingredient of sound economic growth in a free enterprise system. The President's new program undermines confidence through protracted deficit spending and creation of uncertainties as to the future.

Control of Federal spending is essential if action on the tax front is to be effective.

A. It is the height of fiscal irresponsibility to propose a $5¾ billion increase in cash spending along with a tax cut.

B. Federal spending must be controlled by a determined effort to meet only essential needs while cutting programs of lower national priority.

C. While deficits may be unavoidable in periods of recession or economic slack, our firm goal must be to balance the cash budget, and indeed to produce a surplus over the course of the business cycle.

D. If Government expenditures are provided through deficit financing to a degree and with a persistence that undermines confidence in the fiscal responsibility of Government, they can inhibit an even greater amount of private investment and expenditures that would otherwise have been made.

E. On this score, the economic vision of the current administration is astigmatic—in its new program, as well as in its old one.

Its spokesmen, with their slighting references to the "Puritan Ethics" of budget balancing, and their espousal of "Sophisticated Economics," and their bland proposal for a program envisaging deficits for a sustained period of years without any manifest effort to pare expenditures, have invited the interpretation that budget-balancing is an exercise beneath their concern.

F. The American public will accept any necessary, temporary deficit, but they will be deeply disturbed—and should be—at indications that fiscal responsibility is regarded by their Government as old-fashioned and outmoded.

IV. REAL INCENTIVES FOR GROWTH—AN ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL

(a) I am convinced in the light of the foregoing analysis that the Kennedy proposals should be replaced by a balanced national economic program that will:

Have immediate and sufficient economic impact on both industrial expansion and consumer spending;

Be definitive and decisive;

End deficit financing quickly;

Restore confidence in our economic future, and

Achieve the growth essential to producing more jobs and thus ending chronic unemployment at the present unacceptably high levels. Specifically, I recommend:

1. Reduction of the corporate income tax rate to 47 percent, fully effective in the fiscal year beginning this July 1. This will immediately release $2.5 billion for new investment and provide the incentives required for a substantial acceleration of economic growth.

2. An equitable $7.5 billion across-the-board cut in individual income taxes also effective in the fiscal year beginning this July 1—abandoning the so-called reforms which have shaken the confidence of so many millions of taxpayers. This would stimulate saving for investment and consumer spending in the private sector as opposed to Government spending.

3. Hold Federal spending down at least to the fiscal 1963 level by cutting back sharply on low-priority programs.

4. Set as the goal—through resultant economic growth and restraint on spending—a balanced cash budget in fiscal 1965.

5. After the budget has been balanced, it would then be possible to reduce the debt and to finance essential new or expanded Government programs from rising receipts.

V. WHY THIS PROGRAM IS ESSENTIAL

(a) It is time to come to grips realistically with the problem of slow growth in America.

The Kennedy program of more spending and improperly designed and diluted tax cuts will not produce full prosperity and vital growth—but more and larger Government deficits.

(b) A balanced tax program to spur incentives combined with fiscal responsibility will enable America to realize its vast potential for economic advance.

Everyone stands to gain from growth. It means more jobs, rising real pay for all jobs, and an expanding horizon of opportunity for all. With growth, Government can restore fiscal integrity and afford sound programs which enhance individual welfare.

(c) America faces great opportunities for economic development which can support a better and fuller life for all individuals.

By prompt, effective, and concerted action to stimulate incentives, we can break out of the pattern of slow economic growth and move on to greater prosperity and meaningful improvement in the national well-being.

Only in this way can we insure our capacity to meet our responsibility in the preservation of peace and freedom.

TWO DISTINGUISHED PASADENANS GET AWARDS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, last month the first National Medal of Science, established 3 years ago by Congress, was presented by President Kennedy. It went to Dr. Theodore von Karman, Hungarian-born American citizen, and now a resident of Pasadena, Calif. Dr. von Karman was cited for the "incomparable contributions" he has made "not only to the field of applied mechanics, aerodynamics and astronautics, and to education in general, but also to industrial, national, international, and human affairs in their broadest sense."

Dr. William Pickering, another eminent Pasadenan, was also honored last month. Dr. Pickering, director of Caltech's Jet Propulsion Laboratory, was named southern California's Engineer of the Year and received the accompanying George Washington Achievement Award. He was cited particularly for his part in the development of the Corporal missile in 1950 and for his work on Explorer I and Pioneer IV.

An editorial on February 27 in the Pasadena Star-News pays tribute to Dr. von Karman and Dr. Pickering. I want to join this paper in extending my warmest congratulations to these distinguished gentlemen. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pasadena (Calif.) Star-News, Feb. 27, 1963]

EMINENT PASADENANS

Not many months elapse, usually, between the awards to distinguished Pasadenans that cause the community to renew its pride in itself, and burnish anew its image as a center of intellectual attainment.

Within the space of only a few days recently, two Pasadenans have brought honor to themselves and to the city. First, Dr. Theodore von Karman became the first recipient of the new National Medal of Science, established by Congress 3 years ago. The presentation was made by President Kennedy at a ceremony in the White House.

Next, Dr. William Pickering, director of Caltech's Jet Propulsion Laboratory, was designated Southern California's Engineer of the Year and received the accompanying George Washington Achievement Award at the annual Engineers Week dinner in Beverly Hills.

Other things link the work of these men, besides their residence in Pasadena. Both were notable figures on the staff of the California Institute of Technology before going on to other endeavors. And Dr. von Karman's work at Caltech led to the establishment of the Laboratory Dr. Pickering now heads.

Dr. von Karman's attainments are multifarious. He is internationally renowned as an aerodynamicist. He was was one of the founders, in 1942, of the Aerojet-General Corp., whose technical advisory board he still heads.

Dr. von Karman is known also for large contributions to applied mechanics and astronautics, as well as to education in general. He is chairman of the NATO Advisory Group for Aeronautical Research and Development.

Dr. Pickering is himself a graduate of Caltech, and taught there until his assignment to the Jet Propulsion Laboratory on a leave of absence from the faculty. He was named director of Jet Propulsion Laboratory in 1954.

The engineers' award cited his part in development in 1950 of the Corporal missile, which was the Nation's first operational guided missile; the production of Explorer I, the first successful U.S. earth satellite, and Pioneer IV, the first successful U.S. space probe.

Both awards have sidelights. That to Dr. von Karman is additionally gratifying because it represents a kind of national recognition to scientific attainment that previously has been reserved for military heroes. We favor more of this kind of thing, extended, perhaps, to the fields of arts and education.

Dr. Pickering's award places in better perspective the tremendous achievement of Jet Propulsion Laboratory over the years and relegates to its proper place the recent criticisms, however valid, of certain work underway there.

We are happy to congratulate Dr. von Karman and Dr. Pickering on these newest additions to their long lists of distinctions, and to bask, together with our fellow Pasadenans, in their reflected effulgence.

NEWS MANAGEMENT

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, New Hampshire's largest daily newspaper, the Manchester Union Leader, recently featured a syndicated column and a guest editorial dealing with a matter of grave concern to the American public. The column, which was written by an acute observer of the Washington political scene, Holmes Alexander, and is entitled "Krock, Loeb, Kennedy, and the Kept Men," appeared in the Union Leader on Friday, March 15, 1963. The guest editorial, entitled "The Kennedys and the News," from Newsday, Garden City, Long Island, N.Y., was reprinted in the Union Leader on Saturday, March 9, 1963.

In both instances, the writers address themselves to the chilling specter of managed news, as we have seen this phenomenon develop during the last 2 years. Insidious indeed, is what Holmes Alexander calls "Krock's Law," which postulates that purveyors of news can be managed by promise or threat, cajolery or fear. The position occupied by Arthur Krock in the world of journalism requires no comment. Suffice it to say, he represents courage and integrity among newsmen. William Loeb, as he has demonstrated repeatedly, reflects those same high qualities as a publisher. His forthright discharge of the responsibility for public service imposed upon any publisher, without compromise or equivocation, would have warranted the plaudits of Pulitzer himself.

I believe these articles direct themselves to a problem of increasingly alarming dimensions, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Manchester Union, Mar. 8, 1963]

KROCK, LOEB, KENNEDY, AND THE KEPT MEN

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Let's say that Krock's law has been enunciated—and Loeb's edict has been activated. America will be cleaner if both are accepted as gospel of this free land.

Columnist Arthur Krock, of the New York Times, has been, for a good half century, a stellar performer in several fields of journalism. It is less well known that Krock also has been, for a full quarter century, the encourager of young and eager writers, including John F. Kennedy, author (1940) of "Why England Slept." At 77, twice a Pulitzer prize winner, and a secure Olympian of his profession, Krock has his say about presidential "news management" in a much-discussed article that runs in the current Fortune. Since the magazine costs $1.25 per issue and is not popularly available, Krock's piece has been more read about than read. Krock's law, which I venture to paraphrase, appears in his final paragraph and may be extracted to say:

'Not news, but the purveyors of news, can be managed by an American President who is wickedly willing and able to do so."

Publisher William Loeb, who runs successful and robustious newspapers in New Hampshire and Vermont, is a savvy and audacious survivor of the days when American journalism didn't count the cost of voicing its convictions. I have personal knowledge that early in the 1960 campaign Loeb was entertained by Ambassador Joe Kennedy and was entreated to support Senator Jack Kennedy on two grounds: One, that the Senator was fit to be President and, two, that the Senator was going to win, anyhow.

DIDN'T BUY IT

Loeb went home, mulled over the available data, concluded that the Senator's record indicated an appalling incapacity to put up a winning fight against communism, this Nation's mortal enemy. Upon those grounds, Loeb has vigorously opposed the advancement of each and every Kennedy. Only recently Loeb editorialized and threatened suit against Senator TED KENNEDY for allegedly breaking the camera of a Loeb photographer who attempted to get pictures of the Senator at a New England ski resort. Loeb's law, digested from his fulminations on the episode, may be said to read:

"Not even the presidential family in America is immune from legitimate coverage of the news."

Krock and Loeb, then, have both defied the lightning that is said to fall from heaven upon those who irk the gods that be. Both have put their hands in the fire with a brave intent to snatch and brandish a searing ember of truth. Loeb, as it happens, has always been a militant individualist with scant concern for any guidance but his own. But Krock, living in Washington and accustomed to the association and friendship of the peerage in both journalism and politics, has laid his professional reputation and personal tranquility on the line in a deed of daring that merits the admiration and gratitude of his countrymen.

Nobody can well evaluate Krock's contribution without reading the text of his Fortune article. Samples from it and gossip about it will not suffice. For he produced not mere denunciation, but documentation. Names, dates, specifications and sagacious observations on news management are all there. Until somebody can knock over this citadel of citations, it will stand against the yelping of the Yahoos at its walls.

His indictment—please note well—is not principally against the Kennedys. It is against the Kennedy kept men. Krock concedes that every White House administration tries, with varying degrees of scruple and intensity, to get good publicity and to identify itself with the "national interest." But the guilt that he imputes is laid against the "purveyors" of news who succumb to fear, flattery and humbug, which causes writers and broadcasters to prevaricate and equivocate.

So, it isn't strange that the kept men are beginning to caterwaul. Washington Post columnist Eldon Griffiths, chief European correspondent of the Post-owned Newsweek, led off the chorus on March 2. Krock, writes Griffiths, is "an elderly thunderer," who's jealous because "the President talks to other correspondents more than he talks to Krock." Krock is saying, says Griffiths, that "almost everyone—except Krock—has been taken in," and Krock is asking us to "believe that old men are always right and all young men are wrong."

Not many readers of the Fortune article, I daresay, will find this criticism just. Rather, they will find that this caterwauling of the Kennedy kept men was implicitly predicted in Krock's indictment of them.

[From the Manchester Union, Mar. 9, 1963]

THE KENNEDYS AND THE NEWS

(Guest editorial from Newsday, Garden City, Long Island, N.Y.)

Two events connected with the Kennedy family and the news have earned space in the papers.

Up in Vermont at a ski area, Senator EDWARD M. (TED) KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, snatched the camera of a press photographer and ripped out the film because he objected to being photographed unposed. This is known as controlling the news in no uncertain fashion.

In New York, Fortune magazine published a thoughtful article by Arthur Krock, columnist for the New York Times, asserting that the President and his administration have been managing the news more cynically and boldly than by any previous administration in a period when the United States was not in a war or without visible means of regression from the verge of war.

For reasons that vary, the Kennedys seem to want things printed the way they want them, or not at all.

TED KENNEDY's burst of bad temper can't be excused on the ground that he hates publicity. He thrives upon it, and he courted it during his recent, successful campaign for U.S. Senator. He is now much more a public figure than he was in the days when he was simply the President's younger brother. Public figures can't object—or shouldn't—if photographers snap pictures of them, though such pictures may be unflattering. The easy way to avoid such quick-draw photography is either to remember that photos are bound to be taken or else to withdraw from public life. The latter, in TED KENNEDY's case, is not likely to be the solution he chooses.

As to Krock's conclusions, he is stating what the administration already has admitted. Arthur Sylvester, Under Secretary of Defense, boasted after the Cuban crisis that he had helped to manage, control, and channel the flow of news.

This is a delicate issue for both sides—the President, because he found himself on the brink of war with Russia during the Cuban imbroglio; the press, because it has a responsibility to print all but the most sensitive information relating to national security. Without this freedom, the press is muzzled, and in some instances decisions may be made that constitute a real danger to our republican form of government. If situations of gravity arise, the President would be wiser to form (as in World War II) a committee of publishers to whom the facts can be confided; good citizens who can counsel as to the effect of printing or nonprinting. That system worked before and it can work again.

As to Krock's further comment that the President has gulled editors and publishers into favorable dispatches about his administration—doing so by intimate background briefings and personal enchantment—this, if so, is the fault of the recipients of a dose of his charm. Reporters and publishers are paid to be hardboiled, to accept courtesies without a quid pro quo in the news columns, and to remember that no newspaperman ever can permit friendship to stand in the way of the truth. Those who fail to live up to this principle are doing a disservice to the free press—and, what's more, to their readers. Managed news ought to be dismanaged. Managed newspapermen had better make sure that nothing is kept out of print, and that no story is colored, simply because the President is a very persuasive and a thoroughly agreeable person.

SLEEPING BEAR NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, early this month a group of prominent Michigan citizens joined together to form the Michigan Committee for a Sleeping Bear National Lakeshore. The purpose of the committee is to stimulate general public support for a Federal recreational development in that area.

This event marks an important milestone along the road we have traveled since Senator MCNAMARA and I first introduced a bill to establish the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in June of 1961.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks an article on the formation of the committee which appeared in the Benzie County Patriot of March 7, 1963, and a statement of intent which has been issued by the committee.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Benzie County Patriot, Mar. 7, 1963]

ANNOUNCE FORMATION OF COMMITTEE FOR A PARK

Formation of the Michigan Committee for a Sleeping Bear National Lakeshore was announced March 2 by C. T. Carland, chairman of the Citizens for a National Park in Benzie and Leelanau Counties. Its purpose is an attempt to stimulate favorable opinion for a Federal recreational area formed about the impressive Benzie-Leelanau dunes and moraines. Three bills to authorize such an undertaking are now before Congress where hearings are expected to be held during the present session.

Committee members are John C. Beukema, industrial consultant, Muskegon; Edward L. Cushman, vice president, American Motors, Detroit; George A. Griffith, former conservation commissioner, Grayling; Miss Ethel L. Larsen, conservation chairman, National Federation of Women's Clubs, Manistee; W. K. McInally, regent, University of Michigan, Jackson; Alexander G. Ruthven, ex-president, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and Harold Titus, conservation editor Field and Stream, Traverse City, chairman.

As yet the group has not endorsed any one bill but a spokesman said that it favors an acreage large enough to include besides the principal dunes and Lake Michigan bluffs several of the inland vantage points which afford spectacular views. Also while declaring that in general, private rights in developed properties within the project must be assured it recommends that Federal support for local efforts be available if needed to avoid uses which would not be compatible with park atmosphere.

Statement of intent from Michigan Committee for Sleeping Bear National Seashore:

"We, all long-time residents of Michigan, believe that Sleeping Bear Dune and its environs contain scenic and scientific values which are of national significance and should be preserved for posterity. These values are highly perishable in a period when the native landscape is rapidly being altered for one purpose or another. We are convinced that the only method of insuring the safety of these assets is in public ownership of adequate acreage. The State of Michigan is obviously unable to assume this national responsibility which makes Federal acquisition imperative.

"Several bills are currently before Congress which would establish a project here under administration by the National Park Service. We believe that this project should include not only the dune and nearby bluffs but several of the overlook sites so that the visitor may enjoy and be impressed with the panorama of lake, dune and forested moraines revealed from these vantage points.

"We heartily agree that private rights in developed properties inside the boundaries of the project be maintained in general but insist that the steadying hand of a Federal agency should be available if local efforts fail to preserve uses which are compatible with a park project. This point is emphasized because we are aware of the attraction that any large concentration of tourist activity has for enterprises which, while profitable to the owners, may prove to be highly detrimental for all other uses of the area."

HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL NEEDS OF RETIRED PERSONS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, several weeks ago I received a letter from Mr. Nicholas C. Vrataric, vice president and director of region VIII of the United Papermakers & Paperworkers, AFL-CIO, Ann Arbor, Mich.

This letter related the history of a retirement program established for members of that union employed at the Consolidated Paper Co. in Monroe, Mich. In short, this history has been one of requests by the private insurance carrier for increases in premiums. This has meant the necessity for either increased contributions by active members or reduced benefits to retired members.

Mr. President, it has been clearly demonstrated in this case, as in so many others, that private insurance alone is not an adequate solution to the hospital and medical needs of retired persons.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Vrataric's letter, which describes a problem likely to be found in all corners of our country, and the accompanying table, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED PAPERMAKERS &
PAPERWORKERS, AFL–CIO,
Ann Arbor, Mich., January 22, 1963.

Hon. PHILIP A. HART,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Consolidated Paper Co. of Monroe, Mich., and our union have enjoyed collective bargaining relations since 1941, and late in 1949 we were fortunate in establishing a pension program to provide for a retirement program for our members. In 1954 the union recognized the serious problem that retired employees have in regards to hospitalization and medical expenses during their retirement and requested the company to provide for hospitalization and medical coverage for retired employees, which was agreed to by the company. In 1955 we were able to prevail upon the company to likewise provide coverage for the dependents of retired employees. Both of the above were to be provided for at no cost to the retired employee, but were paid for by the active members sacrificing a portion of the wage increase, which they would have otherwise secured.

As the number of retired employees increased, they became a burden upon the overall insurance program and in 1961 the insurance carrier requested an increase in premiums for the retired employees. Our collective bargaining agreement provided that the company pay the entire premium for both employee and dependents and since the company's financial condition in 1961, and for several years prior to that, showed it was operating at a loss instead of a profit, the company could not afford the increased premiums, a proposal was made to the union to reduce the benefits provided to the retired employees and such reduction would have reduced retiree benefits by more than 50 percent, the union bargaining committee proposed to the membership, that since these retired employees must have protection against sickness and accident in their old age, that instead of a reduction in benefits and the retirees paying an increased premium, all of the active employees would contribute 40 cents per week to pay for the increased cost of retiree insurance, which was overwhelmingly approved and instituted.

However, due to the increased utilization of insurance and primarily among the retirees, the insurance carrier has again approached the company and the union stating that its last year's operating experience has shown a loss for the insurance carrier and there must be a 40-percent increase in insurance premiums for the coming year.

At a recent union and company meeting, this problem was discussed and we are now faced with a serious problem whereby it may be necessary to reduce the benefits of the retired employees.

At this meeting it was suggested by Joseph Stanifer, an officer of our local 1000, that it would be a good idea to forward to you this letter, together with a copy of our insurance experience with the insurance carrier, which will accurately portray the usage of medical programs by retirees and clearly demonstrate that private carriers is not the solution to the medical care and needs of retired employees. We feel that our experience clearly demonstrates the need for the passage of President Kennedy's medical care program.

While the retired employees of Consolidated Paper Co. have been fortunate to have some coverage, there are many other retirees who are not as fortunate, who are paying the same medical claims out of the small pensions that they are able to receive. With best wishes and regards, I am

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS C. VRATARIC,
Vice President and Regional Director, Region VIII.

Insurance experience rating, Consolidated Paper Co., No. 559 and No. 560

Period	Premium	Claims	Ratio
Oct. 1, 1954, to Oct. 1, 1955	$225,289	$180,570	80.2
Active	220,493	173,902	78.9
Retired	4,796	6,668	139.0
Oct. 1, 1955, to Oct. 1, 1956	248,724	242,309	97.4
Active	234,923	226,779	96.5
Retired	13,801	15,530	112.5
Oct. 1, 1956, to Oct. 1, 1957	278,503	246,992	88.7
Active	260,514	221,956	85.2
Retired	17,989	25,036	139.2
Oct. 1, 1957, to Oct. 1, 1958	254,441	235,099	92.4
Active	234,425	206,290	88.0
Retired	20,016	28,809	143.9
Oct. 1, 1958, to Aug. 13, 1959	242,442	243,731	100.5
Active	222,239	214,006	96.3
Retired	20,203	29,725	147.1
Aug. 13, 1959, to Nov. 13, 1959	$42,197	$28,522	67.6
Nov. 13, 1959, to Nov. 1, 1960	227,779	184,292	80.9
Active	205,029	161,272	78.7
Retired	22,750	23,020	101.2
Nov. 1, 1960, to Nov. 1, 1961	230,503	223,199	96.8
Active	205,613	183,597	89.3
Retired	24,890	39,602	159.1
Nov. 1, 1961, to Nov. 1, 1962	244,533	272,492	111.2
Active	214,307	215,781	100.5
Retired	30,226	56,711	187.0

THE REFUGEE PROBLEM

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on March 8 the Michigan Committee on Immigration sponsored a 1-day conference on immigration in Detroit, Mich. Among the many excellent presentations at this conference was a speech by Mr. James J. Norris, president of the International Catholic Migration Commission, entitled "The Century of the Homeless Man."

We all hear from time to time about the refugee problem and its implications for national and international policies. In his speech, Mr. Norris speaks of what it means, in stark human and individual terms, to be a refugee. Often in discussing the definition of a refugee, the question is: "What is a refugee?" rather than: "Who is a refugee?" Mr. Norris is talking of the man and woman and child who are the refugees of this world. And I believe all of us would benefit from his thoughts.

For this reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this speech by Mr. James J. Norris be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CENTURY OF THE HOMELESS MAN

(Remarks of James J. Norris)

It has been said that the refugee problem in our day has been the largest single human issue facing the world community, but there has been no effort to face up to it on a global scale. Because the problem has been considered in fragments, the true dimensions of the problem have been unknown to the man in the street, and for most part governments have been just as well pleased that it remains so.

In many cases, local governments that were overwhelmed by refugee problems were, with a few exceptions, left to go it alone to face those problems.

The vast displacements of peoples since the beginning of World War II are almost incomprehensible. The more than 40 million people who have been displaced, expelled, or have fled in that period of time, represent a population larger than that of France. The majority of the 40 million have already been resettled either in the country where they took asylum or in some other land.

This resettlement means moves to another place but it does not necessarily mean that they have been integrated into the life of the country.

Any effort to go into detail concerning who these people are would be almost a dreary recital of statistics.

Many of you have taken a trip across the Atlantic, but I am sure that as you left behind you the Statue of Liberty the thought never occurred to you that you were heading eastward into a vast belt of homelessness and hunger. You have read many times of the refugee problem in Europe including the story of the 14 million people of German origin driven like animals from their homes after the Potsdam Agreement. You are also familiar with the story of the 1 million Arab refugees who are rotting away in their camps in the Near East. Likewise, I am sure, you are acquainted with the overwhelming problem of more than 1 million Chinese who have sought asylum in Hong Kong, over 200,000 of whom are said to be living on rooftops.

Not quite so well known are the problems of the 300,000 Algerians who sought temporary asylum in Morocco and Tunisia during the Algerian war, but have now returned to their homeland only to find everything destroyed and they are confronted with the task of building a new life. The majority of the 15 million refugees displaced by the partition of India are eking out a day-to-day existence, but there is still an acute problem among the refugees in Bengal.

India has added to its burden by granting asylum to more than 50,000 Tibetans who fled their country after the Chinese aggression. The 800,000 Vietnamese who fled from North Vietnam to the south were given much attention in the press at the time of the Indochina war, but once the hostilities were over. and the big movement of people finished, little attention was paid to them by the outside world. The same is true of the 3 million persons who fled from North to South Korea.

Very little has appeared in the press concerning the latest wave of refugee problems being created in Africa and yet it is apparent that this continent is going to be faced with problems of refugees for years to come. Two hundred thousand Angolese have sought temporary refuge in the Congo; thousands of Ghanaians have been expelled or fled from the Ivory Coast back to Ghana and into Togo; many thousands of refugees

have fled from Rwanda into Tanganyika, Uganda and the Congo.

At our conference today there will be a discussion of the Cuban refugees who have sought asylum in our own United States; so I shall not detail their plight.

The immensity of the problem of refugees, because it is discussed in statistical terms and frequently not in human terms, almost causes us to lose sight of the fact that we are talking about individual human beings who had all the same human hopes and aspirations as everyone of us in this room today.

It is significant that when there is a discussion of the definition of a refugee, the question is: What is a refugee rather than: Who is a refugee? This lack of human approach has been taken by large segments of the international community in considering the problem of the refugee world.

A refugee neither chooses nor prepares his flight. He is not able to select the country into which he must flee. He is not protected by his own country and he arrives without identity documents. From a legal standpoint he is nonexistent. He is more a phantom than a living human being. From a symbol of being antisomething, he becomes an anonymity. The refugee must seek permission to move from one place to another and his very existence depends on the charity and goodwill of those among whom he seeks asylum. He usually lives in some kind of temporary shelter, which was formerly a military camp, a factory or a row of rotting wooden barracks, or the remnants of destroyed buildings. Not one of these shelters was intended as a home for human beings. The compound he lives in is frequently an unpaved thoroughfare that turns into mire and muck when it rains, weeds grow everywhere and broken windowpanes are plugged with paper. Doors, riddled with dry rot, hang crazily from rusting hinges. Whole families may live together in a single room, with a paraffin stove in a corner as their only kitchen. Sanitation is always insufficient and frequently the water for a whole camp may come from a single tap standing in the open. The very living in a camp forces a refugee to accept camp existence as a way of life.

Since the refugee lives at the mercy of local authorities, he becomes de facto a man without rights, in an age when the declaration of human rights is praised as one of the great steps forward of our century. The refugee's problem is legal, physical and psychological.

When a refugee seeks to emigrate he finds that it is easier to ship a newly manufactured car, or a ton of steel, than to send a man and his family from one country to another. It is inevitable that his thoughts go back to the native homeland that he loves, to his relatives, neighbors and friends whom he has left behind; to the church or synagogue in which he worshiped; to the friendly social gatherings that mean so much in the life of a human being; to the former happiness of his children. In desperation at times he seriously considers giving up refugeedom and going back because he never realized that he was not expected to make a choice between freedom from fear and freedom from want, the goals of the Atlantic Charter.

The refugee looks around him and sees the aged, the sick, the handicapped, the unmarried mother, who are the remnants of an earlier generation of refugees. He wonders whether or not his fate is to be one of this number. He suddenly realizes that the worldshaking events that created the refugee problem get far more attention than the human beings who have lost everything because of those events. He is confronted with the fact that in order to be helped he must meet the definition of the word "refugee" as spelled out by the United Nations, the U.S. Government, or some local government. He comes to realize that refugees are not simply people who have fled their homes seeking freedom, but are frequently men who are of political interest to one faction or another. He learns that a ration card may become a certificate of identity and a guarantee of security, more important at the moment than any other document in the world. He is a man who lives among men, but is not accepted by his neighbors. He is discriminated against if he seeks work or housing. He is a man who is newsworthy for a short period of time, but for whom international concern is short-lived.

The refugee looks around him and reads about or sees a small number of the people of the world who are living in an affluent society, with more food than they can consume, and with more luxuries in their homes than they can afford. He wonders if he is to spend the rest of his life in the world of the dispossessed and the exiled.

The refugee reads about international protection, international organizations helping refugees and private organization concern, and wonders whether he will ever be touched by any one of them.

This is the refugee to whom a small group of governmental agencies, governments and private organizations are striving to draw attention and for whom help is sought. The private voluntary agencies have insisted throughout the years that the refugee problem is dynamic rather than static and for that reason governmental and intergovernmental organizations must be flexible so as to meet refugee problems when and where they arise. They have insisted that the refugee problem is an international responsibility, and must not remain the burden of a single country in a time of crisis. There are times when the world does respond magnificently to such a crisis, such as it did at the time of the Hungarian uprising, but there are other times when the response is meager or nonexistent.

The persistent efforts of such men as the U.S. High Commissioner for Refugees, the Director of the United Nations Relief and Works Administration for Arab Refugees, the Director of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, and the devoted staffs of the private agencies working for refugees, with sympathetic understanding from our own American and other governments, have brought about solution to a number of problems that for years appear to be insoluble. But in spite of the year-in and year-out efforts to arouse interest to bring to a satisfactory conclusion some of these problems, such efforts have been less than successful.

Recently, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees put out a publication entitled "The Opening Door." It describes the efforts of his office to help resettle the residual group of refugees in Europe. By patient perseverance, on an individual case-by-case basis, many thousands of refugees, formerly considered "hopeless" for resettlement, were given a new opportunity to resettle in Scandinavia, Switzerland, England, Australia, and Canada. This task, undertaken with determination and understanding, has proven that there are very few refugees who cannot be helped to resettle, if there is a will to do so on the part of governments and private groups working together.

But the door which has been opened for these refugees means nothing to the old Russian couple in China who are still waiting for word that the exit door from Communist China has been opened and that the welcome mat has been laid out in another land; it does not touch the refugee who this very day is fleeing from the oppression in Yugoslavia to Austria or Italy, only to be forcibly pushed back because those countries are not being given adequate help from outside to meet this refugee burden either through relief assistance or immigration; it does not help the Jewish refugee who must flee from North Africa and wait in France until another door opens for him; it is of little concern to the Chinese in Hong Kong with relatives in the United States who have not as yet been able to bring them into our land; it is of little consequence to the man and wife living on a dole in a refugee camp in Greece.

The problem of refugees will never be met adequately until it is recognized that the major free world governments, including our own, have no provision for asylum and forcibly deport men who have fled oppression; it will never be met until the international community realizes that the refugee fleeing into Austria has chosen the freedom of the Western World over the enslavement of communism, and therefore it is the obligation of the entire free West to help him; it will never be met until voluntary and private groups like ours do their job and make known to our fellow countrymen the worldwide scope of the refugee problem and until such time as all of us, governmental and private, join together to face up to a serious service on behalf of the homeless of the world wherever they may be.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.—A RAPIDLY GROWING RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as many Senators may know, we have at Ann Arbor, Mich., the most rapidly growing research complex in the Midwest. Here is located the University of Michigan which in 1963 will expend over $36 million for its research programs, about $30 million of which will come from the Federal Government. And a growing number of research laboratories and new industries using research technology and methods are locating there, among them the Systems Division of Bendix Corp., Parke, Davis & Co., and Conductron Corp.

Recently the Wall Street Journal published an article reporting serious doubts by some in the Boston area as to whether or not a NASA research facility which is proposed to be built there is really wanted.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to say that we in Michigan would be delighted to see this facility located at Ann Arbor, and I can assure officials at NASA that they would be welcomed there with open arms. Of equal interest to NASA, the excellence of the activities now located at Ann Arbor would assure the interest of top talent in living in one of this Nation's most delightful university communities.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Wall Street Journal be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPACE INDUSTRY

(By Cal Brumley)

BOSTON.—Electronic and other scientific Yankee businessmen are looking critically at a proffered Federal gift.

The object of this appraisal is a $50 million space electronics research center the National Aeronautics and Space Administration plans to build in the Boston area. President Kennedy asked for an initial appropriation of $8.5 million to acquire a site and begin construction in 1964. Additional funds would be requested in later years for completion.

As could be expected, many people here are clapping their hands at the prospect of a big Government plum which will employ about 2,000 people. Among others, however, the reception is cooler. Some are asking such questions as:

Will the NASA center perform research which otherwise would be contracted to private industry? Will the center compete with private industry for scientific personnel? Is it really needed or will it duplicate facilities or work private industry is doing and thus be a waste of taxpayers' money? Will Government bureaucracy stifle research inspiration?

NASA IS QUESTIONED

"These questions are being asked pretty generally" by executives of Boston's research and electronic-minded industries, says Lt. Gen. Roscoe C. Wilson, chairman of Allied Research Associates, Inc., and until retirement about a year ago deputy chief of the Air Force staff for research and technology. A NASA spokesman says at least 100 people have called the NASA office in Boston with similar questions.

The Boston complex of research and electronic industries and institutions makes up one of the Nation's major scientific communities. Such electronic giants as Raytheon Co., General Telephone & Electronics Corp., Radio Corp. of America, and Avco Corp. have sizable installations in the area. Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University are centers for advanced research.

The questions probably are even more significant nationally than locally. Besides focusing on differences in basic political philosophy—big government versus reduced government—they also strike at the heart of another problem: Is the Government robbing the private sector of research?

Companies here, which already have a difficult time finding scientific brainpower and an equally difficult time keeping it from slipping away to competitors, fear that the answer is yes in the personnel field.

"When anything like the proposed NASA center is brought in it has a harmful effect on the men of local companies," says Henry Harding, president of Laboratory for Electronics, Inc. "As the NASA center builds its staff, it is sure to put pressure on research people to move around."

There is evidence that even some top-level New Frontiersmen are beginning to worry about the shortage of technical and scientific manpower. Commerce Secretary Luther H. Hodges in a recent speech expressed concern about the "relatively little" research directed at improving the civilian economy. He also pointed out that even if money were available for additional civilian-oriented research there is still a serious shortage of technically educated personnel.

NASA says it plans to minimize the personnel impact by staffing the center from its existing personnel, other Government agencies, and by recruiting nationwide.

If NASA's laboratories in effect compete with private industry for research assignments the impact on industry could be even greater than that of personnel raids. Massachusetts companies had about $16.5 million in NASA research contracts last year out of a national total of nearly $1.3 billion.

HELP FROM SUBCONTRACTS

New England companies probably would not feel competition from a NASA center as much as companies in other parts of the country, however. "There probably would be enough spillover, or subcontracts from the NASA center to make up for what local companies might lose, but I fear contract losses by research companies in other parts of the country," says one executive.

New Englanders have real doubts about the need for a NASA research center. One specific objection: One center's research intelligence is more limited than is industry-wide capability. "It is my feeling that the genius of the people is large,"' say Lieutenant General Wilson.

NASA spokesmen, as could be expected, stoutly defend their proposed center. One in Washington says NASA cannot expect private industry to provide critically needed increased competence in the areas of electronics and physics. He adds that NASA expects to increase contracts to private industry.

But a spokesman for a big New York company with facilities ranging over a broad field of research and hardware says, "Although it may be inappropriate for us to comment, the question remains: Is the Government doing too much research?"

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE PERSONNEL FROM BOISE TO SALT LAKE CITY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as you know, the Internal Revenue Service has announced plans to consolidate a considerable portion of its field operations. While this effort is being made in the name of economy, numerous questions as to its efficiency and necessity in Idaho have been rightfully propounded.

The Internal Revenue Service would transfer, according to some figures I have seen, almost half of its Idaho personnel from Boise to Salt Lake, with a reduction in functions which would quite obviously create hardship for many Idaho taxpayers.

Announcement of the plan has resulted in my office being flooded with sincere objections. The Greater Boise Chamber of Commerce is also on record against the proposal. The main office of the Internal Revenue Service in Boise has earned a reputation for its efficient work, and to curtail its handling of Idaho cases can assure only delay and additional expense for many of our citizens.

Like other States of the Intermountain and Pacific Northwest regions, Idaho has a sparse population, but vast distances which must often be negotiated to conduct business even in the State capital. The proposal to transfer functions of the Boise Internal Revenue Service office to Salt Lake, means—as an example—that someone living in Boise with a particular tax problem would have to travel 370 miles to Salt Lake. However, since Boise is centrally located between north and south, someone living in northern Idaho would have to travel almost twice that distance with their tax problem. The injustice of this is apparent.

In addition, it is no simple matter for the employees of the Boise IRS to make such a transfer; many are native Idahoans, owning their own homes, with children established in schools. Many are wives whose husbands are employed in jobs they cannot leave. This is the human equation, and it cannot be ignored.

I have objected vigorously to the administration, the Treasury Department and the IRS, and Secretary Dillon has given assurances that the plan will be reviewed, and that it will not be implemented pending a decision.

However, several days have passed since we received such assurances, and I want to reiterate that my State wholeheartedly opposes this move.

On March 10, 1963, the Idaho Sunday Statesman of Boise published an editorial which accurately and fairly sets forth the feelings of Idaho on this proposal. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE CHANGES AFFECTING IDAHO DRAW SENATOR CHURCH PROTEST, INVITE FURTHER OPPOSITION

The announced plan of the Internal Revenue Service to make Idaho a field office for Utah headquarters in an arrangement that demands strong protest. Under the claim of effecting economics, this consolidation would bring parallel penalties to Idahoans that would cause expense, delay and inconvenience. It is to be noted that Senator CHURCH has filed an effective protest with the Treasury Department, and it is to be hoped that he is able to make his protest stick.

Through the transfer of Idaho IRS personnel, in numbers that vary from an estimated 25 to 75, there is no contention that the department will hire fewer persons. Nor is there any indication that the IRS staff has surplus or would have extra help if the consolidation were effected. What is happening here is nothing more than another of the endless damaging changes that are thought up in Washington without any consideration for the final result.

Idahoans presently have the service of an efficient and well-administered Internal Revenue Service office in Boise with a field office in Pocatello. To either city, our residents may go with their problems and transact their business. Under the realinement they would be required to go to Salt Lake City. Since considerable contact is involved between the public and the IRS, it is immediately apparent that this transfer of personnel would leave Idaho out in left field, faced with considerable commuting to another State.

Involved in this transfer would be the payment of all Idaho Federal moneys to the Utah office which, on the involved payroll transfer, would add further penalty to State finance. Most important, a number of established Idaho families would be forced to relocate in Salt Lake City to do the same work they are doing right here in Idaho for Idaho people. It would be just as logical to locate the entire IRS operation in Washington, D.C.

The important point, of course, is that Idaho people not be deprived of the present arrangement which allows them to settle most of their Internal Revenue Department problems within their own State. Sufficient revenue is provided the Federal Government to continue Idaho offices. The department has been wasteful for many years.

Senator CHURCH, on the job immediately, has assured concerned Idahoans that he is hopeful that this realinement of IRS offices will not be made following his personal protest to the White House and the Treasury Department. We commend the Senator for this effort. He is attempting to perform an important service for every Idaho taxpayer. He deserves the support of the other three members of the Idaho delegation and as much ammunition from Idaho sources as possible. This is one change in the working of Government that Idaho cannot accept without vigorous protest.

Undoubtedly there are hundreds of ways in which the Federal Government could effect economies. But this doesn't happen to be one. The Internal Revenue Department, covering an enormous scope of the affairs of every individual, and operating under the most complex set of rules and regulations in

Government history, must be accessible to residents of every State for conferences and guidance. Here in Idaho, where the arrangement has good prestige, is well organized, directed and manned, there is no justification for any interruption in the IRS operation. Idahoans should show concern that this change does not take place.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SALE OF CADMIUM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 64, S. 1089.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1089) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately two million pounds of cadmium now held in the national stockpile. Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, relating to dispositions on the basis of a revised determination pursuant to section 2 of said Act, to the effect that no such disposition shall be made until six months after publication in the Federal Register and transmission to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committees thereof of a notice of the proposed disposition.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain portions of the report on the bill—No. 66—be printed in the RECORD at this point in explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follow:

This bill would (1) grant express approval of the Congress for the disposal by the General Services Administration from the national stockpile of approximately 2 million pounds of cadmium, and (2) waive a statutory requirement that the disposal may not be accomplished until 6 months after publication of notice of disposal in the Federal Register.

EXPLANATION

On October 16, 1962, the Administrator of the General Services Administration caused to be published in the Federal Register a notice of a proposed disposal of approximately 2 million pounds of cadmium. The published notice reads as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., October 16, 1962.

CADMIUM HELD IN NATIONAL STOCKPILE—PROPOSED DISPOSITION

Pursuant to the provisions of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98(b) e) notice is hereby given of a proposed disposition of approximately 2 million pounds of cadmium.

The Office of Emergency Planning has made a revised determination, pursuant to section 2(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98a(a)) that said cadmium is excess to stockpile needs. The revised determination was occasioned in part by a change in the mobilization planning period from 5 to 3 years.

Since the revised determination is not by reason of obsolescence of the cadmium for use in time of war, this proposed disposition is being referred to the Congress for its express approval, as required by section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

General Services Administration proposes to transfer said cadmium to other Government agencies, to offer the material for sale on a competitive basis, or otherwise to dispose of it in the best interest of the Government upon the express approval by the Congress of this proposed disposition but not earlier than 6 months after the date of publication of this notice in the Federal Register. This notice has also been transmitted to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committee of each House thereof.

The initial quantity to be offered for sale will not exceed 300,000 pounds. Subsequent offers will be scheduled at intervals of not less than 60 days.

This plan and the dates of disposition have been fixed with due regard to the protection of producers, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets as well as the protection of the United States against avoidable loss on disposal.

BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
Administrator.

NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Under section 2(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98a(a)) the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization is charged with the responsibility of determining the strategic and critical materials to be stockpiled. Section 3(e) of the act empowers the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to authorize the Administrator of General Services to dispose of any materials in the stockpile that are no longer needed. Such disposals may not be made until 6 months after the publication in the Federal Register and transmission of a notice of the proposed disposal to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committee of each House. If determination to dispose of certain materials is for reasons other than obsolescence of the material for use in time of war, express approval of the Congress is required before the disposal can be accomplished. If the proposed disposal is based on a determination that the material is obsolescent for use in time of war, express approval of the Congress is not required. For the purposes of these requirements the law provides that a determination is by reason of obsolescence if such determination is on account of (1) deterioration, (2) development or discovery of a new or better material or materials, or (3) no further usefulness for use in time of war.

Since the proposed disposal is not by reason of obsolescence, express approval of the Congress is required. This congressional approval could be granted in the form of a concurrent resolution. Because of favorable current market conditions this legislative proposal not only would grant congressional approval for the disposal but would permit the disposal to begin upon enactment of the bill instead of waiting until 6 months after October 20, 1962, the date of publication of the disposal notice in the Federal Register.

Information on disposal

The Army and Navy Munitions Board (a predecessor in function to the Office of Emergency Planning), placed cadmium on the list of strategic and critical materials to be stockpiled. Pursuant to section 2(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, the Army and Navy Munitions Board directed the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department (a predecessor in function to the General Services Administration) to make purchases of cadmium for the national stockpile, although a sizable quantity was obtained by surplus transfer from other agencies.

The Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, pursuant to section 2(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, revised the determination as to the quantity of cadmium to be stockpiled and authorized the disposal of the quantity of 2 million pounds of cadmium in excess of the revised stockpile objective. The revised determination was based in part on a change in the mobilization planning period from 5 to 3 years. The Office of Emergency Planning authorized General Services Administration, by letter dated July 2, 1962, to prepare this disposal plan which it later approved.

Cadmium is a soft, silver-white metal chiefly used in electroplating, pigments and chemicals, alloys, and storage batteries. No ore is mined solely as a source of cadmium, but it is obtained mainly as a byproduct from zinc, copper, and lead operations. The United States is the world's leading producer of cadmium. Other principal producing countries in the free world are Mexico, Canada, Belgium, Republic of Congo, Southwest Africa, and Japan.

The U.S. production of cadmium metal for 1961 was 9,943,000 pounds, and imports of cadmium contained in flue dust have averaged about 1,500,000 pounds annually in recent years. In 1961 the United States exported 702,000 pounds of cadmium. Consumption in the United States in 1961 was approximately 10,116,000 pounds. Estimated world production of cadmium in 1961 totaled approximately 20,800,000 pounds.

The quantity proposed for disposal is stockpile-grade cadmium metal in various shapes and sizes, packed in wooden containers, and stored indoors at several locations throughout the United States. The correct domestic price of cadmium is $1.85 to $2.10 per pound in ton lots. The average acquisition cost per pound of cadmium in the stockpile is $1.97.

In 1962 a tight supply situation developed with regard to this material and its scarcity increased the market price and created a favorable market for an early sale of this material. For these reasons, no substantial problem is present in relation to protecting the United States against avoidable loss or protecting producers, processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The quantity offered for initial sale will not exceed approximately 300,000 pounds. Subsequent offerings will be scheduled at intervals of not less than 60 days. The amount and timing of the subsequent offerings will be determined, based on the evaluation of the results of the earlier sales and existing market conditions. Because the cadmium will be offered for sale in small lots, small business should be able to participate fully in the disposal sale.

Departmental recommendation

Printed below and hereby made a part of this report is a letter from the Administrator of General Services dated October 16, 1962, requesting congressional approval for the disposal of excess cadmium from the national stockpile.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., October 16, 1962.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is a notice of a proposed disposition of approximately

2 million pounds of cadmium now held in the national stockpile. This notice is being published in the Federal Register and is forwarded to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committee of each House thereof in accordance with the provisions of section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98b(e)).

The Office of Emergency Planning has made a revised determination, pursuant to section 2(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98a (a)), that there is no longer any need for stockpiling said cadmium. The revised determination was made for the reason that said cadmium is excess to stockpile needs.

Section 3(e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act provides that no material constituting a part of the stockpile may be disposed of without the express approval of Congress, except where the revised determination is by reason of obsolescence of the material for use in time of war. Since the revised determination in this case was not by reason of obsolescence, we request that the Congress approve the proposed disposition.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
Administrator.

BURIAL ALLOWANCES FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 66, H.R. 212.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 212) to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain portions of the report on the bill (No. 68) be printed in the RECORD in explanation.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Veterans' Administration today is authorized to pay not more than $250 to cover the burial and funeral expenses of a deceased war veteran, a veteran discharged from service for a disability incurred or aggravated in line of duty, or a veteran in receipt of or entitled to receive disability compensation. Discharges must be under other than dishonorable conditions. Claims must be filed within 2 years after burial.

The subject bill would extend the time limitation for filing a claim for burial allowance in any case where a veteran's discharge has been corrected, after death, to one under conditions other than dishonorable to 2 years from date of correction or 2 years from the date of the bill's enactment, whichever is later. The committee believes this bill is equitable and concurs in the favorable report of the Veterans' Administration.

The Veterans' Administration advises there are no data available on which to predict an estimate of cost but it is believed relatively few cases will be affected and the cost will not be significant.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORT

The favorable report of the Veterans' Administration follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR
OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., February 18, 1963.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We are pleased to furnish the following comments in response to your request for a report by the Veterans' Administration on H.R. 212, 88th Congress, an act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable.

Under existing law (38 U.S.C. 902) the Veterans' Administration is authorized to pay a sum not exceeding $250 to cover the burial and funeral expenses of a deceased war veteran, a veteran discharged from service for a disability incurred or aggravated in line of duty, or a veteran in receipt of or entitled to receive disability compensation. It is required that a claim for this burial allowance be filed within 2 years after burial, with an additional year allowed from date of notification by the Veterans' Administration in which to submit necessary evidence.

H.R. 212 does not create a new class of persons eligible for the benefit, but is directed toward the situation where a discharge originally issued under conditions other than honorable is corrected by competent authority after his death—either upon his own application theretofore filed, or upon the application of his next of kin or legal representative. If the action of the correcting board or other authority is accomplished while a sufficient amount of the 2-year delimiting period remains for an application for burial allowance to be filed with the Veterans' Administration, no problem exists. However, if such action is delayed beyond the 2 years we are forced to deny the claim.

H.R. 212 would correct this situation by adjusting the time for filing a claim to provide that all persons will have an equal period of time to apply for the burial allowance, once the eligibility to receive it exists. Specifically, H.R. 212 would extend the time limits for filing a claim for the burial allowance in any case where a veteran's discharge has been corrected, after death, to one under conditions other than dishonorable, to 2 years from date of correction or 2 years from the date of the bill's enactment, whichever is later.

In view of the fact that the principal purpose of granting a corrected discharge is to remedy an injustice and afford equitable relief the objective sought to be accomplished by the bill would seem to be justified and would be consistent in principle with other provisions of the laws we administer. For example, 38 U.S.C. 3010(1), provides that, under certain conditions, monthly benefits, such as compensation or pension, may be awarded retroactively to the date on which application was filed with the service department for correction of the discharge. We would favor the enactment of this bill. There is no data available upon which to predicate an estimate of the cost which would result from its enactment. However, it is believed that relatively few cases would be affected and that the cost would not be significant.

We were advised by the Bureau of the Budget with respect to a similar report on this bill to the chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, that there was no objection from the standpoint of this administration's program to the presentation of the report to that committee.

Sincerely,

J. S. GLEASON, Jr.,
Administrator.

DEDUCTION FOR CHILD CARE EXPENSES IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 67, H.R. 2085.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2085) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that portions of the report on the bill—No. 69—be printed in the RECORD in explanation.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. SUMMARY OF BILL

H.R. 2085, as amended, would amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to make the $600 child-care deduction available, on the same basis as for widows, to women who have been deserted by their husbands. However, for the woman to have this status she must have been deserted by her husband, not know his whereabouts at any time during the taxable year, and must have applied to a court to compel him to pay support. Thus, such women would not be required to file a joint return with their husband in order to be eligible for the child-care deduction and the deduction would not be decreased $1 for every dollar of earnings above $4,500.

II. GENERAL STATEMENT

Under present law (sec. 214) a deduction of up to $600 a year can be taken for expenses incurred by a woman or a widower for the care of a dependent son or daughter (or stepson or stepdaughter) under age 12 (and also for dependents who are physically or mentally incapable of caring for themselves) if the care is to enable the individual involved to be gainfully employed. However, for working wives who are married to obtain this deduction they must file a joint income tax return with their husbands. In this case the deduction allowable is reduced $1 for each dollar of income of the husband and wife in excess of $4,500. For purposes of this provision a woman is not considered as married if she is legally separated from her husband under a decree of divorce or of separate maintenance.

This bill would amend present law to treat in the same manner as a widow, a woman who has been deserted by her husband. For this treatment to be available, however, she must not know of the husband's whereabouts nor have known of his whereabouts at any time during the taxable year. Also,

she must have applied to a court of competent jurisdiction to compel him to pay support or otherwise comply with the law or a judicial order (as determined under regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate).

Your committee has reported this bill favorably because it believes that where women clearly have been deserted by their husbands, they should be eligible for any child-care-expenditure deduction in the same manner as a widow. Under present law they cannot obtain this deduction because of the requirement that they file a joint return with the husbands who deserted them. Moreover, even apart from this restriction, the deduction under present law would be of limited value, because it decreases if they earn more than $4,500 a year and disappears entirely if their earnings exceed $5,100 a year. No comparable restriction is imposed in the case of widows. Your committee has favorably reported this bill because it believes these women should be treated, for purposes of this deduction, in the same manner as widows.

This provision is to apply to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this bill.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORT

The favorable report of the Treasury Department follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, March 12, 1963.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of this Department on H.R. 2085, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman.

This bill would amend section 214 of the Internal Revenue Code to allow a deduction for the expenses of child care to a wife who has been deserted by her husband whose whereabouts is unknown and has not been known at any time during the taxable year provided she has applied to a court of competent jurisdiction to compel the husband to pay support or otherwise comply wtih the law or a judicial order.

Under present section 214, a married woman is entitled to a deduction of up to $600 for the care of children under 12 and disabled dependents of any age, only if she files a joint income tax return with her husband. The deduction is reduced dollar-for-dollar to the extent the couple's combined adjusted gross income exceeds $4,500. Thus, a married woman who has been deserted by her husband and cannot locate him is deprived of the child-care deduction because she is unable to file a joint return. On the other hand, a single woman or a woman who has been divorced or is legally separated from her husband may claim such a deduction on her separate return.

A wife who has been deserted by her husband and left without financial support for her children is frequently in a more difficult financial situation than a woman who is divorced or legally separated from her husband because in the latter case, a court will generally require and enforce some form of support arrangement for dependent children before granting the decree of divorce or of legal separation. Since the child-care deduction was originally authorized to alleviate the burdens on families where the mother had to work in order to maintain minimum living standards and had to pay for child care while outside the home, it seems inequitable to deprive deserted wives of this form of assistance when they are in similar circumstances.

Accordingly, the Treasury is sympathetic to the policy underlying H.R. 2085 and, in his statement before the House Ways and Means Committee on the current tax program, the Secretary recommended the adoption of the amendment proposed in H.R. 2085. Because the Secretary has also recommended other liberalizing changes in section 214 of the Code which H.R. 2085 would amend, and testimony has been received which might cause the House committee to suggest further changes, you may wish to give thought to whether it would not be more appropriate to consider the instant amendment in the light of the overall proposals with respect to section 214.

Except for this suggestion, the Department has no reservation concerning H.R. 2085 and favors its enactment.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Treasury Department that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the presentation of this report.

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY S. SURREY,
Assistant Secretary.

TAX TREATMENT OF REDEEMABLE GROUND RENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 68, H.R. 1597.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 1597) relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments on page 3, after line 10, to insert:

(c) Redeemable Ground Rent Defined.—For purposes of this subtitle, the term "redeemable ground rent" means only a ground rent with respect to which—

(1) there is a lease of land which is assignable by the lessee without the consent of the lessor and which (together with periods for which the lease may be renewed at the option of the lessee) is for a term in excess of 15 years,

(2) the leaseholder has a present or future right to terminate, and to acquire the entire interest of the lessor in the land, by payment of a determined or determinable amount, which right exists by virtue of State or local law and not because of any private agreement or privately created condition, and

(3) the lessor's interest in the land is primarily a security interest to protect the rental payments to which the lessor is entitled under the lease.

And, on page 4, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain portions of the report on the bill (Rept. No. 72) be printed in the RECORD at this point in explanation of the provisions of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. SUMMARY OF BILL

H.R. 1597, as amended, in effect deals with the tax treatment in Maryland of both the buyer of a home subject to a redeemable ground rent and the person selling this real property subject to the redeemable ground rent. For the home buyer the ground rent paid is treated as a mortgage interest payment and, therefore, is deductible by him for tax purposes. The seller of the real property subject to the redeemable ground rent is treated as if he had sold the property subject to a mortgage in a face amount equal to the redemption price of the redeemable ground rent. As a result, the redeemable ground rent is taken into account in determining his sale price for the property and, therefore, is reflected in any gain (or loss) recognized to him. Under the bill, as amended, the deduction of the ground rent, as the equivalent of a mortgage interest payment, is available for 1962 and subsequent years. In the case of the seller of the property, however, the new treatment in general applies only in the case of transactions occurring after the date of enactment of the bill.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it favors the enactment of the bill as amended by your committee.

II. GENERAL STATEMENT

In Maryland private homes have often been sold subject to so-called ground rents. A ground rent is an obligation assumed by the home buyer to pay a fixed amount per year on the property. Under Maryland law, 5 years after the creation of a ground rent any holder of the property may redeem the ground rent by paying an amount computed by capitalizing the rental payment at a 6-percent rate. From 1921 until the decision in the Welsh case (cited below) Treasury Department rules and regulations treated ground rents as mortgages in every respect. Accordingly, the annual rents were deductible as interest by the home buyer, and the seller of the home included the redemption price of the ground rent in his sale price in the same manner as the face amount of a purchase money mortgage.[1]

In 1956, the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit held in *Estate of Ralph W. Simmers* (231 F. 2d 909, affirming 23 T.C. 869) that a person retaining a Maryland ground rent is the actual owner of the property (i.e., the lessor) and, therefore, that a builder who sold houses subject to such rents would not have to include the capitalized value of these rents in his sales price to determine gain (or loss) in the manner in which mortgages are included. The same general principle was followed in *Welsh Homes, Inc.* v. *Commissioner* (32 T.C. 239, affirmed 279 F. 2d 391). The amount of gain not included in current income is somewhat different in the two cases although under both decisions additional gain would be taken into account on redemption of the ground rent.[2]

---

[1] The Treasury position is apparent from G.C.M. 2042; C.B. VI–2, 182 (1921); and I.T. 2679, C.B. XII–1 103 (1933).

[2] Assume a purchaser pays $12,000 for a home subject to an annual ground rent of $120. Capitalizing this at 6 percent indicates a value for the ground rent of $2,000. Thus, the total value of the property is $14,000. Assume the land cost $500 and the house $10,000, a total cost of $10,500. The

With these two decisions that the person retaining the ground rent was the owner of the property, the Treasury Department could no longer maintain its position that the payment of the ground rent was deductible interest payment rather than a nondeductible rental payment. Therefore, effective as of January 1, 1962, the Treasury Department changed its regulations to conform with the principles of the two court cases, both as to the home buyer and as to the seller.

Your committee believes, without regard to the formal legal theory involved, that the result obtained under the court decisions in practice is the wrong result. It sees no reason why the home buyers in Maryland should receive smaller deductions for tax purposes with respect to payments made on their homes than is true of taxpayers elsewhere with respect to similar payments made on their homes.

On the other hand, there also appears to be no justification in permitting the seller of the property in these cases to reduce the gain at the time of his sale below that which would be realized in other States merely by making use of the redeemable ground rent device available in Maryland, rather than a purchase money mortgage which generally would be used in most other States to achieve substantially the same results.

In view of these considerations, your committee's bill, as amended, restores the old rules and regulations of the Treasury Department. First, the code is amended to provide that annual or periodic rentals under a redeemable ground rent (except the amounts paid in redemption of this rent) are to be treated as interest paid on a mortgage indebtedness. Second, the special rules of the code dealing with gain or loss on the disposition of property are amended to treat a redeemable ground rent as a mortgage and to provide that real property held subject to liabilities under a ground rent is to be treated as being held subject to liabilities under a mortgage.

The bill provides different effective dates for the deduction of ground rents by home buyers and the determination of the price received by the seller of property. In addition, the bill also provides transition rules to deal with those situations where homes have been sold in earlier years.

First, for the homeowner, ground rents are to be deductible in the case of rents paid or accrued on or after January 1, 1962. This is the same date existing regulations denying such a deduction were to become effective (sec. 1.163-1(b) of the regulations). By making this change, Congress will be assuring the uninterrupted continuation of the allowance of ground rent as a deduction.

Second, the basis adjustments, made to treat the capitalized value of ground rents in the same manner as mortgages, in general are effective on the day after the date of enactment of this bill. After that date, regardless of when the property was acquired, both in determining the basis and sales price of property held subject to a ground rent, the capitalized value of the ground rent is to be taken into account in the same manner as a mortgage. Thus, the sales price would be increased by such an amount and the basis of the property would be increased by this amount if the property was transferred subject to a ground rental.

Third, rules are provided for the builder or other person who before the date of enactment of this section sold real property retaining a redeemable ground rent, for determining the basis of the redeemable ground rent itself when it, after the date of enactment, is sold or redeemed. If he took the redeemable ground rent into account for tax purposes in the past in determining his sales price for the real property, then there will be included in the basis of the ground rent in his hands this same amount in the case of a subsequent redemption or sale. If he did not in the past take the redeemable ground rent into account for tax purposes in determining the sales price of the property, then he may not take this value into account as part of the basis of the redeemable ground rent when it is sold or redeemed.

Your committee's amendments changed the bill, as passed by the House, so that it will add to the Internal Revenue Code a new section 1055(c) which will define a redeemable ground rent. Your committee feels that this definition will make the effect of the bill considerably clearer.

The "redeemable ground rents" which constitute the arrangements to which the term as used in the bill refers, are agreements in the form of freely assignable leases, as to which there is a statutory right to redeem upon payment of the capitalized value of the rentals reserved in the agreement at a rate not in excess of that fixed by statute. These leases are usually renewable and are for very long terms. In Maryland, in order to have a statutory right of redemption the term (including renewals) must be for at least 15 years and is frequently for 99 years. These arrangements are used primarily as vehicles in the financing of the purchase of real property. An essential characteristic is that in actuality the "tenant" has the equivalence of fee simple ownership in the land, and the "landlord" has only a security interest in the property to protect the rental payments to which he is entitled. The landlord does not have the usual liabilities of a landowner for taxes on the property, nor in tort. Upon ejectment of the "tenant" for nonpayment of the ground rent, the "tenant" has certain rights to redeem his property by curing his default within a limited period of time (similar to the remedy of a mortgagor with an equity of redemption).

The term "redeemable ground rent," as used in the bill, refers to an arrangement in the form of an assignable lease as to which a right to redeem upon payment of a determined or determinable amount exists by virtue of State or local law and not because of any private agreement or privately created condition. Thus, the bill does not alter the existing law applicable to a lease joined with an option to purchase. Accordingly, in any case in which the "tenant" has a right to extinguish the reversionary interest, which right was created by action of the landowner, this arrangement will be treated as a true lease or as a mortgage, as the case may be, in the same manner as if this bill had not been enacted. This will, of course, also be true even if the right to extinguish the reversionary interest was originally created by an earlier landlord for the benefit of a former "tenant."

Of course redeemable ground rents not of the type referred to by the bill, but which are still the substantial equivalent of mortgages bearing interest and to which the Simmers and Welsh Homes decisions do not apply, would continue to be treated in accordance with current Treasury practice. For example, there would be no change in the treatment of Pennsylvania redeemable ground rents created as separate charges at the same time as the owner of the real property conveyed a fee simple estate.

III. DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

Subsection (a) of the first section of the bill, as reported, amends section 163 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction for interest) to provide that the annual or periodic rental payments under a redeemable ground rent is to be treated as interest on an indebtedness secured by a mortgage. This does not apply to amounts paid in redemption of the ground rent.

Thus, it will be clear that a homeowner will be able to deduct rental payments as interest in the same manner as has been done from 1921 through 1961 under the Treasury practice. Also, ground rent payments will be treated as interest for all other purposes of the income tax. Thus, for example, it will be clear that ground rents are not to be treated as "rents" for purposes of the first sentence of section 543(a)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to personal holding company income). However, these payments will be treated as rents for purposes of that subsection to the same extent as ordinary mortgage interest is so treated in the special case described therein (interest payments on purchase money mortgages received by a corporation selling real property held primarily for sale to customers in the ordinary course of business). Accordingly if a corporation is owned by two individuals and is not engaged in the building business, it is a personal holding company if 80 percent of its gross income is from ground rents. On the other hand, if a corporation is engaged in the building business and sells houses, reporting the gain from such sales as ordinary gain, the interest produced by the ground rents reserved on the sale of such houses is treated as rent income, so that even if 80 percent of its gross income is from this source, it is not a personal holding company.

Subsection (b) of the first section of the bill inserts a new section 1055, in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (old sec. 1055 being renumbered as sec. 1056). Subsection (a) of this new section provides that a redeemable ground rent is to be treated as being in the nature of a mortgage and that real property held subject to liabilities under a ground rent is to be treated as being held subject to a mortgage. Thus, under this section it will be clear that the transfer of property subject to a redeemable ground rent has the same effect as the transfer of property subject to a mortgage; that the acquisition of property subject to a redeemable ground rent is to be treated the same as the acquisition of property subject to a mortgage, and that the holding of property subject to a redeemable ground rent is to be treated in the same manner as the holding of property subject to a mortgage.

Paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of new section 1055 provides that subsection (a) shall take effect on the day after the date of enactment of this section and shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after such date of enactment.

Paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of new section 1055 provides that in determining the basis of real property held subject to a redeemable ground rent subsection (a) is to apply whether the real property was acquired before or after the enactment of this section. In other words, if a homeowner paid $10,000 in cash for a house subject to a ground rent redeemable for $2,000, his basis for the house is $12,000 whether he acquired it before or after the date of enactment of the bill. Similarly, if on the date of the enactment of the bill property is owned with a carryover basis (because of a tax-free transaction), the basis of the present owner's predecessor in interest is to be determined by treating a redeemable ground rent as a mortgage. Thus, for example, if in 1962 a corporation acquired a house subject to a redeemable ground rent in a transfer to which section 351 applied, the basis of the transferor of the property is to be determined by treating any redeemable ground rent to which it was subject in such transferor's hands as a mortgage.

---

gain on the transaction under the two cases and under the bill is as follows:

	Cost or basis	Sale price	Gain
Bill	$10,500	$14,000	$3,500
Simmers case	10,000	12,000	2,000
Welsh case	9,000	12,000	3,000

The bill determines the gain as the difference between the total sales price and the total cost or basis. Under the Simmers case the gain is computed as the difference between the sales price and the cost or other basis of the house alone. Under the Welsh case the sales price is the same as in the Simmers case. However under the Welsh case the basis of the interest transferred bears the same ratio to the total basis of the house and land as the sales price bears to the sum of the redemption price of the ground rent plus such sales price.

Paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of new section 1055 provides transitional rules for persons who reserved or created a ground rent on or before the date of enactment of the bill. Under these rules, a person who transferred the right to hold real property reserving a redeemable ground rent and who did not take the ground rent into account for income tax purposes at the time of the transfer, will not have any greater basis than his cost for such ground rent.

This may be illustrated by some simple examples. Assume in all cases that a builder purchased land for $500 and erected a house thereon for $10,000. Thereafter he sold the house for $12,000, reserving a ground rent redeemable for $2,000 ($120 a year)—

(1) In the first case, the builder reported a $2,000 gain on the sale of the house, treating the sale price as $12,000 and his cost as $10,000. Since the builder did not take the ground rent into account at all on the prior sale of property, his basis for the ground rent is not more than $500 (the cost of the land not offset against the sale price of the house.) Thus, if he sells the ground rent for $2,000, he has a gain of $1,500.

(2) In the second case, the builder reported a gain of $3,000 on the sale of the house, treating the sale price received by him as $12,000 but treating his cost allocable to the house and leasehold at 12,000/14,000ths of his total $10,500 cost, or $9,000. In the case of this builder, since he still has remaining $1,500 of unallocated cost, his basis for the ground rent is $1,500. Thus, if he sells it for $2,000, his gain is $500.

(3) In the third case, the builder reported $3,500 gain. He obtained this result by treating his receipts on the sale as $14,000 ($12,000 cash plus a ground rent redeemable for $2,000), and computing his costs as $10,000 for the house and $500 for the land. Since this builder took the entire amount of the ground rent into account in computing his gain, his basis for the ground rent is $2,000. Thus, if he sells the ground rent for $2,000, he has no gain and no loss on the transaction.

Subsection (c) of the new code section 1055 sets forth a definition of a redeemable ground rent. Under this definition, a redeemable ground rent is a ground rent payable under a lease assignable by the lessee without the consent of the lessor which (including possible renewal periods) is for a term in excess of 15 years. The definition also provides that the leaseholder must have a present or future right to acquire the entire interest of the lessor by payment of a determined or determinable amount and that this right must exist by virtue of State or local law and not because of any private agreement or any privately created condition. Finally, the definition provides that the lessor's interest must be primarily a security interest to protect the rental payments to which he is entitled.

Subsection (d) of the new code section 1055 adds a cross-reference to section 163(c) relating to treatment of rentals under redeemable ground rents as interest.

Subsection (c) of the first section of the bill adds to section 163 a cross-reference to the new section 1055.

Subsection (d) of the first section of the bill makes a conforming amendment to the table of sections for part IV of subchapter O of chapter 1.

Under section 2 of the bill, the amendments made by subsection (a) of the first section of the bill are to take effect as of January 1, 1962, and are to apply with respect to taxable years ending on or after such date. The amendments made by subsection (b) of the first section of the bill are to take effect on the day after the date of enactment of this bill and are to apply with respect to taxable years ending after such date of enactment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to note, with respect to this bill, that the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] was much concerned and quite active in securing the committee's favorable report, and urging its acceptance. The Senator from Maryland is now in Mexico as a part of our official delegation to the Interparliamentary Conference in Mexico. I wanted to note for the Record his activity in connection with the bill just passed.

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 65, Senate Resolution 56.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A resolution (S. Res. 56) to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly recommended to the Judiciary Committee a request for $450,000, plus an estimated $25,000 to take care of the legislative salary increase of 7 percent, making a total of $475,000. This was calculated to take care of salaries and other expenses on the same basis as last year, and including the same number of employees on the payroll of the subcommittee.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] had said to me that the minority desired and needed additional personnel consisting of two additional attorneys, one economist and two stenographers.

Their present personnel consists of three very able lawyers, of the senior range, and a secretary.

This increase in personnel for the minority would mean an additional expenditure for salaries of approximately $55,000 or $56,000 per year and bring the total amount of salaries for those assigned to the minority to approximately $110,000 per year.

I stated to Senators Dirksen and Hruska that I would be willing to provide from the $475,000 recommended by the subcommittee one additional employee for the minority which could be an attorney or an economist, as the minority preferred, but that we would not be able to do more than that unless extra funds were provided for that purpose. Since the minority did not move for the extra appropriation necessary for this purpose, the subcommittee's recommendation was limited to the $475,000 necessary to carry the payroll in the same amount as last year.

In the Judiciary Committee, discussion of the need of the minority for additional staff people led to a decision by the Judiciary Committee to increase the request from $475,000 to $535,000 in order to give additional assistance to the minority on the subcommittee. This additional personnel was to include two attorneys, one economist, and two stenographers. The amounts which I have stated were the amounts necessary for the operation of the subcommittee for 12 months.

In the Rules Committee the total amount approved was $443,250 for the 11 months remaining, after excluding funds made available to the subcommittee during February 1963. This amount approximates the amount recommended by the subcommittee to the Judiciary Committee of $475,000 for the 12-month period. Thus, as the resolution stands before the Senate at this time, the funds available to the subcommittee for this legislative year will be approximately the same as the funds were last year, plus the legislative increase in salaries of 7 percent. I want to make it clear now that as chairman of the subcommittee I must say to my colleagues constituting the minority of the subcommittee that it will not be my intention to reduce the present majority staff who are needed by the majority to carry on the program of the subcommittee in order to afford to the minority additional employees other than the one attorney or economist which I will undertake to make available, as I stated to Senator Dirksen, when the matter of this resolution was before the subcommittee, and when it was being discussed by the Judiciary Committee. I also made this fact clear in my statement to the Rules Committee.

I recognize that the subject matter with which this subcommittee deals is one involving complex law and difficult economic problems. I appreciate the need of any member of this subcommittee for expert assistance in performing the duties incumbent upon a member of this subcommittee. For that reason, since the minority considers additional assistance is needed, I am willing to support their effort to make the funds for that purpose available. I have, accordingly, agreed to sponsor, with the Senator from Illinois, an amendment increasing the amount, on an 11-month period, to $490,000, which will be an amount sufficient to employ the 5 additional personnel over a period of 11 months.

I wished to make my position clear and to state how the matter stood.

I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] and myself, for the purpose of increasing the amount to $490,000 on an 11-month basis, beginning March 1, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 2, line 13, after the word "from", it is proposed to strike out "February" and insert in lieu thereof "March".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 3, line 8, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "$535,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$443,250".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I now ask that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois and myself be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered to the committee amendment, on page 3, line 8.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 2, in line 17, immediately after the word *"Provided,"* it is proposed to strike out "that the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee", and to insert in lieu thereof "That from the amount authorized under the provisions of this resolution for the expenses of the committee, the amount of $94,500 on an eleven-month basis shall be available for temporary technical, clerical, and other assistants, economists, and consultants compensations determined by the Members of the Minority"; and on page 3, in line 8, to delete "$535,000", and in lieu thereof to insert "$490,000 on an eleven-month basis beginning March 1, 1963".

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, so that the record may be complete, I should state that when the subcommittee was first considering its budget, there was projected a figure of $475,000. I first moved that the item be cut by $100,000. That proposal did not prevail. Then the $475,000 budget was approved.

Along with my associates on the minority, we abstained from voting when this matter came to the full committee. We made the point that we are inadequately staffed on the minority side, and thought that something should be done about it forthwith. As a result of these deliberations, and in the course of them, we made the point that we should have an economist and we should have two additional counsel and two clerical employees, in addition to the counsel that we already had, for the minority members of the subcommittee.

It was agreed in the Judiciary Committee that this should be done. The chairman's letter sets it forth in the report, and in the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration it is indicated that that committee had no intention of disturbing any agreement made in the full Judiciary Committee.

However, the amount was cut, and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee said he could not release any of his present staff of 31 people, and that there would not be funds enough to take care of the minority needs.

I thought we made a very good case. In the first place, we looked at all the activities of the committee last year. I ask unanimous consent that this table and agenda now be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SENATE ANTITRUST SUBCOMMITTEE RESOLUTION FOR FUNDS

I

A look at the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee activities report for year 1962, indicates that it concerned itself with:

	Witnesses	Days	Pages
1.} 2.} Drugs and patent interference	60	28	4,217
3. Civil demand legislation [1]			
4. Railroad mergers	27	9	1,644
5. Packaging and labeling	41	15	1,104
6. Concentration [2]			
7. Hearing aids	11	5	533
8. Steel	None	2	190
9. Space satellite communications	16	9	757
10. Price fixing in electrical industry	48	26	2,612
11. Strengthening antitrust penalties	9	3	218
12. Insurance (no hearings in 1962)	47	21	5,708
13. Foreign commerce [3]			
Total	259	118	16,983

[1] Senate hearings and legislation completed in 1961.

[2] No hearings. Report prepared by Bureau of Census.

[3] No hearings. Several executive session discussions.

II

A look at the agenda for the 88th Congress submitted by the chairman indicates that the subcommittee probably pursued the following things:

1. Publishing of papers by leading antitrust experts—lawyers and economists, which was begun last year.
2. Publishing electric manufacturing industry reports which resulted from hearings during the past 2 years.
3. Subcommittee plans to keep abreast of legislation passed in drug field during past year.
4. Consideration of legislation in the field of professional team sports.
5. Continue to find legislative remedies in professional boxing.
6. Staff will look into complaints regarding the U.S. Olympic Committee.
7. Continue study of its overall concentration.
8. Looking into the number of practices in manufacture and sale of proprietary drugs and in the furnishing of certain types of services in the health field.
9. Packaging and labeling practices.
10. Continue its examination into the insurance industry.
11. Will continue to keep informed of developments in the steel industry and other basic elements, especially those with which vertical integration has become a serious problem.
12. Dangers to competition inherent in conglomerate integration.
13. Government procurement contracts, especially Defense Department and GSA contracts and to whom they go.
14. Another Defense problem dealing with concentration resulting from patents whose research is financed by the taxpayers.
15. Interrelation between antitrust and the emergence of the Common Market.
16. Another international problem (a) deterioration in our balance of payments; (b) high domestic industry concentration and possible restricted arrangements; (c) foreclosure of markets to smaller companies.
17. Mergers in several major branches of the transportation industry.
18. Such legislation as the President may recommend.
19. Subcommittee itself will look for ways to improve our antitrust laws.
20. If special and unforeseen circumstances arise which warrant subcommittee's attention to any particular industry or problem.

III

It appears that some of the subcomtee's activities invade the jurisdiction of other standing committees of the Senate, as for example:

1. The railroad merger moratorium bill, S. 3097, which has always been the province of the Senate Commerce Committee.
2. The space satellite communications, which was fully ventilated by the Senate Space Committee and the Senate Commerce Committee.
3. The packaging and labeling investigation to which the Senate Commerce Committee has jurisdiction and expressed interest.
4. Drugs, which normally is heard by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and the patent provisions by the Senate Patent Subcommittee.
5. Insurance, which is subject to the jurisdiction of several Senate committees.
6. Common Market, which has been studied by the Joint Economic Committee for several years and by several other committees of Congress.

IV

The majority staff of the subcommittee totals 31 and consists of the following: Bernard Fensterwald, Jr., staff director; Horace L. Flurry, senior counsel; John M. Blair, chief economist; George E. Clifford, assistant counsel; S. Jerry Cohen, assistant counsel; Victor E. Ferrall, assistant counsel; Dorothy D. Goodwin, assistant counsel; Robert M. Hausman, assistant counsel; Charles W. Hughes, assistant counsel; Maurice C. Mackey, Jr., assistant counsel; Herman Schwartz, assistant counsel; Wilbur D. Sparks, assistant counsel; E. Winslow Turner, assistant counsel; Thomas C. Williams, assistant counsel; Lois E. Alexander, economist; E. Wayles Brown, Jr., economist; Irene Till Hamilton, economist; Walter S. Measday, economist; Raymond C. Cole, Jr., investigator; Paul S. Green, editorial director; Julian F. Granger, assistant editorial director; O. Marie Graffam, telephone operator; Kathryn M. Coulter, special assistant to staff director; Janice R. McKellar, executive secretary; Gladys E. Montier, clerk; Lucile Bryant, stenographer; Katherine F. Chaney, stenographer; Catherine M. McCarthy, stenographer; Arlone Read, stenographer; Jo Anne Youngblood, stenographer; Emily Zayyani, stenographer.

V

The minority staff consists of the following: Peter N. Chumbris, counsel; Ronald D. Raitt, counsel; James E. Bailey, counsel; Esther H. Esmond, secretary.

VI

The minority asks for the following additional staff members: One economist, two counsels, and two clerks at salaries to be fixed by the minority members of the subcommittee.

VII

Who does the minority represent? Popular vote 1960 Presidential election: Kennedy, 34,221,349; Nixon, 34,108,546.

In terms of people represented as expressed by their votes at the polls, the minority represents a tremendous segment of the population of the country and is, therefore, entitled to an adequate staff.

VIII

It should be noted that the majority members of the subcommittee have made arrangements to create a subcommittee within the subcommittee with specific members of the majority assigned to the special subcommittees, which permits the majority to be conducting three investigations consecutively, for example: Senator Estes Kefauver is heading the Common Market hearings; Senator Philip A. Hart, the packaging and labeling hearings; and Senator Thomas J. Dodd, the insurance hearings—all three running almost continuously during the months of March and April. The minority members and their limited staff cannot so readily divide themselves into three groups within a group.

Investigation by this subcommittee resulting in legislation where the whole case cannot be adequately made is like going into court and getting a judgment by default. What does such a condition do to business confidence in the country at the very time when the President through his fiscal program is trying to engender confidence and get the country moving again?

IX

We believe our request is fair and if not acceded to, the activity of the subcommittee should be sharply reduced or canceled altogether.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last year we heard 259 witneses. We had 118 days of hearings. We took 16,983 pages of testimony. By reference to be incorporated, an additional 16,000 pages of testimony were taken in the prior session on the drug bill.

I pointed out also that on the new agenda for the present Congress, we are not only going to wander into the national field, but we are going to wander also into the international field. If we get any closer to the moon, probably some members of the committee will take a little trip to the moon to see whether the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act and other acts are doing pretty well up there.

For the Record I recite that there will be published papers by leading antitrust experts and lawyers and economists. All of this began last year. There will be published electric manufacturing industry reports, which resulted from hearings during the past 2 years. The subcommittee also plans to keep abreast of legislation passed in the drug field during the past year. It will consider legislation in the field of professional team sports. It will continue to consider proposed legislation in the field of professional boxing.

Therefore, we will go into the steel industry, the insurance industry, the boxing industry, and the team sport business. Then we are going to look into complaints regarding the U.S. Olympic Committee. I do not know that that properly belonged before us, but I think it does, and it is on the agenda as outlined by the chairman.

Then we will continue the study of overall concentration. We will look into practices in the manufacture and sale of proprietary drugs, which we only touched heretofore, and into the furnishing of certain types of services in the health field.

A hearing is in progress at present on packaging and labeling. We shall continue to examine into the insurance industry.

Mr. President, we have reached the point now where the subcommittee breaks down into other subcommittees. We have any number of subcommittees in action. One subcommittee, a subcommittee on packaging and labeling, is very busy, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart]. Hearings on the insurance industry will soon begin under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd].

We shall examine into the Common Market, and there will be a trip abroad to see what the practices of the Common Market are. We are not only national; we are international.

I hope now that we can amend rule XXV, so that this committee can look into the space field and finally find something that is in orbit. I do not mind. All I want is enough help and enough staffing so that we can keep ahead of activities and be something more than the tail to the kite.

Now we are going to examine into the dangers to competition inherent in conglomerate integration. Mr. President, I will let you figure out what that means.

We shall examine into Government procurement contracts, especially Department of Defense and General Services Administration contracts, and to whom such contracts are awarded.

There is another Defense problem, this one dealing with concentration resulting from patents whose research is financed by the taxpayers.

We will examine into the interrelationship between the antitrust laws and the emergence of the Common Market.

Then there is still another international problem: deterioration in the balance of payments; high domestic industrial concentration and possible restricted arrangements, and foreclosure of markets to smaller companies.

We shall look into mergers in several major branches of the transportation industry and consider such legislation as the President may recommend.

The subcommittee itself will look for ways in which to improve the antitrust laws.

Then, if special and unforeseen circumstances arise, which warrant the subcommittee's attention to any particular industry, we shall examine into that subject as well.

Mr. President, that is a workload. If I did not have another thing to do—if I had no minority leadership chores, no work on the Committee on Finance, or anything else—this agenda would keep me busy 24 hours a day. Mr. President, we cannot pursue these important matters without an adequate minority staff.

The subcommittee's activities have also got into the work of other committees, as in the case of railroad mergers. There was also the communications satellite bill, which was fully ventilated by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Mr. President, I have placed all this information in the Record, and I shall ask unanimous consent to have the names of the members of the majority staff of the subcommittee, which total 31, printed in the Record.

What we have asked is that we have nine persons—one economist, the necessary clerks, and the necessary counsel—to handle this business. I remind the Senate and I remind the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] that we do not speak for a tiny minority, because in 1960, while there were 34,200,000 votes for President on the majority side, there were 34,108,000 Republican votes. So we are speaking for a considerable segment of the country, and we mean to do it as best we can.

We believe, therefore, that the only way in which we can properly do it is to have the necessary staff. That is why we have asked for it.

Much has been said in the press and in the columns about inadequate minority staffing. An attempt was undertaken to correct it in another body, but it failed by one vote. If we do not succeed now, so that, as against a majority staff of 31, we will have a minority staff of at least 9 persons of our own selection, then this fight will continue. I shall encourage the ranking minority members of every standing committee to make absolutely certain that they will have an adequate staff with which to discharge their responsibilities.

It has been said that from the money allowed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, we could have only one additional staff member in addition to the staff we now have.

That is not enough. Besides, no matter how much money was approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, the agreement in the full Committee on the Judiciary was that the minority would have nine staff members. The Committee on Rules and Administration, in its own report, indicated that it was not the intention of that committee to disturb any agreement which was had in the full Committee on the Judiciary before that resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. If our distinguished chairman feels that he will be short of money, I shall support him on this amendment, of which I am a cosponsor. If it is a matter of another $40,000, very well; let us have it, and let us do a good job.

I have made the point on the Senate floor before that I think our legislative bodies too often practice harassment of business and industry in this country, and thus destroy and impair confidence at the very time when the President's fiscal program for tax reduction to consumers and producers, and the huge, astronomical deficit, are all designed to get the country moving again. I doubt whether we shall be able to do that if business and industry are constantly to be attacked, so as to diminish confidence, which is that one elusive ingredient without which such a program will never succeed.

So, as the majority from time to time develops its legislative proposals, we want to see what they look like. We want to take them apart and put them together again. We want to determine for ourselves whether we are against them, whether we want to modify them, or whether we want to support them. We cannot do that unless we have an adequate staff. Therefore, I hope that whether objection to this amendment is registered or not, the Senate will approve it, because we will continue to fight if what it proposes is not to be done.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I support the views expressed by the minority leader. For the past several years the minority has had a most difficult task because of the huge volume of material turned out by the members of the staff who are assigned to the majority. The variety, number, and complexity of the problems have already been touched upon by the minority leader. Our task is made quite difficult, when the presence of minority staff members is required at hearings being conducted simultaneously with intensive staff work on other subjects. It is impossible for the minority staff to perform their duties connected with other work of the subcommittee.

For example, hearings are now in progress on the so-called packaging and labeling bill. At the same time, preliminary investigations are being made in connection with the relationship of the antitrust laws to the Common Market. Obviously, when members of the minority staff are tied up in hearings which are actually being held, they are not in a position to devote their time to the studies and surveys which are necessary in other fields which are soon to be explored. There is only one remedy which can be applied, without regard to the total amount of money which ultimately will be allowed to the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. That is to provide additional staff for the majority, a staff which can be employed and engaged within the amount of money which is actually allowed.

Whatever the amount of money is, there should be a more equitable representation of the minority, so we can discharge our responsibilities in the many fields which are gone into by the subcommittee.

It is said that is not possible, because the majority staff cannot be cut down in order to allow for additional staff members for the minority. But, Mr. President, there is a solution, namely, to reduce the workload of the committee. Far too often, in my judgment, there have been expeditions and forays into the jurisdiction of other committees, in violation of rule XXV, which relates to the reference of bills and other measures to committees. The prescription drug bill is one. If there is any measure which requires the attention of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, it is the prescription drug bill. Still others are the bills dealing with Government procurement, with its many side effects. Basically, procurement measures should not be referred to our committee; neither should patent measures be referred to it.

So I suggest that if there is not room enough to solve all the ills of the Nation's economy, perhaps we had better pare down a little and reduce the number of positions presently held by the majority staff members sufficiently to enlarge the minority staff so it can deal intelligently with the measures in the fields in which the committee works.

Mr. President, for these reasons, I support the statement made this afternoon by the minority leader.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the work of the committee is not easy. All members of the committee and all members of the staff have given it a great deal of time. Certainly our Nation is unusual in its free, competitive enterprise system. The antitrust laws are the regulators and the coordinators of that system. I know it is not popular to discuss those laws; but they are the greatest protection to business, both large and small, which our Nation has. Without them, our economy could not exist as it does.

It is a matter of great joy to me to find that the cartel system, under which the European nations have operated so long, and into which some of our corporations have been tied, much to the detriment of our economy, now is losing its strength. Today many of the nations of Europe are getting away from it, and embracing antitrust principles. That development has occurred, and is still occurring, in the Coal and Steel Community and in the Common Market countries. As a result, trade will become freer, and restrictions will be broken down, and it will become easier and more profitable for American businessmen to do business with the nations of Europe and with the Common Market. This is the wave of today. I am very glad that many European nations which have not antitrust laws have profited by our experience and are passing such laws or are planning to do so. Italy will do that. Australia is planning to enact antitrust laws; and the antitrust provisions of the Common Market, as set forth in the Rome Treaty, should be given every encouragement. In many ways, they are improvements over our antitrust laws. The freedom of trade and commerce and, therefore, the unity of the Western World have much to gain by having more nations provide good, workable antitrust laws.

Furthermore, the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice should, instead of sometimes being condemned by businessmen, be applauded, because they are the protectors of what all our businesses want; namely, a free, competitive enterprise system.

Mr. President, I have been advised by the Parliamentarian that the amendment would be clearer if, on page 3, in line 8, the committee amendment to strike out "$535,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$443,250" were withdrawn. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that that committee amendment be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOMINICK in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise to a point of inquiry: Is that the amendment which was cosponsored by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No, it is not. The Parliamentarian has informed me that if this amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration is withdrawn, the amendment sponsored by the Senator from Illinois and myself will take its place, and in that way the resolution will be clearer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to have the pending amendment read, for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 17, immediately after the word "*Provided,*" it is proposed to strike out "that the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee", and to insert in lieu thereof "That from the amount authorized under the provisions of this resolution for the expenses of the committee, the amount of $94,500 on an eleven-month basis shall be available for temporary technical, clerical, and other asistants, economists, and consultants to be appointed by Members of the Minority of the committee, at compensations determined by the Members of the Minority"; and on page 3, in line 8, to delete "$535,000", and in lieu thereof to insert "$490,000 on an eleven-month basis beginning March 1, 1963".

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada will state it.

Mr. CANNON. Will the Chair state whether the amendment is subject to a point of order, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the amendment is not subject to such a point of order, in that it is not new legislation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am forced to oppose the amendment, for two different reasons. First, I shall direct my remarks to the portion of the amendment covered by section 2, which, if enacted at this time, would very clearly establish a precedent, in that it would earmark specific funds for the use of minority staff purposes. In the past, a precedent which has been considered by the Rules Committee and has been approved and acted on by it and by the Senate is the one which already is set forth in section 2; namely, "that the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee."

Mr. President, therefore I would be forced to oppose that provision of the amendment which would change the precedent which has been established in this respect, particularly in view of the fact that it has not been considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration, the committee which has reported out the resolution in regard to the presentation that has been made here with the amendment.

Second, I am forced to oppose the amendment as to the amount of money requested for the reason set forth in my statement of March 14 to the Senate, in which I pointed out:

> Naturally enough, money must be appropriated for each committee to permit the proper processing, studying, and reporting of proposed legislation referred according to jurisdiction.

However, as I stated on that occasion, I believe that if we are going to attempt to effect economics, we should start right here at home in our own body and try to exercise some reasonable restraint insofar as the money authorized for the conduct of the business of those committees is concerned.

I should like to point out that the subcommittee which we are now discussing has requested $450,000 on previous occasions. In 1962 the committee requested $450,000; in 1961, $450,000; 1960, $450,000; 1959, $425,000; 1958, $365,000; in 1957, $275,000.

Now we come to a total original request in the appropriation of $535,000, which is almost double the amount requested in 1957. I have checked with the Senate disbursing officer. He informed that, according to his records. 37 employees are employed by the subcommittee at the present time. That is exclusive of when actually employed's or those persons on loan. According to the committee report, the budget was based on 44 employees, including 2 when actually employed's. In other words, that provides a leeway of five employees over and above the amount presently employed by the committee which would be available, exclusive of the when actually employed's who are covered in the report at the present time.

I believe that the committee could reasonably accept a reduction in the amount requested, particularly since it has been a constantly increasing amount, as I have indicated, and also in view of the fact that when we compare the amount with the funds received by some of the other committees, the contrast is evident. For example, the Committee on Armed Services, which is a standing committee of the Senate by statute, may employ 10 staff members, including 4 professional staff members and 6 administrative members. On the basis of full employment for those authorized personnel, the budget would amount to $142,250. In addition, the standing committee can make certain other expenditures up to $10,000 a Congress.

If we were to assume that the important Committee on Armed Services of the Senate during 1963 spent its fully-authorized amount, plus the amount that it has requested for all of its subcommittees to operate during the current year, the total figure would come to only $332,250.

When we consider the operation of a committee of the stature of the Committee on Armed Services, with all of its subcommittees—a committee which exercises jurisdiction over the expenditure of almost $50 billion of the national budget—I submit that the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee certainly can live within the amount of money that was recommended by the Committee on Rules and Administration, which is the sum of $443,250 for an 11-month period.

That figure was arrived at in the following manner: I proposed an amendment in the Committee on Rules and Administration relating to instances in which subcommittees had requested more than they had requested in the last previous year to pay the increase in salaries and the fringe benefits which were brought about by action of the Congress last year. My amendment would reduce those requests 10 percent. That is the amendment that was applied to the resolution—Senate Resolution 56—here before us today.

The matter of committee staff is a question for the subcommittee to resolve. I am sure that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will resolve it in a fair and equitable manner between the majority and the minority.

If I remember correctly, I believe the record shows that the minority has five staff employees. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee stated to our committee that he would be able to give the minority one additional employee on the basis of the reduced appropriation which we have approved in the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Again I say that the amendment is poor in two respects: First, it would establish a precedent insofar as fixing a specific amount for the use of the minority in carrying on the business of a subcommittee. Second, the amount approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, as shown in Senate Resolution 56 as amended, in the sum of $443,250 for an 11-month period, is an adequate appropriation. I would merely add that the 11-month authorization is more, proportionately, than the committee received last year and would provide the subcommittee with an adequate amount to pay all of its employees and take care of the additional requirements. As I have previously indicated, the subcommittee budget is based upon the employment of 44 people, including 2 WAE's. The disbursing officer informed me that presently only 37 people are employed on the committee staff.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Merely to keep the record straight, the minority has assigned to it currently not five but four employees. There are three counsel and one stenographer.

The work of the subcommittee is complex and voluminous. There are 37 employees, only four of whom are assigned to the minority. Would that not affect somewhat the Senator's judgment in respect to the question of whether or not fair treatment is extended to the minority?

Mr. CANNON. First, in response to the correction of the distinguished Senator, I am advised that four minority employees are specifically assigned to the subcommittee. But some of the presentations made before the Committee on Rules and Administration have indicated that, in many instances—and I am sure it would be true in this particular instance—employees are not employed by political party, but are employed by the distinguished chairman on the basis of their ability. I am sure that if the record were checked—and I do not know that it is necessary to check it—we would find that the minority certainly has very ample representation.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I do not refer to the political affiliation of the employees. I refer to whether or not they are assigned to the minority to work under instructions of the minority members of the committee. Unless they are responsible to the members of the minority, they are not assigned to it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am sure that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee would be more than fair in seeing that the work of the subcommittee is performed irrespective of who requests it. It is not my understanding that the subcommittee's work is along party lines and that it is doing work for a particular party, but is rather doing work for the business of the subcommittee. I ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if it is not a fact that he carries on the business of the subcommittee irrespective of party lines and of what the minority or majority may have employed?

Mr. HRUSKA. If the Senator will yield further, I wish to assure him that the subcommittee is highly political. With respect to most bills it considers there is a sharp division, philosophically, as to whether the proposed investigation even should go forward, and, when bills are proposed, as to whether the bills should be considered favorably or otherwise. The division is not always along the lines of Democrats and Republicans, but certainly along the line of what are commonly called—I believe under a mistaken construction and application—liberal or conservative views.

The subcommittee is highly political. There is no concealing that fact. There is no way for the minority to have representation by calling on members of the majority committee staff, for help in marshaling facts, arguments, and statistics, in opposition to a bill which the majority wants. That simply does not work.

Mr. CANNON. I say to the distinguished Senator that if the facts did not sustain their position, I do not think it would help the minority members whether they had 5, or 10, or 20 people.

Mr. HRUSKA. If the Senator will yield further, the situation now is that for more than a year there has been an investigation and study into the Common Market antitrust laws. That has been done by the members of the majority staff. We shall, in due time, go into the matter of hearings.

We have not had, on the minority side, the opportunity to have the subject studied so that we will know what facts to look for, or what witnesses would support a given point of view so that we could have a fair and impartial hearing.

It seems to me that procedure is not fair. We cannot, as a minority, ask members of the majority staff to make a study and find out things which will not strictly conform to the thinking of the majority.

Mr. CANNON. Again I say to the distinguished Senator, I do not believe that staff members are assigned to represent particular views. I think they are assigned to carry out the duties of the subcommittee.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee if it is not a fact that the entire staff of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee is directed to carry out the work of the subcommittee, irrespective of whether it may benefit one party or another? Is that not the situation?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Generally that is true. The staff is assigned to try to get the facts, to obtain witnesses, and to carry out the work of the subcommittee. Of course, many members of the staff are stenographers, secretaries, clerks, and telephone girls.

I wish to say further that generally antitrust matters should not be partisan. For instance, the Common Market problem is not partisan in any way at all, that I can see.

I do not think that the drug bill, which the Senate finally passed last year, was a partisan matter; although I recognize that in the presentation of witnesses and evidence, and considering attitudes toward bills, there are times when there are very sharp conflicts as between some of the majority members and some of the minority members.

I think I should also say that it is true, as has been pointed out, that various members of the subcommittee have been carrying on different activities.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] has been very busy studying, and has kept a great many staff members occupied, in connection with the labeling legislation and tax legislation, which is of importance.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] will start hearings soon in connection with certain aspects of the insurance industry.

Antitrust legislation is very technical and very time consuming, and a great deal of research is needed. I should like for the majority members to have an adequate staff, and I should like for the minority members to have the staffing and the representation that they feel they need. That is the reason I have joined with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] in sponsoring the amendment.

That was the attitude of the full Committee on the Judiciary, I say to my friend from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. I ask the Senator from Tennessee, is it not a fact that all the committee staff members are available for use by either the majority or the minority, as the members see fit?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; they are available when they are called upon, although many times they are so busy working on some matter that they may not be immediately available.

The staff members are experts in regard to antitrust matters. I can understand why the minority members would like to have lawyers and economists to whom they can give direct assignments, to present their particular side of some antitrust problem.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. On the score of borrowing staff or referring matters, the Senator from Nebraska has in mind, for example, the problem in regard to the railroad merger bill. The chairman, and the majority want a bill which would freeze, under certain circumstances, railroad mergers as of December 31 of this year.

Here is a Member of the Senate from Nebraska who is opposed to that bill. How practical would it be, Mr. President, to ask a staff member whose loyalty runs to the chairman of the subcommittee to engage himself in working out a brief, arguments, and facts against the bill which the chairman of the subcommittee is advocating? How could a person on a staff serve two masters?

These are positions which are diametrically opposed to each other. One says "Yes" and one says "No."

The same was true with respect to the drug bill, when there was an effort to amend the patent laws of this country. Some of us took strenuous exception to that. How much confidence could I have in asking a member of the majority staff, who is beholden to the chairman of the subcommittee for his appointment and for his continued employment, to develop facts, figures, history and arguments in opposition to the position taken by the chairman of the subcommittee? I do not think that would be practical.

No member of a subcommittee staff should have to work for more than one master. He cannot do the work conscientiously in such a situation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I merely restate my position, that the matter of staff is a matter for the subcommittee to determine. I think that position has consistently been followed, except for the provision written into section 2 of the resolution as it was presented, providing for a minority representative.

It would be a mistake, in my opinion, for this body to attempt to fix a proportion as between staff members of the respective parties. If that were to be done, again I point out that according to the Senate Disbursing Office there are now only 37 employees, and the budget presented was based on 44 employees, which is a difference of 7. Of the 44 listed, 2 are WAE's, so there is plenty of room in the budget for additional staff people. That is a matter for the subcommittee to determine and not for the Senate to determine.

The Committee on Rules and Administration, which reported Senate Resolution 56, considered the matter of the total appropriation, of the total authorization, and saw fit to reduce it. Mr. President, I submit that that reduction is proper.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. May I direct the Senator's attention to page 2 of the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration, in particular the fifth full paragraph, which reads:

> In amending Senate Resolution 56 to reduce the total expenditure authorization requested therein, it was not the intention of the Committee on Rules and Administration to disturb any agreement relating to majority and minority pro rata representation on the staff of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monoply.

I suppose that language should be read in connection with the last two sentences on that page, the last sentence of which reads:

> As the attached budget indicates, the minority will be furnished with five lawyers, one economist, and two clerical assistants.

That was a decision of the entire Judiciary Committee. Was it not the intention of the Committee on Rules and Administration to accommodate that agreement and settlement which was made in regard to the personnel?

Mr. CANNON. Not insofar as the last statement is concerned. The Senator from Nebraska was reading from a letter from the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee to the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HRUSKA. Exactly.

Mr. CANNON. The Rules Committee reduced that amount. It was based on the original $535,000 request, which the Rules Committee did not see fit to approve. The Rules Committee, however, did approve the language which the Senator read first—that it was not the intention of the Committee on Rules and Administration to disturb any agreement relating to majority and minority prorata representation on the staff of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly.

That was the intention of the Rules Committee. It still is. That is the point I am making here. This is not a matter for the Judiciary Committee to determine. The Rules Committee did not see fit to change it, but it did reduce the amount requested and acted on that basis. That is the basis of Senate Resolution 56. That is the reason why I am opposing both parts of the amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Nebraska would like to point out that 44 positions are authorized and yet it is felt there cannot be an accommodation to

extend to the minority 5 additional employees to make an attempt to meet in part, at least, the 33 who remain on the staff representing the majority. It seems to me that, unless some effect is given to the language on page 2 which I first cited, the plain intent of the Rules and Administration Committee cannot be carried out, because we have been told by the chairman of the subcommittee that he does not intend to give us any more than one additional person to represent the minority.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator will recall that I stated to the Rules Committee on both occasions that if the reduced amounts were agreed upon I would be able, out of the sums, to find a place for one senior attorney or economist, as they wished, but unless the increased amount were agreed to, it would not be possible to have five additional employees. That has been my statement in connection with this difficulty now.

That fact is made clear in the letter of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. Eastland], which appears at the bottom of page 2 of the report—that the reason for the additional amount was the additional five employees.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Withobjection, it is so ordered.

MARITIME COMMERCE WITH CUBA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have been keeping in close touch with the list of ships serving the Cuban trade, and from time to time I have placed in the Record a compiled list of the names of ships, the flag of registry, and the gross tonnage. These ships include only ships of free or neutral nations, whichever characterization we may wish to make with respect to them, but does not include the so-called bloc ships. By that I mean, of course, ships that come from the Soviet bloc, with the exception of those listed from Yugoslavia.

I have tried to keep the list up to date. I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at this point, for the benefit of Senators and others who may be following this subject, a list of ships of the free world, but including Yugoslavian ships, which have called in Cuba during the period of January 31 to March 8, 1963, based upon information received from the Maritime Administration.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Name of Ship, Flag of Registry, and Gross Tonnage—20 Ships

Apollon, Greek, 9,744.
Baltyk, Polish, 6,984.
Bar, Yugoslavia, 7,233.
Bialystok, Polish, 7,173.
Cavat, Yugoslavia, 7,266.
King Theseus, Greek, 9,153.
Kongsgaard (tanker), Norwegian, 19,999.
Kyra Hariklia, Greek, 6,888.
London Independence, British (tanker), 22,643.
London Majesty, British (tanker), 12,132.
London Pride, British (tanker), 10,776.
Mastro-Stelios II, Greek, 7,282.
Ole Bratt, Norwegian, 5,252.
Overseas Explorer, British (tanker), 16,267.
Pantanassa, Greek, 7,131.
Piast, Polish, 3,184.
Polyclipper, Norwegian (tanker), 11,737.
Shienfoon, British, 7,127.
Stylianos N. Vlassopulos, Greek, 7,244.
Tulse Hill, British, 7,120.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it is seen by this list that in this short period 20 ships called in Cuban ports. The British are far out in front in terms of total tonnage. During a 5½-week period from January 31 through March 8, these British ships have totaled 76,000 gross tons, including two ships in the 16,000 to 22,000-ton class.

Greece is the only other country whose combined tonnage was significant. These vessels in this period amounted to 47,442 gross tons.

The combined tanker tonnage of 93,555 tons shipped much needed petroleum products in vessels flying the British, Greek, and Norwegian flags.

A few days ago I placed in the Record the number of ships which came through the Panama Canal and stopped in Cuba. They include a very formidable list of ships which either have called in Communist China or were on their way back from Cuba to Communist China.

I have before me a news release, and probably if I had called attention to this matter over a period of weeks, it might have had some effect on the administration's hopes that the nations of the free world would join with us in this matter, particularly in relation to supplying Cuba with commodities when we have the quarantine in existence. Of course, our ships cannot call in Cuba. If they do, they cannot discharge and pick up cargo in the United States.

The Greek Government on March 16 issued an order, which I shall read. It is in the nature of a news release, but it covers the pertinent facts. It states:

> Royal Greek Embassy
> Press and Information Service,
> *Washington, D.C., March 16, 1963.*
>
> With reference to press reports from Athens the Royal Greek Embassy announces that a royal decree has been issued banning all vessels under Greek flag from carrying any kind of cargo to Cuban ports.
>
> Exception is only being made for ships under time charter contracted prior to the promulgation of the present decree.
>
> This measure has been taken by the Royal Hellenic Government in full cognizance of the impact on the interests of the Greek mercantile marine industry, already seriously affected by adverse conditions of the international shipping market.

I commend the Hellenic Government for taking this step. I am only hopeful, after reading the list of ships which have been calling in Cuba, that the action of the Hellenic Government might permeate some other governments which are a part of what we like to call the free nations of the world.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLE, from the Committee on Commerce:

Richard H. Holton, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

Edgar F. Kaiser, of California, and sundry other persons, to be incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of the Army National Guard of the United States officer named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officer of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392: Brig. Gen. Paul Leonard Kleiver, O397818, to be major general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of H. Vearle Payne, of New Mexico, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment of Senate Resolution 56 to investigate the antitrust and monopoly laws.

REQUEST TO WITHHOLD ACTION ON CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS OF OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS OF COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have asked the leadership of the Senate to withhold action on the confirmation of the nominations of the officers and directors of the Communications Satellite Corp. until I shall have finished the preparation of the case, which I think is a very substantial one, against the propriety, advisability, and constitutionality of the Senate allowing itself to be entrapped into the operations of a purely private corporation organized for profit.

I shall raise three questions: First, the propriety of the Senate permitting itself to be used, to become ensnarled in the organization and in the subsequent operations of this private corporation.

Second, the constitutionality of the confirmation by the Senate of officers and directors of a purely private corporation. Section 2 of article 2 of the Constitution provides that the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, "officers of the United States."

Third, I shall raise the question of the legal effect upon the operation of the corporation of the confirmation of the nominations of its officers and directors by the Senate.

I respectfully publicly ask the leadership of the Senate to withhold action on the confirmation of these nominations for a reasonable time, until this case may be properly prepared and presented to the Senate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I desire to commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] upon his request that the Senate withhold action on the confirmation of the nominations of officers to the Communications Satellite Corporation, and upon the study which he is making of the situation.

According to current news on the teletype in the cloakroom, the bylaws which the proposed Satellite Corporation officials have adopted will make it impossible for the general public to buy as much stock as the communications carriers will have. This further confirms the wisdom of the action taken by the Senator from Tennessee.

I have been advised by others that the Communications Satellite Corporation has already borrowed $5 million and has spent two-thirds of it for the employment of personnel, some of them at salaries in excess of $100,000 a year.

In my opinion, the important question before the Senate is the one raised by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who has pointed out that the Constitution provides that the President of the United States shall appoint the officers of the United States. I do not believe it was ever contemplated by the framers of the Constitution that the President should begin to appoint officers of private corporations organized for profit.

RESCINDMENT OF CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF BRIG. GEN. PAUL LEONARD KLEIVER TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the confirmation of the nomination of Brig. Gen. Paul Leonard Kleiver to be a major general be vitiated and that the nomination be returned to the Executive Calendar. There had been a request to withhold action on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in executive session, and without objection, the request of the Senator from Minnesota is granted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

CUBA DIPLOMATIC VICTORY WEAKENED BY ATTACKS AT HOME

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the great American diplomatic victories of our time was achieved by the leadership of this administration last October and November in the confrontation between the United States and Soviet Russia over the presence of Soviet nuclear missiles in Cuba.

It was not a confrontation between the United States and Cuba; it was a confrontation between the United States and Soviet Russia, in which the President of the United States paid no attention to Castro and never conferred with him. The President conferred solely with the leaders of Soviet Russia.

As a result of the American quarantine of Russian military movements into Cuba, a threefold diplomatic achievement was scored:

First. The Russian ships turned back and did not attempt to break the American blockade and quarantine.

Second. After first denying that there were nuclear missiles in Cuba, Khrushchev then admitted that there were such weapons there.

Third. Khrushchev then agreed to pull all of his nuclear missiles out of Cuba and take them back to Russia. He announced to the world that he was doing that. All of this was a complete about-face for Russia. The United States gained prestige in the eyes of the free world, and gave the Communist powers a lesson in Western Hemisphere solidarity and strength that they will not forget.

Each member of the Organization of American States voted to sustain the American quarantine. At the time of this crisis and confrontation in October and November 1963 I was in Argentina and Brazil as a Member of the U.S. congressional delegation to the Inter-Parliamentary Union meeting, which was held in Brasilia. I saw the electric effect on Latin America of the firm American stand, of the Russian bluster, then of the Russian confession and promise of rectification. I talked with delegates from Brazil and many other Latin countries.

I saw the prestige of the United States grow in Latin America hour by hour, day by day, until that prestige reached a pinnacle in the eyes of our Latin American neighbors that it had probably never before reached. I think some of the effects of that victory are being reflected in the tumultuous welcome being given President Kennedy in Costa Rica this week.

This diplomatic victory, this achievement of Russian confession of nuclear arms in Cuba, and Russia's promise of doing better, was a diplomatic victory that the world and particularly our Latin American neighbors would not forget, unless we try to make them forget it by our domestic attacks on our own victory.

In fact, nobody has forgotten it except a few who seek to make political capital for American politicians out of power, at the expense of national prestige, strength, and well-being.

Some of the prime critics of the Democratic administration have sought to bury the October 1962 victory of the United States over the Communist powers under a deluge of scare words.

I do not think the American people are going to be scared out of the fruits of their diplomatic victory by politicians in blue shirts on TV.

But perhaps we should grow concerned about politicians who are trying to make political capital for themselves by going into a war dance every time a TV camera points at them. It seems that hardly anybody in political office goes into a war dance nowadays without having first put on a blue shirt for better television reproduction.

It is easier to put on a blue shirt and go before television and talk tough than to put on a helmet and go to war.

It may be that Cuba has stored weapons in caves. It is a matter for the persons responsible for our national security, the Defense Department, Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Coast Guard, paratroops, intelligence agencies and the Central Intelligence Agency, to check and to be on guard against it.

But the possibility and the danger of weapons being stored in caves in Cuba ought to be kept in perspective. Which is more dangerous, a weapon stored in a cave, or a nuclear missile on a submarine just off our shores, or a nuclear missile in the Soviet Union with the range to strike American shores, or a set of nuclear weapons on Communist-owned ships, or a war-happy ruler in Communist China with weapons of unknown quantity and power?

The simple truth is that all are dangerous to us; and to single out a weapon

in a Cuban cave for cause for special panic and fear in these times is about as sensible as to single out a new model Russian tank as a cause for panic and fear.

Mr. President, a generation of young Americans have lived all their lives with the knowledge that war can come at any time, that when it comes it will be rough on everybody, and that war dances out to be retained only as the Indian tribes have retained them; namely, mostly for show on patriotic holidays, to show the youngsters how things were in the old days.

Mr. President, the Washington Post published on Sunday, March 17, an article written by Philip L. Graham, president of the Post, captioned: "Partisan Brawling Squanders Fruits of Cuba Triumph." The article is well written, and so is the headline. Mr. Philip Graham has indeed earned an accolade for his well-reasoned, hard-hitting, ably written article. The headline tells the story. I ask unanimous consent that this informative and thoughtful article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTISAN BRAWLING SQUANDERS FRUITS OF CUBA TRIUMPH

(By Philip L. Graham, president, the Washington Post)

SAN JUAN, P.R.—The fruits of America's greatest cold war triumph are being recklessly squandered by the partisan brawling over Cuba.

The triumph came on Sunday morning, last October 28, when Chairman Khrushchev announced the surrender of the Soviet missile systems in Cuba. Considering Khrushchev's usual prose style, the announcement was an epic of unambiguous brevity. The missile systems would be taken down and this would be certified by the U.N.

This came less than 6 days after the President's tough TV speech. Thus Mr. Kennedy forced the Soviet Union to agree to "disarmament with inspection," a reversal of years and years of obstinate Soviet rhetoric.

The ensuing reaction is enough to drive toward near despair any observer of our two-party system. Here was an indisputable example of the U.S. Government working soundly, sensibly, sagely under crisis conditions. The President turned his back alike on proponents of armed invasion and proponents of near appeasement.

The United States speedily gathered around Miami an array of armed power that could have bounced Castro all the way to the South Pole. While this "big stick" was being created, the President practiced the sort of intensively skilled diplomacy that alone can find an option different from nuclear warfare or surrender.

A single instance showed the value of instructed and informed inflex action. That was the President's peremptory refusal to consider any trade involving our Turkish bases—and this despite a widespread affliction of weak-kneed jitters on the part of many in and out of Government.

A THROWBACK TO KIPLING

One who visits the Caribbean area, even briefly, cannot help being appalled by the cacophony of abuse and jingoism that has come out of the United States on the heels of the President's success.

First came a caterwauling over the relatively ineffective Soviet bomber contingent, that remained briefly in Cuba. Next came a blather of criticisms of the U.S. intelligence system—either naively amateur in nature or viciously reckless of U.S. security if the sources happened to hold any responsible positions in our security organization.

Finally, there have come the trumpeting swivel-chair warriors, stirred by blurred recollections of Kipling's days, who demand such belligerent acts as blockades. It is surprising that Mr. Nixon could so quickly parole himself from his self-announced sentence of long-term silence. It is appropriate, however, that he selected the setting of Mr. Jack Paar's program for the announcement of what in other circumstances would have constituted a grave demand for acts of war.

Seen from the Caribbean area, Mr. Kennedy's victory over the Cuban missiles is not diluted by these strangely motivated domestic attacks. The Kennedy policy has established, for the last Latin doubter, Castro's suppliant role as a Communist satellite. And by refusing to bring Castro down by the brute force of Yankee arms, Mr. Kennedy has restored faith in the maturity and sense of partnership with South America now infusing U.S. policy.

RESCUE ISN'T THE ANSWER

The Cuban exiles in the Caribbean area have fairly easy and constant communication with Cuba. They know that dissatisfaction with Castro is constantly growing. But they also know that within Cuba there is little desire to be "rescued" from Castro by Yankee arms, only to be returned to the chaos of corruption existing before Castro's tyranny.

"The people of Cuba," a leading exile said, "have done more fundamental political thinking in the past 4 years than in the preceding 50 years." And the Cuban people are reported as wanting not merely an overthrow of Castro, but the creation of a new governmental system that will permit Cubans, by themselves, to find a democratic destiny.

Cubans of this school of thought are horrified by the bellicosity of a Nixon. They are depressed by the partisan speeches in the United States which indicate that we should reassume a benevolent guardianship over Cuba.

Those Cubans who engaged in the early planning of the Bay of Pigs fiasco still remember the callous ideas of superiority held by CIA officials. "The first thing I was asked by the CIA officer in charge," says a leading Cuban exile, "was to state my attitude toward restoration of the King Ranch properties."

These exiles—predominantly young professional men of moderately liberal and democratic leanings—are determined that Castro will be overthrown from within Cuba. They have no interest in a Guatemala type coup d'etat directed by the CIA—or any other outside organization.

They are seeking financial support without strings. And support is just beginning to come, in trickles, from among the exiles themselves and from other Caribbean democratic forces. This is aid without any strings, without any commitments aside from the moral assurance of these men that Cuba shall be freed of communism and freed of corruption.

TOPSY-TURVY SETTING

From the United States, these exiles and their working colleagues now in Cuba will welcome only a form of support for which we have little governmental experience. They do not want the large-scale, massively supervised support that has been America's method in South Korea and South Vietnam.

For in Cuba the tables are turned about topsy-turvy from the usual cold war setting. Here Castro occupies the place of Syngman Rhee or Diem—an unpopular leader propped by massive support of a major power. And in Cuba, it is the Communist bloc, for once, that is trying to prop an unpopular government with an expensive supply line running across thousands of oceanic miles.

The anti-Castro resistance that is already a-building takes heart from the lessons of other areas. These Cubans know that 500,000 French soldiers, including the ruthless professionals of the Foreign Legion, could not conquer the relatively weak bands of native Algerian rebels. They know how large a threat to massive U.S. efforts a few thousand well-trained and dedicated Vietcong Communists have become. They know that ours is an age when force can impose an unpopular dictatorship only when it is as totally overwhelming as the Soviet divisions in East Germany.

The greatest U.S. aid to the free Cuban movement will not come from military action against Castro. The sort of action recommended by Mr. Nixon smacks so much of Yankee imperialism that in the final analysis it could only help Castro.

The major things needed from U.S. policy are already coming forth under President Kennedy. His firm and courageous elimination of the Soviet missiles, and his subsequent actions, have prevented the Communists from turning Cuba into a satellite firmly held by Soviet might.

CLASSIC REVOLUTIONARIES

The responsibility for the final downfall of Castro lies with the people of Cuba. They are now just beginning the gathering of their forces, inside Cuba and among the exiles in the Caribbean area and on the U.S. mainland.

The young men who today are forming these revolutionary forces of freedom are not prominent on our TV screens or in our press photographs. And they are revolutionaries—in the classic sense—not merely opponents of Castro but opponents of his betrayal of the revolution which Cuba under Batista and his predecessors had so long needed.

They are gathering now, and have been for 15 months since their morale began recovering from the almost fatal defeat of the Bay of Pigs. They are resolute in their determination to see Cuba liberated by Cubans. They are not merely wary of, but in fact openly hostile toward, the sort of U.S. support that would make them American satellites.

This is the dominant characteristic of the new Cuban democratic revolutionary movement. It is a characteristic which will never be understood by CIA officers who ask for promises about the future fate of the King Ranch or other U.S. investments in Cuba.

In the final analysis, these Cuban freedom forces are poised to fight the only kind of "war of liberation" that the free world can countenance. Their guerrilla tactics will be frankly imitative of Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh. But their political strategy will be drawn from the experience of Washington and Franklin and Jefferson. For their war will not be aimed to establish a U.S. hegemony but rather to create a new free land.

SUCCOR THAT FAILED

The extent of the determination of the Cuban liberation movement can be shown by a recent poignant example.

Still in Castro's torturing jails, untouched by any ransom effort of Mr. Donovan, are thousands of anti-Castro Cubans. A small group of anti-Communist leaders has been held together under maximum security conditions by Castro. The group, of 25 or so, is composed of men and women sentenced to prison terms averaging 30 years, and they have been tortured and starved since their arrest.

> Four months ago the Cuban liberation movement inside Cuba succeeded in infiltrating the military guarding the prison, the inside prison guards and officials at a nearby landing spot. Conditions were established that gave favorable odds for the success of a "smash and grab" raid by a small landing force of 40 men.
>
> All that was needed by way of outside help was a single fast ship—large enough to put 40 armed men ashore and then take aboard the 25 rescued prisoners.
>
> Weeks were spent in attempts to get a boat. A genteel smuggler with anti-Castro leanings seemed close to offering an appropriate vessel. Then negotiations fell through.
>
> The next week, the 25 suffering prisoners were moved inland to a new heavily guarded prison in the interior of Cuba. Castro regularly moves his more important prisoners as a security safeguard. The chance for rescue had passed.
>
> PATIENT TO A POINT
>
> Among the prisoners, very ill and perhaps even dying, are a man and a woman each of whom is engaged to an exile leader in the United States. But even under such extreme personal stress, the liberation force leaders refused to seek out CIA aid.
>
> "We shall have to wait," one of the exiles said recently, "even if we wait a long time. For this time Cuba must be freed by Cubans who are responsible only to their fellow Cubans. We are pledged to create democracy and self-respect where before Castro we knew only chaos and corruption—and now we have only Communist tyranny. We shall wait. But not forever. Our forces are beginning to gather. And our revolution shall succeed—a revolution for democracy but nevertheless a revolution, and not just a counterrevolution against Castro."
>
> The young man of 38 who said this is brave. He is a well-educated professional with a graduate degree from a U.S. university. He is physically fit beyond even the rigors of a 50-mile hike. He was a leader of the underground against Batista. He supported Castro until the Communist domination became apparent. Then he headed a major part of the anti-Castro underground.
>
> He seemed, to this observer, another impressive example of those courageous resisters of tyranny who have made up some of the best men of our times. He seemed an omen—a working, living omen—of hope for the triumph of freedom.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Texas for his fine defense of the administration's Cuban policy. What he has said is eminently correct.

It occurs to me that it is high time that the carping critics of the administration's policy change their tune, and admit that, insofar as Cuba is concerned, our policy there has been a huge success.

I further agree with the Senator from Texas that the present course of firmness and quiet commonsense which President Kennedy is following with respect to Castro and Cuba and the administration's efforts to mobilize all the other American states to follow a policy of containment to prevent the spread of subversion, but not breaking our treaties and international law, are entitled to the support of all Members of the Senate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for his kind words about me.

I could say no less than I have said, since at the time when this crisis developed, I was—as I have stated—one of the six Members of the Senate, together with six Members of the House of Representatives, in South America, as delegates to the Interparliamentary Union. At the time when the quarantine on Cuba was first proclaimed, those of us who were delegates were asked many questions. It will be recalled that among them was the question of whether Russia would attempt to break through the blockade. But then the ships from Russia turned away.

Then Russia admitted that she had borne false witness to the world about having nuclear missiles in Cuba; and then Khrushchev promised to pull them out of Cuba.

Some persons argue that Khrushchev did not pull all of them out of Cuba. They seek to obscure the greater victory—in that Khrushchev admitted that he was wrong, and promised to pull out of Cuba the missiles he had there. Khrushchev pledged to the people of the United States, to the people of the free world, and to all the world that he would pull those missiles out of Cuba. That was a diplomatic victory of great proportions, and it had an electrifying effect on all those who were assembled at that time at the meeting in Brasília.

I have lived all my life in Texas, and I lived for 3½ years at El Paso, on the border. In all that time I have seen many Latin Americans; but at no other time in my life have I seen the desire of the American people for an American diplomatic victory reach the peak which it reached at that time, in connection with Cuba.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

INVESTIGATION OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 56) to investigate antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] has an amendment which may clarify this matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], who wishes to withdraw the amendment he has offered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am authorized by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] to join in asking that the pending amendment be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I now submit the following amendment: On page 3, in line 8, to strike out "$535,000", and in lieu thereof insert "$468,250".

This is a compromise figure which is arranged on the basis that the committee shall give us an economist in the range of $16,000; and, in addition thereto, the $25,000 will then be used, under direction of the minority, for the additional staff. We believe we can consummate it and can have a total of eight, instead of nine, as per our original request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The **Legislative Clerk.** On page 3, in line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$535,000", and to insert in lieu thereof "$468,250".

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not wish to be bound by the number "8". The idea is that out of the regular appropriation the minority will get one other person in the economist class; and then I would follow the direction of the Senator from Illinois in connection with the $25,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is understood.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 56), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a complete, comprehensive, and continuing study and investigation of unlawful restraints and monopolies, and of the antitrust and monopoly laws of the United States, their administration, interpretation, operation, enforcement, and effect, and to determine and from time to time redetermine the nature and extent of any legislation which may be necessary or desirable for—
>
> (1) clarification of existing law to eliminate conflicts and uncertainties where necessary;
>
> (2) improvement of the administration and enforcement of existing laws; and
>
> (3) supplementation of existing law to provide any additional substantive, procedural, or organizational legislation which may be needed for the attainment of the fundamental objects of the laws and the efficient administration and enforcement thereof.
>
> Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from march 1, 1963, to January 31, 1964, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,600 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.
>
> Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.
>
> Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $468,250, shall be paid from the contingent fund for the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the resolution, as amended, was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK obtained the floor.

NUCLEAR-TEST BAN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for yielding to me. I shall be as brief as possible.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey] and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] have both been speaking with great eloquence and fervor in behalf of the administration's position on a nuclear-test ban. I wish to join them in their remarks; I think both those Senators are absolutely correct.

At this time I wish to call attention to a very fine editorial, published in the Milwaukee Journal, which supports the position those Senators take.

In the editorial it is pointed out that—

> Any lull in negotiations can be used to good effect here at home. There is a special need to answer congressional critics who accuse treaty negotiators of going too far to accommodate the Russians. There is need to explain to the public why 7 on-site inspections are deemed sufficient now, instead of the 20 which were demanded a few years ago.

Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal calls for support of the administration's position and for recognition of the overwhelming importance of doing all we can to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union on a nuclear-test ban—and of course to do so in a practical and sensible way, defending our honor, at the same time.

I am very happy to have a chance to place this editorial in the Record at a time when the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], who has been leading the fight, and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], who also has been taking a very active part in the fight, are on the floor. I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> UNITED STATES TO PURSUE TEST BAN
>
> Secretary of State Rusk makes clear that efforts to reach agreement with Soviet Russia on a treaty to end nuclear testing will not cease. He concedes that prospects are not bright at the moment.
>
> Until Moscow gives evidence of being more reasonable, negotiations will have to mark time. At the most recent round of Geneva talks, the United States expressed readiness to accept as few as seven onsite inspections of suspicious underground disturbances in enforcement of a treaty. The Soviets clung to their demand for no more than three.
>
> Any lull in negotiations can be used to good effect here at home. There is a special need to answer congressional critics who accuse treaty negotiators of going too far to accommodate the Russians. There is need to explain to the public why 7 onsite inspections are deemed sufficient now instead of the 20 which were demanded a few years ago.
>
> A good start has been made in the letter of Adrian Fisher to Senator Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, a leading critic, by President Kennedy at his press conference, and now by Secretary Rusk.
>
> According to Fisher, the Deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, we can safely reduce inspections because of improved detection techniques, and because we now know that there are only 40 percent as many earthquakes in the Soviet Union each year as we originally thought. The fewer earthquakes, the less chance there is of a secret underground nuclear test being mistaken for a natural disturbance. Fisher also pointed out that it would take a series of underground explosions, not a scattered few, to alter the nuclear balance of power.
>
> The President emphasized this point at his press conference and also declared: "We would not accept a test ban which did not give us every assurance that we could detect a series of tests underground. We would not submit a treaty which did not provide that assurance to the U.S. Senate. Nor would the Senate approve it."
>
> It remained for Rusk to restate why efforts to achieve a treaty must go on.
>
> "Unless we can find some way to bring a stop to this qualitative arms race," he warned, "the prospect is that there not only will be increasing billions of dollars applied to nuclear testing but the arms race will become increasingly unpredictable."
>
> There is a further danger. The longer the world goes without curbing nuclear testing and the arms race the more nations will join the nuclear bomb club. Some 20 nations, it is estimated, now have the abilities to build a bomb of sorts. The more the nuclear power spreads, the greater the danger of the bomb being used.
>
> There are measures of risk in any agreement between nations, and a test ban treaty would be only a step toward halting the arms race. But as Rusk pointed out, both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations have recognized the danger of uncontrolled testing and declared it to be in the interest of America and all mankind to bring testing under control.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his strong support on this question, and for bringing to our attention the editorial of the excellent newspaper in Milwaukee, the Milwaukee Journal. It is extremely helpful and reassuring. The fact is that the treaty which our Government is presenting in Geneva today is a more practical, exacting, and safeguarded treaty in terms of American national security interests than any treaty proposal presented at any time in preceding years. It has been worked out on the basis of scientific calculation and fact, as I tried to indicate in the Senate a few days ago, in a detailed and, I believe, a well-documented speech.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It was, indeed. It was a superb speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The administration's proposal at Geneva represents very careful planning and thoughtful consideration of the difficult scientific problems that relate to the detection of earth movements as a result of nuclear blasts. I really believe that the treaty is in our national interest, and I feel, as the editorial states, that we must set the record straight back home so that it does not appear to the public or to the world that the loudest voices in America are opposing the beginnings of some arms control program among the nations of the earth.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Minnesota. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for putting into the Record the fine editorial of the Milwaukee Journal. As the Senator from Minnesota said in this speech, it is difficult indeed to get into print or into the newspapers the true story of the position of the United States in respect to a nuclear test-ban treaty. In his excellent speech to which the Senator from Wisconsin referred, my friend from Minnesota made it perfectly clear that all of the critics of the test-ban position of our Government got headlines and front-page stories. They appeared in newspapers all over the country. At that time when he made his speech, which was the ablest argument in support of the treaty which has yet been made, the Senator from Minnesota predicted it would hardly scratch a line of print in the press the next day. In fact, it did not. The speech got no play in the press anywhere that I saw. Certainly it did not appear in the metropolitan newspapers here or in my State. Yet this very morning, when a certain gentleman over in the other body who has been bitterly opposed to the test-ban negotiations and the possibility of a test-ban treaty, spoke his piece for the third or fourth time, it appeared in headlines: "Republicans Again Attack Test-Ban Treaty."

A picture accompanied the story. I am sure it is an inaccurate representation of the true facts. An enormous area inside of Russia was shown where it is alleged that it would be impossible for an underground nuclear explosion to be detected.

That story appeared prominently in the newspapers. But we do not get in the press a word reporting the sound position of the administration, as so ably set forth on the floor of the Senate in great detail and well documented by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. The Senator is absolutely correct in what he has said in reference to the discussion of this very vital issue. Apparently the only way we can get any comment on our position in the columns of the press is by an exchange of letters to the editor in the Washington Post. I do not believe that that is the way news ought to be generated. I think debate should take place in the Senate. Last week or 2 weeks ago we did have a discussion on this whole subject of a nuclear test ban.

Letters to the editor are one thing, but sincere discussion in the Senate on this question is another thing.

I point out that I saw the newspaper story this morning again in the Washington Post, accompanied by a big picture of a Member of the other body showing that there were approximately 2 million square miles in the heartland of Russia which could camouflage or mask nuclear blasts of an underground nature.

The map was drawn so poorly that the person who drew the map would have been flunked in an elementary course in geography at any country school.

More importantly, the facts upon which the map was predicated were incorrect. Anyone who knows enough to come in out of the rain would know that they are wrong. But there is constant repetition of this sheer nonsense—nonsense which, I may add, is rather dangerous. There are several ways to pollute the atmosphere. One way is by nuclear fallout. Another way is by sheer playing political nonsense. We have been witnessing some of that political nonsense. But it seems to get on the front page. I suggest that comics ought to be on the comic page and not on the front page. What has been going on in some of the present talk on nuclear test prohibition is sheer tragedy, and comedy, may I add—comedy in terms of the facts being misleading, and tragedy, and tragic indeed in terms of the consequences to the world.

I wish to thank both the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Pennsylvania and, may I say, others in this body whose voices have been raised on the side of a sensible, safeguarded agreement relating to nuclear test prohibition, but those voices are seldom reported. All one needs to do is to say that the administration is selling out the security of our country and, bango, the one making the statement receives four columns across the front page or the inside page. Its appearance does not mean that the speaker has been factual. It means he is irresponsible, and irresponsibility has no place in these matters of the discussion of our national security.

I would add only that if the administration's proposal is so bad and so weakens our security, then why do not the Russians accept it? I thought they were out to give us the business. I thought they wanted to see us destroyed. I thought they wanted to overwhelm us. If the administration is presenting a proposal that is shot through with weakness and with serious limitations to our national security—if it is a proposal that would weaken the United States—I would have thought that Khrushchev himself would have come over to Geneva and have embraced it. Instead, the Russians say that it is too tough. They reject it out of hand. They will have nothing to do with it. The reason they will not have anything to do with it is that it is a safeguarded, sensible, scientifically designed treaty and proposal, and it is about time that the public understood it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I wish to say once again that I am very proud and happy to march behind him and support him on this issue as well as on many others.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have the floor. I would be happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado so that he may interrogate the Senator from Minnesota, with the understanding that I shall not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

I shall be brief. As I understand, the Member of the other body to whom the Senator from Minnesota referred has been a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which has been studying this question, hearing all the evidence, and presumably should be well informed in giving out the facts as he sees them. Am I correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator is correct. The Member of the other body, for whom I will always speak with respect, is undoubtedly giving out the facts as he sees them. At one time I was a teacher. I had some students. When they took a test, they gave me back the facts as they saw them. At times I flunked them because their facts were wrong. The facts as we see them may not necessarily be the facts, but one's conception of the facts. Distinguished Members of the other body, as well as Members of this body equally distinguished, have their points of view as to the facts. There is such a thing as a fact and there is such a thing as a point of view. I repeat what I have said. Some of the statements that have been made in respect to the nuclear test ban treaty are not factual. They are opinions. Likewise, some of the statements that the Senator from Minnesota has made are opinions. As I said in the Record 2 weeks ago, at some points facts are no longer clear and well defined. Then we come to value judgments. But when we get to the factual matter, the facts are there. Beyond that it is a question-of-value judgment.

Mr. DOMINICK. The point I was trying to make is that the Senator from Minnesota, for whose opinion I have a high regard, referred to some with whom he did not agree as being irresponsible. I did not wish to have the Record show the opinion of a Member of the other body as being irresponsible.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not intend to speak of my colleagues as being irresponsible. I wished to say that some of the statements I have read are irresponsible. Where those statements came from is a matter of research. It will not take long to find out where they came from. There have been some irresponsible statements. I do not wish to say that either political party has a monopoly upon irresponsibility. Both parties have spawned some, may I say, even on this issue.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senators.

ADMINISTRATION AGENCY TO WIN FASTER ACTION FROM REGULATORY AGENCIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, about 2 years ago—in December of 1960—Dean Landis, of Harvard Law School, made a report on the quasi-judicial agencies of our Government. It was a very constructive report in which he made a series of proposals as to what could be done to improve their operations. He pointed out in many ways how their operations sorely needed improvement.

For instance, there were delays in the administration of justice which were quite excessive—in some cases 1 year, and in some cases 2 years before decisions were handed down.

This morning's Wall Street Journal reported that the administration plans to seek a new agency to reform the regulatory groups. It is pointed out that this new agency would have an advisory role with relation to the 100-odd independent or semiautonomous commissions, boards, or agencies; to try to make constructive proposals—and to follow them up—to see to it that these agencies do a much better job in the future than they have done in the past.

Mr. President, in connection with this question, last January, shortly after the second anniversary of the Landis report, I wrote letters to the heads of several of these agencies, asking them what they had done to bring their agencies into line with the Landis recommendations. I wrote among others to William L. Cary, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission; to Mr. Frank W. McCulloch, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board; to Mr. Laurence K. Walrath, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission; and to others.

The replies I have received from these gentlemen indicate in each case that there has been substantial progress. For example, the Interstate Commerce Commission states that it had the greatest number of cases closed in its history, during the past year.

The Securities and Exchange Commission report a 100-percent increase in registration statements. It has not been able to make much progress as to handling them, and it still takes an inordinate length of time for that, but at least the Commission is keeping its head above water and is not running in the wrong direction or losing ground.

Mr. Frank McCulloch reports that the National Labor Relations Board has been making signal progress and that the time for handling many cases has been cut in half.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Wall Street Journal, my letters to the Chairmen of the various agencies, and the answers I have received from the three Chairmen may be printed in the Record at this point.

I hope the Congress will give careful consideration to what seems to be a thoughtful, constructive, and very useful proposal by the administration. It is about time that we had some way of bringing order to these headless agencies which have proliferated so greatly and which have perfectly enormous economic power.

There being no objection, the article and letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Administration Seeks New Agency To Reform Regulatory Groups—Speedier ICC, NLRB Decisions Are a Goal, Proposals May Have Big Impact on Business

(By Louis M. Kohlmeier)

Washington—President Kennedy, probably within the next few weeks, will ask Congress to put a head on the headless "fourth branch" of Government. Some long-hoped-for reforms could result.

The "fourth branch" is a highly informal assemblage comprising 100-odd independent or semiautonomous commissions, boards, and agencies. Many of them perform both judicial and administrative functions. They range from such potent business regulators as the Federal Trade and Interstate Commerce Commissions to the more obscure Indian Claims Commission.

The agencies' big shortcomings, as one administration official sees them, are "inordinate, costly delays" in decisions, lack of uniformity in procedures, and questions of fairness in their methods. So the administration aims to superimpose on the "fourth branch" a new Government echelon: A Presidentially appointed council of 11 members, atop a larger assembly of delegates from inside and outside Government. This superagency could recommend, though not order, reforms.

WIDESPREAD IMPACT

Some possible remedies that this new headquarters might push have already been worked up. The proposals could carry high significance for those who deal with "fourth branch" agencies, whether they're New York stockbrokers, Texas gas pipeline operators, California television broadcasters, or some larger object of Federal regulation.

For example: To reduce the months and even years it takes agencies to decide whether to allow cuts or increases in railroad, airline, pipeline, and other rates, a whole set of procedural reforms might be adopted. Parties to a case might be required to submit the bulk of their evidence, reduced to writing, early in the case. Rigid limits might be set on the time a hearing could run. Examiners who conduct hearings would get more authority to limit cross-examination of witnesses and insure continuous sessions, instead of "hearing by interludes."

A little-known "black list" that circulates among some agencies names companies that have been barred from receiving Federal contracts "without prior specification of reasons or opportunity to be heard," according to a White House-sponsored group that studies the agencies. A suggested solution would bar any blacklisting until an agency offered a contractor a hearing and handed down in writing its conclusions and reasons.

The Federal Communications Commission, which has been criticized for failure to explain its awards of television and radio station licenses, might be required to "fully publicize and subject to some form of public discussion" its criteria, particularly concerning broadcasters' programing.

COMMUNICATIONS CURB?

And each agency might be required to write its own code barring off-the-record communications between commissioners and outsiders hoping to influence some pending decision. Any agency official who received such a communication would be required to report it to a superior who'd make it public. The code might provide that a lawyer who attempted such back-door influence could be censured or even lose his right to practice before the agency; an applicant involved automatically could be denied the license or other privilege he sought.

These and other reform recommendations, now under study at the White House, may be sent to Congress shortly. Or they might be held back until the new superagency could be set up to review them.

The administration's decision to go to Congress with agency reform legislation came after White House aids saw a compilation of the time it still takes agencies after years of talk about "regulatory lag," to decide cases.

These facts and figures, put together during the past 2 years by a White House study group called the Administrative Conference of the United States, represent the first comprehensive survey of regulatory lag ever conducted, according to the Conference. During the fiscal year ended last June, it found that the Interstate Commerce Commission on average was taking 1½ years to decide a transportation rate case. An unfair labor charge rested 350 days on average with the National Labor Relations Board. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board needed 248 days to decide the average application to organize a new federally chartered savings and loan association. And the Civil Service Commission consumed an average of 350 days on proceedings under the Hatch Act, which restricts political activities of Federal employees.

Other evidence of snail-pace action abounds. The Atlantic Coast Line and Seaboard Air Line Railroads, which filed merger plans with the ICC in July 1960, still are awaiting a final yes or no. The other day the Civil Aeronautics Board finally concluded a proceeding ordered in 1954 on subsidy payments to Colonial Airlines, a company swallowed up 7 years ago in a merger with Eastern Air Lines.

What worries the administration most, one official suggests, is that regulatory delay may hold back the whole economy. Says he: "A year's unnecessary delay in a license to build a hydroelectric project or a gas pipeline can have effects all down the line, on constructing, the hiring of operating personnel, and ultimately consumers."

No one can pinpoint the total dollars-and-cents impact, but certainly big sums are involved. Natural gas pipeline companies have pending at the Federal Power Commission applications to construct some $914 million worth of new facilities; on average, it takes the Commission 9 months to a year to decide these cases. Pending for some 5 years at the FPC have been the bid of four private utilities to build a $190-million dam on the Snake River at the Idaho-Oregon border and the competing application of a group of public utility districts for a $369-million project.

Four big railroad merger plans dragging on before the ICC would produce estimated annual savings of $182 million, much of which probably would be invested in new facilities.

Any effort at reform must face the stubborn fact that the regulatory realm is both highly complex and politically tender.

Almost every one of the 100-odd agencies was set up under its own law to deal with a particular economic or other problem. So reform would require changes in a lot of laws. Moreover, because each of the agencies is independent or semiautonomous, there has been little cooperation even on improved procedures the agencies can set up themselves, and no general reform leadership has emerged from within the agencies.

Their independence has made the agencies balk at direct White House intervention. And they've frequently had congressional support in fending off the White House. The lawmakers, who had a major hand in creating many of the agencies, like to think of them as "arms of Congress." Because of these political considerations, Mr. Kennedy apparently has rejected an idea offered by an adviser early in his administration for a White House czar to oversee the agencies.

Instead, the White House has drafted bills to set up a superagency, closely following a recommendation of the administrative conference which studied the fourth branch. As chief executive officer, this agency would have a chairman appointed by the President. But because he'd be outside the White House and because his power would be limited, it's reasoned that he'd be something less than the czar once proposed.

The Chairman, with a rank roughly that of a Cabinet Under Secretary, would be spokesman for the superagency before congressional committees and in public forums. He'd preside over an 11-member council, also appointed by the President, that would function like a board of directors. But ultimate authority to recommend new laws and procedures would rest with an assembly of some 80 delegates, mainly from the agencies but including representatives from other Government branches, bar groups, and universities.

January 11, 1963.

Hon. William L. Cary,
Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C.

Dear Bill: What progress has been made in putting into action the recommendations of Judge Landis' report on regulatory agencies of December 1960 with respect to your Commission?

My particular interest is in obtaining statistics on the Commission's current caseload, the backlog, the amount of time it now takes to dispose of cases, the Commission's current budget and whether or not this budget represents an increase or a decrease in relation to its budget for 1959.

Your cooperation in this respect will be greatly appreciated by me.

Sincerely,

William Proxmire,
U.S. Senator.

January 11, 1963.

Hon. Frank W. McCulloch,
Chairman, National Labor Relations Board,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: What progress has been made in putting into action the recommendations of Judge Landis' report on regulatory agencies of December 1960 with respect to your Board?

My particular interest is in obtaining statistics on the Board's current caseload, the backlog, the amount of time it now takes to dispose of cases, the Board's current budget, and whether or not this budget represents an increase or a decrease in relation to its budget for 1959.

Your cooperation in this respect will be greatly appreciated by me.

Sincerely,

William Proxmire,
U.S. Senator.

January 11, 1963.

Hon. Laurence K. Walrath,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Walrath: What progress has been made in putting into action the recommendations of Judge Landis' report on regulatory agencies of December 1960 with respect to your Commission?

My particular interest is in obtaining statistics on the Commission's current caseload, the backlog, the amount of time it now takes to dispose of cases, the Commission's current budget and whether or not this budget represents an increase or a decrease in relation to its budget for 1959.

Your cooperation in this respect will be greatly appreciated by me.

Sincerely,

William Proxmire,
U.S. Senator.

National Labor Relations Board,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1963.

Hon. William Proxmire,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

Dear Bill: This is in reply to your letter of January 11, 1963, which I acknowledged on the 18th, concerning the Landis report on regulatory agencies of December 1960 and the current statistical picture at the Board.

You may recall that Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1961 grew out of the Landis report's principal recommendation for the N.L.R.B. This plan, which would have enabled the Board to delegate to its trial examiners the power to make initial decisions in unfair labor practice cases, subject to a limited discretionary review by the Board, was defeated in the House, although favorable reports on it came from both the House and Senate Government Operations Committees.

We still believe in and endorse the principles of that plan. Its wisdom has been confirmed by our experience since May 15, 1961, with the delegation of decisionmaking in representation cases to our regional directors. As our timelag figures show, the delegation of authority in representation cases and our revised internal procedures have permitted the Board to issue decisions somewhat more promptly and to cope with the increased intake of unfair labor practice complaint cases which would have been impossible but for the delegation of representation cases.

Although the need for a plan 5 or similar plan is not as urgent today as it was in 1961, the rise in our caseload and the continuing, though now decreased, backlog may still make essential the eventual attainment of the objectives of plan 5 of 1961. Hence, legislative proposals, such as S. 1734 (with revisions as proposed by the Bureau of the Budget), which was introduced in the 87th Congress, or other proposed legislation that we hope will be introduced with the President's approval to carry out the administrative conference's recommendation 9, would be, if enacted, a substantial further help in meeting many of our current problems.

The basic administrative problem of the division of the agency between the Board and its independent General Counsel was discussed in some detail by Landis. He concluded that a return to the earlier system (pre-Taft-Hartley) would be preferable. But no one, least of all Mr. Landis, has considered this feasible, and no action has been proposed to effect this change.

While Landis stated that "inordinate delay and docket congestions" were not the NLRB's "pattern," he and we recognized that the time required for disposition of cases was too long. We have made signal progress on this matter, cutting the time for representation case decisions in the regions almost in half, to a median average of 40 days in July–December 1962, and reducing the contested complaint case median average to around 300 days. The enclosed tables give these figures more fully.

The case intake which the filing parties control, not the Board, and which averaged a little over 13,000 for the first 10 years under Taft-Hartley, has now virtually doubled, to about 26,000. The current and comparative intake of cases since 1958 may be seen from the attached table.

The numbers of contested cases on hand, our backlog, at the end of the last 5 fiscal years and as of December 30, 1962, are as follows:

	Complaint cases			Representation cases			Total
	Contested	Stipulated	Total	Contested	Stipulated	Total	
1958	190	9	199	220	2	222	421
1959	196	14	210	387	12	399	609
1960	312	18	330	516	6	522	852
1961	443	17	460	540	9	549	1,009
1962	305	18	323	150	15	165	488
Dec. 30, 1962	297	9	306	112	18	130	436

Our current budget (fiscal 1963) of $21,006,000 exceeds our 1959 budget of $13,256,600 by approximately $8 million. The growth in the Board's budget since 1958 is as follows:

1958	$9,749,000
1959	13,256,600
1960	15,280,000
1961	18,213,000
1962	19,989,000
1963	21,006,000
1964 (requested)	23,060,000

I know of your deep and consistent interest in economy, and I believe you know from my experience with Senator Douglas that I am trained in the same school. I want therefore to underline that in the 1¾ years for which I can account the Board and General Counsel have exercised the greatest care in their caseload estimates (and the actual figures have been amazingly close, thus far in excess of estimates), have pursued every means of securing greater efficiency, have increased the settlement averages significantly (avoiding litigation) and have budgeted for increased productivity in each succeeding year, despite staff turnover. I cannot do justice to these matters in a paragraph. But the figures alone do not tell our story.

If you have other questions about any of these subjects, or other aspects of the Agency's work, please let me know. I shall be glad to send you whatever information may be helpful.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

Frank W. McCulloch,
Chairman.

P.S.—Because of its broad scope, I shall enclose a copy of the General Counsel's 1962 report, which I think you will find interesting.

Interstate Commerce Commission,
Washington, D.C., January 16, 1963.

Hon. William Proxmire,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Proxmire: This is in reply to your letter of January 11, 1963, about the action the Commission has taken in connection with the Landis Report on Regulatory Agencies, dated December 27, 1960.

The Landis report was but one of several reports and studies concerning this Commission which were released in the fall of 1960. Among others was a comprehensive organization and procedures survey conducted by the management consultant firm of Booz, Allen & Hamilton. This report, authorized and paid for by the Bureau of the Budget, was received on November 9, 1960. Also at the request of the Commission, a committee of outstanding practitioners conducted an extensive survey of our operations and organization and submitted their findings and recommendations in October 1960.

On the basis of these studies and the critical self-analysis which they generated, extensive organizational and procedural changes have been made since January 1961. Stated briefly, changes were made which:

1. Strengthened the role of the Chairman.

2. Created the new office of Vice Chairman.

3. Eliminated the "reporting Commissioner" concept, relieving seven Commissioners of burdensome administrative responsibilities.

4. Reduced the number of divisions from four to three.

5. Delegated authority to the Vice Chairman to institute formal docket investigations arising out of the work of the seven regulatory bureaus.

6. Directed the seven regulatory bureaus to report to the Chairman through the Vice Chairman.

7. Adopted a procedure for assigning responsibility for important cases to individual Commissioners.

8. Limited the right of appeal to the entire Commission.

9. Established 12 new employee boards to act for the Commission in nonadversary proceedings.

10. Delegated greater authority to staff members.

11. On the basis of new legislation approved September 14, 1961, established three additional employee boards which are authorized to act for the Commission in deciding cases which involve the taking of testimony at public hearings or submission of evidence by affidavits.

12. Adopted a realinement of our field organization resulting in closer coordination of all field activities of the Commission.

With reference to your request for statistical data, please be advised that the Commission had 4,711 formal proceedings cases pending as of December 31, 1962. During fiscal year 1962, 7,588 formal cases were opened and 7,902 cases were closed. The 7,902 cases closed during fiscal year 1962 represents the greatest number of cases closed during any similar period and a figure 30 percent higher than 5 years ago. During fiscal year 1962, an average of 7.8 months was required to close a case, either on the basis of a decision on the merits or on the basis of an order discontinuing the proceeding prior to a decision. Those cases dismissed or discontinued prior to a decision required 3.6 months to close, those cases decided by an examiner's recommended report becoming effective required 6.8 months to close, and those cases decided by the Commission or an employee board required an average of 12.6 months to reach a decision.

The Commission's appropriation for fiscal year 1963 is $22,606,000, which amount is $3,858,200 higher than the $18,747,800 appropriated for fiscal year 1959. In 1959 the Commission's average level of employment was 2,268, for 1963 average employment is estimated at 2,426.

I appreciate the opportunity to supply you with this information. Should you desire further information, I shall be pleased to furnish it.

Sincerely yours,

Laurence K. Walrath,
Chairman.

Securities and Exchange Commission,
Washington, D.C., February 12, 1963.

Hon. William Proxmire,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Proxmire: Since Chairman Cary is out of the city, I am further responding to your letter of January 11, 1963, in which you requested information regarding

the progress that has been made by this Commission in effectuating recommendations contained in Mr. Landis' Report on Regulatory Agencies of December 1960. In addition, you requested statistics on the Commission's current caseload, backlog, the time required to dispose of cases and the Commission's current budget.

The discussions and recommendations contained in Mr. Landis' report applying to the Securities and Exchange Commission dealt mainly with four matters: (1) delay in the processing of registration statements; (2) the need for controls to be more widely extended as against investment advisers; (3) the need for delegation of certain of the Commission's functions; and (4) the holding of individual Commissioners responsible for the preparation of opinions. Significant steps have been taken in each of these areas which, it is believed, meet the criticisms expressed by Mr. Landis in his report.

1. Registration statements: During fiscal years 1959–62, the number of registration statements filed increased progressively—almost 100 percent increase from 1959 to 1962. The tremendous upsurge in filings, despite the additional personnel to examine these statements, caused a progressive increase in the number of registration statements pending on June 30 of the past 4 years. (See item 1 of exhibit I.)

In recent months, it has been possible to reduce substantially the time in process for many categories of registration statements and, in addition, gradually to reduce the number of pending statements. Neither of these aspects of the Commission's work is entirely within our control, since an issuer or underwriter or both may wish to defer the effective date of a pending registration statement because of market conditions or for other business reasons. As of June 30, 1962, our records showed 730 pending statements, a fairly high percentage of which had not been completely processed at that time. As of a recent date, there were approximately 350 pending, over two-thirds of which had been reviewed. We hope that as of the end of the current fiscal year, the number of cases then pending will approximate 180. Market conditions between now and the end of June will of course largely affect the validity of our estimate.

In August 1962, the Commission modified form S–8 to permit the use of that form for the registration of securities to be offered pursuant to restricted stock options. Form S–8 is less complex than form S–1, which ordinarily would have been the appropriate form for use in connection with such offerings.

2. Investment advisers: Regulation of investment advisers has been extended in several important respects. Amendments to the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 which had been proposed by the Commission, were enacted into law in the closing days of the 86th Congress. Those amendments substantially increased the Commission's power with regard to the regulation of investment advisers. Pursuant to the authorization contained in those amendments, the Commission has adopted rules and taken other steps designed to make regulation of investment advisers more effective. The Commission has taken the following actions in this area:

(a) A new registration form indicating the new bases for disqualification from acting as an investment adviser which are now incorporated in the statute.

(b) Rule 206(4)–1 has been adopted by the Commission which has the effect of proscribing the use by investment advisers of certain specified types of advertising, and has instituted a program for the enforcement of the provisions of that rule.

(c) Rule 206(4)–2 has been promulgated which requires that clients' funds and securities held in the custody of an investment adviser be segregated, that clients be notified in writing of the place and manner in which their funds and securities will be maintained, that clients receive a report at least quarterly of transactions in their accounts and that all funds and securities of clients be verified at least once during each calendar year through examination by an independent public accountant.

(d) Rule 204–2 has been issued which requires investment advisers to maintain certain books and records, and has under consideration at the present time a proposed amendment to that rule which would require reports from persons who are associated with investment advisers and who engage in specified activities.

3. Delegations of authority: Pursuant to provisions of Public Law No. 87–592, the Commission has published a notice of proposal to adopt rules delegating certain of its functions and has received comments thereon. The comments which have been received are now being considered to determine what modification should be made in the proposed rules. It is anticipated that delegation rules will be adopted in the very near future.

4. Opinions: On January 16, 1961, shortly after the publication of Mr. Landis' report, the Commission adopted the practice of assigning to individual Commissioners the responsibility for opinions, except in cases which are of a routine nature and which may be disposed of by orders or short-form opinions, a practice that has been followed since that time.

As indicated in the attached exhibit I, the appropriation increase from fiscal 1959 to 1963 approximates $5.6 million. This increase is distributed generally as follows: $2.9 million for program increases, $1.7 million for pay increases and $1.0 million for the special study of the securities markets.

For the past 5 years, a total of about 600 positions have been added to the staff, of which approximately 400 were allocated to the investigations and enforcement program, and the registration statement and regulation A program. In addition, 65 were assigned to the special study of the securities markets. The balance or 135 positions were distributed to the several other programs administered by the Commission. In general, the progressive and substantial workload increases in major programs as shown in exhibit I exceeded the personnel allocations to these programs, thus resulting in mounting backlogs during the period 1959, through 1962. In 1963, it is anticipated that some of these backlogs will be reduced substantially.

Your request for statistics relating to pending cases is shown on pages 59 through 65 and 270 through 279 of the attached publication entitled "Statistical Data Relating to Administrative Proceedings Conducted by Federal Agencies."

Should you desire any additional information, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

Byron D. Woodside,
Commissioner.

EXHIBIT I—SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Statement of principal workload items—Fiscal years 1959 to 1963

	Actual				Estimate 1963
	1959	1960	1961	1962	
Appropriation (in thousands)	[1] $7,705	$8,100	[2] $9,512	[3] $11,412	[4] $13,286
1. Examination of registration statements:					
Pending, beginning of year	145	252	335	515	730
Filed	1,226	1,628	1,830	2,307	1,550
Subtotal	1,371	1,880	2,165	2,822	2,280
Examined	1,119	1,545	1,650	2,092	2,100
Pending, end of year	252	335	515	730	180
2. Examination of other filings and applications	475	564	670	680	600
3. Preliminary proxy statements:					
Pending, beginning of year	35	122	50	45	35
Filed	2,024	2,133	2,228	2,381	2,600
Subtotal	2,059	2,255	2,278	2,426	2,635
Examined	1,937	2,205	2,233	2,391	2,600
Pending, end of year	122	50	45	35	35
4. Examination of regulation A filings:					
Pending, beginning of year	120	147	343	289	227
Filed	854	1,049	1,057	1,065	850
Subtotal	974	1,196	1,400	1,354	1,077
Examined	827	853	1,111	1,127	1,027
Pending, end of year	147	343	289	227	50

See footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT I—SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION—Continued

Statement of principal workload items—Fiscal years 1959 to 1963—Continued

	Actual				Estimate 1963
	1959	1960	1961	1962	
5. Regulation A suspension orders:					
Pending, beginning of year	$24	$29	$31	$28	$31
Instituted during year	87	77	54	52	65
Subtotal	111	106	85	80	96
Closed during year	82	75	57	49	56
Pending, end of year	29	31	28	31	40
6. Examination of annual and periodic reports (form 8, 9, and 10K):					
Pending, beginning of year	5,833	7,154	8,865	9,947	11,819
Filed	11,094	11,698	12,404	13,769	15,200
Total for disposition	16,927	18,852	21,269	23,716	27,019
Examined	9,773	9,987	11,322	11,897	20,219
Pending, end of year	7,154	8,865	9,947	11,819	6,800
7. Examination of other annual and periodic reports:					
Pending, beginning of year	2,649	3,207	3,653	2,410	3,158
Filed	43,528	43,015	44,978	47,598	50,000
Subtotal	46,177	46,222	48,631	50,008	53,158
Examined	42,970	42,569	46,221	46,850	50,758
Pending, end of year	3,207	3,653	2,410	3,158	2,400
8. Stop order proceedings and other administrative actions:					
Pending, beginning of year	49	64	68	60	71
Instituted	46	57	47	53	90
Total for completion	95	121	115	113	161
Closed	31	53	55	42	66
Pending, end of year	64	68	60	71	95
9. Investigations including administrative, civil, and criminal proceedings:					
Pending, beginning of year	937	977	960	1,126	985
Opened	523	519	567	510	615
Subtotal	1,460	1,496	1,527	1,636	1,600
Closed	483	536	401	651	660
Pending, end of year	977	960	1,126	985	940
(a) Administrative proceedings to deny or revoke registrations of brokers and dealers or to expel from NASD:					
Pending, beginning of year	50	98	115	124	162
Opened	111	94	77	95	120
Subtotal	161	192	192	219	282
Closed	63	77	68	57	125
Pending, end of year	98	115	124	162	157
(b) Administrative proceedings to deny or revoke registrations of investment advisers:					
Pending, beginning of year	(5)	1	7	4	11
Opened	(5)	6	----------	7	25
Subtotal	(5)	7	7	11	36
Closed	(5)	----------	3	----------	25
Pending, end of year	(5)	7	4	11	11
(c) Injunction actions:					
Pending, beginning of year	(5)	(5)	84	96	105
Filed	60	91	90	89	100
Subtotal	(5)	(5)	174	185	205
Disposed	(5)	(5)	78	80	105
Pending, end of year	(5)	(5)	96	105	100
(d) Criminal reference reports referred to the Department of Justice:					
Pending, beginning of year	(5)	(5)	102	100	130
Referred	48	53	42	64	55
Subtotal	(5)	(5)	144	164	185
Disposed	(5)	(5)	44	34	60
Pending, end of year	(5)	(5)	100	130	125
10. Number of broker dealers registered, end of year	4,907	5,288	5,500	5,870	6,100
(a) Applications for broker-dealer registration:					
Pending, beginning of year	60	87	61	126	81
Received	944	1,077	1,065	1,133	1,100
Subtotal	1,004	1,164	1,126	1,259	1,181
Processed	917	1,103	1,000	1,178	1,101
Pending, end of year	87	61	126	81	80
(b) Amendments to registration of brokers and dealers:					
Pending, beginning of year	244	120	31	160	982
Received	2,573	2,985	3,193	3,337	3,100
Subtotal	2,817	3,105	3,224	3,497	4,082
Processed	2,697	3,074	3,064	2,515	3,582
Pending, end of year	120	31	160	982	500
(c) Terminations	(5)	(5)	(5)	791	800
(d) Number of broker-dealer inspections	1,471	1,499	1,627	1,515	1,670

See footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT I—SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION—Continued

Statement of principal workload items—Fiscal years 1959 to 1963—Continued

	Actual				Estimate 1963
	1959	1960	1961	1962	
11. Number of investment advisers registered, end of year	$1,671	$1,867	$1,855	$1,836	$1,600
(a) Applications for registration of investment advisers:					
Pending, beginning of year	22	30	26	24	16
Received	278	305	313	315	315
Subtotal	300	335	339	339	331
Processed	270	309	315	323	310
Pending, end of year	30	26	24	16	21
(b) Amendments to registration of investment advisers:					
Pending, beginning of year	231	16	6	65	373
Received	730	813	764	699	600
Subtotal	961	829	770	764	973
Processed	945	823	705	391	673
Pending, end of year	16	6	65	373	300
(c) Terminations	(5)	(5)	(5)	338	546
(d) Number of Investment Adviser Inspections	----------	----------	8	149	200
12. Regulation of investment companies:					
(a) Applications reviewed for exemption of transactions with affiliates, status matters, and other proposals of investment companies:					
Pending, beginning of year	44	52	86	84	93
Filed during year	102	132	130	137	175
Subtotal	146	184	216	221	268
Applications reviewed during year	94	98	132	128	208
Pending, end of year	52	86	84	93	60
(b) Review of filings for compliance with regulatory provisions of the act:					
Pending, beginning of year	22	22	52	72	51
Filed during year	1,115	1,361	1,162	1,201	1,374
Subtotal	1,137	1,383	1,214	1,273	1,325
Reviewed during year	1,115	1,331	1,142	1,222	1,300
Pending, end of year	22	52	72	51	25
(c) Review of annual compliance reports:					
Pending, beginning of year					
Filed during year	----------	----------	----------	----------	767
Subtotal	----------	----------	----------	----------	767
Reviewed during year	----------	----------	----------	----------	567
Pending, end of year	----------	----------	----------	----------	200
13. Registered investment companies:					
(a) Number of registered investment companies:					
Number at beginning of year	453	512	570	663	727
Number of registrations during year	76	67	118	97	60
Subtotal	523	579	688	760	787
Number of registrations terminated during year	11	9	25	33	30
Number of registrations end of year	512	570	663	727	757
(b) Investment company inspections	14	27	56	52	90
14. Reorganization proceedings:					
(a) Review of reorganization proceedings filed in courts	88	83	111	94	110
(b) Reorganization proceedings in which the Commission participated during the fiscal year:					
Pending, beginning of year	35	45	45	48	61
Notices of appearances filed in courts during year	14	9	12	18	20
Subtotal	49	54	57	66	81
Proceedings closed during year	4	9	9	5	11
Pending, end of year	45	45	48	61	70

---

[1] Includes $605,000 for pay increases.

[2] Includes $605,000 for pay increases.

[3] Includes $412,500 for the special study of the securities markets.

[4] Includes an estimate of $486,000 for pay increases and $537,500 for the special study of the securities markets.

[5] Not available.

REPUBLICAN UPSIDE-DOWN APPROACH TO BUDGET CUTTING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have one other insertion to make in the RECORD, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will indulge me further.

Mr. President, we have seen an example of our good friends on the Republican side of the aisle increasing spending once again, and increasing expenditures by the Federal Government.

The distinguished minority leader led the fight for a $25,000 increase, as I understand it, in the budget for the Committee on the Judiciary. That is a small amount of money. However, I think it is another specific example of the fact that Republicans do have a tendency to increase spending.

In the House of Representatives the other day there was a more spectacular example. As Mr. Roscoe Drummond pointed out this morning, the Republicans to a very great extent were instrumental in producing a military appropriation bill which, together with committee action increasing the administration's military pay bill, exceeded the Kennedy request by $1.1 billion—$1.1 billion.

As Roscoe Drummond pointed out, the Republicans seem to be going in exactly the opposite direction from the way in which they have been talking. They talk about cutting spending. They were going to cut $3 billion from defense. But in fact they are helping to increase the defense budget. So far it appears that they will vote for a bigger budget than the President himself requested.

As Roscoe Drummond pointed out, this seems to be an upside-down approach.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the excellent column written by Mr. Drummond may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BUDGET CUTTERS—AN UPSIDE-DOWN APPROACH

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The Republicans are making a very odd beginning in their avowed crusade to cut the Federal budget. It is an upside-down approach—this cutting the budget by increasing it. It is not much of a way to go about it.

The first test vote in the House dealing with fiscal 1964 provided the Republicans with the opportunity to begin to do what they have proclaimed and pledged they would do.

The test found the majority of Republicans voting to add still more to the already record-high defense budget.

It helped to produce a military appropriation bill which, together with a committee action increasing the administration's military pay bill, exceeded the Kennedy request by $1.1 billion.

It elicited a barrage of Republican criticism as the best ally the economizers could possibly have at the Pentagon, Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara.

That's the picture and unless you are wearing upside-down glasses, it looks like this:

In their first big opportunity to show that they meant it when they set a goal of $10 to $15 billion in budget-cutting, the Republicans not only took no action, they took reverse action—upped the spending.

The Republicans by their own votes are now further from their objective than when they started—and are moving in the opposite direction.

Instead of having to trim $3 billion from the defense budget, as the Republicans have been talking about doing, they now face the task—in part as a result of their own votes—of having to cut about $4 billion if they are to achieve their goal.

No wonder Representative KATHERINE ST. GEORGE, Republican, of New York, who votes economy as well as talks economy and who cast one firm ballot against the whole military authorization bill in protest over its size, had this to say after her fellow Republicans had increased it:

"How can we go out to our people, harassed taxpayers, and tell them that things have got to be cut, and then vote more than was requested?"

I suspect that this is a rhetorical, if tearful, question and that no answer is really needed. The only answer I could give is that the Republicans flunked their first economy test badly. If they hadn't cut the defense budget by a single penny, they would have only flunked by 100 percent. They did worse than that. They voted to add money to the budget; they voted to authorize more than was requested; they came up to the starting line of their economy race and took a big step backward. Unless the Republicans do have a secret formula by which appropriating more money will mean spending less, they simply talked out of one side of their mouths and voted out the other in their first economy test. Not a pretty sight.

Are the Republicans helping their cause by harassing Secretary McNamara? I doubt it.

The central criticism they bring against McNamara is that he is substituting civilian judgment for military judgment in making the final decisions of the budget and selection of weapons systems.

I do not say that the Secretary of Defense cannot err, but where does this argument take you? McNamara had to substitute civilian for military judgment in cutting $16 billion from the total military requests of the three services down to $52.5 billion. If he hadn't the Republicans would have to cut $20 billion instead of $4 billion to reach their goal.

If the Republicans in Congress are going to succeed in cutting $4 billion from the defense appropriations, they will also be substituting civilian for military judgment.

There is, however, one military command they could well ponder: "About face."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to place in the RECORD, as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration of this body—a new member, to be sure—the view that the effort to increase the appropriation of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate was purely a Republican maneuver. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] was only doing what he thought was proper in order to carry out an arrangement made with the minority leader and the other minority members of that committee, but the subcommittee today will have 44 employees, though prior to the increase it had 39 employees.

The subcommittee proposes to investigate a host of different matters, including a number which, in my opinion, would come more appropriately within the jurisdiction of other committees.

If we wish to cut our waste, this would have been a place to support the Senator from Nevada in his effort to cut the appropriation. The subcommittee has doubled its staff number since 1956, and there are among the employees a number of individuals who, I am informed, are of not much use to the Senator from Tennessee in his efforts to carry on his investigations of the operation of the monopoly and antitrust laws.

I commend the Senator from Wisconsin for raising this point on the floor.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before I take my seat, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will indulge me, I wish to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania, who, with his characteristic graciousness, has permitted me to make my insertions in the RECORD prior to his speech. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I merely wished to express my appreciation to the Senator from Pennsylvania and to the Senator from Wisconsin for their expressions about the obvious power which they have attributed to the Republicans, both on the Committee on the Judiciary and in the Senate. It is quite unusual, when we are outnumbered 2 to 1 for the Republicans to be able to be so successful in endeavors to get proper staffing on committees. I think this is quite a compliment to the Republicans for their ability and prestige.

Mr. CLARK. I think it is, too, I say to my friend from Colorado, but this is the way they operate in this bipartisan coalition which I have called "the establishment." As a part of the contribution which the Republicans make to "the establishment," every now and then they are given four or five more employees on some subcommittee.

UNITED STATES AND UNITED NATIONS CONGO POLICIES: SUCCESSES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall speak on the United States and the United Nations Congo policies; their successes and their future opportunities.

Mr. President, in the early days of the session, harsh criticism of the administration's support of the United Nations' activities in the Congo was heard in this Chamber and read in certain journals.

> The United Nations has involved us in a terrible and expensive war in the Congo—a war of bald aggression.

One of our colleagues was heard to say. It was even said by another Senator that—

> The situation in the Congo is chaotic and menacing, and our Government is still pursuing an African policy which parallels Communist aims and objectives, which is inimical to the best interests of this country and of the so-called Dark Continent.

Another member was widely quoted as saying:

> It is an unspeakable tragedy * * * that the U.N. should be starting wars.

Mr. Luce's weekly journal of plutocratic opinion, Time, added fuel to the fire:

> The world is horrified witness to the spectacle of foreign soldiers, aided by the United States, seizing the towns and firing on native soldiers of the Congo. * * * The blazing guns and swooping planes of the United Nations hardly fitted the pacifying intent of its original Congo mandate.

At this time when President Kennedy's policies toward Cuba and a test ban are the objects of equally harsh criticism, I think it may be useful to attempt an objective review of the Congo situation to see why the critics, who were so vocal just a few weeks ago, are so very silent indeed today.

I submit that such a review indicates that the United Nations and the U.S. Government, which has consistently supported United Nations actions in the Congo, have scored a brilliant triumph.

Though perseverance, tact, wisdom, the United Nations has brought a real semblance of order out of the chaos existing in the Congo during the early days of its independence. As Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, stated recently, the Katanga secession has ended and "the phase of active military involvement by United Nations forces in the Congo is about over." Threats to destroy plant and equipment in Katanga and elsewhere have faded. The peaceful return of European residents has accelerated. Soviet technicians and military air and surface craft, once present in large numbers, have been withdrawn. A brave and moderate Congolese, Cyrille Adoula, is leading his country in peace and freedom in the difficult reconstruction and development tasks ahead.

I. RECENT HISTORY

The drive for Congolese independence got underway in earnest in December of

1958 with a call for an immediate end to Belgian rule at the Pan-African Conference in Ghana. Sporadic demonstration started in key cities throughout the Congo. In January 1959, serious riots occurred in Léopoldville and elsewhere, and by the end of the year, demands for independence could no longer be ignored.

In January 1960, King Baudouin invited representatives of the various Congolese parties and factions to a conference in Brussels. On January 27, Belgian and Congolese officials agreed that the Congo would become independent by mid-year. The conferees also agreed that the six Provinces of the Congo—Katanga, Léopoldville, Kivu, Kasai, Oriental, and Equator—would be integrated into a single independent government with a bicameral, freely elected parliament in Léopoldville. The parliament was charged with the responsibility for electing a national president, who would appoint a premier.

The first general elections were held in the Congo under Belgian control in May of 1960.

In Katanga Province, which was destined to play a crucial role in the months to follow, Moise Tshombe's party, the Conakat—the political arm of the Lunda and Bayeke tribes—won 91,116 votes. The opposing Balubaket party, representing the Baluba tribe, received 134,916 votes. Mr. Tshombe lost the provincial capital city of Elisabethville. Thus, Mr. Tshombe was defeated in his first and only election in his own province.

The Conakat Party and its allies, however, captured 27 seats in the Provincial Assembly of 60 seats. The Baluba Party won only 25 seats. Eight seats were never filled because of contests, so the Conakat formed the Provincial Government.

In due course and after some contest, the newly elected Parliament elected Joseph Kasavubu, President, and Patrice Lumumba was appointed Premier.

In June 30, 1960, 53 years of Belgian rule ended for the 14 million inhabitants of the Congo, including 120,000 European residents. A pitifully small handful of Congolese had received formal education. There were only about 30 Congolese university graduates in the country; almost no professional men or lawyers to enforce the law and carry out its administration. Fewer than 20,000 were attending academic secondary schools. A large number of tribes existed, speaking over 100 languages, and tribal loyalties claimed first allegiance with a large portion of the population.

Five days after independence, the 20,000-man Congolese Army mutinied. President Kasavubu and Premier Lumumba were unable to restore order. Belgium sent paratroopers in to protect Belgian citizens and property. Katanga Province thereupon declared its independence from the Central Government in Léopoldville.

On July 10, 1960, the Congolese leaders appealed to the United States and the United Nations to help restore order. President Eisenhower decided the proper course was to work through the United Nations.

On July 14, the Security Council approved a resolution, backed by the Eisenhower administration, authorizing the formation of a United Nations force to maintain order in the Congo and to effect the withdrawal of Belgian troops. The difficult process of building a 20,000-man U.N. Congo force began.

The situation in Katanga Province soon became critical. With only one-twentieth of the population of the Congo and occupying less than one-twelfth of the country's terrain, Katanga accounted, because of its mineral resources, for more than one-half of the country's revenues prior to independence. In turn, the great, Belgian-controlled mining complex, Union Miniere, paid about 80 percent of Katanga tax revenues.

Due to the harassment of the Balubas by Mr. Tshombe's government, the Baluba tribe representatives in the Provincial Assembly withdrew and Tshombe's party representatives, with less than a majority of the total seats, held a rump session and "ratified" Katanga's secession. Seventy thousand Baluba tribesmen subsequently sought refuge from Tshombe in U.N. refugee camps.

Note again that the secession of Katanga was a totally illegal act, not based on proper parliamentary law. It was carried out by a minority of the people of Katanga, who had rejected Mr. Tshombe's leadership in the one election which had been held in that province.

It is significant that, despite costly propaganda efforts in this country and elsewhere, Katanga was never recognized as an independent State by any country in the world.

I digress from my text to emphasize the costly propaganda campaign which was carried out by groups in the United States who supported Katanga secession. They tried to foster an anti-United Nations feeling throughout the country which is totally unjustified. For example, there is a television-movie program entitled "Katanga, the Untold Story," sponsored by the Dr. Ross Pet Food Co., featuring former Congressman Donald Jackson of California—sometimes erroneously identified with our able colleague from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] who has absolutely nothing to do with it—the former being a well-known spokesman for Tshombe's secessionist movement.

At my request, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] has given me samples of the mail which he has received expressing outrage at the activities of the United Nations, supported by the United States, in the Congo, basing their views on this totally false television and motion picture production.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] has been assiduous in sending constituents who wrote him the true story of the Katanga situation. It is a shame that under our system of free press, free television, and free motion pictures—which I strongly support—such widely distorted versions of the facts should be given so much credence and should mislead so many members of the American press.

The tortuous series of events in the long history of the United Nations' efforts to restore order in the Congo since the summer of 1960 needs only passing reference: Mobutu's efforts to establish a military dictatorship in late 1960; Lumumba's kidnapping in February of 1961 and eventual death in Katanga in early 1961; Tshombe's increasing hostility to United Nations' activities and the repeated attacks on United Nations' personnel by his armed forces, led largely by white European mercenary soldiers; Tshombe's many talks with Central Government and United Nations' representatives and his persistent refusal to cooperate with the Léopoldville authorities.

In mid-September 1961, while on a trip to effect a cease-fire between United Nations' and Katangan troops, Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, one of the world's foremost citizens, was killed in a plane crash near Ndola, Northern Rhodesia. The causes of the crash were never determined.

Late last December, events reached a climax when drunken Katangan soldiers subjected U.N. troops to repeated fire and shot down a U.N. helicopter near Elisabethville, brutally beat its crew and allowed an Indian lieutenant to bleed to death. Two days later, Katangan soldiers fired heavily on U.N. positions. The United Nations negotiated patiently for hours with Mr. Tshombe. The Katangan leader even visited the scene, admitted that the firing was coming from his own forces and said he would stop it. When it became obvious that Mr. Tshombe was powerless to control his own troops, the United Nations had no alternative but to defend itself and to carry out its mandate to maintain law and order and to insist upon freedom of movement to avoid further dangerous situations.

Those who portrayed the mercenary-led Katangan Army as an effective and highly motivated fighting force must have been sorely disappointed by the events that followed. The Katangan soldiers offered practically no resistance to the U.N. troops. In certain areas, the population demonstrated its pleasure at being rid of the Katangan gendarmeries and enthusiastically welcomed the U.N. troops. In the industrial city of Jadotville, the Africans hoisted the U.N. force commander to their shoulders and loudly proclaimed their relief over the end of 2 years of tension and warfare.

At long last, and only as a result of U.N. actions, Mr. Tshombe announced his readiness to implement Secretary General U Thant's plan for Congo unity. How much suffering would have been spared had Mr. Tshombe decided to do this when he first accepted the plan last September. The record clearly shows that every conceivable effort was made by both the Congolese and by the United Nations—to say nothing of major efforts by the U.S. Government including even a trip to Elisabethville by the third ranking man in the State Department, Under Secretary George McGhee—to reunite Katanga with the Congo by peaceful means.

Two essential points about the U.N. operation in the Congo are frequently forgotten. One is that the United Nations was invited into the Congo by the legitimately elected Government of that country, and it acted in Katanga with the full approval of the Congo's recognized Prime Minister and Chief of State. The other is that the U.N.'s actions were strictly in accord with its mandate from the Security Council. This mandate called upon the United Nations to maintain the territorial integrity and political independence of the Congo and to assist the Central Government in the restoration and maintenance of law and order. Until the Katanga secession was terminated, there was no hope for national development. The nation's limited resources in men had to be devoted exclusively to national reunification.

The allegation referred to earlier that our Congo policies have paralleled Communist aims and objectives is an irresponsible distortion of truth. The Soviet Union during the long period of the Congo crisis consistently opposed the U.N.'s operations there. It tried to remove the late Secretary General Hammarskjold when his efforts to restore order and unity began to succeed. It opposed the recognition by the United Nations of Kasavubu as Central Government President. It supplied military aid and technicians to assist Lumumba before Mobutu ordered all Soviet personnel out of the country in September of 1960.

When Lumumba was arrested, Moscow-oriented Vice Premier Gizenga, who had been appointed to his post by Lumumba, announced his succession to the premiership and seized the assets of the National Government in Stanleyville, the capital of Oriental Province. Gizenga's regime was immediately recognized as the legitimate head of the Congo by the Soviet Union. After prolonged, unsuccessful negotiations, the United Nations moved to assist soldiers loyal to the Central Congo Government in putting down Gizenga's insurrection. Gizenga was taken into custody and has been under detention ever since January of 1962, despite repeated protests by the Communists. The Soviet Union has refused and still refuses to contribute one ruble to support U.N. operations in the Congo.

In short, the U.N. and the U.S. policies in the Congo have been a striking success. The Soviet Union has received nothing for the large sums of money and the efforts of many of its personnel, which it has invested in the Congo. The Soviet Union is out of the Congo for all practical purposes, and credit for this goes to the policies of the Eisenhower administration and the Kennedy administration and to the able administration of the United Nations and the dedicated members of its peace force.

II. CYRILLE ADOULA

Clearly an important turning point in the ultimate resolution of Congolese affairs was the formation of a coalition government in August of 1961 under the leadership of Cyrille Adoula as Prime Minister. Some of my colleagues will recall meeting Mr. Adoula during his good will tour of the United States in early 1962, when he met with the President and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Under Mr. Adoula, the Congo has made much forward progress. His government quashed the extremist leftwing rival regime established in Stanleyville by Antoine Gizenga and ended the secession of the diamond-rich South Kasai province. Mr. Adoula fought off the combined parliamentary efforts of Gizenga's supporters and those of Katanga Provincial President Moise Tshombe to overthrow the central government.

The Central Government under President Joseph Kasavubu and Prime Minister Adoula has acted in a statesmanlike manner toward Mr. Tshombe and has appointed former Prime Minister Joseph Ileo, a man known for his moderate, pro-Western views, to be minister to Katanga. I am confident that President Kasavubu and Prime Minister Adoula will continue to do everything possible to complete the reintegration of Katanga in a constructive and farsighted manner.

Just last month, Cyrille Adoula was attacked in this Chamber as at best a neutralist and perhaps very far to the left. In my view, this is a great unfairness to a man who has been a vital force for law and order, moderation and progress in his country; a man who has whipped both the Communist left and the plutocratic or Fascist right.

I ask permission to insert in the RECORD at this place in my remarks excerpts from a statement by Mr. Adoula to the Parliament in Léopoldville in January of this year. Judge for yourselves whether these are the words of a dangerous extremist or a responsible leader of his people, aware of the virtues of freedom and private enterprise, and compassionate in victory:

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My dear compatriots, following this appeal for patriotism and constructive work, the situation requires me to explain to you the cause of our misfortune: South Katanga secession. For the first time since we acquired independence, all necessary conditions for reunification of Congo seem to have been found. You know the situation that exists today in South Katanga. We are happy to confirm that the U.N. operation has been carried out in accordance with the mission of that organization and with a concern for sparing as far as possible the civilian population, be they Congolese or foreign.

We have spared no effort to arrive at an amicable solution. By its attitude the Central Government has proved to the world its good will and has thus unmasked the game of the secessionists. The process has been long and difficult because, contrary to international opinion, the Congolese public was aware of the spirit of the group in power in Elisabethville. Because it was aware, the Congolese public did not understand our conciliatory attitude, which they took to be weakness. We needed great courage and firmness to keep to this line of conduct and to persevere in our action, which today is beginning to bear fruit.

I would like to take this occasion to define the conditions of the Government as to the return of South Katanga to the Republic of the Congo, so as to avoid speculation of certain people with respect to our intentions. The reintegration of South Katanga will not mean reprisals. On the contrary, we will be very happy finally to reunite the Congolese people and resolve the problem which has constituted a heavy mortgage on our future.

These are not simple words: examples of South Kasai and Orientale Provinces, which have been reintegrated after having been in rebellion, bear witness to our conciliatory spirit and to our understanding of the true interests of our country.

As you know, the President of the Republic has solemnly proclaimed amnesty for political infractions. In doing this he committed his personal honor and the honor of the Government he represents. For the Chief of State, for the Government, for all authorities, for each Congolese, the return of South Katanga to the Republic means an end to the atmosphere of uneasiness and insecurity.

Reintegration of South Katanga will mean for each citizen of that province full enjoyment of civil rights throughout the Congolese Republic. Restrictions imposed on people by the Elisabethville authorities will be lifted and Katangans will have access to positions in the Central Government and to all posts of responsibility.

As to the Katangan economy, I wish to make clear that the Central Government intends to respect its commitments to encourage and protect, there as elsewhere in the Republic, all private investment, both Congolese and foreign.

As to foreign technicians, I wish to affirm that the Central Government appreciates the services they render to our country. We will make sure that their persons and their interests are preserved. So as to give them all possible guarantees, we intend to regularize their status through direct agreements with their countries of origin. I wish to reaffirm to them, in my position as chief of Government, and in the name of the Congolese people, that they will always be welcome in this country.

To make more precise the intentions of the Central Government on the solution of the South Katanga problem, I wish to borrow the following quotation from Abraham Lincoln, who seeing civil war approaching its end, declared: "With malice toward none, but with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphans, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all Nations."

My dear compatriots, I could not end this talk without thanking the United Nations and its Secretary General for their persevering efforts to help us restore the territorial integrity of our country.

I also express my gratitude to all countries which have helped us, particularly in this phase in the life of our country.

The support and comfort that African countries have brought to us, of which the latest example was the PAFMECSA meeting in Léopoldville, strengthen us in our faith in the future of our country, and in the future of African friendship.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I submit that these are the words of a man we can be proud to call our ally.

III. THE FUTURE

Much remains to be done. As the military phase has receded, the enormous backlog of economic and social problems of the Congo have come to the fore. Inflation has been rampant, and a black market flourishes. Food, formerly available in adequate supply, now has to be imported with costly foreign exchange. Half the work force has been unemployed for more than 2 years. Tribal warfare still takes its toll of human lives.

The bank vaults of the Katanga Banks have been found to be pretty well rifled, presumably by Tshombe or his followers. More than a billion Congolese francs have been located in two small banks in British Rhodesia, and some 300 million francs—about 1.5 million U.S. dollars—are believed to have been spirited away to Portuguese Angola. An unknown amount of foreign exchange accounts is missing, and the International Monetary Fund is attempting to trace its location. Substantial sums are suspected to have been hidden by Tshombe and his colleagues in numbered bank accounts in Switzerland.

But while the problems of the Congo loom large, so, too, do the opportunities. The Congo is one of the largest, wealthiest countries in all of Africa. It has common borders with nine other areas—some of which are newly independent; others which seem headed for a period of tension and strife. The Congo is a member of the Lagos-Monrovia group of countries and of the Pan African Freedom Movement for East, Central, and Southern Africa, and it has recently drawn closer to the Afro-Malagasy Union of 12 French-speaking nations. Thus, in many respects, the Congo is pivotal to many of the forces that will affect the future of Africa.

Clearly, U.N. forces will have to be retained at reduced levels for some time to help quell tribal disorders until local gendarmes can be trained in sufficient numbers to maintain order.

To help alleviate the critical shortage of trained Congolese needed to run the machinery of government, U.N. recruited personnel have helped operate essential services throughout the country since the summer of 1960.

International civil servants have stood behind the Congo administration to assist and to teach Congolese officials. Schools were manned by teachers recruited by the United Nations from all over the world. Economic and technical aid on a sizable scale has been provided by the United Nations and will have to be continued. Doctors of the World Health Organization have contributed much in medical work throughout the Congo since 1960.

Adoula flew to Belgium recently to arrange for a settlement of his government's holdings in the Belgian-run Katanga mining company. Belgium herself has sent some technicians to Léopoldville. Italy sent some officials there to look into a training program for the Congolese Air Force. And the European Common Market sent a team to the Congo to arrange a trading program of $60 to $80 million over the next 5 years.

The United States carried almost 50 percent of the U.N.'s military and economic expenses during the last 2½ years. The stated U.S. objective from the start has been the encouragement of a "free, stable, non-Communist government for the Congo as a whole." With this objective much closer at hand than before but still short of realization, a continuation of U.S. economic assistance will clearly be needed. The administration has made clear it will see that the United States does not pay more than its fair share of development costs.

Assistant Secretary of State for International Institution, Harlan Cleveland, upon his return in February from a fact-finding mission to the Congo, is reported to have met with Secretary-General U Thant and to have urged that the United Nations now undertake the role of coordinator for all economic aid to the Congo to prevent East-West competition. As visualized, the United Nations would provide a broad umbrella for aid from all countries, and even nations and groups not members of the United Nations, such as West Germany, and the Common Market, would be urged to make effective contributions.

I ask consent that a summary of the recommendations of the Congo planning group headed by Mr. Cleveland, identified as State Department press release 109, dated March 1, 1963, be inserted in the RECORD at this place in my remarks:

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF U.S. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A PROGRAM OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE TO THE CONGO

The Congo is a paradox: staggering problems in the present, and impressive prospects in the future.

The United Nations has already made a very great contribution to the future. There is a large reservoir of good will toward the United States, the product of our general African policy, our support of the United Nations and the Central Government in Léopoldville, and our close working relations with other governments interested in the Congo's welfare in spite of policy differences from time to time. The Congo has maintained its independence despite efforts of subversion and secession. Such threats continue, but, on balance, the Congo is going the way of free choice and not coercion; we should not neglect the next necessary steps to help it stay on that course.

As it enters the nation-building phase of its young life, the Republic of the Congo appears to face three key obstacles to progress:

A political system which is in the developing stage and requires increased executive powers and the capability to discharge such responsibility;

A relatively expensive military establishment that does not yet function in full response to the country's needs;

A financial administration which collects too little revenue and does not yet have dependable budgetary controls.

More than external aid, success of a nation-building effort in the Congo depends on developing the administrative capacity to rehabilitate the national army, bring the fiscal system under control, and construct a political system featuring a strong executive. If these prerequisites can be met, the Congo should no longer require substantial outside aid in a few years' time, for its resources are great and its population relatively small.

II

The relevant portions of the U Thant plan for national reconciliation have been largely fulfilled and partly bypassed by the events of December 1962 and January 1963.

What is needed now is an agenda for nation-building in the Congo, including as one part the knotting of the loose ends of Katanga's reintegration.

One point of the U Thant plan which awaits further action is the constitution. But a new, Federal Constitution for the Congo will necessarily depend on the parliamentary situation. Meanwhile, a de facto federalism is actually developing in the Congo.

An executive amnesty for political crimes has already been announced for Tshombe and his colleagues;

The integration of the currency is well underway and can be speeded up;

Parts of the Katangan gendarmerie are being integrated by unit or individual applications to the ANC;

Katanga's "foreign affairs" establishment is to be formally disestablished; and

Arrangements to bring the Conakat Party into the Central Government are being considered.

III

One of the most critical tasks facing the Congo is to bring military expenditures under control and to raise the Congolese National Army (ANC) to a higher degree of efficiency and discipline. Plans already suggested for a multinational training program based on a reduced but more effective army, plus an adequate air and naval capability, offer excellent prospects if they can be put into effect.

Multinational assistance to the Congolese Government in the military field should be coordinated under an acceptable arrangement between the Congolese Government, the United Nations and the nations concerned. This will permit the establishment of a national military aid pattern allowing several countries to help. Our own assistance, if requested, would primarily take the form of logistics support.

A civic action survey is needed to help plan an economic development role for the ANC and to consider how discharged veterans might best be employed.

The Congolese Government's desire to assure its authority in Katanga against the day when the United Nations will be pulled out must be met.

The requirements of a training program for provincial and municipal police are being given urgent consideration. It is encouraging that offers of assistance have also been forthcoming for this task.

U.S. policy favors the most rapid possible phase-out of the ONUC force consistent with the increasing capability of the Congolese Government to maintain minimum levels of security and insure its national integrity. It would, however, be dangerous to phase-out the ONUC force so rapidly as to leave an "internal security gap" before the adequate national security forces are trained, for insecurity in the Congo would invite unacceptable foreign intervention.

IV

Domestic harmony in the Congo nation will crucially depend this year on the value of the money in which soldiers are paid and the provincial governments are financed. Just as you cannot do business without insuring internal security, you cannot have growth without sound money.

In spite of growing production and rising exports, the Congo suffers from severe inflation. The actual market value of Congolese currency is about one-fourth the legal rate.

A well-financed, well-coordinated and well-staffed stabilization program including effective budgetary procedures, spending controls, tax collection and differential exchange rates is required. Unless this is done, the Congo may be faced with runaway inflation. The additional requirement is to obtain enough external resources to maintain minimum levels of essential imports, finance necessary expatriate technicians, and service the external debt.

To move toward stabilization, the Congo will require:

A strong administration in the Ministry of Finance and provision for this purpose of a substantial number of foreign technicians to assist in the Ministry of Finance.

Husbanding of military expenditures.

A special effort to make the most effective use of the sums available for education.

Assurance through foreign aid of a minimum level of essential imports. This should help to meet the inflation problem.

Launching a public works program to reduce unemployment, rehabilitate the vital transportation network, and build constructive ties between the Central Government and provincial and local governments.

V

Other nations can do much, and we should encourage them to do more.

The Belgians already support 2,000 technicians, teachers, judges, and public administrators. They also will be continuing to make other payments, including the service on Congolese debts.

Belgian assistance in the financing of imports would be an important contribution, and we hope substantial assistance of this kind will be made available.

We expect that the United Kingdom, and the Federal Republic of Germany will also wish to participate in assisting the Congo. The Economic Development Fund of the European Economic Community (EEC) may provide substantial assistance over the next few years.

A dozen other countries are potential small contributors to a plan for nation building in the Congo. The nation building effort can be particularly stimulated by contributions from non-European countries.

The United States should endeavor to:

Continue Public Law 480 food sales as required to assist the supply of food to the Congo.

Although some direct aid will be required to finance imports, we can aim at putting a rapidly increasing portion of this aid on a loan basis, in view of the basically strong potential of the Congolese economy. Loans will be especially appropriate for equipment and spare parts in the transportation sector.

Continue support of the United Nations Congo Fund but shift the emphasis to such priority sectors as public financing, and try to assure that other donors finance at least half of the Fund.

Secure adequate assurances about the spending of aid-generated local currencies available for economic development, public works and budget support, and its use in support of a vigorous stabilization strategy.

Continue a development grant program operated under the United Nations umbrella and reoriented to emphasize activities directly in support of stabilization and internal security objectives.

VI.

The presence in the Congo's future of several large contributors, and several additional smaller ones, requires the multilateral coordination of bilateral efforts, both in retraining the ANC and in stabilizing and developing the Congolese economy.

A competition of purely bilateral aid is not only inefficient but risks importing the cold war into the Congo. A creative combination of bilateral aid and multilateral coordination is what is needed to conduct an effective, well integrated program.

The United Nations should provide the Central Government with direct technical aid in the areas of greatest national importance—that is, in internal security matters, the control of foreign exchange, the coordination of external aid and the administration of the public finances.

We should help the United Nations to find additional high-level talent for these purposes.

The technical work done by specialized agency teams in education, health, food and agriculture, manpower training, meteorology, telecommunications and airport management is useful, and generally of good quality and high repute. The United Nations Secretariat should continue to take the responsibility for the supervision and the coordination of these activities in the field. But they should be increasingly funded after 1963 from the Special Fund, the expanded technical assistance program, or the specialized agencies' budgets themselves.

We understand it is the desire of the Government of the Congo that the United Nations should serve as general coordinator for all bilateral aid to the Congo's economic development. This role will involve:

(a) providing top personnel to help the Government of the Congo coordinate external aid from all sources for all purposes.

(b) reviewing each proposed bilateral program to make sure that it fits within a framework agreed between the Government of the Congo and the United Nations; and

(c) participating directly in decisions about the use of some important development aid, as is now the case in the allocation of local currency generated from Public Law 480 imports.

The contributors to the reconstruction task in the Congo should consult on the types of aid needed in assuring a rational and fair distribution of the assistance effort.

The question of the future financing of the United Nations peace-keeping activities in the Congo is being considered in the Committee of 21 and is not being treated in this paper.

It is our hope that the maximum number of countries will find it possible to assist the Republic of the Congo as it enters the important nation-building phase of its development.

IV. CONCLUSION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the resolution of the Congo crisis represents a major success for American policy. Steadfast U.S. support of United Nations efforts to restore order and unity in the Congo, begun under President Eisenhower and carried out under President Kennedy, continues despite loud voices of dissent in this country and in the Congress.

U.S. policy has received widespread support throughout the free world, and has been praised by virtually all African leaders. The delegates to the last meeting of the Pan African Freedom Movement for East, Central, and Southern Africa, sent a message to President Kennedy expressing "appreciation for the enlightened Congo policy now pursued by your Government and also for assistance given to the Congo."

The United Nations has scored a most impressive achievement. Scorned as too weak to keep the peace by those who place their faith in national machines alone, criticized by the anti-internationalists who prefer to see the United States "go it alone" as in Teddy Roosevelt's days, the United Nations has succeeded, where we alone might well have failed or invited another big power conflict. The United Nations forces from 21 nations, including India, Ireland, Sweden, Ghana, Guinea, Tunisia, Morocco, and Ethiopia, who carried out the U.N. tasks in the Congo—and suffered 260 casualties—deserve our warm praise and thanks.

The tragedy is that the United Nations was not recognized from the first as the best source of stability in Katanga as elsewhere in the Congo. As the late Dag Hammarskjold said in one of his last statements to the Security Council of the United Nations:

> I believe, and many believe with me, that this Organization, in all its frailty, represents the sole approach which may give us a chance to reduce the risk that the constant frictions which characterize the life of our present day world will build up to a tension easily triggered in which we would all be engulfed.

Mrs. Marian McVitty, an able U.N. observer, in a recent newsletter summed up the U.N. efforts in the Congo in words that may well be used by an historian looking back on recent events there with greater perspective:

> The record will show that any U.N. mistakes were inadvertently made; that the United Nations was impartial, devoted and effective; that U.N. representatives were more mindful of the dignity of Congo officials than of credit they might claim for themselves or the organization; that U.N. individuals bore criticism from all sides although not one of them could expect to gain any personal advantage. The United Nations operation in the Congo is not finished, but it has accomplished much in a difficult situation. It bids fair to succeed in an experiment of great importance to the future of international undertakings to provide peace and security by maintaining order under law.

Those of us who support President Kennedy in his support of the United Nations and its efforts to secure a just and lasting peace for a free Congo nation can take real satisfaction in the progress of that country toward the achievement of its national aspirations and goals.

The success of our Congo policy is a triumph for freedom over the forces of communism, racism, and plutocratic fascism.

Mr. President, how nice it would be if the defense of the foreign policy in the Congo of President Eisenhower and President Kennedy could receive the same coverage in the press which the attack of its irresponsible critics has been given in the newspapers of the United States.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in accordance with the order heretofore entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, March 21, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, March 19, 1963:

U.S. District Judge

H. Vearle Payne, of New Mexico, to be U.S. district judge for the district of New Mexico.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I Corinthians 4: 11: *It is required of stewards that they be found faithful.*

O Thou God of might and of mercy, we thank Thee for the patience and perseverance of those who, in these troublous days, are taking hold of Thee with renewed faith and are determined never to let go.

Bestow Thy sustaining grace and courage upon all who are struggling

desperately against the moods of doubt and despair which assail them when the victory for righteousness and justice appears very dark and gloomy.

Grant that our chosen leaders and representatives may continue to carry on faithfully, as good stewards, even when distrust and derision, scorn, and carping criticism seem to be rife among those whom they are seeking to serve.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO THURSDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit during general debate on March 20, 21, and 22.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

REAPPOINTMENT OF JOHN NICHOLAS BROWN

The clerk called House Joint Resolution 234, to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, which will occur by the expiration of the term of John Nicholas Brown, of Providence, Rhode Island, on March 14, 1963, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of six years.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

HISTORY OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a statement on the history of the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

Since the Private Calendar is being called today the first time during the 88th Congress, I would like to take this opportunity to set forth some of the history behind, as well as describe the workings of, this calendar. I hope this might be of some value to the Members of this House, especially our newer colleagues.

Of the five House calendars, the Private Calendar is the one to which all private bills are referred. Private bills deal with specific individuals, corporations, institutions, etc., as distinguished from public bills, which deal with classes only.

Of the 108 laws approved by the First Congress, only 5 were private laws. But, their number quickly grew as the wars of the new Republic produced veterans and veterans' widows seeking pensions and as more citizens came to have private claims and demands against the Federal Government. The 49th Congress (1885–87)—the first Congress for which complete workload and output data is available—passed 1,031 private laws, as compared with 434 public laws. At the turn of the century, the 56th Congress (1899–1901) passed 1,498 private laws and 443 public laws—a better than 3-to-1 ratio.

Private bills were referred to the Committee of the Whole House as far back as 1820, and a calendar of private bills was established in 1839. These bills were initially brought before the House by special orders, but the 62d Congress (1911–13) changed this procedure by its rule XXIV, clause 6, which provided for the consideration of the Private Calendar in lieu of special orders. This rule was amended in 1932 and then adopted in its present form on March 27, 1935.

A determined effort to reduce the private bill workload of the Congress was made in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Section 131 of that act banned the introduction or the consideration of four types of private bills: (1) Those authorizing the payment of money for pensions, or (2) for personal or property damages for which suit may be brought under the Federal tort claims procedure, (3) those authorizing the construction of a bridge across a navigable stream, or (4) those authorizing the correction of a military or naval record.

This ban afforded some temporary relief but was soon offset by the rising postwar and cold war flood of private immigration bills. The 82d Congress (1951–53) passed 1,023 private laws, as compared with 594 public laws. The 87th Congress (1961–63) passed 684 private laws and 885 public laws.

Under rule XXIV, clause 6, the Private Calendar is called the first and third Tuesdays of each month. The consideration of Private Calendar bills on the first Tuesday is mandatory unless dispensed with by two-thirds vote. On the third Tuesday, however, recognition for consideration of the Private Calendar is within the discretion of the Speaker and does not take precedence over other privileged business in the House.

On the first Tuesday of each month, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table for reference only, the Speaker directs the call of the Private Calendar. If a bill called is objected to by two or more Members, it is automatically recommitted to the committee reporting it. No reservation of objection is entertained. Bills unobjected to are considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

On the third Tuesday of each month the same procedure is followed with the exception that omnibus bills embodying bills previously rejected have preference and are in order regardless of objection. Such omnibus bills are read by paragraph, and no amendments are entertained except to strike out or reduce amounts or provide limitations. Matter so stricken out shall not again be included in an omnibus bill during the session. Debate is limited to motions allowable under the rule and does not admit motions to strike out the last word or reservation of objections. The rules prohibit the Speaker from recognizing Members for statements or for requests for unanimous consent for debate. Omnibus bills so passed are thereupon resolved into their component bills, which are engrossed separately and disposed of as if passed severally.

Private Calendar bills unfinished on one Tuesday go over to the next Tuesday on which such bills are in order and are considered before the call of bills subsequently on the calendar. Omnibus bills follow the same procedure and go over to the next Tuesday on which that class of business is again in order. When the previous question is ordered on a Private Calendar bill, the bill comes up for disposition on the next legislative day.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to describe to the newer Members the official objectors system the House has established to deal with our great volume of private bills.

The majority leader and minority leader each appoint three Members to serve as Private Calendar objectors during a Congress. The objectors have the responsibility of carefully studying all bills which are placed on the Private Calendar. When the Private Calendar is called, the objectors are on the floor ready to object to any private bill which they feel is objectionable for any reason. Seated near them to provide technical assistance are the majority and minority legislative clerks.

Should any Member have a doubt or question about a particular private bill, he can get assistance from the objectors, their clerks, or from the Member who introduced the bill.

The great volume of private bills and the desire to have an opportunity to study them carefully before they are called on the Private Calendar has caused the six objectors to agree upon certain ground rules. Those rules limit consideration of bills placed on the Private Calendar only shortly before the calendar is called. The agreement is as follows:

"Reaffirming the policy initially adopted on June 3, 1958, the members of the majority and minority Private Calendar objectors committees have today agreed that during the 88th Congress they will consider only those bills which have been on the Private Calendar for a period of 7 calendar days, excluding the day the bills are reported and the day the Private Calendar is called.

"It is agreed that the majority and minority legislative clerks will not submit to the objectors any bills which do not meet this requirement.

"This policy will be strictly observed except during the closing days of each session when House rules are suspended."

The agreement was entered into by the majority objectors—the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Hemphill]—and the minority objectors—the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Avery], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson].

I feel confident I speak for my colleague objectors when I request all Members to

enable us to give the necessary advance consideration to the private bills, by not asking us to depart from the above agreement unless absolutely necessary.

NATIONAL RICE WEEK

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is National Rice Week. Tomorrow, in commemoration of this event, the rice industry is sponsoring a free serving of a rice dish to all who dine in the restaurants and cafeterias in the Capitol and the House and Senate Office Buildings. It is estimated that 6,000 persons will be able to have this delicacy on their luncheon plate. On behalf of the Congress, I want to thank the rice industry for this generosity and to salute this observance.

Too often we have experienced on this floor bitter and heated controversy over agricultural policy. Today, I want to tell you a brief story which I hope will reassure those who do not represent farm areas that progress is being made in solving the problems of agriculture.

Some years ago, the rice industry was faced with a critical surplus problem. They recognized that something had to be done and proceeded to do it with the help of legislation which the Congress saw fit to pass. At the moment, there is no surplus problem. A heartening example of how the rice industry has gone about in getting its industry stable has to do with Cuba. Prior to Castro, Cuba was the No. 1 dollar market for our rice exports. When it was recognized that Castro was a full-fledged and uncompromising Communist, the rice industry voluntarily wrote Cuba off as a market for its produce. This was a hard blow to take, but the industry wanted to play its part in cutting our economic ties with the Cuban dictator. To make up for this loss the rice industry, with remarkable determination and ingenuity, went out into the world markets and found customers for the rice previously sent to Cuba.

This is just but one of many examples that the industry has been putting forth in keeping its production in line with demand. It is a pleasure for me to pay tribute to them today for a job well done.

NAVY DEPARTMENT PROCUREMENT

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have uncovered another case of Navy Department sleight of hand in regard to plans and blueprints for a certain piece of equipment which proves what I have been contending for the past 2 years, and that is that as long as we allow the military to act as its own judge, jury, prosecutor, defense attorney, and witness, we cannot hope to save any money on our massive military expenditure.

The case I am about to detail for you is typical of so many more. The Navy has rigged a procurement so that only one company will bid on it, but I hope, after my presentation here today and after the General Accounting Office looks into the matter, more competition will be induced. It certainly should be, and the middle-grade civil servants who arrange this sort of thing should be chastised severely.

Here is what has happened:

In January 1961 a contract—85111—was issued to Chu Associates, Cambridge, Mass., for development and production of 250 units of the AS–1018/URC(XMI) antenna. Since Chu was paid for development of the antenna, you would expect the Navy would ask for blueprints and plans, would you not?

In June of 1962, under terms of contract 87534, the Turbo Machine Co. was issued a contract for the same equipment. It produced 107 units at a cost of $541 each. Just a few days after this, the Navy negotiated another contract—again with Chu Associates—No. 87698—for another 121 units of the same equipment at a price of $970 each—almost twice what was paid Turbo Machine Co.

The waste in this is self-evident. There can be no question.

Now the Navy presently has another requirement for the same equipment under terms of request for proposal 26057. This bid closes April 9, 1963, and is for 261 units. In a special notice on the bid set, the Navy states that it does not know if any patents are involved. Such a statement is enough to frighten away many bidders, and that is apparently the intent of some middle-grade civil servant in the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, after paying for development of this antenna and after buying it from two different makers, I think you will agree the Navy should know if patents are involved. As a matter of fact, it should have those patent rights for itself because the taxpayers paid for the development of this item.

Unless the Navy is flushed from behind the woodpile, here is another procurement that will go to a favored company and another instance in which the taxpayer will be the fall guy. I have today asked the General Accounting Office to make a full investigation of this procurement and have also referred the matter to the Justice Department and the Secretary of Defense.

SECRETARY FREEMAN'S SURPLUS GRAIN STOCKPILE CLAIM

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, I challenged Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's flat claim that surplus grain stockpiles have been reduced over one billion bushels during his two years in office.

I used statistics from Mr. Freeman's own department to prove his claim was unfounded. The actual reduction was about one-half that claimed.

I am glad to report that Mr. Freeman now recognizes the error of his ways.

Tonight Mr. Freeman will address the National Farmers Union in New York City. In the official text of his speech, released early today by the Department of Agriculture, he is quoted as saying:

> By October, we expect to have 1.1 billion fewer bushels of grain in storage and under loan than we had 2 years ago.

Compare this with Mr. Freeman's flat claim on March 8—less than 2 weeks ago—to Americans for Democratic Action in Pittsburgh:

> We have already reduced our stockpiles of surpluses by 1,077 million bushels.

Mr. Freeman obviously now acknowledges that the billion-bushel reduction is not a fact. It is not an accomplishment. It is wishful thinking, a speculative guess on what may materialize by October.

SPECIAL FUND OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, this Special Fund of the United Nations is a tremendous thing. It was not so tremendous back in the beginning in 1959, but since then the generous taxpayers of the United States have increased their contributions 300 percent until this year we except to put in perhaps $29 million.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to insert in the Record today two tables that provide an at-a-glance study of the scope of this Fund that has become a second foreign policy for the United States, and I want to point out a few of the highlights of these tables.

We find that since its beginning in May 1959, the Special Fund has undertaken 286 projects in 74 countries and territories. The total cost of Fund projects has been $588,784,716 of which the Special Fund has contributed $250,625,800. Beneficiary territories and nations have chipped in with $338,158,916.

The total contribution of the United States to the Special Fund is estimated by our State Department to be some $100,400,000 up to this point.

The first table shows that the three areas of the world benefiting the most from Fund projects are the Americas, Africa, and Asia, and the Far East.

There have been 83 projects in the Americas. Total cost is highest in Asia and the Far East at $175,077,371.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N.—remember that agriculture grant to Red Cuba?—has administered far and away the most Special Fund projects with a total of 113. UNESCO is next with 48. The International Atomic Energy Agency trails with one project—that nuclear research project in Yugoslavia about which I have commented to the House in considerable detail.

The second table provides a quick view of the total number of and the costs of projects received by each individual country and territory. It shows that India, with 20 projects, has the most projects and the greatest total cost at $58,704,546.

We note that the United States has received no Special Fund aid.

The tables follow:

1. Projects approved by the Governing Council: Summary, May 1959 to January 1963

	Number of projects approved [1]	Cost of projects (U.S. dollar equivalent)		
		Total	Special fund [3] earmarkings [2]	Government counterpart contribution [3]
Governing Council session:				
May 1959	13	31,265,287	9,575,500	21,689,787
December 1959	30	49,187,129	25,237,700	23,949,429
May 1960	30	58,604,600	22,820,600	35,784,000
December 1960	41	85,388,400	36,233,300	49,155,100
May 1961	41	74,907,500	33,368,300	41,539,200
January 1962	48	110,520,900	42,814,300	67,706,600
May 1962	41	82,278,600	36,902,600	45,376,000
January 1963	42	96,632,300	43,673,500	52,958,800
Total	286	588,784,716	250,625,800	338,158,916
Region:				
Africa	76	154,058,450	67,463,400	86,595,050
The Americas	83	155,316,095	72,243,900	83,072,195
Asia and the Far East	82	175,077,371	73,806,000	101,271,371
Europe	16	47,821,687	13,211,000	34,610,687
Middle East	28	52,645,113	30,035,500	32,609,613
Interregional	1	3,866,000	3,866,000	----------
Total	286	588,784,716	250,625,800	338,158,916
Category of project:				
Resource surveys	118	175,097,114	88,077,100	87,020,014
Technical education and training	107	270,799,589	102,104,900	168,694,689
Applied research	57	131,335,713	52,146,500	79,189,213
Economic development planning	4	11,552,300	8,297,300	3,255,000
Total	286	588,784,716	250,625,800	338,158,916
Executing agency:				
FAO	113	197,652,389	90,824,300	106,828,089
IAEA	1	1,752,400	546,400	1,206,000
IBRD	14	17,261,200	10,103,700	7,157,500
ICAO	8	27,616,600	10,397,700	17,218,900
ILO	37	75,188,112	30,521,600	44,666,512
ITU	8	18,789,900	6,479,700	12,310,200
UNESCO	48	155,531,077	52,059,000	103,472,077
UN	46	77,637,575	43,680,800	33,956,775
WHO	4	7,963,300	2,118,400	5,844,900
WMO	7	9,392,163	3,894,200	5,497,963
Total	286	588,784,716	250,625,800	338,158,916

[1] Excludes 2 projects which had been canceled prior to commencement of execution.

[2] Revised earmarkings as of Jan. 31, 1963.

[3] The Government's cash payments toward local operating costs are included under "Governing Council earmarkings" and not under "Government counterpart contribution."

2. Total number and cost of projects by recipient country or region, May 1959 to January 1963

Country	Number of projects approved	Cost of projects (U.S. dollar equivalent)		
		Total	Special fund earmarkings [1]	Government counterpart contribution [1]
Afghanistan	2	3,338,700	2,363,700	975,000
Argentina	8	14,180,500	6,238,900	7,941,600
Bolivia	3	3,451,600	[2] 1,993,600	1,458,000
Brazil	5	9,226,400	4,965,200	4,261,200
Burma	5	9,534,800	4,193,800	5,341,000
Cambodia	1	2,038,500	947,500	1,091,000
Cameroon	1	2,692,800	1,174,800	1,518,000
Ceylon	2	2,396,300	1,053,300	1,343,000
Chile	8	15,415,950	7,525,700	7,890,250
China	5	5,925,675	3,361,600	2,564,075
Colombia	9	14,915,450	6,384,900	8,530,550
Congo (Brazzaville)	2	3,738,900	1,816,900	1,922,000
Cuba	1	3,035,600	1,157,600	1,878,000
Cyprus	2	4,879,000	2,127,100	2,751,900
Ecuador	7	10,824,200	5,159,900	5,664,300
El Salvador	1	910,800	348,300	562,500
Ethiopia	2	1,979,800	1,362,800	617,000
Federation of Malaya	2	4,133,000	1,421,500	2,711,500
Gabon	1	2,892,000	2,092,000	800,000
Ghana	5	7,601,500	3,461,500	4,140,000
Greece	4	5,639,300	2,128,300	3,511,000
Guatemala	2	2,543,700	1,400,700	1,143,000
Guinea	2	1,944,100	1,273,100	671,000
Haiti	2	1,724,900	1,004,600	720,300
Honduras	1	1,002,300	422,300	580,000
India	20	58,704,546	17,391,500	41,313,046
Indonesia	2	3,481,800	1,548,300	1,933,500
Iran	8	20,271,600	7,705,600	12,566,000
Iraq	5	11,495,800	3,779,800	7,716,000
Israel	6	7,987,313	2,643,200	5,344,113
Ivory Coast	1	3,150,400	1,034,800	2,115,600
Japan	1	1,676,800	702,500	974,300
Jordan	2	2,026,200	1,318,700	707,500
Laos	1	1,338,900	583,900	755,000
Lebanon	6	13,218,700	5,757,700	7,461,000
Liberia	1	1,756,900	1,006,900	750,000
Libya	2	4,247,550	1,639,600	2,607,950
Madagascar	1	2,924,200	1,435,200	1,489,000
Mali	2	5,131,900	2,032,900	3,099,000
Mexico	5	12,955,000	4,789,000	8,166,000
Morocco	6	16,072,200	5,144,200	10,928,000
Nepal	1	1,199,400	974,400	225,000
Netherlands: Surinam	1	1,462,000	770,000	692,000
Nicaragua	2	2,384,400	1,590,400	794,000
Nigeria	10	26,138,200	10,630,300	15,507,900
Pakistan	9	25,798,450	11,484,000	14,314,450
Panama	1	509,600	418,600	91,000
Paraguay	1	908,900	543,900	365,000
Peru	9	13,536,955	[3] 6,582,700	6,954,255
Philippines	3	4,733,300	2,428,600	2,304,700
Poland	2	7,968,500	1,837,500	6,131,000
Republic of Korea	5	8,344,200	4,112,400	4,231,800
Republic of Vietnam	1	421,400	268,500	152,900
Saudi Arabia	3	5,886,200	2,077,700	3,808,500
Senegal	4	9,006,000	3,964,100	5,041,900
Somalia	2	2,093,100	1,523,100	570,000
Sudan	8	12,090,600	5,321,000	6,769,600
Syrian Arab Republic	6	12,030,900	4,458,400	7,572,500
Thailand	7	10,682,900	5,497,500	5,185,400
Togo	2	2,756,500	1,973,500	783,000
Tunisia	5	11,321,800	4,988,800	6,333,000
Turkey	4	14,637,687	3,889,400	10,748,287
Uganda	2	5,566,000	1,473,000	4,093,000
United Arab Republic	11	21,269,000	8,497,900	12,771,100
United Kingdom:				
British Guiana	4	3,246,900	1,762,400	1,484,500
Colony of North Borneo	1	1,559,900	769,900	790,000
Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland	2	2,482,300	1,341,300	1,141,000
Kenya	3	5,361,800	3,234,800	2,127,000
Malta	1	1,501,200	601,200	900,000
Singapore	1	1,449,100	578,100	871,000
Upper Volta	1	1,840,900	1,040,900	800,000
Uruguay	2	3,868,000	1,975,000	1,893,000
Venezuela	5	18,031,300	4,780,30	13,251,000
Yugoslavia	3	13,196,000	2,627,500	10,568,500
Subtotal (74 countries and territories)	274	555,688,976	227,910,500	327,778,476
Regional and interregional projects:				
The Americas	6	21,181,640	12,429,900	8,751,740
Asia and the Far East	5	8,048,100	6,419,400	1,628,700
Interregional	1	3,866,000	3,866,000	----------
Subtotal	12	33,095,740	22,715,300	10,380,440
Total	286	588,784,716	250,625,800	338,158,916

[1] The Government's cash payments toward local operating costs are included under "Governing Council earmarkings" and not under "Government counterpart contribution."

[2] Includes residual earmarking of $1,000 to cover initial expenditures on a project which was subsequently canceled.

[3] Includes residual earmarking of $1,725 to cover initial expenditures on a project which was subsequently canceled.

A BILL TO ELIMINATE APPROPRIATIONS CEILING ON THE ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, section 49 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act states that aggregate appropriations for this vital Agency must not exceed $10 million. I am today introducing a bill to eliminate that ceiling, which if left standing means that not more than $10 million may be appropriated during the life of that Agency. Already, Mr. Speaker, about $8.3 million of the $10 million authorized has been appropriated.

It would be tragic and a waste of the valuable work already performed by the Agency if this ceiling is not removed. This leaves $1.7 million authorized but unappropriated, while the Agency requests $15 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963.

Tens of billions—more than $50 billion this year—are being spent in the quest for defense. Surely, activities aimed at an indispensable element in defense—the search for effective international arms control—should not be impaired by an outdated appropriations ceiling.

In connection with this, I wish to call attention to two observations—one by President Kennedy and the second by William C. Foster, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

President Kennedy in September 1961, appeared before the U.N. General Assembly to state:

> Every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.

Mr. Foster at a symposium at Ann Arbor, Mich., last December stated:

> Nonetheless, we can not enjoy a real sense of security today. If the arms race continues, the hazards to our own security will become increasingly sharp.

These are concise statements, Mr. Speaker, which should bring home to us the urgency in permitting the Agency to continue its quest unhampered by an unrealistic appropriations level.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE EDITH GREEN, OF OREGON, ACCOMPANYING BILL TO PROVIDE CERTAIN DATA FROM MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, THEIR SPOUSES, AND CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with my March 11 speech on the floor of the House, I am introducing today a bill—the third in a projected series—to require from Members of Congress and their spouses annual statements of sources of income as well as transactions in real estate, commodities, and securities. The requirement also applies to employees of the Congress with an income at the annual rate of $12,500 or more.

CAPITAL GAINS FOR PULPWOOD AND TIMBER

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina tree farmers have much more land in forest than all the other cropland combined including grassland. Our tree farmers realize more income annually from trees than any other single crop in South Carolina.

When pine trees are planted or when they just come up, as is common in the pine belt, it is usually a minimum of 12 to 15 years before any income can be realized; and this is in the form of pulpwood. It is usually a minimum of 25 to 30 years before pine timber can be harvested for lumber; and thereafter it can be selectively cut every 5, 10, or sometimes it is 20 years. This is true for pine and poplar, and for our hardwoods it requires many more extra years to mature. In the meantime, the farmer must pay taxes on his forest land, he must prevent fire, and in some cases he must do some thinning and pruning for which he receives no return whatever.

The small tree farmer cannot harvest a few trees annually for pulpwood or for timber. He must wait for a number of years until his trees reach such size or such volume that it will be economically feasible for someone with equipment and trucks to come in and buy his pulpwood and timber.

Many small farmers have invested heavily in pine trees in the hope that in 10, 15, or 20 years they could make a harvest with which to send their children or grandchildren to college. This is the only means thousands of our tree farmers in the Southland have to send their children to college.

The elimination of capital gains on pulpwood and timber production, as proposed by the tax program of the President, would be a severe and tragic blow to the tree farmers of South Carolina and to those of the entire South. This tax proposal, if adopted, would add greatly to the farm problem, particularly the already depressed family-size farmer who owns most of the pulp and timber land in the South.

Mr. Speaker, my people have been encouraged for 30 years to plant trees under our conservation program. They have been taught reforestation. They have been urged to set out trees to conserve water, and lately, milllions of trees have been set out under the soil bank. As an example, my home county in 1919 planted more than 70,000 acres in cotton—last year only 2,200 acres. We have gone to pine trees, but trees simply cannot be harvested every year on our small farms. Therefore, I know of nothing which would set back agriculture in the whole Southland more than this proposal to eliminate capital gains.

Mr. Speaker, I served in the house and in the senate in South Carolina; and I have never served with more dignified, dedicated, and patriotic legislators.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to you and to this entire Congress for your earnest consideration the following, most timely, concurrent resolution unanimously adopted by the Senate and House of the State of South Carolina on March 6, 1963, opposing the elimination of capital gains on pulp and timber. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was offered by three of our most distinguished Senators, Senator John West, of Camden; Senator Henry B. Richardson, of Sumter; and Senator C. Claymon Grimes, Jr., of Georgetown.

> CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO REJECT THAT PORTION OF THE TAX PROGRAM OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES WHICH WOULD ELIMINATE THE CAPITAL GAINS ON THE SALE OF TIMBER AND URGING THE CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION FROM SOUTH CAROLINA TO OPPOSE, WITH ALL THE STRENGTH AT THEIR DISPOSAL, THE PASSAGE OF SUCH A MEASURE
>
> Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina has been informed that a portion of the tax program of the President of the United States includes the elimination of capital gains on the sale of timber; and
>
> Whereas this information has caused the general assembly and a large segment of the population of the State great concern in view of the fact that timber and forest products generally constitute the No. 1 farm crop of the State; and
>
> Whereas the enacting into law the President's proposal will most certainly effect the economy of the State very adversely; and
>
> Whereas the general assembly notes that many less advantageous crops of this State have, through recent years, been shifted to forests and that thousands of acres of land formerly planted in less productive crops are now planted in vast forests resulting in great financial gain; and
>
> Whereas the members of the general assembly believe that any effort to saddle this new industry of the State with an additional tax burden would serve to greatly discourage the further advancement of this most important crop: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which proposes the elimination of the capital gains of the sale of timber; be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That the members of the congressional delegation from South Carolina are urged to oppose with all the strength at their command the enactment of this legislation; be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the presiding officers of the two Houses in the Congress and to each member of the congressional delegation from South Carolina.

ISSUANCE OF PASSPORTS AND AREA TRAVEL BANS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Members of the House about a problem that I ran into in the case of one of my constituents in his relations with the U.S. Government.

The reason I asked for 30 minutes on the floor of the House during which to discuss this problem is that the underlying policies involved are very important ones. They should mean something, to the country as a whole, and they are indicative of attitudes of the Government that are in need of reorganization.

My constituent's name is George W. Martin, Jr. He lives in Manhattan. Mr. Martin had planned to leave on April 15 of this year for a 2-week cruise to the Greek islands with stops in various cities in Greece, Turkey, Yugoslavia, and Albania. This particular cruise was arranged by an English organization entitled "Swan's Hellenic Cruises." The tour consists largely of a group of Englishmen and Europeans who are interested in Greek civilization. The cruise will be accompanied by British university professors who will provide lectures during the tour.

Each of the persons on this tour presumably is a person interested in Greek history, Greek civilization, and how Greek civilization relates to the modern age.

My constituent, Mr. Martin, is a distinguished author. His most recently published book is entitled "The Battle of the Frogs and the Mice," subtitle "A Homeric Fable." It is based on Greek mythology adapted to the present time.

Prior to this publication Mr. Martin was the author of a leading book on the opera and recently he has completed a manuscript on the Italian composer, Verdi.

On April 27 it is planned the ship will dock at Durres, Albania, in order to take a brief bus ride, as a group, to examine some of the most ancient and most interesting Greek ruins of the whole trip. The excursion does not involve any overnight stay in Albania nor at any time moving in anything less than a group.

After making arrangements for the trip Mr. Martin was advised by the British company that his American passport would not be valid for Albania; that he, Mr. Martin, will be relieved of the passport when the ship reaches Durres; and that if he should attempt to leave the ship the U.S. Government has given instructions that he is to be reported to the U.S. authorities.

Mr. Martin brought this to my attention and I took up the matter orally with the Department of State. I made the point that here was a group of British and European scholars and professors, all interested in Greek civilization, together taking a most interesting tour of the Greek isles, and yet when they stop at the port of Durres to see some of the greatest Greek ruins of all, Mr. Martin will be the only person on board the ship who will be required to stand at the gangplank, to surrender his passport and suffer the humiliation of being left behind because his government won't let him go.

I pointed out to the gentlemen in the State Department that I thought this was not only an embarrassment to my constituent but that it was an embarrassment as well to the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a new subject. As the House well knows the subject of the issuance of passports and area travel bans is in a state of confusion. Past procedures of the State Department in this area were struck down by the Supreme Court in three important cases, the Kent, Briehl and Dayton cases. So I immediately raised the question on what power and authority does the State Department rest its case. In addition, assuming authority exists, is the power reasonably exercised in any particular case.

The case of Mr. Martin has triggered off quite a discussion, I am pleased to say, at various levels in the Department of State. I will tell you how this particular tale came out in just a few moments. You will be interested to know what happened in the case of Mr. Martin.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, there has been a reluctance to come to grips with this whole problem of area travel bans. The Martin case has served the useful purpose of removing the subject from the back burner.

Subsequent to my conversations with the State Department I received a letter from Assistant Secretary Frederick G. Dutton on this subject dated February 28, 1963, which reads as follows:

> DEAR CONGRESSMAN LINDSAY: I am writing in response to your oral request to me regarding existing restrictions on the travel of U.S. citizens to Albania.
>
> In order that you may more fully appreciate the Department's current policy in this matter, it may be useful if I relate briefly some of the background.
>
> The Department's policies with respect to travel limitations as established by previous administrations had not been reflected in any published regulations but were brought to public attention through the issuance of press releases.

This is the U.S. Government, I insert here parenthetically, standing on a power base of authority created only by press release.

> This unsatisfactory procedure has been under review at the direction of the Secretary in the Department with the object of achieving a more orderly procedure through published regulations of the Department. This includes a complete review of past policies, including the present limitation on travel to Albania. This review involves both form and substance and is expected to be completed in the near future.
>
> In the meantime, in order to be responsive to your immediate inquiry, I would call to your attention the fact that the Secretary of State has the statutory power to designate restricted geographical areas and to refuse to sanction the travel of U.S. citizens to that area (sec. 215 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1185).
>
> Application of this authority in the Secretary to restrict travel to Communist China was upheld in *Worthy* v. *Herter*, 106 App. D.C. 153. 270 F. 2d 905 (1959) certiorari denied 361 U.S. 918 (1959). The same considerations apply to the restriction of travel of citizens of the United States to Albania.
>
> On April 28, 1952, the Department of State limited the travel of U.S. citizens to Albania by invalidating all passports issued thereafter for such travel unless specifically endorsed under the authority of the Department to be valid for such travel. The decision to restrict travel to Albania was announced in a Department press release dated May 1, 1952. The limitations on the travel of U.S. citizens to Albania have not been lifted or removed.
>
> Passports are being specifically endorsed for travel to Albania when information furnished by the applicant shows that he meets the standards established by the Department as a condition for such endorsement and if there is no adverse information available which would bar such travel.
>
> The passports of persons wishing to travel to Albania are validated for such travel when there is a "legitimate business justification, reason of compelling interest, or when the refusal will result in considerable damage to the individual concerned." A request made for the purpose of visiting relatives or settling an estate is considered as falling within a "reason of compelling interest." Tourist travel to Albania is not being approved.
>
> The Department appreciates your interest in the problem of limitation upon travel and would be glad to receive any views which you may hold regarding this area of restricted travel of U.S. citizens.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
> *Assistant Secretary.*

The provision of the Immigration and Naturalization Act that is referred to as the underlying basis for authority is 8 U.S.C. 1185, mentioned in Mr. Dutton's letter. But this provision in the Immigration and Naturalization Act is a provision pertaining only to wartime conditions or existence of a national emergency proclaimed as such by the President of the United States in an official proclamation, and even in this case the imposition of an area ban is a discretionary act on the part of the executive branch and not an act by any direction of the Congress.

One would suppose, Mr. Speaker, that there would be some commonsense attached to discretionary acts on the part of Government.

In this case the U.S. State Department was asking Mr. Martin to submit to embarrassment, and for what reason? In my view, if there were anything to be gained by the United States or its citizens it would be one thing. But there is nothing to be gained.

I do not accept the fact that this is done for the protection of responsible U.S. citizens such as Mr. Martin. This is often given as the reason. But the State Department let the cat out of the bag in its letter to me. In Mr. Dutton's letter to me he states that the State Department would make an exception for a U.S. citizen traveling in Albania where there is legitimate business justification or reason of compelling interests or that the refusal will result in considerable damage to the individual concerned. The letter goes on to state that a request made for the purpose of visiting relatives or settling an estate is considered as falling within a reasonable or compelling interest.

Now what a grand jumble of legal niceties this is. If it is safe for Joe Doakes to visit Albania because his Aunt Mary has left him a valuable set of library books on Greek mythology, and the will is being contested, why is it unsafe for a U.S. citizen who is a writer on Greek mythology to travel in a bus a few miles in from the coast in order to see preserved relics of ancient Greek history. If Charles Dickens were alive today, he would have found no greater example of legal humbug than this.

It will be said that Albania is a Communist state. Of course it is. It is under the domination of Moscow. But we permit our citizens to visit Moscow. If the Soviet Union or Albania will not permit our citizens to enter, that is another matter, but that is not the case in point.

But apart from the legal and other inconsistencies involved, it seems to me that the State Department has in the past been treading on some very fundamental rights. The right to travel, Mr. Speaker, which means the right to communicate is an important and sensitive right. The Supreme Court has stated it is a right subject to the due process protection. A rereading of the opinions of the Supreme Court in the three cases that I mentioned—Kent, Briehl, and Dayton—will suggest the dangers of resting such cases on a press release as authority for a very doubtful proposition to begin with.

I was very pleased that Mr. Dutton in his letter asked me for my views regarding this area of restricted travel for U.S. citizens. My views, Mr. Speaker, can be very simply stated. I doubt that the State Department has the power to withhold a passport in this particular case, and if the State Department does have the power, it is a discretionary power only and would have been very badly exercised in this case.

Now back to Mr. Martin. I want to extend a compliment to the State Department because, on review of the whole case, the Department found that it would serve no useful purpose whatever not to allow Mr. Martin to visit Durres with the others. That is a very sensible and sound conclusion, and I give the State Department good marks for having reached this conclusion in this case.

You may ask, Why am I taking the floor now to talk about this case and to bring it to public attention? I even run the risk of having some of my colleagues here, who may take a different view than I, making some complaint, raising some question suggesting that the State Department acted unwisely in the case of Mr. Martin. Why rock the boat? That is the very reason I am talking. It is time the boat was rocked. I am very interested in bringing this matter to public attention and in pushing the State Department into a resolution of the underlying question. This question has remained unresolved for some years. It has lain around unresolved with various aspects of the State Department going in quite different directions, and with all persons in the State Department quite aware that an entire area of U.S. policy has been grounded on the issuance of some press releases and not on proper regulations.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I just wanted to ascertain whether or not you are advocating the principle of uncontrolled travel by U.S. citizens, including Communists, to any Communist country, which includes Albania, which, as you know, is Communist controlled and also a country with which we do not have diplomatic relations.

Mr. LINDSAY. The short answer to the gentleman's question as stated and framed by him is, "No."

Now, to go on. The State Department cannot continue in this never-never land in which it finds itself at the present time. Proper regulations have to be issued, and those regulations must have due regard to a very fundamental right, which is the right to communicate, which means the right to travel.

A review of the regulations, further, should have in mind that there are due process rights and first amendment rights involved. The area ban is a very doubtful basis to begin with. I am not sure it serves any useful purpose. In any event I hope the Department will not operate out of fear or narrowmindedness. The issue is far too important.

BRITISH SHIPPING REPUTATION SUFFERS MAINLY FROM ONE TRADER

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, I disclosed on the floor of the House that an American citizen held substantial interest in British shipping concerns which may be held accountable for two-thirds of all current British shipping to Communist Cuba. Ironically, this same citizen has received some $32 million in U.S. Government-insured ship construction loans.

It has come to my attention that the British firm of Rethymnis & Kulukundis, Ltd., in which American citizen Manuel Kulukundis of New York owns 25 of 115 shares, has served as agent for 80 percent of the non-Communist tankers calling in Cuban ports since the beginning of 1963. Presumably these tankers are carrying vital petroleum cargoes from the Soviet Union—and we know that if Castro's oil supply was crimped, Cuba's economy would come to a screeching halt.

During the summer months of 1962, when the Soviets launched their full-scale buildup in Cuba, 12 of the 14 Kulukundis-controlled ships supplying the island of Cuba were tankers, and these ships carried cargoes vital to the Communists from ports inside the Soviet Union. Kulukundis' British affiliates signed a long-term oil shipping contract with the Soviets in 1960, the same year he received some $23 million in U.S. Government-insured loans.

Most British shipping firms have voluntarily suspended shipping to Cuba. It is unfortunate that one shipping syndicate is allowed to continue its aid to the Communists, thereby creating a blotch on the reputations of the responsible members of Britain's merchant fleet.

The International Chamber of Shipping, a worldwide association of the maritime industry, stated that it could not unilaterally ban free world shipping to Cuba because "it was not for the International Chamber of Shipping to usurp the responsibilities of governments." Just last Friday the Greek Government instituted a ban on further Greek shipping to Cuba. The government of Greece is to be commended for this action, and the American people give this positive affirmation of friendship their applause.

Hopefully, the responsible British shipping interests will urge their government to halt further British shipping to Cuba. The British shipping ministry could start with the British affiliates of American citizen Manuel Kulukundis.

Mr. Speaker, since January 1, 1963, there have been 10 ships affiliated with the Rethymnis & Kulukundis Agency in London which have called in U.S. ports. Dollars from profitable American cargoes have thus gone to further the operations of this shipping syndicate which chooses to do business with the Communists while enjoying the privileges of freedom.

I urge that Great Britain halt continued British shipping to Cuba, and that the United States close its ports to nations which allow further sea trade with Castro's Communist island.

EPILEPTIC CHILDREN

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to call to the attention of my colleagues a bill which I am introducing today, which deals with what is, in my opinion, one of the most sadly neglected segments of our population today—the 1,200,000 school-age children and adolescents in America who suffer from epilepsy.

The research and treatment data which has been gathered on this condition, chiefly by such organizations as the Epilepsy Foundation which has national headquarters in Washington, demonstrates conclusively that the overwhelming majority of the children and adolescents stricken with this disease are capable of taking full advantage of the scholastic opportunities offered by the public and private schools of America.

You will note that I said capable of so doing. The tragedy of the situation is that because of the fear and ignorance which shrouds this condition thousands of these youngsters are being denied the equal educational opportunity which is every American child's birthright. This fear and ignorance unfortunately permeates our public school system as well as other segments of our population.

The unfortunate fact is that many teachers, principals, and school officials of America are not aware of the advances which have been made in the understanding and treatment of epilepsy in recent years. Because of this, admissions policies and policies for dealing with epileptics within the schools have resulted in too many cases in the denial to epileptics of opportunities to realize the educational levels they could otherwise achieve.

This bill would help to overcome this problem. In a society where education is crucially important in preparation for employment and social adjustment, the Nation cannot afford to lose to neglect these present 1,200,000 Americans, and the many more thousands who will follow.

The child with epilepsy does not differ from any other child in the way he looks or behaves as a direct result of having epilepsy. But he is affected by the attitudes of his parents, teachers, and other members of his social environment.

Medical research has proved that most epileptics are not injured physiologically by seizures—the only possible damage is bodily injury resulting from a fall. So the principal effect is a psychosocial disturbance. Without these psychological and social effects, the child with epilepsy would be expected to live a completely normal life, receive his education in a completely normal way. But this psychosocial disturbance is a result of attitudes toward the epileptic child—the attitude of his parents, teachers, and schoolmates.

In a pamphlet published by the Epilepsy Foundation, Dr. Norris Haring writes of a recent survey of the attitudes of educators toward epileptic schoolchildren. A large percentage of these teachers, principals, and school administrators expressed fear. This feeling of fear ranged from fear that the child would harm himself or someone else during a seizure, to the fear of not knowing what to do in the case of a child having a seizure.

Dr. Haring notes that a large number of studies over the past 20 years have provided convincing evidence that changing public attitudes toward the child with epilepsy can best be accomplished by keeping the child in the public or private school and the design of a careful program of training educators on understanding epilepsy and knowing how to meet classroom problems arising from the condition.

The Education of Students With Epilepsy Act will be the first nationwide effort to help solve the most insidious problem facing one of our Nation's most valuable resources, the over 1 million capable, potentially productive schoolchildren, whose chief misfortune is their suffering from the misconceptions of those who are supposed to lead them to a rich and useful adulthood.

THE URGENT NEED FOR AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on February 21 of this year I introduced H.R. 4061, a bill to accelerate, extend, and strengthen the Federal air pollution control program. I did so because I feel air pollution control is a vitally important problem and one which demands our immediate action.

Of course, the problem of air pollution is not a new one. Indeed, as early as the first century men had begun to complain about the murky air which they breathed and to suspect that it was the cause of some of their physical ailments. Seneca wrote of the "heavy air of Rome and the stench of its smoky chimneys which when stirred poured forth whatever pestilent vapors and soot they held enclosed." Centuries later both Shakespeare and Milton noted this matter, Shakespeare calling the London air "a foul and pestilent congregation of vapors." So we see that both Imperial Rome and Elizabethan England were beset by the same problem which is confronting modern-day industrial America. It seems clear, however, that in our civilization air pollution is a greater menace to health than it has ever been before. Ancient Rome and Elizabethan England breathed air polluted by smoke and soot from fires used to heat homes. Today we in the United States breathe air that is polluted not only by the dirt and fumes from home furnaces, but also by automobile exhaust, industrial chemicals, and the residues from burning wastes as well as from the fuels necessary for generating power.

Unless we adopt stringent measures to control air pollution, this health hazard will most certainly assume even more gigantic proportions in the years ahead. There are several reasons for this. One is that our country is growing and at the same time is becoming increasingly urbanized. By 1970 our population will have reached the 220 million mark. Two-thirds of these people will live in cities covering less than 10 percent of our total land area. More people will require more cars, more factories, and more power for domestic and industrial purposes. Into air already hazy with smoke, soot, and chemical vapors will go more of the same.

Another factor to be considered is that our national economy is expanding. Between 1960 and 1970 the gross national product is expected to climb by 60 percent. This means, of course, an increase in commercial and industrial activities which will require more and more energy. It has been estimated that demand for power will nearly double in the next 20 years. Although some energy will be generated by water power and some by nuclear reactors, most of it will have to be provided by combustion of fuels with a corresponding increase in potential air pollution.

Yet another very significant aspect of the air pollution picture is the rising number of motor vehicles and the enormously increased fuel consumption and mileage recorded each year. By 1980 experts predict we will have 120 million vehicles on our highways—50 million more than at present. Moreover, the number of vehicle miles traveled will nearly double. In other words, 120 million cars, trucks, and buses will crowd the roads, each averaging 9,400 miles per year and emitting thousands of tons of combustion products into the air we breathe.

Now why am I concerned and why should you be concerned about air pollution? Why should we try to do something about it? Why not accept it as one of the prices that must be paid for progress by an urban, industrial, and mobile society? One reason is that air pollution costs us as much as $11 billion per year in damaged or destroyed crops, reduced meat and milk production, and depressed property values. Another reason, and to me a much more important one, is that air pollution is a real threat to the health of all our citizens. We have all seen the dramatic and frightening results of a heavy smog which envelops a city for days or weeks such as the one which settled over Britain this winter, bringing with it illness and even death for the weak and the elderly. Such episodes, fortunately, are not numerous; however, it is just this fact that leads to our apathy in regard to air pollution control. Because we do not see constant and striking evidence of the effects of air pollution, we relegate the subject of its control to the list of things we plan to do something about later—always later. Growing evidence as to the deleterious effects of long-term exposure to air pollution, however, is forcing us at last to examine this problem and to take action to conquer it.

Evidence is beginning to accumulate which points to air pollution as the cause of several diseases and an accelerating factor in the progress of a number of others. Air pollution has been linked to emphysema, a chronic lung disease in which there is a breakdown of lung tissue capable of carrying out oxygen transfer. As a result the victim experiences shortness of breath and is unable to bear even slight exertion. Various other respiratory conditions such as asthma and bronchitis are also aggravated by air pollution. Studies show that these conditions are more prevalent in urban areas than in rural areas where pollution is less severe and also that these conditions are alleviated when the patients are placed in an environment where chemical irritants are removed from the air by means of filters.

Lung cancer is significantly higher among urban dwellers than among rural groups, even when smoking habits are the same. Although the research is still incomplete, there is evidence linking lung cancer to air pollution, and it is known that a number of the pollutants found in community air supplies will produce cancer in experimental animals. Also under study is cancer of the stomach and esophagus since a considerable amount of the pollution in the air is swallowed.

Additional research is now in progress to establish the relationship between air pollution and heart disease. Although there are many contributing causes of heart disease, circumstantial evidence is strong that air pollution plays an important role.

Less tragic than heart disease or cancer but nevertheless inconvenient and uncomfortable is the common cold. And that too has now been linked to air pollution. Just this week the Public Health Service has issued a statement citing the studies of Dr. F. Curtis Dohan of the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine as evidence that airborne sulfur compounds "trigger outbreaks of upper respiratory infections."

When we think of the tens of millions of workdays lost due to colds and chronic respiratory complaints as well as of the suffering and death that could be prevented, surely we must recognize the urgent necessity of finding and enforcing means of controlling air pollution.

I have long been deeply concerned about air pollution. I have voted for air pollution control bills when they have come before the House. I am proud to have been instrumental in the drawing up of a tristate compact by New York, Connecticut, and my home State, New Jersey, for air pollution study and control.

However, the time has come for more drastic action. The problem is of more than local significance; it affects every citizen. Moreover, the threat to our national health grows more ominous each month, each week, each day that we procrastinate. Therefore, I have introduced H.R. 4061, a bill which provides for a national research program into the causes, effects, and methods of control of air pollution. My bill also authorizes the appropriation of $74 million over a 10-year period for grants for support of air pollution control. It calls for the encouragement of interstate cooperative activities and the adoption of uniform laws. It creates an air pollution advisory board in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and, most important of all, provides the authority and machinery for enforcing air pollution control measures.

My bill, H.R. 4061, meets the requirements outlined by the President in his recent health message for necessary legislation in the field of air pollution control. It also embodies many of the recommendations of the Committee on Environmental Health Problems which submitted its report to the Surgeon General in November 1961. It is a strong bill and, I believe, a sound one. I cannot emphasize too strongly the urgency of this matter. There is much to do, and we have already delayed too long. Let us now move with all possible speed toward a solution of this problem. It is a difficult problem but one which must be solved—which can be solved by passage of this bill.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Conte, for 3 hours, on March 26, 1963.

Mr. Lindsay, for 1 hour, on Thursday next, vacating his special order for Wednesday, March 20.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Feighan.

Mrs. Green of Oregon.

Mr. Patman.

Mr. Staebler.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hall) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Barry in three instances.

Mr. McLoskey.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Udall.

Mr. Carey.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2438. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, March 21, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

567. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, relative to reporting that an adequate soil survey and land classification of the lands in the Glen Elder unit, Solomon division, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas, has been completed, pursuant to Public Law 172, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Appropriations.

568. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act (Public Law 87–27, 87th Congress, 1st sess.); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 12. A bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 4987. A bill to provide for the return to the United States of the remains of members of the Armed Forces who died after September 2, 1939, and whose remains are buried outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 4988. A bill relating to the taxable status of sales prior to September 1, 1955, of tubes for use in the production of certain component parts of television receiving sets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 4989. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to transfer the counties of Genesee and Shiawassee in the State of Michigan from the northern division to the southern division of the eastern judicial district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 4990. A bill to amend section 314(q) of title 38, United States Code, to provide an increased rate of compensation for arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS (by request):

H.R. 4991. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Commitee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 4992. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act to eliminate the ceiling upon amounts that may be appropriated to carry out that act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 4993. A bill to require Members of Congress, their spouses and certain other related persons, and all employees of the Congress to file statements disclosing the amount and sources of their incomes, the value of their assets, and their dealings in real estate, securities, and commodities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 4994. A bill to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 in order to require that imported woven labels must have woven into them the name of the country where woven; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 4995. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the additions to the reserves for bad debts of certain agricultural and livestock credit corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 4996. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 4997. A bill to extend the feed grain program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 4998. A bill to authorize the construction of the Big Pine Reservoir in the State of Indiana for flood control, recreation, and related purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 4999. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Fire Island National Seashore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of Michigan:

H.R. 5000. A bill to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to improved methods of education of students with epilepsy in public and private schools and institutions of higher learning; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 5001. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 5002. A bill to amend the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.J. Res. 330. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to defeat and reject the extreme and harmful changes in timber taxation proposed by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon to the Ways and Means Committee on February 6, 1963; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pursue an equitable fiscal policy for the purpose of preserving the economic freedom of the citizens of the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorials of the Legislature of the State of Georgia memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to eliminate the inequity of the two-price system of cotton cost; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to stating that in the interest of maintaining our second largest industry, forest products, that IRC 631–A should neither be tampered with nor repealed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reject the proposal of the President of the United States to revise the income tax laws of this country by requiring those persons who itemize their deductions in their returns to subtract 5 percent of the adjusted gross income from the total income of their itemized deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 5003. A bill for the relief of Hugh A. Bruce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 5004. A bill for the relief of Konstantina D. Ioannou (Johnson); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 5005. A bill for the relief of Bruno Neglio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5006. A bill for the relief of Irma Hegedus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5007. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Noto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5008. A bill for the relief of Joseph Artio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Tribute to the American Legion, on the Occasion of Its 44th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to call attention to the fact that 44 years ago this month the American Legion came into existence at the so-called Paris caucus of March 1919.

That was, in my estimation, a singularly important event, Mr. Speaker, representing as it did the first major attempt of American veterans of World War I to quash the expansion of world communism—a baby tiger in the year 1919, that was to grow into the awesome beast which we confront today.

Had all Americans risen in like spirit, to meet the threat of communism in 1919, there would be no such problem confronting us at this moment as that represented by Russia, Red China, Cuba, and the rest of Communist society. Unfortunately, however, the Legion stood virtually alone, back in those days, in viewing with alarm the dramatic spread of Communist ideology. While others, in a manner befitting idiot children, spoke in terms of communism as a kind of interesting experiment, the newborn American Legion of 1919 was pouring forth its condemnation of Communist principles from the start.

This was the period, you will recall, when European veterans were returning home en masse to join the Socialist Party of that period, from which revolutionary efforts developed in Russia, Hungary, Germany, and many other countries, including even Canada. Moving in to eliminate the revolutionary spirit among American veterans, the American Legion reminded its followers of that for which they had fought: a set of principles standing forth far and above the feeble promises of socialism. In short time the Legion battle cry had carried the day among the great mass of American doughboys and there was not the slightest chance for socialism's spread within the United States—at least, not with the aid of American veterans, and not without their bitter opposition.

Notwithstanding all later contributions of the American Legion to the American way of life, none, in my opinion, exceeds in importance the very first step, by which the Legion aided and abetted the democratic cause at a dangerous and perilous time, and with remarkable effect.

We have every reason to hail the accomplishments of the American Legion at this time, and to wish its membership good health and a glorious future in the stirring days ahead.

Increase in Residual Oil Import Levels Not Viewed as Victory for Coal, Nor Is This Action a Loss for Venezuela Or East Coast Area of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on March 16, 1963, the Washington Post reported in its news columns an action by the Secretary of the Interior on March 15 wherein he issued an order in which maximum import levels for residual fuel oil to be used as fuel were announced at a new level of 575,000 barrels daily for the east coast—PAD District I—for the allocation period April 1, 1963 through March 31, 1964.

The Post's staff reporter, Julius Duscha, set the stage in his interpretative news article for an editorial in the same issue. The headline of the Duscha story was "Residual Oil Imports Get 9.6 Percent Increase." That staff reporter described the action in the first two paragraphs as follows:

> Domestic coal and oil producers won a significant victory yesterday when Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall authorized only a small increase in residual oil imports.
>
> The losers in the decision were Venezuela, which produces nearly all of the residual oil burned in the United States, and the users of the thick industrial fuel, most of whom are in New England.

Mr. Duscha then wrote in the next paragraph that—

> The White House and the Interior Department have been subject to intense political pressures both from the supporters and from the opponents of the controversial import control program.

In an editorial, the title of which was "Skidding on Oil," the Post expanded the Duscha line and attacked the residual oil import control program in general and the March 15 policy and quota pronouncement in particular.

It is my view that both Mr. Duscha and the writer of the opinion article, "Skidding on Oil," wrote prejudged accounts of the action. I have responded in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post.

It is my judgment that the news dispatch under the headline, "Eastern Import Quotas for Residual Fuel Oil Are Boosted by Agency," in the March 18, 1963, issue of the Wall Street Journal comes closer to being an accurate account, and I quote parts of that news story as follows:

> WASHINGTON.—The Interior Department, as expected, set maximum import levels for residual fuel oil on the east coast at about 575,000 barrels a day, beginning April 1. This is about 50,200 barrels a day more than currently authorized.

I inquire, Mr. President, where is the victory for domestic coal and oil producers claimed by Mr. Duscha in the Washington Post article? A daily increase of 50,200 barrels of residual oil imports is hardly a victory for coal and it certainly does not represent the loss for Venezuela that Mr. Duscha and the Post editorial imply.

Now, Mr. President, I call attention to the following additional paragraph from the Wall Street Journal dispatch:

> There is pressure on one side from coal mining interests to tighten Government curbs on residual fuel oil imports, and pressure on the other side from industrial consumers to scrap the curbs. The Kennedy administration, in announcing the new allocations, in effect, ignored both sides and continued the present policy of setting the aggregate quota equal to the difference between estimated demand and domestic output.

That interpretation appears to me to be much more realistic than the news article and the editorial published in the March 16 issue of the Washington Post.

I have stated in a letter to the editor of the Post the personal view and official opinion that "the President, as our Chief of State, as our Commander in Chief, and as the Chief Executive—and he does wear all of these hats in this instance—has been attempting to perform the art of the possible through democratic compromise, and has not been trying to do the impossible—please everybody—as charged in the Post editorial."

And I stated further that because the policy seems not to be especially pleasing to anyone, "this is not necessarily an indictment of the administration; perhaps it has, on balance, done the best that it is possible to do in arriving at its solution to a problem on which there is such wide disagreement."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the March 16, 1963, Washington Post editorial, "Skidding on Oil," and my letter of March 18 to the editor of that paper in which I comment in considerable detail on the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 16, 1963]

SKIDDING ON OIL

Caught between the devil of domestic politics and the deep blue Caribbean Sea, the administration is trying to do the impossible in framing its residual oil policy. It is seeking to please everybody. During the Eisenhower administration, this country unwisely began placing import restrictions on residual oil, a thick, sticky substance chiefly produced in Venezuela for industrial purposes in the Eastern States. And what has been bad for Venezuela and costly for American consumers has been mistakenly considered a help to the domestic coal industry.

A month ago, a top-level White House memorandum called for a "careful and meaningful relaxation" of controls on residual oil imports. The outcry from coal producers and from the refining branch of the oil industry was prompt and predictable—and apparently the outcry was heard. As this newspaper forecast, the administration yesterday announced the smallest possible increase in residual quotas—50,000 barrels a day which would make the daily quota 567,000 barrels.

The figures are slippery, and by artful presentation it may be possible to argue that something is being done for the embattled democracy of Venezuela. But can it be seriously argued that the wafer-thin increase is in any sense meaningful? That was the phrase used by the White House memorandum—a phrase, be it noted, that was approved by every department involved except the Labor Department. Last year, without benefit of a White House report, residual quotas were increased by 56,000 barrels a day.

Let it be acknowledged that the dilemma is real. But this administration has a way of using glowing rhetoric about free trade and then retreating in concrete instances into the foxholes of protectionism. It surely might entail some difficulties with coal State Senators if a genuinely meaningful relaxation of residual oil imports were put into effect April 1. But then it would entail infinitely more difficulties if the regime of President Betancourt should be overwhelmed by the totalitarian enemies who find comfort in every trade discrimination this country aims at Venezuela.

WASHINGTON, *March 18, 1963.*

EDITOR,
The Washington Post.

SIR: Your editorial, "Skidding on Oil," in the Saturday, March 16, 1963, issue is representative of the type of advocacy of uncontrolled entry of foreign products into this country that tends to increase the ranks of both protectionist and isolationist blocs in the United States—especially in the interior States. And I write this as one who supported the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and most foreign aid and international policy legislation during my 19 years in the Congress. But I write also in the role of one who is becoming alarmed in seeing the ranks of employed American labor thinned by the impact of imports on certain domestic industries and markets.

In this connection, I suggest that the rush of the coal industry into manpower-displacing mechanization of mining came principally at the time of and as a consequence of the advent of uncontrolled imports of predatorially priced foreign residual oil. It was and continues to be a condition forced by growing foreign competition—a competition the Post apparently would have expanded and accelerated notwithstanding the economic consequences of driving domestic fuels industries out of more and more of the domestic markets.

Your editorial observes that the administration is trying to do the impossible in framing its residual oil policy, namely, is seeking to please everybody. Without implying complete approval of the administration's residual oil policy, I cannot agree with this observation.

In representing a coal, oil, and gas producing State, I have been endeavoring to work for the appropriate and necessary interests of these important domestic industries, the health of which means so much to our local, State, and national economies and to our people. Accordingly, I have been a consistent and persistent participant in discussions, negotiations, and deliberations with a bearing on the development of international trade legislation and on the formulation of residual oil policies especially.

It is clear that there are differing views within the administration concerning the question of what should be this Government's policy on residual oil as a commodity and on importation of foreign residual oil in particular. But it is my personal and official opinion that the President, as our Chief of State, as our Commander in Chief, and as the Chief Executive—and he does wear all of these hats in this instance—has been attempting to perform the art of the possible through democratic compromise, and has not been trying to do the impossible, as charged in the Post editorial.

I feel that the President knows it is impossible to please or satisfy within the framework of a single policy the editors of the Post, the Venezuelan Government, the international oil companies involved in the refining and marketing of Venezuelan and Dutch Antilles petroleum products (including residuals), the east coast importers-marketers, and the domestic coal, oil, and gas economy interests—including the so-called coal State Senators to whom you refer.

The fact is, of course, that the residual oil import control program announced last Friday in the Post as a "coal victory" was not that at all. It is obvious that it was not pleasing in any degree to the Post's editors. Apparently it was not received with applause by either the Venezuelan Government or some of the international oil companies or by importers-marketers. But neither was it totally satisfactory to me or to colleagues allied in the effort to keep residual oil imports at tolerable and reasonable levels. Segments of the coal industry, in fact, have severely criticized the latest installment of the administration's residual oil import control plan.

It seems, therefore, that the editorial allegation that "the administration is seeking to please everybody" is one which does not square with the facts because no one especially seems to be pleased with the policy. This condition is not necessarily an indictment of the administration; perhaps it has, on balance, done the best that it is possible to do in arriving at its solution to a problem on which there is such wide disagreement on all facets.

I am disappointed that the announced residual oil control program lacks elements which are necessary to help bring about more stability for domestic fuels industries. But this does not alter my view that the President arbitrated the widely differing opinions on the controversial subject in what he doubtless construed to be the best interests of the combined and inseparable national security, national economy, and so-called hemisphere solidarity considerations which it is his duty to evaluate and protect.

Although I do differ with the administration on some details, I do not concur with the Post's editorial inference that there is nothing "meaningful" about "placing import restrictions on residual oil, a thick, sticky substance chiefly produced in Venezuela for industrial purposes in the Eastern States."

It is amazing your newspaper should imply that the Government of the United States has little if any obligation to the interior States but seemingly does have a superior obligation to Venezuela and the industries of the eastern seaboard States.

After terming the restrictions on residual oil imports to be unwise, your editorial declared that the control program "has been bad for Venezuela and costly for American consumers (and) has been mistakenly considered a help to the domestic coal industry."

I challenge this assertion. The following is in rebuttal:

Residual oil sales in the Eastern United States alone are and have been for some time supporting approximately one-fourth of the total cost of the Venezuelan Government. This certainly is a real and very substantial yield for a country's waste product. And it is a considerable contribution for this one Venezuelan commodity to elicit from U.S. dollar-paying customers. Does this help our balance-of-payments deficit situation?

Furthermore, this foreign residual oil, derived and delivered cheaper on our east coast than most domestic residuals, is fast driving the domestic residuals out of not only the eastern fuel markets but, in fact, out of domestic production. Consequently, at the higher levels of imports authorized, foreign residual oil in increasing quantities has been and will be admitted to replace and displace domestic residuals. Certainly it cannot be said that this has been bad for Venezuela. The opposite is true. Venezuela has been helped while the domestic refineries have been forced to cut production or to extend the refinery processes to eliminate or vastly reduce residual yield.

As for the assertion that the residual oil import control program has been mistakenly considered a help to the domestic coal industry, the mistake is in the increasing of the levels of residual oil import quotas so that more and more of this foreign waste product can be brought into our country at predatorily administered prices to compete with and to displace domestic fuels, especially coal. Without controls, foreign residual oil would virtually flood domestic coal out of eastern electric utility and heavy industry markets before such innovations as coal by unit trains at lower delivered prices and extra-high voltage, long-line transmission electricity can be delivered competitively from coalfield powerplants to the east coast, including New England.

Furthermore, the Government of the United States, for national security reasons, has no right to permit the strategically and economically important east coast to become almost totally dependent on an offshore product to supply its heat and energy requirements.

If the domestic coal industry of the interior United States is to be eliminated or domestic petroleum refinery production to be endangered, at least let these conditions be the result of domestic competition—not foreign. Energy from American coal helped build the vast utility and heavy industry complex of the east coast; the coal and domestic petroleum interests should not therefore be condemned for seeking to maintain a fair share of the fuels markets of the region.

If the east coast is going to turn more substantially outward and offshore for supply there doubtless will be an appropriate "interior America" response. This condition should be avoided in the interest of a strong and healthy United States of America. A condition of strength in the Nation's perimeter regions only and economic strangulation and sociological decline inland is unthinkable.

I am not suggesting that the east coast should reorient its supply lines totally inward or that it should be required to do so by Government decree. But I urge that there be closer cooperation between our coastal areas and the interior. Parenthetically, it is important to note that such overwhelming proportions of our country's vast defense spending have gravitated to the coastal States that this, too, is becoming a cause for real concern in interior U.S.A.

It is my belief that our President is so cognizant of these conditions that the administration's continuation of the residual oil import control program—rather than a scuttling of it by relaxation of controls as recommended by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning—is one of the necessary resulting actions.

Finally, I am in disagreement with your concluding statement which seeks to include the oil import quota program under the blanket indictment of "every trade discrimination this country aims at Venezuela." Admiration for the administration of President Betancourt—an admiration which I share with the editors of the Post—should not blind us from acknowledging the very generous trade policy maintained by the United States toward Venezuela.

Contrary to the implications of your statement, U.S. imports from Venezuela are more than double our exports to that country, and our purchases account for approximately 50 percent of all Venezuelan crude production and about 75 percent of that country's residual oil production. Nor does this tell the entire story; for Venezuela receives further benefit from U.S. trade in the rate of exchange of pegging the oil export rate at 3.05 bolivares per U.S. dollar in contrast to the rate for Venezuelan imports of 3.35 bolivares per dollar. The rapid progress toward economic recovery in Venezuela during the past year is perhaps the best evidence of the working of the so-called trade discrimination this country aims at Venezuela. I rather doubt that there are many nations that would balk at this kind of discrimination—at this type of treatment.

For these reasons and those mentioned earlier, and notwithstanding my disagreement with some details of the residual oil policy and quota announcement, I believe the Post's editorial, "Skidding on Oil," does injustice both to the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. In establishing the oil import quota program, the previous administration rightfully acknowledged the relation between national security and the health of our domestic economy. In continuing the quota program the Kennedy administration has rightfully reaffirmed the importance of this relationship.

Sincerely,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senate.

Let Supply and Demand Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 14, my distinguished colleague from Illinois, the Honorable PAUL FINDLEY, graphically pointed out the sharp decline in hog and cattle prices which has occurred in 90 days of the Kennedy-Freeman feed grain program.

To further dramatize the economical bind livestock producers now find themselves in, I should like to include in the RECORD excerpts from a letter which has just reached my desk.

This letter was in the form of a petition and included the signatures of 43 reputable, hardworking farmers who reside in the 19th Illinois District which I represent.

At the outset, this communication pointed out that as beef producers the writers of the petition were not interested in having the Government subsidize the beef industry nor guarantee a specific profit on feed cattle.

It was pointed out that to condone this type of practice would only bring about Government control and would weaken the overall agriculture structure.

In addition to the policy which has driven down corn prices through Government sales in order to get a good signup under this feed grain program, and is in a large measure responsible for the recent drop in prices, there is another factor which I believe needs proper investigation, and has added to our economic problems. I refer, of course, to the disproportionate drop in dressed beef prices in over-the-counter sales.

As pointed out in the letter received from my constituents, in December 1962, the average price of choice fat steers in Chicago was $30.50. Three months later, on February 25, 1963, the average price of the same type cattle was $24—a drop of 21 percent. During the same period beef sold over-the-counter in the local chainstores dropped 11 percent.

This severe decline in the price of fat cattle without a proportionate drop in dressed beef is a serious threat to the welfare of the economy. Comparable figures with respect to dressed pork would reflect similar discrepancies.

We cannot be both fish and fowl. If this administration is attempting to rig prices of feed grains then I respectfully suggest we go into the area of controlled labor costs and take practicable steps to investigate whether or not chainstores are exercising undue control over the dressed meat market.

I believe if the economics of supply and demand are allowed to work freely, without the threat or influence of monopolistic forces, be they from within or out of Government, then we shall have some hope of overcoming the present threat to our economy.

Closure of the Glen Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, closure of the left diversion tunnel of the Glen Canyon Dam restricting the flow of the Colorado River, which initiated the storage of water in Lake Powell, was accomplished March 13. Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy has issued instructions to commence storage immediately in order to take advantage of fortuitous circumstances which will permit earlier storage than was originally anticipated.

Commissioner Dominy has said:

> Storage in Lake Mead is near an alltime peak—not only from a cyclical standpoint but additionally for this time of year to meet lower basin water needs. We have been able to expedite work on the outlet gate at Glen Canyon Dam to effect immediate control. This combination of circumstances makes this the most favorable time we could possibly select to commence storage.

Commissioner Dominy added:

> We are indeed fortunate to be able to close the gates 30 days earlier than anticipated. In this year of likely reduced runoff, every day's storage will make a difference in the total operational program. It is fully expected that even with approximately 75 percent of normal runoff, as currently forecast from March 1 snow surveys, dead storage can be obtained within 10 to 12 months. This will insure meeting the power production scheduled at Glen Canyon Dam next year.
>
> The dam proper is now more than 90 percent completed with the highest block in the 710-foot dam now within 10 feet of crest elevation. About 300,000 cubic yards of concrete is needed to bring all of the blocks in the dam to crest height. Glen Canyon Dam will be "topped out" with placement of the last bucket of concrete sometime this summer.

L. F. Wylie, project construction engineer for Glen Canyon Dam, manipulated the hydraulic controls of the left tunnel high pressure gates. The controls are located in the gate chamber deep within the bedrock of the left abutment of the dam and directly above the gates in the left diversion tunnel. Access to the gate chamber is by way of galleries and shafts through the concrete of the dam and the rocks of the dam's abutment.

The filling of Lake Powell also heralds the beginning of boating and other recreation on this great manmade lake. By midsummer it is estimated that Lake Powell will be more than 150 miles long and reach a point above Hite, Utah. The new lake will exceed 65 square miles in area.

Temporary boat ramps and other facilities have been built by the National Park Service at the Wahweap Recreation Area located about 5 miles from Glen Canyon Dam. The rising waters of Lake Powell will reach these temporary ramps by June. Until that time, boats can be launched at Kane Creek, 20 miles from Wahweap Recreation Area. James Eden, superintendent for Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, has pointed out that, as the water level gradually rises this summer, Lake Powell will offer unparalleled scenery to boaters who can explore the many side canyons which enter the Glen Canyon of the Colorado.

Millions of game fish will be planted in Lake Powell this spring, under a program planned by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the State Fish and Game Departments of Arizona and Utah. Opening of Lake Powell to fishing is planned for 1964.

Development of recreational facilities and the fish and wildlife program on Lake Powell is being accomplished under the provisions of section 8, Public Law 485, which authorized the Colorado River storage project with Glen Canyon Dam as the key feature.

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT R. BARRY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, recently Westchester County was deeply saddened and left the poorer by the loss of a most illustrious and distinguished Methodist clergyman, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam. Bishop Oxnam before his retirement in 1960 had a varied, long and rich career. Prior to his election as bishop in 1936, he was the president of DePauw University. In addition to being the Methodist bishop of the areas of Omaha, Boston, New York and Washington he was the president of the Federal Council of Churches from 1944 to 1946 and one of six presidents of the World Council of Churches from 1948 to 1954.

Bishop Oxnam was the exemplar of a dynamic combination of physical, intellectual and moral excellence. He was a former football player at the University of Southern California, where he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa, before he went to pursue his theological studies at Boston University.

Upon his passing Bishop John Wesley Lord was quoted as saying:

> Bishop Oxnam was recognized by friend and foe alike as one of the "summit souls" with whom God on occasion blesses mankind.

We in Westchester share this sentiment and to his wife, the former Ruth Fisher, his sons and daughter and his eight grandchildren we send our deepest sympathy. Their loss and ours and the Nation's is very great.

President Speaks to Advertising Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an Associated Press dispatch containing excerpts of President Kennedy's recent remarks to the Advertising Council in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> The first 2 months of the 88th Congress have been dominated by discussions of fiscal and economic policy—and the next several months may well be dominated by these topics. In the last 100 years, questions of economic policy have become as complex to the layman as questions of space and military technology. Free soil, free silver and free trade, for example, were basically easier to understand than the balance of payments, the tools of debt management and the application of countercyclical forces. Today every problem has several alternative solutions, and every answer raises several questions. I am more than ever convinced of the words once uttered by George Bernard Shaw: "If all economists were laid end to end, they still would not reach a conclusion."
>
> FAMILIAR QUESTIONS
>
> Three familiar questions of fiscal policy must be decided by the Congress:
>
> 1. The limit on the national debt;
> 2. The size of the Federal budget and
> 3. The desirability and extent of Federal tax reduction.
>
> All three of these questions have faced the legislative and executive branches before—and we have an obligation to learn the lessons of history if we do not wish to relive it. Economic history—specifically the history of 1957–60, which produced two recessions from which the economy never wholly recovered—clearly warns us now that the wrong answer to each of these three questions would spell downturn and disaster for the American economy as a whole.
>
> I do not speak as a partisan. The errors of a Republican administration and a Democratic Congress during those crucial years have been previously acknowledged by members of both parties. I do not review them now to gain political advantage in hindsight, but to gain a greater degree of foresight on the same problems that face us now. I do not intend to assess the blame for the past—but we shall all be deserving of blame if we do not learn its lessons for the future.
>
> HARSH RESULTS
>
> The Federal Government—and I shall speak here not of any one party or branch of Government, but the Government as a whole—decided in 1957 to keep the debt limited unrealistically low, to cut back and stretch out budget expenditures, to tighten monetary policy and to reject all efforts at tax reduction. The harsh results of those decisions are still with us.
>
> —In the decade previous to July 1957, unemployment had barely exceeded 4 percent. In the 64 months since those decisions, it has remained above 5 percent.
>
> —In the earlier decade, business fixed investment averaged nearly 11 percent of total output—it has since that time fallen steadily to roughly 9 percent today.
>
> —In the previous decade, our total output of goods and services, measured in constant prices, had increased at the rate of nearly 4 percent a year. Since mid-1957, the rate of increase has been limited to 3 percent.
>
> All three of these decisions were taken in the name of fiscal responsibility. But if that high-sounding label is intended to refer primarily to budget and balance-of-payments surpluses, it was a name taken in vain.
>
> STRONG ECONOMY
>
> The preceding 11 fiscal years had produced seven cash surpluses in the Federal budget, for a net cash surplus of $20 billion. The six succeeding fiscal years produced one surplus and five deficits, including the greatest peacetime deficit of all time in fiscal 1959, for a net cash deficit of $30 billion. Had the economy been operating at full employment, there would have been no deficit at all.
>
> The balance-of-payments problem became a problem only after the mid-1957 decisions, with a total deficit of $11.2 billion during the next 3 calendar years and a gold loss of more than $5 billion during the same period. The fact that short-term interest rates had been increased 40 percent in 1955 and 1957 did not help to stem the tide. As the OECD said last December:
>
> "Confidence in the dollar depends in good part on a strong domestic economy; it is unlikely to be fostered for any length of time by policies that keep the level of activity low."
>
> An unrealistic debt ceiling or budget cut today would also cause a slowdown in contracts, a stretchout in payments, a cash drain on business, and ultimately another recession. Instead of balancing the budget, it would produce a budget deficit far greater than the temporary addition to the deficit that will come from tax reduction. Let us remember that the $12.4 billion deficit of fiscal year 1959 was the result of a recession which wiped out what had originally been estimated to be a surplus of $466 million.
>
> REALISTIC CEILING
>
> This administration is not asking for an unlimited debt ceiling, but a realistic one which will still keep the actual debt burden—as measured by its proportion of gross national product—steadily declining.
>
> We are not asking for uncontrolled budget increases, but for a prudent budget which, contrary to the trend at all levels of government, actually reduces civilian expenditures below their level of the previous year, a feat which has occurred only four times in the last 15 years.
>
> And we are not asking for an unprecedented tax cut, but for a program which will add only $2.7 billion to the next budget deficit. Certainly it is clear that, if we slide into another recession, the deficit without a tax cut will be far larger than the projected deficit we face with a tax cut.
>
> So I am hopeful that the lessons of history will be remembered by us all—by those of us in the administration and the Congress, and those in this audience who are leaders of opinion in the business community.
>
> "The great advantage of Americans," wrote De Tocqueville in 1835, "consists in their being able to commit faults which they may afterward repair." To this I would add the fact that the great advantage of hindsight consists of our applying its lessons by way of foresight. If this Nation can apply the lessons and repair the faults of the last 5 years—if we can stick to the facts and cast out falsehoods and, above all, distinguish clearly between facts and falsehoods—then, surely, this great country can achieve the full fruits of greatness which today remain beyond our reach.
>
> Unfortunately, the size of the deficits in our Federal budget and our international accounts led the Government in 1959 to adopt even more restrictive fiscal and monetary policies. The Federal cash budget during the first quarter 1959 was operating at the level of a $17 billion deficit at annual rates. By the third quarter, this had become a $2 billion deficit—and by the second quarter of the next year, 1960, a surplus of $7 billion. These figures are from Arthur Burns, who served my predecessor as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and who calls this "one of the very sharpest shifts of Federal finance in our Nation's history."
>
> At the same time, Dr. Burns pointed out, economic expansion was curbed by a tightening of both short- and long-term credit—long-term rates, in fact, "advanced faster than during a comparable stage of any business cycle during the past hundred years."
>
> The result was another recession, more unemployment, more unused capacity, and another incomplete recovery. Today output is $30 to $40 billion below our productive capacity. The rate of unemployment has risen to 6.1 percent of those actively seeking work. Corporate investment last year was—for the first time in any nonrecession year since the war—below the level of gross retained earnings. And business spending on new plant and equipment was at a lower level than it was in 1957.
>
> SAME DECISIONS
>
> Now, in 1963, the Government is once again faced with these same decisions. I hope we will bear in mind the lessons of history. I hope we will remember the editorial in Business Week magazine, June 28, 1958, which pointed out the effects of an unrealistic debt ceiling and a harmful slash in expenditures:
>
> "In the second half of 1957 the debt ceiling forced the administration to cut back programs needed for long-term national security. And the resulting slash in defense expenditures was an important contributing cause of the recession."

Farm Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, in December 1962 I arranged for distribution of about 4,000 questionnaires to the farming counties of the Second Congressional District of Arizona. I believe that the results, now tabulated, may be of interest to our colleagues.

In the first instance I mailed this questionnaire to approximately 2,000 persons on my mailing list in Cochise, Pinal, and Yuma Counties—areas whose economy is heavily based on agriculture. In addition, I had the splendid cooperation of the Arizona Farm Bureau Federation and its fine director, Bill Davis. With the consent of the Federation boards in each of my five counties, the questionnaire was mailed to every Farm Bureau family. Additionally, the Yuma Daily Sun kindly consented to publish the questionnaire in its columns, urging readers to clip the questionnaire and send the answers directly to me.

Mr. Speaker, with this wide distribution I had hoped for a large cross-section of farmer opinion. The results, in number, were disappointing; there were only 195 returns. At first I was inclined to believe that this response indicated apathy among farmers. On closer examination—and after talking to numerous farmers who received the mailing—I am satisfied that this is not the case. I believe that Arizona farmers are vitally concerned about present farm legislation. They are, however, confused by their long experience with different and changing programs. They recognize that there are big deficiencies in our present programs, and they recognize that city dwellers, who far outnumber farmers, are unhappy about the cost. Yet they fear any sudden or drastic changes. Farmers, as a group, do not have any simple, clear-cut solutions to this massive crop of problems and inequities. I am inclined to believe that these feelings, rather than apathy, account for the small number of returns.

This conclusion is suggested by a Marana farmer who wrote a long, sincere, and constructive letter reporting on a meeting of his friends called specifically to discuss my questionnaire:

> I am sure you will not be surprised to learn that this group of only eight or so persons could not arrive at 100-percent agreement as to the program we would like to see enacted.

I have said that the returns were small in number, but I can report that they were very large in quality. The great majority of those who replied wrote separate additional letters, or extensive marginal comments, giving their detailed thoughts and suggestions. I have read each one of these, and I was impressed by the seriousness and good sense with which these Arizonians discussed problems of vital importance to their livelihood. The depth of these replies and the wide discussion touched off by the questionnaire have fully justified my efforts in this undertaking.

In tabulating the returns I had them divided into three categories:

First. Price support farmers—110 replies: This group included all those who indicated that they were participating this year in one or more price support programs. Many of the replies tabulated in this group were from farmers who also grow crops for free-market sale.

Second. Free-market farmers—60 replies: Counted here were active farmers cultivating citrus, alfalfa or other crops not subject to price support programs.

Third. Nonfarmers—25 replies: These were individuals not presently engaged in farming. Many of these are people who formerly engaged in agriculture, who work in farm-related businesses, or who had some special interest in farm legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the tabulations themselves are worth careful examination, but I have noted the following highlights:

First. Present programs are not popular: Both farmers and nonfarmers in my district agree that the present programs are wrong and should be revised in some way. A Pinal County nonfarmer echoes the sentiment expressed by many who wrote comments on the questionnaire:

> Things are in such a mess that patchwork or piecemeal mending of the present programs can never work any real or lasting benefits. A completely new approach is needed.

Second. Free-market conditions are preferred: Almost 90 percent of the non-price-support farmers and 66 percent of the price-support farmers prefer that the Federal Government establish free-market conditions—either now or eventually. A small Cochise cotton farmer expressed a common feeling when he wrote:

> I have seen farmers become well-to-do while others could not make a living—all because of farm subsidy and restrictions. Free enterprise would help us no end.

Third. A transition to free enterprise farming is favored: While there is general agreement that free-market conditions should be established, a large majority do not want the Government to "quit agriculture" immediately. One price-support farmer wrote:

> In my own personal situation, if the cotton and feed grain programs were discontinued, I would be out of this type of farming fast. I would go broke.

The price-support farmers are especially opposed to any sudden change. What all the groups prefer is that free-market conditions be established by way of a transition period of 3 to 5 years during which there would be declining price supports, or some kind of transition payment. According to one farmer:

> By using a transition period and working toward free enterprise we might be able to adjust financial policies so that few, if any, farmers would be wiped out.

Fourth. Cotton policy disliked: With regard to Federal cotton policy—cotton is the chief agricultural product in my district—none of the nonfarm replies and only 4 percent of the free enterprise farmers favored the present programs. While 29 percent of the price-support farmers favored the present policy, more than 50 percent preferred that free-market conditions be established sooner or later. A high percentage—over 80 percent—of the nonfarmers and free-market farmers preferred a return to the free enterprise way of farming cotton. Only a small percentage of the respondents favored voluntary land retirement payments.

Fifth. Food-for-peace program is liked: Arizonians are very much in favor of the food-for-peace program. Over 86 percent of the returns gave favorable responses.

Sixth. Price-support farmers and free-market farmers differ: Price-support farmers are less anxious for the Federal Government to revise present agricultural policies than free-market farmers, yet each want free-enterprise conditions established eventually.

The price-support farmers—58 percent—favor the present cotton export subsidy, and the free-market farmers—89 percent—oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I recently published the results of a survey I made of constituent opinion on a wide range of legislative matters. Included in this questionnaire, which prompted more than 2,500 replies from all parts of my district, was the same question on farm legislation asked of farmers in this questionnaire. The results were as follows:

Generally speaking, which of these courses do you believe Federal farm legislation should take?	Percent in favor
Continue present programs for basic commodities (wheat, tobacco, rice, cotton) under which price supports and mandatory acreage allotments are provided if approved by two-thirds of farmers voting in referendum	21
Discontinue price supports and acreage allotments for basic crops, substituting a voluntary system of land retirement payments for farmers who wish to participate	13
Abolish all Federal controls, acreage allotments, and price supports for basic crops, letting the agriculture industry operate under free-market conditions with the Government's role restricted to soil conservation, research, extension work, etc	66

While my poll of farmers is not a scientific cross section, it does give me a general idea of what Arizona farm people are thinking. The general attitude is that the present makeshift and piecemeal programs are inadequate and that something should be done about it.

Mr. Speaker, a small Cochise cotton farmer, who is also a cattle rancher, summed up the option of some southern Arizona farmers when he wrote me.

> I think that we should move to free enterprise farming as quickly as possible. I am one of those who is privileged to enjoy the freedom of a cow ranch. I can raise as much beef to sell as feed conditions and my own ability will allow. I can look my banker and the rest of the world in the face (as a rancher). As a farmer I lie, connive, and perjure myself to the local PMA board. I beg them for more cotton acreage and would steal some if it were possible. I bow to the most high in Washington and hang my head in shame. My farm is for sale.

This blunt opinion, of course, would be sharply disrupted by many who feel that bankruptcy for farmers and farm communities would quickly result from any drastic change.

It is hard to draw any positive conclusions from this interesting project, but I believe it was worthwhile. I want to thank especially all those who responded. I shall keep their opinions in mind in the months ahead.

The complete results of this poll follow:

Responses to the farm questionnaire

	Nonfarmer		Free-market farmer		Price-support farmer		All responses	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1. Generally speaking, which of these courses do you believe the Federal Government should take?								
A. Continue present programs for basic commodities (wheat, tobacco, rice, cotton) under which price supports and mandatory acreage allotments are provided if approved by ⅔ of farmers voting in referendum	0	100	2	98	36	64	20	80
B. Discontinue price supports and acreage allotments for basic crops, substituting a voluntary system of land retirement payments for farmers who wish to participate	27	73	27	73	35	65	31	69
C. Abolish all Federal controls, acreage allotments, and price supports for basic crops, letting the agriculture industry operate under free-market conditions with the Government's role restricted to soil conservation, research, extension work, etc	92	8	90	10	66	34	78	22
2. If Congress should decide to abolish acreage allotments and price supports for basic commodities, would you favor—								
A. An immediate change with no transition or phase-out period and no transition payments?	20	80	27	73	15	85	20	80
B. A transition period of 5 to 10 years, during which price supports would be gradually reduced to nothing?	28	72	24	76	45	55	36	64
C. The Udall plan for immediate elimination of acreage allotments and price supports, but with a 3- to 4-year period of declining cash transition payments based on a percentage of the price support payments paid during the last year of the present programs?	81	19	80	20	70	30	75	25
3. If free-market conditions were adopted for basic farm crops, would you favor—								
A. Marketing-order legislation providing that a two-thirds majority of producers could use Agriculture Department machinery to establish quotas so that production could be adjusted to the approximate level of demand?	14	86	31	69	50	50	39	61
B. Laws to permit USDA to make annual estimates of quantities which producers could market at fair prices, so that farmers could through voluntary action restrict production—without controls or price supports—to the approximate level of demand?	74	26	84	16	55	45	68	32
4. Do you favor or oppose the food-for-peace program under which surplus foodstuffs are used in our foreign aid program?	84	16	77	23	92	8	86	14
5. With regard to Federal programs for cotton, what is your thinking on these points:								
A. Should the present export subsidy be continued?	8	92	11	89	58	42	36	64
B. U.S. textile manufacturers often complain about the export subsidy, and are demanding some kind of import fee on cotton textile imports equivalent to the amount of export subsidy. Would you favor such an import fee?	50	50	45	55	61	39	59	41
C. At the present time, cotton farmers generally cannot transfer cotton allotments from one State to another. Which of these would be better?	*Percent in favor*		*Percent in favor*		*Percent in favor*		*Percent in favor*	
1. No transfers permitted	26		45		51		46	
2. Transfers allowed only in cases of real hardship	53		16		18		22	
3. Allotment transfers permitted without restrictions	21		39		31		32	
D. At the present time cotton allotments cannot be transferred from one county to another within a State. Which of these rules would be better?								
1. No transfers permitted	16		35		38		35	
2. Transfers permitted without restriction	31		35		47		41	
3. Hardship transfers only	53		30		15		24	
E. If we are to continue with price supports and acreage allotments, what should be the per-pound support price?	*Cents per pound*		*Cents per pound*		*Cents per pound*		*Cents per pound*	
Extra long staple	[1]		43		48		46	
Upland	[1]		25		28		27	
6. What legislation would be best for corn and other feed grains?	*Percent in favor*		*Percent in favor*		*Percent in favor*		*Percent in favor*	
A. Present temporary programs of price supports, based on voluntary acreage reductions	5		7		19		13	
B. A mandatory type program with price supports and acreage or bushel allotments if approved by two-thirds of the farmers voting	0		3		13		8	
C. Free-market conditions	95		90		68		79	

[1] Nonfarm responses were inconclusive.

Responses to the farm questionnaire—Continued

	Percent in favor		
	Present programs	Voluntary land retirement payments but no supports or allotments	Free market
7. What kind of farm legislation would you favor for these crops?			
Cotton:			
Nonfarmer	0	19	81
Free-market farmer	4	12	84
Price-support farmer	29	21	50
All respondents	17	18	65
Wheat:			
Nonfarmer	0	23	76
Free-market farmer	2	13	85
Price-support farmer	20	20	60
All respondents	11	18	71
Dairy products:			
Nonfarmer	4	11	85
Free-market farmer	4	6	90
Price-support farmer	18	6	76
All respondents	10	7	83
Produce, vegetables, fruit, citrus:			
Nonfarmer	3	12	85
Free-market farmer	4	8	88
Price-support farmer	10	3	87
All respondents	7	6	87

SIZE OF THE FARMS

	Free-market farmers	Price-support farmers
Size of farms owned or operated by the respondents to this survey:	*Percent*	*Percent*
Small (0 to 300 acres)	66	40
Medium (300 to 700 acres)	16	21
Large (700 acres or more)	18	39

New Bill on Area Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of introducing today the administration's proposals to extend and improve the Area Redevelopment Act. This legislation was one of the first and most important bills passed under the Kennedy administration. Those of us who fought long and hard over the years to get this on the statute books are tremendously heartened by the progress made over the past 2 years.

The area redevelopment program has brought hope to hundreds of communities and rural areas which have suffered for years from heavy unemployment. Already some 800 areas, accounting for 78 percent of all eligible places, have submitted overall economic development plans analyzing the problems which face them and blueprinting the steps to be taken to restore prosperity and full employment. The agency has approved 700 individual projects which will create 34,000 jobs and help 18,000 worker-trainees. The benefits of this program, of course, go far beyond those directly involved by helping to stimulate the growth of the entire area and, in fact, helping to raise production and incomes nationally.

The bill I am introducing today is one of high priority. I am sure it will have the support of all of us who are concerned over the plight of the unemployed and the waste of national resources and manpower. I plan to hold hearings on the bill before the Committee on Banking and Currency beginning April 1. In these hearings we will take testimony on every aspect of the problem and give careful consideration to every point of view. I am hopeful that we can bring the bill to the floor in the near future.

For the benefit of Members, I am inserting a section-by-section summary of the administration proposals contained in my bill.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1963

GENERAL

The attached amendments would allow the Area Redevelopment Act more fully to meet the needs for which it was created through increased fund authorizations and flexibility. These amendments are based upon the experience of the Area Redevelopment Administration during the period May 1, 1961, through February 28, 1963, and are more fully described below:

Section 2. Declaration of purpose

* * * * *

Section 3. Amendments to section 6(b)

(A) Authorization To Increase the Total Amount of Industrial and Commercial Loans Outstanding

Section 6(b)(1)(A) of the Area Redevelopment Act now places a $100 million ceiling on the total amount of loans and/or purchases of indebtedness outstanding for commercial or industrial projects in areas designated under section 5(a) of the act. Section 6(b)(1)(B) places a similar limitation on the amount of loans or purchases of indebtedness outstanding for such projects in areas designated under section 5(b) of the act. It is the purpose of section 3(a) of the proposed amendments to raise the ceilings on the total amounts of loans outstanding under each of these sections from $100 million to $250 million.

As of February 28, 1963, the Area Redevelopment Administration had instructed the Small Business Administration to execute loan agreements amounting to $20,431,335 in industrial and commercial loans for projects in 5(a) redevelopment areas and $17,711,442 for projects in 5(b) areas. In addition, the Area Redevelopment Administration has project applications in the total amount of $86,431,967 pending for projects in 5(a) areas and $118,510,788 pending for projects in 5(b) areas. Evidence indicates that loan activity will continue to rise steadily. Assuming a gradual increase in the present rate of loan approvals, the Area Redevelopment Administration could have approximately $425 million in loans outstanding under section 6 by June 30, 1965, if there were no statutory limitations. It is clear that the present ceilings imposed by section 6(b)(1) of the Area Redevelopment Act will be reached considerably before the act's termination on June 30, 1965, unless otherwise amended.

(B) Refining the Minimum 10-Percent Requirement

Section 6(b)(9)(B) requires at least 10 percent of the aggregate cost on an industrial or commercial project for which an Area Redevelopment Administration loan is sought, to be supplied by a public or semipublic body in the form of equity capital or as a subordinated loan with delayed repayment. The proposed amendment to this section would authorize the minimum 10-percent money to be repaid during the same time but at no faster rate than the financial assistance extended under section 6 of the Area Redevelopment Act.

American Redevelopment Administration has experienced great difficulty in obtaining the required 10-percent money in order to advance the economies of redevelopment areas. In fact, there is a direct relationship between the severity of the economic problem and the difficulty experienced by communities attempting to raise the required funds. The present proposal would not eliminate the 10-percent requirement but would make it possible for redevelopment areas to attract additional financial sources which are presently unable to participate in projects because of the statutory restrictions on repayment.

Section 4. Authorization to increase the total amount of loans for public facilities outstanding

Section 7(c) of the act places a $100 million ceiling on the total amount of public facility loans which can be outstanding at any one time for public facilities under section 7. The purpose of this amendment is to increase the total amount authorized to be outstanding from $100 to $150 million.

As of February 28, 1963, the Area Redevelopment Administration had instructed delegate agencies to execute loan agreements amounting to $24,777,200 in public facility loans for projects located in areas designated under section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act. Loan applications were pending in the amount of $13,178,525 for such projects. However, the pending applications figure does not include anticipated loans resulting from the denial of section 8 applications in whole or in part. Evidence again indicates that loan activity resulting from section 7 and 8 applications will continue to rise steadily. Assuming a gradual increase in the present rate of approvals, the Area Redevelopment Administration could have more than $100 million in loans outstanding under section 7 by June 30, 1965, but for the present $100 million limitation.

Section 5. Authorization to increase the total amount which can be appropriated for grants for public facilities

Section 8(d) of the act authorizes $75 million to be appropriated for the purpose of making grants for public facilities under section 8. This amendment would increase the total amount authorized to be appropriated for this purpose for the duration of the act from $75 to $175 million, and would enable it to remain available until expended when so specified in appropriation acts.

The appropriation for fiscal year 1963 in the amount of $35 million for public facility grants, together with the $40 million previously appropriated for fiscal year 1962, exhausts the authorization under the act for this purpose. As of February 28, 1963, applications for grants totaled $26,875,566. Obligations for 1964 are currently being estimated at $35 million, with a minimum 10-percent increase estimated for 1965. The requested increase in authorization to $175 million takes into account both the $75 million previously appropriated and the approximately $75 million currently projected, with some leeway for anticipated increases. If the statutory authorization is not increased, ARA's public facility grant program will go out of existence at the end of fiscal year 1963.

Section 6. Amendments to section 11

(A) Authorization To Increase the Annual Amounts which Can Be Appropriated for Technical Assistance

Section 11 of the act authorizes appropriations not to exceed $4.5 million annually to provide technical assistance useful in alleviating or preventing excessive unemployment or underemployment. The purpose of this amendment is to increase the annual amount authorized to be appropriated for this purpose from $4.5 to $10 million.

Under its present authorization, the Area Redevelopment Administration as of February 28, 1963, had approved contracts in the amount of $1,651,000 for technical assistance. Applications for such assistance had been received in the total amount of $25,799,248. Of this total, approximately $11 million of these applications were received in fiscal year 1963. Currently, applications are arriving at a rate of $1 million per month. Experience has shown that this assistance is of great value, and it is anticipated that the rate of applications will continue to rise.

(B) Amendment To Make Explicit Discretionary Authority to Require Repayment of Technical Assistance

The additional language makes it clear that the Secretary has the authority to require repayment of funds advanced for technical assistance in appropriate cases.

Section 7. Procuring the services of experts and consultants under section 12(10)

This section governs the procurement and payment for services of experts and consultants hired temporarily by contract or appointment to assist the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of the act. It limits temporary services to 6 months, omits mention of intermittent services, and limits the per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence to $15. The proposed amendment would modify the provisions of this section in conformity with 5 United States Code 5a by authorizing the procurement of temporary services of experts or consultants up to 1 year instead of 6 months and providing for intermittent services, thereby explicitly assuring to ARA the authority customarily available to executive departments in this regard. It would also automatically conform the authorized per diem allowance to the current applicable rate prescribed in the standardized Government travel regulations, which is now $16.

Section 8. Authorization for appropriated funds to remain available until expended and for depositing certain appropriations in the Area Redevelopment Fund

The proposed amendment to section 23 will provide for appropriations being made on a basis where funds may remain available until expended. In addition, funds appropriated for the purpose of making loans under sections 6 and 7 of the act are directed to be deposited in the Area Redevelopment Fund which is established by section 9(b) of the act. This amendment further provides for payments of interest to the Treasury on use of funds appropriated to the Area Redevelopment Fund.

Detroit Hosts 1968 Olympic Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEIL STAEBLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. STAEBLER. I am extremely pleased that Detroit has been designated as the American city to bid for the 1968 Olympic Games. I congratulate the U.S. Olympic Committee for not letting the unsportsmanlike maneuvers of the Los Angeles committee upset the previous decision picking Detroit.

All of us owe a debt of thanks to the Detroit Olympic Committee, Mayor Cavanagh and other elected officials who have worked so hard to promote Detroit's selection. I also want to commend the

gentleman from Michigan, Representative HAROLD RYAN, of Detroit, who was among the first to act after Los Angeles attempted its end run.

The action of the U.S. Olympic Committee reflects the vitality of the city of Detroit and the citizens of Michigan in making it perfectly clear that Detroit is ready and eager and able to do an outstanding job as host for the 1968 Olympics.

The Power of Prayer and Christian Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave previously obtained, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my 20th annual St. Patrick's Day address carried on Cleveland radio stations WERE and WDOK:

THE POWER OF PRAYER AND CHRISTIAN ACTION

St. Patrick's endowment to the Irish race and to all humanity is so rich and so vast that scholars and orators down through the centuries have been recording and relating his life and times with enthusiasm and without pause. It makes little difference that disagreement exists as to the time and place of his birth and death, or that documentary evidence is not now available to confirm all the good and great work of his lifetime. Among mortal men St. Patrick holds a unique place, untarnished by centuries of inquiry, undiminished by the doubts which attach to the legends of time, and unshaken by the eras of disbelief which have disturbed the tranquillity of Christendom over the past centuries. The spirit of St. Patrick lives on with the steady sureness of the rise and set of the sun, with the power of the rushing tides which move the seas and with the refreshment of life akin to the spring when so much of God's handiwork is again reborn.

The gifts of St. Patrick to all the human family live on with each generation, because they provide food for the human spirit. The nature of man is unchanging. It is the same today as it was in the days of St. Patrick. We in our times have seen that man lives not by bread alone, as we witness the evil outcomes of a belief that holds the animal desires and needs of man are all that matter. Those evil outcomes today pose a threat to the survival of the entire human family. Atheistic communism is but a part of that threat. Equally dangerous is the pernicious infection of materialism in Western society, with its false goals and symbols, with its cold detachment from responsibility for the common weal, with its disdain for those human concerns which mark Christian life and its preoccupation with personal gain above all else. The signs of this disintegrating process are many. But the spiritual power of Christianity, upon which Western society has been built, remains strong and restive beneath the thin veneer of contemporary life. We who believe must break through that artificial surface which has fallen upon our civilization. A spiritual rebirth of the Western world is sorely overdue.

Turning to the ways and means through which a spiritual rebirth of the Western World may be launched, we find no shortage of suggestions or remedies. There are no doubt many roads leading to that end. None is short and the one that is sure is marked with dangers, sacrifice, and commitment. That is the road Patrick traveled from his early youth, in his years of preparation to convert pagan Ireland to the cause of Christ, in his tireless mission among the Irish people until his happy death among men.

Two lessons from the life of our patron Saint demonstrate the spiritual power of Christianity. The first is the lesson of prayer and the second is the lesson of Christian action.

It will be recalled that Patrick, as a boy of 16 years, was captured and carried off to slavery in Ireland. Baptized a Christian before his capture, he found the real meaning of his faith during 6 years of captivity. While he ate the bitter bread of bondage in a foreign land, a profound spiritual change came over him. "The Lord," said Saint Patrick in his confessions "opened the sense of my unbelief." The love of God so fully consumed his soul that in a single day or night he would offer a hundred prayers—for strength and deliverance and for the conversion of his captors. He often thought about escape and he longed for his family. But the dangers of escape were many. He did not know the countryside or how to get to the sea. If his master recaptured him it might mean loss of his life. Along the way he could be captured by hostile forces and resold into slavery. A voice came to him in his sleep—"Behold thy ship is ready," heartening him to attempt the perils of escape to a port some 180 miles from his master's house. He escaped, avoided all dangers en route, and reached the port to find the ship of his dreams waiting and soon to sail. Applying for service on the ship, he was rebuffed. Patrick was not robust of body and the ship's crew was comprised of sea ruffians. Turning to depart he began to pray and before he had finished the ship's master had a change of heart and called out to him to come aboard. At sea, Patrick tried to convert the members of the crew. Before Patrick reached the safety of a monastery in Europe his trials and dangers were many and the power of prayer was many times demonstrated for him.

But Patrick sought much more than his personal safety. He had set as his goal the life of a missionary to spread the light of Christianity. This required intensive preparation, as Patrick was aware of the shortcomings of his early life, particularly his lack of scholarly training. In the course of his preparations under the tutelage of learned men, he dreamed of his experience in far away Ireland in which a man came to him bearing many letters, handing him one he opened it and it began "We pray thee, holy youth, to come and again walk amongst us as before." It was then that Patrick removed any doubts about his goal to convert the Irish people.

Patrick's wish to return to Ireland as a missionary was not quickly granted. After his ordination there appears to have been some doubts as to the wisdom of his wish as well as his adequacy to fulfill it. Palladius was the first bishop sent to Ireland by authority of Rome. His mission was to administer to the spiritual needs of the small Christian communities then existing in Ireland. There were many doubts held about efforts to convert the entire Irish race, some based upon the fierce character of most tribes, some upon insufficient knowledge about the customs of the people, and others upon the magnitude of the undertaking and the lack of missionaries for the task. Bishop Palladius died after 1 year of work in Ireland and the way was then opened for Patrick to fulfill his mission. Consecrated a bishop, he departed for Ireland with a small band of followers in the year 432. From then on until the death of Patrick, the many lessons of Christian action which he left us were performed on Irish soil.

Patrick, in his mission to the Irish people, maintained a happy balance between prayer and the good works of Christianity in action. He learned from his early youth that prayer and good works were inseparable, that one without the other could not work God's will on earth. Accounts of his missionary life are filled with events marking this happy combination.

Patrick prayed for strength, spiritual as well as physical, to carry on his work. He needed both in abundance as he traveled the hostile countryside, filled with the hardships and fraught with dangers from tribal chiefs and lesser kings and their followers.

Patrick prayed for courage to face the dangerous tests of his mission. To convert the Irish he had decided on the bold course of confronting the tribal chiefs and lesser kings with the message of Christianity. Patrick dared to accept the greatest risks as necessary to the success of his mission. His life was in the balance on many occasions, in the test with the Druids, in the exchange with the tribal magicians, and in his challenges to the superstitions and false idols of the pagan way of life.

Patrick prayed for wisdom to understand the strange ways of the many Irish tribes, to understand their customs, their legends, the background of their particular places of ceremonial worship, and their fierce spirit. His understanding of all these things made easier his mission of conversion and on occasion saved his life and the lives of his followers. By the use of reason and the sincerity of his good example, he changed ancient ways without offending those attached to them.

Patrick prayed for the gift of eloquence in bringing the message of Christ to a people set in their ways and not easy to convince. And his eloquence in support of the way, the truth, and the light was so great as to leave this blessing as a dominant trait of the sons and daughters of Ireland in every generation.

Patrick prayed for the virtue of patience and in his mission he was patient with all and everything except evil. Evil was the handiwork of the Devil and Patrick could have no patience with the Devil or any of his works. He did not believe in the peaceful coexistence of good and evil. How well he understood that one or the other must triumph. His victory was the triumph over evil.

Patrick prayed for fortitude to persevere in all trial and suffering, in times of temptation, in situations of seemingly hopeless odds, and in the loneliness that so often attended his role as shepherd of his flock. Fortitude and perseverance were strong in the works of Patrick. He could not be deterred from his mission. Setbacks were regarded as but a test for more important tests to come. Success was accepted as a sign that he must redouble his efforts.

It is accurate to conclude that Patrick prayed for the opportunity to prove himself a strong and unyielding soldier in the army of Christ. How else can we explain his readiness to give his life so that the teachings of Christ might be brought to the people of Ireland, living in what was then regarded as the most distant land of the known world? He never sought the easy way, but always the right way. He never held to the warmth and comfort of the hearth because his home was wherever his holy mission took him, always ready to carry the message of Christianity into the contest with pagan beliefs, customs, and traditions.

Patrick was more than a true and tried soldier in the army of Christ. His place in history as a bold and determined leader of men to a life of eternal happiness is assured. Patrick did not seek this reward. Fifteen centuries of Christendom have conferred it upon him. Patron saint of the Irish, St. Patrick is beloved and honored by all who believe that life does not end in this world and that the life of the spirit is eternal.

We have learned that the power of prayer can move mountains, light the darkest skies, calm the most violent storms, and heal the gravest wounds. But St. Patrick has taught us that prayer, accompanied by Christian action, in a spirit of total commitment, can change the world. And change the world we must, through a vigorous rebirth of Christian life.

Few of us can hope to emulate the life of St. Patrick in our journey through this world. But all of us can aspire to follow in his well marked journey those footsteps which come closest to our individual station in life, to our individual capacities, and to the opportunities which come to each and every one of us in our daily lives. The true Christian can not detach himself from responsibility for the common good. Christian life must be filled with a warm and human concern for the misfortunes and needs of our fellowmen. As we pass along the road of life we must be aware of those who fall by the wayside and whose cries for help are weak or timid. And like Simon of Cyrene we must be ready to share the burdens of others less fortunate. For this is the fulfillment of Christian life in the spirit of good St. Patrick which can change the world of our times.

Retardation: A Matter of National Interest Which Deserves Our Maximum Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, one of our major concerns in this session of Congress must be a program to help solve a major problem facing the country today. We all are becoming familiar with the great problems of the mentally retarded. We know that mental retardation continues as a major problem to this Nation, socially and economically. We know that while only 4 percent of the mentally retarded are confined to institutions, their care costs relatives and communities some $300 million annually. Additional amounts are required for the construction of facilities for custodial and educational purposes. These costs amount to an additional $1 billion per year or more. We know, Mr. Speaker, that about 3 percent of the population of this Nation are persons having significant difficulties in adapting adequately to their environment. Based on this figure of 3 percent, approximately 126,000 children born each year will be classified as mentally retarded. Of this group, 110,000 will suffer mild retardation which can, with special training and assistance, be reduced, enabling them to acquire limited job skills and achieve a certain independence in the community. The remaining children in the group classified as mentally retarded will range from severe retardation to moderate retardation, for which additional services are required. As a nation we were slow in recognizing the problem and attempts at a solution. However, since 1950, interest in the problem of mental retardation has grown very rapidly. Foundations, parents groups, professional groups, and members of legislative bodies have stimulated activity in this field when they became convinced of the urgent need for some solution to the problem. I feel it timely, Mr. Speaker, at this time, to emphasize the part taken by the Federal Government in this important work. I would like to review the activities of the administration in studying the problem, discovering its scope, and planning its solution.

I. THE PRESIDENT'S FIRST STATEMENT, OCTOBER 11, 1961

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, the President's message of October 11, 1961, calling for a national plan in mental retardation. The President expressed a deep concern over the Nation's failure to act to solve the problems of the mentally retarded. He defined mental retardation as a "condition resulting from a basic abnormality of the human mind." He recognized mental retardation as a symptom of a disease, rather than a disease itself.

The President reviewed the scope of the problem indicating that "mental retardation is a serious personal matter to at least 1 out of every 12 people." He indicated that by 1970 "we will have at least 1 million more retarded persons than there are at present." After referring to the birth rate of mentally retarded children the President said:

> This is a national problem and it requires a national solution.

The President went on to indicate the financial hardships to the families of the mentally retarded and the emotional strain suffered by the retarded child in trying to cope with modern society. He stated that we must act nationally to alleviate the problems of the mentally retarded. We owe it to them as individuals and to ourselves as a Nation.

The President indicated that the effort to help the mentally retarded at that time took six basic forms:

First. Diagnostic and clinical services for the retarded were being expanded.

Second. An increase in beds in residential institutions.

Third. An increase in the number of special education classes.

Fourth. Parent counseling was conducted by professional persons in the field.

Fifth. Child welfare agencies were attempting to meet some of the needs.

Sixth. Vocational centers to prepare the child for a useful life were established.

The President in his first statement went on to say that although the effort was being made along the foregoing lines, "the central problem remains unsolved, for the causes and treatment of mental retardation are largely untouched." He therefore called together a panel of outstanding professional people to prescribe a program of action. The activities of the panel were directed generally to "the adequacy of existing programs and the possibilities for greater utilization of current knowledge." More specifically the President instructed the panel to review and make recommendations with regard to—

First. The personnel required to do the job.

Second. The areas of concern that offer the best hope of success and the means necessary to encourage activity in the area.

Third. Present programs of treatment, education, and rehabilitation.

Fourth. Unity faction between Federal and State Governments and private resources.

II. REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S PANEL ON MENTAL RETARDATION, OCTOBER 1962

The President's Panel, chaired by Hon. Leonard W. Mayo, made its 194-page report to the President in October 1962. After introductory remarks on the nature and effects of mental retardation, the panel made eight recommendations which it discussed in the report:

1. Research in the causes of retardation and in methods of care, rehabilitation, and learning.
2. Preventative health measures including (a) a greatly strengthened program of maternal and infant care directed first at the centers of population where prematurity and the rate of damaged children are high; (b) protection against such known hazards to pregnancy as radiation and harmful drugs; and (c) extended diagnostic and screening services.
3. Strengthened educational programs generally and extended and enriched programs of special education in public and private schools closely coordinated with vocational guidance, vocational rehabilitation, and specific training and preparation for employment, education for the adult mentally retarded, and workshops geared to their needs.
4. More comprehensive and improved clinical and social services.
5. Improved methods and facilities for care, with emphasis on the home and the development of a wide range of local community facilities.
6. A new legal, as well as social, concept of the retarded, including protection of their rights, life guardianship provisions when needed, an enlightened attitude on the part of the law and the courts, and clarification of the theory of responsibility in criminal acts.
7. Helping overcome the serious problems of manpower as they affect the entire field of science and every type of service through extended programs of recruiting with fellowships, and increased opportunities for graduate students and those preparing for the professions to observe and learn at first hand about the phenomenon of retardation. Because there will never be a fully adequate supply of personnel in this field and for other cogent reasons, the panel has emphasized the need for more volunteers in health, recreation, and welfare activities, and for a Domestic Peace Corps to stimulate voluntary service.
8. Programs of education and information to increase public awareness of the problem of mental retardation.

III. THE PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE TO CONGRESS, FEBRUARY 5, 1963

For the first time in our history the President sent a special message to Congress on the problems of mental retardation and mental illness. He suggested a threefold attack on these crucial problems:

First. Discover the cause and eradicate.

Second. Strengthen the skilled manpower and resources of knowledge necessary to sustain the attack.

Third. Strengthen the programs and facilities serving the mentally ill and mentally retarded.

With these objectives in mind the President suggested a new approach, "designed, in large measure, to use Federal resources to stimulate State, local and private action."

To prevent the increase of mental retardation, the President recommended a 5-year program to stimulate State and local activity to "plan, initiate and develop comprehensive maternity and child health care service programs" which would aid families unable to afford needed medical care. To further aid to reduce the effect of mental retardation, the President suggested doubling the existing $25 million annual authorization for Federal grants for maternal and child health, using a significant portion for the mentally retarded. I suggest that the Congress should promptly and fully support this recommendation. Further, the President emphasized the need for community facilities and services for the mentally retarded. The President suggested grants to be awarded to the States on a selective basis to give every State an opportunity to begin a well organized, comprehensive program to meet the needs of the mentally retarded. The President urged the granting of Federal funds for the construction of facilities for first, inpatient clinical units in which specialists on mental retardation would serve; second, outpatient clinics including facilities for special treatment; and third, "satellite" clinics in outlying cities for treatment of the mentally retarded.

Finally to promote research the President suggested "legislation to authorize the establishment of centers for research on human development including the training of scientific personnel."

The President urged action in his recommendations stating the intention to promote, "to the best of our ability and by all possible and appropriate means—the mental and physical health of all our citizens."

IV. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has proposed to the Congress a program responsive to the President's special message of February 5, 1963, and the Report of the President's Panel on Mental Retardation. The program will cost $204,723,000 for fiscal year 1964, an increase of $76,219,000 over the program for fiscal year 1963. Through the enactment of this program, expanded activities would be permitted by the Public Health Service through the National Institutes of Health; through the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; through the Bureau of State Services; through the Children's Bureau; through the Office of Education and through the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. The emphasis in all of the foregoing units would be on research development with a view to studying the scope of the problem and possible solutions.

V. THE CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, I know every Member of this distinguished body is concerned with the problem of mental retardation and is desirous of doing everything possible to solve what the President has correctly called a national problem. The maternal and child health and mental retardation planning amendment of 1963, known as H.R. 3386, was introduced by my distinguished colleague, Representative WILBUR MILLS and on the Senate side by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, Mr. RIBICOFF (S. 1072). This bill proposes to accomplish the following:

First. Project grants to the States to pay for comprehensive State and community action on mental retardation.

Second. Project grants for comprehensive maternity care—including infant care after childbirth—for women in low-income groups among whom there is a high incidence of births of children who are mentally retarded. This would be a 5-year program of project grants in which the Federal share would be up to 75 percent. The program would be administered by the Children's Bureau, under a proposed amendment to the Social Security Act.

Third. An expansion of both the maternal and child health program, and the crippled children's program of the Children's Bureau from the current $25 million annually for each program to an ultimate $50 million annually after 7 years. Under the President's budget for fiscal 1964 at least $1 million would be used specifically for mental retardation activities in these two programs.

Fourth. A new research program of the Children's Bureau authorizing grants, contracts, and jointly financed cooperative arrangements relating to maternal and child health and crippled children's services. Of the recommended first year appropriations of $2.1 million, it is expected that about $500,000 will be used for research in the field of mental retardation.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I recall at this time that the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], has introduced in the Senate bills to provide funds for the construction of mental retardation research centers and the construction of facilities for the care, treatment, and training of the mentally retarded—S. 755 and S. 756—and a bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act which would provide Federal assistance for service to the mentally retarded and others whose vocational rehabilitation potential is difficult to determine (S. 968).

Mr. Speaker, I say the action of the President in addressing himself to this problem early in his first term is commendable. The action taken at that time in appointing the panel of distinguished citizens resulted in a comprehensive study of the problem and recommendations which the President could use as a basis for the special message on this national problem. The bills now before this distinguished body which I have briefly reviewed indicate the beginning of Federal action to alleviate the problem. I look for continued action in this field, constant attention to this grave problem, and a day when this national problem will be measurably alleviated.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to introduce legislation which will further treat with this subject. I have used as a basis the clear way of progress already made in an area once considered hopeless. I am indebted for suggestions to such groups as the Guild for Exceptional Children, from my own district who are doing much fine work in this field. I trust that Members of this House will support pending legislation and the bills I have briefly made reference to. For each Member knows that any delay on our part will result in increased suffering among what I have often called "our greatest asset"—the Nation's young and their dedicated and loving parents.

For those who wish to go into this subject in depth, I suggest the following publications:

"A Proposed Program for National Action To Combat Mental Retardation"—The President's Panel on Mental Retardation, October 1962.

"First National Report on Patients of Mental Health Clinics"—Anita K. Bahn, B.A.; and Vivian B. Norman, B.S.

"A Proposed Program To Combat Mental Retardation"—Rudolf P. Hornuth.

"Preparations of Mentally Retarded Youth for Gainful Employment"—U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin 1959, No. 25.

"Research Relating to Mentally Retarded Children"—U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1960.

"The Mentally Retarded Child at Home"—Laura L. Dittmann, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to join my colleagues in saluting the action taken by the House in unanimously passing H.R. 274 on March 4, 1963. This resolution embodies the high esteem and respect which all Members have for Mr. Lewis Deschler who in his role as Parliamentarian, impartially advises the Speaker and other Members on the innumerable precedents and the intricate operation of this body's rules. For 35 years Mr. Deschler has rendered invaluable and inestimable service to many Speakers, Members and indeed to the whole Nation. All of us owe a true debt of gratitude to this gentleman, and I am delighted that the House has provided an opportunity for us to express it. The honest confidence we place in this able and learned gentleman is a key factor in contributing to the smooth and orderly function of this great legislative body. Mr. Speaker it is my fond hope that Mr. Deschler will serve us for many more years.

Frederick R. Kappel Receives Silver Quill Award of Nation's Specialized Business Publications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 19, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from the proceedings of the recent 14th annual state of the Nation dinner of the Specialized Business Press of America, sponsored by National Business Publications, Inc., at the Sheraton-Park, February 7, 1963, in Washington, at which the chairman of the board and chief executive officer of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Frederick R. Kappel, was presented the Silver Quill Award for 1962 by the Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, for "distinguished service to the business community."

Many Members of the Congress joined industry and business leaders, Government officials and policymakers in our national life, at this notable event.

The excerpts follow:

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY MASTER OF CEREMONIES MILTON B. KIHLSTRUM, PRESIDENT, MILLER PUBLISHING CO., AND CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS, INC.

We come to the climax of our evening—the presentation of the Silver Quill Award of the Specialized Business Press. As always, there were many candidates considered—all outstanding; all deserving. However, none sparkled with such brilliance as that guiding genius behind Telstar who is here to receive our highest tribute.

We are also favored by the presence of another great man of universal respect—the Vice President of the United States—who was himself, last year, recipient of this award. The Specialized Business Press of America will always be honored, Mr. JOHNSON, by its association with your momentous endeavor. We are delighted to have you now present the Silver Quill Award for 1962.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON IN PRESENTING THE 1962 SILVER QUILL AWARD OF NATIONAL BUSINESS PUBLICATIONS TO FREDERICK R. KAPPEL

Mr. Kihlstrum, Mr. Schoenbrun, Mr. Kappel, distinguished guests at the head table, ladies and gentlemen—the dynamics of living are at an alltime peak. Time and distance are shrinking, as the marvels of the space age burst forth at an ever-increasing rate. We're in a race—a race for survival, a race for solutions to social problems, a race to the moon and beyond. This competition involves our way of life—involves our way of doing business, involves our way of maintaining leadership—maintaining it through freedom rather than maintaining it through force.

I suggest that there is more to the space race than those whose rockets are more reliable and those whose spacecrafts first attain their objectives. Those are important, of course, but, as I say, there is much more involved.

There is a contest between a democracy with private enterprise and a dictatorship without private enterprise. As the leaders of the former, we must continue to prove to ourselves and to the world that partnership between private business and free government is the superior way of getting things done.

The Silver Quill Award is peculiarly devoted to the field of business. It is granted by the Nation's business publishers to those whom they have selected as having performed outstanding service to business. But, we're living in a world where all of us—business and labor and agriculture or professionals—must operate in such a manner that what we do in our own field also serves the best interests of our country.

I have not come here this evening to lavish compliments on Frederick Kappel—the people in this audience have recounted his accomplishments so many times that words from an amateur are entirely superfluous. It is the tradition of the Silver Quill that the recipient of the previous year's award make the presentation and I am pleased that this tradition has selected me to pass it on to a most deserving, most distinguished, most competent and a greatly dedicated all-American, Fred Kappel.

REMARKS OF FREDERICK R. KAPPEL

This is an honor I deeply appreciate for several reasons. The first is that this occasion has come through the years to be such a meaningful event. What makes it so, of course, is all people who have gathered around. And, certainly, this gathering is a great tribute to the business publications of the country. We have only to look around this room to realize the importance attached to the business publishing function.

I can't help thinking, too, of the men who have been honored in previous years. It makes me very proud and also very humble to be associated with such a group. One of its most distinguished members, your guest of honor last year, just sat down a minute ago after saying more about me than I could recognize. Thank you, Mr. Vice President, for being so generous in overstating my case.

Another thing that pleases me especially is that this year's award really honors many people and not just me. I have been in the Bell System nearly 39 years. It doesn't take that long to realize that whatever credit we earn is the work of able and devoted men and women all through the business. And it doesn't lessen my personal appreciation, it only increases it, to be able to say—on their behalf as well as for myself—thank you for this recognition.

The story of Telstar is a perfect example of what I have just said. Hundreds and hundreds of people have done their absolute best to make this wonderful thing work. This best involves disciplined scientific imagination, great technical proficiency and the most demanding insistence on quality. But something more is needed, too. What is it that invigorates such effort? What fires people up and then pours on the coal?

I think it is the realization that there are great ends to be served and that every job well done contributes importantly to serving them. By great ends, I mean the mastery of space as a new medium for worldwide communications; the creation of a system which, along with ocean cables, will meet fast-growing human needs; the demonstration of continuing American leadership in extending and improving services that, hopefully, will help bring together the peoples of all nations.

As matters now stand, Telstar has provided basic assurance that satellite communications are indeed feasible and practical and that design and construction of commercial satellites, and ground stations to work with them, can now be approached pretty much as a straight engineering project. There is no scientific obstacle to designing a commercial system immediately and bringing it into being as soon as the satellites could be manufactured and put into orbit, say in 2 or 3 years.

I also mentioned ocean cables. Regarding them, I might say, too, that in a few years' time, their capabilities for handling all kinds of communications will surely equal those of satellites. It would be a great mistake to think that all the paths of progress are out in space.

The important thing of course is to make the best use of all the opportunities. The incorporators appointed by the President are working hard, as you know, to get the Space Communications Corp. started. Speaking for the Bell System, I will just say again that our wish and hope are to take an active, constructive part in this, and as soon as possible. We want to help build a strong, healthy enterprise that will be a great success.

Now the theme of this meeting tonight has been "The Challenge of Universal Communication." And it seems to me this takes us inevitably to the problems of communication in the broad sense—not just the kind I have been talking about, but the whole matter of communicating ideas and purposes of spreading and getting understanding. It is in this effort that the specialized business publications play their important part, not merely as reporters but as lively interpreters of the goals, the achievements, the significant thinking of American industry.

But how can we in business communicate better? And what do we want to communicate anyway?

Several thoughts occur to me. First, I think business simply must communicate more successfully than it has; that the economic growth we are all striving for depends first and foremost on the vitality and drive that is generated in the private sector of the economy—on stimulating and rousing the energies of private enterprise—on encouraging acceptance of risk and the enthusiastic, eager exercise of management skills.

I honestly don't believe the country can get where it wants to go in any other way. Without question these factors have been central to our progress so far. Yet we seem unable to communicate the very philosophy that the country has prospered by. We have watched millions of young people grow up with little or no understanding of the practical economics of business enterprise. We have let profit come to be a dirty word—or a mere technical term in professional economic lingo—while the absolute need for profitability has been clouded over and obscured.

Second, we have big problems in this country and we will not solve them if our aims are small. I said earlier that I thought the driving force behind Telstar was the realization of important ends to be served. If we in business want to instill confidence in others, if we want to inspire people to strive, then we must communicate a feeling of purpose, a feeling that what we are doing is deeply and truly important—important to the country and important to the future.

But we can never communicate this kind of feeling just by using words. I don't say words can be dispensed with. Basically, however, business—and Government, too, for that matter—communicates by how it works. This is age-old doctrine, I realize, but I still can't find a better one. The determination to produce quality, the utmost in value, whatever the product or service may be—this makes work important. This gives dignity to employees, character to the business, lasting substance to investment and satisfaction to consumers, with attendant public respect. Performance and only performance will largely communicate itself—with the help of words to be sure—but the business

that puts on great performance will never need the dictionary to explain it.

As a third point, I think more businesses are learning that by the very act of stating their purposes, they greatly encourage their own effort to achieve them. This involves what I call giving hostages to performance. When you commit yourself to the public plainly, for all to read or hear—well, you are committed. You are out on a limb. You have to stand or fall, and that is a wonderful discipline.

Unhappily, most instances of climbing out on a limb now occur in disputes of various kinds and involve demands made on others. What I am speaking for here is that we make more demands on ourselves, and make them in public. The words we use to do this might even be the most important in all business communication.

Finally, just a word about communication and agreement. Some people I talk with seem to think these are two sides of the same coin. I don't think so at all. I agree that communicating means to listen as well as to talk, but the name of the game is not "Me, too." After all, one of the main purposes of communication is to make clear when you disagree, and why.

I make this rather obvious point because I hope the theme of this meeting will not carry any of us off into dreamland. We surely need, in this country, broad unity of purpose. But we shall never arrive at it by pretending to agree when we do not. We shall get there only by continuously testing and prodding each other—by a continuous dialog, as the intellectuals call it. And what I am saying here tonight comes down essentially to this:

First, business needs to do all it can to improve its part in the dialog; and second, the foundations for success in this effort must be, as they have always been, good purposes, good will, good faith, and good works.

To the national business publications I say again, for myself and equally for my associates in the Bell System—we are deeply grateful for this award. We shall try our best, with your valued and important help, to contribute usefully toward solving problems of communication, in every sense of the word.

Thank you very much.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. G. Willard Collins, evangelist, Church of Christ, Nashville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee because Thou hast revealed to man the meaning of love and sacrifice through the gift of Thy Son. Today we thank Thee for all the men and women who have worked with Thee to carve upon the soil of this land a fruitful nation and people. Our God, we pray that the Members who assemble in this House may recognize their power and responsibility as our leaders, and we ask for Thy guidance to them in this day's activities. May we believe enough to trust Thee; may we obey Thee that Thou might bless us; may we serve Thee and our neighbors that all men may know that we are Thy people. In the name of Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 19, 1963, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 212. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; and

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1597. An act relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1089. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

"A REPORT ON U.S. FOREIGN OPERATIONS IN AFRICA"

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 29 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document, a report entitled "A Report on United States Foreign Operations in Africa", submitted by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and that four thousand additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REFERENDUM ON THE NEW WHEAT PROGRAM

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as the result of conversations which I had with several farmers who were in Washington this week on a tour sponsored by the Missouri Farm Bureau, I am led to believe that many of the farmers of this Nation are being given advice which is based upon a false assumption, and that if they follow this advice it can only result in irreparable damage to their own interests.

I am talking about the advice which some of these farmers have received from those who are recommending that they vote against the new wheat program which is scheduled to go into effect in 1964 if the referendum carries in the election, to be held in the late spring or early summer.

After I had explained to the group the importance of approving this new program, I pointed out that in the event two-thirds did not approve the program they would then revert to the basic law under which there would be maximum supports of 50 percent of parity only for those who planted within their base allotments. This, I said, would mean a support price of about $1.25 a bushel for those who restricted their plantings, but the market price would in all probability be less than a dollar a bushel, this estimate being made on the theory that without restrictions the overall planting would be increased with no limits on acreage.

Then, some of these farmers replied:

> If the referendum results in a vote against the program, then the Secretary of Agriculture will be forced to ask Congress to enact a new law, for he cannot afford to let the basic law go into effect, especially with an election year coming up in 1964.

Mr. Speaker, I do not profess to be an expert on agriculture, and I do not pretend to have the solution to the farm problem, but after 12 years of sitting on the House Committee on Agriculture, I think I have learned a few things. One of them is this, and I am willing to stake my reputation on this prediction. If this new wheat program is not approved by the two-thirds vote in the forthcoming referendum, you are going to see some mighty sick and disappointed farmers throughout this land of ours, and the most surprised bunch will be those who are banking on the Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress—at least the House Committee on Agriculture—coming up with some alternative proposal to "pull their fat out of the fire."

If the referendum fails, I am predicting that you will see good wheat selling for less than a dollar a bushel in 1964, and the warehouses will be filled with loan wheat on which the farmer has received only $1.25 a bushel.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the reading of the following editorial, taken from the March 6, 1963, issue of the Des Moines Register:

[From the Des Moines (Iowa) Register, Mar. 6, 1963]

WHEAT FACT AND FANCY

The Farm Bureau is conducting a major drive to defeat the new wheat program which will go into effect in 1964 if two-thirds of the growers vote in favor of it in a referendum in June of this year. The bureau says the basic issue is "whether the farms of America are to be managed by farmers or by a Government bureaucracy." It says a favorable vote would "give a great boost" to the administration's efforts to expand "supply management" to other commodities, but a "no" vote would be interpreted as a sign farmers do not want additional compulsory supply management programs.

This view of the wheat referendum seems unduly apocalyptic.

If farmers vote for the program, they will not be committing themselves to it for all time to come, but only for the 1964 wheat crop. If the program proved in practice to be as bad as the Farm Bureau says it is, surely this would be apparent to farmers, and they could reject the program on the next vote. And Congress could change it. What farmers are voting for in the referendum is not a new direction for all farm programs, as the Farm Bureau says, but a trial of a new plan for wheat.

The Farm Bureau is sounding dire warnings about the wheat controls which Charles B. Shuman, president of the organization, says are the "tightest, most restrictive ever proposed for any farm crop." That is extreme language, and it is careless language. Many kinds of controls have been proposed since 1920. The wheat controls are no tighter than those which have been in effect for tobacco and cotton for years and are not as tight as the controls for sugar. The Farm Bureau consistently backs these programs.

If two-thirds of the farmers vote in favor of the program, every wheat grower will be required to comply with his acreage allotment. He can grow as much wheat as he is able to grow on the allotted acres, but he will receive the full support (about $2 a bushel) only on a number of bushels to be determined as his share of the national supply used for domestic food consumption plus a portion of exports.

There are no more "controls" on the farmer than in the case of any crop where mandatory acreage allotments are in effect, as they have been in wheat for years. The main difference in the new program is that the price support will be a two-price deal: The grain not eligible for the top price support (probably about one-seventh of production) will receive a lower support comparable to feed grain supports, about $1.25 a bushel. Growers also will get a land-retirement payment for acres taken out of wheat.

The Farm Bureau correctly says that this new program will result in some decline, probably small, in the total net income received by wheat growers (but not in average income, because the number of growers is dropping). The two-price support plan results in a lower blend price support for wheat.

But rejection of the new plan would mean a much larger drop in wheat income. Price supports for all wheat produced would drop to 50 percent of parity, about $1.25 a bushel.

It is hard to see how the Farm Bureau leaders can get so wrought up about "compulsion" and dictatorial controls which do not go into effect unless two-thirds of the producers vote to accept them. What the Government is saying is that, if two-thirds of the producers favor the controls, then everyone who chooses to grow wheat will have to go along. Every business has regulations, governmental or private.

It seems not unreasonable that the Government ask farmers to cooperate in limiting production if they want a guaranteed price for their product. If they don't want to comply with acreage allotments in return for a higher price, well, that settles that. But it isn't an issue of Government management of farms, nor is it setting the course of farm policy forevermore.

EARNED INCOME LIMIT FOR THOSE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which would increase to $1,800 the annual amount of earned income a person may receive without having his social security benefits reduced.

My bill would liberalize present social security requirements that retirees under 72 must have $1 of social security benefits withheld for every $2 of earnings between $1,200 and $1,700 per annum, and $1 withheld for every $1 of earnings in excess of $1,700.

I am pleased to join Senator HUMPHREY, who has introduced an identical bill in the Senate, and other House Members in proposing this legislation which will give older citizens an opportunity to receive a more adequate income to meet the heavy costs of living.

This is the third major amendment to the Social Security Act which I have proposed so far this session of the Congress.

My other bills, H.R. 2107 and H.R. 2685, would increase minimum social security benefits from $40 to $50 per month and lower age requirements for full social security benefits to 60 years for both men and women.

These bills are designed to strengthen our economy at the base. They would put needed purchasing power into the hands of those who need it most. They would bring a measure of social justice to individuals and families and those 35 million of our fellow citizens—including many in the Sixth District of Pennsylvania which I am privileged to represent—who are denied the opportunity of a decent livelihood in the midst of great national surpluses and prosperity.

I hope that the amendments to the Social Security Act which I have introduced will be carefully considered and that they will be approved by this present Congress.

INTERPRETATION

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, last night's issue of the Washington Star carried a story by George Sherman, a staff writer, commenting on the recent visit of President Kennedy to Costa Rica. The article goes on in this manner:

> Both in private and public, U.S. officials are hailing Mr. Kennedy's meetings with the six Presidents of Central America and Panama as a major landmark in U.S. policy in the hemisphere.

In view of the testimony taken in the Moss committee in the last 3 or 4 days I think that most Members of Congress and certainly most taxpayers are going to have their tongue in their cheek and take a hard look at the final result. We have learned that "managed news" does not necessarily reflect what has actually taken place. But the point I want to make further is that apparently we are committed to another foreign aid program in Central America, because further down in the story it states that the prestige of the President was going to be thrown with full weight behind a new program which is described as a new Fund for Central American Economic Integration.

I would only conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that those of us who have cast an unpopular vote in our district for mutual security and foreign aid are finding it increasingly difficult to go along. We find another program that is announced for the first time, not in the United States, not requested from Congress, but perfunctorily announced from a place out of the country. I recall that the Alliance for Progress was announced first in Uruguay and we found out that U.S. credit was committed for $10 billion.

I think we have four programs already working in Central America and I certainly hope that this program will be screened very carefully by the House before any binding commitments are made.

DISARMAMENT AGENCY SPOKESMAN STATES INACCURATE TEST-BAN FACTS

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include two tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on the Voice of America's "Press Conference, U.S.A.," broadcast worldwide on Tuesday, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency's Deputy Director Adrian S. Fischer inaccurately charged the big 2½-million-square-mile hole for Soviet undetectable test ban cheating under the administration's new test-ban treaty proposals does not exist. The big hole was revealed Monday by the Republican Conference Committee on Nuclear Testing.

Mr. Fischer's statements to the world simply are not factual. If he had been on commercial radio selling health pills as phony as the big hole test-ban treaty proposal he would be landed on by the Federal Food and Drug Administration like a ton of bricks and charged with misleading advertising, failure to label deleterious ingredients, and peddling a product dangerous to public health and safety.

Fischer denies existence of the big hole by alleging signals equal to a 3-kiloton shot in alluvium—that is, a 3 bury signal—beyond a distance of 1,240 miles are larger than the size signal for distances 620 to 1,240 miles used by the

conference committee to illustrate the big hole. Table 1 shows the situation for the 620 to 1,240 distance where the size of the seismic signal is 4 millimicrons. Table 2 shows the situation for distances beyond 1,240 miles where the size of the signals goes back up to about 10 millimicrons, their size at 480 miles or about 800 kilometers. What table 2 illustrates is that even if, with this larger size signal, there is a marginal detection capability, the signal still is not sufficiently larger in size than background microseismic noise to permit identification of a cheat test shot, or series of them, from among thousands of small earthquakes of similar size occurring annually in the U.S.S.R. Without this identification capability, the big hole still exists. Paint it black for the future U.S. national security.

Fischer complains that the 3 bury signal—that is, signal equivalent to a 3-kiloton shot in alluvium—used as a measuring yardstick in the conference committee's report do not establish the big hole because there is relatively little dry alluvium in the U.S.S.R. His argument is specious because the dry alluvium equivalent is merely an expression of measurement, a yardstick. Units on this yardstick are now called a "bury" to eliminate such confusion. There are many other geological formations in the U.S.S.R. which may have an equal or greater muffling effect on the seismic shock signal of cheat tests. Alternatively, the signal may be reduced below thresholds of detection and identification merely by conducting the tests in underground cavities which decouple the shock wave of the explosion from the surrounding earth and thereby produce seismic signals of meager size. The big hole still exists, despite Mr. Fischer's misleading reasoning. Paint it black for the future U.S. national security.

Fischer further asserts the big hole does not exist because a seismic observatory at Mould Bay, Canada, has detected shots less than 3 kilotons fired by the AEC in Nevada. Again his reasoning is specious because reputable seismologists tell us Mould Bay's peculiar capability is a rare accident of geography based on the relative locations of the Nevada shots and the Mould Bay instrument. Such rare accidents can never tell us where to locate a seismic detection station in similar juxtaposition to an underground cheat shot that has not even yet been planned, let alone located somewhere within the Soviet Union's 8½ million square miles of real estate. The big hole still exists. Paint it black for the future U.S. national security.

It is hoped that the factual tables accompanying these remarks will be noted by the Member of the other body who Tuesday made disparaging remarks in the RECORD about the big hole charges. The tables are based on factual statements of a responsible Defense Department seismologist. If the gentleman will examine these tables he will possess information I believe he did not have then. These plain scientific facts of physical life have a direct bearing on the responsible evaluation of treaty proposals in context of the ability to deter a determined and intelligent cheater. He should admit this.

TABLE 1.—*Actual size (in millimicrons) of 3-bury*[1] *seismic signal compared with size of signal required for detection, location, and identification of "suspicious" shots at 620 to 1,240 miles (1,000 to 2,000 kilometers) distance*

Microseismic background "noise" level	3-bury[1] signal	Signal size needed for detection and location	Signal size needed for identification
5	4	10	[2]50
4	4	8	[2]40
3	4	6	[2]30
2	4	[3]4	[2]20
1	4	[3]2	[2]10

[1] A "bury" is a unit of seismic signal measurement. For example: 1 bury is the equivalent of a seismic signal created by a 1-kiloton explosion where the shot is fired in alluvium formation in direct contact with the soil, i.e., without decoupling: 2 bury is the same for a 2-kiloton explosion and so on: Explanation of the origin of this unit of measurement will be found in remarks by Representative HOSMER in this issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 4767–4768.

[2] 3-bury signal useless for identifying it as a cheat test.

[3] 3-bury signal begins to show on seismograph for detection purposes.

NOTE.—Average microseismic background level is 10 to 20 millimicrons. Table shows only "very quiet" areas of 5 millimicrons and less. 2 times background required for detection and location. 10 to 20 times background required for identification.

TABLE 2.—*Actual size (in millimicrons) of 3-bury*[1] *seismic signal compared with size of signal required for detection, location, and identification of "suspicious" shots beyond 1,240 miles (2,000 kilometers) distance*

Microseismic background "noise" level	3-bury[1] signal	Signal size needed for detection and location	Signal size needed for identification
5	10	[2]10	[3]50
4	10	[2]8	[3]40
3[4]	10	[2]6	[3]30
2[4]	10	[2]4	[3]20
1[4]	10	[2]2	[5]10

[1] A "bury" is a unit of seismic signal measurement. For example: 1 bury is the equivalent of a seismic signal created by a 1-kiloton explosion where the shot is fired in alluvium formation in direct contact with the soil, i.e., without decoupling; 2 bury is the same for a 2-kiloton explosion and so on. Explanation of the origin of this unit of measurement will be found in remarks by Representative HOSMER in this issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 4767–4768.

[2] 3-bury signal begins to show on seismograph for detection purposes.

[3] 3-bury signal useless for purpose of identifying it as a cheat test.

[4] Reduction of background noise to these extremely low levels even by installation of highly sophisticated equipment is not assured.

[5] 3-bury signal barely enters threshold of identification.

NOTE.—Average microseismic background level is 10 to 20 millimicrons. Table shows only "very quiet" areas of 5 millimicrons and less. 2 times background required for detection and location. 10 to 20 times background required for identification.

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT ON TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, under date of March 18 I wrote the President respecting deficiencies of a nuclear test ban treaty his advisers state is under preparation for offer to the Soviets in the near future. The letter also discusses possible reasons for what I feel to be bad advice on the subject these advisers are giving him. I hope the President will be given the letter to read. It is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1963.

Re nuclear test ban.

The HONORABLE JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President, the White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I sincerely hope this letter may reach your eyes because it contains information relating to the national security which I feel you may not otherwise receive.

Your Disarmament Agency people recently outlined to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy many of the provisions of a revised test ban treaty under preparation which they state soon will be offered the Soviets. This proposal contains a loophole through which the Soviets can move clandestinely to nuclear weapons superiority and its equivalent, Communist world domination.

According to testimony of Government technical witnesses heard by the JCAE at the same hearings, the verification system to be proposed is inadequate to detect and identify underground test cheating at yields equivalent to "3 kilotons and below conducted in alluvium formations" if cheating is carried on at least 620 miles inside Soviet borders. According to my calculations, this leaves an area of at least 2½ million square miles in the interior of the U.S.S.R.—and probably twice that size—in which significant secret Soviet underground tests can be carried on wholly without fear of detection.

This undetectability results from the inherent inability of seismographs to detect and locate signals unless they are at least twice the size of the earth's normal microseismic background noises and their inherent inability to distinguish, that is, identify, suspicious events from earthquakes unless the signals are 10 to 20 times larger than background noise.

In short, natural background noise, which averages 10 to 20 millimicrons, affects seismographs just like static affects a radio receiver—the signal's are blotted out by the noise.

This is what happens:

Assume a quiet location for the seismograph, with background noise of only 5 millimicrons. This means the signal must be at least 10 millimicrons for detection and location and at least 50 millimicrons for identification. Yet, the signal from a 3-kiloton shot 620 miles distance will be only 4 millimicrons in size—far below levels required for verification of cheating.

Even assuming special instruments could reduce the background noise to an irreducible 1 millimicron minimum, where marginal detection and location capability would appear, still a 10 millimicron signal would be needed for identification, and the actual signal will be only 4 millimicrons.

It is to be noted that signals can be held to the 4 millimicron level either by limiting test yields to 3 kilotron in alluvium or equivalent soils or by conducting larger shots in underground cavities which "decouple" the shock waves from surrounding earth and reduce the signal to the undetectable level.

The foregoing all is a matter of public record in the JCAE's hearings. Also on the JCAE's public record is testimony as to what weapons development progress can be made in this big hole undetectable cheating area. It amounts to the entire spectrum of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons except an "unsubstantial fraction" of strategic weapons—these being superyield H-bombs the U.S.S.R. already has developed anyway.

If you offer the Soviets the treaty now being drafted it will mean an offer by the United States to forgo wholly all nuclear weapons development and, as a practical matter, simply trust a Communist promise not to continue nuclear weapons development when it can be done without fear of discovery.

This is exactly what your Disarmament Agency relates it is advising you to do on the grounds the risks of not doing so are greater than those of doing so. In effect, they say it is more risky for both sides to test in the open than it is for the Communist to be given the opportunity for cheat testing while we stop progress. This flies in the face of logic if we assume we distrust the Soviets enough to spend $50 billion a year on military defense.

The advice also flies in the face of logic if a treaty with a big hole in it is an ineffective treaty, and I do not see how it could be otherwise. Secret weapons testing of the magnitude possible would drastically affect the military balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Further, if an ineffective treaty is concluded, it will surrender all opportunity to conclude an effective one. What happens then to the hopes and aspirations of people everywhere who see an effective treaty as one of the very few opportunities there is to achieve a less risky world?

There is no need to take my word, Mr. President, for the facts on undetectability and clandestine weapons development opportunities above related. Dr. Carl Romney, seismologist for the Air Force Technical Applications Center, can explain the inherent physical limitations on seismic detection imposed by background noise as he did to the JCAE. Gen. A. W. Betts, the AEC's director of military applications, can define for you the wide spectrum of opportunity for undetectable weapons development, as he did to the JCAE. I urge you to confer with these men.

Why do I suggest bypassing your Disarmament Agency advisers for this information?

Simply because if they have not already put this matter to you, then you should no longer have confidence in their advice. With the hopes of mankind aroused for a reduction in the world's risks by an effective test ban treaty, they are not doing their jobs advising you to enter an ineffective one. They cannot safely be relied upon if they tell you to trade the reality of an effective risk reduction device for only an illusion of effectiveness, with the eventual prospect of a nuclear Pearl Harbor thrown in for good measure.

If their advice to you is so bad, why do they give it? These are patriotic men of integrity—what, you may ask, is my answer to that?

My answer, Mr. President, does not reflect on either the patriotism or the integrity of these men. They are hard working people, intensely anxious to succeed in their jobs. It is simply that success in their jobs can only be demonstrated by the conclusion of some agreement with the Soviets. They want a good agreement, not a bad one. But they want an agreement. I am certain that this factor leads them into subconscious miscalculations of the balance of risks which overemphasizes hopes for the verification system and underemphasizes practical difficulties with it.

Mr. Foster, who heads the agency, is a former business executive, his assistant is Mr. Fischer, a former lawyer. Both receive their advice on seismology from Dr. Long, a chemist. None have been on their jobs even for a period of 2 years. Your Committee of Principals which reviews the Disarmament Agency's advice is composed of three former business executives and four former college professors. This group too has only been on the job for about 2 years.

Look at it this way: At Cape Canaveral, where "all systems are go" it means the check out of many, many components of a missile have been made electronically and infallibly before the final light is green.

By contrast, at the Disarmament Agency all components of a test ban proposal are not checked out electronically and infallibly before you receive the green light. They are checked by human beings who must make many, many individual subjective judgments as to each component before giving you a red or green light on the overall treaty package. Each of these many, many judgments is subject to a subconscious intrusion of the desire for an agreement. Constant favorable resolution of small doubt by this means, a bit by bit, piece by piece, eventually add up to one big major miscalculation.

Such miscalculation, Mr. President, I sincerely feel has occurred. It has occurred substantially in the manner I have outlined. Both you and the Nation will be its innocent victims unless prompt steps are taken, steps which can only be taken by you.

So again, I urge you to talk directly with Dr. Romney and General Betts, or others of equal knowledge and ability, who are not subject to the subconscious pressures upon Mr. Foster and his associates.

I am certain what they tell you will substantiate the proposition that an effective test ban treaty—one which will in fact cause the Soviets to stop nuclear weapons development if we do—will require manned seismic observatories inside the Soviet Union as well as on free world soil.

Again, in closing, I reiterate the danger of missing the chance for an effective, risk reducing treaty by the proposal of an ineffective, risk increasing treaty.

Sincerely,

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress.

THE STORY OF A MAGAZINE ARTICLE FIX

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, on the flimsiest possible evidence, a major national publication has sought in recent weeks to discredit southern football generally and athletic officials at the University of Alabama in particular.

In the Saturday Evening Post dated March 23, 1963, there is an article entitled "The Story of a College Football Fix" which, according to the editors of the magazine, is "shocking" and the biggest sports scandal since the 1919 World Series baseball games. The article makes charges against two men, athletic directors at their respective universities, Paul Bryant, University of Alabama, and Wallace Butts, University of Georgia.

The facts on which these charges have been based run from the ephemeral to the nonexistent. However, the facts do speak for themselves that the magazine article is "fixed" in such a way as to cause the readers to draw distorted conclusions. First, they accuse Butts and Bryant of conspiring and fixing the 1962 football game between the University of Georgia and the University of Alabama, which was played at Birmingham, saying in a prefatory note to the article:

> Before the University of Georgia played the University of Alabama last September 22, Wally Butts, the athletic director of Georgia, gave Paul "Bear" Bryant, head coach of Alabama, Georgia's plays, defensive patterns, all the significant secrets Georgia's football team possessed.

The basis of this charge was a telephone call allegedly overheard by a man who admittedly knows little about football.

This is not evidence you could go into court with, or even get very many people familiar with football to take seriously. Yet the Saturday Evening Post has seen fit to put Paul Bryant and Wally Butts on trial in the court of public opinion. They are being tried in a "fixed" article with the facts arrayed in an effort to present a case against two honored and respected men.

Some of the "shocking" revelations of Butts to Bryant in the alleged telephone conversation were that Georgia did not have a man who could quick kick, that the Georgia quarterback revealed whether he was going to pass or run by the way he held his feet, and that certain other players committed themselves in advance on particular plays. Butts is also supposed to have given away offensive and defensive plays. While all of this is very interesting, there is some question that in this day of intensive scouting of opposing teams and slow motion photography the coach of one of the top teams in the country and a man voted by his peers as coach of the year in 1961 would have to be leaked information such as that alluded to in the article. It is outrageous that such a charge should be made, on the strength of statements by a convicted bad check artist. Furthermore, Coach Bryant was never even contacted by the Post to ascertain the validity of the charges or to obtain his comments. This failure to contact the victim of the charges bespeaks malice and a callous disregard for truthful, objective reporting.

Coach Bryant, in a statewide television appearance before the people of Alabama, answered these absurd charges in this way:

> I have been accused in print of collusion or attempts at collusion with the athletic director of the University of Georgia to fix or rig the game we played with the University of Georgia last fall.
>
> Our boys won the game by a score of 35 to 0.
>
> I welcome this opportunity to tell the people of Alabama that these charges are false in every sense of the word. I want to take this time to deny them with every force at my command. Never in my life have I attempted to rig or fix any game either as a player or as a coach.
>
> In these charges there is a statement that I had information on the Georgia football team. Certainly we did. We have information on and about every team that we play. This is scouting and research and study, etc.
>
> The Saturday Evening Post charges that I obtained confidential, detailed plans that would affect the outcome of the game with Georgia.

> It is part of the business of coaching football and is the duty of my staff and me to know as much about an opposing team as is possible. We attempt to do this, and, ladies and gentlemen, that is what a coach does the other 9 months of the year when football season is over.
>
> We study films of other schools. They study our films. All college teams exchange coaching films. We study the movements of players, their abilities, their weaknesses, and their habits. We study the coaches and their techniques, the games that they have played with us previously, and the games they played with other teams.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it might be useful to mention at this point that last October, Coach Bryant was the subject of a previous defamatory article in the Saturday Evening Post and that he has filed a suit for libel against the magazine on the basis of the false and misleading material contained in that article. The charges brought against the University of Alabama coach in the earlier article are as defamatory as in the present one.

However, the Post is not content to defend the earlier article in a court of law—they have set out to wreck the career of a man. The present article, "The Story of a College Football Fix," constitutes their countersuit against Paul Bryant. By the skillful manipulation of facts with quotes, the article indicts two men when the facts will not uphold their contention that a "fix" was on. The only "fix" in this whole affair is the Post's article.

The alleged phone call was overheard and noted by a man who is highly questionable at the very least. First, why did he listen to a phone conversation that he was accidentally cut in on? Secondly, the Post intimates that Wally Butts' alleged motives were both personal and financial. The phone call listener is an insurance man who has had a little trouble about issuing bad checks. He was convicted on charges of issuing two bad checks, was fined and placed on probation for the offense. He admits in the article that he has always had trouble with his financial affairs. Motives? Considering the background of the accuser, his motives are the ones which should be called into question.

But motives are not the issue here. What is an issue is that the Saturday Evening Post has libeled and defamed two honored and respected men.

Mr. Speaker, Coach Paul Bryant is a man who has dedicated his life to the youth of our country and to college athletics. He has risen to pre-eminence in his field. For that reason he makes a good target for the irresponsible and the rumor mongers. The Saturday Evening Post has attempted to take from Paul Bryant what no man or magazine should ever be allowed to take from any man. They have tried to take his good name.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a new departure for the Saturday Evening Post. Over the past several months, they have time and again resorted to sensationalism and mad-dog journalism. This magazine has published in each recent issue so-called "inside dope" stories that characterize some of the worst journalism in America. Articles like "Air Crashes: Growing Peril in the Skies"; "A Vote Against Motherhood"; "Birmingham: City of Fear"; and now this scurrilous piece of reporting on "The Story of a College Football Fix," raise serious questions about the future of the Post. In the last 3 years, the Post has lost $40 million in advertising revenues while almost every other national magazine has increased its advertising income. Figures from Advertising Age show that the Post advertising revenues were $105 million in 1960. In 1961, the figure dropped to $86.5 million and dropped more sharply in 1962 to $66.5 million.

It is tragic to see a magazine with an illustrious history like the Post, a magazine in which many people have formerly had confidence, resort to this type of yellow journalism in an effort to bolster sagging revenues. One naturally cannot evaluate the accuracy of every article published in a given magazine. If a person reads an article about a subject he does know something about, and that article is full of distortions and inaccuracies, then it raises serious questions in the reader's mind about the validity of other articles.

For me, their recent article about my home city of Birmingham was such an article. Now, this attack on a renowned football coach in an article skillfully designed to cause the readers to conclude his guilt, makes me wonder if the Saturday Evening Post may not fade away into the oblivion they have suggested for Coach Bryant. Confidence once lost is hard to regain. Recent articles in the Post have caused a loss of confidence and I will not be surprised if that magazine in the near future ceases publication like the Literary Digest of the 1930's.

One facet of the case of the Saturday Evening Post is that it points to the need for review of our libel laws and regulations for publications using the U.S. mails. As the postal regulations stand now, libelous matter is mailable as long as it is not on the outside wrapper of the magazine. No reference to "The Story of a College Football Fix" was made on the outside of the Saturday Evening Post.

By the time court cases covering the libel suits come to trial, the damage caused by these articles will already have been done no matter what the outcome of the suits. Moreover, the laws and penalties for libel are obviously no obstacle to a magazine that has lost $40 million in advertising revenues in a 2-year period. The Post, financially desperate and losing revenue in the tens of millions of dollars, can regard the threat of libel judgments with indifference.

Yet let the record show first, that the University of Alabama board of trustees has investigated the charges thoroughly and has issued a statement absolving Coach Bryant; second, that a lie detector test given Coach Bryant has established his innocence; third, that the Justice Department has looked into the case and dropped its investigation; and fourth, that the president of the University of Alabama, Dr. Frank A. Rose, has issued this statement:

> The rumors concerning Coach Bryant were brought to my attention 3 weeks ago. After careful and thorough investigation, including the most favorable results of a lie-detector test given by a man who is a former member of the FBI and lecturer at the Keeler Polygraph Institute in Chicago, administered at the request of Coach Bryant for Commissioner Bernie Moore and me, I have found no evidence of any kind that would implicate Coach Bryant in any way with rigging or fixing, or betting on football games.
>
> A real injustice has been done to the University of Alabama and Coach Bryant and I am delighted to be able to make this statement at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the University of Alabama is my alma mater and it is for that reason that I rise to speak—for that reason and the fact that a fine man has been defamed by a shameless "reporter" and an irresponsible magazine. Their article has done its damage, the magazine has achieved its goal of sensationalism, and it has caused widespread comment, but all of these petty and shortsighted goals have been achieved at the fearful sacrifice of truth.

RICE AS THE STAFF OF LIFE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, when you consider the world production and value of the 10 most important commodities and materials, rice is on the top of the list. More than one-half of the total world population looks to rice as the staff of life as it provides 80 percent of the food for more than 50 percent of all the people over the globe. There must be a reason for such a universal and wide acceptance of rice. It is one of the most versatile of all foods.

A well-balanced diet consists of four general classifications—the milk and dairy products, meats, fruits and vegetables, and cereals and bread. Rice is a part of two of these four great food groups, being classified in the fruit and vegetable and bread and cereal food groups. Rice works so well with all of these major classifications of foods. As main dishes it harmonizes with meats, fish, poultry, and seafood dishes. As for use in desserts, it combines with milk and dairy products as well as with eggs as an ingredient, along with sugar and starches. So rice is one of our most versatile foods which is adaptable to dishes for use in any season of the year and at every meal.

There are three principal kinds of rice—white milled rice, long, medium, and short grain, brown rice, and parboiled rice. There are many byproducts of rice, including rice flour, rice oil, rice hulls, rice polish, and rice bran.

White rice contains nutrients of the finest biological value, including protein, calcium, iron, carbohydrates, vitamins of the B complex, and a bit of fat. Rice is wholesome, economical, tasty, palatable, as well as nutritious. It is quite easy to prepare. Boiled rice is one of the most acceptable and widely severed rice dishes. For usual servings for a family of from four to six people here is all that is required in preparation: three cups of water with a teaspoon of salt placed in a cooking vessel. Bring to a boil. Pour in 1 cup of white rice, either long, medium, or short grain, or parboiled. Place cover on vessel, turn down to low heat, and cook for 22 minutes. It is ready to serve usually with butter or margarine. To make more flavorful, a couple of pats of margarine or butter may be added before cooking.

Some of the vast number of recipes which were made available by the Washton Embassies include: From the Embassy of Turkey; dolmas—stuffed vegetables; from the Embassy of Brazil: chicken soup with rice; from the Embassy of France: entrements au riz; from the Embassy of Indonesia: fried rice; from the Embassy of Cambodia: royal rice; from the Embassy of Germany: rice a la trautmannsdorff; from the Embassy of Iran: loobia polau; from the Embassy of Italy: rice croquettes; from the Embassy of Mexico: arroz a la Mexicana; from the Embassy of Saudi Arabia: rice with lamb and nuts; from the Embassy of Israel; Palestine rice plate; from the Embassy of Australia: creamed rice with apricot sauce; from the Embassy of the Philippines: royal rice cake; from the Embassy of Japan: rice is best as is.

My favorite rice recipe, rice with mushrooms, is as follows: One cup uncooked rice; one can consommé; one small can mushrooms; one-eighth pound butter or margarine. Melt margarine in skillet. Add rice and fry until it pops or swells. Put rice in a baking dish and add the consommé and mushrooms. Cook 45 minutes in oven at 350 degrees.

Thanks to Mrs. John Cooper, West Memphis, for first introducing me to this.

The Rice Council for Market Development sponsors two major yearly rice events: National Rice Week March 17 through 23, and the October Rice Harvest Festival. It is comprised of rice growers, mills, and all segments of the rice industry in the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas. The council is a voluntary organization devoted to the promotion of rice at home and abroad.

The rice industry is most appreciative of the fine cooperation accorded it by Capitol Architect J. George Stewart, who operates Capitol restaurants and cafeterias, together with Mr. Kermit Cowan, who is superintendent of the House Restaurant and Cafeteria, and Mr. Robert S. Sonntag who is in charge of the Senate facilities, in serving rice to all of its patrons on Wednesday, March 20, 1963. Green rice was enjoyed by several hundred Members of the Senate, House of Representatives, press news media, Capitol Hill employees and visitors.

The work of the rice council in promotion of rice in foreign markets could not be accomplished without the cooperation and work of the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Rice Export Development Association. The Department of Agriculture has been most helpful to the industry in the administration of Public Law 480 consistently since its passage in 1955.

U.N. CORRECTS PROJECT: CANCELLATION BETTER SOLUTION

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform our colleagues that the United Nations has agreed to correct a Special Fund project which has been the cause of concern in this House.

I am glad to see the U.N. admit a mistake and correct it. Now, I hope they will admit that this whole project is a mistake and cancel it. The project would provide radioactive isotopes to a Communist bloc nation—that is not the sort of thing Americans should be helping provide for Communists. At the very least American financial support—a planned $218,560—should be withdrawn.

The project to which I refer is that for nuclear research in Yugoslavia about which I first advised this House February 25, in the early stages of my investigation, into the foreign aid funds of the United Nations—a large measure of which American taxpayers provide.

The Special Fund of the U.N. has agreed to revise and correct the authorization for this $1.7 million project. The House will recall that the Special Fund—40 percent financed by American taxpayers—will contribute $546,400 to this project.

In a restricted U.N. document the project is called an agriculture research project. But, in fact, the proposed authorization clearly provided for research in agriculture, and also for a Federal center for general nuclear research in Red Yugoslavia.

I carried an objection about that authorization to the United Nations and to the U.S. Department of State, after I had advised the House of my concern. Today, I can report that I have been informed by Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton and by U.N. Special Fund Managing Director Paul G. Hoffman, that the final contract for this project will provide clearly and specifically that the nuclear research may pertain only to agriculture.

However, I trust that the House will note that radioactive isotopes, once provided for this project, might be used for many purposes other than agricultural research. And, the United Nations very limited checking system on its projects makes it unlikely that it, or the United States, would ever know what the isotopes actually were used for. For instance, isotopes can be used to trace the flow of liquids and gases in pipelines, to test and measure metals, and in connection with biological and chemical warfare.

The American delegation to the U.N. and our State Department fell sound asleep on this job and would have allowed this project to have been agreed to, complete with a loophole, so that Communist Yugoslavia could have gained knowledge in a nuclear research center using U.N. aid subsidized 40 percent by American taxpayers.

Luckily, congressional inquiry stirred the bureaucrats from that snooze and dream fantasy of one-worldism, and I trust they will stay awake from now on to veto this project; and to check upon just where U.S. contributions to the U.N.'s ballooning foreign aid program go. I can only wonder how loudly they were snoring when the Fund approved that $1.2 million to aid Red Cuban agriculture—to say nothing of the 11 other U.N. aid projects approved for Cuba.

Ambassador Stevenson of our U.N. delegation agreed with me that the original Yugoslav project authorization could conceivably be misinterpreted. Mr. Hoffman said he felt the original provision was somewhat ambiguous.

Secretary Dutton, acting for the Secretary of State, informed me that the State Department—belatedly—understands my concern about the language of the original authorization. An officer of that Department informed the United Nations that the authorization was incorrect.

I hope the State Department understands equally well my opposition to the nuclear research project, in toto—corrected or uncorrected. Radioactive isotopes are critical items in this atomic age. Americans never should provide them or finance the purchase of them for a Communist nation.

Mr. Speaker, I will include in the RECORD pertinent portions of the correspondence documenting the U.N.'s project correction:

REPRESENTATIVE HALL TO MR. PAUL HOFFMAN, FEBRUARY 21, 1963

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I would like to ask you for clarification of the intentions of the Special Fund and the International Atomic Energy Agency in connection with a project approved but not yet started entitled "Nuclear Research and Training in Agriculture" in Yugoslavia.

I find in studying the Special Fund pamphlets on this project that it calls for a "Federal center for nuclear research and training and for the application of nuclear research to the field of agriculture. That would indicate that the Federal center is a separate facility from the agriculture research. I would appreciate receiving detailed comments about this.

DURWARD G. HALL,
Member of Congress.

REPRESENTATIVE HALL TO SECRETARY OF STATE RUSK, U.N. AMBASSADOR STEVENSON, MR. PAUL HOFFMAN, FEBRUARY 25, 1963

Mr. ———: A matter of serious concern has come to my attention in connection with a United Nations' project under the Special Fund. The project is in Yugoslavia and is entitled "Nuclear Research and Training in Agriculture."

May I call your attention to the "restricted" publication of the Special Fund dated March 22, 1962, and covering the recommendations of the Fund's managing director for approval of the nuclear research project.

In paragraph 5 of the publication under the subheading "III—The Project" I find the first sentence which states:

"The request calls for a Federal center for nuclear research and training and for the application of nuclear research to solve practical problems in the various fields of agriculture."

My concern arises from the construction of that sentence detailing the aims and goals of the project. As the sentence reads it authorizes development in two directions (1) to solve problems in agriculture and (2) to provide for a nuclear research and training center.

DURWARD G. HALL,
Member of Congress.

MR. PAUL HOFFMAN TO REPRESENTATIVE HALL, MARCH 4, 1963

MY DEAR MR. HALL: I acknowledge receipt of your letters of February 21 and 25, 1963, relating to the Special Fund project in Yugoslavia entitled "Nuclear Research and Training in Agriculture."

I wish to offer the following comments in reply to your inquiry:

1. From paragraph 2 of the Governing Council document dated March 22, 1962, and referred to by your letters, you will see that the Yugoslav Government already operates an Institute for Application of Nuclear Research in Agriculture, Forestry, and Veterinary Sciences at Zemun and that institutions applying nuclear research methods are found also at four other locations in the country.

2. Through provision of international experts, equipment and fellowships for studying abroad, the Special Fund is assisting in upgrading and expanding the Institute at Zemun, as detailed in paragraphs 5, 6, and 7 of the mentioned document. The Federal center mentioned in line 1 of paragraph 5 is synonymous with the Institute at Zemun mentioned in paragraph 2.

3. The phrasing of the first sentence of paragraph 5 quoted by your letter of February 25 is admittedly somewhat ambiguous. The essence of the sentence is that the request calls for a Federal center which will apply nuclear research to solve practical problems in the various fields of agriculture.

PAUL HOFFMAN.

REPRESENTATIVE HALL TO MR. HOFFMAN, MARCH 7, 1963

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you for your letter of March 4, providing me with information about the operation of your Special Fund and answering my specific questions. It is of great value to me and to the Congress to receive cooperation from international civil servants in our consideration of the Special Fund during this time when it is being questioned in the United States and in the Congress.

With regard to paragraphs 2 and 3 of your letter may I ask if any action has been taken by your office to set straight the ambiguity that you and I both see in the first sentence of paragraph 5 of the Special Fund document mentioned as it concerns the Federal center for nuclear research. If not, might I suggest that you issue a specific directive clearing up this loophole officially by proclaiming that the Federal center is indeed synonymous with the Institute at Zemun and providing that under no circumstances is the Special Fund project to involve any nuclear research other than that involved with plant and animal agricultural research. It seems to me that action by you would clear the air and eliminate the problem.

DURWARD G. HALL,
Member of Congress.

AMBASSADOR STEVENSON TO REPRESENTATIVE HALL, MARCH 8, 1963

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: I was glad to have your views on the United Nations' Special Fund for Nuclear Research and Training in Agriculture project in Yugoslavia. As a result, I have undertaken some special homework on my own and am now in a position to share a few thoughts with you.

This particular project, like 289 others currently being implemented under U.N. Special Fund auspices, was first approved by the Governing Council. This Government took an active role in the establishment of the Special Fund some years ago and, as a member of the Governing Council, the U.S. representative devotes considerable attention to each recommendation of the Managing Director. This was particularly true with respect to the Yugoslav project to which you refer.

Following a thorough review by the Governing Council, the plan was approved in May 1962. The International Atomic Energy Agency was asked to serve as executing authority. Incidentally, the Italian representative was particularly praiseworthy of Yugoslav efforts in this field and encouraged adoption of the project.

While I agree that the purpose as stated in paragraph 5 of the Special Fund document you mentioned in your letter could conceivably be misinterpreted, subparagraphs a, b, and c are, in my mind, crystal clear. You will note that following the opening statement:

"The request calls for a Federal center for nuclear research and training and for the application of nuclear research to solve practical problems in the various fields of agriculture."

The document specifies:

"The Institution will deal with the following major subjects:

"(a) Soil fertility and plant nutrition, including methods for laboratory assessment of the phosphorous status of the soil and methods of application of phosphorous fertilizers; studies of leaching of plant nutrients; study of soil moisture in connection with irrigation; grafting work in orchard and grape cultures; and studies on the absorption of plant nutrients by plants from the soil and on their movements and accumulation within the plant;

"(b) plant breeding, using irradiation as a supplement to conventional breeding methods, in order to produce mutants of agricultural crops and forest trees; and

"(c) animal husbandry, including protein nutrition studies of poultry and thyroid activity as a guide in nutrition studies of beef cattle."

ADLAI E. STEVENSON.

REPRESENTATIVE HALL TO AMBASSADOR STEVENSON, MARCH 12, 1963

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: Thank you for your letter of March 8 providing me with information about the Special Fund and the particular Yugoslav project with which I expressed concern.

Since you agree that paragraph 5 of the U.N. document we discussed "could conceivably be misinterpreted," may I ask if any action has been taken by your office to set straight the ambiguity that you and I both see. I agree with you that the later subparagraphs are clear, but these subparagraphs do not change the major premise to which you and I object.

Since the major concern of the Congress appears to be the relative lack of postappropriation checking on how the Special Fund spends money provided chiefly by American taxpayers, I feel it would serve a useful purpose for the American delegation to initiate a clarification of the paragraph in question proclaiming that the Federal center is indeed synonymous with the Institute at Zemun and providing specifically and in clear English that under no circumstances is the Special Fund project to include any nuclear research other than that involved with plant and animal agricultural research. Clarification will hurt nobody and will ease the way of the Special Fund when this Congress reaches the question of foreign aid appropriations.

DURWARD G. HALL,
Member of Congress.

MR. PAUL HOFFMAN TO REPRESENTATIVE HALL, MARCH 13, 1963

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: Thank you for your letter of March 7 which awaited my return to New York today.

With regard to its second paragraph, I should like to inform you that the plan of operation for the Yugoslav project is about to be signed by the Yugoslav Government, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the Special Fund. I can assure you that this tripartite contract for the implementation of the project will not contain the ambiguity which appears in paragraph 5 of Special Fund document SF/R.5/Add.40. It will, on the other hand, conform to the correct description of the purpose and activities of the project as set forth elsewhere in the rest of that document.

PAUL HOFFMAN.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE DUTTON TO REPRESENTATIVE HALL, MARCH 13, 1963

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HALL: I want to thank you for your letter of February 25, 1963, concerning the United Nations Special Fund project in Yugoslavia covering nuclear research and training in agriculture which has been referred to me for reply.

I note your inquiry concerning the precise meaning of paragraph 5 of the Special Fund document covering this project. An officer of the Department has spoken with Mr. Clinton Rehling, assistant to Mr. Paul Hoffman of the Special Fund, who has informed him that the language in paragraph 5 is incorrect and that in the publication of the final project agreement the present incorrect language will be appropriately modified. The first sentence of paragraph 5 will then read:

"The request calls for a Federal center for nuclear research and training in agriculture and for the application of nuclear research to solve practical problems in the various fields of agriculture."

I can well understand your concern about the language as it stands in the original document and appreciate your inquiry which will lead to its being more accurately expressed in the final project agreement.

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
(For the Secretary of State).

TAX CREDITS FOR ADDITIONAL WORKERS HIRED BY EMPLOYERS

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which can contribute greatly to the solution of our rising unemployment through the traditional American system of free enterprise. The bill which I am presenting would encourage private employment by providing tax credits for additional workers hired by those employers who conduct our trades and businesses. The measure, which was suggested in an article appearing in the Chicago Tribune several weeks ago, has been advanced by Mr. R. Edwin Moore, chairman of the Bell & Gossett Co., a typical American business developed through the opportunities afforded by our free system. This measure would give the employer credit for each added worker over the average number of employees on the payroll during the previous 3 years. And—in the case of a 100-percent increase, the employer would be entitled to a 1-percent reduction in his corporate tax rate. This incentive would continue until a maximum of 10-percent reduction in corporate tax rate had been achieved.

This measure would encourage greater employment in private industry and would add to the incentives so necessary to stimulate our economic growth and progress. Not only is there incentive for the employer, but for the individual who seeks gainful employment and brings personal skills and talents to the labor market in return for a fair wage and the satisfaction of knowing he is earning his way. There is incentive here for the men and women to whom private employment is the American way of life and who are reluctant to participate in a "made work" program which threatens to destroy our economy and reduce this once proud Nation to a welfare state.

This is not a gimmick nor a device to be taken lightly. Rather, it is a practical and workable method of helping to resolve a national problem in a manner consistent with our American system. It avoids the theories and schemes and the alien philosophies which appear to motivate some so-called economists who have captured the ear of our President. This is a practical businessman's solution. It deserves the fullest consideration in the very serious efforts with which we are engaged—those of demonstrating the adaptability of our free enterprise system to meet the needs of our expanding population in a rapidly changing economy.

U.S. LOAN TO BRAZIL

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, Brazil and our State Department are now wrapping up a U.S. loan which may range up to $200 million. Negotiations started under a bit of a pall when it was announced from Rio that Finance Minister Dantas was coming here to get the money so Brazil could build a trade program with Russia.

At interviews here, Mr. Dantas further admitted that the money would be used to develop trade with Russia. Then the Brazilian Embassy issued a statement denying any such purpose and claimed that Mr. Dantas misunderstood the question.

The Brazilian Embassy further stated:

> Any forthcoming American credits to Brazil will be used exclusively to finance the importation of U.S. goods and services and for repayment of commitments to U.S. creditors.

If this is so, then there is no need to deliver the money to Brazil, the United States should retain it and make the payments direct to the American creditors; but if the money is delivered to Brazil, it will find its way into the Communist trade program.

One could no more keep this money separate and aloof from such Red negotiations than one could pour a glass of cream from off the top of a bottle of homogenized milk.

The American Ambassador to Brazil, Lincoln Gordon, testified before the House Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee that the Government of Brazil was infiltrated with Communists. The State Department, seeing congressional opposition to the Soviet trade loan building up, issued a statement that must appear ludicrous to the rest of the world. It said that Communist infiltration of the Brazilian Government is not sufficient "to have a substantial influence on Brazilian Government policy."

Yet, 3 members of the 15-man Brazilian Cabinet are notorious Marxists, 2 others were former Communist Party members. Goulart's press secretary is a self-declared Communist. The powerful National Industrial Workers Confederation, which unites industrial unions, is under Communist control. The big oil monopoly, Petrobras, is run by an extreme leftwinger.

If the loan is to be used to further Brazil-Red trade, it should not be made regardless of the pleas that Brazil's economy is in poor condition. If the money is to be delivered to the Brazilian Government, the loan should not be made because it will find its way into the program to promote Communist trade.

ARE FEDERAL SUBSIDIES ABUSED?

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, we hear much today about the need for Federal Government subsidies to assist us in our various responsibilities—education, transportation, medical care, urban renewal, and others—that should be taken care of on the local level. We see, read, and hear much about dollars in the form of Federal aid, but I am fearful that we do not understand that with Federal aid we also get Federal control and regulation.

This continually growing bureaucratic control and regimentation of our lives is the greatest single enemy today against our freedom as individuals. We need to awaken again the spirit in America that individual freedom, incentive and the desire to be free are the building blocks upon which was founded the greatest country ever known in the history of mankind.

We have freedom, which sometimes we tend to take for granted, having had it so long we are not really conscious of what it is. While we have the courage and will to die for freedom, we sometimes wonder if we have the guts to live for freedom.

It is particularly refreshing to me to see those seemingly few dedicated individuals today who are living and working and fighting to preserve this precious inheritance. My friend, Mr. Ben H. Wooten, chairman of the board of the First National Bank in Dallas, Tex., is one such individual. A living example and dynamic exponent of the free-enterprise system, Ben Wooten travels thousands of miles each year speaking to Americans about their precious heritage, their freedom and their responsibilities.

We had the honor and privilege of having this free enterprise spokesman visit our west Texas area this month to speak at the annual chamber of commerce banquet in Pecos, Tex. I commend Ben Wooten for the very excellent, nonpartisan, thought-provoking message he delivered.

I would like, unanimous consent, to include Mr. Ben Wooten's remarks in the Congressional Record at this point:

THE WILL TO BE ECONOMICALLY FREE

(By Ben H. Wooten, chairman of the board, First National Bank in Dallas, annual chamber of commerce banquet, Pecos, Tex., Tuesday, March 12, 1963)

Anyone is honored by an invitation to talk to this outstanding group. If I were able to coin beautiful and expressive phrases at will, I could better tell you of my gratitude for being with you this evening. My mind wanders down memory lane and dwells upon my most precious possessions—friends. Friendships have been likened unto the homing ships that touch our evening shores; unto the flowers fair that sweeten the desert air; unto the stars that slip out at night and give us light after the sun has gone away.

There is a poem I like very much:

"It is always a joy in life to find,
At every turn of the road,
A strong arm of the comrade kind,
To help me onward with my load.

"And since I have no gold to give,
'Tis love must make amends,
It is my prayer that while I live,
God shall make me worthy of my friends."

I trust that God shall make me worthy of my friends in Pecos.

My subject is an abiding one, namely, "The Will To Be Economically Free." I have no apologies for the seriousness of my talk and it is completely nonpartisan.

In the din of battle with accompanying stresses and strains, men do not falter in pushing the fray even to death in order that freedom survives. Yet, history tells us again and again that in order to keep freedom, we must daily live it, embrace it economically as well as guard it militarily.

With Kipling, let us pray:

"God of our fathers, known of old,
Lord of our far flung battle lines,
Beneath whose awful hands we hold,
Dominion over palm and pine.
Lord, God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

We must not forget that the economic fallacy of continuously spending more than we collect will ultimately do for us what it

has done for every people in history—namely, financial destruction and poverty. A broke United States would truly be a world tragedy. We must not forget that nations, like individuals, are financially broke when their liabilities exceed their assets. This is a simple financial and economic fact easily understood—one that cannot be circumvented.

Robert Louis Stevenson once said: "Soon or late everybody sits down to his banquet of consequences." Regardless of the amount of wealth possessed by our Nation, if we continue in our annual deficits and unbalanced payments, we will finally come to the banquet of consequences that result from further depreciation of the dollar. We, of course, will spend whether at a deficit or not any amount necessary to defend our country, but certainly, until the great danger is past, we should not adopt any new giveaway plans abroad or at home.

Back in the year 1932, one of the presidential candidates said along with other things that, if elected, his party would support laws establishing a minimum wage, unemployment insurance, medical care, a 30-hour week and improved workmen's compensation. He further stated that his party would support spending $5 billion annually for relief and another $5 billion for public works. He favored Federal aid to agriculture and socialization of power. His party wanted steep increases in income and inheritance taxes and a tax on the interest of Government securities. He also asked Federal aid for homeowners who had mortgage problems. This platform was offered the American people by the presidential candidate of the Socialist Party. He did not win the office of president but his platform cast before it the shadow of coming events. It is not my purpose today to discuss the merits of any individual plank in the Socialist candidate's program; however, we must, in the light of present-day policies and laws, admit that in the main his socialistic ideas have prevailed in the United States.

I once read an article by a young man who said: "I favor private enterprise because I am poor. I would never be happy to be a mere cog in the wheel. I could never be happy were every choice concerning my life made by someone else. I would rather be poor and live under the freedom and opportunities that private enterprise offers than to be rich and live in a penthouse on Manhattan Island under the restrictions of national socialism."

Like the young man who favored private enterprise, let us remember that economic freedom is a personal thing, a precious thing to be valued much greater than subsistence security. There is no economic reason whatever for us to surrender the mastery of our individual fate to the state. We have the highest living standard in the world under our unique American system, and we should never tamper with success. Every American should keep in mind that if he becomes a ward of the state, he will no longer be a free man.

Woodrow Wilson said: "Liberty has never come from the government. Liberty has always come from the subjects of it. The history of liberty is a history of limitations of governmental power, not the increase of it."

Judge Louis D. Brandeis said: "Experience should teach us to be more on our guard to protect our liberties when the government's purposes are beneficient."

Benjamin Franklin said: "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither safety nor liberty."

During the past 5 or 6 years especially, we have heard a great deal and witnessed the followthrough of at least one philosophy of Abraham Lincoln, namely, "You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred." We do not quarrel with this statement; however, we direct attention to other admonitions of Mr. Lincoln just as important, just as vital and deserving of as much attention as the one quoted above. We regret that these admonitions appear to be ignored by a large segment of our people in authority. Mr. Lincoln gave us nine essential economic "cannots" all worthy of our deep concern. They are as follows:

"(1) You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn.

"(2) You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.

"(3) You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.

"(4) You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

"(5) You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.

"(6) You cannot help little men by tearing down big men.

"(7) You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.

"(8) You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could do for themselves.

"(9) You cannot build character and courage by taking away men's initiative and independence."

In effect, these great Americans—Messrs. Wilson, Brandeis, Franklin, and Lincoln—say that the socialist state makes beggars out of proud men, cowards of strong men, and serfs of freemen. The socialist state ultimately brings inflation through the deficit door and continued spiraling inflation always produces restrictions on personal liberties.

Inflation has long been the greatest destroyer of freedom in the world. Deficit financing is inflationary. When the value of a nation's money is lost, some kind of dictatorship usually takes hold in order to avoid complete chaos. We would be reminded that since 1946 the value of the dollar has gone down 21½ cents.

We may well ask what can you and I do about it. The antidote is a renewed faith in God, in ourselves, in the American tradition, and the principles under which we have reached the highest living standards of any people ever on earth. Let us emphasize thrift, courage, personal independence, a willingness to live for individual economic freedom, and support officeseekers that are dedicated in purpose and deed to the tenets of Americanism. Under drastic inflation the American people would suffer more intensely than the people of any other nation in history in that 90 percent of all the life insurance in the world is written in the United States. The security we have provided through insurance loses the exact amount as the dollar in circulation.

John Milton once said: "Awake, arise, or be forever fallen." This admonition was given 275 years ago, but it is applicable today to every American, so let's resolve that our individual freedoms shall not be further whittled away. We are firmly of the opinion that in the afternoon of life when the gold of the sunset has been driven away by the gray of the twilight, there will be more dignity, joy and comfort in living off what we have created for ourselves than in wondering for whom to vote in order to keep a socialistic stipend from being cut. Liberty is more precious than any governmental handout or subsidy.

We are reminded that Ella Wheeler Wilcox once wrote:

"One ship drives east, another west,
With the self-same gale that blows;
'Tis the set of the sail, and not the gale,
That determines the way we go."

It is certainly time for us to reexamine the setting of our economic sails and steer our financial ship of state into the harbor of a sound dollar and there permanently drop anchor.

An author whose name I do not know once wrote:

"Isn't it strange that princes and kings,
And clowns that caper in sawdust rings,
And common folk like you and me,
Are builders of eternity.

"To each is given a book of rules,
A shapeless mass, a bag of tools,
And each must make 'ere life has flown
A stumbling block or a stepping stone."

We know the rules of individual freedom and we have the tools to maintain and promote it. Let's resolve that we shall be stepping stones along the pathway of freedom and humbly pray that we shall have the will, the courage, and the determination to bear the personal economic risks of freedom and thus keep America what it is today—the most blessed place this side of Heaven.

LAW ENFORCEMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, several months ago, we were expressing concern over a rash of violent crime in the District of Columbia. In the ensuing months, that rash has become a virulent fever. It is in a critical stage. I am not one who believes that crime can be prevented, or even abated, solely by rigid police methods. But law enforcement is an important and essential factor in securing the peace and guaranteeing the safety of citizens as they go about upon their lawful occasions. The Congress must not neglect to provide the legislative tools for law enforcement.

On March 15, 1963, the practice of investigative arrest in the District of Columbia was terminated by administrative order. I did not condone the practice and do not mourn it. Every reasonable man must be concerned, however, with the legal void created when the suspension of investigative arrest was not coordinated with the substitution of some constitutional alternative.

In fairness to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, it is generally known that they did seasonably prepare a recommendation for authorizing judicial officers to require the giving of evidence relating to crimes. The Commissioners draft has not been offered as a bill, allegedly because it is the subject of an extended constitutional debate in some pigeonhole in the Justice Department.

With all deference to the able lawyers in the Justice Department, I would submit to the House that there are some Members here who are capable of considering constitutional issues. If there is to be a debate on this subject, let it be open, let it be free, and above all, let it begin.

I have, therefore, today introduced the draft legislation on this subject. It has been neither ratified by the Bureau of the Budget nor confirmed by the Justice

Department. To be candid, I have not had an opportunity to research the constitutional history of this procedure and I cannot personally vouch for every word in this bill. I am offering it as a basis of discussion to encourage prompt action. The people of the Nation's Capital look to us for protection. We must act now to provide it.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have as of this date sent the following letter to the Secretary of State:

March 21, 1963.

Hon. Dean Rusk,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: I have called to the attention of the Congress, and to your agency, previously, my remarks in the Congressional Record of Thursday, March 14, and Monday, March 18, evidencing my concern over the existing open door of subversion through the Cuban Embassy and Cubana Airlines in Mexico City, which facilitates the visitation of not only Latin American but U.S. citizens as well to Cuba.

By the State Department's own announcement of January 16, 1961, such travel by U.S. citizens is in violation of the U.S. law, punishable by penalty of $5,000 or 5 years in jail, or both.

It is quite obvious that a number of persons visiting Cuba by this route are engaging in subversive activities and rendering services to the Castro Communist government, which appears obvious for two reasons, the first being that Cuban Embassy approval, thus Castro government approval, is necessary and, secondly, some of those known to have visited Cuba since the State Department announcement have known Communist backgrounds.

This open door to subversion in this hemisphere obviously must be closed and I am therefore asking that a strong protest be made to the Mexican Government, urging that government to withhold flight permission from any and all U.S. citizens who attempt, contrary to U.S. laws, to secure passage to Cuba and to demand that the Cuban Government stop issuing visas to those citizens and that all other Latin American governments be encouraged to make a similar demand of Mexico.

I am requesting that unified action by all the Latin American countries in this respect be taken up by the State Department through the Organization of American States, believing that a strongly worded protest from that Organization and from a number of Latin American nations and the United States could result in closing this open door to subversion.

I am further recommending that the State Department consider, in the event the Mexican Government does not heed this protest, that Alliance for Progress funds be withheld from Mexico until this necessary action is taken.

I am further requesting that the State Department, in cooperation with the Department of Justice, seek immediate prosecution of persons known to have violated the law, title 8, United States Code, section 1185, particularly in view of the fact that some of these persons who have visited Cuba since January 16, 1961, are known to have Communist backgrounds and others have openly and notoriously evidenced their recent visitations to Cuba in the Worker and the Peoples World, Communist front newspapers. Public statements emanating from the State Department to the effect that prosecution is difficult would seem to be without substance in view of the notoriety some of these Cuban travelers are providing themselves.

I would be delighted to discuss this matter with you or your representative at your convenience and to make available to you such information as I have. I also suggest that the House Un-American Activities Committee has a copy of the list of some 73 U.S. citizens who, in the short period of 4 months, illegally visited Cuba through this open door of subversion through Mexico, the list of which I turned over to the committee and I am sure the committee would make it available to your Department. I have already asked that this list be made available to the Justice Department.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

William C. Cramer,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have previously set forth in the Record some 73 U.S. citizens who have gone to Cuba despite the fact it is illegal.

BIPARTISAN OPPOSITION

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat has a well-deserved reputation as one of the fairest, most forthright newspapers in the country. In its lead editorial of March 6, the Globe focuses a clear and timely light on the subject of "Bipartisan Opposition," noting that:

> The fact is, antagonism for the sterile policy Mr. Kennedy improvises at Cuba is itself bipartisan. Responsible Members of Congress are Americans first, party members second. If they fear an administration shuffling into critical national hazard, they have an obligation to oppose policy.

Bipartisan Opposition

Administration spokesmen, even the President by his attitude, are blaming Republican politics for the bristling worry in Congress and the wide public disenchantment over Kennedy policy in Cuba.

But far more than that is at the root of national anxiety about our acute fumbling at Cuba.

Many Democrats have joined GOP Members of Congress in opposition, at least in open criticism, of New Frontier ploys in the Castro-Soviet issue.

The deep concern transcends politics. It is a rising fear that the country, under Mr. Kennedy's vacillating tactics and endless temporizing, nurtures in Cuba the military and subversive seeds of Communist takeover throughout Latin America—eventually a bloodless Moscow triumph in the Western Hemisphere.

The lament is heard in Washington that politics should end at the water's edge; bipartisan backing ought to rally behind the President's Cuba policy—no matter apparently what it is. Closed ranks will always be true in time of war. It is neither wise nor realistic under present conditions.

The fact is antagonism for the sterile policy Mr. Kennedy improvises at Cuba is itself bipartisan. Responsible Members of Congress are Americans first, party members, second. If they fear an administration shuffling into critical national hazard, they have an obligation to oppose policy.

This is precisely what has been happening on Capitol Hill. The back-and-fill conduct of the New Frontier at the time of the abortive Cuban blockade—and subsequent hand-sitting as Russia builds its Castro redoubt for a spread of subversion, sabotage and Red revolution through Central and South America—have evoked sincere and urgent warnings from both sides of the aisle in Congress.

Naturally, Republican leaders have led one contingent of opposition to the Cuba involvement. Senator Keating of New York has been the chief Jeremiah over the Red Cuban buildup. So right and so ahead of administration information has he proved he has seemed Delphic. Senator Dirksen, of Illinois, has been articulate over failure to come to grips with the Cuba problem. Senator Hickenlooper, of Iowa, wants a full-dress review.

Senator Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania, pertinently demands baring of secret communications between the White House and Khrushchev, to see if a deal was made to vacate European bases in return for removal of Moscow big missiles from Cuba.

But many Democrats have shown frank criticism and dismay over administration helplessness or accommodation at Cuba. Such comment has been voiced by Senators Stennis, Lausche, Thurmond, and Holland. House Speaker McCormack tersely called the attack on an American shrimp boat an act of aggression. Senator Russell, of Georgia, urged a policy of hot pursuit, in which he was joined by ultraliberal Congressman Claude Pepper, of Florida.

Four investigations of the Cuba policy are underway in Congress. A probe of the Soviet buildup has been undertaken by Senator Stennis. Senator Dodd, of Connecticut, is launching a probe into pro-Castro activities in the United States. Representative Selden, of Alabama, has his Foreign Affairs Subcommittee looking into Cuba subversion in Latin America. Liberal Senator Frank Church, of Idaho, is inquiring into the administration's failure to halt U.N. aid to Castro.

All these committee heads, of course, are Democrats.

There is bipartisan opposition to Kennedy Cuban policies, which have so far been largely impotent and promise no improvement.

It is overt misrepresentation to impute the Cuba policy critiques to partisan politics.

When the President stiffens his policy, more accurately develops an intelligent policy for the Cuban issue, he will get all the bipartisan support he wants. Unless he starts to do something about Cuba, bipartisan opposition will continue—and mount.

OLD FRIENDS IN COSTA RICA

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House an editorial from the Richmond News Leader dated Tuesday, March 19, 1963, entitled "Old Friends in Costa Rica," which contains some rather revealing information concerning leftwing and Communist activities in Central and South America.

As the record shows, I have on a number of occasions, based upon established facts, asked that a careful evaluation of President Romulo Betancourt's previous affiliations be made by the United States, as well as, in light of those past facts, that careful consideration be given to all present evidences that perhaps all is not as well in Venezuela under the Betancourt regime as appears on the surface.

This editorial also brings into interesting focus the activities of a number of the radical left leaders in Central and South America for closer examination.

I also include an editorial by Constantine Brown which appeared in the Washington Star on March 16, 1963, entitled "Our Image Is Anti-Communist, But Washington Buffets Conservatives Around the World, Observer Says." This editorial of coincidental actions which have had the effect of toppling or making less stable the governments of conservatives throughout the rest of the world, is an interesting corollary to the Richmond News Leader editorial which indicates the New Frontier's results are similar in Latin America, whether intentional or otherwise.

The editorial points out that President Betancourt, of Venezuela, formed, and was honorary president of, the IADF, the Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom, in 1950 and that the first conference of this ultra leftwing organization was attended by Jose Figureres, Haya de la Torre, Muñoz-Marin, Victor Andrade, and others, and in the late 1950's Betancourt and Figueres were joined by Fidel Castro. The three of them formed the "Pact of Caracas" and by 1958 the Betancourt junta had toppled the Government of Venezuela. "Less than a month after Betancourt's election in December of 1958, Castro was in power in Cuba."

A second conference of the IADF was held in 1960 in Caracas and was attended by a delegation of eight from Cuba, together with other leftist leaders, including Cheddi Jagan.

Further consideration should be given to the ultraliberals who have taken over in other countries, including the Presidents of Mexico, the Dominican Republic, British Guinea, and Brazil, and the efforts of Betancourt to assist in the election of his good friend and ultraliberal who opposed the present President of Chile. The pattern is becoming rather obvious and I think it is time for the people of the United States to realize what is happening throughout the world, the result of the new pattern being that the conservatives in governments throughout the world are having a difficult time and are being replaced in many instances.

I submit the following two editorials for the attention of the House:

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Mar. 19, 1963]

Old Friends in Costa Rica

As President Kennedy begins talks in Costa Rica today, American warships ride uneasily off the coast and security arrangements on land are as tight as those in Caracas when the President made his Venezuelan tour in 1961. The reason is that Manuel Mora Valverde, head of the Costa Rican Communist Party and brother-in-law to Romulo Betancourt, has announced in advance that the Communists will not take the responsibility for any disaster. The six Central American countries at the San Jose Conference are scared of Castro; and those who are crying the loudest for action are those who brought Castro to power and were still praising him in 1961.

Mr. Kennedy is at San Jose to boost the prestige of the year-old Socialist regime of Francisco Orlich, figurehead for the party of Jose Figueres. The relative stability of Costa Rica is due to the sound economic development attracted by the previous conservative regime of Mario Echandi. Echandi was the first Latin American to be elected in U.N.-supervised elections; a real anti-Communist, he tolerated training camps in Costa Rica for the 1961 Cuban invasion at a time when Figueres and his friends were still praising Castro.

Venezuela's Betancourt is of course not at the conference, although his exposed position on the Caribbean makes him vulnerable. But Betancourt has always worked closely with his fellow-revolutionary Figueres. In the late fifties, the two of them found a third friend whose views seemed identical to theirs. This congenial man was Fidel Castro. The three of them formed the ironically named "Pact of Caracas" (where the hated Jiminez held sway); and by 1958 the Betancourt junta had toppled the government of Venezuela. Less than a month after Betancourt's election in December of 1958, Castro was in power in Cuba.

By January 1959, Figueres began to doubt Castro's reliability. The former U.S. Ambassador to Costa Rica, Whiting Willauer, has testified that Figueres had helped Castro with arms and ammunition. "You and your liberal group of Betancourt, Muñoz Marin, and others, of course, put this man into power, or at least supported him very strongly," Willauer told Figueres one day over lunch; "I feel that the chances are very strong that he will be dominated by communism, if he is not already a Communist." Figueres said he was "worried," and would consult with his friends at Betancourt's inauguration in February. But still Figueres went to Havana in March at Castro's invitation; he was insulted, ignored, and had the microphone ripped away from him in the middle of his congratulatory speech.

Yet, as late as 1961, members of the Figueres-Betancourt group were still praising the Cuban revolution and boasting of the support they had given. An interesting publication of the Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom gives the whole story. The founder and honorary president of the IADF is Betancourt himself, who organized the group in 1950 while he was an exile in Havana. The first conference was a rollcall of the leading revolutionaries of South America: Figueres, Haya de la Torre, Muñoz Marin, Victor Andrade, and other names better known to Latins.

The first purpose of the IADF was to return Betancourt to power; and when that was accomplished in 1958, the occasion was celebrated, according to the official account, with "a dinner which proved one of the most dramatic and symbolic moments of IADF history."

Thus by 1960 the IADF was able to hold its second conference in Caracas, with Betancourt as host. There were no qualms about admitting a delegation of eight from the worker's Cuba or British Guiana's Cheddi Jagan. The Secretary General presented a report on the IADF's interventions in the Western Hemisphere, a report climaxed by a proud account of support for the Cuban revolution (see below).

Special awards were announced for Figueres, Muñoz Marin, Adolf Berle, and Herbert L. Matthews, of the New York Times (the last-named for "consistent articles clarifying the democratic struggle"). The report concluded by admitting that "the IADF organized literally hundreds of meetings, seminars, roundtable discussions, mass public meetings, luncheons, and dinners. We held numerous significant off-the-record meetings which had deep influence in many cases, in changing the attitudes of key personalities, and creating a climate of understanding, through private discussions of hemisphere problems."

All of this was published a year later, in 1961, when Castro's course had been unmistakably confirmed. Early in November 1961 Venezuela severed relations with Cuba in preparation for Mr. Kennedy's visit a few days later. An ill wind from Cuba began to fan the Marxist flames Betancourt and Figueres themselves had set. "I am a Marxist-Leninist and will be one until the day I die," said Castro on December 2. Castro is not dead, and his old friends in Costa Rica are very much alive. We hope they will examine their failure to detect that Marxist-Leninism before the shooting started.

[From the Richmond (Va.) News Leader, Mar. 19, 1963]

Betancourt Praises Cuban Revolution

(In 1961, just a few months before Venezuela severed relations with Cuba, Romulo Betancourt's Inter-American Association for Democracy and Freedom published the following account of its considerable support for the Cuban revolution. At the time of publication, the names listed in the last paragraph were still part of the Cuban regime. Editorial comment above.—Editor.)

Cuba's liberation from the dictatorship of Batista concerned us since the coup d'etat in 1952 when we began collecting materials; we made the first protest against Batista's betrayal of the scheduled elections.

From that date throughout the 5 years of the anti-Batista struggle, we constantly made public protests, arranged interviews for the leaders in exile with the press, facilitated the possibilities of journalists in reaching and seeing the revolutionary forces in Cuba; protesting in the United States the shipment of arms to Batista.

In the United States, IADE, for the 5 years of the anti-Batista struggle, continuously identified itself with the fighters for liberation; the secretary-general, as well as other members of our U.S. committee, talked before literally hundreds of meetings, explaining the aims of the struggle, and the brutalities against which they were fighting.

We assisted the spokesman for the revolutionary forces in the United States as elsewhere; we arranged press conferences for Dr. Urrutia, Dr. Llerena, Dr. Agramonte, and Dr. Chibas. We met in Mexico and elsewhere with Dr. Aureliano Sanchez Arango and others. We gave our constant encouragement and help to the hosts of Cuban patriots in New York, who gave so generously of their limited substance toward the liberation fight.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 16, 1963]

Our Image Is Anti-Communist—But Washington Buffets Conservatives Around the World, Observer Says

(By Constantine Brown)

Shortly before this reporer left Rome for a brief visit to Washington, he asked a Roman newspaperman what he believed was President Kennedy's image in Italy.

The reply was, "The Communists and leftists will always hate President Kennedy. But in the last year or so he has disappointed the right-of-center people. However, there are still those who look upon him as the man who will save the world—and naturally Italy—from communism."

This recalled a recent dinner conversation in Rome. The signora on my right asked, "Why does President Kennedy give such warm support to Premier Fanfani? Fanfani has brought a left government to Italy."

I replied that the Kennedy New Frontier was itself a "progressive" Government in the belief that this policy would further its goal for coexistence and world peace, and naturally it tends to support leftist governments. The signora's surprise on learning this caused her to say, "But then we are lost. Italy—the whole world is—if America is not determined to destroy communism."

The above conversations came to mind when recently Senator Humphrey delayed the approval of the Foreign Relations Committee of Outerbridge Horsey as Ambassador to Czechoslovakia.

The reason, he said, was that Mr. Horsey had offended "some of the more liberal element" of the State Department when he was minister counselor in Rome and paid little special attention to the "leftist elements" in Italian politics.

It has been known for some time that members of our foreign service as well as those serving in the State Department in Washington must be exceptionally careful with whom they associate if they expect promotions. This has been so for the last 5 or 6 years and has been accentuated in the last 2 years.

In Rome Mr. Horsey was known for his independence in associating with those on both sides of the fence in the belief that this was the best way of obtaining a complete picture of Italian politics. But Senator Humphrey's questioning of this sort of independence is serving as a warning to every member of the State Department at home and abroad.

The questioning of the Horsey appointment also brings clearly into view the basic foreign policy of the administration: that is, warm approval for leftist governments and frowns and sometimes hostility for those right of center. If one reviews the policies of the New Frontier over the last 2 years it becomes obvious that this was its intention from the beginning. To name a few instances in Laos we did not support the conservative element, but rather encouraged forcefully a neutral government with a "broad base." That is a government composed of conservative center and Communist elements.

We actually used a blackjack against the conservative Katangan leader Tshombe, preventing Katanga by force from being autonomous. Only recently we offended the Portuguese Salazar government when Assistant Secretary of State Mennen Williams stated that the United States favored self-determination of the Portuguese territory of Angola.

In Europe, Washington has frequently needled the conservative German Government. We scolded Ambassador Grewe and caused his recall. President Kennedy gave a dressing down to Ambassador Grewe's successor and we have established a lobby in Bonn against the Paris-Bonn treaty. The dislike for President de Gaulle in Washington is well known because of his policy of a Europe of the Fatherlands.

We have offended Canada's conservative Diefenbaker government, causing its overthrow. And although our relations with Britain are still cordial, President Kennedy greatly weakened the Macmillan Conservative government when he pulled the Skybolt rug from under it at Nassau.

All this, of course, is well known among political observers, but the rank and file of citizens around the world still look upon the U.S. Government as determinedly anti-Communist. Perhaps this is so because of the vast sums we spend on economic and military aid, and the great publicity given to our plans to strengthen the NATO. Abroad, our goal for peaceful coexistence seems to get lost in the shuffle.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the special order I have for today be vacated, and that it be moved to Thursday next, March 28.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE CRIME SITUATION IN WASHINGTON

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mathias] has just stated he has introduced or is going to introduce a bill dealing with the crime situation in the District of Columbia. I do not know what his bill provides, but if it strikes at this problem of increased crime in Washington, even if it does so only a little bit, I want to commend him for it.

The crime situation in Washington has not only become deplorable and disgusting, but it is absolutely frightening. Almost every morning when I pick up my paper I read about a horrifying crime committed on the streets or in someone's home in Washington.

Just recently I saw where an 11-time loser, a man who had been convicted of a felony 11 times in his life, was again arrested for armed robbery. The leniency with which the criminals are treated in the District of Columbia has become an open invitation for every ex-convict in the United States to converge on the Capital of this Nation. The District of Columbia has become a teeming anthill of ex-cons and hoodlums, and I certainly hope that something can be done for stricter law enforcement, more rigid prosecution, longer, sterner sentences by our judiciary; and, if necessary, I would like to see a real habitual criminal act in the District of Columbia to stop this sort of crime wave.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to hear what the legislative program is for the rest of the week and next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we have no further legislative business for this week except one resolution which will be called up. We are not ready yet to announce the legislative program for next week.

Mr. GROSS. Will there be any legislation next week?

Mr. ALBERT. We are hoping that there will be some legislation next week. If the gentleman will assist us in getting the members of the Committee on Rules on his side to report rules, there will be legislation next week.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I will say to the gentleman that the gentleman's party has a 2-to-1 majority on the Committee on Rules, and I doubt that he needs my help under those circumstances.

Mr. ALBERT. May I advise the gentleman that one of the members on the Committee on Rules on this side of the House is in the hospital.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the gentleman from Iowa cannot do very much about that.

Mr. ALBERT. Neither can the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. At long last it has come to pass. Again we see the poor old Committee on Rules being blamed for the alleged failure to do their work as they should. Now, if I recall correctly, along about the 9th of January this year some of our more brilliant leaders packed the Committee on Rules so that the leadership and the administration could do just as they pleased in connection with all activities in this august body. Now we come to the floor here today without a legislative program, and the poor old Committee on Rules is responsible for the fact that we do not have any legislation. Really, I feel that somebody ought to be just a bit sorry for the Committee on Rules and have a little sympathy in their hearts for the members of the committee who are serving time without assistance from either the administration or the leadership.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Of course I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, no one is blaming the Committee on Rules. I was merely asking what the gentleman from Iowa might do with some of the gentleman's friends who serve on that committee, because we had hoped that we would get a rule on a certain bill. However, I would like further to state to the gentleman from Iowa that I appreciate the gentleman's concern. The gentleman is always a very, very conscientious Member of the House and he continually makes sure that the proprieties of the House are observed. The gentleman is quick to make sure that

every member conscientiously pursues his duties. But does not the gentleman from Iowa realize also that during the first session of every Congress the matter of organizing and considering legislation by committees is one that takes considerable time? The gentleman would not be one who would want the committees of the House hastily to consider legislation before it was reported to the floor. The gentleman would not want that, because the gentleman is very conscientious in the attention that he gives to the details of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will check the Congressional Record he will find, as I know he has already done, that all of the committees in the House are busy considering important legislation at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the gentleman that we will program legislation just as fast as it can be expeditiously reported and ready for action on the floor of the House.

Mr. GROSS. I want to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I cannot recall in my years around here—some 14 years—a session getting the late start of this one. Spring has already arrived. This is almost the last of March and still the dawdling goes on.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield further, I think if the gentleman will check back to the 83d Congress the gentleman will find that there was not very much legislation before Easter.

Mr. GROSS. I am going to have to do a little specific research with respect to past sessions.

Mr. ALBERT. I recommend that to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wonder what makes the gentleman from Iowa, or the gentleman from Oklahoma, for that matter, feel that the gentleman from Iowa would have any more influence with the Committee on Rules which is controlled not by the minority party, but by the majority party by a 2 to 1 voting margin, than you would have with the full membership of the House which is also controlled by the majority party.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I always yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] obviously does not have as much confidence in the gentleman from Iowa as the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am just inquiring what influence you might have. I am sure the gentleman from Iowa has not had too much influence this morning thus far in this matter.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I might supplement what the distinguished gentleman from Ohio has said. The Committee on Rules, in its wisdom, did reserve judgment on a certain bill by a 7-to-7 vote, but I might also say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that there was a proposal pending before the Committee on Rules having to do with backdoor spending. If the gentleman could get us one more vote, we could have had that scheduled for next week and I think it would have made a very comfortable legislative program for at least 1 day.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman from Iowa will yield further, I thank the gentleman from Kansas for his suggestion.

I would like to state further—I have made one request and I am about to make another—that committees be permitted to sit this afternoon. I have been making those requests for the committees day in and day out. I would advise the gentleman that the committees have been busy. They have been sitting morning and afternoon, and I am sure that when the fruits of their efforts are forthcoming, we will have the cooperation of the gentleman from Iowa in putting these bills through the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I only hope that we can arrive at some week soon when the House can do some business.

Mr. Speaker, with that I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Calendar Wednesday rule program may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

RECENT SURVEY OF WESTERN EUROPEAN PUBLIC OPINION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the press reported last week an alleged leak of a recent survey of Western European public opinion. Because the results of this survey have produced considerable comment, I have made an investigation into the circumstances. I am satisfied that there was no intentional leak of this confidential document which was supposed to have remained classified for 2 years; and I am also satisfied that the public release and discussion of the survey at this time would be useful because the results have great significance for our foreign policy.

There has been considerable concern, not only among Members of Congress but also in the press that the prestige of the United States may have been adversely affected by recent events in Western Europe.

In France, for example, General de Gaulle's attitude toward the Nassau pact, his policies which suggest some degree of political and economic isolation for Europe, and his insistence upon an independent nuclear force, all have made it appear that the people of France may have suddenly become disenchanted with their close association with the United States and U.S. policy.

One might conclude that President Kennedy's unwavering support of those great principles which have been the foundation of our relations with Europe for many years may have set back the United States in the eyes of French opinion. The survey indicates that this is by no means the case.

In February 1960 only 28 percent of Frenchmen interviewed approved of our foreign policy and 23 percent disapproved. In February of this year the percentage of Frenchmen approving had increased to 46 percent against 24 percent who continued to disapprove.

It is also important to note that 2 years ago most Frenchmen believed that we were not doing all we should to prevent World War III and that our actions did not match our words. Today the majority of Frenchmen believe that the reverse is true.

The survey results in Great Britain are just as startling. Contrary to what some have been saying and thinking, the recent Skybolt controversy has not caused a wave of anti-American feeling. In the past 2 years the confidence of the British people in our ability to lead the free world has risen from 35 to 54 percent; and today 59 percent of them regard our recent actions in international affairs favorably, as against only 48 percent 2 years ago.

The attitude of the British people toward neutralism has also shifted significantly in the 2-year period. In May of 1960, 46 percent of the people interviewed in Great Britain believed that their Government should not take sides in the cold war, while 42 percent believed that Great Britain should side with the United States. Today 52 percent want to align themselves with us, and only 38 percent prefer the neutral role.

And finally, nearly two Britons out of three now believe that our country is doing what it should do to prevent a third world war. In 1960 the majority interviewed felt we were not.

In West Germany public opinion has reached a new high in favor of the

United States and its foreign policy objectives. Seventy-seven percent of Germans have confidence in our leadership as against 57 percent in 1960. Seventy percent believe that we have the will to translate our words into deeds, as compared to 45 percent in 1960. More than two-thirds of the Germans interviewed approve of our foreign policy and peacemaking efforts today, while less than half approved them in 1960.

I think we can draw a lesson from the reports of opinion in these three Western European countries. The prestige of the United States, it seems to me, does not vary with the daily ups and downs of diplomatic exchanges. Rather it depends on the qualities of firmness and consistency in our leadership of the free world toward goals which are universally approved and which are responsive to the desires of freemen.

I think the President can take considerable pride in the results of this survey, for they demonstrate clearly that if the major lines of our foreign policy are forcefully and constantly expressed, and if we follow up with consistent actions taken with calmness and without hysteria, the message of the United States will be understood and approved in the free world.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I am not clear as to the source of this survey. Can the gentleman tell me the source of this survey? Who made the survey?

Mr. ALBERT. It is the survey with respect to which there was an alleged leak of confidential information.

Mr. GROSS. Who conducted the survey?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman knows as much as I about who conducted it.

Mr. GROSS. No, I do not know; I will tell the gentleman honestly I do not know.

Mr. ALBERT. I do not know any more about the names of the individuals who conducted it than does the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Well, what agency or department of Government conducted it? Was it the USIA?

Mr. ALBERT. I assume that it was conducted under the direction of the USIA but I have not discussed this matter with the USIA and I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if this is the same survey which the USIA refused to give a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs only a couple of weeks ago?

Mr. ALBERT. I am unable to advise the gentleman as to that. The information to which I have referred, having been compromised by having been published in the press in part at least, could not now be considered confidential in my opinion.

A TWO-WAY SAVINGS PLAN FOR THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, an article in this morning's Washington Post discloses very concisely how this Congress can effect a multimillion dollar saving in the Federal budget and at the same time inject a note of equitable treatment for the Nation's coal industry. I am going to ask that the item, "Lilienthal Asks Halt in Atomic Power Plans," be inserted in the Congressional Record this very day, and I hope that a copy of the complete speech referred to will soon be available for this purpose.

David Lilienthal, the first chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, once believed that, through a reasonable amount of research, electric power could be generated by the atom at great savings over conventional fuels. He now feels that enough Federal funds have been fed into the research program, energy from the atom is not needed at this time, and that industry can and will put fissionable materials to use in electric power generation when and if needed.

Mr. Lilienthal is to be congratulated for this forthright stand. We, who represent coal areas are especially grateful, inasmuch as the Atomic Energy Commission has been planning to dole out millions of dollars to private utilities to stimulate the civilian atomic power program and thus deprive coal from getting a fair share of the increasing business of its best customer.

Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 1956, the Honorable Cleveland M. Bailey of West Virginia inserted in the Record an article which I had prepared for Public Utilities Fortnightly in regard to the subsidization of atomic generating stations. To give emphasis to Mr. Lilienthal's current appraisal and to demonstrate what few changes have taken place in this field over the past 7 years, I ask at this time for unanimous consent to reprint in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks the full magazine article, with the introductory remarks by Mr. Bailey. The Washington Post article will then follow, and I urge my colleagues to note all of this material carefully.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not ask for further space at this time, but I should like to refer to other newspaper articles that have appeared in Washington newspapers during the past week with respect to the search for a building site for the U.S. Patent Office. There has been talk of its locating in areas removed from downtown Washington, including the Annapolis-Baltimore area. In view of the grave need for reducing Government spending, the executive department can quickly solve the Patent Office space problem by making room for it at the Atomic Energy Commission headquarters in Germantown, Md.

I propose, Mr. Speaker, that the AEC be put on notice that this Congress is going to slash its appropriations to the extent that personnel engaged in the civilian atomic power program will be relieved of their duties immediately. Once this order is complied with, there will be more than enough space for the Patent Office at Germantown. In effect, Congress will be bringing about a dual savings: by reducing AEC expenditures and making a new Government building unnecessary.

Lest this premise sound harsh, Mr. Speaker, be assured that the cutback in personnel at the AEC can be accomplished without undue hardship to anyone. In an organization the size of this Government, there are jobs opening every day in other departments. Many of them should never be filled because they are unnecessary; still there will be hiring, and the other departments of the bureaucracy will be able to absorb some of the AEC people. Private industry will want some of the scientists and engineers. In any event, it is the business of Congress to force the executive department to operate as efficiently as possible, and here is the place where we definitely must begin to tighten the purse strings.

Perhaps the job of clearing out unnecessary personnel at AEC could be superintended by Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, Director of the Office of Science and Technology, who also questions the advisability of going forward with the AEC's civilian research program.

The articles follow:

Atomic Waste: Financial and Otherwise—Speech of Hon. Cleveland M. Bailey, of West Virginia, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. Bailey. Mr. Speaker, under special permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Record an article entitled "The Basic Danger in the A-Power Program," which was written for Public Utilities Fortnightly magazine by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor]. In that it points up some questionable spending of the taxpayers' money by a Government agency, I feel that the article merits the attention of every Member of the House and Senate.

Congressman Saylor has stated, in effect, that the Atomic Energy Commission's rapacious penchant for developing atom-powered electric plants has led to extravagant expenditures for which justification is sought through the use of distorted figures on coal reserves.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset of these remarks let me make it clear that the prospects of using the atom to make electricity and for other peacetime chores is a welcome thought. We are cheered at the U.S. Navy's success in using the atom as a fuel for powering submarines. We look with relish to the improvement of agricultural crop yields through the application of radiation from radioisotopes. We hope that someday a jigger of uranium will be all that is needed to move our automobiles for hundreds of thousands of miles. And we will be grateful if research and science ultimately enable us to light and heat our homes through fissionable materials at as small a cost as we have been led to believe will be possible. But I protest the idea that an endless stream of funds from the Federal Treasury should be channeled through the Atomic Energy Commission to conduct a myriad of experiments in an effort to make these dreams come true.

As representative of the Nation's largest coal-producing State, I particularly resent the AEC's implication that atomic powerplants must be constructed at all costs because there will not be an adequate supply of conventional fuels to meet demand. We recognize that electric-generating capacity is steadily being increased; it is estimated that in another 20 years 350 million tons of coal

per year will be required by the electric utilities alone. A current advertisement published by the First National City Bank of New York predicts that the figure may reach 500 million tons by 1975. Well, West Virginia can guarantee to provide its share of that load, plus its other commitments for both industrial and domestic use, for at least another two centuries.

Yes, annual coal production can be doubled over present output and there will still be enough mineable reserves to last for at least 200 years. If that sounds like such a short time as to be cause for alarm, let me remind you that two centuries would take you back 20 years before this great Republic was born. In 1756 Benjamin Franklin, whose memory we honor this week, still had more than three decades of his life to go. Young Charles Cornwallis, who later surrendered at Yorktown to end the fighting in the Revolutionary War, was commissioned an ensign in the British Army. Maria Antoinette and Louis XVI were still babes-in-arms and Napoleon Boneparte was not yet born. There was no talk of atomic piles at that time; in fact Alessandro Volta was still too young to have developed Volta's pile, which was to become the first real battery capable of delivering a steady current of electricity.

So you see a lot can happen in 200 years; in fact, there is a good chance that the atom as a source of power for electric power will become obsolete even before those supplies of coal in West Virginia are exhausted. For the record, let me also point out that there will be a lot more coal in America's reserve stockpile even after West Virginia's share is gone. In addition to the 50 billion tons in my home State, there are at least 1,162 billion tons of coal elsewhere in the United States. Members of Congress should keep these figures in mind when they are told that the Atomic Energy Commission must be given more millions of dollars to hurry up the job of developing reactors that will compete with coal and other conventional fuels.

Another factor which cannot be overlooked in the program for peacetime application of nuclear power is the risk element. Thus far the insurance companies have found it impractical to underwrite the hazards, and the Federal Government apparently will soon be asked to accept this responsibility as a necessary expense.

I contend that if the operation of a nuclear powerplant, as well as the disposal of radioactive wastes resulting therefrom, constitutes such a tremendous hazard to the welfare of the people, then Members of Congress had better stop and decide whether the Government should be willing to stimulate the growth of the hazard by accepting such a responsibility. Congress is first obliged to demand concrete information that will enable us to determine whether the need for setting up atomic powerplants at this time is worth taking such chances, and whether the tremendous outlays for nuclear power and the perils to which our people may be exposed will be compensated for by savings in the cost of power.

Before such questions can be answered, we need additional information which has not yet been made public. The dangers that would come with the disposition of radioactive wastes, and attendant hazards that go with the operation of a nuclear powerplant, appear to be of such tremendous magnitude that the Members of Congress cannot blindly stimulate further the creation of such jeopardy without breaching the trust imposed by the American people.

Not long ago a scientist warned that the disposal of atomic waste might inflict serious damage on the minds and the bodies of future generations. Another scientist, a sanitary engineer for the Atomic Energy Commission, recently made a speech in which he admitted that, as the atomic power industry grows, the problems of sufficiently diluting atomic wastes to make the air and water safe for human beings could be fabulous. He said that if one-third of the electric power which this country expects to produce in 1980 were to be supplied through atomic energy, the amount of water required to dilute the poisonous byproducts to safe levels would be equivalent to the flow of 12,600 Mississippi Rivers.

I cannot vouch for the authenticity of these statements, but I do know that the man who tried to tell the world about the serious effects of atomic radiation was quickly hushed up by the people who want to rush the reactor program through without first taking heed of the consequences.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the conditions which must be studied carefully when the request for the Atomic Energy Commission budget is taken into consideration. In view of the fact that U.S. coal reserves will last us hundreds of years longer than AEC spokesmen have been saying, I question the soundness of placing almost $2 billion at the disposal of the crowd which is so quick to dispose of coal's potentialities. For the further elucidation of Congress, I believe that the AEC could be most helpful if it would make available complete data on how much of its total expenditures are actually being spent on the electric power phase of the program. These statistics would include information on how many persons were sent to the atoms-for-peace session at Geneva at taxpayers' expense and how many others are traveling all over this country and the rest of the globe working on a project that no one is sure will be practical.

You can be sure, Mr. Speaker, that I do not for one minute object to the appropriation of funds for the continuance of the defense aspects of the nuclear program. We will give our scientists and engineers what they need to develop the necessary weapons to protect our shores and our homes, but I think that the time has arrived when we should check closely to find out just how much of the rest of the work is necessary and feasible, and how much of it is the dream of that coterie of spenders who insist upon discounting the coal industry and its potential. West Virginians who have been put out of work by maneuverings of free trade theorists and other stargazers want to know how much of the money which we pay in taxes is being used to develop another means of encroaching upon our markets.

I commend Congressman Saylor's article to your reading.

(The article referred to is as follows:)

"[From Public Utilities Fortnightly of Jan. 19, 1956]

"The Basic Danger in the 'A' Power Program

"(By the Honorable John P. Saylor, U.S. Representative from Pennsylvania)

"(This author warns against expecting too much and too soon in the way of atomic power. It could be just as disastrous as too little and too late—if the American taxpayer has to pay the bill for a pig in a poke.)

"For an industry traditionally disdainful of Government supports and subsidies, the electric utilities today appear to be treading on dangerous right of way. The perilous path originates at the disbursing office of the Atomic Energy Commission and moves along the course carefully designed by advocates of public power.

"Of a certainty, the Atomic Energy Commission—in its headlong drive to set up the atom as a producer of electricity—has made it difficult for private companies to refuse its generous subventions; perhaps, however, the time has come for beneficiaries in the utility field to make it distinctly clear that further grants—whether in the form of finished reactors, guaranties, or writeoffs—are unwanted, unwelcome, and unacceptable.

"The desirability of encouraging research and development leading to the production of electricity at reasonable costs through the medium of fissionable materials is not in question. There is definitely a place for the atom as an added fuel, particularly in areas where conventional fuels are not readily available. Development of economically feasible nuclear power is necessary to provide electrical energy for underdeveloped areas of the world, to assist nations which have power shortages, and to protect the future of the United States in the power field. The atom should be put to work in whatever peacetime roles it is capable of assuming in our competitive economy, but not at the risk of enabling the Federal Government to encroach further into the realm of private business.

"House-to-house salesmen often use gifts as a guise for getting a foot in the door. The Government also employs this technique most effectively. It entered the electric power business on a broad scale through a backdoor entrance by using agricultural development in the Tennessee Valley as a part of the opening wedge. By the same token, bureaucracy's continued investments in the power-by-atom program might give the Government a foothold on private property that would ultimately bring a demand for full title. Meanwhile the A program may be placing all supporters of the free enterprise system in an embarrassing position, for the so-called participating projects are creating a made-to-order and more-than-valid issue for public power protagonists.

"The recent history of AEC's participation in the development of atomic energy for commercial purposes would imply that (1) the Federal Treasury has such an abundance of funds as to preclude the necessity for careful and economic expenditures, and (2) the welfare of the Nation depends upon the ability of the Government and/or the utilities to generate power through the use of fissionable material.

"The fallacy of the first premise is evident to everyone save possibly those Government officials behind the go-for-broke program. Assumption No. 2 has been given such widespread publication that the principal arguments of the program's promoters need to be exposed if the AEC spending spree is to be effectively restrained.

"The obvious strategy of the program has been to attempt to convince the general public that diminishing resources of conventional fuels make it necessary for the rapid development of electric-generating plants powered by the atom. Voluminous statistical reports have been prepared in whatever way is deemed necessary to strengthen this impression. Few have any basis in fact, and all such allegations can automatically be refuted by a reference to authentic tables on coal reserves.

"Oil and natural-gas reserves, are undeniably being depleted at an increasing rate and eventually will be exhausted. Natural gas is admittedly a short-term fuel. The necessity for conserving it has prompted the Federal Power Commission, on occasion, to refuse applications for the use of natural gas under industrial boilers in areas where coal is available.

"The end of our oil reserves, on the other hand, is not in sight at the present time, although it is highly possible that the country will begin to feel a pinch before the end of the century. When this scarcity develops, America's fuel industries will be prepared for it. Atomic energy cannot replace the higher uses of petroleum, but synthetic fuel plants can provide both gas and oil when they are no longer available in Nature's storehouse. The raw material to be used in the production of synthetic fuels will be oil shale or coal—both of which occur in generous quantities within America's soil.

"All indications point to coal's carrying a progressively increasing portion of the energy load in the years ahead. The continued upturn in the use of electrical and mechanical energy will spiral demand for coal from the present 400 million to 500 million tons per annum to the billion-ton mark before the year 2000. Even at this rate of production, however, there is enough coal within the borders of the United States to last for more than a thousand years.

"Specifically, recoverable coal reserves are in excess of 1.2 trillion tons. Pennsylvania, which has produced about one-third of all the coal used in this country since 1850, still contains some 30 billion tons of mineable deposits. These estimates are based on studies of the U.S. Geological Survey, an agency which apparently has not been consulted by the AEC officials who have set out to portray coal as a short-life fuel.

"The other misconception being publicized in the all-out campaign to continue using taxpayers' money in attempts to expedite creation of an atom-powered electric utility industry is being developed around the cost factor. In the past year there have been numerous news stories based on promises by AEC spokesmen that the atom will eventually generate cheap electric power. Presumably, this objective will be reached if a kilowatt-hour of electricity can be produced in a range somewhere between 4 and 7 mills.

"To the average reader, that statement may sound most attractive. The fact is, however, that conventional fuels have long been producing electricity at a cost of less than 4 mills per kilowatt-hour. Modern steam plants within close proximity of coal mines are producing 3-mill electricity at the present time. Even in remote areas, where freight rates boost the delivered cost of coal to twice the cost at the mine, electricity is generated for less than 7 mills per kilowatt-hour.

"The Government's failure to disseminate actual cost information in regard to the peacetime nuclear program makes it almost impossible to determine how many billions of dollars will have to be turned over to the AEC before the atom will produce electric power at a reasonable cost. When construction began on the atomic powerplant at Shippingport, Pa., in September 1954, the AEC—which is building the reactor—was extremely vague about the cost factor. Finally, 15 months and a great many millions of dollars later, a Commission spokesman was cornered at a press conference and admitted that electricity from the Shippingport plant is expected to cost 52 mills per kilowatt-hour—at least 10 times the cost of electric power generated with conventional fuels.

"The AEC's propensity for keeping expenses in the darkroom while the artist's conception of nuclear powerplants is projected to the public in glowing terms could eventually strike a damaging blow at the private utility industry. Sooner or later the public power sodality will reveal figures disclosing the total amount invested by the AEC in developing atomic electricity, then ask this question:

" 'Since the Federal Government has contributed such an enormous sum toward making nuclear power stations possible, is there any reason why the taxpayer should permit public utilities to profit from this undertaking?'

"To obviate such a possibility, the general public should demand dissemination of actual cost information except where publication would be inimical to the national security.

"The assumption that nuclear power from presently contemplated reactors may eventually become competitive with electricity from conventional plants disregards the progress in coal utilization. In other words, the nuclear power planners are assuming that atomic-generated electricity will challenge coal pricewise if capital and operating costs of nuclear reactors are reduced as hoped for and—meanwhile—coal technology stands still.

"In 1920 it required an average of 3 pounds of coal to produce 1 kilowatt-hour of electricity. By 1930 the figure was down to 1.60; in 1940 it was 1.34 and in 1950 it was 1.19. Early in 1955 the average dropped below 1 pound of coal per kilowatt-hour. Some of the modern plants are far below that average. These figures, unlike those pertaining to power costs in atomic electric plants, are not hypothetical. They are based on established records and are in the files of the Federal Power Commission.

"In spite of continuing progress, the present utilization efficiency of coal in the steam plant is only about 38 percent. Obviously, there is still a great deal of room for progress. It is not inconceivable, if research underway bears fruit, that when and if nuclear power reaches the point where it can be producing 7-mill electricity, the efficiency of coal utilization will have doubled over its present rate. Philip Sporn, president of the American Gas & Electric Co., explains it this way:

" 'It needs to be kept in mind, too, in judging whether and to what extent nuclear plants will be built in the future in place of new conventional plants, that the nuclear development will always be competing with a constantly improved—that is to say, more efficient—conventional alternative.'

"Another factor which the backers of this new application of atomic power find convenient to withhold from publication is the relative cost of fuels in the overall operating budget of a public utility system. It is therefore not generally realized that only 16 percent of the total cost involved in generating power and bringing it to the consumers is chargeable to fuels. Thus, even if it were possible to find a way to generate electricity through a self-perpetuating fuel that could be obtained absolutely free, it would still be impossible to reduce a $6 electric bill by more than $1.

"Under the circumstances, it would appear that U.S. consumers are already receiving inexpensive electricity and that, since the promised cheap power from the atom is still confined to the province of theory, there is no justification for the vast expenditures being made under the auspices of the AEC research on the commercial application of nuclear materials.

"There is no denying that if the Government is going to subsidize construction of reactors and other necessary facilities; if the Government is going to undertake to insure property and personnel against damage that could be inflicted in the event of an accident in an atomic plant; if the Government is going to underwrite commercial operations against losses incurred in developmental programs; if the Government is going to supply atomic fuel at less than the full cost thereof; if the Government is going to subsidize atomic fuel processing and disposal of atomic waste—then there is a basis for the assertion that the atom may soon become a principal source of electric power. In all likelihood, electricity at TVA rates can be made available to consumers in various areas of the country if the Federal Government is willing to pour sufficient funds into the atomic energy program.

"Public power groups want to make Federal funds available to whatever extent is necessary to produce their brand of cheap electricity. They are urging more AEC help to private firms for the construction of atom power reactors. They want research and development aid on more liberal terms, and they want the AEC to bear the cost of fuel elements for small reactors. And while the Nation's private insurance industry is attempting to determine the most feasible methods of providing indemnity to cover damages that would result from an accident in an atomic electric plant, the public power enthusiasts would have the Government assume the insurance burden regardless of costs involved. What we who oppose unnecessary expansion of the public power program must realize is that each such subsidy provides bureaucratic forces with a further opportunity to claim a vested interest in the electric power industry; to believe otherwise is to underestimate the intent of public power supporters.

"Those who would socialize the whole power industry find the atom's potential in the generation of electricity a very convenient steppingstone, particularly since the Government fostered basic research and has exercised strict control over succeeding developments. The new atomic energy law, enacted in 1954, tended to lessen the Government's monopolistic grasp on the atom, but it retained Federal control over private development in the nuclear fission field. The revised law has been described thusly by Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board of Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), himself a renowned engineer:

" 'If anyone claims that the new Atomic Energy Act turns over to private industry a bonanza in the form of already solved technical and economic problems and an assured profit, either he does not know the facts or he is an arrant demagog. Any private investment in commercial atomic power generation in the near future will have to be inspired more by public service motives than by any reasonable expectation of substantial profit.'

"Atomic energy is novel, and its advertised possibilities in industrial application have wide public appeal. It arouses the curiosity, heightens the imagination. It is another source of heat with a new and special technology, yet on close examination we discover that it has no immediate advantages which should impel us to expedite its advent into the power field by investing billions of hard-to-get tax dollars.

"Practical businessmen and industrialists will welcome the opportunity to put this new source of power to work. Yet they foresee no immediate need for it. The electric-utility industry is proceeding with an unprecedented expansion program in steam-electric stations. Some of the companies, while not discounting the theory that in a decade or so hence it may be profitable to invest in full-scale atomic-energy plants in certain areas of the country, are erecting steam-generating stations in coal-producing regions at greater distances from consuming communities than has heretofore been considered economically feasible. At the present time 340,000 volts are transmitted by generating stations; utility experts believe that eventually it will be possible to operate 500,000-volt wires, thereby decreasing line losses and permitting transmission over greater distances. Under such circumstances, more and more generating stations would be located at the mine mouth, thus reducing costs and further discouraging the entry of competitive sources of power, except in remote sections of the country.

"Left to their own resources and ingenuity, the electric utilities will develop atom plants soon enough. Meanwhile the industry will supply all the power that is required without any help from the Federal Government. This point was stipulated very succinctly in one sentence of Adm. Ben Moreell's analysis of the Hoover Commission Task Force Report on Water Resources and Power: 'Technically and financially there is no present prospective need for Federal power activities.'

"Federal encroachment in the power-making business has already gone entirely too far. Neither the general public nor the electric-utility companies can afford to permit the Government to proceed with some of its elaborate plans for participation in the atomic-energy projects that belong in the private-industry classification. By allowing the Government to come into the tent so long as it has the price of admission, electric utilities might learn too late that they have made it possible for the bureaucrats to take over the center ring."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1963]

LILIENTHAL ASKS HALT IN ATOMIC POWER PLANS

(By Howard Simons)

A call by David Lilienthal for the Government to abandon its support of atomic power development and to reduce substantially its support of basic atomic research has prompted a congressional committee to ask the Atomic Energy Commission to answer its critic.

Lilienthal, the first Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, challenged the AEC last month in a series of lectures at Princeton University. The theme of his lectures was that "the facts of the world of 1963 are in conflict with the way in which we think and deal with the atom, we should jettison and junk those outmoded ideas."

Lilienthal urged the Government to put "the atom into the mainstream of men's affairs" and not keep it artificially separate and apart, as Lilienthal views the present role of the atom in U.S. activities. To do this, Lilienthal suggested that the AEC, itself, might need drastic modification.

What aroused the interest of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy even more than these comments were Lilienthal's suggestions about continued Government support for civilian nuclear power and basic science as it relates to the atom.

The Joint Committee has championed Government support of both these programs.

As regards atomic power development, Lilienthal suggested the following as premises for 1963:

Energy from the atom is not now needed for civilian purposes.

At the time and place where it is needed it will be forthcoming without governmental prodding. If there is a real need it will be met by the utility and manufacturing industries, as it has been with the automobile, the diesel engine, the telephone, and so on, in response to proved economic need.

There is now no urgent fuel or power crisis and no prospect of one in the foreseeable future; when such a shortage develops, it will be taken care of by the atom if that is then the best alternative.

Moreover, said Lilienthal, who resigned as Chairman of the AEC on February 15, 1950, the Government "should stop trying to force feed atomic energy."

Throw away the present discredited timetable. Don't abandon the hope for competitive power, he advised, but deal with it realistically.

The same approach, Lilienthal argued, should apply to the atom in basic science, in medicine and agriculture and industry. Funds and scientific manpower should be freed for other starved areas of research and development, such as biochemistry.

In effect, Lilienthal was saying just the opposite of what the AEC had reported to President Kennedy in November 1962, and what AEC officials told the Joint Committee in late February.

This was essentially that nuclear energy can and should make a vital contribution toward meeting the Nation's long-term energy requirements and that the proper role for the Government is to develop and to demonstrate the technology that will lead to a self-sustaining and growing nuclear power industry.

In short, where Lilienthal wants the AEC to get out of the nuclear power business, the AEC not only wants to remain in the atomic power business, but to increase its support of the Nation's nuclear power efforts.

Citing such variances between the AEC and Lilienthal, the Joint Committee, in an unpublished letter, has asked the AEC for its comments. The Joint Committee further asked the AEC to make its views of Lilienthal's views known before the resumption of its annual hearings on the state of the Nation's atomic energy industry.

These hearings, continuing those held in February, will begin on April 2 and will be devoted largely to non-Government witnesses.

ON COMMEMORATIONS AND SPECIAL OBSERVANCES AND ON THE ISSUANCE OF A SPECIAL COIN TO COMMEMORATE THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on a recent revelation that disturbs me greatly. I refer to Secret Service proposals for this fiscal year that would increase Vice President JOHNSON's personal protection staff to approximately 36 men, or 34 more than any other Vice President in history. Since the days of the Honorable Vice President Barkley, it has been traditional to have two agents protect the Vice President. Before making a number of specific points, and filling in my colleagues on the background, I would like to say that the proposals are both preposterous and presumptuous.

Even more alarming, Mr. Speaker, is that 19 agents would be taken directly from the field at a time when counterfeiting, for example, is at an alltime peak. Justification of this fantastic personal staff for Mr. JOHNSON is, I suggest, absolutely impossible. There is not a single individual in this House who could say to me that this is a sensible proposal. It suggests everything unwise, unreasonable, and unnatural.

And I might direct my next comment to the Vice President himself, a man in whom I have the greatest respect and one who was a great majority leader of the other body. He comes from the State, Mr. Speaker, that has its would-be tradition wrapped in praise of its tough frontier spirit—the land of the six-shooter and so many other things. This sedate House, Mr. Speaker has heard Texan after Texan extoll the great virtues of independence almost beyond the point of toleration. Yet we have listened, Mr. Speaker, and we have accepted this in the best tradition of our national life.

But now we are confronted with a very serious matter. The Chief of the Secret Service, Mr. James T. Rowley, is authorized to provide this protection of the Vice President. To go back a bit, after the Blair House shooting of 1950, the election of coverage has been up to the Vice President himself, by request.

The law, Public Law 87–829, passed on October 15, 1962, states that the Secret Service is authorized to protect the Vice President 24 hours a day for 365 days a year. This is something that we here would agree to. What I cannot understand is that previous protection by request never amounted to more than two individuals except while the Vice President was on an exceptionally important mission.

I can well understand and appreciate the dangers incumbent upon the Vice President when he goes abroad. No one would doubt this. However, I cannot quite rationalize how the Congress in its right senses could justify this tremendous expansion at a time when the lives of a number of public officials in town are in greater potential danger than is the life of the Vice President. I do not mean to play "cloak and dagger" in this situation, but certain Justices of the Supreme Court and U.S. Senators are much more controversial. I do not have to name names here. I simply do not feel the Vice President is in any great danger. I am strongly in favor of the maximum protection for the President, but some armies do not have 35 guards trained with the efficiency and expertise of the Secret Service.

Unlike the feast at Cana, where the best wine was served last, I have saved the worst news for my conclusion.

The cost for the 35 Johnson agents would amount to over $261,000 and the 1 clerk over $4,000. There would be an additional expense of over $20,000 for personal benefits and over $37,000 for overtime pay. This does not include travel expenses which total $390,000 for both the President and Vice President, an increase of $165,000. Without travel the cost to the taxpayers per year will be $322,000.

In summation, Mr. Speaker, the whole issue here is exceedingly unwise. We are being asked to take men from strategic positions within the Secret Service for protection that has never before been necessary. Is it now analogous that the Secretary of State would also demand the same amount of protection? We could be establishing a precedent here that would cost thousands of dollars. I want to reiterate my claim that I have nothing personal against the Vice President in this matter, but simply with the precedent involved. I believe firmly in the rightness of my cause and I intend to pursue it. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, do you not think we should start protecting the poor overburdened taxpayers?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman for bringing out these facts. But, I think an even more dangerous precedent was set 2 years ago, which I brought out on the floor of the House at that time, and that is the fact that about $1 million is being spent annually for a private FBI investigative force for the Attorney General to be used at his sole discretion and direction for the first time in the history of this country, outside of J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI itself. Recently there was published for the first time that I had seen it in print—in Newsweek—this fact that some 54 private investigators, under the direct supervision and control solely of the Attorney General, exist. I understand that number is closer to 100, and last year a substantial increase over the previous year was asked for and granted. And, I think that this expenditure of funds for this private, separate, exclusive investigative force, solely under the control of the Attorney General, outside of the FBI, is a matter that this Congress should give serious consideration to, in that I know of nowhere that this force and its functions are authorized or their duties prescribed by law or proper authorizing legislation. Therefore, the serious question is raised as to what authority did Congress in the first place have to appropriate funds and to establish this force without proper authorizing legislation proscribing, prescribing, and ascribing the duties of these people that should have come out of the Committee on the Judiciary on which I serve. I favor adequate personnel to investigate organized crime, but I think Congress should have authorized such a unit and set out its duties or should have added to the FBI force already authorized.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman from Florida. Of course, we will have an opportunity to vote on this particular item when the Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill comes to the floor before the Easter vacation, and I hope my colleagues will support me to strike out all of the agents except two, which is all the other Vice Presidents have had; one or two, but two was the maximum that any Vice President ever had.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts on the speech he just delivered on this important matter and endorse what he said and associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. First of all, I am interested to learn that we are going to have one appropriation bill before Easter. I was not aware that we were going to do any business at all before the Easter recess. But, let me have those figures again. My hearing is not very good this morning. Did I understand that there are going to be 37 new agents?

Mr. CONTE. Thirty-five Johnson agents and one clerk. Of course, besides those you will have supervisors and assistant supervisors on down the line.

Mr. GROSS. How many have past Vice Presidents had?

Mr. CONTE. The most any Vice President had since Barkley was two.

Mr. GROSS. Why has this sudden danger to the life of this brave Texan developed?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad you brought up that question. For, when this law went through the House, it was estimated that at best it would not cost over $100,000 for these additional agents. That law merely authorized protection for the Vice President. So, I asked the Chief of the Secret Service, a very able man, "Prior to this law it was by request of the Vice President; is that correct?" He said, "Yes." I said, "Did JOHNSON ask for protection last year?" He said, "Yes." I said, "How many men did you give him?" He said, "Two." So I said, "Why give him 35 now? Because there is a law on the books?"

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that 37 or 35, whichever it is, will be enough, or should we turn out a platoon of marines to trail him around day by day, hour by hour, and evening by evening?

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. Let me ask my friend from Massachusetts this question. Did the Vice President request these agents himself?

Mr. CONTE. He did request last year and received two.

Mr. BASS. I mean, did he request this increase?

Mr. CONTE. Now, I think I made it clear here that I am not directing my remarks to the Vice President.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, when he presented his budget to the Congress or to the President, and the administration in turn presented it to the Congress, requested 35 men on behalf of the Chief of the Secret Service.

Mr. BASS. Could it be that the Chief of the Secret Service knows much more about this situation than I and perhaps even than the gentleman from Massachusetts, and feels that in his great wisdom and experience that it would take 35 men to carry out the wishes of the Congress when we stated we would provide the Vice President protection?

Mr. CONTE. First let us get the record straight. I certainly do not want to assume here that I am an authority on this. I think Mr. Rowley is doing a fine job. He is an authority. However, it does not take much commonsense to rationalize that in the past when the Vice President requested protection, he was given two. Why, all of a sudden, has that figure jumped up to 35? I cannot understand this.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman cannot tell me that Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State, who possesses great secrets, is not in as much grave danger as the Vice President. The gentleman cannot tell me that Chief Justice Warren, who is a controversial figure in certain parts of the country, does not require the same amount of protection as does the Vice President. The gentleman cannot tell me that Senators like the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Senator GOLDWATER, and other controversial Senators in the U.S. Senate do not require the same type of protection.

I am all for protecting the Vice President. I think he is a fine man. I am willing to give him two men, but I cannot see why he needs 35. What are they going to do with these 35 men?

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I cannot yield further at this point. I yielded to the gentleman from Massachusetts for a 3-minute statement originally out of the 40 minutes of time that I had taken to talk about something a lot more important than this.

However, since so much of my time has been taken already, I will have to continue making this brilliant statement that I have prepared, which is much more pertinent and valuable to the Congress and to the world than this matter now being discussed.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I have a 15-minute special order during which I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa, if we can pursue this item a little bit further. This is a very important issue.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I only want to say this: I do not know how many agents it takes to protect the Vice President of the United States. However, I want the RECORD to show that the Vice President did not personally request this.

Mr. CONTE. As far as I know, the request came from the Secretary of the Treasury; who requested these men to him, I do not know.

Mr. BASS. He did not personally request a given number of agents to protect him. But let me say this: I refer to the statement I made just a few moments ago on the floor of the House to the effect that if something is not done to relieve the crime-wave situation in Washington, D.C., I can visualize the time when I personally would want 35 people around me to protect my life and the life of my wife, and to protect the life and the life of the wife of the gentleman from Iowa, as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman is absolutely right. I would like to take those 35 men and put them here in the District of Columbia to protect the citizens of this area. I think it would be of greater value.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from New York for 1 minute.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked the distinguished gentleman from Iowa to yield for one purpose only. I was on the floor of the House and listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] about the leak of a group of popularity polls taken abroad. I would like to suggest that one of the things which is wrong with our foreign policy at the present time is that it is foreign policy by popularity polls. If the administration would try to do more of what is right and courageous instead of worrying about what a group of pollsters say, we would be in much better shape in the world today. I think it is unfortunate that this pollster business had to be elevated to such a high level here on the floor today by a distinguished Member, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] the majority leader, who is a spokesman for the administration.

Mr. Speaker, the very fact we spent so much time on it indicates that there is too much concern about what is popular and not enough concern over what is right. If the administration would care more about substance than it does about public relations, we would have a more solid foreign policy today.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to continue this debate, but I have something very important to discuss and I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania). The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have been yielding all over the place. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan can get time as much as he wants. I think I have been very generous. I think the gentleman is unfair in suggesting with this motion and kind of inference with the point that he is making. However, I shall yield to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has made a point of order.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I simply make the observation that this is a continuation of the same blockheaded foreign policy that was displayed by previous administrations.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] made the point that foreign policy was being conducted by popularity poll. It seems to me that I recall that we have had a number of criticisms of the administration on the floor of this body and in the other body for the past 3 or 4 or 5 weeks, because it was charged that the administration proceeded with our foreign policy operations even though they did not satisfy Mr. Diefenbaker, even though they did not satisfy Mr. de Gaulle, and even though they did not satisfy Mr. Tshombe. It does seem to me that the distinguished gentleman from New York might want to consult with other members of his party and decide whether they are criticizing the administration because it is supposed to be conducting foreign policy by popularity poll or because it is supposed to be conducting foreign policy in spite of the wishes of our allies. It does seem clear that the only subject on which the Members on the other side of the aisle can agree is that no matter what the Kennedy administration does, it is wrong.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, maybe we can set this policy question to rest. I recall during the last election this was quite a subject. So we discussed the matter with the head of the USIA when he came before our subcommittee for appropriations and we tried to get him to tell us what the policy picture was going to be under this administration. At that time they decided they were not going to conduct any polls because they were not of any value anyway, because they did not really get to the depth of the question and really did not settle anything. So I think this whole policy question ought to be well buried, because I do not think it has any relevant importance. I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], on the subject.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, with regard to foreign policy and polls and the administration's foreign policy, I think it is a travesty that we dropped the ball when we had a chance to make a touchdown at the Costa Rica Conference. Most of those countries were willing and anxious to have drafted a strong, firm, long-range, planned program to get rid of Castro and communism in Cuba and the subversive results and aftereffects in this hemisphere. I think it is a shame that at the time when we had a real opportunity to work with countries, many of which have actually been invaded by Castro marauders during 1961, and with many of the Presidents of those countries asking for a firm policy, that are largely for a planned program that they could follow, that the Organization of American States could consider on the recommendation of the Central American States—I think it is a shame that we dropped the ball when we could have made a telling touchdown in Costa Rica by providing a long-range, firm program to eventually get rid of Castro and communism in Cuba and in this hemisphere.

I do not know what the polls would show in Latin America after this visit, but I would say our prestige is much lower than it would have been if the United States had provided the firm leadership that we should have at Costa Rica instead of announcing in advance our intentions not to try to carve out a stiff, meaningful program. I call attention to my remarks of Monday, March 18, pages 4425–4430 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, before I launch on my prepared remarks, I want to say in response to the observations made by the majority leader when he stated that committees were hard at work in the Congress and that soon we will get some legislation. If the committees are not any harder at work than the great committee of which I am a member, the Committee on Public Works, then we are not working very hard. There is a lot of important business before that committee. One of the subcommittees, the subcommittee on investigating the interstate highway building program, has not even called together the members of that committee. The members on the minority side do not know what the plans are, what they intend to do, what or where they are investigating, and what the problems are in many areas. We do not know much about it because we do not have an adequate staff to do anything about it.

Last year, I think it was in July, I wrote the chairman of the subcommittee a letter after I had counseled with him about an idea about stepping up the activity and the effectiveness of this committee. He said he thought it was a good one. "Write me a letter and we will take it up." I wrote him a letter and he has not even answered. So I reiterate, I believe the committees are not busy if they are not any busier than the Committee on Public Works of which I am a member.

So much for that.

Very briefly, then, on foreign policy. As the House knows, I have been one of those who believe in presenting a united front on the foreign policy question to the Congress, and that we ought to have a bipartisan foreign policy. But I have been here long enough to know that we have made a lot of mistakes with our foreign programs; in fact, I think the trouble with this whole matter in the foreign area is that we have no discernible, understandable foreign policy. It is for this reason that I have suggested from time to time to the State Department and members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs the issuing of a statement on foreign policy that reflects the true intentions of our country.

I am reminded that just as England needed a Magna Carta in her period of crisis in early history and as we needed a Declaration of Independence in 1776, so somebody needs to issue a policy statement that makes some sense on the foreign front and that will be understood both by the American people and freedom-loving people everywhere. Then we will not have to worry about prestige polls and the other things we have discussed here today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks; also, I ask that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] be allowed to revise and extend his remarks at the close of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, it is a tradition in America that we commemorate significant events, important developments and occasions that have emphasized and carried forward the great ideals authored, enacted into law, fought for, and sacrificed for in our history. It is fitting and proper that we do this. These commemorations serve to remind us of the great ideals and ideas that moved us forward in the right direction on the moving vehicle we call freedom. It has been said that in understanding the past we can open the future. With these commemorations we have strengthened our system in many ways.

Because our forebears understood this and I believe felt more keenly than we do the importance for a rich heritage they wisely formed a pattern of proper observances and built memorials to our Nation's great all over this land we call America. We have a fine collection of these here in the District of Columbia where the millions who come to visit can, while they are here, catch something of the spirit that burned in the hearts of the torchbearers of freedom.

We build libraries everywhere with the aid of foundation money and with tax money where the books that reveal our literature, our art, and our dramatic history can be stored, used, and read by the population in order to better understand our system of popular government and to help give the advantages that came from a free society.

The world's largest and most valuable of these libraries is, very logically, here in Washington.

Archives buildings are found in all of the States and principal cities to house the valuable original documents that signaled our birth such as the Declaration of Independence and the document which carried out its objective—the Constitution—both housed here in our own Archives Building at great cost to the taxpayer who willingly and gladly assumes this responsibility.

Monuments built to the memory of the great in our heritage can be found in every State of the Union. They are also built at the scene of sacrificial action for the preservation and advancement of liberty, there to be a reminder to us and to posterity of those who toiled, who fought and who sacrificed in the struggles that have brought us to this point in our history.

The Congress of the United States, I believe, has shown great wisdom in providing for programs and projects to accent our history by leaving reminders in all of our national parks where it is appropriate and convenient to do so.

There are so many, many areas one could point to where a most significant and appropriate memorial has been constructed and reconstructed. Among the most meaningful and appropriate is the Independence Hall area in Philadelphia—a project that is carried out in cooperation with the city of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania. This project reminds us of the great things that can happen through the cooperative effort of elected representatives of the people.

The National Park Service, responding to congressional action, has also featured contributions by individuals in our heritage. Most important of the people who have received this kind of attention is a man whom I have dubbed the most American American—Abraham Lincoln. In cooperation with Kentucky and the citizens around Hodgenville they have restored the Lincoln birthplace area. Everywhere where Lincoln has lived is marked and is made available for the people to see.

One of the most outstanding in his early life is the Pidgeon Creek area in Indiana where last year a Nancy Hanks Park was dedicated in tribute to the mother of this great American and in appreciation of the contribution the great State of Indiana has made toward the shaping of Lincoln's destiny.

The State of Illinois has restored New Salem so that it looks just like it did when Lincoln lived there. The Lincoln tomb where Lincoln lies buried with his wife and three children is another great tribute made possible by the Government. The city of Springfield and the State of Illinois are now planning to restore a large section of the downtown area so that it will be reminiscent of the kind of community in which Lincoln lived and served as a legislator and a lawyer.

The city of New York wisely has kept the Cooper Union Building where Lincoln made that famous speech ending, "Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it."

In the city of Washington we have built a memorial to Lincoln which is neither tomb nor temple but something of both; a most magnificent structure and appropriate tribute to Lincoln. It draws more people to it than any comparable memorial anywhere else in the world.

Volumes could be written about the other tributes to this great man in bust, in statue, in picture, in books, and on our postage stamps. Why, you ask?

Again I suggest that the reasons are reflected in the some 6,000 books that have been written, all of them in part or in whole dealing with what Lincoln said, what he did, and what he was. What he said throughout his lifetime revealed the heart and soul of this man. It proves his burning desire to know what was right and then to say what was right in such a way that people could understand it. Then, with an unbounded faith in those ideals that gave us freedom he directed the forces spiritually and politically in the tragic and challenging period and we find now that what emerged then was an America more nearly like that envisioned by our forefathers than even the most avid abolitionist believed possible.

In this 100th anniversay and commemoration period of that time, the Civil War, we emphasize not the conflict but the tragedy, that at frightful cost enriched and made clear the American tradition. The phrase, "Conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," acquired a magnificent meaning during and since the war for all of us and for all time. With the result that our Nation under God was unified and made strong beyond any power again to separate and divide. What has emerged now is the last great hope of an imperiled mankind. The fragment of history that we show so humbly today may furnish an insight into the tumult, the bitterness, that in the end cleared the air for the triumph forever of the American genius for justice and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Pennsylvania with its Civil War Centennial Commission assisting and the people of Gettysburg with the Lincoln fellowship there have, through the years, commemorated the anniversary of the Gettysburg Address. To that community, on the 19th of November, they have drawn national leaders, Governors, Senators, Congressmen, Cabinet members, historians, and poets like Sandburg and each time, with these programs, these people have enriched the American heritage there by recalling, reviewing, reappraising, and placing in proper perspective for us what was said there and the things we need to be reminded of that this situation recalls. For this I believe every American should be thankful.

Mr. Speaker, no greater expression of our appreciation could be shown for the sacrifice that was made for freedom, and which, through a combination of circumstances, was so eloquently called to our attention by Lincoln on that important day 100 years ago next November, than the passage of H.R. 1611, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, GEORGE GOODLING, the Representative of that district, calling for the issuance of a 50 cent piece to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Gettysburg Address.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore would like to give my support to H.R. 1611 and review if I may a little history in connection with this address that might be worthwhile for us to think about as we consider this very appropriate tribute to a man, to an occasion and through both to our philosophy of government of, by and for the people.

I will begin by reminding you that 100 years ago two armies met near the little town of Gettysburg, in southern Pennsylvania. The details of the titanic battle that followed have been well covered in numerous books, so that it is not necessary, even if it were possible, to recount them here. The battle raged for 3 days, July 1–3, 1963. Thousands laid down their lives in sacrifice and other thousands were wounded, captured, or missing. We who are so far removed from that awful conflict can hardly imagine the heroism and hope, the tragedy and despair of the men who fought there.

In the end, Lee withdrew across the Potomac. The high-water mark of the Confederacy had been reached. The contest was not ended, but Lee was never again at the head of an army of equal strength, and never again did he set his columns in motion and enter into a conflict with such high hopes. The battles of Cold Harbor, the Wilderness, and Spottsylvania were still to be fought, and Sherman was yet to make his historic march to the sea. But after the failure of Pickett's charge on July 3, Appomattox was inevitable.

Gettysburg was decisive not only in the American Civil War; it was decisive

also in man's long struggle for popular government.

Following the battle the heroic dead were hastily buried in shallow graves, many of them unmarked. This condition was highly unsatisfactory, and Mr. David Wills, a resident of Gettysburg, who was a true-hearted patriot and a man of great executive ability, took the lead in correcting it. On July 24, 1863, he wrote to Governor Curtin, submitting a plan for a cemetery in which the remains of the dead heroes could be reinterred and properly marked. With the approval of Governor Curtin and the cooperation of the Governors of other States, land was purchased and the cemetery grounds plotted and laid out. Plans were made for consecrating the cemetery with appropriate ceremonies and the Honorable Edward Everett of Massachusetts was selected as the orator for the occasion. In deference to his wishes the ceremonies were postponed until November 19.

The invitation to President Lincoln to speak at Gettysburg was an afterthought. On November 2 Mr. Wills wrote to the President informing him:

> These grounds will be consecrated and set apart to this sacred purpose, by appropriate ceremonies, on Thursday, the 19th instant. Hon. Edward Everett will deliver the oration. I am authorized by the Governors of the different States to invite you to be present and participate in these ceremonies, which will doubtless be very imposing and solemnly impressive. It is the desire that after the oration, you, as Chief Executive of the Nation, formally set apart these grounds to their sacred use by a few appropriate remarks. We hope you will be able to be present to perform this last solemn act to the soldier-dead on this battlefield.

President Lincoln needed no urging. His heart was full of gratitude for what had been so gloriously accomplished at Gettysburg. He determined to find time in the midst of a busy schedule to participate in the dedicatory ceremonies.

The original plans proposed that the train carrying the Presidential party should leave Washington at 6 a.m., arriving at Gettysburg at noon. On the return trip, the train was to leave Gettysburg at 6 p.m. and arrive in Washington at midnight. Lincoln was not satisfied. He wrote on the note from Stanton the following endorsement:

> I do not like the arrangement. I do not wish to so go that by the slightest accident we fail entirely; and, at the best, the whole to be a mere breathless running of the gauntlet.

In deference to the President's objection, an alternate arrangement was made providing that the train should leave Washington at noon on November 18 instead of at 6 a.m. on November 19.

Almost innumerable books and magazine articles have professed to tell the true story of Lincoln's notable address. It has been asserted that he wrote it on the train between Washington and Gettysburg; that he wrote it at the Wills' residence the night before its delivery; and that he wrote it in full before leaving Washington. There are five copies, still extant, in Lincoln's own handwriting. The first page of the first draft is on a sheet of "Executive Mansion" letter paper. Except for the first sheet, the first draft is written in pencil on the wide-lined paper that he habitually used for public documents, similar to that which he used for the writing of his second inaugural address. William E. Barton, in his excellent work, "Lincoln at Gettysburg," says:

> Whether Lincoln had wholly completed his first draft before he left Washington, we are not sure; if he had, he was not satisfied with the way it ended. He certainly did not write the address or any large part of it on the train. At Judge Wills' house that evening he read over the first draft of his speech, and was not pleased with the way it ended. His second sheet, whatever he had on it, he presumably destroyed. About 9 o'clock the following morning, Lincoln rose from the breakfast table in the Wills house and went to his room. There, not very long afterward, John G. Nicolay found him rewriting his address. For this rewriting he used the same kind of paper which he had used for the pencilled first draft of his second page. From the new draft, written wholly in ink, and without erasure, on two pages of the wide-lined paper, Lincoln delivered his address that day. This second draft is virtually a fair copy of the first draft.

The dedicatory program opened with a dirge by the Birgfield band of Philadelphia, followed by a prayer by the Reverend Thomas H. Stockton, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate. The effort was eloquent although somewhat lengthy, but it was the embodiment of the spirit of patriotism and victory rather than of the spirit of humility and devotion.

A selection by the Marine band followed, after which letters of regret from Gen. George G. Meade, Gen. Winfield Scott, and others, were read.

It was noon when Mr. Everett arose and spoke the opening words of his oration:

> Standing beneath this serene sky, overlooking these broad fields now reposing from the labors of the waning year, the mighty Alleghenies towering before us, the graves of our brethren beneath our feet, it is with hesitation that I raise my poor voice to break the eloquent silence of God and nature.

His oration, which had been prepared with care, was delivered with effectiveness. It was nearly 2 o'clock when he closed with the prophecy that "down to the latest period of recorded time, in the glorious annals of our common country there will be no brighter page than that which relates the Battles of Gettysburg."

Everett's oration was followed by a hymn composed for the occasion by B. B. French, of Washington, and sung by the Baltimore Glee Club. The second stanza reflected the spirit of the occasion and set the tone of thousands of Memorial Day ceremonies in the decades to come:

> "Here let them rest;
> And summer's heat and winter's cold
> Shall grow and freeze above this mold,
> A thousand years shall pass away,
> A nation still shall mourn this day,
> Which now is blest."

The crowd was silent when Lincoln rose to speak, following the hymn, but the address was so short that the people had hardly adjusted themselves to its spirit when he ceased. It is reported that as he took his seat there was silence for a moment, then some scattered applause.

The Gettysburg address was not received with universal acclaim. The simple remarks were given scant attention by the big dailies. The opposition press, as might be expected, treated the address with indifference or even with scorn. The Springfield (Mass.) Republican was almost alone in its immediate recognition of the immortal words. The following day, the Republican labeled it "a perfect gem, deep in feeling, compact in thought and expression."

It is true that greatness in a speech, like greatness in other events, is often recognized only when seen through the haze of time. As the curious but sympathetic multitude saw a sad-faced man sink down in his chair, how little they realized that the sentences they had been privileged to hear would take their place among the great works of literature. Prof. H. C. Holloway, who was present that day, says in his reminiscences:

> Indeed, so great was the speech that no one at the time comprehended it fully. No eulogistic utterances in regard to it can do it justice. As the ages go by it will lose none of its luster. We had heard very much more that day than we dreamed of.

Yet, even then, the brief address elicited commendation from one who was certainly a qualified judge. Edward Everett spoke with the voice of prophecy when he said:

> Mr. President, your speech will be remembered long after mine is forgotten.

The following day he wrote to Lincoln a letter in which he expressed his great admiration for the address, and said:

> I should be glad if I could flatter myself that I came as near to the central idea of the occasion in my 2 hours as you did in 2 minutes.

Notwithstanding the importance of the battle itself, and in spite of Lincoln's assertion that "the world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here," it is the address that has kept alive the memory of the battle. The Gettysburg address has become a part of our American heritage and of the heritage of freedom-loving people throughout the world. It stands in the very first rank of American state papers, surpassed only by the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, and the Bill of Rights. It is the object of H.R. 1611 to commemorate the anniversary of the delivery of this historic address, a purpose in which I heartily and sincerely concur.

In one version of the address the closing clause reads, "and that this Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth;" in its final form, however, this clause was changed to read, "and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." This change gave it universal application and demonstrated that Lincoln's thoughts and hopes swept far beyond the borders of America and embraced the whole of humanity.

In the Gettysburg Address, delivered in the midst of a long and bloody war, we find no trace of an appeal to the baser passions. It was an occasion on which exultation or vindictiveness might naturally have found a place in wounded hearts. Such sentiments were not entirely absent from the program and from the applause which the expression of those sentiments evoked. Even the chaplain's prayer was not wholly free from a spirit of boasting and bitterness. But no suggestion of rejoicing or revenge is found in Lincoln's words. Emerson says:

> Lincoln's heart was as large as the world, but in it there was no room for the memory of a wrong.

His thought rose above the passing passions of the hour and dwelt on great and abiding truths.

Today, the forces of communism press everywhere against the frontiers of the free world. In international affairs we pass from one crisis to another. In his article entitled "The Last Best Hope of Earth," Carl Haverlin says:

> In this battle for sheer survival, the ideas of Abraham Lincoln and the power that has been generated by what he was, what he accomplished, and what he stood for are, in my opinion, among the most potent weapons that the free world can wield. Since so many of the globe's inhabitants are have-nots, the figure of Abraham Lincoln gains added strength because of his own insignificant beginnings, and his lifelong dedication to the dignity of man. Wherever one looks, whether at home or abroad, there are many examples of this imprint today.

Elsewhere in the same article, Mr. Haverlin writes:

> But I am sure that in the balances of men's minds—whether they be men of Ghana and black, or men of India and brown, or men of China and yellow, or whether pigmented like ourselves and thus in a world sense in the minority—the existence of Abraham Lincoln and the body of people who supported him weighs in those balances more heavily in our national interest than we can realize.

This bill provides that the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparation for such coinage. I mention this point only in passing. I do not desire to emphasize it because I feel that the project would be a worthwhile one even if the expense were substantial.

Mr. Speaker, the United States can have no finer image in the eyes of the world than the one supplied by the Gettysburg Address. The issuing of this commemorative coin is, in a sense, an affirmation of our faith in the ideals of Lincoln and in the sentiments that he expressed in the Gettysburg Address. It is a rededication to the great task remaining before us. It is an indication, before the whole world, that we are willing to stand up and be counted. It is a renewal of his high resolve, and ours, "that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Mr. Speaker, some will argue against this proposition because of precedent. Let me say that while a new precedent may be established with the issuance of this special 50-cent piece to commemorate the Gettysburg Address, it is not new to have a special issue of the 50-cent piece.

This Congress, in its wisdom, did just that to help Iowa commemorate the 100th anniversary of its coming into the Union. This was good public policy and it served the public interest because it did call attention to a great and important event in our history—and I say parenthetically that Congress never did a finer thing when they gave the people of Iowa the opportunity and privilege of having more self-government. This has added both to the welfare of the people there and to the Nation and it has enriched our culture. This issuance encouraged the people of Iowa to reflect on the contribution that they have made to their heritage and to renew their pledges to the great ideals summed up pretty well in the Iowa motto that says "Our liberties we prize and our rights we will maintain."

But Mr. Speaker, if this is establishing a new precedent it is a good one just like the setting of other precedents have been throughout history.

I do not know the details of the impression that they would have on this coin but I imagine there would be a quote from the Gettysburg Address itself if not the complete address. This they tell me is possible. Possibly they would use just the last part which reads:

> That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

If just those ringing, meaningful words could be called to the attention of our people daily and to the attention of all who would have occasion to use our currency, they would be reminded each time of our system which gives freedom for the people. It is clear from this statement, too, that what is referred to here for the people is meant for all the people everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that this can be done almost without cost to the Government and the further fact that it can and will do so much good for freedom, let us join hands in the passage of this legislation and in every way we can to aid and abet those in Pennsylvania and Gettysburg to adequately commemorate this great occasion, this magnificent speech, and this great ideal that was exemplified so eloquently and impressively 100 years ago next November 19.

This does involve history, a great interest of mine. For those, and there may be some, who believe that history is dead, dull, and finished, let me suggest what a great historian has said and that is:

> The events of the past are but the earlier acts in a drama that is still going on—that what happens tomorrow is only the shadow of an action taken today, the echo of a thought conceived yesterday. Understanding the ideas created and nourished by great minds through all our centuries can give contemporary man a new capacity for judgment and vision—a capacity which will clarify and illuminate his life, as a citizen and as a man.

I suggest in addition, that the deeper we look into our own history, the further we can look forward with confidence in the great ideals that were reflected in the life and action of Abraham Lincoln who, in my opinion, stood so tall among us that day when he gave us the 267 words we find in the Gettysburg Address. They need to be remembered forever, they need to be commemorated in such a way that the impact of what was there said will be made more manifest, more meaningful, to more people everywhere.

A COIN SHOULD BE MINTED TO COMMEMORATE THE CENTENARY OF LINCOLN'S GETTYSBURG ADDRESS

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Goodling] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, 5 score if you will, come November 19, thousands of Americans gathered at Gettysburg to witness ceremonies held to dedicate a portion of a great battlefield of the American Civil War as a national cemetery. What transpired on that day has made the name of Gettysburg known and cherished wherever in this world men love freedom.

On that occasion, the President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, was asked to make a "few appropriate remarks." Confining his remarks to less than 300 words is an indication he complied with the first request. The President did not live to learn how appropriate his words actually were. Their real significance is attested by their lasting fame. They have been revered throughout the world as the sublime Gettysburg Address. A grateful posterity has taken what he said as the creed for all who love liberty. Freedom and sacrifice then as now, are inseparable.

It would appear fitting and proper that a coin should be stricken to commemorate the centenary of what is probably the most meaningful and lasting address, one which acquires deeper significance with each passing year. It has become an American heritage and stands as a beacon light for the entire world. Like the man who uttered it, its fame does not end at waters edge. Wherever there is written and spoken language, Lincoln and his immortal passages are known.

There is no more fitting and finer tribute to the Gettysburg Address than that of Lord Curzon, in an address delivered at Cambridge University, November 6, 1931. The following is a part of that speech:

> It is an amazingly comprehensive and forceful presentation of the principles for which the war then was waging. It joined the local to the national, the occasional to the permanent, it went straight at a declaration of the purpose which animated the soul of Abraham Lincoln, and for which the men buried at Gettysburg had given their lives. Above all, it was a declaration of America's fundamental principles.

When Mr. Lincoln went to Gettysburg he must have had some supernatural power to look beyond his immediate audience. Democracy was on trial and this had to be shown to the world. There is evidence that the phrase a "few appropriate remarks" gave him considerable concern and weighed heavily upon him and caused him to give serious consideration to what he should say.

The President reached Gettysburg in the afternoon of November 18, carrying with him at least part of his address. It was completed in the home of Judge Wills where he was a guest.

The ceremonies on the 19th were solemn and impressive. There was appropriate music, the recital of a dirge written for the occasion by Benjamin B. French, the U.S. Commissioner of Public Buildings and what was to be the main address of the day. This was delivered by the foremost orator of the time, Hon. Edward Everett, of Massachusetts. For 2 hours he expounded in his graceful polished phrases which had gained him his standing as the Nation's greatest orator.

This then was the situation as the tall man arose. So brief were his dedicatory remarks the audience had barely settled before he had finished. It was probably a disappointed audience, it having expected more. It was not until it appeared in print that its true beauty became apparent. As stated, the President was looking beyond the Gettysburg audience. Here he summed up the one fundamental principle of American Government—political equality. He portrayed briefly all fields where men have contended and died for human liberty and for government which would assure to all the rights and opportunities of life. Lincoln showed the country the Civil War was waged to test democracy and that his and future generations must dedicate themselves to the unfinished tasks. One hundred years later much remains unfinished.

Few men have the ability to say so much in so few words. The real significance of the Gettysburg Address can be summed up in one word—simplicity.

Gettysburg was the turning point in the war. It was decisive in the Civil War, but was also decisive in the world struggle for popular government, one that would recognize all who would become Americans, one which believed in the brotherhood of man.

A coin should be minted for Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. The words are as relevant today as they were one century ago. An unknown minister said:

> Lincoln's Gettysburg speech was a coin dropped from the mine of the Anglo-Saxon language.

The precedent has been established. A coin was minted to commemorate the 75th anniversary in 1938. Within the last few days this House did what had never been done in the history of the country. It established a precedent by making a distinguished gentleman an honorary citizen of the United States.

It does appear fitting and proper that a coin should be minted to commemorate the centennial of what is truly a landmark in history and will live as long as the spoken language. This event should be properly remembered, for contrary to what Mr. Lincoln suggested, the world did note and remember what he said there.

THE TFX CONTROVERSY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we are all concerned about the continuing controversy reported daily in the press on the subject of the congressional inquiry into the TFX award recently made by the Department of Defense. I participated in the discussions on this subject on the floor on March 4. At that time my interest centered around the appeal of one of the two major participants to the Congress after having lost the competition primarily because of failure to adhere to the ground rules prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. The losing company really designed two airplanes rather than one as prescribed in the ground rules. A number of the other participants, major aircraft companies, which had previously been eliminated could easily have duplicated the proposal of the losing company had they, too, failed to adhere to the ground rules.

That the ground rules were feasible can be readily demonstrated. The tactical plane currently in major production for the Air Force is produced in an aircraft plant adjacent to my district. It was designed and built by the Navy for the Navy mission. Afterward this plane was found to be the best plane for the Air Force tactical mission as well. I am greatly disturbed that the example of this plane has apparently escaped the notice of the inquiry and the press.

Subsequent to my remarks on the floor on March 4 the press has taken a much more balanced view of the whole matter. One of the articles that has done much to clear up the uncertainties is an article by John G. Norris published in the Washington Post on March 18. After very capably reviewing all facets of the matter, Mr. Norris points out that no one seriously suggests that politics entered into Mr. McNamara's decision. He very knowledgeably sums the situation up as follows:

> In the last analysis, it comes down to a question of judgment. And as McNamara pointed out, he is the man charged by law with making such highly important judgments. Right or wrong, most people feel that it will turn out to have been an honest judgment.

During my membership for some years on the House Armed Services Committee we have been urged repeatedly to pass legislation giving the Secretary of Defense adequate authority over the military. These recommendations cautioned us on the danger of the military-industrial threat to our way of life and have come from people at high levels who have borne high responsibility and from both political parties. In the instance of Mr. McNamara we have the capable man that we have all sought who is attempting to do the job that we in the Congress have outlined by our legislation. The columnist, Mr. William S. White, has adequately addressed himself to this aspect of the matter in the Evening Star of March 18 in which he says:

> Congress clamored for years for a Secretary who would knock heads together at the Pentagon.

If Mr. McNamara is seriously embarrassed by the congressional inquiry, perhaps subsequent weaker Secretaries of Defense will be tempted to view problems in terms of what powerful Member of Congress from what powerful congressional committee is interested in the problem rather than the merits of the matter at hand. Let me quote Mr. White:

> Somebody will be hurt; and this is a pity. But if the principal victim is Mr. McNamara, it will be a very bad thing, indeed.

I commend to you for your earnest consideration both articles as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 18, 1963]

MISJUDGING MCNAMARA SEEN AS BOEING'S ERROR

(By John G. Norris)

Boeing lost the $6.5 billion TFX warplane order, it now seems clear, not as the result of political influence, but because it did not realize who was boss at the Pentagon.

In repeated proposals, the Seattle aircraft company offered the Air Force and Navy higher combat performance than its rival, General Dynamics—made possible only by building what are essentially two separate planes—instead of meeting Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara's demand for one all-purpose craft that may save $1 billion.

HOW BOEING LOST OUT

After 22 months, General Dynamics finally came up with what is essentially a single fighter plane design acceptable to both services' military chiefs even though its performance will be less than Boeing offered.

Boeing apparently based its hopes of winning on: (1) a bid that was about $100 million less than its rival's, and (2) a conviction that McNamara finally would yield to the military view that air combat performance was all important.

Instead, he rejected Boeing's bid as unrealistically low, declaring some of its proposed design innovations to attain higher performance were technically risky.

General Dynamics and its affiliate, Grumman Aircraft, received the award to build essentially similar versions of one fighter, on the ground that the one-plane approach and more conventional design promised to deliver a satisfactory plane sooner and cheaper.

M'NAMARA FACES QUIZ

In essence, McNamara's position is that the expected $1 billion savings outweighed the extra performance Boeing offered.

Whether McNamara is right remains to be seen. When he goes before the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee this week for questioning on the detailed brief he submitted to it Wednesday, McNamara must:

Convince the public that Boeing greatly underestimated the cost of developing the complex TFX fighter and that the Government would have had to bail out the company had it been given the order even though its proposal was a fixed-price bid. Pentagon officials say he not only will present detailed data on where Boeing was low but will give official estimates of what the cost actually would have been.

Uphold his contention that Boeing's inexperience in building fighters—whereas General Dynamics and Grumman are veterans in the field—is a valid argument against it. Opponents insist that Boeing's record in making bombers is excellent and that fighter production techniques are not too different.

Explain away the errors discovered in some Pentagon evaluations of the rival bids and some charges of "unusual procedures" employed in the evaluation that have been brought out before the Senate subcommittee. McNamara did not touch on these in his "brief" last week, but aids insist they are of minor importance.

Convince Congress that his estimate of a billion-dollar saving in having one plane instead of two is realizable. The Secretary is relying not only on economics in development costs, but those in production, operation, maintenance, and spare parts inventories once in service.

The importance of this central point of McNamara's case has been challenged. Some contend that the differences between the Air Force and Navy versions of the Boeing proposal—compared to these in the successful bid—were less marked and vital than claimed.

Show that the added performance offered by Boeing was marginal compared to the marked advantages that introduction of the General Dynamics-Grumman plane will bring when the TFX is introduced to Air Force squadrons and Navy aircraft carriers in the late 1960's.

NEW TYPE OF WING

The new plane, to be known as the F-111, employs a radically new variable sweep wing than can be pulled back for high speed—1,700 miles an hour—or pushed forward for "loitering" over combat areas and landing on short, rough fields. This innovation also will give the craft much improved performance at both low and high altitudes and in cross-ocean ferrying range. It is designed for use in both conventional and nuclear warfare.

Congressional testimony so far has brought out that the original specifications set by McNamara in 1961 for the all-purpose plane had to be watered down because bidders could not satisfy the differing Air Force and Navy needs without building what amounted to two airplanes.

McNamara's opponents say that because of this and the final decision favoring General Dynamics instead of Boeing, the Air Force and Navy will get poorer planes than if the aircraft industry had been allowed to push for two top performance aircraft.

DELAYS IN PAST PRACTICE

In the past, the practice generally has been to try to build the best combat plane possible within the state of the art of aeronautical science. This has often led to delays in eliminating bugs and getting them into service on schedule—a point made by McNamara against the Boeing design.

Many believe, however, that if time shows McNamara to have been wrong, it will be because he overruled the military and insisted on his moneysaving all-purpose airplane.

No one now seems to be seriously suggesting that politics entered into his decision. When General Dynamics won the coveted order last fall, some people's eyebrows were raised. The company will develop and build the TFX at its Fort Worth plant in Democratic Texas, while Boeing would have done the work at its Wichita plant in Republican Kansas.

GROUNDLESS INNUENDOS

Washington wiseacres promptly dubbed the TFX—which stands for tactical fighter experimental—the L.B.J.—short for Lyndon B. Johnson. But after extensive airing of the controversy these innuendos seem completely groundless.

It is too early to say definitely who is right and who is wrong in the complex controversy. McNamara made a strong case in his statement filed with the Senate subcommittee last week. The evidence before Senator John L. McClellan's investigating group so far indicates there may be a strong case against it.

In the last analysis, it comes down to a question of judgment. And as McNamara pointed out, he is the man charged by law with making such highly important judgments. Right or wrong, most people feel that it will turn out to have been an honest judgment.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 18, 1963]

McNamara's Biggest Test—Strongest Member of Kennedy's Cabinet Faces Strongest Men of Congress

(By William S. White)

Irresistible force and immovable object are meeting in a great and melancholy contest now drawn taut between the strongest member of the Cabinet, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, and the strongest men of Congress.

Somebody will be hurt; and this is a pity. But if the principal victim is Mr. McNamara, it will be a very bad thing, indeed.

For the real issues lying between the devoted Robert McNamara and the equally devoted men of Congress are infinitely bigger than even the chief present symbol of their dispute, the multibillion-dollar contract now being investigated in the Senate.

Aptly enough, this inquiry is being conducted by one of the best groups in Congress, the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee headed by Senator John L. McClellan, of Arkansas. His panel is doggedly examining why Secretary McNamara let a contract for the all-purpose TFX warplane to General Dynamics Corp. rather than to the rival Boeing Co., which had offered what seemed on its face to be a lower bid.

With equal doggedness, Mr. McNamara is defending that decision on the ground that, taking everything into consideration, it was his judgment that General Dynamics could do the job in the least time, at the least risk, with the best result in weaponry and, in the end, also at the least cost.

The rights and wrongs, in sheer terms of immediate dollars and cents, are quite beyond any independent evaluation by this columnist and may forever be. For by their very nature such vast outlays by the Pentagon include such immense and varied factors as to make any outside judgment as difficult to grasp as a wavering moonbeam flitting across the ceiling of a shuttered room at midnight.

Other and more important things, however, can be said with complete confidence. Involved here is a challenge to Secretary McNamara's ultimate civilian control over the Pentagon by uniformed officers with pipelines to Congress who beyond question are far less interested in economy than he is. Their professional interest, and rightly so, is in having all the arms they want of the kind they prefer, period.

His interest must be in procuring the best arms available; but with due regard to economy, to unified general military policy and to many other considerations which do not overly concern the uniformed military fellows.

And involved—though not in the McClellan committee itself as a whole—is a determined movement in Congress to reduce the authority of this civilian head of the Pentagon and to increase that of the generals and admirals.

There is no "conspiracy" between the men in uniform and the men in Congress. But there is undoubtedly some working purpose to cut Secretary McNamara down to size.

At last, the whole question comes to this: Is civilian authority to be supreme, or is it to be abridged in the clearly well-intentioned but profoundly dangerous notion that, in these days of cold war, the generals and admirals really know best?

It is a hard question superficially, but to those who have read the Constitution it has only one answer. The Secretary of Defense must remain the Secretary of Defense. If he falls into fatal error, it will be necessary to get another man. But neither Congress nor the generals-admirals can run the Pentagon—or should.

All the same, there is tragedy here. The men in Congress who are striking at Secretary McNamara are acting from the highest motives. And the man they are striking at has been regarded up to now by these very men of Congress as the best Secretary of Defense in history, tough and nonpolitical.

Congress clamored for years for a Secretary who would knock heads together at the Pentagon. Congress has got him now—and is not so happy with the choice as it was before.

SHOULD THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TOLERATE NONCOMPLIANCE WITH THE LAW?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, should the Congress of the United States tolerate noncompliance with the law? The answer is certainly "no" but it should be a more emphatic "no" when it comes to this body or its Members. Certainly if we are to require obedience to the laws which we enact to regulate the diverse affairs of our fellow men, we should zealously endeavor to live within both the spirit and the letter of the law when it directly relates to us and to this august body.

On March 12, 1963, on pages 4017–4019, I outlined a situation which exists regarding the reporting of counterpart funds under title 22, section 1754 of the United States Code. This law clearly requires the reporting and full disclosure of the counterpart funds expended by Congress. Section (b) of this statutory requirement says, in part:

> (b) *Provided*, That each member or employee of any such committee shall make, to the chairman of such committee in accordance with regulations prescribed by such committee, an itemized report showing the amounts and dollar equivalent values of each such foreign currency expended and the amounts of dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds in connection with travel outside the United States, together with the purposes of the expenditure, including lodging, meals, transportation, and other purposes. Within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, the chairman of each such committee shall prepare a consolidated report showing the total itemized expenditures during the preceding calendar year of the committee and each subcommittee thereof, and of each member and employee of such committee or subcommittee, and shall forward such consolidated report to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

The report which was filed for the Committee on Education and Labor in the March 11, 1963, Congressional Record on pages 3967–3968, clearly was not in accordance with the requirements of this law. I pointed out these areas of noncompliance in my March 12 address to this body.

It is interesting to see the impasse regarding this noncompliance with our own statutory mandate. As a Member of Congress, I have used every means available to find out the full story on these funds expended by our committee, but everywhere it is a dead end. I am well aware of the fact that the Attorney General does not give opinions to Members of Congress but I nonetheless wrote to him and asked if he had any responsibility to enforce title 22, section 1754. This is the reply I received:

Department of Justice,
Washington, March 18, 1963.

Hon. John M. Ashbrook,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Ashbrook: This is with reference to your letter to the Attorney General of March 13, 1963, regarding the responsibility placed upon Members of Congress by the reporting requirements of 22 U.S.C. 1754(b).

We very much regret that the Attorney General is unable to furnish you with an opinion on the matter. The law limits him to giving legal advice to the President and the heads of the executive departments. See 5 U.S.C. 303, 304. Beginning with Attorney General Wirt, it has been the traditional position of Attorneys General that legal opinions should not be rendered either to Congress, its committees or its Members. (See e.g., 1 Op. A.G. 335; 2 id. 499; 36 id. 532.)

We are, however, desirous of assisting you as far as possible, and therefore offer the following as an unofficial comment. The statute in question authorizes local currencies owned by the United States to be made available to certain committees of Congress for their local currency expenses, and provides that each member or employee of any such committee shall make an itemized expenditure report to the chairman of the committee. It is further provided that the chairman of a House committee shall forward a consolidated expenditure report to the House Committee on House Administration and the chairman of a Senate committee shall forward such a report to the Senate Appropriations Committee. The section does not contain any penal sanction for failure to comply with its provisions, and we are not aware of any. We assume that noncompliance is a matter for the chairman of the committee involved or for each House of Congress itself in an appropriate case. I invite your attention to the Conference Report on the Mutual Security Act of 1958 (H. Rept. No. 2038, 85th Cong., 2d sess.), the relevant portions of which appear at 1958 U.S. Code Congressional and Administration News 2805–06.

Sincerely,

Norbert A. Schlei,
Assistant Attorney General.

I also wrote to the State Department after a telephone conversation with Mr. John Leahy of that Department. Mr. Leahy was most courteous but felt it was not within his authority to release to me the figures on counterpart moneys expended by the Committee on Education and Labor. The letter I directed to Secretary Rusk elicited the following reply:

Department of State,
Washington, March 18, 1963.

Hon. John M. Ashbrook,
House of Representatives.

Dear Congressman Ashbrook: I am replying to your letter of March 11 requesting statistics on counterpart funds expended by the Committee on Education and Labor.

Present procedures for the disbursement and accounting of local currencies owned by the United States were established in 1953 after consultation with Congress and provide for annual reports to be made in detail to the chairman of the congressional committee authorizing the use of those funds. This is done on the basis of the relevant act of Congress (sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1959) which states that local currencies "shall be made available to appropriate committees of the Congress engaged in carrying out their duties * * *."

A detailed report is annually provided by the Department to each committee covering all funds drawn by its members and staff pursuant to letter of authorization from the committee chairman. Since the sole authority for the use of the local currency resides with the legislative branch and the funds are for the use of its members and staff in carrying out their duties, it has been concluded by both the executive and legislative branches for a number of years that information concerning congressional use of the money should be obtained from Congress rather than the State Department. I respectfully urge that the proper place to which your inquiry concerning the Education and Labor Committee should be directed is appropriate officials in Congress and submit that this is strictly pursuant to the long evident intent of Congress on these matters.

For an agency of the executive branch to undertake unilaterally to change established procedures primarily concerning the Congress would obviously not be proper. Also, as a matter of basic policy, the separation of the executive and legislative branches of Government militates that Members of Congress be accountable through their respective Houses concerning these funds. For it to be otherwise would, in effect, have the Department police Members of Congress.

The Department submitted on February 28 to the Committee on Education and Labor a full report on the disbursement of local currencies for its members and staff pursuant to letters of authorization from the committee chairman. This was done on the same basis as in past years. The report included the amount of local currency obtained by its members, the date the money was furnished, the country where it was provided, the equivalent U.S. dollar value, and whether for transportation, as an advance, or other purpose specified by the Members of Congress.

I regret that I cannot provide the specific information which you request.

Sincerely,

Frederick G. Dutton,
Assistant Secretary.

You will note that the Department "submitted on February 28 to the Committee on Education and Labor a full report on the disbursement of local currencies for its members and staff pursuant to letters of authorization from the committee chairman." I have therefore directed the following letter to the chairman of our committee:

House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1963.

Hon. Adam C. Powell,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.

Dear Chairman Powell: As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor I am interested, as I am certain you are, in making sure that our committee complies with the law. It is apparent to me on the face of the report which you filed with the Committee on House Administration concerning the expenditure of so-called counterpart funds that this report is not in compliance with title 22, section 1754, United States Code.

Possibly this is a clerical error on the part of one of our committee staff members. At any rate, the error should be rectified. The State Department informs me that on February 28, 1963, they furnished you with a full report on the counterpart funds expended by our committee. Unless you consider this report as a matter which is private to you and not available to the members of the committee, I would like to receive a copy of it.

At any rate, I hope every effort will be made to correct this report so we will comply with the law.

Sincerely,

John M. Ashbrook,
Representative to Congress.

This is a most interesting situation, as I have stated before. The Committee on House Administration says that it is not their responsibility to check into the expenditure of these funds. I am sure that they are right. On the other hand, the only department which knows the full story, the State Department, will not tell and the Attorney General's Office is not interested. Now, if our chairman will not tell me, how will we ever know the true picture of these moneys expended? Possibly some Members feel that the expenditure of these funds should be treated like a private little game preserve for chairmen of the various committees, but I am sure that the taxpaying public does not agree with this contention.

In checking the history of this provision, we once again see what happens in a Senate-House conference where the House recedes from its position. The mutual security bill of the House of Representatives, H.R. 12181, 85th Congress, had provided for a substantial modification and reorganization of the accounting procedures of the House of Representatives which would have brought about a more thorough disclosure of the counterpart funds used by Members of Congress. In the language of Senate Report No. 1627, which accompanied the conference report, the conferees stated that:

> The House conferees * * * accepted the simpler language of the Senate amendment, since it appeared to attain their desired objectives.

It is now evident that this provision has not accomplished the desired objective.

"THE TEST BAN: AN AMERICAN STRATEGY OF GRADUAL SELF-MUTILATION"—CHAPTERS I AND II, BY STEFAN T. POSSONY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Hosmer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert at this point in the Record chapters I and II of an article entitled "The Test Ban: An American Strategy of Gradual Self-Mutilation" by Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institution.

CHAPTER I

At all times and ages, some people felt the urge to turn back the wheel of time. Mostly, this urge degenerates into innocent "reactionary" talk; but sometimes the talk affects policy and delays reform. Since 1945, when the first atomic bombs were exploded, the urge to go back to the "good old days" of World War I and World War II (which cost upward of 100 million casualties, worldwide) has become overpowering in many, and has resulted in a foreign policy out of Pandora's Box. But these nuclear age reactionaries are posing a threat far worse than mere slowdown of technical progress; they are playing into the hands of the Communist revolutionaries, and thus endanger both peace and survival.

In the late 1940's some nuclear physicists, hoping that the invention of atomic weapons could be undone or neutralized, proposed a ban on testing. It was assumed that, given adequate detection equipment, any nuclear explosion anywhere on the globe could be detected without difficulty. Consequently, cheating would be impossible and a test ban would be self-enforcing. As a result, the development of nuclear weapons would be delayed or stopped, and the specter of nuclear holocaust eliminated.

Geneva, 1958: Science turns political

In 1958, American, British, and Soviet scientists met in Geneva to determine the nature, performance characteristics, and size of an international detection system which would be needed to control compliance with a test ban. The theory was that the inspection system should be constructed according to the findings of objective scientists, i.e. a reliable detection system was to be the prerequisite for a political test ban agreement, the system was to possess as much reliability as the scientists were able to build into it, and the political compact was to insure the construction and operation of the detection system, substantially as the scientists recommended it.

The findings of the first Geneva scientific conference reflected many concessions by American scientists to Russian scientists. Russian negotiators were setting forth arguments inspired by political decisions, and some of them were not very familiar with the problems under discussion. American negotiators were interpreting scientific facts as loosely as possible in order to ensure that the negotiations not be broken off prematurely. It turned out later that much of the information on which the initial Geneva recommendations had been based, was invalid. The conferees had taken the "easy way out" by disregarding such outstanding questions as the technology of cheating, or even the feasibility of underground and space testing. Subsequent scientific conferences had to be called to cover some of the gaps, but to this day such crucial questions as techniques of evasion still remain to be discussed, and great uncertainty about the requisite number and performance capabilities of control stations persists. For example, the number of control stations recommended at Geneva implicitly assumed that the test violator would cheat on or under terra firma but not at sea.

Careful study of the various Geneva documents shows that even in theory it is quite impossible to build a dependable detection system. In the political reality, only more or less phony detection systems are practical. Nevertheless, the test ban negotiations were continued and the unduly optimistic Geneva recommendations were watered down step by step. During the past few years test ban negotiations have centered around inspection and control systems which would provide only uncertain protection. Great trust is placed in unmanned so-called "black boxes" which a dictatorial state should not find too difficult to tamper with. But even the number of these black boxes has been reduced to below the bare minimum—obviously it is easiest to tamper with the smallest black box system.

Thus, the terms "detection," "identification," "inspection," and "control" have become mere symbols, and no longer refer to substantive hardware systems. The strategy of the test ban proponents has been to bring about a treaty in which lip service is paid to the need for inspection, for example, but in which provisions are made only for a pro forma inspection system. Shadowboxing of this sort is necessary to obtain the required public support.

Naive and biased test ban advisers

Many American policymakers have been sympathetic to test ban proposals for reasons not directly connected with American military security. Some have held that by pushing the test ban negotiation, the "image" of the United States would gain, notably in the underdeveloped areas. These proponents are forgetting entirely that a country which fritters away its basic strength and which is susceptible to being fooled by its opponent, is bound to lose prestige. Others hoped that the emplacement of a worldwide inspection system would open up presently closed societies—entirely forgetting that no dictatorial regime would acquiesce in a test ban if it involves the demise of the dictatorship, and overlooking the fact that a few inspectors digging a few holes in isolated mountain wastelands hardly can have political impact.

Unfortunately, many American decisions on test ban negotiations resulted in part from misinformation which was fed to decisionmakers and from a personnel policy through which test ban advocates were placed at focal positions throughout the Government, while their critics were silenced or removed.

Many of the U.S. scientists who presently are advocating for a test ban agreement, in 1949 were arguing against ICBM's and hydrogen bombs. Some of these people were then arguing that the United States did not need fusion devices and that if it did develop hydrogen weapons, the Soviets would be put in a position to copy the technology—yet at the time these arguments were set forth, the Soviets already were busy working on fusion weapons of their own design. If the advice of these experts had been followed, the Soviets would have gained a monopoly in ICBM systems with highly effective warheads and might have been in a position, sometime during the 1950's, to defeat the United States with little risk to their own survival.

Most of the American nuclear scientists who presently favor the test ban as a device to stop the arms race, to avoid nuclear holocaust, and to obtain mutual accommodation between the United States and the Soviet Union have not taken the trouble to study communism, its objectives and action patterns. They have not familiarized themselves with Soviet strategy. They have no understanding of how the test ban, or rather the Communist protest ban propaganda, fits into the strategy of the Kremlin. Some assume naively that the Soviets are interested in the test ban as a step to securing world peace as we understand this term in the United States. These people would be highly surprised to learn that in Communist "Aesopian" semantics, the expression "lasting peace" is synonymous with "fully established worldwide Communist dictatorship after the elimination of all actual and potential forces of opposition and resistance."

It should be pointed out that some of the scientists favoring a test ban very often have been wrong in their scientific estimates. In particular, many have a record of denying feasibility of certain technical developments which later proved entirely feasible. The history of the H-bomb, among others, gives ample illustrations of this point. In other words, scientific interpretations have been bent to conform to political desires.

Soviet test ban strategy: Weapons superiority

The test ban was advertised as a "first step" to a broader agreement with the Soviets. It was argued that since both the Soviets and ourselves are interested in avoiding nuclear destruction, the test ban would satisfy an identical mutual interest, consequently, it would be feasible despite the cold war. Unfortunately, the assumption of a common mutual interest in strategy is fallacious. True, the Soviets don't want to be blown up, just as we don't want to succumb in a nuclear exchange. But the Soviets do not have the slightest interest in the survival of the United States or even the American people. They are interested in their own survival and victory, and in our destruction. Similarly, they are not interested in slowing down the technological race. Their interest is to slow down the technological progress of American weapon systems.

A relative slowdown of American nuclear progress was precisely what the Soviets achieved through the first unpoliced weapons moratorium. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara on March 3, 1962, stated that the Soviet test series of 1961—by which the Soviets broke the de facto moratorium which had existed since October 31, 1958—made it "mandatory for the United States to examine our present and projected capabilities very closely" emphasizing that weapons systems development "is a dynamic technology similar to many industrial technologies," Mr. McNamara reassured Americans that as of March 1962, "The weapons in the arsenal of the free world are adequate to meet the strategic objectives of the present." However, he added the warning that "every effort must be made to insure" that these weapons "do not in fact become obsolete in their relationship to capabilities of a potential enemy."

In discussing the Soviet test series of 1961, Mr. McNamara characterized it as an "extensive weapons development effort." The implications of continuing the moratorium on atmospheric testing by the United States would be very grave indeed: "It would only be a matter of time before the present powerful U.S. nuclear strategic advantages would begin to diminish in relation to Soviet force capabilities and might ultimately shift in favor of the U.S.S.R." The United States, therefore, was forced "to recognize the extreme importance of the so-called 'technological momentum' as applied to this aspect of national defense." In other words, nuclear technology is progressing very fast, and American security policies must be based on a sober recognition of this central fact.

President Kennedy, in his address of March 2, 1962, indicated that the Soviet tests of 1961 "reflected a highly sophisticated technology, the trial of novel designs and techniques, and some substantial gains in weaponry." The President emphasized that the Soviet test series had as a "primary purpose * * * the development of warheads which weigh very little compared to the destructive efficiency of their thermonuclear yield," thus implying that the Soviets succeeded in increasing nuclear efficiency in terms of the yield-to-weight ratio. The increase of nuclear efficiency is one of the most significant factors governing weapons design. Not surprisingly, therefore, the President disclosed "in all candor that further Soviet series, in the absence of further Western progress, could well provide the Soviet Union

with a nuclear attack and defense capability so powerful as to encourage aggressive designs. Were we to stand still while the Soviets surpassed us, or even appear to surpass us, the free world's ability to deter, to survive and to respond to an all-out attack would be seriously weakened."

The President added that the United States "cannot make similar strides without testing in the atmosphere as well as underground" and that "in many areas of nuclear weapons research we have reached the point where our progress is stifled without experiments in every environment."

The President added another discouraging observation: as of March 1962, the Soviets had tested 30 high yield devices, while the United States had tested only 20 devices in the megaton range. It should be added that the United States never tested devices of a yield as high as those tested by the Soviets. Furthermore, as a result of the 1962 Soviet test series, during which they exploded at least 11 megaton shots, including two of about 30 megatons, the relative Soviet advantages over the United States in the high yield area should have increased further—unless we assume that we are smarter than our opponents and obtain better results through half the number of tests.

The 1961 tests provided the Soviets, as President Kennedy pointed out, "with a mass of data and experience on which, over the next 2 or 3 years, they can base significant analyses, experiments, and extrapolations, preparing for the next test series which would confirm and advance their findings." Chairman Chet Holifield, of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on March 2, 1962, reiterated this same point: "Should the Soviets build upon their last series of tests with another series, the free world could be in great danger."

It so happens that the Soviets, during 1962, indeed conducted an additional, very extensive series of tests. According to U.S. announcements there were at least 34 shots. As soon as they concluded this second test series, they promptly made a "concession" to restart the test ban negotiations in earnest.

Political pressures devalue U.S. tests

It is true that the United States also tested during 1962, but as appears from Secretary McNamara's statement of March 3, 1962, as well as from many other statements and indications, the American tests were put under stringent operational limitations. There is a great difference in a test series designed to gain a maximum of scientific data and another in which many of the research requirements are subordinated to political apprehensions leading to inflexibility in scheduling events to sharp curtailments of yield.

One of the objectives of American testing was stated succinctly by Secretary McNamara: "Since the actual high altitude physical environment cannot be duplicated below ground, it was recognized that on the basis of technical developments in nuclear weaponry, the United States under the present conditions has no alternative but to proceed with an atmospheric test program." In this connection President Kennedy referred to Soviet high altitude nuclear explosions—"in one case over 100 miles high"—explaining that our opponents were seeking information on the effects of nuclear blasts on radar and communications and that this sort of testing constituted an important step in the development of an antimissile defense system. On the basis of these disclosures, it should have been expected that the U.S. high altitude tests would be pressed with vigor. But as soon as our high altitude tests ran into a number of technical difficulties and propaganda headwinds, the effort apparently was greatly scaled down.

With one known exception, the Soviet test shots were all atmospheric, whereas the majority of ours were underground In my judgment, much of the criticism of underground testing is ill-considered but it is true that certain tests must be conducted in other media. Hence an underground testing program, if it is to produce satisfactory results, must be larger in scope than an equivalent atmospheric program.

The plan was, as Mr. Kennedy announced last March, that "we will be conducting far fewer tests than the Soviets." Actually we attempted during 1962 about 103 shots—41 atmospheric, 2 underwater, 55 underground, 2 joint United States-United Kingdom underground, and 3 at high altitude, of which 2 were failures—but apparently less than a handful were genuinely high-yield tests. If the two Soviet test series of 1961 and 1962 are compared with our tests since the rupture of the moratorium, it appears that the Soviets detonated about 90 devices, including 25 of high yield, while the United States shot about 115 devices, with an absolute minimum of explosions in the megaton range.

Naturally, the number of Soviet tests as announced by USAEC must be considered to be a minimum figure: AEC may have missed a few shots, and it may not have announced all it knew; in particular, their figures do not include more than one Soviet underground shot. In the absence of a detailed analysis, one might infer (perhaps quite wrongly) that in general, progress in both countries probably was about even. However, with a high degree of confidence one could conclude that the Soviets now enjoy a lead in the capability of designing high-yield weapons.

To control the amount of radioactivity released during test series by testing underground, is neither unwise nor undesirable. The simple fact, however, is that the significance of tests with no holds barred is considerably higher than of those tests where one of the main intentions is just to go through the motions, and to advance physics rather than weaponry. I do not know whether the Soviets or we progressed farther during 1962, but to judge from the manner in which the two test series were conducted, the Soviets should have achieved substantially greater improvements in their relative strategic position.

Who now has nuclear superiority?

The possibility that there might now be in process a reversal in the strategic balance of power was spelled out with great clarity by Adm. Chester C. Ward on February 8, 1963, in his statement to the GOP conference committee on nuclear testing. He asserted that the Soviet weight-to-yield ratio which before 1961 had been about twice ours, by 1963 had leap-frogged over our capability. Irrespective of what the exact figures are, our previous lead, it is generally agreed, has diminished and may be disappearing. The Soviet weight-to-yield improvement apparently was particularly impressive in the large and superyield categories. Admiral Ward deduces from this fact that the Soviet stockpile of 1961 which was estimated at 20,000 megatons, in theory, could be reworked without addition of any new nuclear materials, into a stockpile of far larger dimensions. It is well to observe that a stockpile, to be militarily effective, must be deliverable. But it is also important to realize that the Soviets, through their test ban strategy, are attempting a reversal in the global nuclear power contest. They are aiming at superior nuclear efficiency, and through a technological quantum jump, at a vast enlargement of their weapons stockpile, as expressed in terms of megatons.

It is most discouraging, to say the least, that prior to ordering the temporary cessation of underground tests on January 26, 1963, neither the President, nor the Secretary of Defense, nor the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, felt a need to report to the Nation about the nuclear events of the past year. They did not disclose any information, let alone exact data, as to whether, as a result of the recent American tests, our lead which had become narrower by the end of 1961, again had been increased in American favor. If our advances had been spectacular, perhaps a temporary and very short suspension of our tests would have little meaning, even though the President stated in March 1962: "The basic lesson of some 3 years and 353 negotiating sessions at Geneva is this—that the Soviets will not agree to an effective ban * * * as long as * * * a new uninspected moratorium or a new agreement without controls, would enable them once again to prevent the West from testing while they prepare in secret."

The United States, on January 20, 1963, had again discontinued testing at a moment when the Soviets had done all the testing they planned to do and needed the time to digest the information. That this decision was based upon another misreading of Soviet intentions appeared speedily and on February 1, 1963, resumption of testing was ordered. But complicated programs cannot be turned off and on like water without falling to pieces. Nuclear security is not an area for playing a diplomatic cat-and-mouse game.

CHAPTER II

The test ban: a Soviet strategy for unilaterally disarming the West

There is a widespread assumption throughout the United States, and particularly among scientists, that the Soviet Union presently pursues a policy of "peaceful coexistence" and that this term means to the Soviets an attitude of live-and-let-live with the United States. Even if this is the correct interpretation, it does not follow that a test ban is desirable. The present policies of the Kremlin cannot be considered to be permanent. Technology continues to advance and requires constant endeavor.

"Peaceful coexistence"

But this wishful interpretation of peaceful coexistence is quite inaccurate. In his speech of January 6, 1961, for example, Khrushchev stated that peaceful coexistence, among other things "helps * * * the forces struggling for socialism, and in capitalist countries it facilitates the activities of Communist parties * * * it helps the national liberation movement to gain successes." Peaceful coexistence, according to the very architect of that strategy, "implies intensification of the struggle of the working class, of all the Communist parties, for the triumph of Socialist ideas." It is "a form of intense economic, political, and ideological struggle of the proletariat against the aggressive forces of imperialism in the international arena." "Peaceful coexistence of states does not imply renunciation of the class struggle * * * the coexistence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism."

Khrushchev summed up the essence of his current strategy as follows: "The policy of peaceful coexistence is a policy of mobilizing the masses and launching vigorous action against the enemies of peace."

The Communist magazine National Affairs Monthly (February 1955) made the point very explicit by saying: "peaceful coexistence does not take away from the right of the peoples to change their governments * * * but presupposes this right. The idea that peaceful coexistence must include the maintenance of the status quo is imperialist propaganda."

"Sincere" disarmament

Another widespread illusion is that the Soviets want disarmament "sincerely." The Communists are indeed very sincere about desiring U.S. disarmament but they don't have the slightest intention of disarming themselves. It is patently unfair to accuse the Communists of insincerity in these matters because they did state what they want very clearly. Insincerity, by contrast, must be ascribed to those Americans who deliberately ignore the Communist message.

The Communist doctrine on war and disarmament has been entirely consistent since the times of Marx and Engels. For the Soviet Union the doctrine was laid down explicitly by Lenin. For example, in 1916, Lenin stated: "Only after the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie will it be able, without betraying its world historical mission, to throw all armaments on the scrap heap." In 1917, he said: "We are no pacifists * * * we have always declared that it would be stupid if the revolutionary proletariat promised not to wage revolutionary wars which might become indispensable in the interest of socialism."

In 1928, the resolutions of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International disclosed: "The aim of the Soviet proposals (for general and complete disarmament submitted in November 1927) is * * * to propagate the fundamental Marxian postulates that disarmament and the abolition of war are possible only with the fall of capitalism."

In the same vein, Khrushchev, during the 20th party congress in 1956, made this interesting "dialectic" statement: "Putting into effect a policy of peace our party considers it to be its most important duty to strengthen untiringly the gallant and glory-covered armed forces of the Soviet state—our army, navy, and air force; equip them with the latest technology * * *."

On October 20, 1960, Khrushchev spoke about the need to "force" the capitalist countries to come to an agreement on disarmament. Similarly, at a meeting of representatives of 81 Communist parties, in December 1960, the directive was laid down that "an active determined struggle" had to be waged to "force the imperialists into an agreement on general disarmament."

In his speech of January 6, 1961, Khrushchev quoted Lenin to the effect that it was necessary to establish "contacts with those circles of the bourgeoisie who gravitate toward pacifism." A Russo-German military dictionary published in 1962 by the Military Academy of Communist East Germany defined liberal pacifism as "impotent peace sentimentality" which serves to bemuse the masses. It adds: "The Communists have never been pacifists" but "fight against unjust wars and support, with all means, just wars." The current world peace movement, the dictionary avers, is different from "pacifism" in that it conducts an "active offensive struggle against the danger of war. The best elements among the pacifists support the world peace movement. Imperialist agents are attempting to carry pacifism into the Socialist countries * * * to weaken their defensive power. Therefore pacifism is fought energetically in the Socialist countries."

On January 6, 1961, Khrushchev made points which should be remembered by every American: "The struggle for disarmament * * * is an effective struggle against imperialism." This struggle is also "an active struggle against imperialism" but above all, it is an active struggle "for restricting its military potentialities."

In the very next sentence, after he explained that the purpose of the Communist disarmament policy is to weaken the military power of the United States (this is a translation into English of Khrushchev's "Aesopian" version that disarmament is an active struggle to restrict the military potentialities of imperialism), he insisted that "peoples must do everything to achieve the prohibition and destruction of atomic weapons." The achievement of both a nuclear test ban and the cessation of production of nuclear materials have been assigned as a high priority objective to the Communist world movement since 1956. Can a Communist objective really be in U.S. interest? Did they err in assuming the test ban agitation serves their purposes? Or are we wrong in thinking it helps our cause?

Perhaps the clearest statement was made by Khrushchev to the World Congress on General Disarmament and Peace on July 10, 1962: "The struggle for general disarmament facilitates the struggle for national independence. For their part the successes of the national liberation movements strengthen the cause of peace, contribute to strengthening the struggle for disarmament. Disarmament means disarmament of the forces of war, the liquidation of militarism." The meaning of the last sentence is again that the U.S. should be disarmed but not the U.S.S.R.

"Just" war

In his recent book on military strategy, marshal of the Soviet Union, V. D. Sokolovsky specifically argued that the invention of nuclear weapons in no way changed the character of war. He opposed the contention that nuclear war was unthinkable and that war no longer could be considered as the continuation of politics by forceful means. According to the Sokolovsky book, war remains an instrument of politics, a concept which, incidentally, coincides closely with Mao Tse-tung's dictum: "Whether shields and spears are used as in ancient times, or modern weapons, the objective of warfare remains the same."

In brief, as V. Cherpakov, a representative of the Soviet Ministry of National Defense expressed it in 1954, "Communists link the cause of peace with the cause of victory of the proletarian revolution." Lenin originally defined the purpose of Soviet disarmament policy as being to disarm the bourgeoisie and arm the proletariat. Khrushchev, in January 1961, phrased it slightly differently: "The slogan of the struggle for peace does not contradict the slogan of the struggle for communism."

These statements must be read with the understanding that the Soviets firmly adhere to the doctrine of "just war," i.e., of wars fought to overthrow "oppressing classes," are legitimate and may have to be fought. The above quoted dictionary states that a "distinction of the character of war according to its conduct (offensive or defensive war) is false." It also avers that "just wars" occur particularly frequently in our modern era and clarifies the key point: if it were to come to a war between "imperialism" and the "socialist camp," this war would end "inevitably with the victory of socialism and the complete liquidation of imperialism. It would be the last war in history, on the part of socialism the most just, and on the part of imperialism the most unjust of all wars."

In October 1962, the World Marxist Review, the theoretical organ of world communism, wrote that "general disarmament does not mean disarming the peoples fighting for national liberation. On the contrary, it would deprive the imperialists of the means to halt progress and crush the struggle for independence * * * disarmed, the imperialists would be powerless to prevent the people from attaining freedom. Disarmament primarily means dismantling the gigantic war machines of the highly developed countries," i.e., the United States.

It should be emphasized that these quotes are just a sample and could be multiplied virtually ad infinitum. The wishful notion that the Soviets have abandoned all intentions to go to war against the United States just cannot be supported by any dependable evidence.

"THE TEST BAN: AN AMERICAN STRATEGY OF GRADUAL SELF-MUTILATION"—CHAPTERS III AND IV, BY STEFAN T. POSSONY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert at this point in the RECORD, chapters III and IV of an article entitled "The Test Ban: An American Strategy of Gradual Self-Mutilation" by Stefan T. Possony, of the Hoover Institution:

CHAPTER III

The test ban: A Soviet strategy for military superiority

At this stage of the game, the Soviet Union is not yet in a position to carry through its plans for world conquest or, to put it differently, to complete the world revolution. The ultimate victory of communism necessitates the elimination of the United States as a military power, preferably through surrender but through nuclear war if otherwise unattainable.

Surrender cannot possibly be achieved unless and until the Soviet Union acquires a vast qualitative and quantitative preponderance in nuclear firepower, means of delivery and defensive weapons. Nuclear war cannot possibly be waged, let alone won, by the Soviet Union against the United States unless the Soviet forces are militarily vastly superior and in particular capable of inflicting heavy initial destruction on, or even crippling U.S. retaliatory forces by means of a nuclear surprise attack, as well as fending off and absorbing any strikes by residual American capabilities.

To achieve a posture where, by one means or the other, the Soviets can impose their will on the United States and the rest of the world, they must yet accomplish considerable advances in nuclear weapons systems. Marshal Sokolovsky's book is permeated by the twin ideas that modern conflict is nuclear in character and that it is necessary for the Soviets to win the technological race. He emphasized that the "appearance of qualitatively new types of weapons and war materiel and their rapid introduction into the armed forces" is a distinguishing feature of modern war and concluded that "the armed forces of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries must be prepared, above all, to wage war under the conditions of massive use of atomic weapons by both belligerent parties."

In connection with U.S. reluctance to share nuclear weapons with our allies and our inclination rather to risk the destruction of NATO than the "proliferation" of nuclear weapons, note Sokolovsky's reference to the "other Socialist countries." This passage seems to indicate that the Soviets may be willing to "share" their nuclear weapons with at least some of their satellites. The Russo-German military dictionary also dealt with this problem and stated, somewhat ambiguously, that the U.S.S.R. is compelled "to produce the most modern nuclear arms and to equip with those weapons the Socialist armed forces for the defense of the Socialist camp."

According to Sokolovsky, nuclear weapons which achieve "incomparably better results than ordinary means of destruction * * *

can be used for the solution of problems on every scale: strategic, operational, and tactical." His conclusion is: "The correct and profoundly scientific solution of all the theoretical and practical questions related to the preparation and waging of just such a war (nuclear war) must be regarded as the main task of the theory of military strategy and strategic leadership."

There are, of course, numerous statements indicating that Soviet scientists are fully alive to the potentialities of rapidly advancing nuclear technology, including statements showing their awareness of revolutionary new approaches like neutron bombs and even particle annihilation. Soviet awareness of the feasibility and utility of neutron bombs dates back to 1952. V. S. Yemilyanov, member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, a strong influence within the Soviet nuclear program, and director of Glavstom, the Soviet AEC, between 1960 and 1962, suggested in Izvestiya on August 31, 1961, that if it were feasible to bring about particle annihilation, for example by "uniting the proton and the antiproton" and thus transforming the particle mass completely into radiation, the highest release of energy would be accomplished, "approximately a thousand times greater than through thermonuclear fusion." There is no point in viewing this particular theoretical statement with alarm. The quote is given merely to illustrate the direction of Soviet thinking, not to suggest that the Soviets are presently embarked upon a program of particle annihilation. By contrast, there is every reason to assume that they are busy developing the neutron bomb.

The Soviets are indeed sincere in pushing the test ban—as a stratagem to slow down American technological progress, nuclear and nonnuclear, in order to facilitate the winning of the technological race by the Soviets. It is inevitable that a decline in the rate of nuclear progress will affect the design of all delivery and defense systems.

It is true that as compared with the first round of the test moratorium, a simple verbal commitment no longer seems acceptable to the United States. This point was stressed by the President last spring. Consequently, to slow down American nuclear programs again, Khrushchev may be prepared to make a slight concession in the hope of achieving a second moratorium round. The Soviets intimated that they would allow three—or perhaps only two?—inspections and the installation of detection equipment at three points selected by the Soviets themselves. In 1958, Soviet and Western scientists envisaged a quota of 27 inspections and 21 monitoring stations. It is a foregone conclusion that an inspection system acceptable to the Soviets will be in no position to inspect anything of importance, let alone verify that no clandestine testing is taking place.

A careful reading of Khrushchev's communications to President Kennedy leaves some doubt as to what the Soviet Union is ready to "give." In his letter of January 7, 1963, he stated: "We believe and we continue to believe now that, in general, inspection is not necessary and if we give our consent to an annual quota or two or three inspections this is done solely for the purpose of removing the remaining differences for the sake of reaching agreement." However, in his letter of December 19, 1962, Khrushchev referred to "Ambassador Dean's statement, the United States would also be prepared to work out measures which would rule out any possibility of carrying on espionage under the cover of these inspection trips including such measures as the use of Soviet planes piloted by Soviet crews for transportation of inspectors to the sites, screening of windows in the planes, prohibition to carry photocameras, etc."

And again in his second letter, Khrushchev wrote: "Of course, in carrying out on-site inspection there can be circumstances when in the area designated for inspection there will be some object of defense importance. Naturally, in such a case it will be necessary to take appropriate measures which would exclude a possibility to cause damage to the interests of security of the state on the territory of which inspection is carried out."

Assuming that the verification of a cheat explosion would damage the "interests of security" of the U.S.S.R., it would appear that the inspectors will not be allowed entry to the places were evasions have occurred and can be confirmed.

Whether or not the Soviets will, for a long period of time, cheat, for example underground, or at a time of their choosing resume atmospheric tests openly, is conjectural. The point which in terms of international law is of overriding significance is this: The Soviet Constitution specifically authorizes the Government of the Soviet Union to abrogate any international agreement or treaty at any time unilaterally (art. 49–0).

CHAPTER IV

The test ban: an American strategy for military inferiority

In times past, some American scientists have argued that, in the advance of nuclear weapons, a sort of a plateau was reached. In terms of nuclear efficiency, not too many additional improvements could be expected; moreover all, or practically all, bright design ideas which would be useful for weapons uses, already had been proposed. The possibility of further discovery and progress was not denied but the significance of such progress for U.S. security was questioned. Sometimes it was intimated that U.S. security would be served better if further progress were inhibited. Such ideas were propagated many years ago and set forth with considerable conviction during 1958. Undoubtedly, these same notions are repeated today, despite the fact that events disproved these expectations.

Even a cursory reading of technological history will show that basic inventions (like electricity or electronics) do not run their course within a 20-year timespan; the development curve of nuclear physics hardly will have a unique shape of its own, nor be the shortest of all major inventions.

If a scientist does not foresee possibilities of future developments, his contentions are in the nature of statements on his own limitations but cannot be considered as predictions of things to come.

Other scientists argued that the yield of nuclear weapons in the American arsenal has reached an upper limit of practical usefulness. This type of argument depends on many assumptions, few of which ever are made explicit. Surely, as the putative opponent hardens his installations to secure them against nuclear attack, yields must be increased to keep pace with such hardening. Yield requirements also depend, among other factors, on accuracy and on the strategy adopted. For example, a strategy designed to knock out cities can do with relatively low yields but a counterforce strategy, as announced by Mr. McNamara, needs rather hefty yields.

It is, of course, true that yields and numbers may be "traded off" against each other; and it may even be preferable to launch against a target 10 missiles with 10-megaton warheads each, instead of 1 missile with a 100-megaton warhead. But according to this arithmetic 10-megaton warheads and 10 missiles would be required. Naturally, we have no program to augment the number of our missiles to the enormous quantities needed to maintain an effective firepower balance, and even if this were the plan, we could not afford the cost. In addition, we are mostly buying missiles with warheads in the low megaton range. Perhaps one 100-megaton missile does not equal fifty 2-megaton missiles, but what is the ratio according to the administration? On a straight firepower basis, 2,000 Minutemen and Polaris with yields augmented through testing would be the equivalent of eighty 50-megaton Soviet missiles. In such a confrontation, we would be far more seriously deterred by fallout dangers than our opponent.

It is true that the overall cost of the superyield missile would be much higher, perhaps twice or three times as high as the cost of smaller missiles. Hardening, in particular, would call for very heavy expenditures. The Soviets, however, could dispense with hardening their large missiles, because presumably they would use them for a first strike, while we are obligated to keeping our missiles for retaliatory operations. The superyield missile also possesses the advantage of a very high single shot kill probability.

Against these reasons favoring increases in yield, the argument is customarily being made that increased accuracy would achieve the same result as the augmentation of yield. In other words, a bull's-eye with a 1-megaton missile may be more effective than a miss by 1 mile with a 100-megaton missile. Actually, for a 1-megaton missile to achieve the same kill effectiveness as a 100-megaton missile, its accuracy must be almost five times greater. For all practical purposes, this would mean that an intercontinental missile requires a CEP of around 1,000 feet. Accuracies of this order of magnitude are extremely hard to attain and they may require gear which would reduce the payload of the missile, in addition to greatly increasing its cost. It is generally admitted that improvements in accuracy above a CEP of 3,000–4,000 feet follow an asymptotic curve.

Thus, it is technologically far easier and economically far cheaper to improve the effectiveness of missiles by increasing yields, rather than by trying "shoot for the moon" in accuracy. If, in addition, accuracy should improve according to a normal growth curve, the effectiveness of a superyield weapon would be enhanced as a bonus.

It should be added that a superyield weapon, in a sense, anticipates the first generation of anti-missile missiles: the superyield weapon can be exploded at a very high altitude and still cause a great deal of damage. The small yield missile must be detonated at a far lower height over the target. If antimissiles force the height of burst upwards—the incoming missile would be set to explode before it is intercepted—the effect of the explosion would be negligible.

In any event, the Soviet Union clearly has embarked on a course of maximizing the yields of its warheads and bombs. Whether or not this is desirable, it is incumbent upon the United States to acquire the technological know-how and the equipments which would allow our forces to use yields at least as effective as the opponent. The "escalation" to our detriment from a lower to a higher level of nuclear violence, can be prevented only if U.S. yield and overall firepower capabilities exceed those of the U.S.S.R. The implied message of Khrushchev's speech of January 16, 1963 is this: a thermonuclear showdown with the United States is infeasible so long as ways have not been found to reduce substantially the amount of deliverable firepower held by the United States. Is it our intent to help Khrushchev solve the most crucial task confronting his strategy of world revolution?

Many scientists have argued the desirability of slowing down technological progress. There is indeed no doubt that if technology could be decelerated, weapon systems would obsolesce much more slowly and military expenditures could be reduced.

Unfortunately, technology is in the nature of an impersonal force. Hence it can be influenced only in a very limited fashion. Certainly, it is feasible deliberately to slow down one's own technology, for example by starving R. & D. budgets and stopping experimental physics in the form of a unilateral test ban. But such a unilateral decision does not necessarily influence the rate of technological progress in the Soviet Union. In fact, the European states, formerly the leaders in weapons technology, have slowed down almost to a standstill, but their security was not helped by this forbearance. They would have bet their independence if the United States had stepped out of the technological contest, too.

If we decelerate American technology now, the main result will be that the Soviet Union will achieve technological superiority which it can and will use to destroy the United States. Let us not forget that the Soviets operate in line with a command issued by Khrushchev as recently as January 16, 1963 at Berlin: "The duty of Communists at the helm of state power is to do everything possible to insure that our strength will grow."

It would be definitely to American advantage if, for example, Soviet advances in nuclear efficiency could be stopped. But if we were to enter into a test ban now—and assuming the test ban would work as expected by its proponents—we would be stabilizing a military situation which is most unfavorable for our strategy of not striking the first blow. The present technological situation favors aggression and renders defensive warfare almost unmanageable. Actually, if a test ban were consummated, we would only be making this situation worse by allowing the Soviets, through clandestine testing, to acquire strategic missiles and bombs with a higher effectiveness than our own. Whether Soviet knowledge of the effect of high altitude explosions facilitates their planning for a surprise attack or not, our lack of warheads most suitable for anti-ICBM weapons and the relative inefficiency, and cost, of our current tactical nuclear weapons would facilitate Soviet attack against the United States and Europe.

To put it differently: nuclear technology presently has produced the most potent offensive weapon systems of history. This brutal fact certainly does not stabilize the international situation. If, against the trends of the past two decades, we want to stabilize international life, we must be able to reduce the relative advantages of aggression. Hence it would not be to our benefit to decelerate or stop nuclear technological progress before some balance between the offense and the defense has been reestablished. By interfering with U.S. technological progress now, we facilitate a Soviet strategy of agression and expose ourselves to the danger of military defeat. Let us not forget that in his Berlin speech of January 16, 1963, Khrushchev reiterated one of the oldest points in Communist conflict doctrine, viz that "especially in countries which have suffered defeat, a favorable situation arises for the victory of the working class."

As we analyze official U.S. statements on recent Soviet test series, it appears that these were designed to improve existing nuclear technology. Their progress in the yield-to-weight ratio has given the Soviets two additional options and thereby that increased flexibility to which we pay lipservice: they can increase the yield of their individual weapons, both missile warheads and bombs, and they are able to utilize their improved nuclear efficiency, if they so desire, to reduce the size of their missiles, while preserving very significant yields. Since in addition, the Soviets have been using their recent tests to improve their antimissile capabilities, it is apparent that they are making considerable strides in augmenting the threat they are holding out against the United States. The United States, in turn, is in dire need of increasing the explosive strength of practically all its missiles, and it too has requirements for antimissile defense.

All this, however, has been, and still is in the nature of evolutionary improvements in existing technologies. To forgo technical progress which still can be achieved would be a far greater strategic sacrifice for the United States than for the Soviet Union, simply because we are operating, by and large, under a second strike nonaggressive strategy. But the crucial issue of the test ban revolves around a problem which is far more basic than a matter of mere evolutionary improvement. In the present period the issue is not whether we want to assure continued technological progress in abstracto, nor whether we can afford to stop experimental tests undertaken for the purpose of chance discovery. The specific question which is the guts of the test ban decision, is whether or not the United States should develop so-called neutron bombs and pure fusion weapons.

"THE TEST BAN: AN AMERICAN STRATEGY OF GRADUAL SELF-MUTILATION" CHAPTERS V AND VI, BY STEFAN T. POSSONY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Miller] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert at this point in the Record chapters V and VI of an article entitled "The Test Ban: An American Strategy of Gradual Self-Mutilation," by Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institution:

CHAPTER V

The test ban and the neutron bomb

For years, a great deal of misinformation has been propagated about the neutron technology. It is remarkable, to say the least, that opponents of the neutron development—and they are more or less the same people who opposed the H-bomb and otherwise have excelled by "cautious advice"—have been very vociferous, whereas the scientists with firsthand knowledge on the subject have been unable to speak out or even to correct false and falsified information.

It has been suggested, for example, that the neutron bomb could not be perfected for nearly half a century; that even if the scientific problem could be licked, no useful weapons that would be light and compact enough for practical use could be developed; that, even if a weapon were available, it would have barely any military use; and that it would be very easy to achieve protection against neutron weapons.

It is patently impossible to state with finality when a weapon development will be completed, and to predict exact design and performance characteristics, before the weapon has been tested, developed, and perfected. The optimist is not always right, and the pessimist not always wrong. It is nevertheless incredible that supposedly responsible people are setting forth arguments for which there is no basis in fact. This observer, for one, has gained the conviction that many of these evaluations of future weapons do not reflect professional knowledge and judgment but rather emanate from political considerations, notably from wishful thinking on how the conflict with the Soviets could be settled.

It is remarkable that, despite the fact that a debate on the neutron bomb has been going on for some time, the Government has not seen fit to publish basic information on the subject.[1] Thus, as of 1963 we have presented to the American people less information regarding it than Soviet scientists presented as of 1958 to the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy at Geneva. The fundamental design idea of the neutron bomb was explained by the Russian physicist L. A. Artsimovich, who also disclosed that the Soviets apparently were interested in this technology as early as 1952. Here is his explanation:

"A pulsed thermonuclear reaction may also be possible under conditions when a high temperature is reached during the compression and implosion produced by a charge of conventional explosives (such as TNT or something more powerful) surrounding a capsule of deuterium or a mixture of deuterium and tritium."

In simple terms: an atomic bomb is a device by which an explosion is achieved through the fission of uranium, plutonium or perhaps thorium; the hydrogen bomb is a device by which an explosion is obtained through the fusion of hydrogen, brought about initially through a fission explosion; a neutron bomb is a device by which an explosion is accomplished through the fusion of the heavy isotopes of hydrogen, namely deuterium and tritium. If the fusion of the heavy hydrogen isotopes is achieved without initial fission, but by nonnuclear means we would have an all-fusion weapon.

The term "neutron bomb" refers to the fact that unlike fission and fission-fusion bombs, which produce mostly heat and blast, the energy released from the fusion of the heavy hydrogen isotopes will be largely in the form of neutrons. A Soviet colonel by name of M. Pavlov has given more exact data:

"In the reaction of the nuclear fission of uranium or plutonium, the neutron flow comprises about 1 percent of the total weight of the nuclear charge. The kinetic energy of the neutrons accounts for only 3 percent of the total energy of the explosion. * * * In a thermonuclear bomb * * * as much as 20 to 33 percent of the total weight of the nuclear charge is used in the creation of a neutron flow and a considerable part of the energy of the nuclear explosion is accounted for by the kinetic energy of the neutrons."

The neutron weapon is therefore different in kind from other nuclear weapons, not only because it has an entirely different ratio between heat, blast, and radiation, but also becaus it differs in the nature of the radiation and in the penetrating power of the released neutrons.

The neutron weapon kills people and except in the area of immediate impact, does not destroy equipment, installations or housing. Another characteristic of this weapon is that on a yield-by-yield basis, its effectiveness against personnel extends over a greater radius than that of other nuclear weapons. Hence the yields needed to incapacitate targets can be reduced, in practically all cases by one order of magnitude or better.

In addition, the weapon does not result in uncontrolled fallout which, it is generally agreed, would be the main cause of the ultimate cost of nuclear war. More specifically, it would cause very little genetic damage and it would result in a low disability rate, i.e. most of those casualties who escape death would have a full recovery.

The neutron weapon would allow conducting operations with great accuracy, making it possible to reduce the losses among the civilian population. The most basic cause of military destructiveness and the long duration of military conflicts always has been that in order to kill enemy troops, the surrounding territory had to be flattened, and weapons and logistics had to be destroyed. With the neutron weapon, much of this traditional requirement for destruction can be ignored. To destroy a company in a ditch, it will no longer be necessary to destroy an entire village; and to stop production in a factory, it will no longer be unavoidable to flatten an entire town.

It is true that protection against the neutron weapon can be developed; protection is always forthcoming ultimately. For the time being, however, the neutron bomb will have the upper hand over protective materials and measures that would be available on a battlefield. It is interesting to note that some of those who argue that defense against A and H-weapons is impossible, view the chances of protection against N-weapons very optimistically. Protection against neutrons is harder to come by, even in a normal fallout shelter.

The fact that through the accurate employment of neutron bombs casualties can be more or less restricted to the military force and that industries and cities may escape being smashed up, naturally would allow faster and more effective reconstruction after the war.

Mr. William C. Foster, Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, stated that "pure fusion weapons would not be of great advantage to us because they would constitute primarily a cheaper substitute for the explosive component in our already large stockpile of nuclear weapons." The above listing of some of the characteristics of the neutron bomb would indicate that a neutron device would be considerably more than just a "cheaper substitute" for existing weapons, but would be a new weapon with entirely new use patterns and effects. It should not be forgotten that this weapon would have features which, to the extent that any weapon can be "attractive," would be considerably more attractive from the humane point of view than existing fission and fusion weapons.

It is no minor matter by any means whether weapons are cheaper or more expensive. Perhaps it is true that cost reduction (if this were the only advantage to be gained from the neutron device) would be of marginal utility for our strategic systems. But this would certainly not be the case of our tactical weapons requirements; let alone of the requirements for air and missile defense which, if the statistics of past wars are any guide, will be very large. To turn this around: if we could combine in our missile defenses accuracy with large numbers we would possess so strong a defensive position that a Soviet first-strike strategy may become impractical. What is so wrong about this?

Moreover, the question of cheapness has a great bearing on the effectiveness of the NATO alliance. The United States should not be surprised to discover that our allies are getting somewhat restless when we base our technological policies on this sort of reasoning. What may be a minor economic advantage for us may mean the political survival of many of our friends as independent nations. It should be obvious that all-fusion weapons are economically far closer within the reach of Western Europe than fission and fission-fusion weapons, that they are well suited for European conditions, and that they would really improve the defense of Europe. If this is true, then it also is obvious that decisions on neutron weapons should not be made unilaterally by the United States.

The military significance of the neutron bomb has been deprecated by comments to the effect that it would have only tactical applicability and that we already are well provided for with tactical weapons. Disregarding the fact that the neutron device probably will be particularly effective in antimissile defense, it is surely incorrect to state that the tactical nuclear weapons we now have are adequate in numbers and performance. With the present technology which is ruled by the requirement of the "critical mass," low-yield weapons are extremely costly and can be achieved only through the deliberate prevention of a higher yield for a given amount of fissile material, i.e., a low yield is achieved by willfully reducing efficiency. Cost price of present nuclear weapons is largely independent of yield; a lower yield and a higher yield weapon come at about the same price.

But let us assume our present tactical arsenal were adequate and let us even assume that there were enough tactical weapons to equip, in case of war, our allies and fight on for a while. The full utilization of our present weapons, even if we restrict ourselves to relatively low yields, would create considerable havoc in densely populated areas. I do not think that a weapon which inflicts unnecessary casualties on friendly or even hostile populations is very desirable, nor does it help to further good relations among allies. I can only marvel at the strange logic of those who, in the name of humanism, oppose the development of a weapon like the neutron bomb.

But let us for a moment suppose that the Soviets have neutron weapons and we do not, and let us suppose that the Soviets are attacking Western Europe. An enemy in possession of neutron technology would have no trouble appearing on the battlefield with 10 or a 100 times more tactical weapons than we would have available. These weapons would come in a greater variety of yield but most of them within the lower spectrum of yields, and the cost of each weapon would be proportionate to the yield. The owner of the neutron weapon thus would possess vast numerical superiority and greater tactical versatility, and his armed forces would be far less vulnerable than those of his opponent. In addition, the use of neutron devices by the Soviets would make a great deal of sense because it would allow them to conquer Europe pretty much intact.

Our first encounter with a Soviet force unilaterally equipped with neutron weapons probably would lead to a rather catastrophic defeat because our troops would suffer from tactical and technological surprise. If we want to recoup and resist, we would have no other choice but escalate the conflict. If we started with conventional weapons only, we probably would be compelled to use weapons in the 10 to 100 kiloton range, and if we started with tactical atomic weapons, we might have to decide to move into the full strategic exchange. In the words of Professor Dyson, "any country which renounces for itself the development of nuclear weapons, without certain knowledge that its adherents have done the same is likely to find itself in the position of the Polish Army in 1939, fighting tanks with horses." The hapless Poles had little choice in the matter, but we are picking a strategy of inferiority deliberately.

It is a grave mistake to think that the neutron bomb has no applicability to strategic warfare. Neutron weapons are perfectly adaptable to strategic and massive operations. They would allow both a very effective "selective bombing" campaign in the style of World War II (but with a firepower suitable to a conflict in the present technological era), and they could also be used for "city busting" and a genocidal strategy. The point is that the present hydrogen technology precludes the selective bombing approach and forces everybody else into a strategy of across-the-board destruction. The neutron technology, by contrast, would increase our flexibility and greatly reduce the probability of a holocaust conflict. There would be more and better options.

It would make sense for the Soviets, in an aggressive war against the United States, to use superyield devices as counterforce weapons to knock out our retaliatory capabilities, and to follow up the disarming strike with selective attacks with neutron weapons against segments of our population. The main advantage for the Soviets of this strategy would be that while the United States is knocked out, the American industrial plants would remain intact and be available to the victor. At the same time, a neutron strategy on the continent would allow the seizure of the European industrial plant. Thus, the Communists would avoid a Pyrrhic victory. Even if Soviet industry were smashed by our residual retaliation, the Communists, despite nuclear war, would be in possession of the wherewithal needed to rule the world. Hence, it is to be expected that the Soviets will make every effort to equip themselves with the neutron weapon. We cannot, for that matter, be sure they are not yet in possession of a neutron capability.

This argument can be spun out endlessly but it seems self-evident that the new technology opens vast new horizons and for the nation which does not possess these weapons, poses enormous dangers of technological surprise. However, one of the most interesting aspects of this development is that the new nuclear technology does not continue the trend toward greater destructiveness and greater human loss. In fact, it reverses this trend and does so not by a futile program trying to go back to the weapons of McKinley and the troglodytes, but by moving forward with the clock of history.

It is, of course, easy to argue that the neutron technology should be resisted because it would make war again more manageable and hence more "thinkable." But responsible statesmen cannot operate with sophistry of this type. They must assume that, under certain circumstances, their best efforts to preserve peace will fail and that if a war has to be fought, it is preferable to fight it with highly effective weapons which allow to keep down the cost of human suffering and material damage, instead of with weapons which are far more destructive than necessary but not necessarily more effective than weapons which could be used instead. Flexibility is one of our announced strategic goals—here is a way to achieve this objective.

If the United States were to sign a test ban treaty, it would ipso facto renounce the development of the neutron bomb. As matters stand today, our neutron development proceeds at a pace slower than necessary or prudent. In view of the fact that the Soviets have known about the neutron bomb design principles for at least 11 years, this development should be accelerated to the maximum extent possible. But if we were to sign the test ban, we also would institute a so-called control system which, according to the most liberal interpretations of the treaty's present stipulations, would be entirely ineffective in preventing the Soviets from developing the neutron weapon through clandestine testing.

CHAPTER VI

The test ban: A cheater's paradise

In addition to many overriding strategical considerations militating against the test ban, the proposed control scheme will founder on numerous technical and practical difficulties. To begin with, there is no definition of the term "testing" and "test."

---

[1] An American blackout of the discussion on space flight preceded the surprise ascent of sputnik in 1957.

An international agreement on a subject which remains undefined can only lead to trouble.

During the past moratorium, the United States operated most of the time under the most restrictive possible definition of testing. We could have been entitled, within the spirit of gentlemanly behavior, to adopt a sensible definition. But as soon as we engage in a venture we consider "progressive" we lose, temporarily, all sense of proportion. This is a bit of national psychology which has great bearing on the problem.

There is no doubt that the Soviets did adopt an entirely different definition—one which allows them maximal freedom of action—and they would again operate under the most permissive definition. Unless this particular confusion were straightened out, a test ban agreement would work to the detriment of the United States, even if the Soviets did not cheat and just continued their nuclear "experiments" up to the yield which, in their judgment, constitutes the borderline between a "test" and an "experiment."

There is not much argument that nuclear explosions in the open atmosphere can be detected with standard equipment. It usually is overlooked, however, that the probability of detection varies with several factors, including yield and altitude of the shot, the amount of radioactivity thrown out, topographical conditions of the area, distance from the test equipment, etc.

While it would be imprudent for a violator to carry out high yield tests in the open atmosphere, a good possibility exists that relatively low yield tests of clean weapons may go undetected and that effective concealment techniques may be developed for some types of shots. Furthermore, tests undertaken in remote areas, such as oceans in the southern hemisphere, though they may be "detected" in a fashion, probably would provide only ambiguous instrument readings.

With respect to space shots, the launching of a space vehicle may or may not be detected. This depends, among other things, on intelligence capabilities: no provisos for this type of detection would be included in a test ban agreement. Depending on altitude, the explosion may or may not be discovered by optical and electromagnetic gear. A detection system in space might conceivably scoop up or record the presence of radioactive debris. Yet this detection of radioactivity could be made known to observers on the earth only by telemetry which is ambiguous evidence; or else the space vehicle must be recoverable.

To put it mildly, the capability to detect space shots at present is strictly circumscribed. Though we are planning to make five shots to install a space detection system, such a system does not exist now and may never exist. Space is very large and the probability of detection obviously depends on the distance of the control vehicle from the explosion, the yield of that explosion, and environmental conditions. The would-be violator would know the exact characteristics of the control orbits and hence would be able to plan his shots with a view toward minimum detectability. In any event, the effectiveness of a satellite system would have to be tested out experimentally before we can place any figure of reliability upon it—but this presupposes several nuclear space shots which would be outlawed by the test ban.

It is generally admitted that the detection of underground shots is most difficult and in many ways a matter of chance. Recently, the Government has issued much publicity advertising alleged progress in the technology for detecting underground explosions. There is no reason to doubt that such progress has been made although it is strange that the Government has exercised strong censorship to prevent dissenting voices from being heard. Moreover, the releases were couched in vague language.

But just as the art of detection is making progress, so the art of cheating could make progress, too, and undoubtedly is making such progress in the U.S.S.R. The technologies of detection and concealment are in a see-saw race, with the latter still enjoying a very considerable lead. Whoever concentrates more brains, efforts and resources on this problem, whether the detector or the violator will gain an advantage. Without going into any details, let it be stated that if the would-be violator has a good knowledge of the performance characteristics of the detection system, he always will possess a superior capability to conceal clandestine tests.

Depending on definitions of testing, there may be arguments on whether very low yield explosions are really tests or just experiments. It may be possible to accommodate significant explosions in metal containers and certainly it is feasible to combine the techniques of container testing with those of underground testing. Whether the violator will go to any lengths to insure secrecy for such experiments is debatable, but it is apparent that laboratory experimentation up to the high fractional kiloton level can be conducted undetected quite easily.

It is true, on the other hand, that the very existence of a detection system would force the violator to forego certain types of tests and to place restrictions on others. This may or may not be a handicap to him, but it is to be presumed that if a test ban were to last for 10 or more years, the main result would be that the technology of the violator would be deflected into directions different from those which would be followed in the absence of a detection system. To make this point more specific: a test ban would virtually assure that the Soviets will develop neutron weapons.

Verification is more difficult and in some ways more important than detection. Yet it is rarely discussed. Verification is that portion of a test ban arrangement through which an accusation of violation is proved or disproved. For example, the American detection system would be alerted, by instrument readings, to a possible underground shot in the Soviet Union. Thereupon inspectors would be sent to the probable place of the explosion, where they would "inspect," dig for radioactive samples and other evidence, and ultimately find the radioactive debris. Through this radioactive corpus delicti it would be "verified" that the Soviet Union, indeed, had violated the agreement. If by contrast, no radioactive sample is found, the accusation must be dismissed.

However, lack of incontestable evidence by no means constitutes proof that no violation has taken place. Should the detection system receive indicators of suspect events and should the inspectorate fail to uncover verificatory evidence, there would be a great deal of confusion and apprehension which could lead easily to an international crisis.

The verification of shots in the atmosphere over land usually is deemed to be simple. But is it? Disregarding the fact that vast tracts of land may not be accessible to the inspectors (e.g. China), the verification of an explosion probably can be prevented without too much trouble. The nuclear test device may have been dropped from an airplane, and not be exploded from installations on the ground. It may have been shot in by missile from a distant launch point and exploded over a "proving ground," which is nothing but a set of measurement instruments. The measurement equipment can be withdrawn, within a few hours, by trucks and helicopters. Moreover, the shot need not leave any residual radioactivity.

If after such a carefully planned event the inspectors arrive on the scene, perhaps after 2 or 3 days which would be early, they might find a single depression on the ground. This depression hardly would constitute evidence, even if it could be proved that it did not exist 1 week earlier. But there may be no depression at all.

If the device was missile-fired, inspection of the launch site—provided it is identified—might indeed indicate that it has a store of nuclear weapons. But so what? Any missile site must be provided with warheads. For that matter, the inspectors would not be allowed even close to the missile base and they certainly would not be allowed to inspect its books and installations. The violator also may claim that the missile was fired from a foreign base and that the shot actually constituted an act of aggression. There is no limit to this sort of skulduggery.

Take, for example, atmospheric shots fired by submarines at sea. Suppose a Soviet submarine fires a test device in the South Atlantic and suppose that within 3 or 4 days enough evidence, including radioactive air samples, is available suggesting that an explosion did occur. Suppose that the exact location of the explosion can be determined. If the inspectors were to go to the place of the explosion, it would be impossible for them to find any evidence: they would find the ocean in the same shape as an ocean is always found. But the radioactivity, if any, would have been long dispersed. To catch the violator it would be necessary to discover the submarine and force it to surface, which is an impractical proposition. It seems unnecessary to spin out this case further; verification of overwater shots indeed is far from certain.

Currently there is no feasible method of verifying explosions in space. If the Soviets were to launch a space vehicle and explode a nuclear device, at not too great a distance, the United States might gain a good notion of what was going on. But we would not possess the type of evidence which "would stand up in court," assuming that we could make public use of the evidence we have. Hence, we would be reluctant to move, just as during the Cuban crisis, Washington did not move before there was clear photographic evidence of the presence of Soviet missiles.

With respect to the verification of underground shots, the situation is that in order to get at the radioactive debris caused by an underground nuclear explosion, the location of the presumed event must be pinpointed with extraordinary accuracy. Once the inspectors are in place, it would be necessary to start digging through an area of tens or even hundreds of square miles. All kinds of fascinating calculations can be made to determine the probable number of man-days required for digging and drilling until the debris is actually discovered. However, unless telltale clues of test preparation are discovered, it is clear that the discovery of the debris is clearly a matter of chance and a very small one at that. Naturally, an inspectoral team may discover all sorts of circumstantial evidence confirming the indicators received from the detection system. But such sort of ambiguous evidence simply does not constitute valid verification.

Actually, it would be relatively simple to "discover" all kinds of "evidence" which are not there. As soon as there were some evidence on Soviet cheating, we can rest assured that they would find "evidence" of U.S. cheating. The violator has at his disposal numerous political tactics to vitiate any attempt at verification, and it can be predicted safely, on the basis of past United States and Soviet performances, that after one or two tries, inspection will fade out of business.

Undoubtedly, if indicators multiply, suggesting continuous cheating, the most cooperative signatories to the test ban will be forced to react. Theoretically, they can

decide upon "sanctions" but in practice they have few alternatives but to resume testing themselves. Since their reaction will be sluggish and since furthermore the violator will have made allowance in his plans that he might be found out, he will have arranged things in such a manner that he maximizes his time advantages.

If the cheating starts at a moment when the cheater and the noncheater enjoy technological parity, the violator, without too much trouble, may gain a lead of 2 to 3 years. If this advance were achieved during a period when, for one reason or the other, war is ruled out, the violator would have gained only a temporary advantage. However, the violator may be preparing for aggression and may have readied his weapon systems in such a way that he can rapidly incorporate the most up-to-date nuclear devices. If then he restricts his tests to the proofing of radical designs, he can arm his delivery means with the types of warheads which the tests showed to be most successful. Ingenuity and careful planning should go a long way toward rendering the violation of the test ban militarily productive.

The effectiveness of the test ban stratagem can be seen more clearly if we assume that concealment techniques have advanced to such a point that clandestine underground testing will, in fact, not be detected, let alone verified. If after a long series of clandestine shots, the violator openly abrogates the test ban treaty by full-yield atmospheric proof tests, and at the same time checks the reliability of his existing weapon systems, he may be able to secure nuclear preponderance and insure maximum effectiveness of his first strike.

Intelligently employed, the test ban stratagem of conceal and surprise could prove to be decisive for the outcome of the war, or even for success of the ultimatum: "Surrender or die."

"THE TEST BAN: AN AMERICAN STRATEGY OF GRADUAL SELF-MUTILATION"—CHAPTERS VII AND VIII, BY STEFAN T. POSSONY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert at this point in the RECORD chapters VII and VIII of an article entitled "The Test Ban: An American Strategy of Gradual Self-Mutilation," by Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institution:

CHAPTER VII

The test ban treaty: Manifold problems of verification

A signatory to a test ban, if he decides to cheat, will try to commit a perfect crime. It will be recalled that a large percentage of murders go unpunished because the murderer is not identified or apprehended. Even if tried, murderers are not always convicted and they often benefit from loopholes in the law and thus escape a penalty which would fit the crime. In addition, many deaths which go into the books as accidents, heart attacks or suicide actually are homicides.

Perhaps it is pertinent, in this connection, to recall that the true nature of the death of Pavl Bang-Jensen, the U.N. official from Denmark who was in charge of the files concerned with the Hungarian uprising of 1956, never has been fully clarified. Was it suicide or was it murder dressed up as suicide?

In any event, many murders remain unpunished because the average police detective does not reach the standards set by fiction writers like Conan Doyle and Erle Stanley Gardner; because there often is lack of personnel and laboratory resources to investigate evidence thoroughly and completely; and because indicators of foul play often escape physicians and coroners engaged in rapid routine examinations. There is no perfect crime but many crimes remain unpunished because enforcement agencies are inadequate and overworked. The key to detection is a strong incentive to detect, perseverance, and even creativity in interpreting indicators. If these ingredients are lacking in a test ban inspectorate, cheating would be easy.

The detection of clandestine nuclear explosions is primarily entrusted to scientific instruments, including unattended "black boxes." Presumably these instruments provide "objective" data which can be easily read and interpreted; thus, human frailties seem to be excluded.

If the violator is clumsy, then the instrument readings, in all likelihood, would disclose the transgression. But if he is skillful, these readings could be very ambiguous. Contrary to what laymen may think, even seemingly unambiguous instrument readings can give rise to protracted debates and often interpretations are affected by a priori theories.

In the end, debates about the meaning of detection data would be decided by the conviction of those within the detection bureaucracy who possess the greatest power and whose function it is to coordinate different views. This situation, incidentally, may work in two directions: it may facilitate cheating or it may lead to a major international crisis in all those cases where the coordinators are convinced, rightly or wrongly, that despite lack of verificatory evidence cheating is taking place.

Inspectors who are sent into the field to investigate a presumed violation will find indicators and evidence according to their observational talents and their eagerness either to find or to overlook. Naturally, their effectiveness also may be reduced by "red herring" indicators conveniently planted by the evader, as well as by any number of diversionary techniques. Conversely, the inspectors of some countries would find it relatively easy to act as provocateurs.

As year-in-year-out inspections do not produce any results, the inspectors will lose enthusiasm for the job and the numbers of inspectors may be cut. After all, if everybody is honest, a small police force is adequate. Presumably, only few technically qualified personnel will apply for positions within the inspectorate.[1] If genuine professionals are assigned to the job, the situation may be different but there are not too many of those available in the first place. It would be very imprudent to assume that the Communists cannot influence any of the inspectors or plant their own agents (with American or British nationality) within the inspectorate.

Even an otherwise effective intelligence service is not immune against deterioration or wishful thinking. During the last moratorium there was an argument about whether the Soviets were cheating by means of underground testing.

Honest men were entitled to differ in their conclusions on this point. But whether or not the Soviets were cheating before resuming open testing in 1961, there was no great eagerness to find out. On the contrary, suggestions that this problem better be investigated were frowned upon; and some of those who got busy with the task and unearthed suggestive indicators were ridiculed.

Much of this negative attitude was derived from an assumption that it would make no sense for the Soviets to cheat. Some of the more naive "true believers" even asserted the Soviets would abide by the moratorium lest they risk the censure of public opinion. Bureaucracies are not likely to push causes against the predilections of the upper echelons, and intelligence bureaucracies are no exception. This sort of thing is highly irrational and ultimately backfires. Nevertheless, chances are that within a democracy, the reaction time against test ban violations will be exceedingly slow.

Incidentally, it is noteworthy that the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission announced on February 2, 1962, that the Soviets had fired an underground shot; some time later, the Soviets confirmed, in an offhand manner that, indeed, they had carried out a single underground explosion. It is, of course, wildly improbable that the Soviets never checked on underground test technology. They are known to possess very good information on the phenomenology of underground shots, and disclosed themselves that they fired a considerable number of subterranean HE explosions. If they did not experiment with underground nuclear explosions, someone should be fired in the Soviet Union for dereliction of duty.

Their disclosure about the one and only shot may be interpreted as an attempt to convince us that our capabilities for detecting underground shots are perfectly adequate. This little incident illustrates Soviet mastery of deception techniques, as well as, unfortunately, an American reluctance to recognize the fact that the Soviets are employing deception as a standard operating procedure.

CHAPTER VIII

The test ban: Range of nondetectable cheating

It is generally agreed that underground testing is the most promising method of evading a test ban agreement. Mr. William C. Foster in his statement to the Republican Conference Committee on Nuclear Testing belittled the feasibility of clandestine underground testing. He argued that since seismic signals which occur from explosions of the same size vary, an evader could not be sure of evading seismic detection. He also alleged that "big hole" decoupling is time consuming and expensive. In addition, the excavation of the large cavity might be detected and an underground test might unexpectedly produce a visible surface crater which may be found.

Undoubtedly, these possibilities exist but only on condition that the would-be evader of a test ban is clumsy, does not plan his cheating properly, or does not bother to spend too much money and effort on hiding the clandestine shots because he is not worried about the ambiguous indicators that might result from a poorly concealed clandestine program.

Some of our underground tests have unexpectedly led to venting and to some minor changes in the configuration of the mountains over the test sites. On the basis of our experience, the chances that there would be an unexpected large visible surface crater is certainly not better than 1 in 10. That such a change in the landscape would be detected, presumably by intelligence, is a little farfetched but let us assume that there is a probability of one in five. The combined probability that such a crater would occur and that it would be detected is then 1 in 50. This means that there is a chance of 1 such an occurrence per 2 test series of 25 shots each. However, this is merely the chance that intelligence might discover the crater, by no means to be confused with detection of a shot by instruments, let alone with verification through ground inspection.

---

[1] Mr. Foster explained that a "surprise abrogation by the Soviets" of a test ban treaty "might leave us as much as 18 months behind in our readiness to test." He stated that the Government will make it "a matter of national policy to maintain readiness to test"; scientists would continue nuclear weapons research and "our weapons laboratories should function effectively." This is wishful thinking because the most creative scientists would have no incentive to stay with a dead-end program; at best, our laboratories would decline in quality.

The argument that big hole decoupling is time consuming is irrelevant. The test ban negotiation has been going on for 5 years already, hence there was adequate time to produce any number of big holes. The argument that the creation of a big hole is expensive is equally irrelevant, since cost is meaningful in terms of what a price buys. If a test ban immobilizes the technological progress of the United States and allows the Soviet Union, through cheating, to achieve nuclear supremacy, the expenditure for a few big holes would be trivial.

It is perhaps true that a large excavation project might be discovered during the construction phase, but such a possibility would be anticipated by the evader. There are any number of techniques through which discovery even of a large earth-moving job can be prevented, some of them very simple and inexpensive. The observation might be added that during the construction phase no suspect seismic signals would be received from the particular area: testing has not started yet. But in the absence of specific suspicions attached to a specific area, the excavation would be discovered only by chance. Even in this case the excavation may be explained away through a cover project.

But this criticism of big hole decoupling overlooks the fact that adequate decoupling can be achieved in natural caves as well as in mines; and that it is not always necessary to produce a very big hole: depending on the yield of the test as well as on the decoupling factor which is desired, the size of the hole can be increased or decreased. There are other decoupling techniques which either may be substituted for the big hole or used in combination with it. In the latter case, the decoupling factor may be increased for any given size of the cavity.

It is true that explosions of the same size produce variable signals. Some of these are due to variations in the geological environment and presumably can be anticipated through proper analysis. Other variations are caused, among other factors, by weather and temperature changes. There are a few unpredictable elements. However, these variations occur within limits: a 1-kiloton shot will not unexpectedly result in a 100-kiloton signal. Hence this danger can be easily guarded against through a prudent choice of yields and decoupling techniques.

Mr. Foster asserted that the "number of tremors from earthquakes in the Soviet Union which might be confused with tremors from nuclear explosions" originally was overestimated. He added that our ability to distinguish between earthquakes and explosions has been improving steadily.

But what is an improvement? Mr. Foster indicated that so far we are able to distinguish only over half of the seismic events. Actually, he chose careful language by saying that over half of the earth tremors give indications of being earthquakes on the basis of such seismic criteria as first earth motion. He did not say that the distinction could be made with finality from seismic criteria; he merely talked about indications. He added that somewhat less than another third of the seismic events were ruled out by nonseismic criteria; that is, by a number of judgments entirely divorced from instrument readings. These judgments may be right or wrong, but even if they are excellent they have no bearing on the effectiveness of scientific detection. Hence the seismic system produces reasonable indications on about half of the events.

However, even according to Mr. Foster's statistics, about 15 percent of the seismic events remain in the dubious category, that is, they could be earthquakes or explosions. Significantly, Mr. Foster left it to the reader to figure out the magnitude of this residue for himself. It may be presumed that if we concern ourselves only with large seismic events, this residual number may not be too large. But since the decoupling technique exists, we really must be concerned with very small seismic events whose number, especially during periods of high seismic activity, is very considerable. The fact that fewer earthquakes which produce tremors similar to those of an explosion have been observed than was expected, is not very meaningful.

In the absence of exact figures, we will grant, for argument's sake, that the difference between expectation and observation is significant. But seismic activity varies in intensity. When we talk about an annual number of earthquakes in a given region, we are talking about a statistical average. It is obvious that in a period of low seismic activity, the number of suspect events will be smaller than in a period of high activity. Our present statistical evidence is based on too short a timespan to allow a firm assessment of what the true average may be. Furthermore, this type of argument again disregards the decoupling technique: the number of small earth tremors is quite large, and the signals from low-energy events are most ambiguous. Hence, if these events must be taken into consideration, the challenge remains considerable, even if the number of easy-to-identify, high-energy events has declined. Mr. Foster's argument would be valid if we assume that the Soviets are stupid enough to cheat by means of tamped shots. It loses much of its force if we assume that the Soviets are more clever than USACDA seems to give them credit for.

What, then, is the capability of seismic detection? Mr. Foster disclosed these facts: "None of the seismic systems proposed by the United States from 1959 on would be capable of detecting with any certainty any explosion of 3 kilotons or less, if they occurred in alluvium. Moreover, artificial decoupling might permit considerably larger yield explosions without detection."

Now let us go back to the perfect crime and let us assume that the Soviets plan their crime to consist in the clandestine decoupled testing of neutron devices. We assume that the detection system would be capable of detecting explosions of 1 kiloton (instead of 3) and that the decoupling factor is 100 (instead of about 300). In this case a test explosion of 1 kiloton would provide a signal of the equivalent of 10 tons which is clearly not detectable and which is two orders of magnitude below the threshold of detection. Yet in view of the effects radius of a neutron bomb, a 1-kiloton device is easily the equivalent of 10-kiloton fission bomb.

Theoretically, if we want to keep the signal down to the 1-kiloton level and if the decoupling factor were 300, a 300-kiloton device could be tested, but for the purposes of the neutron program such a large shot would be entirely unnecessary.

If we assume that the neutron test program could be managed to full satisfaction, with shots up to 10 kilotons (in addition to which there would be a requirement for much HE testing), and if we furthermore assume that the decoupling factor would not be larger than 100, the expected maximum strength of the seismic signals would not exceed the equivalent of 100 tons. This would be an insurance factor of 10:1 if the system were capable to detect down to the 1-kiloton level and of 30:1 if it had only a 3-kiloton capability.

An insurance factor of this magnitude should easily accommodate the various hazards which could occur, e.g., signal strength variations.

Incidentally, the signals produced from neutron devices may be much less than those from fission and fission-fusion weapons and telltale radioactivity would be vastly less. Hence much of what we now assert about detection capabilities will not be correct if the system were to operate against a neutron test program.

But we have not yet reached the crucial point: Earlier treaty drafts stipulated that inspection would apply only to signals of a strength of 4.75 or larger, on the earthquake scale, i.e., to tamped shots of 20 kilotons or higher. If the signals remain below this intensity, we would, according to these early drafts, not be entitled to inspect. The area below this magic figure of 4.75 or 20 kilotons was placed under the regime of a gentlemen's agreement: we would have taken the Soviet's word of honor that they are not testing.

In other words, in order for us to be entitled to inspect and to have a chance to verify evasion, the Soviets would have to shoot at about 20 kilotons without decoupling or 2 megatons or more, with decoupling. Shots of such magnitudes are entirely unnecessary in the neutron program.

The lower threshold of 4.75 was eliminated from current draft treaties: theoretically we would be free to inspect any signal which we consider suspect. In reality, of course, the threshold had been suggested because of many practical considerations, including the ambiguity and frequency of the weaker signals. For all practical purposes, inspection will continue to apply mainly to the larger signals, although it may be granted that absence of a precise lower threshold figure would allow greater flexibility.

But the point is still this: A large percentage of neutron tests could be carried out on the fractional kiloton level and would not even require decoupling. The few larger tests which might be necessary would require only moderate decoupling. The program can be concealed, even with larger yields, below the threshold of actual detection—provided decoupling and possibly additional camouflage, concealment and deception techniques are utilized. These facts dispose of Mr. Foster's point that though single tests "might sometimes escape detection by seismic means a test series would be far more difficult to hide. Yet, little progress can ordinarily be made with individual, isolated tests." There is no need whatever for the Soviets to restrict themselves to isolated shots.

The conclusion is clear: a systematic, full-fledged neutron test program can be carried out in its entirety by clandestine underground explosions. It is not excluded that our detection system would produce indicators and that through intelligence, we might become suspicious of what was going on. Yet we could not prove the violation and we would have no legal justification in cancelling the treaty. The test ban thus would be an excellent cover for the neutron program. In this case the perfect crime seems to have a high degree of feasibility.

"THE TEST BAN: AN AMERICAN STRATEGY OF GRADUAL SELF-MUTILATION" CHAPTERS IX, X, XI, AND XII, BY STEFAN T. POSSONY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include at this point in the

RECORD chapters IX, X, XI, and XII, of an article entitled "The Test Ban: An American Strategy of Gradual Self-Mutilation," by Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institution:

CHAPTER IX

The test ban: The need for weapons systems tests, new weapons systems and peacetime nuclear explosives

The discussion on the test ban usually centers on the implicit assumption that a continuation of tests is necessary only to insure technological progress. Whether or not technological and design experimentation is the most important aspect of testing, the fact remains that additional types of testing are mandatory for the security of the Nation.

Few people realize that though we are entrusting our security to ICBM's, we never have tested a full assembly of such a missile, i.e., we have not launched an ICBM together with its warhead, nor destroyed a target with an ICBM-launched warhead. There is no particular reason to assume that our ICBM's won't function when the dire moment arrives, but the fate of the Nation is far too serious a matter to be entrusted to mere, albeit persuasive, assumptions.

Similarly, much can be achieved in testing weapons like anti-ICBM's without nuclear warheads. But at one point it will become necessary to test the whole assembly. Indeed, we might be well advised to launch an anti-ICBM together with its warhead, in order to determine whether or not we are developing our anti-ICBM's the hard way. The President intimated that the Soviets had been conducting such tests. It is quite probable that through nuclear tests we could accelerate our anti-ICBM work—and what could be more desirable for the physical security of our Nation.

Some experts argue that from time to time a weapon, for example, an ICBM in its silo, or a bomb in the bay of a B–52, must be shot off in order to determine readiness and reliability. After all, we are checking on all other aspects of our readiness posture—is the business end of a weapon not its most important part? Before World War II our torpedoes were not tested but were assumed to be battle ready. We found out in combat, very much to our chagrin, surprise, and detriment, that many of those torpedoes proved to be duds. We could very easily lose a war if we did not continuously check on the reliability of our weapons.

Secretary McNamara already has been quoted with reference to the need of determining the effects of high altitude explosions on radars and communications, as well as possibly on antiballistic defense designs. We have fired a few high altitude shots but a little reflection will show that the phenomenology of such explosions must vary with yield and altitude of the detonations. Yet we tested only up to certain yield limits and we restricted ourselves to few selected altitudes. In other words, much needs still to be learned about the effects of nuclear explosions in the upper atmosphere and in near space.

Furthermore, we need considerably more knowledge about the effects of nuclear weapons on material, equipment, artifacts, vegetation, etc., notably we should test out shelter designs and the effectiveness of the hardened missile silos. The ability of our hardened sites to withstand nuclear blasts presently can be only estimated. Granted that these estimates reflect the best available professional judgment. However, this judgment is derived from extrapolations and is quite hazardous with respect to blasts of very high yields.

If the effectiveness of hardening were presently underrated, we would be spending too much money; at the same time we could assume that our hardened missiles are far less vulnerable than postulated in our defense planning. If, by contrast, the effects of hardening were overrated, our missile force would be at greater jeopardy than we have calculated, especially if the enemy were in possession of reliable data on our sites. This is a subject where guesswork should be entirely taboo.

From the technological point of view, testing is needed to increase our nuclear efficiencies in order, for example, to provide smaller missiles like Minuteman and Polaris with far greater yields than they presently possess. Secretary McNamara recently testified about Soviet hardening and suggested that it may be increasingly difficult for us to attack Soviet missile sites. Surely, it is self-evident that as hardening increases, yields must grow. But the boosting of yields must be accomplished within the constraint that the size of delivery vehicles must be reduced; this is a formidable challenge which cannot be met by occasional shots. Apparently we are unwilling to face up to this problem.

The Soviets presumably are staking much of their fortune on big yields. Conversely, they may use their nuclear efficiency to employ ever smaller ICBM's without losing firepower. In fact, if they want to attack the United States effectively, they need small—and cheap—ICBM's, perhaps several thousands of them. In terms of fission-fusion technology, the warheads of these missiles must have the maximum yield that can be packed into the nose cone. This is not all they need, but let us suppose the Soviets beat us in the race for nuclear efficiency; in this case, given numerical equality or even superiority on our part, they would be able, in addition to optimizing their posture for surprise attack, to exceed, force by force, the punch of our light as well as our heavy ICBM's.

Perhaps it is pertinent in this context to remember that Khrushchev withdrew his missiles from Cuba because, as he admitted by implication himself, the United States was capable of delivering far more firepower on the Soviet Union than the U.S.S.R. was capable of visiting on America. This firepower was vested, almost exclusively, in our SAC and fleet bombers, while the firepower of our long-range missiles hardly exceeded 5 percent of the total. Since firepower obviously is not the only factor that must be considered, this statistic is in no manner an objection to missiles. Yet the requirement for heavy firepower remains. The elimination of bomber aircraft whether justified from the aeronautical point of view or not, calls for more than a mere substitution of delivery vehicles: it also is necessary to prevent a precipitous decline in firepower.

To illustrate this point just a little further: assume our present SAC bombers average a firepower of 15 megatons per plane and assume that 15 percent of the planes would be able to execute 2 missions: This would give 1,600-odd SAC bombers the capability to deliver approximately 28,000 megatons of destruction. If this firepower were to be carried in 2-megaton missiles, about 14,000 light ICBM's would be necessary and even if we were to decide on 10-megaton missiles, we would need 2,800 heavy ICBM's. These are infeasible numbers which demonstrate the impracticability of an all-missile strategic force. These figures prove also that nuclear efficiency must be boosted considerably in order to insure that tomorrow's missile, in terms of firepower, will be a weapon that, at least in some missions, will be reasonably equivalent to today's bomber.

To return to other weapons requirements: We need clean weapons to be able to fight tactical wars effectively in densely populated areas—a clean technology is almost a prerequisite to holding the NATO alliance together. We also need optimal weapons for ground-to-air and antiballistic missiles; for a variety of reasons, including cleanliness, all-fusion warheads may fit the bill best. Tactical weapons must be of a high order of nuclear efficiency and will be required in large numbers. Hence to keep overall costs down, they must be small and cheap. The development of devices which in addition to being clean also are effective and economical is a tall order.

By contrast, if the Soviets were to show up with all-fusion devices, notably in antimissile and tactical weapons, and we would be stuck with the old technology—in addition to which we might have kept low or even cut down the number of such weapons in battle order—we might find ourselves in a very critical situation.

In the age of the Polaris submarine it is almost unbelievable that the Soviets would forgo developing nuclear missile and torpedo warheads, as well as bombs and possibly depth charges to satisfy the ASW requirement. We, too, must have nuclear tests to develop effective antisubmarine weapons, including some weapons with a relatively large lethal radius.

In addition, we need tests for weapons which would be peculiarly effective within the framework of our military tasks in Europe. For example, in order to facilitate the holding of forward positions on the ground, we should develop nuclear land mines. Nuclear sea mines would have their uses in defending positions like offshore islands and landing beaches. We may need nuclear explosives to destroy installations from which our forces have to retreat.

Very small nuclear weapons may help stay-behind forces to defend themselves for long periods and they may give immense strength to resistance movements in occupied countries.

It is all very well to worry about escalation of limited wars and to argue, with considerable propagandistic exaggeration, that even the use of a 0.1 kiloton device against, for example, secret police headquarters in a recently conquered country, would unleash a global thermonuclear war at the 10 to 100-megation level, i.e., cause escalation by an order of magnitude of 100,000 to 1 million on a single shot basis, however, the contingencies of war are unpredictable. To prepare weapons for certain uses does not mean that such weapons will be used, but that they can be used if they are needed. The chances are that escalation will be prevented most effectively if a whole spectrum of nuclear weapons were available. If we allow the enemy to become superior in the tactical nuclear field, we either will be losing limited local wars or to stave off defeat, will be compelled to escalate by our own initiative. Moreover, the absence of adequate tactical nuclear capabilities invites local aggression.

Despite wishful thinking about the exclusively civilian uses of space, sooner or later space will become a decisive military medium. Hence there exists the requirement for developing types of weapons and firepower which are effective in the vacuum above the atmosphere. It is apparent that neutron devices would be particularly useful in the space medium.

Testing also has a bearing on space propulsion. It is generally agreed that the Orion project—which is designed to use small nuclear "bombs" to propel a space vehicle—would allow the lifting of maximal payloads into orbit and permit the deepest penetration into the solar system. Of all propulsion systems it would provide for the most effective utilization of space. However, so far it seems impractical, because of radioactivity, to launch an Orion assembly from the ground; unfortunately, by using Orion propulsion only from orbit, much of the system's utility would be lost. An all-fusion technology would eliminate the radioactivity and thereby open the road to getting really important payloads into space.

Should the Soviets decide to move into space as a decisive military medium, they may employ Orion techniques even before they are able to eliminate the radioactivity. Actual Orion shots, in all likelihood, would be detected but the testing of the propulsion unit may be done on test stands which, by their very construction, could provide a great deal of decoupling. The required yields would be small in comparison with weapons. On balance it is likely, for various practical reasons, that the Soviets would base their Orion propulsion on all-fusion devices. By the same token, a requirement for effective space utilization might induce them to develop the all-fusion technology on a high priority basis.

As usual, the skeptics find it difficult to visualize the possible advantages of this new technology. But skepticism always opposes any new approach. Many decades of experience in weapons planning should have taught us to distrust the emotional opposition of scientists who are only superficially familiar with the new concept. Security would be served better if we were to rely more heavily on the cautious optimism of those scientists who really have explored the new possibility and found it attractive. The brutal twin facts which we cannot circumvent are that space utilization requires maximum energy releases and that nuclear explosions are the method through which maximum energy releases can be produced—and produced most cheaply.

In earlier years, some people hoped that radioactive substances could be used for military purposes. These expectations, so far, have been disappointed and perhaps radiological warfare remains impractical. Nevertheless, if radiological weapons could be perfected they would offer some possibilities of humane warfare. For example, a factory could be made inoperative by covering it with radioactive substances of suitable half-lives; if so, it would not be necessary to destroy the installation and in the process kill the working crews and the population living within the vicinity of ground zero. This sort of denial weapon also would make it unnecessary in case of retreat, to carry out scorched earth destructions; hence postwar recovery would be facilitated. Surely, the prospect of fighting war with less casualties than was heretofore possible merits some attention.

The aforementioned Russo-German military dictionary talks about radioactive weapons (boyevyye radioaktivnyye veshchestva) as though they do exist in the Communist arsenal, and states that radioactivity can be propagated in the form of powders, liquids, and smokes delivered from rockets, aerial bombs, artillery shells, and mines. It is added that radioactive substances can be used in combination with gas warfare. Is this another capability which we abandon unilaterally to the enemy?

Finally, there is the possibility of using nuclear explosions for industrial and civilian purposes, as envisaged in the Plowshare program. While this program has been continuing, it is allowed only a very low momentum and its vast potentialities are still unconvincing to those skeptics who are skeptical on a priori grounds and because they sense that Plowshare invalidates the basic concept of the test ban.

But the United States, who is over its neck in foreign aid, can ill afford to forgo modern technology in operations abroad (or at home, for that matter). For example, if a second Panama Canal were built by nuclear explosions rather than by conventional methods of earth moving, something like $8 billion could be saved, according to one estimate. Surely, this sort of money could be used to transform the economy of the Caribbean area. Instead of commenting further on the potentials of Plowshare, I refer to the book by Dr. Ralph Sanders of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, where the possible impacts of this technology on our security and economy are spelled out, with the exception of the possible developments in the chemical industry.

Plowshare explosions may be required for the building of stations on the moon. It is indeed self-evident that to establish anything like a useful environment on the moon, or later on some planets, a great deal of "earth" moving will be required. Hence we would have to transport vast amounts of energy into space, which would be impossible unless we can package the energy into minimum weights. Again, the nuclear explosive—of the all-fusion variety—provides the solution.

These various requirements do not necessarily have to be satisfied within the next few years. But ultimately they will have to be met. Hence it is not surprising that the United States, as appears from Mr. Foster's statement, envisages the possibility of a sudden cancellation of a test-ban treaty by the Soviets. In other words, we do not anticipate a permanent but merely a temporary test ban. This anticipation would be justified even if we assumed that the Soviets would like to stick to the ban, simply because some of these requirements will catch up with us. Peace may descend on this earth (which unfortunately is not very likely) but to maintain it in the face of rising populations and expectations as well as of raw material shortages, the utilization of Plowshare techniques will become mandatory; hence the all-fusion techniques must be developed. Lord Curzon once said in the House of Commons: "I do not exclude the intelligent anticipation of facts even before they occur."

In any event, the administration has not provided answers to these questions: if the test ban, by its very nature, can be only temporary, why try to achieve it in the first place? But even if a temporary ban would make sense, why shoot for it now? And why try to apply a test ban to the development of neutron and all-fusion devices when tests of such devices cannot be policed at all and when furthermore such tests would not produce significant fallout?

When the United States went into its first moratorium, it was generally assumed that our test organizations and crews would be kept together so that testing could be resumed almost instantly. It turned out that while we were able to conduct underground tests a few weeks after the Soviets broke the moratorium, almost 9 months were required to get ready for atmospheric testing. Now, it is promised again that if there were another moratorium or even a full-fledged ban, our test capabilities would be kept intact and on an instant readiness basis. These promises are unrealistic unless the American political behavior pattern changes. Even if the budgets were available—and in reality they won't be—the best talents would leave our weapons laboratories and test organizations, and perhaps the recruitment of younger physicists would become difficult. The Soviet Union which controls its scientific manpower does not suffer from a similar handicap. Hence a test ban would be disadvantageous to ourselves even if the Soviets were to observe it for the time being. At one point or the other, the test ban, which can only be temporary in nature, will come to a close, be it through detection of cheating, through cancellation, or through the action of nonsignatory states. On the day of expiration of the agreement, the Soviets would be in a far stronger position to resume operations than the United States.

CHAPTER X

The test ban: The jaws of the trap

According to a recent argument, the difficulties of policing a test ban were exaggerated by those who emphasized the potentialities of underground testing. It is alleged that the scientists who warned about the feasibility of cheating in underground test sites contradicted themselves when, after the resumption of testing by the United States, they called for atmospheric tests and voiced their discontent with our own underground testing program. This, it is argued, proves that underground testing gives only marginal results. Therefore, if a test ban does nothing else but force a would-be violator into ineffective testing, it would serve its purpose.

As so many arguments which have been produced ad hoc in the test ban debate, this particular line of reasoning is superficial, illogical, and to a large extent demagogic.

No one has ever claimed that underground testing can do all the jobs required in an effective testing program. By definition such matters as the phenomenology of high-altitude and deepwater shots and the vulnerability of ground equipments may have to be determined through atmospheric tests. This also holds true for the proof testing of high-yield battle order weapons, and finally for strictly technological testing at high yields.

In comparison with atmospheric testing, underground technological testing has several advantages (e.g., independence from weather and wind, and avoidance of fallout), but it also has a number of disadvantages. There are limitation on instrumentation, possibly modifications of effects, and vexatious restrictions on yield. If the underground tests were to be kept secret, yield limitations might be considerable, or else very large test sites must be constructed. Very large weapons, of course, never could be tested underground at their full yield.

During 1961 and 1962, therefore, when our test organization was hamstrung by many political limitations and when it was working feverishly against the danger that a new moratorium may be proclaimed, insistence on atmospheric tests was justified. But it is also noteworthy that the AEC, which at first evinced dissatisfaction with underground testing, on the basis of its experience during 1962, changed its mind and now considers underground testing favorably. Obviously, underground testing is an art and skills can be improved through learning.

This concrete situation has very little relevance for evaluating the potentialities of a stratagem aiming at a test ban and its evasion.

The trick the Soviets are trying to perform is to negotiate a test ban which would allow us the shadow of an inspection system and provide the Soviet Union with the substance of an effective clandestine testing capability.

Depending on how much inspection they would have to concede, clandestine test series can always be constructed in such a way that they will forever remain below the threshold of discovery and verification.

The frequent changes in Soviet policy, their unwillingness to grant even platonic concessions and the resultant postponement of the day when the United States will fall into the self-made test ban trap can be explained best by assuming that the Soviets have not yet decided how far they should go toward marrying American shadow to Soviet substance. Perhaps they do not feel they have yet reached the stage where adequate further progress can be insured by an exclusively underground program of several years duration. Once they have the super-yields they want and once they accomplish an anti-ICBM warhead, they may be ready for a clandestine underground program—at that moment American disarmament apostles, for a short while, may find that their prophecies on Soviet intentions are coming true.

Of course, the question is not whether underground and space testing is superior to atmospheric testing (which, for many cases, clearly, it is not), but whether clandestine testing allows more significant and rapid advances in weapons design than no testing at all, which equally clearly, it does, especially if the main challenge is to develop neutron devices.

Even if it were, on balance, not very probable that underground and space cheating alone would give sufficient results to allow the would-be aggressor to forgo other tests entirely, it can be argued that atmospheric test actually can be dispensed with for a protracted period, especially during periods when the other chief signatory of the ban does not test at all.

Obviously, a secret test program, even if it were restricted in scope, will in due time allow numerous improvements in weapons design, with the result that the balance of nuclear power gradually would shift to the violator.

Whether such a shift would occur with slow or rapid speed and how soon it might make a significant strategic difference, depends on many variable and unpredictable factors, including the ability of the violator to hit on unforeseen techniques through which the control system could be further degraded.

But even granting that testing would lead the violator only to a certain point. Assume he has achieved a new design but assume also that he feels he cannot just scale up but must test at full yield. In this case, he could risk a space shot, which may not be much of a risk after all. He also might produce a very deep and large underground cavity—in fact he may have used earlier underground shots to dig such a mammoth hole—and test the full yield underground. The rationale would not be that such a test would necessarily remain undiscovered but rather that the risk of detection is small, that attempts at verification will remain fruitless, and that more time will be gained in this fashion than by an open violation in the style of 1961.

The test ban danger can be understood most clearly if we do not overemphasize the question of whether shots can be detected and verified, but analyze the problem within the framework of a technological race in time. The Soviets may not be chiefly concerned about the danger of discovery. Their chief problem, as I see it, is to gain time advantages over the United States. It is only in this context that they must prevent premature discovery.

Naturally, time planning for the test program is part of their overall strategic time planning. Assume they estimate, after 8 years of cautious clandestine testing, that they probably gained the technical advantages they were seeking; assume that they decide to go to war after 2 more years. Since probably a fairly large number of atmospheric tests at full yield would be required to check the overall reliability of their battle order weapons, they should resume atmospheric testing on D-day minus 1 year. Even if the United States resumed testing within the year, the Soviets could have reaped great strategic benefits. Naturally, the proof tests may show that the weapons function less well than had been anticipated, in which case the stratagem may have failed in part. The odds are, however, that while yield predictions and the like may not be entirely accurate, serious and noncorrectable failures will not occur.

CHAPTER XI

The test ban: its strain on free world alliances

In all this pressure for the test ban, the United States has shown willingness, or so it seems to many outside observers, to subordinate the interests of the NATO alliance to the chimera of a Soviet-American test ban. If such a ban were concluded, it would amount to a quasi-alliance between the two hostile superpowers, especially if it were accompanied by a proviso that the nuclear club would remain closed to new applicants. The implications of such an agreement would be far reaching. Even in the present phase when the agreement is merely being discussed, the alliance has been weakening politically and militarily, and Europe has remained disarmed in terms of a future war. In the end, if the test ban were to stick, it would constitute a reorientation of the entire foreign policy of the United States. The effect of this policy would be, whether this is the intent or not, to divide the globe into an American and a Soviet orbit—until the day when the Soviets will see fit to grasp for it all.

Naturally, the proviso against the enlargement of the nuclear club cannot be enforced unless we or the Soviets, or both, were to threaten and even attack nations acquiring nuclear capabilities. Yet the Soviets hardly could afford to attack China. Khrushchev's recently commented: "When we will throw the last shovelful of dirt on the grave of capitalism, we will do it with China." In view of this attitude, it is very plausible to expect that the Chinese, once they get around to testing under moratorium conditions, actually would be acting as proxies for the Soviets. Similarly, the United States cannot prevent the French from pursuing their atomic program, and we have announced—and reiterated—that we won't interfere.

In this connection it is to be noted that the Soviets repeatedly stated they would stick to the principle that for each Western shot, they would fire a shot of their own. Hence, so long as the French continue their tests, the Soviets, irrespective of what they sign with the United States, will not consider that they are obligated in any manner by the discontinuance of American testing.

The incongruity of our policy can also be seen from the fact that we only recently offered to France Polaris missiles without warheads or submarines. This offer, which was refused, for good and sound reasons, was predicated on the assumption that the French would develop their own atomic warheads for that missile. It is fantastic to expect that the Polaris missile which has been in service for 2 years, will remain so desirable that still in 1970 it should be introduced into the French arsenal, i.e., at a time when the Soviets may be in the second generation of their antimissiles. Certainly, Polaris would be the wrong missile if by 1970 neutron technology were mastered, and missile as well as submarine could be reduced in size. By offering just one element of an entire weapon system, we are ignoring the main lesson in arms design since 1940: Weapons must be designed as systems; hence if we want the French and the British to have a nuclear submarine force, we had better get together and negotiate about the system in toto.

The French have yet to prove mastery of fusion techniques and surely a fission warhead on Polaris makes no sense at all. Irrespective of whether it is sound to expect that the French can have a truly effective Polaris warhead by 1970, if the United States were to enter into a test ban, we would expect the French not to engage in any tests. How then could the French acquire the warhead for the missile which we are offering to them? Would we not feel compelled to withhold the missile if they did not adhere to the moratorium—and to withhold it also if they did observe the moratorium, because they could not use the missile?

Truly, the United States has been maneuvering itself into an untenable position. While we have been chasing the will-o'-the-wisp of a test ban designed to initiate a series of arms control or disarmament agreements, or failing in this most illusory objective, to pursue a strategy of nuclear stalemate rather than deterrence, we have not even attempted to make some real progress for the benefit of mankind. The whole agitation about the test ban came about because of fears that fallout would endanger human health. It might have been feasible to conclude an international agreement for the control of the amounts of radioactivity released into the air every year. Such an agreement could be patterned, for example, after the international whaling convention or provisions for the control of epidemics. Perhaps the Soviets would have been unwilling to forgo their stratagem and substitute a beneficial measure. But the pursuit of a useful public health convention, instead of a strategic boomerang, would conform both to American security interests and to its traditional concern for human welfare.

It is distressing that the United States has gradually been slipping into a policy of unilateral nuclear disarmament, on the one hand, and illusions and duplicity on the other. Major strategic decisions in a democracy should be based upon a proper democratic debate. Instead, secret diplomacy abounds, the Government manipulates the news and abuses security provisions by withholding information to which the American public is entitled, especially since the pertinent information is known to the Soviets. The absence of regular reports on the nuclear race bespeaks a fear that the American people may become apprehensive of Soviet nuclear advances and consequently demand the initiation of a serious and continuous American test program.

A democracy cannot function without an effective opposition. It would seem as though in many vital security areas, but especially in the nuclear field, there has been a de facto suspension of the democratic procedure within the United States.

The voice of those who oppose the folly of the test ban has been stifled effectively and it remains to be seen whether this particular intra-American iron curtain can be pierced before the security of the United States is permanently imperilled. In a democracy the opposition is expected to be loyal. But it is a vital element of its loyalty to the Nation that the opposition must fulfill its functions of opposing false policies, even at the price of a loss in popularity. An opposition which keeps silent throws away its chances and forfeits the future of the Nation.

CHAPTER XII

The test ban: an American retreat from supremacy

The test ban is one important step in the many unilateral measures which the United States has been taking toward unilateral nuclear disarmament. The Soviets have carried out more tests at high yields than we have, and when they announced that they would use 100 megaton devices in their weapons, we stuck to bombs and warheads of far lesser firepower. We are reducing the total megatonnage of our strategic delivery system. If we allow a firepower gap to develop according to present trends, we would simply make the Soviets a present of the greatest blackmail potential ever possessed by an aggressor.

We are holding back with the development of warheads of optimal usefulness in anti-ICBM's. It is utterly incomprehensible that Disarmament Agency Chief William C. Foster lists as an advantage of the test ban that "the development of antimissile systems would be slowed down on both sides." There can be no advantage in such a slowdown for a second-strike power. International stability would be enhanced through a better balance between offensive and defensive weapon systems. Mr. Foster's statement, however, discloses the true attitude of the administration to antimissile defense: they just don't want it.

There has been a recent downgrading of the utility of low-yield tactical weapons and a great eagerness to strengthen the conventional firepower of the ground forces rather than their nuclear capability. We are more afraid of rash acts by our own troops than of enemy aggression and have put our nuclear weapons under so many controls that it will be a miracle, should aggression eventuate, if they can be used before the storage and launch sites have been hit. To top all this, we are relying on weapon systems which were never fully tested and whose reliability is not checked at regular intervals.

It is apparent that by contrast, the Soviet Union is trying to maximize its nuclear capabilities for all weapon systems useful in a modern war.

The solid strategic result, so far, of 5 years of unpoliced test moratorium, test-ban negotiation, and somewhat desultory U.S. testing has been that the Soviets caught up and possibly overtook us in the yield of strategic weapons as well as in high-yield nuclear efficiencies. Presumably, to judge from Mr. Foster's statement, we still enjoy advantages in smaller and tactical weapons—but this seems to be irrelevant in view of the fact that the administration plans to stop production of tactical weapons and makes every effort to downgrade the utility of these weapons, be it even at the price of further undermining NATO.

Hence we don't really need a second test-ban round to help the enemy because we are conceding the tactical weapons to the Soviets anyway. But the second round, in all likelihood, would provide the Soviets with a monopoly in neutron weapons. In any event, a test ban which by definition cannot be used to police tests on neutron weapons and which would be observed unilaterally by the United States because we don't want to develop the neutron technology, would provide the Soviet Union with an optimal condition to achieve military supremacy.

Has Khrushchev forsaken nuclear war? Perhaps, but for how long? How long will he stay in power? He anticipates that as a result of his peaceful coexistence strategy, major crises will develop. What he plans to do when a crisis occurs was stated by him in blunt language on January 16, 1963: "If a revolutionary situation has arisen, the working class, led by its vanguard, must utilize this situation for seizing power * * *. The people have the right to use the most decisive means including armed struggle, in the interest of the victory of socialism."

Impregnable Troy fell to a primitive ruse. The test ban is a highly sophisticated stratagem, but it is really based on an elementary point of observation: Americans are so highly susceptible to high-sounding propaganda that they can be persuaded to commit political suicide. The trick is to disarm us and make us die by an infinite number of small steps. The test-ban stratagem is the most effective psychological warfare campaign of the century, a real breakthrough in the art of psychological warfare, just as radar, the fission bomb, the missile, and sputnik constituted technological breakthroughs. But of all these breakthroughs, the test ban has the optimal cost-to-effect ratio.

Shall we be extinguished because we are listening to Kipling's prophets "of the utterly absurd, of the patently impossible and vain?" Odysseus knew how to behave when he encountered the Sirens; we are eager to be charmed by their sweet songs. "Around them the bodies of their victims lie in heaps."

APPLICATION OF POWER REVENUES FROM RECLAMATION PROJECTS FOR THE REDUCTION OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, when the Government makes a profit on a Government-owned business, those profits rightfully belong to the people of the United States. With this in mind, I am introducing a bill that would provide for the application of power revenues from reclamation projects to the reduction of the public debt.

What my bill means is that revenues derived from reclamation projects will first be used to repay the costs of such projects, but once the project is on a paying basis, additional profits would be transferred to the General Treasury and would be applied only for the reduction of the public debt of the United States.

We all recognize the value of necessary reclamation power projects, but we should also recognize that profits from such projects belong to the taxpayers. Instead of turning such profits back into the Treasury, as was originally intended, they have been used in the past to support irrigation projects that not only cannot pay their own way but even add to the already staggering surpluses of agricultural products in this country. Some do not even benefit the power customers served by the original project.

Using these power profits for unsound irrigation projects is a direct form of subsidy, paid for by the American people. The figures are juggled, however, to make it appear that they cost us nothing. My bill would put an end to this reshuffling and dealing off the bottom of the deck. The cards would then be on the table, face up, for all to see.

This bill would not only work to reduce the national debt, but would amount to a wiser expenditure of these moneys than is now being done through questionable irrigation projects. These projects would then have to stand on their own merits instead of sneaking in behind the skirts of public power profits.

The worst part of all is that these irrigation projects put new acres into production raising the same crops that we pay other sections of the country not to raise. These farms are not even capable of paying back the interest-free money they are using to get into production.

Using these power profits to reduce the national debt would be the first step taken in that direction for some time. Our Government ran $6.3 billion in the red last year, expects to run another $8 or $9 billion in the hole during the fiscal year ending June 30, and anticipates a deficit of at least $11.9 billion next year if current budget requests are approved.

If this is the case, Congress may be asked to up the debt limit to $320 billion after this June 30 to meet the spending requirements for fiscal 1964. The debt limit was $285 billion in 1961, which means we are on the threshold of increasing it by the whopping total of $35 billion in just 3 years.

If reclamation power profits had been returned to the Treasury under the terms of my bill in the past, our public debt would now be around $4 billion less than it is. This may seem insignificant in these days of $100 billion budgets, but at least it is a first step toward a goal of fiscal sanity.

My bill has three major purposes, to reduce our impossible national debt, to eliminate a practice that results in increased farm surpluses at taxpayer expense, and to make wiser use of these moneys at a time when the fiscal strain is big enough to begin with.

HOW STRONG IS THE DOLLAR?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1963, I made a statement on the floor entitled "How Strong Is the Dollar?" This statement called attention to one facet of our balance-of-payments problem.

On March 13, 1963, I read into the Record, page 4106, an editorial from the Wall Street Journal, "Ignorance or Intent?" This article demonstrated the close relationship between our balance of payments and the administration's budget handling.

Calling attention to the need for maintaining confidence in the U.S. dollar, the Wall Street Journal advocated reduced Federal spending as the best way of stimulating healthy economic development.

On March 19, 1963, the distinguished minority leader of the Senate issued the following statement:

Statement by Senator Dirksen, March 19, 1963

The Kennedy administration's highly questionable proposal to increase the national debt so that the Federal Government can spend more while the people pay less in taxes offers so many dangers to our economy that it is difficult to list them.

Certainly one of the greatest dangers is further inflation which means rising prices. The American people, who saw their money cheapened by nearly 50 percent under the Truman administration, understand this danger and it is one of the reasons they doubt the wisdom of President Kennedy's proposal to increase spending while cutting taxes.

But there is a much less understood danger—the threat the President's program presents to an already bad economic problem, the flow of gold from this country to foreign lands.

In 1962, the United States paid to foreign creditors $2.2 billion more than it received in the balance of payments and it is already estimated our deficit position will be equally bad this year. As a result of the 1962 payments, our shrinking gold holdings were reduced $911 million, meaning our foreign creditors demanded gold instead of accepting our dollars more than 40 percent of the time.

It is a fact of economic life that the demand for gold by foreign holders of dollars will step up sharply if the Kennedy program should result in additional inflation. Foreign economists and financiers recognize the inflation potential in the proposed Kennedy deficit and just their fear of it could produce increased difficulties in our flow of gold problem.

We, the members of the Joint Senate-House Republican leadership, feel it imperative to point out that higher prices which inevitably follow inflation could only mean less export of American goods and more export of gold to pay for the increased imports of goods made by cheaper foreign labor. Instead of helping solve unemployment, Mr. Kennedy's planned deficit very conceivably could increase unemployment and worsen our gold position to boot.

The creation of jobs is our No. 1 problem and we believe any tax-and-spend program which weakens confidence is likely to worsen rather than solve the problem.

The Senator from Illinois has done a commendable job in linking our balance-of-payments problem to the planned budget deficit proposed by this administration.

Until a year ago, balance of payments was a subject with which Americans were largely unconcerned. In the last 2 years foreign creditors have been demanding gold instead of accepting our dollars. If this situation continues, balance of payments may become as well known as Mickey Mantle's batting average.

W. A. SHEAFFER PEN CO.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the golden anniversary of one of my State's major industrial enterprises—a company whose name in the short span of 50 years has become known to many millions of people throughout the free world.

I refer to the W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., incorporated in 1913 in Fort Madison, Iowa, by the inventor of the lever-fill fountain pen, and now directed by the two grandsons of the founder.

When W. A. Sheaffer began production of writing instruments a half-century ago with a staff of six employees, his "factory" was a 12- by 14-foot room in the back of his small jewelry store on the main street of this southeast Iowa community.

Today, in the same city, Sheaffer Pen Co.'s three modern plants cover an area of several blocks and contribute substantially to the economy of the area by employing more than 1,400 of Fort Madison's 15,000 citizens.

In addition, there are hundreds more employed in Sheaffer facilities in Canada, Australia, South America, and Europe—evidence of the opportunities for growth and expansion under the American free enterprise system.

I am proud of the accomplishments of this Iowa firm that for 50 years has adhered unswervingly to the philosophy of its founder: build quality products, charge a fair price for them, and sell them with pride. In the years ahead I am sure that Sheaffer management and employees will have as their goal even greater service to the fundamental area of personal communication as a force for international understanding and well-being.

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, last year I had extensive correspondence with the Reverend Stanley Stuber of Jefferson City, Mo., and the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Walter] regarding the use of information provided by the committee from its public files. This exchange originated when I received a letter from Dr. Stuber calling for the abolition of the committee because of certain "abuses" of which he, and others, contend the committee have been guilty.

In following up on his complaints, which centered around the publication by certain individuals and groups in Missouri of committee material concerning him, I believe some important questions of procedure were raised. This correspondence appeared in the Congressional Record, volume 108, part 3, pages 3776–3779, volume 108, part 13, pages 18279–18282, and volume 108, part 14, pages 19503–19505.

A further instance has been brought to my attention by Dr. Stuber of the use of committee materials dealing with him. Once again, I believe that this subject is of such importance to the Congress and the country in evaluating the work of the committee that I am placing the correspondence dealing with it in the Record.

First is a letter which I received from Dr. Stuber enclosing a copy of a memorandum circulated by the Reverend Alfred Thornton of the Bible Baptist Church of Jefferson City to all members of the Missouri State Legislature. My reply follows:

Missouri Council of Churches,
Jefferson City, Mo., January 28, 1963.

The Honorable Thomas B. Curtis,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Curtis: Enclosed is another documentation of how the listings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities are being used to smear Americans who may believe in the National Council of Churches and the United Nations.

You will note that the Reverend Mr. Thornton claims that he received the listings from Chairman Walter and that this information is directly from the official records in Washington.

This is very serious business, since this document was sent to all the members of the house and senate of the Missouri Legislature.

I certainly hope that you will find time to follow up on this matter, and discover some way of keeping the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from the hands of those who want to use the great influence of a congressional committee for their own personal purposes of smearing those with whom they do not agree.

Sincerely yours,
Stanley I. Stuber,
Executive Director.

Bible Baptist Church,
Jefferson City, Mo.

Dear Lawmaker: A copy of this letter is being put in the hands of all senators and representatives of our State legislature. It concerns the Reverend Dr. Stanley I. Stuber of Jefferson City.

Dr. Stuber is executive secretary of the Missouri Council of Churches with headquarters here in the capital city. You will be hearing from this man for he will be using his position as head of a large council of churches to influence certain legislation. Please notice very carefully the following information about Dr. Stuber.

I have a personal letter from the Honorable Francis E. Walter, Chairman of Committee on Un-American Activities. Mr. Walter enclosed the following data.

"1. In 1950 and 1951 Dr. Stanley I. Stuber sponsored the National Committee To Repeal the McCarran Act. (The Internal Security Subcommittee said that this organization was subversive.)

"2. Dr. Stuber was secretary-treasurer of the Inter-Church Committee of The American Russian Institute. (That organization was listed as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States Senate Judiciary Committee, and Internal Security Subcommittee.)

"3. Dr. Stuber was connected with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. (This organization was declared subversive by the Committee on Un-American Activities, Attorney General of the United States, Internal Security Subcommittee, and Subversive Activities Control Board.)

"4. Dr. Stuber was a sponsor of The Call for a National Emergency Conference. (That organization was declared subversive by the Committee on Un-American Activities.)

"5. Dr. Stuber was a sponsor of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom. (This organization was declared subversive by the Attorney General of the United States, Committee on Un-American Activities.)"

In recent weeks Dr. Stuber has been reported in the local newspapers as opposing the House Un-American Activities Committee making known publicly the names of persons found to belong to Communist-front organizations, and that he and his Council of Churches would officially favor legislation to abolish the death penalty in Missouri.

Dr. Stuber will probably deny this report—he has already in the past, but I remind you this information is directly from the official records in Washington. If you should like a photostatic copy of this report from Washington I will be happy to provide you with one. If for any reason you should want to contact me further, my telephone numbers are Jefferson City 635–1970 or 635–1097.

By the way, the above report on Dr. Stuber is only fragmentary. There are other men in Missouri who know more on him than I do. Their names and addresses are available for you.

With every good wish, I am
Yours sincerely,
Rev. Alfred O. Thornton,
Pastor.

February 5, 1963.

Stanley I. Stuber, Th. M., D.D.,
Executive Director, Missouri Council of Churches, Jefferson City, Mo.

Dear Dr. Stuber: I wish to acknowledge your letter of January 28, 1963. It is obvious to me that the Reverend Thornton is referring back to the incident which I checked into where Congressman Walter released the unevaluated material in the committee's files under the caveat the committee employs. I do not condone what was done and I have endeavored to persuade the House Un-American Activities Committee not to permit this kind of thing to happen.

On the other hand, it is quite obvious that Reverend Thornton is misusing this material as he does not call attention to the caveat of the House Un-American Activities Committee which accompanies this material. Quite the contrary, Reverend Thornton seeks to create innuendoes the other way. This is a matter of Reverend Thornton's actions, however, not the House Un-American Activities Committee. It does demonstrate, however, the point you sought to make of the manner in which House Un-American Activities Committee material can be misused when placed in the hands of certain people.

I still find it strange, however, that you do not have your explanation of your association with these various groups adjudged to be subversive firmly placed in the House Un-American Activities Committee files. The House Un-American Activities Committee points out that they have asked you for this statement several times and have assured you that this becomes just as much a part of the files as the derogatory material.

I have no knowledge of any new incident of the House Un-American Activities Committee releasing unevaluated material to a member of the public, or even to another Congressman, who then made it available.

Sincerely,

Thomas B. Curtis.

Next is a letter which I received from the Missouri Convention of American Baptists, written in an attempt to clarify the situation and put Reverend Thornton's memorandum into proper perspective. Again my response follows:

Missouri Convention of
American Baptists,
Columbia, Mo., February 4, 1963.
Hon. Thomas B. Curtis,
Webster Groves, Mo.

Dear Mr. Curtis: I have reason to believe that you have received a communication from the Reverend Alfred O. Thornton, pastor of the Bible Baptist Church, Jefferson City, Mo., which seeks to cast suspicion on the patriotism of the Reverend Dr. Stanley I. Stuber, executive director and Ecumenical Minister of the Missouri Council of Churches.

I am privileged to serve as the official representative of the American Baptist Convention in Missouri and Dr. Stuber is an ordained minister of this denomination. It is in this capacity that I am writing to call your attention to two things:

1. I have in my files photostatic copies of letters from the staff director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and from one of the members of the committee, stating that there has never been a hearing nor an investigation of Dr. Stuber and that he has never been identified as a member of the Communist Party.

2. The statement regarding the practice of the House Committee on Un-American Activities making public the content of their files is a reference to and consistent with a resolution adopted by the Greater Council of the American Baptist Convention and submitted in writing to Members of the Congress by the American Baptist Convention.

I have taken the liberty of writing because I believe that Mr. Thornton, through misinformation which has come to his hands, has possibly cast one of American Baptists' respected leaders in an unfavorable light.

I shall be pleased to discuss this further with you if you should care to request it.

Respectfully,

James Havens,
Executive Secretary.

February 19, 1963.

Mr. James Havens,
Executive Secretary, Missouri Convention of American Baptists, Columbia, Mo.

Dear Mr. Havens: Thank you for sending me a copy of the letter you are sending to people who may have received communications from Rev. Alfred Thornton, pastor of the Bible Baptist Church of Jefferson City, in respect to Rev. Dr. Stanley Stuber.

I think this goes a long way toward putting this matter in the proper light. This is a way much preferable to that of castigating the Congress and its committees, as was done in the unfortunate statement to which you make reference in point two of your letter.

The phrase "unevaluated and limited" information should be used in place of the word "misinformation" contained in the next to the last paragraph of your letter. The House Un-American Activities Committee did not give out misinformation, as Dr. Stuber himself acknowledges, only unevaluated and limited information, which could be and was used by Reverend Thornton to draw or to suggest unwarranted conclusions.

Sincerely,

Thomas B. Curtis.

A copy of my reply to Mr. Havens was directed to the attention of Reverend Thornton. He took issue with my contention that his "Dear Lawmakers" memorandum drew or suggested "unwarranted conclusions" and asked for an explanation of my statement. Here, I feel, is the crux of the matter; in this can be found the responsibilities of the various interested parties to safeguard the personal reputations of those about whom the committee has material in its public files.

In its form for providing requested information from its public files on specific individuals and groups, the committee prints a caveat stating that the information which follows is not evaluated and contains only material which has been received by the committee, not results of any investigation by it. It goes on to say that the information set forth is "not, per se, an indication that this individual is subversive, unless specifically stated."

This caveat is as much a part of the committee's information as the material which follows it. Yet, there are those, like Reverend Thornton in the case at hand, who republish this material, often edited and always leaving out the explanatory caveat. We can hold open for discussion whether there should be files of the committee open to the public and whether the committee should cooperate with those interested in this material to the extent of reproducing it and sending it on request. A case could be made either way on this, and should be made.

Nevertheless, the committee in responding to requests for information of this nature takes the very commendable precaution of making sure the caveat noted above goes with it. Then we come to the responsibility of those who receive and republish the material from the committee. If they follow the procedures which Reverend Thornton has, they ignore their responsibility to the people who are subjects of the committee files and to the people to whom their reports are sent. If their purpose is to smear, they can use the edited committee file material, just as they can any other half-truth, and make what appears to be a damning case. To turn back for a moment to the basic issue which brought me into correspondence with Dr. Stuber, is this adequate reason for abolishing the committee? Clearly not. It may indicate a need for a better procedure on the part of the committee to prevent abuses by other people outside of the Congress, but it cannot impute the motives of those on the outside to the committee.

The letter of Reverend Thornton asking for a clarification of my statement and my response follows.

Bible Baptist Church,
Jefferson City, Mo., February 23, 1963.
The Honorable Thomas B. Curtis,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Curtis: Thank you for sending me a copy of your recent letter to Mr. James Havens, executive secretary, Missouri Convention of American Baptists.

In the last paragraph of your letter to Mr. Havens you say, "The House Un-American Activities Committee did not give out misinformation, as Dr. Stuber himself acknowledges, only unevaluated and limited information, which could be and was used by Reverend Thornton to draw or to suggest unwarranted conclusions."

I would appreciate very much your explaining simply what you meant by the last clause of that paragraph, quote: "which could be and was used by Reverend Thornton to draw or to suggest unwarranted conclusions." I am completely in the dark as to what you meant by that and since I am directly involved I assure you of my sincere desire for an explanation.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Alfred O. Thornton.

House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., March 7, 1963.
Rev. Alfred O. Thornton,
Pastor, Bible Baptist Church,
Jefferson City, Mo.

Dear Dr. Thornton: I am happy to comply with your request that I explain what I meant by the last clause of the paragraph you refer to in my letter to Mr. James Havens: "which could be and was used by Reverend Thornton to draw or to suggest unwarranted conclusions."

Your "Dear Lawmaker" letter addressed to all Missouri State legislators stated, "Please notice very carefully the following information about Dr. Stuber.

"I have a personal letter from the Honorable Francis E. Walter, chairman of Committee on Un-American Activities. Mr. Walter enclosed the following data:"

This data was typed on the standard form employed by the House Un-American Activities Committee which has a printed caveat preceding the information set out. This caveat reads as follows:

"This committee makes no evaluation in this report. The following is only a compilation of recorded public material contained in our files and should not be construed as representing the results of any investigation or finding by the committee. The fact that the committee has information as set forth below on the subject of this report is not per se an indication that this individual, organization, or publication is subversive, unless specifically stated."

You did not print this caveat in your letter or in any way warn the people you were writing to that this was unevaluated material and that deductions should not be drawn from it that a person is or was subversive.

As a matter of fact, you edited the material from the House Un-American Activities Committee files.

Item 1. The House Un-American Activities Committee files state that the Daily Worker "reported" Dr. Stuber to be a sponsor of the Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act and a circular and petition of this committee listed him as among "prominent

Americans" who urged the repeal of the McCarran Act.

Your letter states baldly that Dr. Stuber sponsored this national committee. This is drawing an unwarranted conclusion. I remind you the sole authority for drawing the conclusion is the Daily Worker, which, according to my standards, and I suspect yours, is a very unreliable authority.

Item 2. The House Un-American Activities Committee file merely says that a letterhead, received in 1949, listed Dr. Stuber as secretary-treasurer of the Inter-Church Committee of the American-Russian Institute.

You draw the unwarranted conclusion that "Dr. Stuber was the secretary-treasurer * * *." A letterhead at most is some evidence of this fact, not conclusive proof. Furthermore, you very neatly have edited out of the House Un-American Activities Committee report references to dates, except in your item 1, dealing with the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act—and there you put in the years in which the Daily Worker and the committee said Dr. Stuber was active in this but failed to note that the earliest citation of this committee as subversive was in 1956. Dates become very important in evaluating membership in organizations. An organization can start out perfectly sound and be subverted at a later date. It is for this reason that the House Un-American Activities Committee files give the date when the organization under question was declared subversive and by which governmental agency. In this instance, the Inter-Church Committee of the American-Russian Institute, the dates were 1949, 1952, and 1956. There is no statement as to when the letterhead might have been printed. The House Un-American Activities Committee statement is limited and quite clear, "the letterhead was received in 1949."

Item 3. The files state the Daily Worker reported in 1947 that Dr. Stuber was among many signers of a statement sponsored by the organization in question. Two pamphlets of the organization said Dr. Stuber was among the signers of a statement and appeal sponsored by it. You draw the unwarranted conclusion that "Dr. Stuber was connected with" the organization. This is an indication of some connection, but not proof of it. The dates of the statements are not listed so we have no way of knowing whether they were issued before or after the organization in question was found to be subversive.

Item 4. The files state that the call for a National Emergency Conference May 13, 14, 1939, "named Dr. Stuber as a sponsor." You draw the unwarranted conclusion that he was a sponsor. Maybe he was, but this is only an indication he was. The organization was not declared subversive until 1946 and 1949.

Item 5. The file states that Dr. Stuber's name was on a letterhead (no date) of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom which was declared subversive in 1946 and 1949. The date of the Spanish Civil War suggests that the letterhead, whatever it signifies, probably was printed about 10 years earlier. You draw the unwarranted conclusion that "he was a sponsor."

I have pointed out specifically where you have drawn unwarranted conclusions. Let me now point out where you suggest unwarranted conclusions. Your final paragraph is as follows: "By the way the above report on Dr. Stuber is only fragmentary. There are other men in Missouri who know more on him than I do." Now what do you mean "know more on him" unless you are suggesting that all the secondhand, quoted out of context, rephrased material you have previously set out is something "on him," that is, against him.

What indeed is the entire purpose of your letter if it is not to draw and suggest unwarranted conclusions about Dr. Stuber?

Now let me conclude by saying this. I have no brief for Dr. Stuber. I don't believe I have ever met him, although I may be in error on this. I am at considerable odds with him on many important matters including his actions and attitudes toward the House Un-American Activities Committee, which I believe is doing a very difficult task under very trying circumstances with a reasonable record of fairness. I have criticized and still criticize the House Un-American Activities Committee for certain specific things, but I try to make my criticism constructive and I am also guided by the thought that I may be the one in error.

I believe that freedom of thought and the freedom to express one's thoughts is very basic to our way of life. It is because the Communist ideology would deprive our people of these freedoms—and our other important freedoms as well—that I am so strongly opposed to communism. However, we must not in combating communism and its attempt to infiltrate our society (and this threat is not a figment of the imagination) sacrifice the very freedoms we are fighting to protect. The end cannot justify these self-defeating means.

I am satisfied that if we are careful and fair we can combat communism effectively. Communism thrives on unfairness, excesses and carelessness with the truth; it withers in the light of honest debate and true seeking after facts. I do not believe the material which you circulated has helped in the fight against communism.

With best wishes,

Yours very truly,

Thomas B. Curtis.

There is a final level of responsibility which I feel deserves mention in this area. It is the responsibility of men like Dr. Stuber, leaders in their communities, to those who look to them for guidance. I am placing a letter which I have written to Dr. Stuber below, but I should like to point up its major thrust. As a preface to my letter is a letter which Dr. Stuber has written to the committee, in response to their invitation and request, stating his comments on the listings which the committee has dealing with him in its public files. I am pleased that Dr. Stuber has done this and, I might note, committee procedure is that this statement will be made part of the file of material on Dr. Stuber and will be with the file material to those who request such material.

In joining, supporting, or lending his name—if indeed he did—to the various organizations which are mentioned in the committee's files, Dr. Stuber placed the prestige of his person and his office behind these organizations. Because of this prestige which Dr. Stuber has, it is incumbent upon him, just as it is incumbent upon every Member of this body, to use care in giving support to groups which seek it. His giving support is not a private thing; it is an act which the recipient organization will publicize and upon which those who respect Dr. Stuber and have faith in him can rely. He owes it to the public to make the full extent of his connections an open matter—if he does support a cause, he should be glad to say why and, if the cause has been found subversive, to explain why he feels he can still cooperate with it in the best interests of the country or, on the other hand, announce that he no longer gives it his support. Just as Reverend Thornton has failed in his responsibility, Dr. Stuber, too, has helped create what I believe is a very unfortunate situation.

February 21, 1963.

The Honorable Francis E. Walter,
Chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Walter: At your suggestion I am making the following statement to be used in connection with the public file dealing with my name: "Dr. Stuber Not Connected With Communism."

In view of the above listing I want to state that it is entirely misleading and has absolutely false implications. I have never been a member of any Communist or Communist-front organization. Neither have I paid membership dues to any such organizations nor attended any of their meetings. All during my public ministry I have been opposed to communism and to other totalitarian groups. What I have said and done have been inspired by Christian convictions and have had no connection with communism. As an American citizen, believing in our Bill of Rights, I feel that it is not un-American to speak out boldly for what I believe to be Christian principles. I am perfectly willing to be judged by my Christian position. I am unwilling to be associated to any degree with communism.

The Reverend Dr. Stanley I. Stuber.

House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., March 13, 1963.
Stanley I. Stuber, Th.M., D.D.,
Executive Director, Missouri Council of Churches, Jefferson City, Mo.

Dear Dr. Stuber: In reviewing your recent letter to Chairman Francis Walter of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the statement which you have prepared for inclusion in the public file of material dealing with you, I felt compelled to write further carrying on our exchange on this matter.

I am very happy that you have chosen to accept the invitation of the committee to give this statement. I regret that you did not do so earlier. You have attained, and I am sure earned, a position of great respect in your community—a community which, I might say, extends far beyond the bounds of Jefferson City and the State of Missouri. Many people look to you for leadership and respect the opinions which you express.

With this prestige which you enjoy goes a duty to those who rely upon you. I feel I have the same duty. I cannot give my support to an organization without knowing that with it I lend whatever prestige my name carries to the organization as well. My support for an organization, and yours, is not a private thing; it thrusts this relationship out into the public eye, with all of the personal satisfaction and problems which this implies.

With the relationship public, the duty attaches to one who has lent his prestige to an organization to assure that the reliance placed in him is not misdirected in support of the organization. The duty can be met by letting those who rely upon you know the details of your connection with the organization and, if you disagree with the organization, your duty compels that you do whatever you can to make this disagreement known.

The content of your statement to the committee should reassure everyone of your beliefs. It does nothing to meet your duty to those who rely upon you to bring to light your connection, if any, with the organization with which your name is linked in the committee public files.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

Thomas B. Curtis.

AREA JOB RETRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 18, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles] inserted in the Congressional Record a statement in which he discussed the operation of the Area Redevelopment Administration's job retraining program in Hagerstown, Md.

The net effect of the gentleman's statement was to absolve the agencies involved of any responsibility for a situation in which Federal funds were used in this program to train workers, directly and indirectly, for the benefit of a company, Mack Trucks, Inc., which relocated one of its plants from Plainfield, N.J., to Hagerstown, Md.

I must respectfully take exception to the gentleman's conclusion.

The gentleman's statement in the Record, Mr. Speaker, was generally factual—so far as it went. Not only did he omit some pertinent considerations, however, but he also placed an interpretation on the situation which I believe runs directly at variance with the facts he concedes.

He concedes that Mack Trucks, Inc., is a runaway plant, that its removal from Plainfield, N.J., to Hagerstown, Md., was a clear case of a relocation of industry; that the Area Redevelopment Act contains a clear bar against using Federal funds for a relocating industry; that an application was filed for Federal funds under the Area Redevelopment Act to set up a program for retaining workers as machine tool operators at the Mack plant in Hagerstown; that, even though this specific application was denied, three different programs for training machine tool operators were established in the immediate area; and that a total of about 60 or more workers retrained in these programs with Federal funds were employed by Mack Trucks.

In one very important respect, however, the gentleman's recital of the facts is, I believe, incorrect. He states that "as soon as this situation"—the direct referral of 15 graduates of the first retraining program to the Mack Co.—"came to the attention of officials in Washington, the Hagerstown Employment Service Office was reminded of the bar against aiding relocating industries, and no future references were made to Mack."

According to my information, Mr. Speaker, at no time during this period did officials in Washington remind the Employment Service Office of this prohibition. The Courier-News of Plainfield, N.J., which first revealed the situation on March 7, following an extensive, firsthand investigation in Hagerstown and Washington, quoted the director of the Maryland Office of Employment Security in Hagerstown as stating that he does not recall anyone ever telling him to stop referring people to Mack.

If this were the whole story, Mr. Speaker, it would represent a clear violation of the spirit and specific provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act, whether intentional or a result of poor administration. These additional facts, however, which the gentleman from Maryland ignores, makes the violation even more obvious.

The Federally subsidized retraining programs were established in Hagerstown and vicinity in full knowledge of the fact that Mack was the area's biggest employer and the source of the largest demand for machine tool operators.

Those who established the program knew, too, that the demand for machine tool operators by other employers was a direct result of Mack's policy of "pirating" skilled employees from these other employers through the promise of higher wages.

Therefore, those who established the retraining programs had every reason to know that most of the demand for machine tool operators was created, directly and indirectly, by a relocating industry, and that the principal purpose of the retraining programs, financed by Federal funds, was to meet the demand created by this relocating industry, Mack.

Not counting those workers undergoing retraining who went to work for employers other than Mack, because Mack had previously raided those employers, the direct cost to taxpayers of retraining the 60 or so workers employed by Mack totaled $50,000.

Part of this $50,000 of tax receipts was paid by the 2,000 or more former employees of Mack in Plainfield, N.J., who lost their jobs when Mack moved to Hagerstown. Therefore, those who became unemployed by virtue of a runaway plant were forced to help support the training of workers to take their places in this same runaway plant.

It is this fundamental injustice, Mr. Speaker, that led Congress to write a forceful antipiracy provision in the Area Redevelopment Act. The Mack experience suggests this provision is either being administered inadequately or is incapable of enforcement.

The gentleman from Maryland seems to imply that the law cannot properly be enforced. He dismisses as an "inadvertance" the fact that workers were trained for employment in a relocated plant. He writes off as "a fact of life" the inevitability that other retrained workers, not specifically referred to the relocated plant, will eventually go to work for the relocated plant in answer to widely advertised employment opportunities for workers retrained as machine tool operators. And he further defends the use of a federally subsidized retraining program to supply workers to industries which have lost employees to the relocated plant.

If this is a proper interpretation of the manner in which the Area Redevelopment Act should be administered, or if the act is in fact being so administered, I feel certain the news will come as something of a shock to many Members of Congress who voted in favor of the act. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee which considered the legislation and reported it favorably, I can say with some assurance that this was not the understanding at the time the act was approved. On the contrary, no other provision of the act received more extended and careful consideration than the antipiracy clause. Everything possible was done to make this provision airtight, to guarantee that Federal assistance would not be used in any way to aid, abet, or encourage the relocation of plants from an industrially developed area to a labor surplus area, or to otherwise benefit such plants. I do not believe the Area Redevelopment Act could have been passed if there had been any reasonable doubt that the administration shared this understanding and was prepared to administer the act accordingly.

The reasonableness of a strict interpretation of the antipiracy provision is, I believe, self-evident. First, it would be the grossest kind of injustice to require displaced workers, who are also taxpayers, to help finance a tax-supported program providing benefits to the company which caused his unemployment by relocating its plant. Second, it is obviously uneconomic for a Federal-aid program to function in such a way that it benefits the act of exchanging unemployment, and this is clearly the effect of relocating existing industrial plants. The new employment created by the new plant is often more than matched by the unemployment caused by closing the existing plant. While private companies have a right, of course, to relocate their facilities, they have no right—either in reason or law—to expect the Federal Government to provide assistance of any kind in connection with the relocation. The purpose of the distressed area program is to help create new job opportunities by encouraging establishment of new and expanded industrial facilities, not by relocating plants already in existence.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I must respectfully but vigorously disagree with our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles], with respect to the responsibility for permitting Federal funds to be used to benefit the Mack Co.'s relocated plant. The assistance the Mack Co. received was both direct and indirect. It was substantial. It was provided knowingly in a situation in which the Mack Co. was both the chief cause of the Federal-aid project and its principal beneficiary. And it was provided in violation of a specific provision of law.

Under these circumstances, accountability cannot be waived. Whether it is the Area Redevelopment Administration or the Department of Labor, someone is responsible for permitting Federal funds to be used to assist a relocated plant. Congress has an obligation to look into the situation thoroughly and determine whether such violations of the antipiracy provision of the Area Redevelopment Act can be prevented or whether this provision cannot be enforced adequately.

I have discussed this matter, Mr. Speaker, with several of my colleagues on the Banking and Currency Committee, including the chairman of the committee. I have written to the Secretaries of Commerce and Labor asking them to investigate and provide us with a full report. The Secretary of Commerce has assured me it will be looked into carefully and a full report furnished in the near future. I have not yet heard from the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure our colleagues, especially those who represent industrial areas as I do, will agree that this situation is extremely serious.

If the Area Redevelopment Act is not being administered in accordance with the spirit of the law and the clear intent of Congress, then we must take appropriate steps to insist on proper administration. If the antipiracy provision of the act is ambiguous or inadequate in any way, then Congress ought to tighten it up. If the antipiracy provision cannot be enforced as Congress intended, or if the act cannot be so administered as to prevent the use of Federal funds to aid relocated plants, then I believe the entire act should be repealed or drastically revised and a fresh start made to find a more workable way of aiding distressed areas.

Otherwise, we shall be permitting, indeed encouraging, the Area Redevelopment program to be used as a lure to companies interested in relocating their plants when they can get something for nothing. The people we represent, many of whom are potential victims of such piracy, would not be likely to agree that this is a proper use of Federal funds.

FREEMAN'S POLICY FIGURES ON WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, all of us have been confronted during the past 2 years by the paper curtain—the New Frontier-style barrier through which only officially slanted news is permitted to come to public view.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has its own paper curtain, and this is particularly true of the deceptive propaganda being fed to farmers about the wheat referendum.

Officials of the Department, from Secretary Freeman down to county ASC office managers, are declaring that the referendum is a choice between $2 wheat and $1 wheat.

This is false and grossly misleading. It is made for an obvious reason: It plays on the price-depression fears of farmers. But neither the $2 figure nor the $1 figure is accurate.

Price is only one of several important considerations in the referendum. But considering price only, the choice is not between $2 wheat and $1 wheat. It is between wheat at about $1.85 the first year and, under the worst circumstances, $1.25 wheat if the referendum fails.

Where the $1 figure originated is anybody's guess. It did not come from anything in the lawbooks. If the referendum fails—and if Congress should fail to pass new legislation—wheat would be supported at 50 percent of parity. This means price support at $1.25 a bushel. Of course, no one seriously suggests that Congress would fail to act if the referendum fails.

Consider the facts. Mr. Carl Albert, majority leader of the House, represents a major wheatgrowing area. Would he block new legislation if farmers vote down the certificate scheme. Of course not. Indeed he would be in the front ranks hustling to get a new bill passed.

With the 1964 election just around the corner, is President Kennedy apt to put the clamps on voters who grow wheat just because they turned down the bill to establish mandatory acre-and-bushel controls? He is not about to, and all the threats to the contrary will be smothered in wide smiles once the referendum tally is counted.

Does a car salesman refuse to deal with a customer just because he will not buy one particular model? Of course not. He is back quicklike with another one—probably the same day.

That is why I say that only under the worst circumstances wheat would be supported at $1.25 if the referendum fails. Those circumstances just will not come to be, particularly with a politically sensitive President in the White House.

Now, the promise of $2 wheat if the referendum carries. Probably the least understood portion of the proposal is that if a farmer stays within his allotment he gets a certificate for only a portion of the production. The portion is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture on the basis of the national quota. Secretary Freeman has indicated farmers staying within their allotments would get a 70-cent certificate for between 80 and 85 percent of their normal production. Note the word normal.

This means the farmer would average about $1.85 per bushel—not $2—since he would sell the balance of his production—some 15 to 20 percent—under the $1.30 per bushel support level.

If the farmer heaps on the fertilizer and gets a bigger-than-normal yield, the extra yield would go under the $1.30 support too, and thus the average per bushel would drop below $1.85.

The new legislation would give the Secretary vast discretionary authority.

Suppose the wheat harvest is good in 1964, and stockpiles rise. Under the new legislation the Secretary would have the authority—and the responsibility, for that matter—to cut back the bushelage quota still more. It is anybody's guess what the per bushel average price for wheat might then be in 1965 and beyond.

The new legislation provides that wheat used for food at home and such portion of wheat exports as the Secretary determines, would be supported at between 65 and 90 percent of parity. The Secretary is directed to consider eight factors in making this determination.

Previous legislation provided a minimum price support at 75 percent of parity for all wheat produced within the allotment.

Now wheat not accompanied by certificates would be supported at a still lower level than 65 percent of parity, again to be determined by the Secretary. He has announced that wheat not accompanied by certificates on farms that stay within their allotments will be supported at $1.30 a bushel, or a shade over 50 percent of parity.

Under the law the Secretary could have gone much lower and related the price support to feed grains. This lower support would be possible, of course, after 1964. Budget troubles might force such action.

All the erroneous talk about $2 versus $1 wheat obscures other dangerous features of the new legislation.

For example. No payment for diverted acres after 1965, and payment at the Secretary's option in 1965.

Let me explain. Under the new legislation the old 55-million-acre minimum national allotment would be eliminated. In its place would be a billion-bushel minimum marketing quota. This quota, on a bushel and acre basis would be divided among wheat farmers.

As technology improves, this could mean sharp acreage cuts in years beyond 1964. As yields go up, allotments and quotas go down.

You might assume that as acreage allotments are cut, farmers will be paid for the diverted acres. Payments are authorized only for 1964 and 1965. After 1965, no payments are authorized. Secretary Freeman has already announced that farmers will receive a diversion payment for 1964 on a 10-percent mandatory cut at 30 percent of the normal yield. In 1965 he may make it substantially lower or eliminate it altogether. Here again budget problems may govern policy.

Here is something even more serious, a strange new penalty never before applied in commodity programs. The new legislation provides that after 1965 the diverted acreage must go into conserving or certain special crop uses, but no payment is authorized for this diversion. If the farmer fails to place this acreage in conserving uses, he becomes ineligible for price supports or certificates and is subject to high marketing-quota penalties. All this, even though he stays within his wheat allotment.

As I said, this is something new: truly a straitjacket within a straitjacket.

This is a good time for the wheat farmers of America, and particularly those in my home State of Illinois, to stop, look, and listen.

Somehow they must pierce the paper curtain and get the facts—before it is too late.

BRAZIL THREATENS TO QUIT TAKING OUR MONEY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, if we are not careful we will make some of the foreign countries so mad they will quit taking our money.

This occurred to me when I read in the March 18 Evening Star this Associated Press story, the first three paragraphs of which are reprinted here:

> BRASILIA, March 18.—President Joao Goulart has reacted angrily to U.S. assertions that Communists had infiltrated his government. A big new obstacle arose to harmonious relations between the two countries.
>
> Mr. Goulart demanded that President Kennedy personally clarify the charges made by the State Department in a published statement to the House Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs.
>
> The President issued an order to his finance minister, Francisco San Tiago Dantas, to suspend his negotiations in Washington for more U.S. aid. Informed sources said, however, that Foreign Minister Hermes Lima persuaded Mr. Goulart to withdraw the order.

Mr. Goulart was really going to get even with us, was he not? The moral of it: if we want our foreign aid program to keep going full blast, we had better quit complaining about such incidentals as Communist infiltration in the countries on the receiving end.

COLLEGIATE NURSING EDUCATION ACT OF 1963

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the measure I am introducing today authorizes a 5-year program of grants and scholarships for college training in the nursing field. The legislation is designed to help alleviate the pressing need for more and better trained nurses which exists in our Nation today.

This need is reflected in the present shortage of public health nurses, industrial nurses, and school nurses, as well as in the chronic shortage of nurses to staff hospitals and nursing homes. If we are to properly provide for the long-range nursing needs of this country, the time for action is now.

The Collegiate Nursing Education Act of 1963 has three main parts:

The first section provides matching grants for nursing school construction and specifies that no school could receive more than $500,000 in the 5-year period.

The second section authorizes funds for teaching assistance and states that no institution can receive over $25,000.

The third section makes scholarships available to both entering students and to graduate nurses with a 3-year hospital diploma.

I am pleased to advise the House that the Rhode Island State Nurses' Association and other nursing organizations are solidly behind this measure.

Nursing is a great vocation which seeks to serve those who cannot serve themselves. In order to close the gap which exists between the supply of qualified nurses and the demand for them, and to further upgrade the nursing profession, I urge enactment of the Collegiate Nursing Act of 1963 at this session of Congress.

A COGENT ANALYSIS OF THE PATENT PROBLEM

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, an important aspect of the present scale of economic growth in the United States arises from our need to see that we make the best possible use of the inventions which are developed in laboratories across the country. This is a complex problem, relating to the way we disseminate the results of technical and scientific research and the way in which we encourage the best brains and the best talent to apply itself to solutions of difficult technical problems.

An element of this problem is the handling of patents in such a way as to stimulate the progress of science and the useful arts. This area has provoked a great deal of discussion in recent years as some who are fearful of monopoly in any form have challenged the patent system, even though the Congress has established legislation to be invoked whenever antitrust situations appear.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions in the last Congress and a member of its predecessor, I have had occasion to study this controversy at some length. The House, on one occasion, has indicated its belief that a flexible patent policy with regard to inventions under the Space Act should be adopted by passing legislation which so stated and, on a second occasion, the Committee on Science and Astronautics overwhelmingly recommended such a statement.

There is no question that the Space Act should be amended to speed and improve our national space program and to give the Administrator of the National Space and Aeronautics Administration more flexibility with which to carry out his congressional mandate to use the full resources of the United States in achieving his goals. This will require legislative action.

The conflict in patent policies and theories has been brought to the attention of the President on a number of occasions and, in the early months of the present administration, there was a major attempt to urge Executive action which would take this policy out of the hands of the Congress. Wisely, the President recognized the complexity of this problem, and indicated at a press conference last year, in response to questions, that he would submit any proposal for a solution to the Congress.

Considerable study was given this question by the executive branch. Much of the study centered in the Office of Science and Technology, which is headed by Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner and which has very grave responsibilities in the shaping of science policy for the Nation. The Office is a staff arm of the President to advise and assist him in these matters.

Dr. Wiesner testified on March 14 at a hearing of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee which has held hearings on patent policies within the Federal Government. Dr. Wiesner discussed the complexities of this problem, and I found his remarks most significant and useful. I believe they should be given wider distribution and should be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress, who should gave an interest in what he had to say.

In essence, Dr. Wiesner's statement sets forth a philosophy which evaluates the importance of the patent issue to the future of research and development and its relation to our national goals. From this, he draws certain guidelines for any real solution to this difficult problem. I was especially pleased to note that it concurs generally with the principles developed by our subcommittee last year.

Thus it seems apparent that, after extensive study of the question of the ownership of patents developed by industry in whole or in part with Federal research funds, Dr. Wiesner and his associates have arrived at most of the same conclusions which our committee recommended last year and which we reported to the House as House Resolution 12812 on August 12, 1962.

It is clear from Dr. Wiesner's testimony that he has found a definite need for flexibility in approaching the matter and that there are many instances in which title to inventions should remain with private enterprise as well as some in which title should become the property of the Federal Government. Dr. Wiesner emphasized that the Government should always retain a royalty free irrevocable license on these inventions for use by the Government. I believe it is implicit in his testimony that, for the most part, such license is sufficient protection of the public interest except in cases where the Government has been the chief instigator and financer of the inventions in question.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the views expressed by Dr. Wiesner show that the administration has looked into this question carefully and identified the equities which must be protected. I believe they also show clearly the need for a change in the present Space Act if we are to obtain the equity and flexibility toward which Dr. Wiesner is striving—and toward which we on this committee have been working for a number of years.

As things now stand, the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 so restricts administrative procedures that NASA cannot deal with industry on a completely equitable basis. Where NASA is now compelled to demand ownership of inventions developed by contractors during the course of their research, subject only to possible waiver, the change which we have recommended would leave this matter to the discretion of the administrator who may choose that course which is in the best interests of the United States.

Evidence submitted to our committee overwhelmingly supported a change to provide much needed flexibility and thereby speed and improve our space program. Facts show that the rigid nature of the present law has resulted in a paucity of truly meaningful scientific disclosures to come thus far from NASA's research and development program. It is my hope that this matter can be rectified during the present Congress, after which the extreme partisans on this patent question may find themselves able to converge on a common meeting ground.

I am submitting Dr. Wiesner's remarks for publication in the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF JEROME B. WIESNER, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, BEFORE THE MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, MARCH 14, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee to discuss policies concerning patents resulting from federally financed research and development.

Some months ago my office undertook an examination of the patent practices of the Federal agencies with respect to the allocation of patent rights under their contracts with private organizations. We examined the need for Government-wide uniformity of patent practices; explored the rationale behind current practices; and looked into the feasibility of developing a set of common criteria that would guide agency judgment in the handling of patent rights.

I am not speaking as an expert on patent law or on the intricacies of patent procedures in the several agencies. Rather, I am presenting observations from the vantage point of the Office of Science and Technology which is a staff arm of the President to advise and assist him in the coordination of science and technology functions. I am concerned with patent policy from the standpoint of its effects on the conduct of research and development and on the contributions of research to national objectives. Since the office of Science and Technology does not conduct research and development, I am not here to state or defend a particular policy position. We have analyzed this complex and tangled situation from a neutral corner and have conscientiously attempted to assess what the public interest requires, taking into consideration the many relevant factors, both public and private.

There are as many different patent policies and practices within Government as there are agencies engaged in research and development. In the course of our inquiry, we worked with some 20 different departments and agencies and found their attitudes in this matter full cooperative and constructive. Some of their practices are required by legislation; others have been developed through experience over the past 20 or more years. Each agency feels that its own policies are consistent with the public interest and its own mission. The present diversity of policy is due in part to the differing objectives of the Federal agencies and in part reflects differences in the principal industries with which they do business. Some like Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare support research of a type that might normally be tackled by nongovernmental research organizations were there sufficient private resources and motivation. Others like the Department of Defense engage in research and development where the occasional civilian byproducts are incidental to the main object of developing new hardware for governmental purposes. Some fields, such as atomic energy, have largely been developed at public expense. In certain areas of military and space technology, the Government agencies are drawing on extensive industrial experience and know-how developed at both public and private expense.

There can be little disagreement as to the national needs that Government patent policy should serve: the need for maximum creativity and inventiveness in solving scientific and engineering problems; the need to attract the Nation's most competent scientists and engineers and technical management teams to Government research and development tasks; the need for expeditious development and civilian use of any resulting inventions which are practicable for civilian use; and the need to promote healthy competition in industry.

Despite general agreement as to the objectives of Government patent policy, there are divergent views as to the extent patent incentives are required to accomplish these objectives where the work is financed by the Government. I would like to explore this in more detail; there is need for much better public understanding of the issues involved.

Unquestionably, the Government should acquire at least an irrevocable nonexclusive royalty free license with respect to all inventions made in the course of any contract of any Government agency. The questions that have been raised relate to the commercial exploitation of patents. Under what circumstances should the Government take title to inventions made under Government contracts? What are the circumstances where the public interest would be served by leaving exclusive rights with the contractor?

We can delineate several categories of research and development activity carried out for the Government in which a strong case can be made that it would be contrary to the public interest to permit the contractor to acquire exclusive patent rights under the contract. These are categories of scientific and technical work where the widespread availability of the results would be better served through publication and complete freedom of use; where the retention of exclusive rights by the contractor might unfairly put him in a dominant or preferred position. I have in mind the following situations:

First, where a principal purpose of the contract is to create products or processes which are intended to be used in the civilian economy, or which are otherwise intended to be available for use by the general public at home or abroad. Similarly, where the use of the product is required by governmental regulations, the Government should acquire the principal or exclusive rights.

Second, where a principal purpose of the contract is for exploration into fields which directly concern the public health or public welfare, such as the development of a new drug, a medical instrument, or an agricultural chemical.

Third, where the contract is in a field of science or technology in which there has been little significant experience outside of work funded by the Government, or where the Government has been the principal developer of the field. In these situations, the Federal Government should acquire the principal rights where the acquisition of exclusive rights by the contractor at the time of contracting might confer on him a preferred or dominant position.

Fourth, where the services of the contractor are for the operation of a Government-owned research or production facility; or where the contractor is hired to coordinate and direct the work of others. In this situation the acquisition of exclusive rights by the contractor would be inconsistent with the purposes of the contract.

There are other circumstances in which a strong case can be made that would permit the contractor to retain exclusive rights for nongovernmental purposes. Such circumstances must clearly arise in the situation where the work is in an area where the contractor has an established nongovernmental commercial position and has demonstrated technical competence indicated by know-how, experience, and patent position. For example, consider the case of a pump manufacturer who has, over a period of years, invested considerable private resources in the development of new techniques for pumping fluids. In the course of research and development for the Federal Government in developing a pump for liquid fueled rockets, the contractor draws on his extensive background and know-how. Does the possibility that the improvement in the pump may have potential for commercial uses require the Government to obtain title to patents on the improvement?

We are familiar with the points made within and outside of the Government on both sides of this question.

On the one hand it has been advocated that since the Government pays for the research, it should own all the rights; that retention of exclusive rights by the large contractors would undesirably restrain competition and could lead to undesirable economic concentration; that the contractor receives exclusive patent rights without taking financial risks in the research; that the patent incentive is not needed to attract the most competent industries to Government work; that the contractor would be in position to exploit the invention at unreasonable charges or could withhold it from commercial use; that the patent incentive might result in withholding of information until patent applications are filed.

It has been just as vigorously alleged that in these circumstances there is greater likelihood of public availability of the invention if exclusive rights are left in the contractor as an incentive to encourage substantial private investment in product development, production, and establishing a market; that companies with independent investments in know-how and patent position will be reluctant to contract with the Government or to draw upon this background if their inventions were to be made available to competitors; that fewer, not more, contractors would perform important Government work; that there are likely to be fewer inventions reported as such under contracts where the protections and incentives of the patent system for public disclosure of the invention will not be available; that making inventions available for public use destroys the incentives of a privately owned patent; that the Government would be acquiring more rights than it needs for carrying out governmental functions.

The balance of wisdom between these two positions is difficult to reach. There is some validity to points on both sides. Some of them rest on conflicting assumptions. Some go beyond the narrow question of invention under Government contracts and seem to go to the philosophical foundations of the American patent system. I believe that many of the arguments advanced have weak factual foundation, and overgeneralize the actual situation. There is regrettably little fact on which to formulate policy in this difficult area of public administration.

I do not believe that the commercial value of patent rights arising under Government contracts in the past has been such either to support concerns about unjust enrichment or economic concentration, or to lend substantial force to claims that such rights provide an important incentive to attracting industrial firms to undertake federally sponsored research and development. The survey of defense contractors conducted by the

Patents Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary revealed quite limited commercial exploitation. The importance of patent incentives will vary from industry to industry and may also depend on the size of contractor. In the electronics industry with which I have had firsthand experience, the ownership of patent rights can be an important nutrient for the establishment and growth of small companies, and the lack of such rights poses a serious hazard. I know of several instances in which a small company struggled for years to establish a new product only to have a large company then come along and take advantage of the market when it became attractive. Patent protection in such instances would be most important. Therefore, in considering the allocation of patent rights under Government contracts, appropriate weight must be given to the views and unpredictable response of the large number of subcontractors on which the vitality of our military and space program heavily rests.

It has been the practice in some of the Government agencies to accord exclusive rights to contractors in the last-mentioned situation after the invention has been identified; that is, where the contractor has a nongovernmental commercial position, and where the commercial use of the invention is incidental to the primary object of the contract and is not of a type that would fall in one of the four public-interest categories previously described.

The Department of Defense feels strongly among other things that the performance of its mission requires the ability to assure the contractor at the time of contracting that he will retain commercial rights to his ideas, in order to assure the unrestrained participation by the most competent elements of American industry in the defense programs. There is concern that such unrestrained participation cannot be achieved without giving heavy weight to the contractor's commercial position and past investment in the field of his specialization in according exclusive patent rights. It is impossible, of course, to prove this contention short of trial by experience, although the views of many industrial firms large and small in support of the defense position are well known. Whether or not one agrees with the concern, it is real. There are grounds for caution lest a change in longstanding defense policy to insist that all rights to such inventions be retained by the Government in all cases result in research and development of lesser quality, of greater costs, or of longer times required to produce the desired results. A middle ground might be found to give particular weight at the time of contracting to the contractor's commercial position and his prior investment. The central question is not primarily whether experienced contractors could be found to accept more restrictive patent clauses. It is whether the terms of the contract will encourage the contractor to apply his full technical background and experience to the Government work. These considerations also apply to contracts of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The national interest requires greater uniformity between DOD and NASA patent practices since they are drawing on the services of the same sector of industrial research and development competence.

Despite the wide apparent variations in agency practices at the present time and the fact that there has been a difference of view within the Congress, within the administration, and between industry and Government for well over 15 years, I feel that a reasonable basis for framing a governmentwide patent policy can be found. It seems important for the Government to move in the direction of a more consistent policy that will eliminate the unhealthy confusion and instabilities that attend the present situation. Such a policy should provide for the Government to retain title in the range of circumstances that I listed earlier; but it is necessary to recognize that, because of the problems of the type that concern the Department of Defense and NASA, any policy, to be realistic, should enable industry to retain exclusive rights in certain circumstances. As I have already indicated, the nature of the work involved, the commercial background of the contractor, and the extent to which the contractor would be expected to work the invention in the public interest would be significant factors in permitting contractors to retain exclusive commercial rights. Of course, where agencies now feel it necessary to acquire greater rights for the Government, such requirements should continue.

I think that any concern regarding such exclusive rights might be further alleviated if a further step were taken to assure the protection of the public interest. I have in mind the possibility that whenever the principal rights remain in the contractor, the Government would reserve the right to require the granting of a license on a nonexclusive royalty free basis unless the contractor or his licensee has taken effective steps within a limited period, as for example 3 years, after a patent issues on the invention to bring the invention to the point of practical application, or unless he has made the invention available for licensing royalty free or on reasonable terms. This would preserve the patent protection for a reasonable period in this time of rapid technological advance, and increase the incentives for expeditious commercialization and public use of new inventions while eliminating the possibility that commercial use of such inventions could be suppressed.

A Government policy along the foregoing lines could be adopted on a trial basis. At the same time I would urge the marshaling of facts by the Government agencies with respect to the development, reporting, and use of inventions made under Government contracts in order to provide a sounder basis for the formulation of future policy. Through my office and the Federal Council for Science and Technology, I would propose to develop by mutual consultation and coordination with the agencies a common approach to the implementation and further development of policy in this area, consistent with existing statutes.

I hope that various interests of the Federal agencies in stimulating and promoting the making and utilization of inventions under research and development contracts can converge in a common objective to serve all of the elements of our society and reinforce the partnership between Government and industry in accomplishing the many jobs required in the national interest.

NEED FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, a resolution proposing the establishment of a House Committee on Captive Nations, known as House Resolution 211, was submitted to the 87th Congress, first session, more than 2 years ago. The fact that it has not moved a step forward and had to be resubmitted to this Congress as House Resolution 14, is directly attributable to the State Department's opposition. Secretary Dean Rusk, in his famous letter to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], dated August 22, 1961, mentioned two arguments against such a committee:

> (1) The establishment of such a committee might be taken as a pretext for actions by the Soviet Union which would interfere with the resolution of the present crisis over Berlin;
>
> (2) The U.S. Government's position would be weakened by any action which places the U.S. Government in the undesirable position of seeming to advocate the dismemberment of an historical state—

Meaning the Soviet Union, which hardly may be termed an historical state since it was established but 40 years ago. But to continue quoting Mr. Rusk, he also would oppose any action that "confuses the rights of formerly independent peoples or nations with the status of areas, such as the Ukraine, Armenia or Georgia, which are traditional parts of the Soviet Union."

However, Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention lately that the State Department is using a third argument to defeat the establishment of a Committee on Captive Nations. I quote from a letter, dated February 16, 1962, and signed by Mr. Frederick G. Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State:

> The creation of a specialized committee to operate in one sector of our foreign relations, without responsibility in the broader area of foreign affairs problems, would ignore the fact that our efforts on behalf of the captive nations can only be effective if they are made within the context of the overall Soviet threat as well as of our national interests and capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, the spokesman for the State Department in this case committed a basic error. Congressional committees are not established to operate in any sector of the executive branch of Government. Mr. Dutton's fear of competition is groundless. The congressional committees are established to conduct studies and investigations of matters properly coming before the Congress and make recommendations thereon. Congress examines such recommendations against a much broader background of its responsibilities than those of the State Department, and either accepts, modifies, or rejects the recommendations.

But what the State Department really wants is to preclude any congressional committee from exercising its constitutional duty of investigation within the sacred preserves of the Department. Taking the captive nations as an example, the State Department would like to deal with their problem the way it sees fit.

The Assistant Secretary of State makes no mistake about it. He says:

> We will continue our efforts on behalf of the captive nations, and we are confident that the established bodies responsible for these matters are able and determined to give them the full attention which they merit.

However, Mr. Speaker, I must stand corrected on one point. The State Department, as indicated in Mr. Dutton's letter, condescendingly agreed that "the

House Foreign Affairs Committee was taking a special interest in the question of the captive nations within the broader framework of the responsibilities of that committee."

The recognition would be too good if it were true. It is not. I understand the State Department has vetoed the establishment of a Subcommittee on Captive Nations under the Foreign Affairs Committee. Such a measure was recommended in the committee's "Report on Hearings on Captive European Nations," dated October 26, 1962. Evidently, the Foreign Affairs Committee was taking too much interest in the captive nations. Too much, that is, to the State Department's liking.

Mr. Speaker, do I hear the State Department tell us, "Hands off the captive nations," and are we going to take its dictates lying down? I hope we are not.

TAXES

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to testify on March 6 before the House Ways and Means Committee on the subject of the revision of our tax structure.

The following is the text of my statement and the questions and answers which were asked concerning it:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 6, 1963

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today to comment on the President's proposal to revise our tax structure.

In dealing with legislation as important as this and covering as wide an area, it is unlikely that we will find many people who will agree with every facet of the President's recommendations. I assure you that I do not envy the tremendous burden which you must assume in performing the task of bringing out a bill that will be acceptable to a majority of Members of the House. I do trust that my comments will prove helpful and not further confuse an already complicated problem.

In the interests of time I will not discuss the general principles underlying these tax recommendations but will address myself to specific parts thereof. I would like, however, to make this one general statement, to wit, the enactment of the bulk of the President's recommendations should redound to the benefit of the entire economy of our country and more particularly to the benefit of the small businessman and to the lower income groups.

I address myself first to the matter of treatment of itemized deductions from personal income.

The proposed new treatment of these deductions by limiting them to that in excess of 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income is in my opinion the wrong way to tackle this problem. This would hit hardest at the lower income groups whose deductions while small dollarwise are most meaningful to them. There certainly will be no incentive to anyone to meet their civic and charitable obligations by saying to them that they can get no tax deduction or credit until after they have paid 5 percent of their income. It works an even greater hardship to say to them that the first 3, 4, or 5 percent of their gross income which they actually expend for medical expenses is not deductible. I could never understand the theory by which only the excess over these percentages was deductible.

The recommendation as to minor casualty losses so as to exclude all deductions up to 4 percent of the taxpayer's income would merely create another incentive to cheat. This is analogous to insurance policies which provide that the first $25 or $50 of loss is not payable by the insurance company. Insurance carriers will tell you that this results in most people getting bills for double the amount of the loss in order to cover the excludable portion thereof. The same thing will undoubtedly occur if this provision should be enacted. The Internal Revenue Service couldn't find a force large enough to investigate and check upon those items. It would undoubtedly cost the Government many times more to unsuccessfully attempt to collect the taxes for these deductions than the deductions themselves would aggregate.

Any attempt to remove the exemption from interest on mortgages and the real estate taxes on homeowners' properties would be nothing less than a breach of faith by our Government. Thomas Jefferson wrote, "The small landowners are the most precious part of a State." For years our Government has been urging our citizens to become homeowners. The latest statistics show that almost 60 percent of our families own their own homes today. One of the greatest incentives to the acquisition of homes was the fact repeatedly stressed that interest on mortgages and real estate taxes were deductions from gross income for tax purposes. I urge that we do not change that exclusion.

Another recommendation that I oppose is the repeal of the $50 and 4 percent deduction on dividend income. This exemption was to have been a first step toward the elimination of the unfair and inequitable double taxation on earnings.

In considering what should be done with this recommendation I urge that this committee do not consider how much tax can be received by our Government but rather, do we have a right to tax earnings twice? Once the earnings of a corporation have been taxed, the net amount belongs to the stockholders and, while there might be some logic in taxing a corporation for failure to pay those earnings as dividends to the stockholders, we cannot justify taxing those identical earnings a second time when they are distributed to the owners therof.

With reference to capital gains, I urge that you will decrease the net revenue payable to the Government on capital gains by extending the period from 6 months to 1 year in order to qualify for a long-term capital gain. It is my opinion that the capital gains taxes payable to the Government would increase two or three times if instead of increasing the period we decreased it to 3 or 4 months. By decreasing the period to 3 or 4 months these capital assets would turn over that much more frequently and each time they were sold there would be a capital gains tax paid.

I heartily endorse the recommendation to tax as earnings and not as capital gains the moneys realized on stock options. But I suggest that that tax be payable not on earnings in connection with stock options granted after enactment of the law but on all earnings received after the enactment of the law, regardless of when the stock option was granted. The proposed changes of the rate of taxation will apply to all earnings thereafter received and any change in the tax structure should equally be made to apply to all earnings thereafter received regardless of when and where contracted for.

The President has recommended an additional tax credit of $300 for all people age 65 or over regardless of the source of their income. This credit is to replace both the extra exemption allowed to older people and the retirement income credit. Our senior citizens are greatly in need of tax relief since the annuities which they receive are usually not enough to live on. I believe that the Committee should consider the exemption from Federal income tax of annuities received by individuals age 65 and over. As a partial step in this direction I have introduced H.R. 4182, which would exempt amounts up to $2,400 in annuities, pensions, or requirement benefits paid by local, State, or Federal governments.

I strongly urge that as recommended in H.R. 4182 all annuities paid by State, local, and Federal governments be exempt from Federal income tax.

I recommend that the provisions of my bill, H.R. 525, to assist small business and persons engaged in small business by allowing a deduction from Federal income tax for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable, should be included in any new tax bill enacted.

I also urge the inclusion of the provisions of my bill, H.R. 530, which would amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business by permitting individuals and partnerships filing income tax returns for small businesses to revoke an election to be taxed as a corporation; to provide a normal tax rate of 20 percent for taxable years after June 30, 1963, and to increase the surtax exemption; to provide a growth, expansion, and modernization exemption on net taxable earnings; to liberalize the income tax treatment of losses incurred through loans; to provide an exemption for goodwill in the determination of the value of an estate and to provide family-sized farmers an exemption for the improvement, modernization, and renewal of buildings or equipment used in the production, care and marketing of farm products, and to provide family-sized farms the same exemption.

I believe that these last two items will greatly stimulate small business.

Thank you for your time and attention.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr MULTER, the committee appreciates you presenting your views to it.

Any questions?

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, it is a source of constant marvel to me, the scope and depth of my distinguished colleague's activities and this morning is another example of it.

I would, however, like to ask you a question with reference to your proposal concerning stock options. You used in your formal statement the word, "earnings." What did you mean by that?

Mr. MULTER. Stock options, as granted today, are in lieu of additional salaries or compensation to officers and employees of companies. I am not talking about the stock option that would be given to the run-of-the-mill employee where he is actually buying the stock and paying for it on the installment plan, but I am talking about the alleged incentive that big business gives to employees and officers, usually, in the top, higher echelon, to buy stock at less than market value at some future time.

The usual procedure is to offer the stock option at anywhere from 80 to 90 percent of the current market value at the time of the issuance or granting of the option which will be exercised at some future time when the stock is selling at a price two or three times the market value at the time of granting the option.

This, in my opinion, is earnings. It is compensation, and should be taxed as such when the profit is received on the sale of that stock.

In other words, I am granted this option to buy at 85 percent of market value and 2 years from today I exercise that option and buy the stock at 85 percent of today's market value but sell it at twice that price. The difference between what I pay then and what I get for it on resale at that time is earnings to me.

Mr. Keogh. I see.

You mean earnings to the holder of the option. Is it your recommendation that the difference between the sale price and the option price should be taxed to him as ordinary income in the year received?

Mr. Multer. Yes, sir; that is what I am suggesting.

Mr. Keogh. You are, in effect, disagreeing with the proposal of the Treasury Department in that area that the individual be given the 5-year averaging?

Mr. Multer. I am in agreement with the averaging provision. I would not pay the full tax in the one year if the provision for averaging is enacted as part of the law. I think that is a very essential part of the tax recommendation.

Mr. Keogh. My reaction to your statement as you delivered it was you were placing a greater burden on the individual who exercises the stock option than even the Treasury and the President have proposed in the message and testimony?

Mr. Multer. You had a right to draw that conclusion from my statement standing alone without further explanation.

Mr. Keogh. You referred to the bill, H.R. 4184, and indicated, at least gave me the impression, you were increasing the retirement income credit to the recipients of public retirement systems, local, State, and Federal. Is that the purpose of the bill?

Mr. Multer. Yes.

Mr. Keogh. Well, would you accord the same treatment to those who receive retirement annuities from private pension plans?

Mr. Multer. Yes. The point is, the income that has been used to buy those annuities whether privately or from Government by deposits or withholdings in a Government pension system, has been income to the payer in the first instance on which he paid the tax.

Mr. Keogh. Not for the share of the employing agencies that the Government contributes and in the case of the Federal retirement system not for the difference between the percentage contributed and the benefits that the Congress have voted the Federal employees which represents to those individuals a virtual tax free gift, not of 52-cent dollars like in the corporate plans but of tax dollars?

Mr. Multer. You are quite right. To that extent, my plan would be a subsidy to that pension or annuity. But I say we must do it because these pensions and annuities have been bought on the basis of what they were worth many years ago and for persons getting $2,400 pensions today they can hardly live on it. When they originally sought to buy that pension or annuity, it was enough in those days. Today it is not.

Mr. Keogh. Well, with the personal exemptions and with the retirement income credit accorded those individuals under existing law, in my opinion the tax burden of an annuity of $2,400 a year is not very heavy.

Mr. Multer. It hits hardest the single person, the widow or widower, who gets the smaller exemption.

Mr. Keogh. Well, there are sociologists who will argue that perhaps they should bear a greater burden.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Any further questions? We thank you, Mr. Multer.

Mr. Multer. Thank you.

VICIOUS ATTACK ON COACH PAUL BRYANT

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Selden] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, as an alumnus of the University of Alabama, I condemn the vicious and irresponsible March 23 Saturday Evening Post attack on Coach Paul Bryant.

The charges contained in the Post article are little short of ludicrous. Those of us who know Paul Bryant and his devotion to the best interests of the University of Alabama and collegiate athletics generally are amazed and shocked that any magazine could sink to this low level of journalistic irresponsibility.

The Saturday Evening Post article is replete with half-truths and vicious innuendo, based on the flimsiest of testimony. That the magazine published this material without so much as contacting Coach Bryant tells us a great deal about the Saturday Evening Post's type of reporting.

Dr. Frank Rose, president of the University of Alabama, and the university board of trustees early this week responded to the Post's attack by expressing complete confidence in Paul Bryant. These expressions of confidence followed an investigation of the charges made by the magazine article, and I believe they reflect the feeling of the people of Alabama regarding this unwarranted attack.

DECLARATION OF CENTRAL AMERICA

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Selden] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, President Kennedy began a 3-day visit to San José, Costa Rica, for the purpose of meeting with the Presidents of Guatemala, El Salvador, Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama. It was my privilege to attend this meeting at the invitation of the President along with my colleague from the House of Representatives, the gentleman from California, Representative Mailliard, Republican; and with Senators Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas; Senator Morse, Democrat, of Oregon; and Senator Hickenlooper, Republican, of Iowa.

As a member of the bipartisan congressional group at the San José meeting and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, I was especially concerned with the need for action to curb the Communist subversive threat in Central America.

The final Declaration of Central America issued by the heads of state in attendance calls for an April meeting of the ministers of government "to develop and put into immediate effect common measures to restrict movement of their nationals to and from Cuba and the flow of material, propaganda, and funds from that country."

The declaration also states that the April meeting is to take specific action toward increasing air and sea surveillance and interception of any Cuban Communist movement of money, propaganda, material, or arms to any area of Central America.

These points closely follow the recommendations made by the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs in its recent report dealing with subversive activities and traffic.

Should this implementing action follow in April, an important step will have been taken toward reducing the Castro Communist subversive threat to the hemisphere.

In addition to the proposed April meeting, the declaration contains pledges on the part of both the United States and participating Central American governments designed to further the creation of a Central American Economic Community.

As press reports have indicated, the President and his party were enthusiastically received in San José. Despite unprecedented Communist propaganda aimed at undermining inter-American confidence in our leadership, it was most encouraging to find in Central America obvious and sincere friendship for the President and the people of the United States.

PROTECTION FOR SMALL BUSINESS IS IMPORTANT, TOO

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Roosevelt] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a news item.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, together with other members of the Select Committee on Small Business, I have been gratified at the decision of our able chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee, the Honorable Joe L. Evins, to proceed at once with hearings by the full committee concerning the impact of international trade upon the American small business community. This is a most important matter, one that holds deep implications for the prosperity of not only small businesses, but, indeed, for all of America.

Much has been said about the opportunities offered the small businessmen of the Nation by increasing their markets in foreign lands. As trade is a two-way street, the opportunities also exist for smaller firms through the importation of foreign goods.

An example of this has been the use of imported steel wire rod by several hundred small processing and fabricating firms. Steel wire rods have been in short supply domestically. Prices charged for wire rods have, in some instances, been higher than those charged by the steel mills for mesh wire fabricated from the rods, according to charges filed with the Federal Trade Commission. Further, there have been allegations by some small businessmen that prices on wire rod have been kept high while finished product prices were slashed for the express purpose of squeezing out these small, independent firms.

Many of the steel mills of the Nation are engaged in dual distribution of a great number of products. As an example, they manufacture wire rod, which they sell to small processors. In addition, they also fabricate the same products made by these processors and sell them in direct competition with the products of their customers.

A news item from the March 19 issue of the Wall Street Journal indicates that the Treasury Department has recently ruled that these wire rods are being imported at cutrate prices in violation of the U.S. antidumping law, the matter has been referred to the Tariff Commission for decision as to whether U.S. steelmakers are being harmed. I submit that of at least equal importance is the question of whether the banning of these imports would not do irreparable damage to the small businesses presently purchasing the imported rods. Particularly so, since it appears that these small firms cannot afford to purchase domestically produced rods, regardless of whether the importing continues or not.

This is the kind of question upon which much light can be shed by the hearings recently announced by Representative Evins.

It seems to me that, as a condition precedent to the banning of further imports of steel wire rods at present prices as sought by our domestic steel mills, the question of the price squeeze tactics apparently being used by the domestic steel industry to the detriment of independent small businesses must be fully resolved. To this end, it is my intent to fully investigate this matter as part of the hearings on dual distribution which will be held by the Subcommittee on Distribution next month. If our domestic steel mills are guilty of the tactics with which they have been charged, it is clear that the banning of these imports could serve only to snuff out a number of small business concerns.

Chairman Evins will, I am sure, at the hearing on foreign trade by the full committee, fully investigate all aspects of the tariff problem involved here. As an adjunct to this, my subcommittee will attempt to determine what impact upon small business the dual distribution of products manufactured from wire rod, such as mesh wire, is having upon the small businesses manufacturing these products.

I insert the news item, mentioned above, at this point in the Record:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 19, 1963]

The Treasury Department upheld the complaint of U.S. steel mills that hot-rolled carbon steel wire rods are being imported from Belgium at cutrate prices in violation of the U.S. antidumping law.

The Treasury referred the case to the Tariff Commission, which must decide whether the imports are injuring U.S. steelmakers. If it decides they are, the Tariff Commission is empowered to boost customs levies to bring the imports in line with domestic goods.

A controversy has long been simmering between U.S. producers of wire rods and domestic users who have been buying the product from foreign mills. These users insist the steel industry's effort to reduce the wire-rod imports, if successful, could put some of the fabricators out of business.

TO CONSIDER OTHER COMPLAINTS

Under the antidumping law, the Tariff Commission has 3 months to decide the Belgian rod case. Treasury officials said they hope to use the time to rule on other sections of the complaint involving steel rods imported from West Germany, France, Luxembourg, and Japan.

Six U.S. steel mills participated in the original charge against wire-rod imports. They were Bethlehem Steel Corp., Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Republic Steel Corp., Armco Steel Corp., and Detroit Steel Corp. Youngstown Sheet & Tube Corp. joined later.

In their complaint, filed last September, the companies alleged that Belgian rods were being sold in the United States at from $24.95 to $25.85 a ton below the indicated value in the Belgian market.

WELL BELOW EUROPEAN LEVEL

The Treasury, in ruling that the Belgian prices had violated the antidumping law, computed a weighted average price for steel rods sold in Belgium and made a similar computation for the price paid by importers in the United States.

The average import price, a Treasury official said, was well below the European level. The official added, however, that Department rules forbid publication of the price figures used in the comparison.

An official of one of the U.S. mills that participated in the complaint said of the Treasury ruling, "We're glad to have some results, but we had hopes that the European countries would be considered together rather than separately." He said the Common Market mills operate as a single entity, through the European Coal and Steel Community, and joint consideration would have eased the investigation. Members of the Common Market, in addition to Belgium, are West Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.

Other sources, however, observed that U.S. mills had pushed for joint treatment by the Tariff Commission because it would have been easier for the mills to prove injury from the combined imports of all foreign nations, instead of one by one.

The impact of wire rod imports has been significant. According to industry data, foreign producers sold 645,000 tons of the product in this country last year, up from 451,000 tons in 1961 and only 54,000 tons in 1957. The imported volume in 1962 accounted for 39 percent of the U.S. wire rod market.

The Treasury estimated the value of wire rods imported from Belgium last year at $1.8 million.

Imported rods have sold for as little as $95 a ton in recent months. Prices, however, have moved to $105 to $115 a ton, still well below the U.S.-made price of generally $140 to $145 a ton.

IMPORTERS SEE DISMISSAL

Despite the price differential, U.S. importers of the foreign-made goods insist there is no violation of the antidumping law. Declared Ernest Wimpfheimer, president of the American Institute for Imported Steel, a New York trade group representing importers:

"We think that the dumping charge has no merit and the sooner we have a chance to present the evidence the sooner we can get a determination and dismiss the complaint. There is every reason to assume that this case will be dismissed by the Tariff Commission with a findings of no injury to the American steel industry."

U.S. fabricators said they have been buying the imported rods because they can't afford the higher priced domestic goods. Many contend that even if U.S. mills are able to force higher prices on imports, this won't mean more business for domestic steel makers. The fabricators said they still won't be able to afford the U.S. rods.

Nearly 300 small companies process wire rods into such products as wire staples, chain link fence and nuts and bolts, and a large percentage of them use imported steel. Some said they would try to pass higher import prices along to customers, but most insisted the market wouldn't stand this and that it would mean a sharp pinch on profit.

Some users of wire rods and drawn wire have even charged that U.S. mills have refused to cut the price of rods or wire, but have slashed prices on some finished wire products in recent years to put a squeeze on these smaller companies with which they compete for wire product business. One Texas maker of wire mesh used to reinforce concrete said it has filed complaints with the Federal Trade Commission and the Texas attorney general that U.S. mills charge more for wire used to make the mesh than they do for the finished mesh itself.

An attorney for makers and importers of European steel said some wire-rod users plan to testifiy at any Tariff Commission hearing that U.S. mills are squeezing these customers by selling wire products at a relatively small markup over the rod prices, or even at the same prices. The counsel also said he plans to offer evidence aimed at showing U.S. mills are pricing their wire rods more than $50 a ton above the cost of making them.

OTHER DUMPING CHARGES

A Midwest maker of chain-link fence and wire mesh used to reinforce concrete for such uses as garage floors, delivers the mesh to customers at Grand Island, Nebr., for a price equal to 8 cents a pound. The company currently pays about 6 cents a pound for Japanese wire rods, giving it a 2-cent spread to prepare the rods, draw the wire, fabricate the mesh and ship it to Grand Island.

But this concern said it would have to pay 7½ cents a pound for domestic rods, and freight charges to Grand Island alone would be more than that half-cent spread. If imported rods climbed another $10 a ton, or a half-cent a pound, "we'd just have to throw reinforcing mesh in mothballs," a company official said.

An eastern rod user said it would have to pay nearly $145 a ton for domestic rods, but sells its wire product for an average of only $150 a ton and has operating and overhead costs of more than $30 a ton. The company currently pays about $105 a ton for foreign wire rods and said that if the price got up to around $115, "we'd have a difficult time keeping our head above water."

An eastern make of wire for items from paper clips to fasteners for aircraft construction had a loss of nearly $100,000 last year. The company buys 30 percent of its wire rods from abroad and says a $10-a-ton increase in rod prices would add $60,000 annually to its costs. "An increase of $10 a ton over the present level of foreign rod prices would put a certain number of people into a marginal situation, and a $20 rise—if it lasted for long—would have better than 50 percent of the people who are using imported rods operating at a loss," a Florida maker of drawn wire and reinforcing mesh said.

WOULDN'T SWING TO U.S. RODS

U.S. steel mills in the past 6 months also have filed antidumping complaints against European and Japanese producers of standard pipe, Japanese makers of hot-rolled sheet, and Canadian producers of reinforcing bars.

Many wire-rod customers insist higher foreign rod prices wouldn't swing them to domestic rods, which would still be too high in price unless U.S. mills abandon their policy of not cutting rod prices to meet import competition.

The eastern company that buys 30 percent of its rods from abroad said that as foreign-rod prices rise, "the saving on the 30 percent we buy is less effective. We could not afford to do other than buy a larger percentage from abroad to keep our average cost of supply down." Many rod users contend the antidumping drive seems so pointless that U.S. mills must be waging it for some reason such as attempting to create a general hostility toward imported steel.

OUTCOME IN DOUBT

Domestic steel mills that make wire rods say they don't know what the final outcome of their antidumping drive will be. But some feel that if import prices are boosted a bit, and they can count on these prices staying there, then the U.S. mills will be able to trim their own prices enough to win back some business. "Until the antidumping law is enforced, it's impossible for the domestic mills to know what we are going to do to get this business back. We have got to decide where we stand first," one major producer said.

Steel mills deny any effort to put a squeeze on their wire rod customers. A few insist they have at times offered price concessions on rods. And while most mills concede they haven't tried to bring the price of rods down to meet import prices, they insist these prices are far too low to attempt to compete with them and they have no assurance they wouldn't go still lower if they did make the try.

Some steel sales officials said they have met price reductions on many fabricated wire products but not on wire rods because there seemed more justification for adjustment on fabricated wire products. Less drastic cuts were needed on the fabricated products and a greater profit margin was available to play with, they said. "Unlike rods," said one official, "you have a chance to be competitive with the going price on mesh."

Mills don't deny they have, in past years, been unable to provide all their customers with desired wire rod tonnages because of short supply. One steel executive says, however: "I wish we were short today—I'll take all the orders we can get."

And while wire rod users are unhappy about the steel industry's antidumping drive, they aren't necessarily opposed to the principle of dumping charges. One Eastern wire mesh maker has filed charges with the Customs Bureau that Belgian and French wire mesh producers have dumped their product in this country. The concern says the Bureau threw out the Belgian case, but hasn't ruled on the French case.

A PLEA FOR CORRECTION OF AN UNFAIR POLICY

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the Record a copy of a letter which I have written to Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara. It brings to light a most unfair situation which cries out for correction:

March 20, 1963.

Hon. Robert S. McNamara,
Secretary, Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: I want to call to your attention a situation which I believe merits your careful consideration. Admiring your performance in office as I do and realizing how overburdened you are with work, I hesitate to add to your workload. However, I feel impelled to write to you because of a policy which I feel to be unjust and definitely detrimental to servicemen's morale.

The policy to which I refer is one under which servicemen are required to reimburse the Government for damage to Government property which was caused in the line of duty. As I understand it, these charges are assessed even though the damages are not caused through any willfulness or recklessness. Within the past week, two such cases involving constituents have been called to my attention.

In the first case, a private on duty who while driving a jeep became involved in an accident, has been required to pay damages of $276 which are being deducted from his monthly paychecks. I might add that the serviceman claims that he did not have a driver's license when he entered the service, but was taught to drive while in the Army.

The second case, although even more glaring, is obviously the result of some type of administrative error. In that case, a young serviceman was a passenger on a vehicle which was in an accident in Germany. This resulted in his sustaining a depressed skull fracture lacerating the brain. He now has practically no vision in his right eye and severe neurological disturbances which I need not specify here.

The serviceman was discharged from service and granted a 70-percent total disability rating. Shortly thereafter he received a letter advising him that he was "pecuniarily liable to the United States of America in the amount of $1,619.86 to cover the damage to the truck." Since the serviceman was merely a passenger in the truck at the time of the accident, the assessment of damages against him was obviously an administrative error, but my point is that it is unfair to assess such damages even against the driver if the accident was not due to negligence of a wanton or willful type.

Servicemen cannot control their assignments and should not, therefore, be held accountable for damage to equipment upon which they are ordered to work.

I do not question the need for economy in the armed services, but surely in view of the huge amounts expended by the military, there must be a better starting place than these charges to our servicemen which can cause severe hardships to the men and their families.

Sincerely,

Charles S. Joelson,
Member of Congress.

AMERICAN WORKING WOMEN

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, there are almost 25 million women in the work force of our Nation. There are 3 million American families who depend almost entirely on the earnings of a woman. There is scarcely a major American industry which does not depend in some measure on the skill, training, intelligence, and efficiency of its feminine employees.

The American woman has traveled far from the era when she was considered the property of her husband, only slightly more valuable than his cattle. However, there are still areas where—through ignorance, prejudice, or crass-profit interests—she is denied fair treatment. Women who work find that time after time the choicest jobs go to men no better and sometimes less qualified than themselves. In case after case, men doing the same work, with the same skills, and the same qualifications receive higher pay. National differentials range from 42 percent among salesworkers to 68 percent among clerical workers.

I think we all agree that women are entitled to their full rights as American citizens. Failure to guarantee these rights works hardships not only on the women themselves, but on the families they support. It unnecessarily and unreasonably lessens purchasing power at a time when increased buying is a needed stimulus to our economy. It prevents the full utilization of workers' skills thereby adversely affecting production, as well as morale.

I believe that we need every national asset functioning to its fullest extent. We cannot afford the waste produced by this discrimination against our working women. In line with this, I am introducing an equal pay bill similar to the measure introduced by Representative Edith Green to help remedy the situation by prohibiting discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers involved directly in interstate or foreign commerce. It sets up procedures for complaints, investigations, and, where violations are found, enforcement. It authorizes the Secretary of Labor to act to correct violations by informal, or if this fails, legal means.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Conte, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Price, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Hall), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. Whitener, for 1 hour, on March 25.

Mr. Ryan of New York, for 2 hours, on March 28.

Mr. Cramer, for 30 minutes, on Monday, March 25, 1963.

Mr. Hemphill (at the request of Mr. Marsh), for 1 hour on Tuesday, March 26, and Wednesday, March 27, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Harvey of Indiana, for 30 minutes, on Monday, March 25, 1963.

Mr. Alger, for 1 hour, on Wednesday, April 3, and 1 hour on Monday, April 8, 1963.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Hosmer in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hall) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Findley.
Mr. Berry.
Mr. Anderson.
Mr. Ashbrook.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Marsh) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Powell.
Mr. Hemphill.
Mr. Garmatz.
Mr. Boggs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 212. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; and

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 25, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

569. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting an additional amendment to the amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure for the U.S. district courts, which was ordered printed as House Document No. 48 of the 88th Congress (H. Doc. No. 48, pt. 2); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

570. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report entitled "A Plan for Strengthening Utilization Research and Development," pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 415, 87th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

571. A letter from the chief Scout executive, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting the Annual Report of the Boy Scouts of America for 1962, which represents their 53d year, pursuant to a Federal charter granted on June 15, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 85); to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

572. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Dixie project, Utah, pursuant to section 9(a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 86); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

573. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Buttes Dam and Reservoir, Middle Gila River project, Arizona, pursuant to section 9(a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. No. 87); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

574. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to establish a Commission on Rural Life to study the changing scope of rural America, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

575. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a purposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act" (68 Stat. 666, as amended); to the Committee on Agriculture.

576. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen," for the fiscal year 1963, has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

577. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the semiannual report of the Department of the Army contracts for military construction awarded without formal advertisement covering the period July 1 through December 31, 1962, pursuant to section 605 of Public Law 87–554; to the Committee on Armed Services.

578. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on borrowing authority for December 31, 1962, pursuant to section 304(b) of the Defense Production Act as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

579. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

580. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of January 31, 1963, pursuant to Public Law 554, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

581. A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

582. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

583. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions which this Service has approved according the beneficiaries of such petitions first preference classification under the act, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1988. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of certain residents of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 844. A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation; with amendment (Rept. No. 111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 845. A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2635. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955, for the purpose of including the Fort Mojave Indian Reservation among reservations excepted from the 25 year lease limitations; with amendment (Rept. No. 113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Missouri: Committee on House administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 29. Concurrent resolution to print with illustrations "A Report on U.S. Foreign Operations in Africa," by Senator Allen J. Ellender; without amendment (Rept. No. 114). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 5009. A bill to provide a uniform rate of duty for portable container locks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 5010. A bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections free from arbitrary discrimination by literacy tests or other means; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.R. 5011. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehoood of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5012. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the admission of the State of Indiana to the United States to be celebrated in 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 5013. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 5014. A bill to provide for the crediting for civil service retirement purposes of certain service rendered by civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5015. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 5016. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to authorize educational institutions to be reimbursed for facilities furnished for Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 5017. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Padre Junipero Serra; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 5018. A bill to protect postal patrons from obnoxious and offensive mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5019. A bill to amend the Hatch Act to permit all officers and employees of the Government to exercise the full responsibility of citizenship and to take an active part in the political life of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 5020. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for income tax purposes of commutation fares paid by an individual in traveling to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5021. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that any unmarried person who maintains his or her own home shall be entitled to be taxed at the rate provided for the head of a household; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 5022. A bill to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5023. A bill to provide for assistance in the construction and initial operation of community mental health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5024. A bill to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H.R. 5025. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 5026. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 5027. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit restraints of trade carried into effect through the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 5028. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 5029. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5030. A bill to repeal section 303(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relating to the water-carrier bulk commodity exemption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5031. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to utilize funds received from State and local governments for special meteorological services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 5032. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 5033. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 72 to 70 the age at which beneficiaries are no longer subject to restrictions on outside earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 5034. A bill to amend section 218(d)(6)(C) so as to require that coverage by the old-age and survivors' disability and insurance program in States permitted to divide retirement systems for State and local employees shall cover a majority of the members of such a retirement system at the time the agreement therefor is entered into; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (by request):

H.R. 5035. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

H.R. 5036. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 5037. A bill to control the human intake of agricultural commodities containing radioactive substances, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (by request):

H.R. 5038. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to postage rates on certain educational kits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 5039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an increase in the amount for which a credit may be allowed against the Federal estate tax for estate taxes paid to States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5040. A bill to amend section 114 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to state the policy of Congress with respect to reimbursement for certain highways on the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 5041. A bill to provide for the application of power revenues from reclamation projects to the reduction of the public debt; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 5042. A bill for the relief of certain officers of the naval service erroneously in receipt of compensation based upon an incorrect computation of service for basic pay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 5043. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the Federal income tax for employers who hire additional employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 5044. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a mutual-aid plan for fire protection by and for the District of Columbia and certain adjacent communities in Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 5045. A bill to authorize a grant for carrying out a project of construction for the expansion of the facilities of the Washington Hospital Center in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 5046. A bill to authorize judicial officers to require the giving of evidence relating to crimes committed in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5047. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5048. A bill to amend section 207 of the National Housing Act to eliminate the provision presently limiting mortgages thereunder to the cost of the physical improvements involved; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 5049. A bill to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 5050. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that, in the case of gasoline used in vehicles furnishing taxicab service, 2 cents of the 4-cent Federal gasoline tax shall be rebated to the ultimate purchaser of such gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 5051. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5052. A bill relating to the power of the States to impose use tax assessments with respect to sales in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 5053. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 5054. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, the Investment Company Act of 1940, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5055. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5056. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of small business investment companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5057. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800, the

annual amount individuals are permitted to earn while receiving benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 5058. A bill to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations and the specialized agencies thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 5059. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring William Sidney Porter who wrote under the name "O. Henry"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 5060. A bill to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 5061. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act to eliminate the ceiling upon amounts that may be appropriated to carry out that act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 5062. A bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants and scholarships for collegiate education in the field of nursing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 5063. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 5064. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Kentucky among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 5065. A bill relating to the interest rates on loans made by the Treasury to the Department of Agriculture to carry out the programs authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 5066. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital at San Diego, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 5067. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H.R. 5068. A bill to strengthen State governments, to provide financial assistance to States for educational purposes by returning a portion of the Federal taxes collected therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 5069. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for certain educational expenses incurred at certain public and private institutions of higher education and high schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.J. Res. 331. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.J. Res. 332. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.J. Res. 333. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.J. Res. 334. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 335. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December of each year as "Wright Brothers Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.J. Res. 336. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the use of prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.J. Res. 337. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 338. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.J. Res. 339. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue annually a proclamation respecting the ringing of bells in celebration of the anniversary of Declaration of Independence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.J. Res. 340. Joint resolution to amend title 39, United States Code, to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.J. Res. 341. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 342. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting the offering of prayers in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. Con. Res. 117. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence should be observed throughout the United States by the ringing of bells, requesting the President to issue a proclamation to this effect, and calling on civic and other community leaders to encourage public participation in such observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. Con. Res. 118. Concurrent resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Res. 296. Resolution to print as a House document, the Fourth Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of Alabama: Memorial of the Alabama Legislature, known as Senate Joint Resolution 9, which deplores the exodus of continent-based textile plants to Puerto Rico to take advantage of income tax regulations indigenous only there and jeopardizing the healthy future of statewide textile and other industries and demands an equalization of income taxes between the island and continental United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to resist any changes in the present capital gains tax laws, relating to the cutting or disposal of timber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 5070. A bill for the relief of Branko Cule; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 5071. A bill for the relief of the Norvell Bros. Painting & Decorating Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5072. A bill for the relief of Ignazio Rinella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5073. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of Lawrence Nestor against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5074. A bill for the relief of Valdo Santoro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 5075. A bill for the relief of Renzo Giretti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 5076. A bill relating to the exchange of certain lands between the town of Powell, Wyo., and the Presbyterian Retirement Facilities Corp.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 5077. A bill for the relief of Sun Young Choy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 5078. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Beatrice D'Errico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 5079. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Yates and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H.R. 5080. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stojanka Frankovich and her son, Zvonimir Frankovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 5081. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell a right-of-way across a portion of the District Training School grounds at Laurel, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 5082. A bill for the relief of Herminia C. Balagot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 5083. A bill for the relief of John Stewart Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 5084. A bill for the relief of Ilia Vasil Karakostas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 5085. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Georgious Sopassakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5086. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Stellario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5087. A bill for the relief of Fotini Selitsanou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 5088. A bill for the relief of Dimitrious Lintzeri, his wife, Panagniota G. Lintzeri, and his minor children, Dina Lintzeri and Andrew Lintzeri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 5089. A bill to grant, posthumously to the late Gen. Robert E. Lee of Virginia, restoration of full rights of U.S. citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 5090. A bill to authorize the appointment of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur to the grade of General of the Armies of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5091. A bill for the relief of Eugene J. Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 5092. A bill for the relief of Shi Young Rhee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5093. A bill for the relief of Rigas Giokas and his wife, Vangelya Giokas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 5094. A bill for the relief of Geoffrey Howard Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 5095. A bill for the relief of Yasuko Sugiura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

70. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Malcolm W. Bayley and other citizens of the Third Congressional District of Kentucky to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

71. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Harlan Savage, president, La Habra Democratic Club, La Habra, Calif., relating to the establishment of a Scientific Constitutional Monetary System; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God, our Father, amid all life's changing scenes, make us conscious of Thy overshadowing presence. Thou art the love that will not let us go, the love that followeth us all the way.

We touch the hem of Thy garment in the human love which hallows our own lives and sanctifies our homes—love which, at its best, bears witness to Thee and the divine love which alone is the balm able to cure the hurt of the world.

In the midst of crushing cares, relentless demands, and tormenting fears which the Nation's problems bring, may the quieting peace of Thy presence restore our jaded souls. Give truth to our words, sincerity to our hearts, and courage to our deeds in these times that are testing as by fire the treasure bequeathed to us. So may we in our day make patriotism beautiful with loyalty and dedication to this free land of our love and prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 19, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) to print with illustrations "A Report on U.S. Foreign Operations in Africa," by Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 242. An act to amend section 1820 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration; and

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 212. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; and

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 242. An act to amend section 1820 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of John Nicholas Brown as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING THE MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee on the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Establishment of a Commission on Rural Life

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Commission on Rural Life to study the changing scope of rural America, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Amendment of Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Reapportionment of an Appropriation

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Unemployment Compensation for Federal Employees and Ex-Servicemen," for the fiscal year 1963, had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Department of the Army Contracts for Military Construction Awarded Without Formal Advertisement

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of the Army contracts for military construction awarded without formal advertisement, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Borrowing Authority

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, dated December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Removal of Percentage Limitations on Retirement of Enlisted Men of the Coast Guard

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report on Backlog of Pending Applications and Hearing Cases in the Federal Communications Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of January 31, 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Report of U.S. Information Agency

A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Contracts Negotiated for Experimental, Developmental, or Research Work

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental or research work, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Buttes Dam and Reservoir, Middle Gila River Project, Arizona

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Buttes Dam and Reservoir, Middle Gila River project, Arizona (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on the Dixie Project, Utah

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Dixie project, Utah (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Certification of Adequate Soil Survey and Land Classification, Glen Elder Unit, Solomon Division, Missouri River Basin Project, Kansas

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the Glen Elder Unit, Solomon Division, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Amendment to Rules of Civil Procedure for U.S. District Courts

A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, an amendment to the amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure for the U.S. District Courts, adopted March 18, 1963 (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Issuance of Certificates of Citizenship in the Canal Zone

A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Reports on Petitions To Classify Status of Certain Aliens for First Preference

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on petitions to classify the status of certain aliens for first preference (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of Boy Scouts of America

A letter from the chief Scout executive, National Council, Boy Scouts of America, New Brunswick, N.J., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 12

"A joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled and to the Honorable Secretary of the Treasury of the United States

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 37th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas it is reported some high placed officials have endorsed the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury to disallow capital gains tax treatment under the provisions of current IRC 631–A (formerly 117K) on privately owned timber subsequently processed or manufactured by the same owner into lumber or other forest products; and

"Whereas IRC 631–A has had the effect in Idaho of encouraging the growth of privately owned forests such as tree farms; despite the risk and hazard of fire, insects, disease and the payment of ad valorem taxes on both land and trees for a period of up to 100 years with the forest crop of trees being the only growing crop on which ad valorem tax is paid each year. Logs and lumber from the tree crop are again assessed as personal property and tax paid on the assessed value on the second Monday in January of each year thereafter; and

"Whereas most operators have deemed it essential to possess a reserve of privately owned timber to insure the continuity of economic units and stable employment rather than depend on public sources of timber with the indefinite and vascillating policies of the latter, and

"Whereas the American lumber industry is, and has been, adversely affected by constantly increasing imports, mostly from Canada. The imports from the latter amounted to 17 percent of 1962 U.S. production, which was 14 percent more than for 1961; and which Government is aiding and assisting its industry in the promotion of the exploitation of foreign markets, and

"Whereas the blowdown as the result of a windstorm in 1962 of some 10 billion feet of timber on the Pacific Coast will add to already existing competitive problems, and

"Whereas an investor who purchases forest, fruit or nut trees for resale would not be deprived of capital gains tax treatment whereas the timber-owning, job-furnishing operator would not be accorded similar treatment, and

"Whereas the repeal of IRC 631–A would force an incentive for a policy of "cut out and get out," which were the common practices of early day lumbermen in the northern tier of States at the beginning of the 20th century; now, with progressive, enlightened sustained yield forest practices in effect on private ownership, the proposed tax change would leave no other alternative than a return to the regressive policy of 50 years ago of "cut out and get out", and would: (1) Destroy the incentive for maintaining intensified forest yield management with a goal of perpetual sustained yield of a timber crop; (2) have a devastating effect on county, school, and municipal tax valuations for necessary tax revenue in counties having substantial private ownership; (3) after allowing the denuded land to go for taxes and reverting to public ownership, there would be no tax revenue, as the Government does not pay taxes. Or only many years in the future when the 25-percent return from Federal forest sales might be available on reforested land, would Idaho counties receive any return of tax revenue; (4) create such a situation profitwise that it would be impractical, if not impossible, for timber-owning companies to stay in business; and

"Whereas the "cut out and get out" policy would have a depressing effect on the market value of publicly owned timber as well as disrupting the orderly disposal of the annual growth; and

"Whereas privately owned forest owners have neither received nor requested subsidies, or price supports from public sources: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 37th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the senate and the house of representatives concurring*, That the Congress, the President, and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of America are hereby respectfully petitioned that in the interest of maintaining our second largest industry—forest products—that IRC 631–A should neither be tampered with nor repealed; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President, Vice President, and Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress and the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"W. E. DREVLOW,
"*President of the Senate.*
"PETE T. CENARRUSA,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 2

"A memorial urging the Congress of the United States to pursue an equitable fiscal policy for the purpose of preserving the economic freedom of the citizens of the United States of America

"*To the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Whereas the economic freedom of each of the citizens of the United States is in peril because of the fiscal policy being followed; and

"Whereas a primary element of freedom for each citizen is fiscal stability; and

"Whereas during the past decade the Government of the United States has been pursuing a fiscal policy which is endangering the fiscal stability of each citizen of the United States.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States set a firm fiscal policy which will guarantee to each citizen economic freedom.

"2. The Secretary of State of Arizona is directed to transmit a copy of this memorial to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Arizona congressional delegation."

"Approved by the Governor March 11, 1963."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Resolution 206

"A resolution urging the Governor of the State of Georgia and the Georgia congressional delegation to resist any changes in the present capital gains tax laws, relating to the cutting or disposal of timber; and for other purposes

"Whereas forest land comprises 25,772,200 acres, 69 percent of the total land area of the State; and

"Whereas 23,931,100 acres are in private ownership and constitute 93 percent of the total forest land; and

"Whereas these forest lands are providing approximately a gross return of $1 billion to the State's economy through forest industries; and

"Whereas forest industry represents the third largest dollar volume of industry and supports 200,000 or more persons annually; and

"Whereas Georgia has led the Nation in reforestation for many years, having converted almost 700,000 acres from cropland to trees under the soilbank program in recent years; and

"Whereas investments are made for long periods of time during which they are continuously subject to many hazards, such as fire, insects, disease, and market fluctuations; and

"Whereas the State and Federal Governments have encouraged forestland owners to develop previously unproductive lands for timber products; and

"Whereas Georgia leads the Nation in the number of acres under the tree farm program; and

"Whereas an incentive must exist to encourage the production of crops that must be produced over two or more decades before any substantial financial return is realized; and

"Whereas the capital gains tax treatment on long-term timber gains recognizes these various factors; and

"Whereas this type of tax treatment has been effective in stimulating private forest owners to adopt management plans and programs to produce timber to meet the national needs; and

"Whereas private forest land is in a wide variety of ownerships with 197,000 owners in Georgia; and

"Whereas the repeal of capital gains taxation will materially reduce the ability of private individuals and industry to continue reforestation and will accelerate the cutting of present timber growth; and

"Whereas forestry has made its greatest advances during the last 20 years as the result of stimulus of capital gains: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives*, that the Governor of the State of Georgia and all members of the Georgia congressional delegation are urged to do everything in their power to maintain the present capital gains tax treatment regarding the cutting or disposal of timber; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the house of representatives is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Governor of the State of Georgia and to each member of the Georgia congressional delegation.

"Glenn W. Ellard,
"*Clerk.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Concurrent Resolution L—Pembilier Dam and Reservoir

"Concurrent resolution endorsing and supporting the construction of the proposed Pembilier dam and reservoir project and commending the agencies participating in its investigation and planning

"Whereas the proposed Pembilier dam and reservoir on the Pembina River, near Walhalla, N. Dak., is progressing to the point where a report thereon by the investigating agencies of both Canada and the United States can be expected before another session of the legislature; and

"Whereas the surveys, investigations and studies so far made all indicate economic feasibility, that the construction thereof would insure control of flooding on the Pembina River, adequate municipal and industrial water supplies for several communities in both countries, also supplemental water for potential irrigable areas, and for other beneficial purposes; and

"Whereas the International Joint Commission has devoted much time and study to this proposal and has individually and collectively toured the Pembina River basin and inspected the various sites and areas involved in the proposed project: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein;* That the 38th Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota hereby reaffirms its wholehearted endorsement and support of the Pembilier dam and reservoir project aforesaid, commends the International Joint Commission and all the agencies of both Canada and the United States participating in the important investigative and planning activities for their faithful and conscientious devotion to their task and trusts that the definite report thereon will become available sometime during the next fiscal year; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies hereof be transmitted by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States; Secretary of the Department of State; President of the U.S. Senate; Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; District Engineer, St. Paul Office of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation; Chairmen of the Canadian and United States Sections, International Joint Commission; Members of the North Dakota delegation in Congress; and the Governor of North Dakota.

"Stanley Saugstad,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Gerald F. Stair,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*
"Frank A. Wenstrom,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Howard F. Doherty,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Concurrent Resolution X—Erosion Control and Bank Stabilization, Missouri River, N. Dak.

"Concurrent resolution urging early completion of spot bank stabilization and erosion control adjacent to the Missouri River

"Whereas the Garrison Reservoir was constructed to provide, and has provided, substantial benefits to the entire Missouri River basin for municipal and industrial water supplies, sewage dilution, flood control, navigation, irrigation, power generation, and other beneficial uses; and

"Whereas that reach of the Missouri River between the Garrison Reservoir and the Oahe Reservoir constitutes an unprotected portion of the river extremely vulnerable to erosion from erratic water releases; and

"Whereas since the construction of the Garrison Dam, without supplementary erosion control or bank stabilization structures, the clear water being released from the Garrison Reservoir is eroding approximately 500 acres yearly of valuable bottom land from the banks of this stream; and

"Whereas future releases will increase the loss to 800 acres or more annually; and

"Whereas specific areas constituting several thousand acres of land are threatened by erosion should the erratic pattern of water released from Garrison Reservoir be continued; and

"Whereas the problem appears to be the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein,* That the U.S. Congress is respectfully urged to direct the Corps of Engineers to forthwith undertake emergency measures to prevent this impending irreparable loss through construction of spot revetment works between the Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs in consultation with the North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission so corrective stabilization will be applied to the areas imperiled; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That sufficient copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to each member of the North Dakota congressional delegation for their own use and for appropriate distribution to congressional committees, officials, Representatives and Senators.

"Stanley Saugstad,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Gerald F. Stair,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*
"Frank A. Wenstrom,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Howard F. Doherty,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHURCH (for himself and Mr. Goldwater):

S. 1152. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for contributions to candidates for elective Federal office or to political parties; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Church when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. Magnuson) (by request):

S. 1153. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Monroney when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1154. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Christmas Lake, Inc., and Karlson Development Corp.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina:

S. 1155. A bill for the relief of the estate of Paul F. Ridge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 1156. A bill to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Curtis when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1157. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion of certain additional types of compensation within the meaning of the term "basic salary" for the purposes of such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1158. A bill for the relief of Samuel C. Neiburg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE (by request):

S. 1159. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 1160. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1161. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1162. A bill for the relief of Ginseppe Stracquadanio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1163. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Douglas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1164. A bill for the relief of Miss Katina J. Nakopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1165. A bill for the relief of Dr. Florencio A. Hipona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1166. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts and make grants for research and development in furtherance of the purposes of the act of May 16, 1910 (36 Stat. 369; 30 U.S.C. 1, 3, 5, and 7), as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1167. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Felicite A. Clignett; and

S. 1168. A bill to amend section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hruska when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. Magnuson) (by request):

S. 1169. A bill to authorize a per capita distribution of $350 from funds arising from judgments in favor of any of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. Morse, Mr. Randolph, Mr. McIntyre, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey):

S. 1170. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Clark when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Morse, Mr. Hart, Mr. Young of Ohio, Mr. Douglas, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey):

S. 1171. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special issue of bonds in order to afford an opportunity for the people of the United States, through the purchase of such bonds, to participate in the financing of peace-keeping activities of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Clark when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

COMMITTEE TO EVALUATE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM IN EACH COUNTRY

Mr. COOPER submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34) to express the sense of Congress that the President appoint a committee to evaluate our foreign aid program in each country and report its finding to the President and Congress, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Cooper, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

ESTABLISHMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON CONSUMERS

Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Keating, and Mr. Scott), submitted a resolution (S. Res. 116) to establish a Select Committee on Consumers, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Javits, which appears under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED INCOME-TAX DEDUCTION FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow a deduction for contributions to candidates for elective Federal office or to political parties.

In an article published last August in the New York Times magazine, I dealt with the rising costs of running for office, and argued for several reforms to relieve candidates and political parties from the necessity of relying too much on large contributors—which in practice generally means either big business or big labor—for the money needed to finance political campaigns. In the article, I wrote:

> Campaign costs have simply grown too big for the average candidate to cope with. Political elections have been subject to the same rising costs that have affected all our lives in recent decades. This has been aggravated by the rapid growth in population requiring more and more voters to be reached, and by the introduction and expansion of television, which is not only expensive but essential as a campaign medium.

Later in the article, I pointed out:

> Congressional candidates have employed many methods for raising campaign funds in small amounts from the public at large. Yet most of them have proved unproductive. Door-to-door solicitations have been tried, but seldom have they yielded substantial returns. Any number of candidates have sought to raise money with return-mail appeals, usually with the most disappointing results.
>
> As a consequence of such experiences, most congressional candidates have been left with no alternative but to depend upon the large contributor for their campaign money.

Mr. President, as one remedy for this situation, I proposed to the tax laws an amendment to furnish an inducement to the small contributor, the individual citizen of modest means. I suggested that each taxpayer, in computing his taxable income for the year, ought to be allowed to deduct up to $100 for contributions made to either the candidates or the political party of his choice. I said that—

> Our tax laws should be designed to encourage more people to support, with their dollars as well as with their votes, the whole of the election process, for this is the lifeblood of a free society.

The bill I now introduce would accomplish this result. The fact that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] joins me in sponsoring the bill demonstrates that the proposal enjoys both Republican and Democratic support. For this purpose, we have created a liberal-conservative axis, spanning the width of the Senate and the width of the political spectrum. We share a common concern that present trends have brought about an excessive polarization in our politics, and we believe this bill would be a constructive step toward proliferating the financial base of costly campaigns. The bill would furnish to the individual taxpayer an incentive to contribute a modest amount, either in support of the political party of his choice, or of a candidate he favors, and thus would tend to free those who hold high public office, and those who aspire to it, from undue reliance upon a few large contributors.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article to which I have referred be printed at this point in the Record, and that the bill be received and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1152) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for contributions to candidates for elective Federal office or to political parties, introduced by Mr. Church (for himself and Mr. Goldwater), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The article presented by Mr. Church is as follows:

CAMPAIGN MONEY—HOW MUCH? FROM WHOM?

(By Senator Frank Church)

Washington.—A prominent citizen of my State announced his candidacy for Governor by declaring he was not a politician but a businessman. "The word 'politician' is a nasty word," he was quoted as saying.

Now, Idaho usually enjoys clean government and there is no question that the Government of the United States is untainted by the kind of pervasive corruption which plagues so many other governments in the world. Why, then, should "politician" still be regarded as a nasty word?

The ambassador of an Asian country asked me this very question just a few weeks ago. Ironically, the country he represents is nearly engulfed by graft. Yet, he said, "In my country, as in most others I have known, public service is thought to be the highest calling. To become a member of the parliament is the noblest ambition a man can hold."

If we don't accord the same prestige to Members of Congress, it is not because we fail to hold our politicians to strict account. Anyone entering Congress from private life becomes at once aware of the higher standard of behavior expected of him.

Indeed, we are so accustomed to having our politicians tread the straight and narrow that the occasional scandal in public life will produce far more indignation than any comparable scandal elsewhere. A few deep freezers discredited the entire Truman administration; the gift of an oriental rug and a vicuna coat not only drove Sherman Adams from the White House, but shook public confidence in the administration of Dwight Eisenhower for months afterward. The affair of Billie Sol Estes has rocked the New Frontier as no other single episode.

This could be true only in a country where the people expect, and usually get, honest performance in public office. In short, it isn't corruption in Congress that puts the taint upon the term "politician." It isn't what we do in Congress but how we get into Congress that accounts for the lingering suspicion in the public mind.

Campaign costs have simply grown too big for the average candidate to cope with. Political elections have been subject to the same rising costs that have affected all our lives in recent decades. This has been aggravated by the rapid growth in population requiring more and more voters to be reached, and by the introduction and expansion of television, which is not only expensive but essential as a campaign medium.

The recent announcement that some network TV shows will be shortened by 5 minutes to allow senatorial, gubernatorial, and other local candidates time for paid political broadcasts during this general election campaign is encouraging news. Prime evening time is usually difficult to buy except in 15- and 30-minute segments. Similar time was afforded presidential candidates in 1956 and 1960, but this is the first breakthrough for local candidates; it should help.

Laws forbid candidates to spend more than the barest minimum of their own funds, but most candidates could not begin to afford the whole cost, even if it were permitted. Therefore, contributions must be sought, and the question at once arises: How much, and from whom?

To help furnish an answer to this question, President Kennedy appointed a special Commission on Campaign Costs, composed of a group of distinguished citizens experienced in raising money for either the Democratic or Republican Party, together with several nationally recognized academic authorities on the subject. They spent months studying the problem, and the President has now submitted their recommendations to Congress.

Unfortunately, the commission confined itself to the financing of presidential campaigns. Congressional contests were ignored, though clearly they constitute the more urgent problem. Of course, presidential campaigns are immensely expensive, but it is much more difficult for congressional candidates to raise the money they need, and they are far more vulnerable to pressures from special-interests groups.

In an effort to escape these pressures, congressional candidates have employed many methods for raising campaign funds in small amounts from the public at large. Yet most of them have proved unproductive. Door-to-door solicitations have been tried, but seldom have they yielded substantial returns. Any number of candidates have sought to raise money with return-mail appeals, usually with the most disappointing results.

Representative WILLIAM H. AYRES, Republican, of Ohio, is said to have run a newspaper ad during a campaign which read: "BILL AYRES Needs Your Help." In the ad, AYRES requested $1 contributions. In a single newspaper, the ad cost $200. Total returns attributed to the ad amounted to $51.

As a consequence of such experiences, most congressional candidates have been left with no alternative but to depend upon the large contributor for their campaign money. I recall a Congressman once telling me that his entire campaign had been financed by not more than 20 contributors. "They were the only ones on my side who could afford sizable donations," he said.

As a candidate for reelection to the Senate this year, I am acutely aware of how badly we need to reform the methods for raising money to finance campaigns for Congress. And I know we shall never achieve these reforms until the public acquires a better understanding of the problems we face.

Congressional campaign costs vary greatly from State to State. A House candidate running in 1 of New York City's 19 districts would find telecasting prohibitively expensive and wasteful, since it would reach millions of people who are not involved in his election. A candidate for the single House seat representing the State of Nevada not only must make use of television to reach his constituents, but is compelled to do so on what amounts to a network basis.

A Senate candidate in a State like Idaho may hope to meet personally a very high proportion of the voters, while a candidate for the Senate in a State like California wouldn't even try. I have heard of Senate campaigns in which upward of a million dollars was spent by each side. My own successful campaign for election to the Senate in 1956 cost barely more than $40,000—and my Republican opponent's just over twice that amount.

But the problem for the Idaho candidate can still be more difficult than for a candidate in California. Hundred-dollar-a-plate dinners are not uncommon in States with large metropolitan centers. Yet my friends felt that they were aiming very high when they scheduled a $12.50-a-plate fundraising dinner in my honor in Boise a few months ago.

People in the smaller States either do not have or are not accustomed to giving the amounts of money necessary for modern campaigning. The inevitable consequence is that candidates on both sides are compelled to accept help from outside their own State. This circumstance is not well understood by many of the voters in these States, and there is often bitter criticism of big contributions which cross State lines.

Seldom is the big contributor, whether in or outside the State, so brash as to offer a campaign contribution to a Congressman or Senator at a time, or in a manner, which tends to link the money to a pending bill. But occasionally this happens. A classic example occurred in 1956, when the Harris-Fulbright natural gas bill was under consideration by the Senate.

The late Senator Francis Case of South Dakota was up for reelection, and it was thought that he was inclined to support the bill, which would have exempted independent natural gas producers from Federal utility rate control. Then, on February 3, Case strode out onto the Senate floor to announce he would vote against the bill—because improper influence had been exerted on him to vote for it, in the form of a $2,500 cash donation which he had refused.

On February 7, a Senate select committee was established to investigate the incident. During the committee's hearings on the contribution, John M. Neff, a lawyer representing the Superior Oil Co. of California and Texas, was identified as the immediate donor. Later testimony, however, revealed that the money was from the personal funds of Howard B. Keck, president of the Superior Oil Co. The Senate committee's report, released 2 months later, said that "the objective of the individuals who initiated and carried out this chain of events was to influence by political contribution the vote of a Member of Congress."

Fortunately, cash bribes are about extinct as a method of attempting to influence votes in the U.S. Congress. Yet the problem of exerting influence through heavy, though legitimate, campaign contributions still remains unsolved. The late Senator Richard L. Neuberger of Oregon once wrote:

"If MAURINE (Mrs. NEUBERGER, then an Oregon State legislator and now her husband's successor in the Senate) or I ever would take $100 in cash behind the locked door of a hotel room to cast our vote for or against a specific legislative bill, we would be guilty of receiving a bribe. But if, at the next election, we accept not $100 in cash but $1,000 in a check from the same donor, it is all perfectly legal, providing the check is made out to the Neuberger-for-election committee."

I don't hold that the large campaign contribution necessarily clamps a manacle upon either a candidate or an elected official. The candidate, of course, must scrupulously refuse any contribution tendered for a commitment which would restrict his freedom of action if elected; the elected official must make his convictions and his conscience the final arbiters of his vote. I believe that nearly all the Members of Congress—Senators and Representatives alike—do their utmost to live up to these standards.

Still, given the infirmities of human nature, there is always the danger that a certain bias, favorable to the big contributor, will weigh upon the judgment of even the most objective legislator. For this reason, and because so general a dependence upon the big contributor erodes public confidence in the "politician"—and thus weakens popular respect for the very processes of representative government—there is a real and immediate need for changes in the methods of financing our election campaigns.

I would suggest as the minimum required, the following:

1. Let the television stations in each State set aside, as a public service, a reasonable amount of free time to be equally divided between the two parties during the general election campaign.

If local stations would offer this time on a voluntary basis, as the national networks did for the two presidential candidates in 1960, it would work a significant reduction in the high cost of campaigns and help candidates for major State and congressional offices to free themselves from undue reliance upon big contributors.

2. Let the tax laws be revised to furnish an inducement to the small contributor, the individual citizen of modest means. Each taxpayer, in computing his taxable income for the year, ought to be allowed to deduct up to $100 for contributions made to either the candidates or the political party of his choice.

Our tax laws should be designed to encourage more people to support, with their dollars as well as with their votes, the whole of the

election process, for this is the lifeblood of a free society.

3. Let us gather public support behind those methods for raising campaign funds which draw from the many and not from the few. The fund-raising banquet, if the price of the tickets is within the reach of the average voter, is one method. The citizens' committee openly soliciting at large is another.

In this connection permit me a personal reference. During my first campaign for the Senate in 1956, I lacked the money for more than the very minimum of television time, and so I spent 9 months on the road, with my wife at the wheel of the car, going from store to store, from farm to farm, from house to house, knocking on doors in order to meet the people personally.

A thick, protective callus formed between my right thumb and forefinger from shaking hands, which led one pundit to comment: "FRANK CHURCH is the only lawyer in Idaho with a callus—on his hand."

But despite rigorous efforts to cut costs, and although I engaged no advertising agency, wrote my own copy, and depended solely upon the services of volunteer workers, it soon became evident that I couldn't begin to finance my campaign on the offerings of small contributors. I discovered what every candidate for Congress learns, that big contributions are essential.

The largest contributor to my campaign was the National Committee for an Effective Congress, a nonpartisan citizens' action group which undertakes to raise money for selected congressional races. One of the purposes of the committee is to increase the number of small contributions to campaigns, thus broadening and diversifying the sources of political funds and consequently relieving candidates of the pressure to answer to specific interests.

The money donated to me was raised principally through a series of advertisements bearing the caption, "A Clean Politics Appeal," calling for personal contributions from the readers of such newspapers as the New York Times and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and such periodicals as the Reporter, Commonweal, and the Saturday Review.

The money came in $1, $5, $20 amounts. To this day, I do not know the identity of the individual contributors. Moreover, neither then nor since has any member of the committee ever asked me to vote a given way on any issue.

It is true that the National Committee for an Effective Congress usually supports liberal candidates, whether they be Democrats or Republicans. I think it would be desirable for a comparable committee to be organized for the purpose of giving a similar type of support to conservative candidates.

These three proposals, when taken together, would help materially to reduce the importance of the big contributor in our political campaigns.

Honesty in government, in the last analysis, will always depend upon the integrity of the men who hold public office. But if we can shift to the people at large the responsibility they should bear for financing our political campaigns, then far more public confidence in our representative form of government will result, the public service will recapture that prestige to which it is entitled, and the institutions of free government will be strengthened throughout the land.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. CHURCH. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I merely wish to state on the floor of the Senate my pleasure in joining with the distinguished Senator from Idaho in presenting a long overdue bill. Several Congresses ago I served on a Select Committee To Investigate Lobbying and Campaign Expenses. During that time it became very obvious that some approach like the one now proposed should be made and would have to be made if we in politics would be able in the future to meet the rising costs of campaigns. I am very glad that the Senator from Idaho has introduced his bill. I suggest that he might allow it to be held at the table for a day or two, because I feel, since we are all plagued with the same curse, that all Senators, both the Republicans and Democrats, might wish to join in sponsoring the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. I shall be very happy to do so. Other Senators, including the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, have offered different versions of the bill in the past. There is widespread interest in the subject on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk for the remainder of the week in order that other Senators who may wish to add their names as cosponsors may have an opportunity to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be held at the desk as requested by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Idaho on his bill. I shall look it over, and most likely I shall associate myself with it.

I could not help but note that the distinguished Senator from Arizona had announced that he was a candidate for reelection. I am becoming a little concerned about this bipartisan play this morning. I trust that what we have heard is not an announcement of a new "Union" ticket under new financial auspices. But if it is, may I say that it could not involve two more worthy gentlemen.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. If I have any time remaining, I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, I request 1 additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, I wish to state that last year the subcommittee held extensive hearings on a bill in the nature of the one proposed, and recommended to the Senate the passage of a measure very similar to that covered by the bill introduced by the Senator from Idaho. Unfortunately, the bill was subject to a point of order in that it did not originate in the House. An identical bill was introduced in the House, but the House failed to take action on it. I am sure that the sense of this body was in favor of a bill of the nature of the one that the Senator has introduced. I feel sure that if the House would see fit to act on a similar type of bill, the Senate would have no difficulty in passing such a measure.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator. I hope the committee will give favorable consideration to the bill this year.

Mr. GOLDWATER obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I shall be happy to yield if I can secure some additional time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall see that the Senator has his 3 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the $100 deduction allowed each taxpayer be in addition to the $12 billion deficit we already face?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Naturally, if we deny the general fund moneys, it would be included in any deficit. But I believe the proposal would work a much better purpose on moral grounds. For that reason I can support the measure.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I merely wished to be sure whether a further diminution of revenue would be contemplated.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Any time that we disallow money to the Federal Treasury, our deficit problems are increased. However, I think in the Senate we could correct that if we could get the other side to work very closely with us.

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL AIRPORT ACT TO EXTEND THE TIME FOR MAKING GRANTS THEREUNDER

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce and myself, a bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes.

This bill, which is part of the President's legislative program, extends the existing law, which expires June 30, 1964, for 3 years to June 30, 1967.

The bill provides for extension of the appropriation authority for the 3 additional fiscal years at an annual level of $75 million. This extension is considered essential to satisfy the firmly projected needs of the national airport system. The urgency of these needs is indicated by the fact that applications are now pending for improvements at 540 airports during fiscal 1964 which would cost a total of approximately $150 million, and these applications must be considered on the basis of the existing $75 million per year funding. In fiscal 1962, eligible project requests totaled $149,782,000, and in fiscal 1963 these applications totaled $140,114,000.

Since its inception in 1947, the act authorizing Federal grants to local communities for the construction and improvements of airports on a matching fund basis has provided funds for 5,372 separate projects leading to improvements at 1,762 airports. Through January 1 of this year, Federal funds totaling $721,861,000 have been granted for these purposes. Sponsoring communities have expended $748,866,000 in this period of tremendous growth in our civil aviation industry.

Throughout the history of this program the emphasis has been on safety, for it has been through the improvement of runways, runway lighting, and other nagivational and terminal facilities that the use of the airplane has developed into a routine necessity for many millions of our citizens.

Fully 50 percent of the users of our airport and airways facilities are military aircraft. The airport improvements made possible under this legislation have therefore been of vital significance to our military aviation capabilities.

The rapid expansion of air transport needs and requirements could justify an increase in this program to permit matching grants totaling $100 million a year. However, the realities of the present overall budget situation, and particularly our national defense needs, rule out such an increase at this time. A larger and larger percentage of our people are relying each year on air transportation. From 1957 to 1961 the total flight time of our general aviation fleet increased from 10,738,000 hours per year to 12,650,000 hours. The explosive development of our air transport industry in the past decade has been possible to a large extent through this program. In 1952, 27½ million persons bought airline tickets in the United States. Last year this figure had more than doubled to 61,700,000. In 1952, at 141 control towers then in operation a total of 15,814,000 landings and takeoffs were recorded. Ten years later, with 270 towers operating, landings and takeoffs had nearly doubled to 28,200,000.

In 1952, this country had 52,670 licensed aircraft. On January 1 of this year 85,669 aircraft were using the airports of this country. This steady and ever-increasing growth of our air transport fleet will continue.

Without question, this program must be continued and must be efficiently and expeditiously administered to meet the additional air traffic demands throughout the 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Dependable and ever-more rapid transportation is essential to our economic security. Our national security also requires the development of these transportation facilities.

The grants provided by this act have been, and will continue to be, the basis for increasing the accessibility of air travel and air transport in both urban and rural regions of the country. The act establishes criteria enabling the development of our huge metropolitan air traffic centers as well as the establishment of profitable and usable airports of more modest size within the financial means of smaller communities.

I would like to cite now the principal features of the existing law and set forth a number of proposed changes incorporated in this bill.

First. The existing law expires June 30, 1964. Proposed change extends act for 3 years, expiring June 30, 1967.

Second. Existing law authorizes a total of $225 million available at rate of $75 million annually. No change.

Third. Existing law provides special $7 million annual set-aside for general aviation to relieve congestion at high-density airports. No change.

Fourth. Existing law disallows Federal contribution for items not directly related to safety, that is, terminal buildings, and so forth. No change.

Fifth. Existing law allows 75 percent contribution for certain landing aids, that is, in-runway lighting, runway distance markers, and so forth. No change.

Sixth. Existing law provides for apportionment to States—under area population formula—75 percent with 25 percent placed in discretionary fund. Proposed change: Apportionment to States would be decreased to 50 percent and amount placed in discretionary fund increased to 50 percent.

Seventh. Existing law provides an annual amount available to Hawaii of $731,618—$131,618 under State apportionment plus $600,000 special set-aside. Under existing law the amount annually available to Puerto Rico is $600,000 and to the Virgin Islands $300,000. Proposed change: It would eliminate the $600,000 set aside for Hawaii, treating Hawaii as any other State. It would treat Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands equally, each entitled to $450,000 annually. These proposed changes must be reviewed very carefully to make sure that international air traffic needs are not neglected.

Eighth. Existing law permits 50 percent Federal contribution for planning costs, provided grant agreement for a specific project is entered into. Proposed change: Adds new provision for advanced planning grants up to 66⅔ percent of total estimated planning cost.

Ninth. Under existing law funds allocated to any State under the apportionment formula which are not obligated within 2 fiscal years revert to the discretionary fund. Proposed change: Reduces from 2 years to 1 year the time such funds will revert to discretionary funds. This was proposed under the previous act but met with strong objections from airport operators who claimed that 1 year did not allow adequate lead time to arrange for planning, financing, and so forth.

The bill has a new provision requiring that as a condition to any grant the Administrator must satisfy himself that reasonable effort, including the enactment of zoning laws, has been made to restrict the use of land adjacent to the affected airport so as to make it compatible with the operation of the airport. This requirement for such assurances can in future years insure greater safety in the operation of aircraft and great comfort and livability in areas adjacent to major airports. The Agency recognizes that proper zoning by airport sponsors is not always possible. This is especially true where multiple jurisdiction is involved. At the same time, corrective zoning is impossible in many already developed areas. Therefore, it proposes to require assurances with respect to land uses only where feasible under the circumstances.

I question personally the proposal reducing the percentage of funds to be apportioned among the States. At the present time, 75 percent of available funds are apportioned among the States on an area population basis. This bill would decrease this apportionment to 50 percent and place 50 percent in the discretionary fund. The present act provides that 25 percent of the money be placed in the discretionary fund. I am convinced the present allocation formula has proven efficient and effective. Because of much greater traffic density in heavily populated areas, the construction dollar benefits more citizens. Local financing certainly is more easily accomplished in populous transportation centers.

I am sure also that amendments will be carefully considered to eliminate the proposed redistribution to the discretionary fund of all apportioned funds unobligated at the expiration of 1 year rather than at the end of 2 years as now provided. The present provision provides local communities with crucial leadtime in the development of airport projects. It permits the phasing of construction at the cost economical and efficient time schedule with the certainty that Federal funds will be available over a longer period.

One of the most progressive features of this proposal would authorize advance planning grants up to 66⅔ percent of the estimated planning costs, thus encouraging more adequate planning by local sponsors in advance of the preparation and submission of requests. The existing Federal Airport Act authorizes Federal reimbursement of 50 percent of certain planning costs incurred in connection with a specific project. Because Federal financial participation occurs only after the project for which the planning was undertaken is approved, we have found that communities are reluctant to undertake extensive airport planning. However, only through careful advance planning can we be certain that construction on the airport proceeds in the most economic and orderly manner. We believe the additional funds expended for planning at this predevelopment stage will be fully offset by a reduction in future construction costs.

Careful, cautious, but quick planning for future airport needs was never more important than it is today. The phenomenal growth of our aviation industry means that each month more and more planes will be landing and taking off from our airports, and more and more people will be crowding through our terminals. The economic growth of communities throughout the Nation depends upon the extension of this program. It has been an outstanding success in the past and holds the promise of even greater benefits for the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at the end of my remarks and that it be allowed to lie on the table for 5 days so that the Senators who wish to cosponsor the bill may do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred;

and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The bill (S. 1153) to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Monroney (for himself and Mr. Magnuson) (by request), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 2 of the Federal Airport Act (49 U.S.C. 1101) is amended:

(1) by striking out the designation "(a)" at the beginning thereof;

(2) by inserting the words "(except advance planning for which specific grants have been made)" immediately after the word "specifications" in the present paragraph (6);

(3) by striking out the subsection heading "Airport Classifications" and all of subsection (b).

Sec. 2. Section 4(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1103(a)) is amended by inserting "and advance planning therefor", immediately following the word "development".

Sec. 3. Section 5(d) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1104(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZATION FOR ADVANCE PLANNING AND PROJECTS

"(d)(1) For the purpose of carrying out this Act in the several States, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Act, appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $201,300,000 are hereby authorized to be made to the Administrator over a period of three fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. Of amounts appropriated under this paragraph $67,100,000 shall become available for obligation, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12, beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967. All funds appropriated for these and prior fiscal years shall continue to be so available until expended.

"(2) For the purpose of carrying out this Act in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Act, appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $2,700,000 are hereby authorized to be made to the Administrator over a period of three fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. Of the amounts appropriated, $900,000 shall become available for obligation, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12, beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967. All funds appropriated for these and prior fiscal years shall continue to be so available until expended. Of each such amounts appropriated during the fiscal years enumerated herein 50 per centum shall be available for Puerto Rico and 50 per centum shall be available for the Virgin Islands. Amounts appropriated pursuant to this section prior to fiscal year 1965 shall be available in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph in effect on January 1, 1963."

"(3) For the purpose of developing, in the several States, airports, the primary purpose of which is to serve general aviation and to relieve congestion at airports having high density of traffic serving other segments of aviation, in addition to other amounts authorized by this Act for such purpose, appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $21,000,000 are hereby authorized to be made to the Administrator over a period of three fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. Of amounts appropriated under this paragraph $7,000,000 shall become available for obligation, by the execution of grant agreements pursuant to section 12, beginning July 1 of each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967. All funds appropriated for these and prior fiscal years shall continue to be so available until expended."

Sec. 4(a) Section 6(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1105(a)) is amended as follows:

(1) by striking out "75 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "50 per centum";

(2) by striking out "and the fiscal year immediately following" in the second sentence;

(3) by inserting "for advance planning or" immediately following the word "grants" in the second sentence;

(4) by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the second sentence the following: ": *Provided,* That any funds authorized to be obligated prior to fiscal year 1965 shall be apportioned in accordance with the provisions of this subsection in effect January 1, 1963."

(b) Section 6(b)(1) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1105(b)(1)) is amended:

(1) by striking out "Twenty-five per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "Fifty per centum";

(2) by inserting immediately before the period the following: ": *Provided,* That any funds authorized to be obligated prior to fiscal year 1965 shall be placed in the discretionary fund in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph and subsection 6(c) in effect January 1, 1963."

(c) Section 6(b)(2) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1105(b)(2)) is amended:

(1) by inserting "advance planning grants or" between the words "for" and "such" in the first sentence; and

(2) by inserting "advance planning or" before "projects" in the second sentence.

(d) Section 6(c) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1105(c)) is amended:

(1) by inserting "advance planning and" immediately preceding "projects";

(2) by striking out "two fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year".

Sec. 5. Section 7 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1106) is amended:

(1) by inserting in the section heading "Advance Planning And" immediately preceding "Projects";

(2) by inserting "advance planning and" immediately preceding "projects" where that word first appears in the text.

Sec. 6. The Act is amended by adding a new Section 8 to read as follows:

"ADVANCE PLANNING GRANTS"

"For the purpose of developing airport layout plans and plans directly related to eligible construction projects, the Administrator is authorized to make grants to sponsors, based upon approved advance planning proposals, for not more than 66⅔ per centum of the estimated planning cost. For the purposes of this section, "airport layout plan" means a plan for an airport showing boundaries and proposed additions to all areas owned or controlled by the sponsor for airport purposes, the location and nature of existing and proposed airport facilities and structures, and the location on the airport of existing and proposed nonaviation areas and improvements thereon."

Sec. 7(a) Section 9(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1108(a)) is amended by:

(1) inserting "Advance Planning Proposals And" immediately preceding "Projects" in the title to section 9.

(2) by inserting "an advance planning proposal or" immediately following "Administrator" where that word first appears in the first sentence.

(b) Section 9(b) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1108(b)) is amended by striking out "submission of a project" and inserting "submission of an advance planning proposal or a project".

(c) Section 9(c) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1108(c)) is amended by striking out "submission of a project" and inserting "submission of an advance planning proposal or a project".

(d) Section 9(d) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1108(d)) is amended by striking out "that the project will contribute" and inserting "that the project is not inconsistent with existing plans for the development of the area in which the airport is located and will contribute".

Sec. 8(a) Section 10(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1109(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"Except as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section, the United States share payable on account of any approved project under this Act shall not exceed 50 per centum of the allowable project costs".

(b) Section 10(b) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1109(a)) is amended by striking out "(1), and the maximum United States share under subsection (a)(2),".

(c) Section 10(c) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1109(c)) is amended by striking out the parentheses and all words within the parentheses and inserting ", not to exceed 75 per centum,".

Sec. 9. Section 11 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1110) is amended:

(a) by adding a new paragraph (4) as follows:

"Appropriate action, including the adoption of zoning laws, has been or will be taken, to the extent feasible, to restrict the use of land adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of the airport to activities and purposes compatible with normal airport operations including landing and takeoff of aircraft".

(b) by renumbering the present paragraphs (4) through (8) as (5) through (9), respectively.

Sec. 10. Section 12 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1111) is amended:

(1) by changing the first sentence to read as follows:

"Upon approving an advance planning proposal or a project application, the Administrator, on behalf of the United States, shall transmit to the sponsor or sponsors of the advance planning proposal or project application an offer to pay the United States share of the planning costs or allowable project costs."

(2) by striking out "of the project" where it appears at the end of the third sentence:

(3) by changing the fifth sentence to read as follows:

"Unless and until such a grant agreement has been executed, the United States shall not pay, nor be obligated to pay, any portion of the costs which have been or may be incurred."

Sec. 11. Section 14 of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1113) is amended:

(1) by inserting "advance planning costs or" immediately preceding "allowable" in the second sentence;

(2) by striking out "of the project" where it appears in the second and third sentences;

(3) by inserting "advance planning or" immediately preceding the term "airport development" wherever it appears.

(4) by inserting "plan or" immediately preceding the word "development" where it appears the second time in the fourth sentence.

INCREASED USE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS FOR INDUSTRIAL PURPOSES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing a bill to carry out the recommendations of the Welsh report on agriculture. I send the bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1156) to provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial purposes, introduced by Mr. CURTIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it will be recalled that a few years ago the Congress passed a proposal of mine which called upon President Eisenhower to appoint a bipartisan Commission to find new industrial uses for the products of our farms. This five-man Commission was headed by Mr. J. Leroy Welsh, of Omaha. The Commission secured the voluntary services of some 200 leaders in agriculture, chemistry, engineering, industry, and research.

These experts were divided up into a number of task force groups. They performed their services without compensation and many of them even declined to submit a bill for their travel expenses. The Commission reported in general that the problem of farm surpluses could be solved by finding new uses for the products that we can produce on the farm.

The program recommended by the Welsh Commission was divided into three parts. These parts were: research, trial commercialization, and pilot testing.

The bill I am introducing today is similar to S. 714 which was introduced in the last Congress, with one important addition.

This addition consists of a new section which calls upon the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with municipalities and others in research on the problems of air pollution, through the use of alcohol made from farm crops as a component of motor fuel. This should be of interest to all of our great cities.

For instance, a well-qualified source expresses the opinion that a reduction in the level of unburned hydrocarbons through the use of alcohol-gasoline blends could have an immediate effect on the Los Angeles smog problem. This authority contends that such a blend of motor fuel could reduce the unburned hydrocarbon emission approximately 50 percent. There is a reasonable possibility that after such a plan had been followed for a few years, accompanied by additional research, it could bring about even greater benefits.

After preparing the bill and these remarks, there came to my desk an article published in the Omaha Herald of March 18, 1963. It was published on the front page of that newspaper. It is entitled "Smog-Free Fuel Could Cut Grain—Two Headaches Solved at Once." The article was written by Bob Considine and bears the dateline of New York. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in full at this time in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMOG-FREE FUEL COULD CUT GRAIN—TWO HEADACHES SOLVED AT ONCE

(By Bob Considine)

NEW YORK.—The Southwest Research Institute of San Antonio, Tex., has produced a remedy calculated to do something constructive, simultaneously, about the Nation's colossal grain surplus and Greater Los Angeles smog.

Here's the pitch:

Turn the mountains of Government-owned wheat into alcohol, dump some of it in the oceans of gasoline burned in cars every day, and presto. Smog-producing exhaust gases will be reduced by as much as 60 percent.

So will the burden on the back of the American taxpayer, who not only buys the subsidized grain but foots the $1 million a day rent bills to store it and other surpluses.

GRAIN, SMOG GROWS

The grain stocks grow larger each day, and the smog gets thicker not only over Los Angeles but over an increasing number of cities.

These two apparently unrelated headaches have long been the concern of Nebraska grain dealer J. Leroy Welsh, who headed President Eisenhower's commission to find industrial uses of surplus grain.

He persuaded the Nebraska Department of Agriculture and Inspection to turn the problem over to the remarkable San Antonio research outfit.

The research team began with a discouraging hurdle: Alcohol has long been used as a car fuel, notably in racing cars, but the cost has been commercially prohibitive.

HURDLE CLEARED

The researchers cleared the hurdle by getting more out of the alcohol they made from wheat. Mixed with high-test gas to the degree of 25 percent, the blended fuel was just as efficient as high-test gas at average car speeds, and almost as efficient at low and high speeds.

Remarkable differences showed up in the reduction of exhaust gases. Early findings indicate that the use of this in the Los Angeles Smog Control District would reduce the unburned hydrocarbon emission approximately 50 percent.

In the course of its study, Southwest Research Institute wizards devised a new concept in auto motors, one that will increase compression and efficiency by as much as 50 percent—and, not incidentally, make better use of an alcohol-gasoline fuel if that comes about.

ONE FOR THE ROAD

Major car companies are seeking rights to mass-produce the motor.

"Give your gasoline one for the road," is the slogan at the research center.

"The entire wheat surplus could be wiped out in less than a year if the fuel people accept this program," the institute's bright young president, Dr. Martin Goland, said.

"It is also quite conceivable that farmers would in the future be urged to raise more wheat, and other grains that can be reduced to alcohol, instead of being subsidized not to plant.

LOT OF PRESSURE

"We could unload the heavy burdens of subsidy and storage. As for the big fuel companies, they've been under a lot of pressure to do something about their role in smog. They should regard this development with enthusiasm."

Unless something is done to devour the mounting grain surplus we'll all be up to our hips in it. Every time the Government in effect bribes a farmer to take X number of acres out of production, another section of government, Federal or State, broadcasts new ways and means of coaxing the earth to yield greater gains.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it has long been my hope that alcohol produced from grain could be used as a part of our motor fuel. Farmers buy a great deal of gasoline and tractor fuel. Certainly they should be allowed to produce their own fuel. The number of cars in the country is constantly increasing and likewise the motor fuel market is increasing. European countries have blended alcohol into their gasoline up to 25 percent. Were we to blend alcohol into our gasoline to the extent of 10 percent, it would require more than 1 billion bushels of grain a year. In other words, that one use alone could go a long way toward solving the grain surplus problem.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, in its report, based on the work of the agricultural research service at Peoria, Ill., said on June 9, 1954:

> Because of extensive practical experience in the use of alcohol-gasoline blends in foreign countries and laboratory and road studies made in this country, it is evident that the use of alcohol as a fuel for internal combustion engines is practical from the technological standpoint.

However, we face a very definite obstacle in regard to this. It is an economic fact that gasoline can be produced cheaper than alcohol. Consequently, no one selling gasoline is going to turn to a blended alcohol. In peacetime, under our free American system, we cannot compel that to be done by law.

I am thoroughly convinced that a broad program of research will lower the cost of producing alcohol from farm products. At the present time, when we make alcohol out of farm products, we have a protein residue that is a very valuable food for animals, however, with improved methods brought about by research and trial commercialization, it is believed that the alcohol can be extracted, and the protein residue will be a fine human food. Its value will then be many times greater than its value for livestock food. The alcohol will become more or less a byproduct and can be sold at a price that will enable it to compete with gasoline for a part of the motor fuel market. So, while a portion of the motor fuel market is not the farmer's at this time, it is not an impossibility that one day it will be.

A number of leaders in the petroleum industry are not adverse to these efforts. They realize that the farmers are purchasers of their products. Oil companies are taxpayers too and should be interested in farm program costs. They realize that farm prosperity means a great deal to the prosperity of our country. Furthermore, the same companies will be selling the motor fuel at all the filling stations in the country, regardless of the components of that fuel. They are not going to lose the business.

Incidentally, it is my objective and that of the Welsh Commission that the Government enter into the field of research, trial commercialization, and pilot testing with limited subsidies, but that the results be turned over to private enterprise. We do not advocate a program of Government-owned plants and Government manufacturing of products from the farm or from any other source.

Our surpluses are primarily starches. From starch we make alcohol, and from alcohol we can make rubber, plastics, and a thousand and one things that are now being made from other materials.

We are not limited by any means to motor fuel and rubber and like products. There are literally hundreds of possibilities of making industrial uses of agricultural products. These include solvents, surface coatings, medicines, chemicals, building materials, containers, utensils, electronic components, fibers, films, explosives, adhesives, lubricants, insecticides, waxes, drilling muds, paints, varnishes, and even paving materials.

Practically all of the research that has been carried on in behalf of agriculture has had to do with increased production. This is necessary and wise because it lowers costs. We have failed to carry on an adequate program to find new markets and new uses. In fact, it is believed that only about one-sixteenth of 1 percent of the gross sales of agriculture has been used on research to find new uses of agricultural products.

By contrast, industry is currently investing about $11 billion a year in research. The result is a constant flow of new and improved products. These new products—the result of modern research—have provided the foundation for new industries, new consumer demand, more jobs and more business. This research by industry is continuous, systematic, and intensive. I find no fault with it. I merely point out that a similar research program should be carried on in behalf of agriculture.

Because research has gone on in industry and it has been lacking in agriculture, the farmers of America have lost many of the markets they previously had. For instance, linseed oil has been replaced as a component of paint to a large extent. Were we using the same amount of linseed oil per gallon of paint as we did back in the thirties, the farmers could plant an additional 1 million acres of flax.

Half of the market for natural fibers, including cotton, wool, and silk, has been taken over by synthetic fibers. Two-thirds of the shoes now are made partly or wholly of leather substitutes. Soap made from natural fats has lost out to detergents. In the last 10 or 12 years, the use of detergents per person has increased from 1 pound to 15 pounds per year, while the use of soap has decreased from 23 pounds to 8 pounds a year.

Perhaps one of the most discussed problems over the country is the heavy traffic and the difficulty of finding a parking place. This indicates that the United States is using a great amount of rubber, although there are many, many uses for rubber besides that which is used by the automobile industry. A small portion of this rubber is natural rubber, but most of it is synthetic rubber. If only part of this synthetic rubber market would be supplied with synthetic rubber made from alcohol made from grain, it would take hundreds of millions of bushels a year. This was done during World War II under the rubber czar, Mr. William Jeffers. As the program progressed the cost lowered materially, again pointing up the need for trial commercialization and pilot testing to make these proposals economically feasible.

Research should be carried on to find the additional uses for the 55 million tons of legumes produced annually in the United States. One of the task force groups of the Welsh Commission made an estimate of the untapped possibilities in this field. This estimate included a billion dollars worth of protein, carotene worth $2¾ billion, vitamin E worth $2 billion, vitamin K worth $115 million, xanthophyll worth $12½ billion, and chlorophyll worth $19 billion. These figures sound a bit fantastic, but they show that these materials in our legumes are waiting to be used and developed for medicinal and other nonfood uses.

Another task force, working on potatoes, reported:

> The potato industry is confident that a materially enlarged research and development program would so expand the market that surpluses would disappear and it might even be necessary to increase production.

Likewise, the task force on sugar had this to say:

> The sugar industry is confident that these industrial uses will be developed, to the extent perhaps of utilizing an extra million tons of sugar by 1965 and 2 million tons by 1975. This would add more than 10 percent to the projected 1965 demand and more than 16 percent to the projected demand for 1975. Sugar is an inexpensive, exceptionally pure, and chemically very reactive material, adaptable for many large-scale industrial applications. Present industrial use is small, but a dozen years of research have turned up some highly promising leads.

Not all of the new uses that are economically possible of our farm crops are confined to crops already being raised. The Welsh Commission had a task group on new crops. It is estimated that about 250,000 plants are on the earth that have been identified. We have only domesticated around 150. There remain about 249,850 plants that should have our attention because they can supply many things needed in our economy.

A new type of bamboo can be produced in the South, especially in areas that have had to cut down their cotton acreage, which would be very valuable in preventing a paper shortage in this country. It is estimated that this could take a million acres.

Due to research already carried on, safflower is now an important crop in Nebraska. In addition to its food value it is being sold to manufacturers for alkyd resins, enamels, varnishes, and high-quality paint.

Instead of our resorting to abaca and sisal to supply our cordage and rope, we should develop the sansevieris, a commonly used house plant known as a snake plant. This promises a market for possibly a hundred thousand acres.

Our economy could use 200,000 acres of kenaf to make fiber for post office twine, carpet yarn, camouflage, and burlap instead of using imported jute.

Wax is now in demand in industry. We ought to be producing 150,000 acres of Simmondsia from which a needed high quality wax can be produced.

We import our tannins used in the production of leather. This tannin could be supplied from canaigre and we could perhaps use a hundred thousand acres of that crop.

Mr. President, it is entirely possible that if a broad program of research and trial commercialization can be undertaken, many of these things I have mentioned can be developed. It is also possible that some of them will not prove practical, but in this process of research we will develop many things that I have not mentioned or that were not even thought of by the fine individuals who worked on the Welsh Commission report.

The important problems facing our Nation have been solved, if they have been solved, by education, research and trial and error endeavors. It is my opinion that it will be along this line that progress comes to American agriculture. It will not come through political answers or a negative approach of reducing the number of acres that a farmer can farm. A reduction of acres has not provided the answer. We have not yet scratched the surface in increased productivity.

In developing such a program for agriculture there is a definite part to be played by government. Individual farmers, unlike a great corporation extending from coast to coast, cannot do their own research. This must be done by government. It must be research for the purpose of finding new uses and new markets.

The program that I advocate and that is advocated by the Welsh Commission falls into three parts. First, is research. That is most important, but it must not end there. Research merely for the shelf, for someone to read years later, if ever, does not provide the answer.

In the second place, the Government must sponsor a program of trial commercialization and pilot testing. The Government should take the ideas developed in our laboratories and try them out as pilot operations sponsored by the Government and on a contract basis handled by private enterprise.

Thirdly, it calls for a program of limited subsidies on a test pilot basis to both farmers and industry, to get the program started. Farmers cannot be expected to plant one of the untried 250,000 plants existing on the earth if they have no hope for a market. Industry likewise cannot build factories to use the products of the farm until they know that the crop is available, that it will afford a product the American public wants, and they can produce it economically. Consequently, on a trial basis, on a pilot testing basis, the Government should finance such a program. I would be willing to reduce other parts of the agricultural budget to finance this program.

The results of all this research, trial commercialization and pilot testing, which will have been supported by limited subsidies, will then be turned over to all segments of our economy which are non-Government, to the end that it will be used by private enterprise, and that competition will prevail.

To further this program the Government should forthwith cause the Commodity Credit Corporation to make surpluses available to Government laboratories, private laboratories, universities and private businesses for research purposes without cost.

The Government should be authorized to enter into contracts to furnish, at low price, surplus agricultural products over a period of 5 or 10 years to any business to manufacture new industrial products. The present subsidy now being paid for exports should be extended to domestic concerns which would put the surpluses to new uses which are for other than human or animal consumption. Such a business should by contract be assured of their supply of raw materials over a period of years so they could depend on it.

A program of industrial uses when it becomes a reality, or any other farm program, cannot succeed if the United States is flooded with agricultural imports from other countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record at this point Legislative Resolution 25 passed by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska. The resolution points out the injury suffered by our farmers and ranchers from the increased imports of livestock and meat and meat products.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Legislative Resolution 25

Whereas this legislature wishes to focus the attention of the Nation and the Federal Government upon the probability that the rising volume of imports of mutton, pork, beef, and veal into the United States has been a factor in contributing to the serious decline of livestock prices; and

Whereas the imports of beef and veal, product weight, for the 11-month period of January through November of 1962, totaled 884 million pounds, which volume was equal to 9 percent of the U.S. production of beef and veal during this same period and represented a 39-percent increase from the 635 million pounds of beef and veal imported during the same period in 1961; and

Whereas the imports of pork for the first 9-month period of 1962, totaled 151,464,000 million pounds, which volume was 22 percent greater than during the same period in 1961. Pigskin imports during the first three quarters of the year 1962 were up 150 percent; and

Whereas imports of all red meats during the first three quarters of 1962 were up 36 percent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 73d session assembled:

1. That the Nebraska Legislature hereby petitions the executive branch of the Federal Government, the Senators and Congressmen from Nebraska to exercise their authority immediately under the powers and privileges granted in Public Law 87–794, and to further consider the wisdom of flexible quota of imports to balance the consumptive need, in relation to U.S. domestic production.

2. That action be taken immediately because the situation is unusually serious and requires correction at the earliest possible moment.

3. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the President of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the U.S. Senate and in the House of Representatives.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the bill which I have introduced, if promptly enacted, would relieve the present situation and would, without a doubt, increase the price of cattle and hogs and sheep to our farmers and feeders. Our big increase in imports has occurred in the last few years. This bill which I have introduced, S. 1126, would place an additional 25 percent ad valorem duty on all imports of livestock, meat and meat products which were in excess of the level of imports for the calendar year 1957.

Mr. President, when the administration presented its trade bill to Congress last year, I voted against the measure. It was unwise. The damage it will do to agriculture was foreseeable.

During the course of the consideration of the trade bill, a number of amendments were offered which would have been beneficial to agriculture. They were all opposed by the administration forces and all defeated. I offered an amendment which would have directed our negotiators to hold down our annual imports of agricultural products to the 1957 level and to maintain our annual exports at not less than the 1957 level. That amendment, like the others, was opposed on the Senate floor by administration forces and defeated. We are now suffering the consequences.

The European Common Market is a good thing for Europe. It will bring political unity. It is a private enterprise operation and it will give to the European countries a strength which will be a bulwark against communism.

The trade policy of this administration in respect to the European Common Market has been totally unrealistic and unsound. Administration sources presented the Common Market to the people of the United States as a free trade movement. The fact is, it is a protectionist movement. The Common Market seeks to abolish trade barriers between the member nations in Europe, but establishes protection around the outer rim of the Common Market countries. It is their intention to produce for themselves all of the agricultural products and other products they possibly can. The Common Market of Europe aims to do for Europe what the Constitution of the United States did for our States in 1787. Barriers were then abolished between the several States, but a tariff policy was adopted for the entire United States. That policy developed a strong economy for the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks my individual views as printed in the report of the Committee on Finance when the Kennedy trade bill was before the Senate.

There being no objection, the individual views were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Individual Views of Senator Carl T. Curtis, on H.R. 11970

This measure goes far beyond the existing trade agreements program and I do not favor its enactment in its present form.

The European Common Market is a very desirable entity. It will lead to greater unity among the nations of Europe; it will elevate their economies and strengthen their political ties. It is a fortress against international communism and our national policy should be to encourage and to cooperate with the Common Market. The bill presented by the committee will not, in my opinion, be mutually advantageous to the United States and to the European nations. Both need each other and whatever weakens the United States weakens Europe.

Under the trade agreements program existing for more than a quarter of a century the Congress has delegated its constitutional powers to levy, modify, and repeal taxes, and its powers to regulate portions of our commerce to the executive. In the past there have been certain limitations in this delegation of power. In most recent years the Congress has provided for safeguards such as the peril point and escape clause procedures. The measure before us departs from all these previous concepts.

Our reciprocal trade program of the past is not free of criticism. The United States has allowed foreign countries to impose many nontariff barriers against us such as quotas, embargos, import licenses, unreasonable inspection, variable import fees, currency manipulations, and other harassments. In the past the Congress has authorized the President, in his negotiations, to lower tariffs by 50 percent. Under the successive acts passed, the United States has bargained away 80 percent of its tariffs and bargaining power. The result is not praiseworthy. The average U.S. tariff on dutiable goods at present is 11 percent while the average for other major industrial nations is 14 percent. Many important examples are in greater contrast—for instance, the tariff on European cars sold in the United States is 6½ percent and the tariff on American cars, under EEC proposals will soon be 22½ percent. Many other unfair situations can be cited especially in connection with our agricultural products. Candy is a widely consumed item and is made entirely from agricultural products. We permit candy to come in from Switzerland, France, Germany, or England under a tariff of 14 percent. American-made candy shipped to many of these nations faces a tariff of 30 percent. The farmers want to trade with the Common Market countries. We are the world's most efficient and lowest cost producers of agricultural products. Under the variable duties now in effect within the Common Market countries, the products of American farmers face a tariff in the Common Market countries, as of August 1, 1962, at least six times as high as corresponding tariffs on identical items imported from the Common Market into the United States. In addition to the inequality of tariffs facing the United States, we meet continually countless instances of the imposition of nontariff barriers mentioned above.

It is my belief trade negotiations can be carried on that would be mutually advantageous to the United States and to other countries. It must be a two-way street. The only safeguards remaining in the bill before us are ineffective. Discretionary power is given to the President, without limitation, to raise tariffs, to any level or to impose any other trade restriction. These provisions are not guidelines for negotiation. They will be applied, if at all, after the fact. They will subject the President to innumerable requests and pressures from deserving industries at home and will create ill will for the United States within foreign countries if they are ever applied.

The bill before us eliminates the peril-point procedure. No longer will the Tariff Commission, after it has made its studies, advise the President before the negotiations at what point injury might occur. This measure abandons the policy of economically sound increased trade and proceeds upon an admission that negotiations will be consummated to the injury of segments of our economy. The escape clause is shorn of effectiveness in existing law.

The powers delegated to the President are vastly greater than the powers heretofore delegated. He may, through negotiation, lower all tariffs from their present level, a level lower than almost any other country, by an average of 50 percent. An additional list of commodities is subject to being lowered more than 50 percent—in fact down to zero. The President is specifically authorized to negotiate away all tariffs now less

than a 5-percent ad valorem equivalent. In these two latter categories of additional power will rest many of our agricultural products.

Prior acts had, as their goal, an expansion of trade and an increase of jobs. This measure substitutes a Government-managed economy for the United States and for foreign countries with shocking disregard for business and employment results. The bill sets up a superunemployment compensation system in addition to individual programs of our 50 States. It is another major step toward federalizing our unemployment systems. The bill permits workers or management to seek a finding that they are injured by imports. A worker so found to be unemployed by the reason of imports will be entitled to unemployment compensation for 52 weeks at approximately 65 percent of his salary. This will amount to almost twice the average rate of unemployment compensation paid by our States. He will receive these benefits for 52 weeks, a longer period than is provided by most State unemployment compensation systems.

If this Federal unemployment compensation system becomes the law it will bring about many inequalities and many instances of unfairness. A person whose unemployment is caused by the Executive granting concessions to destroy his job will draw a higher rate of unemployment compensation, for a longer period, than his neighbor who is secondarily unemployed because his employment was based upon goods or services provided to the business which closed because of imports. Attention is called to the testimony in the hearings of longtime, well-qualified administrators of State unemployment compensation systems who testified against this provision of the bill.

This measure is defective in its unprecedented and far-reaching delegation of power. It is lacking in that it fails to provide guidelines before agreements are entered into with foreign nations to protect the United States from arbitrary barriers or to protect the U.S. domestic market from excessive and uneconomic imports. The measure should be materially revised or delayed until January when such revision could be made.

Carl T. Curtis,
U.S. Senator.

BASIC SALARY OF FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES FOR RETIREMENT PURPOSES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit Federal employees to have withheld from their pay for retirement purposes their appropriate share of compensation for overtime, night, holiday, and similar work.

Under the present Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, only basic salary is subject to the 6½-percent payroll deduction, which is then transferred to the civil service retirement fund. The definition of basic salary in the current law does not permit credit for work in excess of the normal 40-hour tour of duty.

The objective of the legislation is to expand the statutory definition to include the various types of pay enumerated above for retirement purposes.

Over the years of an employee's career, this could mean a slightly higher annuity based upon the additional contributions he makes resulting from work in these categories.

The individual who is required to spend hours over and above the normal work cycle or who must perform service on a less desirable shift is certainly performing work, just as he would under normal circumstances. Yet, under existing law, he may not add the value of his work to his retirement account.

Fundamentally, a staff retirement program is designed to permit employees to cease working after the required years of service and at the required age with a reasonable expectation of continuing income to maintain them during the later years of life. This bill is simply an extension of that principle to allow workers to acquire retirement credit for certain periods of works upon payment of their normal share of the retirement cost.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1157) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion of certain additional types of compensation within the meaning of the term "basic salary" for the purposes of such act, introduced by Mr. Yarborough, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPEAL OF SECTION 13A OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in 1958, believing that the railroads then were on the verge of bankruptcy, Congress enacted an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act along with a package of other measures intended to provide emergency help to what was then regarded as a sick industry. This legislation was known as the Transportation Act of 1958 and most of its provisions were, I believe, warranted as measures intended to bring about more equitable treatment of the railroads, even though we now are aware that the railroads were nowhere nearly as sick in 1958 as they had led many of us to believe.

One provision of this legislation, however, has been the subject of strong controversy ever since its enactment. I refer to that strange provision of law which became section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act. This section, according to its legislative history, was intended to provide a means by which the railroads could circumvent State agencies which the railroads claimed has been treating them unfairly by denying them permission to discontinue passenger trains for which there was no longer a need. This law has now been in effect for more than 4 years and during that time more than 220 trains have been completely discontinued and 51 additional trains have been partially discontinued as a result of this statute. It would seem that 4 years is certainly long enough for any railroad which may have been unfairly treated by the State agencies to have taken advantage of this enactment and to get rid of any unprofitable trains it may have been unfairly compelled to continue.

I am therefore, today, introducing a bill which would repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act. This measure would return to the States and to the railroad commissions the authority over passenger train discontinuances which they had always exercised prior to the 1958 amendment. It is my belief that the State railroad commissions, which are most familiar with the needs for service in a given area, are the most logical agencies to determine whether or not the public convenience and necessity requires continued passenger train operations. I believe that action to repeal section 13a is essential at this session of Congress if the public is not to be denied passenger train service which it still requires. The provisions of section 13a, to my mind, are unique in the legislative history of our country in that, in effect, they give to the railroads themselves as a public utility the right to regulate themselves insofar as passenger train operations are involved. In fact, this law has frequently been criticized for its lack of adequate protection of the public interest.

Among the ways by which section 13a clearly ignores the public interest are the following:

First. It permits the railroads to discontinue passenger train service by the mere posting of a notice unless the Interstate Commerce Commission decides that it should act on the notice and hold a hearing. Such action is entirely discretionary with the Commission.

Second. The public is denied the right to appeal a passenger train discontinuance to the courts, but the right of such an appeal is preserved for the railroads whenever the Interstate Commerce Commission orders them to continue a train. Lopsided justice is no justice at all.

Third. Discontinuances of passenger trains are permitted to take place without any requirement for the holding of a public hearing.

Fourth. Railroads are permitted to discontinue interstate passenger train operation without being required to justify such action.

Fifth. If the Interstate Commerce Commission does decide to hold a hearing, the law requires the public to prove that the continued operation of the interstate passenger train will not be an undue burden on the railroad, although the public can only secure such proof from material which only the railroads can supply.

Sixth. The law permits the railroads to withhold from opponents of proposed discontinuances all material needed to prove undue financial burden until the day of the hearing, if one is held.

Section 13a thus places a completely unrealistic and unfair restriction upon efforts by the public and even the Interstate Commerce Commission to keep a passenger train in operation. One of the provisions most damaging to the public interest is that which authorizes automatic discontinuance of interstate passenger trains unless the Interstate Commerce Commission renders a final decision within 4 months of the original discontinuance date. This unreasonable time limit clearly denies the public adequate time to prepare its opposition to the discontinuance.

There is much evidence that many railroads have used section 13a deliberately to downgrade passenger train service in order to eliminate trains. The present law permits the ICC only to look at the facts—or alleged facts—which the carrier decides to disclose in the application submitted and it is not permitted to examine the motives of the carrier in seeking to abandon trains. The Commission is limited to determining, solely on the basis of the evidence before it, whether the public convenience and necessity requires the continuance of the train and whether that continued operation will be an undue burden on the railroad. Thus, under the present law, the Commission is required to permit the discontinuance of a train on which the service has deliberately been deteriorated.

Many of the State laws, which were made ineffective by section 13a, on the other hand, permit the State commissions to require continued service on specific schedules and with specific equipment, and this authority thus can prevent deliberate destruction and reduction of service. Section 13a, however, has left the Interstate Commerce Commission powerless to set minimum service standards.

The need for repeal of section 13a has been repeatedly pointed to by the State railroad commissioners. Regularly at the annual convention of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, the delegates have voted to adopt a resolution calling for repeal of this legislation.

In conclusion, I submit the following tabular summary, compiled as of February 7, 1963, of section 13a cases which have arisen since the Transportation Act of 1958 was enacted:

	13a(1)	13a(2)	Total
Nnmber of applications	86	26	112
Number of trains involved	316	142	458
Number of trains discontinued	188	41	229
Number of trains partially discontinued [1]	51	0	51
Number of trains completely or partially discontinued	239	41	280
Number of trains ordered to keep operating [2]	41	67	108
Number of trains where case was dismissed or withdrawn	24	27	51
Number of trains involved in cases still pending	12	3	15

[1] A partially discontinued train would be one that was ordered to operate during only a portion of the year—such as holiday seasons—one where service was cut during several days of the week, etc.

[2] Most of the orders stipulating that a train must keep operating were for the usual 1-year moratorium, allowing a new application after 1 year. Thus, the same "trains" will appear in the figures more than once. Therefore, since a case-by-case rather than train-by-train method is used for record purposes, the figures are not completely additive.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be published in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1161) to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act is repealed.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the Area Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963.

Two years ago it was my privilege to be the chief sponsor of S. 1, the area redevelopment legislation which was finally enacted into law on May 1, 1961. In the short period of time that has elapsed, the Area Redevelopment Administration has made tremendous strides in assisting in the rejuvenation of many local economies that had suffered from persistent economic distress. In less than 24 months, the agency has designated eligible for assistance under the terms of the act 996 local areas and 51 Indian reservations in 50 States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa; received 792 overall economic development programs from 792 areas and 42 Indian reservations in 48 States; approved the overall economic development plans of 700 areas and 36 Indian reservations; approved 724 projects in 47 States, American Samoa, and Puerto Rico, which will create approximately 35,000 direct jobs and countless more new jobs through the indirect effects of increasing economic growth and prosperity in these areas; and approved 345 training and subsistence programs to assist over 18,000 previously unemployed in developing new skills for new jobs.

More specifically, the Area Development Administration has approved 139 industrial loans at a total cost of approximately $42 million; 78 public facility projects totaling approximately $25 million in the form of loans and almost $17 million in the form of grants. At the same time, the agency has approved 162 technical assistance projects at a total cost of $5.4 million.

However, the task of the Area Redevelopment Administration is far from completed. Therefore, the administration has proposed legislation to extend and improve the Area Redevelopment Act, which I am introducing today.

Basically, the bill would—

First. Increase the authorization for industrial and commercial loans from $100 million to $250 million for industrial or commercial projects in areas designated under section 5(a) of the act—so-called urban areas.

Second. Increase the authorization for industrial and commercial loans from $100 million to $250 million for industrial or commercial projects in areas designated under section 5(b) of the act—so-called rural areas.

Third. Increase the authorization for public facility loans from $100 to $150 million.

Fourth. Increase the authorization for public facility grants from $75 to $175 million.

Fifth. Permit the required 10-percent local contribution for industrial or commercial projects if it is in the form of a loan to be repaid concurrently with financial assistance extended by the Area Redevelopment Administration.

Sixth. Increase the authorization for technical assistance from $4.5 to $10 million.

I hope that the Senate will be able to act quickly on this request of the administration for amendments to the Area Redevelopment Act. The Secretary of Commerce, in his letter of transmittal to the President of the Senate, has ably stated the case for this legislation. Secretary Hodges said:

> The Area Redevelopment Act embodies the primary legislative authorization for attacking the problem of unemployment and underemployment in those areas of the Nation which are suffering the greatest economic adversity. The problems of these pockets of distress—and the measures which are appropriate to their economic revitalization—are distinct and in addition to the economic challenges which face the Nation as a whole. Impressive strides have been made under the area redevelopment program. A continuation of this essential work is dependent upon additional appropriation authorizations. Also, experience in administration has indicated the need of certain modifications to more effectively attain the objectives of the act.
>
> I commend this proposed legislation to you as being in the greatest national interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks a detailed analysis of the provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act amendments of 1963.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1163) to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The analysis presented by Mr. DOUGLAS is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1963

GENERAL

The attached amendments would allow the Area Redevelopment Act more fully to meet the needs for which it was created through increased fund authorizations and flexibility. These amendments are based upon the experience of the Area Redevelopment Administration during the period May 1, 1961, through February 28, 1963, and are more fully described below.

Section 2: Declaration of purpose.

Section 3: Amendments to section 6(b).

(a) Authorization to increase the total amount of industrial and commercial loans outstanding: Section 6(b)(1)(A) of the Area Redevelopment Act now places a $100 million ceiling on the total amount of loans and/or purchases of indebtedness outstanding for commercial or industrial projects in areas designated under section 5(a) of the act. Section 6(b)(1)(B) places a similar limitation on the amount of loans or purchases of indebtedness outstanding for such projects in areas designated under section 5(b) of the act. It is the purpose of section 3(a) of the proposed amendments to raise the ceilings on the total amounts of loans outstanding under each of these sections from $100 to $250 million.

As of February 28, 1963, the Area Redevelopment Administration had instructed the Small Business Administration to execute loan agreements amounting to $20,431,335 in industrial and commercial loans for projects in 5(a) redevelopment areas and $17,711,442 for projects in 5(b) areas. In addition, the Area Redevelopment Administration has project applications in the total amount of $86,431,967 pending for projects in 5(a) areas and $118,510,788 pending for projects in 5(b) areas. Evidence indicates that loan activity will continue to rise steadily. Assuming a gradual increase in the present rate of loan approvals, the Area Redevelopment Administration could have approximately $425 million in loans outstanding under section 6 by June 30, 1965, if there were no statutory limitations. It is clear that the present ceilings imposed by section 6(b)(1) of the Area Redevelopment Act will be reached considerably before the act's termination on June 30, 1965, unless otherwise amended.

(b) Refining the minimum 10 percent requirement: Section 6(b)(9)(B) requires at least 10 percent of the aggregate cost of an industrial or commercial project for which an ARA loan is sought, to be supplied by a public or semipublic body in the form of equity capital or as a subordinated loan with delayed repayment. The proposed amendment to this section would authorize the minimum 10 percent money to be repaid during the same time but at no faster rate than the financial assistance extended under section 6 of the Area Redevelopment Act.

ARA has experienced great difficulty in obtaining the required 10-percent money in order to advance the economies of redevelopment areas. In fact, there is a direct relationship between the severity of the economic problem and the difficulty experienced by communities attempting to raise the required funds. The present proposal would not eliminate the 10-percent requirement but would make it possible for redevelopment areas to attract additional financial sources which are presently unable to participate in projects because of the statutory restrictions on repayment.

Section 4, authorization to increase the total amount of loans for public facilities outstanding: Section 7(c) of the act places a $100 million ceiling on the total amount of public facility loans which can be outstanding at any one time for public facilities under section 7. The purpose of this amendment is to increase the total amount authorized to be outstanding from $100 to $150 million.

As of February 28, 1963, the Area Redevelopment Administration has instructed delegate agencies to execute loan agreements amounting to $24,777,200 in public facility loans for projects located in areas designated under section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act. Loan applications were pending in the amount of $13,178,525 for such projects. However, the pending applications figure does not include anticipated loans resulting from the denial of section 8 applications in whole or in part. Evidence again indicates that loan activity resulting from sections 7 and 8 applications will continue to rise steadily. Assuming a gradual increase in the present rate of approvals, the Area Redevelopment Administration could have more than $100 million in loans outstanding under section 7 by June 30, 1965, but for the present $100 million limitation.

Section 5. authorization to increase the total amount which can be appropriated for grants for public facilities: Section 8(d) of the act authorizes $75 million to be appropriated for the purpose of making grants for public facilities under section 8. This amendment would increase the total amount authorized to be appropriated for this purpose for the duration of the act from $75 to $175 million, and would enable it to remain available until expended when so specified in appropriation acts.

The appropriation for fiscal year 1963 in the amount of $35 million for public facility grants, together with the $40 million previously appropriated for fiscal year 1962, exhausts the authorization under the act for this purpose. As of February 28, 1963, applications for grants totaled $26,875,566. Obligations for 1964 are currently being estimated at $35 million, with a minimum 10-percent increase estimated for 1965. The requested increase in authorization to $175 million takes into account both the $75 million previously appropriated and the approximately $75 million currently projected, with some leeway for anticipated increases. If the statutory authorization is not increased, ARA's public facility grant program will go out of existence at the end of fiscal year 1963.

Section 6, amendments to section 11:

(a) Authorization to increase the annual amounts which can be appropriated for technical assistance: Section 11 of the act authorizes appropriations not to exceed $4.5 million annually to provide technical assistance useful in alleviating or preventing excessive unemployment or underemployment. The purpose of this amendment is to increase the annual amount authorized to be appropriated for this purpose from $4.5 to $10 million.

Under its present authorization, the Area Redevelopment Administration as of February 28, 1963, had approved contracts in the amount of $1,651,000 for technical assistance. Applications for such assistance had been received in the total amount of $25,799,248. Of this total, approximately $11 million of these applications were received in fiscal year 1963. Currently, applications are arriving at a rate of $1 million per month. Experience has shown that this assistance is of great value, and it it anticipated that the rate of applications will continue to rise.

(b) Amendment to make explicit discretionary authority to require repayment of technical assistance: The additional language makes it clear that the Secretary has the authority to require repayment of funds advanced for technical assistance in appropriate cases.

Section 7, procuring the services of experts and consultants under section 12(10): This section governs the procurement and payment for services of experts and consultants hired temporarily by contract or appointment to assist the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of the act. It limits temporary services to 6 months, omits mention of intermittent services, and limits the per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence to $15. The proposed amendment would modify the provisions of this section in conformity with 5 U.S.C. 5a by authorizing the procurement of temporary services of experts or consultants up to 1 year instead of 6 months and providing for intermittent services, thereby explicitly assuring to ARA the authority customarily available to executive departments in this regard. It would also automatically conform the authorized per diem allowance to the current applicable rate prescribed in the standardized Government travel regulations, which is now $16.

Section 8, authorization for appropriated funds to remain available until expended and for depositing certain appropriations in the area redevelopment fund: The proposed amendment to section 23 will provide for appropriations being made on a basis where funds may remain available until expended. In addition, funds appropriated for the purpose of making loans under sections 6 and 7 of the act are directed to be deposited in the area redevelopment fund which is established by section 9(b) of the act. This amendment further provides for payments of interest to the Treasury on use of funds appropriated to the area redevelopment fund.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill entitled "Area Redevelopment Act Amendments of 1963," introduced today by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] be held at the desk until next Wednesday for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned about the decline of the mining industry in Michigan's Upper Peninsula and elsewhere in the United States. I have been counseling with experts at various colleges and universities, including the Michigan College of Mining and Technology, as well as in the Bureau of Mines and the Area Redevelopment Administration. Indeed, as far back as June 22, 1961, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held a hearing on the subject at my request.

From these explorations it is evident that the single most helpful avenue to pursue to help this industry and the people who want to work in it is through research. We have outstanding technical ability in the United States and especially in Michigan, but funds are in very short supply.

It appears logical for this research to be under the administration of the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior. And, it appears equally logical and desirable for the Bureau of Mines to be authorized to utilize professional skills, not available in sufficient quantity in its staff, from other sources by contract or grant. This procedure would permit the Nation to step up its attack on the sticky problems standing in the way of maximum resource utilization. Unfortunately, however, I find the Bureau of Mines is not presently authorized by law to make grants or contract for research of the type I have in mind.

The bill I am now introducing would provide authority for the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with and make grants for the conduct of research and development programs of the Bureau of Mines. This proposed legislation, if enacted, will enable the Bureau to draw on large supplies of scientific and engineering talents and technologic resources to supplement and complement the Bureau's own scientific establishment. Thus augmented the Bureau of Mines will better provide for the Nation's expanding needs for minerals and for the welfare of the people engaged in obtaining mineral commodities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1166) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts and make grants for research and development in furtherance of the purposes of the act of May 16, 1910 (36 Stat. 369; 30 U.S.C. 1, 3, 5, and 7), as amended and supplemented, introduced by Mr. HART, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AFFIDAVITS OF BIAS OR PREJUDICE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code. The measure is identical to S. 2478, which was reported favorably with amendments and passed the Senate on October 3, 1962. Unfortunately, it did not reach the House in time for consideration by that body last session.

The bill makes a significant, but not sweeping, change in the procedure for passing on affidavits of bias or prejudice in the Federal court. Under the present law, when a party to an action files an affidavit of personal bias or prejudice against the judge before whom a matter is pending that judge may determine whether it is sufficient to warrant disqualification from further consideration of the case.

The indelicate nature of the situation alone suggests that the judge against whom the affidavit is filed should not pass on its sufficiency. The proposed amendment to section 144 accomplishes this purpose by requiring that its disposition be placed in the hands of another judge. The bill also changes the time when such an affidavit may be filed to reflect the current court practices in setting down cases for trial.

In its midwinter meeting last month, the Judicial Conference of the United States reaffirmed its support of the measure. Because the bill is highly desirable, it is my hope that it will receive the early consideration and approval of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1168) to amend section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code, introduced by Mr. Hruska, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended so as to read:

"Whenever a party to any proceeding in a district court makes and files a timely and sufficient affidavit that the judge before whom the matter is pending has a personal bias or prejudice either against him or in favor of any adverse party, such judge shall proceed no further therein, but another judge shall be assigned to hear such proceeding.

"The affidavit shall state the facts and the reasons for the belief that bias or prejudice exists, and shall be filed not less than thirty days before the trial or hearing of the proceeding, or good cause shall be shown for failure to file it within such time. An order shall then be entered directing that an authenticated copy of the affidavit shall be forthwith certified to the chief judge for the circuit in which such proceeding is pending, and said chief judge, or any judge designated by him, shall determine whether the affidavit is timely and sufficient. A party may file only one such affidavit in any case. It shall be accompanied by a certificate of counsel of record stating that it is made in good faith."

UNITED NATIONS PEACE BONDS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations a bill to authorize a special Treasury issue of United Nations peace bonds designed to give the American people an opportunity for the first time to demonstrate in a tangible, effective manner their support for the peacekeeping activities of the United Nations.

Senators Humphrey, Morse, Hart, Young of Ohio, Douglas, and Williams of New Jersey have consented to join me as cosponsors of this measure.

The bill would direct the Treasury to make available for public purchase for a 2-year period a special $50 million issue of peace bonds for use by the President in support of the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations. Notification and approval of Congress would be required for all expenditures. The bonds would yield the same rate of interest as U.S. savings bonds when held to maturity 25 years from date of issue, and, like savings bonds, they would be redeemable according to a preassigned schedule of values. They would be sold on a discount basis in small denominations of $25 to $1,000, and no person would be allowed to hold more than $10,000 of bonds at any one time.

Many Members of Congress seem to be under the impression that most of the U.N. financial problems were taken care of last year by the enactment of legislation authorizing U.S. matching purchases of up to $100 million of United Nations bonds. Unfortunately, this is not the case.

Due primarily to continuing, highly successful peacekeeping operations in the Congo, the Middle East and elsewhere, the U.N. deficit, which stood at $72.4 million last December 31, is expected to increase to $126 million by June 30 even if no new peacekeeping assignments are undertaken. This latter estimate takes into account all receipts expected from the U.N. bond sales, which are not expected to exceed much more than $150 million in all, although $200 million were authorized, and, as of March 1, $126 million actually sold.

Congo expenses have already dropped somewhat from the $10 million per month cost averaged last year, and it is hoped that they will drop to $5 million per month by the middle of this year, but they cannot drop much further in the immediate future because of heavy reconstruction, development, and technical assistance obligations. Middle East expenses continue at about $1.6 million a month.

The World Court advisory holding last summer that emergency U.N. costs of the Congo and Middle East forces constitute a legal obligation of all members was approved by resolution on a vote of 76 to 17 in the General Assembly last December. To date, however, this action has not had an appreciable effect on cutting members' arrears, although it is hoped that it will have such an effect in the future when members are threatened with automatic loss of voting powers under Charter Article 19 when 2 years' arrearages accumulate. The Soviet Union will reach this stage in January of 1964 unless it makes new payments.

A 21-nation working party was formed at the last U.N. session to study future financing of the United Nations. This group will report to a special session of the Assembly in mid-May, but no miracles are expected. The U.S. position at the meetings of the group has been that our Government will not pay more than 32.08 percent of the cost of peacekeeping operations in the future—the same share as we pay of the regular assessments. Indeed there is reported to be a healthy consensus at the United Nations against any one nation assuming a larger share of U.N. support than the United States has been shouldering, although the wisdom of the rigid, percentage cutoff is questionable. We spend more than the total current deficit of the United Nations daily for defense—or every 4 months for chewing gum.

Clearly the United Nations must find new and reliable sources of funds if its effectiveness is to be maintained or increased. The people of this country and other countries should be given the opportunity to supplement the support given to U.N. activities by their governments.

Legally the United Nations belong to its member governments, and the latter have been jealous not to dilute their control over the organization by authorizing individuals to have an equity in the United Nations. If the United Nations fails, however, the loss in terms of increased tensions and risks of war will be borne equally by the governments and the peoples of the world.

All popular opinion polls show that support for the United Nations in this country and elsewhere is broad and deep.

A Gallup poll early in 1962 showed that 83 percent of the people think it very important that the United States make the U.N. a success. A poll I took in Pennsylvania at the same time showed that an overwhelming 87 percent of those responding favored U.S. efforts to strengthen the United Nations. The millions who have listened or watched anxiously the U.N.'s deliberations during severe international crises in recent years know of the vital role the organization has played in providing a forum for venting national emotions and in actually supplying the means of establishing or maintaining the peace in trouble spots around the globe. The U.N.'s efforts for peace are acceptable frequently where no nation or group of nations, no matter how well intentioned, could prevent war by unilateral threats of action.

I think the popular subscription to "peace bonds" in the United States would surprise the cynics who tend to deprecate the U.N. and the antiinternationalists who think the United States should always go it alone.

In the last Congress when I introduced a like measure, a number of influential nongovernmental organizations, foreign policy, and labor groups in particular, testified in support of the proposal at a hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee in July. State Department and Treasury officials appeared in support of it, although a basic misunderstanding developed as to the authority of the President to use the funds realized from the bond sales over and beyond amounts otherwise authorized and appropriated for U.N. support activities or merely to displace such appropriations.

I have amended the bill, first, to make clear that the moneys made available to the President from the bond sales shall be in addition to and not in lieu of any other amounts appropriated for U.N. support purposes, and expendable only after Congress has been notified and had opportunity to disapprove planned expenditures; second, to provide peace bond holders with a return equal to the going rate of interest on U.S. savings bonds, which happens to be 3¾ percent at present, rather than 2 percent as suggested earlier; third, to limit the period of issue to 2 years and the total face amounts to $25 million per year; and fourth, to specify use of the funds to support special peacekeeping operations of the United Nations rather than general U.N. activities. I am hopeful that the amended bill will again receive administration approval and be enacted by the 88th Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1171) to authorize the issuance of a special issue of bonds in order to afford an opportunity for the people of the United States, through the purchase of such bonds, to participate in the financing of peacekeeping activities of the United Nations, introduced by Mr. Clark (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CONSUMERS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to create a Select Committee on Consumers in the Senate, analogous to the existing Select Committee on Small Business. The bill is cosponsored by Senators Cooper, Keating, Prouty, and Scott.

This means of aiding the interests of consumers has been a constant cause of mine since I have been in the Congress. The measure I am introducing today is identical to those I proposed in the 86th and 87th Congresses.

In July, 1962, President Kennedy appointed a Consumers' Advisory Council, somewhat along the lines of a promise he made during the 1960 campaign. At that time I placed in the Record a New York Times editorial stating that the appointment of the advisory committee while laudable could express only a pro forma interest in consumer problems. Only a committee in each House of Congress could represent significantly the fact that ours is a consumers' economy. Legislation handled by a variety of standing committees affects the interests of consumers in, for example, consumer frauds, quality, prices and productivity. Yet there is no single forum in which the consumers' interest in all such legislation can be adequately taken into consideration in a comprehensive way, just as the Small Business Committee represents comprehensively the problems of the small business community.

Nothing has come to my attention since the creation of the advisory committee to change my view that a congressional committee is vitally needed. I strongly urge the administration to take the same view and support this measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 116) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby established a select committee of the Senate to be known as the Select Committee on Consumers (referred to hereinafter as the "committee") consisting of seventeen Members of the Senate, of whom eleven shall be members of the majority party and six shall be members of the minority party. Members and the chairman thereof shall be selected as soon as may be practicable after the date of adoption of this resolution, and at the beginning of each Congress commencing thereafter, in the same manner as members and chairmen of standing committees of the Senate are selected. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the authority of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as original appointments thereto are made.

(b) The committee shall adopt rules of procedure not inconsistent with the rules of the Senate governing standing committees of the Senate, and from time to time may establish such subcommittees thereof as it may determine to be required for the performance of its duties. A majority of the members of the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business, except that such committee or subcommittee may fix a lesser number thereof as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

(c) No legislative measure shall be referred to the committee, and it shall have no authority to report any such measure to the Senate.

Sec. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to conduct a continuing comprehensive study and investigation with respect to—

(1) the nature and extent of economic problems of consumers within the United States;

(2) the extent to which authority heretofore conferred by law upon executive, administrative, and regulatory agencies of the United States provides effective means for the solution of consumers' problems; and

(3) the nature of any additional legislative or other measures necessary or desirable for the solution of such problems.

(b) The committee shall report to the Senate from time to time the results of its studies and investigations, together with its recommendations for any additional legislative or other measures which it may determine to be necessary or desirable for the solution of economic problems of consumers.

Sec. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to (1) hold such hearings; (2) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (3) require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (4) administer such oaths; (5) take such testimony either orally or by deposition; and (6) employ and fix the compensation of such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable, except that the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for comparable duties.

(b) With the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, may utilize the services, information, and facilities of any such department or agency and may employ on a reimbursable basis the services of such personnel of any such department or agency, as it deems advisable. With the consent of any other committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, the committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such other committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

Sec. 4. Until an appropriation is made for the payment of the expenses of the committee, such expenses, in an amount not to exceed $———, may be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 30, a measure to broaden the legislative authority of the Select Committee on Small Business.

I also ask unanimous consent that on the next printing of the resolution the name of the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] may be added to the list of those Senators who are cosponsoring the measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. MONRONEY:

Excerpts from address by Senator McClellan, delivered at Tulsa, Okla., on March 8, 1963, before the Arkansas Basin Development Association.

SOVIET TECHNOLOGY ANALYZED IN RECENT STUDY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the West German embargo on the sale of large-bore steel piping to the Soviet Union is an encouraging sign of a more realistic free world attitude toward trade with the Communist bloc. For many years the Sino-Soviet bloc has been able to procure from the West vital machinery and equipment needed to build up Communist military and economic strength. According to press reports, the Department of State fully backed the West German ban on the sale of this steel pipe, after it was classified as strategic by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Mr. President, I applaud this action by the Department of State, and I hope this is an omen of a firm U.S. policy on this subject, and that whatever steps are necessary will be taken to make certain that all our allies stand behind the decision of the Federal Republic.

One of the real difficulties in coordinating Western efforts against the Soviet economic offensive was pinpointed in a Washington Post editorial published yesterday. The editorial reads in part as follows:

> What is at fault here is a situation which makes NATO's export controls a matter of ad hoc political maneuver instead of common constant policy. COCOM, the existing NATO mechanism, provides only for voluntary adherence to a thin list of banned goods, while the United States applies strict legislative controls to a thick list. Thus an item like pipeline is strategic and banned on this side of the Atlantic but—despite the NATO action of last November—available for export at a given country's discretion on the other side. A common NATO policy on exports to the Communist bloc is clearly needed.

The action of the West German Government this week evidenced its good faith in wanting to form such a common policy; and we must make every effort to get the same cooperation from our other NATO allies.

Coming in the wake of a barrage of vicious slanders by the Soviet radio and press, the determined position of the German Government deserves commendation. Soviet attacks on the German Government have been growing in intensity since Chancellor Adenauer's original move, 3 months ago, banning sales of steel pipe to the Soviet Union.

It is particularly appropriate today, when former Foreign Minister Von Brentano is visiting the United States, to express the approval of the American people of the ban which has been maintained by the Federal Republic.

International communism has made all too clear its objective of world conquest. On more than one occasion, Khrushchev has threatened our annihilation and burial.

Since our conflict with communism is economic as well as political, we have nothing to gain in this struggle by helping the Reds build up their economy by filling gaps in their technology. It is ridiculous, and perhaps suicidal, for the United States or any of its allies to contribute in any way to the building of Soviet military or industrial strength. I do not know of any businessman who would consider it sound practice to help his competitor put him out of business.

A new trade agreement signed between France and the Soviet Union, which is to run through 1965, represents a trade increase of up to 15 percent over that under the previous trade pact. Among the items which France will supply to the Soviet Union are machinery for chemical, paper, pulp, electronic, and food industries, machine tools, pipe, nickel, and other goods. In return, the Soviet Union will supply France with anthracite coal, oil, manganese, and other commodities.

This is only one of a number of agreements signed during the past 3 years between the Soviets and our allies. Statistics show that the trade between Great Britain, Italy, and West Germany, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union, on the other, has been steadily growing since 1956. Among the goods which our allies are shipping to the Soviet Union are items of definite strategic importance.

It is obvious that the arrangements we have made with our allies to control the flow of strategic goods to the Soviet Union have not been completely effective.

It is suggested in some quarters that the United States should scrap or relax restrictions on trade with the Communist bloc; first, because our allies are not cooperating; and, second, because Soviet technological advances have equipped the Communist bloc with everything we have.

It is certainly true that our allies have not fully cooperated; and it is not a secret that the greatest offender has been Great Britain, whose former President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Peter Thorneycroft, currently her Secretary of Defense, as far back as October 1953, advocated the lifting of the ban on the shipment of strategic materials to countries in the Soviet bloc.

But certainly it is not true that the Soviet bloc no longer requires, in order to achieve its various goals, advanced machinery and technology from the free world. The Soviet Union is in dire need in many industrial areas of advanced equipment and engineering know-how; and reports that the Soviet Union today is self-sufficient in terms of her industrial needs are refuted by the Soviets themselves.

A recent study entitled "Quality Control and Reliability in the U.S.S.R.," by Mr. Joseph A. Gwyer, senior research analyst in the Library of Congress, prepared as background material for his lectures before the various sections of the American Society for Quality Control, reviews pertinent data on the subject contained in Soviet technical and scientific publications reaching this country. His findings, based on statements of personnel representing a cross-section of the Soviet technological community, as well as top political leaders of the Soviet Union, are startling in the degree to which they expose the substandard quality of both industrial and consumer goods mass-produced in the Soviet bloc.

In his answer to those who have judged Soviet progress on the basis of their successful ventures into outer space, Mr. Gwyer has this to say:

> Such feats are less attributable to the volume and quality of industrial output than to the ability of a ruthless totalitarian system to allocate by decree its best brains and almost unlimited material resources to the solution of a problem which is given the highest priority by the leaders of the system. * * * These Soviet spectaculars were, in fact, attained through crash programs conducted at the expense of research and development that does not contribute directly or indirectly to the military effort.

Mr. Gwyer points out that the Soviet's mass-produced nonmilitary goods are definitely not of a high quality. Disclosures that 3 out of 10 Soviet tractors, 6 out of 10 automobiles, 1 out of 4 pieces of construction machinery, and 1 out of every 3 metal-cutting machine tools are systematically idle because of the substandard quality of parts and assemblies are definite evidence that the Soviet emphasis on quantity, rather than on quality, of goods produced, is having a detrimental effect on the entire economic structure of the Soviet Union. A similar situation exists with respect to diesel engines, electric motors and generators, chemical processing equipment, compressors, gages, measuring equipment, testing equipment, as well as spare parts for all of these; and also on batteries, spark plugs, tires, agricultural implements, telephones, television and radio receivers, refrigerators, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, light bulbs, and similar equipment. According to calculations by Soviet specialists, this substandard production costs the Soviet Union fantastic amounts of money yearly. In 1958, these losses amounted to between $16.5 and $22 billion—150 to 200 billion rubles, old currency. Mr. Gwyer cites a knowledgeable Soviet engineer as saying that the situation is so bad that "a number of establishments and scientific-technical organizations do not know the actual precision, reliability, service life, and resistance to wear of most important types of equipment manufactured by the Soviets."

The inability of the Soviets to solve these problems was also the subject of Khrushchev's tirade before the Central Committee of the Communist Party on November 19, 1962. His remarks included references to the effect that the Soviets should "utilize that which the capitalists have—that which is rational and economically advantageous."

He even pointed to "western efficiency through competition" citing the experience of General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler in solving their production problems.

In summing up his study, Mr. Gwyer states that the Soviets do have the necessary theoretical knowledge of the problem, but that they have not bridged the gap between theory and practice. He writes:

> The difficulties of translating the theory into practice stem basically from organizational problems, lack of trained personnel, obsolescence of manufacturing equipment and above all, the reluctance of the state to substitute quality for quantity as the prevailing consideration in mapping its expansion goals.

Any review of East-West trade makes it evident that Soviet purchases of equipment from the West are as quite selective, indicating that most of it will be used for either military or semimilitary purposes. Machine tools, instrumentation, and electronics are given a high priority, and consumer goods receive a very low priority. The Soviets are doing their best to build up their industrial power with the free world's help, and our NATO allies have cooperated in a shocking degree in this scheme.

I hope we shall wake up to these Soviet economic tactics before it is too late. In the present state of world affairs, it is senseless to talk about scrapping controls and expanding trade with the Communist bloc. The free world's technological superiority could be a powerful weapon in combating international communism; but, to date, our advantages have been largely forfeited by a lack of coordination and cooperation. I hope that studies such as that made by Mr. Gwyer will help promote a keener understanding of the opportunities for the West in an economic counteroffensive against the Communist bloc.

CAUTION REQUIRED IN SALE OF GENERAL ANILINE & FILM CORP.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, steps have been taken in recent weeks by the Department of Justice to sell the Government's holdings in the General Aniline & Film Corp., and to turn over to private enterprise the ownership and management of the company. In my judgment this company and its employees can achieve, under private ownership, levels of growth and prosperity which could not be reached under continued Government control. This view is shared by virtually every labor, management, and civic organization interested in the welfare of this giant industry and its thousands of employees. For this reason, the plan to sell the company to private enterprise generally has been welcomed.

Concern has been expressed, however, with regard to the conditions under which the company will be sold. A recent letter to me from the president of the International Association of Machinists, Mr. A. J. Hayes, emphasizes the importance of insuring "that the company will be maintained as a wholly integrated corporation continuing to function at all the locations and plants now in existence."

A resolution adopted by the American Shareholders Committee of the General Aniline & Film Corp., also emphasizes the necessity of continued operation of the company as "a wholly integrated functioning unit."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time available to the Senator from New York, under the 3-minute limitation, has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, these communications reflect a sentiment which is shared by all of us who have been interested in promoting the interests of the General Aniline & Film Corp., its employees, and the communities in which it operates. It would be a grave mistake for this company to be sold to any small clique, for dismemberment or relocation; and every possible safeguard against such an eventuality should be provided in the sales arrangements worked out by the Department of Justice. I strongly endorse the suggestion of both the International Association of Machinists and the minority shareholders committee that the best way to promote the future of this corporation as a strong, independent enterprise is to provide for the widest possible distribution to the public of its stock.

This matter is of tremendous importance, not only to the areas in which this corporation operates, but also to the general public. The corporation is a valuable Government asset, and it should be sold in a manner which will be of maximum benefit to the economy. This will not be the case if it falls into the hands of any group more interested in exploiting the corporation's stored up resources than in promoting its future prospects. While I have no reason to doubt the good faith of the Department of Justice, this matter deserves the closest scrutiny by the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Hayes' letter and the American shareholders resolution be printed in the Record, following my remarks, and be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the Record, and were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

[IAM Letter, Mar. 12. 1963]

Re: General Aniline & Film Corp.
Hon. Kenneth B. Keating,
U. S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Keating: It has come to the attention of the International Association of Machinists that the Attorney General of the United States has authorized the formation of a committee to formulate procedures for the sale of the Government-held stock of the above subject corporation. I am sure that you are aware that our organization represents a considerable number of the employees of this corporation, and it is our desire to insure the employees that the company will be maintained as a wholly integrated corporation continuing to function at all the locations and plants now in existence.

In that it is our desire to continue the integrated operation, we are opposed to the sale of any shares of this corporation to any large company that could be considered as a competitor, and whose only purpose in purchasing the stock would be to eliminate competition and thereby close or remove one or a number of the plants which would, of course, result in unemployment to our members.

In our opinion the best interests of all parties concerned would be the sale of the Government-controlled shares to a large group of American underwriters for a wise and thorough distribution of the stock to individuals rather than to the competitors of this corporation. In order to achieve this objective we would suggest that the Justice Department prohibit competitor corporations from bidding and also purchasing the shares that will be sold and distributed by the Attorney General.

Very truly yours,

A. J. Hayes,
International President.

Resolution

At a meeting of the American Shareholders Committee of General Aniline & Film Corp., held on the 8th day of March 1963, the following resolution was proposed, seconded and unanimously passed:

"*Resolved,* That it is a matter of vital concern to our country, shareholders of the company, its employees and management to preserve and continue the company as a wholly integrated functioning unit; and be it

"*Resolved,* That the American Shareholders are unalterably opposed to a sale of the vested shares to General Aniline & Film Corp.'s competitors or any other industrial combine which may seek to dismember our company and destroy competition, causing the closing or removal of plants, widespread unemployment and irretrievable loss to the shareholders; and be it

"*Resolved,* That the interest of all will be best served by a sale of the vested shares to a large group of American underwriters for a wide and wholesome distribution of the stock to American citizens only.

"In order to achieve this objective, the American Shareholders Committee urges the Justice Department to draw up a list of companies which will be prohibited from bidding and gaining control of the vested shares.

"There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

"Harold Rappe,
"Secretary."

WHAT GOES ON—DESTRUCTION OF BOMBERS?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, because of this administration's deliberate attempt to manage the news, some confusion has arisen over a question I asked on March 9 during a speech at North Aurora, Ill. I wish to clear it up now. During my speech, Mr. President, I asked this question:

> Is it true that there are plans in the making to give up 30 of our B-47 bombers along with 30 Russian Badgers—that there would then be a gigantic bonfire in which all of these weapons would be destroyed for the benefit of mankind?

I went on to explain that this question had not been dreamed up; that I had heard on good authority that the administration was considering plans for such a pool with the Russians to destroy weapons.

Mr. President, I want to say now that my question was answered twice. Once by officials of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency who denied the existence of such a plan. The second answer came from Secretary of State Dean Rusk in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 11. Secretary Rusk not only admitted that the bomber-burning plan had been discussed in the Disarmament Agency and with other Government departments and with leaders in Congress, but he also offered the opinion that the news stories of the Disarmament Agency's denial were erroneous.

Now, Mr. President, it has been 10 days since Secretary Rusk attempted to set the record straight. Presumably he knows what he is talking about. And if he is right, then either the Disarmament Agency is guilty of crass dishonesty in its dealings with the press or the reporters who wrote the stories about the Disarmament Agency's denial are guilty of completely misunderstanding what the Agency was talking about.

In any event, I have not seen any statement from the Disarmament Agency which has attempted to clear up the impression that came from that Agency and which was distributed throughout the United States to the effect that no such bomber-burning plan was ever under consideration. And I doubt if we shall ever see the truth from this source. I believe that this Agency deliberately set about creating the impression that Senator Goldwater was talking through his hat when he asked about the plan to destroy bombers in a joint disarmament display with the Soviet Union. Fortunately for the American people—who, I submit, have a right to know about any and all crazy disarmament plans that are being hatched within this Government—Secretary Rusk told the unvarnished truth. He answered questions put to him by the committee chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in a way which gives the lie to Disarmament Agency assertions that it was puzzled at my question and that I might have been confusing the bomber-burning plan with a portion of the general disarmament treaty suggested by the United States at Geneva. They were not any more confused than was Secretary Rusk. They knew and he knew precisely what I was talking about. They knew I was talking about a plan that they were actively pushing within the Government of the United States. The only difference is that the Disarmament Agency, in talking with reporters for publication, failed to tell the truth and admit that they knew what I was talking about. Secretary Rusk acknowledged that he did and suggested that reporters covering the Disarmament Agency were at fault.

Mr. President, I seriously doubt if any reporters wrote stories about a denial that was not made. But I do not doubt that the issuance of deliberately false and misleading information—and then blaming the conclusions stemming from that information on reporters—may be the newest brand of news management practiced on the New Frontier to hide some of its secret activities.

And I say this is a disgraceful state of affairs. If any agency of the Government can deliberately create false information about a question raised in all good faith by a Member of the U.S. Senate, who is ever going to trust anything that agency says again? There is one thing the bright young men along the New Frontier better start learning about news management. When it is practiced in any degree and when the operation is exposed for phony, the result is a loss of confidence on the part of the American people in their own Government. This is a high price for any administration to pay for what has come to be recognized in recent months as standard operating procedure in the New Frontier. But it is the price of dishonesty in the handling of the people's affairs.

Now, Mr. President, just so there will not be any misunderstanding, I want to emphasize that Secretary Rusk, in his Senate testimony, made it very clear that this Government had not made any proposal, formal or otherwise, to the Russians on the bomber-burning plan. To quote him exactly in a reply he made to Committee Chairman FULBRIGHT—and these are his words:

> The idea is being studied. The idea is being considered. But no proposals have been made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In this connection, I want to make it equally as clear that I did not ask in the question I propounded whether a proposal had been made to the Russians. I simply asked if it were true that there are plans "in the making." And I believe it is extremely clear now that such a plan was in the making in the Disarmament Agency. But why could we not have the truth right from the beginning? What goes on in this mysterious new agency we created? Are they ashamed to acknowledge what kind of projects are under discussion? I can only say if this idea to destroy bombers is any sample, I can understand why they are reluctant for the American people to know what they are up to.

During his testimony on this subject, Mr. President, Secretary Rusk said the bomber plan was only one of a great many possible steps in the disarmament field which is under consideration. I believe it is appropriate to ask what other steps are under active study in the Disarmament Agency. These are matters which I believe directly affect the safety of the American people and the security of the Nation. They should be brought out into the light of day where the American people can see what they are and where they might lead us as a nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Secretary Rusk's testimony on the bomber plan before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reprinted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The CHAIRMAN. I have one other thing. The chairman, in his usual and inimitable way, made the point much better than I could possibly make it. I do not see why you necessarily must look forward to a continuation of this procedure in this and other cases. It seems to me you ought to be able to arrange for negotiations to be private, of course, making whatever you arrive at, if you ever do arrive at one, public.
>
> They are quite different things.
>
> Now, as to this question that is again in the morning paper, I believe, about the destruction of bombers, is there any relation to this disarmament business?
>
> Secretary RUSK. Well, it has no direct relation with the nuclear test-ban discussion.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Not nuclear but disarmament?
>
> Secretary RUSK. I think that story was incorrect, Senator. There has been discussion in the Disarmament Agency of a great many possible steps in the disarmament field.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. I am not particularly interested in the substance of the other, and, as I say, this whole thing is becoming political in its nature.
>
> This contest between who is telling the truth—I do not care whether you destroy these obsolete bombers or not, but it seems to me it ought to be possible to have whether you are or whether you are not understood, without there being implications of deception and untruths about it.
>
> We have destroyed thousands, or hundreds, at least, of bombers in my State after World War II that were old fashioned. We are beginning to, what is it they call it, decommission these 47's now, I understand. I have heard that with one of the bases in my State, they are substituting 52's or some other number, anyway.
>
> In any case, I see it in the paper as a matter of controversy. Can this not be cleared up or can you clear it up this morning?
>
> Secretary RUSK. This is a point that has been discussed inside the Disarmament Agency and with the departments as one possible step which might at some stage be seriously considered. There has been no proposal made on this to other governments or to the Soviet Union on such a step.
>
> Now, one of the elements in this sort of an idea, that you destroy mutually certain of your obsolescent weapons, is to be sure to limit the extent which weapons which are highly sophisticated, but which become obsolete as between, say, the Soviet Union and the NATO powers, do not find themselves spread all over the world and become a part of theo ther arms races that are going on in different parts of the world, and do not feed out into a lot of countries which would find them a burden and would stimulate the dangers elsewhere.
>
> But, here, again, is a problem. We are concerned with a lot of things in the Disarmament Agency, looking at them as possibilities. We reject a lot of them; we put others up for further study. But, with reference to your earlier remark about negotiations, Senator, it is very difficult to have these things prematurely out for public debate before one even knows whether it will be well to negotiate them.
>
> So that clarification on a point of this sort is not simple. The idea is being studied. The idea is being considered. But no proposals have been made.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. I personally do not think much of the idea one way or the other, but I do not like to see these controversies develop which have political overtones, because, regardless of our difficulties in getting along with Russia, we do not need to tear ourselves apart internally as between the two parties over something of this kind, which, I am frank to say, I do not think is particularly significant.
>
> And, lastly, I will just end by saying that my real suspicion about this disarmament is that this is diverting your attention and the attention of the whole Government from those areas which might lend themselves to improving our relations with our present enemies, and I doubt if this is and does contribute very much. But it is preoccupied with—you have created a whole agency for this particular activity. Nobody is very optimistic about getting anywhere. A lot doubt, even if you made an agreement, that you would achieve very much, whereas the other areas of relationships that are connected with trade, with definite human relations, which are fundamental, rather than the symptom, that you neglect by fixing your attention so strongly upon this aspect of our problem.
>
> For whatever it is worth, there are some people who feel this very strongly.
>
> Secretary RUSK. I think, sir, that public attention has been drawn very strongly to the nuclear test ban discussion and to the whole disarmament problem, but I do not think that means that the other problems are being neglected inside Government, to that extent.
>
> I think, also, it is fair to say——
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Well, for example, you are very concerned about this, but, at the same time, last year, this Government reimposed, did not reimpose—I mean it took away the most-favored-nation clause for two countries which are important in this area.
>
> So, with one hand, you are very concerned about this, as you say, because of its peace overtones. On the other hand, we go out of our way to create worse relations with the people who are involved. We seem very inconsistent.

> Secretary RUSK. Senator, my views on the most-favored nations, actually, with respect to Poland and Yugoslavia have been stated repeatedly to the Congress. I was, myself, very regretful to have that action occur. I think it has not been in our public interest to have it occur.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Well, it did occur, anyway.
>
> Secretary RUSK. But I think on the disarmament point, sir, here is a place where there could be a genuine common interest between ourselves and the Soviet Union to try to move ahead, if we can.
>
> As late as this so-called electoral speech the other day, about a week or 10 days ago, Mr. Khrushchev pointed once more to the great burden that this arms race imposes upon the Soviet Government in the allocation of its resources as between arms, on the one side, and consumer and other goods on the other.
>
> Now, leaving aside ideological considerations, for the moment, I think an outsider would say that here is one field in which there is some basis of continuing common interest between these two groups of nations. They both have great unfinished business which calls for resources, and the arms race makes it more difficult for them to turn to that unfinished business, so that we have felt that as one of the points at which we might engage a genuine interest, that the disarmament idea, the disarmament possibility was one that ought to be thoroughly explored.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. I do not mean to disengage complete. I think it is overemphasized, is all I meant. I think it is given more attention than it really deserves. I think it ought to be continued, and, if there is anything to it, why, take advantage of it.
>
> But you certainly ought not to get the idea that this is the one and only way you can make progress toward peace.
>
> That is all, Mr. Chairman.
>
> Senator HUMPHREY. Senator CARLSON?
>
> Senator CARLSON. Mr. Secretary, I just want to follow along with what our chairman, Mr. FULBRIGHT, mentioned in regard to this article that appeared in the paper this morning. I want to be sure that I understand you correctly. This article states that: "U.S. disarmament officials denied yesterday that any plan had been shaped for the reciprocal burning of bombers by the United States and the Soviet Union."
>
> Do I understand your answer to our chairman was that you had been considering this?
>
> Secretary RUSK. Yes.
>
> Senator CARLSON. And it was part of your program?
>
> Secretary RUSK. But I believe the reported denial itself was a misunderstanding of what the Disarmament Agency official has said.
>
> Senator CARLSON. I am glad to get that clarification, because, as the chairman has well stated, that is one of the problems that we have up here on the Hill.
>
> Senator MORSE. Will the Senator yield for a clarification?
>
> Senator CARLSON. I certainly will.
>
> Senator MORSE. I do not think the record is clear now at all, since this last response of the Secretary. I understood the Secretary to say, and he can check me, that there had been no negotiations with the Soviets or anyone else in regard to the destruction of any bombers, but that there had been discussions within our own Government as to possible programs for the demolishing of obsolete equipment including bombers. Now, if that is the statement, the record ought to show.
>
> Secretary RUSK. That is right.
>
> Senator MORSE. Is that your position?
>
> Secretary RUSK. That is correct.
>
> Senator CARLSON. I wanted to clear it up because this quote in the paper this morning says that there had been no discussion, at least for reciprocal burning. Now, the Secretary says there has at least been discussion within the Agency here in Washington in regard to this; is this correct?
>
> Secretary RUSK. That is correct, sir.
>
> And I added the point that I think the reporter misunderstood what the official in the Agency said, because the official did not deny that there had been discussion.
>
> Senator CARLSON. I wanted the record to be clear on this, because I want to state categorically that there have been representatives of the disarmament representatives up on the Hill.
>
> Secretary RUSK. That is correct. This has been discussed with leaders of the Congress as one of the possible steps that we might want to take.
>
> Senator CARLSON. That clears that up, I hope.
>
> Senator AIKEN. May I ask, Mr. Chairman: Does that mean that we will agree to destroy our antiquated equipment rather than selling it to the so-called developing nations? Would that not be a good agreement for Russia and the United States to make?
>
> Secretary RUSK. Senator, I mentioned this earlier because one of the curious things about the disarmament discussions——
>
> Senator AIKEN. I am for it——
>
> Secretary RUSK (continuing). Has been that it tends to concentrate on the arms as between the Soviet Union and the United States without regard to the other arms races going on in other parts of the world.
>
> At the time the General Assembly was voting for disarmament, 70 nations were asking for military assistance.
>
> Senator AIKEN. That is right.
>
> Secretary RUSK. We do not want to see weapons, burdensome weapons, of this sort move out into general supply in competition around the world, because they are expensive, burdensome, and, in many situations, could increase the dangers.
>
> Senator AIKEN. I think that would be a profitable subject for discussion, and one which, perhaps, might prove more fruitful than the test ban treaty, and more immediate, perhaps.

STATES RIGHTS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, when asked by a local friend what the recently adjourned Constitutional Convention had accomplished, Benjamin Franklin replied that they had given them "a republic, if you can keep it."

That Republic was to be founded upon a written Constitution, under which would be created a Union of sovereign States. The keystone of the arch of that Union was the rights of those sovereign States and the people thereof. Although fully embodied in the Constitution, the rights of the States were explicitly spelled out in the 10th amendment. The greatest of all Chief Justices, John Marshall, said of the 10th amendment:

> No political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States, and compounding the American people into one common mass.

From that time, until 1937, the Supreme Court honored that construction of the Constitution. In that year, the Supreme Court repealed the 10th amendment so far as constitutional restraint on the spending powers of Congress are concerned. And, in the next 25 years the Supreme Court reversed nearly 50 percent more of its previous decisions than during the first 146 years of its existence. In addition to reversing previous decisions on the meaning of the 10th and 14th amendments, the Supreme Court has, in effect, held that it can strike down any State law it pleases.

Last Tuesday, in the case of Fay against Noia, the Court struck another serious blow at the rights of the States, when it denied the right of a State to enforce its own judicial procedures in criminal cases.

> The rights of the States to develop and enforce their own judicial procedures, consistent with the 14th amendment, have long been recognized as essential to the concept of a healthy federalism. Those rights are today attenuated if not obliterated in the name of a victory for the struggle for personal liberty. But the Constitution comprehends another struggle of equal importance and places upon our shoulders the burden of maintaining it—the struggle for law and order. I regret that the Court does not often recognize that each defeat in that struggle chips away inexorably at the base of that very personal liberty which it seeks to protect. One is reminded of the exclamation of Pyrrhus: "One more such victory * * * and we are utterly undone."

Mr. President, those are not my words—predicting the destruction of our Republic unless we stem the current trend to destroy the rights of the States. That solemn warning was issued by a distinguished member of our Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Clark, when he concurred in the dissenting views of Justices Harlan and Stewart in the Fay case.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this time, excepts from the dissenting opinions of Mr. Justice Clark and Mr. Justice Harlan.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Mr. Justice Clark (dissenting): "I agree fully with and join the opinion of my Brother Harlan. Beyond question the Federal courts until today have had no power to release a prisoner in respondent Noia's predicament, there being no basis for such power in either the Constitution or the statute. But the Court today in releasing Noia makes an "abrupt break" not only with the Constitution and the statute but also with its past decisions, disrupting the delicate balance of federalism so foremost in the minds of the Founding Fathers and so uniquely important in the field of law enforcement. The short of it is that Noia's incarceration rests entirely on an adequate and independent State ground—namely, that he knowingly failed to perfect any appeal from his conviction of murder. While it may be that the Court's 'decision today swings open no prison gates,' the Court must admit in all candor that it effectively swings closed the doors of justice in the face of the State, since it certainly cannot prove its case 20 years after the fact. In view of this unfortunate turn of events, it appears important that we canvass the consequences of today's action on State law enforcement.
>
> "First, there can be no question but that a rash of new applications from State prisoners will pour into the Federal courts, and 98 percent of them will be frivolous, if history is any guide.[1] This influx will necessarily have an adverse effect upon the disposition of meritorious applications, for, as my Brother Jackson said, they will "be buried in a flood of worthless ones. He who must search a haystack for a needle is likely

---

[1] In the 12-year period from 1946 to 1957 the petitioners were successful in 1.4% of the cases. H.R. Rep. No. 548, 86th Cong., 1st Sess. 37.

to end up with the attitude that the needle is not worth the search." *Brown* v. *Allen*, 344 U.S. 443, 537 (1953) (concurring opinion). In fact, the courts are already swamped with applications which cannot, because of sheer numbers, be given more than cursory attention.[2]

"Second, the effective administration of criminal justice in State courts receives a staggering blow. Habeas corpus is in effect substituted for appeal, seriously disturbing the orderly disposition of State prosecutions and jeopardizing the finality of State convictions in disregard of the States' comprehensive procedural safeguards which, until today, have been respected by the Federal courts. Essential to the administration of justice is the prompt enforcement of judicial decrees. After today State judgments will be relegated to a judicial limbo, subject to Federal collateral attack—as here—a score of years later despite a defendant's willful failure to appeal.

"The rights of the States to develop and enforce their own judicial procedures, consistent with the Fourteenth Amendment, have long been recognized as essential to the concept of a healthy federalism. Those rights are today attenuated if not obliterated in the name of a victory for the 'struggle for personal liberty.' But the Constitution comprehends another struggle of equal importance and places upon our shoulders the burden of maintaining it—the struggle for law and order. I regret that the Court does not often recognize that each defeat in that struggle chips away inexorably at the base of that very personal liberty which it seeks to protect. One is reminded of the exclamation of Pyrrhus: 'One more such victory * * * and we are utterly undone.'"

* * * * *

Mr. Justice Harlan, whom Mr. Justice Clark and Mr. Justice Stewart join (dissenting): "This decision, both in its abrupt break with the past and in its consequences for the future, is one of the most disquieting that the Court has rendered in a long time."

* * * * *

"I dissent from the Court's opinion and judgment for the reason that the Federal courts have no power, statutory, or constitutional, to release the respondent Noia from State detention. This is because his custody by New York does not violate any Federal right, since it is pursuant to a conviction whose validity rests upon an adequate and independent State ground which the Federal courts are required to respect.

"A full exposition of the matter is necessary, and I believe it will justify the statement that in what it does today the Court has turned its back on history and struck a heavy blow at the foundations of our Federal system.

I. DEPARTURE FROM HISTORY

"The history of Federal habeas corpus jurisdiction, I believe, leaves no doubt that today's decision constitutes a square rejection of long-accepted principles governing the nature and scope of the Great Writ.[3]

"Habeas corpus *ad subjiciendum* is today, as it has always been, a fundamental safeguard against unlawful custody. The importance of this prerogative writ, requiring the body of a person restrained of liberty to be brought before the court so that the lawfulness of the restraint may be determined, was recognized in the Constitution,[4] and the first Judiciary Act gave the Federal courts authority to issue the writ "agreeable to the principles and usages of law."[5] Although the wording of earlier statutory provisions has been changed, the basic question before the court to which the writ is addressed has always been the same: in the language of the present statute, on the books since 1867, is the detention complained of "in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States"? *Supra*, p. 1.

Detention can occur in many contexts, and in each the scope of judicial inquiry will differ.

* * * * *

"The question before us is the circumstances under which that custody may be held to be inconsistent with the commands of the Federal Constitution. What does history show?

"1. Pre-1915 period: The formative stage of the development of habeas corpus jurisdiction may be said to have ended in 1915, the year in which *Frank* v. *Mangum*, 237 U.S. 309, was decided. During this period the Federal courts, on applications for habeas corpus complaining of detention pursuant to a judgment of conviction and sentence, purported to examine only the jurisdiction of the sentencing tribunal. In the leading case of *Ex parte Watkins*, 3 Pet. 193, the Court stated:

"'An imprisonment under a judgment cannot be unlawful unless that judgment be an absolute nullity; and it is not a nullity if the Court has general jurisdiction of the subject, although it should be erroneous' (3 Pet., at 203).

* * * * *

"The concept of jurisdiction, however, was subjected to considerable strain during this period, and the strain was not lessened by the fact that until the latter part of the last century, Federal criminal convictions were not generally reviewable by the Supreme Court.[6] The expansion of the definition of jurisdiction occurred primarily in two classes of cases: (1) those in which the conviction was for violation of an allegedly unconstitutional statute, and (2) those in which the Court viewed the detention as based on some claimed illegality in the sentence imposed, as distinguished from the judgment of conviction. An example of the former is *Ex parte Siebold*, 100 U.S. 371.

* * * * *

"It was also during this period that Congress, in 1867, first made habeas corpus available by statute to prisoners held under state authority. Act of February 5, 1867, c. 28, § 1, 14 Stat. 385. In this 1867 Act the Court now seems to find justification for today's decision, relying on the statement of one of its proponents that the bill was "coextensive with all the powers that can be conferred" on the courts and judges of the United States. Cong. Globe, 39th Cong., 1st Sess. 4151. But neither the statute itself, its legislative history, nor its subsequent interpretation lends any support to the view that habeas corpus jurisdiction since 1867 has been exercisable whether or not the state detention complained of rested on decision of a federal question.

* * * * *

"In dealing with applications by state prisoners the Court developed the doctrine of exhaustion of state remedies, a doctrine now embodied in 28 U.S.C. § 2254. In *Ex parte Royall*, 117 U.S. 241.

* * * * *

"In subsequent decisions, the court continued to insist that state remedies be exhausted, even when the applicant alleged a lack of jurisdiction in state authorities which, if true, would have enabled the federal court to act on the application immediately.

* * * * *

"There can be no doubt of the limited scope of habeas corpus during this formative period, and of the consistent efforts to confine the writ to questions of jurisdiction. But the cardinal point for present purposes is that in no case was it held, or even suggested, that habeas corpus would be available to consider any claims by a prisoner held pursuant to a state court judgment whose validity rested on an adequate nonfederal ground. Indeed, so long as the writ was confined to claims by state prisoners that the State was constitutionally precluded from exercising its jurisdiction in the particular case, it is difficult to conceive of a decision to detain in such cases resting on an adequate state ground. Even when the concept of jurisdiction was expanded, as in *Ex parte Siebold*, 100 U.S. 371, and other decisions, the matters open on habeas were still limited to those which were believed to have deprived the sentencing court of all competence to act, and which therefore could always be raised on collateral attack. It is for this reason that the Royall line of 'exhaustion' cases, relied on so heavily by the Court, has no real bearing on the problem before us. For those cases dealt only with the discretion of the court to take action which, if the allegations of lack of state jurisdiction were upheld, it would have had power to take either before or after state consideration. The issue here, on the other hand, is one of power, and wholly different considerations are involved.

* * * * *

"2. 1915–1953 period.—The next stage of development may be described as beginning in 1915, with *Frank* v. *Mangum*, 237 U.S. 309, and ending in 1953 with *Brown* v. *Allen*, 344 U.S. 443. In *Frank*, the prisoner had claimed before the state courts that the proceedings in which he had been convicted for murder had been dominated by a mob, and the State Supreme Court, after consideration not only of the record but of extensive affidavits, had concluded that mob domination had not been established. Frank then sought federal habeas, and this Court affirmed the denial of relief. But in doing so the Court recognized that Frank's allegation of mob domination raised a constitutional question which he was entitled to have considered by a competent tribunal uncoerced by popular pressures. Such 'corrective process' had been afforded by the State Supreme Court, however, and since Frank had received 'notice, and a hearing, or an opportunity to be heard' on his constitutional claims (237 U.S., at 326), his detention was not in violation of federal law and habeas corpus would not lie.

"It is clear that a new dimension was added to habeas corpus in this case, for in addition to questions previously thought of as 'jurisdictional,' the federal courts were now to consider whether the applicant had

---

[2] The increase in number of habeas corpus applications filed in Federal district courts by State prisoners is illustrated by the following figures:

1941	127
1945	536
1950	560
1955	660
1960	872
1961	906
1962	1, 232

(1962 and 1959 annual reports, Administrative Office of U.S. Courts, pp. 23 and 109, respectively.)

[3] For a broad range of views, see the analytical discussions of the development of Federal habeas corpus jurisdiction in Hart, Foreword, 73 Harv. L. Rev. 84; Reitz, Federal Habeas Corpus: Impact of an Abortive State Proceeding, 74 Harv. L. Rev. 1315; Brennan, Federal Habeas Corpus and State Prisoners: An Exercise in Federalism, 7 Utah L. Rev. 423; and Bator, Finality in Criminal Law and Federal Habeas Corpus for State Prisoners, 76 Harv. L. Rev. 441.

[4] U.S. Const., Art. I, § 9, cl. 2.

[5] Section 14 of the Judiciary Act of 1789, c. 20, 1 Stat. 73, 81, 82.

[6] The statutory development relating to review of criminal cases by the Supreme Court is discussed in Bator, supra, note 1, at 473, n. 75.

been given an adequate opportunity to raise his constitutional claims before the state courts. And if no such opportunity had been afforded in the state courts, the federal claim would be heard on its merits. The Court thus rejected the views expressed in *Andrews* v. *Swartz, supra*, by holding, in effect, that a constitutional claim could be heard on habeas if the State's refusal to give it proper consideration rested on an inadequate state ground. But habeas would not lie to reconsider constitutional questions that had been fairly determined. And a fortiori it would not lie to consider a question when the state court's refusal to do so rested on an adequate and independent state ground.

* * * * *

"Subsequent decisions involving state prisoners continued to indicate that the controlling question on federal habeas—apart from matters going to lack of state jurisdiction in light of federal law—was whether or not the State had afforded adequate opportunity to raise the federal claim. If not, the federal claim could be considered on its merits.

* * * * *

"A development paralleling that in *Frank* v. *Mangum* took place during this period with regard to federal prisoners. The writ remained unavailable to consider questions that were or could have been raised in the original proceedings, or on direct appeal, see *Sunal* v. *Large*, 332 U.S. 174, but it was employed to permit consideration of constitutional questions that could not otherwise have been adequately presented to the courts.

* * * * *

"To recapitulate, then, prior to *Brown* v. *Allen*, habeas corpus would not lie for a prisoner who was in custody pursuant to a state judgment of conviction by a court of competent jurisdiction if he had been given an adequate opportunity to obtain full and fair consideration of his federal claim in the state courts. Clearly, under this approach, a detention was not in violation of federal law if the validity of the state conviction on which that detention was based rested on an adequate nonfederal ground.

"3. Post-1953, *Brown* v. *Allen*, period: In 1953, this Court rendered its landmark decisions in *Brown* v. *Allen*, 344 U.S. 443, and *Daniels* v. *Allen*, reported therewith, 344 U.S., at 482–487. Both cases involved applications for federal habeas corpus by prisoners who were awaiting execution pursuant to state convictions. In both cases, the constitutional contentions made were that the trial court had erred in ruling confessions admissible and in overruling motions to quash the indictment on the basis of alleged discrimination in the selection of jurors.

"In *Brown*, these contentions had been presented to the highest court of the State, on direct appeal from the conviction, and had been rejected by that court on the merits, *State* v. *Brown*, 233 N.C. 202, 63 S.E. 2d 99, after which this Court had denied certiorari, 341 U.S. 943. At this point, the Court held, Brown was entitled to full reconsideration of these constitutional claims, with a hearing if appropriate, in an application to a Federal District Court for habeas corpus.

"It is manifest that this decision substantially expanded the scope of inquiry on an application for federal habeas corpus. *Frank* v. *Mangum* and *Moore* v. *Dempsey* had denied that the federal courts in habeas corpus sat to determine whether errors of law, even constitutional law, had been made in the original trial and appellate proceedings. Under the decision in *Brown*, if a petitioner could show that the validity of a state decision to detain rested on a determination of a constitutional claim, and if he alleged that determination to be erroneous, the Federal court had the right and the duty to satisfy itself of the correctness of the state decision.

"But what if the validity of the state decision to detain rested not on the determination of a federal claim but rather on an adequate nonfederal ground which would have barred direct review by this Court? That was the question in Daniels. The attorney for the petitioners in that case had failed to mail the appeal papers on the last day for filing, and although he delivered them by hand the next day, the State Supreme Court refused to entertain the appeal, ruling that it had not been filed on time. This ruling, this Court held, barred federal habeas corpus consideration of the claims that the state appellate court had refused to consider. Language in Mr. Justice Reed's opinion for the Court appeared to support the result alternatively in terms of waiver,[7] failure to exhaust state remedies,[8] and the existence of an adequate state ground.[9] But while the explanation may have been ambiguous, the result was clear: habeas corpus would not lie for a prisoner who was detained pursuant to a state judgment which, in the view of the majority in Daniels, rested on a reasonable application of the State's own procedural requirements. Moreover, the issue was plainly viewed as one of authority, not of discretion. 344 U.S., at 485.

* * * * *

"This brings us to the present case. There can, I think, be no doubt that today's holding—that federal habeas will lie despite the existence of an adequate and independent nonfederal ground for the judgment pursuant to which the applicant is detained—is wholly unprecedented. Indeed, it constitutes a direct rejection of authority that is squarely to the contrary. That the result now reached is a novel one does not, of course, mean that it is necessarily incorrect or unwise. But a decision which finds virtually no support in more than a century of this Court's experience should certainly be subject to the most careful scrutiny.

II. CONSTITUTIONAL BARRIER

"The true significance of today's decision can perhaps best be laid bare in terms of a hypothetical case presenting questions of the powers of this Court on direct review, and of a Federal District Court on habeas corpus.

* * * * *

"What is the reason for the rule that an adequate and independent state ground of decision bars Supreme Court review of that decision—a rule which, of course, is as applicable to procedural as to substantive grounds? In *Murdock* v. *Memphis*, 20 Wall. 590, 632–636, it was concluded that under the governing statute (i) the Court did not have jurisdiction, on review of a state decision, to examine and decide 'questions not of a federal character,' id., at 633, and (ii) an erroneous decision of a federal question by a state court could not warrant reversal if there were: 'any other matter or issue adjudged by the State court, which is sufficiently broad to maintain the judgment of that court, notwithstanding the error in deciding the issue raised by the Federal question.' (Id., at 636.)

"But as the Court in *Murdock* so strongly implied, and as emphasized in subsequent decisions, the adequate state ground rule has roots far deeper than the statutes governing our jurisdiction, and rests on fundamentals that touch this Court's habeas corpus jurisdiction equally with its direct reviewing power. An examination of the alternatives that might conceivably be followed will, I submit, confirm that the rule is one of constitutional dimensions going to the heart of the division of judicial powers in a federal system.

"One alternative to the present rule would be for the Court to review and decide any federal questions in the case, even if the determination of nonfederal questions were adequate to sustain the judgment below, and then to send the case back to the state court for further consideration. But it needs no extended analysis to demonstrate that such action would exceed this Court's powers under article III. As stated in *Herb* v. *Pitcairn*, 324 U.S. 117, 126:

"'[O]ur power is to correct wrong judgments, not to revise opinions. We are not permitted to render an advisory opinion, and if the same judgment would be rendered by the state court after we corrected its views of Federal laws, our review could amount to nothing more than an advisory opinion.'

"Another alternative, which would avoid the problem of advisory opinions, would be to take the entire case and to review on the merits the state court's decision of every question in it.

* * * * *

"Determination of the adequacy and independence of the state ground, I submit, marks the constitutional limit of our power in this sphere. The reason why this is so was perhaps most articulately expressed in a different but closely related context by Mr. Justice Field in his opinion in *Baltimore & O. R. Co.* v. *Baugh*, 149 U.S. 368, 401. He stated, in a passage quoted with approval by the Court in the historic decision in *Erie R. Co.* v. *Tompkins*, 304 U.S. 64, 78–79:

"'The Constitution of the United States * * * recognizes and preserves the autonomy and independence of the States—independence in their legislative and independence in their judicial departments. Supervision over either the legislative or the judicial action of the States is in no case permissible except as to matters by the Constitution specifically authorized or delegated to the United States. Any interference with either, except as thus permitted, is an invasion of the authority of the State and, to that extent, a denial of its independence.'

"For this Court to go beyond the adequacy of the state ground and to review and determine the correctness of that ground on its merits would, * * * be to assume full control over a State's procedures for the administration of its own criminal justice. This is and must be beyond our power if the federal system is to exist in substance as well as form. The right of the State to regulate its own procedures governing the conduct of litigants in its courts, and its interest in supervision of those procedures, stand on the same constitutional plane as its right and interest in framing "substantive" laws governing other aspects of the conduct of those within its borders.

There is still a third possible course this Court might follow if it were to reject the adequate state ground rule.

* * * * *

"This Court might grant certiorari, 'ignore' the state ground of decision, decide the federal question and, instead of merely remanding the case, issue a writ requiring the petitioner's release from custody. By this simple device, the Court, it might be argued, would avoid problems of advisory opinions while at the same time refraining from consideration of questions of State law.

---

[7] See 344 U.S., at 486. See also Mr. Justice Frankfurter's separate opinion, 344 U.S., at 488, 503.

[8] "A failure to use a state's available remedy, in the absence of some interference or incapacity * * * bars federal habeas corpus. The statute requires that the applicant exhaust available remedies. To show that the time has passed for appeal is not enough to empower the Federal District Court to issue the writ." 344 U.S., at 487.

[9] "[W]here the state action was based on an adequate state ground, no further examination is required unless no state remedy for the deprivation of federal constitutional rights ever existed." 344 U.S., at 458.

"In short, the constitutional infirmities of such a disposition by this Court are the same as those inherent in review of the state question on its merits. The vice, however, is greater because the Court would, in actuality, be invalidating a state rule without even purporting to consider it.

"2. On habeas corpus: The adequate state ground doctrine thus finds its source in basic constitutional principles, and the question before us is whether this is as true in a collateral attack in habeas corpus as on direct review. * * * Is that federal court constitutionally more free than the Supreme Court on direct review to 'ignore' the adequate state ground, proceed to the Federal question, and order the prisoner's release?

"The answer must be that it is not.

* * * * *

The Court exceeds its constitutional power if in fact the state ground relied upon to sustain the judgment of conviction is an adequate one. See infra. The effect of the approach adopted by the Court is, indeed, to do away with the adequate state ground rule entirely in every state case, involving a federal question, in which detention follows from a judgment.

"III. ATTEMPTED PALLIATIVES

"Apparently on the basis of a doctrine analogous to that of 'unclean hands,' the Court states that a federal judge, in his discretion, may deny relief on habeas corpus to one who has understandingly and knowingly refused to avail himself of state procedures. But such a test, if it is meant to constitute a limitation on interference with state administration of criminal justice, falls far short of the mark. In fact, as explained and applied in this case, it amounts to no limitation at all.

* * * * *

"Looked at from any angle, the concept of waiver which the Court has created must be found wanting. Of gravest importance, it carries this Court into a sphere in which it has no proper place in the context of the federal system. The true limitations on our constitutional power are those inherent in the rule requiring that a judgment resting on an adequate state ground must be respected.

"IV. ADEQUACY OF THE STATE GROUND HERE INVOLVED

"It is the adequacy, or fairness, of the state ground that should be the controlling question in this case.[10] This controlling question the Court does not discuss.

"New York asserts that a claim of the kind involved here must be raised on timely appeal if it is to be preserved, and contends that in permitting an appeal it has provided a reasonable opportunity for the claim to be made. * * * In other words, the State claims that it may constitutionally detain a man pursuant to a judgment of conviction, regardless of any error that may have led to that conviction, if the relevant facts were reasonably available and an appeal was not taken.

"Under the circumstances here—particularly the fact that Nola was represented by counsel whose competence is not challenged—is this a reasonable ground for barring collateral assertion of the federal claim? Certainly the State has a vital interest in requiring that appeals be taken on the basis of facts known at the time, since the first assertion of a claim many years later might otherwise require release long after it was feasible to hold a new trial.

* * * * *

"Moreover, we should be slow to reject—as an invalid barrier to the raising of a federal right—a state determination that one forum rather than another must be resorted to for the assertion of that right. A far more rigid restriction of federal forums was upheld in *Yakus* v. *United States,* 321 U.S. 414. In that case, the Court sustained a federal statute permitting an attack on the validity of an administrative price regulation to be made only on timely review of the administrative order, and precluding the defense of invalidity in a later criminal prosecution for violation of the regulation. What the Court there said bears repetition here:

"'No procedural principle is more familiar to this Court than that a constitutional right may be forfeited in criminal as well as civil cases by the failure to make timely assertion of the right before a tribunal having jurisdiction to determine it' (321 U.S., at 44)."

THE DEFICIT IN THE INTERNATIONAL ACCOUNTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the deficit in the international accounts of the United States is a matter of grave and continuing concern to the Congress. It is a problem which is seldom brought into focus in as analytical, objective and concise a manner as has recently been done by Leland James Pritchard, professor of economics and business administration at the University of Kansas.

Professor Pritchard has a long career in the study of economics and is a person highly respected by his colleagues in both the academic and business world. His analysis of the present balance of payments problem and possible solutions is of immediate interest to all concerned, primarily because of his conclusion that the present situation in which we find ourselves is not the reponsibility of the private sector of our economy but rather finds its explanation in "the vast volume of unilateral transfers—payments—made by the Federal Government to finance foreign military and economic aid."

Because I believe that the Members of Congress will find Professor Pritchard's analysis enlightening and useful, I request unanimous consent that this article, as it appeared in the Lawrence Journal World of March 18, 1963, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS: THE PROBLEM AND ITS SOLUTION

With the exception of 1957, there has been a deficit in the international accounts of the United States for every year since 1950. The cumulative total of this deficit now exceeds $23 billion. This is the proximate source of our balance-of-payment problem. The problem arises from the fact that the accumulated deficits jeopardize the future gold convertibility of the dollar.

At the end of 1949 our monetary gold stocks were in excess of $24 billion while net foreign short-term claims against these stocks came to about $7 billion. Now we find the situation reversed with nearly $22 billion of foreign demand claims outstanding against our gold, and a gold stock which has shrunk to less than $16 billion. It is no exaggeration to say that the United States is only technically solvent.

If the dollar is to remain a reserve currency, which is tantamount to saying: if the United States is to remain a leader of the Western bloc, the convertibility of the dollar must remain credible—the dollar must continue to be "as good as gold."

An understanding, and acceptance, of these statements will be facilitated if we define our terms and explain some of the more salient relationships involved in balance-of-payment analysis.

The so-called balance of payments represent the aggregate volume of payments made to foreigners in a given period, and the aggregate volume of receipts from foreigners in the same period.

Types of transactions which give rise to receipts (from our standpoint) include: Exports of merchandise, services rendered to foreigners, the collection of interest, dividends, rents, and royalties from foreigners, the sale of securities to foreigners, etc.

Conversely, transactions which give rise to payments include: Imports, expenditures of U.S. tourists abroad, payments for the use of foreign-owned ships, the payment of insurance premiums to foreign-owned companies, the purchase of foreign securities, the payment of interest dividends, rents, and royalties to foreigners, etc.

In contradistinction to the balance of payments of individuals, cities, and even States, the balance of payments of the United States—and of every other nation having its own money system—always balances. Payments always equal receipts; debits equal credits. The balance of payments always balances because there can be no net transfer of bank deposits. The fact that payments can be, and are, made by using hand-to-hand currency in no way invalidates this economic law, since national regulations tend to restrict net transfers of hand-to-hand currency to inconsequential magnitudes.

Where international transactions are largely negotiated by private individuals and business firms on their own initiative, rather than through State agencies, it would only be by sheer coincidence that the payments transactions entered into in a given period came to an equality with the receipts transactions for that period. To the extent that equality is not achieved, some type or types of payments (or receipts) are necessary to fill the gap; for, as noted, the balance of payments always balances.

The stopgap payments (or receipts) involve changes in monetary gold stocks and/or net foreign short-term dollar claims. Insofar as these claims are against us they are in the form of demand and time deposits and Treasury bills. A country is said to have a deficit in its balance of payments when an export of gold is not offset by a decrease in foreign-owned short-term claims; or conversely, when an increase in foreign-owned short-term claims is not offset by gold imports.

With $22 billion of short-term claims (in effect international clearing balances) against less than $16 billion of gold, $12 billion of which is pledged (via the gold certificate) as collateral for the note and deposit liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks, the U.S. dollar could even now be dethroned if the foreign holders of these claims chose to exercise any considerable volume of their options. And they do have the option. The gold and short-term dollar holdings of foreign countries (excluding the Eastern bloc) are now in excess of $43 billion, nearly $30 billion of which is held by Western Europe. Even on the basis of an enlarged volume of world trade this represents an excess of dollar liquidity for Western Europe. Even were the Reserve authorities to suspend the gold certificate requirement or Congress to abolish this redundant provision altogether (proposed by H.R. 642, introduced into Congress January 9, 1963), the future of the dollar as a reserve currency would remain uncertain.

---

[10] In view of the concession by the State, I assume in this discussion that Nola's confession was coerced. A confession, of course, may be coerced and yet still be a wholly reliable admission of guilt. See *Rogers* v. *Richmond,* 365 U.S. 534. Whether or not Nola was guilty of the crime of felony murder, and whether the evidence of his guilt was accurate and substantial, are matters irrelevant to the question of coercion and also irrelevant here.

How has the once almighty dollar been brought into such jeopardy? An examination of the components of our balance of payments will provide the answer. In dissecting the balance of payments we are justified in placing complementary transactions in juxtaposition; that is, receipts from exports are matched against payments for imports; receipts from services rendered foreigners are matched against payments for services rendered to us by foreigners; and capital items (interest, dividends, purchases, and sales of securities, etc.) involving receipts are offset against capital items involving payments.

For the period of our chronic deficits (since 1950) receipts from merchandise exports have amounted to $206.5 billion; payments for imports, $163.7 billion or an excess of receipts of $42.8 billion. Receipts from services total $43 billion while payments for services come to $51.3 billion or an excess of payments on service accounts of $8.3 billion. Capital account receipts during this period total $35.7 billion, payments on capital accounts, $38.5 billion or an excess of payments of $2.8 billion. Summating all of these nongovernmental transactions we find receipts equal to $285.2 billion, payments equal to $253.5 billion, leaving an excess of receipts on nongovernmental account of $31.7 billion. Obviously the private sector is not responsible for our chronic deficits. The explanation is to be found in the vast volume of unilateral transfers (payments) made by the Federal Government to finance foreign military and economic aid.

During the postwar period (fiscal years 1946–62) these outlays, on a net basis, amounted to $89.9 billion, and to $66.7 billion since 1950. The largess of the Federal Government in dispensing free dollars to foreigners has been on such a vast scale it has washed out the $31.7 billion of dollar credits accumulated by the private sector during the past 13 years and has brought about a cumulative deficit in our balance of payments in excess of $23 billion.

The obvious solution to our balance-of-payments difficulties is to reduce foreign aid. This solution is rarely suggested because of the widespread tendency in this country to regard military expenditures both at home and abroad as sancrosanct and therefore inviolate. In lieu of reducing foreign aid it has been suggested that we devalue the dollar, increase exports, and even curtail imports and foreign investment by U.S. nationals.

To meet the situation through a devaluation of the dollar, or a suspension of the convertibility of the dollar would eliminate the dollar as a reserve currency. It would destroy confidence in the country and definitely eliminate the United States as a leader of the Western bloc. Furthermore, devaluation would provide only temporary relief even if other nations did not devalue by compensatory amounts. Devaluation would not change the underlying causes of the imbalance and deficits would resume as domestic prices rose in response to the devaluation.

An endeavor to reduce the deficits through greater import restrictions or through curtailment of U.S. oversea investment would be self-defeating and contrary to our professed intentions of fostering a free world. Furthermore, capital outflows can only be moderately affected through a restrictive domestic monetary policy, and we can ill afford the higher interest rates required by such a policy. Such punitive rates would further dampen down an already sluggish economy. Direct controls must be eschewed because of their totalitarian nature.

Some expansion of exports, however, is possible. This can be achieved by providing more tie-ins of exports to our foreign aid, and by changing our selection of foreign aid beneficiaries. Under the Marshall plan aid went mostly to Western Europe and gave rise to a concomitant volume of exports: tractors from International Harvester, generators from General Electric, etc. Now our aid is mostly to governments located in east and southeast Asia, Latin America, Africa and the Middle East. Too often these governments are controlled by military strong men, wastrels and plain incompetents (these designations are not necessarily mutually exclusive); men who have difficulty distinguishing their private purse from the public treasury; who have little interest in, or aptitude for, the economic development of their countries; who lack the support of the mass of their peoples and who regard their offices as temporary sojourns for their private enrichment. For these and other reasons they prefer an anonymous Zurich bank account to spending balances allocated to them in the Chase-Manhattan Bank on machinery, equipment, and supplies that would assist in the habilitation of their national economies. So great has this dissipation of funds been that the United States has had to obtain loans from Switzerland, Italy, and West Germany to arrest the outflow of gold. Central bank and treasury loans from these countries now amount to $500 million.

In addition to obtaining loans to support the dollar, the Treasury and the Federal Reserve have entered into reciprocal currency "swap" agreements amounting to $1.1 billion with 10 foreign central banks and the Bank for International Settlements. Neither the Treasury nor the Federal Reserve has any illusions that such devices provide a substitute for policy actions to correct basic imbalances in our balance of payments. Such arrangements can only provide temporary stability to the dollar and discourage speculative forays against the dollar. All such loan and stabilization arrangements are mere palliatives. They can do no more than temporarily slow down the denudation of our gold stocks.

In some instances we could actually increase our exports by decreasing foreign aid, for, as any Yankee trader should know, it makes little sense to buy something if it can be obtained free.

Improvement in our export position could also result from spending more on research and development of civilian products, and by holding prices down, our goods would remain competitive on both a quality and a price basis. But the gains to be achieved here can easily be overestimated; for we are not suffering from declining exports. Our exports have not only increased markedly, approximately doubling in value in the 1950–62 period, but their value, as a proportion of total world trade, has not diminished.

Because the deficit in our balance-of-payments was about $2.2 billion in 1962 compared to $2.4 billion in 1961 and $3.9 billion in 1960, some believe the problem can be solved without a drastic cut in foreign military and economic aid. Those who hold to this view seem to overlook the fact that a part of the decline in the deficit is due to the payment ahead of schedule of debt service charges by West Germany and France, as well as to increased military procurement in this country and an actual reduction in oversea military personnel expenditures. And they seem far too sanguine about the possibility of expanding exports.

The maintenance of personnel overseas, a number now exceeding 600,000 not counting dependents, constitutes the principal drain on the dollar since their maintenance necessitates a multi-billion conversion of dollars into local currencies. A lesser drain derives from the rental of oversea military bases and the many other costs associated with their maintenance. On the other hand, a Polaris submarine roaming the Atlantic provides no foreign exchange problem—unless it is based abroad.

We are increasingly told that a curtailment of our foreign Military Establishment or a reduction in foreign economic aid will open the floodgates and communism will inundate the world, or, at least, would produce a loss of confidence in the United States as a leader of the free world.

Even if one subscribes to the questionable belief that our extensive oversea military bases have contained communism, the fact is that the situation has deteriorated until we have no choice except to curtail those types of foreign military and economic aid which create a drain on the dollar.

If we do not, the dollar will cease to be a convertible currency, will cease to be a reserve currency, and the United States will be forced into a high degree of economic isolation. We shall then discover that, irrespective of the number of bombers and missiles we have, we are no longer the leader of the free world; indeed, we will be held responsible (and rightly so) for scuttling a goodly share of it.

MEANINGFUL TAX RELIEF

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, an editorial in the March 14 issue of the Rocky Mountain News has cut like a breath of fresh air across the administration's arguments for a tax cut with continually mounting Federal deficits.

The editorial, entitled "What's Wrong in the United States?" draws a conclusion that should be mounted on a plaque over the desk of each tax debator—the simple truth that the only way to get a meaningful tax reduction is to legislate a healthy cut in Federal spending.

To the administration's advocates of the Keynesian theory of massive Federal spending as the solution to all our economic ills, I recommend for reading the Rocky Mountain news article, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WHAT'S WRONG IN THE UNITED STATES?

You look over the list of domestic economic troubles as noted by President Kennedy at his press conferences. There isn't one of them that a healthy tax cut wouldn't cure or at least help substantially.

And the only way to get a meaningful tax reduction is to legislate a healthy cut in Federal spending.

The basic problem is as simple as that, though the solution is difficult in the present political atmosphere.

Relief from the extortionate load of Government spending would generate energy from top to bottom. It would give people something to work for.

To hear the talk as to lack of opportunity for youth you would think there were just so many jobs until the Government passed a law to create some more. You wonder how youngsters ever got a job in the past. This same frightened scramble to divide up poverty held back recovery from the great depression and now dominates discussion of automation.

Jobs generate jobs. Wages and profits create the demand for goods, which puts more and more people to work—unless the chain is broken by bungling Government intervention or expropriation of the fruits of industry.

Talk about our crop of "war babies" growing up and needing jobs. They are relatively few in numbers compared to the millions of refugees from communism who streamed into demoralized West Germany after the war. Work was found for all of them and West Germany actually has a labor shortage. Automation did it—along with the sane, old-fashioned fiscal policies which balanced budgets, made the mark one of the soundest currencies in history and produced the feeling of confidence in the future which comes with a rising living standard.

On the other extreme are such countries as Argentina. There is a land potentially as rich as ours—demoralized by massive governmental bungling and an inflated currency.

Argentina's trouble is our trouble, though we are not nearly so far gone and had more fat in the form of capital to eat up.

The complacent tendency in Washington to cut taxes while letting the spending run simply is a plan to eat up some more of the capital which makes jobs. By inciting more inflation it will nullify any tax cut. By breeding fear of an unsound currency it will discourage enterprise and we will have more unemployment, not less.

The prosperity of Western Europe dates from the time when it scorned the advice of our frightened liberals, hardened their currencies and started paying their bills with cash. We now owe them money in form of balance of payments. Our Government now is buying these currencies in great quantities to protect the once almighty dollar.

More vocal politicans and economists in the United States are in the grip of an economic obsession that we can borrow ourselves rich. This brand of mass insanity has run its course in Europe but still afflicts a great deal of the world including the underdeveloped countries, all of which somehow managed to eat for centuries without our help, or maybe in spite of it.

None of these new nations has a chance until it discovers that only work creates wealth and that capital accumulations must be protected if their people are to have the tools which make work productive.

Under present policies, they are frightening away capital faster than it can be poured down the ratholes thus created, through foreign aid from the U.S. Treasury.

We see two main sources of hope. One is the amazing resiliency of the U.S. economy which has survived and even progressed during a generation which has expropriated half its profits and sterilized them in wasteful Government schemes. The other is mounting impatience with the whole red-ink business, out through the country.

When the people finally sense what has been happening to them and vote their indignation, the politicians will sober up and find a way. If the country—and particularly the unemployed—are to be spared deepening troubles, that had better be soon.

ARMED FORCES CHESS TOURNAMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, 3 years ago I announced to the Senate the opening of the first annual Armed Forces Chess Tournament sponsored by the American Chess Foundation. I wish to once again bring this highly commendable program to the attention of my colleagues upon the successful completion of the third servicewide chess tournament last October.

The American Chess Foundation conceived the idea of annual all-service tournaments as part of its continuing program of encouraging the playing of chess as a national sport and pastime for young and old. I fully support this objective. Chess represents a useful auxiliary to our national goal of creating a strongly intellectual atmosphere in the schools, on the job, and at home. Chess is one of the most ancient and honorable of intellectual pastimes—it is the indoor sport par excellence not only in the West but in the Orient. It is played with equal satisfaction by the international chess master or the rank amateur.

Chess on the tournament level presents the kind of rigorous intellectual challenge that should be encouraged in the United States. That our young men in the military have accepted this challenge with such enthusiasm is most encouraging. The Department of Defense should be commended for its support of the foundation's program. Similar commendation is due the United Service Organizations and member agencies for their willingness to provide essential facilities and assist in the planning of the program. And finally, those young Americans who disciplined themselves during their limited leisure hours for the rigors of tournament play should be especially congratulated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report on the 1962 Armed Forces Chess Tournament taken from the Army Information Digest be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Army Gains Top Honors in Armed Forces Chess Tourney

It was check and checkmate for two Army players who moved their forces across the boards to take first and second place in the 1962 Armed Forces chess tournament held in October at the Lafayette Square USO Club in Washington, D.C. As a result, the Army holds the Thomas Emery Armed Forces chess championship trophy for a year.

Sp4c. Roy D. Mallett, of the 51st Infantry, 4th Armored Division, Germany, became the new chess champion of the military services by virtue of seven wins and two draws. Runnerup was Pvt. Harry Mayer of Special Troops, Fort Knox, Ky., with a score of six wins, two draws, and one loss. The Army also was represented in the field of 10 finalists by another competitor, Sp4c Laszlo Incze, from Fort Richardson, Alaska.

Other finalists included three entries from the Navy, three from the Air Force, and one from the Marine Corps. In addition to the Emery Cup, silver cups were presented to the first three winners and silver plaques to the seven other finalists.

The 1962 tournament is the third in a program sponsored by the American Chess Foundation with cooperation of the Department of Defense, U.S. Chess Federation, USO, and the Adjutant General's Office. It was initiated with a grant from Thomas Emery, of New York, Marine Corps veteran of World War I and internationally recognized chess master, who stresses the game's unmatched value in mental discipline and strategic planning.

At the posttourney awards dinner, Edward L. Katzenbach, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Education and Manpower Resources, cited the relevance of chess to the strategic problems of our times—to counterinsurgency, guerrilla actions, and resolution of the cold war: "The chess player understands, as we all must understand, that there may be tactical advantages to retreats in seeking victory. He understands the most important factor of all—that a pawn is not something to be taken lightly, for the least of the powers cannot only get in the way but can actually bring about the downfall of figures more powerful."

SUPPORT FOR THE CLEAN AIR ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, S. 432, the Clean Air Act of 1963, introduced by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], is the most comprehensive proposal on the subject of air pollution control ever put before the Congress.

The bill faces squarely the fact that while the control of air pollution is primarily a State and local responsibility, there is a corresponding Federal responsibility to provide leadership, technical know-how, and financial encouragement on a national basis to combat this national problem.

We cannot continue to go at this problem on a piecemeal basis. A national effort is essential, and a well-grounded 10-year program of research, technical assistance, and enforcement, as provided in S. 432, will give us the tools needed for the job. It is a privilege to join with the junior Senator from Connecticut in his comprehensive attack on what truly should be described as a life-or-death domestic problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that several recent press reports from Minnesota dealing with air pollution be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, Dec. 9, 1962]

Air Pollution Chief Fearful of UCLA Smog

Malcolm McLouth, Minneapolis chief air pollution control engineer, today wrote to S. Smith Griswold, his Los Angeles, Calif., counterpart, expressing concern about what the smog might do to the Minnesota football team, which is to play in the Rose Bowl January 1.

Here is the text of the McLouth letter:

"The problem of the exact chemical analysis of Los Angeles-type smog is again a matter of concern for us in Minnesota.

"Last year a toxic substance called U. of W. was responsible for an unfortunate first half in the Rose Bowl. It was not until the second half that our scientists had devised a counter reagent but by then it was too late.

"In recent technical journals in the sports section, I have noted that a new substance called UCLA has been found in increasing quantities in airwaves in Los Angeles. Could you rush me a complete chemical and physical analysis of this new medium so that we may devise a counter reagent that will immunize our players from UCLA poisoning?"

(The University of Washington defeated Minnesota 17–7 in the Rose Bowl last January 1. Minnesota plays the University of California at Los Angeles in the Rose Bowl January 1.)

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, Oct. 10, 1961]

Piping Off Bus Fumes

To the Editor:

I noted in a September 21 letter a suggestion that buses be forced to eliminate their odor nuisance by extending the exhaust pipe to the roof. This is not a new approach as a law was proposed by the Minneapolis City Council in 1955 that would have made this

mandatory. This proposal was subsequently defeated when several disadvantages were pointed out.

Madison, Wis., did pass such an ordinance but it was later repealed after a short and unsuccessful trial run. Included in the disadvantages are the spewing of water and carbon particles on pedestrians near bus stops, the increased back pressure on the engine creating more objectionable fumes, and the heat and fire hazard created by the extended pipe.

Malcolm E. McLouth,
Chief Air Pollution Control Engineer.

[From the Duluth (Minn.) News-Tribune]

Protecting the Air From Motor Pollution

California is testing a variety of exhaust control devices for automobiles. These are said to remove from 60 to 80 percent of smog-producing chemical byproducts. Crankcase devices, now being installed voluntarily on new cars sold in California, are believed to remove about 20 percent of these irritants. Eventually these will be required on every car registered in California. Better air by 1966 is promised.

Smog has forced California to face this problem. Other States don't have the combination of conditions to make smog from exhaust very often, but their people deserve the purest air possible. It seems likely that all motor vehicles will have such protective devices before many years have gone by.

As the population increases, particularly in some areas, and we all use various modern mechanisms and discoveries so freely, other problems will surely bother us. Noise is one. So is the appearance of quantities of almost indestructible detergent bubbles in many drain and sewage disposal systems.

Human beings need clean air and water for a happy existence. We must be ready to pay for these with various precautions, some of them not even imagined as yet.

[From the Willmar (Minn.) Tribune, Mar. 7, 1962]

Air Pollution Controversy

(By O. B. Auguston)

This evening there will be, what looms up, as a very interesting meeting of the city council when the air pollution ordinance is supposed to get its third reading. The meeting place of the council and in order to accommodate the expected crowd, has been changed from the council chambers to the city auditorium. Apparently the council will hear both pros and cons, favor and opposition, to this proposed ordinance. And we imagine the city fathers are striven between the two camps of thought. All of this controversial subject stems from the feather plant incident wherein we find a large segment of our city protesting odors which have been coming from this particular plant. And, as we have maintained before, those people have had just cause. We too believe in clean air and we should surely try to keep our air as clean and pure as possible. And surely as we have stated before, our citizens have a right to champion clean air as they often do for clean pure water. This right of our citizens should never be forgotten in this entire controversy. We live in an area of town not affected but if we were living in the area really concerned we would kick like steers with the rest of those folks. The point at issue seems to be the extent to which the proposed ordinance goes in trying to meet the problem of air pollution. Those who are seeking to encourage local industry fear that too drastic an ordinance will discourage plants from locating here, providing more employment and more payroll which our city needs. They too have a point if we are to build our city which has seen some of its payrolls decline. So one sees two forces arrayed and opposing each other and one wonders if in this matter, like most questions of this nature, there is not some middle road of compromise. An ordinance that will be strong enough to avert instances like the feather plant odors which we have found quite extreme and still not so drastic that it would become an extreme discouragement for most any kind of industry to locate in our city. We want a clean city and with as clean air as possible. At the same time we surely do not wish to establish a reputation as a city which does not want industry. Somewhere in the middle of these two schools of thought may be found a happy medium that would be acceptable to both the citizens of the community and industry or those who would promote more industry. The air pollution we have had in our city has been declared a nuisance and one only has to live in that part of town most seriously affected to so designate it. At the same time in our fervor for such an extreme case of air pollution we do not exactly want to burn down the house to catch the rats. Perhaps out of the meeting tonight will come some solution of this controversial issue. Surely we may need some sort of an ordinance that will avoid repetitions of the gravity of the feather plant nuisance odors and this perhaps can be arrived at without too severe provisions that could needlessly hurt us industrywise.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer-Press, Dec. 10, 1961]

Cities Spend More and More for Pure Air

(By Richard A. Williams)

The expression "free as the air we breathe" rapidly is going out of date.

Cities are spending more and more money to eliminate or curb the pollution which industries, homes, and automobiles pour into the air every day.

How great is the problem? Atomic fallout has received an enormous amount of publicity, but one State public health official said he is more concerned about the pollution in the air at the intersection of Seventh and Robert on a busy shopping day than he is about the fallout from atomic tests.

And he has good reason to be concerned because there is statistical evidence that air pollution contributes to lung cancer, heart disease, and other illnesses such as the bronchitis which is so prevalent in London, England.

In the Twin Cities, the most immediately noticeable effect has been irritation of the eyes. How unhealthy this is will depend upon your point of view; nevertheless, it is uncomfortable and could be the forerunner of more serious ailments.

George Rascka, associate chief of the radiation and occupational health section of the State department of health, says there are three main sources of air pollution in the Twin Cities metropolitan area.

The pollution can be attributed in roughly equal amounts to industrial, home, and automobile wastes, he said. This isn't true in other areas. In London, for instance, coal smoke predominates while in Los Angeles, where much has been done to clean up industrially, about 60 percent of the trouble is attributed to automobiles.

And home activities shouldn't be discounted. An illustration of the effect backyard activities can have on the air is the smoke haze that hangs over the city during leaf-burning time in the fall. Rascka predicts the time will come when people won't even be allowed to burn trash in their backyards.

In fact, the burning of trash and garbage at public dumps may be eliminated by the use of sanitary landfill types of disposal or through community-type incinerators.

These new methods of home waste will call for the expenditure of public funds. Industry already is being required to take steps to eliminate its stack wastes.

Now, in Los Angeles, the city officials are thinking in terms of exhaust suppressors for automobiles. These would be an expense to the owners of the vehicles.

With the St. Paul-Minneapolis metropolitan area growing the way it is, the problem is going to become more troublesome with the passage of time. There is no doubt that before the problem is licked, the air the citizens breathe no longer will be free.

But the price the citizens will pay for a breath of fresh air in the future can be reduced materially by some relatively inexpensive preventative measures now.

ADEQUATE STAFF FOR MINORITY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on Tuesday last the Senate was presented with the highly important matter of providing funds for the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver]. In the course of the discussion, I offered an amendment to increase by $25,000 the amount to be expended by that committee for its work during the present Congress and the present calendar year. That amendment was the result of a compromise and a general discussion which was had with all parties in interest.

My very distinguished friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] took occasion to remark that this was "a Republican maneuver"; and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] was impelled to remark that this was an "upside down approach to budget cutting."

I cannot leave the permanent Record stand in that fashion. First, I point out that I tried to cut the amount by $100,000 in the subcommittee, and it was voted down by a party vote. Second, it was agreed in the full committee that the minority should have additional staff. Third, it was agreed in the Committee on Rules and Administration, and inserted in its report, that no agreement contrived in the full committee should be impaired or modified by any reduction that might have been allowed by the Rules Committee.

All of these matters were disclosed before that time, and it just seems to me that where there is a passion for truth and fact, the whole bundle should be set forth, because the Congressional Record is read, not merely here in Washington, but in all sections of the country. It is a permanent Record. It is used by youngsters when they debate in high school and college. It goes to nearly all the libraries of the country. Since these debates appear in the body of the Record, it occurs to me that we ought to be pretty careful to set out the whole package, so all the facts are readily available and so readers do not have to skim through the whole Record.

It makes me a little curious and makes me wonder whether the New Frontier is going to have a new one-way street. To be logical about it, I suppose they should try to deny us all our staff, give us nobody, give us no weapons, give us no instrumentality with which to do our duty, and then let the pilloring and the harassment of the business confraternity of the country go forward full tilt. Then we would have an open door and they could do anything they would like to contrive.

When we look at the 1960 election returns, it will be noted how close the Republicans came to winning the presidency. The minority party spoke for nearly half of the people of the country, who saw fit to vote the Republican ticket. They are entitled to be heard.

The only way they can be heard in this body is through their elected Senators. The only way those Senators can properly and adequately do their duty and discharge their responsibility is to have more personnel.

I was going to ask the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], if he were here, what he would think if the University of Wisconsin football team trotted out on the field with 2 players and the California team in the Rose Bowl trotted out with 11 players. Someone would say, "What kind of a business is this? Is this the way to run a railroad?" [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The record shows that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has 31 on his team and it shows we have 4. That is a very considerable disparity when the minority attempts to properly do its duty.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] mentioned Roscoe Drummond, celebrated columnist, in connection with budget cutting. I am glad he did. If I remember correctly, Roscoe Drummond wrote one column last year on the question of staffing, and he castigated not only those on the other side, but me and others, for failure to do something about it. I am glad to use Mr. Drummond as a witness in the case.

So, having made his case, we caused a study to be made by the Legislative Reference Service, and I expect at an early date I shall be conferring with the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished acting majority leader on the question of staff adequacy.

But I do not like to be pilloried on the floor and let it be made to appear that the minority leader has reversed course simply because he gets a few dollars out of the contingency fund. Before all of this amount can be spent, we want to get a little of it for adequate staffing.

I have only one more thing to say. There appeared in the Washington Star some weeks ago a cartoon of me by a distinguished cartoonist, Jim Berryman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The cartoon depicted a table on which was a whole series of cutting tools for use by the minority leader when he starts out to cut the budget.

I wrote Mr. Berryman a note, "Jim, send me the original, but when you do, I want you to take the dent out of the meat ax and sharpen it with a grindstone, because I do not like to deal with dull tools." [Laughter.]

I am going to be determined that on this floor an appropriate, accurate record is made; and if it is not made I am going to get out the broadax and put it on the grindstone and then there is going to be some business.

So I say to the Senator that I am sure it was an inadvertence when he said what he did about trying to get a little money for additional Republican staff members, so that we can adequately and efficiently pursue Mr. KEFAUVER in whatever the agenda of the subcommittee is. That is little to ask, especially now that the Antitrust Subcommittee has taken on international attributes. The subcommittee is going to Brussels before Easter. They are going to talk with the Common Market. They are going to Paris. I am not going with them. I have business here, and I will send no minority staff man, either. All we want is people to help us do the work.

If we ever get around to the time where there is a constituency on the moon, and they are violating the Clayton Act or the Sherman Act or the Federal Trade Commission Act, that trip I might take sometime. However, when I do I want to be sure that we have had all the necessary staff work done so we can come back from that great stellar orb in the firmament and give the Senate a proper report.

Therefore, I was just going to put this all into one package. This staff problem has been besetting the Senate for a long time. We have been inadequately staffed. We have had 40 as against 3. We asked for five. In a way, I am sorry that we compromised. Instead of getting five, we will get four. That is awfully meager. I am willing, like Lazarus, to take whatever drops from the table, if they drop just enough for us to do our job.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield. However, I must ask for additional time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Illinois is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I only wish that this same point had been made by my good friend 10 years ago, in 1953, when the committees had Republican majorities. I am one of those who like to see these inequities remedied, no matter how late, or how long we waited for a change. However, I wish to say to my good friend from Illinois that if he wants to take that trip to the moon, I believe we can get an even bigger appropriation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will not go unless the Senator from Minnesota goes also.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Further, I should like to say to him that he makes such a great contribution to our deliberations and is so jovial and makes such good sense that I hope he will decide not to go to the moon, because if he and I get together, I am sure we can agree on sending someone else. I am sure we can agree on someone else.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as always, I am completely overwhelmed by the oratory of my good friend from Illinois, and his crushing and logical argument leaves me breathless for reply. His defense of minority rights in the Senate makes me recall his strong stand on the antifilibuster resolution only a short time ago.

I am quite in accord with him that there ought to be more minority staff members on all the committees. I hope that he will join with me and, I hope we will be joined by the Senator from Nebraska, whom I see on the floor now, in bringing out that resolution, for a complete investigation of all the rules and customs and manners of the Senate, including minority staffing of the committees. I for one shall be glad to support him in seeing to it that the somewhat underprivileged minority of the Senate should have an adequate number of coaches, so that when the time comes for them to stand for reelection and perhaps try to capture some of the seats on this side of the aisle, no one will be able to say that they do not know the score.

Therefore, I commend the Senator for his defense of the minority. I point out only that in connection with this particular subcommittee we are discussing, I was of the view that the subcommittee was already badly overstaffed. I had no objection whatever to the staffing being adjusted so that the minority would have appropriate representation, and I commend the Senator from Illinois for coming to the floor and speaking again on this matter. I only say, in defense of the Senator from Wisconsin, who is not here, that he was talking primarily, not about the minority staffing in the Senate, but that the honorable, able, wonderful, and historic party to which my friend from Illinois belongs, having marched up the hill in defense of cutting the budget, had turned around, like the troops of the King of France, and has increased the defense budget by over $1 billion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am absolutely overwhelmed by this burst of charity coming from the distinguished Senator from——

Mr. CLARK. Pennsylvania.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Pennsylvania. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin did take occasion to point out that it was the minority leader who was asking for $25,000.

Mr. CLARK. However, he was talking mostly——

Mr. DIRKSEN. He mentioned the minority leader in the RECORD. The fact is, he came to my desk after the Committee on Rules and Administration had taken action, and he said to me, "We cannot even give you one; not even one."

Mr. CLARK. That was not the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; it was the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CLARK. Whose name has just come into this discussion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Therefore, entreaties and supplications and importunities, and everything else we tried were of no avail, and we had to bring it out here on the floor of the Senate and fight it out here. I was glad to do it.

I do not like to see thousands of copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD go out all over the country, and have it appear that the minority leader was reversing his position with respect to economy in the Federal budget. What we are trying to do is get enough people to help us, so that the ax might cut even deeper.

RATIFICATION OF ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT BY THE STATE OF NEVADA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to inform the Senate that the State of Nevada on Tuesday of this week, March 19, ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment which the 87th Congress submitted to the States last year.

This brings to 23 the number of States which have ratified this important amendment, which would eliminate the prerequisite that a poll tax or any other tax be a requirement for voting in a Federal election.

I am informed that the Assembly of the Nevada Legislature ratified the amendment on Tuesday by a vote of 34 to 0. The Nevada Senate approved its resolution ratifying the amendment a month before on February 19, by a vote of 14 to 0. The action of the Nevada Assembly completes ratification of the amendment.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and to the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]. Each of the Senators cosponsored and supported my resolution vigorously to passage in the 87th Congress, and lent his effective assistance this year in bringing the matter to the attention of his State legislature, with the most gratifying result which I have announced today.

In addition to this good news, Mr. President, the legislatures which at present are in session in many of the other States are considering this matter at this time. Among them, either the house or the senate of the legislatures in five States has ratified the amendment. Those States are Arizona, Connecticut, Kansas, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin.

I express my appreciation to the Senators representing each of those States for the splendid progress made thus far. I hope that we soon shall hear that each of these States has completed ratification of the amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Florida. It was a real pleasure to work with him on this measure. The unanimity in the Nevada Senate, as shown by the vote of 14 to 0, and the vote in the Nevada Assembly, of 34 to 0, likewise unanimous, indicate that the feeling of the people of Nevada is similar to or exactly the same as that of the Senator from Florida. He is to be commended for the fight he has been making.

I hope that the amendment will soon be reaching the end of the trail and that its final ratification will be consummated in the very near future.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am most grateful for the gracious comment of the Senator from Nevada. I do not believe that the action of the Legislature of Nevada, as shown by the results just reported, would have been possible without the very helpful work which was done by both the distinguished Senators from Nevada, through their aggressive and continuing support of the amendment.

NEWSPAPER STRIKES IN CLEVELAND AND NEW YORK

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in my native city of Cleveland, which has a metropolitan population of approximately 1,800,000, the 2 major newspapers have not been published since November 29, 1962, because of a labor-management dispute existing between the publishers of the newspapers on the one side and 11 labor unions on the other.

In Metropolitan New York having a population of 12 million, the 8 major newspapers have been out of circulation since December 7, 1962, because of a labor dispute with the International Typographical Union.

Obviously, the owners of these newspapers as well as the workers and the general public have been seriously and adversely affected by these work stoppages. The evidences of what is going on indicate that the prospects of a discontinuance of these strikes in New York and Cleveland are practically nil. Neither the publishers nor the labor unions are prepared to yield. They are supposedly of equal strength—the one insisting upon the surrender of the other.

While this fight to the death is going on, other business enterprises and workers, and the general public, as well, are being adversely affected. The problem has reached proportions so great that the President of the United States felt obliged to make a statement in connection with the controversy. He stated that the union was "attempting to impose a settlement which could shut down several newspapers in New York and throw thousands out of work."

It is assumed that the President's statement was motivated by his knowledge that some of the New York newspapers, even before they were closed down by the strike, had severe financial problems. The eight publishers of New York and the two publishers of the Cleveland newspapers have insisted that they cannot meet the demands of the unions with any hope of survival.

The unions, on the other hand, reject the positions taken by the publishers. They contend that the publishers can meet the demands for increased pay, reformed working conditions, and for improved terms in employment security.

Recently, I read a statement attributed to the Secretary of Labor, Mr. W. Willard Wirtz, to the effect that collective bargaining in the United States is breaking down because neither management nor labor occupies a position of weakness requiring the one to yield to the other because of exhaustion. I disagree most violently with the implications contained in the alleged statements of Mr. Wirtz, the Secretary of Labor, that in our economy in labor-management disputes, the weak should yield and the strong should survive. That type of philosophy means that might is right and that ethics have no place in labor-management disputes.

If labor strikes are to be decided in our country on the basis of which of the two has the greatest economic and political power, then our democracy is doomed. I am unwilling to subscribe to that type of thinking.

Mr. President, it has been brought to my attention that a strong conviction exists in some quarters that the strikes of the typographical unions against the newspapers of New York City are tied in with the strike against the two newspapers in Cleveland in my own State of Ohio. I would, therefore, strongly urge that the Government Operations Committee of the Senate, headed by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], take a look at these two strike situations for the purpose of finding the answers to the following questions:

Are the two strikes tied together in any way?

Is the settlement of the Cleveland strike dependent upon the settlement of the New York City strike?

Is there an understanding among the unions involved that the picketing must continue until a settlement is reached with respect to all of the claims of all of the unions?

Is there an understanding between the New York publishers and the Cleveland publishers that no settlement shall be accepted by one or more of the publishers unless the same settlement is entered into by the unions with all of the publishers involved in the strike?

Mr. President, it is my view that the principal object of such an investigation should be the gathering of all the facts needed to serve as the basis for a legislative program which would accomplish the following goals:

An effective enforcement of the freedoms intended by the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States to be enjoyed by both the managers of business and industry and the working people of the Nation;

The prohibition and elimination of conspiratorial combinations fixing prices and illegitimate commercial practices, or practices otherwise creating monopolies at the expense of the general public;

The enactment of provisions that will insure to the workers, to the publisher, the businessman, and to the public generally, the full enjoyment of their constitutional rights without impairment because of improper combinations amounting to monopolies.

Mr. President, since I dictated this memorandum and had it typed, I read in the newspapers, this morning, that Mr. Bridges, of the Longshoremen's Union on the west coast, said that if the recommendation made for the settlement of the Longshoremen's strike had not been accepted, he would have acted to paralyze shipping on the west coast. In that event, the east coast, the west coast, and the gulf coast would have been imperiled and shipping on all those coasts would have been shut down because of the combination of activities of labor leaders in those three areas of the country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the December 3, 1962, issue of Steel Magazine contained on page 18 an article which reported, among other things, the award by the Department of the Interior to a foreign bidder of a contract, in the amount of $3,200,000 for eight pump turbines. The lowest bid from a domestic bidder was $3,481,000. The difference would thus appear to be a matter of $281,000; and some persons might conclude that the Department of the Interior has saved the taxpayers this sum. But has it? This is a vital question.

There has recently come to my attention an analysis of this transaction which shows that, instead of a saving to the taxpayers of this Nation, the awarding of the contract to the foreign bidder may well result in a loss of more than $1.5 million.

The analysis was prepared by the National Association of Manufacturers; and it certainly offers something to think about. I ask unanimous consent that portions of the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> On the basis that the domestic bidder would have realized 10 percent profit before Federal income taxes and that this increment of earning would have been taxed at the rate of 52 percent, the tax thereon would have amounted to $181,012.
>
> Payment of the net earning in the amount of $167,088 to the domestic bidder's stockholders might be deferred in part or all, but it would ultimately go to the stockholders and on the basis of an average tax rate of 25 percent their tax thereon would have amounted to $41,772.
>
> On the basis that the domestic bidder's direct labor and salary costs would have been 30 percent of his bid price and that his employees would have been taxed at an average rate of 20 percent, their collective tax thereon would have amounted to $208,860.
>
> On the basis that the domestic bidder's direct material costs would have been 30 percent of his bid price and that his suppliers likewise would have averaged 10 percent profit before taxes and would have been taxed at the rate of 52 percent, the tax thereon would have amounted to $54,303.60.
>
> With 30 percent of the domestic bidder's price remaining for overhead expenses, which for the most part include services, supplies, replacements, etc., and with the suppliers thereon making an average of 10 percent profit with a tax rate of 52 percent, the tax thereon would have amounted to $54,303.60.
>
> Thus, for an implied saving of $281,000 by placing this contract with a foreign bidder instead of the lowest domestic bidder, the Government stands to lose $540,251.20 in taxes just from the domestic bidder, his stockholders, his employees and his direct suppliers. If consideration is extended to indirect stockholders or owners, indirect employees and indirect suppliers, the tax loss to the Government could conceivably be two or three times the amount of $540,251.
>
> The $3,200,000 to be paid to the foreign bidder will, of course, further deplete this Nation's gold reserves which are already approaching a sad state.
>
> With our Nation's high unemployment and attendant high unemployment taxes to support the unemployed, together with high welfare costs for those who have exhausted their unemployment benefits, it is inconceivable that the Government would place this contract with a foreign bidder under any circumstances.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, it should be noted that the analysis dealt largely with the dollar cost, in terms of the loss of tax revenue, to the Federal Government. Even more important, to my mind, is the need, where possible, to provide job opportunities for our unemployed. Here was a clear opportunity for the Federal Government to give private industry an opportunity to prosper and expand, and thereby to provide much-needed jobs for American workers, instead of further distributing American taxpayers' funds to foreign countries, at the expense of our own citizens. The Department failed to recognize the opportunity; and the cost of Government continues to climb. This is not the only example of this mistaken evaluation of bids. Similar matters have been called to public attention in connection with Department of Defense contracts for steel and other equipment. In the evaluation of bids of this type, such opportunities for American private industry and such job opportunities for our unemployed should be taken more fully into consideration.

BARGAINING AGREEMENT BETWEEN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT AND SIX EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, yesterday I had the pleasure of participating in a ceremony at which the Postmaster General signed the first bargaining agreement with six employee organizations representing the Nation's half-million postal employees. In scope, it is the largest agreement of its kind in our history.

The occasion was of great historic importance to these loyal Federal employees, and it marked a milestone for the Post Office Department in employee relations, this agreement—made official yesterday—will be good for the Federal Government and good for the employees. Not only will the provisions benefit both sides, but also this contract marks a great stride forward in the President's new labor-management program, by giving official recognition to our Federal employee organizations. I join with those who hope and believe that through this agreement we may see the dawn of a new era in the Federal service.

For many years, I have sponsored employee-recognition legislation to bring about an enlightened program such as this one. I am very much pleased that the President has moved ahead through his Executive authority in this field.

I congratulate the Post Office Department on its work in putting into effect the President's program. Much credit is due Postmaster General J. Edward Day for his untiring efforts and friendly cooperation. Credit is also due the Department of Labor for the fine pioneering work it did in establishing the ground rules for this agreement. I congratulate also my many friends—both leaders and rank-and-file members—in the employee organizations. They have worked long and hard to achieve the recognition accorded them yesterday. I rejoice that their efforts are now being rewarded.

SECRETARY McNAMARA AND THE TFX

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, because of the confusion that has been generated by the Senate committee's investigation of the TFX contract, I wish to have printed in the RECORD today's article by Walter Lippmann, as published in the Washington Post.

In the article it seems to me that Mr. Lippmann has put in clear context the major issue before the Congress in this matter; namely, the right of the Secretary of Defense to be the final arbiter over the vast defense appropriations. The issue has been confused by the running newspaper stories. In this article Mr. Lippmann clearly stated the case for the one basic design for Air Force and Navy fighter aircraft and the reason why vast economies can be made by this concentration.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McNAMARA AND THE TFX

(By Walter Lippmann)

> After swimming around for a while in the sea of technical detail of the TFX argument, I emerged dripping with facts and wondering, since there is so much that I do not understand, whether there is anything which I am entitled to write about. However, while I have nothing to say about the use of titanium, of thrust reversers in supersonic flight, or even about high inlet ducts in the propulsion system, there is, I think, a simple and important question at the heart of the argument between Secretary McNamara and his critics.
>
> There are, as I see it, no villains involved, and there is not a shred of evidence to show that the contract went to the General Dynamics Corporation because the Vice President is from Texas, or that Senator JACKSON has been doing anything improper because the Boeing Co. is from the State of Washington. The crux of the argument is not technical, military, or political, but economic. From the beginning Secretary McNamara's conception has been governed by his intention to keep the defense budget, which is already enormous, from becoming uncontrollably larger.
>
> In order to keep military spending within some limit, it is necessary to sacrifice perfectionism in the choice of weapons. If money did not matter, each of the three military services could be allowed to build for itself the most perfect specialized tactical fighter. But since money does matter, the Defense Department has to forgo demanding the best weapons that unlimited money could buy and to content itself with the less perfect weapons that will do the military job. Secretary McNamara's friction with the uniformed hierarchy stems from his commitment to the basic proposition that if military spending is not to run wild, the weapons chosen have to be fully adequate but less than perfect.

> Thus, Secretary McNamara has, as Mr. Reston reminded us the other day, canceled the nuclear powered airplane and the Skybolt missile, he has opposed the all-out development of the RS–70, and has given up two or three other very expensive projects which, in his judgment, are not necessary military weapons but military luxuries. In the same way of thinking he has been insisting that for the new supersonic tactical planes, which both the Navy and the Air Force need, every effort should be made to develop one tactical fighter plane that can be adapted to the needs of each service.
>
> The whole controversy turns on this. The General Dynamics proposal is very much nearer to being one plane for both Navy and Air Force than is the Boeing proposal. According to Secretary McNamara, the Boeing proposal is in fact for two much more specialized fighter planes. The General Dynamics proposal is for "an air-frame design that has a very high degree of identical structure for the Navy and the Air Force versions," whereas in the two Boeing versions "less than half of the structural components of the wings, fuselage, and tail were the same."
>
> To illustrate how wasteful is overspecialization, Secretary McNamara tells us that the Navy now has a large number of aircraft out of operation for lack of spare parts while the Air Force has a $2.2 billion inventory of spare parts that are "already obsolete and practically worthless."
>
> The judgments which Secretary McNamara is making in the choice of these very expensive weapons are judgments which somebody has to make. Congress has the right and the power to hold him accountable for them. Congress is not qualified and it hasn't the time to make those judgments itself. Congress also has the opportunity to review the Secretary's decisions. For these new complicated weapons systems take years to develop.
>
> But the kind of judgment which Mr. McNamara is making is the kind of judgment the Secretary of Defense is meant to make. That is one of the main reasons why his office was created. We know from experience that it has not always been easy to find a Secretary of Defense who was competent to do that. In Secretary McNamara the country has a Secretary of Defense who in his training, in his practical experience, and in his technical knowledge of production, is remarkably, perhaps uniquely, qualified to pass judgment on a problem like that of the TFX.

NELLE WYRICK LEWIS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, early this year, one of Oklahoma's most distinguished women passed away. Mrs. Nelle Wyrick Lewis, who became one of Oklahoma's first women lawyers, first woman marshal of the State supreme court, and chief law clerk of the same court, passed away in Washington on January 15 of this year.

Mrs. Lewis was the wife of Gen. William C. Lewis, and the mother of Gen. William C. Lewis, Jr. Her husband served Oklahoma in many capacities—as U.S. district attorney, as State senator, and as an outstanding military leader in two World Wars. Her son has, since 1949, served as administrative assistant to Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine. He, too, holds a general's commission in the Reserves. Because of Mrs. Lewis' achievements and because of her great courage, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the eloquent tribute to her which her son, William C. Lewis, Jr., has written in her memory.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NELLE WYRICK LEWIS, JANUARY 24, 1892–JANUARY 15, 1963, ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

Because we feel that those who have been so thoughtful in their expressions of sympathy and condolences would be interested in certain facts of the life of Nelle Wyrick Lewis, whose internal beauty equaled her external beauty—and more important, because of how her experiences can possibly give hope to others—this is sent to you.

She was a remarkable woman of outstanding professional achievements. She did not attend college until her son was 6 years old. At that time (accompanied by her son), she returned to her native State of Tennessee and attended Cumberland Law University at Lebanon and from which she received her bachelor of laws degree. The motivation came during the time her husband was in the military service in World War I.

But before she completed her studies, received her law degree and passed the Oklahoma bar examination, World War I had long before ended. And instead of entering the practice of law at that time with her husband, she accepted appointment as marshal of the supreme court of the State of Oklahoma. She was the first woman to ever hold the position of marshal of a State supreme court. Subsequent to this, she became the chief law clerk of the Oklahoma Supreme Court. In this position, her principal responsibility was to supervise the drafting of legal opinions rendered by the members of the court. She wrote many of the original drafts herself—and had the distinction of being rated by two successive chief justices as the "best brief lawyer in the State of Oklahoma."

When the family moved to Duncan, Okla., she formed the law partnership of Lewis & Lewis with her husband—and after several years she retired from full practice but did not become inactive. A great source of pride to her was an event in 1939, when, upon the motion of her husband, she and her son were admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States. On that occasion, the then Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes observed that such was a historic first for the Court—the first time that an entire family where there was one child or more had participated in an admission ceremony before the Court.

She used to speak of this in connection with another distinction of which she was proud—that she "was the only woman whose husband and son were Generals in the Air Force Reserve."

What was practically unknown about her was that she was a woman of great political acumen—and that it was she who provided the backbone and impetus to the penny-postcard organization campaign for the successful candidacy of another great woman, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, for U.S. Senator in 1948. For the organization of that campaign was built upon the financial shoestring of a penny-postcard followthrough to the thousands, who signed the primary papers of MARGARET CHASE SMITH.

As outstanding as these achievements are, they do not reflect the true greatness of Nelle Wyrick Lewis—and the potential value of her life to others. These were accomplishments of happiness. Yet, she did far more in accomplishments marked with discouragement and saddened by tragedy in her health.

If the latter accomplishments could be summed up in one word, that word would be "comeback." In normal terms, "comeback" signifies the unusual and rare recovery from failure, loss or defeat.

But Nelle Wyrick Lewis made so many unbelievable comebacks that ultimately those comebacks were regarded by her, and the members of her family, as routine and normal—and certainly not rare. In fact, at the time she did finally pass away both she and her family were confident that she would make another one of those remarkable comebacks to which they had become accustomed.

She lived 29 years beyond the first time that doctors said she would die. That first gloomy prediction was back in 1934 when she and her husband were in an automobile accident and in which she suffered a fractured skull and three broken vertebrae and other serious injuries. Her doctors said that she would not live through the night. She suffered through a long and difficult year, but she came back with full recovery.

Next she suffered illness with her mouth and there was serious suspicion that she had cancer of the tongue. But she came back on that and ultimately the condition cleared up.

Her next illness was colitis, which her doctor said she would have the rest of her life. But, in time, she came back on that and recovered fully from it.

Her next illness was anemia. But again, in time, she made a comeback on that and with full recovery.

In 1950 in Waterville, Maine, she had her first heart attack. This was to be the first one on which she would make unbelievable recoveries.

In March 1952 she suffered a series of strokes and the doctors at George Washington University Hospital gave her only 6 hours to 6 months to live. Again in July 1952 she suffered a second series of strokes and was given no more than 6 months to live. Her paralysis was practically complete as she could not talk, she could not move her limbs, and her vision was blurred, as was her memory.

Some cells of her mid-brain were destroyed by the strokes—the cells which controlled her basic reflexes. Ironically, her brain cells that controlled the more advanced mental processes were not damaged. This made the situation all the more difficult for her for while her intelligence continued as bright as ever, she was unable to express thoughts because she could not talk, could not see clearly and could not even make signs because of the paralysis of her limbs.

But again, she made a remarkable and unbelievable comeback—for she taught the remaining unimpaired cells of her mid-brain to do the work that the dead cells had done before. It was a long and difficult battle but she won—and her comeback and recovery was so complete that she regained her sight to the extent of wearing glasses only for reading, of walking with a cane only to steady her, and regaining her speech fully.

In fact, on the very night that she finally passed away she was answering the telephone with the vibrance and bell-tone clarity that many people earlier had characterized as the "best telephone voice they ever heard."

She suffered the unbelievable number of some 2 dozen heart attacks. Repeatedly her doctor said that she could not survive during these attacks. On January 2, 1961, when she fought for 6 hours, her doctor requested authority for an autopsy from her family. Between May 1962 and January 1963, she had 12 heart attacks of the magnitude requiring hospitalization. In early December when she was at the hospital as a result of the ninth of these 12 attacks, her doctor told her family that she would never leave the hospital. Yet, she not only recovered from that attack sufficiently enough to return home—and to enjoy a full Christmas at home—but she similarly recovered from two subsequent attacks.

She would recover so well and so quickly from the attacks that as few as only two or three days hospitalization would be required. Indicative of her confidence and courage was the fact that when her husband and son took her to the hospital in these attack times—her son driving and her husband administering oxygen on the way—she would caution them against getting nervous. As she left the house on her last attack, her confidence and courage was shown when she said she wanted her small transistor radio to take to the hospital with her.

In spite of all this physical adversity, she lived a full and happy life—for she never really was an invalid simply because she just didn't permit herself to be.

This remarkable medical history of Nelle Wyrick Lewis is given not just as a tribute to her—but also to demonstrate what courage can accomplish—and to give courage to those who may have lost hope—to show what can be accomplished even in the face of physical adversity.

Its objective is to encourage afflicted persons—and their families so endeared to them—to make adjustments—to live their lives with as much happiness, optimism and faith as they can—and to resist the understandable despondency that can paralyze the lives of such persons and their families.

For if Nelle Wyrick Lewis had let such despondency capture her and her family, she would never have enjoyed the tall and stately green spruce and fir trees, the beautiful white birches, and the ocean at her home in Cundys Harbor, Maine—she would never have enjoyed the beautiful Maryland spring with its myriad of multicolored blossoms of the dogwood, redbud, apple, peach, and cherry trees; and the azaleas, forsythia and mock orange plants; the cardinals, bluebirds, robins, mockingbirds, and even quail; and the chipmunk, squirrels and rabbits that she watched through the picture window from her comfortable rocking chair at the home of her son—she would never have enjoyed the miracles of television that kept her active mind abreast of the public and political affairs, in which she had such a keen interest.

Repeatedly she counseled that if you believed in something strongly enough and set your heart on achieving it enough, you would realize your dreams. She practiced, and literally lived, what she counseled, in spite of physical adversity, until her remarkable heart finally went to sleep.

Yes, she was "quite a girl"—even if we do say so.

SOUTH DAKOTA'S JOE FOSS FEATURED IN AIR PROGRESS MAGAZINE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most dramatic chapters in World War II is the story of South Dakota's Congressional Medal of Honor winner, Joe Foss. Foss, who later served as the Governor of my State, was the first American fighter pilot of World War II to equal Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker's World War I score of 26 enemy planes shot down.

Now serving as the commissioner of the new American Football League with headquarters in Dallas, Tex., Joe Foss continues to hold our admiration for his brilliant work as a Marine pilot in World War II. Air Progress magazine in the April–May 1963 issue features a dramatic account of Mr. Foss' achievements. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPT. JOSEPH J. FOSS

Congressional Medal of Honor winner Capt. Joseph Jacob Foss was the first American fighter pilot of World War II to equal Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker's World War I victory score of 26 victories. Foss, a U.S. Marine flier, registered all his victories in the short period of 3 months—during which time he was suffering from malaria. Although the majority of the Marine ace's victims flew the technically and numerically superior Mitsubishi Zero, Joe Foss and his men turned the tide in the violent air fighting over the steaming jungles and shark-infested sea.

Foss was born April 17, 1915, in a small white farmhouse a few miles east of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. His parents of Norwegian and Scotch-Irish descent were simple living, hard-working farmers. As a boy, Joe roamed the countryside trapping wild animals for extra money. His dad, a superb marksman with a rifle, taught Joe all that he knew about guns. When Joe was a senior in high school, his father was killed and the responsibility of running the farm fell on the young man's shoulders.

Joe wanted a college education and he entered Augustana College in Sioux Falls in 1934, but he found it difficult to run the farm and study, too, so he left college after his freshman year. Then a dry season descended upon the area and the crops failed. Determined to get a college degree, Foss entered Sioux Falls College the following year and worked as the college janitor to support himself and his family. He was a member of the football and track teams and also did some boxing during his sophomore year. He sold 20 acres of farmland plus his car, and worked in his spare time in order to pay for his junior and senior college years which were spent at the University of South Dakota. He was graduated in 1940.

The future ace's first airplane ride occurred in 1934; by 1937 he had learned to fly in a Taylorcraft. Whenever he had a few dollars, Joe Foss would rent a plane at the local airport. He took ground school training at Rickenbacker Field near Sioux City. In February 1940, with $5 in his pocket, the airminded youth hitchhiked to Minneapolis to enlist in the U.S. Marine Corps. Second Lieutenant Joseph Foss won his wings in March 1941, and was made an instructor. On January 1, 1942, Foss was sent to photo school at Pensacola and then was posted in San Diego with a reconnaissance squadron. When he requested fighter duty, he was told that his 27 years made him too old. But repeated requests finally bore fruit and Lieutenant Foss was made executive officer of Marine Fighting Squadron 121 at Camp Kearney, Calif., August 1, 1942. Eight days later he married his childhood sweetheart, June Shakstad. By September 1, 1942, Capt. Joe Foss and VMF–121 were on their way to the South Pacific.

The squadron was equipped with six-gun Grumman Wildcats. Sixteen planes were on active duty. Foss led eight of these while the squadron leader led the remainder. The men liked Foss and called him "Old Foos." Flying from Henderson Field on Guadalcanal he shot down his first Zero on October 13, 1942. The Japanese pilot had surprised the Wildcat from 6 o'clock high, but his shots missed. As the Zero sped by, Foss fired and the Mitsubishi exploded. Then three more Jap fighters attacked the isolated flier. Their lethal fire put holes in his wings and destroyed the Grumman's oil system, causing the engine to overheat and freeze up. With the Zeros still attacking, Foss made a dead-stick landing back at his field unharmed. This fracas taught Foss a lesson—after this he kept a sharp lookout in all directions at all times. In fact, he soon earned the nickname of "Swivel Neck Joe."

Marine Fighting Squadron 121 was kept busy escorting torpedo planes and dive bombers, strafing Japanese supply areas, and intercepting enemy bombers. During the afternoon of October 23, Captain Foss took off on his second flight of the day to intercept a formation of 16 Japanese bombers with Zero escort. As 5 Zeros dived to the attack and Joe turned his flight toward them he spotted 20 more Mitsubishi fighters joining the melee. As he dived to gain speed, Foss fired at a Zero tailing a Wildcat and the enemy plane exploded with a blinding flash. A split second later he followed another Zero into a loop and destroyed it while both were inverted at the top of the maneuver. Coming out of the loop, Foss fired at a third Japanese fighter which crashed into the sea. The Marine flier's fourth victory for the day was another Zero sent down in flames.

Joe Foss' ability to score so rapidly is attributed to the fact that he was a superb marksman. The enemy appeared doomed once he pressed the firing button. The flight leader, in many cases, had to break away from a dogfight because of plane damage, shortage of fuel or ammunition. To conserve the latter, Foss often used only four of his six guns, alternating to conserve ammunition.

His victories mounted quickly. On October 25, Joe Foss shot down five Japanese aircraft. Five of his Wildcats were attacked by six Zeros that morning and "Old Foos" quickly rode the tail of one attacker, firing at long range. As its pilot bailed out the Mitsubishi disintegrated. Before the pieces had fluttered into the sea, Foss was slamming .50-caliber bullets into the belly of the second Zero and sent this crashing into the sea also.

That afternoon his third Zero of the day blew up after a short burst. Its engine almost smashed into the captain's wing man. During the confusion another Zero dived on the ace but the Jap's aim was poor. As the enemy plane sped by, Foss sent it down out of control. When the pilots returned to the field almost out of fuel and ammunition, throttled back for landing, more Zeros attacked and shot down one of the unsuspecting marines. With two Zeros on his tail, Joe climbed into a cloud and quickly turned in a complete circle. When the trio emerged the Wildcat was behind the Japanese. With his last few rounds of ammunition, Foss racked up his 5th victory of the day, his 16th of the war.

After dispatching two reconnaissance float planes and a Zero on November 7, Captain Foss became separated from his flight. As he headed for home he was forced to fly through violent rain squalls which drove him far off course. When his engine began smoking and then stopped, Foss put the Wildcat into a long glide and dead-sticked to a belly landing in the water. The rough landing split the fuselage and the fighter sank almost immediately with the startled pilot trapped inside his flooded cockpit. Five, ten, twenty, thirty feet beneath the shark-infested waters until, at last, Joe Foss managed to break free and shot to the surface. The ace used chlorine capsules to keep the sharks away as the twilight turned to darkness.

After hours in the water, Joe heard the sound of a canoe and muffled voices, but he remained silent as the searchers circled about since the occupants could have been Japanese or unfriendly natives. Upon hearing a few English words, Foss finally cried out and was hauled aboard by a local white planter and helpful natives. He was taken to a mission on a deserted island and was well cared for until the U.S. Navy picked him up with a PBY Catalina flying boat. When Foss returned to Guadalcanal he loaded his Wildcat with razor blades, chewing gum, tobacco, cigarettes and magazines, and dropped all this in a sack over the mission in thanks for their kindness to him.

Adm. W. F. "Bull" Halsey presented Captain Foss with the Distinguished Flying Cross on November 9, 1942. The captain's flight outfit became known as "Joe's Flying Circus" and collected 72 victories during the time that Foss was in command.

Soon after the Distinguished Flying Cross presentation Captain Foss became severely ill while flying; by the time he landed he could

hardly sit up. With a fever of 104 degrees, there was no question but that Joe had a bad case of malaria. On November 19, he was flown to New Calendonia in a C–47. During his illness Foss lost 37 pounds. By November 30, the ace was in Sydney, Australia, on sick leave and it was here that he met two other famous aces of World War II—"Bluey" Truscott and "Killer" Caldwell.

One month later Joe Foss was back on Guadalcanal and on January 15, 1943, he was in a very tough dogfight over New Georgia, during which he shot down 3 more Zeros which brought his "destroyed" total to 26.

Eleven days later he was ordered back to the States. Although he stopped at Espertu Santo until February 17 to regain some of his strength, during the trip home he again became ill with malaria and was just about given up for dead on several occasions. But he shook it off and as the leading ace of the U.S. Armed Forces landed on the West Coast on April 19, 1943, and was given a hero's welcome. He was cheered, made speeches, conferred with the top brass on tactics and equipment.

Foss was ordered to the White House where, on May 18, 1943, President Roosevelt presented him with the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest award the United States has to offer. In view of his extensive and successful battle experience the Armed Forces valued his ideas on air fighting and Joe became a tactical advisor to the U.S. Marine Corps.

Promoted to the rank of major, the ace agitated for more action and was placed in command of a marine squadron flying Vought F4U Corsairs. After training at Santa Barbara, the unit was in the South Pacific by March 1944. On many occasions Joe Foss flew with Col. Charles Lindbergh who was a technical representative of the Vought-Sikorsky Co.

After the War in 1946, Foss started a flying service with one airplane. Within 3 years, the outfit had 14 planes and 12 employees. Joe resigned his commission in the Marine Corps to become a lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Air Force Reserve. He then organized the South Dakota Air National Guard and became its commander and then chief of staff. He entered politics and was elected State representative from Minnehaha County in 1948 and 2 years later ran unsuccessfully for the governorship of South Dakota.

Foss returned to active duty with his Air National Guard in 1951 during the Korean conflict, but could not obtain a combat assignment due to an Air Force ruling which prohibits Medal of Honor winners from accepting frontline duties. The colonel went to Washington to seek a waiver of this ruling and even offered to give back his medal but he was politely refused. This was a man who really wanted to fight for his country.

In 1953, Foss was promoted to the rank of brigadier general in the South Dakota National Guard. The following year he was elected Governor. He is now the commissioner of the new American Football League with headquarters in Dallas, Tex.

Joe Foss will always be remembered as being typical of the handful of U.S. pilots who fought our Nation's enemies under the most adverse conditions and, with determination and skill, stopped the Japanese advance during one of the darkest periods in this country's history.

SENATOR BURDICK MAKES IMPORTANT AGRICULTURAL ADDRESS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, Senator BURDICK, of North Dakota, was a featured speaker at the Farmers Union Central Exchange banquet in St. Paul on March 6. On that occasion he delivered one of the most thoughtful and provocative addresses on the agricultural problems of today which I have yet seen. The Senator, who is known as one of the Nation's most distinguished authorities on agricultural problems, concentrated his remarks on the forthcoming wheat referendum. He asserted that this spring's wheat referendum is the "single most important event in agriculture this year."

I hope that the Members of the Congress will read Senator BURDICK's address and that what he has to say will be taken very seriously not only by his colleagues in the Congress, but by farmers who will be participating in this spring's wheat referendum.

I ask unanimous consent that this superb address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR QUENTIN N. BURDICK AT FARMERS UNION CENTRAL EXCHANGE BANQUET, MARCH 6, 1963

I consider it a real pleasure and a distinct honor to appear before the representatives of a great cooperative. Your institution has placed in the hands of farmers from my State of North Dakota and the great area of the Midwest tools with which to gain a better life on the farm. Great credit is due you for your part in the fight to retain and keep traditional rural America as a place for American families—a place where churches, schools and communities can exist and serve. The stress of economic forces has been difficult in the past. Your fathers and my father, Usher L. Burdick, served in the cause of the American farmer then. We must do it now. We must do it for the national interest and the national economy. Today we face a period of great crisis—a period of great decision, which will affect the economy of that vast area of the midwest extending from the Canadian border down the Missouri-Mississippi Valley.

The single most important event in agriculture this year will be the national wheat referendum.

The economic stakes in the referendum are tremendous. The choice wheat farmers make will be final and conclusive.

If two-thirds of the voting farmers approve, then the two-price wheat certificate program for 1964 will go into effect and farmers will be assured of a high level of wheat income with very little reduction in acres. The program also makes possible the orderly disposal of our surplus stocks of wheat which—unless reduced—threatens the whole price structure of our wheat markets.

On the other hand, if one-third plus one of the voting farmers reject the program, then I hesitate to predict the chaos and the disaster that will result—not only for wheat farmers but all of agriculture.

Most of the farmers served by this great regional cooperative—Farmers Union Central Exchange—grow wheat as a major cash crop. This is particularly true of those of you who live in Montana, North and South Dakota, Wyoming, and western Minnesota. There is not one among you who hasn't been deeply concerned in recent years with the increasing gravity of the wheat problem. Under the previous administration—under Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, in case you have forgotten—surplus stocks of wheat were permitted to pile up year after year for 7 consecutive years—until we had well over a billion bushels in our Government inventory.

That's the problem we inherited when the present administration took over in 1961.

It's not easy—and it's not pleasant—to remedy a chronic problem of such magnitude. It's not easy or pleasant for an administration nor for Congress charged with the responsibility of finding a workable solution—and certainly it is not easy or pleasant for the farmers who have the problem on their backs.

But this administration and the Democratic 87th Congress did not duck the problem—we did not run away from it and pretend the problem wasn't there.

As all of you know, we immediately took positive measures—and we did it against the bitterest, most obstructionist kind of partisan opposition.

Early in 1961 Secretary Freeman stepped up our wheat shipments abroad—both in dollar cash sales and through an expanded food-for-peace program. By 1962 we were shipping more than 700 million bushels of wheat abroad—that's more wheat than we use for all purposes here at home in 1 year.

In the closing days of the 87th Congress—against solid Republican opposition in both Housea of Congress—we passed the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 which included the 1964 wheat program.

It was our judgment then—as it is now—that a two-price wheat certificate program is constructive, realistic, and workable legislation. There really is nothing now in the program. The two-price idea has been carefully considered by some of the best farm statesmen in Congress for many years. The two-price plan was written into the 1956 farm act but was vetoed by President Eisenhower for an entirely different reason. The certificate idea has been proposed and discussed by competent and thoughtful people in agriculture for over 30 years. The program assures the wheat grower $2 a bushel for 80 percent or more of his quota and around $1.40 for the balance.

The program is designed to reduce our surplus stocks of wheat to 600 million bushels within 4 years—this is an amount considered necessary for national security.

In addition the 1964 program further supplements the wheat growers' income by offering diversion payments for land taken out of wheat. These payments are at a rate of 30 percent of parity times normal average yield for the 10-percent mandatory cut in acreage and 50 percent of parity times normal average yield for additional acres.

The end result is that wheat growers will have a national wheat income equal to 1962, even with slightly reduced acres. The program is designed to bring in a wheat income of from $2.3 to $2.4 billion which I think is a very favorable level of income compared to other segments of agriculture.

Anyway you want to look at it—the issue—the only issue—in the national wheat referendum this year is economic. It is not a political test of strength—though some would like to have you think so. It is not a conflict of ideologies—though some would have you believe it is. It is not a test of a farmer's loyalty to one farm organization or another. It is simply a matter of dollars and cents—nothing more.

Do you want more wheat income or less? Do you want to reduce surpluses or add to them? Do you want order and stability in the market place or do you want chaos and disaster? Do you want $2 wheat or do you want 90 cent wheat?

I think the great national debate now going on about the 1964 wheat program is healthy. I wouldn't want it any other way. But in this instance, the tactics and public statements being made by the opposition point up how desperate they are—how intellectually bankrupt they are. The opposition has made us more concerned, more knowledgeable about the program, and more determined that the 1964 wheat program should be approved in this year's referendum.

It might be well to spend a few moments to sift the fiction from the facts.

Claims are being made that wheat farmers have nothing to lose if they vote down the program because—they say—Congress is patiently waiting at their beck and call to write another wheat program—a better program, mind you—as soon as the referendum is over.

I don't think many farmers will be hoodwinked. At least, I hope not.

There is absolutely no basis to believe or hope that Congress can or would pass another wheat program if farmers turn down this one in the referendum.

In the first place, Congress is in no mood to do it. The truth is, Congress is sick and tired of the wheat problem. The 87th Congress passed the program and now if farmers turn it down, the only logical interpretation Congress can make is that farmers don't want any program.

I'm not the only one who says this and believes this.

Here is what President Kennedy said on the subject in his farm message to Congress on January 31 of this year: "Net farm income at the end of 1962 was $1.8 billion a year more than it was in 1960 * * * The increase in farm income has generated added business for rural industries and farm communities, putting millions of dollars in Main Street cash registers and adding at least 200,000 jobs to the national economy * * * The successes of these principles have been made possible by a series of congressional and executive actions undertaken in the last 2 years * * * The success of these principles also calls for an affirmative vote in the forthcoming wheat referendum to be held under the permanent legislation enacted by the Congress last year. If two-thirds of the wheat producers vote this spring to approve the bushel marketing program authorized by that law, the present income of our wheat farms will be protected and the overhanging surpluses of wheat will be further reduced. Failure to approve the wheat program will leave the wheat farmer without either supply management or effective price supports—at the mercy of unlimited production and unprotected prices. I do not believe that anyone who clearly understands the choice would prefer a return to the depression conditions that preceded the initiation of price supports a generation ago. New legislation for wheat is neither necessary nor feasible this year."

Senator ELLENDER, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, had this to say—and I quote: "In my humble judgment it would be calamitous to the wheat farmers of the Nation if a negative vote is cast because Congress cannot and should not take action to further deal with the wheat problem for this year."

Congressman FRANK THOMPSON of New Jersey, I think accurately reflects the attitude of nonfarm Congressmen when he said, "If wheat farmers don't want a program which has scant support from the people in my district, neither do I."

There are 435 Members in the House of Representatives. Since the reapportionment resulting from the 1960 census, there are only 131 seats from farm districts—out of the 435. The attitude of Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, and other city Congressmen like him is important, since they represent the urban majority in the House. I knew FRANK THOMPSON when I was a Member of the House in the 86th Congress, and we could generally rely upon his vote for farm legislation. Because he came from a nonfarm district, he cast some very difficult votes—very unpopular votes among his constituents. When he says "if the wheat farmers don't want a program which has scant support from the people in my district, neither do I," I am certain that is what he and others like him will do. So don't rely upon any hope that a better wheat bill, or any wheat bill will be passed this year.

It is being said during this referendum campaign that if the 1964 wheat program is approved in the referendum, then government will be running the farms and not the farmers.

It is interesting to note, the opposition who is making this ridiculous claim, are the very same people who come back to Congress year after year and ask for renewal of almost identical programs for rice, tobacco, cotton, wool, and sugar. I say that if farm programs are right and necessary for these major crops—they are equally necessary for wheat—and with no more danger of government interference or controls. And I may point out, that if farmers want stabilized prices and supports, then there is no alternative but to comply with quotas. There is no other way. And the Department of Agriculture neither can nor wants control of the Nation's farms—and it never will.

Regulation and management does not mean loss of freedom or independence. Management of production in line with demand has been practiced and used by almost every other segment of our economy except agriculture. And I think it is about time farmers be given a chance to employ the same production and market techniques that have long been enjoyed by oil companies—the steel and auto industries—to mention just a few.

The claim is being made that the price of wheat would never go below $1.35 or $1.40 a bushel if the program is voted out in the referendum.

Even if this were true—which it isn't—that price level of $1.40 would be a disaster level for 90 percent of the wheat farmers in the Nation.

The facts are, wheat would probably go down to less than a dollar a bushel. I'll tell you why.

If there is no program for 1964, wheat farmers in the desperate and lonely effort to maintain gross income, would plant at least 65 million acres—that's a conservative estimate.

On that 65 million acres, farmers would harvest something like 1.5 billion bushels—that is 300 to 400 million bushels more than we could possibly use at home and ship abroad.

You pile that 400 million bushels on top of the present surplus stocks of a billion bushels and what do you think will happen to the price of wheat? The bottom would drop out and you'd be lucky to get 90 cents.

This would be bad enough if only wheat farmers got hurt—and thousands upon thousands would. But dollar wheat would wreck the feed grain market and it would wreck the livestock market. Cheap feed means cheap hogs—cheap cattle—cheap poultry—cheap eggs—cheap milk and cheap butter.

Knock out the 1964 wheat program and you would start a chain action that will knock down farmers in other areas of agriculture like bowling pins.

The claim is made that major wheat States in the Great Plains have lost acres to Eastern States and Southern States. This is absolutely untrue.

In fact, all major wheat States in this area have maintained their historical percentage of the national wheat allotment or have gained sizable increases in acreage at the expense of other States.

It has been claimed that the wheat grown in the Great Plains is superior wheat and is not the cause of our surpluses.

It is true that hard winter and hard spring wheat are superior in breadbaking qualities. But it is the soft wheats that are in most demand for ready-mix pastries and cakes and cookies. The biggest bulk of wheat in surplus is grown right in the Great Plains area. This is a fact we must face—as unpleasant as it may be. We cannot run from it—we cannot sweep the surplus under the rug and forget about it.

The opposition says "vote down this program and we'll get you a better one."

Well, nobody that I know has seen such a program. All we know is what they tell us. First, apparently, they want a massive land retirement program—a super soil bank. It would be tremendously costly, in terms of payments, to retire 65 million acres—and in terms of dried-up towns and closed-up businesses and of people seeking work in cities—it would be sheer disaster.

Secondly, they say wheat would then be sold at cash market prices and these prices would be sufficient—in time—because the production of wheat would be in line with demand.

The facts are, before all this would happen—before the price of wheat on the open market got up to a high stable level—there would be precious few family wheat farmers left. The sheer attrition of dollar wheat would see to that.

My friends, I have lived among you long enough to know that none of you are falling for these claims. The stakes in the referendum are great. The choice you will make is final and irrevocable. There will be no second chance. I urge you to consider your decision thoughtfully—based on facts. These facts are available to you—at your local ASC offices—from your local cooperative—at your county agent's office—at your land grant colleges. All major organizations, cooperatives and commodity groups directly concerned with wheat and feed grain—with one exception—are urging farmers to approve the 1964 wheat program.

But you must remember—the opposition needs only one vote to your two votes to defeat it. So it takes more than good attitude—it takes your vote.

It will take the dedication and determination of the type of men who built the Central Exchange.

Again I wish to say that it has been a great pleasure to be with you this evening. May I extend to your board of directors, your manager and to you, best wishes in your deliberations here in convention, and in all your operations at home.

SOUTH DAKOTA FARM YOUTH'S VIEWS ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most sincere and effective statements concerning the problems confronting our farm families that has come to my attention in recent months is a letter I received from a young high school senior in White Lake, S. Dak., Mr. Larry Vissia.

Larry is an honor student and a delegate to Boy's State with a most promising future. Yet, limitations beyond his control have made it virtually impossible for his family to operate their farm successfully. He has indicated that he would be pleased to have his letter placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that Larry's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 2, 1963.

DEAR SENATOR McGOVERN: Excuse me for bothering you like this because I know you receive many letters and you are very busy with your job.

I am a senior in White Lake High School and this spring I will graduate hoping to go onto college. As you know White Lake is a small town with farming as its life blood, but what is going to happen to this small town if the present trend keeps up? Every year thousands of farmers in South Dakota and across the Nation are leaving hoping to go to the city to try to find employment. Let me give you an example:

In 1956 a man with five boys had to give up farming because the landlord of this farm sold it to another person who put it in the soil bank. This person who bought it was rich; he had several sections of land already and he did not need it. The farmer, who was set off the farm lost all his livestock and machinery to pay off a mortgage. He tried to start farming again, but there were no farms available. Why? Because these farms are in the soil bank and the large farms are buying out the small farmer. Where are all the small farmers going? To the city because they have no other alternative. Now to get back to this farmer. He is now a construction worker and a farm laborer. He works in the summer and has to draw unemployment in the winter. He wants still to get back on the farm, but he cannot because of the prices on pigs and cattle, and the price of feed. The price of hogs now is 15 cents and you have to pay 79 cents per pound at the grocery store. It costs you about $25,000 to start farming now and in order to get a loan you have to have a certain size farm and certain qualifications. This farmer I am talking about is 57 years old. How is he to get back on the farm at his age. Every day I have to look at his and his wife's down-hearted faces because they can't. You see they are my parents.

I received honor grades in school and last year I was a Boy's Stater. I have to make a choice now whether to go on to college or to stay home and help my parents get back on a farm. But how in the world am I going to do this? I am only a 17-year-old boy. Something has to be done about the situation of the farmer, and I hope that you will try to ease the situation.

I love and respect my parents very much and I want to do my best to please them. What should I do in this type of situation? I know my parents want me to stay and help them, but still they want me to go to college, too.

I have always admired you since I shook hands with you at Fish Lake last fall. I would very much like to have your opinion on this. Could this be just between you and me? Thank you very much for listening to this.

Respectfully yours,

LARRY VISSIA.

NATIONAL RICE WEEK

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, most Americans tend to think of Texas as a beautiful land with vast herds of cattle, numerous oil wells, great cities, pretty girls, a wonderful climate, and unlimited opportunity for the young at heart. And all this is true.

However, Texas has much more than this. The State produces, as a rule, more rice than is produced in any of the other States of the Union. I say as a rule, for occasionally we allow one of the other States to come in first. We do this to keep them from getting an inferiority complex.

But I rise today not to say a few kind words about Texas, for all the world knows we are a modest people, but to say a word about the domestic rice industry's program of self-help.

As my colleagues know, the week of March 17 through 23 is National Rice Week. Capitol cafeterias and restaurants on Wednesday of this week featured free servings of rice with the compliments of growers, millers, and Members of Congress from the rice-producing States.

The rice industry has undertaken an extensive campaign of advertising this month in an effort to boost their sales. Advertising of rice is being done by private brand distributors and the Rice Council, a national organization of the rice industry for promoting domestic consumption. The council is supported by voluntary contributions from all rice growers and millers.

Mr. President, I offer my congratulations to those rice growers and millers who are doing what they can, on their own initiative, to increase the sales of their products.

And I urge my colleagues to partake of rice when they have the opportunity—Texas rice if at all possible.

PROFIT IN RECLAMATION

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Central Valley project is a blue chip investment. That is proven by the 1962 annual report for this great and growing reclamation project in California which shows that at its 25th anniversary it is financially solvent in high degree.

Last year the Central Valley project earned a net profit of $8,131,000 which was turned in to the U.S. Treasury. This net income, mind you, was over and above operation and maintenance expenditures, over and above provision for replacement and depreciation, and over and above interest paid on the power investment and the municipal water investment.

The new report just issued by the Bureau of Reclamation shows that the Central Valley project's 1962 gross income from irrigation repayment, power sales, municipal and industrial water sales totaled $17,865,000. The liabilities that I mentioned, including interest, totaled $9,734,000. The net for the year was $8,131,000.

Let me comment further about that interest item. We generally think of reclamation projects as being interest-free. Of course it is the irrigation costs that are interest-free. In the case of the Central Valley project, which observed its 25th birthday last October, it has now piled up accrued interest on its power and municipal water supply investments of more than $25 million.

In addition, in the same period, it has returned to the Treasury net operating income of $106 million. And in 25 years the value of its crop returns to the farmers it serves has reached a total of $2,300 million.

Mr. President, I think that is a pretty good financial record. One fundamental reason why it is so good, so far as repayment is concerned, is that on the Central Valley project we held on to the electric power as an integral part of the project. Proceeds from the publicly built, publicly owned, publicly operated power facilities account for 77 percent of the operating revenue of the Central Valley project to date. Irrigation repayment has accounted for about 20 percent; municipal and industrial water sales 3 percent. Obviously, power is the paying partner.

I said the Central Valley project is a growing project. The Trinity River division, which will add more power revenue, is just getting into operation. The San Luis division, authorized 3 years ago, is now under construction. The new Auburn Dam-Folsom South Canal unit is proposed for authorization by this Congress as another badly needed and likewise highly feasible addition to the project. I expect to request hearings on S. 351, my Auburn-Folsom bill, as soon as the Bureau of Reclamation's new engineering report on the unit reaches the Congress.

Mr. President, I am proud of the Central Valley project and the multiple benefits it has conferred on the people of California. I am proud of its sound repayment record. I am proud to have been the author or coauthor of every addition to the project since the initial authorization in 1937. The entire Congress can rightly share this pride which, I am sure, will be enhanced by the new Auburn-Folsom unit proposed in S. 351.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS FOR 1962

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, during the last session of Congress I had the honor and the pleasure of serving as chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, of which I remain a member. In that capacity, I gained new insight into the importance of the Library of Congress not only to the parent body but to the Nation. We have reason to be proud of our Library—the National Library of the United States—and the imagination and competence with which it is administered by Dr. L. Quincy Mumford and his able staff.

In his annual report to Congress for the fiscal year 1962, which was recently published, Dr. Mumford gives an account of his stewardship, pointing out, among other things, that 22 percent of the funds appropriated to the Library for fiscal 1962 were returned to the Treasury in the form of income. I believe that his report warrants our careful attention. Consequently, I would like to summarize it for the RECORD.

In the report Dr. Mumford examines—

First, the role of the Library of Congress as the National Library of the United States and the need for a commission on the Nation's library problems;

Second, the Library's efforts toward automating the information systems of research libraries in general but particularly that of the Library of Congress—one of the first Government agencies to mechanize its business operations;

Third, the present status in the Library's desperate need for space;

Fourth, the resounding success of the Library's Public Law 480 program to acquire and catalog foreign publications for 22 American libraries;

Fifth, the growth of the Library's collections by nearly 700,000 items to a total of nearly 42 million—in circumstances that dictate comprehensive collections to serve national needs but selective acquisition;

Sixth, the Library's many-faceted cataloging and classification programs to control research materials—among them a publication called the biggest bargain of the year;

Seventh, an impressive array of new or expanded reference services to Congress, Government, and the public—especially scientists—as outlined below;

Eighth, varied national and international activities in cultural fields in which the Library has long been active because of its unusual collections—in music, poetry and literature, and fine prints;

Ninth, a staggering increase again in the sale of printed cards, the deposit of $2,792,099 in the U.S. Treasury from the sale of cards and technical publications, and the success of an experiment with card distribution; and

Tenth, the highest number of copyright registrations in history, fees of $1,043,588 (which funds are deposited in the Treasury) for registrations and other services of the Copyright Office, and issuance of a report on revision of the U.S. copyright law.

THE ROLE OF THE NATIONAL LIBRARY

In its continuing appraisal of its role and obligations, the Library of Congress had an opportunity in fiscal 1962 to review in depth certain basic assumptions about it in relation to a memorandum prepared by Douglas W. Bryant of Harvard University Library for Senator CLAIBORNE PELL, of the Joint Committee on the Library, for the purpose of constructive discussion. That objective, Dr. Mumford reports, was realized, and both the memorandum and an accompanying report on it by Dr. Mumford are published as an appendix to the Librarian's annual report.

Questions were raised in the Bryant memorandum with respect to the place of the Library of Congress in the Federal Government, its formal designation as the National Library of the United States, and a change in name to reflect such designation. Dr. Mumford points out that "the Library of Congress is in fact the national library of the United States" and that "the Congress, the Nation, and other countries fully recognize this role." He believes that Congress, moreover, "is willing to support not only this concept but programs in keeping with it." He notes that a change of name would "throw away the symbol of prestige and influence that years of leadership on both the national and international scenes have built," and that, although favoring formal recognition of the Library as the National Library, he would prefer to retain its name and its place in the legislative branch, and that "more than a century and a half of history cannot be abrogated."

Dr. Mumford reports also on his recommendation for a high-level permanent commission, created by Congress and appointed by the President, to consider the constantly developing and changing library problems of the Nation—whether at the Federal, State, or local level and whether in school, university, or public libraries—if the American library world is to meet the challenges created by the Nation's educational and research needs.

AUTOMATION SURVEY

After several years of study by members of the Library staff, the Library of Congress obtained in 1961 a $100,000 grant from the Council on Library Resources, Inc., for a survey in depth of the possibilities of automating the information system in the Library of Congress in particular and in research libraries in general. A team of experts engaged shortly before the beginning of fiscal 1962 completed its study after the fiscal year had closed, and a final report is expected in the spring of 1963.

Meanwhile, Dr. Mumford reports on supporting studies and on efforts to share experience with other libraries, and he adds:

> There is good reason to believe that the answer to the basic question—Is automation of the information system in a large research library * * * technically feasible?—will be in the affirmative. But solutions must be found for the whole range of problems involved in the task.

In addition to that survey, the Library also has underway a study of using a small-scale computer in its business operations, which were among the first in the Government to be mechanized.

SPACE PROBLEMS

Long-sought suitable space to provide partial relief for the Library's overcrowded conditions until a third building can be built was at least found late in fiscal 1962; 80,000 square feet of space with adequate weight-bearing capacity for heavy library materials and cardstock will be made available late in 1963 or early in 1964 in the Naval Weapons Plant, for the renovation of which Congress has provided a supplemental appropriation.

Plans for a third Library building were radically altered by the proposal for a Madison Memorial to be built south of the Library and to contain space for Library collections; since such space would provide for only about 24 percent of the Library's projected needs for 25 years but would permit scaling down the size of the third building, plans for a smaller third building were drawn by the Architect of the Capitol in fiscal 1962.

Dr. Mumford also reports on adjustments made within the present two buildings to create usable space, but little or nothing more can be done there. He concludes his introduction to his annual report that "in a third building there is hope."

PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAM

The first year of the Library's program to acquire foreign research materials under Public Law 480, as amended, was a resounding success in the 3 countries to which the program is limited and for the 22 American libraries that received the publications. From India, Pakistan, and the United Arab Republic some 400,000 publications were shipped to the Library of Congress and to 21 other research libraries by the close of fiscal 1962, after only a few months of actual operation. The participating libraries are contributing to the cost of operating the program and have also combined to finance cataloging programs for the materials received.

THE COLLECTIONS OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Since a research library must grow if it is to serve its users, and since the National Library must have comprehensive collections, 664,313 items were added to the permanent collections in fiscal 1962. That number—about a quarter of a million fewer than usual—resulted from a highly selective acquisitions program. Simultaneously, surplus and deteriorated materials were "weeded out" where possible, and newspapers which have been microfilmed were removed from the collections. The total collections now number more than 41,879,900 items and include more than 12,534,000 books and pamphlets, 17,989,000 manuscripts, 3,088,000 photographic negatives, prints, and slides, 2,684,000 maps, 2,110,000 volumes and pieces of music, 587,000 fine prints and reproductions, 592,000 volumes in raised type, 481,000 containers of "talking books," 160,000 bound volumes of newspapers, 76,000 reels of microfilmed newspapers, 147,000 other reels and strips of microfilm, 150,000 microprint cards, 53,000 microcards, 68,000 reels of motion pictures, 120,000 phonograph records, and 1,033,000 broadsides, posters, and other materials.

CATALOGING AND CLASSIFICATION

A major characteristic of a national library is an active program for bringing under control materials for research not only in its own collections but in those of other institutions so that library users may exploit them. The many-faceted efforts of the Library of Congress in this field began more than half a century ago, and the current status of many such projects is discussed in the pages of the annual report.

But the most interesting for fiscal 1962 is a 6-pound, 1,100-page catalog published at no expense to the Government, "The National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections." Compiled and produced by the Library of Congress through a grant from the Council on Library Resources, this initial volume represents this country's first success in bringing bibliographic control to the tremendous numbers of manuscripts that are scattered throughout the land in thousands and thousands of collections. At $9.75, it is described by Dr. Mumford as "one of the biggest bargains of the year for research institutions."

REFERENCE AND BIBLIOGRAPHIC SERVICES

The account of the Library's increased reference services in their many aspects is a formidable story in itself—without regard to the initiation of new services. Among them, in brief, fiscal 1962 saw—

First, a new high in research and reference work for Congress in response to 142,400 inquiries, 99,400 of which were answered by the Legislative Reference Service and 43,000 by the Law Library and the Reference Department—(for the Legislative Reference Service, the 99,400 inquiries represented an 18-percent increase;

Second, the loan of more than 2 million items within the reading rooms and 217,000 on interlibrary loan;

Third, an increase of 12 percent in readers using the national books-for-the-blind program and an 11-percent increase in circulation of such books, to

which 562 new titles were added in multiple copies; and

Fourth, an extensive list of publications prepared and issued by the Library to guide scholars to materials on subjects of vital importance to the Nation.

Fiscal 1962 also saw the success of a service initiated by the Library shortly before the year began—a scientific and technical literature-searching service, available to industry on a fee basis. In this same field, there is such a multiplicity of resources for information that the Library in 1962 made plans to set up also, through a grant from the National Science Foundation, a National Referral Center for Science and Technology. This national clearinghouse will identify and keep a record of the proliferating sources of information, wherever located, and will tell inquirers where to go for the answers to their queries in the field of science and technology. This Center became operational on March 4, 1963.

CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

A brief review of the Library's cultural activities of the last four decades is included in the annual report, in addition to current programs. There is also a report on the Library's program of lending materials for exhibition in this country and abroad, with emphasis on its traveling exhibits of fine prints and on reactions to them.

INCOME-PRODUCING OPERATIONS

For fiscal 1962, Congress appropriated to the Library of Congress $17,193,700. Other funds are available to the Library from gifts, grants, and transfers. Annually, two income-producing operations in the Library return moneys to the U.S. Treasury, and in fiscal 1962 their combined returns to the Treasury represented more than 22 percent of the Library's appropriations for the same period. When the sale of printed catalog cards and technical publications boomed again to a new high in fiscal 1962, the card division deposited in the Treasury a total of $2,792,099 from this service that is so useful to other libraries and scholars. In the Copyright Office, registrations passed the quarter-million mark for the first time in history—254,776—and fees for these and other services brought in $1,043,588.

Other operations of the card division included an experiment to distribute sets of printed cards to wholesale bookdealers and publishers to accompany books purchased by libraries. More than 4,880,000 cards were sold thus. Total cards sold numbered 42,386,314—compared with 35,678,496 the year before.

Among Copyright Office activities were the preparation and publication of a comprehensive "Report of the Register of Copyrights on the General Revision of the U.S. Copyright Law," which summarizes the present law and presents specific recommendations for a new statute. Wide discussion of it has been held and comments collected and analyzed by the Copyright Office.

CHICAGO OUTLOOK FORUM SUPPORTS CONSUMER TAX CUT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the light of the popular view that the financial community almost unanimously believes that the emphasis of a tax reduction should be on stimulating investment and not consumer demand, I should like to insert into the RECORD a clipping from the March 7 issue of the Journal of Commerce indicating an opposite opinion expressed by four prominent Chicago bankers.

At the monthly outlook forum sponsored by the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, Mr. Tilford Gaines, vice president, First National Bank of Chicago; Mr. Arnold C. Schumacher, vice president, Chicago Title and Trust Co.; and Mr. Herbert E. Neil, Jr., economist, Harris Trust & Savings Bank, all agreed that a tax cut should be aimed at stimulating consumer spending rather than corporate investment.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the March 7, 1963, edition of the Journal of Commerce, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMISTS CONTEND CONSUMER SPENDING SEEN GOAL OF TAX CUT

(By Murray Harding)

CHICAGO, March 6.—A tax cut should be aimed at stimulating consumer spending rather than corporate investment, agreed three economists at the monthly economic outlook forum sponsored by the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry.

A fourth pointed out that investment had been strongly prodded already by the 7-percent investment tax credit and new depreciation guidelines established last year.

FAVOR SHOT IN ARM

Favoring a shot in the arm for consumer spending was Tilford Gaines, vice president, First National Bank of Chicago; Arnold C. Schumacher, vice president, Chicago Title & Trust Co.; and Herbert E. Neil, Jr., economist, Harris Trust & Savings Bank.

The increase in capital spending by businesses in 1963, put at 3 percent by a McGraw Hill survey, had been somewhat underestimated, declared George Cloos, senior economist of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago. The increase was 9 percent in 1962, and he predicted it would be in the same range this year despite a stuttering start caused partly by the dock strike.

A 12-percent decline had been forecast for railroad spending in the survey but more recent soundings indicated a 20-percent increase, he noted. Similarly, steel, petroleum, and auto company spending were all running ahead of the McGraw Hill estimate.

The tax credit and depreciation guidelines had a more invigorating effect than anticipated, he said. The Treasury thought that less than half the $4.7 billion added depreciation would be, resulting in a revenue loss to the Government of only a little more than $1 billion.

Actually, said Mr. Cloos, businesses were likely to take the full amount possible for 1962, and the total might run higher than the Treasury figured it could. Deferral made no particular sense, he explained, since money taken down was worth more now than in the future, even disregarding inflation, because of the interest it could earn.

If fully utilized, the credit and depreciation revisions would have the same effect as a cut in the corporate tax rate from 52 percent to 45 percent; either would cost the Treasury about $3.5 billion of the $50 billion annual corporate tax bill, he said.

RECORD SIGHTED

Using the Treasury's estimates of possible tax savings and projecting a modest increase in profits this year, Mr. Cloos said that corporate cash generation could approach a record $40 billion. He defines cash generation as the amount a company has left after taxes and pays out for dividends and depreciation reserve. The existing mark of $35 billion was set last year; the highest figure prior to 1960 was $31 billion.

Many firms, increasingly confident about the outlook, have indicated the extra cash will be used for added capital spending, he said.

Mr. Cloos took no position on how a tax cut should be oriented, but argued that no matter which was stimulated, consumer spending or capital investment, the other would be favorably affected.

"They work on each other and I think both will be higher in 1963," he said.

"The No. 1 problem is reaching a level of reasonably full employment," said Mr. Gaines, "A tax reduction directed at increasing the national growth rate though greater capital investment could have the effect of stimulating growth at a given level of underemployment."

It was not true, he stressed, that faster economic growth would automatically increase employment, nor that employment could not be expanded without an increased rate of economic growth.

Confusion arose because of the aggregate indexes, like gross national product, used to measure growth, he said. Productivity should be rated by the labor input per unit of output, and manufacturing productivity, which theoretically would be stimulated most by added investment, was already the fastest growing segment of the economy.

Over the last 5 years, production of goods had increased 17 percent while manufacturing employment was cut back 2½ percent. In the same span, consumer spending for goods had tailed off.

SHIFT IN EMPLOYMENT

He noted that employment was shifting from industrial to service industries, like utilities, transportation, communication and financial institutions, where the rate of growth was slower, and suggested this might be the reason the economy appeared to be marking time.

Mr. Schumacher remarked that the stimulator effect of service industries, long a "stepchild" to economists, was underestimated. They were buyers of equipment products, as well as increasingly substantial employers.

"We have moved through a capital goods cycle and are beyond it now," he declared. Rather than investment incentives, "we need stimulation of middle income consumers."

Mr. Neil agreed with Mr. Gaines that a tax cut should be used to spur consumer buying in an effort "to push the economy back up to full utilization."

HOW TO CONSPIRE TO FIX PRICES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How To Conspire To Fix Prices," which is a reprint from the Harvard Business Review of March–April 1963.

This article is a humorous reflection in an ironic tone on the lessons to be learned from the now famous price-fixing cases in the electrical equipment industry. Although written with considerable humor, it describes realistically the modern-day price-fixing conspiracies which were so typified by the electrical price-fixing cases. It indicates not only the folly of such conspiracies under the law but also when considered from the viewpoint of the businessman without regard for the law. I believe it will be informative and interesting reading on the subject of price fixing in violation of our antitrust laws.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

How To Conspire To Fix Prices

(By John Q. Lawyer)

(Editor's Note.—It has been a firm policy of Harvard Business Review to identify authors of all articles and letters, but in this instance we are making an exception, and calling attention to it by the use of a name that is obviously a pseudonym. We do so in the belief that because of the author's involvement as an attorney in a number of pending cases, the use of his actual name might be both unethical and prejudicial.)

Now that the smoke has lifted from the price-fixing conspiracy rubble of the electrical-equipment industry, boardrooms across the Nation will be submerged in pipe-sucking reflection on the lessons to be learned from it. Surely a most striking aspect of this antitrust fiasco is that so many capable executives could make such a botch of the relatively simple job of running a tidy conspiracy. Many basic rules of successful conspiring were sadly neglected.

GETTING STARTED

The fundamental rule of conspiring is:

Rule 1: Do not overlook the fact that the purpose of a price-fixing conspiracy is to make more money than you would have made if you had not conspired in the first place.

A most disturbing aspect of the electrical-equipment debacle was that several conspirators simply did not believe that they (and their companies) could make more money fixing prices than competing. As one $100,000-per-year executive explained it:

"These conspiracies had been going on for decades. [Actually, they apparently date back to the old 60–40 agreement between General Electric and Westinghouse, made in 1896.] They were virtually an industry tradition. I was convinced that I could make a hell of a lot more money without going to the meetings. By getting my sales up, I could cut costs so low that I would clean the board. But suppose this didn't work out. Suppose there was a recession or something which I couldn't possibly foresee. If things went badly for my division, everyone would say that I had refused to be reasonable, that I had been the cause of the fall in prices and profits—and I would get it in the neck.

"But, if I played along and did what my predecessors had been doing for years and profits went dry, I would get sympathy instead of condemnation. Everyone would say that I was doing my best in a depressed market—and my job would not be jeopardized.

"I couldn't afford to take the chance of not going to the meetings and playing the game."

This kind of thinking is what game theorists lovingly refer to as "playing the minimax solution." By this they mean making the best of a bad situation. What the corporate strategist does not do is try to make the biggest profits possible for his company and win the biggest incentive bonus for himself. Rather, he seeks to maximize the chance of not losing.

This is, of course, sound strategy. But it is not sound conspiracy. While a minimax player remains in good stead with top management in the short run, he is likely to end up in jail in the long run; and that is not good for anyone's job rating.

From the company's point of view, such a situation is bad business. If bigger profits can be made by competing than by conspiring, it behooves top management to stamp out the meetings. Conspirators may be reluctant to give them up. They have to worry not only about profits, but also about keeping their jobs. Getting the message across to them will be a tough job. But tough as it may be, top management's next rule of successful conspiring is clear:

Rule 2: Don't wink at a conspiracy unless it is a moneymaking proposition.

This sounds obvious, but it is not. Figuring out whether a conspiracy will be profitable is a tricky business. Too often, top management is guilty of accepting tradition without question. Therefore, its first operating rule should be:

Operating rule 2a: Get your economists and market analysts busy. Do not continue a profitless conspiracy. And, if you are not now conspiring, do not overlook this potentially profitable marketing technique.

An effective conspiracy permits a group of corporations to set their collective price just as though they were one company, i.e., a monopoly. If, however, you are already top dog in your industry by virtue of your lower costs and if your greater efficiency makes it possible for you to squeeze out of the market any competitor you want, then think twice before conspiring. By going along with your less efficient coconspirators, you may be siphoning off to them some of your profit potential.

But if you are one of the high-cost companies in the industry, beware. The more efficient companies may discover their mistake after the conspiracy is under way and then stab you in the back. The general rule is:

General rule 2b: Price-fixing works best where no one conspirator has a substantial cost advantage over his coconspirators.

Suppose that you and your market analysis team have thought it through carefully and are convinced that price conspiracy is what your profit picture calls for. You are, however, faced with a reluctant competitor. How can you persuade him to join? (If it happens that the reluctant dragon is also much more efficient than you are, you will need some sure tool for keeping him in line, once you get the conspiracy rolling. The mere threat on your part to "cop out" is not enough. Such a threat is a two-edged sword.) There is an answer to this problem:

Rule 3: Threaten a reluctant conspirator with antitrust action in order to bring him into the fold.

This basic rule seems anomalous. But it is not, as these cases show:

Case 1: If the doubting Thomas already has 61 percent of the market, your job is easy. Say to him, in an offhand way (preferably in an informal atmosphere, such as the country club or a hospitality room): "Tom, I notice you already have 61 percent of the market. If you get much bigger, you'll have Loevinger on your back."

This should do the trick. But if it does not, see that Tom's company does get bigger. Suppose you usually get 9 percent of the market. For the next couple of months, make it a point to let Tom get all the business you usually get. That will give him 70 percent of the market and will surely attract the attention of the Antitrust Division, particularly if accompanied by a well-timed news item or poison-pen letter. While a costly gambit, if your economists have done their job, you will know to the penny whether it is worth it.

An attractive feature of this approach is that you can do it all by yourself even if you are a relatively small part of the industry. Of course, if you can get your fellow would-be conspirators to help out, a faster, better job can be done with less cost to you personally.

Case 2: Suppose, however, Tom does not have 61 percent of the market. He only has 33 percent of the market which, as is well known, "is not enough."[1] If Tom is, in fact, much more efficient than any of his competitors but, being canny about antitrust, prefers to let sleeping dogs lie and not drive them all out of business, you still have the problem licked. Simply say (under the same circumstances as in case 1): "Tom, you old deceiver [smile] you are too much for me and the rest of the fellows. We can't compete with those low costs of yours." Then, proceed not to for a couple of months.

The only additional difficulty you will encounter in case 2 is that it will take more than one would-be conspirator to get Tom's market share up to 70 percent.

Case 3: The real test comes when Tom's company is just as (or more) inefficient as every other company in the industry and when he accounts for only a small part of the market. This is a relatively unlikely situation because, odds on, under such circumstances Tom will want in as badly as you do.

If Tom is too stubborn to see reason, you will simply have to bluff it through in the manner described in cases 1 and 2 and hope for the best. If he is really hopelessly inefficient, you may want to consider the possibility of driving him out of business as quietly as possible. This latter course is not without risks.

ALTERNATIVES TO CONSIDER

Even though you have decided that it would be profitable to give up competing, it does not logically follow that you must conspire. Other, less exotic, avenues of noncompetition should first be explored:

Rule 4: Before conspiring, be sure that follow-the-leaderism and conscious parallelism are not in the cards. They are much less dangerous and work every bit as well.

Follow-the-leaderism is a terrific way of not competing. It works especially well when your industry makes a large variety of shelf items. And it has the enormous advantage of not being illegal—at least, not very.

Further, it is very economical. It involves no traveling expenses. All companies (except one) can give up printing price books. The larger the number of items and the more frequent price changes, the bigger the savings on this important item.

Annoying details of covering your tracks are eliminated. You simply announce (publicly) that from now on you will follow Amalgamated's prices; throw away your salesmen's out-of-date pricebooks and you are ready to begin not competing. There is no risk of suspicion or mistrust between you and your fellow noncompetitors because nobody is trusting anybody.

An appealing feature of follow-the-leaderism is the delightful incantation which goes along with it:

Incantation rule 4a: A successful leader-follower constantly repeats the incantation, "A like price is a competitive price, a like price is a competitive price, a like price is * * *."

Anyone with a modicum of economic sophistication knows that there is only one price in a perfectly competitive market. (Of course, this is also true in a perfect monopoly, and probably true in a perfect oligopoly. Further, it is probably correct that no such thing exists as "perfect competition," "perfect monopoly," or "perfect oligopoly." But these sorts of hypersophisticated statements rarely get stated.) A neat variation on this theme is to argue as follows:

"An equal price is a competitive price. If the prices of various sellers on a given product are different, the purchaser has no choice. He must buy from the lowest price seller—or risk looking like a nut. But if the prices are the same, the purchaser can shop around and buy from whomever he wishes. His consumer's sovereignty is restored."

---

[1] See *United States v. Aluminum Co. of America*, 148 F. 2d 416, 424 (2d Cir. 1945)

Once follow-the-leaderism is firmly entrenched in your industry, worries about cutthroat competition and being priced out of the market are ended. One cannot ask more than this, even from a conspiracy.

A really important advantage of follow-the-leaderism is that it permits the leader to set his prices as if he is the only seller, i.e., a monopolist. This is so because he knows that only one price will prevail in the market—the one that he sets. This is a good break for him, and he undoubtedly will be gratified about the situation even if he had no part in its creation. And since your prices will be the same as his, his monopoly advantages will rub off on you.

The mood of cooperation which follow-the-leaderism creates has much to recommend it. By escaping the nagging irritations of having to set your own prices, by avoiding worry about being undercut, and so forth, you free yourself to devote your management talents to industrial statesmanship. This, in turn, will give a resounding boost to your corporate image.

The only drawback with follow-the-leaderism is that if you quit following, the leader may decide to take you to task for destroying the industry's spirit of cooperation. But you run this risk with other pricing policies, too, so you have not lost anything by trying:

Operating rule 4b: Conscious parallelism may be illegal, but it is certainly not as illegal as conspiring. Moreover, it is hard to prove.

Conscious parallelism is legally elusive for two reasons: (1) No lawyer is exactly certain what it is; (2) lawyers seem to have great difficulty distinguishing it from cutthroat competition.

These factors pose no deterrence for the businessman. For him, effective conscious parallelism is simply a matter of:

Operating subrule 4b(1): Get to know your competitors.

Operating subrule 4b(2): Develop effective lines of interfirm communication.

Getting to know your competitors is as easy as it is pleasant. Go to conventions, trade association meetings, business seminars, and other get-togethers. Buy drinks for your competitors, play golf and bridge with them, meet their wives and families. In time you will develop the bedrock understanding of your competitors' psychology on which successful conscious parallelism is based. You will find that you can put your feet upon your desk and know exactly what "Old George" over at Amalgamated is thinking—often before "Old George" thinks it.

This specialized aptitude is not only useful for escaping the rigors of cutthroatism, which often results from inaccurately gaging what competitors will do, but can also be helpfully combined with follow-the-leaderism to avoid costly miscalculations, particularly in situations of fluctuating price or demand conditions. In addition, if you decide you must conspire, your predictive talents will be an effective bulwark against misunderstanding, which is the nemesis of a successful conspiracy.

Not enough attention has been given to one ingenious interfirm communications channel—a reliable, time-tested aid to not competing:

Operating sub-subrule 4b(2a). Get in the habit of announcing policy and price changes in the press.

The ability to second-guess your fellow parallelers is all very well. But there can be no slipups if you all read about changes in policy or prices in the newspapers before they happen. Do not keep the industry (and the Nation) in the dark. To do so invites unnecessary confusion and distrust. If the industry knows the exact amount of any planned price change, it will have no difficulty in meeting it to the penny. The risk of one or more parallelers inadvertently setting a price below or above their coparallelers and the embarrassing scramble to get back in line are avoided.

But a word of warning is in order. Only announce planned changes. Public announcement of a fait accompli may have disastrous side effects.

TIDY PROCEDURE

An executive should now be in a position to make a well-informed decision as to whether a price-fixing conspiracy is for him. If the answer is "Yes," the following rules must be adhered to scrupulously:

Rule 5: Do not have more active conspirators than necessary; do not have working-level meetings if not absolutely necessary; and do not include personnel any farther down the hierarchical ladder than is 100 percent necessary.

This rule would seem to go without saying. Yet, astonishingly, it was repeatedly violated in the electrical conspiracies. For example, without intending anything personal, to have an assistant department sales manager attending meetings in a multibillion-dollar conspiracy is preposterous. Hence:

Rule 6: Do not take notes; do not leave papers, work sheets, scratch pads, and the like lying around in hotel rooms and other meeting places; do not register under your real name; do not travel with your coconspirators in public transportation to or from meetings; do not make conspiratorial telephone calls from your office (particularly if your efficient secretary keeps a log); in other words, do not keep records of any kind.

The men in the electrical conspiracies did a little better here than on rule 5, but not well enough. Discipline fell apart particularly badly in the written-records and the registering-under-real-names departments. Admittedly, a modern executive has an almost paranoiac desire to get things in writing. But the desire must be resisted. If you feel yourself weakening, bear in mind:

Operating rule 6a: If it cannot be done without writing it down, do not do it.

Operating rule 6b: If you feel you must have something in writing, you are temperamentally unsuited to conspiring.

The most common problem encountered by otherwise competent executives is that using aliases, burning scratch pads, and the like gives them what one described as "a sort of Harry Bridges feeling." This feeling is psychologically repellent to some managers. However, experience has shown that such repulsion can be overcome. Indeed, deeper within the psychological makeup of most executives is a secret enjoyment and appreciation of counterespionage techniques. Hence:

Operating rule 6c: Learn to take pride in a scratch pad well burned or an alias well rendered.

By so doing, bonus psychic rewards will be reaped from a properly managed conspiracy. Accordingly:

Rule 7: Do not meet in hotel rooms if you can avoid doing so.

This rule is difficult to explain rationally. The fact is that Department of Justice and congressional committee investigators are particularly fond of sniffing around hotels. And, though it repels the modern mind, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that hotel rooms are jinxed—at least insofar as price-fixing conspiracies are concerned. And:

Rule 8: Avoid complicated schemes.

Nothing titillates the curiosity of a Federal investigator more than a complicated scheme such as "phase of the moon." He responds like a jigsaw puzzle addict with a 10,000 interlocking-piece picture of the Bay of Biscayne on a rainy Sunday afternoon. Simple agreements such as, "You take 50 percent of the market, George, and I'll take 25 percent," are more prosaic—but every bit as effective, if not more so. And they are much less exciting to would-be trustbusters.

So much for the "thou shalt nots." What about the affirmative techniques of efficient price fixing, which are much more stimulating for the conspirophile? This brings us to:

Rule 9: Have some reason for meeting besides fixing prices.

It does not matter what the reason is. A convention, vacation, golf, meal, drinks—all are fine. As one conspirator explained it, "I don't know what the devil lawyers talk about after dinner, but businessmen talk about business, and business means prices." This has a strong ring of plausibility. You can hardly send a man to jail for discussing prices over a cup of coffee. Therefore:

Rule 10: Gripe a lot, especially about prices.

Successful price fixers invariably sandwich into their business day endless hours of griping about depressed prices, rising labor costs, and so forth. An expert conspirator can disguise a complicated agreement so thoroughly that it is indistinguishable from a grumbling complaint.

Mastery of the griping technique leads the aspiring conspirator naturally and easily to two grand rules:

Rule 11: Develop a jargon.

Rule 12: Send up "trial balloons."

These two rules, taken in tandem, form the ultimate in sophisticated conspiring. They are perhaps best illustrated by an example: Imagine a meeting. A 3-hour presentation by the group's economist of charts, bar graphs, and economic analysis has just been completed. (Nothing blurs tracks like 3 hours of economic analysis.) Conversation ensues:

"George Leader. 'Fellows, we must do something about prices. They're really bad.'

"Chorus. 'Old George has something there, all right; damned if they aren't. It's all Hoffa's fault.'

"George Leader. 'If we could get prices up a little bit, say 2.79 cents per pound, I think we could hold the line.' ['Holding the line' is a favorite phrase of almost all successful conspirators. It is classic, artful, price-fixing jargon.]

"Chorus. 'Yes, yes, we must hold the line. Damned if Old George hasn't got something there. Sure would be grand if we could get prices up 2.79 cents per pound.'

"George Leader. 'If someone would send up a trial balloon [rule 12], I'm sure everyone would follow.'

"Chorus. 'That's right; if only someone would run it up the flagpole, everyone would salute.'

"George Leader. 'Boys, I'm sure that someone is bound to run it up the flagpole in the next 11 or 13 days—or so.' [At this point, George fixes Frank Follower with a menacing stare.]

"Frank Follower. 'I certainly wouldn't be surprised [warm smile] if someone did just that in the next 11 to 13 days—or so.' [The meeting breaks up with cheering and huzzahs as everyone drains his drink and departs.]"

This type of meeting is price-fixing at its very best and its moral is clear:

Rule 13: Remember that the line between overt price collusion and mere discussion of a common problem is fine indeed.

When the conspiracy is functioning smoothly, it is time to think about maximizing efficiency. Bearing in mind that the reason the conspiracy was organized in the first place was to make more profits (rule 1), you will find that these questions must sooner or later arise: How much profit will our conspiracy make for us? Who will get what share?

The answer to the first is simple. It will depend on the skill of the group in setting its pricing policy. The fact that the conspirators are in a position to price as though they were one company leads to the next maxim:

Rule 14: It is advisable to have at least one member in the conspiracy who has monopoly experience.

Conspiracies most often fail before they are started. Of those which are launched, the most common cause of failure is dissension amongst the conspirators over the question of who gets how much of the swag. This leads us to a key rule:

Rule 15: Do not be greedy.

Typically, difficulties occur when one conspirator feels that another is getting "more than his share." But it does not matter how much more you get if you are better off than you would have been had you not conspired. To conspire harmoniously:

Operating rule 15a: The share of each individual conspirator relative to the shares of any or all of his coconspirators must be, by mutual consent, treated as irrelevant.

If this rule is not followed, bickering, hostility, and ultimate collapse of the conspiracy will result. Accordingly, the following philosophy should be uniformly pursued by all conspirators, to the exclusion of any other philosophy:

Operating rule 15b. If you are getting more than you would have gotten, stay in; if you are not, get out.

So much for sharing the spoils. Another common source of quibbling in otherwise effective conspiracies is the question of who will get which bid. This aggravating problem of musical chairs has been the downfall of many excellent conspiracies.

A highly efficient answer, sometimes known as the "Fellner solution," is recommended. It can be stated as follows:

Optional rule 16: Do not overlook the possibility of dividing up sales revenues at the end of a prearranged conspiracy accounting period, irrespective of who actually made the sales.

Here is how this method works: During a conspiracy accounting period, say, 3 months, make a rough attempt to keep to the prearranged market shares of each conspirator in the allocation of bids. But do not worry if the market shares and the bids actually obtained get slightly out of line. At the end of the 3-month period, have an accounting with conspirators who have exceeded their market share—paying rebates to those who have not.

Strict adherence to the Fellner solution will eliminate a great deal of intraconspiracy tension. It has, unfortunately, one modest drawback: it poses some tricky difficulties for each conspiring company's accounting department. These are, however, largely a matter of aesthetics. Experience with the Fellner solution suggests that, in fact, such a challenge brings out the artist in most accountants. Any accountant worth his salt will find pleasure and satisfaction in untangling the rebates, and then carefully retangling them in his T-accounts and profit and loss statement.

A good optional course to follow is:

Operating optional rule 16a: Have at least one member in the conspiracy who has accounting experience.

Another obstacle commonly encountered is the competitor who, through unenlightenment, inadvertence, or plain unpleasantness refuses to conspire. In such a case, stern measures are required:

Rule 17: Have an adequate contingency fund for educating (or eliminating) mavericks.

Many avenues for effective employment of the conspiracy contingency fund—to which all members have contributed on a pro rata basis—are available. Most commonly, such funds are used to subsidize the member who is forced to compete with the maverick. Another popular tactic is to elect one member to compete with the maverick, giving him appropriate subsidization from the contingency fund. Designation may also be done in a kind of Russian roulette style, rotating member by member as each bid arises, with the understanding that when the maverick strikes, the member with that bid number will do the job of breaking him in—or just breaking him. But do not forget:

Important operating rule 17a: Avoid giving the appearance of selling below cost. It antagonizes the Federal Trade Commission.

What are the proper areas for price conspiracy? Philosophically speaking, it is inescapably true that:

Philosophical rule 18: Conspiracies work best on shelf items, but are least necessary. They work worst on special-order items, but are most needed in these areas.

As one frustrated conspirator put it, referring to the electrical fracas, "It's damned hard to conspire about a $17 million turbogenerator. It's a lot easier when you are selling watt-hour meters or something like that." Why is this so? First, price books are not generally available for items made to specification. When they are, they are not reliable. Secondly, follow-the-leaderism and conscious parallelism are easily created for stock items and can be effectively combined with a well-organized conspiracy. Thirdly, the artful conspiratorial techniques that are outlined in rules 10 to 12 are not readily applicable to specially designed products. More specificity is needed.

The slightest change from standard "specs" clogs the wheels of conspiracy. It forces conspirators to wrestle with bidding problems in great detail. This, in turn, leads to more meetings, more scratch pads, more notes, and more telephone calls (violating rule 6). It necessitates more conspirators, some of whom may have to be drawn from the lower operating levels of the member companies (violating rule 5). It may even require "working meetings," and this is absolutely incompatible with a smoothly functioning conspiracy. Perhaps worst of all, it opens up myriad opportunities for bickering, dickering, and nit-picking.

I have no ready answer to this problem. American industry appears inescapably skewered on the horns of a dilemma. Caution should be the watchword of would-be conspirators selling special-order items. Hence:

Operating rule 18a: If you sell special-order items, do not allow your enthusiasm to conspire to get out of hand.

PROBLEM OF APPREHENSION

The possibility of apprehension is, of course, an important element in the decisional thinking of conspirators and would-be conspirators. The rational conspirator not only weighs this possibility in his initial decision to enter a conspiracy, but engages in a a continuous process of reevaluation during the conspiracy's duration. A reliable rule to observe is:

Rule 19: When the heat is on, get out.

Extensively applied in both economic and noneconomic conspiracies, rule 19 has stood the test of time. A conspirator cannot find a more reliable benchmark.

Rules 5 through 12, as well as operating rules 6a and 6b—if scrupulously observed—have a salutory impact on the apprehension potential of a conspiracy. Another rule, frequently recommended by old-school conspirators, is that solid citizens are less likely to end up in the jug than unsolid citizens. This has not proved reliable in recent years. The better rule now appears to be:

Rule 20: Do not worry about being a good citizen and a respected member of the community. It will not help you.

Certain Members of Congress and of the administration are notorious for the dim view with which they regard identical prices. They are joined by an uncomfortably large majority of economists in the belief that "strict price uniformity outside the organized exchanges is * * * conclusive proof of collusion in a world like ours where supply and demand are constantly changing."[2] This situation has led to a popular rule among conspirators, to wit: Steer clear of identical prices at all costs.

In the above-quoted standard text, "The Theory of Price," George J. Stigler advises that "the best policy of concealment for collusive oligopolists at the present time is to purchase a table of random numbers and quote agreed prices subject to a small random addition or subtraction."[3]

Unfortunately, the Department of Justice attorneys' dogged refusal to be deceived by "phase of the moon" conspiring techniques suggests that they, too, have discovered Stigler's sound advice. Another better rule is, therefore, apparent:

Rule 21: Do not worry about avoiding identity of price. This will not solve your problem.

There are, no doubt, many useful and original rules for conspiring which have not been discussed here. It is only commonsense that a would-be conspirator should:

Rule 22: Get the advice of an experienced conspirator.

CONCLUSION

Sooner or later, however, after all the expert conspirators have been consulted, the neophyte will have to make up his own mind. To conspire or not to conspire; that is the question.

The rules outlined above, if scrupulously followed, will make this an easy decision. For the mathematically inclined, would-be conspirator, the following, more precise formulation would be a useful guideline:

$$r_c > c_o^f + c_o^p + a \cdot c_a^f + a \cdot c_a^p$$

This rule states that a price-fixing conspiracy should be entered when (and only when) the returns from conspiring (r_c) exceed the operating costs to the firm of conspiring (c_o^f), plus the personal operating costs to the conspirator (c_o^p), plus the anticipated costs to the firm of apprehension (c_a^f), discounted by a factor reflecting the likelihood of apprehension (a), plus the personal apprehension costs to the conspirator (c_a^p), similarly discounted.

In using this handy formula, beware of negative personal apprehension costs ($-c_a^p$). One case dramatically illustrates this problem:

Prior to his apprehension in the electrical industry cases, a middle-management executive was earning a salary of $47,000 per year and commuted to work each morning in 30 minutes. When apprehended, he was dismissed from this seemingly lucrative position, but fortunately was able to secure new employment. His salary is now $70,000 per year, and he commutes to work in 20 minutes.

However, the wealth of data made available to students of conspiracy by the electrical-equipment cases strongly suggests that such negative apprehension costs are the exception rather than the rule. It seems appropriate, therefore, to conclude with a moral:

Moral: Even price fixers who do not get caught may not benefit by conspiring.

TAX REDUCTION PROGRAM DESCRIBED IN UNDERSTANDABLE LANGUAGE TO CHICAGO AUDIENCE BY ASSISTANT TREASURY SECRETARY SURREY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on March 18, 1963, Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, spoke before the Union League Club of Chicago on the proposed tax cut.

Mr. Surrey brought out some pertinent and interesting facts in his remarks which I think are worthy of the attention of the Members of this body. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE STANLEY S. SURREY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE UNION LEAGUE CLUB OF CHICAGO, CHICAGO, ILL., MARCH 18, 1963

Today, after 25 months of recovery from the last recession, although gross national product, personal income, and retail sales are at record levels, our economy is still operating far below where it could be—and moving at a rate of growth that will leave us far short of where we could be in the years ahead.

The gap between our economic accomplishment and our economic potential has persisted for 5 years. That gap at present represents $30 to $40 billion in total output, $18 to $20 billion in wages and salaries, and $7 to $8 billion in business profits. It is also reflected in an unemployment rate of more than 6 percent and our persistent large budget deficits, which have totaled $30 billion in the last 6 fiscal years.

Our failure to move ahead more rapidly leaves our economy all the more vulnerable to the damaging effects of another recession. The best way to avoid a recession or to moderate its effects is to make a sustained effort to accelerate growth—which will increase employment, output, income, business profits, and tax revenues.

To do nothing at this time would be to gamble with our economic security and with our hope for a better tomorrow. I believe nearly all of us recognize this, and that there is a general consensus today on the need to accelerate our economic growth. The consensus goes even further. It has become increasingly clear that a major contributing factor to our inability to achieve greater economic activity lies in our tax system.

For our high tax rates—forged in the necessity of war and maintained during the inflationary period of high postwar demand—have in recent years become a major deterrent to economic expansion. Their role, with the changing character of our economy, has shifted from that of holding down inflation to one of holding down growth.

These high rates operate to repress economic activity, with the result that tax revenues are reduced. The recent persistent large budget deficits reflect the inability of a lagging economy to produce enough tax revenue to meet the demands of national security, space exploration, and an expanding population.

Our repressive tax rates simply soak up too many dollars that would otherwise increase consumer spending, or finance new business investment, or provide added incentives to both individuals and businesses to produce more, earn more, and invest more. High tax rates are serious restraints on private incentives, and they unduly reduce the profitability of private enterprise. By weakening consumer demand they sap one of the strongest forces influencing business investment—the prospect of profit through expanding markets.

Here also, therefore, the discussion of recent weeks has shown a remarkable consensus—that income taxes must be reduced. But there are some who believe this reduction should wait until Federal expenditures are greatly reduced.

Some believe a cutback of at least $4 to $5 billion is required—such as would be involved in holding total expenditures at the 1963 level—while others believe far greater cuts should be made before we can proceed with tax reduction. But imposing such rigid conditions on tax reduction is far more likely to make tax reduction impossible or to substantially reduce the benefits of a tax cut to the economy. We must not let the agreement we have finally achieved for revision of our tax structure be destroyed by an unwillingness to be realistic about our present expenditures.

This administration has already shown that it recognizes the need to hold expenditures down. This year, with the exception of space, defense, and interest costs, President Kennedy's 1964 budget actually shows a reduction in total expenditures. This was achieved despite the fact that over the past 9 years this sector of the budget has increased by an average of 7.5 percent a year.

The many billions that would have to be cut from the budget to achieve the large absolute expenditure reductions that some would require as a condition to tax reduction must presumably come at least in part from defense and space programs. Our country's defense requirements and its place in the frontier of space exploration simply do not permit large reductions in these areas.

Apart from the damage to vital programs that would result from large expenditure cuts, a sharp cutback in Government spending could well result in an economic downturn which would shortly reduce revenues to the point where deficits might actually increase.

A sensible program of expenditure control—not rigid or impossible conditions of large expenditure reductions—will permit us to proceed with the tax revision we all agree is needed. But no one should believe that this course means a resignation to continued deficits.

The best way to balance the budget is first to balance the economy. This requires significant tax rate reduction that will add to incentives to work and invest, to purchasing power, and to the flow of investment funds. The increased economic activity generated by such a rate reduction will, within a few years, even at the new lower tax rates, bring in more tax revenue than we would have had otherwise. Thus the renewed vitality in the private sector, fed by new investment, new demand, and new incentives, would provide increasing tax revenue which can and will be used to achieve a balanced Federal budget. The entire increase in revenues which we foresee as a benefit of tax reduction will not be spent by Government. A portion of it will be used to reduce the deficit. President Kennedy made that clear in his budget message when he stated:

"As the tax cut becomes fully effective and the economy climbs toward full employment, a substantial part of the revenue increases must go toward eliminating the transitional deficit. Although it will be necessary to increase certain expenditures, we shall continue, and indeed intensify our effort to include in our fiscal program only those expenditures which meet strict criteria of fulfilling important national needs."

The point I want to make is that you can work toward balancing the budget far more effectively, far more constructively, far more safely, by means of a responsible, balanced tax program combined with firm and rational expenditure control than you can by attempting massive and immediate spending cuts.

The first course demonstrates faith in the latent vitality of our free market economy. It indicates a belief that our economy can move ahead, wipe out the temporary additional deficit from the tax cuts, and through an accelerated rate of economic growth move on toward full employment and a balanced budget. The other course could, if put into effect in the current economic climate, produce results of the kind its supporters most want to avoid.

It is clear, then, that our country is not moving ahead as fast as it can and must. It is clear that the restraints of the income tax structure are a major cause of our economic lag and that revision of the tax structure is therefore an imperative task. There is also increasing recognition that despite our present deficit the path to a balanced budget is through a tax reduction in a climate of expenditure control. The final, hard step remains—to reach agreement on the details of the tax revision. This revision must provide maximum benefit to the economy at a minimum of budgetary cost, and do so in a manner that is fair to all taxpayers. The tax program the President has proposed fully meets these requirements.

The chief revision in the President's program—its No. 1 reform—is a very large reduction in the rates of the income tax. The individual rate scale at the completion of the program would be reduced from the present range of 20 to 91 percent to a lower range of from 14 to 65 percent—with rates throughout the scale 20 to 30 percent lower than today. The corporate normal tax rate would be 22 percent for the first $25,000 of profit—27 percent less than the present 30-percent rate. This is the only rate that concerns 80 percent of our corporations. The maximum corporate rate would drop from 52 to 47 percent.

These are sweeping rate changes that significantly pull down the rates of tax. An individual concerned with his marginal rate of tax—what will the Government take as its share of the added dollar he earns through a risky investment or increased personal effort—will find the Government taking 20 to 30 percent less than it does today. On the corporate side, after-tax profitability on new investment under the combination of the 1962 program, with its investment tax credit and depreciation reform, and the proposed rate reduction, is increased by almost 30 percent.

The cost of the rate reductions in the President's program comes to $13.7 billion—over $11 billion for individuals and over $2.6 billion for corporations. Yet this much revenue must be involved if the rate reductions are to be as significant and effective as the President has recommended. Anything less simply means a lesser rate reduction. Thus, a rate reduction involving, say, $7.5 billion for individuals is, of course, a rate reduction—but will not yield a rate scale from 14 to 65 percent. Somewhere in that scale—at the bottom, at the top, in the middle, or all along—the rates will have to be significantly higher than those proposed by the President. The barriers to private incentives and higher demand simply would not come down as far as the President has recommended.

The President has, in addition, recommended several reforms—all of which involve a revenue cost—to alleviate certain hardships under the tax structure which rate reduction alone cannot eliminate. One reform creates a minimum standard deduction to help low-income families, particularly those with many dependents. This proposal for a minimum standard deduction achieves the effect of an increase in personal exemptions, strongly urged by many in our society, at a revenue cost of only $310 million, by focusing that loss directly in the area of hardship. Another reform would benefit and treat more fairly taxpayers over 65, particularly those who are still working. Other changes would benefit taxpayers whose employment requires them to move to a new community, taxpayers who must provide care for their children in order to work, and people whose incomes fluctuate sharply from year to year. One reform, designed to promote civilian research and technology, benefits business directly by providing for the immediate writeoff of equipment used in research and development. Surely the need for these changes is evident.

---

[2] George J. Stigler, "The Theory of Price" (New York, the Macmillan Co., 1952), p. 240.

[3] Ibid., p. 240.

The rate reductions, plus these structural reforms or changes, involve a revenue cost of nearly $14.5 billion. Together, they represent a program of significant and effective rate reduction complemented by relief of obvious tax hardships and a needed incentive to civilian technology and increased productivity. Programs which involve a lesser revenue cost than $14.5 billion for these purposes must mean less significant rate reductions and the elimination of some or all of the hardship-relieving and growth-inducing reforms. They must involve less incentive to private initiative and activity. In terms, therefore, of rate reduction and incentive, in terms of hardship relief and increased growth, they are "second-best" programs. They cannot, of necessity, be as effective as the program proposed by President Kennedy.

But $14.5 billion is a large revenue cost. Our Federal budget is in a deficit position, brought on by necessary increases in defense, space and public debt interest expenditures and by a failure of the economy to operate at full potential—the very failure the tax program is designed to meet. Firm Presidential expenditure control—which has even lowered remaining budget expenditures from the 1963 level—has kept the budget deficit to $9.2 billion, apart from the tax program. Under these conditions the most appropriate course is to seek an overall tax program that permits us to achieve in a fiscally responsible way the full rate reduction and hardship relief afforded by the $14.5 billion figure—rather than to seek a "second best" rate reduction or to incur a greater increase in the deficit than is required.

The tax program permits the accomplishment of the benefits of the $14.5 billion proposals in a fiscally responsible way through two measures: One, it spaces the rate reductions in three steps, starting in 1963 and ending January 1, 1965, and two, it obtains through other structural changes and reforms, which would commence in 1964, $4.1 billion in direct revenue gains and $1.5 billion in increased budgetary receipts, or a total of $5.6 billion. The result is a net budgetary cost of $8.8 billion for the total program when completed, before account is taken of the increase in revenues resulting from economic expansion induced by the program itself.

These revenue-raising structural changes or reforms are in three groups. The first group comprises seven changes affecting individuals and totaling $3 billion, the principal ones involving a 5 percent floor under itemized deductions, the elimination of the $50 dividend exclusion and 4-percent dividend credit, and the elimination of the present tax exclusion for sick pay. These three changes would yield $2.9 billion.

The second group contains several changes primarily involving corporations, which would increase tax revenue $320 million. One would involve the allowance of only a single surtax exemption to multicorporate structures, coupled with elimination of the penalty taxes on consolidated income taxes. Another would improve tax rules affecting natural resources. Still another would put larger corporations—the 15,000 corporations with tax liabilities over $100,000—on a current-payment tax basis over a 5-year transition period, involving no increase in tax liabilities but increasing budgetary receipts by $1.5 billion in each of the 5 years. The third group involves an interrelated set of changes in the capital gains area which would yield a $750 million increase in revenue resulting from increased turnover and mobility of capital.

These revenue-raising structural reforms, while contributing to the fiscal responsibility of the overall program, are in themselves needed improvements in the tax structure. They eliminate special provisions—which now permit unfair escape from tax—and thereby increase the equity of the income tax structure. They substitute the economic marketplace for the tax avoidance device as the governing factor in the allocation of investment resources. They broaden the tax base, without harm to existing incentives, such as those involved in charitable giving or home ownership, and foster private initiative through the lower marginal tax rate they permit.

These structural adjustments, involving a change in the computation of taxable income, are in a sense made only once. The rate reductions will far more than offset these adjustments so that from the very start of the program almost all taxpayers obtain a significant net reduction in tax liabilities—the average is 18 percent.

As taxpayers subsequently increase their incomes—through wage or salary increases, increased investment, increased dividends, increased business activity—the increase in income will be subject to the far lower rate scale involved in the program. It is this year-in, year-out effect of the large rate cuts—made possible, especially in the middle and upper brackets, by the revenue-raising reforms—that will provide the basic change in the impact of the tax structure on incentives and the economy.

The large amount of revenue devoted to rate reduction will provide both increased incentives to private investment and initiative and an increase in consumer purchasing power. While some may stress increased investment incentives as the more important of the two and others may favor increased spending power, the real lesson of recent years is that both have a necessary contribution to make to our economic health.

The increase in spending power will help to absorb existing unused capacity and provide a more favorable climate in which the investment incentives of lower rates, the investment credit, and depreciation revision will operate, enabling us to move more rapidly toward full employment. The investment incentives, exerting a constantly more powerful effect as the economy moves upward, will then contribute to a continued acceleration of our rate of growth.

We should not and need not rely upon only one of those two forces for our economic advance. That is the reason for the large amount of revenue devoted to rate reductions in the President's program. A significantly lesser amount could make us choose between the forces of demand and investment. Here we find either no unanimity as to the line of choice or an unwillingness on the part of those who urge a lesser amount to face up to the task of making the choice.

In sum, the President's program is a balanced program. It is balanced in terms of time, neither attempting to do everything at once with the consequent risk of inflation and possible damage to our balance of payments, nor delaying action in the vain hope that the economy would somehow move by itself to a level which would lead to balanced budgets. It is balanced in terms of equity, with the benefits fairly distributed among all income groups of taxpayers and to corporations as well. It is balanced in terms of achieving maximum economic impact with a minimum budgetary cost, both because of the staging over 3 years and the offsetting effect of certain reforms. It is important to keep in mind that this economic impact is far greater and more immediate than the staging might indicate. By July of next year, for instance, close to $6 billion in additional spending power will have been poured back into the economy. Before 1964 is out, the tax program will have increased net after-tax income of business and individuals by more than $10 billion. In addition, income and spending will be still further increased as the economy expands in response to the stimulus provided by the tax program. Finally, the tax program is balanced because it includes both incentives to investment and an increase in demand.

The Ways and Means Committee is now engaged in its consideration of the proposed tax program—the stage where, through public hearings and otherwise, various groups seek to pull the tax revision this way or that way closer to one extreme or the other. It is the stage when those who are affected by a recommendation to change a particular provision seek to justify the present situation or to alter the recommendation.

This is the final, hard stage of tax revision—where the general consensus on the goal of greater economic activity, on the repressive effect of the tax system, on the need for tax revision and net tax reduction leaves off and the disputes over the shape of the tax revision commence.

Here clearly no general consensus on final details has yet been reached. Thus the testimony before the committee indicates a wide spectrum of opinion as to which groups should receive the tax cuts. If, for instance, the rate reductions recommended by the AFL–CIO and the NAM were both accepted by the Congress, the total revenue cost involved would be $24 billion. Necessarily, in this context of competing tax plans the proponents of each plan will criticize the President's program—but each with a different criticism. High-income taxpayers look at the larger percentage reductions in tax liabilities going to low- and middle-income taxpayers and feel that those groups are getting too much. They say some of the reforms remove the otherwise almost uniform changes in the rates. Low- and middle-income taxpayers look at the larger dollar reductions and the larger percentage increases in after-tax incomes going to high-income groups and feel that the upper-income taxpayers are getting too much. They may argue that the proposed rate scale of 14 to 65 percent is not as progressive as the present scale running from 20 to 91 percent. In reality, much of this criticism is really testimony to the basic fairness of the overall program.

Certainly improvements and helpful changes will occur as the work of the committee proceeds toward resolving conflicting views and writing the actual legislation. But those who are trying to pull the program this way or that way, or to pull out this or that part, should not lose sight of the main goal.

The goal is to move the economy closer to full employment by raising our rate of economic growth. This can best be achieved by removing the repressive effects of our income tax structure on the economy. To accomplish this result will mean far more to all taxpayers before this decade is out than will the dollars that the program will put in their pockets in 1963, or 1964, or 1965.

For the interaction of increased incentives to produce and invest, both corporate and individual, together with the increased funds available for consumer spending and for investment will create an upward spiral—not of wages and prices but of economic activity and accelerating growth—which will permit us to achieve our goal of a full employment economy.

The President's program proposes to reach this goal through a major tax rate reduction, combined with some reforms that remove hardships and some that raise revenue through broadening the tax base and eliminating special provisions. Only in this way can sufficiently large rate reductions be achieved in a fair way, without undue budgetary strain.

This is no time for half measures or attempted short cuts. There is an urgent need for action on the matter of taxes—action that is basic and lasting. The President's program is a balanced, fair and effective response to this critical need.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE, MICHIGAN, EDITORIAL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Ann Arbor News recently published an editorial giving a thoughtful presentation on the pending bills before the Congress to establish a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan.

The Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Interior Committee will begin hearings on the bill, S. 792, which Senator McNamara and I have introduced, later this month.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Ann Arbor News be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Hart's Park Bill Better

Senator Philip A. Hart says there are no important differences except size in the proposals for a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Park which he and Representative Robert P. Griffin, Republican, of Traverse City, have introduced this year. This appears to be true, but it is an important difference.

Hart's bill calls for a 77,000-acre park, including the lake a short distance inland from the dunes. Griffin wants a park of only 37,000 acres, which would include North Manitou Island but stop short of the inland lakes.

There is still room for compromise on acreage, in the direction of a somewhat smaller area than Hart proposes. But those who are lauding Griffin's small park plan as the ultimate in protection of individual rights, and are calling Hart's bill socialistic, are failing to take account of all the relevant facts.

Except in the eyes of those who just don't believe in national parks there no longer seems to be a significant difference in the provisions for protecting local property owners proposed by Hart and Griffin.

Both bills have provisions forbidding the Federal Government to condemn private homes. Both would give the Department of the Interior first option on private property within the park boundaries when it did go on the market, with price-setting provisions similar to those which have proven acceptable at Cape Cod National Seashore.

Hart's bill would bring property around the inland lakes, just east of the dunes, under these property protection provisions. Griffin's bill would draw the park boundary west of these lake properties. It would be better to have these properties stabilized by zoning codes, as provided in Hart's bill, than to have them on the edge of the park, where commercialism would probably run rampant as visits by tourists to the new park increased.

Any land speculator who has ever attacked a township zoning code in court knows that such codes would not protect the inland lake properties, once a park was established along the lines suggested by Griffin.

Griffin has proposed including North Manitou Island in the dunes park, for the sake of additional shoreline. But this island is a privately operated hunting preserve, heavily stocked with deer and very short on scenery.

It is not the business of the Interior Department to operate hunting preserves. If the Department chose to include North Manitou inside the park—which is unlikely—it would have to find a way to greatly reduce and control the deer population in order to make the island usable for camping and visits by tourists. But the lack of trees and scenery would make it pointless for the Government to get into such a project.

Despite these differences, the important thing is that the idea of a Sleeping Bear National Park has bipartisan support this year, meaning that it should be possible to pass a bill for which both parties can take some of the credit.

THOMAS JEFFERSON AND THE WORLD OF TODAY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Alexandria Library Co. in recent years has invited nationally known scholars and creative writers to speak on some aspects of the life, history, or culture of Virginia, or of the other Southern States, in order to remind the present generation of the great part which the South has played in creating and molding this Nation.

On March 14, 1963, the Alexandria Library Co. invited to give its annual lecture Mr. John Dos Passos, author and writer in residence at the University of Virginia. Mr. Dos Passos spoke on the topic, "Thomas Jefferson and the World of Today."

In order to give this informative and important speech the circulation which it justly deserves, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Thomas Jefferson and the World of Today

Only 137 years, merely the span of a couple of long lifetimes, have gone by since Jefferson died at Monticello and, on the same Independence Day 1826, his old friend and political opponent, John Adams, died at Braintree, near Boston, whispering, so the old tradition has it: "Thomas Jefferson still survives." Both men lived to see the first half century of the Republic they had helped found. They lived to see the United States spread from the eastern seaboard to the Rocky Mountains. They lived to see the beginnings of the age of steam and of the industrial revolution. They lived to see their experiment in government strike roots and become an established nation.

Their ideas of how men should be governed took somewhat divergent paths during their long lives. Jefferson believed in government by the people by universal suffrage; Adams felt that popular democracy must be held in check by representation of the rich and well educated, and that both powers should be balanced by a strong Executive. Though they saw plenty of dangers ahead both Jefferson and Adams were able to turn their faces to the wall in their last hour happy in the assurance that the work they had done was good.

Looking back on them from the viewpoint of the mid-20th century we can see that the political attitudes of the radicals and conservatives among the men who founded this Republic were really much closer together than they seemed at that time.

When Gouverneur Morris, who was a conservative, and cynical about human capabilities for self-government, wrote to George Washington describing politics as "that divine science that has for its object the happiness of mankind," he meant the same thing by the word "happiness" that the radical idealist Jefferson meant when he drafted the Declaration of Independence. They both were thinking of the right of every man—which they considered his inalienable birthright—to live his life as he chose so long as he didn't interfere with his neighbor. They differed as to what kind of government would best preserve this right, which they agreed was based on the freedom of speech and assembly, and of the press; and on freedom to own property and to handle your property according to what seemed to be your best advantage.

Essentially the happiness they were thinking of was a moral happiness. Whether they were Deists or Congregationalists they were still too close to the old Protestant religion of salvation as a private, individual, and personal experience (the Quakers' light within) to confuse moral and spiritual happiness with affluence in material things. They believed in material well being, but as a basis for the godly life. Adams would have called it that. Jefferson and Gouverneur Morris would probably have called it the philosophic life, but essentially they would have meant the same thing.

These 137 years have seen such a transformation in American society that the aspirations of Jefferson and Adams and Washington and Gouverneur Morris and Hamilton and the rest sometimes seem to us as far away as the aspirations of Confucius. I think they are more cogent than we realize.

Of course, when I was a boy everybody told me that the dominant stamp on the American Government was Hamilton's. For many years I hope and prayed that Jefferson's tradition, with its emphasis on personal rights and decentralized administration, would prevail. Today any dispassionate appraisal of the development of this country since Franklin Roosevelt's first administration will lead to the conclusion that American institutions have evolved in a way which neither Jefferson nor John Adams nor Hamilton could have imagined.

Mass production techniques have spread physical well-being throughout the social heap, with results directly contrary to the forecasts of early 19th century economists, who from Jefferson to Marx could see only evil in the factory system. A second unforeseen byproduct has been the development of an all-encompassing and possibly stifling bureaucracy of the sort which in ancient times took something like 300 years to mature to the point where it stifled the Roman Empire.

The wise old village elders John Adams had his trust in hardly came to the fore.

Hamilton's money men, even when they attained undisputed power in the period after the Civil War, failed to produce the sort of stable ruling class on the model of the English gentry that Hamilton dreamed about.

Whatever really conservative business tradition there was in this country abdicated about the time of the panic of 1929.

The independent farmer, whom Jefferson hoped would be the cornerstone of civil liberties, has been losing ground ever since the failure of La Follette's progressivism.

Jefferson never believed the 18th century Englishman's political axiom that the rich and wellborn are politically more gifted than the poor. In August of the busy year of 1776 he wrote one of his personal friends (who was also a political opponent) Edmund Pendleton, the conservative Virginia lawyer from Caroline County, speaking of the property qualifications for voting which Pendleton wanted in the projected Virginia constitution, "You have lived longer than I have and perhaps may have formed a different judgment on better grounds; but my observations do not enable me to say I think integrity the characteristic of wealth. In general I think the decisions of the people in a body will be more honest and more disinterested than those of wealthy men."

The years I think have more or less borne Jefferson out. The various vested interests have had their fling and have vanished from the scene. The southern slaveowners almost brought the Nation to total disaster. Whenever the American capitalists who took over next messed in politics they proved themselves shortsighted and inept. Now we are governed by mass appeals and pressure groups. Occasionally I'm afraid that we'll have to admit that "the decisions of the people in a body" have taken forms that Jefferson would neither have considered "honest" or "disinterested." Up to now the record of popular democracy has not been too bad, but the danger looms that as a result of the voters' abdication of sovereignty, a regimenting and bureaucratic Federal Government will take on powers which would have been unthinkable to Thomas Jefferson or any of the founders in their most despairing nightmares.

Politicians have to deal with the present as they see it. Our practical politicians have in their hearts, though many of them wouldn't admit it even in private, lost respect for the brainwashed masses whose votes they woo. Dealing with the mass organizations of leviathan labor and leviathan business too many of them have come to the opinion, which is beginning to be made vocal by the phrasemakers from the colleges, that the ideals and practical precepts of men like Jefferson and Adams and Hamilton are under modern conditions nugatory and void; or else merely useful for the adornment of political speeches, like the red, white, and blue bunting around the speakers' stand.

To me, on the contrary, the challenge of the times to individual liberty and individual initiative makes the thought and the practice of the men who founded this Republic more to the point, than ever.

The organization of society has changed in a century and a half, but the nature of man has not changed. A man can no more be trusted with unlimited power over his fellows today than he could in the days when the authors of the Constitution labored so hard to curb his instincts for evil.

Politics in the great sense—Gouverneur Morris's divine science—which men like Jefferson and Adams thought of as the art of influencing their neighbors for their own good, was based on a knowledge of basic factors in human behavior which haven't changed since the beginnings of recorded history.

The United States must stand or fall by the success of self-government.

If there should grow up in this country a generation of men and women who felt that the most important thing in life was to save the United States from destruction and their own liberties along with their country's, they would find in the records of the founders of the Republic a storehouse of the skills and mental attitudes they would need in their work.

They would find they needed a formula by which to apply the basic libertarian ideas as directly to modern institutionalized society as Jefferson and his friends applied them to the everyday world they knew. The formula will never be found by denying the premises on which the Government was founded.

Lord knows for the last 30 years we have done enough talking about democracy in this country. Maybe the reason why the talk doesn't turn into useful action is because the terms don't apply exactly enough in our lives as we live them. Something of that sort may help to explain our failure of nerve and failure of will as a nation upon the international scene at the moment of victory at the end of the Second World War. It is this failure which continues to threaten terrible consequences for our lives and our children's lives and for our hope of setting up some kind of civilization fit for a man to live in.

Let's have a look at what life was like in America at the end of the 18th century.

Speaking in general terms peoples' lives were assembled in two kinds of social organization. There was the New England type town where social standing depended on a combination of godliness with that possession of this world's goods which was thought of as the outward expression of divine favor. The New England town developed a paradoxical combination of social stratification with political democracy. At Harvard College students were listed according to their social standing instead of according to their scholastic ability, but that doesn't mean that literacy wasn't highly regarded by the Bostonians. The New Englanders were people of the book. Their towns were socially small oligarchies but their government was town meeting where in spite of stratification every man wellborn or lowborn had his say. This was the society which produced the Adamses.

Then there was the plantation society, where men were rated according to the acreage of their lands. The plantation society produced George Mason and George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and James Madison and the rest. In the Virginia county governments, as in rural England, the landowners were the law.

Both of these systems were subject to the stimulus of the ebb and flow of the new settlements to the westward, where skill and courage and the push necessary for survival were the most admired qualities. The educated men, the men of book learning, of all these differing communities were steeped in the spirit of noblesse oblige which was the good side of the arrogance and selfseeking of the British ruling gentry.

The thing the Americans—townsmen, fishermen, and sailors of the New England seaports; planters and merchants from the Chesapeake; hunters and furtraders from the Ohio—had in common was that they thoroughly understood the society they lived in. The technology was simple. From the time of Confucius or Abraham to the time of the American Revolution the basic operations by which men sowed crops for food and produced clothing and shelter had changed remarkably little. The tools had improved, but production was still based on the skill of the hand and the arm and the eye.

The family was everywhere the productive unit, as it was the social unit. The work of apprentices, indentured servants, Negro slaves on the smaller plantations in the South, all meshed into the framework of a man and his wife and his sons and daughters coping with life as a group.

Any tolerably bright individual knew from personal experience how wheeled carriages and sailing ships worked, understood the processes of agriculture and manufacturing, the use of money and the techniques of buying and selling on the marketplace. Much more important, they all knew by direct personal experience how the different kinds of people worked who made up their society.

They took human cussedness for granted.

None of them had many illusions about how men behaved. A radical idealist like Jefferson allowed for the self-interest (real or imagined) of the average voter or the vanity and ambition and greed of the officeholder as much as a cynical conservative like Gouverneur Morris. They were practical people in the sense that many of our politicians today are impractical people. They checked their high-sounding oratory with real events they saw happening around them.

The difference between radicals and conservatives was that they applied their knowledge according to different theories. Jefferson thought that enlightened by universal education under self-government, the people would improve themselves indefinitely. Like his Scottish contemporary Adam Smith he had almost pathetic faith in the workings of enlightened self-interest.

Both parties understood the old Adam as well as any of the more desperate demagogs we have with us today. They allowed for the old Adam's selfseeking, for his shortsightedness, his timidity, his only intermittent public spirit. The difference was that the statesmen of the early republic used that knowledge in the service of great aims. Using men as they found them, they managed, out of their debates and their bitter political struggles to set up the system of balancing powers which made possible the exuberant growth of the United States.

Jefferson led the radical wing which was in favor of more popular rule rather than less. At the same time he thought of universal suffrage always within the frame of decentralized administration.

In a letter he wrote a few days before his death refusing, on account of the state of his health, an invitation to spend that very Fourth of July which was going to be his last with a group of admirers in Washington City, he spoke happily of the blessings and security of self-government and "the free right to the unbounded exercise of reason and freedom of opinion," and rephrased the basic conviction of his life with characteristic vehemence: "The general spread of the light of science has already laid open to every view the palpable truth that the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred ready to ride them legitimately by the grace of God."

It is one of the ironies of history, that the Communist zealots whose dogma provides them with boots and spurs to ride the mass of mankind legitimately by the grace of Karl Marx, justify themselves by the same political phraseology which the men of Jefferson's day hoped would make forever impossible the oppression of the many by the few.

The detractors of the American people naturally make a great play of our faults and our vices, but it's for our virtues that they really hate us. King George of England hated us in Jefferson's day because we had the nerve to challenge the right of a small group of privileged Englishmen to determine the destinies of their kinsmen overseas. The social engineers in the Kremlin and of Mao's imperial court in Peiping hate us because the success of our comparatively free economy, in spreading the benefits of mass production through all levels of society, challenges the Marxist dogma on which they base their dictatorship.

We must not forget that the commonest practice of mankind is that a few shall impose authority and the majority shall submit to it. Watch any bunch of children playing during a school recess. It's the habit of individual liberty which is the exception.

The remaining liberties we enjoy today, freedom to express our ideas if we have any, freedom to jump in a car and drive any place we want to on the highway and indeed to leave our own country if we have a mind to, freedom (so long as we are at peace with the union) to choose the trade or profession we want to make our living by, were won, we must never forget, by the struggles and pains of generations of English-speaking people who somehow had resistance to authority in their blood. What the generation of 1776 did was to organize those traditions into a new system.

When the British troops marched out of Yorktown to surrender to Washington's army, one of their bands played a tune called "The World Turned Upside Down." In the long run we have managed to make the promise of that tune come true. Underdog has come mighty near to becoming top dog.

I think we may add on the credit side of the ledger, that there has never been a society where so many men and women have shared a fellow feeling for so many other men and women. With every change in economic organization new class lines and stratifications have appeared, but they've hardly outlasted a generation or two. The old saying about three generations from shirt sleeves to shirt sleeves has turned out profoundly true. Compared to the rest of mankind, we've come nearest to producing a classless society. Ask any recent immigrant. Nine times out of

ten he'll tell you that what struck him first in the United States was that feeling of the world being turned upside down.

Right from the beginning the wise men have said that Jefferson's ideas wouldn't work. Washington in his last years, and John Adams and the whole Federalist Party thought majority rule through universal suffrage would be disastrous. Their reasoning was the basis of the lamentations of the school of Brooks Adams and Henry Adams at the beginning of this century. In fact I think it is safe to say that since the earliest days only a small minority have really, in the privacy of their own consciences, believed that American democracy would truly in the last analysis succeed.

The point of view of the learned and well born was admirably put forward in a letter the English historian Macauley wrote in 1857 to H. N. Randall when he was putting the finishing touches on his biography of Jefferson.

"You are surprised to learn," Macauley wrote Randall, "I have not a high opinion of Mr. Jefferson and I am surprised at your surprise. I am certain that I never wrote a line and that I never in Parliament, in conversation or even on the hustings—a place where it is the fashion to court the populace—uttered a word indicating the opinion that the supreme authority in a state ought to be entrusted to the majority of citizens told by head; in other words, to the poorest and most ignorant part of society. I have long been convinced that institutions purely democratic must, sooner or later, destroy liberty or civilization or both.

"You think that your country enjoys an exemption from these evils. I will frankly own to you that I am of a very different opinion. Your fate I believe to be certain, though it is deferred by a physical cause. As long as you have a boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land, your laboring population will be far more at ease than the laboring population of the Old World; and while that is the case the Jeffersonian policy may continue to exist without causing any fatal calamity." (You'll recognize the theory of the last frontier which has long been popular among certain historians.) "But the time will come," Macauley went on, "when New England will be as thickly populated as Old England. Wages will be as low and will fluctuate as much with you as with us. You will have your Manchesters and Birminghams. Hundreds and thousands of artisans will be sometimes out of work.

Then your institutions will be fairly brought to the test. Distress everywhere makes the laborer mutinous and discontented and inclines him to listen with eagerness to agitators who tell him that it is a monstrous iniquity that one man should have millions, while another cannot get a full meal. The day will come when, in the State of New York a multitude of people, none of whom has had more than half a breakfast or expects to have more than half a dinner, will choose the legislature. Is it possible to doubt what sort of legislature will be chosen? On one side is a statesman preaching patience, respect for vested rights, a strict observance of public faith. On the other side is a demagogue ranting about tyranny or capitalists and usurers, and asking why anybody should be permitted to drink champagne and to ride in a carriage while thousands of honest people are in want of necessities. Which of the two candidates is likely to be preferred by a workingman who hears his children cry for bread?

"I seriously apprehend that you will in some such season of adversity as I have described do things which will prevent prosperity from returning; that you will act, like people in a year of scarcity who devour all the seed corn and thus make the next year not one of scarcity but of absolute distress. The distress will produce fresh spoliation. There is nothing to stay you. Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. As I said, when society has entered on this downward progress, either civilization or liberty must perish. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the 20th century as the Roman Empire was in the 5th; with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and your Huns and Vandals will have engendered within your own country by your own institutions.

"Thinking this, of course I cannot reckon Jefferson among the benefactors of mankind."

You'll recognize in this letter of Macaulay's an early statement of the underlying theme of Ortega y Gasset's "Revolt of the Masses," which is still I think the clearest expression in modern terms of the dangers of the cult of the lowest common denominator.

If there should grow up in this continent a generation of men and women ready to give up their lives to defending the last strongholds of the practice of individual liberty, their first duty would be to prove, by word and deed, that Macaulay and Ortega y Gasset were wrong. The imperative need of our time is to prove to ourselves first, and to the rest of the world after, that the methods of self-government can cope with the human problems of industrial society.

Don't let anybody tell you that Macaulay wasn't a great historian, because he was. His practical experience in Parliament gave him a particularly sharp insight into political behavior, but he had no way of foreseeing the new factors which have come into the picture. One is the immense increase in productivity. Another is the mass market which resulted from high wages.

Macaulay had no way of knowing that the American industrialist and the American farmer would be producing within a hundred years such a profusion of goods that the problems facing our political economy would be those of surplus rather than scarcity. Whenever we get a breathing space from the waste of war, we start to pile up such mountains of wheat and corn, such rivers of crude oil, such avalanches of automobiles, washing machines, hedge clippers, of everything you can think of, that the economy gets the blind staggers.

Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal revolution had all the earmarks of the sort of uprising Macaulay looked forward to with so much dread. We had our hundreds and thousands of artisans out of work. We had our mutinous and discontented labor.

"Spend spend spend. Tax tax tax. Elect elect elect" was the watchword. The sufferers marched to the polls and elected and reelected Franklin Roosevelt who sure ranted plenty about the tyranny of capitalists and bankers. The rich were despoiled through the income tax. The poor were to a certain extent subsidized. But the end result, instead of the Republic's being laid waste by the barbarians from below, was that everybody got richer. If the New Deal demagogues, ranting, as Macaulay put it, about the tyranny of capitalists, were able to produce such a successful readjustment of the economy, majority rule must have more resources than he imagined.

The trouble is that every good thing has its bad side. In Jefferson's day the average man could understand how the world he lived in worked. Today our industrial world has become so cut up into specialized departments and vocabularies, and has become so hard to understand and to see as a whole that most people won't even try. Even people of first-rate intelligence, at work in various segregated segments of our economy tend to get so walled up in the particular work they are doing that they never look outside of it. We have forgotten that citizens have duties as well as rights. Along with the benefits of the New Deal revolution came an apathetic complacency toward the general good and the neglect of inventive and original thought about sociology and politics. It is possible that future historians will discover that at the moment of its greatest material success the American Republic was brought to destruction because its people ran out of ideas.

Future historians may puzzle over the fact that just at the moment when American society was proving how versatile it was and how adaptable to changing conditions, so many well-educated young men should throw overboard the theories and practices which had brought the American system into being and turn back to the socialist dogmas of a century ago which would seem to have been discredited by the dreadful history of the Soviet Union since the time of Lenin's revolution. The subject is confused by the prevalence of a sort of totalitarian doubletalk, by which the vocabulary of self-government is used to mean something quite different; but the fact remains that a great many Americans are finding it harder and harder to apply the words and phrases that fitted the agrarian society Jefferson and Madison lived in to the pyramidal structure of today's industry.

Man is an institution-building animal. Every new process for the production of food and goods or their distribution changes the shape of the lives of the men and women who take part in it. Careers have to be molded to fit each new process. People's lives become intertwined in complicated structures of vested interests. With every change adaptations are demanded. Adaptation is slow and difficult and painful. The symptoms of insufficient adaptation are maladjustment, frustration, and finally, apathy. The social structure that has grown up around the present type of industrial production has developed so fast that we haven't had time to adapt to it. In this new environment we are finding it hard, perhaps harder than we realize, to operate the institutions which the English-speaking people built up through centuries of resistance to authority. The challenge which has to be met by all Americans alive today, if their lives are not going to end in ruin and defeat, is the adaptation of free institutions to a rapidly changing industrial society.

The men who founded this Republic gave their lives to the study of how to regulate the interaction between some men's instinct to boss and take advantage of their fellow men, and the freemans' instinctive resistance to authority. They called that interaction self-government. If we are to learn to adapt self-government to the needs of an institutionalized society (the alternative is the type of universal servitude we see in its extremest form of Chinese communism) we are going to need to study the skills and aptitudes of the statesmen who so successfully fitted the old Adam of their time into a government of laws rather than of men.

It was Jefferson's sarcastic young friend from Orange County, little James Madison, who set down in the oftenquoted No. 51 of the Federalist the basic hardheaded rule which, for all these men, radical and conservative alike, became the cornerstone of their political theory: "In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this; you must first enable the Government to control the governed and in the next place oblige it to control itself."

Jefferson phrased and rephrased the doctrine many times. When he was Minister to France, during the period when the Constitution was being argued in Philadelphia, he wrote a letter to his old friend Edward Carrington.

This was the same Colonel Carrington who was such a great lover of liberty that an amusing story was told of him. St. John's Church in Richmond was so crowded when Patrick Henry made his most famous oration that many of the delegates couldn't get in. Among those hanging by their eyelashes to the outside framing of the open windows was this Colonel Carrington. When Henry ended his speech with "Give me liberty or give me death" Carrington turned to his friends who were also dangling from the window ledges and begged them to see to it that when he died he should be buried on this spot where he had experienced his life's greatest moment. His tomb is still there to prove it.

Jefferson in Europe had been enjoying the music, the architecture, the light wines and the landscape, the society of attractive and entertaining women, the skillful gardening of the English and the politeness of the French, but he had been horrified to find himself living in a social system in which, as he put it in words he quoted from Voltaire, every man was either the hammer or the anvil.

"I am convinced," he wrote Carrington while trying to explain his general principles of government, "that those societies (as the Indians) which live without government, enjoy in their general mass an infinitely greater degree of happiness than those who live under the European governments. Among the former public opinion is in the place of law, and restrains morals as powerfully as laws ever did anywhere. Among the latter under the pretext of governing, they have divided their nations into two classes, wolves and sheep. I do not exaggerate. This is a true picture of Europe."

What Jefferson was saying in his characteristically extreme way was that there was a universal law in human affairs by which any group which achieved power over their fellows, whether you called them representatives, commissars, bureaucrats, or monarchs and their courts, would exploit them to the limit of their capacity.

The Marxists of Lenin's day truly thought that if they threw out the businessmen exploitation would stop. What happened was that the bureaucrats became a new and more ferocious exploiting class. The realities of the Soviet Union have disproved Karl Marx. Jefferson and his friends thoroughly understood that any dominant group whatsoever, if you gave them a chance, would exploit the people under their charge, leaving them, so Jefferson put it, the way beekeepers do with bees, just enough of their product to give them strength to keep on working.

"Cherish therefore," Jefferson went on to Carrington, "the spirit of our people, and keep alive their attention. Do not be too severe upon their errors, but reclaim them by enlightening them. Once they become inattentive to public affairs, you and I, and Congress and assemblies, judges and Governors, shall all become wolves. It seems to be the law of our general nature, in spite of individual exceptions, and experience declares that man is the only animal that devours his own kind; for I can apply no milder term to the governments of Europe and to the general prey of the rich on the poor."

Later in his life, in a letter to Dr. Cooper, looking back on the England he'd seen in the beginnings of the industrial revolution, Jefferson described the stratifications of English society as scathingly as Karl Marx did several decades later. He explained that the people were divided into an aristocracy of wealth, a laboring class, and a pauper class. "The aristocracy, which have the laws and government in their hands, have so managed them as to reduce the third description below the means of supporting life, even by labor; and to force the second, whether employed in agriculture, or the arts" (by arts he meant handicraft and machine production) "to the maximum of labor which the construction of the human body can endure, and to the minimum of food and of the meanest kind, which will preserve it in life * * * To obtain food enough and clothing, not only their whole strength must be unremittingly exerted, but with the utmost dexterity they can only keep their ground * * * Hence the industry and manual dexterity of their journeymen and daylaborers and the science of their master workmen"—I'm skipping a little—"keep them in the foremost ranks of competition with other nations: and the less dextrous individuals * * * furnish materials for armies and navies to defend their country, exercise piracy on the ocean, and carry conflagration, plunder, and devastation on the shores of all those who endeavor to withstand their aggressions."

Jefferson was writing in the full bitterness of the War of 1812. He was writing about the rising British empire (which we now look back on with some nostalgia facing as we do the advance of another and much more brutal conqueror), but it is amusing how aptly his description fits the social stratification which has developed in the Soviet Union and its satellites.

The sentences that follow might be quoted from an editorial on the suppressed revolt in Hungary. "A society thus constituted possesses certainly the means of defense, but what does it defend? the pauperism of the lowest class, the abject depression of the laboring, and the luxury, the riot, the domination and the vicious happiness of the aristocracy." (For aristocracy read bureaucracy.) "In their hands the paupers are used as tools to maintain their own wretchedness, and to keep down the laboring portion by shooting them whenever the desperation produced by the cravings of their stomachs drives them into riots. Such is the happiness of scientific England." And such we might add is the happiness of every nation in recorded history, where the power to govern has outrun the power of the governed to resist infringements on their liberty.

The profound emotional basis of Jefferson's belief in popular government was that he instinctively saw society with the eye of the underdog. In letters written at various times in his life you come across remarks about how important he felt it was, especially when he was holding public office, to break down the barriers which inevitably grew up between an officeholder and the general mass of his fellow citizens. Often he'd travel on his trips back and forth between Monticello and the seat of government in the miserable jouncing carts that were the public stages of the time, instead of in his own carriage, just for that purpose.

Now what would my imaginary generation of men and women, who would be ready to give up their whole lives to save these United States and the liberties they stand for, learn from this argument, as they followed it through the letters and statements of the statesmen and the acrimonious journalism of the day?

The first thing that would strike them would be, I think, that all these men loved the United States better than their own lives. In spite of their bitter political conflict at the time of Adams' presidency and Jefferson's leadership of the republican party, Jefferson and John Adams died friends. In spite of all his differences with Hamilton, Jefferson set up a bust of him in the hall at Monticello. In spite of Hamilton's scorn of Jefferson and his theories, he threw the votes he controlled in Congress to Jefferson in the election of 1801, because he thought it was his patriotic duty to do so.

These men of the first generation of leadership were ready, at the last ditch, to sacrifice their own feelings and even their own convictions to the country's good. They were able to stand aside enough from their own political passions to see the country's good as separate from their own aims. The United States constituted the ruling passion of their lives.

A recent example of this grand tradition was the magnificent way Senator TAFT, after he lost the Republican nomination, threw all the fading energy of the last days of his life into helping General Eisenhower win the presidency, and then into trying to help him deserve it once he'd won it. Compare this with Stalin's assassination of Trotsky or the struggles for power in the Soviet Union that followed Stalin's death and you'll understand how much we have to defend.

That year of 1776 which launched the United States was a year of gruelling work for Jefferson. It's amazing how much work people can get into a short period if they have to. When Jefferson walked up the stairs to his parlor in bricklayer Graaf's new house during those hot June days in Philadelphia to set down at his traveling desk the first rough draft of the Declaration of Independence his mind was still busy with his plans for the new constitution of his home State, where the old House of Burgesses had turned itself into a constitutional convention.

He had been trying to get himself recalled to Williamsburg so that he could take part in the crucial committee work. He was smarting under the suspicion that the Virginia conservatives were keeping him in Philadelphia because they were afraid of his radical influence in Williamsburg. There was a geographical cleavage in Virginia between the conservative tidewater landowners and the radical young man from the pioneer counties of the west. Jefferson, although Albermarle had been settled territory since his father's day, usually sided with the westerners. He felt that the work of the Virginia convention was a great deal more important for the future than the mere drafting of a state paper for Congress. The new State governments were, as he put it "the whole object of the present controversy; for should a bad government be instituted for us in future it had been as well to have accepted at first the bad one offered us from beyond the water without the risk and expense of the contest."

He'd already sent his notes as to what kind of government he thought was good to his friends in Williamsburg.

He wanted every citizen to be a property owner and every property owner to have a vote. He wanted to abolish the English custom of entail on the eldest son so that properties would be broken up at each generation by being divided among a number of heirs. He was willing to have incomes further leveled by a tax on surplus earnings. He wanted complete religious liberty, with church and state quite separate, freedom of discussion and of the press, and the gradual abolition of slavery. In the end this became the scheme along which the country developed.

All these victories for the human spirit, which our fathers took for granted have been called in question in our lifetimes.

It turned out that Virginia adopted George Mason's constitution (of course George Mason wanted a great many of the same things) but Jefferson had another chance to set the pattern for the new social order which would come out of the Revolution when he was chosen later that same fall, along with his old lawteacher George Wythe, and fastidious George Mason, and Edmund Pendleton, and one of the Lees, to take on the tremendous job of revising, modernizing, and clarifying the entire code of English law as it applied to Virginia. A challenge for Lycurgus.

A few days after George Washington wound up his retreat through the Jerseys by

whipping the Hessians at Trenton the committee met in the wintry little village of Fredericksburg up at the falls of the Rappahannock. Jefferson took home enough work from that meeting to kill a mule. "A great rubber off of dust," John Adams called him. It was in the course of this work that he worded his great statute on religious liberty, and his bill, which unfortunately turned out to be ahead of its time, to set up a free public school system in Virginia.

These country gentlemen who settled down quietly to work up a new code of laws for their country certainly had their nerve with them. They had declared war on the richest nation in the world. They were part of a scattered confederation of ill-organized settlements on the edge of an undiscovered continent between the hostile Indians and the roaring ocean. Some of their chief cities were occupied by the enemy. Their coast was blockaded by the world's most powerful fleet. The last summer's expedition to try to rally the Canadians to their cause had proved an expensive failure. Their only properly organized army, after continuous retreats, had managed one very small victory.

Nothing daunted they set to work to draw the plans for governing the nation that was yet to be.

You can catch something of the ardor of those days from the letters and documents printed in the first two volumes of the Princeton edition of Jefferson's complete papers. If there should appear this race of men and women I've been trying to imagine, hellbent on saving this Republic and the practice of personal liberty, that's where I should advise them to start their education in the art of statesmanship.

From reading the thoughts and doings of the men who found themselves in positions of leadership in this difficult season of wartime defeats they would perhaps contract the conviction that men of shrewdness and honesty and willpower can in the face of every kind of difficulty reshape a society as they live in it from day to day.

They might pick up some of the affection for the practical machinery of self-government that these men had. They might learn from them a national patriotism hot enough to cut through class lines and group pressures and local interests. They would learn that being an American is an urgent business.

The first thing it took to sit down at Fredericksburg in the winter of 1777 and start to work on a new code of laws was courage. Courage is just as contagious as cowardice. From an enthusiastic study of the daily work of the architects of this Nation, we can catch some of the feeling they had of being masters of their destiny.

Our weakness so far in the endless yelling match with the Communists and in our arguments with our allies is that the people who represent the United States seem hardly convinced at the bottom of their hearts that it is from our kind of liberty under our kind of self-government that the new and radical and adventurous methods of conducting human affairs will develop. Our public men have forgotten the passion for freedom which should be our weapon and our defense.

The Communists have often had the better of the argument during the last 20 dishonorable years—the most disheartening years in our history—because they are thoroughly convinced that they can remake the world. They have proved that they can too; the trouble is that they are remaking it in the wrong direction.

Don't we perhaps need to go to school again to the Americans who, only four or five generations ago did remake the world? They turned it upside down and remade it in the right direction. They can teach us to get our courage back. The moment we can prove to ourselves that we are masters of our destiny at home, we will maybe start to win the worldwide battle too.

HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL AT PANGUITCH, UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, a most interesting and, for me, nostalgic article about the high school basketball team at Panguitch, Utah, written by John Underwood, appears in the March 4 issue of Sports Illustrated. Because the experiences of this little town and its people are rather typical of small American towns everywhere, I am asking that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Panguitch is in the southern part of my State and lies in an arid plateau area, where the earning of a livelihood is still difficult and where our people must pit their energies against a sometimes hostile environment. Yet, from this little town and the other little towns of America, have come the leaders of our Nation and here has grown the culture of America. This article is about a basketball team. Most of these boys, perhaps all of them, will go on to college and perhaps few, or none, of them will return to Panguitch, but this will always be their home and their heritage.

As a footnote to the article, I would like to add that Panguitch won the consolation championship of the class B—small student body—high schools of the State of Utah on March 16, 1963. This means that the team lost its game on the first night of the tournament and won every game thereafter.

I can visualize that tournament because my father, James E. Moss, was one of the founders of high school basketball in Utah and was known affectionately throughout the State as the father of high school athletics. From my earliest childhood, I attended basketball tournaments and other athletic contests with my father. This is the first year that he has not attended the high school basketball tournament since it was founded in Utah—because he passed on last September.

I ask unanimous consent that the Panguitch article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ONLY GAME IN PANGUITCH, UTAH—THOSE BOBCATS CAN'T BE BEAT

The only thing that stood between Donald Ortman and basketball was his terrible modesty. Lank, limby and obviously cut for the game, Don Ortman would gladly play for Panguitch High, he told the coach in 1936, but not if it meant taking off his long pants. The coach, equally inflexible, could not agree ("Long pants?" he shrieked. "Out there on the court? Long pants?"), and Panguitch, Utah had to wait until Don's son Wally grew up before it could fully appreciate the Ortman family.

Nowadays, unabashed by the sight of his bare legs, Wally Ortman wears the conventional blue-and-white briefs of the undefeated Panguitch team and receives vast quantities of Panguitchian appreciation. This includes being a principal conversation topic on U.S. Highway 89 (Main Street) and at the Latter-day Saints Social Hall and around the corner at Daly's pool and billiard retreat. Rhyming couplets are composed by adoring teenage girls: "The score goes up, that player, golly. He's real neat, his name is Wally." His younger brothers, Kenny and Dennis, bask in his prominence and beg him to teach them to back dribble. They consider the time golden when Wally gets with them at the make-do court in the vacant corral across the road. His girl, Barbara, has promised to retrieve the ring and picture she gave to another boy after the Panguitch coach, Bob Davis, a purist, got the team to swear off girls for the season.

Wally's gray-haired mother is still his most devoted fan. She recounts Panguitch basketball lore—like the time the "sore losers" from Marysvale set fire to a neighbor's car—while she struggles with the heavy batter for Wally's favorite boiled-raisin cake or punctiliously launders his uniform. Sometimes she cries to herself as she watches him disappear up the gravel road, walking, bag in hand, to the Panguitch gym on game nights. "It's sad for parents, the way time flies," she says. "We're content and we stay. Where can we go now? But when the children get out of school, they always go. There's nothing here to keep them."

Panguitch, Utah, is a blinking amber light at a dogleg on U.S. 89, 170 miles southwest of the nearest big town, Provo, and roughly along what Salt Lake City sensationalists imagine to be the beeline taken by itinerant bank robbers and high rollers heading west for Las Vegas. A brush with such glamorous villains was suspected in Panguitch last winter when the drugstore was robbed, but other than that, Panguitch doesn't qualify as much of a sin town. The local Garfield County News reported some time ago that when a woman in nearby Escalante called to report a robbery, the sheriff (since retired) instructed her to please get the name and address of the crook and he'd be over to make the arrest.

Panguitch (Ute Indian for "big fish") squats in a water-scarce trough between the Parowan Range on the west and the Panguitch Plateau, a branch of the Wasatch Mountains, on the east. Deer are plentiful in the hills, and no self-respecting Panguitch boy will go a season without getting his buck; venison is, therefore, staple fare in Panguitch. The area is 6,560 feet above a sea most Panguitchians have never seen, and is crisscrossed with irrigation ditches partly filled with snow at this time of year. It is a gray land studded with cottonwood, ponderosa pine and native fir, but mostly there is sagebrush, uninspiring, mile after mile. The beauty is in the mountains, where there are vivid streaks of red beneath peaks that seem to have been confected with Reddi-Wip.

Because of the water shortage the population of Panguitch—1,435—has remained almost constant since the turn of the century. The people are interested in outsiders ("I have never seen a Negro," said the mother of one of the basketball players) and inquisitive about their tastes, yet they are at a loss to explain the red in their own mountains. The State's largest sawmill is at Panguitch, and there are alfalfa farms and small cattle ranches that vie for the water, but the lifeblood of the community is a million dollars' worth of tourists and hunters each year. There are 13 modern motels and 9 gas stations to snare the traveler within the town limits. In summer the principal attraction is Bryce Canyon, a sort of Grand Canyon in miniature 25 miles to the southeast (Grand Canyon itself is only 175 miles south). The hunters come by the hundreds in the fall. The sign outside town discriminates only against "peddlers and hawkers" (licenses required) and "noisy mufflers and cutouts." Panguitch cafe food is hearty and the hospitality is, too, despite regiments of big-city parking meters. (This winter a second-string Panguitch High basketball player called Whips is famous for his fancy dribbling and fakes between and around the meters.)

The town's religious preference is Mormon, by 95 percent—which makes it a challenge for a visitor to achieve a social cup of coffee. The town's passion is basketball, and it is a challenge for anybody to talk about anything else. Bill Coltrine, a high school sportswriter for the Salt Lake City Tribune, stopped in Panguitch while vacationing last summer and was assailed by a delegation of townspeople eager to stuff him with details on the great team Coach Bob Davis was going to have. "But friends, this is July," protested Coltrine. "Nobody talks basketball in July."

"We do," chorused the delegates.

The Panguitch team had won its 16th straight and appeared well on its way to the State class B championship when Photographer Rich Clarkson and I checked into the New Western Motel down the street from the school the other day. We had driven the 71 miles from Cedar City, the nearest airport town. "You'll find people in this part of the country are very friendly," said the proprietor of the New Western, a native named Clarence Cameron. "Now, you'll be in rooms 15 and 16. But before you unpack, let me tell you about our basketball team. They've won 16 straight. Could be better than that 1957 bunch that won the State championship. And that was an exciting team. Never knew what they were going to do.

"Anyway, this could be the best we've ever had. They're fine boys, too, all of them. Joe Riggs is our little guard. We call him the Little General. Smart, very sensitive kid. His father runs the AG market in town. Just built a new house. Brent Turek is the big boy who scores so many points. His dad works for the State parks. Good job. Wally Ortman's dad has had a lot of bad luck. Been very sick. Wally's a great shooter. Lou Tibbs' dad is a rancher and a State legislator. Ned Richards' dad is the postmaster. They're big boys. Seem to get bigger every year. But listen. Let Bob Davis tell you about how they got to be the first five in the first place. Quite a scandal. Took a lot of courage on Bob's part."

Mrs. Cameron passed out dishes of peanut butter fudge ("It's my specialty") and said it wasn't unusual of a game night for Mr. Cameron to run back and forth from the motel to the gym, puffing and puffing, to get progressive accounts of the scoring. "We play Bryce Valley tonight," she said, "but there's not a seat to be had. The gym is sold out for the year. All 250 seats."

"We're getting a brand-new gym next year," said the proprietor. "Blueprints are already in. It'll cost $380,000 and will seat 2,300 people, which is 2,000 more than it'll seat now and 1,000 more than we've got people. But we're aiming to bring in the Region 9 tournament.

"Basketball," he said, "is really it in this town. Look around you at all the nets and goals in the backyards. There's as many backboards as there are TV antennas. In some places there was a basketball goal before there was indoor plumbing. Some of them still don't have indoor plumbing."

"Actually, there's no other diversion in the winter," said another Panguitch man. "Except the movie house and the pool hall. And the movie screen has a big slice in it where a kid threw a piece of cardboard. The slice always shows up on the hero's nose. And as for the pool hall, that's no place for a youngster."

"The pool hall is the blight of the community. Always has been," said a third man. "The idle brain is the devil's workshop."

Down the street there was only a handful of cars in front of the high school though it was 2 o'clock. This, it was explained, was because only a handful of Panguitch High School kids could afford cars. The bright yellow-and-silver Chevrolet, souped up to 250 horsepower, belonged to Dr. Sims Duggins' son Rodney. The Studebaker with the bongo drums in the back belonged to the marshal's son, and it was given to him because his father didn't want him flitting around in the patrol car.

There were sheep and cows in the yard across the street from the school. (Panguitch zoning restrictions, said the hotel proprietor, maybe aren't what they ought to be.) The school is a compact, two-story, buff-brick building built to last in 1937. It is right next door to the older Panguitch Junior High, which is condemned but still in use. Standing on the steps out front, one can feel the throb of the physical education students pounding around in the gym upstairs, can smell the pastry being burned in the home economics oven and can hear, from somewhere, a struggling cornet soloist playing "The Nutcracker Suite," or is it "Bye Bye Blues"?

Enrollment at Panguitch is 110, of which 64 are boys. The principal, Clifford LeFevre, a bright, middle-aged man, says he gave up ranching to return to education, and this explained the huge hide of a Hereford steer that covered one wall of his tiny office. He has a staff of only 13 and therefore requires double duty from some faculty members. In addition to his own job, LeFevre teaches biology and speech; Wrestling Coach Allen Smith is also the music teacher and directs the 30-piece band; and Basketball Coach Davis instructs in math and makes a stab at trigonometry. Davis will be qualified in chemistry as soon as he completes the biweekly course at Cedar City. Teachers get nothing extra for coaching, so Davis, father of five, with a sixth due in June (his annual salary is $4,750), works summers at the slaughterhouse in Kanab and is always on call when somebody in Panguitch needs a pig butchered or some linoleum laid. "Bob can do just about anything he sets his mind to," says Principal LeFevre.

Coach Davis is a tall, curly-haired, handsome man of 32 with a crank-and-go voice and a knowledge of basketball gleaned mostly from books ("I didn't play when I was at Brigham Young, you see"). Sitting in Principal LeFevre's office, he talked about the intricacies of his offense and how he had decided to use a double post this year. Then he was asked about the basketball scandal he'd cleared up, and about his moratorium on dating. How did a coach cope with such explosive issues?

"A couple of years ago," he said soberly, "I discovered some of the boys on the team—all of the first five, in fact—were smoking and drinking. I passed on a warning and let it ride, hoping they'd see the light. Well, there was this party. Cigarettes and beer. A couple of the boys joined in only because they knew if I found out and was going to do anything I'd have to go against them all. That's what I did. I made a clean sweep, and the next thing you know we're starting a bunch of sophomores—Brent and Wally and Joe and Lou. It was tough going for a while. I don't imagine I was too popular a fellow down at the pool hall. But it was a blessing in disguise. This team found itself. You'll see tonight. And I didn't have to worry about them. They made their own training rules and they abide by them. They're good boys."

Did they honest and truly give up girls on their own?

"Well, not exactly," said Davis, clearing his throat. "But rules are rules. Even now I have to get after them for standing around the halls mooning. There'll be plenty of time for that after the State tournament."

Principal LeFevre and his visitors stepped out into the hall. Basketball star Turek, tall and blond, and basketball star Riggs, short and brunet, were lounging by the locker of Cheerleader Melanie McEwen, soft and dreamy. "See what Coach means?" said LeFevre. On the bulletin board there was a huge chart divided into 40 squares. The first few squares had been crossed off with bold black strokes. "Countdown Calendar," read the title, and LeFevre explained that the girls had put up the poster as a reminder of that day of salvation when the ball boys, as they are called in Panguitch, would be freed from Davis' clutches. "Happy Days Are Here Again" said the caption under the last square.

As part of the general displeasure with the rules, Sophomore Sandra Crofts had written a poem (English Teacher Irene McEwen, Melanie's lovely mother, is very strong on poetry). The poem was called "Ball Season," and it portrayed the grim life of the boyless world of Panguitch girls and the girlless world of basketball players. "In bed every night, right at 10," Sandra had written sagely. "Being on the team is like being locked in a pen." She went on to say that all a girl does every day is go home to mother, and predicted that soon the girls will be dousing their hair with Brylcreem for something to run their fingers through.

The Panguitch gym was filled to popping for the game with Bryce Valley. In a front row seat Hot Rodney Duggins, the doctor's son, pointed out that on both sides the fans were sticking out onto the playing court. This was all right, he said, because it made it impossible for a Panguitch player to go out of bounds. Rodney's father leaned over to say that in days past, when crowds were not so orderly, the corners of the playing floor would actually round off with people.

The Panguitch junior varsity players won the preliminary game as the key decisions by the two officials, both Panguitch High faculty members, consistently went in their favor. "Think they're prejudiced?" said Rodney, winking wildly. Dr. Duggins said that this was, after all, just the preliminary, but he remembered a Panguitch varsity game in Marysvale when the timekeeper kept the clock between his knees, hidden from view, and the last 17 seconds took half an hour. "Then there was the referee who gave the opposition the ball while Panguitch was out getting a drink of water. The other team scored," said Dr. Duggins, "and one of our lady fans fainted on the spot." By this time the preliminary game was over and Official Maloy Dodds came over to join the conversation. When he was playing for Panguitch, he said, the ladies of Escalante used to line the street outside after a game and throw their high-heeled shoes at the Panguitch players.

The varsity game began, and Dr. Duggins noted with pride that he had delivered every boy on the starting team. "The starting teams of both schools," he added. Melanie McEwen and her cheerleaders soon had the metal-roofed Panguitch gym, the exact acoustical equivalent of a rural mailbox, rocking with repetition: "Baskets! Baskets! Baskets, boys! You make the baskets, we'll make the noise!" The boys responded, after a slow start, and soon were making baskets as fast as Melanie's group could suggest them.

Still, Bryce Valley, which had won only once previously, clung to the lead. It was sacrilege, said a Panguitch father. Coach Davis called for time. "Posing," he said to the Bobcats. "You saw a photographer out there, and you started posing." He sat back down. "Slow starts, slow starts," he muttered. "Times like this we couldn't throw the ball into the Great Salt Lake." Lou Tibbs slumped beside him, momentarily relieved of his job at forward. "Have you ever seen a worse basketball player than me?" he asked. "I think I probably have," said Coach Davis absently.

The tide, inexorable as it always is for the better, taller team, began to change. Joe

Riggs made six straight points, and Brent Turek and Wally Ortman seemed to get every rebound. Six, eight, ten, twenty ahead. The Bobcats piled it on.

They were every bit up their credits. The 6-foot-3, 180-pound Turek played with exceptional basketball sense, timing, and touch. His rebounding was superb. Wally Ortman's back dribble evoked many a long ah, and little Joe Riggs—inspired, his mother said afterward when the parents got together on the floor—scored 16 points on long one-hand shots. "Unh-unh, unh-unh, those Bobcats can't be beat," cheered the cheerleaders. Bryce Valley became Panguitch's 17th victim, 71 to 48, and the State tournament was just five games away.

"Now what do we do?" I asked Hot Rodney as the crowd filed out. It was barely 10 o'clock.

"Nothing to do," said Rodney despairingly. "Unless"—he brightened—"unless you want to ride up and down Main Street a couple times."

The next day, training rules notwithstanding, there remained the question of whether little Joe Riggs or big Brent Turek was in the lead with the beautiful Melanie. Between classes, Mrs. McEwen discussed this, but first she brought out a bundle of papers, the classroom compositions of Joe Riggs. One was entitled "Marriage Before Education?" and in it Joe wrote: "To a teenager of a small country town who has any foresight into the problems of the near future, the bonds of matrimony is a dread."

"Look at the others," said Mrs. McEwen. There was a poem, "Panguitch," in which Joe vowed to stay in his hometown "forever," and a thesis on the multiple horrors of opiate analgesics. They were well written. On one of them, Mrs. McEwen had scribbled, "You're such a swell guy."

"This is a smart, sensitive boy," she said. "But, most important, he realizes there's more to this world—and should be more to Panguitch—than basketball. Oh, they know how I feel," she went on, eyes flashing, "I'm still as much a fan as anybody. Go to all the games. But I'm also the oldest teacher here. My husband has done well in the motel business and we have been many places and seen many things. We're going to Hawaii next month and we're going to send Melanie to Paris to school if she wants to go. What I'm driving at is this: as a teacher, I want a great deal more for these kids, these very fine, wonderful kids, than just a score and a winning streak." Her voice had been rising. She stopped.

"Now," she continued quietly, "Melanie was named after that fine young woman in 'Gone With the Wind,' the one with such high character. I'm pleased to say Melanie has lived up to the image. And as for her love life, that's pretty much her own business."

Brent Turek, the third corner of the triangle, lives in Hatch, a village of 198 people, 16 miles south of Panguitch. In "My Story," a composition for Mrs. McEwen, Brent depicted himself as being initially amazed by how fast the crowd was at Panguitch High and how dumb he must have seemed. The night after the Bryce Valley game Mrs. Turek, a large, friendly, pink-faced woman, served a dinner of venison, rice, pear salad with strips of cheese, great slices of homemade bread baked in a wood-burning stove and milk. "I'm really very sorry," she said, "but there's no coffee." She said they didn't get much company in Hatch, and coffee-drinking strangers are rare. "It was funny last fall," she said. "Two bandits were supposed to be on the loose and the man on the radio said to lock your doors. Nobody in Hatch owns a lock."

It was suggested to Brent that he obviously had a talent for basketball and would surely get a scholarship offer. But what of the fair Melanie?

"Oh, gee, she's Joe's girl now, I guess," said Brent modestly. "I'm no heart smasher. Besides, girls are plenty destructive. 'Come on, come on, you don't have to be in training all the time,' that's what they say. Not Melanie, mind you, but some of them.

"Say, listen, I'd like to tell you a few things about the Mormon religion. I won't try to convert you or anything, but you'd be surprised how important it is in our lives and how much we help each other. It's a good feeling to be in touch with people. Tonight I'm going up to the Little Ranch to give them the monthly lesson. As a priest—you get to be a priest when you're 16—I'm supposed to give a lesson to two families a month. Come along and see."

The Little Ranch was another 5 miles south and apparently had fared poorly in the last 100 years. A simple unfrosted light bulb illuminated the tiny living room. There were pictures of old people on the walls, and a frayed Indian blanket covered the sofa. Mrs. Little, a painfully thin bright-eyed woman of 77, sat rocking in a misshapen black chair, her fur-lined boots unbuckled after a long day. As Brent gave the lesson—"Honor thy father and thy mother"—she nodded approvingly, interrupting on occasion to test him with a question.

When the lesson was over she said, "He's a fine boy, isn't he? And a fine Mormon. And isn't that a fine basketball team he's on? Undefeated, you know."

U.S.S. "UTAH"—UNMARKED GRAVE OF A MEDAL OF HONOR WINNER

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, a timely and touching article, entitled "U.S.S. *Utah*—Unmarked Grave of a Medal of Honor Winner," appeared in the Navy Times of March 27, 1963. This article points out that one of the Navy heroes who lies entombed in the U.S.S. *Utah* in Pearl Harbor holds the highest military honor which this country can give, the Congressional Medal of Honor. Pending before the Senate of the United States is S. 703, which would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Navy to fly the colors of the United States above the U.S.S. *Utah*, which is the grave of 54 men who died at Pearl Harbor.

In my opinion, it is a mark of ingratitude that this Nation has so long neglected these men. Thirty-six other Members of this body agree with me, because they have joined as cosponsors of S. 703. Additional Senators are still calling into my office and asking to be placed on the bill as cosponsors. I recommend for the reading of all the Senate and for all others who see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, this very timely article by Bill Kreh, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S.S. "UTAH"—UNMARKED GRAVE OF A MEDAL OF HONOR WINNER

(By Bill Kreh)

Pearl Harbor was in flames. Hoarse klaxon horns were sounding general quarters through the bark of 5-inchers and the chatter of machineguns.

The ex-battleship U.S.S. *Utah*, moored northwest of Ford Island, shuddered at her berth as she took a torpedo hit from an attacking Japanese plane. A second hit came seconds later. She started to list rapidly.

The order came:

"Abandon ship over starboard side."

On deck, a ruddy-faced, brown-haired chief watertender named Peter Tomich pushed his way back through the men who were scrambling to get over the side. He headed for the nearest hatch.

"Gotta get below to my men and my boilers or they'll blow to hell," he shouted to an officer as he pushed him aside.

Pete Tomich disappeared down the hatch that December Sunday morning. He got his men out of the engine room and secured his boilers.

Then he refused to leave his post as the mortally wounded *Utah* rolled over in the water.

Chief Tomich is still at his post within the scorched hulk of the *Utah* that lies awash off Ford Island. He and 53 other *Utah* men never made it out of the ship on Pearl Harbor Day. They've been there since—their final resting place marked only by a small bronze plaque on the *Utah*'s exposed side.

Tomich's devotion to duty and heroism didn't go unnoticed. He was awarded the Medal of Honor posthumously on March 4, 1942, by President Franklin Roosevelt—one of 15 Navy men to win the Nation's highest decoration at Pearl Harbor.

The fact that a Medal of Honor winner is among the 54 entombed *Utah* sailors was brought to attention by the officer who was skipper of the *Utah* at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack—Capt. James M. Steele, U.S. Navy Retired. He wrote to Senator FRANK MOSS, Democrat, of Utah, who is spearheading the combined campaign of Navy Times and Parade magazine to have a flag flown over the *Utah's* hulk.

"I think Chief Tomich knew he didn't have a chance of coming out alive when he went back down to his boilers," Captain Steele told Navy Times. "He deserved that medal."

The ex-U.S.S. *Utah* skipper says he believes the Japanese knew well the training value of the *Utah* to the fleet and considered her a worthy target. Captain Steele's views run counter to others' speculation that the *Utah*, which had been used as a target ship, was mistaken for an aircraft carrier by the enemy because of her stripped deck.

Captain Steele revealed that the *Utah*, besides being a target ship, had also been used as a test vessel for antiaircraft training.

"Far from being unarmed," he wrote Senator Moss, "the vessel had the most advanced antiaircraft guns in our Navy on board, some of which had not yet been installed on any of our major combatant ships."

The retired captain also made another point clear. "On December 7, 1941, the U.S.S. *Utah* was in full commission in the U.S. Navy," he wrote.

In the past, the Navy has maintained it could not, under present regulations, fly a flag on the half-submerged *Utah* because she was not in commission at the time she was sunk. Secretary of the Navy Fred Korth has told Senator Moss that the Navy would erect a flagpole and fly a flag over the *Utah* if Congress told it to and provided the money. A bill to do this—S. 703—has been introduced by Moss and is cosponsored by 36 other Senators.

The Pearl Harbor Survivors Association, composed of 12,000 members, has just put its support behind the bill.

In his letter to Moss, Captain Steele told how the *Utah* survivors used the ship's service funds of more than $1,000 to pay for the erection of a bronze plaque in the State Capitol Building at Salt Lake City in memory of their shipmates. The plaque was dedicated in 1945. It is the only place where the names of the entombed *Utah* men are inscribed.

Here, too, is where Peter Tomich's Medal of Honor is displayed—a medal which has gone unclaimed for 20 years by next-of-kin of a hero whose background is shrouded in mystery.

There's probably less known about Peter Tomich than about any other winner of the Medal of Honor in recent years. Records show he was born in Austria on June 3, 1893. He enlisted in the Navy at Newark, N.J., on January 23, 1919, and was naturalized the following October in Charlotte, N.C.

When he enlisted, he spelled his name "Tonich," but by 1922 had substituted an "m" for the "n." He never married and always gave as his next of kin, a cousin, John Tomich, 363 Brown Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

When he was killed at Pearl Harbor, the Navy's telegram to John Tomich was returned marked "address unknown." So was the letter notifying his cousin of his winning the Medal of Honor.

A check showed there was no such address in Los Angeles, nor was there any record of a John Tomich.

Exhaustive efforts were made by the Navy and the Red Cross to find some kin of Chief Tomich. An article in a national news magazine brought forth some clue to his background but no tangible leads on relatives.

One Navy officer wrote that he'd known Tomich for many years. He gave some insight into the type of man who would go back down to his boilers and certain doom in a sinking ship.

"Boilers were his life and steam was in his blood," the officer told the Navy. "He always knew the speed the ship was expected to make because he taught himself to read the signal flags—and he was always where he could read them."

"He knew his job and he knew his limitations. He was a wise and simple man * * * had no other interest in life but his boilers and his ship.

"One of the many stories about him is worth retelling. The destroyer squadron commander was a demanding soul who would ask the impossible and then want to know why it was not done expeditiously.

"One afternoon the speed was increased rapidly to full power. The steam pressure fell and some smoke was made. A little excitement ensued but when it was all over Tomich commented in his Slavic accent: 'He rings up 30 knots from stop and yells no smoke. I like to tell him that he is gottam lucky to be moving at all'."

No kin were found to claim his Medal of Honor and for nearly a year it remained filed away in the Navy Department.

In 1948, the Navy decided to name a new destroyer escort after the Pearl Harbor hero. The prospective skipper asked the Navy for the medal to be displayed in the ship. For 3 years the medal stayed with the U.S.S. *Tomich* (DE–242).

When the ship was put in mothballs in 1946, Tomich's medal was returned to the Navy. The Governor of Utah, at the suggestion of ex-*Utah* Skipper Captain Steele, asked the Navy to display it alongside the *Utah* memorial plaque in Salt Lake City. The Navy agreed, with the provision that it would be returned should a next of kin show up after all these years or if the Navy ever names another ship after Tomich.

There's a final ironic note to the Peter Tomich story. In 1936, he asked for transfer to either the destroyer *Perkins* or *Cushing*. His request was not granted—the billets for chief watertender aboard both these ships were already filled.

A few weeks later, his orders came through. They transferred him to the U.S.S. *Utah*.

It's been his home—and grave—ever since.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GALE W. McGEE, OF WYOMING, BEFORE 13TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, this Nation's relationships with the United Nations have long been a subject of long and heated debate. Unfortunately, too many people are more eager to debate than they are to consider the issues at stake. For they often criticize the United Nations for doing or not doing things that organization was never designed to do.

In the interest of a realistic look at this subject and a better understanding of the role of the United Nations in our foreign policy, I would like to call the attention of the Senate to a speech made recently at the 13th Annual Conference of National Organizations by my esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee].

This speech not only puts the issues in proper perspective but also provides a real challenge for Americans who would destroy a valuable organization to further their own selfish ends.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] has demonstrated, once again, his insight into the problems we face today. I ask unanimous consent that his address may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Part We Have To Play

(Address by the Honorable Gale W. McGee before the 13th annual Conference of National Organizations, called by the American Association for the United Nations, March 12, 1963, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.)

The United Nations is today facing its most critical test in the realm of public opinion. The critical nature of this test stems from two factors—first: After a decade and a half of operations, the world dream which emerged from World War II has now been taken for granted. Second, the practical application of the operations of the U.N. has run into the many frustrations that inevitably accompany the quest for practical, political solutions to theoretical problems. In fact, we may even now be paying the price for overselling the U.N. in its adoption as a cure-all for many things.

A national attitude of taking a working U.N. for granted, however, has created a new opening for the perpetual enemies of international understanding to mobilize a new assault on the operations located on the banks of the East River in New York. The mail in my office, as I'm sure in every Senator's office, daily records a litany of hate preached by the executive secretaries of a collection of right-wing organizations. These tirades are launched from a pre-Columbian world that is still flat rather than round. The cliches of hatred are routinely regurgitated by lackeys strategically located in the home districts of all Congressmen. That the attack marshals untruth and resorts to distortion should not distract from its impact upon the misinformed or uninformed mind where it can prey on ignorance and indifference. Hitler himself taught us the deadly effectiveness of the big lie. These enemies in our midst even now not only have perfected the Hitlerian techniques, they have added their own embellishments to get the United States out of the U.N. and the U.N. out of the United States.

What this means is that you and I have to spend less time talking to each other and more time out on the front lines in the marketplace spiking the falsehoods and promoting the truth.

Typical of these is contained in a letter I received only last week from New York which inquires, "Mr. Congressman, how can we uphold the U.N. which every layman knows supersedes the Constitution of the United States? The United States has become but a tool of the Communists." The truth of the matter, of course, is that the Communists charge exactly the opposite; namely, that the U.N. is a tool of the United States. The events in Korea and in the Congo sometimes seem to lend credence to this latter charge where in both instances we decided that it was a fundamental security interest of the United States to stop the Communist Chinese from crossing the 38th parallel on one hand and from preventing the Russians from moving into central Africa on the other. In each instance, we persuaded the U.N. to endorse these responsibilities.

Or take the point raised in this letter recently received from Casper in my own State. "When are we going to withdraw from the Communist-dominated U.N. and expel the whole stinking mess from our shores?" With all of the assertions that the U.N. is a Red tool, it remains strange indeed how violently the Communists themselves oppose it and how strenuously they seek to disrupt its activity. We ought to weigh well Ambassador Adlai Stevenson's reminder that in the U.N. the free world has not lost a single vote to the Communists.

Unfortunately, the facts don't get in the way of the U.N. haters. They will continue the attack—as one did only this morning when he wrote, "I am sorry to read that you are such a champion of the dying U.N. It is a Communist, Jew-dominated Zeus god, glasshouse in New York. I hope the voters of Wyoming catch up with you on this question."

And from California, "Can't you explain to me why communism has spread so rapidly since we joined the U.N.?" This man needs to be reminded of some elementary facts of international life. One is that, so far, communism has gone nowhere in the world and stayed as an idea. It has remained only where shored up by bayonets. Even more significantly, of the 46 newly independent nations born since World War II, not a single one of them has adopted communism as its way of life.

Basic to eliminating misunderstanding about the U.N. is that we make it abundantly clear what it is not. This should then leave us with our base of operations for what it is and can do. First of all, it is not a private American club. It is truly, as its name describes, a world organization. Second, it is not an anti-Communist league. In all truth, as one woman from Illinois wrote, "I suspect there may be some Communists in that U.N. thing in New York." In fact, she ought to understand that there are also Buddhists, Presbyterians, and a wide assortment of other species currently at loose in the world. Third, the U.N. was not originally conceived as a peace-enforcing agency. It was created to talk peace, and even to make it possible but not to carry it out.

Once we accept those fundamentals, it is possible then to cast the U.N. in its proper international perspective of this moment.

(a) In keeping with that perspective, we have to see the United Nations as one of several strings to our own survival bow. The United Nations no more determines U.S. foreign policy than does NATO, or the OAS, or SEATO. The pot of international politics is continually boiling. Where it spills over may vary from crisis to crisis. How we succeed in turning down the fire may be as variable as the tongues of the flames themselves.

For example, the most critical international tension point is Berlin. Yet Berlin does not lend itself to United Nations action nearly as effectively as it does to NATO action. Emotionally, Cuba is our hottest current question. It does not lend itself to United Nations action because the U.N. is not an anti-Communist group. The OAS,

however, is more appropriately tailored for this hemisphere problem. Or in Vietnam, where no other existing agency has seemed capable of acting, unilateral activity on the part of the United States has been required. Finally, in special instances, like the Israeli-Arab question, or the Congo, the U.N. itself is peculiarly better suited to cope with those areas. What this means is that there can be no pat formula or single solution to all crises. The nature of each threat has to be assessed against the capabilities of the several reservoirs of power available to us, whether this be NATO in Berlin, OAS in Cuba, the U.N. in the Near East, or the USA alone in Southeast Asia. It permits us a flexibility and a set of alternatives for resisting the encroachments of Soviet imperialism—or anybody else's for that matter.

(b) The emergence of neutralism and national sovereignty within the U.N. constitute a new and great defense against international predators. For some, this fact alone would seem to be a reversal of international goals. Beginning with World War I, students of international policy preached the evil of national sovereignty as a cause of war. With the appearance of many new nations since the last war, however, the importance of each new country standing on its own feet and jealously guarding its independent status has come to be recognized. Irrespective of choosing up sides, or even of which side, national independence for Togo, or Indonesia, or Venezuela is a far more certain deterrent to the erosions of international communism than short-range pacts and treaties. In the United Nations independence has been dignified and upgraded. The extent to which it continues to do so can only enhance the capacities of the new states for resisting threats from the outside.

(c) Here in the United States it behooves us to avoid the pitfall of fixed percentage ceilings on our contributions to the U.N. Mindful as we must be of the disproportionate share of those burdens which we have been carrying, we, nonetheless, must be quick to weigh the consequences of the alternative. To be specific, in fixing our own percentage of contributions, we forfeit to the other side the initiative for destroying the U.N. By cutting off our contributions at whatever level arbitrarily, we leave open to the Soviets the decision simply not to pay up their share and thus destroy the U.N. I do not believe we ought to be maneuvered into that kind of bind.

(d) Keeping the U.N. in perspective requires that we continually examine its operations as a changing force. On the anvil of experience there have been hammered out new concepts of U.N. capacities. The resolution for peace during the Korean crisis is a case in point. By transferring the weight of power from the Security Council to the General Assembly, the act likewise alters the relationship of our own national interests to that body. What was then regarded as a brilliant tactical victory for the United States has left in its wake some new headaches connected with our own veto power.

Also, the role of the United Nations which the exigencies of the Congo crisis have spelled out in recent years has materially altered the peace-enforcing role of this international body. These two illustrations are sufficient to remind us that it would be folly to look upon the U.N. with fixed concepts or as a static institution. Unless or until it responds to the forces of change and our attitudes toward it react the same way, those same changing forces will tear it apart. History teaches us nothing if not the inevitability of change.

If reason and wisdom are to prevail and the opportunity for a free interchange of ideas and alternatives, individual citizens—not statesmen and diplomats—are going to have to be willing to go to bat again for the cause of the United Nations. If we're going to the luxury of a division of opinion in plotting a direction for human affairs, it is necessary that we spike now these insidious rumors and deliberate misrepresentations of the issues at stake in today's world. This cannot be fought in the chambers of the United Nations; this cannot be dealt with in releases from the Department of State; this cannot be resolved in the Halls of Congress. This must be settled first of all on Main Street.

1. The next time you hear at your bridge club, or at Rotary, or at your coffee break some of the allegations referred to earlier in these remarks, do not avoid nailing them then and there. Too many of those of us who believe have been tempted to avoid controversy rather than to accept responsibility for correcting untruth.

2. Write a letter to your editor. Recent studies are conclusive that letters to the editor, particularly in our smalltown newspapers, have become an effective instrument for reaching the public mind. The hate mongers are busy perfecting this technique. It is time we fight back in kind.

3. Get on your local radio station. Get your organization to buy time, if necessary, to reply to the charges of the McIntyres, Billy Hargises, the Paul Harveys, and the Dan Smoots. It is not a question of denying the enemies of the U.N. an opportunity to be heard but rather whether we should forfeit the field to them through indifference. The U.N. and the cause of world peace do not speak for themselves; they have to be spoken for. Peace does not just happen; it has to be sought and its cause waged as vigorously as we wage war.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, does that conclude the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Is there additional morning business?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there additional morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

THE TFX CONTROVERSY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the interest of the good name of as able a public servant as we have had in the years I have worked in the legislative and executive branches of this Government, I will discuss briefly today a subject which recently has been the source of a great deal of publicity.

I refer to the current Senate investigation of the award by the Department of Defense of the so-called TFX contract to the General Dynamics Corp., instead of the Boeing Co.; and more specifically, to an article in the Washington Evening Star of March 20, entitled: "Gilpatric Relationship Probed in TFX Award—Senators Find Pentagon Official Was in Contract Winner's Law Firm."

A great many people already know of the extraordinary qualifications for his present position that are contained in the career of Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric.

In that he is one of the Nation's most prominent lawyers, it was only natural that he came to know well the managements of major companies in the aircraft and other industries, including both Boeing and General Dynamics. It is of interest that at various times he has done legal work for both these corporations; and as a result he became a friend of both William Allen, president of Boeing, and Frank Pace, then Secretary of the Army, later head of General Dynamics-Convair.

After returning in 1953 to his law firm, Cravath, Swaine & Moore, in which he was a senior partner, Mr. Gilpatric followed scrupulously the policy of never representing any member of the defense industry in matters having to do with the Defense Establishment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I conclude my statement before yielding to the able Senator from Nebraska, unless he prefers I yield at this time.

Mr. CURTIS. Before the Senator goes into other questions, I should like the distinguished Senator from Missouri to yield on the question of the law firm to which he has referred. If he does not wish to do so at this time, I shall wait.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would appreciate it if my friend would wait. Otherwise I must yield, of course, to other Senators.

Occasionally, however, Mr. Gilpatric did serve as an adviser on other matters for such concerns as Boeing and Convair.

For example, during 1957 and 1958, Mr. Gilpatric was asked by the Boeing Co. to assist in preparing its case against the Renegotiation Board in the U.S. Court of Claims; and in 1958 he appeared as a witness for Boeing in that proceeding, testifying as to Boeing's performance in the production of B–47 bombers on the basis of his knowledge of that program during the time he was with the Air Force in the years 1951–53.

Mr. Gilpatric also served as adviser to General Dynamics Corp. during 1959 and 1960 in connection with the acquisition of a business that was not connected with the aircraft industry.

Since formed in the early part of the 19th century, Secretary Gilpatric's law firm has represented many American corporations, both large and small, which have done business with the U.S. Military Establishment. Among the firm's clients are such companies as Bethlehem Steel, Newport News Shipbuilding, Westinghouse Electric, International Business Machine, Minneapolis-Honeywell, Fairchild Camera & Instrument, Perkin-Elmer Corp., Studebaker, Olin Mathieson Chemical.

Almost always the legal work done for such concerns by the Cravath firm does not include advice and assistance to them in connection with the sale to the Government of military equipment. In the case of General Dynamics, for example, his firm advises on certain corporate and financial matters; but has nothing to do with any military procurement activities of that corporation or its divisions, such as Canadair, Convair, and Electric Boat.

But to be sure he would have no conflict of interest, when Mr. Gilpatric entered Government service in 1951, and again in 1961, he withdrew from his firm and had no connection with it during the entire period of his Government service.

In addition, his prior firm association, as well as the nature of its legal work, were made a matter of public record each time he was confirmed unanimously by the Senate Armed Services Committee, and later by the Senate itself.

With such a record of accomplishment, it is saddening to feel constrained to rise in defense of such a public servant.

Actually, this defense also constitutes a defense of scores of others who have come into Government from private life; and also citizens who, we can only hope, will in the future be willing to make the same type and character of sacrifice in undertaking Government service as has been characteristic of the career of Roswell Gilpatric.

Let us look for a minute at past history with respect to the careers of his predecessors.

Since its inception, this Nation has had in all over 100 military Secretaries; that is, Secretaries of War, Navy, Army, Air Force, and Defense.

Over two-thirds of these public servants have had a professional background, mostly the legal profession.

Amonk the latter have been such Secretaries of War as Elihu Root, Newton D. Baker, Henry L. Stimson, Louis Johnson, and Kenneth Royall.

There have also been a number of military Secretaries chosen from the investment banking profession, such as James Forrestal, Robert Lovett, and Thomas Gates.

Coming as they often have from large legal or banking firms, professional men of this type have usually had associations with broad sectors of American business, including those elements which serve the Defense Establishment.

It is a fact that it would be well nigh impossible to select a man for a Defense secretaryship from either a large law firm or banking firm who had not had some previous connection with a client doing business with the Military Establishment.

The question then may be asked: Does this state of affairs give rise to a conflict-of-interest problem comparable to that in the case of an individual who comes to the Defense Department from a corporation doing business with the military? In the latter case, however, any "conflict of interest" has been avoided by having the appointee, as a condition to acceptance of his office, divest himself of any financial interest or other connection with the business he is leaving to enter Government service.

In the case of professional men accepting Presidential appointments in the Defense Department, it has been considered proper to require that the individuals sever their relationships with their firms, afer a disclosure of the nature of the business carried on by such firms.

Thus, in the case of Secretary Gilpatric, when he appeared before the Senate Committee on Armed Services for the hearing on his confirmation on January 17, 1961, he made the following statement prior to the committee's approval of his nomination:

> Now, I did not submit to the committee any financial statement, because, I am sorry to say, I do not own beneficially any securities in any corporation.
>
> In that respect I, unhappily, do not have a conflict-of-interest problem.
>
> I do, however, want to explain to the committee my situation with respect to my law firm, because I have been a member for 20 years, except for the time I was in Government, of a firm that has served many large companies, small companies, that have done business with the Defense Department.
>
> Before I take office, if I am confirmed, I will retire, of course, from that firm, and I will have no financial or other interest in it, except that I will be paid sums of money that will represent my interest in work that was done before I left the firm; not large sums of money, but sums that represent the unbilled and uncollected work of the firm for past periods.
>
> But, I repeat, I will have no interest whatsoever in the future business of the firm, and I will sever my connection with it.

If these steps—namely, withdrawal from his law firm and disclosure of the fact that the firm's clients include companies doing business with the Defense Department—do not meet any conflicts of interest problem, no professional man with the extraordinary background of Mr. Gilpatric could ever qualify for appointment to a statutory position in the Department of Defense.

In this respect, Gilpatric's position is no different whatever from that of many of his distinguished predecessors, including his own former partner, John J. McCloy, who left the Cravath firm in 1939, to become Assistant Secretary of War under Secretary Stimson.

The latter, considered one of the greatest of all Secretaries, also came from a large New York law firm, one which numbered among its clients many concerns doing business with the Defense Department.

So much for Roswell Gilpatric, who, after these widely published stories implying, if not asserting, a conflict of interest, can receive little reward for his long and distinguished public career beyond the inner gratification which is the right of any man who knows he has served his country well.

Now as to other aspects of this TFX award.

Let me say first what I am sure all my colleagues know, namely: in no sense are these remarks to be considered any criticism of any member of the Senate Permanent Investigating Subcommittee on Investigations. There is no one in the Senate for whom I have greater respect and affection than I do for its chairman, the senior Senator from Arkansas. I served with him for many years on this committee, and know firsthand of his paramount desire to be fair and just at all times. I have the same high respect and regard for the ranking member of his committee, the very able Senator from Washington.

With that premise, and because of my growing apprehension as to what these hearings could well be doing to the true defense posture of the United States, I take the liberty of presenting a few additional thoughts.

As one who, in 1946, was assigned by the Secretary of War the task of monitoring with the Congress the original National Defense Act of 1947; and who has participated, in some fashion, in the subsequent changes in this act of 1949, 1953, and most important, 1958, I well remember that, each time the question of the structure of the organization of the Department of Defense came up for review, invariably the investigation made by the Congress resulted in this body concluding that the Secretary of Defense needed more authority to properly conduct the operations of his office; and as a result, many of the original restraints on his authority have been removed.

At this point the record should show that, as of now, and as the result of a law passed by the Congress, the Secretary of Defense has "direction, authority, and control" over the conduct of our Military Establishment.

The statute clearly spells out this authority. Therefore why this formal, continued, and intense scrutiny of his decision, which decision followed the recommendations of three of his four chief civilian heads—Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilpatric, Secretary of the Navy Korth, and Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert—the fourth, the Secretary of the Army, was not connected with the matter.

But regardless of what the Service Secretaries thought, or any member of the military, the Secretary of Defense was the only person who could make the decision in this case; because the decision involved the assignment of the development of a weapon system to one service, the Air Force, for operational use by two services, the Air Force and the Navy.

The National Security Act vests the responsibility for this type of decision directly in the Secretary of Defense. Moreover, it is the Secretary of Defense who recommends to the President and the Congress the budget for the Department. Only he can make a decision having budgetary implications in excess of $6 billion.

If this is true, even if a mistake in judgment has been made—and I do not believe any such mistake was made—the right of decision was clearly that of the Secretary of Defense.

That is the law, and anybody who opposes that position opposes the law.

There is another aspect of this matter which worries me even more, however.

Some of us have differed with the present Secretary of Defense on matters of judgment—on at least one occasion that has been true of myself. Differences in matters of judgment, however, and a formal effort to reverse a major policy decision on the grounds the Secretary has exceeded his authority, are two entirely different subjects.

If every time a disgruntled contractor, or a party in interest with a disgruntled contractor, does not obtain a contract on which the contractor has bid, a congressional investigation is thereupon requested, then much, if not most, of the time of those responsible for our defense policies—in this most critical world of

today—must be taken up in justifying an administrative decision.

It is not paradoxical that the company involved, Boeing, has received more business from the Department of Defense than any airplane company in the history of the United States.

In the 11 years, 1951 to 1961 inclusive, Boeing received from the U.S. Government $11,818,900,000.

From that business, Boeing earned a net profit of $907,700,000.

And that is not all. In addition to this tremendous amount of defense business, during these 11 years Boeing obtained $1,346,400,000 of commercial business. On this latter business they earned some $90 million.

This commercial business, on which they also profited, was primarily a fallout from their military work. Much of their outstanding success, commercially, has been the 707 series of airliners, a fallout from the B–52 bomber—as the leader in the Senate in the field of domestic aviation, my able colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], well knows, along with the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

In addition, they have the Minuteman program, and the Dyna-Soar, and have just received an order from the space agency, NASA, for some half a billion dollars.

Now let me turn to another aspect of the problem.

Of equal importance is what the continuation of this investigation could do to the security of the country; to our capacity to resist the obviously growing danger of Communist aggressions, from all over the world.

Anyone with experience in the military knows it is vital, under our system, that there be a proper relationship of mutual trust and respect between those who devote their lives to a military career, and those appointed under the statute to be the civilian leaders of the military.

One of the basic principles of our Government is civilian control over the military; but that control, whether real or apparent, means little or nothing from the standpoint of adequate defense unless there is mutual respect on both sides.

From many sources one hears that these hearings are now breaking down the normal mutual trust and respect between the military and its civilian leadership; and those of us in this body who have had some military experience know that morale is a priceless asset in case military action is ever forced upon us.

If these four able and dedicated Americans cannot be permitted to handle these defense problems in accordance with the law, how can we ever obtain those civilian leaders with proper experience and background, especially when recognizing the great personal sacrifices involved for them?

Despite the eminence of these civilian heads in their own communities, and in the Nation as a whole, they are now being held up to public criticism and censure because they exercised their right of judgment, under the law.

It goes further. People in my State are now asking me if lack of integrity is involved in this award.

If men who give up what these men have given up in order to serve their country in peacetime, run the risk of not only having their judgment but also their integrity attacked, what chance will there be to continue to obtain the talent vital to the security of our Nation?

I have read the statement of the Secretary of Defense; and, based on his position, I believe he made the correct decision, not only from the standpoint of the Military Establishment, in which I have had some experience, but also from the standpoint of the American taxpayer.

Even if he and his principal associates did not, however, make the correct decision, it was still their right, under the law this Congress passed; and that fact cannot be overemphasized.

In closing, Mr. President, may I say with greatest respect to all those involved, that I believe each day this attack on our civilian leaders of the Defense Establishment continues, the morale of the Armed Forces is further lowered; and such a result can only be detrimental to the security of the United States.

Therefore because of all the reasons previously mentioned and especially because of the obvious necessity for us to cope with current Communist aggression, I would hope whatever the decision, that decision be reached expeditiously and these hearings be concluded.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to my beloved colleague the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do I correctly understand that the distinguished Senator from Missouri was not criticizing the committee for its investigation?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is right. I am not criticizing the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do I correctly understand it is the view of the distinguished Senator from Missouri that this investigation should not continue?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No. Let me say to the distinguished chairman I believe it should be continued. I hope it can be concluded as expeditiously as possible, because I believe it is detrimental to our security, since in my opinion it is reducing the morale of the Armed Forces. The able chairman of the committee and I agree on most things, and I know he wants me to express my opinion.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he thinks it would be well, under all the circumstances and the apprehensions that have been expressed, for the Senate simply to adopt a resolution directing that the hearings be ended and that no further proceedings be held thereunder.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No. Any such action would be implied criticism of the able and distinguished Senator from Arkansas. He knows of my devotion to him. We have differences of opinion in some matters with respect to this particular case. But I hope he will continue with his investigation. He is fair and just.

I hope, as soon as the chairman interrogates the man who, under the law, had the right to make the decision, the committee will find this decision was proper.

May I add that one of the mistakes in the Department of Defense—and many have been made—is that it felt it would be better for the Secretary of Defense to postpone his appearance. I have heard this from both sides. So if there has been any delay in calling the Secretary of Defense, it had nothing to do with the chairman. He offered to accede to the wishes of the Secretary.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I do not want to take the time of the Senate. I want to go back to the hearings. I am trying to expedite them. If my friend will yield to me for this one observation, he speaks of the military being under attack and the Defense Department being under attack. I hope it has not come to the point that if the Congress, or an arm of the Senate, under its duty as spelled out in the law, undertakes to perform that duty and inquires how that decision was arrived at, what was taken into account, whether or not the other bid or offer was valid, as good, or better—such inquiry will be characterized as an attack. If so, the Senate has authorized that attack. I do not believe it comes properly within that context.

I have done a great deal of investigating as a representative of this body. I have tried to be fair. I appreciate the Senator's having just said that I offered to let Secretary McNamara appear first and put his case before the committee and the country before any other testimony was heard. Immediately when he felt he ought to, he had his opportunity. He is offering it this afternoon and, further, implementing a statement he sent to the committee, which the committee received when he was not able to appear earlier. I think the committee is carrying out its mandate.

If it is not, the Senate can control it. It can pass a resolution and tell the committee to cease and desist in this inquiry. If it will do that, it will relieve the chairman, and I am sure other members of the committee, from a very heavy responsibility. If we make mistakes, people have a right to criticize us. If I do something that is wrong, let them criticize me. I am willing to do the best I can. I welcome criticism when I make mistakes. I do not believe that all criticism is malicious. I do not regard it that way. I welcome constructive criticism. I do believe that this committee is either carrying out the will of the Senate, and serving as an arm of the Senate, and performing a duty that it is under mandate to perform, or it is beyond its jurisdiction, and it has launched out on something in which the Senate is not interested and in which the country is not interested. If we are doing that, the Senate has a responsibility to act and to pass a resolution directing that the committee desist from further proceedings.

That is all I want to say, Mr. President. Until the Senate does that, I shall do my duty as I see it, and that is to proceed with the hearings. I shall certainly proceed with them expeditiously.

Right before me, in the newspaper, I read of complaints about witnesses being mistreated. This committee is meeting at night in order to expedite the hearings. It is interrogating witnesses at night in order to expedite the business of the committee. I am going to stand by the committee until it can be shown that we are doing something wrong. I will stand behind the staff until it can be shown that they are doing something wrong. One member of the staff has served the committee for 16 years. He served under the present Attorney General. He is one of the top men. I do not believe that he has any such characteristics as he is being criticized for. The other member of the staff who is under criticism here is on loan from the General Accounting Office. He is a humble fellow. I never heard him raise his voice or saw him do anything improper in his work for the committee.

We might just as well get down to these things right here on the floor. If the Senate does not have confidence in the committee, it should withdraw its authority. This is not a pleasant thing. I get no pleasure out of doing hard work.

The Senator speaks about the country and about what is happening.

I say to the Senator that there is enough of a question raised here that the matter ought to be cleared up, and that the country wants it cleared up, in my judgment. I will do the best I can. I say that when all the facts are in, the record will justify the committee's being sustained in the action it has taken. If we do not get all the facts, we will get other reports which will do a great deal of harm. It is like the reports that are made to members of the press but with the admonition, "You cannot quote me. You must not say where this comes from." Yet it comes from the Pentagon. When I want to criticize anyone, or cast aspersions against anyone in Government, I never resort to going under cover or hiding behind that kind of stratagem.

Let us hope that there is nothing wrong in all this, and that at most it is a case of bad judgment or a difference of opinion. Let us hope that is all there is to it. In the meantime, I will carry out the will of the Senate. That is all I want to say.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I will be glad to yield, but first let me say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that I am grateful for his remarks. I join him in feeling that these background press conferences are dangerous. They have been going on for some time, ever since 1946 at least, when I first went to the Pentagon. They are held in order to help the press get all the story.

I am worried about the fact the Deputy Secretary of Defense said this morning that statements attributed to him by some members of the press—and he emphasized there were only some members—were at variance with what he had said.

In all my experience in government I have never known a man of higher character, or greater ability, than Roswell Gilpatric. That is one of the chief reasons I am making these remarks today. I also have complete respect and confidence in the distinguished chairman of the committee.

But I do believe, because of the turn of events, all this is affecting the morale of the Armed Forces. I am grateful to him for saying that he will conduct these hearings as expeditiously as possible. In my statement today there is no implication or criticism that he has not done so.

I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. In urging that the hearings proceed expeditiously and that they be ended soon, does the Senator suggest that they be ended before all the facts are in?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No, I do not.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator will yield further——

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have had some experience in the aviation industry. As long as the Senator has raised this point, I believe it is possible that I know as much about the aviation industry as most Members of the Senate. This is a technical discussion. It involves wing structure, overall performance. These are always very difficult problems to analyze in detail. Therefore, what we are doing is criticizing the judgment of the Secretary of Defense. The able Senator from Nebraska is a lawyer. What I am saying is that, even if the Secretary of Defense has made a mistake—and I have studied the record, and based on my experience I do not believe he has, but even if he has made a mistake, we, the Congress, passed a law, the National Security Act of 1947, which we further amended in 1958, and that law gives him the right to make that mistake. I do not say he did. I do not believe he did.

I say to the Senator from Nebraska, who represents a great State, the center of our Strategic Air Force, that the basis of our Military Establishment under the Constitution is civilian control. I would be a little nervous if the Secretary had gone against all his civilian advisers when he made this decision. But he did not do so. Every one of his leading civilian advisers involved in this decision recommended, without any reservation of any kind, that he make the decision which he did make.

I might add that the military board, in its final presentation to civilian authority, said that either one of these airplanes could do the job for which it was designed.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator does not believe the hearing should be ended until all the facts are in. Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I answered that question before when the Senator raised it; of course not.

Mr. CURTIS. Has the distinguished Senator from Missouri read the classified hearings?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not know what classified hearings the Senator is referring to. Through the courtesy and fairness of the Senator from Arkansas, the chairman of the committee, the members of the Military Preparedness Subcommittee were not only invited to attend the hearings, but were allowed to ask questions of the witnesses. I have attended as many hearings as I could, and read as much of the proceedings as I could. I also have an expert aeronautical engineer on my staff, who has studied the hearings. I have interrogated witnesses before the committee. Let me assure the Senator from Nebraska that I have done my best to understand the subject.

Mr. CURTIS. I might say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that I have noticed him at the hearings. I wish he could be there all the time. Before I came to the floor today I inquired of the chief clerk of the committee if anyone had withdrawn copies of the hearings to read. I was informed that not one Senator has asked for them. I inquired of the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gilpatric, this morning, if any person other than the people connected with the Department of Defense had received classified copies of the hearings. He said that to his knowledge they had not.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I was there when that was said.

Mr. CURTIS. I noticed what the Senator said about the employment of the law firm. He read some material similar to the statement made by Mr. Gilpatric this morning, which was that in 1957 and 1958, Mr. Gilpatric performed legal services for Boeing. Also, Mr. Gilpatric's statement said that in 1959 and 1960, while he was a member of that firm, he performed services for General Dynamics.

It is also true—and I might ask the Senator if he is aware of it—that upon my cross-examination of Mr. Gilpatric, we found that there had been no employment by Boeing since 1938——

Mr. SYMINGTON. Since 1958.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, 1958, almost 5 years ago; and upon cross examination, Mr. Gilpatric told us that the firm now—in 1963—is employed by General Dynamics.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What is the point?

Mr. CURTIS. It was employed in 1962 and 1961.

Mr. SYMINGTON. So what?

Mr. CURTIS. His statement referred only to 1959 and 1960.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator imply that Mr. Gilpatric's statement was disingenuous; that he was trying to conceal facts? What is the purpose of the interrogation of the Senator?

Mr. CURTIS. The purpose of the interrogation is to point out that as of this hour the firm is employed by General Dynamics and has been since 1959; and that the current employment by General Dynamics was brought about by the effort of Mr. Gilpatric while he was in the firm.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I want to check the record carefully. I heard what the distinguished Deputy Secretary of Defense stated this morning. He is one of the ablest and most patriotic men I have ever known. He was Under Secretary of the Air Force when the Secretary of the Army was Mr. Frank Pace. He also told

the Senator from Nebraska, as he did the rest of us, that the founder of General Dynamics was previously a member of the law firm of Cravath, and that therefore he obviously had absolutely nothing to do with originating the relationships. The fact is that General Dynamics Corp., due in part to the success of the Boeing Co., lost more money, to the best of my knowledge, than any company ever lost on a program in the history of the free world. That is sad but true and is partly attributed to the superiority of the 707 and the 727 to other planned commercial aircraft.

Nevertheless, if the Senator from Nebraska feels that inasmuch as the former Secretary of the Army, an able and patriotic public servant who was previously Director of the Bureau of the Budget, had an opportunity to learn of the vision, ability, and skill of the Under Secretary of the Air Force of that time, and who later went back to practice law in New York—if the Senator from Nebraska feels that the former Secretary of the Army later, in private business, on his own, trying to make money for his company, made a mistake either in ethics, propriety, or intelligence, when he requested the current distinguished Deputy Secretary of Defense, who was then in private practice, to help him with his problem, as great a problem as any I know of in the history of private business in this country, I cannot agree.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator from Missouri believe that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] would proceed with an investigation because Boeing or any other company was, as the Senator has stated, "a disgruntled bidder"?

Mr. SYMINGTON. A few minutes ago I gave my opinion on that to the Senator from Arkansas. He is one of the closest friends I have in the Senate or anywhere else, a dedicated and devoted patriot. I do not in any way criticize the establishment of these hearings; nor in turn would he ever suggest to me that I could not come on the floor of the Senate and tell him, with great respect, what I felt was going on as a result of the hearings. In any case, I fully support the hearings.

All I said was, first, that I deeply regretted the implied press attacks made against one of the ablest and most patriotic men I have ever known in Government, and second, I hoped that, inasmuch as this subject is boiling over and a subject of discussion in hundreds of military establishments all over the world, they could be concluded as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator did refer to these hearings, and stated that Boeing was a "disgruntled bidder." Is it the intention of the distinguished Senator from Missouri to suggest that this investigation is being carried on because the Boeing Co. was a disappointed or "disgruntled bidder"?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Presumably, this investigation is being carried on because someone objected to this award not being made to the Boeing Co. Inasmuch as my able friend from Nebraska is a member of the committee, he probably knows more about that than I.

Mr. CURTIS. I should say, in response to that statement, that many military people, civilians who are not connected with either company, competent aeronautical engineers, and others, are greatly disturbed over the decision that was made.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As a former Assistant Secretary of War and former Secretary, I am not surprised that some of the military in uniform object to some decisions made by those civilians who, under our Constitution and the statute, have the right of decision.

Mr. CURTIS. Still, I cannot reconcile the position of the distinguished Senator from Missouri by citing all the millions of dollars of business which Boeing has received as a reason why this investigation should not go on.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I never cited that as a reason why the investigation should not continue.

Mr. CURTIS. What was the purpose of reciting the business that Boeing received? What does that show?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think it shows that the Boeing Co. in the past had been treated fairly; that the Boeing Co. at present, with the Minuteman, is being treated fairly; and that the Boeing Co. in the future, if the Dyna-Soar goes into production, as I hope it will, will have been treated fairly.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I am sure the Senator from Missouri will agree that the amount of business which a company has is certainly not a relevant basis for the consideration of the decision whether an award of a contract should be made.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No, it is not. The only reason I mentioned it was that I have heard people felt the Boeing Co. was treated unfairly. All I can say is that the Boeing Co. has obtained nearly $11 billion in business in the last 11 years, and I think that would show it has not been treated unfairly.

When Skybolt was cancelled, the Boeing Co. received a heavy addition to their already heavy Minuteman schedule.

I hope the Senator from Washington will join with me—and I am sure he does—in the hope Dyna-Soar will continue.

I have also learned recently that NASA has given Boeing a half-billion-dollar space order.

Mr. JACKSON. I suggest that that statement is not relevant to anything which the committee is considering. If we are to say that a company which has a good business record is to be discounted in the consideration of Government contracts, if we say that the awarding of a contract is not to be decided on the merits, that is a sad day. But since the Senator has raised this question, I ask him, Who is the largest holder of defense contracts today?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Over the last 11 years——

Mr. JACKSON. That is not the question. Who is the largest holder of defense contracts, excluding this TFX contract?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not know. If the Senator from Washington knows, I hope he will tell us.

Mr. JACKSON. It is General Dynamics. I did not want to bring this up. I do not see why the Senator wishes to inject irrelevant questions into the particular hearing we are considering. The committee is trying to decide this question on the merits, simply to get the facts. If there is any real criticism, the Senator, who is of course an invited member of the committee can ask questions. To my knowledge, he has not attended the hearings all the time. Probably he could not have done so.

But I would suggest that those complaints be directed in the committee, where he has a chance to ask the questions and to get the information.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not think the Senator from Washington was on the floor to hear all my statement, else he would better understand my position and my respect for him.

Mr. JACKSON. I am sorry that I came in a little late.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I understand. With all due respect to my friend, the Senator from Washington, who knows how fond I am of him, and how much I respect him, I still will say what I believe.

Mr. JACKSON. Of course the Senator from Missouri can say what he wants to say. But let me ask whether he condones the attacks made by an unknown accuser against the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and myself.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No. Before the Senator from Washington entered the Chamber, I expressed my opinion about the unfortunate aspects of these anonymous statements. I would never condone an attack on the Senator from Washington, because in my judgment he is one of the most able Members of the Senate, one who knows as much as any Senator about the functioning of the executive and legislative branches.

However, I do not appreciate the attacks made on a long-time friend of mine, whom perhaps I had something to do with persuading to return to Government service. I think he is as honorable as any Member of this body.

Mr. JACKSON. I have not made any attacks on him; but he did make an attack on me, and it was made from an anonymous platform. I do not mind attacks on me, but I should like to know who my accuser is.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I listened to the Secretary's statement this morning. It is my understanding of the record—of course the record will speak for itself—that Mr. Gilpatric said he did not attack the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, I shall not go into that matter now; the record will be made available to the press, and the record will speak for itself.

But I think it unfortunate to have such a development occur, when it could have been avoided by the Pentagon. On the very day when these news stories came out, the Pentagon had an opportunity to repudiate them; but the Pentagon did not do so until representatives of the Pentagon were required to come before the committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, if I were in the position of the very able Senator from Washington, I would feel incensed about this matter, especially after the publication of some of the articles he showed to me. The last thing I would want to do would be to criticize him.

As I said before he came to the floor, these background press conferences have been going on in the Pentagon ever since I came here—1945, 18 years ago. That is done in an effort to help the press with their problem of getting the truth to the people—all truth which will not help a possible enemy.

I feel that one good coming from these hearings is the indication that perhaps these press conferences should be abolished. Based on the testimony of the Deputy Secretary of Defense, at least someone in that group did not carry out what the Secretary of Defense called the ground rules.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield again to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator from Missouri is concerned with the reputations of people. Does he not think that, in fairness, he should also criticize high officials in the Pentagon who make such statements? I do not refer to statements about the background of defense problems, as such; but they should not make personal attacks, such as those which appeared in the press, attacking the integrity or the character of the chairman of the committee [Mr. McClellan] or of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Of course I agree that should not occur.

Mr. JACKSON. Of course it should not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to speak only briefly.

First, I desire to have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], who surely is highly regarded by all the Members of this body, as are also the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington]. I believe it fair to say that what disturbed the Senator from Missouri was the making of charges and countercharges which did not provide any information on the issue into which the committee itself seeks to probe. I believe it can well be stated now that the Senator from Missouri has not proposed that the hearings not be conducted. To the contrary, in the course of his cross-examination by the chairman of the committee, the Senator said the hearings should be conducted.

I wish to say that the chairman of the committee is working day and night, as we know; and any Senator who has served at any time on that committee knows that its chairmanship is handled with great intelligence, honor, and integrity.

I say most respectfully to my colleagues that it would be well if we could subdue the kind of personal invective which seems to be developing, because that has nothing to do with the issue.

Let me state that before the Senator from Washington entered the Chamber, the Senator from Missouri pointed out, several times, that the anonymous statements which came from the Pentagon were uncalled for. Furthermore, as was pointed out by the Senator from Arkansas, the complaint made against the committee staff is without merit and is uncalled for, and every Senator resents it.

This is the important point which we need to develop. This is what the Senator from Missouri has said very well.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The important point which we need to develop is that the civilian authorities had a right to make the judgment. They may have made an incorrect judgment; that point is yet to be determined. But the law gives them this responsibility, and the civilian authorities should be respected in the position they take under the law, even if the committee itself arrives at a determination that bad judgment was exercised.

What the Senator from Missouri is rightly worried about is that a person of the character of Mr. Gilpatric would be smeared by innuendoes going back and forth in connection with a law firm with which he has been associated. I am not a lawyer; but Members of the Senate who have been associated with law firms certainly should be able to return to those firms after their Government service is terminated. Certainly if one serves in the Department of Defense at a salary of $22,000 or $25,000, and if he lives in Washington, D.C., he had better have another job to return to—either that, or be prepared to find himself heavily in debt.

It is also difficult for a Senator to live here on the salary he receives.

I believe the Senator from Missouri is making a plea that this investigation be allowed to go on without interruption and without personal invectives. I believe he is also making a plea to stand by the statute law of the country—namely, that in connection with interservice and interagency disputes, the Department of Defense and its Secretary have authority to make the final determination. What is wrong with that?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to thank the assistant majority leader, who is a member of the committee. What he has said certainly should be done. But if, every day, we are to be confronted with anonymous statements coming from the Pentagon or with statements which, when we ask about them, those in the Pentagon admit had no basis of fact, but apparently were issued in an effort to influence the committee in some way or to deter it from doing its duty, I will not know how to proceed.

All that we in the committee want is to obtain the facts which attended the making of the award; that is all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield again to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think now the Pentagon has issued some mismanaged news.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Part of it was concealed news. I think the authors of these statements should be made known.

I thank the Senator from Missouri. I know of his patriotic service to the country and of his desire to protect our interests. All we want is to have the committee protected. If Senators do not favor that, they can say so.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield again to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I support the Senator from Arkansas. I would be the last who would want to indulge in personal invective in connection with such a matter.

I have the highest regard for the senior Senator from Missouri. Over the years he and I have worked together on these questions. I do say that we have a duty in the committee to make an honest judicial review. Unfortunately, all of this trouble really started across the river when the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Information and Public Affairs, Mr. Sylvester, cut loose with a shotgun charge against every member of the committee but one, alleging self-interest. The incident occurred on one weekend, and was handled on a managed platform basis. The following weekend we received a charge on an anonymous basis against the chairman and against myself.

I think that is rather sad. If there are smears, it is clear where they started. I think the time has come that when a question is to be raised about any individual or issue, it should be done out in the open and in the proper way. I am sure that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Missouri, feels that way. At least most of this controversy could be avoided.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It was a very poor job of public relations. The Senator knows I feel that way since I told him before. I agree on that point without reservation.

Mr. JACKSON. I have known Mr. Gilpatric for many, many years. He served in the Department of the Air Force, I believe as Under Secretary, from 1951 to 1953. I am sure he would desire that this matter be handled in the same fair and just way.

I merely hope and trust that the developments that have occurred will be avoided in the future insofar as personal invective is concerned. We do have a responsibility to review the acts of civilians as well as the military. Civilians can be wrong; the military can be wrong. But I must say that while the Secretary of Defense has the final say-so on the question involved, I do believe that the American people have a right to know whether his judgment was sound. We should know, not whether he was fallible, as we all are, but whether there really was an abuse of his authority. That statement applies to the military as well as to the civilians. That is what we are trying to do, and there is no other desire.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As far as abuse of authority is concerned, I cannot agree.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not possible for a civilian to abuse his authority?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The military said that both of those companies could do the job. The question was one of commonness, a decision between the Air Force, Navy, Defense, and the civilian heads.

As I understand under the law, in the matter of procurement, the civilian leader of the Pentagon, the Secretary of Defense, has the right to make the decision. In this case he followed the unanimous recommendation of his civilian leaders. If he was wrong—and I believe that is the only point on which the able Senator from Washington and I differ—at least he, McNamara, did what he believed was right under the law from his standpoint.

Mr. JACKSON. I did not say that he abused his authority.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thought the Senator felt he did.

Mr. JACKSON. I said that we have a right to investigate and determine whether he abused his authority. I do not think the fact that he is acting under a statute which gives him final authority means that we cannot question the judgment that went into the use of that authority. Surely if we reached that point, it would be civilian dictatorship, and I do not believe the Senator wished to leave that impression.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not want to see any form of dictatorship. As a result of some unfortunate experiences, in which I had a participating part, we passed a law which gave the Secretary of Defense the authority to use his judgment to make the final decision in a matter of this character.

I want to associate myself with respect to the integrity of Mr. McNamara in the same way that I have Mr. Gilpatric. He may have made a mistake, but he did what he thought was right. And he followed the recommendations of many of his assistants in the doing of it. I am sorry this action is not approved by everyone, but in any case he had the right under the law to do what he did. That is my major point.

Mr. JACKSON. I am not attacking the integrity of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, or the integrity of the Deputy Secretary of Defense. I am maintaining—and surely I cannot believe my friend disagrees with this statement—that we have the right to investigate to determine whether there has been an abuse of discretion by the Secretary of Defense. Surely he does not believe that we do not have that right or authority.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree we have the authority. I only regret the matter of the integrity of the Deputy Secretary of Defense has been in the press; and inasmuch as I believe these hearings are now affecting the morale of the armed services, I felt it obligatory for me to present respectfully my position. I know that my friend from Washington, with whom I have worked for so many years, would grant me that privilege.

Mr. JACKSON. I fully agree, but at the same time two Senators—the senior Senator from Arkansas and the junior Senator from Washington—were involved in the question, too. I share the high regard of the Senator from Missouri for people who are endeavoring to serve in a very difficult spot in the Department of Defense. But surely we have the right to conduct a judicial type of inquiry such as the chairman of the committee is endeavoring to do. That is all I have to say.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the able Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator. He has been very patient. The distinguished Senator from Missouri has a very wide acquaintance among military personnel and civilians who are interested in and are familiar with our defense program. Does the Senator state that the decision that was made did not adversely affect morale?

Mr. SYMINGTON. My answer to that is that some of the people in the military feel the decision was correct. Others feel the decision was wrong. I would illustrate my answer: During World War II, before I came into the Government, it was my job to put armament on airplanes, in this country and in England. Airplanes were first designed without any guns. As a result, they had magnificent performance. The only trouble was nobody would fight them until guns were put on, so the performance was always reduced when guns were added. When that happened, the people in the armament division were pleased, but flying people were often displeased.

We will always have disagreements in the military, not only with relation to types of decisions by the Secretary of Defense like those to which we are referring—and I say this with great respect for the military—but also because the military often do not like the exercise of civilian control.

Mr. CURTIS. My question was not whether there was disagreement. My question was whether or not the disagreement had hurt morale. There is great evidence that it did.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think the Senator is correct. Some people in the military feel very deeply about this matter. They thought a mistake had been made. It was their right to feel that way. There are also people in the military who felt a mistake had not been made. As I see it, since we had in the past such disagreements—the famous B–36 hearings, when the Secretary of Defense could not cork the bottle with decision—that was one of the reasons why, in 1958, we gave direction, authority, and control to the Secretary; so when such differences arose between various segments of the military, or between the military and the civilians, the Secretary could say, "This is it"—just as would the head of any other business, using stockholders' money, would arrive at a decision.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The distinguished Senator from Missouri has discussed the activities of our committee primarily in two sections. One was a defense of the integrity of Deputy Under Secretary Gilpatric. In the other section he commented upon some of the activities of the committee and its investigation of the situation here. So that we may proceed, I should like to make a couple of comments in each area. I ask unanimous consent that I may make the comments not in the form of a question, and then let the Senator from Missouri rejoin me.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to yield first for a question by the able Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. MUNDT. That is all right.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Could we finish our colloquy?

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to have the Senator from Missouri in the Chamber when I make my statement.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I assure my friend I shall be in the Chamber.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will yield to me before he concludes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the statement made by my distinguished colleague and friend, the senior Senator from Missouri, as well as the colloquy which he has had with my friend the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], who is one the most distinguished committee chairmen the Senate has ever had.

By voicing, as he has, in such a fair and dispassionate way, many of the details involved, which help to add knowledge with respect to the magnitude of the question and the problem involved, and by outlining the authority which Congress has seen fit to transfer to one man in order to obtain a joint service operation when that is necessary, I feel that the senior Senator from Missouri has rendered a genuine service. The subject has been handled, I think, in a most dispassionate way.

I should like to join the Senator from Missouri. I express not only my confidence in him, in the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], and in the other Members of this body, but also my confidence in those fine men who have been the pride of this administration. I speak of the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara and Mr. Gilpatric.

If anyone wishes to call whatever this "dead cat" that has been thrown in, in some way, a conflict of interest, I merely say that the only way we could avoid that situation would be by not having competent men handling the problem. We should have competent men handling it. We could, of course, perhaps find some lawyer in New York City who does not have any clients, who does not have any practice, who does not have any experience in industrial operations. It seems to me that that would go far beyond the bounds of propriety.

The committee is not guilty of anything. It has been construed by the press that because a man is a partner in a New York firm and because one of its clients is perhaps a very small portion of the package of business, and is a successful bidder, that something irregular is involved. Such a situation, however, does not make anybody a crook or a conspirator. It merely means that the man is a member of a firm, from which firm he resigned and to which firm he has not belonged for the past 2½ years.

We would do a great disservice, it seems to me, if we need competent men to handle a business running $52 billion a year, if we were supercritical of them in the press, or if there were intimations that they have committed some wrong.

I think that Mr. McNamara and Mr. Gilpatric are two of the finest men I have ever seen in Government. They are dedicated men. If they have made a mistake, they are, of course, subject to criticism. Certainly, the Senator from Missouri and I and every other Member of the Senate knows that if a mistake was made it was not a mistake of integrity but a mistake, perhaps, in understanding all of the ramifications involved.

I for one think this project is a good concept. There will be billions of dollars saved if we can have one common plane which can be modified slightly to serve both the Navy and the Air Force. This is an approach through which real economy can develop. The Senator from Missouri knows, as I know, that the bid by the low bidder for whatever is involved in the initial prototype is a mere fraction of what will be involved in the total.

By this bid this company has won the right for the follow-on, if a large quantity of these planes is later to be purchased.

I think this was a deal which was very carefully studied. I, for one, join in expressing my vote of confidence for the able men who run the Department of Defense.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank my able colleague the senior Senator from Oklahoma. He has said, in a very few words what it took me many more words to say this afternoon.

There is one point I should like to make for my friend from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt]. I in no way criticized either the handling of the contract or the conduct of the committee. I do not think the Senator from South Dakota was in the Chamber when I started my remarks. I said that I hoped the hearings would be ended as soon as possible.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have read the Senator's statement in its entirety. On that basis I desire to question the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS rose.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he concludes?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania, and then I shall yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator for his most mature, well-mannered, and excellent remarks, delivered without rancor and without controversy.

Last week I took the floor of the Senate to defend the Secretary of Defense. I am happy to see that the Senator from Missouri, who is far better qualified than I in this area, is also defending the President's Secretary of Defense. I hope that others who belong to the President's party will feel the same way about the matter.

I wonder if the Senator has had occasion to see, in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, the very interesting article written by Walter Lippmann entitled "McNamara and the TFX"?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I did see it. After having read it, I was especially gratified to note the appropriate compliment paid to the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I find myself in complete agreement with the statements made not only by the Senator from Missouri, but also by Mr. Lippmann in his column. I wonder if the Senator would permit me to ask unanimous consent to have the column printed in the Record.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I so request, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

McNamara and the TFX

(By Walter Lippmann)

After swimming around for a while in the sea of technical detail of the TFX argument, I emerged dripping with facts and wondering, since there is so much that I do not understand, whether there is anything which I am entitled to write about. However, while I have nothing to say about the use of titanium, of thrust reversers in supersonic flight, or even about high inlet ducts in the propulsion system, there is, I think, a simple and important question at the heart of the argument between Secretary McNamara and his critics.

There are, as I see it, no villains involved, and there is not a shred of evidence to show that the contract went to the General Dynamics Corp. because the Vice President is from Texas, or that Senator Jackson has been doing anything improper because the Boeing Co. is from the State of Washington. The crux of the argument is not technical, military, or political but economic. From the beginning Secretary McNamara's conception has been governed by his intention to keep the Defense budget, which is already enormous, from becoming uncontrollably larger.

In order to keep military spending within some limit, it is necessary to sacrifice perfectionism in the choice of weapons. If money did not matter, each of the three military services could be allowed to build for itself the most perfect specialized tactical fighter. But since money does matter, the Defense Department has to forgo demanding the best weapons that unlimited money could buy and to content itself with the less perfect weapons that will do the military job. Secretary McNamara's friction with the uniformed hierarchy stems from his commitment to the basic proposition that if military spending is not to run wild, the weapons chosen have to be fully adequate but less than perfect.

Thus Secretary McNamara has, as Mr. Reston reminded us the other day, canceled the nuclear powered airplane and the Skybolt missile, he has opposed the all-out development of the RS–70, and has given up two or three other very expensive projects which, in his judgment, are not necessary military weapons but military luxuries. In the same way of thinking he has been insisting that for the new supersonic tactical planes, which both the Navy and the Air Force need, every effort should be made to develop one tactical fighter plane that can be adapted to the needs of each service.

The whole controversy turns on this. The General Dynamics proposal is very much nearer to being one plane for both Navy and Air Force than is the Boeing proposal. According to Secretary McNamara, the Boeing proposal is in fact for two much more specialized fighter planes. The General Dynamics proposal is for "an airframe design that has a very high degree of identical structure for the Navy and the Air Force versions" whereas in the two Boeing versions "less than half of the structural components of the wings, fuselage and tail were the same."

To illustrate how wasteful is overspecialization, Secretary McNamara tells us that the Navy now has a large number of aircraft out of operation for lack of spare parts while the Air Force has a $2.2 billion inventory of spare parts that are "already obsolete and practically worthless."

The judgments which Secretary McNamara is making in the choice of these very expensive weapons are judgments which somebody has to make. Congress has the right and the power to hold him accountable for them. Congress is not qualified and it hasn't the time to make those judgments itself. Congress also has the opportunity to review the Secretary's decisions. For these new complicated weapons systems take years to develop.

But the kind of judgment which Mr. McNamara is making is the kind of judgment the Secretary of Defense is meant to make. That is one of the main reasons why his office was created. We know from experience that it has not always been easy to find a Secretary of Defense who was competent to do that. In Secretary McNamara the country has a Secretary of Defense who in his training, in his practical experience, and in his technical knowledge of production, is remarkably, perhaps uniquely, qualified to pass judgment on a problem like that of the TFX.

Mr. JACKSON rose.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me to do so, I should like to yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson]. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. JACKSON. I wondered whether I could clarify this somewhat.

Is there any reason why we should not criticize officials in this Administration because we happen to be members of the same political party.

Mr. CLARK. That is the privilege the Senator from Washington has, if he wishes to do so.

Mr. JACKSON. I have a good record in the Senate of supporting this administration. That does not mean that we are not at liberty to criticize acts by members of the administration.

Is that the position the Senator from Pennsylvania takes?

Mr. CLARK. I say again what I said a moment ago; the Senator from Washington is quite within his rights.

Mr. JACKSON. Is that the Senator's position?

Mr. CLARK. My position is that the Senator from Washington is quite within his rights.

Mr. JACKSON. In other words, no matter how wrong someone in this administration may be, we are not to criticize him because he is within the administration?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has put words in my mouth which I did not speak. I have a high regard for the Senator from Washington. I am not trying to criticize him.

Mr. JACKSON. I am trying to find out the Senator's position.

Mr. CLARK. I have stated my position. I am in accord with the President. I am in accord with Mr. Lippmann.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt]. I thank the Senator for waiting.

I hope the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] will be kind enough to permit me to yield to the Senator, because he did seek the floor first.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have only one comment to make on the first portion of the remarks by the distinguished Senator, in which he defended the integrity of the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Gilpatric.

I have no disposition to quarrel with his defense in that connection whatsoever. As a matter of fact, until this morning, when it was initiated by Mr. Gilpatric, I think there was no testimony before our committee in any way criticizing him for a conflict of interest or any other matter.

I cannot refrain, however, from expressing the wish that the distinguished Senator from Missouri might have been as considerate and as restrained with respect to possible conflicts of interest when he was questioning the former Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. George Humphrey, because that was a similar situation.

The question of conflict of interest is a very difficult one, Mr. President. I served on a Senate committee, with the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] as the chairman, when the committee made a complete study of the conflict-of-interest problem. We thought we could come up with some suggestions or recommendations for eliminating it. It is very difficult to find people with satisfactory qualifications who are not connected with various corporations, banks, or law firms.

I remember the unhappy situation which involved Mr. Harold Talbott, who I believe at one time was Secretary of the Air Force, and who I thought was a dedicated and fine public servant.

An uproar developed all across the country out of an investigation which showed that he had written a letter at one time on somebody else's stationery, and President Eisenhower promptly asked for his resignation.

I point out in this connection that I do not know any foolproof law which we could set up for any screening process. I am sure that there are people who can go in and out of law firms and back to public service, and in and out of corporations and back to public service, and never let their associations in any way influence their judgement.

I am sure it has been done in the past. I am sure it can be done now and that it can be done in the future. I am equally sure, however, that in the past, perhaps now, and it will certainly be true sometime in the future, we are going to find individuals whose judgments are colored by previous or existing associations. But I point out that the so-called conflict-of-interest issue involving Mr. Gilpatric was not initiated by the committee, but developed out of a newspaper story and was brought into the committee room on that basis.

Mr. SYMINGTON. First, with respect to the news story, the Senator can correct me if I am wrong, but I believe I read a story in which it was stated that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota stated the conflict-of-interest matter would be investigated; and when it was suggested to him that it might include Secretary Gilpatric, he said that was correct. That was before Secretary Gilpatric testified this morning.

Mr. MUNDT. May I comment on that statement? The Senator from South Dakota was asked by the press whether or not the conflict-of-interest aspects would be investigated. I said of course; in any investigation one would go into those matters. But at that time I did not know of Mr. Gilpatric's connection with the law firm and its relations with General Dynamics and did not have him in mind at all.

Mr. SYMINGTON. With respect to Mr. Talbott, Mr. Talbott was a dear friend of mine. I did my best to defend him; in fact when the problem came before the committee of the Senator from Arkansas, I discussed with the chairman the problems in connection with that investigation and received his approval to advise and consult with Mr. Talbott, even though I was on the committee. This he granted me and this I did.

Mr. MUNDT. I recall the contributions of the Senator from Missouri with regard to that question. I appreciate the contributions of the Senator in the hearings. Would the Senator like to comment?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let me yield first to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think the danger that has been laid before the Senate is that the talk about conflict of interest casts a shadow on a man like Roswell Gilpatric. I repeat, these are rather serious charges—even innuendoes. It seems to me we have an obligation, in light of the sacrifices we ask of people to serve in these sensitive positions, not to cross their countenance or path with such shadows. Secretary Gilpatric and Secretary McNamara are men of unusual competence and ability. They have been recognized as such in the professional and business areas. I do not know of anything either one of them has done which would indicate that it represented an unethical practice or in any way involved a conflict of interest.

I do think these officials are obviously subject to criticism or interrogation. It cannot be said that because a man is a civilian official he is immune from investigation or inquiry. However, I think a disservice may have been done, and has been done, by the indication that there may be a conflict of interest. Lawyers have their problems about it, as do others.

When one is in a law firm, and in order to get into the Government he resigns his position from the law firm, unless he gets a lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court, there is always the possibility that he is going back to the law firm. If that situation exists, a great disservice is done to a lawyer, from his professional point of view as well as from his personal point of view, when a conflict of interest is indicated, particularly when lawyers have represented many clients.

I think the Senator from Missouri was trying to point out in a very dispassionate way that this gentleman did serve his country with distinction. He had many clients and he has represented people in different areas of the aviation industry. That is the real reason for being disturbed over the assertion or innuendo that there was a conflict of interest.

I join with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] when he said that he knows of no two men in this Government who have had a finer record in both private and public life than Secretary McNamara and Secretary Roswell Gilpatric. Why Secretary McNamara was willing to give up a fine post in private industry and come here and take over the huge, intricate mechanism called the Defense Department and the Pentagon is something that is almost beyond my comprehension. But he has done an admirable job. He is a man of decision. That is why he was in private industry. He did not wiggle and wobble, but went to the job and did what he had to do.

The same goes for Roswell Gilpatric. He has had years of service. Whether he made a good judgment or a bad judgement is subject to individual view. That question will be determined by the committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Minnesota. He always says better what others have tried to say.

I am glad to yield again to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say for the benefit of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], who, of course, has not been at the hearings, that there have been no charges nor innuendoes emanating from the committee concerning Mr. Gilpatric or any other individual in the Pentagon. The whole question of discussing the background of individuals is a prerequisite to making a good investigation. I would want to have no part of an investigation which stated as its purpose that we were not going to investigate the background of people, but simply the charges. We have made no charges. None have been made.

I pointed out earlier that Secretary Gilpatric ran into the same kind of difficulties, because of his background, that

George Humphrey and Harold Talbott encountered because of their backgrounds. I remember the Senator from Missouri rose and made a spirited defense of Harold Talbott, and in the end, because of derogatory statements growing out of charges of conflict of interest, the Government was deprived of the services of a very able public servant.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I said that one of the purposes of the debate, if we can do anything today, is to set the record straight. So far as those who are interested is concerned—and the Senator from South Dakota is on the committee, and I am not—we can make clear that the so-called conflict-of-interest assertion which has found its way into print can be set straight by the statement that there is no known evidence that there exists any conflict of interest.

Mr. MUNDT. We cannot decide the issues of the investigation, here on the Senate floor today but as of 20 minutes of 3 o'clock today, which is the correct current time by the Senate clock, I can say there is no evidence I know of that would cast a blight on Mr. Gilpatric.

On the other matter, it seems to me the Senator from Missouri was proceeding on an improper basis in his efforts to try to induce the committee to close its hearings as rapidly as it can, and in questioning what the committee was actually trying to do.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is putting words in my mouth.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me quote the words from the mouth of the Senator from Missouri, then:

> The right of decision was clearly that of the Secretary of Defense. That is the law; and anybody who opposes that position opposes the law.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is right.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator said again:

> Differences in matters of judgment, however, and a formal effort to reverse a major policy decision on the grounds the Secretary has exceeded his authority, are two entirely different subjects.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Which implies the committee is attacking the problem on that basis. We are not. I have never heard in committee any question that the Secretary of Defense has the right to overrule the decisions of the military.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad the Senator agrees with me.

Mr. MUNDT. The whole question is whether, in the exercise of that right, he utilized sound and justifiable judgment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad the Senator agrees with me. I hope he will postpone judgment on Secretary Gilpatric.

Mr. MUNDT. I have said, and I repeat, that as of 20 minutes to 3 I have heard no evidence that there is any conflict of interest, and I have formed no judgment with regard to Secretary Gilpatric.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to have the Senator take that position on the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is proceeding on the wrong basis when he assumes that that is what the committee is trying to do, namely, to attack the right of the Secretary of Defense to make decisions.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Missouri has a right, in a talk, to say what he wants the Senate to know. When the Senator from South Dakota says that I am criticizing the committee, he is reading into my remarks something that is not correct. I went out of my way to state that I am not criticizing the committee. I am emphasing three main points. The first is that whether this decision, this exercise of judgment, was right or wrong, under the law the Secretary of Defense has the right to do it.

Second, in my opinion the continuation of these hearings over many weeks—I believe the Senator from South Dakota said they might run through the spring——

Mr. MUNDT. It is spring now. So I suppose that is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator knows what I am getting at. He probably knows better than I what the press referred to.

Based on my experience, I believe all this is hurting the morale of the Armed Forces of the United States, and therefore I hope the hearings will be conducted as expeditiously as possible, and I am confident that the chairman feels this way.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe I can say for the chairman that no one has ever conducted hearings more expeditiously than he has. He told us the first time that we had a hearing, and before any minority member of the committee learned about the TFX controversy, and when we voted unanimously to proceed with the investigation, that he thought the hearings would last 4 or 5 days. I said facetiously at that time that I thought it might take that many weeks. I am convinced that the chairman will not terminate the hearings until we have had all the facts presented. We have heard, so far, only three of the major witnesses. We have heard, actually, only from John Stack, a world-wide renowned aeronautical engineer; from Col. Charles Gayle, the TFX system project officer at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base; and from George Spangenberg, the Navy Department's chief aeronautical engineer. From the Pentagon we have heard only from members of the Evaluation Board. Except for an affidavit from the Secretary of Defense which was presented to the committee in his absence.

Still to be heard from in the investigation are a number of four-star admirals and generals, including the Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. Curtis LeMay. We have not yet heard from him. We have not yet heard from the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Anderson. We have not yet heard from the management and the technical people of either Boeing or General Dynamics. Of course the Senator may urge, if he wishes, that we fold up the hearings, but I believe that——

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is misquoting me. I did not say that I urged the hearings be folded up. I said they should be conducted expeditiously.

Mr. MUNDT. I will read what the Senator has said:

> I would hope whatever the decision, that decision be reached expeditiously and these hearings be concluded.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct, concluded after being handled expeditiously.

Mr. MUNDT. To me that means folded up.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It means expedited.

Mr. MUNDT. Very well. We agree that it should be done expeditiously.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator agree that the hearings should be concluded as expeditiously as possible, provided the facts are obtained?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Then we are in agreement on this point.

Mr. MUNDT. We are not in agreement with what the Senator has said. I read again what the Senator has said:

> Therefore, because of all the reasons previously mentioned and especially because of the obvious necessity for us to cope with current Communist aggression, I would hope whatever the decision, that the decision be reached expeditiously and these hearings be concluded.

I do not go along with believing the hearings should be concluded. I say we are proceeding expeditiously.

Mr. SYMINGTON. One of the reasons for putting that statement in my remarks today was based on a comment which the Senator is supposed to have made to the press that it looked to him as though the hearings would run for months.

Mr. MUNDT. If I was quoted as saying that, I was misquoted. I did not say it would take months.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD at this point part of the press report which referred to the statement made in this connection by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. That is perfectly all right with me.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCNAMARA, AID CALLED TOMORROW FOR QUESTIONING

(By Cecil Holland)

* * * * *

Meanwhile, Senator MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, said he was sure the subcommittee would look into the financial connections and interests of all those who participated in the decision to award the contract to General Dynamics.

Besides Mr. McNamara these included Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert and Navy Secretary Fred Korth. The civilian Secretaries overruled a unanimous recommendation of military experts that Boeing be granted the $6.5 billion contract.

Senator MUNDT made the statement in commenting on reports that Mr. Gilpatric, before joining the Defense Department, was connected with a New York law firm that has represented General Dynamics in some matters. According to the testimony received by the subcommittee, Mr. Gilpatric participated in the contract award decision, although Mr. McNamara said he assumes full responsibility for the award.

Senator MUNDT also indicated that the subcommittee would look into the role of Mr. Korth in the decision. Before becoming Secretary of the Navy last year, Mr. Korth was a prominent Fort Worth banker.

However, the Senator said he doubted that the subcommittee would question Mr. Gilpatric on his law firm connections until a later time.

LONG PROBE SEEN

Senator MUNDT said the investigation probably will last much longer than the subcommittee had anticipated.

"We are getting into fields we never anticipated," the Senator said. "This conflict-of-interest thing was never in our minds until events and the reading of newspapers put it there."

* * * * *

Mr. MUNDT. Now I wish to read this statement from the Senator's speech, because it raises an implication as to what we are trying to do. I am sure that the Senator does it out of good motivation. However, it puts an entirely different focus on the hearings. I read:

> Some of us have differed with the present Secretary of Defense on matters of judgment—on at least one occasion that has been true of myself. Differences in matters of judgment, however, and a formal effort to reverse a major policy decision on the grounds the Secretary has exceeded his authority, are two entirely different matters.

I say categorically, first, there has been no effort on the part of our committee to reverse a decision for any reason. We have raised no question as to whether the Secretary of Defense has exceeded his authority. Why attribute that to us?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is the Senator asking me a question?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe that the purpose of the hearings is to see that this contract does not go to General Dynamics. That would be a reversal.

Mr. MUNDT. There is no such purpose.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator has a right to his opinion. I have a right to mine.

Mr. MUNDT. We have never been told, and we have never assumed, that the purpose was to take it away from anyone.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am sure the Senator would not say that these hearings are being conducted for no purpose.

Mr. MUNDT. May I tell the Senator that purpose? We are trying to determine whether, rightly or wrongly, they gave it to the company which could produce an acceptable plane at the cheaper price. Secondly, we are trying to determine if they gave it to the company which could produce a plane which provides, at the present stage of the art, the best possible plane available from American producers. I am more concerned as to whether we are getting in this TFX plane, a plane which measures up to the capabilities of American industry to provide a plane of maximum performance, than I am as to whether or not we paid $100 million or $500 million too much for it, because, if in fact, a better plane is available than the one for which we have contracted, we have virtually squandered the whole $5 billion. I am sure that the former Secretary of the Air Force, the distinguished Senator from Missouri, will agree that we need the best possible plane, not one that is second best. That is what we are trying to determine.

Proceeding with the Senator's statement, I am, like the Senator from Washington, a little perplexed as to this recital of the financial integrity and engineering ability of the Boeing Co. The Senator failed to put in a similar review of the financial success of General Dynamics. I suppose that will be available to the committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. No; the Senator is incorrect. In debate I volunteered the fact that in recent years General Dynamics lost more money than any other corporation in the history of the free enterprise system.

Mr. MUNDT. At all events, the Senator realizes that he is in dispute with Mr. McNamara in this connection, because——

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would like to have the Senator from South Dakota guide me with respect to where I am in dispute with the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator will let me finish the sentence, I will be glad to provide some guidance.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yielded to the Senator from South Dakota for a short statement. He has been proceeding now for 15 minutes. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has been on his feet for not less than a half hour. I am glad to yield to the Senator, so that he can explain anything he wants to explain.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Missouri has been on his feet a while himself. The Senator from Missouri is in dispute with the civilian officials in the Pentagon, who say that one reason why they believe the contract should have gone to General Dynamics is that on the basis of experience Boeing has had some criticism about the correctness of some of its estimates. It would seem to me that a company which has done so well in the past might be inclined to do well in the future, as against a company which, the Senator now says, has lost more money than any other company ever lost in American history. I did not know that.

I have one more comment to make in connection with the Senator's talk. This arose out of the basis on which our investigation is being held. Perhaps I can save time by inserting in the RECORD the facts which are sanitized, publicized, uncensored, and made available to the public, so by studying this RECORD all citizens will have the data needed to help them formulate their own judgment concerning the kind of evidence which our committee has been considering, as against that which has been imputed to us.

I have an unclassified table showing the operational comparisons of the two TFX proposals, the one by General Dynamics, the other by Boeing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Operational comparison of 2 TFX proposals—General Dynamics versus Boeing as evaluated by U.S. Air Force

[Only subcommittee selected items are shown]

	General Dynamics	Boeing
Cost factors:		
Contractor's proposal (millions) [1]	$5,455.5	$5,364.2.
Air Force program estimate (millions)	$7,083.2	$6,983.0.
Air Force program estimate adjusted figure	$5,803.0	$5,387.5.
Performance comparisons:		
1. Ferry range (nautical miles)	X	X plus 1,100 miles.
2. Reaction time at minus 65° F. (minutes)	2 times X	X.
3. Landing distance over 50-foot obstacle (feet)	X plus 590 feet	X.
4. Deceleration device	Dive brakes and spoilers	Thrust reverser.
5. Air Force estimate of Navy weight (pounds)	X plus 2,208 pounds	X.
6. Air Force estimate of Navy mission A (loiter time in hours)	X	X plus 30 minutes.
7. Air Force estimate of Navy mission B (loiter time in minutes).	X	5½ times X.
8. Aircraft carrier spotting [2]	X plus 5	X.
9. Avoidance of foreign object damage	Deflectors	High scoops.
10. Area intercept mission (radius in nautical miles) [1]	X	X plus 177 miles.
11. Ordnance carrying capability (pounds of demolition bombs):		
Wings out	X	X plus 69 percent.
Wings in	X	X plus 11 percent.
Contractor's proposed ordnance loading: [1]		
12. Nuclear bombs	X	X plus 50 percent.
13. Air-to-ground missile	X	X plus 50 percent.
14. Demolition bomb	X	X plus 105 percent.
15. Cluster dispenser	X	X plus 180 percent.
16. Fire bomb	X	X plus 250 percent.
17. Land mine	X	X plus 70 percent.
18. Rocket launcher	X	X plus 44 percent.
19. Air-to-air missile	X	X plus 100 percent.
20. General Dynamics superior on supersonic speed		
21. Boeing superior on subsonic speed		
22. Commonality of parts, General Dynamics is superior		

[1] Contractor data.

[2] Navy evaluation.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I point out and emphasize, for the guidance of those who read, that this information is with respect to the present stage of the investigation, with many competent witnesses yet to be heard, and with the Secretary of Defense now in the hearing room waiting and ready to testify. On the basis of the evidence now before the committee—which is available at this time—there are 22 different performance criteria listed, comparing the performance of the two TFX planes. On only three of them is the preference given to

General Dynamics, as against the preference given on about 16 or 17 to Boeing.

It is evidence of this type, Mr. President, that the committee has been receiving and considering and which perplexes and puzzles us as to the reasons the Pentagon insisted upon the more expensive plane with the poorer performance evaluations.

On some comparisons there is apparently equal ability. There are some comparisons as to which there is a reasonable argument, such as the relative merits of dive brakes and spoilers as against thrust reverser. With respect to the deceleration device, General Dynamics uses dive brakes and spoilers, while Boeing proposes thrust reversers.

Finally, with regard to the attacks made upon our committee, I am happy that the Senator from Missouri joins with the rest of us in regretting the kind of attack which comes from the Pentagon upon the integrity of the chairman and the rest of the members of the committee. The Senator from Missouri has himself served on committees which have been under attack.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. He recognizes that such attacks are somewhat distasteful.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I had the honor to serve with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota on such a committee not too many years ago.

Mr. MUNDT. Every one of us was constantly under attack.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. In that connection, my experience on investigating committees of Congress dates back to the time when I served on the House Committee on Un-American Activities, under the chairmanship of Martin Dies. For some strange reason, I have been assigned to investigating committees from that time until now and have the perhaps doubtful distinction of having served more years on congressional investigating committees than any other Member in the history of Congress.

I must say that in all my experience, except for this, the most exciting experience was as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, under Martin Dies, when that committee was investigating the allegations of communism in the Government, and almost everyone in the administration was attacking our committee. At no time since then have I seen a congressional committee subjected to as determined a drumfire attack from a Government Department as has occurred from the Pentagon on the McClellan committee in the instant case.

People will read in the Washington Evening Star tonight, for example, under the banner headline "Air Force Hits TFX Probe Tactics," still another item indicative of the extremes to which the Pentagon will go. Let me read from the article:

> The report, prepared by an Air Force officer for internal Air Force use, says the questioning was so rough that one man "collapsed from nervous exhaustion and reoccurring ulcer" and that two others "showed signs of deep fatigue."

As I said in the committee room today, the military personnel of the country, including emphatically members of the Air Force, have demonstrated a stamina, a fighting capacity, and a capacity to serve which, it seems to me, negatives any suggestion of their being any validity in the suggestion that Air Force officers are collapsing all over the place because Jerome S. Adlerman has asked them some pertinent questions. I cannot conceive of any questions he could ask which would be so rough that the fighting heart of the Air Force was going to faint away, because our American airmen have well earned their reputation as gladiators. It illustrates the hyperbole involved, the extremes to which some go in attacking this committee in almost an hysterical manner—certainly in an unrealistic one.

I hope that if nothing else grows out of the colloquy on the floor today, a cease-fire order will be issued from the Pentagon or from places higher up in Washington to get off the backs of the committee, and let us proceed in an orderly and objective fashion.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall be very brief, because I know that the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Pennsylvania have been waiting to speak.

First, as to Under Secretary Gilpatric, he is a New York lawyer. I have known him for many years. I understand very well the problems of lawyers in large firms who retire from those firms to enter government service. It is our objective to get the best men at the salaries allowed, and we will jeopardize getting them if we impugn their motives. I say this advisedly. I do not question Under Secretary Gilpatric or any member of the committee, whatever may have been Mr. Gilpatric's connection with the law firm, or our connection—and that includes my own—in the interest of getting the maximum amount of business for our States. It is a fact that one of the parties involved is Grumman, which has important manufacturing interests in my State. I question as little the bona fides of Mr. Gilpatric as I do of my own, in my own field, to rise above any such considerations in a matter so critically important to the defense and security of America as is this contract which we are discussing, and the end result which it will mean to the security of our Nation.

I join with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] in calling for a standstill, a freeze, upon all of the recriminations, back and forth, which have only sought to divert the distinguished chairman of our committee. I have been a lawyer in the trial courts for almost 30 years. I will testify to the fairness, decency, and lack of intimidation with which he is conducting the hearing. The answer is to get on with it.

But certainly a man like Mr. Gilpatric is entitled from me, a fellow lawyer from New York, perhaps above anybody else, to an absolutely clean bill of health in this matter, as he is, in my judgment, from the Senator from Washington or any other member of the committee, notwithstanding any very ill-advised comments made off the cuff or off the top of his head by anybody from the Pentagon.

I am delighted to join with all Senators in nailing that and laying it at rest.

Second, it is my judgment that what we are seeking to determine—and I am sorry that I differ with the Senator from South Dakota in the objective of this hearing—is to determine whether there has been an abuse of discretion. I was delighted to hear the Senator from Washington say that very thing. The question of whether he made a mistake in judgment or not is a matter of basic policy within the constitutional prerogative of the civilian head of the Department of Defense. If I were convinced, to the bottom of my being, that Secretary McNamara made a mistake in judgment, that there was not an abuse of discretion due to some outside influence, or whatever other errant consideration there was in coming to such a finding, I think it is extremely important to air this matter.

I do not believe the 21 or 22 criteria now set forth in the Record—and I think the Senator from South Dakota was quite right to use whatever he could in that regard, without investigation—represents the whole basis on which the decision will have to be made. We also have to decide if there were requirements far above the specifications required of those airplanes. In other words, if we are dealing with specifications beyond the specifications set up by the Department, then we are dealing in an area which other considerations, like those of common use between the Army and the Air Force, become particularly pertinent and important to the decision of the Secretary.

So, unless we find an abuse of discretion, this matter must remain exactly as it is, whatever we report, but the report of this committee will have a material effect on the whole matter.

Finally, and most important, we must consider the morale of the Armed Forces. Probably the single most important question in the whole discussion relates to the morale of the Armed Forces. I have served, the Senator from Missouri has served, almost every Senator involved has served in the Armed Forces, and we know that men will have to fly this plane, whether it is the one which Secretary McNamara picked or the one that was rejected, insofar as Boeing is concerned. Men will have to fly the plane, and the morale of the Air Force is critically important. I think we have a job—and this is collective to all of us—to establish, absolutely and firmly, the morale of the Armed Forces. If we should decide that this contract is to be awarded on the basis of a superior civilian decision, then it is our job also to rally behind the decision the full moral support of the Armed Forces. I think a grave danger exists. It is a fact that military officers are testifying the other way, and that their testimony is being kept from the public. Furthermore, more of that may occur.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is our duty to see to it that the facts are made known, and that, when this matter is concluded, we, ourselves, shall have

acted to fortify the Armed Forces of the United States.

As a member of the committee headed by the gifted Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan], I thank the Senator from Missouri for his contribution to our consideration of this matter.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from New York.

Let me say that I had the privilege of serving as Assistant Secretary of War for Air and Secretary of the Air Force at the time contracts were awarded for the construction of the B–47 and the B–52, perhaps the greatest airplane ever flown. I approved those contracts after study, but have not approached this matter from that point of view. Furthermore, I did not and do not wish to become involved in a technical discussion this afternoon.

Next, Mr. President, let me say that I agree thoroughly with the Senator from New York, who served in the military as a distinguished officer during the last World War, that the morale of the Armed Forces is being adversely affected by these hearings. Anyone who reads the sad and unfortunate article appearing this afternoon in the newspapers and that has been referred to knows that such an article is bound to affect adversely the proper intertwining of the civilian and military in our system.

Next, Mr. President, I refer to the Secretary of Defense. I think highly of him, and know he has the right, under the law, to have direction, authority, and control in connection with this decision, and he has made the decision to the best of his ability. He may have erred in arriving at his judgment, but I am sure he felt he did the correct thing and I happen to agree with him.

Finally, Mr. President, let me present that I have been around this Capital for many years—indirectly, for more than 40 years; and directly, in Government service for some 18 years. The more I see of life, the more important I think it is to try to have justice done, especially to one's friends. I am sure no member of the committee on the Senate had anything to do with the unfortunate stories about Mr. Gilpatric. I know of no one in Government who ever served more ably than he has. My statement today is made primarily because of the attacks against him that have appeared in the press. Whenever a friend of mine in whom I believe, and who is serving the Government to the best of his ability, is unfairly attacked in the press, I intend to take the floor to defend him.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I share the sentiments which have been expressed in regard to expediting the hearings.

This morning we undertook to hear Secretary McNamara. At his request, we scheduled his appearance. In the meantime, we could not ascertain the source of the derogatory statements which issued from the Pentagon under an injunction not to reveal the author of the statements. So, as the first witness today, we had Mr. Gilpatric, the Deputy Secretary, who finally acknowledged that he had held the press conference; and I am told by the press that that is where the members of the press got the information.

Furthermore, that delayed us and prevented us from hearing the Secretary. But while we were holding the hearing this morning on the complaint, and were trying to ascertain the source of the derogatory news article which went out last Sunday, another one came out, right in our teeth. I hold in my hand today's Washington Star, and the principal headline reads as follows: "Air Force Hits TFX Probe Tactics—Abuse Charged Against Staff of McClellan."

Mr. President, if they want the hearings expedited—and let me say that already, in two instances, they, themselves, have retracted their statements; they did so this morning, when they said they did not mean any such thing—I do not know what they will say about this new article; but I state to the Senate that it is not true.

Senators speak of defending their friends; but I do not believe that the three staff members mentioned in the article are at all of the character described in the article. One of them has served the Government for 16 years; and for approximately 8 years of that time, I believe, he served under the distinguished Attorney General.

Mr. President, such tactics cannot be defended. If Senators are going to defend their friends, I shall defend the distinguished staff members who must do work which often is not pleasant.

If the hearing is being delayed and if there is a lack of expedition, the fault lies with those who are trying to obstruct it and interrupt it. So far as I know, that is not coming from the legislative branch. It is coming from the Pentagon; and when I make that statement, Mr. President, I am not hiding behind anonymity. I make that statement. This morning I made it in the committee; and now I make it again, here on the floor of the Senate.

At this time I must leave the Senate Chamber, to attend the committee hearing, where the Secretary is waiting. I ask my colleagues who serve with me on the committee to join me now in attending that hearing. Let us go there now and hear the Secretary as long as we can.

I have another appointment this afternoon, and I shall have to adjourn this hearing early. But I ask the Senators who serve on the committee to go with me to the committee hearing, and let us give the Secretary an hour of the time of the committee, and thus expedite the matter.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Arkansas, "Godspeed."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there has been a great deal said here today about the purpose of the investigation conducted by the McClellan committee on the awarding of the TFX contract. The award, of course, involved, in the end, two companies, one the General Dynamics Co., and the other the Boeing Co. of my home town, Seattle.

Although the contract itself, so far as the Boeing Co. is concerned, was mainly concerned geographically with the Wichita, Kans., division of the Boeing Co., the Senator from Washington, my colleague [Mr. Jackson] and I, of course, have a deep interest in the matter. We are, first of all, very proud of the record of the Boeing Co. in the field of defense, commercial airplanes, and other pioneering efforts which the company has engaged in over the years. We are also proud of the fine engineering staff which has been assembled by the company over many, many years. It has been called by Defense officials on many occasions, the finest engineering staff, particularly in the aerodynamic field, in the United States, if not the world.

So we have had an interest in this matter, as would any two Senators representing the State of Washington, the home base of the Boeing Co.

We, of course, knew that Boeing Co. and General Dynamics were the two companies being considered, some months prior to the time the award was finally made. As such, we were hopeful the Boeing Co. would be awarded the contract, because we were confident they could do the job demanded by the Defense Department, and had an adequate staff in engineering, a work pool, to do the job. And second, we were the representatives from the home area of the company. We, of course, did not at any time think that the contract should be given to any company which would not be in the best interest of the country and produce the best possible airplane in this important field at the lowest cost.

The contract was awarded, and this investigation is going on. I joined with my colleague when the question was asked as to who started this investigation. It was started by people who had some doubts about whether or not the award was made in the best interest of the country and if it was the type of plane that was really wanted.

Also I joined with my colleague from Washington in the hope, too, that the committee would take a look at this award to see exactly what happened and to determine, as the Senator from South Dakota said today, whether or not we were going to end up with the best possible defense vehicle. At no time did the junior Senator from Washington or I, directly or indirectly, try to influence anyone in the Pentagon or anywhere else in the Government regarding the award. We were hopeful the contract would be given solely on its merit and solely on the basic criterion of who could produce the best type of plane the Defense Department said it wanted for this country.

I believe my colleague [Mr. Jackson] stated he called once or twice regarding the status of this particular contract; and I think I did on one or two occasions. By "status" we meant when they expected to give the award and how far it had proceeded along through the evaluation boards and the different studies. That is all.

I must say for the Record that no one in the Boeing Co. and no Boeing official ever suggested to any of us that we should do anything political about this contract; and I am sure this statement applies to the delegation in the House who represent the Seattle area, and I am sure this is true also for that section of the country represented by the Senators from Kansas, or the Representatives from the Wichita area, where the Wichita division is located.

The Boeing officials, in discussing the matter with me, said they wanted absolutely no politics involved in it at all. We discussed it in a general way. They wanted the matter decided on the merits. They were so sure of their own ability to be able to stack up on the merits on this particular plane that they almost leaned over backward.

A great deal has been said in the past few days that there has been some interest on the part of the Senators in regard to this contract, particularly with respect to Senators who serve on the committee. I believe at one time the Deputy Secretary of Defense, on a television broadcast, mentioned that two powerful Senators from the State of Washington were involved. He referred to me and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who is a member of the McClellan committee.

I wanted the record to be clear that the Boeing officials and anyone cognizant with this matter had pinned their hopes on this being decided on the bare merits of the ability of the Boeing Co. to produce the kind of plane that the Defense people said was needed in the interest of this country.

We know, of course, what it means to bid on contracts. Sometimes a bid is difficult to make, and very often it does not necessarily mean that the low bidder will perform his contract in a way that it will cost the Government exactly what was bid, or vice versa. That is because on a matter of this kind there are thousands of engineering changes. That necessitates many changes in the contract.

They felt that they could do this job and do it well. They spent a great deal of time and effort on it in their engineering department. They wanted the award to be made in the highest possible sense, fairly and in the best interests of defense, lacking of politics.

I do not know what the committee will come up with. Their inquiry is a perfectly proper one. It is to find out, not the right of the Secretary of Defense to make the decision, but how the decision was made, and whether in the end the country is going to get what he and the rest of his people think they should have of this plane.

I reserve judgment on this matter until the committee makes its findings.

I have received many letters from my constituency at home and from others, asking what we are doing about this. A great deal stems from the fact that the Pentagon itself has released certain portions of its testimony to the press. Other portions have been held in executive session. Therefore, it is difficult to get all of the facts and to put them together. When the committee finally concludes its work and makes a report, only then will the case be clearly stated. We, of course, are looking anxiously toward that report.

Mention was made today about the morale of the military. We better, also, consider the morale of the country. When so much of the taxpayers' money is being spent for a weapon, the people want to be sure not only that we are getting our money's worth, but also that they are getting the best possible product. If awards are made contrary to this or with political influence, therefore, their morale and faith in government would be shaken.

Many of the people who have written to me from my home State of Washington, particularly from the Seattle area, have been very fair in their comments. I should like to read an excerpt from one letter as typical:

> I have, with intent interest, followed the investigation of the TFX contract. It is quite true that I am a resident of Seattle and, therefore, have an interest in the growth of the Boeing Co. However, this letter is not motivated by such regional loyalty. I am quite sure I would feel the same if, under the circumstances, Douglas or Lockheed Aircraft Co. were involved.
>
> It is extremely disturbing to think that the U.S. Government will not accept the principles of the competitive bidding system which is, as you know, one of the mainstays of the free enterprise system in America.
>
> And, when any firm submits a bid that is superior in design and lower in price and has that bid rejected for what appears to be political reasons, I think the consequences can be disastrous and will most certainly result in the future loss of confidence in our Government.

This citizen's morale is just as important as the military.

I do not say what the writer suggests, that there were political reasons involved in this award. I do not know. I am sure the committee will continue expeditiously to get all the facts, and come to a conclusion on this. However, I believe this letter is typical, because the general tenor of what has been released so far and of all the stories relating to this contract certainly justify any private citizen feeling what this writer states.

If that is the case, I know the committee will not only discover it but will pass upon whether the award was rightly made or that there was an abuse of discretion.

Here is another letter. The writer says, in part:

> The fact that Boeing lost the contract is important, but it is not as important as the question of why and when in the military affairs of this country such things could happen as we read in the reports.

All this involves the morale of the people. Up to date they have been wondering whether there is something here that is not right. This must be resolved for the morale of everyone.

Some newspaper articles have been confusing to us. I quote from one. The headline states: "Solon Charges Favoritism in Plane Contract." I read from it the following:

> Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, said today he will expect the Secretaries of Defense and Air Force to explain what he termed "unusual" steps in the award of the TFX warplane contract.

Actually, the Senator from Arkansas did not charge favoritism. He used the word "unusual." But this is what the public is getting from the release of fragmentary parts of the testimony by the Pentagon. No wonder the Senator from Arkansas uses the word "unusual."

I have a legitimate interest in this matter. It has been most objective. The Boeing Co., of course, naturally was disappointed, as were we, because they felt they could do the job on this particular project better than anyone else.

Mention was also made today of the amount of money which Boeing has received over the years and of the profit it has made on both commercial and military contracts. I am sure the figures which have been given are correct. They might seem to be a little large. But I remind the Senate that Boeing Aircraft Co., pioneered in this field long before any of the rest of the companies ever existed or had a name. So it is only natural that Boeing should have received many contracts, dating back to the early days of the Boeing Aircraft Co. They developed a know-how. Boeing has not received any more military contracts than have been justified by their know-how and ability to do the job, and the fact that they submitted engineering estimates and lower bids was because of their faith in this know-how. Secondly, they could do the job on time.

The RECORD ought to show also, looking back upon a 10-year period, that four or five companies, including Boeing, Lockheed, North American, Douglas, and perhaps others, have shared fairly equally in the awarding of defense contracts.

It was somewhat ironical today, as I listened to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] make his speech, to recall that when he was Secretary of the Air Force he was involved in the move of a part of the Boeing Aircraft Co. to Wichita, Kans. Naturally, I opposed that transfer; I thought Boeing should stay in Seattle. I thought the concept of moving plants inland at that time for defense reasons was a little farfetched. He was helpful on this.

A part of the difficulty here is that the Wichita plant is available to do the kind of job the Department of Defense said it wanted to have done under the TFX contract. So Boeing's earnings should be placed in context.

I think the discussion today was wholesome. I could place in the RECORD numerous telegrams and letters, all suggesting that political reasons are involved in the awarding of this particular contract, and implicating many persons, including persons in Texas, and persons high in the Government. I repeat I do not know whether there was any political influence in awarding the contract or not. I know there was none from our end, so far as Boeing is concerned. I know that for certain. If there was any influence used from the other end, so far as the other company is concerned, I am sure that the committee will find out about it.

The fact is that the public is commencing to think because of the fragmentary news releases, that political influence must have been used. So it behooves us to back up the committee in its continuance of the investigation—expeditiously, surely, but principally to get all the facts involved, and not to stop until it has all the facts.

I think that not only is the purpose of the investigation well taken, but also the committee should examine into every possible angle of the subject, so that the American people may know what is taking place.

My colleague from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has been made the target of some attacks. When I say that I do not know what took place on the other end, I am speaking from my own personal knowledge that, so far as he and I are concerned, no attempt was made and no attempt was suggested by anyone—the Boeing officials, ourselves, or anyone else—to exert any political influence at our end. Senator JACKSON has been attacked twice, I believe, in the last week. I wish to read into the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pentagon's Attack on JACKSON," published in the Seattle Times of March 18, 1963. The editorial relates to the first attack:

> Washington's Senator JACKSON has been made the target of a vicious, underhanded attack of the type being employed too frequently in the National Capital.
>
> We refer to a United Press International news dispatch over the weekend quoting Defense Department officials, who "insisted on anonymity" as charging that JACKSON helped initiate the TFX fighter-bomber investigation to "further his political fortunes."
>
> These anonymous officials in the Pentagon declared further that JACKSON asked for the inquiry by Senator MCCLELLAN's committee to make it "look as if he had done his duty to his constituents" because the contract was not awarded to the Boeing Co. The innuendo was that JACKSON was motivated to build himself for reelection in 1964.

Mr. President, I should like to intrude my own statement that the constituents of Senator JACKSON and myself are the Boeing officials, the people who run the company; but the jobs probably or mainly would be at the Wichita division. So what has been said must be placed in that light, too. Since the Pentagon has suggested that two powerful Senators were involved in this question, I think that point should be referred to. I continue to read from the editorial, with which I wholeheartedly agree:

> The charges are absurd. In our view JACKSON has little to worry about in the 1964 election. And at the time the TFX investigation was begun there was no perceptible sentiment in the Seattle community that the decision to award the contract to General Dynamics was not in the best interests of the Nation.
>
> Boeing, of course, raised no question—either directly or indirectly.

I suggest that had they raised any question, Senator JACKSON would have been the first to be contacted. But no question was raised. I continue to read:

> The community sentiment, it seemed to the Times, was to the effect that the contract had gone to General Dynamics for justifiable reasons best known to the Pentagon and the decision should be accepted here without protest. That, incidentally, was the attitude of this newspaper.

Mr. President, I can say that that is true also. So much stress has been placed on awarding contracts on the merits that it would have been impossible for anyone in the community—this newspaper, Senator JACKSON, or myself—to believe that they had not been awarded on their merits, and solely on their merits. The editorial continues:

> As we watched the situation develop underlying suspicions in the National Capital—as reflected by news magazines—began raising questions as to whether politics had not been a motivating factor in the selection of the Texas firm.

I think the Seattle Times has put its finger on the real fact, namely, that there were so many articles written about this matter, not wholly in the newspapers or over the wire services, but articles appearing mainly in news magazines. I myself read several of them. They intimated some of the things which I have placed in the RECORD today, and surely enough to have caused any responsible Senate committee to think that there was something basic on which to proceed in this particular case. The Seattle Times puts its finger on the point when it says:

> As we watched the situation develop, underlying suspicions in the National Capital—as reflected by news magazines—began raising questions as to whether politics had not been a motivating factor in the selection of the Texas firm.
>
> It was only after the McClellan committee began getting into the details of the contract award that there arose local concern that perhaps the Pentagon had selected the "second best plane at the highest price."

I interrupt my reading of the editorial to say that, surely, the committee had not only the right—if that was the conclusion of news magazines, of the Seattle Times, and of some of the people from whom I have received letters—but also the duty and responsibility, to determine whether the Pentagon has selected the second best plane at the highest price.

I read further from the editorial:

> This, it should be noted, was quite a little while after the time specified by the anonymous Pentagon spokesmen that JACKSON was supposed to have declared that the McClellan committee should "take a little, brief look" to further JACKSON's political fortunes. JACKSON has denied that he made any such overtures.

Of course, no one believes more than I do that that is entirely true.

I read further from the editorial:

> The emphasis of this editorial, however, does not deal with the TFX investigation itself. It is to condemn the practice of the Pentagon, as well as other agencies of the National Government, to accuse and hide behind anonymity.
>
> If the accusers of Senator JACKSON were of good conscience in the matter, they would not have hidden behind anonymity. They would have permitted their names to be used. The Senator, as anyone else, is entitled to know who his accusers are and to have them face him. Frankly, we don't care for the type of journalism that permits such anonymity.
>
> We suspect that the Pentagon will rue the day its spokesmen stooped to the low level of accuse and hide. They have been using as a defensive tactic the smear technique in endeavors to discredit the McClellan committee. This will be resented deeply throughout Congress, where MCCLELLAN and JACKSON are held in the highest esteem as responsible Members of the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

Then the editorial states—and this is my primary point, which surely is quite pertinent, following the Senate debate earlier today:

> It is Congress' duty to probe the TFX contract award and one may be certain that the arrogant attitude of the civilian experts in the Pentagon—from Secretary McNamara on down—will not deter the committee.

Mr. President, I make these points, not only to reaffirm the interest of my colleague [Mr. JACKSON] and myself in the affairs of this company, which has its home office in our State, and not only to reaffirm our concern with what is in the best interests of the country, but also in hopes that the committee will do what has been suggested here today by many Senators; namely, get at this matter and ascertain exactly what happened, not only because of its importance, but also because the faith of the people of the United States in their Government is involved. I do not want to see the morale of the people of the country shaken, any more than we would wish to see the morale of the members of the Armed Forces shaken.

I hope this will be done expeditiously. I hope every facet of the award will be explored, so that the public will know exactly what happened.

Mr. President, certainly the statement made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] at the opening of the committee inquiry into the TFX contract award should result in keeping the attention of the entire country directed toward the hearing his investigations subcommittee is holding. As the Senator from Arkansas has reported, a top-ranking military evaluation team repeatedly and unanimously recommended that the contract be awarded the Boeing Co., but—and this is a most alarming fact—that decision was overruled each time by civilians in the Pentagon.

Mr. President, it is clear that the findings made thus far by the Senator from Arkansas and his subcommittee demonstrate that it is necessary that further inquiry be made into the procedures being employed in selecting the weapons on which our country and all the rest of the free world must depend. We must ascertain whether the recommendations made by professional military officers are being subordinated to the recommendations made by a group of young "experts" in the Pentagon. We must also ascertain why—as indicated by the findings of the subcommittee—a less expensive and more effective fighter-bomber proposed by the Boeing Co. was rejected, in favor of a more expensive and less effective one, proposed by another company. We must also ascertain whether regional politics is playing any part in the matter of the selection of weapons.

Mr. President, certainly this issue surpasses by far any local concern over the size of the payrolls in connection with the operations of the Boeing Co. This matter involves the defenses of the free world.

All of us hope most sincerely that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas will press his subcommittee inquiry until he can satisfy himself and the entire country that neither political considerations nor any other improper considerations are affecting the national safety.

If the Pentagon made an honest mistake it is not too late to correct it—if not for the total award, at least for the bulk of it in the interests of getting for us the best at the lowest cost.

Mr. ALLOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, I had hoped to get the floor earlier this afternoon, while the subject of the TFX contract was under discussion, but so many Senators had great pearls to leave with the Senate that it was impossible for me to obtain recognition at that time.

I should like to leave this suggestion with the Senate. Last week I read in the press that we loaned to Indonesia the sum of $17 million, and that at the same time Indonesia bought three jet planes from Convair—which is to say General Dynamics—for the sum of $20 million.

While the Senate is in the process of investigating contracts, particularly as they relate to relationships of various people in the Government, I hope that this particular item also, which came up almost coincidentally with the TFX matter, can be explored to ascertain what relationship there is, if any, to the loan to Indonesia and the almost identical price-range purchase by Indonesia of the three jet planes from General Dynamics.

I know that the hour is late, and the Presiding Officer (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair) desires to leave shortly. I merely wish that the expressions of fellowship for the members of the Department of Defense, which were stated this afternoon, had been thought of many times during the Eisenhower administration.

I do not wish to accuse Mr. Gilpatric of anything. I think that such accusations have to be proved. So far as I am concerned, until they are proved, Mr. Gilpatric is as pure as the driven snow. I only wish it had been possible to engender in the hearts of Senators on the other side of the aisle the same sympathetic gleam of consideration and concern for the lives and professions of people as was raised this afternoon, because it was needed many times.

The problem comes back to one point. I will say this now, and I will say it again when we Republicans are in the majority, which will be in a couple of years. It is not possible to secure people who amount to anything unless they have achieved some success in their lives. No matter who they are, if people are to be selected to perform important service in the Government, it is necessary that they be people who have done something worthwhile. They should have done something of consequence or have had important positions either with business, a profession, in the field of education, in the field of religion, or perhaps in allied fields.

I hope the members of the committee will read these words and will examine into the matter of the sale of jet planes to Indonesia.

SECRETARY McNAMARA'S GREAT CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICAN STRENGTH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do not intend to speak primarily on the TFX situation; I think it has been handled superbly by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. But I do feel that the criticism which has been rising in general against the Secretary of Defense should be answered; and I intend to do so briefly.

ARMED FORCES MANAGEMENT APPRAISES M'NAMARA

Recently an editorial was published in the Armed Forces Management magazine. It was written by the editor of that magazine, Mr. C. W. Borklund. I read from the editorial:

> We find little objective fact to support the argument that McNamara's mailed fist is creating in the ranks, all by itself, a truly horrendous state of affairs.
>
> Having just finished an analysis of the 15-year evolution in how the Defense Department has been run, we are convinced today's apprehensive palaver (that "The Trend" must be reversed) is largely overloaded with nonsense.
>
> Part of the complainers' difficulty comes from their being forced to view the total national defense need from somewhere below the top level.
>
> It is hardly surprising then that McNamara faces a raft of internal communications problems. The manned bomber force is being told it has precious little life expectancy left. The fleets are under serious challenge to prove they have any mission worth their expense. The Army is struggling with an organizational shakeup greater than anything it has faced in recent history.
>
> Drop into that environment a hard-driving leader who analyzes problems and options with cold, unemotional logic and makes rapid-fire decisions based on cost-effectiveness facts—all of which are changing drastically the former decisionmaking routine of the services—and some human turmoil is bound to result.
>
> This ridiculous business that he ignores his professional military leaders' views, apart from being an incredibly suspect charge on the face of it, ignores a couple key points:
>
> 1. McNamara is pushing programs which were not that popular before. The reason, said one general, "There have been too many problems critical to the total national defense interest which we and the other services, with limited resources and our own rating of mission priority, could only be half interested in before."
>
> 2. His highly skeptical questioning of service statements on new weapons has soured a lot of military types but considering the current, generally poor military track record for estimating hardware cost, development time and performance, he can hardly be blamed for that.
>
> Unless this complaining is allowed to well up into a crusade, we have little doubt that the internal hassle over decisionmaking will ease off eventually if (1) McNamara and his team stick with the job another couple years and (2) all levels—McNamara's immediate staff, the service staffs, the field installations—bend over backward a little to view problems as seen by the rest of the outfit.

Mr. President, I think the editorial is an extremely statesmanlike one; and I believe it deserves our careful attention. It comes from a competent, authoritative, and expert publication. We as U.S. Senators have an obligation to view this problem overall. We must recognize—as the editorial states so well—that we are in a rapidly changing technology. We are living in a time when each of the services would like to have a great deal more hardware. The Secretary of Defense has cut by approximately $13 billion or $14 billion the requests of the armed services. Of course, under those circumstances, the Secretary of Defense will make enemies. His task is an extremely difficult one. How difficult was shown by the proceedings in the House of Representatives the other day. There, after a great deal of debate about trimming the defense budget, after argument by members of the Republican Party that they felt that the defense budget could be cut by $3 billion, instead of voting to reduce the McNamara budget, the House voted to increase it by over $1 billion, and a majority of the Republican Members of the House voted to support that increase.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial which was published in the Armed Forces Management magazine printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS HORRENDOUS STATE OF AFFAIRS

(By C. W. Borklund)

> Packs of nasty little academic debates have been scurrying around military circles, and even beyond, recently over a tongue-twisting polysyllabic mouthful called the trend to centralization of decisionmaking authority in the Pentagon.
>
> While we sympathize with the subjective reasons for this fretting, we find little objective fact to support the argument that McNamara's mailed fist is creating in the ranks, all by itself, a truly horrendous state of affairs.
>
> Having just finished an analysis of the 15-year evolution in how the Defense Department has been run, we are convinced today's apprehensive palaver (that "The Trend" must be reversed) is largely overloaded with nonsense.
>
> Part of the complainers' difficulty comes from their being forced to view the total national defense need from somewhere below the top level. Properly, but unfortunately for their peace of mind, the nature of the challenge and of the resources we have to meet it can be evaluated best only from Defense Secretary McNamara's office—and this would be so, incidentally, whether he or someone else was warming the chair.
>
> On top of that, the cause of good personnel relations is boosted little when the job itself is such that a new Secretary, whether he wants to or not, must operate not unlike, interestingly enough, Boston Celtics basketball coach Red Auerbach. Said Auerbach recently, describing why his ball club has for years been so successful, "They (the team) must adjust to me. I don't have to adjust to them."
>
> It is hardly surprising then, that McNamara faces a raft of internal communications problems. The manned bomber force is being told it has precious little life expectancy left. The fleets are under serious challenge to prove they have any mission worth their expense. The Army is struggling with an organizational shakeup greater than anything it has faced in recent history.
>
> Drop into that environment a hard-driving leader who analyzes problems and options with cold, unemotional logic and makes rapid-fire decisions based on cost-effectiveness facts—all of which are changing drastically the former decisionmaking routine of the services—and some human turmoil is bound to result.
>
> Significantly, much of the chatter has cropped up at budget hearing time on Capitol Hill. Thus, Pentagon veterans write about 20 percent of the talk off to "gamesmanship," that grand old military art of setting the proper congressional stage for stating why a particular program should be given by the legislators better than it got from its own military review.
>
> Not that the Secretary's Office is executing its decisions these days with unchallengeable excellence. Its sledgehammer implementation in some very detailed areas has caused considerable consternation; discouraged all but the most courageous crusaders from responding to a key McNamara philosophy (printed in AFM 2 years ago) that he expected "prompt decisions from Defense personnel who accepted responsibility and did not seek excessive advice."
>
> But translating philosophy into procedure in as complex a setup as Defense takes quite awhile. Until McNamara closes the large-sized information gap which exists, particularly at the working military level, over who is supposed to do what and why, he will probably have to continue to make many decisions on details. (The fact that they haven't bogged him down so far is a break for the rest of the organization.)
>
> However, this understandable lag in awareness has been twisted around lately by some incomprehensible thought process into a set of qualifying credentials for criticizing McNamara. Even more ridiculous: he's being charged, basically, not with incompetence but with having the audacity to do what the law says he's supposed to do—run the Defense Department.
>
> If you inspect the record, it is clear that most, if not all, the barbs being thrown at McNamara accuse him of doing today what a Defense Secretary was being chastised for not doing just 3 years ago.
>
> Understandably, observers who don't have their emotions all jangled up in this debate are considerably confused by the flip-flop nature of the protagonists' new viewpoint, find few facts to support it and know many facts that don't.
>
> For instance, this ridiculous business that he ignores his professional military leaders' views, apart from being an incredibly suspect charge on the face of it, ignores a couple key points:
>
> 1. McNamara is pushing programs which were not that popular before. The reason, said one general, "There have been too many problems critical to the total national defense interest which we and the other services, with limited resources and our own rating of mission priority, could only be half interested in before."
>
> 2. His highly skeptical questioning of service statements on new weapons has soured a lot of military types but considering the current, generally poor military track record for estimating hardware cost, development time and performance, he can hardly be blamed for that.
>
> Unless this complaining is allowed to well up into a crusade, we have little doubt that the internal hassle over decisionmaking will ease off eventually if (1) McNamara and his team stick with the job another couple years and (2) all levels—McNamara's immediate staff, the service staffs, the field installations—bend over backward a little to view problems as seen by the rest of the outfit.
>
> To nurture understanding (which in final analysis is the only real problem) will require the highest kind of statesmanship. But we can hardly expect much progress when reasonable, responsible people are tangled instead in a distracting separatist argument full of high-flown theorizing and ghostly managerial abstractions which have no fact-supported substance except in their own minds.

WASHINGTON STAR COMMENDS M'NAMARA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star, recently commenting on Robert McNamara, had the following to say:

> The real point is, however, that someone must be willing to do the homework, to take the responsibility and to assume the personal risks of decisionmaking in the Defense Department. This is what Mr. McNamara has been doing, and we do not believe that Congress, the President, or anyone else is in a position to do it for him. If the Secretary is strong willed and hard boiled, these qualities are essential in his job.

Mr. President, that is a fine editorial from the Star. It touches on the fact that all the qualities for which the Secretary of Defense has been criticized—that he is cold, calculating, operates like a calculating machine, and is unemotional—are exactly the qualities we need in a Secretary of Defense. We need one who is able to make his decisions based on the facts and based on a careful evaluation which is objective and fair. That is actually what the Secretary has done.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENTAGON BOSS MAN

> When Robert S. McNamara first came to the Pentagon 2 years ago to be briefed on his new job, the outgoing Secretary, Thomas S. Gates, suggested he study a new Air Force report on the legal powers of the Secretary of Defense. The theme of the study was that Congress in 1958 had voted vast but unexplored authority to the Secretary—authority that Mr. Gates was just beginning to understand and to exercise.
>
> Mr. McNamara found in that report one of the solutions to the problem that had plagued previous Secretaries and had deeply disturbed Congress and the public—the problem of forcing four services to agree on a minimum essential national defense.
>
> Ever since he was sworn in Mr. McNamara has used the full legal powers of his office. He has consolidated functions common to all of the services; he has plunged into the details of Defense Department problems; he has asked the services embarrassing questions about imbalances and inconsistencies in the force structures and has insisted on clear, fast answers to his questions; he has introduced new management techniques to meet military objectives more cheaply, and he has made the tough decisions required by his job.
>
> Some Congressmen are criticizing him today, largely on the score of not leaving the decisions up to military men. They do not say Mr. McNamara has failed to consult the military men, for the record of congressional hearings show he has done this exhaustively. The conclusion is that the Congressmen can only be asking that the military men make more decisions—or, more likely, argue more and procrastinate more.
>
> We like Mr. McNamara's approach. Other approaches have been tried, and they did not work. There was the spectacle, for instance, of former Secretary of Defense McElroy begging Congress to "hold our feet to the fire" and force the Pentagon to choose between the Bomarc and Hercules missiles.
>
> If Congress wants to return to the old days, then Congress must change the law to take power of decision away from the Secretary of Defense. We think that Congress, upon reflection, will not want to do this. For someone must make the decisions, and they are tough to make. We hope that Mr. McNamara will come up with the right answers, and we think, certainly on the whole, that he has been right. The real point is, however, that someone must be willing to do the homework, to take the responsibility and to assume the personal risks of decisionmaking in the Defense Department. This is what Mr. McNamara has been doing, and we do not believe that Congress, the President, or anyone else, is in a position to do it for him. If the Secretary is strong willed and hard boiled, these qualities are essential in his job.

WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS EVALUATES M'NAMARA

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in a recent editorial the Washington Daily News also commented in the same way. The Washington Daily News said:

> In the current controversy between Defense Secretary McNamara and Congress over the TFX fighter plane contract, it may be a good idea to recall the chief reason Congress unified the Armed Forces back in 1947 and set up a single Secretary of Defense:
>
> To wipe out obvious costly duplication among the services and thus save the taxpayers billions of dollars.
>
> And ever since passage of unification, Congress has been reinforcing the idea by giving the Defense Secretary more power.
>
> Now the country has in Mr. McNamara a Defense Secretary with both the statutory backing and the personal ability to enforce unification as never before.

Obviously a man of that force and with his authority is bound to make enemies. In the past it has been indicated that we can judge a strong man's ability when he is in a position of authority by the weight of criticism leveled at him. That is true in the case of Mr. McNamara. He is assuming the responsibility for making tough decisions. He is making them. In doing so, of course, he is incurring predictable and understandable criticism.

He is also serving the national interest and serving it mighty well. Imagine what a perfectly enormous defense budget we would have if Mr. McNamara merely accepted the recommendations of the armed services. Instead of a $52-billion defense budget, we would have a $65-billion defense budget. While some people might argue that Congress could then proceed to cut it, I doubt that it would. If Mr. McNamara had not made the cut he did, I believe that a $65-billion defense budget might very well be passed by Congress. Then our deficit would really be perfectly enormous.

The service that Secretary of Defense McNamara has performed in his hard and difficult task should be appreciated by our taxpayers, because it is a great service to them as well as to all of us citizens. Mr. McNamara has not only succeeded in achieving economies in our Defense Establishment, but also in the process he has given us the strongest Army, Navy, and Air Force that we have had in our history by far, and probably a more decisive edge over the Soviet Union than we have had in the past.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "McNamara and the TFX," published in the Washington Daily News of recent date, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCNAMARA AND THE TFX

> In the current controversy between Defense Secretary McNamara and Congress over the TFX fighter plane contract, it may be a good idea to recall the chief reason Congress unified the Armed Forces back in 1947 and set up a single Secretary of Defense:
>
> To wipe out obvious costly duplication among the services and thus save the taxpayers billions of dollars.

> And ever since passage of unification, Congress has been reinforcing the idea by giving the Defense Secretary more power.
>
> Now the country has in Mr. McNamara a Defense Secretary with both the statutory backing and the personal ability to enforce unification as never before.
>
> So when both the Army and Navy demonstrated a need for a supersonic fighter plane, Mr. McNamara demanded a single craft which would meet the differing requirements of both services. He estimated that if such a plane could be designed it would save the taxpayers a billion dollars.
>
> With as much as $6 billion involved in developing and producing this plane, the race for the contract naturally was hot. In time, the field was narrowed to two—Boeing and General Dynamics-Grumman.
>
> Boeing went into the judging finals with a design most pleasing to the services themselves—a design which varied enough for Air Force and Navy functions for Mr. McNamara to hold that the company, in effect, was proposing two different airplanes from a structures point of view.
>
> General Dynamics followed the boss' orders more explicitly, producing a design of much greater "commonality" for both services and which would have greater interchange of parts. Mr. McNamara, supported by the Air Force and Navy Secretaries, calmly overruled the military and awarded what will be the first of a series of huge contracts to General Dynamics—despite Boeing's somewhat lower bid.
>
> Mr. McNamara's argument for a single plane is persuasive. As for Boeing's lower bid, he points out with much justification that original bids on such huge weapons systems have meant little in the past because actual costs have commonly increased from 300 to 500 percent over estimated costs.

WALL STREET JOURNAL APPROVES M'NAMARA STRENGTH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call the attention of Senators to another editorial on the same subject which appeared in today's issue of the Wall Street Journal. The Wall Street Journal comments:

> Now whatever the merits of the arguments over any of these specific decisions and plans, it seems to us it ought to be possible to keep a couple of basic points clear.
>
> One is that civilian control of the Defense Department is a principle long since agreed upon for the soundest of reasons. If Mr. McNamara is applying it more vigorously than others have, that is hardly a good excuse for military dismay; officers so supersensitive reflect only on themselves.
>
> A further point: It is not necessarily so that military men are the most impartial judges of weapons—particularly new design concepts like the TFX intended for use by more than one service. Nor are they always the most prudent purchasers of weapons.
>
> Experience has shown that responsible officers do develop vested interests in particular weapons systems, interests which may impede the development of advanced weapons essential for future defense needs.

The editorial concludes:

> For our part, we wish he had been able to do more, particularly in keeping costs from soaring as they have the past couple of years. But at least he is making a needed effort to impose control on an institution made almost uncontrollable by its built-in rivalries, its encrustation of traditions, its proclivity for committee creation and empire building and, above all, its sheer size and the vast sums at its disposal.

It is very hard for any mere mortal to envision the perfectly fantastic size of the Defense Department budget, the enormous amount at their disposal—$50,000 million—$50 billion.

For any Defense Secretary to have the kind of competent, effective control over the Defense Establishment which Mr. McNamara has developed is a great service, when that man has the kind of values and the kind of judgment that Mr. McNamara has. I think he has served this country mighty well.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Grappling With an Octopus," published in the Wall Street Journal on March 21, 1963, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAPPLING WITH AN OCTOPUS

> Many men have had many ideas about how to run the Department of Defense—what its strategic plans should be, how much money it should spend, how to make it more efficient. But they would all be compelled to agree that the Pentagon is a sprawling octopus which practically defies coherent management.
>
> Secretary McNamara's current troubles stem largely from the fact that he is indeed trying to get hold of this octopus that more passive men would let lie. He is accused of setting up a "McNamara monarchy" of civilians which, among other alleged evils, is said to be having bad effect on military morale. He is charged with asserting, by implication at least, too much independence of Congress. And so the military-political fur keeps flying.
>
> For what they are worth, the charges appear true enough. The famous TFX fighter-bomber case shows the move toward a greater civilian centralization of the Defense Establishment, with some downgrading of the role of the individual services and of the military men as decisionmakers. It also shows the concern of Congress, where Mr. McNamara is scheduled to testify on the matter today.
>
> The Secretary and his civilian advisers awarded the TFX development, which may provide some $6.5 billion in eventual orders, to General Dynamics and Grumman even though the military advisers thought Boeing had the better design; Mr. McNamara believes they paid too little attention to other considerations.
>
> What's more, he is thinking of putting still greater responsibility for both evaluating and procuring weapons in civilian rather than military hands. In his view there is too much inefficiency and waste in present practices.
>
> Now whatever the merits of the arguments over any of these specific decisions and plans, it seems to us it ought to be possible to keep a couple of basic points clear.
>
> One is that civilian control of the Defense Department is a principle long since agreed upon for the soundest of reasons. If Mr. McNamara is applying it more vigorously than others have, that is hardly a good excuse for military dismay; officers so supersensitive reflect only on themselves.
>
> A further point: It is not necessarily so that military men are the most impartial judges of weapons—particularly new design concepts like the TFX intended for use by more than one service. Nor are they always the most prudent purchasers of weapons.
>
> Experience has shown that responsible officers do develop vested interests in particular weapons systems, interests which may impede the development of advanced weapons essential for future defense needs. Also that they may develop vested interests in particular contractors, not with sinister intent but often just out of familiarity with their operations. Civilian experts might do better for the Nation in many cases.
>
> As for Congress, its defense responsibilities are obviously enormous and it is certainly entitled to question anything it wants. Yet if it pushes its inquiries to the point of the harassment and niggling interference, it is not helping the defense effort. Congress cannot run the Pentagon day by day; that is what the Secretary has been delegated to do. As Mr. McNamara himself asks, if he is not to knock heads together for the sake of efficiency and curbing military extravagance, who is going to do it?
>
> For our part, we wish he had been able to do more, particularly in keeping costs from soaring as they have the past couple of years. But at least he is making a needed effort to impose control on an institution made almost uncontrollable by its built-in rivalries, its encrustation of traditions, its proclivity for committee creation and empire building—and, above all, its sheer size and the vast sums at its disposal.
>
> The whole Government would deserve more respect if other officials in other departments were equally interested in tackling the bureaucratic octopus.

TIME FOR CASE RESOLUTION TO PREVENT CONGRESSIONAL PRESSURE FOR CONTRACT PREFERENCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on a related subject, Marquis Childs recently wrote a column in the Washington Post in which he briefly discussed the TFX controversy. In the column, Mr. Childs pointed out that the controversy underlined how very constructive is the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. I am honored to be a cosponsor of the Case proposal, which would provide for a continuing congressional investigation of defense contracts, particularly seeing that no political influence from the Congress was involved. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] has made an excellent proposal. The controversy over the TFX in the Senate today underlines how valuable the Case proposal would be.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post also be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMS RACE SEEN INFECTING POLITICS

(By Marquis Childs)

> The noisy quarrel, which is essentially between two giant contractors and their congressional backers, over the TFX plane contract points up the ever-growing entanglement of huge defense spending with the politics of who gets what.
>
> The Senate subcommittee investigating the $6.5 billion contract has taken after Secretary of Defense McNamara on the ground that he gave the contract to General Dynamics even though Boeing entered a lower bid. McNamara's answer is that economies to be achieved through developing a single plane for both the Air Force and the Navy determined the award. A resolute man, he shows no signs of reversing his decision.
>
> The Defense Department has responded by saying, in effect, that you can hardly expect an unbiased finding when Senators with a direct stake in the outcome sit on the investigating committee. The accusing finger is pointed at Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat of Washington, for whom the Boeing plant in Seattle and its payroll must be a major consideration.
>
> But it is possible that JACKSON, with his wide and continuing interest in national security, would welcome a way out of the pressures that inevitably bear down on a Senator with important defense industry in his State. If he can deliver for a particular industry back home he may at the same time be doing a disservice to the Nation.
>
> That is why the Senate, instead of indulging in the quarrel currently going on, would do well to give serious consideration to the proposals of Senator CLIFFORD CASE, Republican of New Jersey. CASE put in bills the other day calling for complete public disclosure of all communications whether written or oral and from Members of Congress and anyone in the executive branch seeking to influence the awarding of a contract. He would also require full and prompt disclosure of the basis on which a negotiated contract is granted.
>
> Of the $60 billion a year in defense and space contracts an estimated 65 percent are negotiated without competitive bidding. This is a wide-open invitation to pull and push. While by most accounts McNamara has done a remarkable job of standing up to these pressures, it is too great a burden to put on one man.
>
> CASE, in introducing his proposals, cited examples of the "I can do more for you" theme that is more and more resorted to. He quoted speeches by President Kennedy in last year's election in Pennsylvania and West Virginia, claiming a marked increase in Government contracts for those States under his administration, with the President urging election of Democratic Governors to continue this collaboration.
>
> The Defense Department has fallen into the habit of allowing Senators and Representatives to announce important defense contracts in their States and districts. That tends to create the impression they are responsible for obtaining this prize. In most instances the impression is false but there is rivalry for the local headlines that come out of such an announcement.
>
> Senator CASE has a third proposal. That is to establish a joint Senate-House committee to review defense and space contracts, with special attention to negotiated contracts. It would be made up of a Democrat and a Republican each named from the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, Senate and House Government Operations and Senate and House Space Committees.
>
> It would bear a family resemblance to the Committee on the Conduct of the War which Harry S. Truman so ably directed in World War II.
>
> That any of the Case proposals will be adopted seems unlikely even though five other Senators have joined in sponsoring the bills. The joint committee on contracts cuts across too many privileges and prerogatives which present committee chairmen cling to.
>
> With each succeeding election, so long as defense budgets run at $55 or $60 billion, the game of contract promise and grab will become more deeply entrenched in the political system. As this system prevails any meaningful disarmament is bound to become more difficult. Each Member of Congress will have a stake in keeping the home plant going. This has already been demonstrated in areas where aircraft contracts have been cut back as missiles have begun to dominate.
>
> In his farewell address President Eisenhower spoke solemn words of warning about the growing influence of what he called the military-industrial complex. Today it might better be called the military-industrial-political complex.

DEPRESSED CONDITIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, "approximately 285 million years ago Pennsylvania was in worse shape than it is today."

Mr. President, that observation appeared recently in a Philadelphia business review.

In those dim and dismal days of the early Paleozoic Era, Pennsylvania was a bleak place, a vast swamp swarming with reptiles; dominated by the most primitive concept of survival by the fittest.

Pennsylvania has come far since then. It is the "Keystone State" of our great Nation. Its importance was pointed out with unusual clarity by Governor Scranton in a recent address to our State legislature. The Governor said:

> What say we Pennsylvanians to America? We say this:
>
> As you are our Nation, we are your heartland.
>
> You rolled across the prairies in our Conestoga wagons; you roared across a continent on our rails of steel.
>
> With our textiles, we clothed you.
>
> With our coal, we warmed you.
>
> With the rich produce of our soil, we nourished your bodies; with our genius, we nourished your minds.
>
> We gave Ben Franklin a home, Andrew Carnegie a furnace; Charles Schwab an opportunity, and John Mitchell a cause.
>
> In our largest city, your freedom was born, your Constitution came to life there. Your Union was preserved with mingeld blood on the fields of Gettysburg.
>
> A Massachusetts man, Henry Adams, once wrote that Pennsylvania both managed and paid for every war in which the United States had been engaged. And he was right. We built the Nation's war machine with the same skill as we manned her peacetime workbench.
>
> We lit up your sky with the rich red fire of our forges; we lit up your hearts with the high promise of our vision of the American dream.
>
> We built your machinery; we made it hum and sing.
>
> We are Pennsylvanians; ours is the Keystone State.

Yes, Mr. President, we have come a long way since the Paleozoic era; but we have our difficulties—some very serious.

In that time long ago they had no unemployment problems; they had no people. There was no concern over great industries working at partial capacity; there were no industries. There was no controversy over Government contracts: there were no governments.

So, although things are better in Pennsylvania than they were 285 million years ago, still, things are not particularly good. Our unemployment has for many years been excessively high, frequently double the national average; and it stays grievously high.

Governor Scranton is now instituting positive programs, to get our people back to work; but he has barely had time to start. Furthermore, the influence and operations of the Federal Government play an increasingly important role in the economics of all of our States. Government purchasing practices, both at home and abroad, have an enormous impact on industrial growth and employment levels.

Hopes were high in Pennsylvania after the 1960 presidential election. The winning candidate had campaigned in our State many times, and promised much. Under his leadership there was to be no return to the Paleozoic era but, rather, a forward march into a majestic and even greater future. He had shown an understanding of our related business, economic and unemployment problems, and, he had shown a desire to help.

Let me recall some of his words to Pennsylvanians:

> I pledge that a new administration will move at once to put our people back to work. The policy of full employment—which the Democratic Party wrote into law in 1945—will be taken out of the ash can where the Republicans have thrown it and made once more a primary objective of national economic policy.—Sharon, Pa., October 15, 1960.
>
> The Democratic Party today has set forth many goals for the future of America * * * a goal whose attainment is basic to all our other programs is the goal of full employment.—Levittown, Pa., October 30, 1960.
>
> Let us take our abundance out of storage at home and put it to work. Let us give our money and our workers and our factories fulltime jobs. Let us have more new jobs and more new buying power. Let us start building again.—Philadelphia, Pa., October 1960.
>
> Let us take our great productive capacity—our money and our men and women and our machines and our factories—out of storage.—Brookville, Pa., October 1960.

We all remember such stirring words of promise and hope. We all remember that incessant theme of "I am going to get this country moving again." But, after more than 2 years, what have been the results? What do we find today?

Well, I can say that things are still better in Pennsylvania than they were in the Paleozoic era. But 57 of our 67 counties are classified as persistent or substantial labor surplus areas. In late 1960, 37 of our counties were so classified.

So in getting the country moving forward, we have had at least 20 Pennsylvania counties moving steadily backward.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] has observed that "the existence of labor surplus areas depresses the commerce of the entire Nation."

Unemployment in Pennsylvania is 9.3 percent. That means that 1 out of every 12 Pennsylvanians is unemployed.

The Labor Department's group F category, which lists areas with the very highest unemployment percentages, shows only three areas. Two are in Puerto Rico. The third is Johnstown, Pa., with 15.6 percent unemployed. In Wilkes-Barre the figure is 14.1 percent. In Scranton it is 13.5 percent. In Pittsburgh 11.1 percent are out of work. In Altoona it is 14.1 percent. In Erie, the figure is 9.9 percent. Even in Philadelphia the figure, at 7.6 percent, is well over the national average.

Depressed areas are tragic places. You should walk some of their streets. You can see it in the hunger, the hopelessness in the faces of children, as well as their job-seeking elders. We hear much of terrible conditions in underdeveloped lands. Well, these areas in our own great country are not underdeveloped, but it can be said they are underhelped.

I am sure that if Pennsylvania could get under a foreign aid program, conditions would improve drastically, and I imagine if we were a foreign nation which was particularly threatening to the United States, we could probably double the amount of Federal help in short order. However, unfortunately for Pennsylvania, it is close to Washington in everything except help.

Past the multitude of human tragedies, of human waste, which this situation represents, though, there are other important aspects requiring consideration.

Pennsylvania is a basic, a vital industry State. As Governor Scranton has so eloquently pointed out, Pennsylvania's industries, resources, and ingenuity have played a decisive role in America's historic rise to world prestige and power.

Yet, as one outstanding example of our dilemma, our steel industry—without which the U.S. economy and defense effort would collapse—is operating at little over half capacity. This is occurring at a time when the Government continues to buy steel abroad.

Our coal industry is characterized by chronic unemployment—yet, again, we find the Federal Government frequently buying abroad.

I am not opposed to foreign purchasing if it is necessary, and does not contribute to keeping our industries down, and unemployment up. This is now too often the case. Foreign purchasing also contributes directly to our present balance-of-payments difficulties, about which the administration voices such great concern. Dollars go abroad which could and should be kept at home; dollars which might serve as wages for our unemployed, investment capital for our businessmen.

One positive action the Government could take to help us to help ourselves would be issuance of a new Executive order to implement the Buy American Act. I have long advocated this, and though I have had some success in specific instances in Pennsylvania, the overall picture is still one of procrastination, indecision, and inaction on the part of the Federal executive department.

Last July, my intervention resulted in an award to an American rather than a West German, steel company for 2,400 tons of carbon steel. I was gratified by the administration's cooperative attitude in that instance. The Government was also buying coal and coke abroad for our military installations in Europe last year. I am again happy to report that my pleas, and those of others, in behalf of the coal industry and the miners resulted in the purchase of 400,000 tons of coal from Pennsylvania mines.

But the results of such interventions are not always so salutary.

Recently, the Defense Department awarded a contract to reconstruct two naval vessels, to a west coast shipbuilding firm, which intends to subcontract most of the new construction to Japan. Defense Secretary McNamara informed me that it was impossible to consider the bid of Pennsylvania's Sunshipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. under the present Executive order implementing the Buy American Act.

As they now stand, the criteria and guidelines of the Buy American Act are not geared to a period in which we must simultaneously cope with heavy involvement abroad, and large-scale unemployment and lagging industry at home.

So, on August 23 of last year, I forwarded a series of recommendations, made by the American Iron and Steel Institute, on the Government's foreign steel purchases, to Mr. David Bell, the then Director of the Bureau of the Budget. One of the institute's recommendations was for a new Executive order to implement the Buy American Act.

In my covering letter to Mr. Bell, I pointed out that:

> I endorse these recommendations because I believe that if present foreign steel purchases by the U.S. Government continue at the present rate they could jeopardize the jobs of thousands of steelworkers and may be a threat to one of the most important defense industries in the Nation.
>
> It has been estimated that every ton of steel purchased from foreign sources with U.S. Government funds means up to 2 days less work for an American steelworker.

In mid-September I was notified that a Cabinet Committee, chaired by the Secretary of the Treasury has been established to consider changes in procurement policies.

On November 1, the United Steel Workers of America informed me that they were supporting efforts for a new Executive order on the Buy American Act. As I had had no word of any disposition having been made of my recommendations, I wired the President on November 2.

Promptly on December 3, I received a letter from Mr. Bell which stated that a study was being carried out on Federal purchases of foreign materials, and that it would be completed and presented to the President in the near future.

This study is apparently continuing. And so is unemployment.

The recommendations which I submitted to the Budget Bureau proposed that all purchases of $10,000 and less, and all purchases above that figure where the domestic cost over the foreign cost is 50 percent or less should be made from domestic sources; all cases where the domestic cost is more than 50 percent larger than the foreign cost should be referred to the head of the procurement agency; and for an end product to be considered of American origin, 80 percent of its components should be of such origin. This could be embodied in a new Executive order, but the administration's silence continues.

The question of a new Executive order on the Buy American Act is now in the hands of the executive department. There is little more that we in Congress can do than hope that the President will see the urgency of this crisis in employment and act promptly.

However, I cannot remain idle while more than 9 percent of the workers in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are seeking jobs which do not exist.

I propose a direct legislative attack on this problem.

Today the U.S. Government purchases goods and services that represent about 10 percent of our gross national product. I would like to see those dollars—one out of 10 in our economy—go to work for our unemployed.

I am now drafting legislation to give businesses in economically depressed areas a percentage advantage when they bid on Government contracts.

This legislation would authorize the Secretary of Labor to set up classifications for areas, depending on their relative rates of unemployment. Then, companies in those areas would receive a 2 to 12 percent price advantage when bidding on Government contracts.

The percentage would depend on where the work actually would be performed. When work was to be done in several areas, the percentage would be adjusted accordingly.

In terms of my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, for instance, when the Government wants to buy coal, a company in Scranton—where 13.5 percent of the people are unemployed—would get a 10 or 12 percent advantage over a company in an area of relative prosperity.

A similar advantage would apply to railroad ties when they come from Johnstown, where there are more than 15 percent of the people out of work, to steel when it comes from Altoona where 14 percent of the people are unemployed, and so forth. I have used Pennsylvania illustrations, but of course these figures would be applicable to any area in the United States which qualified under the percentage computations to be made by the Secretary of Labor.

When contracts were negotiated, rather than let by competitive bidding, my bill would require that these advantages be computed into the weighted factors in such contracts.

My proposal does not require the Government to buy from any one area, regardless of the unemployment, because it is obvious that each area is not equipped to provide all the goods and services required by the Government. But it does seek to turn some of the contracts toward areas which are able to meet the production requirements but need a price advantage to equalize the competitive advantage now enjoyed by companies from more prosperous areas.

This bill is designed to assist all areas suffering from economically depressed conditions, but obviously my principal concern is with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I am concerned, even saddened, that Pennsylvania, with its wealth of skilled manpower, its almost unique industrial capacity—not to speak of potential—and 7 percent of our population—far too many of them unemployed—received in the last fiscal year a mere 3.8 percent of total Federal military and research and development contracts. During the period since 1960, when Federal expenditures on such contracts rose over 20 percent, Pennsylvania contracts increased only one-half of 1 percent.

So, Pennsylvania, which pays over 10 percent of our Nation's taxes, is being left behind. Yet, research and development, for example, lies at the very heart of an expanding future, a future which does not include depressed areas.

Moreover, there has been a noticeable trend toward withdrawal of military installations from our State. Six Army Ordnance departments have, for example, been closed. I am looking into a report that the Optical Glass Division

of the Middletown Air Force Depot is to be moved to another State. There are others.

Although this trend may be justifiable from defense or other standpoints, it still works to aggravate Pennsylvania's unemployment problem. It points up another facet of the Federal Government's impact on our State.

Though their interest in revision of Government purchasing policies has not been readily apparent, the administration has been acting, or attempting to act, in ways which their thinkers and theorists believe will solve unemployment throughout the country. They know, and we know that it is a national problem—Pennsylvania just seems to get the worst of so many national problems.

One of the administration's articles of faith seems to be a belief in the magic of deficit spending—the idea that debt-based artificial stimulants to our economy hold some strange cure-all power. They have even started planning deficits. With most of us, in our daily lives, debt is enough of a problem without deliberately planning more of the same.

Though deficit spending may furnish a short-term stimulus to the economy, it must be recognized that it also causes more inflation at a time when the cost of living is at an all-time high, and rising. Furthermore, continuing deficits increase the interest on our national debts, thus, ultimately increasing taxes, and weakening our Government's credit. This policy will not solve our unemployment problems now any more than it did in the 1930's.

The interest on our $300 billion debt—soon to be increased—amounts to $9 billion a year. This is increased at the rate of $30 million with each added billion of debt. And, most dollars borrowed by the Federal Government are new dollars, which automatically cheapen all those already in existence.

I know that some people consider these deficit spending dangers of which I have been speaking, to be a myth, old copybook maxims; the cliches of our forebears. Thus, the new economists justify modern follies by sneering at ancient truths. To them I would further point out: Deficit spending is not going to reopen closed coal mines. It will only increase the prices of the miners food and clothing. Nor is deficit spending going to reopen closed plants and railroad yards. It will only succeed in cutting the buying capacity of those who have little enough as it is.

No, I am not for deficit spending, and those that are might well recall some line by Rudyard Kipling:

> Then the gods of the market tumbled,
> And their smooth-tongued wizards withdrew,
> And the hearts of the meanest were humbled,
> And began to believe it was true
> That all is not gold that glitters
> And 2 and 2 make 4—
> And the gods of the copybook headings
> Limped up to explain it once more.

The fundamental point is that regardless of the degree of stimulation which may or may not be furnished the economy by deficit spending, it does not get to the root of the problem. It merely delays the day of solution, or collapse. I want action which will help us get to the root of the problem, action which will get our people back to work for good.

There are the public works programs, of course, the youth conservation programs, all the rest. Though one may see merit in some of these programs, they fail to apply to the root causes, basic curatives. They propose surface solutions which merely delay the day when someone will have to limp up and "explain it once more."

Further, if we are going to take people off the streets, we should certainly try to help them to keep themselves off the street when we are through with them, perhaps through aid to vocational and technical training—a subject which I plan to discuss in detail at a later date.

In his address to the legislature, Governor Scranton pointed out that "the next half dozen years are going to be critical ones for establishing the growth patterns of American industry." One vital element will be location of the job-producing research and development firms. The Governor is now offering proposals which will enhance Pennsylvania's appeal to these firms. He has stated:

> Presently Pennsylvania has the same rate structure as the Federal Government for determining depreciation allowances. This should be changed to allow manufacturing and research and development companies erecting new or enlarged plants to claim a depreciation allowance on the new facility of one and a half times that now allowed.
>
> Obviously, this will make Pennsylvania an attractive place for industry to begin or to expand.
>
> Another change we should make in our tax laws is called for because the new types of research and development industries are sure to bring jobs and prosperity.
>
> Presently we exempt corporations dealing in manufacturing or processing from capital stock and franchise taxes. We should extend this exemption to cover firms dealing in research and development.

In addition to these and other proposals, a Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Washington office has been established under the direction of former Representative James Van Zandt. Its mission will be to coordinate the overlapping interests of Federal and State Government, to cut through some of the complexities which so frequently prevent the right contract coming together with the right company, and to more effectively present the picture of a Pennsylvania which has much to offer.

So, we are moving to help ourselves, but with few signs from the Federal administration of workable, job-creating programs, and solid meaningful progress toward real solutions.

In fiscal year 1962, only 29.5 percent of total military prime contracts awarded went to areas of substantial unemployment.

Though approximately half of the dollars received by large companies are paid out in the form of subcontracts to other companies, it is of interest to note that some 85 percent of reported receipts of military contractors for both prime and subcontract work go to 100 defense contracting firms. Thus, many are obviously passing contracts back and forth between themselves. In a great many instances this may be necessary, even imperative, but I doubt that this overall trend contributes to strengthening our grassroots industry.

These figures indicate that the so-called set-aside policies for small business and surplus labor areas have not been overly successful. And, Government procurement regulations provide that "in no case will price differentials be paid for the purpose of carrying out this policy." The General Accounting Office has interpreted this to mean that practices of negotiating contracts with labor surplus firms which would meet the lowest price offered by any other bidder on a designated procurement might be continued, but that no such contract could be awarded at a price in excess of the lowest available.

It is my hope that many of my colleagues will join with me in sponsoring legislation which help us to realistically meet this problem. I would also hope to work in close cooperation with the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies. The national unemployment rate has, after all, just climbed to 6.1 percent—if it keeps on, it may soon catch up with our rate in Pennsylvania.

There has been much talk in recent years about these problems, but I seriously doubt that anyone can talk us into more jobs. Nor can they spend us into real solutions. We in Pennsylvania have heard a lot about programs. What we prefer is progress. There are no calories in statistics, no nourishment in sympathy.

It is a time for action, for a concerted attack on this tragic and basic infection which daily gnaws away at the very cornerstone—the keystone—of our great, and in so many ways, materially blessed society.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I shall be very brief.

Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the words of my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania. He is performing a great service in spotlighting the problems created by chronic and continued unemployment. The persistence in our so-called affluent society of areas of high unemployment, of low per capita income, and of unsatisfactory career opportunities is one of the greatest challenges that our Nation faces today. Although I have not had an opportunity to study his recommendations carefully, the Senator's discussion should, undoubtedly, stimulate interest and concern in the role that can be played by the Federal Government to alleviate conditions that are in many ways the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, as of February, 1963, there were 19 areas of substantial unemployment within the State of New York. They include Erie and Niagara Counties, with the city of Buffalo, second largest city in the State. They include Herkeimer and Oneida Counties, with the cities of Utica and Rome. They also include Amsterdam, Auburn, Batavia, Catskill, Cobleskill, Elmira, Geneva-Canandaigua, Glens Falls-Hudson Falls, Gloversville, Jamestown-Dunkirk, Medina-Albion, Newburg-Middletown-Beacon, Ogedensburg - Massena - Malone, Plattsburgh, Ticonderoga, Watertown, and Wellsville.

What can be done to bring more jobs to these cities and rural areas? What can be done to train the unemployed now living in these areas to perform work that, undoubtedly, needs to be done in other fields?

In my judgment, there is no one answer. Vocational retraining, if undertaken intelligently and on a sufficiently broad scale, can help in certain instances. Appropriate public works projects can provide immediate employment and over the long run can create the factors that encourage economic development and growth. Tax reduction has a role to play both in encouraging corporations to expand and create new jobs and in returning to the individuals funds that can flow out into the economy. Export expansion can also bring new jobs to areas of unemployment, if combined with vigorous resistance against protectionist tendencies developing in other countries. In short, Mr. President, we must explore a number of areas and methods in order to meet the heart-rending challenge of unemployment, of men laid off from their lifetime work, of women forced to take low-wage jobs where there is no work for men, of youngsters coming out of school without the complex skills necessary to find a place in our modern society. No problem is more serious in our society today. No problem deserves our attention more urgently. The answer does not necessarily lie in a proliferation of hastily concocted Federal programs but rather in a thorough analysis of the basic need and in an overall fiscal policy that will provide the national growth we need. I congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania on discussing this very pressing problem here today.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York very much. I appreciate his comments. During the time we have been here I have always known that we shared the same concern about a problem relating to which many of us feel something more should be done, and it certainly must be done, to meet the problem of unemployment than we have so far managed. I thank the Senator.

PUBLICATION OF USIA OPINION SURVEY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the controversy over news reports of the findings of recent U.S. Information Agency surveys of public opinion in Western Europe has tended to obscure the findings themselves.

There is no good reason to believe that portions of this report were leaked to the press, as has been suggested by critics. None of the critics can give any good reason—political, or partisan, or personal—as to why this information might have been given out at this season, or, on the contrary, why it should be withheld. The portion of the report which has been publicized certainly contains no information which proves detrimental to the national interest, nor is there any good reason to believe that its release is having any significant effect upon our foreign policy or the political strength of either of the political parties in the United States.

The survey results reflect a high level of prestige. The substance of the survey report is this: Contrary to allegations which have been made by some Members of Congress and some members of the press, U.S. prestige in Western Europe is extremely high. The reaction to our foreign policy and programs by the citizens of our closest allies is generally very favorable. The people of Europe express confidence in American policies and in our willingness to support our words with action. They understand our efforts for peace; they share our world objectives; and they have a high esteem for the United States. Far from embracing a position of "third force" neutrality, the people of Western Europe continue to identify their national interests with those of the United States.

Concern has been expressed that the discussions relating to the substitution of the Polaris submarine for the Skybolt missile caused marked resentment against the United States in Great Britain. However, in February of 1963, 59 percent of the people in Great Britain expressed a favorable impression of our Government's recent conduct of international affairs, whereas only 14 percent had an unfavorable impression. In 1960, the results showed 48 percent favorable and 18 percent unfavorable. Since 1960, the number of British citizens expressing confidence in U.S. leadership has risen from 35 to 54 percent. In May of 1960, 42 percent of those interviewed thought that Great Brintain should ally itself with the United States and 46 percent thought that Great Britain should remain neutral. Today that trend has been reversed, and 52 percent prefer alliance with the United States and 38 percent prefer neutrality. In May of 1960, a majority of those interviewed in Great Britain felt that the United States was not doing all it should to prevent war. Today our efforts for peace are endorsed by a majority of nearly two to one.

In West Germany, confidence in American leadership stands at a record 77 percent—compared to 57 percent in 1960. Seventy percent of the German citizens interviewed expressed confidence in U.S. willingness to support its policies with necessary action, compared to 45 percent in 1960. Sixty-five percent approve of our foreign policy in general and 76 percent approve of our efforts toward peace in particular. In 1960, the comparable figures were 48 percent and 44 percent. Public opinion in West Germany expressed a decided preference for association with the United States as opposed to neutrality, and a highly favororable opinion of this country and its objectives.

The results of the survey in France have a special interest because of the widespread speculation about the consequences of France's rejection of Great Britain's application for membership in the European Common Market and the rejection of the U.S. offer of a multilateral deterrent force. These actions did not drastically alter the basic political, military, and economic problems of the Atlantic community nor of the Common Market countries, but the resulting controversy and the exaggerated response in some quarters might have been expected to result in adverse French reaction.

The published results of the USIA survey, however, indicate greater approval of U.S. foreign policy by the people of France than at any time since the surveys were initiated in 1956. Forty-six percent of the French citizens interviewed expressed approval of U.S. foreign policy in February of this year, compared to 24 percent with an unfavorable opinion. In February 1960, only 28 percent expressed approval, while 23 percent expressed disapproval. General approval of U.S. policies is higher today among the people of France than it was last summer, and it is substantially greater than it was 3 years ago. A majority of those expressing an opinion now feels that the United States is exerting responsible leadership in the common effort to achieve and maintain order and peace in the world.

The results of the poll are an inadequate guide to policy. These results are an answer to those who arbitrarily, on the basis of a kind of private inspiration, charge that we are losing prestige in European countries. They reflect clearly the confidence of Europeans in the President as a leader in world affairs and are evidence of better understanding among Europeans of our Government's response to international challenges. I have serious doubts as to whether the USIA should be taking polls on potentially confidential matters.

The controversy and confusion resulting from this incident suggests another reason for establishing a Joint Committee of the House and Senate on Foreign Information and Intelligence. Continuing supervision over the foreign information and intelligence activities of the U.S. Government help to prevent pointless and unworthy political controversy.

ALASKA'S DEFENSES ARE INADEQUATE—THE RUSSIAN FLYERS PROVED IT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the so-called defenses of Alaska are not adequate. They never have been. The invasion of Alaska's airspace by two Russian planes demonstrated that fact.

Beginning about 15 years ago, the United States began to build, at great cost, bases around the world to contain the potential aggression of Soviet Russia.

At that time I stated—publicly—my belief that many of these bases were built, figuratively speaking, on quicksand. I warned that rampant nationalism, Communist subversion, or other factors would cause the governments of these nations to request that our bases be withdrawn.

It has happened. In other cases where we have not been compelled to scrap an investment of many millions of dollars, the United States has been blackmailed into paying more rent for the land on which these bases are located or paying through the nose with vastly increased economic aid. That happened in Spain. It happened in Libya, where, in addition to an initial retainer payment of $7,500,000, the United States agreed to pay $4 million a year. When that agreement expired, the Libyan Government insisted on raising the ante to $10 million a year. The United States yielded, although in addition to these fantastic payments, the presence of these bases with their substantial employment of local labor, payment of local rents, and purchases of local products constitute a great economic bonanza for that underdeveloped country. Likewise, we are granting substantial economic aid to Libya, running into many millions of dollars.

Even in presumably friendly countries our military tenure is uncertain.

There is no danger of our losing any of our military strength in the 49th State, except as by our own unwisdom we fail to install it or keep it there. The Alaska delegation in Congress protested in vain, 4 years ago, when the Air Force suddenly reversed its policy of strengthening the air materiel in Alaska and abandoned Ladd Field, near Fairbanks, the first airbase to be established in Alaska 25 years ago and the northernmost base on the continent. Alaskans considered it folly then and do now.

No area—as Billy Mitchell pointed out in his last public appearance in 1935 before the House Committee on Military Affairs—is strategically more important. It lies within naked eye view of Soviet Siberia. It fronts on the new air crossways of the world, the Arctic Ocean. It is, needless to say, inhabited by a militantly patriotic population of American citizens. It holds the key to the defense—and offense—of the North American Continent and thereby of the heart of the free world.

But it is as true today as when Gen. H. H. "Hap" Arnold, the five-star General who commanded the Air Force during World War II, wrote it in his book: "Global Mission" 15 years ago:

> Through to this day Alaska has never received the attention in national defense planning that it deserves.

Alaska is the logical place for missiles. There are none there, and when Lt. Gen. Frank Armstrong, the commander in chief in Alaska from 1957 to 1962, who had, a decade earlier, been stationed there as its air commander—a great and capable officer with 2 years more of service in view—recommended missiles for Alaska, he was promptly called to Washington and his retirement ordered by Chief of Staff, Gen. Curtis Le May—a deplorable action in my view and that of virtually all Alaskans.

The Anchorage Daily Times has just published an excellent editorial on the State of Alaska's defenses entitled: "Alaska Wide Open to Soviet Tourists."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Alaska Wide Open To Soviet Tourists

Two Soviet planes have now demonstrated the glaring defense weaknesses that Alaskans have been citing for years.

The Russians flew over western Alaska last week like tourists out for a sightseeing excursion. They flew slow and they flew low.

The only capability the Alaska defenses showed was the ineffective measure of watching a blip on a radar screen.

Fighter planes sent to intercept the intruders did not even get close enough to see them. They could not have hit them with gunfire had they wanted to.

The Russians apparently continued their sightseeing trip unconcerned by blips and the interceptors.

This military response by the United States to an incursion over our land is a marked contrast to the response of the Russians in 1955 when they shot down a U.S. Navy plane 40 miles southwest of St. Lawrence Island.

The Russians went out over international waters and downed a U.S. plane that was not violating any law. But the United States could not even look at the Russians when they intruded.

The incident points up the fact that the United States has left this gateway to America undefended. The billion-dollar warning systems for invading aircraft and ballistic missiles can sound alarms but the military capability to respond is no more than a gesture.

The warning systems in Alaska are the most important defense investment here. Radar stations stand like a picket fence from the Aleutians along the western coast to the Arctic Ocean shores.

The Soviet incursion shows that the warning systems are vulnerable to sneak attack at any time. The Russians could knock them out while their "tourists" are out for a joyride.

A few well-placed sorties in slow planes could hit each White Alice communications station. Word of whatever happened after that would be a long time getting to military headquarters.

Simultaneously with a strike at the warning and communications systems, the Russians could capture Fairbanks and Anchorage military establishments with a few paratroopers. And Alaska would be theirs until the United States marshaled enough strength to recapture it by force.

Perhaps the Pentagon can read what the Russians say with their reconnaissance planes better than what is said by Alaskans.

The incident proved that the handful of fighter interceptors assigned to Alaska are inadequate to do an effective job. The interceptors are too far away and are too few to protect the important radar installations and the communications system.

There should be more fighters assigned to Alaska. They should be deployed so that every strategic point on the coastline of Alaska can be protected. And they should be in sufficient numbers to provide capability for an effective response in many places simultaneously.

The best place to stop the Russians is beyond the shores of Alaska, not inland. The most economical defense is one that insures retention of Alaska in American hands, not one that will require a costly, bloody war to recapture it.

Mr. GRUENING. Governor Egan has just written a vigorous letter to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara on the State of Alaska's defenses or lack of them. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State of Alaska,
Office of the Governor,
Juneau, March 19, 1963.

Hon. Robert S. McNamara,
Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense,
Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: The U.S. State Department's formal protest to Soviet Russia against the overflight of an area of southwest Alaska by two Soviet reconnaissance aircraft on March 14, vividly points up a situation which could result in catastrophe for our Nation unless remedied at the earliest possible time.

One news item quoted Washington, D.C., sources as stating that the Soviet planes had penetrated U.S. airspace to a depth of 30 miles. Yet, the first press release from Washington, D.C., indicated the planes were tracked going out of Kuskokwim Bay, one of them passing over Nunivak Island, and the other plane passing over Nelson Island. A 200-mile arc drawn on the map using the central area of Kuskokwim Bay as the beginning point, passes through St. Lawrence Island at an area approximately 15 miles back from St. Lawrence's most easterly point.

The question most commonly asked in Alaska following news of the overflight is: Just what does the United States consider to be U.S. airspace for defense purposes?

There would have been a lesser alarm in the minds of Americans if the flights had passed over the area of Wales in the northwest Seward Peninsula area. It is only a short distance from that point across Bering Strait to the easternmost point of Siberia, and it is always possible for a plane to get off its course and violate U.S. airspace.

The shock of learning of the extremely deep Soviet penetration into the southwest area, is another matter altogether. Those planes had to have been flying and flying and flying to reach the Kuskokwim Bay area. Thus, it is extremely clear that something must be done at the earliest possible moment to bulwark Alaska's defenses.

The occurrence of this flight and its penetration over the Alaska mainland was not surprising to anyone of even passing familiarity with the woeful inadequacy of U.S. Air Force capability to maintain surveillance over Alaska's long and sparsely populated coastline.

On numerous occasions in recent years, I and other Alaskans have protested vigorously the inadequacy of U.S. military installations in our State. This weakness, which exists both as to offensive and defensive forces, has also been cited repeatedly by some of our Nation's top military authorities.

Despite our pleas, those in policymaking positions in our military establishment have chosen to ignore the all too obvious need to enhance Alaska's military capabilities. That such a situation has been permitted to continue defies both logic and reason.

Contrast, for example, the continuing indifference to Alaska's military deficiencies to the national furor and the urgent concentration of military forces in Florida which followed disclosure of the presence of a comparative handful of Russian missiles and technicians in Cuba.

This comparison is not made for purposes of criticizing the military buildup undertaken as a result of the Cuban situation. Such action was essential and the prompt response to the challenge which it posed is to be commended. I ask only that comparable recognition be given to counteract the far more serious and continuing danger posed by the situation along Alaska's unguarded coastline.

The March 14 incident protested by the State Department points up vividly the inadequacy of Air Force capability in Alaska for either reconnaissance or defense. It gives renewed emphasis to the need for the establishment of medium range ballistic missile launching sites capable of neutralizing Russian strength known to exist in Siberia.

Forces now available in Alaska for reconnaissance or aircraft interception are too few in number and too far removed from the Alaska coast to be meaningful.

There is an immediate and urgent need for additional fighter plane bases along the entire coast of western Alaska, particularly along the northwest Alaska coastline.

I strongly urge your prompt and favorable reassessment of our Nation's present ineffective military policy in Alaska to the end that these obvious needs may be met during the coming construction season.

Sincerely,

William A. Egan,
Governor.

HAROLD F. COFFEY, FREE ENTERPRISER

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on December 11, 1962, the Free Enterprise Awards Association, an organization chartered in the State of New York, made its annual awards for outstanding free enterprise achievements to eight men and two women.

One of the recipients of the award was a long-time personal friend, Harold F. Coffey, a most enlightened industrialist from North Carolina.

On behalf of myself and my colleague the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], I ask unanimous consent that certain items from the Evening Capital, of Annapolis, Md., of December 11, 1962, and the citation which accompanied the award to Harold F. Coffey, and a sketch of Harold F. Coffey which appeared in the Davidson College Bulletin for January 1963 be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Annapolis (Md.) Evening Capital, Dec. 11, 1962]

Free Enterprise Awards Association Presents Them—Two Women, Eight Men Receive Top Recognition for Outstanding Service as Heads of Businesses

New York, N.Y., December 11—American Success Story Awards for 1962 were presented today by the Free Enterprise Awards Association to two women and eight men as examples of the success possible under America's free enterprise democracy.

The recipients rose from the ranks to own or head giant industries. They started as a reporter, a farmer, a teacher, a laborer, a Russian immigrant, a woman "stogie" roller and other jobs.

All praised the American democratic system and its freedoms for making their success possible.

Presentation of Free Enterprise Awards Association's 11th annual awards were made at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel by Free Enterprise Awards Association awards chairman, Talbot T. Speer, who rose to own a Maryland newspaper chain, one of America's oldest papers, the 235-year-old Maryland Gazette and the Baltimore Business Forms, Inc.

Speer read the citations which stated that the recipients had "* * * won an enduring place in the history of American endeavor by achieving success despite adversity through industry, sacrifice and ethics, symbolizing the success possible under our free enterprise system."

He cited them for their dedicated work in civic, religious and philanthropic causes and contributions to their fields.

Speer declared that the Berlin wall was a 25-mile monument attesting to the failure of Russia's despotic system and pointed out that the recipients' success stories were proof by comparison, that the American democratic system was best and that it gave spiritual and material success to all.

"The only walls we build are for homes and industries, to raise our highest standard of living still higher" added Speer.

He warned that the Berlin wall and the Cuban crisis prove that "the totalitarian ideologies would desperately use any inhuman means to wipe out democratic nations" and he urged all people who wish to maintain their liberty to "join the conflict between human dignity and slavery."

The Free Enterprise Awards Association was chartered by New York State in 1952 and approved by the Supreme Court. With leaders in all fields, it carries out its charter duties, "to promote incentive and champion the cause of the American free enterprise democracy" through morale defense projects to bolster the faith of all people in the American democratic system.

The award participants, selected from various trades and areas to show the awards of success possible in large and small communities in America, were:

Walter J. Tuohy, president of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., and subsidaries, of Cleveland, Ohio.

John D. MacArthur, owner of the Bankers Life & Casualty Co., of Chicago, Ill.

J. Donovan Forney, founder-owner of Forney Industries, Inc., of Fort Collins, Colo.

Mrs. Mae Bonnell Sauls, president of the William L. Bonnell Co., of Newnan, Ga.

Lilburn S. Barksdale, owner of the Barksdale Valves Co., of Los Angeles, Calif.

Mrs. Zella Ritz-Woller, president of the King Bee Manufacturing Co., of Bellwood, Ill.

Dudley D. Sherman, president of the National Chemical & Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, Ill.

Harold F. Coffey, president of the Kent-Coffey Manufacturing Co., of Lenoir, N.C.

Dr. Charles D. Bradley, president, founder and owner of the Bradley Semiconductor Corp., of New Haven, Conn.

James R. Riley, president of Suburban Motor Freight, Inc., of Columbus, Ohio.

Here's what the recipients said about the free enterprise system which made their successes possible:

Walter J. Tuohy, president, Chesapeake & Ohio Railway: "A company's success, as does a nation's, depends on the loyalty and dedication of its people. Teamwork, sharing of problems, and freedom of opinion, assures the success of any endeavor. Just as despotism in government or business crushes the human spirit, so does democracy bring out the dignity of the individual—the best in citizen or worker."

John D. MacArthur, president, Bankers Life & Casualty Co.: "In our democracy any person can reach for the rainbow. Don't stop if you come up with a fistful of air. If you stop trying you start dying."

J. Donovan Forney, owner, Forney Industries, Inc.: "In our free enterprise democracy workers have the best working conditions, benefits, and own shares in industries. Yet, don't be too 'chicken' to go into business for yourself or you might end up with nothing to crow about. Faith in God, your Nation, and your ability will bring peace and success."

Mrs. Mae Bonnell Sauls, president, the William Bonnell Co.: "Free enterprise is the only economic system that gives each of us the right to be what we want to be, including the right a woman has to make business or homemaking her career."

Mrs. Zella Ritz-Woller, president, King Bee Manufacturing Co.: "America gives equal opportunity to men and women. Success in a man's world is not always through pleasing his palate. Give him a good product and you will succeed. If men can make ladies dresses why can't a woman make safety lighting and products for truck-drivers?"

Dudley D. Sherman, president, National Chemical & Manufacturing Co.: "I am just one of the thousands of Russian and other immigrants who achieved success and freedom in America. Our success is a tribute to America's free enterprise democracy and proof that it works for all."

Harold F. Coffey, president, Kent-Coffey Manufacturing Co.: "In our democracy you are free to build your own business. You can make it last forever—like the work of the old masters, if you put beauty, durability, and craftsmanship into any product you make."

Dr. Charles D. Bradley, president, Bradley Semiconductor Corp.: "America's free enterprise gives incentive to original research. Anyone is free to develop new and better products and enrich himself and his fellow men. Our competitive system insures success for better 'traps.'"

James Ralph Riley, president, Suburban Motor Freight, Inc.: "Success in America's democracy is assured if you give unselfish service to your customers and your community. Help improve the areas you serve and you will prosper in material and spiritual values."

Lilburn S. Barksdale, president, Barksdale Valves: "In our democracy one can achieve personal and business fulfillment if he couples determination to suceed with personal integrity in his dealings with employees and customers and has a sincere desire to be of service to his fellow men."

[From the Evening Capital, Annapolis (Md.), December 11, 1962]

Congratulations to Recipients of These Well-Earned Awards

Congratulations to the two women and eight men whose outstanding records of business and civic service have won them today's richly deserved American Success Story Awards.

The presentation of the awards by the Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc., to these 10 persons who rose from humble jobs to become owners and heads of giant industries demonstrates how all may find and earn opportunity in this land of freedom and democracy through their own ability, hard work and study.

The awards, which were presented by Talbot T. Speer, chairman-president of Baltimore Business Forms, Inc. and president-publisher of the Capital-Gazette Press, Inc. of Annapolis, Md., constitute stories of success won by men and women who started careers "on their own" and rose to positions of eminence in the business world.

Their stories are outstanding examples of what can be achieved under democracy, where freedom of choice and ability, based on the foundation of a belief in God and in the dignity of man prevails.

They did not have to function under a system that places itself above the dignity of man as an individual, or have to please party agents or leaders, to obtain success.

Their judges were not party functionaries but the free people of this Nation. The services or products of the business in which they are engaged had to appeal to the mass of consumers, whose favorable reaction determined success or failure. In other words, they were freemen and had to please other free men and women in order to attain success.

The American Success Story Awards are a perfect answer to any who criticize our democratic system.

Russia's Nikita Khrushchev would do well to take a lesson from this and give it deep

thought. It would give him a better understanding of the democratic system, which he criticizes and tries to tear down, and also of the power and strength of the United States and other free people.

The Free Enterprise Awards Association deserves high praise for pointing out to the world the proof of the value of our free enterprise system.

Citation

Harold F. Coffey, 64, resident 480 West Harper Avenue, Lenoir, N.C. President, Kent-Coffey Manufacturing Co., Union Mirror Co., NuWoods, Inc., Furniture Manufacturers, Inc., Lenoir, N.C. Director, Charlotte Branch of North Carolina National Bank, Carolina Northwestern Ry., Fidelity Bankers Life Insurance Corp., others. Was farm boy. From age 9 helped father build business and learned every step in producing furniture. From small shop employing 50 people, Kent-Coffey, under Harold Coffey's expert direction, is now a leading producer of bedroom and other furniture with 13 acres of roofed plant area employing hundreds of craftsmen with multimillion dollars in sales through nationwide showrooms and thousands of dealer stores in United States, Canada and worldwide. Cited for his contributions to and leadership in the furniture industry and his dedicated work as director and member of many civic and charitable organizations.

[From the Davidson College Bulletin, January 1963]

Success Story: Harold F. Coffey, 1920

Harold F. Coffey, 1920, of Lenoir, is one of eight winners of the 1962 American Success Story Awards, presented annually by the Free Enterprise Awards Association, an organization with the purpose of promoting incentive and championing the cause of the American democratic system.

The association said the citation for Mr. Coffey, president of the Kent-Coffey Manufacturing Co., is for contributions to the furniture industry and his work as director and member of many local, State, and national civic and charitable organizations.

This busy man is also president of the Union Mirror Co., Furniture Manufacturers, Inc., and Nu-Woods, Inc. (the latter organized in 1961), all of Lenoir. He is vice president of the Southern Furniture Manufacturers' Association, High Point, and is a director of the National Veneer Co. and the Blue Ridge Development Corp., both of Lenoir; the Fidelity Bankers Life Insurance Co., Richmond; the Carolina Motor Club, Charlotte, and the Charlotte branch of the North Carolina National Bank; the Furniture Factories' Marketing Association of the South; the Carolina & Northwestern Railway, Washington, D.C.; and the Southern Furniture Exposition Building, Inc., High Point.

Mr. Coffey serves as an associate member of the American Institute of Management, New York City; as a member of the Advisory Board of Manufacturers for the New York Furniture Exchange, New York City; as a member of the Board of Governors of the American Furniture Mart (a former chairman of the board), Chicago, and of the Dallas Trade Mart, Dallas, Tex.; and as a member and former president of the North Carolina Industrial Council. He is a life member of Oasis Shrine Temple and served as Potentate in 1942.

His club affiliations include the Lenoir Moose Club, Lenoir Gold Club, Lenoir Country Club; the Commerce Club of Atlanta; the Blowing Rock Country Club; the Lake Hickory Country Club and the Foothills Shrine Club of Hickory; the Charlotte Country Club, the Charlotte City Club, and the Red Fez Club of Charlotte; the Ponte Vedra Club of Ponte Vedra, Fla.; the Circus Saints and Sinners Club of Miami, Fla.; the Chicago Athletic Association and the Furniture Club of America, Chicago; and the Marco Polo Club of New York City.

His political appointments have covered a long period of service. In the first year of Gov. William B. Umstead's administration, he was appointed a member of the North Carolina State Ports Authority and continued in that position until Governor Umstead's death and for the next 2 years of that administration when Luther Hodges was Governor. During the 1920's, he served for several years on the Lenoir City Council. And early in 1962, he was appointed a member of the Governor's Commission on Educational Television. It is not surprising that, due to other pressing duties, he recently resigned from that post.

This Davidsonian is listed in "Who's Who in America," "Who's Who in Commerce and Industry," and in "Who's Who in the South and Southwest."

This success story, which Mr. Coffey attributes to breaks and hard work, began as an office clerk in the concern which was founded by his father. This was about 1917–18 when he left Davidson to enlist in service for World War I but was rejected because of flat feet.

Or perhaps it goes back to 1907, when he was 9, and he began working in his father's factory for 3 cents an hour (no child labor laws then). From 3:30 to 6 p.m. each day after school he learned to operate the machines—the lathes, the sanders, the bandsaws. There were 50 employees of the company then receiving a dollar a day in wages. The Kent-Coffey Co. today has 500 to 1,000 employees and sales are in the multimillions of dollars.

By the time he was 22 he was vice president, and on his father's death in 1943 he became president. He is a Democrat, a Presbyterian, and member of Pi Kappa Phi social fraternity. In 1923 he married Miss Annie Neely, of Rock Hill. They have no children.

TRUTH IN CREDIT NEEDS DRAMATIZED IN SMALL CLAIMS COURT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] of the truth in credit bill. Recently the Washington Daily News disclosed that the need for the truth in credit bill is becoming more evident every day. In 1960, when the small claims branch in Washington had a jurisdiction limited to $50, there were about 12,500 cases. Last year with the jurisdiction upped to $150 there were 28,000 cases. The testimony is that 90 percent involve suits by firms or collection agencies against individuals for unpaid bills.

The fact is that with our present enormously expanding credit system, people have no idea how much interest they are paying. The facts are that they are being exploited, and they should have the right to know what true interest rate they are paying. That is what the Douglas bill provides. It is an excellent bill. I hope that the Committee on Banking and Currency will report it out and that the Senate will act favorably upon it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Easy Credit Brings Thousands to Claims Court," by Rice Odell, published in the Washington Daily News on March 15, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Easy Credit Brings Thousands to Claims Court

(By Rice Odell)

Every day a constant, nagging battle is waged in the District between angry merchants and angry customers.

The scene of the battle is the small claims branch of the Court of General Sessions, a relatively obscure courtroom tucked away in the courthouse at Fourth and E Streets NW.

The merchants whose lawyers come there are angry because, after extending easy credit on purchases, they find themselves unable to collect the bills.

Some collection agencies complain that government employees, in making credit purchases, often take advantage of the fact that their wages cannot be garnisheed.

The customers who come to court (in far fewer numbers) are even more angered by a feeling they have been cheated—perhaps because they succumbed to high pressure, or what they bought was not delivered, or was not what they ordered, or they were unable to get a down payment back when the sale didn't go through, or the price was raised without explanation.

This is the extent of the easy credit problem as reflected in small claims cases only:

In 1960, when the small claims branch had a jurisdiction limited to $50, there were about 12,500 cases.

Last year (the first full year after the jurisdiction was raised to $150), there were 28,216 cases.

Of the cases which come into court, according to Chief Deputy Clerk Charles P. Henry, Jr., "at least 90 percent" involve suits by firms or collection agencies against individuals for unpaid bills.

Last Tuesday, for example, there were 153 cases on the court's calendar, of which 139 involved such suits.

It seems safe to estimate that there is at least $2 million worth of unpaid debts brought into that court alone in a year, and possibly much more.

In most of the cases called in small claims branch, the defendant doesn't show up, and judgment is automatically entered for the merchant suing.

On one end of the scale are the firms which have made honest and forthright sales and are victimized by the cheats who have no intention of paying their bills. On the other are the men and women who didn't realize what deep financial water they were getting in, to whom the missing money leads to serious arguments at home, perhaps a family breakup, and even a start in crime to recover the sorely needed money.

It may sound farfetched but it has happened many times, and with tragic consequences.

This, of course, has no reference to the large majority of firms which do not hand out credit without some feeling of responsibility, or to collection agencies which decline business from such firms.

UNEMPLOYMENT A SERIOUS LONG-RANGE PROBLEM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, unfortunately there has been much too little discussion or consideration of the very fine manpower report issued by the President recently. The long-term unemployment problem is more serious than the short-term problem, but it is getting far less attention. One of the reasons that I opposed the proposed tax cut is that it is aimed to correct a long-term situation with a short-term cure.

Recently the Washington Post commented on the manpower and unemployment report made by the President of the United States. The highlights set forth in the editorial are an excellent way to get a brief résumé of what the report contains. One of the things that impressed me most is that whereas in 1960 we had some 2.6 million Americans becoming 18 years of age, in 1965—only 3 years from now—we shall have 3.8 million Americans becoming 18 years of age, which is the average age at which they enter the labor force. We will have a perfectly enormous job in the future providing the kind of employment which those people will require. It will take a great deal more training and a great deal more emphasis on education, especially vocational education, than the Congress or the American people have contemplated.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 18, 1963]

MANPOWER AND EMPLOYMENT

President Kennedy's first manpower report, submitted in accordance with the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, is a sobering document which should convince even the most casual reader that unemployment, the Nation's most pressing economic problem, is not susceptible of quick and easy solutions.

Since 1947 some 10 million new jobs have been created, bringing the volume of employment to an alltime record of 67.8 million in 1962. Nevertheless, employment opportunities have failed to keep pace with the rapidly growing labor force, and since 1958 the average rate of unemployment has been well in excess of 5.5 percent. There are now 4.9 million jobless persons who comprise 6.1 percent of the labor force, and unless the present trend is sharply reversed, the problem will become more acute. According to the President's calculations:

"The net growth of the labor force in the sixties is expected to be about 13 million, more than 50 percent greater than in the fifties.

"Unless the growth of new job opportunities is also accelerated, unemployment totals will rise. If in the next 5 years we provide new employment at the pace of the last 5, by 1967 unemployment will come to over 5½ million, or more than 7 percent of the 1967 labor force."

Although our knowledge of the causes underlying the rising trend of unemployment is as yet imperfect, some of the more salient factors are readily discernible. Labor has been displaced by advances in technology and the striking gains in man-hour productivity. Since 1947, output per man-hour in private industry has increased at an annual average rate of 3.2 percent, and these gains, rather than increases in man-hours of work, account for more than 80 percent of the growth of total output since 1947. Employment in the manufacturing sector has been declining since 1956, and the introduction of labor-saving technology has doubtless affected employment even in those sectors of the economy which have been growing most rapidly.

The technological innovations of the past 15 years have also created employment opportunities, but the jobs which they have produced demand skills and a degree of sophistication that cannot be supplied by the traditional blue-collar worker with a limited education. Yet 7.5 million out of the 26 million young people entering the labor force between 1960 and 1970—or some 29 percent—will lack high school diplomas. Unless the gap between the requirements demanded by the new technology and the educational attainment of those entering the labor force can be narrowed, widespread unemployment among young people is likely to persist.

The difficulties created by rapid technological change can be substantially mitigated by fiscal and monetary policies designed to accelerate the overall rate of economic growth. But their elimination will require a massive program for the retraining of displaced workers and a nationwide effort to lower the high school dropout rate. While a promising start was made with the passage of the Manpower Development Act which will provide for the training of some 400,000 people over a 3-year period, it is only the beginning of what will prove to be a very long campaign.

EXCELLENT REUSS WILDLIFE CONSERVATION RESOLUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague in the House, Representative HENRY REUSS, has submitted a concurrent resolution which would urge our country to call an international conference for the purpose of launching a worldwide wildlife conservation program. Mr. REUSS has been a great friend of conservation. He has excellent judgment in that field. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Washington Post supporting the Reuss resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALL OF THE WILD

One of the most disheartening spectacles arising from the spread of civilization is the steady and relentless extermination of entire species of wildlife. Some 200 species of birds and animals have already been wiped out and nearly 250 more are in present jeopardy. The problem exists everywhere, but is especially acute in Africa. The quest for ivory and pelts, for trophies and supposed aphrodisiacs (a quality attributed to powdered rhinoceros horn), has threatened vast herds of antelopes, zebras, elephants, rhinos, and hippos with reduction to the point of peril.

All this has been brought to the attention of Congress by Representative HENRY REUSS, who has introduced a concurrent resolution that would urge this country to call an international conference for the purpose of launching a worldwide wildlife conservation program. Here is an instance where an ounce of prevention is surely needed—especially since no question of vast costs is involved. What is needed, as Mr. REUSS points out, is legislative protection for wildlife and training in wildlife management—both objectives eminently within the grasp of reason.

If the world is to avert the day when only man and his domesticated animals occupy the globe, some form of concerted action is needed. An International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) has existed since 1948, but it has only a paltry budget (reportedly about $90,000 a year) and the only large and prosperous member-nation is West Germany. The World Wildlife Fund is another concerned organization that has used limited resources for conservation. The WWF estimates that $1.5 million a year is needed to save the most seriously threatened species.

Mr. REUSS proposes that local currencies accumulating abroad under food-for-peace programs be made available for wildlife conservation work. Certainly this seems a legitimate use of counterpart funds. The earth will be a barren place if modern Noahs fail to create an ark for the vanishing and colorful creatures of the wild.

EDITORIAL SUPPORT BY HOARD'S DAIRYMAN ON PROPOSED CLASS 1 MILK PRICING SYSTEM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this afternoon we concluded hearings before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on dairy legislation, and particularly on the three bills—one introduced by the chairman of the committee [Mr. ELLENDER], one by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and one by me—which would provide for a class 1 pricing system.

Hoard's Dairyman, a very fine publication printed at Fort Atkinson, Wis., edited by the Hoards, carries an editorial in the March 25, 1963, issue supporting the class 1 principle and the class 1 bills in general. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, which sets forth the case for our bills, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOMESTIC DUMPING: A 13-BILLION-POUND TARGET

Dairymen producing manufacturing milk have asked how they would benefit from the use of class I bases in Federal milk marketing orders. It is our conviction that they stand to benefit materially. At least 20 billion pounds of manufacturing milk are being produced in Federal order markets. Compare this, if you will, to Government purchases of about 10.8 billion pounds last year.

We all recognize that some manufacturing milk must be produced with Federal order grade A milk because a reserve is needed to supply the variations in the market. Certainly, there is no need for anything like 20 billion pounds. A liberal reserve would be no more than 7 billion pounds. This leaves a real surplus of Federal order manufacturing milk of at least 13 billion pounds. Here is the target at which class I base proposals are directed.

Our basic point, however, is that such milk is "subsidized" milk. It is produced at a fictitious price because the consumer of class I or bottled milk underwrites the cost of its production. If the class I price is $5 per hundredweight and the class II or manufacturing price is $3 per hundredweight, and the milk is evenly divided in its utilization in the market, then the blend or uniform price to the dairyman is $4. The farmer produces in response to the $4 price, not the $3 price.

But the surplus milk is thrown onto the national manufacturing milk market in the form of butter, powder, and cheese in competition with the products of the manufacturing milk producer. We believe a lot of this milk would not be produced if class I bases were used. In that event, manufacturing milk dairymen would benefit from a much improved supply-demand situation. If farmers in Federal order markets wanted to produce manufacturing milk for the manufacturing price, that would be their privilege and the manufacturing milk producer should not complain. He has every justification for vigorous protest now.

We have offered the opinion, from time to time, that without the dumping of manufacturing milk on the national market from Federal milk orders the free, open-market farm price of manufacturing milk could very well be in the area of $3.40 per hundredweight or even higher. Frankly, we cannot support this guesstimate by well-documented data. It wasn't too long ago, however, that manufacturing milk price was this high—well above the old support level of $3.25.

A change in direction in Federal order markets, we conclude, would redound to the advantage of both Federal order producers and manufacturing milk producers. Higher utilization of class I in the order markets would mean a higher average price to those dairymen. Less manufacturing milk being dumped on the market would be a direct benefit to all other dairy farmers.

MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION ANSWERS TO CLASS I MILK PRICE PLAN QUESTIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milk Producers Federation submitted to the committee the answers to the standard questions asked about the proposal we have made. I think that in extremely simple language they have answered each of the questions extremely well.

This is such a fine and thoughtful job that it should be brought to the attention of all Senators, because I earnestly hope we shall have an opportunity to act on the bill in the near future, so I ask unanimous consent that the series of questions and answers may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. What are the objectives of this plan?

The principal objectives are to (a) eliminate a basic defect of blend pricing which provides milk producers a price higher than the lowest class price for manufacturing milk in excess of the market's normal supply requirements for fluid milk products, (b) permit individual producers to produce in line with market requirements for fluid milk products without having their prices reduced by present surplus or increased production of other producers, (c) provide individual producers an opportunity to increase net income, and (d) reduce the national dairy surplus and the cost to taxpayers of the dairy support price program.

2. Is this plan production control?

No. It does not limit any producer to any maximum quantity of milk he is allowed to produce or sell. It does not place any physical limitations on the number of cows he may keep. It does not limit in any way any factor of production or sale of milk. It allows producers supplying a given market, at their own request, to receive a price for base milk related to the class I price, and a lower price related to manufacturing milk value for any milk in excess of base sold, instead of a single blended price for all milk.

3. How can this plan be expected to reduce the dairy surplus?

Reduction of the national dairy surplus is one of the principal objectives of the dairymen's class I base plan. The plan can be expected to accomplish this in a number of ways:

(a) By reducing the incentive to produce surplus milk under the Federal order program. Approximately half of the milk produced in the country is marketed under Federal milk orders. Under some of these orders there is now a high degree of surplus. Under others there is only a moderate amount. Under still others there is no surplus. The base plan would allow each market to establish surplus reducing incentive in line with the degree of surplus existing in each respective market—be it a lot or a little. Several Federal order markets now have a surplus of 10 to 25 percent or more and have blended prices of $4 per hundredweight or more and a surplus class price of approximately $3. The base plan would discourage production of surplus by reducing the price paid for surplus production from $4 or more per hundredweight to about $3.

(b) By relieving producers of the pressure they are now under to continually produce more milk, hence, more surplus, as the only available means of maintaining the size of their milk checks to keep up with increasing production costs. The single blend price system we have now penalizes a producer who might try to keep production in line with his share of the class I market. The penalty is in the form of a lower blended price caused by the increased surplus production of other producers. His only recourse is to engage in a surplus production race with his neighbor. The base plan, by treating each producer as an individual relative to his production and his market, frees each producer from this penalty and the incentive to produce unneeded surplus milk. The result should be a reduction in surplus.

(c) By using the order to build into the market price structure incentives to adjust supply in line with class I demand. This is done by a number of interrelated factors, all of which aim in the general direction of supply-demand balance. Such incentives should operate toward a reduction of the Nation's dairy surplus.

4. What effect will base plans have on the cost of the national dairy support program?

Since the dairymen's class I base plan provides voluntary incentives to reduce production, it should reduce the surplus and in this way should reduce the cost of the support program. Such plan should result in reduced expenditures by the Congress.

5. What will this plan cost to administer?

The Federal Order Administrator's offices are set up and functioning. Many of them are already administering seasonal base plans. Administration of Federal milk orders has been competent and efficient since its inception. It is supported by the industry at no cost to the taxpayer as will be this program.

6. How does this plan avoid being a trade barrier?

First we must clarify the term "trade barrier." On the production side of the dairy industry the class I price for milk in any given milk market is never high enough to permit dairy farmers in every other part of the country to compete. This is because milk's natural characteristics result in high cost of transportation, thereby giving a natural advantage to dairy farmers nearby a given market. This is why class I prices decrease with distance from the market center and why class I prices vary among markets.

Reflection of natural characteristics of production and marketing through geographic variations in milk prices does not constitute a trade barrier. The dairymen's class I base plan is not a trade barrier. Only if a base plan in a particular order contained features which kept out milk from other supply areas to preserve an artificially high class I price or an artificially low surplus price would it be a trade barrier within the meaning of section 8c(5)(G) of the act, and such an effect is not intended.

7. Does the plan require any changes in language or interpretation of class I pricing standards of the act (Sec. 8c 18)?

Language—no; interpretation—yes. The pricing standards are as follows:

"The prices which it is declared to be the policy of Congress to establish * * * shall, * * * reflect the price of feeds, the available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk or its products in the marketing area to which the contemplated marketing agreement, order, or amendment relates * * * insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk, and be in the public interest * * * (and) thereafter, as the Secretary finds necessary on account of changed circumstances, he shall, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, make adjustments in such prices."

The dairymen's class I base plan is designed to improve the application of supply-demand pricing now provided in the act. The phrase "other economic conditions" in the present standard makes it sufficiently broad to be properly applied to the base plan without change in language.

Certain changes in interpretation of the present standard from its past application to single blend pricing would be necessary. For example, the pricing standard has been interpreted to require automatic supply-demand adjustors in class I pricing formulas. The base plans provide incentives and opportunities to individual dairy farmers which are designed to improve upon this application of supply-demand pricing. For this reason, if a base plan is introduced, the necessity of retaining the supply-demand factor in the orders, presented class I price formula needs to be reevaluated.

With the task of obtaining a supply-demand balance in the order given over to some extent to the base plan, the general level of the class I price can reflect other objectives such as an equitable income goal for producers, changes in production costs, and costs of available alternative supplies of milk from other supply areas, all of which may properly be considered encompassed in the phrase in the present pricing standard, "* * * other economic conditions * * *."

The various incentives among producers set in motion by a base plan particularly with respect to the market's milk supply, necessitate reinterpretation of the class I pricing standards of the act because supply-demand forces under the order will be influenced in a different manner than under present operations. For this reason they must be taken into account in a proper determination of what the class I price should be in conjunction with a base plan.

8. Does the plan require any changes in pricing milk used for manufacturing under Federal orders?

No. Under the plan milk marketed in excess of fluid milk requirements will be priced on the same basis as under the current orders. The lowest use class price must be at a level at which milk will be accepted for processing, and in line with nationwide values of manufactured dairy products. This class price in Federal orders now reflects national competitive forces affecting the supply of milk of dairy farmers delivered to manufacturing plants not regulated by Federal orders and the consumer demand for dairy products (butter, cheese, ice cream, evaporated milk, etc.) including the level of the price support program. To the extent that the base plan becomes an inducement to producers to market less excess milk, thereby reducing the national dairy surplus, there might be some impact on prices in the manufacturing milk market. This in turn automatically would be reflected in the class price under orders. This effect would be indirect. No amendments to surplus class price formulas should be required as a result of the base plan.

9. What effect would this plan have on the dairy price support level?

In orders where the plan is adopted bases will be related to market requirements for fluid milk products, and the undesirable effects of blend pricing eliminated. The result should be a closer alinement of market supplies with market requirements. The plan does not provide for positive reduction in total supplies; but with closer adjustment to market requirements on a market-by-market basis, the pressure to reduce support prices will be relieved.

10. How would bases be applied?

There are a number of different ways that bases could be applied. One way would be to establish for each producer under an order a base expressed in pounds per day or per pooling period. These bases would be predicated upon deliveries during a prior representative period, adjusted to reflect the total fluid milk utilization of milk allocated to producers, plus a reasonable necessary reserve. These bases then could be projected 1 year in advance from a specified beginning date, which would be the first day of a given month. Then each month the market administrator would compute, as separate totals, all base milk and all milk in excess of base delivered to handlers by all producers under the order. He would first assign milk used in the lowest class to excess milk, and compute a blend price for base milk consisting of the weighted average class use value of the remaining milk in the pool. Each producer would be entitled to this base price for his base milk, and the manufacturing milk price for any excess.

Another way would be to have the plan optional in the sense that producers under a given order who so wished could request bases for their share of class I without other producers being required to have bases. Those who applied would have the market's class I milk assigned to their base first, and milk in the lowest price class assigned to their excess first. They would then be entitled to the class I price for base milk and the lowest class price for their excess. For producers who did not apply for bases a single blended price would be computed from the remaining class uses of milk remaining unassigned to base or excess.

For orders where the plan is applied by requiring all producers to have a base, these bills allow for the inclusion within base of a reserve above actual sales of fluid milk products to cover the day to day and weekend variations in sales. This is expressed as a percentage above monthly average of sales. The percentage of reserve considered necessary is variously estimated among markets at between 10 and 25 percent of actual sales in the month of lowest production seasonally. The reserve milk is actually used for manufacturing in the lowest price for lack of a market in a higher priced class. The price for base milk where reserves are thus included in base will reflect some milk at the manufacturing price class ranging from the defined percentage of reserve in the shortest production month to higher proportions in the flush season to the extent of the seasonal range in the particular market.

The pooling procedure must also allow for the eventuality of all producers together delivering less base milk than the volume of class I sales, but with some individual producers delivering some excess.

11. What is the base period?

The "representative period" for determining bases should be a period preceding the date that the plan starts, ending as close to the start of the plan as possible. It may include all or portions of more than 1 year. Each market need not have the same base period years nor the same length of period. Factors which should guide the Secretary in his selection of the period for a given market should include local customs regarding any current base plan, desires of producers affected, past trends in market supply, abnormal conditions, shifts in supply sources, availability of data, etc. The computations necessarily require time which can be provided only by some lag between the base period and the time of application of bases.

12. How are bases determined and changed?

The bill provides for making "due allowance" for "abnormal conditions" and "hardship cases."

These terms are meant to apply to the base period. If a producer's "total deliveries" in the base period were low due to an abnormal condition, he might be entitled to an adjustment in his base to offset the effect of the abnormal condition.

The allocation concept also includes the opportunity to adjust all bases periodically in line with changes in sales of the products on which the initial base allocations were made.

Another way that a given plan might allow all bases to be changed periodically (such as annually) would be the use of a 2-, 3-, 4-, or 5-year moving or "rolling" average base according to deliveries or a new base every year in the case of a 1-year base plan. In this way a producer's increase (or decrease) in deliveries each year would have an effect on his next year's base to the extent of 100, 50, 33⅓, 25, or 20 percent of the change depending on whether the base period is 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 years long. If this type of automatic adjustment were allowed, it would also be necessary to refigure every year the percentage of total market deliveries to normal supply requirements and apply this percentage to prevent automatic base adjustment from getting the sum total of the market's bases out of line with normal supply requirements.

Another way that an individual producer could change the size of his base would be to obtain part or all of the base of another producer.

In summary the bill would provide for bases to be changed in a number of ways depending on the circumstances of individual producers and market conditions, with considerable flexibility allowed on each market to provide for changes to best meet its needs.

13. How does a new producer obtain a base?

The bill specifies that the sales allocation (base) must make "due allowance" for "new producers including new producers thereafter entering a market." This means that the plan must provide some means for new producers to obtain a base. This is one of the safeguards provided which would prevent any base plan under this bill from becoming a trade barrier. The particular procedure for granting bases to new producers would depend on the particular local market situation, as developed in the required hearing. A number of different methods of accommodating new producers could be used, and should be allowed consideration, such as:

(a) A small percentage of the total market's base to be set aside out of which new producers could be granted bases according to some prescribed performance rules.

(b) A new producer to be allowed average market value (or some specified percentage thereof) for a period equal to the base period, after which he is given a base according to his deliveries.

(c) New producers allowed to earn a base according to deliveries but required to take the excess price while earning a base.

(d) New producers allowed to obtain bases from other producers. In the case of limited transfer bases, new producers could enter the market by earning bases. The method would be provided under the order by requiring shipments for a period, for example, of 3 years to earn a full base. Under this situation, a portion of the increase in class I sales or the bases of retiring producers could be set aside for allocation to new producers. In the event the plan allowed for unlimited transfer of bases, new producers could enter the market by purchasing bases of producers who may retire or desire to reduce their production. In no event would new producers receive more favorable treatment than old producers.

14. To what extent would bases be transferable among producers?

The bills specify no particular degree of transferability. All past experience with any type of base plan, for whatever purpose, and whether privately operated or under Government auspices, indicates a need for some degree of transferability. The tighter the base in terms of limitation of opportunity for adjustments, the greater the need for freedom of transferability and vice versa.

This is for the purpose of preventing a "tight" base plan from freezing producers to their production at some point in time in such a way that they are hampered from making future shifts in resource allocation to improve efficiency.

There is a need for limiting transfer of base to milk producers to avoid the abuse of their being acquired and hoarded for coercive purposes by anybody, particularly persons who are not milk producers.

On this detail of a base plan, as in any other described above, there is need for flexibility among orders. Bases may or may not be negotiable, depending upon the rules adopted for the particular market. If, for example, farmers supplying a particular market favored unlimited transfer of bases, such an arrangement could be established. If, on the other hand, farmers supplying a market favored restricting the transfer of bases, such arrangement could also be established. Transfer of bases then might be limited to transfer from one person to another on the same farm, or to allow a tenant farmer who had earned a base to take his base to another farm.

15. To what extent would bases be transferable among markets?

Base allocations are claims upon the class I returns from a market to the producer milk delivered in that market. Ownership of a base on a particular market is of no value unless the holder delivers milk to that market. Individual producer bases are determined by deliveries of such producer during a predetermined representative period. The terms of each of the individual orders could recognize deliveries of producers transferring between markets.

If producers shifted from a market, with or without bases, to another market with bases, then they would be entitled to bases computed in the same manner as used for assigning bases to the original producers on that market.

If producers moved from a base market to a market with no base, their bases would have no value in the new market.

16. In what way would a base plan affect intermarket movements of milk?

Base plans are not intended to encourage either more or less intermarket movements of milk. Intermarket class prices relationships, rules for pool participation and type of pool are the features of orders, along with the natural characteristics of milk production and marketing, which determine intermarket movements of milk. Since base plans are to be applied only to the producer milk under an order, any inshipments of other milk would not be affected by the base plan. Shifts of producers from one market to another would be affected by whatever rules the base plan provided for allowing new producers in a given order to obtain base, as explained in the answer to the question concerning transferability of bases.

17. Does the plan provide any maximum or minimum on individual bases?

No. The average size of producers varies among Federal order markets from less than 500 pounds of milk per day in some areas of highly diversified farming to more than 13,000 pounds per day in other markets where dairying is characterized by a few large feedlot type of milking herds. Because of these wide variations in production conditions, any base ceiling to be prescribed by the law would have to be so high as to be meaningless or else it would work a hardship and discriminate against the normal pattern of family farms in some areas. If any performance standard with respect to base sizes is needed, it could be considered in the hearing for a base plan for a given market.

18. What effect would this plan have on other farm crops or livestock products?

The effect of this plan on other farm crops or livestock products would be limited to the release of production resources from dairying to the extent that dairymen adjusted production to meet market requirements.

19. What would be the effect of this plan on producers of manufacturing grade milk?

The plan's purpose is to eliminate the payment of any part of the money derived from class I sales for surplus milk delivered by order producers in excess of market requirements. In effect, it says to manufacturing milk producers, "You may still have to compete with producers under Federal orders, but you have the assurance that those producers will be receiving the manufacturing price for their surplus milk."

20. What effect can the plan be expected to have on negotiated marketwide premiums?

If the surplus in a market is reduced, the incentive for premium prices may be lessened.

21. Can the plan work satisfactorily in one market without being in effect in all other markets?

Yes, but producers who adopt this program and reduce production to meet market requirements may require some assurance, by way of order provisions, that the results of their efforts will not be undermined or eroded by contrary actions of other handlers or groups of producers outside the program, including other Government programs.

22. What advantage does this plan have over national dairy supply management proposals involving allotments, bases, or quotas?

Base plans as features of Federal orders would have the advantage of being tailored much more closely to local market conditions and customs. Great variation exists among markets in the degree of surplus, all the way from some which have no surplus above normal reserve requirements to some with as much as 40 percent of such surplus. It would be most difficult if not impossible to fit any single national adjustment program to the varying conditions which exist among markets. The base plan has the further advantage of being introduced on a market-by-market basis with much better chance of approval by local referendum.

23. What would be the effect of this plan on fluid milk markets which are not regulated under Federal or State controls?

(a) The rules for the movement of milk from plants in unregulated areas are established under other order provisions, allocation, pool plant qualification, etc. The base plan would place no added burden on such movement.

(b) For producers in currently unregulated markets who wished to become producers in an order market having a base plan, the acquisition of a base by purchase or performance would be a requisite.

(c) All markets, regulated or not, feel the effects of national surpluses. To the extent that the plan removes some of the pressure for increased production, all markets will benefit.

HIGH COSTS CRUSHING AMERICAN DAIRY FARMER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the National Farmers Organization requested the Doane Agricultural Service to make a study of the cost of producing milk in Missouri, Kentucky, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and a number of other States.

Mr. President, this is a very competent and capable service. The study was made, and it indicated how high is the cost, as well as the fact that farmers throughout these areas are in fact losing a great deal of money at present prices. This emphasizes, therefore, how very important is the need for some kind of dairy action of the kind we are considering.

I ask unanimous consent that the table relating to comparative costs may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Comparative cost of producing milk in selected States assuming a 30-cow herd using a pasture system and producing 232,290 pounds 3.5-percent-fat-corrected milk (average 7,743 pounds), July 1

Item	Missouri	Kentucky	Illinois	Indiana	Ohio	Michigan	Wisconsin	Minnesota	Iowa	South Dakota	Nebraska	Kansas	Idaho
Labor, total amount	$2,068	$1,310	$2,214	$2,050	$2,050	$2,211	$2,285	$2,515	$2,585	$2,419	$2,511	$2,448	$2,670
Feed cost:													
Hay	976	1,109	953	1,089	1,163	1,082	877	1,024	840	832	840	790	1,606
Concentrate	2,299	2,568	2,874	2,606	2,836	2,376	2,184	2,261	2,759	2,491	2,606	2,299	2,759
Pasture, 20 cents per head per day	1,260	1,320	1,260	1,200	1,200	1,080	1,020	1,020	1,140	1,080	1,140	1,260	900
Cow replacement, 15 percent	1,026	999	1,080	1,242	1,134	1,296	1,242	1,215	1,215	1,242	1,134	1,161	1,107
Death loss, 3 percent	205	200	216	248	227	259	248	243	243	248	227	232	221
Artificial insemination	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210
Veterinary and medicine	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120	120
Utilities	150	150	160	160	160	170	170	180	170	180	160	160	170
Gas and oil	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	220	210	200	210
Supplies	125	125	125	125	125	125	125	125	125	125	125	125	125
Miscellaneous	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130
Hauling milk, 35 cents per hundredweight	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813
Taxes, 1 percent of present value	298	248	514	418	373	328	277	342	423	324	415	339	459
Repairs, 4 percent of present value	767	767	767	767	767	767	767	767	767	767	767	767	767
Insurance, $7 per $1,000 value	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64	64
Depreciation	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838
Management allowance, 1 percent	298	248	514	418	373	328	277	342	423	324	415	339	459
Return on investment, 5 percent	1,490	1,240	2,570	2,090	1,865	1,640	1,385	1,710	2,115	1,620	2,075	1,695	2,295
Less:													
Calf sales	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288
Manure credit	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300
Total cost	13,763	13,071	16,034	15,200	15,060	14,449	13,644	14,531	15,592	14,459	15,212	14,402	16,335
Cost per hundredweight	5.92	5.62	6.90	6.54	6.48	6.22	5.87	6.25	6.71	6.22	6.55	6.20	7.03
Same as above except drylot rather than pasture system:													
Labor	2,262	1,421	2,398	2,218	2,218	2,422	2,499	2,751	2,836	2,650	2,754	2,611	2,956
Feed cost:													
Hay	2,310	2,805	2,255	2,420	2,585	2,145	1,650	1,925	1,760	1,650	1,760	1,870	2,805
Concentrate	2,299	2,568	2,874	2,606	2,836	2,376	2,184	2,261	2,759	2,491	2,606	2,299	2,759
Cow replacement	1,232	1,199	1,296	1,490	1,361	1,555	1,490	1,458	1,458	1,490	1,361	1,393	1,329
Death loss	205	200	216	248	227	259	248	243	243	248	227	232	221
Artificial insemination	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210	210
Veterinary and medicine	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180
Utilities	160	160	170	170	170	180	180	190	180	190	170	170	180
Gas and oil	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	110	105	100	105
Supplies	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150
Miscellaneous	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130	130
Hauling milk	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813	813
Taxes, 1 percent of investment	268	268	281	289	282	290	283	282	287	279	274	276	273
Repairs, 4 percent	774	774	774	774	774	774	774	774	774	774	774	774	774
Insurance	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70	70
Depreciation	1,898	1.898	1.898	1.898	1,898	1,898	1,898	1,898	1,898	1,898	1,898	1,898	1,898
Management allowance, 1 percent	268	268	281	289	282	290	283	282	287	279	274	276	273
Return on investment, 5 percent	1,340	1,340	1,405	1,445	1,410	1,450	1,415	1,410	1,435	1,395	1,370	1,370	1,365
Less:													
Calf sales	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288	−288
Manure credit	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300	−300
Total cost	14,081	13,961	14,913	14,907	15,108	14,704	13,969	14,539	14,982	14,419	14,538	14,234	15,901
Cost per hundredweight	6.06	6.01	6.42	6.42	6.50	6.33	6.01	6.26	6.45	6.21	6.26	6.13	6.84

Source: Prepared December 1962 for National Farmers Organization (NFO) by Doane Agricultural Service, St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Proxmire in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE TO REVIEW AND EVALUATE THE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OF NATIONS RECEIVING ECONOMIC AID FROM THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point, and that it may lie upon the desk until April 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the Record and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Kentucky.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34), submitted by Mr. Cooper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the United States has been engaged since World War II in programs of economic aid to other countries; and

Whereas an essential purpose of the United States in carrying out these programs has been to assist free countries in developing as quickly and effectively as possible, to the end that such countries may be able to raise the living standards of their peoples, achieve economic stability, and maintain and strengthen free institutions; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has appropriated approximately 66 billion dollars to the fulfillment of these objectives; and

Whereas the Congress does not have available to it the necessary information to enable it to evaluate the effectiveness of the aid extended by the United States to specific countries: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should appoint as quickly as possible a committee for each country receiving economic aid from the United States, composed of at least five members, including representatives of the public, to review and evaluate the development program of such country and to report to the President and to the Congress not later than January 1, 1964, their findings with respect to the following—

(1) Whether the recipient country (a) has a practical national development program which affords a reasonable expectation that the objectives of such program will be attained, taking into consideration the human and natural resources and capabilities of the country, (b) is providing the maximum amount of self-help within its capabilities, and (c) has adopted the fiscal, administrative, and social reforms necessary to the success of such program;

(2) whether the specific projects to which United States aid is allocated will contribute materially to the fulfillment of the primary needs of the recipient country's development program, and to the purpose of the United States to assist in raising the standards of living of the people of the country; and

(3) such other matters as, in their opinion, will be useful to the Congress in its consideration of legislation authorizing or appropriating funds for financing foreign-aid programs for 1965 and subsequent fiscal years.

Sec. 2. It is further the sense of Congress that such committees should be appointed first to review the development programs for the following countries, which have received approximately one-third of the assistance extended by the United States under foreign-aid programs: Korea, India, Japan, China, Greece, Vietnam, Brazil, Pakistan, Turkey, Philippines, and Iran; and that legislation authorizing or appropriating funds for carrying out these programs for fiscal year 1965 and subsequent fiscal years should not be enacted until the Congress has received and considered the reports referred to in this resolution.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, early this year the President of the United States appointed a distinguished Committee, headed by Gen. Lucius Clay, to study the foreign aid program. I am sure the work of that Committee—because it is made up of such distinguished and able men—will be of great value to the administration in the formulation of its assistance program, as well as to the Congress, and in informing the people of the United States of the effectiveness of our foreign aid program. It is my understanding that the Committee will make its first report within a short time, and that it will be followed by others.

Of course, I do not know what the Committee will recommend. But I am convinced that the only way the administration, the Congress, and the people of this country can know whether our foreign aid program is effective and economical is to assess the program in each country which is receiving foreign assistance.

Last year, when the Senate was considering the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962, I offered a similar proposal, in the form of an amendment to the bill, expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should appoint small committees to assess our foreign aid program in each country receiving aid, and to report their findings to the President and to the Congress. The amendment was adopted by the Senate, but it was stricken in the House-Senate conference.

Today I am offering a concurrent resolution similar in purpose. It is my hope that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, the administration, and the distinguished committee which the President has appointed, will give thought to the proposals which the concurrent resolution expresses.

In substance, my suggestion is small committees made up of perhaps five members, appointed by the President, assess in depth our foreign aid program in each country.

I know that when one mentions the word committee, the thought of a superficial examination comes to mind. This is not correct. The purpose of the resolution is that the committees would make an assessment and study in depth of the program in each country. They would determine whether the plan for development which each country has formulated is one which is suited to the needs of the country and its resources, and whether it has a reasonable chance of success.

Second, it would determine if the projects to which we give assistance are ones which are adequately related, and contribute substantially, to the development plan of the country.

Another purpose of the resolution is to find out if the countries we assist are exerting maximum self-help, and whether they are instituting necessary fiscal, administrative, and social reforms.

I believe that if this effort is not made we will see rising discontent and disaffection in Congress and throughout the country with the foreign aid program, and a rising danger that the program may not survive. I speak in this regard as one who has supported foreign aid, and believes in its value.

Later, next week, I expect to discuss the subject again and to give in greater detail my reasons for advancing this resolution.

The resolution has precedence. The Senate adopted my similar resolution last year; and in 1959, then Senator Kennedy and I submitted a resolution—which was adopted by the Congress—which provided for a special study of the foreign assistance program in India and in Pakistan. The study was made. If an effective study can be made in two countries, it can be made in all of the countries to which we give assistance.

A question was raised last year about the cost of such studies. Of course this would cost a considerable sum of money, but it would be miniscule in comparison to the $4 billion or more we are being asked to appropriate this year. Moreover, the studies could be paid for out of the foreign assistance funds appropriated for each country.

Another objection was made that perhaps we could not find men from private life who would be willing to undertake such work. I would want to see two prominent and able men from outside the Government appointed to serve on each such committee, with others added if the President decided to enlarge the committee beyond five. In addition, each committee should have at least three members of the administration familiar with our foreign assistance program. In my judgment the separate studies would require probably 4 to 6 months, perhaps less for some countries, to make the detailed study and evaluation of the program in each country.

Commencing with countries such as Korea, India, Japan, Nationalist China, Greece, South Vietnam, Brazil, Pakistan, Turkey, the Philippines, and Iran, we could perhaps do the study in one-half of the countries in 1 year. That would require, say, 80 or 100 men from private life. If we cannot find 80 or 100 men from private life who would be willing to do this important work, our country is in very bad shape indeed.

The purpose of our foreign aid program, as I conceive it, is to assist the developing free countries of the world in their economic and social development in raising the standards of living of their people, and thus to help them maintain and strengthen free institutions and democratic values.

If our aid is not being effectively used, we will fail, or at least fall short of the objectives of our country and of the countries we assist.

So I submit the resolution today, and I have asked that it lie on the desk until April 1. I expect to consult with other Senators about it. Later, next week, I shall elaborate in more detail on my reasons for submitting the resolution.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until Monday next at 12 noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record a remarkable address which was delivered yesterday by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson. The address was delivered at the First Inter-American Defense College graduation at Fort McNair. The speech was heard by many Central and South American ambassadors and distinguished representatives of those countries in both civilian and military life. It was received enthusiastically. In fact, I have been told today that many of the embassies of the South American and Central American countries have asked for copies of the speech, including the tape recording that was made of it.

The Vice President not only gave a challenging message relating to the need for solidarity and the cooperation among the members of the American states, but presented some good, hard, factual material concerning our relationships with all the countries of this hemisphere, including Cuba.

I call to the attention of the Senate particularly the facts the Vice President outlined relating to Cuba.

First. He said in Cuba, under communism, the gross national product has fallen by 25 percent.

Second. In Cuba, as elsewhere, communism has demonstrated again its inability to meet the food requirements of the people. Food consumption has declined 15 percent under Castro.

Third. Sugar production, the lifeblood of Cuba's economy traditionally, has consistently declined each year under the Communist regime, and the 1963 crop will be the smallest since the end of World War II.

Fourth. The Cuban economy has already cost the Soviet Union more than $1 billion.

Fifth. It is of significance to Americans in each republic of this hemisphere that since communism seized control of Cuba, nearly a quarter million people have fled from Cuba.

These are the facts, as the Vice President cited them. I am sure when my colleagues in the Senate study this speech, they will find it to be one of the most thought provoking and one of the most ably documented speeches on U.S. policy relating to Latin American countries that has been delivered to date.

I compliment the Vice President and thank him for this splendid presentation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, First Inter-American Defense College Graduation, Fort McNair, Washington, D.C.

This is a proud occasion for all the Americas—and all Americans. Only a year ago the Inter-American Defense Board observed its 20th anniversary by meeting with President Kennedy to discuss the concept of the Inter-American Defense College. The college was an improved plan then—but still on paper. Today the first class of the college meets for graduation.

It is fitting that the emphasis of the college emphasizes more than the study of military affairs alone. As the charter of this institution spells out, economic, political, and social factors—as well as military—"constitute essential components of inter-American defense."

The Republics of this hemisphere share the common purpose of safeguarding peace, independence and well-being of all men who bear the name of Americans. But that purpose cannot be accomplished by arms alone. To preserve peace, to maintain independence, and to further the well-being of all our people, we must achieve political, economic and social stability under responsive and responsible democratic institutions.

That is the purpose of the Alliance for Progress. That is the purpose of the deliberations underway today in Central America. That is—and will continue to be—the purpose of our expanding efforts to achieve greater unity and more effective cooperation among the free nations of this New World.

At this moment, the most urgent problem in our hemisphere is the existence of communism in Cuba. Our mutual objective is to end that Communist regime in Cuba. We cannot be really content until communism is gone from Cuba and gone from this hemisphere.

The united action last October of the Organization of American States made indelibly clear that the Americas will not acquiesce to the establishment of Communist arms in the Western Hemisphere.

Equally, we shall not be content until the last of Soviet forces are withdrawn from Cuban soil.

We are mutually determined that the Cuban people shall have opportunity to choose their own government, freely and without oppression.

If the naked attempt of the Soviet Union to transform Cuba into a military threat to the hemisphere required realism of us all, no less realism is required of us in meeting the broader threat to our security which is presented by the presence of poverty, privation, illiteracy, disease, and injustice anywhere among our Republics.

The basic problem of security in our hemisphere is not Cuba, not Castro, not communism. The most impressive lesson learned from Cuba is that communism is not the answer to the need of this hemisphere. Cuba is clearly proving to be for the Communists a showcase of failure—not a show window of success. Where West Berlin stands behind the Iron Curtain as a conspicuous example of the superiority of freedom, Cuba today exists within the community of free American Republics as an even more glaring example of Communist failure in and for the New World.

We must not overlook—we must not minimize—the significance and importance of these facts:

1. In Cuba, under communism, the gross national product has fallen by 25 percent.

2. In Cuba, as elsewhere, communism has demonstrated again its inability to meet the food requirements of the people. Food consumption has declined 15 percent under Castro. For the past 1 year, foodstuffs have been rationed. Clothing was added to the ration list last month.

3. Sugar production, the lifeblood of Cuba's economy traditionally, has consistently declined each year under the Communist regime and the 1963 crop will be the smallest since the end of World War II.

4. The Cuban economy has already cost the Soviet Union more than $1 billion. We estimate that Cuba currently is costing the Soviets $1 million per day. Yet even this support has been unable to arrest the deterioration and decline of the Cuban economy.

5. Finally, it is of significance to Americans in each Republic of this hemisphere that since communism seized control of Cuba, nearly a quarter million people have fled from Cuba. The United States has issued authorizations to another 300,000 Cubans to enter this country if they are permitted to leave their island prison. I might add that we have received nearly 600,000 individual Cuban requests for visa waivers.

To recite these facts is to recite a story of failure—the failure of communism in this hemisphere. That failure is inherent in the Communist system itself. But we must not overlook the fact that this failure is also a result of the unity and cooperation of free nations acting together through nonmilitary means to accelerate and precipitate that failure.

While some argue that the application of selective controls are not enough, it is well for us to examine the results of our efforts in this regard.

1. In 1962, free world trade with Cuba was less than $90 million—only one-tenth the precommunism level. That trade will be even lower this year.

2. Total trade between Cuba and all of Latin America last year was only $12 million and will virtually disappear this year. I would emphasize that a large portion of the free world's limited 1962 trade with Cuba was food. None of it was in arms. None of it was strategic goods. None of Cuba's oil came from or is coming from free world sources.

3. Contrary to some beliefs, free world countries are cooperating closely in these efforts. Free world shipping to Cuban ports is now one-tenth what it was before October. Where in January 1962 128 free world ships put in at Cuban ports, in January of this year only 12 free world ships carried cargoes to Cuba.

4. Increasingly effective political isolation of the Communist regime in Cuba has been achieved on a hemispheric basis. Fourteen Latin American countries have broken diplomatic relations with Cuba. Last October complete hemispheric solidarity on the Cuban issue was achieved for the first time with the unanimous vote in support of the quarantine. In many student and labor elections in the hemisphere during the past 2 years there have been significant gains for the democratic forces and a significant decline in the appeal and influence of Castro communism.

5. Members of the OAS are now taking vigorous steps to deal with the threat of Cuban subversion of democratic institutions throughout the hemisphere.

More could be mentioned. These measures make the point, however, that both the will and the capacity of American Republics to unite in common purpose is maturing responsibility—and this offers all of us solid and tangible encouragement to believe that we can achieve and maintain the unity essential to meet and master the long-standing and continuing problems of our hemisphere.

If Cuba offers to Americans, North and South, convincing proof that communism does not hold the answer to the needs and aspirations of the peoples of this hemisphere, we must not fail to look at the other side of the coin. Communism's failure merely underscores for us freedom's responsibilities. The needs of this hemisphere are needs of the people. Those needs must be met—and we must meet them under freedom.

The presence of Communist forces in Cuba is testimony to the ultimate failure of communism in this hemisphere. Those forces are there because communism cannot—in either the New World or the Old World—dare to permit the people to exercise the rights of representative democracy.

The high purpose of the Alliance for Progress is to make real for all the peoples of the Americas a democratic alternative to the doctrine and dogma and defaults of totalitarianism—in all its forms.

The ultimate goal of the Alliance for Progress is to serve the people of this hemisphere. The Alliance for Progress is for people—it was designed to solve human problems, to help people to live better and more productive, more dignified and satisfactory lives. Through the Alliance, we are trying to make accessible for every citizen of this hemisphere the opportunity to satisfy men's basic needs for home, land, work, and schooling in an environment of freedom and health and opportunity.

The real story of the Alliance for Progress is not the present story of its difficulties but, rather, the long-range story of its absolute necessity. All alliances, all effective confederations, all successful unifications among freemen have begun uncertainly. Unity itself is more difficult to achieve than are the works which flow from unity. But unity of purpose is the special genius of this hemisphere and we can be confident that this genius will find its finest hour in the 10 years of common purpose of our efforts through the Alliance for Progress.

Building new industries and new roads, laying new rails, and modernizing old agricultures are difficult labors. Even so, it is easier and quicker to do these things than to produce a people with an economy capable of fully utilizing such works. Under the Alliance for Progress, we are trying to do both. Long, hard years may lie ahead. But those years of effort and progress will be neither so long nor so hard as the years of inertia and inaction which lie forever behind us.

In the work that we must do as Americans, the military of the American Republics will be filling a creative and constructive role of the first magnitude. Under the civic action program, we began last year actively encouraging Latin American armed forces to expand their participation in public works, in improving agriculture, transportation and communications, health, sanitation, and other such lasting contributions to economic and social development. Such work has been performed as a matter of standard practice over the years by armed forces in a number of our Republics, such as Peru, Bolivia, Brazil, and Chile. In Peru and Bolivia, this country has supported engineer construction units through our military assistance program—and we are now actively planning expansion of this program in other countries of the hemisphere.

Because we live in a hemisphere where peace has found a home, we can realistically look forward to utilizing our military forces for the full realization of the promise of peace. This is a pioneering concept—a new departure in the affairs of man. It is a new departure of which all members of the military of our Republics can be especially proud to take an active and creative part.

All of our achievements in hemispheric unity—whether military or nonmilitary in character—aim toward the common purpose of realizing the fruits of peace. We must not be deterred from this goal. We must maintain the strength, efficiency, and alertness of our military forces. We must be sure of our state of preparedness, as we must be swift in our response to danger. But the presence of military challenges must not mislead us to believe that the solution of our problems in this hemisphere is a military solution alone—or even foremost.

Today, as throughout the modern history of the Western Hemisphere, our guard must be constant and strong against subversion of our democratic institutions and integrity. But we can well recall the words of a great free world leader—not of our hemisphere—Winston Churchill, who said: "The first victory we have to win is to avoid a battle; the second, if we cannot avoid it, to win it."

Against the dangers which face us, we must bring the response of responsible freemen to bear—the response of greater unity, constant cooperation, continuing joint purpose. There can be no peace in the hemisphere unless there is peace in the world and there will be no peace in the world if we are irresponsible as peacekeepers in the hemisphere. Our purpose is peace—with honor. But we shall not allow our honor to be compromised, our freedom to be jeopardized, and our opportunity to be defaulted.

ASSISTANCE IN PROVISION OF HOUSING FOR ELDERLY PERSONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly persons on behalf of myself, Senator MORSE, Senator RANDOLPH, Senator MCINTYRE, and Senator NEUBERGER. I ask that the bill be allowed to lie on the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The bill (S. 1170) to assist in the provision of housing for elderly persons, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in his message on the aging, President Kennedy painted a full portrait of the sorry plight in which many of our older citizens find themselves. He drew attention, in particular, to the very special problems of shelter faced by those who are past their middle sixties.

One-fourth do not have households of their own, but live in the homes of relatives, in lodging houses, or in institutions. Of the remainder, over 30 percent live in substandard housing lacking a private bath, toilet, or hot running water, or which is otherwise dilapidated or deficient. And many others live in housing unsafe or unsuitable for elderly people.

The President further pointed out that almost half of those over 65 and living alone receive $1,000 or less a year. About half the spending units headed by persons over 65 have liquid assets of less than $1,000. Two-fifths have a total net worth, including their home, of less than $5,000.

Last year, the Subcommittee on Elderly Housing of the Special Committee on the Aging, of which I had the honor to serve as chairman, held extensive hearings on the shelter problems of the elderly. Out of those hearings came important legislation but it was introduced too late in the session for action.

Mr. President, the subcommittee's findings coincided precisely with those of the President. Many of our older people with very limited income live in rental housing which falls far short of any reasonable standard of health or safety. Nearly 40 percent of those who live in rental housing are in quarters classified as substandard and yet they are frequently charged exorbitant rents.

It is true, of course, that over the years Congress has enacted a variety of measures designed to ease the shelter problems of the elderly. Within the higher income brackets these programs have been generally successful in meeting a vital need. But they fail to meet the requirements of most single older persons and those couples who can afford to pay only $40 or so per month.

Under the public housing program, for example, approximately 120,000 persons 65 and over now have been provided shelter—just under 80,000 families. But over 2 million elderly persons have incomes low enough to qualify for this kind of housing.

Under section 202 of the Housing Act, long-term loans may be made to private nonprofit corporations, consumer cooperatives, or public bodies which sponsor rental or cooperative housing for older people. Fund authorizations for this program currently are far below the applications. This has occurred despite difficulty in finding sponsors to undertake these projects in specific communities. Such an undertaking requires a high level of expertise—in many communities most available in the local housing authority. Unfortunately, however, such authorities are presently excluded from participation in the program.

The subcommittee found that rental housing stimulated by section 231 of the Housing Act, which insures lenders against losses on mortgages used for construction or rehabilitation of rental accommodations for older persons, has been largely in so-called retirement communities in the sunshine States of Arizona, California, and Florida. Comparatively little use of the program is found in the more populous States.

The FHA loan program for moderate income housing, enacted in 1961, is greatly impaired by its limitation to family units. Just about a quarter of the older population lives alone or with nonrelatives. A large proportion is, of course, widowed. In the Housing Act of 1956, Congress made single men and women over 65 eligible for public housing. This program should be similarly improved.

The regular FHA mortgage program encourages homeownership by those over 65, but, unfortunately, those with

the financial means to avail themselves of the program comprise an extremely small minority among our older citizens.

With 5 million ill-housed senior citizens in the country it is a grave disappointment to find that only 100,000 units of elderly housing have been built in the last 6 years under all these existing Federal programs.

There are those who argue that this is a problem best left to the private market to resolve. Indeed, they espouse a "rollback" in Federal expenditures for housing.

They put forward their arguments with added vehemence in a year when a tax cut has been recommended.

Well, how well has the construction industry done in meeting this challenge?

True, it has performed well in providing quality housing for millions of Americans since World War II. But virtually all of this has been suburban housing for younger and comparatively well-to-do families.

The three-bedroom house, often on two floors with a large lot and no convenient transportation, is hardly the kind of place for an elderly couple in its retirement years. Such a couple or an individual wants quarters convenient for its own purposes, not child rearing—quarters relatively small, convenient to public transportation, stores, health services and recreation, possibly including special safety features.

This is not the kind of housing the building industry has been interested in providing. Not, that is, without outside incentives.

And those incentives, by and large, must come from Government.

This leads to the crux of the problem. If we assume that only 20 percent of the 5 million who need better housing would want to live in the kind of quarters being erected under the Federal programs, a very radical assumption indeed—in other words, if we assume that 80 percent can be satisfactorily housed by the private economy in hand-me-down family housing or converted hotels and roominghouses—we still need to provide something like 1 million units through the Federal programs. At $10,000 to $12,000 a unit, which is our current experience, an investment of $10 to $12 billion is required.

These figures are perhaps speculative. But they are clearly frightening. The 20-percent estimate is arbitrary, but it seems conservative. Two years ago I had the opportunity to look at specialized housing for the elderly in Sweden and Denmark, both of which have far more such housing than does the United States in relation to population. Their experience would bear out the suggestion that if we had specialized housing for the elderly for 9 percent of our elderly households—in other words, 20 percent of those needing housing—such housing would be readily occupied by people who would find their new homes far preferable to their present ones.

Thus, while we cannot say with confidence what the ultimate need is, we can say with total confidence that it is far greater than the supply of specialized housing that now exists. The subcommittee has urged intensive research to find answers to the questions of how much such housing is needed, and what the characteristics of such housing should be.

As a phase of this research, we urge community-by-community surveys, and we propose that Federal assistance to urban planning under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, be extended to cover these surveys. The official planning body and the community wide council of social agencies, under our recommendation, would collaborate in organizing a survey in a given community. They would find out with some degree of exactness the actual living conditions of senior citizens in the community, the extent of their need for better housing, and the kind of housing they would like to have.

Do the old people want to live in multiunit buildings with other old people, or do they want to be scattered throughout the community in neighborhoods with younger families? Do they want to live downtown, or on the edge of town, or somewhere in between? How do they feel about high-rise buildings? How many can prepare their own meals, and how many need the service of a central kitchen or dining hall?

We know that the answers to these questions will be that some old people prefer one pattern of living, and some prefer another. Some can live independently; the degree of dependence of the others varies widely. But the important thing is to determine, in each community, the approximate numbers who want and need one or another kind of accommodation and then to develop the plans, and select the sites, that will be suitable to that community. Those making the surveys in each community would have the benefit of the experience of other communities and the best available knowledge on the subject, made available to them by the central research staff in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The undertaking would be closely coordinated with urban renewal activity.

Now, how about the money problem in this year of the tax cut? Obviously, any adequate housing program for the elderly or any other group will cost a great deal of money. Only through Federal assistance can rentals be brought down within the range of "ability to pay" for those living on small pensions and other retirement income. The subcommittee urged that the Federal programs be expanded as rapidly as the demand develops in the communities throughout the country.

Whether the result will be a demand for $10 or $12 billion worth of projects, or somewhat more or less, is not clear—and for that reason this particular bill suggests no amount. But what is clear is that the demand will be of a totally new order of magnitude compared to that of the existing programs.

It is equally clear that this kind of money can never be squeezed out of the Federal budget. Of the three Federal programs, only the public housing program involves a subsidy from the taxpayers. Yet, ironically, it is the only one of the three that does not suffer severely from budget limitations. Under this program, the capital cost of a project is spread over 40 years of Federal budgets and the immediate impact of a new project on the current year's budget is consequently not great.

The section 202 direct loan program and the section 231 FHA insurance program, on the other hand, involve no subsidy. Under section 202, the Federal Government lends the money at a rate sufficiently high to cover its own cost of borrowing plus a margin to cover administrative costs and provide a reserve against possible losses. Under section 231, the Federal Government, through FNMA, purchases mortgages with appropriate funds, but the interest rates are sufficient to cover the cost of FNMA's borrowing from the Treasury.

Yet, in both cases, the total amount of the loan or the mortgage, as the case may be, is carried in the budget as an expenditure during the year in which it is made. If we were to set out to build 100,000 units under these programs, therefore, it would require at least $1 billion from the budget. This would provide only 2 percent of the 5 million who need better housing. Yet our budget limitations are so tight that it is not easy to see how this kind of money—much less 10 times that amount—could be provided in any reasonably short period of time.

Thus, the anomalies of our budget practices make it far easier to finance 10,000 units of nonsubsdized private housing under the direct loan or mortgage insurance programs which pay their own way. That is because one of them is in the budget and the other one is not.

Accordingly, our subcommittee stressed the urgency of developing either a new method of financing, or a new method of budget presentation. This bill embodies the latter approach. It does it very simply—by directing that only the ultimate estimated net loss, if any, from the loan and mortgage purchase progams be treated as an expenditure in the budget. Since there has been and will be no ultimate net loss at all, these programs would simply be excluded from the expenditures column. The Congress would still control the magnitude of the programs, of course, by limiting the borrowing authority of the responsible agencies. And the operations of the programs would, of course, be shown in the budget documents, but much as trust fund operations are shown—outside and separate from the administrative budget.

This proposal may sound novel, but it is not. It merely applies, to a single program, the principle of capital budgeting which many of us have long advocated.

Every State, every city, every county, every private business, and every foreign country whose budgeting practices have been examined by our own experts, I believe, separates recoverable investments from outright expenditures. A city government may borrow in the tens of millions for capital expenditures, but it is regarded as fiscally sound if its operating budget, including amortization of its bonds, is balanced. The same is true of county and State governments. No private business would lump together its payrolls and its loans in a single column called expenditures; a loan is offset by an entry in the income column reflecting the value of the obligation created by the loan. Yet the Federal Government, if it lends $10 million, ignores the fact of an equal increase in the total of debt owed to the Government. Does a bank treat a loan just as if the money were given away? Of course not. Then why should the Federal Government, when it performs the functions of a bank, treat its loans in that manner?

There is no other jurisdiction, public or private, on the face of the earth that keeps its books in the ridiculous way the Federal Government does.

This is what the President of the United States referred to in his commencement address at Yale University last year, when he complained that the Federal budget "cannot tell a loan from a straight expenditure" and "cannot distinguish between operating expenditures and long-term investments."

Perhaps someday, with the leadership of the President, we will shift our budget as a whole over to a new system of presentation. But I am tired of waiting. I think we should begin by applying the principles of capital budgeting to a single program, housing for the elderly. It is an urgent program. It is one with an enormous potential for increasing human happiness. It is one which helps people who are least able to help themselves, helps them to satisfy what may be the most important single yearning in their lives—for a decent place in which to live. And it is a program which can go nowhere, which cannot really get off the ground, without a change in budget practices.

I submit that here is the place to begin. Let us try the principle of capital budgeting in this one program. We can consider the principle separately and later for other programs which may have an equally valid claim. But if we wait for a complete recasting of the Federal budget before we apply the principle anywhere, we will certainly wait for years—if not forever. And, meanwhile, old men and women will continue to live in unsafe, rundown, unsanitary, unsuitable housing instead of in the bright, new attractive quarters which can be theirs if the Federal programs now underway can be expanded to meet the demand which will come from the communities of America.

There are other provisions in the bill—to facilitate the provision of housing for the elderly in urban renewal areas, to ease the impact of renewal on elderly people, to broaden participation in both the direct-loan program and the nursing-home programs, and otherwise make our efforts more effective. Instead of elaborating on these points, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, a summary of conclusions and recommendations from the report of the Subcommittee on Housing for the Elderly and a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

(1) A national problem: Housing for the elderly is a national problem of great magnitude, which the Nation has only begun to recognize and come to grips with. And the problem will grow as the number of elderly persons grows—from 17 million over 65 in 1960 to 24.5 million in 1980.

(2) Magnitude of the need: While the supply of housing is inadequate for all age groups—as indicated by the estimated 11 million substandard units still in use—a higher proportion of elderly than of any other age group live in substandard dwellings because their income is least. About 5 million households among the 11 million containing elderly persons, or 45 percent, need to be better housed.

(3) Need for specially designed housing: Even among elderly persons living in "standard" housing, many are ill-housed because units designed for families may be unsuitable for the special needs of elderly persons, especially those most advanced in age. They need housing especially designed for older persons. Such housing units should be suitable in size for single individuals or couples, easy to maintain, economical in cost, convenient to community activities and services, and incorporating certain design features which reduce the hazards to older people whose physical mobility is reduced. Housing properly designed for older people enables them to maintain independent households longer than is possible otherwise.

(4) Need for range of choice: Individual retired people differ widely in their housing needs and desires. Specially designed housing should, therefore, offer a range of choice, adjusting to the requirements of the older person rather than requiring him to make the adjustments to a style of living he may find objectionable.

(5) Expansion of Federal programs: In view of the severely limited incomes of most persons over 65, substantial improvement in the living conditions of the Nation's elderly depends heavily on Federal assistance to provide specially designed housing at reduced costs. Present Federal programs—FHA insurance, direct Federal loans, and special public housing units—are well conceived, and for those relatively few persons whom they serve, they are of great benefit. But compared with the magnitude of the need, they have barely scratched the surface—producing a few thousand units when the need is in the millions. If the Nation is to succeed in providing decent shelter for all its older citizens, it must undertake an effort on a scale far greater than is now underway.

(6) Financing of Federal programs: Such an effort can hardly be undertaken as long as all of these Federal programs depend on appropriated funds which are included as budget expenditures. The FHA and VA programs which have been instrumental in the vast expansion of suburbia since World War II have succeeded only because their insurance and guarantee operations were outside the budget. The direct loan and loan insurance programs for the elderly involve no cost to the taxpayer, and no net increase in the Federal debt. In the case of the direct loan program, all the Government does is pass on to the borrower the comparatively low interest rates which the Government is able to obtain. The mortgage insurance program makes private financing more readily available by insuring lenders against loss. Yet through the technicalities of budget presentation these transactions are treated the same as other governmental expenditures which involve 100 percent subsidy. Either a new method of financing housing for the elderly must be found which will bring down interest rates without requiring the use of appropriated funds, or the methods of budget presentation must be changed so that repayable loans are not lumped in with outright expenditures.

(7) Nursing homes: Progress in meeting the need for good nursing home accommodations has been retarded by the exclusion of nonprofit nursing homes from FHA insurance aid now given to proprietary nursing homes.

(8) Research: In order that housing for the elderly may be properly planned, much more knowledge is needed. Research should be of two kinds—general studies aimed at learning more about the effects of various housing arrangements on older persons and evaluating the varied projects which have been undertaken; and community-by-community studies of the shortcomings of housing for the elderly and the particular needs and desires for improved shelter expressed by the elderly themselves in each locality.

(9) Community organization and leadership: Even if the limits could be removed from Federal assistance, few communities are prepared to take advantage of such assistance and proceed rapidly with the design and construction of specialized housing for the elderly. This is due not only to the absence of data, referred to above, but to the absence of community organizations prepared and competent to assume leadership. The country needs more specialists in the field of housing for the elderly, and communities need to mobilize the resources of all organizations, both public and private, which can contribute to leadership and planning.

(10) Community planning: Based on the results of both general and local research, each community should develop a plan for housing its own elderly which will enable those who are ill-housed to move into suitable dwellings and offering a range of choice within the limits of what the elderly can afford. This plan should be an element of, and consistent with, the community's comprehensive physical plan.

(11) Urban renewal: Urban renewal has worked particular hardships on elderly persons, both because they are heavily concentrated in renewal areas and because as a group they are less adaptable and hence suffer more from sudden and enforced change in their living arrangements. Every possible step should be taken to soften the impact of urban renewal on older people.

PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The subcommittee offers the following recommendations, which are developed in more detail in the remainder of this report, and requests their consideration by the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(1) Expansion of Federal programs: Federal assistance under existing programs for housing for the elderly—FHA insurance, direct loans, and special public housing units—should be expanded as rapidly as communities are prepared to take advantage of these aids. The authorization for the direct loan program should be increased immediately, since applications exceed total funds now authorized.

(2) Financing of Federal programs: To make the needed expansion of Federal assistance possible, a new method of financing those programs which involve no subsidy—the insurance and loan programs—should be devised to remove their dependence on appropriated funds, or methods of budget presentation should be revised so that these transactions, which involve no ultimate expenditure, are not classified as outright expenditures.

(3) Community organization and leadership: In order that all of a community's resources may be mobilized to deal with the housing problems of its elderly citizens, the restriction on participation by local housing authorities in the direct loan program should be modified.

(4) Nursing homes: Nonprofit as well as proprietary nursing homes should be made eligible to participate in the FHA mortgage insurance program.

(5) Research: The Housing and Home Finance Agency should undertake a major research program to obtain far better data than now exists on the housing needs of the elderly and the effect on older persons of various housing arrangements.

(6) Community planning: Federal assistance to community planning should be expanded to provide aid for surveys of the housing needs of the elderly in each locality and the development of comprehensive community plans.

(7) Urban renewal: In order to ease the impact of urban redevelopment on housing for the elderly, the following steps should be considered:

(a) Amend provisions of the Housing Act of 1949 relative to local noncash grants in aid to permit local public agencies to make sites available for development of cooperative and nonprofit sponsors of housing for the elderly and to credit the value of such sites to the project as a local noncash grant.

(b) Authorize the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages for the rehabilitation of the residence of an elderly homeowner on terms which do not require full amortization of the loan. Such mortgages could require payment of interest only or interest plus a part of the principal with the balance becoming due upon the sale, devolution, or other transfer of the property.

(c) Authorize rent subsidies for limited periods to enable persons displaced by urban renewal or other Federal programs to obtain decent housing, the subsidies to be included as part of the project cost.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY ACT OF 1962

NEED FOR THE SECTION	EFFECT OF THE SECTION
Section 2. Home improvement loans under section 220(h) of the National Housing Act	
Many elderly persons and couples own their own homes, and are able to live comfortably on very small retirement incomes because they are homeowners and do not have to make rent or mortgage payments. But this independence can come abruptly to an end if their homes are in areas designated for rehabilitation and they are required to make major alterations or improvements to meet the housing standards of the neighborhood. It is becoming an increasingly acute problem that elderly homeowners in rehabilitation areas cannot take advantage of even the liberal mortgage insurance provisions which now are available and have no alternative but to move out of their deteriorated homes.	This section would permit the Federal Housing Administration to insure loans for elderly homeowners, the terms of which provide that all, or any unamortized part, of the principal becomes due upon the death of the owner or sale or other transfer of the property. Loans insured under this subsection would carry an amortization schedule which the lender and the borrower agree can be met with the elderly borrower's income; with the possibility, in the case of very low income persons, of the payment of interest only with the entire principal amount becoming due upon the next transfer of the property.
Section 3. Repair and rehabilitation under section 221 of the National Housing Act	
	Section 3 would extend the benefits of the same type of rehabilitation loan as contemplated in section 2 to elderly persons occupying housing which requires rehabilitation to make it suitable for their use after having been displaced from an urban renewal area.
Section 4. Eligibility for occupancy of single elderly persons in moderate income housing	
Section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act provides for a below-market interest rate for certain types of sponsors to provide moderate income housing. The present language makes this financing aid available for developers of family units with the result that widowed and single elderly individuals are excluded from occupancy of this housing.	The amendment made by this section would simply permit housing to be constructed under this provision for single elderly persons, as well as families. This is in the nature of a technical amendment to existing law, but one which should have considerable impact on the amount of new housing available to elderly persons.
Section 5. Mortgage insurance for nonprofit nursing homes	
Section 232 of the National Housing Act as now written discriminates against a major group of the providers of this specialized type of housing. Section 232, which was enacted in 1959, has proved effective in facilitating the financing of the private profitmaking nursing homes. But the many nonprofit groups, including the thousands of nonprofit hospitals which might add such facilities, are at a great disadvantage since they must raise their funds through private subscription or seek to borrow them without the benefit of mortgage insurance.	The amendment made by section 5 would extend the authority of the FHA Commissioner to insure mortgages for nonprofit groups to construct nursing home facilities. Mortgages could be up to 100 percent of the project cost with the same limitations now applicable to proprietary nursing home mortgages, or for the amount of the non-Federal share of Hill-Burton approved projects. The extension of mortgage insurance to nonprofit nursing homes does not in any way substitute for, or infringe upon that part of the Hill-Burton program which is devoted to nursing homes, but simply offers an aid to the financing through private channels of the sponsor's share of the project cost.

Section 6. Community planning to meet the housing needs of the elderly

This section is directed toward helping communities to make full and proper use of Federal programs, as well as the other resources available to them to provide housing for their older citizens. Among the greatest lacks in this field is the paucity of information at the community level on the housing problems and needs of the elderly and how steps to meet these needs might be integrated with the total development plan of the community.

Section 6 would amend section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, which provides grants on a matching basis for long-range urban planning, to authorize such grants to competent community planning agencies for surveys of the actual needs and problems of their older citizens.

Section 7. Eligibility of public housing agencies for direct loans for housing for the elderly

It is important, if we are to meet the tremendous needs of our elderly people for appropriate housing, that all of the knowledge and skill available in each community be able to play its proper role. The direct loan program established under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, specifically excludes local housing authorities from participation, the program being primarily directed to stimulating and making possible the provision of housing by nonprofit and cooperative groups.

It has been found, however, that in many communities, and especially in the smaller communities, there simply is no nonprofit group with the necessary experience, resources, and permanence to undertake such projects.

This section would modify the eligibility provisions of section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, to provide that in communities where a demonstrable need exists for housing of the type built under this program, the local housing authority may be considered an eligible sponsor if no otherwise eligible group exists to meet this need.

Section 8. Relocation of elderly persons from urban renewal areas

It has been found that the elderly tend to be concentrated in the older sections of cities and are disproportionately represented in areas subject to renewal. The present requirements imposed by the urban renewal program for relocation of persons in project areas do not now protect the interests of the elderly residents as well as they do those of the working population and, in fact, do not require any special consideration of the elderly being relocated.

There is a serious shortage in most areas of decent, safe, and sanitary housing for relocation of very low income people. This problem is especially acute with respect to the elderly because they are less able to adapt to inadequacies in housing and because their incomes generally are among the lowest. Many proposals have been made for tapping the private housing market through supplementation of the rent paying ability of elderly persons being relocated. Although this approach obviously is fraught with many serious problems, the need for relief from the shortage of decent housing for relocation, especially of elderly persons, is so great that careful study is warranted.

Section 8(a) would amend section 105(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that the special needs and physical limitations of the elderly be provided for in relocation plans submitted to the Urban Renewal Administration.

Subsection (b) defines "elderly families" and "elderly persons" for purposes of this section.

Subsection (c) calls for a study by the Housing and Home Finance Agency of the need for and feasibility of a rent supplementation program as an aid in proper relocation of the elderly from urban renewal areas. The results of the study are to be reported to the Congress.

Section 9. Property in urban renewal areas to be used for elderly persons housing

The possibilities for the reuse of cleared land in urban renewal areas for housing and related facilities for the elderly have not even been approached by renewal projects to date. In fact, it has been found that potential sponsors of low and moderate cost housing for the elderly have had great difficulty in obtaining sites in urban renewal areas because of the high cost of land and the competition of economically higher alternative uses.

An amendment to present programs is needed to help make possible through urban renewal the continued residence of elderly people in the areas of the city where they have lived, but in greatly improved physical surroundings.

This section authorizes the Urban Renewal Administration to add to the Federal share of the capital grant the difference between the amount of a local public agency receives for land used for housing for the elderly constructed by nonprofit or public agencies and the amount which would have been received from a developer who would devote the site to its highest alternative use. The section provides safeguards to assure that this authority and additional subsidy are used only to create complete developments with the facilities and services in addition to housing necessary for independent living by older people.

Section 10. Budget treatment of certain capital, recoverable and investment expenditures

The need for better housing for the Nation's elderly amounts to millions of units. This need simply cannot be met without the assistance of the Federal Government.

When this assistance is in the form of direct loans or FNMA mortgage purchases, it involves no subsidy by the taxpayers. It is inaccurate and misleading for such loans and purchases to be shown in the Federal budget as expenditures rather than as investments which will be repaid in full.

Section 10 would provide that only estimated net losses to the Government from mortgages purchased by FNMA under section 231 of the National Housing Act, as amended, and loans made under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, will be shown as expenditures in the President's budget.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I note in the Presiding Officer's chair the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the chairman of the Special Committee on Problems of the Aging. I wish to pay this public tribute to him for the assistance he gave the subcommittee of which I am the chairman in preparing this report and hearing the testimony. I wish to thank him again for his support in having the report of the subcommittee approved by the full committee, and to point out publicly what a magnificent public service the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] has rendered over the years in studying and then in bringing to the floor of the Senate legislation to improve the lot of our senior citizens who are so badly in need of that kind of compassion which senior citizens get in almost every civilized country in the world except our own.

HOUSING FOR PEOPLE IN THE MIDDLE-INCOME BRACKETS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I do not mean to imply in my preceding remarks that the only housing problems in America today are those of the elderly. Far from it.

Even in the middle-income brackets, the homebuilding industry has tended to concentrate its efforts among the families which are better off financially.

We are producing fewer homes per year than a decade ago, despite a housing market going unmet, a large number of unemployed who are seeking work, and a building industry with a sizable unused capacity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of a valuable document entitled "Report on Middle-Income Housing," prepared by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, we will produce this year in the neighborhood of 1,400,000 housing units. Yet we should be building more than 2 million.

How big is the need in specific terms?

Last year, I requested the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to prepare a report on the extent to which various income groups in typical American cities could afford moderately priced new homes.

In response to this request Administrator Weaver has provided information on construction costs, housing expenses, income groups served and income groups not served by the homebuilding industry in some representative cities. These data have not been available previously and constitute an important new set of facts for the Congress to consider.

This study reveals what has long been suspected by housing economists, that the present product of the homebuilding industry is within the reach of only one-third to one-half of American families. The other half to two-thirds of our families cannot typically afford to purchase even the most modest home. Further, the study reveals that there are wide differences in both capital and operating costs of comparable homes in the cities selected for study. There is a marked tendency for the homebuilding industry to concentrate upon the construction of luxury-class homes as opposed to the minimum-price house. Thus, even where the industry might serve somewhat lower income groups it apparently tends not to do so in many cities, thus further curtailing the housing market.

I say this without assigning blame, for the industry is obviously pursuing a course of action intended to maximize profit and, indeed, must do so.

In addition, I have little question that the regulations of local government, and possibly some Federal aid programs, tend to induce the industry to produce somewhat higher quality and higher priced homes than minimum prices alone would suggest.

The study reveals wide variations between cities in the income groups served by the building industry. In some metropolitan areas as many as half of all families can apparently afford the typical minimum-priced product of the industry, at least when located on the cheapest available suburban land. This study does not treat of the difficult problems of providing some new housing, particularly rental housing, for moderate-income families who prefer to live in central cities. In the city of Philadelphia this is an especially difficult problem—one which arises in most of the major cities of the country.

The study also calculates the effects which different financial terms would have on the proportions of families able to afford new modest homes. These calculations reveal that the extension of terms comparable to those now available in the program of housing for the aged, or in the so-called 221(d)(3) program of renewal housing, could increase the proportion of families in the housing market by 50 percent. In almost every one of the cities studied, the extension of such credit terms would bring half to nearly two-thirds of our families within reach of a new home. I wonder how long the American housing economy can tolerate a situation in which more than one-half of the market is unserved. It seems to me that this is a crucial area wherein government can assist the building industry to achieve broader service to the American people as other industries are accustomed to doing.

It is my conviction that this study demonstrates the need for a new permanent program of credit aid for families in the moderate and lower income groups now excluded from the market. Such a program should make it possible for the average American family to buy or rent a new home. Even more desirable would be a program which would extend the same right to every American family which had a steady income and was prepared to assume the responsibilities of homeownership. I believe that it is our objective to provide incentives to enable the building industry to broaden its market to do this job. Further, such program would provide a needed bolstering of our national economy through largely private investment and business.

I do not hold, of course, that credit alone can do the required job. We need to provide incentives for the industry to build lower priced homes, incentives for potential customers to spend more on housing and less on frills, and incentives for local governments to remove any impediments which they may have put in the way of low-cost production. But these are features of a program which might well be tied to Federal credit aids designed for moderate and lower income families.

Mr. President, in the year ahead we will be reviewing the experimental programs adopted in 1961 and will be considering the features which are required in a permanent program to enlarge housing production and meet a broader segment of our housing needs. The study which the Housing Agency made for me provides valuable data on the extent of our present deficiencies and on some of the means for overcoming them.

EXHIBIT 1

REPORT ON MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING

INTRODUCTION

The problems of providing an adequate supply of housing for middle and lower income families have attracted the attention of Congress in almost every year for the last 30 years. The enactment of each piece of basic housing legislation, the Home Loan Bank Act in 1933, the National Housing Act in 1934, the U.S. Housing Act in 1937, the Housing Act of 1949, and the Housing Act of 1961 was motivated by desire to make home ownership and decent rental housing available to families who could not otherwise obtain adequate housing, as well as by the

desire to provide opportunities for expanding employment and investment in the homebuilding industry.

During the last decade, the Congress has steadily expanded earlier programs in an attempt to solve these same problems more adequately. The progressive reduction of downpayment requirements and the extension of amortization periods for loans insured by the Federal Housing Administration or guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration were attempts to move in this direction. As early as 1950, a bill, S. 2246, introduced by Senator SPARKMAN would have established a new Federal mortgage corporation for cooperative and nonprofit housing for families otherwise unable to afford new homes. This principle was recognized in the Housing Act of 1961 which authorized the Federal National Mortgage Association together with the Federal Housing Administration to engage in an experimental program of mortgage insurance and loans directed specifically to middle income families.

Despite the extensive programs already enacted by Congress, it has been charged that the homebuilding industry as presently constituted and with present Government aids is unable to provide new housing for more than the upper 30 to 40 percent of the income groups of American families. If this is the case, then the homebuilding industry service to the American public is more narrowly limited and its market more narrowly circumscribed than that of other industries. This obviously has important implications, both for the housing conditions of middle and lower income families and for employment and investment in one of our major industries.

Of course, it is not necessary for all American families to be able to purchase or rent new homes. At any time most of our families are living in homes which are at least 10 years old. The partly depreciated stock of used housing is our major housing resource and most always accommodates the vast majority of families. In the Housing Acts of 1954 through 1961, the Congress enacted important legislation to help preserve and improve that existing stock.

If the housing market worked better it would provide a large volume of new housing for middle and higher income families. As these housing units aged, they would depreciate in value and decline in price or rent through what is called the filtration process, until eventually they became available at sufficiently low prices and rents in sufficiently good condition and in large enough quantities to meet the needs of other families of lower income at prices and rents within the means of those families. Unfortunately, this filtration process has never worked perfectly, as is evident from the fact that significant fractions of our population still live in substandard housing and that in many cities there is still a shortage of standard older homes and apartments at prices or rents within reach of moderate income families. If the market processes are to be made more effective, a larger volume of new construction must be produced each year so that there will be a larger stock of housing and lower prices for housing in the future. As long as the building industry serves only an upper income minority of the population, however, the volume of new construction is too limited to achieve the necessary amount of filtration. Historically this appears to have been the case.

This point may be simply illustrated. If homes are produced only for people in the top 30 percent of the income distribution and homes filter down through a decile of the income distribution in, for example, 10 years, it would take 40 years after completion before any of the housing units would reach the lowest 30 percent of the income distribution. Few of the units would then still be of acceptable standards. On the other hand, if new units were produced that were within reach of people in the top 60 percent of the income distribution, it would take only 10 years for some of these units to filter down to the lowest 30 percent of the income distribution, and the units would still be of acceptable standards.

The production of new housing units available to lower income groups would also enlarge the market for new units and lead to an increased annual production rate. The accelerated increase in the housing stock would add pressures for a hastened filtration process that would help cut short the economic life of the millions of substandard units that are still occupied at present.

The mobility of families, increases in population, changes in locational preferences, changes in the distribution of income, neighborhood obsolescence rates, withdrawals from the stock and other factors also influence the filtration rate, of course, but these forces are probably less direct than the proportion of families in the new home market.

Unfortunately, our understanding of these market facts has been severely limited in the past. In the absence of complete data on housing market processes and with inadequate research funds, we have had to infer even major facts about the market and have been unable to proceed on the basis of sound factual data. The recent census studies on components of change in the housing supply, and statistics now being gathered on new home sales and prices, will undoubtedly help to provide a sound scientific foundation for the development of programs for the home building indusrty which will enable it to expand its markets and serve American families more fully. The tables submitted below by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and developed from data in the files of the Federal Housing Administration is an important contribution to this understanding. It will unquestionably assist the Congress, the American people, and the home building industry in their joint efforts to provide more and better housing and to provide enlarged opportunities for employment and investment in housing.

SUMMARY OF REPORT ON THE MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING MARKET

The accompanying report presents statistics which are helpful in considering the financial aids needed in developing sales and rental housing programs for middle-income families.

The data presented are based upon the estimated construction cost and estimated monthly housing expenses for a basic single-family home built for sale in each of 10 geographically distributed metropolitan areas in the United States. Similar data are also presented on the estimated construction cost and estimated monthly rent for a basic rental unit in a walk-up type project in each of the same 10 metropolitan areas. Utilizing these basic data, interest rates and amortization periods were varied to determine the extent to which such changes in mortgage terms would reduce monthly housing expenses or monthly rentals, and in turn the number or percentage of families whose incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient, based upon an assumed 20 percent of income for housing expenses or rents, to afford the lower monthly housing expenses or rents.

An important qualification should be noted in interpreting the figures presented in this report. The estimated number or percentage of families who had sufficient incomes in 1959 to afford the housing expenses estimated were predicated upon the assumption of sales housing program for middle-income families. Similarly, the number or percentage of families who had sufficient incomes in 1959 to afford the rentals estimated were predicated upon the assumption of a rental housing program for middle-income families. If it is assumed, however, that both a sales housing program and a rental housing program were to be adopted, the estimates for a sales housing program could not be added to those for a rental housing program. For a combined sales and rental housing program, the number or percentage of families who would have had sufficient income to afford either to purchase the basic sales housing unit or rent the basic rental unit would tend to approximate the higher of the estimates for either the rental or sales housing program.

It should be noted also that substantial variation among cities can be expected in the extent to which sales or rental housing would be used, since local preferences for sales versus rental housing vary considerably.

SALES HOUSING

Minimum cost homes assumed

The accompanying tables show the costs required for the construction of a minimum standard, single detached home in the lowest price class meeting FHA standards in 10 geographically distributed metropolitan areas. The housing data were prepared from information in the files of the Federal Housing Administration and the income distributions are from census reports. It should be noted, first, that construction costs vary widely from metropolitan area to metropolitan area. In high cost areas such as Boston, Mass., and Newark, N.J., the minimum cost house is estimated by FHA to require $14,500, including costs of land. These costs are for a very small house of less than 1,000 square feet, with three bedrooms, meeting FHA local mortgage insurance standards and mortgage ceilings. The lowest construction cost for a comparable house is found in Phoenix, Ariz., where it would cost $11,000. Other metropolitan areas range between these extremes.

Incomes required by purchasers

The minimum incomes required to purchase this modest home under present circumstances, with current interest rates, and the 30-year financing now available in many of the areas in the sample are shown in table 1. This income will be from $7,800 in Newark, N.J., the highest cost area, to $5,200 in Atlanta, Ga., one of the lower cost areas. The other metropolitan areas in the sample, range between these extremes.

Families having required incomes

Table 2 shows the percentage of all normal families who have an income this high. In the Houston, Tex., metropolitan area, 58 percent of the families have the income required to purchase minimum standard homes. On the other hand, only 37.8 percent of the families in Boston, Mass., metropolitan area, have an income high enough to permit them to purchase the FHA minimum homes in that community. These percentages assume that the housing expense-to-income ratio is that found by FHA experience to be typical of families in these income groups. If, on the other hand, it is assumed that housing expense-to-income ratio should not exceed 20 percent of income, then only 50 percent of the families in the Houston metropolitan area have incomes sufficient to permit them to purchase the FHA minimum home and only 33.8 percent of the Boston metropolitan area families have such incomes. These figures clearly indicate that even under the most favorable circumstances the home industry can rarely serve as much as 50 percent of American families and more typically is serving between 35 and 45 percent of such families. As the report indicates, these are median or average figures. Many families can spend more of their income on housing than the tables assume, others much less.

Variation in monthly housing cost

It should be noted that just as construction costs vary from community to community, so also do the costs of homeownership. Appendix tables 1–A through 1–J show the components of these costs of homeownership. The costs of mortgage interest and principal payments are assumed to be at the same interest rates, but vary with the capital costs of the dwelling in the several communities. FHA mortgage insurance premium rates are of course, standard. Other housing expenses, including the costs of heat, light and maintenance vary both with the costs of the dwelling and with climatic and other circumstances. These tend to be higher in the northern metropolitan areas and lower in souther metropolitan areas. On the other hand, there is a very wide variation in local real estate taxes which range from $26 per month in the highest cost community in the sample to as low as $4.94 per month in the lowest cost community. While the tables do not show what is received for these tax payments, the FHA reports them as typical of taxes on this type of home in each of the communities.

It is quite evident that local taxing practices and local service standards must vary widely and that some essential costs of local government are not revealed by the estimated tax payments. It seems reasonable to assume that the average American family purchasing a typical three-bedroom house has two children, both of whom would be in school in the years following home purchase. The costs of educating a child in reasonably managed public school systems will vary from as little as $200 per year per child, in school systems having the lowest possible standards, to as much as $1,000 per year per child in communities having very high standards. Where the home is paying only $60 per year in taxes it must be obvious that sales or other local or State taxes are supporting large parts of the cost of education. In addition, a substantial fraction of other costs of police, fire, streets and highways, recreation, health and other services must come from other taxes or these services are being provided at levels substantially below those which are common in most American communities. Thus, the tax payment component in housing cost may often conceal substantially higher nonproperty taxes which must be paid by the resident to provide essential services for housing. In more than half of the communities in the sample, real property taxes are less than a typical payment of approximately $20 per month, which is scarcely sufficient to support general government services plus a share of educational costs in most American communities.

Variations in median income

Appendix table 2 shows the distribution of income in the sample cities in 1959. It will be noted that median income ranges from a high of over $7,000 to a low of just over $5,000. Thus, the median income family in the highest income community can be as much as 40 percent above the median income in the lowest income community. There are comparable variations in the distribution of income among the several income classes as shown in Appendix table 2. This table also shows the cumulative percentage distribution of incomes in the sample cities. It will be noted that the percentage of families having an income less than $6,000 per year ranges from 37 percent to over 60 percent.

Proportion of families actually purchasing FHA homes

Appendix tables 3 and 4 show the distribution by income of families actually purchasing FHA insured homes during 1959 and 1960 under section 203 of the National Housing Act. These proportions obviously vary with the incomes of the families in each metropolitan area, the costs and prices of the homes produced by the building industry in each area and variations of cost of home ownership previously discussed. Appendix table 3 thus indicates that from 31 percent to as little as 3.4 percent of FHA home purchasers in 1959 had such incomes of less than $6,000. Comparable figures are presented in appendix table 4 for 1960.

When these income distributions of families actually purchasing FHA homes are compared with minimum incomes required for purchasers of a minimum standard house, it is interesting to note that in three northern cities from 31 to 49 percent of actual FHA purchasers had less than the minimum income required to purchase the minimum standard home. Put it another way, 69 to 51 percent of purchasing families did have adequate incomes to purchase the minimum standard home. By contrast, among the southern cities only 13 to 16 percent of FHA home purchasers had incomes less than those required for the minimum standard home as revealed by the tables.

Price classes of homes produced under FHA mortgage insurance

Appendix table 5 shows the appraised value of homes actually produced under FHA programs in the year 1959. This table reveals that a majority of the homes produced are valued at more than the minimum price assumed by the tables. Indeed, in the high cost area of the Boston metropolitan area, only 6.3 percent of all homes produced under FHA insurance were priced below $14,000 and in a lower cost metropolitan area of Mobile, Ala., only 6.6 percent of all FHA insured homes were produced at prices below $12,000.

Thus, the tables reveal startling disparities in the performance of the housing market in different metropolitan areas. Some cities like Indianapolis, Ind., are characterized by moderate building and housing costs and relatively high incomes. Here the building industry is in a position to serve about half of the potential market under ideal circumstances. Other metropolitan areas which have low costs, but low incomes, find the industry able to serve less than 20 percent of the potential market. It is interesting to note that, as measured by these ratios, some higher income, higher cost northern cities seem to have a better potential performance record than some lower income, lower cost southern and western cities. In eight of the metropolitan areas, the homebuilding industry is apparently serving less than 20 percent of its potential market, but in the other two areas, this percentage is 31.1 percent and 52.5 percent of the potential market.

These calculations, of course, ignore the proportion of families who are actually in the housing market, since in any one year less than 10 percent of the families will normally purchase a home. It is obvious that well over half of all families are not potentially in the market in any real sense in any year. If data were available on the income distribution of these families it would probably become evident that the proportion of the potential market actually served by the homebuilding industry was substantially less than that indicated by the tables. It might be reasonable to infer that the proportion in the market would be half or less than that shown in the tables. If adjustments were to be made for the extraordinary low tax areas, to take account of other taxes paid by homeowners in other ways, the proportion in the market would, of course, be further reduced.

Effects of financing charges on homeownership

Each of the tables to which reference has been made above also contains a series of columns showing the family incomes and the proportion of the families which would be served by progressive reductions in interest rate from 5¼ to 2 percent and extension of amortization period to 40 years. Tables 1 and 2 bring out very sharply the potential enlargement in the housing market which would result if such favorable terms were made available to families in moderate and low-income classes. Thus, under present financing terms of 5¼-percent interest rate and a 30-year amortization period, only 37.8 percent of Boston metropolitan area families would have had incomes in 1959 which would have permitted them to buy the minimum standard FHA home. Under the most liberal financing terms assumed—2-percent interest rate and 40-year amortization period—this proportion could almost be doubled to 61.7 percent. If it is assumed that a 20-percent ratio between housing expense and family income is a desirable objective, then the percentage of the families in the housing market in the Boston metropolitan area would have been raised from 33.8 to 57.6 percent by the variation in the terms described. Similarly, in the southern metropolitan area of Mobile, Ala., an estimated 39.4 percent of families would have been within income classes in 1959 which could have afforded a minimum standard house under present financing terms; 61.6 percent would have been brought into the housing market by the indicated change of terms. Since, as already has been noted, these are theoretical rather than actual proportions, the proportional increase in the market might be substantially higher than that indicated by the tables, if the homebuilding industry could be persuaded to produce a higher proportion of low-cost homes in such communities.

The following table shows the percentage of families whose incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient to pay the estimated housing expenses for the basic house, assuming housing expenses equal to 20 percent of income, 100-percent mortgage financing for 40 years and interest rates ranging from 4 to 2 percent; as compared with present rather generally available financing terms of 5¼-percent interest and a 30-year amortization period:

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Percentage of families with sufficient incomes in 1959			
	Under present terms of 5¼ percent, 30 years	Under terms of—		
		4 percent, 40 years	3 percent, 40 years	2 percent, 40 years
Northeast:				
Boston, Mass	33.8	45.6	51.8	57.6
Newark, N.J	39.3	50.4	56.1	61.5
North Central:				
Indianapolis, Ind	36.8	49.0	55.0	60.6
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	41.2	56.0	63.0	69.3
Topeka, Kans	34.7	47.0	53.3	59.3
South:				
Atlanta, Ga	49.2	59.5	63.9	68.0
Houston, Tex	50.8	61.1	65.3	69.2
Mobile, Ala	39.4	51.6	56.8	61.6
West:				
Phoenix, Ariz	43.7	53.0	57.7	62.0
Portland, Oreg	38.2	50.1	55.7	61.1

The figures presented in the table above should not be interpreted to mean that all the families who had sufficient incomes in 1959 would have been eligible under a middle-income program. In any middle-income program which provides unusual financial aids, such as below market interest rates and extended loan maturities, it would be advisable not only to limit the sales price of the house, but also to limit in some way the eligible purchasers of the homes to those most in need. The latter might be done by establishing maximum income limits. Preference might well be given to families displaced by renewal. No public purpose would be served if the homes to be provided under a program intended for middle-income families would be made available to families whose incomes are considered adequate to purchase standard homes under presently available financing terms.

The more meaningful figures, however, would be the number or percentage of additional families who have sufficient incomes to afford to purchase the basic home under the particular financing plan adopted, but who would not have sufficient income to afford to purchase the basic house under the present best available financing terms of 5¼ percent interest and a 30-year amortization period. The following table presenting figures to illustrate this were derived from the previous table, and are based upon the distribution of family incomes for 1959:

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Additional percentage of families who would have had sufficient incomes in 1959, under the terms indicated, but with insufficient incomes under 5¼ percent, 30-year financing		
	4 percent, 40 years	3 percent, 40 years	2 percent, 40 years
Northeast:			
Boston, Mass	11.8	18.0	23.8
Newark, N.J	11.1	16.8	22.2
North Central:			
Indianapolis, Ind	12.2	18.2	23.8
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	14.8	21.8	28.1
Topeka, Kans	12.3	18.6	24.6
South:			
Atlanta, Ga	10.3	14.7	18.8
Houston, Tex	10.3	14.5	18.4
Mobile, Ala	12.2	17.4	22.2
West:			
Phoenix, Ariz	9.3	14.0	18.3
Portland, Oreg	11.9	17.5	22.9

The above figures indicate, for example, that if the interest rate was reduced from 5¼ percent to 3 percent, and the amortization period extended from 30 years to 40 years, the reduction in estimated monthly housing expenses would have reduced the income needed to purchase the basic house so that an additional 18 percent of the families in the Boston metropolitan area would have had sufficient incomes in 1959 to purchase the basic house. Comparable figures for the other nine metropolitan areas indicate a range of 14 percent to 21.8 percent as the additional families who would have had sufficient incomes in 1959.

On the same basis, if the interest rate was reduced from 5¼ percent to 2 percent and the amortization period extended from 30 years to 40 years, the percentage of additional families who would have had sufficient income to purchase the basic house would have ranged from 18.3 to 28.1 percent in the 10 metropolitan areas included in the report.

These percentages of additional families are based upon the assumption that all of the additional families would become eligible for a middle-income program which would be based upon any one of the particular terms indicated. This would mean that the maximum income limit would be established just below the income needed to purchase the basic house under presently available financing terms, and the minimum income would be the income equal to five times the estimated monthly housing expenses for the basic house under the particular financing terms adopted. It will be noted, however, that practically all the families to be housed under such a program would have estimated housing expenses equal to less than 20 percent of income. On the other hand, mortgage terms could be tailored to meet the housing needs of families, to avoid this.

A middle-income housing program might be designed to provide for only the lower income part of the additional families. This could be done by reducing the maximum income described above, but making no change in the minimum income limit.

Another approach to a middle-income program might be to reduce the maximum income limit to the income level needed on a five times estimated housing expense basis under the particular financing terms adopted, and permit any family with an income below this income level to purchase the house if it so desired.

PRICE DISTRIBUTIONS OF HOMES ACTUALLY PRODUCED

Table 3 shows the actual distribution by price class in 1959 of homes built in three of the selected metropolitan areas during the period 1950–59. Since this was a period of steadily rising costs with very sharp cost increases during the first part of the decade, the median value of homes produced is actually substantially lower than it would be if comparable data were available for homes built in the years 1959 or 1960. Despite this fact, it should be noted that more than 81 percent of all the homes produced in the Boston area and over three-fourths of the homes produced in Atlanta or Minneapolis-St. Paul area had market values which exceeded the construction cost assumed for the minimum standard house cost.

SOME QUALIFICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA

These data present for the first time authoritative evidence on the actual performance of the home building industry under the most important and the most effective of the Government's programs of aid to housing. The data present no evidence, however, on housing in central cities as opposed to suburban areas where lower land costs are found. Many American families prefer or must have close-in locations on higher cost land in order to preserve their access to places of employment.

The tables do not take account of the important variable of family savings. A proportion of home buyers make substantial down payments and thus reduce their current out-of-pocket housing expense. Doubtless, this will continue to be true in the future, though the proportion of low-income families with substantial savings is quite small. Nor do the tables deal with other family expenses which limit the ability of the family to purchase a home. Extra-large families, those who are required by employment locations to have two cars, those who have serious or prolonged illness in a family, or who care for parents or grandparents may often be unable to afford the ratio of housing expense to income assumed by the tables or found in actual FHA practice.

RENTAL HOUSING

The statistics on rental housing presented in the report which follows are similar to those for sales housing described in the first section of this summary, and cover the same 10 metropolitan areas.

The statistics on rental housing are predicated upon estimates of construction costs and monthly rentals, prepared by the Federal Housing Administration, for a basic two-bedroom rental unit in a walkup type structure. Inasmuch as a standard rental unit was used as a basis of comparison, these figures reflect the local cost differences which exist among the 10 metropolitan areas included in the report. Table 4 shows incomes of families now served by the 221(d)(3) program, and under other possible terms. Table 5 shows the proportion of all families with these incomes. Appendix tables 2 and 7A–J show the cost and income figures used for each metropolitan area.

The basic facts revealed by these statistics relate to (1) the extent to which reductions in the mortgage interest rate will reduce the monthly payment required for principal and interest, and in turn, the reduction possible in the monthly rent of the basic unit because of this; (2) the extent to which the family income needed could be lowered because of this reduced rent; (3) the proportion of the families in each of the 10 metropolitan areas whose incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient to pay the estimated rent for the basic unit under the various financing terms indicated; and (4) the additional proportion of the families whose 1959 incomes would have been sufficient to pay the estimated rent for the basic unit under the various financing terms indicated, but would not have had sufficient incomes to pay the estimated rent under present market interest rate financing terms. It is assumed in deriving these statistics relating to rental housing that the family income needed would be five times the estimated rent, or in other words that rent would be equal to 20 percent of income.

These basic facts are summarized in the statistics for each of the 10 metropolitan areas which are presented in the 2 following tables. The first table shows the percentage of families whose incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient to pay the estimated rent for the basic unit, assuming 100 percent mortgage financing is provided for a 40-year term, at interest rates ranging from 5¼ percent down to 2 percent.

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Percentage of families with sufficient incomes in 1959				
	Under present terms of 5¼ percent, 40 years	Under terms of—			
		4 percent, 40 years	3⅛ percent, 40 years[1]	3 percent, 40 years	2 percent, 40 years
Northeast:					
Boston, Mass.	35.3	42.7	47.8	48.6	54.5
Newark, N.J.	31.8	38.0	42.3	43.1	48.2
North Central:					
Indianapolis, Ind.	35.9	43.4	48.6	49.4	55.3
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	23.3	29.0	33.5	34.2	39.8
Topeka, Kans.	25.1	31.6	36.1	36.8	42.7
South:					
Atlanta, Ga.	46.5	53.2	57.7	58.3	62.8
Houston, Tex.	44.5	51.3	55.9	56.6	61.4
Mobile, Ala.	37.8	45.4	50.5	51.3	56.5
West:					
Phoenix, Ariz.	28.8	34.7	38.8	39.5	44.5
Portland, Oreg.	31.2	39.3	45.2	46.1	52.7

[1] These estimates for 3⅛ percent, 40-year financing differ somewhat from similar estimates based upon FHA income limits established under FHA sec. 221(d)(3) which also provides for 3⅛ percent, 40-year financing. The 2 main reasons for these differences are that in establishing maximum income limits (1) FHA adjusted the census income data for underreporting of income, whereas in preparing the above estimates no such adjustment was made, and (2) where the annual income limits based on a 5-times-annual-rent basis, exceeded the median income for an area, FHA reduced the maximum amount of mortgage insurable so that the resultant lower rent would be consistent with the median income: no similar adjustment was made in preparing the above estimates. For detailed figures, see tables 4 and 5 in the attached report.

The figures in above table show a considerable variation among the metropolitan areas covered in the percentage of families whose incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient to pay the estimated rent for the basic unit under the financing terms of a 5¼-percent interest rate and a term of 40 years. The percentages range from 23.3 percent in Minneapolis-St. Paul to 46.5 percent in Atlanta, Ga., and the percentages are higher for the three metropolitan areas in the South than in the metropolitan areas covered in other sections of the country.

The figures also show that if financing at reduced interest rates is provided, a substantially increased percentage of families would have had sufficient incomes in 1959 to pay the lower rent for the basic rental unit made possible because of lower interest rate financing. With financing at a 2-percent interest rate, for example, the percentage of families with sufficient incomes in 1959 to pay the reduced rent would have ranged from 39.8 percent in Minneapolis-St. Paul to 62.8 percent in Atlanta, Ga.

The figures presented above should not be interpreted to mean that all of the families who had sufficient incomes in 1959 would have been eligible under a middle-income program. In any middle-income program which would involve unusual financial aids, such as below-market interest rates, it would be advisable not only to limit the rents to be charged and thereby channel the reduction in debt service resulting from the lower interest rate financing into lower rentals, but also to limit in some way the tenants to be made eligible to rent the units under the program. The latter might be done by establishing maximum income limits, so that the units to be provided would be made available only to the families most in need. No public purpose would be served if the rental units to be provided under a program intended for middle-income families would be made available to families whose incomes are considered adequate to pay rentals predicated upon project financing at market interest rates.

The more meaningful figures, however, would be the number of additional families who have sufficient incomes to afford the estimated rent for the basic unit under a reduced interest rate financing plan, but who would not have sufficient income to afford the estimated rent for the basic unit under the present 5¼-percent interest rate financing plan. The following table presenting figures to illustrate this was derived from the previous table and is based upon the distribution of family incomes for 1959:

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Additional percentage of families who would have had sufficient income in 1959, under the terms indicated, but with insufficient incomes under 5¼ percent, 40-year financing.			
	4 percent, 40 years	3⅛ percent, 40 years[1]	3 percent, 40 years	2 percent, 40 years
Northeast:				
Boston, Mass.	7.4	12.5	13.3	19.2
Newark, N.J.	6.2	10.5	11.3	16.4
North Central:				
Indianapolis, Ind.	7.5	12.7	13.5	19.4
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	5.7	10.2	10.9	16.5
Topeka, Kans.	6.5	11.0	11.7	17.6
South:				
Atlanta, Ga.	6.7	11.2	11.8	16.3
Houston, Tex.	6.8	11.4	12.1	16.9
Mobile, Ala.	7.6	12.7	13.5	18.7
West:				
Phoenix, Ariz.	5.9	10.0	10.7	15.7
Portland, Oreg.	8.1	14.0	14.9	21.5

[1] See the footnote to the preceding table for an explanation of why these estimates differ somewhat from similar figures for FHA sec. 221(d)(3).

The above figures indicate, for example, that if the interest rate is reduced from 5¼ percent to 3 percent with no change in the 40-year amortization period, 13.3 percent of the families in the Boston metropolitan area would have been in the income classes between the lowest income level which could afford the rent for the basic unit under the present 5¼-percent interest rate financing plan and the income level of families who could afford the rent under the 3-percent interest rate financing plan, assuming annual income equal to 5 times annual rent. In other words, if a middle-income program with 3-percent interest rate financing was so designed as to make all the families in this income gap eligible, an additional 13.3 percent of the families in the Boston metropolitan area would have been eligible incomewise, according to family income figures for 1959.

On the same basis, a reduction in the interest rate from 5¼ to 4 percent would have made eligible, from an income viewpoint, an additional 6 to 8 percent of the families in the 10 areas covered. Similarly, a reduction in interest rate from 5¼ to 3 percent would have added 11 to 15 percent of the families; and a reduction from 5¼ to 2 percent would have added 16 to 22 percent of the families.

These percentages of additional families are based upon the assumption that all the families whose incomes fell in the income gap would become eligible for a middle-income program. However, a middle-income program might be designed to provide for only part of these families. This could be done by reducing the upper income limit of this income gap.

A second approach to a middle-income program might be to establish the maximum income at five times estimated rent under a particular financing plan but permit families with incomes below this maximum income level to be eligible.

A third approach might be to establish the maximum income at a level somewhat higher than the indicated income required on a five-times-rent basis under a particular financing plan, but provided that the rent to be paid by such higher income families would be 20 percent of their income. This would have the effect of increasing the rent to be paid by such families who are admitted to a middle-income project. Also, some families with incomes less than the indicated income limit could be admitted to the project, but they would also pay rent equal to 20 percent of their income. This would have the effect of reducing the rent for such families with lower income who are admitted to the project. This approach would necessitate a finely balanced selection of tenants in a project according to their incomes, in order to assure that the total rental income to be collected in a project would be adequate to maintain the financial soundness of the project. Additionally, of course, the program might be designed to permit rent increases as incomes rose so that rents would remain at a constant proportion of family incomes, and the interest paid on the mortgage would increase toward market rates.

RENTAL DISTRIBUTIONS OF UNITS ACTUALLY PRODUCED

Table 6 of the accompanying report shows the actual distribution by gross rent in 1959 of the renter-occupied units in 1959 which were built during the period 1950–59 in three of the selected metropolitan areas included in the report. Since this was a period of steadily rising construction costs and operating expenses, the median gross rent of rental units is actually substantially lower than it would be if comparable figures were available for rental units built in 1959 or 1960. Despite this fact, it should be noted that from 85 to 90 percent of the rental units produced in the Boston, Atlanta, or Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan areas had gross rents which exceeded the estimated rent for the minimum standard unit assumed.

SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR NATIONAL HOUSING POLICY

These tables are indicative of the inability of the homebuilding industry to reach the very wide market among all American families which has traditionally characterized other American industries. The data compiled by the Housing and Home Finance Agency constitute an important contribution to our understanding of the functioning of the housing market under present circumstances and with present programs with Government assistance. Unquestionably, the Congress is interested in these facts, in an effort to improve the performance of both Government programs of assistance and of the homebuilding industry, just as it has almost continually for the last 30 years. Without commenting upon the feasibility of any of the many approaches toward the broadening of the housing market which have been proposed in recent years, some broad conclusions from this study are quite evident.

1. The market for housing is a peculiarly local one, because of the wide variations which now exist in construction costs, in other costs of homeownership, and in the distribution in family incomes. It seems apparent that what is high income in some areas is low income in others, that what is high cost in some areas is low cost in other areas. Thus, it seems reasonable to conclude that no program with arbitrary cost or income limits can serve the needs of all American communities and that a much greater degree of flexibility in such limits will be required by any program directed specifically to serve the housing needs of middle and lower income families. This principle has been recognized in past housing legislation but seems particularly important in connection with the kinds of programs that might become necessary in order to widen the market for housing to a larger proportion of all American families.

2. The tables also clearly indicate that the proportion of the American families who are able to afford modest new homes could be substantially increased by further liberalization of home financing terms. Indeed, the proportion of families potentially in the market might in many communities be doubled if loan terms were available comparable to those now authorized in some other nonhousing Government loan programs. The present programs for loans for housing for the aged and the program of submarket interest rates conducted by the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Housing Administration under section 221 (d)(3) of the Housing Act of 1961 are examples of congressional recognition that special needs exist which may necessitate terms not required by the vast majority of American families. The extent to which such terms should be made available, the controls required to prevent such favorable terms from becoming competitive with conventional, private lending, or with FHA and VA insured and guaranteed mortgages are not treated by this study and remain for further analysis and discussion. The extent to which favorable loan terms might be made available utilizing existing lending institutions and practices are illustrative of other problems not treated by the current study. A letter of transmittal from the Housing Administrator to Senator Clark discusses some of these problems, however.

3. It is also evident that the price and rent distributions of homes produced by the building industry are an important variable in the industry's service to American families in middle and lower income groups. The study reveals wide variation in the distribution of houses produced as between high priced and relatively lower priced homes, and in rents of new rental units. Thus, it is quite evident that mere liberalization of credit terms will not produce the maximum possible benefit to middle and lower income families unless such liberalization can be coupled with incentives for builders to produce significant proportions of homes and rental property at the lowest possible price and rental classes. In future studies on the subject, it would unquestionably be desirable to examine the incentives which now lead the building industry to produce such high proportions of such high-priced homes in higher price brackets in some communities, and to ignore the potentially larger market for lower priced homes. Since it must be presumed that the industry responds to what is most profitable, and since all programs of aid to housing are operated on voluntary basis and depend on the cooperation of local enterprise, present and future programs must be scrutinized carefully to assure that they provide appropriate incentives to the building industry to produce homes in the lower price classes where the need is apparently the greatest.

4. The regulatory and tax effects of local government are relatively unexplored influences in the housing market which are suggested by this study. The share of local government cost carried by taxes on housing varies widely in the 10 metropolitan areas included in this report. Indeed the range exceeds 500 percent. Further, this study does not bring out the extent to which local regulations may impose added costs on home ownership or operation or added construction costs of the building industry. Unquestionably there are communities in which excessively high standards of building codes, zoning, local street requirement and the like serve to limit the market for housing and produce incentives in the building industry to produce only the highest price housing. These impacts on the housing market should also be studied and considered in any comprehensive attempt to enable the building industry to serve a broader market.

5. Finally, except under liberal term loans with no interest and with indefinite amortization periods, it is obvious that there will remain a significant proportion of American families who cannot afford new houses without extraordinary aid or subsidy. The needs of many such families, indeed of most of them, could be served by a better functioning of the market for used homes, if the market for new housing could be enlarged sufficiently so as to permit the filtration process to work more expeditiously and more broadly. Some families will doubtless continue to require low-rent public housing, especially among very low income groups, those without stable employment, those with health or other problems which impair their ability to assume responsibilities for home ownership or to rent decent privately provided accommodations.

The present study makes a significant contribution to the enlargement of the understanding of the housing market. There follow the factual study prepared by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and a copy of a letter from the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to Senator Joseph S. Clark dealing with some policy problems in the middle- and lower-income housing field.

Housing and Home Finance Agency, Office of the Administrator,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1962.
Hon. Joseph S. Clark,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Clark: This is in reply to your letter of December 29, 1961, in which you requested our assistance and advice to clarify middle-income housing issues which are likely to be before the Congress during 1962 and later years.

In that letter you requested certain factual data and some suggestions regarding policies which might better serve the needs of middle-income families and the housing industry. The factual data you requested with respect to sales housing are presented in the enclosed statement and the policy suggestions are presented below. The factual data you requested on rental housing are in process of preparation and will be provided soon. The unavoidable delay in providing the rental data is regretted, but it was necessary to request additional information from FHA insuring offices and also to analyze the operating statements of rental housing projects in order to develop the detailed basic local data needed for the analyses you desired.

The factual data presented in the enclosed statement are predicated upon comparative figures among selected areas for a basic house for sale. The data being prepared on rental housing will also be predicated upon a basic unit for rent. It is our feeling that unless comparable units are used, the analysis by areas would reflect differences in housing quality which would distort comparisons among areas as to what a middle-income program might accomplish.

The enclosed factual statement presents comparative figures showing the percentage of families in each of 10 selected standard metropolitan statistical areas, whose incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient to purchase the basic house under the assumptions indicated in your letter. The data are for 1959 since the latest census figures on family incomes for individual areas are for that year. For sales housing, separate figures are shown assuming: Interest rates of 5¼ percent, 4 percent, 3 percent, and 2 percent; amortization periods of 30, 35, and 40 years; and housing expense in relation to income at the average for homeowners having FHA-insured loans as computed herein, and at a uniform 20 percent for all areas, as you requested. These data are summarized in table 2 of the enclosed statement.

Your attention is directed to a number of qualifications to the use of these figures which are presented in the enclosed statement. The statement also includes a detailed explanation of how the figures were derived.

I would like to comment now on the policy suggestions you requested for middle-income housing. With respect to policies which might be adopted to assure that any program of middle-income housing would be channeled to the most economical or efficiently built housing available in the private market for new housing in the area, I might submit the following for your consideration.

1. The experience with the so-called below-market interest rate FHA program (FHA sec. 221(d)(3)) indicates that this may be a desirable approach to consider. In initiating this program, each FHA insuring office estimated the construction cost of a basic, livable, rental unit of non-extravagant character and size, which could be built and rented in the local area. Estimates were then prepared for each area of the maximum income limits for families of various sizes who would be eligible to rent such units at rents approved by FHA. Subsequent changes in rents would also have to be approved by FHA. This approach would assure that the new rental units in an area would be of the lowest feasible construction costs, that the rents charged would reflect the financing terms made available, and that the families

moving into the new units would have incomes at or below the prescribed income level for the area.

If we attempted to use this same approach for sales housing, however, we would be faced with the problem of controlling the sales price to the initial purchaser, as well as possible resale by him to make a quick profit. This would be necessary because a house with the more favorable middle-income financing terms would command a better price in the market. However, any attempt to limit sales prices, and thereby keep the houses in the middle-income stream, would result in onerous controls which no one wants and which are difficult to police. One possibility might be a permanent-type cooperative of single-family homes, wherein transfers of homes would be appropriately controlled by the cooperative.

2. In order to induce the building industry to design and produce the most economic units within the construction cost limitations prescribed, an architectural-engineering design competition could be sponsored. The most economical and acceptable designs resulting could be used by a local sponsor as a basis for competitive bidding to contract for the production of a designated number of units. Also, it would be advantageous to a building to utilize these designs in building units for sale or rent since financing under the program would be assured, and marketability of units largely assured because the financing terms would provide below market housing expenses or rents. The proposals providing the best prospects for cost reductions or better value for the housing dollar, could be accorded a priority in processing and thus have first claim on the funds to be made available under the middle-income program.

You also requested suggestions with respect to policies needed to assure that a middle-income housing program would in fact not be in competition with other new or existing housing. It is our considered judgment that there is no practical way of preventing new construction under a middle-income program in an area from competing with conventionally financed new construction in low-priced brackets. However, the volume of conventionally financed new construction of desirable standards and location in an area which would be in the same price or rental brackets as a middle-income program in that area would most likely be quite small.

A middle-income program in an area would also compete with existing units in the area, whether financed conventionally, or with regular FHA-insured or VA-guaranteed mortgages. If the volume of such new housing in an area was large enough, it would tend to weaken sales prices and rents of existing units. On the other hand, the supply of existing acceptable middle-income housing is generally so tight that some new middle-income housing would be a desirable addition to the supply. As the program expanded, however, it would be necessary to study the local housing market carefully in order to prevent the development of an undue adverse effect upon existing housing.

I am hopeful that the factual data and policy suggestions presented herein will be helpful to you and other Members of the Congress in considering middle-income housing proposals.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Administrator.

FACTUAL DATA FOR SALES-TYPE MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING

The factual data requested for sales-type housing are presented herein for 10 selected standard metropolitan statistical areas of varying sizes and geographical distribution. The selection of these areas was limited somewhat, since the data from the Population and Housing Census of 1960, presenting statistics on family incomes for 1959, were not available for some of the larger standard metropolitan areas at the time that work was started in obtaining the related FHA data that were needed.

The SMSA's for which data are presented herein and their population in 1960 are as follows:

Northeast:	
Boston, Mass	2,589,301
Newark, N.J	1,689,420
North Central:	
Indianapolis, Ind	697,567
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	1,482,030
Topeka, Kans	141,286
South:	
Atlanta, Ga	1,017,188
Houston, Tex	1,243,158
Mobile, Ala	314,301
West:	
Phoenix, Ariz	663,510
Portland, Oreg	821,897

FHA DATA

Appendix tables 1–A to 1–J, comprising a similar table for each of the above standard metropolitan statistical areas, present estimated monthly housing expenses data for sales-type housing. Separate estimates are presented, assuming financing available at interest rates of 5¼ percent, 4 percent, 3 percent and 2 percent, and also for amortization terms of 30, 35, and 40 years.

Before considering the specific figures presented in these appendix tables, it is necessary to explain how the figures were obtained and what qualifications should be placed upon their use. The comments which follow are keyed into each of the lines shown on appendix tables 1–A to 1–J.

(a) Estimated cost (including land):

The figures on construction costs, including land, presented in these tables are estimates for constructing a basically comparable one-story, three-bedroom house of 929 square feet.

The construction cost estimates were prepared by local FHA insuring offices to reflect local costs, and were used to establish the mortgage ceilings for various areas, under section 221(d)(2). Some minor variations in the specified house were permitted in order to conform to local practices, and heating installations were estimated on the basis of local practices.

These construction cost estimates have the unique advantage, therefore, of showing comparative costs, including land, of a comparable house in each of the 10 selected areas. This approach is preferred over the use of average appraised value under section 203 in each of the selected areas, since the latter would reflect differences in quality of houses built among these areas and thereby distort comparisons for acceptable housing under a middle-income housing program.

The estimated construction cost, including land, for this basically comparable house varied among the areas covered as follows:

Northeast:	
Boston, Mass	$14,500
Newark, N.J	14,500
North Central:	
Indianapolis, Ind	14,000
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	14,000
Topeka, Kans	13,000
South:	
Atlanta, Ga	11,500
Houston, Tex	12,000
Mobile, Ala	12,000
West:	
Phoenix, Ariz	$11,000
Portland, Oreg	12,000

(b) Mortgage amount:

The maximum mortgage amounts presented in appendix-tables 1–A to 1–J, which are the same as the estimated cost, are the maximum mortgages permitted for the locality under present regulations for section 221(d)(2). The minimum downpayment of $200 for displaced families or 3 percent of investment required for other families are thus presumed to be equal to the prepaid expenses or closing costs which are not in the property costs.

To the extent that property replacement costs (or initial expenses which are not in the property costs) can be held below these figures for individual properties, estimates of housing expense and of the income needed to purchase would be proportionately reduced. We have no basis for stating what reductions in housing costs below the maximum mortgage amounts authorized for section 221(d)(3) might be attained with FHA minimum standards.

Operations under this program in the next year or two may give partial answers to this question. A range of costs down to 15 or 20 percent below permitted maximums in individual localities might not be an unreasonable expectation.

(c) Interest and principal: Monthly mortgage payments to interest and principal, presented in appendix tables 1–A to 1–J, are level annuity payments for the repayment terms and interest rates indicated on the mortgage amounts specified.

(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium insurance (first year): The mortgage insurance premium indicated in the average monthly amount for the first year premium charge, based on a one-half of 1 percent annual rate. This monthly amount will decline slightly for each subsequent year, since it would be recomputed each year on the basis of the reduced outstanding balance of the mortgage.

(e) Real estate taxes: The monthly amounts shown for real estate taxes were computed by deriving an average tax rate for all FHA section 203 mortgages insured in 1961 on new homes within the housing market area of the city specified, and applying this tax rate to the replacement costs indicated. Actual charges for the assumed property would vary according to specific property assessments, tax rates for minor civil divisions where construction occurs, and the incidence of homestead exemptions, if any.

(f) Other housing expense:

Other housing expense includes charges for heating and utilities, hazard insurance, and expenses for maintenance and repairs. They were estimated on the basis of experience for all FHA section 203 mortgages insured in 1961 on new homes within the housing market area of the city specified, and by applying a pro rata estimate for a property of the replacement cost specified. For detailed figures on each of the areas, refer to footnote 6 on the page attached to appendix table 1–J.

It will be noted that the estimated real estate taxes and other housing expenses referred to above are based upon the FHA experience for 1961. Estimates based on FHA experience for 1959 would have been only slightly lower. For example, the monthly payment for real estate taxes for all new homes in the $13,000 value class on which FHA-insured mortgages under section 203 in the United States was $13.76 in 1959 and $14.20 in 1961. Similarly, other housing

expenses for heating and utilities and for maintenance and repair were $24.50 in 1959 and $24.72 in 1961.

(g) Total monthly housing expense: The total was obtained by adding items (e) through (f) for each column, in each of appendix tables 1–A to 1–J.

(h) Estimated annual income needed by purchaser, based on FHA experience:

The two lines of estimates in appendix tables 1–A to 1–J under the caption "Estimated Annual Income Needed by Purchasers," indicate the annual income of families who can afford to pay the estimated monthly housing expenses indicated, under the assumptions specified.

The first line of estimates for an area is based upon the FHA national ratio of housing expense-to-income for that income group which purchased new homes in the same value class as the replacement cost of the basic house in that area. This approach was necessary since housing expense-to-income ratios by income classes are not available for individual areas.

In computing these estimated ratios, current family income, rather than effective family income, was used since current family income is more nearly comparable to the Bureau of Census definition of income. FHA processing of loan applications, however, is based upon effective family incomes. It will be noted also, that the ratios are based upon 1961 experience. However, comparable ratios for 1959 would have differed only slightly. The average housing expense-to-effective income ratio for the United States was 20.5 percent in 1959, as compared with 20.8 percent in 1961.

The annual income figure appearing in a particular column was derived by multiplying the estimated monthly housing expense figure appearing in that column by 12, and dividing the result thus obtained by the FHA ratio of housing expense to income. For example, in appendix table 1–A for Boston, the figure of $7,802 appearing in the column captioned "5¼ Percent Interest Rate and 30-Year Amortization," was derived by multiplying total monthly housing expense of $137.19 by 12, and dividing the result by 21.1 percent, the FHA ratio of housing expense to income.

It should be specifically noted that, in practice, a wide range of incomes above and below the computed income specified will be represented among the purchasers of a particular home value, reflecting both choice on the part of the purchasers and the relative burdens of other demands upon family income. Representative experience suggests about 70 percent of the families might be within a range 25 percent above and 25 percent below the computed median of family incomes of purchasers of a moderate price home.

(i) Estimated annual income needed by purchasers, based upon a 20-percent housing expense-to-income ratio:

The annual income figures appearing on line (i) were derived in the same manner as those on line (h); except that a uniform 20 percent of income was assumed for housing expense in each of the areas covered, an alternative assumption requested in Senator CLARK's letter.

The estimated annual incomes needed by purchasers, derived as explained above, were taken from appendix tables 1–A to 1–J and are summarized in table 1.

CENSUS DATA ON FAMILY INCOME

Appendix table 2 presents, for each of the standard metropolitan statistical areas covered, family income figures for 1959 taken from the 1960 census. Unrelated individuals occupying dwelling units are excluded from these figures. The family income figures are the latest available for individual metropolitan areas or cities.

There evidently is some underreporting of family income in these census figures, although the extent of such underreporting is uncertain. The following explanation by the Bureau of the Census is quoted in support of this point:

"The schedule entries for income are frequently based not on records but on memory, and this factor probably produced underestimates, because the tendency is to forget minor or irregular sources of income. Other errors of reporting are due to misunderstanding of the income questions or to misrepresentation.

"A possible source of understatement in the income figures was the assumption in the editing process that no income other than earnings was received by a person who reported the receipt of either wage or salary income or self-employment income but failed to report on the receipt of other money income. This procedure was adopted in order to make better use of the information obtained.

"The income tables for families and unrelated individuals include in the lowest income group (under $1,000) those that were classified as having no 1959 income, as defined in the census. Many of these were living on income in kind, savings, or gifts, or were newly created families or unrelated individuals, or were families in which the sole breadwinner had recently died or left the household. However, many of the families and unrelated individuals who reported no income probably had some money income which was not recorded in the census.

(Source: P. XXV, U.S. Census of Population, District of Columbia, PC(1) 10C. A similar explanation will appear in each of the other census publications in this series.)

PERCENT OF FAMILIES WITH INCOMES SUFFICIENT TO PURCHASE THE BASIC NEW HOUSE

Table 2 presents for each standard metropolitan statistical area covered, estimates of the percent of families whose incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient to purchase the basic house described previously, under financing assumed at the indicated interest rates and amortization periods. Separate estimates are also presented assuming housing expense as a percent of income based upon FHA experience as described previously, and at a uniform 20 percent.

The estimates were derived for each area by computing the percent of families from the census data on income (appendix table 2) whose incomes would have been equal to or in excess of the income needed to purchase the basic house under the assumed financing terms and ratios of housing expense to income, as summarized in table 1. Where the income needed for purchase fell within a census income class, the division was estimated by assuming that the number of families in the census income class was evenly distributed within that income class.

The figures in table 2 show, for example, that in the Boston standard metropolitan statistical area in 1959, 37.8 percent of the families had incomes sufficient to purchase the basic house, assuming 100 percent financing at 5¼ percent, a 30-year mortgage, and the average FHA ratio of housing expense to income as previously described. At the other extreme of the terms presented, the comparable figure for the same area would be 61.7 percent of the families, assuming interest rates of 2 percent and a 40-year mortgage. If a housing expense-to-income ratio of 20 percent was assumed, the comparable percentages would be 33.8 and 57.6.

There are several qualifications to these figures which should be noted. One is that the census income figures, as stated previously, are underreported, and to the extent that they are underreported, the percentages of families with sufficient incomes to purchase the basic house would be understated.

A second qualification is that, as stated previously, there actually is a wide range of income above and below the computed average income among the purchasers of a house of a given value.

A third qualification is that the figures do not specifically measure housing market potential, since many of the families which have sufficient incomes to purchase may not be in the market if they are presently adequately housed, and many who seek new quarters may desire rental rather than sales units.

CENSUS DATA ON NEW UNITS CONSTRUCTED, 1950–59

The data in table 3 are presented for informational purposes, since they shed some light on the range of market values of new units added to the housing supply through new construction during the period 1950–59.

These figures show the market values reported as of December 1959, for owner-occupied one-family nonfarm units constructed during 1950–59. While these figures do not reflect market values as of the time the new units were initially sold, nevertheless, they provide some general guides on the market value classes in which new housing was concentrated as a result of market influences upon new housing production and subsequent value changes during the decade.

These statistics are taken from the Census of Housing, 1960, Components of Inventory Change. Separate data are to be published for 18 standard metropolitan statistical areas, among which are the three areas covered in this report. Data for these three areas are presented in table 3, which shows, for the one-family nonfarm homes which were constructed during 1950 to 1959 and were owner-occupied in December 1959, the market value at the end of the decade, as reported by the homeowner.

ADDITIONAL DATA ON FHA-INSURED HOME LOANS

Appendix tables 3 to 6 present additional information on FHA-insured mortgages on new one-family homes for each of the areas covered. These data are useful in indicating the income and property value classes served under FHA section 203 mortgage insuring operations.

Appendix table 3 shows the percentage distribution by family current income of purchasers of new one-family homes, mortgages on which were insured by FHA under section 203 in 1959. It will be noted that the class intervals for which these 1959 data are available differ markedly for those of the census. Since the class intervals for the 1960 FHA data are more nearly comparable with those of the census, we have also provided the FHA income data for 1960 in appendix table 4. It will be noted that the FHA income data in these tables are for family current income which is more nearly comparable to the census definition of family income. FHA uses effective income for processing loan applications for insurance. Here again we should caution, as we have previously, that the census figures understate family incomes.

Appendix tables 5 and 6 present percentage distributions by property value of new one-family homes, mortgages on which were insured by FHA under section 203 in 1959 and 1960.

TABLE 1.—*Estimated annual incomes needed in selected SMSA's by purchasers of the basic 1-family house, assuming financing terms and housing expense ratios as indicated*

ASSUMING FHA SEC. 203 AVERAGE RATIOS OF HOUSING EXPENSE TO INCOME FOR INCOME GROUPS WHO PURCHASED HOMES OF THE COST SPECIFIED[1]

Standard metropolitan statistical areas	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Northeast:												
Boston, Mass	$7,802	$7,539	$7,358	$7,183	$6,895	$6,690	$6,721	$6,417	$6,194	$6,291	$5,979	$5,741
Newark, N.J	7,847	7,584	7,402	7,227	6,939	6,734	6,765	6,461	6,238	6,336	6,023	5,785
North Central:												
Indianapolis, Ind	7,349	7,097	6,923	6,756	6,481	6,285	6,314	6,024	5,811	5,904	5,604	5,377
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	7,083	6,831	6,657	6,490	6,215	6,019	6,048	5,758	5,545	5,638	5,339	5,111
Topeka, Kans	6,591	6,364	6,208	6,056	5,808	5,631	5,658	5,394	5,202	5,287	5,016	4,810
South:												
Atlanta, Ga	5,229	5,032	4,896	4,764	5,449	4,394	4,418	4,190	4,022	4,096	3,861	3,662
Houston, Tex	5,304	5,117	4,988	4,863	4,658	4,512	4,534	4,318	4,159	4,229	4,006	3,837
Mobile, Ala	5,408	5,200	5,057	4,919	4,691	4,529	4,554	4,314	4,138	4,214	3,968	3,779
West:												
Phoenix, Ariz	5,818	5,631	5,502	5,377	5,172	5,027	5,049	4,832	4,675	4,743	4,521	4,351
Portland, Oreg	6,610	6,402	6,258	6,121	5,893	5,731	5,756	5,515	5,339	5,416	5,169	4,961

ASSUMING HOUSING EXPENSE EQUAL TO 20 PERCENT OF INCOME

Standard metropolitan statistical areas	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Northeast:												
Boston, Mass	$8,231	$7,954	$7,763	$7,578	$7,274	$7,058	$7,091	$6,770	$6,535	$6,637	$6,308	$6,056
Newark, N.J	8,278	8,001	7,810	7,625	7,321	7,105	7,138	6,817	6,581	6,684	6,355	6,103
North Central:												
Indianapolis, Ind	7,826	7,558	7,373	7,195	6,902	6,693	6,725	6,415	6,188	6,287	5,969	5,726
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	7,543	7,275	7,090	6,912	6,619	6,410	6,442	6,132	5,905	6,004	5,686	5,443
Topeka, Kans	7,217	6,959	6,797	6,632	6,359	6,166	6,195	5,907	5,696	5,789	5,493	5,267
South:												
Atlanta, Ga	5,831	5,611	5,459	5,312	5,072	4,900	4,926	4,672	4,485	4,567	4,305	4,106
Houston, Tex	5,966	5,756	5,611	5,471	5,840	5,077	5,101	4,858	4,679	4,757	4,507	4,316
Mobile, Ala	5,976	5,746	5,558	5,435	5,184	5,005	5,032	4,766	4,572	4,657	4,384	4,176
West:												
Phoenix, Ariz	6,545	6,335	6,190	6,049	5,819	5,655	5,680	5,436	5,258	5,336	5,086	4,895
Portland, Oreg	7,304	7,074	6,916	6,763	6,512	6,332	6,360	6,094	5,900	5,984	5,712	5,504

[1] The ratio used in each area was derived by estimating, on the basis of FHA sec. 203 mortgages on new homes insured by FHA in 1961 in the United States, the ratio for those income groups who purchased new homes averaging the replacement cost specified (see appendix tables 1-A to 1-J) for that area.

NOTE.—For details on how these figures were derived, refer to appendix tables 1-A to 1-J.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated percentage of families in selected SMSA's whose incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient to purchase the basic 1-family house, assuming financing terms and housing expense-to-income ratios as indicated*

ASSUMING FHA SEC. 203 AVERAGE RATIOS OF HOUSING EXPENSE TO INCOME FOR INCOME GROUPS WHO PURCHASED HOMES OF THE COST SPECIFIED[1]

Standard metropolitan statistical areas	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Northeast:												
Boston, Mass	37.8	40.5	42.4	44.3	47.5	49.9	49.6	53.2	55.9	54.7	58.5	61.7
Newark, N.J	43.2	45.7	47.5	49.2	52.1	54.4	54.1	57.2	60.0	58.9	62.4	65.2
North Central:												
Indianapolis, Ind	41.7	44.3	46.3	48.2	51.5	53.8	53.5	57.0	59.6	58.4	62.1	65.0
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	46.7	50.1	52.5	54.9	58.7	61.5	61.1	65.0	68.0	66.7	70.7	73.8
Topeka, Kans	41.8	44.6	46.5	48.3	51.7	54.2	53.8	57.5	60.2	59.0	62.8	65.3
South:												
Atlanta, Ga	55.9	58.1	59.6	61.0	63.2	64.9	64.6	67.0	68.8	68.0	73.3	78.8
Houston, Tex	58.5	60.6	62.1	63.4	65.6	67.1	66.9	69.1	70.8	70.1	72.4	77.0
Mobile, Ala	46.5	49.1	51.0	52.6	55.4	57.3	57.0	60.0	62.0	61.1	64.8	71.7
West:												
Phoenix, Ariz	51.0	53.2	54.7	56.3	58.7	60.5	60.2	62.7	64.4	63.6	66.1	68.0
Portland, Oreg	46.5	49.2	51.0	52.8	55.8	58.0	57.7	61.0	63.3	62.2	65.6	68.1

ASSUMING HOUSING EXPENSE EQUAL TO 20 PERCENT OF INCOME

Standard metropolitan statistical areas	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Northeast:												
Boston, Mass	33.8	36.2	38.2	40.2	43.4	45.6	45.3	49.0	51.8	50.6	54.5	57.6
Newark, N.J	39.3	41.6	43.5	45.3	48.3	50.4	50.1	53.5	56.1	55.0	58.7	61.3
North Central:												
Indianapolis, Ind	36.8	39.6	41.5	43.3	46.5	49.0	48.6	52.3	55.0	53.8	57.6	60.6
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	41.2	44.4	46.7	49.0	53.1	56.0	55.5	60.0	63.0	61.7	66.0	69.3
Topeka, Kans	34.7	37.4	39.3	41.3	44.6	47.0	46.6	50.3	53.3	52.0	56.1	59.3
South:												
Atlanta, Ga	49.2	51.6	53.3	55.0	57.7	59.5	59.3	62.0	63.9	63.0	65.8	68.0
Houston, Tex	50.8	53.2	55.0	56.5	59.2	61.1	60.8	63.5	65.3	64.5	67.2	69.2
Mobile, Ala	39.4	42.3	44.6	46.2	49.3	51.6	51.3	54.5	56.8	55.8	59.1	61.6
West:												
Phoenix, Ariz	43.7	45.0	46.6	48.2	51.0	53.0	52.6	55.5	57.7	56.8	59.8	62.0
Portland, Oreg	38.2	40.7	42.5	44.5	47.8	50.1	49.7	53.2	55.7	54.6	58.2	61.1

[1] The ratio used in each area was derived by estimating, on the basis of the FHA sec. 203 mortgages on new homes insured by FHA in 1961 in the United States, the ratio for those income groups who purchased new homes averaging the replacement cost specified (see appendix tables 1-A to 1-J) for that area.

TABLE 3.—*Market value in December 1959 of owner-occupied 1-family nonfarm homes which were constructed during 1950–59, for designated standard metropolitan statistical areas*

Total and value[1]	Boston, Mass.	Atlanta, Ga.	Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.
Total number of homes	75,660	79,307	91,556
Percent of total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Value of home:			
Less than $5,000		1.6	.3
$5,000 to $7,400		3.4	
$7,500 to $9,900	.7	6.1	
$10,000 to $12,400	3.8	19.5	7.2
$12,500 to $14,900	17.1	18.6	25.3
$15,000 to $17,400	22.7	16.3	29.5
$17,500 to $19,900	14.7	10.4	14.6
$20,000 to $24,900	20.8	11.9	14.7
$25,000 to $34,900	9.7	8.5	6.7
$35,000 or more	10.6	3.5	1.6
Median value	$18,500	$15,100	$16,500

[1] Market value as reported by the homeowner.

NOTE.—Percentages may not add to 100 precisely due to rounding.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, HC(4)—pt. 1A,

FACTUAL DATA ON RENTAL-TYPE MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING

The factual data requested for rental-type housing are presented herein for 10 selected standard metropolitan statistical areas of varying size and geographic distribution. These are the same 10 areas for which sales housing data were submitted in our previous correspondence.

The estimates of families who could afford the rent for the basic rental unit, as presented herein, were based upon the assumption of a middle income rental housing program. The estimates of families who could afford to purchase the basic sales unit, as submitted in our previous correspondence, were based upon the assumption of a middle income sales housing program. If it is assumed, however, that both a rental housing program and a sales housing program were to be adopted, the estimates for the rental program could not, of course, be added to the estimates for the sales program. For a combined rental and sales program, the percentage of families who could afford either to purchase the basic sales unit or rent the basic rental unit would tend to approximate the higher of the estimates for either the rental or sales housing programs. It should also be noted that substantial variation among cities can be expected in the extent to which sales or rental housing would be used, since local preferences for sales versus rental housing vary considerably.

FHA RENTAL DATA

Appendix tables 7-A to 7-J, comprising a similar table for each of the above standard metropolitan statistical areas, present estimated monthly rental data. Separate estimates are presented, assuming financing available at interest rates of 5¼ percent, 4 percent, 3⅛ percent, and 2 percent, and for an amortization period of 40 years.

Before considering the specific figures presented in these appendix tables, it is necessary to explain how the figures were estimated and what qualifications should be placed upon their use. It was necessary to rely upon estimates rather than actual section 221(d)(3) projects since there is little specific experience available at this time with completed projects under this section. The explanations which follow are keyed into each of the lines shown on appendix tables 7-A to 7-J.

(*a*) Estimated cost per room (including land):

The figures on construction costs per room, including land, presented in these tables are estimates for constructing a comparable two-bedroom rental unit in a walkup-type structure. The estimates were used to help establish maximum income limits for various areas under FHA section 221(d)(3).

Each FHA insuring office prepared estimates, based upon local costs, of the cost of construction, including land, of the basic unit or a basically comparable unit where some minor variations were necessary to conform to local practices.

The rental for each unit was then estimated, in Washington headquarters, on the basis of standard assumptions as to operating expenses, debt service, taxes, etc. Also, the estimated income, for three- or four-person occupancy, needed to pay this rental was estimated on the basis that the rent would be 20 percent of income. For a locality where the income so estimated was less than the median income reported by the Bureau of the Census (after adjustment by FHA for underreporting), the maximum permissible mortgage was authorized for the construction cost amount estimated. However, for a locality where the estimated income was higher than the adjusted median income of the Bureau of the Census, the maximum permissible mortgage was reduced proportionally and the construction cost also was reduced accordingly. As a result of this type of change, the construction cost was reduced for 6 of the 10 areas, but the amount of reduction was only $50 to $150, and in one case $250 per room.

Thus, the construction costs estimates presented in these tables are primarily for the same basic unit, with exceptions mostly of a minor nature. These construction cost estimates have the unique advantage, therefore, of showing comparative costs, including land, of a comparable rental unit in each of the 10 selected areas. While there is no firm basis for predicting what, if any, economies below these costs might be attained locally, experience, with actual construction under section 221(d)(3) might well demonstrate within the next few years that lower costs than those estimated herein are feasible. To the extent that lower costs are achieved, attainable rentals will be proportionately lower than those in the attached estimates.

The estimated construction costs, including land, for the basically comparable rental unit varied among the 10 areas covered as follows:

	Estimated construction costs	
	Per room	Per unit[1]
Northeast:		
Boston, Mass	$2,400	$13,800
Newark, N.J	2,600	14,950
North Central:		
Indianapolis, Ind	2,400	13,800
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	2,500	14,375
Topeka, Kans	2,400	13,800
South:		
Atlanta, Ga	2,050	11,788
Houston, Tex	2,050	11,788
Mobile, Ala	2,100	12,075
West:		
Phoenix, Ariz	2,150	12,363
Portland, Oreg	2,500	14,375

[1] Assuming 5.75 rooms for a typical 2-bedroom apartment by FHA room count, consisting of living room, dining room (or equivalent), kitchen, 2 bedrooms, 1 bathroom, and foyer or porch.

(*b*) Mortgage amount per room: The mortgage amounts presented, which are the same as the estimated costs described above, are the maximum permissible amounts for the basic unit, assuming the mortgagor is an eligible public body or agency, a cooperative, or a private nonprofit corporation or association. For other types of mortgagors, the maximum mortgage amounts would be 90 percent of the construction costs indicated.

(*c*) Interest and principal per month per room: Represents the level monthly payment of interest plus principal for a 40-year repayment period, at the interest rate and for the mortgage amount stated.

(*d*) FHA mortgage insurance premium per month per room: The FHA mortgage insurance premium is omitted, in keeping with FHA established policy for section 221(d)(3) projects.

(*e*), (*f*), and (*h*) Real estate taxes, hazard insurance, and replacement reserves per month per room.

The locality estimates for real estate taxes, hazard insurance premiums, other operating expenses, and replacement reserves, are each based upon actual expenses reported for section 207 projects built in the respective localities in the mid-1950's. Since there is no standardization of these projects and no ascertainable relative relationship of these projects to the section 221(d)(3) standard project assumed, the individual expense estimates might be biased in the direction of being excessive. Some restraint on this bias has been exercised by the arbitrary exclusion of projects with typically high rentals, or of reports with individual charges which differed sharply from other reporting local projects.

The estimated real estate taxes for section 207 projects in an area, derived as explained above, were expressed as a percentage of the replacement cost and this percentage was applied to the replacement cost for the basic unit for that locality. A similar procedure was used to estimate hazard insurance premiums and replacement reserves.

(*g*) Other operating expenses per month per room: Average per unit other operating expenses were estimated for each locality as explained in the first paragraph of the above section, and then adjusted to a per room basis, assuming 5.75 rooms per unit.

(*i*) Vacancy allowance per month per room: Calculated at 7 percent of total monthly rent, which is typically used in FHA processing of section 221(d)(3) proposals. Occasionally a smaller vacancy allowance might be justified.

(*j*) Total monthly rent per room: Represents the sum of lines (c) through (i). These estimates do not include tenant's electricity or telephone, and, in some cases, cooking gas.

(*k*) Estimated monthly rent per unit: Represents item in line (j) multiplied by 5.75, on the assumption that a typical two-bedroom apartment contains 5.75 rooms by FHA room count. This consists of a living room, dining room (or equivalent), kitchen, two bedrooms, one bathroom, and foyer or porch.

(*l*) FHA maximum income limits under section 221(d)(3) for families of three and four persons: The FHA maximum income limit for a locality was determined as explained in (a) above, under the caption "Estimated Cost Per Room, Including Land."

(*m*) Estimated median family income: Estimates for each locality are based upon census data, adjusted by FHA for estimated underreporting of income.

(*n*) Estimated income required to pay the two-bedroom monthly rent:

Estimates for each locality are based upon the assumption of the 20-percent rent-income ratio for the rental shown for the typical two-bedroom unit.

It will be noted that the FHA maximum income limits under section 221(d)(3) for families of three or four persons (line l) often differ from the estimated median income (line m) and the income required to pay the two-bedroom rent (line n) where 3⅛-percent financing is assumed. The reasons for these differences are:

(*aa*) The FHA maximum income limits were based upon a ratio of five times rent, wherein part of the rent was estimated by using standard or uniform assumptions as to real estate taxes, operating costs, hazard insurance and replacement reserves. In preparing the rent estimates contained herein, these individual expenses were estimated on the basis of reports of section 207 operating projects in the particular area, as was explained under the section headed "(c), (f) and (h)," and section (g) above. The principal differences occurred in the estimates for real estate taxes, other operating costs, and the ratio of operating costs to rent.

To the extent that the estimates of rent differ, the FHA maximum income (line 1) would differ from the "Income required to pay two-bedroom monthly rent" (line n), since both estimates of income assume 20 percent of income for rent.

(bb) The upper limit on the FHA maximum income for an area (line 1) is the Bureau of the Census median income, after adjustment by FHA for underreporting, for that area. In other words, in those areas where the FHA estimate of income needed to pay the rent for the basic unit under section 221(d)(3) was greater than the census adjusted median income, the census adjusted median income was adopted as the FHA maximum income, and the permissible construction cost and mortgage amount was reduced accordingly. Thus, in these areas, the FHA maximum income (line l) would be the same as "Estimated median family income (line m), but might be either greater or less than the "Income required to pay two-bedroom monthly rent" (line n), since the latter is computed independently on the basis of the rental estimates described above.

(cc) The FHA maximum-income limit for an area (line l) is often less than the census adjusted median income for that area. Since the income necessary to pay the rent, on a five-times-rent basis, often was less than the census adjusted median income, no public purposes would be served in such areas by permitting families with higher incomes—that is, as high as the census adjusted median income—to occupy the rental units under the program.

Summary figures for each of the 10 selected standard metropolitan statistical areas are presented in table 4, which shows the FHA maximum income limits under section 221(d)(3) for families of three or four persons and the estimated annual incomes required to pay the two-bedroom rent. These figures are taken from lines (l) and (n) of appendix tables 7–A to 7–J.

CENSUS DATA ON FAMILY INCOME

Appendix table 2 presents, for each of the standard metropolitan statistical areas covered, family income figures for 1959 taken from the 1960 census. Unrelated individuals occupying dwelling units are excluded from these figures.

There evidently is some underreporting of family income in these census figures. The following explanation by the Bureau of the Census is quoted in support of this point:

"The schedule entries for income are frequently based not on records but on memory, and this factor probably produced underestimates, because the tendency is to forget minor or irregular sources of income. Other errors of reporting are due to misunderstanding of the income questions or to misrepresentation.

"A possible source of understatement in the income figures was the assumption in the editing process that no income other than earnings was received by a person who reported the receipt of either wage or salary income or self-employment income but failed to report on the receipt of other money income. This procedure was adopted in order to make better use of the information obtained.

"The income tables for families and unrelated individuals include in the lowest income group (under $1,000) those that were classified as having no 1959 income, as defined in the census. Many of these were living on income "in kind," savings, or gifts, or were newly created families or unrelated individuals, or were families in which the sole breadwinner had recently died or left the household. However, many of the families and unrelated individuals who reported no income probably had some money income which was not recorded in the census. (Source: P. XXV, U.S. Census of Population, District of Columbia, PC(1) 10C. A similar explanation will appear in each of the other census publications in this series.)".

The figures presented in appendix table 2 are those as reported in the 1960 census, and are therefore not adjusted for underreporting.

PERCENT OF FAMILIES WITH INCOMES SUFFICIENT TO RENT THE BASIC UNIT

Table 5 presents for each standard metropolitan statistical area covered, estimates of the percentage of families whose annual incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient to pay the rent for the basic unit described previously. Separate estimates are presented assuming FHA maximum annual income limits under FHA section 221(d)(3) for families of three or four persons, and also assuming annual income limits based upon rent equal to 20 percent of income wherein the computed rent reflects payment of interest and principal on a 40-year mortgage at interest rates of 5¼, 4, 3⅛, 3, and 2 percent.

The estimates were derived for each area by computing the percent of families from the census data on incomes (appendix table 2) whose incomes would have been equal to or in excess of (a) the FHA maximum income under section 221(d)(3) as presented in the top part of the table, and (b) the income needed to pay the rent for the basic unit under the assumed financing terms and a 20-percent, rent-to-income ratio as presented in the lower part of the table. In preparing these estimates, when the income needed to pay the rent fell within a census income class, the division was estimated by assuming that the number of families in the census income class was evenly distributed within that income class.

There are several qualifications to those figures which should be noted. One is that the census income figures, as stated previously, are underreported, and to the extent that they are underreported, the percentages of families with sufficient incomes to pay the rent for the basic unit would be understated.

A second qualification is that in contrast to a uniform 20-percent, rent-to-income ratio, census figures relating rent to income show a wide range in the ratios of rent-to-income among, as well as within, income groups.

A third qualification is that the figures do not specifically measure housing market potential, since many of the families who have sufficient incomes to pay the rent required for the basic unit may not be in the market if they are presently adequately housed, and many who seek new quarters may desire to purchase sales units rather than rent.

CENSUS DATA ON NEW RENTAL UNITS CONSTRUCTED, 1950–59

The data in table 6 are presented for informational purposes since they shed some light on the range of gross monthly rentals for new rental units added to the housing supply through new construction during the period 1950–59.

These figures show the gross monthly rent as of December 1959, for renter-occupied nonfarm units constructed during 1950–59. While these figures do not reflect gross rents as of the time the new rental rents were initially rented, nevertheless, they provide some general guides on the gross monthly rental classes in which new building was concentrated as a result of market and other influences upon new housing production and subsequent rental changes during the decade.

These statistics are taken from the Census of Housing, 1960, Components of Inventory Change. Separate data are to be published for 18 standard metropolitan statistical areas, among which are three areas covered in this report. Data for these three areas are presented in table 6.

Gross monthly rent is defined by census to include the cost of utilities—water, electricity, and gas—and fuels, such as wood, coal and oil. Low-rent public housing units constructed during 1950–59 are included in the lower end of the gross monthly rental distribution, but are not identified as such in these figures of the Bureau of the Census.

TABLE 4.—*Estimated annual incomes needed in selected SMSA's by renters of a basic walkup type of rental unit, assuming 100-percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and rent-to-income ratios as indicated*

ASSUMING RENT EQUAL TO 20 PERCENT OF INCOME

Standard metropolitan statistical areas	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
Northeast:					
Boston, Mass.			7,000		
Newark, N.J.			7,550		
North Central:					
Indianapolis, Ind.			6,900		
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.			7,300		
Topeka, Kans.			6,900		
South:					
Atlanta, Ga.			6,000		
Houston, Tex.			5,900		
Mobile, Ala.			6,050		
West:					
Phoenix, Ariz.			6,300		
Portland, Oreg.			7,300		

ASSUMING FHA MAXIMUM INCOME LIMITS UNDER SEC. 221(d)(3) FOR FAMILIES OF 3 OR 4 PERSONS[1]

Standard metropolitan statistical areas	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
Northeast:					
Boston, Mass.	8,056	7,335	6,869	6,800	6,310
Newark, N.J.	9,215	8,435	7,935	7,856	7,328
North Central:					
Indianapolis, Ind.	7,915	7,100	6,724	6,655	6,165
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	9,477	8,725	8,242	8,170	7,659
Topeka, Kans.	8,273	7,549	7,087	7,014	6,524
South:					
Atlanta, Ga.	6,082	5,468	5,072	5,013	4,592
Houston, Tex.	6,541	5,924	5,527	5,468	5,047
Mobile, Ala.	6,127	5,500	5,092	5,030	4,609
West:					
Phoenix, Ariz.	7,945	7,300	6,886	6,821	6,379
Portland, Oreg.	7,949	7,197	6,714	6,641	6,131

[1] Data are not available on rent-to-income ratios for FHA multifamily rental housing programs other than sec. 221(d)(3).

Source: Appendix tables 7–A to 7–J. These appendix tables also present data on the construction cost, mortgage amount, estimated monthly rental, and a description of the basic rental unit.

TABLE 5.—*Estimated percentage of families in selected SMSA's whose incomes in 1959 would have been sufficient to pay the rent for the basic walkup type of rental unit, assuming 100-percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and rent-to-income ratios as indicated*

ASSUMING FHA MAXIMUM INCOME LIMITS UNDER SEC. 221(d)(3) FOR FAMILIES OF 3 OR 4 PERSONS

Standard metropolitan statistical areas	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
Northeast:					
Boston, Mass.			46.2		
Newark, N.J.			46.1		
North Central:					
Indianapolis, Ind.			46.5		
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.			44.2		
Topeka, Kans.			38.1		
South:					
Atlanta, Ga.			47.3		
Houston, Tex.			51.6		
Mobile, Ala.			38.6		
West:					
Phoenix, Ariz.			45.4		
Portland, Oreg.			38.2		

ASSUMING RENT EQUAL TO 20 PERCENT OF INCOME

Standard metropolitan statistical areas	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
Northeast:					
Boston, Mass.	35.3	42.7	47.8	48.6	54.5
Newark, N.J.	31.8	38.0	42.3	43.1	48.2
North Central:					
Indianapolis, Ind.	35.9	43.4	48.6	49.4	55.3
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	23.3	29.0	33.5	34.2	39.8
Topeka, Kans.	25.1	31.6	36.1	36.8	42.7
South:					
Atlanta, Ga.	46.5	53.2	57.7	58.3	62.8
Houston, Tex.	44.5	51.3	55.9	56.6	61.4
Mobile, Ala.	37.8	45.4	50.5	51.3	56.5
West:					
Phoenix, Ariz.	28.8	34.7	38.8	39.5	44.5
Portland, Oreg.	31.2	39.3	45.2	46.1	52.7

Source: Derived by computing the percentage of families whose incomes in 1959 (appendix table 2) equaled or exceeded the incomes required to pay the rent for the basic rental unit (table 4).

TABLE 6.—*Gross monthly rent in December 1959 of the renter-occupied nonfarm units which were constructed during 1950–59, for designated standard metropolitan statistical areas*

Gross monthly rent [1]	Boston, Mass.	Atlanta, Ga.	Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.
Total number of units reporting	17,230	30,562	19,157
Percent of total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Gross monthly rent:			
Less than $40	3.6	12.7	2.4
$40 to $59	29.6	20.9	1.4
$60 to $79	25.5	35.1	6.0
$80 to $99	19.9	15.8	8.9
$100 to $119	6.0	6.9	44.4
$120 to $149	8.0	5.7	21.1
$150 to $199	3.4	2.3	9.1
$200 or more	4.2	.6	6.8
Median gross rent	$73	$69	$114
Median contract rent [2]	$67	$61	$107

[1] Gross rent includes cost of utilities—water, electricity or gas, and fuels such as wood, coal, and oil. Low-rent public housing units constructed during 1950 to 1959 are included in the lower end of the gross monthly rental distribution, but are not identified as such in these figures of the Bureau of the Census.

[2] Contract rent is the monthly rent agreed upon regardless of any furnishings, utilities, or services that may be included.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, HC(4)—pt. 1A.

INDEX OF APPENDIX TABLES

Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic one-family owner-occupied new home:

Appendix table 1–A: Boston, Mass., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 1–B: Newark, N.J., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 1–C: Indianapolis, Ind., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 1–D: Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 1–E: Topeka, Kans., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 1–F: Atlanta, Ga., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 1–G: Houston, Tex., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 1–H: Mobile, Ala., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 1–I: Phoenix, Ariz., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 1–J: Portland, Oreg., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 2: Family income distribution of families in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas for 1959.

Appendix table 3: Percentage distribution by family current annual income of purchasers of new one-family homes, mortgages on which were insured by FHA under section 203 in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas for 1959.

Appendix table 4: Percentage distribution by family current annual income of purchasers of new one-family homes, mortgages on which were insured by FHA under section 203 in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas for 1960.

Appendix table 5: Percentage distribution by property value of new one-family homes, mortgages on which were insured by FHA under section 203 in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas in 1959.

Appendix table 6: Percentage distribution by property value of new one-family homes, mortgages on which were insured by FHA under section 203 in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas in 1960.

Estimated monthly rent assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit:

Appendix table 7–A: Boston, Mass., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 7–B: Newark, N.J., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 7–C: Indianapolis, Ind., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 7–D: Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 7–E: Topeka, Kans., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 7–F: Atlanta, Ga., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 7–G: Houston, Tex., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 7–H: Mobile, Ala., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 7–I: Phoenix, Ariz., standard metropolitan statistical area.

Appendix table 7–J: Portland, Oreg., standard metropolitan statistical area.

APPENDIX TABLE 1–A.—*Boston, Mass., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family owner-occupied new home*[1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land) [1] Mortgage amount [2]	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$80.19	$75.55	$72.36	$69.31	$64.24	$60.61	$61.19	$55.83	$51.91	$53.65	$48.14	$43.94
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	6.00	6.02	6.02	5.99	6.00	6.02	5.99	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00
Real estate taxes [5]	26.27	26.27	26.27	26.27	26.27	26.27	26.27	26.27	26.27	26.27	26.27	26.27
Other housing expense [6]	24.73	24.73	24.73	24.73	24.73	24.73	24.73	24.73	24.73	24.73	24.73	24.73
Total monthly housing expense	137.19	132.57	129.38	126.30	121.24	117.63	118.18	112.83	108.91	110.62	105.13	100.94
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 21.1 [7]	$7,802	$7,539	$7,358	$7,183	$6,895	$6,690	$6,721	$6,417	$6,194	$6,291	$5,979	$5,741
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	8,231	7,954	7,763	7,578	7,274	7,058	7,091	6,770	6,535	6,637	6,308	6,056

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 1–J.

APPENDIX TABLE 1-B.—*Newark, N.J., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family owner-occupied new home* [1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land) [1]												
Mortgage amount [2]	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500	$14,500
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$80.19	$75.55	$72.36	$69.31	$64.24	$60.61	$61.19	$55.83	$51.91	$53.65	$48.14	$43.94
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	6.00	6.02	6.02	5.99	6.00	6.02	5.99	6.00	6.00	5.97	5.99	6.00
Real estate taxes [5]	24.31	24.31	24.31	24.31	24.31	24.31	24.31	24.31	24.31	24.31	24.31	24.31
Other housing expense [6]	27.47	27.47	27.47	27.47	27.47	27.47	27.47	27.47	27.47	27.47	27.47	27.47
Total monthly housing expense	137.97	133.35	130.16	127.08	122.02	118.41	118.96	113.61	109.69	111.40	105.91	101.72
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 21.1 [7]	$7,847	$7,584	$7,402	$7,227	$6,939	$6,734	$6,765	$6,461	$6,238	$6,336	$6,023	$5,785
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	8,278	8,001	7,810	7,625	7,321	7,105	7,138	6,817	6,581	6,684	6,355	6,103

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 1-J.

APPENDIX TABLE 1-C.—*Indianapolis, Ind., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family owner-occupied new home* [1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land) [1]												
Mortgage amount [2]	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$77.42	$72.94	$69.86	$66.32	$62.02	$58.52	$59.08	$53.90	$50.12	$51.80	$46.48	$42.42
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	5.80	5.81	5.81	5.78	5.80	5.81	5.78	5.80	5.80	5.77	5.78	5.80
Real estate taxes [5]	10.67	10.67	10.67	10.67	10.67	10.67	10.67	10.67	10.67	10.67	10.67	10.67
Other housing expense [6]	36.55	36.55	36.55	36.55	36.55	36.55	36.55	36.55	36.55	36.55	36.55	36.55
Total monthly housing expense	130.44	125.97	122.89	119.92	115.04	111.55	112.08	106.92	103.14	104.79	99.48	95.44
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 21.3 [7]	$7,349	$7,097	$6,923	$6,756	$6,481	$6,285	$6,314	$6,024	$5,811	$5,904	$5,604	$5,377
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	7,826	7,558	7,373	7,195	6,902	6,693	6,725	6,415	6,188	6,287	5,969	5,726

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 1-J.

APPENDIX TABLE 1-D.—*Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family owner-occupied new home* [1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land) [1]												
Mortgage amount [2]	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000	$14,000
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$77.42	$72.94	$69.86	$66.92	$62.02	$58.52	$59.08	$53.90	$50.12	$51.80	$46.48	$42.42
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	5.80	5.81	5.81	5.78	5.80	5.81	5.78	5.80	5.80	5.77	5.78	5.80
Real estate taxes [5]	17.01	17.01	17.01	17.01	17.01	17.01	17.01	17.01	17.01	17.01	17.01	17.01
Other housing expense [6]	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49	25.49
Total monthly housing expense	125.72	121.25	118.17	115.20	110.32	106.83	107.36	102.20	98.42	100.07	94.76	90.72
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 21.3 [7]	$7,083	$6,831	$6,657	$6,490	$6,215	$6,019	$6,048	$5,758	$5,545	$5,638	$5,339	$5,111
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	7,548	7,275	7,090	6,912	6,619	6,410	6,442	6,132	5,905	6,004	5,686	5,443

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 1-J.

APPENDIX TABLE 1-E.—*Topeka, Kans., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family owner-occupied new home* [1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land) [1]												
Mortgage amount [2]	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000	$13,000
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$71.89	$67.73	$64.87	$62.14	$57.59	$54.34	$54.86	$50.05	$46.54	$48.10	$43.16	$39.39
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	5.38	5.40	5.40	5.37	5.38	5.40	5.37	5.38	5.38	5.36	5.37	5.38
Real estate taxes [5]	16.37	16.37	16.37	16.37	16.37	16.37	16.37	16.37	16.37	16.37	16.37	16.37
Other housing expense [6]	26.65	26.65	26.65	26.65	26.65	26.65	26.65	26.65	26.65	26.65	26.65	26.65
Total monthly housing expense	120.29	116.15	113.29	110.53	105.99	102.76	103.25	98.45	94.94	96.48	91.55	87.79
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 21.9 [7]	$6,591	$6,364	$6,208	$6,056	$5,808	$5,631	$5,658	$5,394	$5,202	$5,287	$5,016	$4,810
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	7,217	6,969	6,797	6,632	6,359	6,186	6,195	5,907	5,696	5,789	5,493	5,267

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 1-J.

APPENDIX TABLE 1-F.—*Atlanta, Ga., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family owner-occupied new home* [1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land) [1]												
Mortgage amount [2]	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500	$11,500
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$63.60	$59.92	$57.39	$54.97	$50.95	$48.07	$48.53	$44.28	$41.17	$42.55	$38.18	$34.85
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	4.78	4.77	4.77	4.76	4.76	4.77	4.75	4.76	4.76	4.74	4.75	4.76
Real estate taxes [5]	8.60	8.60	8.60	8.60	8.60	8.60	8.60	8.60	8.60	8.60	8.60	8.60
Other housing expense [6]	20.22	20.22	20.22	20.22	20.22	20.22	20.22	20.22	20.22	20.22	20.22	20.22
Total monthly housing expense	97.18	93.51	90.98	88.54	84.53	81.66	82.10	77.86	74.75	76.11	71.75	68.43
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 22.3 [7]	$5,229	$5,032	$4,896	$4,764	$4,549	$4,394	$4,418	$4,190	$4,022	$4,096	$3,861	$3,682
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	5,831	5,611	5,459	5,312	5,072	4,900	4,926	4,672	4,485	4,567	4,305	4,106

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 1-J.

APPENDIX TABLE 1-G.—*Houston, Tex., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family owner-occupied new home* [1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land) [1]												
Mortgage amount [2]	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$60.83	$57.31	$54.89	$52.58	$48.73	$45.98	$46.42	$42.35	$39.38	$40.70	$36.52	$33.33
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	4.55	4.57	4.57	4.54	4.55	4.57	4.54	4.55	4.55	4.53	4.54	4.55
Real estate taxes [5]	11.77	11.77	11.77	11.77	11.77	11.77	11.77	11.77	11.77	11.77	11.77	11.77
Other housing expense [6]	22.29	22.29	22.29	22.29	22.29	22.29	22.29	22.29	22.29	22.29	22.29	22.29
Total monthly housing expense	99.44	95.94	93.52	91.18	87.34	84.61	85.02	80.96	77.99	79.29	75.12	71.94
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 22.5 [7]	$5,304	$5,117	$4,988	$4,863	$4,658	$4,512	$4,534	$4,318	$4,159	$4,229	$4,006	$3,837
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	5,966	5,756	5,611	5,471	5,240	5,077	5,101	4,858	4,679	4,757	4,507	4,316

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 1-J.

APPENDIX TABLE 1-H.—*Mobile, Ala., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family, owner-occupied new home* [1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land) [1]												
Mortgage amount [2]	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$66.36	$62.52	$59.88	$57.36	$53.16	$50.16	$50.64	$46.20	$42.96	$44.40	$39.84	$36.36
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	4.97	4.98	4.98	4.96	4.97	4.98	4.96	4.97	4.97	4.94	4.96	4.97
Real estate taxes [5]	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94	4.94
Other housing expense [6]	23.33	23.33	23.33	23.33	23.33	23.33	23.33	23.33	23.33	23.33	23.33	23.33
Total monthly housing expense	99.60	95.77	93.13	90.59	86.40	83.41	83.87	79.44	76.20	77.61	73.07	69.60
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 22.1 [7]	$5,408	$5,200	$5,057	$4,919	$4,691	$4,529	$4,554	$4,314	$4,138	$4,214	$3,968	$3,779
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	5,976	5,746	5,588	5,435	5,184	5,005	5,032	4,766	4,572	4,657	4,384	4,176

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 1-J.

APPENDIX TABLE 1-I.—*Phoenix, Ariz., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family owner-occupied new home* [1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land) [1]												
Mortgage amount [2]	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000	$11,000
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal [3]	$60.83	$57.31	$54.89	$52.58	$48.73	$45.98	$46.42	$42.35	$39.38	$40.70	$36.52	$33.33
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year) [4]	4.55	4.57	4.57	4.54	4.55	4.57	4.54	4.55	4.55	4.53	4.54	4.55
Real estate taxes [5]	20.15	20.15	20.15	20.15	20.15	20.15	20.15	20.15	20.15	20.15	20.15	20.15
Other housing expense [6]	23.55	23.55	23.55	23.55	23.55	23.55	23.55	23.55	23.55	23.55	23.55	23.55
Total monthly housing expense	109.08	105.58	103.16	100.82	96.98	94.25	94.66	90.60	87.63	88.93	84.76	81.58
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 22.5 [7]	$5,818	$5,631	$5,502	$5,377	$5,172	$5,027	$5,049	$4,832	$4,674	$4,743	$4,521	$4,351
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	6,545	6,335	6,190	6,049	5,819	5,655	5,680	5,436	5,258	5,336	5,086	4,895

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 1-J.

APPENDIX TABLE 1-J.—*Portland, Oreg., standard metropolitan statistical area—Estimated monthly housing expense assuming financing at selected interest rates and amortization periods, and estimated income groups served, for a basic 1-family owner-occupied new home*[1]

	5¼-percent interest rate			4-percent interest rate			3-percent interest rate			2-percent interest rate		
	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years	30 years	35 years	40 years
Estimated cost (including land).[1]												
Mortgage amount[2]	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000	$12,000
Estimated monthly housing expense:												
Interest and principal[3]	$66.36	$62.52	$59.88	$57.36	$53.16	$50.16	$50.64	$46.20	$42.96	$44.40	$39.84	$36.36
FHA mortgage insurance premium (1st year)[4]	4.97	4.98	4.98	4.96	4.97	4.98	4.96	4.97	4.97	4.94	4.96	4.97
Real estate taxes[5]	18.45	18.45	18.45	18.45	18.45	18.45	18.45	18.45	18.45	18.45	18.45	18.45
Other housing expense[6]	31.95	31.95	31.95	31.95	31.95	31.95	31.95	31.95	31.95	31.95	31.95	31.95
Total monthly housing expense	121.73	117.90	115.26	112.72	108.53	105.54	106.00	101.57	98.33	99.74	95.20	91.73
Estimated annual income needed by purchasers:												
Assuming FHA sec. 203 average ratio of housing expense to current income of 22.1[7]	$6,610	$6,402	$6,258	$6,121	$5,893	$5,731	$5,756	$5,515	$5,339	$5,416	$5,169	$4,961
Assuming housing expense equal to 20 percent of income	7,304	7,074	6,916	6,763	6,512	6,332	6,360	6,094	5,900	5,984	5,712	5,504

[1] The basic house of 3 bedrooms was used in establishing the maximum mortgage ceiling needed for various areas under FHA sec. 221(d)(2). Each FHA insuring office prepared estimates, based upon local costs, of the cost of construction, including land, of this house, or of a basically comparable house where some minor variations were necessary in order to conform to local practices.

[2] This is the computed maximum mortgage amount which would be permissible under sec. 221(d)(2).

[3] This monthly amount would remain constant throughout the life of the mortgage.

[4] This monthly amount would decline slightly each year the outstanding balance of the mortgage is reduced.

[5] Represents 1/12 of the estimated real estate taxes.

[6] Includes the following estimated monthly amounts:

	Other housing expense	For maintenance and repair	For heating and utilities[a]	Miscellaneous expenses[b]
Atlanta, Ga	$20.22	$5.92	$11.20	$3.11
Boston, Mass	24.73	5.05	15.70	3.99
Houston, Tex	22.29	7.21	11.57	3.51
Indianapolis, Ind	36.55	8.28	24.13	4.13
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	25.49	3.70	17.72	4.06
Mobile, Ala	23.33	6.30	13.62	3.42
Newark, N.J	27.47	5.59	19.31	2.57
Phoenix, Ariz	23.55	6.82	13.88	2.86
Portland, Oreg	31.95	7.44	21.59	2.92
Topeka, Kans	26.65	6.84	14.22	5.59

[a] Excluding telephones.

[b] Mainly hazard insurance premiums.

[7] The number of sec. 221 cases were too few to compute a meaningful average, consequently the ratio used was based upon all sec. 203 mortgages on new 1-family homes insured in the United States in 1961. In computing this ratio, total current income, rather than total effective income, was used.

APPENDIX TABLE 2.—*Family income distribution of families in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas for 1959*

NUMBER OF FAMILIES

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Family incomes[1] of—										
	Median income	Total	Less than $4,000	$4,000 to $4,999	$5,000 to $5,999	$6,000 to $6,999	$7,000 to $7,999	$8,000 to $8,999	$9,000 to $9,999	$10,000 to $14,999	$15,000 or more
Northeast:											
Boston, Mass	6,687	640,526	116,418	64,861	86,156	76,842	67,392	53,207	39,380	90,769	45,501
Newark, N.J	7,149	443,681	74,132	39,088	52,493	49,640	43,484	37,135	30,300	74,688	42,721
North Central:											
Indianapolis, Ind	6,609	178,446	36,240	17,911	22,175	21,194	18,449	15,260	11,179	25,432	10,606
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	6,840	364,127	58,046	31,803	49,394	50,981	43,705	33,721	24.461	49,896	22,120
Topeka, Kans	5,931	36,369	9,067	4,366	5,104	4,408	3,539	2,697	1,925	3,858	1,405
South:											
Atlanta, Ga	5,758	255,983	79,302	26,968	28,670	25,555	21,641	17,065	13,313	29,349	14,120
Houston, Tex	6,040	316,194	86,906	33,296	36,490	34,710	29,559	22,580	17,059	37,692	17,902
Mobile, Ala	5,132	73,993	26,837	8,929	9,289	7,650	5,574	4,167	2,898	6,499	2,150
West:											
Phoenix, Ariz	5,896	162,697	45,857	17,810	19,740	18,255	14,975	11,598	8,251	17,560	8,651
Portland, Oreg	6,340	215,196	47,446	21,664	29,046	27,782	23,199	17,672	12,696	25,464	10,227

See footnote at end of table.

APPENDIX TABLE 2.—*Family income distribution of families in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas for 1959*—Continued

PERCENT OF TOTAL FAMILIES

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Family incomes[1] of—										
	Median income	Total	Less than $4,000	$4,000 to $4,999	$5,000 to $5,999	$6,000 to $6,999	$7,000 to $7,999	$8,000 to $8,999	$9,000 to $9,999	$10,000 to $14,999	$15,000 or more
Northeast:											
Boston, Mass	....	100	18.1	10.0	13.5	12.0	10.5	8.3	6.1	14.2	7.1
Newark, N.J	....	100	16.7	8.8	11.8	11.2	9.8	8.4	6.8	16.8	9.7
North Central:											
Indianapolis, Ind	....	100	20.3	10.0	12.4	11.9	10.3	8.6	6.3	14.3	5.9
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	....	100	15.9	8.7	13.6	14.0	12.0	9.3	6.7	13.7	6.0
Topeka, Kans	....	100	24.9	12.0	14.0	12.1	9.7	7.4	5.3	10.6	3.8
South:											
Atlanta, Ga	....	100	31.0	10.5	11.2	10.0	8.4	6.7	5.2	11.5	5.5
Houston, Tex	....	100	27.5	10.5	11.5	11.0	9.3	7.1	5.4	12.0	5.6
Mobile, Ala	....	100	36.3	12.0	12.5	10.3	7.5	5.6	3.9	8.8	3.0
West:											
Phoenix, Ariz	....	100	28.2	11.0	12.1	11.2	9.2	7.1	5.1	10.8	5.3
Portland, Oreg	....	100	22.4	10.1	13.5	12.9	10.7	8.2	5.8	11.8	4.6

CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGES

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Median income	Total	Less than $4,000	$4,000 to $4,999	$5,000 to $5,999	$6,000 to $6,999	$7,000 to $7,999	$8,000 to $8,999	$9,000 to $9,999	$10,000 to $14,999	$15,000 or more
Northeast:											
Boston, Mass	....	....	18.1	28.1	41.6	53.6	64.1	72.4	78.5	92.7	100
Newark, N.J	....	....	16.7	25.5	37.3	48.5	58.3	66.7	73.5	90.3	100
North Central:											
Indianapolis, Ind	....	....	20.3	30.3	42.7	54.6	64.9	73.5	79.8	94.1	100
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	....	....	15.9	24.6	38.2	52.2	64.2	73.5	80.2	93.9	100
Topeka, Kans	....	....	24.9	36.9	50.9	63.0	72.7	80.1	85.4	96.0	100
South:											
Atlanta, Ga	....	....	31.0	41.5	52.7	62.7	71.1	77.8	83.0	94.5	100
Houston, Tex	....	....	27.5	38.0	49.5	60.5	69.8	76.9	82.3	94.3	100
Mobile, Ala	....	....	36.3	48.3	60.8	71.1	78.6	84.2	88.1	96.9	100
West:											
Phoenix, Ariz	....	....	28.2	39.2	51.3	62.5	71.7	78.8	83.9	94.7	100
Portland, Oreg	....	....	22.4	32.5	46.0	58.9	69.6	77.8	83.6	95.4	100

[1] Incomes of unrelated individuals occupying dwelling units are not included in the figures above.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1960 Census of Population and Housing, Series PHC(1), Census Tracts.

APPENDIX TABLE 3.—*Percentage distribution by family current*[1] *annual income of purchasers of new 1-family homes, mortgages on which were insured by FHA under sec. 203 in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas in 1959*

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Median income	Total		Family current incomes of—								
		Number	Percent	Less than $3,600	$3,600–$4,799	$4,800–$5,999	$6,000–$7,199	$7,200–$8,399	$8,400–$9,599	$9,600–$11,999	$12,000–$14,399	$14,400 or more
Northeast:												
Boston, Mass	$7,933	339	100.0	....	....	7.5	25.2	28.3	17.0	14.5	5.6	1.9
Newark, N.J	8,871	143	100.0	....	....	5.6	21.2	15.5	19.7	29.6	7.0	1.4
North Central:												
Indianapolis, Ind	7,498	1,454	100.0	0.2	5.2	19.0	21.0	18.6	16.8	13.4	3.0	2.8
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	6,762	1,679	100.0	.1	4.8	26.9	28.7	18.9	11.0	7.7	1.3	.6
Topeka, Kans	8,143	86	100.0	....	....	3.4	27.6	24.2	20.7	20.7	3.4	....
South:												
Atlanta, Ga	7,616	1,834	100.0	.4	3.6	15.0	23.1	22.9	15.9	13.9	3.3	1.9
Houston, Tex	7,298	2,124	100.0	....	2.7	19.5	26.0	21.8	13.6	11.2	3.6	1.6
Mobile, Ala	7,844	550	100.0	....	1.7	11.4	24.5	23.2	17.3	13.9	6.7	1.3
West:												
Phoenix, Ariz	8,040	6,050	100.0	.1	2.8	12.1	21.1	19.9	14.7	16.2	7.5	5.6
Portland, Oreg	7,818	874	100.0	....	2.5	13.7	24.2	18.7	20.1	15.0	3.6	2.2
				Cumulative percentages								
Northeast:												
Boston, Mass	....	....	....	....	....	7.5	32.7	61.0	78.0	92.5	98.1	100.0
Newark, N.J	....	....	....	....	....	5.6	26.8	42.3	62.0	91.6	98.6	100.0
North Central:												
Indianapolis, Ind	....	....	....	0.2	5.4	24.4	45.4	64.0	80.8	94.2	97.2	100.0
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn	....	....	....	.1	4.9	31.8	60.5	79.4	90.4	98.1	99.4	100.0
Topeka, Kans	....	....	....	....	....	3.4	31.0	55.2	75.9	96.6	100.0	....
South:												
Atlanta, Ga	....	....	....	.4	4.0	19.0	42.1	65.0	80.9	94.8	98.1	100.0
Houston, Tex	....	....	....	....	2.7	22.2	48.2	70.0	83.6	94.8	98.4	100.0
Mobile, Ala	....	....	....	....	1.7	13.1	37.6	60.8	78.1	92.0	98.7	100.0
West:												
Phoenix, Ariz	....	....	....	.1	2.9	15.0	36.1	56.0	70.7	86.9	94.4	100.0
Portland, Oreg	....	....	....	....	2.5	16.2	40.4	59.1	79.2	94.2	97.8	100.0

[1] Represents the sum of all amounts received by the principal mortgagor or the comortgagor(s) from any source, as reported on the application, adjusted to conform to any available verifications. This includes occupational income and income from commissions, fees, bonuses, business, corporations or partnerships, investments or other supplemental sources. These figures are more nearly comparable to census family income data than are the FHA figures on effective income.

NOTE.—Data for income classes comparable to those for 1960 (app. table 4) are not available for 1959.

Source: FHA Homes, 1959, "Data for States and Selected Areas on Characteristics of FHA Operations Under Sec. 203," table 84-M.

APPENDIX TABLE 4.—*Percentage distribution by family current[1] annual income of purchasers of new 1-family homes, mortgages on which were insured by FHA under sec. 203 in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas in 1960*

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Median income	Total		Family current incomes of—									
		Number	Percent	Less than $4,000	$4,000–$4,999	$5,000–$5,999	$6,000–$6,999	$7,000–$7,999	$8,000–$8,999	$9,000–$9,999	$10,000–$11,999	$12,000–$14,999	$15,000 or more
Northeast:													
Boston, Mass.	$8,773	247	100.0	--------	0.9	3.6	14.0	21.1	13.4	23.0	13.3	8.3	2.4
Newark, N.J.[2]	--------	58	100.0	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
North Central:													
Indianapolis, Ind.	8,012	1,142	100.0	0.3	4.1	11.6	18.0	15.9	13.5	16.2	12.9	5.9	1.6
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	6,991	1,409	100.0	.1	5.3	21.0	23.8	16.8	13.2	9.8	6.9	2.3	.8
Topeka, Kans.	7,698	142	100.0	--------	3.0	11.7	19.6	22.6	17.6	9.9	12.1	3.5	--------
South:													
Atlanta, Ga.	7,987	1,523	100.0	.1	3.1	9.7	18.2	19.1	16.2	16.2	12.9	3.7	.8
Houston, Tex.	7,751	1,795	100.0	.1	4.8	11.9	19.9	17.8	14.6	12.2	10.7	6.7	1.3
Mobile, Ala.	8,157	378	100.0	--------	4.4	11.9	18.2	12.9	16.6	18.6	11.5	4.9	1.0
West:													
Phoenix, Ariz.	8,456	6,164	100.0	.6	3.6	9.3	14.4	15.6	14.3	12.4	14.4	8.7	6.7
Portland, Oreg.	8,187	742	100.0	--------	.4	10.1	16.7	19.4	18.2	14.7	11.7	6.5	2.3
				Cumulative percentages									
Northeast:													
Boston, Mass.	--------	--------	--------	--------	0.9	4.5	18.5	39.6	53.0	76.0	89.3	97.6	100.0
Newark, N.J.[2]	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
North Central:													
Indianapolis, Ind.	--------	--------	--------	0.3	4.4	16.0	34.0	49.9	63.4	79.6	92.5	98.4	100.0
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	--------	--------	--------	.1	5.4	26.4	50.2	67.0	80.2	90.0	96.9	99.2	100.0
Topeka, Kans.	--------	--------	--------	--------	3.0	14.7	34.3	56.9	74.5	84.4	96.5	100.0	--------
South:													
Atlanta, Ga.	--------	--------	--------	.1	3.2	12.9	31.1	50.2	66.4	82.6	95.5	99.2	100.0
Houston, Tex.	--------	--------	--------	.1	4.9	16.8	36.7	54.5	69.1	81.3	92.0	98.7	100.0
Mobile, Ala.	--------	--------	--------	--------	4.4	16.3	34.5	47.4	64.0	82.6	94.1	99.0	100.0
West:													
Phoenix, Ariz.	--------	--------	--------	.6	4.2	13.5	27.9	43.5	57.8	70.2	84.6	93.3	100.0
Portland, Oreg.	--------	--------	--------	--------	.4	10.5	27.2	46.6	64.8	79.5	91.2	97.7	100.0

[1] Represents the sum of all amounts received by the principal mortgagor or the co-mortgagor(s) from any source, as reported on the application, adjusted to conform to any available verifications. This includes occupational income and income from commissions, fees, bonuses, business, corporations or partnerships, investments or other supplemental sources. These figures are more nearly comparable to census family income data than are the FHA figures on effective income.

[2] Sample considered too small for tabulation.

Source: FHA Homes, 1960, "Data for States and Selected Areas on Characteristics of FHA Operations Under Sec. 203," table 85–M.

APPENDIX TABLE 5.—*Percentage distribution by property value of new 1-family homes, mortgages on which were insured by FHA under sec. 203 in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas in 1959*

Standard metropolitan statistical area	Total		FHA appraised values of—							
	Number	Percent	Less than $8,000	$8,000–$9,999	$10,000–$11,999	$12,000–$13,999	$14,000–$15,999	$16,000–$17,999	$18,000–$19,999	$20,000 or more
Northeast:										
Boston, Mass.	339	100.0	--------	--------	0.6	5.7	35.8	32.7	15.1	10.1
Newark, N.J.	143	100.0	--------	--------	--------	--------	36.6	25.4	5.6	32.4
North Central:										
Indianapolis, Ind.	1,454	100.0	--------	0.4	15.4	36.7	23.3	10.4	8.5	5.3
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	1,679	100.0	--------	--------	3.2	27.9	38.5	19.5	7.8	3.1
Topeka, Kans.	86	100.0	--------	--------	--------	11.1	33.3	33.3	16.7	5.6
South:										
Atlanta, Ga.	1,834	100.0	--------	1.7	11.9	32.0	26.9	15.0	7.0	5.5
Houston, Tex.	2,124	100.0	--------	2.9	22.4	24.7	24.9	17.4	5.4	2.3
Mobile, Ala.	550	100.0	--------	--------	6.6	23.0	33.3	18.1	6.2	12.8
West:										
Phoenix, Ariz.	6,050	100.0	0.3	7.1	25.1	30.6	21.3	6.8	2.3	6.5
Portland, Oreg.	874	100.0	--------	.3	17.1	39.7	25.5	11.3	3.7	2.4
			Cumulative percentages							
Northeast:										
Boston, Mass.	--------	--------	--------	--------	0.6	6.3	42.1	74.8	89.9	100.0
Newark, N.J.	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	36.6	62.0	67.6	100.0
North Central:										
Indianapolis, Ind.	--------	--------	--------	0.4	15.8	52.5	75.8	86.2	94.7	100.0
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	--------	--------	--------	--------	3.2	31.1	69.6	89.1	96.9	100.0
Topeka, Kans.	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	11.5	41.4	77.7	94.4	100.0
South:										
Atlanta, Ga.	--------	--------	--------	1.7	13.6	45.6	72.5	87.5	94.5	100.0
Houston, Tex.	--------	--------	--------	2.9	25.3	50.0	74.9	92.3	97.7	100.0
Mobile, Ala.	--------	--------	--------	--------	6.6	29.6	62.9	81.0	87.2	100.0
West:										
Phoenix, Ariz.	--------	--------	0.3	7.4	32.5	63.1	84.4	91.2	93.5	100.0
Portland, Oreg.	--------	--------	--------	.3	17.4	57.1	82.6	93.9	97.6	100.0

Source: FHA Homes, 1959, "Data for States and Selected Areas on Characteristics of FHA Operations Under Sec. 203," table 43–M.

APPENDIX TABLE 6.—*Percentage distribution by property value of new 1-family homes, mortgages on which insured by FHA under sec. 203 in selected standard metropolitan statistical areas in 1960*

Standard metropolitan statistical areas	Total		FHA appraised values of—							
	Number	Percent	Less than $8,000	$8,000 to $9,999	$10,000 to $11,999	$12,000 to $13,999	$14,000 to $15,999	$16,000 to $17,999	$18,000 to $19,999	$20,000 or more
Northeast:										
Boston, Mass.	247	100.0	0.6	--------	--------	5.0	28.5	33.5	18.4	14.0
Newark, N.J.[1]	58	100.0	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
North Central:										
Indianapolis, Ind.	1,142	100.0	--------	.2	12.5	30.2	26.0	22.6	6.5	2.0
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	1,409	100.0	--------	--------	.6	24.5	38.5	23.4	6.2	6.8
Topeka, Kans.	142	100.0	--------	1.2	12.8	39.5	28.5	12.7	2.9	2.4
South:										
Atlanta, Ga.	1,523	100.0	--------	.6	8.1	24.7	33.8	20.6	8.8	3.4
Houston, Tex.	1,795	100.0	--------	4.0	19.7	19.8	25.9	19.1	9.5	2.0
Mobile, Ala.	378	100.0	--------	.6	5.2	22.3	29.1	21.8	8.2	12.8
West:										
Phoenix, Ariz.	6,164	100.0	--------	5.8	21.9	27.3	24.6	12.1	3.4	4.9
Portland, Oreg.	742	100.0	--------	.3	14.1	27.2	32.0	18.9	6.1	1.4
			Cumulative percentages							
Northeast:										
Boston, Mass.	--------	--------	0.6	0.6	0.6	5.6	34.1	67.6	86.0	100.0
Newark, N.J.[1]	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
North Central:										
Indianapolis, Ind.	--------	--------	--------	.2	12.7	42.9	68.9	91.5	98.0	100.0
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	--------	--------	--------	--------	.6	25.1	63.6	87.0	93.2	100.0
Topeka, Kans.	--------	--------	--------	1.2	14.0	53.5	82.0	94.7	97.6	100.0
South:										
Atlanta, Ga.	--------	--------	--------	.6	8.7	33.4	67.2	87.8	96.6	100.0
Houston, Tex.	--------	--------	--------	4.0	23.7	43.5	69.4	88.5	98.0	100.0
Mobile, Ala.	--------	--------	--------	.6	5.8	28.1	57.2	79.0	87.2	100.0
West:										
Phoenix, Ariz.	--------	--------	--------	5.8	27.7	55.0	79.6	91.7	95.1	100.0
Portland, Oreg.	--------	--------	--------	.3	14.4	41.6	73.6	92.5	98.6	100.0

[1] Sample considered too small for tabulation.

Source: FHA Homes, 1960, "Data for States and Selected Areas on Characteristics of FHA Operations Under Sec. 203," table 41–M.

APPENDIX TABLE 7–A.—*Boston, Mass., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent[1] assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served for a basic walkup type of rental unit[2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land[3]	$2,400.00	$2,400.00	$2,400.00	$2,400.00	$2,400.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room[3]	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal[4]	11.98	10.03	8.78	8.59	7.27
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium[4]	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
(e) Real estate taxes[5]	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00
(f) Hazard insurance[5]	.38	.38	.38	.38	.38
(g) Other operating expenses[6]	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80	4.80
(h) Replacement reserve[5]	.56	.56	.56	.56	.56
(i) Vacancy allowance[7]	1.63	1.49	1.39	1.38	1.28
(j) Total monthly rent	23.35	21.26	19.91	19.71	18.29
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit[8]	134.26	122.25	114.48	113.33	105.17
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d) (3): families of 3 and 4 persons[9]	--------	--------	7,000.00	--------	--------
(m) Estimated median family income[10]	7,000.00	7,000.00	7,000.00	7,000.00	7,000.00
(n) Income required to pay 2 bedroom monthly rent[11]	8,055.60	7,335.00	6,868.80	6,799.80	6,310.20

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 7–J.

APPENDIX TABLE 7–B.—*Newark, N.J., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent[1] assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit[2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land[3]	$2,600.00	$2,600.00	$2,600.00	$2,600.00	$2,600.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room[3]	2,600.00	2,600.00	2,600.00	2,600.00	2,600.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal[4]	12.97	10.87	9.52	9.31	7.88
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium[4]	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------
(e) Real estate taxes[5]	5.42	5.42	5.42	5.42	5.42
(f) Hazard insurance[5]	.35	.35	.35	.35	.35
(g) Other operating expenses[6]	5.41	5.41	5.41	5.41	5.41
(h) Replacement reserve[5]	.69	.69	.69	.69	.69
(i) Vacancy allowance[7]	1.87	1.71	1.61	1.59	1.49
(j) Total monthly rent	26.71	24.45	23.00	22.77	21.24
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit[8]	153.58	140.59	132.25	130.93	122.13
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d)(3): Families of 3 and 4 persons[9]	--------	--------	7,550.00	--------	--------
(m) Estimated median family income[10]	7,550.00	7,550.00	7,550.00	7,550.00	7,550.00
(n) Income required to pay 2-bedroom monthly rent[11]	9,214.80	8,435.40	7,935.00	7,855.80	7,327.80

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 7–J.

APPENDIX TABLE 7-C.—*Indianapolis, Ind., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent [1] assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit [2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land [3]	$2,400.00	$2,400.00	$2,400.00	$2,400.00	$2,400.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room [3]	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal [4]	11.98	10.03	8.78	8.59	7.27
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium [4]					
(e) Real estate taxes [5]	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
(f) Hazard insurance [5]	.66	.66	.66	.66	.66
(g) Other operating expenses [6]	5.03	5.03	5.03	5.03	5.03
(h) Replacement reserve [5]	.86	.86	.86	.86	.86
(i) Vacancy allowance [7]	1.61	1.46	1.36	1.35	1.25
(j) Total monthly rent	22.94	20.84	19.49	19.29	17.87
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit [8]	131.91	119.83	112.07	110.92	102.75
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d)(3): Families of 3 and 4 persons [9]			6,900.00		
(m) Estimated median family income [10]	7,300.00	7,300.00	7,300.00	7,300.00	7,300.00
(n) Income required to pay 2-bedroom monthly rent [11]	7,914.60	7,189.80	6,724.20	6,655.20	6,165.00

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 7-J.

APPENDIX TABLE 7-D.—*Minneapolis, Minn., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent [1] assuming 100-percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit [2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land [3]	$2,500.00	$2,500.00	$2,500.00	$2,500.00	$2,500.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room [3]	2,500.00	2,500.00	2,500.00	2,500.00	2,500.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal [4]	12.48	10.45	9.15	8.95	7.58
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium [4]					
(e) Real estate taxes [5]	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25	6.25
(f) Hazard insurance [5]	.71	.71	.71	.71	.71
(g) Other operating expenses [6]	5.19	5.19	5.19	5.19	5.19
(h) Replacement reserve [5]	.92	.92	.92	.92	.92
(i) Vacancy allowance [7]	1.92	1.77	1.67	1.66	1.55
(j) Total monthly rent	27.47	25.29	23.89	23.68	22.20
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit [8]	157.95	145.42	137.37	136.16	127.65
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d)(3): Families of 3 and 4 persons [9]			7,300.00		
(m) Estimated median family income [10]	8,000.00	8,000.00	8,000.00	8,000.00	8,000.00
(n) Income required to pay 2-bedroom monthly rent [11]	9,477.00	8,725.20	8,242.20	8,169.60	7,659.00

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 7-J.

APPENDIX TABLE 7-E.—*Topeka, Kans., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent [1] assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit [2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land [3]	$2,400.00	$2,400.00	$2,400.00	$2,400.00	$2,400.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room [3]	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00	2,400.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal [4]	11.98	10.03	8.78	8.59	7.27
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium [4]					
(e) Real estate taxes [5]	4.60	4.60	4.60	4.60	4.60
(f) Hazard insurance [5]	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.34	1.34
(g) Other operating expenses [6]	3.86	3.86	3.86	3.86	3.86
(h) Replacement reserve [5]	.52	.52	.52	.52	.52
(i) Vacancy allowance [7]	1.68	1.53	1.44	1.42	1.32
(j) Total monthly rent	23.98	21.88	20.54	20.33	18.91
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit [8]	137.89	125.81	118.11	116.90	108.73
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d)(3): Families of 3 and 4 persons [9]			6,900.00		
(m) Estimated median family income [10]	6,900.00	6,900.00	6,900.00	6,900.00	6,900.00
(n) Income required to pay 2-bedroom monthly rent [11]	8,273.40	7,548.60	7,086.60	7,014.00	6,523.80

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 7-J.

APPENDIX TABLE 7-F.—*Atlanta, Ga., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent [1] assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit [2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land [3]	$2,050.00	$2,050.00	$2,050.00	$2,050.00	$2,050.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room [3]	2,050.00	2,050.00	2,050.00	2,050.00	2,050.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal [4]	10.23	8.57	7.50	7.34	6.21
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium [4]					
(e) Real estate taxes [5]	2.22	2.22	2.22	2.22	2.22
(f) Hazard insurance [5]	.36	.36	.36	.36	.36
(g) Other operating expenses [6]	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80	2.80
(h) Replacement reserve [5]	.79	.79	.79	.79	.79
(i) Vacancy allowance [7]	1.23	1.11	1.03	1.02	.93
(j) Total monthly rent	17.63	15.85	14.70	14.53	13.31
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit [8]	101.37	91.14	84.53	83.55	76.53
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d)(3): Families of 3 and 4 persons [9]			6,000.00		
(m) Estimated median family income [10]	6,000.00	6,000.00	6,000.00	6,000.00	6,000.00
(n) Income required to pay 2-bedroom monthly rent [11]	6,082.20	5,468.40	5,071.80	5,013.00	4,591.80

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 7-J.

APPENDIX TABLE 7-G.—*Houston, Tex., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent [1] assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit [2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land [3]	$2,050.00	$2,050.00	$2,050.00	$2,050.00	$2,050.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room [3]	2,050.00	2,050.00	2,050.00	2,050.00	2,050.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal [4]	10.23	8.57	7.50	7.34	6.12
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium [4]					
(e) Real estate taxes [5]	2.39	2.39	2.39	2.39	2.39
(f) Hazard insurance [5]	.51	.51	.51	.51	.51
(g) Other operating expenses [6]	4.16	4.16	4.16	4.16	4.16
(h) Replacement reserve [5]	.34	.34	.34	.34	.34
(i) Vacancy allowance [7]	1.33	1.20	1.12	1.11	1.02
(j) Total monthly rent	18.96	17.17	16.02	15.85	14.63
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit [8]	109.02	98.73	92.12	91.14	84.12
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d)(3): Families of 3 and 4 persons [9]			5,900.00		
(m) Estimated median family income [10]	6,900.00	6,900.00	6,900.00	6,900.00	6,900.00
(n) Income required to pay 2-bedroom monthly rent [11]	6,541.20	5,923.80	5,527.20	5,468.40	5,047.20

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 7-J.

APPENDIX TABLE 7-H.—*Mobile, Ala., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent [1] assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit [2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land [3]	$2,100.00	$2,100.00	$2,100.00	$2,100.00	$2,100.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room [3]	2,100.00	2,100.00	2,100.00	2,100.00	2,100.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal [4]	10.48	8.78	7.69	7.52	6.36
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium [4]					
(e) Real estate taxes [5]	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.23
(f) Hazard insurance [5]	.51	.51	.51	.51	.51
(g) Other operating expenses [6]	3.74	3.74	3.74	3.74	3.74
(h) Replacement reserve [5]	.56	.56	.56	.56	.56
(i) Vacancy allowance [7]	1.24	1.12	1.03	1.02	.93
(j) Total monthly rent	17.76	15.94	14.76	14.58	13.33
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit [8]	102.12	91.66	84.87	83.84	76.65
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d)(3): Families of 3 and 4 persons [9]			6,050.00		
(m) Estimated median family income [10]	6,050.00	6,050.00	6,050.00	6,050.00	6,050.00
(n) Income required to pay 2-bedroom monthly rent [11]	6,127.20	5,499.60	5,092.20	5,030.40	4,599.00

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 7-J.

APPENDIX TABLE 7-I.—*Phoenix, Ariz., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent [1] assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit [2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land [3]	$2,150.00	$2,150.00	$2,150.00	$2,150.00	$2,150.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room [3]	2,150.00	2,150.00	2,150.00	2,150.00	2,150.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal [4]	10.73	8.99	7.87	7.70	6.51
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium [4]					
(e) Real estate taxes [5]	4.48	4.48	4.48	4.48	4.48
(f) Hazard insurance [5]	.45	.45	.45	.45	.45
(g) Other operating expenses [6]	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.06
(h) Replacement reserve [5]	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70
(i) Vacancy allowance [7]	1.61	1.48	1.40	1.38	1.29
(j) Total monthly rent	23.03	21.16	19.96	19.77	18.49
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit [8]	132.42	121.67	114.77	113.68	106.32
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d)(3): Families of 3 and 4 persons [9]			6,300.00		
(m) Established median family income [10]	6,300.00	6,300.00	6,300.00	6,300.00	6,300.00
(n) Income required to pay 2-bedroom monthly rent [11]	7,945.20	7,300.20	6,886.20	6,820.80	6,379.20

NOTE.—For footnotes, refer to appendix table 7-J.

APPENDIX TABLE 7-J.—*Portland, Oreg., standard metropolitan statistical area*

[Estimated monthly rent [1] assuming 100 percent mortgage financing at selected interest rates and a 40-year amortization period, and estimated income groups served, for a basic walkup type of rental unit [2]]

	Interest rates of—				
	5¼ percent	4 percent	3⅛ percent	3 percent	2 percent
(a) Estimated cost per room, including land [3]	$2,500.00	$2,500.00	$2,500.00	$2,500.00	$2,500.00
(b) Mortgage amount per room [3]	2,500.00	2,500.00	2,500.00	2,500.00	2,500.00
ESTIMATED MONTHLY RENT PER ROOM					
(c) Interest and principal [4]	12.48	10.45	9.15	8.95	7.58
(d) FHA mortgage insurance premium [4]					
(e) Real estate taxes [5]	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.13	3.13
(f) Hazard insurance [5]	.71	.71	.71	.71	.71
(g) Other operating expenses [6]	4.36	4.36	4.36	4.36	4.36
(h) Replacement reserve [5]	.75	.75	.75	.75	.75
(i) Vacancy allowance [7]	1.61	1.46	1.36	1.35	1.24
(j) Total monthly rent	23.04	20.86	19.46	19.25	17.77
(k) Estimated monthly rent per typical 2-bedroom unit [8]	132.48	119.95	111.90	110.69	102.18
ESTIMATED ANNUAL INCOME OF GROUP SERVED					
(l) FHA maximum income limits under sec. 221(d)(3): Families of 3 and 4 persons [9]			7,300.00		
(m) Estimated median family income [10]	7,300.00	7,300.00	7,300.00	7,300.00	7,300.00
(n) Income required to pay 2-bedroom monthly rent [11]	7,948.80	7,197.00	6,714.00	6,641.40	6,130.80

FOOTNOTES TO APPENDIX TABLES 7-A TO 7-J

[1] Not including tenants' electricity or telephone and, in some cases, cooking gas.

[2] This basic 2-bedroom rental unit in a walkup-type structure was used to help establish maximum income limits for various areas under FHA sec. 221(d)(3). Each FHA insuring office prepared estimates, based upon local costs, of the cost of construction, including land, of this basic unit, or a basically comparable unit where some minor variations were necessary to conform to local practices. For localities in which the requisite income for 3- or 4-person occupancy of such a unit (calculated with rentals of 20 percent of income) does not exceed the estimated median income in that locality. maximum permissible mortgages are authorized for this cost amount. If the median income estimate is lower, maximum permissible mortgage amounts are reduced proportionately from the cost estimate.

[3] Estimated cost, including land, is assumed to be the maximum mortgage amount permitted for each locality under sec. 221(d)(3) for projects sponsored by nonprofit, cooperative, and public agency sponsors. Maximum mortgage amounts were established at the lower amount of (1) estimated cost for a characteristic moderate rental 2-bedroom unit in a walkup project or (2) the estimated mortgage amount for a 2-bedroom unit which could be amortized over a 40-year period at 3⅛ percent interest and standard assumptions of taxes, operating costs, vacancy allowances, etc., with 20 percent rental payments by median income families.

[4] Level annuity monthly payments for a 40-year repayment period at the interest rate shown. Mortgage insurance premium omitted, in keeping with FHA established policy for sec. 221(d)(3).

[5] Computed as a percent of replacement cost. Real estate figures include certain other taxes (FICA, excise, etc.), which total not over 10 percent of the stated figures. Ratios reflect average experience of post-Korean crisis sec. 207 projects with a few years of operating experience reported in the last half of 1950's. (See attached schedule.)

[6] Average of per unit operating costs (adjusted to a per room basis at 5¾ rooms per unit) for post-Korean crisis sec. 207 projects having a few years' operating experience in the last half of 1950's, after eliminating project averages which were substantially higher than other project averages. (See attached schedule.)

[7] Calculated at 7 percent, which is typically used in FHA processing of sec. 221(d)(3) proposals. Occasionally a smaller vacancy assumption might be justified.

[8] Assuming typical 2-bedroom apartment equals 5.75 rooms by FHA room count, consisting of living room, dining room (or equivalent), kitchen, 2 bedrooms, 1 bathroom, and foyer or porch.

[9] Maximum income permitted by FHA for 3- and 4-person families eligible for admission to sec. 221(d)(3) projects in the localities specified.

[10] Based on census data, adjusted for estimated underreporting.

[11] Assuming a 20-percent rent-income ratio for the rental shown for a typical 2-bedroom unit.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES BY WOMEN MEMBERS OF IOWA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, annually the women members of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation send to Washington a delegation representative of the farm bureau women of Iowa. This practice has been followed for a number of years, These women are outstanding in civic activities, in contributions to public affairs, and in agricultural promotional activities in the various counties.

This year their meeting was held in Washington on Tuesday, March 12. At a banquet which took place at the culmination of the meeting, four of the women delivered short speeches on various phases of subjects which appealed to them. The speeches were not written for them and given to them for repetition at a banquet. They wrote their own speeches and delivered them. I was so much impressed by the sound philosophy contained in the speeches that I asked for copies of them to be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the basic, independent philosophy of the people who built the West, and which is perpetuated in the philosophy which these women have expressed, could be given wider currency and circulation.

Mr. President, I recommend a reading of these addresses as statements encouraging and stimulating the American philosophy of independence, self-reliance, and determination. The statements they made are representative not only of their philosophy, but also of the philosophy of countless others in our area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, first, to have printed as a part of my remarks the address entitled "Fiscal Responsibility of the Federal Government," which was delivered by Mrs. Jessie Zellmer.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

I am Jessie Zellmer, I was born on a farm near the Missouri River bottom 29 years ago. If you figure back that far you know that my childhood was marked by depression, drought, and on the bottom land a few miles from the Missouri, always spring floods whether it rained or not. I hated the long hours and hard work that showed on my parents face, so I wasn't unhappy when we left the farm when I was about 10 years old and moved to town. Dad still farmed. He said, "As long as I can farm I am a free man." It took me a long time to figure out what he meant. Nevertheless, I vowed that when I grew up I would never marry a farmer. Well, I met a tall handsome fellow about a year before I graduated from high school. He let me know that all he ever wanted to do was farm. I married him a few weeks after I graduated and a few weeks after that he left me and his dreams of a farm to help Uncle Sam during the Korean War.

When he returned, he helped his dad on the farm for awhile, then worked in Sioux City for about a year. He was always looking for the farm. We found it in Woodbury County, a few miles east of Sioux City. Our home is on a hilltop, and on a clear day I can see South Dakota and Nebraska and the flash of the sun on cars traveling near the Missouri River.

Our farm is 150 acres of rolling hills and valleys, quite different from the bottomland of my childhood. My husband, his father, and his brother exchange help and equipment and between the three of them, work about 550 acres. We raise hogs and fatten cattle. I have a flock of chickens. The chickens and a few cows and a garden that we irrigated, fed us for the first years we farmed as they were the driest years I can remember. In a way, these dry years were a godsend, because of them, my husband had the time to teach and show me things I would probably never bothered to find out for myself. You see, if I had ever learned anything about farming in my youth, I had forgotten almost every bit of it. I have learned to love the farm now and I would not be happy anyplace else.

We were very happy when our first daughter was born on the 4th of July 1956. She brought an end to the drought complete with hailstones as big as baseballs. That year, we became interested in Farm Bureau. It was also the first sign of an upswing in our farming operation, because, with the advent of rain our land yielded beyond my wildest dreams.

Two years later we had another daughter. Where our eldest is serious, dark, and studious, our youngest is a bright little blond bombshell.

The girls and the farm are our present and our future, because what we have in material wealth and what we believe in will effect the children now and in the years to come. Eventually we hope to have a larger farming operation. In the meantime we feel we must be alert and improve what we have in every way possible.

In our business the most important single item is finance. Money to buy more land, cattle, hogs, feed, and what have you. In this respect, credit is a very useful tool, but is also one that can easily become the master rather than the servant. We believe the same standards of fiscal responsibility hold true both for individuals and our Federal Government. Suppose your family took in $8,590 and you spent $9,370. You'd be in debt $780. And, suppose that 7 times in the last 10 years you have ended up in the red. Now you owe a little over $30,000. Suppose in the coming years, you are likely to become anywhere from $600 to $1,200 behind. Then you ask your banker for more credit to get your business going again. He might lend it to you if you use it to make more money, but he'd be pretty tough about using it for better living.

Well, just add seven zeros to the figures I've just mentioned and you have the picture of the financial health of the U.S. Government.

As a family, our concern is deficit spending at home and on the Federal, State, and local level. It almost seems that deficit financing has become a way of life both for families and for the Federal Government. In fact, our national fiscal policy for the past several years has convinced millions of American people that saving for the future is undesirable and a poor business practice.

The theory is that the Government monetary and fiscal policy should be designed to stabilize the economy. According to the theory, the Government should spend more than it receives when unemployment is high and make payments on the national debt when the country is prosperous. The idea may be fine, but it just doesn't work that way.

The national debt has increased in 24 out of the last 30 years. When recession threatens, Government spending is considered necessary. We are assured that the budget will balance again as soon as the stimulating effects of the increased spending is felt. When we are prosperous the economists and planners cite rapid growth and prosperity and find new ways to spend still more money. They point out that the rate of growth will bring the budget into balance in just a few years so why be concerned? Therefore, we have deficits either way. This policy has to be inflationary. If deficit spending is not inflationary, why do we collect taxes at all? The Federal Government has never quite exhausted its borrowing powers, if it should, it can always resort to the printing presses for more money. If financing the Government entirely by borrowing and printing money would be inflationary, then partial deficit financing is inflationary. Continuous inflation adds up to a considerable amount over a period of years—3 percent a year for 10 years is 30 percent.

The unbalanced budget cheapens the purchasing power of the dollar. The worker may end up with more paper money but it buys less. So inflation is a form of tax. Whatever the Government spends and does not collect, it must obtain by taking a small piece of each dollar in circulation. This burden falls heaviest on people with fixed investments and relatively fixed incomes such as our old people and widows. This is a cruel byproduct of inflation. It also adds to the cost-price squeeze which farmers find themselves. For example, between 1946 and 1958 farm prices rose little if any while the price of milk to the consumer increased 47 percent, the price of gasoline has gone up 50 percent, automobiles 140 percent, college tuition 235 percent. The housewife pays 173 percent more for coffee and the contractor 200 percent more for lumber.

Economists often point out 1 year or part of 2 or 3 years and prove statistically that no inflation has occurred. This is misleading. Inflationary pressures are like the steam in a tea kettle. They build up considerably without showing, but eventually pressure is so great that the lid comes off, because something has to give.

The things I've said are familiar to you I'm sure. I believe, however, Iowa can be proud of the record of its Senators and Representatives in their attempt to reduce Government spending. Our Iowa congressional delegation as individual Congressmen have constantly demanded more responsible thinking in Federal Government programs. Our Congressmen have introduced bills to eliminate nepotism, congressional junkets, and many bills of long-range significance. My family is extremely appreciative for this responsible attitude taken by our Congressmen and ask that it be continued.

Like the President, we believe that income taxes should be reduced, because they may be stifling economic growth. However, we do not feel that this can be done unless Federal expenditures are reduced, too.

I'm sure no intelligent person could examine the Federal budget without concluding that huge reductions could be made in defense, foreign aid, and domestic programs without impairing any program vital to our welfare and security. We would like to see expenditures reduced at least $10 billion and taxes an equal amount.

Former Secretary of the Treasury Anderson once said, "If we ever reach the point

where people believe that to speculate is safe, but to save is to gamble—then we are indeed in trouble."

In this the Iowa Farmer agrees.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, next, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks the speech entitled "Foreign Affairs and Peace," delivered by Mrs. Bryon Falk.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND PEACE

It is my privilege as a member of the Farm Bureau organization to be here this evening, participating in a program so constructed that we may come to know each other in a much better way, to acquaint ourselves with this great capital of ours, to so pack away jewels for our box of memories, jewels that we may share with others.

We are from Iowa, that State that ranks so high in literacy, so very important in this fast-changing world of ours today our golden age folks have an amazing depth of knowledge in current affairs.

Iowa ranks high in many things. Figures are available to indicate this ranking. The greatly enlarged photos in the foyer of the State Farm Bureau Building in Des Moines attest to the beauty of our State.

I am from Page County, in the southwestern part of Iowa, one of the border counties so prominent in our State legislation discussions, We are proud of Page County. We have many "firsts." First in the U.S. Soil Conservation Service with the State experimental farm still in operation. Our 4–H beginnings were of the first in the Nation. The little Goldenrod Schoolhouse where Jesse Field Shambaugh, as a teacher, encouraged the boys to bring samples of corn to be judged. This dear person is known nationally as author of "The Country Girl Creed." Her beginnings with 4–H was the forerunner of our present 4–H. It was in 1959 that our Page County boys and girls visited in Canada, the first of such exchangee programs. In 1960, we had a boy and girl from Canada in our home. In 1961, our son went to Tennessee, and last summer a 4–H boy from Tennessee visited in our home. These young people have a deeper appreciation of farming processes from the thousand-acre wheat fields of Saskatchewan to the 2-acre tobacco farms of Tennessee, and with our northern and southern visitors we proudly viewed our corn lands of Iowa. Of interest to them in particular were the corn shellers and the cattle feeding operations.

Page County has at Shenandoah the two largest nurseries in the world, the offices of the largest seed and nursery retail stores in the world. Visitors from all over the United States view the all-American trials. Our geographical location at the end of the Wisconsin drift gives us a fertile soil for our part in filling the huge market basket.

My husband, Bryon Falk, and I live 2½ miles east of Essex, on my husband's home place. The abstract of which has never carried a mortgage or loan, hardly two pages in length, literally from Iowa or Waubonsie tribes to the U.S. Government, railroad, Iowa, and to our family. We also own and operate 160 acres, 2 miles to the east of us. We were of the generation that stayed home and cared for the folks and were a bit older than most when we married in 1939. We bought our farm and moved there in 1941, losing everything but the house by fire one hot July noon in 1942. We rebuilt only to have a tornado move in June 1, 1949, and take the two complete sets of improvements—houses and buildings. We lost about $75,000 in buildings, hogs and all, but we were safe with our children. We did not rebuild, for in the face of two disasters, we felt the debt too large to assume. We moved then to our present home, thankful in our hearts for God's great goodness to us. We have diversified farming, corn, beans, hogs, and home-raised cattle. We are not big farmers in any sense of the word, but we love the life of the farm. We are very active in church and community affairs. We firmly believe in our schools and in advanced education. Our daughter is a sophomore in college, majoring in physical education and minoring in home economics; the latter a direct result of 8 years active in 4–H. She serves now on a national level with Girl Scout summer programing. She loves the farm and can lend a hand in weeding beans or haying, if necessary. Our son is a senior in high school, very active in all affairs; holding offices of responsibility in county 4–H and district church youth. He has been accepted for college in the fall and as so many young people of today, is not quite sure what the future holds for him. While not planning at the present to farm, he feels sure that in 5 years, we will have farm plans in line.

We weathered together the ravages of fire, the devastating tornado, which only served to temper us for trying times ahead. Our family interests constantly change and widen. Economically, need we say more with two to be in college a total of 8 years and then more years as needed. Politically, we keep an awareness of situation by use of all media possible. We are avid readers of papers and magazines. We try to follow the work of our Senators and Representatives. Too often, though, we back home have a tendency to criticize before we know your position. We are happy with your firm convictions of what you feel is right with no fence riding.

My husband and I feel that the key to financial structure is confidence and gentlemen, we gave you that confidence when we cast the ballot. There is so much yet to learn.

We have been Farm Bureau members for over 20 years and I am happy here to say our Page County of 1,178 was net plus. Our district meeting for National Policy Committees met just 10 days ago and again I was proud to be a member of Farm Bureau. To have heard these discussions from the grassroots would have interested you. We realize it is from small acorns that great oaks grow. An example: several years ago a buzz session in the northeast corner of Griswold Hall in Page County—a justifiable complaint from a Farm Bureau woman as to the unfairness in the location of mailboxes in the county. Result? County to district to State and, yes, some of our Page County women were in Washington when that law went into effect.

Our Farm Bureau woman's theme for the year is "free in 1963." This is truly an American advantage and means so very much. In the summer of 1958, I visited in homes in nine foreign countries in Europe. I have shown slides to over 12,000 people. I was a guest in a Netherlands home through a member of ACWW (Associated Country Women of the World), an organization doing so much to prove an effective means of promoting understanding and goodwill throughout the world and helping people to help themselves. We hope these women of other countries may study their programs as we—our ABC's of Farm Bureau actions, beliefs, concerns, cultural, healthful, and responsible living. We are concerned not only with our own country, but with others. One of our chief concerns is for the betterment of international relations and peace. Do you know what it is to be a foreigner? You are a foreigner when you leave the shores of this country. How wonderful and a God-given bless to return. We speak of peace. Just what will bring about this peace? Maybe it will take the women to help do the job. In my own mind and from observations made while over there, we must first conquer the misunderstanding of language and the money problem. Picture to yourself a Norwegian woman about to buy a hat for $8 of her Norwegian money, and an American woman steps up and buys it with one of our American dollars. We must understand each other.

The American Farm Bureau is endeavoring to foster understanding among the farm people of the world as a means of furthering international good will. I want to assure you that Iowa farm women are not "peace at any price" advocates. We reject this concept as both futile and fatal. We recommend careful analysis of world problems and an attitude of international good will. A sincere dedication to the welfare and preservation of the human race, a concern for our Nation and our citizens here at home. We believe the implementation of this policy may call for more firmness in international leadership, less catering to neutrals and enemies, and fewer idle slogans and impractical theories.

We hope it will be possible to continue a high level of international trade. Agriculture has an important stake in foreign markets. We must not set our price supports so high as to discourage foreign trade. We believe the United States should better demonstrate to the world the advantages of our capitalistic system. To do so, we must encourage private investment and stimulate private trade. We must do at home as we encourage other countries to do. We favor continued support of United Nations. We should encourage the United Nations to become an effective implement for the attainment of the world peace with freedom and honor. The United Nations can be of value toward this end. It should be careful that it does not become imperialistic of itself or a super state. We believe membership and the right to vote should be limited to those nations that have paid their dues in full. We do not favor giving the United Nations U.S. money to be used in economic development. We should administer these programs ourselves.

We Farm Bureau women have the necessary and vital interest in peace, the needed compassion for the human race, and at the same time the practicality and courage to be an asset in making the vital decisions and taking actions necessary for the preservation of peace and survival.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, third, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks the address delivered by Mrs. J. S. Van Wert, entitled "What Farm Program?"

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT FARM PROGRAM?

I'm Mrs. J. S. Van Wert, of Franklin County. I live on a 40-acre farm 5 miles northeast of Hampton, Iowa.

As a child I grew up on a farm near Worthington, Minn. My parents both came from Sweden with no more than clothes to wear and a determination to establish a good Christian home in a land of free enterprise. My dad was one of the first settlers, having purchased our farm from the railroad for $9 per acre. My parents were hard workers and conservative. I was fortunate that they encouraged me and helped me through Iowa State University.

There I met my husband. This was during the depression. He had worked all of his way through the university and even supplemented his family's grocery basket. We were married after I taught 1 year to get some experience and incidentally pay a college debt. He was the county agent in Butler County at the time. That was when we struggled to maintain more than the minimum 200 Farm Bureau members in order to get the appropriation to continue the extension program and assure us of a job.

We purchased our first 40 acres later, the place where we now live. As land became available around us and we could make a downpayment, we added on.

After 5 years in extension work, we moved onto the farm. It was a big decision to make, to leave a salary job and enter more deeply into the competitive free enterprise system. We were happy that we made the choice however, as it was a wonderful place to rear our four children.

My husband was one who loved to be challenged and surely farming provided many such opportunities. Besides challenges, there were always elements of weather—too much rain, too little rain (which was a greater obstacle on our sandy soil), new worms, new weeds, new bugs, and unscheduled freezes. But we thank God for our blessings which outweighed the adversities.

General farming wasn't enough for us as my husband saw a service to agriculture in developing hybrid seed corn and hybrid hogs. We were pioneers in both, so, often we were the laughing stock of the community—what scrubby-looking corn were those inbred plots. One of our first hybrid-boar purchasers said, "I better keep him shut up for fear my neighbors shoot him for a rat."

Our children all helped in our farming ventures. As soon as they were old enough, they had their own livestock projects. We always felt that work helped develop their character. And when we all worked, as well as played together, we had greater fellowship.

This was a big help when my husband was suddenly killed in an auto accident in 1954. We stayed on the farm and managed the affairs the best we could. The boys finished their projects and went to college, both graduating in animal science.

The older son is now in extension work in Indiana while the other one is working for Swifts in St. Louis. My two girls enjoyed the duties on the farm too, but now the older one is a sophomore at the university, and the younger one will start there this summer.

Presently my older son thinks he would like to come back to the farm. History repeats itself in more ways than one, but I feel that this would be a greater jump for him than it was for us. It costs much more to start farming today.

He and I are concerned about farm prices and farm income. Gross income is not keeping up with the rising costs of machinery and other things we buy. Consequently, the squeeze is tightening. The January statistics showed that farm prices went up 1 percent but the prices of things purchased by us went up 2 percent. Would you advise a young man to start farming under these conditions?

My son knows that he will have to be very efficient and manage well. But one of the greatest concerns is what kind of farm program will we have? Will he be free to choose his type of farming or will the Government tell him what and how much to grow and perhaps eventually when to sell, as in England?

We believe a well-planned Government program can be of help to farmers and also be of value to consumers. At least, it can help us out of the situation we find ourselves today.

We would like to see a sound farm program planned for several years ahead—not keyed to each election and used as a political football.

Farm prices in the future will be determined either by the market or by the Government. Although the market method is not perfect, we believe it is better than Government price fixing. Government programs can be of assistance without destroying the market. This type of program would best serve the interests of farmers and is essential to the continuation of private enterprise.

President Kennedy has said: "The free market is a decentralized regulator of our economic system. The free market is not only a more efficient decisionmaker than the wisest central planning body, but even more important, the free market keeps economic power widely dispersed. We regard the preservation and strengthening of the free market as a cardinal objective of this or any administration."

I agree with this viewpoint and would like to see farm programs adapted to this concept. However, it seems all departments are not in line with the President's statement.

For example, I was quite concerned by Secretary Freeman's announcement to stabilize corn prices for the southeastern area of the United States. Supports must be floors only with the price having opportunity to bounce upward from the floor. When prices ride on the floor, they will not be completely satisfactory, but in other years, may be high enough to make the average more acceptable. For example, soybeans have ranged from the old support price of $1.85 a bushel to as high as $3 in the last 5 years. I believe corn might at the moment be running well above the floor price, if we had our Government stocks isolated. Cotton is an example of having the floor too high and delivering the market to synthetic substitutes. I am informed that the use of these substitutes for cotton has increased 26 percent since the price support was raised 2 years ago.

Specifically, I think a helpful program could be simple. (1) It should isolate Government surpluses so that they cannot be used to depress markets. (2) It should provide floor-type price supports for staple commodities. These floors should be a protection against being forced to dump on the market at harvest time or the necessity of accepting unnecessarily low prices. However, they cannot be so high as to encourage unneeded production, the use of synthetics, cause us to lose our foreign markets, or to become a ceiling as well as a floor.

A long-term land retirement program may be necessary to adjust land resources. I believe this is all the control that is necessary for corn, soybean, and livestock. Corn consumpton has increased from 2.7 billion bushels in 1955 to 4 billion bushels in 1961. Soybean usage has increased similarly. Red meat consumption is encouraging. The midwest farm horizon has some bright spots—if we can avoid solving the wheat problem at our expense—avoid price fixing. It would certainly be a serious threat to our future if livestock were to be subjected to either price supports or quotas.

In summary, I would like to see a farm income. It need not be expensive nor in any way conflict with the long-term interests of the consumer. It can help us financially today and encourage our youth to continue efficient food production in the future.

My son is willing to work hard if he comes back to the farm, but he must be able to enjoy a moderate net income to justify the terrific capital investment he must make to start farming. He doesn't want Government handouts, but a healthy economy in which to operate freely so that his income is fair and proportionate to his efforts and his investment.

This concludes our panel to help you know your Iowa farm neighbor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, fourth, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks the speech entitled "Survival of Private Enterprise and Freedom," delivered by Mrs. Lloyd Moir.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURVIVAL OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE AND FREEDOM

I am Mrs. Lloyd Moir, and my husband and I live on our own farm 5 miles south of Orange City, Iowa, in Sioux County. Sioux County is in the northwest corner of Iowa. It is a Dutch community, and an excellent farming area. While we are not Dutch, we truly have enjoyed the warm hospitality and friendships. We joined Farm Bureau in 1939, because we wanted to and because we believe in Farm Bureau philosophy.

Lloyd and I were born and raised in town and moved to the farm in 1939. While it wasn't the best year to go farming, we have been forever grateful. It surely gives us a better perspective on life—to have lived in town and on the farm.

We have four children, Peggy Jeanne, Lloyd, John, and Suzanne—three are married, and we have six grandchildren. All have attended Iowa State University and John is a sophomore student there now, majoring in electrical engineering. He interrupted his freshman year to get his service time taken care of and served 4 years in the Air Force. Lloyd is a captain in the Air Force, a jet copilot, and stationed at Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. Mex. We have always been the kind of family that likes to read, work, and play together.

It is my concern for these our children and other young people, and our continued freedoms that prompted me to select the title "Survival of Private Enterprise and Freedoms."

Freedom of enterprise means only the right to choose an occupation, but does not necessarily guarantee success to the individual in his chosen field of work—that is up to him. This freedom, however, does not extend to antisocial activities such as to steal, to commit burglary, to organize murder for profit, and others of this nature.

Freedom to choose and to use one's own judgment in the conduct of our life and our business, permits mistakes to grow on as the old adage says, and it encourages progress and success. As humans, there are bound to be some failures in some of our ventures, but they are localized. One of the advantages in a competitive private enterprise is that penalties for failure are levied against those who fail, only. My grandfather used to say "We learn more by mistakes than by the things we do successfully." As individuals, with self-responsibility, we can try again, but under government controls and government price fixing, a whole society is penalized and one can lose that personal initiative of wanting to try again, and some may be lulled into a false sense of security.

Our system of government depends upon private property, freedom of enterprise, the price system, competition and the motivating factors of individual initiative and self interest to stimulate production and economic development. To trample on anyone of these, and cause the loss of this personal initiative would result in the gradual deterioration of our great Nation. We surely do not want this to happen—it would be a direct affront to the men and women who settled in this country, fought for its freedoms and drew up our Constitution.

My husband and I are very concerned about the survival of private enterprise and freedom. We consider the rapid and continued growth of Federal Government and authority vested in Washington to be a threat. I do want to emphasize that we do

not consider this to be a partisan issue. The size of the Federal Government has increased alarmingly under both Democrat and Republican administrations. Big government and big budgets mean less money and less decisions for the people themselves. In many ways, big government means little people.

Some will argue that there is nothing to be concerned about in a democracy. They contend that people have the opportunity to reverse this at any time and consequently there need be no concern. This is true, if the citizens recognize the danger in time. But world history is filled with the stories of democracies that have fallen—and become dictatorships because the people themselves asked far too much from government—or at least protested too late. Democracies do not usually fall before the onslaught of evil people. In fact, the change from democracy to a dictatorship is often so gradual that even the dictator does not recognize when it occurs. History indicates that most dictatorships were benevolent dictators with the very best of intentions in the beginning. At times it seems we are losing sight of the basic principle our Founding Fathers had in mind—the leader of a democracy is not the source of power, he only directs it. Power itself must continue to be invested in the people. If power is given to an individual or group, it will eventually be used and it will eventually be abused.

The Government's hand in labor disputes has become increasingly evident. It was never more so than during the recent longshoremen's strike. The Government finally appointed a fact-finding committee. This committee came up with a recommendation which was between labor's demands and management's offer—but leaning toward labor. Labor and management were then told they could accept this or legislation would be enacted to end their right to free bargaining. Is this the pattern for the future? I do not pretend to have the answer, but I question the amount of private enterprise—or freedom involved in the Government deciding all future disputes on wages and working conditions.

The steel episode was a shocking one and possibly an eye opener for millions of citizens who are unaware of the mounting powers of Federal Government. It is not my intention to defend the steel companies—it may be that they did not live up to the spirit of the agreement signed between them and Steelworkers Union. Be that as it may, liberty and private enterprise is threatened when any individual or group of individuals can insist that industry reduce prices or be subject to antitrust prosecution and loss of Government contracts. If the steel companies were guilty of monopoly activities after they raised prices, they were guilty before and should have been prosecuted regardless. In my opinion, the most urgent need is not more laws, but revision or repeal of bad laws now on the books.

Then we have the medical care plan under social security that is being considered. The features about it of concern to us is that it is compulsory—again under government—and that it really doesn't solve the problem. Under this system, we would be handing out benefits to many elder citizens who don't need them, inadequate benefits to some, and none at all to others. While it is our Christian duty to care for the aged, I do feel the law we have and our rapidly growing private medical-insurance will be of more benefit. The cost of this one item can be a real burden on our young people's income and I think it is about time we think of them and the young people to come after them.

The Secretary of Agriculture recently announced that he had taken action to fix corn prices for 11 or 12 States in the Southeastern part of the United States. Now it is a well known fact that the Secretary has within his authority the ability to cause commodity futures to go up or down the full legal limit merely by an announcement or inference of future plans of the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture has been charged by the Congress with conducting a referendum of wheat producers to decide whether they want the certificate plan. The Secretary has said that he will use the full force of his Department to secure a favorable vote from wheat producers. Should the Department be both a referee and a participant? Is this a completely free society? We are all Iowans and I am sure familiar with the "Cow Pool," and its failure. This isn't being said in a gloating manner, but it is reassurance that the family farm is farming at its best. A family with its own money invested will plan, work and fight harder to survive and prosper than hired help will ever do for a manager.

I have heard the expression said by my own neighbors, "I prefer security." That is fine, providing it is the right kind of security—the kind we have earned ourselves that enables us to raise our families, take care of our old age, our medical expenses, and a depression (if that should happen). However, these few were thinking of the kind of security they felt came from the Government. Freedom isn't a gift—we must work for it. We must see beyond ourselves, beyond our homes and families, and each one must work for it—the laborer, the wife, the employer and our public officials. Whenever government assumes responsibility for the security, welfare, and prosperity of citizens, the cost of Government naturally continues to rise and we as citizens may be primarily to blame, as we clamor for more legislation and place more power in the hands of the executive.

I am happy to say that every poll of farmers I've seen shows that farmers want less—not more Government. I certainly do not have the answers, but perhaps be a little more reluctant to delegate powers. In closing, I want to say that I recognize the need and necessity of many Government functions and programs. We, as a family, blame ourselves and other citizens as much as we blame public officials. We hope that farm women—all farm people—all citizens will make it a point to become better informed and take more interest in Government, and rededicate themselves to the one principal that safeguards all others in our lives—freedom—both economical and political. I think of the story of the little boy whose father brought home a gift to him after one of his trips. It was a little world globe. The boy held it in his arms all day and looked at it and admired it and even took it to bed with him that night. When his father came to tuck him in he was sound asleep with the globe clutched in his arms. He carefully removed it and naturally awakened his son, who looked up at him and said, "Daddy, what are you doing with my world?" And this is truly something to think about. What are we doing with our children's world? Thank you.

CONDITION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I noted with interest reports in the press that members of the House Education and Labor Committee had visited several District schools on March 11. Particularly interesting were their expletives used to describe the lamentable conditions of Hine Junior High School.

"Horrible Hine" was visited by one of my staff members in February, and his report to me contained information that fully confirms results of the recent inspection tour undertaken by the Members of the other body.

First, a survey of District of Columbia public schools conducted in 1949 granted Hine only 262 out of a possible 1,000 points. It was judged then as "of such quality as to definitely eliminate consideration of it for rehabilitation or continuance in use." Remember, Mr. President, that this evaluation of Hine was made 14 years ago. The lighting in Hine is so old and so insufficient as to unquestionably hazard the eyesight of those trying to read or study by it.

Hine is made up of three buildings. Their age has been discussed repeatedly, but of greater significance is the fact that the three buildings are merged in such a haphazard manner that communication between them is difficult. If there were a fire, as there was in 1959, removing the children from the building safely would be a perilous task at best. The fire hazards in the building are further heightened by the wooden floors and wainscoating in the halls and stairwells.

The building is an unquestioned firetrap.

The toilet facilities are grossly inadequate. There is only one toilet for boys and one for girls in the entire complex.

The third floor of one of the older buildings that comprise Hine, burned in 1959, thus fulfilling the dire predictions of the fire marshals who had ruled it unsafe in 1949. The debris and trash from the conflagration are still lying around in the burned out section.

There is only one electrical outlet in the home economics classroom area, thus necessitating the concentration of all electrical equipment at one side of the room, It is a strange sight indeed to see 12 or 15 sewing machines grouped in a semicircle in one section of a large room, joined by a maze of electrical cords, extensions, and plugs—strange, and potentially dangerous.

In brief, in the words of Dr. Bolden, the principal of Hine, "There is not a single area in which our school is adequate."

In spite of the foregoing, it should be noted to their credit that the staff's morale is high, and that the discipline maintained is surprisingly good.

Last year, when Dr. Hansen, in his testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, supplied the reasons for continuing to use Hine, Dr. Hansen said:

> Hine's situation is really a tragedy in terms of school plant, but nevertheless there is seating capacity there for students. Making the hard choice between classrooms for children who otherwise would be put on part time and classrooms which are available for children even though they are inadequate would force us to choose the first.

It took great courage for Dr. Hansen to make that statement. But I believe his judgment on the matter is quite sound. The tragedy of the situation is that Hine was not torn down 20 years ago and replaced with a totally new structure. The Superintendent of Schools should not be called upon to make judgments between two such unacceptable alternatives.

Recently, Dr. Hansen presented to the Board of Education a report entitled "Our Schools and Their Prospects." The report outlines the present state of the District school system, and spells out what must be done to bring the physical plant up to acceptable standards. The present situation is so poor as to be practically beyond recall, without immediate improvement in the budgetary support given to the District schools.

I am confident that the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress will give this report the full attention and study it deserves. I intend to do whatever I can to see that its basic recommendations are carried out.

If we reject the recommendations contained in "Our Schools and Their Prospects," let us do so honestly, and without deluding ourselves in the process. Let us frankly admit that our District schools are rapidly becoming mere way stations between the streets, the reformatories, and the penitentiaries. If we are willing to accept this policy for District schools, perhaps we might just as well begin cutting the existing budgetary requests.

On the other hand, if we decide to provide more adequate facilities, let us look at the problem in its fullest dimensions and courageously accept our responsibilities.

I know the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] is deeply concerned about these conditions, in his capacity as chairman of the District Appropriations Subcommittee. He has advocated increased expenditures for the District schools, and has consistently demonstrated a keen determination to bring about a more adequate building and salary program. He certainly will have the full support of the Senator from Minnesota, who is honored to serve with him as a member of the District Appropriations Subcommittee.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S MEETING WITH THE PRESIDENTS OF THE CENTRAL AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to comment on President Kennedy's trip, this week, to Costa Rica, to meet with the Presidents of the six Central American Republics. This is, indeed, a notable event. It is one more indication that the Kennedy administration considers Latin America to be one of the most critical areas in the world. The personal visit of our President is a true reflection of the importance which our country places on the Alliance for Progress. It is hard to overestimate the importance of a Presidential visit to the long-neglected Central American Republics; and already the press reports informing us of the overwhelmingly enthusiastic reception the President received indicate that our Central American neighbors fully appreciate the significance of the visit.

I was sure the President would receive that kind of warm and enthusiastic welcome. In my visits to Central America and South America, I found that President Kennedy is exceedingly popular and highly respected.

The Declaration of Central America, issued by the Presidents of the Central American countries, along with the President of Panama and the President of the United States, is a remarkable document, and in the years ahead will rank as one of the basic documents of the Alliance for Progress. In this document the Presidents of the seven countries addressed themselves to two key problems facing the Central American area: First, the problem of Central American economic integration, and second, the problem of the threat to the internal security of the Central American countries from Castro-Communist subversion.

In my report, on the Alliance for Progress that was issued last week, it was my privilege to discuss these matters at some length.

Today I will note only one or two highlights contained in the Declaration of Central America. First, I am happy to note the expressed determination of the seven Presidents to accelerate programs aimed at achieving the economic integration of the area, and that the United States has indicated a willingness to make a substantial contribution to a special fund to promote regional integration. I take particular pleasure in noting that this proposal is similar to one contained in my report on the Alliance for Progress. I am also encouraged that the President of the United States indicated our willingness to make available substantial assistance to implement a regional plan for economic and social development, when such a plan is completed by the Central American countries. In all of these actions, our Government is once again making unmistakably clear our support of the regional integration movement in Central America.

On the question of resisting Communist subversion in Central America, it is encouraging to note that the Declaration of Central America places high priority on early action by members of the OAS to restrict movement of materiel, propaganda and funds, as well as arms and trained saboteurs, to and from Cuba. To achieve this aim, the Central American countries and the United States will cooperate in joint programs for additional air and sea surveillance to cut down on the movement of men and materiel from Cuba, and will work out a system of exchanging intelligence information on the movement of people, money, propaganda, and arms between Cuba and Central American countries.

Third, I am happy to note that the Presidents took note of the plight of the Cuban people, and expressed their sympathy for them. In my report last week I stated:

> At the same time it is important that throughout Cuba and all Latin America it be clearly understood that we want the Castro-Communist tyranny to be replaced with the best of governments, that we will not tolerate a rightwing dictatorship. A Cuban government dedicated to political liberty and economic and social reforms will have the firm support of the United States.

It is heartening to note that the Presidents of the Central American countries and the President of the United States share this view. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, at this point in my remarks, an article reporting on the meetings in Costa Rica.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 19, 1963]

Costa Rica Crowd Hails Kennedy—Pledge To Contain Cuba Communism Is Wildly Cheered

(By Dan Kurzman, Staff Reporter)

San José, Costa Rica, March 18.—This usually sleepy Caribbean capital went wild today as virtually the whole population turned out to welcome President Kennedy in a frenzied reception that surprised even the optimistic observers.

The crowds that greeted Mr. Kennedy were estimated at more than 250,000. After a tumultuous greeting along the 3-mile route from the airport to the Presidential Palace, Mr. Kennedy last night addressed the Presidents of the six Central American Republics in San José's ornate National Theater.

WALL OF DETERMINATION

"We will build a wall around Cuba—not a wall of mortar or brick or barbed wire but a wall of dedicated men determined to protect their own freedom and sovereignty," he said after hearing speeches by the other conference participants.

In opening his 3-day meeting with the Presidents of the six Middle-American nations he vowed "fierce and unyielding resistance" to the spread of "foreign tyranny" in the Western Hemisphere.

"The Soviet Union through its Cuban puppets absorbed the Cuba nation into its despotic empire—and it now seeks to extend its rule to the shores of continental America," Mr. Kennedy said.

"At the Organization of American States, at this meeting and wherever Americans gather to consult about the future of their continent, we will continue to strengthen the structure of resistance to subversion."

ALLIANCE STRESSED

A major portion of the President's speech was devoted to the Alliance for Progress. Mr. Kennedy pledged continued U.S. aid toward the developing Central American Economic Community and congratulated the assembled nations on their long-range economic vision. All except Panama have joined in a move toward economic integration.

"We shall continue under the Alliance to build economies more balanced and less dependent on one or two export commodities," he said. "To this end, we must push forward plans for industrialization, greater crop diversification, strong educational facilities and better utilization of resources."

From the moment the President and his party left the airport, where he was greeted by his host, President Francisco J. Orlich of Costa Rica, the waiting throngs were an explosive mass of emotion. The President's car was swallowed up in a sea of screaming people waving United States and Central American flags, and it was impossible to see him, or the car, even from several feet behind.

Dozens of youths climbed aboard the press buses that followed and stamped on the roof. Others reached into the windows to shake the hands of reporters who were reminded of the tumultuous welcome given President Eisenhower in New Delhi 4 years ago.

Smiling women in summery print dresses held up their children to see the procession. Many people made the V-sign with their fingers.

"This is one of the most important days in Latin American history," one Costa Rican official said.

It was apparent that the spirit of mutual partnership in which the Alliance for Progress was spawning was at last showing signs of blossoming. The Central American people were known to be friendly to the United States, and their hospitality was anticipated. But today's demonstration appeared to indicate more than friendliness. It seemed to reflect a sense of genuine kinship.

The tremendous welcome given Mr. Kennedy augurs well for the 3-day Presidential conference that started today. There is hope here that the wild enthusiasm will give the Alliance for Progress a significant shot in the arm, at least in Central America.

And it seemed to give more meaning to President Orlich's welcoming remark that the results of the Conference may affect all Latin America as well as the rest of the world.

In a brief reply at the airport, Mr. Kennedy said:

"I come here today not only with Members of Congress and the Secretary of State but as the representative of 180 million fellow Americans who want this hemisphere to be free and an example to a watching world in the crucial years of this century," he said.

American officials here are stressing that economic integration under the Alliance will be the main topic of conversation, and that the issue of subversion will be secondary.

The meeting is regarded as a means of putting some teeth into a statement made by President Kennedy at a recent news conference that the social and economic improvement of the Latin nations was the most important hemisphere problem.

Measures to be taken to reduce Castro-Communist subversion, it appears, will be discussed more for political purposes than as a topic of overwhelming importance. The Presidents of the six isthmus nations represented—Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Panama—actually seem more interested in discussing subversion than do the others.

This is attributed by diplomatic observers partly to an honest fear of Castro-Communist activity, partly to efforts to take the minds of the people off explosive domestic problems, and partly to a desire to please what is believed to be a large segment of American popular and congressional opinion.

It is expected that the final communique will recommend that antisubversion measures be taken by the participating nations individually, particularly in regard to restrictions on travel to and from Cuba.

The United States is likely to set the stage, however, for an impressive offer of economic aid after the conference to facilitate the advancement of the Central American Common Market and other measures for economic integration, which is considered necessary for the area's advancement under the Alliance and the containment of communism.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the first article tells of the warm and enthusiastic reception which the President of the United States received when he arrived at San José. The article is entitled "Costa Rica Crowd Hails Kennedy." The article states, in part:

> This usually sleepy Caribbean capital went wild today as virtually the whole population turned out to welcome President Kennedy in a frenzied reception that surprised even the most optimistic observers.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of President Kennedy's speech, delivered in San José on March 18, for the opening of his conference with the presidents of the Central American Republics; also a news article entitled "Anti-Castro Plan Set Up at San José"; also the official text of the Declaration of Central America; and also the text of President Kennedy's speech at Costa Rica University

There being no objection, the addresses, the article, and the declaration were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 19, 1963]

Text of Kennedy Speech at San José Conference

In 1825 a son of El Salvador and a citizen of Central America, Antonio Jose Canas, first minister accredited by the United Provinces of Central America to the United States, delivered an invitation to Secretary of State Henry Clay.

He asked him to send representatives to the first Inter-American Congress at Panama, a meeting at which he said the struggling new nations of this hemisphere "might consider upon and adopt best plan for defending states of new world from foreign aggression and * * * raise them to that elevation of wealth and power which from their resources they may attain."

Today, 108 years later, we are gathered in this theater in pursuit of those same goals—preservation of our independence, extension of freedom and elevation of welfare of our citizens to a level as high as "from our resources" we can attain.

And today I, too, have come from the United States at the invitation of Central America, which, with Panama, is rapidly attaining a unity of purpose, effort and achievement which has been unknown since the dissolution of that earliest federation.

That early conference did not achieve all its goals. But from it flowed a dream and creation of Bolivar and Canas and Jose Cecilio de Valle of Costa Rica—a dream which became the inter-American system, and this system has been the most successful, the most fruitful and most enduring system of international order in the history of all the world.

UNMATCHED RECORD

We can say this without exaggeration, because every effort to reimpose despotisms of the old world on the people of the new has been ultimately beaten back, because within this system 20 republics have attained full recognition of their dignity as sovereign nations—and because this system has maintained an unmatched record of peaceful relations among its members.

There have been occasional conflicts to mar this record. But nowhere else have nations lived as neighbors with so little hostility and warfare. And today the principle of nonintervention and peaceful resolution of disputes has been so firmly imbedded in our tradition that the heroic democracy in which we meet today can pursue its national goals without an armed force to guard its frontiers. In few other spots in the world would this be true.

We have not attained this strength by trying merely to protect what was already won, to preserve gains of the past to maintain the status quo. If these were our system's goals it would inevitably have crumbled as old orders crumbled.

Instead it has survived, prospered and grown despite wars and revolutions, despite changing ideologies and changing technologies, despite shifts in power and shifts in wealth—because it has itself been an instrument of change, profound revolutionary change which has molded the history of this hemisphere and shaped the thinking of men seeking freedom and dignity.

UNIQUE EFFORT

As each powerful new wave of ideas and aspirations has swept across our shores the inter-American system has been able to translate these ideas and aspirations into working reality for our people. In this respect it has been unique among efforts at world collaboration and this is why it has endured and will endure in future.

In the first three centuries of our history seeds of Western civilization and culture were here planted. In the next century we established an inter-American system which helped to complete and maintain our freedom from foreign rule.

This freedom has often been challenged—as it is challenged today in Cuba. But with help of dedicated and brave men—men such as those who drove out Maximilian or men such as those who prevented Spanish reconquest in 1866, men such as Costa Rica's Juan Rafael Mora, who helped drive out William Walker—with such help we have destroyed all efforts at foreign conquest in the past as we will ultimately triumph over aggressors of today.

In the 50 years following its creation the inter-American system worked to establish politically the equality and national dignity of all its members to extend political democracy and to strengthen the principle that no nation should forcibly impose its will upon another.

Those goals have been largely met. Equality of sovereign states is accepted by all. Intervention and force have been renounced, machinery of peaceful settlement has been strengthened. Democracy rules in most of our lands and it will ultimately prevail over the last vestiges of tyranny in every land in this hemisphere.

NEW CHALLENGES

Now, in our own time the inter-American system faces old foes and new challenges and it is again demonstrating capacity for change which has always given it strength. Foes are stronger and more determined than ever before and challenges are more difficult, more complex and more burdensome.

For today we are faced not merely with protection of new nations, but with remolding of ancient societies—not only with the destruction of political enemies but with the destruction of poverty, hunger, ignorance, and disease—not alone with the creation of national dignity, but with the preservation of human dignity. To meet this enormous challenge peoples of the Americas have fashioned an Alianza.

The Alliance for Progress is a system in which all American states have mobilized their resources and energies to secure land for the landless, education for those without schools, and a faster rate of economic growth within a society where all can share in fruits of progress.

Here in Central America we have already begun to move toward goals of Alianza. You have made enormous strides toward creation of the Central American economic community of 13 million people. New regional institutions have been created, a Central American Bank has been established, and centralized planning and direction are going ahead in education, finance, and many other fields.

I congratulate you on your effort to reestablish a historic unity to meet new needs and I pledge my Government's continued assistance to that effort.

REFORM CITED

In addition, you have begun to formulate long-range economic development plans essential to the success of Alianza. In nearly every country represented here, new land reform or tax reform programs have been adopted in an effort to meet basic pledges of increased social justice contained in the charter of Punta Del Este and demanded by your people.

In the 2-year period beginning July 1961 under programs supported by the United States as its contribution to the Alliance, almost 3,000 new classrooms will have been built in nations represented here today, almost a million new books have been distributed, and tomorrow we will begin to distribute more than 2 million more to children hungry for learning.

More remains to be done. Some 7,600 new homes will have been built during this 2-year period under Alianza programs in these nations, but far more remains to be built.

Six thousand new teachers have been trained as well as many thousands of agricultural workers, public health, and other public administrators. Still more are needed.

During the last 18 months almost 3 million people in Central America—farmers, workers, children, and slum dwellers—have received some form of direct benefit under Alianza, and almost $250 million of external resources has been committed in support of the Alliance in Central America and Panama to help strengthen the basic structure of the economy and at the same time meet basic needs of people for improved health, education, and housing.

COFFEE AGREEMENT

Finally a revolutionary worldwide agreement to stabilize the price of coffee has been entered into which we in the United States are determined to make work—to protect your most vital source of export earnings. And we are also willing to move ahead on agreements stabilizing prices of other commodities so that your future prosperity will not depend on often destructive fluctuation of prices beyond your control.

Tomorrow, at El Bosque, we will see with our own eyes how Alianza enters into lives of the citizens of Costa Rica, providing them with new homes in which they and their families could find decent shelter for the first time.

We shall continue under the Alliance to build economies more balanced and less dependent on one or two export commodities. To this end we must push forward plans for industrialization, greater crop diversification, stronger educational facilities and better utilization of resources.

Yet we cannot be satisfied with the progress we have made. Peoples who have waited centuries for opportunity and dignity cannot wait much longer. And unless those of us now making an effort are willing to redouble our efforts, unless the rich are willing to use some of their riches more wisely, unless the privileged are willing to yield up their privileges to common good, unless the young and educated are given opportunity to use their education, and unless governments are willing to dedicate themselves tirelessly to the tasks of governing efficiently and developing swiftly, then let us realize our Alianza will fail and with it will fall the society of free nations which our forefathers labored to build.

CUBA UNDER COMMUNISM

Unfortunately, while this new endeavor goes forward we are also confronted by one of the oldest of our enemies. For at the very time that newly independent nations rise in the Caribbean the people of Cuba have been forcibly compelled to submit to new imperialism more ruthless, more powerful, and more deadly in its pursuit of power than any this hemisphere has known.

Just when it was hoped that Cuba was about to enter upon a new era of democracy and social justice, the Soviet Union through its Cuban puppets absorbed the Cuban nation into its despotic empire and it now seeks to extend its rule to shores of the continent itself.

But other foreign powers have discovered the American hemisphere is not fertile ground for foreign tyranny and any effort to spread such rule will meet with fierce and unyielding resistance. For Americans will not easily yield up those freedoms which they shed so much blood to achieve.

At the OAS, at this meeting and whenever Americans gather to consult about the future of their continent, we will continue to strengthen the structure of resistance to subversion.

I am hopeful that at this meeting we will again increase our capacity to prevent infiltration of Cuban agents, money, and propaganda. We will build a wall around Cuba—not a wall of mortar or brick or barbed wire, but a wall of dedicated men determined to protect their own freedom and sovereignty.

In 1822, Bolivar, father of the inter-American system, said this: "United in heart, in spirit, and in arms this continent * * * must raise its eyes * * * to peer into centuries which lie ahead. It can then contemplate with pride those future generations of men, happy and free, enjoying to full the blessings that heaven bestows on this earth and recalling in their hearts protectors and liberators of our day."

My friends and colleagues: today we meet, representing seven of the great Republics of America, united in spirit and in arms. We are confident of our ultimate success in protecting our freedom, in raising living standards of our citizens, in beginning a new era of hope in American history. Secure in that confidence, we, too, can look forward to future centuries, knowing that our descendants also will gratefully recall in their hearts "protectors and liberators" of our day.

ANTI-CASTRO PLAN SET UP AT SAN JOSÉ—SEVEN PRESIDENTS AGREE ON AID FOR CENTRAL AMERICA

(By Morris W. Rosenberg)

SAN JOSÉ, COSTA RICA, March 19.—The United States and six middle American nations vowed tonight to halt Castro Communist subversion with ships and planes if necessary and combat the threat of Soviet imperialism via Cuba with a massive assault on economic and social ills.

President Kennedy and the Latin chiefs of state wound up the second day of their San José meeting with a 2,000-word "Declaration of Central America" that raised no threat of armed intervention in Cuba but affirmed their "conviction that Cuba soon will join the family of free nations."

They emphasized that in the meantime they would not suffer the Castro regime's efforts to subvert the six nations.

The declaration disclosed arrangements for special U.S. cooperation in additional sea and air surveillance and interception within territorial waters to block any Cuban attempts to smuggle agents, guns, and propaganda into Central America.

RESTRICTIONS PLANNED

In addition, the Presidents of Panama, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Honduras summoned a meeting of Interior Ministers for early April to "put into immediate effect common measures to restrict the movement of their nationals to and from Cuba and the flow of material, propaganda, and funds from that country."

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in response to questions at a news briefing, would not rule out a possibility that Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy would represent the United States at the meeting. It probably would be held in Managua, Nicaragua.

Rusk said President Kennedy gave the six Latin Presidents "the full story" of U.S. military commitments in the Cuban crisis. Citing measures to isolate the Castro regime, Rusk said "about the only thing not being done (by the United States) is shooting at Cuba."

After their second closed-door meeting of the day, the seven Presidents sat in a box in Costa Rica's ornate National Theater while Foreign Minister Daniel Odubur of Costa Rica read the declaration from the stage at a formal meeting of the Foreign Ministers.

Most of the statement was devoted to plans for economic development of the middle American nations, and Mr. Kennedy pledged what was called a substantial initial American contribution to a new fund to finance regional development projects. No figure was given, but Central American leaders spoke earlier of the need for $200 million.

It was emphasized, however, that money was not enough to turn back the threat of communism.

"In order to carry out their programs for social and economic betterment," it said, "it is essential to reinforce the measures to meet subversive aggression originating in focal points of Communist agitation which Soviet imperialism may maintain in Cuba or in any other place in America."

As for Cuba, the seven Presidents declared they "have no doubt that the genuine Cuban revolution will live again and that its betrayers will fall into the shadows of history and the martyred people of the oppressed isle of the Caribbean will be free from foreign Communist domination."

As the most effective means of combating Communist agitation and social discontent in the area, the declaration emphasized that Panama and the Central American States will join with renewed vigor in implementing the aims of the Alliance for Progress.

Between conference sessions earlier today, Mr. Kennedy visited a suburban housing project under construction as a joint United States-Costa Rican effort and said such projects will further the goals of democracy in this hemisphere.

These goals, he said, "call for ever-increasing standards of living which can liberate each individual for the full use of his capacities in the pursuit of a better life."

Today's sessions fell on the Feast Day of St. Joseph, Patron Saint of Costa Rica. This Roman Catholic holiday is a national holiday here and Mr. Kennedy observed it by attending special services at the San José Cathedral.

President Francisco J. Orlich of Costa Rica, his host, was seated at the place of honor in front of the altar and President Kennedy in a special chair nearby.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 20, 1963]

OFFICIAL TEXT OF DECLARATION OF CENTRAL AMERICA

The Presidents of the Republics of Central America and Panama are determined to improve the well-being of their peoples and are aware such a task demands a dynamic economic and social development program based on the carefully planned use of human, natural and financial resources. It also depends on important changes of the economic, social, and administrative structure within the framework of principles that govern our democratic institutions. They have met with the President of the United States in San José to review difficulties which impede the achievement of these objectives as well as the progress thus far made in the isthmus since the integration programs began and since the Alliance for Progress was jointly established by the Republics of the hemisphere in August 1961.

Following an analysis of the situation, the Presidents of the Republics of Central America are convinced the best hope for the development of the region is through economic integration and, bearing in mind extraordinary efforts made toward this end in the last decade and of the importance of accelerating

overall economic growth, pledge to their peoples:

To accelerate the establishment of a customs union to perfect the functioning of the Central American Common Market—to formulate and implement national economic and social development plans, coordinating at the Central American level, and progressively to carry out regional planning for various sectors of the economy.

To establish a monetary union and common fiscal monetary and social policies within the program of economic integration.

To cooperate in programs to improve the prices of primary export commodities.

To complete soonest possible reforms needed to achieve the objectives set forth in the Act of Bogotá and the Charter of Punta del Este, especially in the fields of agriculture, taxation, education, public administration and social welfare.

To take the above measures with a view to achieving creation of a Central American Economic Community which will establish relationship with other nations or regional groups having similar objectives.

The Central American Presidents affirm the economic integration movement in itself constitutes an effort which is laying the groundwork for regional planning in which sectoral plans of common interest to the isthmian Republics serve as a point of departure. Their governments already have taken measures to coordinate national plans so their execution will aid, rather than impede, achievement of the objectives of the economic integration program.

It is intended that the first global plan for harmonious regional development will be presented as soon as possible for evaluation in accordance with procedures set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este. Meanwhile, the Central American Presidents declare their resolve to proceed immediately with their sectoral plans and with projects of interest to the isthmus. The President of the United States agrees to consider a long-term loan to enable appropriate Central American regional organizations, principally the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, to conduct an economic feasibility survey relative to this program of regional development.

The Presidents of Central America reaffirmed their hope the Republic of Panama will participate more closely in the economic integration movement and the President of Panama declares his government fully reaffirms its support of the program of Central American economic integration. He further declares his government is prepared to initiate immediate negotiations with the governments of the general treaty of economic integration as a whole, with a view to concluding a special agreement to facilitate association of his country with the program.

The President of the United States is impressed by the determination of the Presidents of the Central American republics to move as rapidly as possible toward integration of the economies of their countries and their intention to formulate a regional economic development plan within which national plans will be monetary, fiscal, economy and social policies. It is a great step forward in achievement of this objective as well as toward achievement of the goals set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este.

The President of the United States is prepared to offer the greatest cooperation in preparation and implementation of the regional and national development projects of Central America and Panama and declares that his Government will intensify its joint efforts with the governments and appropriate regional organizations in order to extend to them increased technical and financial assistance for this purpose within the framework of the broad regional program entitled joint exposition of the Presidents of Central America and the development plan being prepared by Panama.

U.S. CONTRIBUTION

To this end he proposes a fund for Central American economic integration to be made available through the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, to which the United States would make an immediate substantial initial contribution to assist in carrying out regional development projects in accordance with various sectoral plans now being developed by regional organizations.

For the longer term he also declares that as soon as the Central American Republics have formulated an overall regional development plan and as soon as this plan has been evaluated favorably in accordance with procedures established in the Charter of Punta del Este, the United States will enlarge and expand its participation in the fund and will work with the Central American countries in obtaining other free world resources so that the agreed plan can be effectively implemented.

The Presidents have discussed the fundamental importance to economic development of a vigorous and freely competitive private sector and declare their intention of taking necessary steps to encourage private investment which is prepared to accept normal responsibilities compatible with development of a modern economy. These measures include establishment of regional trade and promotion offices for the specific purpose of attracting private foreign investment. They also agree that development banks or corporations should be established in each country as soon as possible to provide credit on reasonable terms for the growth of private industry, the President of the United States offering financial assistance to their operation.

BETTER LIVING STANDARD

Currently they agree that economic and social conditions should be created to assure labor of an improved living standard through better distribution of national income. Furthermore, they agree to encourage and support free democratic labor organizations as a means of contributing toward greater worker participation in the common effort on behalf of the general welfare.

The Presidents also agree that opportunities should be given to the people of Central America to build and purchase their homes. There exist in Central America national savings and loan institutions which have been assisted under Alliance for Progress, and others are about to be created. In order to give further support for these national efforts the Presidents of Central America suggest that a regional home loan department which would be a secondary source of home mortgage funds should be created as a division within the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, and the President of the United States agrees to offer technical and financial assistance to it.

The isthmian Presidents indicate that Central American institutions should be strengthened as much as possible to enable them to play a major role in training personnel who will be needed to put into effect plans for integration of the isthmus. The large part of the responsibility for training will devolve on the Superior Council of Central American Universities (CSUCA). Recognizing, moreover, that trained manpower at all levels is needed for economic development, they agree to a proposal of the President of the United States to establish a multimillion-dollar scholarship fund for vocational training in agriculture and in industry for young people of outstanding ability who cannot afford normal expenses of such training, to which the United States will offer substantial financial assistance.

IMPORTANCE OF COFFEE

The Presidents note the primary role of coffee in the economies of Central America and the importance of an international coffee agreement for achievement of stable and remunerative prices.

They reiterate the intention of their governments to fully support the agreement so that it will serve as an effective instrument to improve the earnings of exporting countries from coffee and to promote their economic development.

Other primary commodity problems exist and the isthmian Presidents will hand to President Kennedy studies on these problems.

President Kennedy agrees he will have them reviewed immediately on his return to Washington.

The Presidents, notwithstanding the fact that present conditions are favorable to undertake a solution of economic and social problems of the isthmus through joint action of countries of area, believe that all of them are faced with an extremely provoked political problem which by its very nature can imperil the exercise of representative democracy and normal development of plans in which their respective governments are engaged to attain as rapidly as possible the highest levels of economic and social justice and to bring to full realization plans for Central American integration. Consequently the Presidents declare that in order to carry out their program for social and economic betterment it is essential to reinforce measures to meet subversive aggression originating in focal points of Communist agitation, which Soviet imperialism may maintain in Cuba or in any other place in America.

The Presidents note that the Council of Organization of American States is actively engaged in maintaining vigilance over continued intervention of the Sino-Soviet powers in this hemisphere as requested by the eighth meeting of consultation of foreign ministers. They express special interest in early completion by the Council of OAS of studies on Castro-Communist subversion in the hemisphere and particularly in early action by the Council on recommendations to the governments for counteracting those activities in these areas.

MEETING CALLED

The Presidents agree that the Ministers of Government of the seven countries should meet early in April to develop and put into immediate effect common measures to restrict movement of their nations to and from Cuba and the flow of material propaganda and funds from that country.

This meeting will take action among other things to secure stricter travel and passport controls, including appropriate limitations in passports and other travel documents on travel to Cuba. Cooperative arrangements among not only the countries meeting here but also among the OAS members will have to be sought.

To restrict more effectively not only these movements for subversive purposes of people but also to prevent insofar as possible introduction of money, propaganda, materials, and arms arrangements for additional sea and air surveillance and interception within territorial waters will be worked out with special cooperation from the United States.

In addition to these measures a more rapid and complete exchange of intelligence information on movement of people, propaganda, money, and arms between Cuba and our countries is to be developed by a meeting of ministers.

SYMPATHY FOR CUBANS

The Presidents voice their deep sympathy for the people of Cuba and reaffirm their conviction that Cuba soon will join the family of free nations. The Presidents recall how in 1959 the Cuban people were fired with hope of a purely Cuban revolution that was to bring them freedom and social justice, honest government, and free elections, fair sharing of goods, opportunities for all, more schools and jobs, better health and housing, and constructive land reforms, not collectivization of land. In sum a progressive republic which, in the words of Marti, would be "con todos y para todos." The Presidents declare that they have no doubt that a genuine Cuban revolution will live again, that its betrayers will fall into shadows of history and the martyred people of the oppressed isle of the Caribbean will be free from foreign Communist domination, free to choose for themselves the kind of government they wish to have, and free to join their brothers of the hemisphere in a common undertaking to secure for each individual liberty, dignity, and well being, which are the objectives of all free societies.

Finally the Presidents solemnly reaffirm their adherence to the principles established by treaty of reciprocal assistance of the Rio de Janeiro Charter of the OAS, in the act of Bogotá and in the charter of Punta del Este.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21 1963]

TEXT OF KENNEDY'S SPEECH AT COSTA RICA UNIVERSITY

It is a great pleasure to leave Washington where I am lectured to by professors to come to Costa Rica where I can talk to students.

In 1834 it was written of your city that "the people of San José (are) persuaded that knowledge produces all good and dispels all evil, that from it come good laws, good customs, good government, and that in short it is the soul of all happiness."

This great university is proof of that judgment, for from behind its walls have come much of the knowledge, the skill and the learning that have made Costa Rica one of the most enlightened and progressive democracies in the world—a principal source of good laws, good customs and a good government. Although I am not sure that your university courses can take credit for the beautiful women for which your country is also famous, they are well represented here today. I think therefore it is appropriate that the first speech by any United States President to a student audience in Latin America should take place at this center of learning in a nation so dedicated to democracy, and I am honored that you have invited me here.

For the past 3 days seven Presidents of seven American nations have been grappling with great questions which confront this hemisphere. On the answers to these questions depends the preservation of our liberties, the extension of democracy and the welfare and dignity of our people. But behind all the efforts of this week, behind the communiques and declarations, elaborate programs and the ambitious projects, lengthy speeches and formal proclamations, behind all this there has been one fundamental and essential assumption. And that is the assumption that you students—and young people of Latin America—are prepared to take up the great cause of liberty and welfare on which we are embarked.

More than half the population of Latin America is in your age group or younger. Without your effort and sacrifice and leadership, the plans and hopes of today's leaders for tomorrow's hemisphere will be doomed to failure. But with your help we can and will succeed.

This is an awesome task and a great opportunity. For we—you and I—are embarked together on a great adventure, the greatest perhaps since an Italian mariner first set sail for the west and touched on this old land. To you has been given the task of demonstrating that free men can conquer ancient enemies of poverty, hunger and ignorance—of protecting freedom against those who would destroy it—of bringing hope to those who search for hope—and of extending liberty to those who lack it. This is an immense task. It is filled with difficulties and dangers, hardships and hazards. But you have also been given an opportunity to shape history and serve man which has come to few generations of men.

RENDEZVOUS WITH DESTINY

And what Franklin Roosevelt said to the people of the United States I can say now here to you: This generation of Americans—your generation of Americans—has a rendezvous with destiny.

I am confident that you will meet that rendezvous. For I can remember my own country when it was quite different from the country we know today. It was not so many years ago that I was a university student as you are now. And at that time only 1 out of every 10 American farms was electrified—half the farmers of our Southland were tenants and sharecroppers—thousands of families in the Tennessee River Valley had cash incomes of less than $100 a year—and all this was in addition to a great depression which had thrown 12 million people out of work, 10 times the population of your country and almost the population of all Central America. This was the United States of my own university days.

Then under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt we carried through a great New Deal. One program after another brought an end to tenancy, helped farmers win title to their own land, brought electricity to the countryside, transformed the poverty-stricken Tennessee Valley into a thriving industrial and agricultural area, and demonstrated to every man the immense power of an affirmative free government—the power which adds the idea of social responsibility to the idea of individual liberty.

I tell you this story not out of any sense of complacency or satisfaction that the job in my country is done. For we in the United States still have much unfinished work—to improve our housing and cities, our economy, our education and equal opportunities for all our citizens. That fight is still going forward.

But the New Deal does illustrate the transformation which a single energetic generation can make in the life of a country. And it is also an illustration of the capacity of free men to achieve a profound peaceful revolution on behalf of economic progress and social justice.

It is perhaps difficult for you to think of the United States as a revolutionary country—a country which has carried out many basic and sweeping social changes during its short history. But my country like all the countries of the Americas is the possessor of a profound revolutionary tradition which has helped shape the modern world. For it was in Philadelphia in 1776 and in Guatemala in 1821 that the American nations became the first to strike against colonial rule. And today in Africa, Asia and the Middle East, newly emerging nations are still struggling to perfect national independence and the freedom from foreign domination which we were first to achieve.

TRIBUTE TO FREE MEN

This history is an answer to those who claim that free people lack the drive and flexibility to remold the societies in which they live. The history of the Americas—the history of your own country in the last 20 years—is a tribute to the capacity of free men to call upon the deepest reservoirs of human mind and spirit. And if the task of progress with freedom is more complex, subtle and difficult than the promise of progress without freedom, we are unafraid of the challenge. We are prepared to follow that path which advances man's welfare without destroying his dignity. And we know that lessons of our past promise success for our future.

Our goals for the future of this hemisphere—the challenge we have issued to you and to your compatriots throughout the Americas—is contained in the Alianza para el Progreso. Within the framework of this Alianza are contained four basic principles of American society which it will be your task to build.

First of these is the right of each nation to govern itself, to be free from outside dictation or coercion, to mold its own economy and society in any fashion consistent with the will of its people. Within our inter-American system we will accept no new empires and no domination of one nation by another.

Second is the right of each individual citizen to political freedom and individual liberty—the right to speak his view, to worship God in his own way, to select the government which rules him and to reject it when it no longer serves the good of the nation. We have taken great strides toward achievement of this right in the last two decades but the job is not yet finished and it will not be finished until every American lives under freedom

Third is the right to social justice, the right of every citizen to participate in the progress of his nation. This means land for the landless and education for those who are today denied the right to learn. It may often mean that ancient institutions which serve merely to perpetuate the privileges of a fortunate few will be ended. It means that rich and poor alike must bear a fair share of the burden of national development. It will not be easy to achieve social justice but the experience of my own nation has been that once it is achieved it leads inevitably to a richer and fuller life for all.

The fourth principle of the Alianza is the right of every nation to pursue a course of rapid economic progress which modern knowledge and technology have made possible. We of the United States who have been fortunate in our own development have committed vast resources to assist those who have been less fortunate. And Latin American nations themselves have pledged to mobilize their own resources and energies to carry forward the task of development. This task is not easy either. To break centuries-old bonds of hunger and poverty and ignorance will require sacrifice and unending toil. But we are determined to pursue this road.

These are principles of our Alianza para el Progreso whose ultimate fulfillment is in your hands. They will not be attained by speeches or documents but by work and sacrifice, courage and endurance, on the part of millions of individuals throughout this hemisphere.

I speak to you as men and women pursuing the highest calling of a free society. A distinguished leader of my own country, Thomas Jefferson, once warned us that "if a nation expects to be ignorant and free * * * it expects what never was and never will be, that no other foundation than education can be devised for preservation of freedom and happiness."

That is why you who are fortunate enough to be attending this school have also assumed a great obligation along with that opportunity. A distinguished rector of your university—for whom this campus is named—Dr. Ordigo Facio—wrote that "liberty is not a thing but a way of life which needs to constantly grow, to expand, to become stronger, if it is to live—for her to stop is to surrender—to become rigid is to lose the breath of life."

In your hands, my friends, have been placed tools of knowledge and skill which can make liberty grow and flourish.

Now I return to the United States. I return with the renewed confidence that I have seen here at this university those whose

efforts will insure that the hopes and labors of my generation of Americans shall not have been in vain.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I particularly call to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of those who may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarkable address delivered by President Kennedy to the young people at the University of Costa Rica.

Frequently we hear it said that university students in such countries are not very friendly to American visitors. On the other hand, I have never found that to be the case when, as a Senator, I have visited these countries. In my visits, I have found the university students to be very friendly, very active, very inquisitive, and sometimes quite probing with their questions. But they are always willing to listen and always willing to learn.

President Kennedy thrilled the students there, and I am sure he set an excellent example for the Presidents of other great countries. In his address, President Kennedy cited the history of the United States as an example of the revolutionary, progressive spirit which should grip a people who are seeking a better life.

Mr. President, earlier in these remarks I mentioned that last week I had released a report entitled "A Report on the Alliance for Progress," based upon two trips to South and Central America. I now ask unanimous consent that selected excerpts from this report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From release of Mar. 16, 1963]

SELECTED EXCERPTS: REPORT ON ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

In terms of where it was a year ago, the Alianza para el Progreso has taken a giant leap forward. In terms of where it has yet to go, it has taken only a short faltering step.

In reviewing the Alliance today, there are solid grounds for encouragement—and serious grounds for concern. The Alliance has begun to gather momentum; the question is whether it can maintain and increase this momentum sufficiently to overcome the obstacles it now faces and those which loom in the near future.

Latin America needs a new deal. And the United States needs to understand that the changes we are calling for in Latin America—the reforms that we are demanding—will bring in their wake political, economic, and social developments which may not be readily understood or even acceptable to the United States. We are asking for a peaceful democratic revolution. We ought to understand that such a development is unique in history, particularly in areas where oppression, exploitation, poverty, and discrimination have been an established pattern for many generations. Such a democratic revolution, if it can be accomplished, may bring into power democratic governments that are left of center. In other words, liberal, progressive, and even radical political parties will be in the ascendancy and in power. We should be prepared to see a good deal of disorder, temporary confusion, and political disarray as the reforms and changes come about.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE ALLIANCE

The Alliance is not just another U.S. aid program, but rather a cooperative endeavor by 19 Latin American countries and the United States to enjoy more fully the cultural, spiritual, and material riches available in the 20th century, and to put these within the reach of full populations rather than only a select few. Its origins and its operation spring from both the northern and the southern half of the hemisphere.

Now that the Alliance is in operation, it is readily acknowledged that the actions of Latin American countries themselves in achieving the goals of the Alliance are far more important than those of the United States.

It is silly to think that a program of the magnitude of the Alianza para el Progreso can be carried out without making any mistakes. Indeed, the effort to do so is the biggest mistake of all. The most sterile box score is the one that reads, "no runs, no hits, no errors." A team can survive a few errors if it gets some runs; but no matter how flawless its play, it will surely lose without runs. The Alianza has made a few hits; it has managed to get some men on base. But it badly needs some runs, and it ought to be prepared to take a few chances to get them.

For 2 years now, the emphasis (in the aid program) has been on long-range development—on economic growth and social progress. With some exceptions, and oversimplifying the matter somewhat, the United States has been trying to run a development program with a machine designed for a technical assistance program.

We speak of Latin America, but at best it is only a phrase that represents a broad generalization and roughly identifies a geographical area. Actually, Latin America is made up of individual nation states, all with their own history, background, and culture, and all very different. Therefore, we must face the fact that each country requires special and separate consideration. There is no general program that can be applied universally.

Whatever we do in Latin America we need to remember that Brazil is the key to success or failure. Brazil is the big country, and if the Alliance for Progress fails in Brazil and if our relationships with Brazil deteriorate to the point of noncooperation or emotional hostility, then whatever we seek to do in the Western Hemisphere will be endangered. It should be recognized that the success or failure of the Alliance for Progress in either Chile or Argentina will have far-reaching consequences in the hemisphere.

The experience of the past 2 years indicates that a basic mistake made was not in switching from technical assistance to economic development but in attempting to apply the new economic development formula universally. U.S. officials have attempted to apply it to Venezuela, Chile, and Mexico—with good reason—but also to Honduras, Paraguay, Ecuador, and Guatemala—which are at an entirely different stage in their development. The latter countries at the present time need further technical assistance before any economic development program can ever succeed.

Economic aid to be effective must be used where there is competence in management, skilled workers, and modern business know-how. Capital without the trained people is but a palliative. It yields little or no development. At best, it gives only temporary relief. The U.S. aid program and those of other aid institutions participating in the Alliance must be prepared to gear aid programs to the development level of the various countries in Latin America, not just to those of the more advanced countries. This will require a different balance of technical assistance and capital aid in the Central American countries than in the advanced countries of the southern cone such as Argentina and Chile.

Another factor in administration, closely related to the second is that at the same time that this process of change from technical assistance to economic development was occurring, the administrative machinery in Washington was becoming even more complex, which is to say more cumbersome and less capable of making decisions, even wrong decisions. One expects some administrative confusion in launching a new program, but much of this is plainly inexcusable, especially in a government which thinks it is good enough to include projects in public administration among some of its technical assistance programs abroad. I for one have never received an adequate answer to the question, "Why does it take a year to decide whether to build a housing project in the Dominican Republic, and then another year to actually build it?" Something is wrong here. If there are not sufficient loan officers or engineers available to review and appraise proposals, more should be hired—and if the law does not permit this it should be changed. If legislation is required, Congress should be informed accordingly.

Since 1948 there have been 10 administrators of the foreign aid program. The location of the agency has changed almost as frequently as the administrators. Sheer movement of physical facilities all over the city has created chaos and destroyed morale. Movement of files, desks, and partitions has been enough to leave officials in a state of permanent bewilderment. Under two administrations (1953–63) the foreign aid program has been the best example of administrative bungling in the Federal Government. In actual handling of the aid program, both have operated under the assumption that the program is temporary even while claiming to recognize that it is permanent.

Possibly the greatest single factor in weakening the morale of the aid agency is the succession of 1-year appointees as administrator. It is to be hoped that the appointment by President Kennedy of an experienced administrator, known to have the President's confidence will mean the end of the senseless pattern in which 1-year men are expected to do a 10 year-job. The knowledge by upper echelon officials that the policy directives they must implement will not be changed every year will do much to improve their morale and that of their subordinates. The knowledge that the AID Administrator enjoys the complete confidence of the President will do even more.

To implement successfully such a program requires experienced professionals who will remain in the program over a long period of time. We have learned over the past decade that you cannot tackle 30-year problems with 5-year plans using 1-year money. We must learn that the job cannot be done with 2-year personnel—who leave the program 6 months after they have really learned their job. One must not only recruit good men at both the higher and lower levels but must hold them. The Foreign Service has succeeded in this. The foreign aid program has not.

THE ROLE OF AID

Who makes the key decisions on aid matters for Latin America? Where are they made? On the political side in the State Department the locus of decision making has been fairly clear since the spring of 1962. This unfortunately, is not true on the foreign aid side. When the Alliance was first announced, it was suggested that U.S. programs under it be directed from the White House. This was considered but rejected in view of the formidable obstacles that would result in coordinating them with the State Department. The Alliance aid program was placed with the rest of the foreign aid program in the State Department. Yet it often appeared that the Alliance program was in the State Department and key decisions were made in the White House. If those responsible for the direction of the Alliance aid program are to stand a chance of success, they must have the authority commensurate with their responsibilities. Effective orderly administration of the Alliance program is impossible if designated Alliance officials cannot make final decisions.

The morale of AID personnel in Washington dealing with Latin America is suffering. In some of the missions abroad it is even worse. There is no more urgent task for the Washington headquarters of AID than to give a sense of confidence and firm policy direction to officials in the field. A good way to start would be to delegate more authority to AID mission chiefs and to ambassadors. If the Administration feels a man cannot be trusted, it ought to replace him with a man it feels can be trusted. But it ought not to give men responsibility without authority.

Since mission directors are the representatives of the U.S. Government in the field, it is essential that they understand the thinking of their Washington superiors and enjoy their confidence. This understanding and confidence will ordinarily be gained through regular consultations in Washington, during which directors meet individually with the AID Administrator and the Director of the Latin American region. Ready access to one's superiors in Washington is essential. I am encouraged to hear that the new AID Administrator places a high priority on regular meetings with aid mission directors.

THE COST OF THE ALLIANCE

There are at least three striking differences which should be noted between those three successful programs (point four, food for peace, and Peace Corps) and the economic and military aid programs. All three of these involve the outlay of comparatively small amounts of American dollars. All three have an immediate impact upon the recipient country. All three benefit the common people, rather than the elite group. Because they benefit the common people, they have been gratefully received.

Both military and economic aid are expensive—they involve expenditure of large sums of money. In both cases, the impact of the aid is usually delayed. There is a long time span between the agreement to support the building of a dam, an airport, or an industrial plant and the realization of the goal. In both cases, the immediate benefits are often enjoyed to a disproportionate extent by a small minority of the population—by the military, by contractors, businessmen, and high government officials. There is a pressing need for those types of immediate impact projects which will at least partially satisfy popular demand while long-range projects are being developed. Such programs in education, health, and housing can yield quick politically valuable results.

As the Alliance for Progress develops and more and more countries qualify for the above combination of aid programs, the total aid required may substantially increase. The United States must be prepared to face this prospect. For example, if the plans currently being discussed in Brazil to mobilize the resources of that great country to meet pressing economic and social problems are carried through, the United States should be prepared to render the massive assistance required—assistance which would undoubtedly be on a scale similar to that now available to India.

We should prepare to face the fact that the prospect of increasing our aid program in Latin America may require a careful reevaluation of our assistance to other parts of the world.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The importance of rural development can hardly be overstated. Over half of the countries of Latin America continue to spend sizable amounts of precious foreign exchange reserves to import food to feed their populations. This occurs in countries that are primarily agricultural. For the common man in most of Latin America, the key to a higher standard of living in the near future is still an increase in agricultural productivity. In this field the United States has a record of proven performance. We abound in technical expertise in the field of agriculture and the key to success appears to be our ability to secure the widespread adoption of known and proven techniques.

A successful agricultural program will require not only support of programs aimed at providing supervised credit, seed and fertilizer, machinery, land drainage, but will require continued technical assistance on a large scale. In the United States this massive dissemination of technical know-how was achieved through the agricultural extension system of county agents. Until some Latin American equivalent of this is realized, it is doubtful this can be done even through cooperatives. The choice in Latin America is between cooperatives and collectivism. Cooperatives provide an opportunity to pool resources and technical expertise.

LABOR

Throughout the Central American area, as well as Mexico and Venezuela, progress during the past year has been made in the field of labor. Mexico is a good example. Through our labor information officers assigned to USIA, we are now reaching the trade union movement in Mexico. One reason why we are now being effective is because we are using experienced union men. Five of the nine labor information officers now serving in Mexico City have a union background. These men have earned the confidence of Mexican labor leaders and now are beginning to make an impact in a labor milieu long dominated by Marxist-oriented groups. Some progress can also be noted in the training of Latin American labor leaders in this country. Through the American Institute for Free Labor Development, hundreds of labor leaders are now being brought to the United States for training. This is an excellent program, but can handle only a small fraction of the total number of leaders eligible. Much more needs to be done in this crucial area.

IMPORTANCE OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

I found in my discussions in Latin American countries and I find in my discussions with businessmen here in this country much agreement with the U.S. Coordinator's conclusion: Two years after the Alliance was launched, Latin Americans have come a long way in learning the truth—the fact that the Alliance will succeed only if it accords a large role to a vigorous system of modern private enterprise. They have come a long way in facing the fact that of the $20 billion that will be required from abroad for investment under the Alliance program, $3 billion must come from the United States in private investments. Many now recognize, if they did not when the Alliance was launched in 1961, that the larger share of the investment capital needed for the Alliance must come from private sources, both domestic and foreign.

The pattern for business success in Latin America has already been established—right here in the United States. The U.S. businessman has a record of unparalleled success in adapting to a changing environment, in combining profitable business ventures with farsighted social welfare programs. In adapting to the changing environment of Latin American countries, American business must follow the same practices implemented here at home: support of education, training of nationals for responsible supervisory and managerial positions; sharing of profits, bona fide collective bargaining; opening up stock ownership to the people of the country. In Brazil a prominent and successful businessman told me that American business must expand its stock ownership to more and more Brazilians. He said, "Either get naturalized or be nationalized. Become a part of us instead of using us." His analysis may be prejudiced but it seems to represent the attitude of Latin Americans, rich or poor.

To promote new large scale foreign private investment, some system of international insurance may be needed to guarantee new investments. No individual government can supply all the capital needed. But the U.S. Government, working with European and Latin American governments, could devise a system to guarantee capital lent by private banks to private businesses interested in investing in manufacturing enterprises in Latin American countries. This would follow the procedure now in effect for the housing investment guarantee program under section 224 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1961.

Another essential means of strengthening the private sector is through expansion of trade. The private sector of Latin American economies cannot be strengthened unless markets are available for exports, both commodities and manufactured products. The immediate need is to expand trade between Latin American countries—which is now only 10 percent of their total trade.

One possible way of increasing this inter-country trade would be through the establishment of an export credit system modeled on the U.S. Export-Import Bank. Such a system might be worked out through OAS members, possibly administered through institutions such as the Inter-American Development Bank and/or through the Central American Bank.

THE BATTLE OF ATTITUDES

Even more important than equipping people with the skills needed in a developing economy is exposing both youth and adults to the values and traditions of a free society. This in turn will require that special attention be given to the institutions and media that shape the minds of the men who shape the society—specifically to the university professors, the teachers, to the textbook writers and publishers, to the writers, journalists, and news media personnel. A good example of progress in this area is the textbook program supported by AID in Central America. For the first time, first and second grade children will have modern textbooks published, not by Marxist-oriented presses shipped in from Eastern Europe, but by pro-Western groups and competent educators. This program could profitably be repeated in over half the countries of the continent.

Strange and alien as it may sound to North American ears, the key to controlling a university in many Latin American capitals is control of the student government. For years, Communists have had free run of universities—have had no competition. The vast majority of students and professors are non-Communists. But through organization Communists have dominated the university scene. It is now being proven that they can be beaten through counterorganization. Marxist influence in the national universities in Chile, Venezuela, and the Dominican Republic is now on the decline because the Christian Democratic student organization backed by other pro-Western groups, have organized and have won the student elections, thereby gaining control of the student government. In these instances, democratic oriented groups have matched the leftwing

groups in zeal, in organization and in perseverance—all of which are required to win the intellectual struggle being waged in the universities of Central and South America.

We in the United States are beginning to learn what the Communists have learned long ago—that resources invested in wooing and training the future leaders of society, in all fields, will pay high dividends. But our investment is still a pittance, considering the magnitude of the challenge. I for one have never heard a convincing explanation of why we have not launched a massive program to bring Latin American students and potential leaders to the United States for training and schooling. By massive, I mean 10,000 per year. The cost would be less than that of one modest highway loan, and the benefit for U.S. foreign policy could not be compared.

INFILTRATION OF JOURNALISM

On my trip to the Caribbean area in 1962, I was favorably impressed with improvements in the work of the U.S. Information Agency; its activities seem to have a better sense of proportion and of priority. The Voice of America broadcasts are better, but not yet as good as they ought to be, especially as regards to signal strength. Service to local broadcasters has been effectively strengthened.

In the daily press of many Latin American cities, however, the portrayal of the United States as the "Yanqui imperialist" is continued—or at least goes unchallenged. It is a well-established fact that journalists, and radio and TV commentators are regularly trained in Havana and Moscow and carefully placed in positions in the communications world. The journalist profession has been heavily infiltrated by Marxist trained writers and it is notorious that some large U.S. business firms regularly advertise in the Communist daily that is found in many capital cities.

HELP FROM THE CHURCH

One of the most hopeful signs in Latin America in recent years is the renaissance of the Catholic Church and a new awakening on the part of the church leaders to the shocking social and economic problems of the continent. The farsighted social and economic philosophy of Pope John's recent social encyclical Mater et Magistra is being strongly pushed by the Vatican. Men who once would have been promoted to mountain parishes for their advanced views are now being appointed bishops and cardinals. Efforts are now being pursued to extend the programs in education and health in which the church has long been involved to the mass of the people. An excellent indication of the change taking place in the church in Latin America is found in the pastoral letter on "Social Reform and Common Good" issued in November 1962 by the 24 Roman Catholic bishops of Chile. The pastoral letter scathingly criticized existing social and economic abuses, deplored the inequality in distribution of incomes, and called on the government to extend and speed up its reforms and its social welfare programs. Offering its own example, the church in Chile is now redistributing most of its own lands to local peasants.

Closely related to the new orientation developing in the church is the growth of the Christian democratic movement in Chile, Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, Brazil, Argentina, and Panama. Although currently electorally strong in only two countries, Chile and Venezuela, these strongly reformist pro-Western parties have growing strength in university and labor circles. Such leaders as Eduardo Frei and Radomiro Tomic, in Chile, and Ralfael Caldera, in Venezuela, can be expected to play an increasingly significant role in providing leadership for progressive democratic forces in Latin America.

ECONOMIC INTEGRATION

One of the most promising movements toward economic and political integration is taking place today in Central America. The progress of the six small Central American Republics to achieve economic and political integration is especially gratifying in view of the minimal progress made by the countries of South America in achieving integration through the Latin American free trade area. President Kennedy's trip to San Jose in mid-March to confer with the Presidents of the six Republics is a grand gesture of the support we are giving to the integration movement.

In order to deal with Central America as a unit, the United States has established an AID mission known as ROCAP (Regional Office Central America and Panama) with headquarters in Guatemala.

ROCAP is only a few months old, and its precise relationship to the U.S. country missions and to Washington has not yet taken form, but its general role is clear: It is to use the AID program as a means of encouraging the Central American economic integration movement. Similarly, the basic role of the Central American Bank for Economic Integration is clear: It is to use credit as an instrument of encouraging the movement. ROCAP has able leadership, it has the strong support of the U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, it has been well received by Central American leaders. In the allocation of U.S. funds under the Alliance for Progress program, this regional mission should receive high priority.

As it is our policy to promote integration in Central America, U.S. diplomats and AID officials assigned to Central American countries will be expected to endorse and promote this aim. If the regional mission, the regional bank and the Common Market are the instruments chosen to achieve this goal, then U.S. officials should support them.

I believe the time has come for another dramatic gesture by the United States—this time to accelerate the efforts now being made to achieve economic and social development in Central America. I propose that the United States offer to make available immediately up to $50 million toward the establishment of a Regional Integration Trust Fund to be administered by the Central American Bank. Because of the preference of some countries for bilateral aid, the decision on whether to accept the offer would be made by the governments of the participating countries. It should be discussed at the meeting of presidents next week in San Jose, Costa Rica. The purpose of the fund would be to initiate new projects and accelerate those now underway that contribute most directly toward economic and political integration.

The following discussion of the Cuban issue reflects the conversations held with numbers of Latin American leaders in the Caribbean and in South America. It should be recognized, of course, that differences exist among Latin leaders on this question.

THE THREAT OF TERRORISM

In the case of Latin America today, there is an immediate problem which must be distinguished from the long-range economic and social problems which the Alliance is designed to solve. This is the problem of the external Communist threat from Cuba, backed by the Soviet Union and China. Cuba by itself is not a military threat to the United States, but Cuba as an extension of Soviet military power is a threat to our security. The Cuban threat to Latin America however is not mythological but real. In the immediate sense, it is not economic, but primarily political, propagandistic and paramilitary. The threat arises from the fact that Castro's Cuba, backed by the Soviet Union and China, has become a forward base for the subversion of the hemisphere. It is now a base for indoctrination and training of hundreds of Latin Americans, including training in sabotage, terrorism, and guerrilla tactics. The threat is magnified by the fact that the aroused peoples of Latin America are pressuring their governments to meet basic social and economic problems that have gone unsolved for centuries.

This systematic attempt to subvert democratic governments in Latin America is best seen in the case of Venezuela. Venezuela is today the No. 1 immediate target of Castro-Communist subversion because the Alliance for Progress is succeeding there. It is the immediate target because the subversion of Venezuela with its huge resources of oil and iron would provide a springboard for the penetration of the entire South American continent. It could convert the Caribbean into a Communist sea. The United States has now made it clear that these attacks on Venezuela will not be permitted to succeed. They will be repelled—regardless of cost. Venezuela has top priority for U.S. support. From Cuba, the Communists have unleashed a continual torrent of intimidation, violence and terror in Venezuela. It is no surprise that of the 1,500 persons from Latin America trained in Cuba in 1962, the largest number have been Venezuelans.

Venezuela has withstood attacks from the radical right and Communist conspirators because its democratic government has been capable of defending itself against armed attack from within and because its action programs in economic and social betterment command popular allegiance. It is obvious to the Betancourt government and to the United States that to cope with such attacks, economic aid alone is not sufficiently effective. Meeting the threat requires measures which are primarily paramilitary, political and propagandistic. All of these programs are designed to provide a shield of security behind which the Alliance for Progress can develop. They are essential to repulse the immediate threat to the stability and internal security that are necessary if the long-term Alliance for Progress economic programs are to succeed.

In considering the Communist problem in relation to the Alliance for Progress, we must therefore always bear in mind the distinction between the two salient Communist threats in the Western Hemisphere: (1) the appeal of the Communist economic model as a solution to the economic needs of impoverished people; (2) the attempt of a Communist regime (i.e., Cuba) and Communist groups within Latin American countries to subvert non-Communist governments through armed attack, internal terror and sabotage and propaganda.

The economic threat cannot be met by military solutions—but rather by effective mobilization of resources and accomplishment of reforms by local governments, combined with U.S. help in the form of foreign aid loans, Food for Peace, the Peace Corps and technical assistance. The subversion and terrorism problem requires specific political and internal security measures. Violence and subversion in Latin America cannot be defeated by relying wholly on the elimination of hunger, poverty and disease.

A POLICY ON CUBA

The United States has made it clear that our policy is to eliminate Castroism. The Cuban satellite will never be permitted to gain the status of an Eastern European satellite. Here the commitment itself is more important than the particular means and methods chosen to implement the commitment.

At the same time, it is important that throughout Cuba and all Latin America it is clearly understood that we want the Castro-Communist tyranny to be replaced with a progressive government, that we will not tolerate a rightwing dictatorship. A Cuban Government dedicated to political liberty and economic and social reform will have the firm support of the United States, just as the progressive government of Venezuela does today.

We must emphasize again and again that the United States is dedicated to the welfare of the Cuban people. Although our Government has placed high priority in getting this message to the Cubans themselves (and was particularly successful at the time of the Cuban crisis in October 1962) a good share of the American public has been so preoccupied with the Castro military threat that it has given too little thought to consideration of a program for post-Castro Cuba. Our goal must be a free Cuba participating in the Alliance for Progress working for economic progress, better health, housing, and education—as well as political liberty.

Latin Americans are acutely aware of being under attack. They sometimes express the feeling that North Americans are mesmerized by Cuba as a military threat, whereas they feel the real war with communism goes on year after year at every level of activity. They are as concerned about the young Brazilian who returns from the Soviet Union, Cuba, or China to enter the journalistic profession as they are about the young Peruvian who comes back trained for guerrilla warfare in the Andes.

In describing the degree of infiltration of Communist-trained opinionmakers into the press, radio, TV and other areas of Latin American life, a perceptive Brazilian concluded that over the past decade the Latin American Republics had already received the billionth bullet in the Communist assault.

Our Latin American friends rightly remind us that the Communist problem existed in Latin America long before Castro came to power in Cuba. The Communist Party has been operating in Latin America for decades, and the threat of communism has been growing because the shocking economic and social problems in so many of these countries have gone unsolved.

Even if Castro and communism should be removed from Cuba, this would not eliminate from the Western Hemisphere the problems of Communist terror, subversion and psychological warfare, nor solve the terrible economic and social ills that plague vast areas of Central and South America. We must keep in mind that Cuba, however important, is only a part of the total problem; part of the total challenge we face in Latin America.

If the Alliance for Progress is to succeed in meeting the staggering problems of poverty, illiteracy, maldistribution of wealth, and economic stagnation in vast areas in Latin America, we must administer and support the Alliance with the same sense of urgency that presently motivates our thinking about Cuba.

We are obliged to take note of the differing attitudes toward Cuba among Latin American countries. The governments of the countries on the South American cone, plus Brazil and Mexico, will continue to be under strong pressure from well-organized groups to oppose firm measures against Castro. Most Latin American leaders in the Caribbean area, on the other hand, will firmly support a strong policy although differing sharply on tactics. In my conversations with leaders of the Caribbean countries, I was repeatedly told that Castro had lost much of the popular appeal that he may once have had, and that public opinion regards his government as a dangerous menace to be eliminated, rather than as a model to be copied. But they look to the United States for leadership. I am hopeful that the guidelines of a common policy with respect to the Cuban problem will be agreed to in San Jose at the meeting of the Presidents.

In implementing such a common policy toward Communist-Castro Cuba, we must recognize that our leaders require wide latitude in choosing means, tactics, and timing. The national interest is not served by emotional and flamboyant public speeches, but rather by cooperative planning, cold reckoning, and persistent action to solve the Cuban problem.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to invite the attention of my colleagues particularly to the contents of this report on the organizational structure of the AID administration and the problems which exist in the administration of our Alliance for Progress program. I have called for the same sense of urgency in carrying out this program that we have in our concern over Cuba.

We ought to recognize that whether or not the Communists ever gained a foothold in Cuba, the social and economic problems of South and Central America would be with us. The problems we face today result from years of neglect, years of tyranny, despotism, and aristocracy. Therefore, we are now trying to do in a very few years what should have been underway for decades. Also I have pointed out in the report the importance of our private investments and private enterprise in the Latin American area. I believe that some of the observations on the economic integration movement in Central America are worthy of our thoughtful consideration.

The Central American Republics have possibly done more than any other area in the world, save Western Europe, to develop a program of economic integration and of a common market. They have made great progress. They have competent, experienced, intelligent leaders who are doing their very best to bring about a more stable, just, and progressive society in this hemisphere.

Mr. President, on the same subject matter, I also wish to invite the attention of Senators to an editorial entitled "Castro: Time Waster for Latin Conference," which appeared in the Detroit Free Press, of Tuesday, March 19. It relates to the report by Representative Martha Griffiths, on her recent trip into the Latin American area. Representative Griffiths traveled in Panama, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, and Honduras during December of this past year.

Her report made a very favorable impact upon Members of the House and upon those persons who were privileged to receive it. I commend Representative Griffiths on the very fine report of her study mission and journey. I commend the Detroit Free Press for the thoughtful and constructive editorial that relates to this report and to all the problems that we face in Latin America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Castro a Time Waster for Latin Conference

Telling the Central American nations to forget about Castro for the moment and concentrate on their own problems, as President Kennedy did yesterday, is like telling junior to quit tattling on sister and clean up his own room.

Junior may not like it, but mother knows best.

Without running the real risk of war, there is not much the United States or the Central American nations can do about communism within Cuba right now. The President is doing about as well as anyone can expect.

The real question, which the President wants to deal with, is how to keep communism and Castroism from spreading throughout Latin America. In the Central American nations, he has a good starting place.

As Representative Martha Griffiths reported after her December trip to the area, these six nations—Panama, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Guatemala, and Honduras—are largely ignored in the rest of the world. They are, in varying degrees, desperately poor, and their main export crop, coffee, has suffered a 30- to 40-percent price drop.

Some of the nations, in fact, are so poor that they can hardly afford the temporary drop in tax revenue that a sensible tax reform program would bring. Instead, to get working cash, they have to rely on a jerry-built program of high excise taxes on such things as cablegrams and slaughtering licenses.

In Panama, rural roads are so bad, she said, that it takes a farmer longer to get his goods the 7 miles to market than it did for John Glenn to circle the earth. In Honduras, there are no roads in the eastern half of the country, and even the Inter-American Highway is far from the economic center. Instead of being able to use Alliance for Progress funds for developing industries, the money must go first for roads.

In addition, we have long ignored the Central American nations in favor first of Europe, then Asia, and then South America. Since 1939, during the era of the good neighbor policy, U.S. disbursements to Central America, partly in loans already repaid, have come to only $14.10 per person, or 56 cents a year.

Mrs. Griffiths found that these nations need to do major work on improving their higher education programs, both in the caliber of the work and the role of the universities. Five of the six nations, excluding Panama, have begun to pool their graduate level studies, but this is only a beginning.

A further problem facing these countries—and us—is the simple problem of how to give or lend our money. When we get into aid programs, we do not dip a toe, but plunge head first.

There are, for example, six agencies in the tiny country of Costa Rica borrowing or begging from six different U.S. agencies.

Add on the international lending agencies and the United Nations, and there are 15 channels of U.S. assistance, many working without knowing what the others are doing, and some even working at cross-purposes.

It is no wonder that much of our money is wasted, while the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

To begin on these problems is as much as the Presidents of the six nations, plus Mr. Kennedy, can do in the short and formal time alloted to the San Jose meeting.

It is all well and good that the six Latin Presidents want a declaration of opposition to Castro. But the conference would be a waste if their time is spent discussing how to get rid of him.

Their most effective way, as President Kennedy said, is to solve their own problems, so that the seeds of Castro's communism cannot find fertile soil in Central America.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND BRAZIL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since we are speaking on matters relating to South and Central America, I should like to take the State Department to task for just a moment for what I consider to be a rather amateurish, unprecedented and, I believe, unwarranted handling of very difficult and sensitive relationships between our country and Brazil.

I cannot imagine how this situation developed. To say that the Government of Brazil was being infiltrated by Communists, and to say so in the public press, does little to help our efforts to improve our relationships in Latin America.

There is a time and a place for making statements of that kind if we believe them and if we have evidence to support them. If other so-called friendly governments were to make that kind of charge about our country, we would be very much disturbed, and rightly so. It is not a good idea for the officials of one country to inject themselves into the internal politics of another country, publicly at least. We had ways of doing this through our embassies and our diplomatic missions. But, as many of the newspapers in our country have noted, there was little to be gained and much to be lost by the rather crude and abrupt public comments upon the situation in Brazil. The Brazilian Republic has many problems. As a fellow member of the OAS we have every right to be concerned about those problems. If Brazil should fall by the wayside or should fall into the lap of the Castroites and Communists, the Alliance for Progress would surely fail. Not only that, but the security of our hemisphere would be seriously jeopardized.

There are many men in the Government of Brazil today—and I know some of them—who are as deeply dedicated to the principles of freedom and democracy as is anyone in our country.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of recent days be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Dealing With Brazil

Whatever the chill wind from Paris, there is at least one rift in this country's historic alliances that can and should be promptly repaired. Few countries in the world have been older friends and allies than Brazil, the giant Republic of South America, which, more than any other, may determine the success of the Alliance for Progress. For more than 2 years there has been static in United States-Brazilian relations, a melancholy outbreak of petty vexations in which an insistence on being right on small things has obscured larger common goals.

Fortunately, with the visit of Francisco Clementino San Tiago Dantas, Brazil's powerful Minister of Finance, there is at hand an opportunity for a fresh start. Mr. Dantas, a pragmatic liberal leftist of formidable gifts, brings an important distinction to his mission. He represents an administration that has the power (and hopefully) the will to govern. Last January, the voters gave President Goulart the full executive powers that had been withheld from him 2 years before when he succeeded the erratic Janio Quadros.

The overriding hope in this country is that Mr. Goulart will use this power to cope responsibly with the single most pressing economic problem in Brazil—uncontrolled inflation. Though Brazil has had a dramatic rate of economic growth, fiscal insolvency has eaten away at the fruits of development. Everyone acknowledges this. To his credit, President Goulart has begun the task of reform. Brazil's anti-inflation program calls for a 35-percent cut in public expenditures, an elimination of subsidies for fuel and wheat, credit ceilings on Bank of Brazil loans to private firms, an internal price freeze on coffee and wage limitations for governement employees.

In the past months, Brazil has received ample and unsolicited criticism in the United States for its failure to set its house in order. What Brazil now needs is support and encouragement in carrying out an anti-inflation program that is long overdue. Specifically, Mr. Dantas is seeking to reschedule debt payments and release $84 million in aid money held up by the United States pending a genuine counterattack on inflation.

But what Brazil also needs is an affirmative attitude in the United States based on an understanding of life and politics in a swiftly changing country. Brazil is not a banana Republic and is on the threshold of great power status. It is foolish to expect Brazil to see eye-to-eye on the details of foreign policy, yet the amount of noise aroused by dissent on specifics has tended to obscure solidarity on fundamentals. When the Cuban crisis shook the world last October, there was no question of where Brazil stood.

As elsewhere in Latin America, there is an exotic spectrum of left-wing politics in Brazil. There are men like Mr. Dantas who describe themselves as liberal leftists. There are nationalists who want free enterprise at home but anti-American policy abroad. There are Moscow Communists and Castro Communists, and some of these, as our Ambassador, Lincoln Gordon, accurately reported, are in the government.

But no responsible U.S. official, emphatically including Mr. Gordon, would describe the government of Brazil as pro-Communist. The places of power are held by non-Communists, leaders whose influence will grow if Brazil prospers. It is this vigorous center, speaking for a burgeoning middle class, that should get more attention than the fanatic fringe. By dealing justly and generously with Brazil, by remembering that the overall terms of trade have tipped to Brazil's disadvantage, and by viewing Brazil in continental perspective, the United States can now give new strength to a faltering partnership.

SEISMIC CALCULATIONS SUPPORT U.S. TEST-BAN PROPOSAL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I had hoped that I might present for the Record of the Senate earlier today some observations on recent statements that have been made by Members of Congress, as well as other citizens, concerning the U.S. proposals at the nuclear test-ban conference in Geneva.

I should like to comment today on the seismic calculations that support the U.S. test-ban proposals.

It has been alleged that there is a big hole in our present proposals for a nuclear test-ban treaty with the Soviet Union. I would like to point out a few rather substantial holes in this unwarranted attack on the administration's proposals for an effective and safeguarded halt to the further testing of nuclear weapons.

The opponents of the U.S. proposal now assert that underground nuclear explosions below 3 kilotons carried out more than 620 miles inside the borders of the Soviet Union could not be detected by the U.S.-operated network of control posts, which would be located around the periphery of the Soviet Union but outside its borders. In order to create this so-called big hole or zone of undetectability, three assumptions have been made, none of which stands up under close analysis.

My colleagues will recall that about 3 days ago a map appeared in one of the local newspapers, showing a picture of the Soviet Union and an area within the center of the Soviet Union called the zone of undetectability, or the big hole in the proposals of the United States at Geneva.

The map was not drawn very well. As I said earlier, it was a poor example of map drawing. The geographical aspects were even more unlikely and inadequate.

As I said, there were three assumptions which had been made, none which stands up under close analysis.

First, it is assumed that our detection capability necessarily decreased as the distance of the detection station from the location of the clandestine test increased. This assumption is not based on scientific fact.

The truth is that our capabilities to detect underground nuclear explosions at long range are frequently better than our capabilities to detect the same explosions at shorter ranges. This is due to the characteristics of the seismic waves which are generated by an underground nuclear explosion and the manner in which these waves pass from the point of detonation through the earth's crust or mantle to the detection station. For example, detection capability actually increases from about 2,000 to 3,000 miles. As a matter of fact, two relatively simple seismic stations located 2,000 and 2,500 miles away from our Nevada test site detected most of the 3-kiloton underground shots which have occurred in the dry desert dirt at the site. Improved equipment at these two stations would certainly have permitted detection of even smaller explosions.

These significant discoveries as well as overall improvements in our long-range detection capabilities have been the result of the continuing research effort in the field of the seismology of nuclear explosions—an effort which has been carried on by the Department of Defense since 1959.

The second assumption upon which the "big hole" argument is based is that the explosions of 3 kilotons or less would occur in a type of dry sandy soil known as alluvium. The proponents of this theory seem to recognize that tests in harder rock would increase the size of the seismic signals generated by the explosion, and therefore increase its detectability. This Soviet Union, however, contains precious little of the required type of soil to muffle the 3-kiloton tests. In fact, according to a U.S. Geological Survey map, no dry alluvium beds are to be found more than 620 miles inside the Soviet Union, which, according to the theory, would be the distance required to be outside the range of detectability. The two relatively small areas where soil of this alluvium type is shown to exist are both within 500 miles of the southern border of the Soviet Union.

Moreover, testing in this dry, loose soil creates many more hazards of external detection than does testing in other more substantial types of rock. In order to prevent a large cavity clearly visible on the earth's surface, tests in alluvium must be carried out at considerable depths. However, it is rare to find any dry sandy soil very far below the earth's surface—in the U.S.S.R. or anywhere else. The horns of this dilemma seem to punch quite a hole in the "big hole" argument, which its proponents have carefully chosen to omit from discussion.

In fact, I think it would have been much better if the proponents of the "big hole" argument had gone to our geologists. We know a good deal about it.

The third assumption on which the U.S. proposals have been challenged is that the long-range detection system would have a fixed detection threshold of 3 kilotons below which nuclear explosions could not be detected. This is not the case. The detection threshold varies from station to station, and, for each station, from day to day. It depends on the way the station is constructed, on the structure of the earth between the station and the explosion, and on the amount of background noise at the time of the explosion. A potential violator could not possibly know the threshold at each of the 100 or more detection stations located all around the world at the instant of the explosion. He could therefore never be able to be sure that even a small clandestine explosion would go undetected.

This should suffice to collapse the "big hole." But its proponents have also made rather broad claims about what can be done in the alleged big hole—that is, nuclear testing that might escape detection under a nuclear test-ban treaty. It is claimed that all tactical nuclear weapons and a substantial fraction of strategic nuclear weapons can be developed without detection. This assessment runs directly counter to the unanimous opinion of some of the best qualified people to judge. I am referring to the Secretary of Defense; the Secretary of State; and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; in addition to Mr. William Foster, the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; and their scientists. On March 11, in a public hearing before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Secretary Rusk stated, in answer to my question, that these individuals had unanimously recommended to the President the adoption of our latest test-ban proposals. Therefore, it is the unanimous and considered judgment of those who have primary responsibility in this field that our nuclear test-ban proposals would promote our national security. I will return to this question in a subsequent portion of my remarks. It is a very important one.

Granted there are risks that certain small and carefully concealed nuclear tests might escape detection. But any conceivable advances in weaponry resulting from these tests could not significantly affect the strategic military balance between ourselves and the Soviet Union, a balance which, according to the President's top national security advisers, presently runs in our favor.

That is not my judgment. That is the judgment of the most competent scientists and military weaponry men we have.

Those who assert that there is a "big hole" in our test ban proposals have made a number of other misstatements of fact and errors in judgment in reaching their conclusion. For example, whereas they emphasize the problem of "background noise" caused by all kinds of natural phenomena as placing restrictions on our ability to detect seismic disturbances, they totally ignore the significant improvements that have been made in our ability to deal with this problem through finding quiet locations for seismic stations, placing seismic instruments in arrays, and perhaps locating some in deep holes—not big holes.

When our latest proposals for a nuclear test ban and the verification system associated with it are examined in their totality, it becomes clear that the President and his advisers have proposed an effective and safeguarded treaty which would be in our national interest. In fact, it is a much better treaty ban than that proposed 2 or 3 years ago. I might add, that was a treaty which did not run into the same kind of sharp, partisan criticism this treaty is now facing. On the other hand, the "big hole" shrinks to its real size when it is tested against what we have actually proposed in the light of our substantial detection capabilities.

Frankly, I am puzzled why these irresponsible, misleading, and mischievous criticisms are being heard now, when the U.S. position is stronger than ever before. Why were they not made under the previous administration, which proposed a treaty below a threshold of approximately 20 kilotons? This was our position between 1958 and 1961—it was proposed, offered, supported and adopted by both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy. But now the opposition is quibbling over tests with a yield of 3 kilotons or less. To my way of thinking there is no comparison between the potential military significance of a test of 20 kilotons and one of 3 kilotons.

What is really going on? Does the "big hole" theory represent a concern for genuine scientific truth, or as seems more likely, is it simply a device to undercut a nuclear test ban regardless of the cost in terms of scientific veracity and probability?

Mr. President, up to this point I have tried to avoid injecting personalities into the dispute. I have tried to present a factual case without reference, except in very general terms, to the individuals who, in all good faith, have objected to the current test ban proposals of the United States. This morning, however, I obtained a copy of a letter from the Honorable Craig Hosmer, a Representative from California, to the President of the United States. The gentleman implores the President to accept certain very dubious scientific claims with a view to dumping the carefully worked out test ban proposals which he, the President, has already approved. Over and beyond that, Mr. Hosmer literally asks the President to disregard the advice of three principal officers of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, as well as the advice of some of his top Cabinet and sub-Cabinet officials. Now that the gentleman from California has injected personalities into the controversy, I have no choice but to meet him on his own ground and to demonstrate where he is both misinformed and the victim of his own bias against an effective test-ban treaty.

The Republican spokesman asserts that three top officials of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—Director William Foster, Deputy Director Adrian Fisher, and the highly respected scientist, Dr. Franklin A. Long—are so anxious to "succeed" in their jobs by concluding a test-ban agreement with the Soviet Union, that they are the victims of "subconscious miscalculations of the balance of risks." He attacks their qualifications for the responsible posts in which they have all been confirmed by the U.S. Senate. In less detail, but with far-reaching implications, he denigrates the President's "Committee of Principals," which advises him on disarmament and test ban matters. In so doing, the Republican spokesman is casting aspersions on the qualifications and judgment of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and several others. Many of these responsible public servants were Republicans—and I imagine they are still of that political persuasion—before accepting the invitation to serve the President of the United States.

But I want to deal specifically with the points raised against three of the top officers of the ACDA. These men, all appointed by President Kennedy and confirmed by the Senate, are Director William C. Foster, Deputy Director Adrian S. Fisher, and Assistant Director for Science and Technology Franklin A. Long.

The Republican spokesman believes he is better qualified to evaluate the advantages and risks of a test-ban agreement than these men are. Let us examine their records.

Mr. Foster—a Republican—has served under Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy. He came to Washington from private industry in 1941 to help out for a few weeks in the war effort. He stayed for the duration of the war. He held key positions in the War Department and was responsible for millions of dollars in weapons procurement. After the war he served as Under Secretary of Commerce, head of the Marshall Plan, and Deputy Secretary of Defense. President Eisenhower appointed him to the Gaither Committee and to be Chairman of the U.S. delegation to the 1958 Geneva Surprise Attack Conference. He also served as executive vice president of Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. and chairman of the board of the Aerospace Corp. In 1961 John J. McCloy—I may add, another good Republican—then the President's advisor on disarmament, asked him to join his staff as a special consultant. When Congress created the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, President Kennedy, on the same day that he signed the bill, asked Foster to be its director.

This is the man whom the Republican spokesman attempts to dismiss as a "former business executive."

I submit this man has had quite a record in terms of national security and in terms of protecting the vital interests of this Nation.

Adrian Fisher also has a long record of public service. In the early forties he served in the State Department and in the War Department. He was awarded the Legion of Merit for his service as a B-29 navigator with the 20th Air Force. He was appointed Solicitor of the Department of Commerce in 1947, General Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission in 1948, and Legal Adviser to the State Department in 1949. He has served as a member of the U.S. Panel on Permanent Court Arbitration, a member of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, chief reporter for the American Law Institute's Restatement of Foreign Relations Law of the United States, trustee of the Institute of Advanced International Studies, and member of the advisory committee of the mathematics department of Princeton University.

This is the man the Republican spokesman attempts to dismiss as "a former lawyer."

Dr. Franklin H. Long, in addition to his long service as a professor of chemistry and head of the Department of Chemistry at Cornell, has a long record of Government service. He became a consultant to the National Defense Research Committee, Office of Scientific Research and Development, in 1941. Later in World War II, from 1943 to 1945, he engaged in explosives research pursuant to a Government contract. Beginning in 1946, he served as consultant to the AEC's Brookhaven National Laboratories, and in 1947 he was named a member of the board of trustees of Associated Universities, which operates Brookhaven for the AEC. In the fifties and sixties he served as a consultant to the Army's Ballistics Research Laboratory at Aberdeen, as a member of the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board, as Chairman of the Chemistry Advisory Committee of the Air Force Office of Scientific Research, as a member of the Navy's Solid Propellant Advisory Committee, as a consultant to the Defense Department's Scientific Advisory Committee, and as a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee.

This is the man the Republican spokesman seeks to dismiss as just a "chemist."

Mr. President, if these men are to be "bypassed"—and I use the word which appears in the published text of Mr. Hosmer's letter to President Kennedy—who is left to be trusted? According to the gentleman from California, the President should rely on Dr. Carl Romney, seismologist for the Air Force Technical Applications Center, and on Gen. A. W. Betts, Director of Military Applications for the Atomic Energy Commission.

These are distinguished gentlemen, exceedingly able scientists, and their testimony should be considered with the greatest concern and respect, because they are considered among the best men in their field. Without minimizing the qualifications of these men in the slightest degree, the Senator from Minnesota is not convinced that their judgment should outweigh that of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the AEC—not to speak of the leading officials of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—when it comes to a political calculation based on the best available scientific evidence and demonstrated U.S. detection capability.

Here again we have a situation in which a policy decision has to be made, and that policy decision must be made by policy officers. The law of the land sets up the program known as a Committee of Principals. That committee represents high level officials of the Government. They are directed, by law, to advise the President of the United States on these difficult, complex, and sensitive matters of nuclear test proposals. The President meets with the committee, which consists of the Director of the Central Intelligence, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Those men have their technical advisers, the best this country can offer, and these men have unanimously recommended to the President of the United States the proposals presented at Geneva. Those proposals undoubtedly have shortcomings. Any proposal would. But the question is whether the risks we take with those proposals are greater or less than the continued unlimited nuclear arms race in which we now find ourselves.

I believe that the men making the proposals have more information about this question than I have, or the gentleman from California. Therefore, I rest my case on the many years of study which have been made by the leading scientists in this area and the policy officers to whom I have referred.

I ask unanimous consent that further information which sheds light on various aspects of this problem be printed at this point in the Record. I call attention, for example, to the critique of the scientific assertions of Representative Craig Hosmer in his letter of March 18, to President John F. Kennedy, which was prepared by representatives of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; also a copy of a letter from Representative Hosmer to the President of the United States, which was sent to me; and an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Concession and Alteration."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Critique of the Scientific Assertions of Representative Craig Hosmer in His Letter of March 18 to President John F. Kennedy

The Representative from California [Mr. Hosmer] argues that a signal of 10 millimicrons strength is necessary to overcome background noise which at a quiet location may be 5 millimicrons. He ignores the fact that several American stations have average background noise levels of only 1 millimicron. He ignores the fact that a 5-millimicron background level can be reduced to 1 millimicron by using arrays of seismographs or placing one seismograph down a deep hole. Even a natural background level of 1 millimicron is not "irreducible" as Hosmer contends.

Hosmer's mistaken calculations throw his whole computation into a cocked hat. If a 1-millimicron average background level can be achieved, a 2-millimicron signal is sufficient for detection. Hosmer's own table shows a 4-millimicron signal over 600 miles from a 3-kiloton shot muffled by dry desert dirt. If he had continued the figures in his table to greater distances instead of stopping arbitrarily at 620 miles, he would have found that a 10-millimicron signal could be obtained at about 1,200 miles, and that the signal remained above the 2-millimicron level for hundreds of miles after that.

STATEMENT IN REPLY TO CONTENTION THAT A "BIG HOLE" EXISTS IN OUR PROPOSED TEST BAN VERIFICATION SYSTEM

The opponents of a test ban treaty have again resorted to the well-known technique of answering careful, reasoned, and factual arguments with a misleading but eye-catching slogan. This time the slogan is that a "big hole" exists in the proposed test ban treaty draft.

No "big hole" exists

The "big hole" contention is based on three assumptions, each of which is wholly inaccurate.

1. The first assumption is that small tests could not be detected by stations more than 620 miles away. Since the U.S. proposal is to rely on stations outside the Soviet Union to detect tests inside, the opponents contend that tests carried out within about 2½ million square miles in the center of the Soviet Union more than 620 miles from its border would be immune from detection.

The fact is that detection at distances greater than 620 miles is frequently better than that at 620 miles. Indeed, a 1961 study made by two scientists from the AEC's Livermore Laboratory and one from the Rand Corp. shows that the signal from a 1-kiloton shot in soft rock (tuff) at about 1,200 miles is over twice as high as the signal is at 620 miles. At either distance, the signal was strong enough for detection. A graph showing conclusions from this study has been given to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Another graph submitted to the Joint Committee by Defense Department Scientist Jack P. Ruina shows that while detection capability decreases from about 1,000 to 2,000 miles, it increases again from 2,000 to 3,000 miles. Throughout the range from about 600 to 6,000 miles, a modern multielement detection station would have a high probability of detecting nuclear explosions down to 1 or 2 kilotons in soft rock (tuff). As a matter of fact, two relatively simple seismic stations located 2,000 and 2,500 miles from our Nevada test site detected most of the shots equivalent to about 1 kiloton in soft rock. Improved equipment at these two stations would have permitted detection of even smaller explosions.

The falsity of the opponents first assumption alone destroys their "big hole" contentions.

2. The second assumption on which the "big hole" is based is that the central part of the Soviet Union contains areas of dry desert dirt (alluvium) which would muffle nuclear explosions. According to a U.S. Geological Survey map shown at the Joint Committee hearings, it is unlikely that dry alluvial beds of the requisite depth are to be found more than 620 miles inside the Soviet Union. The two relatively small areas

where soil of this type appears to exist are both within 500 miles of the Soviet border.

The falsity of this second assumption is also alone sufficient to destroy the "big hole" argument.

3. The third assumption on which the "big hole" contention is based is that the long-range detection system would have a fixed detection threshold of 3 kilotons below which nuclear explosions could not be detected. This is not the case. The detection threshold varies from station to station, and, for each station, from day to day. It depends on the way the station is constructed, on the structure of the earth between the station and the explosion, and on the amount of background noise at the instant of the explosion. A potential violator could not possibly know the threshold at each of the hundred or more detection stations located all around the world at the instant of the explosion. He could therefore never be sure that even a small clandestine explosion would go undetected.

The falsity of this assumption is also sufficient in and of itself to destroy the "big hole."

PROPOSED ONSITE INSPECTION PROVISIONS WOULD INCREASE RISKS OF CHEATING NOT DECREASE THEM

The opponents of a test-ban treaty contend that there are some 400 earthquakes each year in the Soviet Union which would have to be distinguished from clandestine nuclear explosions; that Soviet "military areas" would be totally excluded from inspection; that inspection parties would be limited to only 14 people of whom not more than 10 may be American or British; and that the administration's proposals would not deter cheating. These contentions are incorrect.

1. There are some 170 shallow continental earthquakes in the Soviet Union each year equivalent in size to about a 2-kiloton explosion in soft rock (tuff). By various methods other than onsite inspection, this number could be reduced to about 30 which would be relatively more questionable than the others. Seven annual onsite inspections would be provided.

In 1960 and 1961, when the United States was proposing 20, and then 12 to 20 onsite inspections each year, our Government estimated that there would be 600 earthquakes of this size each year in the Soviet Union. Of these, about 70, which were large enough to be subject to inspection under the treaty draft, would not have been identified as earthquakes or explosions without onsite inspection, according to estimates submitted to the Geneva test ban conference.

During this same period, inspection of earth tremors equivalent in size to about 19 kilotons in soft rock would not have been permitted by the treaty drafts. An uninspected moratorium on such tests was then contemplated while research was conducted to determine how to detect and identify them. The United States does not presently propose any uninspected moratorium. Any detected and located earth tremor which we regarded as suspicious could be inspected within the quota.

The present U.S. proposals would provide as great a deterrent as before against clandestine tests above 19 kilotons and a far greater deterrent against those below.

2. "Military areas" would not be excluded from inspection. However, we would clearly not wish Soviet teams to inspect the Pentagon or a missile installation. Therefore, the U.S. proposal would exclude sensitive defense buildings or similar military installations with the proviso that abuse of this provision by the Soviets would justify our withdrawal from the treaty.

3. Fourteen key members of an inspection team sent to the Soviet Union would be designated by the United States and the United Kingdom. The team would contain six or more individuals from the staff of the international control organization, but the leader of the team would be American or British. This is a strengthening of earlier proposals.

The earth tremors in the Soviet Union which would be inspected by this team would be selected and located by American and British scientists from data supplied by stations which they chose. This is also a strengthening of earlier proposals.

TESTS WHICH MIGHT ESCAPE DETECTION WOULD NOT ALTER MILITARY BALANCE

The opponents of a test ban argue that a broad range of militarily significant tests could be conducted without risk of getting caught.

The administration believes that a potential violator could never conduct a significant series without risk of getting caught either by seismic detection or intelligence means. It is true that the smaller the test and the greater the effort at concealment, the greater will be the difficulties of detection. However, this is the risk with any test ban treaty because no detection system can be made entirely cheat proof.

This problem has been carefully studied by the President, the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, and other interested agencies in both this and other preceding administrations. Both administrations came to the conclusions that the risks of cheating were outweighed by the advantages of a test ban treaty. It is the unanimous view of the President, the Secretaries of State and Defense, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency that our present proposals are in the national interest despite risk of cheating.

It is the view of this administration that, for the developments which could make a substantial change in the military balance in a way unfavorable to the United States, underground testing of a kind which might evade detection would be unsatisfactory. The most significant improvements in weight-yield ratios have probably already been made. Pure fusion weapons which might be developed either in the laboratory or with very small tests would be of lesser advantage to us than to the Soviet Union because such weapons would constitute for us primarily a cheaper substitute for the explosive component in our already larger stockpile of fission weapons. Hence, any inhibitions on the development of pure fusion weapons would appear to be to our net advantage. Moreover, we have already made significant advances in the direction of tactical weapons with a smaller fission as compared with thermonuclear and fusion components. For these and the reasons set forth below, there is general agreement within the executive branch that a test ban of the kind now contemplated would be in the interest of the United States. There has been a strong consensus in favor of a nuclear test ban since 1958 and earlier.

ADVANTAGES OF A TEST-BAN TREATY

No statement in reply to the opponents of a test ban would be complete without describing the advantages of a test ban to the United States, something which the opponents wholly ignore.

The advantages are as follows:

First, the President and his key advisers in the national security area believe that a treaty of the kind we are proposing would preserve for a longer period our present nuclear advantages.

With continued unlimited testing by both the United States and the U.S.S.R., there would be further increases by both in the efficiency of weapons of higher yield. Our advantage in small weight, high yield weapons would most probably diminish. Both sides would certainly increase their knowledge of weapons effects. In the field of tactical weapons, the Soviets would probably be able to match our more diversified and numerous arsenal. It is in the nature of the nuclear weapons race that unlimited testing on both sides would tend to produce equality.

With a treaty, improvements in yield-to-weight ratios would come more slowly through laboratory work alone. Our advantage in smaller weapons would last for a longer period. Some weapons effects phenomena would remain unknown by both sides. The development of missile defense systems would be slowed down on both sides. Our tactical weapon superiority would persist longer. In general, our present nuclear advantages would last for a considerably longer period. In fact, if President Eisenhower's repeated efforts to secure a test-ban treaty from 1958 to 1961 had been successful, we would probably be in a better position than we are today.

Secondly, a nuclear test ban would constitute a significant first step in achieving control over the further spread of nuclear weapons. A test ban would by no means solve the problem of the spread of nuclear weapons. But it would place the principal nuclear powers in a position to come to grips with the problem more effectively, and in a position from which further steps in the same direction could be taken more easily than at present.

If a nuclear test-ban treaty were concluded, it would be to the interests of both sides to seek to obtain as broad participation as possible among present and potential nuclear powers. The difficulties of obtaining the adherence of France and Communist China to the treaty cannot be underestimated. However, there are a number of other countries likely to develop nuclear weapons in the absence of a test ban adhered to by the United States, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. With unlimited testing, the incentives to other powers to secure nuclear weapons are greatly increased. With a treaty and relatively broad participation, our ability to persuade other nations to accede should be substantially increased.

A third advantage of a nuclear test ban treaty is the effect it would have in eliminating radioactive fallout. The extent of the danger to ourselves and future generations from fallout has been the subject of a good deal of controversy and the question has not been completely answered. However, there is general agreement in the scientific community that any increase in the general level of radioactivity is harmful to some degree. Moreover, the danger of radioactive fallout is a significant political issue in many countries of the world, and is a source of real concern to many people in the United States.

A final advantage is that a nuclear test ban treaty would constitute a first step in the direction of bringing the arms race under control. It would at the same time constitute an opportunity for the United States to demonstrate to the Soviet Union that some reciprocal control in our relations does not necessarily mean less security for the Soviet Union. It would give both sides experience with inspection and permit us to appraise their cooperation, and in the light of that appraisal, to estimate the cooperation which we might receive in the verification of broader agreements. It could lead to the development of a basis for confidence in other agreements.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1963.

Re nuclear test ban.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President, the White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I sincerely hope this letter may reach your eyes because it contains information relating to the national security which I feel you may not otherwise receive.

Your Disarmament Agency people recently outlined to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy many of the provisions of a revised test ban treaty under preparation which they state soon will be offered the Soviets. This proposal contains a loophole through which the Soviets can move clandestinely to nuclear weapons superiority and its equivalent Communist world domination.

According to testimony of Government technical witnesses heard by the JCAE at the same hearings, the verification system to be proposed is inadequate to detect and identify underground test cheating at yields equivalent to 3 kilotons and below conducted in alluvium formations if cheating is carried on at least 620 miles inside Soviet borders. According to my calculations, this leaves an area of at least 2½ million square miles in the interior of the U.S.S.R.—and probably twice that size—in which significant secret Soviet underground tests can be carried on wholly without fear of detection.

This undetectability results from the inherent inability of seismographs to detect and locate signals unless they are at least twice the size of the earth's normal microseismic background noises and their inherent inability to distinguish, i.e., identify, suspicious events from earthquakes unless the signals are 10 to 20 times larger than background noise.

In short, natural background noise, which averages 10 to 20 millimicrons, affects seismographs just like static affects a radio receiver—the signals are blotted out by the noise.

This is what happens:

Assume a quiet location for the seismograph, with background noise of only 5 millimicrons. This means the signal must be at least 10 millimicrons for detection and location and at least 50 millimicrons for identification. Yet, the signal from a 3 kiloton shot 620 miles distance will be only 4 millimicrons in size—far below levels required for verification of cheating.

Even assuming special instruments could reduce the background noise to an irreducible 1 millimicron minimum—where marginal detection and location capability would appear, still a 10 millimicron signal would be needed for identification, and the actual signal will be only 4 millimicrons.

It is to be noted that signals can be held to the 4 millimicron level either by limiting test yields to 3 kilotons in alluvium or equivalent soils or by conducting larger shots in underground cavities which "decouple" the shock waves from surrounding earth and reduce the signal to the undetectable level.

The foregoing all is a matter of public record in the JCAE's hearings. Also on the JCAE's public record is testimony as to what weapons development progress can be made in this big hole undetectable cheating area. It amounts to the entire spectrum of tactical and strategic nuclear weapons except an "unsubstantial fraction" of strategic weapons—these being superyield H-bombs the U.S.S.R. already has developed anyway.

If you offer the Soviets the treaty now being drafted it will mean an offer by the United States to forego wholly all nuclear weapons development and, as a practical matter, simply to trust a Communist promise not to continue nuclear weapons development when it can be done without fear of discovery.

This is exactly what your Disarmament Agency relates it is advising you to do on the grounds the risks of not doing so are greater than those of doing so. In effect, they say it is more risky for both sides to test in the open than it is for the Communists to be given the opportunity for cheat testing while we stop progress. This flies in the face of logic if we assume we distrust the Soviets enough to spend $50 billion a year on military defense.

The advice also flies in the face of logic if a treaty with a big hole in it is an ineffective treaty, and I do not see how it could be otherwise. Secret weapons testing of the magnitude possible would drastically affect the military balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Further, if an ineffective treaty is concluded, it will surrender all opportunity to conclude an effective one. What happens then to the hopes and aspirations of people everywhere who see an effective treaty as one of the very few opportunities there is to achieve a less risky world?

There is no need to take my word, Mr. President, for the facts on undetectability and clandestine weapons development opportunities above related. Dr. Carl Romney, seismologist for the Air Force Technical Applications Center, can explain the inherent physical limitations on seismic detection imposed by background noise as he did to the JCAE. Gen. A. W. Betts, the AEC's Director of Military Applications, can define for you the wide spectrum of opportunity for undetectable weapons development, as he did to the JCAE. I urge you to confer with these men.

Why do I suggest bypassing your Disarmament Agency advisers for this information?

Simply because if they have not already put this matter to you, then you should no longer have confidence in their advice. With the hopes of mankind aroused for a reduction in the world's risks by an effective test-ban treaty, they are not doing their jobs advising you to enter an ineffective one. They cannot safely be relied upon if they tell you to trade the reality of an effective risk reduction device for only an illusion of effectiveness, with the eventual prospect of a nuclear Pearl Harbor thrown in for good measure.

If their advice to you is so bad, why do they give it? These are patriotic men of integrity—what, you may ask, is my answer to that?

My answer, Mr. President, does not reflect on either the patriotism or the integrity of these men. They are hard working people, intensely anxious to succeed in their jobs. It is simply that success in their jobs can only be demonstrated by the conclusion of some agreement with the Soviets. They want a good agreement, not a bad one. But they want an agreement. I am certain that this factor leads them into subconscious miscalculations of the balance of risks which overemphasizes hopes for the verification system and underemphasizes practical difficulties with it.

Mr. Foster, who heads the agency, is a former business executive, his assistant is Mr. Fischer, a former lawyer. Both receive their advice on seismology from Dr. Long, a chemist. None have been on their jobs even for a period of 2 years. Your committee of principals which reviews the Disarmament Agency's advice is composed of three former business executives and four former college professors. This group too has only been on the job for about 2 years.

Look at it this way: At Cape Canaveral, when "all systems are go" it means the check out of many, many components of a missile have been made electronically and infallibly before the final light is green.

By contrast, at the Disarmament Agency all components of a test-ban proposal are not checked out electronically and infallibly before you receive the green light. They are checked by human beings who must make many, many individual subjective judgments as to each component before giving you a red or green light on the overall treaty package. Each of these many, many judgments is subject to a subconscious intrusion of the desire for an agreement. Constant favorable resolution of small doubts by this means, bit by bit, piece by piece, eventually add up to one big major miscalculation.

Such miscalculation, Mr. President, I sincerely feel has occurred. It has occurred substantially in the manner I have outlined. Both you and the Nation will be its innocent victims unless prompt steps are taken—steps which can only be taken by you.

So again, I urge you to talk directly with Dr. Romney and General Betts, or others of equal knowledge and ability, who are not subject to the subconscious pressures upon Mr. Foster and his associates.

I am certain what they tell you will substantiate the proposition that an effective test ban treaty—one which will in fact cause the Soviets to stop nuclear weapons development if we do—will require manned seismic observatories inside the Soviet Union as well as on free world soil.

Again, in closing, I reiterate the danger of missing the chance for an effective, risk reducing treaty by the proposal of an ineffective, risk increasing treaty.

Sincerely,

CRAIG HOSMER.

CONCESSION AND ALTERATION

The English language is so swiftly, subtly and silently changed by the environment in which it exists that it is sometimes necessary to use the swiftest photography to catch a word in flight from an old to a new meaning.

Such a metamorphosis seems to be overtaking the words "concession" and "alteration" as they concern negotiations for a test-ban agreement. The word "concession" hitherto has meant a "yielding" or "conceding" or "surrendering." But in the vernacular of this controversy, the word "concession" suddenly has become synonymous with "change" or "alteration" whether the change or alteration demands a reduction in American demands or even an increase in American demands.

Those who criticize recent changes in the U.S. proposals were not conspicuously the advocates of the earlier American proposals when they were made. But suddenly, the offers of last year have become the basis of national security and any change from them is endowed with peril to the Republic. Whether the U.S. amendments stiffen or relax previous offers, in the language of the day's debate, they are all "concessions."

The semantic objective of the Arms Control Agency must be the development of a word which, in English, has the connotations of virtue and which is synonymous with "tough," "hard," "stiffening," and "unyielding" and which, in translation into Russian, means "surrender," "softening," "yielding" and "conceding." Armed with such a vocabulary, it should be possible to get a test-ban treaty approved by both countries.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

A NATIONAL STANDARD FOR EDUCATION

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have had my attention called to an article which appeared, in the newspapers this week, I believe, written by Admiral Rickover, on the subject of education. As everyone knows, the admiral over the years has shown a great interest in this field, and many times has had a very thoughtful approach to the fulfillment of the goal that I believe every American has a right to look for with respect to our educational institutions, and that is, chiefly, an improvement in education at all levels.

In the 4 years that I served on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have many times called the attention of the Senate to the fact that our primary and secondary institutions of learning are not availing themselves of the quality of education which they can produce, and that this, as much as anything else, is responsible for the state of education of which so many people, including educators, complain.

Admiral Rickover reiterates a suggestion he made earlier to help speed educational progress through the establishment of a National Standards Committee. The Committee would be composed of prominent persons devoted, as he puts it, to the ideal of an American education second to none.

I was particularly interested in this article because the recommendations parallel to a considerable degree title I of S. 181, a bill introduced by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater], which I was pleased to cosponsor. Title I of S. 181 calls for the establishment of a National Scholarship Board consisting of 13 members, to be appointed by the President, whose duty would be to administer the scholarship program.

It appears to me that when hearings are held on the bill it would be worthwhile to consider the possibility of delegating additional responsibility to this Board, somewhat along the lines advocated by Admiral Rickover. I say "somewhat along the lines" because I am not fully in accord with the views he expresses in the article. However, I believe they are challenging enough that they should be very carefully considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Subcommittee on Education.

I invite particular attention to these words of Admiral Rickover:

> Now, the word "standard" has many connotations. I use it in the sense that comes first to mind: A specific requirement or level of excellence deemed worthy of esteem or reward.

I do not say that I would wish to see any such committee have control over the educational system of this country. I believe implicitly that the educational system should be controlled at the local level, and nowhere else. However, it seems to me that a committee which would set up standards which were acceptable and which were recognized standards, as to grade school graduates and high school graduates and college graduates, would be a step forward in our educational system.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks the article to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Rickover Urges Educators To Set National Standard

(By Adm. Hyman Rickover)

(Note.—Admiral Rickover, one of the most outspoken men of the times, is unhappy about the state of American education. Here he bluntly states what he thinks is wrong with education and educators, and what he thinks ought to be done.)

American education just isn't good enough.

That statement is true whether we look at it from the point of view of the kind of educated youth we need in our complex society, or from the point of view of our competitive position in education vis-a-vis other advanced nations.

Every American wants the best for our children. In education, the best we can give them is the chance to stretch their minds and reach the highest goal their intellect can encompass. They do not get this chance in "progressive" schools and permissive homes.

WHAT'S TO BE DONE

What, then, is to be done to improve American education?

Well, local communities and State governments have the power to increase the amount of classroom instruction per school year. We have the shortest school day and school year among leading nations.

They could eliminate from the curriculums everything that can be learned elsewhere. We are the only advanced country where precious school hours are wasted teaching children how to make fudge, twirl batons, drive cars, budget income, handle the telephone, catch fish, and similar trivia that any reasonably normal person picks up on his own or learns at home.

NEED NATIONAL STANDARD

Most important of all, they could improve teacher qualifications, bringing them up to the level existing abroad.

All this is important, but I am convinced we cannot put through a really effective reform program unless we set up a national scholastic standard.

Now the word "standard" has many connotations. I use it in the sense that comes first to mind: a specific requirement or level of excellence deemed worthy of esteem or reward.

Last May, in a hearing on English education before the House Appropriations Committee, Chairman Clarence Cannon asked me by what means I thought Congress might help speed educational progress.

I suggested that a National Standards Committee be created. This would be a small committee, composed of men of national stature and eminence—trustworthy, intelligent, scholarly and devoted to the ideal of an American education second to none.

The committee would have two tasks:

First, it would act as an educational watchtower, announcing danger when it saw it approaching. It would keep under continuous scrutiny, and periodically report on, the state of American education. Does it meet the needs of our times? Is it competitive with education in countries of similar levels of culture and technology?

We need a disinterested agency to tell us the unvarnished truth about the true state of American education.

Second, the committee would formulate a national scholastic standard on the basis of its findings; a standard which would make us internationally competitive and which also respond to our specific domestic needs. The committee would do this by means of examinations set at different ability levels. No one would have to take them, but those who passed would receive national accreditation.

INTERFERENCE RULED OUT

The committee would in no way interfere with established institutions now granting degrees or diplomas. It would simply set up a higher standard, offer it to anyone who wished to meet it, and certify those who had successfully done so.

Such a committee would help prevent complacency and illusions of superiority and thus save us from the kind of painful shocks that sputnik and other evidence of Russian scientific proficiency have given us in the past few years.

Let me make it crystal clear that nothing in my proposal would violate the constitutional separation of power between Federal and State Governments, nor go counter to our tradition of control of schools by the local community.

A SERVICE ONLY

I envisage the rendering of a service, not regulation in any way, shape or manner.

The committee might provide one set of examinations at the level appropriate for a high school graduate who aspires to enter a first-rate college, and another set at the level of students who may wish to prepare for a semiprofessional or technician's job not requiring a bachelor degree but still requiring a good high school education.

There could be still another set of graduates of various types of colleges, especially those bound for the teaching profession.

I stress again that no one would need to take these examinations; but those who did pass them successfully would obtain national certification, perhaps the notation "N.S."—National Scholar—stamped on their regular diplomas or degrees.

SAVINGS ENVISAGED

There are many occasions where admissions officers of higher educational institutions, or prospective employers, have a valid reason for wanting to know what an applicant's scholastic qualifications actually are. Think how much time and money would be saved if the diploma were clearly to indicate this.

I do not share the pride our educationists take in the fact that we are the only leading nation with a school system that does not challenge its children to meet a national scholastic standard in order to receive academic awards.

I do not agree with them that children must not be judged, that each child has a right to equal education and equal status.

I do not believe that, as one superintendent of schools put it, "straight thinking and democratically minded school administrators will hand out the same diploma, regardless of the variation of high school courses and the range of scholastic achievement that are presented by the graduates as evidence of accomplishment."

DIFFERS WITH EDUCATIONISTS

Nor do I share educationist concern that children who do not measure up to a standard will suffer pain and lose face.

All of life is a series of tests. Young people will be better able to take these tests in their stride if at an early age they begin to learn that everything worthwhile requires great effort but that the satisfaction derived from attaining a standard makes effort worthwhile.

Given the wide differences of aptitude with which we are born and which we do not know how to alter, is it not good for young children to discover that some goals are beyond their capacities, that they cannot win all the tests?

Is it not better to know one's limitations, as well as one's capacities; not to live in delusions which life sooner or later will rudely shatter?

FRANK S. HOAG

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President it is with a great sense of sorrow that I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding American and a true pioneer in the publishing field for my State of Colorado.

On Saturday, March 16 at 7:50 p.m., after a full and rewarding life of 91 years, Mr. Frank S. Hoag passed away at the Parkview Episcopal Hospital in his home city and my original home city, Pueblo, Colo.

Until just prior to the death of his beloved wife, Mrs. Louise Hillebrand Hoag, on February 12 of this year, Mr. Hoag, despite his advanced years, remained mentally and physically alert and actively engaged as president of the Star-Journal Publishing Corp. in Pueblo.

Mr. Hoag was one of the newspaper pioneers of my State, having been actively engaged there in his profession since 1901. He was an outstanding civic leader and lay leader in his church. Only last month, Mr. Hoag received the Service to Mankind Award from the Pueblo Sertoma Club. He was one of the Nation's oldest Rotarians and a past president of the Pueblo Chamber of Commerce. His newspapers had long battled for improved conditions in the city he loved, and in his State. He and his papers were also one of the leading supporters for a measure which only last year he was able to see reach a successful culmination by action of the Congress—the Frying Pan-Arkansas project.

In the short space of time available to me here, it would be impossible to enumerate all of the accomplishments of this truly great and respected Coloradan—but, I should like it known here that Mrs. Allott and I, along with many thousands of others in my State, have felt, since last Saturday, a deep sense of personal loss with the death of Mr. Hoag. Additionally, a sense of nostalgia has prevailed, with the passing of an era—an era of journalistic greats—of which Mr. Hoag was surely one of the greatest.

I ask unanimous consent to have read into the Record immediately following my remarks, the Associated Press dispatch appearing in the Denver Post on Sunday, March 17, reporting on the passing of Mr. Hoag.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Frank S. Hoag Dies in Pueblo—Publisher 91

Pueblo, Colo.—Frank Stephen Hoag, 91, president of the Star-Journal Publishing Corp. here, died at Parkview Episcopal Hospital at 7:50 p.m. Saturday.

An erect and energetic man, Hoag was active until the last few weeks of his life. He entered the hospital February 6.

His wife, the former Louise M. Allebrand, died at the same hospital February 12 after a long illness. They were married October 3, 1895, in McKeesport, Pa., and celebrated their 67th wedding anniversary last fall.

Hoag was born September 23, 1871, in Minerva, Ohio, of Quaker parents whose strict religious views provided a guiding influence throughout his life.

As a boy he supplemented the family income by trapping muskrats and raising bees. His father owned a country store and young Hoag learned to bargain with the customers.

After attending elementary and commercial schools he became a stenographer for the Iron City Tool Works in Pittsburgh, Pa. Later he became a bookkeeper for the Philadelphia Record.

The family moved to Colorado in 1901 because of Mrs. Hoag's health. After a short time with a lumber company in Colorado Springs, Hoag became associated with the Colorado Springs Gazette.

A short time later he moved to Pueblo to become an advertising solicitor for the recently merged Evening Star and Pueblo Journal.

The new company was owned by John F. Vail, head of the light and power company; Alva B. Adams, later a U.S. Senator; James B. Orman, a former Governor; Thomas Kelly, I. C. Porterfield, J. W. Finland, J. A. Black, Hume Lewis, and Samuel D. Trimble, later a district judge.

Hoag became discouraged because he felt the new owners of the paper did not take sufficient interest in the editorial content and returned to Colorado Springs where he remained for 2½ years.

BACK TO PUEBLO

Stockholders later persuaded Hoag to return to Pueblo to become general manager. He did, with the understanding that he could purchase the paper if he became financially able.

Hoag bought the Star-Journal in 1908. In 1933, he acquired the Pueblo Chieftain, the second oldest newspaper in Colorado.

Last month Hoag received the Service to Mankind Award from the Pueblo Sertoma Club.

He was president of the Pueblo Chamber of Commerce, a past president of the Rotary Club here, and one of the Nation's oldest Rotarians.

He was a cofounder of the Rocky Mountain Council of Boy Scouts, founding president of the Pueblo Knife and Fork Club, and president of Pueblo Manufacturers and Jobbers.

His newspapers long battled for improved conditions in the city and were among the forces behind the Fryingpan-Arkansas water diversion project.

CIVIL SERVICE

From 1919 to 1930 he was a member of the board of corrections which administered the State hospital here, penitentiary in Canon City, and reformatory in Buena Vista.

Hoag is survived by a son, Frank S. Hoag, Jr., publisher of the Star-Journal and Chieftain; two daughters, Mrs. John W. Rawlings and Mrs. Frank E. Evana, Sr., both of Pueblo; five grandchildren, Robert H. Rawlings and Frank E. Evans, Jr., both of Pueblo; Col. John W. Rawlings and Mrs. Walter G. Farr, both of Washington, D.C.; and Mrs. Richard Nelson, who is with her husband in Pakistan; and 16 great-grandchildren.

Services will be at 3:30 p.m., Monday, at the First Presbyterian Church in Pueblo. Burial services at Rozelawn Cemetery will be private.

DISARMAMENT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to one other matter very briefly, apropos of the recent remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota who now occupies the Presiding Officer's chair [Mr. Humphrey].

I for one admit I am no authority on disarmament. I will have to say that I really cannot recognize any great authorities on the subject of disarmament in the Senate at this time, either.

However, I should like to say this about the criticism which has been made of the distinguished gentleman from California, Representative Craig Hosmer. I know that he has performed outstanding service in the House. He is a Republican. I know that he works very hard at his job of being a Representative, as I have found in personal relationships with him when I have had reason to come in contact with him through my work in the Senate.

I have always found him to be very well informed on any subject on which he was speaking.

However, I believe that this matter goes to another little point, and I wish to say one thing relative to the comment made by the Senator from Minnesota, our distinguished assistant majority leader [Mr. Humphrey], and that is, that I believe Mr. Hosmer had a legitimate right to do what he has done. Aside from everything else, if this is the way he feels, it is his duty, representing his constituents, to write this letter to the President, even if he is a hundred percent wrong. I do not believe he is a hundred percent wrong. After looking at the performance of this administration in the field of foreign affairs for the last 2 years, anyone has a right to look at any proposal made by it along the lines of disarmament or otherwise with a somewhat jaundiced and at least a critical eye from the standpoint of whether we are making true progress in this field.

I, too, am concerned about disarmament. I had the privilege last fall, as a delegate to the United Nations—a subject upon which I intend to speak at some length later, but not this evening—to spend a great deal of time with our Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Stevenson, and with others also, including our Ambassador to the disarmament conference.

I am not certain that we are pursuing the right course. If Mr. Hosmer does nothing else than to interject a note of caution at this point, the purpose will have been served, because we cannot become so enamored of the subject of disarmament itself, desirable as that is, as to make so many concessions that our public safety will be endangered.

Perhaps the President feels that the present proposals are satisfactory. Perhaps Mr. Foster, Mr. Fisher, and Mr. Long feel that these proposals are all right. I simply add that I believe Mr. Hosmer is completely correct in raising the question, because there are a great many of us who are wondering whether, in our desire to reach a disarmament agreement, we may not go too far. I hope we do not.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, if there is no other business to be transacted, I move that the Senate adjourn, in accordance with the previous order, until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, March 25, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Independence Day of Tunisia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 20, the Republic of Tunisia celebrated the seventh anniversary of her independence. On this memorable occasion, I wish to take this opportunity to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency, the President of Tunisia, Habib Bourguiba; and His Excellency, the Tunisian Ambassador to the United States, Habib Bourguiba, Jr.

The granting of complete independence by the French on March 20, 1956, was but an intermediate step in the political growth of the Tunisian state. Since 1881 when they had been forced to live under a French protectorate, Tunisians had gradually and steadfastly fought for their sovereign rights and liberty. With the formation of national parties in the 1920's, the political energy of the people became canalized and the national movement was accelerated. French rule was first challenged actively during the month of April 1938, when serious clashes occurred between French soldiers and the nationalist-led Tunisian populace. These riots caused the French to clamp down strongly on any political activity.

It was not until June 3, 1955, that the French authorities, pressured by internal disorders and by the nations of the world through the United Nations, bowed to the inevitable and ceded their powers of internal rule to the Tunisians, keeping only foreign affairs and defense matters under their control. A year of peaceful negotiations led finally to complete sovereignty for the Tunisian state.

The first obstacle which the Neo-Destour Party, the major political organization in Tunisia, had to overcome was an archaic government, both foreign and obsolete, headed by an unpopular hereditary ruler, the Bey. This party, guided by the competent Habib Bourguiba, was able, in 1 year, not only to depose the Bey and establish a republic, but also to promulgate a constitution whereby the rights of the people, freedom of religion, and equality of all citizens are guaranteed. This was the culmination of political growth and freedom for which the Tunisians had long hoped and fought.

The new Republic was immediately beset with many serious problems which had to be met and overcome; chief among them were exploitation of natural resources, insufficient housing, and unemployment. Because of political cohesion through the Neo-Destour Party, the Government made rapid gains. Children's villages were established to take care of the orphans and those small children who were forced to work for a living. Foreign investments, so important for the growth of a country, were guaranteed by public law. Attention was focused on mineral development and water resources—a 35,000 acre tract of irrigated land was opened for cultivation. And recently construction was begun on an oil refinery to supply fuel for local consumption, thus eliminating costly fuel imports.

Since our troops first fought to liberate Tunisia from the Axis Powers, the United States has proved itself to be a generous friend. Through foreign aid, we are helping the Government build electric power stations, enlarge port facilities, and extend airports to accommodate jet service for tourists who wish to see famous Roman and Carthaginian antiquities. When Mr. Bourguiba visited Washington in May 1961, the President promised further assistance for more noteworthy and necessary development projects. As one writer commented:

> This decision by the American Government to make of Tunisia a pilot project for long-term investment came as a clear recognition of the commendable progress the country (Tunisia) has made in every respect.
>
> (Lorna Hahn, "Tunisia: Pragmatism and Progress," the Middle East Journal, winter 1962, p. 28.)

Thus it is with pride that we in the United States salute our sister Republic, Tunisia, on its Independence Day anniversary and wish the people of the country continued success.

Communists Use United Nations To Promote Their Cause

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, more and more we are learning of the double standard which has existed at the United Nations. Americans have clung to a hope through the past 17 years that this organization would help bring about world peace but increasingly we find evidence to indicate that we are being taken for a sucker in many of its efforts. This sad fact has come from the fact that in no sense is this organization a united nations. Working within the framework of this world organization is the hard-core Communist bloc which is not even remotely united in the same beliefs and aspirations which motivate American policy or interest.

A long series of instances including almost 100 Soviet vetoes which have blocked most constructive action can be recounted down to the happenings of the past month. After diligent inquiry, I believe I have received the only copy on Capitol Hill of the fraudulent 106-page booklet published by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, commonly known as UNESCO, which is an insult not only to America but to commonsense. In the foreword, UNESCO indicated its duplicity in referring to "race discrimination" in the United States in the factual sense while semantically mentioning "a concise statement of the constitutional position of the non-Russian populations of the U.S.S.R. and an account of their economic and social condition at the present time." Note there is no reference to discrimination. This report, UNESCO concludes "will be found most useful." As a tool of Communist progaganda, I would say, yes, but as an objective treatment of the situation in the U.S.S.R. today, absolutely not.

Written by two Russian professors, S. L. Ronin and I. P. Tsamerian, the first 8 lines are a dead giveaway. They piously state:

> The purpose of this publication is to acquaint the public with one of the major social triumphs of our day, namely, the way in which the problem of nationalities has been solved in the Soviet Union. It is, in fact, the story of the successful establishment of full equality of rights between races and nationalities in the U.S.S.R.

The booklet states the Communist line of economic determinism. All problems relate to the economic. There is no morality, just the economic. On page 11, the two Reds state:

> Thus in czarist Russia, the inequalities between national elements, and the oppression of national minorities and colonial peoples, were consequences of a reactionary social syatem based on czarist absolutism, capitalism, and landlordism.

The Russians had their dirty capitalism but overthrew it. The line is then propounded throughout the book that only communism will answer this situation which is prevalent where neofascism and western colonialism breed discrimination. The writers observe:

> Only the revolution of October 1917, which overthrew this regime and instituted the Soviet system, enabled the peoples of Russia to achieve genuine equality of rights and freedom of development. * * * It was the Communist Party which showed the peoples of Russia the true way to free themselves from social and national oppression.

Just consider a few more of the quotes from this fantastic booklet which parrots the Communist Party line:

> Another well-known object lesson is the immense progress achieved by the great Chinese people in all economic and cultural fields since it freed itself from colonial domination, overthrew the reactionary regime, and established the rule of the people (p. 10).
>
> The Soviet Union is a brotherhood of free and equal peoples comprising 15 sovereign Soviet Republics in voluntary association on a footing of complete equality. Under the Constitution of the U.S.S.R., each of these Republics retains the right to secede from the union. Each of them embodies the collective will of its people and can decide its own future in entire freedom (p. 13).
>
> Socialist internationalism, fraternal union with equality of rights, steadfast friendship, and mutual aid, such are the true foundations of the sovereignty of the Union Republics (p. 13).

> Soviet citizens of all nationalities are working enthusiastically to build a Communist society. For that purpose it is essential to consolidate peace throughout the world. The Soviet Government is resolutely and firmly pursuing a policy of peace between the peoples and upholds the principle of peaceful coexistence between nations with different social systems (p. 15).
>
> The Soviet Union Constitution of 1936, which marks the triumph of socialism and the full flowering of Socialist democracy, sets out and confirms in the most definite and absolute fashion the principle of equality of rights for all nationalities and all races on the juridical plane (p. 28).
>
> The principle of national and racial equality of citizens of the U.S.S.R. is fully applied in the electoral sphere. All citizens have equal electoral rights and are equally eligible for election to all organs of the state—from the village Soviet to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. (p. 29).
>
> The multinational Soviet state, grouping the equal peoples of Russia in a single state in a manner unprecedented in history, was a mighty achievement of the October revolution which thus solved a highly complex problem (p. 33).

The lies are even more blatant when mention is made to the Baltic and Ukrainian affiliations with the U.S.S.R. It is well remembered how the many millions of Ukrainians were liquidated and yet the UNESCO booklet contains this mention on page 41:

> It was likewise thanks to the conditions created by the Soviet Socialist regime and the multinational Soviet State that the Ukrainian people were unified for the first time in history in a national Soviet State.

As to the Baltic States, the report notes:

> In 1940, the Soviet regime was restored in the Baltic Republics (Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia), which voluntarily joined the Union (p. 37).

One lie after another is propounded in this United Nations organization booklet. The writers say that the central feature of the new government in the U.S.S.R. "was the assertion of the peoples' right to self-determination, including the right of secession and self-government." Few American apologists of communism will even go that far. Can anyone believe that the right of secession exists in Russia? Could Hungary secede? The "cornerstone" of this wonderful system in Russia, the professors venture, was the solemn proclamation of Lenin in 1917 when he said:

"Your beliefs, your traditions, and your national cultural institutions are henceforth declared free and inviolable. Organize your national life in complete freedom and without hindrance; it is your right."

What about the millions of White Russians, Georgians, and Ukrainians who were liquidated—not purged as is popularly stated but murdered? What about religion in Russia today?

This is not an isolated case. It is happening all of the time. The more obvious cases like the U.N. Special Fund expenditure of $1,157,000 in Cuba for an agricultural aid project receives great press but the day-to-day operations which are just as one sided in all too many instances, go unnoticed.

I have followed UNESCO particularly close because of my interest in education. This same double standard was obvious in their 1960 discourse on discrimination throughout the world. The October 1960 edition of their magazine UNESCO Courier depicts the Little Rock situation, and so forth, but not one word about discrimination in the Soviet Union where entire peoples are enslaved.

When questioned on this, the Director General of UNESCO wrote that the Soviet Union denies that minorities are persecuted in the U.S.S.R. and, therefore, nothing was said or could be said about it. On the other hand, the Courier only presented what American officials readily admit to exist within our country. A neat double standard, do you not think?

It is in light of this terrible double standard that we should start taking a second look at many of the programs of the United Nations. As long as we play by the rules of decent and civilized people we will be hamstrung. The Soviets use the veto, every cunning and deceit to promote their ends. I do not want us to change our high-principled ways but there is no need to be stupid either. Emotional cliches in behalf of the United Nations will not change the fact that the 17-year history shows a definite pattern of Soviet subversions which are working against our interests and the interests of all of the peoples of the world. The publication, "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R." is a good example of this. What makes it worse, the U.S. taxpayers are paying a great share of the cost of these efforts. Efforts are now being made by our Government to have the United Nations supervise our disarmament despite the fact that a Communist now heads up and, in fact, has always headed up the U.N. Military Secretariat which would supervise the world police force. One of these days we are going to wake up and ask, "Why did not someone tell us about all of this?"

"Bury": A New Unit of Measurement Appears in the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a new unit of measurement appeared for the first time anywhere in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The new measurement unit is "bury."

It is found in the proceedings of the House entitled "Disarmament Agency Spokesman States Inaccurate Test-Ban Facts," and two accompanying tables.

Heretofore in evaluation of capabilities of seismic detection systems to check on possible underground test ban treaty cheating, seismic signals equivalent to those produced by an underground shot of 1, 2, 3, or more kilotons fired in alluvium soil formations have been used as a yardstick.

This yardstick has been used simply because the United States has fired underground shots in Nevada alluvium soil from which fairly accurate seismic signal readings have been obtained. Equivalent signals may be produced in other soft geologic formations. The equivalents also may be produced in harder formation by firing a shot of larger kiloton yield in a cavity which decouples the explosive force from the surrounding earth thereby reducing the seismic shock signal to that created by a smaller kiloton yield device which is not decoupled by a cavity.

I have adopted "bury" as the unit of measurement for this signal equivalent for shots fired in alluvium. Thus, "1 bury" is the seismic signal equivalent of a 1-kiloton shot in alluvium; "2 bury" is the seismic signal equivalent of a 2-kiloton shot, and so forth.

This unit measurement has been adopted because of the widespread confusion being created in the evaluation of capabilities of the seismic verification system in a new test ban treaty draft soon to be offered to the Soviets by the Kennedy administration according to its Disarmament Agency spokesmen.

In this connection, it was demonstrated in a recent report of the GOP conference's nuclear testing committee based on testimony to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that cheat shots at "3 bury" and less, that is, 3 kiloton equivalents or less, can be kept from detection by the administration's verification system. The Soviets need only fire the shot underground anywhere in an area of approximately 2½ million square miles in the interior of the U.S.S.R. The testimony also revealed that almost the entire spectrum of nuclear weapons of interest to the military, including the neutron bomb, could be developed clandestinely in this big hole of undetectability. Soviet cheating in this way could lead to Communist nuclear weapons superiority and its equivalent, Communist world domination.

In fact, that is why the name "bury" was selected for this measurement unit. It seemed particularly appropriate in the context of Premier Khrushchev's threat: "We will bury you."

Public statements by persons who have not done their homework on recent testimony to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy illustrate this confusion between the yardstick and the actual formations in which cheat test shots can be fired.

For example, Deputy Disarmament Administrator Adrian Fischer contends there is not much alluvium in the Soviet Union, and reasons therefore, that the Soviets would not have much chance to cheat without being detected. Inasmuch as he surely would not want to mislead anyone as to the deficiencies in detection, identification, and location of cheat shots under a test-ban treaty, one must conclude he simply does not understand that undetectable seismic signals can be manufactured in soils other than alluvium or by firing in underground cavities. Use of the bury should clean this matter up.

Another victim of apparent confusion in this matter seems to be a vocal Member of the other body. The gentleman was moved recently to term as "irresponsible," "misleading" and "mischievous" the GOP's revelation of the big hole in the interior of the Soviet Union open for cheat testing toward Communist nuclear weapons superiority.

In the same statement to newsmen, the gentleman also asked, "If our proposals are as poor as HOSMER says they are, as full of loopholes as he says, why don't the Russians accept them?"

Perhaps that gentleman has forgotten that just a short time ago he, himself, gave the answer to that question in another of his recent interviews by the press. As I recall it, his statement was to the effect that the Russians are planning another series of nuclear tests in the atmosphere this year. They would, of course, stall accepting a treaty until they get them out of the way.

Also Russians well know the oriental bargaining technique of never accepting an agreement until the last possible concession is euchred out of the victim by sharp bargaining practices. U.S. negotiators certainly have given no reason for the Kremlin to assume that the long string of U.S. test ban concessions is anywhere near its end.

Message to Hibernian Society of Baltimore From President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as is customary, the Hiberian Society of Baltimore left no stone unturned to make their St. Patrick's Day celebration last Saturday one of the biggest and best the city has seen for a long time. Approximately a thousand members and guests were in attendance, including all the members of the Maryland congressional delegation.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland, GEORGE FALLON, not only the dean of the Maryland delegation in the House, but obviously Irish, was honored by the society by being selected to toast the President. Incidentally, several years ago President Kennedy was the guest speaker at the annual dinner. Following the toast, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], read the following message which was sent to the group by the President:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

It has been said, by an Irishman I am sure, that the whole world is Irish on the 17th of March. Perhaps not the whole world, but it is indeed true and worth noting well that the joyful observance of St. Patrick's Day is now fully as much an American as an Irish tradition.

It is no simple matter to fix in words the teeming and contrary past, far less the bounding future of the Gael. Effort, even some guile, is required to sort out the truth from the facts. But certainly the celebration of St. Patrick's Day is centuries old in America. It began before the Revolution; it has never ceased; may it never do so. It has taken root among us because it is an occasion dedicated to freedom; to national freedom and religious freedom, and to the great St. Patrick.

There was never a better cause. We stand in the mighty succession of those who first proclaimed it, and those who brought it to fulfillment in our land. It is our cause to defend and ours to advance. In that conviction, I send you the greetings of this day.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Cuban Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose a newsletter from the Yorkville Enquirer, York, S.C., from our beloved and distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina, Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON. The letter is as follows:

CUBAN PROBLEM

(By Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina)

Overshadowing all other problems facing the Congress is the needling and dangerous problem of Cuba. In a very short time, Castro and his brand of communism in Cuba has become a great funnel for world communism to pour in on the Western Hemisphere. Castro and Cuba do not just represent an island of Communist activity but a dynamite key which could blast us into world war if treated carelessly.

In view of this situation, it is my opinion that any public official making statements concerning the Cuban situation should do so only with care and when he is armed with facts. Officials of Government, whether they are elected like myself or appointed as they are in the State and Defense Departments, must realize that when they speak to the people of the United States and the world, they have the ability to inflame and excite or to calm and subdue.

REPUBLICANS RESPONSIBLE

The Kennedy administration inherited the Cuban mess from the previous Republican administration and the very ones who are now attacking the administration for its policy in Cuba, were a part and parcel of the Eisenhower administration which helped to put Castro in office. It was back in 1957 that I conducted an investigation into Communist activity in Latin and Central America. In my published report I warned the Republican State Department and President Eisenhower that unless we took affirmative action in the Caribbean area as well as in other points in Latin America to lead these people away from communism, that world communism would gain a foothold in the Western Hemisphere. Those who now criticize President Kennedy, at that time laughed off my report and continued to ignore Latin America.

Later, when Castro's revolt was progressing in Cuba, the State Department under Eisenhower, together with his own executive orders, halted the shipment of arms and supplies necessary to protect the Cuban Government against the Rebel Castro. The Republican administration closed its eyes at shipments of American arms and other help to Castro's Communist guerrillas in the mountains of Cuba.

NAIVE STATE DEPARTMENT

Castro had hardly reached Havana to claim his new office of Dictator when the State Department rushed in blindly to recognize the new regime without even so much as asking a question. During all this time, I had pointed out in the Senate by speeches and press releases, Castro was surrounded by a brother and a number of key friends who had been trained by Russians in guerrilla warfare tactics and who had been schooled in communism. Long before the first Russian saw Cuban soil, the Eisenhower administration could have acted out of a just cause when our properties were seized and our citizens jailed and some even shot to death. This was the time to act.

The leadership in the Republican Party which now criticizes Kennedy for his policies toward Cuba, conveniently forgot the mess they made and handed to President Kennedy when he took office. The time to preserve the Monroe Doctrine should have been when it was being torn up and not wait until now when the Russians are holding the pieces.

NOT POLITICAL ISSUE

Any politician who harps on the Cuban situation to make it a political issue is doing his nation a great disservice. Those who cry invasion without just provocation should accompany their remarks with an estimation of how many Americans will die as a result. We are not cowards but neither do we wish to be foolhardy. So I urge every citizen to weigh carefully the charges and countercharges that may come as a result of major and lesser crises coming from the Cuban situation. We must rid Cuba of communism, but the means we use to achieve this end can be the difference between peace and war.

Let Freedom Ring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I call the Members attention to a most worthwhile project being advanced by the citizens of one of the communities in my congressional district.

On July 4, the residents of Mount Morris, Ill., will commemorate the birth of our great nation with an old-fashioned patriotic celebration. The highlight of which will be ringing of every bell in the city at the same time. It is hoped that this resounding simultaneous peal will ring out loud and clear the theme of the celebration—Let Freedom Ring—thus vividly reminding the community of the reason why the holiday is celebrated.

Since the Liberty Bell in Philadelphia typifies the Nation's heritage of freedom, it has been suggested that the ringing of the Nation's freedom bell be carried coast to coast by the national communication media, immediately to be followed by the ringing of every available bell in every community across the country. At this time of grave national concern a return to the traditional theme of the Fourth of July—flying the flag and ringing the bells—is needed. Thus I strongly urge the Members to impress upon every American the importance of this project and the need for their participation in this nationwide symbolic rededication to the principles upon which this Nation was founded.

Mr. Charles Himes, Jr., chairman of the Mount Morris Family Festival Committee, as well as the many other Mount Morris citizens who are working diligently to make this affair a success are to be commended for this concerted attempt to refresh our memories as to the true meaning of the Fourth of July.

United Fruit Co. Cited for Part in Cuban Prisoner Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the very fine letters of congratulations written by the Honorable Robert Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States, and Gen. Alfred Gruenther, president of the American Red Cross, to Mr. Thomas Sunderland, president of the United Fruit Co., for that company's humanitarian service in providing one of its ships for the shipment of supplies to Cuba in connection with the prisoner exchange program, and for the return of some 750 Cuban refugees to our country.

The United Fruit Co. certainly is to be commended for this unselfish service to the Cuban Families Committee; the ship, SS *Santo Cerro* and her crew were most welcome in this humanitarian project, and this act of generosity will always be remembered among the finest ones in our Nation's history.

Under unanimous consent, I include the letters from the Attorney General and from General Gruenther to Mr. Sunderland in the RECORD, along with Mr. Sunderland's gracious reply to General Gruenther.

The letters follow:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1963.
Mr. T. E. SUNDERLAND,
President, United Fruit Co.
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. SUNDERLAND: The recent return of the Cuban prisoners to their families has been a source of satisfaction to all of us. Your company is to be commended for its willingness to help the American Red Cross and the Cuban Families Committee in this outstanding humanitarian project, and I hope you will accept my sincerest congratulations.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1963.
Mr. THOMAS E. SUNDERLAND,
President, United Fruit Co.,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. SUNDERLAND: The American Red Cross is most grateful to the United Fruit Co., for the use of the SS *Santo Cerro* for the shipment of supplies to Cuba in connection with the prisoner exchange program, and for bringing 750 Cuban refugees to Port Everglades on the return voyage.

Several of our Red Cross personnel had an opportunity to work with officials of your company and with personnel aboard the *Santo Cerro*. The cooperation was perfect at all times.

I was especially impressed by the warm attitude of the crew toward the refugees on the return voyage. I am sure this created a most favorable impression of their new home.

Thus far three ships and several planes have carried supplies to Cuba totaling approximately $28 million. Twenty-nine hundred refugees have been transported to Port Everglades. A fourth ship is scheduled to sail from Baltimore within a few days.

It is clear that we shall be in the shipping business for at least 2 more months. Please pray that we do not have any natural disasters in the United States during that period. Our key disaster experts are heavily engaged in the Cuban program.

With warm regard.

Sincerely,

ALFRED M. GRUENTHER,
President.

UNITED FRUIT CO.,
Boston, Mass., March 12, 1963.
Gen. ALFRED M. GRUENTHER,
President, the American National Red Cross,
National Headquarters, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL GRUENTHER: Thank you for your letter of February 20 concerning our donation of the use of the SS *Santo Cerro* and its crew in connection with the prisoner exchange program. We appreciate your very generous comments, particularly with respect to the attitude and action of our personnel.

Our personnel enjoyed working on this project, especially as it was concerned with the people of Latin America with whom we have enjoyed such a long relationship. Although the Cuban exchange program is a controversial matter, we could not permit this to stand in the way of the humanitarian aspect of the exchange. It was this latter aspect which was a major factor in our company decision to contribute over a quarter-million dollars in addition to the use of the ship and its crew.

I am certain you join in our hope that the day will come when Cuba will again be governed by the democratic. freedom-loving Cubans.

Sincerely,

THOMAS E. SUNDERLAND.

Thirty-five Years a Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding members of the legal profession in the Midwest is Marks P. Alexander, who recently retired after 35 years' public service. Federal Judge Omer Poos describes Mr. Alexander's knowledge of criminal law this way:

> I think he knows more about it than any other man in the United States.

Mr. Alexander recently observed his 76th birthday and is recovering from surgery. He is retiring as assistant U.S. attorney for southern Illinois.

It is noteworthy that every U.S. attorney who has taken office since 1927 has asked Mr. Alexander to remain on the staff.

Address By Senator McClellan Before Arkansas Basin Development Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on March 8 at Tulsa, Okla., the Arkansas Basin Development Association held its annual meeting. We were fortunate in having as our guest speaker the Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, U.S. Senator from Arkansas. I cannot recall attending a meeting where the crowd was more enthusiastic or accepted more completely the views of a speaker.

I had the honor of being master of ceremonies at that meeting; and it is a distinct pleasure and honor for me to submit, for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the remarks of our distinguished colleague, who made such a profound impression upon those who were present to hear him.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address by the senior Senator from Arkansas printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY SENATOR MCCLELLAN, THE ARKANSAS BASIN DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, TULSA, OKLA., MARCH 8, 1963

Mr. Chairman, it is a real pleasure to be your guest on this occasion and to have the privilege of addressing this splendid audience of fellow citizens of the Arkansas River Basin.

Your presence here this evening impressively demonstrates again your support of, your enthusiasm for, and your dedication to, the accomplishment of the comprehensive water resource development program of this valley, to the construction of which our Federal Government is now, I think, irrevocably committed.

The large attendance at this meeting and the ardor and buoyancy of spirit prevailing here, significantly indicate that you are generally satisfied with the progress made and the momentum that we have achieved in carrying this project forward. We have, I am sure, every right and good reason to be pleased and gratified.

We have long since passed the conception, visionary and planning periods, and the authorization action that necessarily precede all construction programs of magnitude that are sponsored and financed by the Federal Government.

Our Arkansas River Basin program has now reached the stage where it is so thoroughly and finally planned, so firmly and positively directed, and so completely activated and energized that we now not only know where and how it is going, but we also know when it will get there. As presently scheduled, we will reach our goal in 1970.

To that end I can assure you that all members of your congressional delegations will not only be alert to and will oppose any proposal or action that would hinder, delay, or interfere with that happening; but we will also actively support adequate appropriations to expedite further construction and make certain the job is completed by that time.

The distance we have traveled to reach the milestone of the present has, at times, been rugged and difficult. In earlier stages of our journey, we encountered delays and hindrances that were vexing and disappointing. Some of them, of course, were unavoidable.

However, faith, vigilance, perseverance, and hard work on the part of your organization, other auxiliary groups, and your Representatives in Congress have succeeded in moving the project from the early stages of hope and uncertainty to the present state of advancement and progress that assures success and the full attainment of our ultimate goal.

When measured by the dollar yardstick, this basin project is now about one-fourth completed. We are probably further along, however, than the dollar figures would indicate. With the closure of the big upstream dams and of Dardenelle on the main stem, and with the progress that has been made on bank stabilization work, we have already gained substantial control over the river's bad habits—silting, wandering, bank destruction, and irregular flow and flooding.

The size of the total task in which we are engaged in this valley is hard to comprehend. It is immense. Over the period of the next 7 or 8 years, nearly $1 billion will be poured into this basin in the form of contracts, wages, and materials by the Federal Government. Some of the material used, will be bought outside the basin, but much of it and most of the labor are being procured right here in the area.

More than 100 million cubic yards of earth will have to be dredged from the channels. Another 100 million yards will be piled into earth embankments. More than 600 million pounds of steel, 8 million barrels of cement, and 8 million tons of rock and aggregate will have to be put into place.

In addition, some 1,700 miles of highway, railway, and utility lines will have to be moved and relocated.

Within the next 10 years, State, county, and municipal governments, along with private enterprise, are expected to spend at least another billion dollars for the improvements necessary to make adjustments to the changes taking place and in the opportunity investments that this great resource development invites and provides.

Income and employment generated by such large scale construction is bound to provide an economic surge of unprecedented dimensions in this basin—one that is sure to carry forward until the project is completed. After completion, and when the Government's construction income has dwindled off, no doubt there will be a slack period of time—maybe a few years—before the full impact of new industrial development is felt.

State and local governments and business should be aware of this problem and make plans accordingly for that transition period. To the extent, of course, that industrial development can be accelerated, this situation can be met or at least greatly alleviated. We must keep on, and never cease planning for more expansion, more growth, and more building as our valley changes and future needs develop. For it is when we look beyond the construction period, that we foresee in the decades ahead, great, almost revolutionary, changes in our lives.

Much has already been written and said about the glowing future of the Arkansas River Basin. I will not attempt to match crystal balls with anyone, but I would suggest that we recall many demonstrated facts as revealed and experienced by other river basins that have had similar programs. I shall only mention one as an illustration.

In 1920 the tonnage carried on the Ohio River was only about 10 million tons. By 1929, when the Corps of Engineers had completed the first canalization program on the Ohio, that tonnage had more than doubled. It had increased to almost 50 million tons by 1950, and now it is in excess of 80 million tons.

There can be no doubt that water resource development has tremendously accelerated economic growth and progress in the Ohio River Basin. That development is credited with being an important reason for the investment of about $13 billion in industrial facilities in that valley during the 1950's.

As I have indicated, the Ohio River is not an isolated instance. Comparable statistics could be recited for the Illinois River, the upper Mississippi, and the Tennessee Valley.

Our late lamented and beloved Senator Kerr, to whom we are indebted more than to any other man for progress on the Arkansas Basin program, recently estimated that if the Arkansas Valley matches the achievements of the Tennessee Valley (and there is no real reason why it shouldn't), this development program should bring $20 billion in personal income into this region within the next 20 years. He felt that in view of its superior resources, the Arkansas Basin should far outstrip the achievements of the Tennessee. I share that view.

The more we look at this region, the more we must wonder that so many of its opportunities have remained neglected and untapped for so long.

A disadvantageous freight rate structure, which placed us in a poor position to compete for industrial development; the unreliability of our river with its unstable course and irregular flow; the relative sparseness of population; and the limited markets available to this region—all these have handicapped us in the past.

But these handicaps are being overcome. Navigation on the Arkansas will give us the low-cost transportation we need to open our coal resources and attract industries. And, as people move out of the increasingly congested eastern section of the country to seek open spaces and opportunities farther west, we may expect the population growth of our States to be greatly accelerated.

Then, at long last, we will be able to capitalize on the great blessings that nature has given us. We can utilize to the fullest one of the largest supplies of uncommitted water to be found in the United States—water which modern industry seeks with increasing eagerness to cool its machines, to drive its turbines, and to incorporate into its manufacturing processes.

Thus, industry can make maximum use of our huge wealth in basic energy fuels—gas, oil, and coal. Moreover, our many other mineral resources would also be turned into wealth. The Arkansas-White-Red Basin contains 65 commercial minerals, including 30 of the 38 important minerals that our country is now importing from abroad. Among these 65 minerals are sulphur, coal, salt, glass sands, ceramic clay, building stone, lead, zinc, and petroleum with its vast implications for the development of petrochemical industries.

Along with industry, other forms of enterprise will benefit. Fertilizer and farm machinery, building materials, steel and cement will come to our communities at lower cost; and many of our agricultural and other domestic products can likewise be shipped and marketed more cheaply.

To proclaim the Arkansas River Basin to be the land of opportunity, both as of now and for tomorrow, is no idle boast, no overstatement, nor is it an exaggeration. Instead, that assertion is based on fact and simply declares that which is true.

This claim of opportunity that we can proudly make today for this river valley and for our respective States amounts to only a modest appraisal and a very conservative evaluation of the great worth of the magnificent multipurpose development now in progress and the tremendous wealth and benefits that are destined to flow therefrom.

Reference to our area as a land of opportunity is not a mere attempt to coin or to make use of the phrase for any propaganda value that it may have, but rather to describe adequately and appropriately a pleasant and impressive reality.

This comprehensive development program on the Arkansas River is one of the largest ever undertaken by our Government, as an overall project, under the direction of the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army.

In many respects its potentials transcend and surpass those of any other water resource development system in our Nation. It is truly one of the most dramatic and progressive programs for the conservation and development of water resources ever authorized and embarked upon by the Federal Government.

The completion and operation of these vast improvements will open up new vistas of prospects and possibilities for the expansion and growth of agriculture and industry, far beyond anything that was contemplated when the project was first envisioned or when it was finally justified and authorized.

What we have here is not just a local or area development standing alone or apart and isolated from other national interests. It is not a development whose benefits are restricted and confined to the immediate community or to the geographic section in which the improvements are being made. It is, and will be, a vital integral part of the overall structure of America's might and power.

New products and increased production emanating and resulting from this great venture will tremendously strengthen our economy, reinforce our national defense establishment, and further promote and enhance progress and general prosperity throughout the Nation.

Every dollar being expended on this program is an investment in these things—in the future of our country. All the cost incurred in the building of this system of improvements properly comes within the category of national investments rather than in the column of Federal expenditures. In the course of time—and much sooner than we may have estimated—these funds now being appropriated for this purpose will all be recovered into the Federal treasury. It will pay for itself many times over, by reason of the enlargement of the tax resources which this development will generate.

Thus, we are transforming what has heretofore been a significant, but dormant, economic potential into a future dynamic national asset. What we are building here is another powerful pillar of strength of such quality and endurance that the march of time for generations to come cannot efface or weaken. The years of progress that lie ahead can only augment and accentuate its force and influence upon our national image and stature.

By doing this—by making large investments of public funds—we also enrich the heritage of future generations.

In my judgment, some of the fiscal policies our Government is pursuing are unsound. In some other fields, I believe, it is unwisely making excessive and unnecessary expenditures—expenditures that are improvidently swelling our national indebtedness and further encumbering the estate that we are leaving to those who will follow us.

I definitely oppose that course and policy. But, in the vast development and conservation that we are making in our vital water resources—for every dollar we are prudently spending for this purpose—we are adding substantially to the wealth of their heritage.

We should also keep in mind another and vital area of compelling interest in which

enormous expenditures are necessary and currently being made—that is in the field of science and technology. Some $15 billion annually is now being spent by Government and private sources for research and development. Research and development, in fact, has itself become a major industry in this country, one of the largest—one of the fastest growing.

We must therefore anticipate and prepare for the future by looking understandingly at what is happening today—what is emerging from the present. It is clear, and becoming more and more so every day, that the economic pattern of the future is emerging around science and technology. It is emerging through the difficult process of creative thought and innovation. We see this all around us everywhere.

The principal elements of this developing economic change are threefold. They are the scientists and their research facilities; the management and financial resources capable of bringing research to an economic outcome; and the educational, business, and political leadership capable of creating the proper setting for these scientific and technological forces.

Research and development have definitely become one of the few determinative influences in the ebb and flow of industrial location. This is a positive factor that we should not lose sight of. Again, I think, circumstances greatly favor us, and opportunity is knocking at our door.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has built five major installations to the south and east of us. They are Cape Canaveral; the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville, Ala.; the Michoud plant in Louisiana (where the Saturn rockets will be assembled); the giant test facility now being built in Mississippi; and the Manned Spacecraft Center at Houston, Tex. (the home of the astronauts).

These installations are permanent—they are here to stay. They are fundamental to the creation, the assembly, the manning, and the launching of this Nation's largest rockets. These plants may, in time, be supplanted, but they will not be duplicated. They are a part of our economic landscape for many, many years to come.

It is of significant advantage that our great river basin leads directly into this whole gigantic space complex. It would seem, therefore, that we have done our river work in good time. We should seek to take full advantage of this magnificent opportunity to manufacture here in our area many of the components for missiles and spaceships and to carry on other vital work related to these installations.

It is not enough, however, for us to look down the river and see those things that might be of value to us. We must bring our great potential to life and find ways and means to make it an efficient part and parcel of this vital new space system. We must make this a major effort. Just as we have worked over the years to build the base from which we can now draw out the physical potential of this great river basin, so should we now work to achieve the full fruits and benefits of the opportunities this river development program has opened up to us.

We should pursue with unrelenting vigilance the opportunities that we have to develop those industries and those services that are now coming within our reach. This will be no easy task. It may well be more difficult than our work has been thus far, but it is most challenging, and success in the effort will surely be abundantly rewarded.

In conclusion, may I say, that the wonderful progress we have made in our river basin program is a tremendous tribute to the unity, vigor, and indefatigable persistence with which the people of this basin, and particularly your organizations, have supported the program throughout the years. The unified presentations made to the congressional Appropriations Committees each year by the Tri-State Committee representing Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, and speaking for them with one strong voice, have been truly impressive and effective. The unity of your respective organizations and their working together have brought home to the people of this region a broad understanding of the importance of this development program and rallied their support behind it.

I congratulate you, and may I urge that you continue to labor harmoniously together in further seeking to bring into full fruition the magnificent and dynamic possibilities of future progress and prosperity that are now available to us.

The Nuclear Test Ban: An Appraisal of Mr. Foster's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, William C. Foster, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, submitted a statement on the nuclear test ban issue to the GOP conference committee on nuclear testing. It is to be found at page 1641 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 4, 1963. Of the many statements submitted to the committee, Mr. Foster's contribution is perhaps the most significant, since it almost certainly must represent the official views of the administration of the subject.

In what follows, a critical appraisal will be made of Mr. Foster's statement. Admittedly the test ban issue contains a number of vital factors which are not amenable to scientific or even logical analysis. These factors relate to the great political issues which enfold the problem and there is little doubt but that they are the truly determining factors in the final judgment which one makes on the matter. As such it is only natural that the test ban issue should be a highly controversial one, as all important political issues are apt to be. However, in the overall assessment of the problem it is crucial that those scientific and military factors which are subject to reasonable analysis be understood and clearly expressed by those who attempt to arrive at judgment decisions. Rather than challenge Mr. Foster's statement in those areas which pertain to political judgments, this appraisal will mainly be restricted to an examination of those arguments which include technical and military considerations.

Section I of Mr. Foster's statement is headed by the contention that "a test ban treaty is in our national interests." To support this contention the following remarks pertaining to nuclear weapons development are made:

> Without a treaty and with continued unlimited testing on both sides, there would be a further increase by both in the efficiency of weapons at the higher yield end of the scale. Our advantage in small-weight, high-yield weapons would most probably diminish. Both sides would enhance their knowledge of weapons effects. In the field of tactical weapons, the Soviets would eventually be able to match our more diversified and numerous arsenal. Overall, the trend would be more toward equality between the United States and the U.S.S.R.
>
> With a treaty, improvements in yield-to-weight ratios would come more slowly through laboratory work alone. The U.S. advantage in smaller weapons would persist over a longer time. Some weapons effects phenomena would remain unsettled or undiscovered by both sides. The developments of antimissile systems would be slowed down on both sides. Our tactical weapon superiority would persist longer. In general, our present nuclear advantages would last for a considerably longer period.

Implicit in these remarks are two basic assumptions: First, our current knowledge of Soviet nuclear weapons technology is sufficiently accurate to permit an assessment of the relative nuclear capabilities of the United States and the U.S.S.R., and, second, a test ban treaty would not permit significant progress to be made by unverified clandestine testing.

It should be understood that our knowledge of Soviet nuclear weapons is based far more upon speculation than upon cold hard facts. Edward Teller has described our process of evaluation as akin to trying to determine a neighbor's cooking by means of sniffing the smoke from his kitchen. Evaluation of this kind must of necessity be highly narcissistic, in that we must guess the Soviet technology by assuming that it is essentially the same as ours. To put it mildly, such methods are bound to be highly inaccurate and subject to human interpretation. As a result our evaluation process is really a result of human compromise rather than an exact analysis.

Dr. Hans Bethe, who is the Chairman of the evaluation panel which assesses the Soviet tests, reported early last year that the Soviet tests in 1961 had produced very substantial gains in multimegaton warhead technology, especially in the 1- to 5-megaton category and indicated that the yield-to-weight ratios they had achieved would permit them to attain hardened missile capabilities similar to our own. Such remarks as these hardly conform to the statement by Mr. Foster that we hold an advantage in small-weight high-yield weapons. If there is indeed a difference between Bethe's interpretations and those of Mr. Foster, it should be explained to a concerned public.

Incidentally, Mr. Foster chooses to ignore the relative position of the United States and the U.S.S.R. in the very high yield range, that is, tons of megatons. One wonders whether this is because he attaches no military significance to this range or whether, perhaps, he believes the Soviets now lead us in this area.

The lower the yield which the Soviets elect to test, the more difficult it is for our diagnostic system to analyze the debris from the explosion. And should the Soviets have elected to conduct extensive underground tests similar to our own, our ignorance of the nature of these tests will be complete. In this context it is important to understand that we really have only the most sketchy knowledge of low-yield Soviet tests. Since these yields are representative of those most preferred for tactical military operations it is both misleading and dangerous to assume that our tactical arsenal is superior, more diversified, and more numerous than that of the Soviets. Unfortunately, the current administration, and, but to a lesser extent, its predecessor, have elected to take a "what we don't know won't hurt us" attitude toward unknown and poorly known Soviet nuclear tests. This has been both fallacious and highly perilous, considering the great importance of the test issue to our national security.

In order to assess Mr. Foster's remarks on the progress that could be made in the event of a test ban treaty it is necessary to obtain an idea as to how effectively a violator might operate through clandestine testing which cannot be verified under the treaty conditions. In discussing these possibilities, what are believed to be our present detection and verification capabilities—in terms of our more recent proposals to the Soviets—should first be briefly summarized.

It is generally conceded that the major obstacles to effective detection and verification of clandestine tests arise from considerations of underground and outer space testing.

Over the last few years the proposals we have advanced toward monitoring underground tests have reflected a belief that explosions of approximately 20 kilotons and above could be effectively policed. The advisors to the current and the last administration have, in their considered judgment, on the matter tended to minimize the effect of seismic decoupling, and have, in effect, ruled it out from serious consideration. Rather than making serious efforts to reduce this yield threshold, that is, 20 kilotons, to a lower, and presumably safer, value, the recent gains in seismic verification capability which have been claimed have been used to wipe out any threshold whatever and to lower the inspection quota, and thus constitute a concession to Soviet demands instead of an increase in the effectiveness and security of the system. In this light, let us examine some of Mr. Foster's statements on the possibilities of successfully catching the Soviets at clandestine underground testing.

Mr. Foster states that—

> None of the seismic systems proposed by the United States from 1959 on would be capable of detecting with any certainty many explosions of 3 kilotons or less if they occurred in alluvium, a common soil formation similar to gravel. Moreover, artificial decoupling (i.e., the so-called big hole technique), might permit considerably larger yield explosions without detection. Furthermore, an evader testing in alluvium would probably have little assurance that the cavity produced by the explosion would not collapse, leading to a large visible surface crater which might itself be detected. Moreover, due to the variability in the size of the seismic signals which can occur from explosions of the same size, an evader could not be sure of evading even seismic detection at low yields by testing in alluvium. "Big hole" decoupling is both time consuming and expensive. Preparation of a large cavity might itself be detected during the construction phase. Moreover, since this form of decoupling has never been tried on any practical scale so far as we know, a potential evader would again be unsure that he could escape detection. Finally, while single tests might sometimes escape detection by seismic means, a test series would be far more difficult to hide. Yet little progress can ordinarily be made with individual, isolated tests.

An examination of these statements shows that they are incomplete, inconsistent, and illogical—with respect to those facts which are incorporated in our actual test ban proposals, present and upcoming.

Perhaps the seismic network can detect some number of underground—but also undecoupled—events in the range, of, say, 3 to 20 kilotons. But what about the probability that these detected events can be distinguished from earthquakes and be verified, through on-site inspection, as cheat nuclear explosions? Considering that we are now bargaining over an inspection quota which involves but only a handful of inspections each year and taking into account the fact that there will be many hundreds of earthquakes each year in the Soviet Union which will be indistinguishable from nuclear explosions in the 3- to 20-kiloton range, many more below that, it would hardly seem that we stand a good chance of catching a violator even if no other problems existed.

With respect to the remarks on the efficacy of decoupling, the conclusions reached in Mr. Foster's statement are misleading and contain a strange brand of illogic. It is stated that "big hole decoupling is both time consuming and expensive." It would appear from this that we have made up the Russians' minds for them on whether they felt that such procedures would work toward their advantage—this is certainly fallacious reasoning. However, what is perhaps more important than "big hole" decoupling is "small hole" decoupling, which need not entail excavations too much larger than those we have been making in our underground tests in Nevada; and the AEC has recently stated that underground testing has actually proved to have a number of advantages not previously foreseen. To decouple a nuclear explosion to the maximum theoretical extent—that is, by a factor of 300 in reducing the strength of the seismic signal—might well entail a "big hole" and involve considerable time and expense. But the far more germane point is that a relatively "small hole" type of decoupling could lead to a serious degradation in the efficiency of the monitoring system.

For example, a 20-kiloton explosion could be reduced in seismic strength to well below 1 kiloton, and thus be undetectable, less alone be distinguishable as an explosion, in a hole which is but a few tens of yards in diameter—hardly an evacuation which is too time consuming and expensive. Perhaps we could get a much better idea of how far the Soviets might be willing to go in decoupling if the Disarmament Agency would release some rough estimates of the relationship between the cost of such measures and the gains in weapon system effectiveness which can be achieved. After all, it must be realized that such gains can represent sizable cost savings in weapon systems for which we have spent, or will spend, billions of dollars.

Without meaning to do so, Mr. Foster unconsciously displayed a degree of both illogic and conceit in stating that—

> Since this form of decoupling has never been tried on any practical scale so far as we know, a potential evader would again be unsure that he could escape detection.

Because we have not yet done decoupling experiments on a practical scale by no means should lend any degree of assurance that the Soviets have not done so. And if the Soviets have achieved a reliable understanding of how far they can go in such evasive tactics, they could get away with a lot more than Mr. Foster's estimates indicate.

How much the Soviets can get away with is something which only they can decide, not we. But one statement that does seem reasonably safe to make is that they can test underground, without too much difficulty, at yield levels in excess of 20 kilotons, and with propensively less difficulty at successively lower yields, with little fear of detection and with a really trivial chance of being caught. In this respect, if the cheating is not even detected, it will be of precious little good to have observed the preparation of the test during the construction phase. The treaty we are proposing does not allow for suspicion, it covers only the positive verification that a nuclear explosion has taken place.

It is most peculiar that the possibility of cheating through tests in outer space is not even mentioned in Mr. Foster's paper. Perhaps this is because our present state of knowledge does not permit any practical scheme which could detect and verify nuclear explosions in outer space.

In testifying before the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee last September, Dr. Franklin Long, who is Mr. Foster's technical director in the Disarmament Agency, answered a number of questions posed by Senator Jackson, regarding outer space detection and verification. Dr. Long made the following remarks:

> I think the Senator's point is basically correct; namely, that if you have a test in far outer space, the type of verification that for near tests we think of as adequate, is not accessible to you—the thing is very far away. But you do not get positive verification in the sense that you can never know for sure that some natural phenomena might have produced the same signal. So in that kind of sense, verification of an outer space test is difficult.

The best that Dr. Long could say about attempts to monitor such tests was that they could lead to a "heightening of suspicion, perhaps."

Should we sign a test ban treaty with the Soviets if it is extremely doubtful that we would attempt to establish an effective monitoring system, such as satellite detection systems orbiting around the earth and the sun. The expense of such systems would be prodigious and they would not be able to provide positive verification; and, as previously remarked, suspicion is not covered by the treaty.

The question to which the American people deserve a fair answer is what types of gains in nuclear technology can be made by our outer space testing? Several years ago, when space technology was in its infancy and we were making efforts to orbit grapefruit-sized objects, it was fashionable to dismiss space testing of nuclear weapons as being Buck Rogers stuff. It is not so easy to do this today and our recent Venus shot gave proof enough of the great wealth of information that can be telemetered back to earth. And we should keep in mind that the Soviets are still adjudged to be ahead of us in placing large payloads in outer space.

Admittedly, space testing will be expensive but it would now be irresponsible to claim that it is infeasible. The question then is whether such tests would be worthwhile to the Russians; and, of course, only the Russians can provide the answer. However, we might get some clue to the answer by considering our own possibilities.

Take for example, the warhead for our Minuteman missile, which will soon constitute the major strategic weapon system of the Air Force, or equally well, one could consider the warhead for the Navy's Polaris missile. Over the coming years we are going to invest tens of billions of dollars toward developing and maintaining these systems.

Suppose that it was possible, through such improvements as increasing warhead yield and decreasing warhead cost, to effect a substantial decrease in missile requirements, or, conversely, achieve a substantial increase in missile firepower. Substantial fractions of tens of billions of dollars represent substantial sums indeed, and thus the question of space testing is far from trivial.

Many experts hold the firm belief that space testing, expensive as it may seem, would be a huge bargain to a would-be cheater. In all fairness to the American people, they should be provided by the Government with the opinion of the Disarmament Agency on this matter and the relevant factors—which need not reveal sensitive information—should be brought into the light of public scrutiny.

Having discussed the frailties of the arguments which Mr. Foster advanced to defend the effectiveness of our proposed detection system, we can now turn to an examination of his statements regarding the effect of clandestine testing upon the balance of military power.

Mr. Foster states that with a treaty "the U.S. advantage in smaller weapons would persist over a longer time" and "our tactical weapon superiority would persist longer." It is interesting to note that his views on this matter were not quite so optimistic a few months ago. Testifying before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, Mr. Foster was queried by Senator Goldwater, who said:

> The point that I would like to raise is this: Is detectable testing required to develop the type of tactical weapon in which some of us believe we are still deficient and in which the Soviet Union is also believed to be deficient?

Mr. Foster replied:

> There can be some developments in that type of weapon, presumably below the threshold of detection. Whether this is adequate, in a sense, to distort the tactical balance, I don't know. The military decision has been—the military advice is that in weighing that risk against the risk of continued testing, it is in the national interest to attempt to get a comprehensive test ban which would terminate presumably tests in all environments and at all levels.

Senator Goldwater:

> I can appreciate that. But knowing the nature of the enemy, I don't think we can have much faith in their stopping testing at any level at which they think they need further development. I can believe that they might agree to stopping the testing of large yield weapons. They might even agree to stop testing at all levels. But they could continue with the testing of weapons of a strength that we could not detect. I am talking now of the yield of weapons that will measure in pounds and small tonnages, not kilotons or megatons.

It would appear that the discussion between Senator Goldwater and Mr. Foster, was based upon consideration of the much publicized all-fusion bomb, or, as popularly called, the neutron bomb, and Mr. Foster admitted to some uncertainty as to whether the development of this weapon might distort the tactical balance. Furthermore, he divulged the military opinion on this matter—namely, that it would be in the national interest to get a ban which would not permit clandestine testing of such weapons.

But is such a ban possible? Apparently not, and Mr. Foster's statement on all-fusion weapons confirms this.

Mr. Foster states:

> Many important scientific principles involved in nuclear weapons can be studied with nuclear explosions of less than 3 kilotons, including certain of the principles involved in developing possible pure fusion weapons and in reducing weight-yield ratios. This figure is significant, for explosions of this size and smaller may not always be detectable. However, for the weapons developments and knowledge of weapons effects which are of primary concern to us, and which might make a substantial change in the military balance in a way which would be unfavorable to us, clandestine underground testing would be unsatisfactory * * * and pure fusion weapons would not be of a great advantage to us because they would constitute primarily a cheaper substitute for the explosive component in our already large stockpile of nuclear weapons. Hence, any inhibitions on the development of these weapons would appear to be to our net advantage.

An analysis of this train of reasoning quickly reveals two gross discrepancies: First, a complete ignorance, or avoidance, of the fundamental importance of pure fusion weapons, and, second, a strange inconsistency regarding the importance of pure fusion weapons.

First, we shall consider the inconsistency, and then we shall examine the implications of all-fusion weapons. It is contended by many of our most knowledgeable experts that this class of yet undeveloped—at least by us—weapons is one of the most important factors, if not the most important, entering into the test ban issue.

The inconsistency is briefly, the following:

It is first implied that pure fusion weapons can be developed by testing at yields, less than 3 kilotons—which are well below the threshold of effectiveness of the monitoring system we have proposed. Next, it is claimed that such weapons would not be of great advantage to us. And, finally, it is concluded that inhibitions on the development of such weapons would be to our net advantage.

It is quite apparent that the thought process behind such remarks could not have been very deep, for they are plainly self-defeating. If the pure fusion weapon is not advantageous then why worry about whether or not its clandestine development can be detected? On the other hand, if, as stated, inhibiting such development works to our good then there must be some advantage to the weapon. But plainly, since our proposed monitoring system is incapable of inhibiting such development, there is this puzzling inconsistency which leads to the growing question: Are those weapons advantageous or are they not? It is truly surprising that a statement dealing with a subject of such great importance should contain such obvious inconsistences.

During the past 3 years, a number of public statements regarding the importance of pure fusion weapons have been made. To do those statements full justice would be far too time consuming. and only a relatively brief synopsis of them is presented here.

In May 1960 Senator Thomas J. Dodd gave a major speech in the Senate on the test ban issue. In an incisive analysis of the then existing weakness of our proposals at Geneva—which have since became increasingly weaker—Senator Dodd brought up the importance of the neutron bomb:

> The production of a clean tactical nuclear weapon would open the way to a whole series of technologically significant breakthroughs. By definition such a weapon would have to have a fusion warhead—that is, a heavy hydrogon or tritium warhead. If a straight fusion weapon can be developed—and there is no doubt that it can—this would open the way to the production of thermonuclear weapons of all yields in vastly increased quantities and at much smaller cost.
>
> And then there is the matter of the neutron bomb, to which there has already been some reference in the press. Such a bomb can be theoretically produced by tailoring the energy of a fusion explosion so that, instead of heat and blast, its primary product is a burst of neutrons. Such a burst would do negligible physical damage, but it would immediately destroy all life in the target area. It would in short, operate as a kind of deathray.
>
> I consider all the hush-hush that surrounds the neutron bomb to be a glaring instance of the official abuse of secrecy. To keep the facts of life on the nuclear age from the American people is foolish, and potentially disastrous. If there is a possibility that a neutron bomb can be built, if there appears to be any chance that the Soviets may succeed in building one before we do, then the American people have a right to the facts.

In April 1960, Freeman Dyson, a nuclear physicist and also a consultant to the AEC nuclear weapon laboratories, wrote an article in the magazine Foreign Affairs. The article discussed the important characteristics and military implications of pure fusion weapons. In concluding the discussion of these weapons, Dyson stated:

> Imagine a hypothetical situation in which the United States is armed with existing weapons, while some adversary (not necessarily the Soviet Union) has a comparable supply of nuclear fuel and has learned how to ignite it fission-free. The adversary's bombs would then outnumber ours ten or a hundred to one, and theirs could be used with far greater versatility in infantry warfare. Suppose that in this situation a local war of the Korean type should begin. God help the American infantryman who is sent in to fight, against these odds. Practically speaking, our army would have only two alternatives, either to retreat precipitously or to strike back with our much more limited number of heavier nuclear weapons and thoroughly destroy the whole country. This is not a pleasant situation to contemplate, and yet it is necessary that our people understand that it is a possibility. Any country which renounces for itself the development of nuclear weapons, without certain knowlege that its adversaries have done the same, is likely to find itself in the position of the Polish Army in 1939, fighting tanks with horses.

John Wheeler, a nuclear physicist who did pioneering work with the famed Niels Bohr on the physics of nuclear fission and has long consulted with the AEC and the Department of Defense on nuclear weapons problems has very recently issued the following statement:

> As a physicist and specialist on nuclear fission I see a decisive loss to national security from a test ban.
>
> It will prevent us from developing a technology of pure hydrogen devices free of fission fallout. I am convinced that present nuclear weapons will be outdated in 3 to 10 years. The new technology will have important peacetime applications in mining and earthmoving and will revolutionize ground warfare.
>
> If we do not keep this scientific leadership others will take it. Second level nations will be able to make these ultimately inexpensive devices. No responsible proponent of any detection system has claimed ability to detect a minuscule pure hydrogen detonation underground.
>
> It is unconscionable to renounce for the free world a revolutionary device which others will then make without our knowledge.

If these statements, and many others made by responsible public officials and scientists—who have held access to the so-called secrets of nuclear weaponry—are at all correct, then Mr. Foster's statements that a test ban treaty would allow "our advantage in smaller weapons" to "persist over a longer time" and that "our tactical weapon superiority would persist longer" simply do not bear out. In fact, quite the contrary would be true; we would fall greatly and tragically behind and the credibility of our tactical forces would disappear, and so might much of the free world.

After introducing a bold and imaginative new strategic counterforce concept which held high promise of greatly reducing the level of death and destruction to the civilian fabric, in case of thermonuclear war, the Department of Defense is now retreating to a position of nuclear statemate. If this transition is to actually occur the balance of thermonuclear terror will again begin to act upon the will of the American people—a prospect which is not a happy one to contemplate.

The rationale behind this new and unpleasant shift is twofold:

First. Both sides will soon have invulnerable strategic weapons, that is, hardened missile sites and undetectable nuclear submarines armed with ballistic missiles; and

Second. There is no evidence that the defense against ballistic missile attacks will become feasible and practical.

Both of these premises are inherently dangerous because they are based upon an inherent smugness that technological breakthroughs will not occur to destroy the strategic balance. History has invariably shown such assumptions to be ill-founded and disaster has frequently resulted from such stubborn opinion.

Indeed, it was little more than a dozen years ago when some of our leading nuclear weapons experts were arguing against the H-bomb development and were recommending that we concentrate upon improving our A-bomb technology. Incidentally, in the foreground of those who argued against the H-bomb in this vein was Hans Bethe, and it is revealing to note that Bethe was an early pioneer in helping develop the new "nuclear stalemate" concept.

At present it is difficult to perceive how hardened missile sites can be destroyed in an economical fashion and how Polaris submarines can be located and destroyed. But it is not nearly as difficult to conceive of advanced antimissile weapons which could dangerously offset the presently envisaged nuclear stalemate.

From time to time there have been reports in the press that the pure fusion bomb would have an important effect upon the development of a successful antimissile system. Very recently, Senator Dodd intimated quite strongly that this is the case. With these in mind, we return to Mr. Foster's statement that a test ban treaty would slow down the development of antimissile systems on both sides.

If these contentions about the importance of the pure fusion warhead ballistic missile defense are essentially correct, then Mr. Foster's claim is only half true—we would be slowed down, but not the Soviets. And, if pure fusion warheads were to provide the final step to the feasibility of an antimissile system under development by the Soviets, a test ban treaty might portend a disaster of a magnitude which is difficult to even comprehend.

The criticisms which have been leveled here against Mr. Foster's statement are not intended to be a personal attack against him. Indeed, Mr. Foster must bear the responsibility for his statement, but it is incorrect to state that he is fully responsible for its contents. Like any high-ranking Government official who is called upon to guide a large, complex effort which embraces many different skills, some of which are extremely technical, Mr. Foster is in no small measure at the mercy of his advisers and consultants. It is against certain of these advisers and consultants, particularly the technical experts, that this criticism is directed.

That a certain body of scientists has figured prominently in the test ban positions held by this administration, and its predecessor, is a subject which has not been thoroughly understood and appreciated by the public. However, such has indeed been the case; and although proved wrong and even biased, time after time, these scientists have continued to have a profound influence upon the proposals we have made at Geneva and upon the rationale which the current and past administrations have adopted.

To question the intellectual competence of these scientists would be folly; practically all of them represent top caliber in their fields. But to question their judgment on these vital matters appears to be well in order.

Mr. Foster's statement is far from reassuring. Without questioning the validity of his political judgments, relating to such subjects as the proliferation of nuclear capabilities and the effect of a test ban treaty upon future arms control agreements, the great variance between the technical-military arguments he presents and those which have been presented here in rebuttal is extremely disturbing. And its is emphasized again that the judgment of his scientific advisers is open to serious question as it appears highly probable that their technical judgment has been conditioned to a large degree by nontechnical considerations.

The differences in opinion, on such a crucial issue, which have been brought out here are too great to go unresolved. If our democracy is to remain strong, effective, and truly democratic then a greatly concerned, worried, and confused citizenry must be given sufficient data to participate in debates which affect their very existence.

Thus far, the artificial security barriers erected by the current and past administrations have prevented the necessary healthy public debate. The basic information necessary to foster such debate need not include numerical detail and specific weapon designs; such information would not even be understood by most people. What is needed is a qualitative appraisal of the important technical factors which bear the test ban. Such information should be released as soon as possible.

We should keep in mind that all of these secrets will be of little avail in the future if we are to act falsely and unwisely in our negotiations with the Soviets and consummate a treaty which will allow them to fully exploit their potential while we remain paralyzed by our good intentions. It will be of precious little comfort for our Nation to perish with its secrets clasped tightly to its bosom.

The importance of secrets is not whom they are kept from but how they are handled and interpreted in deciding the destiny of our country. The American people have every right to know whether these secrets are being treated objectively in the deliberations of those who provide the guidance for our top decisionmakers, such as Mr. Foster. If the strong criticism made here is essentially fair and correct then the advisers to Mr. Foster have not been objective in their interpretation of the meaning of classified material. Let the people decide for themselves who is more nearly right. They have every right and reason to do so; it is their fate which hangs in the balance.

Replies to a Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 21, 1963

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the Congressional Record the results of my recent questionnaire, distributed to every resident of my district whose address was available through telephone directories.

The questionnaire covered two main fields—domestic and foreign affairs. I feel sure the views of my constituents as expressed through this questionnaire will be of special interest to my colleagues. The questionnaire results are as follows:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
Domestic affairs:			
1. Do you favor tax reduction without an equal reduction in Federal spending?	10	88	2
2. Do you favor stricter controls over agricultural production and marketing?	11	84	5
3. Do you prefer the present voluntary medical care program for the aged over a compulsory plan, financed by increased social security taxes?	76	20	4
4. Do you favor establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps similar to the CCC's of the thirties?	36	55	9
5. Do you favor the establishment of a domestic Peace Corps?	19	69	12
6. Do you favor aid to public schools below the college level?	36	58	6
7. Do you think the President is doing a good job in domestic affairs?	22	59	19
Foreign affairs:			
1. Should we continue to support the U.N.?	63	25	12
2. Would you favor elimination of the foreign aid program?	33	52	15
3. Do you favor substantial reduction in foreign aid?	84	9	7
4. Would you maintain the foreign aid program at about its present level?	15	64	21
5. Do you approve of the handling of the situation in Cuba?	28	62	10
6. Do you approve of the handling of the situation in the Congo?	20	49	31
7. Should the existing foreign Peace Corps program be expanded?	31	52	17
8. Do you think the President is doing a good job in foreign affairs?	26	53	21

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 25, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rabbi Gershon B. Chertoff, of the Temple B'nai Israel, of Elizabeth, N.J., offered the following prayer:

Sovereign of the universe, whose law is perfect: Do Thou instruct out of Thy law the Members of the Senate of these United States, that they might exercise just and rightful authority. Confer upon them the wisdom and understanding to convert righteousness into law, and justice into statute. Remove from them a sense of guilt in the employment of power, by alerting them to the ethic of power. Uphold them in their conviction that the complexities of international relations admit of no easy solutions: so that they shall pursue peace, not despair, and seek security with quiet confidence.

The days proclaimed by Daniel are at hand: *There shall be a time of trouble such as never has been since there was a nation.* Do Thou, O God, confirm Daniel's hope and trust in Thee that: *Every one of your people shall be delivered.*

May God bless you with every good, and keep you from all evil. May He enlighten your heart with lifegiving prudence, and favor you with enduring insights. May He befriend and prosper you with peace, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 21, 1963, was dispensed with.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, March 25, 1963, the Vice President signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 212. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable; and

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR WAIVED

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was ordered to be waived.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Appropriations for National Aeronautics and Space Administration

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation; construction of facilities; and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Stockpiling, Storage, and Distribution of Essential Foodstuffs

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Title I Agreements Under Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954

A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on title I agreements under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, for the month of February 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on Strengthening Research on Utilization of Agricultural Commodities

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on "Strengthening Research on Utilization of Agricultural Commodities," dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Reapportionment of an Appropriation

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Employees' compensation claims and expenses," for the fiscal year 1963, had been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Report on Department of Defense Procurement From Small and Other Business Firms

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the 7-month period ended January 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Amendment of Act Entitled "An Act To Authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia To Remove Dangerous or Unsafe Buildings and Parts Thereof, and for Other Purposes"

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report on Review of Retention by General Dynamics/Pomona of Certain Refunds

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of retention by General Dynamics/Pomona, a division of General Dynamics Corp., Pomona, Calif., of refunds related to illegally imposed local taxes included in the prices of Department of the Navy contracts, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of the Supply Management of Electric Lamps Within the Department of Defense

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the supply management of electric lamps within the Department of Defense, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Unnecessary Costs to the Government for Packing Shipments of Household Goods for Certain Armed Services Personnel

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of unnecessary costs to the Government for packing shipments of household goods for Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps personnel, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report Under Saline Water Act of 1952

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on operations under the Saline Water Act of 1952, during calendar year 1962; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 115

"Resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to reject the changes in timber taxation proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury

"Whereas capital gains treatment of timber under the Internal Revenue Code of the United States has been a major factor in the progress of the State of Georgia in forest management and in the development and growth of forest resources during the past half century; and

"Whereas the substantial elimination of capital gains treatment to the owners of forest lands would constitute a most severe setback to the development of the timber and forestry industry in Georgia; and

"Whereas thousands of Georgians are dependent upon the forest industries for employment and their jobs are jeopardized by the proposed elimination of capital gains treatment of timber; and

"Whereas the taxing of income derived from the sale of timber at ordinary income rates by the United States would be disastrous to a major portion of the overall economy of the State of Georgia: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia:*

"1. That the General Assembly of the State of Georgia does petition the Congress of the United States to defeat and reject the extreme and harmful changes in timber taxation proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States on February 6, 1963."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 8

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation regarding the feasibility reports required in connection with applications for Federal small projects loans, and requiring such reports only when they are needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan

"Whereas it has been the experience in the State of Wyoming that the detailed feasibility reports required in connection with the application for a Federal small projects loan are such that the cost of such feasibility reports are clearly out of proportion to the cost of many small supplemental water supply projects in Wyoming that could benefit from such a loan program; and

"Whereas for small supplemental water supply projects for entities within a growing and established agricultural economy, the detailed and costly feasibility studies which are necessary for large new projects are not needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring)*, That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary so that the feasibility reports required in connection with an application for a Federal small projects loan for a small supplemental water supply project be required only when such are needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator Gale McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison, and the State legislatures of all the States of the United States.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 22

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior with reference to the killing of animals within the boundaries of Yellowstone National Park, by park rangers

"Whereas the animals that range within the boundaries of Yellowstone National Park in the State of Wyoming constitute a part of the natural resources of Wyoming; and

"Whereas the natural resources of the State of Wyoming should be utilized to the greatest good of the people of the State of Wyoming and of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the slaughter of over 4,500 head of elk in the past 2 years in Yellowstone National Park by the park rangers was a gross waste of an important natural resource as aforesaid; and

"Whereas better methods of control of these resources than those now being utilized by the National Park Service are available: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior be and are hereby memorialized to pass such laws and prescribe such regulations as necessary to prohibit the wanton killing of elk by the park rangers in Yellowstone National Park as has been the practice in the past to permit the State of Wyoming to trap and transplant the animals to other areas within the boundaries of the State of Wyoming and if trapping and transplanting practices do not give the necessary reductions, to permit the hunting of such animals in remote areas of the park; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a certified copy of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Interior, U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress, William Henry Harrison.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate.*"

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 16

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to passing legislation which would place the timber industry of this country in a competitive position with foreign production through the establishment of import quotas or other means

"Whereas there is not a shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

"Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes; and

"Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide the best working conditions, equal to or above other nations; and

"Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing out their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canada, due to such advantages as depreciated currency, low stumpage rates, noncompetitive bidding, less costly and restrictive forest practices, lower wage rates, high tariff rates on lumber shipped into Canada, lower charter rates for coastwide and intercoastal shipping, and a cooperative government; and

"Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about a sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

"Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing in all lumber-producing States with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring)*, That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they hereby are memorialized to give immediate attention and take the action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable basis of competition with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirement that foreign lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of taxes and deterioration of communities; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, U.S. Senator Gale McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate.*"

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 23

"Joint memorial memorializing the U.S. Congress to oppose Federal legislation which would encroach on State-administered workmen's compensation programs

"Whereas the U.S. Congress by a series of amendments to the Social Security Act during the period 1956 to 1962 has extended and broadened the Social Security Act to provide disability and other benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases; and

"Whereas the workmen's compensation laws of the individual States were designed to be the basic and exclusive method and remedy providing benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases and their administration has, for over 50 years, been the function of the several industrial accident boards and commissions, based on the accepted principle that benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases be tailored to fit social and economic conditions at the local level; and

"Whereas the extension of the Social Security Act to provide benefits for work-connected injuries and diseases has resulted in duplication of benefits; and

"Whereas legislation resulting in further intrusion into the field of work-connected injuries and diseases constitutes a severe threat to the survival of State-administered workmen's compensation programs: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming and the Senate of such Legislature concurring are opposed to any legislation by the U.S. Congress which would infringe on the right of the State of Wyoming to enact and administer its own workmen's compensation laws and to further Federal encroachment into the field of State-administered workmen's compensation programs and strongly urge that the U.S. Congress again affirm that the workmen's compensation system is the basic program for compensating work-connected injuries and diseases; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison, and the State legislatures of all States of the United States.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate,*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*"

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 25

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning the Federal Insurance Contribution Act and opposing any future increase in the social security tax rate

"Whereas the Federal Insurance Contribution Act was passed by Congress in 1935, effective January 1, 1937, establishing a social security tax rate of 2 percent on the first $3,000.00 of employee earnings to be paid in equal amounts of 1 percent by each the employer and the employee; and

"Whereas since January 1, 1937, the social security tax rate has increased from 2 percent of employee taxable earnings of $3,000 to 7½ percent of employee taxable earnings of $4,800, with further increases scheduled in 1966, and 1968 to reach a maximum of 9¼ percent; and

"Whereas the social security tax has become a heavy burden, as is presently programed, and will be more burdensome to the end that neither the profits of employers nor the wages of employees can absorb the tax increases; and

"Whereas in the interest of good government and sound economics the presently effective social security tax rate should not be further increased except on a voluntary basis and not as a result of further imposition of taxes levied upon both the employers and employees: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring)*, That the President and Congress of the United States of America be, and they are hereby memorialized to amend the Federal Insurance Contribution Act to stabilize the social security tax at the rate effective as of January 1, 1963, with no further increase except on a voluntary basis; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, U.S. Senator Gale McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison, and to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Government Operations:

Enrolled Joint Memorial 13

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress to enact legislation governing the acquisition and relinquishment of legislative jurisdiction over Federal holdings within the 13 Western States

"Whereas general authority does not presently exist in Federal law for the Federal Government to restore to the States legislative jurisdiction over Federal holdings within the States; and

"Whereas in the late 1950's a special committee set up by the Board of Managers of the Council of State Governments, in cooperation with a Federal Interdepartmental Committee established by the President, developed proposed Federal legislation governing the acquisition and relinquishment by the Federal Government of legislative jurisdiction over such Federal holdings; and

"Whereas the Council of State Governments and its affiliated organizations, including the National Legislative Conference, the Governors' Conference, the National Association of Attorneys General, the General Assembly of the States, and the Council's several regional conferences have gone on record in support of the proposed Federal legislation; and

"Whereas the suggested Federal act, which in its present form—S. 154—would apply to Federal holdings in all States, has not been enacted by Congress; and

"Whereas in view of the fact that the bulk of the Federal land holdings is located in the 13 Western States, and the lack of suitable Federal laws governing acquisition and relinquishment of legislative jurisdiction over such lands is of critical importance in the West; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring)*, That Congress be urged to enact legislation similar to S. 154, but applying only to the acquisition and relinquishment of legislative jurisdiction by the Federal Government over Federal holdings in the 13 Western States; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate.*"

Five joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed to return to the State of Wyoming additional sections of land from the public domain

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:*

"Whereas the State of Wyoming is at a disadvantage due to the fact that in excess of 50 percent of the land area of the State is owned or controlled by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming has received 2 sections per township from the public domain for the support of public schools and whereas many States, including several Western States have received 4 sections per township for similar purposes: *now, therefore be it*

"*Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring)*, That the President and Congress of the United States of America, be, and they are hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to return to the State of Wyoming the two additional sections from the public domain the same as have been granted other States, or the equivalent thereof; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be transmitted promptly to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison.

"Approved 1:37 p.m., January 29, 1963.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*"

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 7

"Joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact certain legislation to make various areas of reclamation nonreimbursables to the full extent of the national interest

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"Whereas the costs allocated to flood control, navigation, and fish and wildlife benefits are now authorized by law as nonreimbursables; and

"Whereas many Federal reclamation projects provide recreational facilities, salinity control, sediment control, public transportation, protection of public health and protection of national defense benefits which are of more value to a river basin and to the Nation as a whole than they are to the irrigation water users under the projects; and

"Whereas it is no more logical to make the local irrigation water users pay for these benefits to the region and to the Nation than it would be to make them pay for flood control, navigation, and fish and wildlife benefits which are now nonreimbursables: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider fairly and diligently the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming, who favor legislation which would authorize (1) recreational, (2) general salinity control, (3) sediment control, (4) public transportation, (5) protection of public health, (6) promotion of national defense, and (7) fulfillment of international obligation benefits; to be nonreimbursables to the full extent of the national interest; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison and the State legislatures of all the States of the United States.

"Approved 1:32 p.m., January 29, 1963.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"Governor.
"Charles G. Irwin,
"President of the Senate.
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"Speaker of the House."

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 9

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Bureau of Land Management, with reference to passing legislation granting 90 percent of all moneys from the sale, of or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals, on federally controlled minerals within the State of Wyoming to the State of Wyoming; the people of the sovereign State of Wyoming recognize that the United States of America controls over 50 percent of all the lands within the borders of the State of Wyoming, and over 70 percent of the minerals on, in or under the lands of the State of Wyoming.

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"Whereas the surface and minerals constitute an important part of the life and economy of the State of Wyoming; and

"Whereas only 37½ percent of all royalties that the Federal Government collects on Federal lands in Wyoming is returned to the State; and

"Whereas the financial needs of the States are becoming more acute each year; and

"Whereas Alaska in its act of admission was given 90 percent of the mineral royalties on Federal lands and on private lands in which the Federal Government has reserved the minerals; and

"Whereas the tideland States have been granted the mineral rights on offshore submerged lands; and

"Whereas historically, Eastern States were given all of the land within their confines; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming and the Western States have been denied equality of treatment as given Alaska, tideland States, and the Eastern States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America, be and they are hereby memorialized to fairly and diligently consider the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming who favor legislation providing that 90 percent of all moneys received from the sale of or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals on federally controlled minerals within the State of Wyoming be paid by the Treasurer of the United States to the State of Wyoming to be used as the Legislature of the State of Wyoming may direct; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and to the State legislatures of all the States of the United States.

"Approved 5:53 p.m., January 31, 1963.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"Governor.
"Charles G. Irwin,
"President of the Senate.
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"Speaker of the House."

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 11

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide legislation designed and with reference to the recognition of the rights and laws of the States of the United States relating to the control, development, appropriation and use of waters within the States boundaries

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"Whereas the recognition by the Federal agencies of the rights and laws of the States relating to control, development, appropriation and use of waters within the States boundaries is one of the fundamental concepts of Wyoming law and of the reclamation law as stated in section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902; and

"Whereas at the present time there is uncertainty in regard to the validity of this fundamental concept of State and Federal law: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider fairly and diligently the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming, who favor Federal legislation providing for recognition of the rights of the State of Wyoming and her sister States to regulation and control the appropriation, distribution and use of underground and surface waters within their respective States, and to require compliance with such laws by the Federal agencies and their licensees; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be transmitted promptly to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison, and the State legislatures of all the States of the United States.

"Approved 9:05 a.m., February 2, 1963.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"Governor.
"Charles G. Irwin,
"President of the Senate.
"Martin T. Kurtz,
"Speaker of the House."

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 24

"Joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States to prevent by legislation, the curtailment, by departmental regulation, of the acquisition of rights-of-way across Federal lands in the State of Wyoming

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

"Whereas the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture have proposed to adopt similar regulations respecting the granting of rights-of-way for transmission lines across Federal land under their respective jurisdictions; and

"Whereas those regulations would provide that such rights-of-way would only be granted if the applying company agreed that any unused capacity of the transmission line constructed thereon could be appropriated by the Federal Government for the transmission of power generated by the United States through its agencies and, secondly, that the use of such transmission line would not, in the opinion of the Secretary, interfere with proposed sales of power by the United States; and

"Whereas such regulations would restrict the multiple use of the lands of the United States to the detriment of the industrial development of the State of Wyoming; and

"Whereas such regulations would constitute an usurpation by such departments of the power of Congress to prescribe the uses to be made of the land of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to prevent such usurpation of its authority and to continue the multiple use of such Federal lands in the State of Wyoming for the benefit of its citizens and to promote its development; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress, William Henry Harrison.

"Approved, 9:27 p.m., February 15, 1963.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"Governor.
"Charles G. Irwin,
"President of the Senate.
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"Speaker of the House."

Five joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Enrolled Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, That the Legislature of the State of Wyoming respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. Upon demand of the legislatures of five States, no two of which shall share any common boundary, made within 2 years after the rendition of any judgment of the Supreme Court relating to the rights reserved to the States or to the people by this Constitution, such judgment shall be reviewed by a court composed of the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States to be known as the Court of the Union. The sole issue before the Court of the Union shall be whether the power or jurisdiction sought to be exercised on the part of the United States is a power granted to it under this Constitution.

" 'Sec. 2. Three-fourths of the justices of the Court of the Union shall constitute a quorum, but it shall require concurrence of a majority of the entire court to reverse a decision of the Supreme Court. In event of incapacity of the chief justices of the highest court of any State to sit upon the Court of the Union, his place shall be filled by another justice of such State court selected by affirmative vote of a majority of its membership.

" 'Sec. 3. On the first Monday of the third calendar month following the ratification of this amendment, the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States shall convene at the National Capitol, at which time the Court of the Union shall be organized and shall adopt rules governing its procedure.

" 'Sec. 4. Decisions of the Court of the Union upon matters within its jurisdiction shall be final and shall not thereafter be overruled by any court and may be changed only by an amendment of this Constitution.

" 'Sec. 5. The Congress shall make provision for the housing of the Court of the Union and the expenses of its operation.

" 'Sec. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.'

"Be it further resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force and effect; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress for this State.

"Approved 10:24 p.m., February 14, 1963.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"Governor.
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"Speaker of the House.
"Charles G. Irwin,
"President of the Senate."

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States reaffirming support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Committee

"Whereas the State of Wyoming is an inseparable part of the Federal Union; and

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land; and

"Whereas since its founding, the State of Wyoming has cherished, supported and defended the Constitution and the Government of the United States; and

"Whereas there are certain insidious movements alien to our free society which are engaged in a concerted effort to destroy our form of Government, the Constitution of the United States, the constitutions of the several States, and deny to the citizens of this Nation those rights, privileges and liberties which are fundamental to free men; and

"Whereas in the Congress of the United States there are duly authorized committees constituted to investigate the activities of those insidious movements and to make known their perfidy, for truth will render them impotent; and

"Whereas there is currently in progress an attack upon those legally established committees of the Congress of the United States by certain organizations and individuals designed to abolish or weaken those committees so that this Nation and its citizens will be denied their protection: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such Legislature concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized that the Legislature of the State of Wyoming pledges and reaffirms its unequivocal support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Committee of the Congress of the United States, and openly condemns those organizations and individuals who would destroy those committees or reduce their effectiveness in the investigation and exposition of subversion and subversive organizations; and be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy; the Vice President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson; the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, John W. McCormack; U.S. Senator, Gale W. McGee; U.S. Senator, Milward L. Simpson; and Representative in Congress, William Henry Harrison.

"Approved 5:50 p.m., January 31, 1963.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"Governor.
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"Speaker of the House.
"Charles G. Irwin,
"President of the Senate."

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 14

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States with reference to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would provide that the Federal Government may not, through legislative or judicial action restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, That the House of Representatives and the Senate of the 37th session, voting separately, concurring therein that this legislature respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following articles as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. No provision of this Constitution, or any amendment thereto, shall restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature.

" 'Section 2. The judicial power of the United States shall not extend to any suit in law or equity, or to any controversy, relating to apportionment of representation in a State legislature.

" 'Section 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.'

"Be it further resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison.

"Approved 1:56 p.m., February 9, 1963.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"Governor.
"Charles G. Irwin,
"President of the Senate.
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"Speaker of the House."

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 15

"Joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States, with reference to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to article V of the Constitution of the United States which would provide a change in the procedure for proposing a constitutional amendment

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, That the house of representatives and the senate of the 37th session, voting separately, concurring therein that this legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" ' "The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

" ' "Sec. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission." '

"Be it further resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison.

"Approved 9:12 p.m., February 15, 1963.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"Governor.
"Charles G. Irwin,
"President of the Senate.
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"Speaker of the House."

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 19

"Joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to limiting and reducing the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere

"Whereas the people of the Western Hemisphere have for over 100 years had the privilege of determining, without outside intervention, their own form of government; and

"Whereas the United States of America has supported their privilege through enforcement of the principles of the Monroe Doctrine; and

"Whereas there now exists within this hemisphere a militant and aggressive arm of international communism, that has formed its roots in Cuba; and

"Whereas the existence of the Communist government of Cuba is dependent upon support from outside this hemisphere; and

"Whereas the avowed purpose of the Communist government of Cuba is to exhort its revolution throughout the Americas, with the aid of governments beyond our hemisphere; and

"Whereas this situation is not conducive to the continued peace, harmony, and progress among nations of free peoples in this hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming* (*the Senate of such Legislature concurring*), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider the welfare and interest of the people of Wyoming, the United States of America, and our sister republics throughout the Western Hemisphere who favor a strong and vigorous action through every available means to limit and reduce the Communist threat to our safety and well-being; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Senator Gale W. McGee, Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison.

"Approved 9:08 p.m., February 13, 1963.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 20

"Joint memorial, memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning the Cooperative Extension Service and opposing the use of the Extension Service as a promotional arm of the Federal Government

"Whereas the Cooperative Extension Service was established as a means of conveying to the user the results and general education in the field of agriculture; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming bears the major portion of the cost of the program; and

"Whereas there are efforts being made to alter the traditional objectives of the Extension Service to one which promotes the agricultural program of the Federal administration, thus having political instead of educational aspects: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming,* (*the Senate of such Legislature concurring*), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to take whatever steps necessary to prohibit the use of the Cooperative Extension Service as a means of promoting political programs as a tool of the Federal administration, which, if continued, might necessitate a review of the whole extension program as to the intent thereof; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, Senator Milward Simpson, Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison, and to the Governors of the 50 States.

"Approved 9:20 p.m., February 13, 1963.

"Clifford P. Hansen,
"*Governor.*
"Charles G. Irwin,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Marlin T. Kurtz,
"*Speaker of the House.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which would substantially eliminate the capital gains on the sale of timber and urging the congressional delegation from South Carolina to oppose, with all the strength at their disposal, the passage of such a measure

"Whereas the General Assembly of South Carolina has been informed that a portion of the tax program of the President of the United States includes the substantial elimination of capital gains on the sale of timber; and

"Whereas this information has caused the general assembly and a large segment of the population of the State great concern in view of the fact that timber and forest products generally constitute the No. 1 farm crop of the State; and

"Whereas the enacting into law of the President's proposal will most certainly affect the economy of the State very adversely; and

"Whereas the general assembly notes that many less advantageous crops of this State have through recent years, been shifted to forests and that thousands of acres of land formerly planted in less productive crops are now planted in vast forests resulting in great financial gain; and

"Whereas the members of the general assembly believe that any effort to saddle this new industry of the State with an additional tax burden would serve to greatly discourage the further advancement of this most important crop: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives* (*the senate concurring*), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which proposes the substantial elimination of the capital gains of the sale of timber; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Members of the congressional delegation from South Carolina are urged to oppose with all the strength at their command the enactment of this legislation; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in the Congress and to each Member of the congressional delegation from South Carolina.

"Inez Watson,
"*Clerk of the House.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services.

"Senate Resolution 40

"Resolution relating to the air defense of the Nation in northwestern Alaska

"Whereas the Governor of Alaska and the Alaska delegation in Congress have continually expressed their alarm and complained to Federal defense officials regarding the defense gap along the western and northern coasts of Alaska; and

"Whereas the western and northern coasts of Alaska are the back door to the Nation; and

"Whereas it has been established for years that Soviet Russia has ringed western Alaska with air bases along the coast of and throughout Soviet Siberia posing a continuing threat to Alaska's meager interior defenses which are the defense frontier of the Nation; and

"Whereas while official attention is showered on a few Russian troops 60 miles from Florida and Soviet air surveillance of American ships at sea, Soviet reconnaissance planes have been flying over the American defense frontier territory of southwestern Alaska; and

"Whereas the area flown over by the Russians is without any American military base and the nearest defense bases are from 700 to 1,000 miles distant; and

"Whereas this entire frontier area so close to Russian bases is not immediately served by American reconnaissance and interceptor forces which are considered essential in the Caribbean area; and

"Whereas there is a former Air Force airfield now available at Nome which along with other sites along this defense perimeter could and should be used for the stationing of fighter interceptor and reconnaissance squadrons: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, is most respectfully urged to take immediate action for the realistic defense of this back door to the Nation by ordering that the Secretary of Defense locate two or three air fighter interceptor and reconnaissance squadrons along the northwest coast of Alaska; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be directed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; the Honorable Richard Russell, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee; the Honorable Carl Vinson, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee; and the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the Senate, March 18, 1963.

"Frank Peratrovich,
"*President of the Senate.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Resolution 31

"Resolution relating to the restoration of medical care to owner-operators of fishing vessels and self-employed seamen under Federal law

"Whereas S. 978 has been introduced and referred to the Senate Commerce Committee to restore medical benefits to owner-operators of fishing vessels and other self-employed seamen; and

"Whereas the proposed legislation seeks to restore medical benefits to working owners and working part owners who have been deprived by administrative ruling of medical care in Public Health Service hospitals and other facilities since 1954; and

"Whereas it is only equitable that medical benefits be restored to this segment of the maritime force in recognition of the vital role it plays in the Nation's oldest industry: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the Congress is respectfully urged to give favorable consideration to the proposal to restore medical care benefits to owner-operators of fishing vessels and self-employed seamen as an equitable action and a forward step toward the revival of the Nation's maritime industry; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson, chairman, Senate Commerce Committee; the Honorable Herbert Bonner, chairman, House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; and the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Frank Peratrovich,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 25

"Whereas a serious need exists for increasing water flows on the lower Yakima River; and

"Whereas additional water storage for the Yakima River can be obtained by construction of a storage dam at the Bumping Lake Reservoir; and

"Whereas such a project would provide great benefit to the Yakima River Valley, particularly in the areas of fisheries, flood control, reclamation, and recreation; and

"Whereas the U.S. Department of the Interior has completed a study of this project; and

"Whereas Senators Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson have introduced legislation authorizing this project: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That we, the Senate of the State of Washington, respectfully petition that the President and the Congress of the United States enact legislation authorizing the Bumping Lake Reservoir project; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution immediately be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each Member in the Congress of the United States from the State of Washington.

"Attest.

"Ward Bowden,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Resolution 15

"Resolution relating to the national defense system in Alaska

"Whereas the Governor and congressional delegation of Alaska have again urgently renewed their representations that there is a defense gap in the national defense system in western Alaska; and

"Whereas the existence of this gap was demonstrated last week when Russian reconnaissance aircraft were allowed to violate American territory in western Alaska without challenge; and

"Whereas while it has been known for years that Alaska, the defense frontier of the Nation, has been ringed with Russian air and ground bases in Soviet Siberia 40 miles from American territory, national defense officials have been giving their attention to a handful of Russian troops located 90 miles from Florida; and

"Whereas existing American bases in Alaska are located from 700 to 1,000 miles from Alaska's defense perimeter leaving western Alaska with meager radar coverage and completely without on-the-scene fighter interceptor and reconnaissance support; and

"Whereas an adequate airfield for Air Force interceptor and reconnaissance planes already exists but is unused at Nome: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, is respectfully urged to direct that immediate action be taken to effect a realistic defense of Alaska as the continent's and Nation's defense frontier through the placement of two or three interceptor and reconnaissance squadrons along the northwest coast of Alaska; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be directed to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; the Honorable Richard Russell, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee; the Honorable Carl Vinson, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee; and the members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Passed by the house March 19, 1963.

"Bruce Kendall,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"Patricia R. Slack,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*"

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Wayne County, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation relating to acquisition of Federal revenue stamps in connection with property transactions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, N.Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to make Columbus Day, October 12, a Federal legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF ILLINOIS LEGISLATURE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on March 6, 1963, the Senate of the State of Illinois considered and adopted Senate Joint Resolution 4 suggesting an article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The secretary of state of Illinois has transmitted a copy to me, and I ask unanimous consent for its inclusion as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate of the 73d General Assembly of the State of Illinois (*the House of Representatives concurring herein*), That this general assembly respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"Article —

"Section 1. Article V of the Constitution of the United States is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States. Whenever applications from the legislatures of two-thirds of the total number of States of the United States shall contain identical texts of an amendment to be proposed, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall so certify, and the amendment as contained in the application shall be deemed to have been proposed, without further action by Congress. No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.'

"Sec. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission"; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of Illinois to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Adopted by the senate January 29, 1963.

"Samuel H. Shapiro,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Edward E. Fernandes,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"Concurred in by the house of representatives, March 5, 1963.

"John W. Lewis, Jr.,
"*Speaker of House of Representatives.*
"Fredric B. Selike,
"*Clerk of House of Representatives.*"

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, last week the South Carolina Senate forwarded a resolution to me expressing appreciation to Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman for his action holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound. Today I have received a similar resolution from the South Carolina House of Representatives commending Secretary Freeman. This makes it unanimous on the part of the South Carolina General Assembly endorsing Secretary Freeman's price support program on cotton. While this resolution does not memorialize Congress, I do want this resolution placed in the Record as a testimonial of South Carolina's support to Secretary Freeman's cotton program. Therefore, I am asking that this resolution be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House resolution to express the appreciation of the members of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound

Whereas cotton farmers will take a 10-percent reduction in the 1963 cotton acreage allotment and there is all indication that the cotton production cost per acre will continue at high or higher levels than the 1962 crop; and

Whereas it is becoming increasingly difficult for family-size farms to exist and provide the necessities of life for such families; and

Whereas the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture has announced the 1963 support rate on middling 1 inch upland cotton as 32.47 cents per pound and this decision of the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, is of material importance to cotton producers of South Carolina and the economy of the State; and

Whereas any reduction from this base support price would be punitive to the State's cotton growers and general economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the members of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina express appreciation to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. House of Representatives and to each Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from South Carolina and to the Honorable Orville L. Freeman.

Attest:

Inez Watson,
Clerk of the House.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF WYOMING LEGISLATURE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate an expression of the will of the people of Wyoming.

The Wyoming State Legislature voiced a belief of the people of Wyoming when it memorialized Congress to consider fairly and diligently the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming, who oppose the creation or extension of wilderness areas in Wyoming.

The 37th State Legislature of Wyoming is convinced that the creation of wilderness areas would interfere with the development of Wyoming's water resources, and would jeopardize the multiple-use concept of the areas which gives protection to the water, forage, timber, minerals, and recreational opportunities.

We should not prejudice the interests of the Rocky Mountain West by locking up in a Federal vault vast areas of land within our Western States.

It is the sense of Wyoming's lawmakers that the multiple-use concept, an effective guideline for over 50 years, has shaped the economy of the West and must not now be abandoned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint memorial be made a part of the Record.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Enrolled Joint Memorial 12

Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning wilderness legislation and opposing the creation or extension of wilderness areas within the State of Wyoming

Whereas bills have been introduced in the U.S. Congress to establish a national wilderness preservation system; and

Whereas these bills would create wilderness areas in Wyoming; and

Whereas the creation of wilderness areas would interfere with the development of Wyoming's water resources, and would jeopardize the multiple-use concept of the areas for the projection of water, forage, timber, minerals, and recreational opportunities, which multiple-use concept policy has been in effect for over 50 years, and has shaped the economy of the West: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to consider fairly and diligently the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming, who oppose the creation or extension of wilderness areas in Wyoming: that, furthermore, if such wilderness areas are necessary and desired in other States, that areas adjacent to centers of population be purchased and returned to the wilderness state, believing that such a program would make wilderness areas available to more people of the country than the creation of such areas in the West; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison, and the State legislatures of all the States of the United States.

Clifford P. Hansen,
Governor.
Charles G. Irwin,
President of the Senate.
Marlin T. Kurtz,
Speaker of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF NEW MEXICO LEGISLATURE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, during the 26th session of the New Mexico State Legislature both houses passed House Joint Memorial No. 1, memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the insurance limit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to $25,000. I ask unanimous consent that Memorial No. 1 as passed by the New Mexico Legislature be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House Joint Memorial 1

Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the insurance limit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to $25,000

Whereas a current evaluation of Federal bank deposit insurance in relation to the expansion of deposits in commercial and mutual savings banks made by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation evidences the advantages of increasing the present limit of $10,000 on insurance deposit accounts and supports to the preferable limit of $25,000; and

Whereas this evaluation is derived from projections through 1971 based on insurance operations for the 10-year period ending December 31, 1961; and

Whereas increasing the limit of deposit coverage to $25,000 would (1) have practically no effect on the Insurance Fund; (2) result in worthwhile extended opportunities for the depositing public of New Mexico and of the several States; (3) increase the circulating monetary media; (4) give assistance to the expanding economy of the several states; and (5) be of advantage to insured banks, whether small, medium or large size in New Mexico and the several States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the 88th Congress, 1st session, be respectfully memorialized to amend title 12 United States Code Annotated, section 1821, to increase the present limit of Federal insurance deposit coverage to the amount of $25,000; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the Senate, the Honorable Lyndon Baines Johnson; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable John W. McCormack; to the U.S. Senators from New Mexico, the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson and the Honorable Edwin L. Mechem; and to the U.S. Representatives from New Mexico, the Honorable Joseph M. Montoya and the Honorable Thomas G. Morris.

Bruce King,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Mack Easley,
Speaker, Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, during the 26th session of the New Mexico State Legislature both houses passed Senate Joint Memorial 11, a resolution urging the Congress of the United States to give all due consideration to the passage of H.R. 2332. I ask unanimous consent that Memorial 11 as passed by the New Mexico Legislature be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 11

Whereas H.R. 2332 was introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives on January 18, 1963, and was referred to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs; and

Whereas the veterans of World War I in New Mexico consider that passage of H.R. 2332 by the Congress will favorably benefit the low-income veterans of World War I and their widows: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to give all due consideration to the passage of H.R. 2332; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be sent to New Mexico's congressional delegation, and to the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives.

RESOLUTION OF NEW MEXICO STATE SENATE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, during the 26th session of the New Mexico State Legislature the State senate passed Senate Memorial 15, memorializing the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Mexico in the Congress of the United States to protect the U.S. lumbering industry. I ask unanimous consent that Memorial 15 as passed by the New Mexico Senate be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Memorial 15

Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canada and Mexico, due to advantages such as:

1. Depreciated currency;
2. Low stumpage rates;
3. Noncompetitive bidding;
4. Less costly and restrictive forest practices;
5. Lower wage rates;
6. High tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada and Mexico;
7. Low charter rates for coastwise and intercoastal shipping;
8. A cooperative Government; and

Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the worker, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 26th Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress and President of the United States of America, be respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to and request action necessary to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirements that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes, and deterioration of communities; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Senate of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF WYOMING LEGISLATURE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I am very pleased today to call to the attention of the Members of this body a joint memorial from the 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming. This memorial voices the support of the Wyoming Legislature for the resolution that I have been privileged to introduce in Congress to name the lake and recreational area that will be created by the Flaming Gorge Dam after the late Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney.

Mr. President, I am sure the Members of the body who served with Senator O'Mahoney and especially the 53 Members who have cosponsored this resolution, will concur in the language of this memorial and its tribute to the late "Senator Joe." This action is a further indication of the great works and record of this man and the nonpartisan support for this resolution to provide a permanent memorial to his name.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this memorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Joint Memorial 18

Whereas for many years, the late Honorable Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of the State of Wyoming, labored to improve Wyoming and the West; and

Whereas because of the dedication and labors of men such as Joseph C. O'Mahoney, reclamation and water development and recreational facilities of the West have been developed and increased; and

Whereas a lake and recreational area will be created by the Flaming Gorge Dam on the Wyoming-Utah border, and it would be a suitable memorial to the late Joseph C. O'Mahoney to name said lake and recreational area created by the Flaming Gorge Dam the "O'Mahoney Lake and Recreation Area"; and

Whereas the name of such lake and recreational area after the late Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney would be indicative of his love for the State of Wyoming, his monumental record on reclamation projects throughout the West, and his interest and concern for people: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of the 37th Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such Legislature concurring), That the President and the Congress of the United States of America be and they are hereby memorialized to take such action as may be necessary to name the lake and recreation area created by the Flaming Gorge Dam on the Wyoming-Utah border the "O'Mahoney Lake and Recreation Area"; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies hereof be transmitted promptly to U.S. Senator Gale W. McGee, U.S. Senator Milward L. Simpson, and Representative in Congress William Henry Harrison.

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Livestock Association at its annual meeting in Wichita recently approved resolutions affecting the growth and development of their livestock industry in our State.

The resolutions deal with national problems, as well as State problems.

I want to call the Senate's attention to the resolutions adopted by the association affecting national programs and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution on Brucellosis Eradication

Whereas calfhood vaccination is one of the most important tools we have in the eradication of brucellosis, and

Whereas some of the States surrounding Kansas are not yet modified certified; and

Whereas a large amount of money has been spent in the last 8 years in testing and vaccinating in the brucellosis eradication program: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association request the livestock sanitary commissioner, the State budget department, and the Governor, to endorse and approve, and for the Kansas Legislature to continue to appropriate funds to be used to pay for brucellosis calfhood vaccination at public expense until all States bordering Kansas are modified certified brucellosis States.

Resolution on the 1964 Wheat Program

Recent national legislation provides for a national wheat referendum to be held in 1963. This referendum provides for a wheat program starting with the 1964 crop.

Under this program such wheat will probably be channeled into use as a food grain. Since this will directly affect livestock production, and since many of our livestock producers also are wheat growers, we believe that livestock producers have a vital interest in this referendum.

We condemn the use of any Federal agency such as the Extension Service, the FHA, the ASCS, and others, as a means of selling any farm program. We feel that this is completely improper and that their role should be only in the administration and educational fields.

We find it all the more objectionable because we feel that the recent USDA publications (printed at taxpayers expense) are being used to promote the 1964 wheat program.

Therefore, we urge that all members of the Kansas Livestock Association vigorously let their reasons be known for supporting a no vote in the forthcoming wheat referendum.

Resolution on Taxes

Since the livestockman's income varies widely from year to year because of weather fluctuating prices, we are in favor of the proposed tax reform insofar as it provides for averaging the taxable income of farmers and livestock producers over a 5-year period.

We are in favor of a continuation of the present capital gains provision on capital assets, including the sale of breeding livestock.

However, we are strongly opposed to an administration sponsored capital gains tax on appreciation in property upon gift, transfer, or death. We feel few farmers and ranchers could get the necessary cash to close an estate without selling off land, livestock, or both: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association will vigorously oppose passage of such a bill.

Resolution on Water Resources

Whereas the Kansas Livestock Association feels that U.S. Senate bill 2246 providing for regional planning of water resources would create unnecessary bureaus: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association oppose this and any other bills of like content.

Resolution on National Live Stock and Meat Board

The Kansas Livestock Association and the Kansas Meat Industry Committee recommend the continuation of the National Live Stock and Meat Board under its present method of financing. They have always vigorously supported the nationwide program of research, education, and promotion conducted by this board.

Therefore, we ask all livestock producers and the officers of our Association to urge the Secretary of Agriculture to rescind P. & S. regulation, chapter II, part 201, which is scheduled to be effective July 1, 1963. This order would virtually eliminate the financing and seriously curtail the work of this board.

Resolution on Reaffirmation

Be it resolved by the Kansas Livestock Annual Convention at Wichita, Kans., March 16, 1963, That we reaffirm the following resolutions previously adopted:

1. The resolution urging steps be taken to expedite watershed planning.

2. The resolution to continue opposition to the establishment of the Prairie National Park in Pottawatomie County.

3. The resolution requesting that Lyon Creek Watershed have opportunity to develop their plan without interference from outside sources.

4. The resolutions on public relations pointing out that livestock continues to be a major segment of the Kansas economy.

Therefore, members of the association should be on the alert for opportunities to create better public relations.

BYPASSING OF VETERANS QUALIFIED FOR CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have received a resolution adopted by the McKinstry-Jones Post No. 380, regarding the bypassing of veterans who are qualified for civil service appointments.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of these remarks and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Whereas the Congress of the United States has developed a point preference system for veterans taking civil service examinations; and
>
> Whereas this would indicate that the Congress intended to favor said veterans when applying for jobs in the field of civil service; and
>
> Whereas the Post Office Department and other agencies coming under the civil service regulations have followed this policy; and
>
> Whereas a situation has arisen in this community that would indicate appointments covered under civil service regulations are being made without considering the applicants' service in the Armed Forces of the United States; and
>
> Whereas it is the belief of this post that such appointments should be made on the basis of ability and veterans preferences and not on the basis of previous or current political activity: Be it therefore
>
> *Resolved,* That this post take all necessary action to inform the citizens of the community as to the situation as pertains to the appointment of applicants in the field of civil service; and be it further
>
> *Resolved,* That this action be brought to the attention of all county committee members of all political parties in this area; and be it further resolved that this action be brought to the attention of the U.S. Congressman from this district, the U.S. Senators from this State, and the district, State, and national levels of this organization.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1172. A bill to amend Public Law 86–518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86–518; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. Edmondson):

S. 1173. A bill to change the name of Short Mountain Lock and Dam and Reservoir in the State of Oklahoma to Robert S. Kerr Lock and Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Monroney when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1174. A bill to provide assistance to the States in certain surveying and planning with respect to college facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Case when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1175. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1176. A bill for the relief of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1177. A bill for the relief of Richard A. Gagne; and

S. 1178. A bill for the relief of William B. Plumer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1179. A bill changing Memorial Day to the last Monday of May;

S. 1180. A bill for the relief of Robert Fair;

S. 1181. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Cafiso; and

S. 1182. A bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kefauver when he introduced the first and last above-mentioned bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. McIntyre):

S. 1183. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic detergents manufactured for use in the United States or imported for use in the United States comply with certain standards of decomposability; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Neuberger when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1184. A bill to amend and consolidate the laws providing for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kefauver when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1185. A bill relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. Neuberger):

S. 1186. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 1187. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to equalize additional annuities in return for contributions of annuitants during service in excess of the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity under such act at the time of their retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S.J. Res. 64. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF CONTRACTS WITH SHIPOWNERS DEALING WITH CERTAIN VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend Public Law 86–518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86–518. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement submitted to me by the proponents of this legislation be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1172) to amend Public Law 86–518 and section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the amendment of contracts between shipowners and the United States dealing with vessels whose life has been extended by Public Law 86–518, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The explanation presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

> Section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, requires that the operator of a subsidized vessel in the foreign trades, whenever such vessel operates in a domestic trade, shall pay annually to the Government that proportion of one twenty-fifth of the construction differential subsidy paid for such vessel as the gross revenue derived from the domestic trade bears to the gross revenue derived from the entire voyages completed during the preceding year. Public Law 86–518, which established the depreciation period of U.S.-flag vessels at 25 years, instead of 20 years as formerly, failed to take into account the effect of this changed depreciation period on vessels of various ages operating in the foreign trades when Public Law 86–518 was enacted.
>
> Shipping interests affected thereby now ask that the refund base be recomputed by spreading the unallocated balance of the construction differential subsidy cost over the remaining years of the vessels' now 25-year life. For example, a vessel 5 years of age at time of enactment, with a construction differential subsidy cost of $2 million, would have used up one-fourth of its construction differential subsidy base. Applying the 25-year law, the vessel should have as its annual

---

> base thereafter the remaining three-fourths of the subsidy payment divided by the balance of the vessel's present 25-year life, or 20 years. Under existing law the computation base would be $100,000, but enactment of this proposed amendment would reduce that base to $75,000 per annum over the longer remaining life of the vessel.
>
> Proponents say that the Maritime Administration's position is that in computing the adjustment due the Government in such cases one twenty-fifth of the entire construction differential subsidy cost must be used annually as a base for subsidy refund, because of the prescribed 25-year life of the vessel.
>
> However, they argue, a method of computation which spreads the balance of the construction differential subsidy base over the remaining years of the vessel's 25-year life is the most equitable and logical solution of the problem, in that it eliminates duplication of the base. Otherwise, assuming a vessel was 10 years old at the time of passage of Public Law 86–518, there would be the illogical situation where an operator would have passed one-half of his subsidy base, but then would have three-fifths of the base to use up over the balance of the vessel's life. In other words, he then would have to extinguish 110 one-hundredths of the construction differential subsidy base over the life of the vessel, or 110 percent. Under such an interpretation, the operator would have to pay a larger adjustment to the Government under section 506 than was intended by Congress when the 25-year-life statute was passed.
>
> Section 2 provides a technical correction of an ambiguity in section 506 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936. Though section 506 provides for payment of the refund for domestic service on a formula based on the depreciable life of the vessel in question it has not made clear that the obligation to make such payments ends on the completion of the vessel's useful life. Section 2 eliminates this uncertainty.

CHANGE OF NAME OF SHORT MOUNTAIN LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR, OKLAHOMA, TO ROBERT S. KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson], I introduce a bill to change the name of Short Mountain lock and dam and reservoir, in the State of Oklahoma, to Robert S. Kerr lock and dam and reservoir.

It is unnecessary to speak of the late Senator's interest and leadership in resource development. His accomplishments in that field are legion.

In his beloved State, every community which has a project, either completed, under construction, or authorized, wishes to honor him by making its project a memorial to him and having it bear his name.

After careful consideration and after ascertaining the wishes of Mrs. Kerr and her family, the Oklahoma congressional delegation has come to the conclusion that this is the best and most logical project to bear the name of Robert S. Kerr.

First, it is in Le Flore County, Okla., the same county in which he had developed a beautiful ranch for his great herd of Angus cattle, and in which he and Mrs. Kerr built their beautiful home.

Second, it is the first large lock and dam in Oklahoma on the Arkansas River, through which traffic bound upstream to Tulsa, Muskogee, McAlester, Okmulgee, Henryetta, and Oklahoma City will pass, and through which downriver traffic will pass to ports of the world.

Third, it symbolizes the might and bigness of Bob Kerr. With each end of the dam anchored to a towering hill, and holding the mighty Arkansas River, to be used at man's will to generate power, to motivate traffic, to control floods, and to provide pleasure to man in recreational developments, its utility suggests the name we wish it to bear.

The Short Mountain lock and dam and reservoir wil be located entirely in Oklahoma. The dam will be about 8 miles south of the town of Sallisaw, Okla., and about 25 miles north of Wister, Okla. The dam will be a concrete and rolled earthfilled structure, with a total crest length of about 6,700 feet, and a maximum height of 64 feet above streambed. The concrete portion of the structure will contain a 2,500-foot spillway, topped by 50 steel tainter gates 50 feet high. A navigation lock 110 by 600 feet will be located at the left abutment, and a powerplant housing 4 units, with a total installed capacity of 110,000 kilowatts, will be located at the right abutment. The pool behind the dam will impound 500,000 acre-feet of water, and will have a surface area of about 42,000 acres.

The total cost of the lock, dam, and reservoir is estimated at $101 million at 1961 price levels. They are now being budgeted for advance planning, and are presently scheduled for completion in June 1970. The Short Mountain project is truly an imposing water-resource development. It will be the first large, multiple-purpose project to be encountered in Oklahoma by vessels moving upstream on the Arkansas navigation project, and will be the largest and most costly of the improvements for navigation.

This lock, dam, and reservoir will be a fitting memorial to Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, who was so very greatly instrumental in the development of public works for the Nation, including the Arkansas River Basin program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1173) to change the name of Short Mountain lock and dam and reservoir in the State of Oklahoma to Robert S. Kerr lock and dam and reservoir; introduced by Mr. Monroney (for himself and Mr. Edmondson), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] for introducing the bill to change the name of the Short Mountain lock, dam, and reservoir, in Oklahoma, to the Robert S. Kerr lock, dam, and reservoir.

I know of no one in the Nation more entitled to this recognition than the late Senator Robert Kerr, of Oklahoma. Those of us in the Middle West are deeply indebted to him for his great vision in dealing with problems of conservation and the control of water runoff. I sincerely hope that early action and passage of the bill will occur.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES TO SURVEY AND PLAN EXPANSION OF COLLEGE FACILITIES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing Federal assistance to the States to survey and plan expansion of college facilities.

The bill was approved by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee in the last Congress as part of an omnibus measure expanding the National Defense Education Act, but was not brought to a vote in the Senate.

The bill is intended to stimulate the States, and the public at large, to recognize the extent of the problem we face and to begin making comprehensive plans for its solution. Wise planning will bring facilities for higher education to areas now without them, and will avoid duplicating facilities in other areas.

The President's manpower report to Congress this month pointed out that the trend in youth unemployment demands special concern and action. Alarming numbers of our youth lack work opportunities as well as the educational preparation necessary for a rewarding adult life.

One of every seven youngsters between the ages of 16 and 21 now out of school is also out of work. Both lack of work opportunity and lack of suitable preparation are involved in this situation, and are combining to spread frustration and disillusion among large numbers of young people.

Our educational level is the highest in our history, but it will have to advance at a faster rate to keep pace with the growing complexities of the scientific age. The education received is often out of step with rising skill and versatility requirements of our advanced economy.

The manpower report also pointed out that shortages of qualified workers are particularly widespread in scientific, engineering, teaching, health, and other professional and technical fields, because expansion in scientific research, greater education and health needs have led to increased demand for such manpower.

These ordinarily are not occupations toward which unemployed workers can be directed. Extensive education and training are needed for such demands; the supply of well-trained personnel cannot be built up overnight from existing unemployed manpower resources.

The report underscored the need for effective planning to develop additional college facilities, adequate to the needs of our population and the demands of the time in which we live.

The college survey bill would provide up to $2,500,000 in matching grants to the States. It is a companion measure to my community college legislation, which would assist the States in establishing and expanding 2-year public community colleges.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1174) to provide assistance to the States in certain surveying and planning with respect to college facilities, introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CHANGE OF DATE OF MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to change the date of Memorial Day from the 30th of May to the last Monday of May in each year.

The practical reason for such a change is very simple. As it is now, Memorial Day may fall on any day of the week. This year, for example, it falls on Thursday; next year it will come on Friday, and so on.

If Memorial Day were to fall on a Monday each year, our people could count on a long weekend for relaxation and spiritual refreshment, just as they do now in observing Labor Day, the first Monday of September; and Thanksgiving, the fourth Thursday of November. This would work to the benefit not only of those millions of workers in offices and factories but also of their employers in scheduling their work.

But there is another reason, Mr. President, why a change to a Monday would be beneficial. I believe that more of our people would observe Memorial Day as a holiday and consequently pause to reflect upon the real meaning and purpose of this day.

We ought to be, and we are, thankful for every new day that our country is at peace—or, at least, not in a shooting war. At the same time, we should never let ourselves forget our gratitude to those departed for their supreme contribution to the preservation of freedom. Nor should we allow the new generations to forget.

I believe we can better achieve these aims, Mr. President, through the legislation I am offering.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1179) changing Memorial Day to the last Monday of May, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL BOXING COMMISSION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Davey Moore's death is another tragic milestone in the boxing industry's history of mishandled human beings. It underlines the desperate need for a National Boxing Commission with authority to require thorough physical examinations of all boxers.

Today, I am introducing a bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, and establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner.

This is the same bill which was before the last Congress as S. 1474. The need for this bill is even greater today than it was when the bill was previously introduced. Hearings before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee showed beyond any doubt that professional boxing has had too many connections with the underworld. Nothing has taken place since those hearings to indicate that professional boxing ever will, on its own initiative, free itself from control by racketeers and other undesirables.

The primary purpose of this bill is to aid the States in their efforts to drive the racketeers out of boxing and, thus, to end their monopolistic control of one of our most popular sports. Also the health of the boxers must be protected. If strong measures are not taken to clean up boxing, it will not survive as a major sport. If boxing cannot be cleaned up, then it should be abolished.

The sports tradition of our country has been enriched by the contributions of boxing, and many a young man has found that boxing can develop a sound body and strength of character. In many of our cities, boxing programs for boys have been an important factor in combating juvenile delinquency. In accord with the principles of the President's physical fitness program, the training these young men receive in the ring can be of great value.

The bill I am introducing will make it easier for State and local governments to do their job of regulating boxing and keeping the sport free of the criminal element. It will make it possible to insure that only those men who are in proper physical condition will be allowed in the ring. The bill is necessary because the interstate nature of boxing contests makes it impossible for any State to regulate boxing fully and effectively without Federal help. Many of the States whose own boxing commissions have made substantial efforts to regulate boxing within their States recognize that many of the problems are interstate in nature, and support this bill.

Mr. President, an article appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald recently reporting a statement made by the Boxing Writers Association before the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Professional Boxing. The boxing writers urged a strengthening of regulation of professional boxing to prevent the death of the sport. This statement highlights the problems confronting boxing today and emphasizes the need for this legislation. Just last week the New York Standard carried a story that the chairman of the New York investigating committee has introduced a bill calling for Federal regulation of professional boxing. I request unanimous consent that these articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Standard, Mar. 19, 1963]

BILL TO ASK FEDERAL CHECK OF BOXING

A bill calling for Federal regulation of professional boxing will be introduced in the New York State Legislature Tuesday. Assemblyman Hayward H. Plumadore, Republican of Saranac Lake, who will submit the bill, also said he would ask for changes in State laws governing the sport.

Plumadore is chairman of the Joint Legislative Committee on Professional Boxing, which recently ended its inquiry into boxing following the death of Benny (Kid) Paret as a result of injuries suffered in a fight.

He does not expect any action to abolish boxing and wrestling, which also was covered in his unit's inquiry.

He said many of the injuries in competitive sports are caused by a lack of conditioning. That can be corrected by physical fitness programs, he added.

The final report of the Plumadore committee's study of boxing is due within 2 weeks.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

ABOLITION OF SPORT OPPOSED

NEW YORK, January 2.—The Boxing Writers Association today called for a strengthening of regulation of pro boxing and not the death of the sport in a statement to the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Professional Boxing.

The writers urged that candidates for jobs as officials, especially referees, should be screened carefully on the basis of personality, experience, and integrity, to assure a supply of qualified officials.

They also called for a new testing device for boxers to determine a young man's psychological attitude as a complement to the clinical examination now provided by the medical advisory board.

The writers asked a firmer supervision of training and urged that fighters, no matter what their status, should be required to space their fights in keeping with sound medical judgment. The present regulations were called inadequate.

"Even a victorious fighter might be subjected to an unreasonably heavy drain on his physical resources," the statement read. "We cannot stress this point too strongly. It is a vital matter."

The writers offered their opinion that the New York State Athletic Commission's record over a 40-year period supported the claim that nowhere in the world has boxing been better regulated and administered than in this State.

In conclusion, the writers' statement read:

"We have over the years divined a goodness in boxing. We deplore gangsterism and death and dishonesty, which does not mark us as men striking a singular posture.

"We seek with you a strengthening of boxing regulation and not the demise of the sport, either through legislation or atrophy. We believe it is important and in the public interest."

The committee was set up shortly after the death of welterweight Benny (Kid) Paret following his knockout loss to Emile Griffith in a television fight at Madison Square Garden last March.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce the bill, for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1182) to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF FIRE AND CASUALTY INSURANCE RATES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on December 1, 1962, Joseph C. O'Mahoney, a beloved and revered Member of this body for almost 30 years, died at the Naval Hospital at Bethesda, Md., at the age of 78. As the last act of Senator O'Mahoney's distinguished legislative career, he introduced in the Senate a bill to regulate fire and casualty insurance rates in the District of Columbia, in a manner consistent with his deep and abiding lifetime belief in competition as the guiding force in our free enterprise system.

Along with many other distinguished Members of this body, Senator O'Mahoney applauded the Supreme Court decision in the South-Eastern Underwriters case in 1945, which applied the Sherman Antitrust Act to certain monopolistic and anticompetitive practices in the fire insurance field. Senator O'Mahoney was instrumental in the enactment of the McCarran-Ferguson Act of 1945, which continued the application of the Federal antitrust laws to the business of insurance to the extent that such business was not regulated by State law.

Under his direction, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee conducted a 3-year study to examine the adequacy of State regulation and to measure the vitality of the insurance industry under the McCarran Act. I welcomed the opportunity to participate actively in these hearings, and joined with Senator O'Mahoney and the other members of the Judiciary Committee in Report No. 831, 87th Congress, filed in the Senate August 1961. The bill which Senator O'Mahoney introduced in the Senate on August 29, 1960, and which I reintroduced on January 23, 1961, reflected the views of the Judiciary Committee as contained in its report.

Along with Senator O'Mahoney, I was appalled to learn during the course of this study that certain of the monopolistic practices which the Supreme Court had condemned in the South-Eastern Underwriters case were actually sanctioned by the fire insurance rate law for the District of Columbia. This law had been enacted a few days prior to this decision, and Congress has never seen fit to amend it. I refer to the requirement in the District of Columbia fire rate law that compels all insurers to belong to the rating bureau. This forces companies to join a price-fixing combination and denies them the right of independence, even though membership in a rating bureau may be completely anathema to the philosophy and to the traditions of such companies. As the Judiciary Committee noted:

> There can be no doubt that coercion in insurance is the antithesis of the congressional purpose in enacting Public Law 15.

Laws which require membership in rating bureaus, or which eliminate all rate competition are in direct conflict with the McCarran Act.

In the course of this Antitrust Committee's insurance study, we learned that the casualty insurance rate law for the District of Columbia enacted in 1948 did not contain either this restrictive feature or other tight controls over rates which were in the early fire rate law. My essential purpose in introducing this bill today is to repeal the fire rate law and to apply the salutary principles of the casualty law to both fire and casualty insurance rates.

The original bills which Senator O'Mahoney and I introduced met wtih considerable opposition from certain groups in the insurance industry, primarily under the belief that they were designed as model bills upon which the States would be required to pattern their rate laws. This was not our intention, and is not now my purpose. I concur in the remarks of Senator MORSE, who cosponsored this bill with me, when he stated during the hearings before the District of Columbia Committee that the bill is intended to be a model of good legislation for the District of Columbia, and not as any congressional mandate that the States are obligated to follow.

The National Association of Insurance Commissioners has frequently encouraged the development of all-industry bills which have served as models. However, the Congress possesses no authority to establish model laws which the States shall be required to adopt. But, as Senator MORSE properly noted, if there is anything in a rate law enacted for the District of Columbia which the States find to be valuable, they would, of course, be free to draw from such laws whatever comfort they can in enacting their own laws. It should be noted, however, that the Constitution prohibits the enactment by the States of laws which conflict with valid Federal laws.

I think largely because of this unfortunate misconception concerning the original bills, the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce of the Committee on the District of Columbia, which held hearings on this legislation last year, never saw fit to bring this issue to a vote. Regrettably, the full membership of the District Committee had no opportunity to register their views on this measure.

In the hearings which were conducted last year, the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia testified in favor of a rate bill which had been introduced by Senator BIBLE, chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia. This bill repealed the fire rate law of 1944 and subjected fire rates to the provisions of the casualty rate law. In addition, it denied rate bureaus the status of aggrieved persons in opposing rate deviations. I consider this bill a very constructive measure in correcting the principal defects which the Antitrust Committee had found in the District of Columbia rate law. Therefore, during the hearings which were held last June, together with Senator MORSE, I agreed to support this bill, and to abandon the approach endorsed in the previous bills I had sponsored, provided a few basic amendments could be incorporated.

The bill which I introduce today is modeled after the original bill introduced by Senator BIBLE, at the request of Superintendent Jordan, but containing the amendments which I proposed last year. I am firmly convinced that there are now only minor differences separating my views from those of the insurance superintendent. It is my sincere hope that the superintendent will join with me and other industry groups in support of this bill, in order that the District Committee may act favorably upon the bill promptly, and that the Congress will have an opportunity to vote on this issue this year.

While the bill I introduce today adopts the approach proposed by Senator BIBLE, at the instance of Superintendent Jordan, I feel some amendments are necessary. One of these amendments would deny status as an aggrieved person to rating organizations, not only in opposing deviations, but also in opposition to independent rate filings. During the hearings last June, Superintendent Jordan indicated agreement with this amendment. The only major issue raised by these amendments is the requirement that like bureau and independent filings, deviated rate filings be effective upon filing. Such deviations, of course, remain subject to the right of subsequent disapproval by the superintendent if they do not comply with the standards of the act. This would also be true for either bureau or independent filings. Superintendent Jordan wants to keep deviations subject to the prior approval requirement, in order that he can deal effectively with the possibility of flash filings, that is, filings deliberately made at inadequate rates to capture a particular piece of business. However, in response to questions, he did say that flash filings had not been made under the file-and-use provision of the existing casualty rate law. The superintendent contended that flash filings cannot occur under the existing law, because of the power to retroactively disapprove certain filings. The bill which I offer today not only retains this authority the superintendent deems necessary to curb flash filings, but specifically makes it applicable to deviations, as well as basic filings. As now drafted, I believe that any differences we have with the insurance superintendent are minor. Nevertheless, I believe the principle must be preserved that deviations cannot be subjected to any more onerous requirements than obtain in the case of other rate filings.

The bill which I am introducing contains a number of other minor amendments to which the superintendent has raised no specific objections. These amendments would, first, expressly authorize public inspection of all filings; second, permit a filer to incorporate by reference any previously filed material open to public inspection; third, clarify the partial subscribership provision; and fourth, define the term "excessive and inadequate" rates. I want to point out that the definition of "inadequate rates" contained in this bill affords the superintendent an additional tool to combat the problem of flash filings. The superintendent's concern about flash filings is also met by the new provision included in this bill which prescribed a 1-year minimum period for deviations.

Because of the importance of preserving reasonable competition in the insurance industry in the District of Columbia, Judge Lee Loevinger, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, appeared personally before the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce last year and urged the adoption of legislation substantially the same as that contained in the bill I am now proposing. I think the Congress ought to give great weight to the special competence of the experts in the Department of Justice on this vital issue. Only the magnitude of this issue would have caused the Assistant Attorney General to appear before the Subcommittee of the District of Columbia to testimony in favor of this remedial legislation. It is important, therefore, to note that Judge Loevinger concluded his testimony by saying:

> We urge that legislation be enacted to provide within the District the competitive climate which Congress intended to create in the insurance industry when it passed the McCarran Act; and to provide the States with an unequivocal expression of the type of regulation which Congress contemplated when it granted the States the authority to regulate this great industry and immunize it from the full impact of the antitrust laws.

I am entirely in agreement with the Assistant Attorney General that a competitive climate for the insurance industry should be provided by Congress for the District of Columbia. I believe that the bill which I introduce today would provide that climate, and I urge its serious consideration by the Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1184) to amend and consolidate the laws providing for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Kefauver, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS BETWEEN THE STATE OF OREGON AND THE C. & B. LIVESTOCK CO., INC.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1185) relating to the exchange of certain lands between the State of Oregon and the C. & B. Livestock Co., Inc., introduced by Mr. Morse, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the Act of September 23, 1950 (64 Stat. 981), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept from the State of Oregon (without cost to the United States) a deed conveying to the United States all right, title, and interest of the State of Oregon in and to the following described land (together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon): the west half of the southwest quarter of section 22, township 4 North, Range 28 East, Willamette meridian, Oregon, such land being a part of a tract of land conveyed to the State of Oregon by patent numbered 1308889, dated September 17, 1954, pursuant to the aforementioned Act.

(b) Upon the receipt of a deed from the State of Oregon conveying to the United States the land described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey by patent or other appropriate conveyance to the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, of Hermiston, Oregon (without cost to the United States), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to such land (including all minerals contained therein), together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon, upon the condition that:

(1) The C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, convey to the United States fee simple title to the following described parcels of land (including all minerals contained therein), together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon: The west half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15, lying south of U.S.R.S. canal "A", the east half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15, lying south of U.S.R.S. canal "A", less the westerly 135 feet thereof; the east half of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 22, less railroad right-of-way; that portion of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 22 and of the north half of the northwest quarter of section 22, lying south and east of U.S.R.S. canal "A", excepting from said north half of said northwest quarter of section 22, that certain portion thereof as conveyed to the State of Oregon by deed recorded October 19, 1960, in deed book 260 at page 512, records of Umatilla County, Oregon. All being in township 4 north, range 28 east, of the Willamette meridian, in the county of Umatilla and State of Oregon. Excepting any and all roads and water rights-of-way.

(2) If it is determined after an appraisal by the Secretary of the Interior that the property to be conveyed to the United States by such company is of less value than the property to be conveyed to such company by the United States, the State of Oregon and the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, pay to the United States an amount equal to that difference in value, which amount shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(c) The conveyance to the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, authorized under subsection (b) of this section shall be made subject to a right-of-way in the land so conveyed for ditches or canals constructed under the authority of the United States, as authorized by the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 391).

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey by patent or other appropriate conveyance to the State of Oregon all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those lands (together with any buildings and other permanent improvements thereon) conveyed to the United States by the C. and B. Livestock Company, Incorporated, pursuant to the first section of this Act; except that there shall be reserved to the United States all minerals in such lands, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

(b) The conveyance authorized under subsection (a) of this section shall be made subject to the same covenants, conditions, and limitations as those contained in patent numbered 1308889, dated September 17, 1954, referred to in the first section of this Act.

AUTHORIZATION FOR IRRIGATION OF ADDITIONAL LANDS, CROOKED RIVER FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, to provide for the irrigation of additional lands. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1186) to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project to provide for the irrigation of additional lands, introduced by Mr. Morse (for himself and Mrs. Neuberger), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon", approved August 6, 1956 (70 Stat. 1058), as amended, is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence of such section the following: "and the Crooked River project extension. The principal new works for the project extension shall include six pumping plants, canals, and related distribution and drainage facilities".

Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the new works involved in the Crooked River project extension $995,000 (January 1962 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the cost of construction work of the types involved therein as shown by engineering cost indexes and, in addition thereto, such sums as may be required to operate and maintain said extension.

Sec. 3. Power and energy required for irrigation pumping for the Crooked River project and the Crooked River project extension shall be made available by the Secretary of the Interior from the Dalles Dam powerplant and other Federal plants interconnected therewith at rates not to exceed the costs of such power and energy from the Dalles Dam, taking into account all costs of the dam, reservoir, and powerplant which are determined by the Secretary under provisions of the Federal reclamation laws to be properly allocable to such irrigation pumping power and energy.

TO AMEND THE JOINT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU FOR THE PROTECTION OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific joint resolution to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this joint resolution, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be printed in the Record at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary dated February 23, 1963, to the Vice President in regard to it and also a memorandum in regard to this joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution, and letter, will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 64) to amend the joint resolution providing for U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of July 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 381) is hereby amended by striking out the figure "$7,250" in section (b) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$15,000".

The letter presented by Mr. Fulbright is as follows:

February 23, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate.

Dear Mr. Vice President: I enclose a proposed draft joint resolution to authorize appropriations incident to U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property. The legislation would allow the increase of the maximum annual U.S. contribution to the Bureau from the present $7,250 to $15,000.

The Bureau, located in Geneva, Switzerland, is the secretariat of the International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property. The Union is composed of the 51 countries, including the United States, which are parties to the Convention of Paris for the Protection of Industrial Property. This Convention is and has been for more than 70 years the major instrumentality through which the patents, trademarks and industrial designs of U.S. inventors, industries, and business are assured protection in the other 50 member countries. Many millions of dollars are collected abroad each year for the assignment or licensing of these industrial property rights, and thus they are important dollar earners for this country.

The Bureau is in the process of complete reorganization and revitalization. We hope that, as a result of this reorganization, it will provide for increased services to the member countries, assist industrially less developed countries in their industrial property problems, and increase its publications in the English language. This reorganization and assumption of new tasks, together with the general increase in salaries and the rising costs of goods and services, make necessary an increase in the Bureau's budget (a background memorandum relating to the proposal is enclosed).

I believe it is in the best interests of the United States to raise its annual contribution to the Bureau in order that the extremely valuable and important services performed can be continued and increased in scope and efficiency. Our contribution to the total budget of the Industrial Property Union is expected to remain between 5 and 7 percent.

I hope that the Congress will be able to take action on this request during the current session since the recommended effective date of the increased contribution is January 1, 1963. The Bureau of the Budget has advised me that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

Dean Rusk,
Secretary of State.

U.S. Participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property

The obligation of this Government to pay contributions to the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property results from the fact that the United States is party to the Convention of the International (Paris) Union for the Protection of Industrial Property, established in Paris on March 20, 1883, and revised at Washington on June 2, 1911 (38 Stat. 1645; TS 579), at The Hague on November 6, 1925 (47 Stat. 1789; TS 834); at London on June 2, 1934 (53 Stat. 1748; TS 941), and at Lisbon on October 31, 1958 (13 UST 1; TIAS 4931). In accordance with article 1 of the Convention, the countries to which the convention applies constituted themselves into a Union for the Protection of Industrial Property.

The convention provides basically that each country shall accord to nationals of other member countries the same protection with respect to industrial property rights that it accords its own nationals. Nationals of member countries are also accorded, throughout the Union, certain special rights and advantages, such as the right of priority and protection against arbitrary forfeiture of patents, if not immediately worked. The provisions governing priority are particularly important. Under these provisions, when an American inventor has filed for a patent in the United States or a member country on a given date, he has a 1-year period from the date of his first filing to file a corresponding patent application and acquire appropriate protection in other member countries. A similar 6-month right of priority applies to trademarks.

The convention also establishes an international office known as the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property which performs the following administrative functions: (1) Serves as a clearing house for information on and interpretation of patent and trademark laws; (2) serves as a medium to promote the ratification by members of revisions of the convention and the adherence of new members; (3) collects and publishes information relating to matters of general usefulness to members of the Union, and prepares a periodical paper concerning matters of interest to members of the Union; (4) holds itself at the service of members of the Union in order to supply them with any special information they may need on questions relating to the international system of industrial property; (5) handles the preparatory and administrative work of the conferences of revision.

The Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property provides that the budget of the International Bureau shall not exceed 140,000 Swiss francs (approximately $33,000). This amount was written in the convention in 1925.

Attempts were made at the Lisbon Conference in 1958 to raise this amount to 600,000 Swiss francs (approximately $140,000) by revising the convention. Such a revision, for which the United States voted at the diplomatic conference, would have required the unanimous decision of all member countries. The decision was vetoed by the Soviet bloc for political reasons, in retaliation for the conference's decision not to seat the representatives of the Eastern Zone of Germany. Thereupon, the conference adopted a simple resolution inviting the countries to raise their contributions to an extent which brought the ceiling of the Bureau's budget to 600,000 Swiss francs. This budget did not, of course, take into account any increased costs arising out of the proposed reorganization of the Bureau which was only approved by a committee of members of the Union in October 1962.

At the present time, the United States and almost all the other member countries pay their contributions on the basis recommended by the Lisbon resolution. The contribution of each State is computed according to a system in which countries belong in one of six classes. Each class is allotted a certain percentage of the total budget, and each state freely chooses the class in which it wants to belong. (The United States and five other countries belong to class I.) The percentage of each class may undergo slight variations from year to year, as the total number of the members and their appurtenance to a given class change. The present annual contribution of the United States and other countries in class I is approximately $7,000.

Congress gave authority in 1960 to the Department of State to pay on the basis of a yearly maximum of $7,250 (Public Law 86–614; 74 Stat. 381) which is roughly 5 percent of the present total budget with a $140,000 ceiling.

This ceiling, voted in 1958, is going to be insufficient in the next few years primarily for three reasons: (1) general increase in salaries, and the rising cost of printing, materials, and services; (2) the reorganization of the Bureau in order to increase its efficiency and usefulness to member states; (3) new activities. The salaries will be brought to a level comparable with the salaries paid by other intergovernmental organizations having their headquarters in Geneva. This is necessary for the recruitment of a truly international and high quality staff. The cost of printing, materials, and services has considerably increased in Switzerland in recent years. The most important new activities include increased efforts to have additional countries adhere to the Union; cooperation with the United Nations in industrial property matters; and technical-legal assistance to less developed countries.

A 15-member Committee of the Paris Union (called the "Permanent Bureau"), on which the United States is represented, has carefully studied the financial implications of the proposed future activities in a meeting held in October 1962. It estimated that the yearly amounts needed in the near future will be in the neighborhood of 900,000 Swiss francs (approximately $210,000). The question of increase was brought before this committee rather than before a diplomatic conference because the Soviet bloc countries would have probably again vetoed a revision of the convention in protest against the nonrecognition of East Germany. Thus it was necessary once again to resolve the question of an increase by way of a recommendation not requiring unanimity. Consequently, the committee adopted a resolution recommending that the supervisory authority (i.e. the Swiss Government) "invite the Govments of the States members of the Paris Union to accept that the ceiling of that Union be raised to 900,000 Swiss francs per year and to pay their contributions on this basis from January 1, 1963."

This represents an increase of 50 percent and, assuming that the percentage of the countries belonging to class I would remain 5 percent of the total budget, would mean for the United States that its yearly contribution would increase by $3,500 (i.e., from the present $7,000 to $10,500; all amounts being approximative).

The Department of State recommends, however, that the authority sought from Congress allow us to contribute up to $15,000 per annum in order to avoid the need of seeking new authorizations in the next few years, should the $10,500 prove to be insufficient. It is, in fact, possible that the percentage of class I countries will become slightly higher, since some countries may change class or withdraw. The amount of $15,000 would allow for a 2-percent increase on this account. Furthermore, it is possible that because of increases in salary due to rising costs of living and other increases, the ceiling of $210,000 would prove to be inadequate. The amount of $15,000 would allow the raising of the ceiling to approximately $300,000 if contributions of class I members continue to represent about 5 percent of the total budget. If this percentage rises, the authority to pay $15,000 per annum would allow a budget of correspondingly less than $300,000. However, it is believed that an authorization to contribute not more than $15,000 per year will suffice for the foreseeable future.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] be placed on S. 943 as a cosponsor, and that the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] be placed on the bill S. 1013 as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 987) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain additional losses, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] be added, and that when the bill is again printed, it may include their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in behalf of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 887, related to the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of March 14, 1963:

S. 1100. A bill to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism: Mr. Byrd of West Virginia.

Authority of March 19, 1963:

S. 1117. A bill to extend for 4 years the Commission on Civil Rights as an agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes: Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Case, Mr. Church, Mr. Clark, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Engle, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Javits, Mr. Keating, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Moss, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NORTHWEST POWER PREFERENCE BILL, S. 1007

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate that the public hearing on S. 1007, the Northwest power preference bill, previously scheduled by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to begin on April 2, has now been rescheduled to begin on Monday, April 1, at 10 a.m., in our committee hearing room.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

Statement by Representative Robert W. Hemphill, of South Carolina, before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on March 14, 1963, on the subject of the 1963 tax message.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY AT DEDICATION OF O'HARE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, CHICAGO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last Saturday, President Kennedy spoke at the dedication of the O'Hare International Airport in Chicago.

I recommend to Senators a reading of his remarks on that occasion. They remind us how much our country owes to men such as "Butch" O'Hare, for whom the airport is named; at the same time, they demonstrate our need for such men in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the President's dedicatory address and also the text of a speech he delivered later that day at a luncheon in the Conrad Hilton Hotel.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of the President at the Dedication of the O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Ill.

Mayor Daley, Governor Kerner, Senator Douglas, Government and State officials, ladies and gentlemen: 21 years ago this year, a young Navy officer stood at the White House and was decorated by President Roosevelt with the Congressional Medal of Honor for heroism extending far beyond the line of duty. I remember as a young naval officer myself how the extraordinary feat of "Butch" O'Hare captured the imagination not only of our Armed Forces but also of the country. His extraordinary act in protecting his ship, shooting down, while he was alone, shooting down five of the enemy, during difficult days in the Second War, gave this country hope and confidence not only in the quality and caliber of our fighting men, but also in the certainty of victory.

Therefore, 21 years later, I am proud to come to Chicago, to this airport, to take part in this act which commemorates his public service, his great naval service, and also reminds me of how much we owe to those who made this country of ours great.

I think one of the extraordinary facts of the Second War was this number of men who were highly decorated, particularly with the Congressional Medal of Honor, who later lost their lives in combat in later days. "Butch" O'Hare was one of them, being killed 18 months after the act of honor by the President of the United States, when his life could have been much easier. John Basilone, who got the Congressional Medal of Honor, in the Marine Corps, in Guadalcanal, and who was later killed on the beach at Iwo Jima, was another. But time after time, men who could have stayed at home and felt their duty done, went out again and some of them were killed. So today we not only dedicate the International Airport, but we also recall all those who made it possible. This is an extraordinary airport in an extraordinary city, in an extraordinary country, and it is a tribute to the constructive action of the Federal Government, the State government and the city government, under the distinguished leadership of your great mayor, Mayor Daley.

To keep these various interests working together and make this the most extraordinary airport in the world for this great city is an amazing feat. This airport lives up to its name. There is no other airport in the world where planes can make instrument landings on parallel runways, simultaneously. There is no other airport in the Nation which maintains three instrument landing systems. And there is no other airport in the world, and this should be a source of satisfaction to the people of Chicago, there is no other airport in the world which serves so many people and so many planes. Some 13.5 million airline travelers passed through O'Hare Airport last year. In 5 years it has gone from the 16th most active field in the country to the first, like so many other things about Chicago. During this airport's daily peak periods, an airliner lands and takes off every 43 seconds. Every day, one out of every five air travelers in this country passes through this airport, enough people in one day to equal the population of Bloomington, Ill. Every day, some 1,300 to 1,400 landings and takeoffs occur. So I think this airport is an extraordinary national asset named after an extraordinary American.

All of this traffic in and out of Chicago proves, as it has since the beginning of this country, that Chicago occupies a most important and vital strategic area in the United States, where all the lines of communication cross. That is why the future of this city is so bright. Indian canoes traveled this route from Lake Michigan and the Mississippi River before this was the United States.

And it will be doing the same thing in the year 2000. Railroads, highways—all the rest will come and meet in Chicago and make this a vital, booming city. These are all the things that can be done, but I think a good deal more must be done. One of the problems is with the people who live around the airports. I hope that the National Government, along with the airlines, will continue to work as hard as they can to make sure that the noise from these jets which take us in and out do not disturb the lives of a half-million people whose homes are in the

immediate area. In addition, air cargo is only beginning in importance. In addition, I think we must make a special effort at O'Hare and all our other airports to welcome the people who come from abroad. This may be the first view they have of America. We want them to know what a warm and vital and vigorous country this is. And I hope we will make every effort to make them at home, and to urge their countrymen to come and visit us.

Finally, we look forward to the day in aviation when we are going to travel three times the speed of sound, and go to any place in the world in a few hours. And when that happens, we want the United States to be in the lead, as it has been in the lead in jet transportation since the jet was invented. All in all, I am proud to be here in Chicago taking part in a great ceremony, honoring a great American to whom we owe much, looking to the past and saluting him and looking to the future and saluting the city of Chicago.

Thank you.

Remarks of the President at a Civic Luncheon, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. Mayor, Your Eminence, Rabbi Mann, Bishop Burrill, Senator Douglas, Mr. Logelin, Mr. Lee, distinguished guests, Mr. Smith, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to be in Chicago because I am struck every time I come by the strong public spirit which runs through this city in the determination to make Chicago second to none, and everything about Chicago to be the best, that men and women working together can provide. And also by the happy spirit of community effort which joins business, labor, the civic groups and all the rest, in selling Chicago to the people of Chicago, to the country, and the world.

As Mr. Smith said, all these things do not just happen; they are made to happen. And the reason they are made to happen, I think, in Chicago, is because of Mayor Daley. So I am glad to be here today.

I did not realize, which shows the advantage of getting out of Washington—I did not realize until I began to look up some of the details of O'Hare what an extraordinary effort this has been, the largest airport in the world here in the center of the United States. So I hope that Chicago will continue to tell its story, not only here but all across this country, of what a great metropolis it is, its energy and vitality, and its commitment to the future. I don't think that there is any doubt that if this country continues to grow, if we can maintain a rate of economic vitality and prosperity, that Chicago will be among the leaders, and that the future of O'Hare Airport, named as the mayor has said, after a great Chicagoan who died a good many thousands of miles away from here, that Chicago and O'Hare will be symbolic of the progress of this country.

There is, I think, the central thesis, however, that we face serious problems in this country in the decade ahead if we are going to maintain that growth, and I want to mention one of those problems because I think it concerns us all, in government, in the city, the National Government, the State, labor, management, all of us as citizens. I think the No. 1 domestic concern of the United States is going to be in the 1960's the question of jobs, jobs for a tidal wave of men and women who are going to be hitting our labor market in the next 5 years. It is a concern which requires the united effort of all of us. Some people may think it strange that jobs, which was the great issue of the thirties, when we were in a depression, should also be the great concern of the sixties, when we enjoy a relative period of economic prosperity. The difficulty in the thirties was that there was an inordinately low supply of jobs for the men and women who wished to find work.

The difficulty now is the tremendously high manpower demand which exceeds the supply of jobs. But now, as then, every effort must be made by all of us to strengthen the economy so that we can find work for the people who want it. This involves not only Chicago in this country, but it involves our position of leadership in the world. Mr. Khrushchev has said that the hinge of history would move when he was able to demonstrate that his system could outproduce ours. The hinge of history will move if we are not able to find jobs for our people, not only during recessions, but also during periods of prosperity; and there are three reasons why I regard this as the No. 1 problem we are going to face in this country in the coming years, and it is serious enough to warrant a careful examination by all of us to realize that it cannot be reduced by platitudes and hopes, and the effect of this problem is being felt and will be felt here in Chicago, Ill., and across the country. There are three reasons for it: First is the labor released by the revolution in farm technology. Agriculture has been this Nation's largest employer, engaging more people than steel, automobiles, and public utilities, and the transportation industries combined.

But now one farmer can produce the food and fiber needed for 25 Americans; compared to only 7 at the turn of the century. New fertilizers, insecticides, research, and all the rest have made this one of the great productive miracles of all time, has been one of the great stories for the United States around the world in contrast to the failure of our adversaries, but it is a fact that since 1947 our farms have increased their output 30 percent, at the very time that the man-hours worked on those farms were cut in half. Farm employment during that period declined by 3 million, an average of 200,000 a year; comparable to the population of the city of Akron, Ohio, being thrown out of work every 12 months. In the last 2 years alone, farm employment dropped by a half million, while farm production and farm income were both rising. It is estimated that, disturbing as it may sound, only 1 out of every 10 boys growing up on the farms of the United States will find a living in agriculture.

This leads us to the second growing tide of manpower, our Nation's youth.

The crest of the postwar baby flood has swept through our elementary and secondary schools and is now about to engulf the labor force. Last year, for example, 2.8 million young Americans reached the age of 16. This year, 3.8 million will be coming into the labor market at that age. Altogether, in the 1960's, 26 million new young workers will enter the labor market, an increase of 40 percent over the 1950's, and a far greater number than this country has ever had to absorb and train in our history.

Already workers under the age of 25, although they comprise less than one-fifth of our labor force, constitute more than one third of our unemployed. Last year, the unemployment rate for men age 25 and over was 4.4 percent. But for those age 20 to 24 it was 9 percent, and for those 14 to 19 it was a shocking 13 percent. Although young people are staying in school longer than their fathers, the rate of school dropouts, 4 out of every 10, is too high, for job openings for the untrained are declining, in factories, mines, farms, and railroads, in the construction and service industries.

Moreover, the jobless rate is always highest among the unskilled. In our modern society, even high school graduates find that their skills are inadequate. But Labor Department surveys show that their rate of unemployment is at least far below that of school dropouts, not only in the year of leaving school, but in the later years.

The latest surveys also show that unemployment rates among college graduates are much lower than among those coming out of high school. But unfortunately, only 1 out of every 10 finish college. In short, as challenging as it will be to provide, first, jobs for the 26 million new young workers entering the labor market in the 1960's, far more difficult will be the problem of absorbing the 7.5 million who will not even finish high school, including nearly 2½ million who will not even finish the eighth grade.

I ask you to mark these figures well, for youth unemployment poses one of the most expensive and explosive social and economic problems now facing this country and this city. In the last decade, for example, arrests of youth increased 86 percent. What will the figure be for the next decade when the net increase of potential young workers in the labor force rises to 15 times as fast as it did in the 1950's?

Finally, underlying all of these trends is the third phenomenon, both cursed and praised, and that is technological advance, known loosely by the name of automation. During the last 6 years, the Nation increased its manufacturing output by nearly 20 percent, but it did so with 800,000 fewer production workers, and the gain in white collar jobs did not offset this loss. Since the Second World War, the real output of the private economy has risen 67 percent, with only a 3-percent rise in man-hours.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. Increasing productivity and advancing technological skills are essential to our ability to compete and to progress. But we also have an obligation to find the nearly 2 million jobs which are displaced by these advances.

This city is no stranger to any of these problems. You have seen your railroads laying off machinists and boilermakers, as the proportion of diesel locomotives rose from less than 15 percent of all locomotives in 1947 to 97 percent today. You have seen your downstate coal mines laying off workers as new machinery makes it possible for 46 men to dig the coal that 100 men dug in 1947. And you have seen your steel mills employ 79 men to produce the steel products which required 100 men only 10 years ago. Chicago, I might add parenthetically, also proves the exception to this pattern since it now takes 10 men to manage the Cubs instead of 1.

This is not a blue collar problem alone. Office and clerical workers are increasingly being displaced by automatic computers and processes. The Farm Home Administration of the U.S. Government processes 35 percent more loans per employee than it did only 2 years ago.

This administration intends to press ahead with Government economy, but we also have to find in the private economy jobs for these people who are willing.

All these trends you have seen in this city and State, workers displaced by automation, school dropouts roaming the streets, men looking for work who have left the farm, the mine, the factory, the railroad, or the distressed area. You have your share of jobless Negroes and women and older workers and all the rest, even though under Mayor Daley's hard-driving leadership this city is creating new jobs faster than almost any city in the country. The same is true on a larger scale of the Nation as a whole. Our civilian labor force grew by nearly 12 million during the last 15 years. But the number of jobs grew by only 10 million. In the last 5 years we saw an annual increase of only 175,000 private jobs, outside of agriculture, compared to 700,000 in each of the previous 10 years. Our total gross national product output grew at a rate of only 3 percent, while unemployment remained continuously above 5 percent. And last year's loss of man-hours, in terms of those willing but unable to find full-time work, was a staggering 1 billion work days, equivalent to shutting down the entire country with no production, no services, and no pay for over 3 weeks.

Some 14 million Americans had some unemployment in 1962, and 28 percent of last year's unemployed were out of work 15 weeks or longer. Fifteen percent were out of work a full 6 months or longer.

This Nation must do better than that.

The trouble is that each of these figures grow worse, after each recession, and each one is bound to grow worse in the sixties as the labor force increases even faster, unless we take actions to reverse these trends and make the most of the manpower. Unless we step up our rate of growth, unless we create a supply of jobs which is more equal to the demand, our rate of unemployment will steadily and swiftly climb to the recession level of 7 percent, even without a recession. Without full employment, consumer markets are below their potential, without strong consumer demand plant capacity is not fully in use, without full plant utilization profit margins are reduced, without higher profits investment lags, and so the sagging spiral continues downward.

Our task is to reverse this spiral, to recognize it in the first place, and no single magic solution will solve all of our manpower problems. Above all, we need to release the brake of wartime tax rates which are now holding down growth at the very time we need more growth in order to create more jobs. Ten million dollars more in tax savings in the hands of American consumers and investors, as I have proposed to the Congress, will be multiplied many times in new markets, new equipment, new jobs, new payrolls, and then still more consumption and investment.

As this decade is unique in terms of the trends converging upon it, so is 1963 uniquely qualified to be the year that we cut Federal taxes. Inflationary pressures are at bay, no world crisis strains our resources, the dollar is strong, new investment incentives have been enacted, world war material prices are stable, and the number of idle men and machines can clearly absorb this expansion. But tax reduction alone is not enough if we are to attack unemployment in those areas and among those workers where the need is greatest.

Tax reduction alone will not employ the unskilled or bring business to a distressed area, and tax reduction alone is not, therefore, the only program we must put forward. To mention but a few, we urgently need to improve our schools and colleges, to reduce the number of dropouts, to reduce the number of unskilled workers, to keep young people out of the labor market until they are ready for the jobs which automation creates, instead of those it is sure to replace.

We urgently need a youth employment opportunities program to give young people training and job experience instead of hanging around the streets, out of work, and out of hope. We need to step up our efforts for aid to distressed areas, for the retraining of the unemployed, particularly in those areas where it has been chronic, for more security for our aged, for improving our housing and our transportation industries, and for ending race discrimination in education and employment, which helps increase, of course, the chronic unemployment of minority groups.

These are all controversial measures. There may possibly be others that are needed or others that are better, but at least it is a problem that we should all concentrate our attention on and not merely assume it is going to be settled if we ignore it.

O'Hare Airport was not built in that spirit and this problem will not be solved unless we concentrate the best energies of this country on the solution of a serious national problem. I have no doubt these problems will some day be solved. The question is will they be solved in ways which impoverish us, with restrictions on the workweek, or inefficiency, or in competition, or will they be solved in ways which enrich us by expanding our economy and putting people to work.

The choice is up to us all, to you here in Chicago, to those of us in Washington; depends on the will of the people and the will of the Congress.

Twenty-five hundred years ago the Greek poet Alcaeus laid down the principle which best sums up the greatness of Chicago: "Not houses firmly roofed," he wrote, "or the stones of walls well builded, nay, nor canals and dockyards make the city—but men able to use their opportunities."

Chicago is blessed to have such men at their head, and my fervent hope is that the United States of America in meeting the needs of this decade will also be peopled by "men able to use their opportunities."

Thank you.

DR. WALTER P. WEBB

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, each generation is privileged to know certain individuals of whom it readily can be said that they carry the torch of wisdom, from which untold numbers light their own fires of thought and learning.

One of that number of wise men, Dr. Walter Prescott Webb, the eminent Texas and Southwest historian, recently was torn from this life by a tragic traffic accident.

It was the same Dr. Webb, professor emeritus of the University of Texas, who provided "A Tribute to the Southwest" for the official inaugural program, January 20, 1961, from which I am privileged to quote the following:

> There is something infectious about the magic of the Southwest. Some are immune to it, but there are others who have no resistence, and who must spend the rest of their lives dreaming of the incredible sweep of the desert, of great golden mesas with purple shadows, and tremendous stars appearing at dusk in a turquoise sky.
>
> And I am one of those.

On March 17, 1963, the Dallas Morning News published an article written by Dr. J. Frank Dobie, who walked, talked, and taught with Dr. Webb for many years. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Mar. 17, 1963]

ON THE PROJECTED SHADOW OF WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB

(By J. Frank Dobie)

I cannot speak freely of Walter Webb apart from personal life. Each of us was born in the year 1888 and reared in the country. We were underling instructors together, he in history and I in English, in the University of Texas; we came to know each other better along in the thirties. The evening he was killed in a car accident, March 8, 1963, I and two other men were sitting down to dinner as guests of Frank Wardlaw, director of the University of Texas Press, all of us expecting Webb to appear before long.

Many times in newspapers and elsewhere I've seen the names of Roy Bedichek, naturalist and humanist, Walter Prescott Webb, historian and thinker, and Frank Dobie linked together as a triumvirate of writers. Bedichek, the dearest comrade of my life, died in 1959. We three not infrequently went out in the country late in the day to cook steak and eat it along with a bottle of beer. Bedichek was the planner of these parties, also the cook. He saw that each man paid his part of the expenses. There was no host. There was not much drinking. Webb didn't care for beer. A sip of wine suited him. If he took whisky, he didn't take more than a jigger without water.

The site for our camp suppers came to be Friday Mountain Ranch in the hills about 17 miles southwest of Austin. It consists of approximately a section of land; an ancient two-storied rock house on it was once a kind of academy. After Webb acquired the place it entered into his bones—into the very fibers of his being. He spent an enormous amount of time and money restoring the soil and bringing back a turf of grass. Bear Creek, normally running, twists through the land. Webb dammed it, compounding a fine hole of water. The water, the soil, and the grass restored him as much as he restored the land.

In 1945 or 1946 Roy Bedichek was provided with a grant of money by a civilized man who demanded anonymity. He spent a year at Friday Mountain batching and writing the book published in 1947, "Adventures With a Texas Naturalist." Webb wanted humanity to benefit from the land. Without living on it and there associating with himself and with nature, free from everything else but the occupation of writing, Bedichek probably could not have achieved the classic that he did achieve.

It was only after rains broke the terrible drought of the fifties that grass really came back on Friday Mountain land. In 1962 it was at its prime and Walter Webb was also.

He wrote an essay, published in Harper's and then reprinted in Reader's Digest, telling of the poverty of his boyhood and of a stranger named Hinds in New York who sent him books to read and aided him in getting a college education. Hinds died many years ago. Webb never saw him and remained to the end concerned over some way to pay him back. His paying back seems to have lain in aiding certain struggling and able students.

He was always on the side of humanity, the people. One of his books, "Divided We Stand" (1937), analyzes the dearth of prosperity in the South while the North burgeoned and for a long while treated the South pretty much as a colony. Webb himself prospered through investing earnings from teaching and writing—especially from two textbooks—in real estate.

Webb had a dim view of certain English teachers under whom he had studied in the university. He wanted to write but learned by himself the craft of writing. Some time after World War I, he was avidly reading O. Henry and writing some short stories of his own. One that I remember was based on an electric sign above Joske's store in San Antonio that flashed every night, showing a cowboy roping a steer. Webb taught for a while in a San Antonio high school.

His superiority as a historian lies to a marked degree in power of thought, in revealing the meaning of things as well as characters, and in interpreting the ever-evolving currents of human affairs. His last big book, "The Great Frontier" (1958), interprets the Western Hemisphere as a frontier for the expansion of Europe. It says plainly and emphatically that America has been consuming irreplaceable resources and that the future of such a policy is not bright. This book came out during the outrage of McCarthyism, and some fanatics, without reading it, slammed it as a rebuke to free enterprise.

When Webb took a stand, he took it. If the radical right seemed to him unjust and undemocratic the radical left annoyed him. He was not a crusader and was not contentious. Much went on in his mind that he never gave words to. He sometimes wished, he once told me, that he didn't have to think. One time while we were walking along the railroad about Third Street in Austin, we stopped beside the oldtime steam locomotive. It was stationary but was throbbing with power. Webb said, "That is the greatest manifestation of power in the world."

Whether Webb actually ever hated anybody or not I cannot say; I never heard him express hatred toward anybody. He was more inclined to set forth the facts about a man than to praise or condemn. He was tolerant of the vagaries of individuals.

He developed as a professor and historian under the late Dr. Eugene C. Barker, for years head of the history department of the University of Texas. The older Barker grew, the more conservative he grew. His directness and his integrity were admirable. I myself owe considerable to him. He came to think that the masses of mankind need a kind of dictatorial direction in religion, in politics, and in other regions.

While Dr. Barker became hostile to the New Deal, active against Homer Price Rainey as president of the University of Texas, and was standing with the by-no-means-intellectual regents who deposed Rainey, Webb was for Rainey, also for Franklin D. Roosevelt, as he was later for Truman. But he was never against Barker. "I did not understand him," I heard him say, "but he stood by me. He was generous. He stood for fine things. I remember him with respect and gratitude."

The first Mrs. Webb, after having been married to Walter for more than 43 years, died in the summer of 1960, survived by a daughter, Mildred, of whom Dr. Webb as well as Mrs. Webb was very fond. In December of 1961 he married the widow of the late Maury Maverick, of San Antonio, a very spritely mind and a delightful lady. Considering his love for her and her marrying him, he said, "This is an unexpected dividend from life."

Any man who has seen and been a part of life wants to leave it before decomposing into a senile vegetable. Webb died standing up, as Caesar considered it mete for a man to die. In a flash he passed from wisdom and happiness to whatever death means. No person who has added as much to the heritage of human life as Walter Webb added ceases to be. His living, thinking, writing, standing up will surely continue as parts of his projected shadow.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on this date 142 years ago the people of Greece, unwilling to tolerate any longer the oppressive domination imposed by their Ottoman conquerors, began an all-out struggle for their freedom—a struggle which was to last for more than 6 years, and was to culminate, in 1827, in the establishment of an independent Greek state. It is entirely appropriate that we here in the Senate, and Americans everywhere, pause to commemorate this occasion and to pay tribute to the valiant courage and indomitable spirit of the Greek people.

The entire Western civilization owes an incalculable debt to the Greeks for the contributions they have made to almost every facet of modern life. In architecture, literature, philosophy, and sculpture, to mention only a few, the imagination and creativity of the Greeks have served as sources of inspiration to all of us over the years. But the Greeks are perhaps best noted for their political theories. Their early philosophers are recognized as the true architects of democracy, believing as they did in the dignity of the individual man and the supremacy of the law. It is indeed ironic that the Greek nation, so steeped in democratic principles, should have been subjected for so long to the despotic rule of alien tyrants. But the people of Greece, united by the dream of national political independence, and sharing the will and determination to be free, were ultimately successful in reestablishing a democratic state, which has survived countless threats from would-be aggressors, even in the span of our own history.

The struggle to maintain the independence won in 1827 has not been easy. But with a maximum of perseverance and a minimum of outside assistance, the Greek people have built a state which today stands as a bastion of freedom in the turbulent eastern Mediterranean area. In a locale where constant vigilance and courage are vital in order to protect against Communist advances, the Greeks have proven themselves capable of resisting the onward push of the Communists. The Greeks are continuing to strengthen the economic and social fibers of their nation, and have become a valuable and trusted ally in the NATO pact of nations.

We Americans can never completely repay our debt to the Greek nation and people, who have contributed so significantly to the development of democratic ideals and institutions. We are indeed proud of and grateful to the more than 1½ million Americans of Greek descent who have done so much to strengthen democracy and freedom in our own land.

In my own State of Massachusetts, there are many eminent citizens of Greek descent to whom I wish to pay special tribute today. Their influence is widely felt throughout the Commonwealth, and they have provided constructive leadership in many aspects of our community life.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by him in tribute to the 142d anniversary of Greek independence.

The Senator from New York calls attention to the many fine contributions which the Greeks have made to the Western civilization, and points out the fact that Greece has been a significant outpost of freedom in the free world today.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

I am happy to pay tribute today to the 142d anniversary of Greek independence. One hundred and forty-two years ago today —in 1821—the freedom loving Greeks cast away the dark forces of oppression and set out on a new course of liberty and self-determination.

On this significant day, Americans should pause and remember the many fine contributions the Greeks have made to Western civilization. We need only to look about us here in Washington at the many Government buildings inspired by Greek architecture and Greek culture. In 18th-century America, architects turned to Greek prototypes in an effort to anchor our art upon the best ideals of the past in a desire to find lasting monuments to the spirit of human achievement.

American Government today reflects the concept of the Greek city-state which has served for centuries as a forerunner of government by and for the people. Greece has inspired and enriched many areas of our own society—in art, literature, music, to mention only a few.

The culture of the United States has been vastly enriched not only by the Greek heritage but also by the manifold contributions that American citizens of Greek descent have made to the building of our nation. In work and in play, American citizens of Greek origin have done their part and more in fulfilling the vital functions of citizenship and enriching our society.

Also noteworthy is the fact that Greece has been a significant outpost of freedom in the free world today. Only 15 years ago, the liberty of Greece was threatened with the black cloud of communism. It was possible, as a result of determined free world resistance and the full backing of the United States, for the heroic people of Greece to throw off the Communist guerrillas and to reestablish an independent nation which today is a vital part of the free world. The Greek example clearly demonstrates that freedom and independence are cherished principles of the Greek people today.

I am happy to take this opportunity to salute the Greek people: their heritage has contributed immeasurably to our own; their spirit of freedom has set a dramatic example for the free world.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, March 25 marks the 142d anniversary of Greek Independence Day. It is a day of great significance for Greek people everywhere, since it commemorates the successful outcome of Greece's centuries-long struggle against the domination of the Ottoman Empire.

This anniversary gives us an occasion to consider the importance of Greece to the free world. In the first place, the history, philosophy, and literature of ancient and modern Greece are a continuing source of inspiration for freedom-loving peoples throughout the world. One of the two cradles of Western civilization, ancient Greece gave birth to such vital traditions as democratic government, individual liberties, and the rule of law.

In recent times Greece has played an important role in the evolution of the cold war. In the aftermath of World War II, Greece was wracked by civil dissension and imperiled by Communist infiltration. These dangers were eliminated through the valiant efforts of Greek patriots and assistance from the United States. The repulsion of the Communist menace in Greece marked an early turning point in the cold war. Additional economic aid through the Marshall plan enabled Greece to rebuild her economy.

Greece is now a member of the Council of Europe, NATO, and the Balkan Pact with Turkey and Yugoslavia, and last year she became an associate member of the European Economic Community. Greece is thus a valued partner in the community of free nations. Its continuing prosperity and freedom are a matter of vital concern to us all as we observe the 142d anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

IMPORTANCE OF GREECE TO AMERICA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today is Greek Independence Day, a day of special significance for our own great Republic.

Without the philosophy and principles bequeathed to our Founding Fathers by the ancient Greeks, we today might not enjoy the fruits of representative government firmly based on individual freedom.

President Monroe recognized our great debt to Greece when, 142 years ago, he announced the New World's sympathy for the Greeks then striving to sunder the shackles of foreign domination. Since then, the ties between our two countries have continued to be close, and the United States has particularly benefited from those million and a half Americans of Hellenic background who have enriched our Nation in so many fields, and are amongst our most distinguished citizens.

I treasure my own associations with that great people, and take special pride in the award of Commander of the Royal Order of Phoenix bestowed on me last year by the King of Greece through his Consul General.

Modern Greece has the distinction of having fought communism longer than any other nation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and is one of our most trusted allies in the cold war with Communist tyranny. As in the past, she is today a bulwark of freedom, and a cherished friend of the United States.

Mr. President, Louis H. Simons of the Beaver County Times made an interesting proposal in the March 6 edition of that newspaper. I ask unanimous consent that his article, "Bring Foreign Youth to United States To Study Our Ways" be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE CORPS IN REVERSE: BRING FOREIGN YOUTH TO UNITED STATES TO STUDY OUR WAYS

(By Louis H. Simons)

The Peace Corps marked its second anniversary last Friday and a blurb received here from Washington had a lot of nice things to say about the organization. This included the statement that 1 year ago there were 698 volunteers working abroad in 12 countries and that today there are 4,595 either overseas or in training for programs in 44 countries. Congress appropriated $59 million for the second fiscal year.

The anniversary appears to be an appropriate time to evaluate the Peace Corps' contributions in the broad perspective of world events. And in any consideration of their work there is bound to be unanimity in the conviction that the Corps' achievements are deserving of their country's commendation.

In these extraordinary times, however, we must regard the work of the Corps in relation to its impact on the revolutionary change brought on by Marxian ideology. In this context, we must consider the Corps as constituting nothing more than a mere gesture in the promotion of understanding among nations.

The most urgent problem in these times is to find ways and means to stem the tide of communism. It is the most pressing problem that will be occupying the attention of the Western World for many years to come. Therefore, every endeavor should be keyed to the general theme of doing something about it. The powerful Soviet colossus poses a long-range threat to all free nations.

(The Soviets have invaded India, they are making headway in southeast Asia and are now strongly entrenched only 90 miles off the Florida coast.)

But the Peace Corps, although directly concerned with foreign affairs, is unable to be effective in this enterprise. Such an undertaking would prove beyond its capacity. It work is confined within certain narrow limitations. The members of this worthy group are admittedly overwhelmed by the magnitude of the tasks before them. And in the performance of their special skills they are regarded, locally, as ambassadors of good will.

It must be acknowledged, however, that something of great depth and substance must be done about the dangerous imbalance in the world today. Something has got to be done to implant the American idea into the consciousness of the common man in the underdeveloped countries. This must be achieved in a manner that will reach great multitudes in the briefest possible time.

What is the answer? Perhaps the approach has been suggested in a statement made to Sargent Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, by Ashadevi, an associate of the late Mahatma Gandhi. "They (the Peace Corps) must bring more than science and technology," the distinguished woman told the Director. "They must be carriers of your best values and ideals. Can your Peace Corps touch the idealism of America and bring that to us?"

Of course they can. The men and women in the Peace Corps have fulfilled unusual requirements to qualify for their mission. But they can accomplish comparatively little. The immensity of the task is generally understood. There must be some other way.

Indeed, there is another way. The idealism of America can be made to pervade the underprivileged areas of the world by a peace corps in reverse. This can be done by the simple procedure of getting their own people to come over here so that they could sense the mood and idealism of the American people.

Who should qualify for the mission in reverse? These should be selected not from the oil barons of the Near East, but from the populaces who live in poverty over the world's richest oil deposits; from among those who are kept down by an antique feudalism; from the areas where there is no middle class; from those parts of the world where there appears to be inherent instability by reason of disease and hunger. An actual case will serve to illustrate.

In recent months an administrator of elementary schools in Kenya, Africa, came to this country on a Fulbright scholarship. The pupils under his supervision numbered 230,000. He took some courses in a great university and then spent several weeks as an observer in the elementary schools of Elizabeth Borough in Allegheny County. Before his departure he explained what he had learned in a typical American public school. Among other things, he said this:

"In Kenya we give the children in the fourth grade a final examination to determine their fitness to continue with their education, and in the eighth grade we give another test that further reduces the number that can go on into high school. When I get back those examinations will be discontinued, for we not only got the cream of the crop in our high schools, we got the cream of the cream."

That the idealism of America rubbed off on the Kenyan educator is beyond any doubt.

It is essential that qualified young people with good minds, who are underprivileged, be brought here to our high schools and universities. Let them come so that they may discern for themselves the true concept of democracy. Let them be the carriers of our best values and ideals. In a word, let them become imbued with the spirit of free men in a free society.

With this type of Peace Corps, we can help the weaker nations mobilize the spirit and capacities of their people and thereby create a bulwark against the Communist threat.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on this day, 142 years ago, Greece won its independence from the Ottoman Empire.

The Greek war of independence, like ours, was a long, bitter struggle and is historically interesting because it showed how stubbornly a people can cling to a democratic tradition despite years of dictatorial oppression.

The Greek democratic theory, of course, is the ancestor of ours. If there had been no Greece, would there be an America? Or would there be a Senate in which I could stand to speak admiringly of the Greeks? An academic question, perhaps, but a fascinating one.

Democracy was not an inevitable historical development. The Egyptian civilization stood for several thousand years without finding any necessity for it.

But Egypt, of course, had the disadvantage of being flat. One man could survey and rule a lot of country and a lot of people.

But in the privacy of their mountains, the Greeks learned to be free and individualistic. They developed a theory of democracy with so much appeal that it spread through the world and has endured to this day.

The Greeks have defended that theory more than once. They defended it against Persians, against the Turkish emirs, against the Nazis and against the Communists.

A long democratic tradition and the will to defend it has left its mark. It has given the Greeks dignity and pride. On this anniversary of their nation's independence, Greeks everywhere and their descendants certainly deserve a congratulatory salute—and a nod of thanks.

GEORGIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS ON POULTRY, BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION, AND OPPOSITION TO CHANGE IN TIMBER TAX

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, which recently concluded its annual session, adopted three resolutions concerning matters of great importance to the people of my State.

Unreasonable and discriminatory import levies imposed by the European Common Market countries are inflicting great economic damage on the poultry industry of Georgia, which brings the State $500 million a year directly, and indirectly is responsible for an annual business of $2.5 billion.

The general assembly rightly fears that unfair import levies on U.S. poultry, if allowed to stand, can lead to similar inequities concerning other agricultural products of this country. I join my fellow Georgians in urging that every effort

be made to remove discriminatory import levies on poultry and to prevent the imposition of any similar barriers on U.S. agricultural products.

Another resolution calls for construction of a bridge across one of nature's true wonderlands, the Okefenokee Swamp, in south Georgia. As proposed, the bridge would connect the northern and southeastern ends of State Highway No. 177.

In the third resolution the general assembly urges that no changes be made in the present capital gains tax laws relating to the cutting or disposal of timber.

Mr. President, for myself and in behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H.R. 170

Resolution urging construction of a bridge across the Okefenokee Swamp connecting State Highway No. 177; and for other purposes

Whereas State Highway No. 177 has been constructed so that the northern portion thereof extends southward from U.S. highway No. 23 and the southern portion extends northeasterly from U.S. No. 441 into the Okefenokee Wildlife Refuge; and

Whereas there is a 16-mile gap between the northern and southeastern terminus of said highway; and

Whereas it is possible and feasible to construct a 16-mile, 6-foot vertical clearance, tangent, two lane level concrete bridge with pulloff parking areas to complete said highway; and

Whereas said bridge would have a 6-foot vertical clearance, permitting sufficient clearance for passage of boats and wildlife thereunder; and

Whereas the right-of-way for such bridge would not exceed 50 feet in width, thus leaving the tall and majestic cypress trees which abound in said area, thereby providing an abundance of natural shade, beauty and scenic views; and

Whereas the erection, maintenance, and use of this proposed bridge would not in any way be harmful to fish, serpents or wildlife, which inhabit said area; and

Whereas through the employment of appropriate wildlife rangers, restrictions prohibiting the use of firearms as a protection to wildlife population could be easily imposed; and

Whereas a tourist attraction of this type would be the only one of its kind on the North American Continent; and

Whereas the assistance afforded to the students of the study of biology, entomology, wildlife and forestry would be untold; and

Whereas construction of this bridge would provide a national landmark that would greatly assist private, commercial and military aviation; and

Whereas construction of this proposed bridge would furnish a bountiful market for employment in a depressed area which is suffering from a critical unemployment problem; and

Whereas the construction of this project would make available and accessible to the general public the natural beauty possessed by this vast wilderness known as the Land of the Trembling Earth, who would never have an opportunity to observe it otherwise; and

Whereas the benefits to be derived from the construction of this bridge would be many times the cost of the initial investment in its construction cost; and

Whereas the author of this resolution, in the early twenties, was employed and assisted in surveying and building many miles of piling track railroads throughout the Okefenokee Swamp and is fully aware that this bridge is feasible and could be built at a reasonable cost; and

Whereas completion of Georgia Highway No. 177 would connect the Stephen C. Foster State Park and the Laurel S. Walker State Park: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this body does hereby solicit from all members of the Georgia congressional delegation their cooperation and support in seeking the completion of the connection of Georgia Highway No. 177 by the erection of a 16-mile bridge to be constructed through the heart of the Okefenokee Wildlife Refuge; be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby recommend and request the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Roads, to approve and begin construction of this project; be it further

Resolved, That this body does hereby recommend and request the U.S. Department of Interior to approve and begin construction of this project; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives is hereby authorized and instructed to transmit to the Director of the U.S. Department of Commerce, the Secretary of Interior, and to each and every Member of the Georgia congressional delegation, a copy of this resolution.

In house, read and adopted, February 27, 1963.

GLENN W. ELLARD,
Clerk.

In senate, read and adopted, March 4, 1963.

GEORGE D. STEWART,
Secretary.

H.R. 206

Resolution urging the Governor of the State of Georgia and the Georgia congressional delegation to resist any changes in the present capital gains tax laws, relating to the cutting or disposal of timber, and for other purposes

Whereas forest land comprises 25,772,200 acres, 69 percent of the total land area of the State; and

Whereas 23,931,100 acres are in private ownership and constitute 93 percent of the total forest land; and

Whereas these forest lands are providing approximately a gross return of $1 billion to the State's economy through forest industries; and

Whereas forest industry represents the third largest dollar volume of industry and supports 200,000 or more persons annually; and

Whereas Georgia has led the Nation in reforestation for many years, having converted almost 700,000 acres from cropland to trees under the soil bank program in recent years; and

Whereas investments are made for long periods of time during which they are continuously subject to many hazards, such as fire, insects, disease, and market fluctuations; and

Whereas the State and Federal Governments have encouraged forest land owners to develop previously unproductive lands for timber products; and

Whereas Georgia leads the Nation in the number of acres under the tree farm program; and

Whereas an incentive must exist to encourage the production of crops that must be produced over two or more decades before any substantial financial return is realized; and

Whereas the capital gains tax treatment on long-term timber gains recognizes these various factors; and

Whereas this type of tax treatment has been effective in stimulating private forest owners to adopt management plans and programs to produce timber to meet the national needs; and

Whereas private forest land is in a wide variety of ownerships with 197,000 owners in Georgia; and

Whereas the repeal of capital gains taxation will materially reduce the ability of private individuals and industry to continue reforestation and will accelerate the cutting of present timber growth; and

Whereas, forestry has made its greatest advances during the last 20 years as the result of stimulus of capital gains: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That the Governor of the State of Georgia and all Members of the Georgia congressional delegation are urged to do everything in their power to maintain the present capital gains tax treatment regarding the cutting or disposal of timber; be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Governor of the State of Georgia and to each member of the Georgia congressional delegation.

In the house, read and adopted, March 6, 1963.

GLENN W. ELLARD,
Clerk.

H.R. 142

Resolution calling upon the President to take certain measures relating to the poultry industry; and for other purposes

Whereas the U.S. poultry industry has developed a $50 million a year market in the Common Market countries, primarily West Germany; and

Whereas the market has grown each year and could continue to increase considerably in the absence of unreasonable and discriminatory barriers; and

Whereas the U.S. poultry industry has done extensive promotion in these countries so that consumption and local production have also increased; and

Whereas the imposition of gate prices and variable import levies have brought about a loss of this valuable market; and

Whereas levies on U.S. poultry were increased from approximately 16 percent to approximately 43 percent on whole broilers and 320 percent on certain parts; and

Whereas U.S. imports from Common Market countries have continued to increase each year; and

Whereas Georgia producers and processors were shipping over 4¾ million pounds per month prior to the first levies, with shipments dropping to approximately 1½ million pounds per month following the first levy and to practically nothing following the additional levy; and

Whereas this means a direct loss to Georgia of $16 million of export income; and

Whereas additional losses through depressed domestic prices might result if this volume is continually forced back into domestic channels; and

Whereas the loss of these poultry exports which generated $80 million of business for the State annually means a loss to feed, ports, utilities, banking, insurance, transportation, paper, retail, wholesale, and many other industries; and

Whereas the levies in question are contrary to the general agreement on tariffs and trade; and

Whereas immediate action to obtain fair import levies on U.S. poultry is of vital importance to the Georgia poultry industry which represents over 32 percent of total farm income and brings the State $500 million a year directly, and generates $2½ billion a year business; and

Whereas 160,000 Georgians earn their living from poultry and others benefit indirectly from this giant agri-business; and

Whereas this is a forerunner of problems for other commodities which might be avoided if the U.S. Government acts forcefully and settles this one; and

Whereas the United States is now exporting one-sixteenth of our agricultural production and Georgia is exporting one-fifth of its production; and

Whereas 41,600 Georgia farmworkers may be attributed to the production of farm products for export; and

Whereas quick results might serve as a deterrent of other problems which would affect the State and Nation; and

Whereas the barriers proposed by the Common Market would destroy the competitive position our farm products have gained through efficiency; and

Whereas the loss of agricultural exports which may result if the Common Market agricultural proposals are imposed on our agricultural products will weaken our ability to carry the heavy financial burden which the United States now assumes in the effort to protect and strengthen the free world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That this body does recommend that the Georgia congressional delegation continue and redouble its efforts for immediate action and that this body further recommends that President Kennedy take immediate steps including use of the retaliatory powers of the Trade Expansion Act if necessary, to obtain prompt removal of these unfair and discriminatory levies; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives is hereby authorized and directed to forward appropriate copy of this resolution to each Member of the U.S. Congress from Georgia, President John F. Kennedy, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, and Ambassador Christian Herter.

In house, read and adopted February 20, 1963.

GLENN W. ELLARD,
Clerk.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, to consider the nominations for the Department of Commerce only.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Capt. Albert J. Carpenter, U.S. Coast Guard, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS OF INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF THE SEA BY OIL—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the certified text of amendments of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil—Executive C, 88th Congress, 1st session—sent to the Senate today by the President, and that the document be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to acceptance, I transmit herewith a certified text of amendments of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, which were adopted by a Conference of Contracting Governments convened at London on April 11, 1962. The amendments would strengthen and expand the present Convention in ways deemed advantageous to United States interests.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the amendments.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 25, 1963*

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Bernard M. Decker, of Illinois, to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar in the Department of Commerce will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

Mr. PROUTY obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator defer to me for a moment so I may ask the Senator from Vermont to yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I shall not ask for the yeas and nays on the vote to confirm the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce, but I wish the RECORD to show that I am unalterably opposed to his appointment.

I have been in politics long enough to understand the meaning of political debts, but I resent very deeply that in this instance Mr. Roosevelt is being rewarded for what some consider to be "below the belt" political attacks against a distinguished Member of the Senate, whose views I do not always share but for whom I have the highest personal respect—rewarded by appointment to an office for which, in my judgment, he is not qualified.

If Mr. Roosevelt's activities of the past several years were subjected to close scrutiny, I believe the inescapable conclusion would be reached that, to say the least, he lacks the experience, the administrative ability, and the sense of public and personal responsibility essential to the proper fulfillment of his duties as Under Secretary of Commerce.

Inasmuch as there are persistent rumors to the effect that Mr. Roosevelt may become Secretary of Commerce, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a biographical sketch of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.; a biographical sketch of the present very distinguished and able Secretary of Commerce, Luther H. Hodges; and a biographical sketch of Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, who was designated by President Eisenhower to be Secretary of Commerce.

There being no objection, the biographical sketches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. was born on August 17, 1914, at Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada. After graduating from Groton School, Groton, Mass., he received his A.B. from Harvard College in 1937 and his L.L.B. degree from the University of Virginia in 1940.

As a graduate of the Harvard naval ROTC he was called to active duty in March 1941, and served until 1946. He was awarded the Secretary of Navy's commendation, the Legion of Merit, the Silver Star, and the Purple Heart.

Mr. Roosevelt practiced law from 1946 to 1958 as a senior partner in the firm of Roosevelt and Freidin of New York City. He was a Member of Congress from 1949 through 1954 representing the 20th District of New York.

Since 1957 Mr. Roosevelt has been owner and manager of the Roosevelt Automobile Co. of Washington, D.C., U.S. distributor of Fiat and Jaguar automobiles.

Mr. Roosevelt returned to politics in 1960 and campaigned for President Kennedy in his primary and general election campaigns.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF SECRETARY OF COMMERCE LUTHER H. HODGES

Luther Hartwell Hodges was born March 9, 1898, in Pittsylvania County, Va.

He attended public schools in Leaksville and Spray, N.C., his family having moved to this area in the year 1900. Following graduation from high school in 1915, he entered the University of North Carolina and was graduated in 1919 with the A.B. degree. He served briefly in the U.S. Army, in which he held the rank of lieutenant.

Following his military service, he began his career in the textile industry starting as

secretary to the manager of a local textile mill in the Leaksville-Spray area, and in 1938, following several intermediate promotions, he was made general manager in charge of manufacturing for Marshall Field & Co. In 1943 he became vice president of that corporation.

He was head of the Textile Division of OPA in 1944, and consultant to the Secretary of Agriculture in 1945.

In 1950, upon retirement from private business, he spent over a year in West Germany as head of the Industry Division of the Economic Cooperation Administration, and was consultant to the State Department in the latter months of 1951 on the International Management Conference.

In November 1952 he was elected Lieutenant Governor of North Carolina, and succeeded to the governorship in November 1954 upon the death of the then Governor, William B. Umstead. Governor Hodges was reelected Governor of North Carolina in November 1956, and his term ended in January 1961.

He is past chairman of the Southern Governors' Conference and of the Southern Region Education Board. He was one of the nine American Governors to make an extensive tour of the Soviet Union in the summer of 1959 and was subsequently in charge of his State's trade and industry mission to Europe in November 1959.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF ADM. LEWIS L. STRAUSS

Lewis L. Strauss was born in Charleston, W. Va., on January 31, 1896, and educated in the Richmond, Va., public schools.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Years 1917–19: Secretary to Herbert C. Hoover (then U.S. Food Administrator and Chairman of the Commission for the Relief of Belgium) in relief operations in Belgium and elsewhere overseas, and in the U.S. Food Administration. Served as U.S. Delegate at Final Armistice Convention.

Years 1941–46: In Naval Reserve 1926; active duty from February 1941 to May 1946; successively promoted through officer grades to the rank of rear admiral, being one of the first Reserve officers to reach that rank. Navy assignments included:

Years 1941–43: Staff assistant to the Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance. General Inspection of Ordnance;

Years 1943–44: Assistant Chief of Procurement and Material; Special Assistant to the Vice Chief of Naval Operations;

Years 1944–46: Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy; Navy member of the Army-Navy Munitions Board;

Years 1945–56: Navy member of the Interdepartmental Committee on Atomic Energy.

Year 1946: Appointed member of the first Atomic Energy Commission; resigned in April 1950.

Years 1946–52: Served as a member of the Naval Research Advisory Committee (the Office of Naval Research, was established following Admiral Strauss' recommendations to Secretary of the Navy Forrestal).

Year 1950: Appointed consultant to Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

Years 1950–58: Adviser on occasions to congressional and executive agencies studying and reporting on production and procurement problems for the Department of Defense.

Year 1953: Completed report on hazardous duty and other special pays, requested by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate.

Year 1953: Appointed special assistant to President Eisenhower on March 9.

Years 1953–58: Nominated by President to be Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission on June 24, confirmed by the Senate on June 27, and took oath of office on July 2. Retired at end of 5-year term, June 30, 1958.

Years 1955 and 1958: Chairman of U.S. delegation to the United Nations Conferences on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, held at Geneva, Switzerland, August 8–20, 1955, and September 1–13, 1958. Developed concept which resulted in President Eisenhower's speech of December 8, 1953, before the United Nations General Assembly. Administered the actions taken to implement that program, representing the U.S. Government at the sessions at the United Nations and as chairman of the U.S. delegation to the first meeting of the International Atomic Energy Agency. (Proposed the International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.)

Year 1958: Appointed special assistant to the President on matters concerning atoms for peace.

Year 1958: Appointed on October 24 as Secretary of Commerce; took oath of office, November 18.

BUSINESS SERVICE

Years 1919–46: Associated with the investment firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., New York, N.Y. Became partner in 1929, resigning in 1946 to take office as AEC Commissioner. At same time relinquished all business directorships.

At various times was director of business enterprises, including Radio Corp. of America, National Broadcasting Co., General American Transportation Corp., U.S. Rubber Co., Industrial Rayon Corp., Hudson and Manhattan Railroad, Rockefeller Bros., Inc., Rockefeller Center, Inc., Merchants Fire Assurance Corp., etc.

DECORATIONS, HONORS, AND DEGREES

Awarded the Distinguished Service Medal; and the Legion of Merit with Gold Star (Navy) in lieu of a second award and an Oak Leaf Cluster (Army) in lieu of a third award.

Officer of the Legion of Honor (France); Grand Officer, Order of Leopold (Belgium); and other decorations from foreign governments.

Year 1958: Awarded the Medal of Freedom by President Eisenhower in person in July.

Recipient of 23 honorary degrees from colleges and universities in the United States and abroad.

TRUSTEESHIPS AND OTHER OFFICES

President of the board of trustees of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

Trustee of the Hampton Institute, the Sloan-Kettering Institute Memorial Center for Cancer and Allied Diseases, the New York Institute for the Crippled and the Disabled, the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Belgian-American Educational Foundation, Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., Virginia Museum of Fine Arts at Richmond and Congregation Emanu-El of the city of New York (also its past president).

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, if an evaluation is made of the records of these three individuals, I am sure Mr. Roosevelt's will be notable only for its lack of notability.

In her column which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of March 12, Doris Fleeson capsuled the situation very effectively. When referring to Mr. Roosevelt she wrote:

> Most Members of Congress wish the appointment had not been made. They would like to get rid of it quietly. Democrats in particular hope that Mr. Roosevelt will sink into decent obscurity.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, since this is an important nomination, which has engaged the interest and attention of the country, and since I have known Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., personally for not less than 17 years, I think I owe an explanation to the Senate as to why I have interposed no objection to the confirmation of his nomination, and why I do not interpose one now, especially in view of the seriousness with which his qualifications have been analyzed in the committee which considered the matter and the very serious, interesting, and important analysis which has been made by my distinguished colleague from Vermont.

Mr. President, I interpose no objection to the confirmation of the nomination for two reasons.

First. I believe that the President is entitled to the widest latitude and discretion in the choice of his assistants and that the confirmation process should not be utilized to deny to the President the assistants he seeks, unless we find some reasons over, above, and beyond a matter of judgment—that is, ideology, venality, immorality, or some obvious and clear inability to carry out the functions of the appointed office.

All those are very apparent reasons for objecting. There are many other reasons which may come closer to the borderline.

I have stated the general policy which has motivated me in my attitude toward the confirming of nominations of other appointees, when before the Senate—and we have considered a number of them on which there have been very close debates. I remember very well, Mr. President, a nomination the confirmation of which I opposed very strongly, recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency, if I recall correctly, for a position on the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank. I felt that the record, which demonstrated an attitude of mind upon the question of segregation and discrimination in our country and the enforcement of civil rights of Americans—a matter quite removed from the bases of judgment exercised by the President, in the choice of the appointees for that particular job—dictated that that nomination should not be confirmed.

Mr. President, I find no such situation here now. Whatever may be said for or against Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr.—whom, as I say, I have know personally for 17 years—there is no element of an extraneous set of considerations, other than his capacity, his outlook—as my colleague so properly explained—his experience, his administrative ability, and his sense of public accountability, to qualify or disqualify him for the position.

Mr. President, what the Senator from Vermont has said on that subject—and I say this in order to be helpful to a man I know well—should be taken to heart with the deepest seriousness by Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr. I hope he will listen to the words of the Senator from Vermont and perhaps even more than he does to mine, because that will do him far more good in making something of a life for him in the future, as the son of so distinguished and historic an American President as Franklin D. Roosevelt.

So, Mr. President, I say that, according to my own definition of what is proper in the way of the confirming process, I did not find those elements which would entitle me to object to the confirmation of the nomination.

Second. I believe Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., upon this record, has done at least some things which I and most of us wish he had not done.

I have little doubt that my dear friend and colleague who was the subject of the matter about which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Prouty] spoke, was consulted about this nomination. I have no doubt the recommendation would not have been made without his consent. Knowing him as I do, he would not have had it within his heart to turn Mr. Roosevelt down, in spite of whatever deep grief he may have been made to suffer.

Mr. President, I say, in conclusion, that the nominee has a fine opportunity before him.

Incidentally, and while I say this for myself, I am sure I speak for others, I do not think anybody need fear that Mr. Roosevelt's name will come before us for nomination as Secretary of Commerce unless he demonstrates by his future career a very different order of "performance and public accountability"—to use the words of my colleague from Vermont—from that which he has evidenced thus far. Here is yet another opportunity, given to few men, to demonstrate capacity, performance, and ability in the service of the Nation in one's lifetime. I express the hope and expectation that this opportunity will be used in the true spirit of a son of a four-time President of the United States.

Mr. RANDOLPH subsequently said: Mr. President, I support the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

I have known Mr. Roosevelt personally for many years—first as a youth when his father was elected President of the United States, and later when he returned to civilian life after having served his country courageously for more than 5 years as a naval officer during World War II.

It was with interest that I watched as he followed his distinguished father into the public life of this Nation and won his seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. His service during the 5 years when he represented the 20th District of New York was exemplary. As a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, he was active, able, and effective. He ably supported the passage of legislation important to the progress of our country.

Through the vagaries and vicissitudes of politics, with which most of us in this Chamber are familiar, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., in 1954, was temporarily removed from what I believe to be the mainstream of his life—the field of public service. He returned to the practice of law in New York City where he had previously practiced immediately after his period of service in World War II.

After 3 more years as a successful attorney, he entered business in 1957—and in an especially competitive area, the distribution of automobiles. His business acumen, judgment, and energy helped his firm to be chosen by two world-famous European automobile companies as their U.S. outlet, responsible for the sale of their cars in an area embracing more than 20 States. The men who headed these European companies are capable businessmen, and I am confident that it was on a hard-headed business basis that they appointed Mr. Roosevelt, appraised the results of his work, and retained him for the past 6 years. The top executive officer of one of these companies was quoted as having said, after the announcement of Mr. Roosevelt's appointment was announced by President Kennedy, that replacing him would be a difficult task.

As I review Mr. Roosevelt's record over a 22-year period of adult life, it appears clear to me that he is an effective person—a man who gets tasks done. During that period he became a distinguished naval officer, having progressed from lieutenant, junior grade, to commander, and having been entrusted with ship command. He was cited several times for meritorious performance of duties, as well as for "conspicuous bravery" in combat. Following this service he became an effective Representative in Congress, an attorney at law, and a businessman.

Mr. Roosevelt's record of success is not, however, the only reason why I endorse his appointment. His confirmation by the Senate is merited because I am convinced that the capacities and talents he will bring to his new position will help to advance the economic and business interests of our country. I believe the Department of Commerce will be a more valuable and more useful instrumentality with Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., as one of its top officials.

The Commerce Department has served our Nation for the past 60 years. At present it has approximately 30,000 employees. It comprises more than a dozen agencies, each carrying out programs that are essential to our Nation's economic growth and to the well-being of our 187 million citizens. Included are such important agencies as the Census Bureau, the Patent Office, the National Bureau of Standards, the Maritime Administration, the Business, and Defense Services Administration, the Bureau of International Commerce, the Area Redevelopment Administration, the Weather Bureau, and the U.S. Travel Service.

Some of these agencies are important to us mainly because their work enables the business community of this Nation to function more effectively, to prosper and expand, to create more jobs for American workers, to raise the American standard of living, and to provide the industrial capacity that is so essential to national defense. Other Commerce agencies serve both the business community and the general public, and contribute to our individual and national well-being.

In the aggregate, the activities of the Department of Commerce are important. Some of them are vital to national strength and progress. And these programs are being made even more valuable and useful under the kind of inspiring leadership and capable direction which Secretary Hodges has given to the Department during the past 2 years. This has been the Commerce Department's period of exceptional service.

The principal reason for this is because the Commerce Department under Luther H. Hodges is fulfilling its rightful role as the American businessman's principal spokesman in the economic councils of the Federal Government.

The Commerce Department, with Secretary Hodges at the helm, enjoys the confidence and support of the U.S. business community, and is conveying the businessman's point of view with increasing emphasis to the President, his advisers, and the other executive departments and agencies. These views are being listened to with respect, and they are being reflected in new national goals and programs. For example, the business community and the Commerce Department contributed to the passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The President's current tax program incorporates many of the businessman's ideas—and the Commerce Department's ideas—on how our national economy can be stimulated and accelerated by removing some of the tax shackles which have for years impeded the growth of American business firms. The Commerce Department is also responsible for implementing the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, which is now beginning to bear fruit and provide jobs for workers who live in economically depressed areas.

In one of our most important goals and most critical problems, the Commerce Department has major responsibility for stimulating increased sales of American products in foreign countries. This is essential to the solution of our international balance-of-payments problem.

I am confident, Mr. President, that colleagues will agree when I say that the Department of Commerce has progressed in the past 2 years, and that the Department's effectiveness in carrying out its new activities and responsibilities will have significant and far-reaching effects on our future national growth and development.

I am equally sure that all of us realize that to carry out these programs successfully the Commerce Department needs leadership of the highest order—leadership that emphasizes imagination, energy, determination and sound thinking.

This is the kind of leadership that Secretary Hodges is providing, and it is the kind of leadership that Mr. Roosevelt will also bring to the Department. Mr. Hodges' effectiveness and competence will be enhanced by having Mr. Roosevelt as his principal assistant, because in addition to his general qualifications, Mr. Roosevelt has other, more specific attributes that are especially applicable to the work he will be doing. I mention these:

First. He enjoys the personal friendship, respect and confidence of the President and his advisers. This will provide yet another channel through which the views and opinions of the business community can be effectively conveyed to the White House.

Second. He has a good understanding of the legislative branch and the legislative process, as well as a personal relationship with many Members of Congress. Thus he is uniquely competent to represent the Commerce Department to the Members and committees on the Hill, and to speak accurately and authoritatively before them on behalf of the U.S. business community.

Third. As Secretary Hodges recently commented, Mr. Roosevelt has the happy faculty of being able to work with other people. This ability will help to implement those programs for which the Commerce Department shares responsibility with other executive departments and agencies, where the Department must work closely with these other groups in carrying out such multifaceted programs as export expansion, area redevelopment, civilian technology, job retraining and other national efforts involving several agencies.

Fourth. In addition, Mr. Roosevelt is both knowledgeable and experienced in the field of foreign trade. The most important program of the Commerce Department, as I have said, is to implement the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, expand our exports, and thus improve our unfavorable balance of payments. Accomplishing this means educating, stimulating and assisting thousands of American manufacturing firms to go out and fight for their rightful share of foreign markets. It involves working closely with the Honorable Christian Herter and others in negotiating with nations the new arrangements for the international exchange of goods. It also means protecting the interests of American firms in such negotiations, and in providing them Government assistance of various kinds if they should be adversely and unavoidably affected by the revolution in international commerce that is now in depth and scope in the world. With his knowledge and practical business experience in foreign trade, plus his energy, dedication and rapport with people, Mr. Roosevelt can contribute greatly to the realization of our national goals in this tremendously important field of international commerce.

I have mentioned, Mr. President, the attributes, both general and specific, that I believe make Mr. Roosevelt eminently qualified to serve as Under Secretary of Commerce. There is also one other reason why I am so wholeheartedly in favor of this nomination, and it is this: Both the President and Secretary Hodges, after thoughtful consideration, want Mr. Roosevelt to serve in this post. Mr. Hodges was consulted fully, in advance, by the President concerning this appointment; and I believe that Mr. Hodges expressed his own true convictions when he publicly described Mr. Roosevelt as a dynamic and gifted person, as well as a successful businessman, and when he said that he will be delighted to have a man of Mr. Roosevelt's capability as his principal assistant. I also have genuine respect for the President's ability to select the people who can best serve the Nation, and I believe this faculty has been demonstrated by the outstanding performance of the President's Cabinet and most other key officials of the executive branch during the past 2 years. Mr. Roosevelt's performance will be no less successful.

I believe, Mr. President, that when Mr. Roosevelt actually begins to serve as Under Secretary of Commerce, both the business community and the American people will be as well pleased with his performance as they are now with the performance of Secretary Hodges and the other dedicated, competent leaders who serve the President and the Nation so well.

Mr. Roosevelt is bringing to this position intelligence, education, integrity, energy, sound basic knowledge of the field of work, the faculty of getting jobs done, the ability to cooperate with other people, and the determination and persistence to become a valuable, competent, dedicated public servant. I do not know what else we can, or should, ask of him. Mr. President, Mr. Roosevelt is worthy of confirmation, and I am confident that most of my colleagues will agree that he is eminently qualified to serve as Under Secretary of Commerce of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I wish the Record to show that the vote of the junior Senator from Wyoming on the Roosevelt nomination was "nay."

NOMINATION OF RICHARD H. HOLTON

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Richard H. Holton, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER subsequently said: Mr. President, I was not present during the call of the Executive Calendar, when the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to be Under Secretary of Commerce was under consideration and his nomination was confirmed.

I have known Mr. Roosevelt for many years, as a legislator and as a friend. I know his philosophy of life. He has great ability. He has untiring energy. He understands legislative problems. He understands business problems. In my opinion, he will make an excellent record as Under Secretary of Commerce.

I congratulate the President for nominating him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to legislative session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF 1913 OHIO FLOODS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], to have printed in the Record at this point a statement prepared by him concerning the 1913 floods in Ohio.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Lausche

This is a significant date in Ohio history. Fifty years ago my State faced one of the major problems of the first half century. Many Ohio communities were faced with oblivion—and all because of disastrous flooding—a result of a severe and tremendous storm, which accelerated the melting of heavy snow and ice covered rivers.

One portion of the State did not hesitate in facing its problem squarely. Recovering from the major flood of recorded history in the area, as much as 11 feet in the center of urban communities, the citizens of the Great Miami Valley reaching from Piqua to Hamilton, Ohio, saw dawn breaking on new and better days ahead. These citizens, having returned from burying their dead and facing property losses estimated at over $100 million, banded together to write a new law—enabling assessments on their properties in the amount each benefited, which after much study and planning provided a major wonder of the world, the Miami Conservancy District.

The cost of this protection, $34 million, has long since been paid for by the valley property owners—not the Federal Government or the State government—but by the people themselves. Even today this valley pays its own way for flood control projects in areas rural in 1913—urban now—and still without outside aid.

Today is the anniversary date of the great flood in the communities in the Miami Valley. Tonight in Dayton—that metropolis of industry, commerce, and education—the citizens will pause and remember. They are not celebrating a flood—they are observing 50 years of economic and commercial development—and this in a community that 50 years ago was devastated, virtually destroyed.

Much has been written and spoken about the great leadership required to motivate this recovery, but the property owners, large and small, have accomplished this gigantic task which has done so much to make Ohio great.

Tonight, as those citizens gather to reflect and ponder their contribution to the recovery of their valley, they carry in their hearts a pride in the knowledge that their community has done much to build the economy of the State and of the Nation.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a statement prepared by him on the subject of Byelorussian Independence Day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Lausche

The Byelorussians form one of the lesser known and less numerous of the Slavic peoples. This is partly because they probably never numbered more than 10 million and partly because they have been overshadowed by their far more numerous and powerful neighbors. One reason we know so little about them is because they have been subjected to alien rule and oppressed by foreigners in their homeland. For centuries the Russians have done their utmost to eliminate the Byelorussians as a distinct national entity. But we know from history that these people formed a distinct national group between Poland and Moscow long before the rise of modern Russia as the colossus of the Slavic world.

The czarist rulers of Russia failed to eliminate the Byelorussians as an ethnic group. The more these people were oppressed by their Russian masters, the more they hung to their ethnic and national ideals, and longed for the day of their deliverance. This came about at last early in 1918. On March 25 of that year the Byelorussians National Republic was proclaimed, with its capital in the historic city of Minsk. Soon this Republic was recognized by the governments of many countries, and it looked as if the new state was to attain sovereignty in historic Byelorussia. Unfortunately the independence thus attained and jubilantly proclaimed did not last long. Russian Communists attacked and overran it early in 1921, thus putting an end to the Byelorussian Republic.

Since then some 10 million Byelorussians have lived under the oppressive Soviet totalitarian regime. But the Byelorussians have not abandoned their ultimate goal, national freedom and independence. On this 45th anniversary celebration of their Independence Day we ardently pray for their deliverance from Soviet tyranny. We also wish that we could do more for them, by showing our determination to help these people combat Communist totalitarianism with all the means at our disposal short of open warfare. We could, however, be of considerable aid to these poeple in their fight for freedom by refusing to make concessions to the Kremlin in the Cuban question as well as on the Berlin issue, and also by broadcasting in the Byelorussian and Ukrainian languages our determination to oppose communism. I know full well that some or even all of these measures cannot easily liberate the Byelorussian people from Soviet tyranny, but I am sure they will serve as a definite boon to their sacred cause.

THE NEW LIBERALS: ARE THEY REALLY "20TH-CENTURY TORIES"?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the current issue of U.S. News & World Report contains a keenly perceptive essay entitled, "The New Liberals: Are They Really '20th-Century Tories'?"

Its author is the senior Senator from South Dakota, whose highly professional and entertaining skill as an author is well known to his colleagues.

Senator MUNDT's thesis is that the present-day liberals of both parties are not liberals at all, in the original sense of the word. They have altered the meaning of "liberal."

The essence of the essay can be caught in these excerpts:

> It is my conviction that those who inaccurately describe themselves as "liberals," while persistently advocating policies and programs promoting authoritarian government, might be described more accurately as the "20th-century tories."
>
> Somewhere along the line these tories have lost confidence in the American people and have—by some curious form of self-delusionment—convinced themselves that only the Federal politicians are motivated by a high sense of ethics; only the Federal politicians can be trusted to do what is right; and only the Federal politicians can understand and provide what the people need and want.
>
> Thus, these misnamed and misdirected liberals continue to chip away at the power, the rights and the free choice of the people while transferring to big-time politicians in Washington the authority to determine the people's destiny.

Senator MUNDT with his characteristic and constant fairness, gives assurance that no charges of insincerity or ulterior motives are made; but points out rather that they seek a fundamental and deplorable change of emphasis and place of National Government in the lives of Americans. He puts it in this language:

> This does not imply that these self-proclaimed but thoroughly deluded liberals are evil men. It definitely does mean, however, that they would substitute for a government devoted to promoting the general welfare one imbued with the paternalistic concepts of ancient times and tory governments.
>
> The function of such government would be to provide for the general welfare rather than to promote the conditions through which the people can advance themselves in accordance with their desires, desserts, and abilities.
>
> They have lost sight of, or propose to destroy, the careful distinction between the responsibility of the Federal Government to "provide for the common defense" and the responsibility of the Central Government only to "promote the general welfare" as it is set out so clearly and meticulously in the preamble to our Constitution.

Mr. President, I fully subscribe to the reasoning and conclusions set out by the Senator from South Dakota.

I highly commend this thoughtful and well-reasoned article to the Senate. Those who carelessly use the words, "liberal" and "conservative" to describe today's political philosophies will find in it something of a shock.

Senator MUNDT seeks to debunk this tendency to pin labels as "forensic fakery." He seeks to distinguish between what he calls today's "linguistic liberals" and the philosophy espoused by Jefferson, Wilson, and Senator Wheeler.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the March 25 edition of the U.S. News & World Report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report magazine, Mar. 25, 1963]

THE NEW LIBERALS: ARE THEY REALLY 20TH-CENTURY TORIES?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Who are today's political liberals? What do they stand for? How do they compare with the liberals of an earlier day—such men as Thomas Jefferson and Woodrow Wilson? In this article, a prominent Republican Senator examines the present-day liberals of both parties. His finding: They have altered the meaning of the word "liberal." The ideal has moved from preservation of individual freedom to the concentration of power in authoritarian government. And the liberals have become the American tories of the 20th century.)

(By Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota)

"All down the ages, the fight of the true liberals has been to take power from the executive and give it to the legislative branch. Now the so-called liberals want to give more power to the executive."—Former Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Democrat, of Montana.

Nobody familiar with our political history of the past three decades can deny that Burt Wheeler, of Montana, is rightfully one of the great fighting liberals of this era. It is likewise pertinent that his liberalism was demonstrated on the floor of the U.S. Senate and in his public career rather than in the safe, serene atmosphere of a college classroom or the impersonal and untested philippics of a book.

Senator Wheeler expressed his convictions with a consistent courage that made him an effective advocate willing to wager his reputation and political future on the logic and wisdom of his viewpoints.

As a consequence, when former Senator Wheeler speaks of today's liberalism and the curious and irrational projects which its present-day disciples advocate, he speaks as an authority on what comprises genuine liberalism in public life and what principles and concepts give validity to the term "liberal" as a political philosophy. Thus, he serves the Nation well when he bluntly calls attention to the fact that our latter-day liberals have deserted the traditional liberal crusade and have, strangely enough, associated themselves with power drives similar to those of the Tories of early America.

It is my conviction that those who inaccurately describe themselves as liberals, while persistently advocating policies and programs promoting authoritarian government, might be described more accurately as the "20th-century tories."

THERE IS A SHIFT TOWARD AN AUTHORITARIAN AMERICAN STATE

Somewhere along the line these tories have lost confidence in the American people and have—by some curious form of self-delusionment—convinced themselves that only the Federal politicians are motivated by a high sense of ethics; only the Federal politicians can be trusted to do what is right; and only the Federal politicians can understand and provide what the people need and want.

Thus, these misnamed and misdirected liberals continue to chip away at the power, the rights, and the free choice of the people while transferring to bigtime politicians in Washington the authority to determine the people's destiny.

This does not imply that these self-proclaimed but thoroughly deluded liberals are evil men. It definitely does mean, however, that they would substitute for a government devoted to promoting the general welfare one imbued with the paternalistic concepts of ancient times and Tory governments.

The function of such government would be to provide for the general welfare rather than to promote the conditions through which the people can advance themselves in accordance with their desires, desserts, and abilities.

They have lost sight of, or propose to destroy, the careful distinction between the responsibility of the Federal Government to "provide for the common defense" and the responsibility of the Central Government only to "promote the general welfare" as it is set out so clearly and meticulously in the preamble to our Constitution.

Our wise and prudent constitutional forefathers evaluated and weighed every word before it was enshrined in our great charter of freedom.

It was with specific purpose and prudent forethought that they drew the distinction between the terms "promote" and "provide." They deliberately emphasized their conception of the vast difference between Federal responsibilities for the common defense and the promoting of the general welfare.

The programs and projects which our modern liberals espouse eliminate that difference and shift to the Federal state the same responsibilities and authority for the

general welfare that are rightly exercised by it in maintaining the common defense.

BACK TO AN AGE OF TORYISM

By placing primary trust in bigtime politicians, instead of in the people our Government was designed to serve—not control—these illegitimate liberals revive a golden age of toryism when the king—Federal Government—could do no wrong.

During the past 30 years, the growing influence of those I prefer to designate as "20th-century tories"—instead of identifying them as "liberal"—has made an important but unfortunate impact upon our national destiny. We have been following a global drift toward overcentralization of Government and glorification of the central politician over the rights and privileges of the individual.

We live in an era of big Government with big powers. We are witnessing a shift toward an authoritarian American state in which big politicians hold the whip and in which "whom you know" in Government circles seems likely to replace "what you know."

As yet, this consolidated central state is neither Socialist nor Communist nor Fascist in nature. But, neither is there anything remotely liberal about its design. It is bigtime politics in action.

Regardless of which "ism" it eventually embraces or which embraces it, it would be a careless student of history who could not see that our basic American concepts of private ownership, reward of merit, self-determination, and effective control of the politicians by the people are being threatened.

This switch of emphasis, and the exaltation of the Federal politician at the expense of the private citizen, is a deplorable change. It is the more deplorable because it has been promoted by a sustained drive for concentrated political power led by self-designated liberals who have practiced a semantic sham unprecedented in political history. It is a sham because it espouses the same type of proposals for expanding political controls over the people as advocated by the reactionaries, the tories, and the royalists of the past.

RECOGNIZING A TRUE LIBERAL

The true, tried, tested liberal of history and of today is the private citizen or public official who advocates maintenance or extension of individual liberties free alike from the power and the encroachments of an economic or political monopoly.

It is the danger—and presence—of a political monopoly and of programs moving toward that ugly goal which is the "blind spot" in the thinking of today's liberals who are so busy looking at the problems of our times that they fail to see the even greater perils created by their proposals for solution.

Our American dream has evolved from the idealistic concept that proper ethics, sound morals, good judgment, prudent economy, and wise decisions are not the monopoly of those holding positions of power and authority in Washington.

It is an ideal our current pretenders to the liberal label seem unable to comprehend or to accept.

While the Republican Party has excelled its major adversary in clinging to this liberal ideal which has had its greatest fruition on American soil and which has provided more happiness for more people and greater individual liberties than man has attained in any other era or area of human history, it must be admitted that some Republicans, also, have succumbed to the seductive concept that the people must be pushed around by their political officials rather than have them retain the power and push the politicians toward the goals which they desire.

It is not, however, my intent to identify basic republicanism with true liberalism nor to stigmatize all Democrats as people seeking personal and political power after the manner of tories.

Rather, it is my purpose to point up the forensic fakery involved in trying to identify a candidate, a party or a cause involved in seeking more power over more people through Central Government, with any realistic, accurate, honest or historic relationship with liberalism unless the relationship is to show how these "linguistic liberals" differ sharply and deeply from programs and philosophies of such recognized liberals as Jefferson, Wilson, and Wheeler.

One of the great responsibilities of any administration is to protect and wisely use what we usually term, "the American system." To me, the American system means that system which seeks to provide a maximum of opportunity and freedom for our individual citizens. It is a system which manifests confidence in its people. It is a system which has produced results unequaled and unexcelled by any other, any place, any time.

WE MAY BE DESTROYING THE SYSTEM OF CHECKS AND BALANCES

Those who would change our system to place basic responsibility for progress in the hands of Federal politicians instead of with the local citizens and governments are turning back the clock of history.

If one were to accept the pratings of the current crop of self-appointed liberals as providing courses of action and programs of progress which are, in fact, liberal in nature, one would logically be forced to conclude that the greatest liberals of current history are such advocates of concentrated power as Khrushchev, Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, Salazar and Castro.

WHAT DICTATORS PROMISED

Each promised the more abundant life, better schooling, better health, better economic opportunities and greater well-being to their people.

Each sought to provide them by reducing areas of self-determination and free choice enjoyed by the private citizen and by expanding areas of control and power enjoyed by the politicians in their lands.

Each failed to achieve the degrees of well-being and human happiness enjoyed by the peoples of free countries where even the right to err in judgment is an inherent part of any system which provides unlimited rights to succeed and to aspire.

How, then, can one recognize an actual liberal in the great American tradition and in conformity with the true meaning of the term as shaped by the flow of human history? Obviously, not by accepting the unsupported boast of an ambitious politician who proclaims, "I am a liberal." A real liberal must be tested by his actions, his programs, his goals and his methods just as we test the veracity and worth of any sloganeer or propagandist who hopes to persuade by rhetoric rather than reason.

There is available a test which every intelligent and thoughtful citizen should use to decide whether any public proposal or public personality is in fact liberal in conception and nature.

Simply stated, a man or a program is appropriately described as liberal if identified with circumscribing excessive power over the people from any source whether it be concentrated economic, political or hereditary power.

On the other hand, if any man or program is identified with expanding and increasing the power of politicians or economic tycoons over the average citizen, that smacks of reactionism, toryism, and has no place anywhere in the dictionary of valid liberalism.

This do-it-yourself test of whether a political party, an individual citizen or a proposed change is in fact liberal in nature can be employed by applying the following tests to any given circumstance:

1. Does the proposal expand individual freedom or does it expand the power and authority of the central state?
2. Does the proposal give a greater choice to the greatest number or does it give greater decisions to be made by a steadily decreasing number of politicians at the top?
3. Does it enlarge the powers and opportunities of all citizens to determine their own destiny or does it give greater power and additional opportunity to politicians at the Federal level to determine the destiny of all citizens?

After examining a public proposal or a suggested reform; after analyzing speeches, votes and positions of a politician or a public figure; after studying recommendations of an organization, a political party or a reform group, and after asking the foregoing questions and relating your honest answers to the steps which have been advocated, you will know whether what is proposed is actually liberal, or reactionary and paternalistic in conception.

With clarification of its character, one can still be for or against a proposal or consider it wise or unwise, but it will be assured that no literate and prudent citizen will be found supporting an issue or cause on the pretext it is liberal when, in fact, it is demonstrably a step backward toward the eras of the overpowering central state.

Since 1776, the march of human freedom in this republic has been in the direction of expanding and protecting the rights of self-determination by each citizen.

We have been moving toward a more effective implementation of the goals set out in our Declaration of Independence and in the preamble to our Constitution.

We have endeavored to extend the vote to all citizens; to correct imbalances of political power between urban and rural areas; to reform our electoral college system so every citizen shall have the right to exercise equitable authority through the vote he casts for a President.

AN EBB TIDE OF FREEDOM

But the ebb tide of freedom is in motion in our country. It is imperative that we seriously question ourselves as to whether, in our impatience to get things done and to bring about improvements, we may be destroying a system of checks and balances which has helped shape the basic formula by which, in less than 200 years, we have developed a system so successful that no other country has remotely approximated it.

Not only have we provided more happiness and more opportunity for more people than the world has ever seen, but we are today also contributing to the support of over 80 less fortunate, or perhaps less prudent, countries in the world.

We have done all this under a constitutional charter of freedom providing for the most liberal Government in the world—one in which the wishes and ideals of the people can predominate.

The light of human liberty burns brightest when the will of man is given free rein—uncontrollable by the politicians of his time and place.

Let us not reduce that light to a mere smudge pot of low-level security by casting aside our traditions in reckless pursuit of illusionary goals that require subjugation of the individual to achieve the false promises of any form of authoritative or totalitarian government.

Let us examine each proposal with an analytic test rather than accepting or rejecting it because of a political label or a mistaken notion that because it is noble in objective it must be liberal in nature.

All Americans are challenged these days—but the greatest challenge is to the real American liberal. If he is true to the liberal heritage which is his, he cannot embrace concepts of collectivism or of centralized controls which would have been as much anathema to Thomas Jefferson as they are to the real constitutional libertarians of today.

RETRAINING WORKERS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on the editorial page of today's Wall Street Journal there is an interesting article on the retraining of workers. The Journal reporter selected Connecticut and Massachusetts for his study, and in general a very favorable impression emerges of the retraining programs that have been set up in these two States.

Even before Congress approved the Manpower Development and Training Act, early in 1962, Connecticut had initiated a program to teach unemployed workers new skills that could be used by businesses located in the area where the workers reside.

The results in Connecticut have been most satisfactory. To quote the Journal:

> Proper retraining can help many unemployed individuals, provided they want to work. Here in Connecticut nearly 2,100 jobless men and women have completed courses since 1959, ranging from 4 weeks in welding to 18 weeks in typing. Nearly all immediately got jobs in their new fields.

The article goes on to describe briefly how Connecticut officials approach this problem. It is an excellent example of how the American system can work. State officials and businessmen consult and cooperate with each other, labor market surveys are made, and not until it is determined that there is a need for certain types of skills is a training program started.

And now that the Federal Government helps to finance approved training programs, we have both Federal and State governments working together with private industry, to help unemployed persons find a good job.

Not only do these retraining programs help thousands of people enjoy a better life. They also help businesses find workers trained in important, even essential, skills, workers who otherwise might not be available in the local labor market.

I want to highly commend the Connecticut officials, and the Connecticut businessmen who have cooperated with them, for their work in setting up "no nonsense, businesslike programs." The success that has been achieved in my State is a tribute to their dedication and to their intelligent approach to helping the unemployed find a new place in their communities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, "Retraining Workers, Two States Find It Pays To Pick Students Carefully," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETRAINING WORKERS—TWO STATES FIND IT PAYS TO PICK STUDENTS CAREFULLY

(By Ralph E. Winter)

HARTFORD, CONN.—Retraining idle workers with skills to fill labor vacancies sounds like a simple and noncontroversial solution to at least part of the Nation's unemployment problem.

In Washington, Congress has appropriated money and whipped up blueprints for massive retraining programs. The trouble is, though, that out in the shops and classrooms retraining often proves to be difficult, frustrating and unrewarding. For example, only about half of 5,000 unemployed West Virginians trained in State and Federal programs, often run just for the sake of having a program, found work in their new fields.

This contrasts with results in Massachusetts and Connecticut, where the States began practical retraining on their own long before Federal programs were set up. Nearly all of the 3,700 workers retrained in these two States during the last 4 years are working at better jobs.

Retraining officials here, however, long ago lost any Cinderella-like illusions they may have had about retraining magic. "Retraining is a salvage operation to help individuals without a marketable skill, not a real solution to unemployment," asserts Edwin Gooding, Boston Federal Reserve Bank economist who studied retraining in the two States.

"Most of the unemployed couldn't fill the jobs where most openings are if you trained them 100 years," adds John J. Higgiston, manpower coordinator for Connecticut's education department.

WASHINGTON'S PLANS

Washington officials apparently do not agree. For, although the size and scope of the Federal effort has not been finally determined, the 1962 Manpower Development and Training Act is designed to retrain up to 570,000 people in the next 3 years at a Federal cost of $430 million.

In addition, the year-old Area Redevelopment administration plans to spend $14.5 million during the next 4 years on retraining the unemployed in depressed areas. And Congress is considering a youth conservation program involving retraining for young people.

The quality of job retraining, like education in general, is hard to evaluate. Results depend upon intangibles such as the individual's native ability and such pragmatic things as the number and kinds of jobs available. "Paradoxically, retraining is most successful where it is needed least in terms of numbers of unemployed," says Mr. Gooding.

Any evaulation of retraining in West Virginia, for example, must take into consideration the high rate of joblessness, about double the national average, caused by a drop in demand for coal miners and lack of widespread industrial diversification. There just are no jobs even for many of the retrained. Industrialized southern New England offers more varied job opportunities.

Even here, no one claims retraining can make a big dent in unemployed rolls, now accounting for more than 6 percent of the Nation's work force. Only economic expansion that sharply boosts job openings can do that. Most workers now rejected for lack of skill probably would find jobs without Government retraining if business were booming, economists agree.

CONNECTICUT'S RESULTS

However, proper retraining can help many unemployed individuals, provided they want to work. Here in Connecticut nearly 2,100 jobless men and women have completed courses since 1959, ranging from 4 weeks in welding to 18 weeks of typing. Nearly all immediately got jobs in their new fields.

John Perry, Jr., 34, a periodically unemployed father of six from Montville, Conn., is an example. "I was working at construction labor, but I got laid off every winter so I decided to take a pipefitter course," he says. "I'm starting at $1.95 an hour on what should be a steady job," he adds.

Rene E. Theroux, 20, an apprentice electrician, demonstrates the upgrading retraining often gives income. On his last job as a maintenance worker he made $1.60 an hour. As an apprentice he draws $2.11 an hour.

In Massachusetts 1,600 adults have been retrained since 1958. Graduates with a year on the job have increased their incomes an average of $1,000 a year, or 35 percent, according to Mr. Gooding of the Federal Reserve.

Yankee retraining officials attribute the high placement rate to no nonsense, businesslike programs, in contrast to what they consider a shotgun welfare approach in some other places. West Virginia is an example. Among the factors retraining officials have learned are necessary ingredients are close cooperation with industry, careful selection of courses, high admission standards and concentration on younger people.

A NUMBERS GAME

"Some Federal people and State politicians are playing a numbers game," observes one State training official. "They just want us to hurry up and get a lot of people in some kind of training."

So far, Connecticut and Massachusetts have resisted such pressure. Connecticut, for example, does not set up classes "until area employers tell us they want a retraining program," says Thomas J. Yoczik, coordinator of manpower training in the State's department of labor. "Then we start with a labor market survey to determine skill needs. And we don't overtrain. If companies say they want 90 machine operators, we train 60 and add more classes later if necessary," he adds.

One result of tailoring courses to employers' requirements: Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics Corp., Groton, Conn., has hired 1,036 trainees so far, often employing entire classes the day after graduation.

"This program has been very good for us because we were consulted in advance," says Lawrence Crowley, trade training coordinator for Electric Boat. "The men we hire work out extremely well because their training covers skills we need." The company sends two of its own training supervisors to the State-run classes at least once a week to answer questions and keep track of progress of individual students.

"We find that the welders who were trained to our specifications work out very well," agrees an official of Crusader Lancer Corp., North Grosvenor Dale, Conn., maker of immersion gas water heaters.

Failure to pin down job openings can cause a fiasco. Rhode Island officials just assumed, without questioning many employers to find actual openings, that growing use of electronic data processing would make it easy for persons trained to operate and program computers to find jobs. But after more than 4 months of training, graduates of the State's computer course found openings scarce.

Another principle New England authorities follow is to avoid the jobless who have records of being unable to hold any job. Unfortunately, many of them can't absorb training either.

"Many of the unemployed are not well educated enough to benefit from what we understand as vocational education," says Mr. Gooding. "To include them we would have to create new courses including basic reading, writing, grammar, and arithmetic."

STANDARDS ARE HIGH

Connecticut and Massachusetts officials are convinced that high admission requirements are a major reason for their success. Only persons scoring high enough on general intelligence tests and specific aptitude tests to indicate probable success in the field are allowed to enter a course.

"We select about one applicant out of three for retraining," says Connecticut's Mr. Yoczik.

Even size can be a factor. Massachusetts authorities recently turned down a 275-pound applicant who wanted to train for tree care work involving climbing trees to remove dead or diseased limbs.

"We are not going to be caught dead training people who are inadequate," adds Connecticut's Mr. Higgiston. "That would destroy employer confidence in the program. We can and do drop anyone who has the wrong attitude, doesn't attend regularly or can't do the work."

Another factor aiding success of retraining in the two New England States is concentration on younger workers who have many productive years ahead of them. In Connecticut few trainees are more than 40 years old. In a typical Massachusetts group more than half were less than 25 years old and another 25 percent were younger than 35. West Virginia's placement ratio is held down by a higher proportion of trainees over 40, officials admit.

Although their State-fashioned programs have been successful over a broad range of courses, both Massachusetts and Connecticut were unable to resist the lure of Federal funds. But Connecticut, while welcoming Federal money, has some complaints. "When we ran our own program, starting a new class was simple, but under the Federal program I have to make 26 copies of every document and get 9 different signatures," complains Mr. Yoczik.

ADMINISTRATION TAX PLAN

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, more and more, as people throughout the Nation study the administration's tax cut and tax reform plan, as people look at the sluggish state of the national economy, and as people observe higher State and local taxes in the offing, it becomes clear that the President's tax proposals are inadequate.

One of Honolulu's fine daily newspapers, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, ably edited by William H. Ewing, has analyzed the situation with great care and perception. The last three paragraphs of its March 15 editorial tell the story succinctly and clearly:

> For every dollar the taxpayer saves at the Federal level, he may find he will have to pay an equal or greater amount to his local or State government.
>
> So where is the great shot in the arm to the economy that the Kennedy tax program is designed to produce?
>
> The Kennedy tax cut may well go down in history as the great illusion of 1963.

This is in line with what I told the people of Hawaii on January 31, just after the President submitted his tax plan to Congress. I said then, in an address over radio station KGU, Honolulu:

> Because the President has spread his tax cut proposals over 3 years, many experts fear the reduction will be too small to relieve unemployment to any great extent.

I also pointed out that social security taxes on workers and their employers had just gone up all over the country and that State and local taxes were rising. In addition, I noted that the President wants corporations to pay their taxes much sooner than in the past, and that, as a result, corporations may pay more tax money to the Government during the next 3 years than they did before.

With all these factors, people and businesses may actually have far less to spend and invest than the administration hopes. So the stimulus to the economy may be minor, when what we need is a major injection.

Because of the great interest everywhere in taxes, unemployment, and our Nation's fiscal picture, the Star-Bulletin editorial is most timely and informative I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD. I also ask to have printed my January 31 KGU radio script on the same subject.

There being no objection, the editorial and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Star Bulletin,
Mar. 15, 1963]

TAKING UP THE SLACK

Even if President Kennedy gets the Federal tax cuts he wants, the American taxpayer in most cases will be no better off.

States and local governments are moving right in to take up the slack—and in some cases to add an even heavier burden.

Governor Burns deplores any general tax increase for Hawaii at this time, but has indicated he approves a higher fuel tax to pay for the State-accelerated roadbuilding program. Mayor Blaisdell has asked the city council to approve an increase in the real property tax. Although these won't hit all taxpayers, they will affect enough so that any saving in Federal taxes, provided cuts are voted will be lost in additional local and State levies.

This is true across the country. Business Week magazine reports that 44 of the 47 State legislatures meeting this year are considering total tax increases of $1.5 billion.

This increase, which may be on the conservative side, would bring the State tax bite on individuals and corporations to $22 billion. That's more than a 7 percent increase over last year, and double the total of 10 years ago.

While proposals range from an increased corporation tax in Connecticut to a gift tax in New Mexico, sales taxes remain in the easiest and most politically appealing way for legislators to boost revenue, Business Week reports.

Eight of the 14 States that do not now have a broad-based sales tax will consider one, while at least 13 other States will propose raising existing sales tax rates. All told, sales taxes should account for $1.3 billion of the total State tax increase this year.

A mixed bag of selective sales tax increases on gasoline, cigarettes, and liquor will be voted on by lawmakers in 15 States. In addition motor vehicle license fees may rise in six, including Hawaii, where it has been proposed that the automobile weight tax be doubled.

Pressures on States to raise more and more cash are relentless. While the Federal budget has registered several dips in spending over the past 10 years, State expenditures have risen in an almost straight line. In recent years, nearly two-thirds of the States spent more money than they took in. In 1961, there were 29 States operating in the red.

On the municipal level, few cities enjoy the kind of home rule that would enable them to keep their fiscal house in order and still provide the services their citizens demand. While States normally reserve income and sales taxes for themselves, they usually forbid their cities to operate at a deficit. The result is an annual tug-of-war between city hall and taxpayer groups over whether nuisance taxes should be levied or services cut.

New York's Mayor Robert F. Wagner, with a city income greater than the entire Federal Government's in 1933, says he's now faced with the unpleasant task of either trimming essential services or imposing an array of unpopular levies such as a payroll tax, an auto use tax, an overnight parking fee, or taxes on beer and liquor licenses.

Other cities have similar problems. And, to the city taxpayer burdened by nuisance taxes, it often seems that his mayor's definition of essential services gets broader each year. But, as New York's Budget Director William W. Shea points out, those who cry for economy often change their tune when it comes to a pet service.

Generally speaking, we would prefer to see cities and States providing more of the services and taking a larger share of the tax dollar than the Federal Government. The closer taxing and spending power is to the voter, the greater his influence over it, the better chance there is of rational limits to Government spending.

But the point in this case is that for every dollar the taxpayer saves at the Federal level, he may find he will have to pay an equal or greater amount to his local or State government.

So where is the great shot in the arm to the economy that the Kennedy tax program is designed to produce?

The Kennedy tax cut may well go down in history as the great illusion of 1963.

REMARKS BY SENATOR FONG ON RADIO STATION KGU, JANUARY 31, 1963

Good evening, friends. The President's long-awaited tax plan is now before Congress. It is a plan with two main parts: one, reductions in tax rates for persons and for businesses; two, many changes in such items as personal deductions, dividend treatment, capital gains, and mineral depletion which will partly offset the lower tax rates.

The President says lower tax rates will save $13.6 billion in income taxes, while the other tax changes he proposes will put a tax bite on persons and businesses of $3.4 billion. So the net tax reduction would be $10.2 billion.

Now Congress must decide whether the tax cuts are big enough to stimulate our lagging national economy, whether the reforms are fair and just, and whether the tax changes are timed to take effect so as to do the most good.

Our Nation's economy rose about 3 percent last year and shows no signs of doing any better this year. This rise was not enough to reduce unemployment significantly. Unemployment continued at more than 5 percent throughout 1962 and still exceeds 5 percent today. Every year we need more than 1 million new jobs just to take care of the men and women entering the labor force.

Because the President has spread his tax cut proposals over 3 years, many experts fear the reduction will be too small to relieve unemployment to any great extent. For individuals and for business with profits under $25,000, the President wants the lower rates to be effective starting next July; for other business, not until next January. So the impact in the year beginning next July would be only $4 billion in Federal income taxes.

Meantime, social security taxes on workers and their employers have just gone up all over the country. State and local taxes are in an upward trend in America and still climbing. Here in Hawaii, for example, the Governor has announced he wants an increase in gasoline taxes and the City Council of Honolulu is considering a raise in the property tax rate.

In addition, the President wants corporations to pay their taxes much sooner than in the past. As a result, corporations may pay more tax money to the Government during the next 3 years than they did before. Corporations may not get the promised percentage basis of reduction until 1969, whereas the economy needs a boost in 1963.

With all these factors, people and businesses may actually have far less to spend and invest than the administration hopes. So the stimulus to the economy may be minor, when what we need is a major injection.

Congress must carefully assess the overall impact of the President's tax plan. At the same time, Congress must study the so-called reforms to make sure they are fair and just to taxpayers.

For example, I am disturbed that the President wants workers who are off the job because of illness to be taxed on money they receive under sick pay plans. This may well cause hardship to families trying to make ends meet on sick pay while the head of the family cannot work.

I am disturbed also by the President's plan to tax workers on the amount their employers pay toward premiums for employees' group term life insurance.

I am happy that the President proposes to liberalize the deduction allowed for expenses of child care of a working parent. I am also happy about the proposed tax breaks for the elderly. These would exempt from taxation single persons over 65 with income under $2,900 and married couples under $5,800. Elderly persons would not have to file tax returns unless the earned at least $1,800, instead of $1,200 as now.

Without question the tax bill is the most important domestic issue before Congress today. Next Wednesday, the House Ways and Means Committee is scheduled to start some 7 weeks of hearings. Writing the bill may take 7 more weeks, with passage by the House perhaps in June. Senate Finance Committee hearings and action may take another 2 months, followed by floor debate and then conferences between House and Senate Members to iron out differences. So it looks as if summer is the earliest that Congress could complete action on such a complex bill.

What Congress finally does will depend a great deal on the size of the Federal budget deficit. The President now predicts almost a $12 billion deficit in 1964. If by July an even higher deficit appears likely, Congress may not reduce taxes as much as the President wants. So the President must hold the line on Federal spending. This is indispensable to enactment of tax cuts large enough to invigorate our national economy.

Thank you for listening, friends. Until next week at this same time, this is your Senator, HIRAM FONG, saying goodnight and aloha from the Nation's Capital.

EDUCATION AND THE NATIONAL WELFARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON—an "unabashed partisan of education"—went to Atlantic City in New Jersey recently to address the American Association of School Administrators. At that time the Vice President described to the school administrators the challenge and promise facing not only education, but our entire democratic society. He asked his audience to see beyond the "mountains of immediate problems" and to see in the distance "even higher mountains which should not be ignored in determining the course for the present." And he also asked the people of America to recognize their own strengths, to see the weaknesses of nations ruled by force, and to fulfill the cause of freedom "through the policies we pursue as leaders of the grand alliance of freemen."

Mr. President, the address was an inspiring summary which should be shared by many other Americans. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, ATLANTIC CITY, N.J., FEBRUARY 17, 1963

CHALLENGE AND PROMISE

In the early years of his administration, President Franklin Roosevelt was a strong advocate of the U.S. Navy. He loved the sea, he had served as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and he believed a modern, two-ocean Navy was essential to our security. The story is told of an encounter F.D.R. had with the Army Chief of Staff at that time, Gen. Malin Craig.

The general and the President had been holding many conferences on the defense budget. The President noted some discomfort on the part of the general and asked him to speak frankly. General Craig is said to have replied, "Mr. President, I don't mind that when you refer to the Army you always say 'they'—but I would be more comfortable if, when you refer to the Navy, you did not always say 'we.' "

Whenever I meet with public school administrators or teachers, I have to guard against a longstanding personal inclination to use "we" in references to "them and us." Today the typical public school principal is a 40-year-old man, with 14 years of experience, who works 55 hours a week and who is paid $6,181 a year. Thirty years ago my first jobs after college were as principal of small schools in the Southwest—and if both my age and experience were considerably less than today's average, I can say that the paycheck was in proportion, also.

That experience left its indelible impression. I make no apology today for continuing to be an unabashed partisan of education, or the untiring champion of our administrators and teachers whose work is so vital to the strength, stability, and success of our country and our cause in this century.

In coming here today, it is not my purpose to take the time of this informed and responsible audience to discuss those questions and topics to which your attention is given continuously. Instead, it is my purpose to talk with you about the broad challenges—and broader opportunities—of this period of your Nation's leadership and freedom in the world.

DRAMATIC CHANGE

As school administrators, you are acutely aware that this is a time of decisive and dramatic change in public education. The basic concepts of education's mission and purpose are undergoing revision. The role and leadership of public schools to our society is changing. You—and all associated with public education—are faced with mountains of immediate problems which must be dealt with immediately. At the same time, you can see in the distance even higher mountains which should not be ignored in determining the course for the present.

In world affairs now, we are passing through a period of change—one of the most profound such periods in history—in which it is difficult to achieve answers which are both quick and responsible. As seldom before, the hasty answer is unlikely to be the right and lasting answer. It is most important to our national success that we understand, first, that only the strong can afford to be patient, and, second, that the tide of world affairs is running with us—not against us—and that our staying power is the key to our ultimate success.

OUR POSITION AND POLICY

In this perspective, then, let me make to you several key points about the position and the policy of this America at this period in the affairs of the world.

1. To display patience is not the same as displaying weakness. If we are to be patient and prudent, it is mandatory that we also be prepared. This assault which communism has mounted against us aims at the total destruction of our freedoms. We must maintain our strength on a scale commensurate with the clear and present danger to our survival.

2. The strength of our position depends upon the collective total strength of the free world. If the prospects and high promise of the future are to be realized, we cannot—and we will not—permit the penetration of the perimeter of the free world by Communist aggression, and subversion or default on our own part. Each attack, each threat, each bluff and bluster must be met—and this we shall do.

3. The ultimate success of our cause depends not merely upon preserving the integrity of the free world from assaults from without. That success rests upon the uses we make and the strength we build from the resources which lie within the free world. We must and we shall pursue on a day-to-day and a year-to-year basis a positive program of adding to the strength of our own free world community.

In speaking of a world divided, of a world part free and part slave, we cannot—and we do not—accept this division as permanent, eternal, and unchanging. Men cannot live as freemen as long as they must live under the shadow of what Winston Churchill once called "the two giant marauders of war and tyranny." We do not propose to accept for our children and our children's children a life of constant threat and constant fear of nuclear destruction. There is no ceiling on the price we are willing to pay to preserve ourselves and the free world and to maintain the strength of the free civilizations until the forces of history have wrought the great changes which will improve the condition of man and the climate for peace.

TO BREAK THE BONDS

It is on this point that I believe Americans need to keep their thinking straight at this time—and to recognize the full significance of the forces we see at work within the Communist world. We are not dealing in abstracts. We are not dealing in intangibles or theory. There is clear and growing evidence that influences are now at work within the Communist world which may well break the bonds with which the Communists have shackled both themselves and the people they rule.

In the nations of the Communist bloc, the future is not being controlled by the mechanical and arbitrary laws conceived by antisocial and mystical Marx. The aspiration of the different national groups now living under Communist rule are being asserted and the course of the present clearly contradicts Communist assumptions about its own future.

When the Communist empire was established—reaching from the shores of the Adriatic to the seas of Japan and from the North Pole to the Himalayas—first Stalin and then Khrushchev proclaimed it as an irrevocable shift in the "balance of world forces" in favor of the Communists. That empire was supposed to live forever. The countries captured and controlled by the Communists were to be united in a single cohesive unit which would move forward with a singular will to rule the world. Like all the visions of world domination of the past, this Communist vision is being shattered and a vital process of disintegration in the Communist camp has begun before our eyes.

Instead of assuming—as too many among us have assumed—that communism is an irresistible wave of the future, we must realistically reassess the record—which contradicts that assumption.

COMMUNIST FAILURE

The proof of this last half of the 20th century is convincing that communism is failing as both an international conspiracy and as a domestic economic system.

1. Of the more than 50 countries which have moved from colonial status to independence since World War II, Communists have failed to win control of a single one.

2. In every country under Communist control, the Communist system has failed to produce enough food to make possible improvements and advances in the standard of living for the people under their subjugation.

3. On the mainland of China, the application of the Communist system has tragically failed to resolve the basic problems of that country.

4. After almost two decades of indoctrination and thought control, Communists have not been able to overcome the deep antagonism and hostility of the peoples of the satellite states of Eastern Europe.

5. Within the Soviet Union itself, the Communist leadership is plagued with growing problems about the allocation of limited resources, conflicts over policy decisions, and stirrings among the people aspiring to greater intellectual freedom, a larger voice in their own affairs, and for greater opportunity to enjoy the fruits of their own labors.

The Communist vision and dream of solidarity within an empire ruled by force is fading. The Russian Communists and the Chinese Communists are experiencing a division which places the inner debates of the free world in perspective as passing disagreements. The Russians have, to all intents and purposes, cut off economic and military aid to the Chinese. They have tried to undercut Chinese influence within the Communist movement. They have mobilized other parties outside Russia to criticize and challenge Chinese positions. The Russian attempts to whip the Chinese into line have only produced greater defiance—and open and bitter conflict.

On our part, there is no value in attempting to guess when or whether the conflicts between Peiping and Moscow will reach a formal break. What matters to us is that a change of historical significance is under way in this relationship within the Communist bloc. And this conflict is not merely ideological dispute. It is a conflict of basic national interests.

OLD TIMES CHANGING

The Chinese Communists are refusing to accept the old line of Lenin and Stalin that whatever is good for the Soviet Union is good for Communists everywhere. The Chinese reaction to Russian domination of the Communist empire is a reaction against a basically unnatural system—a system running counter to fundamental forces of history and human nature.

With this great new force asserting itself within the Communist empire, it must continue to be the object of our policy to make sure that communism is not permitted to bring the world down in ruins before collapsing itself from within. The split between Communist Russia and Communist China does not relieve us of any immediate dangers or threats. Neither is it likely to bring improvements in the world climate during the years immediately ahead. Should we of the West relinquish either our vigilance or our unity, the forces of communism would be quick to seize upon the opening thus presented to fulfill their ambition of burying us.

What this situation does demand of us is to maintain the strength to permit patience and to preserve the patience to permit the free world's strength to work its influence upon the disintegration from within the Communist bloc. The world we face today is vastly different than most Americans imagined it could be as recently as 10 or even 5 years ago. We must recognize that change has come.

RECOGNIZE OUR STRENGTH

As a people, we of America must—above all else—examine and reexamine our national attitudes. We will deny and betray the opportunity of the future if we fail to recognize fully the strength of our national position today. We cannot win the future if we allow our confidence to be impaired by false cries of those who monger the idea that we are losing the present. Our efforts as a Nation—our sacrifices as a people—have preserved freedom against the high tide of Communist danger. Our success in the past permits us to have confidence in the future—and Americans must carry such confidence into the period of challenge and change which will dominate the remaining years of this century.

While this is and will continue to be a time of peril for freedom, we will be stronger as a Nation and we will be a stronger force as leaders of the cause of freedom if we realistically and honestly recognize that we have come upon one of the great moments of promise in mankind's history—and it is our destiny to fulfill that promise through the policies we pursue as leaders of the grand alliance of freemen.

LOBBYING IN WASHINGTON

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, Felton West, chief of the Washington bureau of the Houston Post, has written an outstanding series of articles on lobbying in Washington. The inadequate regulation of lobbyists has troubled Members of Congress for several years. I believe that Mr. West's series indicates that our concern is not misplaced. I therefore ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the text of the articles.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—LOBBYING ACT OF 1946 NEEDS OVERHAUL JOB

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—Every few years an incident comes to light that prompts Members of Congress and the public to say, "For shame, look how brazen those lobbyists are getting." Or words to that effect.

There will be an investigation, maybe a particular culprit will be identified and shamed, rarely even convicted for violating a law. But usually that is the end of it, until the next case that stirs the imagination.

Meanwhile, the persuasive and enduring lobbyist, as one writer described him, goes right on persuading and enduring, his profession getting more widespread and powerful all the time, with nobody paying much attention to it. At least, not enough attention to find out much about it and disturb it.

The last case that stirred Congress and the country much was in 1956, when the late Senator Francis Case, Republican of South Dakota, dropped the bombshell that he had been offered a $2,500 campaign contribution he thought was strictly to get his vote on the Harris-Fulbright bill to relieve natural gas of Federal regulation.

Congress was shocked, though not too shocked to go ahead and pass the bill. Although indicating he favored the bill, President Eisenhower was so shocked that he vetoed it because of such arrogant activities.

The incident touched off a Justice Department investigation and prosecution that led to the only convictions so far under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946—Elmer Patman and John Neff each drew a $2,500 fine and a 1-year suspended sentence and their company, the Superior Oil Co., was fined $10,000.

SENATE GROUP RAPPED LOBBYING ACT

It also touched off a lengthy investigation by a special Senate committee, headed by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas. Congress authorized the committee to spend more than $400,000 looking at the whole subject of lobbying and the adequacy of the 1946 law, along with studying campaign contributions.

This committee produced an interesting final report that pointed fingers of scorn at weaknesses of the 1946 law. It recommended a complete substitute.

But, as so often happens when the furor over an initial disclosure dies down and a serious report on the problem necessarily comes along much later in competition with more current sensations, the suggestions for strengthening the law fell on deaf ears.

Since then, there have been occasional speeches critical of lobbying, even a few remarks by the President of the United States, but nobody has been pushing for reform.

So when Congress came back from the hustings in early January, there was still waiting for it that army of persuaders considerably outnumbering it, still doing business just as usual not telling anybody much about it, some of its troops registered as lobbyists, some not, although doing the same things as the registrants, some disclosing their sources of money and their spending, some not.

LOBBYISTS QUICK TO PICK UP CHECK

There are close to 1,200 lobbyists in this army, at least—and if the truth were known, probably hundreds more.

They include many friends of the reelected Congressmen, many as close as their most influential constituents back home. And soon a lot will be close friends of the new Congressmen, if they did not get that way during their election campaigns last fall.

The lobbyists are ready to wine and dine the lawmakers at the drop of a hat, pick up the checks for their parties, do all sorts of favors whether asked or not. A lobbyist is eager to please.

They'll meet a lot of Congressmen in the lobbies outside the legislative halls. That is how they got their name, hanging around legislativies lobbies, starting with that of the British House of Commons.

But nowadays most of their work will be done elsewhere.

Many will direct as much of their attention to you voters back in the Congressman's district as directly as to the Congressman. They hope your pressure on him will have more effect than theirs, which it probably will.

As long as the lobbyists keep within the bounds of propriety and beyond bribery, there is nothing improper about what they are doing. They are within their rights and their clients' rights of freedom of speech, assembly and petition guaranteed by the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. In fact, they undoubtedly perform a valuable service. One or more of them may even be representing you, indirectly if not directly.

Congress and the courts have taken the position that lobbyists should not and could not be limited.

The only special law they are subject to is the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946, which to start with was misnamed—it is not a regulatory law at all but merely a disclosure requirement.

But this law is one of the most confusing ones ever put on the books. It was vague and indefinite, poorly written. Court decisions have weakened it. Few people understand it, including the highest-paid lobbyists.

It has become a Washington joke. Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, recently called it a "farce." It is inconceivable that the Congressmen who wrote it intended for lobby disclosure to turn out to be the botched-up job it is.

The law creates the impression lobbyists are regulated, or their activities well disclosed, when they are not, which may be as much a disservice to the country as no law at all.

There are people registered under it who doubtless did not need to register, while probably others who are really professional lobbyists are not registered, or at least are not reporting their spending. Some follow the advice, "If in doubt, register and report." Others give themselves the benefit of the doubt.

No agency of the Government is designated to see that lobbyists do report or pay any attention to what they do report. The reports are just accepted and filed. Nobody is designated to report violations.

Nobody has been prosecuted since 1956.

Senator John F. Kennedy, Democrat, of Massachusetts, said after the Neff-Case incident in that year that the lobbying act was practically worthless. The main thing wrong, he said was its failure to make anybody responsible for administering and enforcing it.

Twice he introduced bills to improve the law, one of the main changes being to make the Department of Justice administer it. But the bills got nowhere.

Now, as President, Mr. Kennedy has complained bitterly at least once about powerful lobbying that he said misrepresented the facts on his proposals to Congress. His legislative program has taken some big lumps from several lobbies. Big lobbies are opposing all his major legislative proposals, though at the same time he has big lobbies giving him some support.

Recently the President was reported to be discouraged over the power of lobbies, feeling that some are more persuasive and powerful than the Office of the President.

But so far, since becoming President, he has left the lobby problem strictly in Congress hands, not recommending any reform legislation on the subject.

Meanwhile, lobbying is getting to be bigger business all the time.

Although no recent estimate is available on how much is really spent on lobbying, a House investigating committee estimated in 1950 that, in all its ramifications, it was a billion-dollar industry then. It has been growing ever since, even though disclosed spending figures do not indicate it.

And thanks to a change in the Federal tax laws last year that amounts to an incentive to lobbying, such activity in Washington, State capitals, and local communities may increase in the next few years at a rate much faster than in the past.

Whether this is good or bad, the fact is that the law and the machinery the Federal Government has for disclosure of such activity are puny.

In the Supreme Court opinion upholding the constitutionality of the lobbying act, Chief Justice Earl Warren said Congress has not tried to prohibit pressures but "wants only to know who is being hired, who is putting up the money, and how much."

Unfortunately, under the present law, neither you nor Congress knows much about that. And nothing is likely to be done about it this year.

[From the Houston Post Feb. 4, 1963]

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—SPENDING REPORTS OF LOBBYISTS FAIL TO KEEP PACE

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—For the first quarter of 1962, quarterly reports required by the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act were filed by 1,187 individuals and organizations.

Only 643 of them listed expenditures for lobbying.

In 1961, 312 pressure groups and their lobbyists reported lobbying expenditures that totaled $3,770,108—the smallest annual total of lobby spending since 1947, the first full year of operation of the lobbying act.

The total of spending reported in 1962 is not yet available, but in the first 6 months of the year 273 organizations and their lobbyists reported spending $2,007,866. If as much was spent in the second half of the year as in the first, the year's total would still be about $1 million less than the spending of $5,191,856 reported in 1947.

Since, as the New York Times observed in early 1962, "there is abundant evidence that Washington's 'Third House' has waxed fatter and richer with each passing biennium," the decline in reported expenditures would seem to indicate the lobbying regulation act is not working well as a disclosure requirement.

In view of the inflation since 1947 and the many controversial matters before Congress in 1961 and 1962, it is rather unlikely that lobby spending was actually less than in 1947. It is more likely that considerably less of the total spent is being reported now than in past years.

The total reported spent in a year ballooned to $10,303,204 in 1950. Since 1952, however, it has ranged between $3 and $4 million a year.

The count of 1,187 individuals and organizations who filed reports during the first quarter of 1962 is the best indication available of the number of lobbyists active at that time. But there could have been many more, such is the state of confusion over the law and the lack of administration and enforcement.

Between January 1 and October 30 of last year, 367 individuals and organizations registered with the Clerk of the House and the Senate as lobbyists, as required by the law. The average number of registrations a year is 383.

The total number of registrations since enactment of the law in 1946 was 6,504 as of October 30, which represented only 4,586 different lobbyists or groups because some registered more than once or registered for two or more organizations.

There is no accurate way of telling how many of the 4,586 were still lobbying, unless you assume that all who were filed the quarterly reports. Many are dead and haven't reported the fact; nobody has wiped their names off the rolls. Others perhaps once thought they needed to file reports but don't think so now. Some of them and others may be violating the law by not reporting, or not registering.

But nobody is checking up to see. The law does not require notice of discontinuance of legislative representation.

The Justice Department will investigate complaints of noncompliance and either bring about voluntary compliance or prosecute if it thinks the facts warrant it, a spokesman said. But it does not consider itself the policing agent for lobbying. Somebody has to bring it complaints and no particular person is designated to do this.

Through warnings, the Department has brought about voluntary compliance in a few cases in recent years after investigations that stemmed from inquiries by Congressmen, the spokesman said. But it has not prosecuted anybody for illegal lobbying since the Neff-Patman-Superior Oil case in 1956.

In the whole history of the lobbying act there have been only five cases taken to court, with convictions only in the 1956 case.

The 4,586 different lobbyists registered since 1946 included 3,798 individuals, 231 public relations and law firms and 557 organizations.

For most of the statistics in this story, the public is indebted to Congressional Quarterly, a Washington research organization, which compiles registration and spending statistics periodically and is the only source for such information unless one wants to wade laboriously through the spending reports and compile them himself.

No official agency keeps tabs on them. The House clerk and Senate secretary merely accept and file the lobby reports and prepare alphabetical lists of those registering and reporting, showing their clients, their total contributions and total expenses, for publication quarterly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The lobby law is considered so weak that if there were not so much uncertainty about what it does require, many people now filing reports probably would not be.

"After 17 years," said an influential and affluent lobbyist who dutifully files reports in spite of his contention that it is a clerical nuisance serving no worthwhile purpose, "I still don't know what the law means."

By its own language, the law applies to those persons and organizations which receive or spend money for the principal purpose of influencing directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of legislation by Congress.

The law says every person or organization paid to influence legislation shall register with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate, identifying himself and his employer and disclosing the source and amount of his compensation, expense money, and the nature of his expenses.

Exceptions to this are persons who merely appear before committees of Congress, public officials acting in their official capacity, and newspapers or periodicals, their owners or employees, as long as they do nothing outside the ordinary course of business to influence legislation. The law does not state any similar exemption for radio or television.

Those receiving contributions are required to keep accounts and keep receipts for expenditures of more than $10. Money received and spent for lobbying is supposed to be reported quarterly to the House Clerk and the Senate Secretary, showing the identity of contributors of $500 or more and the identity of those to whom aggregate expenditures of more than $10 have been made.

A lobbyist is required to show in his reports the proposed legislation he was employed to influence and the names of publications in which he has caused articles or editorials to be published.

Violation of the law is punishable by a fine of up to $5,000 and imprisonment up to a year and prohibition from lobbying for 3 years.

The act does not apply to activities regulated by the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, which deals with campaign contributions and expenditures, or to political party committees.

Senate and House committee reports accompanying the law when it was passed were identical. Both said the law applied mainly to three classes of lobbyists: (1) those who without visiting the Capitol initiated propaganda letters and telegrams from all over the country; (2) those who are employed to come to the Capitol * * * and spend their time in Washington presumably exerting some mysterious influence on legislation but carefully conceal from Congressmen the purpose of their presence; and (3) a third class of entirely honest and respectable representatives of business, professional, and philanthropic organizations who come to Washington openly and frankly to express their views * * * many of whom serve a useful and perfectly legitimate purpose.

Both reports said the act did not apply to organizations formed for other purposes whose efforts to influence legislation are merely incidental to the purposes for which formed. This was probably the first monkey wrench that started confusing the works.

The words "principal purpose" have caused confusion ever since. Some organizations and individuals do not register, or register but do not file spending reports, on the ground that lobbying is not their principal purpose. Others in the same circumstances follow the principle of "if in doubt, do".

In upholding the constitutionality of the law in *United States* v. *Harris* in 1954, the Supreme Court severely limited coverage in a way that seemed counter to the congressional authors' intention.

The Court laid down these prerequisites to coverage:

1. The person must have solicited, collected, or received contributions;

2. One of the main purposes of such person, or one of the main purposes of such contributions, must have been to influence the passage or defeat of legislation by Congress, and

3. The intended method of accomplishing this purpose must have been through direct communication with Members of Congress.

Some groups which formerly filed reports claim the Harris decision made the law inapplicable to them because they do not engage in direct communication with Congressmen; some that lobbying is not their principal purpose; some that their function is not to influence legislation but to inform and educate their members and the public.

Among the national groups which did not file spending reports in 1961 were the American Bankers Association, Americans for Democratic Action, the American Public Power Association and the National Association of Manufacturers.

The NAM has not filed a spending report since 1950, claiming it is not subject to the reporting requirements, although its lobbyists do register.

Students of the lobby law point out that the Supreme Court's first prerequisite for coverage by the law exempts a corporation or group which might spend several million dollars to obtain passage of legislation solely to line its own pockets, as long as it spends only its own money. Some of the Nation's largest defense contractors, incidentally, have large Washington offices but no registered lobbyists.

Students of the law argue that the Supreme Court's second prerequisite—main purpose—is difficult to apply and leaves too much to a lobbyist's conscience. It is suggested that a dollars-and-cents standard on lobby spending would be more practical than the purpose test.

The direct communication prerequisite exempts from coverage of the law the area where the most lobbying money is spent.

However, investigation would show that, unpoliced, even those lobbyists registering and filing quarterly reports do not comply fully with the letter of the law.

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Democrat of Wisconsin, told the Senate last year he estimated that less than 25 percent of all lobbyists in Washington comply fully with the requirements. He based the statement on a study his staff made of oil and gas industry representatives during the 1960 session of Congress.

"Of the 41 lobbyists who did file reports," he said, "36 violated the law by failing to give their specific legislative interests, 21 failed to comply with the law by stating whether they had received contributions of more than $500, 20 illegally refused to list the parties they had paid money to, and 17 did not state the nature of their employers' businesses as the law requires."

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 5, 1963]

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—EVERYBODY HAS A LOBBYIST

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—Just about everybody has a lobbyist or lobbyists these days, at least for part of his total interests—even if he's not paying for it.

Doctors have their American Medical Association lobbyists. Bankers have theirs. Workingmen have various labor union lobbyists; nonunion workers have certain business lobbyists who work indirectly for some of their aims.

Practically every kind of business has its own trade association that lobbies for it, and other groups try to further business' common aims.

If you are a veteran, there are organizations looking out for your particular interests in this field.

It requires a lot of thought to look at the list of organizations registered as lobbies or represented by individual lobbyists and think of somebody not represented directly or indirectly, at least in some way, by registered lobbyists.

Those registered under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act range from spokesmen for the Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, the AMA, the AFL–CIO, and the American Legion to the Council for Exceptional Children, the Christian Amendment Movement, the Sacramento (Calif.) Municipal Utility District, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

In between are lobbyists for numerous tribes of Indians.

The 312 pressure groups which filed spending reports totaling about $3,770,100 in 1961 were classified by Congressional Quarterly, the Washington research organization, in 6 categories. This breakdown showed that 171 business groups reported spending $1,598,091, 52 citizens groups $437,695, 40 employee and labor groups $857,768, 22 farm groups $365,887, 10 military and veterans groups $133,734, and 17 professional groups $376,911.

Five organizations reported spending more than $100,000 each on lobbying during 1961, and 14 other groups reported spending more than $50,000 each. (See accompanying table for a list of these groups and their reported spending.)

Eight organizations reported spending more than $50,000 each during the first half of 1962, while 11 other groups reported spending more than $25,000 apiece during that period. Compilations for the whole of 1962 are not yet available.

The 171 business lobby groups that reported spending in 1961 included the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, scores of trade and industry associations like the National Association of Chain Drug Stores and the American Petroleum Institute, and many individual businesses, like insurance and oil companies.

They included some notable omissions, like the National Association of Manufacturers, which claims the reporting requirements do not cover it.

The 52 citizens groups included such organizations as the American Cancer Society, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the National Reclamation Association, the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Committee To Support U.S. Congress Bill Creating a Commission on Obscene Matters and Materials, and the National Council on the Facts of Overpopulation.

Employee and labor organizations included a dozen organizations in the various transportation industries, 14 Federal employee organizations and a number of AFL–CIO affiliate groups.

Among farm groups represented by lobbyists were the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Farmers Union, the National Grange, and organizations of cattlemen, citrus growers, vegetable growers, milk producers, soil conservation districts, wheat growers, turkey growers, wool producers, cotton growers, and tobacco growers.

Military and veterans lobbying groups, in addition to the American Legion, included the American Veterans of World War II (AMVETS), the Disabled American Veterans, the Disabled Officers Association, the Jewish War Veterans, the Reserve Officers Association, the Retired Officers Association, and the Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc.

The latter group, incidentally, known as the "Wonnies," was the biggest spender of all lobbies in 1960, according to the reports; it reported spending $200,623 then in behalf of a pension bill, mostly on bringing World War I vets to Washington.

The 17 professional groups reporting in 1961 included dental, nurse, optometric, surgeon, veterinary, professional women, engineer and social worker associations, in addition to the AMA.

The more powerful pressure groups have whole batteries of registered lobbyists. For example, during the third quarter of 1962, lobbying reports were filed by 10 persons for the American Farm Bureau Federation, by 7 for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, by 6 each for the AMA and the AFL–CIO national headquarters, and by 5 for the American Petroleum Institute.

Many lobbyists are integral units, such as executive vice presidents, of the organizations for which they lobby. Many are Washington business representatives of business firms elsewhere and spend only part time at legislation influencing. Some lobbyists, though, are full-time pros who do nothing but lobby, sometimes for several clients.

Of the 239 registrations in 1962 that represented individuals or organizations filing for the first time, 188 were individuals, 14 were public relations or law firms and 37 were organizations.

Thirty-five of the individuals or firms were registered lobbyists for more than one employee, representing a total of 88 employers. One Washington law firm registered for 13 clients, another for 8, another for 7.

Many of the better known lobbyists are former Members of Congress. Turning lobbyist is quite the accepted thing for a Congressman to do when defeated or looking for a better paying job. About 85 have registered as lobbyists after leaving office since the lobby law was passed in 1946, but some of these are dead and some others apparently are no longer active as lobbyists.

Probably the best known of those still active is former Senator Scott W. Lucas, Democrat, of Illinois, onetime Senate majority leader, who usually has several clients. Another well-known one is former Representative Andrew J. Biemiller, the AFL–CIO's chief lobbyist. Another is former Representative Frank Ikard, of Texas, who resigned from Congress last year to become the American Petroleum Institute's chief lobbyist and executive vice president, at a salary said to be $50,000 a year.

Quite a few former high officials in the executive branch of the Government also turn lobbyist, especially after changes in administration. The best known of these is probably Oscar L. Chapman, President Truman's Secretary of the Interior.

It has often been said that in Washington there are lobbyists for everybody except "the people." But this is an oversimplification not as accurate as it sounds.

In the first place, all lobbies represent people. Put them all together and you have quite a lot of people and different kinds. Secondly, Members of Congress are lobbyists themselves—for the people in their States and districts—and work to influence each other.

Finally, the largest paid lobby of all in Washington consists not of spokesmen for the AMA, the NAM, the AFL–CIO or any such group. It is made up of spokesmen for the various agencies of the Government—Cabinet members, "legislative liaison" staff members, experts in various fields—who, under the direction of Presidential assistants as expert as any business lobbyists, push legislation or oppose it, often as effectively as any "special interest" lobbyists.

This network is at the President's fingertips, and some Members of Congress have called this "White House lobby" the most powerful there is. The "White House lobby" has almost unlimited sources of information, unusual powers of persuasion in patronage, public works projects and other ways to pay off Congressmen for support, and the best forum in the world for presenting its views.

What it spends influencing Congressmen has never been added up. But if it were, this lobbying expense would be impressive.

Theoretically, the "White House lobby" is a lobby for the people, since they elect the President. Actually, of course, it may represent only those who think like the President. But if it does not represent the people, they have the chance to change that by choosing a different President, just as any special interest organization has the chance to change the course of its lobbying by selecting a different administration.

TOP SPENDERS

The following 19 organizations reported spending more than $50,000 on lobbying during 1961, the latest year for which complete figures are available:

American Medical Association	$163,405
AFL-CIO (national headquarters)	139,919
American Farm Bureau Federation	111,364
American Legion	103,566
U.S. Savings and Loan League	101,801
National Farmers Union	88,273
American Trucking Associations	84,986
National Committee for Insurance Taxation	73,012
District Lodge 44, International Association of Machinists	71,737
National Housing Conference, Inc.	68,675
International Brotherhood of Teamsters	68,012
National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc.	55,936
National Association of Electric Companies	55,205
American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies	54,028
National Association of Home Builders	53,712
Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy	53,101
National Education Association	51,910
National Retail Merchants	51,042
National Association of Letter Carriers	50,920

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 6, 1963]

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—TEXANS ARE ACTIVE LOBBYISTS

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—Texans are prominent among the lobbyists in Washington, and quite a few Texas interests have representation of their own in the so-called Third House, in addition to the countless ones represented by lobbyists for various trade and industry associations.

One of the most successful lobbyists in the Capital, and by far the one most identified with the Lone Star State, is Dale Miller, a 53-year-old native of Corpus Christi.

Congressmen call him the dean of Texas lobbyists.

Holiday magazine once called Miller and his wife, whose friends call her Scooter, a "social lobbying team par excellence." It said that in 20 years in Washington they had "danced rings around other lobbyists on the party circuit and know just about everyone worthwhile to Miller's clients in the city."

Though Miller says he and Mrs. Miller don't do nearly as much entertaining as they get credit for, the birthday parties they gave for 18 years for the late Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn made them the talk of Washington. This annual event became a 440-person party with an all-star crowd.

Miller has long been close to Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, as he was to Speaker Rayburn. His father, Roy Miller, a lobbyist too, was a friend of both Rayburn and JOHNSON. Roy Miller helped JOHNSON get the job that first brought him to Washington years ago as an administrative assistant to Congressman Richard Kleberg.

Dale Miller grew up in Corpus Christi and as a boy did cub reporting chores on the Corpus Christi Caller, which his father owned then. After college—New Mexico Military Institute, the University of Texas, the University of Missouri Journalism School—he taught journalism at the University of Texas, wrote for Texas Weekly magazine and handled publicity for the Texas centennial celebration of 1936.

In 1941 he moved to Washington to represent the Dallas Chamber of Commerce as an experiment, which proved so successful that the Dallas Chamber is still one of the clients for whom he lobbies.

His other clients are the Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, of which he has been executive vice president since 1946; the Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., and the Port of Corpus Christi, which he represents only in navigation matters.

The canal association and Texas Gulf Sulphur, which have offices in Houston, are clients he inherited from his father, who represented them before his death in 1946. Dale had shared the same office, his present suite in the Mayflower Hotel here, with his father. He was familiar with the clients' affairs and naturally gravitated into representing them after his father's death.

Miller describes himself as "about the most unlobbying lobbyist you ever saw," saying he does very little persuading on legislation.

Actually, he said, in none of his jobs is the primary purpose influencing legislation. Most of his work involves visits to Government agencies, helping visitors to Washington and giving people in Washington information about Texas, he said.

He testifies every year before House and Senate Appropriation Committees, about every other year before Public Works Committees of both Houses, and occasionally before other congressional committees on general legislation in which the Dallas chamber is interested. He appears from time to time before the Civil Aeronautics Board and other executive or independent agencies in behalf of his clients.

Being here permanently and well known for his interests, Miller says he never has to ask a Congressman to vote for or against particular legislation. "They know my interests," he said.

Indeed, some say Miller is consulted more often by Congressmen than they are consulted by him because he is an expert on intracoastal waterway affairs, the Trinity River and other subjects.

He says he is more useful to his clients simply by finding out what is going to happen and alerting them than by influencing what happens.

Miller is proud of his profession and thinks it is essential and important and becoming more so as civilization becomes more complex and Congress must deal with more technical matters.

In frequent conflict with Miller's activities as lobbyist for water transportation interests are the activities of another Texas lobbyist, Tom Pickett. One of several former Congressmen from Texas who registered as lobbyists after leaving office, Pickett now represents the Association of American Railroads. He formerly represented the National Coal Association.

Former Congressman Fritz G. Lanham of Texas has been registered recently as a lobbyist for the National Patent Council, Inc., and Quality Brands Associates of America, Inc.

The chief lobbyist for the powerful American Petroleum Institute is former Congressman Frank N. Ikard of Wichita Falls, who resigned from Congress last year to become executive vice president of the API and is now its president.

Former Congressman J. T. Rutherford, of Odessa, who lost his bid for reelection last November, became a legislative consultant soon after his term expired and said he would be doing some lobbying. Some of it will be for the American Trucking Association, Inc.

Former Republican Congressman Ben H. Guill of Pampa, who served a short term by special election in 1950, is a lobbyist for the National Automobile Dealers Association and has in the past done lobbying for the American Smelting & Refining Co.

Another Texan, like Ikard, lobbies for a major oil industry organization. He is Joe T. Dickerson of Houston, who represents the Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association.

Two of the American Medical Association's six registered lobbyists are Texans—Dr. Roy T. Lester and Cecil B. Dickson. Dr. Lester, from Dallas, is the AMA's Washington office manager. He formerly was the chief medical officer for the Blue Cross-Blue Shield organization in Texas. Dickson, who was a close friend of the late Speaker Rayburn, is a former Texas newspaperman, Associated Press reporter and once coordinator of information for the House of Representatives.

The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, headquartered at League City, is represented here by Clair P. Guess, Jr., who recently moved to Washington from League City.

Joe G. Fender, of Houston, general attorney for the National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, is registered as a lobbyist for that organization.

C. Herschel Schooley, a former Abilene newspaperman and journalism teacher, who has spent 20 years in Government information positions, recently resigned his position as press assistant to Senator JOHN G. TOWER, Republican of Texas, to become Washington office manager and a lobbyist for the Independent Bankers Association.

Several Texas oil and gas companies have registered lobbyists.

One well-known one is James H. Pipkin, a Texan, who represents Texaco, Inc.

Harold S. Skinner of Houston is registered to represent the Continental Oil Co., which is headquartered in Houston.

The Humble Oil & Refining Co., headquartered in Houston, is represented by Paul H. Long of Houston and Charles C. Keeble and John M. Sprague, both of Washington.

Leonard F. Lee and the Washington law firm of Hedrick & Lane are registered as lobbyists for the Tennessee Gas Transmission Co. of Houston.

The Texas Eastern Transmission Corp. of Houston is represented by the Washington law firm of Chapman & Friedman, which is registered as a lobbyist. This is the law firm

of Oscar L. Chapman, President Truman's Secretary of the Interior.

Dick Tullis of Dallas is registered as a lobbyist for the Superior Oil Co. of Houston and Los Angeles, Calif.

William L. Shea of Washington is registered as a lobbyist for the Delhi-Taylor Oil Corp. of Dallas.

W. O. Reed of Dallas is registered as a lobbyist for Texas railroads.

Several persons have registered as lobbyists for Dresser Industries, Inc., of Dallas, and two have registered as lobbyists for the American Life Insurance Co. of Dallas.

Sydney C. Reagan of Dallas is registered as a lobbyist for the Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association of Durant, Okla.

The Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries of Dallas and the Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., of Lubbock are registered as lobbying organizations.

The North Texas Municipal Water District at Wylie, the Texas Aluminum Co., Inc., at Rockwall, and the Wherry Housing Association have Roland Boyd of McKinney as their registered lobbyist.

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 7, 1963]

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—LOBBYISTS WINCE AT TITLE

(By Felton West)

WASHINGTON.—A common caricature of a lobbyist pictures a fat, cigar-smoking, diamond-stickpin-wearing slob carrying a suitcase of bills to be doled out to lawmakers, whom he buttonholes in legislative halls, saturates with food and booze and butters up with blondes.

The picture had some basis in fact many years ago. But it is probably not accurate anywhere in the United States any more, though some elements of it still appear in State capitals.

Lobbying now lacks the color of the old days, and the picture is far from descriptive of the current Washington lobbyist. But the "new lobbyists," as Potomac persuaders like to think of themselves if they have to embrace the term "lobbyists" at all, are still having to overcome that picture implanted in the public mind.

In State capitals, lobbyists still call themselves lobbyists. But in Washington the term is unfashionable with lobbyists—it makes some of them wince—though they can't escape it because the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act's title hung it on them.

The "new lobbyist" calls himself a "Washington representative," "legislative counsel," "consultant," "legislative liaison man" or "information specialist."

His business is big business, and he is more businesslike than his professional ancestors—in fact, so businesslike he is often dull by comparison with flamboyant lobbyists of the past.

The names he gives himself actually describe him better than "lobbyist" in many cases.

He is trying, and succeeding slowly, to convince the world he is straight where some of his predecessors were crooked, a gentleman where they were boors, sophisticated where they were ignorant, honorable where some of them were bribers and cheats.

He may be a former newspaperman; many lobbyists are. He may be a former public relations man, or "press agent"; many lobbyists are. He may be a lawyer who spends only a little time lobbying, as many do. He may have become a lobbyist, as many do, via the route of petty civil servant to law student to Capitol Hill staff man to Washington lawyer to high-paid legislative persuader.

He may be a former Congressman or Senator, as many are, and have a distinct advantage over most lobbyists because he has the privilege for life of going on the floor of the legislative body he served in and talking with present Members at any time.

The Government has become so complex in the last 30-odd years that, if he is successful, the lobbyist likely has had years of familiarity with it.

The successful lobbyist may earn anywhere from $15,000 to $50,000 a year. If he is especially sharp and has a loaded client with sufficient interest at stake, he may draw down $100,000.

If he is successful, he is probably articulate, convivial, a hustler, and has an organizing knack. He will ooze confidence in whatever he is promoting and convince you be believes sincerely that what he advocates is in the national interest, whether he does or not.

He will probably be very persuasive, but not necessarily highly influential. Most lobbyists belittle the idea that they and most others are personally very influential with Congressmen, and they are probably telling the truth. Of course, when selling a client on themselves many probably tell a different story.

Most are much more successful at channeling toward Congressmen pressure from persons more influential than themselves than they are at influencing the lawmakers themselves.

A spokesman for one of the biggest lobbies in the country says a lot of money is wasted on lobbying in Washington because lobbyists don't have the personal influence the spenders think they do. The usual lobbyist does not have any personal influence with more than a few Congressmen, he said.

The lobbyist nowadays has a much bigger theater of operations than the persuader of the past. He works on at least five fronts.

First, in the only activity that by definition of the law is actually lobbying, he works directly with Members of Congress and their staff members, trying to influence legislation.

Then he represents his clients before various agencies of the executive branch of Government, roaming the halls and offices of places like the Pentagon, seeking information or contacts, trying to shape regulations and specifications in his client's interests in visits with Cabinet members and subordinates, testifying before quasi-judicial boards or arranging for others to testify, seeking administration support of his clients' legislative objectives.

None of these activities is subject to the lobbying regulation act, although some are subject to certain agency regulations on ex parte communications or other agency disclosure requirements.

The lobbyist acts as a public relations man for his clients, seeking to help their image in the press by issuing press releases or planting information with newsmen at the National Press Club.

He keeps his clients posted on what is happening in Washington that affects their interests. He may write regular reports or report regularly by telephone. Often he will try to stir them into lobbying or prodding others into it.

Much of his time is spent maintaining social rapport with various officials of value to both him and his client. He attends many parties and entertains a lot himself. One Congressman, who said he seldom accepts lobbyists' invitations, claims he would be going to parties 15 nights a week if he accepted all. New Congressmen accept plenty, but the older Members learn to be highly selective.

Naturally, Congressmen with seniority—particularly committee chairmen—are the lobbyist's preferred targets. But they are also the busiest and most difficult to see.

A chairman of two House committees, for example, said he would be talking to lobbyists 18 hours a day if he would see all who tried to see him, so he sees very few. But a Congressman with little seniority said not even one lobbyist a day tries to visit him.

In his lobbying activity as narrowly defined by the law, the lobbyist is a legislative engineer who concentrates most of his efforts on congressional committees handling legislation in which he is interested, particularly the chairmen and ranking members. The power of committees has grown with the expansion of Congress and, just in the past 2 years, with the weakening of congressional leadership in both Houses.

Just winning the favor of a committee chairman is doing half of the lobbyist's job, a prominent persuader says.

If the lobbyist wants to pass a bill, he often will write it himself or have it written, then find a Congressman—preferably a committee chairman and one for whom he has done favors—to introduce it.

He will find witnesses for the bill before the committee, perhaps write their testimony and coach them on how to answer questions, plant friendly questions with committeemen. He may testify himself. He may help the committee staff prepare a report on the bill that will get it off to a good start on the House or Senate floor. He may write the sponsor's floor speech.

Generally, he will try to make a case for his bill with facts, while buttering up the chairman and committee members to vote it out. But if mere facts won't do the trick, there are other ways he tries to win friends and influence Congressmen.

He may arrange for some legal business to come the way of the law firm in which a Congressman has not given up his interest. He may make a campaign donation or arrange for somebody else to. He may promise blocs of votes, or opposition. He may arrange a speaking engagement for which the Congressman will get an honorarium—$1,000 would not be unusual.

He may help a busy and expense-burdened Congressman in many other ways, such as taking him on fishing trips, finding tickets for sold out Broadway shows, making it possible for a daughter to have a nice social debut or be queen of the such-and-such festival. He may pick up an assortment of night club and hotel bills and dinner checks along the way to success.

Probably he will be more discreet than to say he's doing anything for the Congressman's vote. He had better be discreet, for opposition lobbyists will be looking for a chance to expose him and pour his work down the drain.

When the bill reaches the floor, he'll count votes, stiffen the backbone of waverers and direct pressure from home against opponents.

While doing everything else, he may have been arranging for influential contributors and constituents of various Congressmen to call them and urge support for his bill. And he has probably been working for a long time on indirect lobbying; that is, lobbying the people back in the Congressmen's districts so that they'll put on pressure with letters, telegrams and telephone calls.

If the lobbyist is opposed to a bill, he will also concentrate on the committee and try to bury it there, using many of the same tactics as in supporting one.

Friendship with a committee chairman, or bringing the right influence to bear upon him, may get committee vacancies filled with friendly Congressmen, get pesky legislation dropped, get an investigating committee deflected to a less bothersome pursuit, get a bill written in obscure ineffective language, or leave a tax loophole undisturbed.

How effective lobbyists are is a subject of much debate. It is easy to show that Lobby X spent so many thousands of dollars and bill Y in which it was interested was passed; but it is nigh impossible to show that the bill would not have been passed anyway and that Congressmen have not voted the way their constituents collectively probably would have voted.

Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota, says some lobbies "are wholly ineffective but take credit for what happens without, in fact, having in any way influenced events."

There are indications that the most effective lobbying consists of merely presenting true facts to Congressmen and then directing the propaganda at the people, to turn them into lobbyists.

Though lobbies are often accused of bringing ruthless pressure on Congress, lobbyists themselves and most Congressmen say the persuaders actually perform a very useful service by providing Congress expert information on legislation. To the claim that they often provide slanted information, they reply that a counter lobby on the other side of most questions will slant the information from the other side and Congress can get the truth somewhere in the middle.

Senator McCarthy has another argument: That expert lobbyists can help maintain a balance between Congress and the executive branch. The executive branch usually has a prepared case on legislation, sustained by expert witnesses, he said. Congress can offer in opposition the knowledge and experience of its Members, committee staffs or assistants, he said, but "often this is an unfair contest." The lobbyists can make it fairer, he said.

[From The Houston Post, Mar. 8, 1963]

The Patient Persuaders—Lobbyists Enlisting Public

(By Felton West)

Washington.—Senator Stephen M. Young, Democrat, of Ohio, tells the story that more than a century ago Senator Thomas Hart Benton, of Missouri, quickly gave in to pressure from several lobbyists to help nail down a profitable ship subsidy.

The story goes that Benton threw in one condition: That "when the vessels are finished they will be used to take all such damned rascals as you out of the country."

Young commented:

"Today Senator Benton's inspired remedy might be impossible. Thanks to the activities of the 'new lobby' such a solution would mean a big population loss."

He's right.

The reason is that today's lobbyist is not just going his solitary way trying to put the bite on Congressmen. He's trying to make lobbyists for his cause out of everybody else.

Indirectly, by interesting as much as possible of the general public in his cause, he is putting far more pressure on the lawmakers than he could possibly exert himself.

There is a growing trend toward this kind of lobbying, which already is pretty full-blown.

The spare-no-expense, no-holds-barred publicity and public relations campaigns are exciting the voters and turning the heat on lawmakers with pleasant or angry letters, telegrams and votes that are far more persuasive or frightening than mere lobbyists face to face.

Such campaigns sometimes express the will of the majority. But often they distort, exaggerate and oversimplify, and sometimes it is not clear who is behind them.

Said Senator John L. McClellan's special committee investigating lobbying in 1956–57:

"The ability of pressure groups to stir up such deluges (of inspired letters and telegrams) is well known to all Members of Congress. In the absence of adequate disclosure laws concerning pressure groups, Members of the Congress can only conjecture as to whether or not direct communications they receive are spontaneous expressions of constituents' views, or strands in a net held by the unseen hand of a pressure group attempting to scoop up a vote here, a vote there."

Senator Young said the abuses in political pressure today are precisely in this area.

The way the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act has been interpreted—as applying only to direct communications with legislators by persons principally engaged in trying to influence legislation—Congress is barred from policing these indirect efforts of the new lobby.

Thus the expenditures reported under the lobbying act are a feeble gage of how much is really spent on lobbying these days. Only a fraction of the cost of these massive advertising and public relations campaigns, or none of it, shows up on spending reports.

This probably is much of the explanation of why the total of lobby spending reported has dropped and leveled off in the neighborhood of $4 million a year in spite of inflation, the expansion of lobbying that is obvious but difficult to prove, and the annual totals that were much higher in the early days of lobby registration.

Illustrative of the magnitude of such indirect lobbying campaigns is the program sponsored by the American Medical Association against President Truman's compulsory health insurance legislation for about 3 years, starting in 1949.

The AMA hired a California public relations firm, Whitaker & Baxter, for a grassroots campaign which, according to testimony before Senator McClellan's committee, cost the doctors' association $4,678,157. Whitaker & Baxter registered and reported under the lobbying act, the committee said, although it allegedly made no contacts with Congress and confined its activities to public relations work at the grassroots level.

The McClellan committee developed information about an expensive campaign conducted in the mid-1950's by an organization called the Natural Gas and Oil Resources Committee (NGO), which supported the Harris-Fulbright natural gas bill.

NGO was organized by a cross-section of the oil and gas industry in October 1954, with the avowed purpose of carrying out a long-range educational program about the gas industry, including the harmful effects of Federal regulation and the benefits of an unregulated industry.

NGO raised $1,950,000 in contributions from more than 1,000 donors and between October 1954, and March 31, 1956, spent $1,753,513 in an advertising and publicity effort.

It did not consider this lobbying, since it made no direct contact with Congress to influence legislation, so it did not register under the lobbying act.

The donors, it developed, were counting on considering their contributions as operating expenses for tax purposes, until the McClellan committee brought this to the attention of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Bureau ruled they did not qualify as allowable tax deductions.

Afterward, the McClellan committee proposed that the Lobbying Act be amended to require reporting of expenditures on advertising and public relations campaigns containing implicit appeals to the public to contact Congress to influence legislation.

Pressure mail and telegrams from such campaigns often flood Congressmen's offices. Often the communications are obviously parts of inspired campaigns. Sometimes those who own the signed names don't even know the communications are sent.

In May 1961, Senator Young received thousands of letters from Ohio, each asking that he oppose Senate bills 1089 and 1197 concerning the railroad industry. He concluded this was an inspired mail campaign, and a mighty sloppy one at that. Each was addressed Stephen A. Young, whereas his middle initial is M. And the lobbyist made a telling mistake in having writers use bill numbers. Most Senators don't know bills by numbers themselves, let alone the people out in the sticks.

The McClellan committee conducted hearings on two spurious telegram campaigns. It showed that 1 Minnesota Senator in 1956 got about 900 telegrams in 2 days urging passage of the Harris-Fulbright bill and that many of the wires were sent without the knowledge or authorization of purported senders. An oil company had staged and financed the campaign.

Also in 1956, the two Senators from Massachusetts each received 80 telegrams opposing a social security bill which, though varying somewhat in content, often spelled amendment with a double m. Two insurance agents had charged the costs to their firm, the investigation showed, and some of the purported senders said they had not authorized the wires.

A campaign, fostered by the U.S. Savings and Loan League and others, last year demonstrated how a well-timed grassroots lobbying effort can bowl over Congress and the President without much of its expense being subject to reporting under the Lobbying Act.

It dropped a hailstorm of mail on Senators, urging that they oppose President Kennedy's proposal for withholding income taxes from dividend and interest payments, just as taxes have been withheld on wages for years.

Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, said he got about 75,000 letters against the plan, while Senator Joseph S. Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, said he got about 60,000.

The campaign resulted from sample letters sent out by the Savings and Loan League to its several thousand member institutions to help them prepare letters to their millions of savers.

The resulting flood of letters to Congressmen contained thousands indicating the writers thought Mr. Kennedy was proposing a brandnew tax on dividends and interest, instead of just a new way of collecting taxes already owed but often not paid.

So many misunderstood that Mr. Kennedy and the Treasury Department complained that the lobbyists had badly misrepresented his proposal. But it did not do any good to complain. The Senate killed his plan 66 to 20, although it had been passed by the House before the letterwriters went into action.

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 9, 1963]

The Patient Persuaders—Foreign Lobby To Come Under Senate Committee

(By Felton West)

Washington.—Like domestic lobbying directed at the American public, lobbying by representatives of foreign interests has not received much attention from Congress in past years.

But some startling testimony about it may be developed this month by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which began both public and closed hearings on the subject last Monday after months of investigation.

Already, in the first 3 days of hearings, Committee Chairman J. W. Fulbright, Democrat, of Arkansas, has charged that the Department of Justice has failed to enforce well the existing law for disclosing foreign lobbyists' activities. Already Fulbright has accused the Department of State of being "rather casual" about the law's enforcement and failing to complain about lack of compliance with it.

Already, a State Department official testifying has suggested new legislation to require the licensing of foreign agents, subjecting them to review of their qualifications, and to outlaw foreign contributions to American political campaigns.

And already a Justice Department spokesman has testified that the criminal penalty in the present law is a heavy but unwieldy weapon and recommended that Congress give his Department a new tool. He suggested

authority to seek injunctions against foreign agents operating until they satisfy disclosure requirements.

Last year, when Congress dealt again with a bill establishing foreign sugar quotas, lobbyists for both domestic and foreign sugar interests were, in Senator Fulbright's words, "thick as flies" around sugar on Capitol Hill.

Fulbright started his committee's extensive investigation because of this.

Both Fulbright and President Kennedy criticized the fact that fees of some of the foreign lobbyists depended on the size of the sugar quotas they could get from Congress for their clients.

If foreign governments found such success in lobbying for sugar quotas, Fulbright said, they might try to increase their military and economic aid from the United States that way—or maybe already had.

The committee is trying to assess the extent to which foreign agents try to influence U.S. policies, through Congress, the executive branch, and the American public.

Unlike domestic lobbying, foreign lobbying of the public is subject to reporting.

Lobbying on the sugar bill, which sparked the current investigation, was one of the most intensive efforts in a long time, and many Congressmen thought it got out of hand.

Senator Fulbright said only four lobbyists had spoken at public hearings when Congress revised the sugar quota bill in 1956, but last year no less than 22 were heard. He was disturbed not only by the proliferation of them, but also by the types of contracts they had and the size of their fees.

Shortly before he announced the investigation, the Senate Finance Committee released a document showing fees paid lobbyists who sought changes in the sugar bill. The information came from statements filed at the committee's request by 15 lobbyists for domestic interests and 25 for foreign interests.

Examples of what the document showed were:

That Oscar L. Chapman, who was Secretary of the Interior in the Truman administration, represented Mexican sugar interests and would receive a $200,000 retainer over 4 years beginning January 1, 1961, plus 25 cents a ton for any increase in Mexico's basic quota.

That I. Irving Davidson, representing Ecuadoran sugar producers, was to receive basic compensation of $500 but was to receive $1 a ton for all sugar shipped from Ecuador to the United States for 1 year after July 1, 1962, and 50 cents a ton for the following 3 years.

That James W. Riddell, representing the India Sugar Mills Association, was to receive a basic fee of $50,000 plus up to $5,000 in expenses; but if India received a quota for 3 years or more, he was to receive $99,000 plus up to $15,000 for expenses.

Riddell is a member of the law firm of Donald Dawson, one-time White House aid to President Truman.

Foreign sugar lobbyists included former assistants to Presidents Eisenhower, Truman, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, a former Congressman, a former congressional adviser and member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, a former Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, a former General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, and a former Assistant Secretary of Labor, in addition to former Interior Secretary Chapman.

Democratic industry lobbyists included a former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

Nearly all, if not all, of the domestic and foreign sugar lobbyists had registered under the Federal Lobbying Act. The lobbyists for foreign interests were registered also with the Department of Justice, as required by the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938.

Administration of this act is the main concern of the Fulbright committee.

Although the term "foreign lobbyist" sometimes is applied to all who register under this act, this is very loose usage. By definition of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act, such agents are not really lobbyists unless they work directly on Congress trying to influence legislation. That is when they should register with the House and the Senate.

Under the Foreign Agents Act, every agent doing business of a political nature in the United States for a foreign principal must register with the Justice Department, describe the nature of his work, list his offices and employees, list the principal's activities and report every 6 months all funds received and spent in the United States.

Distributed propaganda, printed matter sent through the mail and speeches on radio and television must be labeled foreign propaganda and copies furnished to the Library of Congress.

The Justice Department requires foreign agents to fill out registration and reporting forms much more extensive than those used for the lobby regulation act.

Fulbright's committee staff, in a published preliminary study, said the four forms would satisfactorily fulfill the disclosure requirements if completed fully and accurately.

But the study said that so far the requirement of full and accurate completion of the forms has been enforced only sporadically by the Justice Department.

It said 29 indictments had been brought by the Justice Department for violations of the act between 1939 and mid-1962. But it said the Department had not brought a single action since 1945 for failure to list all activities, expenses, or principals, although a study of the registration statements disclosed a number of apparent omissions and evasions.

The study also said the Government had never brought a single case under the 1942 political propaganda labeling provisions of the act.

As of last June 30, 411 foreign agents were registered in active status. A breakdown of the 376 active agents at the end of 1960 showed 202 American citizens and domestic business firms and 174 aliens and foreign concerns.

Many large U.S. law, advertising and public relations firms and many prominent American individuals are or have been registered foreign agents.

They include Thomas E. Dewey, the former Governor of New York and 1948 Republican presidential candidate; former Congressman Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., of New York; former Secretary of State Dean Acheson; Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat, of Connecticut, and George W. Ball, now Under Secretary of State.

Foreign agents promote travel in countries they represent, seek U.S. loans, promote industrial development, buy embassies, draw up peace treaties, buy armaments and machinery, conduct propaganda campaigns, lobby bills through Congress and other things.

Their activities concerning legislation have been little explored heretofore.

[From the Houston Post, March 11, 1963]

The Patient Persuaders—Tax Deduction Act Will Reduce Lobbying Expenses

(By Felton West)

Washington.—As if there were not already enough unidentified lobbying, Congress passed a law last year that will make lobbying cheaper and no doubt encourage a lot more.

It made expenses for direct lobbying of Congress by businesses tax deductible.

The deduction feature passed through the House of Representatives a sleeper—"a sleeping giant," Senator Estes Kefauver, Democrat, of Tennessee, called it critically—without debate after the House Ways and Means Committee quietly slipped it into what had started out to be President Kennedy's tax reform bill. The committee held no public hearings on it.

President Kennedy had not proposed this windfall.

Not until the bill was being considered in the Senate did opposition come alive. A small group of Senators, mostly so-called liberals, then fought it stubbornly but lost the fight to kill it by a vote of 51 to 13.

The deduction provision has been labeled by some critics the Lobbyists Aid Act. It has also been called the Legislators Aid Act, since one highly disputable argument made for it was that it might bring legislators information lobbyists might not otherwise present.

Another critic suggested it be called the bill to authorize the purchase of State legislatures. The reasoning: Its biggest effect will be to increase lobbying in the State capitols tremendously.

Congress made the deduction apply to expenses for lobbying State and local legislative bodies as well as itself.

Here's what the provision, section 3 of Public Law 87–834, provides:

1. A business firm may deduct for income tax purposes all "ordinary and necessary" expenses for appearing before individual legislators, committees or legislative bodies of all levels of government concerning legislation or proposed legislation of direct interest to it or an organization of which it is a member. The deduction includes travel, preparation and submission of statements and the sending of communications. It does not apply to entertainment.

2. The business firm and an organization it belongs to may also deduct expenses of communicating with each other about legislation or proposed legislation of direct interest to them.

3. Dues paid by the business firm to such an organization are also deductible to the extent to which the organization uses them for lobbying.

The law specifies that no deductions will be allowed for spending in behalf of candidates in political campaigns or for advertising or other grass-roots methods to influence the general public on legislative matters, elections or referendums.

The latter specification was all the comfort Senate opponents of the deduction feature could find in the law. An effort to let business firms and their trade associations deduct lobbying expenditures for all purposes, including grass-roots campaigns, was made but failed.

The deduction provisions became effective for taxable years beginning after last Dec. 31.

Except for the few critical Senators, about the only voices raised in Washington against the deduction provision were those of the Treasury Department, the AFL–CIO and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon told the Senate Finance Committee the provision would be a "substantial change" in the law, which since 1919 had forbidden deductions for lobbying expenses. Dillon said the Treasury was opposed to all of several forms of the lobby deduction that were discussed. But the administration made no real fight against the change.

AFL–CIO spokesmen, who urged the Senate to kill the provision, said it would permit corporations to double their expenditures on lobbying and thereby increase substantially their lobbying activity.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, however, took another tack with its criticism: The deduction section was not broad enough; it should grant tax relief for all forms of lobbying.

The House Ways and Means Committee's report on the tax bill made two arguments for the lobbying deduction:

1. Action was needed to put expenses for presentations to legislative bodies on the same tax-deductibility basis as expenses for presentations of a business firm's case in courts and before executive or administrative bodies.

2. It * * * is desirable that taxpayers who have information bearing on the impact of present laws, or proposed legislation, on their trades or businesses not be discouraged in making this information available to the Members of Congress or legislators at other levels of government.

Opponents, including Senator Ralph W. Yarborough, Democrat, of Texas, called the deduction provision unconscionable, discriminatory, shocking and outrageous. Senator William Proxmire, Democrat, of Wisconsin, called the day the Senate passed it "one of the saddest days in the history of the Senate."

Critics said the change would cut the effective cost of lobbying for business about in half and, by shifting the burden of lost revenue to the general taxpayers, make them pay for the privilege of being lobbied, often against their own interests.

Until this change came along, the critics pointed out, the Federal tax laws had been neutral concerning expenses incurred by different groups lobbying.

The change discriminates against the ordinary citizens, who cannot deduct expenses for visiting his Congressman if he is not a businessman, they said.

Proxmire said the deduction gives "a thoroughly unjustified tax advantage to special business interests over the public interest." A corporation can deduct some of its dues to a lobbying trade association, but a member of the League of Women Voters or some other nonprofit organization could not deduct any of the dues to her organization for lobbying on the same legislation, he pointed out.

Kefauver said he could not believe "that there is such a shortage of lobbying activity that we need to encourage it by tax advantages." He added:

"It is already unfortunate that there is no lobby for consumers and the public at large to represent their interests in legislation, but it will only compound the one-sided picture we often get if we allow tax incentives to encourage more and better lobbying."

Opponents have dreamed up all sorts of inequities they say can result, such as:

A racetrack could deduct expenses of lobbying before a State legislature for on-track betting, but a minister could not deduct his expense for opposing the same legislation on moral grounds.

A manufacturer dumping waste into a stream could deduct expenses for lobbying against a State pollution law, but homeowners interested in purifying that stream by law would have to pay their legislative expenses with no deduction.

Some Senators have made predictions that the deduction will expand lobbying at all levels of Government and flood their offices with a lot more mail, telegrams, phone calls and visits.

How much it will cut Uncle Sam's revenue has not been estimated by anybody. Nobody can say how much the deductions may total.

The Internal Revenue Service expects to publish proposed regulations to carry out the new law in the spring and issue the regulations in final form this summer.

If the IRS ever adds up the lobbying deductions taken by businesses in 1963, the country should have a figure on total lobby spending in the United States that is much nearer the actual amount than has ever previously been available.

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 12, 1963]

THE PATIENT PERSUADERS—LOBBY LAW FAILINGS KNOWN

(By Felton West)

Washington.—The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act's weaknesses and shortcomings have been fairly well identified since it was included almost as an afterthought in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

As long ago as 1957, Senator John L. McClellan's special committee to investigate lobbying political activities and campaign contributions offered the Senate a substitute law that would seem to be a considerable improvement.

But the proposals stemming from this committee's expensive investigation got no action.

Students of the present lobby law, who agree that lobbying should not be restricted but only properly identified, have pointed out these major shortcomings:

1. There is too much confusion about who should register and make contribution and spending reports, and too much is left to the discretion and conscience of the lobbyist about what he should report and need not report.

This has resulted mainly from the interpretation that the act applies only to those whose principal purpose is to influence laws—a standard hard to pin down. Some now register and report who probably do not need to, while others who probably should do not. Some report contributions and spending they probably do not need to, while others do not report such items when they probably should.

2. Nobody is administering and enforcing the law, because the law designated nobody to do it. And nobody is continually studying and suggesting improvements in the law, as is the case in most situations where an agency is charged with administering a law.

The House Clerk and the Senate Secretary, with whom reports are filed, merely act as depositories and compile the reports for listing in the Congressional Record. They do not advise persons to file or not to file, do not check on those who file once or more and then cease filing, do not check the information filed even for obvious omissions or contradictions, and do not recommend investigations of suspected violators.

For a while in 1947 and 1948, the Justice Department made an attempt at enforcing the law, getting copies of lobby reports and checking into some. But the act did not give it this responsibility, and finally the Department dropped it.

3. The law does not cover lobbying of the people in grassroots campaigns designed to bring pressure on Congress from the voters, by far the biggest effort in lobbying these days and growing all the time.

4. It does not cover lobbying in the executive branch, where lobbyists actually spend most of their time. They lobby there for two things: (1) For administration support of their legislative aims, and (2) for favorable actions on purely administrative matters. But the lobbying law does not cover either.

5. The law does not require groups or corporations which do not solicit or collect money for lobbying to register or report spending—a gaping hole through which a big business, such as a defense contractor, can pour wads of influence money of its own to make things go its way, all without bothersome disclosure.

6. Reporting requirements of the present law are so complicated they are a clerical nuisance, though they could easily be simplified.

There have been other suggestions for changes—that contingent fees for lobbying should be outlawed, a suggestion with which, however, there is strong disagreement; that Government lobbyists, such as White House and other agency legislative liaison people, should be required to register; that notices of termination of representation should be required of lobbyists or their employers; that there should be more publication of contribution and spending reports, including lists of contributors and recipients; and that a penalty should be established for sending spurious communications to lawmakers.

In 1957, after months of investigation, the eight members of McClellan's Senate committee—including then Senator John F. Kennedy—introduced a bill designed to cure many of these shortcomings. It would have done a complete overhauling.

Called the Legislative Activities Disclosure Act, it even had a name that was more to the point than the old law, which was not designed to "regulate" as its name implied and which did not even use in its body the word "lobbyist" that lobbyists so dislike.

It would have called one hired to influence legislation by direct communication a "legislative agent" and required him to register and report receipts and expenditures for lobbying.

It would also have required reports from the legislative agent's employers if they spent more than $300 a year for lobbying; from persons with legislative and nonlegislative duties if they received $300 or more a year for legislative activities, exclusive of personal traveling expenses; from persons who conduct campaigns specifically urging others to communicate with Congress in order to influence legislation; and from persons who conduct large (more than $50,000 a year) campaigns which implicitly urge others to communicate with Congress to influence legislation.

Thus the proposed law would have extended to most direct lobbying campaigns and removed some of the uncertainty about who was covered by the reporting and registration requirements by using a dollar standard instead of a hazy "purpose" standard.

The committee's bill proposed to make the Comptroller General of the United States, an agent of Congress, responsible for administering the law. He had said he thought his agency could do a good job of it.

He would have been directed to prescribe new forms and reporting procedures, compile and summarize information from the reports and report it to Congress, make investigations to determine whether all who should register and report did so and whether reports were accurate and complete, report violations to the appropriate law enforcement agencies and tell Congress what they did about them, make studies and recommendations to Congress that would further objectives of the law, and report annually to Congress on his administration—almost all duties or powers nobody has now.

The bill would have required notices of termination of representation.

It would have given radio and television the same exemptions newspapers have under the lobbying law.

It would have established a maximum fine of $10,000 (twice the present one) and the present 1-year maximum imprisonment for failure of a legislative agent to register and report. Falsification of reports would have been made punishable by a maximum of $10,000 fine and 5 years' imprisonment.

The bill would have given the attorney general power, at the request of the administrator, to seek mandatory civil injunctions to force compliance by persons or organizations other than legislative agents, such as those conducting grassroots campaigns.

Only three spending reports a year, instead of the present four, would have been required, and report-filing problems would have been simplified. Lastly, the bill would have made transmitting, uttering or publishing forged, false, countrefeit or fictitious communications to Congress punishable by up to $10,000 fine and 5 years in prison.

When McClellan introduced this bill in behalf of himself and his colleagues on May 31, 1957, the Senate referred it to its Government Operations Committee, of which McClellan was and still is chairman. And there it died.

What happened?

The Senator from Arkansas said no hearing was ever scheduled or any action taken on the bill. The bill would have required a hearing, but the committee had more time in session that year and all of the next year's session in which it could have held one.

"There was no real demand for the legislation then," McClellan said, "and there was a lot of opposition."

He said he thought then and still thinks that the bill would have been a considerable improvement over the present law. But he has no plan to introduce the bill again.

The only legislation introduced so far this session that would do anything about overall revision of the present lobbying act is S. 177 by Senator Clifford Case, Republican of New Jersey. This bill, which Case introduced in behalf of himself and Senators Joseph S. Clark, Jr., Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and Kenneth Keating, Republican, of New York, would establish a commission on congressional organization and direct it, among other things, to study the operation and effectiveness of existing lobbying laws. It would also direct the commission to study conflicts of interest of members of Congress.

Congress is never eager to crack down on lobbyists, and doesn't seem in the mood now. It could stir up so much trouble.

A lobbyist says it is almost impossible to get a major bill through Congress without a big lobbying campaign. He is probably right, and if he is, the prospects of better lobby disclosure legislation's being passed are pretty dim.

There's no lobbying for it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

THE GOSPEL OF FEAR

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, 30 years ago this month, Franklin Roosevelt stood before a vast crowd, within a stone's throw of where we sit, and proclaimed, in the midst of a depression, that "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself." Thirty years later to the month, President Kennedy, before a vast crowd in Chicago, spoke of concern, of recession dangers, of growing troubles, of the jobless problem, of the turbulent sixties, of warnings, of chronic troubles. In pursuit of this fearful theme, he cited the retreat from the farm because of production efficiency, the maturing crop of war babies entering the labor market, the school dropouts, automation, the number of women in the labor force, longevity, and the availability of our senior citizens for useful work.

But in all candor, it must be pointed out that every one of these factors was operating years ago when the Republicans were in power, and at a time when Mr. Kennedy was charging them with timidity, retreat, lack of faith, lack of vision, lack of leadership. One might surmise from the general temper of the President's observations that these factors have taken on new force, new size, to plague him.

I believe a reminder is in order. It is now 2 years and 5 months since the election of 1960. The charges against Republicans made in that campaign are on the record for all to see, but so are the pledges and promises of what the New Frontier said it would do. Many things have been tried, but the number of jobless increases and Mr. Kennedy predicts that unemployment will increase some more.

But despite this concern, despite their fear complex, there is still no hint that the administration will draw back from the new ventures it proposes, such as the Domestic Peace Corps, the Youth Conservation Corps, Federal aid to education, and numerous other New Frontier proposals that will not create a single new job.

Despite all this, there is no hint of an effort to reduce the gigantic budget deficit, the swollen budget.

It is certainly not amiss to point out that:

First, the travel and entertainment regulations of the Internal Revenue Service have disemployed thousands and thousands. I have seen an estimate as high as 200,000.

Second, that the arbitrary treatment of the steel industry has built no confidence in the future.

Third, that the drive for more and more intense regulation by the regulatory agencies have not won friends and influenced future job-creating investments.

Fourth, that a planned deficit of $12 billion produces little faith and little confidence.

The lament of this tearful and fearful New Frontier over the future might better be supplanted by some words from the administration and some action which is calculated to inspire faith, not fear; confidence, not concern; hope, and not despair.

SECRET SERVICE PROTECTION FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week there appeared on the front pages of the newspapers considerable publicity concerning the so-called Secret Service people who give protection to the Vice President of the United States. In one account I read, it seemed to appear that this was something which was contrived by Vice President Johnson.

In all fairness, I think I must say that the bill to provide this protection was introduced by me, and was ordered reported and put on the calendar on the 16th of May 1960.

It came from the Eisenhower administration, and it had the endorsement of the Treasury Department, as indicated in a letter which they wrote on January 27, 1960. The letter was signed by Acting Secretary of the Treasury A. Gilmore Flues. It was not done at the request of the Vice President, either the incumbent or the previous Vice President. It was an administration request. It called for an amendment of title 18 of the United States Code so that the Vice President or other officer next in order of succession to the office of President of the United States or the Vice-President-elect should have this kind of protection. It provided for a criminal penalty for anyone who violated that act. It did not indicate how many people were to be assigned; nor is there an indication as to how much money Congress should appropriate for that purpose.

I wish to make it abundantly clear that this protective legislation for the Vice-President-elect and others was sponsored by the prior administration. It was introduced by me, was reported to the Senate on May 16, passed in the Senate on May 26, and was referred to the House Judiciary Committee on May 27, 1960.

A POINT OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege. It was my distinct honor and opportunity to serve as one of the Senate delegates to the Costa Rica conference which was held last week under the very statesmanlike leadership of the President of the United States.

Last Tuesday morning the seven Presidents met in executive session at San José, Costa Rica. It was well understood that at the conclusion of that executive session the Presidents would reach an agreement on the principles to be encompassed in the final communique, but that some further time would be needed to reduce the understandings to a final draft, both in Spanish and in English. Those who have attended such international conferences, where there exists the language barrier, know that it is necessary to be particularly careful in seeing to it that the drafts in the two languages mean identically the same thing. It was understandable, therefore, that when we came out of the executive conference, the press would attempt to seek to find out what had transpired in executive session.

Each member of the U.S. delegation, including the senior Senator from Oregon, was set upon—which I believe is an appropriate descriptive phrase under these circumstances—by members of the press. They were determined to find out whatever they could as to our understandings, if any, of what transpired in the morning session.

We on the delegation took the position that it was a conference of the President and the Secretary of State, and that it would be presumptuous of us, as Members of Congress, to be holding press interviews or commenting on anything that had transpired in any conference attended by the President of the United States as the spokesman for our country.

As we walked from the National Theater, where the sessions were held, to the hotel across the street at least six or seven times various members of the press, sometimes singly, but very often by twos and threes and fours, and other numbers, sought to elicit some judgment or information about the morning session. I said the same thing to each group. As I was leaving the lobby of the hotel to go up to my room there was present Pierre Salinger, who is in charge of press relations at the White House, and who heard me when I said that I would not even comment on the weather. I said I would make no statement. I said that in my judgment the two people who should speak for the American delegation were the President and the Secretary of State, who, I said, were doing a grand job. I said if I had anything to say about the conference I would say it when I got back to Washington, and that I had no intention of having any press interviews in San José.

In one of those instances the correspondent for the Newhouse papers—and the Portland Oregonian is the largest newspaper in my State—was quite understandably insistent upon getting some statement that he could send back to his home newspaper. I told him that my position went for him as well as the other correspondents, and that I was not even commenting on the weather in San José.

This correspondent of the Portland Oregonian sent a statement to that effect to his paper, indicating that I had declined to give the press any statement about what had transpired in that meeting. It appeared in the Oregonian of March 21.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Morse Mum on Meeting

> President Kennedy seems to have done what no one else has been able to do—muzzle the voluble Senator from Oregon, Wayne Morse.
>
> Morse talked freely at previous Latin American conferences attended only by Secretary of State Dean Rusk or lesser officials, even to the point of differing openly with the U.S. position.
>
> Tuesday, Morse emerged from an economic session to be met by reporters.
>
> "I'm not talking until I get back to Washington," Morse said. "This is a State Department matter."

Mr. MORSE. Well, Mr. President, it was surprising—and, in my judgment, shocking—to note the journalistic irresponsibility shown by the story written by Mr. Paul P. Kennedy of the New York Times, which resulted from my refusal to give any information in regard to what had transpired at the executive session of the seven Presidents.

I fully appreciate the job that the journalists have to do. I can understand how they would have welcomed someone in the delegation speaking out—in this instance such a person would have been speaking out of turn—and giving them some kind of story as to what had transpired in the executive session. I can understand their desire to get that kind of information. However, I cannot understand such a story as Mr. Kennedy wrote.

Mr. President, freedom of the press carries with it the responsibility of being responsible. I am shocked by the increasing frequency of irresponsible journalism in this country. In fact, we had some of this kind of experience at Punta del Este. Sometimes we get the impression that journalists are laboring under an illusion that they are a supergovernmental body in this democracy. That is not characteristic of a majority of journalists, but of too many.

As the record shows, I have never hesitated in my many years in the Senate in telling off journalists who I thought needed to be told off because of their irresponsibility.

I find none of them to be supermen; in fact, it is my considered judgment that they are very average men who, very often, write out of the depths of great ignorance, because too frequently they do not do their bookwork and are not well informed.

Any injustice that was done to the senior Senator from Oregon as a result of Mr. Paul Kennedy's article is inconsequential, for I am never concerned about injustices which are done to me by the press. Those injustices, for the most part, particularly strengthen me. The people in my State have long ago come to learn that they will never read the truth about their senior Senator from American newspapers—although I would be less than honest if I did not say that I should prefer to have the newspapers supporting my campaigns, for that would make campaigning a little easier. Nevertheless, I have learned that it is not necessary to have their support. I have been treated for many years to the overwhelming opposition of the press of my State. In the last campaign there were 3 dailies, out of all the dailies in the State, which endorsed me; and 3 weeklies out of some 60 weeklies. I have often said that the opposition of the press made me thousands and thousands of votes.

So the misrepresenting article by Mr. Paul Kennedy, published in the Western edition of the New York Times for Wednesday, March 20, 1963, will not harm the senior Senator from Oregon in Oregon. What I do resent is the injustice which it does to the Nation and the President of the United States. The article is a gross misrepresentation of the fact. It was a gross misrepresentation of fact to plant the seed of falsehood in the New York Times, Western edition, for Wednesday, March 20, 1963, seeking to give the American people the impression that the congressional delegation at San Jose was not solidly behind the President.

In my judgment, no President could possibly have had such unity of support as President Kennedy had at San Jose from the congressional delegation; he deserved it, for he displayed magnificent statesmanship at San José. As I have said since returning home, in my judgment the President never missed a cue, so to speak. He rose to every occasion in magnificent form. In fact, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion to my remarks the final communique which was signed by the seven Presidents. I think it should appear in the Congressional Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the inspiring speech delivered by the President of the United States at the dedication of a great housing project in San José. I only wish that Senators could have heard and seen the reaction of that crowd to the high ideals which the President of the United States set forth in his address, his challenge to the people of Central America to carry out the opportunities for cooperative action that the Alliance for Progress offers them and offers us. It was one of the President's great speeches.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the speech which was delivered by the President of the United States at the University of San José. It, too, was a strong challenge to the peoples of all Latin America, not merely Central America. It discussed the economic problems of Latin America, and it also discussed the Cuban problem. I ask unanimous consent for the printing of the speech by the President at the University of San Jose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. MORSE. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two other statements by President Kennedy be printed at the conclusion of these remarks. One is the text of his remarks upon arrival at the San Jose airport; the second is the text of his remarks upon the convening of the President's Conference on March 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 4 and 5.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now turn to the article written by Mr. Paul P. Kennedy, which was published in the New York Times, western edition, on Wednesday, March 20, 1963. Incidentally, I do not know Mr. Paul Kennedy; I would not know him if he walked through the doorway. I feel that is no loss. However, this is a correspondent with whom, so far as I know, I have had no previous associations; and if this is the last one, the senior Senator from Oregon will be very happy. On the basis of this kind of subversive journalism, I do not wish to have interviews with newspaper reporters of that stripe; and this is subversive journalism because an article which misrepresents the position of the U.S. Government in a foreign land to the detriment of our country is a form of subversion. The headline reads: "Six Latin Nations and United States Sidestep Cuba Showdown."

Interesting, but untrue. If ever a subject was thoroughly discussed, it was the subject of Cuba. In fact, it was important that our Central American friends understand what our record has been with respect to Cuba. Speaking for myself on the floor of the Senate today, I can say that they were very agreeably surprised. They were not aware of the policies which the United States has followed since Punta del Este, based upon the Punta del Este Pact which all the nations signed. The headline continues: "Costa Rica Declaration Is Limited to General Pledges To Combat Communism."

The subheading reads: "Morse Dissatisfied—Kennedy Pledges Fund for Economic Study—Panama Moves Toward Markets." And the byline is credited to Paul Kennedy, special to the New York Times.

Then the article begins. I shall read the first paragraph and then go to the gross misrepresentation in the article:

> San José, Costa Rica, March 19.—President Kennedy and the six Presidents of the Central American States signed today a declaration covering the economic and political aspects of their 2 days of discussions here.

Down in the body of the article, the correspondent writes:

> There were numerous indications this afternoon that some of the legislators in the U.S. delegation here were not happy over the Declaration of San José, as the final document is formally entitled. Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat, of Oregon, and chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin America, was obviously nettled as he walked from the meeting of foreign ministers and the delegations this afternoon.
>
> He declined to comment on the proceedings, saying: "I won't even comment on the weather here but when I get home I will make my views known."

Mr. President, I have already told the Senate what the senior Senator from Oregon said, as the press tried to get out of us information which would have been very improper for us to give; namely, information based upon our personal knowledge of what had happened at the executive session participated in by the seven Presidents. Mr. Kennedy simply drew a completely false and unfounded conclusion from what I said.

I told those reporters that any statement concerning the Conference should come from the President or the Secretary of State and that I would not even comment on the weather. I said:

> If I have anything to say in regard to the Costa Rica Conference, I will comment on it on the floor of the Senate when I return to Washington.

Mr. President, that is what I am doing this afternoon.

Apparently, Mr. Paul Kennedy had to have a conflict. Apparently he felt impelled to write an article which would have controversy in it, without regard for the great injustice which this kind of misrepresentation does to the President of the United States. The article spreads across the continent and the hemisphere a false statement to the effect that the U.S. delegation was dissatisfied with the communique. Actually, to the contrary, we were highly pleased with the communique, as I feel certain every Member of the Senate will be when it appears in the Congressional Record tomorrow, after having been placed in the Record today.

The next day, the editorial board of the New York Times, taking the misrepresenting article by Paul Kennedy, wrote an editorial, which was published in the western edition of the New York Times of Friday, March 22, 1963. The editorial, which is entitled "After San José," reads, in part, as follows:

> Some of the delegates (Senator Morse, of Oregon, is apparently one of them) seem to be dissatisfied with the results achieved at the Central American Conference at San José. Not enough Cuba. Not enough fire and brimstone about Castro. No threat of invasion or even an embargo on oil. Merely a call to the interior ministers of the six Central American republics to meet next month "to effect common measures to restrict the movement of their nationals to and from Cuba and the flow of material, propaganda and funds from that country."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire New York Times western edition editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

After San José

> Some of the Delegates (Senator Morse, of Oregon, is apparently one of them) seem to be dissatisfied with the results achieved at the Central American Conference at San José. Not enough Cuba. Not enough fire and brimstone about Castro. No threat of invasion or even an embargo on oil. Merely a call to the interior ministers of the six Central American Republics to meet next month "to effect common measures to restrict the movement of their nationals to and from Cuba and the flow of material, propaganda and funds from that country."
>
> Cuba, in fact, is scarcely mentioned in the new San José manifesto that bears the name of the Declaration of Central America. Practically this entire document is concerned with humdrum economic matters, such as fiscal policy and tariff rates. The six Republics agree to accelerate the establishment of a customs union for the benefit of the new Central American common market. They agree to cooperate in programs to improve the prices of primary commodities. They welcome the promise of the President of the United States to consider a long-term loan to the Central American Bank for Economic Integration. They agree—and this is perhaps the most important item in the catalog of their agreement—that economic and social conditions should be created to assure labor of an improved living standard through better distribution of national income.
>
> Scarcely a mention of Cuba and Castro. Yet this declaration contains, as does the Alliance for Progress, the real nub and core of an effective anti-Castro program. The best defense against Castro—and the best offense, too—is to lift the Latin American Republics to a level of prosperity and economic democracy at which they will be impervious to Cuban propaganda and in fact a continuing incentive to the Cubans themselves to seek their own advancement by ridding themselves of Castro.
>
> In a noteworthy speech to the Senate a few days ago, entitled "Our Castro Fixation Versus the Alliance for Progress," freshman Senator George McGovern of South Dakota said:
>
> "There can be no mistaking the fact that much of Castro's appeal to the oppressed rests on the knowledge that his presence has forced every government in the hemisphere to take a new and more searching look at the crying needs of the great masses of human beings.
>
> "The real issue turns upon the question of whether or not the people can overturn an unjust social order through a peaceful democratic revolution, or whether they will do it by a violent Communist-led upheaval.
>
> "The Alliance for Progress is a mutual effort to raise standards of living through the painstaking, often frustrating, method of democratic reform and economic development * * *.
>
> "It is easier to make loud speeches against an irritable bearded dictator than to face the tough and sometimes painful tasks of making Alliance for Progress work. I suggest that we have had * * * not enough courageous and thoughtful men giving their attention to the real problems confronting the Alliance."
>
> To the degree that it focused interest on these problems and pushed things ahead in this direction, the conference at San Jose can be considered a success.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the deans of all American schools of journalism that if they wish to see a good exhibit of irresponsible editorial writing to use in their classes on that subject, I refer them to this New York Times editorial, published in the western edition of Friday, March 22, because here again we find that an editor has engaged in the pastime of intellectual sophistry called "supposing," and, on the basis of his suppositions, has written an editorial which simply is factually untrue.

It is not pleasing to make these comments about any person or any institution, even a newspaper. But American foreign policy is so vital to the American people and is so important to the security of this country that the representatives of our free people in the U.S. Congress should not remain silent when such irresponsible journalism is spread on the pages of U.S. newspapers.

I close these remarks by saying—as the Secretary of State and the President and the members of the official executive branch delegation know—that at all times at the San José Conference the President had the support and cooperation of the congressional delegation. He was entitled to have it for many reasons, but the most important is that he was completely correct at every turn of events at the conference.

So a great disservice has been done by the New York Times, through its correspondent, Paul Kennedy, and through its board of editors, by giving the American people these two false representations concerning me and, by implication, the congressional delegation. The editors of the New York Times owe me nothing; but certainly, in my opinion, they owe an apology to the U.S. President.

I recognize that an apology never rights a wrong; but I think there is no excuse when a U.S. newspaper which claims to be responsible undermines the President of the United States by publishing an untrue article in regard to the position of the congressional delegation—or in regard to one of its members, and, by implication, the others—and which also does damage to the President of the United States, in connection with an international conference.

I have made these remarks today because in my judgment I owe them to the President, and I also have an obligation to the country to set the record straight.

Whenever I find myself in disagreement with the policy of this administration or any other administration, I shall never hesitate to say so. But I attribute the fact that I have the confidence of a great many officials in Latin America in no small measure to the fact that they know they can sit down with me and talk about United States-Latin American problems and the Alliance of Progress program, and that when I walk out of their offices I will not then proceed to hold a press interview in regard to the matters we discussed, but will do my discussing after I return to my country.

So, Mr. President, I hope the New York Times will proceed without delay to correct the clear misstatements of fact which it has made in the editorial and in the article, which in my judgement do damage to the President of the United States. I do not care what they say about me, but I do care what they do in regard to damaging the President.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Exhibit 1

[From Department of State Press Release No. 145, Mar. 20, 1963]

Declaration of Central America Approved by the Presidents of Central America, Panama, and the United States March 19, 1963

The Presidents of the Republics of Central America and Panama are determined to improve the well-being of their peoples, and are aware that such a task demands a dynamic economic and social development program based on the carefully planned use of human, natural and financial resources. It also depends on important changes of the economic, social and administrative structure, within the framework of the principles that govern our democratic institutions. They have met with the President of the United States of America in San Jose, Costa Rica, to review the difficulties which impede the achievement of these objectives as well as the progress thus far made in the isthmus since the integration programs began and since the Alliance for Progress was jointly established by the Republics of the hemisphere in August 1961.

Following an analysis of the situation, the Presidents of the Republics of Central America, convinced that the best hope for the development of the region is through economic integration, and bearing in mind the extraordinary efforts made toward this end in the last decade and of the importance of accelerating overall economic growth, pledge to their peoples:

To accelerate establishment of a customs union to perfect the functioning of the Central American Common Market;

To formulate and implement national economic and social development plans, coordinating them at the Central American level, and progressively to carry out regional planning for the various sectors of the economy;

To establish a monetary union and common fiscal, monetary and social policies within the program of economic integration;

To cooperate in programs to improve the prices of primary export commodities;

To complete as soon as possible the reforms needed to achieve the objectives set forth in the act of Bogotá and the Charter of Punta del Este especially in the fields of agriculture, taxation, education, public administration, and social welfare;

To take the above measures with a view to achieving the creation of a Central American Economic Community which will establish relationships with other nations or regional groups having similar objectives.

The Central American Presidents affirm that the economic integration movement in itself constitutes an effort which is laying the groundwork for regional planning in which sectoral plans of common interest to the Isthmian Republics serve as a point of departure. Their governments have already taken measures to coordinate national plans so that their execution will aid rather than impede the achievement of the objectives of the economic integration program. It is intended that the first global plan for harmonious regional development be presented as soon as possible for evaluation in accordance with the procedures set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este. Meanwhile, the Central American Presidents declare their resolve to proceed immediately with their sectoral plans and with projects of interest to the Isthmus. The President of the United States agrees to consider a long-term loan to enable the appropriate Central American regional organizations, principally the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, to conduct economic feasibility surveys relative to this program of regional development.

The Presidents of Central America reaffirm their hope that the Republic of Panama will participate more closely in the economic integration movement, and the President of Panama declares that his Government fully reaffirms its support of the program of Central American economic integration. He further declares that his Government is prepared to initiate immediate negotiations with the Governments of the general treaty of economic integration as a whole with a view to concluding a special agreement to facilitate the association of his country with this program.

The President of the United States is impressed by the determination of the Presidents of the Central American Republics to move as rapidly as possible toward the integration of the economies of their countries, and of their intention to formulate a regional economic development plan within which national plans would be coordinated, and he believes that the coordination of their respective monetary, fiscal, economic and social policies is a great step forward in the achievement of this objective as well as toward the achievement of the goals set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este.

The President of the United States is prepared to offer the greatest cooperation in the preparation and implementation of the regional and national development projects of Central America and Panama and declares that his government will intensify its joint efforts with the governments and appropriate regional organizations in order to extend to them increased technical and financial assistance for this purpose within the framework of the broad regional program entitled joint exposition of the Presidents of Central America, and the development plan being prepared by Panama.

To this end he proposes a fund for Central American economic integration, to be made available through the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, to which the United States would make an immediate substantial initial contribution, to assist in carrying out regional development projects in accordance with various sectoral plans now being developed by the regional organizations.

For the longer term, he also declares that as soon as the Central American Republics have formulated an overall regional development plan, and as soon as this plan has been evaluated favorably in accordance with the procedures established in the Charter of Punta del Este, the United States will enlarge and expand its participation in the fund and will work with the Central American countries in obtaining other free world resources so that the agreed plan can be effectively implemented.

The Presidents have discussed the fundamental importance to economic development of a vigorous and freely competitive private sector, and declare their intention of taking the necessary steps to encourage private investment which is prepared to accept the normal responsibilities compatible with the development of a modern economy. These measures include establishment of regional trade and promotion offices for the specific purpose of attracting private foreign investment. They also agree that development banks or corporations should be established in each country as soon as possible to provide credit on reasonable terms for the growth of private industry, the President of the United States offering financial assistance to their operation.

Concurrently they agree that economic and social conditions should be created to assure labor of an improved living standard through a better distribution of national income. Furthermore they agree to encourage and support free democratic labor organizations as a means of contributing toward greater worker participation in the common effort on behalf of the general welfare.

The Presidents also agree that opportunities should be given to the people of Central America to build and purchase their homes. There exist in Central America national savings and loan institutions which have been assisted under the Alliance for Progress, and others are about to be created. In order to give further support for these national efforts, the Presidents of Central America suggest that a regional home loan department, which would be a secondary source of home mortgage funds, should be created as a division within the Central American Bank for Economic Integration and the President of the United States agrees to offer technical and financial assistance to it.

The Isthmian Presidents indicate that Central American institutions should be strengthened as much as possible to enable them to play a major role in training the personnel who will be needed to put into effect the plans for integration of the Isthmus. A large part of the responsibility for training will devolve on the Superior Council of Central American Universities (CSUCA). Recognizing, moreover, that trained manpower at all levels is needed for economic development, they agree to the proposal of the President of the United States to establish a multimillion-dollar scholarship fund for vocational training in agriculture and in industry for young people of outstanding ability who cannot afford the normal expenses of such training, to which the United States will offer substantial financial assistance.

The Presidents note the primary role of coffee in the economies of Central America and the importance of the International Coffee Agreement for the achievement of stable and remunerative prices.

They reiterate the intention of their governments to fully support the agreement so that it will serve as an effective instrument to improve the earnings of exporting countries from coffee and to promote their economic development.

Other primary commodity problems exist and the Isthmian Presidents will hand to President Kennedy studies on these problems.

President Kennedy agrees he will have them reviewed immediately on his return to Washington.

The Presidents, notwithstanding the fact that present conditions are favorable to undertake a solution of the economic and social problems of the isthmus through joint action of the countries of the area, believe that all of them are faced with an externally provoked political problem, which by its very nature can imperil the exercise of representative democracy and the normal development of the plans in which their respective governments are engaged to attain as rapidly as possible the highest levels of economic and social justice and to bring to full realization the plans for Central American integration. Consequently, the Presidents declare that in order to carry out their programs for social and economic betterment, it is essential to reinforce the measures to meet subversive aggression originating in the focal points of Communist agitation which Soviet imperialism may maintain in Cuba or in any other place in America.

The Presidents note that the Council of the Organization of American States is actively engaged in maintaining vigilance over the

continued intervention of Sino-Soviet powers in this hemisphere as requested by the Eighth Meeting of Consultation of Foreign Ministers. They express special interest in early completion by the Council of the OAS of the studies on Castro-Communist subversion in the hemisphere, and particularly in early action by the Council on recommendations to the governments for counteracting those activities in these areas.

The Presidents agree that Ministers of Government of the seven countries should meet as soon as possible to develop and put into immediate effect common measures to restrict the movement of their nationals to and from Cuba, and the flow of materiel, propaganda and funds from that country.

This meeting will take action, among other things, to secure stricter travel and passport controls, including appropriate limitations in passports and other travel documents on travel to Cuba. Cooperative arrangements among not only the countries meeting here but also among all OAS members will have to be sought to restrict more effectively not only these movements of people for subversive purposes but also to prevent insofar as possible the introduction of money, propaganda, materials, and arms, arrangements for additional ses and air surveillance and interception within territorial waters will be worked out with special cooperation from the United States.

In addition to these measures, a more rapid and complete exchange of intelligence information on the movement of people, propaganda, money, and arms between Cuba and our countries is to be developed by the meeting of ministers.

The Presidents voice their deep sympathy for the people of Cuba, and reaffirm their conviction that Cuba soon will join the family of free nations. The Presidents recall how, in 1959, the Cuban people were fired with the hope of a purely Cuban revolution that was to bring them freedom and social justice; honest government and free elections; fair sharing of goods; opportunities for all; more schools and jobs, better health and housing, and constructive land reform; no collectivization of the land. In sum, a progressive republic which, in the words of Marti would be "con todos y para todos." The Presidents declare that they have no doubt that the genuine Cuban revolution will live again, and its betrayers will fall into the shadows of history, and the martyred people of the oppressed isle of the Caribbean will be free from foreign Communist domination, free to choose for themselves the kind of government they wish to have, and free to join their brothers of the hemisphere in the common undertaking to secure for each individual the liberty, dignity, and well-being which are the objectives of all free societies.

Finally the Presidents solemnly reaffirm their adherence to the principles established by the Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance of Rio de Janeiro, the Charter of the OAS, in the Act of Bogotá and in the Charter of Punta del Este.

March 19, 1963.

Exhibit 2

Remarks of the President at El Bosque Housing Project, El Bosque, Costa Rica

Mr. President, Mr. Minister, Ambassador, our friends from Costa Rica, we celebrate here today a great victory, and that is a victory for the human spirit, for these houses, these medical units, these books, are today freeing men and women from centuries of bondage and poverty which has imprisoned their capacity, their happiness and their future, and I am proud, as a citizen of the United States, to be here in Costa Rica taking part in this great effort.

As a citizen of a sister republic, as a strong believer in the democratic faith, we take pride in the democracy of this Republic and the other Republics of this hemisphere, but we know that our enjoyment of freedom is not so much a gift from the past as a challenge for the future. not so much a reward for old victories, but a goal for new struggles, not so much an inheritance from our forefathers as an obligation to those of us who follow, for democracy is never a final achievement. It is a call to effort, to sacrifice, and a willingness to live and to die in its defense.

Every generation of the Americas has shaped new goals for democracy to suit the demands of a new age. These goals for today's America are summed up in the words Alianza para el Progreso. They call for an end to social institutions which deny men and women the opportunity to live decent lives. They call for a better standard of living for all of our citizens in order that they may produce and live up to their capabilities. They call for an end to the remnants of dictatorship in this hemisphere, and they call for an unyielding defense against all those who seek to impose a new tyranny in this hemisphere. They call, in short, for a recognition that no man's job is done until every man in this hemisphere shares an equal opportunity to pursue his hopes as far as his capacities will carry him. That is the commitment of this country and my own, and the commitment of our sister Republics.

It is sometimes easy for us, living in our nations' capitals, to become disheartened about the nature of the struggle. but it is here with you in this project, sharing in your achievements, participating in your labors, that we renew our faith and determination to succeed, for in this project, hundreds of people will move into decent housing. By October 1st of this year, almost 8,000 people will have moved into homes financed under the Alliance for Progress, and built by the labor of the people of Costa Rica, and in every country in this hemisphere, similar housing programs must go forward. These medical units which we have seen are only a few of the 60 which will be in operation throughout Central America and Panama this year. They will provide 4 million medical examinations a year, reaching almost a third of the population of the isthmus. In them, doctors and nurses will bring modern medicine to our people who have had no protection against disability or disease, entering hundreds of villages where no doctor has been. Approximately 8,000 people in Costa Rica already have received treatment under these units.

These books we have distributed to these children are a token of a massive program which will bring more than 2 million new schoolbooks to the children of Central America and Panama. With these books, millions of children for the first time will have the tools to conquer life and make something of their future.

Education, homes, jobs, health, security—those are the things for which this country stands. Those are the things in which the people of the United States strongly believe. Those are the things which together we must achieve for our people, and I want to assure you through the Alliance for Progress we will stand and work shoulder to shoulder in making this hemisphere an example of what democracy can mean.

Viva Costa Rica. Arriba Costa Rica.

Exhibit 3

Remarks of the President at the University of Costa Rica, San José, Costa Rica

Mr. Rector, Mr. Minister, I would like first to present to you my colleagues from the U.S. Congress who have traveled with us on this voyage of the last 3 days, and I would like to have them meet you.

First, I would like to present the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the former president of the University of Arkansas, Senator Fulbright.

I would like to present the leader of the opposition in the U.S. Senate, but we both agree that we love Costa Rica, Senator Hickenlooper.

The chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin America of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, formerly dean of the University of Oregon Law School, Senator Wayne Morse.

Congressman Selden, who is chairman of the House Committee on Latin America, Congressman Selden, of Alabama. And the Republican leader of that committee in the House of Representatives, Congressman William Mailliard.

And the U.S. Ambassador.

It is a great pleasure to leave Washington, where I am lectured to by professors, to come to Costa Rica where I can speak to students.

I think it is appropriate that the first speech by any U.S. President to any student audience in Latin America should take place at this center of learning in a nation so dedicated to democracy, and I am honored that you have invited me here today.

For the past 3 days the Presidents of seven American nations have been grappling with the central question which faces this country, my own country, and my hemisphere, and that is whether, under a system of political liberty, we can solve the economic problems that press upon our people. We are embarked upon a great adventure together, and that is the task of demonstrating to a watching world that free men can conquer the ancient enemies of man, poverty, ignorance, and hunger; of protecting freedom against those who would destroy it; of bringing hope to those who search for hope; of extending liberty to those who lack it.

This is an immense task, filled with difficulty and hardship and danger, but you have been given an opportunity to shape the destiny of man which has been given to no other generation in the last 2,000 years. And as a fellow American, I know that you welcome that responsibility and that opportunity. What Franklin Roosevelt said to the American people in the 1930's I say to you now: This generation of Americans, your generation of Americans, has a rendezvous with destiny. I am confident that you will meet that rendezvous, for I can remember my own country when it was quite different from our country today. It was not so many years ago that I was a university student as you are now, and at that time, only 1 in every 10 American farms was electrified, half of the farmers in our Southland were tenant farmers and sharecroppers, thousands of families in the Tennessee Valley had cash incomes of less than $100 a year, and all this in addition to a great depression which threw 12 million men and women out of work and had 20 million Americans on relief—that in that time I was at the university.

Then, under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt, we carried through a great New Deal for the United States. One program after another brought an end to tenant farming in the United States, electrified nearly every farm in our country, transformed the poverty-ridden Tennessee Valley into one of the richest agricultural and industrial areas in the United States. It demonstrated in those great years the immense power of affirmative, free government, the power which adds the idea of social responsibility to individual liberty.

The history of your country in the last years has demonstrated that same quality. And if the task of progress with freedom is more complex, more subtle, and more difficult than the promise of progress without freedom, we are unafraid of that challenge. We are committed to four basic principles in this hemisphere in the Alliance for Progress. The first is the right of every nation to govern itself, to be free from outside dictation and coercion, to mold its own economy and society in any fashion consistent with the will of the people.

Second is the right of every individual citizen to political liberty, the right to speak his own views, to worship God in his own way, to select the government which rules him, and to reject it when it no longer serves the need of a nation.

And third is the right to social justice, the right of every citizen to participate in the progress of his nation. This means land for the landless, and education for those who are denied their education today in this hemisphere. It means that ancient institutions which perpetuate privilege must give way. It means that rich and poor alike must bear the burden and the opportunity of building a nation. It will not be easy to achieve social justice, but freedom cannot last without it.

And the fourth principle of the Alliance is the right of every nation to make economic progress with modern technological means. This is the job, it seems to me, of all of us in this hemisphere, in this decade, all of you who have the opportunity to study at this university, and that is, as I said at the beginning, to demonstrate that we can provide a better life for our people under a system of freedom, to demonstrate that it is our adversaries who must build walls to hold their people in, who must deny their people the right not only of freedom, but economic advancement as well. It is no accident that this year in Cuba agricultural production will be 25 percent below what it was 5 years ago. The great myth of the 1950's was that through a system of communism it was possible to produce a better life for our people; through a denial of political freedom we could provide more material advances, but the fifties showed us well, in China, the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, East Berlin, and Cuba, that when you deny political and social freedom, you also deny the right to advance economically.

Gracias. I want to express the thanks of all of us to you for having us here today. Occasionally, universities are regarded as dangerous places for Presidents, and we are grateful to you for your warm welcome to all of us on this occasion. We also want to express our thanks to the people of Costa Rica. Every one of us will go home with the most profound impression of what a strong, vital people can accomplish, and I think that this journey to Costa Rica has illuminated the minds of 180 million people of what a great opportunity and privilege we have to be associated together in our common cause. Viva Costa Rica. Arriba Costa Rica. Muchas gracias.

EXHIBIT 4

REMARKS OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY UPON ARRIVAL AT LA SABANA AIRPORT, SAN JOSÉ, COSTA RICA

Mr. President, I want to express my warm appreciation to you and the people of Costa Rica for your welcome to us today.

About 500 years ago, Christopher Columbus, after having discovered Costa Rica, turned from Panama and began his last journey home. He described this fourth voyage as the "high journey," the high voyage, and I feel in a very real sense that this is a high voyage for all of us who meet today in this free and democratic country. Our high voyage, Mr. President, is not to seek new lands to conquer, but to make sure that old lands remain free. We don't seek gold for a few in our voyage; we seek a better life for all of our people.

Mr. President, the purpose of our meeting is, as you have suggested, to see what our countries, working together, the United States and the countries of the isthmus, we working together, can do for our people to make sure that along with a system of political independence, hand in hand will go economic well being.

It is our responsibility in this hemisphere, in this isthmus, in my own country in the 1960's, to demonstrate that economic prosperity is the handmaiden of political liberty. That is the responsibility of all of us. If we meet that responsibility, then this country and all countries like it in this hemisphere will remain free. If we do not meet this responsibility, then their inevitable fate will be one of enslavement by those who already have indicated their desire to crush out independence in this hemisphere.

So this meeting is most vital, and I want you to know, Mr. President, that I come here today not only with the Members of the Congress and the Secretary of State and others, but I come here today with 180 million fellow Americans who want this hemisphere to be an example to a watching world in the crucial years of this century and this decade.

And, Mr. President, I want to express again our thanks to you. We could not feel more at home a thousand miles from the United States than here in Costa Rica.

EXHIBIT 5

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON CONVENING THE PRESIDENTS' CONFERENCE, TEATRO NACIONAL, SAN JOSÉ, COSTA RICA

Presidents of the Central American Republics, President of Panama, Your Excellencies the First Ladies of the Central American Republics, members of the diplomatic service, the Archbishop, ladies and gentlemen, I think the extraordinary statements which we have heard this afternoon will serve to illuminate for the people of this hemisphere, and particularly for the people of the United States, the harsh and striking challenges we face in these Republics and in the other Republics of this hemisphere in attempting to improve the life of our people. The statements that have been made today I think serve as a call to action by all of us, north and south, to move ahead in these days before time passes by.

In 1825, a son of El Salvador and a citizen of Central America, Antonio Jose Canas, the first minister accredited by the United Provinces of Central America to the United States, delivered an invitation to Secretary of State Henry Clay. He asked him to send representatives to the first Inter-American Congress at Panama, a meeting at which, he said, the struggling new nations of this hemisphere "might consider upon and adopt the best plan for defending the states of the New World from foreign aggression, and * * * raise them to that elevation of wealth and power, which, from their resources, they may attain."

Today, 138 years later, we are gathered in this theater in pursuit of those same goals—the preservation of our independence, the extension of freedom, and the elevation of the welfare of our citizens to a level as high as from our resources we can attain. And today I have come from the United States at the invitation of a Central America which with Panama, is rapidly attaining a unity of purpose, effort and achievement which has been unknown since the dissolution of that earliest federation.

That early conference did not achieve all its goals. But from it flowed the dream and creation of Bolivar, and Canas, and Jose Cecilio de Valle of Costa Rica—the dream which became the inter-American system and this system has been the most successful, the most fruitful and the most enduring of international order in the history of the world.

We can say this because every effort to reimpose the despotisms of the Old World on the people of the New has ultimately been beaten back—because within this system 20 Republicans have attained the full recognition of their dignity as sovereign nations, and because this system has maintained an unmatched record of peaceful relations among its members. There have been occasional conflicts to mar this record. But nowhere else have nations lived as neighbors with so little hostility and warfare. And today the principles of nonintervention and the peaceful resolution of disputes have been so firmly imbedded in our tradition that the heroic democracy in which we meet today can pursue its national goals without an armed force to guard its frontiers. In few other spots in the world would this be true.

We have not attained this strength by merely trying to protect what was already won, to preserve the gains of the past, to maintain the status quo. If these were our system's goals, it would inevitably have crumbled as old orders crumbled. Instead, it has survived, prospered and grown, despite wars and revolutions, despite changing ideologies and changing technologies, despite shifts in power and shifts in wealth—because it has itself been an instrument of change, profound revolutionary change which has molded the history of this hemisphere and shaped the thinking of men seeking freedom and dignity in all lands. As each powerful new wave of ideas and aspiration has swept across our shores, the inter-American system has been able to translate these ideas and aspirations into a working reality for our people. In this respect it has been unique among efforts at world collaboration. That is why it has endured in the past and must endure in the future.

In the first three centuries of our history, the seeds of Western civilization and culture were planted here.

In the next century, we established an inter-American system which helped to complete and maintain our freedom from foreign rule. This freedom has often been challenged—as today it is challenged in Cuba. But with the help of dedicated and brave men—men such as those who drove out Maximilian or men such as those who prevented the Spanish reconquest in 1866, men such as Costa Rica's Mora, who helped to drive out William Walker—with such help, we have destroyed all efforts at foreign conquest in the past, as we will ultimately triumph over the new conquerors of today.

In the 50 years following its creation, the inter-American system worked to establish the political equality and national dignity of all its members, to extend political democracy and strengthen the principle that no nation should forcibly impose its will upon another. Those goals have been largely met. The equality of sovereign states is accepted by all. Intervention and force have been renounced. Machinery of peaceful settlement has been strengthened. Democracy rules in most of our lands. It will ultimately prevail over the last vestiges of tyranny in every land in this hemisphere.

Now, in our own time, the inter-American system faces old foes and new challenges; and it is again demonstrating the capacity for change which has always given it strength. The foes are stronger and more determined than ever before and the challenges are more difficult, more complex and burdensome. For today we are faced not merely with the protection of new nations, but with the remolding of ancient societies—not only with the destruction of political enemies, but with the destrucion of poverty, hunger, ignorance, and disease—not alone with the creation of national dignity but with the preservation of human dignity.

To meet this enormous challenge, the peoples of the Americas have fashioned an Alianza para el Progreso, an alliance in which all the American States have mobilized their resources and energies to secure land for the landless, education for those without schools, and a faster rate of economic growth within a society where all can share in the fruits of progress.

Here in Central America we have already begun to move towards the goals of the Alianza.

You have made enormous strides toward the creation of a Common Market of 13 million people. New regional institutions have been created; a central bank has been established; and centralized planning and direction are going ahead in education, finance, and many other fields. I congratulate you on your effort to reestablish an historic unity to meet new needs; and I pledge my Government's continued assistance to that great effort.

In addition, you have begun to formulate the long-range economic development plans essential to the success of the Alianza. The organization of the Central American Joint Planning Mission gives new impetus to planning on a regional development scale.

In nearly every country represented here, new land reform or tax reform programs have been adopted in an effort to meet the basic pledges of increased social justice contained in the Charter of Punta del Este and demanded by all of our people.

In the 2-year period beginning July 1961, under programs supported by the United States as part of its contribution to the Alliance, almost 3,000 new classrooms will have been built in the nations represented here today; almost a million new books have been distributed; and tomorrow we will begin to distribute more than 2 million more to children hungry for learning. Much more remains to be done.

Some 7,600 new homes will have been built during this 2-year period under Alianza programs in these nations—but much more remains to be done.

Three-quarters of a million children will have been fed, but many are still hungry.

Nearly 6,000 new teachers have been trained, as well as many thousands of agricultural workers, public health, and other public administrators. Still more are needed.

During the last 18 months, almost 3 million people in Central America—farmers, workers, children, and slumdwellers—have received some form of direct benefit under the Alianza; and almost $250 million of external resources have been committed in support of the Alliance in Central America and Panama, to help strengthen the basic structure of the economy and at the same time meet the basic needs of the people for improved health, education, housing, and institutions.

Finally, a revolutionary worldwide agreement to stabilize the price of coffee has been entered into which we in the United States are determined to make work—to protect your most vital source of export earnings. As every speaker here today has said, all of these countries sell their agricultural commodities in a sense at wholesale, and buy their manufactured goods at retail, and pay the freight both ways. And we are also willing to move ahead on agreements stabilizing the prices of other commodities, so that your future prosperity will not depend on the often destructive fluctuation of prices beyond your control.

Tomorrow, at El Bosque, we will see with our own eyes how the Alianza enters into the lives of citizens of Costa Rica—providing them with new homes in which they and their families can find decent shelter for the first time.

We shall continue under the Alliance to build economies more balanced and less dependent on one or two export commodities. To this end we must push forward plans for industrialization, greater crop diversification, stronger educational facilities, and better utilization of resources.

Yet we cannot be, and I know none of us are, satisfied with the progress we have made. Peoples who have waited centuries for opportunity and dignity cannot wait much longer. And unless those of us now making an effort are willing to redouble our efforts, unless the rich are willing to use some of their riches more wisely, unless the privileged are willing to yield up their privileges to the common good, unless the young and the educated are given opportunities to use their education, and unless governments are willing to dedicate themselves tirelessly to the tasks of governing efficiently and developing swiftly, then let us realize our Alianza will fail, and with it will fall the society of free nations which our forefathers labored to build.

Unfortunately, while this new endeavor goes forward, we are also confronted by one of the oldest of our enemies. For, at the very time that newly independent nations rise in the Caribbean—the people of Cuba have been forcibly compelled to submit to a new imperialism, more ruthless, more powerful, and more deadly in its pursuit of power than any this hemisphere has known. Just when it was hoped that Cuba was about to enter upon a new era of democracy and social justice, the Soviet Union, through its Cuban puppets, absorbed the Cuban nation into its empire—and it now seeks to extend its rule to the shores of the continent itself.

But other foreign powers have discovered that the American Hemisphere is not fertile ground for foreign tyranny, and that any effort to spread such rule will meet with fierce and unyielding resistance. For Americans will not easily yield up those freedoms which they shed so much blood to achieve.

At the OAS, at this meeting, and wherever Americans gather to consult about the future of their continent, we will continue to strengthen the structure of resistance to subversion. I am hopeful that at this meeting we will again increase our capacity to prevent the infiltration of Cuban agents, money, and propaganda. We will build a wall around Cuba—not a wall of mortar or brick or barbed wire, but a wall of dedicated men determined to protect their freedom and sovereignty. And in this effort, as in all the other necessary efforts, I can assure you the United States will play its full part and carry its full burden.

In 1822, Bolivar, the father of the inter-American system, said this: "United in heart, in spirit, and in aims, this continent * * * must raise its eyes * * * to peer into the centuries which lie ahead. It can then contemplate with pride those future generations of men, happy and free, enjoying to the full the blessings that heaven bestows on this earth, and recalling in their hearts the protectors and liberators of our day."

My friends and colleagues, today we meet, representing seven of the great Republics of America, united in spirit and in aims. We are confident of our ultimate success in protecting our freedom, in raising the living standards of our citizens, in beginning a new era of hope in American history. Secure in that confidence, we, too, can look forward to future centuries knowing that our descendants may also gratefully recall in their hearts the protectors and liberators of our day.

Thank you.

RATIFICATION OF ANTI-POLL-TAX CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT BY ADDITIONAL STATES

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to announce to the Senate that two additional States have ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment which the 87th Congress submitted to the States last August. Those States are Tennessee and Connecticut.

This brings to 25 the number of States which have ratified this important Constitutional amendment which would eliminate the prerequisite that payment of a poll tax or any other tax be a requirement for voting for President, Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senators or Representatives in Congress.

Mr. President, I am particularly pleased by the favorable action of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee. The Senate of the Tennessee Legislature on last Wednesday, March 20, approved the amendment by a vote of 22 to 1; and on the following day, March 21, the Tennessee House approved the amendment by a vote of 55 to 20, thus completing ratification by that State—the first Southern State to ratify the amendment.

I wish to express my profound appreciation to my distinguished friends, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who cosponsored and vigorously supported passage of my resolution proposing the amendment in the 87th Congress, and his colleague [Mr. GORE], who likewise supported passage of the resolution. Each of them has worked valiantly in seeking its ratification by the legislature of their State.

I likewise express my deep appreciation to Governor Clement, of Tennessee, for his most effective leadership in this matter.

In the case of Connecticut, the senate of that State's legislature approved the anti-poll-tax amendment on last Wednesday, March 20, by a unanimous vote of 33 to 0, completing ratification by the State, the house having previously approved the amendment on March 6 by the overwhelming vote of 251 to 4.

Mr. President, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to the two distinguished Senators from Connecticut—Senator DODD, who cosponsored, warmly supported, and directed his efforts toward ratification of the amendment by the Legislature of Connecticut; and Senator RIBICOFF, who likewise has vigorously supported ratification by the legislature of his State.

In addition to the good news from Tennessee and Connecticut, I have been informed that the House of Representatives of the Pennsylvania Legislature has voted favorably on ratification of the amendment, but I do not know the date on which the Pennsylvania House acted or the vote. I understand that the concurrent resolution is now pending before the Senate of the Pennsylvania Legislature, and that the indications are that it will be favorably acted upon at an early date.

Either the house or the senate of the legislatures of four other States have approved the amendment. Those States are Arizona, Kansas, Wisconsin, and Missouri.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend. First, I wish to say that in connection with this matter I am very greatly indebted to the senior Senator from Tennessee. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Judiciary Committee, he kindly allowed me to be heard on this matter on two or three different occasions, in different Congresses. Under his leadership, the subcommittee favorably reported the resolution proposing adoption of the amendment.

He supported us on the floor. He went further, and in the 86th Congress, when an amendment of his own was pending, he was gracious and generous enough to permit me to offer my amendment and to aid me in offering it as an amendment to his amendment. Then he followed with the superb work which he has done with the legislature of his own State. I wish publicly to express on the floor of the Senate and as a part of the permanent Senate RECORD my sense of very deep appreciation to the senior Senator from Tennessee, who has done a yeoman's work in this whole matter.

I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am most gratified for the kind remarks of my colleague from Florida. It has been easy to work with him for this important resolution for a constitutional amendment because of the consistent, progressive, and intelligent leadership that he has given the effort. The Senator from Florida is doing one of the finest services that has been done in the Senate during my tenure here in pointing out the importance of this amendment to the Constitution and in urging State legislatures to ratify it.

I am gratified that the Volunteer State, the State of Tennessee, has ratified the amendment by overwhelming votes—as has been stated, 22 to 1 in the senate, and 55 to 20 in the house of representatives—and that the ratification of the amendment by the State of Tennesseee represents the first ratification by a Southern State. I know that as the legislatures of other Southern States meet, the amendment will be approved by other States which realize the importance of doing away with the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting.

Mr. President, in all States where poll taxes have been in existence and where they have been eliminated there is a better grade of citizenship. We have more participation in elections. We have better expression of the will of the voter and a better formulation of public opinion. I did what I could to urge ratification of the amendment on the part of the senate and the house of representatives in Tennessee. My colleague [Mr. GORE] did likewise.

But without the leadership of the Governor of Tennessee, Frank Clement, this great record would not have been made. He has worked diligently on the problem. He has urged the legislature to ratify the amendment. While on some matters we have not always seen eye to eye, I have been very happy to join with him in this effort. While we in Tennessee think we have the most progressive State in the South, I feel that other Southern States will follow suit in this march toward greater democracy in the United States and greater rights to the voters of our country.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate those cordial and very generous remarks of the Senator from Tennessee. We have here exemplified again the fact that people in public life who do not agree on many things have made common cause on this particular subject. We have seen it in the bipartisan pressing of this issue on the floor of the Senate, on the floor of the House, and in the followup with the State legislatures. We have seen it in almost every State. I think that the remarks of my distinguished friend from Tennessee have made it clear that, even within a party, leaders who are not of exactly the same philosophy have found it equally important to join in the furtherance of this effort. I have already expressed my appreciation of Governor Clement's leadership in this field. I say again that without the continued, devoted effort of the senior Senator from Tennessee, I doubt very seriously if the State of Tennessee would have acted as it has. Certainly we would have had greater difficulty in getting favorable action here in the Senate without his help. I again express my appreciation.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. I should like to know how many States have now ratified the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to say 25 States have now ratified the amendment, so far as I know. We have been informed that one more State may complete ratification of the amendment today or tomorrow. We know of five States altogether which have ratified by action of one house of the legislature. We know of several others which are considering the matter with apparent favorable prospects.

We are pushing as rapidly as we can. We do not have an organized campaign. We have not attempted anything of that kind. The good and kindly efforts of the Senators here on this floor, on both sides of the aisle—and I include in those who have worked hard the distinguished Senator from Idaho—those efforts have been more responsible for favorable action than any other one source. But in some States we have had, just as we have seen in Tennessee, aggressive action by the Governors of those States. I hope that we shall learn as we go along just who has been providing the aggressive leadership. I certainly want to be equally fair to all who have participated and will participate. The effort is not a personal one. We wish to eliminate something which I think has been harmful to good government and the citizens of our country.

Mr. CHURCH. I think the signal progress of so many States having ratified the amendment in so short a time testifies to the high merit of the amendment. I wish personally to extend my congratulations to the Senator from Florida for his effort. He has rendered very great service to his country.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. I, too, wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Florida for his ingenuity and foresight in bringing the amendment to the attention of the Senate and the people of America. He sponsored the resolution at the last session of the Congress. Maryland was, I believe, the fifth or sixth State to ratify the amendment.

It is very fitting that today, the 330th birthday of Maryland, the Senators should bring up this matter.

On behalf of Marylanders, I desire to say to him that we are very grateful to him for having brought to our attention the fact that the Tennessee Legislature ratified the amendment. It is very fitting that on our 330th birthday of Maryland we should pay tribute to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank my distinguished friend. I have already stated in the RECORD previously that we are indebted to him and to his colleague for the bipartisan leadership which resulted in favorable action by his great State. I appreciate his kind remarks today.

I yield the floor.

PEACETIME VETERANS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as a result of our country's farflung responsibilities, American servicemen stationed in many parts of the world are frequently exposed to dangers as great as those in active warfare. These brave men should be entitled to receive the same protection and benefits as our wartime veterans. I have joined in sponsoring legislation which would authorize benefits for such veterans and their dependents who have served in an area which the President may designate as an "area of hostilities."

A recent series of reports published by the Newhouse newspapers throughout the country graphically describes the kind of fighting that these so-called peacetime veterans are experiencing. I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the three-part series by Jules Witcover, which appeared in the Syracuse Herald-Journal and other Newhouse newspapers on February 10, 11, and 12.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Feb. 10, 1963]

UNITED STATES AT PEACE, BUT AMERICANS DYING IN HOT "COLD WAR"

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Though the United States has been officially at peace for nearly a decade, Americans have been serving and dying in foreign lands throughout that time. For these men and their survivors, there has been nothing cold about the cold war. This is the first of a three-part series about their sacrifices.)

(By Jules Witcover)

WASHINGTON, February 9.—On July 27, 1953, the day an armistice was signed in the Korean war, Soviet Mig fighters gunned down an American RB–50 reconnaissance plane over the Sea of Japan. Sixteen Americans lost their lives. Since then, more than 100 others have died in the cold war.

Many of them, like those who have perished in south Vietnam and Laos; have been soldiers and airmen in a kind of hot combat that mocks such expressions as cold war.

Many others, including several score in south Vietnam and four in Laos, have died in incidents the Pentagon calls "not the result of actions by hostile forces." The distinction is lost on the families of such men.

To the casual reader, the recent heavy casualties in southeast Asia may have seemed to be a sharp, sudden break in a long period of unruffled peace. To hundreds of service families and their friends, they have constituted a particularly hard period in a decade of apprehension, uncertainty and sorrow.

On November 7, 1954, a B–29 was shot down by a Soviet plane over northern Japan. All 11 crewmen bailed out and were picked up. But one American was dead when they found him.

On August 17, 1955, a propeller-driven T-6 trainer was shot down by a North Korean plane in the Korean theater, killing the American observer.

On September 2, 1958, a C–130 transport was attacked by three Soviet jet fighters over Soviet Armenia and crashed. The bodies of six crewmen were returned by the Russians 3 weeks later. Eleven other crew members were never heard from and are presumed dead.

On July 1, 1960, an RB–47 reconnaissance plane was shot down over the Barents Sea off the Arctic coast of the Soviet Union. Four Americans lost their lives. Two others were released 7 months later.

Until the start of the major U.S. military commitment in southeast Asia, these were the most highly publicized cold war incidents in which Americans made the supreme sacrifice. But there were others—scores, even hundreds of them.

In the same periods, American military men died in what have come to be considered routine incidents—routine in terms of military experience: Planes crashing in training, on patrol or trying to land on the deck of a carrier in rough seas: auto and truck accidents, accidents in everyday drill.

But to the widows, parents, and children of the men who lost their lives, there was nothing routine about them. The incidents brought grief just as profound as did any death of an American soldier or sailor in World War II.

The Army alone lists 2,909 "accidental military fatalities" to its troops overseas in the period July 1, 1953, to June 30, 1962, of which 2,007 occurred in Europe and 902 in the Pacific. Comparable statistics are not kept by the Air Force and Navy.

Just how many lives have been lost in the cold war is a question neither the Pentagon nor the State Department is prepared to answer. To draw the line between a man who died in a hot incident along the Iron Curtain and one who perished in training made necessary by the cold war conflict, their officials say, would be an injustice to both.

Thus, in the recent Cuban crisis, the only clear-cut fatality listed by the Defense Department was Air Force Maj. Rudolf Anderson, Jr., of Greenville, S.C., pilot of the U-2 photo reconnaissance plane reported shot down over the island October 27.

However, in another incident directly related to the crisis, seven Air Force crew members of the C–135 stratolifter cargo transport perished when their plane crashed while making an approach to the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, October 22.

The Navy does not list this crash—nor any other that has occurred in the last decade—as a cold war casualty. The term is a diplomatic one, not a military one, service spokesmen insist. The loss of any service life in this twilight period of limited war and counterinsurgency, whether under fire overseas or in training in the States, is a cold war casualty, they say.

Even on the so-called quiet fronts of the cold war—like Korea, where an armistice has been in effect for nearly 10 years—Americans are dying. The latest was the death last November 20 of 18-year-old Army Sp4c. James Allen Johnson, of Paris, Ky.

Johnson, who was one of three cold war victims mentioned by President Kennedy in this year's state of the Union message, was ambushed by North Koreans while he stood guard in an observation post along the South Korean border. He had been in the Army 13 months and 16 days.

It is perhaps a measure of the casual American attitude toward the cold war that the Army, asked how many other James Allen Johnsons there have been in Korea since the armistice, cannot provide the answer.

In World War I, in World War II, even in what is still euphemistically called the Korean conflict, a compilation of the number of Americans killed in any theater of action was readily available after notification of next of kin.

So it is now concerning Americans who die in Vietnam. The Pentagon prints up a weekly list of deaths there, dating back to January 1, 1961, from actions by hostile forces. The situation has become hot enough to warrant hot-war treatment in this regard.

But in Korea and in West Germany the Americans who have died as a result of hostile action or otherwise are not toted up on any list by the services. War's grimmest statistics, like the cold war itself, become blurred and hard to lay your hands on in the era of limited war and limited concern.

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Feb. 11, 1963]

THREE DEATHS POINT UP U.S. COLD WAR LOSSES

(By Jules Witcover)

WASHINGTON, FEBRUARY 11.—President Kennedy, concluding his state of the Union message to Congress on January 14, singled out three men who died in the cold war in recent months as a reminder of the commitment the United States continues to make in the fight against communism.

The name of one of the three, Air Force Maj. Rudolf Anderson, Jr., of Greenville, S.C., was recognizable to millions of Americans as the U–2 pilot killed on a photo-reconnaissance flight over Cuba in the heat of the October crisis.

The names of the other two—Marine Sgt. Gerald Pendall, of Macomb, Ill., and Sp.4 James A. Johnson, of Paris, Ky.—were not. Pendell was one of five Americans killed last October 6 when their helicopter crashed into a mountainside in south Vietnam. Johnson was killed last November 20 when North Koreans ambushed his observation post on the border between North and South Korea.

Of the two, the marine sergeant is the more typical of the men who are on the firing line of the cold war—a career serviceman, married and the father of four small children, a specialist in marine aviation enroute to an outlying fuel station established to meet the heavy demands of U.S. helicopters.

The Army specialist 4, the equivalent of a World War II corporal, was single, 18 years old, just out of high school, an enlistee only 13 months earlier. He was standing his post peacefully with two other young soldiers who survived the ambush.

Sergeant Pendell's wife, Donna, back at Macomb with the children—ages 8, 5, 4, and 2—is a service wife who has lived with the risks of the cold war for a long time and has been exposed to the military environment. She knows why her husband was sent to Vietnam, and why he had to die there.

"My husband was a very dedicated Marine and he was satisfied he was doing his work," she says calmly. "His letters told me some things, but I didn't think it was so bad over there until it happened.

"I've always been around military bases and have been more aware of the cold war than the people in a small town in Illinois. I know it's necessary."

Specialist Johnson's mother, Mrs. James Johnson, at home with her husband and three other sons, knows only that going into the Army was what her son wanted to do. To her, the cold war is an indefinite thing that suddenly entered her home.

"He joined the Army to serve his country, and they put him in Korea," she says. "He never complained. He was doing what he wanted. I appreciate the President taking time out to mention him."

Though brief conversation quickly reveals the difference between the two women in terms of their comprehension of cold war politics, there is little basic difference in their attitudes in this first difficult period of adjustment.

They are proud of their men in an unspoken way; somewhat surprisingly perhaps, they voice no bitterness that their men have been taken from them while the rest of America goes blissfully about its peaceful pursuits.

"A lot of people here woke up when the news came about my husband," Mrs. Pendell says. "But people in a small town can't be expected to really comprehend. They need something like the Cuban crisis close to home to reach them."

Says Mr. Johnson: "Most people listen to the news, but if it doesn't hit their own families they don't know. You can't blame them."

Others who have lost men in the cold war reflect in different words the same mood of understanding.

Mrs. Archie T. Bourg, of Baton Rouge, La., mother of Airman 2–C Archie Bourg, Jr., one of 11 Americans never recovered in the crash of a C–130 transport over Soviet Armenia in 1958, says: "The American people are always ready to take up arms to defend their country. But this is just something they read about."

There is, of course, some bitterness among some of the widows and mothers. But it is mostly bitterness against bureaucratic callousness in handling personal matters, or in the Government's inability to project to the public the depth of American sacrifices. They do not question the need for committing troops to cold-war fronts.

Mrs. Julia Oshinskie, of Shamokin, Pa., mother of Airman 1–C Robert J. Oshinskie, another of the never recovered in the 1958 crash over Soviet Armenia, says she never has received a satisfactory answer on what happened to the plane, and adds:

"Hardly anyone remembers how that plane was shot down 4 years ago. We throw out a lot of propaganda on our gains, but why didn't they keep reminding the public of the toll we have paid?"

Mrs. Edgar W. Weitkamp, of Arlington, Va., wife of an Army warrant officer whose body never was recovered from a transport crash in Laos in March 1961, says, "We've got to stop communism someplace." But she does not understand why the Government did not press at the Geneva talks later that year for the return of her husband's body.

And of the public's apparent apathy toward the cold war, she adds: "Only in this thing with Cuba did people suddenly realize something is going on in this world. For the first time they felt fearful. They don't even read the papers. It won't be a personal thing until they're personally involved, the way I am."

And there are those, like Mrs. Pauline Tencza, of Fairfax, Va., wife of Army Lt. Col. Anthony J. Tencza, who died in Vietnam in a helicopter crash last July, who have lived through "hot" conflicts like World War II and Korea and feel somehow singled out by the cost of a "limited" war.

Her husband had 21 years in the Army and had received two Purple Hearts in Korea before he was sent to Vietnam.

"In total war you expect it to happen, and every family is in the same boat," she says. "But it's hard for the families that are hit when it's less than a total war."

According to a man who has dealt with numerous survivors of men lost in the cold war, Chief of Air Force Chaplains Gen. Robert P. Taylor, those who express bitterness or any doubts about the need for cold-war losses are in a distinct minority.

"Most widows react as courageously as those of World War II did," he says. "They may not comprehend the full meaning of the cold war, but they respond with the same patriotism that has buoyed up American women in all wars."

As for the public's reaction, General Taylor says:

"I'm not so sure the people at large are to blame for their lackadaisical attitude. Maybe the military hasn't kept them abreast of the importance of the cold war. When the people are truly informed about what it really means, they will rally."

[From the Birmingham (Ala.) News, Feb. 12, 1963]

U.S. Fighters in Vietnam Go Benefitless and Unsung

(By Jules Witcover)

Washington, February 12.—Though hardly a week goes by now without the death of another American serviceman in Vietnam, the U.S. troops there are still considered by their Government to be serving peacetime duty.

Among the official distinctions drawn by Uncle Sam concerning these and other cold-war combatants are:

1. They are not eligible for the major combat decorations for heroism—the Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Navy Cross, the Air Force Cross, the Silver Star.
2. They are not eligible, after discharge, for the same pension given World War I, World War II, and Korean war veterans totally and permanently disabled by a non-service-connected cause.
3. They are not eligible for the so-called GI bill of rights providing educational, housing loan, and other readjustment benefits available to men who served in the last three hot wars.
4. They are not eligible, if they lose a limb, for a special automobile made available for men who suffered such losses in World War II or Korea.
5. They are judged by much more stringent presumptions of preservice fitness than are applied to bonafide "wartime" servicemen in determining eligibility for service-connected disability compensation.
6. They cannot buy the cheap $10,000 national service life insurance policy available to men who served in the last three hot wars.

The first-mentioned distinction—their ineligibility for major combat decorations—soon may be removed. The Kennedy administration has asked Congress for legislation permitting the award of these medals, now restricted to distinguished service in active conflict with an armed enemy of the United States in time of hot war.

Until last April, men killed or wounded by hostile action on cold-war fronts were not even eligible for the Purple Heart. An executive order by President Kennedy changed that ruling, but Congress must act on the remaining decorations.

As far as other benefits are concerned, there is no distinction made between those servicemen who are on active duty on the front lines of the cold war places like Vietnam, Laos, Korea, and Berlin, and those who are carrying out normal military peacetime pursuits in the States.

If a man is permanently disabled or killed in a cold war front, he or his next of kin may be eligible for a somewhat higher disability compensation or death benefit payment based on "extra hazardous" service. But this is one of the few instances in which a special consideration is given.

The Government's distinction between hot and cold war apparently is not drawn by a number of insurance companies. Widows and parents complain that life insurance policies they hold on their deceased men are not paid because death occurred overseas and on a hazardous mission of war.

Mrs. Julia Oshinskie of Shamokin, Pa., mother of A1c Robert J. Oshinskie, one of 11 Americans never recovered in the 1958 crash of a C-130 transport over Soviet Armenia, says:

"We had two personal policies on Bob, and when he was lost they refused to pay the full benefits because he was overseas and was on this type of mission."

Mrs. Edgar W. Weitkamp, of Arlington, Va., wife of an Army warrant officer lost in a transport crash in Laos in 1961, says:

"This wasn't supposed to be a war, but the insurance company won't pay double indemnity for an accidental death. How can it be both ways?"

Other survivors wonder at the distinctions drawn. Mr. and Mrs. Edward S. Connard, Sr., of Milton, Del., parents of Capt. Edward S. Connard Jr., navigator of the Air Force transport that crashed attempting to land at Guantanamo Bay Naval Base at the outset of the Cuban crisis, are among them.

They frankly question why the Pentagon singled out Air Force Maj. Rudolf Anderson, the U-2 pilot who lost his life on a photo reconnaissance mission over Cuba, for full military honors and did not list their son and the other six crew members of the Guantanamo crash as Cuban crisis casualties.

"We don't think they received proper recognition," Captain Connard's father says. "They were there to bring out the women and children. They were doing their part as much as anyone."

Another parent, one more closely associated with the military's attitude toward the problem of casualties, gets down to the nub of things—more important than how a casualty is categorized is public understanding of the necessity for it.

Maj. Gen. William F. Train, commandant of the U.S. Army War College at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., is the father of Lt. William F. Train III, killed in south Vietnam in June, 1962, while traveling with a Vietnamese army convoy. He says:

"The desirable thing would be to have everyone fully understand the term cold war. Insofar as the Vietnamese are concerned, their nation is a battleground and the shooting makes it a 'hot' war for them.

"Lives are frequently lost in the periphery of the Nation's interest.

"I think my son's loss of life in the service of his country is similar to the loss of life in any operation providing the freedom we know—in war or peace."

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is the intention of the leadership to proceed to consider Calendar No. 69, S. 6, which is known as the mass transit bill, and to have general debate on Friday of this week. I expect the debate to continue for some time. The Senate surely will be considering the bill until at least Monday of the following week.

I thought I should give notice now, so that Senators who are interested in discussing the proposed legislation can be prepared to initiate debate on Friday of this week.

ELECTION OF KARL ROLVAAG AS GOVERNOR OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Minnesota has been in the news lately. At long last there has been settled the question as to who is Governor of the State of Minnesota. I am happy to note, for the edification of my colleagues, that as of this day Mr. Karl Rolvaag, Democrat-Farmer-Labor candidate for Governor, the man we thought and knew had been elected Governor, has now been certified as the Governor of the State of Minnesota and will take his oath of office today. He will deliver a message to a joint session of the legislature this week.

Then, on April 16, it is our plan to have a sort of replay of Andrew Jackson's inaugural, Minnesota style, for a genuine community and statewide celebration. I hope that all my colleagues who know Minnesota and Minnesotans, and who know the distinguished Governor-elect and now Governor, Karl Rolvaag, will keep this date in mind.

I note that my friend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] who is so well known in Minnesota that he "bowls over" everybody whenever he contests with anyone in Minnesota, is in the Chamber. I hope that he will see fit to arrange his travel plans so that he can be with us. That would be a wonderful occasion for all of us.

The distinguished present Presiding Officer (Mr. McGovern in the chair) is beloved in the State of Minnesota, as well as respected and admired. We should like to have him there.

I see my good friend the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] the former Governor of that State, is in the Chamber. He should be at the celebration.

Senators will have to pay their own transportation costs, but we would like to have them come. They may be able to get a free lunch or two.

I include everyone in the invitation. I would even like to see my good friend the minority leader [Mr. Dirksen] there, if he could find the time to come.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think I ought to make one suggestion to our distinguished friend. Since the candidate won by only 73 votes——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh no; it was a landslide victory, with a margin of 91 votes. It was a major victory.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Whoever may be in the entourage who go, full garrisoned and full panoplied, to the inaugural, the majority delegation should not exceed the minority delegation by more than one, to keep the ratio straight.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. Actually, it ought not to exceed it by more than 14/1000ths of 1 percent, because that was the margin of victory. We will try to keep the arithmetical proportion in mind.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is very kind of the Senator from Minnesota to invite us all to his State. We all enjoy visiting in Minnesota.

The only successes I have had in Minnesota have always been in the wintertime. I do not know how I would fare at this season. I am sure it will be a most enjoyable occasion, especially if it is to be along the line of the inauguration of Andrew Jackson.

I know Karl Rolvaag. He has been through a very tortuous route. He is a capable man, with great experience in government, who has had many years of enlightened politics.

In my opinion, Karl Rolvaag will become one of the great chief executives of a wonderful State. If I cannot be present, I hope the Senator from Minnesota will extend to him my very best wishes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be happy to do so.

We would be honored if the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] could also find her way out to Minnesota for one of these occasions.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That would make it more interesting for all of us.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would be more interesting for all of us. Of course, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], has been to Minnesota before. We would love to have him return. We should like to see him as soon as possible.

To the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] I extend a cordial invitation.

I extend the invitation to all Senators. As I said, we are frugal people. In the light of the fact that there has been a rather extensive campaign, I imagine we shall not be able to provide too much of what are called "representation allowances."

In Minnesota we have a new slogan. Instead of "Travel now, pay later" we say, "Run now, pay later".

We have proved the value of a vote. We vote in November and count all winter.

This has been a wonderful experience. I am delighted that the Senator from Tennessee has paid such a well deserved tribute to my personal good friend and political associate and colleague for his many years of politics in Minnesota, Hon. Karl Rolvaag. He is a remarkable man, and a truly outstanding public servant.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am curious to know one thing about Minnesota politics. After such a long winter, is there any place left for the governor to appoint a good Democrat to office, or have all the places been filled?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I fear the pickings will be rather slim. Most of the appointments have already been made.

I should like to make another comment about Minnesota politics. It has been a long, cold winter, and there was not much else to do but to recount the votes, anyway. Now that spring is here—with work to be done, fields to be plowed, and wheat to be planted, to prepare for the future—we have put a Democrat in as Governor of Minnesota. During the winter months we just let the Republicans hang on. [Laughter.]

THE LAKES OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as long as I am dealing with my beloved, great State of Minnesota, I would like to talk about prospects for summer and the subject of the lakes of Minnesota.

Mr. President, Minnesota has long been known as the "Land of Ten Thousand Lakes."

What may not be as well known is Minnesota's proclivity for understatement. We are, indeed, a modest people.

I do not know whether this Senator should be making that statement or not, but, at least, this is the statement I have prepared. [Laughter.]

Having never subjected Minnesota's myriad lakes to actual count, we were content to claim a mere 10,000. For residents of other States this probably sounded like blatant extravagance; for Minnesotans it only represented another example of our great modesty.

Minnesota is currently engaged in the first statewide lake census.

You see, Mr. President, not only are we going to count votes, we are going to count lakes.

Although the results are not yet fully known, it is already evident that the record must be corrected.

Mr. President, it takes a long time for the results to be known in some of these hotly contested elections in our State.

Latest returns disclose 12,211 sparkling lakes dotting the Minnesota countryside and 2 of our 87 counties remain uncounted. Moreover, these two counties—Cook and Lake Counties—are among the most heavily dotted with those sparkling gems of sky-blue water.

Clearly, the final total will run well in excess of 13,000 lakes. And, my colleagues, these are genuine lakes, not swamps, bogs, mudholes, or pools of stagnant water that are often identified as lakes by other sections of this country less restrained and circumspect in their claims.

Mr. President, for those Members of the Senate who still harbor vestiges of doubt regarding the extent or beauty of Minnesota lakes, the Senator from Minnesota extends a cordial invitation to make an on-site inspection.

The matter of on-site inspections has received a great deal of international comment, but I believe I can say, without fear of successful contradiction, that in Minnesota we will welcome any number of on-site inspections by Members of the Senate at our lakes.

Come this summer; bring your family and friends. Explore the cool clear waters of Minnetonka, Winnibigoshish, Mille Lacs, or Ottertail Lakes, or the 13,000 other lakes. Mr. President, try your luck fishing on Kabetogoma, Burntside, Itasca, or Leech. We guarantee a Minnesota welcome. If you do not like one lake, we have another waiting around the corner for you.

I am grateful to my colleagues for their attention on the matter of statecraft and public policy.

I yield the floor to Senators who want to talk about the lakes in their States.

THE STRUGGLE FOR LATIN AMERICA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, with the President's return from Costa Rica, there will be renewed interest in the course he has chosen for dealing with the problem of Castroism in Latin America.

Stewart Alsop's timely article in the Saturday Evening Post entitled "The Fruits of Castro's Plotting," develops the thesis that the struggle for Latin America, which President Kennedy has described as "the most critical area in the world today," may be won for freedom and democracy in part because of the lessons the hemisphere is learning from the Marxist revolution in Cuba. He says that Castro has dramatized the importance to us of Latin America, shown the Latin American "intellectuals" the reality of communism, thrown a badly needed scare into the Latin American ruling classes, and given the United States an opportunity to demonstrate that the real center of power in this hemisphere is in the United States.

The article reports some interesting first-hand observations by Mr. Alsop, and acknowledges that he is "now convinced" that the key decision made by President Kennedy last October was the right one. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Fruits of Castro's Plotting

(By Stewart Alsop)

President Kennedy flies to Costa Rica in a few days for a summit conference with the leaders of Central America. Two questions, which have been on his mind before, will surely be on his mind still.

Is it enough that the Soviet missiles and other offensive weapons have been removed from Cuba? Or must Fidel Castro himself be removed, and with him the Soviet military base in the Western Hemisphere?

The final responsibility for answering these questions belongs to the President. But a reporter can at least try to put the questions in a meaningful context. To that end, this reporter recently traveled some 10,000 miles through the Caribbean and Central America.

Toward the beginning of the trip, an American Ambassador in one of the countries most dangerously threatened by Castroism made an oddly optimistic remark. "You remember the old saying about the Lord protecting drunks and the United States," he said. "Maybe Fidel Castro is one of the best things the Lord has ever done for us."

When I heard the remark, it seemed to me a rather feeble attempt at originality. But by the time I had got home again, the Ambassador's remark had begun to make a surprising amount of sense to me.

No one but a fool would deny for a moment the seriousness of the threat Castro represents to this hemisphere. The threat is visible to anyone with eyes to see and a mind to understand.

It is visible, for example, in the left hand of Rómulo Betancourt, President of Venezuela. Since he became President in 1959, there have been five attempts to assassinate Betancourt. The attempt that most nearly succeeded was unquestionably inspired and directed by Fidel Castro. When his car was bombed by Castro's henchmen, Betancourt put his left hand down on the pavement, which was covered with burning gasoline. The hand is still a raw, puffy, scabrous red.

Betancourt's hand is an ugly symbol of the means the Communists use to achieve what Castro calls the liberation of Latin America. Because Betancourt's reform-minded government represents a real alternative to Castroism, Venezuela is Castro's chief target for liberation among Cuba's neighbors, and the Communists have resorted to what they call direct action. The Communists and their allies regularly explode "Cuban dinamitas"—plastic bombs—in stores, warehouses, factories and, on one occasion, in the American Embassy.

Elsewhere conditions are not judged ripe for direct action, and other means are used. A Soviet-financed campaign is underway to achieve what Lenin called the alienation of the intellectual. Latin Americas who go to a university—1 or 2 percent of the population in most countries—are the main object of this campaign, for the university students of today are the ruling class of tomorrow.

Universities are flooded with Marxist books subsidized by the Russians and on sale for a few pennies. The Communists make every effort to seize political control of the universities. When I was in Panama, the university's student body in a free vote had recently elected a slate of pro-Castro student leaders. In Guatemala several hundred students have illegally made the round trip through Mexico and Cuba to Prague or Moscow and back home again to form the hard core of the Communist underground.

Communism's drive to conquer Latin America is, in short, carefully planned, well financed, and deadly serious. Many countries in Latin America are, moreover, in what the Marxists call a prerevolutionary situation. Because I wanted to sense the immediate impact of Castroism, I confined my trip to Castro's closest neighbors—Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Venezuela, Panama, Guatemala, Mexico, with a last stop in Guantanamo, the great American naval base in Cuba itself.

The countries I visited are all very different in various ways. But they all have certain characteristics in common, which are also shared by almost all countries in Latin America. All have a long history of despotism, violence, and political corruption. All have a near-cancerous rate of population growth, higher in some cases than in Asia. All are raw-material producers, perilously dependent on the world price of oil, coffee, bananas.

In all these countries there is a dark and massive underlayer of illiterate or semiliterate Negroes or Indians, ruled by a thin upper layer of intellectuals with white or near-white (or, in Haiti, mulatto) skins. And in all these countries there is a constantly visible contrast between the gleaming skyscrapers and expensive cars of the world of the rich, and the slums and mud-walled villages of the poor.

These characteristics suggest what President Kennedy meant when he recently said, "I think the big dangers to Latin America are the * * * desperate conditions in the countries themselves, unrelated to Cuba." But the threat of Castro and communism to this hemisphere is also visible in Cuba itself. It is visible in the Czech helmets and Soviet arms of the Cuban militiamen who stand guard sullenly around the fenced periphery of the Guantánamo base.

"We used to exchange cigarettes and chow and call each other amigo, even after Castro took over," a marine private told me. "Not anymore, not since the Russians came."

Since the Russians came, Cuba has been transformed into a Soviet satellite and a military base 90 miles from Florida. That ugly fact remains true, even since the withdrawal of the offensive weapons and the reduction in Soviet troop strength. As one result, Guantánamo is today locally indefensible—the corporal's guard of marines on the base could not possibly hold out against Castro's big Soviet-equipped army, let alone the remaining Russian troops.

As another result, communism is now so firmly established in Cuba that, according to current Pentagon estimates, it would require a Korea-scale war to dislodge it. Even minus the missiles, the Communist establishment in Cuba thus represents the most serious military threat to this hemisphere since the Monroe Doctrine was promulgated.

For all these reasons, it is easy to see why President Kennedy has said, "I regard Latin America as the most critical area in the world today." It is much more difficult to see how any sensible man could maintain that Castro may be "one of the best things the Lord has ever done for us."

But the Ambassador's remark was a sensible remark all the same. There are four distinct ways in which Fidel Castro has served the vital interests of the United States. Let me list them:

First,, he has reminded us North Americans of the existence—and the importance to our Nation—of Latin America.

Second, he has shown the Latin American intellectuals the reality, not the dream, of communism. In so doing, he has acted as a sort of inoculation against the Communist smallpox in this hemisphere.

Third, Castro has thrown a badly needed scare into the Latin American ruling class. Without such a scare, the Kennedy administration's Alliance for Progress would not stand a ghost of a chance of succeeding.

Fourth, Castro and Khrushchev have given the United States an opportunity to demonstrate for all the world to see, where the real center of power in this hemisphere lies. It lies in the United States. Since Khrushchev's October backdown, all Latin Americans know that this is so.

Castro's harsh reminder of the existence of Latin America was by no means the least useful of his services to the United States. For historical and geographic reasons, we North Americans have long suffered from a sort of mental block about Latin America. Except for a minority of specialists, we have simply refused to read about, or think about, Latin America. This national complacency about Latin America has been reflected in American policy.

In the pre-Castro era Latin Americans could—and did—accurately complain that the United States sent more dollar aid to Communist Yugoslavia than to all the 20 Latin American states with their more than 200 million people. If Castroism is not to be the wave of the future in Latin America, one reason is that last October's great Cuban crisis made Americans belatedly realize that Latin America is indeed the most critical area in the world today.

Castro's second useful service to the United States—the inoculating effect of his visible demonstration of the reality of communism—is admited even by the Communists themselves. One of the most interesting persons I interviewed on my travels was Señor Gustavo Machado, secretary general of the Venezuelan Communist Party.

Because his party is in semirevolt, Senor Machado was in semihiding. When I finally tracked him to his lair, in the comfortable, California-style Caracas house of a brother-in-law (Machado's family, like Castro's, is rich) he turned out to be a mild-mannered man in his midsixties, with gold cuff links and the air of a Spanish don.

Senor Machado was remarkably candid. There is no doubt, he said, that 80 percent of the people of Latin America were for Castro 2 years ago. Now 80 percent are against him. Why? He shrugged. Fidel should not have admitted he was a Communist. (As this suggests, communism as such is not admired among Latin America's heavily Catholic people.) Khrushchev "saved civilization" by withdrawing his missiles from Cuba, Senor Machado said, but Khrushchev "should have asked Fidel first instead of treating him like a puppet." But, he concluded, "our party is very militant, and we shall win in the end, all over this continent."

Maybe so, but old Senor Machado sounded oddly dispirited. He has reason to be. Castro's immense popularity in Latin America a year or so ago is an undisputed fact. But the precipitous decline in Castro's following, sadly acknowledged by Machado, is also a fact—it is confirmed, as President Kennedy has said, by all American intelligence surveys. Yet it is important to understand what the decline means, and what it does not mean.

It does not mean that the United States is universally loved in Latin America. In Guatemala City I gave a dinner party for five university student leaders. A sample of the way those five boys talked is worth recording, for it reflects both the nature of the decline in Castro's popularity, and the dangers of being too complacent about it. All five boys agreed that a year or so ago Castro had been their hero. He was a hero still to one—a sallow-faced youth who looked remarkedly like a beardless Castro and talked only in the glum Marxist dialectic. Castro was no longer a hero to the four other boys. But there were very audible Marxist overtones in their talk too, especially on the subject of the United States. Here is a sample:

"You Americans are not Greek people. You are Phoenician people—traders, materialists, no things of the spirit."

"You need our raw materials, our markets, so you do not send money to us because you want to help us but because you must. The Alliance for Progress is just some sort of business. Now Fidel is a monkey on your back, so that is another reason why you must send us money."

"The United States owned Cuba, and there would be no Castro if there had been no Batista. You Americans forced Castro to turn to the Russians."

SPREADING MARXIST GOSPEL

In most Latin-American universities the science of Marxism-Leninism is taught as gospel, and the students' mental image of the United States—with an assist from some local business interests—is twisted to fit the gospel. Anti-Americanism, like anticommunism in the United States, is part of the air Latin-American students breathe. Marxist simplifications were also reflected in their talk about Castro:

"Castro put in social justice in Cuba," said one. "He built houses, he sent poor children to schools. But we do not like his totalitarian state."

"Castro has done good things," said another. "But in Cuba, under communism, speak the wrong thing, and al paredón." "Al paredón" means "to the wall"—the wall against which Castro's critics are shot.

"Here is false democracy," said another boy. "Big show, but vote is directed. Yet there is some sort of democracy here, because I can speak what I want to speak. Not in Cuba."

In most of Latin America the freedom to "speak what I want to speak" is a new thing. Take the area I visited. Only in Cuba has one old-style dictator, Fulgencio Batista, been replaced by the new-style dictator, Fidel Castro. In Haiti, hated Francois Duvalier, surrounded by the bully boys of the Tonton Macoute, maintaining his torture chamber in the cellar of the presidential palace, still clings precariously to power.

Other old-style dictators have gone down like ninepins. Guatemala's Jorge Ubico was one of the first to be thrown out, back in 1944. Venezuela's corrupt and greedy Marcos Pérez Jiménez took to his heels in 1958, and the Dominican Republic's little Hitler, bloody Rafael Trujillo, was assassinated in 1961. The old-style dictators are a dying breed.

What is to replace the breed? A lot depends on the students and intellectuals like those Guatemalan boys, for they—not the dark-skinned, illiterate people of the underlayer—are the ruling class of the future. The minds of those boys, like the minds of the other Latin-American students, are being pulled in two directions.

One pull is the instinctive distrust of the Yankee colossus, the lure of the neat Marxist explanation for everything, the need for change. The other pull is the urge to speak what I want to speak—and Castro's wall. The wall in Cuba, in short, is as vivid a symbol of communism as Khrushchev's wall in Berlin.

But wall or no wall, Latin America is ripe for change. The only question is whether it will be Castro's kind of change. The Alliance for Progress is a carrot-and-stick device for promoting another kind of social justice. The great roadblock in front of the Alliance for Progress is the established ruling class in most Latin-American countries. This is understandable, since, from the point of view of the ruling class, everything is dandy already, and any change would be for the worse.

Consider one rather typical member of the ruling class, whom we shall call Rafael Castillo. Rafael is an amusing, American-educated Panamanian in his midthirties. His family is immensely rich. In the last election Rafael was the chief coiner of slogans. "My best poster was a picture of a slum and another picture of a rich man's horse in an air-conditioned stall. Below was the slogan: 'Are you for the people or the horse?'

"Did your side win?" I asked.

"Of course," said Rafael. "That was all arranged."

"And are the people still in the slums and the horse in the air-conditioned stall?"

"Of course," said Rafael, and laughed hugely.

Rafael is an oligarch, a member of the handful of families who run, and largely own, such countries as Panama. Many oligarchs, like Rafael, are agreeable people, but they usually invest their money abroad, pay few taxes and feel no responsibility for their own people. Rafael, in short, represents the old way of doing things in Latin America.

The old way of doing things in Latin America has deep roots. Among the Presidents I interviewed, Roberto F. Chiari, of Panama, and Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes, of Guatemala, are fairly representative of the old way. Both are agreeable old gentlemen—Ydigoras especially: a gutty, shrewd old man of great physical courage. Both are personally very rich—Chiari has a near monopoly of milk in Panama, and Ydigoras' income from government and other sources is estimated at around a million dollars a year. And although both have introduced minimal reforms in a bow to the Alliance for Progress, both are essentially conservative—they are themselves members of the oligarchy and represent its interests.

There is a pro-Castro underground in both countries. In Panama the incestuous, blandly luxurious life of the "Zonians"—the privileged Americans in the Canal Zone—provides a constant irritant which is the Communists' greatest asset. Guatemala had the first overtly pro-Communist government in this hemisphere—fellow-traveling President Jacobo Arbenz Guzman was thrown out with an assist from the CIA in 1954—and the Communists are waiting to make a comeback. They may make it.

But Castro and communism no longer represent the only alternative to old-style oligarchical governments in Latin America. One reason is that Castro's wall frightens the Latin-American ruling class as much as the intellectuals. Another reason is that a new breed of modern-minded businessman is challenging the power of the established oligarchies. Rómulo Betancourt's progressive Venezuelan Government, which has redistributed land, increased taxes on the rich and undertaken a massive educational program, has survived in part because it has the support of the more sensible portion of the Venezuelan business community. Dr. Pedro Tinoco, Jr., of Caracas, who is the spokesman for these business interests, told me that economic and social reform are both essential in Latin America, since "they represent the only real alternative to Castroism." A few years ago such views were anathema among the Latin-American ruling class. Thanks to Castro, that is no longer so.

Thanks again to Castro, a new kind of politician is beginning to emerge in Latin America. Betancourt is an example. So is Juan Bosch, new president of the Dominican Republic, a white-haired, very handsome man in his mid-50's, with a lined, thoughtful face. Betancourt and Bosch are members of what is sometimes known as the club—other members are men like Governor Luis Muñoz Marin of Puerto Rico, and ex-President José (Pepe) Figueres of Costa Rica. The members of the club know each other well, often correspond. In sharp contrast to traditional Latin-American politicians, they are not in politics for money. The members of the club are idealists within reason, and prophets of peaceful, non-Communist social and economic change.

They are left-leaning—Betancourt is an ex-Communist, Bosch had a pro-Castro period. They are not necessarily pro-American, not in the sense some dictators of the past have been. (Franklin Roosevelt said of Trujillo: "He is an s.o.b., but he is our s.o.b.") Yet in the opinion of the ablest American observers on the scene, men like these represent the best bet we can make. In fact, the Kennedy administration has already bet heavily on Betancourt and Bosch.

Overt American support is another reason Betancourt has survived so far. And although Bosch is no American stooge, American power, including plain old gunboat diplomacy, which was used to prevent the reestablishment of the Trujillo gang's dictatorship, made his presidency possible.

And here we come to the last of Castro's four great services to the United States. The successful American blockade of Cuba in October was a public demonstration of a simple fact. In the Caribbean and Central America the power of the United States is unchallengeably predominant.

We have become oddly shamefaced about American power—like female legs a century ago, it is not mentioned in polite liberal society. Yet our power exists, and we need only be ashamed of it when it is used badly or for wrong ends, or when it is not used when it ought to be used.

American power takes many forms—propaganda, economic pressure, economic and military aid, and the quiet persuasion of diplomacy. But simple military power is the essential ingredient. And the essential ingredient of military power is the willingness to use it. That is why Castro has not attacked Guantanamo. If he attacked Guantanamo or a neighboring Latin-American state, he would be in a war he would quickly lose, and he knows it. In short, Castro's big, expensive army isn't going anywhere. Neither are the Russian troops in Cuba, not unless Khrushchev wants a war.

WHAT STEPS SHOULD WE TAKE?

Even so, Castro's Cuba still represents an important Communist military base in America's backyard. That brings us back to the question with which this report began: Should American power, even at the risk of general war, be used to pull communism out of Cuba by the roots?

President Kennedy decided against that course during the crisis of October, when he overruled the "hawks," who wanted to strike directly at Cuba and thus remove not only the missiles but Castro himself. He has since reaffirmed that decision. I am now convinced that it was on balance the right one.

Mind you, it is extremely unlikely, in the opinion of the best observers on the scene, that the Cubans themselves will get rid of Castro. Castro's secret-police system, let alone the backstop of Soviet troops, all but rules out that happy ending. Nor will half measures suffice, as we learned at the Bay of Pigs. In short, bar an American invasion in force, Castro for the foreseeable future is here to stay.

But President Kennedy has ruled out an unprovoked invasion, for what now seem to me three good reasons. One reason is suggested by Woodrow Wilson's smug remark when he ordered the American landing at Vera Cruz in 1914. His purpose, he said, was to "teach the Latin Americans to elect good men." We have since learned that heavy-handed military intervention only teaches the Latin Americans to hate the United States.

Thus military intervention is a desperate last resort. Even so, we must be willing to use that last resort if necessary. President Kennedy has already made it clear that aggression by Castro against Guantanamo or a neighboring state will mean war. We must also make it clear that we will, if necessary, use our power to prevent the Communist smallpox from infecting Castro's neighbors—that we will intervene with force to prevent a Communist takeover anywhere in the Caribbean or Central America.

If we make this clear in advance, we are far less likely to have to use our power in this way. Latin Americans (like everybody else) are bandwagon jumpers. Much of Castro's former popularity in Latin America derived from the notion that his bandwagon was going places. Khrushchev's big backdown in October helped to dispel that notion. But it is still important to make it abundantly obvious that Castro's bandwagon is going nowhere. The fact that we have the military power to prevent Castro's bandwagon from going anywhere is a second good reason for ruling out an invasion of Cuba under present circumstances.

A third good reason is that the example of Castro's own regime makes it more practical than ever before for American power to be used in order to promote the kind of Latin American governments described by Simón Bolivar. Bolivar's rule was, "Do not adopt the best system of government, but the one most likely to succeed."

A carbon copy of our own system of government is not at all likely to succeed. In countries where assassination is considered a standard political instrument, where the mass of the people cannot read or write, where the opposition regards incitement to rebellion as its proper function, a certain executive ruthlessness is essential.

The Mexican Government, for example, is a peculiar, bland dictatorship in which individual freedom is permitted, but the mass of the people have no real voice. Betancourt's government in Venezuela is building a powerful internal police system and practices press censorship—necessarily so, where the opposition expresses its displeasure with "Cuban dinamitas." The "system of government most likely to succeed" in such countries stops short of full libertarian democracy. But it also stops short of both Duvalier's torture chamber and Castro's wall. Except in Cuba and Haiti, the young men in the countries I visited can "speak what I want to speak." They cherish that new-found right.

It may seem corny to say so, but the freedom to "speak what I want to speak" remains our greatest asset in the struggle with communism. The Latin American students of today are the rulers of tomorrow and nothing has so successfully "alienated the intellectual" as Castro's wall—but not in the sense Lenin meant. That is why it may indeed turn out that "Fidel Castro is one of the best things the Lord has ever done for us."

ANNIVERSARY OF MARYLAND STATEHOOD

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, today is the birthday of the most beguiling member of the sisterhood of States, the great Free State of Maryland.

Since 1634, this ever youthful charmer has won the hearts of all who have been fortunate enough to enter her company, captivating them with an alluring mixture of her southern coquetry and her Yankee ingenuity.

Perhaps, Mr. President, the secret of Maryland's attraction lies in that combination of factors which was the inspiration for her sobriquet, "America in Miniature." And this she truly is, Mr. President.

Temperamentally, for instance, she represents the heritage of our industrious North, the zest for gracious living of our romantic South, and the enormous promise of our expansive West, all assimilated into one unique and unforgettable personality.

Physically, too, Mr. President, she is truly "America in Miniature," and like one of Nature's true beauties, she takes justifiable pride in flirtatiously displaying her lustrous seashores, her verdant farmlands, and her softly rolling mountains.

I am afraid, Mr. President, that these remarks betray my longtime love affair with fair Maryland, and if this is true, I can only admit that I am one of the multitude of suitors who have fallen under her spell.

May her birthday anniversary be a pleasant one, and may all the Members of this body join me in wishing her many more centuries of happiness and prosperity.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to join with the Senator from Maryland in celebrating Maryland's birthday. I have a special interest in Maryland, because she was one of the first States to adopt an antibillboard law. I recommend to my colleagues a drive to Frederick, which they will find absolutely free from signboards. I commend Maryland for having taken that forward step.

Mr. BEALL. I thank the Senator for those remarks. I may say, with some modesty, that 33 years ago I was one of the original sponsors of the elimination of signboards at roadsides, when I was a member of the State senate.

AN END TO DETERGENT POLLUTION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the American housewife is deeply in debt to modern industrial technology for eliminating one after another of the backbreaking chores that long plagued her daily life. Yet, while new products have most often proved a blessing, they have from time to time also proved costly in unexpected and even grotesque ways. And nowhere has this been more dramatically illustrated than in the case of the modern synthetic detergent.

For the housewife depressed by soap rings and by stubborn particles clinging to dishes, and by the unpleasant knowledge that hard water makes for hard washes, the synthetic detergent promised an efficient economical solution—with no apparent defect.

Today, however, the housewife has begun to wonder if her detergent is not more bane than blessing. She has now discovered that it is impossible to buy a container of detergent in a standard size and shape with its contents clearly marked. She is met at the supermarket counter with a cockeyed array of squeezeable, narrow-waisted, slant-shouldered detergent packages in odd and mystical measurements. The selection of a suitable detergent at an economical price has become a dismal, new, and unrewarding chore.

But one dispenser of detergents that the housewife had not bargained for was her own tap faucet. Yet just last summer the inhabitants of Lindenhurst, Long Island, discovered that they could draw from the taps in their kitchen sinks long draughts of white sudsy water. Unfortunately, or perhaps fortunately, the suds were not strong enough to wash any dishes. Neither was the water potable. Ironically, the Lindenhurst housewife found that, while detergents came out of her tap, she was forced to buy her drinking water in containers. This is scarcely my idea of progress.

The experience of Lindenhurst was not unique. Synthetic detergents have infiltrated water supplies in both this country and in Europe, clogging water and sewage systems, and polluting rivers and streams. Many an idyllic city on the banks of a river has been punctuated by the sight of an enormous floating raft of suds.

There is some evidence that drinking water containing substantial quantities of detergents may be harmful to human health. There is additional evidence that not uncommon levels of detergent pollution are harmful to fish.

The reason for the emergence of the synthetic detergent as a prime source of pollution is quite simple. The detergents presently being marketed simply do not decompose as soap through the natural action of bacteria decomposes. Detergents, once finding their way into the water supply, are removed neither by the natural action of bacteria nor the artificial action of water purification plants. And as greater and greater quantities of detergents are discharged into our sewage systems, they remain in the water supply building up at an alarming rate.

Is this the price we must pay if we are to have the convenience of detergents? The answer, fortunately, is "no." Representative Reuss of Wisconsin who has long been a leader in the fight to rid our environment of artificial contaminants has made an exhaustive review of the detergent problem and has suggested what I consider to be a sound and feasible approach to the detergent problem. Congressman Reuss discovered that Germany—which ironically produced the first synthetic detergent—has enacted legislation banning nondecomposable detergents from German markets after December 31, 1964. Synthetic detergents capable of satisfying the standards set by the German Government have already been developed at Huells, at Gelsenkrichen, and at Hamburg. These new detergents are fully as efficient as their predecessors but they decompose as quickly and harmlessly as soap made from animal and vegetable fats. And they do so without leaving great traces of foam. They are only slightly more expensive than detergents now on the market.

Representative Reuss introduced legislation in the House embodying the essential elements of the successful German legislation. The Reuss bill would require that detergents manufactured or imported into the United States after June 30, 1965, comply with standards of decomposability set by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

My colleagues, the junior Senators from New Hampshire and Wisconsin, and I share Representatives Reuss' concern over the detergent problem. Working together, and utilizing the Reuss bill as a basis, we have prepared legislation which I believe will insure the removal of the incriminated agents from all detergents.

For myself and on behalf of Senators McIntyre and Nelson I introduce at this time a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic detergents manufactured for use in the United States or imported for use in the United States comply with certain standards of decomposability.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be included at the close of my remarks and that the bill lay over for 3 legislative days for cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 1183) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic detergents manufactured for use in the United States or imported for use in the United States comply with certain standards of decomposability, introduced by Mrs. Neuberger (for herself, Mr. Nelson, and Mr. McIntyre), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, who is a coworker in this field and a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. McINTYRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for yielding to me at this time so that I may add my views on this worthwhile cause.

New England's preeminence in higher education, research, per capita income, and advanced manufacturing indicates an excellent potential for future growth. But its distance from national markets and the exhaustion of some natural resources means that extra effort is needed to achieve results that are sometimes taken for granted elsewhere. And the early lead of the New England States in the industrial revolution has saddled the present generation with such inherited obstacles to progress as an illogical transportation system, high population density in unplanned urban centers, overcrowded stands of poor second-growth timber, and polluted waters.

Thus, New England's public problems are apt to be persistent, stubborn, and intractable. This is why the citizens and governments of our region must usually combine conservative methods of solution with the most imaginative long-range planning. Our complex inherited problems rarely yield to quick or easy solutions, so our determination to overcome them must be all the greater. And water pollution is such a problem.

Water pollution is a bar to our long-term development. It is a menace to public health. It imposes immense responsibilities on cities, far beyond the financial resources available to them for treatment facilities. As mayor of the city of Laconia, N.H., I helped to build a new treatment plant and am well aware of the difficulties faced by cities all across the Nation. The needs of recreation and modern industry for clean water constantly increases. Today 40 percent of Americans drink water that has already been used once. This national need for reusing both ground and surface water is the basis upon which I join the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] in introducing the detergent control bill to correct an increasingly critical element of our national pollution problem. In my opinion, the proper division of responsibility between the States and the Federal Government in controlling water pollution deserves further study. But the control of detergents seems a proper subject for Federal action.

In the United States we use 4 billion pounds of synthetic detergents every year, virtually all of which eventually enters the ground-water system of our navigable waters. By devising chemical substances which clean effectively and leave no sludge in hard waters, the manufacturers of detergents have earned the approval of consumers in an immense market. But with the widespread use of modern detergents has arisen a serious national problem which commands the attention of Congress.

The principal ingredient of modern detergents is a type of chemical which cleans effectively but contains a refractory kernel which resists decomposition by the bacterial action of waste treatment systems and natural waters.

The surface-active agents in detergents, of which the principal variety is known as ABS, very rarely decompose more than 50 percent in waste treatment. The chemical has a half-life of about 15 days in most water and may travel for a week over 100 miles in a river and still be less than one-third decomposed. By that time, the river water may have been taken for use by a downstream user. ABS persists for years in ground water as well. This gives rise to interstate problems upon which I urge Congress to act.

The national average of ABS in navigable waters is now about one-fiftieth of 1 part per million. In waste treatment even this concentration may impede coagulation and floc formation, adding to the expense and difficulty of operating municipal treatment works.

The national average in drinking water is now one-twentieth of a part per million, one-tenth of the minimum level recommended by the Public Health Service, but there are areas in which even that concentration of one-half part per million has been reached. In existing concentrations, ABS promotes the growth of undesirable oxygen-demanding algae in streams and of slime obstructions in treatment systems. A film may form over streams, delaying gas exchange with the atmosphere, reducing river water's capacity for reoxygenation by a very sizable percentage. These are the chronic problems, but in areas of greater concentration there are acute problems.

As concentration increase with reuse, the problems become even more serious. In the Ohio River, where water is reused 4 times, the concentration is already 10 times the national average for streams. The city of Cleveland, Ohio, has installed high pressure water jets in its sewage plant to beat back the foam, and a similar problem at Chanute, Kans., several years ago attracted international attention. In many places in the country billows of foam blow from streams and clog municipal treatment plants. In large apartment houses detergent suds clog drains, backing up water to create very serious health hazards. Other acute problems, which indicate concentrations greater than the national average, include the drowning of ducks whose feathers are permeated by detergent chemicals, refusal of water by livestock, side-effects on irrigated crops, and injury to fish.

I do not advocate increased assistance for local treatment plants. For one thing, it is unfair to expect our cities or the Federal Government to bear costs which should be assumed by the manufacturers of detergents. Also, such a subsidy could deal only with surface waters and would not reach the pollution of ground waters. In Suffolk County, N.Y., for example, the Federal Housing Administration has been refusing to insure mortgages because the quality of well water has been adversely affected by the very long-term effects of detergents from septic tank effluent. Congress has the power to protect the interstate ground water table, which is bound up with navigable waters in many ways. For this reason, the detergent control bill reaches beyond local treatment to control the process of manufacture.

The detergent control bill requires the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to set standards to be met by all detergents which may enter the navigable waters of the United States after June 30, 1965, to assure that they no longer contain biologically "hard" surface-active agents that resist decomposition in natural waters and treatment plants. This bill does not contemplate a national tolerance level for detergent materials, but is directed at the elimination of a specific class of ingredients and their replacement with materials that will decompose.

I am happy to be able to say that this direct, effective approach to the problem has been made possible by advances in chemical technology and the experience of one of our European allies.

The West German Bundestag has passed an act requiring that all detergents meet minimum standards of decomposability. The very able Congressman from Wisconsin, Mr. Reuss, studied that act in operation and concluded that the United States could and should profit from West German experience.

The chemical companies which supply detergent manufacturers with ABS and other ingredients are contemplating a shift to the production of more readily decomposable chemicals. It is my confident hope that the manufacturers will greet legislation which recognizes their technical achievement and the sizable market that I am sure awaits the introduction of a better product. The detergent control bill will require the replacement of present chemical structures, not up to some uncertain national tolerance standard, but to the limit of technical feasibility consistent with commercial reasonableness. No company need fear that some kind of artificial bar will impede rapid technological development in devising new materials.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a recent discussion of this subject in the Chemical & Engineering News of March 18, 1963, appear in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks, as well as the West German Act, a competent technical report by an expert of the Public Health Service, and a telegram describing the city of Cleveland's foam abatement works.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McINTYRE. It is because very satisfactory alternatives exist within the range of commercial reasonableness that we today move to eliminate biologically hard surface-active chemicals from detergents. Their replacement with more advanced substances will improve what is obviously too threatening a type of contamination to be permitted to continue. Without this legislation, users of ground and surface waters will face unnecessary increases in concentrations of detergent chemicals whose chronic effects are economically injurious and whose effects in acute concentrations are a menace to the public health and safety.

Mr. President, the advanced industrial societies of the West have benefited greatly from quickening technology, which has carried us to the threshold of interplanetary travel and brought us the fruits of abundance and leisure. But at the same time our standard of living may decline in other ways. I have spoken today in hopes of helping to maintain our traditionally high standard of natural resources. America has been uniquely blessed by nature in a world largely denied the beauty and natural abundance that has always been ours.

We must not accept a declining standard of water that threatens health, industrial development, the resources of local governments, and the very outdoors which are a source of spiritual strength to us all.

EXHIBIT 1

BIODEGRADABILITY OF DETERGENTS—A STORY ABOUT SURFACTANTS

Detergents—a boon to mankind—have come in for a fair share of criticism these days. The reason: pollution. Although ABS accounts for only a minor share of water pollution, a spate of pending legislation would restrict the use of alkylbenzene sulfonate (ABS) based detergents. Notwithstanding the fact that the role of ABS in pollution is probably overemphasized, industry spends more than $5 million annually on research aimed at reducing the problem of undegraded detergents in our water supply. This research takes many forms. At the one extreme, it is aimed at developing more degradable surfactants. At the other extreme, it attempts to prove—quite successfully, it might be said—that ABS is only a very minor contributor to overall water pollution.

Roughly 75 percent of all household detergents contain some ABS. In 1962, some 4 billion pounds of household detergents were sold—meaning about 560 million pounds of ABS. ABS-based detergents get most of the blame for pollution stemming from detergents, but other types—alkylphenol nonionics—are also at fault.

With pressure mounting to ban ABS detergents, raw material suppliers are scurrying around to come up with suitable materials. Alpha olefins are often mentioned as starting materials that would make a more degradable product. Five companies are building plants to make these olefins. It is generally agreed that they are more degradable than present materials; but, at present, their cost is in question.

Price may not be a factor though, if legislation forces a switch to new materials. Two Federal bills have been proposed by Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, which would do just that; and States are also pondering such legislation. Meanwhile in West Germany, where the problem is more critical than in the United States, legislation has been enacted. German detergent makers must switch over to products which are at least 80 percent degradable by October 1, 1964.

U.S. makers, although not now saddled with a deadline, appear to be shooting for new products by about 1964–65. Right now there is a 50–50 chance that Federal legislation will be enacted, but with the large stakes involved, detergent makers would surely like better odds.

In the final analysis, many experts say, pollution in general will prevail, whether detergents are improved or not. The call is out to improve our basic sewage treatment facilities and replace archaic cesspool type disposal systems with sewers.

Alkylbenzene sulfonate is the largest single surface active agent in household heavy-duty detergents. It is produced today almost entirely by alkylating benzene with propylene tetramer, followed by sulfonation of the benzene ring. The propylene tetramer is predominantly C_{12} but it may also contain varying amounts of C_9 to C_{15} molecules. It consists of a multitude of branched isomers that have never really been specifically characterized. Commonly referred to as ABS, it might be more descriptively called TPBS to distinguish it from proposed substitutes where the alkyl radical is some type of "straight" chain.

The opinion most widely held is that the highly branched isomers of the alkyl chain cause the problem—these just don't degrade rapidly enough under treatment conditions.

Dr. R. D. Swisher, research group leader in Monsanto's inorganic chemicals research department and the one most referred to in discussions on biodegradability and branched chains, says there are 3,057 isomers for the $C_{12}H_{25}$ group and about 80,000 different structures possible from C_{10} through C_{15}. "Thus, when we read in the newspapers that ABS is not biodegradable, we are reading a very broad statement. And furthermore, it is a statement that is not true."

Dr. Swisher's work shows that the present-day mixture of TPBS does, indeed, degrade. In river-water tests (a few parts per million of surfactant are dissolved in river water, and the solution is analyzed every few days, the methylene blue method being used to determine the amount of degradation), a typical household TPBS will drop from 7 parts per million at the beginning to 2 parts per million after about 3 weeks. While not all of the isomers present degrade equally fast, even the more resistant components degrade if given enough exposure to microorganisms, Dr. Swisher points out.

Much of the research effort in finding a more degradable detergent has been to develop a straight-chain hydrocarbon to make alkylbenzene. If these materials degrade readily in sewage treatment plants in a matter of hours, the detergent part of the overall pollution problem will be solved.

Most soapers will agree privately to a maximum of 10 percent of the total organic residue from a sewage treatment plant as TPBS (public health officials are more apt to say 5 to 10 percent). Assuming the soapers' most damning figure of 10 percent, then, a readily degradable detergent will leave about 90 percent of the pollution problem unsolved for surface water.

Sewage treatment plant effluent, however, is only part of the water pollution problem. The 1960 census showed that about 34 percent of all housing units may lack public sewage facilities. Many of these households obtain water from their own wells. Here, detergents must be degraded mainly in the ground rather than in a sewage treatment plant. Most significant is the fact that there are many questions yet unanswered about the rate of degradation even of improved detergents under such conditions.

The ground water problem has become most acute in New York's Suffolk County. Close proximity of septic tanks to drinking water supplies has led to foaming in fresh water from private wells, is seriously affecting this area. It has led to a concerted effort on the part of industry and State, local, and Federal authorities to pinpoint the degradation of detergents in soils and ground water. During this past fall, tests began in Long Island to gather basic knowledge on the problem.

The Soap and Detergent Association got from its members composite samples of more degradable detergents. SDA hasn't said what they are specifically, but likely candidates are a straight-chain ABS material, an alcohol sulfate, and a normal TPBS detergent for control purposes. These products are being used individually for 8-week periods in an Oakdale (Long Island) home. About 30 test wells have been drilled in the area to check the flow from the cesspool. Weekly samples from each well are analyzed in order to get an idea of the amount of degradation taking place. The concentration level of other sewage constituents is also being checked. Just 2 weeks ago, tests were begun at a second home and within the next 2 months the goal is to have four test sites in operation.

The tests, partially sponsored by New York State's Temporary State Commission on Water Resources Planning, will be completed possibly in another year. At that time the authorities involved hope to have the answer to many questions. Probably the most important: What type of detergent, if any, is most easily degraded under these conditions?

TWO PROBLEMS

Actually there are two problems in the United States. One involves ground waters, the other surface waters. Surface waters receive waste from sewage plants where aerobic degradation is used to clear the effluent of contaminants. Without sewage systems, septic tanks or cesspools are used to degrade wastes. In these systems, some anaerobic degradation may take place within the tank. (Some experts question whether septic tanks are completely anaerobic systems or a combination of anaerobic and aerobic.) From there the waste seeps into the soil. Should the soil be saturated, there is little chance for proper degradation since an abundance of oxygen is lacking. Many feel that the more serious of these problems is in ground waters.

This attitude is shared by Dr. R. L. Woodward, chief of the engineering section at the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center. He says surface water is not so great a problem as are ground water problems in the United States. His colleague, M. B. Ettinger, chief of chemistry and physics (engineering section), pointing to the surface water problem, says from 5 to 10 percent of total organic matter in a sewage plant effluent is TPBS. But removing this will not nearly solve the whole pollution problem.

Toxicity is also mentioned frequently in discussion of ABS. A report to the Soap and Detergent Association in January states "In a statistically controlled experiment, beagle dogs consumed for a 2-year period 1,300 grams of food per week, containing up to 1,000 parts per million of ABS, with no discernible differences apparent in the health of any of the animals as determined by outward appearance or medical examination of the vital internal organs." This confirms previous 2-year tests that were carried out on rats.

Bad odor and taste are also at times attributed to ABS. Yet in Public Health Service Drinking Water Standards, revised 1962, it is stated, "ABS itself is essentially odorless * * * odor and taste characteristics are likely to rise from degradation of products of other wastes rather than from ABS."

Major organic chemicals used in detergents—over-all consumption, 1962

[In millions of pounds]

	Alkylbenzene sulfonate	*Alkylbenzene*
Procter & Gamble	235	165–170
Colgate-Palmolive	95	70
Lever Bros	90	65
Others	140	95
Total	560	395–400

	Alkylphenol adducts
Procter & Gamble	None
Colgate-Palmolive	15–20
Lever Bros	55–60
Others	30–35
Total	100–115

	Alkanolamines
Procter & Gamble	10 –12
Colgate-Palmolive	0.5–1
Lever Bros	5 – 6
Others	1 – 2
Total	16.5–21

	Fatty alcohol adducts [1]	*Fatty alcohol* [2]
Procter & Gamble	190–200	95–105
Colgate-Palmolive	None	------
Lever Bros	None	------

	Alkanolamides
Procter & Gamble	50–55
Colgate-Palmolive	3–4
Lever Bros	22–25
Others	6–8
Total	81–92

[1] Roughly 95,000,000 to 100,000,000 lbs. lauryl alcohol sulfate; 95,000,000 to 100,000,000 lbs. tallow alcohol sulfate.

[2] Roughly 45,000,000 to 50,000,000 lbs. lauryl alcohol; 50,000,000 to 55,000,000 lbs. tallow alcohol.

Source: C. & E.N. estimates.

The revised PHS standards do recommend a 0.5 part per million maximum ABS content in drinking water, although tests by PHS show most surface waters are below this limit. ABS does not foam until concentrations reach about 0.5 part per million, and odor and taste cannot be attributed to ABS where concentration is below 0.5 part per million. This revision is apparently directed to improving the esthetic qualities and economic utility of drinking water rather than as a protective limit.

It has been stated that one favorable result of ABS's occurrence in drinking water is that it is an indication of other pollutants. The revised standards bear this out by saying, "concentrations of ABS above 0.5 milligram per liter are also indicative of questionably undesirable levels of other sewage pollution."

SUBSTITUTE

The scramble for a TPBS substitute has led to much discussion about straight-chain materials—and alpha olefins take up a good share of this. The list of companies known active in alpha olefins stands at eight and probably hasn't stopped growing. Most significant, apart from the implications of a new volume organic chemical, is the potential reshuffling among major alkylbenzene producers. This market today is under the predominance of California Chemical, Continental Oil, Atlantic Refining, and Monsanto. Eyeing the hassle over degradability as a chance to carve out their share are a number of newcomers, including Gulf, Enjay, Union Carbide Olefins, and Phillips.

Continental Oil is well on the road to becoming an alpha olefin producer. It soon will have a semicommercial plant with about 10 million pounds' capacity at Lake Charles, La. Conoco's alpha olefins, already available in small quantities, range from C_6 to C_{20}. The company uses a Ziegler-type ploymarization route.

Atlantic Refining put an alpha olefin unit on stream late last year. The company uses its own process, based on cracking paraffin, and can supply tank car quantities. Capacity of the unit is probably in the 10 to 15 million pound-per-year range, and the process turns out C_6 to C_{18} alpha olefins.

California Chemical, another of the more recent public entries in the large scaled plants derby, is building a commercial unit at Richmond, Calif., which will use a paraffin-cracking route. Completion is set for this spring, and the capacity for 1963 will probably be about 20 million pounds. Prices of its alpha olefins range from 7 to 15 cents per pound and should hold at this level when the plants are on stream.

Monsanto, fourth of today's Big Four AB producers, doesn't say much about what direction its efforts will take, but does indicate that it feels alpha olefins are not the solution. Henry Moss, director of product quality in Monsanto's inorganic chemicals division, says the best approach, considering all the factors, is tailoring AB. Length of the chain, position of the aromatic ring on the chain, and the position of the sulfonate group on the ring in relation to the alkyl group all must be considered.

According to Mr. Moss, Monsanto is now at the point where it has two approaches that offer commercial feasibility. What these are, Monsanto isn't saying at this time.

Enjay is the latest official entry into alpha olefins. The company says it will build a plant at Baton Rouge, La.; and the process, developed by Enjay, will involve cracking petroleum wax. Completion is set for the second quarter of 1964. Trade sources have speculated that Enjay (via its parent, Jersey Standard) has been working closely with Monsanto. These sources add that Monsanto is a likely customer for Enjay's output. Neither firm will comment.

Gulf Oil, a purveyor of development quantities of various alpha olefins for some time, is one of the most recent entrants into the larger scale plant field. Its Port Arthur, Tex., refinery is the site of a unit to make alpha olefins via ethylene polymerization. The unit will make either blends of from C_6 to C_{20} or specific olefins with purities as high as 98 percent. Gulf says the unit, slated to start up next month, will make tank car quantities. Trade observers say the company will have a capacity to produce 8 million pounds of alpha olefins this year.

Union Carbide Olefins has also been mentioned in the trade as a possible producer of alpha olefins. Industry sources say Carbide has contracted for the paraffin output of South Hampton Oil (Silsbee, Tex.), estimated at 500 barrels a day. Carbide has no comment on this report, but does admit it is studying the olefins as a business possibility. Carbide could get to alpha olefins through molecular sieve separation of paraffins or by ethylene polymerization.

Sinclair, also linked with alpha olefins, apparently had a small pilot plant size polymerization unit going about 4 years ago. It decided at that time not to go ahead, although various sources mention the company as a possible producer.

Sohio, also listed as a possible among trade observers, says it has looked at the alpha olefins market, but no decision has been reached.

Phillips, mentioned in most discussions on alpha olefins, will not comment on details, says only that it "has been active for some time in the research, development, and sampling of biodegradable detergent intermediates produced from several different routes. At this time, however, no decision has been reached regarding manufacturing plans.",

One trade source feels Phillips is close to making this decision and that the route would be a molecular sieve extraction of kerosene to get a straight-chain paraffin. Then it would use the chlorination-alkylation route to a straight-chain AB.

Dow is another name mentioned as a possible producer of a new type of detergent alkylate. Dow admits to following developments in this field, but declines to give any specifics as to what directions its own work might pursue.

A new, or what some people might consider a variation of an old, approach has come from Stepan Chemical. Stepan has revealed a group of alpha-sulfo fatty acid esters, which it has trade-named Bio-Terge. These compounds include a variety of materials, but Stepan is mainly promoting Bio-Terge TMS (alpha-sulfo-tallow methyl ester) and Bio-Terge MMS (alpha-sulfo-myristic methyl ester). Stepan says that in its river die-away tests Bio-Terge TMS has completely degraded in about a week compared to either semicommercial straight-chain ABS or standard ABS, neither of which was completely degraded at the end of 30 days.

Alfred C. Stepan, Jr., president, said before the Chemical and Drug Analysts Group in January that Bio-Terge detergents "make it possible for the major soap companies to shift over to a biologically soft detergent which will eliminate the problem in the water supply and at the same time have no loss in cleaning efficiency and no increase in costs." He added that it appeared likely that Stepan "will build a large plant to make substantial quantities of Bio-Terge, probably late in 1963."

Another source of alpha olefins, around for a long time, is natural fats. Archer Daniels Midland is one of the oldest producers from this source. Economics do not allow them to be competitive with petroleum derivatives, however.

While alpha olefins generate the most talk and appear to be the replacement leader for propylene tetramer, not all agree. California Chemical, well along with its alpha olefin plant, says it is basing its plans on a spectrum of markets, including specialty surface-active agents, plastics, fibers, and lubricant additives. The company adds that the potential outlet for alkylating benzene to make a more degradable detergent alkylate does not enter into its plans because of cost. Atlantic also seems to be heading for markets other than detergent alkylate for its alpha olefins.

OVERSEAS ACTIVITY

West Germany has also come in for its fair share of activity in this area. With the deadline on its detergent legislation little more than 18 months off, producers of nondegradable detergents are readying substitutes to meet legal requirements.

Chemische Werke Huels (West Germany's largest syndet manufacturer) has decided to work with straight-chain (99.2 percent) paraffins in the C_{12} to C_{14} range as a raw material. It will buy this material from Gelsenberg Benzin, which has licensed UOP's Molex process to produce the straight-chain paraffins. Then, through a Friedel-Crafts reaction the paraffin is used to alkylate benzene. Final step is then sulfonation.

Huels will guarantee at least 80-percent biodegradability according to the government test, but says the product will do considerably better. Cost is slightly higher than that of TPBS. Huels has completed all of its testing and has a pilot plant working. It expects it to go into production in about a year, Dr. Franz Broich, vice chairman of the board of directors of Huels, says.

Huels started work back in 1956 on this problem and, before deciding on its present route, had considered other methods. It looked at alpha olefins based on petroleum wax and on Ziegler chemistry. But Huels feels alpha olefins are too expensive. It also points out that only about 30 to 50 percent of the olefins are C_{12}'s. For the process to be economical, there must be a substantial credit for the non-C_{12} olefins, Dr. Broich says.

The firm also considered fatty alcohol sulfates, which are 100 percent biodegradable, but it feels fatty alcohols are too costly at present.

A question concerning the toxicity of the new unbranched-chain ABS detergents has been raised. Huels says that the new material, considered by itself, is no more toxic than TPBS. But it emphasizes that, with the higher degradability, the final product in treatment plant effluent is less toxic than TPBS.

Other companies are also at work in West Germany. Rheinpreussen says it has been making a biodegradable material in quantity, which it calls Korenyl. This is probably an unbranched dodecylbenzene sulfonate similar to Huels' product, but derived from a different starting material. The company won't comment.

Conoco and Deutsche Erdöl have joined hands in a new 65 million pound-per-year fatty alcohol sulfonate plant being built near Hamburg. The plant will probably start up late this year or early next year. It will make Ziegler-type Alfol alcohols, as starting materials for various sulfates and will be similar to Conoco's Lake Charles, La., operation.

As the deadline nears, other firms will probably come up with candidate syndets. H. J. Zimmer, A.G., made news last month with its sugar esters of fatty acids. Although Zimmer seems confident, other firms tend to downgrade the sugar esters as serious contenders for any large share of the detergent market. They feel that the products are too expensive and will probably find use in higher value products, such as cosmetic detergents.

One of the earliest entries in the biodegradable market is Dobane JN, Dutch Shell's product. Dobane, a straight-chain AB produced from wax cracking, has been made and marketed on a limited basis—mainly in England. At present Shell is building a urea wax plant at its Pernis chemical complex near Rotterdam in the Netherlands. The plant, slated for completion in mid-1964, will make commercial quantities of Dobane JN.

LARGE PIE

Why all this activity in the United States and abroad? Contenders are vying for a piece of a multimillion-pound pie. Total sales (active plus inert ingredients) of solid and liquid household detergents were about 4 billion pounds (containing about 560 million pounds of ABS) in 1962. Growth is roughly 4 percent per year. These figures exclude floor and wall cleaners as well as scouring cleansers. The Soap and Detergent Association reported sales at 3.75 billion pounds in 1962, but their reporting does not account for the entire industry. The big three of the industry—Procter & Gamble, Lever, and Colgate—have between 80 and 85 percent of the business, C. & E.N. estimates.

In the industry's parlance, last year's sales amounted to about 140 million cases. Solid detergents average 32 pounds a case (varying from 30 to 36 pounds), while the liquid detergents average about 20 pounds a case. The various light- and heavy-duty liquids comprised about 22 percent of last year's sales, compared to 11.5 percent in 1957.

Detergent composition can vary widely among producers. The solid products generally use TPBS as the key surface-active agent. But some producers, such as P. & G. use fatty alcohol sulfates in combination with TPBS, or as the sole active ingredient. These products also contain other ingredients, such as phosphates, dyes, optical bleaches, sodium carboxymethyl cellulose, and fatty acid amides (Colgate does not use amides in its solid detergents).

Variations continue in the liquid area. Procter & Gamble avoids ABS in its liquids, while Colgate and Lever use these sulfonates. Otherwise, the major organic components are generally an ethoxylated fatty alcohol sulfate or an ethoxylated alkylphenol adduct. Too, the liquids have various other materials, such as phosphates and hydrotropes (sodium xylene sulfonate or sodium toluene sulfonates), and they usually average 4 to 6 percent amides, compared to 2 percent for solid detergents. Moreover, some new liquids in early stages contain lauryl ether sulfate and an amine oxide, such as lauryl dimethyl amine oxide. The amine oxide could displace amides in household detergents.

Biodegradability problems seem destined to affect the outlook for present-day alkylphenols as well as alkylbenzenes. Although most of the concern as to biodegradability of synthetic detergents is for TPBS, where it rightly belongs, the biodegradability of alkylphenol is in question. Alkylphenol nonionics are generally quite markedly resistant to biodegradation. Alkylphenol adducts comprised 105 to 115 million pounds of household detergent formulations in 1962, with nearly half being accounted for by Lever. P. & G. does not use alkylphenols, primarily because its interest over the years has centered more on fatty acid derivatives.

These adducts require about 40 to 46 million pounds of alkylphenol, some 33 percent of the total alkylphenol market. Colgate does not purchase the alkylphenol, but rather buys the sulfated adduct for use in its formulations. Lever, although it does buy some alkylphenol for its own sulfonation, also buys sulfated adducts.

All told, household detergents account for about 40 percent of all nonionic detergent consumption. The trade feels that alkylphenol-based nonionics will decline because of the biodegradability fracas, although they could possibly be made more degradable with a straight side chain, while alcohol-based nonionics will rise rapidly. The decline phase for alkylphenols should become evident by 1965; and it is probable that, once it starts, alkylphenol adducts will be completely out of the household detergent market within a year.

The TPBS market faces the biggest turmoil because of the biodegradability problem. Last year, the detergent industry consumed about 560 million pounds of these sulfonates. The use of TPBS has virtually leveled off, since it has just about completely penetrated the high-sudsing, heavy-duty, solid detergent market.

The sulfonate production in 1962 meant a domestic demand for about 395 million pounds of alkylbenzene, chiefly as dodecylbenzene. Alkylbenzene production in 1962 was 527 million pounds, and exports ran about 102 million pounds. Procter & Gamble is the big consumer, taking about 170 million pounds last year. Colgate used 65 million pounds and Lever, 70 million. Miscellaneous detergent makers had consumed the balance.

With the biodegradability problem weighing heavily on detergent makers, it seems likely that a switch to straight-chain alkylbenzene could come quite strongly by 1964–65. This move, then, would not affect the benzene part of the demand, but it would cause serious repercussions in the propylene tetramer market. Whether a shift is the final solution to biodgradability or not is hard to say at this time.

Meanwhile, the use of fatty alcohols to make detergents should continue its upward trend. Procter & Gamble uses between 45 and 50 million pounds of lauryl alcohol and 50 to 55 million pounds of tallow alcohol annually in its detergent manufacture, with practically all going to household products.

HIGH STAKES

The stakes are just as high in West Germany. Total production in 1961 (latest available figures) of detergent raw materials was about 282 million pounds (active material). This includes some 56 million pounds that were processed into finished detergent material by the raw material producers themselves. Net production sold in 1961 to final processors was thus about 224 million pounds, valued at about $30 million. This includes some 31 million pounds of exports. The net amount sold in Germany was thus about 19 million pounds. Imports were minor, amounting to about 550,000 pounds. Exports were mostly to ECM countries, with smaller amounts going to EFTA countries, South America, and Asia. The bulk of imports came from the Netherlands, with a small amount coming from the United States. In the first half of last year, total production was 16 million pounds.

Estimates vary, but of total production, about 60 to 80 percent is ABS type, and about 20 to 40 percent is fatty alcohol sulfates and nonionic types, such as fatty alcohols, polyglycol ethers, and alkyl polyoxyethylene ethanol. Probably nonionics had the larger share of the 40 percent non-ABS type.

Huels produced about 9 million pounds of tetrapropylene ABS last year. Smaller producers, such as Sunlicht (owned by Unilever) and Elektrochemische Fabrik Kempden (owned by Rheinpreussen), accounted for an estimated 4.5 million pounds of ABS raw materials used in synthetic detergents.

In the United States, where the situation is a step or two behind West Germany, detergent makers either have not settled on what raw materials will do the trick, or they aren't saying. But something should break soon.

EXTENSIVE RESEARCH

All sizable detergent makers have extensive research programs going on for new products. Also, raw material suppliers are almost constantly furnishing new samples for testing by detergent makers. Dr. Richard B. Wearn, director of research at Colgate-Palmolive, says that in his labs at present there are about 70 samples of straight-chain material which are in some stage of processing. He feels the straight chains are feasible as substitutes for TPBS, but the economics are in question. Dr. Wearn adds that he believes alpha olefins could be used as intermediates to make alcohols or sulfates and possibly replace lauryl alcohol, if their price were in the 6- to 7-cent range.

Proctor & Gamble says either Ziegler or wax cracked alpha olefins may do the trick, depending on price. P. J. Weaver, head of P. & G.'s sanitary engineering research services, and Frank Coughlin, associate director, product development division, state that the company is receiving tank car quantities of straight-chain materials for evaluation.

P. & G., as well as other detergent makers, would apparently like to get a degradable product out before any Federal legislation, and for two apparent reasons. As the Federal bill appears now, it may follow the lead of the West Germans, meaning a minimum of 80 percent degradation in a product under a particular type of test. If this should go through, some detergent makers might feel they have no incentive to come up with a product any better than to pass the test. Without legislation, P. & G. states—and other detergent makers appear to agree—the industry will come up with the most degradable product it possibly can under a wider range of field conditions.

The second reason involves price. Although the Reuss bill would not take effect until June 30, 1965, there would probably not be enough time for cost of the new raw material to come down to that of tetrapropylene. Therefore, detergent makers would end up paying a premium which would have to be passed on.

YEARS 1964–65

As to when we can expect to see some new products from P. & G., Lever, Colgate, and other detergent makers, 1964–65 seems to be the date most heard. P. & G. and Colgate have reached the tank car test stage with some products, and it is likely that other detergent makers have also.

Detergent makers seem most interested in three qualities in any product to replace TPBS. First, it must be more biodegradable. As to how much more, the only answer detergent makers give is, "as much as possible." Second, performance must equal present ABS-based products. Third, the price must be in line. At present there are these prices to consider: Propylene tetramer at 4 cents per pound, alkylbenzene at 10 cents per pound. Since most detergent makers do their own sulfonation, the price to shoot for is a 10-cent-per-pound detergent alkylate.

Industry observers expect that initial offerings of straight-chain detergent alkylates will be about 15 cents per pound. These will be from commercial plants of 50 million pounds or more. These sources also qualify this further by saying that the materials will be obtained by cracking paraffin or by extracting straight-chain paraffins from kerosene or heavy naphtha. By 1963–64, this price will drop to 12 cents; by 1964–65, to 11 cents; beyond 1965, to 10 cents; and eventually down to 8 cents per pound.

On the other hand, alpha olefins from ethylene polymerization can also be expected to go at 15 cents per pound as an initial offering from commercial plants. By 1965 this could come near the 10-cent mark, depending to a great degree on the ethylene situation of any particular maker.

Among the many questions in this area is the one as to which route to take to alpha olefins—Ziegler or paraffin cracking. Paraffin cracking gives a product mix that contains a broad range of olefins of different chain lengths, and this mix must be fractionated to provide a specific fraction. The Ziegler route does not give a wide product range, although fractionation is also needed.

The Ziegler chemistry route starts with ethylene at less than 5 cents per pound. No one has said in so many words what the cracking routes start with, but a slack (high

oil content) wax is the likely candidate. With the wide variation in refinery economics, it is hard to pin down the price of slack wax. Some experts put it at 1.8 cents per pound, but it depends heavily on a particular refinery's situation—long or short on slack wax.

Whichever the route, raw material suppliers are gearing for the change. Whatever the change is, and whenever it takes place, pressure is building. State and Federal legislators got off to an eager start this year, throwing "ban the detergent" bills into the hopper in quick succession.

The legislative action was topped off late in January, with Representative REUSS introducing a bill which would prohibit use of degradation-resistant detergents. H.R. 2105 would take effect June 30, 1965. Before then, standards of decomposability would be set up by the U.S. Surgeon General.

EVEN ODDS

The bill is now before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. No hearing date has been set. When such a date is set, the U.S. Public Health Service will probably put forth its opinion on the bill, which could easily affect its outcome. Should the technical people in Public Health Service back the bill, its chances for passing would increase. On the other hand, should they take a stand against the bill, its chances of passing would be lessened. At last check, the bill was given a 50–50 chance of passing this year.

Latest word from Washington: Congressman REUSS has followed H.R. 2105 with a second bill. H.R. 4571, introduced about a week ago, plugs a loophole in the previous bill. Although H.R. 2105 would ban detergents that don't meet decomposability standards from interstate commerce, it would have no control on intrastate manufacture. So detergents made in a State could be sold within that State. But some of these products would presumably end up in interstate waterways, and here's where the second bill plugs the hole. It bans detergents completely which could possibly end up in interstate waters.

Also the new bill would empower the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out its provisions. H.R. 2105 gave authority to the Surgeon General.

Five State legislatures have seen some type of detergent bill introduced this year. These vary from calling for study committees to all-out bans on nondegradable detergents.

Maryland's bill (No. A464) would make it unlawful to sell detergents containing alkylbenzene sulfonate. Also in Maryland, a joint resolution requests the Governor to appoint a committee "to review the need for a standard of degradability in waste treatment systems for detergent materials and to recommend a standard of and method for determining such degradability."

The third bit of legal action taken against detergents in Maryland would forbid the discharge of untreated detergents into streams and septic tanks from coin-operated laundries and car-washing operations. Effective date is January 1, 1964. A new bill proposed in Maryland would defer this matter until the committee reports on degradable matters.

Wisconsin, also bothered by water pollution, has set up a study committee to examine the detergent problem. In addition, a bill has been introduced which would ban any nondegradable detergent.

Another bill will soon be introduced in Wisconsin to outlaw the use of nondegradable detergents and also set up authority for the State board of health to formulate rules and regulations for detergents.

Nebraska is also in the act, with two bills. One would place a 10-cent-per-pound tax on hard detergents, and the other would set up standards of biodegradability and ban detergents not meeting these standards after January 30, 1965.

Behind these bills is the Nebraska Department of Agriculture's plan for a degradable detergent based on corn. Midwest Research Institute, working under a grant from the Nebraska Department of Agriculture and Inspection, has developed a process which would start with cornstarch to make what MRI says is a detergent showing promising biodegradability.

On the surface, Nebraska's proposed legislation looks like a serious attempt at solving a problem. But the remarks of Dr. E. A. Rogers, State health director, cast some serious doubt on the need for such legislation. Dr. Rogers has told the State health board that foam on rivers and streams created by nondegradable detergents is not a health hazard, merely a nuisance. He adds that if the bill is an attempt to raise tax funds, then why not present it on an economic basis and leave out the health problem propaganda? Despite the possible lack of need for or motives behind the proposed legislation, some observers feel the bill may pass this year.

The remainder of proposed State legislation comes from California and Connecticut. California would ban nondegradable syndets. The Connecticut bill would also ban these products, although biodegradability is not specifically mentioned in the bill.

The Soap and Detergent Association, acting as spokesman for the industry, says legislation will not help the situation and therefore is unnecessary. In general, detergent makers believe no legislation is required, neither State nor Federal, because they feel no health emergency is involved. Producers agree that eventually they must shift their raw materials to a more degradable material, and they feel they will do this as fast as possible. But because test methods for degradability do not yet correlate with actual field experience, there is no sound basis for regulation now, SDA says.

The West Germans echo this feeling. As Dr. Broich of Huels puts it, "The chemical industry must do whatever it can do."

As in the United States, however, German detergent producers feel the problem has been exaggerated as a result of constant pressure by the press and politicians. The producers don't deny that there is a growing problem and that detergents—especially TPBS, which is only about 25 percent degradable in West German treatment procedure—contribute significantly to it. But they emphasize that syndets are only part of the problem, and perhaps a smaller part at that.

FOAM, A NUISANCE

Foam is mainly a nuisance, the Germans say, although it may possibly lower the efficiency of sewage treatment plants by its effect on the surface tension of water. Further, they point out, syndets alone don't cause foaming in rivers, where their concentration is about 1 part per million. It's TPBS in the presence of protein material in sewage that makes the foam. Thus, surface-active agents are a visible indicator of a polluted stream. But the general public tends to place full blame on detergents. Far more serious a problem, it is felt, is the unseen pollution.

What of the future? Apparently, nobody is completely convinced that the new unbranched-chain ABS material is the ultimate solution. One highly placed West German executive of an ABS producer feels that, if fatty alcohol prices come down, then fatty alcohol sulfonates, with their 100 percent biodegradability, might be the big detergent of the future. But this doesn't seem likely.

Even in West Germany, where the situation appears nice and tidy on the surface, things aren't completely nailed down. For instance, there is talk of raising the 80 percent requirement to 100 percent and adding a nontoxicity requirement. Neither action seems likely in the near future. But some in the industry feel that the law will become progressively more severe.

Some feel that the Government test, based as it is on a miniature treatment plant, is unrealistic for Germany, which has few treatment plants. They feel that the Warburg test, which measures oxygen uptake, and hence gives a measure of true degradation to CO_2, water sulfates, etc., is more realistic. It more closely matches degradation in a river, they say. The Government test, on the other hand, is a measure of loss of surface activity. This doesn't necessarily mean complete degradation of the molecule. Supporters of the Government test say that it is imperative that more treatment plants be built (only about 20 percent of German communities have such plants) and that as time passes, tests will become more representative of actual conditions.

The United States has its uncertainties, too. Biodegradability and new raw materials, in the end, will cause major changes in the detergent industry. The multi-million-dollar industry will solve its share of the pollution problem as well as it possibly can, but it has been shown that a very substantial water pollution problem will still exist. Added to this, the reuse of water will increase. At present, some industries recycle waste waters or use municipal sewage effluent to conserve water and reduce stream pollution. Water reclamation has also been practiced to a certain extent in municipalities.

Already, reuse of water is widespread in the United States. A summary report put out by Taft Sanitary Engineering Center clearly points this out. "One fact is clear, we are already reusing our water; 40 percent of the United States' population is using water that has been used at least once for domestic or industrial purposes. This natural reuse will increase."

There seems to be general agreement that increased and improved water and waste treatment facilities can remove greater amounts of detergent pollutants, and, equally important, greater amounts of other organic and inorganic contaminants. The Taft engineering group says that work at the Center—lab scale—has shown that, under proper conditions, percolation through unsaturated soils reduces ABS content by 90 percent. Total organics will be reduced similarly. Facilities to treat secondary effluent for further removal of organics and inorganic materials, including ABS, could include adsorption techniques, foam fractionation, ion exchange methods, and electrodialysis.

Adsorptive techniques have centered mainly on the use of activated carbon. The Taft group believes that, of the methods studied to date, the carbon technique offers the most promise for removal of organic wastes, with cost for carbon adsorption to achieve 90 percent ABS removal and 70 percent overall organic removal being estimated at 6 to 8 cents per 1,000 gallons of effluent processed. Foam fractionation cost is estimated to be in the neighborhood of 5 cents per 1,000 gallons to remove 90 percent ABS and 30 percent overall organic content.

At the annual meeting of the Soap and Detergent Association in January, three research men from California Research Corp. told of their success in removing 95 percent of the ABS in a sewage plant. This was done by foaming and recycling the foam to the activated sludge reactor in the plant. Taft's advanced research treatment section is considering a pilot-size foam operation to investigate overall organic removal, including use of the recycle system.

Ion exchange has proved effective in removing contaminants, although the cost depends to a high degree on success in regenerating the resin. The Taft research group points out that ion exchange is most successful in removing inorganics, since organic materials may foul the resin. But ion exchange resins also hold promise for removing organics. Dr. Irving R. Abrams of Diamond Alkali's research labs has stated that in his labs products have been developed which are now being used commercially for removing organics similar to those encountered in sewage and industrial waste water.

Electrodialysis has also shown some worth in lab-scale setups. The Taft team says that, although organics are reduced in concentration in the purification cell of an electrodialysis setup, the organic particles tend to lodge in the membrane. But, they add, electrodialysis has been able to reduce inorganic content from a range of 500 to 600 parts per million to one of 100 to 200 parts per million in sewage waste. All of these, and other methods, are being studied. The more successful, if applied on a large scale, would remove not only detergent contaminants if they are still around at that time, but also all pollutants from sewage effluents.

Act Concerning Detergents in Washing and Cleansing Media (Act on Detergents) of September 5, 1961

(Bundesgetzblatt, pt. I, 1962)

The following act has been enacted by the Bundestag:

ARTICLE 1

(1) It is the purpose of this act to achieve maximum decomposability of surface-active and cleansing agents (detergents) contained in washing and cleansing media.

(2) Washing and cleansing media containing detergents shall not be put on the market by the manufacturer or importer, unless the decomposability of the detergents meets the requirements of the statutory ordinance to be issued under article 2.

(3) Paragraph 2 shall not apply where washing and cleansing media are supplied to third persons as samples for testing and experimental purposes.

(4) Nor shall paragraph 2 apply to the export or transit of washing and cleansing media.

(5) Any other conveyance of washing and cleansing media into or out of the area to which this act applies shall be deemed to be import or export.

ARTICLE 2

(1) The Federal Government shall be authorized to establish, by a statutory ordinance requiring the consent of the Bundesrat, the requirements of decomposability with regard to detergents in washing and cleansing media, as well as the necessary methods of testing. Such requirements must be in keeping with the level of scientific knowledge and technology attained in the field of detergent manufacture and sewage plant efficiency.

(2) The Federal Government shall issue the first statutory ordinance under paragraph 1 not later than June 30, 1962.

ARTICLE 3

(1) The authority competent under land legislation may take samples of washing and cleansing mediums needed for inspection at the importers' or manufacturers' premises. Part of the sample, officially packed and sealed, shall be left behind, if so demanded.

(2) The persons commissioned by the competent authority shall be permitted to enter rooms and premises insofar as their duty so requires. The fundamental right of inviolability of the home as defined by article 13 of the basic law shall be restricted to that extent.

(3) The officials of the authority competent under land legislation or their authorized agents shall not, without authority, disclose or make use of any business or technical secrets which have become known to them in the course of their duties, even if they are no longer in the service or if their employment has come to an end. This shall also apply to other persons who, by reason of official reporting, have obtained knowledge of the facts stated in the first sentence.

ARTICLE 4

(1) Any person violating the obligation imposed on him by virtue of paragraph 3 of article 3 shall be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year and a fine, or to either of these penalties.

(2) If the offender acts for remuneration or with the intent to secure pecuniary benefit for himself or for a third person, or to cause damage to a third person, he shall be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 2 years. In addition, a fine may be imposed.

(3) Prosecution shall only take place upon petition of the injured person.

ARTICLE 5

(1) Any person who, in his capacity as a manufacturer or importer, deliberately puts washing or cleansing media on the market which do not meet the provisions of article 1, shall be guilty of a statutory offense.

(2) A statutory offense may render the offender liable to (1) a fine not exceeding DM10,000, where such offense has been committed intentionally; (2) a fine not exceeding DM5,000, where such offense has been committed negligently.

ARTICLE 6

(1) The provision in respect of fines contained in article 5 shall also apply to any person acting as an executive organ on behalf of, and authorized to represent, a body corporate, or as a member of any such organ, or as the legal representative of a third person. This shall also apply if the legal act establishing the representative authority is void.

(2) Any person charged with the management or supervision of the enterprise or of part of the enterprise of a third person, or who is expressly entrusted by such third person to fulfill, on his own responsibility, any duties imposed by this act shall be accorded the same legal treatment as persons specified in paragraph 1.

ARTICLE 7

If, in an enterprise, any person commits an act subject to a fine under paragraph 1 of article 5, the owner or manager of the enterprise or the owner's legal representative or a member of the executive organ in charge of the legal representation of a body corporate or a partner authorized to represent a partnership (Personengescellschaft) under German commercial law may be liable to a fine, provided that they have failed in their duty of supervision either intentionally or negligently and the offense is attributable thereto. The amount of the fine shall be determined in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 5.

ARTICLE 8

(1) If any person, in his capacity as a member of the executive organ in charge of the legal representation or as a "Prokurist"[1] of a body corporate or as a partner authorized to represent a partnership under German commercial law or as a "Prokurist" of a partnership, commits a statutory offense under the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 5, a fine to be determined in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 5 may also be imposed on the body corporate or the partnership.

(2) Article 6 of the law on statutory offenses shall also apply in respect of any remuneration or profit which the body corporate or the partnership under German commercial law has received in consideration of the statutory offense or derived therefrom.

ARTICLE 9

Objects may be confiscated which are connected with an offense punishable under paragraph 1 of article 5. Paragraph 4 of article 18 and articles 19 to 26 of the law on statutory offenses shall apply correspondingly.

ARTICLE 10

In accordance with paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Third Transition Act of January 4, 1952 (BGBI[2] I, p. 1), this act shall also be valid in the land Berlin. Statutory ordinances made under this act shall apply to the land Berlin in accordance with article 14 of the Third Transition Act.

ARTICLE 11

This act shall come into force on the day following its promulgation.

The constitutional rights of the Bundesrat have been observed.

The foregoing act is hereby promulgated. Bonn, September 5, 1961.

Lübke,
The Federal President.
Ludwig Erhard,
The Deputy for the Federal Chancellor.
Ludwig Erhard,
The Federal Minister for Economic Affairs.
Balke.
The Federal Minister of Nuclear Energy and Water Economy.

Aspects of Synthetic Detergents in Water

(By Jesse M. Cohen, Engineering Section, Water Supply and Water Pollution Branch, Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Cincinnati, Ohio, at the July 1959 meeting of the American Society of Sanitary Engineering, Washington, D.C.)

INTRODUCTION

During the past 20 years, the development of petrochemicals for household and industrial uses has undergone tremendous expansion and diversification. Leading this burgeoning market are the synthetic detergents. Derived from crude oil, they emerged about 20–25 years ago as a poor competitor for soaps, which are produced from vegetable and animal fats and oils. The challenge of synthetic detergents to soap supremacy as a cleansing agent began on a very modest scale. In 1939, sales of soaps totaled 3.3 billion pounds, compared to a sales total of synthetic detergents of only 18 million pounds, as illustrated, in figure 1 (not printed in Record).[1][2] This beachhead was to advance steadily into a full-scale invasion of the detergent market. Ten years later, in 1949, soap sales totaled about 3 billion (2.96) pounds while total synthetic detergent sales, although still far behind, had expanded to 815 million pounds. In 1953, for the first time, total sales of synthetic detergents surpassed those of soap products, until today they comprise 75 percent of all detergent sales with a total of 3.8 billion pounds. Eighty-five to ninety percent of this impressive total is sold to the household market.

Synthetic household detergents are mixtures of at least 3 and sometimes as many as 10 individual components, each of which plays a specific part in the washing process. The one essential ingredient common to all is the surface-active agent, often referred to as the "surfactant" portion. Supplementary compounds, generally termed "builders," include polyphosphates, sodium silicates, sodium sulfate, and sodium carboxymethylcellulose. Other constituents, such as foam stabilizers, perfumes, and optical bleaches are usually added in minor amounts. Some typical formulations are shown in figure 2.

FIGURE 2.—*Examples of household synthetic detergent formulations*

Component	Amount (percent)			
	A	B	C	D
Alkyl aryl sulfonate	9	18	8	31
Alkyl sulfate	9	------	22	------
Sodium polyphosphates	50	47	------	------
Sodium silicate	7	7	------	------
Sodium sulfate	18	23	63	62
Moisture	5	3	5	5
Other compounds	2	2	2	2

Although soaps perform well in warm, soft water, they all form insoluble calcium and magnesium salts which lack cleansing properties and cause deposits on plumbing fixtures and appliances. Soaps also lose cleansing activity in acid waters. To overcome these difficulties, chemists have created entirely new substances whose molecules are enough like those of soap to have essentially the same cleansing properties, but differ enough to be immune to the effects of acids or hard water.

Synthetic detergents are divided into three groups: anionic, cationic, and nonionic compounds. When soaps and most of the synthetic detergents are dissolved in water, their molecules split into two electrically charged parts, or ions. These ions consist of a large organic group which is hydrophobic, that is, relatively insoluble in water, and a smaller inorganic group which is hydrophilic, or soluble in water. This hydrophobic-hydrophilic structure is characteristic of all synthetic detergents. The various classes of synthetic detergents, including soap, are illustrated in figure 3 (not printed in Record). Of the hundreds of different commercial surfactants available, the one compound in greatest use is an anionic surfactant, the sodium salt of dodecylbenzene sulfonate, which is frequently referred to as alkyl benzene sulfonate or ABS for short.

Synthetic detergents have caused concern among waste and water treatment people for the past few years for two important reasons. One is that almost the entire industrial production of 3.8 billion pounds is eventually discharged to surface or ground water; second that some of the surfactants are endowed with remarkable abilities to resist the treatment processes available to the sanitary engineer. A portion of the detergent materials consistently resists absorption and sedimentation in the primary treatment of sewage. Even sewage plants possessing secondary treatment processes are able to reduce only partially the surfactant content. Hence, practically all sewage effluents contain some surfactant, which, because it has survived the rigors of sewage treatment, is inherently prepared for an even longer survival against the purification agencies in surface and ground waters. In many instances the stream water containing the persistent surfactant is used for municipal drinking water supply.

During the past few years an extensive technical literature has appeared covering many aspects of synthetic detergents in sewage and water. I will confine my discussion to synthetic detergents in water and water treatment plants.

EFFECTS ON RIVER WATER

Streamflow is commonly relied upon to dilute and further degrade treatment plant effluent by natural stream purification processes. It becomes pertinent therefore, to consider the persistence of synthetic detergents in river waters.

The surfactants that reach the rivers in sewage plant effluents are those residual materials that have resisted the intense biological activity of sewage and, hence, are not likely to be easily oxidized in river water. In fact, it has been shown that the surfactant in greatest use today will resist natural stream purification processes. In figure 4 (not printed in Record) are shown the data of Hammerton[3] which illustrate the rates at which various types of surfactants are destroyed in river water. It is apparent from these curves that a portion of surfactants C and D will persist for longer than 20 days, long enough for this contaminated water to arrive at a water treatment plant as part of the water supply.

Along with the surfactant, one of the "builders," polyphosphate compounds are discharged into streams in quantities 2–2½ times the amount of surfactant. Phosphates are an essential nutrient for biological life and the constant discharge of synthetic detergents into a river provides additional material for growths of algae. Algae may cause difficulties with water plant operation and frequently are responsible for unpleasant tastes and odors in water. The polyphosphates also become important in water treatment, as I will show later.

DETERGENTS IN WATER TREATMENT

During the years 1950–54. when synthetic detergent sales were mounting rapidly (fig. 1) a number of instances were reported throughout the country of difficulty with the coagulation process in water treatment plants. These difficulties were generally ascribed to the presence of surfactant in the raw water supply. At about this time, in response to requests from various State agencies, the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center initiated research on the effects of synthetic detergents on the coagulation process.[4][5] Other research laboratories have since published results which have substantially confirmed our work.[6]

At the center we studied the individual components commonly included in household synthetic detergents to determine which of the major ingredients was responsible for the coagulation difficulties with alum and with iron salts. They were discovered to be two chemical compounds, the organic surfactants which generally is an alkyl benzene sulfonate, or ABS. and sodium polyphosphate which invariably is sodium tripolyphosphate.

Extensive investigation was done on the concentration of surfactant material which interferes with chemical coagulation. The data showed that damage to this process does not occur until relatively high concentrations of organic material are present. These interference concentrations are much higher than ever recorded as present in any drinking water supply. It is clear, then, that difficulties with chemical coagulation cannot be assigned to only the presence of surfactants.

Experiments with various concentrations of polyphosphates demonstrated that very small amounts of these phosphate compounds can interfere with coagulation. With a slight increase in phosphate concentration, the process of coagulation can be disrupted completely. Figure 5 (not printed in Record) illustrates the damage that small amounts of sodium tripolyphosphate can cause to a coagulation with ferric sulfate.[5] As little as 0.025 parts per million, or 0.2 of a pound in a million gallons of water, can decrease the quality of chemical coagulation in a water treatment plant. While many water supplies now contain interference concentrations of polyphosphates, fortunately no serious damage to water quality has occurred, for several reasons. First their interference may be overcome by increased coagulant dosage. Second, hardness which is present in varying degrees in practically all waters tends to reduce or eliminate their interference. Third, polyphosphates are rapidly converted in sewage to relatively innocuous forms of phosphates.

REMOVAL OF SURFACTANTS FROM WATER

I have already indicated that all sewage contains surfactant material in concentrations varying from a few parts per million to 20 parts or more per million. Sewage treatment processes at best remove up to 50–60 percent of the original surfactants and sewage effluents contain resistant forms which do not readily decompose. Dilution by river water further reduces the concentration so that municipal raw water supplies now contain surfactant concentrations ranging from a few parts per billion up to perhaps a few parts per million. This water will also contain varying amounts of phosphate compounds, but now in a form which will not interfere with chemical coagulation.

Water treatment processes have been shown to be ineffective in achieving significant removal of surfactant material.[6][7] Chlorination, which is common to all water treatment plants in this country, has no effect in reducing the concentration. Chemical coagulation has been shown by several investigators[5][7][8] to be incapable of removing more than minor amounts, from 5–10 percent. Chemical coagulation is, however, very effective in reducing the phosphate compounds to very low concentrations. No research has been reported on the effect of rapid sand filtration which is a step in the water treatment process, on removal of surfactant. This unit process is used in all plants which chemically coagulate water, and indirect evidence indicates that no removals of dissolved materials such as surfactants would be obtained. It has been reported[7] that slow sand filtration, which is more common abroad than in this country, has shown removals up to 40 percent.

When synthetic detergents first became a problem to sanitary engineers, it was stated that turbidity present in most surface waters would adsorb surfactants and remove them by sedimentation. This has since been shown to be wishful thinking, since such predicted removals have not occurred in practice.

To date only one water treatment process will remove substantial amounts of surfactants, but at such great cost, unfortunately, that it is unlikely any plant will undertake the treatment. This process consists of the addition of activated carbon, which is commonly used in many water plants for the control of tastes and odors. The activated carbon is generally applied in amounts up to 10 p.p.m., with some exceptional plants using more during short periods of difficulty. Activated carbon will remove surfactant compounds at rates which can be predicted, as shown in figure 6 (not printed in Record).

---

[1] Translator's note: "Prokurist"—proxy authorized by virtue of article 49 of the German Commercial Code to perform all judicial and extrajudicial legal acts arising from the management of a commercial enterprise.

[2] Translator's note: "BGBI" is an abbreviation for "Bundesgesetzblatt," which has been the official legal gazette since 1949.

[1] Macon, J. R., "Detergent Market Trends," Soap and Chemical Specialties, 31, 41 (March 1955).

[2] Anon. "Specialties Ignore Recession," Chemical and Engineering News, 36, 113 (September 1958).

[3] Hammerton, C., "Observations on the Decay of Synthetic Anionic Detergents in Natural Waters," J. Appl. Chem., 5, 517 (1955).

[4] Smith, R. S., Cohen, J. M., and Walton, G., "Effects of Synthetic Detergents on Water Coagulation," Journal American Water Works Association, 48, 55 (1956).

[5] Cohen, J. M., Rourke, G. A., and Woodward, R. L., "Ferric Sulfate Coagulation in the Presence of Synthetic Detergent Components," accepted for publication in the Journal, American Water Works Association, (1959).

[6] Howells, D. H., and Sawyer, C. N., "Effects of Synthetic Detergents on Chemical Coagulation of Water," Water and Sewage Works, 103, 71 (1956).

[7] Hammerton, C., "Synthetic Detergents and Water Supplies," Proc. Soc. for Wat. Treat. and Exam., 5, 145 (1956).

[8] Vaughn, J. C., Falkenthal, R. F., and Schmidt, R. W., "Effects of Synthetic Detergents on Water," Journal American Water Works Association, 48, 30 (1956).

For example, if 1.6 p.p.m. of surfactant are present in a water supply, removal to a residual of .01 p.p.m. will require treatment with 120 p.p.m. of carbon; if residuals of 0.1 p.p.m. of surfactant are desired, then 60 p.p.m. of carbon would have to be added.

In both cases, the required doses of carbon are prohibitive economically. Up to the present time, there is no economical way of removing surfactant material from drinking water. Present research activities are more logically directed toward removal at the sewage treatment plant.

GROUND WATER CONTAMINATION

Growth of suburban areas has increased the use of individual household water supplies from ground water and of sewage disposal to septic tanks or cesspools. Use of small lots for both waste disposal and water source has resulted in increasing incidents of contamination of the ground water with sewage.[9][10][11] One of the first evidences of detergent pollution of drinking water is foaming at the tap. This qualitative test for surfactant is surprisingly sensitive and will indicate concentrations as low as 0.8 ppm. Pollution with greater concentrations produces, in addition to increased foaming, unpleasant tastes and odors. The polyphosphates which almost always accompany the surfactants apparently do not travel too far through the ground, but are precipitated and immobilized. While the surfactant material may not in itself be hazardous to health, its mere presence serves to warn that sewage has contaminated the ground water. Pollution of ground water is far more serious than similar pollution of a surface water. Underground waters move slowly; it may take months or even years before contamination appears, but once it has occurred it may require as much or more time before the water is free again from contamination.

DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

The tremendous expansion in the use of synthetic detergents has posed problems for the sanitary engineers that were not present when soap was the common cleansing agent. Those difficulties have appeared for the very reasons that make synthetic detergents more desirable as a cleanser than soap. Soaps are precipitated by hardness, synthetic detergents are not. Soaps are easily decomposed both by acid conditions and biological activity; synthetic detergents are immune to acids and, more important, will resist biological decomposition and hence will survive, at least in part, sewage treatment, river self-purification processes, ground water travel and will appear in varying reduced amounts in drinking water. At the present time and under normal conditions of rainfall, the concentrations of surfactant in drinking water are low, probably in the parts per billion range, but under conditions of abnormally low rainfall or increased pollution of the raw water supply with sewage effluents, concentrations have reached a few parts per million. These concentrations are easily detected both by foaming and by off-tastes and odors. The deteriorated quality of the drinking water and apprehension about the possible chronic effects of continued ingestion of small amounts of synthetic detergents have spurred research on the problem. Most of the effort at present is directed toward removing the surfactants at the sewage treatment plant. Some consideration has also been given by the major producers of synthetic detergents to the development of other suitable compounds equal to the present surfactants in cleansing properties but different in the important characteristics of being decomposable by biological life. A step in this direction has been the development of a synthetic detergent based, not on petroleum as most of them are, but on sugar.[12] The compound is still largely in the development stage.

I have no doubts that continued active research will discover means for increasing the efficiency of removal of surfactants by sewage treatment processes.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *March 22, 1963.*

HON JOHN J. MCINTYRE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Regarding foam control measures, Cleveland Easterly Sewage Treatment Plant: Recent investment to the extent of one-quarter of a million dollars for process equipment to control foam has been expediency rather than a cure for the situation. Briefly a water spray system provides the energy to depress or break up the foam, driving the foam back into the liquid system. This method largely prevents the contamination by foam of any surface within the wind carrying distance.

The basic problem of removal of foaming constituents from the treatment process has not been changed. We are well aware that existing process equipment only partially removes refractory materials.

The new chemical molecules used by man are reasons for investigation. Molecular complexes are in the foam which we see. To a lesser extent they are unseen in the waters which we use. For this reason we search to find answers for complex relationships with which you are concerned.

JOHN J. WIRTS,
Chemical Engineer.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire upon his freshman speech in the Senate and upon taking an active interest in a problem which is of concern to the Federal Government. The Senator from New Hampshire brings to the Senate experience in local government. He is aware of the difficulties which descend upon us as we become more and more an urban community.

The housewives of New Hampshire will welcome his participation in this action, as will city fathers and others interested in the health of the State.

I am also glad to have heard the comments of the Senator from New Hampshire with respect to the field of conservation, the need for which we in the West are aware, but for which we are always in need of the support of easterners. I am pleased to join forces today with the junior Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join as a cosponsor of the bill introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], who has a long and distinguished record in the field of the preservation of America's natural resources. She represents one of the great natural recreation States of the Nation.

I am also pleased to join with the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], who has had a long and abiding interest in the broad aspects of the preservation of America's natural resources, and a wide knowledge of the specific aspects involved in the bill introduced a few minutes ago by the junior Senator from Oregon.

The bill seeks to end the growing problem of detergent chemicals in our water supplies. It is gratifying to note that a number of distinguished Senators and Representatives, including Representative REUSS, of the Fifth Congressional District of Wisconsin, understand this serious problem and are willing to provide the leadership to meet it. It is likewise gratifying to note the interest shown by leaders in the field of conservation and in other fields in the serious problem raised by the pollution of our waters in a number of different ways, especially pollution by detergents.

As Governor of Wisconsin, I spent much time in the past year or two working on this rapidly increasing menace to public health and recreational enjoyment. At my request, the Wisconsin State Board of Health, the State committee on water pollution and the natural resource committee of State agencies, made an exhaustive study of the triple threat which detergent chemicals now constitute: The pollution of our drinking water and the fresh water in rivers, lakes, and streams; the serious disruption of our sewage treatment plants, and the blighting of the landscape with detergent foam which scientists warn may contain dangerous bacteria.

These Wisconsin studies produced a wealth of valuable information. They revealed that the problem was far worse than we realized. They showed that detergent chemicals already had polluted some of the underground water supplies in 64 of Wisconsin's 72 counties. They found mountains of detergent foam piling up on some of our most scenic rivers.

But most important of all, they proved that it is almost impossible to deal with this problem at the State level.

First of all, it is extremely difficult for a single State to do the research and testing necessary to set standards and impose adequate controls on detergents. Second, it is a principle of physics that water—and the dangerous pollution which stalks our water—does not respect State boundaries. Wisconsin is almost an island, surrounded by rivers and lakes which lead to every part of the Nation. Its underground water supplies follow mysterious underground routes which lead for hundreds of miles.

A determined effort still is being made to enact legislation immediately in Wisconsin to deal with this problem, but even if successful, such legislation cannot guarantee the people of my State that their water will be free of detergent chemical pollution. This can be done only by the U.S. Congress, with a bill such as the one introduced today.

Should anyone have any doubts, as to the urgency of this problem, I want to emphasize this basic fact:

The control of detergent pollution is just one part of what I consider the most urgent domestic crisis facing our Nation today—the preservation of our priceless natural resources and the defense of the environment in which we live against the most powerful assault in the history of our Nation. Unless this Nation girds for battle immediately, its people are not going to have clean water to drink, clean air to breathe decent soil in which to grow their food, and a green outdoors in which to live a few decades from now. This is a battle to preserve the simplest, basic elements necessary to human survival.

I am familiar, of course, with the tremendous threats our country faces around the world. We are all deeply concerned about Cuba and atomic bombs, with Communist subversion, crime, and human suffering. I support the programs our Nation has developed to meet those great problems.

But while we mobilize all the powers of our National Government to meet those perplexing problems, we cannot be blind to the growing crisis of our own immediate environment. Our soil, our water, and our air are becoming more polluted every day. Our most priceless natural resources—trees, lakes, rivers, fish spawning grounds, wildlife habitat, scenic landscapes—are being rapidly and systematically destroyed.

Wisconsin, one of the Nation's favorite outdoor playgrounds and a State having a great tradition of enlightened conservation, has moved to meet this crisis as best it can. My State has earmarked $50 million, in addition to all other conservation budget money, to be used in the coming decade to preserve as much as can be saved from this vanishing public treasure—to buy up land for public parks and forests, to preserve scenic vistas with long-term easements, to save the wetlands for fish, birds, and wildlife habitat.

But even this program cannot begin to save the environment in which we live against the powerful assaults of industrialization, congestion, pollution, erosion, blight, and decay.

We need a comprehensive, nationwide program to save the natural resources of America.

We need this just as desperately as we need a defense against atomic missiles.

This rather simple bill—to call a halt in 2 years to the pollution of water by detergents—is one small but important step in that direction. We must fight the destruction of our natural environment on every front where the battle is joined.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a report which I have prepared on the detergent pollution problem and also a letter from a constituent of mine. The letter relates to this specific problem in his area.

There being no objection, the report and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE THREAT TO THE PUBLIC FROM DETERGENT POLLUTION

The U.S. Congress must ban the use in this country of certain detergent chemicals which are polluting our water supplies, disrupting our sewage treatment plants, and blighting our landscape with detergent foam which may represent a serious health hazard.

The Congress can do this without upsetting the soap and detergent industry, and without denying housewives a valuable aid to household cleanliness.

All that is necessary is to use the powers of the Congress to shift the soap and detergent industry into production of a slightly different type of detergent which will not pollute water, will not interfere with sewage treatment, and will not smother the landscape with foam.

These facts are solidly supported by scientific evidence.

WHAT IS THE PROBLEM?

"The off-taste has been described as oily, fishy, or perfume like.

"The toxic effects of the surface active agents studied in the experiments with rats were produced by irritation of the gastrointestinal tract (10,000 parts per million or more in the diet). To an extent which depended on the concentration of the surface active agents in the diet, this irritation prevented proper nutrition. In severe cases of irritation, death resulted" ("Drinking Water Standards, 1962," U.S. Public Health Service).

Detergents as we know them today have been an important part of our lives only since about the end of World War II. But ever since 1950, their rapidly increased use has caused concern in the minds of scientists, some public officials, and lovers of the outdoors.

Today, after more than a decade of serious research and experience, the detergent threat to public health and to outdoor resources has been thoroughly documented.

Most of our popular detergents today contain a chemical made from crude oil. It is this powerful chemical, alkyl benzene sulfonate (ABS) which makes the detergent such an excellent cleaning agent. It cuts through grease and dirt in hard or soft water. It does not leave a scum or deposit as soap does.

But it is this same chemical which threatens our water supply today. By its very nature, this "surface active agent" or "surfactant" forms a union with the water which is extremely difficult to break. It follows the water wherever it goes. Even the complex processes of a modern sewage disposal plant, which remove the most dangerous human wastes and industrial acids, cannot remove all of this detergent chemical, ABS.

The sewage effluent from these plants, which ultimately is discharged into lakes and streams, is loaded with this detergent chemical.

Similarly, this chemical also defies the purification processes of nature, which we rely on where there are no such sewage plants. Many parts of Wisconsin, including heavily populated suburbs around Milwaukee and highly desirable rural residential land in other areas, rely on individual wells and septic tanks.

In such situations, the detergent chemical—unlike other wastes—passes through the septic tank and the drainage system, filters down through the soil and enters the underground well.

HOW BIG IS THE PROBLEM?

Americans are presently using detergents at the rate of 3.8 billion pounds every year. If packed into one pound boxes 6 inches high and laid end to end, this would more than reach around the world.

A Public Health Service report from the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center at Cincinnati, Ohio, says:

"This is cause for great concern because almost all of this material ultimately finds its way into our surface and ground waters. Until recently, we believed our water supplies were inexhaustible. Today, however, we know this is not true. We must use our waters over and over if there is to be an adequate supply for all of us."

This pinpoints the problem: The use of detergents is growing at a phenomenal rate, and the presence of their oil-based chemicals in our water supplies is steadily increasing because water is used and reused.

This matter of reuse of water is one of the most important aspects of detergent pollution. Until recently, water could be safely reused because most of the conventional pollutants were removed or rendered harmless by the sewage disposal systems and by the effects of oxygen, sunlight, and dilution if they did manage to reach our lakes and streams. But these forces cannot combat the detergent chemical, ABS.

SCIENTIST URGES REMOVAL

After an exhaustive review of 10 years of research on this problem, this conclusion was reached by Edward Wise, senior specialist in science and technology in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress:

"It has been the writer's observation that removal of detergents and other contaminants at the source is most essential to the protection of our water supply with our increasing population. The old theory, 'dilution is the solution to pollution,' would seem no longer valid."

A similar conclusion was reached by F. M. Middleton at the Taft Sanitary Engineering Center:

"No one would want to give up detergents, antifreeze, synthetic fibers, miracle drugs, insecticides, modern paints, and the myriad other products that make our lives efficient and pleasant. Progress is not, however, always an unmixed blessing. Man may, in his rush forward, foul the environment and unleash forces that will deter him in his progress."

Fortunately, in the case of detergents, there is no need to "foul the environment" any longer. The legislation proposed here to the Congress, combined with the research already done by the soap and detergent industry, makes a prompt solution possible.

Detergents came to us from Germany, where a substitute was needed in the prewar years for the animal fats used in soap.

Germany led in the development of detergents; it was the first to find them a serious public problem; it was the first to pass a law such as this one; and it is the first to develop an adequate substitute for the chemicals which have been found to be dangerous to the public.

Mountains of foam on Germany's historic rivers and the increasing pollution of water supplies led West Germany to pass a law setting December 31, 1964, as the cutoff date for manufacture of detergents containing ABS, which would not break down in the water. In October 1962, the West German government drafted standards for detergents which requires that they decompose at least 80 percent after entering the water supply.

Meanwhile, German scientists have developed new detergent chemicals made from sugar which will decompose, instead of flowing along with the water like the oil-based chemical, ABS.

WILL THIS BE A COSTLY PROGRAM?

Passage of this bill, setting June 30, 1965, as the cutoff date for manufacture of detergents which do not decompose in the water, will involve some temporary disruption to the soap and detergent industry. But it will not put anyone out of business and it will not be a serious problem to anyone.

It allows more than 2 years for a transition which is already technically possible.

The firms which make detergents also make soap, and they also will make the new type of detergent. The most they face is the problem of developing and marketing a slightly different product, but with the same production and marketing facilities and the same vast and growing market.

Engineers tell me that the new type of detergent at present would have to sell for about 15 percent more. Presumably, extended mass production and continued research would bring this cost down.

---

[9] Flynn, J. M., Andreoli, A., and Guerrera, A. A., "Study of Synthetic Detergents in Ground Water," Journal American Water Works Association, 50, 1551 (1958).

[10] Neel, J. K., and Hopkins, G. J., "Experimental Lagooning of Raw Sewage," Sewage and Industrial Wastes, 28, 1326 (1956).

[11] Metzler, D. F., "Recommended Action Against Effects of Severe Droughts in Kansas," Journal American Water Works Association, 48, 999 (1956).

[12] McCarty, P. L., "Effects of Syndets on Some Sewage Treatment Processes," research report on project DSA-7554, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (September 1957).

For the present, however, the slightly higher cost makes it impossible for any detergent firm to shift over to the new type of detergent, even though detergent company scientists themselves have documented the dangers in continued use of ABS detergents.

As long as competitors can manufacture and sell the cheaper type, no company will undertake the transition.

Here is an obvious case where the Congress should simply draw the ground rules, and let free enterprise proceed with the steps it already knows should be taken.

IS 2 YEARS TOO LONG TO WAIT?

Presumably, the only opposition facing obviously necessary legislation of this type would come from the soap and detergent industry. Therefore, simply in the interests of getting a corrective program started, it seems reasonable to allow the 2 year transition period.

Meanwhile, the public should not be too alarmed. The tests made of public water supplies, while astonishing, still do not show the presence of detergents in such quantities as to pose an immediate threat to public health.

However, two important points must be remembered.

First, no one knows exactly what effect these powerful oil-based chemicals have on the human system, even in small quantities, especially when drunk over a long period of time. It stands to reason that their very power to cut the caked grease off a frying pan, and their amazing ability to combine with water and cling to it wherever it goes, make them a danger to the human digestive and nutritional system.

Second, the relatively slight concentrations of detergent in our water supply today should not lull us into inaction because scientists have proven conclusively that this concentration will continue to climb upward and upward. Remember, almost 4 billion pounds a year are being dumped into our water supply, and also that through the reuse of water, the concentration tends to multiply.

The Public Health Service tests indicated that death resulted, in the experiments with rats, only when the detergent concentration rose far above any level conceivable in our water supplies today. However, there have been no conclusive long-term tests involving the human system.

A publication of the official West German Institute for Water, Soil, and Air Hygiene of June 1962, prepared by Dr. H. W. Janicke, finds indications of cancer-producing effects of detergents in the water supply.

This remains to be proved, of course. But let it be proved in the laboratories of the future. Let it not be proved in the stomachs of American citizens. It would be idiotic for Americans to go on drinking this powerful, oil-based chemical, which creeps into their water supply through the sewage system, until some scientist on some future day proves that it is truly deadly.

THE FOAM PROBLEM

I want to discuss two final aspects of the detergent problem: Foaming, which has caused so much public protest, and the disruption of our sewage disposal systems.

It is important to understand this fact: Foaming is part of the detergent problem, but it is not the heart of the problem. If housewives voluntarily used only detergents which did not foam, or if industry voluntarily shifted over to such detergents, or if this bill was aimed only at foaming detergents, the problem still would not be solved. Any detergent containing ABS will find its way into our water supply, whether it has foaming properties or not. Furthermore, the only way to eliminate the problem of foaming is to eliminate detergent chemicals from the water supplies.

It was foaming which brought the detergent problem to the attention of scientists, public officials, lovers of the outdoors and even housewives. The foam has been piling up now for a decade.

On Long Island, some citizens have had to carry water in from the outside because the tap water was so detergent-polluted that turning on the faucet produced a glass of foam.

I am attaching a report of the Wisconsin State Board of Health which describes the most incredible amounts of foam desecrating our landscape. As early as 1950, the board of health reported a wall of foam on the Mississippi River in western Wisconsin which was 15 feet high, 35 feet wide and 300 feet long. In 1956, a helicopter had to be used to blow away foam on the Baraboo River so rescuers could search for a lost boy.

Last week foam cascaded down the Wisconsin River in central Wisconsin. I have a letter from Mr. R. G. Barz, of Merrill, protesting this disgusting sight.

The Milwaukee Journal photographed detergent foam filling the entire bed of Turtle Creek in Rock County in southern Wisconsin. The Janesville Gazette warned citizens to "duck unless you want to be clobbered by suds in downtown Janesville" and pictured "giant billowing seas of foam on the Rock River."

And the Peoria (Ill.) Journal-Star, in a photograph which looked like a spectacular ice jam at Niagara Falls, showed a 40-foot high wall of foam filling the bed of the Rock River at Oregon, Ill.

This is simply revolting. We cannot continue to allow our beautiful lakes and rivers and country streams to be buried in foam—foam which everyone knows comes from detergent pollution which in turn comes from sewage.

This will destroy the recreation industry if it is not stopped at once.

AN ECONOMIC PROBLEM AS WELL

But I want to emphasize one very important point: Foaming is not merely an esthetic problem; it is a serious economic problem and I now believe that it carries a graver threat to public health than the pollution of underground water.

The Taft Sanitary Engineering Center, in a 1962 report, discusses the foaming which has been a growing problem at sewage disposal plants since 1950.

Detergents disrupt sewage disposal plants in two ways. First, their oily mixing powers disrupt the normal coagulation process used in these plants (when the detergent concentration is high enough).

Secondly, foam billows up above the sewage aeration tanks which shuts off oxygen and sunlight, a vital part of the process.

This Taft Center report goes on to state:

"The effect most often mentioned by sewage treatment operations has been excessive foaming in aeration tanks. Bacterial counts in the foam phase have been found to be at least 20 times as great as in the liquid phase. Thus, wind-blown foam could be a significant health hazard."

So far as I know, this shocking fact has been completely overlooked in the discussion of the detergent problem.

Does the American public realize that foam containing 20 times the bacteria count of liquid sewage is blowing away from our sewage disposal plants and spreading itself across the countryside?

This final example—the problem of foaming and the problem at sewage disposal plants—shows the economic issues at stake in this detergent question.

THE CONSERVATION ISSUE

It seems almost unnecessary to mention the threat which detergents present to the conservation of our natural resources, which I believe is one of our most urgent duties as American citizens.

Scientists have found that fish shun water polluted with detergents. It's not that they are smarter than humans. Apparently they just have better detection equipment.

No bubbling spring in the forest is safe today from detergent pollution. No canoeist in the wilderness can be certain that he will not round the bend and become lost in a disgusting mass of detergent foam.

The problem is there for all to see. The only question is whether we have the intelligence and the courage to meet it.

Excerpts From a Report by Jesse M. Cohen, Engineering Section, Water Supply and Water Pollution Branch, Taft Engineering Center, Cincinnati, Ohio

Synthetic detergents have caused concern among waste and water treatment people for the past few years for two important reasons. One is that almost the entire industrial production of 3.8 billion pounds is eventually discharged to surface or ground water; second, that some of the surfactants are endowed with remarkable abilities to resist the treatment processes available to the sanitary engineer. * * * Even sewage treatment plants possessing secondary treatment processes are able to reduce only partially the surfactant content. Hence, practically all sewage effluents contain some surfactant, which, because it has survived the rigors of sewage treatment, is inherently prepared for an even longer survival against the purification agencies in surface and ground waters.

In many instances the stream water containing the persistent surfactant is used for municipal drinking water supply. * * * A portion of surfactants * * * will persist for longer than 20 days, long enough for this contaminated water to arrive at a water-treatment plant as part of the water supply. * * *

Pollution of ground water is far more serious than similar pollution of a surfact water. Underground waters move slowly. It may take months or even years before contamination appears. But once it has occurred, it may require as much or more time before the water is free again from contamination.

Up to the present time, there is no economical way of removing surfactant material from drinking water.

Surface Water Foam Occurrences—Report of Wisconsin State Board of Health

Year 1950: On February 6 foam was observed below the Government dams at Lynxville and Genoa on the Mississippi River. A wall of foam 35 feet wide, 300 feet long and 15 feet high was noted at Lynxville, and 50 feet wide, 300 feet long and 10 feet high at Genoa. These occurred simultaneously. There was ice cover on most of the river.

Year 1955: April 2 to April 15 foam was observed below the flood gates at Petenwell Dam. Foam 3 to 4 inches thick. There was ice cover on lower part of Petenwell Pond. April 12 to 15 foam observed over eddy currents below dam at Wisconsin Dells rose to a height of 12 feet.

Year 1956: On March 4 foam 30 inches high was reported below the New Lisbon Dam on the Lemonweir River. On March 7 foam occurred below the Reedsburg Dam on the Baraboo River. There was ice present on the river. Helicopter was used to break up foam in an attempt to assist in search of body of a boy who had fallen into the river.

Year 1957: On February 11 water rushing out from beneath ice on Turtle Creek at the dam at Shopiere in Rock County, churned up a foam at least 7 feet high.

Year 1960: A news report dated December 28 stated that foaming had occurred at the city of Milwaukee water filtration plant.

Year 1961: A news photo dated February 28 shows high foam below a small dam on the Neshoto River in Manitowoc County.

Year 1962: On September 20 an accumulation of foam on the southeast side of Lake Waubesa was investigated. Foam 15 to 20 inches high had accumulated along this shoreline for a distance of about 20 feet out. Samples of the foam were determined to contain less than 5 mg/1 of ABS. In the fall of the year foam was observed on Lake Nemahbin where Highway 30 crosses between upper and lower Nemahbin Lakes. The foam was reported to reach a height of 4 to 5 feet, and occurred early in the week. Beach water analysis in the area showed 0.5 mg/1 of ABS.

MERRILL, WIS., *March 20, 1963.*

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: * * * I was particularly pleased with your program to bar the use of detergents in their present form in this State. I live on the Wisconsin River, south of Merrill, and spend much time on its shores. Nothing disgusts me more than to see much raw sewage and large balls of detergent foam cover the water. Efforts have been made locally to put an end to this practice. However, no tangible results are noticeable. What suggestions can you give me to enable me to pursue this contamination problem?

I am enclosing a photograph removed from the Sunday Milwaukee Journal which illustrates a condition caused by detergents in another community. The condition here has not reached such proportions, however, at times there are hundreds of large balls of detergent foam floating down the river and lodging on the shoreline. This along with paper mill runoff still exists in proportions enough to make fish taken from this water unfit for consumption.

The Wall Street Journal recently carried an article about the Federal Government enacting some legislation to eliminate the use of detergents having components to cause this condition. We, who are dependent on the use of dry wells and water wells are particularly concerned. I believe your name was mentioned as championing the curtailment or barring of further use of detergents. There is no question in my mind that the soap lobby in Washington will strenuously oppose any action.

Having spent several years in Washington during World War II in the War Production Board and also in the Pentagon as a staff member for the U.S. Engineers dealing with supply matters, I am cognizant of the problems involved in passing legislation. Your comments regarding the continued flow of sewage into the river and the detergent problem will be appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

R. G. BARZ.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I congratulate the junior Senator from Wisconsin on his freshman speech before the U.S. Senate. My spirits have been buoyed very high this afternoon by having two such eminent freshmen Senators announce their interest in and their concern with conservation. Indeed, it is not the first time for either of them, for the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin was successful, as Governor of his great State, in obtaining probably the most comprehensive program of any of our 50 States for the preservation and development of the natural resources of his State.

Mr. President, today we have heard remarkable comments from persons in varied offices in government. One was by the former Governor of Wisconsin. Another was by the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTIRE], and was based on his experience with local government. I hope I have contributed from the viewpoint of the housewives. All of us are united in recognizing the danger to health, the danger to fish, and the danger to esthetic values in our country from the excessive use of detergents. I look forward to control of this problem through the Government of the United States.

The bill (S. 1183), introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MCINTYRE), was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466–466k) is amended by redesignating sections 10 through 14 as sections 11 through 15, respectively, and by inserting immediately after section 9 thereof the following new section:

"REGULATION OF DETERGENTS

"SEC. 10. (a) The Congress finds that the navigable waters of the United States are being polluted by surface-active chemicals used in detergents which resist decomposition in natural waters and water treatment systems, and that the presence of such chemicals constitutes a national problem. The undesirable taste and foaming of drinking water, the additional expense of water treatment, and the ever-increasing concentration of these materials through re-use of water require regulation of the composition of detergents in order to protect navigable waters and public health.

"(b) It shall be unlawful after June 30, 1965, for any person to import for use in the United States or manufacture for use in the United States any detergent, unless such detergent conforms with standards of decomposability prescribed pursuant to subsection (c) of this section.

"(c) The Secretary shall, on or before the one hundred and eightieth day after the date of enactment of this section prescribe and publish in the Federal Register, pursuant to section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1003), standards of decomposability for detergents which will assure that all surface-active chemicals in detergents conforming thereto will decompose reasonably quickly and completely after use so as not to pollute the navigable waters of the United States. Included with such standards shall be specific methods by which detergents shall be tested by the Secretary to determine if they conform to such standards. Such standards shall be the sole standards of decomposability applicable to any detergent manufactured for use in or imported for use in the United States.

"(d)(1) Any detergent which after June 30, 1965, does not conform with standards prescribed pursuant to subsection (c) of this section shall be liable to be proceeded against on libel of information and condemned in any district court in the United States within the jurisdiction of which such detergent is found.

"(2) Such detergent shall be liable to seizure by process pursuant to the libel, and the procedure in cases under this subsection shall conform, as nearly as may be, to the procedure in admiralty; except that on demand of either party any issue of fact joined in such case shall be tried by jury. When libel for condemnation proceedings under this subsection, involving the same claimant and the same issues, are pending in two or more jurisdictions, such pending proceedings, upon application of the United States or the claimant seasonably made to the court of one such jurisdiction, shall be consolidated for trial by order of such court, and tried in (A) any district selected by the applicant where one of such proceedings is pending; or (B) a district agreed upon by stipulation between the parties. If no order for consolidation is so made within a reasonable time, the United States or the claimant may apply to the court of one such jurisdiction, and such court (after giving the other party, the claimant, or the United States attorney for such district, reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard) shall by order, unless good cause to the contrary is shown, specify a district of reasonable proximity to the claimant's principal place of business, in which all such pending proceedings shall be consolidated for trial and tried. Such order of consolidation shall not apply so as to require the removal of any case the date for trial of which has been fixed. The court granting such order shall give prompt notification thereof to the other courts having jurisdiction of the cases covered thereby.

"(3) Any detergent condemned under this subsection shall, after entry of the decree, be disposed of by destruction or sale as the court may, in accordance with the provisions of this subsection, direct and the proceeds thereof, if sold, less the legal costs and charges, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States; but such detergent shall not be sold under such decree for a use which would result in the pollution of the navigable waters of the United States contrary to the purpose of this section; except that after entry of the decree and upon the payment of the costs of such proceedings and the execution of a good and sufficient bond conditioned that such detergent shall not be used contrary to the provisions of this section, the court may by order direct that such detergent be delivered to the owner thereof to be destroyed or brought into compliance with the provisions of this section under the supervision of an officer or employee duly designated by the Secretary, and the expenses of such supervision shall be paid by the person obtaining release of the detergent under bond.

"(4) When a decree of condemnation is entered against the detergent, court costs and fees, and storage and other proper expenses, shall be awarded against the person, if any, intervening as claimant of the detergent.

"(5) In the case of removal for trial of any case as provided by paragraph (2) of this subsection—

"(A) the clerk of the court from which removal is made shall promptly transmit to the court in which the case is to be tried all records in the case necessary in order that such court may exercise jurisdiction;

"(B) the court to which such case is removed shall have the powers and be subject to the duties, for purposes of such case, which the court from which removal was made would have had, or to which such court would have been subject, if such case had not been removed.

"(e)(1) The United States district courts shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown and subject to the provisions of rule 65 (a) and (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to restrain violations of this section.

"(2) In any proceeding for criminal contempt for violation of an injunction or restraining order issued under this subsection, which violation also constitutes a violation of this section, trial shall be by the court or, upon demand of the accused, by a jury. Such trial shall be conducted in accordance with the practice and procedure applicable in the case of proceedings subject to the provisions of rule 42(b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

"(f) All libel or injunction proceedings for the enforcement, or to restrain violations, of this section shall be by and in the name of the United States. Subpenas for witnesses who are required to attend a court of the

United States in any district may run into any other district in any such proceeding.

"(g) The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary shall jointly prescribe regulations for the efficient enforcement of the provisions of subsection (i) of this section, except as otherwise provided therein. Such regulations shall be promulgated in such manner and take effect at such time, after due notice as the Secretary shall determine.

"(h)(1) The Secretary is authorized to conduct examinations, inspections, and investigations for the purposes of this section through officers and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or through any health officer or employee of any State, or political subdivision thereof, duly commissioned by the Secretary.

"(2) For purposes of enforcement of this section, officers or employees duly designated by the Secretary, upon presenting appropriate credentials and a written notice to the owner, operator, or agent in charge, are authorized (A) to enter, at reasonable times, any factory, warehouse, or establishment in which detergents are manufactured, processed, packed, or held, or to enter any vehicle being used to transport or hold such detergents; (B) to inspect, at reasonable times and within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner, such factory, warehouse, establishment, or vehicle, and all pertinent equipment, finished and unfinished materials; and (C) to obtain samples of such materials. A separate notice shall be given for each such inspection, but a notice shall not be required for each entry made during the period covered by the inspection. Each such inspection shall be commenced and completed with reasonable promptness.

"(3) If the officer or employee obtains any sample, prior to leaving the premises, he shall give to the owner, operator, or agent in charge a receipt describing the samples obtained. If an analysis is made of such sample, a copy of the results of such analysis shall be furnished promptly to the owner, operator, or agent in charge.

"(i)(1) The Secretary of the Treasury shall deliver to the Secretary, upon his request, samples of detergents which are being imported, or offered for import, for use in the United States, giving notice thereof to the owner or consignee, who may appear before the Secretary and have the right to introduce testimony. If it appears from the examination of such samples or otherwise that such detergent does not conform to standards prescribed pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, such detergent shall be refused admission, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause the destruction of any such detergent being imported and refused admission unless such detergent is exported, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, within 90 days of the date of notice of such refusal or within such additional time as may be permitted pursuant to such regulations.

"(2) Pending decision as to the admission of a detergent being imported or offered for import, the Secretary of the Treasury may authorize delivery of such detergent to the owner or consignee upon the execution by him of a good and sufficient bond providing for the payment of such liquidated damages in the event of default as may be required pursuant to regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

"(j) As used in this section, the term 'detergent' means any cleaning agent which contains surface-active chemicals."

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Williams of New Jersey in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). Without objection, is is so ordered.

AMBASSADOR RAYMOND TELLES, FROM TEXAS TO COSTA RICA, RENDERS GREAT SERVICE WITH SEVEN PRESIDENTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the tremendous success of President Kennedy's visit to Costa Rica is now recognized all over the world.

From the welcome given President Kennedy, it is apparent that the President himself is one of our greatest assets in our efforts to strengthen our friendships with Central and South America.

Credit should also be given to the U.S. Ambassador to Costa Rica, Raymond Telles, the brilliant former mayor of El Paso, Tex.

On February 20, 1961, I made the following statement on the Senate floor, at the time of Senate confirmation of the nomination of Mayor Telles to be Ambassador to Costa Rica:

> Mayor Telles and I have been friends for many years; and I know him to be a man of exceptional ability, powerful personality, and deep dedication to the ideal of human liberty.
>
> My prediction is that not only will he make an outstanding record of service in Costa Rica, but this will prove only the beginning step toward even bigger assignments in the future.

Mr. President, Ambassador Telles is bringing a long-range prediction into reality by his outstanding service in Costa Rica.

Texas is proud, as the United States may be proud, of the work being done by Mr. Telles, formerly mayor of El Paso, Tex., where some 40 percent of the population is of Latin American ancestry. Ambassador Telles is a fourth-generation American of Latin American ancestry who, as an Air Force liaison officer, built an admirable record of achievement, in working with Latin American countries during World War II.

The trip by President Kennedy was more than a visit to Costa Rica. It was a visit to Central America, with six Central American presidents as cohosts. They were: President Orlich, of Costa Rica; President Ydigoras, of Guatemala; President Rivera, of El Salvador; President Vielleda, of Honduras; President Somoza, of Nicaragua; and President Chiari, of Panama.

Indeed, it was a visit to all Latin America.

This indicates something of the scope of the planning that faced Ambassador Telles when President Kennedy decided in January to go to Central America.

Ambassador Telles, working with the distinguished Costa Rican Foreign Minister, Daniel Oduber, was in charge of arrangements covering the broad fields of public information, aid, transportation, protocol, security, accommodations, administration, and finance. This included everything from when and where the President would speak and would attend receptions, to where new desk space for additional secretaries would be found.

President Kennedy set up residence in Ambassador Telles' residence in San Jose, so that the Ambassador had to manage protocol arrangements for seven presidents while rearranging his own domestic schedule, as well.

The assignment for Ambassador Telles for this trip by President Kennedy required broad vision and minute attention to endless detail.

It is obvious from all reports that Ambassador Telles has successfully ridden a whirlwind.

I wish to extend my congratulations to President Kennedy, to Ambassador Telles, and to the six Central American Presidents, for an unprecedented demonstration of international goodwill.

This is the kind of diplomatic achievement that builds lasting friendships.

Out of the San José Conference came a Declaration of Central America signed by the seven participating Presidents in the San José Conference. It is a declaration of solidarity, of progress, of peace, and of prosperity for Central America that may well be copied all over the Americas. The San José Conference was not a mere talkfest—it was a conference of solid accomplishment. A brief summation of those accomplishments is set forth in the Declaration of Central America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the official text of the Declaration of Central America as printed in the Wednesday, March 20, edition of the Washington Post be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Official Text of Declaration of Central America

San José, Costa Rica, March 19.—Text of the official English translation of the Declaration of Central America issued tonight:

"The Presidents of the Republics of Central America and Panama are determined to improve the well-being of their peoples and are aware such a task demands a dynamic economic and social development program based on the carefully planned use of human, natural, and financial resources. It also depends on important changes of the economic, social, and administrative structure within the framework of principles that govern our democratic institutions. They have met with the President of the United States in San José to review difficulties which impede the achievement of these objectives as well as the progress thus far made in the isthmus since the integration programs began and since the Alliance for Progress was jointly established by the Republics of the hemisphere in August 1961.

"Following an analysis of the situation, the Presidents of the Republics of Central America are convinced the best hope for the development of the region is through economic integration and, bearing in mind extraordinary efforts made toward this end in the last decade and of the importance of accelerating overall economic growth, pledge to their peoples:

"To accelerate the establishment of a customs union to perfect the functioning of the Central America Common Market—to formulate and implement national economic and social development plans, coordinating

at the Central American level, and progressively to carry out regional planning for various sectors of the economy.

"To establish a monetary union and common fiscal monetary and social policies within the program of economic integration.

"To cooperate in programs to improve the prices of primary export commodities.

"To complete soonest possible reforms needed to achieve the objectives set forth in the Act of Bogotá and the Charter of Punta del Este, especially in the fields of agriculture, taxation, education, public administration, and social welfare.

"To take the above measures with a view to achieving creation of a Central American Economic Community which will establish relationship with other nations or regional groups having similar objectives.

"The Central American Presidents affirm the economic integration movement in itself constitutes an effort which is laying the groundwork for regional planning in which sectoral plans of common interest to the isthmian republics serve as a point of departure. Their governments already have taken measures to coordinate national plans so their execution will aid, rather than impede, achievement of the objectives of the economic integration program.

"It is intended that the first global plan for harmonious regional development will be presented as soon as possible for evaluation in accordance with procedures set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este. Meanwhile, the Central American Presidents declare their resolve to proceed immediately with their sectoral plans and with projects of interest to the isthmus. The President of the United States agrees to consider a long-term loan to enable appropriate Central American regional organizations, principally the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, to conduct an economic feasibility survey relative to this program of regional development."

PANAMA LINK SOUGHT

"The Presidents of Central America reaffirmed their hope the Republic of Panama will participate more closely in the economic integration movement and the President of Panama declares his government fully reaffirms its support of the program of Central American economic integration. He further declares his government is prepared to initiate immediate negotiations with the governments of the general treaty of economic integration as a whole, with a view to concluding a special agreement to facilitate association of his country with the program.

"The President of the United States is impressed by the determination of the Presidents of the Central American Republics to move as rapidly as possible toward integration of the economies of their countries and their intention to formulate a regional economic development plan within which national plans will be monetary, fiscal, economy, and social policies. It is a great step forward in achievement of this objective as well as toward achievement of the goals set forth in the Charter of Punta del Este.

"The President of the United States is prepared to offer the greatest cooperation in preparation and implementation of the regional and national development projects of Central America and Panama and declares that his government will intensify its joint efforts with the governments and appropriate regional organizations in order to extend to them increased technical and financial assistance for this purpose within the framework of the broad regional program entitled joint exposition of the Presidents of Central America and the development plan being prepared by Panama."

UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTION

"To this end he proposes a fund for Central American economic integration to be made available through the Central American Bank for Economic Integration, to which the United States would make an immediate substantial initial contribution to assist in carrying out regional development projects in accordance with various sectoral plans now being developed by regional organizations.

"For the longer term he also declares that as soon as the Central American Republics have formulated an overall regional development plan and as soon as this plan has been evaluated favorably in accordance with procedures established in the Charte of Punta del Este, the United States will enlarge and expand its participation in the fund and will work with the Central American countries in obtaining other Free World resources so that the agreed plan can be effectively implemented.

"The Presidents have discussed the fundamental importance to economic development of a vigorous and freely competitive private sector and declare their intention of taking necessary steps to encourage private investment which is prepared to accept nomal responsibilities compatible with development of a modern economy. These measures include establishment of regional trade and promotion offices for the specific purposes of attracting private foreign investment. They also agree that development banks or corporations should be established in each country as soon as possible to provide credit on reasonable terms for the growth of private industry, the President of the United States offering financial assistance to their operation."

BETTER LIVING STANDARD

"Currently they agree that economic and social conditions should be created to assure labor of an improved living standard through better distribution of national income. Furthermore, they agree to encourage and support free democratic labor organizations as a means of contributing toward greater worker participation in the common effort on behalf of the general welfare."

BILLBOARDS AND THE HIGH ACCIDENT RATES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the vehicular accident rate is three times greater per mile in areas having advertising devices such as billboards than in areas without advertising.

This is the report of a study prepared for the New York State Thruway Authority by Consulting Engineers Madigan-Hyland, Inc., of Long Island City, N.Y. Consideration of a certain sentence in the report is vital as we proceed to deal with the subject of billboards and their effect upon accidents. I quote that sentence from the report:

> It was recognized that advertising devices are a factor in accidents, principally because they distract the motorists' attention.

The New York authority requested an analysis of accident statistics and records of the New York State Thruway for the past 2 years, 1961–62, to determine the relationship, if any, between the number of accidents and the existence of advertising devices along the route of the expressway.

A copy of this study was released on February 19, 1963, and has been sent to me by the Honorable R. Burdell Bixby, chairman and secretary of the New York State Thruway Authority.

It is significant that the study showed that almost one-third of the accidents attributed to driver inattention on the thruway mainline occurred on the one-eighth of thruway mileage upon which motorists were exposed to advertising devices.

Thus there is now scientific evidence to refute what some billboard apologists have often stated, which is that billboards and roadside advertising help maintain driver attention and reduce accident rates.

Because this coming June 30 is the expiration date for States to elect to participate in the billboard control program in the Federal Interstate and Defense Highway System this study is of tremendous value. I know that many State legislatures at this time are currently considering legislation to allow their States to participate in the billboard control program and receive a bonus of one-half of 1 percent of the highway costs in their jurisdictions. Seventeen States to date have elected to participate in the program, including Oregon and New York. The States soon will be receiving the first of Federal payments under the billboard control legislation.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] and I have been consulting about plans to reintroduce the proposed legislation to continue that provision. The Senator from Kentucky has long been a great advocate of the control of signboards, in line with the amendment to the Federal Interstate and Defense Highway Act. I think that he and I both feel that this statistical and impartial study bolsters our plans for further signboard control.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks the engineers' study which clearly shows the relationship between accidents and advertising devices on the New York State Thruway.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

February 19, 1963.

Mr. R. Burdell Bixby,
Chairman, New York State Thruway Authority, Albany, N.Y.

Dear Mr. Bixby: You have requested that we analyze the accident statistics and records of the New York State Thruway for the past 2 years (1961–62) to determine the relationship, if any, between the number of accidents and the existence of advertising devices along the route of the expressway.

As you know, authority personnel on the basis of onsite inspections determined the exact locations where signs and other similar devices could be seen by motorists. After examining the authority's detailed records of all accidents occurring on the thruway, we noted that the records indicate, among other things, the type of accident, the location of the accident, and the probable cause. These data are punched into tabulating cards and can therefore easily be summarized.

By correlating the information describing the locations of the advertising devices with the accident records for the past 2 years, it was possible to determine the number of accidents that occurred where the motorist was exposed to these advertising devices and the number that occurred where there was no such exposure.

In preparing the analysis set forth below, however, it was recognized that advertising devices are a factor in accidents principally because they distract the motorists' attention. It was therefore considered essential to endeavor to eliminate all accidents caused by factors other than driver inattention.

The New York State police, at the on-the-scene investigation, classify each accident by probable cause and this information is coded on the authority's tabulating cards. It was therefore possible to exclude from the analysis all accidents except those in which the investigating State trooper reported the probable cause of the mishap as driver inattention.

In order to further restrict the analysis to data that are pertinent, all factors that might influence the pattern of these accidents due to inattention, other than the distracting effect of the advertising devices, should be eliminated from the statistics, so far as possible.

About one-quarter of the accidents due to driver inattention occurred at thruways toll barriers and interchanges. These areas are more likely to have a proportionately greater number of advertising signs and similar distractions situated in relatively close proximity because of their advantageous locations. Accidents occurring at most of these areas therefore are included in the category "accidents that take place where advertising devices were visible." However, there are other factors that increase the likelihood of accidents due to driver inattention at these same locations, such as the need to locate money for toll payment.

We therefore eliminated from the statistics all accidents that occurred at these sites on the ground that the factors noted above might unrealistically increase the accident ratio in such areas of exposure.

In order to evaluate this information about "driver inattention" accidents properly, it also was necessary to relate the accident statistics to the one-way miles of roadway involved.

Drivers were exposed to advertising devices on approximately one-eighth (13.1 percent) of the thruway's 1,118 miles of one-way roadway.

Our analysis of the data for the last 2 years showed, however, that almost one-third (32.6 percent) of the 1,550 accidents attributed to driver inattention on the thruway mainline occurred on the one-eighth of the thruway mileage upon which motorists were exposed to advertising devices.

There was an annual average of 1.7 accidents per mile due to driver inattention on the portions of the thruway mainline where advertising devices were visible, and only 0.5 of an accident per mile for this cause on the stretches where advertising devices were not visible.

The relative number of such accidents per mile in areas with advertising devices, therefore, was three times greater.

Another factor that was considered in our analysis was the effect of traffic densities on accident frequency. Areas of greater traffic volumes are likely to have a greater accident frequency. Such areas also tend to have more advertising devices. Pursuing this evaluation, accident-per-mile data were developed for the New York division of the thruway, which includes high density traffic along virtually its entire length. Separate figures were developed for the Buffalo division, which features a combination of high density traffic in the Buffalo area and moderate traffic volumes in other areas such as the Erie section. A third set of figures was developed for the Albany and Syracuse divisions, which do not have substantial stretches of high density traffic. The results of these studies are shown below in terms of annual accidents per mile of mainline roadway due to driver inattention:

Heavy density area (New York division): Areas where advertising devices were visible, 2.9 accidents per mile; areas where no advertising devices were visible, 2 accidents per mile.

Combination heavy density and medium density area (Buffalo division): Areas where advertising devices were visible, 2.5 accidents per mile; areas where no advertising devices were visible, 0.30 accident per mile.

Medium-density area (Albany and Syracuse divisions): Areas where advertising devices were visible, 0.40 accident per mile; areas where no advertising devices were visible, 0.26 accident per mile.

As expected, the areas of heavy density showed a much higher number of accidents per mile.

However, in all cases (heavy density areas, combination areas, and medium density areas) there were proportionately more accidents per mile where drivers were exposed to advertising devices than in areas where no such exposure existed.

Even in the areas of medium density, where the effect of heavy traffic is minimized, accidents caused by driver inattention were still 1½ times more frequent along thruway stretches where advertising devices were visible as in other areas.

Our analysis of thruway accident records for 1961 and 1962 clearly demonstrated a pattern of substantially more "driver inattention" accidents in all areas where motorists were exposed to advertising devices than in the areas where no such devices existed.

Very truly yours,

Madican-Hyland, Inc.
Daniel W. Greenbaum.

THE MALLORY RULE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there appeared in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of Thursday, March 7, an editorial entitled "The Mallory Rule." It was sent to me by a former constituent. I ask unanimous consent that the letter which I received from my former constituent and the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Minneapolis, Minn.,
March 7, 1963.

Dear Wayne: As one of your transplanted constituents and admirers it is always refreshing to see your name in print, especially when the Minneapolis Morning Tribune takes special pains to be complimentary to you.

I hope the enclosed clipping is of interest to you—and with all my good wishes for you.

I remain, as ever, your friend,

Phiell P. Harris.

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Morning Tribune, Mar. 7, 1963]

The Mallory Rule

Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon has served notice that he will fight police pressure groups who are attempting to get Congress to outlaw the Mallory rule laid down by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Mallory rule is a simple and fundamental declaration of a basic right of free men—to be taken before a magistrate without delay following arrest. The high court has said that confessions obtained when this rule is violated will not stand in court. In brief, police cannot hold suspects as long as they please and they are not the valid judges of their own arrests.

"The Mallory rule," Morse told the Senate, "constitutes a protection of a basic freedom in this Republic and I do not intend, under the pressure of a police department, to support any modifications of it whatsoever. There is no reason at all why anyone arrested for crime should not be taken forthwith to a committing magistrate for commitment or for freedom from commitment."

We haven't always cheered Wayne Morse in the past—but we do so now. He couldn't be more right.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask that there be printed in the Record an excellent editorial published in the Washington Post of March 21, 1963, entitled "Revising Mallory."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 21, 1963]

Revising Mallory

The difficulties inherent in any attempt to revise the Supreme Court's Mallory rule by legislation are made painfully clear by the tortured report of the District Bar Association's so-called Killough committee. The committee recommends a bill which backs and fills, advances and retreats and demonstrates, in short, how hard it is for conscientious lawyers to tinker with basic constitutional rights.

The bar association bill begins, like proposals already advanced in Congress, by declaring that "confessions otherwise admissible shall not be inadmissible solely because of delay in taking an arrested person before a commissioner." Troubled by what this entails, however, the lawyers have added a proviso—"unless the effect of the delay is to render the confession involuntary."

This is, of course, sheer surplusage. The Constitution itself forbids the admission of involuntary confessions. The trouble is that it becomes exceedingly difficult to determine whether a confession was voluntary or involuntary after it has been wrested from a defendant in the lonely and frightening atmosphere of a police station where he was questioned without a lawyer or even a friend to advise him. This is precisely why the Supreme Court decided to exclude all confessions obtained in such circumstances.

The bar bill proceeds, then, to a section requiring that a defendant be advised of his right to remain silent before being interrogated and at once reveals its complete lack of confidence in this requirement by a succeeding section which says, "Nothing in this act shall be construed to limit or abridge the privilege against self-incrimination." The Mallory rule was designed to assure an accused person of a judicial warning as to his constitutional rights. The lawyers ought to understand full well that a police warning is by no means as efficacious.

Recognizing that police zeal will lead inevitably to coercion of confessions if policemen are allowed to interrogate suspects in police stations, the lawyers have added two sections designed to provide for the disciplining of such conduct by a police trial board. This is a wholly illusory remedy. Policemen are not going to punish each other for having cut constitutional corners in an effort to catch criminals.

One member of the bar association committee, James J. Bierbower, dissented because of constitutional qualms, which do him honor. Those who glibly assume that legislative revision of the Mallory rule raises no constitutional issues, simply because the Supreme Court found it unnecessary to reach such issues in deciding the Mallory case, would do well to read the Court's recent opinion in *Wong Sun v. United States*. The Court intimated plainly in that case that it could see no distinction between physical and verbal evidence in determining admissibility. In other words, the Court may protect constitutional rights by excluding confessions obtained as a result of arbitrary arrests just as it has for many years excluded physical evidence obtained as a result of unreasonable searches.

In any case, it is sad and strange indeed to find a bar association inviting the police to arrest and detain citizens without judicial authorization.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Modifying Mallory Rule Opposed By Bar Group," published in the Washington Evening Star of March 22, 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 22, 1963]

Modifying Mallory Rule Opposed by Bar Group

(By Jack Landau)

The District Bar Association Criminal Law Committee has dissented sharply with a blue-ribbon report approved by the board of directors which advocated substantial modification of the Mallory rule.

The blue-ribbon recommendations for changes in the Mallory rule were made public March 14 and have been submitted to House and Senate District Committees now considering proposed legislation to alter the rule in favor of increased police questioning of arrested persons.

The Mallory rule excludes from criminal trials confessions and other evidence obtained by police from an arrested man during a period of unreasonable delay between his arrest and his preliminary arraignment.

A specially appointed bar association committee recommended that confessions not be excluded merely because they were obtained during a period of unreasonable delay; advocated a police questioning period with a 6-hour minimum during which police could obtain voluntary confessions; and supported proposals to permit arrests of material witnesses to allow the taking of testimony for future use in trials.

SENT TO CAPITOL

The special committee report, from which one member dissented, was sent to the congressional District Committees and to the District Commissioners after it had been approved by the board of directors but not by the membership. Last Monday, the criminal law division attended a hurriedly called meeting at the behest of Joseph Sitnick, vice chairman of the committee.

The criminal law committee, which is the association's standing committee on criminal law problems, unanimously approved a resolution asking that the Mallory rule not be disturbed, a committee spokesman reported.

The spokesman said that the blue-ribbon panel was composed of prominent members of the bar associations, but not of attorneys who had extensive experience in criminal law. The spokesman said the committee unanimously opposed three pending bills in Congress which are similar in substance to the blue-ribbon committee's proposals for changes in the rule.

The committee also resolved, the spokesman added, to insist that its views favoring the Mallory rule be given the same association publicity as the blue-ribbon report—publication in the Bar Association Journal, submission to the congressional District committees, and to the District Commissioners.

APPARENT CONSENT

The criminal law committee meeting, which was attended by 21 of the 30 members, the spokesman said, also opposed the blue-ribbon report on the grounds that its publication appeared to be with the full consent of the bar association.

The spokesman said the criminal lawyers believed that bylaws require a full bar association vote on any committee recommendations made with a dissenting vote before the association backing is attached to the report.

The criminal law committee also voted against any 6-hour questioning period and against arrests for investigation, which were prohibited last week by the District Commissioners.

In addition, the spokesman said, extreme resentment was expressed at bypassing the criminal law committee by not submitting to it the blue-ribbon recommendations prior to their publication. There is a feeling among committee members, the spokesman said, that the select committee was packed to obtain a predetermined report supporting repudiation of the Mallory rule.

TO ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT

The spokesman said that all the resolutions were sent to Thomas Jackson, bar association president. Mr. Jackson reported that he had received the letter with the resolutions, but declined to comment further pending the letter's presentation to the board of directors.

The criminal law committee meeting also supported the recent Killough decision handed down by the U.S. Court of Appeals. That decision held that a confession obtained during a period of unreasonable delay so tainted a second confession given after a preliminary arraignment that the second confession was also to be excluded from evidence.

The bar association special committee had taken no position on the Killough decision, and had recommended that any further amplification or limitation be left to the courts.

The whole matter is now expected to come before the next monthly meeting of the bar association.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when I was in Mexico this last week talking to a group of Mexican lawyers, it was very interesting to observe the extent to which those lawyers have full knowledge of the principle which is involved in the Mallory rule in the United States. They are at a loss to know why there should be a serious attempt to change the rule.

I am receiving an increasing amount of mail from lawyers throughout the country who are beginning to familiarize themselves with the due process principle that is involved in the Mallory rule. I am gratified that the Minneapolis Morning Tribune and the Washington Post are leading the way in calling the attention of the people of our country to the soundness of the Mallory rule. I welcome this opportunity to put this material on the Mallory rule in the Record.

CHANGE IN CHAIRMANSHIP OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while I was out of the country there appeared in the Washington Evening Star for March 18 a story entitled "Beall Let Out as Chairman." The article refers to the fact that the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre], was appointed chairman of the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, a post formerly held by my very good friend the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall], a member of the opposition party. In the course of the story the following language appeared:

> It was understood, too, that Senator Morse was at odds with Senator Beall on some local legislation due to come before Senator Beall's old Subcommittee on Business and Commerce. So, the Oregonian reportedly preferred the new Subcommittee Chairman McIntyre.

Mr. President, that statement does the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall] a great injustice. I rise to clear the Record, for I have served with the Senator from Maryland on the Senate District of Columbia Committee for a good many years. He is a dedicated member of that committee and has performed a great many valuable services for the people of the District of Columbia. In the course of the news story the Senator from Maryland is quoted as saying, in effect, that there is no partianship on the committee.

When the majority members came to organize the Senate District Committee, they observed that the Senator from New Hampshire, a member of the majority party, had been appointed as a new member of that committee. The senior Senator from Oregon, along with other Democrats on the committee—with no reflection on the Senator from Maryland whatsoever—took the position that the chairmanships of the subcommittees should go to the members of the majority party. After all, the majority party will and should be held responsible for the policy course of action taken by the Democratic Party in all committees, including the District of Columbia Committee. The fact that I shared the point of view that the subchairmanship should be held by Democrats is no reflection on my good friend from Maryland. I would be glad to welcome him into the Democratic Party if he desired to come in. But in my judgment, a subcommittee chairmanship should be held by a Democrat when the Democrats are in the majority. It should be held by the Republicans when the Republicans are in the majority.

I make these comments only because I think they are due the Senator from Maryland. I consider him a warm, personal friend. In fact, out in Poolesville, Md., where I have a little farm, I refer to him as "my Senator." I josh him occasionally because I think there should be a little road repair operation out there which I would like to put him to work on. The finest personal relationships exist between the senior Senator from Oregon and the senior Senator from Maryland. I make that statement today to clear the Record. There is certainly no basis for anyone thinking that the senior Senator from Oregon joined in an effort to have the senior Senator from Maryland removed as chairman of the subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee, because we do not always vote together, either in the committee or in the Senate. I supported a proposal that all of our subcommittee chairmanships should be held by Democrats. I offer no apology for it. I am proud to take that position, and in taking it I cast no reflection whatsoever on my good friend from Maryland.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire Bassett Evening Star editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEALL LET OUT AS CHAIRMAN

(By Grace Bassett)

Senator BEALL, senior Republican on the Senate District Committee, today lost his subcommittee chairmanship for the first time in 8 years.

The Maryland Senator said immediately after an organization meeting that he thought the nonpartisan approach to local affairs would continue.

"We never vote along party lines," said Senator BEALL, who is up for reelection next year.

BIBLE WILL SERVE

The official reason for the change was that Chairman BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, for the first time took the chairmanship of one of the four subcommittees. He will handle fiscal affairs because of his experience and the city's pressing need for funda this year, committee spokesmen said.

Politics, both of the Democratic and committee varieties, appeared to be more persuasive if less vocal reasons for the demotion of Senator BEALL.

There are four Democrats and four subcommittees on the District Committee. Privately, Democrats BIBLE, HARTKE of Indiana, MORSE of Oregon, and MCINTYRE of New Hampshire, all subcommittee chairmen, have wondered if their party was undercutting their own future candidates against Senator BEALL by giving the Maryland incumbent the prestige and publicity that goes with a subcommittee chairmanship in this area.

MORSE FOR M'INTYRE

It was understood, too, that Senator MORSE was at odds with Senator BEALL on some local legislation due to come before Senator BEALL's old Subcommittee on Business and Commerce. So, the Oregonian reportedly preferred the new Subcommittee Chairman MCINTYRE.

Senator MORSE was absent when the committee organized today. He is attending the Central American Conference in Costa Rica.

On his insistence, however, Chairman BIBLE postponed consideration of seven bills, considered noncontroversial after their passage last year by the Senate.

Senator BEALL was named the first minority chairman of any subcommittee of a standing Senate committee 8 years ago by the late District Committee Chairman Matthew Neely, Democrat, of West Virginia.

NEELY SURPRISED BEALL

"I was very much surprised when Senator Neely chose me," Senator BEALL said. "Naturally, the majority has the right to hold subcommittee chairmanships.

"I am grateful for anything I can get from the majority but I can't expect anything," Senator BEALL said.

He said he was not surprised that Senator BIBLE wanted to be chairman of the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee.

"Senator BIBLE is interested in fiscal affairs and this move is understandable and is his prerogative," Senator BEALL added.

Asked if he thought politics motivated the change, the Senator said:

"I suppose that at the other end of the avenue nothing is ever done without political motivation."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the story which appeared in the Washington Post and Times-Herald for March 19, 1963, entitled "Senate District Committee Organized With Chairman Heading Fiscal Unit" represents the fact, in contrast to the story which appeared in the Evening Star. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIBLE ASSUMES KEY POST—SENATE DISTRICT COMMITTEE ORGANIZED WITH CHAIRMAN HEADING FISCAL UNIT

The Senate District Committee was organized yesterday with Chairman ALAN BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, assuming the chairmanship of the Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee.

BIBLE said he was taking over the chairmanship of the subcommittee because of the importance to the District of the President's fiscal program. Mr. Kennedy has proposed a formula for Federal payment that would represent taxes lost to the District and has recommended an increase in the city's borrowing authority.

The Fiscal Affairs Subcommittee also will take up tax increases proposed by the Commissioners. BIBLE has not headed a subcommittee since he took over as chairman of the full committee.

He said he is still hopeful the Senate and House District Committees will hold joint hearings on the entire package of fiscal legislation. He has made such proposals to House District Committee Chairman JOHN L. MCMILLAN, Democrat, of South Carolina.

Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, retained his post as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee, Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, as chairman of the Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee, and Senator THOMAS J. MCINTYRE, Democrat, New Hampshire, recently appointed to the committee, was named chairman of the Business and Commerce Subcommittee. He replaces Senator J. GLENN BEALL, Republican, of Maryland, who has headed the subcommittee for the past 8 years. It is most unusual for a Republican to hold a chairmanship when Democrats control the Congress.

BIBLE said the full committee would consider bills to curb crime on which joint hearings already have been held and will take up transportation legislation when it comes from the White House.

Action on seven bills approved by the Senate last year was put off by the committee after it was decided new hearings should be held on them. The legislation failed to clear the House.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the January, 1963, issue of Higher Education, Mr. Oliver J. Caldwell, of the Office of Education, has published an excellent article on the liberal arts, which I feel will be helpful to my colleagues in the Senate as the President's comprehensive education legislation is considered during this session.

I announce today, Mr. President, that I hope to be able to start hearings on the education bill before my subcommittee immediately following Easter.

I commend Mr. Caldwell on the lucidity and clarity with which he has set forth his thesis. It presents in short compass background material which we would do well to keep in mind at the time the specifics of education legislation are under discussion. The type of appraisal and reorientation which Mr. Caldwell advocates if our colleges are to perform their function are, or should be in all of our minds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIBERAL ARTS IN A REVOLUTIONARY WORLD

(By Oliver J. Caldwell)

(NOTE.—Oliver J. Caldwell has been acting associate commissioner for international education, U.S. Office of Education, since April 1962. Since joining the office in 1952, Mr. Caldwell has visited more than 50 countries and has served as education consultant to many organizations. He also served with the Department of State and on the faculty of the University of Amoy and the University of Nanking, China. Mr. Caldwell holds the B.A. and M.A. degrees from Oberlin College. He has received two honorary degrees.)

We live in a time of continuing multiple crises. The status of mankind is changing. There is a rapid change in the relationships of man to his fellows and to his universe. This is a time of paramount danger. Once we could defend ourselves against danger by force. But now the nature of the forces available to us prohibits their use except as a last resort. Our best defense in these times is the universal understanding which is the goal of liberal education.

The American liberal arts college today has a new mission. Although these colleges owe much to Europe, they are unique. In the past, they have served an evolving American people exceedingly well by giving millions of Americans an intellectual grand tour of their cultural heritage. The liberal curriculum has been a powerful force for sanity in a troubled world. It has built for our country a foundation of idealism and has created a sense of identity with our neighbors of the Western World. Liberal education has been the platform on which we have built a towering edifice of technical and scientific achievement. Our social and political wisdom, which so far has guided us through a growing crescendo of crises, we owe largely to the liberal tradition in our colleges.

But education in a dynamic society must keep pace with social changes and new obligations. I have an uneasy feeling that our system of liberal education is losing touch with reality, that it is not adapting effectively to a new world. The intellectual structure of yesterday is growing obsolete.

There is a critical need for a reappraisal of the processes and goals of liberal education. The nature of the opportunities which challenge our children requires that they receive an intensified and broadened liberal learning which will accurately reflect the realities of their generation.

When we consider the more serious changes in our world, we see that a reassessment of our ideas of liberal education is required.

Recently the president of the American Bible Society and a prominent Russian rocket expert separately stated that the world is becoming a village. Isolation and distance have been destroyed by improved communications and transportation, by nuclear weapons, and by the rocket. Suddenly the earth is shrunken, and every man is neighbor to every other man. Herein lies a great danger because everyman does not understand his neighbor. There are barriers of prejudice and ignorance, supported by political, social, racial, and religious differences. The survival of the village of man requires the removal of ancient barriers by new skills and wisdom, and the creation of a new awareness that all of mankind are one species.

The removal of barriers is a special challenge to American education. Today our liberal arts curriculum emphasizes Western Europe and North America. But Americans live everywhere, and every American is part of the Main. Our Western civilization is only one of several great traditions. The truly educated man of tomorrow must also understand the other great traditions.

Living together as a family of man requires new awareness and understanding. Liberal education may no longer be based on a single culture. Monocultural education in a polycultural world is obsolete. Liberal education adequate for tomorrow must be polycultural education.

It is said that the volume of man's knowledge is doubling every 15 years. A recent news release states that 90 percent of all of the people in human history who have made major contributions to the natural sciences are alive today. This certainly could not be said of the social sciences, the humanities, and the fine arts. Knowledge has expanded suddenly and also unevenly.

We are faced by a critically unbalanced growth in our intellectual heritage. We seem to know much more about what happens inside an atom than we do about the workings of a human mind. This is dangerous because the energies in the atom may be misused by man's mind. To protect ourselves against ourselves we must learn to know ourselves at least as well as we understand the forces of nature.

We also are challenged by the changing value of various kinds of knowledge. In today's world a 1946 curriculum is not valid, because whole new sciences have been developed. One of the hardest problems we face is the assignment of appropriate priorities to new knowledge; an even harder problem is how to get rid of surplus intellectual baggage to make room for important new knowledge. Perhaps the hardest problem is to identify and preserve the knowledge of the past which is eternally valid.

There is a dangerous temptation to rate only the hard sciences, mathematics, and related subjects as essential, and to eliminate broad humanistic studies to make room for the skills which contribute directly to the conquest of the cosmos and to our military strength. This is very bad reasoning. It is true that we must increase our physical power in order to stay alive and free, but an increased knowledge of humanity and a fresh awareness of spiritual values, are essential if we are not to abuse the new physical power we already have. We must cultivate wisdom if we are to survive in a world in which potential enemies also possess the physical power necessary to destroy mankind.

Surely the answer lies in part in a new and stronger liberal education for everyone. It is our responsibility to make opportunities available to our young people to acquire this new and stronger learning.

Many other changes in our society present challenges to the educator which our fathers never faced. I will discuss only two more, two which have a special bearing on the importance of learning. One is the Communist revolution. The rapid expansion of communism should be likened to the spread of Islam in the first half century after the Hejira. Communism should be considered as both a revolution and a religion. We are more familiar with its revolutionary than with its religious aspects. We should become more familiar with its religious aspects.

It is a religion which denies the validity of religions. It is to other religions as the newly postulated antimatter is to our own material world. For this reason, any genuine coexistence will be difficult until the nature of communism itself has changed. There is, however, reason to believe that communism does change. There are now at least three types of communism which all claim to present the true revelation; these are the Russian, the Chinese, and the Yugoslav versions of Marxism.

Communists of all three types agree on one thing: the importance of the human mind as the source of all social, political, and economic advancement. Thus communism challenges all the nations to educate all of their children.

Americans, though they are only a small minority—6 percent—of mankind, stand as an effective barrier against the conquest of the whole world by communism; to help them continue to stand, American education today has special responsibilities.

It must give Americans the technical skills they need to compete effectively against Communist polytechnic education.

It must also equip every American with a broad general background.

It must help the many emerging hungry nations to develop their human resources.

It must impart to our students reverence for beauty and humility before the unknown lest man in his arrogance destroy himself.

The other multiple pressure of our society and system of education which I will mention is the rising power of the non-Western World. For the past 300 years mankind has been dominated by Western Europeans. They conquered the weaker inhabitants of North and South America and Australia and established new nations on these continents. They made colonies of almost all of the peoples of Africa and southeast Asia. Only Japan of all non-Western nations was able to thrive in the face of Western power, and then only by developing superior military force.

There has been a sudden collapse of the old empires of Western Europe. The former colonies are emerging as free and independent nations. The rapid economic, political, and social developments in many of these new countries are matched by a transfer to them of the authority which once rested in Western Europe.

This situation is aggravated by prejudices, ignorance, hatred, and envy. Much of the trouble rises from the fact of race; the Western World is predominately white, but the emerging new nations are largely nonwhite.

The social, political, and economic facts of our times require that liberal education no longer be content to introduce young Americans to the traditions of Western Europe, the Mediterranean world, and North America. If the principal function of liberal education is to introduce a young mind to its world, then it is clear that the young minds of today must be introduced to the great cultures which now vie with the Western tradition for power in the world of tomorrow.

The Slavic cultures are dominant in areas controlled by the Soviet Union; Chinese culture in its many variations is dominant in eastern Asia; Indian culture is predominant in southeast Asia; Islamic culture dominates the Arabic world which extends from Pakistan to Morocco; the countries of Latin America are rapidly becoming a powerful cultural unit which combines elements of the traditions of Spain and Portugal with the great traditions of the American Indian. There are also a number of important smaller cultures, especially in Africa.

A new liberal education must introduce young Americans to the total cultural traditions of mankind. The inadequacy of our present education structure to this task is dramatized by the failures of many individual Americans to adapt to life in the new nations and by the unwillingness or inability of many Americans at home to understand the nature of the new world in which they live. Americans abroad often establish plush-lined ghettos for themselves in Africa and Asia, and sometimes also in the Latin American countries. While many Americans have been welcome and understanding guests in other countries, millions who have lived abroad have huddled together suspiciously as they looked out at a world they had not been taught to understand. This lack of understanding has been a serious barrier to our success in helping to build a peaceful world order.

We need a new kind of education in the liberal arts college which will perform at least the following functions:

It will prepare all of its graduates to understand that our culture is not an island, that we stand as an equal among equals in a world in which there are many cultures. It will teach every young American, that, while there are many differences among the world's cultures, there is also a common foundation of humanity which all peoples share.

It will prepare a new generation of teachers who at all levels will teach in the context of a single human family.

It will prepare an increasingly large number of young Americans to serve with charity, courage, and insight among men of all cultures. It will also contribute to the evolution of an international civil service under the United Nations which may enable that organization to fulfill its historic function without infringing on any nation's heritage.

There are many efforts underway to meet our growing national need for polycultural education. There have been many attempts to broaden our present monocultural curriculum to make it an effective introduction to mankind. Although it is doubtful whether any of them have been fully effective, all of these efforts are significant:

1. The East-West Center in Hawaii is a noble experiment which will undoubtedly increase understanding among the peoples on both sides of the northern Pacific Ocean. However, it is an incomplete effort because it is limited by law and by the intent of its sponsors to the peoples who live on the shores of one ocean.

2. A great many colleges and universities are developing new languages and area programs. These are excellent and significant enterprises, but they prepare too small a number of specialists in a few fields of knowledge. We need many more of these specialists, and we also need a general reorientation toward mankind for all of our students.

3. Several States, including New York, Pennsylvania, and California, have decreed that their elementary children shall begin to study foreign languages and non-Western cultures. However, according to reports, the educational authorities in these States are finding it difficult to locate teachers who can carry out these directives effectively.

4. Several years ago Colgate University launched an experimental project in which undergraduates were required to take a minor in a non-Western culture. Apparently this effort was not fully successful and the project has been considerably modified.

5. The Elbert Covell College at the University of the Pacific, in an interesting new experiment, will teach all subjects in Spanish except English language and literature. The college should be very useful in helping students from the United States become experts in Latin American affairs, and students from Latin America become experts in U.S. affairs. We need more colleges of this type, and they should cover all the major non-English cultures.

6. Two New York State experiments are of particular interest. The Plattsburgh State University College of Education is trying to reorganize its curriculum to enable instructors to teach most subjects from the standpoint of the total contribution of all cultures to specific subject areas. The State teachers college at New Paltz has for some years carried on highly effective inservice summer training programs to inform elementary and secondary teachers about Africa and Asian affairs. In addition it has established a world study center and now requires all of its graduates to have credits in certain courses in the history and traditions of non-Western cultures.

7. Several of the foundations are promoting the idea of mobilizing total academic resources of a few of our institutions for experimental work in polycultural education.

All of these and many other experiments are an indication of the intellectual ferment of our times. We may hope that we are on the verge of a new renaissance, since the great outburst of learning and creativity of our earlier renaissance was probably stimulated in part by contact with other cultures.

What should we do in the face of all of this activity? A few years ago the faculty of one of our largest universities worked for 2 years on a plan which it adopted, only to have it vetoed by the board of trustees. This plan is worthy of our consideration today, since something like it could be a major step toward providing adequate polycultural liberal education.

First, this plan would establish a core of 54 semester hours which all undergraduates would study. These 54 credit hours would be distributed equally among the social sciences, the humanities including the fine arts, and the natural sciences. These courses would emphasize the total contribution of all of mankind to these specific areas of knowledge. For example, a philosophy professor would no longer teach that certain philosophical concepts originated in Greece, were modified by the Hebraic-Christian tradition, and are the exclusive heritage of a superior people who live in Western Europe, North America, and certain parts of the British Commonwealth. Instead he would teach that certain ideas emerge at a given level of the evolutionary development of many cultures and are in fact a common ground on which men and women everywhere may meet.

Students would be able to count 18 hours of this core toward the fulfillment of their major requirement.

In addition the plan would intensify traditional language and area studies, and each student would be required to take a minor in a non-Western culture. Thus every graduate from this undergraduate college would have a broad polycultural background and also an introduction to a specific part of the world.

This plan could be the beginning of a new conception of the liberal arts in this country. Something like this approach to liberal learning is seriously needed in the United States today.

The 4-year course of study outlined above could be followed by 2 years of study which would lead to a master of international arts for those who desire a more thorough introduction to the world in which they live. Candidates for this degree would take their first year of study abroad in a university approved by their American colleges. They would then return for a second graduate year competent in a language and in the culture of another country. On fulfilling normal academic requirements for a master's degree, they would be better prepared than any people now graduating from American higher educational institutions for a variety of services, including national and international civil service and teaching in American and foreign institutions.

How can these objectives be achieved, and who should attempt to achieve them?

The second question is more easily answered. It is the duty of the American educator at every level from elementary through graduate school to emphasize the fact that we live in a whole world rather than in an island culture in that world. It is going to be many years before we can solve the problem of what should be taught at each level, and how the new subject matter should be taught. There may be a wholesale revolution in American education which will involve a strengthening and deepening of the American curriculum at every level. It is possible that completion of a junior or community college may become a universal requirement, adding 2 years to the traditional 12 of compulsory-free education, and that on top of this perhaps a new 4-year polycultural liberal arts college may be built as the foundation of a new university.

The increased complexity of knowledge, the need for new skills and new wisdom, together with the rapid increase in our average life span, are likely to require not only higher standards, but an expansion of the time allotted to the formal schooling.

The need for polycultural education grows out of the new interdependence of all mankind and the new role of the United States as a leader in a rapidly evolving world. The responsibilities of world leadership compel an increasing number of Americans to live and to work in non-Western societies. If Americans are to serve effectively overseas, and if Americans at home are to understand the nature of their world, it is imperative that we develop a new polycultural education.

A number of Federal programs are already creating, both directly and indirectly, a new polycultural foundation for American education. The various exchange programs now united under the authorization of the new Fulbright-Hays Act are directly contributing to this goal. Since 1947 thousands of Americans have received opportunities to broaden their educational horizons through study, teaching, lecturing, and observing in non-western areas. Indirectly, American education has been enriched by the experience of these Americans and thousands of others who have served as educators in such programs as schools for American children overseas and the activities now administered by AID (the Agency for International Development). Our schools and colleges now have a growing number of teachers at every level who have had polycultural experience as participants in various Federal programs. The supply of American educators with polycultural experience will be greatly increased in the next few years by returning Peace Corps volunteers.

One of the more substantial contributions to polycultural education has been the program under the National Defense Education Act, administered through the Office of Education. The Office now has an important new resource in section 102(b)(6) of the Fulbright-Hays Act. The section will enable the Office to cooperate with American institutions in offering polycultural education opportunities to Americans both at home and overseas. This enterprise can be effective only if there is effective cooperation between American educators and the Federal Government in carrying out this program.

Private efforts of the foundations, colleges, and universities, and mission boards created the beginning of an American polycultural education. Private initiative will continue to play an important part in the development of this new education. But time is short, the need is great, and the consequences of failure to instill a new wisdom into our students through our educational processes might be catastrophic.

TERCERA REUNION PARLIAMENTARIA MEXICO-NORTEAMERICANA—REMARKS BY JOSE LOPEZ BERMUDEZ

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also had the privilege, in recent days, of serving as one of the U.S. congressional delegates to the Third Interparliamentary Conference in Mexico. It was a great pleasure for me to serve on that delegation with the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE].

Some very notable speeches were made by our Mexican colleagues at that conference. There were two in particular, Mr. President, by Senor Jose Lopez Bermudez, which deserve the very careful consideration of the Senate. There were others of the same high quality, which undoubtedly will be discussed in the Senate with respect to other foreign relations matters in the days ahead, and some of which will also be offered for printing in the RECORD.

At one of the sessions Senor Jose Lopez Bermudez delivered an able speech entitled "Let Us Win a New Independence," which contained inspiring proof that our friends in Latin America—and particularly in Mexico—are determined to join with us in a cooperative spirit to preserve and strengthen freedom in the Western Hemisphere. I ask unanimous consent to have the speech printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET US WIN A NEW INDEPENDENCE

In the name of the Congress of Mexico, I wish to express our profound acknowledgment to the Legislators from the United States for making a pause in our deliberations in order to render homage to the first of our liberators.

Hidalgo has deserved the highest title in our history: the Father of the Nation.

Like Bolivar and Martí, like Washington and Lincoln, like Sucre and San Martín, like O'Higgins and Santander, like Morelos and Juárez, Hidalgo projects his image upon our time with the universal dimension of the great heroes of America.

Under the shadow of his glory here in Dolores, we are filled with a clean, American pride when we declare that the Independence of Mexico is not the result of the action of cannon, but rather the supreme outgrowth of culture. Hidalgo was the rector of one of the oldest educational institutions of new Spain. The students and professors, who daily listened to his exhortations on liberty, began to see about his head not the soft radiance of the saints, but rather the aureola that marks the great leaders.

Because in his classroom he expounded his ideas as a reformer, Hidalgo was expelled from the illustrious College of San Nicolás. Without fear or sorrow he left his academic teaching, and Hidalgo became the dean of freedom for his people.

Hidalgo, degraded, arrived in Colima with a temporary appointment as a parish priest. There he continued his redemptive preaching: to the children he would speak of hope, to the women of self-sacrifice, to the men he would speak of liberty.

It is said that each morning, accompanied by an old man named Pablo, Hidalgo would go out for a walk. Going from house to house, he would speak words of encouragement and also buy small pieces of copper. One day the old man asked him: "Father, why do you want so many pieces of copper?" Hidalgo replied: "I am going to melt them and cast a big bell, so big that it will be heard around the world."

Hidalgo did not have to cast the bell of liberty over there in Colina; because the bell of liberty was already here in the humble belfry of the Church of Dolores. Ringing the bell, Hidalgo called upon all Mexicans to attend the first liberty mass. All men of his day heard the sound of that bell.

Later when he was urged to seek his own safety, because it was clear that it would be impossible to win a war without soldiers, Hidalgo refused to flee. He knew that wars are won by soldiers, but a revolution is won by the people. And so Hidalgo was able to make of the war of independence a movement designed to become a regime of law. Simultaneously, he started a profound social revolution which aspires to constitute itself into a state where justice shall prevail.

In the wonderful human resources present in his people, Hidalgo found all those values on which a nation can be built, and its moral wealth preserved.

In the person of Doña Josefa Ortiz de Domínguez, wife of the Magistrate of Querétaro, Hidalgo found the stoic and faithful soul of our women. In a humble heroine in Guanajuato, named Doña Gertrudis Vargas, he found the infinite fortitude of Mexican mothers. Doña Gertrudis stopped Hidalgo near the hill of Zempoala and told him: "Reverend Father, inasmuch as my age and the fact that I am a woman do not allow me to join your ranks, I want to offer to you the life of my only son, because he, as well as you, wishes to live or to die for the achievement of independence."

In the midst of fire in Guanajuato, Father Hidalgo found in the person of El Pipila—the legendary hero who covered his back with a flat stone to protect himself from the bullets of the enemy, and thus set fire to the doors of the fortified Alhóndiga de Granaditas—the spirit of Mexican youth, which is capable of burning down with the fire of its faith the doors of all despotism, in order to open for the fatherland the road to the fullness of human dignity.

Hidalgo, the teacher of patriotism, was able to recognize in Morelos the disciple who was to exceed him in achievements and who equaled him in immortality.

From the moment when Hidalgo became the leader in the struggle for independence, he manifested, not the stature and brilliance of military genius, but rather the character and the determination which made him the first of our social heroes. Not quite 3 months after that memorable night in Dolores when, with a shout, he proclaimed independence, Hidalgo drafted in Guadalajara, in December 1810, two historic decrees. The first proclaimed the abolition of slavery on our soil. The second was the first agrarian decree in the New World. "Because it is my will," declared Hidalgo, "that land should be for the exclusive benefit of the native people in their respective villages."

We do not defend what is Mexican merely moved by that profound sentiment of attachment to our country, something natural to the soul of men in every country. Neither are we moved by blind devotion when we bow before the greatness of our historic relics. Our veneration for Hidalgo flows from what Hidalgo represents in terms of prophecy and as a forerunner on the road to a better justice, without which both emancipation and the happiness of man are precarious values.

What Hidalgo proclaimed when he shouted: "Long live independence. And death to bad government" is the same thing that the hand of Jefferson wrote in a glorious declaration. "But when a long train of abuses and usurpations," stated the first builder of your Nation, "evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security."

Fellow legislators, a son of Guanajuato declared that in our country, in America, and in all parts of the world there are still many "alhóndigas" or strongholds of oppression which must be set on fire. These are the presidios erected during centuries among men by misery and violence, by ignorance and despotism, by sickness and injustice.

Let us reaffirm here in Dolores our determination to endeavor to win the new independence completely, the new independence toward which the American peoples are resolutely advancing. It is independence with peace and prosperity; independence with law and culture; independence with health and equality.

Let us bring together the honor of our flags. Let the immortal bells of Philadelphia and Dolores join their voices in order to recall to the world the example of two peoples who, notwithstanding the marked differences in their cultures and in their economies, in their power and in their customs, in their beliefs and in their technologies, have decided through their own sovereign will to live, with mutual respect, in concord and to grow in labor and dignity.

May liberty rule again wherever dictatorship has despoiled the people of their mandate. May democracy triumph in those territories which violence and terror have delivered to the temporary dominion of tyranny.

Let us establish measures of justice wherever inequality has erected walls of hatred or maintains extensive areas of poverty.

In our living together as nations and also in regard to the internal tasks of our respective countries, let us, from day to day, improve our relations and our policies with such equity and intelligence that neither adverse prices nor unfair wages shall become factors producing hardship or oppression.

Let us disarm within ourselves the law of force, in order to strengthen our spirit and conscience with the noble, peacemaking force of law. Maintaining respect for the borders of our national habitations, let us live fulfilling an ascending destiny wherein men and nations will both know how and be able to earn their bread without fear and to achieve progress without weapons.

Mr. MORSE. Following that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have other remarks by Senor Jose Lopez Bermudez at the Interparliamentary Conference held in Mexico, before Committee IV of that conference, dealing with the whole question of nuclear disarmament, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Before no other Congress of the world does the appeal for peace made by the Congress of Mexico acquire greater importance than before the Congress of the United States, because the Congress represents one of the nations which have reached the highest level in nuclear power. The decision of its Legislators to work for peace would be a determinant factor to bring about the disappearance of the anxiety in which humanity lives. This anguish is justified, because while war with conventional weapons which formerly resulted in the destruction of armies and cities, and then ended in an armistice which permitted the people involved both the rebuilding of their societies and the rehabilitation or renewal of the human groups affected. But now the unleashing of nuclear war would mean the total destruction of man and the surrender of civilization and history itself.

For this reason our country has raised its voice in support, invariably of its decision not to admit within the national territory nuclear weapons of any kind, nor the means that could be used to transport them. This decision is based on our purpose not to participate in military blocs or alliances which, as products of cold war are an antithesis to the principle of collective security, the unsubstitutible basis of peaceful living together within the order and principles established in the Charter of United Nations.

Such is the degree of danger of the bombs now at the disposal of the nuclear powers that in their devastating capacity lies, in our judgment, the possibility of controlling the use of the same. This has been the possible reason which illuminated the conduct of the nuclear powers in their decision to use in the settlement of their problems every objective save nuclear war. A few days ago distinguished Senator MORSE stated that the possibility of one nation to destroy its adversary with atomic weapons is in turn accompanied by the risk of being destroyed.

Just as youth, and vital energy and potentiality must be correctly channeled in order to produce good results, otherwise they would only produce danger—likewise nuclear energy should be directed toward its most useful aspect: its use for peaceful purposes.

From the allocations for the warlike use of nuclear energy reductions corresponding to personnel, budget and the general effort should be made, in order to apply the amount resulting from such reductions to peaceful purposes. All activity in connection with nuclear energy for a warlike purpose involves a very small number of countries who control it; whereas with its use for peaceful purposes there would be a way for each and every country to be able to cooperate in the measure of its capacity, and such advance would constitute universal progress. This approach requires the technical and economic assistance so that all countries may participate and cease to be mere spectators, and in turn become actors who cooperate in the utilization of nuclear energy for peace.

This points to the necessity of obtaining the adequate training of a large number of persons, the granting of subsidies in order to study special problems, and the guidance and coordination of programs of scientific world interest, feasible of achievement in the different regions of the world in accordance with their particular interest.

Undoubtedly, the greater the number of trained and competent persons more firmly the world will be guided concerning its responsibility.

I wish to insist on the necessity that exists for us as legislators to make an effort to go forward to meet a new area of law being born: nuclear war.

Man has unleashed a force which man must control. He must control it not only in its technical aspect but also with regard to its moral aspect. While it is possible to speak about the area of atomic energy used for warlike purposes of a desire of the nuclear powers to reach a balance of forces; on the other hand, when we transfer this problem to the area of cold war we can speak of a balance on the basis of fears. A nuclear power may resort to creating a degree of panic among peoples who do not possess atomic powers, in order to impress the immense majority of men and women with the power of its warlike strength.

I consider that this fear to which I refer is produced by each threat that invokes the possibility of nuclear war, by each statement that reaches us, in the manner of radioactive rain which has the power to penetrate our homes and our conscience and to contaminate us with such fear, without any fault or guilt on our part.

The statement of the National Commission on Science of the United States which points to the danger that every person undergoes under ionizing radiation, sufficient would be to entertain the justified hope that we legislators listen to the men of science and to the experts on nuclear energy, with the desire to undertake an effort to present in our Congresses the adequate principles for the protection of our peoples.

If nuclear energy is not controlled both in experimentation for warlike uses as well as for peaceful purposes, attempts against the first and most sacred right of man: the right to paternity.

On the other hand we face the grave international responsibility of states who possess the means for the production of nuclear energy.

The immense majority of peoples who do not possess nuclear weapons face a situation of anguish: ocean currents or atmospheric currents can bring us highly ionized harmful radiations which inexorably harm our population, and forever. We ask ourselves with consternation: Against whom shall we establish responsibility? How can we determine who was responsible and what is the sanction he deserves?

In short, honorable legislators, I invoke your patriotism to the end that we may express a common purpose in support of the appeal for peace addressed by the Congress of Mexico to all the parliaments of the world, so that as the essential outcome of this meeting we take with us one sole conviction: to continue working for peace, to study those measures that we as legislators can propose in our countries in order to establish principles which provide a greater protection for our populations. One final conclusion: we must make every effort at our command so that our people can demolish that blind alley in which fear of nuclear war holds captive the conscience of the world. Let us break down this dangerous obstacle and come out upon the broad and innumerable roads which peace and science have opened to mankind.

ALEXANDER GRAHAM BELL AWARD TO SENATOR LISTER HILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished senior Senator from the great State of Alabama, was recently honored by the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, Inc.

When the first Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf award was presented to him on March 3d on the 116th anniversary of Alexander Graham Bell's birth, Mr. Justice Burton, honorary vice president of the association, made the presentation.

Mr. President, there is little that I can add to the citation which accompanied the award. All of us, I am sure, join in saluting Lister Hill for his great humanitarian achievements; and, as a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I can testify to the wholehearted support he has always given to legislation designed to assist the handicapped and particularly those who suffer from auditory defects.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded, which appears on pages 118 and 119 of the Volta Review, be printed at this point in my remarks, together with the citation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

First A. G. Bell Award Given to Senator Lister Hill

The first Alexander Graham Bell Award for service to the deaf was presented to Senator Lister Hill, of Alabama, in Washington, D.C., on March 3, the 116th anniversary of Bell's birth. Justice Harold Hitz Burton, honorary vice president of the association, made the presentation.

Senator Hill's sustained interest in combating deafness, and his compassion for the deaf are reflected in his outstanding record of legislative achievements in the fields of medical research, research training, rehabilitation, and education.

His legislative successes in behalf of the deaf speak eloquently of his leadership, his wisdom, his parliamentary skill, and his persuasiveness in the U.S. Senate where he serves as chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee that has jurisdiction over all legislation on public health, medical research, hospitals, rehabilitation, and education. In addition, he is chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee with jurisdiction over funds for the programs administered by the Public Health Service, the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the Office of Education, Gallaudet College, and other agencies of the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

Senator Hill was a sponsor of the legislation in 1949 that directed the Public Health Service to establish the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness to mobilize our research and research training resources against deafness, other sensory disorders, and all neurological diseases.

The funds available to the Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness for research and research training to combat deafness and speech impairments have increased fivefold since 1958—from $1.3 to $6.5 million. Some of these funds have been used to support the scientists who have contributed to the development and further refinement of techniques that are now so successful against otosclerosis.

Senator Hill provided the leadership for the program initiated in 1962 to provide professional and technical assistance to the States and their committees in the prevention, early detection, and treatment of deafness and other sensory disabilities. High priority is given to refining the methodology for screening procedures of children at an early age so that the necessary early education of the deaf can be initiated.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senator Hill has been a leading advocate of legislation that would improve and strengthen educational and training programs for the deaf. He strongly supported the legislation enacted in 1958 that authorized a loan service of captioned films for the deaf to be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In 1962 the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, under Senator Hill's chairmanship, approved legislation to expand and strengthen the program of captioned films for the deaf. With the enactment of this legislation, the scope of the program was broadened and authorization for appropriations was raised from $250,000 to $1,500,000 per year.

It was Senator Hill who introduced the legislation to authorize Federal assistance for the training of teachers of the deaf in 1961 in order to meet a critical shortage of such teachers in the United States. In September of that year his bill was enacted into Public Law 87–276 and the full authorization of $1.5 million has been appropriated by the Congress in each of the last 2 years.

Under this law, scholarships and grants-in-aid have been made available through approved university and college training centers. It has been estimated that approximately 380 persons have undertaken the training to become teachers of the deaf as a direct result of this financial aid under Public Law 87–276, sponsored by Senator Hill.

Senator Hill's leadership in the Appropriations Committee has also greatly benefited the programs of Gallaudet College. Senator Hill's subcommittee recommended appropriations totaling $9.1 million over the past 4 years, and the increases approved each year were earmarked for higher faculty salaries, additional operating funds and new physical facilities.

Senator Hill has also been a consistent supporter of the programs for the deaf that are administered by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and in each of the past 2 years the annual appropriation for vocational rehabilitation has included funds especially earmarked by the Congress for new programs related to the rehabilitation of the deaf. In 1964 the number of individuals with hearing disabilities rehabilitated will reach an estimated 7,000. The increasing level of financial support to the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration has made it possible to facilitate the establishment of speech and hearing centers. Also, between 1962 and 1963 the number of traineeships in speech pathology and audiology increased from 253 to 452.

When the presentation of the award was made, the following citation was read:

ASSOCIATION CITATION TO SENATOR HILL

"From time to time there comes upon the scene of human events a man of unusual insight and conviction. After surveying the circumstances involved, he sets his course, and thereafter his faith and confidence in the rightness and justice of his decision are unshakable. Such a man is Senator Lister Hill.

"Children born profoundly deaf are cut off from the normal experience of speech and language, the prime avenue to information, education, and self-fulfillment. Until medical science produces a cure, the opportunity for them to reach their full potential lies largely with unusually supportive parents and specially trained teachers. Since World War II the shortage of fully qualified teachers of deaf children has become an acute national problem.

"In August 1959, Senator Hill introduced legislation in the U.S. Senate to provide scholarships and grants-in-aid to assist in attracting capable young people into our profession and training them as teachers. His initiative, leadership, and persistence were essential ingredients in the outcome. Public Law 87–276, which has in 1 year doubled the number of students in our training centers, stands as a monument to his effective efforts, and represents a significant and substantial step forward for all deaf children.

"The Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf extends its most sincere expression of gratitude to Senator Lister Hill for his stanch championship of the cause of deaf children, which will assist materially in bringing to them the abiding blessings of human fellowship through speech and language. In token of deep appreciation, the association does this day confer upon him its highest honor for distinguished service for the deaf, the Alexander Graham Bell Award."

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OHIO'S DEVASTATING FLOOD OF 1913

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, 50 years ago, on March 22 through March 27, 1913, one of the worst floods ever to occur in this country swept the Miami Valley in southwest Ohio.

More than 300 people lost their lives and thousands of the residents of this area suffered untold hardships. Property loss alone exceeded $100 million in 1913 values. At that time I was a new member of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio. I can vividly recall helping, along with many of my colleagues,

in the rescue operations. It was a terrible tragedy to witness.

The residents of the cities of Piqua, Troy, Dayton, West Carrollton, Miamisburg, Franklin, Middletown, and Hamilton, and in villages of other sections of Ohio could have thrown up their hands in dismay, disgust, and despair, and quit. However, these hardy, resourceful men and women were not quitters—they were initiators and inventors.

They voluntarily donated $2,156,616 to initiate flood control in the Miami Valley to protect forever their loved ones and their homes from a future terrible natural disaster such as they had just suffered.

From these donations evolved an engineering staff led by Arthur Morgan, who roamed the valley seeking suitable sites for high retarding basins.

A new law was drafted, and passed by an emergency session of the Ohio Legislature, enabling citizens to form conservancy districts and assess their own properties to pay for the necessary flood protection structures.

Thirty-four million dollars was eventually required to construct the necessary dams and levees. Every cent came, not from the Government, but from the pockets of these hardworking residents of the valley. During this week the cities of the valley have been observing the anniversary of this great flood—not in celebration, but in review of the tremendous economic progress of the valley since the communites were flat on their backs and almost counted out.

They can be justifiably proud of their communities and of their fathers and mothers and grandparents, for their wisdom, foresight, and self-reliance.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGES ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to congratulate the President on his recent civil rights message.

The proposals the administration has made are both the most far-reaching and the most practical that have been submitted by a President during this century. There are some who would like to solve every civil rights problem this year. However, because of the inability or unwillingness of this body to reform its rules, we know that it will be difficult even to bring to a vote many of the measures in this category.

President Kennedy has not proposed a radical, divisive program or one subject to constitutional objections. Rather, it is a program designed to overcome the most pressing facets of the civil rights problem. It is bold, intelligent, constructive, and well conceived. Most important, it is one that, with sincere bipartisan support, can pass this Congress. These recommendations are not political bones tossed to an interest group with no hope of implementation. They are desperately needed tools with which to fight the insidious disease of bigotry and discrimination.

Mr. President, there was one aspect of the President's message that impressed me as being of great importance. For the first time since 1952, a President has endorsed America's need to observe basic human rights on other than political or legal grounds. Heretofore, Presidents have told us that constitutional government demands our obedience to the Supreme Court's decision; that our international image will suffer unless we treat all men with respect; that our economy will not achieve its full potential until the opportunity for equal employment is granted without regard to race; that no governmental official is truly representative unless every qualified elector is allowed to cast his ballot. All of these are important reasons for eliminating discrimination. They are politically sound judgments based on cold logic. However, for the first time in many years we have a President who has had the insight and compassion to say simply, that integration is right, that discrimination is wrong, and that equality is demanded by every moral and religious principle. This would be true even if all political considerations dictated otherwise. President Kennedy's affirmation of the dignity of man is important to every American, but especially meaningful to the Negro who is struggling to obtain the equality which rightfully should have been his a hundred years ago.

In itself, the President's recognition of the moral principle underlying the civil rights problem is a major step toward its solution. The next major step, enactment of the President's program, should be taken by Congress.

Having made these general observations on the President's message, I would like now to comment briefly on each of the recommendations. The first of these concerns voting rights. Inasmuch as the ballot is the cornerstone of democracy, it is most appropriate that the Congress first assure the most basic of our rights. To those who argue that national voting legislation would constitute usurpation of the rights and powers of the States, I say that Federal intervention to guarantee the right to vote will make less urgent certain other civil rights legislation. I have always contended that if every qualified person were given the franchise and exercise that franchise, that many civil rights problems would be resolved at the local level without the necessity for Federal intervention in his behalf. The vote gives the individual a voice in his own destiny. This is a voice that is heard clearly by all those persons who periodically place their personal careers in the hands of the voters.

Almost without exception, Federal judges are men of great integrity. However, their crowded calendars in many instances have made a mockery of the swift justice which is indispensable in securing basic civil rights.

I am sure all of us agree with the legal maxim that justice delayed is justice denied. With the heavy calendars in our courts, it is very difficult to have a prompt adjudication of these many cases. In one case, the President noted, it took 19 months to resolve a voting complaint. When a man's right to vote is not determined expeditiously, his right to vote in the next election is lost forever.

The Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 were great advances, and this administration has been the first to take full advantage of their provisions. But they are not sufficient. To fill the gaps in our Federal election laws, to guarantee the integrity of the Federal electoral process, the President has made four recommendations. First, in counties where less than 15 percent of eligible persons of a race are registered, Federal registrars would be authorized to register those who are qualified under State law immediately upon filing of a suit. The decision of the Federal referee would be subject to review by the court. In my opinion, this is a moderate approach to a difficult problem. In any county in which there are fewer than 15 percent of the Negroes registered—and the President noted that there are 200 such counties in the country—a pattern of discrimination is clearly apparent. In such a case it is not only unwise, but also morally wrong to force an applicant to wait another year before his right to vote is vindicated. We know that one vote can conceivably change the result of an election. We must be certain that that vote is cast.

Earlier today I spoke about the recent gubernatorial election in my State, in which 1,265,000 votes were cast. The question of who was elected, after a recount, was settled by a majority of 91. Therefore a single vote is important. We must be certain that every impediment to the casting of a vote is removed. We must make certain that the vote can be cast legally without interference.

This is by no means a radical proposal. It is a principle of American law that justice delayed is justice denied. If the threat of immediate harm is so great that to await the decision of the court would deny effective relief, then courts should adhere to the time-honored precedent of granting temporary relief. The President's proposal provides one more judicial tool for preventing the frustration of deferred justice in the process of litigation.

The second request of the President is that voting suits be given first priority in the Federal courts. This would mean that voting cases would be decided by the courts much more quickly than such cases are decided now. This is another measure which would help make every man's right to vote a reality in the present, not a hope for the future.

Like the proposal for registrars, this expediting legislation is not a radical innovation in our legal system. As early as 1903, legislation was passed which provides that cases brought by the United States arising under the Interstate Commerce Act and the antitrust laws shall be accorded expedited treatment in the courts (49 U.S.C. 44).

Mr. President, when we can give expeditious treatment to the matter of railroad charges and transportation rates, and matters related to antitrust laws, it seems to me that such a basic political right and privilege as the right to vote should be given equally expeditious treatment.

The denial of the right to vote is indeed a threat to national security in that it is a threat to the foundation of democracy, and the fight against it cannot await the solution of other lesser problems. Together, Federal referees and expedited court action would be effective weapons against the frustrating delay that now exists.

Next, the President requested legislation which would specifically prohibit the application of different standards to those seeking to register for a Federal election. The Civil Rights Commission's 1961 Report on Voting is replete with examples of Negroes being given ridiculous, impossible tests, while white residents of the same county were being registered as a matter of course. This practice is a flagrant violation of the 15th amendment; and the President's recommendation is designed to combat it. The proposed legislation is not only constitutional in the sense that it does not violate a constitutional provision; but such legislation is also affirmatively required by the mandate of the 15th amendment.

The last voting proposal is essentially the same as the principle provision of the administration's 1962 civil rights bill. It would create a presumption that those who have completed the sixth grade are literate for the purposes of election registration. We all have heard of cases where Negroes with postgraduate degrees have been denied the franchise because of a literacy test, while uneducated whites have passed the same tests. This being true, how many perfectly literate Negroes with a grammar or high school education are unconscionably denied the right to vote on the basis of their alleged illiteracy? The President's proposal is designed not to abolish the literacy test, but to insure that it is administered on an objective basis. This would be a legitimate, reasonable exercise of Congress power to implement the 15th amendment.

These, then, are the President's recommendations concerning voting, and these are the proposals that must be enacted if we are finally to eliminate the evil which has haunted the conscience of the Nation so long. For 2 years the President has enforced the existing voting laws with unprecedented vigor. Of 35 suits which have been brought under these laws, 25 have been brought by this administration. It is time for Congress to meet the challenge and to assume its responsibility by passing the requested measures. I hope there will be early action on these four proposals.

Education is the second area of concern which the President treated in his message. He noted the great progress that has been made recently in school integration. He also noted, however, that the progress is much too slow. There are a great many things that I feel Congress could do to help solve this problem. But since politics is the art of the possible, the President has wisely chosen those proposals which will both aid the progress of integration and have the greatest possibility of being adopted by Congress.

The message asks action of Congress on two proposals. First, he advocated a program of technical and financial assistance to aid school districts in desegregating. All of us here are well aware of the great social and financial burden which was placed upon the South by the Supreme Court's decision in 1954. The Court, of course, was the first to recognize the various problems which the school boards would face; and it was with this in mind that the Court left to each locality the difficult task of the implementation of its decision. It is now for Congress to join the other two branches and authorize the Executive to alleviate the difficulties faced by school districts honestly attempting to obey the law of the land by providing them with financial and technical assistance.

The President has also again asked Congress to remove the words "separate but equal" from the Morill Land-Grant College Act. This phrase is not simply outmoded. It is unconstitutional and self-contradictory; it should be deleted from the act immediately. This could be done rapidly and, I would hope, with little or no controversy.

In both these proposals the President has asked Congress to do that which it has unfortunately failed to do for the last 8 years; that is, to recognize the legality and the morality of the Supreme Court's school integration decision.

The President then considered the extension of the term of the Civil Rights Commission. Again, this year the Commission will die if its term is not extended. It is ridiculous for Congress to spend its time rehashing the same objections in this biennial fight; and I know it must be discouraging to those who work so hard for the Commission to have to wait for our approval every 2 years before they can plan their studies.

I say "objections"; really they are objections without much substance. It is needed as a guardian of our basic civil rights, not only the rights of the Negro, but of every person in the land.

The President has asked that this year the commission be extended for at least 4 years and that it be authorized to act as a national civil rights clearinghouse. This request must have top priority, for if we do not act during this session there will be no Commission. Every member is or should be familiar with the scholarly, objective reports the Commission has made during the past few years. In themselves, they justify the Commission's continued existence. I compliment the members of the Civil Rights Commission for service beyond call of duty, for the highest form of patriotism. Civil rights are so closely associated with emotion and politics that the aid of an independent and expert group is essential for the dissemination of objective information. Too much of the information the country receives is from those in both the North and South, who, consciously or not, color the facts to conform with their convictions. The Commission is the organization which informs Congress and the President of the true facts. The Commissioners are disinterested and nonpolitical experts from all sections of the country whose integrity and objective approach are above question.

When I say they are disinterested, I mean they are without prejudice. They are not zealots. They are men who have earned the right to advise the Nation on the difficult problems of civil liberties and civil rights—earned the right because of the exemplary performance in the law, in education, in the civic life of the Nation, and in their scholarly attainments.

We now know that all civil rights problems will not be solved in the next 2 years. In fact, both because of the failure of Congress to use its power to help solve the problem, and because of the size of the problem itself, I hold no illusions about the chances of full solution in the near future. The Commission has proved its worth beyond a shadow of a doubt, and we must extend it for 4 years at the very least.

The value of the Commission's work to Congress and the executive branch is inestimable. However, this expertise should also be made available to others—to Federal agencies, States, local communities, and the general public. The people need to know the true facts as much as we do, and there are many governmental bodies and organizations which could profit greatly from technical assistance by the Commission. It was for this reason that the President asked for an extension of its authority as well as its life. It is for this reason that we must grant it.

Last week the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] introduced the administration's bill (S. 1117) to extend the Civil Rights Commission for an additional 4 years and also to broaden the scope of the functions and work of the Commission.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Michigan for his constant efforts in the area of civil rights and civil liberties. He is a source of great inspiration and strength to the Members of this body. He deserves our cooperation and support.

The bill which was introduced by the Senator from Michigan has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I sincerely hope that the committee will give this important legislation early and favorable consideration.

The President reported in his message the accomplishments and goals of the administration in the fields of equal employment, equal public accommodations, and the use of Federal funds, as well as in the fields of voting and education. The record is indeed impressive, but the President alone should not have to carry the whole burden, and he alone cannot solve all the problems. He must have our help. His program is meaningful; it is not oppressive to any section of the country; in fact, it is fair, it is just, it is considerate, and it deserves our immediate attention and our wholehearted support.

Mr. President, the Attorney General recently addressed a meeting of the Civil Rights Committee of the New York City Central Labor Council at which he commented extensively on the President's civil rights message. The speech is an excellent analysis, and I believe Senators will find it interesting and informative. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a fine address by the Honorable Chester Bowles delivered at Lincoln University, Oxford, Pa., be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. The speech is entitled "Emancipation: the Record and the Challenge" and is another example of the wisdom, courage, and commonsense of this outstanding and distinguished public servant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many Senators have asked: Will the Senate be able to pass important civil rights legislation? My answer is that there are Members of this body who have made personal commitments, as well as political commitments, and who, as well, have endorsed the commitments of political parties to pass civil rights legislation. The number of such Senators is a majority. Congress can do much to alleviate the growing tension in this country over racial problems by acting constructively, by acting with a sense of intelligent moderation, which is exactly the kind of program proposed by the President of the United States.

Many of the President's critics will say that the program does not go far enough. Many will say that it invades the rights of the States. What the President has done is to analyze where we are and to attempt to bring the Nation another step forward in the guaranteeing of the basic political and social rights of the American people.

The right to vote is a precious right. It is a right that this Nation has fought for, and for which many of our people have died. It is a right which we insist upon for people behind the Iron Curtain as well as for people on this side of the Iron Curtain. It is a right that we talk about for the peoples of Latin America. It seems to me that the least we can do is to assure this right to every American of qualified age. Every American should be entitled, at least, to have one voice and one vote in the decisions of his government.

The only way that decision can in any way be affected by the individual citizen is through the exercise of the franchise, the right to vote.

I wish to commend President Kennedy for his forthright and statesmanlike message on civil rights. It has been before us for some weeks; and I believe the message carries a message of hope and reassurance, if Congress will but expedite its action upon it.

I heard the comments of several of my colleagues on the occasion of the adoption of the resolutions which provide the funds for the respective committees of the Senate. Those comments clearly outlined the fact that civil rights measures will be given prompt attention in the appropriate committees of this Congress. I call upon those who have responsibility in the committees to see to it that these bills are introduced, that they are promptly referred to the appropriate committees, that they are scheduled first for subcommittee hearings, consideration, and report to the full committees. Then the full committees will take whatever action they see fit and will report the legislation to the whole Senate for decision.

This Congress will be unworthy of being called a great Congress, or even of being called a good Congress, if it fails to respond to the demonstrated need of the American people for protection of their voting rights and voting privileges.

Once we in Congress have acted to give proper protection to those rights, we can say to the American people that the rights should be exercised fully, intelligently, and constructively, so that the citizen can exercise his responsibility to participate in the election process as a well-informed and conscientious citizen.

EXHIBIT 1

ADDRESS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ROBERT F. KENNEDY, TO THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMITTEE, NEW YORK CITY CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL, AFL–CIO, MARCH 9, 1963

I suppose it is inevitable that most of us are near-sighted about national problems. We are able to focus on them only as they apply close to home and we find it difficult to see how they affect people in other fields and other States. One of the curious things I have found since becoming Attorney General, however, is that when it comes to civil rights, we very quickly become farsighted. We are quite ready to point accusing fingers at the South and are easily outraged by a Little Rock, by the beating of Freedom Riders, or by a Meredith case. Yet we respond to discrimination right around us with blank and uncomprehending stares. The attitude is "the other fellow is wrong" and the more wrong he is, the more that automatically puts us on the side of the angels.

There is no question that segregation in the South is socially, politically, and morally wrong. But there is deep-seated segregation in the North, also, and it is just as wrong. Racial discrimination is a national, not a regional problem, and it cannot be solved simply by individual instances of Federal action on behalf of freedom riders or a single college student. The solution requires the hearts, the voices, the mind, and the muscle of individuals and organizations all over the country, public and private. The President said last week, in his civil rights message:

"The cruel disease of discrimination knows no sectional or State boundaries. The continuing attack on this problem must be equally broad."

I am particularly pleased to be with you here today because labor, and especially groups like yours, historically have been committed to social justice and social action. For years, unions have been in the forefront of efforts toward equal opportunity for all workers and all citizens.

Last year, Mr. Van Arsdale's local 3 provided an example of such leadership by including 200 Negroes and Puerto Ricans among its 1,000 new apprentices. The New York Council of Painters also has opened its apprenticeship program to Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

In the past few months, 122 international unions, representing more than 10 million workers have joined with the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and pledged themselves to union programs for fair practices. The dual seniority problem is the subject of wide and serious attention by labor. Segregated locals are fast disappearing. Indeed, probably at no time in the long history of the American labor movement have so many union leaders given such deep and effective attention to the problem of providing equal opportunity for all, regardless of race.

Yet we would be dishonest with ourselves if we did not admit that some discrimination continues to exist within the labor movement, and by no means only in the South. I am thinking, for example, of a particularly ironic situation that exists right now in Washington. Howard University, a distinguished Negro institution, is building a new gymnasium. At least four of the building trades locals involved, however, have no Negroes working on the project. For that matter, these locals have only a handful of Negro members or apprentices.

The fundamental responsibility for solving problems like this is that of labor itself. Your group and others like it do a great deal to help. The Government also has a responsibility in this field: the work of the Vice President and the Equal Employment Committee is well known to you and the President has directed me to seek legal techniques, rules, and procedures to deal with such discrimination.

But there is a more fundamental responsibility for both you in the labor movement and for us in Government. We are as firmly opposed to discrimination in voting, education, and other fields as we are to discrimination in unions. It is in order to help the Nation act more effectively against discrimination that the President last week sent Congress a special message on civil rights. The administration's program includes three legislative proposals, concerning voting, education, and assistance to areas and organizations undertaking desegregation.

The first and most important bill deals with voting. The people's vote is the people's voice and when some people cannot vote they cannot effectively speak against injustice and deprivation of other rights.

It's like the story told at the time the 19th amendment was being voted on by the States. A decided antifeminist complained to his Congressman: "Can't you do something to stop them scarecrow suffragettes from voting?" The Congressman replied, "You mean my charming constituents of the fairer sex?"

We have worked very hard under existing law seeking to guarantee the right to vote to all citizens. The Department of Justice has filed 35 voting suits, 25 of them in this administration, challenging discrimination or threats in southern counties against Negro registration applicants. But this is a painfully slow way of providing what is, after all, the fundamental right of citizenship. There remain more than 200 counties in the South where less than 15 percent of the eligible Negroes are registered.

Even where we have brought suit, the cases require extremely detailed preparation. In our suit in Montgomery County, Ala., for example, it was necessary to analyze 36,000 pages of voted applications and to subpena 185 witnesses for the trial. Such suits each require the total attention of 4 to 6 of the 40 lawyers in our civil rights division for several months.

It often takes many more months before Negroes finally can register and vote. In Ouachita Parish, La., for example, the Department filed suit in July 1961. Although 24,000 out of the 40,000 eligible whites were registered to vote, only 725 of the 16,000 eligible Negroes were registered. Another 5,000 Negroes had, in fact, been purged from the voting rolls.

In the 33 months since we brought the suit, a special election for Congress has passed. A general election has passed. And still not even the date for trial has been set. It may well be 1964 before we finally secure a decision and Negroes can register and vote freely.

This is neither an extreme nor an isolated case. There is a real and immediate need for speeding up the process.

We are asking Congress, therefore, to authorize that voting suits be given preference on court dockets and tried in an expedited manner. This parallels the laws of many States which give priority to election suits in an effort to resolve them before the election is over and the chance to vote wiped out.

Even if cases can be expedited, there still will be a timelag between the filing of a suit and the issuance of orders against further discrimination. Therefore, we have asked Congress to provide for the appointment of temporary Federal referees to determine the qualifications of registration applicants during the time voting suits are pending in court.

In addition to the need for speed in guaranteeing the right to vote, there also is a great need for insuring fairness in determining who is qualified to vote.

Some Southern States use the literacy test to make this determination. As a result, barely literate whites, coached by the registrar, often are registered. Meanwhile, Negroes—like a National Science Foundation graduate student from Cornell, or teachers with advanced degrees—arbitrarily are declared illiterate and thus ineligible to vote.

Other States have used the constitutional interpretation test. Applicants must copy and explain sections of the Federal or State Constitutions. Negroes often are required to copy and interpret long, archaic sections of a State constitution, or are required to explain what due process means, to a registrar who knows no law.

Whites, meanwhile, copy such provisions as, "There shall be no imprisonment for debt." One white gentleman, who was registered, interpreted that section in these words:

"I think that a Neogroe Should Have 8 years in college Be for voting Be couse He dont under Stand."

We should reflect on such examples more in sadness than in irony, because they demonstrate the double burden of injustice inflicted on the Negro. Not only is he prevented from registering and voting, but the method of doing so is a grotesquely unfair test.

There's an acid joke about the Negro who attempted to register in a southern county. The registrar asked him to copy and interpret the 14th amendment. He did so, brilliantly. "All right, if you're so smart," the registrar said, "recite the Gettysburg Address from memory." The Negro did. "OK, give us the second inaugural speech." Again the Negro came through beautifully. Finally, the registrar pulled a Chinese newspaper out of his desk and asked, "Can you read this?"

"That's easy," said the Negro. "It says, 'No Negroes are going to vote in this State this year.' "

We are asking Congress in our proposed voting measure to prohibit specifically the use of different tests or standards for different registration applicants. And we have asked that completion of the sixth grade should be regarded as evidence that an applicant is literate.

We also are asking Congress for two other pieces of legislation, both stemming from a need for assistance as well as enforcement. Our experience has demonstrated that people want to obey the law. In the field of education, for example, the violence last fall at the University of Mississippi should not overshadow the fact that 60 southern school districts were desegregated last year—peacefully and without fanfare. In many cases the Department of Justice assisted through informal consultations.

Communities in the South not only want to obey the law, but they want and need assistance in doing so. One of the laws we seek would establish in the Office of Education a program of technical and financial assistance to communities in the process of integrating their schools.

Such a program would help such school districts profit from the lessons of others—such as Atlanta, where public and private bodies combined with great success in 1961 to desegregate schools without incident. Many communities lack the background and resources required to minimize tensions both outside and inside the schools and to assure the maintenance and improvement of educational standards.

We have applied the same principle of providing information in our third legislative proposal, for the extension and expansion of the Commission on Civil Rights. Not only community governments, but many organizations, both public and private, both in the North and the South, can benefit substantially from expert guidance and information about how others have handled integration problems.

The Civil Rights Commission has the background and ability to satisfy this need and the President consequently has recommended that it be authorized to serve as a national civil rights clearinghouse—providing information and technical guidance to any requesting agency.

Combined with continued effort under existing laws and policies, this, then is the administration's civil rights program. There are those who say this program does not go far enough. It is true that there is other civil rights legislation which might be introduced, such as a bill seeking authority for the Government to initiate school desegregation suits. But I would say to these critics that it is perfectly simple to introduce and support bills that have no chance of passage. But to do so would endanger measures that do have a chance. These critics have no responsibility for action. It is the aim of this administration to seek action and progress, not merely talk and headlines.

Further, let it be clear that this civil rights program is only that—a program. To sit back and wait for progress to come just because somebody in Washington has asked for new laws is as starry-eyed as waiting for the day labor minstrels once described when "the mills are made of marble and the machines are made of gold."

It took courage and effort for the labor movement to achieve the economic standards it enjoys today. It will take the same kind of effort to achieve the social ideals we profess in the field of civil rights.

We stand not only for labor or the Negro or minority groups, but for the ideal of freedom and dignity which underlies our society.

I come here today to call on you for your efforts on behalf of the administration's program. I come to ask you to speak out and act as a body. I ask you to go back to your internationals, your locals, and your communities to seek their support, both for this program and for its aim.

"Race discrimination," the President said in his civil rights message, "hampers our economic growth by preventing the maximum development and utilization of our manpower. It hampers our world leadership by contradicting at home the message we preach abroad. It mars the atmosphere of a united and classless society in which this Nation rose to greatness. It increases the costs of public welfare, crime, delinquency, and disorder. Above all, it is wrong."

EXHIBIT 2

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE CHESTER BOWLES, PRESIDENT'S SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE AND ADVISER ON AFRICAN, ASIAN, AND LATIN AMERICAN AFFAIRS, AT LINCOLN UNIVERSITY, OXFORD, PA., FEBRUARY 15, 1963

EMANCIPATION: THE RECORD AND THE CHALLENGE

Last autumn I made a month-long trip through 13 African countries. At each of my stops one question was inevitable, urgent, and recurrent: What about James Meredith at the University of Mississippi?

Time and time again, at press conferences, official dinners, and meetings with students, I was asked to explain events in Mississippi, their meaning for the future, and the views of the U.S. Government.

I soon found that the most effective means of extricating myself from a difficult tactical position was to take the offensive.

Where else, I would ask, have you ever heard of a government with such strong convictions about racial equality and such respect for law that it was willing to muster 16,000 soldiers to enforce the right of 1 Negro student to an integrated education?

The Meredith case, I would add, demonstrated that the United States is dedicated to the rule of law and to equal rights, despite the most bitter opposition from many Mississippians.

Fortunately, my questioners were so polite that they failed to ask me what surely occurred to them as an obvious followup question: Why, 100 years after our Emancipation Proclamation, was it necessary to call up an Army division to secure a basic human right established under the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution?

The answer to that unasked central question is clear to all of us: The process of fully integrating the 10 percent of our Nation which is Negro into the fabric of American society has been painfully slow—tragically and outrageously slow.

In regard to the democratic rights of our Negro citizens we have lived for nearly a century in a condition of moral sickness—relieved to have ended slavery, but callously indifferent to the child of slavery.

We have refused to face up to the implications of our faith and our democracy; we have postponed the action that our national conscience must demand of us.

And so a majority of Americans have continued to procrastinate and to refuse to become involved—sometimes out of malice or fear, more often because their attitudes have become insulated by the hardened cake of custom.

Yet when the history of our era has been written, it will be said that the pace of progress toward true emancipation has been far more rapid in the last decade than in the preceding nine decades, and that in 1963 the struggle for equal dignity and opportunity at long last began to assume promising new forms and extraordinary new vigor.

It is startling to remind ourselves that only a few years ago Negroes were still segregated in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Indeed I recall my own astonishment in 1949 when, as Governor of Connecticut, I desegregated our State National Guard and discovered that I was the first State Governor to do so.

Of all the changes that have marked these years of progress, however, none has been so important and so dramatic as the change in the attitude of Negroes themselves. In the last few years there has emerged a new sense of urgency, of impatience, of determination.

I might illustrate the pace of this change by citing a personal experience in 1954, the year of the Supreme Court decision.

I had recently returned from service in India, deeply conscious of the influence of Gandhi and especially of the moral power he had used in gaining freedom for his people from British rule: the moral power of passive resistance, victorious against the physical force of an empire.

In the spring of 1954 I was invited to speak at a distinguished Negro institution in Atlanta. In my talk I said that I knew of no case in history where one race had been able to deliver both freedom and dignity to another. Freedom, I said, was something that had to be fought for and won; regardless of the rights and wrongs, it could never be achieved without struggle.

I then described the role of Gandhi in leading such a fight for Indian freedom and how, through a passive but militant program of action, he and his followers eventually triumphed over the vastly superior military and economic power of the British Raj.

I concluded my talk with an appeal to the Negro students present to hold up their heads with pride and confidence and to develop a comparable program of cooperative action directed at achieving the equal opportunities guaranteed under our Constitution and reaffirmed by the Supreme Court.

To my surprise, I found that what I had regarded as a logical, temperate appeal had left my audience in something of a state of shock.

This was later explained by a student leader on the grounds that most of my hearers had never felt any personal responsibility for group action designed to establish their rights as citizens, and were hesitant to accept such responsibility now.

In the following months a remarkable pioneer, Dr. Martin Luther King, a man deeply influenced by Gandhi, assumed leadership in a historic first step toward firm, direct action on the Gandhian model—the Montgomery bus boycott.

Yet the temper of the times was slow to change. Even as late as 1958, when I wrote an article for the Saturday Evening Post, entitled "What Negroes Can Learn From Gandhi," I received many letters from thoughtful Negroes who questioned my central thesis. Though sympathetic with my objectives, they felt that action by Negroes could not be expected to solve their problems; responsibility belonged to others.

How dramatically the atmosphere has changed in these last 5 years. Today it is evident that Negroes with a new vision and a new commitment to results have taken command.

This is true not only among student groups—although many of them have led the way—but among the older and more established elements as well.

Indeed, what has been most striking about this new movement among our Negro citizens has been its dynamism, its depth of moral commitment, and its explicit charge of inaction against many leaders of previous generations.

Impatience is the watchword of the new generation of Negro students—and high time it is for such impatience.

Yet impatience is a quality of mind, not a program. What lies ahead? And, the most important question of all, what are the implications of the Negro's struggle for the future of American society?

In the last 10 years the principal focus of the continuing battle for equal rights has been twofold; in the area of school integration—the route to the intellectual excellence, and peaceful human relations both inside and outside the school building; and in the area of voting rights—the route to political responsibility.

Let us consider in some detail the first of these basic areas: what has been accomplished, and what we have learned for the future.

Much has been said about progress toward school desegregation, and we should be gratified by this progress. Yet 9 years after the Supreme Court's historic decision, out of 3,200,000 Negro children attending schools in the 17 Southern States and the District of Columbia that formerly practiced segregation, only 200,000 are in fact now attending integrated schools. And of these 200,000 the vast majority are in schools that are either 95 percent Negro or 95 percent white.

In other words, the record still shows that old patterns of segregation remain largely unchanged for the vast majority of Negro students. And because of the complexities of our laws, the opportunities for delay, and court acquiescence in so-called token integration as evidence of compliance, this situation will be slow to change.

As our new Ambassador to Finland, Carl T. Rowan, pointed out in a recent article in the Saturday Evening Post "There is something about these legal dodges, these obvious frauds, that leaves me baffled."

Nine years after the Supreme Court's decision, it seems to me that not just Negroes, but all of us, are entitled to ask: Precisely what is the meaning of "all deliberate speed"?

I for one think it means something more than the so-called token integration that we have witnessed so far. I am tempted to say that the 14th amendment, as the "law of the land," should be regarded as exactly that, and enforced like any other law.

Yet it is far easier to deplore the slow pace than to provide effective answers. On the basis of our experience, what can be said about the nature of segregation as a problem?

In the first place, it would be simple but unfair smugly to castigate the South for the snail's pace of integration—for its failure by and large to comply with a court decision that is overwhelmingly unpopular in that region. In view of the equally slow rate of change in many parts of the North, this would be sheer hypocrisy. Segregation is clearly a national problem, not a regional one.

Now can we escape from our national dilemma and responsibility by thinking of integration as purely a legal question dividing those who believe in upholding the law from those who seek to circumvent it. This turns the problem inside out. The Supreme Court acted because the constitutional guarantee of equality involves the deepest political principles of this Nation; on the basis of these principles, segregation poses a moral issue which goes to the heart of our society.

In short, the primary reason why racial discrimination in America must ultimately be ended is not because of a clause in our Constitution, nor, as we sometimes hear, because of the Communist challenge, nor because of the need to curry favor with the new African States which now account for nearly one-third of the United Nations.

The reason is purely and simply because racial discrimination is fundamentally wrong. It flies in the fact of our Judeo-Christian heritage, our democratic ethics, our sense of how man should treat his brother.

And it is every bit as wrong in the North, where custom and economics serve unwittingly as the enforcement agency, as it is in the South, where the local police and often the school boards themselves more dramatically strive to hold back the clock.

Let us look the facts squarely in the face: In many Northern cities which customarily elect liberal mayors, liberal city councilors and liberal Congressmen, the professed equal protection under law still hides extensive segregation in fact—by residential exclusion and by the natural selection of poverty. As a result, in only a handful of northern cities do more than 20 percent of the Negro students now attend school with white children.

If we are to be honest, therefore, the conclusion seems to me inescapable that an immediate and perfectly executed legal application of the Supreme Court's order—welcome though it would be—would not by itself eliminate the pattern of segregation; it would only establish it along new lines.

This is not to minimize the tremendous achievements of a whole generation of able lawyers and strategists who have fought and won literally hundreds of legal battles on behalf of racial democracy. Without the dedication and leadership provided by such men as the late Walter White, A. Phillip Randolph, Lester Granger, Roy Wilkins, Thurgood Marshall, Robert Weaver, Whitney Young, and many more, we would not be making the extraordinary progress we are achieving today.

Yet these great leaders would be the first to agree that their efforts have been designed to establish the legal rights of our Negro citizens in order to create a solid framework for the civil rights breakthrough which is yet to come—that legal action alone is inadequate to free the 15 million Americans who still suffer discrimination because of the color of their skin.

To illustrate the point, let me briefly consider the present results of integration in the city of Washington, D.C., from a hopefully impartial viewpoint.

Here is a city that has rapidly evolved from a southern to a northern community. Yet after a program of successful school integration, approximately 80 percent of the schools in Washington, although theoretically integrated, are in fact still attended mostly by Negro students.

The problem does not lie, as some have charged, in the mechanics of integration. If responsibility can be fixed anywhere, it should focus on the totally inadequate social, health, welfare, and educational programs forced on the District of Columbia by a long record of congressional stinginess, indifference, and neglect.

What can be done about this? A great deal can be done about it—starting with home rule for the Capital City of the United States, continued White House pressure along the lines of the President's recent message, and increased welfare and educational program funds.

In the meantime, our experience in Washington underscores the fact that school integration alone is not an adequate answer. The Supreme Court decision and the enlightened and courageous action of many school boards and city governments in carrying out its provisions are important steps toward the elimination of all discrimination. Yet such action cannot be expected by itself to solve the basic problem.

What can we conclude from these first years of struggle toward full equality for the Negro student?

The primary lesson for us, I believe, is that what has to be changed is not simply the school districting and admission process, but the attitude of the whole community—white and Negro alike.

Court orders cannot transform the hearts and minds of people. A reluctant and grudging acceptance of the inevitable force of the law will prove inadequate, for laws can win support only if they embody the moral purposes of our society.

Therefore, the task of those who are determined to establish equal rights, opportunities, and responsibilities for all Americans goes beyond victorious court decisions and becomes a task of persuasion: to convince people that these decisions are right, and especially, to convince white people that integration is not personally or economically damaging.

Only in this way can we bring the divergent elements of every community into growing harmony.

This particular aspect of the problem was aptly put in a recent magazine article in which the writer described our objective in terms of persuading the man who wouldn't mind a Ralph Bunche as a next-door neighbor also to accept a Ralph Brown.

Unless we can so broaden his perspective, white neighborhoods will remain white, Negro will remain Negro, and all the laws, court orders, and Federal directives in the world will not suffice to make a fundamental alteration in the ugly persistent pattern of segregation.

What I am saying is that school integration is not an end itself but one means among many of reaching the fundamental objective of our democratic society which is nothing less than complete social, economic, and political equality for all Americans.

A second means to full democracy, of course, is the right to vote. On this vital issue I am proud of the record that the present administration has made toward the enfranchisement of Negroes in Southern States.

But here again progress is inevitably slow, with a tangle of legal obstacles to be overcome, county by county, State by State.

The 1960 Democratic platform, which as committee chairman I helped to draft, pledges this administration "to assure equal access for all Americans to all areas of community life, including voting booths, schoolrooms, jobs, housing, and public facilities."

In my opinion, that pledge still stands at the top of our agenda in dealing with the unfinished business of our society.

So much for the lessons of the past decade. What are our responsibilities for the future?

Let me begin with the task facing Negroes.

It seems to me that the basic question that confronts the Negro community today is essentially a tactical one of how our democratic objectives can best be achieved.

As I see it, there are three courses of action available:

At one extreme is the strictly legalistic approach through continued court action and patient efforts at public education.

At the other extreme are those, such as the Black Muslims, who assert that the only answer lies in violence and separation.

A third course which lies between these two extremes can perhaps be best described as a policy of continued legal action backed by a persuasive militancy among all Americans—white and Negro directed toward the conscience of the white man. It is this combination approach which in my opinion offers the greatest hope to Negroes and to the future of our society.

This means nonviolence undertaken in full acceptance of the risks of the violence it may provoke; but nonviolence directed toward the conscience of the white man. It is this combination approach which in my opinion offers the geatest hope to Negroes and to the future of our society.

This brings me to an important point: One of the most remarkable phenomena of the struggle for equality in this country has been the extraordinary patience of most of our Negro fellow citizens.

James Baldwin recently wrote, in "The Fire Next Time," of his immense respect for generations of Negro Americans who understood that "the country was in no hurry to educate Negroes," and who "put their pride in their pockets in order to do it." He spoke of "that unsung army of black men and women who trudged down back lanes and entered back doors saying 'yes, sir' and 'no, ma'am' in order to acquire a new roof for the schoolhouse, new books, a new chemistry lab, more beds for the dormitories, more dormitories."

I share Mr. Baldwin's respect. After 100 years of penitent yes, sir's and no, ma'am's, it is extraordinary that the Negro's patience has not long since erupted into violence.

However much we may deplore it, a sense of frustration, antagonism, and belligerence after a century of patient and until recently largely fruitless effort, is understandable in human terms. Indeed, it is possible that the new dynamism we are witnessing among today's Negro students and leaders may in fact be turned toward negative and destructive channels.

This would be both tragic and self-defeating. Instead of eliminating the evils of segregation, it would tend to perpetuate them.

On the other hand, blind, unquestioning patience, I regret to say, is unlikely to produce results either. After a century of waiting for the courts and the Government fully to implement the 14th amendment, we may conclude that in this revolutionary era "trickle-down democracy" is much too slow a process.

What is needed is not just equal rights in law but equal skills in fact, leading to equal opportunities. The quality of Negro education must be improved through local school boards, by court action, by militant pressure from local citizen groups, and by more adequate budgets.

There must also be a greatly invigorated new effort to strengthen and to assist Negro youngsters who are now handicapped by inadequate housing, education, and cultural opportunities.

Can this be done by whites working in behalf of Negroes? Can it be done by legal recourse to the courts, the Federal Government, and State legislatures? To some degree—perhaps to a large degree—it can.

But I believe the major progress that has been made in the last decade has been due, not to the Supreme Court decision of 1954, great as it was, which acted essentially as a trigger, nor to meager and long overdue legislative handouts, but to the new militancy, the new unity of purpose, and the new willingness to make sacrifices which is becoming evident throughout the Negro community.

The problem for the Negro community is to find a constructive approach that is vigorous enough to produce results, yet not so provocative as to close doors that have already been opened or are in the process of opening.

What now can we say of the chief responsibility of all Americans, both white and Negro, in this struggle for the realization of our democratic objectives?

One easy reply is reliance on Government action.

Yet there is a clear limit to what even our Federal Government can do. To be sure, Government must be prodded and pressured; but Government has to deal with scores of problems; and its attention is necessarily divided. Discrimination is only one among many problems, all important, all clamoring for solutions.

For this reason alone, it is shortsighted and inadequate to look wholly to Government. What white Americans need is a new climate of urgency, a new framework for action, a new perspective on the basic problem and the means of dealing with it on a local neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis.

Basic to such an approach, in my opinion, is a nationwide inventory, an analysis, of the civil rights problems of every community in the United States as a basis for community action.

I am not suggesting a critical exercise by unfriendly snoopers armed with sliderules and IBM cards. What I have in mind is an honest evaluation by a committee of public-spirited local citizens of both races, working through religious and civic groups with the support of the community.

The efforts of these committees would be narrowly directed at factfinding. But their reports would inevitably become vehicles for discussion, disagreement and, I am sure, in many cases an evolving consensus about the unfinished business of local democracy and what can and should be done about it.

If the growing national concern about discrimination can be channeled into hundreds of community programs throughout the country, spectacular progress may be achieved in the finest tradition of American democracy.

A citizen's "check list" for communities both North and South of the Mason-Dixon line might include the following questions:

How many Negroes are members of the police force? The fire department? City hall? The school system?

Do Negroes have a full opportunity to get such jobs? And if so, are they promoted solely on merit and performance?

What kind of housing, both public and private, is available to Negroes? What kind of medical and hospital care?

Is there direct or indirect discrimination in public housing and entertainment facilities?

What about private enterprise jobs? Do Negro workers have jobs which use their skill to the fullest?

Is vocational and professional training freely available to qualified Negroes?

Are the police and the courts as fair to them as to other sections of the population?

A widely-publicized, objective study by nongovernmental groups in each city under the sponsorship of a national committee of outstanding citizens, with able and respected local leadership, supported by churches and synagogues, could do much to develop agreement in thousands of communities in regard to such questions.

And once the facts are agreed upon, responsible Negroes and whites working together can learn to deal with them effectively through constructive democratic action.

In closing, let me add a few words about the vitally important role of the Negro in contemporary American history.

Thoughtful observers recognize the new Negro movement toward full equality and first-class citizenship as a unique phenomenon in American society. No other cause is compelling the allegiance of so many young Americans with such intensity and fervor.

This fact has deep significance in the present condition of American society. For the Negro's struggle is taking place within a Nation that too often appears to have forgotten its own moral values, and to have largely lost its sense of positive purpose. Indeed, it may be said that our Negro citizens have a clearer idea of what they really want than any other Americans.

In our efforts to deal pragmatically with a vast agenda of new and unfamiliar problems, we Americans have been losing something of the moral direction which has always been basic to the health and vigor of our society.

We have not only condoned the slick operator and cynical manipulator; in a backhanded sort of way, we have glorified them. We have adopted the semantics of materialism and manipulation to explain some of our most admirable actions. It is as though we felt it necessary to justify decency by proving that the real reasons for our actions are not so decent as they might seem.

Indeed, at the very moment in history when the true nature of our world contest with communism is coming into focus, we find ourselves faced with a crisis in values. The moral standards in which we profess to believe are marred by our immoral tolerance of tax evasion and false expense accounts, of fake advertisements, the thumb on the

scale, the adulterated product, and the exploitation of violence as entertainment.

In our national effort not to seem gullible, not to seem vulnerable to criticism from any quarter, to avoid controversy, and to prove that we are "realists" who do not "go off half-cocked," we have developed a moral gap between the beliefs to which we subscribe and our actual day-to-day performance. This moral gap can become an increasing danger to our survival as a free society.

It is in this context that I see a special responsibility and opportunity for American Negroes. For in the course of removing our national curse of racial discrimination, the Negro can force all Americans of good conscience to reexamine their own sense of values.

And so the leaders in the civil rights struggle can help to bridge the dangerous gap which increasingly exists between beliefs and actions. They can reawaken in their fellow Americans a commitment to the moral objectives on which our society was founded—and this reawakening can give a new tone, a new vigor, and a new honesty to the American Nation.

Regardless of color, most Americans now know in their hearts that the time for explanations is over and that the time for action is here on the great frontier of civil rights.

The challenge to the American Negro is enormous.

Today we see him increasingly accept that challenge, and in so doing set a standard for all Americans to follow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn, under the previous order, until noon on Thursday of this week.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, March 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 25, 1963:

IN THE COAST GUARD

Capt. Albert J. Carpenter, U.S. Coast Guard, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 25, 1963:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., of New York, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

Richard H. Holton, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 25, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The Clerk will read the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARCH 25, 1963.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I John 2: 17: *He that doeth the will of God abideth forever.*

Eternal God, our Father, grant that the motives, which daily impel our thoughts and actions and the aims and aspirations, which dominate our lives, may not be at variance with Thy will and the true, the beautiful, and the good.

Inspire us with a passionate desire to devote and dedicate our strength of body, mind, and heart to every worthy enterprise and forward movement that will minister to the health and happiness of all mankind.

May we never seek to avoid and escape our responsibilities to have a share in promoting not only the material and physical welfare of humanity but in elevating and enforcing its moral and spiritual well-being.

To Thy Name, through Christ Jesus, our Lord, we shall give all the praise and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 21, 1963, was read and approved.

COSTA RICAN CONFERENCE SHOWS SUPPORT FOR ACTION TO ISOLATE COMMUNIST CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the conference of Central American leaders meeting with the President and congressional representatives recently in San Jose, Costa Rica, has produced evidence that a firm basis for hemispheric isolation of Communist Cuba not only exists, but cries for leadership and action.

The exuberance and warmth which our President and delegation received in Costa Rica dramatically proves that the hopes and aspirations of our Latin neighbors are riding with the United States, a fact which is given additional credence by the unanimous support which this Nation received in the Organization of American States last October during the Cuban missile crisis.

But the Communists are organizing rapidly in Latin America, ironically they plan to convene in Brazil shortly, a country which is at this moment pleading for U.S. financial aid. In the face of this threat to the freedom of this hemisphere, we cannot withhold a solution to the Cuban problem.

As the President has now stated, our immediate policy is the isolation of Cuba. It is gratifying to see that one of the topics discussed at Costa Rica included measures I have long recommended as necessary to place Cuba in solitary confinement—namely the ban on movement of Castro agents and propaganda, and the restriction of Cuban Government funds.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the United States assume the first step of leadership by closing U.S. ports to nations which engage in sea trade with Cuba, then make the following proposals to the OAS for adoption by the nations of this hemisphere:

First, close hemispheric seaports to nations engaged in sea trade with Cuba,

Second, close hemispheric airports to airlines flying into Cuba,

Third, ban movement of Castro agents and propaganda throughout Latin America,

Fourth, ban relay of unofficial telecommunications messages to and from Cuba, and

Fifth, freeze Cuban Government funds now on deposit in Latin American financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, adoption of this plan by the Organization of American States would effectively place Cuba in solitary confinement. Isolation of Cuba is now a matter of official U.S. policy, and the above steps are our only immediate recourse to the Cuban problem short of an act of war.

If we are serious about fighting communism in this hemisphere, we will act quickly in the coming days with a concentrated, hard-driving campaign to place the policy of isolating Cuba into practice.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS TRANSFERRED

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent that all special orders heretofore entered into for tomorrow and Wednesday be carried over until Thursday next.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would those that were scheduled for tomorrow come first then on Thursday?

Mr. BOGGS. That would be my understanding, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HALLECK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, might I inquire of the majority whip whether his request was to the effect that all special orders for today and tomorrow go over?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the request is for those special orders for Tuesday and Wednesday.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PROTECTION OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inform the House that I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. James J. Rowley, Chief, U.S. Secret Service, relative to the protection of the Vice President of the United States.

The letter follows:

Treasury Department,
U.S. Secret Service,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.

The Honorable John W. McCormack,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Speaker: In response to your request for my comments on the remarks yesterday by Congressman Silvio O. Conte, regarding the Secret Service's appropriation request for additional staff to carry out its responsibilities under present law which calls for the protection of the Vice President, may I say that a number of questions were raised that need clarification.

As you know, the present law states: "Subject to the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, the U.S. Secret Service, Treasury Department, is authorized to protect the person of the President of the United States, the members of his immediate family, the President-elect, the Vice President or other officer next in order of succession to the office of President, or the Vice President-elect; protect a former President, at his request, for a reasonable time after he leaves office."

This law was approved October 15, 1962.

The request to the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, made on March 11 of this year, was the first time that the Secret Service sought, in the routine presentation of its operating needs for the coming fiscal year 1964, the funds it had determined as needed to carry out its responsibilities under the law.

At the hearings last week I furnished the subcommittee the number of personnel the Service had determined was needed, after careful consideration of the responsibilities and nature of duties required. As this testimony was made in executive session, and has not been made public by the subcommittee, I feel I must stand upon my position as outlined to the subcommittee.

At this point it is appropriate to point out that Vice President Johnson had not made any requests for the protective services proposed nor was he consulted concerning the number of personnel determined to be necessary to properly protect the person of the Vice President. The request for appropriations was made because the present law, Public Law 87-829, broadened considerably the scope of the Service's protective responsibilities which in turn requires additional personnel to carry out its provisions.

The present law differs markedly from the law under which the Secret Service protected the Vice President during the previous decade. On July 16, 1951, spurred by such events as the assassination attempt upon President Truman at the Blair House, the law which set forth the protective duties of the Secret Service was amended to include protection of the Vice President at his request.

The new law has three objectives: To close loopholes that existed in the old law with respect to threats against, and Secret Service protection for, the person who is next in line for the Presidency. Second, to remove from the Vice President the discretion as to whether he should or should not receive Secret Service protection. Third, to authorize Secret Service protection of a former President for a reasonable time after he leaves office.

Therefore it was clear that the intent and purpose of the present law was to focus upon the inadequacies of the old law regarding the succession to the Presidency, by authorizing adequate protection to the President and the Vice President, or in the event of their deaths, the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Secretary of State, etc. The law closed the gap by recognizing the reality that Presidents in the past have been killed, or died in office, and so have officers in the sequence of possible succession.

Further than that, the new law took heed of the fact that in the period 1951 to 1962 the President had no choice whether or not he was protected by the Secret Service. But as to the Vice President, he was to be protected only upon his request. Should he not choose to request it, the Secret Service was not authorized to furnish it.

The reasoning behind this phase of the law was clear: If a Vice President did not ask for protection, he was highly vulnerable to attempts upon his life. When he asked for protection only upon occasion, this kind of part-time protection was highly unsatisfactory, and indeed, ineffectual. Anyone who wanted to harm him need only plan to do so at a time when the Secret Service was not guarding him.

A bill to eliminate the discretion of the Vice President as to whether or not he will receive protection was first proposed in 1960, and was passed by the Senate in that year, but was not acted upon by the House of Representatives. When the law was first proposed, the Treasury Department, in its transmittal of the legislation, expressed the opinion that the existing law, providing protection for the Vice President only at his request, "presents an untenable situation." The Treasury further pointed out that part-time protection is ineffectual, since anyone with a premeditated design to harm the Vice President would be expected to execute his plan at a time when no Secret Service protection was afforded.

The bill was again introduced in 1961, and lay pending until it was passed by the Senate and approved on October 15, 1962. In retransmitting it the argument was again put forth that gaps in existing legislation needed closing with respect to those individuals who were next in line to the Presidency.

I would like to further emphasize that the growing importance of the Office of the Vice Presidency, the troubled times in which we live—marked by international plots and counterplots, the possibility of actions of the mentally unstable—all have fortified my belief that the assignment of Secret Service agents to the protection of the Vice President is in the best interest of the U.S. Government.

Congressman Conte referred to the difference between the number of men assigned to protect Vice President Johnson prior to the passage of the current law, and the number now being requested. In the light of my experience over the past 24 years, and through the accumulated experience of our agents in protecting Presidents of the United States, I feel that I am in a position best suited to make such plans and prescribe the manpower needed.

Under the old law, the protection by the Secret Service was intermittent, and not around the clock. To provide the manpower needed, the Service drew upon its existing personnel, generally from the field offices. Now that the law calls for adequate, full-time protection, it is obvious that more individuals are needed.

In order to carry out its responsibilities, the Secret Service must now provide full-time around-the-clock protection for the Vice President's residence and for his person. To provide such protection on a minimum basis it estimates 36 persons will be required on the basis of a 40-hour working week for each agent, plus time off for holidays, sickness, and annual leave.

Congressman Conte indicated he would agree to protection of the Vice President 24 hours a day for 365 days a year, but that no more than two agents should be made available to do this entire job except when the Vice President was on an exceptionally important mission. Such a limited number of agents, of course, could not even begin to provide protection on an around-the-clock basis, 365 days a year.

I agree as to the inadvisability of taking agents away from their duties in the field in order to provide protection. This is just what our request for personnel is designed to avoid. The only way to insure adequate protection is to establish a detail specifically charged with the task, and not to rely upon part-time services from personnel assigned to other duties.

The issues raised by Congressman Conte are sensitive ones. No one impugns the courage of the President or the Vice President, or any of the gentlemen covered by the provisions of the law. This is not a question of their courage, nor of their own desire for privacy or freedom from the burden such protection necessarily imposes. The responsibilities we face are the safety of the men who stand at the highest elective posts in the land. We must adequately plan to meet such contingencies as accidents, or deeds of violence, as unpleasant as they may be. The Secret Service as the organization which must meet this full-time responsibility, cannot do so on a part-time basis.

It is clear that the protection called for in the law, and for which we have asked the necessary appropriations, is not for the individual, but for the position of the Vice President—a position second only to that of the Presidency of the United States—the position from which the Nation will draw its next Chief Executive in the unhappy event that this would become necessary because of death.

There are a great many Americans whose lives may be in greater potential danger than that of the Vice President, as Congressman Conte said, but they are not the President nor those who would be, in the event of tragedy. We in the Secret Service feel strongly that this is what the law considers in assigning us the responsibility of providing the necessary protection.

If Congress does not wish to provide the funds necessary to carry out the mandate of the new law, it should be repealed. As long as the law is on the books, however, I feel that it is my duty to provide for its proper administration.

Sincerely yours,

James J. Rowley.

Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.

The Treasury Department today said that the request of the Secret Service for 36 positions in order to fulfill its statutory responsibilities of protecting the Vice President has apparently been subject to misunderstanding because of the nature of protective work.

There will not be 36 agents accompanying the Vice President at once. There will normally be only 4 assigned at any one time to protective duties, which means advance work as well as on-the-spot protection. The protective organization would also include two agents assigned to the Vice President's Washington residence and one agent to his Texas home.

How, then, does the total figure come to 36? Because there are three 8-hour shifts to be filled, because the weekends must be covered as well as week days, and because sick and annual leave must be taken into account. The overall number includes supporting personnel bringing the total to 36.

Under the old law, Vice Presidents were furnished protection upon request (not necessarily the request of the Vice President, but also of the President or the Secretary of the Treasury). This was unsatisfactory because a Vice President or other people acting on his behalf should not be required to make the decision as to whether or not he needs protection. That is the reason for the legislation giving this responsibility to the Secret Service through the Treasury Department. It was first proposed and passed by the Senate in 1960. It became law last October.

The following points will also help clarify recent discussions of this matter:

1. The Secret Service as an interim measure assigned 19 agents to the protection of the Vice President last fall after the new legislation was approved. In order to meet its responsibilities to the extent possible in the absence of any appropriated funds, it became necessary for the Secret Service temporarily to draw agents from the field for this purpose.

2. The law authorizes rather than directs this protection of the Vice President. This provision is identical to that authorizing protection of the President. The purpose of last year's legislation was to give the Secret Service responsibility for protecting the Vice President in the exact same manner as it already had the responsibility for protecting the President.

3. Under the former law, Vice President Johnson refused to request full-time permanent protection. He made only occasional requests for oversea travel and where large crowds or other special circumstances made temporary protection necessary in domestic travel.

GRATEFUL MEMORY AND HOPEFUL FORECAST

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this is the centennial year of Boston College. Boston College has exercised a mighty and beneficial influence upon the intellectual and moral thought of our country and has been a glory and credit to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. All sacrifices of the past in establishing this institution are vindicated as one beholds this magnificent higher institution of learning as it stands today.

A nobler civilization is the dream of all men through the ages and it has been this high hope that Boston College has served so steadfastly. Beginning humbly, it has flourished in the great traditions set down by Jesuit educators some four centuries ago. Prompted by the age-old search for truth, goodness, and beauty, its endeavors have enriched our civilization.

I recall once reading an anniversary address by Henry Van Dyke in which he said: "The occasion is one of grateful memory and hopeful forecast." Such an event is this. Grateful memories of a heritage won by toil, hopes, and prayers, and hopeful forecast for a better world won by the search for truth and the attaining of wisdom.

Boston College has been fortunate indeed in the dedicated and talented men who have been associated with her through the years. I might add that Father Walsh, who is providing one of the richest periods in the history of Boston College, is a worthy successor to the great men who built this school.

A small but determined group of men led by Father John McElroy saw their hope for a college to serve the large Catholic community of Boston materialize with approval of a charter for Boston College on April 1, 1863. The years ahead were filled with struggle but the college grew and the city grew around it. The enrollment increased steadily each year and by 1905 it had reached 500. Cramped college facilities led to the building, under the leadership of Father Gasson, of this loveliest of campuses at Chesnut Hill and the first classes were held there exactly 50 years ago. The school continued to expand and today the original faculty of six Jesuits has grown to become the largest collegiate teaching community of Jesuits in the world.[1]

Although the history of Boston College is not unique in its growth amidst tremendous hardship, it is a towering monument to the devoted men of the Society of Jesus who have made this community of learning possible. The test of the ages imparts confidence in the Catholic system of education where the teaching of Christian morality is never lost sight of and goes hand-in-hand with the mental training of youth.

While recognizing the value of specialized skills, Boston College has adhered to the Jesuit belief in the excellence of a liberal arts education. In his "Idea of a University," Cardinal Newman wrote:

> A university training is the great ordinary means to a great but ordinary end; it aims at raising the intellectual tone of society, at cultivating the public mind, at purifying the national taste, at supplying true principles to popular enthusiasm and fixed aims to popular aspirations, at giving enlargement and sobriety to the ideas of the age, at facilitating the exercise of political power, and refining the intercourse of private life. It is the education which gives a man a clear conscious view of his own opinions and judgments, a truth in developing them, an eloquence in expressing them, and a force in urging them. It prepares him to fill any post with credit, and to master any subject with facility.

This has been the function of Boston College.

The 100th anniversary of this institution brings forth grateful memories of great men and great ideas which have been fulfilled throughout the years of growth and maturing. And the occasion also brings to mind illustrious men who have passed through the portals of this college as students, such as our beloved Cardinal Cushing and the honored and eminent Cardinal O'Connell who exclaimed as a student:

> I am more in love with the college than ever. There is plenty of hard work, but there is happiness and fine feeling all around.

Because of its solid foundation and rich heritage, Boston College offers today a hopeful forecast. In these critical times, with the ever increasing needs for an educated citizenry, Boston College is a fortress of broad and humane learning, a kind of learning which is often overlooked in today's clamor for vocationalism in American education. With higher learning so essential to our democratic way of life, the role of the private college becomes vital. The Jesuit school, particularly, provides the necessary well-rounded mental development for coping successfully with the deepening complexity of our age. The undergraduate and graduate schools of Boston College must continue to send out men and women who will provide leadership for our Commonwealth and other parts of the world. Our American way of life depends upon these graduates sent out as well equipped teachers, priests, lawyers—serving as judges, legislators and attorneys, and leaders for industry, business, and the community.

A century ago Ralph Waldo Emerson penned these lines:

> Daughters of Time, the hypocritic Days,
> Muffled and dumb like barefoot dervishes,
> And marching single in an endless file,
> Bring diadems and fagots in their hands,
> To each they offer gifts after his will,
> Bread, kindom, stars, and sky that holds
> them all.

Our age brings days of unlimited opportunity—days in which our moral strength and intellectual power can be used to shape a better and more peaceful world despite pessimistic moods and alarm over the development of nuclear weapons, inordinate scientific knowledge, and precarious international relationships. The days bring gifts of greater challenge than ever before. In a recent writing, Cardinal Cushing warned:

> The urgency of the times makes it imperative for us to take counsel, to sharpen our thought in regard to the specific ideals for which we stand. This is a period of transition, of realinement. We are seemingly at the end of a civilization.

The times are dangerous, but there is hopeful forecast in a university such as this one, dedicated as it is to truth and wisdom, both human and divine. The knowledge and morality imparted by Boston College will be of no small value in the contests which face us. We echo the words in Proverbs:

---

[1] Frost, Jack, "The Crowned Hilltop," Boston: Hawthorne Press, 1962.

> Through knowledge shall the just be divided.

I congratulate Boston College on its splendor and successful achievements. My sincere hope is that Boston College may continue to develop and prosper, that the sphere of its influence may ever increase, and that the sons and daughters of Boston College will be found in the coming years, as in the past, leading useful lives, doing good to their fellow men, ever faithful to the teachings of their glorious alma mater, and improving and strengthening our institutions of government.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, marks the 142d anniversary of the Greek war of independence. I am pleased to pay tribute to the Greek people and their indomitable spirit. Greek learning, philosophy, science, and drama have had a profound impact upon our modern civilization. In the United States we live under a system of government propounded from Greek culture—democracy, a word held sacred by all Americans.

In their homeland, the spirit of ancient Greece resides in the hearts of all the inhabitants, just as it did when their nation was a conquered territory under the rule of Ottoman might. The Greece of 1821 was governed by Turkish officials and had been since the fall of Constantinople in the 15th century. The populace was not unduly persecuted by their Muslim overlords; in fact, many Greeks had attained responsible positions in the government of the Sublime Porte. Yet ethnic mores and deeprooted traditions recalled to the citizens of the Hellenes that their land was the home of the hero, of democracy, and freedom. Bondage could not and would not be tolerated forever.

The weakening of the Turkish Government gave to the conquered peoples of the empire an opportunity to seek autonomy and, as in the case of Greece, independence. Borrowing from their heroic past, a group of peasants armed with clubs, scythes, and slings, and led by the Archbishop Germanos of Patras, raised the banner of liberty at Kalavryta on March 25, 1821, and declared their fight for freedom. Ships, so important to the defenders of Athens against the forces of Darius and Xerxes, were employed to defend the coastlines against invading armies from Turkey and Egypt. Familiar terrain was used to great advantage against alien troops by selecting in advance propitious sites for battles to be fought. Rebellion soon spread across the Isthmus of Corinth to Attica and Boeotia.

The nations of the world first became cognizant of this struggle when the Greek Orthodox patriarch, Gregorious of Constantinople, was executed. His execution was followed by a series of massacres of Christians which the Russian czar, as Protector of the Orthodox Church, took as a personal affront. The cause then became one for all of Christendom.

In the United States the sympathy of the American people was so great that cities and towns were named to honor this struggle for liberty. Thus we have several Athens, a Spartansburg, Corinth, an Ithaca, and 31 Troys. Groups of Philhellenes sprang up throughout America to fill ships with much needed clothing, medical supplies, and food. Daniel Webster spoke in the House for official support of the Greek patriots, while President Monroe inserted in his famous address, which contained the Monroe Doctrine, a section expressing America's sympathy and urging aid for the Greeks.

The ranks of the insurgents, swelled by volunteers from America and Europe, including the poet, Lord Byron, were at first highly successful. The Acropolis at Athens, the symbol of democracy for the world, was seized, as were many other cities throughout the Peloponnesus. A constitution was proclaimed in January 1822 with Prince Alexander Mavrocordato presiding over the first national assembly at Epidaurus. The Turks, in retaliation for their losses on the mainland, attacked with full force some of the islands and proceeded to massacre the inhabitants. Chios was used as an example to the others, as a threat not to join with the rebels; 25,000 inhabitants were slaughtered, and 45,000 were sold into slavery. This warning only enraged the Greeks to greater ferocity; so when Turkish garrisons fell into their hands, all were put to the sword. The reciprocal atrocities left the land ravaged and war torn.

There followed a period of internal strife among the victorious Greek forces. Mavrocordato was discredited and challenged by other leaders, which led to civil war between the Greek parties. The Government, though, was able to suppress the internecine strife and prevent the Turks from reconquering any territory.

In 1824, the sultan, unable to check the advance of the insurgents, called upon Mehemet Ali, Governor of Egypt, for succor. The pasha's son, Ibrahim, eluded the Greek fleet and, on February 24, 1825, landed at Modon in the Morea with a well-equipped army of 4,000 regular infantry and 500 cavalry. There followed a series of victories for the Turks, and the Greek forces retreated to the cities which they held in the south. Missolonghi was besieged for 12 months and capitulated only when command of the sea was lost. Athens, too, was taken, but the Acropolis held out until forced to surrender 9 months later.

It was now the turn of the European powers to enter into the fray. England, France, and Russia had pledged on May 6, 1827, that Greece should be given autonomy under Turkish suzerainty. Fearing now that the Porte would again enslave the populace, a joint British-French-Russian fleet entered Greek water and attempted to relieve the besieged rebels. At the battle of Navarino on October 20, 1827, the allied fleet completely destroyed the Turkish ships, thus preventing supplies from reaching Ibrahim's troops. When the hard-pressed sultan called for a holy war against the insurgents and their allies, Russia declared war on the Ottoman Empire and proceeded to attack the Porte from the north. The command of the Greco-allied fleet in the Peloponnesus was entrusted to Lord Cochrane, while the land forces were put under the command of General Church.

Now on the defensive, the sultan agreed by protocol, signed on February 3, 1828, and implemented in the treaty of Adrianople, September 1829, to complete independence for the Greeks. Turkish troops soon began evacuating Greek territory, and independence became a reality. The rebellion had lasted many years. Victorious but utterly devastated, Greece emerged as a sovereign state, created and sanctioned by the Convention of London on May 11, 1832.

The years following independence were ones of internal consolidation and acquisition. Thessaly, most of Greek-inhabited Epirus and Macedonia, Crete, and the majority of the Aegean Islands were added to the kingdom. Dissension between the Greek people and their Bavarian Prince Otho, who had been selected by the convention powers to be ruler, brought about the deposition of the king and the election and installation of Prince William of Denmark, who took the title George I of the Hellense, the progenitor of the present king. When he took his oath of accession, he promised to uphold a new constitution which proclaimed a monarchical democracy.

With the advent of World War II, much of what had been accomplished since independence was destroyed. On October 28, 1940, the Italians invaded the country from Albania, and were immediately repulsed by the Greek army under the command of Alexander Pagapos. The Germans, though, came to the aid of their stricken ally and soon overran the entire mainland and islands. The King and his government fled into enforced exile. During the 3½ years of occupation, the country suffered severe economic damage. The merchant marine, the lifeblood of the nation, was reduced to one-quarter of its size. Industrial production fell by 80 percent, while half the roads were destroyed and railroads were completely immobile.

Resistance to the Germans began with passive noncooperation, which soon developed into sabotage and the formation of guerrilla bands. Severe reprisals by the invaders only instilled in the people greater determination and courage. When the Germans finally retreated in 1944, they left behind them a situation comparable to 1821—complete chaos and devastation.

Peace was not yet destined for the war-weary Greeks. Guerrilla bands in the north, lured by Communist propaganda and promises, refused to surrender their arms to the central Government. Abetted by aid from Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, these Communist bands seized towns and carried out acts of terrorism against those loyal to the regime in Athens. To insure complaisance in the regions under their control, children were captured and held as hostages. It has been estimated that over 24,000 boys and girls had been spirited into Yugoslavia and Albania by the guerrillas. The Communist forces were so successful as to lay siege to Athens. On December 24, 1947, the Communist leader Markos Vifiades felt confident enough to proclaim a provisional government.

The central Government, an unworkable coalition, was unable to decide on a course of action. Moreover, when the army did take to the field, obsolete methods and armaments proved ineffective against the elusive guerrillas.

On March 12, 1947, President Truman asked and received from Congress authority for immediate financial and economic aid to Greece. This commitment, known as the Truman Doctrine, proved to be the catalyst for effective action against the Communists. By 1949, with the defection by Yugoslavia from the Soviet bloc and the closing of its border to the Greek guerrillas, the last of the Communists had surrendered or had fled into Albania.

At the conclusion of the civil war the Government was able to turn its attention to internal development and the alleviation of the financial crisis caused by the two wars. It was only by means of massive aid from the United States (almost $1 billion granted under the European recovery program and other aid programs) that recovery was effected. A visitor touring Greece today sees much construction work. Port facilities, piles of rubble a few years ago, have now been cleared and enlarged to accommodate increased shipping. Large factories rose in the cities and the countryside to increase an already expanding industrial production.

Perhaps the most phenomenal recovery has been the merchant marine. In 1946 the fleet totaled only 500,000 tons. Today shipping is surpassing the 5 million ton mark. The Greek flag, a white cross and horizontal stripes on a field of blue, is seen in ports-of-call throughout the world, flying from the masts of freighters, tankers, and liners.

Tourism, too, has played an important part in Greece's resurgence. Emphasis is placed on the ruins of their ancient past. In Athens the Acropolis and the partly restored Agora are the major attractions. Dramas are held in the Roman theater built on the side of the Acropolis by one of Rome's conquering Emperors. Elsewhere, Delphia and the ancient Greek city-states of Thebes, Corinth, and Sparta, receive their share of the tourists' curiosity. A booming resort center is attracting many to Rhodes, where Greco-Roman architecture mingles with Crusader fortification.

To America and the Western World, Greece is more than just a tourist spot. As a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, it is a link in the chain encompassing the Soviet bloc, a bulwark for democracy and the free-world. The United States has strategic bases on the Greek mainland. The country joined NATO in order to increase its security against Communist aggression from within and without. With the combined allied weapons to support its claims, Greek security is thus safeguarded.

Greece continues to be a bridge between Europe and Asia. Militarily, because of its strategic location, it is the link between NATO and CENTO. Its people, though, have remained primarily unchanged. As in 1821, Greece is a nation of small farmers. With all its contributions to civilization, the average Greek tilled his few acres and raised enough food to support his family. Population increases have demanded that every available acre be cultivated. Where none existed, terraced plots were hacked from the mountain sides or gorges. Unfortunately, the land could not support its own people. Emigrants by the hundreds of thousands left their homeland and settled in other parts of the globe. Those who came to America brought with them their religion and their crafts. Throughout the United States, Greeks and descendents of Greek immigrants form an integral part of the community, be it mayor, representative, restaurateur, or wine grower. These people of Greek origin have been told the story of how their forefathers fought for liberty during the war of independence in their homeland. They know that the Greek nation celebrates its independence day on March 25, the day when the glorious struggle for freedom began. We in the United States, whose own forefathers strove for Greek sovereignty, extend to our friends and allies in the Hellenes greetings on their independence day. We, too, remember our past and salute with pride the Greek nation.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM SHOULD BE EXPANDED

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy on Saturday called attention to the seriousness of the unemployment problem, which he termed the Nation's No. 1 domestic problem for the 1960's.

The proposed tax cut will certainly provide a stimulus to economic activity. But the extension of the accelerated public works program would have more immediate and tangible effects than a tax cut. I believe that Congress should not only appropriate the $500 million which the President has requested to meet the current authorization, but should extend the accelerated public works program another year. On February 4, I introduced H.R. 3311 providing that an additional $900 million be authorized beyond the $900 million currently authorized for the accelerated public works program.

Mr. Speaker, we have already seen the beneficial results from this program. Men have been put back to work on useful, productive work. More than that, these projects—water and sewer lines, sewage treatment systems, public buildings, streets, and other projects, have made communities all over the Nation better places to live and more attractive to the expansion of industry.

I therefore urge that Congress take action to appropriate the $500 million requested by the President, and also to extend the authorization of the accelerated public works act.

Perhaps the excellent report of General Clay on foreign aid will give the Congress some ideas on how we may obtain the necessary funds to carry on the accelerated public works program.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during general debate today and the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Small Business Committee be permitted to sit during general debate on March 26, 27, and 28 of this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

DENIAL TO THE FEDERAL COURTS OF JURISDICTION IN LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT CASES

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution providing for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States recently proposed in a resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Legislature.

This proposed amendment would deny to the Federal courts jurisdiction in legislative reapportionment cases in States affording direct initiative by the people in voting on this subject. It would restrict Federal court activity in this traditionally State area to cases in which a

State does not provide to its citizens a procedure whereby they can directly initiate a vote on State legislative reapportionment.

Control of this issue by the people is fundamental to our Federal system. This is basically the business of the people, not of the Federal courts, and as long as a State provides a rational means for the people to express their will the Federal courts should stay out.

This proposal is not an attack on the Tennessee decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. In cases where there is no recourse of initiative from the acts of the State legislature the amendment would not apply.

It may be that the Supreme Court does not now have jurisdiction in this field. But I believe the Oklahoma Legislature is right in its stand that a point of such significance should be specifically resolved.

THE ROYAL GREEK DECREE

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it was with great pleasure that I read a release from the Royal Greek Embassy and Information Service dated March 16 announcing that "a royal decree has been issued banning vessels under Greek flag from carrying any kind of cargo to Cuban ports." My enthusiasm rose as I completed reading the first paragraph. Immediately I was reminded of President Truman's determined action to save Greece in their hour of greatest peril. President Truman engaged in no if's, and's, or but's. He made no exceptions. He decided the road ahead was clear—we must not permit the Communist takeover of Greece. Pursuant to his determined stand, he initiated a historic program which stopped the Communist takeover of Greece as well as Turkey, and which has preserved the national independence of the Greek people. I could not help but feel that here was an act of real reciprocity in the cause of freedom.

My enthusiasm was chilled as I read the second paragraph, coming as it did like a cold, biting, friendless storm out of the north. That paragraph stated, and I quote:

> Exception is only being made for ships under time charter contracted prior to the promulgation of the present decree.

The effect of the royal decree was thereby nullified. Anyone with an iota of commonsense understands that the need is now to stop all, and I repeat, "all," merchant vessels entering Cuba flying any flag of the free world. We are not primarily interested in what countries may do to help our cause; that is, the cause of the whole Western Hemisphere, in the next year or two ahead. Our interest is what are they doing to help the cause of freedom in the Western Hemisphere now.

I ask that the Greek Government make a full public disclosure of the number of vessels flying the Greek flag which are under time-charter contracts to anyone who has shipped cargo to Cuba during the past 12 months. That disclosure should include such time-charter contracts with any government or individual. That disclosure also should divulge the length of time left on each contract for every vessel authorized to sail under the Greek flag which has carried any cargo to Cuba during the past 12 months. Anything less will confirm my judgment, and the judgment of any reasonable person who understands the realities of international commerce, that the royal decree is made meaningless by the second paragraph of the news release which I have quoted. This is a necessary disclosure, a practical disclosure to which the American people are entitled, concerned as they are by the Russian beachhead in Cuba.

The record shows that the American people, among other things, have contributed nearly $3½ billion to Greece since 1945. The Presidential advisory committee, which has made its report to the President, makes note of the fact that Greece stands 10th among all the nations of the world in terms of the amount of money received from the American taxpayers.

No one, in honesty, can say that the American people have not been generous toward the Greek nation in its hour of greatest need, as they have been generous to all who are willing to fight for freedom. That record suggests that the Greek Government should move with haste to make public the information which I have requested. Any response short of 48 hours would make an equal sham of the word "haste."

SUMMARY OF THE NET BUDGET RECEIPT AND EXPENDITURE TRENDS (THE ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET) IN CURRENT FISCAL 1963 (AS OF FEBRUARY 28, 1963) COMPARED TO FISCAL 1962 AND TO BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, for the information of Members and others who may find it of interest, I include the second monthly synoptic tabulation of the trend of net budget receipts and expenditures in the current fiscal year 1963 as of February 28, 1963, with comparisons to the official budget estimate for the fiscal year 1963 and to corresponding actual data for the previous fiscal year 1962.

BUDGET RECEIPTS

Budget revenues are officially projected at $85,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30—an increase of $4,091,000,000, over actual budget revenues for fiscal 1962. Through the first 8 months—to February 28, 1963—actual budget revenues exceeded the corresponding 8 months of fiscal 1962—to February 28, 1962—by $4,051,000,000.

To reach the net budget revenue prediction of $85,500,000,000 for fiscal 1963 will require net revenues of $33,537,000,000 in the 4 months, March–June 1963. In the corresponding 4 months of fiscal 1962, net budget revenues were $33,497,000,000.

BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Budget expenditures are officially projected at $94,311,000,000 for the fiscal year 1963 ending this June 30—an increase of $6,524,000,000 over actual budget expenditures for fiscal 1962, of which $1,901 million is for national defense and $4,623,000,000 is for other than national defense.

Through the first 8 months—to February 28, 1963—actual budget expenditures exceed the corresponding 8 months of fiscal 1962—to February 28, 1962—by $4,644,000,000, of which $2,323,000,000 is for national defense and $2,412,000,000 is for other than national defense.

AVERAGE MONTHLY EXPENDITURES

Using straight averages in both instances, the table discloses that expenditures during the first 8 months of fiscal 1963 averaged $7,757,000,000—slightly less than the projected average of $7,859,000,000 for the full fiscal year of 1963 based on the official budget estimate of expenditures—a little less for national defense items and also slightly less for nonnational defense items.

To reach the net budget expenditure prediction of $94,311,000,000 for fiscal 1963, net budget expenditures in the 4 months March 1–June 30, 1963, would have to aggregate at least $32,249,000,000—in other words, a monthly average of at least $8,062,000,000 during the 4-month period as against the actual monthly average of $7,757,000,000 in the first 8 months of fiscal 1963. Thus the monthly average in the 4 months, March–June, could rise $305,000,000 above the monthly average during the first 8 months without exceeding the budget total of $94,311,000,000 for the full 12 months. On the other hand, the table discloses that expenditures for all of fiscal 1963 are officially budgeted at a monthly average $544,000,000 greater than the actual monthly average for all of the preceding fiscal year 1962 and that, in comparison to this, in the first 8 months of fiscal 1963 the actual monthly average exceeded the corresponding 8 month average of fiscal 1962 by $580,000,000. Stated another way, in the first two-thirds of the fiscal year about 71 percent, or $4,644,000,000 of the officially projected $6,524,000,000 expenditure increase, fiscal 1963 over fiscal 1962, has been realized.

BUDGET DEFICIT

The official budget estimate of the deficit for fiscal 1963 is $8,811,000,000, or $2,433,000,000 larger than the actual deficit in fiscal 1962.

Through 8 months of fiscal 1963 the actual deficit is $10,099,000,000, or $593,000,000 larger than the deficit during the corresponding 8 months of fiscal 1962.

The comparisons and the trends will, of course, vary each month between March 1 and June 30 in relation to the full year amounts and in relation to each other.

The table follows:

Net budget receipts and expenditures (the administrative budget), 8 months of fiscal 1963 versus 8 months of fiscal 1962 and comparison with full year estimates

[In millions of dollars]

	Actual for 8 months			Budget estimates for fiscal 1963 compared to actual for fiscal 1962		
	1963	1962	1963 compared to 1962	Budget estimate, 1963	Actual, 1962	Estimate, 1963 over actual 1962
1. Budget receipts (net)	51,963	47,912	+4,051	85,500	81,409	+4,091
2. Budget expenditures (net):						
(a) National defense (per official budget classification)	34,603	32,371	+2,232	53,004	51,103	+1,901
(b) Other than national defense	27,459	25,047	+2,412	41,307	36,684	+4,623
3. Total expenditures	62,062	57,418	+4,644	94,311	87,787	+6,524
4. Net surplus (+) or deficit (−) (line 1 minus line 3)	−10,099	−9,506	−593	−8,811	−6,378	[1]−2,433
5. Average monthly expenditures:						
(a) National defense	4,325			4,417		
(b) Other than national defense	3,432			3,442		
Total monthly average	7,757	7,177	+580	7,859	7,315	+544

[1] That is to say, the budget predicts an increase of $2,433,000,000 in the size of the deficit in fiscal 1963 as compared to the actual deficit in fiscal 1962.

Sources: Budget for 1964 and monthly Treasury statement for Feb. 28, 1963.

THE GREAT FLOOD OF THE MIAMI RIVER IN 1913

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this week in Ohio, citizens in the Miami River valley are assembling in many meetings to recall and discuss the great flood which took place 50 years ago, between March 22 and March 27, 1913, in which more than 300 persons lost their lives in the floodwaters of the Miami River and its tributaries. Cities such as Dayton, Middletown, and Hamilton were inundated; thousands of homes and factories were destroyed or greatly damaged; commerce and industry were brought to a standstill. Smaller communities, such as West Carrollton, Miamisburg, Franklin, Piqua, and Troy, were virtually turned into ghost towns.

As a young law student, I went into the devastated area as the floodwaters receded to make reports for the great Bradstreet credit concern and saw firsthand the catastrophe that had struck that section of Ohio. I heard and I saw there how men and women of all walks of life worked and labored against great odds to save lives, to take care of the injured and the sick, and to feed the hungry.

Once the waters had receded it would have been easy for the citizens of many of these cities and towns to have turned their backs on their home communities and to perhaps move elsewhere to start a new life. Yet, they came from a hardy stock of pioneers and made their own hard decision to stay and to do what they could tc see to it that there would never be another such major catastrophe in that area.

They did not appeal to the Federal Government. Instead, they sent their representatives to the Ohio General Assembly in Columbus, which had been called into an emergency session, and requested that legislation be enacted under State law to permit those in the flooded areas to solve their own problems through the establishing of a conservancy law under which the Miami Conservancy District came into being. This conservancy district built a huge system of dams to hold back floodwaters in the future and to give protection to the communities that had been destroyed in 1913. The conservancy district was given the authority to levy taxes against the properties that would benefit from this great new flood-control program. Rich and poor, alike, working together to attain freedom from future flood disasters, contributed more than $2 million to the project. At a cost of more than $33 million, the great Miami Valley was given flood protection through huge dams and levees which ever since that time have withstood the ravages of recurrent storms and high water and have given flood protection to the communities in that area of Ohio.

As a result, the people of the Miami Valley have prospered. Today the valley is a great industrial and commercial center, growing and thriving, equaled by few areas in the United States. All this has come about by the courageous reaction of the Miami Valley people in 1913 and their willingness to meet themselves the tremendous cost of attaining the flood protection they desire. No Federal funds were sought or used; no State funds were made available. Instead, the miracle that was accomplished—one of the greatest engineering feats in modern times—came about through men and women who stood on their own feet and met their own responsibility to solve their own area problems.

So, this week, many citizens of the great Miami Valley are looking back 50 years to the time of death, destruction, danger, and despair. All of those who personally experienced the disaster, or learned of it from their elders, are recalling the great efforts that were made to restore the valley and its cities to that which they had been before 1913; and, in rebuilding, to build even better communities than ever before. As a result of their efforts their great homeland in western Ohio has prospered, and also the State and the Nation have benefited, through the readiness, the willingness, the courage, and the faith of Ohioans to meet their own problems and to create the great Miami Conservancy District which has protected the valley from floods and permitted their dreams to be fulfilled, their families to live in safety, and to so rebuild as to make the Miami Valley one of the most productive, one of the most prosperous, one of the most beautiful areas to be found anywhere in the whole Republic.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Schenck] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, as a lad nearly 14 years old at that time I have many vivid memories of the terrible flood disaster which struck the great Miami Valley 50 years ago on March 25, 1913. My father owned a rather large grocery store located on the northeast corner of Broadway and Riverview in Dayton. Wolf Creek, usually only a few inches deep, crossed Broadway about a block south of my father's store and as it began to rise higher and higher toward the top of its banks everyone became alarmed. One of the first thoughts was, naturally, to get in a supply of food. People began to crowd into the store in such numbers that the clerks could not get around to wait on them. It finally became necessary, in fairness to all, for my father to close the doors from time to time and limit the amount of food that could be sold to each customer. This was my first experience, Mr. Speaker, with a distribution system similar to the food rationing restrictions that were put in effect during the war years later.

The floodwaters continued to rise until they finally got up as high as the handrails of the old iron Wolf Creek bridge there on Broadway. The water came up Broadway almost to my father's store and reached the second floors of the homes south of the bridge. Boats began to appear as though by magic and folks of all ages in both good and bad health were rescued from the second floors, attics, and rooftops in spite of the very treacherous crosscurrents. Deeds of bravery without number could be cited. As the boats reached shallow waters men and boys would wade out to help the folks disembark and get them to the homes of friends or strangers who provided them with food, shelter, and medical care. Schools, churches, and other public buildings were immediately pressed into use to care for the victims. Farmers and other folks from the surrounding higher areas came to their aid with wagonloads of food, clothing, and other needed supplies of all kinds. I shall never forget the great thrill, Mr. Speaker, of seeing all those people open their hearts, their homes, and share their possessions with the flood victims without any hesitancy and with no thought whatsoever of being repaid. It was a time and experience I shall never forget.

After the first fright and removal of the victims from the scene, new dangers began to appear. Explosions occurred—buildings were destroyed—the sky was lit by fires in areas where it was later discovered there were people who could not be reached for rescut. People prayed—some had forgotten how but they prayed anyway and God did answer them. The rains slackened; the floodwaters began to recede a small fraction of an inch at a time until finally the great Miami and its tributaries were once again within their banks.

Gradually, Mr. Speaker, many amazing stories came out about the work that was done during the tragic disaster. The National Cash Register Co., for example, under the personal direction of its founder and president, the late John H. Patterson, had made all its facilities available to the flood victims. Boats were built to use in rescue operations. A hospital area was set up in the plant and a number of babies were born there. One baby, appropriately named "Cash" Durst, grew up to become employed by the National Cash Register Co. Mr. Patterson, a man of tremendous vision and ability, devoted his energies after the flood to developing plans for preventing any recurrence of such a disaster in the Miami Valley area. As soon as his plans were well underway Mr. Patterson set about revitalizing the economic growth of the entire valley, improving its governmental structure and its educational facilities and programs. We who live in that area owe much to the vision, leadership, wisdom, and energy of this great man. Inspired by John H. Patterson, others have followed his example and continue to develop the potentialities of the area to an extent never equaled in any other part of the country. Mr. Patterson had many close, personal friends who gave generously of their time and resources in helping him spearhead a drive to raise a fund to study the problem and do something about it. In a community just prostrated by a great calamity, the raising of funds by public subscription was a tremendous undertaking. Nevertheless, the people, poor and rich, young and old, contributed $2,156,616 within 3 months following the flood. Goaded by the leadership of the Honorable James M. Cox, who resigned after serving two terms in the U.S. Congress to become the Governor of Ohio, the State legislature in a special emergency session enacted a law that has withstood the tests of courts and time, the conservancy law of Ohio. This later led to the formation of the Miami Conservancy District, which was administered by a board of directors headed by Col. Edward A. Deeds, its first president. One of the board members was the Honorable John A. McMahon who had been an illustrious and distinguished member of the U.S. House of Representatives for three terms during the years between 1875 and 1881. It was he who actually drew up the Conservancy Act. Arthur E. Morgan who, you probably know, at one time headed the Tennessee Valley Authority and later became the president of Antioch College, was appointed the chief engineer for the conservancy district. It was he who masterminded the whole complicated flood prevention plan that has protected and will continue to protect the Miami Valley area from disasters such as occurred in 1913. We who live in that area take justifiable pride in the success of this unique and effective flood prevention program. I say "unique" because every cent, amounting to more than $34 million, to provide this protection has come from the residents of the valley. Not 1 cent has come from the Federal Government or the government of the State of Ohio. Even now, as the citizens of the area desire to improve the system, they pay for it themselves.

This week in Dayton, Ohio, and in the entire valley, one of the major industrial and commercial centers of our Nation, an observance of the 1913 flood is in progress. We are not celebrating a flood anniversary—we are proudly recalling and recognizing 50 years of economic recovery and progress unequalled in our Nation's history. Yes, we are remembering that the "Promises Made In the Attic" were kept and that hard work, adherence to the underlying sound principles of our Nation, cooperation with our neighbors, and love of our homesites have produced a valley of vitality and progress. On behalf of the people in the Third District of Ohio whom I have the privilege of representing here in the Congress, I am happy to join my colleagues from our neighboring districts in paying tribute to those great men in the past whose vision and leadership brought about the establishment of the Miami Conservancy District and to those dedicated men who now administer the program so effectively.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, it will, in my opinion, serve a useful purpose to reflect upon a major disaster in the great Miami Valley a half century ago, and what was done to prevent its reoccurrence.

The unprecedented and uncontrolled floodwaters of that river from March 22 through March 27, 1913, brought death and destruction to the Miami Valley from Piqua to Hamilton, Ohio, with all of its attendant suffering. Cut off from the rest of the world by the devastating floodwaters, the residents could only seek shelter and food from their neighbors and pray for better days. But these hearty souls, after the floodwaters receded, refused to abandon their homes and communities to seek homesites elsewhere. They chose to remain and begin anew, and this they did in a manner and with success never previously attained.

These citizens, through their elected representatives in the Ohio Legislature, enacted into law the authority for a system of flood control unequaled in excellence and accomplishment in the United States, if not in the entire world. The Ohio Legislature provided the legal system—through the Ohio conservancy law—but the local people, by approving and paying tax assessments against their own property in accordance with individual benefit to each parcel within the flood plain, insured completion of the project and its completely satisfactory operation ever since completion.

Today, the valley is free from floods in its urban communities. Five huge earthen dams, levees, and channel systems provide complete protection for the major communities. Unbelievable as it may be to those who say that an all-powerful Central Government is needed to solve all our problems and to pay for the solution of them, in part, at least by deficit financing, this great flood control system was conceived, planned, executed, and paid for by the people within the flood plain of the great Miami Valley without any help from State or Federal Government.

This week the valley citizens are observing the flood date of 50 years ago, but they are celebrating the effective conquering of the elements and with justifiable pride. They can without reservation point out that this undertaking was accomplished by local people for the benefit of the valley, the State, and the Nation, and it has served as a model for much of the world.

The valley is now one of America's industrial, commercial, and educational empires and the people did it by and for themselves.

Lest my colleagues and others who may hear and read our story think we have magnified our performance, I wish to incorporate in my remarks the objective editorial found in the Saturday Evening Post in the issue of November 16, 1946. I quote the editorial in its entirety.

This Flood-Control Project Wasn't on the Cuff

When the spring rains start washing down the Ohio, Missouri, and Mississippi River Basins next year, residents of nine western Ohio counties will not be obliged to grab their cots, frying pans, and chicken coops and scramble for higher and drier ground.

Their security was assured by their own action 30 years ago when the Miami Conservancy District completed five dams and improvements of channels in the Miami, Stillwater, and Mad Rivers. There have been no serious floods in the district since 1917, although neighbors in the Ohio Valley each spring prepare to pack up and leave with the first thaws and heavy rains.

Unbelievable as it may be to many American communities today, the Miami Valley this year completes this course in self-treatment for a $100 million flood headache without once calling in Dr. New Deal or any of his interns. The local remedy was applied after a 1913 flood swept through the rich agricultural lands and busy industrial centers of Dayton, Troy, Middletown, and Hamilton. Four days later, as they kicked at the mud and debris, the stunned citizens counted the actual damage at $100 million, plus 400 lives lost, business as stagnant as the pools of dirty water in the streets, thousands of head of livestock drowned, and tons of good black dirt gone forever.

Despite this heartbreaking disaster there was no anguished cry for aid from Washington or the State capitol at Columbus. True, the refinements of Federal aid had not been thought of then, but Congress was only too happy to logroll a hodgepodge of river and harbor bills to relieve localities of the costs of local improvements. Instead of calling on the logrollers, the thoroughly drenched Miami Valley citizens took the quaint stand that control of the river was their job, and not a legitimate burden on the taxpayers of Montana or New York.

All they asked from the lawgivers at Columbus was permission to form the conservancy district, with power to levy taxes for the purpose of keeping the rivers from their doors and barnyards. That permission was granted by the State legislature. No appeal of any kind went to Washington, and the only entrance of the National Government came when a Federal district court ruled that the United States had no objection.

The district issued almost $34 million in bonds. Proceeds were used for construction of dams and channel regulation, and that ended the floods for the Miami Valley. In this engineering project there were no extras such as hydroelectric power, swanky fishing and recreation resorts or resettlement projects. Flood control was what the Miami Valley people paid their money for and flood control is what they got.

Today, as the district prepares to levy the final assessment for retirement of the last bonds, the flood-free communities, farms, and individuals of the Miami Valley are pretty proud of their accomplishment. It's theirs and they paid for it without outside help, advice, second guessing or the nostrums of the District of Columbia school of medicine. Equally pleasing to most is the fact that the district provided no plum tree for anxious jobseekers. Only 56 persons are employed on the entire project, hardly enough to staff the public relations office of almost any Washington bureau you care to name.

COMMUNISM IS NOT NEGOTIABLE

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, many of the citizens in this country will argue that communism is negotiable. The people using this argument are usually those who have only a surface understanding of communism. The following article from the Northwest Progress, of Seattle, Wash., very graphically points out our current stance against communism:

Not Negotiable

If there is any lesson that can be learned from Castro's takeover of Cuba it would seem to be this: That as far as our State Department goes, we have learned absolutely nothing at all.

The U.S. policy in Cuba is based upon the same political principle that has determined our dealings with atheistic communism in China, Hungary, Vietnam, Yugoslavia, Poland, and all the other nations that have fallen to Red aggression.

Our State Department has always operated on the principle that communism, however dangerous, is negotiable. As long as that principle is maintained as a modus agendi by the U.S. Government, regardless of the sincerity of the men involved or the name of the administration, what happened in Hungary had to happen in Cuba and what has happened in Cuba must happen in all of America, North and South, unless we change our policy.

Communism is not negotiable. The reason for saying this is not political but philosophical. Despite the new "nice guy" mask Khrushchev is wearing, he is still a Communist. As such, he will be content with but one objective: mastery of the entire world. He has told us this, he has set about scientifically and methodically to prove it. Cuba is just one more step along the way.

Communism understands but one law: force. And brute force is not negotiable. Force is only countered by counterforce. The brief blockade was a beautiful example of this simple fact.

We have been told that we must not "fear to negotiate." Where communism is concerned, dare we make such a statement? It might be good rhetoric—but what about the logic? It would seem that in dealing with Khrushchev, negotiation ought to be our greatest fear. If Cuba has not taught us this, it has taught us nothing.

Our verbal threats against Russia's presence 90 miles off the Florida coast are beginning to sound about as dangerous as the "do that again and I'll spank" of an indulgent mother to her spoiled child.

Soviet presence on the island of Cuba cannot be tolerated. Everybody in the free world agrees to this. This presence cannot effectively and completely be removed by mere negotiation. Recent history attests to that.

An editorial in this week's issue of Life magazine outlines some excellent steps that could be taken to rid ourselves of Castro's so-called defensive Russian army.

While the Life editorial's specific recommendations may not be in every instance as carefully conceived or outlined as those of a military strategist, still the principle upon which they are based is absolutely correct. The editorial rightly contends that "It is time for deeds as well as negotiations * * *."

BRAZILIAN LOAN

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, again we have been had. The Brazilian Government has announced plans for hemisphere Communists to hold a conference in Sao Paulo starting today.

On March 18, in a speech in the House of Representatives, I called to the attention of Congress the fact that Brazil was going to host the second Communist-inspired continental congress of solidarity with Cuba. The first such congress, 2 years ago in Mexico City, is widely regarded as having brought about violent efforts to subvert the governments of Venezuela and Peru and with organizing leftist agitation in Panama and Puerto Rico.

This is obviously giving aid and comfort to the enemy of democracy, and literally thumbs the Brazilian nose at the United States.

Furthermore, in a speech on the floor of the House on March 21, I called attention to the fact that three members of the 15-man Brazilian Cabinet are notorious Marxists, two others were former Communist Party members. Goulart's press secreary is a self-declared Communist. The powerful National Industrial Workers Confederation, which unites industrial unions, is under Communist control. The big oil monopoly, Petrobras, is run by an extreme leftwinger. Regardless, the State Department will loan Brazil the money she requested.

While we heard anguished cries from the Brazilian Government when the State Department announced Communist infiltration of Brazil, it has yet to refute these charges.

As far as I am concerned, Brazil should not get a plugged nickel from the United States.

YUGOSLAV MILITARY ATTENDING ARMY COMMAND AND GENERAL STAFF COLLEGE AT FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if our citizens know that a uniformed military officer from Communist Yugoslavia attends the regular Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. I wonder if they know that no less than four general officers of the Yugoslav Army are graduates of our top staff college. I wonder if they know that clearance for this must come from the White House. I wonder if they know that this has been happening for some years.

Mr. Speaker, what goes on here? Even the most uninformed among our citizenry knows that such military men have sworn allegiance to a Communist flag; that everything they learn at our General Staff College goes right back to Communists; that Yugoslavia is in close military liaison with the Soviet general staff.

Whether or not attendance at classified classes is barred to these men, the vast military knowledge they gain in a full course at Fort Leavenworth is undeniable. It is the sheerest lunacy to condone educating Communists about the operations of our general staff on the theory that it encourages splinter groups within the Soviet periphery.

I believe that we should investigate so that we can know just who cleared this assignment in this administration as well as under whose individual direction and initiative this sorry practice was initiated years ago. It is not the Army's fault. Orders for such inanity come from on high, not from the Army, of that we can be certain.

This is further glaring evidence that the present administration does not understand that all genuine Communists are deadly serious in their fanatical desire to destroy the United States. This is so whether they are Russian Communists or Chinese Communists or Yugoslav Communists. One does not appease a rattlesnake by inviting him into his house.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest, over the weekend, the Clay report on foreign aid and think that there is much of value in it. Many of the things that it points out are matters which some of us in the Congress who have been studying the aid program have been saying for years.

Perhaps, the thing that catches the attention first is the suggestion that hundreds of millions of dollars can be cut from the annual programs without damaging them. In fact, the inference is clear that the programs would be better for having reduced amounts of money to spend.

But, there are other, less obvious, but equally important proposals. One of those relates to the selection of the countries which receive our aid. From the report, I gain the very strong impression that the committee feels that we should be much more selective in the matter of our aid and should concentrate our efforts in those countries with which we have a community of interest and which will not treat our assistance as a mere basis for bargaining with the Communists to get aid from them also.

Reference is made to the participation of the private sector of our economy and here again is a matter upon which most of us in the Congress acted a year ago over the strong protests of the Agency for International Development and the State Department. Now, the committee finds that this action has been helpful. On the whole, Mr. Speaker, one feels anew that before we act upon the foreign aid authorization and appropriation bills this year most careful scrutiny should be given to the whole program to the end that, as a minimum, very substantial dollar reductions be made and that the recipients of our assistance be more carefully chosen.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PEACE CORPS PERSONNEL

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the stated dedication of higher echelon personnel in the Peace Corps, I offer the following news article without comment:

> ### Top Peace Corps Personnel To Take 2-Week Retreat
>
> Some 160 executives of the Peace Corps will spend 2 weeks at the Corps training camp in Puerto Rico, reports Deputy Director William Moyers.
>
> "The idea is to spend 2 weeks in a close and familiar setting with the volunteers and also to balk desk flabbiness," explains Moyers.
>
> While on the Caribbean island they will collect their regular salaries ($11,000 a year and up) and have their expenses paid.

WHY THE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE 15-ACRE FARMER, MR. FREEMAN?

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, on February 26 of this year I expressed my fears to this House that Freeman and company would attempt to use a double set of standards for our Nation's farmers in the forthcoming wheat referendum in that one method of voting would be required for the small 15-acre wheat farmers and another for the larger producers. My fears were not unfounded as the Department of Agriculture has now filed its "Notice of Proposed Rulemaking" in the Federal Register to amend existing regulations relative to voting in the 1964 wheat referendum. The Department is proposing that the regulations be changed to read as follows:

> (4) WHEAT
>
> Any producer who has a farm acreage allotment shall be eligible to vote in any wheat referendum held pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 1336, as amended: *Provided*, That a producer on a farm with a wheat acreage allotment of less than 15 acres shall be eligible to vote only if the operator on such farm files with the county committee, not later than 7 days prior to the date of the referendum, an election in writing to be subject to the wheat marketing quota for the farm.

Should this regulation be put into effect by Mr. Freeman it would mean that our Nation's 15-acre wheat producers would have to agree in writing at least 7 days before they voted that they would comply with the administration's program—should it be approved in the referendum. If they did not so signify their intent to comply with these new Freeman rules, they would be ineligible to vote. Large wheat farmers would be eligible to vote on election day automatically without previously signifying their intentions to do so.

Is it consistent for the administration to protest the inability of some citizens to vote in general elections due to unnecessary and discriminatory voting regulations and then to arbitrarily place such regulations in the paths of the Nation's small wheat farmers to keep them from voting in a referendum?

Why double standards for our American wheat producers, Mr. Freeman? Is it necessary to make first- and second-class citizens out of our wheat farmers in order to make your supply-management theory work? If so, this is another good reason why your supply-management approach for agriculture should not be adopted.

What is the real reason for this pre-election signup for our 15-acre wheat farmers, Mr. Freeman? You cannot argue that you need this information in order to ascertain who these 15-acre farmers are as your county committees already have this information. It cannot be argued that a farmer could not just as easily and as quickly signify his intent at the time he came in to vote. It could, however, be argued that since your program will be extremely detrimental to our small wheat producers and as a consequence they will probably not look upon it with favor, that the powers that be do not want them to vote and this accounts for these additional and burdensome regulations being placed upon them. It also could be argued that a 7-day open season on our 15-acre farmers who do sign up will be needed in order to launch an all-out, concentrated attack upon them in the hope of convincing them to vote right. If this is the case, someone has misjudged these farmers as they do not succumb to badgering and cajoling.

Whatever the reason for this proposed regulation, it is not sufficient to warrant such rank discrimination among the wheat producers of America. I therefore, urge you, Mr. Secretary, in fairness to these small wheat farmers, not to put this proposed regulation into effect.

THE NEW FRONTIER

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, after reading the President's speech made at Chicago on Saturday, I am wondering when he is going to stop his changing moods and let the American people know when and where he expects to find the New Frontier. On Saturday he said that perhaps if we do not have a tax reduction we may not have a recession, but here he changed his mood. He went on to say:

> But, if we do not have tax reduction our unemployment may go from 6 to 7 percent.

In the campaign in 1960 President Kennedy promised he was going to end unemployment, but I say seriously that in his changing moods and changing course of action, he might at least let everybody know what the New Frontier is and whether he ever expects to find it. His changing mood is giving the American people and business the jitters. Perhaps if he stopped changing his position so frequently, business could settle down, expand, and be in a position to put more people to work and end the rise in unemployment.

CAN WE CUT FEDERAL EXPENDITURES IN YOUR DISTRICT?

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing much talk about the need for reducing Federal expenditures for years, but getting very little action.

Although the talk still continues, the fact remains that in fiscal 1963, out of a total Federal budget of $94 billion, the following appropriations were passed unanimously: About $50 billion for national defense, $5½ billion for veterans' benefits, and $3½ billion for space exploration. These items, together with interest on the national debt which is a fixed charge, account for approximately 75 cents out of every tax dollar.

Because of the unanimity with which these appropriations were endorsed by my colleagues, those who are calling for decreased spending evidently want cuts to be made in the appropriations which consume the remaining 25 cents out of every tax dollar.

Since each Congressman knows his own district the best, I would appreciate hearing from each of my colleagues about his suggestions for cutting down on Federal spending in his own district. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I would be pleased to total the suggested amounts and pass the information along to my chairman.

If a flood control or land reclamation project which is scheduled for construction in a Representative's district is considered unnecessary by him, I would appreciate hearing from him about it. Likewise, those of my colleagues who object to their districts receiving area redevelopment funds or moneys for their local schools under the aid to federally impacted areas legislation should not hesitate to let me know about it.

Those of my colleagues from farm areas should feel free to tell me how much less they want spent in their own districts for price supports, and those who represent urban districts should similarly advise how much less they wish their districts to receive for urban renewal.

Does any Congressman wish to file objection to the spending of money in his district under the Federal road program? If so, just let me know. For that matter, I should also like to hear from anyone who dissents from the expenditure of Federal funds in his area for hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act.

Naturally, I should also welcome any information from anyone who would like a large defense contract terminated in his district.

When I total all the response, I shall announce the result. I doubt that I shall require an adding machine.

WASTING MONEY

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on Printing of the Committee on House Administration, I have been advised that a number of bills will be considered tomorrow. This has reminded me of a wasteful practice that has gone on for years and which is proposed to be perpetuated in another way. I am referring to the printing of calendars which are distributed to the Members. Now that is a small item and I will probably be branded as a nitpicker. But we are spending $27,473 a year to print calendars to be distributed to the Members, and each one of us gets 10 of these calendars and more if we request them. To me that is an utter waste of money and I intend to try to stop it. If there are others who concur in my views with respect to this, I would appreciate it if they would so inform the Subcommittee on Printing stating that they do not endorse this waste of money. With millions of calendars of every conceivable size and design being distributed by all types of businesses as well as individuals, I cannot believe that anyone is being denied a free calendar, and for that reason can see no reason why the Congress should approve this waste of money. This is just one of many small ways in which Members of Congress can effect small savings, which total a substantial sum. The greatest good that can come from this action of discontinuing this practice is that it would indicate Congress' desire to practice economy—and once we make the start, I believe it will result in greater and substantial savings.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET HYPOCRISY

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the partisan statements of Republican leaders in reference to the President's tax reduction and budget proposals border on political hypocrisy.

They have apparently forgotten, in their zeal to discredit the Democratic program, that the largest peacetime deficit in history occurred during a Republican administration in 1959 and totaled $12.427 billion.

They have apparently forgotten that the cumulative deficit during the Eisenhower Republican administration was $21.953 billion.

They criticize the President's efforts to stimulate the economy with a tax reduction at a time when a deficit will occur.

I would call their attention to the year 1954—during the Republican administration—when there were tax reductions totaling an estimated $7.4 billion. This came at a time when it was obvious there would be a deficit, and there was a deficit.

The tax reduction included removal of excess profits tax, reductions in individual income taxes, reduction in excise taxes, and revisions of the Federal Revenue Code.

The Republican leadership now takes the position that tax reduction in the face of a deficit is an unpardonable financial sin.

But in 1954, when the economy was lagging, the Republicans turned to tax reduction and the economy showed a substantial upswing. With the healthier economy, the Republicans were able to achieve surpluses.

The Republican leadership questions an increase in the national debt ceiling. Yet during the Republican administration the debt ceiling was increased for fiscal 1955, for 1958, for 1959, and 1960.

So it is apparent that the criticism of the Republican leadership stems from sheer partisan politics. When a Republican President called for tax reduction, an increase in the debt ceiling, and a deficit budget, this was acceptable, even praised.

But when the Democratic administration in office attempts to stimulate a lagging economy and increase Federal revenues looking toward ultimate balancing of the budget, then—in the Republican view—an outrageous financial crime is being committed.

The facts are that we are falling $30 to $40 billion short of our potential in national output, $18 to $20 billion short in wages and salaries, and $7 to $8 billion in business profits. We have an unemployment rate of more than 6 percent and persistent, large budget deficits.

Failure to act now to stimulate the economy is inviting another recession. Our high tax rates are repressive. A tax reduction is needed urgently.

Certainly our expenditures should be carefully studied. They have been carefully studied. Some reductions are being made. But to achieve the sort of budget reduction the Republicans advocate would seriously hamper our defense efforts—because that is where the bulk of the budgetary increases have been.

The best way to balance the budget is to balance the economy. The increased economic activity from a tax rate will produce more revenues which can and will be used to achieve a balanced Federal budget.

The Republican leadership would do well to lend its support to a sensible economic program of this kind, rather than devoting its time to irresponsible sniping for political purposes.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT AMENDMENTS

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to correct what I believe to be a serious inadequacy in this legislation.

The bill provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall include in his standards for designation of counties under this act, standards based on the migration out of the county.

The present law provides that this shall be one of the things considered in formulating the standards. But it is very necessary to make counties eligible on this basis alone if we are to stem the tide of migration to already overcrowded metropolitan areas.

The many communities which are losing population today because of a lack of jobs would like to be able to retain the young people who are leaving today. With just a little help, such as assistance through the Area Redevelopment Act, these communities could establish new industry and provide new jobs for these young people.

The figures on unemployment and income do not show these counties to be within the standards adopted by the Secretary of Commerce for designation under this law. However, the fact is that many of these counties which are rapidly losing population are in very serious trouble. What has happened is that, instead of hanging on, these people who have lost jobs have moved out of the county. Those who had businesses have shut them down and gone elsewhere, usually to work for someone else rather than open a new business.

The net effect has been that the unemployment rate and the income rate in the counties do not reflect the total situation. Those who are unemployed show up on the rolls of a big metropolitan city. They show up on the welfare rolls of these cities. The effect is the same on the national economic picture. The people are still unemployed. The county still is deteriorating from lack of industry and employment opportunity. And we are now doing nothing about it.

The expansion of this program, Mr. Speaker, as proposed in the bill I have introduced today, will have an immediate stimulating effect on the economy of many rural areas across our land just because of the existence of this provision. The effect when the provision is implemented with proper funds and administrative action would be tremendous.

When people want to help themselves, I feel we should assist them in this effort. That is the purpose of this bill. I hope my colleagues will give it their prompt and serious consideration.

COMMUNIST INSPIRED CONTINENTAL CONGRESS OF SOLIDARITY WITH CUBA MEETS IN RIO WHILE UNITED STATES GIVES MORE AID TO BRAZIL—TO BUILD TRADE WITH RUSSIA

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I along with other Members of this House of Representatives had the privilege over the weekend of visiting Guantanamo Bay, the American military base in Cuba. I do not want to make that particular visit the principal subject of my remarks, but it does have a relationship to the subject which I do want to discuss rather briefly and that is the question of the proposed foreign aid to Brazil, particularly in view of the announcement which we see on the UPI ticker just today, to the effect—it has been known before of course, but the number of countries attending has not been known—the fact that the Communist-inspired Continental Congress of Solidarity With Cuba meets in Rio de Janeiro the 28th of this month, Thursday of this week, and who is going to be in attendance—78 countries have decided to attend at this meeting which is commonly known as a meeting for the purpose of ultra liberals and some Communists to carve out a solidarity with Cuba—that means Communist Cuba program. Included in these 78 countries are Cuba itself, Russia and Red China, and a number of other countries are to be involved including many in this hemisphere. Representatives from 78 countries are attending. Despite this and other evidence of the growth of communism in Brazil as even stated by the State Department itself in Brazilian Ambassador Gordon's testimony before the Selden subcommittee to the effect in Brazil the Government has been infiltrated with Communists, the student movement has been infiltrated with Communists as well as the labor union movement.

Of course, there was an effort by the State Department to claim that this testimony which appears in the record of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs was taken out of the context and did not really mean what it says. Anybody who reads it will note that it is very clearly stated that there has been Communist infiltration in the Government, in union movements, and in student groups—on page 247 of the hearings I quote "The principal field of infiltration and influence is in the labor unions. In the Government staff there has been infiltration. The student movement in another major area of penetration with the National Student Union now being dominated by Communists."

What does all this amount to? And I am going to take a few minutes to review the extent of Communist infiltration and buildup in Brazil. As a matter of fact, the fearless reporter who had the intestinal fortitude to state the facts of what is going on in Brazil was just recently declared to be persona non grata by the Government because he had the intestinal fortitude to put in the record for all to read the story of the Communist buildup in Brazil. I am sure most of you have read that article by Mr. Stein with regard to the amazing Communist buildup in Brazil which is, I believe, self-explanatory. I include the article at the close of my remarks.

Here is what happened, for instance, in Costa Rica during the visit of the President on March 20 with regard to our policy in giving foreign aid to these Latin American countries who still recognize and do business with Castro's Cuba and who do not do all they can to oppose Communist subversion within their countries, but, as a mater of fact, in some instances are even encouraging it.

Here is what one Costa Rican student stated at the time of this visit at the University of Costa Rica:

> It is foolish for you Americans to give money to corrupt, oligarchy-controlled Latin American governments without supervising the expenditure of every dollar. You're throwing money down the drain, and in the end you'll lose both the money and the country. And you shouldn't make an exception of our own Government, however advanced it might be.

These were students in a university in a country with a long history of democracy and social progress, conditions lacking in most Latin American countries. This was the advice of students given to reporters at the time of the President's visit at the Costa Rican Conference on March 20, 1963. Good advice, I believe, but advice which we are not heeding these days.

Who is going to be in attendance at this conference in Rio, in a country to whose Government we are proposing to give $55 million of a $1½ billion program for the purpose of building up the economy of Brazil so she can continue to trade with Soviet Russia? I understand, although it has not been officially announced at the movement, by the wire services, that the President is expected to make a pronouncement concerning it sometime today that this $55 million to Brazil has been agreed to as the first installment despite the fact the Government of Brazil refuses to condemn this conference, as a matter of fact is going to let it go on in Rio de Janeiro, is weakening in its opposition to communism, is doing business with Russia, and continues to recognize Castro.

Who are some of the Brazilians who are going to be in attendance at this conference? I think this indicates the extent of the infiltration of communism in the country. Who are some of the Brazilians who are going to be in attendance at this Red continental congress?

There is going to be Luis Carlos Prestes, Secretary General of the Brazilian Communist Party. Another is General Luiz Gonzaga de Oliveira Leite, president of the Brazilian Association of Reserve Officers; and Francisco Juliao, a federal deputy and founder-president of the Castroist Peasants' Leagues.

Dante Pelicani, president of the National Federation of Industrial Workers,

and Almino Afonso, Minister of Labor in President Goulart's Cabinet and leader of Goulart's Brazilian Labor Party in the Federal Chamber.

Clodsmith Riani, a Labor Ministry functionary and chief of labor's general strike command. Mario Shemberg; a well known Sao Paulo physicist, and Roberto Morena, who, according to Lacerda, served as a political commissar with the Communist forces in the Spanish civil war.

Where did this list come from? This list came from a list of those expected to be in attendance, taken from the luggage of Luis Carlos Prestes, secretary general of the outlawed Brazilian Communist Party, as he departed recently on a trip to Havana, Prague, and Moscow. It was taken from his luggage by Carlos Lacerda of the city where the convention is going to be held; namely, Rio de Janeiro. His public security officers were the ones who got possession of these documents. No one has denied them. There is not any question but what in all probability these persons named are not only going to attend but it also gives best evidence of their background and their inclination.

Many of them are very substantial people in the Goulart government. How could these people maintain these positions under the Brazilian Government setup if the President did not agree to their receiving these positions, because the appointive power in Brazil is with the Executive, not even subject to confirmation by the legislative branch.

So these people are in the government at least by sufferance of the President himself.

I am not going to read in detail, but I have in my possession a document that reviews the history of the buildup of the Communist Party and of Communist subversive activities in Brazil, starting back in April of 1960, when Francisco Juliao, whose name I just mentioned, and Santos Morais, accompanied the Brazilian presidential candidate on his visit to Cuba in April 1960.

During that visit, Juliao and Morais had a personal meeting with Fidel Castro in which they requested Castro's financial support for the Peasants' Leagues. Castro studied the request, and after consultation with Che Guevara, he informed Juliao that his decision was to not support the leagues, a decision that was due in great extent, to the observation made by Guevara that there was no existing proof that these leagues were organized.

In November 1960, Juliao made a visit to Red China, where he again requested financial assistance, this time from the Communist Chinese government. Juliao obtained the promise of financial help which would have to be channeled through the Castro government.

The reason I am spreading this information on the RECORD is I believe our Government should seriously reconsider any approval of a loan to Brazil until Brazil shows its ability to clean out the Communists that are known to have infiltrated the Brazilian Government, and insist that Brazil withdraw recognition of Castro's Communist government and stop doing business with him and to side with the forces of freedom—having opposed the United States at Punte del Este and during the quarantine refusing to join it.

I made a similar request that related to Mexico the other day. Until Mexico stops permitting the inflow of persons for subversive purposes—including U.S. citizens—through the open door of subversion out of Mexico City and the Cuban Embassy, we should not give it any aid. Even the CIA Director himself admitted there were individuals going to Cuba for training purposes in 1962, at which time I brought out the fact that there were some 73 Americans as well going down there in violation of the U.S. laws—and unprosecuted.

After a strong protest, that aid should be withdrawn from Mexico until this open door is closed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wish to commend him for the statement he has just made. For the life of me I cannot understand how this Government can seriously consider giving one thin dime to Brazil under the circumstances that exist. The Finance Minister of Brazil and the Ambassador of that Government in Washington told our subcommittee that Brazil would not hold the Continental Congress for Cuban Solidarity or whatever the specific title of that meeting, the Communist meeting in support of Cuba. But now the meeting is to be held, apparently, with the sanction of the Government of Brazil, and President Kennedy and this administration ought not to give Brazil one single dime as long as this meeting is in the works.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. Of course, he is an authority on this subject, being a member of the Selden subcommittee, at least to that extent, and I am glad that he placed on the RECORD the fact that assurances were made to that committee. This is something I did not have knowledge of myself, that Brazil did make assurances that this congress would not be held, which obviously seems to me to be a condition precedent in Alliance for Progress funds being seriously negotiated at this time. And, I will say to the gentleman further that I called the State Department, Mr. Moscoso's office, and I inquired in regard to the Alliance for Progress funds and I tried to get some information even in regard to what requests had been made, and that was denied me. As to the conditions that were being considered, they would not even discuss that. I said, "Are you going to attempt to gain assurances that if they get this money, they are going to fight communism instead of permitting it to grow in that country, as part of the policy of the United States, and what should be the basic policy of our Alliance for Progress funds" and I was denied any information of any kind at that time and have received none subsequently.

So far as the buildup is concerned, I could quote, for instance, from the Worker, the Communist newspaper in this country, on Sunday, March 17. And that happened to be the very weekend that I was asking for this information, the very weekend that the State Department was trying to expunge from the official records of the Selden committee the testimony of its own Ambassador to Brazil to the effect that there was infiltration in the Government, in the unions, in the student movement. Here is what the Worker said on that very Sunday, March 17, when the papers reported the fact that the State Department did not mean what it said. This is a report by Art Shields:

> Brazil Communist Party's strength doubles in 2 years, says Carlos Prestes.

The very man I was just referring to who is going to this Rio conference:

> Big changes are coming in Brazil, and the Brazilian Communist Party is much in this changing picture.
>
> Its strength has doubled since 1960, says Luis Carlos Prestes, the party's general-secretary.

They say in the last 2 years that the Peasant Union has expanded from 50,000 2 years ago to 600,000 today.

Further quoting from the article:

> The movement for peace, which is the party's central issue, has made great advances.
>
> I met Prestes when he talked to a group of correspondents during a short visit to Moscow.

Further quoting from the article:

> Prestes gave us many details of the rising strength of the people's forces. Thus the Communist Party's ties with the militant working class of Brazil have grown much stronger since the late 1950's.
>
> The student movement is rapidly growing. It is led by Communists in alliance with members of the Catholic youth.
>
> "The influence of the Communist Party and other democratic groups is rising in the ranks of the Brazilian Army," said Prestes, who used to be an army colonel himself.

Further quoting from the article:

> The big job internationally is to win socialism with the least sacrifices. "But socialism" he said, "cannot be prevented." He proudly declared, "We Brazilians are fighting to become the second people in Latin America to open the door to socialism."

This was the very day the State Department was trying to expunge from the records of the Congress its own testimony with respect to the Communist buildup in Brazil.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand that the gentleman made a request of the State Department to give the gentleman information as to the amount of money we have spent in Brazil in this Alliance for Progress program?

Mr. CRAMER. No; that information is readily available to everyone, including the gentleman from Florida, and the gentleman from Florida is well aware of it. What I asked for was how much they are now negotiating for; how much have they requested? The news reports vary as to the amount of money involved.

I was told that I could not get this information—that I was not entitled to it—and they would not discuss what the Brazilian Finance Minister asked for.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further, how long ago was that request denied to the gentleman?

Mr. CRAMER. That was on Saturday, March 16, 1963, the very day before this Worker article came out.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The reason I ask this is the fact that I have a constituent who is interested in the amount of money being proposed that we spend in Brazil. He asked me that question in a letter.

Has the gentleman from Florida any information or is the gentleman going to place in the RECORD the amount of money that has been spent heretofore in Brazil?

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado if the gentleman will look at my remarks of March 18, 1963, page 4428, the gentleman will see that information, indicating that some $450 million to date is to be repaid by Brazil, and they are asking for forgiveness on that. He is asking, according to the press, for release of $84 million to the $553 million U.S. aid which was given to Brazil since 1951. And according to today's report, $55 million more is requested as the first of three yearly amounts.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. If the gentleman will yield further, when the gentleman discussed with them the question of the request that had been made, did they give the gentleman any substantial reasons why they would not give the gentleman the information?

Mr. CRAMER. They said negotiations were underway and that they had no information to give, even though my request related to the request of the Brazilian Government at the outset of the negotiations which, at least speculatively, was printed in the press time and time again. But a Member of Congress is not entitled to have this information. Mr. Moscoso, who is in charge of the Alliance for Progress administration, would not advise me as to present demands or negotiations which were made even at the outset, and this I cannot understand.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa. However, permit me to say before I yield to the gentleman that my interest is obviously not only a personal one but I believe the people of this country are entitled to know that information under these circurmstances.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman from Colorado that the asking price of the Brazilians is the round figure of $500 million—one-half billion dollars. That is what they want.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand from testimony which is available that the asking price now by Brazil is that they want one-half billion dollars for next year?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will have to take my word for that.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Oh; surely.

Mr. GROSS. The asking price, the Brazilian asking price, is in round figures $500 million. This is on top of, as I understand it, somewhere near $1.5 billion already made available to Brazil in various financing deals. And from the $500 million there would be a refinancing, as I understand it, of payments to Soviet-bloc countries of certain short-term credits that are due or very shortly coming due. In other words, they would like to obtain money from U.S. taxpayers to refinance their obligations to the Soviet-bloc countries, among other things.

This is a rather complicated thing, but it boils down to the asking from this country in various ways of refinancing, new money, and so on and so forth, approximately one-half billion dollars.

Mr. CRAMER. To substantiate what the gentleman from Iowa says on trade with Russia as part of the Brazilian deal it was reported from Rio de Janeiro in the press that just before Dantas, the Finance Secretary, came to this country to negotiate as follows:

> Brazil is about to sign a long-term $160 million-a-year trade agreement with the Russians as part of a 3-year plan the United States would be asked to help finance.

The announcement further stated:

> Government sources said they do not expect the United States to press for curbs on Iron Curtain trade which will be approximately doubled by the new agreement and may be increased to as much as $300 million a year by 1965.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman, with reference to his treatment by the State Department, that Mr. Martin, who is Chief of the Latin American Desk in the State Department is the same Mr. Martin who not too long ago stated in hearings before our own subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture that he had proceeded to carry out one program, having to do with Brazil, by the way, without any regard to the wishes of the Congress or even, for that matter, taking the trouble to bring the matter to the attention of his superiors as under the law he was supposed to do.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman. I believe that the American people are entitled to this information. That is why I requested it, as well as because of my concern over the statement of the Department of State itself to the effect that Communist infiltration in Brazil had reached what I would call serious proportions and still existed, which is found in the record of the hearings of the Selden Committee.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about training schools for subversives in Cuba, by Castro and the Communists. This report which I am placing in the RECORD gives an example in very specific detail of how these schools are carried on, how the students are brought in, and even names some of the students. They follow up their activities in Brazil, after their training.

For instance, from July 28 to August 20, a total of 52 Latin Americans attended the guerrilla warfare instruction course. Besides the 12 Brazilian students from the Peasants' Leagues there were 12 Venezuelans, 17 Argentines, 6 Paraguayans and 5 Panamanians.

This was way back in 1961. The principal Brazilians taking the course were the same men who later directed the development of the guerrilla movement of the leagues in Brazil. They were, for instance:

Clodomir de los Santos Morais, ex-Deputy of the state of Pernambuco, member of the Communist Party of Brazil (PCB) and the principal aide of Francisco Juliao.

Joaquin Ferreira, member of the Communist Party and ex-Economist of the "SUDENE," a state organization for the so-called development of Northeast Brazil, under the direction of Celso Furtado.

Pedro Mate de Barros, leader of the youth sector of the Communist Party and law student in Pernambuco.

Adamastar Antonio Bonilla, one of the secretaries of the state committee of the Communist Party in Rio Grande do Sol.

Armando Luiz de Carvelho, also known as Palmeira, member of the Communist Party of Pernambuco.

The instruction course was given in Managua, a camp near Havana, where the general headquarters of the Cuban Revolutionary Army is situated. Maj. Guillermo Franco was in charge of the course. The holding of this guerrilla course was carefully disguised, even within Cuba. The "students of guerrilla tactics" were presented officially as delegates to the 26th of July anniversary festivities and after that date as visitors and tourists. This was the second course of this nature under the patronage of the Cubans, the first having been held in May 1961.

These instructions included daily rifle practice, guerrilla maneuvers simulated in the mountains of Los Organos, the handling and identifications of weapons and ideological indoctrination. The "students" were instructed in the dismounting, handling, and maintenance of various American firearms, including models M–1 and M–3, Garand, and Hatchkiss and Browning machineguns. The instruction was limited to American weapons, according to explanations of the instructor, because they, as guerrillas, should capture and use the arms of the enemy. They were familiarized with the manufacture of "Molotov cocktails" and the M–26 incendiary bomb. The instructor explained that this bomb has been perfected by Che Guevara to be shot from a rifle.

> Some theoretical classrooms were operating in Granja del Pueblo Hermanos Saiz [Saiz Brothers People Farm] under the direction of Major Franco, where the "students" attended classes. Franco, a very close confidential friend of Fidel Castro, also held the position of paymaster, handing out funds for the occasional expenses of the "students." These latter were constantly reminded that a good revolutionary must be well indoctrinated in the Marxist-Leninist theories. Besides Major Franco, the following members of the Cuban Revolutionary Army acted as instructors: Rolando Lazaro Requeijo, Antonio Reina Jimenez, and Teodoro Braunn. The Panamanians, under the direction of Jorge Ferreira, were subjected to a special rigorous course.

It goes on to describe the balance of the course and how they were hidden in the hotel and were taken out on a 1-day basis for the trip, so it would not appear they were other than tourists:

> The majority of the trained guerrillas returned to their respective countries on August 20, 1961, arriving on the 21st or 22d. The plane that was to take the Brazilians, Argentines, and Paraguayans was overfilled, because some visitors—not "guerrilla students"—also had taken passage on that plane. For this reason, those who had less urgent needs to return remained another 2 days in Havana, as tourists, leaving on a second Cuban plane on August 22. This plane also transported the Uruguayan delegation. The plane returned via Port of Spain, reaching São Paulo on August 23. The Brazilians who landed on this occasion were arrested by the police, charged with carrying subversive propaganda. But they were set free, together with the propaganda, on the same day.
>
> After the resignation of Janio Quadros in August 1961, and the absence of a subsequent revolution, Fidel Castro decided that he should give massive financial support to the Peasants' Leagues in Brazil—

And that is what has been happening—

> transforming the revolutionary sector of the leagues into a liaison agent for the Brazilian revolution in the same manner as his group had acted for the Cuban Revolution. In the meanwhile Juliao would continue his preaching that the leagues constituted an organization whose objective was to better the status of the peasants.

They set up a general headquarters in Recife, at 216 Respiolo Street. These headquarters consist of the following personnel. I will put those names in the RECORD.

They went on with the initiation of the establishment of Peasants' Leagues Councils in several states of Brazil. The name of the head of this movement to maintain contact with the Cuban movement and the description of these activities likewise will be in the RECORD.

Quoting again:

> Morais began the supervision of the purchase of a number of farms in which guerrilla training could be held. In each one of these farms, Morais placed a director who was responsible for this training. In October 1962 six separate locations existed, in Goiss, Maranhao, Matto Grosso, Estado de Bahis, Rio, and Rio Grande de Sul. During the previous year, at least two other farms were closed down. One in Matto Grosso, and the other in Parana. At the end of 1961, the director of the Dianopolis Farm in the State of Goias, was Amaro Luiz de Carvalho, known by the name of "Palmeira," member of the Brazilian Communist Party of Pernambuco.

It goes further through the buildup of the Peasant League movement, how they operate, the training they receive, the contact they have not only with the Cuban Embassy but the Embassies from Russia and Red China and Communists from throughout the world as well.

I think you will find this heretofore unpublished documentation in detail of the buildup in the Peasants' League, a Communist organization in Brazil not only interesting reading but essential information in connection with this consideration of a loan to Brazil at this time. This entire history of the League from which I have taken excerpts appear at the end of my remarks. This comes from a source I consider beyond question—and related to known incidents reported to the press and from other sources.

HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMMUNIST PEASANTS' LEAGUES IN BRAZIL—PROOF OF SUBVERSION IN BRAZIL

Deputies Francisco Juliao and Clodomir de los Santos Morais accompanied the Brazilian presidential candidate, Janio Quadros on his visit to Cuba in April 1960. During that visit, Juliao and Morais had a personal meeting with Fidel Castro in which they requested Castro's financial support for the Peasants' Leagues. Castro studied the request, and after consultation with Che Guevara, he informed Juliao that his decision was not to support the Leagues, a decision that was due in great extent, to the observation made by Guevara that there was no existing proof that these Leagues were organized.

In November 1960, Juliao made a visit to Red China, where he again requested financial assistance, this time from the Communist Chinese Government. Juliao obtained the promise of financial help which would have to be channeled through the Castro government. This financial aid would not be extended under the heading of support to the rural organizations led by Juliao in Pernambuco, but would be for the purpose of creating and developing the guerrilla groups in Brazil which would be capable of spearheading a violent revolutionary movement with the objective of overthrowing the Government of Brazil.

Juliao returned to Brazil at the end of December 1960, and immediately left for Cuba in order to attend the celebration of the second anniversary of the Cuban Revolution. When he returned later to Brazil, he selected Clodomir Morais to head the revolutionary groups of Peasants' Leagues, while he acted as the figurehead of an organization ostensibly dedicated to the peaceful promotion of interests of the Brazilian farmers. In his speeches and statements to the press in the beginning of 1961, Juliao said that he hoped that the P.S.B. Socialist Brazilian Party and the P.T.B. Brazilian Workers' Party, presided by João Goulart and the Communist Party would be able to unite in their efforts to bring about agrarian reform through peaceful means. When he was reminded of the belligerent nature of communism, Juliao answered the reporter by stating that "communism is different in Brazil."

While Clodomir Morais was engaged in the work of the basic organization of establishing the mechanism of guerrilla warfare, Juliao alternated his tasks between making speeches in favor of the Leagues and traveling between Brazil and Cuba. In 1961 Juliao made three trips to Cuba. In June and July of that year, Morais selected 11 members of the Peasants' Leagues to accompany him to Cuba, where they were taken for a specialized course in guerrilla warfare.

This group of 13 Brazilians left Recife on July 21, 1961. They traveled together with a group of Argentines and Paraguayans in a Britannia plane chartered specially by the "Compañía Cubana de Aviación." The plane made a stop at Rio de Janeiro to take on other passengers, also making another stop at Port of Spain, for refueling before landing on July 22, at the José Marti airport in Havana.

The group were welcomed and shown around by representatives of the Cuban Institute of Friendship with Nations (ICAP) an organization which ostensibly promoted the trip. The group pretended to be members of the Brazilian delegation to attend the 26th of July celebrations.

They were lodged in the hotel Riviera in Havana. During the first few days they took an active part in all the various festivities commemorating the 26th of July anniversary. On the afternoon of July 24, a reception was held in honor of the Soviet's cosmonaut, Maj. Yuri Gagarin, who was visiting Cuba, followed by a public dance, that night. On July 25, a sports parade was held; the following day, the 26th, a huge public demonstration was held and on the 27th, the visitors were taken on a tour of Cuban beaches in Havana. On the night of July 28, together with representatives from other Latin American countries, the Brazilian left the hotel and riding in official Cadillac cars they were taken to the instruction camps for guerrilla warfare, where they were divided into nationality groups and lodged in different instruction centers.

From July 28 to August 20, a total of 52 Latin Americans attended the guerrilla warfare instruction course. Besides the 12 Brazilian students from the Peasants' Leagues, there were 12 Venezuelans, 17 Argentines, 6 Paraguayans and 5 Panamanians.

The principal Brazilians taking the course were the same men who later directed the development of the guerrilla movement of the leagues in Brazil. They were the following:

Clodomir de los Santos Morais, ex-Deputy of the State of Pernambuco, member of the Communist Party of Brazil (PCB) and the principal aid of Francisco Juliao.

Joaquin Ferreira, member of the Communist Party and ex-Economist of the "Sudene" (a state organization for the so-called development of Northeast Brazil, under the direction of Celso Furtado).

Pedro Mate de Barros, leader of the youth sector of the Communist Party and law student in Pernambuco.

Adamastar Antonio Bonille, one of the secretaries of the state committee of the Communist Party in Rio Grande do Sol.

Armando Luiz de Carvalho, also known as Palmeira, member of the Communist Party of Pernambuco.

The instruction course was given in Managua, a camp near Havana, where the general headquarters of the Cuban Revolutionary Army is situated. Maj. Guillermo Franco was in charge of the course. The holding of this guerrilla course was carefully disguised, even within Cuba. The "students of guerrilla tactics" were presented officially as delegates to the 26th of July anniversary festivities and after that date, as visitors and tourists. This was the second course of this nature under the patronage of the Cubans, the first having been held in May 1961.

These instructions include daily rifle practice, guerrilla maneuvers simulated in the mountains of Los Organos, the handling and identifications of weapons and ideological indoctrination. The students were instructed in the dismounting, handling, and maintenance of various American firearms, including models M–1 and M–3, Garand and Hatchkiss and Browning machineguns. The instruction was limited to American weapons, according to explanations of the instructor, because they, as guerrillas, should capture and use the arms of the enemy. They were familiarized with the manufacture of Molotov cocktails and the M–26 incendiary bomb. The instructor explained that this bomb has been perfected by Che Guevara to be shot from a rifle.

Same theoretical classrooms were operating in (Granja del Pueblo Hermanos Saiz)

(Saiz Brothers People Farm) under the direction of Major Franco, where the students attended classes. Franco, a very close confidential friend of Fidel Castro, also held the position of paymaster, handing out funds for the occasional expenses of the students. These latter were constantly reminded that a good revolutionary must be well indoctrinated in the Marxist-Leninist theories. Besides Major Franco, the following members of the Cuban Revolutionary Army acted as instructors: Rolando Lazaro Requeijo, Antonio Reina Jiménez and Teodoro Braunn. The Panamanians, under the direction of Jorge Ferreire, were subjected to a special rigorous course.

When the other students asked why this special treatment for the Panamanians, they were informed that the group from Panama were being prepared to act as saboteurs in the Panama Canal Zone.

In order to maintain their appearances as tourists, the students returned to the point of their departure, the Havana Riviera Hotel. While there, they told everyone who asked that they had been visiting the interior of the island on a tourist jaunt. The students in the hotel made contact with delegations of Czechs, Russians, and Red Chinese, who were introduced to them as "technicians." The guerrilla students had little contact with these visitors from the Iron Curtain because they remained aloof and unfriendly, limiting their encounters to more social amenities.

On completing the course, the Brazilian students were told that they had passed the course with exceptional qualifications and as a premium for this achievement they would be given the honor of an informal meeting with Fidel Castro in the Cienega de Zapats, where they were taken in Fidel's personal helicopter. Castro congratulated them on the splendid results they obtained from the course, relating some of his own experiences as a guerrilla fighter and entered into the discussion of the political scene in Latin America. He exhorted them not to be deceived by apparent measures of agrarian reform, such as those proposed by Janio Quadros, of Brazil, but to continue fighting for revolutionary and radical reforms.

The majority of the trained guerrillas returned to their respective countries on August 20, 1961 arriving on the 21st or 22d. The plane that was to take the Brazilians, Argentines and Paraguayans, was over-filled because some visitors—not "guerrilla students"—also had taken passage on that plane. For this reason, those who had less urgent needs to return, remained another 2 days in Havana, as tourists, leaving on a second Cuban plane on August 22. This plane also transported the Uruguayan delegation. The plane returned via Port of Spain, reaching Sao Paulo on August 23. The Brazilians who landed on this occasion were arrested by the police, charged with carrying subversive propaganda. But they were set free together with the propaganda on the same day.

After the resignation of Janio Quadros in August 1961, and the absence of a subsequent revolution, Fidel Castro decided that he should give massive financial support to the Peasants Leagues, transforming the revolutionary sector of the leagues into a liaison agent for the Brazilian revolution in the same manner as his group had acted for the Cuban revolution. In the meanwhile, Julião would continue his preaching that the leagues constituted an organization whose objective was to better the status of the peasants. In this interim, the major part of Cuban money poured in for the organization of guerrilla fighters. Julião and Morais decided to adopt the following measures to give shape to the leagues:

1. To enlarge the general headquarters of the leagues in Recife, at 216 Respiolo Street. These headquarters consist of the following personnel:

Francisco Julião: Honorary president.

Maria Ceares Barreto Novais: Secretary (also consulting attorney in the Economic Department of SUDENE).

Jonas Alburquerque Sosa.

José Severino Cunha.

Dzacy Megalhaes Florencio: Treasurer (Recife attorney and member of the state committee of the Communist Party of Pernambuco).

Emmanuel Egberto de Araujo.

Rivadavis Braz de Oliveira: One of the group trained in the guerrilla warfare course in Managua, Cuba.

Luis Serafin los Santos.

2. Initiation of the establishment of Peasants Leagues Councils in several states of Brazil. In various regions, Julião procured and obtained the support of ex-student leaders. In 1961, the leader of the Deliberative Council of the Peasant Leagues, was Tarzan de Castro, 25 years of age, who had formerly presided over the Brazilian Union of High School Students (U.B.E.S.). Jarbes Miranda de Santana, ex-president of the U.B.E.S. was made head of the Deliberative Council of the Leagues in 1961.

3. Formation of a movement to serve as the convert sector through which recruits for guerrilla training was conducted. This organization was known as Movimiento Revolucionario Triadentes (MRT) (Triadentes Revolutionary Movement). The two principal recruiting officers of the MRT were Clodomir Morais and Joaquin Ferrairs Filho. Both had attended the guerrilla course in Managua, Cuba. Later the MRT was transferred to the offices of La Liga, the official newspaper of the Peasants Leagues, directed by Julião, and managing director, Antonio Avertano. La Liga leases the buildings 1001 and 1002, situated at No. 15 Alcino Guanabera Street.

4. Julião established an agency in Rio de Janeiro in order to maintain contact with the Cuban Embassy. Regina Coelho de Alburquerque and Nives Borges do Brazil, were in charge of the agency. Regina Coelho's apartment in Avenida Rainhe Elizabeth No. 587, became a frequent meeting place for the leagues as well as a nightly stopover for members of the league who were traveling. Regina Coelho was the recipient of all correspondence and verbal messages of representatives arriving in Rio de Janeiro. She immediately contacted Nives Borges do Brazil passing on all information received; on the other hand Nives Borges contacted a member of the Cuban Embassy, usually the Third Secretary, Ana Sermiento, who was informed of the matter in question.

In December 1961, Nives Borges do Brazil left for Cuba in order to receive special instruction in clandestine activities, in preparation for becoming the intermediary between the leagues and the Cuban Embassy. Notwithstanding the extreme caution exercised by the personnel of the Cuban Embassy to separate Regina and use Nives as intermediary, at times Regina was invited to participate in receptions and other social functions given by Embassy personnel. Besides representatives of other Embassies of the Communist bloc, such as Ludwick Nekar of the Czech Embassy, were occasional visitors to Regina's apartment, generally for the purpose of meeting Julião and Morais. These two, during a certain period, frequently spent the night in Regina's apartment; later, fearing that their activities might be under scrutiny, Julião changed his temporary residence in Rio for the home of Osny Duarte Ferreirs, Magistrate of the Court of Appeals.

5. Morais began the supervision of the purchase of a number of farms in which guerrilla training could be held. In each one of these farms, Morais placed a director who was responsible for this training. In October 1962, six separate locations existed in Coiss, Moranhõa, Matto Grosso, Estado de Bahia, Rio, and Rio Grande do Sul. During the previous year, at least two other farms were closed down. One in Matto Grosso, and the other in Parana. At the end of 1961, the director of the Disnapolis Farm in the State of Goiss, was Amaro Luiz de Carvalho, known by the name of "Palmeira," member of the Brazilian Communist Party of Pernambuco.

Later, this farm was turned over to Carlos Montalrroyo. The Farm of Naranhão was directed by Carvalho through his assistant Cleto da Conta Campolo Neto. The farm in Parana was directed by Diniz Cabrel Filho, another longtime member of the U.B.E.S. who joined the leagues. The farm at Rio Grande do Sul was under the supervision of Adamastar Antonio Bonilla, Secretary of the State Committee of the Brazilian Communist Party of Rio Grande do Sul.

6. Morais continued in his purpose to recruit candidates for guerrilla instructors selecting from them a group which was to be sent to Cuba for intensified training. In a general way, the procedure covering the trip to this group was similar to that of the first group of the Peasant Leagues trained in Managua, Cuba. The candidate traveled to Cuba as a delegate from Brazil to one of the many Cuban anniversaries. Frequently he stayed at one of the best hotels in Havana, visited the city for several days as a tourist, and then began his training in Havana itself or in nearby surroundings. After approximately 1 or 2 months training, the candidate returned and began to put into practice in one of the farms belonging to the leagues, the new technique just learned.

Morais and Ferreira attempted to evaluate each candidate before final acceptance and providing training. Before being invited to join the leagues, the candidate was usually subjected to a test on several questions to be answered, such as:

Do you believe in a social revolution for Brazil?

Would you swear to dedicate yourself, even at the expense of your own life, to the success of your objective?

Have you any other interests which would interfere with the bringing about reforms for your country?

Do you consider it advantageous in the event of having to take part in guerrilla warfare in order to introduce these reforms in Brazil?

On November 8, 1961, Josquín Hernándes Armas, new Cuban Ambassador in Brazil, presented his credentials to President Goulart. Already at this time, the Ambassador was aware that his government was giving support to the guerrilla groups of the leagues.

On December 8, 1961, when the major number of the farms were being opened, the translation by Mauricio Grabais, of Che Guevara's book, "The War of Guerrillas," was published. This book became the basic manual for all guerrilla activities undertaken in the farms belonging to the leagues.

On December 27, 1961, Alexina Line Crespo de Paula, the wife of Julião and her two children left Brazil for an extended trip to Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, Red China, and North Korea. Alexina acted as messenger for the leagues, which she had frequently done in Brazil. On this trip she spoke to Mao Tse-tung, giving him information on conditions existing in Brazil, all of this mission was confided to her by Morais. Alexina told Mao that the leagues counted on the support of many high ranking officers of the army; that the leagues were in possession of arms, munitions and money necessary to explode a violent revolution. When Alexina returned from China and related what she had told Mao to various members of the leagues, her statements caused a great feeling of animosity against Morais among leaders of the leagues. In the opinion of these dissatisfied leaders, the optimism of Morais had cost them valuable financial support from Red China.

In January 1962, the Brazilian Army discovered that arms, manufactured in Czechoslovakia were being introduced into the country for distribution, possibly among the Peasant Leagues.

On the 22d of April, Julião issued a statement of his convictions in his "Declaration de Ouro Preto," in which he said that the Brazilians should aspire toward giving their lives for the creation of a new society, which he said would be "like the dawn."

On April 30, 1962, the Communists Jaos Amazonas de Sosa Pedroso and Mauricio Grabois arrived in Havana to participate ostensibly in the celebration of Labor Day, but this was only a pretext to cover their real objectives. They both attended the guerrilla course. In the middle of August 1962, two more Communists, Carlos Danielli and Angelo Arroyo arrived in Cuba to take the same course.

At the end of May 1962, Pedro Mota de Barros, another member of the leagues, who accompanied Morais to the Cuban training camp in Managua, left Brazil on a trip to establish links between Julião and other Communists revolutionaries throughout Latin America, Mota de Barros visited Chile, Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Venezuela, where he met with revolutionaries who had trained with him in Cuba. In several interviews he asked them what type of support they could give to the leagues and what could the leagues give to them.

In the beginning of July 1962, the farm in Parana was closed after one of the men who had been trained in Cuba, was mortally wounded by local farmers. The victim was 19-year-old Antonio Thiago Filho. Upon learning of this assassination, Morais instructed the leaders of the farm to bury the young man and to close the farm, without giving the news of his death for publication.

In August 1962, the revolutionary plot of the Peasant Leagues began to appear. The first incident took place in Pernambuco when Joel Arruda Camara and Manuel Tertuliano, brother of Julião, and 12 other members of the leagues were arrested by the Brazilian Fourth Army. When arrested, they had in their possession documents revealing guerrilla operations plans prepared against rural properties located in nearly 30 municipal districts of Pernambuco. Julião reacted by stating that the imprisonment and the documents were part of a lie created by reactionaries against the leagues, and sent a telegram to President Goulart, protesting the Army's action.

The second public manifestation took place in August when Rivadavia Bras de Olivera, the same person who attended the training course in Managua, together with Atausipa Alves de Lima and José Bartolomeu de Souza, were served with a prison warrant in an office belonging to the leagues in Rio de Janeiro, situated on 496 Russel Street, apartment 803, which had been rented by Paulo Bezerra de Andrade, and employee of the newspaper A Lig, official organ of the Peasant Leagues. On that occasion a large quantity of Communist propaganda was found in the office.

The third manifestation of this revolutionary plot was the discovery of one of the farms of the leagues in Dianopolis, in the State of Goies on November 23, 1962. Guerrilla operation plans again were seized.

Temporary imprisonment was decreed against 26 members of the leagues by Judge Moreira Marquez. Among these were Clodomir dos Santos Morais, Amaro Luiz de Carvalho and Joaquin Ferriers Filho, all of whom had been trained in Managua, Cuba. Besides these, another training companion was included, Clovis José Estevez de Souze.

The fourth manifestation was the imprisonment of Clodomir dos Santos Morais, Celia Lima and José Francisco da Silva on December 13, 1962. Clodomir was arrested while transporting a shipment of arms to members of the leagues; he carried a visiting card of Antale Chardin, chief of the consular section of the Soviet Union Embassy on which Chadrin had written a note apologizing for failing to keep an appointment with Julião. Celia Lima, who had been traveling companion of Morais for some time, was more than just a companion. Morais had included her in his guerrilla activities, giving her the supervision of what she called School of Revolutionary Development, situated in a house in the northern zone of Rio de Janeiro, where courses ranging from ideological indoctrination to sabotage were held.

The fifth and most recent manifestation of the guerrilla activities is the contents of the documents found in the wreckage of the Varig plane which crashed near Lima, Peru, on November 27, 1962. The documents will explain many of the leagues' problems, in the development of their guerilla capacity as well as their overall program.

Beginning in 1962, many of the leagues' leaders commenced complaining about the activities of Morais, accusing him of dedicating more importance to his own interests than to those of the leagues; of not concerning himself with the welfare of the leagues' members, and what is even more important, of diverting funds given by the Cuban Government for promoting guerrilla activities, for his own personal use.

During the development of the Peasants Leagues, the Cuban Embassy in Rio de Janeiro, constantly directed their activities. The official of the Cuban Embassy, principally responsible for the operations of the leagues, was Miguel Brugueras del Valle, in reality a member of the Cuban Secret Service in Brazil, acting under the pretext of his post of cultural counselor of the Cuban Embassy. At times, Brugueras had two other assistants—"cultural attachés," Felix Pita and Arturo Garcia Rodriguez. They maintained constant contact with Morais and occasionally with Julião. Haroldo Hall, representative of "Prensa Latina" in Rio de Janeiro, also helped Brugueras in his contact with the leagues. Brugueras directed the Cuban subversive operations which involved Brazilian Communist organizations, through the mediation of such well-known Communists as Mullis Bandsire, Joêo Amazonas and Maurico Grabios. In July 1962 Brugueras accompanied a group of Brazilians on a trip to Cuba to attend the celebration of the 26th of July anniversary. On August 24, 1962, Brugueras accompanied the Cuban Ambassador, Josquin Hernándes Armas, to Goisnis, where the Ambassador addressed the law school. On this occasion, Brugueras met with Tarsan de Castro, head of the Deliberative Council of the Peasants Leagues of Goise. This meeting between Brugueras and Castro is referred to in one of the documents found in the wreckage of the plane which crashed in Lima. Brugueras and Tarsan maintained frequent meetings to discuss the actions of Morais, with which they were not in accord. Later, they continued their frequent meetings to discuss the disagreements occurring in the leagues during the last 6 months of 1962. Brugueras wrote two letters to his chief (Petronio) in the Cuban Government in 1962, explaining the then existing conditions in the leagues, signing them with his pseudonym, "Gerardo." Brugueras gave the two dispatches, with a copy of a letter in which he complained of the actions of Clodomiro Morais to the postal messenger, Raúl Capero Bonilla, who headed the Cuban delegation in the recent Congress of the FAO, held in the Copacabana Palace Hotel, shortly before the delegation departed on their ill-fated journey. These dispatches have been recovered, the material referred to showing subversion in Brazil has been summarized in the press. Brazil frantically tried to cover up the dispatch report and to keep it secret because it documents Communist activities in Brazil.

NOT EVEN THE REDS FORESAW THEIR RISE TO POWER

(By Louis R. Stein)

RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL.—Brazilian Communists wield more power today than they would have dreamed of when President Joao Goulart took office a year and one-half ago.

The man most responsible for giving a leg up to the Communists is the President himself.

Sr. Goulart has named numerous Communists and fellow traveling nationalists to key administration jobs and facilitated election of Communist slates in labor unions formerly controlled by more conservative leaders.

Yet anyone in Brazil will tell you the President is not a Communist.

The 15-man Cabinet contains three notorious Marxists: Hermes Lima, Foreign Minister; Joa Mangabeira, Justice and Interior Minister, and Almino Afonso, Labor Minister. Two doubtfuls in the Cabinet are Celso Furtado, Minister for Planning who was a Communist in his youth, and Jose Ermirio de Moraes, millionaire industrialist who financed the election campaign of Miguel Arraes, Communist governor of the northeastern State of Pernambuco.

DECLARED

Raul Riff, Sr. Goulart's press secretary, is a self-declared Communist. Evandro Linse Silva, director of the presidential secretariat, is closely linked with the Communists.

The most important labor organization taken over by the Communists since Sr. Goulart's inauguration is the National Industrial Workers Confederation which unites most industrial unions in the country.

Sr. Goulart personally intervened in the last CNTI election on behalf of the Communist-backed slate led by Dante Pelecani.

Sr. Goulart named Francisco Mangabeira, an extreme leftwing nationalist son of the Justice Minister, to be president of Petrobras, the Government oil monopoly. Petrobras is the largest single firm in Brazil.

"Watermelons" (green outside, red inside), a term used here to describe fellow travelers, hold many lesser posts in the Government.

NO VETS

Congress has no control over composition of the Cabinet or choice of government agency directors. It can summon ministers to give an accounting but cannot veto nominations.

Sr. Goulart's Brazilian Labor Party has assisted election of Communists to Congress. Communist Party leader Luis Carlos Prestes says the current Congress contains 17 Communists. Most ran with PTB backing.

There were only 16 Communists in the Federal Legislature at the time the Party was outlawed in 1948. Sr. Prestes, then a senator, was among those who lost his mandate. The Party still is officially illegal but operates openly without interference.

It is feared in democratic circles here that Sr. Goulart is riding a tiger. Leftist forces around him could cause considerable trouble and possibly destroy his austerity program if they decided to actively oppose it.

Finance Minister Francisco San Tiago Dantas, now in the United States for money talks, has already run up against leftist criticism which, for the nonce, is being held in check by Sr. Goulart.

All efforts to bar Commmuists from the armed forces and Government jobs have been thwarted.

The latest attempt was a bill written by Social Democratic Party (PSD) Deputy Mendes de Morais. It was killed in committee.

NAMELESS

Sr. Prestes said this month that since the Cuban revolution Communists sympathizers have increased six-fold in Brazil.

The Prestes' estimate may be high, there is no denying that there are more Communist sympathizers in Brazil today than ever before.

And, if Sr. Prestes had spoken the whole truth he would have added that the bulk of the new strength yearns for revolt instead of a silent revolution through subversive infiltration.

The mellowed chief of the bloody 1935 revolution now professes to believe the Communists can eventually bring off a bloodless coup in Brazil.

Sr. Prestes wrote the 1958 party manifesto laying down a new nationalistic, anti-American policy to bring the party into line with Nikita Khrushchev's program of subversion as opposed to revolution.

The new line split the party and fostered the formation of several deviationist groups. The strongest of these is led by veterans Joao Amazonas and Mauricio Grabois.

Their weekly newspaper Classe Operaria gives extensive play to Chinese communism and ignores Russia except to criticize the Kremlin. So does the weekly Politica Operaria, published by the Frente Operaria, another splinter group.

The Chinese and Castroites are flooding the country with propaganda. Castro portraits unfailingly appear at student rallies and meetings of the revolutionary rural leagues, led by self-proclaimed Marxist Deputy Francisco Julião.

In his latest comment on the subject Sr. Julião said, "The only way out for the oppressed masses is armed struggle."

No one in Brazil could hope to mount a successful coup without control of the armed forces.

The Communists know this. Leftwing nationalist officers also appear to realize it.

Hence, both groups are courting the noncommissioned officers.

Sr. Julião flatly stated recently that "we expect to carry out our revolution with the help of the sergeants in the armed forces."

BRASS

The importance of the noncoms as an emerging new power within the armed forces was stressed recently by the presence of high brass sitting down front at a noncommissioned officers meeting.

On hand were: Admiral Pedro Araujo Suzano, navy minister; Brig. Reynaldo de Carvalho, air minister; Gen. Osvino Ferreira Alves, first army commander; Admiral Candido Aragao, marine corps commander.

The generals applauded political speeches by noncoms who criticized Congress and the courts. The military code actually prohibits any person in uniform from making political statements.

All the officers present were leftwing nationalist supporters of President Goulart. Fellow officers call Admiral Aragao a Communist while General Alves proclaimed at a public gathering that he and fellow traveling Labor Minister Afonso "have the same ideology."

Several sergeants were elected last October to atate assemblies with nationalist and Communist backing and one was sent to the Federal House of Deputies.

Although the electoral laws require that they resign from the service before they may be seated they are fighting in the courts to retain their military status while serving as congressmen.

BRAZILIAN ENVOY GIVING EXPLANATION

Brazil's Ambassador Roberto Campos today said his hour-long talk with Under Secretary of State George W. Ball yesterday had "helped to clarify unwarranted misunderstandings" of a U.S. charge that Communists had infiltrated the government of President Joao Goulart.

But the Brazilian envoy sternly warned that "one should be extremely careful in making these accusations."

The controversy has cast a shadow over a visiting mission's efforts to get U.S. aid for Brazil's 3-year multimillion-dollar economic reconstruction program.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FROM COMMUNIST YUGOSLAVIA AND POLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on February 26 I brought to the attention of the House the fact that our President has not taken the action which section 231 of the Trade Expansion Act clearly requires him to take. Section 231 requires that the President shall withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from Communist Yugoslavia and Poland and require that the products of these countries be dutiable at the same full duty rates as the other Communist countries. Although this is a matter of principle more than anything else, I want the House to understand that it is not just a demand for action based on legality alone, but that the factual situation is such that serious injury is being caused to domestic industries because of the failure of the President to act in accordance with the explicit requirement of the statute.

There are two rolled zinc plants in Indiana. One is located in Greencastle and the other in Muncie. These plants manufacture zinc sheet and zinc strip. There is substantial production of zinc strip by these plants. Formerly there was substantial production of zinc sheet but imports now have ruined the zinc sheet business in this country. In 1962 more than half of the imports of zinc sheet were of Yugoslavian origin. These foreign zinc sheet imports had an average declared foreign value in 1962 of only 12.1 cents per pound—less than the price which my constituents must pay for the metal from which to manufacture zinc strip and zinc sheet. In 1952 imports of zinc sheet represented a quantity equivalent to only 1 percent of domestic industry production. For 1962 zinc sheet imports represented a quantity equivalent to 48 percent of domestic industry production. I am presenting zinc sheet import statistics and not zinc strip import statistics because the Bureau of the Census only collects data on zinc sheet imports. Zinc strip imports are in a category with a number of other products even though interestingly enough, zinc strip production is many times that of zinc sheet.

Employees in rolled zinc plants in my State, I am pleased to say, are well paid. Their wages are more than eight times the wages paid in metal industries in Communist Yugoslavia. With a situation such as this, combined with the fact that the raw material in the United States costs more than the declared Yugoslav value of the finished manufactured product, it is no wonder that domestic zinc sheet manufacturers virtually have been put out of business and that domestic zinc strip manufacturers probably will suffer the same fate if the President does not act at once to require Communist Yugoslav products to be assessed the same full-duty rates as the other Communist countries.

Under the circumstances, I ask you, why does not the President act? Even if the law were discretionary and he only had authority to act to assist an American industry confronted with ruinous import competition from Communist Yugoslavia, you would think he would act. But this is not a discretionary matter. The law clearly requires that the President shall take this action. He has not acted, and he has given no indication of when he is going to act. This is one of the greatest affronts Congress has ever received from a President. A law is passed which the President signs, and then he does not act as the law specifically provides that he shall act.

New, let us be completely fair about the matter and see if there is any basis for the President failing to act. In 1951 in the Trade Agreements Extension Act the same language was used to require the President to withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from countries which are members of the world Communist movement. This involved 13 countries and yet President Truman was able to complete action and issue the necessary directives within 2 months—August 3, 1951, Proclamation No. 2935, 16 Federal Register 7635, and 16 Federal Register 7637. You see, most-favored-nation treatment was not withdrawn from Yugoslavia and Poland at that time because it was determined that these countries, while Communist countries, were not members of the world Communist movement but instead, so-called independent Communist countries—an interesting refinement and distinction.

Because of this distinction and the fact that most-favored-nation treatment was not withdrawn from Yugoslavia and Poland under the 1951 act, it was necessary to include an additional provision in the 1962 act which directed that most-favored-nation treatment be withdrawn from any Communist country irrespective of whether or not the country is a member of the world Communist movement.

Five months have now elapsed since the effective date of the law. Only two countries are involved and yet the President has not acted. President Truman was able to withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from 13 countries within a 2-month period, but President Kennedy has been unable to withdraw most-favored-nation treatment from only 2 Communist countries in 5 months.

Are we Members of Congress going to do nothing while the President disregards the explicit requirement of the law and American industries are being ruined by import competition from Communist countries?

Zinc strip produced in the United States

	Production (in tons)	Sales: (A) Tonnage	Sales: (B) Dollars	Exports (in tons)	Average number of employees	Man-hours expended	Average hourly pay to employees	Approximate fringe cost per paid hour	Average total hourly labor cost	Labor cost as percent of cost of finished product	Dollars of profit (loss) on these items
1959	32,364	32,221	10,773,634	1,052	242	459,716	$2.37	$0.48	$2.85	14.55	$505,347
1960	30,843	30,433	10,823,882	637	228	392,573	2.44	.49	2.93	14.63	(73,197)
1961	31,902	31,890	11,028,920	761	236	407,691	2.47	.51	2.98	13.70	(98,273)
1962	33,924	34,056	11,635,416	1,016	220	405,171	2.56	.54	3.10	13.67	116,920

Source: Rolled Zinc Manufacturers Association.

Zinc sheet produced in the United States

	Production (in tons)	Sales: (A) Tonnage	Sales: (B) Dollars	Exports (in tons)	Average number of employees	Man-hours expended	Average hourly pay to employees	Approximate fringe cost per paid hour	Average total hourly labor cost	Labor cost as percent of cost of finished product	Dollars of profit (loss) on these items
1952	6,930	6,864	4,281,164	299	349	635,493	$1.71	$0.18	$1.89	21.98	$52,571
1953	6,881	6,700	4,098,844	449	334	655,710	1.81	.24	2.05	28.85	205,229
1954	6,129	6,101	3,671,196	292	320	587,668	1.85	.30	2.15	30.55	160,057
1955	6,583	6,442	4,118,618	339	320	642,008	1.90	.30	2.20	28.53	126,104
1956	5,888	6,013	4,063,219	367	315	612,658	2.03	.33	2.36	29.72	6,350
1957	4,640	4,596	3,367,451	335	276	511,653	2.11	.37	2.48	32.90	63,408
1958	4,214	4,175	3,024,755	294	259	428,353	2.21	.40	2.61	34.62	37,774
1959	3,825	3,756	2,849,939	221	245	430,992	2.26	.46	2.72	36.68	(130,826)
1960	3,356	3,276	2,575,121	224	223	380,767	2.30	.48	2.78	33.65	(251,348)
1961	2,647	2,933	2,194,504	164	188	279,641	2.36	.54	2.90	32.66	(421,886)
1962	2,609	2,752	2,026,750	172	157	279,478	2.43	.62	3.05	33.70	(357,641)

Source: Rolled Zinc Manufacturers Association.

Zinc sheets—Imports by volume and value, average value of imports in terms of cents per pound and imports as percentage of domestic production

Year	Imports: Tons	Imports: Dollars	Average foreign value of imports (cents per pound)	Imports by volume as percent of domestic production
1952	47	23,557	25.0	1
1953	196	76,751	19.5	3
1954	259	88,010	17.0	4
1955	431	148,389	17.2	7
1956	450	170,416	18.9	8
1957	732	244,722	16.7	16
1958	823	262,324	15.9	19
1959	950	310,855	16.3	25
1960	904	301,667	16.6	27
1961	1,177	350,200	14.9	44
1962	1,298	363,916	14.0	48

Source: Imports by tons and dollar value are as reported by the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce Commodity Classification 6559000 except that for the years 1952 through 1958 they have been revised in accordance with the findings of the U.S. Tariff Commission in Report on Zinc Sheet—Escape Clause Investigation No. 81, dated January 1960, table 12. Other data as computed by Rolled Zinc Manufacturers Association. Excludes quantities erroneously reported as having been entered from Canada.

1962 zinc sheet imports—quantity, value, and average foreign value by country of origin in terms of cents per pound

	Belgium	Japan	Netherlands	West Germany	United Kingdom	Yugoslavia
Quantity (pounds)	235,638	1,788	223,011	541,395	42,557	1,552,513
Value	$35,250	$626	$33,559	$99,585	$7,300	$187,596
Average value (cents)	14.9	35.0	15.0	18.4	17.1	12.1

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Zinc sheet imports by country of origin

[In tons]

	Yugoslavia	West Germany	Belgium	Netherlands	United Kingdom
1956	--------	323	43	75	--------
1957	236	314	78	103	--------
1958	267	361	112	141	17
1959	222	450	113	155	6
1960	411	251	92	58	5
1961	769	244	67	92	5
1962	776	271	118	111	21

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. First, I would like to say that I am completely in agreement with the fine statement the gentleman from Indiana is making, because I know he is well aware I represent the community of Greencastle, Ind., that has one of these zinc mills. I know firsthand of the tremendous damage, the tremendous loss of employment and business which has resulted from interfering foreign imports of zinc. I want to commend the gentleman for the wonderful job he is doing in explaining this to the Congress, and I certainly hope that as a result of his efforts here today and of the astute remarks he is making that the administration will bring in a directive to grant relief to a very worthwhile industry in this country.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. I also wish to commend the gentleman for bringing this information out. I would like to ask him a couple of questions.

First, is this zinc that is being imported into the United States from Communist Yugoslavia identified in any way so the purchaser of this zinc plate in this country can identify it as being manufactured in a Communist country?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. To the best of my knowledge, let me say to the gentleman, I think not.

Mr. STINSON. So a consumer in this country could possibly buy this zinc sheet on the open market in the United States without any knowledge of its having been manufactured in a Communist country.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. To the best of my knowledge I am sure that is correct.

Mr. STINSON. Another question if the gentleman will permit: Is it possible that the industry manufacturing this zinc sheet in Yugoslavia is subsidized by the American taxpayers through the foreign aid program?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I am very sorry I cannot answer the gentleman's question. I do not have that information.

Mr. STINSON. The fact that the United States has given something over $2 billion in aid to various foreign constituencies and economies, it is just possible that some of it went to establish the zinc sheet industry in Yugoslavia, and that our own aid is being used against American workers in this country.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman and can only say I think that is entirely possible.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in commending the gentleman for the presentation of these facts here today. The imports of zinc are having a very seriously damaging effect, as the gentleman has pointed out, upon our American economy and upon American employment; and I sincerely hope that these remarks will serve to bring to those charged with the responsibility in this respect the need for direct and immediate remedial action.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. As a very knowledgeable member of the Foreign Affairs Committee I am very sure the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] is aware of the impact of these importations, and I am very hopeful that through his support and that of my other colleagues in the House we will be able to bring this forcefully enough to the attention of the President that he can take action.

THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, March 24, 1963, marked an historic milestone in the long and proud history of the State of North Carolina. Three hundred years ago yesterday King Charles II of England issued a charter at his royal court in Westminster, conveying to eight of his close friends and supporters a vast tract of land in North America. The grant extended southward from present-day Virginia to Florida, which was then a Spanish possession, and from the Atlantic Ocean to the South Seas, or Pacific Ocean.

Over his royal seal King Charles officially designated the territory conveyed in the charter as "Carolina." March 24, 1963, therefore, marked the 300th anniversary of the founding of the modern State of North Carolina.

The people of North Carolina take pride in the history and the accomplishments of our great State. They are fully aware of the fact that our State existed long before there was a United States of America. They are proud of the tremendous progress the State has made in industry and in the arts and sciences during the past 300 years.

To make appropriate plans to commemorate the tercentenary of North Carolina, the general assembly of the State established the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission in 1959. Distinguished North Carolinians from every part of the State are serving on the commission. Under the direction of the commission pageants, plays, and historical observances are being held this year over North Carolina to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the State.

Mr. Speaker, out of the vast tract of land designated "Carolina" on March 24, 1663, by King Charles II, 14 great States of the Union, wholly or in part, were subsequently created. In view of this fact, the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission felt that the observance of the 300th anniversary of North Carolina was an event of significance, not only to North Carolina, but to the other States of the Union and to foreign nations as well. To place the tercentenary, therefore, in its proper perspective, the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission requested the North Carolina delegation in the Congress to sponsor legislation to create a Federal North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I was pleased to introduce the House bill creating the Commission. The Commission consists of 15 members, 4 of whom are Members of the Senate and 4 of whom are Members of the House of Representatives. In addition, seven members have been appointed to the Commission by the President of the United States.

I have long felt that the magnificent story of the founding of America and the growth of its democratic institutions has largely been a story as yet untold. God has surely blessed the efforts of our forefathers to found a new order in America based on the dignity of man. We have grown to be the most powerful nation in the world, and our voice commands attention in the councils of the great.

As we have made material progress I am afraid we have failed to give enough attention to the wonderful and inspiring history of our Nation. In our zeal to build a new order of material wealth we have overlooked, to a great extent, some of the basic lessons to be learned from our illustrious past.

I sincerely believe that if we are to maintain our position of greatness and if we are to reach the fulfillment of the grand design bequeathed to us by our forefathers, we must rededicate ourselves to the fundamental principles and ideals of our forefathers. In short, Mr. Speaker, we must again study and learn to appreciate the history of our Nation.

The venerable poet, historian, and philosopher, Carl Sandburg, has said:

> If America forgets where she came from, if the people lose sight of what brought them along, if she listens to the deniers and mockers, then will begin rot and dissolution.

The citizens of North Carolina are well aware of the truth of Mr. Sandburg's statement. Thus, in this year of the 300th anniversary of our great State, they are rededicating themselves to the eternal principles upon which their free society was founded.

For a moment let us examine the events that led up to the founding of Carolina. It is a remarkable page in history. On January 30, 1649, King Charles I of England was beheaded. There followed a period of great upheaval and political unrest in the country. England was without a king. Oliver Cromwell, Lord Protector, ruled the land as a virtual dictator.

With the death of Cromwell in 1658 the English people called to the throne Charles II, the son of the beheaded Charles I. On the 28th of May, 1660, his 30th birthday, Charles II entered London.

During the despotic rule of Oliver Cromwell in our mother country, King Charles II had been forced to live in France. Penniless and with few friends, he had eked out a meager existence. On the restoration of the monarchy, therefore, Charles II was understandably generous to those who had supported him with money and who had espoused his cause in England during his exile.

To eight men who had been his strongest supporters and who had done the most for his restoration to the English throne, Charles II gave the Carolina grant of land on March 24, 1663.

These eight men, known in history as the Eight Lords Proprietors of North Carolina, were distinguished Englishmen. Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, was Lord High Chancellor of England. George Monck, Duke of Albemarle, was Master of the King's Horse and Captain General of all his forces. William, Lord Craven, had been a great friend of Charles II's father. John, Lord Berkeley, had supported Charles I and had joined the royal family in exile. Sir George Carteret was Vice Chamberlain of the King's household. Sir William Berkeley, as Governor of Virginia, had persuaded his colony to stand by Charles II, even though he was in exile. Sir John Colleton had supported the royal cause in the Barbados. Anthony Ashley Cooper was Chancellor of the Exchequer and subsequently was created the Earl of Shaftesbury.

The Eight Lords Proprietors, of course, were not aware of the extent of the vast property they acquired in the New World through the generosity of Charles II. In 1585 an unsuccessful attempt had been made by Sir Walter Raleigh to establish an English settlement on Roanoke Island, N.C. This was 20 years before the settlement of the Virginia Jamestown Colony and more than three decades prior to the founding of the Plymouth Colony.

When the Carolina Charter of 1663 was given to the Proprietors, North Carolina had approximately 2,000 European inhabitants. Most of these had filtered into Carolina from the Virginia colony. The ill-fated Sir Walter Raleigh Colony, founded in 1585 on Roanoke Island, had disappeared from the face of the earth. The fate of the 117 members of the colony still remains a mystery.

The Charter of 1663 described Carolina as "not yet cultivated or planted and only inhabited by some barbarous people who have no knowledge of Almighty God." The charter, however, extended to the people then in Carolina and to the future citizens of the colony all of the rights and privileges that Englishmen had inherited in the centuries since Magna Carta.

The Lords Proprietors were required:

> To ordain, make, enact, and under their seals to publish any laws whatsoever, either appertaining to the public state of the said province or the private utility of particular persons, according to their best discretion of, and with the advice, assent, and approbation of the freemen of the said province, or of the greater part of them, or of their delegates or deputies; whom, for enacting of the said laws, when and as often as need shall require, we will that the said Edward, Earl of Clarendon; and their heirs, shall, from time to time, assemble, in such manner and form as to them shall seem best.

At another point in the charter King Charles said that the people of Carolina as his subjects:

> Should enjoy, give, sell, alien, and bequeath; as likewise, all liberties, franchises, and privileges of this our Kingdom of England and of our dominions aforesaid, may freely and quietly have, possess, and enjoy as our liege people born within the same, without the let, molestation, vexation, trouble, or grievance of us, our heirs and successors; any statute, act, ordinance, or provision to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. Speaker, it will be seen, that North Carolina was founded upon the principle of representative government and that the rights of Englishmen were guaranteed to Carolinians. For 300 years the citizens of the State have cultivated their free institutions. The people of North Carolina have always been jealous of their rights and privileges as free citizens.

Even the Lords Proprietors were well aware of the independent nature of North Carolinians. A few years after Carolina was founded the Proprietors said plaintively in a message directed to Carolinians that they were "a people that neither understood your [their] own nor regarded our—the Proprietors'—interests."

Approximately 6 months after the Lords Proprietors received their charter from King Charles one of their number, Sir William Berkeley, Governor of Virginia, was given the authority to exercise the powers of government in Albermarle, the only portion of Carolina settled at that time. Sir William Berkeley, in turn, appointed William Drummond, "a sober Scotch gentleman of good repute" in 1664 as Governor.

In 1665 the first formal plan of government for Carolina was adopted pursuant to the charter. It is known as the Concessions and Agreement of 1665. Under the Concessions, a popular assembly was created which had much broader powers than were actually required by the Proprietors' charter.

The Concessions and Agreement of 1665 was, in turn, succeeded by the Fundamental Constitutions of Carolina in 1669. This plan of government was known as the "Grand Model." It was not as successful an instrument of government as the Concessions. The colony was plagued by what has been described as "many and various commotions, disorders and irregularities."

Although there was friction and turmoil in the Carolina Colony, it made great advancement under the Proprietors. Tobacco, the "bewitching vegetable," as it was called then, was widely used as the currency of the colony.

The proprietary government of North Carolina lasted until the Carolina Charter was surrendered to the English Crown in 1729. In that year North Carolina became a royal colony and so remained until it threw off the English yoke and assumed its position as a sovereign State in the American Union.

Mr. Speaker, this is the inspiring story of the founding of representative government in North Carolina. From the approximately 2,000 people who inhabited Carolina in 1663 we have grown to a great State stretching from the Atlantic Ocean to the highest crest of the Appalachian mountains and embracing within our borders nearly 5 million citizens engaged in industry, commerce, and the arts and sciences.

The motto of our great State is "To Be, Rather Than To Seem." We have fulfilled the meaning of this motto in every respect. The history of North Carolina has been carved by men of vision and faith in the American ideal.

As the people of our State pause this year to mark the 300th anniversary of the Carolina Charter which gave birth to their free society, they will take renewed faith in the great principles which have enabled North Carolina to reach a position of eminence among the States of the Union. In developing an understanding of the glorious past of North Carolina, and indeed of the founding of liberty in the New World, our people will be better prepared to face the trials of the present and the uncertainties of the future.

It is my hope that our sister States will join with North Carolina in this proud moment in her long history. May the 300th anniversary of Carolina be a spark which will rekindle a desire on the part of every American to learn more of the heritage of their Nation and by so doing become better citizens.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay the gentleman from North Carolina the highest tribute I know for delivering here this morning a historical paper that calls to the attention of America the great occasion that is taking place in the State of North Carolina in this tercentenary event.

Mr. Speaker, in 1584 and 1585, the first and second efforts of Sir Walter Raleigh to settle the New World were made on Roanoke Island, North Carolina. At that time the entire area was christened "Virginia" in honor of England's virgin Queen Elizabeth. The third expedition, due to trials and tribulations of the second, moved on to the deep waters of the Chesapeake and settled at Jamestown.

This occasion is particularly significant to me because it is in the district that I have the honor to represent that the first vestiges of permanent colonization took place in the Carolinas. The charter that we commemorate today was the first to provide for the beginning of religious tolerance in the area encompassed by the grant.

It is this tolerance and the Charter's concepts of freedom of thought, that have been handed down through the centuries and have helped make this country what it is today.

The fact that the first effort by the English to colonize the United States occurred in what is now North Carolina is well known. What is less known is that in Edenton, N.C., and Bath, N.C., we find the first permanent North Carolina settlements that stimulated the migration which swept across the State and to the south. Just yesterday tercentenary exercises were held at old St. Thomas Church at Bath, N.C. The communion service at this church was given by Queen Anne. Other historical homes and buildings of the community were open. It was here that the first library in Carolina was established.

On April 6 in Edenton, N.C., the Post Office Department will issue a commemorative stamp that honors the Carolina Charter. There is some question as to whether the first post office in the area encompassed by the grant was in Edenton or Bath, N.C., but the question does not take away in any respect the privilege that is Edenton's in being the focal point for the issuance of this commemorative stamp, that is of significance to all America and particularly to the North Carolinians.

It is right and proper that this 300th anniversary observance should extend far beyond the boundaries of the district I represent, for each part of the State has played a part in the development of the area covered by the grant. It is also fitting and proper that the observance of this 300th anniversary should extend to the schools, the colleges, and the universities, to cultural projects and religious programs, and in effect to all the peoples of the State, for each is concerned with the events of the first century of the colony's history and the provisions for the above that were written in the charter.

One of the great traditions of North Carolina has been the fact that progress has been made through the cooperation of all its peoples. This is why it is quite fitting that no specific city or area be designated as the focal point for the celebration of this 300th anniversary.

Because it is a statewide project of interest to all the State's peoples, it is best that the programs which are being conducted are done at a local level and centered upon local personalities, sites, or events of significance during the early history of the colony, and the entire area is full of great historic events that had bearing on the eventual founding of the independence and the freedom of the peoples of America who exist today.

I am proud that the real history of the development of North Carolina began in the district I have the honor to represent, and the first English-speaking child was born on Roanoke Island, which is now part of Dare County, N.C., and that a drama has been held at Fort Raleigh for 20 years or more portraying that first effort to settle the New World. However, it pleases me that this is a tercentenary celebration that reaches all parts of the State—the Albemarle, the Pamlico, the Cape Fear, the Piedmont, and the Blue Ridge. For it was people who came through from the eastern part of the country and from the eastern seaboard that made the march across our country that caused our country to grow. They banded themselves together and went into the forest and conquered the wild and laid the foundation so that men could live today in freedom and in comfort and enjoy their respective ways of life.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you and I congratulate my distinguished colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] for introducing the resolution that commemorates this great occasion and for arranging these proceedings today so that we might speak about this tercentenary celebration.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] for his splendid remarks, and I would join him in emphasizing that on April 6 at Edenton, N.C., the Carolina tercentenary commemorative stamp which the gentleman has mentioned will go on sale for the first time. I understand there is a great public interest in this outstanding event.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, may I commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] for bringing to the attention of this body this historical event. The word "tercentenary" is a large word. The tercentenary celebration in North Carolina calls for large plans throughout our State to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the founding of North Carolina. Visitors to North Carolina this year will find a wide variety of attractions to make their stay a memorable one. Throughout the State local groups and communities are scheduling programs of varying type and degree, which usually will be centered on local personalities, sites, and events of significance during the early history of our State and our colony. As an example, on June 27 through the 29, the people of Watauga County and the town of Boone, which is situated in the beautiful Blue Ridge Mountains of North Carolina, will join in these commemorative events. An outstanding program and appropriate events are being planned including the opening presentation of the 1963 edition of "Horn in the West," which is a superlative outdoor drama. This part of the State is of particular significance because 200 years ago that famous frontiersman and explorer, Daniel Boone, first crossed the Blue Ridge to open up the western part of our country. In this program at Boone, which is named for this great explorer, there will be events to commemorate his great achievements. A wagon train will be sent across the original route that he took to cross the Blue Ridge and to open up our great West.

I was particularly interested, Mr. Speaker, in the remarks of my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] concerning the historical significance of these events in North Carolina and the importance that they have even today in the history of our country. You know history shows us that many civilizations have risen and have fallen and history also shows us that these civilizations have built many monuments to materialism, usually under a dictatorship-type of government.

It also shows us that these monuments have rotted and decayed. They leave their silent remains as proof to us that these civilizations failed. Why did they fail? It is because human freedom was not the basis for their existence.

I am certainly glad to see that our educational institutions are taking part in this great celebration that we are planning and are having in North Carolina and that the young people and all of the people today can be made aware of the past history not only of our State but also of our country as a whole. Through these and other events, let us rededicate ourselves to the continuation of liberty and freedom in America.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank my colleague for his participation in this discussion and assure him that the people of North Carolina are aware of the activities planned in his congressional district in the Watauga County area, particularly.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my distinguished friend and colleague from North Carolina for being the author of this resolution which provides for the celebration of this significant historical event in our State.

North Carolina is rich in history and tradition; it has a great heritage. It has a greater heritage, I might say quite vainly, if you want to call it that, quite vainly, than any State I know of. I think it is significant for us to keep in mind that this charter that was issued 300 years ago yesterday embraced the grant area that it did. As has already been mentioned by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] and by the distinguished gentleman from the First Congressional District [Mr. BONNER], and our friend from the Blue Ridge area of North Carolina, it started at what would be now the northern boundary of Virginia and extended southward to what is now the northern boundary of Florida. That is a great expanse and area, and then from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean, embracing today 14 or perhaps 15 of our finest States in our union of States.

It is significant to me that just in 1949 after many years of search, North Carolinians were able to locate the original charter. They found it in the hands of a bookseller or merchant in England, in London, to be more precise. Funds were forthwith raised to purchase this historic document to bring it back to North Carolina where it is now housed in our archives of history at our capitol at Raleigh. Here it is seen visually and studied by literally hundreds of thousands of people every year, not only people from North Carolina but people from all the States that are embraced in this total grant covering some 14 States of our Union.

It is significant to me that in this so-called statewide celebration, historic as it is, it was deemed advisable to keep it at the lower level, the level of the community where the people themselves reside, the grassroots, where they can get inspiration from what took place 300 years ago when the forebears of the present generation had the drive and the initiative to move westward to what is now our Pacific coast.

To me it is a very great event. We share with all the people in this great area our pride that the gentleman must have [Mr. WHITENER], a member of this Commission, and the others in North Carolina, who have meant so much in bringing this to the attention not only of the North Carolinians but to people everywhere.

I commend the gentlemen from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL and Mr. BONNER], and the other members of the North Carolina delegation, and others who will offer for the RECORD their statement and thinking along this line.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from the Seventh District for his contribution. I take note of his reference to what may be derived today from the lessons of the past. I known that the gentleman comes from one of the leading tobacco districts of America. I am sure in his section of the State the people will take great interest in the fact that the first known crop control program in the history of the world, I suppose, was proposed for Carolina territory.

In 1666, Gov. William Drummond, of North Carolina, met at St. Mary's the first capital of Maryland, with representatives of Virginia and Maryland to investigate the possibility of controlling tobacco prices. The plan called for a temporary suspension of tobacco planting which would result in a tobacco shortage. The shortage, they hoped, would in turn increase the price paid for the tobacco crop. The Carolina Legislative Assembly was willing to impose the controls, but the plan failed of adoption because Lord Baltimore, the proprietor of Maryland, refused to go along with the agreement.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join my colleagues in paying honor to North Carolina on the 300th anniversary of the North Carolina Charter, issued in 1663.

This document, on display in the North Carolina Hall of History at Raleigh, was issued on March 24, 1663, by King Charles II, of England, to eight loyal supporters whose assistance helped the King regain the English throne.

The original area granted to these eight lord proprietors would dwarf North Carolina's present size. The area was so immense it extended southward from Virginia to Florida and from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean, or

"South Seas," as the Pacific was known in those early days.

By 1763—100 years after issuance of the charter—the colony's population had grown to approximately 200,000 persons and the settlement had extended westward to the Blue Ridge Mountains.

It should be pointed out that North Carolina did not officially become North Carolina until December 7, 1710, when the area then referred to only as Carolina was divided into North and South Carolina.

I wish to take this occasion to pay particular tribute to the North Carolina Tercentenary Commission for the outstanding contribution it has made in calling to the attention of North Carolinians the importance of this 300th anniversary in our history and heritage.

One hundred years ago, we were in the midst of the War between the States and little time was available to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the Carolina Charter. Two hundred years ago, the French and Indian War was drawing to a close and few stopped to look back over the previous 100 years.

This makes it even more fitting that we should pause this year to commemorate North Carolina's 300th year as a unit of government.

As a closing thought, I would state that the last 300 years have been years of progress for North Carolina so that its future today is bright and promising. We are proud of our history and are proud to be one of the 50 States which, collectively, make America what it is today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, March 24, will mark the 300th anniversary of the Carolina Charter of 1663. The grant was issued by King Charles II of England to eight prominent military and political leaders of the time whose help had been indispensable to him. It embraced an immense territory: all the land between the 36th parallel of latitude on the north and the 31st parallel on the south, and stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. This tremendous tract included not only the present-day States of North and South Carolina, but also all or part of a number of States of our country.

Although the charter of 1663 was not the first, nor the last, patent affecting the modern Carolinas to be issued by English sovereigns, it was the most significant because it put the new colony on a permanent footing and added yet another brick to the structure of our American heritage. For this charter qualified the vast powers of the lords proprietors, as its beneficiaries were called, to "enact any laws whatsoever pertaining to the public state of the said Providence, or to the private utility of particular persons," by making such laws subject to the "advice, consent, and approbation of the freemen of the said Providence, or the greater part of them, or of their delegates or deputies" who were required to be assembled from time to time.

The 87th Congress by its Public Law 437 provided for the establishment of the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission to formulate and implement plans for the observance of this most significant occasion. The Federal Government has also put its stamp of approval on the event, literally, by arranging for the issuance next month of a commemorative postage stamp honoring the tercentenary of the Carolina Charter of 1663.

I am sure that I voice the sentiments of the House when I extend felicitations to the present-day beneficiaries of the Carolina Charter of 1663, and express confidence that the principles of freedom and justice which it conveyed to our land will continue to flourish and be strengthened in the decades and generations that lie ahead.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to join with our distinguished Speaker, the members of the delegation in this House from North Carolina, and with the people of the great State of North Carolina in calling the attention of the entire Nation to the tercentenary celebration of the Charter to the Lords Proprietors of Carolina by King Charles II on March 24, 1663.

Certainly, the granting of the Carolina Charter ranks among events of primary historical importance to this Nation. From these vast tracts of territory, a large segment of this Nation has been formed. From the people it has produced have come a succession of leaders who have helped to fashion the detailed architecture of our democracy and its social and economic institutions. Surely these leaders and the people who sent them forth have added to the strength, prosperity, and wisdom of the Nation.

Again, let me express the assurance that all Americans celebrate with you and that their interest will be proved when they join with Carolinians this summer in attending the festivals and ceremonies that are being planned to mark this historic occasion.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, by appointment from you on January 31, 1963, I have the honor to serve as a member of the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission, established by joint Senate and House resolutions, enacted into Public Law 437 of the 87th Congress. The House division of the tercentenary celebration commission, under the able chairmanship of my North Carolina colleague, the Honorable BASIL WHITENER, works in cooperation with the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission, created by the General Assembly of North Carolina.

The purpose of the State and Federal Commissions is to assist in developing plans for the celebration of the 300th anniversary of the granting of the Carolina Charter by King Charles II to the eight Lords Proprietors. The territorial scope of the charter was tremendous, running southward from Virginia to Florida and west to the Pacific Ocean. I believe even my colleagues from the Lone Star State will admit that this is nearly as big as the State of Texas.

But even more significant than its territorial dimensions were the guarantees contained in the charter to the settlers within the boundaries to form a government of freemen with the rights enjoyed by Englishmen under English laws. Thus the shadow of the Magna Charta was extended, through the Carolina Charter, to the shores of the New World.

The impact of this guarantee of political freedom was reflected in the first General Assembly of North Carolina in 1665 and in the several constitutions which were to follow. And so we feel that in Carolina was the genesis of those democratic ideals which have become the cornerstone of our great country and which, please God, will continue to motivate our national life.

The formal opening of the tercentenary celebration occurred in January of this year at the Governor's mansion in Raleigh. The occasion was highlighted by an immense birthday cake, shaped like the U.S. map, bearing 300 candles, which Governor Sanford handily extinguished in four mighty blows.

There are many more events to follow in our observance of the granting of the Carolina Charter of 1663, for when anything of such import becomes 300 years old, it calls for a statewide celebration. These events will call into play all our State resources in the cultural arts, and they are many. Long before the National Capital became concerned about the preservation and enhancement of our national cultural heritage, the State of North Carolina was quietly going about its business of encouraging the arts—through many channels: the State Literary and Historical Society, which every year holds a "culture week" in our State capital of Raleigh; the North Carolina Symphony Orchestra, widely renowned; the Carolina Playmakers at Chapel Hill and the Little Theater movement throughout the State; the State Art Gallery, the finest, say some, south of Washington, and many other university and private art galleries; our grassroots opera company; and our impressive galaxy of writers in all areas of the written word.

If we appear too fulsome in praise of our State today, Mr. Speaker, we are but carrying out the injunction of the late Dr. R. D. W. Connor, of North Carolina, a historian of note and the first Archivist of the United States, who said:

> A people who have not the pride to record their history will not long have the virtue to make history that is worth recording.

In connection with our tercentenary celebration, we are very much gratified that the Post Office Department will issue a 5-cent commemorative stamp, depicting the first page of the Carolina Charter against a background of red velvet. The stamp was unveiled by Postmaster General J. Edward Day at ceremonies held here in the Capitol on February 28. First-day sale of the stamp will take place on April 6 in Edenton, N.C., one of the early settlements of the State which even today retains much of its colonial atmosphere.

We extend to our colleagues in the Congress a cordial invitation to visit North Carolina, either for the first day of issue of this stamp or for some of the subsequent celebrations which will be held in this tercentenary year from Murphy to Manteo.

Come down and drive over our fine highways which unwind like silver ribbons from the mountains to the sea. Visit Mount Mitchell, the highest peak east of the Rockies; visit Roanoke Island, birthplace of Virginia Dare, the first white child born in America; see Kill Devil Hill, where the first flight of a power-driven airplane was made by the Wright Brothers; and by all means visit our capital city of Raleigh, with its brandnew State House and its beautiful old Capitol Building of classic Greek design. And while there do not fail to visit the Hall of History, a component of the State Department of Archives and History, where you may see the selfsame charter we are talking about today, for North Carolina owns the charter, one of the most rare and interesting documents of the world.

Although I have referred to our State cultural activities and interests, let me assure you that we Tar Heels are really as plain as old shoes. The Old North State was not settled by the aristocracy but by plain people. So along with our culture, come down and enjoy our corn pone and chittlin's, our coon hunts and fish fries, breathe our fresh mountain air, sniff our sea coast medley of smells; play our splendid sandhills golf courses; go deep-sea fishing off our coast; see our rolling, industrialized Piedmont where my own district is located and where you will find many colleges and universities, including the University of North Carolina, the first State university to open its doors to students, and Duke University, as well as famous-name textile, furniture, and tobacco factories, famed battlegrounds, and the finest people in the world.

In short, do just about whatever you enjoy doing. You name it, for we believe we have it.

And so, in the vernacular of some sections of our State, let me extend this invitation, which in North Carolina is unsurpassed in neighborliness and enthusiasm: "Y'all come."

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, March 24, 1963, marks the 300th anniversary of the granting of the Carolina Charter of 1663, and in commemoration of that great historical event, the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission, established by the North Carolina General Assembly, has planned appropriate observances throughout 1963.

The original charter itself is preserved in North Carolina's Hall of History in Raleigh, where it is carefully encased in such a way as to protect it while still making it available for page-by-page inspection. It is one of only six of the original charters so preserved.

A number of significant programs and ceremonies are planned for the entire year. Some have already been held and others are scheduled. The U.S. Post Office Department has approved the issuance of a special commemorative stamp for this occasion and was recently unveiled in the Capitol by Postmaster General Day. The stamp will be placed on sale for the first time at Edenton, N.C., on April 6.

Texans and Alaskans who like to boast of the size of their respective States might note that the original Carolina Charter established a land grant to eight men extending from coast to coast in a strip bordered roughly to the north by what is now the present-day border of Virginia, and to the south by what is now Florida.

To those interested in colonial history, 1963 is the ideal year to visit North Carolina, as local groups will be sponsoring various programs throughout the entire year in observance of the tercentennial of the charter, and colonial history will be highlighted throughout the entire State.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in congratulating the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission upon the valuable and lasting service it has rendered, and will doubtless continue to render throughout its existence, to the great State of North Carolina by bringing into better focus and emphasizing the early history of our State. I would also commend the hundreds of others who are assisting in a variety of ways to publicize and dramatize our colonial history and to make a memorable success of the celebration of Carolina's 300th year.

North Carolina is justly proud of the part it has taken in the founding and building of the greatest nation on earth. No country in the world has ever started so humbly and achieved so much in so short a period as America. It did not happen by chance.

As we celebrate Carolina's tercentennial in song, pageant, documentary, narrative and otherwise, I sincerely hope that all North Carolinians will be constantly mindful, or at least often reminded, of the character and spirit of the men and women of 300 years ago who undertook the building of a State in a strange, desolate and wild region. The events which marked the development and progress of colonial Carolina are of immense historical interest, of course, but we of modern North Carolina should find something more than mere interest in the spirit and attiude of the people in whose lives and activities our State had its beginning. We should find inspiration and a challenge.

Three hundred years ago, Carolina was not merely an underdeveloped area, as we understand and so often use that term today, but was an undeveloped raw wilderness. Early Carolinians had no indulgent and benevolent government upon which to lean and depend for their needs from the cradle to the grave; there were no public welfare programs, no government lending agencies, and no foreign aid programs. But they had something of far greater worth, the qualities of character and spirit that underlie all individual and State stability and progress. They actively sought a way of life which they knew beforehand would bring them face to face with dangers, obstacles, barriers, and challenges unnumbered and unknown.

What kind of people were they? What possessed them? They were proud, independent, and self-reliant; their undertakings and accomplishments under hardship conditions required great personal courage, initiative, stamina, and determination. They were willing to work, strive, venture, and sacrifice much in the hope and belief that the future would bring large returns. But they did not know that it would—they ventured much. Most of the natural obstacles they encountered have now been removed and we in modern North Carolina have no occasion to test our mettle against the forces and challenges which the early Carolinians met. Even so, while we celebrate the 300th anniversary of Carolina's first charter, it is in the best of order to ask ourselves a couple of questions: How do we of today compare with them in the qualities of self-reliance, fighting spirit, personal courage, initiative, general strength of character, and urge for individual and collective freedom? Do we as willingly and courageously meet the challenges and responsibilities of modern life as they met those of a far more difficult period?

In this tercentenary year, let us celebrate and glory in the achievements of those early Carolinians who broke the ground and laid the foundation for our great State. But let us be constantly reminded that the glory is theirs, not ours, and that all of our narratives and pageants will not add one whit to the significance and worth of their struggles and accomplishments. As we celebrate, then, let us also pause and take stock of ourselves with the view of honestly determining whether we individually and collectively possess those qualities of character and spirit that would prompt, urge, and enable us, if such were possible, to stand in their stead and duplicate their feats. A negative finding will be cause for concern because real progress in an individual or in a State involves intangibles which are neither seen nor measured by material standards.

In substance, all recorded history is an account of how individuals and nations have met and dealt with the challenges and responsibilities of their times. Other peoples, as well before as since 1663, have taken ignominious flight before challenge and responsibility, having neither the will nor the courage to assume the posture of men and take on the responsibilities essential to the creation and development of a stable system of free government. Such peoples abound in the world today.

I believe the qualities of character and spirit essential to the establishment of a stable system of free government are the same today as they were 300 years ago or 3,000 years ago and as they will be 300 years hence. And I believe that the maintenance of such a system is more difficult than its establishment.

It is suggested from time to time that the so-called underdeveloped countries of the world can eventually be stabilized economically and politically by giving them economic, military and technical aid. I do not agree. Such aids may temporarily serve an apparently good purpose but they will never imbue the people of these countries with the character and spirit which moves and drives individuals and peoples to fight for the privilege of assuming responsibility. Freedom grows out of the assumption of responsibility; it has no other source. To personally or collectively face up to

the challenges of responsibility is the price of freedom.

Little more than 100 years after the charter of 1663, Carolinians joined in a war and fought and died for the privilege of assuming the responsibilities of independence and self-government. I wish that the people of all the restless and underdeveloped countries of the world today could be taught and made to understand and take unto themselves the lessons that may be learned from the example of early Carolina. Let us remember them, too. Our system is established; so let us look to its maintenance.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, March 24, 1963, marked the 300th anniversary of the granting of the Carolina Charter by King Charles II of England. We North Carolinians proudly trace our American heritage to this historic document.

When the charter was granted, North Carolina as we know it today is estimated to have contained but 2,000 people. They had emigrated to a wild, unexplored, undeveloped wilderness seeking religious and political freedom and an opportunity to improve their economic status. From this humble beginning, North Carolina has grown to the point where our State now contains over 4½ million people.

We are all rightfully proud of the advances our State has made in agriculture, industry, education and the arts during three centuries of progress. The emphasis in North Carolina today is on industrial expansion and the improvement of our educational facilities, in short, on the future. This is well and good because no civilization can progress by resting on its oars and reliving the past. But as the French poet Lamartine said, "History teaches everything, even the future."

So I think it is important that in the year 1963, which marks the 300th anniversary of the granting of the charter from which comes North Carolina as we know it today, the attention of the people of our State and the Nation should be focused on some of the lessons to be learned from the past. Our forefathers brought representative government to this land and they earned their freedom by a great outpouring of blood, sweat, and tears. Many of us take this heritage too lightly. We can all glibly recite the things we feel we have a right to expect from our country but many fail to realize that there is a corresponding obligation. The North Carolina General Assembly in 1959 established the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission and the commission is planning a series of festivals and ceremonies designed to refresh the memories of our people about some of the significant events in our State's great history.

A cordial invitation is extended to our fellow citizens from the other States of the Union, and to friends from abroad, to visit North Carolina during this tercentenary year. They will find that North Carolina indeed has a glorious past and a bright and promising future.

The Congress of the United States recognized the importance of this anniversary by creating a North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration Commission composed of four Members of the Senate, four Members of the House, and seven members appointed by the President of the United States. I am very proud to serve as a member on that Commission by appointment of the Speaker of the House.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject on which I just spoke.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

GERMANS MAKING NASSER MISSILES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of this House to developments involving the Federal Republic of West Germany and the United Arab Republic, with respect to the manufacture of weapons of mass destruction, that I regard as a grave threat to peace and stability in the Near East.

These events indicate a need by our Government for closer scrutiny of West Germany's role in NATO.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the active collaboration of German scientists and German industries in the efforts of Colonel Nasser, dictator of the United Arab Republic, to perfect rockets with radiological and bacteriological warheads for use in the destruction of Israel and other countries in Nasser's aggressive designs on his neighbors.

In justifying the nefarious work of German scientists and technicians, authorities at Bonn are trying to hide behind a cloak of spurious legalism all too reminiscent of the "laws" of the Nazi era under which Germans perpetrated horrendous deeds and later said they "were only doing their duty."

German morality may now be reasonably questioned at the very time we hear demands from Bonn for stronger influence in NATO and nuclear weaponry. Instead of contributing a fair share to the peaceful development of developing countries in cooperation with the United States—and I must stress the prosperity of German economy—some Germans are irresponsibly seeking to grow even more prosperous as merchants of death catering to the treacherous Colonel Nasser.

Bonn has as much governmental responsibility to keep radiological and German rockets out of Egyptian hands as the United States has to prevent its citizens and industries from doing similar work for Castro Cuba, which, incidentally, is a good friend of Nasserite Egypt.

I wish to direct attention to the following authoritative news reports pertaining to the situation I have described.

FOUR HUNDRED GERMANS MAKING NASSER MISSILE

(By Antony Terry)

BONN, March 23.—In Egypt's closely guarded missile center Project 333, near Cairo, nearly 400 German scientists and technicians, most of them from the wartime German V–2 missile center at Penemunde, are working on the first Egyptian-made rocket missile with warheads containing radioactive materials designed for President Gamal Abdel Nasser.

Details of this work have been known to Bonn authorities for some time and have caused some concern here.

Israeli anxiety over the military effects of Egyptian rocket development on the power balance in the Mideast at a time when talks on federation of Egypt, Syria and Iraq are getting underway has led to the recent "underground war" by Israel agents in West Germany.

Their aim has been to buy off or scare off German experts engaged on this rocket work.

Though their efforts have been widespread and, according to some German sources, as efficiently organized as Eichmann kidnapping commandos, they have met with only moderate success.

VANISHED MYSTERIOUSLY

One of the West Germans who vanished mysteriously last September is Heinz Krug, a former insurance clerk who ran a firm with headquarters in Munich, whose job was to purchase materials and technical equipment in Europe for Egypt's missile research and construction.

After the war and before joining the Egyptians, Krug was a member of the German research physics under West Germany's best known missile expert, Prof. Eugen Saenger, who was among the first to advise Nasser on his rocket program. Saenger is reported to have received a $5.6 million fee for himself and his German team. Saenger was persuaded to return to West Germany and is now teaching in West Berlin.

West German authorities believed for a while that after Krug vanished and left his family in Munich that he had defected to Israel. When he disappeared, he was said to be in the company of "an Egyptian visitor" and information since received from Cairo showed that documents this man was carrying were forgeries.

But West German intelligence has since received hints that Krug, who was more a businessman than a scientist, may after all have been wanted by the Egyptians—for having tried to doublecross and sell information on his purchasing group to the Israelis.

TAKEN BY TWO OTHERS

Krug's place has since been taken by two other German scientists who normally work in Egypt. One is Paul Gercke, the electronics missiles guidance expert whose 25-year-old daughter, Heidi, is alleged by the Swiss authorities to have been pressured by two Israeli agents who were arrested by the Swiss police earlier this month after they had tried to get her father to join the Israelis. Bonn security authorities have been watching rival activities of Israeli and Egyptian agents in their competition for West German missile experts with growing anxiety. The Bonn constitution gives every West German citizen nominal right to work where and for whom he chooses and the Bonn Government claims it has no power to direct labor or stop the German scientists and technicians from selling their specialist knowledge to the highest bidder.

UNREPENTANT NAZIS

Nevertheless, it is known that the hard core of the German scientific colony in Egypt are unrepentant Nazis, many of whom fled there after the war with avowed aim of helping the Arab world with scientific know-how to continue the fight against the Jews. In addition to Israeli protests, the Egyptian Government has also been flooding the West German security authorities recently with details of the alleged activities of Israeli commanders in West Germany who are trying to intimidate the German rocket experts.

Egyptians, for instance, provided Bonn with full details of passports accidentally left behind by three men who fled after alleged shooting up of another rocket and electronics expert, Hans Kleinwechter, who was on visit to Loerrach near the Swiss-German border a month ago. Egyptians showed that passports were forged and in names of persons living in Egypt at the time of the incident in prison there.

REAL TARGET

Egyptians also showed that official signatures on passports were forgeries. Throughout the story runs the name of Professor Saenger, West Germany's most prominent rocket expert, who was employed by the French Government after the war and for whom many of the German rocket missile team have worked, including both missing Krug and near-assassination victim, Hans Kleinwechter, as well as Gercke who was involved in the Swiss arrests incident this month. A prominent figure in the Egyptian atomic missile team in Cairo is known by West Germans to be Prof. Wolfang Pilz, another Saenger man who during the last war was on Wernher von Braun's staff in Peenemünde research station designing the V-1 flying bombs and now heads the German missile research team in Cairo.

Pilz was the real target of one of the mysterious powerful bombs which exploded on being opened in Cairo and killed five persons. The parcel bomb and letter, which also exploded destroying an eye of Pilz's secretary, was posted in Hamburg and police there are trying to trace who posted it. One major success for the Israeli efforts to sabotage Project 333 has been Austrian Prof. Otto Joklik who was a member of President Nasser's missile research group in Cairo. Joklik one of two men arrested by Swiss police, alleges that while in Cairo he discovered Egyptian plans to use radioactive materials in warheads of new rocket missiles and was so shocked by the discovery that he refused to continue work and offered his help to Israelis. Since leaving Cairo, he has appealed to other Austrian and German scientists working there to follow him.

[Usually reliable sources in Cairo say Swiss, Italians, and Spaniards as well as Germans are employed on jet aircraft and rocket research in the United Arab Republic, according to the Associated Press.

[They said Germans engaged in rocket research are believed to number no more than 10 and that none is engaged in rocket production.

[A spokesman for the West German Embassy in Cairo said he felt an estimate that 400 Germans are working on secret U.A.R. projects is exaggerated. Other sources put the figure in excess of 250.

[Some West German experts live in closely guarded apartment buildings in Cairo. Others have homes in the suburbs.]

A-THREAT TO ISRAEL BEGAN IN 1954 WHEN GERMANS ARRIVED IN EGYPT

TEL AVIV, March 23.—The affair of the German atomic scientists in Egypt, which Israelis see as a growing threat to their survival as a nation, all started 9 years ago, when the Arab-Israeli border warfare was nearing its peak.

President Gamal Abdel Nasser, then new to office, was seeking new allies against Israel. He concluded an arms deal with the Soviet Union, and his representatives also began enlisting likely Germans.

The first group of West German technicians arrived in Egypt in 1954. They helped to establish an iron and steel plant—now producing 300,000 tons annually. A growing stream of German scientists has followed them during the past 2 years.

According to Israeli information, they now number almost 500, and have succeeded in laying the foundations of Egypt's heavy industry and war plant. These items include the construction of an atomic reactor plant for the production of heavy water, a jet aircraft factory, rocket and missile installations and bacteriological and poison gas warheads.

Prof. Otto Bahn is said to be engaged on the construction of a nuclear reactor with a planned capacity of 120,000 kilowatts. When completed, this will be considerably bigger than Israel's Negev reactor and will be the largest in the Middle East. Its plutonium production will only theoretically enable Egypt to produce atomic bombs.

The rocket installations, which he considered the most menacing aspect of the German contribution, are believed to be situated in Helouan.

Concern over the Egyptian rocket development program has increased considerably since the launching of four Egyptian rockets last August—the Al Zafir (Victor) of 180 miles range and the Al Kahir (Conqueror) of 360 miles. Commenting on these launchings, President Nasser then said they were capable of reaching "just south of Beirut"—thus including Israel's entire territory.

In an interview on the Israeli radio this week, Eugen Saenger, who once headed the German rocket team in Egypt, expressed his willingness to work for other countries including Israel. He also said that President Nasser would not be able to launch military rockets within the near future due to a number of technical reasons.

Two particular problems are hindering the rocket program, Israelis believe. The first is the question of accurately guiding the rockets. The other problem is what warheads the rockets should carry.

According to an Austrian who worked in Egypt and has since been arrested in Switzerland as an Israeli spy, the Egyptians are experimenting with genocidal weapons, including so-called death rays, biological and bacteriological warfare and poison gas.

It is feared that German scientists also are trying to help the Egyptians develop a cobalt warhead. A cobalt bomb would scatter radioactive particles over large areas: this also falls into the prohibited weapons category.

Some light on possible ties between the Bonn Government and Egypt's rocket development program are disclosed in a letter written by Sanger's Stuttgart lawyer, Adolph Karch, to a correspondent of a German press agency.

It pointed out that "the Egyptian Government undertook to put at the full disposal of the German Federal Republic all the results of the (rocket) development works and, as the occasion arises, to also put at German disposal the Egyptian ground installations and launching pads for such German experiments as could not be carried out in the Federal Republic."

The original of this letter, dated August 14, 1962, has been shown to this reporter.

The Knesset (Israeli Parliament) this week proclaimed that "the German people cannot absolve itself of responsibility for the continuation of this vile work." The resolution also said: "It is the duty of the German Government to put an immediate end to this dangerous activity of its citizens and to take all steps required to prevent this cooperation with the Egyptian Government."

Alvin Rosenfeld, correspondent for New York Herald Tribune, reported from Jerusalem:

"This week's session of the Israeli Knesset was in fact sitting in judgment on Premier Ben-Gurion's policy of conciliation with postwar Germany, according to the influential and respected Israeli newspaper Haaretz.

"This and other bitter editorial comment in the wake of the Knesset resolution appeared to reflect a deep public resentment of Germany's position and a revival of the old wounds and memories of the Nazi period. It seemed clear that Ben-Gurion's policy had suffered at least a psychological defeat which may postpone full Israel-German reconciliation.

"The Knesset session had been forced upon a reluctant government by the opposition. The overwhelmingly approved Knesset resolution was more strongly worded than the government's official statement delivered in Parliament.

"The liberal nonparty Haaretz, known for its staid responsible views, noted with surprise that Ben-Gurion was not at the Knesset session—he is officially on vacation—and said the Premier had good reasons for not appearing. Ben-Gurion's pro-German policy had once been acceptable to the Israeli public, Haaretz said, 'but he went too far in his belief that in Western Germany we could find an anchor in all storms.' "

GERMANS BUILDING ROCKETS FOR NASSER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have given careful attention to the reports of the last several days concerning the German role in the development of rockets, reportedly with radiological and bacteriological warheads, by the United Arab Republic.

President Nasser of the United Arab Republic openly proclaims that he is developing a powerful arsenal of military rockets for the destruction of Israel. There can be no doubt in the minds of the many German scientists and technicians, bearing valid German passports, who are in Egypt perfecting these rockets, that the weapons are intended for the completion of Adolph Hitler's goal, the mass murder of the Jewish people. Nor can the German industries exporting parts and equipment for rockets and weapons systems have any reasonable doubts of the use intended by Nasser.

Mr. Speaker, I can only conclude that West Germany has defaulted on a grave moral responsibility by permitting Germans and German interests to help Nasser effectuate his aim to destroy those escapees from German barbarism who now reside in Israel. This is definitely not a technical or legalistic issue of what the Bonn Government can or cannot do to influence its scientists or industrialists.

What this is, Mr. Speaker, is a test of the German conscience and the pious professions of sorrow over the murder of 6 million human beings merely because of their religion. I refer, of course, to the Jewish people whose survivors are seeking to rehabilitate themselves in the democratic new State of Israel.

I might note that Israel is sending its scientists and technicians abroad to help the new countries of Africa and Asia. But they, unlike the Germans in Egypt, are bringing medical skills to heal the sick and agricultural skills to feed the hungry and construction skills to shelter

the homeless. I cannot understand how any civilized German scientist can go to Egypt, in view of the events from 1933 to 1945, to build vicious bacteria warheads or warheads using radioactive waste materials or any kind of rocket at all.

Bonn could quickly enough find applicable laws and authority to prevent German scientists from going into East Germany and building the same kind of dreadful weapons. Yet the zealous and efficient German technicians and scientists, unrepentant Nazis among them, are now working with the Soviet-trained and Soviet-equipped Egyptian military force.

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked by the blindness of the West German authorities to the humanitarian aspect involved and blindness to the desire of civilized people for peace and stability in the Near East, and even German blindness—or defiance—to President Kennedy's policy against proliferation to small nations of mass destructive weapon systems.

The time may have come, Mr. Speaker, for us to more carefully observe the alleged maturity of West Germany as a leader of NATO, a nation which wants to be entrusted with more say on use of thermonuclear weapons that may seal the fate of all humanity.

I have made known my deep concern to the Department of State on these matters and will continue to observe developments. I am certain many other Members share my hope that the West German Government will assert the stature of a truly new Germany by terminating this dangerous foolishness in Egypt.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE CREATIVE ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, among the Nation's leading supporters of Federal recognition and programs in the arts and humanities is President Barnaby C. Keeney, of Brown University, who has this to say on the subject:

> It has seemed to me for a long time that it would be well if we had a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities to perform a function similar to that of the National Science Foundation, which has benefited the country greatly. There is no question but that advancements in science and technology have a greater immediate utility in the international and national situation in which we exist today. On the other hand, the whole shape of our lives in the future, and our whole attitude toward life will be strongly formed by our achievements of lack thereof in the arts and humanities.

The American Council of Learned Societies has also shown great interest in this subject, and published in its newsletter of November 1962, a most interesting article by Gustavo O. Arlt, president, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States. President Arlt quoted from the Seaborg report, the important policy statement issued on November 15, 1960, by the President's Science Advisory Committee, which I should like to call to your attention at this time:

> Much of this basic argument for the strengthening of American science applies equally to other fields of learning. While this report centers on the needs of science, we repudiate emphatically any notion that scientific research and scientific education are the only kinds of learning that matter to America. The responsibility of the Committee is limited to scientific matters, but obviously a high civilization must not limit its efforts to science alone. Even in the interests of science itself it is essential to give full value and support to the other great branches of man's artistic, literary, and scholarly activity. The advancement of science must not be accomplished by the impoverishment of anything else, and the life of the mind in our society has needs which are not limited by the particular concerns which belong to this Committee and this report.
>
> We do not, in this report, attempt to consider what direct responsibility and interest the Government has for strengthening basic research and graduate education outside the sciences. This is a subject which deserves careful attention, but it is beyond our mission. What we can say, however, is what earlier reports of this Committee have regularly emphasized, that neither the Government nor the universities should conduct the support of scientific work in such a way as to weaken the capacity of American education to meet its responsibilities in other areas. The costs of scientific progress must not be paid by diverting resources from other great fields of study which have their own urgent need for growth.

This statement was signed by a panel of the country's leading scientists, including Alan T. Waterman, immediate past director of the National Science Foundation, Glen T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, George W. Beadle, president of the University of Chicago, Roger Revelle, director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, and others.

I am introducing a bill today to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, to authorize programs of information, education, advisory services, and financial assistance for the encouragement and advancement of artistic and cultural activities, and for the development of a more widespread appreciation of America's cultural heritage and accomplishments. This measure would also expand the present activities of the National Science Foundation to include the arts and the humanities.

I include as part of my remarks the article by Gustave O. Arlt, president of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States which was published in the November 1962, newsletter of the American Council of Learned Societies.

Also, as part of my remarks I include a speech by W. McNeil Lowry before the Association of Graduate Schools which was published in a recent issue of the Art Journal of the College Art Association.

Mr. Lowry is director of the Ford Foundation program in the humanities and the arts. His speech was delivered at the meeting of the Association of Graduate Schools which took place in New Orleans, October 24, 1961. It is a very important and highly significant speech.

The former Federal Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin, has said:

> The need for superior attainment in the sciences to guarantee our national security in the face of grave international crises has long been recognized by most Americans. There is an equal need for superior attainment on a very broad scale in the arts and humanities if Americans generally are to gain a full understanding of their rich cultural heritage and a genuine commitment to their ideals of individual freedom and human dignity. Only with such understanding and such commitment on the part of all of its citizens will this Nation have the resources in personal and public creativeness and courage to meet successfully the continuing international struggle between freedom and tyranny.

In conclusion I include the text of my bill to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, and to expand the activities and programs of the National Science Foundation to include the arts and the humanities.

The above-mentioned material follows:

A NATIONAL HUMANITIES FOUNDATION? [1]

(By Gustave O. Arlt)

On July 17, 1962, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island, arose in the House of Representatives and began a lengthy speech with the following words:

"Mr. Speaker, there is a pressing need today for Federal legislation that will build up nationwide support for the arts and humanities, on a basis comparable to the support that is provided in other areas, such as science and technology. Progress in the arts and humanities is essential to true national strength."

These are strange words, indeed, to be heard in the Halls of Congress. Fifteen years ago they would have been branded as subversive. Only 3 years ago they would have been called incompatible with, even adverse to, the national interest. That they could be spoken in 1962 in the introduction of a bill in support of the humanities and the arts indicates a remarkable change in the attitude of Congress toward American higher education.

There was a time, not so very long ago, when universities and colleges financed their own teaching and research, when professors expected no subsidies in support of their creative work, and when graduate students were grateful for a small stipend for teaching or for grading papers. No one had heard of a research grant, let alone a contract. A Guggenheim fellowship represented the pinnacle of the hopes and aspirations of the dedicated scholar. And this condition prevailed more or less in all departments and disciplines in the university. The chemist and the philosopher, the physicist and the art historian—all were supported equally well and equally badly. As a result, academic society was homogeneous and virtually classless, for where no one is rich no one is poor.

This academic homogeneity extended down into and pervaded the graduate student body. The student in languages had no reason to cast envious eyes at his colleague in biology because one had as good and as poor a chance at a small fellowship as the other, and when they received their degrees they had equal prospects of a poorly paid instructorship. As a result there were no status problems and academic excellence rather than field of study constituted the badge of distinction.

---

[1] This article is also scheduled to appear in the December 1962 issue of the Journal of Higher Education.

This classless utopia came to an abrupt end about 1940 when the Federal Government discovered that the natural scientist had something to offer that the Nation badly needed. Almost overnight the universities became purveyors of scientific expertise and the Government became their best, perhaps only customer. Before the end of the war, hundreds of scientists in scores of universities, along with thousands of their students were subsidized to perform research in physics, chemistry, and the biological sciences.

But this was only the beginning. The Nation had become science-conscious and its leaders were not about to let the universities relapse into their comfortable prewar torpor. The establishment of the National Science Foundation was inevitable and it was only surprising that its budget for the first year was a mere $3.5 million. By 1961, of course, this meager budget had risen to $261.7 million, and in fiscal 1963, the National Science Foundation aims to spend $360,800,000. But even these impressive figures are dwarfed by the sums disbursed through the National Institutes of Health, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. These various agencies between them support some 12,000 to 15,000 predoctoral and postdoctoral students annually by nonduty fellowships and traineeships. In addition, an estimated 20,000 to 25,000 graduate students in the sciences and engineering hold research assistantships paid from Federal funds.

It hardly seems necessary to document what is now called the imbalance between the natural sciences and the humanities, but a few comments and conclusions from recent studies are pertinent. Both Bernard Berelson in "Graduate Education in the United States" and James A. Davis in "Stipends and Spouses" have made use of the same NORC survey of graduate student finances. This survey is somewhat misleading for our purposes since it does not differentiate between Federal support and subvention from other sources. It tends, therefore, to obscure the full extent of the imbalance. Nevertheless, Berelson concludes that "the sciences, including engineering, are at a clear advantage over other fields" (p. 149). Davis, whose entire book is devoted to graduate student financing, is naturally much more specific. He says, "In every comparison, natural science students are more likely to have high aid than social science and humanities students" (p. 62). "Over-all, natural science students have a marked advantage over their colleagues in the social sciences and humanities. Seventy-nine percent have some sort of stipend, as contrasted with about 60 percent in social science and humanities, and in every subcategory their stipend holding is higher. The extreme is in research assistantships. One out of five natural science students is an RA compared with one out of nine students in social science and one out of a hundred in humanities" (p. 60).

On the faculty level the contrast is, if anything, even more marked. In 1961, the National Science Foundation alone awarded 611 fellowships to persons of faculty rank (postdoctoral, senior postdoctoral, and science faculty). The figures for NIH, AEC, and NASA are generally comparable. In the humanities fields, on the other hand, postdoctoral and other faculty awards are virtually nonexistent, with the exception, of course, of Fulbright and a few other specialized awards that are available to all fields."

No one intended, of course, to relegate the humanities and the arts to an existence in obscurity and poverty and, in a sense, they were not so relegated. They were actually no poorer and no more obscure than they had been in the prescience era. They had become poor and obscure only by contrast with their affluent and distinguished neighbors. But relative poverty and obscurity are as painful as though they were absolute. And even in Academia, much as it hurts to admit it, affluence and public recognition bring with them enhanced academic status. (Of the 60 graduate deans in the land-grant universities, 47 are in the natural sciences, 8 in the social sciences, and 5 in humanities.) At any rate, there is no question that the financial imbalance has brought about a status imbalance in our universities, both on the faculty and graduate student levels, that constitutes a very real threat to higher education.

As one of the results, the number of students entering graduate study in the humanities fields is declining and there are some indications that their quality is deteriorating. In the past 5 years the production of Ph. D.'s in the humanities, arts, and social sciences has not kept pace with the overall increase in all fields nor with the needs of the colleges. In some areas, as for example history, the supply is already critically short of the demand.

Ever since the early 1950's the educational associations, the universities and colleges and the U.S. Office of Education have tried to secure legislation that would help to restore some sort of balance in the lopsided academic world. In 1958 they almost succeeded. In that year the Congress enacted the National Defense Education Act which was designed to stimulate advanced study and research and particularly to expedite and improve the training of college teachers. Under its various titles it provides for graduate fellowships, student loans, summer language institutes, subsidies for courses in critical languages, and for experimental programs in new educational media, including television. For the humanities and the arts, title IV, the graduate fellowship program, seemed to offer the greatest hope, since it provided 1,500 3-year fellowships without any apparent restriction by field of study. And, indeed, in the first year approximately 32 percent of these fellowships were awarded in the arts and humanities fields and 26 percent in the social sciences. But as soon as the lists of awards were published the Congress wanted to know what possible relation to national defense could be claimed for folklore, art history, and ancient languages. When the awards for the second year were to be made, the House Committee on Labor and Education drew up a sharp directive forbidding fellowship awards in fields that had no direct connection with national defense, and specifically naming ancient languages, literatures, and history; arts, folklore, music, philosophy, and religion. No protests availed and the tabu against the arts and humanities still stands. No awards in the prohibited fields were made last year nor will any be made this year.

But perhaps this is a very good thing. For since this drastic congressional directive, a swelling chorus of voices has been raised on behalf of substantial aid to the arts and humanities as well as of those social sciences that are not recognized by the National Science Foundation. Some of the voices came from expected sources: the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools, the presidents of many liberal arts colleges. But some came from unexpected sources and were therefore all the more welcome. On November 15, 1960, the President's Science Advisory Committee issued an important policy statement which has since become known as the Seaborg report. Its introduction includes the following significant paragraphs:

"Much of this basic argument for the strengthening of American science applies equally to other fields of learning. While this report centers on the needs of science, we repudiate emphatically any notion that scientific research and scientific education are the only kinds of learning that matter to America. The responsibility of the Committee is limited to scientific matters, but obviously a high civilization must not limit its efforts to science alone. Even in the interests of science itself it is essential to give full value and support to the other great branches of man's artistic, literary, and scholarly activity. The advancement of science must not be accomplished by the impoverishment of anything else, and the life of the mind in our society has needs which are not limited by the particular concerns which belong to this Committee and this report.

We do not, in this report, attempt to consider what direct responsibility and interest the Government has for strengthening basic research and graduate education outside the sciences. This is a subject which deserves careful attention, but it is beyond our mission. What we can say, however, is what earlier reports of this Committee have regularly emphasized, that neither the Government nor the universities should conduct the support of scientific work in such a way as to weaken the capacity of American education to meet its responsibilities in other areas. The costs of scientific progress must not be paid by diverting resources from other great fields of study which have their own urgent need for growth."

And this statement is signed by a panel of the country's leading scientists, including Alan T. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, Glen T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, George W. Beadle, President of the University of Chicago, Roger Revelle, Director of the Scripps Institution of Oceanograph, and others.

On December 15, 1961, Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, said in a speech before the Council of Graduate Schools that he believed the time was ripe for legislation in support of the arts and humanities and that he would wish personally to introduce such a bill in the 88th Congress. He has further evinced his continuing interest, suggesting preparatory steps to be taken. At the same meeting, Dr. Robert M. Lumiansky, provost of Tulane University, proposed the establishment of a national humanities foundation, specifically defining the term "humanities" to include the fine arts and certain of the social sciences.[2]

In the past 6 months, interest in Federal aid to the humanities has been building up rapidly and there are indications that a favorable climate is developing in the Congress. Various formats have been suggested, three of which seem to be gathering more support than others. The first is the establishment of a national humanities foundation, patterned after the highly successful National Science Foundation. The latter is a unique cross between a private foundation and a Federal agency which has the dual function of setting science policy and of supporting basic research and education. It is governed by a 24-member National Science Board, appointed by the President for 6-year terms, plus a director. The national humanities foundation would be similarly organized and governed and it would support, besides the humanities and the arts, those social sciences which are not included under the National Science Foundation.

The second program proposes the expansion of the National Science Foundation into something like a national arts, letters, and science foundation, with at least two governing boards and perhaps a coordinating body. This type of organization is favored by some Members of Congress who are disturbed over the growing number of agencies disbursing Federal funds for education. Representative EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, for example, has pointed out that the current Federal outlay for 689 education programs is $3 billion, administered by 40 separate agencies. "This," she complains, "makes it impossible for any Member of Congress to know what is going on."

A third proposal is the establishment of a bureau or an institute within the Office of Education, charged with the specific support of the arts and humanities. This would place the ultimate control of the activity in the hands of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This proposal naturally has the support of the Commissioner of Education, and probably of the administration, but it might not find much favor in Congress and it would not satisfy the Council of Graduate Schools.

On April 17, 1962, the executive committee of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States voted unanimously to support the first of the three proposals, that is, the establishment of a national humanities foundation. As a second choice, it would reluctantly support a national arts, letters, and science foundation, but it would accept a bureau of an institute in the Office of Education only as a last desperate resort if all else failed. A fourth proposal to meet the situation by amending and expanding the National Defense Education Act received no support whatever.

Early this year, Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY of Rhode Island drafted a bill for support to the arts and humanities which he introduced in Congress on July 17, 1962. He calls it the Cultural Development Act of 1962 and it is carried on the House docket as H.R. 12560, a bill to establish a national institute of the arts and humanities.

This institute is to be located in the United States Office of Education and is to consist of a Federal advisory council on arts and humanities and a director and staff. It is authorized and directed to conduct studies and develop recommendations for national policy in the encouragement of the arts and humanities; to support research, surveys, demonstrations, or experimental projects designed to advance the arts and humanities through contracts with or grants to State and other public agencies, institutions of higher education, or other nonprofit agencies; to provide through the award of graduate fellowships or traineeships to individuals or through arrangements by contract or grant with institutions of higher education for the conduct of institutes or seminars for the training of teaching, technical, and administrative personnel needed to promote the advancement of the arts and humanities.

The Federal Advisory Council on Arts and Humanities shall consist of 24 members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for terms of 6 years each. They shall be persons eminent in the education in or practice of the arts and letters; they shall be selected solely on the basis of distinction; and they shall be broadly representative of the artistic and cultural interests encompassed by the act. And finally, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to employ a Director of the Institute and a staff of not more than 20 professional and technical persons to carry out the functions of the Institute.

It is apparent that Mr. FOGARTY, in outlining the format of his Institute, has drawn freely from the sucessful model of the National Science Foundation. Like the latter, his plan also provides for a 24-member Federal Advisory Committee plus a Director and staff. The chief difference here is that the Science Board is appointed by the President, while the Arts and Humanities Board is to be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Moreover, the functions of the two organizations are similarly defined as far as the differences between their fields permit. This, of course, is all to the good; it is always sensible to follow a sucessful pattern.

Since the bill was introduced so late in the year it obviously could not expect action by the 87th Congress; nevertheless its introduction has served a very good purpose. It gives the learned societies and the educational associations an opportunity to clarify their thinking on the type of organization they wish to support and it gives them time to build up nationwide interest. Mr. FOGARTY has indicated that the does not insist upon the format now provided by his bill but is quite ready to alter it to meet the needs and the wishes of those concerned. He says, very reasonably, that he wants to provide the kind of support that the humanities and the arts need in a form acceptable to them and to the Congress.

So far, this account has been nothing more than a dry, objective report of the present efforts to provide Federal financial support for the humanities. This reporter, however, whose academic life was dedicated to language and literature, cannot refrain from adding an editorializing conclusion. He need hardly begin by saying that the realm of the spirit in the life of an individual, of the Nation, and of the world is of equal importance with the realm of science. Nor need it be said that the Nation and the world today need spiritual, ethical, and esthetic leadership at least as sorely as they need scientific leadership. Granted that we need scientific leadership to survive, we need spiritual leadership to make survival worthwhile. There was a time when these sentences were axioms. Perhaps they still are today.

A great deal has been written in the last two decades about the ailing humanities but there is little agreement on the nature of the ailment. The only certainty is that the humanities have been relegated to a place of secondary importance, not only in the world at large but unhappily also in the academic world. Our teachers and scholars have gradually accepted this inferior position and, as the strong grew stronger, the weak grew weaker. And today we suffer not so much from financial impoverishment as from status impoverishment. No one can deny the crying need for financial support of our scholarly and creative activities but no one can be so pragmatic as to believe that money alone is the panacea for all our ills.

What we need is reassurance of the validity of what we study and teach and practice. What we need is public recognition of the importance of the humanities and the arts to our system of higher education, to national welfare, and to the life of the individual. This means restoration of the principle of universality and indivisibility of learning. It means equal availability of opportunity accorded to all disciplines—not necessarily equal dollar support. It means, therefore, the establishment of a National Humanities Foundation, parallel in structure, administration, and status to the National Science Foundation. Or it means the establishment of a National Arts, Letters, and Science Foundation, dedicated to the support of the entire edifice of higher education on an equal and impartial basis. Anything short of the establishment of one or the other of these agencies would not constitute restoration of balance and equality of discipline. An Institute or a Bureau or a Division in the Office of Education—no matter how much money it might disburse—would only serve to accentuate the status distinction between the natural sciences and the humanities and deepen the schism in higher education. The healing of the schism is the gravest problem that we face today.

---

[2] ACLS Newsletter, vol. XIII, No. 1 (January 1962).

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE CREATIVE ARTS

(By W. McNeil Lowry)

(The following discussion on the university and the creative arts was prepared for an audience of graduate deans under conditions noted in the first two paragraphs of the text. It is admittedly one sided: I had suggested to the Association of Graduate Schools that a professor of drama, music, or the visual arts be given a hearing on the same program. The AGS urged me to take the role of prosecutor, with the promise that its committee on policies would keep the subject on its agenda and afford opportunities for rebuttal. I am confident that readers of the Art Journal will take up the debate and thus help to clarify many of the issues involved in university training in the arts—W.M.L.)

I hope I have the sympathy of every member here who has read the report of your committee on policies in graduate education. When the committee in that report reaches the problems of higher education in the creative arts, it says:

"The facts of what has occurred are not fully available, however; nor, we believe, is there widespread understanding of the national conditions in the arts which have led to the present trends.

"The committee recommends no action by AGS on the subject. Instead, it has invited Dr. W. McNeil Lowry of the Ford Foundation, who has long been concerned with the state of the creative arts in the United States, to discuss with us 'The University and the Creative Arts.' "

So I am on the spot. You are too, of course, for at the very least your committee has given me a clean slate upon which to write, and though I recommended it they were unable to associate with me upon this program a member of an arts faculty who might really know something about the problem from the inside. Furthermore, if I remember my academic politics, few fine arts, music, or theater professors ever become graduate deans, so there may be none in the audience who will feel like talking back.

My own dilemma remains the more acute, nevertheless, because there are too many ways to begin in analyzing the place of the creative arts in higher education and the impact upon the arts of what the universities do about them. Let us stipulate at the outset that the limit to what I can do today is to raise provocative questions, in the conviction that your committee on policies will keep the subject on its agenda for 2 or 3 years at least. To cover any ground at all, I can not even leave everything I say in the form of questions, and at times I shall have to appear dogmatic without, I hope, being so.

We could spend a great deal of time on the historical developments which have led deans of graduate schools to concern themselves with the relevance of education in the creative arts to the objectives of a university, but for the most profitable discussion the historical background must be treated in summary fashion. In the early days of the Republic private tutors were the source of education in music and the visual arts, creative writing was a thin adjunct of formal education, and only elocution had a remote connection with the theater arts. In 1804 a society of artists and their friends formed the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts. Its original purpose was the professional instruction of painters, sculptors, and graphic artists, but it was thought necessary to collect works of art from the past in order to guide potential artists, and regular training in the history of art was launched. (It is at least worth noting that most of our oldest American museums in the same way grew out of independent art schools.)

It was not until the days of Charles Eliot Norton that history and interpretation of the fine arts became a really proper subject for concentration in those private institutions of higher learning that had their roots in the classics. Until then painting and sculpture (and music too) had been treated as sketchy backgrounds to history. Even in the second and third decades of this century, the students of Paul Sachs at the Fogg were chiefly young men who were destined to take over the museum directorships of the country, for which, as one of them said to me recently, their qualifications were "70 percent social and 30 percent professional." By 1934 a special study of the subject showed that the history of art was well entrenched as a major discipline in both private and public universities, and every college had art appreciation and at least one course in art history. Today's graduate student in the fine arts only rarely trains for curatorial work in a museum. He finds in college or university teaching more sustained opportunities for his own scholarship, higher pay, and more fringe benefits than our financially hard-pressed museums can offer him.

The 1934 study to which I referred also showed that not only the history and appreciation but the practice of art had invaded the universities. Led by the public institutions, the universities had started a process which was less conscious than gravitational but which since 1934 has had a profound impact upon the future of the independent art school and upon art and the artists as well. By 1950 rising costs of operation in the independent professional schools were sharpened by an increasing loss of student tuitions. It was now possible to major in painting or sculpture in State supported universities with lower tuitions, and more important, one could gain a regionally accredited college degree while doing so. Many parents who had only mild enthusiasm for their son's or daughter's desire to become an artist insisted that he or she at least gain the passport to a marketable vocation like teaching. Independent art schools in the past decade have faced a bitter struggle for survival. Many have not survived, many have joined the opposite camp and merged with nearby colleges or universities in their programs, a few have taken leadership in gaining regional accreditation without sacrificing too many professional studio requirements, and only a very few have maintained intact a tradition that was always Spartan financially anyway.

As the universities increased their offerings in studio practice, the professional teacher was joined by the professional artist, first as an artist in residence and then as a regular member of the faculty. The principal economic base of the contemporary American painter and sculptor today, even among the top rank, is university and college teaching. In many ways these men were interlopers upon Olympus so far as historians of art were concerned, and in the early 1950's fine arts deans of the Midwestern State universities had to lead a revolt in the College Art Association to give the practice of art and its practitioners greater recognition within the fraternity. When the president of a small liberal arts college became the president of Harvard, he asked whether Harvard students too should not have some of the liberalizing benefit of aesthetic practice, and there followed a report on visual instruction at Harvard University which still can engender heat between disciples of the künstgeschichte and those who believe that students should be allowed to play with colors on canvas, if only as a sort of extracurricula activity.

I can myself attest to the liveliness of the controversies occasioned by the university's assumption of professional art instruction as a legitimate part of its curriculum. For 4 years in our program in the Ford Foundation we discussed with art historians, museum directors, artists, independent art school heads, and representatives of teachers colleges the need and timeliness of a national study of higher education in the visual arts. Our ultimate aim was to see such a study made under the most objective conditions, with the interests of the artist, the museum director, and the independent art school head as firmly maintained as the interests of the historian of art. Success, as always, came in personal terms, meaning in this case the breadth and judgment of the study's director, and 6 days ago we announced a grant of $180,000 to the College Art Association for an independent study to be led by Andrew Ritchie, director of the Yale University Art Galleries and formerly curator of painting at the Museum of Modern Art and director of the Albright Gallery in Buffalo. Two years from now you and I should know a great deal more about what is going on in your institutions in at least the visual aspects of the creative arts.

Among the many things we already know is that the normal course requirements for a liberal education and even the minimal concentration on technical practice, when put together in a university required more than 4 years and hence a new kind of degree, the master of fine arts. In a few institutions the doctorate itself has been modified to include a program that consists not primarily of history and theory but practice in art.

And the process I have sketched for the visual arts has been paralleled in music, the drama, and creative writing. Independent drama schools, never very strong in the United States, as well as the much stronger music conservatories have generally decayed as the universities, nominally at least, have taken over some of their functions. As your committee on policies has said in its summary:

"Since the 19th century, a steady migration to the campuses has occurred of types of instruction that formerly took place largely in independent schools and institutes. Training in the creative arts has joined this procession. Academic institutions now increasingly perform functions that formerly fell chiefly to independent drama schools, art institutes, music conservatories, and other forums of personal instruction not associated with educational institutions of more general purpose. [And] modern universities seem increasingly to be expected to offer instruction in the creative arts beyond the bachelor's degree."

So much for what has happened. Its implications range far more widely and intricately than we shall have time to discuss today, but the most important of these are, I think, clear, as is their relevance to your own responsibilities. Before coming to analyze the implications, however, I must digress for a moment to sharpen the frame of reference. There are some ways in which the arts are involved with university education which create no problems either for the objectives of a university or the state of the arts in the American society. But the professors of drama, music, and the visual arts for various reasons are on the defensive in many ways, and it is necessary for any critic to say what he is not talking about as well as what he is.

Let me state, therefore, that in analyzing the condition your committee has noted I am not concerned with university education in esthetics or in the history and theory of music, painting, sculpture, architecture, drama, the dance, or any other of the creative arts. Perhaps it is necessary to say this because we can recall that in the generations shortly preceding ours even the literatures written in contemporary tongues were not considered proper subjects for scholarship, particularly of the advanced sort prescribed for graduate students. Twenty years ago I myself was a witness to a tiny change in this fashion when I became the first student in a very large graduate department ever to have the privilege (if that is the word) of writing a dissertation on a living author.

At any rate, I am assuming in this discussion that neither the undergraduate nor the graduate deans in the universities you represent have any special problems from the inclusion in the curriculum of musicology, theater history, the philosophy of art, the history of painting, and other such courses. This is, I take it, what we all mean when we include the fine arts, music, and drama in the humanities, whether we are talking about liberal education for the undergraduate or whether we are trying to get more of society's money into the support of doctoral and postdoctoral scholarship. As some of you know, in the Ford Foundation's support of humanistic scholarship through either the postdoctoral fellowships offered by the American Council of Learned Societies or our subsidies to new material published by university presses, we have tried to stress the importance to the humanities of musicology, art history, theater history, and aesthetics generally.

There is another large area I should like to except from the discussion, and this is harder to do because in one way it can be thought of as the crux of the whole matter. Throughout history institutions of formal education, primary, secondary, or higher, have generally afforded some opportunities for students with a taste for the arts to express this taste in peripheral or informal ways. It was only in our own century that one of these ways became the course in so-called appreciation of art, a curricular practice hard to defend unless such courses are taken in addition to a full and formal schedule. It has always seemed to me that the appreciation of literature, for example, can best come through a fairly rigorous course in literature, and similarly for the other arts. The more traditional ways—chamber music societies, the opportunity to participate in a dramatic performance without regard to courses in acting, literary clubs—all help to enrich the experience of young people living together in an educational community. I think this rather large and general view was what actually motivated President Pusey when he asked whether formal art history and the existence of the Fogg Museum really gave the Harvard undergraduate all the benefits of the visual arts as a means to the liberal education of the individual.

But these two digressions into which I have wandered forcibly bring us back to the subject of the university and the creative arts. The objective of undergraduate education in the humanities, I assume, is the liberal education of the individual; the objective of graduate education in these disciplines is the training of scholars competent to grasp a whole corpus of systematic knowledge and subject it to philosophical analysis. What is the relevance, to either of these objectives, of training in the techniques of painting, acting, directing, dancing, instrumentation, musical composition, creative writing, or any other branch of artistic creation? Can such training, given the objectives of a university, be offered under what are known as "professional" standards? If it cannot, what importance should the university attach to it? If it can, what are the problems to the university of adapting professional training in the arts to its other, more primary objectives?

If we look back at the historical timetable by which the university expanded its role in the creative arts, we find an almost exact coincidence with the growth in the American society of the vague idea that "the a-r-t-s are somehow good for people." Some of us have long hoped that the sources of money in the United States, private or public, individual or corporate, would find a greater share for the professional arts. That greater share for the arts is actually becoming visible, though by no means as yet proportionate to the importance of the arts in any society. But largely it is becoming available to the amateur artist, rather than the professional. So-called cultural centers are on the drawing

boards in many U.S. communities; somehow in our country businessmen or municipal and State officials appear to think that art begins with real estate. But by far the greatest number of these centers have no professional performing groups as components; many of them are to be built by State funds and will use State university budgets as the financing vehicle. It seems that we are to have the audience before we are to have the creators and performers.

Whence does this audience come? It is my belief that it has come largely from the increase in the proportion of our population that has been university trained. The whole phenomenon of that segment of our theater known as off-Broadway is supported, for better or worse, by an audience that has been educated in colleges and universities. Abstract expressionism is kept alive, critically and otherwise, by allied interests. The most consistent proportion of ticket buyers (though not of patrons) of the Metropolitan Opera is found among the physicians, very few of whom, I imagine, ever had courses either in singing, in musical composition, or even in the history of opera. Some of the richest and most varied concert programs outside our largest cities are supported in State university communities. And there are numerous other examples to be cited.

They all would seem to support the idea that the arts are somehow good for people, and given the nature of our democratic and laissez-faire economic society this evolution within it is undoubtedly a necessary step in the development of cultural resources. But it antedates (by how long a period we can only guess) any realization that it is the highly talented and professionally trained artist on whom all depends; it lacks as yet, in short, discrimination as to what the arts are really about. And if I have given the university the bulk of the credit for providing a new audience for the arts in the United States, I feel I must also give it a strong share of the blame for the lack of discrimination visible in that audience.

How did all this come about? I think, to put it bluntly, the university has been having it both ways. It says on the one hand that its function is the liberal education of the individual, and exposure to the creative arts is merely one avenue toward that end. It acts on the other hand as if it were training young people for vocations, and not merely the vocations of scholar or teacher of the arts but the vocation of the professional artist per se. Let me illustrate what I mean generally from two contrasting art fields, one in performance and the other in creation.

The best equipped theaters in the United States are not those in which professional actors appear but those maintained by the universities. The drama is quite legitimately an important vehicle for liberal education, and this is what university administrators say when forced to defend the existence of both the theater and the theater department. It is not the university's function to train professional actors and directors—historians of the drama, of the theater, and of stagecraft, yes, but not performing artists per se. So far, so good. But in the catalog are course sequences not only in theater history or dramatic literature but in acting, directing, technical direction, costuming, even in theater management. And the university, through its accreditation to grant degrees if not through its tuition, competes with the few remaining independent drama schools for the student who thinks he wants to make the theater a career. Such a student will be expected, of course, to take many other subjects in fields he would not have time in which to concern himself if he were apprenticing as an actor in a resident company or would not be required to take in a professional drama school. From these subjects he is expected to receive the balance of the liberal education for which the university intends him. But if his university career is the only training as an actor the young person either expects or knows how to obtain, then for him this is his professional training. It goes on, generally, in a well-equipped theater, but also generally with amateur directors and amateur acting ensembles, and if criticized at all, criticized again by amateurs. He is told by the professors that academic theater stands for the classical, cultural, or avant garde theater, in contrast to Broadway, which is commerce, though with its large budgets and a few great stars Broadway may now and then produce a work of art. He is told that university productions are often "better than Broadway." But in any event, the young actor normally is led to believe that there is nothing in the American theater between academic theater and Broadway; this is the choice given to him; and he leaves the university to beat a path to New York or Los Angeles, where he joins hundreds of other young actors who have been similarly indoctrinated. The fact that he still has not had a professional apprenticeship, and that this is all he is ready for, is ignored. To the theater professor who stays behind, there is always the consolation that if the young actor does not make his way into the professional theater, he has had a liberal education and that is the university's objective anyway. Since, as you must realize, the opportunities for serious actors in spoken dramas are steadily being curtailed on Broadway, the supply of frustrated young academic theater products becomes greater and greater.

I ask your indulgence to quote at length from the analysis of a talented academic theater director, Prof. James H. Clancy of Stanford University. He is talking about a recent opportunity he had to test in Europe Giraudoux' hyperbole that theater is "the only form of a nation's spiritual and artistic education." I quote:

"But unfortunately this is not the sense in which the word 'education' is applied to much of the 'theater in the school' with which I am most familiar [in the United States]. Here the word has been used variously, but most frequently to make palatable the fact that art was neither the possibility nor the aim. This frightened and furtive use of the word 'education' resulted not only from technical incompetence [and helped perpetuate it] but also from faintness of heart and spiritual debility. One of its results has been to produce a strange dichotomy in many of the institutions of higher learning that profess the dramatic arts. On one side tend to be the 'researchers.' Their results may be useful in the theater when and if the artist finds a meaning for them, but they are material to the artist in the same category as any other material. In this sense the theater will possibly find more use for an intensive study of Pepys' diaries than of a calendar of the production at Drury Lane in the last half of the 18th century—although the latter is apt to be considered, mistakenly, more directly the provenance of the department of dramatic art.

"On the other side of this uneasy dichotomy are the 'practical' theater men who, sure of the myopia of their colleagues on the 'research' side, are not troubled by their own astigmatism. Sensing the artistic unlikelihood of the Drury Lane Calendar they remove themselves scornfully from such 'ivory tower' considerations, forgetting, if they ever knew, that the ivory tower and its dreams are an important and necessary extension of reality, and not a substitute for it. Caught in their centripetal activities of box office, billing, and good, clean entertainment, they soon come to regard the construction of a flat as more important than its function [poor Gordon Craig, he didn't know how to stand 'em up in Moscow] and that the values of a play can be best judged by the number of people who can be cajoled or chivied into attending its performances. Working in an institution such as the theater which is fortunately still primitive mechanically, the educational theater is fast developing a large group of extremely competent men who are 'practical'—about the major matters of unimportance.

"One thing, it seems to me, the college or university is eminently fitted to do for the education of the artist: serve as the source of what I can only think to call chronological integration. The university has traditionally served as a repository of the past, a place where the experiences of past generations are sifted, analyzed, and interpreted. Social pressures outside the academy, plus the political pressures of world events, tend to prevent the contemporary artist from becoming a racial or geographical segregationist, but the university can be a major aid in preventing him from developing into a chronological segregationist, producing a gauche and baseless form of 'art moderne' that serves only to express his dissociation from the streams of humanity. This does not mean, God knows, that the academic theater should persist in archeological reconstructions of presumed theatrical methods of the past. The academy rightfully preserves the past only when it constantly interprets in light of the present: it maintains the past by demonstrating its imminence. It helps create the future by demonstrating its continuance."

Let me turn now from the performing to the creative arts. In my introduction I sketched the process by which economic and popularizing forces turned hundreds of would-be painters and sculptors from the independent art schools to the universities. The burgeoning of university curriculums in the practice of painting and sculpture since 1950 has coincided with the supremacy of a particular artistic style—call it action painting, the New York School of Abstract Expressionism, or whatever your favorite term may be. For good or bad, this style in painting particularly lends itself to intellectual and technical imitation even by those young artists who have not had 2 or 3 years of rigid grounding in drawing and design. The result is that we now have a new academic style that has spread throughout college and university studios almost without check. A couple of years ago I was examining student paintings submitted from a variety of institutions as a part of the requirements for admission to an independent art school that will not take candidates before their junior year in college. "You know," the instructor said to me, "each time I leave the room and come back, I couldn't for the life of me prove that all these paintings weren't the work of the same person."

Another result of great importance to all of us whose first interest is in the professional arts, is the effect upon the painter or sculptor who has been brought into the university to teach his craft. This is a subject I hear about all the time in the running conversations we keep up with artists. A few enjoy teaching as a second vocation and believe their own creativity does not suffer from it. Some enjoy teaching while believing their own work does suffer. The great majority endure teaching as a means of livelihood, suffer the fact that there may be only two or three students a year in whom they glimpse any potentialities of talent, agonize over that portion of their own creative quotient which ends in the canvases of amateurs, and yearn for the unlikely year when some agency like the Ford Foundation may permit them simply to paint. Unanimously, even including those who believe their own creativity does not suffer from teaching, the artists to whom I have talked are bitter about the fact that their students are handed to them in groups and they have no voice in screening or selecting them.

One of the first sculptors of his generation chose to go without a regular livelihood when he came to the United States 14 years ago rather than teach students he himself could not select. He was merely more courageous or more optimistic than his colleagues, who are probably equally dedicated to the old atelier system in which social democracy was not allowed to excuse the total absence of talent.

I think you will by now have foreseen my first conclusion: The university has largely taken over the functions of professional training in the arts but in the main has sacrificed professional standards in doing so. The absence of discrimination has proceeded partly from the strong popularizing currents already at work in the society outside the campuses, and partly from the university's original objective, the liberal education of numerous individuals drawn from an affluent democracy.

You may be somewhat more surprised at my second conclusion: The trend is irreversible. The future of professional training in the arts depends, first, upon a radical shift in the university atmosphere surrounding students considered potential artists, and second, upon the provision of postgraduate opportunities for professional apprenticeship removed from an academic environment.

My final conclusion is a mixture of pessimism and optimism: The requisite shift in the university environment for the arts will be achieved only under great difficulties, if at all. Opportunities exist for new forms of cooperation between the university and professional institutions in the arts, provided the university will regard the arts as important and give financial support to the cooperative mechanisms that must be established.

I shall proceed to elaborate on the last two conclusions and to single out the implications for the university graduate school.

As Director of the Ford Foundation in Humanities and the Arts, it has been my privilege since 1957 to study not only the trends in the arts but the ways in which the arts are now or can be financially supported. It is as a result of this latter study that I am convinced we can not reverse the migration to the campuses of all forms of training that formerly took place under independent auspices. There are still many individual patrons of the arts, despite the income tax, but the motives of many of these are largely social and they like to support buildings or performances. Many of them also like to support education, but they think of education in terms of schools and colleges. Organized donors, such as corporations, put education first in their philanthropies, though they still, as you know, do not give the maximum allowed by law. The proportion they give the arts again chiefly reflects the social interests of individual patrons in the arts. The foundations grant much more money through universities and colleges than through the professional arts. When Government bodies come into the act, which in this country is rare, they too act either for public institutions in the arts or for the interests of the schoolchildren.

Academic deans coping with deficit financing in their annual budgets may not make the best audience to which to say it, but the fact is that so far as artistic training is concerned the universities have the money. The retiring president of Indiana University has often said that the State institution in our generation has taken over the regional role in the arts once played by the German princeling and later by the German stadt. He was not thinking merely of training the would-be artists, either. He was thinking of providing Indiana communities with musical and dramatic performances and with art exhibits, both professional and student. But if we think only of training in the creative arts, the future is clear. An enterprising academic theater director in Texas runs a repertory theater in a $1 million building in Dallas with M.A. candidates at Baylor University in Waco. The same illustration emphasizes another reason why individual and organized donors prefer to support the amateur artist in universities. It is safer to give money to people like yourselves and the institutions you represent, and though the donor may get less of the beautiful he gets at least as much of the good and the true.

In short, I think you and I were probably in agreement before I started that except for a few institutes and conservatories that may (and only may) survive our generation, except for a peculiar art like ballet in which the practitioners are already too old if they wait until college age, the university of the future will get the first crack at most potential artists. My question today, and it goes first to your undergraduate deans, is whether the university can change the environment on one part of its campus while holding its traditional atmosphere on another. It does not help to say you have done so on the agricultural campus or in the physical education school. The requisite atmosphere for professional training in the arts is somewhat more subtle than that in the dairy barns or in the locker rooms.

What is that atmosphere? It is easier to describe it than to analyze it. I have met it frequently in the 50-odd cities I have visited, often three or four times, in my personal fieldwork in the arts. I have encountered it most often in two otherwise quite unrelated institutions—the independent school of art and the resident theater company. Even at first blush, the independent art school looks different from the university art department, and not because the models in the latter place generally wear halters and shorts. And the resident theater's atmosphere, contrasted to that of the academic, is not merely a product of its physical inadequacies. (It may interest you to know that the capsule report of the European drama training expert, Michel St. Denis, after his first trip outside New York, was of the amateur work going on in wonderful university theater plants and the truly professional work going on in a few cramped cubbyholes.)

No, the Spartan effect one detects in professional environments is not merely physical, though that situation is general. It has much to do with the drive or fanaticism or whatever of the person who has made his choice, and will eschew anything else—money, the elite identification of a university degree, even health—to develop the talent he hopes he has. It comes also from the pride of doing for oneself, of making ends meet, of giving society what it will pay for even if what it pays is inadequate to sustain a normal life, of working in the midst of a fraternity that will show the same fanaticisms and abnegations. It comes from the endless time, time, time spent on doing one thing, only one thing, and then starting all over again. It comes, finally, from the acceptance of such distortion as a way of life, a way of life, you will note, that is in some ways completely antithetical to the ideal objective of a liberal and humane education. Some of the most professional, the most talented, and the most mature artists I have met lack either the time or the capacity to sort out a decent personal life from the endless hours of their artistic concentration. Only a rare heredity or early environment and not, I am afraid, a very good education, has given some of these artists a humanity that separates them from the talented bums in their midst.

I shall waive the question whether you even want this sort of atmosphere on your campuses, and go instead to whether you can have it if you want it. The best answer is, I do not know. But despite that, there are some implications more obvious than others. The most obvious is that if the university is going to allow the student's distorted concentration on hardnosed doing and redoing it, it cannot also require of him all the courses in humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences that are even minimally thought to constitute a liberal education. The university can, of course, stretch out the years to be applied, as it has done in the MFA. But there is a limit to that adjustment. I have already noted that the ballet dancer, starting at 9 years to train her body as her artistic instrument, knows she must forego the university completely, at least if the potentiality of a professional career still seems good by the time she is 18. There is a real question whether under professional conditions an actor, even if he spent 5 years in college, could leave more than 2 hours a weekday in those 5 years for anything but rehearsal or performance. It is not an accident that the university now probably does a better job in training the musician than in training other artists. Historically there have been so many branches of the musical art required of a training musician that the universities have allowed more concentration in that program. And secondly, the most technical accomplishments of a musician are more easily tested than those of an actor, a writer, a director, or even (these days) a painter. But again it can be argued, as the musicologist, Paul Henry Lang has done, that "pseudo-scholarship is the fateful consequence of the indiscriminate mixing of university with conservatory." (Lang was commenting at the time on the University of Michigan's announcement of a doctoral program in piano.)

Another obvious implication of my general argument is that neither the professors of the creative arts nor the students can be selected for a professional curriculum and atmosphere according to the patterns now employed in universities. No one has found the litmus paper that can make a positive or a negative test for artistic talent, or even for artistic drive, which would help us almost as much in this context. But drives can be isolated for identification if certain choices are forced. Roughly 80 percent of the university students now concentrating in one of the creative arts have chosen to major in art education; they are insuring their ability to have a second vocation if the first fails. For four-fifths of the students, then, I would be so dogmatic as to say no special atmosphere, no distorted concentration need be attempted. By all means excuse them from none of the normal requirements of a liberal education. Let them hunger for the true. Their hunger for the arts is not fanatical enough. They are not, as Brooks Atkinson once said about talented theater directors, hopefully crazy. I would recommend that the universities screen creative arts students twice: once by their own choices, as I have indicated, and again by the choice of the individual teacher after the student has had a term or a year of the distorted concentration for which I am groping to find other words.

Selection of the directors for a truly professional training in the arts will be difficult. But in one stroke, the university will have a wider field of talented artists from which to choose if the reform I have just recommended is taken and the teacher is allowed to have his atelier of potential talents by his own selection. I think this principle from the training of painters and sculptors should be extended to performing artists and to composers and to writers, as indeed for the last named it has already been in many universities. Another obvious corollary is that the man who is trained to teach theater history is not necessarily qualified to direct a play, any more than the historian of arts is qualified to teach painting or sculpture.

The concentration of courses and the selection of students and faculty, though difficult, are probably more feasible than the creation of that intangible atmosphere of professionalism to which I referred a few moments ago. I do not want to be misunderstood; I am not suggesting that the universities simply borrow outright the curriculums and atmosphere of independent institutes and conservatories; I am certainly not suggesting that these independent institutions have done a perfect job in the professional education of the artist. They have not, and today they cannot, because already they have found themselves unable to compete with the universities in the salaries and tenure and fringe benefits of faculty. When I cited the atmosphere of the independent art school and the resident theater company, I was citing an intangible spirit and not model institutions for training. How to translate this spirit into a very different location is problematical. Yet undoubtedly the spirit is a product of motive and procedure, to a large extent, and the changes to which I have already alluded may help produce it. To face the necessary distortion of the primary objective of a university, to reflect that distortion in a highly concentrated curriculum, to open that curriculum only to the students with the most fanatical drives, to give to the artist-professor responsibility for testing both the drives and the talents—these motives and procedures may go part way toward producing a professional atmosphere. That is as strong as I can put it confidently.

There is one other possibility, again by analogy. Wherever Spartan restrictions are logical and natural, they should be applied to the whole enterprise of professional training in the arts. Nothing so much as the raw need to survive pares a resident theater or other institution in the arts to the essentials of professionalism or makes it a better place for hard-nosed apprenticeship. It is fortunate that universities by and large have well-equipped theaters and concert halls, and fairly adequate painting and music studios. It is still possible, perhaps, to emphasize repeatedly that what goes on inside is of prime importance and real estate of only secondary. One of the most influential of all theater departments has flourished for years in shockingly inadequate quarters.

I said earlier that the future of professional training in the arts depends, first, upon a radical shift in the university atmosphere surrounding students considered potential artists and, second, upon the provision of opportunities for professional apprenticeship through nonacademic persons or institutions.

Most of these opportunities, I believe, will be found only when the student is ready to leave his undergraduate career. Not all of them, however. At the University of Utah, for example, mature professional actors are mixed with each student dramatic production. Indiana, Minnesota, Catholic University, and others give graduate and sometimes undergraduate students experience in the trials of the touring theatrical company. Minnesota hopes that Tyrone Guthrie will use some of its student actors in small parts at the new repertory theater going up in Minneapols. And so forth.

In the past 3 years a few universities have been groping toward other developments in the arts. You are all conscious of the festival seasons and seminars involving professional artists on the campus; it would be difficult to assay the lasting impact of these on undergraduates training in the arts. A more important innovation is the idea of maintaining on the campus a professional resident theater company as a cultural resource on a footing with the library. Only the Extension Division of the University of California at Los Angeles has to date pulled it off satisfactorily, and there the secret was actually the long mailing lists of southern Californians addicted to any kind of adult education. Princeton University's experience was instructive, for good and for bad. With the McCarter Theater a white elephant on its hands, Princeton decided it would have two short seasons in the performing arts including the theater. But the university did not want to put much money into the enterprise, so its original plan was to give the professional director and actors 4½ days to rehearse each play. I had occasion to point out that Princeton would not start off a new science laboratory in that fashion and expect the result to reflect the institution's own standards. But as the agenda before us today suggests, the universities are still groping for new patterns in the arts, and I am sure we are all sympathetic to the attempt Princeton is making. Harvard did not have a white elephant, and through the generosity of an alumnus built its own new and challenging theater. To date, however, so far I have learned, this theater is destined as another extracurricular home for the undergraduate.

If they will move in still more unorthodox fashion, the universities can build many more cooperative mechanisms for students who are graduating or have become postgraduates. Our own program in the Ford Foundation affords illustrations; I shall cite two in contrasting fields. Young composers, most of them holding advanced degrees, are selected to write music directly for performance by high school orchestras and choral groups. You are no doubt aware that young composers generally must write for their filing cases rather than for performance, and you may not be too old to recall that the repertoire of even the best high school musical organization is deficient in contemporary music. The other example is the so-called theater communications group, which among other aims, will attempt to point out to both the most talented undergraduate actors and their professors where the young actors may get a year-round professional apprenticeship instead of going off to beat the streets of New York and Los Angeles.

The field for new modes of cooperation between the universities and artistic groups in the same or more distant communities in 1961 appears very wide. I say this rather confidently because my mail and my fieldwork bring me new ideas for such cooperation almost daily. I am even more confident that these artistic groups expect either the universities or the foundations to support such mechanisms, and they are realistic enough to know that a national foundation does not expect to give widespread support to local activities. Theatrical and musical organizations want your students as paid audiences; they will take the best of them as paid apprentices if you will put up the money, and if you want to give them graduate credit for such apprenticeships, that is all right too. Museums want to join with you in the training and retention of curators and directors (as is already being done in half a dozen places), but again they want you to find the money for this.

As administrators in important and complex institutions, you, of course, are most conscious of the fact that raising the funds for existing activities is already a difficult undertaking. But I presume we are talking of the future, too. And I believe that in addition to the trends your Committee on Policies has noted, there is an inevitable trend toward a greater sharing of both your facilities and your funds by community institutions in the arts, particularly and most extensively when your funds come from the taxpayers of your States.

The choice you make in this decade may be crucial for the arts, because already the universities have drifted along with the society in the perpetuation of the amateur and of the imitator. It would be very discouraging to think that your efforts and your financial resources, like most of those being utilized in other quarters, could be expended toward a greater and greater popularization of standards. Whether you can make a home on your campus for what I have called distortion as a way of life, I do not know. If you cannot, I hope you will confine all your activities in the arts to historical and theoretical treatment.

When President Wall came to talk to me about this session, he said you would all be prepared for the fact that in addressing myself to the subject of "The University and the Creative Arts" I would have to speak largely without distinction between the undergraduate and graduate schools, and this is certainly what I have done. But I think whatever specific advice I have to give about graduate curriculums has already emerged from the contest. Just to recapitulate it, however—

Graduate schools, it seems to me, have two responsibilities for the creative arts. One is very old and one is very new. The very old one is to recognize the history, theory, and esthetics of the arts as legitimate subjects for scholarship and research on a par with any of the other humanistic disciplines. The very new responsibility is to support new forms of cooperation between the university and truly professional institutions in the arts, however small or financially pressed such institutions may be. The training resulting from such cooperation will largely go on outside the campus; it will be unorthodox; it will have to be extemporized; but it will not be any less integral a part of the university than many of the scientific and other institutes which you all have tucked away here and there. Whether you will give graduate degrees for such training, and which degrees, I am not prepared at the moment to argue.

Unless and until such new forms can be developed, however, I would not want, if I were a graduate dean, to give either credits or degrees to technical (as distinguished from historical) proficiency in the arts beyond the first year. Under present conditions, the best service you can perform for the potential artist is to throw him out. If he is more interested in the shadow than the substance, in pretense than in intensity, he will readily find his enclave somewhere else anyway. And if he just should happen to be an artist, he will begin his long and painful education. No play was ever more dramatic, no musical composition more evocative, no novel truer to the imagination merely because its author was given a Ph. D. for creating it. And that is probably the safest thing I have said this afternoon.

H.R. 5140

A bill to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, to authorize programs of information, education, advisory services, and financial assistance for the encouragement and advancement of artistic and cultural activities, and for the development of a more widespread appreciation of America's cultural heritage and accomplishments, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Cultural Development Act of 1963".

TITLE I—MISCELLANEOUS

Findings and purposes of Act

Sec. 101. (a) The Congress finds that the vitality, quality, and further development of the arts and humanities in the United States are matters of profound national interest, and that the preservation and extension of the Nation's cultural resources requires that the Federal Government provide appropriate encouragement and support to public and other nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, and associations engaged in education in, sponsorship of, or otherwise advancing, artistic and cultural interest and activity. The Congress also finds that the many Federal programs and activities which involve, or which affect or are related to the arts and humanities should be assessed and evaluated in terms of their impact on American culture, and, insofar as it is practical, be coordinated and related to broad cultural needs and objectives.

(b) While the Congress strongly affirms that individual initiative and personal choice are the inviolable characteristics of American art and culture, it recognizes that government has a responsibility to help assure that conditions in our society encourage creativity. Increasing urbanization and population growth, greatly increased leisure time afforded by industrial and agricultural technology, early retirement, and extended lifespan and related factors have created an enormous need and opportunity for the pursuit and enjoyment of cultural interests. The failure of our society to meet this need and to exploit this opportunity would be a tragic blow to the general welfare of the American people.

(c) It is the purpose of this Act to provide a means by which the Federal Government can render effective assistance, in ways entirely appropriate for government, to efforts to encourage cultural development.

Assurance against Federal interference

Sec. 102. In the administration of this Act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, or the administration or operation of any school or other non-Federal agency, institution, organization; or association.

Definitions

Sec. 103. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) the term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education;

(2) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(3) the term "State" means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia;

(4) the term "nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, or associations" means those organizations described in section 501 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; and

(5) the term "art" or "arts" means both the performing and the nonperforming arts, including but not limited to music, painting, sculpture, architecture, drama, and the dance; the term "humanities" includes modern and ancient language and literature, history, and philosophy; the term "culture" or "cultural" is used more broadly to characterize the whole range of interests and activities that promote the enlightenment and refinement of the public in intellectual and esthetic matters.

Exemption from conflict-of-interest laws of members of Advisory Council

Sec. 104. (a) Any member of the Federal Advisory Council appointed under this Act, who is not a regular full-time employee of the United States, is hereby exempted, with respect to such appointment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), except as otherwise specified in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) The exemption granted by subsection (a) shall not extend—

(1) to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment, or

(2) during the period of such appointment, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the Government involving any matter with which such person, during such period, is or was directly connected by reason of such appointment.

Authorization of appropriations

Sec. 105. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

TITLE II—NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Sec. 201. There is hereby established in the United States Office of Education a National Institute of Arts and Humanities (hereafter referred to as the "Institute"). The Institute shall consist of a Federal Advisory Council on Arts and Humanities (hereafter referred to as the "Council") and a Director and staff.

Functions of the Institute

Sec. 202. (a) The Institute is authorized and directed—

(1) to conduct studies and develop recommendations for national policy in the encouragement of the arts and humanities and in the advancement of culture;

(2) to support research, surveys, demonstrations, or experimental projects designed to advance the arts and humanities, including the evaluation of such activities, through contracts with or grants to State and other public agencies, institutions of higher education, or public or other nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, or associations;

(3) to promote and advance education in the arts and humanities by the production or commissioning, collection, and dissemination of films, records, tapes, reproductions, or printed matter suitable for use in courses or lectures in the arts conducted by schools, colleges, and universities, or other nonprofit institutions engaged in providing education in the arts and humanities;

(4) to maintain a central clearinghouse of information covering the various aspects of the arts and humanities in the United States, including activities of other Federal departments or agencies, and to make such information available to the public;

(5) to provide, through the award of graduate fellowships or traineeships to individuals (within the limits of such sums as the Congress may specifically appropriate for this purpose), or through arrangements (by contract or grant) with groups specified in paragraph (2) for the conduct of institutes or seminars, for the training of teaching, technical, and administrative personnel who, in the judgment of the Council, are in short supply and are most needed by educational and other cultural institutions and agencies to promote the advancement of the arts and humanities; and

(6) to render consultative and advisory services to other Federal departments and agencies, State and other public agencies, public and other nonprofit educational agencies and institutions, and other nonprofit agencies, institutions, organizations, or associations concerned with education in or advancement of the arts and humanities.

(b) In exercising the authority and discharging the functions referred to in subsection (a) of this section, the Institute shall place primary emphasis upon the educational aspects of the arts and humanities but it shall interpret "education" broadly so as to include all levels, conducted formally or informally by both public and private groups specified in paragraph (2) for the benefit of people of all ages.

(c) The Commissioner shall render an annual report to the Secretary for submission on or before the 15th day of January of each year to the Congress, summarizing the activities of the Institute and making such recommendations as he may deem advisable. Such report shall include minority views and recommendations, if any, of members of the Council.

TITLE III—FEDERAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Sec. 301. (a) The Council shall consist of twenty-four members to be appointed without regard to the civil service laws by the Secretary, and of the Institute Director ex officio, and shall, as provided by this Act, advise the Commissioner in the exercise of the authority granted to the Institute by this Act, and advise the Secretary on national needs relating to the arts and humanities in the United States. The persons appointed as members (1) shall be eminent in the education in or the practice, performance, administration, criticism, or promotion of the arts, letters, or cultural interests of the United States; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of records of distinguished service; and (3) shall be so selected as to be broadly representative of the artistic and cultural interests encompassed by this Act.

(b) The term of office of each member of the Council (except that of the Director) shall be six years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of his predecessor shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of members first appointed after the date of enactment of this Act shall expire, as designated by the Secretary, eight at the end of two years, eight at the end of four years, and eight at the end of six years.

(c) The Secretary shall call the first meeting of the Council, at which the first order of business shall be the election of a Chairman and a Vice Chairman. The Institute Director shall be secretary to the Council.

(d) The Council shall meet at least once annually and at such other times as requested by the Commissioner. A majority of the voting members shall constitute a quorum, and each member shall be given reasonable notice in writing of the call of a meeting.

(e) The Chairman and the Vice Chairman shall be elected by the Council at the first meeting for a term of two years, and at every succeeding annual meeting occurring at the end of each such two-year term, except that a vacancy in either office may be filled by vote of the Council.

(f) The members of the Council shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 for each day engaged in the business of the Council pursuant to its authorization, and shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Authority of Commissioner

Sec. 302. In order to carry out the functions of the Institute, the Commissioner shall have the authority, within the limits of available appropriations, to do all things necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act (other than title IV), including but not limited to the authority—

(1) to prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary governing the manner of the Institute's operation and organization and personnel;

(2) to make such expenditures as may be necessary for the administration of this Act;

(3) to make grants or enter into contracts or other financial arrangements as authorized by title II, except that such grants, contracts, or other financial arrangements shall be limited to those recommended by the Council, or by a committee of members established by the Council for this purpose;

(4) to make advance, progress, and other payments in connection with contracts without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529);

(5) to acquire by purchase, lease, loan, or gift, and to hold and dispose of by sale, lease, or loan, real and personal property of all kinds necessary for, or resulting from, the exercise of authority granted by this Act;

(6) to receive and use funds donated by others, provided that such funds are donated without restriction other than that they be used to further one or more of the general purposes of the Institute;

(7) to accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and to provide transportation and subsistence as authorized by law for persons serving without compensation;

(8) to employ such personnel as he may deem necessary to carry out the functions of the Institute under this Act, not to exceed twenty of which may be technical and professional persons including the Director of the Institute compensated at rates not to exceed $19,000 per annum without regard to the civil service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949; and

(9) to delegate any of his functions under this act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

TITLE IV—FUNCTIONS OF NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION IN THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Sec. 401. Section 3(a) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(10) to promote and support activities, projects, and education in the arts and humanities in order to encourage and assist cultural development in the United States in conjunction with the programs provided in titles II and III of the Cultural Development Act of 1963."

Sec. 402. (a) Section 4(a) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 is amended—

(1) by striking out "education, or public affairs" in clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "education, the arts and humanities, or public affairs";

(2) by striking out "scientific leaders" in clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "leaders in these fields"; and

(3) by striking out "other scientific or educational organizations" in the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "other organizations in the fields of science, the arts and humanities, and education".

(b) Section 7(a) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) A Division of the Arts and Humanities."

(c) The first sentence of section 9(a) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "(except that in the case of the Division of the Arts and Humanities six of the members shall be eminent in the arts and humanities and five in other fields)".

(d) Section 9(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "research" and inserting in lieu thereof "activities".

(e) Section 10 of such Act is amended by inserting after "engineering, and other sciences" the following: ", and for study or work in the arts and humanities,".

(f) Section 11(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "such basic scientific research activities" and inserting in lieu thereof "such basic scientific research and other activities".

(g) Section 11(d) of such Act is amended by inserting after "scientific research" the following: "and other activities under this Act".

(h) Section 11(i) of such Act is amended by inserting after "scientific research" the following: "and other activities under this Act".

GREECE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDade] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, we are gathered here in this distinguished hall in the first week of spring in the year 1963. Each year at this time we celebrate the end of the long cold of winter, and the promise of the fine warmth of summer soon to come. It is a day of joy. But it is something else. It is the day on which we celebrate the freedom of a tiny nation. On a map of the world it is scarcely a dot, it is so minute. But on the great map of time and civilization it looms like a veritable Colossus, like a towering mountain of learning and culture. The sands of time may have many footprints, but the prints of this nation walk across all the Western World, and indeed all the Eastern World. It is the day we celebrate the freedom of the great nation of Greece.

The very name conjures up haunting memories.

There is the memory of art. We remember the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World, and among them the great statue of Zeus by Phideas, and the splendid temple of Artemis at Ephesus and the Colossus of Rhodes by Chares. We remember the splendor of the Doric, the Ionian, and Corinthian temples. From across 2,000 years the sculpture of ancient Greece reached its magic hand to form Michelangelo Buonarotti, and still haunts the beauty of Rodin today.

There is the memory of poetry. All of us have learned the wonders of epic poetry from Homer. All of us have encamped outside the walls of Troy with the avenging Greek Army; and all of us have wandered the world with Odysseus, with the distant memory of Penelope haunting the pages of these great books. We remember the odes of Pindar and the lyric poetry of Sappho.

We remember also the drama. There were the great and moving dramas of Aeschylus, with long forgotten death of Iphigenia still waiting to be avenged upon the head of Agamemnon. Sophocles is the one we most remember, with the enormity of the tragedies of Oedipus and Antigone still towering over the world today. And Euripides with Elektra. They are the great foundation stones of the drama, and so well were they written that when Rome turned to the drama, she achieved greatness only when she translated the Greeks, and even in the 20th century, the greatest of American dramatists, Eugene O'Neill, turned back to the Greeks to frame his own dramas, with Euripides and Sophocles walking anew in the pages of "Mourning Becomes Electra."

We remember the wars of Greece. We remember their strength when they stood against the tyranny of the Persians. We remember Thermopolae, and we remember Marathon.

"The mountains look on Marathon
  And Marathon looks on the sea
And musing there an hour alone
  I dreamed that Greece might still be free.
For, standing on the Persian's grave,
  I could not deem myself a slave."

So spoke the poet Byron in "Don Juan," and so indeed speaks all the world when we read anew those tales of heroism, when a small nation stood against the power of an enormous empire.

We remember philosophy. We read again the works of Socrates, of Plato, of Aristotle. We walk through the grove of Academe with the men who came to be taunted, prodded by Socrates. We sit with Plato at the feet of Socrates, and we stand in awe before the ponderous mind of Aristotle. Their footsteps echo like distant thunder all through the history of Western philosophy, and for the great minds of each age, there is that moment when in desperation they turn again to the greatness of the Greeks.

We remember their politics. We stand in awe before the minds which first set up a system of government so similar to our own. We know that if these souls returned from the shades of the past, they could sit beside us in this very house, and could deliberate with us; indeed, would add new notes of wisdom to our deliberations.

These we remember, and these are only part of the greatness of Greece. I sat beside the Greek Orthodox Bishop Iakovos only a week ago when he was honored at a dinner in my district. After a long evening of moving speeches he rose solemnly, knowing that this would be an audience difficult to hold after all the other talks.

Ladies and gentlemen—

He said—

this is a great nation, with freedoms unheard of, especially freedom of speech. But for every privilege there is a price. Tonight the price of freedom of speech is patience.

I assure you, the audience was his, and listened to the wise words of a man who has been chosen president of the World Council of Churches.

Today we celebrate the freedom of this nation. For nearly 400 years Greece was a captive State in the Ottoman Empire but the seeds of freedom would not die and in the war for freedom from 1821 to 1829 Greece proved she had a right to stand among the nations of the modern world. In 1830 her freedom was guaranteed by the nations of the West.

There is a lesson in this for all of us. The freedom of Greece stood strong at the end of the Second World War when the power of communism sought to crush out the flame of freedom, but they fought with bullets and ballots and Greece is a free nation today.

The wisdom of Athens has prevailed over the power of Sparta. The love of liberty that burned brightly at Marathon still burns even brighter from the heights of the Acropolis today. When men look at the awesome brute power of Moscow standing upon the bodies of so many enslaved nations today, let them remember to ask, "Where is Sparta today?" And if Khrushchev is proud of his name among the nations today, let him remember that we all remember Sophocles and Aristophanes, and Socrates, and Plato, and Aristotle, and Phidias, but who remembers the tyrants of Sparta?

Today we can all look with Byron at Marathon. Today we can celebrate the freedom of Greece, and if the course of history runs true, tomorrow we may celebrate the freedom of all the other oppressed nations of the world. In the strange course of history, in the not too distant future children may ask in puzzlement, "Who were Mao Tse-tung, and Stalin and Khrushchev?"

FORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF BYELORUSSIA

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 45th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Byelorussia. Like millions of other oppressed victims of Soviet colonialism, the people of Byelorussia today live in conditions near slavery behind the Iron Curtain. However, in coordination with representatives and spokesmen for other captive peoples, Americans of Byelorussian origin are maintaining the struggle for freedom of the land of their forefathers.

Therefore, this 45th anniversary of Byelorussian independence takes on additional significance since it serves as a reminder that the spirit of freedom continues to burn in the hearts of the people behind the Iron Curtain, and that the determination of all anti-Soviet peoples continues to be the fundamental weakness of the Soviet Union.

In comemmorating Byelorussian Independence, I join the other Members in encouraging them in their perseverance and hope for national independence through the principle of self-determination, and remind the brave Byelorussian people that they do have the sympathetic alinement of other captive nations who, in the cause of justice, must eventually triumph in their drive for political and economic liberty and freedom from the Soviet colonial yoke.

NATIONAL VISITOR AND STUDENT CENTER

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a "19-whereas" resolution that would lead to the development and construction of a National Visitor and Student Center in the District of Columbia.

Most of the whereases deal with the reason why we should have an adequate information center here in Washington, D.C., so that the millions of people who come here every year—and it is estimated that over 15 million people visit here each year—may have a better opportunity to benefit from seeing the memorials, the Capitol Building area, the Library of Congress, the Archives, the Art Gallery, and all the other things that can be seen here. This resolution calls for the creation of a committee of 20: 12 Members of Congress, 6 House Members and 6 Senators, to be appointed on a bipartisan basis; the Superintendent of National Capital Parks; the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission; the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District; the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; 2 distinguished citizens to be appointed by the President of the United States; and 2 members of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade.

This bill calls for the study of the feasibility and advisability of having such a center here in Washington, patterned after the one you can see in Williamsburg, where people may go, park their cars, go into an information center, be refreshed, and see a film demonstrating the historic role of this community.

As I have indicated, Mr. Chairman, my resolution proposes the appointment of a Commission which will carefully study and subsequently report to the Congress its conclusions respecting ways and means of effectively and relatively inexpensively educating the public, both at home and abroad, respecting American history, traditions, democratic processes and devotion to peace.

To be sure, the executive departments carry on some activities toward this objective. The Members of both Houses of the Congress give preferred attention to the subject in talking to their constituents and when speaking before many groups throughout the land. But it is clear that we have neglected to take advantage of the unequaled opportunity for influencing public opinion along these lines here in the Nation's Capital.

Almost 15 million people are now visiting Washington every year. This number included delegates to some 400 conventions, several hundred thousand students and an increasing number of visitors from other countries of the world.

Despite the fact that our National Capital contains a fabulous array of historical material and patriotic shrines as well as living demonstrations of democracy at work, there is no methodical and organized method for educating the millions of visitors concerning their existence and the lessons which can be learned in them.

In my opinion an appropriate designed and operated visitor center should be provided. The Park Service has recognized this need and made a small and very inadequate start by conducting a visitor center in the Old Haines Point Sea House. The residents, particularly the business people, see this need too and have included the outlines for such a center in their plans for revitalizing the central business district. It has also been suggested that the polo field in Potomac Park which provides ample space for parking of cars and sightseeing buses be converted into a visitor center.

My resolution does not contain any specifications respecting the solution to the shortcomings to which I have referred. Its preamble recites in detail existing needs and inadequacies and outlines in broad generalities the wisdom of establishing a vast educational program to create a true image of America in the minds of our millions of visitors.

NEWSLETTER FOR MINORITY STAFFING

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, several of our exceptional and capable freshman Members have already written with great clarity and forcefulness on the problem of minority staffing.

One of those, who has been most active in studying this problem and urging this remedial action, is Congressman Robert McClory, of the 12th Congressional District from Illinois. His newsletter, dated March 7, in a few and well chosen words, clearly presents the need for more adequate minority staffing, and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues, thoughtful students on this subject, and members of the press:

Your Congressman Robert McClory Reports From Washington

A great deal is being said and written these days about minority staffing. It is important for residents of the 12th Congressional District to become better acquainted with this issue and to understand how greater minority staffing can assist their Congressman.

In the first place, congressional committees are composed of majority and minority members. In the case of the Committee on Government Operations on which this writer serves, there are 19 Democratic Congressmen who make up the majority and 12 Republicans representing the minority. This 3-to-2 ratio is roughly that of the total House ratio of 258 Democrats to 177 Republicans.

Committee staffs which consist of lawyers, researchers, writers and other specialists of various types provide committees with the assistance they require in performing their tasks. This assistance consists of factual and legal research, bill drafting, preparing of analyses, summaries and reports, and many other detailed and necessary tasks. If minority members of a committee are to be served equally with the majority, it is essential that minority staff personnel should be provided in the same ratio as the total membership of the committee. For this reason, the Republican Conference (composed of all the Republican Members) urged that 40 percent of committee staffs should be named by the Republican (minority) members of the committee. The Democratic majority in the House opposed this move, and the Republicans in their efforts to serve as an articulate opposition party have been obliged to rely on Democratic assurances that increased minority staff personnel will be furnished as required. While not an entirely satisfactory arrangement, this is a vastly improved situation.

Again, with respect to the writer's Committee on Government Operations (the so-called watchdog committee of the Congress), the majority has engaged 51 while the minority members have been allotted only 3 staff personnel. One can readily see that the staff ratio of 51 to 3 is completely out of line with the committee ratio of 19 to 12. Unless additional staff members are assigned to the Republican minority, there will be roughly three staff members for each Democratic Congressman on this committee, while four Republican Congressmen will have to share one of the minority staff members. In fairness, it must be pointed out that the staffs of some committees, such as the Foreign Affairs and Armed Services Committees, are essentially nonpartisan and strictly professional.

But the members of the Government Operations, Appropriations, Education and Labor, and other committees have vital responsibilities to draw attention to the weaknesses of the majority's position. How, for instance, can the minority of the Committee on Government Operations point out specific objections to the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration, the TVA, the executive department's improper management of the news, the Agriculture Department's abuses (responsible for the Billie Sol Estes scandal), foreign aid waste, etc., unless the minority has the staff with which to do its job? Without adequate staffs, the minority's investigations will result in whitewashes and inactivity in areas where close scrutiny and criticism should be provided.

Respect for and encouragement of the minority party are essential elements of our two-party system. Democrats as well as Republicans should support a vocal, constructive, and responsible minority. Adequate staffing for minority members is essential in performing this role.

FISCAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Foreman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a newspaper item.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, partially in response to the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. Holifield] and secondly, as a matter of clarification of the on-again-off-again attitude of the President and his deficit spending programs, I would like to point out that Mr. Kennedy is running up a deficit at more than twice the rate of the Eisenhower administration. Not that I, in any form, approve of deficit spending under any administration, either Eisenhower or Kennedy or anyone else, but I find it rather amusing that the gentlemen would refer to the increased national debt under Mr. Eisenhower, when Mr. Kennedy will have, using the administration's own estimate for the fiscal year 1964, upped the national debt more in 3 years than Eisenhower did in 6 years.

Also, Mr. Kennedy will have spent money 30 percent faster in his first 3 years than Mr. Eisenhower did in his. In only 2 years, the Kennedy administration has added more new Federal employees than the Eisenhower administration did in 8 years.

At this point, I would like to place in the Record an editorial from the Chicago Tribune which points out some very interesting and informative comparisons of the two administrations referred to:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Tribune, Mar. 23, 1963]

A Degree of Fiscal Responsibility

In his most recent plea for a tax cut without a cut in spending, President Kennedy asserted that such a program would offer a thrust to the economy "and also a degree of fiscal responsibility."

We note that Mr. Kennedy is withdrawing, by degrees, from his earlier contention that the tax program is fiscally responsible without qualifications. And well he might. Not even the most agile economic propagandist could devise a definition of fiscal responsibility which would cover everything put forward in its name by the New Frontier.

Last summer, for example, fiscal responsibility meant delaying a tax cut because a recession did not appear to be imminent. Today Mr. Kennedy's position is that "we don't believe there will be a recession this year" but that, nevertheless, "merely because our prospects look good in 1963, I would think it is all the more pressing for us to take action at this time."

In short, what was fiscally irresponsible last year has, for reasons which may have more to do with politics than economics, become fiscally responsible "to a degree."

In his campaign for the Presidency, Mr. Kennedy voiced firm opinions about fiscal responsibility. Here is what he said on November 4, 1960:

"I want to make it clear that * * * if I am elected President of the United States, we commit ourselves to a sound * * * fiscal and responsible monetary policy.

"From fiscal 1954 to fiscal 1960, the last 6 years, we increased the national debt by $21 billion. In the last 6 years, $21 billion.

"Never before in the history of the United States did any administration in peacetime have a deficit larger than this [the Eisenhower] administration in 1958, $12 billion. They would have had an increase in the debt of more than $10 billion except a Democratic Congress in the last 6 years cut the budget requests of the President of the United States by $10 billion.

"So if we are going to talk about fiscal responsibility; if we are going to talk about meeting our obligations; if we are going to talk about balanced budget; I want to look at the record.

"[The Eisenhower] administration [came to power] on a commitment to reduce Federal spending to $60 billion. It has never been close to $60 billion. They have spent 46 percent more than Harry Truman spent. They have added 106,000 new Federal employees. I think it's about time the people knew."

Very well, then, let's look at the record after 2 years of the Kennedy administration, which was likewise elected on a clear promise of fiscal responsibility.

In 3 years, using the administration's own estimate for the fiscal year 1964, Mr. Kennedy will have run up a cumulative deficit of $26 billion. In 3 years, $26 billion. This is more than double the Eisenhower rate. The Kennedy deficit for 1964, now pinned precariously at $11.9 billion, is almost certain to end up higher than the Eisenhower bellringer of 1958–59.

Mr. Kennedy will have spent money 30 percent faster in his first 3 years than Mr. Eisenhower did in his. And in only 2 years, the Kennedy administration has added more new Federal employees than the Eisenhower administration did in 8.

Mr. Kennedy cannot, with consistency, call his program fiscally responsible, even to a degree. It's time for Congress to do what Mr. Kennedy commended it for doing under Mr. Eisenhower: Cut the budget requests of the President and make certain that our fiscal policy is responsible—not by the wavering Kennedy definition, but by the definition of sensible economists and businessmen everywhere. It's time the people knew—and, fortunately, many of them already do.

GROSS MISMANAGEMENT IN MILITARY PROCUREMENT SELF-SABOTAGES U.S. MILITARY COMBAT READINESS

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pillion] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1963, the Comptroller General issued a report on its study of the supply of repair parts needed for combat and combat-support vehicles of the U.S. Army. This General Accounting Office—GAO—review covered the years of 1958–62.

The management inefficiencies, neglect, and irresponsibility of the U.S. Army Logistics, Ordnance, and Materiel Commands seriously endanger our defensive and offensive military commands.

The operational deficiencies for the supply of vital repair parts for tanks, artillery, and other combat-support vehicles can be attributed to the Army Tank-Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

A partial checklist of Army installations showed the following out-of-combat-readiness vehicles due to lack of spare parts:

First. In Korea, many of our M–48 medium tanks, and other combat vehicles were out of commission due to lack of parts, some of which had been on order for more than a year.

Second. On December 2, 1960, our M–48 medium tanks were in need of 3,900 booster coil items that were in short supply, many of which were urgently needed in Korea.

Third. U.S. Army tanks and combat vehicles were out of combat readiness in the United States, Europe, Korea, Okinawa, and the Panama Canal Zone due to 994 unfilled orders for parts on December 2, 1960. Some of these parts orders had been on order for as long as 313 days.

Fourth. The lack of cylinders was putting many self-propelled artillery howitzers in Europe out of commission.

Fifth. In six Army installations in the United States, 600 tanks, artillery pieces, and combat-support vehicles were out of commission during 1960 and 1961 due to a short supply of repair parts.

Sixth. At Fort Bragg, N.C., 87 combat or combat-supply vehicles were not combat ready on March 8, 1960. Repair items had been on order for from 3 to 9 months.

In its thorough review of the Army Tank-Automotive Center, the GAO found that, on June 30, 1961, that organization had 688 active items out of stock, 260 of which were identified as essential for combat purposes.

The Comptroller General cited three specific management deficiencies that were primarily responsible for the lack of repair parts:

First, delays in awarding contracts after procurement decisions were made; second, delays in determining whether to procure; and third, delays in determining needs for parts.

In his report to the Congress, the Comptroller General cautioned that his "review of unfilled orders disclosed a very serious condition. As of September 10, 1961, the ATAC had 15,662 orders outstanding for repair parts from Army installations throughout the world."

The Comptroller General's report cited an alarming number of instances which attested to the failure of this system to function properly:

> Lack of repair parts in the Army supply system contributed to the reduction in the combat readiness of certain of the Army's combat and combat-support vehicles. In addition, the lack of repair parts was the primary reason for the incurrence of unnecessary costs of over $500,000 during fiscal year 1961 by procurement of parts locally that are normally procured centrally at lower prices.

The GAO revealed that the Red River Arsenal, during fiscal year 1961, procured 184 repair parts for about $362,000. On the basis of unit prices paid for identical parts by ATAC on previous occasions, these parts should have cost only $249,000. The arsenal, therefore, paid $113,000, or 46 percent, more than ATAC would have paid for the same items through centralized procurement.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no excuse for the gross mismanagement that permeates our U.S. Army supply operations for vital parts needed to keep our tanks, artillery, and combat-supply vehicles in instant readiness. The revelations of the General Accounting Office constitute, in effect, a self-sabotage of our military capabilities.

Our Federal system of administrative management is in sore need of a major and complete reform. It lacks production objectives, production techniques, production accountability and responsibility.

Our management process encourages mismanagement and discourages efficiency and good management.

RUSSIA'S CZARIST DESPOTISM CRUSHED HUNGARY'S 1848 WAR OF INDEPENDENCE—RUSSIA'S SOVIET-COMMUNISM TOTALITARIANISM THREATENS ENTIRE FREE WORLD

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on March 17, I had the honor of addressing the United Hungarian Societies of Cleveland, Ohio, on the occasion of the 115th Anniversary of Hungary's 1848 War of Independence.

It was my privilege at that time to pay tribute to Hungary's great leader and patriot, Louis Kossuth.

The following is a quote from a speech delivered by Kossuth in Cleveland, Ohio, on February 3, 1852:

> Yours is a mighty republic, destined to enforce the law of nations, upon which rests the delivery of the world from an all-overwhelming despotism.

By "overwhelming despotism," Kossuth was specifically referring to the then ruling Russian Czarist Government. The Soviet-Communist depotism that we have today is both an extension and an expansion of the czarist tyranny. Kossuth was truly prophetic. The United States is confronted with an all-overwhelming threat led and directed against us by the Russian Soviet-Communist Party and government.

My address before the United Hungarian Societies of Cleveland follows:

Mr. President, Andrew Dono, reverend and, respected members of the clergy; the distinguished mayor, Ralph S. Locher, honored guests; my esteemed fellow Americans of Hungarian ancestry, I appear before you today with a deep sense of attachment by personal and ancestral ties.

We share a common Hungarian inheritance of moralities, of political ideals, of culture, of language.

We share an appreciation of the gay and, at times, sad emotional harmonies of Magyar music.

We have a common acceptance of those highest moralities of the Christian-Judaic religions and our Western civilization.

There is implanted in our Hungarian background an abiding faith and love for one's fellow man.

That greatest Hungarian, Louis Kossuth, has inculcated in every Hungarian some of those political ideals upon which this great country was founded.

That is why I am especially grateful to you for your kind invitation to meet with you, my Hungarian kinsmen.

I extend to this distinguished Hungarian community my respects and offer you my good wishes.

My compatriots, we, each of us, share a deep sadness on this commemoration of Hungary's war of independence of 1848.

That was was a struggle between tyranny and freedom.

It was not a new struggle.

That clash has occurred in every generation since the beginning of recorded history.

One-hundred and fifteen years ago, the Hungarian war had for its objectives: Political home rule for Hungary; an equal political status in a dual monarchy; emancipation of Hungarian serfs and peasants; economic, social, and political reforms to raise the status of the peoples of both Hungary and Austria.

The war of 1848 was a revolution against the tyrannies resulting from the political absolutism of an aristocratic monarchy.

It is appropriate to recall the events of that period.

They are quite applicable to our own unrecognized struggle to maintain our freedom.

In the year of 1848, Europe was in a state of political fermentation.

The forces of liberty, of constitutional limitations upon government, of constitutional guarantees recognizing the sovereignty of the people, were reaching a crescendo.

These popular demands were the aftermath of the American and French Revolutions.

America has her Revolutionary War of 1775; Hungary has her Revolutionary War of 1848.

In our own war of independence, George Washington came to the fore and carried the cause of freedom to final fulfillment.

We, here today, are the beneficiaries of Washingtons personal abilities and devotion.

We are the legatees of man's greatest inheritance, freedom.

The testators are those heroic American soldiers and people who sacrificed 8 years of war to hand down to us our most precious inheritance.

Historians record the 1848 Hungarian war of independence as a failure.

They unanimously state that Kossuth's objectives and Hungary's cause were lost in that war.

That is not my interpretation of the events of that time.

It is not my evaluation of the life work of Louis Kossuth.

No one can possibly understand the casual relationship between the noble efforts of Louis Kossuth, the war of 1848, and subsequent events unless one fully understands and appreciates the "Father of the Hungarian Revolution," Louis Kossuth.

We are not gathered here today to commemorate a lost revolution or to pay our respects to the memory of the leader of a lost revolution.

The Hungarian ideals of independence in the war of 1848; the Kossuth principles of the brotherhood of man were not merely vainglorious, frustrated dreams.

The war of 1884 did result in the attainment of Kossuth's objectives in a very short time after 1848.

Kossuth's grand designs, his platforms, his objectives were fulfilled and came to pass due almost wholly to his political leadership; to his devotion to the cause of freedom; and to his sympathetic understanding for his fellow men.

These are some of the Kossuth reforms that came to fruition: Measures for the emancipation of serfs were enacted; freedom of the press was granted in both Austria and Hungary; flogging and corporal punishment were abolished.

The constitutional settlement in 1867, between Austria and Hungary, was effected. This settlement was based upon the Kossuth Hungarian Constitution of 1848.

Under the terms of the 1867 settlement, the dual monarchy of Austria-Hungary was created.

Power for concerted action within international and military spheres was centralized.

Austria and Hungary were each allotted equal, separate and autonomous powers in domestic affairs.

His crusade for orphanages, for hospitals, for mass education, for fiscal reforms, for economic growth, for industrialization, succeeded in bringing about an early realization of these sociological and economic goals.

Kossuth's character and political ideals were influenced and patterned, to a large degree, upon the life of George Washington.

As a youth, he attended that outstanding law academy at Sarospatok.

Part of his catechism at Sarospatok were these questions and answers:

"Who was the first man?"

The answer to that question was "George Washington."

"What form of government is the best?"

The answer to that question was "The Republican form of Government."

Although Louis Kossuth was the greatest Hungarian, he was also a great American—in his beliefs, in his heart.

Louis Kossuth was a profound philosopher, an eminent historian.

He was a humanitarian above all. His most profound conviction was the brotherhood of man.

He was equally humble, loyal and devoted to his associates, to the peasants, to his superiors in rank.

He was a masterful linguist. He had a remarkable command of a beautiful Shakespearean English.

In addition to his native Magyar language, he was fluent in Latin and German.

Louis Kossuth was an eloquent orator, a fervent inspirational crusader. Yet, he was never a demagog.

He was a strict moralist, a truly devout practitioner of Christian-Judaic moralities.

Kossuth was Hungary's first modern journalist. It was his editorship and his contributions that successfully established the Pesti Hirlap.

It is said that Kossuth was proud. That is true. But it was not an arrogant self-pride.

It was a pride in the principles he believed in.

He had a mind that was conscious of its own rectitude. He zealously protected the sanctity of his grand concepts, of his moralities, of his principles.

Louis Kossuth belongs not alone to the history of Hungary. His concepts are eternal. His work will live in the recording of world history.

My friends:

Father Kossuth still lives. He holds a special place of honor in our hearts.

He remains a symbol of those rare qualities that are so lacking today, that are so sorely needed by this Nation and the free world.

His brilliant concepts provide an answer, the only answer, to these forces that threaten our existence.

Effective countermeasures against the Soviet-Communist politico-military war against all freedom, against all free peoples cannot be founded upon compromise of fundamental principles.

Survival cannot be predicated upon policies of vacillation, conciliation, compromise, retreat, and surrender.

It is a sorrowful commentary to recall that the aspirations of the Hungarian people for freedom have been brutally crushed, bathed in Hungarian blood on three occasions by Russian despotism and totalitarianism.

On August 11, 1848, General Gorgey surrendered his Hungarian Army not to the Austrians, but to the Russian Field Marshal Paskiewitisch.

Hungary's desperate struggle for freedom was defeated not by its oppressor, Austria, but by the overwhelming military forces of Russia.

In the year 1919, Bela Kun overthrew Hungary's democratic government. He cold-bloodedly murdered thousands of Hungary's leaders.

He imposed a Communist regime upon her people. He extinguished all Hungarian freedoms.

Bela Kun was a Moscow-trained murdering revolutionist. Bela Kun was the forerunner of Castro.

That revolution was conceived, planned and its execution directed out of Moscow. History repeated itself in Cuba.

It is most tragic that the State Department of the United States is so incapable of reading and understanding, and interpreting historical events.

It is only 6½ years ago, that these same Soviet-Communist murderers machine-gunned the children of Budapest, in October and November of 1956.

Again, the Russian Soviet-Communist despotism crushed Hungary's struggle for freedom by brutal bloody massacre.

The security of neither the Russian nor the Soviet nation was threatened on any one of these occasions. There was never a scintilla of legitimate justification for these shocking brutalities.

We must not allow time to soften or dim the atrocities of Budapest.

The sacrifices of the children, the women, the men of Hungary will have been in vain if we do not recognize the diabolical purposes behind these events.

These massacres of Hungarian people are a prolongation of a more than 400-year-old fixed obsession for aggressionist expansion—First under Russian czarist despotism and now under Soviet-Communist world totalitarianism.

The Nikita Khrushchev who ordered military mass murder attacks upon the Hungarian civilian population is the same Nikita Khrushchev who repeatedly threatens the evaporation of the American people, you and I, with 50- and 100-megaton nuclear bombs.

The Hungarian Freedom Crusade should serve as a reminder to each of us, every day, every hour, that the same diabolical forces seek our destruction too.

The United States happens to be only a few years further away, on Mr. Khrushchev's timetable.

Today, 1963, marks another anniversary that is of critical significance to we Americans.

It was in 1933, that this Nation gave diplomatic recognition to the Soviet.

The year 1933, marks the beginning of self-defeating policies toward the Soviet and world communism.

This year is the 30th year of our shameful, ruinous policies that are based upon self-deception.

We like to believe the myth that the inherent strength of freedom, the weakness of a tyrannical government assure the United States of victory in this deadly global power war.

Many people have laid down their lives to learn the contrary.

It is not ordained by anyone that freedom cannot be lost.

It is still true that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. We have lost all vigilance.

The most honest homage we can pay to those who died in Budapest is to recognize, and to admit that freemen can, and do, die in vain.

We have become corrupted by prejudices, by false images. Chastity of mind, the stark truth, is a prerequisite virtue for a free people.

A large segment of our intelligentsia, and of those teachers and news media who form and shape public opinion offer the theory that communism is only an ideology, another political philosophy, an alternative series of sociological and economic principles.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a completely false concept of the crises that confront us.

The sociological and economic theories of Karl Marx have been proven to be fallacious almost in toto.

We are not dealing with Marxist dialectics or ideology.

The Soviet-Communist world conspiracy is a system of world political-military power. It is the product not of Marx, but of that mad evil genius, Lenin.

This Moscow-directed worldwide campaign is a permanent international revolution played with the skillful advance planning of a chess game.

All military, economic, social, cultural, ideological resources are focused and concentrated upon world power politics.

Neither freedom, nor prosperity, nor materialism, nor patriotism, nor military strength offers security for this Nation.

We must learn that the survival of this Nation is dependent upon a combination and coordination of truth, power, policy, and will.

For an accurate assessment of the requirements for survival, this Nation and every other nation demands:

First. An accurate appraisal of its own strength and capacity.

Second. Assess correctly the power of the forces against it.

Third. Assess correctly the potential combination of actions the enemy may take.

Fourth. Plan correctly, and be ready to activate, political and other actions under foreseeable future circumstances.

We must, as a people, as a Nation, first establish our national aspirations and human values.

We are currently befuddled in vague, abstract gossip about freedom, survival and peace.

These concepts should be clarified and assigned their proper priorities.

A large segment of our population judges peace to be of supreme importance. They are the citizens who accept the pro-Communist slogan: "Peace at any price."

This attitude is reflected in our national policies, that too often materialize into appeasement, and the attempted bribery of the Communist-Soviet forces.

Another large segment of Americans consider survival to be all important. This spirit is exemplified by another pro-Communist slogan: "Better Red than dead."

These Americans have forgotten that survival without freedom is servitude.

It is heartening to know that there is a third segment of the American people. It is they who accept freedom as the indispensable ingredient of man's existence.

Human history is a record of man's struggle to be free. This Nation was founded, not upon concepts of survival or peace. It was founded upon the concept of human freedom.

In order to effectively bear the burden of our world responsibility, this Nation must reestablish freedom as the keystone of our national purpose. We must never forget that freedom is indispensable, survival is crucial, peace is desirable.

There are those, including Mr. Khrushchev, who maintain that this country must choose between freedom, survival, or peace. I do not believe that we must necessarily sacrifice any one of these objectives in order to preserve the others.

I am convinced that a realistic approach by this Nation, and our people, to the causes of the world crises would realize freedom, secure survival, and attain an enduring, true peace for all humanity.

My friends, the United States and the free world have completely failed to comprehend the magnitude, the scope, the weapons systems of the Soviet-Communist war.

It is a war of demoralization, disintegration, and destruction.

It is a relentless, unlimited war of indefinite duration.

It is a war of total enmity, to which our enemies are irrevocably committed.

It is a dual war.

One war is carried on by the more than 100 Communist parties, organized and operating in every nation on this globe. These parties recognize and serve under the leadership of Nikita Khrushchev as First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The second war is the one being waged by the Soviet and its satellite bloc of nations. This second war concentrates the total military, political, economic, diplomatic, and all other human resources upon the disintegration of the free world. Khrushchev is the commander in chief for both of these wars.

While the Soviet-Communist forces have been waging a unilateral campaign of political, military, economic, diplomatic, and psychomoral war, the United States has been waging a unilateral campaign for peace.

Our foreign policies, for the past 30 years, have completely failed to meet the realities and the practicalities of the Communist offensive.

Our foreign policies have not materially changed in the past 30 years.

There has not been one 5-year period in the past 30 years during which the Soviet Union has not become relatively stronger and the United States has not become relatively weaker.

We are losing the war for survival at an ever-accelerating pace.

Permit me to review some of the failures of our foreign policies that have contributed to our present critical posture:

First. For a period, we relied upon military superiority. Yet, our heaviest losses—the loss of middle Europe and China—were sustained between 1945 and 1950 when the United States had a clear military superiority.

Second. For a time, we relied upon military alliances. NATO and SEATO were not an effective answer. They are today rapidly disintegrating.

Third. The policy of massive retaliation is now only a memory.

Fourth. The United Nations is now recognized as no hindrance to Soviet-Communist subversions.

Fifth. Summit meetings and endless negotiations are an exercise in futility.

Sixth. Foreign aid, atoms for peace plans, international loans, disarmament negotiations, nuclear test bans have proven to be self-defeating.

As a people, we continue to be guilty of oversimplifications. We like to believe that there are easy, simple answers to our most complex international problems.

Let us remind you of some of these oversimplifications that have been peddled to our people.

First. The only missile we need is to distribute Sears, Roebuck catalogs around the world.

Second. The only trouble with the State Department is the failure of our diplomats to speak the language of the nation to which they are accredited to.

Third. Electrify all rural villages.

Fourth. Land reform.

Fifth. Get rid of all dictators—Cuba is an example.

These are samples of our simpleness and gullibility.

Ladies and gentlemen: It is my conviction that the steady decline of the U.S. power and prestige is backing us into the desperate alternatives of either:

Surrender or a preventive thermonuclear war.

Our present unrealistic foreign policies invite and encourage the horrors of either a nuclear war or a cleverly hidden continuation of retreat and eventual surrender.

But, my fellow Americans, there is a third alternative if we have the will to accept the realities of our situation.

The Nation and its people must first of all face up to the grim truth:

First. That the Soviet-Communist international conspiracy is dedicated to the destruction of all free nations and all free peoples.

Second. That the Soviet-led Communist conspiracy is waging a total war against the free world.

Third. That the United States is the No. 1 target of the Soviet-Communist campaign.

Fourth. That the Soviet-Communist forces are winning that world politicomilitary struggle and the United States and the free world are losing it.

Fifth. That we cannot win this struggle unless we recognize its existence, and arouse in our people a will to defend themselves, and to win this conflict.

Sixth. We cannot formulate effective policies to counter Communist-Soviet aggressions, guerrilla wars, and subversions until we identify our enemies, correctly appraise and locate the deployment of their forces.

Ladies and gentlemen; if we accept the need to give national and official recognition to the Soviet-Communist self-proclaimed and self-admitted campaign to destroy all free nations, there are two additional fundamental requirements that this Nation must accept and fulfill if we wish to survive.

The first requirement is that the United States restore a clear, preponderant military superiority over the Soviet-Communist forces.

We have permitted our military power to erode until the Soviet now has a relative parity of military firepower. This policy invites national and international suicide.

Our military superiority and firepower should be in a ratio of at least 1½ to 1 over the Soviet at all times.

We have the wealth, the economy to attain and to maintain this supremacy.

It is essential for our survival.

We must have sufficient military power to prevent a Khrushchev miscalculation of our will and ability to completely eradicate the Soviet Empire. Our first aim must be to avoid the inception of war and still attain our national and international objectives.

The second requirement is in the field of foreign policy.

We sorely need a complete reevaluation of our national goals, our foreign policies, our policymaking machinery.

There is a serious lack of orientation and coordination between our military capabilities and our foreign policies.

Our foreign policies, our economy, our military capabilities are interdependent and must support each other to attain our national objectives and aspirations.

The three successive fiascos of Cuba are a classic example of the complete lack of coordination between the President's Office, the National Security Council, the State Department, and the Central Intelligence Agency.

I refer, first, to our policies that aided Castro's overthrow of Batista when our officials were fully aware of the fact that he was a Soviet-Communist agent.

Second, I refer to the Bay of Pigs debacle—the most ill-conceived, misplanned, and mismanaged military fiasco in all history.

Third, I refer to the recent and present policies that encouraged and permitted the Soviet to convert Cuba into a military base that critically threatens our margin for survival.

Our present policy of halfhearted containment is ineffective and wholly inadequate to meet the Soviet-Communist challenge.

This Nation cannot continue in its present state of schizophrenia psychosis, its split personality and vacillations toward communism.

A military supremacy, combined with a firm, realistic foreign policy is the only hope for our survival.

It is the only hope for the liberation of Hungary and the captive nations.

The sacrifices of the Hungarian people upon the altar of freedom will not have been in vain, if we can remember that freedom is not free. It demands vigilance, courage, dedication, and sacrifice.

The moral principles upon which our freedom is founded are irreconcilable with totalitarianism. Freedom is not compromisable.

Communism is an absolute evil. It is not debatable.

The survival of this Nation, of the free world is not negotiable.

RHODE ISLAND CHARTER TERCENTENARY

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 300th anniversary of the Rhode Island Charter of 1663; I ask permission to revise and extend remarks in order that it may be printed in full in the Record.

Rhode Island was colonized by religious dissenters from Massachusetts, led by Roger Williams. For them he obtained a parliamentary charter in 1643 by which the colony was governed until the restoration of Charles II in 1660. As soon as the restoration had been officially proclaimed, John Clarke was sent to England as the deputy of the colonists in order to solicit a new charter. This was necessary since the charter of 1643 had been granted by parliamentary rather than by royal authority.

Clarke's petition to Charles II contained the following words which found their way into the charter, and are now inscribed on the south front of the Rhode Island Statehouse:

> Wherefore your petitioners have it much on their hearts (if they may be permitted) to hold forth a lively experiment, that a flourishing civill State may stand, yea, and best be maintained, and that among English spirits, with a full liberty in religious concernments.

The charter of 1663 was the first creation by British patent of a body politic. Previously, of course, corporations had been constituted within the realm for the government of colonial plantations; but now specific powers were granted for administering all the affairs of a colony within the colonial territory. And in its provision for representation of the freemen of the colony the charter was a major improvement on that granted to Massachusetts.

The colony was given its new name in the clause establishing it as a body politic:

> We create and make them a bodye politique or corporate, with the powers and privileges hereinafter mentioned. And accordingly * * * wee * * * doe ordeyne, constitute and declare, that they, the sayd (named persons and all subsequently admitted freemen) shall be * * * forever hereafter, a bodie corporate and politique, in fact and name, by the name of The Governor and Company of the English Collonie of Rhode-Island and Providence Plantation, in New-England, in America.

Then follow provisions relating to the Governor, Deputy Governor, and 10 assistants, for an annual general assembly with power to admit freemen, elect officers, and make laws:

> So as such laws, ordinances, and constitutions, so made, be not contrary and repugnant unto, but (as near as may be) agreeable to the laws of this our realm of England, considering the nature and constitution of the place and people there.

Provisions of the charter grant the power to establish courts, and to hold annual elections. The first officers are named. The power to bear arms is granted:

> And to use and exercise the law martiall in such cases only as occasion shall necessarily require.

There is to be no interference with fishery rights. There shall be freedom of migration from England. The inhabitants and their children are to have the rights of persons born in England. There shall be appeals to the Crown in controversies with other New England colonies, and there shall be freedom of movement among the colonies. This clause is of interest since it is the germ of the idea of what much later became the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States:

> Itt shall be lawful to and for the inhabitants of sayd Collony of Providence Plantation, without let or molestation, to passe and repasse with freedom, into and through the rest of the English Collonies, upon their lawful and civill occasions, and to converse, and hold commerce and trade, with such of the inhabitants of our other English Collonies as shall bee willing to admit them thereunto, they behaveing themselves peaceably among them; any act, clause or sentence, in any of the sayd Collonies provided, or that shall bee provided, to the contrary in anywise notwithstanding.

And most important of all:

> The government is to be held by the free and voluntary consent of all or the greater part of the free inhabitants.

By the charter of 1663 complete religious liberty was granted. This is the famous provision:

> Noe person within the sayd colonye, at any tyme hereafter, shall bee any wise molosted, punished, disquieted, or called in question, for any differences in opinione in matters of religion, and doe not actually disturb the civil peace of our sayd colony; but that all and everye person and persons may, from tyme to tyme, and at all tymes hereafter, freelye and fullye have and enjoye his and theire owne judgments and consciences, in matters of religious concernments * * * any lawe, statute, or, clause, therein contayned, or to bee contayned, usage, of custome of this realme, to the contrary hereof, in any wise, notwithstanding.

Founded by those to whom freedom of conscience was more precious than life itself, Rhode Island, throughout its history, has preserved its proud heritage. At this time of celebration of the tercentenary of a famous charter, Rhode Islanders will honor the distinguished past of their State in its days as a colony by preserving in the present and in the future its tradition of freedom.

Lucas, Samuel. Charters of the Old English Colonies in America. London, J. Parker, 1850. JK49.L8.

RHODE ISLAND, GRANTED BY KING CHARLES II, IN THE FOURTEENTH YEAR OF HIS REIGN.

Charles the Second, by the grace of God, &c. To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting. Whereas we have been informed by the humble petition of our trusty and well beloved subjects John Clarke, on the behalf of Benjamin Arnold, William Brenton, William Codington, Nicholas Easton, William Boulston, John Porter, John Smith, Samuel Gorton, John Weekes, Roger Williams, Thomas Olney, Gregory Dexter, John Cogeshall, Joseph Clarke, Randall Houlden, John Greene, John Roome, Samuel Wildbore, William Field, James Barker, Richard Tew, Thomas Harris, and William Dyre, and the rest of the purchasers, and free inhabitants of our island called Rhode Island, and the rest of the colony of Providence Plantations, in the Narraganset Bay, in New England in America, That they, pursuing with peace and loyal minds, their sober, serious, and religious intentions, of godly edifying themselves, and one another, in the holy Christian faith and worship as they were persuaded, together with the gaining over and conversion of the poor ignorant Indian natives, in those parts of America, to the sincere profession and obedience of the same faith and worship, did not only by the consent and good encouragement of our royal progenitors, transport themselves out of this kingdom of England into America; but also since their arrival there, after their first settlement amongst other our subjects in those parts, for the avoiding of discord, and those many evils which were likely to ensue upon those our subjects, not being able to bear in those remote parts their different apprehensions in religious concernments; and in pursuance of the aforesaid ends, did once again leave their desirable stations and habitations, and with excessive labour and travel, hazard, and charge, did transplant themselves into the midst of the Indian natives, who, as we are informed, are the most potent princes and people of all that country; whereby the good providence of God (from whom the plantations have taken their name) upon their labour and industry, they have not only been preserved to admiration, but have increased and prospered, and are seized and possessed, by purchase and consent of the said natives, to their full content, of such lands, islands, rivers, harbours, and roads, as are very convenient both for plantations, and also for building of ships, supply of pipe-staves, and other merchandize, and which lies very commodious in many respects for commerce, and to accommodate our southern plantations, and may much advance the trade of this our realm, and greatly enlarge the territories thereof; they having by near neighbourhood to, and friendly society with, the great body of the Narraganset Indians, given them encouragement, of their own accord, to subject themselves, their people and lands, unto us; whereby (as is hoped) there may, in time, by the blessing of God upon their endeavours, be laid a sure foundation of happiness to all America.

And whereas, in their humble address, they have freely declared, That it is much on their hearts (if they be permitted) to hold forth a lively experiment, that a most flourishing civil state may stand, and best be maintained, and that among our English subjects, with a full liberty in religious concernments, and that true piety, rightly grounded upon gospel principles, will give the best and greatest security to sovereignty, and will lay in the hearts of men the strongest obligations to true loyalty: now know ye, That we being willing to encourage the hopeful undertaking of our said loyal and loving subjects, and to secure them in the free exercise and enjoyment of all their civil and religious rights appertaining to them as our loving subjects; and to preserve unto them that liberty in the true Christian faith and worship of God, which they have sought with so much travel, and with peaceable minds and loyal subjection to our loyal progenitors, and ourselves, to enjoy: and because some of the people and inhabitants of the same colony cannot, in their private opinion, conform to the public exercise of religion, according to the liturgy, form, and ceremonies of the church of England, or take or subscribe the oaths and articles made and established in that behalf; and for that the same, by reason of the remote distances of those places, will, as we hope, be no breach of the unity and uniformity established in this nation, have therefore thought fit, and do hereby publish, grant, ordain, and declare, that our royal will and pleasure is—

That no person within the said colony, at any time hereafter, shall be any-wise molested, punished, disquited, or called in question, for any differences in opinion in matters of religion, and do not actually disturb the civil peace of our said colony; but that all and every person and persons may, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, freely and fully have and enjoy his and their own judgments and consciences, in matters of religious concernments, throughout the tract of land hereafter mentioned, they behaving themselves peaceably and quietly, and not using this liberty to licentiousness and profaneness, nor to the civil injury or outward disturbance of others, any law, statute, or clause therein contained, or to be contained, usage or custom of this realm, to the contrary hereof, in any wise notwithstanding. And that they may be in the better capacity to defend themselves in their just rights and liberties against all the enemies of the Christian faith, and others, in all respects, we have further thought fit, and at the humble petition of the persons aforesaid, are graciously pleased to declare, That they shall have and enjoy the benefit of our late act of indemnity, and free pardon, as the rest of our subjects in other our dominions and territories have; and to create and make them a body politic or corporate, with the powers or privileges hereinafter mentioned: and accordingly, our will and pleasure is, and of our especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, we have ordained, constituted, and declared, and by these presents, for us, our heirs, and successors, do ordain, constitute, and declare.

That they the said William Brenton, William Coddington, Nicholas Easton, Benedict Arnold, William Boulston, John Porter, Samuel Gorton, John Smith, John Weekes, Roger Williams, Thomas Olney, Gregory Dexter, John Cogeshall, Joseph Clarke, Randall Houlden, John Greene, John Roome, William Dyre, Samuel Wildbore, Richard Tew, William Field, Thomas Harris, James Barker, Rainsborrow, Williams, and John Nickson, and all such others as are now, or hereafter shall be admitted, free of the company and society of our colony of Providence Plantations, in the Narraganset Bay, in New England, shall be, from time to time, and for ever hereafter, a body corporate and politic, in fact and name, by the name of the Governor and Company of the English Colony of Rhode Island, and Providence Plantations, in New England, in America; and that by the same name they and their successors shall and may have perpetual succession, and shall and may be persons able and capable in the law to sue and be sued, to plead and be impleaded, to answer and to be answered unto, to defend and to be defended, in all and singular suits, causes, quarrels, matters, actions, and things, of what kind or nature soever; and also to have, take, possess, acquire, and purchase lands, tenements, or hereditaments, or any goods or chattels, and the same to lease, grant, demise, alien, bargain, sell and dispose of, at their own will and pleasure, as other our liege people of this our realm of England, or any corporation or body politic within the same, may lawfully do; and further.

That they the said Governor and Company, and their successors, shall and may, for ever hereafter, have a common seal, to serve and use for all matters, causes, things, and affairs whatsoever, of them and their successors, and the same seal to alter, change, break, an make new from time to time, at their will and pleasure, as they shall think fit. And further, we will and ordain, and by these presents, for us, our heirs, and successors, do declare and appoint, That for the better ordering and managing of the affairs and business of the said company and their successors, there shall be one governor, one deputy governor, and ten assistants, to be from time to time constituted, elected, and chosen, out of the freemen of the said company, for the time being, in such manner and from as is hereafter in these presents expressed; which said officers shall apply themselves to take care for the best disposing and ordering of the general business and affairs of and concerning the lands and hereditaments herein aftermentioned to be granted, and the plantation thereof, and the government of the people there. And for the better execution of our royal pleasure herein, we do for us, our heirs, and successors, assign, name, constitute, and appoint, the aforesaid Benedict Arnold to be the first and present governor of the said company, and the said William Brenton to be the deputy governor, and the said William Boulston, John Porter, Roger Williams, Thomas Olney, John Smith, John Greene, John Cogeshall, James Barker, William Field, and Joseph Clarke, to be the ten present assistants of the said company, to continue in the said several offices respectively, until the first Wednesday which shall be in the month of May now next coming.

And further, we will, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do ordain and grant, That the governor of the said company, for the time being, or in his absence, by occasion of sickness, or otherwise, by his leave or permission, the deputy governor, for the time being, shall and may, from time to time, upon all occasions, give order for the assembling of the said company, and calling them together, to consult and advise of the business and affairs of the said company; and that for ever hereafter, twice in every year, that is to say, on every first Wednesday in the month of May, and on every last Wednesday in October, or oftener, in case it shall be requisite, the assistants, and such of the freemen of the said company, not exceeding six persons, for Newport, four persons for each of the respective towns of Providence, Portsmouth, and Warwick, and two persons for each other place, town or city, who shall be from time to time thereunto elected or deputed by the major part of the freemen of the respective places, towns or places for which they shall be so elected or deputed, shall have a general meeting or assembly, then and there to consult, advise and determine, in and about the affairs and business of the said company and plantations. And further, we do of our especial grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, give and grant unto the said governor and company of the English colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, in New England, in America, and their successors.

That the governor, or in his absence, or by his permission, the deputy governor of the said company, for the time being, the assistants, and such of the freemen of the said company as shall be so aforesaid elected or deputed, or so many of them as shall be present at such meeting or assembly, as aforesaid, shall be called the general assembly; and that they, or the greatest part of them then present, whereof the governor, or deputy governor, and six of the assistants at least, to be seven, shall have, and have hereby given and granted unto them, full power and authority, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, to appoint, alter, and change such days, times and places of meeting, and general assembly, as they shall think fit, and to chuse, nominate and appoint such and so many persons as they shall think fit, and shall be willing to accept the same, to be free of the said company and body politic and them into the same to admit, and to elect, and constitute such offices and officers, and to grant such needful commissions as they shall think fit and requisite, for ordering, managing, and dispatching of the affairs of the said governor and company, and their successors; and, from time to time, to make, ordain, constitute or repeal, such laws, statutes, orders and ordinances, forms and ceremonies of government and magistracy, as to them shall seem meet, for the good and welfare of the said company, and for the government and ordering of the lands and hereditaments herein after mentioned to be granted, and of the people that do, or at any time hereafter shall inhabit, or be within the same; so as such laws, ordinances, and constitutions, so made, be not contrary and repugnant unto, but, as near as may agreeable to the laws of this our realm of England considering the nature and constitution of the place and people there; and also to appoint, order and direct, erect and settle such places and courts of jurisdiction, for hearing and determining of all actions, cases, matters and things, happening within the said colony and plantation, and which shall be in dispute, and depending there, as they shall think fit; and also to distinguish and set forth the several names and titles, duties, powers, and limits, of each court, office and officer, superior and inferior; and also, to contrive and appoint such forms of oaths and attestations, not repugnant, but as near as may be agreeable as aforesaid to the laws and statutes of this our realm, as are convenient and requisite, with respect to the due administration of justice, and due execution and discharge of all offices and places of trust, by the persons that shall be therein concerned; and also to regulate and order the way and manner of all elections to offices and places of trust, and to prescribe, limit and distinguish the number and bounds of all places, towns and cities, with the limits and bounds herein after mentioned, and not herein particularly named, who have or shall have the power of electing and sending of freemen to the said general assembly; and also to order, direct and authorise, the imposing of lawful and reasonable fines; mulcts, imprisonments, and executing other punishments, pecuniary and corporal, upon offenders and delinquents, according to the course of other corporations, within this our kingdom of England; and again, to alter, revoke, annul or pardon, under their common seal, or otherwise, such fines, mulcts, imprisonments, sentences, judgments and condemnations, as shall be thought fit; and to direct, rule, order and dispose of all other matters and things, and particularly that which relates to the making of purchases of the native Indians, as to them shall seem meet.

Whereby our said people and inhabitants in the said plantations, may be so religiously, peaceably and civilly governed, as that by their good life, and orderly conversation, they may win and invite the native Indians of the country to the knowledge and obedience of the only true God and Saviour of mankind; willing, commanding and requiring, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, ordaining and appointing, that all such laws, statutes, orders and ordinances, instructions, impositions and directions, as shall be so made by the governor, deputy, assistants and freemen, or such number of them as aforesaid, and published in writing under their common seal, shall be carefully and duly observed, kept, performed and put in execution, according to the true intent and meaning of the same. And these our letters patents, or the duplicate or exemplification thereof, shall be to all and every such officers, superior or inferior, from time to time, for the putting of the same orders, laws, statutes, ordinances, instructions and directions, in due execution against us, our heirs and successors, a sufficient warrant and discharge. And further, our will and pleasure is, and we do hereby for us, our heirs and successors, establish and ordain, That yearly, once in the year for ever hereafter, namely, the aforesaid Wednesday in May, and at the town of Newport, or elsewhere if urgent occasion do require, the governor, deputy-governor, and assistants of the said company, and other officers of the said company, or such of them as the general assembly shall think fit, shall be in the said general court or assembly, to be held from that day or time, newly chosen for the year ensuing, by greater part of the said company for the time being, as shall be then and there present. And if it shall happen that the present governor, deputy-governor, and assistants, by these presents appointed, or any such as shall hereafter be newly chosen into their rooms, or any of them, or any other the officers of the said company, shall die, or be removed from his or their several offices or places, before the said general day of election (whom we do hereby declare for any misdemeanor or default, to be removeable by the governor, assistants and company, or such greater part of them, in any of the said public courts to be assembled, as aforesaid), that then, and in every such case, it shall and may be lawful to and for the said governor, deputy-governor, assistants and company aforesaid, or such greater part of them so to be assembled, as is aforesaid, in any of their assemblies, to proceed to a new election of one or more of their company, in the room or place, rooms or places, of such officer or officers so dying or removed, according to their directions.

And immediately upon and after such election or elections made of such governor, deputy-governor, assistant or assistants, or any other officer of the said company, in manner and form aforesaid, the authority, office and power, before given to the former governor, deputy-governor, and other officer and officers so removed, in whose stead and place new shall be chosen, shall, as to him and them, and every of them respectively, cease and determine: provided always, and our will and pleasure is, That as well such as are by these presents appointed to be the present governor, deputy-governor, and assistants of the said company, as those which shall succeed them, and all other officers to be appointed and chosen as aforesaid, shall, before the undertaking the execution of the said offices and places respectively, give their solemn engagement by oath or otherwise, for the due and faithful performance of their duties in their several offices and places, before such person or persons as are by these presents hereafter appointed to take and receive the same; (that is to say) the said Benedict Arnold, who is herein before nominated and appointed the present governor of the said company, shall give the aforesaid engagement before William Brenton, of any two of the said assistants of the said company, unto whom we do, by these presents, give full power and authority to require and receive the same; and the said William Brenton, who is hereby before nominated and appointed the present deputy governor of the said company, shall give the aforesaid engagement before the said Benedict Arnold, or any two of the assistants of the said company, unto whom we do, by these presents, give full power and authority to require and receive the same; and the said William Boulston, John Porter, Roger Williams, Thomas Olney, John Smith, John Greene, John Coggeshall, James Barker, William Field, and Joseph Clarke, who are herein before nominated and appointed the present assistants of the company, shall give the said engagement to their offices and places respectively belonging, before the said Benedict Arnold and William Brenton, or one of them, to whom respectively we do hereby give full power and authority to require, administer or receive the same.

And further, our will and pleasure is, that all and every other future governor, or deputy governor, to be elected and chosen by virtue of these presents, shall give the said engagement before two or more of the said assistants of the said company for the time being, unto whom we do, by these presents, give full power and authority to require, administer or receive the same; and the said assistants, and every of them, and all and every other officer or officers, to be hereafter elected and chosen by virtue of these presents, from time to time, shall give the like engagements to their offices and places respectively belonging, before the governor, or deputy governor, for the time being; unto which said governor, or deputy governor, we do by these presents give full power and authority to require, administer, or receive the same accordingly. And we do likewise, for us, our heirs and successors, give and grant unto the said governor and company, and their successors, by these presents, that for the more peaceable and orderly government of the said plantations, it shall and may be lawful for the governor, deputy governor, assistants, and all other officers and ministers, of the said company, in the administration of justice, and exercise of government, in the said plantations, to use, exercise, and put in execution, such methods, rules, orders, and directions, not being contrary and repugnant to the laws and statutes of this our realm, as has been heretofore given, used, and accustomed in such cases respectively, to be put in practice, until, at the next or some other general assembly, especial provision shall be made and ordained in the cases aforesaid. And we do further, for us, our heirs and successors, give and grant unto the said governor and company, and their successors, by these presents, that it shall and may be lawful to and for the said governor, or in his absence the deputy governor, and major part of the said assistants for the time being, at any time, when the said general assembly is not sitting, to nominate, appoint and constitute such and so many commanders, governors, and military officers, as to them shall seem requisite, for the leading, conducting, and training up the inhabitants of the said plantations in martial affairs, and for the defence and safeguard of the said plantations; and that it shall and may be lawful to and for all and every such commander, governor, and military officer, that shall be so as aforesaid, or by the governor, or in his absence the deputy-governor and six of the assistants, and major part of the freemen of the said company, present at any general assemblies, nominated, appointed and constituted, according to the tenor of his and their respective commissions and directions, to assemble, exercise in arms, marshal, array, and put in warlike posture, the inhabitants of the said colony, for their especial defence and safety; and to lead and conduct the said inhabitants, and to encounter, repulse, and resist by force of arms, as well by sea as by land, and also to kill, slay, and destroy, by all fitting ways, enterprizes, and means whatsoever, all and every such person or persons, as shall at any time hereafter attempt or enterprize the destruction, invasion, detriment, or annoyance of the said inhabitants or plantations; and to use and exercise the law martial, in such cases only as occasion shall necessarily require; and to take and surprize, by all ways and means whatsoever, all and every such person and persons, with their ship or ships, armour, ammunition, or other goods of such persons as shall in hostile manner invade or attempt the defeating of the said plantation, or the hurt of the said company and inhabitants; and upon just causes to invade and destroy the natives, Indians, or other enemies of the said colony.

Nevertheless, our will and pleasure is, and we do hereby declare, to the rest of our colonies in New-England, that it shall not be lawful for this our said colony of Rhode-Island and Providence plantations in America, in New-England, to invade the natives inhabiting within the bounds and limits of their said colonies, without the knowledge and consent of the said other colonies. And it is hereby declared that it shall not be lawful to or for the rest of the colonies to invade or molest the native Indians, or any other inhabitants in having within the bounds or limits hereafter mentioned, (they having subjected themselves unto us, and being by us taken into our special protection,) without the knowledge and consent of the governor and company of our colony of Rhode-Island and Providence plantation. Also our will and pleasure is, and we do hereby declare unto all Christian Kings, Princes and States, that if any person, which shall hereafter be of the said company or plantation, or any other by appointment of the said governor and company, for the time being, shall at any time or times hereafter rob or spoil, by sea or land, or do any hurt, or unlawful hostility, to any of the subjects of us, our heirs and successors, or any of the subjects of any Prince or State, being then in league with us, our heirs and successors; upon complaint of such injury done to any such Prince or State, or their subjects, we, our heirs and successors, will make open proclamation, within any parts of our realm of England, fit for that purpose, that the person or persons committing any such robbery or spoil, shall, within the time limited by such proclamation, make full restitution or satisfaction of all such injuries done or committed, so as the said Prince, or others so complaining, may be fully satisfied and contented; and if the said person or persons, who shall commit any such robbery or spoil, shall not make satisfaction accordingly within such time so to be limited, that then we, our heirs and successors, will put such person or persons out of our allegiance and protection; and that then it shall and may be lawful and free for all Princes or others, to prosecute with hostility such offenders, and every of them, their and every of their procurers, aiders, abbetors and counsellors, in that behalf.

Provided also, and our express will and pleasure is, and we do by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, ordain and appoint, that these presents shall not in any manner hinder any of our loving subjects whatsoever, from using and exercising the trade of fishing upon the coast of New-England in America, but that they, and every or any of them, shall have full and free power and liberty to continue and use the trade of fishing upon the said coast, in any of the seas thereunto adjoining, or any arms of the sea, or salt-water, rivers and creeks, where they have been accustomed to fish, and to build and set upon the waste land belonging to the said colony and plantations, such wharfs, stages, and work-houses as shall be necessary for the salting, drying and keeping of their fish, to be taken or gotten upon that coast. And further, for the encouragement of the inhabitants of our said colony of Providence plantation, to set upon the business of taking whales, it shall be lawful for them, or any of them, having struck a whale, dubertus, or other great fish, it or them to pursue unto that coast, and into any bay, river, cove, creek or shore, belonging thereto, and it or them, upon the said coast, or in the said bay, river, cove, creek or shore, belonging thereto, to kill and order for the best advantage without molestation, they making no wilful waste, or spoil; any thing in these presents contained. or any other matter or thing to the contrary notwithstanding. And further also, we are graciously pleased, and do hereby declare, that if any of the inhabitants of our said colony do set upon the planting of vineyards, (the soil and climate both seeming naturally to concur to the production of wines,) or be industrious in the discovery of fishing-banks, in or about the said colony, we will. from time to time, give and allow all due and fitting encouragement therein, as to others in cases of like nature.

And further of our more ample grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, we have given and granted, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give and grant, unto the said governor and company of the English colony of Rhode-Island and Providence plantation in the Narragansett bay in New-England, in America, and to every inhabitant there, and to every person and persons trading thither, and to every such person or persons as are or shall be free of the said colony, full power and authority, from time to time, and at all times hereafter, to take, ship, transport, and carry away, out of any of our realms and dominions, for and towards the plantation and defence of the said colony, such and so many of our loving subjects and strangers, as shall or will willingly accompany them in and to their said colony and plantation, except such person or persons as are or shall be therein restrained by us, our heirs and successors, or any law or statute of this realm; and also to ship and transport all and all manner of goods, chattels, merchandize, and other things whatsoever, that are or shall be useful or necessary for the said plantations, and defence thereof, by any law or statute of this our realm; yielding and paying unto us, our heirs and successors, such the duties, customs, and subsidies, as are or ought to be paid or payable for the same. And further, our will and pleasure is, and we do, for us, our heirs and successors, ordain, declare and grant, unto the said governor and company, and their successors, that all and every the subjects of us, our heirs and successors, which are already planted and settled within our said colony of Providence plantations, or which shall hereafter go to inhabit within the said colony, and all and every of their children which have been born there, or which shall happen hereafter to be born there, or on the sea going thither or returning from thence, shall have and enjoy all liberties and immunities of free and natural subjects, within any the dominions of us, our heirs or successors, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever, as if they and every of them were born within the realm of England.

And further know ye, that we, of our more abundant grace, certain knowledge, and mere motion, have given, granted and confirmed, and by these presents, for us, our heirs and successors, do give, grant and confirm, unto the said governor and company, and their successors, all that part of our dominions, in New-England in America, containing the Nahantick and Nanhlygansett alias Narragansett bay and countries and parts adjacent, bounded on the west, or westerly, to the middle or channel of a river there, commonly called and known by the name of Pawcatuck alias Pawcawtuck river, and so along the said river, as the greater or middle stream thereof reacheth or lies up into the north country, northward unto the head thereof, and from thence by a strait line drawn due north, until it meet with the south line of the Massachusets colony, and on the north or northerly by the aforesaid south or southerly line in the Massachusets colony or plantation, and extending towards the east or eastwardly three English miles, to the east and north-east of the most eastern and north-eastern parts of the aforesaid Narragansett bay, as the said bay lieth or extendeth itself from the ocean on the south or southwardly, unto the mouth of the river which runneth towards the town of Providence, and from thence along the eastwardly side or bank of the said river (higher called by the name of Seacunck river) up to the falls called Patucket falls, being the most westwardly line of Plymouth colony; and so from the said falls, in a strait line due north, until it meet with the aforesaid line of the Massachusetts colony, and bounded on the south by the ocean, and in particular the lands belonging to the town of Providence, Patuxit, Warwicke, Misquammacock alias Pawcatuck, and the rest upon the main land, in the tract aforesaid, together with Rhode-Island, Blocke-Island, and all the rest of the islands and banks in the Narragansett bay, and bordering upon the coast of the tract aforesaid, (Fisher's-Island only excepted) together with all firm lands, soils, grounds, havens, ports, rivers, waters, fishings, mines royal, and all other mines, minerals, precious stones, quarries, woods, wood-grounds, rocks, slates, and all and singular other commodities, jurisdictions, royalties, privileges, franchises, preeminences and hereditaments whatsoever, within the said tract, bounds, lands and islands aforesaid, to them or any of them belonging, or in any-wise appertaining.) To have and to hold the same, unto the said governor and company, and their successors for ever, upon trust, for the use and benefit of themselves, and their asociates, freemen of the said colony, their heirs and assigns.

To be holden of us, our heirs and successors as of the manor of East-Greenwich, in our county of Kent, in free and common soccage, and not in capite, nor by Knight's service. Yielding and paying therefore to us, our heirs and successors, only the fifth part of all the ore of gold and silver, which from time to time, and at all times hereafter, shall be there gotten, had or obtained, in lieu and satisfaction of all services, duties, fines, forfeitures made or to be made, claims and demands whatsoever, to be to us, our heirs or successors, therefore or thereout rendered, made or paid; any grant or clause, in a late grant to the governor and company of Connecticut colony in America, to the contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding; the aforesaid Pawcatuck river having been yielded after much debate, for the fixed and certain bounds between these our said colonies, by the agents thereof, who have also agreed, that the said Pawcatuck river shall be also called alias Narrogancett or Narrogansett river, and to prevent future disputes that otherwise might arise thereby, for ever hereafter, shall be construed, deemed and taken to be the Narrogancett river, in our late grant to Connecticut colony, mentioned as the easterly bounds of that colony. And further, our will and pleasure is, that in all matters of public controversies, which may fall out between our colony of Providence plantation, to make their appeal therein to us, our heirs and successors, for redress in such cases, within this our realm of England; and that it shall be lawful to and for the inhabitants of the said colony of Providence plantation, without lett or molestation, to pass and repass with freedom into and through the rest of the English colonies, upon their lawful and civil occasions, and to converse, and hold commerce, and trade with such of the inhabitants of our other English colonies as shall be willing to admit them thereunto, they behaving themselves peaceably among them; any act, clause or sentence, in any of the said colonies provided, or that shall be provided, to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding. And lastly, we do for us, our heirs and successors, ordain and grant unto the said governor and company, and their successors, by these presents, that these our letters patents shall be firm, good effectual and available, in all things in the law, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever, according to our true intent and meaning herein before declared; and shall be construed, reputed and adjudged, in all cases, most favourably on the behalf, and for the best benefit and behoof of the said governor and company, and their successors, although express mention &c. In witness, &c, witness, &c.

Per Ipsum Regem.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II there have been some 47 new nations created out of the once vast colonial empires of England and France, and the smaller oversea possessions of Holland and the United States, 47 new nations whose people are learning to live and develop alongside their own institutions, under their own leaders, under their own independent governments.

Today I want us to remember a nation that was not so fortunate, a nation whose short-lived independence was one of the first submerged into the monolithic wave of what has become the world's leading colonialist power, Soviet Russia. March 25 is the 45th anniversary of the founding of the Byelorussian Republic, a Republic that lived for 3 short years between 1918 and 1921, after 300 years under the subjection of czarist Russia. The people of Byelorussia are known as White Russians—a name synonymous with heroic resistance against oppression. Their leaders declared their people's independence during the height of Russo-German fighting toward the end of the First World War, when the czarist empire was falling into pieces and when at last it appeared the Russian autocracy was to be destroyed. During Byelorussia's brief independence there was a constant struggle to survive; it was absorbed back into Russia as soon as the new Red autocracy could consolidate power and destroy any self-sought freedoms on the part of former czarist subjects. Today 10 million Byelorussians may find their only vestige of freedom to be membership in the United Nations, but this is a fictional independence, supported and totally controlled by the Kremlin.

On this anniversary we must not, in the onrush of events, forget the peoples past and present, who have fought and are fighting for freedoms that we consider part of our daily lives. We must, in remembering their struggles, renew our determination to see their eventual liberation.

BIRTHDAY OF THE FREE STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, is the birthday of the Free State of Maryland. Although a relatively old State, Maryland was described in a recent report by the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, as a State "whose economy has been showing the boundless energy of a teenager."

Three hundred and twenty-nine years ago today, a group of colonists under the leadership of Leonard Calvert, brother of Lord Baltimore, landed on St. Clement's Island, and the colony of Maryland was founded. The first Lord Baltimore had arranged for a charter for the colony which Charles I insisted should be called Terra Mariae or Maryland in honor of his Queen Henrietta Maria. Lord Baltimore died before the charter was issued, and King Charles granted it to his son Cecil on June 20, 1632.

It took some time to assemble the colonists and supplies for the trip to the New World and it was not until November 22, 1633, that the expedition sailed for America. The two vessels chartered by the colonists—the *Dove*, weighing 50 tons, and the *Ark*, 350 tons—carried Leonard Calvert and about 200 others of various trades, professions, and religious beliefs. On March 25, they landed on St. Clement's Island in the Potomac River and held a religious service. A few days later, they sailed up the St. Marys River and founded the town of St. Marys, which became the capital of the colony. The colony was founded in the spirit of tolerance and religious freedom.

There are many other outstanding events in Maryland's history. In 1783 Annapolis, Md., became the temporary capital of this Nation and in 1791 Maryland ceded to the United States land for the District of Columbia and location of the Nation's Capital. Our National anthem was written at Fort McHenry in September 1814. The first railroad in America and the first telegraph line in America were established in Maryland. Of all these events, however, the initial element in the founding of the colony of Maryland—tolerance—is the most important and much needed in today's world.

On the 300th anniversary of the founding of Maryland, a great American, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, spoke over the radio in honor of the anniversary and highlighted the significance of the founding of Maryland. He said:

> Lord Baltimore and his colonists sought in their charter liberty not alone for the members of the expedition, but for all later comers as well. It is a good thing to demand liberty for ourselves and for those who agree with us, but it is a better thing and rarer thing to give liberty to others who do not agree with us. We would do less than our duty to Lord Baltimore if on such an anniversary we paid no tribute to this, his greatest contribution to America, a free America.

TRIBUTE TO A SOLDIER-PRIEST

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, frequently the heroic deeds of men are not revealed in full until many years after they have occurred. Such is the case of a distinguished and heroic service rendered by the Very Reverend Dr. Vladimir Klodnycky, pastor emeritus of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Holy Ascension of Newark, N.J. Father Klodnycky formerly served a pastorate in my home city of Bayonne, N.J.

The New Jersey region of the Anti-Defamation League has honored Dr. Klodnycky for his humanitarian efforts to save the Jewish community of Chmelnyk in the Ukraine during the years 1919–20.

What follows is an excerpt from an article, "Soldier of Peace," which appeared in the ADL bulletin published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

The article was written by Dr. Joseph H. Lichten, director of ADL's department of intercultural affairs:

SOLDIER OF PEACE

> More than 40 years ago, a time when eastern Europe was plagued by anti-Semitic pogroms, a rabbi in the small Ukrainian town of Chmelnyk wrote an unusual letter and gave it to an army officer. The letter, addressed to the rabbis of all Jewish communities, identified its bearer, Maj. Vladimir Stepanovich Klodnycky, as a man who had "distinguished himself for his great spirit, love of truth, and love for the Jewish people." It also appealed to the rabbis to recognize and aid the major in all things he sought to do.
>
> This month in New Jersey, a different type of Jewish community honored the Chmelnyk rabbi's appeal. Through the Anti-Defamation League's New Jersey regional advisory board, tribute was paid to the former major who is now Reverend Klodnycky, a 70-year-old Orthodox priest who was ordained 30 years ago in the United States and, for the past 23 years, has been pastor of the Holy Ascension Church in Newark.
>
> The League citation to Reverend Klodnycky begins: "In recognition of his humanitarian efforts to save the Jewish community of Chmelnyk in the Ukraine during the years 1919–20 * * *." The story of the major turned priest is one of the brightest memories of a dark and troubled era.
>
> In August 1919, Major Klodnycky's unit of the Ukrainian Galician Army was sent to Chmelnyk in the center of an industrial area. There were two problems in Chmelnyk—plunderers and pillagers had a special interest in the rich territory and unrest had spread throughout the whole region. In addition, the relationship between the Jewish population of 15,000 and the peasantry was an uneasy one. When Major Klodnycky's unit entered the town, antagonism between Christian and Jew had reached the point of crisis—a crisis set off, oddly enough, by love.
>
> The only daughter of a Jewish merchant living in a small village outside of Chmelnyk had eloped with a Christian peasant and converted to Christianity. The Jewish parents, unhappy about the marriage and conversion, severed relations with their daughter. Or, at least, the girl's father did. Her mother secretly met the girl and her husband and invited them to the parents' home—when the father was away. One night the young couple left the house with gifts—two cows, featherbeds, money, and jewelry. When the girl's father returned and found out what had happened, he vowed to destroy his son-in-law's house. The father set fire to the straw-thatched house; the wind carried sparks to other houses, and soon the entire village was burned to the ground. The disaster took place on the eve of Major Klodnycky's arrival.
>
> The Jews feared a pogrom. They knew the inhabitants of the burned village and neighboring villages were waiting for an excuse for vengeance. "The Jews burned down the village of Chmelnyk" would be the cry. Despite their fears, the Jews appeared in town for their market day. On that day, too, an unusually large number of farmers and peasants appeared on the streets of the town, carrying rifles, revolvers, and, as was later discovered, machineguns concealed in their wagons. At the inn, near the center of town, was a small army unit and patrol.
>
> Major Klodnycky ordered his soldiers to ride, fully armed, through the streets. After the villagers had a chance to see the strength of the troops, they were assembled in the main square in front of the city hall. The major addressed them.
>
> "Dear brothers," he said, "certainly every one of you built his own house. When you began laying the foundation, you crossed yourself three times, recited the 'Our Father,' sprinkled your work with holy water, and in a whisper to heaven asked our Lord to help you build.
>
> "My men and I have been summoned by the Ukraine Government to help you build your homes, and your state. We are building a nation, my brothers. How can you think of sprinkling the foundation of our nation with blood? There must be law and order in our nation. To take the law into your own hands to settle real or imagined grievances is sinful."
>
> The peasants put away their weapons and began to return home. In a half hour, the streets of Chmelnyk were empty. Major Klodnycky had stopped a pogrom before it was started.

PRESIDENT'S PHYSICAL FITNESS PROGRAM

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot recently about our President's physical fitness program. The Nation has been swept by an enthusiastic hiking movement.

I am glad, Mr. Speaker, to be the purveyor of additional good news on physical fitness from the Fourth District in Florida. It concerns the sponsors and members of the Homestead, Fla., Bicycle Club. This small group of interested people, who are enthusiastic about the joys and therapeutic effects of the sport of bicycling, had an idea and stanchly went to work to put it into operation.

And so these dozen people of Homestead, Fla., without a budget and at very low cost, propelled the bicycle and the urgent need for a bicycle safety campaign into national prominence.

In order to accomplish their goals—demonstration of the healthful effects of bicycling, and the promulgation of safety measures—this little band of amateurs approached Dr. Paul Dudley White, the eminent heart specialist who attained fame as President Eisenhower's physician. He is a cycling enthusiast. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, he is a very astute man in other areas than his own specialty. He is a frequent vacationer in Homestead and has made public his appreciation of Homestead as, in his words, "a homely and peaceful community without commercialized tourist exploitation." Dr. White is one of the Nation's leading exponents of biking for physical fitness. He prescribes proper diet, sensible living, and such regular exercise as walking and bicycle riding as preventives of heart attacks.

Next, the Homestead bicycle enthusiasts begged, borrowed, and earned sufficient money to erect bicycle signs through the city of Homestead, marking bicycle routes to schools, parks, and the downtown section.

High point of the bicycle safety campaign was the dedication ceremony at which Homestead Mayor Richard Conley, Dr. and Mrs. White arrived, all pedaling bikes. Addressing a group of more than 200, predominantly adults in their middle or past middle years, Dr. White commented:

> Homestead is setting an example for the whole Nation. It's providing the spirit and impetus that can make other cities sit up and take notice—and then follow the lead of this town's bicycle club and the interested and dedicated people who have worked to get these safe-for-cycling routes and to further cycling for exercise and enjoyment.

So successful were the efforts of this little band of Florida amateurs that they have engaged national attention through nationwide press stories, radio and TV coverage, including mention on network TV shows, and stories in Time and Life magazines.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to acquaint my colleagues with the full report and editorial comment on this event in the News Leader, Homestead, Fla., on February 26, 1963:

UNITED STATES NOTES HOMESTEAD BIKING—PEDALCADE HIGHLIGHTS BIKE ROUTE OPENING

> Homestead, bicycles and hearts made national news Sunday with the visit of Dr. Paul Dudley White to South Dade to take part in the dedication of Homestead's bike routes—a first in the Nation.
>
> It was Dr. and Mrs. Paul Dudley White Day, proclaimed by Mayor Richard Conley to coincide with the dedication and with National Heart Sunday, in which the noted cardiac specialist is especially interested.
>
> Kicking off the day's events was the cutting of blue and white ribbons stretched across North West Fourth Street at Krome Avenue—one of the bicycle routes mapped out by traffic experts and marked with new blue and white signs.
>
> Some 500 people turned out to see the ceremony and hear Dr. White. Almost half of them joined in a bicycle tour of the town, led by the famous doctor after the ribbon cutting.
>
> Homestead is the first city in the Nation to be officially proclaimed "The City of Bicycles"—a fact that drew Time and Life magazine photographer-reporters, newsreel cameramen from all three Miami television stations, representatives from a number of newspapers in the area, and cycle-minded visitors from as far away as Missouri.
>
> After more than an hour of pedaling around Homestead and the immediate area, cyclists wound up at the city's ball park and picnic grounds for a chicken barbecue, where caterers served more than 200.
>
> Another group of more than 200, predominantly adults in their middle or past-middle years, turned out Sunday evening at the Homestead Armory to hear the famous cardiac physician tell how to prevent heart attacks through proper diet, sensible living, and such regular exercise as walking and bicycle riding.
>
> The famed heart specialist arrived at dedication ceremonies pedaling beside his wife and Homestead Mayor Conley, and stopped to pose for pictures before mounting the speaker's platform.
>
> "Homestead is setting an example for the whole Nation," Dr. White said. "It's providing the spirit and impetus that can make other cities sit up and take notice—and then follow the lead of this town's bicycle club and the interested and dedicated people

who have worked to get these safe-for-bicycling routes and to further cycling for exercise and enjoyment."

The doctor, one of the Nation's leading exponents of biking for physical fitness, first visited Homestead last year, when the city of bicycles movement was only beginning.

Since then, he has talked of the town and its project to groups all over the country, and has given Homestead untold publicity by his remarks.

"Doctor," said Mayor Conley, "you and your wife are officially citizens of Homestead and we salute you." With a grin, he added, "And no taxes."

The Paul Dudley White Bicycle Club of Homestead, at whose invitation Dr. White officiated at the bike route dedication, presented Mrs. White with a charm bracelet from which dangled three miniature bicycles. Dr. White's "charm," presented by Milton Fischer, was one of the 300 safety route signs, to which a bronze plaque had been attached in tribute to his interest in the bicycle city idea.

Also lauded during the ceremonies was Irvin Barnett, who has been one of the bicycle club's most ardent supporters, both with work and in financing the signs which were dedicated Sunday.

Barnett accepted a framed certificate of appreciation, which he immediately presented to Conley, who was serving as president of the Chamber of Commerce when the bike movement got chamber endorsement and backing.

Congratulations from Gov. Farris Bryant were conveyed by J. Robert Terry of the Florida Development Commission, and a lengthy telegram of approbation from Senator George Smathers was read.

During the bike parade which followed, some 250 cyclists streamed along behind Dr. White, who was preceded by a truck bearing newsreel cameramen, photographers, and reporters.

At first, cyclists filled the streets from curb to curb, but the agile doctor, an advocate of safe cycling, hopped aboard the news truck to direct riders to go two abreast or single file. * * *

Local Bike Club Goes to Town on National Scale

The boosters of Homestead's Bicycle Club deserves the praise and imitation of all organizations in South Dade.

They have taken the bicycle and a campaign of bicycle safety and lifted it to a high position as a "vehicle of national publicity.'"

Nationwide press services have carried the story of Homestead to the newspapers and radio stations.

Time and Life magazines covered the event.

Three TV stations photoed the affair.

And it was mentioned on network TV shows yesterday morning.

Such a job, as these dozen people of a bicycle club, at a very small cost and with no budgeted money, have done is a better job than the heavily financed Dade-Miami Publicity Bureau would have done, or could have done.

In order to accomplish their purposes, this little band of amateurs, enlisted the help of Dr. Paul Dudley White, a heart specialist, who attained fame as President Eisenhower's physician. He is a cycling enthusiast, and vacations in Homestead frequently, finding it a "homely and peaceful community without commercialized tourist exploitation."

This group also begged and borrowed and earned enough money to put up bicycle signs throughout the city, marking bicycle routes to schools, parks, and the downtown section.

These two factors were put together by the bicycle club and with only this to go on, parlayed into a really worthwhile nationwide advertising of Homestead and South Dade.

Other efforts of a similar nature should be invited and promoted by other areas in South Dade, an area which is neglected by the leaders of our county, who know little about our area, and who concentrate their effort to other areas, with South Dade paying part of the bill.

So it is up to the initiative and effort of local groups such as the Dr. Paul Dudley White Bicycle Club of Homestead.

Hats off to these promotion pioneers of South Dade, who are pushing a new club slogan: "I'd rather bike than hike," which is a twist of the hiking craze which recently started in Washington governmental circles, and which amounted to little because the politicos couldn't take it. They too should take up cycling.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to compliment Dr. White for his selection of Homestead, Fla., as a frequent vacation spot and his public service in encouraging and participating in this bicycling and bicycle safety movement, which not only aids the middle-aged and senior citizens by giving them healthy recreation and constructive exercise, but contributes to the well-being and happiness of our youth and all our citizens.

I should like also to commend Mayor Conley and the Homestead City officials, the sponsors and members of the Homestead Bicycle Club, the News Leader, and the citizens of Homestead, for their public-spirited efforts which have brought merited recognition to the Homestead area.

We in Florida have demonstrated that it can be done. We have led the way. Other communities should be inspired to follow our example. I challenge other cities and States to adopt similar programs. Let us get all of America aboard bicycles for health and happiness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Farbstein (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Goodling), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Widnall (at the request of of Mr. Goodling), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Cramer (at the request of Mr. Goodling), for 30 minutes, on Thursday.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Huddleston and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Edwards.

Mr. Willis in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Gross and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Joelson.

Mr. Pucinski.

Mr. St. Onge.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Goodling) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Goodell.

Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Glenn.

Mr. Alger.

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois.

Mr. Daddario.

Mr. Multer.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Gill) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Hemphill.

Mr. Morris.

Mr. Patten.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, March 28, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

584. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on title I, Public Law 480 agreements concluded during February 1963, pursuant to Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

585. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report relating to the appropriation to the Department of Labor for "Employees' compensation claims and expenses" for the fiscal year 1963, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

586. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

587. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the January 1963 report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

588. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act"; to the Commitee on the District of Columbia.

589. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes,' approved March 1, 1899, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

590. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the U.S. Information Agency's 19th semiannual report, pursuant to Public Law 402, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

591. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to

amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize a grant-in-aid program, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

592. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the supply management of electric lamps within the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

593. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of unnecessary costs to the Government for packing shipments of household goods for Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps personnel; to the Committee on Government Operations.

594. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of retention by General Dynamics/Pomona (Convair), a division of General Dynamics Corp., Pomona, Calif., of refunds related to illegally imposed local taxes included in the prices of Department of the Navy contracts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

595. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relating to the Saline Water Act for the calendar year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 448, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

596. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation; construction of facilities; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1989. A bill to authorize the government of the Virgin Islands to issue general obligation bonds; with amendment (Rept. No. 115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 116. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 117. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 118. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 5096. A bill to amend paragraph 368 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to duties imposed on the importation of clocks, clock movements and other measuring devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 5097. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5098. A bill to repeal section 2(d) of the District of Columbia Nonresident Tuition Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 5099. A bill to authorize the acquisition of lands for addition to the Adams National Historic Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 5100. A bill authorizing the modification of the Trinidad Dam on Purgatoire River, Colo., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 5101. A bill to amend titles 10, 14, and 38, United States Code, with respect to the award of certain medals and the Medal of Honor Roll; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 5102. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Cancer Society; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 5103. A bill to prohibit nepotism in Government employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5104. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 5105. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5106. A bill to amend section 36 of the Investment Company Act of 1940; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5107. A bill to provide for the control of mosquitoes and mosquito vectors of human disease through research, technical assistance, and grants-in-aid for control projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5108. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities of certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5109. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of information filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 5110. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to prevent discrimination because of sex in payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 5111. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a form of averaging recovery of amounts received as damages for injury to crops through pollution of air, water, or soil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5112. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5113. A bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5114. A bill to strengthen the criminal penalties for the mailing, importing, or transporting of obscene matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5115. A bill to amend section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 5116. A bill to prohibit the extension of Grand Teton National Park without the expressed approval of Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 5117. A bill to extend for 2 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 5118. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Whitestone Coulee unit of the Okanogan-Similkameen division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 5119. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to advancement by step increases of certain postal field service employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 5120. A bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, Imperial County, Calif., for defense purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 5121. A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 5122. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 5123. A bill to remove wheat for seeding purposes which has been treated with poisonous substances from the "unfit for human consumption" category for the purposes of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5124. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5125. A bill to amend section 22 of the act of August 24, 1935, as amended (49 Stat. 773, 7 U.S.C. 624), to require the Secretary of Agriculture to include lumber and wood products as an agricultural commodity under the act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5126. A bill to establish in the Department of Agriculture an office for two additional Assistant Secretaries, one of whose prime responsibility shall be forest resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5127. A bill to provide for assistance in the construction and initial operation of community mental health centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5128. A bill to extend the benefits of the civil service retirement and group life and health insurance programs to certain legislative employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 5129. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 5130. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act (relating to the insurance of savings and loan accounts) with respect to the maximum amount of insurance which may be provided thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 5131. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize State and community youth employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 5132. A bill to amend section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act to require the Secretary of Commerce to prescribe standards based on the extent of migration out of certain areas for the purpose of designating such areas as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 5133. A bill to make cotton available to domestic users at prices more competitive with prices foreign users pay for cotton, to authorize the Secretary to permit cotton-growers to plant additional acreage for the 1963 and succeeding crops of upland cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5134. A bill to provide transportation for certain parents and unremarried widows of deceased members of the Armed Forces who are buried in national cemeteries outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 5135. A bill to provide that the highway running from Tampa, Fla., through Bradenton, Fla., Punta Gorda, Fla., Fort Myers, Fla., Naples, Fla., and Miami, Fla., to Homestead, Fla., shall be a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 5136. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, with relation to the fees to be charged; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 5137. A bill to amend section 601(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act (relating to compensation of Members of Congress) to provide for a method of incentive pay increases for Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 5138. A bill to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the National railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 5139. A bill to establish in the Department of Agriculture an office for two additional Assistant Secretaries, one of whose prime responsibility shall be forest resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 5140. A bill to establish a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, to authorize programs of information, education, advisory services, and financial assistance for the encouragement and advancement of artistic and cultural activities, and for the development of a more widespread appreciation of America's cultural heritage and accomplishments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.J. Res. 343. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in order to authorize the several States to permit the offering of a prayer in public schools and other public places; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 344. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.J. Res. 345. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.J. Res. 346. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res. 347. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of an instrument for the amendment of the constitution of the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.J. Res. 348. Joint resolution to establish a commission to study the feasibility and advisability of and to formulate preliminary plans and recommendations for a site and for the development and construction of a National Visitor and Student Center in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEED:

H.J. Res. 349. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States restricting the judicial power of the United States in State legislative apportionment cases to those States which do not provide their citizens with the opportunity to initiate and vote upon plans of State legislative apportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.J. Res. 350. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.J. Res. 351. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document, the Constitution of the United States, with an analytical index and auxiliaries regarding proposed amendments; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H. Res. 297. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred for minority purposes in the Education and Labor Committee; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. Res. 298. Resolution to amend clause 2 (a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. Res. 299. Resolution to amend clause 4 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred to as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON: Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning wilderness legislation and opposing the creation or extension of wilderness areas within the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to naming the lake and recreation area created by the Flaming Gorge Dam on the Wyoming-Utah border after the Honorable Joseph C. O'Mahoney; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Senate, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine protesting against the proposed transfer of internal revenue personnel and services from the State of Maine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging immediate action by ordering that the Secretary of Defense locate two or three air fighter interceptor and reconnaissance squadrons along the northwest coast of Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the national defense system in Alaska; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging favorable consideration to the proposal to restore medical care benefits to owner-operators of fishing vessels and self-employed seamen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the rejection of the changes in timber taxation proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to increasing the insurance limit of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to $25,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to protecting the U.S. lumbering industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing appreciation to the Secretary of Agriculture for his action in holding the support price on 1963 upland cotton at 32.47 cents per pound; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reject that portion of the tax program of the President of the United States which would substantially eliminate

the capital gains on the sale of timber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the enactment of legislation authorizing the Bumping Lake Reservoir project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning the Cooperative Extension Service and opposing the use of the Extension Service as a promotional arm of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to limiting and reducing the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging consideration of legislation providing that 90 percent of all moneys received from the sale of or as bonuses, royalties, or rentals on federally controlled minerals within the State be paid by the Treasurer of the United States to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to asking consideration of the welfare and interest of the people of the State of Wyoming who favor Federal legislation providing for regulation and control of appropriations, distribution and use of underground and surface waters within their State and her sister States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning wilderness legislation and opposing the creation or extension of wilderness areas within the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to providing legislation designed to return to the State of Wyoming additional sections of land from the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to providing legislation regarding the feasibility reports required in connection with applications for Federal small projects loans, and requiring such reports only when they are needed to establish the ability of the borrowing entity to repay the loan; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to enacting certain legislation to make various areas of reclamation nonreimbursables to the full extent of the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging legislation to prohibit the killing of elk by the park rangers in Yellowstone National Park and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States reaffirming support of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Committee; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose Federal legislation which would encroach on State-administered workmen's compensation programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning the Federal Insurance Contribution Act and opposing any future increase in the social security tax rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to passing legislation which would place the timber industry of this country in a competitive position with foreign production through the establishment of import quotas or other means; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follow:

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 5141. A bill for the relief of Leung Kar Wai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 5142. A bill for the relief of Dana Hinton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5143. A bill for the relief of Paul Griffith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5144. A bill for the relief of Doyle A. Ballou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5145. A bill for the relief of John F. MacPhail, lieutenant, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5146. A bill for the relief of Adamo Buono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5147. A bill for the relief of Irma Hegedus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5148. A bill for the relief of Pei-Chi Pan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 5149. A bill for the relief of the Liberty National Life Insurance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5150. A bill for the relief of Spyridoula Mavrogianopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 5151. A bill for the relief of Panayota Tanglis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5152. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Vaccarezza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 5153. A bill for the relief of Harry Cornish; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 5154: A bill for the relief of Wilfredo Larar de Leon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5155. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Guiseppa D'Aquanno, Maria D'Aquanno, and Benedicto D'Aquanno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

72. By the SPEAKER: Petition of J. Fred Wynn, chairman, Greater Fort Lauderdale Chamber of Commerce, Fort Lauderdale, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to calling upon Congress in the public interest to initiate proper legislation to make labor unions subject to the same laws as industry, amenable to the national security and public welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

73. Also, petition of John Biancucci and others, Boston, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution to preserve the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

74. Also, petition of Bernard E. Hanus, assistant committee clerk, Wayne County Board of Supervisors, Detroit, Mich., relative to acquisition of Federal revenue stamps in connection with property transaction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Byelorussian Democratic Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1963, marks the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

I proudly join my colleagues in paying tribute to the inspiring courage and determination of Byelorussians all over the world. I am certain that the independence they once enjoyed, will be regained and that freedom will flourish.

Byelorussia was once an independent country and made important contributions to the medieval history of Eastern Europe. In 1795, this freedom was crushed when Byelorussia was made a part of the Russian Empire by force.

Since then, Byelorussians have fought to regain their independence, without success. Major attempts were made in 1812 and 1863; and in 1917, after creating a congress with the goal of establishing an independent Byelorussia, the democratic body was attacked and scattered by the armed power of Soviet Russia.

Unconquered, despite this tragic defeat, the Council of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic proclaimed independence by passing the Third Constitutional Act on March 25, 1918. But Soviet Russia attacked and defeated the young democratic state, consisting of 10 million persons.

Demonstrating their indomitable courage and love for freedom, the people of Byelorussia rebelled and fought in the Slutsk District in 1920, but were defeated by the Soviet armies, and again during

World War II, when the central council organized armed forces.

Despite 45 years of Soviet despotism and exploitation, Byelorussia has not surrendered, and never will. The flame of freedom is never extinguished by the violent winds of tyranny. And as Byron wrote of those who perish in freedom's constant struggle, "they never fail who die in a great cause."

Freedom is the greatest cause of all and its ultimate victory is inevitable.

Byelorussia will be free and happy again.

News Register Becomes a Daily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I address the House of Representatives today on a most felicitous occasion. As you and many of my colleagues know, the most populous portion of the Ninth Congressional District is southerly Alameda County, an area of incomparable climate, rich farmlands, vineyards, and delightful cities and towns.

One of these cities is Fremont, northern California's largest city area. Formed in 1956 by incorporating the five rural communities of Centerville, Irvington, Niles, Mission San Jose, and a large amount of agricultural land, Fremont's population has risen since 1956 from 22,443 to nearly 60,000. The projected constant growth over the next 15 years is 8,000 annually.

Mr. Speaker, such a rapid growth too many times means chaos for a community, but this is not the case in Fremont. The reason is that our city is a planned community in the most perfect sense, a city whose master plan has provided for a proper balance of industrial, commercial and residential development, of parks, recreation, and wildlife areas. As the American Institute of Planners stated in awarding Fremont the 1962 honor award for "outstanding achievement in comprehensive planning," Fremont is, of course, almost unique.

The fact that this explosive growth has been guided and controlled pursuant to sound and imaginative planning is a credit to the city government, its staff, its elected officials, and ultimately to the entire citizenry.

Mr. Speaker, this steady course that I have described has not been easy. After all, what has been accomplished here is the blending into one great city of five rural communities, each with its own leaders, its own points of view. It would have been difficult, perhaps impossible, to have done this continuing job without the existence of an enlightened newspaper, whose first loyalty was to the community and its people and not to any personal partisanship of its publishers.

This newspaper is the News Register, Mr. Speaker, published by Mr. George P. Oakes and Mr. George H. Oakes, and serving, in addition to Fremont, the growing and vital cities of Newark, Union City and Milpitas.

I ask my colleagues today to join me in sending congratulations to the News Register on its joining of the great American family of daily newspapers. May it live long and prosper well, continuing to serve its community and its country in the fair and impartial dissemination of news, and in the honest and incisive criticism of its editorial page.

Tribute to Mrs. Clara I. Harrison Who Is Retiring After Long Congressional Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress fully realize that in order to properly carry out our duties and responsibilities we must have efficient staffs, particularly competent administrative assistants. And not only do the services of these employees mean so much to each of us but to the successful operation of Congress as a whole.

It is most fitting to pay tribute to a congressional aid who will retire March 31 after 22 years of faithful and meritorious service. I refer to Mrs. Clara I. Harrison who has served as an assistant to Louisiana Members of Congress longer than anyone else, having begun her congressional employment in 1922 as secretary to former Representative Leonard Allen of the Eighth Louisiana District. When the latter retired from Congress, Mrs. Harrison became secretary to former Representative Henry D. Larcade of Louisiana's Seventh District and following Representative Larcade's retirement she has served as administrative assistant to his successor, Representative T. A. Thompson, since January 3, 1953.

Incidentally, Mrs. Harrison is closely vied for the longest service to the Louisiana congressional delegation by three other members of our staffs. Miss Florence "Flo" LeCompte, personal secretary to Senator Allen J. Ellender, began her congressional duties May 1, 1942, while Mrs. Florence Cooley has been administrative assistant to Representative James H. Morrison, of the Sixth Louisiana District, since January 3, 1943. Bill Candler, who has been my executive secretary for a number of years, has been on the Hill since November 4, 1942, having previously served with former Representative James Domengeaux, of the Third Louisiana District, and with former Representative Larcade.

A native of Louisiana, Mrs. Harrison was born at Marthaville. She graduated from Northwestern State College at Natchitoches, La., with a bachelor of science degree, and from Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge with a master's degree in business administration, and served as supervisor of student teachers in Louisiana. She is a member of the Baptist Church.

Mrs. Harrison is the wife of Derwood D. Harrison, a career employee with the General Accounting Office. "Bud," as he is best known, came to Washington from North Carolina as an employee of former Representative and Comptroller General Lindsay Warren.

Mr. and Mrs. Harrison maintain a delightful home in Bethesda. In addition to her congressional work she is popular in Washington social circles, numbering among her close friends and personal acquaintances many Members of Congress and others in Washington official circles.

Since Representative Thompson has interested himself over the years in assisting young men to secure an education in Washington, "Miss Clara," as so many know her, has been a veritable Washington housemother to these young people, many of whom have successfully completed their professional educations.

After these many years of devoted, loyal and most helpful service to Congress and to her employers, and her years in the teaching profession, making approximately 30 years she has served the public, Mrs. Harrison is certainly entitled to a well-earned rest although she will no doubt continue many of her activities. Members of the Louisiana congressional delegation and their staffs join with all the many others in her wide circle of friendships in wishing for Miss Clara a very pleasant and happy retirement.

Comparison of Gross Tax Burdens of Various Nations in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, in order to compare the relative tax burdens of industrialized and nondeveloped countries, it is best to show total taxes either as a percentage of gross national product or national income. The generally accepted definition of national income does not include indirect taxes. Many countries rely to very different degrees on indirect taxes—some have a high proportion of indirect taxes in their tax structure, while others do not have such a high percentage. Thus using national income as a yardstick of taxload may result in an overstatement of the fiscal burden for the one class and an understatement for the other.

The United Nations Yearbook of National Accounts Statistics for 1961 gives latest available gross national product and tax figures for 1960. Since the data for gross national product are collected on a relatively uniform basis, percentages of taxes calculated as part of the gross

national product of each country have the advantage of international comparability. These taxes include all indirect taxes collected as well as all social security contributions.

On the basis of latest available U.N. statistics, total taxes as a percentage of gross national product show the following relative tax burdens among various countries for 1960:

Country	Taxes as percent of GNP	Rank
West Germany	34.0	1
France	33.2	2
Austria	32.9	3
Norway	32.1	4
Sweden	31.3	5
Finland	30.8	6
Netherlands	30.1	7
Italy	28.7	8
United Kingdom	27.9	9
United States	27.5	10
New Zealand	27.5	11
Denmark	25.1	12
Canada	24.8	13
Belgium	24.2	14
Australia	23.5	15
Chile	22.9	16
Ireland	22.1	17
Japan	20.2	18
Burma	19.8	19
Greece	19.6	20
Mauritius	19.3	21
Portugal	17.5	22
China-Taiwan	15.5	23
Malta	15.2	24
Republic of South Africa	15.1	25
Ecuador	15.0	26
Costa Rica	14.7	27
Rhodesia and Nyasaland	14.2	28
Korea	14.1	29
Jamaica	13.0	30
Panama	12.2	31
Colombia	11.4	32
India	9.7	33

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to insert in the Record a tribute to the freedom-loving Byelorussians on the occasion of the anniversary of their independence.

For more than four centuries the Byelorussians, one of the oldest and proudest national groups in Eastern Europe, have been living under Russian rule. Except for a brief period of independence, they have been subjected to the worst excesses of the autocratic czarist regime and the Communist totalitarian system. Although they have suffered more than any other national minority group, the Byelorussians have steadfastly maintained their national identity and their love of freedom. They have struggled for independence and liberty for centuries despite hardships, privation, exile, and death.

The turbulent events of World War I and the Russian revolution gave the Byelorussians their long-sought opportunity to break away from the Russian shackles. On March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was proclaimed. The Byelorussian government quickly set to work to expand its activity in such fields as education, culture, and social protection, despite the wartime difficulties and devastation. With the retreat of the German armies in November 1918, the Red army began to advance into Byelorussia. The government, unable to oppose this aggression, was forced to leave the capital city of Minsk and withdraw to Grodno. The fledgling republic's leaders were unable to build up enough military strength to defend its independence and integrity. In 1921 the country was partitioned by Poland and Russia in the treaty which ended the war between these two powers.

Early in World War II Byelorussia was unified under Soviet rule as a constituent republic of the U.S.S.R. The freedom-loving Byelorussians are still under the heel of their Russian oppressors. They do not even have the freedom to observe the anniversary of their Independence Day. We in the free world celebrate the anniversary of that historic event and echo the deep-felt sentiments of the Byelorussian people.

Boom to South Jersey Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, when New Jersey State Senator Frank S. "Hap" Farley, Republican, of Atlantic City, said recently, in speaking of the proposed southern New Jersey expressway, "This is the culmination of an 8-year dream," the senior New Jersey State senator spoke of a dream which has been the aspiration and the hope of every citizen who lives in the southern New Jersey seashore area.

The new expressway provides speedy access to and from Atlantic City and the adjacent resorts. It is worth noting that the $46,800,000 road was made possible by the determined efforts on the part of State Senator Farley and Charles W. Sandman, Republican, of Cape May, and the Republican members of the New Jersey House of Assembly.

This new toll road will be open for the summer of 1964. It will enhance the travel of tourists to and from the area. It lends to the growth and development of business. I foresee, with the opening of the expressway, the beginning of a whole new era of employment and development in south Jersey.

In the not too distant future south Jersey will be highly industrialized, with an easy flow of traffic on a year-round basis into and out of the area.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, with the hundreds of thousands of miles of highways in our Nation, a simple expressway might not appear important. What is important is the fact that for many citizens travel to and from Atlantic City has been difficult, if not awkward. It has cost the area millions in employment, hampered industrial growth, and relegated the area to a place of second consideration for our traveling population.

Now, due to the forthright action and determination of our legislators, we see the dawn of a new day. A day when more of our citizens will come to the world's famous playground, to bathe in the Atlantic Ocean, and to walk upon the most famous boardwalk in the world.

The land of the salt water taffy will again take its rightful place in the hearts of people everywhere.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as one of the smaller Slavic ethnic groups in the Soviet Union, the Byelorussians are little known in the West, and their distinct national identity is often confused.

This is partly because they have always intermingled with other more numerous and powerful Slavic peoples, and partly because for centuries they have been subjected to the oppressive rule of foreign overlords. For hundreds of years their far more powerful neighbors, the Russians, have done all in their power to subdue them and represent them to the world as Russians.

The history of Byelorussian people proves beyond any doubt that they formed a distinct national group in their homeland, east of Poland and west of Moscow, long before the formation of the modern Russian state. However, during most of modern times Byelorussia has been part of the Russian Empire just as it is part of the Soviet Union today.

The autocratic czars of Russia and their callous agents could not eliminate the Byelorussians as a distinct ethnic group. The more the Byelorussians were oppressed by their Russian overlords, the more these sturdy people clung to their traditional national ideals and longed for the day of their independence.

Finally, this came about in 1918, when the czarist regime in Russia was no more. On March 25 of that year Byelorussian leaders took the fate of their people into their hands and proclaimed the Byelorussian National Republic. Independent Byelorussia was recognized by the governments of numerous countries, and the new state seemed to be on its way to full sovereignty in historic Byelorussia with Minsk as its capital.

Unfortunately, the independence thus attained and proclaimed could not last long without effective foreign aid. Such help did not come, and the Republic soon succumbed. It was under constant attack by the Communist forces of Russia. Once the Red army was effectively organized, one of its first tasks was to overrun and occupy, and then annex Byelorussia to the Soviet Union. The Byelorussian National Republic actually existed little more than a year. By late

1919 its status was very shaky and early in the next year it ceased to exist.

Since then, for more than four dreadful and dreary decades, some 10 million Byelorussians have been living under oppressive Soviet tyranny. It is no exaggeration to say they have suffered longer under Soviet communism and have sacrificed more than any other non-Russian people in the Soviet Union. But they have not abandoned their ultimate goal for freedom and independence, and they ardently look forward to the day of their liberation from Communist tyranny.

On the 45th anniversary of their independence day let us all hope and pray for their freedom and independence.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Byelorussians constitute one of the less numerous and little-known Slavic peoples on the East European borderland, east of Poland and west of Moscow. Their modern history is inextricably blended with and sadly overshadowed by Russian history, because for centuries they were subjected to ruthless Russian czarist regimes. But the Byelorussians, who have had a longer history as a nation than the Russians themselves, were never willing to forgo and forget their distinct national identity. They always longed to regain their national independence. This supreme goal was attained in 1918.

On March 25 of that year, after Russia's detested czarist regime had collapsed and the new Communist regime in Russia was still weak, the Byelorussians proclaimed the establishment of the Byelorussian Republic. At the time it was hoped that these 10 million hardworking and liberty-seeking people, having become sovereign in their historic homeland, would be able to enjoy the fruits of freedom in peace. Unfortunately their subsequent history took a disastrous turn. Early in 1921, long before the Byelorussians had the chance to consolidate their new government and put their own house in order, Soviet forces attacked and overran the country. Byelorussia as an independent and sovereign nation vanished from the international scene. For more than four decades since that time these sturdy and stouthearted Byelorussians have been living under the unrelenting and ruthless rule of their Communist overlords in Moscow. As much as any other people subdued by Russia's massive might, these unhappy subjects have been completely isolated from the free world, and today they are no better off as a nationality group than they were under the most ruthless of Russian czars. Even so, they have not given up their hope for their eventual freedom and independence. They all cherish that noble ideal, and on the 45th anniversary of their independence day let us all hope and pray for their deliverance from Soviet totalitarian tyranny.

Appropriation for Conservation Program Should Not Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Record the text of a statement I submitted to the House Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations urging that the 1964 appropriation for the conservation program of the Department of Agriculture should not be reduced.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, OF CONNECTICUT, TO THE AGRICULTURAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Dear Mr. Chairman: I am grateful for the opportunity to present to you and the distinguished members of your subcommittee a brief statement in regard to the 1964 appropriation for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

May I direct your attention to page 126 of the Budget of the U.S. Government, 1964, Appendix, where it is stated as follows in connection with the budget for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:

"A level of $150 million for the 1964 programs is proposed, a reduction of $100 million below the 1963 program. Payments for the 1964 program will be made from the 1965 appropriation."

The proposed reduction from $250 to $150 million for this program in the coming fiscal year—a reduction of 40 percent—is very disturbing. I have received letters of protest from the Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts in the State of Connecticut urging that "this budget proposal should not be cut from $250 to $150 million". In a letter dated March 5, 1963, the president of this association, Mr. Erwin Kelsey of Middletown, Conn., in my Congressional District, informs me as follows:

"We feel that without the Federal cost-sharing our objective in developing the conservation plan with landowners on each acre of his holdings according to its needs and used within its capabilities will be greatly jeopardized."

Your committee is well aware, I am sure, of the aims of this program in encouraging conservation by Federal sharing with farmers of the cost of carrying out approved soilbuilding and soil and water-conserving practices, including also benefits to wildlife. Without this assistance from the Government the farmers would not and could not undertake these conservation projects by themselves with their limited resources. The rate of this cost-sharing program is approximately 50 percent, and that is a fair rate. These conservation measures include the establishment of permanent protective cover, improvement and protection of vegetative cover, conservation and disposal of water, protection of soil from wind and water erosion, and benefits to wildlife.

In Connecticut, the local agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees, participating in this Federal cost-sharing program, place particular emphasis on the physical type practices seeking to benefit wildlife, provide protection of vegetative cover and conservation of soil and disposal of water.

This program is extremely important to the State of Connecticut. A reduction of $100 million in the budget for this vital program is, in my view, shortsighted and may in the long run prove to be a waste of resources rather than an act of economy. I am interested in economy and will gladly support such efforts, but this is most certainly an example of false economy.

I urge you and the members of your committee to increase the amount of the conservation program to the same level as it was last year, namely, to provide the full amount of $250 million for this service which is beneficial to the whole country.

Greg Samuels Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the State finals of the Indiana High School Athletic Association's annual basketball tournament was played last Saturday, March 23, at Indianapolis, Ind.

Garfield High School, of Terre Haute, Ind., which is located in the Sixth Indiana Congressional District, was one of the final four participants in this statewide competition.

An outstanding member of this Garfield team coached by Mr. Willard Kehrt, is Greg Samuels, who was awarded the tournament's coveted Arthur L. Trester Award for mental attitude and scholarship following the final game at Butler University Fieldhouse.

The Trester Award is the highest athletic and scholarship honor that can be attained by an Indiana High School boy and Greg Samuels certainly deserved the honor.

In addition to being a star player for Coach Kehrt, leading his team into the finals with a great performance in the defeat of defending champion, Bosse of Evansville, Greg has compiled an outstanding scholastic record at Garfield.

Greg has been president of his class for 4 consecutive years and has maintained an "A–B" average throughout his high school career.

Greg's achievement in winning the Trester Award is a tribute not only to Greg himself, but his teachers and coaches at Garfield High School, his parents and the entire community of Terre Haute.

Fortunately, for the State of Indiana, Greg is planning to continue his education at either Indiana State College at Terre Haute, or Wabash College in Crawfordsville. Both of these excellent colleges are also located in the Sixth Indiana Congressional District, and Greg could make no finer choice of schools than Indiana State or Wabash.

I am pleased to bring news of Greg Samuels' achievement to the attention of this body. This talented and dedicated youth deserves national recognition for his record at Garfield High School and his personal triumph as Indiana's outstanding athlete-student for this season.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am thinking, not only of the people of ancient Greece who laid the foundations of democratic government and the men, women, and children of modern Greece so close to our hearts, but as well of those of Greek ancestry and blood who as our fellow Americans have made such a mighty contribution to our own United States in culture, religion, business, the professions, in all of our activities, and so well in the new land of America have kept aflame the torch of democracy first lighted centuries ago in ancient Greece.

In my own city of Chicago no nationalistic group is held in higher esteem and affection. Its sons and daughters are numbered among the leaders in all the worthy activities of a great metropolis.

It is only natural that a nation's independence day have a particular significance for the people of that nation. This is the case for Greece, but her independence day is also meaningful for other peoples in the world. The Greeks, it will be recalled, were the first people to conceive and advocate the concept of independence in ancient times, yet for some 2,000 years they were deprived of this precious right. This is why the rebirth of free and independent Greece 142 years ago is such an important milestone in the history of mankind. The Greeks' unceasing determination to fight for their liberation from alien rule earned them the admiration of many people throughout the world, and the free and sovereign state of Greece was welcomed into the family of nations.

The past 400 years of Ottoman rule had proven particularly arduous. The Greeks who have also always cherished the ideals of individual freedom and dignity, were treated as mere subjects to be exploited, rather than as citizens. Their uprisings and rebellions were never successful, however, for the Sultan's forces were superior. It took a 9-year war of independence and the assistance of European powers to wrench Greece free from Turkish rule.

For 142 years now the Greeks have been independent, and their country has become a valued member of the community of free nations. Greece was admitted to the Council of Europe in 1949, to NATO in 1951, and is a party to the Balkan Pact with Turkey and Yugoslavia. Greece took a historic step last year in becoming associated with the European Economic Community. This association presents both a challenge and an opportunity for the Greek people in their efforts to modernize the economy of their country.

On the occasion of the 142d anniversary of Greek Independence Day we congratulate the Greek people on their achievements and reaffirm the close ties between our two nations, democratic Greece and democratic United States.

Maryland Day—1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate a significant anniversary in Maryland. Monday, March 25, is Maryland Day, the 329th anniversary of the first founding of the colony of Maryland when the tiny ships, the *Ark* and *Dove*, brought the first Maryland colonists to St. Clements Island in the Potomac River. Then they landed at St. Marys to found what has become a historic and a great State.

We should take time in 1963 to consider what the State of Maryland means to us now and what it has meant over the years. Maryland has been a place where great ideas have been developed, where great concepts of government have been tried. When proven, they have been handed down to other States and to the world at large. Some of the institutions of Maryland have been preserved in the Government of the United States. And so we have good reason to examine what is great in our own Maryland history.

Last year on Maryland Day we recalled the Act of Toleration. That act was passed by the General Assembly of Maryland 3 centuries ago to give all persons in Maryland the right to practice their religion in their own manner. This was religious freedom and individual liberty which was unique in the 17th century. We can be very proud of our Maryland heritage for developing a climate of toleration which is now a fundamental part of our constitutional right as Americans.

There were other things which we can remember with great pride. For instance, in 1648 there was the incident in the general assembly in which a woman claimed for the first time in recorded American history the right to sit as a legislator. The Journal of the General Assembly of Maryland for Friday, January 21, 1648, records:

> Came Mrs. Margaret Brent and requested to have vote in the House for herself and voice also.

On this occasion the Governor denied Mrs. Brent both voice and vote as a member of the General Assembly of Maryland, but she had asserted for all time the claim that a woman had a right to sit as an equal with other members of the legislature. Today, of course, Mrs. Brent's claim has been vindicated. There are women in Annapolis who are valuable members of the general assembly. And in Washington the Congress, which is in a sense a direct descendant of the General Assembly of Maryland, also has valuable Members who are women. This is a principle which had its birth and its first expression in Maryland. It is another incident of Maryland history which can make us proud of our heritage.

If today we are sometimes discouraged because our political progress in Maryland seems to be slow; if we are discouraged because interest in good government seems to be limited to too few, we can look back to our long and proud history and I think gain good cause for our optimism for the years ahead.

Because of its historic interest I append the Journal of the general assembly for January 21, 1648, as follows:

[From Archives of Maryland, Proceedings and Acts of the Assembly of Maryland 1637/8–1664]

MARYLAND DAY—1963

The freemen bownd to attend the Assembly appeared except Mr. Ffenwick, Mr. Thorneborough, Mr. Brookes & George Saphyer.

Summons to George Saphyer to be att the Assembly forthwth. vppon sight & c

was read certaine orders to be obserued in the howse during the Assembly

Came Mrs. Margarett Brent and requested to have vote in the howse for her selfe and voyce allso for that att eh last Court 3d Jan: it was ordered that the said Mrs. Brent was to be looked uppon and received as his Lps Attorney. The Gov.r denyed that the s.d Mrs Brent should have any uote in the howse. And the s.d Mrs. Brent protested agst all proceedings in this pnt Assembly, unlesse shee may be pnt. and have vote as afores.d.

Byelorussian Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the date of March 25 marks the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. The people of Byelorussia first proclaimed their freedom on March 25, 1918, but their young Republic was soon turned into a battlefield for the armies of Russia and Germany and later of Russia and Poland. Engulfed from the east and from the west, Byelorussia was conquered and her territory divided. During the occupation resistance continued and during World War II Byelorussia was able to organize a free government and arm herself against Soviet Russia. Russian might once again crushed the Republic and, in an attempt to crush also the spirit of the Byelorussian people, the conquering Soviet Union ignored natural ethnographical order and redistributed the people.

During this 45-year history of persecution and oppression, the anniversary of that 1918 proclamation of independence has been honored. From their tragic history we have come to respect and admire the valiant courage and determination of the Byelorussian people. They have become an exceptional symbol of resistance to the flood of communism and it is proper that we should join them on this day in the rededication of their goals toward a free and independent Byelorussian Republic.

Justice Department Asked To Investigate Satevepost "Fix" Story Violations of Federal Wiretap Statute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the Saturday Evening Post article in the March 23, 1963, issue entitled "The Story of a College Football Fix" is false generally in its charges against Paul Bryant, University of Alabama, and Wallace Butts.

However, it also is emerging more clearly now that the alleged source of the article has a record of convictions on bad check charges, various financial difficulties, and obtained the information on which the article is based illegally. It appears, from the story in the Satevepost, that the man, George Burnett, of Atlanta, overheard a conversation between two men over the long distance telephone. His reporting of the conversation appears to be in violation of title 47, section 605 of the United States Code.

I have written the Attorney General the following letter asking that appropriate action be taken. I insert the letter as a part of my remarks herewith:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1963.
Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General of the United States,
U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am writing to call your attention to the Saturday Evening Post article entitled, "The Story of a College Football Fix," which appeared in the issue dated March 23, 1963. The article begins on page 80 and refers to a telephone conversation between Wallace Butts, University of Georgia athletic director, and Paul Bryant, University of Alabama athletic director, allegedly overheard by a George Burnett. The alleged phone call originated in Atlanta, Ga., by Butts calling Bryant in Tuscaloosa, Ala. The article referred to gives details of the conversation which Mr. Burnett "overheard" after he was "accidentally" cut into the conversation.

Although I am personally convinced that the alleged conversation in no way incriminates either of the athletic officials in a fix, it is apparent that the article is based on what Mr. Burnett says he overheard. It is my belief that the article is defamatory and libelous. But that is a civil matter which will be decided in the courts.

I believe that it is equally clear from the language of the article that the author, Frank Graham, Jr., of Brooklyn, N.Y., the Curtis Publishing Co., of New York, N.Y., publishers of the Saturday Evening Post, and George Burnett, of Atlanta, Ga., are in violation of title 47, section 605, United States Code, the Federal wiretap statute. The statute is, as you know, part of the Federal Communications Act. It reads in part as follows:

"And no person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person; and no person not being entitled thereto shall receive or assist in receiving any interstate or foreign communication by wire or radio and use the same or any information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another not entitled thereto; and no person having received such intercepted communication or having become acquainted with the contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of the same or any part thereof, knowing that such information was so obtained, shall divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of the same or any part thereof, or use the same or any information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another not entitled thereto."

I will appreciate your investigating the circumstances surrounding the alleged telephone conversation, keeping in mind the pertinent provision of the Federal wiretap statute, herein quoted, and taking appropriate action in the premises.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.,
Member of Congress.

The 1963 Tax Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, Representative ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, of the Fifth South Carolina District, last week made a most comprehensive detailed statement before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on the 1963 tax message. I ask that these remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 1963 TAX MESSAGE

(Statement of ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Member of Congress, Fifth South Carolina District, before the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, 88th Congress, March 14, 1963)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am most grateful to you for allowing me to appear here today. I am not an expert on taxation, but my appearance here today is stimulated and inspired by the realization that I represent a precious segment of taxpaying American people, the people in the 5th Congressional District of South Carolina, who have a stake in your decision on any changes made in the tax laws in the 88th Congress. Let me assure you that I respect the position of decision and power which each of you holds as a member of this committee, and I recognize that you are members of this committee because you have been recognized by the respective political parties which elected you to this committee.

Let me begin by saying that I favor a tax cut. I also favor tax reform, although I am not in favor of certain proposals which I hope to discuss with you today, and which adversely affect the well-being of the people of my district, or the business which is carried on by or for or with the people of my district. I pause here to salute the President of the United States for his courage and his foresight in proposing tax legislation and change this year, particularly a tax cut. I have every confidence in his sincerity of purpose, his ambition to keep the American economy not only rolling along at the prosperous rate it has enjoyed, but to improve the status of the economy. When the President of the United States stated in his tax message of January 24, 1963, "Our present income tax rates structure now holds back consumer demands, initiative, and investment," he was saying the same thing that I have heard from hundreds of businessmen. Sadly I report that most of these businessmen are people who have expressed a dislike to Mr. Kennedy, and now that he has said it I am sure it is not as popular with them as if others had said it. Nevertheless, he has said it, he has spoken the truth and I am happy in the confidence that your committee will do something about our tax laws, and if any feeble effort on my part can be of assistance to the members of this great committee I am as near as your telephone.

Recently there came across my desk a little booklet entitled "Comments on the President's 1963 Economic Report," put out by the Department of Economics and Research of the American Bankers Association. I quote from that report:

"In our judgment, the requirement for implementing a tax cut 'within the bounds of fiscal prudence' would not preclude a temporary swelling of the Federal deficit—if this increase resulted from a tax reduction of the magnitude proposed by the President. For practical as well as economical reasons, our endorsements of tax reduction has not been coupled with the demand that the reduction be accomplished without exerting a temporary adverse of impact on the Federal budget. We regard tax reduction as an investment in future economic vigor, and we look upon the accompanying temporary enlargement of the deficit as the price, though the purpose, of the tax cut. Even a temporary enlargement of the Federal deficit resulting exclusively from tax reduction is not without risk at this time—the risk of generating renewed inflationary prices and compounding our balance-of-payments difficulties. Yet our confidence in the constructive forces that tax reductions can unleash leads us to believe that the price, in terms of a temporary and manageable swelling of the deficit, can and should be made."

I hope I have not taken this out of context. I respect the group that made the study.

I share your wishes that we could accomplish a tax cut without any enlargement of the deficit. I also share the belief that the President of the United States and those who have recognized the advantages of a tax cut at this time, that a tax cut will be of great benefit to this country, even with a corresponding rise in the national debt. My recollection is that this is the first time in the history of this country that the President of the United States has proposed a tax cut as a stimulation for business. All of us who are privileged to have enjoyed any length of maturity as American citizens, or as people privileged to serve their people as Members

of Congress, recognize the fact that this is the last needle in the economic doctor's kit. We continue to be under the influence of a wartime military budget, which has become a basic foundation of our economy—or should I say we depend more than we realize on expenditures for military purposes to keep the plants running, the people employed, and production steady. We are going to have to face, someday, and soon, the impact of this economic factor, and the problem of reduction of defense outlay without hurting our economy. If we are to stimulate the economy in any way, the tax cut seems to me the last and only hope that we have in our store of possible remedies, under present economic realities.

Before I proceed into discussion of specifics of the proposed tax legislation that I will discuss with you because of the effect on my district, let me ask your indulgence in one area of tax practice. In any consideration of reform of the tax structure of the United States today, or tomorrow, or in the immediate future, one ambition of this committee should be to simplify the filing of tax returns to such an extent that a man with an income of less than $5,000, in order to claim the grace, the benefits allowed him by certain deductions, would be able to accurately and honestly fill out the form without having to hire someone to do it. I believe most of the accountants of this Nation would share that wish with me. I am a country lawyer, and I have filled out hundreds of tax forms; naturally, when I did, I had to charge people for them. I have not filled out any but my own since I have been a Member of the Congress, but I have observed others filling out their forms, and the forms today are too complicated. They encourage mistakes, and I think a major challenge to this committee, not today because I realize that this particular tax legislation you are considering today must be limited to the scope intended, is the challenge shining like a light in the faces of the members of this committee and the Members of the Congress of the United States, to do something about the difficulty of making a return. Perhaps you say that this is an administrative matter; it may be, but you and I as Members of the Congress have some responsibility, too, and the fact that the forms are so complicated, or maybe the laws are so complicated, that people have to pay to get their tax forms filled out, even simple ones, seems to me an added burden of taxation which I know the legislators who passed the tax laws never intended. I plead with you for a simple form at some future date.

I do not believe the average taxpayer in the Nation knows how big a stake he has before this Congress, and which we must meet before we recess this year. The business people know, as a change in travel and entertainment expense account procedure brought them home to reality: the business of the Government is the business of the businessman as well as the responsibility of the Congressman, the Senator, the executive branch of the Government. Everything we do here affects every businessman in America in some way.

I make no apologies for singling out matters of importance to the people of my district. Their problems are my responsibility. I wish time permitted my dwelling on more facets of the tax proposals.

REVISION OF CAPITAL GAINS AND LOSSES

In the committee print of the President's 1963 tax message, February 6, 1963, under subdivision XVIII, C–2(b) (see p. VI of index), at pages 142, 143, I find the following:

"Under present law, a lump-sum distribution of an employee's interest in a qualified pension or profit-sharing plan is taxed as long-term capital gain if the distribution is made to the employee on account of his separation from the service of the employer or is made to the employee's beneficiary on account of his death. Under the recommendation, the recipient would not treat the lump-sum distribution as a capital gain; rather, it would be regarded simply as ordinary income. However, he would be permitted to average the lump-sum distribution in the manner described below.

"The special averaging treatment would generally be available in the case of lump-sum distributions which qualify for capital gains treatment under present law; that is, those that are made on account of separation from service or death. It would not be available, however, unless contributions had been made for the employee under the pension or profit-sharing plan for at least 5 previous years.

"This averaging technique will result in a tax comparable to that which would be payable if the distribution had been received over the first 5 years of the employee's retirement. For the average employee, the tax on his lump-sum distribution will be roughly the same as he would pay under the present capital gains rates. For those employees who are presently covered under pension and profit-sharing plans, the tax may be even lower because a portion of their distributions will qualify as capital gain subject to the new rates.

I am afraid the intended purpose of this proposal will be defeated if drastic change in the proposals are not made. I gather from exhibit No. 17 (p. 483 supra) that this is aimed at "highly paid employees * * * able to withdraw huge sums from the company's pension or profit-sharing plan when they retire or leave the company and pay only the low capital gains tax." The trouble is that we find ourselves at the muzzle end of a scattergun instead of watching someone shoot a rifle at a selected target.

In my district approximately 10,000 people share in a wonderful profit-sharing plan—I believe it is second to none in the Nation—as employees of Springs Cotton Mills. For the calendar year 1962 the employees' share was $4,240,485. I quote from the Springs Bulletin of Wednesday, February 27, 1963:

"In releasing these figures, H. W. Close, president of the Springs organization, pointed out that the company's contribution to the Springs fund was the largest since the fund was established in 1953. There are 9,310 employees in the Springs fund and their share accounts now total $15,420,004.

"PLAN REVISED

"The largest contribution made previously by Springs to the Springs fund was $2,800,000 in 1960. The increase in this year's contribution was made possible by the revision of the plan in 1962. As approved by the Internal Revenue Service, the formula for the amount of the annual contribution is now based on profits, after dividends, without regard to the amount of capital invested.

"On the recommendation of the Internal Revenue Service a division has been made in the Springs fund setting up one trust for hourly and piece-rate employees and another for those on salaries. This change does not affect present account balances but will give hourly and piece-rate employees a larger share in the future.

"The distribution of extra pay in the form of vacation and Christmas checks was begun in 1948 by Col. Elliott Springs. These checks add up to approximately 1 week's pay for employees with less than 5 years' service and range up to 4 weeks' pay for those who have been on the job 25 years or longer. This cash distribution amounted to $879,919 in July 1962 and $862,484 at Christmas.

"FUND GROWING

"Participation in the Springs fund has grown steadily since it was established in 1953. There were 8,836 share accounts in 1960, 9,222 in 1961, and 9,310 at the end of 1962.

"There has also been a steady increase in the total funds in these accounts. This total was $10,404,532 in 1960, $12,515,625 in 1961, and $15,420,004 at the end of 1962.

"The Springs fund has been built up entirely by contributions from the Springs Cotton Mills and through earnings on investments of the trust funds.

"Employees are eligible to participate in the Springs fund after 3 years' employment. They make no contribution to the fund nor is any deduction made from their paychecks.

"They are not compelled to remain in the Springs fund but the greatest benefits build up for those who stay in until they retire, die, or are disabled. Those who 'draw down their cash' forfeit part of the money credited to them and must wait 3 years before they may reenter."

From a little booklet on the profit-sharing plan, I call your attention to certain excerpts:

"The profit-sharing plan is for all employees. If you are an hourly paid or piecework employee, you may join the plan if you have worked for the company for 3 years or more.

"When you have been with the company for 3 years, you simply fill out a registration form, and you are a member.

"You also name the person you want to get your profit-sharing money in the case you die.

"You don't pay a cent to get into the plan. You don't pay a cent to stay in the plan, but it does cost you money to get out of the plan * * * if you pull out before you retire, get disabled or die.

"Let us take an example:

"We take the case of a typical weave room or spinning room employee, presently age 25, who earns $3,500 a year in wages. If he stays in our employ, and in the profit-sharing plan, until retirement at age 65, if his earnings continue at the same rate, if the company's profit experience continues at the present level until that time, and if the plan continues until that time with its current rate of earnings and forfeitures, our typical employee will have a credit at retirement of $36,268.

"Under present capital gain provisions, 50 percent of this credit or $18,134 would be included in taxable income. Assuming no other income and assuming exemptions and deductions of $2,000, our typical employee would pay a tax at current rates, of $3,268.

"Under the proposed capital gain provisions, our typical employee, on the same set of assumptions, would pay a tax, at the proposed reduced rates, of $6,994.20.

"The reason for this rather amazing consequence is to be found in Mr. Dillon's statement respecting the so-called 'averaging' or 'mitigating' provision. Thus, although the lump sum distribution is to be divided by 5 before computing the tax, it would appear that exemptions and deductions (where they exceed other income as in the case above) are to be 'subtracted from the lump-sum distribution before the averaging provision is applied.' (See the end of the fourth subparagraph under paragraph (2)(b).)

"If the exemptions and deductions were deducted after the averaging provision had been applied, our typical employee would pay a tax of only $4,128.25.

"To summarize:

"a. Under the present capital gains provisions and at current rates:

Lump sum distribution	$36,268.00
Includible income (50 percent)	18,134.00
Less deductions and exemptions	2,000.00
Taxable income	16,134.00
Tax	3,965.00

"b. Under the proposed law and at proposed reduced rates (with exemptions and deductions subtracted before averaging):

Lump sum distribution	$36,268.00
Less exemptions and deductions	2,000.00
Total	34,268.00
Divided by 5	6,853.60
Tax on the above	1,398.84
Tax (5 times the above)	6,994.20

"c. Under the proposed law and at proposed reduced rates (with exemptions and deductions subtracted after averaging):

Lump sum distribution	$36,268.00
Divided by 5	7,253.60
Less exemptions and deductions	2,000.00
Total	5,253.00
Tax on the above	825.65
Tax (5 times the above)	4,128.25

"With respect to an employee whose profitsharing credit at retirement is $20,000, the comparable tax figures are (a) $1,680, (b) $2,680, (c) $1,400.

"If we are correct in our reading of the proposal, it would appear that there is no real averaging, no real effort to spread the impact over a 5-year period, for only 1 year's exemptions and deductions are given any effect in computing the tax.

"Perhaps the most disturbing part of this proposed new treatment of lump-sum distributions, at least from the viewpoint of those charged with administering the plan, is the proposal that the new tax treatment shall not apply to that portion of a lump-sum distribution which equals the amount in the employee's account on February 6, 1963, plus future earnings, on this amount. (See the third subparagraph of par. (2)(b) of Mr. Dillon's statement.)

"In other words, the company, or someone, shall have to maintain two accounts for each participant. Instead of 9,310 accounts, there will be 18,620. Each time there is a forfeiture, or an appreciation in investment value, or a dividend or interest item, there will have to be thousands of additional computations in order properly to divide the item and allocate it between that part of each participant's account representing 'the amount in the employee's account as of * * * February 6, 1963, plus the future earnings on this amount,' and that part of the employee's account which represents the balance.

"I'm sure you are aware that this increases the burden imposed on industry to report this project, to make this return, or to supply that information, to Federal, State and local governments."

I represent the people who are in this pension plan. There are other pension plans in effect in my district. Every man, woman, and child in my district will eventually be affected, adversely, if this change takes place. I solicit your earnest consideration.

REPEAL OF UNLIMITED DEDUCTIONS FOR CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

As I understand the statement on page 100 of the committee print on the President's 1963 tax message, the recommendation for repeal of the unlimited deductions for charitable contributions was based upon the premise that such is a special deduction of limited application which enables individuals with substantial incomes to escape all Federal taxes on their income. I am frank to admit that I do not have enough expertise on taxation statistics or practice to refute that statement. Certainly, as a taxpayer, I want to pay my tax, but not more, but, at the same time, I want the other fellow to pay his share because the man who doesn't pay his share adds to the burden of the taxpayer who is honest about his taxes.

I recognize the concern about people who do escape all Federal taxes on their income. I do not think that the rule of unlimited deductions applies only to people with large incomes. If this committee wants to write a limitation as to large incomes, since that is where any alleged inequity is pinpointed, I would certainly consider it proper if it means that the man with the smaller income is paying more tax because a man with a larger income is getting out of paying a fair share of taxes due because of this deduction. But let us consider the matter in the light of facts.

I am happy that I live in a portion of the country where people are moral, extremely religious. We have numerous churches, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish. Many of these churches have small congregations, a majority of which make $5,000 to $7,000 or less. Many of the individuals of these assemblies tithe and I salute them for doing so; they are not rich nor do they try to get out of paying their taxes. If you repeal their right to deduct contributions, it is my opinion that you will do great harm because you would discourage the working people of this country from making contributions to their churches, to their orphanages, to their church schools.

It is not that their contributions are motivated by income tax regulations allowing deductions, but this has been the practice over many, many years, and as a Member of Congress I do not expect to be a part of any effort, or support any legislation, which will reduce the contributions so necessary to the churches, the church schools, and the orphanages.

Many of our orphanages and other charitable and educational church institutions rely heavily on contributions from various groups, particularly those of incomes below $20,000 because, in my section of the country, $20,000 is a tremendous income, and the people who support the various orphanages usually give $5 to $10 at a time; I know because I read the bulletins from the various church orphanages and I am interested in them and I know of the good work that they are doing.

To put a damper on this method of financing charitable institutions would be a disservice to the Nation, a disservice to the churches of this land and the good works they accomplish because they are financed, in large part, by contributions.

Many ministers have talked to me about this and many lay members of the various churches. We today are laboring to improve the education of every American, and were this tax effort to put a stumbling block in the path of church schools that use contributions to help finance the education of pupils who need it, would be a backward step in American progress and not in keeping with our overall purpose as a nation.

I am confident in your consideration of this proposal and your ability to preserve charitable accomplishments. I believe this proposal can be amended to do justice and to accomplish the purpose basically intended, and at the same time take care of the people with smaller incomes, the smaller contributors, and thus take care of our charitable institutions.

Churches, church schools, church orphanages are necessary, magnificent, institutions of this free land. They deserve every consideration from the Members of Congress.

CARRYOVER OF EXCESS DEDUCTIONS

On page 33 of the committee print (Feb. 6, 1963), I read from the statement of the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury:

Under present law, taxpayers are able to reduce their taxable incomes from other sources by deducting substantial amounts of development costs and other expenses incurred when a mineral property is not yet profitable. But they are not required to take these deductions into account in determining net income for the purpose of computing the limit on the percentage depletion allowance on the property when it does become profitable. Even if the deductions are carried forward in the form of a net operating loss carryover and used to reduce future taxable income, they are never subtracted from net income from the property for purposes of the percentage depletion limitation. As a result, the amount of percentage depletion deducted over a property's life may be far more than one-half of its total net income. This result would seem to be clearly contrary to the purpose of the 50-percent net-income limitation on percentage depletion. The operation of present law is illustrated in the technical explanation.

But let us reason about this.

The President stated in his budget message that deductions taken with respect to a mineral property, to the extent they exceed the gross income from the property during the year taken, must be carried forward to future years for the purpose of reducing percentage depletion through reduction of the limiting net income from the property. All costs deducted with respect to the property would be subject to this provision, presumably even to State and local real estate taxes paid on idle mineral land. A careful study of this proposal will show that it is based on an error in reasoning as to the history and intent behind the depletion provisions of the present law and that it would operate to the broad detriment of the mining and quarrying industry. It would unfairly penalize both the small operator with a smaller margin of profit and the large operator who is required to incur heavy carrying costs to maintain levels of reserves in keeping with the size of his operations.

Secretary Dillon has stated that he felt the purpose of the 50 percent of net limitation is violated unless percentage depletion is limited to 50 percent of the net income over the life of the property. A brief review of the history of percentage depletion will reveal this to be erroneous.

In 1918 Congress granted discovery value depletion which in effect placed the finders of any mineral deposits on the same level with those producers who had found their deposits prior to March 31, 1913, and were entitled to deduct the 1913 value thereof. Once the valuation of the mineral deposit was completed the per unit depletion deduction was established and did not fluctuate with prices thereafter. As a result when market values decreased or when operations went sour causing a loss from the operation of the property there was still available a depletion deduction based on the original valuation in 1921. Congress limited the discovery value depletion to 100 percent of the net income from the property during the taxable year and this was later changed to 50 percent of the net income from the property in 1924. Subsequently when percentage depletion replaced discovery value depletion the 50 percent of net income limitation remained unchanged. Congress did not give any reason for its action in 1924 and prior but it is quite evident that the purpose was not to limit the deduction of discovery depletion to 50 percent of the net income over the life of the property. It would seem on the other hand that Congress was somewhat unhappy with the fact that inherent defects in the valuation procedure could result in values for depletion which in light of subsequent events seemed absurd and permitted deduction against nonmining income without the actual expenditure of funds. If the present recommendations are adopted this move cannot be explained by alleging it will carry out the original intent of Congress. In essence this proposal

is simply another method of reducing the benefits and effectiveness of percentage depletion and related provisions of the tax law.

The recommendation that carryover of excess deductions be used to reduce depletion in future years would cause some very inequitable results and would bear much more heavily upon the operation of a marginal quarry or mine than upon the operator of a heavily successful quarry-mine or mine. As an illustration let us assume that two properties have $10,000 excess deduction in the nature of development cost during the first year. In subsequent years assume that each property produces 20,000 units which market for $100,000; if property A makes a small profit so that it is already limited by the net under present law it will eventually lose $5,000 of its depletion deduction because of the proposed carryforward. However, if property B has net income of $30,000 in the first year of operation it will not lose any of the depletion deduction, even if the proposed changes are adopted. Imposing heavier burdens on the marginal mine seems very inequitable and undesirable since these are the properties which will first be driven out of business by this type of taxation. The unfairness of the proposed carryforward can be further illustrated as follows: Assume that two different properties are adjacent, each producing 20,000 units selling for $100,000 with a net profit before depletion of $10,000; assume further that property A has operated at this rate of profit since commencing operation but property B had loss of $5,000; under present law each of these properties having the same gross and net income will have a percentage depletion deduction of $5,000. However, if the proposed carryforward is adopted, property A will continue to have a depletion deduction of $5,000, whereas property B will have its depletion deduction reduced by $2,500, simply because it had an operating loss in the preceding year.

The carrying costs on reserve mineral property would eventually operate under the proposed carryforward to reduce the percentage depletion allowance. Companies which move large tonnages are forced to acquire and hold reserve mineral properties if they are to survive. They cannot wait until a deposit is exhausted before searching for another to replace it. Where ad valorem taxes are imposed during this idle period the payment of those taxes should not reduce the depletion allowance in future years when the property goes into production. Nevertheless this would be the result under the proposed carryover provision.

We do not have lucrative quarrying or mining in my State, my district. As a result, the cost of removing overburden is a factor of economic life or death. I do have mining and quarrying in York, Cherokee, Fairfield, Lancaster and Kershaw Counties in my district and elsewhere in South Carolina. They must be kept in operation.

Actually the appellation "excess depletion" is a misnomer. We are talking about depletion, expense, and cost of production.

MULTIPLE SURTAX EXEMPTIONS

The President has recommended in his 1963 tax message to the Congress that corporations which are members of an affiliated group should be restricted to one surtax exemption, both where a common parent holding company exists (parent-subsidiary group), and even went so far as to favor restriction to one surtax exemption, and to force a single consolidated income tax return on a group of corporations where, by the difficult and complicated attribution rule under section 318 of the code, 80 percent of the stock is owned by five or fewer individuals in substantially the same proportion (brother-sister groups).

In this brother-sister grouping, you are dealing frequently with grassroots, county seat, small, and family-owned businesses. The relation of brother and sister and parents, some quite militantly independent of each other, is difficult to unify by wording of an attribution statute.

As to the impracticality in forced consolidated returns, let me give you an example of a widow aged 80, whose four sons and one daughter are in five separate incorporated businesses in one country town with each member of the family owning approximately 10 percent in each of the units, except that the widow and the child who manages each separate unit own the remainder. Each son and daughter are very independent in the management of each of their separate units, three units are in retailing, two in farming and farm processing.

Merely because the elderly widow continues to live but is sick and is completely inactive, forces all of these business units under section 318 to file one consolidated income tax return wherein all in fact are on a different accounting basis or a different fiscal year basis, and would be in serious management and personal difficulties if forced consolidation were to occur. There is no business relevance to the contended longevity of an aged lady not engaged in business activity.

Section 318 of the Internal Revenue Code has been referred to as a Pandora's box of construal problems (Ownes, "Stock Redemptions and Partial Liquidations under the 1954 Code" 32 Taxes 979 (1954)). To force it upon family-owned businesses is a serious mistake.

The feuding and difficulties in executive management resulting from such a situation would be incalculable, and would greatly hinder the formation of new business units at the family capital level, where the largest volume of new business units start. The difficulties of the average small business dealing with the vagaries of substantially proportionate ownership as set forth in the principal statement of Secretary Dillon, and the tremendous complexities of construing section 318 of the "Code on attribution of Ownership of Stock" will result in a reaction from small business units that would be violent. A mere list of topic headings under section 318 in Mertens, "Law of Federal Income Taxation, Code Commentary," is indicative of the complications:

"TOPICAL HEADINGS, SECTION 318 U.S. INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

"From Mertens Law of Federal Income Taxation

"Section 318. Constructive ownership of stock

"Section 318:1. General

"Section 318:2. Legislative background

"Section 318(a)(1):1. Attribution between members of a family

"Section 318(a)(2):1. Attribution between partnerships, estates, trusts and corporations and their respective partners, beneficiaries and shareholders

"Section 318(a)(2):2. Meaning of 'directly' or 'indirectly'

"Section 318(a)(2)(A):1. Partnerships and estates—Attribution from the entity to the person

"Section 318(a)(2)(A):2. Partnerships and estates—Attribution from the person to the entity.

"Section 318(a)(2)(B):1. Trusts—Attribution from the entity to the person

"Section 318(a)(2)(B):2. Trusts—Attribution from the person to the entity

"Section 318(a)(2)(B):3. Trusts—Meaning of 'maximum exercise of discretion'

"Section 318(a)(2)(B):4. Trusts—Attribution to grantors from the trust entity

"Section 318(a)(2)(B):5. Trusts—Attribution to entity from the grantor

"Section 318(a)(2)(C):1. Corporations—General rules of attribution

"Section 318(a)(2)(C):2. Corporations—Attribution from the entity to the person

"Section 318(a)(2)(C):3. Corporations—Attribution from the person to the entity

"Section 318(a)(3):1. Options

"Section 318(a)(4):1. Constructive ownership as actual ownership

"Section 318(b):1. Cross references."

I know that the recommendations as to the change and reduction in normal tax and surtax is worthy, but in the particular situation of attempting to unify individuals and families at the grassroots level of small business into one consolidated return under the concept of brother-sister affiliated group is one of the most inherently dangerous administrative problems faced in the President's tax message.

This entire matter of multiple corporations was thoroughly considered relative to section 1551 of the Internal Revenue Code by your eminent committee in 1951 and many capital investments, creative to our citizens, have been made in the assumption of reasonable continuity and stability in this field of taxation. I urge your eminent committee not to disrupt business organization without compelling reasons which do not appear at present.

RELATION ALSO TO THE PARENT-SUBSIDIARY GROUPS AS WELL AS "BROTHER-SISTER" AFFILIATED GROUPS

I am opposed to the proposal to limit the surtax exemptions of a group of related corporations to one exemption. Congress in 1951, in considering section 1551 of the Internal Revenue Code, gave to newly organized corporations which were organized as part of a program of expansion, a separate surtax exemption for each. This provision led to expansion. Expansion is what is now desired. Continuation of the present provision will encourage such expansion. Adoption of the Treasury provision on surtax exemption limits would curtail expansion with consequent loss of employment. If the Treasury provision were applied to existing corporations, this would be a breach of faith on the part of Congress and would unduly penalize stockholders who invested their capital in reliance on the existing provision. Denial of the surtax exemption to a small corporate enterprise, albeit a subsidiary, is economically unrealistic and discriminatory, since perforce, it must compete at the community level with other enterprises of surtax size and nature.

This is a matter which also deeply concerns small business.

I particularly refer to the well phrased testimony on March 12, 1963, of John A. Gosnell, general counsel, National Small Business Association where he stated:

"We have also had considerable comment about the proposal to eliminate the corporate surtax exemption in certain cases. This may appear to be primarily important to larger corporations, but it is pointed out that the expansion of small business by the acquisition of small corporations is a sound device, both from a legal and an economic standpoint, and it has a proven and useful place in the small-business segment of the economy. In cases where the separate corporation is established or acquired for a legitimate business purpose, the fact of common control does not destroy its local identity; its contribution to local economy, or its responsibilities under local statutes. It would seem that any attempt at this late day to make a fine distinction between those corporations which should pay the surtax, and those which should not, would result in many unjustified hardships and dislocations which would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to rectify. As a point of general tax law such a move would appear to be the imposition of an additional corporate tax on a discriminatory basis. The motive for the proposal is beyond us. The revenue would not be material, and the present safeguards are adequate to prevent abuse."

Let me assure you again that I am no expert, but the proposals so seriously affect the future of many businesses in my district, and the enterprising people who work there, that I must ask your serious consideration in opposing this recommendation.

ORDINARY INCOME ITEMS TREATED AS CAPITAL GAINS—TIMBER AND COAL

On page 145 of the President's 1963 tax message, we find the proposed treatment of capital gains on timber outlined. This involves a provision of section 631 and section 1231(b)(2) relating to timber and coal.

Under present law, a taxpayer who owns timber is accorded capital gains treatment upon the sale of the timber, whereby an economic interest is retained by such owner whether the taxpayer is making a casual sale or whether the taxpayer is in the trade or business of selling timber.

The new proposal seeks to allow an annual exemption to each individual taxpayer only up to $5,000 of timber sale income for the purposes of capital gains treatment, but amounts in excess of $5,000 would be accorded ordinary income treatment. I fully recognize the loopholes of the present law in connection with some real estate tax shelters, but I must outline to this great committee the damage which might be effected if the proposal is honored by the committee as stated by Secretary Dillon.

We must realize that tree farming has become a major industry in certain parts of America. The growth of this industry has been significant since World War II, and thousands of people are employed in the pulpwood and lumber industry, who otherwise would be unemployed because of the decline in row crop farming, and particularly cotton farming in the South and Midsouth. As a result of the capital gains treatment of timber transactions, not only have many people been able to go into the business properly expecting a profit, but, in addition, this means employment to those who work in the woods as producers of timber or pulpwood, or employees of those producers.

Thousands of people are now employed in paper mills in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and other Southern States. The proposal to limit, or put a ceiling on the capital gains expectations would be a blow to the future expectations or plans of this industry, possibly cause loss of jobs.

Frankly, we need this industry to replace the farming which the soil bank and mechanization have affected.

It is my opinion that capital gains offers the soundest procedure for taxing timber as a natural resource. It is the same for large and small producers, all growers of timber. If the treatment were only to large growers we might speak of special privileges but such is not the fact.

Perhaps the capital gains treatment which has been practiced was enacted in part to recognize the incentive for reforestation in America. Reforestation is expensive and we in Congress well know, for we have appropriated money for the soil bank and other programs. In addition, the capital gains treatment, we believe, acknowledges the risk from fire, insects, diseases, and other hazards in that long period of growth (pine pulpwood about 20 years) between planting and harvesting.

Timber growing is a unique and somewhat new enterprise in some parts of our Nation, which now knows heavy investments in this sort of farming; money is tied up for long periods of time during which there are hazards of fire, insect, and disease, which constitute potentials of physical and economic risk.

Much of the timber farming in the United States is affected by small private forest owners.

Until World War II economic circumstances were adverse to private investment in forestry and only limited progress was made in developing the permanent productive use of the three-fourths of the Nation's forest land in private ownership. The postwar period brought greatly changed economic conditions. Classifications established in the Revenue Act of 1943 in essence permitted capital gains treatment of revenues resulting from long-term increases in timber growth and value, regardless of the method used in disposing of the timber. This removed a major tax barrier to investment in forestry by timber-processing companies and by investors who retain an economic interest in the forest being cut as required by sound forest management. This was of fundamental importance in releasing the flow of investment into private forestry which has occurred during the postwar period. The major improvement in the Nation's timber supplies, the large-scale investment in wood-processing facilities with related permanent employment in many rural areas, and the watershed and recreational benefits derived from forest management which have been achieved on private lands during the last 20 years are directly traceable to this classification of timber revenues.

Private forest land is held in a wide variety of ownerships, ranging from small farm woodlots to large corporate holdings. The owners of the larger holdings have taken the leadership in the development of private forestry; progress has been slower on the small holdings. Equity requires comparable classification of timber revenues regardless of the size of holding. Removal of capital gains treatment from large holdings would penalize the very ownerships which have made the greatest progress in forestry.

Because of the long period of timber production, the greater part of the investments in timber growing which have been made since 1943 have not yet come to fruition. Good faith requires a continuation of the capital gains classification of timber revenues which was a condition of these investments.

Let me give you some idea of the farming business in my home county, Chester County, S.C.

Number acres land in Chester County, 377,000; number acres woodland, 259,000; number farms, 1,322; average size farm, 157.4 acres; percent farm acreage in woodland, 51.5; percent of woodlands in farm woods, 41.3.

Annual farm income in Chester County, $4,156,000; percent income from forest products, 18.2; forest income, $717,000.

Number board feet lumber sold: Pine, 11,700,000; hardwood, 3,600,000; annual income, $319,198.

Number sawmills operating in county, 12; number sawmill workers, 120; weekly sawmill payroll, $6,000.

Number cords pine sold, 57,113; number cords hardwood sold, 10,627; wood chips sold, 250 cars.

Pulpwood income: Pine, $371,234.50; hardwood, $26,567.50; chips, $60,000; total, $451,802.

Number companies buying pulpwood, 10; number pulpwood dealers, 8; number pulpwood workers, 300.

Additional income from pulpwood employment, $664,784; annual income from all forest products and related services, $2,359,784.

Number trees planted yearly: 1959, 1,964,000; 1960, 2,879,600; 1961, 2,580,500.

Number tree farmers, 17; acreage in tree farms, 44,207.

Number professional foresters in county: Private, 1; company, 12; Government, 4.

Let us recognize the fact that growing timber is a long-term risk for every owner. When a tree is cut, a capital asset is gone, no matter how it is sold. The 1944 law placed an owner who cuts his timber or disposes of it under a cutting contract on the same tax basis as an owner selling outright. This was recognition that all such owners are essentially doing the same thing and should receive the same tax treatment.

It takes 20, 50, or 100 years to grow timber. Land and investment are tied up. There are many risks. The Congress recognized that it would not be fair to tax the gain from long-term increase in value under these conditions as if it all occurred in the year when the tree is cut. To tax this long-term growth at steeply graduated income tax rates was confiscatory in effect.

The 1944 tax reforms recognized the national interest in growing and conserving timber. They removed an existing impediment to the practice of sustained renewal of timberlands.

Since the capital gain treatment recognizes the long-term risk and the slow accrual of capital value, owners are now conserving and reproducing timber at rates never before achieved in the Nation's history.

Timber capital gain taxation has proved itself to be in the national interest for nearly two decades.

It has removed inequities in prior law, resulting from different tax treatment of similar transactions.

Our forest resources are expanding.

America's forest owners, 4,500,000 in number, have as a group taken great strides in forestry management and improved the supply of timber, on a sustained yield basis, for the Nation.

Their output is vital to the national economy.

Under fair and equitable taxation, they can be counted on to increase our national wealth in forest resources, meet the national need for forest products, and provide an enduring source of tax revenue to the National Government.

IN CONCLUSION

There are other proposals I would touch on, but I have concentrated on those possibly affecting jobs in my district, my State. I would like to borrow from the fine statement of Hon. Luther H. Hodges, Secretary of Commerce, before the committee, February 6, 1963.

"In order to provide jobs for the unemployed, to accelerate the rate of economic growth and thus demonstrate to the rest of the world the dynamic strength of which we are capable, we must furnish greater incentives to the private sector to improve its performance. These incentives, I believe, are best provided by reductions in individual and corporate income taxes. The tax reduction approach to the solution of our present difficulty is two pronged. The reduction of the individual income tax rates in the middle and lower brackets will serve for the most part to increase consumption expenditures. These are the groups which spend the highest proportion of their incomes. With the expansion in consumer demand, idle plant capacity will be put back into operation and employment will increase. Corporate profits, which are especially sensitive to increases in the rate of plant utilization, will increase. Corporate profits motivate investment in new plant and equipment. Therefore, the gain in consumer spending will lead to greater corporate profits and more funds and incentive for investment.

"The second prong of the tax approach bears more directly on investment incentives. By reducing the tax rates on individuals in the upper brackets and on corporations, the motivation to exploit new opportunities in product and process investment is encouraged directly. Reduction of the corporate income tax to the recommended level will mean that Government is no longer the senior partner in sharing corporate profits. Furthermore, reduced income taxes mean greater cash flow for corporations.

"The President's tax program, therefore, would remove the overburden of taxation from the economy and provide the bigger markets and the greater incentives necessary for more vigorous economic growth."

Again let me assure you that I salute our President for the courageous approach to our tax problems. I hope to work with this committee in solving them. Thank you for listening to me today.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following newsletter of March 23, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman Bruce Alger, Fifth District, Texas, March 23, 1963)

THE STRUGGLE—CAPITALISM VERSUS SOCIALISM

The real struggle in the world today is between capitalism and socialism. The free world, and especially we in the United States have allowed the Communists to put us on the defensive and have made us afraid to say what we are fighting for. They have made capitalism a dirty word and we have let them get away with it. We cannot win the struggle for survival and the freedom of mankind until the people and Members of Congress have the courage to stand up and shout that we believe in capitalism, that the choice man must make is between capitalism and socialism. The victory between these two basic systems will decide whether or not man will be free, for only under capitalism can he be free; he can be only a slave under socialism. The time has come for us to stop being apologists for a system which has given mankind its greatest opportunity and freedom in the history of the world. We know, and it is time to say it out loud, that profits are good, not evil.

The people know what the world struggle is all about. Members of Congress know the real issue, but few have the courage to name the combatants in this world struggle. We see the failure to say what we are fighting for in the stalling tactics of the present session of Congress. Nearly 3 months of this session have gone by and little, if any legislation has been passed by Congress. Indeed, no measures are being reported from the committees. Why? Because practically all of the New Frontier sponsored legislation moves us farther along the road to socialism and Congress is stalling in an effort to save our free enterprise system—capitalism. The only way we can save it is to face the issue openly and squarely, call socialistic legislation socialistic and serve notice that we are out to save and strengthen the capitalistic system.

The first step is to proclaim fiscal responsibility. Cut Federal spending and balance the budget. To be positive in support of capitalism and freedom a Member of Congress, in my opinion, must say "no" to new welfare porgrams and increased Government spending. The budget can be cut. I included in the Congressional Record this week an excerpt from the U.S. News & World Report in which ways were listed to chop $3 billion from the President's spending programs. I suggested ways to chop off an additional $10.5 billion as follows: No public works until the budget is balanced; get the Government out of the power business; liquidate public housing; cut out federally sponsored urban renewal; eliminate Federal participation in depressed areas; cut the farm programs 20 percent; cut foreign aid by $3 billion; cut military authorizations 5 percent, and research 12.5 percent; knock $1 billion off the space program. This is the beginning of the way back to a sound and healthy economy, protection of the value of our dollar, renewed confidence in our system with the increased spur to individual and private initiative which are the weapons to win the war for capitalism and freedom.

DANGER SIGNS IN OUR DEFENSE STRATEGY

There are many danger signs in the various statements by the State Department and in the disarmament programs advocated by the White House and our military leaders. Each item in itself seems harmless, but pulling all the factors together a pattern seems to develop and in it I recognize a potential threat to the sovereignty and freedom of the United States. First, there was the establishment of the Disarmament Agency in the last session of Congress. Many Members of Congress voted for it because they believed it to be a valuable means of propaganda, but would mean nothing. I felt otherwise and voted against the disarmament resolution and said we should not give the world the impression that we were ready to disband our military forces so long as we were faced with a powerful enemy with a military machine dedicated to our destruction. Second, the now-famous State Department statement 7277, "Freedom From War," in which the suggestion is made that we turn our military forces over to the United Nations. Third, a new concept seems to be developing (U.S. News & World Report, March 25) to withdraw all our forces from Europe and Asia and create a Fortress America. It is this pattern that worries me and should worry the American people because we are not being told by the Kennedy administration of its plans—as a Member of Congress, I have to read about the development of a Fortress America in a magazine. Fortress America may be a sound concept, it seems to me, but let's talk it over. Members of Congress and the people should not be bypassed.

WHITHER THE UNITED NATIONS

If the American people are to lose their sovereignty to the U.N., what about a bill of particulars on the purposes of the U.N.? In recent research I am making there are further disturbing signs. The U.N. support of Communist slave states such as Cuba—the tendency of some of our representatives of the U.N. to swear greater allegiance to the international body than to the United States—the throwing the cloak of respectability around international gangsters such as Castro—the acceptance by the U.N. of international immorality in the conduct of government. Additional research has revealed to me direct conflicts between the U.N. Charter and the Constitution of the United States (examples: the charter delegates power to the Security Council to declare war. Under our Constitution only Congress can declare war for the United States. We saw this part of the charter in operation in the Korean war. The Security Council may regulate the kind and size of armaments for our national defense.

Since we have only one vote out of seven our sovereignty is in the hands of seven European and Asiatic nations whose interests are hostile to the United States, and our foreign policy would be in their hands. The charter destroys the Monroe Doctrine and scuttles the Pan American Union by subjecting them to the approval of European and Asiatic nations. We cannot continue to foster an international organization whose authority supercedes our own Constitution unless the people are told the whole truth about our relationship to the United Nations are given an opportunity to decide for themselves if they wish to trade our Constitution for the U.N. Charter. I am pointing out the danger points in this area so that the people may know about them for whatever action the people see fit to take.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN COSTA RICA?

There are no apparent results in the President's trip this week to Costa Rica. We provided no leadership except to squelch any action or desire toward action to eliminate communism from Cuba. Little militant action on the part of the leaders of Latin-American nations against Cuba was indicated. No commitments have been made by Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Chile to tighten up on air travel to Cuba. Frustration continues throughout South America. Out-and-out Communists, according to late news stories, do hold key posts in Brazil's Government. The leftists are due to cause trouble in Argentina in the June elections. Americans fear the Communists will score heavy gains in Chile's 1964 elections. Khrushchev continues to thumb his nose at the United States in his arrogant withdrawal of a handful of troops from Cuba and no guarantee that he intends to do more than that. The stage is now being set for the successful subversion by the Russian Communists of Latin America and South America. I raise these points now as a warning in the hope tragedy can be averted, much as I did my best to sound warnings in my newsletters and on the floor of the House for 22 months before Cuba was blown into a crisis by becoming the armed base for Khrushchev and communism in this hemisphere. Our foreign prestige continues to slide as the world sees us, under this administration, unable to lead the cause of freedom and unwilling to exercise domestic discipline required to bring about fiscal responsibility. In hearings before my Committee on Ways and Means I am now seeing the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American bankers, the NAM, all who have denounced deficit spending and an unbalanced budget now accepting them in order to get a tax cut. In the cause of freedom for all mankind, America must face up to the struggle—we must name the war as a war between capitalism and socialism and win the war for capitalism as only in such a victory can man truly be free.

Legislative History of Public Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of Subcommittee No. 3, of the Committee on the Judiciary, charged with the responsibility of preparing the United States Code and the District of Columbia Code, I am constantly concerned with methods of making the publication of the laws more understandable and useful.

I want to call to the attention of the House a most significant and valuable improvement in the publication of the laws by the General Services Administration; and I want to extend to the Administrator and to his staff in the Office of Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, responsible for this improvement, my warmest congratulations.

In my hand is a copy of Public Law 88–1, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. This print, which is popularly called a "slip law," is the initial publication of a Federal law upon enactment, and may be obtained at the National Archives. At the bottom of the page of this law is a legislative history, showing that this legislation was reported from the House Appropriations Committee, House Report No. 35, from the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senate Report No. 9, and that it was considered and passed by the House on February 27, 1963, and by the Senate on March 4, 1963—with a reference to volume 109 of the Congressional Record. This information, available for the first time as an addendum to the slip law itself, gives the essential information needed for research regarding the law. It will save untold hours of research. Without the information in this form it has, until now, been necessary for interested persons to have recourse either to the House Calendar or to the Congressional Record—which are not always readily available even here in Washington—presupposing that they have the necessary familiarity with those publications to enable them to know what to look for. From now on, with the guide published in the legislative history, that part of the research is already done and all that is necessary is to obtain the reports from the Superintendent of Documents and the Congressional Records for the days indicated.

I understand that the legislative history printed on the slip laws may be expanded in the future to give a reference to printed committee hearings on the legislation. In this connection, I hope that it will be possible for all committees to adopt a uniform simple method of identifying hearings—such as by serial numbers—so that only a brief reference to a serial number in the legislative history will be adequate. This would avoid lengthy descriptions of the subject matter of the hearings now frequently necessary to identify them.

I also understand that it may be planned to present the legislative histories in tabular form in the volumes of the statutes at large in the future. These volumes are, of course, the cumulation of the slip laws for each session. Incidentally, one of the recent improvements in the printing of the slip laws is the marginal reference to the volume and page of the statutes at large in which the particular law will ultimately be printed. Another recent improvement was in the numbering of the laws by incorporating a prefix indicating the number of the Congress. For example, this law is Public Law 88–1 and the next one will be Public Law 88–2. This system precludes the uncertainty that used to prevail when reference was made to, let us say, Public Law 601, without identifying the Congress.

I know that the Members and all other persons who must have recourse to legislative history join me in expressing this commendation to those responsible for these notable improvements.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Congressional Record at this point, a copy of Public Law 88–1—called a slip law—to illustrate these improvements.

PUBLIC LAW 88–1, 88TH CONGRESS, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 284, MARCH 6, 1963

Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963; namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Foreign assistance programs

Public Law 480

For an additional amount for "Public Law 480," to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation due to expenses and costs of sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies pursuant to title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1701–1709), $508,172,000, to remain available until expended.

Approved March 6, 1963.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

House Report No. 35 (Appropriations Committee).

Senate Report No. 9 (Appropriations Committee).

Congressional Record, volume 109: February 27, 1963, considered and passed House; March 4, 1963, considered and passed Senate.

President Kennedy's Chicago Speech—A Sound Warning to Both Democrats and Republicans About America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the people of Chicago had the great pleasure of entertaining President Kennedy, who flew there to dedicate O'Hare Field. Huge throngs greeted the President along the 22-mile route from O'Hare Field to the Conrad Hilton Hotel, where the President was honored at a civic luncheon arranged by Mayor Richard J. Daley.

The President took this occasion to sound a clear and decisive warning to the Congress of the United States and the people of this Nation that unless we start meeting the mounting problem of creating new employment opportunities for the millions of additional Americans coming into the labor force, this Nation could face very serious problems.

President Kennedy's prophetic Chicago speech, in my judgment, is one of the great pronouncements of this century. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the compelling facts marshaled by President Kennedy in his Chicago address should, above all, serve to unite the Democratic majority in the Congress from North and South into a common cause. But just as decidedly, Mr. Speaker, our Republican colleagues can no longer ignore the grim consequences that face our Nation if they do not face up to the staggering problem and instead oppose administration measures merely for the sake of partisan objection.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that every Member of Congress in both Chambers will take the time to read President Kennedy's vitally important message delivered in Chicago and then unite behind this common cause—not as Democrats and Republicans, but as Americans.

The President's address follows:

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S CHICAGO SPEECH—A SOUND WARNING TO BOTH DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS ABOUT AMERICA'S FUTURE

I am grateful for the warmth of your greeting. My gratitude to this city, and to your dynamic mayor, goes back many years; and I shall always welcome the opportunity to come once again to Chicago.

On each trip I see new signs of progress. Today we dedicated a great international airport. Already this city is becoming a great international seaport. And when I contemplate Chicago's role as a hub of American commerce—as a point of concentration for north, south, east and west—and as a point of convergence for rail, highway, air, and waterway travel—I am reminded that the decade in which we live seems to have been given a similar role in history. For in almost every sphere of activity, at home and abroad, countless rivers and streams which began long ago as tiny hidden springs are now all converging at once, in full floodtide, upon the turbulent sixties.

Today I want to talk about one tide that is causing us particular concern—the tide of manpower. That tide could be either favorable or ill fated. If this Nation can provide enough jobs to make the most of that flow, it will surely be a tremendous asset to our economic strength; and those nations which are short of manpower—such as most of those in Western Europe—will then envy America's good fortune.

But if this tide continues to flood our labor markets with pools of idle men, then, I must warn you, this Nation faces a decade of chronic trouble and recession—characterized by the economic waste and the human tragedy of unemployment, by higher welfare payments and weaker consumer markets, by recurrent problems of crime and delinquency and unstable labor relations. Already the issue of job security is placing an undue strain on collective bargaining—as those out of work demand negative solutions, such as import restrictions, featherbedding rules and a 35-hour week—and those still on the job grow less secure in the face of so much labor surplus.

That is why our No. 1 domestic concern is, and must be, jobs—jobs for the sixties, jobs for the tidal wave of men and women now flooding our labor market. It is a concern which requires the best efforts of us all—Federal, State, and local governments—management and labor leaders—builders of education and moulders of opinion.

Some may think it strange that the issue of jobs looms as large in the 1960's as it did in the 1930's, when the Nation was in depression. The difficulty then was an inordinately low supply of jobs to meet the manpower

demand. The difficulty now is an inordinately high manpower demand which exceeds the supply of jobs. But now, as then, every effort must be made to strengthen our economy so that the supply of jobs will equal the demand.

I would like to review with you today three of the principal causes of this manpower tide now converging upon our Nation. For if we can better understand these causes, we can see more clearly that unemployment in the sixties cannot be reduced by the usual platitudes and pious hopes. The effects of all three of these tides, I might add, can be felt right here in Chicago.

FARM

1. First is the labor released by the revolution in farm technology. Agriculture has long been this Nation's largest employer—engaging more people than steel, automobiles, public utilities and the transportation industry combined. But now one farmer can meet the food and fiber needs of 25 Americans, compared to only 7 at the turn of the century. High speed farm machinery is much more widespread, and much more efficient and automatic. New fertilizers, insecticides and research are multiplying the yield per acre and worker. Since 1947, our farms have increased their output by more than 30 percent at the very same time that the number of man-hours worked on our farms was cut nearly in half.

Farm employment during that period declined by 3 million—an average of 200,000 a year, comparable to the entire work force of Akron, Ohio, being thrown out of work each year.

In the last 2 years alone, farm employment dropped by 500,000 while farm production and farm income were both rising. It is estimated—as disturbing as it sounds—that not more than 1 out of every 10 boys now living on the farm will find full-time work in agriculture.

YOUTH

2. This leads us to the second growing tide of manpower—our Nation's youth. The crest of the postwar baby flood has swept through the elementary and secondary schools and is now about to engulf the labor force. Last year, for example, 2.8 million young Americans reached the age of 16—but this year there will be 3.8 million reaching that age. Altogether, in the 1960's 26 million new young workers will enter the labor market—an increase of 40 percent over the fifties and a far greater number than this country has ever had to train and absorb in any previous 10-year period.

Already workers under the age of 25, though they comprise less than one-fifth of the labor force, constitute more than one-third of the unemployed. Last year the unemployment rate for men age 25 and over was roughly 4.4 percent—but for those age 20 to 24, it was 9 percent; and for those age 14 to 19 it was a shocking 13 percent.

Although young people are staying in school longer than their fathers, the rate of school dropouts—4 out of every 10—is still far too high; for job openings for the untrained and the unskilled are declining, in factories and mines, on farms and railroads, in the construction and service industries. Moreover, the jobless rate is always highest among unskilled and semiskilled workers. In our modern society, even high school graduates find their skills too often insufficient. But Labor Department surveys show that their rate of unemployment is at least far below that of school dropouts, not only in the year of leaving school but in later years as well. The latest available survey also showed a rate of unemployment among college graduates, whose job opportunities are broadening continually, to be only one-fifth as high as it was among those who had not completed elementary school; but unfortunately, only 1 out of 10 finishes college.

In short, as challenging as it will be to provide first jobs for the 26 million new young workers entering the labor market in the 1960's, far more difficult will be the problems posed by the 7.5 million of them who will not have completed high school, including nearly 2.5 million who will not even have completed the eighth grade. I ask you to mark those figures well; for youth unemployment poses one of the most highly explosive social and economic problems now facing this country—and this city. In the last decade, for example, arrests of youth increased 86 percent. What will the figure be for the next decade, when the net increase of potential young workers in the labor force rises 15 times as fast as it did in the 1950's.

AUTOMATION

3. Finally, underlying all of these trends is a third phenomenon, both cursed and praised; and that is technological advance, known loosely by the name of "automation." During the last 6 years, this Nation increased its manufacturing output by nearly 20 percent—but it did so with 800,000 fewer production workers; and the gain in white-collar jobs did not offset this loss. Since the Second World War, the real output of the private economy has risen 67 percent, with only a 3-percent rise in man-hours. I do not wish to be misunderstood; increasing productivity and advancing technology are essential to our ability to compete and to progress—but we also have an obligation to create an additional 2 million jobs each year for those displaced by these gains.

This city is no stranger to these problems. You have seen your railroads laying off machinists and boilermakers as the proportion of diesel locomotives rose from less than 15 percent of all locomotives in 1947 to more than 97 percent today. You have seen your downstate coal mines laying off workers as new machinery makes it possible for 46 men to produce the coal dug by 100 workers in 1947. And you have seen your steel mills employ 79 men to produce the steel products which required 100 men only a short decade ago. (Chicago, I might add parenthetically, also provides the exception to this pattern—since it now takes 10 men to manage the Cubs instead of 1.)

This is not a blue-collar problem alone. Office and clerical workers are increasingly being displaced by automatic computers and processors. I know, for example, that the Farmers Home Administration processes 35 percent more loans per employee than it did only 2 years ago.

This administration intends to press ahead with its efforts for Government economy—but we must also expand the private economy to find jobs for all who are willing.

OTHER FACTORS

There are other trends affecting manpower in the 1960's, in addition to those I have mentioned:

Far more women are in the labor market than ever before, now that so many more of them live in urban areas, receive a better education, enjoy more laborsaving devices at home and find more acceptance in industry.

There are more older workers than ever before, and those who lose their jobs must endure an average period of unemployment that is far above the national average.

Job discrimination against Negroes continues to hurt every age and occupational group, with even skilled Negro workers finding that their race keeps them out of work much longer and more often than their white counterparts.

And particular communities, called distressed areas—46 out of our 150 major labor market areas in February—continue to be extra hard hit by persistent and substantial unemployment.

CHICAGO

All these trends you have seen in this city and State—workers displaced by automation, school dropouts roaming the streets, men looking for work who have left the farm or the mines or a railroad or a distressed area. You have your share of jobless Negroes and women and older workers and all the rest, even though, under Mayor Daley's hard-driving, hard-working leadership, this city is creating new jobs faster than most.

THE NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

The same is true on a larger scale of the Nation as a whole. Our civilian labor force grew by nearly 12 million during the last 15 years, but the number of jobs grew by only 10 million. In the last 5 years, we saw an annual increase of only 175,000 private jobs outside of agriculture, compared to 700,000 in each of the previous 10 years. Our total output (gross national product) grew at a rate of only 3 percent—while unemployment remained continuously at 5 percent or above. And last year's loss of man-hours, in terms of those willing but unable to find full-time work, was a staggering 1 billion workdays, equivalent to shutting down the entire country with no production, no services, and no pay for over 3 weeks. Some 14 million Americans had some unemployment in 1962. And 28 percent of last year's unemployed were out of work 15 weeks or longer—15 percent were out of work a full 6 months or longer. This Nation can do better than that.

The trouble is that each of these figures grows worse after each recession—and each one is bound to grow worse in the sixties as the labor force increases even faster, unless we take actions to reverse these trends and make the most of our manpower. Unless we step up our rate of growth—unless we create a supply of jobs that is more equal to the demand—our rate of unemployment will steadily and swiftly climb to the recession level of 7 percent, even without a recession.

Without full employment, consumer markets are below their potential. Without stronger consumer demand, plant capacity is not fully in use. Without full plant utilization, profit margins are reduced. Without higher profits, investment lags behind. And so the sagging spiral continues.

OUR MANPOWER PROGRAM FOR THE SIXTIES

Our task is to reverse this spiral—and no single magic solution will solve all of our manpower problems.

Above all, we need to release the brake of wartime tax rates which are now holding down growth at the very time we need more growth to create more jobs. Ten billion dollars more in tax savings, in the hands of American consumers and investors, as I have proposed to the Congress, will be multiplied many times in new markets, new equipment, new jobs, new payrolls and then still more consumption and investment.

As this decade is unique in terms of the trends converging on it, so is 1963 uniquely qualified to be the year we cut Federal taxes. Inflationary pressures are at bay. No world crisis strains our resources. The dollar is strong and respected. New investment incentives have been enacted. World raw material prices are stable. And the number of idle men and machines can clearly absorb more expansion.

But tax reduction alone is not enough if we are to attack unemployment in those areas and among those workers where the need is greatest.

Tax reduction alone will not employ the unskilled or bring business to distressed areas. And tax reduction alone is not, therefore, the only program we have offered.

To mention but a few:

We urgently need to improve our schools and colleges—to reduce the number of dropouts—to reduce the number of unskilled workers—to keep young people out of the labor market until they are ready for the jobs which automation creates, instead of those it is sure to replace.

We urgently need a new youth employment opportunities program, to give young people training and job experience, and to put their energies to good use.

We need to step up our efforts for aid to distressed areas, for the retraining of the unemployed, for more security for the aged, for improving our housing and our transportation industries, and for ending race discrimination in education and employment.

These are all controversial measures. They all take time to enact and take effect. But meanwhile the growing pool of manpower continues to grow, a burden that should be a blessing, a liability that could be an asset.

I have no doubt that these problems will someday be solved. The question is, Will they be solved in ways that impoverish us—with restrictions on the workweek, or on efficiency, or on competition? Or will they be solved in ways that enrich us—by expanding our economy and putting all hands to work? The choice is up to us all—to you in Chicago as well as to those of us in Washington. It depends on the will of the people as well as the will of the Congress.

Twenty-five hundred years ago the Greek poet Alcaeus laid down the principle which best sums up the greatness of Chicago.

"Not houses firmly roofed," he wrote, "or the stones of walls well builded, nay, nor canals and dockyards make the city—but men able to use their opportunities."

Chicago is blessed to have such men at its helm. And my fervent hope is that the United States of America, in meeting the needs of this decade, will also be peopled and governed by men able to use their opportunities.

Foreign Handouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the December 17, 1962, issue of U.S. News & World Report carried a splendid question and answer exclusive interview with our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [OTTO E. PASSMAN] on the subject of foreign handouts.

Mr. PASSMAN knows more about our foreign aid program than anyone else, either in or out of Congress. For the fiscal year 1964 budget he proposes a 50-percent cut in the appropriation for foreign aid.

I commend this interview to all who wish to be informed on a program which is rapidly undermining our economy.

HARD LOOK AT FOREIGN AID

(NOTE.—Are Americans getting their money's worth out of the foreign-aid billions? Representative OTTO PASSMAN, Democrat, of Louisiana, as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Foreign-aid Appropriations, has studied the U.S. program more thoroughly than any other one Member of Congress. Mr. PASSMAN has just returned from a world tour, taking a look at foreign aid in operation. What are his impressions now? In this exclusive interview, the Congressman tells of widespread waste and mishandling, and what he thinks should be done about it.)

Question. Mr. PASSMAN, after this latest checkup at firsthand, what is your impression of the foreign-aid program?

Answer. I'm completely disgusted with foreign aid. I can convince any reasonable man that we've substituted aid for trade, we've substituted appeasement for a firm and fair foreign policy. The people are taking advantage of us all around the world.

Question. In what way?

Answer. It is a waste of the wealth of the American taxpayer to pour foreign aid into nations that are enjoying a good standard of living and where they do not tax their own people on the same basis we tax ours—we who are giving the aid.

Let me give you an example:

I was in Bangkok, Thailand, having dinner with one of the wealthier merchants, and I asked the specific question: "If you should earn $100,000 net from your business, how much income tax would you pay?" He said: "I'd have to pay $12,000. It's robbery."

I said: "Do you realize that if an individual in the United States earns $100,000 net he must pay the Government $72,000?" He couldn't believe it.

Question. You spoke earlier of waste in foreign aid—

Answer. I mean money going in on a political basis rather than going in actually to help the masses. That's almost the pattern of aid throughout the world, with the exception of a few industrialized nations.

I find the masses in many countries just don't know anything about American aid. The aid is going to governments, not to the people. It's not accomplishing the objectives we wish for it.

The money isn't being used effectively. In almost any country you visit, you'll find a few powerful individuals who are anxious to get hold of cash—and it winds up in some bank in the United States or Switzerland. It doesn't do the country any good.

Question. Is there some way to straighten out these things?

Answer. We're trying to apply the Marshall plan formula that worked successfully in industrialized nations in Europe to primitive and underdeveloped nations around the world. Well, the fact is, you see, many of these people are perfectly happy with things as they are.

Question. Are there fields where aid can be beneficial in these primitive, underdeveloped areas?

Answer. The aid program, in my candid opinion, is uncontrolled and uncontrollable.

Question. What makes you say that?

Answer. A lot of the appointments are made on a political basis. Men are placed in charge of huge programs who have never met a payroll in their lives. They may be good, patriotic Americans—of course, they are—but they just don't know anything about what they're doing.

And many times the aided countries, themselves, don't do anything like their own share to help their people.

Question. Can you give us a concrete example?

Answer. Take Hong Kong. I recommended the full amount requested for the refugee program out there because of suffering caused by a typhoon. Well, when you speak of funds for refugees, that doesn't just mean food. It involves resettlement, sending the children to school, many other things. These take careful, knowledgeable planning.

Another thing. Hong Kong has some of the wealthiest merchants in the world. There are some 3,000 shops there and practically all of the money they take in is either in dollars or can be converted into dollars. Still, a man in Hong Kong who makes $100,000 pays only $3,000 in taxes.

So what we're doing is taxing ourselves into destruction to help people all over the world before we make sure that they are taxing their own people on the same basis as we tax the American people.

Question. Do you expect any major changes as a result of the appointment of David E. Bell to head foreign aid?

Answer. I do not. I don't think the Director has any more to do with running the aid program than I have to do with the doctors who run Walter Reed Hospital. He may make certain decisions as to levels of aid, but, in the end, it is an arm of foreign policy. We're handing out dollars from the top level. It's hard for any man who has been successful in life to take the punishment he has to take as Foreign Aid Director. We've had, if I'm not mistaken, 12 Directors in 14 years.

I think Mr. Bell is quite able. I think he should have the opportunity to do a thorough job and cut down on expenditures. If he does, I'll cooperate with him.

But if he's being put in there to find ways to spend money, I'm going to fight him with all the ability I have.

Question. How much will the administration want next year?

Answer. I hope the request is for far less. Since I became chairman I have had a foreign-aid goal of $2.5 billion annually. We did work it down to where we appropriated $2.8 billion, but then the thing started up again. This year it was almost $4 billion.

Question. Will you still work for that $2.5 billion ceiling

Answer. I shall. Since coming back, I'm just as disgusted with foreign aid as I've ever been—maybe more so. We've gotten to the point where we try to let the American dollar do everything in the world. The world has got to help itself.

The Test-Ban Trap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the March 18, 1963, Washington Report of the American Security Council, entitled "The Test-Ban Trap":

THE TEST-BAN TRAP

By 1958, the long Communist propaganda campaign to arouse world hysteria over nuclear fallout had succeeded even beyond expectations. Perhaps that is why the United States, during that year, plunged into the Geneva nuclear test-ban treaty negotiations without resolving the basic issue of whether any such treaty is in the fundamental U.S. national interest.

There have been attempts since then to resolve this basic question concurrently with a second vital one, namely, whether various proposed treaty terms under negotiation are safe. This has only served to confuse and obscure the answers to both.

The answers cannot be found in well-intentioned hopes for a less dangerous, more peaceful world; they must come from a realistic, hardheaded evaluation of today's risky facts of international life, among which are these:

1. The prime objective of the United States—survival of the Nation and its free world allies—is in direct conflict with communism's unalterable objective—world domination.

2. To deter Communist leaders from choosing nuclear war to quickly gain their

objective, U.S. national policy is to maintain a superior nuclear weapons arsenal capable of instant and deadly retaliation.

3. Risk-reducing international agreements are made difficult by communism's consistent record of treaty breaking, which caused former President Eisenhower to warn, "We can have no confidence in any treaty to which the Communists are a party, except where such a treaty provides within itself for self-enforcing mechanisms."

IS A TEST-BAN TREATY IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES?

Any consideration of this question must assume that an enforceable treaty can be negotiated with the Soviet Union, that is, one under which significant nuclear testing by the U.S.S.R. and the United States would be equally inhibited.

Test-ban adherents contend such a treaty would bring about a net reduction of the risks faced by the United States and its free world partners. Prudence, however, requires that this assertion be examined in the light of whether an actual net reduction in risks would occur, or whether new and different risks might be created which would leave matters worse off than before.

On this score, the reader will be left to his own evaluation of the arguments for and against a comprehensive treaty banning nuclear tests in all environments—the air, underground, underwater, and outer space. Here are the arguments most commonly heard:

Pro. A treaty will slow down the development of nuclear weapons by limiting research to the laboratories, unassisted by the important element of practical experimentation.

Con. The Soviets can keep top-quality scientists working under these conditions; a free society cannot. Thus a shift of nuclear wespons superiority would be inevitable. What happens then?

Pro. A treaty will slow down proliferation of nuclear weapons to other countries—holding down the chances of accidental war and the number of parties to be satisfied before workable arms control agreements can be reached.

Con. It is dangerously naive to believe one nation can "handle" another which is determined to achieve nuclear weapons—France, for example. Attempts by the United States to "handle" European allies will strain NATO to the breaking point.

Pro. A treaty will help to open up the closed Soviet society and establish an invaluable precedent for working out other and more comprehensive arms control agreements.

Con. It is idle to think a very small number of inspections in the U.S.S.R would have significant impact on the structure and attitudes of a Communist society.

Pro. A treaty will eliminate whatever danger exists from fallout from U.S. and U.S.S.R. nuclear weapons testing in the air.

Con. Only a simple atmospheric treaty is needed for this. Until the U.S.S.R. agrees, fallout from tests is the inevitable price for avoiding fallout from war.

Pro. A treaty will promote international good feeling and will spur arms control and disarmament.

Con. Artificially manufactured good will would generate euphoric pressures for schemes in fact disarming the West and only in theory disarming the Communists.

ARE TEST-BAN TREATY PROVISIONS UNDER PRESENT CONSIDERATION SAFE?

Whether or not a study of the pros and cons leads to a conclusion that a test ban treaty is undesirable, the U.S. Government is in the process of negotiating one. Thus it becomes pertinent to inquire: Will provisions the United States now wants to put into the treaty stop the U.S.S.R. from conducting significant nuclear tests and clandestinely capturing nuclear weapons superiority?

The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is writing a new draft treaty for submission at Geneva this spring. During recent hearings of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the draft's "enforcement" provisions were outlined as:

1. Cheat detection machinery capable with fair reliability of spotting underground tests of 3 kilotons or larger in geologic formations of alluvium;

2. Seven "on-site" inspections annually on Soviet soil of "suspicious" events which can be detected; and,

3. Relatively unreliable machinery to detect cheating in space.

We need not examine here the possibilities of cheating in space or at yields above 3 kilotons. This is simply because the draft contains at least three other bigger and more attractive holes through which the Soviets could sneak forward secretly to surprise nuclear superiority and its equivalent: world domination.

HOLE 1: UNDERGROUND TESTS BELOW 3 KILOTONS

A parade of witnesses told the Joint Committee that tests underground—singly or in series—below 3-kiloton yield simply cannot be detected at all. In this testing range the United States would forego wholly any and all weapons development and, as a practical matter, simply trust to the Soviets to keep their word not to carry on undetectable tests and secretly develop nuclear weapons of vast military significance.

These are the significant weapons which Maj. Gen. A. W. Betts, the AEC's director of military applications, told the Joint Committee could be clandestinely tested and developed in this undetectable area:

1. Relatively low-yield weapons of the tactical type.

2. Much high-yield battlefield tactical weapons by extrapolation from explosions as small as 1 kiloton without the necessity for proof testing.

3. At least one-half of all strategic weapons of all yields and types of interest to the military—also without the need for proof testing.

As an indication of where weapons development interest lies, General Betts stated that about 50 percent of all actual U.S. underground testing in Nevada is carried out in this low, undetectable, below 3-kiloton range.

HOLE 2: DECOUPLED UNDERGROUND TESTS

The simplest expedient of conducting tests in underground cavities drastically muffles their seismic effect. Shock waves from the explosion are decoupled from the surrounding earth. In this manner, seismic signals of 10 kilotons to 30 kilotons can be reduced far below the 3-kiloton threshhold of nondetectability.

General Betts authoritatively told the Joint Committee that by this means a cheater, without any possibility of detection, could develop a substantial fraction of all large yield strategic weapons of military interest. The remaining one-half of tactical weapons not sneaked through hole No. 1 could, of course, be sneaked through this hole.

HOLE NO. 3: SURPRISE ABROGATION

Surprise abrogation is possibly the most serious of all holes in the new test ban treaty draft. Even Disarmament Agency Administrator William C. Foster admits surprise abrogation might put us "as much as 18 months behind in our readiness to test." He minimizes its effect by saying:

"The Government will make it a matter of national policy to maintain readiness to test, and to provide funds necessary to keep competent scientific talent available. Under these circumstances, our scientists should retain incentives to continue nuclear weapons research and our weapons laboratories should function effectively."

This, however, is wishful thinking. The best answer to it comes from President Kennedy himself. On March 2, 1962, in announcing test resumption at that time, he said:

"But in actual practice, particularly in a society of free choice, we cannot keep top-flight scientists concentrating on the preparation of an experiment which may or may not take place on an uncertain date in the future. Nor can large technical laboratories be kept fully alert on a standby basis waiting for some other nation to break an agreement. This is not merely difficult or inconvenient—we have explored this alternative thoroughly, and found it impossible of execution."

In summary, there is no rational ground to argue that the test ban treaty draft soon to be offered by the United States is safe—there is more ground to argue that it is not even sane.

CRAIG HOSMER,
Member of Congress, California.

A Salute to Sacony and S. Augstein & Co., Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 25, 1963

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1963, I was privileged to attend the celebration marking two decades in South Carolina for Sacony Manufacturing Co., Inc. On that occasion, along with Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, I flew to Cheraw and there visited the Cheraw Division of the Sacony Manufacturing Co. Later that afternoon I was privileged to stand in the receiving line at the reception when many of the citizens of Cheraw gathered for the purpose of speaking to the various guests. At 7:30 in the Cheraw armory an enormous banquet was held, and 500 people met to do honor to Sacony Manufacturing Co., S. Augstein & Co., Inc., and to salute the members of the Sacony family who have contributed to our growth for 10, 15 years, and more. It was a happy and festive occasion, and pins were given to those with 10 and 15 years of service. The pins were distributed by Mr. Sidney Augstein, president, and chief executive officer of S. Augstein & Co., Inc.

After the national anthem, a most appropriate invocation was given by Rev. H. Dwight McAlister, of Cheraw. The Honorable Reginald R. Sipe, mayor pro tempore, city of Cheraw, delivered the address of welcome in the absence of Mayor Russell Bennett, who had to be out of town on business. Mr. Thomas E. Hassett, Jr., president of Sacony Manufacturing Co., Inc., made appropriate remarks and presented to Mr. Adolph M. Augstein, chairman of the board of directors, a memento from the many officials and employees of Sacony, who were delighted to do him honor and pay him homage on the occasion.

Mr. Adolph M. Augstein then made an address which was followed by the presentation of the gold service pins by President Sidney Augstein. The list of those receiving the pins follows:

Cheraw—10 years: Loyd Allen, Martha Ammons, Dora Bailey, Ruby Baker, Ruby Baucom, Gladys Bone, Geneva Braswell, Edythe Brigman, Eva Mae Brigman, Annie Brock, Christine Brock, William Brown, Dorothy Bruce, Myrtle Campbell, Uzell Campbell, Annie Sue Carpenter, Allen Cassidy, Ramona Cassidy, Emma Jean Chapman, Flora Chavis, Grace Chavis, Mattie Cheves, Vernie Clark, Catherine Crawley, Cora Lee Curry, Lucy Deese, Eva Mae Dixon, Clara Mae Driggers, Mary Driggers, Kathryn Easterling, Rose Evans, Geneva Freeman, Doris Gardner, Edith Gardner, Jean Gaskins, Joan Gaskins, Jayne Gentry, Clyde Hair, Sue Harpe, Mary Etta Keith, Clyde Kimrey, Ruth Kimrey, Lawrence King, Kermit Q. Kirby, Tululah Knight, Charles Kudrna, Edna Lee, Oscar Lewis, Janie Livingston, Nellie Lofton, Geneva Lowrey, Margaret Mathis, Gertrude McDonald, Edith Miller, Alice Moore, Hester Moore, Nora Morris, Lucille Phillips, Betty Margie Pruitt, Virginia Quick, Mary Ruth Rivers, Nezzie Sings, Ethel Spencer, Robert Tanner, Clyde Tolson, Ethel Tolson, John Tucker, Ruby Turnage, Doris Wallace, Jessie Wallace, William Wallace, Ruby Watts, Margaret White, Thelma White, Ophelia Wood, and Irene Wooten.

Fifteen years: Louise Barfield, Beatrice Boatright, Doris Brigman, Viola Bruner, Ruby Butler, Mary Chapman, Victoria Crould, Ruth Culbreth, Mildred DeBerry, Mary Lee Eddings, Evelyn Fisher, Louise Frazier, Eva Graham, Grace Hall, Viola Mathis, Grace McDonald, Pearl McDonald, James McQuaige, Sr., Jaine Parker, Sarah Quick, Nelle Rivers, Josephine Russell, Sue Spease, Elizabeth Strickland, James Stuard, Howard Thomas, Bertha Tilley, and Virgie Wallace.

Chesterfield—10 years: Ethel Adams, Evelyn Adams, Ola Baker, Almeter Brantley, Mary Brantley, Mary Brock, Nell Burch, Frances Burr, Lucy Burr, Maggie Davis, Margaret Davis, Katie Lee Deese, David Douglas, Mildred Douglas, Evelyn Eddins, Barbara Evans, Marguerite Gaskins, Ruth Gaskins, Betty Harpe, Joyce Hinson, Mary Huneycutt, Flora Huntley, Martha Huntley, Mary Huntley, Bessie Lee Jackson, Hallie James, Sally Johnson, Otis Jones, Alberta Jordan, Betty Jordan, Melba Faye Jordan, Marie Kirkley, Mary Lee, Clara Belle Lisenby, Leila Lisenby, Mary Ella Lisenby, Mildred Lisenby, Vivian Lisenby, Eva Mills, Nell Moore, Mary Pate, Nealie Polson, Mary Raffaldt, Carolyn Rhyne, Alma Rivers, Betty Rivers, Elizabeth Rivers, Ralph Rivers, Leila Rollins, Anthel Sellers, Daisy Sellers, Essie Sellers, Ruby Sellers, Vera Sellers, Sara Shaver, Emma Mae Smith, Margaret Smith, Ruby Smith, Ruth Stroud, Marion Teal, B. Thurman Teal, Mary Vaughn, Geraldine Watson, Eleanor White, Eva White, and Leatha White.

Fifteen years: Bessie Oliver and Olivia Watson.

Manning—10 years: Maggie Alsbrook, Cecil Anderson, Margaret Ardis, Frances Broadway, Janie Campbell, Emma Clark, Eunice Clark, Edith Cook, Frances Evans, Mary Evans, Minnie Evans, Sally Gardner, Caddie Gibbons, Aurelia Green, Edna Hodge, Ella Hodge, Rachel Hodge, Mary Johnson, Coline Kennedy, Jewell Langston, Anna Lowder, Corrie Mae McElveen, Mary McRoy, Virginia Melton, Helen Morris, Vista Peebles, Azilea Plowden, Catherine Prescott, Corine Rhodus, Annie Richbourg, Louise Richbourg, Edith Ridgeway, Cornelia Spigner, Ola Spigner, Dorothy Strange, Lucy Tarte, Lila Mae Thames, Corrie Thigpen, Liffie Thigpen, Richard Thigpen, Ruth Timmons, Hummin Tobias, and Luvenia Welch.

Pageland—10 years: Annie Allen, Betty Anderson, Laura Brock, Inez Byrd, Nell Carnes, Vera Cato, Ellen Clark, Evelyn Clark, Martha Clark, Crissie Clontz, Letha Donahue, Loretta Eubanks, Allie Evans, Henrietta Evans, Cleo Funderburk, Eva Funderburk, Marion Funderburk, Eunice Haithcock, Nettie Haithcock, Blondell Hamilton, Wilma Hancock, Azilee Hicks, Lavinia Hinson, Paul Hunter, Harry Jackson, Curtis Jenkins, Bessie Lee Johnson, Marsha Kelly, Lois Knight, Estelle Laney, Worth Lee, Theda Lynn, Cora Mangum, Johnnie Medlin, Virginia Mills, Joanna Nicholson, Lucy Nicholson, Mae Oliver, Mary Outen, Nelle Pigg, Lucy Price, Margaret Rallings, Gladys Rivers, Azilee Robertson, Grace Rogers, Bessie Rollings, Evelyn Rollings, Ola Rollings, Violet Rollings, Flora Rollins, Blanche Rorie, Winona Rorie, Maude Rushing, Clara Short, Grace Shrum, Annie Sims, Leila Sullivan, Cora Taylor, Mary Taylor, Grace Terry, Gladys Thomas, Minor Threatt, Mary Lois Timmons, Gladys Turner, Lessie Walters, and Helen Watts.

Fifteen years: Ovie Agerton, Christine Brewer, Mary Broome, Mildred Byrd, Henrietta Carter, Ethel Courtney, Mae Courtney, Vera Gibson, Lucy Griggs, Eva Gulledge, Ella Hancock, Lela Hicks, Jane Huneycutt, Bessie Jackson, Cloria Kirkley, Mae Laney, Bertha Little, Lillie Mangum, Mary Lee Maples, Janie Nash, Addie Price, Leona Price, Claire Robbins, Azilee S. Robertson, Nell Robinson, Rosa Robinson, Lee Roy Rollings, Lena Rollings, Thelma Rollings, Vinnie Rollings, Pearl Rorie, Mary Sanders, Zula Smith, Thelma Sutton, Allie Terry, Lennie Threatt, Willie Threatt, and Henry Watts.

Appropriate remarks were made by the Honorable Donald S. Russell, Governor of the State of South Carolina, who told of the happiness of our people in having Sacony as part of the South Carolina industrial family and pledged the continuing cooperation of the State of South Carolina in Sacony's magnificent production and posture.

As a pleasant and welcome surprise, Mr. Sidney Augstein presented to Mr. L. C. Wannamaker, dedicated legal counsel for the company, an appropriate plaque. This plaque saluted the wonderful legal services Mr. Wannamaker has rendered to the company over the 20-year period of its efforts in South Carolina. Mr. Wannamaker then introduced the Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON, U.S. Senator from the State of South Carolina, who told of the coming of Sacony to South Carolina when he was Governor. He recited the incidents surrounding the visits to the Governor's office when he was Governor and not only welcomed Sacony to South Carolina, but pledged the cooperation and effort on behalf of the State of South Carolina. Then Senator JOHNSTON took occasion to salute the Augstein family, whose significant history is intertwined with the company presently giving employment and production in South Carolina, and I am sure I speak the feeling of those present when I say that his address was heartwarming, appropriate, and inspiring. I include Senator JOHNSTON's address. It was preceded by a magnificent introduction by Mr. L. C. Wannamaker, whose very cadence reflected the happiness of the occasion and his delight in participating. The address of Senator JOHNSTON is as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR OLIN D. JOHNSTON

Caston, I am not quite sure what you want me to do for you but whatever it is, you let me know because I guess I will have to come through after all those nice things you said about me.

Governor Russell, Mayor Bennett, Mr. Adolph Augstein, and Mr. Sidney Augstein; and other distinguished guests: When I was first asked to attend this 20th anniversary celebration, I hesitated to agree to deliver any speech because I have been so close to the development and life of the Augstein Industries in South Carolina that I thought I might be a little handicapped, or you might say prejudiced, in what I would say.

Today in South Carolina when a great percentage of our people in business, government, and industry think in terms of the industrial growth of our State, we like to pat ourselves on the back, rightfully so, and talk about the miraculous changes that have taken place in our economy as a result of our efforts to bring new industry into our State.

Too often we fail to pat the backs of those who in the early days of our industrial development had the foresight and the pioneering spirit to come into our agricultural area and promote industry. Industry begets industry and I feel that today we owe a deep debt of gratitude to companies such as Sacony, headed by Mr. Augstein, for helping us in South Carolina to grow industrially.

Twenty years ago when Adolph Augstein first came to South Carolina, surveyed our assets and liabilities, I was in my second term as Governor of South Carolina. We had been fighting the freight rate battle and had established the first State development board, the industrial commission, labor department, as well as our ports authority and other institutions looking toward industrial development. Caston, many of the industries we have brought to South Carolina in recent years probably would not have come here if such men as the late Senator Jim Leppard, of Chesterfield and yourself, as legislators, had not followed my recommendations as Governor, and passed laws creating the labor department, the workmens compensation law, and other similar progressive acts necessary for a good industrial climate. But we did not have all the anwers to the industrialists who came into our State wondering whether or not they should move or start new industries within our borders. Anyone starting a new industry in a primarily agricultural society, necessarily took a certain risk in their development. Sacony is one of those industries which helped to lead the way for other industries.

In our early development years we pointed with pride to Sacony as an example of what other industries could do in our primarily agricultural economy. We looked to Sacony as one of our examples of success. I know Sloan Gable with the State development board can well remember in those early days how Mr. Augstein and Sacony helped us with the many industrial prospects who came to South Carolina. Once we had them inside a Sacony mill we let Mr. Augstein and his people do all the talking. We couldn't have hired better salesmen to help us get new industry to South Carolina. So you can see, Sacony has played a principal part in the overall industrial development of our State.

When Sacony located in South Carolina in 1945 the war had ended and it was before the great South Carolina industrial development revolution.

Today Sacony employs over 2,500 people in Pageland, Chesterfield, Bethune, and Manning plants, and the future, because of wise planning and cooperation on local levels, continues to be bright. Throughout these 20 years of growth in South Carolina, I have maintained close personal relations with Sacony and from time to time have been involved in some of the problems and some of the jobs that have come the way of Sacony.

Many people who hear the name Sacony, think of it in terms of just another plant or another industry and another payroll and another source of tax revenue, but the impact on our economy goes far beyond just these factors.

I guess people know more about Sacony through its products than they do about Sacony. Sacony has established high standards of plant operation and relations with employees. From the first day of its operation until now, Sacony's record in South Carolina has never been marred by any labor-management dispute. This speaks well for management and for those employed in these plants.

Sacony represents the kind of industry South Carolina needs and wants. We are glad in South Carolina that we had something to offer Sacony, but let it never be said that South Carolina has not been thankful for what Sacony has given her. I speak in terms of South Carolina because it takes the whole State to cooperate and keep an industry operating successfully and smoothly and to remain on its feet.

But certainly I cannot commend the relationship between Sacony and our State without singling out the people of Chesterfield County who cooperated in this pioneer venture 20 years ago. What the people in Chesterfield County did in cooperation with Sacony equals in contribution to our entire State's industrial growth to what Sacony contributed. The harmonious relationship and the success of Sacony in Chesterfield County has been a living example for other areas of our State to follow. No section of our State has met the challenges of industrial expansion and contributed to our State's growth in a more splendid manner than Chesterfield County.

Sacony is one company that has spanned the entire postwar industrial growth era of our great State, and I predict they will continue on matching their growth and success with our State's growth and success throughout the coming years.

I think I should cite here the executive management of S. Augstein & Co., Inc., and Sacony Manufacturing Co., Inc. They are as follows:

S. Augstein & Co., Inc.; executive management: Chairman of the board of directors, Mr. Adolph M. Augstein; president and chief executive officer, Mr. Sidney Augstein; corporate secretary, Mrs. Carolyn A. Winik; treasurer-controller, Mr. Leon Reinharth; vice president, manufacturing division, Mr. Thomas E. Hassett, Jr.; vice president, women's wear division, Mr. Arthur R. Travis; vice president, assistant to chairman of the board, Mr. Saul N. Pollack; director, children's wear division, Mr. Irwin Alfin; director, fabric division, Mr. Albert S. Baris; and director, sportswear division, Mr. Chester S. Strasser.

Sacony Manufacturing Co., Inc.; executive management: President, Mr. Thomas E. Hassett, Jr.; manager, quality control division, Mr. Charles G. Kudrna; manager, shipping and warehouse division, Mr. William J. O'Donnell; manager, Cheraw cutting division, Mr. Kermit Q. Kirby; manager, Cheraw sewing division, Mr. Clyde Hair; manager, Chesterfield sewing division, Mr. Otis M. Jones; manager, Chesterfield special manufacturing division, Mr. David F. Douglas; manager, Manning sewing division, Mr. Harold Lee; and manager, Pageland sewing division, Mr. Linwood Zeigler.

The young and vigorous president of S. Augstein & Co., Mr. Sidney Augstein, made a most significant address as part of the festivities of the occasion. He recalled the ambitions and the dedication of his family, and in the audience were his father, mother, and his sister. Rather than try to embellish his statements, I include at this point the complete text of his remarks:

REMARKS OF SIDNEY AUGSTEIN AT CHERAW, S.C.

Honored guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I don't need to tell you how proud we are that you have taken the time to come here tonight to break bread with us, and remind us how warm and hospitable the people of South Carolina can be. It was Emerson who said: "Hospitality must be for service not for show." Certainly the hospitality of South Carolinians is one of service and the manner in which you extend it is gratifying indeed.

When we first came to this State 20 years ago, there were, undoubtedly, some among you who were dubious about the establishment of a factory to make women's and children's apparel. There has always been a certain precariousness about the apparel trades, a doubt that any given company can long endure. Justification for this attitude lies, no doubt, in the industry records which show that the average length of company life in the apparel trades is less than 10 years.

I am sure that you recognized something in Sacony, even 20 years ago. At that time we had been in business for over 50 years. I for one am ready to admit that the very real assistance which you gave us has made it possible for us to chalk up more than 70 years of continuous operation, something rare in the apparel trades.

But I want to stress that we are in an important industry, one that is often underrated in a Nation that has become accustomed to the workings of giant corporations; where total business and profits are measured in billions or hundreds of millions of dollars.

By contrast there are no apparel manufacturers who can show as much as $100 million in annual sales, maybe a half dozen have passed the $50 million mark, and only a handful do better than $10 million.

I repeat, we are in an important industry, nevertheless. It is one essential to the welfare of the Nation, and one that we can be proud of even though the individual producing units are relatively small.

Will there ever be a General Motors in the fashion industry? I doubt it. Sacony will grow and so will other apparel manufacturers, but not to a point where any one will ever account for more than 2 or 3 percent of total fashion industry sales.

As apparel producers, we are doing something more than just covering the human body; we are helping the wearer to create an image of good grooming and, I like to think we are helping to uplift her spirit to give a sense of security and well-being.

There is a subtleness in this business that precludes the use of any fully automated process. A good apparel style is like a work of art, but not a work or art that can be reproduced on a printing press. Each garment has in it, a little bit of the maker, his skill, his concern, a little bit of his love for humanity.

Women's apparel alone is a $12 billion industry in the United States. This is at the wholesale level, our level. Including infants' and children's and men's and boys', the figure would easily reach over $20 billion annually. Expenditures for apparel at the retail level are probably in excess of $31 billion a year.

This Nation boasts of the highest standard of living in the world. This is reflected in the expenditures our people make, not only for the essentials of living but for luxuries as well.

Expenditures are now running at a rate of $360 billion a year. Clothing stands high on the list of articles that consumers buy, and contrary to what many think, there is more money spent for the purchase of clothes than the purchase of automobiles. Clothing expenditures are also greater than those for furniture and household equipment.

The late Thorstein Veblen, a brilliant critic on modern business, wrote: "The material framework of modern civilization is the industrial system, and the directing force which animates this framework is business enterprise."

I quote Veblen only to spotlight something we are often reluctant to admit; namely, the goal of business is to make a profit. I believe this is a legitimate goal, but—and it is a big but—if this were our sole aim, we will have failed. We must take into account other human goals, and the hopes and aspirations of the people involved, their friendship, and the need to help the individual achieve a sense of personal identity, a sense of belonging to this endeavor.

It has been said that the ultimate goals in life are often achieved by indirect means. We have among our goals the desire to create products of true economic worth, to offer the buyer a genuine advantage, and serve him better than anyone else. In the Sacony philosophy there is the axiom that building of customer loyalty will pay off.

And we will invest in people, particularly those who work with us, we will seek to create a climate in which they will want to work with us, where they can do the best they have in them to do.

We believe that a company of this kind will prove more profitable in the long run than one in which the "fast buck" is the sole objective, regardless of human values.

We hope that we shall never get so big that we will be out of touch with those who work with us. It is physically impossible, of course, for management to come into daily contact with everyone in our factories, but we want you to feel that we are establishing policies that do fulfill our obligation to you, no matter what your task, and that our supervisory personnel will be ever mindful of these policies.

Someone facetiously once said: "A corporation is an ingenious device for obtaining individual profit without individual responsibility." I disagree. Rather I would subscribe to the thought expressed recently by Mr. Greenewalt, chairman of the Du Pont Co., and I quote him:

"A corporation is not a cold legalistic instrument existing without heart or emotional involvement, but a sensitive human institution, reflecting nothing more or less than the human cells and sinews of which it is composed."

Mr. Greenewalt also expressed a simple truth in successful business operation that we often lose sight of:

"The difference between the notably successful institution and one whose record is simply run of the mill," he said, "is seldom very great. It does not consist of brilliant and inspired flashes of genius—certainly not over a considerable period of time. The difference rather is the small increment of extra performance diffused over a very large number of individuals at all levels of the organizations."

Looking at the business prospects for 1963, I would say that we certainly will have to expend a little extra effort to insure a successful year. The American woman, in large city and small hamlet, is probably more fashion conscious than ever before. And more quality conscious, too. This does not mean that she is looking for the high price items. She expects quality in the medium-range apparel too.

The women we are concerned with mainly are those between the ages of 17 and 35. This market totals about 21 million. While this is less than 20 percent of the entire population, women in this age group are responsible for purchasing 35 percent of all women's apparel.

The children's market is constantly expanding. The segment of this market that we are concerned with is even larger than our women's market. There are 24,500,000 girls in ages from 1 to 12 years. The birth rate now is well over 4 million a year, soon it will be 5 million, and we can figure that about one-half will be girls.

But most important is the consumer's ability and willingness to buy. We haven't much doubt about his ability to buy. Personal income is at peak levels. There is the prospect of a cut in Federal income taxes that will put many more billions of dollars into the hands of the consumer.

In evaluating prospects for apparel, we never know for sure whether the consumer will show greater or less favor for soft goods as against hard goods, or whether he will decide to save more and spend less.

If we are going to forge ahead with Sacony products, we must make them well and make them attractive to insure that we get a fair share of the soft goods dollar. And this is what will take that little extra effort.

What about the future of Sacony? I can say that we have every intention of expanding our lines and our markets. We are not excluding the possibility of merging other apparel companies into our own. This will pose no danger for our factories in South Carolina, rather it will most probably bring more business and employment to this area.

I might add that apparel manufacturing has become an important industry in South Carolina. Plants turning our men's, women's, and children's apparel employ over 30,000 people, or more than 13 percent of all factory employees.

Our roster of employees who have been with us 10 to 20 years not only indicates that we have been here a long time but demonstrates a real measure of stability. With your help, we will continue to grow.

Thank you.

We welcomed Sacony to South Carolina 20 years ago. Our purpose on the evening of March 15 was not only to celebrate the 20th anniversary, but to assure Sacony our welcome continues, that they are an appreciated part of our industrial family, and to wish for them many more decades of successful production in South Carolina.

As we saluted those employees who have given such fine service over the years, we acclaimed also those who have made possible the fine record of this company. I hope I will have the privilege of attending the 30-year dinner, and many more.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Harley S. Hill, Wesleyan Methodist Church, Herrickville, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 1:1, 2: *Blessed is the man who walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful.*

Our Father which art in heaven hallowed be Thy name. We come to Thee in the name of Thy Son, Jesus. The poet wrote: "In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born across the sea, with a glory in His vision that transfigures you and me. As He died to make men holy so He died to make men free." O, God, build this Nation not with second-growth timber, but with virgin growth made strong by the north wind until our taproot gets down to the solid rock of God's divine grace. The Bible states about a nation which should be the head and not the tail. O, God, do not allow our eyes to become besmeared so that we cannot see the way Thou hast marked out for us, nor our minds dulled with selfishness and greed, nor our ears deaf to Thy voice.

The Bible says, "Ye shall hear a voice behind thee, saying 'This is the way, walk ye in it.' "

There will be such voices heard, but may we listen only to Thy voice. We believe that Thou hast raised us up as a nation to make a safe home for the free and the brave.

Bless Mr. Kennedy, our President; help us to hold up his hands in all that is right and strong. Bless the Speaker of the House, each officer, and each Representative. Give each divine wisdom to know the right and the wrong.

Blot out as a thick cloud our transgressions and, as a cloud, our sins.

In the name of the triune God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 25, 1963, was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for 1964.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 3120 and H.R. 3845.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

ANNUAL REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Un-American Activities have permission to file the annual report of the committee for 1962.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE ACT OF 1963

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, at the request of President Kennedy, I introduced H.R. 3920, the Hospital Insurance Act of 1963. As I am sure all of you are aware, this is the President's proposal for health insurance for the aged under the social security insurance system. I am today proud to state that 21 of my distinguished colleagues from the State of California have introduced identical bills. I also am very proud to state that a number of my colleagues in the House already have introduced identical bills and, I am confident, there will be others who will do so as time goes by.

I think it is a significant development that 22 Members of the California delegation are now cosponsors of this exceedingly important legislative proposal and that, as of the present time, a total of 49 Members of the House are sponsors of the bill, or bills quite similar in purpose. I am gratified that this is the case.

I should like to take this occasion to again state that this legislation in my judgment will solve a problem which becomes more pressing with each passing month, and it deserves early and careful consideration. This is meritorious and fiscally sound legislation. Its adoption has been far too long delayed. I am urging that it be given executive consideration by the Committee on Ways and Means as soon as we complete our current schedule on the President's 1963 tax message. I am hopeful we will be successful in this endeavor. I now invite and urge other Members of the House who have not already done so to join with me in sponsoring and working for the early enactment of this legislation. Illness among the aged, and its aftermath of financial crises and ruin, wait for no one. We can and should act now on this bill.

ATTACKS ON FOREIGN SHIPS BY EXILES FROM CUBA

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am reading with increasing concern of attacks being made on foreign ships by exiles from Cuba who are presently in the United States.

These attacks are directly in contravention of U.S. policy and have been made in spite of repeated requests from high Government officials of the United States to desist. The only purpose that can possibly underly these attacks is to create incidents which will involve the people of the United States in an all-out shooting war.

To put it very bluntly, these Cuban exiles have been admitted to the United States in order to give them a place of asylum. We must now make it clear to them that we will immediately expel from these shores any Cuban exiles who so deliberately flaunt the policy of our Government.

We in the United States certainly are determined to oppose Castro-Cuba and Communist intrusion in this hemisphere. However, we work through our duly constituted leaders in the tradition of the democratic self-government. Any Cuban exile who presently finds haven in this country should get out immediately if he will not abide by the processes of orderly democratic government.

A STRANGE POLICY DECISION

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Mr. WYMAN, performed a public service on Monday last in directing the attention of the House to the attendance of a succession of Yugoslav officers at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College.

As our colleague pointed out, and as I should like to reemphasize, these Communist officers were not sought as students by the Army. The Army was required to accept them by decision of higher authority. No criticism should attach to the Army in regard to this policy, which has been in effect for more than 10 years.

I am sure it will be incomprehensible to many citizens, however, that it was decided the national interest would be served by admitting officers of Communist Yugoslavia to one of our most important military schools to learn at first hand how we train for top command and staff assignments the promising officers of our own Army—a force which may be called on to fight a Communist aggressor.

Obviously, the Yugoslav Government has taken full advantage of this opportunity to learn of American military doctrine by sending some of its best officers to study under our instructors at Fort Leavenworth. Three of these students, who attended the school while in the rank of colonel, now are major generals, and one is the chief of Marshal Tito's military cabinet.

Why should the U.S. Army have thrust on it instruction of officers of a Communist nation?

DEDUCTION FOR PAYMENT OF REDEEMABLE GROUND RENTS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 1597) relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, after line 10, insert:

"(c) REDEEMABLE GROUND RENT DEFINED.—For purposes of this subtitle, the term 'redeemable ground rent' means only a ground rent with respect to which—

"(1) there is a lease of land which is assignable by the lessee without the consent of the lessor and which (together with periods for which the lease may be renewed at the option of the lessee) is for a term in excess of 15 years,

"(2) the leaseholder has a present or future right to terminate, and to acquire the entire interest of the lessor in the land, by payment of a determined or determinable amount, which right exists by virtue of State or local law and not because of any private agreement or privately created condition, and

"(3) the lessor's interest in the land is primarily a security interest to protect the rental payments to which the lessor is entitled under the lease."

Page 3, line 11, strike " '(c)" and insert: " '(d)".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as the Members will recall, H.R. 1597, which was passed by the House under unanimous consent on February 26, in effect deals with the tax treatment in Maryland of both the buyer of a home subject to a redeemable ground rent and the person selling this real property subject to the redeemable ground rent. Under the bill, for the home buyer the ground rent paid would be treated as a mortgage interest payment and, therefore, deductible by him for tax purposes. As to the seller of the real property, the property would be treated as if sold subject to a mortgage in a face amount equal to the redemption price of the redeemable ground rent, and as a result, the redeemable ground rent would be taken into account in determining his sale price for the property and would be reflected in any gain or loss recognized to him.

An amendment to the bill was adopted by the other body which adds a section providing a definition of the term "redeemable ground rent." This is in the nature of a clarification and does not alter the substance of the House bill or its basic effect.

I urge that the House concur in the amendments of the other body.

DESIGNATING APRIL 11, 1963, FOR CELEBRATION OF PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I call up House Resolution 300, designating April 11, 1963, for the celebration of Pan-American Day, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 300

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby designates Thursday, April 11, 1963, for the celebration of Pan-American Day, on which day, after the reading of the Journal, remarks appropriate to such occasion may occur.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, this matter has been cleared with the minority side and there is no objection to it. We think it is an excellent idea.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATING WEEK OF APRIL 15, 1963, AS "NATIONAL HARMONY WEEK"

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 282 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas April 11, 1963, marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Incorporated; and

Whereas the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Incorporated, a nonprofit, fraternal organization dedicated to the preservation and promotion of the uniquely American art form known as the barbershop quartet style of close harmony singing, will celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of its founding during the six-day period beginning April 15, 1963: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the six-day period beginning April 15, 1963, and ending April 20, 1963, both dates inclusive, is hereby designated as "National Harmony Week", in recognition and appreciation of the successful efforts of the members of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Incorporated, to maintain the barbershop quartet style of close harmony singing as a traditional form of native American music, and of their efforts, through their stimulus to good music and vocal harmony, to keep America singing. The President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to join in the observance of such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ostertag], the gentleman from New York [Mr. Horton], the gentleman from Maine [Mr. McIntire], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Schadeberg], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels], be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, although I am the sponsor of the bill (H.J. Res. 282), I want to call attention to the fact that similar resolutions have been introduced by my colleagues, Congressmen Horton of New York, McIntire of Maine, Quie of Minnesota and Schadeberg of Wisconsin. I would like to point out that we have had complete harmony in the presentation and advancement of this proposal to designate April 15–20 as National Harmony Week in recognition of the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America.

You will note the terms of the resolution provide that the Senate and House of Representatives shall designate National Harmony Week:

> In recognition and appreciation of the successful efforts of the members of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., to maintain the barbershop quartet style of close harmony singing as a traditional form of native American music, and of their efforts, through their stimulus to good music and vocal harmony, to keep America singing. The President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to join in the observance of such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Barbershop singing is a longtime American favorite. It is a traditional American style of singing which has brought entertainment and pleasure to millions of people over the years. We believe the society has made an important contribution to our American culture by its programs to preserve the barbershop tradition and to keep America singing. I believe we are indebted to the society for saving barbershop singing from going out of use with the barbershop mustache cup.

The Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America is a nonprofit, fraternal organization dedicated to good fellowship and harmony. It has more than 30,000 members in 650 chapters throughout the United States and Canada and is a force for creating goodwill and comity among people of all walks of life.

I am hopeful that my colleagues in Congress will sing out in favor of this resolution. Some people may say that Congress should not concern itself with matters of this kind. But with all the pressures and tensions in the world today, I think it would be good for the country and the Congress to designate and observe a National Harmony Week with the society created to promote good fellowship and to keep America singing. We need more groups dedicated to pleasantness and friendliness in the world, and we should honor them when there is such an opportunity. I, therefore, urge my colleagues in the Congress to give their unanimous endorsement to this resolution.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to speak in behalf of House Joint Resolution 282 designating the 6-day period, April 15 through 20, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," this in observance of the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc.

I would like at the outset to establish this point—that I am not prone to support many of the requests for national observances that in recent years have in number and purpose gone way beyond the border of the plausible into the realm of the ridiculous.

I introduced similar legislation to House Joint Resolution 282, House Joint Resolution 320, for a number of what I believe to be excellent reasons. First is the fact that barbershop quartet singing is American in its origin and is in the field of music symbolic of America. On that basis alone, we should welcome this opportunity and this means of helping in the preservation and encouragement of this great American institution—barbershop quartet singers.

There is nothing more natural, when men get together under conducive circumstances, for them to break in harmonizing some of the old favorites. What member of this committee has not enjoyed many hours of such wholesome activity over the years? And think of the many hours of entertainment the amateur singers in SPEBSQSA have provided audiences throughout the country during the past quarter century. One of the concerts which most of us in the Washington area know about, of course, is the one held at the Water Gate and which regularly attracts an estimated 12,000 persons.

Such concerts for the general public, staged by the nearly 30,000 men in the SPEBSQSA chapters, nowhere begin to tell the story of this very worthwhile organization. The following figures may help to tell that story: In a 6-month period last year, nationwide statistics show that this organization through its local chapters and local quartets entertained free of charge some 32,000 persons in hospitals, homes for the aged, charity, and church organizations, et cetera. The following breakdown of the 8,500-man hours put into such charitable performances may be of interest to you:

	Man-hours
Hospitals	981
Homes for the aged	995
Charitable organizations	2,935
Church groups	747
Schools for the handicapped	1,721
Banquets	232

And that during the short period of 6 months last year.

A significant aspect of SPEBSQSA is that it draws from all areas of our social complex. Workers, teachers, merchants, doctors, truck drivers, lawyers—men from all walks of life—join together in making harmony. Members know little and care less about each other's station in life. In this organization it does not matter.

Last year, 36 States cooperated in helping to observe the 24th anniversary of this organization by issuing either proclamations or letters of commendation. So also did 150 city mayors of metropolitan areas.

Though of special importance to me is the fact that barbershop quartet singing is American in every sense of the word. But not to be overlooked is the fact that when America creates and develops something truly outstanding, it is bound to find wide acceptance elsewhere in the world. And I am sure we all are pleased to know that barbershop quartet singing is becoming popular in other countries.

Especially significant in this respect is the fact that for the first time in its 25-year history, the SPEBSQSA this year will hold its annual convention in Canada, July 2 through 6, in Toronto. I might add that this seems to me most appropriate when harmony between our two neighboring countries could use a little assistance.

The American and Canadian barbershoppers call their frequent trips back and forth across the border to sing for each other—"Hands Across the Border." I for one would like to do what I can for the encouragement and preservation of such activity.

I feel specially privileged, and specially authorized, you might say, to speak in behalf of this legislation. The international headquarters of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., is located in my congressional district, in the city of Kenosha. The international headquarters home, very appropriately, is named Harmony Hall.

There is much more I could say, Mr. Chairman, but I realize time is limited. I believe this to be a most worthy cause, one I trust the House will unanimously agree is worthy.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Joint Resolution 282.

I introduced a similar resolution—House Joint Resolution 307.

My warmest thanks for the deep interest and proper action by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Forrester]. As chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee that give this resolution prompt hearing and to the Judiciary Committee for its prompt consideration.

My legislation—House Joint Resolution 307—is one of several bills that would designate the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week." In so doing the bill would give national recognition to a popular national pastime—barbershop singing.

It is my understanding that some 29,000 men throughout the country spend their leisure time singing with barbershop groups. And it is recognized that many of these groups make a valuable contribution to the community life of America, offering freely their services not only in singing but also in work vital to the well-being of the community.

Barbershop singing is unique in the respect that it traditionally is an American form of music, a musical product that has taken root in the American culture. As such, it should receive proper recognition and support, thereby assuring it a permanent place in the American setting.

It is indeed heartening to observe that there are those who, in spite of world uncertainties and confusion, are bright enough of spirit to bring happiness to others and satisfaction to themselves through song—my legislation is designed to encourage these dispensers of good solid harmonies to keep up their very good work.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge your favorable consideration of this legislation, and I want to express my appreciation for being able to present this statement for the consideration of the members of this committee.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, under date of March 21, 1963, I sponsored House Joint Resolution 333 designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week." I was pleased to lend my support and endorsement of this measure in recognition of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barbershop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., a nonprofit, fraternal organization dedicated to the preservation and promotion of the uniquely American art form known as the barbershop quartet style of close harmony singing. This kind of singing is native American.

In Union City, N.J., we have a very active chapter of this organization, J–20 chapter, which has done much to further this proposal. The society is celebrating its 25th anniversary of spreading musical harmony and good will throughout the Nation. The good people of my congressional district are aware of the many contributions this organization has made to our home area during the past 18 years.

As well as introducing a resolution to this end, I have also contacted our President urging approval of the resolution. President Kennedy has received numerous indications of interest in the designation of National Harmony Week. In the event my colleagues, Hon. E. L. Forrester, of Florida, chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee which reported the measure favorably, and Hon. Harold Ostertag, of New York, and those of us who joined them in this effort, are successful in gaining House approval today, I am assured the President will comply in inviting the people of the United States to join in the observance of National Harmony Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Congressional Record, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, a very timely newspaper article appearing in the Jersey Journal of Jersey City, N.J., March 27, 1963, entitled "Close Cropped Harmony Is American Through and Through." This article points out that "there were no barbershop quartets on the Mayflower" and reminds us that the art form known as the barbershop quartet style of close harmony singing is uniquely American:

Close Cropped Harmony Is American Through and Through

(By Paul McElaney)

There were no barbershop quartets on the Mayflower.

That kind of singing is native American. It reached its heyday in the 1890's when young swains in striped blazers congregated at the local tonsorial palaces with guitars and ukuleles.

The music produced by these stringed instruments was so wild—so far out in those days—it was inspirational.

The gay young blades tried to sing in accompaniment and discovered the only way to vocalize was to harmonize. It was a great revelation.

When the jukebox became popular in the early 1930's, barbershop harmony declined. By 1938 it was almost a lost art. A precious slice of Americana was vanishing from the scene and Owen C. Cash, a tax attorney from Tulsa, Okla, crusaded for its revival.

In Rupert Hall, an investment broker, he met a kindred spirit. One day they sat down and wrote a letter informing the Tulsa citizens that the Bill of Rights still guaranteed them the right to sing barbershop style.

They were going to hold a songfest on the roof garden of the Tulsa Club and everybody was invited. They sent out 100 copies of the letter.

The 26 men who responded to the rebels first meeting sang again the following week. In the interim, word had spread and 70 men showed up.

For the third meeting Cash rented a suite in the Alvin Hotel. On that day 150 men strolled into the lobby humming happily.

A reporter from the Tulsa World was sent downtown to check out an alleged accident that caused a traffic jam. Searching for the "wreck" he asked one of the cops.

"Wreck?" said the patrolman. "There's no wreck. It's just some darn fools up there in the Alvin singing their heads off. Everybody stopped to listen."

As stories go, the Tulsa World printed it and the wire services picked it up and flashed it across the country.

That was it. Cash had struck a responsive chord in the hearts of every bathtub crooner in the Nation. The Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barbershop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., was off to a roaring start.

Since then, their motto "Keep America Singing," has spread to Canada, Alaska, Hawaii, and the Canal Zone. The 700 scattered chapters contain 2,000 quartets and 60 choruses.

Today, the society is the largest singing outfit in the world—and exclusively male.

Some prominent personalities are listed among the 30,000 members: Bing Crosby, Hoagy Carmichael, composers Geoff O'Hara (K-K-K-Kay), and Harry Armstrong (Sweet Adeline), Fred Waring, and that former White House piano player.

What is a barbershop quartet? Simply a tenor, alto, baritone, and bass who produce four-part harmony. The melody is sung below melody note.

It looks easy and sounds great but it takes a lot of practice. When a smooth-blending, chord-bending quartet rigs up a few fast "changes," "slides," and liberal half-tones, the harmony becomes more exacting than any other four-part vocal music.

Good close harmony quartets ignore or scorn conventional musical patterns and toss "swipes" around with the insolent abandon of clown jugglers in a circus. "Swipes" are several chords on separate melody notes.

The singing of a skilled quartet is pure tone adjustment through acute ear sense. Actually, the vibrations, overtones, timbres, and slight modulations in pitch defy analysis.

Some people have extremely sensitive ears and can follow rapid chord changes or distinguish tone elements. On the other hand, recent tests showed that some professional singers, while proficient in musical techniques of one kind or another, have no ability to arrange or blend harmony chords.

Good vowel sounds are another controlling factor in smooth harmony. Consonants have a tendency to distort because they require too much breath. You can't play S's and R's on your vocal chords any better than you can on a violin or piano.

Jersey City was one of the first cities to apply for a charter back in 1938. In those days the Hudson County members used to meet in the old Globe Hotel at Danforth Avenue and the Boulevard.

Currently, there are 52 members in the Jersey City chapter. Known as the Garden State Glee Club, they have been active in numerous benefits for charities throughout the State.

In 1946 they won the international quartet singing contest.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct pleasure to speak in support of the joint resolution which would designate April 15 to 20 as "National Harmony Week."

As we know, this joint resolution, among other things, recognizes the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc. My home community of Rochester, N.Y., is proud to have, as one of its outstanding citizens the International President of this worthy musical organization. He is Mr. S. Wayne Foor.

In fact, it was through Mr. Foor that I first became interested in National Harmony Week. I received a copy of a letter from Mr. Foor, addressed to the President of the United States, asking for the designation of "National Harmony Week."

I wrote to the President and indicated my interest in this matter and suggested that consideration be given to it. In response, I received a letter from the Office of the President indicating that such a designation would have to originate in the Congress.

Thereafter, I introduced a resolution identical to the one we are considering today. I would like to point out that following the introduction of that resolution, I heard from several of our colleagues who expressed their enthusiastic support of this measure. It has been gratifying to note that this support is truly bipartisan; coming as it has, from both sides of the aisle.

Another source of pleasure for me has been to witness the wonderful cooperation which the Committee on the Judiciary, both as a full committee and through its Subcommittee No. 4, have extended in order to expedite this floor consideration. I was given the opportunity to testify before the subcommittee along with our other colleagues who introduced this joint resolution. The subcommittee was most gracious and I appreciate the prompt action they took.

In reporting the bill to the full committee, they added that their action was "without a note of discord."

Like my colleagues who support these resolutions, I feel this is an appropriate tribute to the S.P.E.B.S.Q.S.A.'s nationwide efforts to keep America singing. And I might point out that their motto is "Keep America Singing." With chapters in all 50 States, their 30,000 members are fine Americans, who are dedicated to harmony in their songs and in their lives.

I would urge the designation of "National Harmony Week" in a broader sense, too. Challenged as we are by the evils of a totalitarian system that is unaware of the blessing of harmony among men and nations, this special week could serve to emphasize the unity of noble purpose which is the character of a free people.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in support of the adoption of House Joint Resolution 282 introduced by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ostertag]. Quartet singing and other vocal and choral group singing in the American style of close harmony is conducive to a strong national unity and purpose. In addition, American singing of American songs in close harmony promotes a favorable American image throughout the world. This great native American institution deserves the fullest recognition and encouragement.

TO AUTHORIZE THE PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT THE PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR FLAG"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Concurrent Resolution 86 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the publication entitled "Our Flag", published by the Office of Armed Services Information and Education, Department of Defense, be printed with illustrations as a House document; and that three hundred thousand additional copies be printed, of which two hundred thousand shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and one hundred thousand shall be for the use of the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has a series of these bills that deal with the printing of publications of one kind or another, is that correct?

Mr. HAYS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And they are all limited strictly to the printing; they carry no other amendments of any kind?

Mr. HAYS. Nothing except the authorization to print.

Mr. GROSS. There are no employees involved in any of these bills?

Mr. HAYS. No.

Mr. GROSS. No additional employees, I should say?

Mr. HAYS. No.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

"OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT—WHAT IS IT? HOW DOES IT FUNCTION?"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That with the permission of the copyright owner of the book "Our American Government—1,001 Questions on How It Works," with answers by Wright Patman, published by Scholastic Magazines, Incorporated, there shall be printed as a Senate document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?"; and that there shall be printed one million eighty-four thousand additional copies of such document, of which two hundred and six thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and eight hundred and seventy-eight thousands copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALL MAP OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 98 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be compiled and printed fifty-nine thousand three hundred and fifty copies of a wall map of the United States, prepared cooperatively by the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior, showing information, including historical data, concerning public surveys, reservations, and other appropriate dedications of land of the United States, to be printed on a single sheet, approximately three and one-half feet by five and one-half feet, of which forty-three thousand nine hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and fifteen thousand four hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to explain that this is similar to and replaces House Concurrent Resolution 574 which was passed in the 87th Congress which would call for this map to be printed on two sheets. We found that we could save 25 percent by making it slightly smaller and printing it on one sheet. I asked the staff of the Joint Committee to hold up the printing on it, which they did. This will permit the resolution of the last Congress to go ahead but on a slightly smaller scale at a saving of more than 25 percent.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

"HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 108 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made", by Doctor Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, as set out in House Document 136 of the Eighty-seventh Congress, be printed as a House document, with emendations by the author and with a foreword by Honorable Edwin E. Willis; and that there be printed one hundred and thirty-two thousand additional copies to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of ninety days after which the unused balance shall revert to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Sec. 2. There shall be printed thirty thousand nine hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES WITH ANALYTICAL INDEX

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 119) to print as a House document the Constitution of the United States, with an analytical index and ancillaries regarding proposed amendments, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is authorized to be printed as a House document the Constitution of the United States, with an analytical index and ancillaries regarding proposed amendments, prepared by Representative Emanuel Celler, of New York; and that twenty-five thousand additional copies be printed, of which five thousand shall be for the use of the House Committee on the Judiciary and the balance prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT, COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 296) to print as a House document, the Fourth Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the message from the President, dated March 11, 1963, transmitting the Fourth Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judicial Procedure, covering the period ending December 31, 1962, together with the accompanying report, be printed as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

"OUR CAPITOL"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14) to print as a Senate document, with illustrations, a pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol," and to print additional copies thereof, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, the pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol"; and that three hundred and twenty-three thousand five hundred additional copies shall be printed, of which one hundred and three thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate and two hundred and twenty thousand five hundred copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on this Sunday, March 31, we will celebrate the 30th anniversary of the creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, one of the most far-reaching and successful of the domestic programs inaugurated by Franklin D. Roosevelt. In a time of national domestic crisis, when the chaotic economic state of the country and the desperate unemployment situation created unprecedented social unrest, our President had the imagination and the courage to establish personally this unusual program, confident as he was of its value and its potential success.

His confidence and his judgment and his foresight were borne out during the years of operation of the CCC—both by its magic with press and people and by its splendid record of accomplishments. The CCC camps, set up in every State of the Union and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, provided food, clothing, shelter, and work experience for the better than 3 million young men enrolled. From the work of the Corps this Nation reaped rich benefits, the impact of which may still be demonstrated today: 3 million acres of trees were planted; 4 million acres of wooded land were cleared; millions of acres of grassland were saved from erosion through the erection of dams and other conservation facilities. Through the construction and renovation of recreational facilities, our national parks and forests became treasure grounds for the millions of young and old seeking peace, beauty, sport, and adventure.

While the contributions of the CCC still affect us today, we have reached a critical stage where we must take positive action to preserve these contributions and to assure similar benefits to our children who are richly deserving of a proud heritage from us. There exists currently a critical need for improvements in our national parks, forests, and other public areas, both in the realm of conserving our natural resources and of providing recreational facilities. Each year more and more of our people are visiting our national recreation areas. Last year the total recreation visits to national forests climbed above 112,700,000—an 11-percent increase over the 102 million visits in 1961. This figure, which does not even include people just passing through, represents three times the number of visits made just a decade ago. Officials expect even more people to seek this pleasant leisure diversion during 1963 and the coming years, yet the present facilities are inadequate for these millions of pleasure seekers.

Our backlog of even more vital conservation projects is staggering. Among the things which mightily need to be accomplished are such diversified undertakings as reforestation of public and private lands, timber stand improvements, fish and wildlife, and Western rangeland works, the development of parks and recreational lands and the construction of access roads, and soil and watershed conservation. To bring these programs in line with our present needs, we would have to spend a total of $12.2 billion.

But our conservation needs—and the far more urgent employment needs of our young people—can be met directly, simply, wisely, and far more economically by the reinstitution, not of the CCC itself, but of a version of the Corps designed to meet the problems of today's young people. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have for many years been sponsoring legislation to aid the youngsters of our country who are inexperienced, untrained, and minimally educated. All too often these young men and women have found the doors to employment shut in their faces. They have frequently faced undeserved reprimands at home. They have felt unwanted and unneeded by their communities. They need training and they need motivation. They cannot wait 5 years, nor even 1 year, for our help. They need right now, this year, the opportunity to realize that this Nation has need of them and has a place for them. They need in 1963 a chance to demonstrate to themselves and to the Nation that they can contribute significantly from their abundant personal and individual potentialities.

Mr. Speaker, as we recall the days of the CCC, which some of us, especially those of my generation, remember fondly and well, let us salute its great achievements by an equivalent accomplishment of our own. I am inserting in today's Congressional Record a history of the efforts Senator Humphrey and my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, Carl Perkins—whose effective leadership as chairman of the House General Subcommittee on Education has helped get the CCC legislation favorably reported during several Congresses—and I have been making for some years to endow America of the 1960's with the same domestic magic which Franklin Roosevelt gave her in the 1930's. I sincerely request all my colleagues to read this story, to reconsider the Youth Employment Act of 1963, and to support this measure. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly request that our Nation take the bold step forward it once had the courage to take in the time of F.D.R.

HISTORY

Mr. Speaker, March 31, 1963, marks the 30th anniversary of one of President Roosevelt's first and most important domestic programs—the Civilian Conservation Corps. April 17 will note the 30th anniversary of the establishment of the first CCC camp—in the George Washington National Forest, near Luray, Va.

These two anniversary dates take on additional significance this year because during the first part of April the House will consider and, I certainly hope, pass legislation establishing a Youth Conservation Corps.

This proposal, part of President Kennedy's overall program to do something positive to remedy the continuing problem of youth unemployment, is modeled on the CCC experience. As a former educational director of the unique and renowned CCC, I believe I can speak with some authority, and I think with justifiable pride, of some of its accomplishments.

For the 3 million young men enrolled in the program, the CCC provided—in camps located in every State and in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands—shelter, clothing, good food, and wholesome and healthful surroundings. But far more important, it proffered the individual stimulus and discipline, and not infrequently the incentive needed by many of those depressed young men of the thirties to seek and to acquire more in the way of formal education.

At its termination on June 30, 1942, the CCC could review with pride its record of achievements in conserving our natural resources. Three million acres of trees had been planted, 4 million acres of wooded land cleared, 8 million acres of forest lands freed of insect pests and tree diseases. Through the building of dams and other conservation facilities, other millions of acres of grassland had been saved from erosion. In addition, and directly attributable to the efforts of the CCC, picnic facilities, fishing areas, and other recreational sites had been improved, and a better environment provided for our wildlife.

Again today there is a critical need for similar work in our national parks, forests, and other public areas. This has been evidenced most vividly by the testimony of the numerous witnesses appearing in support of the Youth Employment Act of 1963 before the House General Subcommittee on Education. Our backlog of conservation projects is astounding. Included on the list of things to be accomplished are such diversified undertakings as reforestation of public and private lands, timber stand improvements, fish and wildlife and western rangeland works, the development of parks and recreational lands and the construction of access roads, and soil and watershed conservation. To bring these programs in line with our present needs, we would have to spend a total of $12.2 billion.

But what strikes me as being even more detrimental to the welfare of this great country is the present unemployment situation which is forcing 1 million of our young people who are out of school and out of work to remain unemployed. The alarming figures indicating a serious upswing in the high school dropout and the juvenile delinquency rates have a direct and most pertinent relationship to the incredibly high proportion of youth unemployment. Indeed, this Nation seems to be again experiencing some of the social maladjustment which appeared during the bleak depression days.

The excellent work in reviewing the YCC legislation performed by the General Subcommittee on Labor under the able leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins], both in 1961 and in 1962, can atone only in part for the indifference and neglect of years in trying to meet the snowballing problem of youth unemployment. The years of procrastination since the first Youth Corps bills were introduced in 1950 visit upon us all a guilt which can only be eradicated by our swift response to duty and necessity in this year 1963.

In 1933 the CCC legislation was introduced in the Congress on March 21, and just 10 days later President Roosevelt signed the bill into law.[1] Now no one contends that the current economic situation, serious as it is, compares with the dark days of the thirties, nor does anyone advocate such extraordinary legislative speed. In the 1930's with the whole of society out of focus, the immediacy of the need was obvious. Today's problem of youth unemployment is glossed over by the apparent general prosperity the country is experiencing. We look at the Nation with our sunglasses of affluence, and everything seems lush and green with promise. But the pockets of structural unemployment and the almost total elimination of unskilled labor may erupt into a serious national crisis. The need for palliative measures is only too evident to those of us from distressed areas.

No one considering the attempts over the past several years to alleviate this potentially explosive situation by establishing a Youth Corps would regard the record of the Congress with any feeling of pride, nor would one view it as a model for future emulation. If anything, it is but a lesson in persistency on the part of the realistic and informed.

It is fitting, however, on this anniversary occasion, to review briefly the history of the dedicated efforts which have been made in the Congress to aid our Nation's unemployed youth.

In the 2d session of the 81st Congress—1950—four proposals to revive the CCC spirit were introduced in the House and one in the Senate.[2] No action was taken on the Senate bill, and the House action was limited to a second referral of three of the four bills from the Committee on Education and Labor to the Committee on Public Lands. On June 27, 1950, this country entered into the Korean conflict, negating, at least for a time, any need for a program such as the YCC.

In the 1st session of the 85th Congress—1957—a bill entitled the "Youth Conservation Act of 1957" was introduced in both the House and the Senate,[3] but no action was taken on either proposal.

Two years later, in the 1st session of the 86th Congress—1959—14 bills relating to the establishment of a YCC were introduction in the House,[4] and in the 2d session—1960—8 more bills were submitted.[5] Again, although 2 days of hearings were held, no action was taken.[6] The Senate story for the 86th Congress was somewhat different. Senator Humphrey and 20 others introduced S. 812, providing for the creation of a YCC.[7] After hearings by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the bill was reported out, with amendments, on July 20, 1959.[8] On August 13, by a rollcall vote of 47 to 45,[9] the Senate passed S. 812. The 45 supporting Democrats were joined by 2 Republicans, whereas 15 Democrats and 30 Republicans opposed the measure.[10] This Senate bill was then referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor,[11] where it died.

In the 87th Congress—1961–62—some legislative progress was made though neither the House nor the Senate actually voted on the YCC proposal. Twenty-one bills were introduced in the House during the first session.[12] Hearings were held on H.R. 7536, the administration bill. The General Subcommittee on Labor, under the excellent guidance of the chairman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins], reported out a clean bill (H.R. 8354) on August 2, 1961.[13] The House Committee on Rules, however, took no action.[14]

As reported, H.R. 8354 not only contained recommendations comparable to those in the legislation now proposed in H.R. 1890 and in my bill H.R. 1, but also included provisions for an on-the-job training program. These latter suggestions were subsequently incorporated into the Manpower Development and Training Act. Thus, the House Committee on Education and Labor once again reported the bill, this time as H.R. 10682.[15] The House Committee on Rules still refused to take action.[16]

In September 1962 several of us attempted to bring H.R. 10682 to the House floor under the Calendar Wednesday procedure. After some hours taken up with rollcalls, quorum calls, and a demand for the reading of the House Journal, we had to abandon our efforts[17] in behalf of the YCC in the House.

---

[1] S. 598, 73d, introduced on Mar. 21, 1933, by Senators Robinson, of Arkansas, and Wagner, of New York; reported by the Committee on Education and Labor (with an amendment in the nature of a substitute) on March 23; passed the Senate on March 28; passed the House, amended, on March 29; again considered in the Senate, which concurred in the House amendment on March 30, and signed into law on Mar. 31, 1933. Became Public Law 5 (48 Stat. 22). (77 Congressional Record 652, 853, 937, 995, 1013, and 1102).

[2] S. 3144 introduced by Senators Murray, of Montana; Thomas, of Utah; Pepper, of Florida; Green, of Rhode Island; Kilgore, of West Virginia; Taylor, of Idaho; Humphrey, of Minnesota; Neely, of West Virginia; and Lehman, of New York.

[3] S. 871 by Senator Humphrey, of Minnesota and H.R. 4618 by Representative Roosevelt, of California.

[4] H.R. 425 (Roosevelt, of California), H.R. 3709 (Blatnik, of Minnesota), H.R. 3744 (Pfost, of Idaho), H.R. 4247 (Addonizio, of New Jersey), H.R. 4462 (Rabaut, of Michigan), H.R. 4516 (Miller, of California), H.R. 4561 (Roosevelt, of California), H.R. 5188 (Diggs, of Michigan), H.R. 5856 (Boyle, of Illinois), H.R. 7686 (Stratton, of New York), H.R. 7777 (Kee, of West Virginia), H.R. 7831 (Toll, of Pennsylvania), H.R. 8303 (Sikes, of Florida), and H.R. 8404 (Perkins, of Kentucky).

[5] H.R. 9334 (Kasem, of California), H.R. 9767 (Doyle, of California), H.R. 9704 (Bailey, of West Virginia), H.R. 10057 (Holland, of Pennsylvania), H.R. 10691 (Murphy, of Illinois), H.R. 11072 (Daniels, of New Jersey), H.R. 11715 (Green, of Oregon), and H.R. 12086 (Fulton, of Pennsylvania).

[6] Hearings were held on April 20–21, 1960, but apparently not printed.

[7] Congressional Record, vol. 105, pt. 1, p. 1317. Cosponsors included Senators Murray, of Montana; Byrd of West Virginia; Church, of Idaho; Gruening, of Alaska; Hart, of Michigan; Hennings, of Missouri; Jackson, of Washington; Johnston, of South Carolina; Langer, of North Dakota; Magnuson, of Washington; Mansfield, of Montana; McCarthy, of Minnesota; Morse, of Oregon; Moss, of Utah; Neuberger, of Oregon; Proxmire, of Wisconsin; Randolph, of West Virginia; Yarborough, of Texas; Cannon, of Nevada; and Carroll, of Colorado.

[8] Congressional Record, vol. 105, pt. 11, p. 13753.

[9] Congressional Record, vol. 105, pt. 12, pp. 15792–15793.

[10] Congressional Record, vol. 105, pt. 12, pp. 15792–15793; 1959 C. Q. Almanac, p. 433.

[11] Congressional Record, vol. 105, pt. 12, p. 15916.

[12] H.R. 110 (Kee of West Virginia); H.R. 268 (Roosevelt, of California); H.R. 272 (Ullman, of Oregon); H.R. 363 (Green, of Oregon); H.R. 600 (Zablocki, of Wisconsin); H.R. 1089 (Stratton, of New York); H.R. 2375 (Addonizio, of New Jersey); H.R. 3256 (Daniels, of New Jersey); H.R. 3327 (Multer, of New York); H.R. 4002 (Pfost, of Idaho); H.R. 4158 (Perkins, of Kentucky); H.R. 4264 (Pucinski, of Illinois); H.R. 4531 (O'Hara, of Illinois); H.R. 4971 (Perkins, of Kentucky); H.R. 5004 (Holland, of Pennsylvania); H.R. 5167 (Rostenkowski, of Illinois); H.R. 5418 (Toll, of Pennsylvania); H.R. 5586 (Slack, of West Virginia); H.R. 6039 (Diggs, of Michigan); H.R. 7536 (Perkins, of Kentucky); and H.R. 7541 (Blatnik, of Minnesota).

[13] H. Rept. No. 833, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Aug. 2, 1961; Congressional Record, vol. 107, pt. 11, p. 14369.

[14] 1962 C. Q. Almanac, p. 228.

[15] H. Rept. No. 1540, 87th Cong., 2d sess., March 29, 1962; Congressional Record, vol. 108, pt. 4, p. 5455.

[16] Supra, footnote 15.

In the Senate, Senator Humphrey and 22 of his colleagues cosponsored S. 404 early in the 1st session of the 87th Congress.[18] Later, in June, Senator Humphrey sponsored the administration bill, S. 2036.[19] Hearings were held on both bills, and S. 404 was reported, with amendments, by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.[20] The Senate, however, did not vote on S. 404, because, as Senator Humphrey then stated:

> The policy committee of the Senate has approved S. 404 for action, but * * * we want to make sure that this time we are going to have the cooperation of the other body that the bill will become law, and that we will not be engaged in a mere exercise in legislative processing.[21]

This brief legislative chronology of our efforts to establish a YCC program brings us to the present—to the 1st session of the 88th Congress.

As of mid-March, 36 bills had been introduced in the House. Also, the House Committee on Education and Labor had scheduled and completed hearings on the YCC proposals in the General Subcommittee on Education, under the able leadership of my good friend and distinguished colleague, Carl Perkins of Kentucky. Congressman Perkins, after the recommendations of his committee had been approved, submitted a revised administration bill, H.R. 5131.

In the Senate, Senator Humphrey was joined by 34 of his fellow Senators in support of the administration bill, S. 1. Last week the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare favorably reported S. 1, after public hearings very similar to those held by Mr. Perkins' House committee. Today, the full Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will meet in executive session to vote on reporting this measure.

I am sure that many of my colleagues here in the House join me in urging our colleagues in the Senate committee to favorably report S. 1, so that President Kennedy's wish to have this bill on his desk about the time of the Easter recess will be fulfilled.

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] Cosponsors included Senators Randolph, of West Virginia; Byrd, of West Virginia; Burdick, of North Dakota; Cannon, of Nevada; Carroll of Colorado; Clark of Pennsylvania; Church, of Idaho; Gruening, of Alaska; Hart, of Michigan; Jackson, of Washington; Long, of Hawaii; Long, of Missouri; Magnuson, of Washington; McCarthy, of Minnesota; Metcalf, of Montana, Morse, of Oregon; Moss, of Utah; Neuberger, of Oregon; Pell, of Rhode Island; Williams, of New Jersey; Yarborough, of Texas, and Douglas, of Illinois.

[19] Congressional Record, vol. 107, pt. 7, p. 9698.

[20] S. Rept. No. 976, 87th Cong., 1st sess., Sept. 12, 1961; Congressional Record, vol. 107, pt. 14, p. 18986.

[21] Congressional Record, vol. 108, pt. 11, p. 14718.

AMENDING THE SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY ACT

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, Congress amended the Social Security Act in 1956 to provide benefits for totally and permanently disabled persons covered by the act. Since that time, the social security disability program has been expanded greatly. I am concerned that this expansion has brought about certain developments which, in my opinion, were never envisioned or desired by the Congress.

Take for instance the effect of the repeal of the offset provision in 1958. This action permitted a qualified person to receive both State workmen's compensation and social security disability benefits. I am told that as of today there are 47 jurisdictions where a person receives more in dual benefits than in take-home pay, as an able-bodied workingman on the job.

Such a situation is bound to have a decided effect upon our rehabilitation programs everywhere. I am told that already the incentive for these disabled people to become rehabilitated is practically nil.

A far more serious result of this expanded program is its effect upon the State workmen's compensation programs. These programs last year reached their 50th anniversary. Well known are the contributions made by these plans to the industrial progress of our country.

Workmen's compensation assures payment for job-connected injuries and diseases without costly legal actions, provides for rehabilitation and medical benefits, furnishes artificial limbs and training, provides incentives to employees to emphasize safety and most important of all to an injured person—makes payment of claims promptly. In the minds of some people the State programs, furnishing these services, are in serious jeopardy from the inroads made by the Federal disability program.

I, personally, do not believe it ever was the intent of Congress to bring an end to these State programs through enactment of the Federal program. In Minnesota, however, a law enacted there, as a result of the expanded Federal program, reduces State compensation benefits by the amount of social security disability benefits paid to a qualified person. This year, in Colorado and Maryland, legislation has been introduced to enact this "reverse offset." Such action reveals the handwriting on the wall for the State workmen's compensation programs.

Many persons concerned with this problem have called this matter to my attention, and I could recite other detrimental effects resulting from the expansion of the Social Security Disability Act. This matter concerns me to the degree that I am of the opinion it should be explored fully. To this end, I am today introducing a bill which will provide an opportunity for a complete review of this entire problem area.

MINORITY RIGHTS AD ABSURDUM

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the March 26 edition of the Evening Star, a leading newspaper of Washington, carried a most interesting column on the subject of civil rights. It was exceedingly refreshing, as well as encouraging, in that at long last someone from these parts has taken public note of the fact that the vocal minorities do not have a monopoly on all of the rights in these United States. As the author of this article has so well pointed out, some day the majority will get good and tired of being pushed around by the minorities. In fact, he has clearly indicated that the majority is already tired of it, and he is so right.

Since the earliest colonial days it has been customary to observe in our public schools the Christmas and Easter seasons and to recognize through prayer and reading of the Holy Bible the existence of the Supreme Being. These observances were the daily practice and common custom in the days when our forefathers assembled the Constitution. Had there been any intention on the part of the authors of this great document to throw the Bible out the window and erect a wall between God and the schoolroom, then such would have been made crystal clear in the Constitution, and the observances mentioned would have been summarily stopped.

These and other observances are now under vicious and unwarranted attack by some individuals associated with our minority groups. For quite a long time there has been a strong feeling among the majority that it is being pushed around quite too much, a feeling that self-restraint will repress just so long.

I commend the reading of the above mentioned article to the Members of the Congress, to the people of the country, and particularly to the men who sit on the Supreme Court. The article by Jenkin Lloyd Jones is as follows:

Minority Rights Ad Absurdum—If Court Bars Baltimore School Prayer, How Far Can an Intolerant Few Go?

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

> The U.S. Supreme Court now has under advisement another school prayer case, and if it hasn't learned anything since its decision on the New York regents prayer last fall it is likely to come up with another dizzy ruling.
>
> The new suit came out of Baltimore, where a mother who is an avowed atheist sued the Baltimore school board because a passage from the Old Testament and the Lord's Prayer were part of the daily opening exercises at her son's school.

When she complained in the lower court the school board promptly offered to let her son be excused from hearing the offensive words. But now the mother claims that this sets her son apart and subjects him to ridicule and abuse. She has demanded that no Bible readings or prayers be made in the hearing of any Maryland child while in public school.

Now some day the majority are going to get tired of being pushed around by the minority. Because we have moved into an era where the minority is demanding satisfaction for itself even where it interferes with the satisfaction of the majority. This can get absurd.

The overwhelming majority of Marylanders are not atheists and they think it is a good idea if their children listen to a few preachments. The Communists think so, too. They smother Russian and Chinese children with preachments, most of them from their pickled god, Lenin. Well, the Bible contains preachments. So does the Koran, the Zend Avesta and the sacred books of Buddha—all filled with good advice to youth. But all but a handful of Americans subscribe to religious bodies that venerate the Old Testament.

Yet the angry lady in Baltimore holds that even though it is okay with the majority of Marylanders that her son duck out when the Bible is opened, his "rights" are being outraged. They will only be satisfied if all Marylanders agree to conform to her taboos. Otherwise, Maryland shall be damned as "intolerant."

Is it possible for the minority to be intolerant, too?

Both houses of Congress open with prayer. Isn't this an affront to atheist citizens? Let's fire the chaplains.

On most of the coins and bills we carry there is the legend, "In God We Trust." Aren't we being cruel to sincere atheists in forcing them to purchase their groceries with this pious money?

The school assembly salutes the flag. The students stand with their hands over their hearts intoning the words—"this Nation under God." Surely the cops should be called and the principal arrested.

School lunches offer meat. Meat is an abomination to honest vegetarians. Shall we, therefore, feed our children pea soup and yogurt?

Last December, three public schools in Sharon, Mass., removed all Christmas trees and Christmas decorations from their classrooms on the theory that they were an affront to Jewish students. By-by Santa Claus, because St. Nicholas was a Christian saint. However, the Russians have shown us how we can still get our presents. We welcome Grandfather Frost. Merry Present-Giving Day.

And by-by to all the school Easter bunnies. Easter is a Christian festival in which the resurrection of living things from the death of winter is symbolized by observance of the story of Christ's resurrection, which you may or may not believe. This has got to go. But on the other hand, the millinery business, the garment industry, and the candymakers need something like Easter. So let's train our children to look forward to New Hat, New Dress, Chocolate-Egg Day.

We've got to clean up Thanksgiving, too. These silhouettes of obviously Protestant Pilgrim Fathers that we have the kindergarten kids cutting out are an insult to all other sects and religions. And the whole business is a slam at our atheists. For Thanksgiving means giving thanks to God. What shall we substitute? The United Nations?

American Negroes have properly battled for the right to live where they choose and go to school where they live. In some places the reluctant majority have had to be spanked. These rights have long been guaranteed there.

Yet, at the urging of the NAACP, Negroes are boycotting a school in northern New Jersey because 90 percent of the students are colored. Why? Because white families exercised what Negroes have been demanding, namely, the right to move where they pleased. And they moved out of the neighborhood. So the Negroes are demanding that white children be driven back into that school.

It is one thing to insist that the majority accord a minority the rights the majority enjoys. This is justice. But it is another thing to chase the majority around the block with a stick, demanding that it behave in a way decreed by the minority.

We're getting close to that point. The tragedy is that a growing public consciousness of minority rights is likely to be soured by the arrogance of some minority leaders. This could set us back—way back.

The majority will stand just so much kicking.

EFFICIENT UTILIZATION OF ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT BY U.S. AGENCIES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the record of the House of Representatives in effecting responsible savings in expenditures of the agencies of our National Government is a commendable one. It is a record which was built on day-to-day study and hard work in determining where any dollar could be saved or better utilized. We have made a painstaking effort to investigate each possible saving and to consider each possible plan to increase the efficiency of every agency's service to our people.

It is to continue this critically important work of the House, striving to give our people better essential service for fewer tax dollars wherever possible, that I am introducing legislation today which will save our Nation's taxpayers $145 million in its first 5 years of operation and will save more than $100 million each year afterward.

This proposal which I am offering for the consideration of the House would simply authorize the purchase, lease and utilization of electronic data processing equipment needed by Federal agencies to be effectively coordinated by the General Services Administration.

Mr. Speaker, these significant figures of estimated savings were carefully prepared by the General Accounting Office following an extensive study of the electronic data processing equipment which will be used by Federal agencies by June 30, 1963.

It is estimated that 1,006 electronic computers are budgeted to be leased and in operation by this coming June. A comparison on the cost of leasing versus cost of purchasing of 523 of these machines shows the startling fact that if these machines were actually purchased over a 5-year period instead of leased, we could effect a net saving of $148 million. Purchase price would include maintenance and interest. Ultimate savings each year after these machines were paid for would total an estimated $105 million each year.

These hundreds of millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker, are sound, accountable, direct savings which I am sure each Member of the House of Representatives will want to effect as soon as possible. However, these estimated savings do not include additional significant savings which can follow an intelligently coordinated purchase, lease and utilization policy developed by one Government agency determining the most economical way in which all agencies' needs for electronic data processing equipment can be efficiently met.

Mr. Speaker, because of the interest each of us has in getting a full dollar's worth of good government for every tax dollar we pay to our National Government, the text of this proposed legislation follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title I of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 111. The Administrator is authorized and directed to coordinate and control the purchase, lease, maintenance, and use of electronic data processing equipment by Federal agencies, and to operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment. Electronic data processing equipment suitable for efficient and effective use by Federal agencies shall be provided by the Administrator through purchase, lease, transfer of equipment from other Federal agencies, or otherwise and the Administrator is authorized and directed to provide by contract or otherwise for the maintenance and repair of such equipment. In carrying out his responsibilities under this section the Administrator is authorized to transfer electronic data processing equipment between Federal agencies, to require joint utilization of such equipment by two or more Federal agencies, and to establish equipment pools and data processing centers for such joint use when necessary for its most efficient and effective utilization: *Provided,* That the Administrator, in his discretion, may delegate authority to lease, purchase, maintain, or operate (1) general classes of equipment, (2) equipment of special design needed to fulfill some unique requirement or special purpose of a particular Federal agency, and (3) equipment necessary for national defense and security.

"There is hereby authorized to be established on the books of the Treasury, an electronic data processing fund, which shall be available without fiscal year limitation for expenses, including personal services, other costs, and the procurement by lease, purchase, transfer, or otherwise of equipment, maintenance and repair of such equipment by contract or otherwise, necessary for the efficient coordination, operation, atilization of such equipment by and for Federal agencies.

"There are authorized to be appropriated to said fund such sums as may be required which, together with the value, as determined by the Administrator, of supplies and equipment from time to time transferred to the Administrator, less any liabilities assumed, shall constitute the capital of the fund: *Provided,* That said fund shall be credited with (1) advances and reimbursements from available appropriations and funds of any agency (including the General Services Administration), organization, or persons utilizing such equipment and services rendered them, at rates determined by the Administrator to approximate the costs thereof met by the fund (including depreciation of equipment, provision for accrued leave, and where appropriate, for terminal liability charges and for amortization of installation costs, but excluding, in the determination of rates prior to the fiscal year 1966, such direct operating expenses as may be directly appropriated for, which expenses may be charged to the fund and covered by advances or reimbursements from such direct appropriations) and (2) refunds or recoveries resulting from operations of the fund, including the net proceeds of disposal of excess or surplus personal property and receipts from carriers and others for loss of or damage to property: *Provided further,* That following the close of each fiscal year any net income, after making provisions for prior year losses, if any, shall be transferred to the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

CONGRESSIONAL ETHICS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution which would deal with the whole question of congressional ethics, including travel abroad, nepotism, and payroll manipulations. We have investigated every activity of the Federal Government. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is high time that the Congress adopt a code of ethics which would warrant the respect not only of this Nation, but of the whole free world. Free peoples everywhere are looking to this great instrumentality of the people for guidance and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, I feel sure, will be referred to the Committee on House Administration under the leadership of its distinguished and able chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Burleson]. The resolution I have introduced is a rather long one, but I sincerely believe that this great committee will conduct an exhaustive study of many allegedly shameful practices which are threatening to undermine this great institution we all love—the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to balance the budget and give our people tax relief, we must start with the Congress itself. If we are to deal honestly and fairly with the staggering unemployment problem now approaching 5 million and increasing daily, we must start with our own payrolls and our own committees. We cannot tell the unemployed government student about the glories of democracy with some family friend or campaign ward worker on the payroll. Congress must set the example; we must lead the way.

We must protect the honor and integrity of the Congress. We must preserve this great House for all posterity. It is the most direct contact the people have with the Federal Government. We are close to the people and are the guardians of their individual liberty and freedom. No Member of this House can be replaced nor can any vacancy in this House be filled except by the sovereign will of the people. In the other body, Governors of our States can fill vacancies by appointment. The Vice President can succeed the President, but may I repeat, only the people can elect a Member of this House.

The Congress is a great institution. This House is a great institution. It is a tradition. It is a part of our heritage. We must keep faith with the people. We must continue to warrant their trust and their utmost confidence. The Congress is losing its power to the decrees and whims of unelected bureaucratic officials. We are becoming a rubber stamp to the executive and the slave of party platforms.

We have from history the example of the Roman senate, whose power was eroded and corrupted by the Roman emperor, and they sank into oblivion with presents, gifts, luxurious chariots, villas, and nepotism. Through such conduct, the doom of the Roman republic was sealed forever.

THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS CONTINUES ITS INTEREST IN THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in discussing matters relating to the captive nations.

This subject has been of considerable interest and concern to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, and to me, personally. The extent of this concern can be measured, I believe, by the record of activities of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, relating to the captive nations. I would like to take this opportunity to summarize and review that record.

During the past year, as the Membership of this House knows, the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs held extensive hearings on development within the captive European nations. I had the honor of chairing a good number of those hearings. We invited Members of Congress, officials of the executive branch, private individuals and organizations interested in this subject, to share their views and recommendations with our committee. No less than 49 persons with different backgrounds and different views participated either orally or in writing in the 1962 hearings. The list of witnesses who appeared before our committee, and of those who submitted statements for the record, reads as follows:

List of witnesses who appeared, arranged chronologically:

Hon. Foy Kohler, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs.

Hon. Henry Loomis, Director, Voice of America, U.S. Information Agency.

Mr. John Richardson, Jr., president, Free Europe Committee.

Hon. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former Prime Minister of Poland.

Mr. W. O. Biernacki-Poray, architect-engineer, Montclair, N.J.

Prof. Jan. Karski, Georgetown University, former member of the Polish underground movement.

Hon. Joseph Kajeckas, Chargé d'Affaires, Lithuanian Legation, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Joseph Miklovas, a recent escapee from Lithuania.

Mr. Jack Stukas, a recent American visitor to Lithuania.

Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg, Member of Congress from the State of Wisconsin.

Hon. Samuel S. Stratton, Member of Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. Jim Wright, Member of Congress from the State of Texas.

Mr. Bruno Albats, secretary general, American Latvian Association.

Hon. Donald C. Bruce, Member of Congress from the State of Indiana.

Mr. Josef Lettrich, former Member of the Czechoslovak Parliament.

Hon. William W. Scranton, Member of Congress from the State of Pennsylvania.

Hon. Constantin Visoianu, former Minister of Foreign Affairs of Rumania.

Mr. Brutus Coste, secretary general, Assembly of Captive European Nations.

Hon. Ferenc Nagy, chairman of Assembly of Captive European Nations and former Prime Minister of Hungary.

Dr. George M. Dimitrov, chairman, Bulgarian National Committee.

Mr. Vasil Germenji, Free Albania Committee.

Mr. Aleksander Kutt, Committee for a Free Estonia.

Hon. William R. Tyler, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs.

Mr. Harold C. Vedeler, Director, Office of Eastern European Affairs, Department of State.

Mr. Robert Lee, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State.

Hon. Michael A. Feighan, Member of Congress from the State of Ohio.

Statements submitted:

Hon. Frank J. Becker, Member of Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. Edward P. Boland, Member of Congress from the State of Massachusetts.

Hon. Emilio Q. Daddario, Member of Congress from the State of Connecticut.

Hon. John H. Dent, Member of Congress from the State of Pennsylvania.

Hon. William Jennings Bryan Dorn, Member of Congress from the State of South Carolina.

Hon. Thomas J. Dulski, Member of Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. Florence P. Dwyer, Member of Congress from the State of New Jersey.

Hon. Leonard Farbstein, Member of Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher, Member of Congress from the State of New Jersey.

Hon. Seymour Halpern, Member of Congress from the State of New York.

Mr. Stefan Korbonski, chairman, Polish Delegation to the Assembly of Captive European Nations.

Hon. Harris B.McDowell, Jr., Member of Congress from the State of Delaware.

Mr. Vaclav Majer, member of the executive board, Committee for Free Czechoslovakia.

Hon. Abraham J. Multer, Member of Congress from the State of New York.

Hon. Claiborne Pell, U.S. Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

Hon. Philip J. Philbin, Member of Congress from the State of Massachusetts.

Hon. **Melvin Price**, Member of Congress from the State of Illinois.

Hon. **George M. Rhodes**, Member of Congress from the State of Pennsylvania.

Hon. **Fernand J. St Germain**, Member of Congress from the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. Zbigniew Stypulkowski, Washington representative of the Polish Council of National Unity in London.

Dr. Albert N. Tarulis.

Hon. Clement J. Zablocki, Member of Congress from the State of Wisconsin.

Hon. Petr Zenkl, former mayor of Prague, First Deputy Prime Minister and Member of Parliament of Czechoslovakia, now president, executive committee, Council of Free Czechoslovakia.

Following the completion of our hearings the Special Subcommittee on the Captive Nations submitted a report of its findings to the full Committee on Foreign Affairs. This report, released in the form of a committee print, received wide circulation and, I may add, aroused considerable public notice and discussion. I believe that the following passage from a letter which I received from Dr. George M. Dimitrov, chairman of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, is indicative of the public reaction to our hearings and to our committee's report:

Mr. Dimitrov wrote:

The impressive volume embodying the transcripts of the hearings is certainly an important contribution to a better understanding of conditions prevailing in Eastern Europe and of the policies consonant with the principles guiding U.S. foreign policy and best suited to serve the enlightened self-interest of the United States. The report, in turn, is a brilliant document, remarkably accurate in its findings, foward looking, lucid and realistic in its recommendations. It is a state paper which does honor to the Subcommittee on Europe and which bespeaks the painstaking care and good judgement of the man who assumed the burden of presiding over the hearings.

While I feel that Dr. Dimitrov may have been overly enthusiastic and generous in complimenting my contribution to the hearings and to the report on the captive nations, I would like to place his entire letter in the Congressional Record at this point because I believe it may help to dispel the apprehension of those who appear to feel uneasy about leaving matters relating to the captive nations where they belong under the rules of the House, namely, in the hands of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Dr. Dimitrov's letter reads as follows:

Assembly of Captive
European Nations,
New York, N.Y., January 9, 1963.

The Honorable John S. Monagan,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Representative Monagan: It is my privilege to convey to you the sincere gratification of the Assembly of Captive European Nations for the hearings you have conducted on behalf of Representative Edna Kelly, chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe, and more particularly for the report you have forwarded to the Honorable Thomas E. Morgan, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the findings you made and the recommendations you agreed upon as a result of the hearings.

The impressive volume embodying the transcripts of the hearings is certainly an important contribution to a better understanding of conditions prevailing in Eastern Europe and of the policies consonant with the principles guiding U.S. foreign policy and best suited to serve the enlightened self-interest of the United States. The report, in turn, is a brilliant document, remarkably accurate in its findings, forward looking, lucid and realistic in its recommendations. It is a state paper which does honor to the Subcommittee on Europe and which bespeaks the painstaking care and good judgment of the man who assumed the burden of presiding over the hearings.

We are most grateful to the subcommittee for recommending that the United States continue to manifest its refusal to accept the status quo in Eastern Europe and to support the right of self-determination of the peoples of the captive nations; that the United States expose Soviet colonialism and attach to this task as much importance as our Government does to the championing of the right of self-determination and national independence of the nations of other continents, and that the United States press the Hungarian question before the United Nations.

We are particularly gratified by the findings and recommendations the subcommittee has made in respect to the broadcasts of the Voice of America, in regard to which several of our witnesses felt obliged to present rather negative comments. It is our hope that the subcommittee will pursue this matter with a view to inducing a change in the policy of the Voice of America which would permit a greater emphasis on news which is stimulating for the east-central European audiences.

I take great pleasure in expressing the deep satisfaction of our assembly for your recommendation that consideration be given to the establishment of a special subcommittee on foreign affairs to deal with matters relating to the captive nations. Let me express our sincere wish that this suggestion earn the early approval of the Foreign Affairs Committee and that in the meantime the Subcommittee on Europe maintain its concern for our nations.

Please convey our warm thanks and appreciation to your colleagues in the committee and to the members of your staff for their outstanding work.

I avail myself of this occasion to express to you the warm congratulations of our assembly upon your reelection. The size of your victory was gratifying and indicative of the support your activities in the Congress have found among the people of Connecticut.

Sincerely yours,
Dr. George M. Dimitrov,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I would not want the membership of the House to rely on a single evaluation of my committee's work in this field. I could introduce into the Record many other letters received from persons living in different parts of the country, commenting on our efforts. But to simplify the whole matter, I believe that it would be best to let the Members judge for themselves. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record, at this point, the Findings and the Recommendations of the 1962 Report on the Captive Nations Hearings. These are as follows:

Findings

(A) U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

I

A congressional inquiry relating to the European captive nations must begin with a statement of U.S. policy toward those countries.

The subcommittee pursued this issue with Assistant Secretaries of State Foy Kohler and William Tyler, and with other witnesses, and was encouraged to receive a firm affirmation of the two fundamental principles underlying that policy.

These are the continued refusal by the U.S. Government to accept the status quo of Soviet domination of the captive nations and our Government's insistence on the right of the peoples of the captive nations to live under institutions and governments of their own choice.

In the words of Secretary Tyler:

"The United States desires to see in Eastern Europe fully independent nations enjoying internal freedom and normal relations with all countries."

The pursuit of this goal is founded on the traditional adherence by the United States to the principle of self-determination for all peoples.

II

While the policy of the U.S. Government, thus affirmed, is clear and meets with the approval of the subcommittee, we cannot escape the conclusion that certain executive agencies have failed to implement it to the proper and necessary degree. There is a lack of knowledge, and confusion, behind the Iron Curtain about the U.S. position on the captive European nations. That policy is not clearly understood even in the United States. This tends to undermine the spirit of resistance to communism in the captive nations, and should have been remedied long ago. Indicative of the attitude of executive agencies toward this issue is the failure of the Voice of America to give news coverage to the hearings of this committee on the captive nations even though responsible officials of that very Agency stated that it was obviously important for the people behind the Iron Curtain to be made aware of the continuing U.S. concern about their welfare.

III

There are other examples of this attitude—such as the reluctance to press for the condemnation, by the United Nations, of Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe, and the State Department's failure to counter Soviet threats to Berlin by insisting on a prompt settlement of all Central-East European issues pursuant to treaties entered into by the Allied Powers in connection with the conclusion of hostilities in World War II. Far more could have been done than actually has been done to sustain the spirit of resistance and the nationalistic aspirations of the peoples of the captive nations.

IV

The committee has been disturbed by the inconsistencies in the implementation of the U.S. policy of restricting strategic exports to the captive nations. Complying with the Export Control Act, the executive branch will not issue a license to an American manufacturer for the shipment of certain types of machinery and of other strategic goods to the Soviet bloc. At the same time, the captive nations frequently can import similar items from our allies in Western Europe. Under these circumstances, the members of the Soviet bloc are not denied the opportunity to purchase many products of strategic importance—but the American manufacturers are denied a prospective market. In the committee's view, the executive branch should increase present efforts to effectuate the purposes of the Battle Act by working for the adoption of a uniform policy toward this problem by all of our allies.

V

A majority of the committee feels that U.S. economic assistance to the captive European nations, when limited to nonmilitary, nonstrategic items and made subject to strict conditions, can serve the security interests of the United States. The committee is under no illusion that such assistance will produce a change in the Communist regimes of those countries, or free them from Soviet domination. It is, however, in our

national interest to sustain the spirit of resistance to communism among the peoples of the captive nations, to maintain their friendship and good will, and to strengthen their orientation toward the West. To the extent that economic assistance authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 can achieve these goals, it may prove to be a sound investment in the future.

VI

The committee strongly supports the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 which state that no aid shall be extended to any Communist country unless the President determines that such assistance is vital to the security of the United States and that other conditions set forth in the law are fulfilled.

(B) CONDITIONS IN THE CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS

I

The people of the captive nations, as distinguished from the regimes governing them, constitute a tremendous reservoir of good will for the United States. Their desire to be oriented toward the West, and their hope of eventually regaining their national independence, serve as a powerful brake upon the Soviet Union's freedom of action and capability to extend the Communist empire in Europe through intimidation and overt aggression.

II

Communist indoctrination, repression of religion, and their attempts to destroy the foundations of family life, have not succeeded in creating any substantial popular support for the Communist system in the captive nations. This is true even with respect to the youth of those countries who have been the object of concerted Communist indoctrination.

III

The committee is distressed to note that not only are antireligious activities continuing generally but that anti-Semitism and persecution of other minorities is on the rise in the Soviet bloc. Communist efforts to repress religion far from abating appear to be intensifying even in Poland where the regime has tried to avoid an open showdown with the Roman Catholic Church.

IV

The socialization of industry within the captive nations has frequently produced disappointing and even disastrous results. Collectivization of agriculture has been accompanied by widespread failures. Doctrinaire Communist insistence on the industrialization of each and every bloc country has frequently led to overinvestment in heavy industry, inefficient utilization of resources, and distorted patterns of intrabloc trade.

V

Because of the failure of bilateral trade agreements within the bloc, the Communists are now attempting through the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, to create a Common Market behind the Iron Curtain. Thus far, however, CEMA has failed to effectuate multilateral settlement of balances, or to produce a system of trade based on any realistic division of labor within the bloc.

(C) SOVIET POLICIES TOWARD THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

I

The policy of the Soviet Union toward the captive nations remains one of control and subjugation, even though its application differs in form and intensity from country to country. The military power of the Soviet Union is the sole cohesive agent which presently binds the captive nations to each other and to the Soviet Union.

II

The Soviet Union, in its trade with the captive nations, continues to discriminate against them and to exploit them. This is especially evident in the sales of Soviet oil to the captive nations.

III

Soviet domination of the captive European nations violates binding international agreements entered into by the Allied Powers—including the Soviet Union—in connection with the termination of hostilities in World War II. The forcible imposition of Communist regimes on the captive nations has deprived their peoples of the right to self-determination guaranteed them by those agreements.

Recommendations

The committee recommends that the appropriate executive agencies—

1. Take prompt, continuous, and energetic steps to make clear to the rest of the world that the United States continues to support the policy of refusing to accept the status quo in Eastern Europe, and the right to self-determination of the peoples of the captive nations;
2. Avail themselves of every opportunity to expose—especially to the peoples of the developing countries—the methods, the implications, and the consequences of Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe, attaching to this task as much importance as our Government does to the championing of the right to self-determination and national independence of the nations of other continents;
3. Urgently press the Hungarian question before the appropriate organs of the United Nations Organization;
4. Expand the Voice of America broadcasts, in native languages, to the captive nations;
5. Give proper coverage in those broadcasts and in other communications media to the activities and achievements of escapees and of organizations composed of individuals of Eastern European ancestry, and to other events of particular interest to the peoples of the captive nations;
6. Endeavor to expand exchanges and other contacts between the United States and the peoples of the captive nations;

The committee further recommends—

7. That the Congress provide the various agencies of the executive branch with the funds and support necessary to implement the above recommendations;
8. That all assistance to any captive nation be terminated promptly when it becomes apparent that such assistance is not serving the objectives of U.S. foreign policy;
9. That the Committee on Foreign Affairs continue to study developments in the captive European nations, and make appropriate recommendations to the Congress and to the executive branch;
10. That consideration be given to the advisability of undertaking a congressional study of the condition of other Communist-subjugated peoples; and
11. That consideration be given to the establishment of a special subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to deal with matters relating to the captive nations.

In conclusion, the committee believes that we can achieve diplomatic and strategic gains in the cold war if we pursue our objectives with vigor and determination. The Soviets push every advantage, and exploit every weakness of the free world. We should push every advantage, and exploit every weakness of the Communist bloc. In this respect, while the captive nations add some strength to the Soviet Union, it must be remembered that they are captive nations, seeking to regain their freedom at the earliest opportunity. As such, they constitute large areas of vulnerability for the Soviet Union.

We must always remember that our support for the legitimate objectives of liberty and self-determination for these friendly peoples may exploit a woefully weak spot in the Soviet system.

The reaction of the public to the activities of our subcommittee has been both encouraging and gratifying. As examples of this reaction, I include several selected items. The first is an article from Draugas, the Lithuanian language newspaper of Chicago, as follows:

May the Chips Fly

(An interview with Congressman John S. Monagan)

For the last several months, the House has been holding hearings on captive nations. They are being conducted by the Foreign Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on Europe and chaired by John S. Monagan, Connecticut Fifth District representative.

The Lithuanians know well the Fifth District, encompassing the city of Waterbury. They also know well their Congressman, former city mayor, a distinguished lawyer, and father of a nice family—John S. Monagan. There hardly has been a Lithuanian celebration the Congressman would not have attended, patiently listened to long speeches, enjoyed folk songs, and feasted his eyes on folk dances.

Draugas' Washington correspondent requested Mr. Monagan to tell the readers about the hearings on captive nations. Not only did he oblige; he also bought Draugas correspondent lunch so that the two could talk at length.

The first question was: What are the objectives of the hearings? It developed that the House wants to obtain new evidence on today's conditions in captive nations. What happens to the people and the national economy after several years under Soviet control? How is the Soviet economic system operating? What are its weak points? Does it lead to crises and debacles? Is it going to be replaced by some other form of a free enterprise? Are the captive nations being subjected to economic exploitation? Who gets the lion's share of the national production?

In the political field, the subcommittee wants to find out what happens to the enslavement technique in several years? Do the enslaved people turn Communists? Which groups of population are most resistant, which are the weakest? What can we expect in the future?

The subcommittee also would like to get a clearer picture of the views held by captive peoples on our foreign policy, aid and cultural exchange programs, VOA impact, and so forth.

Asked about the progress, Mr. Monagan replied that he already had heard witnesses from the State Department, VOA, Radio Free Europe, also Lithuanian, Polish, Latvian, Estonian Czechoslovak, Hungarian, Rumanian, and Albanian representatives. All the captive nations' representatives have recently arrived from behind the Iron Curtain or recently visited there. All of them maintain close, often secret contacts, with their countries.

In some instances, the contacts proved so important that the subcommittee will be unable to make public the entire material lest it would endanger the established communications and expose to danger certain persons behind the Iron Curtain.

It was a pleasure to hear Mr. Monagan refer to Engineer Juozas Miklovas as the best witness the subcommittee ever had. He had supplied the most valuable information. He had talked from his firsthand experience, rather than from what he had heard or read. "Read can we, too," the Congressman pointed out. At the same time, he brought out a strange fact, the difficulty of finding good witnesses, who would have recently arrived and held a broader view than their village.

Information the subcommittee received will help both Congress and administration to formulate a clearer idea as to the captive nations problem at this point. In Mr. MONAGAN's words, the subcommittee has barely scratched the surface. A great deal of work in connection with the processing and publication of the data received still lies ahead. Hearings are expected to close soon, since witnesses from all nine captive nations have already been heard.

Mr. MONAGAN withheld comment on the reasons for the failure to hear witnesses from the most populous captive nation—the Ukrainians. Draugas has already reported that the State Department regards the Ukraine as "a traditional part of historic Russia." No reasons are known either for the failure to hear witnesses from East Germany.

Unauthorized to speak on behalf of the whole Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. MONAGAN did not answer another question: Why the Committee is showing no interest in captive nations in Asia, including Asians in the Soviet Union, or in the captive Cuban nation, right beside us. The Congressman himself, while speaking on the floor on July 16, on the occasion of the Captive Nations Week, listed the Ukrainians, the Armenians, the Tibetans, and the North Koreans among the once free nations, now in Communist slavery.

The chairman of the presently conducted hearings on captive nations vigorously denied the oftenheard claim that the whole undertaking will amount to nothing more than whitewash of the State Department, opposing any mention of the captive nations problem. Mr. MONAGAN pointed out that he had not made up his mind ahead of time in regard to the deductions. "May the chips fly where they may," he said. The main objective of the hearings was to demonstrate to the captive nations that they had not been forgotten, that America is on their side, supporting their endeavor to regain freedom.

Mr. MONAGAN mentioned as an example that the captive nations problem lies deep in the heart of Congress: Congressmen who are not members of the subcommittee on Europe or even are not members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs dropped in at the hearings—some did so repeatedly. The Congressman cited more than a dozen names. Democrats and Republicans alike showed a great deal of interest in the hearings.

In concluding the interview, Mr. MONAGAN said quite a few warm words about the Lithuanians who had made a contribution to the hearings, namely, Dr. A. Trimakas, Lithuanian Charge J. Kajeckas, both witnesses Engineer J. Miklovas and J. Stukas, and the interpreter Dr. A. N. Tarulis.

I include also a column from the Washington Daily News of November 28, 1962, by Marshall McNeil, as follows:

GROUP WOULD BARE RED COLONIALISM

(By Marshall McNeil)

The United States should mount a stepped-up campaign to make the rest of the world know it does not accept the captive status of Eastern European nations now in the Kremlin's grip.

A House Foreign Affairs subcommittee today appealed for this, saying we should continually expose to the developing nations of Africa and Asia the results of Russian Communist colonialism.

The people of the captive nations of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania—as distinguished from their Communist rulers—"constitute a tremendous reservoir of good will for the United States," the committee said.

"Their desire to be oriented toward the West, and their hope of eventually regaining their national independence serve as a powerful brake upon the Soviet Union's freedom of action and capability to extend the Communist empire in Europe through intimidation and overt aggression."

The committee, whose report was filed by Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, Democrat, of Connecticut, said it was "distressed to note that not only are antireligious activities continuing generally but that anti-Semitism and persecution of other minorities is on the rise in the Soviet bloc."

But it said Communist indoctrination, repression of religion and attempts to destroy foundations of family life "have not succeeded in creating any substantial popular support for the Communist system."

Assistant Secretary of State William Tyler told the committee: "The United States desires to see in Eastern Europe fully independent nations enjoying internal freedom and normal relations with all countries."

But, the committee report said, while U.S. policy is clear, "we cannot escape the conclusion that certain executive agencies have failed to implement it to the proper and necessary degree."

Another interesting article was written by Philip Warden and appeared in the Chicago Tribune on the same date, as follows:

URGE UNITED STATES KEEP HOPE OF RED CAPTIVES ALIVE

[By Philip Warden]

WASHINGTON.—A House foreign affairs subcommittee dominated by Kennedy Democrats and Eisenhower Republicans issued a report today which was sharply critical of the Kennedy administration in dealing with the problems of the captive nations in Europe.

The report charged that confusion behind the Iron Curtain over America's position on the captive nations has tended to undermine the spirit of resistance to communism in Poland, Latvia, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the others.

The subcommittee accused the Kennedy administration of failing to make a good fight in the United Nations to condemn Russian "colonialism" in eastern Europe, and urged officials to avail themselves of every opportunity to expose Russian methods of colonization and their consequences.

The subcommittee also accused the Voice of America of failing to provide captive nations with news coverage of the extensive hearings conducted by the subcommittee into captive nation problems.

The subcommittee began its hearings last July on matters affecting United States relations with Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania.

Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, Democrat, of Connecticut, was chairman of the subcommittee of six Democrats and three Republicans. Four of the Democrats and two of the Republicans traditionally vote with the Kennedy and Eisenhower wings of their parties, and usually vigorously support administration foreign policies.

Democrats on the subcommittee, besides Monogan, were Edna F. Kelly of New York, Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio, Armistead I. Selden, of Alabama, Cornelius E. Gallagher, of New Jersey, and Lindley Beckworth, of Texas. The Republicans were Peter Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey, Robert R. Barry, of New York, and Horace Seely-Brown, of Connecticut.

The subcommittee said that while there is "continued refusal by the U.S. Government to accept the status quo of Soviet domination of the captive nations," certain executive agencies have failed to implement this policy to the proper and necessary degree.

"There is a lack of knowledge and confusion behind the Iron Curtain about the U.S. position on the captive European nations," the report said. "That policy is not clearly understood even in the United States. This tends to undermine the spirit of resistance to communism in the captive nations, and should have been remedied long ago."

A further article by C. P. Trussell appeared in the New York Times, as follows:

UNITED STATES SAID TO FAIL CAPTIVE LANDS—HOUSE UNIT WOULD STIMULATE SPIRIT OF RESISTANCE

(By C. P. Trussell)

WASHINGTON.—A House Foreign Affairs subcommittee accused the State Department and the Voice of America today of failing to stimulate the spirit of resistance to communism in the eastern European nations behind the Iron Curtain.

In a report on 10 public hearings held earlier this year, the subcommittee contended that resistance was undermined by confusion among the people of these nations regarding the U.S. position.

The panel criticized U.S. reluctance to press for United Nations condemnation of Soviet colonialism in Eastern Europe.

The State Department should counter Soviet threats to Berlin, the subcommittee declared, by insisting on a prompt settlement of all Central and East European issues pursuant to treaties entered into by the Allied Powers in connection with the conclusion of hostilities in World War II.

"Far more could have been done than actually has been done," the subcommittee said, "to sustain the spirit of resistance and the nationalistic aspirations of the peoples of the captive nations."

The panel, headed by Representative EDNA F. KELLY, Democrat, of Brooklyn, concentrated upon conditions in Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Rumania. The hearings were under the chairmanship of Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, Democrat, of Connecticut.

GENERAL POLICY BACKED

In its report the subcommittee emphasized its approval of the Government's policy toward the Iron Curtain nations, but said it had not been given full force.

"Indicative of the attitude of executive agencies toward this issue," the subcommittee said, "is the failure of the Voice of America to give news coverage to the hearings of this committee on the captive nations even though responsible officials of that very agency stated that it was obviously important for the people behind the Iron Curtain to be made aware of the continuing U.S. concern about their welfare."

The panel endorsed provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 under which foreign aid can be extended to a Communist country if the President determines that such assistance is vital to the security of the United States. The report went on:

"The committee is under no illusion that (nonmilitary) assistance will produce a change in the Communist regimes of (captive) countries, or free them from Soviet domination. It is, however, in our national interest to sustain the spirit of resistance to communism among the peoples of captive nations, to maintain their friendship and good will, and to strengthen their orientation toward the West.

"To the extent that economic assistance * * * can achieve these goals, it may prove to be a sound investment in the future."

Also interesting was the reaction of individual citizens and I include herewith two letters which are characteristic of many others which were received.

The letters follow:

NOVEMBER 28, 1962.

Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am very grateful to you for sending me a copy of the "Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Europe" and so forth. I have read the book from cover to cover and have learned much from it. I also wish to thank you again for all you have done in behalf of these captive nations.

Sincerely yours,

ANN I. KOKERNAK.

WORCESTER, MASS.

FEBRUARY 27, 1963.

Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have read and reread with great interest hearings and reports on captive European nations and your remarks made in Congress as well as your speech I heard at American-Lithuanian rally in Waterbury, St. Joseph's School, on February 17, 1963.

All American-Lithuanian people appreciate you and your efforts you have made as a chairman of a subcommittee which held hearings on the captive nations of Europe, and we feel that the material you have got from hearings is useful for free world to keep it well informed against Moscow propaganda.

By the way, I ask you cordially to support all resolutions in Congress that request to restore free, democratic Lithuania.

I am very thankful for all your reports, records, and letters I have got from you.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH GELUMBAUSKAS.

Mr. Speaker, my committee's concern with the developments in the captive nations did not end with the publication of our report. After the adjournment of the Congress, together with the Honorable HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., of Delaware, and the Honorable WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, of Michigan, both members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I traveled on a factfinding mission to Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union. The Honorable ROBERT GRIFFIN, of Michigan, accompanied our group in order to inquire into matters coming under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations, of which he is a member. We have hoped and planned to visit a number of the other captive European nations. Unfortunately, difficulties in obtaining visas and time limitations prevented us from realizing that part of our plans.

As a consequence of this study mission, we submitted a second report relating to the captive nations to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This report is available to all Members of Congress and to the public. It deals with recent developments in Poland and Czechoslovakia, as well as in the Soviet Union, the captor nation. The report is too long to be placed in the RECORD in its entirety. I ask unanimous consent, however, to place in the RECORD at this point the opening part of the report, entitled "The Iron Curtain Stands Fast," and the "Conclusions."

These read as follows:

THE IRON CURTAIN STANDS FAST

Our committee returned from its visit behind the Iron Curtain with strong reactions.

First of all, we had the physical reaction of revulsion at seeing the Berlin wall and the cruel barrier between free Austria and captive Czechoslovakia. No amount of words can convey the impression one gains from the sight of these barricades.

Secondly, we concluded that the Russians, in spite of great advances in some fields, continue to suffer disastrous results in many others and that the triumph of communism over the free world is not implicit in the Marxist system.

Thirdly, we found that many changes have occurred, and are occurring, in the Soviet Union, in her relations with the captive nations, and in her relations with other Communist countries. We would caution, however, against any belief that these changes presage any immediate or large-scale change in the nature of Communist control, of its totalitarian trappings, or of its imperialistic tendencies.

Lastly, we decided that present attitudes on the part of the U.S. Government must change if we are to take advantage of the opportunities for significant gains presented by these changing conditions.

The reality of the Iron Curtain as a barrier remains. It signifies a failure on the part of the Soviet system to reach its goals and to provide successful competition with the free world for the minds and loyalties of the captives behind the barrier.

CONCLUSIONS

Mediocre industrial performances and severe agricultural lags continue to plague several of the captive European nations as well as the Soviet Union. Concurrently, partly as a consequence of the Sino-Soviet rift and partly because of the rising level of expectations and other internal developments within some of those countries, the cohesion of the Communist bloc is being subjected to considerable strain. The latter development affords the West an opportunity to establish broader contacts with the peoples behind the Iron Curtain, to influence their basic orientation, and to sustain such resistance to Communist persuasion as currently exists in that area of the world.

As mentioned in an earlier report of the Subcommittee on Europe, it would be foolhardy to expect any major changes to occur within the Soviet bloc in the near future. The national Communist regimes continue to exercise effective control over the peoples of those countries. This control shows no sign of any significant cracks. The bloc's economic relations with the United States and with other free countries, and such exchange programs as are currently in effect between the free world and some members of the Soviet bloc, will not alter this situation. They will not produce an overflow of the national Communist regimes, nor cause them to suffer a change of heart and abandon the goal of a "Communist world system." At best, they constitute an investment in maintaining Western presence behind the Iron Curtain and in sustaining the captive peoples' basic Western orientation—an investment which may pay off in the long run when the interaction of other, more weighty events will make it possible for the peoples behind the Iron Curtain to exert direct influence upon the domestic and external policies of their countries.

The study group is of the opinion that the Congress and the executive branch should continue to give careful attention to developments within the captive European nations. The study group further believes that sparing and carefully designed use of the instruments of our foreign policy—including trade and other relations—with respect to these countries is appropriate and, in the long run, may produce results beneficial to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that I have imposed excessively upon the time of the Members here present. I felt, however, that the things I have said needed to be put into the RECORD to keep the Members of the House fully apprised of the activities of my committee, relating to the captive nations. I can assure the membership of the House that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Subcommittee on Europe, under the able chairmanship of Congresswoman EDNA F. KELLY, of New York, will continue to pay careful attention to developments within the captive nations, and to make appropriate legislative recommendations bearing on this subject to the House of Representatives.

CUBA—THE GREEK SHIPPING RECORD

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 25 I made a statement on the floor of the House drawing attention to a press release issued by the Royal Greek Embassy Press and Information Service announcing a royal decree had been promulgated to stop all Greek shipping to captive Cuba, known to all who are literate and many who are not as a Russian beachhead in the Western Hemisphere. A careful reading of that Royal Decree, however, revealed an exception to its application which for all practical purposes nullified the decree. That exception applied to all Greek-flag ships under time-charter contract, that is, Greek ships under contract to carry cargo to Russian-occupied Cuba for a period of time set by contract.

When I read that press statement I was shocked by the all too obvious attempt to create by a mirror of words, a public impression that did violence to the facts. Anyone with a passing knowledge of international commerce and the meaning of time-charter contract in the shipping business would have been equally shocked. To right this situation, very likely provoked by the growing public pressure in the United States against all who provide succor to the Russian regime in Cuba, I called upon the Greek Government to move with haste in making a full public disclosure of the facts about Greek-flag ships calling at Cuba. I felt the American people were entitled to all the facts, not a carefully tailored press statement, and suggested action within 48 hours was a reasonable expectation.

That 48 hours has passed and I am unaware of any public disclosure of the facts being released by the Royal Greek Embassy Press and Information Service. Consequently, I will provide an assist. The information which I have been able to secure from official U.S. sources is not claimed to be complete. But I do state it to be accurate and very revealing.

Since January 1, 1963, up to March 25, 1963, a total of 43 ships flying the flag of a free world nation have carried cargo to captive Cuba. Greek-flag ships head the list—a total of 13 with an estimated total cargo in excess of 100,000 tons.

This questionable first place honor is shared with British-flag ships, a total of 13 carried cargo to Cuba during the same 3-month period. The British-flag ships won first prize in total tonnage—over 150,000 tons. But the British have made no official gesture to conceal their tarnished laurels.

A further look at the record reveals that a total of 31 Greek-flag ships carried cargo to captive Cuba during the period September 1, 1962, to December 31, 1962. That was the period of intensive Russian military buildup in Cuba. At that time the danger signals on what the Russians were up to in Cuba were clear for all to see. Those danger signals reached such a critical point in early October that President Kennedy was required to meet the threat head on, which he did in his address to the Nation, and to the world, on October 22.

The record also reveals that a total of 171 Greek-flag ships have carried cargo to captive Cuba since January 1, 1962—a short period of 15 months. That averages over 11 Greek-flag ships per month for the 15-month period.

It is estimated that 80 percent of Greek-flag ships were under time-charter contract to the Russians or Russian bloc regimes during 1962.

That is the record, at least a large part of it, up to last Monday, March 25, 1963. I preferred and hoped that the Royal Greek Embassy Press and Information Service would make this disclosure, but when they did not, I did so in the interest of keeping the record straight.

One large question remains to be answered in the form of a public disclosure by the Royal Greek Embassy Press and Information Service. That question is—How many Greek-flag ships are still under time-charter contract to the Russians or any of their stooge Communist regimes and how much time remains on each of those contracts? This is an important question because an answer to it will reveal how many Greek-flag ships will be carrying cargo to captive Cuba during the months if not years ahead. Every ship, regardless of which flag it flies, carrying cargo to captive Cuba, strikes at the cause of human freedom in the Western Hemisphere. That is a reality with which we and our sister republics of the hemisphere must live.

CONGRESS CAN KEEP A SECRET

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, former CIA Director Allen Dulles told the Magazine Publishers Association last Tuesday evening that he knew from experience that Congress could keep a secret.

To prove his point, Mr. Dulles revealed that he had told Congress about our U–2 flights some 5 years before one was shot down over Russia in May 1960.

I certainly agree with Mr. Dulles, and to prove my point I would like to cite the Hoover Commission report which recommended the establishment of a joint congressional watchdog committee to oversee the CIA. That report, transmitted to the Congress in 1955, showed the similarity between such a watchdog committee and the now existing Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which has jurisdiction over our Nation's nuclear secrets. To my knowledge, there has never been an atomic secret which has leaked from that committee into alien hands.

We live in a free society. That is our Nation's strength. We are forced by world circumstances to engage in the clandestine affairs of international espionage, and have made exceptions to national principles where such efforts are necessary. When Congress created the Central Intelligence Agency in 1947, it granted the CIA privileged exemption from the scrutiny of a free society. However, Congress was painfully neglectful in not providing itself with a sufficient channel for communication and liaison with CIA stewardship.

And Congress knows that no Government agency should be left alone to police itself. Lack of congressional supervision only permits Government bureaus to follow an independent course of action—in effect, to bypass the Congress itself, leaving the American people with a diluted voice in their own affairs.

The CIA is the only Government bureau not subject to routine control by Congress. CIA activities should be given careful and regular review. Secrecy can be maintained in the Congress, and the right of congressional review in sensitive areas should not be questioned.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of a joint House-Senate watchdog committee to give constant and needed review to the intelligence activities of this Nation.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF APRIL 1

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week and for the balance of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. There will be some matters brought up today from the Committee on House Administration, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on the Judiciary, which should not take long. When those matters are completed we will have finished the business of the week and it will be our hope that we may adjourn over until Monday.

With reference to the inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana, the distinguished minority leader, as to the program for next week, Monday is Consent Calendar day and there are seven suspensions, as follows:

H.R. 199, deaf veterans, increase compensation.

H.R. 211, increase compensation, parents of children of deceased veterans.

H.R. 214, statutory award for aphonia.

H.R. 220, new modified life plan for NSLI policyholders.

H.R. 228, additional pay, directors and chiefs of staffs, VA medical installations.

H.R. 243, increased compensation for certain service-connected disabled veterans.

H.R. 248, paraplegic housing program.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called and we will take up the Department of the Interior appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1964.

The program for Wednesday is undetermined.

On Thursday we will take up the Treasury, Post Office, and executive offices appropriation bill for 1964.

This announcement, of course, is made with the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced later.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN'S 85TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate one of the great Americans of our times on his 85th birthday—Senator Herbert H. Lehman.

As Governor of New York, as U.S. Senator from New York, as Director-General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and most of all as a beacon of American liberalism, Senator Lehman has made a substantial and everlasting contribution to our democracy.

Herbert Lehman's supreme integrity, great intellect and deep concern for justice, human dignity and freedom all combine to make him one of the most respected and beloved politicians of all time. Throughout his career he has been a vigilant defender of civil liberties and his courageous fight against the scourge of McCarthyism long will be remembered.

At the age of 80, when he had already received the highest honors the people of New York State could bestow, Senator Lehman undertook a crusade for political reform and against the boss system in New York. As the spiritual father of the reform Democratic movement, he has been a source of great inspiration.

Mr. Speaker, last night on the eve of his 85th birthday Governor Lehman celebrated with his family and friends. It was wonderful to see him surrounded by those who love him and to know that he is recovering so well from his recent accident.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all Members will want to join today in extending to Senator Lehman and Mrs. Lehman and

their family our best wishes on this happy occasion and to wish the Governor many more happy birthdays.

WELFARE OF ALL THE PEOPLE

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration came into being in 1935, 12 years after I came to Congress. The program has proven highly effective. In that year only 6 percent of Missouri's farms, and 11 percent of the Nation's farms, were electrified. Today, 98 percent of our farms are electrified, and every farm and home in rural America that wants this service can have it.

There are some who point to the $3 billion REA has outstanding on its electrification loans and say the cost is too high. But this is not an item of cost. It is investment, gilt edge and the best investment the Government ever has made in a domestic program.

Look at the record. From its beginning, REA has advanced just over $4 billion to its electrification borrowers—$1.1 billion has been repaid on principal, $200 million of this was paid in advance of due date. In addition, $550 million has been paid in interest. Losses total less than $50,000. No bank, no Government agency, no group of borrowers have ever before built up such a record.

The benefits have not stopped at our city and town lines. The rural electrification program has stimulated expenditure of as much as $20 billion of private funds, $5 for each $1 of Federal investment. This has gone for electrical wiring, appliances and equipment, all manufactured in our cities from the raw materials of our mines and farms. It has kept down rates and reduced monthly electric bills in the city as well as in the country. Labor has benefited, as have industry and commerce. Rural electrification has been good for all America. It is truly an all-American program.

Time after time, attempts have been made to cut back and cut down on rural electrification. These attacks have been made in the courts, in the Appropriations Committee, in other commitees, and on the floor of this House. The guns were always loaded by the power company lobbyists who have never stopped trying. When they could not put through cuts in loan funds, they tried to cripple REA by cutting administrative expenses appropriations. Their main target has always been and still is loans for generating plants. These loans—the main defense of the electric cooperatives against the raiders—have been the lifeline of the rural electrics. Only last year, we defeated an attempt to cut down that lifeline. And we can expect them back again this year. Like Khrushchev, they have warned us they will be back.

Another line of attack over the years has been to put the electric cooperatives' generating loans under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. This was tried by a Senate committee rider to the urgent deficient appropriation bill for 1946. It was beaten down by a vote of 52 to 21 after Senate friends of rural electrification warned that adoption of the rider would hamstring the program. Bills to achieve this same result were brought to the floor of the House in 1946 and again in 1948. Even our Appropriations Committee in the House urged this in its May 1947 report on the Agriculture appropriation bill for 1948.

We have held the line all these years in the Congress. We have so far saved rural electrification when it was threatened. But a new threat from a new direction faces the program today. The Federal Power Commission has in recent weeks made the opening moves in the direction of exercising jurisdiction over the rural electric cooperatives. I have heard from systems in my own State who are deeply concerned about the Commission moving in on them. They are concerned with more than the threat to regulate them as public utilities—which they are not. They see the predatory power companies seizing upon this as a new opportunity to interfere and delay. And if the companies do not succeed before the Commission, they can take them to court, piling further delay and expense on their nonprofit operations—hoping to break them down.

There is nothing in the REA and FPC statutes, absolutely nothing, to warrant FPC's assumption of jurisdiction. Congress has never intended that FPC review loans made by REA. The Federal Power Act gave the Commission jurisdiction over public utility financing to protect private investors. The United States does not need protection as an investor in rural electrification. The Federal Power Act gives the Commission jurisdiction over electric power rates charged to the public by the public utilities within its regulatory sphere. The electric cooperatives are self-regulating in this respect. Their member-consumers set the rates. If the rates are higher than needed for nonprofit operation, the overage comes back to them.

I have yet to learn what lies back of this outrageous proposal. Whatever the motive, it has no legal basis. If the Commission wants its jurisdiction extended to include cooperatives, let it come to the Congress legitimately and ask for such an extension.

I append an authoritative exposition by the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration:

FEBRUARY 14, 1963.

Hon. JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: My attention has been called to a succession of actions taken by the Federal Power Commission and its staff which appear to be steps toward the exercising by the Commission of jurisdiction over electric cooperatives which are borrowers from the Rural Electrification Administration. It is not altogether clear what significance these actions may have.

We are aware that in a few instances in the past where REA borrowers have entered into arrangements with public utilities already subject to the Commission's jurisdiction, the particular transactions have been reviewed by the Commission, generally with the full cooperation of the REA borrowers affected. In discussions of these cases with Commission staff members, REA representatives have stated their understanding that these cases did not constitute an assertion of, or acquiescence in, the Commission's exercise of general jurisdiction over REA-financed cooperatives. REA representatives have assumed that, before any such step was taken by the Commission, REA would have an opportunity to present its views.

I am aware that the Commission has certain responsibilities imposed upon it by law. REA not only would not wish to interfere with the Commission's exercise of these responsibilities, but would feel bound to cooperate fully to assist in every way it could in the proper exercise of the Commission's functions. At the same time, however, the Commission should be aware that Congress has imposed certain responsibilities upon the REA Administrator, not only with respect to protection of the Government's security and financial interest as lender of funds, but also with respect to the achievement of the program objectives of rural electrification set forth in the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. These responsibilities of our respective agencies contained in statutes enacted close to each other in point of time should be exercised in such manner as to exclude conflict and to promote most effectively the respective statutory purposes.

I am seriously concerned by indications that assertion of Commission jurisdiction in ways which seem to be contemplated by Commission staff members may interfere with the orderly functioning of the REA program and the performance of my statutory duties. I cannot believe that Congress intended to divide responsibility between REA and the Commission in the making of loans under the Rural Electrification Act. Besides the ineffective administration which would result from having two Federal agencies passing on whether or not a loan was feasible, such fragmentation of authority is completely out of keeping with the nature of the REA program and the expressions of its sponsors in the Congress. The legislative history of the Rural Electrification Act is replete with references to the urgent need for prompt correction of rural America's lag in electrification. The only concession which the Rural Electrification Act made to "second guessing" of the Administrator's loanmaking power when the emergency agency created in 1935 by executive order was given statutory recognition in 1936 was the proviso in section 4 of the Rural Electrification Act that for generating plant loans the consent of commissions which under State law had jurisdiction had to be obtained. Certainly, if Congress intended the Federal Power Commission to enter into the REA program functioning, it would have expressly so provided.

In the more than 25 years since establishment of REA, cooperative borrowers have functioned outside of FPC jurisdiction, with the rare exceptions mentioned above where the transaction before the Commission involved a party clearly subject to FPC jurisdiction. The reason, we believe, your predecessors took no action to exercise general jurisdiction over REA-financed cooperatives (even if we assume for purposes of argument they believed they had the legal power to do so) is to be found in the following two factors which are present in the operations of REA-financed cooperatives as distinguished from electric public utilities generally:

1. Consumer owned service: The need for Commission regulation to assure acceptable standards of service and reasonable rates to the users of the service simply disappears when the users of the service own and control the supplying facilities. In the words

of the Supreme Court of Utah (*Garkane Power Co.* v. *Pub. Serv. Comm.*, 100 P. 2d 571, Annot. 132 ALR 1495):

In its argument the Commission contends that as a matter of policy it would be bad to allow cooperatives such as Garkane to escape supervision and regulation on the theory, largely, that they must be protected from themselves or the members be protected from mismanagement. On the contrary, it appears that there is no need for regulation of true cooperatives. There is no conflict of consumer and producer interests—they are one and the same. If rates are too high the surplus collected is returned to the consumers pro rata. If rates are too low, the consumers must accept curtailed service or provide financial contribution to the corporation. If service is not satisfactory the consumer-members have it in their power to elect other directors and demand certain changes. Resort to equity, as in the case of all mutuals, may be had if one group of members seeks to over-reach the others. The function of the Commission in approving rates, capital structure, etc., is unneeded by Garkane, its members, or the communities which it will serve.

2. REA Loan Application Review and Loan Document Controls. The need for Commission regulation to protect the investing public against unsound financing disappears when the lender of substantially all of the funds involved is the United States itself. Especially is this so where the statute authorizes the making of these loans "on such terms and conditions relating to the expenditure of the moneys loaned and the security therefor as the REA Administrator shall determine." The Rural Electrification Act expressly requires that the Administrator shall find and certify "that in his judgment the security therefor is reasonably adequate and such loan will be repaid within the time agreed." It must be assumed that the Administrator will diligently perform his statutory duties, making the necessary feasibility studies and imposing loan document controls which will assure that only economically sound projects will be constructed.

On a number of occasions, interests hostile to the sound development of the REA program have sought, without success, to amend the REA Act to expressly provide for FPC jurisdiction over REA functioning in certain areas. For example, H.R. 5555 (79th Cong. 2d sess.) would have required FPC consent for generating and transmission loans if they were no State commission with jurisdiction. After a full week of hearings a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce did not report the bill. Another bill would have required FPC certification that there is insufficient power available at reasonable rates as a prerequisite to generating loans. This was defeated in the Senate in 1946 by 52 to 21 rollcall vote (92 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1799). These and other efforts to inject FPC into the functioning of the REA program show that (i) opponents as well as REA program supporters have regarded the REA operation as outside of FPC jurisdiction under the law as it existed and has continued to exist and (ii) Congress, despite the prompting of opponents of the program, has not considered that it would be in the public interest to change the existing REA–FPC relationship by superimposing on the REA operations and FPC review jurisdiction

The indicated enlargement of FPC jurisdiction would provide a forum and opportunity for obstruction of the program which hostile interests have failed to gain, either before Congress or the courts. It would open the way for burdening the REA borrowers and the REA staff with the expense of protracted hearings and appellate proceedings, affording these hostile interests new opportunities for undermining or crippling cooperative projects.

This entire matter is of serious concern to us and we would like to discuss this with you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN M. CLAPP,
Administrator.

ESTABLISHMENT OF OREGON DUNES NATIONAL SEASHORE IN THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon. The bill in its present form represents the work of many months on my part and a great deal of prior work by many persons. It is, I think, as carefully drawn as it can be. Though I am sure additional refinement can be discovered.

A similar bill has been introduced in the other body, the chief differences being the boundaries of the proposed park area. I hope that these differences can be satisfactorily resolved in the legislative process, and that there will be legislation presented to the President and enacted into law to establish this important recreation facility.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter to the people of my district. Although there is opposition to establishment of the park. I believe the concept is sound, and I am convinced the bill as written protects the interests of the people of the area as well as the interests of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point the text of a press release issued from my office in connection with the introduction of this bill:

Congressman ROBERT B. DUNCAN, Democrat, of Oregon, today introduced in the House of Representatives a bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the Fourth District of Oregon.

"My objective," DUNCAN said, "has been to outline as fine a seashore park as possible. My further objectives have been to make certain that the interference with individual private property, with the tree farms and with the local woods products industries is minimal, and that we do not nullify the bills which we passed last session in the Oregon Legislature to insure new woods products industrial development near Gardiner.

"Senator NEUBERGER, Secretary Udall, and I are very close to agreement," said DUNCAN. "The scope of the park is the only serious disagreement. I am hopeful that this can be resolved so that the entire park issue can be solved. I think this is of prime importance to the coastal area which I represent."

DUNCAN's bill defines the seashore park as extending from the Siuslaw River on the north to a point opposite Lakeside on the south and with certain exceptions following the boundaries of the present national forest. The southern boundary is substantially the same as in all the prior proposals. This means that in some areas the park would not extend to the highway. Those areas generally would be along the southern half of Woahink Lake, west of the north half of Siltcoos Lake and in the area just north of the Umpqua River.

DUNCAN pointed out that it would be desirable to have public access in the park to those fresh water lakes. After conferring with property owners, he found that access can probably be obtained on a trade or purchase basis. Corridors of access could be obtained along the south end of Woahink, the southwest side of Siltcoos and the southwest side of Tahkenitch.

In preparing his bill, Congressman DUNCAN has spent uncounted hours conferring in person and by phone with members of the Oregon delegation, the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Secretary of Agriculture, Governor Hatfield, Oregon's Game Department and numerous private citizens and property owners in the involved area.

"I have spent days reviewing other park legislation, poring over section maps delineating ownerships of various tracts and personally drafting language which was incorporated into the bill," DUNCAN said.

At a press conference late last week, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall said of DUNCAN, "He has done a tremendous amount of work on the boundaries and on the problems—he has refined this bill down. I think we are much nearer to agreement than we were 2 months ago. I think Congressman DUNCAN had done a very outstanding job in eliminating some of the differences and in bringing a new approach to the legislation."

DUNCAN feels that his bill would provide Oregon, and the Nation, with a fine seashore park.

"It would preserve the dunes in the hands of the National Park Service. It would give substantial access to the fresh water lakes. Aside from county property, State property, national forest property and comparatively small parcels of property owned by Sparrow and Crown Zellerbach, which I am sure can be obtained by trade or purchase, there are only about 14 parcels of private property involved, and that all west of the highway."

The Fourth District Congressman said he will press for committee hearings as soon as possible by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. These hearings would be held in Oregon so that interested parties could voice their opinions.

"However," DUNCAN said, "it would seem unfeasible to hold such hearings during the coming Easter recess. There is a possibility of scheduling the hearings for some time this summer, but it seems likely this fall would be a more reasonable target date."

DUNCAN pointed out that he has had many letters about the dunes park with all varieties of suggestions—from an all-encompassing park to no park at all.

"I feel the time has come to settle this dispute," he said. "Leaving this matter in doubt, in my opinion, is having an adverse effect on the entire local community of Western Lane, Western Douglas and Coos Counties. I am convinced that my bill will draw strong support from the local area and will result in settling this matter."

DUNCAN said he recognizes that one of the big problems in achieving an agreement is the failure of the counties to achieve any zoning that would prohibit an undesirable development along the proposed borders. He has urged the county courts to move in this direction.

"I am encouraged that work is now underway and I hope that we may have some prompt, affirmative action along this line from the counties," DUNCAN said.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS SITUATED IN THE CITY OF ROSEBURG, OREG.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg. An identical bill is being introduced today in the other body by the two Senators from Oregon. I anticipate early action on this legislation, which is technical in nature and entirely noncontroversial.

This property was originally conveyed to the Federal Government without any payment to the city of Roseburg, and it is now surplus to the needs of the Federal Government. The property will make a fine addition to the municipal park which it abuts.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include at this point the text of a resolution in regard to this matter passed by the City Council of Roseburg at a meeting early this year:

Whereas officials in charge of the U.S. Veterans' Administration facility at Roseburg, Oreg., have indicated that the two separate parcels of land now constituting a portion of the properties of that facility and which are more particularly described in exhibit A attached hereto are no longer needed by that facility and will be recommended to be declared as surplus real property; and

Whereas all of the real property of said facility lying north of the South Umpqua River originally was acquired by the city of Roseburg, Oreg., for a substantial monetary consideration and thereupon was conveyed to the U.S. Government without the payment of any monetary consideration whatsoever; and

Whereas the lands described in exhibit A are adjacent to Stewart Park, a municipal park owned by said city, and are desirable as an addition thereto, and the city desires to acquire the same for said purpose; and

Whereas in all equity and in view of the land transfer by said city to the U.S. Government as aforesaid, it is considered that the provisions of Federal law relative to the disposal of surplus real property should not be applicable to this situation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Roseburg, Oreg., That the Honorable WAYNE MORSE and the Honorable MAURINE NEUBERGER, U.S. Senators from Oregon, and the Honorable ROBERT B. DUNCAN, U.S. Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon, be and they hereby are requested to introduce and work for the passage of a bill in the Congress of the United States to provide for the transfer of title to the said city of Roseburg of the lands described in exhibit A, without the payment of any monetary consideration therefor.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSMEN WHO CHEAT

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, the article entitled "Congressmen Who Cheat," appearing in a nationally distributed Sunday supplement under the cloak of anonymity, was a vicious attack upon Congress itself and unidentified Members.

As one Member, I resent this bitterly. So do the great majority of Members.

It must be remembered, without any apology, that Members of Congress are human beings endowed with all the frailities and virtues of human nature.

Certainly, I do not condone or excuse any abuses of their positions of trust.

These attacks have been arising with increasing regularity so that I have asked the chairman of the Committee on House Administration to conduct open hearings at which the author who purported to report the statements of an anonymous Member would be called to present openly whatever facts he claims to have.

How else can we correct the so-called abuses or cheating, as he calls them? We must have the facts, And, is not the accused entitled to face his accuser?

It is difficult for me to believe that any Member would degrade himself in such a cowardly manner by making charges without providing the proof.

If he has the facts and has not reported them to the proper committee, he is guilty of gross negligence and violation of his oath.

Many things occurring in our country and abroad have aroused my anger this year. But, nothing so riles me as articles like this, that tend to destroy the confidence of the people in Congress.

Frankly, I do not believe this was a statement of any "anonymous Member." I hope the appropriate committee will invite the author of this article at once and ask for proof of facts, and air this subject once and for all and lay it to rest.

OUR AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, there is little consolation in being able to say, "I told you so." But anyone who is interested in the economy of this Nation and particularly in the agricultural economy must certainly be able to see by now that "the chickens are coming home to roost."

And, I am not necessarily referring to broilers when I use the word "chickens." I am referring to agriculture in general.

For a number of years I have been pointing out to the Congress and to the Nation that this constant increase of agricultural imports could only mean destruction to American agriculture. Each time we have had a farm bill on this House floor I have pointed out that the problem of agriculture is not one of domestically produced surpluses, but one of foreign agricultural imports.

Last year, when we had the so-called Trade Expansion Act on this floor for consideration, I again pointed out that the further reduction of tariffs and quotas and the further use of our agricultural industry as a "foreign aid" program could only lead to complete destruction of American agriculture.

As I said at the outset, there is little consolation in saying, "I told you so," but last year I pointed out that beef imports in 1961 had jumped to 2¼ million head, and I said that unless the policy was changed these imports would be bound to increase. I have just completed a tabulation on the 1962 imports of beef, and find that last year we imported over 2¾ million head of thousand-pound beef. All this while our beef exports have been on the decline.

Beef prices have dropped from 9 to 10 cents a pound which means $90 or $100 on a thousand-pound beef, and which has already cost the American rancher and farmer over a billion dollars.

There has been a great deal of talk about "getting the country moving." One of the poorest ways to improve the economy of this country is to take a billion dollars out of farm income by importing the food that goes onto the American tables and the fiber that goes onto the American backs.

BILLION-DOLLAR-A-WEEK CLUB

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in a letter addressed to my colleagues today I am proposing some remedial measures to save us some money in connection with our spending on defense items. The letter reads:

DEAR COLLEAGUES: The billion-dollar-a-week club in the Pentagon is spending almost $16 per week of the earnings of every family head. Some of that money can and should be saved and left in the pocket of the family breadwinner without in any way damaging our Nation's defense posture.

Too much of the over $1 billion a week being spent on defense is spent via the method of sole-source and negotiated procurements; that is, procurements without competitive bidding. I have completely authenticated this observation during a long and painstaking study of many individual cases. I have set forth 10 of the latest cases and the waste they entail on an enclosed sheet.

Some savings have already been effected as a result of my study. Regulations have been changed which make it easier for industry to compete for Government contracts and which reduce the number of sole-source contracts. Yet, the surface has only been scratched. There is much more to be done.

Monday, April 1, I will outline on the floor of the House another case in great detail to prove my point. If you do not have an opportunity to hear this report, I hope you will find time to read it in the Record. It is made to order to explain what is wrong with defense purchasing.

Additionally, I want you to know that I have already introduced two pieces of legislation which will go far toward remedying the ills of defense purchasing. H.R. 4409 provides for the setting up of a blue-ribbon watchdog committee to ride herd on all sole-source and negotiated contract awards. This committee can justify defense budget cuts in the billions. The second is a bill to give the Comptroller General the same before-the-contract authority on sole-source and negotiated contracts that his Office now has on competitive awards. The provisions of this bill are strongly supported by GAO.

I hope you will take time to read these bills, the attached fact sheet, and my speech on the floor. Please be assured that I welcome your support and cooperation in this nonpartisan endeavor.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Earl Wilson,
Member of Congress.

Fact Sheet on Wilson Defense Procurement Study

Following are a few reports on cases which Hon. Earl Wilson of Indiana has uncovered before the contracts were signed for procurement of the items mentioned. In each case, information developed before the fact proved the savings that could be effected. Had bid sets been received as a matter of course, many additional cases could have been developed, and those cases which are shown here could have been spotted much earlier. These cases are simply typical examples. There are scores more.

Case No. 1—AS–1018/URC(XMI) antenna, Navy: In a current procurement (Navy RFP 26057) the Navy says it does not know if patent rights are involved. The fact that permission to use patent rights might cost a manufacturer dearly is enough to frighten most bidders away from this procurement. Wilson's study proves the Navy paid for development and production of this antenna (NObsr 85111) then purchased it again from another company for $541 per unit. A few days later Navy negotiated another purchase from sole source developer for $970 per unit. Thus, Navy has wasted money, should know if patent rights are involved, and should have seen to it that all rights were given to government for use by contractors.

Case No. 2—VHF radio set, FAA: Raleigh, N.C., firm (Aerotron, Inc.) notified Representative Wilson it had been declared nonresponsive to bid for equipment it is presently making. Representative Wilson's study and presentation to GAO enabled Comptroller General to set aside FAA ruling, order award of contract, and save taxpayers 18 percent of purchase price.

Case No. 3—USM–116 multimeter, Navy: This procurement was called competitive when, in truth, a Navy wall surrounded it and made it a sole-source purchase. The Navy insisted that prior to bidding on this equipment, a bidder must manufacture the equipment. Before getting plans to build equipment and have it approved, however, bidder must win contract—which he can't win until he builds a set and has it approved. As Representative Wilson said on the House floor, "You can't get from here to there." His attack on this policy resulted in plans being released to all responsible companies.

Case No. 4—USM–117 oscilloscope, Navy: Same type case as the USM–116. Plans are now available to responsible bidders and a savings to taxpayers of 50 percent is anticipated.

Case No. 5—AT–948/U antenna, Navy: In this case the Navy certified no drawings available in setting up a sole-source purchase. Congressman Wilson learned of this and investigated. His study turned up the exact people in Navy who said drawings were available. Case is presently being studied by GAO, and a savings of 50 percent or more will result if procurement is made competitive.

Case No. 6—AN/MRN–12 mobile communications control, Air Force: This case is now in final stages. Wilson study has uncovered waste in past procurement amounting to over six figures. Study has also disclosed that sole-source contract was based on time of delivery, and that schedule was not even close to being met. Objective here is to show waste in sole-source procurement and try to force competition.

Case No. 7—VRC 12 radio, Army: In two separate sole-source contracts the Army spent almost $100 million. Wilson's study can now prove that almost $30 million was wasted. Had bid sets been available to a Congressman pursuing a study such as Wilson's, this $30 million would have been saved.

Case No. 8—AN/UPM–98, Navy: This set, a tape recorder, was bought for maximum of $4,800 each. After being miniaturized, sole-source price was to be up to $77,000 each. Representative Wilson forced this into open competition. Admiral Corp., Chicago, won the contract in competition—for $1,833.13 each.

Case No. 9—APS–88 radar, Navy: This set was purchased at prices of $28,000 to $30,000 with two companies bidding. Two months after last purchase, Representative Wilson forced procurement into competition and low bid was $11,319. The company that won the bid was same firm that bid $28,000 2 months earlier.

Case No. 10—PP–2100 power supply, Navy: The GAO has documented excess profits of over $100,000 for this equipment. This was another before-the-fact case developed while Representative Wilson was receiving bid sets.

In addition to these cases, check the Congressional Record, June 12, 1961, for eight more in a block. All point toward gross waste in procurement, toward regulations rigged for favored contractors, redtape meant to snarl up any unwanted bidder. In these and other cases, Representative Wilson's study has forced competition, forced the military to release plans for equipment, and has torn down the Chinese wall stifling competition. Savings can be counted in millions, and more can be effected if more before-the-fact information is developed through use of bid sets.

REMOVE CONFLICTING FEDERAL CONTROLS OVER FARM OPERATIONS

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I am again introducing a farm bill. Basically, it provides for the removal of conflicting Federal controls over farm operations. I believe it deserves the immediate attention and consideration of the Congress.

Too long we have witnessed the hamstringing of the Nation's farmers by complex and unrealistic regulations. The farmer has been denied independence. He has been overregulated. Consequently, to meet the requirements of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture, the American farmer has been strait-jacketed. Farming, as a basic part of our economy, has suffered. At the same time, the consumer has been placed at a price and tax disadvantage because of commodity surpluses.

Freedom of production and freedom of the marketplace have been denied the farmer because of these complex controls.

If they are removed, as my bill provides, I firmly believe the American farmer will be able to operate his farm successfully; to sow and harvest essential crops to feed this Nation and the world. But farmers will find it increasingly difficult to prosper, to grow the needed food and fiber, if we continue the agricultural policies laid down under existing law.

EQUALITY OF RIGHTS BETWEEN RACES AND NATIONALITIES IN THE U.S.S.R.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, as our colleagues know there has been considerable interest in this House about the statements in a book published by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and entitled "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R."

However, this book, written by two Russians, proved an elusive target. At one point the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] told us here that even our American Ambassador to the United Nations has not been able to get his hands on one of these booklets. I was informed by the U.N. Information Center Director here in Washington that the U.N. has none of the booklets available and does not sell them at its bookstores.

And yet, somehow this booklet has been distributed in the name of UNESCO. It purports to be a factual document. As we know UNESCO projects, along with all other United Nations projects, are financed up to 40 percent by American taxpayers under our subsidization of the U.N.

Through the courtesy of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook], who had the foresight to send cash money, United States, with his order, I was given the opportunity to study a copy of this UNESCO document.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] are more expert upon this matter than I—as is evidenced by the fact that they have been able to obtain personal copies of this suppressed booklet. I have studied their comments upon it.

I wish, today, only to quote a few statements from this book—things that are presented therein as facts. I ask

only that Americans consider these statements, all the time remembering that they contributed between 30 and 40 percent of the money to pay for publishing this booklet.

American taxpayers paid so that the world could be told:

> It was the Communist Party which showed the peoples of Russia the true way to free themselves from social and national oppression.

American taxpayers paid so the U.N. could tell the world:

> Each of them [the Soviet states] embodies the collective will of its people and can decide its own future in entire freedom.

American taxpayers paid so the U.N. could tell the world:

> Soviet citizens of all nationalities are working enthusiastically to build a Communist society.

American taxpayers paid so this statement of Soviet "rights" could be presented to the world and to history as a fact:

> Your [Soviet] beliefs, your traditions and your national cultural institutions are henceforward [after 1917] declared free and inviolable. Organize your national life in complete freedom.

American taxpayers paid to help publish this outright lie:

> The principal of national and racial equality of citizens of the U.S.S.R. is fully applied in the electoral sphere. All citizens have equal electoral rights and are equally eligible for election to all organs of the state.

American taxpayers who well remember what happened to America in 1776 are paying to present this statement to history:

> The multinational Soviet state grouping the equal peoples of Russia in a single state in a manner unprecedented in history was a mighty achievement.

American taxpayers paid to help rewrite history thus:

> In 1940, the Soviet regime was restored in the Baltic Republics [Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia], which voluntarily joined the union.

American taxpayers paid to publish these alleged joys of communistic life:

> Peoples and nationalities are assured of the right to organize their national life freely.

To cap it all off, American taxpayers will find that their subsidization of UNESCO helped pay the Russians to tell the world:

> It is Soviet power, and that alone, which has brought freedom and the right of self-determination to all the peoples of old Russia. It was the Leninist policy of the Communist Party which made it possible to solve all the problems.

Mr. Speaker, there are the quotations from this U.N. booklet which are being cast out to the world and to history. These statements have the approval of the U.N. and are backed by its prestige which lends credence to these lies. American taxpayers should think twice—or three times—about what is happening to them. It is happening largely at their own expense, and it usually is only an accident that they find out that it is happening.

March 21, 1963.

Hon. Durward Hall,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Hall: I believe you may be interested in the attached material in connection with comments you indicated you might make today on the House floor.

Sincerely,

Frederick G. Dutton,
Assistant Secretary of State.

Fact Sheet on UNESCO Publication "Equality Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.

The booklet entitled "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.," by two Soviet nationals, I. P. Tsamarian and S. L. Ronin, was published by UNESCO in March 1962 as part of a series of studies on "Race and Society." An earlier work in this series was written by an American social scientist and reviewed Federal and State antidiscrimination legislation in the United States.

While these two publications were intended by UNESCO to present comparative scholarly studies of race relations in the Soviet Union and the United States, it is obvious that the Soviet publication has been used instead as a vehicle for political propaganda. It ignores recognized standards of scientific research by presenting a distorted and often fallacious picture of the treatment of nationalities and minority groups in the Soviet Union. It contains numerous blatant examples of Soviet and anti-Western propaganda, making references to "revanchist neo-Fascist elements" in Western European countries, "colonialist oppression" in "capitalist countries" and so forth. In so doing, of course, it serves the national objectives and policy of the Soviet Union and not the objectives of international understanding espoused by UNESCO.

In April 1962 the Department of State vigorously protested publication of this booklet to the Acting Director General of UNESCO, citing the reasons above and pointing out that it violated the principles of the UNESCO constitution. In his reply to this protest the Acting Director General said that the book was a counterpart to the American publication and was to "reflect as faithfully as possible the views of competent Soviet authorities." The Acting Director General added that criticism "elicited by the publication of this brochure throw light, in a more general manner, on the difficulties encountered by the Secretariat in matters of publication, owing to the lack of precise instructions from the governing bodies of UNESCO."

To compensate for this lack of guidance from the governing bodies, the UNESCO Executive Board, with the full support of the Department of State, last fall appointed a committee to prepare policy directives on UNESCO publications. The Department, after seeking the advice of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, formulated comprehensive criteria which, if adopted would prevent the use of UNESCO publications for Soviet propaganda purposes.

The chairman of the U.S. delegation to the 12th General Conference of UNESCO, Assistant Secretary of State Lucius D. Battle, summarized U.S. policy in this regard as follows:

"My Government considers that UNESCO should abandon activities such as tendentious publications, and those seminars, meetings, and other projects which experience has shown lead to polemics rather than to scholarly results. The question is not only one of cost but one of integrity, for UNESCO's standards of scholarship, like Caesar's wife, must be above reproach."

The Organization is expected to take final action on publications policy directives during 1963 taking into account the recommendations by the United States and other member states.

Although UNESCO publishes hundreds of objective and impartial studies every year, the lack of precise policy guidance does, from time to time, result in publications objectionable to the United States. The Department is fully aware of the necessity of formulating publications policy directives and will continue to pursue the matter vigorously.

(Office of Public Services, Department of State, Washington, D.C., March 6, 1963.)

Statement Issued by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization in Answer to Queries Relating to the Organization's Publication, February 15, 1963

"EQUALITY OF RIGHTS BETWEEN RACES AND NATIONALITIES IN THE U.S.S.R.," VOLUME 3, "RACE AND SOCIETY"

In its effort to help eradicate all possible ways of discrimination and more particularly race prejudices, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization has published a number of special studies elucidating problems.

Following the publication in 1954 of a book on "Racial Equality and the Law," which deals with the United States, by American expert Morroe Berger, it was decided in the light of a resolution of the General Conference of the same year to publish another volume on "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R." In 1955 the U.S.S.R. Academy of Science was invited to nominate experts to prepare this report for printing by UNESCO. The volume appeared in a French language edition in 1961, and an English language edition in 1962. The views expressed in this book, as in other studies prepared by authors nominated by competent authorities of member states, and under their signature, are entirely theirs.

In order to clarify the Organization's publication policies, the present Director-General requested the recent UNESCO General Conference to provide the Secretariat with more specific rules governing the Organization's activities in this field. As a result of this initiative, a special 10-nation committee of the Executive Board will meet in April 1963 at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris.

(Note.—The book, "Equality of Rights Between Races and Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.," is not available in the United States as it is out of stock.)

EXTENDING PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, and have sent to the desk for appropriate reference, a bill to extend for 1 additional year the temporary and expiring provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, both 81st Congress, as amended. These provisions are due to expire on June 30, 1963.

As all Members know, these laws authorize Federal payments to public school districts which have experienced a degree of impact due to Federal activities in the area. Public Law 815 authorizes payments for school construction; Public Law 874 payments are made for operation and maintenance of public schools. In both instances, generally speaking, the amount of the Federal payment is determined by the number of children attending the public school whose parents live or work, or both, on tax-exempt Federal property. The expiring provisions authorize payments on account of those children who live with a parent who is employed on Federal property but who lives on private property, or who lives on Federal property but is privately employed. These children represent by far the greater number of all those on account of whom Federal payments are made.

These two acts have been in operation since 1950. They have come many times before Congress for amendment and extension. Since the fiscal year 1951 approximately $2 billion has been appropriated by Congress and distributed to several thousand school districts to carry out the purposes of the acts. Despite all the controversy and difference of viewpoint within the Congress concerning Federal aid to education, these acts have received strong congressional support. The reason for this is that these acts carry out a recognized Federal responsibility. Essentially, they authorize Federal payments in lieu of the taxes which local public school districts would be able to levy on property, were that property not owned by the Federal Government.

Over the years there have been a variety of proposals for the amendment of these acts, and a number of changes have been made. Now the Kennedy administration is proposing extensive amendments to the temporary features of both acts. These would have the effect of sharply reducing the assistance to eligible school districts and, moreover, would render a great many districts wholly ineligible for further assistance. Our committee has not yet been told how many school districts would be eliminated from the program. We have not been told how severely the remaining districts would be affected. Indeed, we have not been presented with a rationale for the proposed changes.

Last year the administration indicated that a major study would be made of the operation of these two acts, and that proposals for amendment would be based upon the findings. To my knowledge, no such study has been conducted. The current proposals, embodied in H.R. 3000, are not based upon a broad reconsideration of the acts.

In my judgment—which I believe is shared by many other Members—the operation of these programs deserves the kind of detailed study that has been promised. Among other things, the nature of the impact of Federal installations upon surrounding school districts requires careful study, if we are to determine the most equitable means of discharging the Federal responsibility. Meanwhile—without sufficient information upon which to act—I doubt that Congress is prepared to make drastic changes in programs which affect public schools in over 3,000 school districts, located in virtually every State and territory.

I am disturbed that the administration has included sweeping amendments to these acts in a huge and highly controversial omnibus bill. They seem to be holding hostage these popular and vital acts to facilitate the enactment of new, expensive, and controversial programs in the field of education. The administration made a similar attempt last session. Their stratagem then was overwhelmingly rejected by Congress.

There is a compelling reason why Congress should act promptly to extend the expiring provisions of these acts. Thousands of federally impacted school districts are beginning to prepare their budgets for next year. Federal funds represent a vital component of those school budgets, and the schools should not be left in doubt as to the amount and availability of the funds. Most particularly, the essential planning of thousands of school districts should not be thrown into confusion because of a dubious legislative strategy.

My bill would extend the expiring features of these acts for 1 year—that is, until June 30, 1964. Meanwhile, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would have time to conduct thorough study of these programs and to make recommendations soundly based upon the results. Our Committee on Education and Labor would then have time to consider these recommendations and to make its own appraisal.

Accordingly, I urge that this bill be enacted at an early date.

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has shown an understandable concern for the plight of the unemployed worker and his or her family. Newsweek magazine for April 1, in a few short paragraphs, puts this problem in sharp focus:

> Some 4.9 million people are jobless; on a seasonally adjusted basis, 6.1 percent of the labor force is unemployed.
>
> At least one in every five persons in the U.S. labor force, what's more, will be unemployed at some time this year. At least another 2.6 million workers will be restricted to part-time employment because a full-time job is unavailable. At least 1 in every 11 workers in the Nation's 30 biggest cities will continue to tramp the streets in search of a job that isn't there. And nowhere will the paradox be more pronounced than in the hard core of unemployment, where there will be at least 5 million persons jobless for 15 weeks and quite probably more, about half of them the breadwinners in their families.
>
> All this adds up to what President Kennedy calls our No. 1 economic problem—and the problem has been growing steadily worse.

Unfortunately, the problem will get even worse unless some existing attitudes and policies within the administration are reversed. I have in mind one situation and am confident the President is not aware of it for if he were I am sure he would not permit gainful employment for a substantial group of American workers to be abolished.

I refer to the increasing tendency on the part of the Department of the Navy to lean in the direction of procurements from foreign shipyards. Only last week, the Navy, with Defense Department concurrence, approved a contract which contemplates the use of midbody sections to be obtained from a Japanese shipyard.

By this action many man-hours of employment will be lost in this country. By this action several thousand tons of steel will not be produced in this country. By this action the balance of payments situation will be made more sensitive by the outflow of several million U.S. dollars.

Of equal importance, by approving this procurement, a very dangerous precedent has been established. Unless corrected, more unemployment for U.S. shipyards and U.S. steelworkers—with a further resulting outflow of dollars, can only follow. Apparently, if a change is to be accomplished, the backbone of the Pentagon must be strengthened, and to that end, I submit a bill "to require use of articles, materials, and products of the United States in performing contracts for the construction, conversion, alteration, or repair of vessels." I hope this measure will be scheduled for early consideration.

NEWS MANAGEMENT

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the American public find themselves, from time to time, victimized by self-serving information policies of the Federal Government. Often, as part of a campaign to prevent or encourage public acceptance of some Federal action or program, we see a flurry of headlines which would justify what the administration wishes to do or is doing. Crisis creation is becoming a fine art in Washington.

This is one aspect of news management which has received little attention in the current controversy. It certainly deserves more examination since it is becoming an all too accepted daily process.

Today, the drumbeat for the President's tax reduction and reform program includes dire predictions that vastly greater unemployment is inevitable if this proposal is not enacted. No one in his right mind would willingly fail to act if through a course of action a recession could be prevented. In terms of human misery, such a failure would be monstrously callous and wholly indefensible. Repetition of the threat continues from the White House, but when we look at the mystical economic wool gathering that supports the President's program, we are doubly concerned and troubled. In the view of many competent observers, the program he is urging could lead to the same drastic consequences he explains he is trying to avert.

Unemployment continues at an unacceptably high rate. How high it actually is remains an unanswered question. Serious doubts exist about the precision of the figures we are being given and we have a basis for doubting the motivation of the releases that are coming from the Department of Labor.

It is a good sign that the Nation's news media are beginning to seek out and to analyze such instances of news manipulation as they are able to piece together. Today, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress recent thoughtful editorial comment on this important issue by station WRAL–TV in Raleigh, N.C. The station's comments are as follows:

> ### News Management
>
> A few years ago, just when the Congress was buckling down to the annual task of making a decision about military appropriations, a prominent Congressman remarked to a friend: "Well, it's about time for that Russian submarine to be sighted off our coast again."
>
> The next day, sure enough, there came reports of the submarine. The Congressman chuckled: "See what I mean? There's always an emergency to stampede us into spending money."
>
> The same is true, he said, with respect to practically every other phase of government. "Take unemployment," he said. Let the Congress begin to consider a welfare measure, he said, "and we inevitably meet a barrage of alarming statistics."
>
> The point that the Congressman was making was that, while any unemployment is bad and ought to be corrected, the picture that the Congress and the American people get is distorted and exaggerated out of all proportion. He suggested that citizens do three things: (1) Look around their own communities to see what is the picture there; (2) see how many jobs are going begging; and (3) make a fair estimate of how many of the so-called unemployed would rather be on relief than hold down a job.
>
> We would add another: Take a good, hard look at the unemployment statistics.
>
> Every time we see an official announcement from the Labor Department, we recall a confession made by Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz a few weeks ago while he was in Charlotte for a speech. Mr. Wirtz, in a moment of candor, acknowledged in an interview that just before the election last November, the Labor Department issued a doctored-up report describing the Kennedy administration's achievements in employment.
>
> Also, we recall that about 2 years ago, the Labor Department reported that almost 5 million people were out of work in the United States. This, said the Department, was about a half-million less than the previous month. Still, it represented about 7 percent of the Nation's working force.
>
> We decided to look into these figures. A relatively new Deputy Secretary of Labor, Dr. Seymour L. Wolfbein, frankly admitted that our Government's absurd recordkeeping is what makes us look bad. He said that if we used the same measurements of unemployment as other countries do, our unemployment figure would drop to below 3 million.
>
> At the time, out of a total of nearly 5 million so-called unemployed persons, 497,000 of them were teenagers down to age 14. There were 225,000 students attending school full-time—but they were counted as unemployed. Of course they didn't have jobs, and weren't seeking them, but they showed up in the unemployed column just the same. There were 860,000 married women living with their husbands and keeping house. They were included in the Government's unemployed figure. Another 120,000 workers were included, even though they had orders to report back to work within 30 days.
>
> This brought the so-called unemployment total down to 3,260,000, but there were still others who could not logically be counted as unemployed. For example, 140,000 of the people counted by the Government as being out of work were people who were changing to new jobs, moving from place to place. Also included were 187,000 retired persons who actually had no intention of returning to work.
>
> That brought the figure down to 2,933,000—and we haven't even mentioned the uncounted army of people who cannot or will not stick to any job for very long.
>
> So how are the Labor Department's figures arrived at? They are not compiled by actual count but by the sampling method. The most charitable thing that can be said about the system is that it is full of holes. Once each month, 600 Government employees visit an average of 55 homes each. From the findings of these 33,000 visits, the Labor Department, by arbitrarily multiplying the totals by 1,400, "projects" the "unemployment" statistics that are used to shock Congress into appropriating more money for emergency use.
>
> So, we have the Russian submarine approach—an emergency to justify every proposal. Governmental budgets grow greater, more people find it easier to turn to the Government for a degrading sort of "security." And then they vote to keep it coming.
>
> It would be interesting to know what the people of America would do if they had access to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

NATIONAL LOTTERY

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while we stubbornly refuse to accept the obvious and while we continue to resist all attempts to capitalize on the American urge to gamble, hundreds of millions of dollars are gambled every day in the United States.

With and without our approval, gambling in this country has grown into a $50-billion-a-year industry. Unfortunately, most of it is illegal and has become the chief source of revenue for organized crime syndicates.

Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to bring to the attention of this House one type of gambling activity in this country that has been accepted and recognized as legal and proper, yet, nonetheless gambling because in every transaction an element of chance exists.

To those who consider a national lottery conducive to sin, I would like to remind them that the purchase of a Government lottery ticket is no more wicked or sinful than the buying and selling activities at every stock exchange where hundreds of millions of dollars change hands every day.

Mr. Speaker, a recent report from the Security Exchange Commission shows that in 1962 the volume of sales effected on all exchanges in the United States totaled over 1,664 million shares. These transactions in 1 year alone represented a total market value of over $56½ billion.

Are not these activities at the stock exchanges, games of chance? Are not stock manipulations subject to the risk of loss for the chance of some gain? Does hypocrisy clothe this type of activity with respectability because we identify the gamblers at the stock markets as investors?

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come for this Congress to realize that a national lottery is the only painless, sensible, and voluntary way to raise over $10 billion a year in additional revenue.

No one, Mr. Speaker, not even this Congress, has the right to be careless of the tremendous tax and revenue advantages offered by a national lottery. Especially in these days of rising budgets and a crying need for tax relief.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced a bill to provide wartime rates of disability compensation for veterans disabled during peacetime services outside the United States.

The current Federal law concerning compensation for disabilities incurred during peacetime service in our Armed Forces, works to the disadvantage of many American service men and women serving overseas.

The present construction of section 336 of title 38, United States Code, limits disability compensation payments for injuries sustained in peacetime service, to 80 percent of the wartime rate. That is, at least, the way the law applies to most cases of disability incurred in peacetime.

I believe this to be an arrangement out of keeping with the American concept of the cold war, and therefore unfair to a large number of American service men and women.

As things stand today, the only service personnel in no way threatened by the potentially explosive nature of the cold war, are those on duty within the limits of the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and U.S. possessions. All others—and there are, indeed, many others—are scattered throughout the so-called trouble spots of the world. As of this moment, most of them are probably not in danger of destruction; but that, for all we know, and for all they know—may be only a temporary state of affairs.

For this reason, then—in recognition of the important part played by our service men and women overseas, it is high time that we move to amend our compensation laws, to the benefit of all veterans disabled from injury or disease incurred or aggravated by service overseas.

With this object in mind, I have reintroduced this bill.

CONGRESSIONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most every Member is aware of an article appearing in Parade of last Sunday, March 24. The author of the article is a Mr. Jack Anderson, whom I understand to be an associate of a Mr. Drew Pearson, a rather well-known columnist. Mr. Anderson alleges that the information contained in the article came from an anonymous Congressman. Among other accusations is one which may possibly constitute a felony. This has to do with an allegation that a Member of Congress, knowing that property was to be purchased on which the new House Office Building is now being constructed, purchased it himself immediately following his knowledge of the location of the building. It is alleged that in the deal he made $4,000 profit in 60 days.

Now, Mr. Speaker, ordinarily my personal reaction to articles of this kind is to follow the adage known to most of us who are in political life, that the newspapers come out every day and have a wider circulation and more interested readers than the Congressional Record. It has been my feeling that to ignore the many unsubstantiated aspersions cast upon the Congress as a whole is the best treatment. Furthermore, few people remember denials, but only the allegations of wrongdoing.

In this instance, Mr. Speaker, it becomes a serious matter when a Member of this or the other body is accused of the perpetration of an act which would constitute a felonious act. Therefore, following the suggestion, and in fact, the direction of my House Administration Committee in session on yesterday, we invite Mr. Anderson or anyone else who can support these charges to come before us in public hearing and reveal all or any part of the allegations in the article referred to and to support the same with legal evidence. I emphasize that the conduct of such an investigation would be in open session, and incidentally Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Administration Committee, I give notice that I will not be a party to receiving any confidential information of whatever nature relating to any of these matters. There will be no privileged communications with me.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, and even more especially, we invite the Member of this House of Representatives or the other body to come forward in open session of the committee and reveal these matters alleged to have been related to Mr. Anderson. As a matter of fact, it is my feeling, and I believe it probably is the feeling of 533 other Members of the entire Congress, that this anonymous Member should not wait to be called before the committee but should come down in the well of this House or the other body, as the case may be, and in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, prefer his charges in order that they be cleared of the reflection cast upon the Congress as an institution.

Mr. Speaker, there is serious doubt in the minds of many that there is any such Member.

Near the close of the article this alleged anonymous Member of Congress is supposed to have said that the reason for his revelation to Mr. Anderson was to help turn the public spotlight on abuses. He advises people to write their Senator and Congressman, demanding they put an end to secrecy on Capitol Hill.

Mr. Speaker, I can imagine no greater practice of secrecy than for a Member of Congress, who is supposed to have this sort of information, not to reveal it in order that something can be done about it. It appears more to be the statement of the bounty hunter with which we are all familiar. The bounty hunter is one who carries a ballpoint pen on each hip as his weapons.

Certainly I am not one who wishes to cast the first stone, and neither do I, nor does my committee, wish to place ourselves in the position of being the overseers of the membership of this House. We have no responsibility as such in this matter, but we all have the responsibility as Members of this great body to find the truth. My committee is willing and ready on short notice to convene itself for a public hearing on these matters. I feel it will meet the approval of this House to say that it is the responsibility, not only legally but morally, for any person who has knowledge and who can support the accusations in this article to come forth and make it known.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I think that to this time it is not sufficiently known that the House Administration Committee is continuously investigating all sorts of charges, almost all of which we find to be completely fallacious and baseless; but beyond that point, the Members should know that under the direction of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Burleson], the Committee on House Administration has gone further in trying to establish the kind of principles, policy, and rules of procedure which would make bad practices impossible.

In other words, I think this occasion offers an opportunity for the Congress to tell the people that they are not without watchdogs inside the House of Representatives and the other body, that all of the good guys are not employed by the press and all of the bad guys employed in the Congress of the United States.

The second thing which should be noted is that the Congress has always welcomed publicity. We need good reporters to continually search out wrongdoing, bad practices, and inefficiencies in the Congress. Always those people who make such investigations should have as their basic purpose the same purpose which we must have, and which I feel we do have; that is, to strengthen the institutions which are so basic to this free Government, so that the people may have faith in the Congress, so that the Congressmen may act in an atmosphere of freedom in trying to do what is right for the country, instead of continually facing the necessity of defending themselves against accusations which, as I said before, are almost always groundless.

The gentleman from Texas is to be congratulated for his efforts now and in the past in seeing that there is indeed no wrongdoing in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BURLESON. I am grateful to my colleague for those kind words. He has made a real contribution to our efforts here today as he has done in other matters relating to the duties of the House Administration Committee.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague from Texas [Mr. Burleson], for his extremely well chosen remarks, and I want to congratulate him on his diligence in attempting to see as chairman of the House Administration Committee that wrongdoing does not occur.

In addition, I think he is to be congratulated for the forthright manner in which he has invited this alleged anonymous Congressman, if such person does indeed exist, to come before his committee to divulge any facts he may have to bear out these otherwise unsupported allegations.

For years now I have read many exposes as printed in the newspapers which have related to individual Members of Congress for the most part. But this is the first time I have read in any such otherwise responsible journal one which cast such a blanket indictment, or one whose author, if an author there is, other than Jack Anderson, seeks to cloak himself with anonymity, or one which tends, as this one does, to cast doubt on the entire Congress of the United States by failing to identify the specific individuals against whom its shocking allegations are made.

I have scarcely seen a more irresponsible piece of journalism than this, and I hereby challenge the veracity of some of the statements it contains. I do not believe any of my colleagues have been guilty of some of the things herein alleged. I say here and now that if such a person exists, who is supposed to have told this tale to Jack Anderson, then he has, or if he does not exist, then Jack Anderson himself has, a responsibility to his country, a responsibility to the Congress, and a responsibility to his own reputation for truth to appear before a grand jury. If Members of Congress have been guilty of buying "liquor, clothes, cars, refrigerators, and TV sets simply by putting the salesmen on the congressional payroll until the purchases were paid off" as the article alleges, then those people are guilty of a felony, and the matter ought to be reported to a grand jury. Those men should not only be exposed individually, but should be prosecuted. If any Member has been guilty of otherwise appropriating Federal funds to his own use, as alleged elsewhere in the article, he clearly deserves to be prosecuted.

I take the position that the rest of the Members of this Congress are as honorable as I want them to consider me to be.

Numerous distortions of fact occur in this article. For example, it says:

> Above our salary, each of us draws a yearly stationery allowance of $1,800, another $1,800 for field office rental and expenses, and an indeterminate amount for clerk hire.

That is incorrect, as all Members know. For one thing, it is definitely not true that each Member of Congress draws $1,800 for field office rental and expenses. I do not know whether my situation is typical or not, but I have not drawn money for field office rental because I have not considered it necessary.

As to stationery allowances, every year I have overshot the stationery allowance and have paid the difference out of my pocket. I am sure many other Members have done so. I am sure that other Members, like myself, have consistently gone into their own pockets by several thousands of dollars to supplement the telephone and telegraph allowance. Certainly this is true of Members who represent populous constituencies.

Many Members, like myself, must have received upward of 7,000 or 8,000 letters in a month. I am sure others take the position, as I do, that everyone who writes his Congressman is entitled to an answer as thoughtful and factual and responsive as the crushing volume of mail will permit. To help perform this task requires a dedicated and efficient staff. It simply could not be done with drones on the public payroll. Unfortunately, no journal has ever undertaken to tell this story of the conscientious and hard-working congressional offices that regularly work 12 and 14 hours a day.

This story has never been told. Ever since I have been in the Congress I have overshot my travel allowance which permits one round trip a year. Most members surely do. Last year I spent $2,700 out of my own pocket for airline fares in an effort to stay as close as possible to the needs of my district. I am not singing the blues; I am not asking for anybody's pity or sympathy; I am not saying I am underpaid. I am, however, saying that the vast majority of the Members of Congress are decent, honorable, hard-working men. This article implies that they have time to go to liquor parties given by lobbyists and go to poker games wherein the lobbyists almost always lose and the Congressmen allegedly almost always win. Perhaps I am naive, but I have been a Member of Congress for 9 years, and I have never heard of a poker game of that sort, or any of my colleagues having been invited to a game of that sort.

I challenge the author of this story to go to the grand jury, if he has that information, and divulge the identity of the Members of Congress who are violating the law and committing the abuses that he is talking about, and thus clear the good names of other Members, or admit that he cannot do it. I challenge Jack Anderson or his unnamed informant to produce the evidence of the things to which he refers in this story. I do not believe some of them exist. If they do exist, those guilty parties ought to be exposed to the proper light of public attention. The facts ought to be made known. If proved guilty of a felony, they ought to be prosecuted. But it seems the height of irresponsibility to cast an indiscriminate blanket indictment upon the entire lawmaking branch of our Government.

So far as the possible remedies suggested in the closing paragraphs of the article are concerned, I think probably they are all right; I think perhaps these three suggestions are good. In addition to that, every Member of this Congress has a responsibility, a responsibility to this Government of the United States, to uphold the honor of his country and the integrity of his constituency. If the faith of the people of America is shaken in those people whose responsibility it is to make the decisions of this Government, then the people cannot long be expected to keep faith in the system itself which produced these people. This is the danger, and a grave danger it is. If the public's faith in the elective process is shaken, then what is there left in which to have faith?

I say, enough of this sort of thing. I have written as of yesterday a letter to this magazine and asked them for the privelege of writing an answer. I would like to write an article about the great majority of my colleagues, about Congressmen who do not cheat. I want the public to get the full story about the fine, dedicated public servants, both Democrats and Republicans, who have not increased their economic well-being by serving in the Congress. I feel certain that most of them have seen a decline in their net worth. But, they did not come here to get rich in the first place. They are willing to serve in the Congress because they love the United States; they love public service; they love and want to serve the cause of freedom and the principles our Nation stands for. And they do not think of it as a sacrifice but as the grandest and noblest opportunity a man can have. For that reason, the average Congressman works harder than he would at any other job in the world.

I think that is a story that ought to be told. And I think the magazine ought to let us write that sort of a story. If they will let me or another of our colleagues do that, we will not hide behind the cloak of anonymity but sign our names to it.

Mr. BURLESON. I accept with sincere thanks and appreciation those remarks. A colleague said to me yesterday, facetiously, of course, that he would like very much to know the formula as to how various fringe benefits could be obtained to increase our compensation by twice the amount of the salary.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If someone acquired title to certain of this property prior to its acquisition by the Government, would that not be a matter of public record that could be determined as a matter of absolute truth?

Mr. BURLESON. I assure the distinguished gentleman and my longtime friend, that we are now making that effort through the General Accounting Office to see if that information can be obtained. It should be available, although this article says that the Member used a broker as a go-between. We want to find out who the broker is or any other detail which might throw light on this alleged transaction. We expect to pursue other inquiries on this particular allegation.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on House Administration. He knows he received a letter from me, and I am delighted that he will hold open hearings and invite the writer of that article to appear before the committee. I had in mind what my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Wright] said, and I actually believe it in my own mind and heart, that the regularity with which these attacks have taken place in the last 2 or 3 years is for the purpose of demeaning this greatest of all legislative bodies in the world, which will ultimately result in loss of faith and confidence by the people. And, that is what I am afraid of, and I resent it, because it is unjustified, unwarranted. If they have an ax to grind, let them come forth and give us the facts, and let us iron out our own problems, and I am sure we will.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. I know the gentleman will do a good job for this body. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would like also to commend the gentleman and the Committee on House Administration. I would like to ask this question: Do I understand that the Committee on House Administration has, or will, extend a formal invitation to Mr. Jack Anderson to appear before the committee?

Mr. BURLESON. This is an invitation being publicly offered the writer at this time.

Mr. GROSS. This is the invitation?

Mr. BURLESON. This is the invitation.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that the committee extend him by mail—by registered mail—an invitation to appear at a public hearing.

Mr. BURLESON. I would assume that he probably reads the Congressional Record.

The committee did discuss the possibility of taking formal action to ask for subpena power and that he be brought before the committee. I would not favor dignifying the controversy by that action and in addition, there is, of course, the matter of what is privileged information. But if he wants to volunteer to come before the committee, which would be the duty of a citizen to do, then we shall see that the committee is convened in a matter of hours to hear him, or anyone else who wishes to bring in substantiating proof of these charges. If it were not of such serious nature, I would not bother to react in this proposed manner. To attempt to respond to every criticism would require just about our full and total attention. Furthermore, we would likely find ourselves chasing myths.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I want to commend the gentleman and the gentleman's committee for bringing this matter out and for the action which it has taken.

I think this is the only way that we can hope to get to the bottom of it and clear the Congress of the aspersions that have been cast.

I know that the gentleman and the gentleman's committee are doing a good job in bringing to rest these charges and bringing to account anyone who might be guilty as charged in this article.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this is my 25th year in Congress and represents a total of 45 years since I first became an elected State official. In those 45 years I have known a great many men and women who have been in the public service. It is my firm conviction that one will find a greater degree of honesty and decency among those who hold public office, whether it be in the Congress or whether it be in the State, than one will find in the ordinary walks of life. But I would like to point out that in the years I have been here alone; that is, the 25 years, I have seen, as many of the Members may recall, several Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle brought into Federal court, tried and convicted for alleged crimes that were far less felonious than those which have been charged in this article. It has always been my understanding that the responsibility of a good citizen is that any citizen who knows of any violation of law, any commission of a crime, he has the responsibility of giving information to the proper officials so that such violator may be prosecuted and sent to prison where he belongs. That has been done in the past. If there is any person in the Congress or out of the Congress engaged in public service anywhere who has violated a law and committed a crime, then he should be prosecuted and his name should be turned in, or the names of those individuals, and action should be taken.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Burleson], on the position he has taken here today.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his remarks and certainly agree with his conclusions.

Mr. Speaker, a great man said a long time ago that "no one can fool all the people all the time." The great former Speaker of this body, Sam Rayburn, often said that not very many bad men ever come to Congress at all, and a bad man would not stay here very long. During the course of his tenure both as a Member of Congress and as Speaker of the House of Representatives, he saw hundreds go and come.

It just does not happen. As to these matters to which the gentleman from Ohio has referred, the men either get caught and the few who are involved are punished, or the people back home retire them, and that is about it.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, every responsible Member of the Congress should be concerned, not only with the vicious attack on Congress in "Parade" last Sunday, but with continued efforts of this kind to discredit the Congress and the President of the United States, and to destroy the confidence of the people in representative government.

There may, of course, be some abuses of congressional privileges, but an effort to smear and discredit every Member of Congress is a disservice to our country and the people.

We should most of all be concerned about the objective of these attacks. A few weeks ago I received a publication with a headline "Is Congress Obsolete?" No one can doubt the fear some groups have for representative government in this country. They fear the people and as a matter of philosophy have opposed all the great social advances made in this century through the democratic process.

There is nothing strange about these name-calling and smear campaigns and efforts to block essential legislation by creating suspicion and distrust of government. We have only to look back to pre-Hitler Germany where the same type of irresponsible attacks on representative government led not only to the end of freedom of the German people but to world conflict, death and destruction.

It is about time, Mr. Speaker, that we took a good look at slanting, distortion of the news and the corruption that pollutes the bloodstream of news and information in our country. I do not blame the working press. For the most part they are a fine group of people. But I think we should look behind the few hired men who write these stories and see who is really responsible and what their interests and objectives really are.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, first I should like to commend the gentleman and the Committee on House Administration, and then point out that in this allegation about office space, for example, it is not only a matter of record of the House from whom each Member rents the office space, if he does not have space in a Federal building, but he has to sign a lease and the lease has to be on file here. We have gone further than that. We publish every year a book telling exactly who gets the payments. The press does not even have to go down and look it up for themselves. It is there in book form. It seems to me that the Congress probably goes far in advance of any other branch of the Government to make available exactly how every dime that is spent, is spent. I do not know of any bureau downtown that, every time a person from that bureau travels, puts it in book form and gives it to the press.

I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Rhodes, and others, have put their finger on it, that either by design or by accident—and I doubt that it is by accident—there is an attempt to discredit the Congress in the eyes of the people. The people are unhappy now. We are living in a world in which nothing is really black or white any more as far as foreign affairs are concerned. I see that every day in the committee. People are unhappy. If a man lives with his wife for 25 years and everything is all right, he does not make the paper, at least the front page. If they have a silver anniversary celebration, he might make some inside page of the paper. But if he steps out of line just once, it is on the front page, it is a front-page story. That is, of course, sensationalism and that is all that they are seeking. I read in the paper about a nationally published magazine that is being sued for $10 million on an article they had published. The editor of the magazine says, Well, we are going to be sensational, we are going to stir them up. In effect, he said, we are not too concerned with whether what we print is true or not as long as it sells magazines. And this magazine, it is well known, is practically bankrupt, is losing money. I suppose if they can prop up their business for a time this way they think it will be good for them. But I do not think it will be good for the country.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman and his committee are to

be commended for issuing the invitation that they issued to the author of the article. Last weekend when I was home, coming down the steps of the church which I attended, at least five or six people who had read the article that morning prior to coming to church said, "What gives with you Congressmen?"

Now I see in this morning's mail a number of letters obviously prompted by this article. One question: It made mention of a contract with Nationwide Foods and the Senate restaurant and a Federal subsidy involved. As I recall, at one time Nationwide Foods did operate one or two of the restaurants here on the Hill. Was that contract not terminated some time back?

Mr. BURLESON. The Nationwide Food Services have not had the contract since August 1961. The article says that your distinguished Senator from Illinois, the minority leader of the other body, got some favoritism at a birthday party given by the contractors of this service. If such a thing ever occurred it would have been more than 2 years ago. As I understand this particular charge it was supposed to have been fairly recent. This among several others is discrepancy, as it is slanderous by innuendo.

Mr. MICHEL. I appreciate the gentleman clarifying that for the record.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. I think the chairman very properly clarified the situation, that he was inviting the author of this article and would not lend the dignity of a subpena for him to come before the committee. Is it proper to inquire of the chairman what his view is or what the innuendo is if the author of this article declines this invitation. Is there not to a certain extent established the fact that, perhaps, this is based on fiction and not on fact in the very fact that he does not accept the invitation?

Mr. BURLESON. I would conclude either that there was no fact or else that he did not respond to the call to exhibit good citizenship and responsibility to come before the committee and tell us what he may actually be able to prove.

Mr. AVERY. I would just like to make one further observation. I would hope the article would not hide behind the conventional adage that the press reserves the right not to divulge the source of their news. It would seem to me that that would be just a little thin and a bit irrelevant in this particular instance.

Mr. BURLESON. That is a factor in our not subpenaing him.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. With further reference to the question by the gentleman from Kansas, I note that the committee would not want to cast any aspersion on the writer of this article as he has cast in our direction. And as evidence of perfect good faith on our part we have, indeed, gone much further than simply inviting the gentleman to tell us what he knows. We have, indeed, asked the General Accounting Office to get the facts and figures if such can be found. If there is basis for investigation there can be further action and if there is no proof of any wrongdoing then the membership of the House will be vindicated in that respect.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the House Administration Committee on being willing to take the initiative in eradicating any abuses which may have occurred, as reported recently in the press.

I believe that either this committee or some special committee on grievances should always be available to the public, so that taxpayers and others may lodge any complaint in order that the true facts can be found and appropriate action taken. When the truth is found to be contrary to the published articles on the subject then that also should be made widely known, for it is not in the public interest that published untruths about Government officials should go unchallenged. I would like to mention that there is now pending before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee a bill I have introduced to provide for similar enquiries on a Government-wide basis. This would establish a Commission on Ethics to do the job. I hope it will be approved.

ERRANT CONGRESSMEN

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, writing anonymously in the March 24 issue of Parade magazine, a Member of the Congress charges that at least 12 Members of the House of Representatives are guilty of petty graft, payroll padding, nepotism, kickbacks, embezzlement, and other shady practices that are considered morally, if not legally wrong. The author's amanuensis is Jack Anderson, the magazine's Washington correspondent.

Ordinarily no one pays any attention to an anonymous writer but when allegations like these appear in a responsible magazine they cannot be summarily dismissed.

From the standpoint of congressional ethics, the article was in bad taste. It was also shocking.

It was in bad taste for two reasons: It is somewhat beneath the dignity of a Congressman who has something important to say to hide behind the shabby curtain of anonymity; and if the allegations are true the place to make them known is not in the pages of a magazine but on the floor of Congress.

The article was also shocking because: the allegations place a severe strain upon the credulity; and if they are true it will be plain enough that we have Congressmen who are unfit to hold a public office.

The author states categorically that he can:

> Mention a dozen Congressmen who not only charge their oversea vacations to the taxpayers, but come back bronzed, fit, and showing a profit. They merely draw more money than they need and pocket the unspent balance. This money is handed over to them by our embassies. Except for lump-sum totals, no accounting is asked or given. I remember one colleague pulling out a fat roll of francs upon his return from Paris. He turned them in at the Idlewild exchange counter for a sheaf of $100 bills, which he regarded as a bonus for the hardships of visiting Paris.

This anonymous author tells us that the more "ingenious and unscrupulous Members of Congress" buy cars, radios, clothes, refrigerators, liquor, and TV sets simply by putting salesmen on the congressional payroll until they are paid for. He declares he can name Congressmen who pay their maids, handymen, and babysitters by putting them down for a Government salary.

These allegations should be taken gravely by the Congress. There are already signs that they will be. Chairman Omar Burleson of the House Administration Committee, of which I am a member, has said that newsman Jack Anderson, the amanuensis, will be invited to appear before the committee and reveal his sources. If Anderson declines to offer enlightenment, it is hoped that all other avenues of inquiry will be traversed until the truth is established.

There is little hope that the anonymous author will crawl out of hiding and offer assistance. In his article he sought to justify his anonymity, but his argument was not very convincing.

> If I were to sign my name to this article—

He wrote—

> I not only would be ostracized by my colleagues but I would never get another bill out of committee.

I believe the gentleman is somewhat exaggerating the moral turpitude of his colleagues for this can only mean that he believes he will suffer persecution for discharging a plain duty to the public.

But if he is still trembling with vague fears and alarms over persecution, I suggest this: If he can produce evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that his allegations are true, I am sure he will encounter no trouble finding a Congressman willing to lay his case before an avid Nation, leaving him free to keep himself warm in the ambuscades of anonymity.

MODERNIZING THE MINING LAWS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, early in this session I introduced a bill, H.R. 935, to modernize the mining laws of the

United States. The applicable act under which citizens of the United States and others who have declared their intention to become citizens may enter upon the open public lands of the United States to explore for, locate, and remove valuable mineral deposits and to occupy such lands in which mineral deposits are found is now nearly 100 years old.

Much good has been accomplished under the mining law of 1872. Its contributions to individual, community, and national welfare have been great. This has not been accomplished without attendant difficulty, however, and in crediting the contributions made possible by the 1872 act we dare not overlook the problems that have been created by our continuing insistence that a once-applicable philosophy of inexhaustible resources and sparse population should be projected into the 20th century. This has proven wrong in other resource areas, and there is plenty of evidence that it also is wrong in this instance.

My bill, H.R. 935, is based on information and supplementary material developed during the course of hearings on mining and related matters held over the last several years by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 935 has a dual purpose. First, it would protect the interest of legitimate prospectors and miners by establishing an orderly procedure for the exploration and discovery of mineral deposits and the patent of mining claims on public lands; second, it would protect the overall public interest in the public lands on which such mining activity is permitted by assuring that mining is conducted in a manner compatible with other multiple-use objectives of the public lands.

The need for modernization of the mining law of 1872 has been demonstrated repeatedly. Delay serves to worsen the situation and to make its solution more difficult and more costly. In its report on legislation that led to enactment of Public Law 167 of the 84th Congress, the House committee noted that:

> The Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of both the House and Senate have in the past several years been made increasingly aware of the abuses under the general mining laws by those persons who locate mining claims on lands for purposes other than that of legitimate mining activity.

The 1955 act prohibits all uses not reasonably incident to prospecting, mining, or processing operations on unpatented claims located after July 23, 1955. This law has resulted in an intensified program to eliminate use of mining claims for purposes inconsistent with mining purposes. This program, in effect, has served to illustrate the need for further and substantial reform.

The committee observed that:

> The ingenuity of American citizens which has made our Nation strong has also operated to develop new and better ways of abusing public land resources through obtaining color of title under the mining law.

Among the possible and practiced abuses under the provisions of the antiquated mining law, the committee cited the staking of mining claims in order to claim title to valuable stands of timber. The widely reported Al Sarena mining case in the Rouge River National Forest, Oreg., is a case in point. Al Sarena mines produced about $16,000 worth of gold, silver, and lead on its claims during the years 1935–43. Payroll reports filed with the Compensation Commission of the State of Oregon showed that the company paid out more than $47,000 during the same period. The total gross from mining operations would not be adequate to defray the cost of assessment work on 23 claims at $100 per claim per year over an 8-year period. Al Sarena did not extract much mineral from its claims, but it did cut and sell more than 2 million board feet of choice timber from the former national forest lands.

Mining claims have been staked in order to get land for such commercial enterprises as filling stations, curio and souvenir shops, cafes, and for residences and summer camps. The term "weekend miner" is widely recognized throughout the West to mean an individual or a group that has used the loopholes of the 1872 act in order to stake out claims and get personal and preferential use in outstanding recreation, scenic, and hunting and fishing areas. These are not rare or isolated instances, Mr. Speaker. There are many thousands of them, and they all were made possible because the 1872 act for many years has been clearly inadequate for the purpose for which it was intended.

The effect of all this has been to cause the heaping of abuse on the legitimate miner and on his industry and to obstruct the proper management of public lands open to mining activity. H.R. 935 seeks to remedy this.

No one knows how many mining claims have been staked on the public lands or where they are located. No record of claims was required prior to the 1955 enactment of Public Law 167. The best agency estimates show that there may be thousands of unpatented mining claims on the public lands. Unpatented mining claims are bought and sold on the open market in the public land States, and the holder or occupant of an unpatented mining claim need not be the original locator in order to be a bona fide occupant in good faith.

The 1872 act presently permits mining claims to run on indefinitely as a claim against the lands of the United States unless the Government takes action to invalidate each claim. It would cost millions of dollars to invalidate all the known mining claims either by publication or by contest proceedings.

H.R. 935 approaches this central problem by requiring that old mining claim locations be recorded along with a description of the minerals considered to be of value in the claim. This requirement holds promise of clearing thousands of mining claims made over the past 100 years that have been lost to antiquity except in the county recorder's office or in the files of the old mining district. The matter of identifying unpatented mining claims that are outstanding against the lands of the United States lies at the very heart of correcting the abuses and confusion that obstruct public lands management.

In addition, and as a means of assuring that mining claims are staked by persons actually interested in mining, H.R. 935 would require increased assessment work and report thereof. The valid claims would normally continue to have assessment work done and the invalid ones would be relinquished.

H.R. 935 would require application for patent within 10 years of location of a mining claim. Failure to make application for patent within that time limit would terminate the claim. Claims presently may go on for years and years with established rights under the law being maintained by little or no assessment work. The exorbitant cost of terminating these claims has prevented earlier action by the Federal Government. And as I said earlier, the situation is further compounded by the fact that these claims also pass in the private real estate market through quitclaim deeds and other ways.

The provision in H.R. 935 that would require termination of patent would eliminate such situations as necessitated the enactment last year of the Mining Claim Occupancy Act, Public Law 87-851. The purpose of that act is to give the Secretary of the Interior sufficient latitude when, in his determination that the public interest will not be injured, to permit persons who live on invalidated or relinquished mining claims for residential purposes, and who were in possession at least 7 years prior to July 23, 1962, to continue to reside in their homes. That act is clearly a relief measure designed to aid mainly otherwise unqualified people on whom a hardship would be visited were they to be required to move from their long-established homes on mining claims.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 935 seeks to correct a situation that every fairminded person will admit has long been in need of correction. This need has arisen because past Congresses have not approached the total problem, viewed it, and decided on a course of action that would protect both the interests of the legitimate miner and also the very profound and deeply entrenched interest of all the people of this country in their public lands. H.R. 935 forms the basis for that approach. It offers suggestions on all of the many involved and often complicated situations that are likely to develop and to be encountered. It covers situations ranging from the first exploration for a mineral to its discovery and ultimate patent of the claim and the removal of the minerals.

I do not claim that H.R. 935 offers all the answers or that it is perfect in every detail, Mr. Speaker. But I am claiming that it forms the basis for a necessary and thorough approach to the problem that already exists and has existed for many years. For that reason I am hopeful that a public hearing can be scheduled by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and that ample time can be provided for the full expressions of the views of members of the mining industry, people from all walks of life who have a legitimate and proper interest in the use and management of the public lands, and from the various land administering agencies charged with the

responsibility of administering those lands in the overall national interest. Then, and only then, Mr. Speaker, can we develop a legislative recommendation that will overcome the very difficult and complicated situation in which we now find ourselves. The mining laws must be rephrased in terms of the needs of the last half of the 20th century.

An editorial, appearing in the Oregon Journal, and dated Thursday, December 13, 1962, comments with appropriate timeliness on this very vital challenge to public-land management. I ask that it be included in the Record as part of my remarks.

Special Privilege for Miners

> The miner is a specially privileged man. He has rights which are not enjoyed by hikers or fishermen or loggers or cattlemen or any of the other interests who use the national forests and most other public lands.
>
> This fact was brought out at the citizens' conference on high mountain policy, held this week at Timberline Lodge.
>
> It is a startling exception to the principle of multiple use which now applies by law to the national forests. That principle means that the Forest Service is supposed to consider the various possible uses of its lands and decide which are the best for each particular tract. And it means that at times there have to be compromises among those who favor logging, recreation, grazing, wildlife management, or the preservation of water supplies.
>
> But when it comes to prospecting and mining, there is no compromise. A man with a valid claim can carry on mining no matter how much damage his operations may cause to the other values in a forest.
>
> This special privilege is based on the mining laws which sprang up spontaneously in the gold-rush camps more than a century ago. They were frozen into Federal law shortly after the Civil War, when few men could see clearly that there might not always be enough public land to satisfy every demand. And they have not been changed materially to this day, in spite of a few attempts to reform them.
>
> Not even the national forest lands which have been set aside to be untouched wilderness are safe. For example, a man with a claim on the Chetko River in southwestern Oregon is preparing right now to dredge for gold well within the Kalmiopsis Wild Area.
>
> Some fear that his operations will ruin fish spawning beds in the river, and others point out that roads are supposed to be excluded from wild and wilderness areas. But because of the provisions of the mining laws, the Forest Service cannot consider what harm he may cause to fish, and must even allow him to build a road into his claim.
>
> The mining industry argues that national security, as well as its own prosperity, requires that the search for minerals should be allowed over as wide a range as possible. This argument has some merit, of course.
>
> The trouble is, though, that the public's officials have no power now to decide whether a particular mining operation really is so valuable that it should be allowed to override other uses of the national forest. Virtually the only test the miner has to pass is to show that he probably can make a profit from his mine. The only way a man with a valid mining claim can be stopped is by getting Congress to pass a special law, and such laws are hard to obtain.
>
> Mining certainly is a vital industry, but it is no more vital than raising cattle or timber, or guaranteeing fresh, clean water, or providing outdoor recreation to the people of our crowded cities. These interests all must meet the multiple-use test. Mining should be made to meet it too.

RING THE BELLS

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 339 authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States, as part of the observance of the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, to ring the bells of all churches and appropriate public and private buildings at such time and for such period on the Fourth of July as the President may designate.

This grand idea was suggested to me last year by Father George, pastor of St. Raphael's Church in Los Angeles. It might well serve to remind us of our constant need for vigilance to protect our liberty. My colleague, the Honorable Edward R. Roybal, has recently made a similar suggestion.

I cannot imagine a better way to commemorate the signing of the first document of freedom in our country than to have the bells across our great land ring out simultaneously to be heard by people in every farm, village, town, and city to remind us of our heritage of freedom and our courageous beginnings. Although the sound of these bells may not reach across the ocean, who knows but that their reverberations of liberty and peace may somehow be felt by all people, enslaved and free.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge that the Committee on the Judiciary consider expeditiously and favorably report this resolution so that the President may issue a proclamation in time for our Independence Day celebration this year.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday of the coming week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] is recognized for 3 hours.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic date for on this day, along with my distinguished colleagues from New England and the eastern seaboard, we will prove that the recent Interior Department decision on residual oil imports is contrary to our wishes and unsuitable to the economic health of the United States. In the course of our 3-hour discussion, we will prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that we have been seriously wronged and by reviewing the history of the import program demonstrate conclusively that our section of the country has been given the very short end of the political stick. New England and the east coast consumers have, for 5 years, been compelled to pay a strong tribute to the so-called depressed coal mining industry. This import quota on inexpensive crude and residual oil has raised prices, disrupted distribution of oil, and caused havoc with our economy in New England. This discriminatory practice has taken place because of the mistaken and naive belief that it will relieve unemployment in the coal mines. This is, I suggest, an improper application of one system of political thought against another more basic, more intrinsically accurate point of view. For 5 years, Mr. Speaker, since President Eisenhower unwisely gave his go-ahead to this import system, I have vigorously searched for the truth. I say here today, as I have said in the past, that the truth—the heart of the matter—is that we have been discriminated against in New England and on the eastern seaboard. Our fight against this system has been, for the most part, ignored. Before reviewing some of the past history of this issue, I would like to begin with a statement on February 13 of this year.

The President's Office of Emergency Planning, which had been studying the effect of residual oil on national security, said this:

> In light of the circumstances as I find them today, a careful and meaningful relaxation of controls would be consistent with national security and the attainment of hemisphere objectives.

The report, written by Edward A. McDermott at the direction of Mr. Kennedy, gave some encouragement, but only temporarily so. It seemed to me that the recommendation removed the primary barriers of the restrictions. These restrictions had been costing the New England economy $30 million a year in increased fuel costs since 1939 when residual oil was put under the mandatory import program. Back in 1959, it was claimed that national security was the reason for doing so. The McDermott report stated essentially this: National security is not at stake and controls can be relaxed. I, along with other members of the New England delegation, had urged this report, and it appeared for a moment that we were on the road to victory. It became apparent, however, that President Kennedy, who directed the report, did not feel that the report should contain anything substantive. Soon, however, another encouraging factor appeared on the horizon in the visit of President Bentancourt to this country. He was given the red carpet treatment by the White House and was told that every effort would be made to help the economy of Venezuela and that the oil import program would be reviewed carefully. As you know, Mr. Speaker, Venezuela exports 90 percent of their crude and residual oil to this country. This is the same oil that New England uses for heating public buildings, schools, hospitals, apartment houses, and for utilities. Its domestic production has been declining steadily in recent years. New England and the east coast must depend on foreign sources for its supply. After the Presidents' meeting here in Washington, it occurred to me that both the economies of New England and Venezuela could be strengthened by lifting the import restrictions.

I feel that the following telegram which I sent to the President when President Betancourt was here should be included at this point in the RECORD:

FEBRUARY 20, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

By dramatically lifting crude and residual oil restrictions you could impress President Betancourt with U.S. desire to assist him in combating communism in the Americas and vigorously aid New England economy at same time.

If these unnecessary controls were scrapped immediately the action would be consistent with national security and attainment of hemispheric objectives.

I fully support, with you, Mr. Betancourt's attempt to resist Castroism in Latin America.

The logic of my request is precise, Mr. President. By lifting these odious restrictions you will advance notably the great cause of Venezuela as well as our own economic growth.

SILVIO O. CONTE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I was gratified a day later when I read the text of a joint statement by both Presidents to the effect that they had reviewed the oil situation and recognized that "the United States has been Venezuela's largest market," and stated that they were both confident that it would continue to be on an expanding scale. They concluded that "Venezuela's position in the U.S. petroleum market is, therefore, a matter of continuing concern" to both Governments, and that this position would be recognized in the "administration of the U.S. oil export program." The two leaders also agreed that there should be an exchange of information and views at a technical level with the goal of reaching "better trade agreements" between the two countries in that they would review "in advance such substantive changes in the oil export program that the United States might contemplate in the future."

These were very definite signs of agreement and at the time, Mr. Speaker, I was convinced that the deadline for the Department of Interior report would end the restrictions. Just a few days later, however, the President met with Mineworkers President Tony Boyle and "assured him" that the OEP recommendations would "not be made effective" until or unless further discussions were held with the Mineworkers. I was absolutely furious when I heard this and checked all over the city for confirmation. Mr. Boyle told my office that he had been quoted exactly and the White House press office refused to either confirm or deny the substance of what Mr. Kennedy told Mr. Boyle. This suggested that the President had completely given in to pressure from the coal industry and domestic oil producers for reasons which were not logically apparent and had no basis in fact. Now this same John F. Kennedy joined with me immediately in 1959 to protest these restrictions. As a new Republican in the House it was not an easy thing for me to question my own President. I was pleased to have the then junior Senator from Massachusetts join with me in appealing to the President. I now would like to enclose a copy of a letter sent to Mr. Eisenhower on September 8, 1959, which includes the signature of John F. Kennedy, now President of the United States, and then U.S. Senator:

SEPTEMBER 8, 1959.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned. are deeply concerned over the restrictions you imposed last March on the importation of residual oils, and the effect this will have on the economy of Massachusetts.

As you know, residual oil is a scrap product of oil processing. In 1957, the amount of residual oil imported represented less than 5.1 percent of the total petroleum products used in the United States. Modern refinery design in the United States permits the distillation of many crudes so that there is no residual oil produced in the refining process. Refiners of domestic oil have not produced sufficient quantities of residual oil. Users of residual oil have been forced to import. As the demand for other more valuable petroleum products increases and the production of residual oil decreases, the use of imported residuals is necessary to fill the gap between domestic production and domestic demand.

The east coast uses more than 50 percent of the residual oil consumed in the United States, and of this amount more than 55 percent is imported. Restrictions would severely disrupt the use of fuel in Massachusetts and would affect industrial heating, shipping, and public utilities, as well as other phases of industrial activity. A reduction in the supply of residual oil would increase substantially the cost of power in Massachusetts.

This is critical in the entire northeastern area, which is already burdened by the high cost of fuel because of the great distance over which such fuel must be transported. The continued use of residual oil imports will aid and not impair national security, and the maintenance of a large tanker fleet is necessary for national defense. In addition, restrictions on importation of this product would threaten the ability of the electric industry to provide a reliable supply of electricity and would affect the price of electricity for a large number of users vital to the national security. Such a restriction is particularly onerous and discriminating to the very important northeastern section of this country.

Also, it would seem to us that the limitation of residual imports would tend to injure the friendly relations we are striving to maintain with Central and South American countries which are important to Western Hemisphere solidarity. For example, Venezuela is one of the large exports of residual oil in the northeastern ports in the United States.

It is our understanding, Mr. President, that the operation of these import controls is subject to continuing review by the appropriate Government departments, and that modifications are made from time to time as are necessary to carry out the purposes of the program.

We respectfully urge your sympathetic consideration of this problem, and ask that residual oil be exempted from the mandatory import controls before the coming of fall and winter demands lead to a price increase in this type of fuel which is so vitally necessary to the economy of Massachusetts and New England and in the interest of national defense.

With every good wish, we are,

Sincerely yours,

Leverett Saltonstall, U.S. Senator; John F. Kennedy, U.S. Senator; John W. McCormack, Member of Congress; Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Member of Congress; Silvio O. Conte, Member of Congress; Harold D. Donohue, Member of Congress; William H. Bates, Member of Congress; Torbett H. Macdonald, Member of Congress; Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Member of Congress; James A. Burke; Member of Congress; Philip J. Philbin, Member of Congress; Edith Nourse Rogers, Member of Congress; Thomas J. Lane, Member of Congress; Hastings Keith, Member of Congress; Laurence Curtis, Member of Congress; Edward P. Boland, Member of Congress.

The signatures, among others enclosed, as I mentioned, include John F. Kennedy and also the distinguished Speaker of the House and other Members from both parties. I am not stating here that the President is dutybound by a stand taken as U.S. Senator, but I must say here that I think the whole situation rather curious. I had hoped that he had, as President, reviewed the facts involved and in doing so considered the conditions today so critical that he would remove these restrictions and, therefore, alleviate the situation in New England.

Mr. Speaker, it grieves me to confess that those of us in this body who represent the consumers of New England have been led down the primrose path. As I have emphasized in remarks on this floor on many previous occasions, the New England States, and indeed all of the seaboard States up and down the Atlantic coast, have a vital interest in an adequate supply of residual fuel oil, a product which is widely used in institutional heating, and also under utility boilers to generate electricity.

I repeat, many of us who have attempted to represent the legitimate interests of New England fuel consumers were under the impression that this matter was receiving fair and impartial consideration at the White House in recent weeks. We were encouraged by the publication of a report by the President's own Executive Office—undoubtedly with White House blessing—which showed conclusively that there is no scintilla of justification for any restrictions on imports of residual fuel oil.

On top of that, Mr. Speaker, we had been encouraged to hope for a fair and nonpolitical resolution of this festering problem, a solution which would place the national security and the legitimate interests of east coast consumers ahead of the special interests of the coal industry, and the political interests of this administration.

We were led to understand that if we would just be good boys and hold our peace, everything would come out all right in the end. The import quotas on residual fuel oil, which the President argued against so persuasively when he was a Member of the other body, would be removed, perhaps gradually, and a free and open fuels market would be restored to the New England States.

Well, we all know what happened. The President bowed once again to the pressures of the coal barons, and continued the restrictive import quotas for another year. This means that New England consumers will continue to lay out millions of dollars annually for fuel and power in a cynical political payoff to the coal industry.

And since the deed was done, I have turned up some evidence which casts quite a different light on the nature of the impartial consideration which the White House staff was giving to the question of residual oil quotas during the weeks after the Executive Office report on heavy fuel oil was issued and before the Interior Department announced its new "liberal" quota.

I discovered that evidence right in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was in the form of a letter, a short note to a Member of the other body, a Member who represents one of the coal States.

I was surprised to see the letter there, and I imagine that the writer was surprised to see it there, too. I do not think he intended that it receive such wide distribution.

It is a short letter of three paragraphs, and I want to read through it, so that Members who represent the fuel-consuming States, rather than the fuel-producing States, may know where they stand with the White House these days.

The letter starts out:

DEAR SENATOR: The time is approaching when the final decision of the President with respect to the future of the program of import controls on residual fuel oil will be made and announced.

Your correspondence with the President, particularly your letters of February 13 and 28, together with your statements on the Senate floor with respect to this problem, have, I believe, made a substantial contribution to clarify the several issues involved.

I feel sure that the President's final decision will reflect the vital interest of the coal industry that you have so ably delineated.

The letter is signed by Lawrence F. O'Brien, special assistant to the President.

There it is in black and white, Mr. Speaker. The President's final decision "will reflect the vital interest of the coal industry." No window dressing about the national security. No nonsense about wartime supplies. No political doubletalk about liberal trade policies. Just the vital interest of the coal industry.

What this letter asserts in black and white, over the signature of one of the closest associates and political advisers of our President, is that New England consumers and ratepayers are being mulcted of millions of dollars every year to pay off a political debt of this administration to the coal industry and the coal-producing States.

Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, what the Executive Office report said: The heavy fuel oil quotas are doing nothing to put coal miners back to work. If all imports of residual oil were to be cut off tomorrow, the coal industry would not hire one additional coal miner. They would just speed up their production schedules a bit, operate their machinery for a few more hours, and the needed coal would pour out. This is what the Government experts said. It is not what this New England Congressman says.

No, the truth is that the residual oil quota program is being operated for the benefit of the coal companies, not the coal miners.

Mr. Speaker, now that we have this testimony on the true motivations behind the administration's actions on heavy fuel oil imports, from an unimpeachable source, let us examine the nature of the quota.

Now of course the new quota appears on the surface to be a little bit bigger than the present quota, and Secretary of the Interior Udall played up the "liberalized" aspect of the program when the new quota was announced.

But, if the administration had wished to be fair about it, they would have admitted that the new quota, in the light of existing circumstances, is even tighter than the present quota, which reduced stocks of heavy fuel oil in New England during this past winter to dangerously low levels. The proof of this last fact lies in the action of the Interior Department granting an emergency increase in the quotas for the last 90 days of the quota year.

What you have to know in order to understand the deception behind the "liberalization" claim is the fact that New England stocks of heavy fuel oil, available for consumption, are currently at much lower levels than they were last year at this time, so that we enter the new quota year with much smaller on-hand supplies of this essential fuel.

The second thing you have to know is that domestic refiners are continuing to reduce their output of residual fuel oil, so that there will be less of the fuel available in the next 12 months from domestic sources than has been during the last 12 months.

And then you have to be aware that the Bureau of Mines has estimated that U.S. demand for heavy fuel oil will rise sharply during 1963–64, over the levels of the last 12 months.

When you put all of these facts together, Mr. Speaker, the lower stocks, the lower domestic production, the higher demand and the slightly higher quota, you immediately become aware of the prospects for a serious fuel shortage in the New England States next winter.

The actual truth is that the Interior Department, in arriving at the quota for the approaching year, used precisely the same formula that was employed in arriving at last year's formula—which proved to be so restrictive that it had to be adjusted in an emergency action by the Interior Department in the middle of the winter heating season. This so-called liberalized program, then, is actually the same old program, with the only change being an increase in the quota figure which is more apparent than real.

As a matter of fact, heavy fuel oil suppliers in the east coast area are already drawing down their quota for next year, in order to meet emergency needs for the current fuel oil import year. This is the actual fact. The inadequate quota for next year is already being used up in order to meet this year's needs.

Under the new regulations, an importer may apply during the last quarter of the qouta year for a higher allocation in order to meet the emergency needs of his customers. These regulations took effect immediately, and the stocks of residual oil along the eastern seaboard were so reduced as a result of the abnormally low temperatures this winter, that several importers have already approached the Interior Department and received permission to bring in more oil to supply urgent needs.

But, under the new regulations, emergency grants of this type have to be paid back by the importers out of their quotas for the first quarter of the ensuing year. Thus, Mr. Speaker, the residual oil quota for April, May, June, 1963, is already being used up before April has even arrived.

It occurs to me that it is highly appropriate that this "liberalized" quota of which the Interior Department boasts goes into effect on April Fool's Day, because when that day arrives, residual oil importers will know, even if the general public does not, that the supposed quota of 575,000 barrels of oil per day has already been shrunk in an effort to meet the emergency requirements of the previous winter.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his kindness in yielding at this point. I certainly wish to associate myself most strongly with those who are opposing the continued control of imports of residual fuel oil which is a great detriment to the people of my State who are so vitally affected through the price that they pay for public utility services. I associate myself with that attitude on the part of the able gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include the following letter by Mr. E. A. Evans, managing director of the Oil Users Association of Miami, Fla., and also an information bulletin by Mr. Evans of February 20, 1963.

OIL USERS ASSOCIATION,
Miami, Fla., January 22, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Oil Users Association, an organization representing industry and electric utilities and whose members have plants in every State of the Union, views with alarm the continued pressure by the National Coal Policy Conference that you reduce the import quotas on residual oil.

The elimination of restrictions on residual oil imports was requested in a joint formal statement by the Oil Users Association, New England Council and American Public Power Association to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization filed July 21, 1961, and also in a rebuttal statement to the Office of Emergency Planning filed August 21, 1961. Both statements pointed out that import restrictions on residual oil as compared with crude oil are entirely different insofar as national security is concerned; that restrictions on residual oil imports are not in the best interests of national security, but do in fact have the opposite effect. Both presentations also pointed out, among other things, that artificially induced high prices have resulted from the restriction and, further, that the imports of residual oil are in no wise responsible for the depressing effects in the bituminous coal industry.

We would respectfully invite your attention to the fact that the artificially induced high prices on residual oil are still continuing. As a typical average example we have taken a single electric utility and a single industrial plant, both located in Florida. The electric utility has been forced to pass on to their consumers during the year 1962 an additional fuel cost of approximately $429,000 and their estimate for 1963 is three times this amount, approximately $1,400,000. In the case of the industrial plant, its costs increased approximately $500,000 during 1962, which must be absorbed by consumers as reflected in higher prices of finished products.

We would like to reiterate our feelings with reference to the situation as outlined in these formal presentations and, furthermore, to indicate that the entire elimination of restriction of residual oil imports would appear to be in line with your Alliance for Progress program and in accordance with the program outlined in the Trade Expansion Act.

Because of the facts that: (1) Importation of residual oil has no harmful effects on our national security; (2) importation of residual oil has not adversely affected the coal industry; (3) continued high prices of residual oil must be absorbed by the consumer; and (4) elimination of import restrictions on residual oil would be entirely consistent with your Alliance for Progress and reciprocal trade programs, we most urgently and sincerely request that restrictions on the importation of residual oil be eliminated.

Yours very truly,

E. A. EVANS.

INFORMATION BULLETIN, FEBRUARY 20, 1963

Under date of February 13, 1963, the Office of Emergency Planning issued a press release stating that: "A careful and meaningful relaxation of controls on imports of residual fuel oil to be used as a fuel was recommended today by Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning in the Executive Office of the President. Mr. McDermott stated that an extended study proved to his satisfaction that this decision is consistent with the national security and the attainment of Western hemispheric objectives which contribute to the national security."

The next development is now up to President Kennedy and, since the present allocation period expires on March 31, a decision by the President prior to that date may be expected.

A copy of Mr. McDermott's "Memorandum for the President" is in our hands. It is lengthy, consisting of 47 pages. In order that you may have a short brief of the principal portions of the report, as well as some pertinent comments thereon, we submit this bulletin for your information.

COMMENTS IN GENERAL

1. While it is disappointing that complete elimination of import restriction on residual was not recommended at this time, we feel, nevertheless, that definite progress has been made.

2. While a careful and meaningful relaxation of residual controls could be helpful, it is felt that nothing short of complete elimination of such controls will solve the problem.

3. It appears that the general tone of the "Memorandum for the President" implies strongly that there should be a substantial relaxation of residual controls, not a token one.

4. We believe the progress we have made is principally contained in the following points:

(a) Only one governmental department suggested the retention of the present program; this was the Department of Interior and their support was mild.

(b) The memorandum clearly indicated the belief that national security requirements do not call for the restriction of imports on residual oil. We have held to this point consistently and the National Coal Policy Conference has strongly held to the opposite view. It should be noted that the only reason for the inclusion of restriction of residual imports in the original 1959 Presidential proclamation was that it was necessary from the standpoint of national security to include residual oil in the restriction program.

(c) The memorandum refutes the claim made by the National Coal Policy Conference that the importation of residual oil was responsible for the unemployment situation in the coal States. We have strongly contended that this was not true, but rather that mechanization of the coal mines, dieselization of the railroads and the shift of small users away from the use of coal were the reasons for their problems. The OEP memorandum strongly supports our viewpoint.

(d) The restriction on residual imports did, in fact, create an artificial price control with increased prices to consumers as the result.

(e) The entire tone of OEP's memorandum tends to indicate that the initial 1959 program probably never should have included residual oil and that the error should be gradually corrected by continued relaxations.

(f) Finally, while at the present time we have not obtained our goal—complete elimination of residual controls—nevertheless we can feel that we have been instrumental in bringing about a move that can reasonably expect to end in complete discontinuance of residual controls in the not too distant future.

QUOTES AND STATEMENTS FROM MEMORANDUM

The following are pertinent quotes from the "Memorandum for the President." They are taken out of context, however we have attempted in each case to be sure we held to the original thought contained in the entire quotation and are included because of their interest and their support of the above comments.

Department of State: "A number of friendly countries and allies have expressed skepticism of the national security justification on which our oil import program is based." Also, "It has been particularly difficult in the case of residual fuel oil to relate, with any effectiveness, the framework of our restrictions to clearly demonstrated national security needs."

Department of Defense: "We cannot see wherein residual fuel oil imports can seriously endanger the national security." The Department also referred to the impact of price increases and difficulties of obtaining domestic supplies of residual.

Department of Commerce: "The continuation of the residual fuel oil import quota plan as a method of increasing exploration, drilling, reserves and crude oil output appears rather tenuous." Also, "First, the program has increased the price of residual fuel oil and has had the tendency to increase the price of other energy fuels. Second, the program has resulted in 'spot shortages' of residual fuel oil resulting in considerable hardship."

Department of Justice: This Department reports its view that the present controls of residual imports are detrimental to existing and future competition, particularly in fuel oil marketing. The result has been, according to the Department, occasional shortage of supply and serious loss to marketers, compromising not only their present competitiveness but their ability to compete in the future.

Department of Labor: This Department stated they believed that the current program should be maintained and that consideration should be given to periodic adjustments in import levels to provide for the growing number of consumers of residual who are dependent on imports. Also, "At the same time, however, we do not believe that there should be further restrictions on the imports of residual fuel oil. The national interest requires a favorable attitude toward the continued receipt of residual fuel oil, particularly from such countries as Venezuela. These imports are required not only to maintain the economy of these exporting countries but also from the standpoint of the interests of consuming centers on the eastern seaboard."

They also stated that the unemployment problem of the coal miners has only in part been the result of reduced demand for coal. The principal contributor has been the 85-percent increase in output per production worker man-hour in the decade following 1949, a change accomplished largely through mechanization.

In the conclusions which finalize the memorandum, the following appears:

"Western hemispheric sources have predominated in the imports of residual fuel oil to the United States. Substantial reliance on this area for an important component of residual fuel oil needs contributes to the achievement of long-term hemispheric goals for the promotion of economic, political, and social progress. At the same time this use of those petroleum resources is compatible with national defense requirements, current and contemplated. Therefore, national policy should not inhibit the realization of the appropriate capacities for oil production, refining, storage, and transportation needed to assure the continuation of the present role of the Western Hemisphere as a source of imported residual fuel oil.

"An inevitable conclusion of this investigation is that the imposition of tighter residual fuel oil controls than those now in effect would be inconsistent with national security objectives. Such action would not contribute in any important degree to the security of fuels for the United States itself or in the broader context of its international security obligations. A more drastic import control program would impose serious economic, political, and social burdens within the Western Hemisphere where it is essential that progress be achieved. That the national security investigation reveals the Western Hemisphere as a suitable source for such imports would accentuate the unfortunate repercussions which would follow the imposition of tighter controls.

"In light of circumstances as I find them today, a careful and meaningful relaxation of controls would be consistent with national security and the attainment of hemispheric objectives which contribute to the national security. Such a relaxation should be designed to achieve the maximum reduction of the burden on the economy, given the import levels resulting from the easing of controls."

The war has not been won, however at the present writing it would appear that we may have won the first skirmish, perhaps even the first battle.

We will continue to work with the many individuals, organizations, and areas with whom we have coordinated all of our moves during the past 2 years, and who have our sincere appreciation for their cooperation which created the close harmony that exists between us. Special appreciation is also given to the many Members of Congress who have been most helpful, particularly the congressional delegations of Florida, New England, and New York.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the remarks of the able gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and we are certainly proud to have him join with us in this fight.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in this discussion of the residual fuel oil problem to make better known the impact upon the State of Florida of the present restrictive policy and, more specifically, the dire effects of the policy upon the economy of the Jacksonville area.

For a number of years before President Eisenhower established the control program, the free availability of fuel oil promoted industrial growth in Florida and encouraged the production of low-cost electricity to meet the consumer needs of my State's booming population.

Partly because of the ease of transporting residual fuel oil by ship to Florida's coastal cities, it took an artifically rigged market to make other fields competitive. Coal and gas are newcomers to Florida, as the Office of Emergency Planning pointed out in its February 13 report to the President. The President's restrictions on the free flow of fuel oil have resulted in higher costs for power of all kinds and in something of a shift to other fuels which are not so controlled.

Yet even in 1961, according to the Federal Power Commission, oil was still the primary source for the production of electric power in Florida, accounting for 43 percent of the total production, when measured in B.t.u. content. Many Florida industrial plants have found it too expensive to convert to other fuels and are captives of higher oil prices.

The higher cost of power is the chief problem for Floridians as a direct effect of the President's import program. Let me cite two examples. The Florida Power Corp. estimates that the import restrictions were responsible for about $429,000 in additional fuel costs in their operation in 1962 and that this year, 1963, the figure will be more than tripled, to about $1,400,000. These costs are being passed onto consumers of electric power.

To take another example, the single industrial plant of the St. Regis Paper Co., Jacksonville, had higher power costs of $500,000 in 1962 directly attributable to the import program. The company's officials decided that these costs would have to be absorbed by buyers of the firm's finished products and this thereby lessens the company's competitive position in the national market.

How does the President's fuel oil program drive up the costs of power in Florida? Let me explain, using the example of the municipally owned electric system in Jacksonville, my home city.

The Jacksonville Electric System is owned by the city and serves 145,000 customers in the northeastern section of Florida. This is not only an area of major industrial, commercial, and transportation importance, but is critical to the national defense effort. In the immediate area are the Jacksonville Naval Air Station, Cecil Field Naval Air Station, and Mayport Naval Station, a major carrier base, together with such support establishments as the Navy Fuel Depot, Naval Air and Fleet Reserve Training Centers, and other military installations.

Three power generating stations in the Jacksonville Electric System depend upon residual fuel oil and the demand for their output grows steadily. In 1961, the latest year for which I have complete statistics, the electric system consumed about 3,500,000 barrels of residual. This was an increase of 57.6 percent over a 5-year period. Three years from now, in 1966, the system will need at least 5 million barrels to meet the continuing requirements of the area.

Now, any action of the President which restricts residual fuel oil imports in the eastern seaboard creates there a short supply, raises prices, stimulates certain trade practices which amount to rationing, and discourages construction of additional generating and industrial capacity.

Domestically produced residual has never met the Florida demand either in quantity or in competitive prices. Our industries, therefore, are caught in the dilemma of relying upon high-priced but inadequate supplies of foreign and domestic residual oil or of converting their plants, at great cost, to be able to use high-priced supplies of other fuels. In some cases they can do neither and face extinction.

This is a major reason for my opposition to the continuation of the President's restrictive quota policy. I am joined in this position by the Florida Municipal Utilities Association—which consists of cities owning their own electric systems as well as rural electric cooperatives—by the Jacksonville Electric System, the Florida Power Corp., the Florida Power & Light Co., the Oil Users Association of Miami, the Florida REA Statewide Association, the Minute Maid Co., and many other industrial firms and municipalities which have expressed a position.

I do not believe there is a single consumer of power in Florida who supports the President on the residual oil problem.

Moreover, the entire Florida congressional delegation is united in its opposition.

The full use of residual oils from abroad would serve our international security interests by backing an ally, Venezuela, in helping itself to combat communism. It would also help us in the United States to retain and not deplete unnecessarily reserves we have at home which may be needed in time of war.

Whatever may have been the reasons for the restrictive policies in the last years of the past administration and the early years of the present one, I feel that the facts of today argue eloquently for an immediate abandonment of the artificial and detrimental restrictive import program. The President's own Office of Emergency Planning has also ably cited many other valid factors for a full liberalization of residual oil importation.

I hope the President will act promptly.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the remarks of our able colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], and we are glad to have him join us on this very important matter.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

It is becoming a frustrating exercise for New England Members to take the floor to ask for elimination of mandatory restrictions on the importation of residual fuel oil. Still, we will continue to protest with all our might these unwise and unfair restrictions that cause New England consumers such hardship.

Perhaps our efforts up to this time have served a useful purpose, for through our diligent research and our collective voices, the erroneous claim that residual oil imports were responsible for a loss of jobs in coal mines, has been fairly well dispelled. And, too, it has been proven beyond all reasonable doubt that the American oil industry is in no way threatened by residual oil imports.

Every New Englander from the President on down can testify to the damaging effects of inflationary fuel oil costs in this area of the country as a direct result of these discriminatory restrictions.

The recent 9.6-percent increase in residual oil imports is encouraging only in the sense that it gives recognition to the validity of our arguments in the past, as well as the unbiased advice of the Office of Emergency Planning.

However, this small increase of about 50,000 barrels daily is not the "meaningful relaxation of controls" that Director of Emergency Planning McDermott termed in his report "consistent with national security and the attainment of hemispheric objectives which contribute to the national security."

The U.S. coal and domestic oil producers who still labor under the misapprehension that residual fuel oil imports harm their industries should take a very careful look at the facts and consider the adverse effect their "protectionist" campaign is having on the northeastern States of the Atlantic seaboard. They should ponder well upon the great damage their activities are having on U.S. relations with Venezuela, and indirectly, with all Latin America.

Venezuelan President Betancourt made the position of his country unmistakably clear when he visited Washington a few weeks ago. The continuance of his pro-U.S. government in Venezuela depends upon expansion of residual oil imports by the United States from his country.

In summary, the record must show that:

First. Residual oil restrictions are harmful to our national security.

Second. They weaken the domestic economy rather than strengthen it and create great economic hardship to New England.

Third. They are harmful to the economies of our anti-Communist friends, and weaken economic and military ties with friends and allies.

It is difficult to understand in the face of these facts why the mistaken objections of special interests are not ignored and these restrictions eliminated.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the fine statement and the support of our colleague, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. TUPPER].

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in protesting the function of the quota system that presently is in effect for imports of residual oil.

It was on February 13, 1963, Mr. Speaker, that Edward A. McDermott, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, recommended a careful and meaningful relaxation of controls on imports of residual fuel oil.

This recommendation was welcomed as encouraging news to those of us who have a great reliance on residual oil as a fuel.

For several years, I have urged not only that controls on residual oil imports be relaxed but that the quota system on such imports be eliminated entirely. Time and time again I have pointed out to the authorities that there is no good reason for this import control to be in effect, and that its only result is to boost the price on residual oil for those of Maine and the other New England States who use this oil as a fuel.

I want to mention that Director McDermott's recommendation for a relaxation of import controls on residual oil came forward as the result of an investigation that commenced in May of 1961. Under the law, the Director of Emergency Planning is required to maintain constant surveillance of imports of petroleum and its primary derivatives in respect of national security.

In addition, numerous petitions from industrial, consumer, and congressional sources had urged an examination of the merits of the import quota on residual oil.

The coal industry has very understandably been an opponent to the removal of the quota system for residual oil imports, feeling that this oil acted to replace coal for fuel purposes. It is interesting to note, however, that the Office of Emergency Planning found—as a result of its study—that any difficulties confronting the coal industry could not justifiably be charged to residual oil but, instead, to various patterns of change in fuel uses.

Those of us who had entertained high hopes for import relief had our hopes somewhat shaken when just the other week it was reported that President Kennedy, meeting in conference with Mr. Boyle of the United Mine Workers, had pledged to Mr. Boyle that no relaxation would be effected on import quotas for residual oil.

At that time I promptly telegraphed President Kennedy, urging that he reconsider any such pledge that he might have made to Mr. Boyle. I also urged the President to give serious attention to the recent recommendation of the Office of Emergency Planning, which called for a relaxation of the quota system on residual oil imports.

Just a few weeks ago, it appeared to some that the administration was making an effort to relax these import restrictions. At that time it was announced that there would be an increase of 9.6 percent in residual oil imports.

However, upon closer examination, it was discovered that this adjustment would not increase the amount of residual oil available for fuel users; instead, this percentage increase just acted to take up the slack in our domestic production of this fuel. This slack, it should be noted, results from the fact that domestic refineries do not find it profitable to produce residual oil, and most of their efforts are spent in trying to increase the production of better grade oil at the expense of residual oil.

Essentially, then, the situation is the same as it was before, and New Englanders are still confronted with restricted supplies of residual oil as a result of the operation of the quota system. And it is reported in some quarters that this restrictive program is requiring New England residual oil consumers to pay just about 23 cents a barrel more than do consumers in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, on March 9, I received a reply in response to a wire I had directed to the White House on this matter. In that communication it was stated as follows:

> We expect an announcement soon from the Department of the Interior on the level of residual oil imports for the coming year. Your telegram is being sent to the Secretary of the Interior for his information, and your comments will be considered in the final analysis which is being made of this entire problem.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to find anything encouraging to my interests in this statement. And I want to state for the record that I think a relaxation of the quota system on residual oil imports is long overdue.

It is difficult to see how this restrictive program contributes an iota to our national security. The program—as studies show—brings little, if any, help to the coal industry, and it appears to do little toward encouraging the development of new domestic oil sources.

About the only thing it accomplishes is higher prices for domestic residual fuel oil consumers, and it is difficult to perceive how this can be considered a positive accomplishment.

The quota system on residual oil imports should be abolished, and the quicker the better.

NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL QUESTIONS LEGALITY OF PRESIDENT'S RESIDUAL OIL DECISION

BOSTON.—The New England Council has questioned the legality of the recent White House decision to maintain residual oil quotas and said the decision perpetuates a Government protected cartel.

In a joint statement, James S. Couzens, chairman of the council's fuel committee and Gardner A. Caverly, executive vice president of the council, condemned the decision as contrary to the administration's own study done by the Office of Emergency Planning and called on the President to either directly regard or disregard the report.

The council statement said that section 7, of the Trade Agreements Act of 1958, as amended by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, gives the President authority to establish residual oil quotas once a national security justification has been established; but in the absence of such a finding or determination he does not have legal authority to maintain it.

"In its February 13 report, the Office of Emergency Planning stated residual oil controls were not in the interest of national security, and that they have little to do with unemployment in the coal industry," said Mr. Caverly. "Accordingly there appears no valid economic or security reason for controls to continue and this would give rise as to whether the Trade Agreements Act is being violated."

"The announced 9.6-percent increase in residual oil imports will do little more than replace the domestic production decline," Mr. Couzens said, "and this still leaves strong enough supply demand pressures to require New England residual oil consumers to pay 23 cents a barrel more than in other countries such as Canada." Residual oil is used as heating fuel for apartment houses and large office buildings and it also affects the cost of many electric utilities.

"The residual oil import quotas let only enough oil into the country to meet demands and this keeps per barrel costs artificially high," said Mr. Couzens.

The statement also said the quota system "locked buyers and sellers together, thus eliminating competition—a situation that the Justice Department condemned in the O.E.P. report.

"The only reason for the President's decision to maintain residual oil import restrictions appears to be pressures put on the White House by misguided leaders of the coal industry," Caverly concluded.

The statement also said the council is not giving up its battle for removal of residual oil quota restrictions but is considering expanding its program to include removal of restrictions for the entire industry and not just residual oils.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks following those of the gentleman from Massachusetts, together with other remarks which have been approved for extension in the RECORD, and add to my own remarks a statement on the part of New England Council which is pertinent to this point, and which is a release of the New England Council.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from the State of Maine who has been continually aware of this problem has assisted myself and other Members from New England who have been fighting since 1959 to have lifted this unfair restriction on the importation of crude oil.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts and say that these residual oil import restrictions have been unnecessarily severe in the past, remain so at the present time, and it is now

hoped that eventually the administration will give consideration to a lessening of these restrictions so they will not be so prohibitive on our free enterprise system in this country.

I wish to ask the gentleman a number of questions. First, What are the causes of the chronic unemployment in the U.S. coal industry?

Mr. CONTE. Primarily, technology. The average productivity per mineworker has risen steadily from about 6 tons per day in 1948 to 13 tons in 1960. Other factors are the loss of coal to natural gas in space heating and to diesel oil as a railroad fuel.

Mr. CRAMER. Recognizing that the imports restrictions work a hardship on all residual fuel oil marketers on the east coast are these restrictions at least equitably administered among all affected marketers?

Mr. CONTE. No. The existing regulations discriminate against most independent marketers by making them captives of one or two major company suppliers.

Mr. CRAMER. How is this done?

Mr. CONTE. The Government has decreed, in effect, that any marketer who in 1957—2 years before the restrictions went into effect—happened to have brought imported residual oil into the United States through another company instead of buying it directly offshore, is forever tied for that portion of his imports to that other company.

Mr. CRAMER. How should the imports regulations be changed pending their eventual complete elimination?

Mr. CONTE. They should be changed in such a way as to restore as far as possible, the previously existing relationship between buyers and sellers of this commodity. This should be done by revising current regulations and the Independent Fuel Oil Marketers of America, Inc., is presently studying this problem. This would suitably distribute the import allocation among all marketers instead of concentrating two-thirds of the total in three companies as is now the case, thereby creating a monopoly cartel.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the imposition of restrictions on imports of residual oil by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower has done more harm to industry in New England than any other act by a Chief Executive.

I want to express the gratitude of the people of my district to President John F. Kennedy who inherited this situation.

Action by the Kennedy administration on three different occasions has brought about relief of conditions as my good friend from Massachusetts knows.

Mr. CONTE. I know that this administration could help the economy in New England merely by repealing this mandatory restriction. This they have failed to do.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, New Hampshire residual oil consumers feel they are being unfairly treated by the Kennedy administration. They are being forced to pay 27 cents extra for a barrel of residual oil than foreign consumers pay.

What does this mean in dollars and cents to my fellow New Englanders?

New England uses 70 million barrels of residual a year, which means we pay an annual penalty of almost $20 million for a program that does no one good, and is harmful to the country.

President Kennedy has done absolutely nothing about wool imports. He might at least be consistent and adopt the same attitude about residual oil.

Under President Kennedy's policies, New England wool businesses are being ruined by foreign imports and at the same time New England consumers are paying a premium for residual oil. We are getting it coming and going.

KENNEDY CHANGES HIS SPOTS

When President Kennedy was a Senator from Massachusetts, he fought against residual oil quotas. In those days, he showed rightful concern for New England consumers. But that is all back in 1960.

During his campaign for the presidency, Mr. Kennedy made certain promises in the coal regions of West Virginia.

COAL NOT INVOLVED

Unemployment in West Virginia is of concern to all Americans. None of us can object to help for an important area of our country. However, there is absolutely no evidence to prove that residual oil restrictions will help West Virginia's economy. There is abundant proof that these restrictions are very costly to the New England consumer. So the President is hurting New England consumers without really helping his new-found friends in West Virginia.

Since becoming President, Mr. Kennedy appears to have forgotten the New England consumer.

Coal has increased its share of electric utilities consumption of energy, while residual oil has been reduced percentagewise. The residual import issue has been cynically promoted by the coal industry as an excuse for all its problems. Most of these problems are the result of its own lack of foresight.

ONLY $20 MILLION FOR R. & D.

For example, the coal industry spends less than $20 million a year in research and development. It has pressured the Kennedy administration into establishing a Coal Research and Development Agency within the Interior Department. The American taxpayer is paying for coal industry research and development instead of the coal corporations.

The budget for this Department of Interior coal operation has been doubled for next year.

The coal industry is spending millions through the National Coal Association and the National Coal Policy Conference Board in Washington to sell false propaganda. Throughout the world the coal industry is fighting not only for the status quo, but a turning back of the clock. Because of their unity they are temporarily winning this battle through various forms of controls and unfair taxation on competitive fuels.

The price the New England taxpayer is paying for a few New Frontier West Virginia votes is very high indeed.

According to the Congressional Quarterly magazine, some U.S. oil interests have joined the coal industry in favoring residual oil quotas. There is no convincing evidence that removal of residual oil restrictions would hurt American oil companies. All the evidence suggests the opposite.

SYMPATHY MAY WEAR THIN

American oil companies should carefully consider the facts before joining an embargo movement on New England progress. One of these facts that I hope they will pay particular attention to is: they traditionally look to intelligent Representatives of New England for assistance in their annual fight to maintain the 27½-percent depletion allowance. One of the main purposes of this allowance is to insure an abundance of petroleum products to benefit the American consumer. This allowance was never intended to act as a handmaiden of restrictions. Intelligent and thoughtful people in New England are sympathetic to the needs of the U.S. oil industry. However, when we find the oil industry combining with groups who want to unnecessarily raise the price of New England fuel, I think it is reasonable to point out that our sympathy may wear thin.

IMPORT QUOTAS NOT JUSTIFIED

Last year, the Interior Committee of the U.S. Senate held that import quotas were not justified and did not endanger national security. Further, the Office of Emergency Planning has said:

> The present controls of residual imports are detrimental to existing and future competition, particularly in fuel oil marketing.

The changes in import regulations, which become effective April 1, in no way solve New England's oil problem. We need to import about 130,000 barrels of residual a day. The administration increase of 50,000 will leave a gap of 80,000 barrels a day.

No program of just enough oil promotes competition. Competitive pricing is still impossible because of this 80,000-barrel gap.

In announcing the April 1 residual import regulation changes, the Interior Department made the questionable statement that the "program assures consumers of the opportunity of obtaining the fuel of their choice."

Before the quota program was put in effect, there were 10 independent heavy fuel oil marketers in the 6 New England States. As of today, there are only three.

BUREAUCRATIC REVIEW

In addition, the Oil Import Administration says that in order for a user to obtain an emergency allocation, the supplier must provide: First, disclosure of the customer's requirements; second, the efforts made by the customer to obtain residual supplies; third, the customer's ability to utilize alternative fuels and the availability of such fuels.

It is perfectly clear that before the prospective customer can decide on the fuel of his choice, his application has to undergo a time-wasting review by Washington bureaucrats.

We in New England do not want to be told what fuel to use. Nor do we want someone else to determine whether the price is right. We do not want this, and we are sure no other American wants it, either.

We want to decide for ourselves what fuel to burn, and we want to pay the free world market price for that fuel. Our competitors in Canada are buying the same residual fuel for less, with the obvious result that many of our jobs may be in jeopardy. Our homes, our hospitals, and our schools are forced to pay higher utility bills because of import restrictions.

Residual oil restrictions are unfair and unnecessary. They must go.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEITH. I want to compliment my colleague from New Hampshire on what I believe is his maiden speech.

Mr. Speaker, New England, which has no natural source of fuel, has suffered needlessly under the residual oil import control program, a program which has been shown to serve no greater purpose than to appease the coal-State bloc and certain small segments of the oil industry.

Two important considerations were originally advanced as the justification for this quota system—national security and protection of domestic fuel industries.

If the administration could have proved that the restrictions were essential to national security and could insure a healthy domestic coal or oil industry, by preventing severe industrial dislocations, then, I am confident, that no New England member would have challenged the right of the Federal Government to continue to curtail the flow of imported residual oil, even if it meant that New England consumers and New England industry would be penalized by higher fuel costs and fuel shortages.

The administration, however, failed to establish the need for this program from the outset and we, rightfully and through channels provided by law, called for an investigation. I am pleased to note that I was the Member of Congress who initiated the petition calling for this investigation.

On February 13, after some 2 years of study, the Office of Emergency Planning finally issued a memorandum for the President—based on this exhaustive study—recommending a "careful and meaningful relaxation" of controls. To those of us who had been urging a complete removal of controls, this recommendation was considered inadequate, but welcome nonetheless, if it would break the impasse and start a movement toward the ultimate abolishment of the burdensome quota system. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we have always been reasonable in our approach to this problem.

The administration's disregard of this study by its own agency, however, is probably good evidence of the fact that we have been too reasonable and too patient.

There is only one fair price for residual oil in New England, and that is the price that it can be shipped there in a free and competitive market—free of the discriminatory restraints of the import control program. The unfairness of the current program has been harshly dramatized by the fact that—having suffered the economic hardships imposed by the program since 1959—it has been shown by an impartial report to have no justification under the two criteria set forth for inclusion of petroleum imports on the national security list, as provided by the Trade Agreements Extension Act and the subsequent Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

The imports of residual oil cannot be shown to adversely affect national security requirements—to the contrary, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning concludes his report to the President with the statement that "a relaxation of controls would be consistent with national security and the attainment of hemispheric objectives which contribute to the national security."

The imports of residual oil cannot be shown to significantly affect labor conditions in coal producing regions—Director McDermott's report states that cutting residual fuel imports would be of only "marginal assistance" to the domestic coal mining industry.

To ignore the pleas of New England consumers, then, obviously is for other reasons than national security or the proper protection of domestic industries. I have previously said that such an action would have to be motivated, purely and simply, by political considerations.

Certainly, I do not know what other interpretation can be placed on the decision of the Interior Department when, 1 month after the OEP report—which drew on the advice of the entire executive branch—the Secretary announced a continuation of the control program with modifications so minor they can only be described as "meaningless."

The Interior Department's action did more than overlook Mr. McDermott's principal recommendation; it treated the entire Office of Emergency Planning as if it had never existed. The OEP report had gone well beyond recommending a "meaningful relaxation" of residual import controls. It had demolished, factually and logically, every argument—save one—for the continuance of the residual import control program. If facts were as powerful in the councils of this administration as they would have us believe, then the residual oil import control program would have collapsed like a tent without a centerpole on the issuance of the OEP report of February 13.

The one argument OEP failed to dispatch proved too potent to overcome with mere facts or logic or equity. Unfortunately for New England, it develops that a truly meaningful relaxation of residual oil import controls was politically inexpedient.

The campaign against residual imports is an excuse for not facing reality. It is a way around hard truths and painful solutions. It satisfies, apparently, the need for a scapegoat—a visible enemy whose picture can be tacked on the post office wall.

The coal industry and the coal unions have managed to convince a good many people in West Virginia and elsewhere that residual imports are responsible for much of the unemployment in mining regions. The fact is that a flat prohibition of all residual imports would not materially improve the unemployment situation in these areas. As the OEP has pointed out, the loss in coal's markets has been "essentially due to causes unrelated to residual."

Thus, between 1950 and 1961, consumption of coal as locomotive fuel virtually ceased due to dieselization of the railroads. Retail deliveries plummeted 67 percent. Use in steel mills declined 29 percent. Even internal use by the coal mines and sales to employees dropped 77 percent.

The only major gain for the coal industry during the decade was in the electric utility market—the precise market where coal and residual oil are in the most direct competition.

If residual oil imports have nothing to do with the decline in coal consumption, they have had even less to do with the drop in coal employment. The major, telling factor has been a phenomenal increase in productivity per worker. The average output per production worker man-hour rose 85 percent from 1949 to 1959, which was twice the average for the total private economy and three times the average for the nonfarm sector.

This productivity revolution in a mature industry was responsible for the 60 percent drop in employment.

I deeply sympathize with the plight of the unemployed mineworker. I understand the numbing effects of joblessness on the individual and on the people around him. And, I know what a high rate of unemployment in a major industry can do to the entire local economy—we have had the same kind of problems in New England and we have had to face facts.

But making residual oil the villian in this situation is a disservice to the unemployed miner as well as to the people of New England, on whom the cost burden of this quota program most directly falls. Miners have been led to believe that a large proportion of their industry's trouble would vanish if residual imports could be halted—this is a cruel and costly deception.

The truth is that in the 10-year period from 1951 to 1961, in the 18 Eastern States which comprise District I, the consumption of coal by electric utilities increased relative to residual fuel consumption, but both decreased in percentage terms relative to natural gas consumption.

Obviously, if residual fuel imports were stopped entirely, coal would not fill the entire gap. Furthermore, any boost given to coal employment would be temporary at best in view of the continuing rise in mining productivity and the continuing rate of improvement in coal utilization.

The administration fully understands these facts.

But even if there were some doubts about the OEP report, certainly this administration can understand the basic economic truth that you cannot successfully treat unemployment in one segment of the U.S. economy by placing inequitable burdens on another segment of the economy. This merely shifts the problem. It merely switches victims. In fact, to the extent that it adds uneconomically to the net cost of doing business in the United States, this kind of political tinkering adds to our overall economic problem instead of diminishing it.

The administration has chosen to ignore this fundamental economic truth.

The administration knows that this import restriction program is unfair to the 18 States of District I, and, as OEP Director McDermott clearly noted, without legal justification under the national security section of the Trade Expansion Act. But equity and the law have also been ignored.

I must conclude by saying that this is not my idea of how the business of the United States ought to be conducted. Facts and economic logic, fairness and propriety, ought to be the controlling factors in any administrative decision. When Congress enacted the Trade Expansion Act there were no provisions stating that these considerations could be ignored if it was deemed less risky or more expedient, politically, to do so. Congress assumed that the law would be administered fairly and in accordance with the carefully considered safeguards against economic inequities written into the law.

Political manipulation ends by undermining the very foundations of democratic government—this, to me, seems a heavy cost for any administration to pay for political expediency.

In this time of peril is our national security endangered by heavy fuel oil imports?

Mr. CONTE. No, for the following reasons:

First. Imported oil is merely supplementing, not supplanting, domestic production as publicly announced by Secretary Udall when the new residual fuel oil import regulations were adopted earlier this year.

Second. Caribbean production of this oil was the main source of energy for our naval vessels during World War II, and in any future national emergency these producing facilities would be recalled into action.

Third. On very short notice, refinery runs in domestic refineries could be changed in order to produce heavy fuel oil to replace imported products, thereby releasing Caribbean products for naval consumption in offshore fighting areas. This is what happened in World War II.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Do imports of heavy fuel oil endanger our international relations?

Mr. CONTE. No, for the following reasons:

First. The main source of imported heavy fuel oil is Venezuela. The dollars earned by her sales to the United States enable Venezuela to maintain an expanding economy, to lift the standard of living of an increasing number of her citizens, to embark on a healthy development of her social needs and economic infrastructure, and to thereby continue her fight, on our side, against communism and Castroism.

Second. The dollars earned by our friends overseas by their sales of heavy fuel oil to the United States of America is an important factor in strengthening and expanding the private enterprise system as well as world trade. All members of the free world benefit under the interflow of foreign exchange that these transactions generate—Venezuela alone spent in excess of $550 million in 1960 in the United States of America to purchase automobiles and trucks, manufactured goods and metals, and so forth.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Are imports of heavy fuel oil endangering our overall economic well-being?

Mr. CONTE. No, for the following reasons:

First. This product is in short supply in our country—domestic refineries produce insufficient amounts to satisfy domestic demand.

Second. The heavily populated and industrialized east coast area must have cheap energy, power and heat, and imported heavy fuel oil satisfied this need at fair and competitive prices.

Third. Imported heavy fuel oil is only marketed in areas adjacent to ocean terminals since only in these areas can it economically compete with other forms of energy. It supplants neither domestic production of the product nor any other domestic source of energy.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Hampshire for that very well thought out and able presentation that he made here on the floor of the House today. I certainly welcome him as a member of the team, the team that is fighting for the poor consumer, so that the coal barons and the domestic oil producers will not be able to feather their nests any further.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues here today. I have in my hand here for immediate release as of yesterday an announcement made by the vice president of J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., and officer in charge of manufacturing of the company's woolen and worsted division:

> After many months of painstaking appraisal and after exhausting all other alternatives, we have reluctantly reached the conclusion that we must discontinue operations at our Marland plant in Andover, Mass. Work now in process there will be run out and the plant will then be closed down. It is with the deepest regret that we have reached this decision as it affects the current employment of 453 people.
>
> This decision is unavoidable in view of the losses which the Marland plant has sustained over the last several years due to the disastrous effect of imports from low-wage countries. As an illustration, fabrics from Japan similar to those made in the Marland plant were offered freely in the domestic market at prices approximately 40 cents per yard under our actual cost.
>
> The losses of the Marland plant have occurred despite the fact that the machinery and equipment are thoroughly modern. Capital expenditures of $1,450,000 have been made in the Marland plant since the Korean crisis.
>
> The closing of the Marland plant with the resultant loss of textile employment is another example of the excessive burden of foreign imports on the American textile industry and its employees. This steadily increasing volume of imports of woolen products reached an all-time high during 1962, when imports were approximately 20 percent of domestic consumption. We, as well as others in the American woolen and worsted textile industry, have hoped for some time that positive action would be taken to correct these inequitable foreign trade problems. To date no such action has been taken.
>
> This action constitutes a further erosion of the textile industry's capability to supply the Armed Forces in the event of an all-out national emergency—for example, during World War II and the Korean crisis, the Marland plant was largely engaged in the production of uniform materials and blankets of our country's Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, the situation which is revealed there is very similar to that which was referred to by the gentleman from Maine when he pointed out that the cost of the residual fuel oil at the excessive price to our area is directly reflected in the manufacturing costs and puts us at a severe competitive disadvantage. There is a very distinct tie-in, and this is something which we feel in New England and which we not alone are going to pay the penalty for but many other sections of the country as well.

The J. P. Stevens Mill closing in Andover, Mass., is unfortunate. It need never have happened if the President had acted to protect the woolen industry. He has been asked to long ago. All that is needed is a Presidential Executive order under powers already given him by Congress. The woolen industry desperately needs such protection against the cheap labor foreign imports that flood this country. Why has not the President acted to help our New England industries? This is a fair question for those now losing their jobs because of it.

Some day, the Federal Government must realize that the United States of America is not run as a world charity. Homes and jobs and earnings for Americans are a first priority as against homes and jobs in foreign nations.

This most recent closing close at hand is one of the prices we are paying that started 16 years ago with excessive foreign aid handouts.

This I have protested against for 16 years. At long last I can now vote against it on the floor of Congress.

We in the New England area remember very well a letter which I now quote from written to Mr. Harry B. Hilts, secretary, Empire State Petroleum Association, Inc.:

> Dear Mr. Hilts: Thank you very much for your recent letter regarding the recently announced mandatory quotas which the administration is imposing on oil imports.
>
> I agree with you entirely that this is a completely unjustified, uneconomic, and short-sighted action which does no credit to either the economic judgment or political foresight of the administration. Of course, as a Senator from New England I feel this especially keenly, since we are already suffering consumer price increases as a result of this action.
>
> But quite beyond that this action cuts athwart our trade position, unnecessarily damages our relations in this hemisphere with Canada and Latin American nations, and does not contribute to the national defense and security.

Who wrote that letter? John F. Kennedy. It sounds good even with respect to Canada and Latin America. Perhaps the situation has changed and perhaps he does not feel the way he felt when he was a Senator from New England and a Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, all it takes is an Executive order to give us this relief. Mr. Speaker, we need this relief in New England. Prices are at an artificially high point and there is no reason why we in New England should be asked to pay more for residual oil in our area than cost warrants to subsidize the coal industry and the domestic oil industry in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the Industrial Park Authority up in my State was headed for a long time by a man by the name of Jim Rogers. He operates an industry in Laconia. He wrote recently to me as follows:

> Like most of our national problems, there must be two sides to this question, but I am actively interested in the development of new industry in New Hampshire and I am also interested in the well-being of the industry with which I am connected in Laconia. I am told that heavy fuel oil delivered in Laconia is sold to us at a premium of $0.23 per barrel over the price quoted on the same oil taken out of bonded storage in international trade.
>
> I am sure you are well aware of the impact of this program on our industries and institutions and I am sure you will use your best efforts to improve the situation as the opportunity arises.

Then, we have had others like that from both Massachusetts and from my colleagues from various States in the New England area.

Mr. Speaker, I have reference to a letter along this line which I have received from the Wyandotte Worsted Co., of Rochester, N.H., from Thomas A. McEwen, who is the head agent of the Wyandotte Worsted Co. in New Hampshire. He says as follows:

> We are sure that you will readily recognize that this price inequality has an adverse effect on our operating costs and position in the competitive market. We, therefore, urge that these restrictions be entirely removed. These controls put an upward pressure on prices and thwart competition among sellers.

Mr. Speaker, we collectively work and seek this relief from this administration in the public interest. There is no reason why the President should not give it to us.

Mr. Speaker, a group of us wrote a protest down to the White House. I think all the Senators and Representatives from New England wrote a protest to the White House, and about a month later, on February 13, 1963, Mr. Edward A. McDermott wrote a 36-page answer, and in the 36-page answer he ended up with a final statement, and I quote it as follows:

> In light of circumstances as I find them today, a careful and meaningful relaxation of controls would be consistent with national security and the attainment of hemispheric objectives which contribute to the national security. Such a relaxation should be designed to achieve the maximum reduction of the burden on the economy, given the import levels resulting from the easing of controls.

Mr. Speaker, that last paragraph followed such paragraphs as those containing sentences like this:

> The possible effects of the modification or elimination of the present program on the place of Western Hemisphere residual fuel oil must be considered with utmost care.

And so on, mumbo-jumbo. I wrote to Mr. McDermott a reply which I am sure, although it was not circulated, would be joined in by all of the gentlemen not only from New England but all of us who feel so resentful of more and more jumbo out of Government agencies.

On February 18, 1963, I wrote Mr. McDermott, as follows:

> I have yours of February 13 just received in the matter of a memorandum for the President on the subject of residual fuel oil imports.
>
> With all due respect to the work that has obviously gone into the preparation of this memorandum, I must confess that I am unable to understand exactly what the memorandum recommends when it says there should be a "careful and meaningful release of controls on residual fuel oil to be used as a fuel." I don't see why under the circumstances as outlined in the memorandum with due regard to the interests in this neck of the woods that it would not be possible to recommend in plain English that controls on imports of residual fuel oil be ended once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy, when a Senator from Massachusetts, petitioned President Eisenhower to do this. I should think now that as President he would take care of the serious New England problem, when all it requires of him is his Executive order. In my opinion the recommendation of the memorandum of February 13, 1963, is an equivocation and from my point of view an unsatisfactory and indefinite generality whereas some concrete objective action is genuinely needed.

I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that these things being said today will be heard by the administration and that New England and the areas that are so sorely affected by this whole picture of foreign competition and this whole picture of the failure to take Executive action, to give us relief in our hospitals and our industries and our communities, will get this relief from the President. All he has to do is to call in an assistant and say, "Take care of the situation." Mr. Udall put out a statement that they are going to change the quotas and allow 75,000 barrels a year more, 9.6 percent. That is no answer. That gives us no relief. Let us have the action that we need, the action that will relieve, the action that will give this very sorely beleaguered section of the country the relief for our industry that is reasonably warranted in the public interest.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman; and at this time I yield to my good friend, the former Governor of the State, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Stafford].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the others who have spoken this afternoon and to associate myself with the very able presentation of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte], and to join in the compliments to our new colleague from New Hampshire on his maiden speech. Let me point out that this is my maiden speech from this side of the well. Like my colleagues, I have received a number of communications from people in the great State of Vermont indicating the difficulties they are suffering from up there as a result of the shortage in residual oils and the cost of obtaining the oils which may be available.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the residual oil situation, may I briefly discuss the office of emergency planning report which was submitted to the President.

This study was undertaken by the OEP at the request of members of the New England congressional delegation, the New England Council, and other interested parties. A total of 105 individuals and organizations participated during the course of the study. They came from throughout the United States.

The OEP invited those concerned to submit briefs on the effects of residual oil quotas, and time was given for rebuttal from opposing factions.

To supplement this, the OEP obtained the views of the Departments of State, Defense, Treasury, Interior, Commerce, and Labor.

From this analysis came the McDermott report, which clearly shows that first, our fuel industry and specifically the coal industry can meet any potential emergency requirements without residual oil import controls; second, import controls of this fuel threaten our mutual security arrangements, especially in the Western Hemisphere.

These findings lead to the conclusion that residual oil import restrictions must be removed.

In spite of this, the President chooses to ignore this recommendation.

From the report itself the following quotes are taken:

Department of Defense:

> As residual fuel oil production continues to decline in Continental U.S. refineries, we feel that imports should make up the deficit which will have to be done in national emergencies. * * * We cannot see where residual fuel oil imports can seriously endanger our national security.

Department of Commerce:

> The continuation of the residual oil quota plan as a method of increasing exploration, drilling, reserves for crude oil output appears rather tenuous.

The General Services Administration, a consumer of 1.7 million barrels of heating oil and 872,000 tons of coal, annually, had this to say in the report:

> In summation we believe that our experience in procurement of residual fuel under the import oil program has restricted full and free competition in our procurements and has resulted in this agency, in the main, paying prices in excess of that which would have been obtained if there were no restrictions on the import of this product.

From the OEP report, page 18:

> The Department of Defense in writing us has also referred to the impact of price increases and of difficulty in obtaining domestic supplies of residual.

From the OEP report, page 30:

> I do not question the desirability to remedy the hardship in the coal region. Of course these measures should be continued. But I do not believe that the national security section of the Trade Expansion Act, can, under the showing of this investigation, be the medium for Government assistance.

The last quote shows clearly that the legal base for continuation of import quota restrictions is nonexistent.

Mr. Speaker, this report which comes from an Executive Office of the President effectively shows the urgent need for abolishment of residual oil quotas.

Mr. CONTE. I thank my distinguished colleague and former Governor of Vermont for his very able presentation, and for his continued interest in protecting the consumer rather than the coal and oil producers.

Mr. Speaker, bear in mind what the Executive order report said:

> The heavy fuel oil quotas are doing nothing to put coal miners back to work. Then you have to be aware that the Bureau of Mines has estimated that the U.S. demand for heavy fuel oil will rise sharply during 1963 and 1964 over the levels of the past 12 months.

When you put all these facts together, Mr. Speaker, the lower stocks, the lower domestic production, the higher demand and the slightly higher quota, you immediately become aware of the prospects for a very serious—and I repeat—very serious fuel shortage for New England next winter.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I am very glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I first want to say I have enjoyed sitting here and listening to the people from New England presenting their side of the story. It has raised a question in my mind that leads me to wonder whether or not what I have read is correct.

First, I would like to ask my colleague whether or not John F. Kennedy is the President of the United States?

Mr. CONTE. I think that is quite obvious and does not warrant an answer.

Mr. SAYLOR. If John F. Kennedy is the President of the United States, is he the same John F. Kennedy who was a native son of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts?

Mr. CONTE. I believe that is fairly obvious also.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would not want a Member of Congress from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts or those from New England and Florida who have joined with my colleague today to have go out on the wire press services of this country the impression that the President of the United States, a native of New England, would do anything that would harm the people of his own native Commonwealth. I think the very idea is almost preposterous to assume, and I would like to have the gentleman's comments with regard to that.

Mr. CONTE. As a great Democrat of the past, Al Smith, once said, "Let's look at the record." I think I have stated very clearly the facts that should be inserted in the Record. When he was a U.S. Senator, yes, he joined with me in petitioning President Eisenhower to remove the statutory restrictions on crude and residual oil. At that time he came to the conclusion, which I came to also, that the national security issue was a phony issue and, therefore, the restrictions should be removed.

But something happened, something happened between that time and now, and I think what happened is fairly obvious. The presidential election transpired. The President went to the coal mining areas of the gentleman's bailiwick and West Virginia, and made certain promises to the voters of that part of the country, and now he has to carry out those promises. I think that last week, around March 15, when Tony Boyle, the head of the United Mine Workers—and the papers carried a picture of the United Mine Workers talking with the President as he sat in his rocking chair, Tony Boyle a few feet away from President Kennedy—I think it is quite obvious that the meeting was designed to carry out some promises that he made in the campaign. But that does not help our situation in New England and on the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. SAYLOR. Let me comment, if my colleague will yield, on the visit of Mr. Boyle to the President of the United States. It is a well-known fact that Mr. Boyle is the newly elected president of the United Mine Workers of America. As such, having just assumed that position, one of the duties one of the obligations of an officer who occupies position of president of a great national labor organization, should be to call upon the President of the United States. He did the same thing which his predecessors, John L. Lewis and Mr. Thomas Kennedy did when they were president of the United Mine Workers. They called on the then President of the United States, President Roosevelt, President Truman, President Eisenhower, and now President Kennedy. So I find nothing wrong with Mr. Boyle's going down there.

Mr. CONTE. I want to agree with the gentleman, and neither do I want to imply that there is anything wrong with Tony Boyle's visiting the President. I do, however, take issue with Tony Boyle's statement after leaving the White House, saying that he was "assured" by President Kennedy that he would not carry out the order of the Office of Emergency Planning in regard to liberalizing the restrictions on crude and residual oil.

Mr. SAYLOR. And I think it is a fact that after the visit of Mr. Boyle the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior did liberalize the quotas on residual oil.

Mr. CONTE. Well, that may be the gentleman's interpretation. I think the word they used—"liberalization"—was wrong. The Department of the Interior used that, and the President also used it. In a couple of days we are going to be celebrating April Fools Day. The Secretary of the Interior and the President may have moved up that day a few weeks because certainly they are not fooling anyone. This slight liberalization they gave us, if you want to call it that, cannot amount to a drop in the bucket. We had a cold winter in New England. The domestic producers' production declined, so we got nothing at all.

This is a question of supply and demand. When the supply is not there and the demand is there they boost the price of the fuel oil for New England and the Atlantic seaboard. I am out to protect the consumer, and I am not worried about feathering the nest of some coal barons and some domestic oil producers.

Mr. SAYLOR. Let me carry this further.

I was interested in the comments of some of our colleagues from New Hampshire, for instance Mr. Wyman. Mr. Wyman explained that the President had done nothing to protect the wool industry of New Hampshire. I have heard Members from New England come down here in the well of the House, those on both sides of the aisle, and complain of the damage that was being done through the importation of woolen goods, through the importation of textiles from Japan, and through the importation of shoes from Czechoslovakia. Now I have heard one which I think is almost tops. They now say that the oil is being sold in Canada at a lower rate than it is in this country.

Does the gentleman realize that Canadian gas comes into this country without any restrictions whatsoever? And it has made quite an impact on the fuel markets in many sections of the country. In turn, when the domestic producers of this country of coal and of oil desire to ship their products to Canada they are faced with embargoes and quotas so that our people cannot ship to this great country to the north of us, Canada.

Mr. CONTE. I think the gentleman should take this up with the President, the Department of Commerce, or the new agency created under the Trade Expansion Act. I for one voted with the President in favor of his Trade Expansion Act. That is the crux of my argument.

Here we are in New England making a finished product. This is a highly industrial area of the United States. We have foreign competition from Japan, Germany, Italy, England, and France because of our liberalized trade laws. At the same time the squeeze is put on the same industrialists who have to compete with foreign imports. At the same time, the raw material needed to produce these finished products becomes prohibitive because of restrictions such as this.

Mr. SAYLOR. The gentleman's statement does not agree with some of our colleagues who joined with him in support of his argument.

Mr. CONTE. I stand on my own statement.

May I point out that I would be the last one in the world to take this floor and do anything to harm the coal miners. I sympathize with them, my heart pains for them and certainly I can well appreciate their problems. But, as I said a few minutes ago, if we were to allow all of the residual oil from Venezuela to come into this country without restriction, it would not put back more than a small percentage of mineworkers, so small that it would not amount to anything.

Let me read a letter from E. A. Evans, managing director, Oil Users Association, together with an advertisement of the National Coal Policy Conference, regarding coal and residual oil:

Oil Users Association,
Miami, Fla., August 31, 1962.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: On August 21, 1962, there appeared in the Washington Post a full page advertisement of the National Coal Policy Conference.

The Oil Users Association, whose members consist of organizations such as manufacturing industries and utilities that use large amounts of energy producing fuels, take strong issue with the statements contained in this advertisement.

The statements of the National Coal Policy Conference, in reference to their claim that coal miners of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Illinois, and Ohio could be put to work right now by stopping all imports of residual oil, is clearly misleading and does not follow the facts as pointed out in our formal presentation of July 1, 1961, to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

Residual oil has long been in short supply in this country and the imports of this product over the years has had very little, if any, effect on the employment of miners in the coal States. That this is true can best be pointed out by the three principal factors which have been responsible for such unemployment.

First. The mechanization of the coal industry, as shown by the data provided by the coal industry itself in "Bituminous Coal Data, 1960." In 1950 the bituminous coal industry employed 415,582 men and produced 516,311,000 tons of coal. The output per man-day was 6.77 tons. Ten years later the industry employed 159,100 men and produced 413 million tons at a productivity rate of 13.25 tons per man-day. In the 10-year period over a quarter of a million men have left the industry, yet the output of those that have remained has doubled. During the same 10-year period the use of residual oil in the United States remained relatively constant; 554 million barrels in 1950 and 556 million barrels in 1960.

Second. The railroads have caused a tremendous decline in the demand for coal. They used 114 million tons of coal in 1947 and they have now switched almost completely to diesel fuel and today use only about 2 million tons of coal per year. This is a loss in volume of approximately 112 million tons per year, or nearly half the total decline in coal demands since 1947.

Third. Millions of families throughout the country stopped shoveling coal into basement furnaces and installed oil burners or gas burners in their homes. In 1947 the figure for retail coal deliveries was 137 million tons; in 1960 the figure was 29 million tons, a loss of 108 million tons per year.

It is of interest to note that the National Coal Policy Conference chose to completely ignore all of these facts in attempting to present their case and it is also of interest that in addition to ignoring them, they chose not to base their case on whether or not the present import program is or is not in the best interest of national security—the only reason why imports of residual oils should or should not have their imports restricted.

Again, as we have clearly outlined in our reports to OCDM and OEP, a reduction in residual oil imports is not in the best interest of national security but do, in fact, have the opposite effect. We have the greatest confidence in the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and feel that at the proper time his report will be submitted to you with recommendations which will be fairly made. All of the inequities created and the increased costs suffered by the public, because of import restrictions on residual fuel oil, continue to exist in ever increasing quantities and we, therefore, urge that the question of the possibility of entirely removing import restrictions on residual fuel oil be considered by you as soon as conveniently possible.

Yours very truly,

E. A. Evans,
Managing Director.

Americans Need Jobs, Not a Dole, Mr. President

President Kennedy: We must end unemployment and move the economy ahead, as you said in your recent television address on the state of the Nation's economy.

But a dole and a handout of surplus food are not the answer.

Only jobs will solve America's economic problems.

Extended unemployment compensation, aid to children of the unemployed, job retraining, work camps for unemployed youth * * * all of these things are fine and what you have done to ease the hardship of America's unfortunate unemployed families is commendable. But they are only stop-gap measures.

You say that employment and income are rising nationally and that other economic indicators do not warrant the conclusion that we are entering a new recession.

Unfortunately, this is not true of coal communities. Unemployment in some coal communities is not 5 or 6 percent—like the national average—but as high as 35 or 40 percent.

Our people want jobs.

You can help put them to work—right now—in the coal fields of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Illinois and Ohio * * * pockets of persistent unemployment and economic distress * * * in which, as you said in your TV address, coal miners can no longer find jobs to support their families.

How can you create the jobs our people want and need?

By using the powers of your office to stem the flood of foreign residual fuel oil imports. * * *

This imported waste product of foreign refining operations is taking jobs away from American coal miners in those very pockets of distress where the Government has been forced to undertake expensive temporary remedial action. If you cut back the amount of residual oil which can now be imported, and limit imports in the future, many of the unemployed miners will again find work and become self-supporting. No longer will their families be subjected to the degrading experience of living on Government handouts. They will again become taxpayers * * * good customers of the local merchant.

The coal industry is the key to economic recovery in many of the Nation's pockets of unemployment. * * *

But the coal industry cannot expand production and employment * * * it cannot put these unemployed miners back to work at productive jobs * * * as long as imported waste residual oil is permitted to take over coal markets.

The power to end this threat to economic expansion * * * to expanded employment * * * to economic vigor and growth in widespread areas of the Nation * * * rests with you, Mr. President.

We respectfully urge you to act today.

(This message is published by the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., in behalf of the following State committees working for the economic recovery of the bituminous coal industry: the Illinois State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference, the Indiana State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference, the Kentucky State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference, the Maryland State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference, the Ohio State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference, the Pennsylvania State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference, the Tennessee State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference, the Virginia State Committee, of the National Coal Policy Conference, the West Virginia State Committee of the National Coal Policy Conference.)

So, the only thing you are doing here—and when I say "you" I mean the coal industry and the domestic oil producer industry—is to force the price of coal and residual oil to go up. You are both going to lose out in the long run, because people will convert to natural gas. You know as well as I do that it is economically unfeasible to transport coal from West Virginia or Pennsylvania out to Massachusetts or Connecticut or Vermont or Maine. The freight cost alone would be enough to prohibit the use of this fuel, and people will move into natural gas, and the coal industry and the residual oil people, the domestic oil producer, will both lose out in the long run.

Mr. SAYLOR. Now, if the gentleman will yield, because I knew he would get to this statement sooner or later, and I just wondered how long it would take me to draw these people from New England out and to show the basic fallacy of their whole argument: We have heard of how residual oil has gone up in price and we have heard how the coal industry has been mechanized. This we are proud of, and the entire argument has come down to this: The coal miner that works today produces more coal than any other miner in any country on the face of the earth, because these people that you call coal barons have been farsighted enough and willing enough to install the kind of machinery that will produce more coal per man per day than any other country in the world, and the coal operators are able today to deliver and are delivering, despite the increased cost of equipment, despite the increased cost of labor, despite every other factor that you can point out, at the pit mouth coal today a ton of coal at a lower cost than they did in 1950.

Mr. CONTE. Even at that, the use of residual oil in New England and the eastern seaboard States is cheaper—the price is cheaper—than coal. We also have many of these industries which

have converted from coal to oil. How are you going to get them to reconvert back to coal? Oil is clean; it is not cumbersome like coal. You do not have to have the great big piles of coal outside your yard. In the home, oil is much cleaner. The little housewife does not have to go downstairs and shovel that coal in the pail and drag it upstairs and put it into the furnace or stove, or anything like that. You are not going to get these people to convert back to coal. So you might as well forget about it.

Mr. SAYLOR. If the gentleman will yield further, no one is talking about the housewife. But you cannot use residual oil in your home consumption. This is the basic policy of the people from New England, and the people up there believe if they get a lower price on residual oil, the cost of the oil which they use in their homes will be reduced. It is not used in the homes.

Mr. CONTE. No; but it is used in apartment houses, hospitals, schools, and factories.

I want to say this in behalf of the coal people: If the coal people are in trouble, assuming that they are, I doubt whether the coal producers are in trouble. It is the poor miners who are in trouble here. If the concerned parties face up to the facts such as the railroads are about to do, let them come into the Congress and ask for a subsidy. Do not subsidize coal now at the expense of New England and the eastern seaboard. We cannot afford it. Our backs are against the wall. It is difficult as it is, as I noted in my statement, to meet foreign competition in finished products. Many of our industries have left. The goods industries—the cottons, the woolens, and the leathers—left many years ago for cheaper labor markets down south.

Mr. Speaker, my people are desperate, and let us not hurt them any more with this foolish mandatory restriction on crude and residual oil. This is one of the most unwise things I have ever seen any President do.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to say to my colleague from New England that for every person he finds in New England who is hurting as a result of the President's policy, my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] and I from Pennsylvania can cite 10 persons in our States for every 1 in New England. The plight of the unemployed miners in West Virginia and Pennsylvania far exceeds the injustice to which the gentleman is pointing in his area.

Mr. CONTE. I think I have proved beyond a reasonable doubt that if all of the residual oil were to come into this country without any restriction whatsoever it would not put miners back to work.

Mr. SAYLOR. That I challenge.

Mr. Speaker, the generosity of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] in permitting me the floor at this time is deeply appreciated. I am especially gratified to have an opportunity to review the problem with the distinguished gentlemen who are speaking to the subject of residual oil imports, because past performances have indicated that the New England delegation would prefer to limit discussion to their own membership.

As a matter of fact, many of us have come to believe that the New England delegation wants to handle foreign trade problems strictly on geographical lines. In order to clarify this matter that has been developed by my colleagues over the past several years, I hope that the gentlemen who have participated in this debate will be good enough to ponder some of the questions which I should like to put to them at this time.

I have heard it said that there has developed a feeling that protection against imported commodities should be an exclusive inheritance for New England States. Their treatment of the subject under discussion today has been particularly responsible for the growing acceptance of this idea.

Now, so far as I am able to understand its position, New England wants protection for products of its industries but does not want the same consideration afforded to other areas. New England Members of this legislative body have stood on this floor asking for tariffs on brass mill products, rubber products, footware, watches, bicycles, textiles, fish, military rifles, and just about every other item produced in your great factories or your rustic little shops. You understandably want protection against the products of foreign countries that are responsible for creating unemployment in your constituencies and your States.

It is not understandable, however, why you are not willing to afford the same treatment to other Americans. The helter-shelter program which you recommend is obviously unfair and unjustified. To put an umbrella over one region exclusively while exposing the rest of the Nation to the damaging effects of a torrent of imports is not in keeping with this Nation's concept of equitable treatment for all.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Members of the New England delegation participating in this colloquy this afternoon to explain the basis for their subscribing to a policy of free entry of residual oil while demanding and expecting rigid barriers against foreign competiton for products native to their region. Or has there been a sudden change in their philosophy on international trade? Do they now approve of reduction or discontinuance of tariffs and duties on those commodities which they have heretofore sought to exclude or restrict?

Congress needs to know the answers to these questions. Since the residual oil import control program as administered by the present administration is little more than a sham and has at no time been adjusted to benefit affected coal producing regions, I am led to suspect that these periodical performances in opposition to the program are part of a sustained campaign to lead the general public into believing that the so-called restrictions on foreign oil are in fact of some assistance to the American coal industry. Whatever the case, the New England delegation is not relieved of the responsibility of explaining its clamor for a double standard with respect to quotas and tariffs.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I shall be glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. I have not had the benefit of the gentleman's complete statement. But I am well aware of the intense desire that the gentleman has to protect the interests of the people he represents, and particularly the gentleman's intense belief that more residual oil has to come into the country if they are going to be able to compete in other areas. But the gentleman raises this premise on the basis that if no more residual oil comes in, or if the residual fuel oil that is coming in is not going to put any miners back to work, I think, perhaps, that is true.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] availed himself of our hearings before the Special Committee on Oil Imports of the Small Business Committee last year where testimony was given which perhaps would support the fact that the gentleman has stated here today; that is, if you were to stop residual fuel oil, that you have converted your fuel requirements up there in such a way that you cannot reconvert them back to coal; that if you could reconvert them, only 3 percent of the industries would go back to burning coal. I think that is what you base the premise upon which you have just stated. But what we in the coal industry are talking about, and what the miners are talking about, is a further erosion of the markets we have. This is what the ever-increasing arguments on residuel fuel oils do. It does not mean that this program as it is now developed, if it were turned back, that your people would go back to burning coal. I wish you would. But I am well aware from the facts developed before our subcommittee that you have so changed your standards of energy requirements up there that you could not aid the miners. However, what we are talking about is that every barrel that comes in writes an additional unemployment check for a coal miner. I know that the gentleman has expressed his desire today not to hurt a coal miner as such. But I would respectfully disagree with the gentleman that we even have a mandatory import oil restriction program today. Again I say, and the gentleman is very kind to permit me to make this statement on his time, that without question to say that we have a mandatory oil import program that prevents residual fuel oil from coming into this country is not a fact at all. Would the gentleman care to inquire of me why I feel that way?

Mr. CONTE. No. I want to comment on the gentleman's statement. I think he will find if he searches the record that since the mandatory restriction on crude and residual oil went into effect in 1959 the consumption of coal has not increased in New England or in the eastern seaboard States.

Mr. MOORE. That would be true.

Mr. CONTE. Ninety percent of all the residual oil that came in from Venezuela was used in that area of the country.

Mr. MOORE. That is right.

Mr. CONTE. Therefore, we are not deteriorating any future markets that the gentleman might have in mind.

Mr. MOORE. I would say at that point that at the present time your fuel requirements will be met about 71 percent of the time by residual fuel oil.

Mr. CONTE. That is correct.

Mr. MOORE. So that 29 percent of that market remains. If we were to follow your thought with respect to this, which is very sincerely presented here today, that your people are entitled to 100-percent conversion to residual fuel oil, and we followed that to its end result, and that was the position you took, then coal has a necessary part in supplying 29 percent of the energy needs of that area.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman discounts the fact that out of the 29 percent that he referred to, much of it has converted over to natural gas. This is my argument. By having this restriction on residual oil, the supply is cut down. The demand is there. After the very severe winter that we had this year in New England, the demand was greater than any period I can recall. The demand was greater the last year and the year before but the supply was not. So what happened? The price of residual oil went up and the price of coal went up accordingly. What happened was this. When the price of residual oil went up and the price of coal went up—that is, bituminous coal—many people began converting to natural gas. As I said to my good friend from Pennsylvania, both the domestic residual oil producer and the coal producer, if they maintain this position, are going to be the losers in the long run. What is going to happen in New England is that more and more industries, more and more apartment houses, more and more hospitals, more and more schools, will convert to natural gas.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further at that point?

Mr. CONTE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. MOORE. On this one point you have so constructed your energy requirements in the New England States that you cannot even reconvert back to natural gas unless at tremendous expense; you cannot even reconvert back to wood without tremendous expense. So the question of reconversion to a more favorable energy source such as gas will mean that you have the same expense, the same problems that exist today.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have to disagree with the gentleman on that statement. If you convert to natural gas from coal or residual fuel oil, you do not have the same expense. For one thing, you do not have the storage facilities to contend with that you do have with coal.

Mr. MOORE. That would be true.

Mr. CONTE. These people who have converted over from residual oil had to build up their yards, have had to put structures in their yards, and it is a physical impossibility for these people to do otherwise. They must convert to natural gas.

Mr. MOORE. That may be. Let us say that they do. The fact is you have created a situation, the people in New England have created this situation. They have put all their eggs in one basket, and that is residual fuel oil. I am quick to admit they have a good and sound and a vocal spokesman in behalf of that theory of all eggs in one basket.

Now what we are trying to do in the coal industry very basically is to preserve that area. I said in the hearing and I am very frank to say that my coal people, perhaps, did not like the observation I made, that we do not want any of that 73 percent. Someone may be quick to say to me, yes we want it. But my theory is that we do not want it. Leave our market areas alone today because our situation is so severe. Let me pick out, if I may, one point which the gentleman mentioned about prices. The gentleman knows far better than I do that the oil people, those who supply the residual oil were well aware of the fact that the Department of the Interior was engaging in a little game of arithmetic again and that the decision on the amount of barrels of residual fuel oil, whether it would be upgraded or not, was about to be declared and whether or not a national policy of doing away with the mandatory import program was going to be continued or whether a meaningful relaxation was going to take place; or whether or not a firm, mandatory program would be in effect. So, naturally, that has to occur. If I were in the business, I assume I would do this.

But I say to you, a very close personal friend of mine, that the oil people, and I will not call them oil barons, but the oil people in this instance have created the demand and they have created the scarcity of the fuel even though they were given the opportunity by reason of the severe winter conditions that existed in order that the pressure would be brought to bear upon the oil administrator and the Secretary of the Interior to get in a little better shape the amount of the residual fuel oil.

Mr. CONTE. I do not know where the gentleman received that information. Certainly, I do not have it available to me. I certainly would like to get it.

Mr. MOORE. Can I give it to you?

Mr. CONTE. As I stated, our quota did not increase very much over the last year. It was a very small percentage of increase and I can vouch that this has been one of the toughest winters and one of the coldest winters we have ever had in New England.

Mr. MOORE. I think that is true.

Mr. CONTE. There was a great deal of this oil, but we could not get it. You could not get it from the domestic producers because they did not want to produce it. It was too costly for them. They would rather coke bunker seed oil and make gasoline out of it and make a greater profit out of it than to produce residual oil. The only place you could receive it was from Venezuela. They did not increase the quota that much, as you mentioned. They were holding back. The demand was there because it was a very severe winter and, unfortunately, the supply was not there and they pushed the price up. And who got it in the back of the neck—the poor consumer.

I would like to call attention to what I said before, I believe the gentleman was not here at the time that I was having a little colloquy with our good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I pointed out, and I do not want to rehash the argument again because it is so time consuming, but I pointed out the three reasons why the coal industry is experiencing difficulties at the present time.

Mr. MOORE. I am aware of what the gentleman said in that respect.

Mr. CONTE. None of those reasons—none at all—are related to the residual oil problem in New England and the eastern seaboard. Believe me, my colleague, I feel sorry for your people. I feel sorry for them, but I feel if you are experiencing difficulties, the proper way is to come down here in the House and offer a bill to subsidize the coal industry. I will tell you that I will give it my consideration. I will not say I will go along with it, but it will get my consideration. But this is not the way to do it. This is wrong, this is cruel. What you are attempting to do here is to subsidize the coal industry at the expense of New England and the eastern seaboard. I cannot take it. I think it is wrong. The President of the United States as a U.S. Senator felt the same way. I remember going over to his office with a petition to then President Eisenhower and the then Senator signed it in a split second. We sent it down to President Eisenhower, but unfortunately after that campaign in West Virginia, Mr. Kennedy changed his mind. Maybe I cannot blame him. He received a very good vote there. Thank God the people had the wisdom to see a good man in you and they sent you back. For that I have to give them credit.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. Certainly, I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. MOORE. I am aware of the three areas which you recited as being the cause of the loss of tonnage by the coal industry. That is exactly the same presentation that the New England residual oil advocates made before our subcommittee last year. The three points without question are substantial.

Mr. CONTE. Oh, no, this comes from the "Bituminous Coal Data, 1960," and is verbatim.

Mr. MOORE. This is the presentation made by the New England people before our committee as to the three areas you referred to and I did get to hear them.

Let me say to the gentleman that I am not so sure that he is willing to take me to task on my statement that we have no mandatory import control program at the present time.

Mr. CONTE. Oh, yes; I stand ready to question the gentleman's statements.

Mr. MOORE. Now, wait a minute. You say we do; I say we do not as a mandatory control program should work, because this thing works, again—and you used the term. I assume the gentleman knows how the Oil Administrator and the Interior Department work and establish these quotas. The Bureau of Mines sits down there. Everybody who wants residual oil regardless of whether he is from District No. 1, which is the gentleman's area, or anywhere else in the United States comes in and makes a demand for oil. That demand without question has been met by the issuance of orders from this Secretary of the Interior since he took office in increasing the allowables under the program. These are people; this is the Secretary of the Interior talking, the Oil Administrator, talking before our subcommittee in response to a question. What have they got to do to get it? All they have to do is to demand it, and the quotas went upward, and upward, and upward, in order to meet the demand.

Now, let me answer one thing the gentleman said.

Mr. CONTE. I must answer that. I know the gentleman has the report of the Office of Emergency Planning. It is the Interior Department which makes this study, and reports are made from the Bureau of Mines. This group says that there is not any national security involved here under section 7, the section which President Eisenhower used for his justification.

Mr. MOORE. This is the one agency of the Government that collects data from Interior and from the Oil Administration.

Mr. CONTE. It is part of the governmental family.

Mr. MOORE. I am not so sure they are part of the family because they will not answer questions as to their policy. They work on the theory of hemispheric solidarity rather than the national security of our country.

The gentleman said that all that the Government knew was the oil industry caused a lessening of the supply. We are aware that after 1959 when the mandatory program was established and went into effect that they busted the program by bringing into this Nation in one 3-month period a whole year's allocation, which prompted the then Secretary of the Interior, Fred Seaton, to make the suggestion to the White House, to then President Eisenhower, that the quota be established based on quarterly arrangements so that the oil companies could not break the market and put the people of New England, for instance, in such severe circumstances that they could not get oil because they had brought it all in in the months of January, February, and March. The comeback of the oil people was that they had brought all the oil allowable in, and they would have to wait unless the quota could be raised. Then the Secretary of the Interior divided the quota into 3- or 4-month periods.

Mr. CONTE. Into four quarters.

Mr. MOORE. Into four quarters. Under such a program they could bring in the quota allowance in 1 month rather than spreading it over a number of months.

Mr. CONTE. The quota was for the quarter. They could not bring in more than the quota during the quarter.

Mr. MOORE. But they could bring the entire quota in during any 1 month if they wanted to.

Mr. CONTE. But they could not exceed the quarterly quota.

Mr. MOORE. The quarter system has been abolished.

Mr. CONTE. Oh, no.

Mr. MOORE. Oh, yes.

Mr. CONTE. I am quite sure it has not been. I have received reports from the Department every quarter telling me how many barrels they are going to allow in that quarter.

Mr. MOORE. That generates the demand when they absorb the whole allotment in that period.

Mr. CONTE. I am not an economist, but I know this and the gentlemen knows it, that we have problems with subsidies on farm and agricultural products. The reason we have the problems is because production is so great, the production of wheat, barley, and corn is so great, the production of poultry is so great, the production of hogs is so great, and the demand is not great, and, therefore, you have a greater supply than you have demand. What happens? It decreases the price of that commodity. As a result they have to come to the Congress and ask for a subsidy. That is simple.

If we had a great supply of residual oil in New England, the price would go down, it would be decreased. At the same time, I am certain we would not erode any of your present coal production. I wish we could use your coal, I wish we could furnish a market for your coal, but it is not economically feasible to transport coal from West Virginia up to Boston or Pittsfield, Mass.

My good friend here said they are producing coal at the same price they produced it 10 years ago.

Mr. MOORE. Cheaper.

Mr. CONTE. That may be so, but what he failed to say was how much it costs to transport that coal by rail from West Virginia or Pennsylvania to Massachusetts today. That price has skyrocketed. That is why there is an economic problem, for the people in New England would love to help you, but we have to take every break we can receive to keep our heads above water.

Mr. MOORE. I know the gentleman does not advocate prosperity for his area at the expense of a nonprosperous climate in the areas of Pennsylvania and West Virginia, or any of the coal-producing States. But the gentleman talks as though we are not doing anything about it. The fact remains on this transportation proposition we have the establishment of the integral trains which means you get coal from the mouth of the mines to the point of consumption.

The gentleman has suggested a subsidy. Let us put it the other way around. Has the gentleman given any thought to the fact when the remaining 27 percent of your energy needs are met with residual oil and you and your industries have converted 100 percent to residual oil, what the price will be then, when it is on a nonconvertible basis where you cannot change back to your old coal or gas? The price of that is going to skyrocket.

Mr. CONTE. As I stated before, a good portion of the 27 percent the gentleman speaks of have converted over to natural gas. There will be many more convert to gas if you keep the price of coal going up. Bring the price of coal down, let them have the residual oil they have had in the past, and I am sure your market in New England and the Eastern Seaboard States will not erode. There is some use for soft coal in New England. But you are driving them down to the ground and if you keep raising the price on both residual oil and on coal we are going to convert to natural gas and you will be out of luck and the domestic oil producers will be out of luck.

Mr. MOORE. I want to join forces with the gentleman. I would love to have him on my side. Let us take on the gas industry if that is what we have got to do.

Mr. CONTE. I would like to bear out my point about that little sojourn the administration made there in the beautiful hills during the campaign——

Mr. MOORE. That was May 1960.

Mr. CONTE. I picked up the Washington Post of March 14, 1963, and there was an article entitled "Oil Issue Reportedly Resolved." This is common knowledge, so I am not disclosing anything. It is all over Washington. Everybody knows it is being done.

He speaks as follows:

> The hottest international oil issue facing the White House reportedly has been resolved largely in favor of domestic economic and political consideration.

The article states further:

> The decision represents a significant victory for the coal industry and for domestic oil producers.

They should have added one more line and said:

> At the expense of the poor consumers and poor taxpayers of New England and the Eastern Seaboard States who are subsidizing the farmers in the West.

The housewives have to pay higher prices for eggs, butter, and other farm products because of the subsidies we are paying the farmers out west.

Now they have to subsidize the coal producers in West Virginia and Pennsylvania and the big oil tycoons of Oklahoma, Texas, and every other State. This is wrong, and it is about time that somebody started doing something and speaking in favor of the poor consumer not only as of today but 365 days of the year.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that my colleagues and I have been forced to rise again in the House to protest the continuation of the program of import quotas on residual fuel oil. Time and time again we have pointed out the disadvantages of pursuing this course of action. Yet the administration has held fast to its position in the face of compelling reasons for discontinuing the program.

First, the import program has not contributed to a solution of the problems of the domestic coal industry. The real problem in coal is not competition from residual fuel, but wornout mines and increased productivity per worker. The number of jobs in the coal industry has declined at a much greater rate than the production of coal. Import quotas have not and will not stop this trend.

To oppose the imposition of import quotas on residual oil is not to be unsympathetic to the very real problem of unemployment in this country. But until the administration realizes that we cannot solve this tragic flaw in our economy with political gimmicks which operate at the expense of other important national interests, I am afraid that many, many able workers are going to remain idle.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that many east coast buildings—factories, hospitals, and public buildings—are not equipped to use coal. And the domestic residual oil production is just not sufficient to meet our needs. Therefore, east coast users are forced to obtain oil outside the import program, at a cost of up to 27 cents per barrel more than other free world users. This provides us with another strong reason for the elimination of the quotas.

Businessmen who must heat their plants at costs so far above the market price must pass this overhead along to their consumers in the form of higher prices for related goods and services. This raises the cost of living for the entire east coast, reduces the purchasing power of consumers, and generally contributes to the sluggishness of our economy. The additional 6.5 million barrels permitted in late January only covered the amount borrowed in the last quarter of 1962 against 1963's allotment to meet the demands of a severe New England winter. This relaxation, as I pointed out on February 6, only indicated "that real weaknesses exist because of the quota system."

The Director of the Office of Emergency Planning told the President in a recent memorandum that "the fact remains that these people"—on the east coast—"are now being penalized by Government action taken on national security grounds." This brings me to my third point.

Although the residual oil import program was initiated under the National Security Amendment to the Trade Agreements Act in 1958, there is every reason to doubt that it is, in fact, serving our national security. Some of these doubts were expressed by the OEP Director, Mr. McDermott, when he wrote:

> In our national security interest there are forceful reasons for unhampered trade relations with other free world countries and an obligation to avoid actions which will weaken their economies and make it more difficult for them to maintain democratic institutions.

I submit that we are weakening the forces of freedom in Latin America by restricting the American market for residual oil to nations like Venezuela.

Surely the Members of the House recall the amount of time that was spent during the last session of the Congress both in committee and on the floor in enacting the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. I voted for that bill in the hope that it would not only aid American access to world markets, but would also enable the developing nations of the world to gain access to our markets. Only economically independent nations will remain strong. By keeping Venezuela, a nation already beseiged by Communist terrorism and subversion, from the American market for residual oil, we serve neither our own national security nor that of the free world.

In a recent editorial, the Washington Post pointed out that the enemies of the current democratic regime in Venezuela would find "comfort in every trade discrimination this country aims at Venezuela." On the occasion of President Betancourt's visit to the United States in February, I urged the President to revoke all restrictions on the importation of residual fuel oil. I said, at that time:

> I can think of no more effective step to demonstrate the friendship of the people of the United States to the people of Venezuela than the removal of restrictions on residual oil imports.

No action has been forthcoming from the White House, however. Here we have another example of the administration's vacillation on foreign trade matters. As the Washington Post noted:

> This administration has a way of using glowing rhetoric about free trade and then retreating in concrete instances into the foxholes of protectionism.

Let me spell out the meaning of this program to Venezuela. Petroleum is the key to the Venezuela economy. Residual oil accounts for 57 percent of its total output of refined oil products. Oil accounts for 90 percent of the foreign trade and 95 percent of the foreign exchange receipts of Venezuela. More than a fifth of the gross national product is due to oil activities. There is, of course, a close relationship between foreign exchange receipts, gross national product, and a nation's capacity to import capital goods. Without these capital goods many projected programs of economic development will be either curtailed sharply or eliminated entirely. The obvious point is that a nation on the threshold of economic viability and independence cannot stand a sharp reduction in its trade revenues.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am concerned lest we isolate our national security from the security of the Western Hemisphere in considering this program. As the events of last October so sharply demonstrated, only strong, independent nations in Latin America will be able to withstand the economic penetration, political subversion and ideological indoctrination to which Cuba has already succumbed.

It has been argued that reliance on foreign imports of residual oil is dangerous because those supplies may be cut off in the event of a national emergency. The fact remains that domestic production is not sufficient to meet our needs. In addition, the record of World War II, the Korean war, and Suez crisis demonstrated the ability, and indeed the necessity of Venezuelan oil to remain the main source of supply to meet both domestic and military needs. There is no reason to assume that in the event of another emergency Venezuelan oil would be substantially less available to the United States. Continuing technological developments in antisubmarine warfare will better enable us to contain enemy interference with trade than in the past.

It is all very well to state that a nation should not be so dependent on one commodity, or one export, but the fact is that oil will be the basis of the Venezuela economy for some time to come. Without revenues from trade with the United States, the Venezuelans will be less able to develop a truly diversified economy. In the meantime we cannot urge the Venezuelan people to build up their oil industry in an effort to encourage economic progress, if we then turn around and deny them access to one of the chief ingredients of that progress.

Last week, in San Jose, Costa Rica, the President described one of the goals of the United States in Latin America:

> We shall continue under the Alliance to build economies more balanced and less dependent on one or two export commodities. To this end we must push forward plans for industrialization, greater crop diversification, strong educational facilities, and better utilization of resources.

I do not disagree with the President's words. I only ask that he permit Venezuela to pursue these aims unhampered by these artificial controls which serve the interest of neither nation.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John K. Evans, executive director of the Independent Fuel Oil Marketers of America, Inc., recently wrote an interesting letter to Secretary Udall in regards the residual oil question. He said that the levels announced on March 15 did not "provide each of the energy fuels a fair opportunity to compete for the expanding energy market on the east coast" and that it did not "assure consumers of the opportunity to obtain the fuel of their choice" and that finally it did not "take into account increased requirements of eastern seaboard consumers."

A number of other specific, factual points are made in this letter, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Evans is certainly correct when he says this is the "spring of our discontent."

I would suggest that my colleagues in this House read Mr. Evans' letter closely, and in doing so, realize that an injustice has been done. He raises many interesting questions and I would like to include the complete letter in the body of the RECORD, certain that it will contribute greatly to this stand being made today by the New England and eastern seaboard Members.

MARCH 18, 1963.

Mr. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY UDALL: We cannot allow your statements made in the press release under date of March 15, 1963, to go unchallenged. You have obviously been misinformed. As you know, this organization has led the fight to get controls on residual imports removed in line with the findings of both the Senate Interior Committee and Office of Emergency Planning studies on the subject. At the least we urged revision of the regulations so as to establish a program wherein the consumer had freedom of choice of his supplier—in other words whichever marketer obtained the customer's business that marketer would receive the covering import license. We failed to achieve either of these objectives.

To compound our difficulties and hardships, the levels you announced last week did not "provide each of the energy fuels a fair opportunity to compete for the expanding energy market on the east coast" and it did not "assure consumers of the opportunity to obtain the fuel of their choice" and finally it did not "take into account increased requirements of eastern seaboard consumers." In proof of our contention that the new levels are utterly inadequate and instead places the consumer in a straitjacket of end-use control with no freedom of choice, we offer the following facts. Due to normal consumption increases caused by population increase plus a conservative industrial development on the east coast, powerplant needs through the years have averaged 6 percent increase per annum—this next year this amount will be 10,000 barrels a day. Add to this figure two new plants in the New York area that are equipped to burn residual fuel oil—one for 20,000 barrels a day and one for 5,000 barrels a day (there may be other new facilities similarly equipped but I omit including since I am not aware of the details). Based on latter facts 35,000 barrels additional per day are needed next year. It is estimated that a normal stock level for national security purposes on April 1, 1964, should be 16.3 million barrels (the April 1, 1962 level) but for the past year we have been living off the fat of our security stockpile and to attain the 1962 level requires 30,000 barrels a day increase for the coming year. Last year's allocation fell short of demand by 30,000 barrels a day. A conservative estimate of decreased availability from the gulf and west coast is 15,000 barrels a day. Through the years nonutility usage has gone up a conservative 3 percent or 20,000 barrels a day for the next license year. Adding the above increases up one arrives at a total daily increase in barrels: public utility 35,000 plus stock buildup 30,000 plus or minus 30,000 barrel compensation for previous year's shortage in supplying demand plus drop domestic availability 15,000 plus nonutility normal increase 20,000 equals 130,000 barrels a day. Yet your agency only allocated an increase of 50,000 barrels a day making a basic shortage of 80,000 barrels a day which automatically creates end-use control and eliminates all freedom of choice.

The consumer and the independent marketer lost this fight even though we had right on our side because we could not match the efforts, financial and political, of the coal industry. The trade journals have crowned the coal industry as champ—it's easy to be a champ when the opposition is a puny starved David facing a well fed and aggressively able Goliath and those who should support and help us walk away from the fight remarking "let George do it." The only consolation is that one day the chickens of cowardice and inertia will come home to roost and the oil industry will have even greater Government interference than now and the consumer even less freedom of choice—a negative and sad consolation. This is the spring of our discontent.

Sincerely,

JOHN K. EVANS.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the New England Council in Boston has raised some interesting questions regarding the legality of the recent Interior Department decision. The council statement said that section 7, of the Trade Agreements Act of 1958, as amended by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, gives the President authority to establish residual oil quotas once a national security justification has been established; but in the absence of such finding or determination he does not have legal authority to maintain it.

In view of the February 13 OEP report, which stated that national security was not a justification for these restrictions, it seems absolutely certain that there has been a direct confrontation with the law. The statement of the council that the Interior decision represents a "Government protected cartel" is not without its truth. I would like to include the full statement made by the New England Council on the legal issues involved.

New England Council Questions Legality of President's Residual Oil Decision

BOSTON.—The New England Council has questioned the legality of the recent White House decision to maintain residual oil quotas and said the decision perpetuates a Government protected cartel.

In a joint statement, James S. Couzens, chairman of the council's fuel committee and Gardner A. Caverly, executive vice president of the council, condemned the decision as contrary to the administration's own study done by the Office of Emergency Planning and called on the President to either directly regard or disregard the report.

The council statement said that section 7, of the Trade Agreements Act of 1958, as amended by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, gives the President authority to establish residual oil quotas once a national security justification has been established; but in the absence of such a finding or determination he does not have legal authority to maintain it.

"In its February 13 report, the Office of Emergency Planning stated residual oil controls were not in the interest of national security, and that they have little to do with unemployment in the coal industry," said Mr. Caverly. "Accordingly there appears no valid economic or security reason for controls to continue and this would give rise as to whether the Trade Agreements Act is being violated."

"The announced 9.6 percent increase in residual oil imports will do little more than replace the domestic production decline," Mr. Couzens said, "and this still leaves strong enough supply-demand pressures to require New England residual oil consumers to pay 23 cents a barrel more than in other countries such as Canada." Residual oil is used as heating fuel for apartment houses and large office buildings and it also affects the cost of many electric utilities.

"The residual oil import quotas let only enough oil into the country to meet demands and this keeps per barrel costs artificially high," said Mr. Couzens.

The statement also said the quota system "locked buyers and sellers together, thus eliminating competition—a situation that the Justice Department condemned in the OEP report."

"The only reason for the President's decision to maintain residual oil import restrictions appears to be pressures put on the White House by misguided leaders of the coal industry," Caverly concluded.

The statement also said the council is not giving up its battle for removal of residual oil quota restrictions but is considering expanding its program to include removal of restrictions for the entire industry and not just residual oils.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly one of the most important aims of our foreign policy is economic development in Latin America. This aim is essential to our Nation's security.

Cuba has brought home to all of us the importance of close cooperation and understanding among the Americas, if freedom is to be preserved in our hemisphere.

One of our Latin American neighbors, Venezuela, has been recognized by President Kennedy for its progress in freedom. Speaking to their people, President Kennedy said:

> Here in Venezuela the meaning of the new Allianza Para El Progresso is being demonstrated, for you have made a transition from a repressing dictatorship to a free life for the people of this country, to a progressive democratic rule under one of the great democratic states of the Western Hemisphere. * * * The United States and Venezuela are bound together and in the 1960's I believe we can demonstrate, so that all the world will follow our example, that freedom and prosperity can move hand in hand and I am proud today to stand on this platform with your distinguished President, who has been working in this field for so many years and who is now showing the people of this country and hemisphere what real progress for the people can mean.

Mr. Speaker, our good relationships with Venezuela are in jeopardy if residual oil import restrictions are allowed to continue. This small Latin American country directly or indirectly supplies the United States with 90 percent of its residual oil, and since 1959 when import restrictions were imposed, the economic development of Venezuela has been severely hampered.

An Office of Emergency Planning report says that development of residual oil supplies from Venezuela is essential to our national security. We cannot expect Venezuela to turn her refineries on and off, holding her production at the ready, waiting to serve the United States in the event of war.

If we continue to deny Venezuela the natural established outlet for her production, we undermine her economy in time of peace and weaken her ability to meet extra demands in time of war.

The importance of residual oil to the Venezuelan economy can best be demonstrated by the following: In U.S. refineries less than 10 percent of every barrel of crude oil becomes residual. This byproduct is slowly decreasing because it is more profitable in this country to produce other petroleum products; quite the contrary in Venezuela.

Residual oil is a major product for this Latin American ally. Each barrel of crude oil produces 55 percent residual oil as compared to under 10 percent for the United States.

In Venezuela 95 percent of foreign trade income is from petroleum products, and the United States is their No. 1 customer.

Residual oil restrictions pose a real threat to the Venezuelan economy. They threaten the success of our Latin American policies and, therefore, undermine our national security.

The restrictions must be lifted.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues from New England have little reason to complain about the administration's policy with regard to import quotas on residual fuel oil.

The President's decision to increase imports by some 50,000 barrels in the import year beginning April 1 seems to demonstrate that he has not changed the views he held when as Senator Kennedy, of Massachusetts, he urged the unrestricted import of this cheap waste product.

The complaints should come from the domestic producers of oil, the coal miners, the railroad workers and many, many others who will suffer unemployment and economic loss because domestic welfare has been sacrificed ruthlessly to international politics.

This is of great importance in the State of Ohio where our great coal industry is already depressed and where the independent oil producers are having a very difficult time in the face of uncertain markets and the threat of increased taxation.

Nor do I believe that our New England friends are wise to place their reliance upon Venezuelan sources of fuel. They may pay dearly for the cheap fuel they enjoy this year if the uncertain political climate in the Caribbean cuts off this foreign source of supply.

They are closing their eyes to the Nation's welfare and to their own welfare.

The Office of Emergency Planning is equally shortsighted when it says that the Nation need not rely upon its own sources of energy.

I believe it is time for congressional review of this entire problem and congressional action to establish a realistic and effective control on the imports of residual fuel oil. Greatly as we may desire the friendship of Venezuela and wish to enhance its economic position, as much as we would like to assist our New England friends, and the tremendous volume of New England manufactured products sold in Ohio is a demonstration of this desire, it seems to me that the national security and the welfare of domestic industry must have prior consideration.

"U.S. CITIZENS GO TO CUBA ILLEGALLY BY WAY OF MEXICO WITHOUT PROSECUTION—ACTION NEEDED BY STATE AND JUSTICE DEPARTMENTS TO CLOSE THIS OPEN DOOR OF SUBVERSION"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am becoming increasingly concerned over the apparent lack of willingness on the part of the Justice and State Departments to prosecute U.S. citizens who over the past 26 months, have been illegally venturing to Cuba through the open door of subversion—the Cuban Embassy in Mexico—or to close this door.

Over the last 2 weeks, I have discussed this situation at length on the floor of this body and have inserted information pertaining thereto in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In addition, I have written letters to the President, Secretary of State and the House Un-American Activities Committee on this subject. From extremely reliable sources, I have furnished names of U.S. citizens making this trip to Cuba to the House Un-American Activities Committee for investigation—from the manifests of the Cubana Airlines in Mexico City. I have, today, given the House Un-American Activities Committee a list of an additional 24 American citizens bringing to 97, the number of U.S. citizens I have turned over to the House Un-American Activities Committee who have made this illegal trip over a 6-month period in 1962. I am doing so in hopes of prodding the Justice and State Departments into taking some action against these violators who openly and notoriously advertise their visits, many of whom are known Communists, and who are raising funds for Communist front organizations. I cannot understand why the executive branch has been reluctant to turn these names over to the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Cuban Embassy in Mexico, the open door through which Communist subversives from throughout the Americas gain entrance to Cuba and then return to their respective homelands, including the United States, for purposes of subversion and sabotage, must be closed if the spreading Communist cancer in this hemisphere is to be arrested. Since January 16, 1961, this has been illegal.

In addition, the violators must be prosecuted and this flow of subversives must be halted if we ever hope to close this dangerous open door of subversion.

It is, therefore, shocking that the State Department has not demanded that this open door to hemispheric subversion be closed.

It is with these objectives in mind that I feel compelled to make public today, the names of some of the U.S. citizens who have not only made this trip, but openly and brazenly advertise and brag about their flagrant violations of the law and their aid and confort to the Communists.

I am doing so, as well, to illustrate how easily these violators could be found and prosecuted if the State Department was sufficiently determined in what should be one of its major efforts—to rid this hemisphere, including the United States, from the threat of Communist subversion.

I am at the same time reiterating my demand, first made in a speech on the floor on March 15, of last year, that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee be cited as a Communist front organization by the Justice Department and be placed on the subversive list.

The Attorney General's failure to place this group on the subversive list becomes increasingly baffling, particularly in view of the Annual FBI Report for Fiscal Year 1961 which states, in part:

> FBI investigations also have shown that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has been heavily infiltrated by the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers' Party, and these parties have actually organized some chapters of the committee.

Naturally, the Communist Party and the Socialist Workers' Party are on the Attorney General's subversive lists.

In addition, overwhelming evidence pinpointing this organization as a Communist front subversive group has been produced at the several hearings held by the Senate Internal Security Committee.

I summarized this evidence on March 15, 1962, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The existing law, as publicly announced by the State Department on January 16, 1961, prohibits U.S. citizens from traveling to Cuba and willful violation of this law is punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a number of pages from the Worker, which is of course the published voice of the Communist Party in the United States. On each of these pages, advertisements appear promoting lectures given by U.S. citizens who have recently returned from Cuba and who are, in turn, promoting the Castro-Communist cause. Most of their appearances are held under the auspices of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

In the June 9, 1962, issue of the Worker on page 15 the following ad appears:

> Cuba—today and tomorrow—as viewed by Gerald Quinn, executive secretary, Monroe Defense Committee who has just returned from Cuba. Monday, June 4, 8:30 p.m. Adelphi Hall, 74 Fifth Avenue, Contr., $1. Students 50 cents. Ausp. Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

This individual, Gerald Quinn, was included in the list I obtained of U.S. citizens who took the route of the Communist subversive and traveled to Cuba through the Cuban Embassy in Mexico. He did so in violation of the law, has openly and notoriously advertized the fact that he has done so, that he is aiding the Communist cause, and still no willingness on the part of the State Department to push for prosecution and no effort to stop this flow of subversion. Instead, he has been allowed to go to Cuba illegally and to return so that he can trot around the United State spreading Communist propaganda and subversion.

In the September 11, 1962, issue of the Worker, on page 6, the following ad appears:

> Eyewitness in Cuba: Hear John Read, just back from Havana. See the latest color slides of Cuba. Monday, September 17, 8:30 p.m. Adelphi Hall, 74 Fifth Avenue, Contr., $1. Students 50 cents.

John Read was also included in the list I obtained of U.S. citizens who ventured to Cuba through the Cuban Embassy in Mexico. He too was allowed to recite what he was taught in Cuba. He too has openly and flagrantly violated the law.

Dozens of other Quinns and Reads can still travel to Cuba because the U.S. Government has failed to close this open door of subversion.

One woman is known to have attended the Women's Congress of the Americas, a Communist meeting in Havana in July 1962.

Mr. Speaker, these ads, all from different individuals, go on in the same vein. In all, the theme is the same—American citizens recently returned from Cuba and gallivanting around the country spreading newly developed Communist propaganda, in violation of the law and, incidentally, raising funds thereby for support for a Communist front organization—the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

There is, however, one other entry which appears in the March 6th, 1962, issue of the Worker which I feel warrants comment. On page 6, the following advertisement appears:

> Current activities of the Cuban counterrevolutionaries in the United States of America, a report by V. T. Lee. Monday, March 12, at 8:30 p.m. Adelphi Hall, 74 Fifth Avenue, Contr., $1. Ausp. Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Mr. Lee, who is known to have made various trips to Cuba, one early this year, originated the Tampa, Florida, chapter of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Tampa, incidentally, was in my district up until this year and now borders my district. He has apparently hit the big time in Communist circles, for my last recollection of him was as an unimpressive individual who, in a Castro-supporting scandal sheet he printed in Tampa, accused President Kennedy and Senator EASTLAND of "withholding diapers from Cuban babies." In this same issue, the Senator is labeled a hatchetman and a loudmouth and reference is likewise made to those "jackasses in Washington."

Although the trash he printed in his newsletter is not worth repeating, what is worth discussing is his present pastime which is apparently speaking for the Cuban counterrevolutionaries in the United States, a rather dangerous vocation. And what is further significant is that in so doing, he has apparently come up from the ranks to a position of national leadership in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Thus, I believe my concern is well founded. I have given here, examples of individuals, many with known Communist backgrounds, who not only violated the law, by going to and from Cuba, but brazenly thumb their noses at the law by advertising their travels in the Communist press published in the United States, preaching communism, and raising funds for the Communist-front Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

And, the Attorney General still refuses to place the Fair Play for Cuba on the subversive list. This organization, working in concert with these fellow travelers, are openly undermining our society, violating our laws, and still an apparent lack of willingness on the part of the State Department to push for prosecution or to close this open door of subversion.

Mr. Speaker, I find these facts alarming and again demand that the proper agencies of our Government prosecute these individuals, place the Fair Play for Cuba Committee on the Attorney General's list of subversives and close this open door to subversion in the United States.

TRIBUTE TO ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to honor the memory of Eleanor Roosevelt, the great and courageous American who was known as the First Lady of the World. When we said farewell to her last November, Congress was not in session. So it seems to me fitting that we pause now to pay tribute to her life and ideals. As the elected representatives of the American people, we have the constant opportunity through our work and efforts to enact programs which will strive to meet the humanitarian goals to which Eleanor Roosevelt dedicated her life. We are privileged to share this opportunity with her eldest son, our distinguished colleague from California, JAMES ROOSEVELT, who is making such a splendid contribution to the deliberations of the House.

Mr. Speaker, Adlai E. Stevenson captured the essence of the spirit of Eleanor Roosevelt when he observed, "She would rather light candles than curse the darkness, and her glow has warmed the world."

Millions of people the world over mourned her passing, for she touched the lives and earned the love and affection of people everywhere. She was the friend of the oppressed and dispossessed, the victims of tyranny and discrimination. Her life of goodness, kindness and compassion will live through the ages as a continuing inspiration.

It is difficult to realize Eleanor Roosevelt is no longer with us. We had become so dependent upon her. We knew that she would always speak out against oppression, injustice, and discrimination. She was our voice. She was our conscience. As the constant advocate of human rights, Eleanor Roosevelt became the great mother figure for all humanity. She was imbued with a sense of mission and a deep conviction that democracy and brotherhood are inseparable.

> Nothing we learn in this world—

She wrote during the early days of the New Deal—

> is ever wasted and I have come to the conclusion that practically nothing we do ever stands by itself. If it is good, it will serve some good purpose in the future. If it is evil, it may haunt us and handicap our efforts in unimagined ways.

In 1933, when Franklin D. Roosevelt entered the White House, Eleanor Roosevelt had already demonstrated a deep social conscience.

Her husband's long illness had deepened her compassion for human suffering and strengthened her determination to find solutions to unresolved problems. Together they fought to overcome his physical handicap and to keep alive his interest in political life. She struggled to conquer her natural shyness so that she could help her husband and further his political career. Her interest in workingwomen brought her into the Women's Trade Union Movement in the early twenties, an affiliation she continued to the end of her life.

In the White House no First Lady ever matched Eleanor Roosevelt for causes espoused, crusades launched, precedents shattered and distances traveled. It has been said that in the 7 years between 1933 and 1940 Eleanor Roosevelt had traveled some 280,000 miles, written a million words, earned and given away over a half million dollars, shaken as many hands, delivered several hundred lectures and radio speeches, attended to her voluminous mail—150,000 letters in the year 1939—and in between times knitted sweaters for her 9 grandchildren.

She became the President's eyes and ears, touring the country, looking in on various New Deal projects and observing how Americans in those grim depression years were living. On these trips she chatted with anyone she met on the plane, bus, or train. She talked with West Virginia miners, many of whom had almost forgotten what it was like to have a job. She talked with small shopkeepers, with taxi drivers, with Americans in all walks of life.

In her autobiography she wrote of these trips:

> Franklin never told me I was a good reporter, nor, in the early days, were any of my trips made at his request. I realized, however, that he would not question me so closely if he were not interested, and I decided this was the only way I could help him, outside of running the house.

Desperate appeals came to her for help from desperate people all over the country in the depression years. Believing it was wise to put people to work to help themselves, she donated her own money to help establish people in small businesses.

During the New Deal days Eleanor Roosevelt was much more than a roving reporter for the President. She served in a real sense as his driving conscience, spurring the President, reminding him of the neglected needs of America: the illhoused, illclad, illnourished. And she constantly stressed the failure of America to live up to its ideals of full equality for all her citizens regardless of race, creed, or color. She helped to mold the fighting liberalism of her husband.

During World War II Eleanor Roosevelt visited battle areas both in Europe and in the Pacific, bringing cheer to men in the service camps and to the wounded in hospitals. Wherever she went, Eleanor Roosevelt always carried a constructive message which inspired our soldiers, sailors, and airmen.

In 1945 when Franklin D. Roosevelt died, Eleanor Roosevelt was 61 years of age. Another First Lady might well have retired to a life of ease. But for Eleanor

Roosevelt, this was only the beginning of a life she called "On My Own."

President Truman named Mrs. Roosevelt a delegate to the General Assembly when the United Nations came into being in 1945. The following year she was elected chairman of the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

At the time she left for her first United Nations meeting, Eleanor Roosevelt said:

> Some things I can take to the first meeting—a sincere desire to understand the problems of the rest of the world and our relationship to them; a real good will for all the peoples throughout the world; a hope that I shall be able to build a sense of personal trust and friendship with my coworkers, for without that type of understanding our work would be doubly difficult.

It was her United Nations work that Mrs. Roosevelt considered one of the most wonderful and worthwhile experiences in her life.

As a result of her work in the United Nations, the esteem in which she was held transcended national boundaries and became virtually worldwide. She became the symbol, too, of the new role women were to play in the world.

Eleanor Roosevelt felt that it was her work on the Human Rights Commission that constituted her most important contribution to the United Nations. The drafting of the Declaration of Human Rights and the Covenants was an exceedingly difficult task. As she, herself, explained:

> It became apparent that it was going to be exceedingly difficult to agree on articles that would, if accepted, be legally binding on the various nations. This was difficult enough in regard to civil and political rights that have become fairly well accepted throughout the civilized world, but when it came to economic and social rights it seemed to me at times that agreement would be all but impossible. The reason for this, in part at least, was the vast social and economic conditions in the United States, for example, as contrasted to existing conditions in a country like India. The gap was so great that it was well-nigh impossible to phrase concepts acceptable to both countries.

The Declaration of Human Rights, a document expressing the aspirations of mankind, is a lasting memorial to the dedication of Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, Eleanor Roosevelt was fearlessly outspoken in her support of the Jewish homeland, Israel.

Her observations and experiences during her visits to refugee camps in Europe just after the war gave her a deep understanding of the sufferings of the Jewish people. She was particularly moved by an experience she had at a camp in Germany. In the mud of that camp, she wrote:

> I remember an old woman whose family had been driven from home by war madness and brutality. I had no idea who she was and we could not speak each other's language, but she knelt in the muddy road and threw her arms around my knees. "Israel," she murmered, over and over. "Israel. Israel."

It was while looking into this woman's weatherbeaten face and hearing her voice that Eleanor Roosevelt found herself for the first time realizing what Israel really meant to so many, many people.

As U.S. delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations, Eleanor Roosevelt put the full weight of her influence behind the Palestine partition plan to establish the State of Israel. Her position was strengthened by a rare combination of idealism and practicality. She realized that the Balfour resolution for the establishment of a Jewish homeland, which had been accepted by the United States and Britain after the First World War, had encouraged the buying of land on the assurance that a homeland would be created in Palestine. The Balfour resolution, she declared, practically committed the United States to the creation of a government there, because, as she pointed out, there cannot be a homeland without a government.

In 1952, with the change in administrations, Eleanor Roosevelt resigned her position with the United Nations. She became active in the American Association for the United Nations, traveling extensively both in the United States and abroad. Everywhere she found friends whom she had come to know through her work in the United Nations. Everywhere she brought her warmth, sincerity, zeal, and everlasting patience.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken of Eleanor Roosevelt's devotion to many causes—civil rights, the United Nations, Israel. When historians assess her magnificent life, I am sure they will find her role in the cause of political reform in New York was a reaffirmation of her belief in the individual's responsibility in a democracy.

In the late 1950's Eleanor Roosevelt, who had been an influential voice in New York and National Democratic politics since the adoption of the 19th amendment, became a tireless campaigner and outspoken leader in the battle to revitalize New York's Democratic Party. Perhaps more than any Democrat of her experience and years she understood how machine control had eroded the vital spirit of the Democratic Party, how too often it had stifled initiative, leaving the party bankrupt of ideas and ideals.

In some ways Mrs. Roosevelt fought to liberalize and move the Democratic Party just as she had sought to move the Nation 30 years earlier when, as I said, she served as a conscience of the President. It was my privilege to work closely with her in this fight.

In 1957, when the Riverside Democrats waged the first battle to bring reform to the West Side of Manhattan, Mrs. Roosevelt cabled from Europe endorsing my candidacy for Democratic leader.

In 1959, after the disastrous Buffalo convention, she joined with Governor Herbert H. Lehman and Thomas K. Finletter to establish the New York Committee for Democratic Voters which brought citywide focus to the reform movement.

Eleanor Roosevelt encouraged young people to enter the political arena. She believed in grassroots politics where decisions are made democratically at the local level. She recognized that mistakes would be made, but that the reform clubs would profit from experience.

Mrs. Roosevelt was the rock of the reform Democratic movement, a soldier as well as a general, a leader always available for advice, always understanding, always encouraging.

During the Democratic Party primaries of 1959, 1960, 1961, and 1962, she went from meeting to meeting, rally to rally, urging the election of reform candidates. No district leadership fight was too insignificant, no crowd too small, no old line Tammany leader too abusive to keep her away. She spoke at more than 100 reform rallies. Climbing the ladders of sound trucks in all kinds of weather, she captivated people with her plea to recognize the importance of voting in primaries and her appeal to support the goals of reform. She was an energetic inspiration to countless volunteer workers and bellringers.

On July 12, 1962, she spoke for my renomination to Congress at two rallies. Although a light rain was falling, she refused to stop. She even refused an umbrella.

Late in August she was scheduled to speak for reform candidates in Queens. She had a mild fever. But she knew people were waiting, and she insisted on going. It was to be her last speech.

When she arrived, a group of children presented her with flowers. "You see," she said, "I had to come. They expected me."

The morning after the September 6 primary I called her to thank her for her help in the reform Democratic victories. She said, "I really didn't do a thing. I wish I could have done more."

She always wished she could do more. But she did more than enough. For beyond her work and leadership, she was a living spirit, an ideal for the reform Democratic movement.

Mr. Speaker, Francis W. H. Adams, Irving Engel, and Lloyd K. Garrison, members of the Advisory Council of the New York Committee for Democratic Voters, have joined in an expression of the debt owed to Mrs. Roosevelt by the coordinating group of the reform movement.

Their statement follows:

Statement by Francis W. H. Adams, Irving Engel, Lloyd K. Garrison on Behalf of the Advisory Council of the New York Committee for Democratic Voters

For 3 years we had the good fortune to serve with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt on the Board of Advisers of the New York Committee for Democratic Voters, the coordinating group of the reform movement within the Democratic Party in New York State.

Her contributions to the work of this committee were, as always, far beyond the call of duty, and her selflessness served as an inspiration to all of us.

Her advice was always sage and to the point. Her political understanding and practical good sense came to our aid time and again in local situations as well as in dealing with larger policy issues.

Her leadership will be sorely missed in our efforts to attain a more vigorous and creative party in this State. The effects of her inspiration will, however, be long-lasting. Whatever improvements are made in our party, and through our party in the government of New York, will in large measure be due to her.

The work of the NYCDV is partisan and Mrs. Roosevelt was a partisan too—yet the

essential political message she preached was a lesson for all Americans. Her basic theme was that all Americans should participate fully in the party of their choice and that it was their duty to stay informed on public affairs.

The reform movement was only one of the many causes for which Mrs. Roosevelt fought. We are grateful to have had the opportunity of working with her, and the balm of her spirit will be with us always.

Mr. Speaker, Arnold L. Fein, the chairman of the New York Committee for Democratic Voters, has written with deep feeling of the many sacrifices Mrs. Roosevelt made for the reform movement. His account of her unique contribution follows:

Statement by Arnold L. Fein, Chairman, New York Committee for Democratic Voters, in Tribute to the Contributions of Eleanor Roosevelt to the Reform Movement in the Democratic Party in New York

As spring comes around again and talk quickens about upcoming primary fights and political campaigns, the reform movement in the Democratic Party in New York feels a special sense of loss. This year, Eleanor Roosevelt, for the first time, will not be with us to light our way and guide our paths.

Her contributions to our cause were too many to recount. Our debt to her is writ large in the life of our party and our town. Remembering and paying tribute to Eleanor Roosevelt, in death, is, as it was in life, a self-serving declaration. By talking with her, by being in her presence, by talking about her, yes, even by remembering her, we uplift ourselves. It was not easy during her lifetime to pay her tribute. A year ago, when we proposed a public tribute to her, she agreed to submit only because she thought it might be useful to the organization for fundraising and publicity.

As she wrote, afterwards:

"While, as I warned you, I did not completely enjoy the evening myself, I think everyone present had a good time. Therefore, I was happy that I was the instrument for bringing them together * * *. You were very kind to put so much effort into making the evening as easy and pleasant as possible and I want all of you to know of my deep gratitude."

As we wrote then:

"We pay tribute * * * to a great lady—Eleanor Roosevelt—

"For her tireless service to the reform movement;

"For her wise counsel;

"For establishing for all of us a standard of unselfish public service.

"We are grateful for the opportunity of working with a human being who exemplifies those attributes all men of good will hold dear and thankful that she has recognized our cause."

From the time Eleanor Roosevelt, Governor Herbert H. Lehman, Thomas K. Finletter and others helped to found and form the New York Committee for Democratic Voters, she was without stint in her efforts on its behalf. Her services to the reform movement in the Democratic Party in New York City demonstrated an overwhelming love of life and of people and a sensitive recognition of their needs and aspirations. Eleanor Roosevelt was a participant at every level. She went from meeting to meeting, rally to rally, preaching the cause of reform, democracy and liberalism in the Democratic Party. In a crowded little local campaign headquarters on the east side of Manhattan, airless, dirty and hot, in the midst of a bitterly fought summer primary election for a local office, she refused to sit in the seat specially provided. She insisted rather on standing, shaking hands with every last one of the many who wished to be in her presence, expressing her thanks that they had come to see and listen to her and urging upon them the meaning and need of democracy and participation. Eleanor Roosevelt was more capable than any in making people understand what they had to do and in making them want to do it.

This was not with a patronizing air, nor the cynicism of a political hand shaker, nor even the sentimentality of too many do-gooders. It was rather a frank confrontation on a person-to-person basis of those who were joined in a common cause. She made clear as no other could that there could be neither contentment nor complacency in the face of those in her party who were indifferent to hunger and distress or who would use them for their own purposes. Nor did she give any impression that she was engaged in a kind of sacrifice. She understood, and others knew from talking to her, listening to her, and being with her that this was not sacrifice, it was living.

She taught us too that it was not enough to be a voice of good works. She taught realism in the practice of democracy and strategy in its use. Far better than any other she understood, accepted and used its complicated and sometimes disheartening processes. She demonstrated her recognition that final solutions are never at hand; that absolutism is the death of life as well as of progress. With humor and understanding she made many of us recognize how it might be necessary, temporarily, to accept choices far from the ultimate goal, from which, she insisted, the eye never swerve. Mrs. Roosevelt imparted and demonstrated to us also her deep belief that slogans are not solutions.

At a meeting called at her home, on short notice, while en route from the South to New England, she sought to persuade some local political leaders that, however high minded or highly motivated the course they were taking, it was unwise in the interest of greater objectives. To the comment, "We don't like to be told what to do," she remarked, "Are you suggesting that I am telling you what to do? I know as well as you that the decision is yours, and I will abide by it."

In that moment she made clear, as she had on so many other occasions, that she was willing to accept the democratic process, albeit she would try to guide and enlighten it. When faced with ultimate disagreement, she neither thundered nor turned her back, nor played the boss, but shrugged and said, "I tried. I will try again. We will move ahead."

On another occasion, after a long and difficult evening in a local campaign headquarters, including speechmaking, handshaking and the rest, she indicated apologetically that she would have to leave. She rejected an offer to drive her home, with the remark, "There is work for you to do." When a cab was hailed for her in the middle of the road, she was right there, insisting on calling the cab herself and going home alone.

One dark and dreary day, when she came to a street corner meeting from her doctor's office, it was suggested, following the doctor's admonition, that she not climb the rickety steps to the top of a sound truck. Mrs. Roosevelt replied, "That is where the meeting is and that is where I am going to talk to the people," and she did.

In that moment, as in many others, she made us recognize that the business of living, particularly within a democracy, is a continuous meeting, a meeting within oneself and a meeting with others, ever seeking personal and community solutions. And so she came to our rallies, our parties and our meetings, sitting and listening with patience, fortitude and grace, and occasionally making realistic suggestions, with fire and humor. It mattered not that only a local candidate was involved, in a difficult district, on a bad day or night. It mattered only that this was democracy in action; that people were participating; that there was concern.

In her memory and in our own interest and in the interest of the many she served, we must and will keep the meeting going, remembering what she, above all others, knew; that in the meeting and in the memory we shall try to achieve the peace, the honor and the understanding that she herself, through all the days of her years, helped so many to find for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include at this point in the Record a statement by Richard A. Brown, executive director of the New York Committee for Democratic Voters, who worked closely with Mrs. Roosevelt in the reform movement:

Statement by Richard A. Brown, Executive Director of the New York Committee for Democratic Voters, March 21, 1963

During the past few years the New York Committee for Democratic Voters has served as the coordinating agency for 50 reform Democratic clubs in their fight to democratize and revitalize the Democratic Party in New York State.

Eleanor Roosevelt, with Gov. Herbert H. Lehman and Ambassador Thomas K. Finletter founded the New York Committee for Democratic Voters to provide guidance and leadership for the thousands of young people dedicated to this worthwhile end.

For the last few years of her life, the New York Committee for Democratic Voters was Mrs. Roosevelt's principal political interest.

She spoke at meetings of local reform clubs; sometimes making as many as five speeches in an evening. She was as readily available to speak at a meeting of 40 in the far reaches of Queens, as at a rally for 3,000 on the West Side of Manhattan.

She mounted sound trucks on street corners as willingly as she faced a $100 a plate dinner audience.

When money was in short supply, as it always is in good causes, she gave dinner parties in her own home and wrote and signed many financial appeals.

And as if all this was not enough—her personal financial contribution was always made without solicitation. Only 3 weeks before her death, while she was in the hospital, we received a substantial contribution from her.

Mrs. Roosevelt was more than a "do-gooder," she was a shrewd and knowledgeable politician. Her advice will be sorely missed in the years ahead.

But all of these contributions were small compared to that of the inspiration which she gave us.

For the knowledge that Mrs. Roosevelt believed in the reform movement gave us confidence, and reinforced our belief that our cause was worth while; that we were helping to create a better world.

It is this knowledge that will enable us to survive the loss of her personal help.

The knowledge that in bringing our work to successful fruition we will be advancing a cause close to Mrs. Roosevelt, will help us overcome the inevitable discouragements and obstacles ahead.

I am grateful that I had the opportunity of being associated with Mrs. Roosevelt and proud that she placed a small measure of trust in me, in the work of the reform movement.

In this association I found what I consider to be the core of Mrs. Roosevelt's greatness—she was a fine human being with compassion and humility.

Mr. Speaker, I have read many moving tributes to Eleanor Roosevelt, but one of the most revealing was written about her to me by Miss Maureen Corr who was her secretary and constant companion for so many years. Miss Corr wrote:

> She lived to be kind, and to me her private image far outshone her public one. There are few famous people who can have that said of them, but then famous people are not necessarily great. People used to say that Mrs. Roosevelt electrified a group when she appeared. May it be said to her credit that she never ceased to electrify me—even after 12 years of daily service.

Mr. Speaker, I shall always be thankful that I knew Mrs. Roosevelt from my earliest memories to the time she last stood on a platform expressing her commitment to democracy. When I was growing up, she would visit my family from time to time; and, of course, in my political career she was a constant inspiration.

I nominated Mrs. Roosevelt for the 1962 Nobel Peace Prize. After her death I urged the Nobel Committee to consider her for a posthumous award, for no one was ever more devoted to the cause of peace and the promotion of international understanding than Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, in discussing the American dream Eleanor Roosevelt once wrote:

> We cannot any longer take an old approach to world problems. They aren't the same problems. It isn't the same world. We must not adopt the methods of our ancestors; instead, we must emulate that pioneer quality in our ancestors that made them attempt new methods for a new world.
>
> If our many young people have lost the excitement of the early settlers who had a country to explore and develop, it is because no one remembers to tell them that the world has never been so challenging, so exciting; the fields of adventure and new fields to conquer have never been so limitless. There is still unfinished business at home, but there is the most tremendous adventure in bringing the peoples of the world to an understanding of the American dream. In this attempt to understand, to give a new concept of the relationships of mankind, there is open to our youngsters an infinite field of exciting adventure where the heart and the mind and the spirit can be engaged.
>
> Perhaps the older generation is often to blame with its cautious warning: "Take a job that will give you security, not adventure." But I say to the young: "Do not stop thinking of life as an adventure. You have no security unless you can live bravely, excitingly, imaginatively; unless you can choose a challenge instead of a competence."

This Eleanor Roosevelt succeeded in doing. She lived her 78 years bravely, excitedly, imaginatively. Her life was a great adventure.

We can take heart that the world could produce an Eleanor Roosevelt—true friend and ally of mankind. If her life has meaning for us, it is that, regardless of race, color, or religion, humankind is one family and the welfare of each member of that family deserves the interest, concern, and labors of us all.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] and all the Members who are joining in this tribute for their eloquent remarks. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in tribute to the life and ideals of Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it would require more time than we have before us today to pay adequate tribute to the life and ideals of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. It would take more foresight than we possess to gage fully the effects of her work upon present and future generations.

We can in complete truth say that Mrs. Roosevelt was in her day the world's most esteemed woman. Few careers, pursued by either man or woman, have embraced such an enormous span of interests and activities. Few lives have had such impact for good as that of this great lady.

Mrs. Roosevelt, of course, was first and foremost, a wife and a mother. That she was also the wife of a public official and for 12 historic and critical years the First Lady of the Land in itself suggests duties which might well have occupied her to the exclusion of any other activities. President Roosevelt regarded his wife not only as his helpmate, but as his teammate.

Her role as the wife of the President and party leader, of course, was a corollary one. Yet Mrs. Roosevelt's independent contributions in public service became so well recognized that after her widowhood and departure from the White House, she was named a U.S. delegate to the United Nations and later was elected chairman of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

It is fair to say that human rights more than any other thing were Mrs. Roosevelt's great concern. Her writings, her lectures, the causes she expoused and for which she worked with such energy and determination, all were tied to the fulfillment or defense of human rights, and to the solution of human problems.

She was deeply interested in the humanitarian measures of the New Deal. She worked for slum clearance, for children's projects, and for playgrounds. She worked for fair and equal labor laws, for public health and medical research. She worked for an end to racial discrimination and for peace throughout the world.

She was a willing and able spokesman for the weak, the underprivileged, the ignored, the forgotten, the unpopular. She prodded the conscience of the world. She pointed out the problem and proceeded to do what she could to improve the situation. She never grew fainthearted under the fire of personal criticism; she refused to be goaded into any unseemly, unkindly or uncourageous act. She did not react to the behavior of those who disagreed with her or who sought to deter her. Her detractors received the same fair and kindly treatment as those whom she sought to help and those who sought to help her.

Mrs. Roosevelt was a citizen of the world. Her compassion spanned the oceans, her sympathy spilled over the border lines of geography, race, creed, and color. Her industry in the human cause produced results equal to those which might normally have been expected of a score of people. She was a wise and selfless and gallant lady. We shall not soon see her like again.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, my wife and I always have been warm admirers of Mrs. Roosevelt. We spent several hours with her on a number of occasions, and I recall one occasion when we were the only Americans to meet her when she arrived in Yugoslavia.

The occasion of her birthday led us to this discussion of some of our joint thoughts concerning her great contribution to this country and to mankind as a whole.

Eleanor Roosevelt will be remembered by the world for many things. She will be remembered because she did great work in the cause of peace. She will be remembered as an effective champion of social justice. She will be remembered because she lent a helping hand to thousands of people in need.

I would like to speak today about another great accomplishment of Eleanor Roosevelt. It is a thing that might be considered by many to be just a byproduct of her other achievements, but to me it ranks with her most important work. I would like to speak about what she did to expand the horizons of the women of the world, and about the effect this expansion has had on us all, men and women alike. In our own country, she made us all aware that what a woman thinks and what a woman does are important—to herself, to her family, and to the whole community. In the rest of the world, especially in those areas where women are still treated as chattels, she became a symbol of hope to women who are reaching out for recognition as human beings.

Eleanor Roosevelt was not a suffragette. In the days when women were parading and lobbying for the vote, she was leading a sheltered life as a schoolgirl and then as a young wife and mother. She was not a militant crusader for women's rights. She started always with a woman's traditional role as wife and mother. Yet she was able—both by her example and by her gentle insistence—to make women see that they could extend themselves, that they could use their brains and their energy to be the best wives and mothers of which they were capable—not only in the narrow confines of their homes, but in the community and the Nation and the world.

She began in the 1920's, by showing the women of the State of New York—and incidentally all the voters of New York—that a woman could be effective in politics. Her husband was chairbound, and he needed a channel back to productive life. So she became his eyes and his ears, and often his voice, as she went around the State to political meetings. In spite of her lack of experience and poor speaking ability, she conquered her timidity and became an effective force in the State's political life, respected by men and women alike.

During the great depression of the 1930's, Mrs. Roosevelt ignored the traditional image of First Lady, and traveled all over the country to see conditions firsthand. She visited hundreds of soup

kitchens, invaded the camp of the Bonus Marchers, went down the West Virginia coal mines and into the great Dust Bowl of the Middle West. She talked to thousands of the unemployed, and reported their problems and their feelings to her husband. She wrote books, made speeches, did a daily newspaper column, and worked on all kinds of programs, both public and private, which might alleviate the human suffering she saw wherever she went.

Some people praised her; some criticized. Clare Boothe Luce put it in a nutshell when she said:

> No woman has ever so comforted the distressed or so distressed the comfortable.

But to many she symbolized more than comfort. She stood for hope and the courage to work hard in spite of the heartbreaking times. People were amazed at her simplicity and directness. As one lobster fisherman put it when she visited Maine in 1933:

> She ain't stuck up, she ain't dressed up, and she ain't afeared to talk.

Women in particular began to realize that something new had been added to their traditional role. Of course, they had already won the right to work at a variety of occupations, the right to vote, the right to participate in the professions and the arts and to do social service work in their communities. Eleanor Roosevelt made them realize that any woman, no matter what her situation, had both the right and the obligation to develop herself and to perform with her mind and her energies all the useful work of which she was capable. If you were in the White House you could do it; if you were in coal town, you could too.

During World War II, she extended her activities with unbelievable energy. Now she was not only the President's eyes and ears, but his wings as well. She visited scores of military camps, tramped hundreds of miles of hospital wards, reported to the President not only on things that affected the war effort directly, but on everything she saw that affected the welfare of human beings in wartime. She set up cots in the halls of the White House for servicemen, wrote thousands of letters to the families of service personnel all over the world. Again she was an inspiration to the women of the country, who followed her into warwork—not just into traditional bandage rolling, but into almost every activity of the military services and the productive life of the country.

In the postwar years, a widow now and no longer First Lady, it would have been easy for her to retire to her grandchildren and her many friends. But she did not want to stop being useful. And the human suffering she had seen during the war had left her with the great conviction that men must be brought to sit around a table to settle the difficulties between nations. So she accepted President Truman's invitation to become a member of our country's first delegation to the United Nations General Assembly. As an outgrowth of this she served on the organizing committee of the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations, then as the U.S. delegate on the Commission. Later she worked with the American Association for the United Nations. For more than 15 years she helped to build these council tables of the world and to persuade men and women to sit around them. Between official tours of duty, she traveled to many parts of the world, not as a tourist, but in order to see and understand people and their problems, and to do what she could to promote peace and understanding among the political leaders with whom she talked.

In all these activities, most especially in her role as delegate to the Human Rights Commission, she became a symbol of hope and of warm humanity to women everywhere.

She broadened the horizons of women; she brought millions of women into new responsibility in government and the life of the community. And in so doing she enriched the personal and public life of us all.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, during this last year I have had the challenging opportunity of serving on the President's Commission on the Status of Women under the chairmanship of Eleanor Roosevelt. I remember being privileged to be present one day during the World's Fair at Brussels when Eleanor Roosevelt spoke on the occasion of honoring American women. On occasions Mrs. Roosevelt has honored the city of Portland, which I represent, with her presence. And as I listened on each occasion to her wise words of counsel and judgment, I recalled that I, like millions of Americans, came first to know her as the wife of a great President some 30 years ago.

Depression, with its attendant unemployment and poverty, gripped the country. Countless professionals—lawyers, politicians, economists—gathered facts and proposed programs to cure our economic misery. Lights burned bright and long in Government offices along the Potomac. But it took Eleanor Roosevelt to breathe into the melancholy facts a sense of these facts. Her trips into the homes of coal miners, her visits to soup kitchens, her social concern for the American Negro, and her applied Christianity jarred the conscience of America—against the background of derisive laughter and abuse from the smoking rooms of the Union League clubs across our prostrate land.

Memory, a wise man once said, is a fable—a story with a moral. And so our small words here today are as nothing against the vital living memory of her good works. As Adlai E. Stevenson has said:

> In gathering here to honor her, we engage in a self-serving act. It is we who are trying, by this ceremony of tribute, to deny the fact that we have lost her.

Mr. Speaker, in view of this occasion I wish to place in the RECORD at this point two eloquent tributes by that great American, Adlai E. Stevenson, an editorial in the November 8, 1962, edition of the Portland, Oreg., Journal, a tribute by Muhammad Zafrulla Khan as President of the 17th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and a statement adopted by the President's Commission on the Status of Women, which as Chairman, Mrs. Roosevelt so splendidly served:

Text of Eulogy Delivered by Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, at a Memorial Service for Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York City, Saturday, November 17, 1962

One week ago this afternoon, in the Rose Garden at Hyde Park, Eleanor Roosevelt came home for the last time. Her journeys are over. The remembrance now begins.

In gathering here to honor her, we engage in a self-serving act. It is we who are trying, by this ceremony of tribute, to deny the fact that we have lost her, and, at least, to prolong the farewell, and—possibly—to say some of the things we dared not say in her presence, because she would have turned aside such testimonial with impatience and gently asked us to get on with some of the more serious business of the meeting.

A grief perhaps not equaled since the death of her husband 17 years ago is the world's best tribute to one of the great figures of our age—a woman whose lucid and luminous faith testified always for sanity in an insane time and for hope in a time of obscure hope—a woman who spoke for the good toward which man aspires in a world which has seen too much of the evil of which man is capable.

She lived 78 years, most of the time in tireless activity as if she knew that only a frail fragment of the things that cry out to be done could be done in the lifetime of even the most fortunate. One has the melancholy sense that when she knew death was at hand, she was contemplating not what she achieved, but what she had not quite managed to do. And I know she wanted to go—when there was no more strength to do.

Yet how much she had done, how much still unchronicled. We dare not try to tabulate the lives she salvaged, the battles, known and unrecorded, she fought, the afflicted she comforted, the hovels she brightened, the faces and places, near and far, that were given some new radiance, some sound of music, by her endeavors. What other single human being has touched and transformed the existence of so many others? What better measure is there of the impact of anyone's life?

There was no sick soul too wounded to engage her mercy. There was no signal of human distress which she did not view as a personal summons. There was no affront to human dignity from which she fled because the timid cried "Danger." And the number of occasions on which her intervention turned despair into victory we may never know.

Her life was crowded, restless, fearless. Perhaps she pitied most, not those whom she aided in the struggle, but the more fortunate who were preoccupied with themselves and cursed with the self-deceptions of private success. She walked in the slums and the ghettos of the world, not on a tour of inspection, nor as a condescending patron, but as one who could not feel complacent while others were hungry, and who could not find contentment while others were in distress. This was not sacrifice; this, for Mrs. Roosevelt, was the only meaningful way of life.

These were not conventional missions of mercy. What rendered this unforgettable woman so extraordinary was not merely her response to suffering; it was her comprehension of the complexity of the human condition.

Not long before she died, she wrote that "within all of us there are two sides. One reaches for the stars, the other descends to the level of beasts." It was, I think, this discernment that made her so unfailingly tolerant of friends who faltered, and led her so often to remind the smug and complacent that "There but for the grace of God."

But we dare not regard her as just a benign incarnation of good works. For she was not only a great woman and a great humanitarian, but a great democrat. I use the word with a small "d"—though it was, of course, equally true that she was a great Democrat with a capital "D." When I say she was a great small "d" democrat, I mean that she had a lively and astute understanding of the nature of the democratic process. She was a master political strategist with a fine sense of humor. And, as she said, she loved a good fight.

She was a realist. Her compassion did not become sentimentality. She understood that progress was a long labor of compromise. She mistrusted absolutism in all its forms—the absolutism of the word and even more the absolutism of the deed. She never supposed that all the problems of life could be cured in a day or a year or a lifetime. Her pungent and salty understanding of human behavior kept her always in intimate contact with reality. I think this was a primary source of her strength, because she never thought that the loss of a battle meant the loss of a war, nor did she suppose that a compromise which produced only part of the objective sought was an act of corruption or of treachery. She knew that no formula of words, no combination of deeds, could abolish the troubles of life overnight and usher in the millennium.

The miracle, I have tried to suggest, is how much tangible good she really did; how much realism and reason were mingled with her instinctive compassion; how her contempt for the perquisites of power ultimately won her the esteem of so many of the powerful; and how, at her death, there was a universality of grief that transcended all the harsh boundaries of political, racial, and religious strife and, for a moment at least, united men in a vision of what their world might be.

We do not claim the right to enshrine another mortal, and this least of all would Mrs. Roosevelt have desired. She would have wanted it said, I believe, that she well knew the pressures of pride and vanity, the sting of bitterness and defeat, the gray days of national peril and personal anguish. But she clung to the confident expectation that man could fashion their own tomorrows if they could only learn that yesterday can be neither relived nor revised.

Many who have spoken of her in these last few days have used a word to which we all assent, because it speaks a part of what we feel. They have called her a lady, a great lady, the first lady of the world. But the word "lady," though it says much about Eleanor Roosevelt, does not say all. To be incapable of self-concern is not a negative virtue; it is the other side of a coin that has a positive face—the most positive, I think, of all the faces. And to enhance the humanity of others is not a kind of humility; it is a kind of pride—the noblest of all the forms of pride. No man or woman can respect other men and women who does not respect life. And to respect life is to love it. Eleanor Roosevelt loved life—and that, perhaps, is the most meaningful thing that can be said about her, for it says so much beside.

It takes courage to love life. Loving it demands imagination and perception and the kind of patience women are more apt to have than men—the bravest and most understanding women. And loving it takes something more beside—it takes a gift for life, a gift for love.

Eleanor Roosevelt's childhood was unhappy—miserably unhappy, she sometimes said. But it was Eleanor Roosevelt who also said that "one must never, for whatever reason, turn his back on life." She did not mean that duty should compel us. She meant that life should. "Life," she said, "was meant to be lived." A simple statement. An obvious statement. But a statement that by its obviousness and its simplicity challenges the most intricate of all the philosophies of despair.

Many of the admonitions she bequeathed us are neither new thoughts nor novel concepts. Her ideas were, in many respects, old fashioned—as old as the Sermon on the Mount, as the reminder that it is more blessed to give than to receive, as the words of St. Francis that she loved so well: "For it is in the giving that we receive."

She imparted to the familiar language—nay, what too many have come to treat as the cliches—of Christianity a new poignancy and vibrance. She did so not by reciting them, but by proving that it is possible to live them. It is this above all that rendered her unique in her century. It was said of her contemptuously at times that she was a do-gooder, a charge leveled with similar derision against another public figure 1,962 years ago.

We who are assembled here are of various religious and political faiths, and perhaps different conceptions of man's destiny in the universe. It is not an irreverence, I trust, to say that the immortality Mrs. Roosevelt would have valued most would be found in the deeds and visions of her life inspired in others, and in the proof that they would be faithful to the spirit of any tribute conducted in her name.

And now one can almost hear Mrs. Roosevelt saying that the speaker has already talked too long. So we must say farewell. We are always saying farewell in this world—always standing at the edge of loss attempting to retrieve some memory, some human meaning, from the silence—something which was precious and is gone.

Often, although we know the absence well enough, we cannot name it or describe it even. What left the world when Lincoln died: Speaker after speaker in those aching days tried to tell his family or his neighbors or his congregation. But no one found the words, not even Whitman. "When lilacs last in the dooryard bloomed" can break the heart, but not with Lincoln's greatness, only with his loss. What the words could never capture was the man himself. His deeds were known; every schoolchild knew them. But it was not his deeds the country mourned: it was the man—the mastery of life which made the greatness of the man.

It was always so. On that April day when Franklin Roosevelt died, it was not a President we wept for. It was a man. In Archibald MacLeish's words:

"Fagged out, worn down, sick. With the weight of his own bones, the task finished, the war won, the victory assured, the glory left behind him for the others. (And the wheels roll up through the night in the sweet land in the cool air in the spring between the lanterns)."

It is so now. What we have lost in Eleanor Roosevelt is not her life. She lived that out to the full. What we have lost, what we wish to recall for ourselves, to remember, is what she was herself. And who can name it? But she left "a name to shine on the entablatures of truth, forever."

We pray that she has found peace, and a glimpse of sunset. But today we weep for ourselves. We are lonelier; someone has gone from one's own life—who was like the certainty of refuge; and someone has gone from the world—who was like a certainty of honor.

A Great Lady of Her Time

Much is to be learned from the life of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, which ended Wednesday after an illness of several months.

More than almost any other person of her era, Mrs. Roosevelt proved the power and resilience of a calm, unruffled spirit and the value of that simple, human quality, kindness.

The testing of her great spirit came early, in the pre-Presidential days of her famous husband, when polio made him a demanding patient just at the time she was rearing a family.

In the White House, she was a different kind of First Lady, whose activities drew the criticisms of those accustomed to a President's wife who stayed in the background.

She had to share with her husband the attacks by political enemies who hated him with a bitterness rarely seen in American politics.

Her travels, her lectures, her countless do-gooder activities drew scorn from people who thought she should retire to a rocking chair.

Through it all, she maintained her poise, refused to reply in kind to her critics. She fended insulting questions with courteous, gentle answers.

Mrs. Roosevelt freely spoke her mind. This sometimes brought her into controversy with other public figures. She had her differences with Harry S. Truman. She opposed the choice of John F. Kennedy at the Democratic National Convention in 1960. But in her criticisms she was never mean or small.

The driving force in her life was to help people. Her climb to greatness really began after her husband's death. Her tireless energy and her kindly manner turned former detractors into admirers. In recent years she had achieved a place in the hearts of many as the First Lady of the World.

Just about a year ago, after a Portland appearance, the Journal sought to explain the wide affection which Mrs. Roosevelt had captured by saying that in her was a blending of kindness and quiet dignity with both idealism and commonsense.

We noted that when she spoke, it was with words carefully chosen and that back of the words appeared to be a wisdom born of experience, a great heart and an honest, searching mind. She told of the need for knowledge and courage in today's world. She avoided slogans and catch phrases. She asked the people to try to understand the terrible burden of decisionmaking carried by the President. She said that the average citizen had no such burden but must be willing to contribute his share to the total strength of the Nation.

Her message then is worth remembering now, and so is the lesson of her life, which is that such qualities as simplicity, kindness, steadfastness, faith lead to greatness. She was truly one of the great ladies of her time.

Series of Statements Made in the United Nations General Assembly on November 9 in Tribute to the Memory of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Who Died at New York on November 7

Muhammad Zafrulla Khan:

"Since our last meeting we have learned with deep sorrow of the death of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. The news came to all of us with a sense of profound shock.

"I need not review in detail Mrs. Roosevelt's outstanding contribution to the United Nations ever since the inception of the organization. She served as a member of successive U.S. delegations, and in particular as a member of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights and of the Commission on the Status of Women. Her contribution is enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in the Covenants on Human

Rights, and in the many related conventions and declarations which have been adopted by the United Nations during the past years. All her many activities reflected her own personal devotion to the cause of enriching the life of all peoples everywhere without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion. Through her work, her personal example, her generous support of many humanitarian causes, especially those sponsored by the United Nations, Mrs. Roosevelt has left us a deepened understanding of the words 'the dignity and worth of the human person.'

"Many of us knew Mrs. Roosevelt personally as a warm friend and an eloquent and thoughtful interpreter of the finest traditions of American life. We shall cherish the memory of her friendship.

"To the members of Mrs. Roosevelt's family and to her fellow citizens in the United States—and, may I add, throughout the world—we extend our deep sympathy.

"May I invite the members of the General Assembly to stand and observe a minute of silence in memory of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt."

(The representatives stood in silence.)

Adlai E. Stevenson (United States):

"I come here for the second time in little more than a year sad in heart and in spirit. The United States, the United Nations—the world—has lost one of its great citizens. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt is dead; a cherished friend of all mankind is gone.

"Yesterday I said I had lost more than a friend. I had lost an inspiration. She would rather light candles than curse the darkness, and her glow had warmed the world.

"My country mourns her, and I know that all in this Assembly mourn with us. But even as we do, the sadness we share is enlivened by the faith in her fellow man and his future which filled the heart of this strong and gentle woman.

"She imparted this faith not only to those who shared the privilege of knowing her and of working by her side but to countless men, women, and children in every part of the world who loved her even as she loved them. For she embodied the vision and the will to achieve a world in which all men can walk in peace and dignity. And to this goal—a better life—she dedicated her tireless energy and the strange strength of her extraordinary personality.

"I don't think it amiss to suggest that the United Nations is, in no small way, a memorial to her and to her aspirations. To it she gave the last 15 years of her restless spirit. She breathed life into this organization. The United Nations has meaning and hope for millions, thanks to her labors, her love, no less than to her ideals—ideals that made her, only weeks after Franklin Roosevelt's death, put aside all thoughts of peace and quiet after the tumult of their lives, to serve as one of this Nation's delegates to the first regular session of the General Assembly. Her duty then—as always—was to the living, to the world, to peace.

"Some of you in this hall were present at that first historic assembly in London 17 years ago. More of you were witnesses to her work in subsequent assemblies in the years that followed. The members of the Third Committee—the committee on social, humanitarian, and cultural questions—and the Commission on Human Rights, which she served so long as chairman—you, in particular, will remember the warmth, the intelligence, and infectious buoyancy which she brought to her tasks. You know better than any of us the unceasing crusade that helped to give the world, after years of painstaking, patient travail, one of the noblest documents of mankind: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

"This is not the time to recount the infinite services of this glorious and gracious lady; the list is as inexhaustible as her energies. But devotion to the world of the charter, to the principles of the United Nations, to a world without war, to the brotherhood of man, underscored them all. And, happily for us all, she could communicate her devotion, her enthusiasm, to others. She saw clearly; she spoke simply. The power of her words came from the depth of her conviction.

" 'We must be willing,' she said, 'to learn the lesson that cooperation may imply compromise, but if it brings a world advance is a gain for each individual nation. There will be those who doubt their ability to rise to these new heights, but the alternative is not possible to contemplate. We must build faith in the hearts of those who doubt, we must rekindle faith in ourselves when it grows dim, and find some kind of divine courage within us to keep on till on earth we have peace and good will among men.'

"While she lived, Mrs. Roosevelt rekindled that faith in ourselves. Now that she is gone, the legacy of her lifetime will do no less. Albert Schweitzer wrote:

" 'No ray of sunlight is ever lost, but the green which it wakes needs time to sprout, and it is not always granted to the sower to live to see the harvest. All work that is worth anything is done in faith.'

"Mr. President, I trust you and the members of the Assembly will forgive me for having taken your time with these very personal thoughts. The issues we debate in this hall are many and grave. But I do not think that we are divided in our grief at the passing of this great and gallant human being—who was called the 'First Lady of the World.' "

Resolution of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, March 1963

TRIBUTE ACCORDED MRS. ROOSEVELT

Commission members, after honoring the memory of their late chairman, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, with a minute of silence, approved the following statement:

"We meet together for the first time since the death of our chairman, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. Her clear philosophy and vast wisdom gave the President's Commission on the Status of Women its basic policy and direction. Eleanor Roosevelt's own life exemplified what we are working toward, in some measure, not only for all women but for all people in our democracy. Her words, insights and character have put her indelible stamp on the work of the Commission. We, who became her friends through the privilege of working with her, feel a deep sense of personal loss. It is our hope that the Commission report will capture and reflect the philosophy so richly illustrated in the life of Eleanor Roosevelt—that the potential for a full and useful life exists for all American women."

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to pay tribute to the name of Eleanor Roosevelt, whose passing from this life has been noted with great mourning by a vast army of admirers, all over the world.

Rising to prominence, originally, as the wife of a political leader, Mrs. Roosevelt, in short time, made clear that she was far too talented merely to sit back and adapt herself to the role of "gentle helpmate." Gentle she was, in fact, and certainly a true helpmate to her husband during the tumultuous years in which he served as President—but the deeds of Eleanor Roosevelt went far beyond the narrow confines of wifely assistance.

Indeed, she created a new role for the First Lady of the United States, by not only devoting her time to crusading for charitable purposes—in line with her predecessors—but also, to the astonishment of many, entering with zeal and purpose into hundreds of crusades in behalf of justice and democracy.

So impressive was the work of Mrs. Roosevelt in this regard that the people came to recognize her as an outstanding personality in her own right, irrespective of her husband's accomplishments. And when her husband passed away, Americans were pleased to see Mrs. Roosevelt continue in public life, as an American delegate to the United Nations and as a major adviser to Democratic Party leaders in the State of New York.

In these roles, and in many lesser roles—as adviser, counselor, lecturer, journalist and friend—she won the heart of the Nation and the world. She, therefore, is mourned today by a host of persons to whom her gentle, generous view of life came, in time, to stand as a symbol of American principles. Of her, it has been said: "She would rather light candles than curse the darkness." No truer words were ever spoken.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in expressing my admiration for Eleanor Roosevelt, one of America's truly great women, whose life from beginning to end was one continuous humanitarian adventure.

Although she was born into a family of great wealth and social position and was married to one of the greatest Presidents in our history, Eleanor Roosevelt identified herself not with the glamorous trappings of her background, but rather with the unglamorous lives of plain people, underprivileged people and suffering people. This was her unique achievement which earned for her the love and respect not only of her fellow Americans but of peoples the world over.

As First Lady she refused to permit the formalities of the White House to dominate her life. Rather, she used her position and influence to win support, both political and financial, for worthy causes and urgent projects which she felt would strengthen American society, particularly during the great economic and social upheaval following the great depression.

Her travels, her lectures, her radio talks and her magazine articles were without precedent in American history. She became the President's eyes and ears. Not only did she turn her earnings over to charitable causes, but she gave away large amounts of her personal wealth to finance projects which would provide Americans with useful employment and restore their self-respect.

When Eleanor left the White House she was 60 years old and a widow. Spurning self-pity, she threw herself into humanitarian causes worldwide in scope. As a U.S. delegate to the United Nations she was one of our most effective ambassadors. As chairman of the Commission on Human Rights, she worked tirelessly to obtain universal recognition of the human dignity of all peoples.

Eleanor Roosevelt's lifework will be a lasting monument to the cause of human understanding and world peace. Her life will also be an inspiration to every generation of American women who can pay her no greater tribute than to take up where she left off.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, today has been set aside in the House of Representatives so that Members could have the opportunity to pay tribute to the ideals and life of Eleanor Roosevelt. Since the House was not in session at the time of her death on November 7 of last year, we have the opportunity to do so at this time.

She has been called the "First Lady of the World." That title, I believe, sums up rather well the feelings of people all around the world toward this great lady, who loved them for what they were themselves, not whether or not they represented wealth, power or could do something for her. She was sincerely interested in what happens to people. What their problems are. And what she could do to help. She was criticized in her lifetime, as is everyone who takes a stand and does anything, but I believe that she will live forever in the hearts of the people of this country and those around the world who learned to revere her name because she was a little bit of heaven and goodness which had somehow found its way into their lives.

Mrs. Roosevelt loved all of humanity. It returned her love in abundance. She never felt herself too high to speak to the poorest or lowest of human beings. Human suffering and poverty were diseases which transcended political boundaries, and racial and ethnic barriers. She made more than her own personal contribution to their eradication. She in fact lived a life which typified her beliefs. All of us can learn much from Eleanor Roosevelt. I am proud to salute her, her work, and her memory today.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues today in honoring the memory of Eleanor Roosevelt, a woman who undoubtedly was loved and admired and respected by more people than any woman in history. I think this is true because Eleanor Roosevelt extended herself far beyond the confines of her position as the wife, and later, widow, of a President of the United States.

At the time of her death last November, tributes from persons all over the world poured in, moving, heartfelt, personal tributes. This was not surprising to those of us who had watched this gallant woman as she went out into the world, giving of her warm, human, generous self, trying to encourage where there was often little to encourage.

Wherever Eleanor Roosevelt went, she went as herself—a woman. To her the world was human and she accepted everyone as human beings who shared with her common aspirations and ideals of what "ought to be." She never responded to a distressing human situation in terms of abstractions or dogmas or theories. She responded in human terms. In her presence, people were themselves. There was never any need for front or face.

Over a long period of rich and active years, Eleanor Roosevelt lived her philosophy. To her, the happy life was the useful life. And she chose to be useful to everyone who called on her for a good cause. To leave the world richer for our having lived in it, she would say, was the best criterion for a successful life.

The largeness of Eleanor Roosevelt's vision was not at first appreciated during the early years of the Roosevelt administration. The often intense and bitter feelings in many quarters of our society during this tense crisis period often spilled over onto the President's wife. She became the butt of jokes and stories. But she proved herself capable of rising above the acrimony. She succeeded in doing so because her heart was large enough to understand human frailties and her vision was large enough to prevent her from retreating from public life.

> No human being is all wise—

She asserted—

> no human being always lives up to the best that he is capable of. Failure comes to everyone, except when one does nothing at all, which in itself is a failure. All we can do is to be honest with ourselves, be humble and try, as we gain wisdom, to rectify our mistakes and possibly to avoid some of them.

No one could quarrel with this frankness and this honesty.

Eleanor Roosevelt was tremendously successful in reaching the hearts and minds of people because she ground no ax for any one faction. She represented no one organization, no one group. She was nonpartisan in the largest sense of the word. One always sensed that her heart and her ideals transcended narrow political boundaries. She supported any organization which she felt was working for universal goals—tolerance, respect, and understanding among all groups.

> We talk so often about the differences between people—

She wrote just a few years before her death.

> Yet, in spite of circumstances which create great differences, we have certain great similarities. Rich or poor, we want our children to be well educated. Rich or poor, we want the respect of our neighbors and perhaps their affection. Love and death come to us all, no matter what the circumstances of our lives. In the big things that matter, the similarities are far greater than the differences. If this is true at home, it is true anywhere in the world. People want the same things. The differences are important but often superficial. The basic things are similar.

It was this intuitive feeling of kinship with humanity that marked Eleanor Roosevelt's life of service to others.

What shall we remember most of Eleanor Roosevelt? Shall we think of her as the first First Lady to ever hold a press conference in the White House? Shall we remember her because of her newspaper column "My Day" which ran for 25 years? Shall we remember her for her support of the Palestine partition plan to establish the state of Israel, or for her efforts to win universal acceptance in the United Nations for the Declaration of Human Rights?

Of course, we shall remember her for these things and many more. But I think her lasting claim to immortality rests upon her own self, her personal goodness, her deep loyalty to democratic ideals and her all-out commitment to improving the conditions of human existence.

A woman such as Eleanor Roosevelt is rare in any age. We are immensely proud that she lived in ours.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor and privilege to join my distinguished colleague from New York, Congressman RYAN, in the tribute being paid today to the outstanding woman of the 20th century, known most often as the First Lady of the World, the late Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mrs. Roosevelt, the humanitarian, spent her life aiding the world's underprivileged. She had an abiding interest in all people, their needs, and their conditions of living, from our own citizens to those in remote corners of the earth. Many men who served in our Armed Forces during World War II remember her kind and thoughtful visits to almost forgotten outposts of duty.

A philosopher, Mrs. Roosevelt devoted her life to leaving among people of the world a shining concept of the United States and its role in world affairs.

An author, she found time in her busy day to write some of the most delightful articles to be found in the English language. Those of us who enjoyed her columns now feel a great silence.

A mother of outstanding devotion, she gave us our distinguished colleague from California, Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, who is making a significant contribution to our Nation, here in Congress, in the finest tradition of his father and mother.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt was all these things and more. Her devotion to her country and to her fellow human beings marks her for the ages. We feel the absence of her counsel and guidance and we miss her gentle, loving presence. But her spirit will forever live among us.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, "Men don't make new worlds in an afternoon; brick has to be placed on brick, and the process is long and incredibly painful."

No one recognized this more than the First Lady of the World to whom we in the Congress are paying tribute today—Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Eleanor Roosevelt was much more than a mere abstract idealist. In serving as her husband's helpmate during his years as Governor and President, she saw for herself the human suffering and problems which existed in the country and throughout the world and determined personally to do something about them.

Through her desire to help others she came to know all sorts and conditions of men. No stranger was Eleanor Roosevelt to slum areas, to mines or even to the front lines during World War II.

Prompting her desire to find practical and effective ways to improve the world in which she lived was the innate ability this unselfish, courageous, and compassionate woman seemed to have for putting herself in the place of others.

Says Mrs. Roosevelt in her autobiography published in 1961:

> One curious thing is that I have always seen life personally; that is my interest or sympathy or indignation is aroused by an abstract cause but by the plight of a single person whom I have seen with my own eyes. Out of my response to an individual develops an awareness of a problem to the community, then to the country, and finally to the world.
>
> More and more—

She said—

> people are coming to realize that what affects an individual affects mankind.

It is not strange, therefore, that her later years found her not dealing as frequently with individual needs at home in the United States as with the deprivations of underprivileged people on a larger scale through her work in the United Nations.

> There is such a big, muddled world—

Said Mrs. Roosevelt on her 75th birthday—

> so much that can be done if we increase in depth of understanding, in learning to care, in thinking of hunger not as an abstraction but as one empty stomach, in having a hospitable mind, open like a window to currents of air and to light from all sides.
>
> Our obligation to the world is, primarily, our obligation to our own future. Obviously we cannot develop beyond a certain point unless other nations develop, too.

Mrs. Roosevelt died before her goals and aspirations for all peoples could be realized. We in the Congress, as well as all Americans, have a chance to aid in carrying on her work by placing that "brick on brick" in making a better world in which to live.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, if Congress had been in session on November 7th at the time of Eleanor Roosevelt's death, in the fullness of our hearts we would have eulogized her. We would have spoken then in the depth of loss and a sense of mourning for ourselves for what had been taken away.

But since the calendar of Congress had led us on to other pursuits, it seems to me now that the accident of chronology is letting us speak with a perspective that Eleanor Roosevelt would have far preferred.

Now that time has mellowed the sharp edges of loss, we can see more clearly the gentle and positive legacy she bequeathed us. Her energies were immense, and her activities broad and varied, but what emerges most clearly in looking back over them is her pervasive and unfaltering love and faith in humankind. She left us a last will and testament in that noblest of human documents, the Declaration of Human Rights, which is to the Charter of the United Nations what our Bill of Rights is to the American Constitution. Through this document she has left her imprimatur on the United Nations.

Eleanor Roosevelt would understand our wish to erect marble memorials to her. But what would please her most, and the greatest tribute to her, would be in our carrying on hopefully and constructively where she left off. Let us have her abiding faith. In our wish to take giant strides toward equity for all, let us be willing to follow her lead in taking the small patient steps that opportunity allows. If we do this, history may write in large and golden script the only epitaph she would have wished: "Eleanor Roosevelt, the Architect of Peace."

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the citizens of the State of Connecticut and for myself, I would like to express our heartfelt grief at the loss of our beloved Eleanor Roosevelt. She had been a part of us for a long while.

She endeared herself to us from the first, as a gracious, retiring wife and mother. We will long remember her warm smile. During the long and eventful Presidency of Franklin Roosevelt, we came to respect her for her courage and her constant devotion for our welfare. Then, at his death, we admired her strength and resolution. For these qualities alone, and her long public life, we would note her passing here. We would not grudge her the quiet rest and eternal peace that is the final due, of high and low alike. But for that, we mourn the death of Eleanor Roosevelt for it has taken something of value from us all.

Yet we are not alone the ones who bear the loss of this grand lady. For she was human, and in her own quiet way she bore the quality of greatness. The great amongst us are never quite possessed by those they serve. But, urged by a higher calling, ever search beyond the bounds of present expediencies for a new and better world for all of us. Eleanor Roosevelt was one such person. Though we are sorely in need of such bold and dauntless spirits, we are vaguely uneasy at times lest, in their seeking, they might upset our customary ways. But how else can we progress except through change? Within the broad sweep of their ambitious vision, pioneers sometimes see as accomplished things yet a little beyond our times and their impatience with our common progress is hard for us to understand. But it serves us too that we be not lax in our efforts. And if we are not always able to feel as they or honestly accept all the things they dream, neither can we at times accept those even of our closest loved ones. Eleanor Roosevelt dared to dream, but who could doubt her sincerity? She was more than a dreamer, she was a crusader. For her quality of greatness lay in her boundless love and compassion for humble people everywhere. In her dream for a world full of hope, prosperity, security, and acceptance among all humanity. She felt keenly the desperate plea for understanding and yearning for peace of all peoples. She did not speak many foreign tongues, but they mourn her loss in lands far from our Nation's shores as well as here at home. And good people of every shade of color and belief realized that they had lost a dear friend.

It is often hard and rarely rewarding in worldly ways to try to help the timid people who toil in silence, noted only because of their great numbers or when some signal disaster befalls them. Yet, in trying, who have not felt overwhelmed by the magnitude of the problems with which these dependent souls are beset. Rarely even do they themselves understand them. And so, in the constant press of one's daily cares, the service of those they love, seek not to brave the scoffs of closer friends in the service of such hapless causes. Eleanor Roosevelt was one who did. Who cannot but admire her stout heart that knew no compromise in the noble fight but fought with all her strength and soul for what she felt was right.

The dreams she dreamed perhaps never will be realized in the ways she had hoped. But oh, that we may share that dedication with which she fought so valiantly to bring them to reality. That we may share her courage to fight for the things of which we dream. That we may dare as she had dared, even when we might know as she may have known, the victory may never be ours to see.

Well, she is gone and her voice is stilled. This may bring relief to some, but for those who dare to love the whole human race, who dare to believe in the "Brotherhood of man" as more than a useful phrase, who dare to dream of a bright new world unfettered by the failures or superstitions of the past, they have lost a warrior of stature who will not soon be replaced.

Eleanor Roosevelt is part of us no more, but she has left to us a priceless legacy: A shining example, of courage and devotion; of a lifetime of duty and dedication to the causes she believed in. She gave freely of her life, and as freely at death; for each may share, fully as much as he would profit; limited only by the bounds of his own capacity.

Her name may even be forgotten, but her spirit will live on, for her heart was noble. Mr. Speaker, a brave or noble thought or deed never dies, but lives on. Like the light from a star. Traveling silently through the void. On and on, through all eternity. There for every world to see, in every age. For all who would but look up from their earthy tasks and dare to dream of fairer worlds and finer lives. A noble spirit never dies.

This is what I believe.

Mr. Speaker, I feel truly privileged to be able to join my colleagues here, and on behalf of the sovereign State of Connecticut, and our fair Nation, to honor the memory of a truly great lady, Anna Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join the House in paying tribute to one of the greatest women of our time, Eleanor Roosevelt.

The honors she received were rare and many.

In 1946, Eleanor Roosevelt was given a standing ovation in the U.N. General Assembly for her magnificent work in directing the drafting of the widely heralded Declaration of Human Rights.

This was the first and only time a U.N. delegate received this honor.

Since 1948, when American women were asked which woman they admired most, Eleanor Roosevelt was selected first every year, with her vote often equaling the total for all other women mentioned.

And when this great woman died, President Kennedy ordered all Government installations to fly their flags at half mast—the first time in history that the White House honored a President's widow in this way.

Other honors were bestowed on this beloved "first lady of the world" after her death.

Because of her fine ability as Chairman of the President's Commission on the Status of Women, President Kennedy said:

> It is my judgment that there can be no adequate replacement for Mrs. Roosevelt. I have, therefore, decided not to appoint a new chairman.

The Nation's Chief Executive on November 15, 1962, further manifested the vast respect he had for Mrs. Roosevelt when he named a committee to promote the major interests she devoted her life to.

On October 11, 1963, on the 79th anniversary of her birth, a President's widow will appear on a U.S. stamp for the first time since Martha Washington.

There have been many other honors—and there will be more.

Eleanor Roosevelt was a great woman, a great American and a great Democrat. One of the most versatile women in history, she was a teacher of civics and literature, a lecturer, the author of five books and for 25 years, wrote the column "My Day."

Because of her husband's physical affliction, she became his "eyes and ears" during the most devastating depression and war in history.

She was champion of the underprivileged and oppressed; she was vice chairman of civil defense; she toured the war areas; she was appointed a delegate to the U.N. by Presidents Truman and Kennedy; she was named to a 4-year term on the U.N. Human Rights Commission; she was chairman of the group that framed the charter of human rights to be ratified by member nations; she was selected by the State Department to answer Soviet denunciations of democracy in the United Nations; the Eleanor Roosevelt Institute for Cancer Research was started in Denver; she received an award for promoting achievement in medical research and public health, she helped raise funds to free Cuba prisoners of war; because her devotion to justice was real and strong, she proposed a fifth freedom: "equally before the law, which assures us of justice without prejudice."

"We remember her with love and gratitude. The entire world becomes one family orphaned by her passing," eulogized Rev. Gordon P. Kidd, who expressed the grief and mourning of a Nation and world that will miss her wisdom, love and understanding very much.

What was the secret of Eleanor Roosevelt's greatness?

She often said, "I feel" and not "I think."

This was her secret, her epitaph and her monument.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, Eleanor Roosevelt is dead and yet she lives. Her lips are silent and yet she speaks. Her spirit rests and yet it roams. She belongs to the ages and she dwells in posterity. This knowledge is perhaps the greatest tribute which mankind can render unto Eleanor Roosevelt.

True, future generations will not enjoy the earthly treasures with which the legendary lady was so generously endowed: the simple smile that subdued suspicion; the vibrant voice that bespoke virtue; the earnest eyes that evoked encouragement.

But Mrs. Roosevelt was more than a memorable woman of flesh and blood. She was and always will be a symbol—a symbol of man's yearning for a fuller life in a wiser world, a symbol that in humanitarianism rests the hope of humanity, a symbol that in the end good will triumph over evil.

As Poet John Donne once remarked:

> No man is an island unto himself.

Eleanor Roosevelt knew the wisdom of these words perhaps better than any person in modern history. Rising majestically from the banks of the East River we see today the living monument of that belief.

Eleanor Roosevelt's life was filled with great works but writing the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights—a a declaration of man's hope for tomorrow—was her most notable achievement. She was eminently qualified to write this declaration because it was one by which she lived. And because she clung to these precepts she added life to her years as she added years to her life. The Lord could ask no more of any of His children.

When Mrs. Roosevelt was placed to rest beside her beloved husband, a simple prayer, found in the drawer of her dresser table, was read. It begins:

> Lord, make me an instrument of Thy peace. Where there is hatred let me sow love, where there is doubt let me sow security.

Let this Congress resolve here today to keep this prayer in its heart and in its mind. Let this prayer be reflected in its actions. Let us strive to deliver a living and meaningful eulogy to Eleanor Roosevelt.

In so doing, we can help insure that future generations will walk hand in hand with the spirit of the first First Lady—a spirit of hope, a spirit of faith, and a spirit of charity.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad of this opportunity to join with my colleagues today to pay tribute to a very great lady, a lady whose name will remain in our hearts and memories as a true friend and benefactor of all mankind. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt passed away after devoting her life to work in all the spheres that honor man in order to advance our world to a better understanding of its great social problems.

She was a great champion of human rights and of all that is true and good and noble in human nature and in human relations regardless of race or color or nationality or of poverty or richness. Women, in particular, have reason to be grateful to her for, as no other American woman has done, she epitomized the women who have made the United States a society in which the rights and needs of the young, the weak, the poor, the tired, the aspiring, must be met.

She was not only a worthy companion of a great President of the United States, she was a great human being in her own right. I know that none of us who knew her will ever forget her enthusiasm and devotion to all mankind. And, happily for us all, she could communicate her devotion, her enthusiasm, to others. She saw clearly; she spoke simply. The power of her words came from the depth of her conviction. Knowing her, it is easy to understand why the following was her favorite Bible passage:

> Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.

Eleanor Roosevelt has not left us; she will remain in our hearts forever.

Mr. RYAN of New York. I thank the gentleman for his very eloquent contribution on this occasion.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of New York. I yield.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, each new day does not seem as welcome and promising since the death of this great lady, Eleanor Roosevelt. We no longer have the calm light of kindness, humanity and wisdom which she so generously cast upon the daily human events which rule our lives.

She was patient and understanding toward the youth of our country, and to the youthful nations of the world. A new country, painfully emerging from centuries of poverty and ignorance, could always find a generous friend in Eleanor Roosevelt.

I feel sure, Mr. Speaker, that we will at last have a peaceful and just world, where all of the people live as members of the international community, under law, and free from the ancient terrors of poverty, disease, ignorance and war.

And Mr. Speaker that blessed day will in no small manner be because of the life and works of Eleanor Roosevelt.

A new idea, painfully emerging from the mind of a concerned man or woman, could always find a generous friend in Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, it has indeed been a privilege to be here today and to hear the inspiring speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN of New York. I thank the gentleman for his very fine and inspiring tribute to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join my colleagues in honoring the memory of one of the most outstanding women of our times, Eleanor Roosevelt.

Eleanor Roosevelt was a rare and wonderful person. Her achievements were unique. She was born into a family of wealth and aristocracy and yet she devoted most of her life to serving the poor and the humble. She was married to a President with a towering will and a majestic personality, and yet she succeeded in making herself a person in her own right, and this despite the additional weight of her dominating and possessive mother-in-law. As a young woman she was terribly shy and, as she said, "afraid of everything." Yet she managed to "stare down" her fears to become a confident self-assured woman, universally admired and respected and loved.

One of her great achievements was what she did for Franklin Roosevelt. When he was stricken with infantile paralysis, it was his wife, Eleanor, who stood her ground against her mother-in-law's wishes that Franklin retire to invalidism. Eleanor Roosevelt went to work to bring her husband back into politics, to help bring him to the Governorship of New York and to the White House.

As First Lady she became her husband's eyes and ears. She helped the President enormously by going everywhere to see for herself how the country was responding or not responding to the early recovery measures.

When the President died in 1945, Eleanor Roosevelt went on with ever increasing vigor, looking into the causes of misfortune and misery everywhere in the world. She gave away thousands of dollars she earned from her magazine articles and radio talks. She never refused to see anyone who came to her with a righteous cause.

In 1946 when Mrs. Roosevelt walked through the United Nations General Assembly after the passage of the Declaration of Human Rights which she had labored so to achieve, the entire group of delegates rose and gave her a prolonged ovation. She was greeted on her trips abroad as though she were a head of state. People loved and admired Eleanor Roosevelt because she was a great humanitarian. She was never out for personal glory.

Her ideal was a life of usefulness to others. This she achieved and achieved mightily.

"I honor the human race," she said. "When it faces life head on, it can almost remake itself." Eleanor Roosevelt faced life head on and the human race was improved for her having done so.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, when nobility of thought and action chooses a woman for its vehicle of expression, it rises to the sublime. History is besmirched with the exploits of evil women, a Jezebel, a Helen of Troy, a Madam de Pompadour, a Tokyo Rose. But a good woman involved in public affairs is beyond price.

Mrs. Roosevelt's concern was with people. Let the poets speak for me in admiration of her character and in humble appreciation of her majestic influence on American life.

> All honor to the one that in this hour
> Cries to the world as from a lighted tower
> Cries for the Man Forgotten.
>
> —*Edwin Markham.*

> A servant who made service seem divine.
>
> —*Longfellow.*

> And statesmen at her council met
> Who knew the season when to take
> Occasion by the hand, and make
> The bounds of freedom wider yet.
>
> —*Tennyson.*

> Whene'er a noble deed is wrought,
> Whene'er is spoken a noble thought,
> Our hearts, in glad surprise,
> To higher levels rise.
>
> —*Longfellow.*

And yet when, full of years and grace and dignity, she passed on her burden to others, her most poignant regret was:

> How little I have gained,
> How vast the unattained.
>
> —*Whittier.*

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, although it was not my privilege to have known Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt personally, I was long an ardent admirer of her and her seemingly endless source of energy. The very mention of her name, in some of the remotest corners of the earth, evoked a warm and instant response from those who knew her and her vast capacity for work in behalf of all mankind.

She was a remarkable and unusual woman, wise, gentle, compassionate and understanding, who loved her fellow man and who stood ready at all times to give succor and assistance to those who sought her help, or those whose cause needed a champion.

Her passing left a tremendous void which cannot be filled. She was a legend in her own time, a living symbol of love and compassion to her own generation, and an inspiration to those generations which follow. Eleanor Roosevelt was a great humanitarian, and there is no way of determining just how much good she accomplished in her active and vigorous lifetime. However, as the great lady she was, as the First Lady of the World she was a true representative of these United States, and she has left a legacy of humanitarian ideals which we must continue to carry forward.

I believe it was most fitting that this House just recently approved legislation to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation as a loving tribute to her constant concern for the poor, the oppressed and the underprivileged. Because of her dedication to those less fortunate, I am sure she would approve of our actions to perpetuate her good works and her democratic ideals of human dignity and the rights of man.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is with feelings of deep remorse that we pay our respects today to the memory of Eleanor Roosevelt, a remarkable person who in her lifetime managed to retain a youthful outlook until and including her last moments on earth. In this manner, she succeeded also in retaining her faith in the ultimate perfectability of mankind.

Some 10 years ago Mrs. Roosevelt came to my district, to the town of Sugar Notch, with the object of dedicating a memorial to her late husband. I met her on that occasion and will never forget the impression she conveyed. Everyone present was impressed by the air of basic kindness, sympathy and wisdom, which won for Mrs. Roosevelt the love and admiration of all who came to know her.

Among the social and political leaders of her generation, Eleanor Roosevelt was one of the outstanding figures, beyond question. As the wife of an American President, she was expected to retire to the background, merely because that was the long standing tradition of American "First Ladies." Eleanor Roosevelt had a few longstanding traditions of her own, however, and none of them had anything to do with retirement. As a matter of fact, she is one of those who actually never retired, and so long as she was able to be up and about, she was fully involved in affairs of national significance.

She will be remembered as a public benefactor, as a writer, a world traveler, a lecturer, and diplomat of high order. In the United Nations, wherein for so many years she served as an American delegate, her philosophical contribution to world society is enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in the Covenants on Human Rights and in the many related conventions and declarations which have been adopted by the United Nations during the past two decades.

Her faith in mankind was constantly in evidence in all that she did, much of which concerned the welfare of the poor. As she saw it, many of those engulfed in poverty are capable of high attainment; that all they need to help them rise is the removal of unnecessary stumbling blocks. In this regard, she fought to establish equal economic opportunity, here in the United States and wherever else her influence could make itself known. For this, her fame has spread throughout the world.

Seldom in human history have a husband and wife had so much in the way of a mutual impact upon world affairs. In this case it was the husband, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who led the fight against the economic depression of the 1930's and against Nazi and Fascist tyranny in the 1940's. In the meanwhile, Eleanor Roosevelt assumed leadership of the struggle for human dignity for all, and by so doing, helped set the stage for sweeping social and economic reforms.

The battle for those things in which Eleanor Roosevelt believed is not yet over. Indeed, it may not be won in this century. And yet victory in this area is a certainty. All that we needed was to get the fight started, and awaken the masses of American people to the shocking absence of equality in their own country. This became a major purpose in the life of Eleanor Roosevelt; a purpose she carried out with everything at her command.

Indeed, it was the habit of Eleanor Roosevelt to try at all times to transform the catchwords of democracy from the realm of farflung theory to that of solid reality. The world will miss her much in this regard.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, of all the fine women of America who have made their marks in history, perhaps none was so much a citizen of the world as Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. She was not content to work for the betterment alone of the less fortunate of her own country, her heart reached into the dark corners of this globe to give comfort to the depressed, to ease the pain of the suffering. To those for whom there was no hope, merely to feel the warmth of her smile was the one real joy of their lives.

She was a leader in her own country in the very early days of the fight for social justice and for the God-given and constitutionally guaranteed rights of every citizen regardless of race or religion to enjoy the full privileges of citizenship.

It is beyond our ability to tally the contribution Eleanor Roosevelt made to the betterment of mankind. But for these alone she would not have been revered as she is today, nor would her passing have been cause for such grief throughout the world.

It was the spirit of her giving, that brightened the dark corners, that gave comfort to the unfortunate and courage to the oppressed.

She had compassion and love for her fellow man and this love was returned a hundredfold.

That she shall be remembered and revered, as she is today by the Members of the House, for decades to come is itself a monument to her greatness.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is usual in paying tribute to the memory of one whose achievements have been great and whose loss occasions sadness and regret to recount those achievements. In paying tribute to Mrs. Roosevelt's memory this is unnecessary, since the entire world knows of those achievements, and honors her for them in death as it respected her for them in life.

In her lifetime she became a symbol of warmhearted and effective support for the cause of the underprivileged, the oppressed, and the ignored. When she adopted a cause it was almost as good as won; simply by her espousel of it she lifted the spirits of those whose hope was faltering. She never faltered, she never quit, and she rarely lost.

Some of the courage which came so naturally to her must have found its way into the character of that other fearless Roosevelt, her husband, when he was stricken with polio, faced a future without a career or health, and then went on with her at his side to one of the great American careers.

She was a shining example to the women of America that members of her sex were at last participants who counted in American political life. She was a power to be feared by those who exploited or oppressed their fellow men.

She was one of the great women of our generation, of our century, and perhaps even of our national history. She will be remembered always by those of us who had the privilege of knowing her.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my colleague in paying tribute to the ideals and life of Eleanor Roosevelt.

When we think of Eleanor Roosevelt, we think of a great woman whose heart was filled with loving kindness toward all mankind. In her role as first lady of the State of New York and then in the White House she fulfilled her public duties with eminent capability and graciousness; she was noted for her warmth and hospitality. Her energy was boundless; she devoted herself to many good causes which aroused her interest, and she spared no efforts to help suffering human beings. Her thoughts of others at all times overcame any inconvenience or discomfort to herself—her sacrifices cannot be numbered. She served our Nation with brilliance and excellence in the United Nations; we are in her debt for the many years she devoted to the best interests of the United States and in the cause of peace.

Millions of words have been written extolling Eleanor Roosevelt's many virtues; poets have written beautiful phases in her memory. Rulers and statesmen the world over expressed their bereavement and people of all nations wept and mourned when they learned of her death; when she left our midst, a grievous loss was suffered by all humanity.

I am certain that in the pages of history her name will be recorded as one of the truly great women of the world and in the history of our country it will be written that she was one of our most outstanding citizens of all time.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, from the instant of the first news announcing the death of Eleanor Roosevelt, the world was united in its universal mourning for the passing of the single most memorable woman of our time.

Ambassador Adlai Stevenson has stated that, "Her glow warmed the world," and indeed his words express the feelings of all of us. For millions of people the realization came that a strong and steady light had been extinguished; a light which had become the beacon for social justice throughout every country in the world.

We live in an age which courts the future. We are constantly besieged to look ahead, to foresee conditions 5, 10, 50 years from now, to see life and society as they will be when we are no longer participants. Mrs. Roosevelt lived her life in tribute to the present. She could not abandon the problems of the living to dwell on problems which might be encountered in another generation. Time was precious to her and she did not waste it; and time repaid her, for she lived to see many of the social improvements which she had advocated come into being.

In this country, we like to think of Mrs. Roosevelt as particularly American: intelligent, resourceful, independent, and humanitarian. But in fact she belonged to every nation for her genuine concern for the plight of the underprivileged was felt far beyond our borders.

She made us universally aware of one another and particularly grateful for our abundant blessings here in America.

As the wife of a President of the United States and as a private citizen, she became the symbol of the great good which results from an unselfish life spent in service to others regardless of ethnic, racial or religious backgrounds.

We are in her debt for reminding us of our own individual abilities to serve mankind and one another. While we spend this brief time on earth, let us resolve once again to spend it wisely, productively and with renewed dedication to peace.

The great spirit which influenced so much of our times is embodied in these lines from an old poem:

> Her love was like the liberal air,
>   Embracing all, to cheer and bless;
> And every grief that mortals share;
>   Found pity in her tenderness.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the First Lady of the 20th century, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is a sorrowful occasion, but a prideful one as well. We pay tribute today to a woman lost to us by death, but whose memory will last as long as courage, faith, and dedication to mankind are held in esteem.

As a wife and mother she was a pillar of strength to her husband and children. As First Lady she earned the admiration of the country. As a fighter for causes that benefited the lonely, the poor, the forgotten, and the oppressed, she became the best known and perhaps the world's best loved feminine public figure of our time.

During her years as First Lady she endeared herself to the country through her press conferences, through her trips to the projects initiated by the New Deal, and through her militant concern for the unemployed and the unwanted. It was her example to the women of America that brought them the realization that they were a political force in our national affairs. She was deeply interested in a number of the measures enacted by the New Deal, especially those for slum clearance, relief, and children's projects. She maintained her interests after the death of her husband. Later she was appointed to represent the United States at the U.N. She was elected chairman of the preliminary Commission on Human Rights which again elected her chairman when it was permanently organized in January of 1947. She became the leading force behind the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. From her early to her dying days she was an outspoken opponent of racial discrimination.

One eulogy, it seems to me, gave the key to her impact on the hearts of Americans, and accounts for the warmth of the reception tendered her in CCC camps, in coal mines, soup kitchens, slums, and in the halls of the United Nations and the governments of the world. A taxicab driver told a reporter for the New York Times that he had taken a photograph of Mrs. Roosevelt when she rode in his cab 4 years before her death: "She was a regular woman," he said. "I sent her the picture and she signed it and returned it to me. She also sent a warm letter. She always had time for people."

To honor the memory of this great American the Eleanor Roosevelt Foundation Memorial was granted a charter of incorporation by the House of Representatives on March 18. The charter states that the foundation shall devote itself to continuing certain major interests to which she had dedicated her life, in particular, the relief of the poor and underprivileged, and the promotion of economic welfare and public health. It is appropriate that such a foundation has been created, but Eleanor Roosevelt's true memorial is the love and affection for her in the hearts of men and women throughout the world.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of profound respect that I rise to join with my colleagues in a tribute to the memory of one of the most outstanding women of this century, Mrs.

Eleanor Roosevelt. I do not intend, at this time, to recount the magnificent accomplishments of her long and full life—there is no need to reiterate what is so well known—but I do want to dwell for just a few moments on a basic quality of her character which made those accomplishments possible, if not inevitable.

To my mind, the genius of Mrs. Roosevelt was derived from the fact that she cared. Perhaps in a way not equaled by any other woman of her time, she cared for her fellow man, whether he was a member of her immediate family or an unknown native of a far-away land. To her they were, each and every one, human beings who possessed the dignity of all mankind. She had the deepest care for that dignity and her life was devoted to accord to them the respect to which they were entitled. None was too lowly to merit her attention and her industry.

It has been said that you cannot build a different world with indifferent people. It was because she was eminently not indifferent that Mrs. Roosevelt was able to accomplish so much in bettering the lives of people in almost every quarter of the globe. When travel entailed many more hardships than it does today she covered countless miles by air and rail, disdaining to spare herself in the interest of others. She was a familiar and most beloved figure to our own fighting men at the front, as well as to natives of many lands. Her presence alone gave cheer and promise of hope to all who saw her.

Mrs. Roosevelt firmly believed that the social advances in the United States accomplished through the New Deal during the depression of the 1930's had much to do with the military victory achieved in World War II. The despair of multitudes of people in stricken areas had given place to the hope engendered by those advances. Of all the individuals who assisted our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in making this all possible, none deserves more credit than Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most unforgettable sights I have ever witnessed was on the occasion of the launching of the U.S.S. *Franklin D. Roosevelt* at the Brooklyn Navy Yard a few days after the tragic death of the President. I shall never forget the aura of dignity and grace that surrounded the former First Lady on that day. Her own personal loss was submerged in her anxiety for the successful termination of the war as she often had to merge her private cares with those on a larger scale.

No one who ever met Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt could fail to recognize instantly the breadth of her care for the dignity of mankind which she so truly exemplified.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the wife and widow of the 32d President of the United States died at 6:15 p.m. on November 7, 1962. The time of passing was such that it might well have been obscured by the other diurnal events in the world. The floodwaters of the Cuban crisis had receded only slightly from their high-water mark of tensions as that same night Khrushchev had announced formally, "we have taken our rockets out and they probably are on the way."

That day, too, was one of reaction to the national election, a readjustment in the body politic. The Democrats had scored a remarkable midterm election success, opined the New York Times. In India, a not-so-passive caucus cheered at Nehru's announcement that Mr. Menon had "resigned."

Thus, the passing of an ex-President's wife might have been lost in the shifting sands of the world, but for the fact that she was an international figure in her own right—a noted humanitarian, symbol of woman's new role, author and columnist, delegate to the United Nations General Assembly and chairman of the Commission on Human Rights, and an active force in political life. "In the death of Eleanor Roosevelt," said the Reverend Dr. Gordon L. Kidd, "the world has suffered an irreparable loss. The entire world becomes one family orphaned by her passing."

And so it is. For the woman who lived by the inspiration of the prayer of St. Francis of Assisi and who observed: "One must never, for whatever reason, turn his back on life," will be remembered not so much for the early controversies stirred by her ceaseless activity and energy but by her warmth, sincerity, zeal, patience, and intellect. To these qualities our present United Nations Ambassador addressed himself when he said:

> Like so many others, I have lost more than a beloved friend. I have lost an inspiration. She would rather light a candle than curse the darkness, and her glow warmed the world.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely happy to join with my fellow Members of the House in tribute to the memory of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt—truly "The First Lady of the World."

Millions of people the world over mourned her passing last November—for her life touched the lives and earned the lasting affection of people everywhere.

As the years go on, Mrs. Roosevelt will continue to gain in respect and esteem for the great causes she supported, and the great missions she pursued.

She was the friend of the oppressed, the champion of the victims of tyranny, and discrimination around the world. Her memory will forever stand for the power of the human spirit over the destruction of war and the poverty of economic distress.

A truly noble person, embodying many of the fine qualities of what we might term the "New Woman" of the 20th century. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt has bequeathed to us a boundless faith in the perfectability of man and the worth of each and every human being, regardless of that person's condition or circumstance, his race, religion or color.

As President Kennedy expressed it, our grief at the death of this extraordinary woman will be "tempered by the knowledge that her memory and spirit will long endure among those who labor for great causes around the world."

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself and the people of my district with the general sentiment here declared today, and to express the deepest condolences on the tragic loss of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

And yet, although we mourn her departure from this earth, that is not the only sad occurrence to darken the occasion, for her death marks the culmination of her dedicated labors, and therein lies another disaster for mankind.

It will now be necessary for some new champion to come forward in behalf of the poor and the politically weak and the socially downtrodden. By this, I do not mean merely some part-time champion; a good hearted, public-spirited citizen, willing to devote some of his time to alleviating the suffering of those in need. On the contrary, I mean someone like Eleanor Roosevelt, who regarded as a national catastrophe the condition of the poor and the depressed and the persecuted, and who never rested in her battle in their behalf.

This was a role that was necessary for someone to play, as a prelude to much of the social legislation that has come about in the period following World War II. For many years, millions and millions of persons of means in this country spent considerable time in cultivating the knack for looking the other way whenever the poor people and the persecuted passed by.

In this manner, they were able to avoid the pangs of conscience that would have driven them to action in behalf of those less fortunate than themselves.

What Eleanor Roosevelt did was to sound the battle cry in behalf of the American conscience, with the result that the Nation responded, to an astonishing degree.

I shall never forget the scene and some of the events surrounding the arrival of Mrs. Roosevelt at Medford, Oreg., some years ago. The occasion was the gathering of a group of persons who meet annually at Medford to honor the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt. On this particular day, Mrs. Roosevelt appeared, with the object of delivering an address. Notwithstanding the fact that it was her late husband whom all were there to honor, it was nonetheless clear, by the way the audience responded in terms of friendship and affection, that Eleanor Roosevelt was also the object of love and admiration in the eyes of everyone on hand.

In paying our last respects to this great lady, we can only hope that there will appear, in the near future, others of her caliber, to aid in the work that she began. To do any more than hope, in this regard, would be presumptuous, indeed.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join today in this great tribute being paid to the memory of Eleanor Roosevelt, whose passing last November was mourned not only in her own State of New York but throughout the world.

Mrs. Roosevelt was a most amazing and remarkable woman, with not one but many different careers of service—social worker, mother, nurse, teacher, adviser, and special confidant of the President of the United States, political party worker, lecturer, diplomat, political reformer, author, columnist, and friend.

No one has ever surpassed her in the breadth and intensity of her interests. Deeply involved in some of the most significant issues and movements of her day, she nevertheless always had time for plain, simple, friendly, and gracious acts, and she was willing, almost until the day of her death, to put herself out to be of service to the humblest individual.

When her husband was President of the United States, Eleanor Roosevelt exerted a profound influence on the shape of his administration. In many ways she served to keep the New Deal true to its basic humanitarian purposes; she was a constant force for good in a steadily growing Federal bureaucratic establishment.

When war broke out Mrs. Roosevelt saw to it that the top planners did not overlook some of the human problems that this vast undertaking of ours was bound to create. And as her husband's personal emissary to the far-flung battle fronts she not only brought back invaluable personal estimates of the progress of our operations, but she in a very real sense represented home and mother to the hundreds of thousands of troops she met in forward combat areas. I know from my own experience the impact of her visit to the South Pacific theater in 1943, for example.

With the end of the war and the death of her husband, Mrs. Roosevelt continued to assume an active and an independent career. She was one of the most eloquent and effective spokesmen for the whole concept of international cooperation embodied in the United Nations. And let us not forget either that she proved herself long ago to be one of the sharpest and most articulate critics of the kind of sabotage of genuine international cooperation which the Soviet Union has been conducting both within and outside of the United Nations. The Soviets never fooled her in the United Nations.

But perhaps most significant of all was the leadership which she gave in my own State of New York some 4 years ago to a new movement designed to revitalize her own Democratic Party, to make it more directly responsive to its traditional goals and objectives as the party of the people, and more directly representative of the views and wishes of the rank and file men and women who make it up.

In a way the success of that movement which Eleanor Roosevelt, together with Senator Herbert Lehman, headed is typical of her whole life. It was easy to brush Eleanor Roosevelt off. It was easy to make light of her efforts. Many in fact did, attacking her with even more virulence than was directed against her husband. But in spite of all their attacks, in spite of all the condescension, she got the results she went after, as those who opposed her discovered to their sorrow. Political leaders who had been regarded as invulnerable fell before the movement which this kindly, considerate, soft-spoken lady directed.

And over the years she has remained, not only First Lady of the World, but the woman most girls have respected, admired, and hoped to emulate.

Mr. Speaker, as one who had the privilege briefly to know Mrs. Roosevelt and to observe her service over a much longer period of years, I am proud to be able to share in this tribute today. I know that my State of New York, the United States of America, and indeed the whole world are better today because Eleanor Roosevelt has lived and worked among us for a little while.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Francis Bacon took all knowledge for his sphere. The great and gracious lady whom we honor today—Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt—took all humanity for her concern. When death took her great husband, and her career of exemplary and inspiring wife ended, she stepped out alone upon the stage of the world to fight man's inhumanity to man. Whatever cause was good and just, whatever was right, whatever would help mankind to walk on higher ground, was her personal cause for which she fought with unrelenting zeal and unfaltering faith and courage. Whatever degraded the dignity of man, whatever held people anywhere down or back, whatever threatened the peace and therefore the lives and the happiness of humanity, against these she fought with an unquenchable fervor and fire. She literally spent her precious life for others. So when she finally came to the end of what had appeared to be her illimitable strength and lay down for her long delayed rest the whole world mourned. Every man, woman and child who lived and those to come to birth in the ages not yet arrived had lost a friend. The glory of her life shall ever glow in the memory of her deeds and throughout the long span and reach of time all who love their God and their fellow man shall call her name blessed.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply moved by the touching tributes to my dear mother, and I find it quite difficult to portray my true feelings. No amount of words could really convey my sincere appreciation and heartfelt thanks for what has today been said on this floor. By honoring her, Mr. RYAN of New York and my colleagues have really honored the principles by which she lived and for which she fought throughout her life. Her upholding of human dignity and its advancement was a major preoccupation of her life. If she were here today, it would please her immensely, I am certain, to know of the high esteem by which her life's work was regarded.

I shall always remember and cherish this memorable day, and would like to once again express my gratitude, and that of my sister and brothers, to all of my colleagues for their poignant remarks.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of the late Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

WHAT IS THE NEXT MANEUVER ON A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, at the present time there are 27 resolutions before the Rules Committee calling for the creation of a necessary Special Committee on the Captive Nations. There will be many others soon, proposing this desperately needed action. Despite this substantial number of resolutions, the Rules Committee has as yet not even considered one of these. My own resolution, House Resolution 14, was submitted early in January. In the light of our experience in the 87th Congress, we raise now the question: "What is the next maneuver on a Special Committee on the Captive Nations?"

FOUR MANEUVERS IN THE 87TH

As we press on with the backing of popular demand for such a committee, I believe it is necessary to state for the record the four maneuvers that were staged in the last Congress to delay action on this legislation. They were as follows:

First. In May 1961, after it appeared that the Rules Committee would take positive action on this measure, two members of the Foreign Affairs Committee requested further hearings on the issue. The chairman of Rules graciously satisfied this belated request, but, as it turned out, the two members failed to appear and time was squandered;

Second. In July 1961, soon after the third Captive Nations Week observance across the Nation, a motion was made in Rules to table the resolutions, but this maneuver was defeated by the farseeing members of the Rules Committee;

Third. In August 1961, the chairman of Rules was requested to seek the personal testimony of a representative from the Department of State on the subject; instead, the now-famous Rusk letter was sent and the need for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations was officially substantiated more than ever before;

Fourth. Beginning, in January 1962 but not getting off the ground until June, the subcommittee on Europe in the Committee on Foreign Affairs suddenly decided to spare some time on the captive nations and proceeded to conduct haphazard hearings on this vital subject. As in the case of the Rusk letters, these hearings have given us further solid proof of the necessity for a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

THE EVIDENCE OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS FOR A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. Speaker, as many of the proponents for a special committee had anticipated and warned, the hearings conducted by a subcommittee of a subcommittee in Foreign Affairs have actually clinched our case for a Special Com-

mittee on the Captive Nations. First, to have assigned this basic issue of the captive nations to a subcommittee of a subcommittee unfortunately demonstrated the little value some of us attach to this vital subject. What a sharp and regrettable contrast this ill-chosen action represented to that taken by the Members of the 86th Congress when they passed the Captive Nations Week Resolution and rocked Moscow to its foundation. Surely the value and dignity of the subject deserve vastly more than what a sub-subcommittee can accord.

Second, the incongruity of a subcommittee in a subcommittee on Europe dealing with the captive nations problem, which extends from Central Europe to the Far East and includes major portions of the U.S.S.R. itself, was obvious and startling to all conversant with the subject. The sub-subcommittee barely scratched the surface of the subject and actually distorted the whole real conception of the captive nations as spelled out in Public Law 86–90. In fact, judging by the hearings, one cannot but wonder whether some of the sub-subcommittee members are even familiar with the progressive contents of this law.

Third, the results of this fourth maneuver clearly show that the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not equipped by reason of its already heavy burdens to do the job that the special committee resolutions envisage. An objective analysis of last year's hearings establishes beyond any doubt that the hearings were conducted in a helter-skelter fashion. They were haphazard, and grossly unbalanced. It is quite ironical to note the bibliography attached to the sub-subcommittee's report. It was borrowed from the solid results of the previous special committees which this Chamber had created—the Katyn Massacre Committee and the Kersten Committee. A comparison of their hard work and methodic labors with what was attempted last year stands as a contrast between day and night.

Mr. Speaker, for an incisive, objective and quite restrained analysis of the sub-subcommittee's hearings and report, I urge every Member to read the article; "How Not To Treat the Captive Nations." Written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, a professor of Georgetown University, the article appears in the winter issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly, an authoritative journal on captive nations problems. I request that this article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

I should, however, like to quote here the conclusion of this article. It states:

> Against the solid contributions of preceding Congresses that made possible the Katyn massacre inquiry, the Kersten investigation, and Public Law 86–90, the sub-subcommittee products of the 87th Congress are well-nigh disgraceful. They confirm all the arguments on time, experience, specialized knowledge, and critical thought that have been advanced by the supporters of a special committee. The 88th Congress has an opportunity to eradicate this blot on America's growing understanding of the captive nations by creating the special committee.

Mr. Speaker, we do indeed have this opportunity. Each of the maneuvers to sidetrack the creation of a special committee has failed. The Rusk letters have indicated the need for this committee, which would immensely benefit those under the illusion that some captive nations in the U.S.S.R. are traditional parts of the Soviet Russian colonial system. The sub-subcommittee hearings also justify the creation of a special committee, which would also benefit our colleagues in foreign affairs. As has been pointed out time and time again, the well-planned work of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations would be of tremendous benefit to our people and those in the free world by concentrating on the reality of the far-flung Soviet Russian imperio-colonial system. Among other things, the facts and truths that have yet to be systematically uncovered by such a committee will have greater impact on the still free peoples of Latin America and elsewhere than just economic attractions.

As the elected representatives of our people, it is our responsibility to see that this opportunity to explore methodically and critically the whole domain of Soviet Russian imperiocolonialism is fully realized. We cannot in any circumstances allow this basic subject to remain hidden from public view. It is too crucial to our national security, to our eventual victory in the cold war, and to the preservation of peace among the major powers. I, therefore, urge that, as quickly as possible, the Rules Committee consider House Resolution 14, which I also request be printed as part of my remarks here today, and the other resolutions proposing the establishment of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

With the fifth Captive Nations Week approaching this July 14–20, the creation of a special committee would reemphasize Congress' leadership on a subject fundamental to our national interest. We have nothing to fear by probing into the full facts and truths about Moscow's imperio-colonial system, both within and outside the U.S.S.R.; only Khrushchev and his puppets have this to fear. I hope we have finished with maneuvers on this issue and are ready to seize this opportunity for congressional leadership.

Following is the text of House Resolution 14 and the aforementioned article by Dr. Dobriansky:

RESOLUTION

Whereas on the issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas two Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian Empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U–2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "noninterference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the four Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

Sec. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

How Not To Treat the Captive Nations

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

In January 1962, a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives suddenly announced its intention to conduct hearings on the captive nations. To casual observers this announcement appeared as a self-motivated step of serious inquiry into the captive world. For those close to the subject, however, it basically represented a maneuver designed to deflect attention from the popular movement in this country for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. In fact, it was freely predicted at the time that the hearings held by the subcommittee on Europe would provide further substantial evidence justifying the need for a special committee.

Such evidence is contained in the two publications released by the Foreign Affairs Committee toward the end of the year. Both the hearings and the report on hearings readily fulfill the prediction that was made. Today, they constitute an additional, formidable reason for the necessary formation of a special committee.

Needless to say, it is somewhat of an unpleasant task to criticize the efforts of several friends who led the hearings. But this burden is lessened enormously by one's good faith in their undoubted desire to view this extremely important subject objectively and constructively. Such a view can only be well beyond the insular confines of jurisdictional prerogative and with selfless concern for the national security of our country. On the basis of the hearings held last year, this compact analysis aims to show in as objective a manner as possible the reasons why a special committee is needed now more than ever before.

Before we briefly consider the background to these hearings, from the very start it would do well for us to bear in mind certain guiding facts and perspectives. The first fact is that the hearings consumed in time parts of only 10 days over a period of 3 months. They were held spottily in June, July, and September, giving every indication of a dearth of testimonies and haphazard organization. Second, over 15 percent of the testimonies given upheld the thesis of a special committee on the captive nations, which wasn't within the purview of the hearings anyway. When one adds to this the approximately 15 percent devoted in the hearings brochure to the operations of the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, the coverage of the captive nations, as envisioned by the proponents of a special committee, becomes slim and superficial indeed. The short time invested, the misappropriation of this time, and a heavy dose of duplication in output, albeit in an artificially restricted area of inquiry, all this and more add up to a rather sorry performance on the captive nations.

Without question, there is some solid and instructive material in several of the recorded testimonies. This will be pointed out in the course of this analysis. Nevertheless, much of it is lost in the poor organization of the hearings; and for purposes of popular reading by the average citizen it can have little constructive effect. Moreover, it is evident that the majority of the private witnesses were quite unaware of the causes and reasons that led to staging the hearings in the first place. What on the whole has been produced strongly substantiates the many arguments advanced by the supporters of a special committee, many of whom had anticipated the maneuver in the late summer of 1961. Regrettable as it may seem, to their arguments one can now add the further point that an established special committee would undoubtedly prove to be of tremendous educational benefit even to some members of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

BACKGROUND TO THE HEARINGS

Essentially, the staging of these hearings has no significant meaning other than in terms of the whole background carved by the fight for a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. To put it bluntly and accurately, if there had been no such educational campaign for a special committee, there certainly would not have been any hearings on the captive nations at this time and the manner in which they were conducted. Both in relation to the subject here and with regard to the continuing fight for such a committee, it is very important to know at least the bare outlines of this background.

Action for a special committee was initiated by Congressman Daniel J. Flood of Pennsylvania as early as August 1960. House Resolution 626, calling for the establishment of a House Committee on Captive Nations, was introduced at that time by its original sponsor chiefly for the purpose of sounding out public interest in the measure.[1] Congress was just about closing out its bobtail session; so there wasn't even the slightest possibility of realizing this measure then. On the other hand, the practical aim of obtaining a public consensus was fulfilled beyond expectations. In 1961, at the beginning of the 87th Congress, Congressman Flood reintroduced the measure as House Resolution 211, and a whole succession of colorful events was begun.[2]

It is not our purpose here to recount in detail the revealing developments that ensued. Once a special committee is established, the full story of this background will be in order. Only those facts that have a bearing on the foreign affairs hearings concern us here. And these facts are as follows: One, after public interest expressed itself intensely on the resolution, the House Rules Committee held hearings on it in May 1961, and was about to take positive action. However, both the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the chairlady of the Subcommittee on Europe requested for an opportunity to appear before Rules. The request was granted, but the opportunity was not seized, and the stall and delaying tactics were on.

Supporters of a special committee, such as Congressmen Derwinski, Stratton and so forth, were well aware of the sources of opposition to the resolution. One of these has been, of course, the Foreign Affairs Committee, which regards the resolution as an encroachment upon its jurisdiction. The other source is the Department of State. Its fears of public evidence, showing not only the defects of our foreign policies but also, and more fundamental, the limitations of knowledge and understanding of some of our officials with regard to the Soviet Union, have been generally appreciated. Thus, it was no surprise that a second maneuver was engineered to table the special committee resolutions in the Rules Committee. In the summer of 1961, such an attempt was made. It was voted down.

As shown in an editorial written by the author, two more maneuvers were to be encountered.[3] Actually forming the third and fourth maneuvers respectively, the first was the involvement of the State Department; the second was the trumped-up hearings in Foreign Affairs. We need only be brief about the former.

After the tabling motion was defeated in Rules, steady public pressure caused the opposition to a special committee to invoke the opinion of the State Department on the issue, as though its opinion was not known. When the matter was brought up in Rules in August 1961, some members demanded that the Department send its representative to appear in person before the committee. This idea was carried, but the Department chose to send a letter signed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk. This was the first of the two now famous Rusk letters which immensely confirmed the position of the special committee advocates.[4] Now State proved the need for a special committee with its two astonishing, blunderous letters.[5]

Following the backfiring results of the third maneuver, it was quite evident to all involved in this fight that a congressional whitewash would be the next step. Proponents of a special committee began to anticipate the hearings in foreign affairs with arguments such as these: (1) Foreign Affairs is ill equipped by reasons of time, preoccupation and composition to undertake satisfactorily the tasks underscored by House Resolution 211 and three dozen other resolutions; (2) the captive nations subject requires a broader and more independent base of inquiry than Foreign Affairs can provide, even in the area of informed personnel (there are many Members who are not on Foreign Affairs and, on the basis of experience and proven interest, have greater competence in this specialized field than do many Members in Foreign Affairs); and (3) because of these

and other reasons, we can expect little in this most vital subject from this standing committee.[6]

With a knowledge of this background, anyone reading carefully the Hearings of Foreign Affairs and also its Report on Hearings—which significantly was issued on October 29, 1962, about a week prior to the congressional elections—cannot but be impressed by these arguments. Both documents support them thoroughly. Time and time again, even for these acutely limited hearings, members are recorded having to excuse themselves because of other commitments. In helter-skelter fashion, many witnesses appeared without prepared statements, indicating the unbalanced proceedings that scarcely measure up to the sterling results of such previous select committees as the Katyn Massacre and the Kersten one. The contrasts are sharp and conclusive. Moreover, as one would expect, the questioning is slipshod, as though Public Law 480 and a couple of quick solutions to the captive nations problem were of conclusive concern; and the type of questions asked shows that some previous knowledge is necessary for an effective treatment of the subject. In short, just like the State Department, the Foreign Affairs Committee has now openly confirmed the position of the special committee advocates.

WHAT VALUE CAPTIVE NATIONS?

Looking at this record of events, the average American interested in the security of his country might well ask himself, "In the eyes of some of our officials, of what value are the captive nations in the cold war?" This record indicates that their views and behavior attach little and light value to what is indeed our most powerful nonmilitary weapon. The two documents of the Foreign Affairs Committee are now a part of this record. And it is for this additional reason that Congressman Flood has reintroduced again his measure to establish a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. His House Resolution 14 has of the time of this writing been joined by 21 other resolutions.

The first obvious underestimation of the value of captive nations to the interests of our country is the relegation of the subject to a subcommittee of the subcommittee of Europe in the Foreign Affairs Committee. The setup of the hearings has all the markings of a cellar investigation. I doubt that legislatively we could descend any lower than this. Apart from considerations of real self-interest, what a sad reflection this is on the idealism of our Nation—indeed, on the 87th Congress which followed the one responsible for the world eye-opening Captive Nations Week resolution. For space, atoms, small business, export-import controls, and a host of other limited material interests, we hardly hesitate to establish special committees; for a billion people in captivity we seem to be satisfied with the meanderings of a sub-subcommittee that in the course of it all appears to be confused about its own status.

In addition to the low value assigned to the captive nations subject, another major criticism is the treatment of this aggregate subject by a group concerned solely with Europe, and at that only part of it. One of the chief arguments for a special committee has been the need for Americans to see the family of captive nations as a whole, in its total aggregate form. This has been one of the most profitable lessons learned from the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution. It is this fact of including all the captive nations in one operational concept that frightened Khrushchev in July 1959. But this lesson and this fact apparently have failed to rub off on some. The subcommittee of Europe shows no understanding of this all-important innovation and, with due unproductive report, has pursued the archaic channels of dealing with a minority of captive nations in central Europe. Little wonder that its work, such as it is, has stimulated almost no interest either here or abroad.

THE SUB-SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

With these general facts in mind, let's take a close, running account of the hearings. Confusion prevails not only with reference to the graded value of the subject and concepts, not to speak of perspectives, but also in relation to the body's own status, the sequence of testimonies, the objectives of the hearings and a number of other items deserving of our attention here. On the matter of the sub-subcommittee's status, in one place it is asserted "that within the Foreign Affairs Committee we have established this permanent Subcommittee for the Captive Nations,"[7] while in another place the assigned chairman of the sub-subcommittee states, "Mrs. Kelly is chairman of the European Subcommittee, and it is more of convenience, than anything else, that I am in this chair."[8] By now the reader must be asking himself, "Who's who, what, and where?" Well, after being told about an already established "permanent subcommittee," in the report we find a recommendation for "the establishment of a special subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs."[9] This may appear as progress in an ascent from cellar investigation, but with all this confusion, don't bank on it.

As to the objectives of the hearings, the reader doesn't meet up with a concrete definition of them until after having read over half of the hearings. Then he is told that the objectives are to determine what our relations are with the captive countries, what the conditions are in those countries, and what our policy should be in relation to them.[10] Up to this point explanations vary from looking "into the present situation of the so-called captive nations of Europe" to "assuming to study the whole subject of the captive nations" to having the hearings "because so many Members had introduced resolutions on the captive nations." Really, if the sub-subcommittee members had bothered to read the resolutions for a special committee, they would have had a partial steering wheel from the start. The objectives of a special committee would be primarily informative and educational, but with legislative intent and in strict accord with the principles and judgments set forth in the Captive Nations Week resolution. The whole subject of the captive nations would be treated as it should be.

Concerning the testimonies themselves, it is obviously not our purpose here to evaluate their content and worth. But they should be considered in terms of the strictures applied to the sub-subcommittee proceedings. Indeed, there are many strange statements in them that were passed by uncritically. The first oddity confronting the critical reader is the illogical sequence of the testimonies. The published hearings start with witnesses from the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, operational media dealing with some captive nations. Sound methodology dictates that you first establish what is and then you proceed to what is being done about it, but the Celler investigation had to proceed rapidly and seized upon anyone willing to testify in these hastily contrived circumstances. Even along the line of these ill-planned hearings we find the chairman appealing to a supporter of a special committee, "If you do have any suggestions or witnesses we would be glad to have you get in touch with Mr. Schupp."[11] What a situation in contrast to the experiences of past select committees. Instead of a dearth of witnesses, special committee supporters can guarantee an overflow of witnesses—and this is no idle statement.

As pointed out earlier, the repetitive material would be enough to discourage an avid American reader—Poland, Public Law 480, sale of agricultural surplus, quick "workable solutions" and the like. The Loomis testimony on VOA operations covers much ground already cultivated in the 1958 hearings on the agency before another Foreign Affairs subcommittee.[12] Another VOA spokesman has this overall contribution to make, without any informed contest or challenge: "the interest of the average Soviet citizen as to the American way of life is insatiable. They are less interested in our form of government and democratic institutions."[13] The ignorance of this statement is accepted wholesale, but this is understandable when throughout the hearings many of the questioners are under the illusion that the U.S.S.R. is Russia. In the Radio Free Europe testimony which has many good points, one also finds some askewed conceptions, such as the identity of the captive nations concept with "the satellites" and Yugoslavia being a nation. Here, too, no informed, critical questioning, which in this task is just as vitally important as hearing, if not more so.

The acute limitations from the questioning side are clearly shown in the responses to the testimonies upholding the need for a special committee. To cite a few among numerous examples, let's consider first the Bruce testimony. Congressman Bruce mentions the Kersten reports: the chairman, showing a complete unfamiliarity with some 27 reports, asks, "What year was that report made?"[14] Another sub-subcommittee member asks, "I wonder if you have any ideas as to how a responsible Government such as ours, dedicated to noninterference in the affairs of other nations, could go about the business of doing what our opponents are doing in constant world revolution."[15] The premise in this statement is strange American doctrine. We know that imperial Moscow has used it for centuries to preserve its empire against intervening forces of freedom, but this writer has been unaware that we are so dedicated. Logically, if we are, then why these hearings, why continue to recognize the free Baltic legations; in short, why do many other things in relation to the captive nations, which by definition spell interference for freedom? Many other curious preconceptions tinge the questions of this particular member who, in the hearings, is constantly seeking a quick workable solution.[16] What an approach for the complex captive nations problem.

An excellent insight into the special committee issue can be obtained from reading the testimony of the Honorable William W. Scranton, now Governor of Pennsylvania. His arguments for a special committee are nowhere met by the sub-subcommittee. With past State Department experience, Mr. Scranton knows whereof he speaks. As concerns the captive nations, he emphasizes that the Department is "automatically inhibited" because "their work is with the so-called constitutional governments of those captive nations."[17] Apparently for the edification of the sub-subcommittee members who think the only European captive nations are in the so-called satellite area, Scranton points out his experience with Khrushchev at Camp David in connection with the Captive Nations Week resolution: "I think anybody who was connected with this visit in any way will tell you that this particular resolution made more of an impression on Chairman Khrushchev and he invected against it at greater rate almost daily while he was here than any other single thing that America was doing in the cold war."[18] Oddly enough, as shown in the hard-hitting Feighan statement and other testimonies, the meaning and significance of this resolution has made little impression on some of the sub-subcommittee members.

---

[1] Flood, Daniel J., "Freedom," Congressional Record, vol. 106, pt. 13, pp. 17674–17694.

[2] Flood, Daniel J., "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," Congressional Record, vol. 107, pt. 3, pp. 3518–3544.

[3] Editorial written by L. E. Dobriansky, "The Rusk Letters," The Ukrainian Quarterly, winter, 1961, pp. 293–300.

[4] Derwinski, Edward J., "The Rusk Letters," Congressional Record, vol. 108, pt. 7, pp. 9553–9555.

[5] "State Proves the Necessity of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations," Congressional Record, vol. 108, pt. 3, pp. 3583–3585.

[6] "Why A Special Congressional Committee on Captive Nations?", Congressional Record, vol. 108, pt. 7, pp. 9617–9619; "Spotlight on Moscow's Imperio-Colonialism," ibid, vol. 108, pt. 3, pp. 3655–3578.

[7] Hearings, p. 197.

[8] Ibid., p. 308

[9] Report on hearings, p. 17.

[10] Hearings, p. 219.

[11] Ibid., p. 164.

[12] See Review of U.S. Information Agency Operations, hearings, Washington, 1959, p. 206.

[13] Hearings, p. 23.

[14] Ibid., p. 164.

[15] Ibid., p. 167.

[16] E.g., ibid., p. 170.

Several of the private testimonies are exceptionally good. It is a pity, however, that their potential impact was lost in this cellar investigation. The testimonies of Aleksander Kutt, Brutus Coste, Stanislaw Mikolaczyk and Dr. Jan Karski are of high quality and certainly deserving of a more serious use. On the questioning end we find the usual superficial queries about what specifically and hastily "could be done,"[19] about "not going to war to do it,"[20] about there being "nothing in the form of overt action that we could do,"[21] and about not winning "a physical victory over communism * * * because of nuclear warfare"[22]—these and many more queries that suggest a lack of perspective and understanding on the whole problem of the cold war. If there is a single argument that alone justifies a special committee, it is the one stressing a concentration on what is in the captive nations, not what the quickie solutions might be.

The State Department statement, submitted by Mr. William R. Tyler, is hardly illuminating. It is a typical statement of well-worded vagaries and some exaggeration. For example, with reference to the fundamental subject of Soviet Russian colonialism, Mr. Tyler tells the sub-subcommittee: "I do believe that sometimes people are unaware of the extent to which the United States has made an effort in the United Nations and elsewhere to publicize and draw attention to this."[23] Unless he's talking about subjective intentions, in the past 10 years there have been only two or three overt actions by us in this respect. Under informed questioning, Mr. Tyler would be hard put to prove his groundless statement.

Some parts of these hearings make for comical reading. For example, one of the sub-subcommittees holds that by relegating the vital captive nations subject to a cellar investigation, he has attached "a dignity" to the "Committee on European Affairs."[24] In inverse ratio, what an indignity to the subject. Here are some more examples of sub-subcommittee comedy: "A select committee, the first thing they are going to have to talk about is foreign policy" (what self-indicting fear); "the State Department and this committee constantly are studying methods whereby they can hope to penetrate the Iron Curtain." (Who's kidding whom?) "The first thing you have to face up to is, What are you going to do about these countries." (No, the first thing is enlightened knowledge); "if we work specifically to free the nations of Europe * * * we are interfering with the internal workings of those countries" (Moscow's favorite argument again). One can go on and on with these comedy errors. The biggest, perhaps, is the note of illusory self-satisfaction expressed by the chairman: "We have compiled a rather substantial record."[25]

THE REPORT ON HEARINGS

Turning finally to the report, the logical judgment that a weak edifice can never support a strong roof applies here thoroughly. As one should expect, the report is studded with contradictions, inaccuracies, misleading statements, and evidences of deficient perspective. These overbalance heavily some of its good points. Here, too, there is little cause for wonder when you know how all this came about and how it was conducted.

For a crass inaccuracy and also a contradiction, the reader is immediately struck by the map entitled "Captive Nations of Eastern Europe." An archaic historical note is given, "Boundaries as of January 1938." Now, are we talking about nations or changing States and imposed boundaries? With typical confusion, the two are combined here. However, if they mean what the caption says, then simple geography tells us that Eastern Europe does not end on the eastern borders of Poland and Rumania. Moreover, if the sub-subcommittee had ever read Public Law 86-90, they would have learned that far more populous and even more important captive nations exist in the U.S.S.R. What little hope the peoples of these nations could expect from some of our legislators who presume to spell out U.S. foreign policy.

As for further contradictions, it is interesting to note that in the foreword a sentence was inserted to absolve the sub-subcommittee of any arbitrary delimitation of the captive nations to the group that was studied—"due to practical limitations of jurisdiction and time"[26] (in itself a noteworthy confession for a body "assuming to study the whole subject of the captive nations").[27] Now, a report is certainly not written before the hearings, and a foreword is usually not written before the body of a report. Thus, it appears that since both the hearings and the body of the report contradict outright this single sentence, someone had an afterthought following a review of the sharply critical Scranton and Feighan statements. In short, the sentence cannot be used as a saving excuse for the malperformed hearings. Taking the sentence at its own face value, one may well ask, "Since when is the European sector of the U.S.S.R. not a part of Europe, and therefore not within the jurisdiction of a committee dealing with European affairs?"

This foreword sentence is also contradicted by many historically misleading statements in the body of the report. For instance, it is stated that one of the objectives of the hearings was "To expose to the rest of the world that the Soviet Union has ruthlessly welded these captive nations into the Soviet colonial empire."[28] Are the captive nations of Armenia, Georgia, Ukraine and others which are part of the U.S.S.R. responsible for this? As Public Law 86–90 points out, it is Soviet Russia, the real imperialist power, and not the legalistic facade, the Soviet Union, which has ruthlessly welded the captive nations, both within and outside the U.S.S.R. On exposing any of this to the rest of the world, the sub-subcommittees complain that even our official VOA failed to give news coverage to the hearings.[29] Considering the low quality of the hearings, VOA's apparent oversight may be construed as a service to the Nation. Disseminating inexcusable confusion is not exactly serviceable to the cause of world freedom.

Nonsensical, too, is the notion that the emergence of European captive nations began in 1939. The sub-subcommittee's special grouping of the Baltic nations "in the family of the European captive nations" is also an artificial device necessitated by a defective understanding of East European history. Where the sub-subcommittee criticizes the executive agencies for a lack of knowledge, and confusion, behind the Iron Curtain about the U.S. position on the captive European nations, one can only say that it has strongly intensified this condition with these hearings. The report's recommendations for a dynamic U.S. policy in the U.N., expanded VOA facilities for captive nations broadcasts, and a congressional study of other Communists subjugated peoples (by a special committee) are, of course, creditable.

When one scans the report's appendix and its bibliography of the Kersten committee hearings, he wonders whether the sub-subcommittee had ever read these works. An objective comparison between the Kersten products and what has been analyzed here would be enough to guarantee the creation of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. Against the solid contributions of preceding Congresses that made possible the Katyn massacre inquiry, the Kersten investigation, and Public Law 86–90, the sub-subcommittees' products of the 87th Congress are well-nigh disgraceful. They confirm all the arguments on time, experience, specialized knowledge, and critical thought that have been advanced by the supporters of a special committee. The 88th Congress has an opportunity to eradicate this blot on America's growing understanding of the captive nations by creating the special committee.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, as one of a number of Members of Congress who have introduced resolutions to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, I greatly appreciate this opportunity to speak in behalf of the passage of this measure.

We in the United States are faced with a great challenge. Our entire system of government, our basic belief in the inherent worth of the individual, and our conviction that people everywhere have the unalienable right to decide their destiny are being tested by a totalitarian system that denies to those under its imperialistic yoke all that we hold precious.

I believe it is incumbent on the United States to be constant in seeking the humanitarian goal of liberation for the enslaved peoples of Eastern Europe and Asia, whose actions have demonstrated beyond doubt their love of freedom. We must be active in nurturing that desire and show by our actions that the liberty they cherish is worthy of their noble sacrifice.

By establishing this Special Committee on the Captive Nations, we can give notice to the world that the United States has a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of all people. This committee, through inquiries and studies of the immorality and illegality of Communist domination of once-free nations, can publicize before all the world the evils of the world's most oppressive colonial system.

The passage of this resolution will say to the brave people imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain:

> We in America are your friends in freedom; we are very much aware of your plight; and we are actively working for the day when you will join your brothers in the family of free nations.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to address the House on this occasion. I thank my colleagues for the consideration they are giving this measure.

---

[17] Ibid., p. 196.

[18] Ibid., p. 195.

[19] Ibid., p. 227.

[20] Ibid., p. 235.

[21] Ibid., p. 73.

[22] Ibid., p. 118.

[23] Ibid., p. 314.

[24] Ibid., p. 148.

[25] Ibid., p. 251.

[26] Report, p. vii.

[27] Hearings, p. 152.

[28] Report, p. 1.

[29] Ibid., p. 13.

H. Res. 175

Whereas on the issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas four Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the annual observances of Captive Nations Week, Moscow has consistently displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian Empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U–2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "noninterference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the four Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sec. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

Sec. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

Sec. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to participate in this discussion of the great need for a House Committee on Captive Nations. I have had the privilege of sponsoring such legislation, as have many others here in the Congress, in both the 87th and in this, the current 88th Congress.

Frankly, I cannot understand the continued opposition of the State Department to these measures, nor do I understand why the House is not permitted to work its will on this matter regardless of what the State Department position is.

The people of the captive nations have been called our secret ally, and certainly this is true. They are the living proof that communism does not work. The continued resistance, albeit necessarily passive in many instances due to the armed force which subjugates them, continues to make a mockery of the boasts of communism as to its effectiveness and individual opportunity and freedom. Certainly we owe it to the peoples of the captive nations to encourage them in their resistance, to encourage them to keep alive the history and tradition of their separate countries which have known the great joy of freedom and self-destiny, to encourage them to work in any way they can to secure a measure of freedom from the Soviet Communists who rule their countries, and to encourage them to teach to the young people the history of the independent countries in which they live.

As I have said, I consider it a privilege to be among the sponsors of legislation to create a Captive Nations Committee. I concur with the recommendation of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that special attention should be given by the Congress to the captive nations. For myself, I am not greatly concerned as to the mechanics. It could either be a special committee or a standing committee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, but I do not see any reason why we cannot go forward with this opportunity to point out to the people of the world that the Communists, despite their talk to the contrary, are today the world's greatest colonial power and that it is military might that has created this empire and military, economic and political pressure which maintains it.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the history of man is in a sense the history of man's struggle for survival. It is difficult to know just what was man's first weapon for protecting himself. Possibly the evolution of weaponry went something like this: first, man's fist; then the stone; the spear; bow and arrow; gunpowder; modern conventional weapons; and nuclear weapons.

Man always has had the ability to change his weapons in order to meet new threats; always able to fashion new tools with which to defend himself. Even in war between men themselves, those who were capable of developing the best weapons had the best chance of survival. It is hardly a secret that the Communist international conspiracy rested upon the premise that the only way that capitalism, the free-enterprise system, the very free world itself could be destroyed would be by violent physical revolution.

It is to the credit of the United States as leader of the free world that the Communist conspiracy has been frustrated in its attempt to destroy our free institutions. It has been frustrated because we have taken the lead in the development of weaponry. We have had tremendous resources and the freedom to apply them. We have been so successful that the Communist conspirators have decided that they must look to other means by which to accomplish their godless ends.

And so they have developed to a fine science the waging of what we now call the cold war. Many of the people of the captive nations are not victims primarily of violent revolution with physical weapons, but rather of subversion—techniques of repetition of the big lie; of misrepresentation; of deceit and duplicity. They have learned, too late, the sad truth as stated by our first President, George Washington, that "the price of liberty is eternal vigilance." Not necessarily that they were not vigilant, nor even that they were indifferent. I have a strong suspicion that their downfall was caused largely by their desire to be tolerant of those who on the surface appeared to be sincere in their support of a movement which would produce a utopia for all but did not, and indeed could not, reveal the price that would have to be paid in terms of the freedom of the individual.

So the Soviet colonial empire, because it has been unsuccessful in winning battles in which physical weapons hold the key to success, has declared an entirely new kind of war which we indifferently call a cold war. The Communists are waging it with as much determination to win as they would to win a hot war. Victory in the cold war means as much as victory in any military engagement in which free men have been able to buy time in which to pursue freedom. Defeat in this cold war brings with it disaster as great as the disaster should free men lose a hot war.

One of the greatest tasks before the American people today, and I am sure most Americans are aware of it, and thus expect those whom they have chosen to represent them to give leadership, is to fashion an entirely new set of weapons with which to win this war. While we must remain militarily strong, and continue to move from a position of armed strength, the facts are that we cannot successfully wage a cold war relying solely on the weapons used in a hot war. We cannot destroy an idea with a bullet or a philosophy with a nuclear bomb. We cannot meet adequately the challenge to preserve and strengthen free society threatened by an atheistic totalitarianism by destroying society itself. We cannot meet the challenges of a new threat peculiar to the age in which we live either by coexistence or by using weapons which in comparison to the threat of 20 years ago is like trying to fight a modern military war with the weapons of the stone age.

Yet in a sense the weapon is not new. It is only new to us because we have not admitted to ourselves that we are engaged in this different kind of war. What are the weapons the enemy is using? First, subversion or the modern adaptation of the Trojan horse of ancient Greece; second, a form of psychiatry, or, brainwashing a people into believing that black is white and white is black; third, lies, distortions, half-truths, deceit, all clearly outlined by Lenin, Marx, and Engels as part of the arsenal of new armament of the Communists.

It is not too late. America must have a complete arsenal of its own of cold war weapons and a vigorous program for waging the cold war. It would not include lies for lies, distortions for distortions, half-truths for half-truths, deceit for deceit. We have, because of the spiritual foundation on which our great Nation was founded and on which it rests—the greatest weapon of them all—truth—and our great need is for the courage to speak it, to live by it, and to demand of others the same. We have a better atmosphere in which to move—an atmosphere in which there is genuine respect for human dignity and deep appreciation for the worth of every individual.

We have a living example of what freedom produces. We have another great weapon—determination, which results from the innate nature of man to want to be free.

We have dedication on the part of our people, which leads them to be willing to pay any price—even with life itself—to preserve and extend freedom.

While the words of Patrick Henry may have been deleted from many of our history books, they still are a part of our thought and purpose. For Americans, "Peace is not so sweet and life is not so dear that it must be purchased at the price of chains."

There are millions of people in the captive nations who share our dedication to the principle of freedom, and they are looking to us for leadership. Our responsibility is to fashion and use whatever weapons we can develop. One of these weapons is a House Committee on the Captive Nations. While I know it is new, it can be added to the arsenal of weapons with which to wage the cold war more effectively. I think in this respect that the old sports axiom is especially pertinent: "The best defense is a good offense." A House Committee on the Captive Nations would contribute greatly to what must be and will be total victory over atheistic communism.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] on the initiative they have maintained over the past years in support of a Special Committee on Captive Nations. Their consistent and enlightened advocacy of this vital cause is equaled only by the importance of this issue to the security of the United States and to the future of human freedom throughout the world.

The issue of captive nations is the primary issue of the cold war in which we are engaged. The captive status of more than a score of once free and independent nations is, in fact, the cause of the cold war. The dangerous international tensions which threaten the armed and shaky truce with imperial Russia springs from the captive status of those many nations. Our concern for the human rights of the hundreds of millions of non-Russian people in those captive nations is well known and conforms to our historic role as defenders of human freedom. As a nation, we support the aspirations of those captive people for national independence because that is our political heritage. But we are also aware that imperial Russia has set upon a course to colonize the world, including the United States. That awareness in the camp of freemen coined the phrase "cold war." The meaning of the cold war has not changed since the historic speech of Sir Winston Churchill at Fulton, Mo., in 1947. That meaning will remain the struggle of freemen against Russian imperialism as long as the cold war remains with us.

In recent years there has been a tendency to brush the meaning of the cold war under the most convenient rug. But the cause remains the same. No amount of sweeping or issue-dodging can change that reality of life. Those who have doubts about the accuracy of this analysis should ask themselves these questions:

> Why do we appropriate billions of tax dollars each year for national defense?
>
> Why are we required to maintain military capabilities of a global nature?
>
> Why have we appropriated over $100 billion for foreign economic and military assistance since the defeat of the Axis Powers in 1945?

We stray from the path of reality when we fail to support, with all our national vigor, the cause of the captive nations. Therein we find several hundred million allies—proven in common cause—and who put no price tag on their allegiance to freedom. It is time we cultivated that alliance for freedom. It has been neglected for too long.

On September 19, 1962, I appeared before the Subcommittee on Europe, Committee on Foreign Affairs, in connection with hearings on the captive nations. At that time I raised a number of pertinent questions which I regret to say remain unanswered today. I suggested that answers to those questions have a vital bearing on our national security and should be determined with all haste. I recommended that either a special committee of the House or a Subcommittee on Captive Nations of the Foreign Affairs Committee be established to ferret out the answers to those questions. Neither the special committee nor the subcommittee has been established and the issue of captive nations remains in limbo. The fundamental issue of the cold war remains hidden under a number of convenient rugs.

I hope Congress will act on this matter without further delay.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, upon his excellent presentation of the subject of captive nations and the great need for the establishment of a House Committee on the Captive Nations. On January 21, 1963, I introduced House Resolution 157 providing for such committee; this is identical with the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Ohio; I was happy to join with him and the many others who have sponsored this measure.

The need for such a committee is clear and undeniable. We know that Moscow

makes every effort to conceal the captive status of the Ukraine and all other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. The Special Committee on the Captive Nations would develop worldwide knowledge and expose the true facts and grave injustices prevalent under the imperio-colonial system which exists in the U.S.S.R.

It is my earnest hope that this Congress will take favorable action on this resolution without further delay.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with renewed determination and a degree of sadness that I add my voice in support of the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and our colleagues to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. Sadness because I regret the long years which have passed in an attempt to adopt this resolution, and renewed determination because I am unwilling ever to yield in obtaining recognition for these enslaved people.

So fervent is my belief in this special committee that I have introduced a similar bill, House Resolution 62, and I further entreat my colleagues to give this measure their attention and concern.

Each year several of our distinguished colleagues speak out for adoption of this measure and reinforce their arguments with facts with which we are all familiar, facts which do not alter or improve with the passage of time. We earnestly believe in this cause and once again direct your attention to the critical plight of the millions now confined within the ominous shroud of Communist imperialism.

Congress has repeatedly supported, by word and often in deed, the oppressed people of the captive nations. I doubt if there is one among us who does not acknowledge the severity of their situation, a situation which is imposed on them by the Kremlin's ruthless denial of their freedoms.

The war has been over for the rest of the world for almost 18 years. Still these people are held in bondage; economical, political, even physical. They are not free to pursue their national interests, to perpetuate their identities as separate cultures. In addition to the loss of individual liberty, they must also suffer their history and tradition being altered to suit the Communist leaders in Moscow.

We in Congress are in a unique position to give these friends and former allies the moral assistance of recognition of their hated domination by Russia. By so doing, we would also serve notice on our friends and our enemies that we continue to support the freedom and self-determination of all men.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to speak out in support of this measure establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations and, in so doing, to take a further step toward freeing all people enslaved by communism.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who had the privilege and pleasure of introducing, on January 24, 1963, House resolutions for the purpose of establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

My resolution, House Resolution 184, appeared to me to be necessary, in order to provide the means to expose the hypocrisy of the Soviet Union in their repeated attempts to brand the United States with the label of colonialism and imperialism. This in spite of the fact that for some time it has been apparent to the world that instead of the freedoms which the Communist regimes promise people of many nations who have been possibly dissatisfied with some aspect of their own existing governmental policies—they have—after successfully taking over the governments—given them slavery.

We have only to view the examples of the Berlin wall, the barbed wire fences, blockades, and border patrols established by Communist regimes all over the world. They have apparently found such means necessary in order to keep the supposedly free people within the borders of the areas they had succeeded in taking over and controlling. These examples clearly prove the fallacy of the supposed Communist freedom. Certainly it should not be necessary to erect walls or maintain border patrols around a country of satisfied citizens in order to keep them within the boundaries of that country. Our Nation is an outstanding example, on the other hand, of a government which instead has had to erect immigration barriers to keep people from all over the world from coming in hordes to this country. It recalls to my mind the descriptive words of the American Indian who said to the missionaries "your acts speak so loud that I cannot hear what you say."

Our United States, now 50 in number, was historically settled for some very opposing reasons. The French wanted to find greater fishing territory, as well as to preach Christianity to the Indians.

The Spaniards, actually the first to successfully colonize this great country, appeared to desire both material and spiritual gain by searching not only for gold and precious metals, "fountains of youth," but also to carry Catholicism to the heathen Indians.

The Dutch and Swedes desired trading posts for furs and other means of economic gain.

The English appeared to have both political, religious, and economic motives behind their efforts to colonize this country.

Most historians agree, however, that the primary and overriding motive in all attempts to colonize or explore this continent were economic.

We all know the first successful English colony was established at Jamestown, Va., and it appears to have been more for commercial or economic reasons.

The second English colony to succeed was at Plymouth, and this appears to have been motivated by the desire for religious freedom by Protestant dissenters.

But from these varied beginnings and varied motivations, we find the first really representative form of government established at Jamestown—the Mayflower Compact—the creation of the Massachusetts Bay Co.—all the result of the policy of colonialism consistently followed by all nations during that period of world history, all evolved gradually into the United States of America. Colonialism carried within its scope of influence the seeds of its own destruction in this country for by its very nature the people were prevented from exercising their freedom of choice. The sturdy, unusually hardy characters who survived those first struggles in this country, and who in the main were God-fearing people, developed in the crucible of hardship, suffering, privation, and danger that spirit of independence and strength of character which has remained a part of the American heritage all these years. It was perhaps too much to be expected that such people would willingly and cheerfully submit their necks to a yoke of slavery placed there by the mother country. Thus, on April 12, 1776, we find the first real and public manifestation of their dissatisfaction with colonialism when the North Carolina Legislature authorized its delegates to the Continental Congress to join with others in a declaration of separation from Great Britain, their mother country.

Virginia followed suit, and on June 7, 1776, Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, offered a resolution to the Continental Congress to the effect that:

> These United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States.

From this beginning grew the beautiful and eloquent document, our Declaration of Independence, adopted on July 4, 1776. It is with a deep feeling of pride and satisfaction, as well as humility, that we read the opening words of that declaration:

> When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

And so, they declared what these causes were, listing 27 in one of the most remarkable documents ever promulgated in this world.

Preceding the listing of injuries and offenses committed against them by the Royal House of England, their statement as to why they felt it necessary to do what heretofore was an unheard of thing, is worth repeating, and should be memorized by every citizen in this country:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

These last 10 words of the phrase I have just quoted formed the die which was cast, and from which a most marvelous thing evolved, our constitutional form of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. From this has developed a nation of people who cannot look lightly upon governments who in the name of freedom force conditions of slavery and servitude, both mental, physical, and spiritual, upon the unfortunate people they desire to control.

From this same mold has developed also the kind of men who feel the need now for a Committee of Captive Nations to be formed in this Congress. The sense of pity, and even guilt, which our resolution expresses, should be felt by each American citizen, because the plight in which these captive nations with which the resolution is concerned, is all too clear.

Our responsibility as a Congress, as individuals, and as a Nation, to make clear to the world and to the Soviets that we disapprove and cannot support or tolerate the legalistic pretensions and untruths spread abroad by the Soviet regime about their actual policy of colonialism and subjugation of these more than 23 non-Russian nations cannot be disputed.

We, in the United States, have a proud history of freeing, both in truth and in spirit, the nations for whom we have felt it necessary to intervene, such as Cuba, the Philippines, the European nations, and those in the Orient during recent years.

We are concerned over the pitiful plight of captive nations. Proclamations by the President, while excellent, are not enough. Setting aside and designating captive nations' weeks also is not enough. To these, all we who have introduced resolutions to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, feel should be added an expression of congressional interest in and a setting up of the machinery for investigation of all the facts surrounding the state of actual slavery and servitude imposed upon the unfortunate peoples of those nations.

The committee, I feel, would prove to be a proper forum for focusing public attention on the actual Soviet policy of colonialism—which they vehemently deny, but which they carry on to a greater and more ruthless degree than any other nation in the history of the world.

These captive peoples should be granted the God-gifted privilege accorded this Nation—of instituting their own government—"deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." It is noteworthy that in no case has the Soviet regime allowed truly free elections in countries which they have added to their colonies. Although originally promising such free elections to the people, one of the first acts taken by the Communist regime is to declare such free elections unnecessary.

Then and only then could such governments claim the "certain unalienable rights" of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

And then and only then can we in this most fortunate country prove we can accept and wholly believe in a statement made by the famous Greek orator, Demosthenes—which I quoted in my January remarks on the 45th anniversary of Ukrainian independence:

> What we have in us of the image of God is the love of truth and justice.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my colleague, Dan Flood, for the determination and perseverance he has shown in calling for the creation of a special House Committee on Captive Nations. The substantial support evidenced by many Members of the House this afternoon shows the true desire of this body for the creation of this committee.

Apparently, the main obstacle is the continued illogical resistance of the State Department and, in turn, the willingness of the Rules Committee to bottle up the various resolutions and prevent the House from working its will on the subject.

In view of continuing Soviet activities in the Western Hemisphere, it is shocking to note the failure of our State Department to cooperate with a long overdue congressional study of conditions behind the Iron Curtain. An effective House Committee on Captive Nations would serve to dramatize the truth concerning the criminal nature of Soviet colonialism and would, in effect, be a most useful aid to the implementation of our foreign policy. I certainly hope I am not presumptuous in thinking that our present foreign policy has for its goal the ultimate defeat of the worldwide Communist threat.

However, the facts are clear—the State Department objections thoroughly discredited.

I, therefore, join in an appeal to the Members of the House to move forward in establishing this special committee, to pursue our legitimate course regardless of State Department harassment, based as it is on either deliberate distortion by the Secretary of State or his personal ignorance of conditions behind the Iron Curtain. We, as an independent branch of the Government, should establish this committee, disregard State Department pressures, and proceed at once to put into operation the committee as called for in the resolutions introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and dozens of other House Members.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania on the relentless leadership he has given in the effort to win a Special Committee on the Captive Nations. I rise in enthusiastic support of this objective, and trust that all our colleagues will join in a massive backing of the proposal.

This is the third consecutive session in which I have been a sponsor of resolutions to create a Special Committee on the Captive Nations and I am more convinced than ever of its need. The vital purpose for such a committee is grounded in the facts of the contemporary world situation. The efforts to create such a committee have received widespread support from many quarters: from my distinguished colleagues of both parties, from high officials in the executive branch, from numerous interested groups, and from many citizens of the land. Yet this important measure has not been given due consideration in the past.

This year, however, I am optimistic about the resolution's chances, for the events of the months while Congress was out of session have brought into dramatic focus the necessity of paying increased attention to the nations held captive by Communist totalitarianism. I refer, of course, to the Cuban crisis, which brought the world perilously near the abyss of nuclear war. This confrontation highlights both the dangers and the opportunities which the captive nations pose for the free world.

We are not yet accustomed to thinking of Cuba as an enslaved nation, for the Caribbean island has come under Communist domination much more recently than the long-oppressed satellites of Eastern Europe. This is the first time, however, that the Communist menace has entered our own backyard, and the specter of Soviet missiles aimed at American cities was a harrowing one. The crisis vividly demonstrated to the American people the grave dangers which the Soviet empire presents to the community of free nations. The very proximity of Cuba, on the other hand, points up the opportunities for constructive efforts to free this enslaved people, for there are numerous possibilities of studying the conditions on the island in order to base our policy recommendations on sound factual information.

The revealing comments of Fidel Castro which appeared last week in the Paris newspaper Le Monde illustrate the challenge which Cuba presents to U.S. policy. The Cuban leader was sharply critical of Khrushchev for withdrawing the Soviet missiles last fall without consulting him, although he went on to praise Khrushchev and the Soviet people personally and expressed his gratitude for Soviet aid. The uneasiness with which Castro wears the Moscow-imposed harness underlies his account of the origins of the plan to set up missile bases in Cuba:

> We had envisaged among ourselves the possibility of asking the U.S.S.R. to furnish us some missiles. But we had not arrived at any decision when Moscow offered them to us. It was explained to us that, in accepting them, we would strengthen the Socialist camp in the world. And, because we receive considerable aid from the Socialist camp, we figured that we could not refuse.

It is clear from these remarks that there are genuine disagreements between Moscow and its satellites on the governmental level, and we know from other evidence that there are seeds of discontent among the people of these oppressed states. I do not want to overemphasize the Cuban case at the expense of the other captive nations of the Soviet empire, for the plight of these countries deserves our attention no less than neighboring Cuba.

We must undertake a continuing and intensive study of all these captive nations. The hard facts produced by these studies would be disseminated to all Americans in order to keep them informed of the international status of

these countries and their political, economic, and social conditions. For it is only on such solid foundations that the American people and their elected representatives can formulate a sound foreign policy toward the Soviet empire. Our general policy should be to assist—by peaceful means—these countries in their struggle to live under institutions and governments of their own choice. The specific measures of assistance must be tailored to the conditions and situations of the individual countries. For these reasons I strongly urge the favorable consideration this year of House Resolution 138 to establish the Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, once again it is a pleasure for me to join with my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] in urging in terms as emphatic as I can command the establishment in this body of a Select Committee on Captive Nations. As the gentleman knows, I have joined with him in sponsoring a companion resolution to establish such a committee.

Last year we came closer than we have in some time toward realizing this goal of ours when the distinguished Committee on Foreign Affairs held hearings on our proposals and filed a report on it. But we still have not succeeded. And so, the fight must go on as the gentleman has eloquently said.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the mere creation of such a committee is not in and of itself overnight going to free the millions of peoples who are now captives behind the Iron Curtain. But the creation of such a committee will dramatically signal to the world our determination as a nation to continue to work for the freedom of these peoples and not just to forget them.

It is a cinch if we do not continue to remind ourselves of this policy objective we will never help them become free again. If we do remind ourselves, then we are more likely to move in the direction of policies and actions that will bring them ultimate freedom from the Communist yoke.

As I see it, it is as simple as that. Let us stop maneuvering, as the gentleman has phrased it, and get the committee created.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the Captive Nations Subcommittee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time on the floor in order to pick up where I left off last year on the subject of the financial problems of the United Nations and, more specifically, the peacekeeping operations in the Congo and in the Middle East.

The 87th Congress enacted, after considerable debate, the United Nations bond issue bill. This bill was presented to the Congress by the administration as an emergency measure to raise necessary funds for the United Nations forces in the Congo and the Middle East.

The resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations authorized the issuance of $200 million worth of interest-bearing bonds. The U.S. Congress authorized our Government to purchase bonds up to the amount purchased by all other countries. I spoke and voted for the bill.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I offered an amendment to the bond issue bill, which instructed the State Department to submit a report to the Congress by the last day of January 1963 "on steps taken in the 17th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on long-term financing of the United Nations." The amendment was adopted by the Congress and signed into law.

The purpose of this amendment was to force the Department of State to insist upon a clarification of the obligations of other countries and to bring about a long-term solution to the problem of maintaining a United Nations police force. Under any circumstances such a police force is a very expensive proposition. Since 1960 the expenses for the Middle East and Congo operations have amounted to about $140 million a year—approximately double the size of the United Nations regular budget. Regular assessments have been insufficient to pay these costs. Starting with the Middle East operation in 1957, the United States made large voluntary contributions each year in addition to its regular scale assessment. In the last several years no other country has made voluntary contributions of this kind, with the exception of the United Kingdom in respect of the Middle East operation.

This has not been a satisfactory arrangement. It is not a good relation for the United States with the United Nations or with other member nations, and vice versa.

Subsequently the bond issue was proposed. Admittedly it was a stopgap measure. The Congress passed the bill authorizing the U.S. participation on the basis of an emergency. But now let us see what happened to it. Although the General Asembly authorized the issuance of $200 million in bonds, only about $74 million has been subscribed by 58 countries other than the United States, despite our readiness to buy up to $100 million of bonds on a matching basis. Assuming that all the bonds subscribed are actually purchased, the U.S. matching purchase would bring the total up to only about $148 million.

Then there is the problem of arrearages. As of January 1, 1963, arrears owed to the United Nations amounted to $121 million. Twenty-five United Nations members have still paid nothing on their UNEF—Middle East—assessments, and 48 members have paid nothing on their Congo assessments.

As was frankly stated recently in an excellent speech by Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Richard N. Gardner:

> It is impossible to escape the conclusion that the United Nations is not being supported.

To me this is an intolerable situation and some real leadership is required in order to put the United Nations on a sound financial basis. The United Nations is deserving of support, but it will not receive it without solid statesmanship and leadership on the part of the great powers.

Pursuant to the Lindsay amendment to the bond issue bill, the Secretary of State reported to the Congress on January 29, 1963, as to the steps taken in the 17th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on long-term financing of the United Nations. At the conclusion of my remarks I am putting in the Congressional Record the full text of the Secretary of State's report.

The report is a good outline of the status of the matter, but Members will see that there is no conclusion other than "the job ahead remains difficult and challenging." The fact of the matter is that by June of this year the United Nations will have run out of all money for its peacekeeping operations and will be faced with the problem of raising the tidy sum of $50 million in order to finance operations between June and the end of the year.

Members will recall that the International Court of Justice rendered an affirmative opinion on July 20, 1962, on the question of whether expenditures authorized for the United Nations operations in the Congo and in the Middle East constitute "expenses of the Organization within the meaning of article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations." The opinion of the Court was accepted by the General Assembly of the United Nations by resolution in December 1962.

This, in theory, means that the assessments that are in arrears are binding obligations on member states and, if not paid, the members become subject to loss of vote under article 19 of the Charter, provided a nation's total arrears exceed its last 2 years' assessments on all accounts. Because of this it will be some time before the clause becomes operative. It will not solve the immediate problem of what happens in June of this year. On that I do not see any clear course proposed by our Government or by other member Governments of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge members to read the report of the Secretary of State so that Members will be apprised of the facts. I do not wish to see a last-minute crisis developing in June with the Congress unapprised in the meantime of growing difficulties. We are all grown men, and there is no use in not facing up to problems in advance. There is no point in being overwhelmed by a crisis when it is too late to solve it.

To this end, therefore, I urge that the Secretary of State and his colleagues in the Department of State convene a roundtable discussion of this whole matter in New York City at the United

Nations, with Members of Congress present and representatives of other member states who wish to attend. It should be informal in nature and it should be frank in admitting the problem. I would hope that at such a conference our Government would be in a position to lay out a more definitive course of action to be followed by the United Nations and member countries, and be prepared to stick to it.

Only by bringing this critical problem out in the open and subjecting it to constructive debate will the public be educated sufficiently to continue its long support of the United Nations.

The text of the report of the Secretary of State to the Congress follows:

JANUARY 29, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Section 4 of Public Law 87–731, 87th Congress, October 2, 1962, an act to promote the foreign policy of the United States by authorizing a loan to the United Nations and the appropriation of funds therefor, instructs the Department of State to submit a report to the Congress. The Department is to "report on steps taken in the 17th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on long-term financing of the United Nations."

The 17th Session of the General Assembly met from September 18, 1962, to December 20, 1962. The General Assembly took certain significant actions which were essential to the working out of future financing arrangements for the United Nations. The principal deliberations on financial and budgetary matters prior to plenary action were, of course, conducted by the Fifth (Administrative and Budgetary) Committee.

The Congress will recall that the 16th Session of the General Assembly, by Resolution 1731 (XVI), December 20, 1961, requested an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice on whether the expenditures authorized for the United Nations operations in the Congo and in the Middle East constitute "expenses of the Organization within the meaning of article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations," and that the International Court of Justice rendered an affirmative opinion on this question on July 20, 1962. The opinion of the Court was placed on the agenda of the 17th General Assembly. By Resolution 1854–A (XVII), December 19, 1962, the General Assembly accepted the opinion of the International Court of Justice on the question submitted to it by a vote of 76 in favor, 17 against, with 8 abstentions. The debate on the resolution made it abundantly clear that the term "accepts" used in the resolution meant that the Organization was adopting the Court's view as its operating rule. This means that the assessments in question have been determined to be binding obligations on member states and are therefore due and payable. If not paid, the member becomes subject to loss of vote under article 19 of the Charter, if its total arrears exceed its last 2 years' assessments on all accounts. A copy of Resolution 1854–A, accepting the Court opinion, together with the breakdown of the votes by states, is attached.

Opposing the wording of the resolution as approved by the General Assembly, a number of states, including the Soviet bloc and France, urged in the Fifth Committee that the General Assembly only take note of the Court's opinion. The effect of this language, as brought out in the debate, would have left it to the discretion of each state whether it considered itself bound to pay for these peacekeeping assessments. An amendment to change the wording of the resolution from "accepts" to "takes note" was proposed in the Fifth Committee and was defeated; there were 28 votes for the change, 61 against, and 14 abstentions.

Quite early in the session, it became apparent that it would not be possible to resolve all of the aspects of the future financing of the Congo and Middle East operations at the 17th Session of the General Assembly. There was a very large body of agreement that, with the heavy volume of work facing the Assembly, adequate time and care could not be devoted to this delicate and controversial problem. The course of the Assembly was such that final action by the General Assembly on the advisory opinion of the Court did not occur until 1 day before the session ended; acceptance of the opinion was, of course, a necessary preliminary to other action on future financing. In addition, many nations recognized that a General Assembly committee of 110 nations was too large a group to work out this matter and that a smaller subcommittee or working group needed to be appointed.

Giving further feasibility to the idea of dealing with this problem outside the pressures of this regular General Assembly session, was the fact that it became clear to the membership that the bond issue proceeds, together with other collections, should provide adequate funds to permit the organization to carry on its activities until late spring or early summer 1963.

The General Assembly, therefore, adopted a resolution whereby a working group of 21 would study and report on "special methods for financing peacekeeping operations of the United Nations involving heavy expenditures, such as those for the Congo and the Middle East, including a possible special scale of assessments." The study and report is to be submitted with the least possible delay and, in any case, not later than March 31, 1963. This resolution was adopted by a teller vote of 78 in favor, 14 against, with 4 abstentions. A copy of Resolution 1854–B (XVII), December 19, 1962, together with the names of the member states appointed to the working group, is attached.

The General Assembly also adopted Resolution 1866 (XVII), December 20, 1962, to convene a special session of the General Assembly prior to June 30, 1963, for the purpose of considering, in the light of the report of the working group of 21, the financial situation of the Organization. This means that the United Nations expects to act on the recommendations of the working group of 21 before June 30, 1963, and to determine upon methods of financing the Congo and Middle East operations beyond that date.

In related Resolutions 1865 (XVII) and 1864 (XVII), the Secretary General was authorized to continue to expend for the Congo and the Middle East operations at not to exceed the existing authorized rates of $10 million per month and $1,580,000, respectively, up to June 30, 1963. The Secretary General has made it clear, however, that he hopes to reduce the size of the Congo force before that time.

The General Assembly, as a part of its budget authorization for 1963, included an amount of $4,650,000 in the regular budget of the United Nations for repayment of the interest and principal due on outstanding United Nations bonds. This action is in accordance with the terms of Resolution 1739 (XVI), the United Nations bonds resolution which authorized the sale of bonds, and is payable at the regular assessment rates of members. The U.S. share of the regular budget is currently 32.02 percent.

Under section 3 of the U.S. authorization to purchase bonds, Public Law 87–731, the U.S. share of the bond interest and principal repayment is to be deducted from the annual payment of the assessed share of the United States of the budget of the United Nations. We have requested and secured the agreement of the Secretary General to handle the matter this way. A copy of his letter of agreement is attached. The amount to be deducted by the United States for repayments due for 1962 is $2,049,480, of which $1,849,858 is for principal and $199,622 for interest.

As of December 31, 1962, a total of $148,776,194 of bonds had been sold or pledged, including presumed U.S. matching of actual payments not yet made but already pledged by others. Nearly $121 million of this amount has actually been purchased. It is intended to extend to June 30, 1963, the time during which additional pledges can be made. Actual purchases against pledges can only be made up to December 31, 1963.

A full listing of bond purchases and pledges, by nation, is attached.

The General Assembly also decided to increase its Working Capital Fund from $25 million to $40 million by Resolution 1863 (XVII), December 20, 1962. This Working Capital Fund increase will add to the financial capability and resources of the Organization. The action also establishes a more rational relationship between the present level of the regular budget and the need for reserves. This $15 million increase was assessed against all members at the regular budget scale. The U.S. share of 32.02 percent, after subtracting minor credits due us on this account, is $4,797,713.

Taken together, the actions taken by the 17th session of the General Assembly indicate that each financial step was constructive and necessary to move from the financial impasse which existed 1 year ago and to set the stage for deciding upon future methods for financing peacekeeping operations. But the job ahead for the working group and for the special session of the General Assembly will not be easy. Nor are there at this time panaceas for resolving the problem which will be both painless and readily acceptable to all members. In particular, the Soviet bloc has not as yet paid any of its arrears for peacekeeping, France has not paid its Congo arrears, and the Arab States have not paid their arrears for the Middle East operation. France, moreover, recently advised the Secretary General that France intends to deduct from its regular budget payments for 1963 France's assessed share of the repayment of principal and interest on United Nations bonds; France has also threatened not to serve on the working group of 21, which is to work out future arrangements for financing peace-and-security operations.

Nevertheless, having settled the important preliminaries, we believe that most members are now prepared to look for and, if possible, produce a solution to the sharing of future costs for the Congo and the Middle East. A decision should emerge from negotiations leading up to the special General Assembly, before the end of our current fiscal year.

The job ahead remains difficult and challenging. The maintenance of sound U.S. positions will require the assistance and support of the Congress, as well as skillful negotiations on the part of U.S. representatives at the United Nations. We have already begun to consult with Members on the elements of U.S. policy and the positions to be taken by our delegates in the working group of 21. We shall expect to consult further with the Congress as developments occur during the next few months.

Sincerely,

DEAN RUSK.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC AND EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to permit deductions for Federal income tax purposes to persons who are paying the expenses of higher education for themselves or their dependents. I am convinced this legislation is timely in terms of national economic and educational objectives. The Nation needs the services of all young people who can complete higher education. These students will benefit themselves and the Nation by obtaining a higher education and improving their ability to contribute to our society and our economy.

The growing demand of our citizens for higher education, and the increasing cost of that education, makes it desirable but difficult for persons of modest income to provide a college education for their children. Many students who enter college and show themselves to have college ability are forced to discontinue their education before graduation for financial reasons. We must recognize the national importance of encouraging and assisting able students to go on to college and to remain there until graduation.

In the United States, we have gradually raised the level of guaranteed educational opportunities to include the high school. We provide not only the teachers and buildings but also public transportation of students and in many cases books and supplies as well. We have done these things because our youth require educational opportunity to meet the increasing complexity of society. The world continues to grow more complex. The educational levels that led to intellectual maturity yesterday do not go far enough today. There has been a continuous upgrading of jobs. The increasing use of the products of scientific technology clearly calls for a higher degree of education and technical skill in every line of work. The same forces that caused us to raise guaranteed educational opportunities through the high school grades now necessitate providing similar opportunities at higher levels. The bill I have introduced is one means of providing some tax relief for those who must finance the costs of this higher education for their children, their spouses, or themselves.

To encourage increased investment in our advancing economy, it has long been our practice to provide for tax-free recovery of income-producing capital outlays through allowances for depreciation and replacement. By the same principle, the tax treatment of investment in education should be at least as liberal as it is for investment in capital goods, since education is at least as important as a basis for producing income as is investment in physical capital.

For some years, we have provided for tax reductions by professional individuals who must upgrade their educational training in order to meet the rising educational requirements of the work they are already doing. There should be some tax relief to encourage investment in the education of those preparing to enter the professions, especially since the amount of education required at the threshold level of most professions is rapidly increasing—and must continue to increase—to provide for the flexibility and adaptability needed to cope with our advancing technology.

My bill restricts its tax deductions to tuition and fees, books and supplies, and the cost of living away from home when necessary. The limitations to not more than $1,000 for meals, lodging and travel and not more than $800 for tuition and fees are safeguards to prevent abuses by those who might choose expensive colleges.

While tax relief would accrue before the individual receives income from the investment in higher education, it must be pointed out that in the long run increased individual incomes would more than offset initial tax income foregone in allowing deductions for amounts invested in higher education. Studies have shown that the median income of families with heads having 4 or more years of college is almost 40 percent higher than the median income of families with heads whose education stopped with completion of high school. Obviously, then higher education is an income-producing investment, and whatever tax relief we grant to encourage it will not only contribute to the economic progress of the Nation but will be more than recovered out of taxes on increased future earnings.

The point to be emphasized here is that there would ultimately be substantial tax gains to the Treasury as a result of the improved earning power of those who go on for higher education. To be quite practical, however, it must be noted that deductions for college expenses would be more effective as a retention device once students are enrolled in college than as a means of bringing to college those who might not have had the financial resources to start their higher education. This is true because the amount of income tax relief realized by the taxpayer—approximately $300 for a dependent in a public institution and $450 for one in a private institution—would not be available to the taxpayer until after the initial college expenses of the student had already been paid. In succeeding years, however, the tax relief might be sufficient to retain in college a substantial number who would have been forced to drop out for financial reasons.

It is currently estimated that about 40 percent of the students who enter college go on to graduate in regular progression from the institution of first registration, that another 20 percent transfer or return at a later date to complete the requirements for graduation, and that about 40 percent withdraw and never finish. Financial difficulties are reported to be among the chief reasons for dropping out, especially in the loss of the better students.

It has been estimated that a college graduate earns about $175,000 more in his lifetime than a high school graduate. If the provisions of this bill are successful in salvaging a fraction of those college students who fail to graduate because of financial difficulties the loss of tax revenue will eventually be offset and conceivably the amendment would improve the overall position of the Treasury.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, following the discussion between myself and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] with respect to residual oil imports, there are a few things that I respectfully want to submit at this time.

The gentleman from Massachusetts in his remarks gave no credence to the hearings conducted by Subcommittee No. 4 with respect to problems created by petroleum imports. On page 9 of that committee's recommendations to the Congress, recommendation No. 7 of the subcommittee was:

> That the import quotas of residual fuel oil to be used solely as fuel should be fixed at a level no higher than the total of such imports in 1961, so as to reduce the threat to the national security which residual oil imports now create, as well as to prevent the further erosion of the coal industry's markets and to alleviate the severe unemployment and overwhelming distress in the coal mining industry. Further, the subcommittee feels that firm assurance should be given by the executive branch that quotas will be maintained at levels no higher than this, so as to eliminate the uncertainties and instability which repeated and unpredictable increases in quotas have created in the domestic coal markets.

Furthermore, this subcommittee also found that excessive oil imports, particularly imported residual oil, was destroying the capacity of the coal industry to produce and contribute its share to the Nation's economy and security. I respectfully point out that the committee stated that the coal industry cannot maintain its production in the face of continued loss of markets to excessive imported residual fuel oil, and the most important observation made by the subcommittee, in my opinion, was to the effect "that a sound and expanding coal industry is also essential to the national security and to the Nation's continued economic expansion."

Now, my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, has complained that the oil import program, which I say to all practical intents and purposes does not exist under this administration, forces the price of residual fuel oil up, thus penalizing people who rely upon this type of fuel to meet their energy needs.

I feel that the price adjustment in this program only occurs when the oil importers desire to bring pressure to bear on the proper agency of the Government to permit an increase in the number of barrels of imported residual oil that comes into the country. In other words, they use price as a factor to obtain public pressure, to obtain larger amounts of imported residual fuel oil on the theory if the additional residual oil is allowed to come in, the price will decrease. This is an ingenuous method of infecting the minds of those that use this oil.

I am amazed at the departure of this administration—one which with high-sounding words and phrases pledged themselves to relieve the plight of the coal-producing States, to find that they have permitted the abuse of the mandatory oil import program to the extent that they have said that national security is not now considered—but that a new word and phrase have been coined to do away with the program in the name of hemispheric solidarity.

I respectfully point out today that hemispheric solidarity has to be a two-way street, but if you look at the figures—Venezuela's economy has not suffered as a result of this Nation's oil import program, but this Nation has suffered as a result of an imbalance with its trade posture with Venezuela. It was brought out in the subcommittee's hearings that sales by Venezuela to the United States of all goods, but mostly petroleum, which includes residual oil, increased from 892.3 million in 1958, the year before controls were imposed, to 948.3 million in 1960. At the same time, purchase of goods from the United States by Venezuela decreased from 809.9 million in 1958 to 550.2 million in 1960.

Much more of this hemispheric solidarity and there will be nothing left for the gentleman from Massachusetts and myself to be discussing.

The statement that I have heard here today is exactly in form and content to that which was presented to the subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business by the Edgar Bergen and Charlie McCarthy—the residual oil lobby—Mr. Charles W. Colson, counsel, and Mr. James S. Couzens, chairman, fuel committee, the New England Council for large imports of residual oil.

I did not have the opportunity to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts what would occur, since his part of the country relies almost completely on residual oil to meet its energy requirements—if Venezuela fell behind the Castro curtain and expropriation were to set in as it did in Cuba. In that instance, I am sure the national security of the United States would be affected for we would lose this great industrial complex of New England. He would certainly not advocate that we buy this residual fuel oil from a Castro Communist-dominated nation—much less would the executive branch of the Government permit this.

We hear rumors and rumors—and rumors of rumors—of the instability of the Government of Venezuela. I would assume then if those circumstances were to occur, New England would be glad to receive that black diamond, produced by men who must have strong backs and who sweat in the bellies of the mountains of West Virginia.

Mandatory residual oil import quotas—a necessity for national security. Hemispheric solidarity—bah, humbug.

THE LATE H. D. "HAPPY" PAULSON

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Nygaard] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, too many times in our busy lives we fail to recognize and accord full credit to many of the people in our communities who have dedicated their lives to the service of their fellowman. Day by day, these people go about their daily work rendering various types of service to their communities. The citizens over a period of years often become accustomed to these services, and though we are aware of them we do not pay proper tribute. What suddenly called my attention to this condition was the death of such a person in my home State of North Dakota.

The people of North Dakota, and particularly the journalistic fraternity, suffered a great loss March 24 with the death of H. D. "Happy" Paulson, editor emeritus of the Fargo Forum at Fargo, N. Dak.

Mr. Paulson was a native son of North Dakota who spent all his active years in journalism on newspapers in Grand Forks and Fargo.

The late J. Fred Essary of the Baltimore Sun once described Mr. Paulson as one of the great reporters of our time, and this view was seconded by J. R. Wiggins, executive editor of the Washington Post, and by Lyle F. Youngstrom, vice president of Carl Byoir & Associates.

His work brought him membership in the American Society of Newspaper Editors. For several years he served on the Pulitzer Prize award jury, and he was a director of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association. He was a member of the North Dakota Professional Chapter of Sigma Delta Chi and for a time was honorary secretary of the national organization of Sigma Delta Chi. He was a past president of the North Dakota Press Association.

In 1943, Mr. Paulson was appointed one of nine members of an advisory committee to the Director of the Office of War Information. Fargo was the smallest city represented.

Mr. Paulson began a distinguished career in political and legislative reporting in 1909, shortly after his 21st birthday, and for 20 years thereafter he regularly covered legislative sessions, resuming the job again during the World War II days of manpower shortages.

In 1915 Mr. Paulson covered a meeting in Bismarck out of which grew the Nonpartisan League, a dominant force in North Dakota politics for many years thereafter until its dissolution a few years ago.

His great faith in the future of North Dakota brought him into active roles in the North Dakota Historical Society and the Fargo Chamber of Commerce.

The initials "H. D." represented the names Holger Doran, but Mr. Paulson was known as "Happy" to all his thousands of friends in North Dakota and elsewhere.

His newspaper career began at the age of 15 with the now-defunct Grand Forks Plaindealer, where he swept floors, worked in the mailing room and in the advertising department. But it wasn't long before he found his field in the company of a pad and pencil.

In 1958, when Look magazine carried a feature story on Mr. Paulson, it said:

> He still sits at a littered desk in a corner of the city room, and he won't let anybody call him editor emeritus. Business is good and he is that rare bird, an editor with no problems whatsoever. No insoluble problems, that is.

The article noted that the economy of the area is throbbing and " 'Happy' Paulson sits there at his desk as though he were presiding over the whole operation."

And in spirit, at least, he was.

GETTING THE GOVERNMENT OUT OF BUSINESS

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer at this time a brief statement in explanation of H.R. 4926, which I introduced to the House on March 18. The bill, which is entitled "A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations by the Government, which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise," is identical to S. 1093 which was introduced to the Senate by Senator Bennett, of Utah, with the distinguished bipartisan sponsorship of Senator McClellan, of Arkansas, Senator Mundt, of South Dakota, Senator Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, Senator Williams of Delaware, Senator Thurmond, of South Carolina, Senator Tower, of Texas, Senator Miller of Nebraska, and Senator Dirksen, of Illinois. It is to be noted that Senator McClellan is chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, to which S. 1093 was referred.

The bill declares it to be the policy of the Federal Government to encourage private competitive enterprise to the maximum extent consistent with national security and the public interest, on the principle that production of goods and rendition of services by the Government tends to weaken private business and to deprive governments at all levels of tax revenues. The bill further requires the Secretary of Commerce to investigate complaints of unfair Government competition with private business, and calls upon the Director of the Budget to pass upon any new business activity proposed by a department or agency.

In other words, H.R. 4296 would definitely affirm the system of free enterprise, upon which our Nation and our business community have grown so great and would set up a policy barrier to the socialistic trend that seems from time to time to threaten us.

But you will note, in section 3(b), "Nothing contained in this act shall authorize the termination or limitation of any business-type activity which was established pursuant to specific statutory authorization," which I believe, Mr. Speaker, gives protection to the 126-year-old rope walk at the Boston Naval Shipyard, which you, sir, and other Members of Congress from your Commonwealth of Massachusetts look upon with the same sentimental affection that caused Henry Wadsworth Longfellow to write, many years ago:

> In that building, long and low,
> With its windows all a-row,
> Like the portholes of a hulk,
> Human spiders spin and spin
> Backward down their threads so thin
> Dropping, each a hempen bulk.

I know of no other governmental business enterprise that is so steeped in tradition or operated with such outstanding efficiency that it cannot be spared.

The real truth of the matter is that billions and billions of dollars of Government money—money obtained by the taxation of individuals and businesses—is today tied up in commercial, industrial, and financial operations, and that uncounted sums are squandered each year in the mismanagement of many enterprises that exist only because they are subsidized.

The scope of Government's involvement in competitive business is one of the best kept secrets in Washington. In 1932 the Shannon committee found Uncle Sam engaged in nearly a hundred categories of competitive business. In 1952 the Bonner committee made a similar study, but its findings were never made public. The Harden committee, in 1954, subtracted a few of the items on the Shannon list but added more than enough to replace them.

The Hoover Commission, in its 1955 report on business enterprises, stated the origin of most Government business operations in one terse paragraph. I quote:

> The Government creates business-type enterprises in economic emergencies, in the emergencies of war, and for the development of projects which are not adapted to private enterprise because of their nature or their magnitude.

The Boston Navy Yard ropewalk, Mr. Speaker, was established in the administration of President Andrew Jackson so that our Navy should not be dependent upon Russian hemp for the rope it then needed. The Mississippi Barge Line was established during World War I; it continued to operate, always at a loss, until just a few years ago. The Rural Electrification Administration was established during the depression of the midthirties, it completed 90-odd percent of its appointed task some years ago, but it keeps on going, at bigger and bigger expense. Such examples could be cited times almost without number.

The Hoover Commission report goes on to say:

> One of the major problems before us is the continuation of Government business enterprises after the emergency that engendered them has terminated. One reason that these agencies tend to perpetuate themselves is that by the time their tasks have been completed their personnel and the citizens in the communities where they operate resist termination. As a consequence, all too often they continue to function long after the original need has passed and even though the operation of many of them is not in the public interest.

I have even heard it said, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of Congress themselves are among the greatest deterrents to getting Government out of business—for while most of us approve in principle the termination of competition with taxpaying companies, there is quite often a Government business enterprise in one's own district that seems somehow to be different from all the rest.

But the time has come, Mr. Speaker, when Government should get out of competitive business. The mounting expenses of Government call for reducing exercises—and Uncle Sam is a most inefficient businessman. The need for new tax revenue can be met in part by selling Government's nontaxpaying enterprises to taxpaying companies—and this has already been proved. Finally, if we are to preserve the free enterprise system we cannot continue to hamper and obstruct it by keeping Government in unfair competition with its own citizens.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Government Operations Committee may set a date for hearings on H.R. 4926 and similar bills, so that businessmen and trade associations may have an opportunity to tell us what goes on.

A PROFIT IS WITH HONOR IN THIS COUNTRY

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, at Yale University the President of the United States urged the American people to engage in a great debate on our country's fiscal and tax policies. We have endeavored to discuss the fiscal and tax measures being urged by the administration and have offered alternatives.

My committee colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means who also serves with distinction on the Joint Economic Committee, the gentleman from Missouri, the Honorable Thomas B. Curtis, has made an outstanding contribution to public understanding of the issues involved in this debate. He has made frequent public statements in constructive support of sound fiscal and economic policies. He has made a major contribution to the development of information during the tax hearings which have just been completed by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Missouri, Tom Curtis, has pointed out that a prerequisite to tax reduction must be spending reduction. He has clearly stated the issue that we cannot reduce debts and deficits by spending more and taxing less. He has exposed the fallacy in the reasoning of those who maintain that we should balance the budget only when we have overcome the gap in our economic growth. The gentleman from Missouri, Tom Curtis, has established the need for public confidence in sound government policies as a condition for investment and growth. He has properly described the need for reasonable profit expectations as a condition for economic progress.

Mr. Speaker, jobs are created as a result of business activity undertaken for the purpose of profit. That is the way our free enterprise system works. As we strengthen the profit expectation we enhance the job opportunities available to our citizens. Our citizens save and invest because of a profit motive and without that motive there could be no progress within the framework of economic freedom. Profits even benefit the consumer because they make possible the productive efficiency that lowers costs.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I will include at this point in the Record two speeches made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] on the issues of fiscal policy, economic growth, and tax reduction. I commend the views expressed in these perceptive speeches to my colleagues. The first speech was made in Pittsburgh before the Tax Executives Institute, and the second speech was made before the Economic Club of Detroit.

The gentleman from Missouri, Congressman Curtis, has pointed the way to expenditure and tax rate reform; he has pointed the way to economic progress for the benefit of every American.

The Missing Prerequisites to Tax Reduction

(Remarks of Hon. Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri, before the Pittsburgh chapter of Tax Executives Institute, February 28, 1963)

Members of the Pittsburgh chapter of Tax Executives Institute, distinguished guests, my fellow Americans, I am pleased to be in Pittsburgh, a city in which you have largely already done what we are now undertaking in St. Louis; namely, a program of urban renewal and revitalization with the impetus and the resources primarily being local in origin. I commend you for your achievement.

As I begin my remarks I would express appreciation to your Pittsburgh TEI membership for the outstanding public service many of you have rendered to promote effective tax administration and improved substantive tax law. I am not unmindful of the outstanding technical assistance and policy support that you have lent to measures I have sponsored. For the most part these started as mere tax ideas or concepts that were developed into statutory drafts with your assistance and became a part of our tax structure with your support. We have more to go on improvements in our tax structure on such things as income averaging and liberalized treatment of basic research expense and in finding revenue sources that ease the present undue reliance on taxation of initiative and incentive. We also need greater success in the avoidance of the taxation of capital investment and in the encouragement of a tax environment that enables economic principles rather than tax consequences to influence our capital utilization.

Tonight I will talk to you on the subject of "The Missing Prerequisites to Tax Reduction." I will not speak partisanly for the sake of partisanship, but as a partisan of my country with strong convictions on fiscal and economic policy, I must speak forthrightly and with candor. This I propose to do.

Prior to coming to Pittsburgh late this afternoon, I spent the day and yesterday with my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee listening to the Secretary of the Treasury attempt to justify a two step temporary increase to $320 billion in the statutory debt ceiling from its present permanent level of $285 billion. He did this at a time when the administration for which he speaks is urging that we start from a budgetary deficit position and add to it more spending with less taxation purportedly so that we can have smaller debt. Therefore, if I sound a bit bewildered or confused or if my puritan ethic is showing, you will have to excuse me.

While I am on the subject of the debt ceiling, I might parenthetically add that the administration will probably get partial congressional approval of the first step in its two prong debt ceiling program. Thus, a $306 billion ceiling through June 30 of this year will be approved. But even here the administration will likely receive rather severe congressional censure for the way in which our fiscal affairs have been managed. The administration's prospects for obtaining the second step of a $320 billion ceiling for fiscal year 1964 are very doubtful. The Treasury will probably try to use the legislative reluctance to go to $320 billion on the debt ceiling as leverage to obtain some of the revenue raising substantive tax reforms being requested of the Congress, but my judgment is that neither goal will be fully achieved. The debt ceiling will be closer to $315 billion or less for fiscal year 1964 and the tax reforms will be commented on in more detail in a few minutes.

I would make one additional comment relative to the debt ceiling before I leave it as a specific subject of consideration. There are those who maintain the debt ceiling is a fiction, that its increase is a pro forma exercise, and that, therefore, it should be abolished. To the critics of the ceiling and to those who view it in an indifferent way, I say that our present attitude toward the ceiling in which we regard its annual legislative consideration only as a time for speechmaking and perhaps a protest vote is a tragic and wasteful neglect of an opportunity for the Congress to enforce frugality to some degree. In a practical sense, because the Congress passes a number of appropriation bills each year and because the spending committees have different memberships from the taxing committees, there is little effective chance to impose an overall degree of spending restraint on the executive. The debt ceiling is the exception. We could, I believe, find a source of spending control by preannounced and determined stringency on debt ceiling levels, perhaps to a more realistic degree than would be feasible under the single appropriation bill approach suggested by that great American, Senator Harry F. Byrd of Virginia. I merely mention this thought for your consideration and comment, if you will. I would welcome any expression you may care to make to me on this or any other subject at any time and by any means.

You may also find it a useful approach to mention to your own elected representatives.

I intend to develop the thought during the forthcoming debates on the ceilings for this and the next fiscal years. In suggesting this attitude toward the debt ceiling I am not urging that we repudiate our debts by suddenly making a substantial amount of them extra legal. What I am urging is that we restrain the compulsive spenders before their lack of fiscal discipline drives our Nation to involuntary debt repudiation through inflation and the chaos that would attend a further weakening in the confidence in the dollar.

With that rather lengthy but perhaps timely digression, I return to my topic—"The Missing Prerequisites to Tax Reduction."

The American taxpayer—long suffering, downtrodden, and oppressed—should in theory begin to experience a twinge of anticipatory joy. After enduring for the past 30 years the payment of more than $1 trillion in Federal taxes—after giving away $100 billion we did not have in foreign aid—after paying more than $50 billion for agricultural products we did not need—and, after instituting program on top of program of multibillion dollar Federal aid to States paid for with nonexistent Federal funds, the American taxpayer of our generation is to be rewarded with a tax cut. Because our generation has done so well in leaving over $1 trillion in unprovided for and unfunded obligations to our progeny we are to vote ourselves a tax cut at their expense and without their consent—a very unworthy form of taxation without representation.

But as we look about and seek to find the joyous citizen reaction that should be resulting from the promised tax cut, we don't find it. Instead, there are varying degrees of apathy, uncertainty, and apprehension present among our people. The doubt abounds over the economic wisdom and the fiscal propriety of what the administration proposes to do in making greater debt by paying less taxes for bigger government. Concern arises because of the missing prerequisites to tax reduction.

In my judgment, the essential prerequisites to any tax reduction vary according to the circumstances under which the reduction is being considered. For example, if we ever reached the fiscal millennium of having our revenues exceed the cost of government goods and services and had no existing debt, then it seems to me the only prerequisite to a tax cut would be that we devise a method of accomplishment that promised a result that was fair and equitable.

If, on the other hand, the circumstances attending a proposed tax reduction were not that favorable but instead involved an attempted remedy for an economic downturn that was already at hand and under a deficit situation, then the prerequisites are substantially different. Under this second situation, it is entirely likely that fairness and equity could be deliberately disregarded. We would be seeking maximum revenue benefit with a minimum even though substantial revenue loss. We would lose what we had to lose in order to bolster the economy but we would do it on a discriminatory basis designed to do the most good at least effective cost.

A third set of circumstances under which we could consider tax reduction describes a condition such as currently confronts us. Under this situation our economic health could be described as hesitant stability with the prospects for attaining a robust condition cloudy, and the danger of a relapse always a possibility despite the fact that we have spent lavishly on virtually every conceivable economic cure-all. In short, in this case we have a bad case of federalitis that finds us failing to pay for a government we neither need nor are willing to afford. Our condition is aggravated by a tax structure that is uneconomic in its impact and inadequate in its result. Hence, in this example, the recommendation to reduce taxes is designed to make the tax structure less an economic deterrent and to improve the revenue yield.

It is to the condition described in this third set of circumstances and the attending prerequisites for tax reduction that I will address the balance of my remarks. It is this situation that now is at hand in our Nation.

On January 21, 1963, the President reported to the Congress in his annual economic report that the outlook for expansion in the current year was favorable and that the year 1962 was ending with new records in such economic statistical categories as "personal income, wages, and salaries, and corporate profits." He went on to acknowledge it was "frustrating" not to be able to achieve a goal more nearly approximating of maximum production. Thus, he found what I have termed a hesitant stability with no recession in sight.

The President proposes as the means of achieving the maximum production goal a $13.6 billion tax rate reduction allocated $11 billion for individuals and $2.6 billion for corporations with a revenue recoupment of $3.4 billion from substantive tax reforms and a revenue pickup of $1.5 billion by a revised acceleration of corporate tax payments. In the face of mounting criticism to his tax panacea, the President suddenly determined that a recession resulting from a failure to enact his program was not so remote after all.

He not only foresaw a possible recession but just 2 weeks after his Treasury Secretary had told the Ways and Means Committee that the Treasury would recommend a veto of any tax cut bill not containing substantive reforms, the President told the press he would sign a bill without reforms. My advice is that we hold out 2 more weeks and we might be able to get rid of the 16th amendment.

It is in the recession context presumably that the administration now would have us evaluate the decision of whether or not to reduce taxes and how. Yet if recession is at hand or in the offing the administration tax package is the poorest approach to remedial fiscal policy because of its increased tax burden in the early period on investment and middle and upper income taxpayers.

The President has properly found that our Federal tax structure is a deterrent to economic growth and an impairer of vigor in our traditional economy. I entirely agree with this conclusion. I do not agree that he has proposed the right remedy to correcting this shortcoming. Hence, the missing prerequisite of the right kind of tax reduction is missing from his tax program.

The proposed tax reduction program in net effect will increase the purchasing power available to lower income groups while increasing the relative tax burdens imposed on middle and upper income taxpayers. I need not spell out to this informed and knowledgeable group the details of the proposals that lead to this conclusion. Suffice it to say that the package of unwise rate reduction and inadequately considered substantive reform and revision negates any potential benefits from tax reduction and threaten to do harm from an impairment of confidence. If there is an absence of confidence then any feasible tax reduction will be to no avail in compensating for that absence. Accordingly, the administration's tax program is recession creating rather than recession curing. The fact that he now repudiates his reform proposals is little cause for confidence because we can all recall the Treasury "temporary" compromises on the 1962 act and the way the Treasury later acted to repudiate them.

The President should have proposed a more moderate revenue loss from tax rate reduction geared more realistically to stimulate incentive and investment. His reforms should have been less ambitious and less controversial at this stage. If the rate revising had been sounder and the reforms less controversial then the principle espoused by that distinguished Secretary of the Treasury Andrew B. Mellon that lower rates produce higher revenues could have come into play to buoy our economy and create sustainable economic growth. It is at the point of such growth that it would have been more appropriate to consider a sweeping tax reform program. What we need now is a minimum

revenue loss allocated in such a way as to produce maximum growth and we must follow tax policy based on sound economics rather than tax policy seeking political advantages. In this way we could meet the first prerequisite that is now missing—namely a wisely conceived approach to tax reduction.

A second missing prerequisite to tax reduction as outlined in the administration's program is the prerequisite of fiscal integrity.

The currently pending tax recommendations completely ignore the possibility of increasing of incentives through tax adjustments achieved within the framework of a balanced budget.

Federal, State, and local taxes currently take 30 percent of our net national product—a shocking statistic that indicates the extent to which we have gone in socializing the endeavors of our people. Twenty percent of our net national product alone goes to the Federal Government. Approximately 85 percent of our Federal revenues come from taxes on income and capital; a comparable composite percentage for all levels of government in the United States is 77.7 percent. This heavy reliance on income and capital taxation is a strange paradox in a so-called free enterprise Nation.

These stifling and confiscatory taxes have been imposed on us to finance a cost of government that has been seldom met by revenues in the last three decades. In 1962 payroll tax receipts for social insurance alone were greater than total Federal taxes 20 years earlier. Despite a 25-fold increase in Federal tax collections in 30 years we find that we have failed to pay our way—in peace and in war—over 80 percent of the time.

But let us turn to more recent considerations that bear more directly on the issue at hand. The budget for 1964 proposes spending that is $19.9 billion or 25 percent over the fiscal year 1961 budget in effect at the time the current administration took office. Are we to believe that there is no room for reduction in a record spending level that has grown that fast?

The last balanced budget occurred in 1960. We are now told that 1967 will be the earliest time by which we can next achieve a balanced budget. In the meantime, we are experiencing a series of successively larger deficits with a certain total addition to the debt of $50 billion by the year 1967 if we do not in the meantime restrain the proclivity for extravagance. This prospect raises the serious question of how much longer our children can afford to let us handle our own affairs. Our deficits are part of their tax burdens; our abandonment of liberty to burgeoning bureaucracy is their government regimentation. "Hold that line" is more than a football cheer. It is the battle cry of our children as they seek to bolster our waning puritan ethic.

To satisfy the puritan ethic and meet the requirement of fiscal integrity that is prerequisite to tax reduction, I propose steps that would in my judgment represent sufficient budgetary savings to enable a substantial first step in achieving an economically sound tax rate structure.

First, I propose that the Congress reluctantly approve a temporary debt ceiling for 1964 that allows a spending level not in excess of that in effect for 1963. I believe this would be in the neighborhood of $312 billion.

Secondly, I propose that all Federal programs involving the granting of aid to foreign governments and instrumentalities be markedly restricted so as to minimize their contribution to deficit spending.

Thirdly, I propose that all new spending programs be deferred and that any scheduled increases in existing programs also be deferred so that only prior spending levels will prevail. If this requires the transfer of funds from nondefense to a higher priority defense purpose, let it happen.

And fourthly, I propose that the Congress proceed to the development of a legislative budget that will bring about a proper degree of self-restraint and spending discipline in the management of our fiscal affairs.

The French philosopher, De Tocqueville, once observed that if the time should ever come when a people should conclude that they can vote themselves benefits out of the Public Treasury, self-government by responsible men would be an impossibility. I submit to you the question: Isn't that what we are proposing to do today? Doesn't the administration's budget and the tax program now before the Congress and the Nation suggest that we should vote ourselves benefits out of the Federal Treasury? As parents we speak of the weekly allowances we give our children but as citizens do we ignore the debt we are daily adding to their future tax bills? These are questions that demand answers so that we can decide when we will pay our own way.

We must apply to any tax-reduction program the missing prerequisites of sound economic policy and fiscal integrity before we proceed to the urgent task of easing tax burdens. Only in this way can our Nation's achievement be worthy of the challenge to freedom's survival.

SHALL WE HAVE A TAX CUT, OR A BALANCED BUDGET?

(Remarks of Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, to the Economic Club of Detroit, Detroit, Mich., March 11, 1963)

I am pleased to have the opportunity to discuss the President's proposals for "tax reduction and tax reform" submitted to the Congress before this distinguished forum of practicing economists. Underlying the President's fiscal proposals are economic ideas so novel that the academicians who have sponsored them now openly admit that the chance of the political implementation of these ideas by the peoples' representatives in Congress has been considerably lessened as a result of the people's lack of understanding and clinging to a puritan ethic. The stated program now is to educate the people. These theoreticians in economics apparently acted upon the advice of fellow theoreticians in political science to politically implement their ideas. Both groups express amazement that the people have not responded to the bait of tax reduction and are asking if the theory which supports it is not a "hooker." As a practicing politician, I must confess to some amazement myself, but it is heartening to realize that the people indeed are asking, What's the catch when you cut revenues and increase expenditures at the same time?

I do not shy away from novel ideas. In fact, I enjoy them and I constantly advance some of my own. However, I do not believe it is becoming for novelists to become angry and arrogant if their ideas are not immediately accepted. The burden of proof should always be, and indeed, human nature being what it is, will always be on the innovator.

The President, in his famous Yale speech, allowed himself to become a spokesman for the novel economic theories which lie at the base of his tax proposals. In this speech the innovators took the offensive to denigrate ahead of time possible opponents of the proposed innovations by stating they had become encrusted with economic myths and out worn shibboleths. In the speech the President suggested that there should be a national debate on the subject.

Ever since that challenge I have been trying to accept it. I have tried to use public forums such as the House-Senate Economic Committee, the forum of the Ways and Means Committee, the forum of the floor of the House of Representatives, the forums of various distinguished organizations of scholars and practitioners which have been opened up to me, such as the Tax Foundation, the National Council of Economic Statistic Users, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Bankers Association, and Economic Clubs such as yours. I have written articles for newspapers and magazines, and appeared on television and radio to debate the matter.

From the record of the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee and the Ways and Means Committee, let me say I can only conclude that it was mere rhetoric on the President's part to ask for a national debate on the subject. He and his advisers have studiously avoided debating the issue. They seek only to pontificate through press releases and prepared speeches. They refuse to come to grips with the questions their theories give rise to. Indeed, when pressed under cross examination, they obfuscate the issue by abandoning what logic lies behind their theories and fall back upon a professed belief on their part in what they had so recently termed shibboleths and myths, such as balanced budgets and avoidance of Federal deficits.

I watched the base being laid for the novel economic theory which the President is now advancing, back in 1957–58. At the time I had thought the purpose was more limited, merely to lay the groundwork for winning the 1960 presidential election. I had not thought that this would be carried to the point of trying to establish national programs in 1962 and 1963.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS became chairman of the Joint Economic Committee in 1957, and I became the ranking and senior Republican member of the committee. A special study into the subject of economic growth was authorized and Dr. Otto Eckstein of Harvard was given a leave of absence to head it up. From this study came the gap theory in economic growth. The theory is that our growth rate would be around 5 percent if we had full employment and full plant utilization. Full employment assumed a rate of unemployment of 4 percent. If our growth rate were 5 percent, than gross national product would be x dollars and from this increased gross national product we would realize x dollars in additional revenue. It is at the point of full employment and not until then that we should talk in terms of a balanced budget.

It was argued that governmental monetary, fiscal, and expenditure policies had not provided this kind of growth. Dr. Eckstein's group sought to bring this theory down to earth by relating it to a period from 1953 to 1958.

This theory was contested from the first day it was published. The minority views accompanying the Eckstein study spell out the basic disagreement. Dr. Arthur Burns points up the errors in the theory in detail in two separate papers, both of which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It may still be a matter of judgment whether the gap theory has been completely disproved in the eyes of economic scholars. Certainly it has not been proven. Scholars should not take anyone's word either way. The Eckstein report, the minority rebuttals and Dr. Burns' critiques are there for anyone to read and reach his own judgment.

What has happened, however, is that the embryonic gap theory has been taken out of the womb of economic science before it has finished a minimum period of gestation. It has been brought into the field of politics by professional economists who have presented it as if it were mature, proven, and uncontested. This theory was promulgated by the President in the 1960 presidential campaign. Since then, a certain school of economists acting in the guise of their professionalism but, in essence, unprofessionally as politicians, have advanced it further and built other untenable premises upon it. Today many businessmen and others untrained in academic economics are told that they are economic illiterates, scoffers at scholarship, and generally suffering from a kind of cretinism if they do not adopt the faith.

I think these attempts at intellectual browbeating by this limited, though powerful, through their vested hold on the positions in our higher institutions of learning, group of economic scholars is shameful and very damaging to the maintenance of good scholarship in their important field and, through contamination, other fields as well.

We looked down our noses at Russian biology because of Lysenkoism—that is biology by politics rather than by scientific method. We can well look at home to the same type of operation in the science of economics.

Now to the issues. Has there been an economic growth gap as alleged by the President's Council of Economic Advisers and by the school of economics for which they speak? In light of a 3-percent growth rate measured in GNP for the past 70 years when our economy was growing more solidly and rapidly perhaps than any economy in history any talk of a gap because the growth rate has not been 4 or 5 percent for any particular short span is unrealistic. This becomes even more unrealistic when we realize the vast enlargement of our economic base would tend to lessen percentage increases. Furthermore, as an economy moves closer to its objectives of providing more freedom and higher standards of living for all its people, consumer choice is bound to play an increasing part in the allocation of resources, not the least important of which is the choice of allocating one's own time. These two items, (1) amount of time spent leisurely, including time in education, training, and certain kinds of research, and (2) increased variety of goods and services available for consumer choice are not measured in any adequate way in the GNP indicator which is the sole measure of economic growth employed by the neo-Keynesians.

Furthermore, increased consumer choice, which includes that precious choice which more and more Americans are finding lies within their power to make—to spend or to invest a dollar—modifies many of the old economic formulas which have been based upon economic scarcity, not economic plenty, particularly this is true in the fields of monetary, fiscal, and Government expenditure policy. The neo-keynesians are trying to put this new wine in old bottles.

Mislaid by the unrealistic and unsubstantiated gap theory, the neo-Keynesians reach the amazing conclusion that our economy is tired, listness, and suffering from tried blood. Using this metaphor, it is understandable that their remedies should be shots in the arm and probably, if they had their way, would include grafting monkey glands. They have diagnosed our economic condition as symptomatic of old age. Actually, the symptoms reveal growing pains.

There has been no economic gap. In fact, measured by the correct measuring rods, our economic growth since World War II has been extremely rapid. It has been this accelerated rate of real economic growth that understandably has created some serious structural problems, particularly in our capital plant and in our labor force. Indeed, when we break down the economic aggregates of GNP, employment and unemployment figures, plant utilization, profits, and consumer purchasing power into their components, as we must if we are to diagnose our condition correctly, we find clear evidence of rapid innovation, rapid obsolescence of both plants and skills, and greatly increased consumer choice of goods and services, vast increases in leisure time, education, training and research, and a very marked increase in our standard of living.

When technological advancement has been unusually rapid in history—and this had happened on a number of occasions—the historians usually come up with a name for it. So we refer to one period as the Renaissance, another as the industrial revolution. Today we are calling it automation.

When the President's economic advisers call this period of rapid technological growth—probably the most rapid in the history of the world—a period of listlessness and tired blood, I am reminded of the story of Hans Christian Andersen about the king's beautiful new suit of clothes. It took a child to break the spell in which the tailors had enmeshed the entire court and most of the populace. Of course, the king had no clothes on. Of course, this theory of a listless economy is nonsense to anyone who looks around.

We do have some real problems resulting from the rapid rate of growth we have been experiencing. If we do not realize that rapid growth creates such problems and so fail to set ourselves to meet them, we will stunt further growth and possibly cause permanent damage. Shots-in-the-arm, dope, and monkey glands may get rid of our growing pains all right, but they will do so by stopping the growth.

There is no question in my mind that the Federal tax structure, based as it is essentially on profits, is a drag on our economy. And this drag has increased as our rapid rate of growth has increased. The essence of the private enterprise system is profits. I would like to take the time to spell out the basic high personal and social morality in profits here, but I would have to digress too much from my immediate theme. However, let me say that this task must be undertaken with more force and repetition than ever before if we are to preserve the essential goodness of our economic system. More basic than the erroneous gap theory underlying the President's tax message is a theory which underlines the entire concept of all his programs, both foreign and domestic, not just taxes, which rests on the disbelief in the morality of profits. The economic Lysenkoists have spread their pseudo-scientific theories among our religious leaders, in our seminaries, and throughout our institutions of learning, based upon a subtle, not direct, attack on the morality of profits. The rest of us have operated on the assumption too long that the value of our private enterprise system is so obvious to all in its achievements that the basic features that go to make it up will withstand any and all attacks. We must recognize that an attack has been going on for some time and has met with enough success that on certain days of the week, at any rate, the President of the United States himself joins in pushing it. It is necessary for us to reevaluate our system and spell out with simplicity the ethics that make it work.

A tax based upon profits has two inherently dangerous features which show up markedly when too much reliance is placed upon it. The first feature I have mentioned * * * it relies upon profits, hence it dampens profits. Dampening profits, the profits tax lowers incentive to invest and particularly to high risk investment. Or innovation which is the life blood of any living and growing organism. The extent of this impact is all relative. When the tax take from profits is relatively small, the dampening effect is small; when it is large, the dampening effect is large.

The second dangerous feature of a tax on profits is the fluctuation of its revenue take with economic cycles and economic disturbances. The Federal Government, in the past decade and a half, has found it very difficult to estimate with any reasonable degree of accuracy the amount of revenues to be derived from the personal and corporate income tax in any given year. For example, the error for fiscal year 1963 is almost 10 percent off, $7.5 billion. The errors work both ways, underestimating as well as overestimating. To adjust to this fluctuation we have been urged to accept the thesis that the Federal budget need not be balanced annually, but rather in a business cycle.

However, for political structural reasons this need to adjust Federal budgeting and fiscal policy to the fluctuations of revenue, based upon a tax on profits, has created even graver dangers. Congress has never created the machinery to develop a legislative budget or even to consider the fiscal impact of the President's budget in its aggregate. Expenditure priorities have never been considered in any systematic manner. What budgetary discipline the Congress has developed is all directed toward annual, rather than cyclical considerations, or really toward ad hoc considerations. The net result is that, although balancing a budget over a business cycle to compensate for the fluctuations of revenue based upon a tax of profits is proper theory, the Federal budgets have not been enacted so that revenues have been recouped in periods of upturn to compensate for the deficits occurring in the downturns.

The one beneficial structural feature many have felt existed in a tax on profits, the countercyclical force it exerts on the business cycle, turns out to be one of the greatest deterrents to economic progress when we have to rely too heavily, as we are presently doing, on the profits tax to obtain revenues. When coming out of a period of economic downturn, the countercyclical force may be so great it dampens the upturn. This has led me to speculate that economic cycles may be in the nature of things and that this is the normal way for an economy to move forward.

We do know in nature that many organisms rely upon a peristaltic type of action for the forward movement. Perhaps, in our desire to eliminate what we have felt were bad features in economic downturns, we have tampered with the very forces that move us forward. I am merely speculating, not advancing a thesis here.

The King's tailors, pardon me, I mean President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, have utilized the public's partial understanding of the cyclical aspects of Federal fiscal affairs to promote an entirely different economic theory.

They argue that in budgetary policy we should not look to periods of cyclical upturns to recoup the deficits created during downturns, but rather, to the period when our economy is operating at full employment. It is at this point that the gap theory is fed into the syllogism.

Any resemblance that seems to exist between this theory and the cyclical theory is the result of semantics. The business cycle theory of balancing Federal budgets is related solely to the erratic nature of a profits tax. The cycle is, by definition, a relationship of conjunctive economic periods. It is measured relatively, in gross national product and unemployment figures, not in assumed absolutes. The new theory is based upon assumed absolutes—that gross national product should be at a 5-percent rate, that unemployment should be at a 4-percent rate, and if unemployment were at 4 percent, gross national product would be six.

Or, to state it in simple terms, we balance the budget when we have full employment which is defined to be 4 percent. When we have full employment we attain a 5-percent growth rate. This theory has nothing to do with compensating for the fluctuations of the revenues derived from taxes based upon profits. It seeks its revenues from an increased tax base measured in terms of gross national product.

What then is the force relied upon to bring about the full employment, the increased growth rate and the increased gross national product? It is increased spending. For understanding, spending may be divided into four parts, by two bisectors: (1) Government and private spending. (2) Consumption and capital spending. For no reason related to the new fiscal theory being advanced, primary attention is directed to private consumptive spending, with Government spending and capital spending theoretically held in reserve. We are told to ignore the figures in the 1962, 1963, and 1964 budgets which show Federal spending continuing to increase at double the rate of increase of the 6 years immediately preceding the Kennedy administration. We are asked to take the President's narrative which says Government spending except in defense, space, and interest is being held to the previous level. Even with these meaningless provisos, the narrative doesn't jibe with the figures. Be that as it may, the one quarter the theorists do not concentrate upon is the quarter which they have identified in the President's 1963 Economic Report as being the area of slack in 1962, private capital spending.

I believe the neo-Keynesians follow a sort of trickle-down theory when it comes to stimulating private capital spending. The argument is that if we increase private consumer purchasing power it will be translated into aggregate consumer demand. Aggregate consumer demand, in turn, through a miracle will break itself into the proper components to be demand for the kinds of goods and services for which our idle plant capacity has been designed and our unemployed labor force has been skilled to produce.

This will stimulate plant capacity to be utilized and people to be employed. I interpolate that this trickling down supposedly will create a rippling effect so private investment will be stimulated to expand into new plants and train people in new skills.

The Congress has been told not to examine into Federal expenditure policy, particularly if the intention is to cut back the aggregate amount. Congress is asked to believe that much of this expenditure is capital investment, as we are asked to believe that much of previous Federal expenditures has been capital investment. This is to lessen our worries over the size of the Federal debt because so much of it is said to be offset by capital assets. Regrettably, this is mostly hypothesis and untrue. Very little of Federal spending, the bulk being for military purposes, is of a capital nature. This is unlike State and local expenditures where a sizable portion is for capital outlay and, indeed, a great deal of it is financed through specific bond issues. However, if increased spending is the force upon which the neo-Keynesians rely to balance the budget in 1967 or 1972, when they have full employment, 5-percent growth rate, and full plant utilization, Congress must dig deeply into expenditure policy. The major political question is, Will Congress do this?

President Kennedy has correctly stated that we must judge borrowing by the purposes for which the borrowed money will be spent. He talks about the frivolous borrower and the prudent borrower. Then let us get on with our appraisals. It is my judgment that the Federal Government, in many respects, has been a pretty frivolous borrower and is seeking to continue on its frivolous ways. The only way we can determine this is by examining into expenditure policies. Certainly, increasing the expenditure rate from $13 billion in 6 years to $19 billion in 3 years as the Kennedy administration has done, calls for an appraisal of the aggregate expenditure policy. And this, in turn, requires hard work in reappraising the components.

We now come back to tax policy, because our spending rate continues to exceed our revenue collections. This means we must market additional Government bonds to make up the difference. A distinction needs to be made between spending, frivolous or prudent, based upon whether we pay for it from current taxes or from borrowing, which is merely deferred taxation.

The tax reduction proposals of the President are based upon stimulating the economy through increasing consumer purchasing power which will increase consumer demand which will increase employment which will increase plant utilization. We must think about what effect financing this tax reduction by deferred taxation, Government bonds, at each transition point, will have. If additional deficit financing results in increasing the Consumer Price Index by three points, there is no net increase in consumer demand. If it results in increases in interest rates, there is a lessening of any increase in consumer demand. If the saving rate turns out to be higher than the 7 percent estimated—two points higher—there will be little increase in consumer demand. The psychological impact of any course chosen, though hard to estimate, is of considerable importance. Here is where the belief of the people in the puritan ethic comes into play again.

Furthermore, we must project this economic theory over the period it is supposed to work and come into fruition. This is in 1972, according to the estimates of Dr. Arthur Burns; 1967 according to Secretary Dillon, on his assumption that Federal expenditures will start to level off in fiscal 1965. We have no budget for this year as yet, so who knows. Judging by the Kennedy budgets we already have, 1962, 1963, and 1964, Dr. Burns is conservative, and Mr. Dillon is dealing in Kennedy narration.

Dr. Burns estimated the additional Federal deficits would amount to $75 billion. Secretary Dillon had not made any estimates at the time he testified before the Ways and Means Committee. This is a rather strong indication that the promoters of this novel theory of balancing budgets only in times of full employment really aren't concerned about Federal deficits or balancing the budget. They seem to be giving lip service to the shibboleths of the people for political reasons. This devious technique robs those who wish to debate this issue out on economic grounds of the opportunity to do so.

Thus, the problems of debt management join expenditure policy as matters outside the national debate President Kennedy requested in his Yale speech.

If President Kennedy's economic and fiscal advisers will not discuss or debate the issues involved in expenditure policy and in the field of debt management, the Congress has only one recourse, to abide by the puritan ethic. This ethic has the merit, at least so far, of not preventing this country from attaining the highest standard of living of any society in history. My own judgment is that this puritan ethic lies at the base of our success and at our peril do we abandon it.

This should leave the people the same recourse, to abide by their basic beliefs, and not abandon them. It appears to me it is not the people who need educating. It is the Neo-Keynesians who advance new theories and refuse to defend them who need education, particularly in the basic rule of debate which places the burden on moving forward on the affirmative.

Finally, I would observe that the President's tax proposal is headed "Tax Reduction and Tax Reform." In this instance, we can learn something by considering the semantics. Under many people's concept of tax reform, which is my own, rate reduction is the greatest reform needed. Tax reduction is part of, not in conjunction or opposition to tax reform, as the Kennedy semantics make it. Tax rate reduction is the largest part of tax reform.

However, under the Neo-Keynesian theory, tax reduction is distinct from tax reform. Indeed, tax reform as they advance it seems to be a recoupment of revenues lost through rate reduction. Tax reduction to them is essentially to release consumer purchasing power, to increase spending, not to reform the tax system. If this action does not increase spending in sufficient amounts, we have been told that we must have increased Federal spending. Indeed, only through narratives and bookkeeping devices have the people been distracted from realizing that the present administration package pending before the Congress includes proposals for both tax reduction and increased Federal spending.

Tax reform, relying heavily on rate reduction, is always in order, whatever the economic cycle, whatever the state of economic growth. This theory looks upon high tax rates as impediments to economic growth. By lowering the rates, we remove the impediment; like replacing shoes and clothes that are too tight with larger sizes for a growing youth. We are not talking about a shot in the arm or grafting on monkey glands.

Under this theory, however, we must consider the economic impact we cause from any new problems we created in the field of debt management. In these critical times of balance of payments and gold flow and large debt to be managed, I think it is foolhardy to create any further problems in the field of debt management, particularly when it has such a close relationship to the problems in monetary policy.

There is a practical way out for those of us who believe that, and have advocated for so many years, there is a great need for tax reform. It lies in Federal expenditure reform. I am convinced that Federal expenditures reform will be beneficial in two basic ways: (1) In the aggregate, to enable us to cut taxes and balance the budget; (2) in its components, where so much of our Federal expenditure has been frivolous rather than prudent.

I want to close on this note. Economic reform is most needed. Today, in the areas where Government policy contributes to or fails to relieve, the price-cost squeeze. Profits are the life blood of a private enterprise system. We will continue to grow if we will preserve the incentive for our people to innovate, to risk, to explore, to research and to study. Taxes are only one of the impediments. Much needs to be done to remove the many other impediments which we have allowed to exist and, indeed, in some instances, we have created from past unwise governmental policies.

THE NEW PHILOSOPHY OF PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, while offering what they call new and sophisticated ideas, the administration's economic spokesmen are constantly urging our people to shed their absolete and outworn economic notions, such as concern over persistent budget deficits.

In the light of the current economic debate, it is especially interesting, therefore, to look back through the years and discover that the ideas which the administration calls new and sophisticated are, themselves, relics of a bygone era.

Into this category must fall the administration's assertion that a large and increasing public debt is not to be feared, but that any cutback in Government spending could result in economic collapse. According to the "new" economic theories, the desire for a balanced budget—at least in periods of relative prosperity—is nothing but obsolete economic dogma.

The administration's emphasis on the need for a capital budget is also offered as a product of the New Frontier, as is its assertion that there is really very little danger of inflation—or other harmful economic consequences—from steady increases in the public debt.

These ideas, which the administration tries to pass off as new, were the products of the depression of the 1930's and were thoroughly discussed—and refuted—in 1943 by an eminent economist, Harold G. Moulton, of the Brookings Institution, in a book entitled "The New Philosophy of Public Debt."

In that book, Mr. Moulton offered a clear and penetrating analysis of what at that time was still a relatively new philosophy on deficit financing and the public debt, but which today looks a bit stale. Mr. Moulton's analysis, however, is as fresh and sound today as it was two decades ago.

I want to commend to my colleagues Mr. Moulton's short and straightforward book. I have excerpted a number of sections from the book which have particular relevance to today's economic debate. I think that this brief condensation of some of the highlights of Mr. Moulton's book is so important and so potentially useful to the Members of Congress, the press, and the public, that I wish to include it in the RECORD at this point:

I. CONFLICTING DEBT PHILOSOPHIES

Two opposing philosophies with respect to public finance exist in high Government circles today. The first, which may be called the traditional view, is that a continuously unbalanced budget and rapidly rising public debt imperil the financial stability of the Nation. The second, or new conception, is that a huge public debt is a national asset rather than a liability and that continuous deficit spending is essential to the economic prosperity of the Nation. According to this view, the conception of a balanced budget belongs in the category of obsolete economic dogma, the fallacy of which has been clearly demonstrated in recent years.

The new philosophy, as already indicated, holds that public finance is really only a matter of bookkeeping, that a rising debt has no adverse consequences, and that without a constantly increasing debt we cannot hope to have full employment and prosperity.

II. THE CRUCIAL ISSUE OF NATIONAL POLICY

The conflict of views so sharply revealed in the foregoing quotations is the crucial economic issue of the present time. If it be true that the recent experience of this and other countries has demonstrated that there cannot be any financial problem so long as we go ahead boldly with production—that just doing the job actually pays the bill; if it be true that all we have to do after the war is to continue public expenditures at whatever level is necessary to provide full employment, our economic future may be viewed in terms of easy optimism. On the other hand, if it be true that a great and continuous growth of the public debt imperils the financial stability of the Nation and undermines the very foundations of the economic system; if it be true that the war debt must be paid, or at least be greatly reduced, and that the treasury must be soundly solvent in order that the Nation may prosper and progress, then the mounting war indebtedness and the postwar outlook must be viewed with deep apprehension.

If we simply lay the issue on the table or put it from our minds because we are unwilling to take the time to think it through, we shall be confronted with ever-increasing difficulties. On the one hand we shall find the spending agencies, where the new philosophy is naturally ascendant, pressing for constant increases in appropriations with which to spend our way into permanent prosperity. On the other hand, we shall find the Treasury striving for ways and means of raising ever-increasing amounts of revenue with which to balance the budget, restrict the growth of the debt, and preserve the credit of the Government.

Until this basic issue of national policy is settled, we shall inevitably drift in the direction indicated by the new philosophy—because the money appropriating authorities can hardly be expected to muster sufficient resolution to resist the persistent demands for increased public outlays or to levy sufficiently heavy taxes to cover the appropriations. The apparently easy way is, moreover, always the popular way. Unless the issue is decided by the process of intellectual discussion, it is likely to be automatically determined by the temper and trend of the times backed by the educational activities and pressures of the spending agencies.

III. THE EVOLUTION OF THE NEW CONCEPTION

The new philosophy of public expenditures in relation to economic prosperity is an outgrowth of the disordered economic conditions of the early thirties; but it developed to its present form by gradual stages.

It was not until the recovery of 1933 had failed to reach the stage of prosperity, or greatly to alleviate the unemployment situation, that attention gradually shifted to the use of public expenditures as a positive and primary force in promoting recovery.

The next stage in the development of the present doctrine grew out of the business recession of 1937. Beginning about the middle of 1936, there was a very substantial expansion of business, and it seemed that the pump priming was really taking effect. But just at the moment when it appeared that at last we might be emerging from the mires of depression the incipient boom collapsed, to be followed by a new depression. Meanwhile, however, the expanding volume of national income had increased tax revenues; and, in consequence, by March 1937 the cash deficit, or to use the new terminology, the "Treasury's net contribution to purchasing power," or "net income-creating expenditures," had been reduced to negligible proportions and continued low during ensuing months.

Before this time the argument had been that we should increase public expenditures in periods of depression and decrease them in periods of prosperity; in other words, that we should have an unbalanced budget in bad times and a balanced budget in good times. (In the terminology of the time this was known as compensatory fiscal action.) But in the light of the 1937 episode, the doctrine that deficit reduction—whether due to increased taxes, reduced expenditures, or a combination of both—is deflationary in effect and will lead to depression became in due time a deeply rooted principle of the evolving philosophy.

It was at this stage that the idea of double and multiple budgeting gained popularity—with capital outlays segregated from current expenditures—without too careful a definition of what might properly be included in capital expenditures. It was about this time that emphasis began to be placed upon the assets created by public debts—whether such assets be in the form of tangible properties or intangible services, whether they yield revenues or are simply useful to society. Whatever their character all public outlays are in reality investments. From this point it was an easy step to the proposition that all increases in public expenditures represent income to someone and that all reductions in public expenditures represent loss to someone; and that costs and income are just opposite sides of the same shield.

It should be apparent without argument that the present war experience has merely confirmed what was already known, namely, that a great expansion of employment can be provided by unlimited expenditures of public funds. But neither in this or other countries has the war experience shed any light on the question whether public deficits can be continued indefinitely without undermining the financial and economic system. If the conclusion is to be reached that internal public debts are of no moment, it must be justified either by convincing historical or other evidence or by irrefutable economic analysis.

IV. APPRAISAL OF THE NEW PHILOSOPHY

The 1937 episode

It has already been noted that the depression of 1937 played an important part in the evolution of the doctrine that continuous or expanding deficits are essential to prosperity—that any reduction in net government outlays will only lead to disaster. In testifying before the Temporary National Economic Committee Mr. Hansen said:[1]

"I think that recession of '37 was to a very large extent due to just that decline in the net income-creating expenditures of the Government.[2]

The implication of the phrase net income-creating expenditures in lieu of treasury deficit will be observed. It should be noted, however, that the decline in net income-creating expenditures was not due to an actual decrease in Treasury outlays; it was rather the result of the increased tax receipts which naturally accompanied the prosperity period. This automatic increase in tax receipts is evidently looked upon as more or less equivalent to a positive curtailment of Government financing and a corresponding restriction of purchasing power. It would appear that we must expand Government expenditures at least in proportion to increases in tax receipts, lest the shrinking cash deficit—that is, the decline in income-creating expenditures—dry up the stream of purchasing power.

This analysis obviously overlooks the fact that it is aggregate national purchasing power, private and public, that counts. The statistics of income disbursements, public and private, show that aggregate purchasing power was rising rapidly during the period in question.

Is the public debt a real debt?

The proponents of the philosophy that the only hope for full employment and continuing prosperity lies in permanent deficit financing recognize, of course, that this means a continuous expansion of the public debt. The economic implications of an ever-expanding public debt are, moreover, given consideration. We are advised that an internal public debt is not a menace and that we should not be "intimidated" by it. "On the contrary, instead of looking upon [it] with the sort of awe that was inspired in our savage ancestors by some incomprehensible phenomenon such as lightning, we must take a leaf out of the book of modern science. It is, in fact, so different from what we commonly think of as debt that it should scarcely be called debt at all."[2] An internal

---

[1] Alvin Hansen, Harvard University.

[2] Hearings, pt. 9, p. 3553.

public debt "has none of the essential earmarks of a private debt."[3]

As a preliminary, it is desirable to clear up some possible sources of confusion or misunderstanding about the public debt problem. In this way the range of controversy or disagreement will be narrowed and the basic issues more clearly revealed.

Must the budget always be in balance?

The answer to this question is obviously "No." The question is raised here only because it is frequently implied that those who are concerned about perpetual increase of the debt are adherents of the obsolete conception of a permanently balanced budget. It is of course generally conceded that in times of war public expenditures may have to run ahead of current tax receipts. Moreover, nearly all students of public finance are, I believe, in agreement that in times of depression and readjustment, public outlays not covered by taxes may be both essential and helpful in stimulating recovery. As for prosperity periods, it has always been taken for granted that the budget should provide a surplus with which to reduce public debt. Insofar as there may be disagreement with respect to the use of public expenditures in conjunction with alternating periods of depression and prosperity (the so-called compensatory fiscal action) it would relate only to the degree to which fiscal policy, as distinguished from other types of policy, might advisedly be relied upon to promote recovery.

Must the public debt be paid off?

It is widely believed that a public debt created by a war or other national emergency must, or at least should, in due course be completely liquidated. This view is fostered by official statements such as those quoted on pages 2 and 3. Students of public finance are, however, agreed on the proposition that there is no necessity of reducing a public debt to zero. Many countries have had large public debts for a century or more. Even the U.S. Government has not been completely out of debt since 1835. While the large debt incurred during the Civil War might readily have been extinguished in a generation, it was decided that some public debt was desirable—as security for bank note issues and as a highly conservative investment. The debt of the First World War was reduced during the twenties from approximately $26 to $16 billion; but no one seriously argued that it was necessary or desirable that the debt be completely paid off.

It is only necessary that the debt be kept under easy control—that is, well within revenue possibilities. Fiscal experts have always regarded it as wise to reduce the debt materially in easy times in order to have a margin of safety for possible hard times in the future. This is simply commonsense, prudent financial management.

Under what conditions may a public debt be gradually expanded?

There are two circumstances under which a gradual expansion of the public debt might occur without endangering financial stability. First, if the Government floats bonds for the purpose of constructing a public enterprise which yields sufficient revenues to cover maintenance, operation, and replacement costs, together with interest on the Government's investment, the accompanying expansion of the debt need cause no concern. The bonds issued for the construction of the Panama Canal are an illustration. The situation here is analogous to the common practice of private corporations in floating bonds with which to construct revenue-producing plant and equipment.

Second, at a time when, in consequence of private business expansion, the national income is steadily rising, with the taxpaying capacity likewise increasing, a country would obviously be able to support an increasing public debt. But prudent management, with forethought for possible difficulties in the future, still would suggest the importance of restraining the debt in order to provide an ample margin of safety for future periods of adversity.

How does an internal debt differ from a foreign debt?

It has long been recognized and repeatedly pointed out that there is an essential difference between a domestic public debt and an external public debt. In the case of a foreign debt the revenues collected from American taxpayers with which to pay interest have to be transferred to bondholders living in another country. In final analysis this means that we have to export goods and services to foreigners in order to obtain the foreign currency required. In the case of an internal debt the interest is paid to bondholders living in the same country as the taxpayers; hence exports and the acquisition of foreign currency are not involved. This obvious difference does not, however, dispose of the issue whether an internal public debt is of any economic significance.

With these preliminary questions cleared, we are in a position to consider the arguments advanced in support of the conclusion that a domestic debt involves no dangers but has positive advantages. It will be necessary to scrutinize a number of specific contentions.

The argument that an internal public debt bears no resemblance to a private debt

The view that "a public debt has none of the earmarks of a private debt," and that "it should scarcely be called a debt at all" arises from contemplation of the fact that the money collected as taxes flows back to the people as interest receipts. "Taxes will be collected to service the bonds, and when interest or principal payments are made on them the money is merely shifted about within the economic system."

The same line of reasoning might be applied to the debt of a State or a city, if such debt were held wholly by the citizens of the particular State or municipality. And, if we consider our States and our cities as a collective whole, all State and local public indebtedness could be looked upon as not really debt at all. Moreover, if we view the corporations of the country collectively, their bonded indebtedness would not really be debt because the income collected from the American people for the services rendered is paid out to the American people as interest. In this way we get rid of all debt problems.

On second thought, however, it will be reflected that particular railroad companies or industrial corporations, or State or local governments, might find themselves in difficulty because they are unable to make financial ends meet. Likewise, one may reflect that the Federal Government might, under certain circumstances, find it impossible to collect sufficient revenues to meet its interest and other obligations. National governments have, in fact, frequently found themselves in serious financial difficulties. Thus the mere fact that in all cases the collection of revenues and the payment of interest "merely shifts money around within the economic system" has not, as historical evidence shows, eliminated the debt problem.

While Mr. Hansen argues in some places that a public debt has none of the earmarks of a private debt, elsewhere he makes them directly analogous. For example:

"Public debt might be likened to the capital account of a corporation, made up, say, of long-term mortgage bonds and of one or more classes of stock. Such liabilities, it is important to remember, are offset by assets on the other side of the balance sheet. So long as these are of a character to produce sufficient earnings to meet the capital charges, including dividends on the stock, nobody would ever think of the corporation as being over capitalized. The essential element determining the soundness of the concern is the ratio of its earning power to its capital account. Precisely the same principle holds with respect to the public debt of a nation, of which the source of earnings or revenue is usually taxation. If the power to raise revenue is in manageable ratio to the capital charges (debt service), it is proper to say that the nation is not, so to speak, over capitalized."[4]

From this statement one could hardly conclude that public debts are something wholly different from other types of indebtedness.

The contention that tax payments and interest receipts are in fairly close adjustment

The contention that a domestic public debt has little significance because the income is merely shifted about within the economic system, going out of one pocket into another, was extensively discussed after the last war. At that time the basic issue was stated by the present writer as follows:

"It is undoubtedly true that the interest on the domestic debt accrues to the people of any given country in the form of revenue. But the particular individuals who pay the taxes do not usually receive back in interest anything like the precise amount of funds that they have parted with in the form of taxes. Some receive a great deal more from the Government than they pay to the Government; others receive a great deal less. The process thus involves a wholesale redistribution of wealth."[5]

That the process might at times involve a considerable redistribution of wealth is admitted by Mr. Hansen. He stated the matter as follows in 1941:

"Insofar as the Government can borrow from small savers, an increase in the public debt will not prove unfavorable to an equitable distribution of wealth.

"But if the growth in the public debt is very rapid, it will not be possible for relatively small savers to take any large proportion of the new securities issued. They will be absorbed by the rich and the well-to-do, and by large corporations. A rapid growth in the public debt is, therefore, likely to intensify the inequality in wealth distribution."[6]

But in 1942—a year of extraordinarily rapid debt increase, in which the bulk of the bond purchases were made by individuals of large means and by the commercial banks—Mr. Hansen contends that "under modern conditions" the ideal of an identity between individual tax payments and individual interest receipts is more closely approximated than was formerly the case. Most of the debt is now actually very widely distributed among individual citizens or among institutions that serve the citizens; and this state of affairs may be expected to continue."[7]

He cites as evidence the following distribution of Government bond holdings as of June 30, 1942, and adds that "Only a little reflection is needed to see that every one of these groups of bondholders—except the 'others'—does in fact serve the public or is itself the public; and even the 'others' are made up in considerable measure of endowments, foundations, and trust funds, rather than rich individuals."[8]

---

[3] The same, p. 166.

[4] Fortune, November 1942, p. 169.

[5] John F. Bass and Harold G. Moulton, "America and the Balance Sheet of Europe," p. 61.

[6] Fiscal Policy and Business Cycles, p. 179.

[7] Fortune, November 1942, p. 170.

[8] The same.

	Billions	Percent
Commercial banks	$28.8	37.7
Life insurance companies and mutual savings banks	12.9	16.8
Purchasers of savings bonds	13.1	17.1
Government trust funds	10.6	13.8
Others	11.2	14.6

The obvious intent here is to convey the impression that these figures show an extremely wide distribution of bond holdings among the masses—that they are not held mainly by the rich. The data cited do not, however, throw any light on the breadth of the distribution of Government bonds. The purchasers of savings bonds include wealthy individuals and business corporations as well as individuals of small means, and the mere statement that there are 13.1 billions outstanding does not show who holds them.

Nearly 40 percent of Government issues are held by commercial banks, and the proportion is rapidly rising. The bulk of deposits of the commercial banks are those made by large corporations, and represent working capital funds. At the end of 1942 the average size of the commercial deposits (excluding Government and bank deposits) of five large New York banks, having aggregate deposits of $5 billion, was roughly $30,000. Quantitatively speaking, the bulk of the deposits of most small commercial banks also are those of business enterprises or of individuals of substantial means.

Even if it could be shown that Government bond holdings were now very widely distributed, it would still be necessary to show that the tax burden is distributed similarly. But no evidence on this point is submitted.

The argument that "costs and income are just opposite sides of the same shield"

It is emphasized that "Every cent expended, public or private, becomes income for the members of our own society." This conception apparently explains the statement of the National Resources Planning Board that costs are of no significance, that "doing the job pays the bill." Since the receipts are necessarily identical with the disbursements everything is satisfactory: cost equals income; and income equals cost.

Note that this argument is applied not only to interest on the public debt, but to all public expenditures. Veterans' compensation does not really cost us anything because the veterans receive the income. The war does not cost us anything because every cent expended (within the country) is income to the American people. Note also that the statement includes private as well as public expenditures. Since the costs of private business are represented on the opposite side of the shield by income disbursements, no one need worry about costs.

The initial error in this proposition is that costs and income are not opposite sides of the same shield. The costs are costs to the Treasury; the income is income to the public. And the Treasury cannot get back all of its outlays in the form of taxes. Hence there is no identity between outflow and inflow. The Treasury goes into debt.

The second error embodies the basic fallacy in the new philosophy of public expenditure and debt. The argument that all government expenditures, for whatever purpose, generate money income and thereby provide the means for liquidating the costs fails to take account of the differing effects of varying types of public expenditure upon future income.

When a government constructs a capital enterprise which sells goods or services in the market it derives revenues—presumably sufficient to cover operating costs and interest, to provide for eventual replacement, and to yield an income to the Government. Such a public outlay would impose no additional tax burden on the rest of the community. The enterprise is not only self-supporting but may even help support the government over a period of years.

Non-revenue-producing public works cannot cover their operating, maintenance, and replacement costs, or interest charges. Hence they involve continuing costs which must be borne by the taxpayers. It is obvious that most types of public works are useful or enjoyable; but it remains true that they do not for that reason yield continuing revenues with which to carry their costs. From a fiscal point of view, instead of carrying themselves, and possibly yielding net revenues to the Government in the future, they involve continuing annual outlays for an indefinite period. Similarly, expenditures for veterans' compensation, doles, interest, and so forth—necessary though they may be—provide no continuing source of public revenues.

But it is contended by Mr. Hansen that all the free services provided by the Government can readily be made to take care of themselves by the simple process of expanding the Nation's money supply and hence its taxable capacity.

"When the Government provides free services, some appropriate monetary expansion is justified. This would permit the collection of taxes sufficient to cover the expenses of operation together with amortization and interest charges." [9]

This seems to say that if: first, we expend public money to construct non-revenue-producing public works, to support the unemployed, and so forth; and then, second, issue an additional volume of money, the taxes will rise sufficiently to liquidate all the costs involved. By what process and to whom the additional money (from which the additional taxes would be derived) is to be issued is not made clear. Nor is there apparently any recognition of the fact that, in order to carry the continuing costs involved, this additional income would have to be issued not once only but in each succeeding year. The basic error in thinking pointed out above still remains. The Treasury simply cannot get back in taxes, levied upon the additional income it distributes through its disbursements, as much money as it pays out.

This general problem may be illustrated by wartime expenditures. Such outlays exert, immediately speaking, quite as powerful an economic stimulus, provide as much employment, and generate as much current money income as any other kind of expenditures, public or private. But neither the munitions and supplies consumed by the military establishment, nor the fixed capital embedded in bomber and fighter planes, in Government shipyards and docks, in naval bases and naval vessels, or in military roads and Army fortifications yield tax revenues. Moreover, they cannot carry their own operating costs or provide for their own replacement. They simply represent deadweight charges against the rest of the economic system. In addition to their original costs, they will entail large annual charges for continued upkeep.

That public expenditures for war purposes do not generate a sufficient increase in income to bring the budget more nearly into balance is readily apparent. When the Government expends $20 billion for war purposes the $20 billion of national income thus generated is only in small part available as revenue to the Treasury. If, say, 20 percent of the increased income be collected in taxes, the Government would receive back as a result of this operation only $4 billion, with a resulting increase of $16 billion in the public debt. This is what has been happening since 1940. This is what will continue to happen with non-revenue-producing Government outlays.

By way of contrast, it is well to note what happens when national income increases as a result of private business expansion. Then the ensuing increase in tax receipts is clear gain for the Treasury. Instead of an increasing deficit we get, inevitably, a decreasing deficit.

It must also be noted that an ever-expanding public debt would adversely affect the level of national income in the future by checking investment. The accompanying increase in taxes and the fears of more to come could hardly fail to prove a serious deterrent to new investment. Hence the rate of capital expansion and the rise in national income would be retarded.

V. THE PUBLIC DEBT AND INFLATION

In the popular mind the public debt is closely related to inflation. How is a great advance in commodity prices to be prevented if the public debt is allowed to increase continuously? Does not history show that an enormous rise in the public debt always results in disastrous inflation? We are assured by the advocates of the new philosophy that inflation can readily be controlled, even though the debt is constantly expanding.

Fiscal management under the new system of public finance, it should be noted, would involve control at two stages: First, whenever we are not making full use of our productive resources the Treasury would stimulate further expansion through borrowings from the commercial banks. If the banks should perchance at any time be unwilling to purchase all the Government securities offered, the Government might possibly endeavor to meet the situation by taking over the banks. Or, as an alternative, the Treasury might turn directly to the Federal Reserve system, which is now under political control. Still another alternative would be for the Treasury to issue its own non-interest-bearing notes.

The second stage is reached when the expansion process has resulted in full use of our productive resources. To check inflation at this point, it is held that the Treasury would henceforth cease to borrow from the banks, and raise the money required solely from taxes or from bonds sold to the investing public. Since the Government's revenues would no longer be derived in part from bank credit expansion, the total money supply would no longer increase; and inflation could not occur. Stated in theoretical terms, the problem sounds simple. But, as we shall see, the inflation appears much more complex than the foregoing statement would indicate, and the practical difficulties involved cannot be surmounted without a very elaborate system of control.

1. The problem of control

The nature of the inflation control problem thus raised may best be revealed by reference to the situation with which the United States is confronted in the year 1943. We are now operating the bulk of our productive resources at maximum capacity; we not only have full employment but a shortage of manpower. We have, moreover, a huge excess of purchasing power requiring absorption by the Treasury.

The experience of other countries during this war has shown that without controls over primary cost factors, an inflationary cycle cannot be prevented. And it has also been demonstrated that given such controls, and an effective rationing system, the rise in commodity prices can be checked even when the fiscal program is not adequate to meet the situation. Canada and England, as well as Germany, kept prices well in hand in 1942, even though all of the excess purchasing power was not currently absorbed.

In time of peace the control of inflation at the stage of full employment would be even more difficult than in time of war. The pressures emanating from special groups would be quite as insistent; and the necessities of a greater national emergency could not be invoked as a restraining influence. The sale of bonds to the investing public would be more difficult because opportunities for investment elsewhere would be more abundant and the patriotic urge for assisting the Government less compelling. Moreover, at the very time the Treasury was seeking to check inflation, the situation might be complicated by heavy public liquidations of existing bond holdings in order to obtain spending money. This problem may confront the Treasury in the early postwar period.

---

[9] Fiscal Policy and Business Cycles, p. 170.

If one were to assume that as the stage of full employment is reached the budget would be virtually in balance, the problem of control through fiscal policy would seem to present less difficulty. But, as we have seen, the very process of creating employment by means of deficit financing inevitably results in a perpetual shortage of tax collections as compared with Government expenditures. The budget thus cannot approach a balance. Moreover, the new philosophy, in one of its manifestations, holds that even in periods of prosperity there must be no reduction in the cash deficit—because this would mean a decrease in the Treasury's "net income-creating" expenditures, with resulting deflation.

In fact, there is nothing in the long history of public finance which indicates that any government, and especially a democratic government, can be depended upon to apply the brakes to credit expansion, when the proper moment has arrived. Always the pressures for continuation along the existing road are powerful and persistent.[10]

It should be recalled here that as a result of long experience with such pressures, the management of bank credit currency was, during the course of the 19th century, nearly everywhere divorced from political control. It was generally believed at that period that the central banks could, through appropriate credit policies, control the fluctuations of the business cycle. But now that experience has demonstrated that the central banks are powerless either to prevent deflation or to provide an adequate stimulus for recovery and expansion, we have turned to the Treasury as the one agency which can directly affect the volume of purchasing power in the hands of the public.

But the Treasury does not occupy a position of independence comparable to that of the Federal Reserve system as originally conceived and organized. The Treasury is basically an administrative agency. The policies which it executes, both in connection with tax levies and expenditures, are determined by Congress. This fact obviously involves difficulties from the point of view of developing a scientific, flexible plan of credit control.

To meet this difficulty, advocates of control of the economic system through fiscal policy recommend that the power of discretion in both taxation and expenditures be transferred from Congress to the executive branch of the Government. The function of Congress would thenceforth be confined to providing lump-sum appropriations and to setting certain limitations within which the administration might operate its fiscal program. In connection with expenditures Congress would merely appropriate totals and leave the administration to determine when, where, and how expenditures should be made.[11]

Such a program would obviously constitute a fundamental departure from the financial principles and procedures laid down by the Constitution. To make such a program really effective it would, however, be necessary to go a step further—for with the overall lump-sum appropriation plan Congress might from year to year so change the amounts appropriated as to cripple the operation of the plan. To assure real freedom of action for the administration a complete delegation of the power to raise and expend money would be necessary.

But even with such a delegation of financial powers the executive branch of the Government would not be free from public pressures. Such pressures are now exerted jointly against the Congress and the administration. With Congress eliminated from the financial picture, they would henceforth simply be concentrated on the Executive.

In any case, inflation could not be completely controlled by means of fiscal policy. As has already been shown, fiscal controls do not directly touch certain vital aspects of the problem—those operating from the side of costs. Moreover, history reveals that price inflation frequently occurs by a very different process from that which has thus far been discussed.

It will be necessary to make a choice. With unlimited debt expansion we cannot prevent inflation without the use of totalitarian methods of control. No compromise or halfway measures can adjust the difficulties. The choice is between regimentation and inflation.

The foregoing analysis serves to disclose the gravest danger with which the United States is now confronted. Unable or unwilling to perceive basic inconsistencies, or to choose between clearcut alternatives, we drift toward the deep financial waters from which there is no return other than through repudiation in one form or another.

AMENDING THE EMPLOYMENT ACT

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, during the annual hearings of the Joint Economic Committee last month, Gerhard Colm, chief economist of the National Planning Association, appeared as a witness. Dr. Colm was especially well qualified for this role since he was one of the nameless authors of the Employment Act of 1946, the statute establishing the Joint Economic Committee and the President's Council of Economic Advisers. In a recent article in Challenge magazine, Dr. Colm assessed the history of the Employment Act and suggested improvements in it.

Dr. Colm offered specific recommendations to strengthen the Joint Economic Committee in its role as an advisory body. He suggested, for example, that the committee could have a greater impact upon legislation if its members and staff were to testify before legislative committees on the economic effects of major bills under consideration.

Dr. Colm offered an interesting analysis of the past and future role of the Employment Act of 1946, and I ask unanimous consent that his article, "Government's Role in a Free Economy," from the November 1962 issue of Challenge be inserted in the Record.

GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN A FREE ECONOMY

(By Gerhard Colm)

It is almost a cliché to call the Employment Act of 1946 a milestone in the development of the Government's responsibilities in the economic sphere.

The act, and similar statutes adopted in other democratic countries, was an expression of the people's determination that appropriate government policies would be used to avert depressions and unemployment. It was, in a way, an expression of confidence that a satisfactory economic performance could be accomplished within the framework of a free society; not through a policy of laissez faire, but through deliberate economic and fiscal measures.

The U.S. Government—as well as every other government of modern times—was, of necessity, concerned with such matters as agriculture, industry, transportation, foreign trade, finance and labor relations long before there was an employment act. But the act marked a new era in that it proclaimed government concern with the performance of the economy as a whole.

Since the American Government is so organized that regional and local interests find effective expression both in the legislative and executive branches, the Employment Act established machinery in the two branches—the Joint Economic Committee and the Council of Economic Advisers—to articulate the Government's concern with the performance of the economy as a whole. The duty of the executive to submit an annual economic report to Congress and the duty of the Joint Economic Committee to evaluate these reports provided the link between the two.

Both the Council of Economic Advisers and the Joint Economic Committee are advisory agencies. The committee has no responsibility for drafting any specific legislation, and the Council has no operating functions. While the act did not prescribe any specific policies to accomplish its stated goal of promoting "maximum employment, production, and purchasing power," it is clear from the legislative deliberations that preceded its passage that fiscal and monetary policies were regarded as the main instruments for achieving the act's purpose.

Since 1947 was the economy's first year of operation under the Employment Act, we can now look back on 15 years' experience with it under the aegis of both political parties. Has this performance fulfilled the expectations of the act's framers? What lessons can we learn from our experience thus far?

The passage of the Employment Act of 1946 was largely motivated by the Nation's concern that post-World War II demobilization might cause the economy to revert to the depressed condition which prevailed during the 1930's. While no such depression has taken place during the last 15 years, nobody would claim that the avoidance of a serious depression can be attributed solely to Government policy under the employment act. As a matter of fact, the United States was faced with economic problems in the postwar years that were quite different from those expected by the act's framers.

The first problem economic policymakers had to face was inflation, which abated in 1949 but was resumed with the beginning of the Korean war. This period came to an end in 1952. Government policies certainly mitigated the inflation through a variety of measures recommended by the President in his Annual Economic Reports. In the switch from a proposed tax reduction in 1950 to tax increases in response to the Korean war, the Joint Economic Committee played a decisive role. In general, it is probably fair to say that the machinery of the Employment Act proved helpful in the fight against inflation without claiming anything like a perfect record.

---

[10] This is well illustrated by Schacht's failure in Germany in 1938.

[11] Hansen in the Chicago Journal of Commerce, June 27, 1942.

The problem of inflation, however, did not end with the Korean war. It continued in the form of a "creeping" price rise. The Economic Reports of the President and those of the Joint Economic Committee between 1952–62 greatly contributed to a better understanding of the difference between a price rise stemming from excess demand on the one hand and one resulting from the exercise of "market power" by business and unions on the other. However, only in exceptional cases did Government action go beyond admonishments to business and labor to exercise self-restraint in price and wage policy. The principal exception was President Kennedy's action last spring to prevent a steel price increase.

The Council of Economic Advisers, for its part, has developed general guidelines for a noninflationary wage policy, but there is no machinery to implement them. Proposals have been made that factfinding committees should look into the price, productivity, and labor cost situation of key industries. Yet even such apparently moderate proposals have been suspected as being steps in the direction of price and wage control. Both business and labor believe they can pursue their own interests better by "free" collective bargaining and "free" price policy than by injection of the "public interest" represented by Government as a third party in price and wage determination.

Yet the increasing talk about the public interest in such matters has undoubtedly had some restraining effect on business and union attitudes. Nevertheless, there remains the task of finding an acceptable structure within which prices and wages can be determined without jeopardizing the public interest.

A second characteristic of the postwar period were the frequent, but short-lived, recessions. As far as recessions are concerned, the machinery created under the Employment Act must serve first as a "storm warning system" and secondly as an instrument to formulate countermeasures.

Encouraged by the Council and the joint committee, tools for business cycle diagnosis have been greatly improved—first by the monthly publication of Economic Indicators and, most recently, by the monthly publication of Business Cycle Development. The latter publication organizes statistical data in an attempt to construct a kind of economic barometer.

Spectacular advances have also been made in sample surveys of businessmen's plans to invest as well as the buying intentions of consumers. In addition, electronic computers have been used for quickly processing available statistical information.

Still the record of the Council as a storm warning agency is far from perfect. Failures in diagnosis can be partly explained by the problem of politics. President Truman fought his 1948 campaign on an anti-inflation platform. It took some time until the Council found the indications of an approaching recession in 1949 clear enough to change the advice it was giving the President. Another example is the denial by the Chairman of the Council during the presidential campaign of 1960 that a recession was in the making when many economists thought that available economic indicators did not permit any other interpretation.

Not all failures in diagnosis, however, can be blamed on politics. In the summer of 1962 some observers of the leading indicators believed that a recession was imminent while others believed that a period of slow expansion might be followed by a new rise in economic activity in 1963. Thus, despite all the technical advancements in the diagnosis of the business cycle, economic forecasts remain statements about probabilities. Actions on the basis of forecasts therefore inevitably run the risk that the forecast was in error. Evaluating the possible harm by not acting in time on the one hand, or by acting prematurely on the basis of an uncertain forecast on the other, always requires a mixture of economic and political judgment.

There is no question that the current political debate about the need for antirecession policies is based on a quality of economic intelligence which is far superior to anything available 15 years ago. But this is still no guarantee that the right decisions will be made.

Not only have we improved our ability to predict recessions; we are much better at combating them, too. The use of variable financial terms for residential construction and home improvements has been particularly successful. Statistical analyses suggest that deliberate Government policies have made at least some contribution to mitigating recessions and promoting recoveries.

During the entire postwar period the desirability of using temporary but substantial tax cuts as an antirecession device was continually discussed. In order to use this device without the delay involved in legislative deliberations, it was proposed that the President be authorized to cut taxes up to a specific amount if the economic indicators demonstrate a need to bolster sagging purchasing power.

While there is no inclination in Congress even to consider such a delegation of authority to the President, the idea that tax reduction and the deliberate creation of deficits should be used as an appropriate antirecession tool is gaining acceptance. In recent discussions before congressional committees this principle was hardly contested. The questions under debate were rather:

Is it certain that a recession is imminent, or is it possible to wait until a tax cut can be worked out in conjunction with tax reform?

Should tax reduction be associated with an increase in expenditures or with a reduction in expenditures? Those who believe that Government expenditures are too high argued for expenditure reduction without considering that such action would counteract the economic effect of tax reduction.

Should the deficit be financed entirely by corporate and individual saving, or should the banking system play its part through action by the Federal Reserve System?

While at the time of this writing no immediate tax reduction has been recommended by the President or adopted by Congress, the debate again shows the advances in thinking about antirecession policies which have been made during the last 15 years. However, it is happening at a time when it is increasingly clear that the frequent recessions are but an expression of a more deeply rooted problem—inadequate economic growth. When President Kennedy appointed Walter Heller as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, he emphasized that growth was his major economic concern. This concern was reflected in some parts of the Economic Report of January 1962. But, in the final analysis, the available information on the factors which make for growth and the existing obstacles in their path have not been used as a springboard for proposing a comprehensive program of action.

The recent statement by the President that he does not intend to recommend an immediate tax cut probably reflects his opinion that such legislation would be supported by Congress and the public only if adopted in the case of a clearly visible recession. The American public, however, has not yet accepted the idea of a tax cut as one element in a comprehensive program designed to stimulate economic growth and combat chronic unemployment.

In any case, a policy of domestic economic expansion is complicated by our balance-of-payments deficit. Many people feel that the fiscal and monetary measures needed to insure full employment and a high rate of growth would at the same time aggravate the balance-of-payments problem. My personal view is that a policy of domestic economic expansion would not in the long run hurt our payments position.

Here, then, is a major unresolved problem which is one of the reasons why the administration's economic policies sometimes seem hesitant and wavering. Under the employment act, it is the job of the Council of Economic Advisers and of the Joint Economic Committee to help resolve such policy dilemmas. In this regard the machinery created under the act has not fulfilled its purpose.

Proposals have repeatedly been made to add to the Employment Act the objectives of price stability, economic growth and a balanced payments position. Actually, however, the act has always been interpreted to include these objectives which are completely compatible with its language and spirit. Therefore, I cannot see any particular reason to specifically add them. The main difficulty is that the Government has not been able to work out a policy which would place these various goals in proper perspective. Such a policy would integrate programs to promote price stability, full employment and an international payments balance with an all-embracing approach to balanced economic growth.

The Council of Economic Advisers has given advice in this direction, and I am sure that the President has recognized its soundness. There is, however, no unanimity within the administration on the relative importance of the various goals and of the monetary and fiscal policies needed to accomplish them. The Council can only advise the President on its own views and inform him of the conflicting views which exist. The Council cannot be expected to coordinate its own ideas with those of the Treasury, the Federal Reserve System and private interest groups unless the President adopts a particular policy.

It appears to be the President's judgment that the time is not ripe for obtaining needed political support for such a comprehensive policy of balanced economic growth in his own official family (including the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board), in Congress and in the various interest groups in the private sector. On the other hand, the political forces which might support such a policy cannot be mobilized unless the President provides determined leadership.

Consequently, hesitation in formulating and adopting a comprehensive program for economic growth cannot be regarded as a failure in the machinery established by the employment act. Nevertheless, improvements in institutional and statistical devices could be used to highlight the need for such a program.

Under the Employment Act the President in his Economic Report must present estimates of the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power necessary to achieve the act's goals. President Eisenhower and his Council have been criticized inside and outside Congress for their failure to live up to this provision. The report of January 1962—President Kennedy's first—was a big step forward, but further progress is still needed.

I believe that national economic projections, both long-term and intermediate, would help to demonstrate the potential levels that could be attained in key sectors of the economy if we attain full employment and utilize all the available technological possibilities. These projections would also indicate the investment required for technological advances and additional productive capacity. Such national economic budgets require coordinated projections of economic data and projections of Federal, State, and local transactions. These budgets would provide useful tools for the economic evaluation of various long-term Government programs. They could also serve as guides for tax and debt management policy. They would help businessmen to determine potential markets for their products and the feasibility of expanding capacity. Projections of this kind are now provided by private research organizations. But their usefulness for long-term business planning would be greatly enhanced if the business community could rely on the Government to contribute to a program of balanced economic growth through appropriate fiscal and monetary policies.

Congress recently appropriated funds for a study of the problem of economic growth under the direction of the Council of Economic Advisers. Thus the proposed development of a medium and long-range national economic budget requires no radical innovation but only a further development of programs which have already been initiated. There is no doubt, however, that a great educational effort is needed before national economic budgets are accepted as the tool for the formulation of long-range economic policies.

On the legislative side, a substantial improvement is needed if the Joint Economic Committee is to live up to the role which was envisaged for it under the Employment Act. It was created (a) to appraise the Economic Reports of the President, (b) to conduct economic studies of its own, and (c) to advise the Congress on legislation needed to accomplish the purposes of the Employment Act.

The committee has regularly issued appraisals of the President's Economic Reports and has conducted very valuable studies of relevant topics. It has held hearings which gave academic and research economists, and representatives of business and labor, an opportunity to discuss current economic issues. Some of the reports have become valuable material for teaching and have helped to bridge the gap between an academic and a more practical approach to economic policy. In all these respects the joint committee has made valuable contributions which have probably exceeded the expectations of the framers of the 1946 act. The joint committee has, however, been much less successful in giving legislative advice to its congressional colleagues.

At present, the joint committee has an impact on legislation mainly through the fact that its members are also members of other committees which consider legislation related to the economy. Actually, the joint committee has been most successful as a kind of postgraduate training ground for legislators. Some of the outstanding speeches on economic matters in the Senate and House have been made by members of the committee, and there is no doubt that its existence has raised the level of economic sophistication in Congress.

I believe, however, that a more regular channel should be provided to bring the joint committee's advice to the attention of the Congress as a whole. The fact that reports by the joint committee are made available to other Members of Congress hardly assures that much attention is paid to them. It would be desirable if other committees which are considering legislation affecting the economy would hear representatives of the Joint Economic Committee to obtain their views (if necessary, majority and minority views) before legislation is framed. If a committee's proposal is not in accord with the views expressed by the Joint Economic Committee, this conflict should be officially reported to the Congress. As far as I know, the joint committee has presented its views only in exceptional cases, such as the Korean war tax program, or in relatively minor problems, such as those involving appropriations for certain statistical programs.

It is significant that the House Committee on Ways and Means held its own hearings before those of the Joint Economic Committee on the economic outlook in July–August 1962, when the question of an immediate tax reduction was being considered. It is obvious that the Joint Committee has not yet been successful in obtaining recognition from the other committees as the source of advice on legislation affecting the economy.

The interest of busy legislators can only be assured if they know that the committee's work has a tangible impact on legislation. Consequently, if the Joint Committee were required to present its views on all legislation and appropriations affecting the economy, it would be more nearly playing the role assigned to it under the Employment Act.

Our 15 years' experience with the Employment Act has definitely proven the importance of this basic legislation, particularly as a means for dramatizing national concern with the economy as a whole. The machinery created under the act has assisted the President in policy formulation and has made him less dependent on Cabinet members who naturally tend to give advice from the point of view of their respective departments. The Joint Economic Committee has been most effective as an educational enterprise in the broadest definition of the term. It has been less effective in directly giving advice on economic and fiscal legislation.

The United States is engaged in a great venture to prove that an economy with free institutions can be adapted to the needs of the space age. But success in this venture requires deliberate Government policies. While the experience of the past 15 years has been encouraging, improvements in the machinery and more boldness in policy formulation and implementation are needed if we are to meet the great economic and social challenge of our time.

REPUBLICAN PROPOSALS FOR EXPENDITURE REFORM

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the minority views to the Joint Economic Committee's 1963 Annual Report, my 5 Republican colleagues and I offered 47 recommendations dealing with tax reduction and reform, expenditure control, agriculture, education and training, and other measures needed to strengthen our dynamic American economy.

Among the recommendations for expenditure reform which were offered was one urging the President to establish an Advisory Commission on Federal Expenditures. The Republicans on the Joint Economic Committee believe that the establishment of a commission designed to take a hard, objective, and nonpartisan look at Federal spending is an essential part of any meaningful and sound program of expenditure control.

In addition to setting forth the recommendation for the establishment of such a commission in our minority views, we have taken the additional step of bringing the recommendation directly to the attention of the President in a letter dated March 19, 1963. In that letter, we set forth some of our observations on tax reduction and reform and on the urgent need to offset through expenditure reform the larger budget deficits that would result from tax reduction. The letter clearly sets forth our proposal for the establishment of the Commission, and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of it be inserted in the Record at this point.

U.S. Congress,
Joint Economic Committee,
Washington, D.C., ~~March 19~~, 1963.

The President,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

Mr. President: In response to your recent invitation for a continuing dialog on the major economic issues before the Nation, we should like to set forth some of our observations on your proposed 1963 tax program and to offer a suggestion for expenditure control which we believe would contribute to sound and stable long-term economic growth.

While we recognize that knowledge of the sources of economic growth and the means of accelerating it are limited, it seems clear that well-conceived incentive tax reduction and reform is a major and necessary step toward improving upon our Nation's rate of economic growth. We have long supported tax reduction and reform as a high priority objective of our economic policy. However, it is also clear that such a program will involve costs as well as benefits. These costs must be weighed and, if possible, offset.

One cost will be budget deficits higher than those which would have been incurred without the tax cut. These would follow 3 years of steadily mounting deficits which have totaled more than $19 billion, or more than the net deficits of the previous 7 fiscal years combined. Some opinion holds that budget deficits need not concern us. We do not share this view.

The experience of the past suggests that it would be reckless to ignore the inflationary dangers posed by persistent and increasing deficits. The state of economic learning is neither so advanced nor so precise as to safely admit any other conclusion as a guide to policymaking. Sound long-term economic growth cannot be based upon a foundation of budget deficits. Furthermore, we cannot ignore the adverse effects such deficits could have on our continuing balance-of-payments problem and on the entire free world trade and payments system.

Recognition of the potential dangers of chronic budget deficits is implicit in your proposed tax program. As one of its objectives, the program seeks to bring the budget into balance by stimulating economic activity and thus increasing revenues.

We should not, however, pin all of our hopes for ending our chronic deficits on the possibility of rapidly rising tax revenues. It is clear that hard thought must be given to the other side of the ledger—to controlling rapidly increasing Federal expenditures.

We do not suggest an across-the-board cut in Federal spending. In view of the Nation's domestic needs and international and security commitments, such an approach would be self-defeating. What we should seek, however, is a reform of Federal expenditure policy so as to effect important savings without impairing the national interest or retarding economic growth. Indeed, thoughtful and selective control of Federal expenditures can increase our national security and stimulate our economic growth.

In view of these considerations, we believe that Federal expenditure policy requires thorough, objective, and nonpartisan examination. Support for the principle of tighter control and more effective use of Federal expenditures is virtually unanimous; support for specific suggestions for achieving it is more difficult to attain. The difficulty of the task, however, should not deter us from making the attempt.

In our separate minority and additional views to the Joint Economic Committee's 1963 Annual Report, we made several specific suggestions which we believe offer a sound basis for a reform of Federal expenditure policy. At this time, we wish to call one of these recommendations to your attention and ask that you give it your serious consideration.

As an essential step to a reform of Federal expenditure policy, we suggest that you appoint a Presidential Advisory Commission on Federal Expenditures, composed of private citizens from business, labor, education, the professions, and Members of Congress equally from both parties. The work of this Commission, assisted by a staff, should parallel the 3-year period over which your tax program is scheduled to take effect. During this period, the Commission should conduct studies and periodically make public its recommendations in the following areas:

(a) Establishment of spending priorities among Federal programs, separating the desirable from those that are essential, in order to serve as a guide to the administration in drawing up the budget, particularly in years of expected deficits.

(b) Appraisal of Federal activities in order to identify those programs which tend to retard economic growth and for which expenditures should be reduced or eliminated.

(c) Improvement of the Federal budgeting and appropriations process in order to increase the effective control of expenditures.

(d) Examination of responsibilities and functions which are now assumed by the Federal Government, but which could be better performed and with superior effectiveness by the private economy.

(e) Review of Federal responsibility and functions in order to determine which could be better performed at the State and local levels.

(f) Improvement of Government organization and procedures in order to increase efficiency and promote savings, including a review of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission in order to determine how those already implemented have worked out in practice and whether those not yet implemented should be given further consideration.

(g) Determination of policies with regard to the level of user charges and fees to be made for special services furnished to members of the public by the Government.

The recommendations of an objective and nonpartisan Commission of the kind described should command widespread support among the public and within the Congress. Its proposals would offer a sound basis upon which to begin the reform of Federal expenditure policy.

In view of the relevance which expenditure control has for the success of a tax reduction and reform program, we earnestly hope you will give this recommendation your early and favorable consideration.

Respectfully yours,

Thomas B. Curtis.
Clarence E. Kilburn.
William B. Widnall.
Jacob K. Javits.
Jack Miller.
Len B. Jordan.

RIGHT OF EMPLOYEES TO EXAMINE PROMOTION EVALUATIONS

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which is intended to give additional protection to Federal employees against arbitrary or unfair ratings by their supervisors and also to give employees the right of rebuttal.

Previously, employees have been given the right to examine the routine performance ratings by their supervisors, which become part of each employee's personnel file. But a practice has grown up of having confidential promotion qualifications inquiries which are never shown to the person being rated.

In personnel matters such as this, I believe it is important to take all possible steps to avoid possible unfair ratings or evaluations due to bias, personality clash, or other reason. Accordingly, the bill I introduced provides that employees have the right, first, to examine such supervisory evaluations and, second, to make written reply which shall at all times be part of that employee's personnel file just as the supervisory evaluation is.

I do not see any good reason why employees should be subjected to possibly damaging evaluations—which could be completely unwarranted—and yet be completely unaware that such damaging material is in their files.

The text of my bill is as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 7 of the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883 (22 Stat. 406; 5 U.S.C. 638) is amended by inserting immediately following the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "Each officer and employee shall have the right to examine each supervisory evaluation of his qualifications for promotion and to file a written comment with respect to all or any part of such evaluation which shall be attached thereto."

To those who say opening these reports to the employee involved will not work, I would merely point to the military services. They have for many years allowed any member of the armed services full access to all unclassified material in his file.

Typical of the type of promotion evaluation to which I object is one used by the Public Health Service. On the face of this inquiry form there is this message:

> Information furnished in this qualification form will be considered along with other pertinent information in evaluating the potential for advancement, under the Public Health Service promotion program, of the individual whose name is shown on the form. As a person who is familiar with this employee's work, you are requested to complete the items on the form as they apply to the individual concerned, following the directions for each section. This is not a performance rating under the DHEW performance rating program.
>
> This form has been designed to cover major factors having a bearing on an employee's qualification for work at a higher level or with broader responsibilities. The success of the Service's programs is vitally affected by the skill and ability of its work force, and the importance of selecting, under the promotion program, the best qualified employees to fill Service vacancies cannot be stressed too much. Your cooperation in considering each factor on the inquiry form carefully and realistically and in completing the form promptly will contribute a great deal to the effective operation of the promotion program.
>
> The qualifications inquiry is confidential, and you are asked not to discuss your evaluation with anyone. The form will not be filed in the employee's official personnel folder but will be maintained as a part of the confidential promotion records. The completed form should be returned by the evaluator in a sealed envelope to the address shown on the last page of the form."

At the bottom of this page is the legend, "Confidential—Personnel."

This evaluation folder contains 63 questions concerning the employee's work haibts, abilities, potential, judgment and so forth. These questions seem reasonable to me, although I have not analyzed each of them. I can certainly understand where such a form would be valuable in seeking persons who have characteristics which are desirable in a supervisor. I do not object to this form, its use or the questions in it.

My only objection is to the fact that the completed forms are not available to the employee who has been rated. He does not know how he was rated, and in the event that there was some bias, he is unaware of it. I think my bill will correct the situation.

AIR POLLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of this House to legislation before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which, if enacted, I strongly feel, would go far toward conquering one of the most vital problems plaguing so many areas and people of our Nation today—air pollution.

The Subcommittee on Health and Safety concluded hearings last week on legislation covering this subject including my own bill, H.R. 4750. I am certain that the enlightening facts brought out at these hearings will prove the case for Federal leadership in this field and the need for meaningful Federal-State-local partnership to eradicate the problem. I was privileged to present my views at the hearings and to offer what I feel to be a constructive program in finding a solution to this plague.

As I pointed out to the committee, I have been particularly concerned with this subject and, in the effort to help formulate a meaningful program, I have had occasion to work with the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Roberts] and to observe firsthand his great ability and unique grasp of this complex problem.

In my own city of New York, often when I have flown in to the city, I have been struck by the fact that what seemed to be a perfectly glorious day from the air became dull and overcast when viewed from the ground. The vivid blue of the sky, the floating clouds, and the brilliance of the sun were all obscured by the gray haze that hung over the city. This haze is composed of smoke and soot, chemical vapors, and motor vehicle exhaust. It covers our buildings with grime and reduces property values. It destroys crops and gardens, and most important, it presents a serious threat to the health of our citizens, especially the aged. For these reasons I am vitally concerned about air-pollution control, and I welcome the opportunity to appear before you today to urge the committee's support for my bill, H.R. 4750, and, of course, Mr. Chairman, your identical bill H.R. 4415.

As you know, air pollution is principally an urban problem, and in my city, America's largest, it is a severe one. With more than 7¾ million people needing heat and electric power for their homes and their offices or factories, vast quantities of combustion products are emitted into the atmosphere daily. Nearly a million automobiles are on the streets each day, consuming 1½ million gallons of gasoline and pouring burned and unburned waste products into the air—waste products consisting of 4½ million pounds of deadly carbon monoxide and 2,500 pounds of hydrocarbons which are believed to be responsible for our steadily rising number of deaths due to chronic bronchitis, emphysema, and lung cancer. Lesser quantities of nitrogen oxides and sulfur dioxide are also given off, as well as particulate matter, all of which contributes to the $150 million lost each year in New York City because of corroded building materials, soiled merchandise, and blighted garden produce.

As you can see, automobile exhaust is already a problem of large dimensions in New York City and other metropolitan areas. Moreover, a steady increase in the number of motor vehicles, the miles traveled per vehicle, and total gasoline consumption is predicted for at least the next two decades. We know that the pollutants in motor vehicle exhaust will induce cancer in experimental animals and that disability days for chronic respiratory conditions vary directly with the quantity of contaminants in the atmosphere. There is also evidence that such pollution contributes to the progress of various types of heart disease.

All of these subjects are deserving of further research, and for that reason my bill specifically requires the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct studies regarding the discharges from motor vehicles and their effect upon human health. I believe this is perhaps the most important aspect of the air pollution problem, and I feel that research in this area is vital and should be conducted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which can provide the coordination and focus necessary in order to achieve satisfactory results.

You may be wondering why the States cannot plan and implement their own air pollution control programs and why the Federal Government should become any further involved. First, let me say that in New York we have taken action leading to the abatement of air pollution from industrial sources and are operating monitoring stations and supporting research programs on the effects of air pollution and methods of pollution control. New York, along with New Jersey and Connecticut, is a member of the Interstate Sanitary Commission which is also actively working for a solution to this problem.

We know there are other States such as California where an intensive effort is also being made in this area. However, a recent study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, reveals that only about half of our cities with populations over 50,000 have air pollution control programs, and many of those are seriously understaffed. Budgets are often too restricted to permit the development of adequate programs. In fact, only nine States are now spending more than $25,000 annually to combat this problem, and half of our States are spending less than $5,000 per year for air pollution control.

However, even if all the States had the funds and facilities to monitor air pollution levels, to enforce control measures, and to carry on urgently needed research, I do not believe it would be the most economical and efficient way in which to attack the problem. The Bureau of Environmental Health of the Public Health Service, on the other hand, is admirably equipped for the job with its research facilities at the sanitary engineering center in Cincinnati, Ohio, and its many monitoring stations as well as its highly qualified staff. I am not advocating usurpation of the States rights nor the shouldering of their responsibilities, but I believe, however, that this is an instance in which the Federal Government can be of great help to the States and can provide the incentive and the assistance needed if we are to see any progress in this area.

One other point that should be made in the case for a strong Federal program of air pollution control is that air pollution is no respecter of county or State boundaries. Countless incidents reveal that contaminants from one State may damage crops or cause illness in a neighboring State. The problem is really national in scope and requires a national effort if we are to deal with it successfully.

I believe a problem of such magnitude merits the expenditure of Federal funds. At the present time we are only spending 10 cents per capita annually from all sources in combating a situation which costs us approximately $65 per capita per year in economic losses plus incalculable losses from chronic respiratory illnesses and premature deaths. My bill, H.R. 4750, and yours, Mr. Chairman, would call for an additional sum of only 3 cents per capita annually for the next 5 years. I believe this is not an excessive amount for such an urgently needed program. Furthermore, these bills offer the advantage that after 5 years we would have the opportunity to review the progress that has been made under the program and to evaluate further needs.

I believe that it is imperative that we enact a Federal program this year to supplement the State and regional efforts already being made and to provide an incentive to those States which as yet have taken no action or only limited steps in this extremely important matter.

Much legislation has been proposed in recent Congresses on the subject of air pollution control, and it is heartening to me to note that two members of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama, Chairman Roberts, and the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman Schenck, have been successful in advocating measures to extend the Air Pollution Control Act and to investigate the extent and effects of pollutants from motor vehicle exhaust. I was privileged even though I am not a member of the committee, to have cosponsored the legislation for this extension. Congressman Rodino has also been interested in this problem for some years and was instrumental in the adoption of a tri-State agreement by Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey to authorize the Interstate Sanitary Commission to study means of air pollution control and to establish air quality standards and regulations. I trust I need not add that I, too, have long been deeply concerned about this menace and have previously introduced legislation providing for the abatement and control of air pollution.

We, then, have all recognized the dangers of air pollution. But in the past there seems to have been little public concern in this area, and Congress itself has failed to appreciate the gravity of the problem. I have noted in the past year, however, an upsurge of interest by the press and lately a marked increase in constituent mail on this subject. I hope, therefore, that this Congress will be aware of the urgency of the situation and will enact the necessary legislation at any early date. We cannot expect the contaminants in the air to disappear of their own accord; in fact, without some action on our part, they will continue to increase, becoming an ever greater threat to our health and prosperity. However, we have it in our power to do something about this problem; your favorable action on H.R. 4415 and H.R. 4750 would be an important step in that direction.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE MEETING OF HALIFAX COUNTY, VA.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Tuck] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 8, 1963, I had the very great pleasure of attending a regular meeting of the Board of Agriculture of Halifax County, Va., which is my home county. It was one of the most inspiring meetings I have attended in a long time. I was impressed with the work being done by every segment of our society to improve and enhance the agricultural, economic and civic conditions of our great county. Those present and participating in this agriculture program were among our best citizens, who have wrought well and who along with others have been responsible for the outstanding improvements made in our county. Among the group were prominent farmers and housewives, civic leaders, businessmen, bankers, and others.

In addition to the president of the association, Mr. R. W. Armistead and those associated with him, I am sure that Mr. C. L. Hall, who is now and has been for many years our county agent, and Mrs. Louise B. Tune, who is now and has been for some years our home demonstration agent, have done much to encourage these worthy endeavors.

In order that the Members of Congress, as well as other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, may have some conception of the scope of this meeting and of the work being done by the various committees, I am glad, under leave heretofore granted me, to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include the minutes of this meeting which are as follows:

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE HALIFAX COUNTY BOARD OF AGRICULTURE, FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 1963, R. W. ARMISTEAD, PRESIDENT, PRESIDING

The Halifax County Board of Agriculture held its annual meeting on March 8, 1963, 10 a.m., at Centerville Rose with 28 members present. The meeting was called to order by the president, Mr. R. W. Armistead, and the minutes of the 1962 meeting were read and approved.

Reports from the county agents office on "highlights of the extension program" for 1962 were given by Mr. C. L. Hall, county agent; and Mrs. Louise B. Tune, home demonstration agent. The agents asked for suggestions and ideas from the board on how they could improve their services to the people of Halifax County.

Commodity committee reports were given by committee chairmen as follows: Soils and crops, Mr. J. T. Burton; foods and nutrition, Mrs. B. A. Epperson; youth, Mr. Stanley Younger; house and house furnishings, Mrs. Robert East; dairy, Mr. C. B. Barksdale; home grounds beautification, Mrs. Ed Buckner; swine, Mr. W. R. Carr, Jr.; clothing, Mrs. A. M. Jones; forestry, Mr. Paul C. Edmunds, Sr.; tobacco, Mr. R. L. Shaw (in absence of chairman, Mr. H. W. Dunn); home management, Mrs. W. N. Tune; and community improvement clubs, Mr. F. G. Lacks.

Mr. W. W. Shapard made a motion that the committee reports be accepted. Copies of this and previous reports are on file in the secretary's book at the county agent's office. The board of agriculture was honored by the attendance and an address by the Honorable W. M. TUCK, Member of the U.S. Congress. Mr. TUCK commended the board of agriculture on its work and urges its continuance. County Agent C. L. Hall led a discussion on the rural areas development program. Upon motion duly seconded, the board voted unanimously that the board of agriculture and the chamber of commerce work together as one in the advancing of the future welfare of the county both agriculturally and industrially. The president of the chamber of commerce stated they would welcome the cooperation with the board of agriculture and the addition of representatives from the board of agriculture to the committee of the chamber of commerce.

Mr. W. W. Shapard moved the county agent's office be given authority to appoint any committee needed to work with the chamber of commerce. This motion was unanimously adopted.

Miss Judy Stitt was elected to fill the secretarial position of the board of agriculture left vacant by Mrs. Shirla Hudson.

A motion was made by Mr. W. W. Shapard and approved by the group that the board of agriculture go on record as approving the Southside Soil Conservation District watershed program for Halifax County.

Mr. Jimmy Shelton asked for a report on the securing of a soil survey for Halifax County. Mr. Hall told the group that the soil surveys by the experiment stations were made for the counties that showed most interest, other things being equal. The director of the experiment station had been contacted and set for the meeting to discuss the possibilities of getting a county soil survey.

Mr. C. B. Barksdale made a motion that the board of agriculture go on record asking for a soil survey and pledging the board's support in working for some.

The chairman of the board expressed appreciation to Mr. Leggett for providing the meal for the group.

Officers other than the secretary were not elected as the president, R. W. Armistead, and Vice President Carter Owen, were elected in 1962 to serve a 2-year term.

The meeting was adjourned by the president, R. W Armistead.

The group then enjoyed a meal prepared and served by the staff of Centerville Rose Restaurant.

SOILS AND CROPS COMMITTEE 1963

J. T. Burton, chairman; Edward Dixon, J. F. Stephens, Jr., Billy Hunt, Eugene Dixon, W. R. Carr, Jr., and A. J. Weatherford.

Corn is a profitable crop in Halifax County, where yields are sufficiently high. This can be accomplished by adopting proper known practices. Farmers are therefore encouraged to adopt these practices:

1. This committee recommends that these practices be demonstrated by two complete corn demonstrations.

2. A "20-ton silage contest" to promote increased yields and the feeding of more silage. Award certificates to those producing 20 tons or more per acre.

3. In order to keep farmers informed on other good crop production practices, conduct three alfalfa demonstrations in which known good practices are used.

4. Hold a 2-day soils tour in early March to further acquaint farmers with the up-to-date soils information. We recommend the following practices to county farmers:

(a) The keeping of permanent soils records on fields devoted to crops. Forms for these records are available from the extension office.

(b) Have a complete soils analysis made for each field including fields on which ASCS practices are applied.

5. Improve the accuracy of soils analysis by carefully taking samples and providing complete information on past fertilization, liming, and other practices that will help in getting the best fertilization recommendations.

6. The pooling of orders to purchase soil sampling tubes.

7. That farmers study experiment station results and especially those of the stations in the Piedmont area of the State before selecting crop varieties to grow.

8. Apply needed lime as indicated by soils test so as to secure maximum benefits from the fertilizer applied.

FOODS AND NUTRITION COMMITTEE, 1953

Present: Mrs. B. A. Epperson, chairman; Mrs. Lois Dismuke, and Mrs. H. P. Anderson.

Situation: The committee made a survey several years ago to determine some of the nutritional problems. This survey was made with all sixth grade pupils in the county. The committee felt that this information gave them a good indication as to the food needs of families. The survey pointed up the need for more milk and green leafy vegetables in the diet. After considering the longtime foods and nutrition program for the county, the committee selected the following phases of the program to put special emphasis on in 1968:

1. That two special interests meetings on food preparation be held during the year with special emphasis on the use of milk.

2. To continue to encourage the schools to replace carbonated beverage machines with milk vending machines. One elementary school in the county has done this and we are well pleased with the results.

3. That 4–H foods leaders continue to be invited to all leader training meetings for the home demonstration clubs.

4. That publicity be given on food supplies needed for fallout shelters and to encourage homemakers to keep an extra supply of canned foods on the pantry shelf.

5. That information racks in laundermats and beauty parlors be supplied with nutritional material.

6. That the "packet for the bride" that have been prepared as a means of reaching people that we are not now reaching should include some material on meal planning, buying, and preparing food.

7. That news articles and radio talks be given on foods and nutrition.

YOUTH COMMITTEE, 1963

Mr. Stanley Younger, chairman, Mrs. Albert Payne, Mr. R. W. Armistead, Mrs. Charlie Woosley.

Committee recommendation

1. Recognizing the problem of a large dropout of club members over 15 years of age the committee recommends the following to help remedy the situation:

(a) Attempt to have some form of recreation at all community 4–H Club meetings. Agents mail leaders a copy of recreation bulletin.

(b) Agents send list of members of last year's high school club to community leaders so they may invite those in their area not now attending a 4–H Club to join their club.

(c) Strive to interest more parents in 4–H work, possibly through a "parent recognition night" held by each individual club.

2. Stimulate more competition on the county level by holding a county demonstration contest. Include both senior and junior contests.

3. Agents provide community leaders with more information on the district and State awards program.

4. Reorganize county honor club; (a) have member of State 4–H staff as guest speaker, (b) award some type of recognition pin to members.

5. Prepare and mail to leaders a calendar of 4–H events for the year in September.

6. Explore the possibility of holding a fat hog and gilt show in conjunction with the baby beef show and sale.

HOUSE AND HOUSE FURNISHINGS COMMITTEE

Present: Mrs. Robert East, chairman; Mrs. Frank Epperson, Mrs. W. A. Childrey, Mrs. Harry Harris, Mrs. Joe Epperson, and Mrs. Carlton Hodnett.

Situation: There is an apparent building boom on in the county and the committee decided that many of these people are giving very little time and thought to storage space, convenience, and quality. After reviewing the longtime plan the committee decided to concentrate their efforts on the following points in 1963:

1. That more publicity be given to the services available on helping families in house planning, house remodeling by the Extension Service.

2. That home demonstration clubs devote some time during the year to kitchen arrangement to save time and energy.

3 That providing adequate storage space be given special emphasis in house planning and remodeling.

4. That the 4–H clubs carrying "room improvement" as a project be given an opportunity to participate in a class at a local furniture store on "selection of furniture."

5. That information on "what's new" in house furnishings be made available to the public through radio, news articles, and meetings.

DAIRY COMMITTEE, 1963

C. B. Barksdale, chairman; W. A. Patterson, John Cole, Carter Owen, Ralph Ward, and L. C. Owen.

Halifax dairymen must keep informed on the latest and best production and marketing practices to satisfactorily compete. The committee makes the following recommendations:

1. Participate in the 20-ton silage contest recommended by the agronomy committee.

2. There is a good opportunity for farms of limited acreage to produce manufacturing milk.

3. Hold a managed milking demonstration in July.

4. That a dairy school be held for the county's dairymen. That such school cover information on diseases, principles of breeding and other new improved practices that will add to the efficiency of dairying. This school also gives information on machinery for dairy farm and its operation.

5. Develop closer cooperation between dairymen and veterinarians. Invite veterinarians to dairy meetings and to participate in the meetings.

6. Farmers with small crop acreage and that like cattle can profitably produce manufacturing milk if they adopt good known practices.

HOME GROUNDS BEAUTIFICATION COMMITTEE, 1963

Present: Mrs. Ed Buckner, Mrs. L. S. Williamson, Mrs. Howard Burgess, Mrs. Jack Grinstead, and Mrs. Jack Collie.

The Home Grounds Beautification Committee recommends:

1. That home grounds beautification programs be continued in the Home Demonstration Clubs, community improvement, and 4–H Clubs.

2. That the VPI landscape notes be sent to interested people in the county.

3. That pruning demonstrations be given in those communities desiring one.

4. That more publicity be given to the services available through the extension service in planning home grounds improvements.

5. Sponsor a tour to a nursery where those people who are interested in studying and learning more about the desirable shrubs can participate.

6. That extension agents use radio and news articles to give information on shrubs and landscaping to the public.

7. That a special interest class on flower arrangements suitable for church be taught. Most rural churches are dependent on the ladies of the church for the arrangements each Sunday.

SWINE COMMITTEE, 1963

W. R. Carr, Jr., chairman; L. B. Hudson, Addison Solomon, R. I. Weatherford, John Crowder, and J. W. Shelton.

After considering the various potentials available for swine production in Halifax County, the committee is convinced that swine production can be a profitable enterprise for many farmers. That is, growers producing considerable grain may elect to feed out hogs for market, whereas those with a small amount of grain might elect to produce feeder pigs.

The committee makes the following recommendations:

1. That hog producers and those interested in producing hogs attend the area swine school scheduled for March 15.

2. The committee sponsor a tour of hog growers to a modern farrowing facility in early April.

3. Plan a tour to Washington, N.C., to observe a farm and facilities with a 700-sow operation.

4. Explore the possibility of holding a commercial gilt sale at Halifax in the fall to supply growers with needed breeding stock.

5. Investigate the possibility of holding a junior fat hog and gilt show and sale in conjunction with the baby beef show and sale.

6. Encourage feeder pig producers to take advantage of the cooperative feeder pig sales to be held June 13, August 8, and October 10.

CLOTHING COMMITTEE, 1963

Present: Mrs. Bennie Carlton, chairman; Mrs. A. B. Crute, Mrs. W. O. Carlton, Mrs. E. A. Lewis, and Mrs. John Burton.

Situation: Clothing is adequate but seems to continue to rise in price. Many families need help on selection, care, and value of clothing, so after reviewing the longtime clothing plan the committee decided to work on the following goals for the year:

1. That Home Demonstration Clubs spend some time in learning the techniques used to give homemade garments a readymade look. For those homemakers who do not sew, they should acquire the knowledge of what to look for in buying readymade garments to give the satisfaction desired.

2. That 4-H girls carrying clothing for a project be given some training in their project.

3. That a general educational program be conducted through radio, news articles, and bulletins.

4. Clothing information to be enclosed in information racks in beauty parlors and laundermats maintained by the extension service.

5. Clothing information be included in the "packet for the bride" kit that is being sent to all new brides in the county.

FORESTRY, 1963

Halifax County Forestry Committee: Paul C. Edmunds, Sr., chairman, Leeland Williamson, Stanley Younger, Linwood Palmer, Jesse Jones, John W. Boyd, Jr., and Franz Elliott.

Committee recommendations: This committee desired to continue the 1962 forestry recommendations through 1963. The committee recommends that special emphasis be given to the following practices.

1. Kill with chemical or otherwise get rid of undesirable hardwood species and other plants that seriously compete with newly planted seedlings.

2. It is recommended that each farmer divert at least a small area of their forest to more desirable trees each year. This be done by killing undesirable plants, cutting fire, fuel wood, or pulpwood or in certain instances, cut trees for a needed lumber supply for farm repairs. Then, plant to desirable trees.

3. Publicize often through the press and by radio, the value of diverting small areas as suggested above, and what this can mean in added wealth to the undivided farmer and the county.

4. Kill or utilize wolf-trees. These are large spreading trees which shade out other trees in a large area in the forest, and which are of little or no value.

5. Use selective cutting whenever harvesting timber for any purpose. In cutting flue or fuel wood, take out diseased, crooked, overtopped, or trees that are being crowded out.

6. Have timber estimated by experienced forester before selling. You need to know what you have for sale.

7. In order to secure full market value when selling timber, advertise to all buyers in the area.

8. When selling pulpwood, take from the forest only the undesirable trees such as crooked, diseased, overtopped trees or those being crowded out. The clean cutting of good growing timber is wasteful.

9. Farmers can make excellent wages by cutting their own timber even where it is necessary to hire the hauling to the plant.

10. More farmers carrying on a good forestry program should be selected for the tree farm award as an added incentive.

11. The committee solicits the help of industry in the publicizing of the many advantages to be gained by adopting good forestry practices.

TOBACCO, 1963

Halifax County Tobacco Committee members: H. W. Dunn, chairman; H. E. Moon, Madison Myers, F. G. Lacks, Harvey Palmer, James Seay, and A. C. Stevens.

Committee suggestions

1. That the county agents mail at an early date, copies of the changes in tobacco grades for 1963 to all farmers in the county.

2. Ask that the extension service continue tobacco demonstrations on farms having special soil problems as was done in 1962.

3. That agents keep growers informed on insecticides and their use. Also, on soil fumigation for root knot and Meadow Nematode.

Committee recommendations

1. As plant bed management is of major importance to the production of a successful tobacco crop, we urge growers to locate their beds in a protected situation, on a well-drained soil, relatively high in organic matter. Also, that the bed not be seeded too thick. A light mulch of sawdust or straw would be helpful.

2. Where cyanamid has been applied for weed control for 3 or more years, it is urged that a soil analysis be made to check the pH as a high pH is inducive to root rot.

3. It is recommended that growers keep their plants protected against blue mold and anthracnose by the use of fermate.

4. The watering of the plant beds before pulling to go into the field is desirable in securing a good stand.

5. Where growers have had problems with mosaic, it is recommended that they apply the milk treatment to their plants at the time the plants are pulled to go into the field.

6. For better stands, apply fertilizer deep or in two bands so plant roots do not come in direct contact with the fertilizer. Applying a portion of the fertilizer in the drill and the remainder as a side dressing soon after planting is very helpful.

7. In order to avoid injury to oneself and the crop, growers are urged to carefully read and follow instructions including precautions when using insecticides.

8. It is urgent that growers produce high quality tobacco. In order to do this, growers should not apply excessive amounts of nitrogen, plant not more than 6,000 to 6,500 plants per acre, top the tobacco, and control suckers. Growers should be sure that the tobacco is ripe before it is pulled and that it is well yellowed in the barn before curing.

9. Farmers are urged to take a good look at their tobacco soils to be sure they are planting tobacco on soils that are well adopted to the crop.

10. We urge that growers pay more attention to the grading of their tobacco before putting it on the market even though there is often very little incentive pricewise.

HOME MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE, 1983

Present: Mrs. W. N. Tune, chairman; Mrs. C. H. Russell, Jr., and Mrs. A. M. Jones.

Situation: Time and money management is a problem for most homemakers. This has been pointed up by many of the groups in the county in program planning. The majority of the demonstrations requested are on time and money management. After a study of the long-time plan, the committee selected the following points to be stressed in 1963:

1. That some time and energy be devoted to assisting homemakers in time and money management.

2. That the family record book be given some publicity and that it be made available to all homemakers.

3. That money management material be used in the information racks in laundermats and in the packets for the bride. This material should include some sample family budgets as guides.

4. That news articles and radio talks be given on management problems.

5. That money and time management be stressed in all the demonstrations given to 4-H, home demonstration, and community improvement clubs.

COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT CLUBS

Mr. F. G. Lacks, chairman; Mrs. Madison Hodnett, Mrs. Jack Grinstead, Mr. L. B. Hudson, Mrs. Frances Weatherford, and Mr. L. S. Williamson.

Committee recommendations

1. Sponsor the 4-H Club Day at Elkhorn Lake with all of the Community Improvement Clubs participating on Wednesday, June 19.

2. The committee would like to recommend to the chamber of commerce that the prize money for 1963 be set up with $200 for first prize, $150 for second, and $75 for third and $50 for fourth.

3. This committee is quite concerned about the litter problem along the roads in Halifax County. The Community Improvement Clubs have been working on this problem for the past 5 or 6 years. They are now soliciting the help of all the civic clubs of the county in this undertaking.

A TRIBUTE TO THE FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, this year Future Homemakers of America Week is observed from March 31 through April 6, and it is with a great deal of pride and pleasure that I pay tribute to this organization which does so much toward helping our young people prepare themselves to meet successfully the challenges of tomorrow.

The membership of 522,000 is drawn from those high school students who are studying homemaking in the schools of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The national organization is composed of chartered State associations which are made up of local chapters. Its inception took place in June of 1945 and there are at present over 11,000 chapters in existence. Cosponsors of the organization are the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the American Home Economics Association.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky was the first State to charter the Future Homemakers of America, and I am proud that in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky, local chapters are numerous, active, and well organized. They conduct programs that give the homemaking student training and experience in home management, childcare, family relations, and community service. The members of the local chapters, through their participation in civic projects, demonstrate their sense of good citizenship, and become highly valuable members of the community. These young people are ably assisted in their endeavors by their home economics teachers and other interested women of the community who recognize the importance of training these girls in the art of homemaking.

The Future Homemakers' national program of work for 1962–65 has as its overall goal "to help individuals improve personal, family, and community living."

Future Homemakers, through their local chapters and individual activities, work toward four national objectives:

First, discovering myself and my worth to others;

Second, contributing to the joys and satisfactions of family living;

Third, strengthening my education for future roles; and

Fourth, launching good citizenship through homemaking.

It can readily be seen that concentration on these four objectives will ultimately bring to the young girl the maturity which is so necessary in a successful wife and mother.

Because of the complex nature of our modern society, the American housewife is no longer concerned solely with the traditional duties of homemaking such as cooking, cleaning, marketing, and childraising. She is now expected to be a skilled nutritionist, psychologist, practical nurse, hostess, educator, efficiency and budget expert as well. The mastering of such skills requires a thorough knowledge of home economics in its many and varied facets.

As important as these many skills are, the most important quality of a homemaker is her ability to bring love, harmony, and a knowledge of God to the family unit. Without the family's working together as a whole, comprised of separate and distinct individuals, the child would never learn the meaning of cooperation and of respect for the rights of others. It is in the home that the child learns a true faith and reverence for God, and a deep understanding of America's goals and purposes in today's world. The role of homemaker is vital to our strength as a free and Christian nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say again that it is a pleasure to commend the Future Homemakers of America for their many past achievements and to wish them continued success in all of their future endeavors.

CREDIT AGAINST FEDERAL ESTATE TAX

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues will be interested in the bill H.R. 5039 I introduced on March 21, 1963, to provide an increase in the amount for which a credit may be allowed against the Federal estate tax for estate taxes paid to States.

The objective of my bill is to improve the coordination between State and Federal inheritance, estate, and gift taxes, to encourage the States to simplify the diverse and complex provisions of their tax laws, and to increase the States' share of revenue from these taxes.

Mr. Speaker, my bill addresses itself to a tax area in which legislation is long overdue. The provisions governing the Federal estate credit for taxes paid to States have remained unchanged since 1926. When first enacted, they made a constructive and unique contribution to sound Federal-State tax relations, particularly by giving States an incentive to pattern their tax laws along similar lines. During the intervening 37 years State and Federal taxation has undergone revolutionary changes which have left the 1926 enactment outdated and obsolete.

In their continuing search for more revenue, the States have successively patched, revised, and broadened their death taxes until it requires a veritable multivolume encyclopedia to detail their divergent and complex provisions. While the Federal tax credit no longer plays the important role for which it was originally created and which hopefully it can soon play again, the States are obliged to fit their own provisions around it. The resulting complexity has long concerned taxpayers, tax practitioners, tax students, and legislators alike. We have been urged time and again to update and modernize the Federal credit. Indeed proposals on this subject have probably outnumbered the other suggestions emanating from the long list of study committees and professional organizations which concern themselves with intergovernmental tax relations.

My bill embodies the recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, created by the Congress in 1959, on which the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman FOUNTAIN, the gentlewoman from New Jersey, Congresswoman DWYER, and I have the honor to represent this House. Our colleagues will recall that the Advisory Commission is composed of members actively representing both the exective and legislative branches of all levels of government in our Federal system which gives its recommendations a balanced quality. We shall want to consider its recommendations with care not only because the interests of each State are involved but also because the estate tax is once-a-lifetime levy and should be changed only infrequently.

I am hopeful that despite our crowded committee calendar, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means will find it possible to schedule hearings on revision of the estate tax credit in order that representatives of the States and other interested groups can give us the benefit of their thinking so that the changes we enact can serve effectively for years to come.

REIMBURSEMENT OF STATES FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ROADS

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would reimburse those States that have with their own funds constructed roads which are now included in the National System of Interstate Highways. This legislation has been introduced in previous Congresses without success but the inequities involved in this matter are so clear I am certain that in the not too distant future those States who on their own initiative went ahead and constructed roads which are up to the standards of the Interstate System we are now building in this country will soon receive the just payment due to them for the inclusion of these roads in the Interstate System.

I estimate that under my bill the Federal Government will pay the States a total of approximately $4,295,600,000. To balance off these payments the legislation I have introduced spreads the reimbursement over a 15-year period. As a result of this the U.S. Treasury will be obligated to pay in any 1 year sums ranging from $225 million to roughly $360 million.

All funds paid to the States under my bill require that the States use these funds only for further highway construction. This construction is to be on the Federal-aid primary system.

The obligation of the Federal Government to these States is clear. If the Federal Government should discover that States have constructed other facilities which were suitable for Federal Government use and the Government occupied these facilities then certainly none would contend that when the Government took over these facilities the States should be reimbursed for the Federal Government's use of them. The same thing applies to those roads which were State built and are now on the Federal system.

Spreading reimbursement to the States over a 15-year period is in keeping with the operation of the highway program as it was set up in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. There the entire original estimated cost was authorized to be spread over a 13-year period.

My bill provides that the money to be paid to the States will come from the general fund of the Treasury and will not touch the highway trust fund. It makes no distinction between toll and free highways. The Federal Government has encouraged the construction of toll roads and bridges since 1927 and tolls for highway use differ little from gasoline taxes used in some States to pay for highway construction.

The usefulness of the toll roads to the public has been endorsed by the inclusion of some of them in the Interstate System.

My bill, as I have said before, provides that the money the States are to receive will be used to add additional needed roads to the overall highway system of the country. It has two important objectives. It repays a valid obligation of the Federal Government to the States and it will further advance the highway construction across the Nation.

I enclose herewith a section-by-section analysis of the legislation as introduced today:

ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED INTERSTATE HIGHWAY REPAYMENT BILL

Section 1: The title is "Interstate Highway Repayment Act."

Section 2: Congress declares it to be the policy that each State shall be entitled to receive reimbursement for certain toll and free highways which have been made a part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. The mileage, cost, and other details concerning these highways with respect to each State are shown on the annexed exhibit A [not printed in RECORD].

Section 3: This section authorized the appropriation over a 15-year period of the total "net reimbursable amount" shown on the annexed exhibit A. This amount totaling $4,295,600,000 is based upon the report (H. Doc. 301, 1958, 85th Cong.) (as brought up to date) concerning the depreciated cost of the free or toll roads, or portions thereof, included in the Interstate System. A schedule of authorizations follows:

Authorizations

Fiscal year ending June 30:	*Amount (000 omitted)*
1964	$225,000
1965	225,000
1966	225,000
1967	225,000
1968	225,000
1969	275,000
1970	275,000
1971	275,000
1972	275,000
1973	275,000
1974	359,120
1975	359,120
1976	359,120
1977	359,120
1978	359,120

The funds authorized are to be appropriated out of General Treasury funds and not out of the Highway Trust Fund.

The remaining sections of this bill amend title 23 of the United States Code, which title is concerned with highways. Some of these amendments are substantive, others are merely technical.

Section 4: This section amends chapter I of title 23 by adding a new section to be known as section 132. Paragraph (a) of this section provides that each State shall be entitled to receive the additional amounts for expenditure for the construction of highways under the Federal-aid primary system. Paragraph (b) of this section provides that any amount which a State is entitled to receive under paragraph (a): (1) shall be in addition to any other amounts authorized for the Federal-aid primary system; (2) may be combined with any other amounts authorized for that system; and (3) shall be available for expenditure for projects in either urban or rural areas.

Section 5: Makes it clear that section 104 of title 23 is not applicable to funds expended under the provisions of this bill.

Section 6: This section amends chapter I of title 23 by adding a new section to be known as section 104–A. Subsection (a) of this new section provides that the funds authorized by this bill shall be apportioned under the provisions of section 104–A. Paragraph (b) provides that each State shall receive as its apportionment for each fiscal year the same percentage of the total authorization for such fiscal year as appears in column 6 in exhibit A.

Section 7: This makes a technical change in section 118 of title 23 to make it conform to the insertion of section 104–A of the code.

Section 8: Subsection (a) of this section makes a technical change in subsection (a) of section 120 of title 23 to make it conform to the insertion of the new subsection (i) authorized in subsection (b). Subsection (b) of this section adds a new subsection (i) to section 120 of title 23 to make it clear that States entitled to reimbursement shall not be required to match any part of the fund to which they are entitled.

Section 9: Subsection (a) of this section makes a technical correction to subsection (a) of section 121 so as to make it conform to the new subsection (f) added by subsection (b) of section 9. Subsection (f) provides that the Secretary is required to make progress payments of the funds authorized not later than 30 days after the date that the payment has been requested by the State.

A BILL TO PREVENT THE RUIN OF SQUAW CREEK NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing for appropriate reference a bill designed to prevent the ruin of the Squaw Creek National Wildlife Refuge near Mound City, Mo., because of faulty drainage conditions within the refuge area.

This bill authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a master plan to the end that the refuge will be protected and preserved for the purposes for which it was established.

The bill would authorize the expenditure of $60,000 for necessary biological, engineering, hydrological and topographic studies.

Poor drainage conditions within the refuge have resulted in a dangerous siltation problem, with silt from the watershed of Squaw Creek and Davis Creek above the refuge already having substantially filled up two of the four refuge pools.

If this drainage problem is not corrected in the near future, the refuge will be completely silted over and useless in a few years.

It is absolutely essential that we save this refuge, which has a value in excess of $18.5 million. The refuge provides sanctuary to hundreds of thousands of waterfowl using the Mississippi flyway. It is a great attraction to sportsmen not only from Missouri but from adjacent States. It is important to the local economy. The refuge is a vital conservation asset we cannot afford to lose.

WILL LEGALIZED MANSLAUGHTER CONTINUE?

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Carey] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, in the light of ring deaths in the past year among boxers of title caliber there is no longer any moral or legal justification for this as a sport. Pro boxing is no more than managed mayhem for money. For every fighter who reaches top billing and makes a buck there are a thousand maimed, disfigured, and half-senseless on the human junkpile. The rationale that injury rates are comparable to other sports is untenable. In no other sport is it the principal aim of a contestant to scar, maim, or induce concussion on his opponent. It is ludicrous that a society which prohibits cockfighting condones assault and battery as a public spectacle. We have lost two courageous champions in a year, Benny Paret and Davey Moore. Who will be next? Those who propose to license and promote the Liston-Patterson rematch with Patterson's record of knockouts and knockdowns are in effect constructively risking a manslaughter. Boxing as a professional sport is a throwback to the dark ages and should be outlawed. State statutes would be hit-and-miss and therefore inadequate.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to prohibit professional boxing for the reasons I have stated. I also call attention of the Members of the House to the March 25 column of Jim Murray in the Washington Post entitled "Another Parole for Boxing?" For those who missed reading this moving and pointed account of that fateful night at Dodger Stadium, I include it in the Record:

ANOTHER PAROLE FOR BOXING?

(By Jim Murray)

Los Angeles, March 24.—If Davey Moore dies, can boxing long survive him? Even if he doesn't should it?

Does a sport which has been on parole deserve a full pardon when it proves again and again it hasn't changed? Do we swallow our conscience one more time and continue to sanction prizefights? Are animals more precious than human beings? Are duels at dawn more immoral than death in the evening? Do we sell tickets to an execution? Is this the 20th century or the Roman Empire? How many deaths and comas are over the legal limit?

The evening at Dodger Stadium Thursday featured one fighter who had killed a man in the ring and, as it turned out, another who was about to be or nearly so. It also featured a boy who has been knocked kicking four times in a career so brief he's only been able to vote for a year. Battling Torres had the bad luck to be a drawing card so he got knocked kicking again from a punch so light that his vanquisher fainted dead away. Several of us watching didn't feel too good either.

Whatever he went down from, Battling Torres didn't get up. For that, they can light candles in Reynosa, Mexico, today. He will, thank God, join his family instead of Davey Moore.

Moore's tragedy is he is—or was—a good game fighter. He not only got up, he would still be fighting if his manager hadn't quit for him. It may have been the greatest service Willie Ketchum ever performed for Davey Moore. Davey had taken a savage beating, but he had dealt one out, too. His face was cruelly marked, he had swallowed and shed blood, his step was a stagger, and the hysterical sounds of the bloodthirsty crowds in the upper tiers must have sounded nightmarish to his muddled brain as they led him dazed and daunted from the ring. This was the face of boxing up close. We didn't know it, then, but if we had listened we could have heard the raucous, mocking laughter of death in the background. He didn't know it then but Davey Moore was in a bigger fight out of the ring than he had been in it.

We newsmen were milling around his locker room when they led this poor, broken, jockey-sized athlete into the airless little room that serves in a happier sport as manager Walt Alston's summer cubicle. The door was quickly barred. There were yelps of dismay from us gentlemen of the press. We had a deadline, we complained.

So did Davey Moore.

We are important to this spectacle of man's inhumanity to man. So they let us in anyway.

Davey sat up on the dressing table with effort, as if he just heard in the recesses of his hemorrhaging mind his own private referee toll the count of 8. Davey never would take a count.

"It just wasn't my night. I just can't take nothing away from that boy but—" He halted, looked around and tried to focus on the sea of faces around him. "Well," he began pathetically, "you fellows have times when you can't write as well as others." He was right. And this is one of them.

"I know I can fight much better than I did tonight," he almost whispered. His manager demonstrated a severed mouthpiece which had been ripped from his fighter's teeth by a savage right-hand punch. "I offered a doctor $100 yesterday to make him a new mouthpiece but there wasn't time," he explained.

But it was not Davey's mouth which needed protection. It was his brain. It was bleeding slowly as he talked. It was to gush later but three of us who leaned over to shake his hand as we left the room didn't know that. "I'm awful glad you stopped it," I told Ketchum.

Apparently, as soon as we left the room, the slow leak became a burst.

An hour and one fight later, surprised the door was still tightly locked as I passed through, I shoved it open again. They were just stripping his fighting togs off the ex-champion. Willie Ketchum and Eddie Foy III put fingers to their lips as they saw me. I closed the door softly. I thought the fighter was under sedation.

He was—God's sedation. A merciful curtain had been drawn over his awful pain the instant he said, "Ooh, my head hurts." Davey Moore, for the first time in his career, was in a fight in which he was the underdog before it started. It was a fight in which the line wasn't posted by Vegas but on an invisible tote board with no wire service, only a chart at the foot of the bed.

I have fought on this prose level before. The counter has been that people are killed in traffic, over water, under ground.

Sure, but we don't sell tickets.

But these are champions, the highest practitioners of their art, that we are admitting to hospitals, mausoleums and vegetation in boxing, not kids in unsupervised activity. Only one big league baseball player, only one big league football player has ever been killed. Even that is too many but no match at all for boxing's toll. People die in auto racing. But they kill themselves. And they are not trying to. As I said before, in boxing, it's the name of the game. "Kill him," the crowd cries. They boo at anything sublethal. They did Thursday when Luis Rodriguez fought as sensibly as if he had been put in the ring with a killer—precisely because he was.

TRIBUTE TO JIMMY DURANTE

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, Jimmy Durante recently celebrated his 70th birthday. Somehow it seems appropriate in the spring of the year to take a few moments to talk about this ageless entertainer whose impish magic has the fresh quality of the season of renewal. Chronologically he may be 70 years old, but his antic spirit denies the passage of years. It is joyous, human, ever-green.

Jimmy Durante has been a permanent fixture of American radio, movies, Broadway, and television for so many years that it is impossible to conceive of any of these vast fields of art and wit without him.

I am sure many aspiring performers would like the know the formula that has given Jimmy his enduring success. Possibly he has been studied to determine his secret; certainly from time to time there have been emulators. If they watched for tricks of expression or clever kinds of "business," they were on the wrong track. It isn't gimmicks that make him endure. It is the force of personality—a warmth of demeanor that stems from his having known all shades and circumstances of life—having known them, absorbed them, appreciated them, and conquered them.

The creation of a legend more often than not requires a passage of time during which a historical perspective gives luster to memories. Jimmy Durante is still with us, and God willing, many years remain to him to touch the quick of American humor. But because he has been a practitioner of the special art of American humor for more than 40 years, already human memory, which polishes and embellishes with loving care anything that represents a continuing and ageless part of itself, has made him into an American legend.

The entertainment world may claim him as their own. Their pride is understandable, but he belongs to all of us.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleague, James Corman of California, in paying tribute to a man who has been one of the stars of the entertainment

world for more than 40 years. Jimmy Durante has had a long and distinguished career in every entertainment media.

Jimmy Durante first gained fame as a member of the outstanding entertainment team of Clayton, Jackson and Durante. This became one of the leading vaudeville acts of the era. He went on to star on Broadway, in motion pictures, radio, and television. In 1951, he won a Peabody Award for his work in radio and television.

The warm humor of this man has endeared him to millions of Americans. His ever-present hat, celebrated nose, and famous closing line, "Good night, Mrs. Calabash, wherever you are," have been symbols of the best in comedy for more than a generation. His career represents everything that is rich and fine in the entertainment industry. His charitable acts are manifold. He has brought in a most wholesome manner happiness and pleasure to countless of millions of persons. Hollywood, and the America of which it is a part, are justifiably proud of this good man and illustrious citizen. I wish for Mr. Durante many more years of a happy and active life.

AIR SAFETY

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, although I have been quite critical in the past of Mr. Halaby's management decisions in the field of air safety, I do believe in giving credit where credit is due. In the past, Mr. Halaby has demonstrated a tendency to make decisions based upon whim, to react violently to technical questions concerning his judgments, and to resort to personal abuse in answering critics of his programs. It is clear that part of his trouble has been due to some poor advice given him by his assistants. However, Mr. Halaby has just overruled his advisers, and reversed himself on an important mater affecting aviation safety. He has decided to cancel his plans for a major involvement in an experiment with the SAGE system.

In mid-1962 Mr. Halaby announced a plan for the integration of certain air defense facilities—SAGE—and air traffic control. This plan called for the closing of the Great Falls Air Route Traffic Control Center—FAA—the transfer of certain responsibilities from the Minneapolis and Seattle Air Route Traffic Control Centers, and the establishment of three colocated air traffic control operations in SAGE Centers in Minot and Grand Forks, N. Dak., and Great Falls, Mont. At that time, August 1962, our distinguished colleague, Congressman Joseph E. Karth, of Minnesota, objected to this plan and offered substantial technical information to prove that the plan was unsound, an experiment in which lives would be risked, and a demonstrated reduction in the already shaky safety standards of the FAA. At that time Mr. Halaby brushed aside the objections of Mr. Karth, refused to answer the technical questions raised, and categorized any objections to the program as a challenge of the President's program.

Now Mr. Halaby has changed his mind. On March 8, 1963, Mr. Halaby announced that the FAA was abandoning the major part of the experiment in SAGE-air traffic control integration. Although this decision is belated, it does offer some encouragement concerning the future administration of the Federal Aviation Agency. It is of course interesting to speculate as to how much money might have been saved had Mr. Halaby acted in this manner last year. Surely the facts concerning the inadequacies of the SAGE facilities to perform the air traffic control function were as readily available in August 1962 as they are now.

I now direct your attention to another decision of this Administrator. I refer to the decision announced in 1962 to abandon the Air Route Traffic Control Centers in New Orleans and San Antonio, and to establish a new facility in Houston. It is significant to note that no mention of such a move was made in the budget then under consideration. No justification was offered, and apparently no opposition was anticipated. At no time was an adequate justification given, and none is forthcoming to this date. When pressed for answers, Mr. Halaby merely stated that he would reprogram funds for more than 100 air safety installations—facilities that were at that time still in the budget under consideration and totaling more than $8 million. These were items that had been laboriously justified in internal FAA budget reviews over a 2-year period, further justified before the Bureau of the Budget, and finally justified before the Appropriation Subcommittee. These items represented over $8 million worth of air safety, deemed absolutely essential by the Agency and its Administrator; then suddenly tossed aside in favor of a hastily conceived and poorly planned move.

As you may recall, after my request last year for an explanation, and after I had been subjected to as intemperate an attack as were ever made by the head of a Federal agency upon a Congressman, Mr. Halaby finally agreed to provide justification. This justification was based largely upon theoretical savings in the costs of computers, projected over a 16-year period. Bear in mind that there are no computers in use in New Orleans and in San Antonio air route traffic control centers today, and none programed for the new Houston center. The FAA is presently using five or six computers in various centers—computers of the 1957 vintage and for all practical purposes, obsolete. The research efforts of the FAA over the past 5 years toward the development of a new computer for air traffic control have been a failure, at a cost of well over $100 million. Bear in mind also that a $3 million building has just been constructed to house the New Orleans air route traffic control center; and a 10-year lease on the new air route traffic control center in San Antonio is only in its fourth year. The effort to foist this building off onto NASA will ultimately cost the taxpayers well over a million dollars for remodeling to suit the needs of NASA. We also know that the FAA is stuck with the remaining years of lease on the San Antonio property.

Later I asked Mr. Halaby for a list of the planned locations of more than 100 safety facilities which he was so ready to abandon in lieu of the new center. He refused to provide this information, stating that it was not in the public interest to divulge. One wonders whether we are here dealing with the FAA or the CIA. This whole sorry matter constitutes one of the most arrogant and flagrant disregards for the taxpayer and the safety of the flying public on record.

But, as I previously mentioned, there is hope. Mr. Halaby belatedly recognized the error of his decision concerning the use of SAGE in air traffic control. Perhaps he will soon come to the realization that his Agency does not have a defined plan for the consolidation of air route traffic control centers.

It is for these reasons I asked the House Subcommittee on Independent Offices to refuse permission and funds to Mr. Halaby for the purpose of moving the San Antonio Air Route Traffic Control Center.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Dorn for Monday, April 1, 1963, on account of official business.

Mr. Patten, for March 28 and 29, 1963, on account of Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight Meeting at Cape Canaveral.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Perkins, for 2 hours, on Tuesday, April 2, on the subject of the Youth Conservation Corps.

Mr. Fogarty (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 5 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. McDowell (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Wilson of Indiana, for 1 hour, on April 1.

Mr. Moore, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Goodling), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Harvey of Indiana (at the request of Mr. Goodling), for 30 minutes, on April 1.

Mr. Hemphill (at the request of Mr. Ryan of New York), for 1 hour on Tuesday, April 2, 1963.

Mr. Whitener (at the request of Mr. Ryan of New York), for 60 minutes, April 2, 1963, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Hemphill (at the request of Mr. Ryan of New York), for 1 hour, on Wednesday, April 3, 1963.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MATTHEWS and to include an address by Mr. BASS.

Mr. WRIGHT and to include a copy of an address by the Honorable JOSEPH MONTOYA.

Mr. DULSKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINNEGAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include a speech.

Mr. PEPPER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD following the discussion on residual oil imports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOODLING) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CURTIS.
Mr. BURTON.
Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
Mr. DOLE.
Mr. MAILLIARD.
Mr. SIBAL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RYAN of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WICKERSHAM.
Mr. CORMAN.
Mr. COOLEY.
Mr. TOLL.
Mr. MORRISON.
Mr. GILL.
Mr. WELTNER in two instances.
Mr. PUCINSKI.
Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.
Mr. MULTER.
Mr. RAINS.
Mr. SICKLES.
Mr. FLOOD.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 25, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 212. An act to amend section 904, title 38, United States Code, so that burial allowances might be paid in cases where discharges were changed by competent authority after death of the veteran from dishonorable to conditions other than dishonorable;

H.R. 2085. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the deduction for child care expenses shall be available to a wife who has been deserted by and cannot locate her husband on the same basis as a single woman; and

H.R. 2438. An act to extend the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 1, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS INCURRED IN TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by section 401(a) of Public Law 86–472, approved May 14, 1960, and section 105 of Public Law 86–628, approved July 12, 1960, require the reporting of expenses incurred in connection with travel outside the United States, including both foreign currencies expended and dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds by Members, employees, and committees of the Congress.

The law requires the chairman of each committee to prepare a consolidated report of foreign currency expenditures and also dollar expenditures from appropriated funds within the first 60 days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, covering expenditures for travel outside the United States during the previous calendar year. The consolidated report is forwarded to the Committee on House Administration which, in turn, prints such report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD within 10 legislative days after receipt. The deadline for filing expenditure reports for travel during the calendar year 1962 was March 9, 1963.

On March 11, 1963, the Committee on House Administration placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD all reports which had been received within the prescribed period of time for filing. There is submitted herewith a supplemental report received March 21, 1963, from a member of the 51st Conference, Interparliamentary Union:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by Representative Dale Alford delegation, 51st Conference, Interparliamentary Union, expended between Oct. 19 and Nov. 2, 1962

Country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mexico	U.S. dollar		39.63		51.20				37.76		128.59
Peru	do		40.52		43.80		2.40		29.60		116.32
Argentina	do		35.07		77.92				27.54		140.53
Brazil	do		96.38		169.92		8.62		116.96		391.88
Trinidad	do		16.05		5.57				1.60		23.22
Total			227.65		348.41		11.02		213.46		800.54

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Appropriated funds (22 U.S.C. 276a)	$800.54

DALE ALFORD, *Delegate.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

597. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1963 involving increases in the amount of $15,300,000 for the Department of Labor and $4 million for the Department of the Interior, and an amendment decreasing the budget for the fiscal year 1964 in the amount of $4 million for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 89); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

598. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, in the amount of $16,993,400, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs (H. Doc. No. 90); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

599. A letter from the president, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting the 13th Annual Report of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 272, 83d Congress (H. Doc. No. 91); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

600. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

601. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to provide protection for the employment opportunities of domestic agricultural workers in the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

602. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of certain commissioned officers of the Army or Air Force who were erroneously paid uniform allowance under the provisions of section 305 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

603. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto, approved June 6, 1892, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

604. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in a health benefits plan established pursuant to such act and to amend the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

605. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of overpricing of spare electronic parts under Department of the Army fixed-price contracts DA–18–119–SC–651, DA–18–119–SC–654, and DA–18–119–SC–799 with Burroughs Corp., Detroit, Mich. These contracts were awarded in 1959 and 1960; to the Committee on Government Operations.

606. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of recreation and other selected land-use activities of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Government Operations.

607. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize and direct that certain lands exclusively administered by the Secretary of the Interior be managed under principles of multiple-use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

608. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense Installations and Logistics, transmitting a report on extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense for the calendar year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 85–804; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

609. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend the provisions of the act of October 11, 1949, 63 Stat. 759, ch. 672 (32 D.C.C. 417), to authorize the commitment of persons of unsound mind found on Federal reservations in Loudon County, Va, to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

610. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the annual report with respect to tort claims paid for the calendar year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 601, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

611. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill relating to the retirement of judges of the territorial district courts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

612. A letter from the Governor of the Canal Zone and President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to grant increased benefits to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937, and to extend cash relief benefits to widows of recipients"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

613. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to continue for 2 years the existing reduction of the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and to eliminate the free entry privilege for articles not accompanying a returning resident"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4423. A bill permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming; without amendment (Rept. No. 119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1049. A bill to amend sections 334, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734, 767, 769) and to add a new section 355 so as to require claims to be filed and to limit the time within which claims may be filed in chapter XI (arrangement) proceedings to the time prescribed by section 57n of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93n); without amendment (Rept. No. 159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1762. A bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2364. A bill for the relief of Clay County Hospital, Brazil, Ind.; without amendment (Rept. No. 161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2859. A bill to provide for the promulgation of rules of practice and procedure under the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 162). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Joint Resolution 180. Joint resolution to authorize the continued use of certain lands within the Sequoia National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project; with amendment (Rept. No. 163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 4555. A bill to extend the provision of section 3 of Public Law 87–346, relating to dual rate contracts; without amendment (Rept. No. 166). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4347. A bill to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to new construction or alteration of veterans' hospitals; with amendment (Rept. No. 165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 282. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 166). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 86. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled, "Our Flag"; without amendment (Rept. No. 167). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 26. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a Senate document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government. What Is It? How Does It Function?"; without amendment (Rept. No. 168). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House concurrent Resolution 98. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of a wall map of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 169). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 108. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of "How Our Laws Are Made" as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 170). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 119. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the Constitution of the United States, with an analytical index and ancillaries regarding proposed amendments; without amendment (Rept. No. 171). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 296. Resolution to print as a House document, the Fourth Annual Report of the Commission on International Rules of Judical Procedure; without amendment (Rept. No. 172). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 14. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document, with illustrations, a pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol," and to print additional copies thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 173). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3120. A bill to simplify administration of the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766); with amendment (Rept. No. 174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3845. A bill to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766); with amendment (Rept. No. 175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Annual report of the Committee on Un-American Activities (Rept. No. 176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5279. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1213. A bill for the relief of World Games, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1292. A bill for the relief of Carmela Calabrese DiVito; without amendment (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1267. A bill for the relief of Lawrence E. Bird; with amendment (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1286. A bill for the relief of Lt. Claude V. Wells; with amendment (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1428. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Knoll; without amendment (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1447. A bill for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co., and/or Holt Import & Export Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MARTIN of California: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1459. A bill for the relief of Oliver Brown; with amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1561. A bill for the relief of Melborn Keat; with amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1853. A bill for the relief of Patti Jean Fulton; without amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1876. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rita M. Bravi; with amendment (Rept. No. 129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2179. A bill for the relief of Mrs. David Ishmael, Manhattan, Kans.; with amendment (Rept. No. 130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2245. A bill for the relief of Stella McKee; without amendment (Rept. No. 131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2257. A bill for the relief of Kenneth F. Miller; without amendment (Rept. No. 132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2292. A bill for the relief of Marvin M. Greenlee; without amendment (Rept. No. 133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2300. A bill for the relief of the Outlet Stores, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2302. A bill for the relief of James M. Norman; with amendment (Rept. No. 135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2326. A bill for the relief of Maurice Casner and Eileen G. Casner; with amendment (Rept. No. 136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2327. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Edward C. Campbell; without amendment (Rept. No. 137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2699. A bill for the relief of Victor L. Ashley; with amendment (Rept. No. 138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2700. A bill for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2706. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain; without amendment (Rept. No. 140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2708. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Moundroukas; with amendment (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2728. A bill for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2736. A bill for the relief of William C. Jessup; with amendment (Rept. No. 143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2743. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary E. O'Rourke; with amendment (Rept. No. 144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2772. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Harley Brewer; with amendment (Rept. No. 145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2798. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Veselenak; with amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3022. A bill for the relief of Gene H. King; with amendment (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3029. A bill for the relief of Maj. Arnold M. Anderson; without amendment (Rept. No. 148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3240. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josephine Dubins; without amendment (Rept. No. 149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3356. A bill for the relief of Josephine Maria (Bonaccorso) Bowtell; without amendment (Rept. No. 150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3369. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Mason; without amendment (Rept. No. 151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3450. A bill for the relief of Herbert B. Shorter, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3624. A bill for the relief of Maj. Donald B. Powers, U.S. Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3662. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Patterson Bartlett; with amendment (Rept. No. 154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3755. A bill for the relief of Glendal W. Hancock; with amendment (Rept. No. 155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4214. A bill for the relief of the Stella Reorganized Schools R–I, Missouri; with amendment (Rept. No. 156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4349. A bill for the relief of Robert O. Nelson and Harold E. Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ASHMORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4965. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 5156. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 5157. A bill to free farmers from Government control; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 5158. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act for acquired lands (61 Stat. 913) with respect to the leasing of mineral deposits in which the United States owns a partial or future interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5159. A bill to authorize and direct that certain lands exclusively administered by the Secretary of the Interior be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 5160. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay fair value for improvements located on the railroad rights-of-way owned by bona fide lessees or permittees; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 5161. A bill to provide that surplus personal property of the United States may be donated to the States for the promotion of fish and wildlife management activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5162. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of State and Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5163. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the donation of surplus property to volunteer lifesaving corps; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 5164. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 512 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (dealing with unrelated business taxable income); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 5165. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 5166. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income tax, interest on obligations issued by tax-exempt colleges and universities to provide funds for educational buildings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 5167. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from taxable income of expenditures for the construction of waste treatment works to control water pollution; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5168. A bill to provide for the abatement of certain penalties and interest otherwise payable with respect to the highway use tax in the case of certain motor vehicles used primarily for hauling unprocessed farm and forest products from their place of production to market or mill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5169. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the highway use tax in the case of certain trucks and other vehicles which are used primarily for hauling unprocessed farm and forest products from their place of production to market or mill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 5170. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that veterans have served 90 days or more during World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict to qualify for pension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 5171. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 5172. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to postpone for one additional year the effectiveness of the matching requirements of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 5173. A bill to prohibit professional boxing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5174. A bill to provide for the payment of royalties for the public performance of copyrighted musical compositions by means of coin-operated machines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5175. A bill to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 5176. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 5177. A bill to authorize appropriations for the purpose of equitably reimbursing the States for certain free and toll roads on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 5178. A bill to grant officers and employees subject to the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, the opportunity to examine and reply to certain evaluations of their promotion qualifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5179. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicle, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 5180. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide annuities for surviving spouses without deduction from original annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5181. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, so as to revise the rates of disability and death pension authorized by the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 5182. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 5183. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide that polished sheets and plates of iron or steel shall be subject to the same duty as unpolished sheets and plates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5184. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax deduction for certain expenses of attending colleges and universities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 5185. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 5186. A bill to establish the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 5187. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to increase the total mileage of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 5188. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an income tax deduction for certain expenses of attending colleges and universities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5189. A bill to allow additional income tax exemptions for a taxpayer or a spouse, or a dependent child under 23 years of age, who is a full-time student at an educational institution above the secondary level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5190. A bill to amend sections 1231, 272, and 631 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to iron ore royalties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5191. A bill to amend section 336 of title 38, United States Code, to provide wartime rates of disability compensation for veterans disabled from injury or disease incurred or aggravated by oversea service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 5192. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow income deductions for certain payments to assist in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 5193. A bill to extend for one additional year the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 5194. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in expansion of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 5195. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5196. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require use of articles, materials, and products of the United States in performing contracts for the construction, conversion, alteration, or repair of vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 5197. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1960, entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park, in the State of Missouri"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5198. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to fix the premium for the insurance of cooperative housing mortgages at the minimum permissible level (one-fourth of 1 percent per annum); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5199. A bill to provide for housing loans to veterans of service in the Armed Forces of the United States who are residing abroad; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 5200. A bill relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5201. A bill to amend section 203(b) (6) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to limit the application of the exemptions provided therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 5202. A bill to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5203. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5204. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Commission on Aging and to authorize Federal grants to assist in the development of programs which will benefit older persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5205. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to postpone for one additional year the effectiveness of the matching requirements of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 5206. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5207. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 5208. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from the tax on club dues for nonprofit hunting and fishing clubs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 5209. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the limitation on the amount of allowable charitable contributions which may be made by individuals to certain organizations for the benefit of churches, educational organizations, hospitals, and certain medical research organizations operating in conjunction with hospitals, and certain other organizations which are organized and operated for the benefit of certain colleges or universities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5210. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent duplication of benefits based on disability in cases where the disabled individual receives workmen's compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H.R. 5211. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent duplication of benefits based on disability in cases where the disabled individual receives workmen's compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 5212. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a master plan for Squaw Creek National Refuge in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 5213. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces may not be held liable for damage to property of the Armed Forces except where the damage was caused by willful and wanton negligence and where the member has been afforded an opportunity for a hearing; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H.R. 5214. A bill to prohibit the printing and distribution of annual wall calendars for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 5215. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 5216. A bill to establish in the government of the District of Columbia a Department of Housing and Planning; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5217. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it a crime to steal certain trade secrets or to transport stolen trade secrets in interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 5218. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit retirement by all persons in the United States at the age of 60 years with benefits that will assure full participation by elderly persons generally in prevailing national standards of living, to provide like benefits for disabled persons, and to provide benefits for certain female heads of families and for certain children, and to provide for the establishment and operation of this system of social security by an equitable gross income tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 5219. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through establishment of acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 5220. A bill to provide for the medical and hospital care of the aged through a system of voluntary health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.R. 5221. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 5222. A bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Chocolate Mountain Aerial Gunnery Range, Imperial County, Calif., for defense purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 5223. A bill to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 5224. A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 5225. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act (relating to the insurance of savings and loan accounts) with respect to the maximum amount of insurance which may be provided thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5226. A bill to increase the limitation on payments for construction engineering for Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 5227. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5228. A bill to extend the benefits of the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act in certain cases; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 5229. A bill to promote State commercial fishery research and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5230. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 5231. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 5232. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5233. A bill to authorize the establishment of (1) a Youth Opportunities Administration, (2) a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas, (3) to authorize local area youth employment programs, (4) to authorize student work-study programs in institutions of higher education; and (5) to authorize student work-study programs in institutions of secondary education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5234. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in expansion of services provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 5235. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 5236. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for contributions to candidates for elective Federal office or to political parties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 5237. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to postpone for one additional year the effectiveness of the matching requirements of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5238. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of small business investment companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 5239. A bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 5240. A bill for the protection of marine mammals on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 5241. A bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development of programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, gathering, evaluating, correlating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research, and other mediums relating to weather, communications, travel, and other areas of information; also to coordinate Antarctic activities among those agencies of the U.S. Government and private institutions interested in or concerned directly with the promotion, advancement, increase, and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic; and to direct and administer U.S. Antarctic programs in the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5242. A bill to provide for the addition of certain property in Philadephia, Pa., to Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5243. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring the famous naturalists, John Burroughs, John Muir, and Henry David Thoreau; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 5244. A bill to modify the project on the Mississippi River at Muscatine, Iowa, to permit the use of certain property for public park purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 5245. A bill to encourage the expansion and improvement of State programs of special education and related services for exceptional children through Federal financial participation in the cost of development and implementation of such programs and in the cost of colleges and universities in providing special courses of instruction and scholarships for persons preparing for professional participation in such programs, and for establishing research grants and special projects and by establishing and providing for consultation with a national training and research council and technical advisory committees on education of exceptional children in the administration of this act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 5246. A bill to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 5247. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Northeastern Water and Related Land Resources Compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 5248. A bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants and scholarships for collegiate education in the field of nursing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 5249. A bill to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 5250. A bill to amend section 411(a) of title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows of veterans dying from service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5251. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to authorize additional disability compensation for certain veterans who have suffered the anatomical loss of a blind eye; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 5252. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require use of articles, materials, and products of the United States in performing contracts for the construction, conversion, alteration, or repair of vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services

H.R. 5253. A bill relating to the income tax basis, in the hands of a surviving spouse, of certain property previously held as community property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H.R. 5254. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 5255. A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 5256. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for contributions to candidates for elective Federal office or to political parties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 5257. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the southern portion of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H.R. 5258. A bill to amend section 2310 of title 10, United States Code, to provide additional authority for review by the Comptroller General of negotiated procurement contracts by the military departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 5259. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes; contingent upon acceptance and approval by the Director of Airports, Federal Aviation Agency, as protector of the interests of the United States of America; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 5260. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 5261. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 5262. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 5263. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 5264. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 5265. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 5266. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 5267. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 5268. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 5269. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 5270. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.R. 5271. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 5272. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 5273. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 5274. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 5275. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 5276. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 5277. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 5278. A bill to provide under the social security program for payment for hospital and related services to aged beneficiaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H.R. 5279. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BOW:

H.J. Res. 352. Joint resolution making the 17th day of September in each year a legal holiday to be known as "Constitution Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROMWELL:

H.J. Res. 353. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 354. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April of each year as National Arbor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.J. Res. 355. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning on the Sunday starting the last full week in October, each year, as Cleaner Air Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN:

H.J. Res. 356. Joint resolution to provide stricter control over expenditures by Members of Congress traveling outside the United States, to require employees of Members to serve at specific places, to promote ethical standards of conduct among Members of Congress, and to prohibit nepotism in Government employment; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 357. Joint resolution to authorize and require the U.S. National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization to submit an annual report concerning its activities, programs, and proceedings; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.J. Res. 358. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of a training program for governmental oversea employment of American youth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.J. Res. 359. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multi-State authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.J. Res. 360. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H. Con. Res. 120. Concurrent resolution relating to Panama Canal sovereignty treaty interpretations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H. Con. Res. 122. Concurrent resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 301. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON: Memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States, with reference to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to article V of the Constitution of the United States which would provide a change in the procedure for proposing a constitutional amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN: House Joint Resolution No. 70 of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to honor Revolutionary War hero Lt. Col. William Ledyard by giving his name to a new submarine being built at Groton, Conn.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to conveyance of Federal lands in Marin County to the State of California; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to honor Revolutionary War hero Lt. Col. William Ledyard by giving his name to a new submarine being built at Groton, Conn.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting that the personnel, military and civil, of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton, Wash., be commended for their past and present contributions to the citizens of this State and this Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting enactment of legislation authorizing the Bumping Lake Reservoir project with full consideration regarding the rights of all water users; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting enactment of legislation governing the acquisition and relinquishment of legislative jurisdiction over Federal holdings within the 13 Western States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to article V of the Constitution which would provide a change in the procedure for proposing a constitutional amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution which would provide that the Federal Government may not, through legislative or judicial action restrict or limit any State in the apportionment of representation in its legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to calling a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 5280. A bill for the relief of Oskiyan Bedros Bedyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5281. A bill for the relief of Winsome Elaine Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5282. A bill for the relief of Liubimiro Iurasich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5283. A bill for the relief of Aron Falshpan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO (by request):

H.R. 5284. A bill for the relief of Alexandros Vasilakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 5285. A bill for the relief of Emilio Vazuez Rouco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 5286. A bill for the relief of Vittorio Galasso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 5287. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zara M. Schreiber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 5288. A bill for the relief of Henry White Bird; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 5289. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zara M. Schreiber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5290. A bill for the relief of Meguerditch Avakian, his wife, Loosin Avakian, and their minor children, Ayda Avakian, Verjine-Eugenie Avakian, and Chazaros Avakian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 5291. A bill for the relief of Fotini Zisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 5292. A bill for the relief of Miss Nellie Fedalizo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5293. A bill for the relief of Sister Nicoletta (Nicoletta Csekey); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H.R. 5294. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5295. A bill for the relief of Irena Romkowska Pol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5296. A bill for the relief of Eftychia Drizis Sioukas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5297. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hooshang Behroozi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5298. A bill for the relief of Zakharia Dorani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 5299. A bill for the relief of Mah Ney Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H.R. 5300. A bill for the relief of Harry P. Nash, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 5301. A bill for the relief of Ettore Iavicoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 5302. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the Newton area, California, to Clarence J. Wilder; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5303. A bill for the relief of Hong Song Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 5304. A bill for the relief of James D. Long; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5305. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ernest P. Imle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 5306. A bill for the relief of Paul James Branan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5307. A bill for the relief of Edward T. Hughes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 5308. A bill for the relief of Manuel Oncina, his wife, Isabel Oncina, and their children, Juan Manuel Oncina and Jose Luis Oncina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 5309. A bill for the relief of Russell D. Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 5310. A bill for the relief of Arthur Mills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 5311. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Kostera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

75. By Mr. ADAIR: Petition of George Kowalczyk, Judge W. O. Hughes, Sheriff Custer A. Dunifon, Dr. Harold R. Griffith, Father John J. Moskal, Gregory J. Bittner, and thousands of others, from Fort Wayne and Allen County, Ind., urging the Congress of the United States to conduct a complete and impartial investigation of the U.S. State Department; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

76. By Mr. DEROUNIAN: Petition of the American Legion embodying resolutions 632 and 641 as unanimously adopted by the American Legion at its recent national convention, to further the continuance of a direct-action program to strengthen the American merchant marine and the furtherance of the extensive information and education campaign carried on by the American Legion; also to register the opposition of the American Legion to the imposition of tolls or user charges upon the enjoyment of inland waterways as a free passageway for commerce; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

77. By Mr. McLOSKEY: Petition of beef producers of the 19th District of Illinois in opposition to the Federal Government subsidizing the beef industry or guaranteeing a profit on the cattle they feed as they feel these practices would be detrimental to the cattleman and beef industry by bringing about Government control and weakening agriculture; also request an investigation of the chain store control over the dressed beef market since the average price of Choice fat cattle has dropped approximately 21 percent and beef sold over the counter in local chain stores has dropped only 17 percent; to the Committee on Agriculture.

78. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Stanley Molik, city clerk, Buffalo, N.Y., requesting passage of legislation which would make Columbus Day, October 12, a Federal legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 28, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Honorable Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana.

Rev. Sam L. Fore, pastor, First Methodist Church, Weslaco, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, whose mighty spirit has guided us thus far and who desires that we act responsibly in Thy world, keep before us in sharp focus the vital issues that confront this assembly today.

In these days of frustrating, unsteadying, nerve-fraying living on the razor's edge of danger, may we refuse to be polarized by those who would push us around one extreme or the other.

Grant that the political health and security of this Nation and all nations who labor for freedom's cause be made strong in our struggle against all forms of totalitarianism.

O Lord, bless our Nation's President and Vice President and these Senators, that they may have stout nerves, steady faith, and quiet confidence in Thee.

Grant that in these days of change we may continue to be sensitive to the winds of change. May we avail ourselves of Thy power and wisdom as we gird ourselves for any emergency as well as the full stretch of the years to come. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D.C., March 28, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 25, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1597) relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions:

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document, with illustrations, a pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol," and to print additional copies thereof; and

S. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a Senate document the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government: What Is It? How Does It Function?"

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Kuchel, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Investigation Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination of Bernard M. Decker, of Illinois.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Fred Gates, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

Also 233 postmaster nominations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the district judge nomination will be stated.

DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Bernard M. Decker, of Illinois, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Illinois.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—MASS TRANSIT BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that it was the anticipation of the leadership to bring up on tomorrow Senate bill 6, the mass transit bill. However, due to the fact that the membership has not as yet had an opportunity to study the report of the Commerce Committee and the amendments proposed by it, it is felt that in the interest of comity it would be better to bring up the bill on Monday next.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m. on Monday morning next.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock on Monday next, instead of at 11 o'clock, as previously ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 8 (b) OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROTECTION FOR EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES OF DOMESTIC AGRICULTURAL WORKERS IN THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to provide protection for the employment opportunities of domestic agricultural workers in the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS TAKEN TO FACILITATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contractual actions taken to facilitate the national defense, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Amendment of Act Relating to Regulation of Practice of Dentistry in the District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto," approved June 6, 1892, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Amendment of Section 503 of Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, To Authorize a Grant-in-Aid Program

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 503 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize a grant-in-aid program, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Overpricing of Spare Electronic Parts Under Department of the Army Fixed-Price Contracts With Burroughs Corp., Detroit, Mich.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of overpricing of spare electronic parts under Department of the Army fixed-price contracts DA–18–119–SC–651, DA–18–119–SC–654, and DA–18–119–SC–799 with Burroughs Corp., Detroit, Mich., dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Relief of Certain Commissioned Officers of the Army or Air Force

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain commissioned officers of the Army or Air Force who were erroneously paid uniform allowance under the provisions of section 305 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Retirement of Judges of the Territorial District Courts

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the retirement of judges of the territorial district courts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of Girl Scouts of America

A letter from the president and national executive director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Amendment of Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 so as to authorize certain teachers employed by the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in a health benefits plan established pursuant to such act and to amend the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 so as to extend insurance coverage to such teachers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Joint Resolution 70

"Resolution memorializing Congress and the President of the United States to honor Revolutionary War hero Lt. Col. William Ledyard by giving his name to a new submarine being built at Groton, Conn.

"Whereas on the 6th day of September 1781, British forces under the overall command of Benedict Arnold assaulted Fort Griswold, in Groton, Conn.; and

"Whereas these forces consisting of 800 British regulars in 2 battalions were opposed by a small body of poorly armed local militia, mostly youths of the immediate neighborhood led by Colonel Ledyard; and

"Whereas the British commander, Lieutenant Colonel Eyre, demanded surrender which the gallant Colonel Ledyard refused despite the overwhelming superiority of the enemy forces; and

"Whereas the infuriated British officer then sent a second demand, stating that no quarter would be granted if resistance was made, and Colonel Ledyard again returned an adamant refusal; and

"Whereas the British thereupon stormed the fort and overwhelmed it in a savage and bloody battle in which losses were very heavy on both sides, and Colonel Ledyard upon realizing that further resistance in the bitter hand-to-hand fighting against 8-to-1 odds would only lead to the useless slaughter of all his friends and neighbors under his command, did order his men to lay down their arms, while at the same time offering his own sword to a British officer in surrender according to the accepted customs of warfare; and

"Whereas this British officer accepted the sword so offered and immediately and most foully plunged the sword through Colonel Ledyard's breast killing him instantly: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by this assembly,* That the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut hereby memorialize the Congress and President of the United States to pay tribute to Lt. Col. William Ledyard, a true hero of America's battle for independence, by causing to be named in his honor a new submarine being built at Groton, Conn.; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and the Members of Congress."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution relative to conveyance of Federal lands in Marin County to the State of California

"Whereas it was with great pleasure that the people of California greeted the recent announcement that all of Angel Island in San Francisco Bay has been turned over to the State of California by the Federal Government for development as a State park; and

"Whereas the continued growth of California, and the San Francisco Bay area in particular, requires still more park and recreational developments; and

"Whereas there are within the areas of Fort Barry, Fort Cronkhite, and Fort Baker in Marin County thousands of acres of extremely beautiful land, including desirable beach land, which is exceptionally well suited for recreational purposes; and

"Whereas the Federal Government already has declared certain of these lands to be surplus as unnecessary for military purposes, and indicated its plans to dispose of such lands: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)* That the Legislature of the State of California wishes to express the appreciation of the people of California upon the conveyance of Angel Island to the State of California for park development, and respectfully requests that the lands in the areas of Fort Barry, Fort Cronkhite, and Fort Baker in Marin County which are unnecessary for military purposes, also be turned over to the State for State park purposes; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Administrator of General Services."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Resolution

"Joint resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the qualifications of electors

"Whereas the 87th Congress of the United States of America, at its 2d session, in both Houses, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, has made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States of America in the following words, to wit:

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"'"Article —

"'"Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

"'"Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation"'; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Idaho:*

"Section 1. That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is hereby ratified by the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

"Passed the house on the 6th day of March 1963.

"Pete T. Cenarrusa,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Passed the senate on the 8th day of March 1963.

"W. E. Drevlow,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"Robert H. Remaklus,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution Y

"Concurrent resolution requesting Congress to designate the impoundment created by Garrison Dam as Lake Sakakawea

"Whereas there is statewide support for designating and naming the impoundment created by the Garrison Dam on the Missouri River in North Dakota by a more historical, romantic, or meaningful name than Garrison Reservoir: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein),* That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, most respectfully petitioned and requested to designate and name the impoundment, known as Garrison Reservoir, located above the Garrison Dam on the Missouri River in North Dakota as Lake Sakakawea; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the North Dakota delegation in Congress is earnestly requested to seek enactment of legislation which will give effect to this proposal; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the U.S. Senate, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the members of the North Dakota congressional delegation."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Resolution 1963 Ex. 5

"Whereas the people of the State of Washington take great pride in the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard with its 65 years of building, converting, and repairing the ships of the U.S. fleet; and

"Whereas this naval shipyard at Bremerton, Wash., has been rated No. 1 of its class in speed, efficiency, and economy throughout the entire Nation; and

"Whereas the maintenance of this fine naval shipyard has been of incomparable aid in the successful termination of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and serves this Nation in readiness in such crises as recently encountered over Berlin and Cuba; and

"Whereas this naval shipyard which has been home port to thousands of young men from all parts of the Nation has, as such, contributed many fine citizens to this State; and

"Whereas the skills and training received by employees at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard has been an important asset to the economy of this State when such employees have moved into other phases of industry: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the senate commend the personnel, military and civil, of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton, Wash., for their past and present contributions to the citizens of this State and this Nation; their dedication to the security of this Nation, and a performance in speed, efficiency and economy unmatched elsewhere in this United States; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate transmit copies of this senate resolution to the officials in command of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Attest:

"Ward Bowden,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Resolution 1963, Ex. 6

"Whereas the President of the United States has recently requested the Congress to establish a National Academy of Foreign Affairs to train American foreign service personnel for the multitude of tasks which confront them throughout the world; and

"Whereas such a proposed National Academy of Foreign Affairs would provide schools for the personnel of all governmental agencies in the United States involved in the formulation, direction, and furtherance of our national goals and foreign policy, and would have graduate school status with a tentative student body of approximately 1,000 student officials; and

"Whereas the present Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State would be incorporated into the National Academy of Foreign Affairs, which would also be open to Army, Navy, and Air Force officers whose military assignments involve the formulation, direction, and furtherance of our national goals and foreign policy; and

"Whereas by concentrating such training in one academy there could be provided an essential unity of purpose and action so that all of these operations can be coordinated into a harmonious whole; and

"Whereas the proposed National Academy of Foreign Affairs would command respect throughout the Government, in academic communities, and with all knowledgeable persons concerned with U.S. foreign policy and oversea operations of our diplomatic and Foreign Service officers; and would provide the United States with added skill and strength to meet and overcome the continuously more complex problems of the cold war, and would be a source of pride and stability for freemen everywhere; and

"Whereas the cost of such an academy would be extremely small as compared to the cost of other service academies, and would provide the potential for a far greater dollar-for-dollar return on the cost of operation than these academies: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Washington,* That we do hereby express our approval and support for the recommendation of the President of the United States that Congress establish a National Academy of Foreign Affairs, and do hereby urge prompt approval of this needed educational facility; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of the senate to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Attest:

"Ward Bowden,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas a serious need exists for increasing water flows on the lower Yakima River; and

"Whereas additional water storage for the Yakima River can be obtained by construction of a storage dam at the Bumping Lake Reservoir; and

"Whereas such a project would provide great benefit to the Yakima River Valley, particularly in the areas of fisheries, flood control, reclamation, and recreation; and

"Whereas the U.S. Department of the Interior has completed a study of this project; and

"Whereas Senators Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson have introduced legislation authorizing this project: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That we, the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, respectfully petition that the President and the Congress of the United States enact legislation authorizing the Bumping Lake Reservoir project with full consideration regarding the rights of all water users; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution immediately be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each Member in the Congress of the United States from the State of Washington.

"Attest:

"S. R. Holcomb,
"*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Resolution 23

"Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

"Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease, and other causes; and

"Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

"Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canada, due to advantages such as depreciated currency, low stumpage rates, noncompetitive bidding, less costly and restrictive forest practices, lower wage rates, high tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada, low charter rates for coastal and intercoastal shipping, and cooperative government; and

"Whereas lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

"Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 64th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas,* That the Congress and President of the United States are respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to, and request action necessary, to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirement that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes, and deterioration of communities; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Arkansas delegation to the Congress of the United States."

RESOLUTION OF DIGHTON, KANS., POST 190, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have received a resolution adopted by Dighton Post No. 190, the American Legion, Dighton, Kans., regarding the bypassing of veterans who are qualified for civil service appointments.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of these remarks and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, as follows:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has developed a point preference system for veterans taking civil service examinations; and

Whereas this would indicate that the Congress intended to favor said veterans when applying for jobs in the field of civil service; and

Whereas the Post Office Department and other agencies coming under the civil service regulations have followed this policy; and

Whereas a situation has arisen in this district that would indicate appointments covered under civil service regulations are being made without considering the applicants' service in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Whereas it is the belief of this post that such appointments should be made on the basis of ability and veterans preferences and not on the basis of previous or current political activity: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this post take all necessary action to inform the citizens of the community as to the situation as pertains to the appointment of applicants in the field of civil service; and be it further

Resolved, That this action be brought to the attention of all county committee members of all political parties in this area; and be it further

Resolved, That this action be brought to the attention of the U.S. Congressman from this district, the U.S. Senators from this State, and the district, State, and National levels of this organization.

ELMER CROWLEY,
Commander.
LOUIS UMMEL,
Adjutant.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF KANSAS RESTAURANT ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, my mail indicates great concern over the effect of the expense account legislation approved in the last session of Congress on unemployment and the economy in general.

There can be no question but what this legislation has had a serious effect on the hotel and restaurant business. It has resulted in unemployment and a reduction in the use of beef and other food products, which has caused real distress among the cattle feeders.

I have received a resolution adopted at an official meeting of the board of directors of the Kansas Restaurant Association at Emporia, Kans., on March 13 and ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of these remarks and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Whereas restaurants, clubs, and food service operators in Kansas are generally reporting a drop in sales of from 10 to 50 percent because of the disastrous effect of the new expense account law and this decrease in business has resulted in unemployment as well as a reduction in the consumption of meat and other food products: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Restaurant Association, at an official meeting of its board of directors held at Emporia, Kans., on March 13, 1963, goes on record as seriously opposed to the new expense account law; and be it further

Resolved, That each member be immediately requested to notify the Senators and Representatives of Kansas concerning this situation; and be it further

Resolved, That the Kansas Restaurant Association immediately contact purveyors and suppliers and offer assistance to them in opposing this law which is affecting their business as well.

Attest:

BILL MORRIS,
President.
J. A. WOLF,
Secretary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF TEXAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, today I received a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives in Texas. It was authored by State Senator George Moffett, of Chillicothe, a distinguished and veteran member of the Texas Senate.

In a word, the resolution deplores the inequitable and impractical situation that now exists in the domestic cotton industry wherein American buyers of American cotton are placed in a disadvantageous position in relation to foreign purchasers. The resolution urges the Congress to review the present two-price support program with a view toward doing what we can to alleviate the problem.

I would like to associate myself with the resolution passed by the Texas Legislature, and ask to insert the resolution in the RECORD for the benefit of the Members of Congress and have it appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 26

Whereas the cotton industry of Texas has for many generations been the mainstay of this State's economy, bringing more gross income to the people of the State than any other farm crop and has thereby become one of the most important foundation stones upon which the prosperity of the people of this State is based; and

Whereas in recent years various economic forces have definitely threatened the welfare of not only cotton producers in this State but all segments of the cotton producing, marketing, and spinning industries in the other States; and

Whereas practically all segments of the cotton industry including producers, ginners, shippers, compressors, warehousemen, oil mills, merchants, exporters, and textile mills, have united in their efforts to seek a practical solution to the problem presented by dwindling cotton markets; and

Whereas the above-mentioned efforts including financial expenditures, have obtained partial but not ample results in the development of new and broadened markets for cotton and its byproducts; and

Whereas the Federal Government, in its prior attempts to revitalize the markets for cotton, has inaugurated a two-price system whereby foreign spinners are able to secure American cotton on a cheaper price basis than domestic cotton mills, thereby bringing unfavorable results to the operation of domestic mills which also have to compete with synthetic products on a lower price level; and

Whereas the foregoing together with other economic factors have contributed and are now contributing to the shrinkage of the overall market for cotton, which has in turn had definite, serious, and very unfavorable effects on the entire American cotton industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That we do hereby respectfully but earnestly urge the Congress of the United States to promptly review the present Federal two-price support program with a view to providing the same assistance through a subsidy or otherwise to American cotton mills, as foreign mills now enjoy, it being our opinion that this action would bring domestic cotton to a competitive price level on world markets and also to a competitive price level with synthetics in the home market, thereby avoiding the prospect of a situation that would ultimately, seriously, and perhaps permanently impair the whole economic structure of our country; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the Texas delegation in the National Congress, and to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in each branch of the National Congress.

PRESTON SMITH,
President of the Senate.
BYRON P. TUNNELL,
Speaker of the Senate.

Adopted by the senate on February 27, 1963.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

Adopted by the house on March 20, 1963.

DOROTHY HALLMAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 82)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 14, 1963, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I submit a report to accompany the bill—S. 6—to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinate mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes. I ask that the report be printed, together with individual views of Senators BENNETT, TOWER, SIMPSON, ROBERTSON, PROXMIRE, MUSKIE, and DOMINICK.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

MASS TRANSPORTATION—AMENDMENT—AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO FILE REPORT (S. REPT. NO. 83)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Commerce, I submit an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the bill S. 6. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce may have until midnight to file a report thereon, and that the report may be printed with minority and

individual views and considered along with the report submitted by the Committee on Banking and Currency. The report from the Committee on Commerce explains in detail the proposed amendments in the nature of a substitute, which I shall file at the desk.

Mr. President, of course, I wish to express the admiration of the whole committee for the expeditious handling of the measure by the subcommittee. It was a massive job. This subcommittee was working against a short time limit, but under the able chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] some excellent amendments have been developed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports of the Committees on Commerce and Government Operations, and the report of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], who is a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works Committees, concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them in 1962 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Butler, John M.:											
Netherlands	Guilder	234.13	65.40	162.50	45.39	3,404.58	951.00	121.29	33.88	3,922.50	1,095.67
England	Pound sterling	16.14.2	46.90	27.0.11	75.92	37.1.9	104.11	41.18.2	117.63	122.14.0	344.56
France	New franc	345.60	69.12	303.45	60.69	306.00	61.20	644.95	128.99	1,600.00	320.00
Subtotal			181.42		182.00		1,116.31		280.50		1,760.23
Ficker, Hermann (on loan to committee from Library of Congress):											
France	New franc	1,000	200.00	1,000	200.00	1,000	200.00	1,035	207.00	4,035	807.00
Senegal	CFA franc	10,000	40.80	8,000	32.64			1,000	4.08	19,000	77.52
Guinea	Guinean franc	1,000	4.00	1,000	4.00					2,000	8.00
Ghana	Ghanaian pound.	10	28.00	10	28.00			5	14.00	25	70.00
Nigeria	Nigerian pound	10	28.00	15	42.00	15	42.00	10	28.00	50	140.00
Netherlands	Guilder					6,934	1,926.15			6,934	1,926.15
South Africa	Rand	20	28.00	20	28.00	100	141.00			140	197.00
Kenya	EA shilling	400	56.20	300	42.15	300	42.15	200	28.10	1,200	168.60
Egypt	Egyptian pound	15	34.50	15	31.50	20	46.00	10	23.00	60	138.00
Jordan	Dinar					5	14.00			5	14.00
Israel	Israeli pound	90	30.00	100	33.33	200	66.67	60	20.00	450	150.00
Greece	Drachma	840	28.00	840	28.00	520	17.33	840	28.00	3,040	101.33
Italy	Lira	20,000	32.26	44,500	72.58	20,000	32.26	20,000	32.26	104,500	169.36
Subtotal			509.76		545.20		2,527.56		384.44		3,966.96
Hartke, Vance:											
France	New franc	1,000	200.00	1,000	200.00	1,000	200.00	1,035	207.00	4,035	807.00
Senegal	CFA franc	10,000	40.80	8,000	32.64			1,000	4.08	19,000	77.52
Guinea	Guinean franc	1,000	4.00	1,000	4.00					2,000	8.00
Ghana	Ghanaian pound.	10	28.00	10	28.00			5	14.00	25	70.00
Nigeria	Nigerian pound	10	28.00	15	42.00	15	42.00	10	28.00	50	140.00
Netherlands	Guilder					6,934	1,926.15			6,934	1,926.15
South Africa	Rand	20	28.20	20	28.20					40	56.40
Kenya	EA shilling	400	56.20	300	42.15	300	42.15	200	28.10	1,200	168.60
Egypt	Egyptian pound.	15	34.50	15	34.50	20	46.00	10	23.00	60	138.00
Jordan:	Dinar					5	14.00			5	14.00
Israel	Israel pound	90	30.00	100	33.33	200	66.67	60	20.00	450	150.00
Greece	Drachma	840	28.00	840	28.00	520	17.33	840	28.00	3,040	101.33
Italy	Lira	20,000	32.26	44,500	72.56	20,000	32.26	20,000	32.26	104,500	169.36
Subtotal			509.96		545.40		2,386.56		384.44		3,826.36
Scott, Hugh:											
Philippines	Peso	52	13.00	80	20.00	44	11.00	84	21.00	260	65.00
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	866.40	152.00	1,026.00	180.00	190.15	33.36	167.45	29.37	2,250	394.73
Subtotal			165.00		200.00		44.36		50.37		459.73
Smathers, George A.:											
Turkey	Turkish lira	477.00	53.28	327.82	36.50	107.11	12.00	197.07	21.00	1,105	122.78
Thailand	Baht	862.90	41.32	527.53	25.26	50.00	2.39	59.57	2.85	1,500	71.82
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	1,524	265.68	1,013.17	176.71	103	17.92	383.14	66.83	3,023.31	527.14
Japan	Yen	117,474	328.92	68,975	193.13	8,357	23.39	45,424	127.18	240,230	672.62
Holland	Guilder					784.23	2,818.55			784.23	2,818.55
Subtotal			689.20		431.60		2,874.25		217.86		4,212.91
Trice, J. Mark:											
Netherlands	Guilder	234.14	65.40	171.85	48.00	3,136.12	876.01	61.79	17.26	3,603.90	1,006.67
England	Pound	16.14.2	46.90	27.0.11	75.92	37.1.9	104.11	41.18.2	117.63	122.14.0	344.56
France	New franc	345.60	69.12	275.00	55.00	315.60	63.12	663.80	132.76	1,600.00	320.00
Subtotal			181.42		178.92		1,043.24		267.65		1,671.23
Total			2,236.76		2,083.12		9,992.28		1,585.26		15,897.42

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$15,897.42
Total	15,897.42

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce.

MAR. 8, 1963.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committee on Government Operations (Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations), U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Ernest Gruening:[1]											
France	Dollar		100.00		73.45		6.59		57.10		237.14
Do	New franc			385	78.91	191	39.25	188	38.56	764	156.72
Turkey	Dollar		83.15		49.05		15.05		46.99		194.24
Do	Lira			1,308	148.83	538	59.86	600	66.42	2,446	275.11
Iran	Dollar		69.47		10.15		11.11		5.66		96.39
Do	Rial			5,489	72.25	3,032	39.90	2,936	38.65	11,457	150.80
Syria	Dollar		21.71		16.90		11.30		9.19		59.10
Do	Pound			23.4	89.09	11.35	43.14	7.7	29.40	14.46	161.63
Lebanon	Dollar		30.00		62.50		24.05		41.65		158.20
Do	Pound			340	114.03	150	49.60	144	47.43	634	211.06
Jordan	Dollar		10.71		3.00		11.00		13.33		38.04
Do	Pound			16.4	46.45	1	2.97	4.4	13.44	21.8	62.86
Israel	Dollar		83.00		31.69		43.56		37.33		195.58
Do	Pound			223	124.84	68	48.49	101	56.67	392	230.00
Greece	Dollar		35.07		10.90		.63		12.39		58.99
Do	Drachma			1,576	52.80	751	25.19	1,143	38.30	3,470	116.29
United States	Dollar						1,275.35				1,275.35
Subtotal			433.11		984.84		1,707.04		552.51		3,677.50
Herbert W. Beaser:[2]											
France	Dollar		95.87		67.72		5.42		27.85		196.86
Do	New franc			385	78.91	191	39.25	188	38.56	764	156.72
Turkey	Dollar		73.15		85.99		9.22		32.96		201.32
Do	Lira			1,308	148.83	538	59.86	600	66.42	2,446	275.11
Iran	Dollar		39.80		10.25		11.14		5.66		66.85
Do	Rial			5,489	72.25	3,032	39.90	2,936	38.65	11,457	150.80
Syria	Dollar		21.45		10.97		11.30		9.49		53.21
Do	Pound			23.4	89.09	11.35	43.14	7.7	29.40	14.46	161.63
Lebanon	Dollar		30.00		40.45		23.95		24.88		119.28
Do	Pound			340	114.03	150	49.60	144	47.43	634	211.06
Jordan	Dollar		14.35		3.00		11.30		12.33		40.98
Do	Pound			16.4	46.45	1	2.97	4.4	13.44	21.8	62.86
Israel	Dollar		43.78		38.84		34.43		22.53		139.58
Do	Pound			223	124.84	68	48.49	101	56.67	392	230.00
Greece	Dollar		19.09		14.51		.63		13.19		47.42
Do	Drachma			1,576	52.80	751	25.19	1,143	38.30	3,470	116.29
United States	Dollar						1,275.35				1,275.35
Subtotal			337.49		998.93		1,691.14		477.76		3,505.32
Total			770.60		1,983.77		3,398.18		1,030.27		7,182.82

[1] Senator Gruening returned to U.S. Treasury $450.00.

[2] Herbert W. Beaser returned to U.S. Treasury $330.79.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$2,728.94
Appropriated funds: Department of Defense	4,453.88
Total	7,182.82

Mar. 27, 1963.

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds, Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works, U.S. Senate, expended between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1962

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Frank E. Moss:											
French Oceania	U.S. dollar		17.44		13.10		5.52		38.61		74.67
American Samoa	do						1.50		1.66		3.16
Fiji Islands	do		3.18		5.19				9.38		17.75
New Guinea	do		11.17		9.11		11.13		3.68		35.09
Indonesia	do		39.72		20.21		4.91		25.72		90.56
Malaya	Malayan dollar			167.75	54.92	68.03	22.88	11.22	3.74	247.00	81.54
Do	U.S. dollar		21.55		16.36		5.54		24.94		68.39
Cambodia	Riel	1,357	38.97	3,257	93.54	4,571	136.41	728	20.82	9,913	289.74
Do	U.S. dollar		21.35		29.92		2.68		17.06		71.01
Vietnam	Piaster	2,182	30.00	3,137	43.13	2,701	37.50	1,898	26.87	9,918	137.50
Do	U.S. dollar		24.66		.82				12.64		38.12
Philippines	Peso			90.65	25.87	87.41	20.00	115.20	28.80	293.26	74.67
Do	U.S. dollar				4.48		.75		23.74		28.97
Hong Kong	Hong Kong dollar.	320	55.83	503	83.68	167	27.75	189	31.54	859	198.80
Do	U.S. dollar		29.46		31.33		.61		15.30		76.70
Taiwan	New Taiwan dollar			845	21.16	888	22.26	806	20.18	2,539	63.60
Do	U.S. dollar		13.75		4.00				3.74		21.49
Korea	Hwan			2,215	17.11	2,067	15.96	31.02	23.95	7,384	57.02
Do	U.S. dollar		4.00		3.00				5.58		12.58
Okinawa	do		1.50		5.07				8.22		14.79
Japan	Yen	21,983	87.45	23,541	92.06	34,750	139.51	9,250	31.26	89,624	350.28
Do	U.S. dollar		40.92		22.30		1.40		11.05		75.67
Total			440.95		596.36		456.31		388.48		1,882.10

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$1,253.25
Appropriated funds: Defense	628.85
Total	1,882.10

FRANK E. MOSS.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated January 14, 1963, February, 20, 1963, and March 19, 1963, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1188. A bill for the relief of Miss Caterina Gadoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1189. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Schumann; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 1190. A bill to maintain the income of cotton producers, to permit cotton producers to grow and market cotton on a free enterprise basis, to protect the welfare of consumers and of those engaged in the manufacture of cotton textiles. to encourage the exportation of cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. TALMADGE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 1191. A bill to provide for punishment of certain offenses committed against postal officers or employees in the course of their employment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1192. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1193. A bill to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that petitions for intervention be filed not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues in the Federal Register; and

S. 1194. A bill to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1195. A bill to establish a system of time standards and measurement for the United States and to promote the uniform observance of such time standards for all purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. COTTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1196. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Nowakowski Chandler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. LONG of Missouri):

S. 1197. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to prepare a master plan for Squaw Creek National Wildlife Refuge in the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1198. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1960, entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park, in the State of Missouri"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 1199. A bill to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof prohibiting the certification, as bargaining representative of persons employed as guards, of a labor organization which admits to membership, or is affiliated with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. METCALF, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. DODD):

S. 1200. A bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for structural or other major defects in homes covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages, and to require indemnification bonds in the case of certain new construction under Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. GRUENING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 1201. A bill for the relief of Dr. James T. Maddux; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1202. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to convey certain surplus property to the Aiken County Historical Commission for use as a historic monument; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mrs. NEUBERGER):

S. 1203. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1204. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Kansas to the State of Kansas, Forestry, Fish and Game Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1205. A bill to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to the contribution made by the Government toward health benefits protection for retired Federal employees and members of their families; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1206. A bill for the relief of Georgie Lou Rader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1207. A bill for the relief of Noble Frank Smith and his wife, Viola Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1208. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a grant program for the prevention and control of dental diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CASE, Mr. FONG, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1209. A bill to establish a procedure for adoption and implementation of plans for the desegregation of public schools; to provide financial and technical assistance to facilitate desegregation of public schools; to restrict Federal financial aid for segregated public schools and institutions of higher education; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. FONG, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1210. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; and

S. 1211. A bill to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity to encourage and enforce a policy of equal employment opportunity in Federal employment, in employment under Government contracts, and in employment in programs supported or in facilities constructed by Federal grants-in-aid; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1212. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in the District of Columbia because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CASE, Mr. FONG, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1213. A bill to assure decent, safe, and sanitary housing to families displaced by construction of highways forming a part of the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CASE, Mr. FONG, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1214. A bill to further secure and protect the rights of citizens to vote in Federal and State elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. CASE, Mr. FONG, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1215. A bill to protect civil rights by providing criminal and civil remedies for unlawful official violence; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1216. A bill to provide Federal assistance to State and local police forces through projects to develop and demonstrate more effective techniques and practices of law enforcement; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1217. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the furnishing of accommodations and facilities to any person at hotels or motels, the business of which affects interstate commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1218. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act to prohibit discrimination in any respect whatsoever on account of race, creed, or color in hospital facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. Fong, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Beall, Mr. Case, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Javits, Mr. Keating, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Pearson):

S. 1219. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Saltonstall when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1220. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States heretofore granted to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., for public airport purposes; contingent upon acceptance and approval by the Director of Airports, Federal Aviation Agency, as protector of the interests of the United States of America; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1221. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Menichelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 1222. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to expand and improve vocational education, with emphasis on the need for providing employment training for youth in a fast-changing economy; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 1223. A bill for the relief of Mr. Miguel Antonio Acosta;

S. 1224. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luis E. Angles; and

S. 1225. A bill for the relief of Dr. Marshall Ku; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1226. A bill to limit and prevent certain concerted activities by labor organizations which interfere with or obstruct or impede the free production of goods for commerce or the free flow thereof in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1227. A bill authorizing the Association of Universalist Women (a nonprofit corporation in the District of Columbia) to consolidate with the Alliance of Unitarian Women (a nonprofit corporation in the State of Massachusetts); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 1228. A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; and

S. 1229. A bill to declare that certain land of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. Kefauver, Mr. Lausche, Mr. Mechem, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Keating, and Mr. Kuchel):

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution to request the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose of setting up a Joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THURMOND:

S.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution expressing declaration of will of the American people and purpose of their Government to achieve complete victory over the forces of the world Communist movement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself, Mr. Javits, and Mr. Humphrey):

S.J. Res. 67. Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART 1 OF HEARINGS OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE ON THE JANUARY 1963 ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) authorizing the printing of additional copies of part 1 of the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee on the January 1963 Economic Report of the President, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Douglas, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT, WITH ADDITIONAL COPIES, A REPORT ENTITLED "STUDY MISSION TO SOUTHEAST ASIA"

Mr. McGEE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 117), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed, as a Senate document, a report entitled "Study Mission to Southeast Asia", submitted by Senator Gale W. McGee to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and that twenty thousand additional copies be printed for the use of that committee.

LOANS WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION ON REAL ESTATE BY FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Senators Beall, Fong, Javits, Keating, and Kuchel) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 118) concerning loans without discriminatory provisions, on real estate by financial institutions, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Scott, which appears under a separate heading.)

PUNISHMENT OF CERTAIN OFFENSES AGAINST POSTAL OFFICERS OR EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for punishment of certain offenses committed against postal officers or employees in the course of their employment. Currently, punishment is provided only in the case of certain offenses committed against post office inspectors. In my opinion, punishment should apply equally to such offenses committed against any officer or employee in the field service of the Post Office Department. The bill I have introduced will accomplish this objective.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1191) to provide for punishment of certain offenses committed against postal officers or employees in the course of their employment, introduced by Mr. Johnston, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF UNIFORM ALLOWANCE FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Uniform Allowance Act of 1954. This measure authorized the departments and agencies to pay not to exceed $100 annually toward the cost of uniforms required by law or administrative order to be worn by employees in the performance of their official duties.

In many instances this did not meet the actual cost of the uniforms even in 1954. During the 9 years since that date, the cost of uniforms has gone up until today the allowance is often totally inadequate. In such instances, employees have no choice except to use part of their meager salaries for the purchase of uniforms that cannot be worn except in the performance of their official duties. This is not a fair or equitable situation.

The bill I have introduced raises the amount the Government can pay from $100 to $150 annually, except where overcoats or other outer garments are prescribed for protection against the elements, in which cases an additional $50 annually would be allowed. Enactment of this measure is required in the interest of justice.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1192) to amend the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, introduced by Mr. Johnston, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 309(e) OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO FILING OF PETITIONS FOR INTERVENTION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that petitions for intervention be filed not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues in the Federal Register. I ask

unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record, together with an explanation of the proposed legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objecton, the letter and explanation will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1193) to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that petitions for intervention be filed not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues in the Federal Register, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and explanation presented by Mr. Magnuson are as follows:

Federal Communications Commission,
Washington, D.C., March 14, 1963.

The Vice President,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Vice President: The Commission has adopted as a part of its legislative program a proposal to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that petitions for intervention be filed within 30 days after publication of the hearing issues, or any substantial amendment thereto, in the Federal Register.

The Commission's draft bill to accomplish the foregoing objective was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. We have now been advised by that Bureau that from the standpoint of the administration's program there would be no objection to the presentation of the draft bill to the Congress for its consideration. Accordingly, there are enclosed six copies of our draft bill and explanatory statement on this subject.

The consideration by the Senate of the proposed amendment to the Communications Act of 1934 would be greatly appreciated. The Commission would be most happy to furnish any additional information that may be desired by the Senate or by the committee to which this proposal is referred.

Sincerely yours,

Newton N. Minow,
Chairman.

Explanation of Proposed Amendment to Section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934, as Amended, To Require That Petitions for Intervention Be Filed Within 30 Days After Publication of the Hearing Issues

Delays in the administrative process are of serious concern to the public, the bar, administrative agencies, and the Congress. In order to promote efficiency, the Commission has been seeking methods of expediting its administrative process while at the same time balancing the requirement of protecting the public interest with its duty to also safeguard the rights of private parties. One of the areas in which undue delay seems to be a special problem is in the hearing process. The Commission's legislative proposal herein is one which it believes will reduce undue delay.

When an application is filed with the Commission, it must be processed to determine what action thereon would be appropriate. Basically, this processing consists of examining an application to determine whether it is complete and whether the applicant is legally, technically, and financially qualified. Assuming that he meets these minimal qualifications and there is no reason for a hearing, the Commission can grant the application without a hearing. But if the applicant's qualifications can be determined only after a hearing, or if some other reason exists, then the Commission is required by section 309(e) of the Communications Act to designate the application for a full hearing, specifying with particularity the grounds and reasons for such hearing.

When an application has been designated for hearing under section 309(e), any party in interest who has not been notified of the designation for hearing can acquire the status of a party to the proceeding by filing a petition for intervention showing the basis for his interest. "* * * at any time not less than 10 days prior to the date of hearing." This procedure has interfered with the expeditious handling and disposition of hearing proceedings.

The Commission's proposed amendment to section 309(e) would require a party in interest who wishes to intervene in a hearing to signify his intention to do so "* * * not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues, or any substantial amendment thereto, in the Federal Register."

This amendment will enhance the effectiveness of the prehearing conference which is one of the chief techniques the Commission has for expediting formal hearings. The Commission is particularly concerned that prehearing conferences be utilized to the fullest extent possible in every proceeding, to the end that there may be no unnecessary delays in the progress of a formal hearing once it is commenced. Our experience has been that prehearing discussions and negotiations, and the stipulations and agreements of the parties reached as a result thereof, are an effective means of insuring, not only an expeditious hearing, but, as well, that the hearing record may be kept down in size to the minimum consistent with the rights of the participants. Obviously, the effectiveness of all prehearing techniques is destroyed when a party in interest, who as of right may be allowed to take part in the formal hearing if he seeks intervention 10 days before commencement thereof, may completely nullify the effect of valuable stipulations and timesaving agreements reached by the other participants during several prehearing conferences held over a period of months, simply because he did not become a party to the case at an earlier date.

Once the hearing issues are published, any interested person knows at the time whether he will have to participate in the hearing to protect his own interests. There is no reason why parties should be given the legal right to delay their intervention when the issues are clear in advance of the hearing. The Commission feels that by requiring a party in interest to intervene within 30 days of publication of the hearing issues, an ample and reasonable period is afforded to parties to determine whether it is necessary for them to intervene to protect their interests and to indicate their intention to participate. The requirement will discourage the dilatory tactics now possible under the present provisions of section 309(e) and will substantially eliminate the need for holding repeated prehearing conferences. It will also have the virtue of providing a date certain for intervention, thus eliminating the present situation where the date for intervention changes every time the date for commencement of the hearing is changed.

The 30-day period provided in the proposal is consistent with the time allowed in many other sections of the Communications Act. For example, section 402(e) allows interested persons to intervene in appeals from Commission decisions within 30 days after the filing of any such appeal with the court of appeals. (See also sections 402(c) and 405). In addition, the 30-day time period takes into consideration the time necessary to comply with the requirement of section 311 of the act that local notice must be given of designation for hearing in broadcast proceedings.

We also wish to point out that section 309(e) deals only with the time within which parties in interest can intervene as of right. The Commission has the discretion to permit intervention by any person (including parties in interest) at any time (even after the period specified in the section or in the Commission's rules) where a showing of good cause and that the public interest would be served thereby, is made. See sections 4(j), 303(r) of the act; section 1.104(d) of the Commission's rules, 47 CFR 1.104(d). This discretion to permit intervention after the time specified in section 309(e), either on the Commission's own motion or on petition, would be equally true under the proposed amendment. Moreover, in any matter in which the hearing issues are substantially amended, it will be possible for new parties to intervene as of right if the changes affect their interests.

REMOVAL OF PERCENTAGE LIMITATIONS ON RETIREMENT OF ENLISTED MEN OF THE COAST GUARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1194) to remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C., March 15, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There is submitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To remove the percentage limitations on retirement of enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

Present law limits the number of enlisted men who may retire upon completion of 20 years of service in any 1 calendar year to not more than 1 percent of the total enlisted force of the Coast Guard. This limitation was enacted along with the adoption of 20-year retirements by the Coast Guard in 1939. One of the original purposes of this limitation was to prevent an excessive loss of experienced personnel. There is no comparable limitation on the retirement of officers. Nor is there a similar limitation applicable to enlisted men of the Navy.

In the years following World War II the large backlog of men who had been unable to retire during the war made it impossible to retire all those who wished to do so upon completion of 20 years of service. But by 1955 this backlog had been eliminated and all men who requested it were able to retire upon completion of 20 years of service or shortly thereafter. That situation has continued until the present. As a result most enlisted men in the service today have come to count on their right to retire at that time. They have made their plans on that basis and it has influenced their decisions as to whether to reenlist or not.

During 1962, 92 more men requested 20-year retirement than could be granted it under the 1-percent limitation. This development was a change which can be expected to continue and intensify as the large groups of men who served in World War II complete 20 years of service. From requests presently on hand it is estimated that at least 250 more enlisted men will request retirement in 1963 than can be granted it under existing law. This number will continue to increase and unless remedial measures are taken it is estimated that by 1968 enlisted men will have to complete over 26 years of service before they can be retired.

This inability to grant the retirement requests of those who have completed 20 years of service has created a morale problem which can be expected to become more serious each year. It will slow promotions to higher enlisted grades and make it more difficult for the career enlisted man to plan intelligently his service career and his post-service life.

The proposed bill would repeal the statutory limitation on retirements of enlisted men who have completed 20 years of service. Such retirements would continue to remain subject to the needs of the service and the availability of appropriated funds.

While removal of the 1-percent limitation on retirement would result in the loss of experienced personnel with over 20 years of service, this would be compensated for by the increased retention of men serving in their second or third enlistments. The absence of an assured 20-year retirement often is a deterrent to reenlistment for men in this latter group.

Removal of this limitation would result in increased retired pay costs. These would be partially compensated for by decreases in costs for active duty pay due to the decrease in average length of service of the active force. It is estimated that the net additional costs through 1970 resulting from removal of the limitation on enlisted retirements would amount to an average of $1,385,000 per year.

The bill would also equalize the Coast Guard's retirement laws with those of the other services in another respect. Coast Guard enlisted men retiring with over 20 years of service are presently eligible to receive an increase in retired pay amounting to 10 percent of their basic pay if they have maintained high marks in conduct during their service. The Comptroller General, in a recent report to Congress, has pointed out that enlisted men of the other armed forces do not receive this benefit and that it is no longer needed in order to insure good conduct. The Department agrees with the desirability of equalizing retirement benefits among the services but believes that this benefit should be retained for career enlisted men now in the service, since these men have probably taken this benefit into account in deciding on a career in the Coast Guard. The bill therefore would repeal the authority for this increased pay for all personnel with less than 4 years of service.

There would be no immediate savings due to repeal of this provision since it would not affect the rights of persons already retired or those who have at least 4 years of service. However, since it is estimated that this benefit amounts to $12,600 for the average Coast Guard enlisted retiree, the eventual savings would be substantial.

A comparative type showing changes in existing law made by the proposed bill is attached.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A SYSTEM OF TIME STANDARDS AND MEASUREMENT

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in another month much of the Nation will advance its clocks and go on daylight saving time, and we will again be caught up in another round of time juggling and clock confusion.

Widespread variation in standard and daylight saving time across the country, complicated by frequent time zone boundary disputes, differing standard-daylight changeover dates, and a wide assortment of local options have all combined to create bewildering uncertainty and confusion in the minds of the public.

The time scramble has complicated the operation and the scheduling problems of the transport industry at untold cost. It confuses communications, industrial and financial interests, and confounds the individual citizen who misses his appointment or has to wait an extra hour for a train, plane, or bus.

This confusion is costly, time consuming, and unnecessary. We now operate on a Standard Time Act, adopted in 1918 and modified but little, despite the tremendous change in our clock habits since then. Furthermore, the present act has serious shortcomings, including a total absence of enforcement provisions. In short, our river of time is heavily shoaled, filled with jagged rocks and treacherous eddies. It is anything but a smooth highway of commerce and communications, and I think we should do something about it.

In its latest annual report, the Interstate Commerce Commission has pointedly called attention to the problems of clock confusion and recommended the enactment of legislation to end it.

The Transportation Association of America has launched a drive to promote greater standardization in the Nation's timekeeping, and has assembled some prime examples of the economic costs of clock confusion. There is, for example, the case of the confused driver and passengers on a bus which operates over the 35-mile stretch of highway between Steubenville, Ohio, and Moundsville, W. Va., and passes through seven different time changes.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my remarks some excerpts from a pamphlet published by the Transportation Association of America entitled "Project Timesaver."

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM A PAMPHLET PREPARED BY THE TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

PROJECT TIMESAVER

It has been said wisely that "Time and tide wait for no man." The poignant tragedy is that considerable time—which can never be regained—is being wasted and lost daily as a result of clock confusion.

How widespread is the use of daylight saving time? Of the 50 States in the Union, 28 States and the District of Columbia observe daylight saving time during the year. Fourteen of these 28 States have it in effect on a statewide basis. The other 14 observe daylight saving time over different areas, ranging from a single city to practically statewide.

Do those States observing daylight saving time make their time changes on the same dates? No. Eleven of the States follow daylight saving time from the end of April to the end of October. The remainder begin or terminate daylight saving time in other months.

Would greater uniformity in the use of daylight saving time help the bus industry? Indeed so. This time problem is particularly aggravating for the bus operators which serve the crossroads and byways of America. The proof: The Carolina Coach Co. deplores the plight of the Salisbury, Md., passengers to New York City who must keep straight the frequent changes in scheduled departures set for 1:45 p.m. in early April, changed to 2:45 p.m. on April 29, changed to 1:45 p.m. on May 30, changed to 2:45 p.m. on September 3, changed to 1:45 p.m. on October 28. As the company aptly observes, the passengers "lay the blame on the bus companies and wind up driving their cars and we lose the revenue."

Trailways complains of the traffic losses, rescheduling of work, reassignment of equipment, excessive cost of publishing timetables, etc., and estimates that up to 40 percent of the time devoted to preparation of schedules could be saved if greater time uniformity could be achieved. Trailways says that "the condition has worsened every year in the last few years."

The National Association of Motor Bus Owners asserts on behalf of the industry that "potential savings might reach a quarter of a million dollars on scheduling and timetable costs alone."

Would increased uniformity around the clock benefit the railroads? Undoubtedly yes. Modern railroading is precision railroading. For 80 years the railroads led the fight to eliminate confusion in time standards. This historical pioneering effort is well documented in "The Day of Two Noons," published by the Association of American Railroads.

In 1957, the New York Herald Tribune highlighted the impact of daylight saving time on the railroad industry under the title "Daylight Time Costs Railroads $1 Million."

Because Federal law still requires the railroads to operate on standard time, many of them are forced to publish two kinds of timetables, one based on standard time for the use by carrier employees and the other reporting passenger train schedules on local time (standard and daylight) for the benefit of the traveling public.

A 1962 survey of more than 20 railroads identified the following areas of general confusion and difficulty attributable to lack of uniform time:

General confusion in passenger timetables.

Difficulty in scheduling passenger trains to accommodate origin, intermediate, and destination requirements.

Extra expense of printing timetables.

Difficulty in handling mail to meet Post Office Department requirements.

Necessity for rescheduling freight trains to meet market delivery times on perishables and livestock, and to maintain adequate interline service.

Work of operating employees on standard time while nonoperating employees work on daylight saving time, resulting in confusion and inconvenience.

Revision of switching crew schedules to meet requirements of local industry.

Confusion, particularly for train and enginemen, for employees who follow standard time at work while using daylight saving time at home.

Reducing communication time between widely separated stations on the same railroad.

Lengthened dining car meal service at increased labor costs.

Are the airlines also concerned? Yes, the airlines are seriously concerned with the confusion, the passenger inconvenience, and the additional expense, caused by variations in daylight saving time observance in different areas of the country.

ITEMS

An airport usually serves a large geographical area which may even extend across State boundaries. These service areas frequently include both daylight and standard time zones. This causes confusion to many passengers, some of whom might arrive at the airport an hour early for their flight or, even worse, arrive an hour late and miss their flight. This frustration also extends to families and friends of departing or arriving passengers.

A missed flight is of serious and expensive concern to both the passenger and the airline. For the airline, a missed passenger today may well become a nonairline passenger of tomorrow.

During certain times of the year, the nonuniformity in dates for daylight time observance results in as much as a 4-hour time change on a coast-to-coast flight, 1 hour beyond the normal 3-hour change. This extra hour which the transcontinental passenger experiences in these circumstances makes his physical adjustment to the new time zone that much more difficult. Anyone who has ever had to adjust to a 4-hour time change on a 5-hour flight will understand this problem.

A very definite and measurable expense to the airline is the required reprinting and redistribution of system timetables with each time change at some individual point on the system. If cutoff dates for daylight saving time were uniform in all areas, schedule reissuance based on time changes would take place only twice each year. This would result in substantial cost saving to the airline industry.

Would less clock juggling help other interests? It's about time to streamline the hourglass for everyone. For example: Oregon and Oregon State Universities are continuing their campus clocks this summer on standard time, yet their classes will begin an hour earlier on daylight saving time.

During a 2-month period in 1959, some offices in the Minnesota State Capitol Building observed daylight saving time while others used standard time.

For husbands who work on daylight saving time and wives who run the home on standard time, Thomas Wolfe in the Washington Post suggested "His" and "Her" clocks so that both will have the "time of their lives."

The West Coast States of Oregon and Washington shift back to standard time on the fourth Sunday in September while most of the rest of the country stays on daylight saving time until the last Sunday in October. This 1-month period of a 4-hour time lag means that the business day on the west coast in these States is only half over when the east coast offices close their doors.

In Pennsylvania, State law requires that official business be conducted on eastern standard time. Yet in 1962 more than 600 Pennsylvania communities observed daylight saving time from April 20 to October 28. What needless confusion.

It's time for a change in our time changes.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the legislation recommended by the Interstate Commerce Commission has already been introduced in the Senate by Senator MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee. It is S. 1033.

As my own contribution toward the solution of this problem, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill which differs in many respects from the recommendation of the ICC.

Briefly, my bill would place the responsibility for setting the time zones and enforcing the act in the Department of Commerce, where all the commercial interests of the Nation can properly be focused on the problem.

Second, the ICC bill would effectively prevent any State or local community from determining for itself whether it wanted daylight saving time or not. The bill I present today would preserve this local option, but it would direct the Secretary of Commerce to use his considerable persuasive power to promote the adoption of uniform time.

It is my hope that the introduction of this bill will serve to further stimulate public awareness of the problems of clock confusion and lead to a quick, constructive solution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1195) to establish a system of time standards and measurement for the United States and to promote the uniform observance of such time standards for all purposes, introduced by Mr. COTTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT REGARDING GUARDS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act to eliminate the provision prohibiting the certification, as bargaining representative of persons employed as guards, of a labor organization which admits to membership, or is affiliated with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards.

Amendment of the act in this regard is, I believe, long overdue. The effect of the present provision in the statute is to prevent guards and watchmen from affiliating with unions of their own choice. They are compelled to form independent unions which, because of their usually small numbers, are unable effectively to represent guards and watchmen members in collective bargaining.

As far back as 1949 efforts were made in the Senate to enact legislation which would permit bargaining units of guards to affiliate with labor organizations of employees other than guards. Such legislation was passed by the Senate in 1949, but no action was taken on it in the House of Representatives. The late Senator Irving Ives, of New York, introduced similar amendments several times, and, during the last two Congresses, I have sponsored or cosponsored this measure.

It is time that the National Labor Relations Act recognized the importance to employees who are guards of being permitted to affiliate with established labor organizations. It should be noted that my amendment does not change in any way the present requirement under the act that a bargaining unit of guards cannot have in it employees who are not guards.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1199) to amend section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to eliminate the provision thereof prohibiting the certification, as bargaining representative of persons employed as guards, of a labor organization which admits to membership, or is affiliated with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 9(b)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by striking out the semicolon and the words: "but no labor organization shall be certified as the representative of employees in a bargaining unit of guards if such organization admits to membership, or is affiliated directly or indirectly with an organization which admits to membership, employees other than guards".

RELIEF OF DR. JAMES T. MADDUX

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, during the last session of Congress, I cosponsored with the senior Senator from Mississippi, S. 377, for the relief of Dr. James T. Maddux. This bill was favorably recommended by the Judiciary Committee, with amendments, and was subsequently passed by the Senate on October 3, 1962. Due to the lateness in session, this measure did not receive consideration in the House.

My colleague and I now introduce this measure again, amended so as to conform to the committee's recommendations.

On July 1, 1961, Dr. Maddux was an employee of the Department of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration, Philadelphia, Pa., and on that date became eligible for promotion from associate grade, Medical Service, to full grade, Medical Service. He met all proficiency ratings and other requirements and would have been promoted, except for the fact that the required certification from the personnel officer, which had been timely prepared and submitted, was misfiled. Dr. Maddux's promotion subsequently became effective on February 18, 1962.

Dr. Maddux was fully qualified and entitled to this promotion and would have been promoted to full grade, Medical Service, effective July 9, 1961, as conceded by the Veterans' Administration, had it not been for a purely clerical mistake. The denial of this promotion to a qualified and competent medical officer on this ground constitutes a grave injustice, Mr. President, and we now introduce this bill to rectify this mistake and authorize compensation for Dr. Maddux to which he is entitled.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1201) for the relief of Dr. James T. Maddux, introduced by Mr. Stennis (for himself and Mr. Eastland), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS ACT, RELATING TO FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to the Government's contribution.

This bill is designed to provide the same degree of equity in the case of retired Federal employees as S. 761, introduced by me on February 11, 1963, will provide for active employees with respect to the proportion of the total cost of the health benefits program to be paid by the Government.

It is my hope that this measure and S. 761 may be considered and acted upon at the same time in order that both our present and former employees receive equal justice in this important matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1205) to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to the contribution made by the Government toward health benefits protection for retired Federal employees and members of their families, introduced by Mr. Carlson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

NOBLE FRANK SMITH AND HIS WIFE, VIOLA SMITH

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Noble Frank Smith and his wife, Viola Smith, of Onarga, Ill.

Mr. President, Mr. Smith is a former U.S. marine and a survivor of the Bataan death march and 3½ years of prison-camp internment. He is now the operator of a small farm near Onarga in Iroquois County, Ill.

In Shanghai, China, just before World War II, young marine Noble Frank Smith married a Portuguese girl who is now Mrs. Viola Mary Smith. When war was declared, Smith's Marine unit was moved to the Philippines but Mrs. Smith was left behind. She was in the hospital where she soon gave birth to their son, Carl.

Subsequently, Shanghai was taken by the Japanese and soon thereafter, the Philippines were taken. Smith fought in Bataan and Corregidor, survived the infamous Bataan death march, and then endured 42 months of Japanese prison camps in Formosa, the Philippines, and Manchuria.

Mrs. Smith, meanwhile, was put in a camp run by the American Refugee Association in a former school. She lived there for about 2 years, until the Japanese took over the school building. Thereafter, she and the others lived as best they could, but were not permitted to earn a living. The American Government sent American dependents a small amount of relief through the Swiss consulate.

At irregular intervals in the years after the Smiths returned to the United States, they received bills of varying amounts from the Department of State which were said to represent the amount Mrs. Smith owed for the maintenance payments made to her during her involuntary refugee status in Shanghai. The Smiths were busy raising their five children and trying to recover from the economic deprivations of his long period of imprisonment in the service of his country. Veterans advisers counseled them to ignore the bills which were received with uncertain and inconsistent justification. Some of the bills, for example, stated an amount due for Mrs. Smith's transportation, but I now am advised that the military took care of this and repayment of transportation costs should not have been sought from the Smiths.

Finally, on February 28 of this year, the Smiths received a bill from the State Department Office of Finance demanding repayment within 30 days of $1,421.92, an amount said to represent maintenance payments to Mrs. Smith from July 2, 1943, to October 19, 1945. Mr. Marvin Craig, editor and publisher of the Onarga Leader Review, became interested and rallied the support of the community behind the belief of many that to make this demand against this Marine hero was unreasonable, punitive, and unjustified.

Mr. President, we all know that the exact letter of the law or what appears to be the exact letter is not always just and in accord with the spirit of the law. In this case, I believe the State Department acted within the letter of the law and probably had no choice but to request repayment. But I also believe, Mr. President, that enforcing this claim against the Smiths, who have a large family and who would have difficulty raising this sum, and who gave so much of their lives for this country, would be wholly outside the spirit of the law. And, Mr. President, if the many telephone calls and messages I have received, and the statements made to me Monday and Tuesday while I was in Illinois are at all representative, all of the people of Illinois, at least, share my opinion.

Therefore, I am introducing this bill to cancel this claim against the Smiths. I hope that the Congress will take quick action on it, and that the State Department and the Bureau of the Budget will quickly approve it.

By telephone I have been advised that in response to my request by telegram of March 26, the State Department has suspended its deadline for payment pending consideration of this bill.

Mr. President, in view of the nationwide interest in this matter, I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory article by Georgie Anne Geyer, which appeared in the Chicago Daily News of March 25, and an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of March 27, be printed in the Record along with my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill also be printed in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, article, and editorial will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1207) for the relief of Noble Frank Smith and his wife, Viola Smith, introduced by Mr. Douglas, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Noble Frank Smith and his wife, Viola Smith, are hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of $1,421.92, representing the amount of payments of advances for subsistence and medical expenses which the said Viola Smith received for herself and her infant son, Carl Smith, during their internment in Shanghai, China, from July, 1952, to October, 1945. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Noble Frank Smith and Viola Smith, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from them or either of them on account of the payments referred to in the first section of this Act.

The article and editorial presented by Mr. Douglas are as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Mar. 25, 1963]

BATAAN HERO GETS U.S. BILL FOR $1,421

(By Georgie Anne Geyer)

Onarga, Ill.—An ex-Marine survivor of the Bataan death march and 3½ years in prison camps has been billed for $1,421.92 by the State Department for emergency war relief given his wife and son.

Noble Frank Smith, 47, a good-looking man of few words who runs a 160-acre farm here, says: "I don't think they've got anything coming, and they ain't going to get it."

Smith's wife and son were stranded in China during World War II.

Smith got the bill on January 28. It gave him 30 days to pay.

The Smiths are worried. "The letter didn't say what they'd do after 30 days," Smith mused, sitting at his kitchen table over a crisp brown pork roast.

Mrs. Smith, a vivacious, handsome woman of 40, leaned across the table. "Maybe they won't try to collect it, hon'," she said.

"We don't know if they will or won't," he said, looking like a man who isn't about to be moved. "But I know one thing: I'm not gonna pay it."

Onarga, an Iroquois County community about 60 miles south of Chicago, and neighboring towns are upset about the Smith case. The local American Legion post has taken the case to the State commander. Other citizens are writing letters to Congressmen.

The Onarga Leader Review recounted the case in an editorial, asking: "Just how much does a soldier owe his country, especially when the circumstances are beyond his control?"

The Smith saga started just before World War II in Shanghai, China, when as a marine, Smith married the young Portuguese girl who is now Viola Mary Smith.

When war was declared on Japan December 7, 1941, the marines were moved to the Philippines. But Mrs. Smith was left behind. She was in a hospital giving birth to their son, Carl.

Shanghai was taken by the Japanese, the Philippines fell.

Smith went through Bataan and Corregidor, and barely survived 42 months of Japanese prison camps in Formosa, the Philippines and, finally, dreaded Manchuria.

"But we got $1 extra a day from the Government while we were in prison," he says wryly.

"Meanwhile, all of the Americans in China were put in a camp run by the American Refugee Association in the former American school in Shanghai," said Mrs. Smith.

"We lived there for about 2 years. Then the Japanese took over the building.

"From then on, we lived on our own, but we couldn't work. You couldn't work for the Japanese, for instance. So the American Government sent American dependents a certain amount of relief through the Swiss consulate.

"Every time I received the money, I signed papers," continued Mrs. Smith, "but they said it was just a formality. They said it was just to show where the money went.

"And when the bills from the Government started coming after the war, and I asked a Veterans' Administration lawyer what to do, he said to ignore them, and I did.

"They got bigger," added Mrs. Smith. "First they were just over $1,000. Then they went up to more than $1,400." The bills read "for subsistence and transportation, July 2, 1943, to October 19, 1945." and they were addressed to Mrs. Smith.

On January 28 came the last bill, giving them 30 days to pay.

"I don't want people to feel sorry for us," said Mrs. Smith. "But we just don't have that much money."

Their family now numbers five children—Carl, 22; Joann, 16; Donna May, 15; Stephanie, 9; and Elena, 6—and Mrs. Smith's mother.

"Well, the bills are in my name," said Mrs. Smith with a smile. "A stay in jail wouldn't be bad. I'd get a little rest."

Smith mused with a slight rakish smile, "I wonder what they'll do to you, mama."

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Mar. 27, 1963]

THE PRESS IS A MONITOR

The case of the ex-marine from Illinois who has been dunned by the State Department for money extended his family while they were interned in Shanghai during World War II is an example of the power and value of a free press.

The ex-marine, Noble Frank Smith, now an Illinois farmer, was moved with his military unit from Shanghai to the Philippines when World War II began. Behind him, in Shanghai, he left his wife, who was expecting their first child.

While Smith was surviving the death march on Bataan and prison camps in the Philippines, Formosa, and Manchuria his wife eked out her stay in the Shanghai internment camp with sums of money made available by the Congress through neutral Swiss offices. Such sums of money are available to any stranded American citizen, even today. A State Department official familiar with the Smith case told the Sun-Times that these sums of money extended during wartime were spent for food, clothing, medicines, shelter or other reasons and that promissory notes were signed. The total amount given to Mrs. Smith was $1,421.92.

Smith is not going to be prosecuted by the United States for this debt. Senator Paul Douglas, Democrat, Illinois, is introducing a bill to forgive the debt and Representative Leslie C. Arends, Republican, Illinois, has asked the Secretary of State to cancel out the debt. The State Department is embarrassed but has no recourse under the law but to bill Smith.

It is notable that when Smith found himself faced with what he conceived to be an injustice he turned to a newspaper for relief. Marvin Craig, editor and publisher of the Onarga (Ill.) Leader Review rallied the support of his community behind Smith.

It is the function of a newspaper, no matter how large or small it may be, to monitor government and those who serve in government. This is the duty of a free press in a democracy—despite recent statements by some government spokesmen.

The Onarga Leader Review and its editor and publisher, Marvin Craig, have discharged their duty well.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT UNITED STATES–MEXICO NARCOTIC COMMISSION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators Kefauver, Lausche, Mechem, Ribicoff, Hruska, Keating, Kuchel, Goldwater, and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference, a joint resolution requesting the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose of setting up a Joint United States-Mexico Commission to investigate the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be allowed to lie on the table for 5 days, so that additional Senators who so desire may join as cosponsors; and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the resolution be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this proposed legislation is necessary in order to overcome one aspect of a most serious problem which we face, not only as legislators, but also as citizens and parents concerned with the welfare of the youth of our Nation. I refer to the narcotics problem. We are concerned as legislators, because it is in large part the responsibility of the Federal Government to crack down, through legislation and law enforcement, on the illegal use of narcotics. We are concerned as citizens and as parents, because large numbers of our young people are already addicted to narcotics, and many more will face the ravages of addiction if the flow of illicit narcotics into the United States is not stopped.

Facing up to this problem has international implications, for the supply of illicit narcotics into the United States has its origin outside our borders, both in countries friendly and in countries hostile to us. Thus we must work in concert with the governments which are friendly toward us if we are to make inroads into this problem, and we must find ways to cut off the drug traffic from hostile sources.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, scores of witnesses have documented the inescapable fact that a major source of illicit narcotics coming into this country is our neighbor to the south, the Republic of Mexico.

Earlier this week, I returned from a 10-day visit to Mexico as a member of the Third Interparliamentary Conference between the United States and Mexico. While I was there, I talked about this problem to members of the Mexican delegation to the Conference and, in particular, to Senorita Maria del Refugio Baez Santoyo, who represents in the Mexican Congress an area where the narcotics problem is widespread.

I found among these Mexican parliamentarians an awareness of the problem, and a desire to do something about it in concert with the United States.

There are many obstacles, in the form of long-entrenched local interests, which must be overcome. But I believe the climate is right for a joint assault on this drug menace, an assault directed by the highest government levels of both the United States and the Republic of Mexico; and I am introducing this resolution today because I feel that the time is right for action.

Despite the diligent efforts of the U.S. Customs Bureau, the flow of illicit narcotics continues to cross our southwestern border from Texas to California, for use by addicts, both young and old. With some 1,200 miles of border between the United States and Mexico, it is virtually impossible to patrol this entire area and apprehend smugglers of heroin, marihuana, and other dangerous drugs. Thus, the full cooperation of the Mexican Government is essential if we are to eliminate effectively this source of illicit narcotics.

Therefore, I intend to document the seriousness of this problem and the need for cooperative action on the part of the Government of Mexico, if we are to halt the river of narcotics, marijuana, and dangerous drugs which flows from Mexico into the United States.

The fact that Mexico is a source for narcotics, marihuana, and other dangerous drugs was attested to by many witnesses during the subcommittee's hearings. Mr. Lee E. Echols, former sheriff of Yuma County, Ariz., and a former agent of the U.S. customs agency service, testified that in the company of two subcommittee staff members he visited Culiacan, Sinaloa, Mexico, in March of 1962, and negotiated with major traffickers in narcotics, who readily supplied him with information concerning opium-producing poppy fields and heroin reducing plants located near Culiacan. Echols, in reporting a conversation he had with one of the traffickers, told the committee:

> The trafficker stated that because of cold weather in the mountains, the opium harvest was several weeks late this year and would not reach the Culiacan market for about 3 weeks. He said that there was more opium growing this year than at any previous time in the past 20 years. We told him that

> we had heard the Mexican Government was destroying the crops, but he assured us that this was not so.
>
> This opium trafficker also deals in the purchasing of mesquite which he makes into charcoal and sells to an American firm in Nogales, Ariz. He stated that in purchasing this mesquite he had been in the Badiraguato Mountains, northeast of Culiacan, where most of the opium in that state is grown, and that he had personally seen large fields of it growing this year. He told us that there were at least six heroin-reducing plants in Sinaloa and that crude opium would be available in ton lots when it arrived in Culiacan, Mocorito, and Guamuchil, probably within the next 3 weeks.
>
> We were also told of an underground refining plant some 30 kilometers from Culiacan with a capacity of about 15 pounds of high-grade heroin a day.

After referring to other conversations with traffickers, Echols said:

> I would say the information we received from widely different sources who were unknown to each other should certainly be given a great deal of credence.

Another witness, Sheriff Peter Pitchess, of Los Angeles County, Calif., testified regarding Mexico as a source of narcotics:

> Our investigators have informed me of having seen poppy fields in great abundance in Mexico.
>
> We are in a position where we could even spot them, together with other investigating agencies. We have had them located on maps by aerial reconnaissance.
>
> I am firmly convinced from my information, which I consider reliable, that there are in existence not one but many such poppy-producing fields in Mexico, and not entirely contiguous to the California border, but inland from the border.

I could cite evidence from other responsible Federal, State, and municipal officials concerning their knowledge of Mexico as a source for illicit narcotics; but I feel that the preceding is sufficient to substantiate the fact that Mexico is a primary source of narcotics.

We have also been informed by several witnesses appearing before the subcommittee that the marijuana which enters our country illegally originates almost exclusively in Mexico.

Shipments of Mexican marihuana in 200-, 300-, and 400-pound lots have been traced from our southwestern border as far east as Chicago and New York. Thus, Mexican marihuana is a nationwide problem, and is not localized in our southwestern border States.

Mr. President, I believe that I should also mention, as a concomitant of the problem of drug addiction, the alarming increase in the misuse of the dangerous drugs—the amphetamines and barbiturates. Here, again, we find that a prime source of these dangerous drugs is our southern neighbor, Mexico. But the traffic pattern in dangerous drugs is different from that in narcotics and marihuana, because the dangerous drugs are produced here in the United States, and then are shipped to Mexico, for illegal reentry into the United States. Testimony of responsible witnesses has documented the increasing number of shipments of dangerous drugs to border towns which only too often are transshipping points for drugs destined for the illicit market in the United States.

Information in the files of the subcommittee indicates that a shipment of some 3 million amphetamine tablets was made to a single drugstore in Tijuana in early 1962. Further reports from two west coast drug firms indicate shipments totaling 4 million units of dangerous drugs from the one and 2,750,000 units from the other to Mexico over a period of time. These shipments were suspended by the firms after learning that the drugstore owner, one Senor Santa Cruz, allowed indiscriminate sale of these drugs to Americans, who in turn smuggled them into the United States.

I do not say that all shipments of dangerous drugs from the United States to Mexico are destined for the illicit reentry into our country, but information from many sources indicates that these drugs are readily available in Mexico and are being smuggled back into the United States. During the fiscal year 1962, at three border points of entry in California and Arizona, U.S. customs agents of the 14th Customs Agency District made some 65 seizures totaling 26,839 units of dangerous drugs. In addition to that, some 24,000 pills and 610 persons were turned over to local police for prosecution. In considering these figures, we must remember that according to the estimates of enforcement officials, only 10 percent at best of such contraband is ever seized.

What then, are the results of this unending flow of narcotics, marihuana, and other dangerous drugs from Mexico into the United States? I can assure the Senate that they are disheartening, and oftimes are tragic.

It is estimated that there are as many as 20,000 narcotic addicts in California; and it has been attested to by responsible Federal and State officials, including the Federal Bureau of Narcotics supervisor in charge of the Los Angeles area, that 75 to 85 percent of the illicit heroin in southern California has its origin in Mexico.

In May 1962, at the subcommittee hearing, Sheriff Pitchess, of Los Angeles County, compared the population increase in his county with the increase in crime and specifically narcotic offenses. Narcotic offenses show startling increases in California. He said:

> In the 12-year period, 1948–60, the population policed by the sheriff of Los Angeles County increased by 90 percent. Part I criminal offenses increased 207 percent.
>
> However, narcotics cases increased from 458 to some 3,521.
>
> Gentlemen, this is a 669-percent increase in narcotic cases in a 12-year period.
>
> The 11-year period 1949–60 indicates adults arrested for narcotic law violations climbed from 663 to some 2,934 or an increase of 343 percent.
>
> Juveniles arrested or investigated for the period 1949–60 reflect a startling increase. The first 5 years reflect an average of 76 juvenile narcotic offenders per year. The next 5-year average jumps to 213 per year.

When we reflect upon these figures in terms of lives ruined and money expended both by the addicts for drugs and by law-enforcement agencies in combatting drug abuse, they become more staggering and exasperating. We can reach no other conclusion than that the flow of narcotics into the United States must be stopped.

When we examine the figures relating to dangerous drug violations, we once again find an alarming pattern of increasing misuse among juveniles.

Capt. Walter C. Colwell, of the Los Angeles Police Department's narcotic division, cited the following dangerous drug statistics:

> In 1961 complaints were obtained against 874 adults. In the current year, 1962, complaints are averaging 121 per month, an increase of 60 percent over the year 1961.

He went on to cite juvenile arrest statistics:

> Juvenile arrests for possession and sale of dangerous drugs reflect the same rise as adult arrests. Juvenile arrests have risen from a total of 35 during 1957 to 426 during 1961. Until late in 1960 only 10 percent of juveniles arrested for violations of the broad field of narcotic enforcement were using dangerous drugs. In September 1960 a sharp increase was noted which in 1961 resulted in a 103-percent increase over 1960, and represented 63 percent of the total juvenile narcotic arrests.

Mr. President, such testimony is evidence of the seriousness of the increasing dangerous drug problem, especially among the youth of our Nation. And here I would like to repeat that such drugs, while produced in the United States and then shipped to Mexico legally, are being smuggled back into the United States for illegal consumption.

The tragic results of this dangerous situation were brought to my attention when, within the week of our hearings in Los Angeles, there was a brutal stabbing of a cab driver by two youths under the influence of drugs. In another tragic case a mother was fatally shot in the course of a struggle between her husband and drug-addicted son. The father had purchased the weapon to protect himself from his own son, who had developed a violent streak as the result of drug use.

Drug-induced crimes such as these cannot be tolerated; and if we are to meet with any success in our endeavor to eradicate addiction, the sources of illicit dangerous drugs must be stamped out.

I feel that the existence of the opium-producing poppy fields and the heroin reducing plants in Mexico has been established in testimony before the subcommittee, and that such activity has been going on for a number of years. It is further substantiated to my satisfaction that Mexico is a source for dangerous drugs illegally shipped into the United States.

Therefore, I question the attitude of both the Mexican and United States Governments with regard to suppressing this scandalous flow of narcotics, marihuana, and dangerous drugs into the United States. It has been going on for too many years to be explained away as a problem that is too difficult to settle or by saying that we must not offend the Mexican Government by taking a firm stand. It has been going on for 30 years, and will go on for 30 more if we do not act now.

The facts that complete cooperation of Mexican officials in suppressing the narcotics traffic is lacking goes virtually unquestioned. Witness after witness

testifying before the subcommittee indicated that the efforts of U.S. narcotic enforcement officials have not been uniformly, enthusiastically supported by Mexican officials responsible for the suppression of this flow of narcotics. No real efforts have been made on the part of the Mexican Government to locate and destroy poppy fields. Half-hearted attempts have at times been made in cooperation with U.S. narcotic enforcement officials, but they have been only token attempts.

I do not make such statements lightly, without thorough reflection on the testimony which I have received as chairman of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. The pattern of testimony of witness after witness after witness is only too convincing.

I can best expose this lack of cooperation by including at this point a résumé of testimony by witnesses which shows there has been a yearly increase in poppy production since 1935. Customs agent Rae V. Vader told the subcommittee, regarding opium-producing poppy fields in Mexico:

> I would say in our work in Mexico, we work with Mexican officials. I have worked with them for 25 years. I have seen poppy fields in Mexico.
>
> I saw them as early as 1937. That is when I believe they began, in 1935 to 1937.
>
> I can recall two instances when officers of my organization went into Mexico with Mexican officials and we furnished the money and the equipment to destroy poppy plants in the field.

In commenting on the results of this endeavor, Vader said:

> They were destroyed. However, one field or two fields were destroyed where we knew they were, but we didn't know what was over the next mountain, and we didn't go; they didn't like us.

Aaron Quick, a California State senator, and a former U.S. customs agency officer, told of the situation 10 years later:

> Fifteen years ago Customs Service undertook to work with the Mexican officials and this was arranged with the top officials to destroy or discourage and discontinue the growing of opium poppy in Mexico. Lots of money was spent on this project. It worked for 3 or 4 years but the Mexican Government—I am not critical of the Mexican people; I have a lot of friends that are Mexican and I am very proud of them. They realize they have a problem. But their answer to me is, "You have the know-how, your Government, you have the money. We need your assistance in coping with this situation in Mexico."

Senator Quick further informed the subcommittee that the U.S. Government had offered money and equipment to the Mexican Government to aid in the eradication of the poppyfields, but that nothing concrete resulted and nothing was done.

In 1960, Commissioner of Narcotics Harry J. Anslinger testified before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, and submitted a statement which he gave before the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs in 1947. In it he said, in part:

> I have received information from the representative of the United States who accompanied the Mexican officials engaged in making an aerial survey in Mexico last spring that the cultivation of the opium poppy in Mexico covers a large area and is increasing year after year. It is estimated on the basis of observations and photographs of an area of about 1,000 square miles that the poppy-fields now number close to 10,000, averaging one-half hectare (1¼ acres) or more per field. The total area is between 4,000 and 5,000 hectares (10,000 and 12,500 acres), producing from 32 to 40 metric tons of opium. The principal opium producing area is roughly 6,000 square miles in extent. It forms a rectangle east of Badiraguato, Sinaloa. It extends in a northwesterly direction with the eastern boundary on the western slopes of the Sierra Madre.
>
> The aerial survey I have mentioned was made northeast of Badiraguato. In this limited area of approximately 1,000 square miles, 1,500 to 1,700 fields were observed. Outside of the 1,000-square-mile main area an additional 3,000 fields were observed.
>
> For various reasons, notably the change in the administration, a misconception of the extent of the task, and the lack of manpower and finances, the 1947 opium poppy destruction campaign conducted by the Attorney General achieved poor results. Approximately 200 poppy fields were destroyed by a ground expedition.
>
> The cultivation of the opium poppy in Mexico, although prohibited by Mexican law, appears to be tolerated by the state and local authorities in the producing areas, with the possible exception of the State of Sonora.

In discussing the then current activities of his agents in Mexico, he told the subcommittee:

> I can tell you right now at this particular time there are about six narcotic and customs agents working on a certain case, and to show the vast areas, and the inaccessible areas when the time came to make the delivery, they were advised, and our men accepted the advice not to go into that territory, they would all be killed, so we couldn't make a case. That was just yesterday.

"Just yesterday," Mr. President, was January 21, 1960. "Just yesterday," neither the Mexican police, nor the U.S. authorities, nor anyone but the criminals who control the opium traffic in Mexico could touch these poppy fields.

In March of 1962, committee investigators were told "there was more opium being grown this year than at any previous time in the past 20 years."

These poppy fields must be sought out and eradicated. We can and we must initiate measures immediately to bring about this end. Our willingness to begin negotiations toward alleviation of this problem should be made known by no less an authority than the President of the United States.

Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce this joint resolution requesting the President of the United States to initiate negotiations with the Government of Mexico for the purpose of setting up a Joint United States-Mexico Commission to investigate and recommend appropriate solutions concerning the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the two countries.

Mr. President, I hope the joint resolution will receive favorable consideration by the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 65) to request the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose of setting up a Joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico, introduced by Mr. Dodd (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> Whereas Mexico is the primary source of supply for narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs brought into the southwestern part of the United States; and
>
> Whereas these narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs are subsequently distributed throughout the United States; and
>
> Whereas one hundred per centum of the marihuana seized by the enforcement officials in the southwestern part of the United States comes from Mexico; and
>
> Whereas the smuggling of narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs into the United States poses the largest single problem for the collectors of the customs and for the Federal courts in the southwestern part of the United States; and
>
> Whereas the use of narcotic drugs and dangerous drugs by juveniles has greatly increased due to the easy accessibility of such drugs from Mexico: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the President is requested to initiate negotiations with the Government of Mexico for the purpose of setting up a Joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate and to recommend appropriate solutions concerning the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between said countries.

Mr. **KEATING**. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the Senator from Connecticut in offering this joint resolution. Both Senator Dodd and I have heard testimony given before the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee on this problem. We learned last May, for example, that 75 percent of the heroin sold in California—the State with the second highest addict population in the country—and 100 percent of the brick marihuana comes from Mexico. There has also been an accelerated influx of amphetamines and barbiturates, the so-called dangerous drugs, from Mexico. The attorney general of California testified that most of the marihuana is grown on the west coast of the Mexican mainland. Opium poppies are also grown on the mainland and heroin processing plants are located in many areas there.

In addition to the hazard presented by the drugs which originate in Mexico, Henry L. Giordano, the Commissioner of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, informed me last week of a new aspect of the problem. "The Cuban drug traffickers," he said, "are taking advantage of Mexico in their effort. Apparently the freedom of movement between Havana and Mexico City assists them in this traffic." He asserted that Castro's cocaine pushers were using Mexico to funnel this poison into the United States.

The Mexican Government has indicated its desire to cooperate with law enforcement agencies in this country to stamp out the sources of narcotics below the border, and to assist in curbing illegal smuggling activities. A joint effort could go a long way toward establishing effective controls on this common problem. We therefore urge the President to initiate negotiations with the Government of Mexico in order that a joint United States-Mexican Commission can be established to study this situation. Addiction has become a national health and law enforcement problem which can be alleviated to some extent by this kind of international cooperation. If we are ever to wipe out this menace we must be willing to treat the individual, to enforce vigorously State and Federal laws, and to cooperate with other nations. Unless we attack on all three levels, we are not even trying.

RESOLUTION TO INVITE 1968 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES TO LAKE PLACID

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympics Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States at Lake Placid, N.Y.

This joint resolution is cosponsored by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. Javits] and, very fortunately, also by the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], who has taken a great interest in this matter and has been one of the most eloquent advocates of increased U.S. interest in Olympic sports.

This resolution is similar to one passed by the Congress in 1959, inviting the International Olympics Committee to hold the regular Olympic games in Detroit.

Last fall the American Olympics Committee selected Lake Placid as the single U.S. contender for the winter gamesite for 1968. In other words, there is no other U.S. site that is competing for the winter games. The only question to be settled now is whether the games will be held in the United States—which means at Lake Placid—or in some other country.

All Americans would be pleased and honored if the winter Olympics, held with such success in Squaw Valley, Calif., in 1960 could again be held in the United States. There are few places in the world with the fine winter facilities and excellent skiing offered by Lake Placid, one of the oldest and best-loved ski resorts of the East.

The committee of local officials which has been formed at Lake Placid to work on this project has done a most impressive job and deserves the support of the country. Nothing could be more in tune with the rising emphasis on physical fitness and the national interest in international athletic competition than prompt congressional action expressing the support and backing of the Congress of the United States for the Lake Placid site. The final presentation to the International Committee is due April 15.

Finally, let me point out, Mr. President, that Lake Placid is located in a region of considerable unemployment. If it should be chosen as the international winter Olympic site, the resulting development would provide new jobs, new opportunities throughout the area—in the long run, it would also encourage the overall economic growth of the State and the Nation and bring foreign tourists and currencies into the United States.

Mr. President, I am very happy to introduce, for myself, for my colleague [Fr. Javits], and for the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Humphrey], who has been one of the most eloquent advocates of increased U.S. interest in Olympic sports, this joint resolution and to ask that it be appropriately referred for favorable Senate action.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 67) extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1968 winter Olympic games in the United States, introduced by Mr. Keating (for himself, Mr. Javits, and Mr. Humphrey), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART 1 OF HEARINGS OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE ON 1963 ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a Senate concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of 1,500 additional copies of part 1 of the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee on the 1963 Economic Report of the President.

As the Senate is aware, there is widespread interest in the publications of the Joint Economic Committee among Members of the Congress, business, labor, and especially the universities. It is the practice of the committee to supply single copies of its hearings on request. This year the hearings were printed in two parts but because of the size of part 1 the committee received only 1,800 copies. This supply has now become exhausted and we still have about 1,200 individual requests which we are unable to fill. We continue to receive additional orders each day. Most of these are from professors and college libraries. Our committee tries to provide copies of its publications for the reference shelves of university libraries and is requesting this additional supply of the hearings to meet this need.

The resolution authorizing the printing of 1,500 additional copies will, we hope, take care of all or most of the requests. We are not asking for an excessive number, just enough copies to take care of the current and anticipated requests.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee fifteen hundred additional copies of part 1 of its hearings on the January 1963 Economic Report of the President, current Congress.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye] be added as a cosponsor to S. 626, to increase the limitation on payments for construction engineering for Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban projects.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] be added as a cosponsor of S. 702, relating to domestically produced fishery products, on the next printing of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] be added as a cosponsor of my bill, S. 1100, to prohibit the importation into the United States of flat-glass products manufactured in Communist countries.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the name of my colleague from New York [Mr. Keating] added at its next printing as a cosponsor to Senate Resolution 116, relating to the Select Committee on Consumers.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CURB OF MONOPOLISTIC CONTROL OF PROFESSIONAL BOXING—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the junior Senator from California [Mr. Engle] be added as a cosponsor of S. 1182, introduced by the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], and that certain remarks of the junior Senator from California [Mr. Engle] on the subject of professional boxing, be printed at this point in the Record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement by Senator Engle is as follows:

Statement by Senator Clair Engle

In the death of former featherweight champion Davey Moore, the Nation and the world have witnessed a requiem for a boxer. It may be that we are also witnessing the requiem for boxing itself.

This fighter's death is another piece of evidence in the growing case against professional boxing.

The sport is on trial. The charge is legalized manslaughter and corruption. And the odds-on favorite, I would say, is the prosecution. Unless something is done in a hurry, chances for acquittal are slight.

We are faced with two alternatives.

We can allow the evidence to mount. We can remain in our ringside seats or in our armchairs before our television sets—but always a safe distance from the mayhem—and watch tragedy follow on the heels of tragedy.

Then, one day there will be no boxing. The sensibilities and sensitivities of too many will have been violated. Professional boxing will take the full 10. It will be knocked out of contention once and for all.

Or we can reform boxing.

The Congress of the United States can step into the ring and provide the machinery and the statutory authority to clean up this sport—while people still call it a sport.

Some may ask, Is Federal regulation necessary?

Yes, it is necessary. The States cannot handle this sport properly. I do not want to leave the impression that the States and their boxing commissions have not tried to clean up boxing. They have made valiant attempts to do so. But their efforts have usually terminated in a dead end.

They can get nowhere in these efforts because they are stymied by the interstate aspects of the business. Subpena powers of local commissioners stop at State borders. A boxer not permitted to fight in one city can pull up stakes and go into another city in another State. And television beams across State lines. The television cameras alone make boxing an interstate business and as such it should be subject to Federal regulation.

Where do we start?

First, I think we must ask ourselves whether or not boxing is worth cleaning up. Perhaps it would be better for all concerned—for fan and fighter—to outlaw boxing. Some important and influential people hold this belief. The pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church, for one; the Governor of my State, for another.

I am of another opinion. I share their distaste for needless death and sadistic beatings and crime and corruption which have—unfortunately but undeniably—accompanied the sport in recent years. But it need not have been this way. And, certainly, there is still time to correct the situation.

While Davey Moore lay dying in a California hospital, I was beset by the frequent thought that this image does reflect the state of boxing today: A picture of violence and crimson and resin sprinkled on a rope-framed canvas, while thugs stand on the sidelines, always one step ahead of the law.

This picture can be changed. It is our job to change it. I have heard no one in this body call for the abolition of boxing. I can only conclude that we agree that boxing is worth keeping, that it is worth saving. We have no choice, therefore, but to get the reform machinery moving.

It is all there in the National Boxing Commissioner Act. I first sponsored this bill, with my distinguished colleague from Tennessee, 2 years ago. Benny Paret was still alive then. Davey Moore was, too. I am tempted to be Monday morning's quarterback and ask: Would these men have been spared if the act had been passed and put into effect?

Would these men have died if there had been a national boxing commissioner—a czar who would set up nationwide health standards and mandatory, modern, and thorough checkups and enforce them vigorously?

This is not idle speculation. It may be speculation—but it is not idle. A man may die in the ring tonight because he went in with undetected brain injuries, suffered in a previous match. Is it idle to wonder how many fighters will die because no action was taken to raise boxing's health standards?

A man may throw a fight tonight because regulation of boxing, the policing and enforcing processes of the States, cannot cope with nationwide syndicates. Is it idle speculation to wonder how much bribery takes place, how many fights are fixed?

It is necessary, I strongly believe, that a Federal law regulating boxing be enacted. I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I do not want to see boxing die. But at present its course is clearly headed for destruction. Without the National Boxing Commissioner Act, boxing will be outlawed in this country.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of March 19, 1963:

S. 1121. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Accelerated Public Works Act (P.L. 87–658): Mr. Cannon, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Morse, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Yarborough.

Authority of March 21, 1963:

S. 1153. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act to extend the time for making grants thereunder, and for other purposes: Mr. Bartlett and Mr. Bible.

S. 1163. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act: Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Clark, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Muskie, Mrs. Neuberger, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

S. 1170. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for elderly persons, and for other purposes: Mr. Engle, Mr. Humphrey, Mr. Javits, and Mr. Long of Missouri.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Brewster H. Morris, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chad.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 63 AND S. 1057 RELATING TO REPRESENTATION OF CERTAIN DEFENDANTS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, April 9, 10, and 11, 1963, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on S. 63, a bill to provide for representation of indigent defendants, and S. 1057, a bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Address by the President of the United States delivered at a civic luncheon in Chicago, Ill., on March 23, 1963.

By Mr. MUSKIE:

Address entitled "Our Naval Shipyards in Times of Challenge," delivered by Senator McIntire before the East Coast District of Metal Trades Council, at Washington, D.C., on March 11, 1963.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Address by Representative Ben Reifel, of South Dakota, accepting, on behalf of Arrow, Inc., paintings presented by Abbott Laboratories depicting the practice of medicine by American Indians, in Washington, D.C., on March 6, 1963.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Address entitled "Now Is the Time To Outlaw All Deficit Spending by the Federal Government," delivered recently over the Manion Radio Forum, of South Bend, Ind.

Article entitled "Minority Rights Ad Absurdum," written by Jenkin Lloyd Jones and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 25, 1963, dealing with the U.S. Supreme Court ruling regarding a noncompulsory New York school prayer; also a statement prepared by himself on the same subject.

FARM EXPORTS AND THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Christian Science Monitor of March 26, there appears an article entitled "U.S. Trigger? Farm Exports and EEC." In the article it is stated that the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] "warns that a shutout of American farm products from the countries of the European Economic Community could, and probably would, trigger a depression here."

Mr. President, in my opinion the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] is not only an expert in the field of farm economics, but also is an expert in the field of foreign policy; and when he makes statements I believe they should be studied carefully.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article, written by Josephine Ripley, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Trigger?—Farm Exports and EEC

(By Josephine Ripley)

Senator George D. Aiken, Republican, of Vermont, warns that a shutout of American farm products from the countries of the European Economic Community (EEC or Common Market) could, and probably would, trigger a depression here.

Agriculture ministers of the six Common Market countries are now meeting in Brussels to discuss a common level for agricultural prices within the market.

If the level is a high one, as anticipated, it will mean a high protective tariff, possibly high enough to curtail if not exclude American imports.

American farmers now sell more than a billion dollars' worth of their produce a year to Europe. Largest exports are wheat and poultry.

POULTRY IMPORT DUTIES JACKED UP

Poultry raisers are already in trouble. The import duty and other levies on chickens have already been jacked up to the point where poultry exports have slumped sharply.

It could be really serious if the same thing happened to wheat, Senator AIKEN told the Christian Science Monitor.

He feels that President de Gaulle's purpose in blackballing Great Britain for the Common Market was to keep France in a position to control the agricultural, as well as the petroleum market.

As far as this country is concerned, wheat is the farm product most dependent on exports. More than 700 million bushels of wheat were exported last year, compared to only about 100 million bushels in exports 10 years or more ago.

"Consider the crushing effect if all this wheat were suddenly excluded from Europe and came pouring into the domestic market," said the Senator.

"Prices would come crashing down. The Government would be forced to spend billions in price support, and would have to crack down with compulsory controls on production."

NATIONWIDE IMPACT SEEN

The whole country would feel the impact—in a farm-led depression, in his opinion. There is no question but what "our people would be hard hit" by loss of farm export markets, he said.

He does not say this is going to happen. In the first place, it is not going to be easy for the Common Market countries to come to agreement on so controversial an issue.

Also, the United States is not going to stand by while its export markets are taken away.

It has the power of "retaliatory action," although authorities prefer the milder term, "compensatory withdrawals."

In other words, what the Common Market does "we can do, too." If the Common Market adopts policies which shut out American farm products, this country can refuse to cooperate on industrial tariffs important to Common Market trade.

Under international trade agreements, the United States can appeal what it feels to be unfair trade restrictions. That is, under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

Or, the President now has broad authority under the authority given him in last year's trade bill to strike tough tariff bargains, if he sees fit.

CASE PENDING ON FROZEN CHICKEN

The United States has already registered a protest in the case of poultry, contending import restrictions are inconsistent with GATT obligations.

This is considered a prime "test case" and is still pending.

American frozen poultry exports to Western Europe had been built up over the past 4 years to a $50 million business. U.S. production methods were so efficient and economical that American chicken was at one time underselling the local product in West Germany.

Import duties in 1962 were jumped from 4½ cents a pound to 12½ cents. The levy in West Germany rose from 4.8 cents to 13 cents a pound.

The result has been a slump in American poultry exports to $12,600,000 in the 4-month period ending November 30, as compared with $20,300,000 in the same period in 1961.

WHEAT SUPPORT PRICE DEBATED

With respect to wheat, Common Market countries face this problem: Where to peg the Common Market price.

France now has a price-support level of about $2.30 a bushel (as against the $1.82 price support in the United States). West Germany supports wheat at $3.15 a bushel.

The expectation is that President de Gaulle will push for the higher West German price support to make France "Europe's granary."

France grows more than three times as much wheat as West Germany. This production would be still further stimulated by the higher price, Senator AIKEN says.

Under these conditions, with France stepping up its production and American wheat shut out by Common Market tariff bars, the French could "virtually wipe out our business," as the Senator put it.

But this has not yet happened and such a catastrophe may be avoided, but it is at present a very threatening cloud on the international horizon.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN INSPECTIONS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, according to reports from Geneva, the Soviet delegate, Ambassador Semyon K. Tsarapkin, has renewed his accusation that it was the United States, not the Soviet Union, which originally offered to settle for three inspections a year. The Soviet delegate states flatly that former Delegate Arthur Dean and President Kennedy's science and technology adviser, Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, told him that three inspections a year would be acceptable to the United States.

If this is true and if the Soviet delegate is not misquoting our people, then I say they have placed us in an untenable position on the matter of the nuclear test-ban inspections we shall undertake each year.

Some 4 years ago the Soviets offered this three-a-year inspection gambit. At that time it was rejected as absolutely unacceptable to the United States. Despite the claims of advances in the art of detection—so far unproved—the bald fact remains that we must have constant or near-constant on-the-spot inspections if we are to protect our national security.

If what the Soviet delegate says is true, our delegates have made a dangerous and potentially disastrous retreat.

I submit that we should not be disarming the United States; and I would suggest that before we pull any missiles out of Turkey and Italy, we lay down as a condition thereto that the Russian Communists leave Cuba completely.

DISTRIBUTION OF RAILROAD CARS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, several days ago, I joined with the senior Senator from Washington and other Senators in the introduction of Senate bill 1063, which seeks equity in the distribution of the available supply of railroad cars throughout the United States. As was pointed out at the time of the introduction of the bill, the distribution of the supply of railroad cars becomes more serious each year, because the total car supply dwindles from year to year.

The situation in my State of Nebraska continues to be very acute. Orders for the shipment of grain far exceed the supply of cars which can be spotted at loading points throughout my State. I recognize that in these acute situations, it is not possible to afford immediate and complete relief. Also, I compliment those in our railroad industry who, I am sure, are making diligent effort to give equitable treatment to the problem throughout the Middle West.

However, the situation is one which cannot improve until the Congress authorizes a more realistic solution to the existing problem. In the face of a dwindling car supply, we cannot permit railroads which are unwilling to build an adequate supply of cars to practice a type of expropriation which, while currently legal, is also completely lacking in morality. A reasonable per diem rate is merited, so that roads which are willing to meet their needs can have their rolling stock when needed. So that we can avoid a repetition of this acute situation, which seems to recur each year with an increasing tempo, I urge the enactment at the earliest feasible time of Senate bill 1063, to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply.

I ask unanimous consent that I may include a telegram addressed to all Interstate Commerce Commissioners by Mr. H. C. Murphy, president, Burlington Lines, 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Burlington's shortage of boxcars for grain loading is worst in history. This morning we had cumulative orders for 12,620 cars for such loading with only 833 available, and cumulative daily system shortage has exceeded 10,000 cars for several weeks.
>
> Many shippers in Nebraska, Colorado, and Kansas are complaining bitterly with sound justification, but we are helpless because we have on line less than 65 percent of our equivalent plain box ownership. Stated otherwise, if all Burlington-owned boxcars were available for our use, we would have at least 7,000 more such cars. Contrast this with conditions on some eastern roads. Three eastern roads alone on February 15 had on their lines over 28,000 more boxcars than they own. In our view, this maldistribution of boxcars at expense of Burlington and its shippers is confiscatory, intolerable, and cannot be justified. If but three eastern lines were ordered to deliver daily to us only 3 percent of boxcars in excess of their ownership, we would receive at least 850 cars daily. Burlington could load 1,800 cars of grain daily contrasted with recently daily loadings of about 600 cars.
>
> Urgently request immediate entry of ICC orders directing such deliveries to us until our equivalent ownership on line reaches 90 percent or until their equivalent ownership on line is reduced to 100 percent.
>
> In addition, and until conditions improve, request ICC order directing that all Burlington-owned boxcars be withheld from distribution east of Mississippi River and returned empty to us at nearest junctions and that existing AAR boxcar orders be continued in effect.
>
> Drastic action required in part because our total boxcar loads offline currently exceeds loads received from connections and empty received under AAR orders do not begin to offset this attrition.
>
> Please advise action taken.

GRAIN SURPLUS AND SMOG

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, a few days ago, I introduced into the RECORD a news story concerning research about which it is contended that an alcohol blend in our motor fuels could reduce substantially the matters released by exhaust fumes which create smog in many of the metropolitan areas throughout the country.

On March 19, 1963, there appeared in the Omaha World Herald an editorial, applauding this research, and expressing the hope that this news might be the forerunner of efforts to control smog. I am pleased to request that this editorial from the Omaha World Herald be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAIN SURPLUS AND SMOG

> That was a mighty hopeful bit of news which Bob Considine reported from the Southwest Research Institute at San Antonio, Tex. Mr. Considine said the early results of experimentation show that a blend of alcohol in the fuel of automobiles can reduce smog by as much as 50 percent.
>
> Moreover, said Mr. Considine, the Southwest researchers have come up with a new concept in motors which would increase compression and efficiency by 50 percent by the use of an alcohol-gasoline blend.
>
> The research project is subsidized by the Nebraska Department of Agriculture under its program to find industrial uses for farm crops. It was proposed by J. Leroy Welsh, of Omaha, who headed President Eisenhower's Commission which studied industrial uses.
>
> The superior qualities of alcohol as a motor fuel have long been recognized. It is used extensively in racing cars. Its cost has prevented more extensive use.
>
> If an alcohol mix can decrease smog, which is becoming an increasingly serious health problem, and if motors can be developed to burn it more efficiently, the search for ways to cope with economic barriers is going to be stimulated considerably. Considerable promise along that line is offered by the prospect of developing supplementary industrial uses of the residue of grain after its starch has been removed to manufacture alcohol.
>
> A blend of 25 percent alcohol—which the Southwest researchers have been testing—in the fluid which flows from America's gasoline pumps every day would solve the Nation's grain surplus in a hurry.

THE CLOTURE RULE AND DISTRIBUTION OF STAFF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the distinguished minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that General Orders 1, 2, 3, and 4—Senate Resolutions 9, 10, 80, and 81—on the Calendar of Business of Thursday, March 28, on page 7, be taken off the "General orders," under rule VIII, and be placed on page 13, under "Subjects on the table."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

STUDY BY SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Public Law 87–196 authorizes and directs the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct a study and investigation of the adequacy, for the protection of investors, of the rules of national securities exchanges and national securities associations.

The study was intended to be a comprehensive one. For this reason Congress authorized the SEC to select a special staff of 65 members and appropriated nearly $1 million to support this staff during its 18-month intensive study of the securities industry.

I have been advised that the SEC will submit the first installment of its two-phase report to Congress on April 3 of this year. The full report, I understand will deal with topics such as qualifications, training, and supervision of salesmen, requirements for entry into the securities business, reporting requirements for companies with over-the-counter securities, selling practices of broker-dealers and investment companies, the role of specialists, floor traders, and odd lot dealers on the exchanges, investment advisers, and margin requirements.

The report will, of necessity, be a long one. Its subject matter will be extremely delicate. Some of its recommendations may well be controversial.

Although I have not read the report, I have been very impressed by the judicious manner in which the study has been conducted. Fortunately for the investing public, the Securities and Exchange Commission appears to have been more concerned with the search for meaningful information than with sensational headlines in the press.

I am taking this opportunity to urge the securities industry, the press, investors, and the general public to accept the forthcoming report in an equally responsible and mature manner. I hope that all interested parties will read the report carefully and consider it thoroughly before criticizing, condemning, or lauding it, in whole or in part. The temptation to rush to press with a dramatic or colorful catchphrase or headlines should be avoided. Shooting from the hip is no substitute for careful analysis.

The argument for a responsible and mature approach to the Commission's findings carries special weight when one considers the volatility of the stock market. It would be indeed unfortunate if hasty, ill-conceived comments should cause a substantial drop in the market. This is the time for calmness and deliberation.

I expect the report to be one of the most important and informative industry studies of many years. Certainly in the securities field, there has been nothing remotely resembling it in breadth and comprehensiveness since the early 1930's.

I anticipate that the report will provide a great deal of new information about the securities business, information which may give us many new insights into the entire financial structure of the United States. The securities business, like every other, must be judged by its results. How well does it serve as a channel for funds from investors of one sort or another to industrial and commercial organizations needing capital in order to participate in the growth and development of the country?

We all recognize that our domestic happiness and our security in the free world both depend upon the continued growth and development of American commerce and industry.

As chairman of the Securities Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, I intend to make a broad study and to hold hearings inquiring into the role of the securities industry as a financial intermediary with particular emphasis upon its relationship to our economic growth and development. The public interest requires not only the protection of our Nation's investors but also the encouragement of investment in our Nation.

Such a study, carefully and responsibly made, might, I think, make it possible for us to view the securities business in the proper setting, and to see if anything is needed to enable it to perform its vital role even more effectively.

I should like to conclude by reemphasizing my concern and my hope that the forthcoming report of the SEC will be received and considered by all concerned—by the industry, by the press, by investors, and by the general public—in a mature and sober manner, with careful reflection and thorough analysis.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, on Monday next it is intended to take up the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administration to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Consideration of that bill will be followed by consideration of the nominations of the incorporators of the Communications Satellite Corp.

It is hoped that action on those nominations will be followed by consideration of the bill relating to youth employment opportunities.

Obviously this schedule will require the Members' attendance and participation. Senators should be on notice that we anticipate a full and heavy workload next week, and should make their plans accordingly.

As of the present moment, Senators need not anticipate an Easter recess because the Senate has some business to transact, and it is behind in its work.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When I queried the majority leader previously about an Easter recess, he was of the opinion that such a recess might start on the evening of Good Friday and continue until Monday next after Easter, which falls on April 14. At that time I asked whether there was any hope, comfort, or expectation. He very politely but firmly suggested that there was no hope, no comfort, and no expectation.

I wonder whether, in the intervening days, some grace, sweetness, and charity has come to our distinguished majority leader, and whether he could assure Senators that there might be an additional day or two added to the Easter recess, particularly since another body will start an Easter recess on April 11, and by 3-day stages continue it until April 22.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is hard to withstand the eloquent plea of the distinguished minority leader, with whom it is a pleasure to work. But, unfortunately, I can give no succor, no hope, and no comfort at the present time. The Senate has really done nothing in the way of lawmaking this year. It has been in session since January 9. It has wasted a great deal of time. The selection of our committees was late. We must attend to the business of the Nation. The Easter season is a good time to show that we are men of good will, good hope, and, we trust, good business sense.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I assume, then, that it is the fervent hope of the majority leader that there may be one or two Easter eggs in the administration basket before that great day.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Easter eggs will be acceptable; others will not.

SHE WAS A GOOD SHIP AND MEN WILL MISS HER

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the great and good ship *Bear* sank on the night of March 19, 260 miles east of Boston and 90 miles south of Cape Sable, Nova Scotia.

Her loss will sadden all Alaskans who remember her 40 years of service in Alaskan waters as the Coast Guard cutter *Bear*. She was America's first icebreaker and her record was a long and proud one.

The *Bear* was launched 88 years ago in 1875 at Greenock, Scotland.

For the first 8 years of her life the *Bear* was operated out of St. Johns, Newfoundland, making annual trips to the sealing grounds of the North Atlantic.

The U.S. Government purchased the ship in 1883 to assist in the rescue of an expedition trapped on Ellesmere Island—the northernmost part of Canada which stretches farther into the Artic Ocean than even Greenland.

This was but the first of many rescues, the first of many lives saved in the *Bear's* long history.

The *Bear* was sent first to Alaskan waters by the U.S. Revenue Marine, the precursor of the Coast Guard. As the original ice cutter, the *Bear* patrolled the Bering Sea and carried everything from mail to missionaries to the far northern communities of Alaska. Many of our State's first settlers were dependent upon the *Bear* for transportation and supplies.

In 1898, the year of the Yukon gold rush, the *Bear* rescued 500 whalers icebound in their boats off Point Barrow.

Retired after 40 years in Alaska waters, the *Bear* was given to the city of Oakland as a marine museum.

Admiral Byrd, on his expedition to Antarctica in 1933 especially asked for the *Bear* to go with him. The ship was as valuable in south polar waters as she was in the north.

Called back on duty in World War II, the *Bear* patrolled the North Atlantic. She was sold at the end of the war to a Nova Scotia shipping company, for which she sailed until this year.

The last men to sail her were Percy Coffin and Henry Dingle, of Dartmouth, Nova Scotia.

The *Bear* was a barkentine. The dictionary tells me a barkentine is "a three-masted vessel having the foremast square rigged and the others fore-and-aft rigged."

There cannot be many of them left.

She was a good ship and men will miss her.

I ask unanimous consent that an article recording the sinking of the *Bear*, from the Associated Press wire of March 20, may be made a part of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner, Mar. 20, 1963]

Sea Claims "Bear" on Final Trip in Atlantic—Famous Patrol Ship Goes Down in Stormy Seas While Being Towed to Philadelphia To Become Restaurant

New York, March 20.—The stalwart old sailing ship *Bear*, veteran of Adm. Richard E. Byrd's Antarctic explorations and a rescuer of hundreds of whaling men off Alaska, sank last night in stormy seas she so long defied.

The three-master went down 260 miles east of Boston while under tow from Halifax, Nova Scotia, to Philadelphia to become a combined restaurant and commercial museum.

Two men aboard the 198-foot vessel made it safely in a liferaft to the towboat, the *Irving Birch*.

The Coast Guard said the tug reported that the *Bear*, a barkentine, sank after her foremast broke off. A barkentine is square rigged on the foremast with fore-and-aft rigging on her other masts.

SEAL FISHER

The *Bear* was built in 1874 in Greenock, Scotland, as a seal fishing vessel. The U.S. Government bought her in 1884 and assigned her to the Revenue Cutter Service, later the Coast Guard.

For 40 years, she sailed out of Oakland, Calif., making 45 voyages to the Arctic.

Her most notable feat came during the winter of 1897–98. An early freeze trapped whaling men off the Yukon and left them in danger of starvation.

The *Bear*, with a wooden hull so tough she could serve as an icebreaker, approached as near as possible to the men. Then her crew, using dogsleds and driving reindeer, reached the trapped whalers.

On her stormy last voyage, it became apparent that age had taken its toll and that her days were numbered. A Coast Guard aircraft dropped a rubber liferaft to the *Birch*, which floated it over to the barkentine to enable the two men aboard to paddle to safety.

The Coast Guard said the *Irving Birch* was not able to get a lifeboat to the *Bear*. A Coast Guard spokesman said wind-whipped Atlantic waves would have made it quite treacherous to jump over the side of the sailing ship into the wooden lifeboat, which could have broken up against the side of the larger vessel.

Her square-rigged foremast trailing over the side, listing to starboard and down at the bow, the *Bear* had struggled through the night.

TOOK WORST

Showing the same sturdiness that won the admiration of Adm. Richard E. Byrd 30 years ago, the 90-year-old *Bear* took the worst the raging Atlantic could give.

Tug Capt. W. C. Chisholm had reported at one point seas had moderated during the night, but because of darkness and distance he could not tell how the gallant old ship was making out.

The saga of the *Bear's* latest battle began yesterday morning when she broke loose from a towline to the *Birch*. She was on her way to Philadelphia, to be preserved as a historic relic.

The 198-foot *Bear* was built to crunch through thick ice floes on the North Atlantic sailing grounds. She was purchased by the United States after 11 years of sailing out of St. Johns, Newfoundland.

Her first mission took her to Ellesmere Island in the Arctic on a rescue expedition. Then she shifted to Alaskan waters.

In the winter of 1897–98, the *Bear* stirred the imagination of all seafarers by rescuing some 500 whaling men trapped in the ice floe off Point Barrow.

The Bering Sea patrol occupied her for some 40 years and then came retirement in 1929. She was taken to Oakland, Calif., where she became part of a marine museum.

Byrd found her there and put her back in service for his 1933 expedition to the Arctic.

In World War II she was sent to Europe for patrol.

Next followed fur-sealing for a few years. Her new owners, Alfred M. Johnston of Villanova, Pa., found her on a Nova Scotia beach.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have gathered some articles from the newspapers and some information from the Coast Guard detailing the record of the *Bear*. I ask unanimous consent that articles from the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, the Boston Globe, and the Baltimore Evening Sun, as well as a press release issued by the Coast Guard be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles and news release were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner]

Rather She Sank Than Be Museum

Seattle, March 20.—A retired rear admiral who served aboard the aged barkentine *Bear*, which sank last night in the stormy Atlantic off Boston, says he would rather she sank than be turned into a museum-restaurant.

"I'd rather have her sink than do the job she was going to do. It's far beneath her," said Rear Adm. F. A. Zeusler, of Seattle, a retired Coast Guard officer, who served on the *Bear* in 1914–16.

That was while the venerable vessel belonged to the Coast Guard and was patrolling the Bering Sea.

"She was coated with iron," Zeusler recalled, "and would withstand just about anything we put her to."

The wooden ship was used as an icebreaker, and Zeusler said, "We had to maneuver from the crow's nest while working through the ice. The snap from the impact was terrific up there.

"We'd be on patrol from April to November. We always were the first ship into Nome each spring. We'd check the ice layout and pass the information along to other ships anxious to get into the harbor."

[From the Boston (Mass.) Globe, Mar. 19, 1963]

Polar Veteran: Famed Cutter "Bear" Sinking, Two Aboard

The former Coast Guard cutter *Bear*, which took part in many polar expeditions with Adm. Richard E. Byrd is sinking today with two men aboard, 90 miles south of Nova Scotia below Cape Sable.

The local Coast Guard, including aircraft from Salem and the cutter *Barataria* from Portland, Maine, is standing by, and said there is no danger of loss of life.

The men aboard the *Bear* were Percy Coffin and Henry Dingle of Darthmouth, Nova Scotia.

The *Bear* was sold in the 1940's to a Nova Scotia sealing firm and several weeks ago was beached at Dartmouth, Novia Scotia, across the bay from Halifax.

The tug *Irving Birch* was towing the famed three-masted vessel to New York when it began to sink this morning. The 198-foot ship was launched 88 years ago in Greenock, Scotland.

The ship was being towed from Halifax to Philadelphia where it was to be converted into a floating restaurant and museum.

The Royal Canadian Air Force and the U.S. Coast Guard said the old vessel, the United States first icebreaker, was taking water. It was listing heavily to starboard, its foremast was broken, and its towrope parted.

Operating out of St. John's, Newfoundland, the *Bear* made 11 annual trips to the icy sealing grounds of the North Atlantic.

The United States bought the vessel for $100,000 in 1883, to be used on a mission on Ellesmere Island to rescue an expedition.

The U.S. Revenue Marine, a forerunner of the Coast Guard, later sent the *Bear* to Alaskan waters where she became a legend, delivering mail, supplies, missionaries, and teachers to the northern outposts.

The *Bear* made many heroic rescues in Alaska.

Veteran mariners have described the *Bear* as one of the oldest, toughest and most colorful ships ever to sail under the American flag. One of the ship's most memorable exploits was the rescue of 500 whalers who were trapped in their ships by ice off Point Barrow, Alaska, in 1898—the year of the Yukon gold rush.

After 40 years on the Bering Sea patrol the *Bear* was decommissioned and given to the city of Oakland, Calif., as a marine museum.

But Admiral Byrd discovered the *Bear* and took it on his 1933 Antarctic expedition.

After Admiral Byrd's expedition, the *Bear* was again retired. When World War II began all able ships were called to duty and the *Bear* patrolled the Atlantic.

Once she towed a captured German supply ship into Boston.

Later the *Bear* was sold to the Shaw Steamship Ltd. of Halifax and only several weeks ago she was put on the beach at Dartmouth—her sailing days apparently over.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun, Mar. 20, 1963]

Ship of Heroic Polar Exploits Sinks at Sea

Boston, March 20.—The barkentine *Bear*, a vessel famed for heroic exploits at the North and South Poles, went down last night in stormy seas 260 miles east of Boston and 90 miles south of Cape Sable, Nova Scotia.

The Coast Guard received word of the craft's death plunge from the tug *Irving Birch* which had been towing the vessel from Halifax to New York. The towline parted yesterday.

The *Birch* did not report whether the craft had broken up or had settled slowly at 8:15 p.m. beneath the waves that reached 12-foot swells.

TWO ABOARD ARE RESCUED

The two men aboard the *Bear* were taken off yesterday.

A Coast Guard aircraft dropped a rubber liferaft to the *Irving Birch*, which floated it over to the barkentine *Bear* to enable its two crewmen to paddle to safety.

The tug radioed the Coast Guard that the ship sank after its foremast broke off. The other mast had been in poor shape.

The *Bear* formerly was a Coast Guard ship, and did iceberg patrol duty for many years.

The Coast Guard said the *Irving Birch* did not send its own lifeboat to the *Bear* because wind-whipped waves would have made it quite treacherous to jump over the side of the sailing ship into a wooden lifeboat, which could have broken up against the side of the larger vessel.

STRUGGLES THROUGH NIGHT

Listing to starboard and down at the bow, and with her square-rigged foremast trailing over the side, the *Bear* had struggled through the night.

Showing the same sturdiness that won the admiration of Adm. Richard E. Byrd 30 years ago, the 90-year-old *Bear* took the worst the raging Atlantic could give.

A Requiem for the "Bear"

Washington, D.C., March 22.—The famous old Coast Guard cutter *Bear*, veteran of nearly 90 years' service in the far north and participant in some of the most thrilling sea rescues of our time, has come to the end of her last voyage in the turbulent waters of the North Atlantic. On Tuesday, March 19, 1963, the gallant old ship went down off the coast of Nova Scotia under the vicious assault of an Atlantic storm. Time and elements have finally done what northern ice and snow failed to do.

If the *Bear* could have chosen her final resting place, it would probably have been the North Atlantic where she had sailed so often. It was here that she came in 1874, shortly after her launching in 1873 at the old Scottish shipyard of Dundee & Son. She spent the first 10 years of her life getting her sea legs with a sealing fleet operating off Newfoundland.

Worldwide fame came to the *Bear* in the early 1880's shortly after the historic Greely expedition to the Arctic came to a disastrous end. The expedition, under the command of the then Lt. Adolphus Washington Greely, was one of two groups dispatched to the Arctic to set up a series of observation stations. Despite elaborately made plans, a series of misfortunes left Greely and his party stranded in the pitiless arctic winter without adequate food and clothing.

To assist the Greely party, the United States organized a rescue fleet of three ships, consisting of the *Bear*, *Thetis*, and *Alert*. On June 22, 1884, less than 2 months after her departure, the *Bear* sighted the pitiful remnants of the expedition. For months they had been surviving on rock moss, leather sledding equipment, and whatever small game they could find. Many of the group had either died or gone mad from privation. Those who had survived resembled skeletons. The surgeon accompanying the expedition had committed suicide.

For a while it looked as though the *Bear's* career was over. Not long after her return from the Greely rescue, she was declared unfit for further service by the Navy. Then in 1885, she was transferred to the Treasury Department for use in Alaskan waters and the Arctic Ocean. That was the beginning of a 41-year career on the Alaskan patrol which has yet to be surpassed.

Her first skipper on patrol, was colorful "Hell Roarin'" Mike Healy, a dynamo of a man with an unpredictable temper. But Healy was a good skipper, and he commanded the *Bear* for more than 9 years, longer than any other. In time, Healy and his ship became legend in the lusty, brawling territory of Alaska.

The *Bear's* duties on the Alaskan patrol were many. She carried mail which had accumulated at Seattle during the winter, as well as Government agents and supplies. On her trip south from Alaska, she transported Federal prisoners and other questionable characters whose presence in Alaska was undesirable.

The deck of the *Bear* often served as a court where justice was dispensed swiftly but fairly. The *Bear* also conducted investigations, undertook crime prevention and law enforcement. She and other cutters like her were often the only law in that turbulent part of the world. The *Bear* also conducted soundings to improve charts of Alaskan waters, and her surgeon furnished medical attention and surgery to natives, prospectors, missionaries, and whalers. These duties are still part of today's Bering Sea patrol.

Not the least of Healy's accomplishments was the importation of reindeer from Siberia to provide food for the natives who were never free of the threat of famine. As Healy reasoned it, the reindeer would also be an excellent source of clothing and transportation. The wisdom of this measure was dramatically proved a few years later during the famous overland trek to save marooned whalers near Point Barrow.

Of all the *Bear's* exploits, none has captured the public imagination more than her overland rescue of 1897. It was in the fall of that year that Captain Tuttle, the *Bear's* new commander, learned that 8 whaling vessels and their crews, totaling about 275 men, were trapped in the icepack off remote Point Barrow, Alaska.

The *Bear* had only recently returned from her patrol duties, but at the order of the Secretary of the Treasury, she prepared to go to the rescue. This was the first time that an Arctic voyage was attempted during the winter season.

By December 14, 1897, it was clear that the *Bear* had come as far north as she could go. Approximately 85 miles off Cape Nome, the ice was so thick that she was forced to turn back. But before she returned, the *Bear* landed an overland party on Nelson Island, near Cape Vancouver. It consisted of 1st Lt. D. H. Jarvis, 2d Lt. E. P. Berthold, and Surgeon S. J. Call, all of the Revenue Cutter Service.

Equipped with dog teams, sleds, and guides, Jarvis and his companions set out for Point Barrow. Before them lay a 1,600 mile journey through frozen, trackless wilderness. But the "overland expedition for the relief of the whalers in the Arctic Ocean" as it was ponderously called, became one of the great epics of the north.

During the exhausting journey, Jarvis and Call collected a herd of nearly 450 reindeer. Driving the herd ahead of them in the face of icy winds the party reached Point Barrow about 3½ months after being put ashore by the *Bear*. To the despairing whalers, the arrival of the relief party was nothing short of a miracle. Healy's foresight had paid off.

The *Bear* which had been read out of service in 1885 was still around in 1917 when the United States entered World War I. For the duration of the war she served with the U.S. Navy. This, however, did not change her routine patrol of Alaskan waters.

In 1929 the *Bear* was decommissioned and turned over to the city of Oakland, Calif., for use as a maritime museum. It was at this time that she served as the set for the filming of Jack London's "Sea Wolf."

The *Bear* was getting on now, but there was still some great moments ahead for the stout old ship. In the early 1930's, the famed Arctic explorer, Adm. Richard E. Byrd, was looking for a vessel suitable for operating in the ice in his second Antarctic expedition. Hearing that the *Bear* was available, he opened negotiations with officials of the City of Oakland, Calif., where the vesel had been serving as a marine museum. The bargain was concluded for the incredibly low price of $1,050—one of the best buys in history. An entry in her log for June 19, 1932, reveals that she was en route to Boston for overhaul and refitting with a volunteer crew aboard.

Refitting completed, the *Bear*, on September 25, 1933 left Boston under the command of Lt. (jg.) Robert A. J. English, U.S. Navy. After a rugged trip, she reached the Bay of Whales and Little America in the latter part of January 1934.

Once again in the U.S. Antarctic expedition of 1939–41, Admiral Byrd called upon the Bear's services. This time, however, her boiler and engine were taken out and a modern diesel drive installed. Her auxiliary equipment was electrified. By May 16, 1941, she had completed her work in the Antarctic and was back at Boston.

By this time, the shadow of World War II was already stretching over the United States. In 1941, shortly after her return from the Antarctic, the *Bear* was assigned to the Greenland Patrol operated by the U.S. Coast Guard. She took part in the capture of the Norweigian trawler *Buskoe* which had been fitted out by the Germans to transmit weather reports and information on Allied ship movements.

The *Bear's* days of active service were now drawing rapidly to a close. In June, 1944 she was stricken from the Navy list of active vessels and turned over to the Maritime Commission for sale.

A Canadian steamship company purchased her in 1948 with the intention of converting her to her former role as a sealing vessel. But before this could be accomplished, the price of seal oil and skins dropped, and all work on her was stopped.

For a while it seemed as though the *Bear* were doomed to end her days in obscurity on a Nova Scotia beach. She was spared this fate by Mr. Alfred M. Johnston of Villanova, Pa., who purchased her for eventual use as a commercial museum and restaurant near Philadelphia, Pa. The end came for the *Bear* as she was being towed to Philadelphia. Apparently, her old timbers were no longer strong enough to withstand the vicious battering of the North Atlantic.

Now the *Bear* lies in her final resting place at the bottom of the Atlantic. After a legendary career, spanning several generations, she has at last found peace. But to all men who are interested in the lore of the sea, she will remain a shining symbol of courage. Her story will continue to be told as long as men sail the seas.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT PURCHASES OF A PROSPECTIVE 13- TO 41-YEAR SUPPLY OF ELECTRIC LAMPS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the question is often asked how it is that dealers handling surplus Government material always seem to have an adequate supply.

The answer is very simple. The procurement officers of the Defense Department and certain other agencies of the Government, either through stupidity or indifference to the cost of the taxpayers, make no effort to relate their purchases to the actual needs of the Government.

The Comptroller General has on repeated occasions called our attention to specific examples or overprocurement, and now in another report to the Congress dated March 21, he cites another glaring example. While the dollar volume in this specific example is not as large as in some of the others, nevertheless the pattern is the same.

In this report he calls attention to the fact that the Defense Department had purchased 670,000 electric lamps over and above its requirements. In some instances this represented a prospective 41-year supply. He also cites that the supply management costs of this excess inventory could be reduced by $1.2 million annually and that the inventory could be reduced by at least $5.5 million by the simple process of those responsible exercising some good commonsense in procurement.

The specific examples cited in this report were as follows:

First. In the Engineer Maintenance Center—EMC—Columbus, Ohio, this depot had on hand 63,662 incandescent lamps with a unit price of 22 cents each, or a total value of $14,006. Based on the use for fiscal year 1961 this quantity represented a 14-year supply for a lamp which was available for procurement in the local area on 3-day delivery.

Second. At the Yards and Docks Supply Office—YDSO—Port Hueneme, Calif., this depot had on hand 312,119 lamps with a unit price of 8 cents each, or a total value of $25,000. Based on the use of this particular lamp in fiscal 1961 this inventory represented a 13-year supply. In December 1961 the depot records showed they had declared 94,044 of these lamps as surplus. This particular bulb was easily available in the local area on a notice of a couple of days.

Third. Rome Air Materiel Area—Roama—Rome, N.Y., this depot had 21,400 incandescent lamps with a unit price of $3.15 each, or a total value of $67,410. Their records showed all these lamps to be excess to established retention levels. Based on their fiscal year 1961 use this represented a 41-year supply for a lamp which was readily available for delivery in the area within 1 to 30 days. The General Accounting Office reported that some of this excess material had been donated for various public activities and that some were being offered to the various States in order to get rid of them.

When the General Accounting Office called this to the attention of the Defense Department it gave its usual shopworn answer, "We will do better the next time." But for 16 years it has been my experience that the next time never arrives.

I suggest that the Secretary of Defense take the same action toward these incompetent procurement officers that he would take were he in private industry and the same situation were to develop; namely, replace them.

THE FRIARS: RHODE ISLAND'S GREATEST EXPORT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, America loves clean sport. The whole land loves physical fitness. Couple this with the expertness tested in the team competition of dazzling basketball—and no wonder the Nation adores the healthy rivalry of college against college.

The State of Rhode Island loves that type of basketball with a fervor that is practically a fever. And Providence College and its basketball team can be blamed—or blessed—for much of that love affair.

Last Saturday, March 23, 1963, a great part of Rhode Island moved into New York City, crowded into Madison Square Garden, until the count of 18,499 spectators made a sold-out record, first in the history of the National Invitation Tournament matinee games.

The Rhode Islanders who could not get in—and the Rhode Islanders who had to stay home—moved closer to their television sets as the clock crept around to 4 in the afternoon. Millions of eyes were on the alert in every corner of the country.

Providence College basketball was on the air.

This was the Providence College team that last played in the Garden on January 31. The day they beat Dayton. From that date they moved on with nary a loss—15 straight victories.

Not in all its history has a team piled up such a record on the way to the National Invitation Tournament Championship.

Providence crowned it all with this final triumph over Canisius—valiant, splendid Canisius—a worthy foe.

The tournaments reveal no record superior to that of Providence College—champion twice, finalist three times, semifinalist once in this 5-year stretch.

Three times in the past 4 years, the team has carried away the award for the most valuable player.

In 1960, it was Len Wilkens. Today you see him with St. Louis Hawks. In 1961 it was little Vin Ernst, then a sophomore and a 5-foot-8 ball of fire. This year it was Ray Flynn, captain of the Friars.

"Friars" is the affectionate title of these boys who play for Providence College in the time they are not in classes under the Dominican Fathers. The very title is a tribute to the Order of Preachers whose goal is a soul of character in sound mind and sound body.

It is a tribute to the school and scholars and players that the people of Rhode Island have taken them into their hearts. This is not so much for the scores—as for the sportsmanship. It is not so much for the "wins" as for the winning ways of these young Americans giving their finest and their fairest in their teamwork for their common cause.

Sunday afternoon the team came home. Rhode Island moved out to the State line to meet them. It is not far from our capital to "Little Rhody's" State line—but it was just 20 miles of terrific welcome.

For miles along the highway the festive cars were waiting, parked bumper to bumper. For the college bus they formed one happy escort to Providence City Hall where thousands had waited for hours to see their favorite flashers "in the flesh."

Retreating to the college campus, the scene defied description.

Here was home.

There would be a trace of a tear to reflect that this was the end of triumph trail for Vinnie Ernst and Ray Fynnn. But let the future take care of itself. This was the proud present and the buildings of Providence College rocked and reechoed with that pride.

One did not have to belong to Providence College to possess it. For the moment, Providence College belonged to everyone. In just those terms of appreciation spoke the Very Reverend Vincent C. Dore, O.P., president of Providence College, with a pride equal to that of Coach Joe Mullaney, to whom goes so much of the credit for the team's performance year after year. By the way, Joe Mullaney was named "Coach of the Year" in the major college division by the Basketball Writers Association of Boston. They echo the praise of the press of the country.

Naturally Rhode Island sports writers went all out for this fantastic team and its sensational season. The pages of pictures and stories will be treasured heirlooms in Rhode Island homes; but I would like to select the after-game dressing room glimpse by John Hanlon of the Providence Journal to sum up the drama of a day to be remembered.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Greatest Rhode Island Export Right Now: the Friars

(By John Hanlon)

New York.—Coach Joe Mullaney, the National Invitation Tournament's trophy cradled under his arm, was first back to the Providence College dressing room.

Alone for a few moments, awaiting his champions' entrance, he paced the floor speaking words such as "fantastic," or, "wonderful," and also a couple of exhausted "Oh, boys." Then he put it all in one sentence.

"We played great," he said, "because we had five most valuable players out there."

That, precisely, was the gist of it yesterday afternoon, here at a soldout Madison Square Garden, against Canisius in the National Invitation Tournament final. Five invaluable young men welded into one great team.

As such, the Friars chopped down Canisius, 81 to 66, with, for them, unaccustomed ease and now have another National Invitation Tournament championship banner to go on the wall at Alumni Hall. It will look better with two. The present one puts the hall out of balance.

The formal and official most valuable player honor went, of course, to Capt. Ray Flynn, and it was completely deserved. But he would be the first to agree with his coach that the other four owned a piece of it, as well.

There was Vinnie Ernst, making those knife-like passes, setting up the scores. There was John Thompson, hauling in the rebounds, maneuvering the ball on attack. There was Bob Kovalski, sinking vital points in the first half when the usual shooters were off, rebounding like an octopus in the second half when he was switched under the basket on defense. And the amazing Jim Stone.

"We give Jim the ball," said Mullaney, "and he creates his own plays."

"Stone," Barney Madden remarked after Jim had twisted one in, "should volunteer for the submarine corps. There's no one who can accomplish so much in so small a space."

These were the five, and they had the title put away almost from the start. For a time, it seemed they couldn't break the four-point barrier. But near the end of the first half, the machine got going and, by midpoint in the second period, it was a venture decided. With some 2 minutes to play, Mullaney even permitted himself to lean back on the bench and enjoy what was happening.

"A short game for you, compared to some," a man remarked to the coach.

"Yes," Joe said, "but earlier I almost fainted."

Mullaney took out the first team with some 90 seconds remaining. When Thompson got to the bench, he clasped Ernst in a great bear hug and lifted him off the floor. When Vinnie got down, he gave Mullaney's head a congratulatory rub. Friar students chanted, "We're No. 1," and there were few doubters.

When the winners got to their quarters, they behaved with championship calm. Pleased, proud—yes. But it was obvious it came as no great surprise.

"Was this team," a man asked Flynn, "as good as the one you won here with in your sophomore year?"

"This team," Ray said with emphasis, "is the best team in the country."

Reporters took down the words, but Ray had more.

"Is there any way you can arrange for us to play Cincinnati?" he asked, half smiling now. "If you can, we'd fill the place, and I'd sell the tickets myself."

He would have a good thing going for him, for the 1962–63 Friars have accomplished much and this was the climax.

And more, overall.

In five tournaments, three finals—two championships—three most valuable players—biggest afternoon crowd in 26 years—the loudest, happiest rooters.

Right now, the Friars are Rhode Island's greatest export.

AID TO BRAZIL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, there came to my desk today a communication issued by Mr. D. E. Bell of the Department of State. In it Mr. Bell recites the correspondence which took place between the Brazilian Government and our Government in connection with the search for aid made by Brazil.

We have pledged our support, in the form of aid for Brazil, in the sum of $398.5 million. Certain conditions, supposedly, are to be attached to the giving of that aid. I should like to list some of them.

First. The Brazilian Government has committed itself to the adoption of a tax reform program which will increase revenues by about 25 percent and which will provide the foundation for important administrative improvements in tax collections. We are to give nearly $400 million to Brazil under the condition that Brazil will increase its revenues by increasing its taxes. In the United States we contemplate improving our tax system by increasing spending and reduced taxing. I cannot see how the two courses are compatible.

Second. The Brazilian Government promised the elimination of subsidies on wheat and petroleum products, so as to reduce the cash deficit of the treasury and free resources for development purposes. We have exacted from Brazil the commitment that it will reduce subsidies. In the United States we are to enter into a subsidy program on mass transportation which will cost at least $5 billion in the next 10 years.

Third. The Brazilian Government suffered the exaction of the promise that there be an increase imposed by the Government on railroad freight and passenger rates, with the view of reducing operating deficits. In the United States the Federal Government, working in collaboration with a transit system in Massachusetts, has sent $3.6 million to the transit board in Massachusetts, which, matched with $1.8 million of Massachusetts money, is to be used to subsidize passengers so as to take them off the highways and put them in the trains.

I was shocked the other day when in testimony it was revealed that the Boston & Maine Railroad reduced passenger rates from $1.99 to $1.10 a person.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bayh in the chair). The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 2 more minutes, Mr. President?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator. With that reduction of 89 cents in the fare charged by the Boston & Maine, 7,000 more passengers used the Boston & Maine Railroad, allegedly leaving their automobiles at home. But then it was disclosed that, in order to induce those 7,000 persons to use the train, the Government had to pay a dollar of subsidy on each ticket. The fare was reduced from $1.99 to $1.10. With such a reduction, of course, there was an increased number of passengers.

So again we have a paradox: In Brazil we tell them, "increase your freight and passenger rates"; in the United States the Federal Government is beginning to contribute money for the purpose of reducing rates so as to induce people to leave the highways and ride the trains. Other conditions have been imposed, allegedly insuring that Brazil will stabilize its currency and thus be able to maintain its own economy.

A few days ago Mr. Per Jacobsson, head of the International Monetary Fund, made a speech about the growth in the Common Market nations of Europe and Japan. We in the United States are complaining because our economic growth is not adequate. Mr. Jacobsson made this statement:

> Looking back through history, the countries who have maintained relatively stable monetary conditions, so that people know they are dealing with a sound currency, have derived distinct advantages from such an achievement. Confidence in currency is a plant of slow growth.

Mr. Jacobsson further went on to point out that Japan and West Germany were the first to enjoy a resurrection of their economy. West Germany and Japan were the first to adopt sound fiscal and monetary policies. Subsequently Italy followed, and then France, trying to live within their budgets. And they are now enjoying unprecedented growth.

What we are telling the people of the world to do—and now this applies especially to Brazil—we are not doing back home. Federal expenditures have risen by $17 billion in 3 years. The budget this year will be in deficiency by $10,800 million, if all works out to the best advantage. If it does not, the deficit is likely to rise $15 billion.

So I say when we tell Brazil and other nations what to do concerning their monetary and fiscal policies, we had better take a look in the mirror and see what our image is and see whether or not we should not follow what we are telling others to do.

HUNGARIAN LIBERATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on March 21 it was learned that Premier Kadar had issued an amnesty order in Hungary covering a wide variety of political crimes. It is reported that amnesty will be given to those who took part in the Hungarian revolution of 1956. Persons convicted of espionage or treason do not come under the amnesty, and they will be required to apply individually.

While this order may raise some degree of hope, there remains considerable apprehension among the enslaved nations that the extremely serious reverses which occurred under the effects of Stalin's personality during and after World War II may be repeated under Khrushchev's personality.

Mr. President, in the brief remarks that I made on the floor of the Senate on August 11, 1962, I expressed my grave fear that the Hungarian problem would not be given full consideration at the 17th General Assembly of the United Nations. The fear expressed at that time has now become a fact.

As for the United States, the final abandonment of American efforts even to seek justice for Hungary through the United Nations would constitute a long step toward the fulfillment of Khrushchev's main purpose, which is to conquer the West by destroying faith in the steadfastness of the United States.

The Hungarian problem should be a must for full consideration by the United Nations General Assembly, which will convene in its 18th session September 16, 1963. The main orders issued by the United Nations in 1956 and 1957 have not been fulfilled and it now appears they will not be.

Mr. President, on December 31, 1962, the Committee for Hungarian Liberation issued a memorandum signed by its executive vice president, Gen. Julius Kovacs, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Committee for Hungarian
Liberation, Inc.,
Cleveland, Ohio, December 31, 1962.

It is with understandable disappointment that the Hungarians living in the free world received knowledge of the fact that the United States made the recommendation to revoke the authority vested in Sir Leslie Munro in the matter of the "question of Hungary." It becomes even more difficult to understand this recommendation when it is considered that Moscow and the Moscow-run government of Budapest have done nothing to satisfy the resolutions passed by the United Nations in 1956 and later. It is absolutely certain that it is the Russian Red army which kept the Kadar puppet government in power in Hungary. As a result, human rights and national independence do not exist as far as the Hungarian people are concerned. The only change which has taken place in Hungary is the improvement of the Communist propaganda techniques aimed at the free west and elsewhere.

The Hungarian people the world over clearly see the consequence of the revocation of the authority of Sir Leslie Munro. There will be no more discussions in the United Nations concerning the brutal and colonialistic suppression of the Hungarian people. It appears to many as the final burial of the international significance of the Hungarian question. The Hungarian freedom fight is no longer a moral and political weapon in the hands of the free nations. It will appear to eastern and central Europe and the Balkans and the suppressed nationalities of the Soviet Union as proof that individual rights and national independence from 1962 forward, will be measured in terms of double standards. It further appears as a silent acceptance of the status quo.

In view of the above, hope for the liberation of the enslaved nations will diminish. At the same time the power of the Soviet Union and its puppet governments will be increased. In the eyes of the enslaved nations there has been decline in the moral reputation of the western peoples. Furthermore, this recommendation will in no way improve the spirit of resistance to Communist slavery among the enslaved peoples.

It is understandable that the enslaved nations are deeply disturbed because the champion of freedom, the United States, made the recommendation, and the protector of small nations, the United Nations, accepted it. The explanation made by U.S. Representative Rowan has not alleviated the unfortunate impression. The transfer of the Hungarian question to the personal authority of the U.N. Secretary General is not comforting, since specific instructions were not provided.

Small nations under these circumstances again are experiencing two great powers taking steps toward agreements without raising the Iron Curtain. The struggles toward liberation and freedom of the small nations which have fallen into an unfortunate sphere of influence became nothing more than sacrificial offerings. Yet, these peoples have been required to sacrifice immeasurably as a result of arrangements made at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Not only did they lose human rights and national liberties, unnumbered millions have lived through the anguish of elimination of free speech, fear, want, and death by torture.

The enslaved nations and the Hungarian people would like to believe that this step was taken as a tactical necessity. They would like to believe that the free west has not abandoned those principles which form the foundation of individual and national existence in the free world. For these reasons we respectfully ask you:

1. That the free nations do not support any action to minimize the significance of the U.N. resolution concerning Hungary, or that these resolutions be stricken from the record with their silent consent.

2. That the free nations refuse to recognize the representative of the Russian puppet government of Hungary, Kadar's government.

3. That the United States of America give recognition to the Russian colonial rulers in Budapest as being the legitimate Government of Hungary by establishing diplomatic relations with it.

4. That the free nations exercise in the United Nations the same energy and sincerity for demanding the disintegration and abolition of the eastern slave empire, as the United States of America have exercised in demanding the freedom of the Asian and African colonies.

The people living under international or national communism still consider communism as an institution which does not recognize moral codes or political boundaries and an international menace just as under Stalin. They draw these conclusions from personal experience. Today as well as under Stalin, they are living under a complete dictatorship. Behind this dictatorship stands the powerful Red army. The happy and free nations living at a safe distance are in no position to clearly understand the true nature of that slave system.

The enslaved peoples cannot share the optimistic views which were implied in a talk given by Secretary General of the U.N., U Thant on December 2, 1962, or by Mr. Ball, Under Secretary of State, in New York on December 13, 1962. In the service of a principle, it does not make much of a difference who the individual is and who holds the flag. There is no difference in the purpose of office whether it is filled by Stalin or Khrushchev.

The experienced people of the enslaved nations watched the Cuban developments with critical awareness. The result of the Cuban situation was not one of victory of the principles of the free West over that of communism, because this never developed into an issue. It was primarily a victory of the United States of America over the Soviet Union in the area of power politics. The Communist ideology and the way of life it represents never was threatened during the critical period.

There is considerable apprehension among the enslaved nations that the extremely serious reverses which occurred under the effects of Stalin's personality during and after World War II will be repeated now under Khrushchev's personality. Because of an error in the interpretations of Stalin's intentions, very grievous errors were made with reference to the small nations and consequently to the entire world. Not only over 200 million people were tossed into slavery, but the present cold war is a direct consequence.

Authorized by the member and cooperating organizations, societies, groups, and branches in the United States of America, Canada, South America, and Europe.

Julius Kovacs,
Executive Vice President.

GREEK EMBARGO ON SHIPMENTS TO CUBA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Embassy of Greece in Washington on March 16, 1963, announced that a royal decree out of Athens has banned all vessels under the Greek flag from carrying any kind of cargo to Cuban ports.

Under the order one exception was made protecting the agreements executed by the shipowners under time-charter contracts prior to the issuance of the March 16 order.

The decree issued by the royal Government of Greece is reflective of the ancient purpose of the Greek people to stand by the cause of freedom.

The Greeks, in banning all vessels under the Greek flag from carrying any kind of cargo to Cuban ports, have taken a position indicating their purpose to serve freedom by giving to and not taking from it. The industry of the Greek mercantile marine, by abiding to the royal decree banning all vessels under Greek flag from carrying any kind of cargo to Cuban ports, has demonstrated its unselfish purpose to occupy a position in the vanguard of people fighting communism.

Little Greece is trying to tell the great United States that we should be firm, unyielding in the purpose of removing communism from Central and Southern America. It knows the methods of communism because of painful experience.

We rose to our greatest heights last October 22 when the President of the United States declared firmly our purpose not to tolerate communism in the Americas. We have fallen basely to dishonorable levels since October 22 by the toleration in Cuba and in other Western American countries of Communist subversion, infiltration, and sabotage.

Our Nation should enlist the aid of every country possible—especially those to which we have been generous in granting aid—to impose sanctions on international water carriers which carry cargoes either into or out of Cuba, banning them the right to enter the ports of the sanctioning nations.

Mr. MONRONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for comment on this same subject discussed by the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Ohio just mentioned shipping to Cuba. Since January, and even since last fall, I have been putting in the Record, week by week, as I get the reports, a list of the ships that call at Communist Cuba. The Record shows the information I have placed in it. I have the latest figures available.

I mentioned the Greek order last week. It was a courageous order on the part of Greece, but it had an escape clause in it in which they suggested they would have no control over ships carrying the Greek flag which were chartered. The Greek Government went as far as it could. I appreciate that. We are hopeful all free nations will go even further.

In view of the remarks of the Senator from Ohio, with which I thoroughly agree, and in keeping with my practice to advise the Senate of free world shipping to Communist Cuba, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues that during a 2-week period from March 8, 1963, through March 22, 1963, 11 free world ships, totaling 84,920 gross tons called in Cuban ports delivering supplies to bulwark the intrusion of communism in this hemisphere. Combined tanker tonnage of 40,684 gross tons in ships flying British and Italian flags delivered more badly wanted petroleum products. The names of the ships, their flag of registry, and tonnage are as follows:

Athelduke (tanker), British, 9,089.
Athelsultan (tanker), British, 9,149.
Bytom, Polish, 5,967.
Benny Viking, Norwegian, 3,857.
Castillo Ampudia, Spanish, 3,566.
Himmerland, Danish, 8,774.
Linda Giovanna (tanker), Italian, 9,985.
North Empress, Greek, 10,904.
Pamit, Greek, 3,929.
San Nicola (tanker), Italian, 12,461.
Seirios, Greek, 7,239.

Mr. President, if we look at the Record for January 9 it will be found that the real offenders in this matter have been the British and the Greeks; but the Greeks have taken some moves to do something about it. I do not know what the British have done.

I have a list of the ships before me. Here is a British tanker. Another British tanker. A Norwegian ship of 3,800 tons. A Polish ship. Of course, we expect the Communist bloc ships to go to Cuba. Here is a new one, a Spanish-flag ship. A Danish ship. An Italian ship. A Greek ship. A Greek ship. A Greek ship——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What have Yugoslavia and Poland done?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yugoslav shipping was quite prominent in all the reports I placed in the Record. I put that information in the Record. But as of June or August last, before all the trouble happened, Yugoslavia sent five ships on seven trips to Cuba. The percentages of ships going into Cuba at that time were 25 percent Greek, 13 percent British, 12 percent German, 9 percent Norwegian, and approximately 4 percent Yugoslav.

The West Germans first issued a strict order, following the Cuban crisis, and have lived up to it so far as we have been informed. The Norwegians have said they will cooperate as best they can, but that they have no control over their chartered ships. The Greeks have taken a move. I am hopeful the British Government will do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to continue for 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The situation the Senator has referred to covered the period before October 22. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have put in the Record a list relating to prior to the October incident, and I have been putting information in the Record approximately every 2 weeks right up to date.

I have here the names of the ships that were involved between March 8 and March 22 of this year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad that the Senator has contributed that information in connection with the remarks I made, because we are in agreement that our allies throughout the world, as well as Yugoslavia and Poland, whose Communist governments are the recipients of our aid and our charity, ought at this point to recognize that they owe something to us and not be giving sustenance to Cuba. I appreciate the Senator's remark.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In all fairness I should say that although many of these countries do not have a merchant fleet comparable in size with those of the countries about which we have been reading, so far as I can ascertain, since October there have been practically no South American countries involved, although there have been some pan-American ships, or ships flying the Panamanian flag. I do not know of any country that is more deserving of our friendship, and whose problems we should view sympathetically, than Panama. Some of these ships have been to Communist Chinese ports. Of course, all of them pass through the Panama Canal. This list is dropping steadily. However, I do believe that we ought to applaud Greece for attempting to do something about it.

A PROPOSED RULE OF GERMANENESS AND OTHER PROPOSALS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 89 was submitted to the Senate on February 19, 1963, by the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore]. This resolution would amend rule 8 of the Standing Rules of the Senate to provide that a rule of germaneness be applied during the 4-hour period after the morning hour is concluded. When this resolution was presented to the Senate, the principal author, the Senator from Rhode Island, yielded the floor to me and I stated at that time that I would like to be a cosponsor. However, I find that this request was not acknowledged by the Chair at that time, and I am not now listed as one of the 30 coauthors of this very important and desirable proposal. Therefore, at this time I ask unanimous consent that I be listed as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 89.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Presiding Officer.

This resolution, Senate Resolution 89, has been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. Among its most enthusiastic supporters are several members of the ad hoc Committee for the Expeditious Handling of Senate Business. This committee was appointed by the majority leader, acting as chairman of the Democratic conference, on January 9, the opening day of this session. It has since held a number of informal conferences and has met with representatives of a similar ad hoc committee appointed at a meeting of the Republican conference on opening day.

The discussions which have been held during these past few weeks have clearly emphasized the need for immediate action on Senate Resolution 89, and also for consideration as soon as possible of another resolution, Senate Resolution 111, which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] submitted on March 14. Joining Senator Church as coauthors of Senate Resolution 111 were Senators Anderson, McGee, Pastore, and myself. It would amend rule 15 of the standing rules of the Senate, which now prohibits meetings of standing committees of the Senate while the Senate is in session, without special leave. It proposes to amend that provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 on which rule 15 is based. A committee would then require special leave of the Senate only in those instances when it desires to sit after the conclusion of the morning hour, or after the Senate has proceeded to the consideration of unfinished business.

All of us are well aware of the increasing volume of critical commentaries regarding the present pace of congressional activities. Much of the criticism along this line has been unjustified. I am convinced that Members of the Senate are working harder than they have ever worked before. The start of committee work was delayed this year by the debate on the proposed change of rule 22, but since that matter was disposed of, committee work has accelerated.

The two resolutions to which I have referred would permit an immediate acceleration of work on the floor of the Senate at a time when an overwhelming workload lies ahead.

The ad hoc committee named by the Democratic conference held one joint session with its equivalent group from the Republican conference. The joint group reached a consensus on a holiday recess schedule which was adopted insofar as Lincoln's Birthday and Washington's Birthday were concerned. According to the consensus, forthcoming recess schedules would be along these general lines:

First. Easter: Recess Thursday, April 11, through Friday, April 19.

Second. Memorial Day: Recess Monday, May 27, through Friday, May 31.

Third. July 4: Recess Wednesday, July 3, through Friday, July 5.

The ad hoc committee, in keeping with the instructions of the majority leader at the time it was organized, has also taken affirmative action concerning a proposed summer recess starting at the close of business Friday, August 16, and extending through Monday, September 2. The members of the ad hoc committee reported on these matters to Senator Mansfield on March 5 with the suggestion that the leadership of the Senate consult with the leaders of the House of Representatives in an effort to firm up a program of work for both Houses during the last 2 weeks of August. Many Members of both the Senate and the House have advocated the 2-week recess in August in the belief that an overall improvement in attendance and in the rate of legislative activity would result. Several Members favoring this late summer recess want to have an opportunity to return home for that period in order to consult with their constituents before the final crucial weeks of the session. Others see the recess as an opportunity to enjoy vacations with their school-age children, who in past years have been back in the classroom before sine die adjournment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the pros and cons of the summer recess will have to be considered eventually from the standpoint of the amount of work which we are able to complete during the immediate months ahead. Now is the time for us to do something about this scheduling problem if we are to avoid another long and wearying extension of our work into the autumn or beyond. The people of the United States, by and large, cannot understand why it is necessary for the sessions of Congress to grow longer and longer. When the Legislative Reorganization was passed in 1946, the Congress went on record as saying that its work should be completed no later than July 31 each year. The Members who passed that bill were convinced that their mission could be accomplished each year before July 31. More and more, Members of Congress, in my opinion, are becoming concerned with our present scheduling. The July 31 deadline seemed reasonable in 1946. Have our problems and our responsibilities become so much more difficult and complex that we must now stay in session into the autumn or later? Are we unwilling to face up to the possibility that millions of Americans do not believe we are moving as fast as we should?

In 1945 and 1946, the Congress, through honest and diligent discussion, agreed upon changes in procedure which have made it possible for us to deal with the more complex problems of government in an era when the course of human events constantly grows in diversity and complexity.

Simple tools are available to us now to increase our horsepower to give us a faster getaway. The ad hoc Committee on the Expeditious Handling of Senate Business has three principal objectives.

First. To schedule as far in advance as possible the periods when no votes of record will occur, so that we can avoid the random and uncertain holiday recess practices which have worked hardships on the Members of the Senate in the past. Stated recess schedules limiting the duration of these periods when Members can schedule conferences and speeches in their home States and be absent from Washington will work to the benefit of all Members and can expedite Senate action, as well. Too often in the past important votes have been delayed through the absence of one or two Members. Too often these absences resulted from ambiguity and misunderstandings regarding the schedule of work here on the floor. If we are to improve our scheduling, we must necessarily adopt the policy of refusing to delay votes due to individual absences. This will be fair when recess and holiday schedules are clearly stated and clearly understood in advance by the Members.

Second. The rule of germaneness, as Senator Pastore has pointed out, would enable Senators to know that for 4 hours after the conclusion of the morning hour the subject matter under discussion on the floor of the Senate would be germane to the pending business. It is that simple. At all other times, both before the period of germaneness and afterward, Senators would have ample time to discuss any and all topics. We will be able to talk early and to talk late, but we would reserve the middle of our legislative day for the specific business at hand.

Third. Senate Resolution 111 should have a fair trial. It likewise will do no violence to the existing privileges of all Senators. It would revise rule 15 to permit committees to continue working through the morning hour if they so desire. It would keep in force the present rule which requires unanimous consent for committees to meet once the morning hour is concluded.

The ad hoc committee urgently seeks expeditious consideration of this proposal, along with the recommended rule of germaneness. We are all fully aware of the very heavy burdens now carried by Senators. Most of us are faced with an increasing volume of legislation and other work. Adoption of these two rules changes, perhaps on an experimental basis, will demonstrate our willingness to undertake our additional workloads and our additional responsibilities in a positive and constructive and timely manner.

PROMOTION AND RETIREMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during the consideration last year of the appropriation bill for independent offices, the subcommittee inaugurated a rule which we hoped would be helpful, if not almost mandatory, to some of the departments and agencies in stopping the rise of employment in the departmental divisions of the Government. The administration can do much in this field. One proposal was made which was used to some advantage to the Committee on Appropriations and, I believe, to the departments and independent offices in the administration.

We found that when an employee retired, at one end of the ladder—we do not know for certain how many persons will retire in a given year—the agency used that amount of money to hire two employees in the lower grades. This added to the employment and, of course, demonstrated what Dr. Parkinson has long held, and which has become known as Parkinson's law. This proposal received some publicity, and some departments and independent agencies have been carrying it out.

Last December 4, the Wenatchee, Wash., Daily World published an editorial entitled "Parkinson's Law—Little Known But Easily Believed." The editorial resulted in a letter being sent to me by the U.S. Department of the Interior, Geological Survey. The letter reads:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY, WATER RESOURCES DIVISION, SURFACE WATER BRANCH.
Tacoma, Wash., February 4, 1963.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: I thought you may not have seen the Wenatchee Daily World editorial of December 4, 1962, concerning some statements attributed to you on the subject of Federal employees and payrolls. A print of it is enclosed.

Some other agencies may do as you say but the Geological Survey would seem to me to be an exception. According to my 38 years of experience I am confident that, generally

speaking, one retirement in our agency results in the promotion of several lower employees and the hiring of only one new person. I thought you might find this information helpful.

Sincerely yours,
F. M. VEATCH,
District Engineer.

I say to Mr. Veatch: It is not only helpful, but also refreshing, to Congress and the administration to learn that such a practice is not followed in the Geological Survey.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the editorial of December 4, 1962, which was published in the Wenatchee Daily World.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PARKINSON'S LAW—LITTLE KNOWN BUT EASILY BELIEVED

At a committee hearing this fall, Senator Magnuson discussed a fact of Government employment that most people probably didn't know about, but won't have much trouble believing.

It was something known as Parkinson's law—that each time a Government employee quits or retires, two others are hired to replace him.

Magnuson explained it this way:

A $14,000 a year career employee retires. The man below him moves into his job. Now, there's an unexpended appropriation that had been budgeted for the man who retired.

No Government bureau ever likes to end its year without spending all the money made available to it, for fear the next time its full request won't be met. So, instead of hiring one man at the bottom and moving the rest up, the bureau has enough unexpended funds from the retirement to hire two or three new beginners.

This it does. These three men ultimately work up to higher salaries, eventually retire, and nine new beginners are hired. So it goes.

Magnuson pointed out that 50,000 career Government employees retire each year. But instead of the total payroll remaining the same, it constantly grows.

The Senator recommended that only one man should be hired to replace an employee who had retired, and that reviews be conducted in all Government agencies after retirements to be sure that it does.

ATTEMPT BY SOVIET RUSSIA TO CONTROL THE OCEANS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, 3 years ago I stated that Soviet Russia, in her thirst to dominate the world, avidly is seeking to control the oceans.

Dominion over the oceans would give the Sino-Soviet bloc control of 90 percent of the earth's surface and enable Russia to imperil the remaining 10 percent with missiles fired from submarines hovering along the Continental Shelf.

Control of the oceans would permit Russia to fragmentize the free world alliance, cut the lifelines to the United States, and block the supply lines from the United States to our oversea allies.

At the time these remarks were made Soviet Russia's maritime activities were only beginning to be widely known and aroused little concern, possibly because of doubt they would be sustained. The popular concept then was—and to some extent still is—that Russia, traditionally a land power, would always so remain.

With the exception of Cuba, Communist land expansion during the past 3 years has been contained. Communist advances on the high seas, however, have continued almost unchallenged, and are constantly being accelerated.

This expansion of Soviet sea power is the theme of a forceful editorial in the March 1963 issue of Navy, official publication of the Navy League of the United States.

This editorial summarizes the four methods by which Russia is seeking to rule the waves and outlines Russia's tactical objectives and quotes both Adm. George W. Anderson, U.S. Chief of Naval Operations, and Fleet Adm. S. G. Gorshkov, of the Soviet Navy.

Mr. President, while we proceed with our program for the scientific conquest of space, we had better look to it also that our country is secure from ocean-based attack.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial entitled "The Growing Challenge at Sea," from the March issue of Navy, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE GROWING CHALLENGE AT SEA

There's a message—you may have seen it in this space before—that is now being read by an increasingly broader, but not yet decisive, section of Washington officialdom. It is this:

The Soviet Union has recognized, more than any other Russian regime in history, the importance of sea power and is daily doing more and more to build the force it needs to achieve a true breakout from its traditional continental fortress in Eurasia.

This Soviet interest in the world's oceans is a broad one. It covers the commercial (fishing and trade); the scientific (oceanography and Arctic and Antarctic exploration); the military (an increasingly powerful navy); and the diplomatic (the drive to obtain lodgments or friendly governments in strategic areas).

Curiously enough, the top uniformed men of the United States and Soviet Navies addressed themselves recently to the Red fleet and its growing importance. Adm. George W. Anderson, U.S. Chief of Naval Operations, sounded this warning in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee:

"I recognize that the Cuban situation was but one facet of an overall challenge which most assuredly will become greater in the future. We must improve our capability to meet it. If we do not do so, our country will be placed in jeopardy because of the rapidly increasing ability of our most formidable adversary to operate with greater intensity, purpose, and scope on the high seas.

"The U.S.S.R. is belatedly recognizing the importance of the seas and seaways. She obviously has come to understand that the extension of empire can be effective only if control of the seas is assured. Some of her more recent rollings of the waters are in areas which traditionally have been of great strategic importance in the maritime sense: in Cuba and Latin America, for instance, which cover the approaches to the Panama Canal; in Indonesia, the route between the Indian Ocean and the Pacific; and in Egypt, Yemen, and the Middle East, which control Suez and the Red Sea.

"These actions, when combined with the rapid expansion of her merchant fleet, the remarkable increase in the scope of the activities of her fishing fleet and her most effective use of oceanographic ships and trawlers in exploring the oceans and gathering intelligence, give us pause for reflection."

We would like to add to the CNO's warning and mention the increasing boldness of Soviet oceangoing submarines and long-range jet bombers which now have taken to buzzing (with impunity, sad to relate) our aircraft carriers in the Atlantic and Pacific.

We would mention, too, that the Red submarine fleet does not only carry a threat to our cities and bases in the United States—it reportedly has rockets with larger warheads than Polaris which can be fired 700 or more miles today and in time will reach out much farther. The Reds have armed some of their more than 400 submarines with deadly antiship rockets, which have ranges up to 200 miles. The threat these weapons pose for our surface fleet is self-evident.

Admiral of the Fleet S. G. Gorshkov, in an article in the publication, Red Star (see "Soviet Naval Notes" elsewhere in this issue for a translation) [not printed in Record], makes it clear that the Soviet Navy is winning increasing favor from the bosses in the Kremlin and that it is being given a greater role in the military plans of the U.S.S.R.

The Russians may exaggerate and even lie about certain aspects of their military prowess. But they have formidable scientific and technological resources and have shown on more than one occasion that they can produce some spectacular things when they concentrate their efforts. Their plumbing may not work well, their postage stamps may not stick, and perhaps they cannot produce enough shoes for their peasants. But they have built huge nuclear warheads and the rockets with which to deliver them. They have built atomic submarines and excellent surface-to-air missiles. And, of course, they produced their first atomic and first hydrogen bombs long before American experts said they would. Accordingly, when they make a claim in the military field, particularly if we have already demonstrated that we can do it, simple prudence would seem to dictate that we not rush to dispute it.

But we are more interested here in the statements made by Admiral Gorshkov in the Red Star article, after he told of "the radical rearmament of our navy and its equipment with qualitatively new submarine and surface ships armed with powerful and long-range rocket-nuclear weapons." He declared:

"By the creation of our new navy which is based on a nuclear power supply, rocket technology, and radioelectronics, an end has been put to the unchallenged domination of the oceans by the traditional maritime powers.

"Transoceanic strategists only have illusions when they hope that their communications and, what is more, their shores will be inaccessible to our navy in case of war. Today there are no invulnerable objectives on the continent just as there were no areas in the seas of the world where, in the course of combat operations, the enemy's ships would not be subject to the threat of destruction."

Discount the boasts and bombast in the Gorshkov article and you are still left with some sobering conclusions. One which seems particularly clear, when combined with what Admiral Anderson told the House committee, is this:

The Soviet Navy is bent upon challenging the U.S. Navy for control of the seas. We, as a nation, had better see about this and soon.

DAIRY RESEARCH IN STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement with respect to the vigorous dairy research which is taking place in many States of the Nation, especially in the State of Washington.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Washington has been exceptionally vigorous in dairy research, reflecting the importance of dairying to the State's agriculture. In 1960, for example, the dairy industry provided an $82 million income for Washington dairymen. This represented 14 percent of all the cash receipts from farm marketings that year.

The State of Washington has a long history of productive work on dairy feeding problems, and did much of the early pioneering work relating carotene in feed to vitamin A in milk. The new J. C. Knott Dairy Research Laboratory at Pullman should speed research along even further with its specialized laboratories and equipment for research and demonstration * * * modern facilities for 500 head of cattle * * * and up-to-date milking parlor. This half-million-dollar plant will certainly play a key role in keeping Washington one of the top dairy States in the Nation.

Currently, USDA and several States are investigating a wide variety of problems facing dairy farmers, processors, and marketers. Some of the research areas being investigated include:

Studies on physiology of reproduction and lactation and various aspects of artificial insemination—breeding studies to improve the performance of cattle so they will yield more and better quality milk, reproduce more efficiently, and live longer; nutritional studies of dairy animals to determine their needs for growth, reproduction, and lactation; methods of improving quality and shelf life of milk and dairy products; work to develop new kinds of dairy foods and new nonfood uses for milk constituents. And I have mentioned only a few.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN M. HURLEY BY LEGISLATURE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an extraordinary tribute recently paid to one of Washington's outstanding citizens. On the 6th of March, the Senate of the State of Washington unanimously adopted a resolution extending "sincere thanks, best wishes, and recognition of his fine services" to Mr. John M. Hurley. On the following day, a similar resolution was unanimously adopted by the Washington State House of Representatives.

John M. Hurley, known to many Washingtonians as "Jack," has been a friend to and servant of the people of his State and their representatives for many years. His efforts in behalf of better government and the promotion of the undying principles of Thomas Jefferson have been tireless. The honesty and dedication with which he has approached his tasks are examples to us all.

I know of no man who has been similarly honored by a seat on the rostum of the house of representatives of our State. And few men have received the standing ovation or the expression of good wishes which Mr. Hurley was given at that time.

Therefore, in recognition of the high esteem in which Jack Hurley is held by all of us who have worked for the State of Washington, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolutions honoring him be printed at this point in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
STATE OF WASHINGTON,
Olympia, Wash., March 8, 1963.
Mr. JOHN M. HURLEY,
Olympia, Wash.

DEAR JACK: It is an honor and a privilege for me to transmit the enclosed resolution, unanimously adopted by the house today.

I might add that as far back as I can remember you are the first member of the third house to ever be accorded the honor of a seat of honor on the rostrum, and the standing ovation you received came from the hearts of every member of the house, I know.

With best wishes to you always,

Sincerely,

S. R. HOLCOMB,
Chief Clerk.

RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF WASHINGTON

(Resolution by Representatives Norman B. Ackley, Alfred O. Adams, H. Maurice Ahlquist, James A. Andersen, Eric O. Anderson, Henry Backstrom, C. W. "Red" Beck, W. J. (Joe) Beierlein, Duane L. Berentson, Arnie Bergh, John Bigley, Horace W. Bozarth, Robert F. Brachtenbach, Eric D. Braun, Frank Buster Brouillet, Jack L. Burtch, Keith H. Campbell, Damon R. Canfield, William "Bill" Chatalas, Cecil C. Clark, Pat Comfort, Paul H. Conner, Thomas L. Copeland, William S. Day, Arlie U. DeJarnatt, Jack Dootson, Robert G. Earley, Robert D. Eberle, Don Eldridge, Daniel J. Evans, S. E. (Sid) Flanagan, Morrill F. Folsom, P. J. Gallagher, Avery Garrett, Mrs. Marian C. Gleason, Robert F. Goldsworthy, Slade Gorton, Gary Grant, H. D. "Herb" Hadley, Edward F. Harris, Joe D. Haussler, Dwight S. Hawley, Mildred E. Henry, Gordon Herr, Jack C. Hood, Elmer C. Huntley, Mrs. Joseph E. Hurley, Elmer E. Johnston, Dan Jolly, Helmut L. Jueling, Chet King, Dick J. Kink, Mrs. Douglas (Gladys) Kirk, William C. Klein, Alfred E. Leland, Harry B. Lewis, Charles E. Lind, Mark Litchman, Gus Lybecker, Marjorie Lynch, Audley F. Mahaffey, Fred R. Mast, William J. S. May, Mary Ellen McCaffree, W. L. "Bill" McCormick, Bob McDougall, Drennan "Mac" McElroy, James L. McFadden, Jack Metcalf, Don Miles, Charles Moon, Donald W. Moos, Richard W. Morphis, Edward M. Morrissey, Roy Mundy, Charles E. Newschwander, John L. O'Brien, W. J. O'Connell, Mike E. Odell, Ann T. O'Donnell, Ray Olsen, Robert A. Perry, Joel M. Pritchard, Walt Reese, Jack H. Rogers, K. O. Rosenberg, Charles R. Savage, Leonard A. Sawyer, Robert M. Schaefer, Harry A. Siler, Samuel J. Smith, Mrs. Frances G. Swayze, Richard "Dick" Taylor, Wes C. Uhlman, Arnold S. Wang, Max Wedekind, (Miss) Ella Wintler, C. G. Witherbee, and William E. Young)

Whereas John M. Hurley, affectionately called "Jack" has long been an admirer of Thomas Jefferson and has been a student of his life and his profound utterances; and

Whereas the said Jack Hurley has served the State of Washington in the department of fisheries and has capably and ably been a representative of the railroad industry in many legislative sessions now past; and

Whereas he has acquired a reputation of being reliable and honest in all of his representations to the members of the House and Senate, both in committee and in private conversations; and

Whereas in his own way he has tried to advance and advocate the principles of Thomas Jefferson in government; and

Whereas he has presented each member of the house and senate and members of the press with copies of the book, "Thomas Jefferson, the Giant"; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we extend to him our sincere thanks, best wishes and recognition of his fine services in the espousal of these principles, in striving to retain these concepts in the government of the State of Washington; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be enrolled and presented to John M. Hurley.

Attest:

S. R. HOLCOMB,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

SENATE RESOLUTION 1963–19

(Resolution by Senators Perry B. Woodall, Marshall A. Neill, Edward F. Riley, and Al Henry)

Whereas John M. Hurley, affectionately called "Jack" has long been an admirer of Thomas Jefferson and has been a student of his life and his profound utterances; and

Whereas the said Jack Hurley has served the State of Washington both in the capacity as chief technician of the Department of Fisheries and has capably and ably been a representative of the railroad industry in many legislative sessions now past; and

Whereas he has acquired a reputation of being reliable and honest in all of his representations to the members of the house and senate, both in committee and in private conversations; and

Whereas in his own way he has tried to advance and advocate the principles of Thomas Jefferson in government; and

Whereas he has presented each member of the house and senate and members of the press with copies of the book, "Thomas Jefferson, the Giant": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we extend to him our sincere thanks, best wishes, and recognition of his fine services in the espousal of these principles, in striving to retain these concepts in the government of the state of Washington; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be enrolled and presented to John M. Hurley.

Attest:

WARD BOWDEN,
Secretary of the Senate.

DEATH OF DALE SWENSON, PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER LEADER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently Dale Swenson, of Amery, Wis., a Peace Corps volunteer, was killed in an automobile accident in Brazil. Dale Swenson was an idealistic, dedicated, intelligent, young man, the best kind of American. He had been in Brazil for some time and had done outstanding work as a member of the Peace Corps. He had been successful in establishing a school where there had been no school.

His death is a serious loss for our State and for the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "We Miss Him," relating to Dale Swenson, and published in the Peace Corps Volunteer of February 1963.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MISS HIM

Life with the Peace Corps during its first year in Brazil has not been all cheering reports and heartwarming vignettes, pouring

forth the enthusiasm and triumphs of the volunteers.

Tragedy has cast its shadow, too, for on December 6 came the news that Dale Swenson, volunteer leader of Brazil I (4–S club project) had been killed while making the rounds of the volunteers under his charge.

Dale, 26, of Amery, Wis., joined the Peace Corps in January 1962. After training at the National 4-H Club Foundation in Washington, at the Peace Corps training center in Puerto Rico, and as a language student at Rural University near Rio de Janeiro, Dale had distinguished himself by his work with the 4-S clubs around Ponte Nova, a small city in the interior of Minas Gerais state.

From June until November, Dale assisted 17 youth clubs to improve their farm and animal projects, demonstrating to the farm youth such practical steps as how to construct a seed bed, when and how to apply fertilizer, how to turn the soil to obtain higher crop yields.

To entice more young people to participate in 4-S work, Dale with his Brazilian colleagues worked out a program of games, dances, and sports to add moments of sheer pleasure to the club's more serious business.

Always desirous that his youth program at Ponte Nova continue after his Peace Corps service, Dale concentrated on attracting and training adult leaders to guide the club in day-to-day activities.

In this he was successful. His efforts stimulated a keen sense of responsibility among parents and neighbors for the future of their youth. And one project which he stimulated raised funds through a community fair to help establish a primary school where none had been before.

Contacts with parents about 4-S work led to close friendship. Dale's warm smile, intense purpose, and quickness to sense the humor in frustrating situations gained him acceptance.

With the expansion of the Peace Corps 4-S program in Brazil, Dale was singled out to became a volunteer leader. Fearful that by accepting the job his work in Ponte Nova would cease, Dale approved only after being assured that a volunteer team would take his place.

He moved to Vitoria, capital of Espirito Santo, in November and set out almost immediately to visit the volunteers. His territory was farflung, encompassing the states of Goias, Rio de Janeiro, Espirito Santo and part of Minas Gerais.

Dale had returned from visiting volunteer teams in frontier towns in Goias and was making his way home from Rio to Vitoria when his jeep met an oncoming truck on a curve.

His example as a helping American and as an outstanding Peace Corps volunteer is inspiring. As a fellow volunteer said of Dale, "His greatest contribution, perhaps, was living a life of practical idealism through his day-to-day activities."

We honor him and miss him.

KILLIAN CALLS FOR RECOGNITION OF CRISIS IN CIVILIAN RESEARCH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there is a difference of opinion in the Senate and in the country as to how our serious economic problems should be solved. However, I think all of us agree that we need urgently to improve and step up our research.

Recently, Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., who certainly is an outstanding expert in this field, and a former president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, wrote an article entitled "The Crisis in Research," which was published in the Atlantic Monthly. In his article, Dr. Killian points out the urgent national need to increase the number of scientists and engineers who will study for their doctor's degrees. Dr. Killian states that there are hundreds of thousands of scientists and engineers whose skills have become obsolete and who, with additional training, could contribute immensely to research. He concludes his article by saying:

I do feel, given present rates of growth, that we face crucial decisions about the future size of the effort, especially the level of our space effort and our capability to carry through present space commitments with success and without unnecessary waste and failures. These decisions must be made with an acute awareness of our manpower resources and of the vital needs of the private, commercial sector of our economy, the engine of our economic growth.

Dr. Killian says that the private sector of our economy may suffer seriously if our emphasis on space and defense research continues to dwarf industrial and commercial effort. While space and defense are necessary areas of research, and should be encouraged, we must recognize the price we are paying for our one-sided emphasis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Dr. Killian be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRISIS IN RESEARCH

(By James R. Killian, Jr.)

(The expenditure of Federal funds for scientific research and development has had an enormous impact on Government projects, on private industry, and on our economy. For an elucidation of the issues involved in our accelerated scientific program, we turn to James R. Killian, Jr., former president of MIT, Chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee from 1957 to 1959, and currently chairman of the corporation of MIT.)

Since World War II, the United States has witnessed an astonishing growth in scientific research and development. Now, with national policy supporting a rapidly growing program in space technology, notably that required for a race to the moon, we see a further buildup of total national effort, especially in development and technology as distinct from basic research and science.

Inherent in this growth of our development commitments is a multitude of problems that call for public understanding and debate. The issues are profoundly important not only to our national security and world position but also to the Nation's general welfare, its economic growth, the utilization of its human resources, and the integrity and strength of its system of higher education. In this article I should like to highlight some of these issues which need more public discussion than they have so far received, giving special attention to the impact of Federal funds for research and development, including those allotted to the space race, on the future strength of American industry and our economy.

Let me list some of the salient and striking facts about our current effort:

Our annual rate of expenditure in the United States for scientific research and development is approximately $17 billion—about 3 percent of our gross national product.

There has been more than a threefold increase in annual dollar outlay for research and development in the last decade, and whereas 10 years ago the Federal Gov[illegible]ment supplied less than half the fund[illegible] this effort, today it finances about [illegible] thirds of it.

Out of the $12.4 billion the Govern[illegible] is spending in the current fiscal year for [illegible]search and development, about 65 percen[illegible] will be spent by industry under contract[illegible] Private industry itself is expected to financ[illegible] another $5 billion for research. Three quarters of all research and development in the United States is performed in industrial laboratories.

Obviously, with some two-thirds of the country's research and development effort being paid for by Federal funds, and with its great procurement contracts, the Government has become directly or indirectly the employer of 60 to 70 percent of the Nation's scientists and engineers.

Dollar expenditure, including public and private, for research and development is rising about 15 percent each year, but our pool of technical manpower is growing only 6 percent a year. With growth in available personnel not keeping pace with the Nation's expanding research expenditures, we may eventually face the possibility of a decline in research productivity and quality of performance. Already the talent squeeze, coupled with the rising cost of instrumentation and other factors, has forced the cost of research to increase by nearly 50 percent since 1954, and this cost will probably double before the end of this decade.

In research that involves the most advanced science and technology—and much of the research financed by the Government is of this kind—the demand for top-grade talent educated to the Ph.D. level is far greater than the supply, and the gap seems to be widening.

Projections of research and development outlays to 1970 yield some startling figures. Given present trends, including the very rapid expansion of our space program, total national expenditures for research and development could exceed $40 billion by 1970, with the Government's share of the bill growing greater and industry's becoming smaller. Some projections (which assume, perhaps wrongly, that a large military space program will inevitably be added to the rapidly growing NASA program) place the Government's own expenditure at this figure or higher by 1970.

This basket of facts and future possibilities holds an array of issues that must command the attention of thoughtful people in Government, industry, and the universities. Private industry, especially, is confronted with some profoundly difficult questions.

For example, there is a tendency for Government funds applied to space and weapons research and development to retard the growth of privately financed industrial research and development. As Dr. Jerome Wiesner commented in recent testimony before a congressional committee, there is danger that this growing Federal research will price private research out of existence. The ease of getting military and space contracts may tempt private companies to neglect research financed by themselves and directed at competitive commercial objectives. The high salaries frequently associated with Government contracts tend also to draw high-quality talent away from other fields of industrial research.

Because of the kind of large-scale, sophisticated research currently needed by the Government, the industrial research it sponsors tends to be concentrated in a small number of companies. In a few industries this concentration may lead to a weakening of the technological capability and the competitive strength of other industries and of small companies at a time when these industries and companies need strengthening if our economy is to grow.

The argument is advanced, especially by protagonists of an expanding man-in-space program, that military and space research have commercial potentialities sufficient to offset these effects and to insure our continued economic growth. Certainly they have important byproducts, especially in furthering the development of advanced technology important to all industry, but I have not yet seen convincing evidence to support the view that our military and space programs can attain their objectives and at the same time feed the civilian economy with enough new technology to warrant any letup in the growth of privately financed research. Industry has a very great responsibility diligently to seek out the byproducts of the military-space research and development programs that have commercial application and at the same time to maintain an adequate growth of privately supported research and development oriented toward new products and processes. Industry should not take the easy course and let its own research and development effort become deemphasized by a growing volume of research sponsored by the Federal Government. This is not unlike the requirement faced by our universities to maintain an adequate level of privately supported basic research, uncommitted to any objective but advancing knowledge.

Despite all the funds we pour into research annually, the percentage of our gross national product that we devote to civilian-commercial research and basic research could be surpassed in the next few years by competing industrial nations, such as Japan and certain members of the European Common Market, which do not have military and space expenditures as heavy as those borne by the United States. Privately financed industrial research has made an immense contribution to our welfare and prosperity in the past, and we depend on it to do so in the future.

If our vast research and development effort in defense and space works, even for the short term, to curtail productivity and economic growth in the United States, the results will damage not only the civilian sector but the space and military sectors as well; our national goals of all kinds, and certainly our defense, depend upon rising productivity and upon our maintaining a sound rate of economic growth. Both depend in part upon the inventiveness and initiative of the civilian sector of our economy and upon an adequate effort in uncommitted basic research, in contrast with applied research and development. While I doubt whether we yet know very much about how economic forces are affected by the distribution of effort between civilian-commercial research and development on the one hand and military space research on the other, wo do hear, increasingly, concern expressed that the growing military and space research programs may be retarding innovation in consumer products and shortchanging the consumer sector of our economy.

This is why some of us feel that we cannot charge ahead with additional space and other large technological Government programs without being mindful of the possible adverse effects on our civilian economy and of the importance of weighing them along with the good effects. I note this in full recognition of the economic assistance our expanding space program is providing many industries and communities.

The way our technical personnel distributes itself and is utilized is more important than the way we allot our research and development dollar, although the two, of course, are linked. While we may not yet face an absolute shortage of technical personnel in the United States, unquestionably we do face an acute shortage of exceptional talent possessing that level of education in science and engineering which enables it to master and use effectively the new and advanced technologies.

As I have noted, the impact of Government funds has been to draw to Government-supported research a high proportion of this up-to-date talent, with the result that industry, in its nonspace and nonmilitary work, has found it increasingly difficult to get enough men to do the high-quality work it requires. The glamour of space research has drawn high-quality industrial personnel away from missile and other weapons programs that militarily are as urgent as ever but now seem relatively old hat. Indeed, there is an increasing number of informed people who are worried about a possible dropoff in the advances the United States has been making in military technology.

The future of the Nation requires that we continue to maintain superiority in military technology (including space technology legitimately important to military strength); in the dangerous world in which we live, this goal must have top priority in the use of our scientific and technological resources. One gains the impression that our military research and development, aside from evolutionary improvements in atomic weapons and from advances in space technology in the last 5 years or so, may have lost innovative vigor. We need to try to understand the influences which may be producing this effect, if indeed it has happened, just as we need to be sensitive to conditions that may be reducing the ingenuity, inventiveness, and advance that have long characterized our nonmilitary, nonspace industrial technology.

These undesirable effects can occur, despite a steadily growing expenditure for research and development, if that expenditure is not carefully managed to encourage innovation and the increase of productivity and if we fail to recognize that fundamental advances in research depend upon brilliant, creative minds and not on numbers or dollars.

Science and technology are both advancing so rapidly, and so much in the direction of greater complexity, that we do not have enough highly educated personnel to carry out well all the tasks we have set for ourselves and at the same time to master and exploit new fields. As we consider further major national programs involving large-scale research and development, we must consider our manpower budget as well as our dollar budget most carefully, both in the executive branch and in Congress.

If we are to have the personnel who can master these advanced technologies, we must accept the necessity of doing two things:

First, we must increase the number of scientists and engineers educated by our universities and institutes of technology. We must urgently try to increase the number of young people who are educated to the level of the doctor's degree or its equivalent in science and related fields. In a recent study (the Gilliland report) issued by the President, his Science Advisory Committee recommends, as a minimum, that the number of doctor's degrees awarded each year in engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences combined be increased from the 3,000 presently given to 7,500 in 1970. Such an unprecedented increase could be achieved only by a large increase in Federal aid for financing graduate education.

And, second, we must devise ways to upgrade technical personnel already at work in industry. There are probably several hundred thousand engineers in the United States whose skills are obsolete in terms of the new technologies and the current requirements of science-based industries. We need to find a way, as one of our leading industrialists has already proposed, whereby this great pool of engineers can be afforded an opportunity to develop new competence in depth in mathematics, science, and engineering, so that their usefulness will be enhanced and their obsolescence docked. We thus face the need for one of the largest and most professionally advanced adult-education programs in history, a program which, to be successful, will require participation by the most advanced and science-rich universities and engineering schools. It cannot be a minor effort or handled by amateurs if we are to continue to lead in our industrial technology. A few leading companies and institutions are now experimenting in the development of strong programs.

What Admiral Rickover recently emphasized in speaking of industrial deficiencies in nuclear-reactor technology, informed scientists and engineers have long been pointing out about inadequate industrial mastery of many new and emerging technologies. It is of the utmost importance to our commercial competitive position, as well as to our security and national prestige, that our private industry achieve unmatched competence in putting our advanced technology to work. The universities and institutes of technology share with industry the possibility for achieving this mastery; it requires the finest and most modern education of our talent, along with a quality of management to match the competence of our technology. A number of American companies have a technological competence and brilliance unmatched anywhere else in the world, but we need many more as good as the best we now have.

Fundamental, also, is more efficient utilization of the personnel now in service. This involves many factors, including better management of our Government research and development programs and the improvement of contracting procedures, so as to eliminate incentives to waste or misuse manpower. At the request of the President's Science Advisory Committee and with the endorsement of the President, the National Academy of Sciences has appointed a committee comprising outstanding industrial, educational, and other leaders to undertake what is undoubtedly the first comprehensive review of the utilization of technical manpower in the United States.

The Federal Government faces a desperate struggle to recruit and hold competent technical supervisory and managerial talent. In fact, it is suffering a dangerous weakening of its management strength largely because its pay scales and personnel policies have not been adequately competitive with those in industry and other private institutions. The recent Federal pay increases authorized by Congress are a first step in remedying this weakness.

High competence is required in Government if we are to make the enormous research and development contracting system work well, preserving the desirable features of Government laboratories, private industry, and nonprofit institutions. We need managers in Government, as well as in industry, who are sensitive to the problems of national balance in the research and development effort, who combine a mastery of both technology and management, and who can minimize the poor judgment that often results in faulty plans and requirements, excessive failures, unnecessary technological complexity, or the launching of projects not practically attainable. The President's Science Advisory Committee has continually emphasized these requirements and accomplished much in initiating measures to meet them, thus proving itself increasingly helpful to the President and to the strengthening of the Government's resources for planning and managing research.

These matters need increased public attention as we adapt ourselves to the greatest research and development effort in history. We are, in fact, becoming a research-oriented society, a condition that has arrived so fast that, quite understandably, we are encountering growing pains. I do not feel that the present magnitude of our Government research effort is too large, even though it may be lacking in balance. I do feel, given present rates of growth, that we face crucial decisions about the future size of the effort, especially the level of our space effort and our capability to carry through present space commitments with success and without unnecessary waste and failures. These decisions must be made with an acute awareness of our manpower resources and of the vital needs of the private, commercial sector of our economy, the engine of our economic growth. Privately financed research, both in industry and in the universities, needs to be steadily increased.

As a research-oriented society, we have the possibility of—in fact, we may now be in the midst of—a great creative thrust in which the energies of our people will find a new measure of release and our power as a nation will be raised to a new level of benignity. This renaissance through research, especially corporate sponsored research, can afford a flowering of individual skills and new avenues of individual fulfillment that will draw out as never before the latent talents and the sense of joyous exploration in increasing numbers of our people. Such is the promise of research if we deploy our funds and creative talent wisely.

WHY ARE NEARLY 5 MILLION AMERICANS JOBLESS?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the April 1 issue of Newsweek contains an excellent article entitled "Unemployment in America." It is one of the most comprehensive, perceptive, and thoughtful articles I have read on this subject.

I ask unanimous consent that an abbreviated version of the article in Newsweek be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNEMPLOYMENT IN AMERICA—IN THE BEST OF TIMES, WHY ARE 4.9 MILLION IDLE?

Poverty in the midst of plenty—that is the bitter, baffling anomaly of unemployment in the United States today.

Americans unquestionably earn more, spend more, and enjoy more material wealth than any other people in the history of the world, and the figures keep going up. The Affluent Society has become a happy statistical cliché:

Americans this year will earn an incredible $452.5 billion, $23.5 billion more than last year.

They will spend the staggering sum of $240 billion.

Their total assets are approaching $1.1 trillion—equal to more than $5,800 for every man, woman, and child in the country.

Yet within these glittering statistics lies a bitter paradox: 4.9 million people are jobless; on a seasonally adjusted basis, 6.1 percent of the labor force is unemployed.

At least one in every five persons in the U.S. labor force, what's more, will be unemployed at some time this year. At least another 2.6 million workers will be restricted to part-time employment because a full-time job is unavailable. At least 1 in every 11 workers in the Nation's 30 biggest cities will continue to tramp the streets in search of a job that isn't there. And nowhere will the paradox be more pronounced than in the hard core of unemployment, where there will be at least 5 million persons jobless for 15 weeks and quite probably more, about half of them the breadwinners in their families.

All this adds up to what President Kennedy calls our No. 1 economic problem—and the problem has been growing steadily worse. After the first postwar slump of 1948–49, the Nation's unemployment rate fell to 2.7 percent in the recovery that accompanied the Korean war (compared with the 3 percent level that U.S. Government economists consider full employment). Then came the recession of 1953–54, followed by an upturn during which joblessness never fell below 4.2 percent. The unemployment floor has moved progressively higher in the succeeding recessions (chart, p. 62) [not printed in the RECORD]. In fact, the Nation hasn't achieved what the administration now calls the interim goal toward full employment—4 percent jobless—during any single month since 1957; the Nation has suffered 5 years of what Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz calls "intolerably high unemployment. Causes of the problem:

The economy hasn't been growing nearly fast enough. The U.S. growth rate since 1957 has averaged only 3 percent a year versus 5 percent for Western Europe (though, of course, Europe started with a greater potential for expansion—a lower overall economy and war devastation to be repaired). New workers have swelled the labor force by 21 percent since World War II versus a 17-percent increase in jobs. And the work force is increasing more rapidly now. Two years ago, 2.6 million Americans reached the age of 18; 2 years from now, the number reaching that age will be 3.8 million.

Automation is eliminating an estimated 1.5 million jobs a year.

Through the rose-colored glasses of the affluent masses, however, the unemployed are almost invisible. "Much of the unemployment is scattered," says Wirtz, "and many who are without jobs are not in a desperate state. This is part of the problem of getting people to care about it."

Furthermore, there are many who challenge the figures—even though a panel of academic experts last year studied the Government's unemployment surveys and pronounced them valid in concept and execution. The president of a big Chicago department store, for one, questions the accuracy of unemployment data; he would like to see a qualitative analysis to show how many of the jobless are in fact employable.

Some Americans are, indeed, fatalistic about joblessness. A successful San Francisco importer says: "Chronic unemployment has been with us in the past. It is with us now. Unemployment is going to stay, and we are going to have to live with it."

Other Americans believe the unemployed are shiftless. A hard-nosed businessman in West Virginia says: "Cut off their relief payments and they'll have to go to work. Give them a deadline and then nothing more."

In truth, unemployment is not as bad as it once was. One need look no further for a striking comparison than the great depression of the thirties—when 12.8 million workers, fully 25 percent of the labor force, were unemployed. Unable to pay rent, unable to meet their mortgage payments, millions of Americans were evicted. Whole families lived—and died—in tarpaper shacks and tin-lined caves and scavenged for food. Many, who could not beg or borrow enough to feed their hungry children, stole what they could. Many others turned their children out to fend for themselves. Before the worst was over, violence and unrest swept the land, and there was open talk of revolution.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF SENATOR NELSON'S MAIDEN SPEECH ON CONSERVING OUR WATER SUPPLY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, my distinguished junior colleague and former Governor of Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] delivered his maiden speech in the Senate on Monday. Unfortunately, I could not be present. Senator NELSON's speech was concise, eloquent, persuasive. It was on a subject on which he is an outstanding national expert; namely, conservation.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin spoke in support of the Neuberger bill, to end the serious threat of detergents to our water supply. GAYLORD NELSON is recognized in Wisconsin as a truly outstanding authority on conservation. He has made the greatest contribution in that field that any Wisconsin Governor has made.. This is demonstrated by the fact that he was responsible for the conception and the enactment of his magnificent $50 million conservation program for Wisconsin, the finest conservation program in America.

PASSOVER MATZOTH

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have heretofore protested the denial by the Soviet authorities of matzoth, the sacred wafer used to celebrate the Passover, which is very dear to the religious observance of Jews throughout the world, including those in the Soviet Union.

Three protests have now been made, in addition to my own; namely, by the New York Board of Rabbis, by the chief rabbi of Great Britain, Rabbi Israel Brodie; and also the protests made in the hearing before the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, which is now in session in Geneva.

Mr. President, the action of the Soviet authorities for the second consecutive year in prohibiting state bakeries from providing matzoth for the celebration of Passover and in rejecting all attempts to import matzoth from other countries can be interpreted in only one way. This is more than another Communist antireligious measure, and it cannot be separated from the entire series of anti-Jewish acts taken by the Communist Government of the U.S.S.R. The total ban on importing or baking matzoth, which for thousands of years has been part of the Jewish religious observance of Passover, is inexcusable, and the chorus of protests from the people of the free world should be loud enough to penetrate the walls of the Kremlin. We know that Chairman Khrushchev and the Soviet authorities are sensitive to the charge of anti-Semitism, and they should know that this is the way the world regards their actions.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three news reports of appeals to the United Nations and to Moscow to permit the baking of matzoth. The appeals were made by the New York Board of Rabbis and by the chief rabbi of Great Britain, Israel Brodie. I also ask consent to have printed in the RECORD a report of hearings on anti-Semitism by the Soviet Union. The hearings were held by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. These dispatches were transmitted on March 25 by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency.

There being no objection, the dispatches were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New York Rabbis Appeal to U.N. To Intervene With Russia for Matzoth

New York, March 24.—An appeal to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva, requesting intervention with the authorities of the Soviet Union for permission to Russian Jews to bake matzoth or to import matzoth from this country, was sent today by the New York Board of Rabbis. The board, comprised of Orthodox, Reform, and Conservative spiritual leaders in New York, is the largest rabbinical body in the world. Signed by Rabbi Israel Mowshowitz, president of the board, and other ranking officers of the organization, the cable stated:

"The New York Board of Rabbis is deeply distressed by the Russian Government's total ban on the public baking and sale of matzoth for the large number of Soviet Jews, thus depriving them of a religious article indispensable for the proper observance of Passover, which begins on the evening of April 8. We, the board's officers, speaking for the entire membership, plead with the Commission that it direct an urgent appeal to the Soviet Government for the revocation of that ban. If facilities are unavailable in Russia, we are prepared to provide matzoth if permitted to do so."

British Chief Rabbi Appeals to Moscow To Permit Matzoth Baking

London, March 24.—British Chief Rabbi Israel Brodie appealed to Soviet authorities today "in the name of Anglo-Jewry" to permit Soviet Jews to have matzoths for Passover next month.

The statement cited the announcement in the Moscow Central Synagogue on March 16 that, as happened in 1962, the state bakeries would not provide matzoth this year. The congregants had been advised to do their best to bake matzoth in their homes.

The chief rabbi cited the difficulties for Soviet Jews in such home baking and noted that any Jewish family which was able to bake more than it needs and sought to dispose of the excess to other families might well be arrested for speculation. The appeal urged the Soviet officials "even at this late hour" to reconsider the decision "and permit this basic religious requirement to be performed in an adequate and satisfactory manner."

U.N. Body To Discuss Soviet Discrimination Against Jews

Geneva, March 24.—Soviet suppression of Jewish religion and culture will come under scrutiny here before the United Nations Commission on Human Rights which is now in session here. The session is drafting a U.N. declaration and a U.N. convention to ban religious discrimination in all countries.

The Human Rights Commission meanwhile heard preliminary attacks against Soviet anti-Semitism from governmental and nongovernmental representatives this weekend. Under its rules of procedure the Commission does not permit the names of countries involved to be mentioned, but representatives of Jewish organizations, of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and of several Latin American member-states, pointedly directed their remarks against the U.S.S.R.

A NOOSE AROUND THE NATION'S FUEL NEEDS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. Keating], and I have joined in sending to the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, a letter in which we seriously question the adequacy of the revised fuel oil quota system. It is our conclusion that the announced revision of the quota system falls short by at least 80,000 barrels a day of meeting our needs.

We find it difficult to reconcile the 7-percent increase in the allocation to the 24 authorized importers in our State with the 68-percent increase given to the two authorized importers in the State of Florida.

The letter to Secretary of the Interior Udall is a serious document, dealing with grave problems and demanding a full answer: an answer of facts and action. We have looked behind the ballyhoo of the administration announcement of a revised quota system to go into effect on April 1, 1963. And we have seen the old, bland wink, telling those who want nothing done that their wishes are being fulfilled and that the fireworks are for public consumption.

The administration announcement of March 15 says that "the new program takes into account increased requirements of eastern seaboard consumers." Actually, it represents a reduction of imports from last year in terms of consumer needs and leaves us short by more than 80,000 barrels a day. What do we do for this short fall? Why does not the administration just tell us that it has decreed that the U.S. consumer will use coal, not fuel oil?

The administration announcement of March 15 says that "procedures for granting allocations to individual importers have been revised to enhance competition in the residual fuel oil market." Actually, the program gives no indication that suppliers will receive enough oil to meet their commitments to consumers, that suppliers—old and new—can bid against each other for customers, or that public utilities can with confidence enter into contracts for supplies with distributors of their choice. What do we do about such distribution shortages? Why does not the administration just tell us that it has decreed an increase in fuel prices?

In a memorandum to the President, dated February 13, 1963, the Office of Emergency Planning recommended a "relaxation of controls consistent with national security and the attainment of hemispheric objectives which contribute to the national security." Actually, the new import quotas and their allocation contribute little if anything to the national security interest in having a hemispheric energy supply system and in having economically strong and politically stable partners in Latin America. What do we do with our American oil producing neighbors whose economic development has such high priority with us? Why does not the administration just tell us that it has decreed the national security and the coal interests to be one and the same, and that the Alliance for Progress objectives will be financed out of the pocket of the U.S. taxpayer, instead of by trade, too?

Mr. President, I ask that our letter to Secretary Udall be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Joint Letter From Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican, of New York, and Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Republican, of New York, to Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall

March 27, 1963.

Dear Mr. Secretary: We refer to the changes in the residual fuel oil import quota system announced by the Department of the Interior on March 15, 1963.

Two broad questions arise in connection with these changes:

1. Do they reflect the recommendation of the February 13, 1963, memorandum for the President from the Office of Emergency Planning (OEP) that there be "a careful and meaningful relaxation of controls" on residual fuel oil imports?

2. To what extent are they consistent with the announcement's stated intention "to enhance competition in the residual fuel oil market?"

We wish to ascertain the answers to these broad questions by requesting a full report from you on the following major questions:

A

In May 1961 the U.S. Bureau of Mines, Branch of Petroleum Economics, issued a "Forecast of Residual Fuel Oil Supply and Demand." Has this forecast been updated to serve as the basis for next year's quota and has adequate allowance been made to rebuild stocks? What assumptions were made as to the actual and projected levels of east coast nonbonded stocks on March 31, 1963, and March 31, 1964, respectively? If a forecast has been made, is it available to be consulted in the same detail as the last one?

B

How does the 50,000 barrels a day (b/d) increase in import allocations affect "the attainment of hemispheric objectives which contribute to the national security," cited in the OEP memorandum? Does the new system of granting allocations assure continued reliance on Western Hemisphere sources for residual fuel oil—and to what extent? How does it reflect our economic and political goals within this hemisphere?

C

The announcement on March 15, 1963, assumes residual fuel oil imports to district I during the current year at a level of 525,000 b/d; an increase of 64,000 b/d over the previous year. The announced level of 575,000 b/d for the coming year, beginning April 1, was described, therefore, as an increase of 50,000 b/d, as compared with the current year. According to the publication, Oil Daily, 15,000 b/d of this 50,000 b/d allocation increase are intended to rebuild inventories drawn down in the current year. Therefore, in tacit recognition of the fact that the import level for the current year was too low by 15,000 b/d, the import level should be considered to have been 540,000 b/d, instead of 525,000 b/d. Had the import allocation for the current year been 540,000 b/d, the import level for the coming year would be 560,000 b/d (575,000 b/d minus 15,000 b/d). Thus, the current year's increase over last year would have been 79,000 b/d (64,000 b/d plus 15,000 b/d), instead of 64,000 b/d. This increase would then be compared to an effective increase for the coming year of 20,000 b/d (560,000 b/d versus 540,000 b/d) instead of the announced 50,000 b/d. The discrepancy between effective and announced increases is further accentuated by the emergency advance draw-downs against the coming fuel year which

are being permitted to the extent of some 3,000 b/d. These draw-downs mean that the import allocations of the current fuel year should be considered to have been increased by that amount, making the appropriate level for the current year 543,000 b/d. Thus, because of the draw-downs, the level for the coming year, should be considered to be only 557,000 b/d, for an effective increase of 14,000 b/d as compared to an 82,000 b/d increase for the current year over the last year. This figure of 14,000 b/d properly would reflect the effective increase in the import allocations for the coming fuel year against which to measure the adequacy of the overall import level for the coming year. It is this figure which is of significance for consumers.

Actually, the case may well be more severe. It is reputably reported that it will be necessary to rebuild stocks to the extent of some 30,000 b/d. This would indicate that the current year's allocation should be considered to have been 555,000 b/d instead of 525,000 b/d, and that next year's allocation for consumer use should be considered to be only 545,000 b/d instead of 575,000 b/d. Thus, next year's actual import quota allocation would represent an effective reduction of 10,000 b/d from the current year's, unless the present desperate inventory situation is allowed to continue. This inventory situation is unfortunate both from the standpoint of marketing and of national security. It is also reputably estimated that a 55,000 b/d increase in demand for residual fuel oil by power plants and nonutility consumers on the east coast is to be expected during the next fuel year, while availability from domestic sources is expected to decline by at least 15,000 b/d. Under this latter set of estimates—a 10,000 b/d reduction of the effective import quota allocation, plus a 55,000 b/d increase in demand plus a 15,000 b/d decline in domestic availability—the announced revision of the quota system falls short of meeting our needs by at least 80,000 b/d.

In the light of either of the assumptions above, how can the new program be reconciled with the statement attributed to you in the March 15 announcement, that it "takes into account the increased requirements of eastern seaboard consumers"?

D

Two new plants in New York (Con-Edison and Long Island Light) will require a total of 25,000 b/d in additional supplies. In addition, there is a normal estimated 6 percent annual increase in consumption demand by powerplants and another 3 percent by nonutility users. The 24 authorized importers for the whole New York area have received an increased allocation of 25,518 b/d. How will all of these demands be met by increased allocations which just about satisfy the new users in the area—even if the problems raised by paragraph (c) are not brought to bear?

Further, as Senators from New York we find it difficult to reconcile the 7 percent increase in the allocation to 24 authorized importers in our State with the 68 percent (5,807 b/d) increase given to the 2 authorized importers in the State of Florida.

E

By what means will the revised procedures for granting allocations to individual importers enhance competition in the residual fuel oil market? Will they permit these importers to obtain a sufficient number of import tickets to fulfill their contractual commitments to consumers? How are they designed to allow utilities and other users freely to choose their suppliers?

Mr. Secretary, we have looked into these questions and have found no answer to them either in the March 15 release of the Department of the Interior nor in any other governmental report. We have noted stories in the press that the recommendations of the OEP memorandum would be ignored and that 15,000 barrels a day of the 50,000 barrel increase in the import allocations are admittedly to be used for stock rebuilding; and we have seen no quoted source or reply as to these allegations.

The questions we raise are based on a serious concern with our national security energy requirements, the success of our foreign policy (especially with respect to the goals of the Alliance for Progress which requires the opening, insofar as possible, not the restriction, of U.S. markets for the products of our hemispheric neighbors), our Nation's continued economic growth under a competitive and free system of private enterprise which calls for free choice of fuels and suppliers, and the welfare of the consuming public. We believe that these questions must be answered, either by a report which clearly demonstrates the effectiveness of the revised quota system in meeting the problems which concern us and many others or by "meaningful" relaxation of controls and a "careful" revision of the means for allocating such quotas as may remain.

Copies of this letter are being sent to the Attorney General of the United States and the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning for their comment as well.

Sincerely,

Jacob K. Javits.
Kenneth B. Keating.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, my colleague [Mr. Javits] addressed himself to the problem of the revision of the fuel oil quota.

Several weeks ago the Secretary of the Interior anounced a revised fuel oil quota system to come into effect April 1, 1963. Theoretically, the objective of this system is to insure adequate residual fuel oil supplies for the requirements of eastern users.

In actual fact, the new allotment permitted by the Secretary of the Interior represents an increase of only 50,000 barrels a day over last year's allotment, which is less than the 56,000 barrels a day increase of last year's over the previous year. The meager addition appears to fly directly in the face of a top-level memorandum prepared in the Office of Emergency Planning which called for a "careful and meaningful relaxation" of controls on residual oil imports.

"Too little and too late" is the reaction of many eastern users of residual fuel, who will be obliged to pay more and who will face continued uncertainty in the future as to the adequacy of oil supplies.

Mr. President, it is unfortunately all too clear that this decision was made to satisfy the interests of a very small factor in our economy at the expense of national growth and progress.

One of the principal announced goals of our Government has been to stimulate national economic growth, to get the country moving again, as the slogan went. Yet, the latest action of the Interior Department, in restricting residual fuel oil imports, has effectively put a stranglehold on the fuel supply of east coast industries and a higher price tag on the needs of east coast consumers. You don't have to be an economist to know that low-cost fuel is essential to economic development. Therefore, we must not countenance putting powerful special interests above the national interest in economic progress, in creating more jobs and in promoting free competition.

It is instructive and alarming to compare this attitude on the part of our Government, in which national security, trade considerations, consumer benefits and economic growth seem to be subordinated to a minority lobbying influence, with the very determined fuel policies that the Soviet Union has adopted. The Soviets have deliberately and skillfully used their oil to undermine Western markets and create a wedge of influence and power in free world countries. While we in effect are pouring down the drain one of the most precious resources of the Western Hemisphere, in order to protect the entrenched interests of coal producing areas, the Soviets are working night and day to find new markets for their products.

It is time to put the national interest first. It is time to consider the right of American enterprises freely and competitively to seek their most economical fuel sources. It is time to build new industries, new jobs for the future, new opportunities for the Nation. To prevent the import of residual fuel oils necessary for the economic demands of the east coast is like restricting sales of automobiles to protect the interests of horse and buggy drivers. It is no way to meet the pressing 20th century demand for jobs and economic progress.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Record the text of an editorial which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 16, which is equally critical of the position taken by our Government in this matter.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Skidding on Oil

Caught between the devil of domestic politics and the deep blue Caribbean Sea, the administration is trying to do the impossible in framing its residual oil policy. It is seeking to please everybody. During the Eisenhower administration, this country unwisely began placing import restrictions on residual oil, a thick, sticky substance chiefly produced in Venezuela for industrial purposes in the Eastern States. And what has been bad for Venezuela and costly for American consumers has been mistakenly considered a help to the domestic coal industry.

A month ago, a top-level White House memorandum called for a "careful and meaningful relaxation" of controls on residual oil imports. The outcry from coal producers and from the refining branch of the oil industry was prompt and predictable—and apparently the outcry was heard. As this newspaper forecast, the administration yesterday announced the smallest possible increase in residual quotas—50,000 barrels a day which would make the daily quota 567,000 barrels.

The figures are slippery, and by artful presentation it may be possible to argue that something is being done for the embattled democracy of Venezuela. But can it be seriously argued that the wafer-thin increase is in any sense "meaningful"? That was the phrase used by the White House memorandum—a phrase, be it noted, that was approved by every department involved except the Labor Department. Last year, without benefit of a White House report, residual quotas were increased by 56,000 barrels a day.

Let it be acknowledged that the dilemma is real. But this administration has a way of using glowing rhetoric about free trade and then retreating in concrete instances into the foxholes of protectionism. It surely might entail some difficulties with coal State Senators if a genuinely "meaningful" relaxation of residual oil imports were put into effect April 1. But then it would entail infinitely more difficulties if the regime of President Betancourt should be overwhelmed by the totalitarian enemies who find comfort in every trade discrimination this country aims at Venezuela.

LET'S MAKE THE WORDS "FHA INSURED" MEAN WHAT THEY SAY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is time to make sure that the written word means what it says.

What do the words "FHA insured" mean, for instance?

The homebuyer assumes those two words give him protection when he secures a home with an FHA mortgage. Until late spring of last year, I shared that belief. Now I know better, as do some 50 homeowners in the Anchorage, Alaska, area, and hundreds more in other portions of the United States, and as will many hundreds more should they discover serious defects in the construction of their homes.

I hope they will not find that the construction of their homes is defective. However, too many homeowners have been misled by the term "FHA insured."

It means only that the repayment of the mortgage is insured. It does not guarantee that the quality of the homes will meet minimum construction standards when the homes are ultimately conveyed to the homebuyer—even though there have been faulty FHA inspections, such as occurred on the materials used in home construction in my State.

Last year I introduced legislation which would give validity to the words "FHA insured." A number of cosponsors endorsed the intent of the legislation; and the then Federal Housing Commissioner, Neal J. Hardy, endorsed the proposed FHA policy change. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Congressional Record at the conclusion of my remarks a news story, by William Steif, published in the Washington Daily News of June 25, 1962, setting forth Mr. Hardy's statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. GRUENING. My attention was directed to the need for reform when a number of Alaskans living in Eagle River, just outside Anchorage, wrote to complain that their FHA insured homes were substandard in many ways.

When I first discussed their plight on the floor of the Senate, I detailed the complaints. That true story appears in the Congressional Record, volume 108, part 8, pages 11290–11294. The owners of the prefabricated homes listed such distressing problems as lost heat through the roofs, ice formations on the interior living room and bedroom walls, cracked and warped cabinets, floors, and walls, uneven ceilings, loose and buckling wall paneling, improperly installed storm doors and windows, and used, rather than new, plumbing concealed in the walls.

These new FHA-approved homes were constructed by Modern Homes, Inc. The FHA case, 60–008464, takes up many files in my office and many more files at the Federal Housing Administration. The Alaska story had a satisfactory ending, because the homeowners complained to the Alaska congressional delegation. The FHA—to its credit—moved swiftly, and required the contractor, Modern Homes, Inc., and Centrex Construction Co., to correct the defective features. Not all home owners with FHA insured mortgages are so fortunate.

Under existing law, there is no obligation on the part of the FHA to make good the losses incurred by homeowners. Since introduction of the legislation in the 87th Congress, numerous cases of complaint, such as occurred in Alaska, have been called to my attention. They have occurred across the country, not in one area. The problem is national. For example, recently similar complaints which occurred in the Reno, Nev., area were called to my attention. I ask unanimous consent that nine news stories concerning the recent complaints in Reno be reprinted in the Record at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. GRUENING. I therefore introduce, on behalf of myself and 12 colleagues, a bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for structural or other major defects in homes covered by FHA-insured mortgages, and to require indemnification in the case of certain new construction under Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages.

I am pleased to be joined in the introduction of this bill by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], and the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd]. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk until the close of business on April 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. So that other Senators may have an opportunity to read the text of the bill I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1200) to authorize the payment of certain claims for structural or other major defects in homes covered by Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages, and to require indemnification bonds in the case of certain new construction under Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages, introduced by Mr. Gruening (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title V of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"PAYMENT OF CLAIMS FOR STRUCTURAL OR OTHER MAJOR DEFECTS IN MORTGAGED PROPERTIES

"Sec. 517. The mortgagor under any mortgage covering a one-to-four family dwelling heretofore or hereafter insured under this Act may file with the Commissioner a claim, within three years after the insurance of such mortgage, for the reasonable costs of correcting structural or other major defects which exist in such dwelling and which require correction in order to bring the dwelling into substantial conformity with plans and specifications approved by the Commissioner or in order to render the dwellings safe and habitable. The Commissioner shall have final and conclusive authority to pass upon the validity and amount of any claim filed in accordance with the provisions of this section, and such claims shall be paid by him on the basis of such terms and conditions as he may prescribe.

"INDEMNIFICATION BONDS

"Sec. 518. (a) The Commissioner is authorized and directed to require, in connection with any property upon which there is located a dwelling designed principally for not more than a four-family residence and which is approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction, that the builder, seller, or such other person as the Commissioner may require, post a bond in such amount as the Commissioner shall require providing indemnification to the Commissioner in the event the Commissioner is required, under section 517 of this title, to pay to the mortgagor of such property the reasonable costs of correcting structural or other defects in the dwelling in order to bring it into substantial conformity with plans and specifications approved by the Commissioner and upon which the Commissioner based his valuation of the property.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall apply to any such property covered by a mortgage insured by the Commissioner after the effective date of this section, unless such mortgage is insured pursuant to a commitment therefor made prior to such date."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the need for legislation such as is proposed in this bill has drawn comment in a number of newspapers. An excellent story appeared in the Monday, March 25, 1963, edition of the Baltimore, Md., Sun. The article was written by Mr. Howard Norton, of the Sun's Washington bureau. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Norton's story be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Bill Urges Broader Federal Housing Administration Insurance—Measure Aims To Help Home Buyers as Well as Protect Lenders

(By Howard Norton)

Washington, March 24.—Congress this week is to get a revolutionary bill that would, for the first time, require that the term "FHA-insured" give protection to the home buyer and not merely to the bank that lends the mortgage money.

The measure would order the Federal Housing Administration to correct any major defects that show up in an FHA-insured house within 3 years of its completion.

FHA BLESSING SEEN

The idea is being put forward by Senator Gruening, Democrat, of Alaska, and his bill is expected to have at least a dozen cosponsors among Members from both parties.

It is also expected to have the official blessing of the FHA.

Heretofore, "FHA-insured" has meant only that the lending bank is assured by the FHA that it will get its money back in case the borrower defaults.

There is nothing in the current Federal housing laws or regulations to protect the home buyer against shoddy construction that does not comply with FHA standards.

And there is nothing in the law that puts any responsibility on the FHA if its inspectors fail to screen FHA construction jobs properly.

Under the Gruening bill, builders of one- to four-family dwellings insured by the FHA would be required to post bond to cover the costs of correcting major structural and other defects that appear after the house is completed.

The bond would insure that the FHA is reimbursed for the cost of making such corrections.

It also would make unnecessary any increase in the current FHA insurance premium to cover this new risk.

BILL WAS TOO LATE

Under the present law, the insurance premium is paid by the home buyer, but the lending bank gets all the benefits of the insurance.

A similar bill was introduced late in the last session of Congress by the Senator from Alaska, but there was not enough time to have it processed through the Senate Housing Subcommittee before the session ended.

That bill (S. 3460) was cosponsored by an even dozen other Senators from States scattered across the country.

And it was indorsed by Neal J. Hardy, who resigned as FHA Commissioner to take a post with the Ford Foundation in January.

Gruening expects to get his bill into the hands of the housing subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Finance Committee in plenty of time to have it considered when the subcommittee opens its public hearings on operations of the FHA, probably about mid-April.

"The FHA maintains construction standards for homes the mortgages on which it will insure," he pointed out today. "But it does not guarantee that the quality of the homes will meet the standards—even though there have been faulty FHA inspections, such as occurred recently in home construction in Alaska.

"MISLEADING," HE SAYS

"Under the existing law, therefore," he added, "the term 'FHA-insured' is misleading, for it means only that repayment of the mortgage is insured."

The Gruening bill does not define what it means by a "major defect," but a member of the Senator's staff said the Senator hopes the committee will fix a definite dollar amount, so there will be no difficulty in determining whether any particular defect comes within the law.

The bill is the direct outgrowth of the loud complaints registered last year by 50 Anchorage (Alaska) families who claimed they had been bilked in buying FHA-insured homes.

The 50 homes were prefabricated in Indiana and put together in Anchorage, where they were sold at prices ranging from $24,000 to $26,000.

In both Indiana and Alaska the construction work was inspected and approved by FHA inspectors, the Senator relates.

DIFFICULTIES FOLLOW

But shortly after they moved in, he said, the families found that in Alaska's —30-degree weather, ice formed on the living room and bedroom walls; they lost heat through the roofs; cabinets, floors, and walls were warped and cracked badly, and in some of them, plumbing was found already to have been used in other buildings.

Since there is nothing in the FHA law to require that agency to make corrections, however, the homeowners were obliged to file suits against the builders.

In the face of the mass of suits, the builders agreed to make some of the corrections demanded.

And the FHA director in Anchorage was fired, because of this case, after having two separate hearings.

Reports of shoddy work and laxity of inspection on FHA-insured projects have been received by housing authorities from many States, especially from Nevada, California, Florida, New York, and New Jersey.

"The housing and home finance agency has agreed with the principle that some relief should be available to homeowners under such circumstances," Hardy wrote in his endorsement of last year's Gruening bill.

This year's bill is to be virtually identical.

Mr. GRUENING. Finally, Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the action of the FHA in the Alaska cases. It did what some other Federal agencies at times fail to do; namely, to do everything within their power to uphold the faith and good name of the Government of the United States, in the consciousness of the people of the United States. Some other Federal agencies, I regret to say, often disclaim responsibility for the actions of their personnel. When this happens, the faith and confidence of the American people in their Government is impaired and destroyed. The action of the FHA in the Alaska cases is all the more praiseworthy in that it had no obligation, legal or specifically mandatory, to move to rectify the malperformance of the builders. The FHA, however, felt that it had a moral obligation, and acted accordingly.

In so doing, it established a principle, a high standard, and a record deserving of the highest commendation. All honor to it and to its officials. They have demonstrated that they are in the fullest and the best sense of the word public servants.

I wish I could list the names of all the persons who worked to help correct the problems which had plagued the purchasers of the Alaskan homes, but unfortunately I do not know them all. I am familiar with the excellent work of then Commissioner Hardy; Mr. Thomas Gray, FHA Zone Operations Commissioner for the Far West, who devoted many long hours to settle the matter with the homeowners; Administrator Robert C. Weaver, of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, who gave these men his full support; and Mr. Elmer Gagnon, the Alaska FHA director who worked closely with Mr. Gray.

Exhibit A

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, June 25, 1962]

After Shoddy Construction Complaints, Hardy Backs New FHA Policy

(By William Steif)

Federal Housing Commissioner Neal J. Hardy today endorsed a proposed FHA policy change calling for the Government to accept some responsibility when buyers of FHA-insured homes are stuck with shoddy construction.

The proposed change results from 50 Alaska families' complaints that they were bilked in buying FHA-insured homes.

Until now FHA has insured only the mortgages of homes, staying out of insuring the homes and officially letting home buyers and sellers fight it out if the buyers don't think the homes come up to specifications.

REQUEST

Because of this year's experience outside Anchorage, Alaska, Mr. Hardy wants FHA authorization to:

Force contractors to bring homes up to adequate standards.

Use FHA money to bring homes up to standard if the contractors fail to live up to their agreements.

Mr. Hardy indorsed "the large idea" of a bill introduced to these ends by Senator Ernest Gruening, Democrat, of Alaska. The FHA boss disagreed on some details of Senator Gruening's bill, introduced Thursday, and said he is "studying its administrative feasibility." But he admitted original FHA error in insuring the $24,000 to $26,000 prefab homes, produced at Carlisle, Ind.

Senator Gruening first started to hear from constituents at Eagle River, Alaska, just outside Anchorage and near two big Air Force bases, last winter.

SUBSTANCE

The substance of their complaints was that in Alaska's 30-below-zero weather their homes:

Lost heat through the roofs.

Ice formed on living room and bedroom walls.

Cabinets, floors, and walls were cracked and warped badly.

The contractor, Modern Homes, Inc., a subsidiary of Centex Construction Co., owned by Clint and John Murchison, was not making good on its 1-year warranty.

FHA said it sent an investigation team to Alaska and confirmed Senator Gruening's information. A report now is being made to Robert Weaver, Chief of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. On the basis of the report, Mr. Weaver either will support Senator Gruening's bill with slight amendments or draft a separate bill embodying ideas in Senator Gruening's bill.

Exhibit B

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Feb. 5, 1963]

FHA Will Inspect Homes—Painters' Union Complaint Heard

The Federal Housing Administration agreed today to reinspect new homes in the Reno-Sparks area after hearing complaints that "every tract" subdivision "is in one way or another below FHA standards."

The complaints against alleged inadequate home construction were made by Gene Crumley, business representative of Painters Local 567, and Al Solari & Sons, Inc., a member of the Painting and Decorating Contractors of California and Nevada, Reno chapter.

Contractors denied the charges when they were first put in a protest letter from Crumley to the FHA.

READY WITH PROOF

"We realize the seriousness of our accusation," Crumley told FHA Director Jay E. Baker and other FHA officials. "But we're willing to back the accusations up with any proof the FHA feel is necessary." The proof, he said, would include sworn statements from workers on the new subdivisions as well as field trip inspections.

"Anyone with 20–20 vision and commonsense" could see that "in one way or another the tracts don't meet FHA specifications," Crumley added. "It would hit them right in the face" if they looked, he said.

Tract builders, said Solari, "should recognize that they can't cut corners." Those who do cut corners, he said, "are throwing a bad light on all of us."

Crumley charged that some builders are "interested only in a fast buck. They come in here and then get out."

CAN'T BID JOBS

Solari said many long-time Reno area contractors can't bid on new homes jobs because the general contractors accept substandard bids from competitors. It is so bad, he said, many of the long-time contractors aren't even competing for the jobs.

Crumley illustrated this by charging that the "legitimate" contractors are "laughed at" by some general contractors because of their higher prices.

"So they (some general contractors) bring in their highbinders" to do the work at lower costs, Crumley charged.

Crumley added that legitimate contractors "turn their backs if they're honest" when they know the competitive bidding would require them to do substandard work.

"We're not on a witchhunt," Crumley said. "All we're trying to do is correct a serious situation."

"We're glad you made the effort to get down here," Baker replied to Crumley. 'You should have come in a year ago."

"Who knew what would happen," Crumley replied. "But now legitimate contractors have to cut corners and John Q. Public pays the price."

Some general contractors have beat down painting contractors to the point it is impossible for them to bid, Solari added.

"Few (general contractors) do it," Solari added. "But the man who has been around a long time can't afford to do it."

LISTS COMPLAINTS

Crumley said specific complaints are: Painting done over bare wood surfaces; not enough coats of paint; not enough paint thickness; doors not sealed at the top and bottom; knotholes not sealed prior to painting; poor paint mixtures; doors are not flush with walls.

Crumley said the situation had worsened during the past 2 years' building boom and that the painters union had kept its eye fixed at what he said might soon be a catastrophe.

He said the union's attention was brought to the situation by new homeowners complaining of poor painting practices.

"The painters only do what their employers tell them to do and 9 percent of the employers do what the general contractors tell them," he said.

NO FINAL LOOK

Crumley said one area with 35 homes was not given a final FHA inspection before new home owners took occupancy. And, he said, homes that were not passed by the FHA 4 and 5 years ago now are given FHA inspectors' approval.

Baker said FHA loans cannot be closed out, however, unless there is a final inspection. But, he added, if home buyers take occupancy from the seller before the final inspection, the FHA can't control it.

Crumley volunteered to take those at the meeting to two subdivisions, which he called among the worst offenders.

Baker said FHA inspectors would take a look and report their findings to himself and other officials.

Crumley said the FHA should toughen its policy and thus raise the standards of those contractors which are not affected by the FHA, too.

"They may learn the hard way," Crumley said. But he added that if the FHA makes its inspections tougher, all the general contractors will react by policing their own operations better.

Solari called it an "educational program" for all concerned and added that the public knowledge of the situation would "ring bells and do a lot of good for the entire industry to correct" any malpractices.

Baker said because of the shortage of FHA inspectors—there are three in this area—it was impossible to maintain a constant check on the construction of all new homes.

Loren Fielder, the chief underwriter for the FHA, said new homes are provided with three or four inspections during the entire building stage and that the inspectors do not supervise the construction constantly.

"What it boils down to," Fielder said, "is the inspectors have to rely on inspections to see if there is adequate coverage in the finished application of the paint."

Lloyd Rider, the FHA's chief architect, said inspectors use a device to scratch the painted surface. If the bare wood shows through, it is evident that there wasn't enough paint put on.

Crumley said it was nearly impossible in some cases to tell if an inferior painting had been done on a house but that on occasion he had taken examples of the paint to the University of Nevada for testing. On at least one occasion, he said, he found the quality of the paint inferior.

FHA officials said that about 40 percent of the new homes in the area aren't under FHA loans and therefore the FHA has no control over what contractors in those areas do.

Baker added that while the FHA does as thorough a job as it can, it is the responsibility of the home buyer, too, to look into the quality of the product he buys.

Baker said the FHA wanted to know any evidence anyone had as to new homes not meeting the specifications and called for the public as well as workers in the field to report such instances.

He said it would be best to catch any malpractices on a day-to-day basis through spot inspections.

Solari said the Painting and Decorating Contractors of California and Nevada, Reno chapter, would look into the situation further at its next meeting.

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Feb. 6, 1963]

Charges Checked—Homes Inspected by FHA

Federal Housing Administration Director Jay E. Baker said today if his inspectors find new homes in the Reno-Sparks area not built according to FHA standards, "There is no way we could do much about it," other than "blacklist" contractors.

He said inspectors began rechecking the homes under FHA loans today following complaints aired Tuesday which charged "every tract is in one way or another below FHA standards."

COMPLAINT MADE

That complaint was made by Gene Crumley, business representative of the Painters Local 567. Other complaints against general contracting in some areas of Reno and Sparks were made by Al Solari, of Solari and Sons, Inc., a member of the Painting and Decorating Contractors of California and Nevada, Reno chapter.

Contractors denied the charges.

Baker said two inspectors would report their findings to the FHA office and then he and other officials would make followup spot checks. But he said it would take time because of other pressing problems faced by the FHA.

"We are going to check into some of these charges," Baker said. "But you can't expect us to drop everything and just jump on this.

WANTS REPORTS

"We would like to await some of the reports of the inspectors before we go out, too," he added. "Then we'll spot check their findings, if anything. I'm sure they'll find something."

Baker said if the inspectors find substandard work in homes less than a year old—still under the 1-year warranty—"we'll ask them (the contractors) do the work over again."

"If he (the contractor) persists in not doing it, we could put him on a blacklist and refuse to do business with him," Baker said.

COULD SUGGEST

If substandard work is found in homes over a year old—the 1-year warranty being expired—"We could suggest the contractor do the work over again," he said, "but there is no way we could do much about it."

"If we find a whole bunch (of substandard houses) with one contractor, we'd hesitate to want to do more work with him," he added.

"If such a contractor was blacklisted, it would mean he wouldn't be able to get FHA loans for buyers of his houses in Nevada, Arizona, California, Idaho, Wyoming, Washington, Oregon, or Hawaii," Baker said.

Baker said he has received calls from contractors defending FHA inspections since protests were lodged earlier this week in a letter from Crumley.

"Only two homeowners have called to inquire about the ruckus," he added.

"We anticipate we'll probably get some more calls, however," he said.

Les Bergin, who built Bergin Garden Apartments at 295 Grove Street, defended the FHA as doing a thorough job of inspections as well as making recommendations during the construction.

He said he installed an office at the construction site for use of FHA inspectors, who looked over the project at least three times a week.

"When we had problems, we'd call the FHA and they'd send over an inspector to give advice," Bergin added.

[From the Nevada State Journal, Feb. 6, 1963]

Reinspection Ordered by State FHA Director for Reno-Sparks Homes

Jay E. Baker, Federal Housing Administration director for Nevada, yesterday said his agency will reinspect new homes in the Reno-Sparks in the wake of statements that many tract homes are "in one way or another below FHA standards."

Making the complaints have been Gene Crumley, business representative of Painters Local No. 597, and Albert Solari, of C. Solari and Sons, Inc., Reno painting contractor and a member of the Painting and Decorating Contractors of California and Nevada, Reno chapter.

Local contractors have denied the charges which were first presented by Crumley in a letter to the FHA.

Crumley said he realized his accusations are serious, but added: "We're willing to back the accusations up with any proof the FHA feels is necessary." That, he said, could include sworn statements from workers on the new subdivisions, as well as field trip inspections.

The labor leader charged some builders are "interested only in a fast buck. They come in here and then get out.

"Anyone with 20–20 vision and commonsense," he charged, could see that "in one way or another the tracts don't meet FHA specifications. It would hit them right in the face if they looked."

Solari, who is a partner in a local development corporation aside from his paint contracting work, said tract builders "should recognize that they can't cut corners." Those who do, he said, "are throwing a bad light on all of us."

Solari said many longtime Reno area contractors can't bid on new homes jobs because the general contractors accept substandard bids from competitors. It is so bad, he said, many of the longtime contractors aren't even competing for the jobs.

Crumley illustrated this by charging that the "legitimate" contractors are "laughed at" by some general contractors because of their higher prices.

"So they (some general contractors) bring in their highbinders" to do the work at lower costs, Crumley charged.

Crumley added that "legitimate" contractors "turn their backs if they're honest" when they know the competitive bidding would require them to do substandard work.

"We're not on a witchhunt," Crumley said. "All we're trying to do is correct a serious situation."

"We're glad you made the effort to get down here," Baker replied to Crumley. "You should have come in a year ago."

"Who knew what would happen," Crumley replied. "But now legitimate contractors have to cut corners and John Q. Public pays the price."

Some general contractors "have beat down" painting contractors to the point it is impossible for them to bid, Solari added.

"Few (general contractors) do it," Solari added. "But the man who has been around a long time can't afford to do it."

Crumley said specific complaints are: Painting done over bare wood surfaces; not enough coats of paint; not enough paint thickness; doors not sealed at the top and bottom; knotholes not sealed prior to painting; poor paint mixtures; doors are not flush with walls.

Crumley said the situation had worsened during the past 2 years' building boom and that the painters union had kept its eye fixed on what he said might soon be a "catastrophe."

He said the union's attention was brought to the situation by new homeowners complaining of poor painting practices.

"The painters only do what their employers tell them to do and 99 percent of the employers do what the general contractors tell them," he said.

Crumley said 1 area with 35 homes was not given a final FHA inspection before new homeowners took occupancy. And, he said, homes that were not passed by the FHA 4 or 5 years ago now are given FHA inspectors' approval.

Baker said FHA loans cannot be closed out, however, unless there is a final inspection. But, he added, if homebuyers take occupancy from the seller before the final inspection, the FHA can't control it.

Crumley volunteered to take those at the meeting to two subdivisions, which he called among the "worst offenders."

Baker said FHA inspectors would take a look and report their findings to himself and other officials.

Crumley said the FHA should toughen its policy and thus raise the standards of those contractors which are not affected by the FHA, too.

"They may learn the hard way," Crumley said. But he added that if the FHA makes its inspections tougher, all the general contractors will react by policing their own operations better.

Solari called it an educational program for all concerned and added that the public knowledge of the situation would "ring bells and do a lot of good for the entire industry to correct" any malpractices.

Baker said because of the shortage of FHA inspectors—there are three in this area—it was impossible to maintain a constant check on the construction of all new homes.

Loren Fielder, the chief underwriter for the FHA, said new homes are provided with three or four inspections during the entire building stage and that the inspectors do not supervise the construction constantly.

"What it boils down to," Fielder said, "is the inspectors have to rely on inspections to see if there is adequate coverage in the finished application of the paint."

Lloyd Rider, the FHA's chief architect, said inspectors use a device to scratch the painted surface. If the bare wood shows through, it is evident that there wasn't enough paint put on.

Crumley said it was nearly impossible in some cases to tell if an inferior painting had been done on a house but that on occasion he had taken examples of the paint to the University of Nevada for testing. On at least one occasion, he said, he found the quality of the paint inferior.

FHA officials said that about 40 percent of the new homes in the area aren't under FHA loans and therefore the FHA has no control over what contractors in those areas do.

Baker added that while the FHA does as thorough a job as it can, it is the responsibility of the home buyer, too, to look into the quality of the product he buys.

Baker said the FHA wanted to know any evidence anyone had as to new homes not meeting the specifications and called for the public as well as workers in the field to report such instances.

He said it would be best to catch any malpractices on a day-to-day basis through spot inspections.

Solari said the Painting and Decorating Contractors of California and Nevada, Reno Chapter, would look into the situation further at its next meeting.

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Feb. 7, 1963]

Results of Check To Be Withheld—FHA Official Hopes Corrections Can Be Accomplished Quietly

Public disclosure will not be made in most instances if Federal Housing Administration inspectors find new subdivisions in the Reno-Sparks area not built according to FHA standards.

"If we can get it corrected without too much publicity," said FHA Director Jay E. Baker, "we'll be a lot further ahead."

Public announcement of any violations discovered would hinder attempts to bring the construction up to FHA standards, he said.

"We'd like to keep it to ourselves and the contractors unless it's all out of shape, unless a violation is real bad," Baker said. "We don't mean to withhold legitimate news," he added, "but our aim is to correct."

Baker ordered more inspections of new homes after Gene Crumley, business representative of Painters Local 567, and Al Solari, of Solari & Sons, Inc., painting contractor, appeared at an FHA meeting to protest certain painting practices they alleged were done at new subdivisions.

"We're trying to do what we think are first things first to stop the practices, if they do exist," said Baker. "We can't change those that already have been painted. But we can change those that are being painted now."

Baker said the inspections have been on homes under construction rather than those, say, over 1 year old.

"The only way we can tell is to look at the ones in the process of being painted," he explained. "Those that are finished, it's pretty hard for anyone to tell.

CONCERNED

"We are concerned about those, if there are some, that haven't stood up," Baker continued, "but we'll try to catch that later on.

"I don't think we can be expected to catch every house in the community," he said. "We just don't have the people to do it with."

Baker said inspectors visited four subdivisions to make spot checks Wednesday and more inspections were planned. What they found, he didn't say.

"We want to reserve our judgment to get enough cases to really make a conclusion," he said. "We want to have a chance to look and give people who are doing the substandard work, if they are doing it, a chance to correct it," he added.

TEMPEST

The controversy, which was started earlier in the week by a letter sent from Crumley to the FHA protesting painting practices, was described as a "tempest in a teapot" by Bob Robertson, secretary-manager of the Northern Nevada Home Builders Association.

"I don't consider Reno and Sparks to be a teapot," retorted Crumley. "And I don't consider the complaints of the homeowners a tempest."

Robertson said the homebuilders police their own industry and didn't need Crumley's advice, calling it union interference.

"Mr. Crumley has chosen this allegation, which I consider to be without basis in fact, as a sounding board for more than just this case," Robertson said. "Even if Mr. Crumley sincerely believes his charges, he certainly could not have chosen a more inappropriate way to seek a quick solution," Robertson continued.

"If he were genuinely interested in solving this problem, he would have gone about it quietly," he added. "He has, instead, only been antagonistic."

Crumley replied: "We have found through our investigation that others tried following the quiet route to a solution and found blank walls. As far as I'm concerned, the solution will be found when the public is aware of what the facts are and what their rights are."

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Feb. 8, 1963]

Some Painting Below Standard—Top FHA Official Reveals Deficiencies Found Here

Some contractors are doing substandard painting work on new homes in the Reno-Sparks area even though they are financed by Federal Housing Administration loans, FHA Director Jay E. Baker revealed today.

The work not meeting FHA requirements was found when Baker ordered a reinspection of new homes after Gene Crumbley, business representative for Painters Local 567, charged "every tract is in one way or another below FHA standards."

Contractors doing the substandard work were called into the FHA office Thursday and more were called in today, Baker said.

"We have found some deficiencies and called in some contractors to straighten things out," he said. "There is every reason to believe they'll come in on invitations because they're aware if they don't it would mean admission of guilt on their part."

Bob Robertson of the Northern Nevada Home Builders Association, who earlier described the controversy as a "tempest in a teapot," said today he still believes the "situation has been blown out of proportion."

"If there are any deficiencies," Robertson added, "they are of a very minor nature."

SIX SUBDIVISIONS

Baker, who said his inspectors have covered six subdivisions so far, did not reveal how many contractors have been doing substandard work, how many have been called into his office, or the number of homes where deficiencies were discovered.

Baker also did not name the contractors doing the substandard work because he said it would "make it tougher to solve the problem." He said any publicity, in fact, would hamper efforts to straighten out the situation.

"We didn't figure we were going to bring the whole thing out because we hadn't had a chance to cover it all," he said. "And I don't see that any service will be made if we identify everything we find.

"The fact that we've found some deficiencies is sufficient knowledge," Baker added. "We're trying to correct them as we find them."

Baker said the contractors he'd called in have shown surprise when told their work was substandard.

WILL CORRECT THEM

"Once they're convinced they don't meet their own requirements or our minimums," he added, "they have assured me they will correct them." He said it wasn't difficult to convince the contractors.

Baker said some contractors need to review the requirements.

"It's just like going to school—you think you know the answers to everything, but unless you're refreshed you're not cognizant of it."

Aside from calling in contractors doing substandard work, Baker said, the FHA has plans to set up a clinic to review the requirements with all contractors.

Crumley, who started the controversy with a letter of protest to the FHA over inadequate painting practices allegedly done at new homes, said he will appeal to the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America, AFL–CIO, at a meeting this weekend in Las Vegas. He said he would ask the national union leaders to bring pressure on the FHA in Washington to force contractors to do standard work.

POLLS PAINTERS

Al Solari of Solari & Sons, Inc., painting contractor, said he polled several members of the Painting and Decorating Contractors of California and Nevada, Reno Chapter, and it was their feeling that the entire industry should work together to improve the situation.

Of Crumley's bringing up the complaints, Solari commented:

"He has done a service, but now we've got to do something about it, not fight about it."

Solari said the organization would discuss the controversy at its meeting next week.

Solari, who met with FHA officials earlier in the week, issued a statement today, saying:

"To my knowledge no painting contractor has inspected any tract or other job site. It is considered unethical to go on a competitor's job.

"The original charges were made by Mr. Crumley, which he has a right to do. My position as a contractor was to defend the legitimate painting contractor, general contractor, public-at-large, and the conscientious painter journeyman.

"My charges were against the few contractors and practices causing this controversy.

"WHAT IS RIGHT

"As an industry, we must face what is right and what is wrong. I sincerely believe a running controversy in the manner it has been carried out will only damage further relations. All concerned must now work together to correct the situation.

"Mr. Baker assured all concerned that if these charges exist they will be corrected properly. Mr. Baker has offered to furnish a representative for review on the correct interpretation of the FHA regulations which the Painting and Decorating Contractors of California and Nevada will welcome.

"The main interest of any legitimate painting contractor is to maintain and improve on the existing high standards and not to let a few deteriorate the standards."

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Feb. 9, 1963]

DEFICIENCIES FOUND IN MOST—FHA CHECK OF TRACTS FINISHED

The director of the Reno office of the Federal Housing Administration said today that FHA inspectors checking local subdivisions for substandard painting have found some deficiencies "in most of them."

And although claims were still being made that the controversy has been blown out of proportion, no exact figures on how many houses are involved—or how extensive the deficiencies are—have been released.

Jay Baker, FHA Director, said his inspectors have finished checking the majority of new housing tracts, "and I'd say we've found some deficiencies in most of them."

And, Baker says, "we don't consider all these deficiencies to be just oversights."

COMPLAINT

The inspection of housing tracts was ordered after Gene Crumley, business representative for Painters Local 567, complained that every tract was in some way or another below FHA standards.

Baker says that where substandard work has been found, the contractors have been—or will be—called into his office and told to correct the job. "All those we've talked with have agreed to bring their work up to our requirements," he said.

Numerous homeowners have complained to the FHA in the past week about the poor quality of the paint jobs on their houses, he said. "We're hearing from them every day," Baker said.

To help with the inspections of these complaints, Baker says he asked for the loan of another man to help his two regular inspectors.

OUT OF PROPORTION

Baker explained his reluctance to name names or be specific about just how many contractors are involved by saying he's trying to get the situation corrected as quickly as possible. "I think the thing's been blown all out of proportion," he said.

"The thing that bothers me," Baker said, "is that the press is trying to put us into the position as watchdog over the contractors, when actually it's also up to the unions and other workers as well. They have standards too."

In instances where substandard painting has been discovered, Baker says he's instructed his inspectors to check other aspects of the house as well.

"We'll be looking at all of the homes more closely," Baker said. "I've cautioned my inspectors to be very careful."

Baker feels "it's unfortunate this thing had to get out into the public like it has. It's destroyed the public's confidence." He says if persons interested in purchasing a new home in the area will check with his office, "we'll steer them in the right direction."

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Feb. 12, 1963]

SHOULD STANDARDS ON PAINTING BE PART OF CODES?

Reno and Sparks building inspectors say painting requirements should be added to city building codes to combat substandard painting. But Washoe County's building inspector disagrees.

None of the inspectors can legally enforce painting standards at present because their respective building codes list no painting requirements.

"We should have them, but we don't," said Wayne Humphreys, Sparks building inspector.

Painting requirements in city building codes would make enforcement of painting easier, commented Ronald Coleman, Reno building inspector, "because we'd have minimum requirements and they could go the minimums or better."

PUBLIC'S JOB

But, Ralph Stoltz, Washoe County building inspector, said it was the responsibility of the house-buying public—not the local governments—to insure that painting is done properly.

The building inspectors comments on their inability to legally enforce good painting followed charges by Gene Crumley, business representative of painters local 567, that painting was being done below Federal Housing Administration standards in some areas.

Crumley's charges prompted FHA Director Jay E. Baker to order his inspectors to recheck new homes in the Reno-Sparks area which are under FHA loans. Baker said the inspectors found there was substandard work in most subdivisions.

Coleman, who said Monday substandard painting was widespread in the area, commented that if the city had tight painting requirements it would serve as an aid to the FHA in cracking down on substandard work.

NO HELP

"They're lone wolves," he said. "They have no help" in inspecting the painting. He added that the FHA is doing "an excellent job."

But, Coleman said, lack of rigid specifications probably was the cause for substandard painting. To remedy this, he said, the city code should have tight specifications.

Humphreys, who said he hadn't found any "really bad jobs" during his inspections, commented that without city code painting requirements, Sparks can't demand any specific amount of paint on new houses.

Humphreys said, however, his department's two inspectors have been looking over paint jobs on new houses even though they can't enforce anything legally.

"We've been pulling a bluff," Humphreys said. "If we find anything that's bad we demand that it be patched up and made to look good. Part of our code says things have to be done in a neat and workmanlike manner." So, we interpret it to include painting.

Both Humphreys and Coleman said if painting requirements were put into city codes by ordinances, they would need more manpower to conduct the inspections.

Humphreys' inspectors make a total of 12 checks on new houses and Coleman's 4 inspectors make from 15 to 20 checks per house.

Sparks would need another inspector to enforce the painting requirements, if they were put in the building code, Humphreys said.

"It means you'd have to hire more personnel," commented Coleman, who said he needs another four inspectors for his normal operation even without official paint checks.

URGES IMPROVEMENT

Stoltz said that when his two inspectors find houses poorly painted, he urges contractors to improve the work even though he has no legal means to force them to do so.

"I know there's lots of jobs inadequately painted," he said. "We tell them 'you've got a heck of a poor job here.' "

"We ride them all the time," he added, "but we couldn't turn the house down because of inadequate painting."

"We don't have any minimum standards on painting," he said. "As far as we're concerned, a house wouldn't even have to be painted" to be given a building permit.

But Stoltz said he didn't feel the county should have the responsibility of inspecting the painting because by the nature of the work the public could do the checking.

"We're interested in what the public can't see," he said, explaining that his inspectors check the portions of a new house which are covered by other materials.

Stoltz recommended that home buyers who aren't familiar with painting have professionals look over the work to advise them as to its quality.

"I would say painting is something the buyer should see and inspect for himself," he added.

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Feb. 13, 1963]

NEW TURN IN PROBE OF HOUSES—SUBCONTRACTORS FALLING SHORT, REPORTS FHA

A detailed investigation of new home painting in the Reno-Sparks area has revealed that few subdivision contractors were violating Federal Housing Administration minimum requirements but most were not meeting their own specifications, Jay E. Baker, FHA director, announced today.

"The general contractor's specifications weren't being met by painting subcontractors," Baker said in a statement on the results of the investigation.

"Wherever violations were found," he added, "we have notified the heads of the various subdivisions of the deficiencies and told them we expected immediate conformance to their own specifications."

AROUSED

Baker said public knowledge of the painting situation in the area, which was aroused through charges of poor painting practices by union and public officials and defense by contractors, has provided a service for the home buyer.

The controversy started when Gene Crumley, business representative for Painters Local 567, filed a letter of protest and then met with FHA officials to charge that every subdivision was in one way or another below FHA standards.

"There's no doubt that it (the controversy) pointed out to us that there were violations of specifications," Baker said. "But I don't feel it will be of any value to keep the pot boiling. We've looked, found violations and corrected them.

WEEK AGO

"This whole controversy started a week ago with the assertion that the FHA was not enforcing its minimum requirements. At that time, there was no dobut in my mind that this office did intend to enforce FHA minimum requirements," he said. "However, there was some doubt as to whether or not the minimum requirements were being achieved in the field.

"During the past week, I have personally checked seven subdivisions in the Reno-Sparks area. I have found very few violations of our minimum requirements," Baker said. "I have found, however, that most of the subdivisions were not meeting their own paint specifications which were better than FHA minimum requirements.

"The general contractor's specifications weren't being met by the painting sub-contractors," he added. "In each case where the subdivisions were put on notice, they were very agreeable to make any changes and assured me that they will make every effort to achieve the results which they specified.

MAKE TRIP

"I would like to suggest that if there is any doubt as to whether or not FHA intends to enforce as minimum requirements, all the doubtful party has to do is make a trip into the field of the various subdivisions and ask the subdivision superintendent.

"The question could also be asked, 'Did FHA representatives inspect your subdivision and did they insist that painting specifications be observed?'

"The FHA intends to make continuous optional inspections on all subdivisions doing business with the FHA to assure itself that the painting specifications and minimum requirements are being achieved," he added.

[From the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette, Feb. 16, 1963]

PAINTING GROUP: INFRACTIONS EXIST "TO SOME DEGREE"

The Painting & Decorating Contractors of California and Nevada, Inc., Reno Chapter, issued a statement today giving the view of its members on a controversy over substandard painting in new homes in the Reno-Sparks area.

The statement, issued following several hours of discussion by the association, said "to some degree" the infractions charged by Gene Crumley, business representative of Painters Local 567, exist.

The controversy touched off an investigation by the Federal Housing Administration, FHA Director Jay E. Baker said after the investigation few contractors were doing work below FHA standards but several were not maintaining their own painting requirements.

The Painting & Decorating Contractors statement follows:

Several members of the Reno Chapter of the PDCA have been approached by reporters to determine if there is truth in the charges made by Mr. Crumley in denouncing the office of the FHA for its laxness in enforcing the minimum painting specifications required under FHA, particular reference being made to tract homes.

After much discussion in the February 13 meeting, the members decided to take a broad and comprehensive view of all the conditions in question. We do not wish to become someone's scapegoat nor are we looking for one. Neither do we condone efforts by any individual or group who may have or will in the future pick out single infractions to promote themselves or their group.

We feel that to some degree the infractions as stated by Mr. Crumley do exist. However, we would like the general public of the Reno-Sparks area to know that similar conditions have existed for several years, further these conditions are no better and no worse than exist in any other metropolitan area on the West Coast from Los Angeles to Seattle.

Most permanent builders in any given area are interested in making an honest living by giving their customers a "fair shake for their money" and in return he expects and deserves like treatment. Reno is endowed with many builders of this caliber. However, Reno like most western cities has and will continue to have "growing pains." This in turn creates a demand beyond the capacity of most conventional builders.

To supply the demand several groups have organized to build in volume. These builders get the job done but their interest is primarily profit. Few of these groups are of local origin, though they are now residents and may intend to make this area their home. In some cases, when the project is completed or the saturation point is imminent, others may move out in search of "greener pastures."

When these builders move out, the new homeowner may swear at him for infractions and complain to the FHA. At the same time he may appreciate that mass production and volume buying power has enabled him to purchase a more spacious home with the most modern conveniences at a price several hundred if not thousands of dollars less than a similar individually built home would have cost him.

The demand for mass production of homes across our Nation since World War II created an immediate demand from labor to get the job done. These carpenters, plumbers, plasterers, electricians, painters, masons, tile layers, etc., could not be developed overnight. This inexperienced labor corps working at established labor scales did involuntarily cause labor cost to magnify.

Add the same increase "caused by the same reasons" to the materials and it is inevitable that the cost of the finished product would necessarily skyrocket. For these same reasons it is also inevitable that the quality of the finished product would suffer.

Quite probably officers in the FHA are aware of these and many other conditions responsible for the criticisms they have received and shall continue to receive until a normal adjustment is reached in supply and demand. These conditions are in no sense limited to the building trades. They are prevalent in some form in every industry and every business.

These 20 years of urgent demand should have produced competent mechanics—it is doubtful in some cases that labor has met its full responsibility for a fair production average and acceptable workmanship for a fair wage received.

The home buyer by virtue of paying one-half of 1 percent for FHA home insurance has a right to expect quality FHA inspections. The FHA in turn has an obligation to render good inspections. We now feel that the local FHA office is trying to furnish this service.

Let no one think the painting contractor is robbing the public. He is getting paid for a job as specified by the builder in some cases, not FHA specifications. If the specifications were FHA and performed as required, undoubtedly an additional cost would be reflected in the sales price to the home buyer.

Will the market afford this increase? Should the FHA specifications for tracts be lowered? In some cases the public is not getting FHA minimums, however, with increase of and better FHA inspections this condition will be gradually eliminated.

In one article, mention was made as to the quality of the paint. In most instances the painting contractor must guarantee his work and material for 1 year. It is not uncommon for nationally known manufacturers of paint to market competitive materials used on tracts. Most of these materials are designed to meet required limits well beyond 1 or 2 years. Some failures are due to overthinning by the journeyman on the job and is usually done without the knowledge or approval of the painting contractor.

In regard to one suggestion that a city code be set up for minimum painting specifications, we are wondering how it would be enforced and who would pay for the policing? The homeowner would indirectly pay for this additional cost as he now pays for any other public service.

Tracts may be one problem but this association feels that most people who have enough money to hire work done have enough judgment to get the job they are paying for. An easy way to be sure is to go to a reputable contractor.

Our closing thought, whether we are painters, auto mechanics, store clerks, union representatives, inspectors, or what, if we keep as sharp an eye on our own responsibilities as we are prone to watch others, then self-improvement in each individual will improve the whole.

THE CHINESE AND PHILIPPINE REPUBLICS: TWO BASTIONS OF FREEDOM IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, Virgil Pinkley, editor and publisher of the Indio Daily News and several other southern California newspapers, is one of our country's most respected newspaper editors and publishers and news commentators. Beyond that, I am proud to call him my friend.

Recently, he visited some of the most important, but often overlooked, areas of the Far East. He has given his readers an informative, firsthand, and up-to-date view of the Philippines and the Republic of China on Quemoy and Formosa.

I ask unanimous consent that four significant articles by Mr. Pinkley be printed at this point in the RECORD. I commend them to Senators.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indio (Calif.) Daily News, Jan. 29, 1963]

PHILIPPINES WOOING FOREIGN INVESTORS' CAPITAL

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following dispatch from Editor and Publisher Virgil Pinkley is the first of a series he is writing on his current aerial tour of the far Pacific and southeast Asia. These will feature interviews with presidents and high officials and eyewitness reports from major capitals and points of tension.)

(By Virgil Pinkley)

MANILA.—Economic conditions highly favorable to the investment of foreign capital are being created in the Philippines, President Diosdado Macapagal told me in an exclusive interview granted in his office at the Malacanang Palace, or the White House of this progressive young Republic.

He said his administration has removed exchange controls and returned the nation's economy to a free basis. The controls, he said, "were one of the main sources of graft and corruption." Then he continued: "The system of controls which had been enforced for 12 years was impeding our economic growth."

In outlining the broad objectives of his program, the President said that emphasis was being placed on the following:

1. Weeding out graft and corruption.
2. Pushing a 5-year economic and recovery drive.
3. Creating conditions which attract foreign investments as well as domestic ones.
4. Pledging that there will be "no confiscation and no expropriation of foreign capital or business."
5. Assuring that "for foreign capital there will be freedom of repatriation of profits and even of capital by insuring a just treatment to foreign investors in this country."
6. Checking and turning back communism by raising living standards and eliminating distress which breeds communism.
7. Making essential changes in the SEATO organization necessitated by altered conditions.
8. Broadening and accelerating educational programs.
9. Keeping Filipino-American relations at their current excellent status.
10. Redoubling efforts to reduce corruption in the administration of Customs.
11. Restoring business now handled by the government to private enterprise whenever and wherever feasible.

Speaking about foreign capital, the youthful fifth President of this rapidly growing and promising nation said: "At the time we took over the Government a year ago, the conditions were about the worst imaginable. The Government was in a state of bankruptcy; the dollar reserves in our Central Bank were negative; there was cynicism on the part of the people, and so we had to roll up our sleeves and act decisively. Within 20 days after I took over, I changed the pattern of the economy from a controlled economy in order to restore and uphold free enterprise.

"It was a very delicate operation as all monetary and currency reforms are delicate but fortunately for us, we have succeeded in effecting this shift."

President Macapagal answered all my extemporaneous questions frankly, quickly, and positively.

Asked about efforts to root out graft and corruption, the liberal leader of the Philippines responded:

"One of the main tasks of our country today is to reduce and eradicate graft and corruption. And, of course, more important in the longrun, is to develop the country economically; to attain a sufficient rate of economic growth for the people.

"Now, on the first task which is the eradication of graft and corruption, we are satisfied that after 1 year in office we have contained and reduced to the minimum, graft and corruption, especially in the upper echelons of the public service.

"This we have been able to do by many measures among them the following: We removed exchange controls which was one of the main sources of graft and corruption. The President and the members of his Cabinet have set the example in honesty and integrity. Although not required by law, the President and every member of his Cabinet have made public their assets and liabilities and they will do so every year during our administration. This is a voluntary act upon the part of the leaders of the administration.

"We have given recognition to citizens who have performed exemplary acts of honesty; we have placed as the first qualification for key positions in the public service honesty, and integrity. I have personally watched the performance of all key officials and have taken immediate steps whenever necessary to insure that there is no deviation from our inflexible creed of honesty and integrity in the public service."

I then asked the Chief Executive of the Philippines how he is faring in efforts to improve the customs service and erasing graft which long has existed.

He replied frankly: "We have reduced corruption in the Customs, but we are still at work there. As a matter of fact, the Customs is practically the remaining office in the Government, unfortunately, in which we are not satisfied in the drive against venalities. But, in a few months, I am confident that we will be able to achieve our purpose of moral integrity in the enforcement of customs and tariff laws in the Customs."

The President received me wearing the traditional garb of the Philippines, a white barong tagalog which is thin, exquisitely woven shirt worn outside the trousers, and white linen pants. In this climate the barong tagalog is a practical dress. It was made highly popular even at the highest state occasion by the late and much beloved President Ramon Magsaysay.

COMMUNISM

Asked what the Philippines are doing to combat communism, the President replied: "In the Philippines we have handled communism by firmly restricting the inroads of local Communists in the various sectors of economic life such as the government, the schools, the labor unions, the newspapers, the offices of politicians. I am satisfied that we have reduced their infiltration to the minimum. But our most important step in meeting the problem of communism is to improve the life of our people through this vigorous economic growth that we are striving for under our 5-year socioeconomic government program. It is my conviction that the best defense against communism and the best measure against communism is to prove that democracy works. If we can prove in the Philippines that democracy works and that under democracy the common people, the masses of the people, can attain a higher level of living, then that is the best answer to communism. It is the best measure against communism. It is my understanding that the local Communists have become baffled by the success we are attaining in demonstrating that through our socioeconomic program, our masses can hope for a happier life in freedom and in democracy."

In view of the recent strained relations between the Philippines and the United States over the war claims bill, I asked the Chief Executive if there were any major problems between the two nations now. He said:

NO MAJOR PROBLEMS

"Problems, there are always the usual problems between nations. But major problems, it is may own view that there are no major problems to settle between the Philippines and the United States.

"The United States has been doing its best to assist us and while we would want that assistance perhaps to be more and more effective or more expeditious, we realize the global responsibilities of America. And there is one thing that characterizes present relations between the Philippines and the United States—the Philippines feels so bound in the pursuit of common ideals as well as in a happy historical association with the United States, that in any crisis, you can always depend on the Philippines to stand by the United States."

Commenting on education and the fact that the Philippines have 26 universities and are graduating thousands of doctors, nurses, engineers, and scientists not only for this country but those who go to neighboring countries in the far Pacific and southeast Asia, I asked how much of the national budget is spent on education.

"More than one-third of the total," Mr. Macapagal responded. He obviously is proud of this record.

A considerable portion of our conversation of 45 minutes was devoted to economic matters and investment of foreign capital. On this vital score the President declared:

WELCOME CAPITAL

"Foreign capital is welcomed. It is one of the principal features of our economic program. The work of developing our resources is so vast that we do not have the domestic capital needed in order to achieve it in the magnitude necessary to provide the needs of our people. Therefore, the answer is foreign investment, foreign capital, and especially from the United States with whose capital we are quite acquainted.

"And so, one of the things I have done in my administration is to provide a climate in order to welcome foreign capital into our country. And by making it clear that we welcome them; by assuring that there will be no confiscation and no expropriation, by assuring that there will be freedom of repatriation of profits and even of capital and by insuring a just treatment to foreign investors in this country."

Asked specifically about nationalization and confiscation of foreign capital, the President continued: "We are not going to indulge in any confiscation or expropriation. I believe that under our program, which I believe will be stabilized within the foreseeable future, our country with its rich natural resources, with many opportunities for profitable investment, and given the climate of freedom and political stability, I venture the statement that the Philippines are going to be one of the best investment fields in Asia if not in the world, within the next 20 years."

SEATO STATUS

Turning to military matters, I inquired as to how the President feels about SEATO.

He responded: "SEATO has been able to do a good job in stopping the advance of communism in this part of the world. Lately, however, it has tended to weaken.

"And so considering the performance of SEATO in the past, and considering the demonstrated utility of regional security arrangements among the free nations, it is my hope that we shall be able to do something to strengthen SEATO—to provide more solidarity among the members of SEATO. Specifically, to perhaps recast the machinery so that within the procedures prescribed, any number of nations within the SEATO could act in order to safeguard the security of the area."

[From the Indio (Calif.) Daily News, Feb. 4, 1963]

CHIANG KAI-SHEK BELIEVES TIME RIGHT FOR FREEING OF MAINLAND

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following is another in the series of exclusive interviews by Editor and Publisher Virgil Pinkley, obtained during his tour of the Far East.)

(By Virgil Pinkley)

TAIPEI, FORMOSA.—President Chiang Kai-shek believes that conditions are more auspicious for his Nationalist government to return to the Chinese mainland now than at any time since the Communist seized China.

The determined, resolute leader of Free China told me during an interview of 1 hour and 16 minutes that the timing currently is right to free some 600 to 700 million Chinese from the bondage of communism.

In this connection he feels that the United States should review the mutual pact of assistance between his nation and the United States in view of changed and changing conditions.

Asked what he would like from the United States, the 75-year-old soldier-statesman said: "First, we want and need the spiritual and moral support of America. This is most essential. From this base will come the other strengths and support we require.

"Second, we need continued material assistance from the United States in the form of military hardware.

"DOMESTIC MATTER

"We do not want or need American troops. This return to the homeland, which must come, is a domestic matter for the Chinese inside and outside the China mainland. For American men ever to hit the shores of China proper would be used by the Reds for immense propaganda. They would be described as foreign invaders.

"But when we return—as we shall—and as we have every right to do as a sovereign nation, we must be as Chinese delivering Chinese from Communist slavery. We are the only duly constituted and legal government of China."

The teatime audience granted by the President was attended by Madame Chiang, easily one of the world's most beautiful and talented ladies. I found the President and Madame looking extremely well. The chief executive appeared even more vigorous and upright than when I last visited the famous couple nearly 7 years ago near Kaohsiung in southern Formosa, or Taiwan.

When I commented on the obvious good health of the President, Madame Chiang said, "He's put on about 10 pounds, and looks better for the extra weight."

He was wearing a dark green tunic soldier uniform devoid of any ribbons, medals, or military insignia. His handshake was long and firm. During our talk he smiled frequently, spoke in a soft, smooth voice except when he discussed returning to the mainland or commented about Mao Tse-tung.

GLINT IN HIS EYES

Then there was a glint in his eyes, he gestured and the firmness of his hands and jaw showed the resolve in his heart and mind.

Asked if his forces possess the necessary military power to carry on a successful return (invasion is never used here and the word is frowned upon), the President replied: "Yes, our forces are sufficient to carry out the mission which I must lead with God's help."

"The air force is small but the quality of men, planes and morale is the highest. Our army of 600,000 is well trained, splendidly equipped for the task at hand, and dedicated. Our naval forces are excellent and growing strong constantly. Our guerrilla and ranger-type troops are ready and eager."

Other subjects reviewed by President Chiang during an unusually frank interview, with some of his statements enclosed in direct quotation markes, included:

The split between the Communist parties of Russia and Red China is probably as wide now as it will become so long as Chinese Communist and Soviet relations and organizations exist approximately as they are currently. "Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung both want each other eliminated as the leader of their respective groups, but Khrushchev wants Mao removed by the Chinese Communist themselves."

FOOD SITUATION WORSE

Food conditions have become worse in China and have gone backward for 3 years despite large purchases of wheat from Canada and Australia. Rations of rice to the Red army have been cut from 24 ounces to 16 ounces daily per man and the pay of Red troops has been reduced too. "Food shortages and famines in China have always led to eruptions and revolutions."

Opposition to communes in China grows—"Recently the entire governmental and party setup in eight provinces had to be changed from top to bottom."

When the Nationalists return to the mainland "Khrushchev will not come to the aid of Mao Tse-tung. But if Russia, however, were ever to become engaged in a nuclear global war with the United States, Red China would go to the assistance of Khrushchev."

The Communists have not succeeded after a dozen years in winning over the millions of China to their cause.

Some top Communist leaders have been "liquidated in recent months, or at least they and a few others have disappeared."

There are growing signs of defections from the Red army and the party. This should not be taken to mean, however, that the regime has lost control of the military or the civil service administration.

Chinese on the mainland give evidences of wanting to leave the country and escape the growing Red oppression.

WANTS U.S. BLESSING

Requested to explain in more detail his feelings about relations with the United States, the President replied: "When we return home I hope it is with the blessings or approval of the United States. We have every right to move as we deem best, but in view of our partnership and long ties with America, I want to see this friendship and alliance continue. Also, we want to keep your government fully informed.

"Our families and brothers and compatriots on the mainland look to us to return and free them. If the United States tries to block this movement, the people of China will blame America more than they will ourselves."

Discussing strategy in the Orient generally Chiang declared: "As long as the Communist regime continues in Peiping, all of southern Asia and the far Pacific are threatened by aggression. If we were not to conduct our campaign of liberation, in time, bits of southeast Asia would be infiltrated or overrun and taken over piece by piece by the Reds. Washington's policy obviously is to fight communism everywhere, including Asia. How better then, than to see Nationalist forces land on the mainland and win back our country to democracy and establish a truly great power in the Orient for the free world?"

Stressing timing and moving at the right moment, the President continued: "There are a number of international factors and domestic situations inside Communist-held China now which may not be duplicated for months or years. We must take advantage of such factors and turn them fully to account."

AT TAIPEI RESIDENCE

The audience granted me by the President and Madam Chiang occurred in the beautiful reception room of their Shihlin residence on the outskirts of Taipei. The room reflects the interior decorating tastes and skills of Madam.

There are three large round Chinese windows looking out on beds of purple azaleas and small yellow chrysanthemums. A fourth window contains a painting by Madam which is made to look as it too opens into a garden. All of the paintings except two in the room were painted by Madam Chiang, who was educated in the United States.

We sat before a cheerful fire with the President and Madam on either side of the fireplace and I was seated on the President's left. There were two small vases filled with daffodils. James C. H. Shen, director of the Government Information Office, served as the interpreter.

The President asked numerous questions about Thailand, Vietnam, and the United States, knowing that I had just visited or left these countries.

Shihlin is a modest, comfortable, and most attractive home located on the slopes of a botanical garden. Nearby is the chapel where the Chiangs pray and attend Methodist services. The President starts each day with prayers and then devotes a considerable time to meditation.

I came away from the interview knowing that the President will never agree to taking his battle-ready and impressive troops out of the rocky fortresses of Quemoy and Matsu which are just a few thousand yards off the mainland coast.

His thoughts are not defensive, but strictly offensive.

In fact, I think he is so determined to return that if necessary he will wade ashore alone. For more than half a century he has fought for and served China. It is the one great dedication of his life.

At this late hour he is determined to free China of communism.

[From the Indio (Calif.) Daily News, Feb. 6, 1963]

IN BATTLE WITH RED "DEVILS" SIMPLE, STRONG CREED AIDS QUEMOY MISSIONARY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following exclusive dispatch from Editor and Publisher Virgil Pinkley, written on the island fortress of Quemoy, tells something of the brutality of the Communists. It also relates what one God-fearing, determined human being can do to battle communism and help his fellow men.)

(By Virgil Pinkley)

SACRED HEART OF MARY CHURCH, QUEMOY, KINMEN ISLANDS, CHINA.—There are many ways to fight communism.

I never cease to marvel at the battles being waged against communism even by individuals in this part of the world.

Father Druetto of the Franciscan Order is an example and an inspiration as he works, ministers, and heals people on this rocky battle station known as Quemoy. He, like the 48,000 civilians and thousands of military on this island only 2,400 yards off the Red Chinese mainland, works and lives under artillery fire and a perpetual Communist propaganda barrage.

The good father, born in Marseilles, France, 63 years ago, came to China in 1931. He is a medical missionary. He weighed 240 pounds when he came from France and it is important to remember this figure. By the time the Reds took over China he had 3,764 followers of the Catholic faith in his parish.

One afternoon 16 Communist police and soldiers with bayonets mounted came to arrest him. Because he spoke English he was charged with being a spy for "Wall Street imperialists and American capitalists." What happened to him then befell thousands of Catholic clergy and nuns and Protestant missionaries in Communist China.

PRESSURE APPLIED

Without any trial or defense he was charged and condemned to die within a week. His execution number was 58. Suddenly, nearly 50 soldiers and secret police removed him from the local jail and took him to the capital city of Changhsa. There he was placed in a cell 5 feet by 5 feet—much, much smaller than the space given a tiger in a cage. For 8 months he was not permitted to see anyone except his Communist captors and tormentors. He received one meager meal daily and developed a prolonged case of dysentery and a badly damaged stomach. He received no medical care or assistance. All kinds of propaganda and pressure of psychological warfare were applied to try and break him down and induce him to sign bogus confessions.

Finally his trial began. It went on for 28 hours in the most gruelling nonstop manner.

"Twenty thousand Chinese jammed the court and surrounding area demanding my release," the father relates with great pride in these people. "During the intervening months after my arrest the Communists could induce only 1 of my 3,764 beloved followers to testify against me. Many were arrested, however, and executed.

"As the trial wore on, I became faint and was near the breaking point. I prayed to God to give me strength. I did not want to let down these brave people who risked their lives to come and demonstrate for me. I thought of Cardinal Mindszenty and how he underwent 76 continuous hours of trial by Communist secret police."

POLICE TIRED

"At about the 24-hour mark, I noticed that the secret police trying me were tiring. They were repeating the same questions over and over. So I prayed and I held on.

"Finally, I was ordered released.

"Dozens and dozens of soldiers took me to the railway station for Canton. Before I left crowds of nearly 50,000 gathered to cheer and to give thanks. All the while the Communists were taunting them and hurling one propaganda charge after another against the United States. Loudspeakers were blaring in every direction. The people booed and shouted back.

"When I arrived in Canton people greeted me with every kindness, giving me food which I could not eat and money. When the Communists dumped me across the border at Lo Wu and into British territory in Hong Kong, I weighed 69 pounds. In the Hong Kong hospital I gained a pound a day for 68 days. Think of it, I weighed 240 pounds when I arrived in China and 69 pounds when I left. Today I weigh 148 pounds."

Asked about his days in the secret police jail of Changhsa which was jammed with 3,000 prisoners, Father Druetto said: "For days and days they would line 60 to 80 inmates up each morning and shoot them. They were pitched onto trucks and hauled away like cord wood. This dreadful ritual went on in the afternoons too. This was being done by Chinese to Chinese. From time to time I would learn of the execution of some brother or sister of mine in the church or of foreigners being shot down."

STRONG, SIMPLE CREED

When Father Druetto finally was discharged from the Hong Kong hospital the church wanted to send him back to Europe for a long rest. But he said no.

"The people of China gave me my life; so I want to devote the remainder of my life to serving them." His strong unbreakable creed is as simple as that.

He decided to go to Fu-Kuo Island off the mainland of South Vietnam where 80,000 Chinese had sought refuge after they fled China through Laos and Cambodia. From there he made his way to Formosa and then on here to Quemoy.

Twice during the heavy 44-day shelling of 1958 and again in 1960 when the Reds fired 180,000 rounds into all parts of Quemoy, Nationalist Chinese authorities sought to evacuate him back to Formosa. He refused. He wanted to remain with his people here, and he has.

BUILT TWO CHURCHES

As I drove up to the Sacred Heart of Mary Church and Mercy Home where he has 12 inpatients, the father was working to enlarge the church, its chapel and the hospital. His hands were skinned and bleeding from stone work he was conducting. He has built two churches on Quemoy entirely with his own hands. The other church is called the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

Father Druetto who was christened Joseph Bernard M., can and does about everything.

In addition to being a priest and medical missionary, he teaches French, English, Italian, and Latin; he speaks several Chinese dialects; and he is a mechanic, electrician, carpenter, stonemason, plumber, farmer, and architect. He showed me blueprints he had just finished for a new church he will build soon on Little Quemoy.

With a delightful sense of humor he said: "I think I shall call it St. Michael's. Just as the Bible relates, it will fight the Devil too—those Red devils on the mainland."

Other plans he is now working on call for the construction of a hospital ward for infants, and a home for the aged. He hopes, also, to build a convent for nuns. There are about 1,600 members of his two churches.

In addition to the sick in his hospital, Father Druetto cares for 25 to 100 ill people in all parts of Quemoy. "I've worn out two jeeps thus far, and am now using my third jeep," he said. He drives an average of about 1,000 miles a week. Everywhere he goes he is greeted with warmth and affection. The people here appreciate that he undergoes their daily dangers and he lives among them.

NINE THOUSAND TREES

Father Druetto has planted more than 9,000 trees around each of his two churches.

Asked when he eats and sleeps, the Father replies with a smile:

"I eat and sleep when I am hungry and tired. I have one thing to thank the Communists for. They left my stomach in such a condition that I eat only once each 24 hours. This saves me time. I usually sleep from two to five hours sometime during the late night hours. There is so much work to be done here, but so little time."

When I visited Father Druetto he was wearing the fatigue uniform and field boots of a GI. He has a large beard which is streaked with gray. He smiles a great deal and has expressive brown eyes. He talks easily and quickly in English. When we switched into Italian he returned after a few sentences to English. Meanwhile, he answered questions addressed to him in Chinese.

"How long do you expect to remain here?" I asked.

"Here, or the Chinese mainland, until I die. It is much cheaper to die here than anywhere else," he said laughingly.

So even all the torture and hell of communism has not broken this wonderful man who works, prays, teaches, and serves. As a Protestant, I salute him.

[From the Indio (Calif.) Daily News of Feb. 7, 1963]

Symbol of Freedom: Quemoy—Rock Fort Off China's Coast

(Editor's Note.—Quemoy has become a symbol of resistance to communism in Asia. For that part of the world Quemoy has the same significance as Berlin in Europe. In the following exclusive dispatch direct from the island fortress, Editor and Publisher Virgil Pinkley relates daily life and something of the military nature of the island.)

(By Virgil Pinkley)

Quemoy, Kinmen Islands; China.—This rocky fortress only 2,400 yards off the Chinese mainland is just as much a symbol in this part of the world as Berlin is in Europe.

Quemoy, and Matsu to the north, give hope to millions on the Chinese mainland that they will be liberated and freed from the slavery of communism. Indirectly they are beacons for much of southeast Asia and the Far Pacific. So long as the forces of Free China hold these islands, there is a strong will to resist. There is hope. And they are strategic in controlling the Formosian Straits.

Coming here as I just have from Taipei, one is impressed by many aspects of this strange and fantastic war which continues between the Red legions of Mao Tse-tung and the free forces of President Chiang Kai-shek. It is waged vigorously on propaganda and psychological fronts as much as on the military one, although people are killed in the exchanges of artillery fire which takes place frequently. It is a war which has been going on for 13 years.

One of the weird aspects of the conflict is the way many operations are conducted on timetable schedules.

If the Communist Chinese shell these islands of the Kinmen group, they do so only on even days of the month. Why? To save face, the Nationalists say.

The Reds usually send over a dozen to several hundred rounds of artillery, mortar, and howitzer shells in the afternoon and evening. If the Nationalists reply they do so the following morning when "the sun is in our favor." Last night the Reds lobbed 116 shells into Quemoy, most of them filled with propaganda material.

Propaganda balloons and bamboo rafts, bottles, and plastic containers loaded with propaganda material are released when winds or tides are in favor of the side sending them.

DUPLICATE BROADCASTS

For 18 hours a day Red Chinese loudspeakers blare out propaganda to the defending Nationalist forces. The free forces of China duplicate these broadcasts in counter-propaganda campaigns. I have just listened for nearly an hour and stood beside an attractive Chinese WAC as she broadcast over the narrow ribbon of water through huge loudspeakers. She tells the Reds how 16 of their fishermen who lost their way and came ashore in Formosa (Taiwan as the Chinese called the island) were received and treated before they were sent

on their way home to the mainland with food, clothes and gifts. Then there are periods of classical, light and martial music and other material countering Peiping claims.

Perhaps I can best relate the status of this fabulous world spot known as Quemoy if I simply tell about my trip here and take you around this island to various spots as we go hand in hand, so to speak.

The Chinese Air Force flew me and a dozen other Americans and Chinese military personnel and their wives here from Taipei right on schedule, in 1 hour and 40 minutes. We took off in a Chinese C-47 air transport and flew along the western coast of Formosa which is 240 miles in length. We turned out to sea and flew across the Pescadores Island group, passing over the city of Ma-Kung. Under the mutual defense pact with Nationalist China the United States pledges to provide joint defense for Formosa, the Pescadores and "such other off-shore islands as the President of the United States may direct."

Until recently the Pescadores produced little food, except fish. But excellent work by the Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction has changed the poor soil which existed formerly. Use of fertilizers, rotation of crops and improved irrigation enable crops of vegetables, peanuts, melons, sweet potatoes and rice. There are now even some exports of surpluses to Quemoy and Formosa.

As we leave the Pescadores and draw closer to the China mainland, the pilot takes us down on the "deck," just a short distance above the water. Although the straits are patrolled and controlled by the crack Nationalist Air Force, being down on the "deck" makes it far more difficult for a Communist jet to make a successful pass at even a propeller-driven transport.

LARGE ISLAND

As we approached Quemoy, I was surprised by the size of the island and to see half a dozen villages and towns, fields being worked by farmers—and even a golf course. The island is in the shape of a butterfly, or a large sausage which has been tied tightly in the middle. Quemoy is the main island of the Kinmens and is 13.5 miles in length and varies in width from 6.8 to 9.3 miles, except for the narrow waist which is only 2.5 miles wide. The island is rocky and hilly and the highest point is 863 feet above the sea.

Just before landing on the airstrip I noticed three ships in the harbor unloading supplies and equipment for the troops holding Quemoy and the 48,000 civilians who live on Big and Little Quemoy and the cluster of surrounding rocky islands.

We were met by General Wang and other top ranking officers after our plane was parked in a well concealed and protected revetment.

I was taken on a 3-hour tour of the island along fine paved and neatly kept roads, lined with small pines to give them protection from enemy observation. I was immediately and repeatedly impressed by the order, cleanliness, and efficiency of all operations on the island. Hedges and shrubs around deeply dug-in gun positions (including 105 to 155 Long Tom artillery pieces) were trimmed like I would like to see gardeners in southern California maintain lawns and gardens.

The soldiers on Quemoy themselves are fine looking troops, well trained and equipped and obviously with high morale. They are happy and proud to be here—and they want to go to the mainland which is less than a mile and a half away at the closest point.

We drove through long, deep, rock and concrete tunnels which are heavily stocked with ammunition, extra guns, shells, hand grenades, spare parts, food, medicines and uniforms and shoes. These tunnels through solid rock and several hundred feet beneath hills are bomb and artillery proof. Other than radiation effects, they undoubtedly would withstand atomic bombs.

CARVED IN ROCK

Around the edges of Quemoy I entered a number of deeply dug in gun positions. They are carved out of rock, heavily sandbagged and have concrete walls and floors. They house artillery, mortars, howitzers, antitank guns, recoilless rifles, and heavy and light machineguns. The fire power they can deliver is murderous. The guns and positions are so arranged that interlacing fire can be laid down at all angles and from various levels or heights. Trying to take this island would be mass suicide as the Communists discovered in 1949 and in 1950 when they attempted landings. In the first onslaught the Communists assigned 20,000 crack troops heavily supported by prelanding artillery. Twelve thousand of the invaders were killed and over 7,000 of the remaining 8,000 captured, many of them badly wounded. In those days the Nationalists had only a fraction of their present firepower and Quemoy was not fortified then as it is now.

Subsequently the Reds have confined their assaults against Quemoy and the surrounding islands, as against Matsu, to artillery and mortar bombardment. In 1950 the Communists shelled Quemoy for 44 continuous days, firing an average of 10,000 rounds daily. In 1960, just before former President Eisenhower visited Formosa, the Reds in an act of defiance pumped 180,000 shells into Quemoy over a period of several days. They killed 9 civilians and wounded 21 others.

Everywhere on the island there are slit trenches, dugouts, bomb shelters and sandbagged areas, even in villages and on farms where life goes on evenly despite the shellings. The local residents have learned to live with these conditions.

BEACHES MINED

The possible landing beaches are heavily mined and fortified. There are many antitank barriers. The underwater defenses against landing craft are murderous affairs of concrete and steel with vicious points and grappling hooks. The area would be tough—mighty tough—to assault and conquer.

In going down or up concrete or rock steps to reach gun positions one notes again how clean and orderly everything is kept. Soldiers manning the guns sleep, eat and bathe in adjacent tunnels or quarters hewn from rock. Their bunk beds are neatly made and from the foot of each hangs a clean, folded towel. Many of these redoubts have springs which run continuously so a fresh water supply is guaranteed.

Hospitals, communication centers, electrical plants, motor pools and maintenance and shop centers are all built deeply underground. The island is really dug in and operations are more heavily protected by guns, firepower, and depth than any I have seen elsewhere.

As I drove through villages and crisscrossed the island I saw some of the 27 elementary schools where nearly 7,000 youngsters attend classes daily.

Everywhere there is industry and a purpose.

After listening to the Nationalist Chinese propaganda broadcasts I went out to the furthermost strongpoint and observation post on the island facing the Communist-held islands and mainland. Using powerful binoculars I pulled up right before my eyes a huge Red observation post and a long-snouted artillery piece. My, but they appeared close and large. Actually, Communist positions ring Quemoy on three sides in a large sweeping semicircle. Red guns can lay down fire on every part of Quemoy.

At noon I was taken to the headquarters of the commanding general for an excellent five-course Chinese luncheon which featured fish, shrimp, vegetables, soup, rice and numerous toasts with Kaoliang wine, a locally produced "firewater" which is 180 percent proof—wow. There were placecards and napkins. The dining hall room with hundreds of feet of rock and earth above, is attractively decorated with large Chinese scrolls and paintings done in red and gold.

As it came time to leave Quemoy I found myself wishing I might remain longer. Of all the experiences I have had in much travel during recent years, the visit to this fortress of freedom and hope is one of the most impressive. I am grateful to have been able to come to Quemoy. Now I think I understand better the symbol which is Quemoy.

RATIFICATION OF THE ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT BY PENNSYLVANIA AND WISCONSIN

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, two additional States have ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment which would eliminate the payment of a poll tax or any other tax as a requirement for voting in a Federal election. This brings, I am happy to say, to 27 the number of States which have ratified thus far.

I am happy to announce, Mr. President, that the two new States which have ratified this important amendment to the Constitution are Pennsylvania and Wisconsin.

I am informed that the senate of the Pennsylvania Legislature on Monday of this week, March 25, ratified the amendment by a unanimous vote of 50 to 0. This most pleasing action by the Pennsylvania Senate completed ratification by the Pennsylvania Legislature, the assembly having approved the amendment on March 6 by the overwhelming vote of 183 to 1.

I express my deepest appreciation to the two distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark and Mr. Scott], both of whom supported my resolution proposing this amendment in the 87th Congress and since submission of the proposed amendment to the respective States, have aggressively directed their efforts toward early ratification by the legislature of their State.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to thank the Senator from Florida for his kind words, which are equally applicable to my colleague [Mr. Scott], who was unable to be present in the Senate at this time. I wish to express my thanks to the Senator from Florida for the leadership he has taken in the constitutional amendment, which I was happy to support. I should like to point out also that the action in Pennsylvania was entirely bypartisan. As the Senator has indicated, the action was unanimous. Was it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. It was unanimous in the senate and only one dissenting vote in the assembly.

Mr. CLARK. It would be interesting to know who was the dissenter. I suppose it shows a keener sense of individuality to be the only one who voted against the amendment. But there was a period, I regret to state, when, on a map showing the States which had ratified the amendment, Pennsylvania was shown in a different color, and was a little oasis—I guess more properly it should be designated a desert in a more fertile country—all the other States in our area having already ratified the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I can assure my distinguished friend that it never occurred to the Senator from Florida to refer to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as a desert.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend. We ourselves like to think of our State as an oasis. In any event, the Senator from Florida did call the subject to my attention a few weeks ago. My colleague and I took steps to urge both parties in the legislature to take appropriate action. I am glad to say that they have now done so, and thereby the day when the amendment will become a part of our Constitution has perhaps been speeded up a little. I thank my friend for his kind comment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his comment, again pointing up the fact that the support of the amendment has been wholly bipartisan, and even nonpartisan in a sense.

Mr. President, I also have been informed that the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin ratified this important amendment, which proposes the highly desirable improvement in our election machinery which I have mentioned earlier, on Tuesday on this week, March 26, by a vote of 30 to 0. The Wisconsin Assembly previously approved the amendment on February 28, 1963, by a vote of 93 to 0, the Wisconsin Senate's action of Tuesday thus completing ratification by that State. Mr. President, I am, indeed, delighted that the vote in both houses of the Wisconsin Legislature was unanimous as it has been in so many of the States which have ratified to date. I believe, including Wisconsin, the legislatures of 9 States have ratified the amendment unanimously, and either the senate or house of the legislatures of 12 other States have ratified without a dissenting vote.

I express my profound appreciation to my distinguished friends the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] who supported my resolution proposing the amendment in the 87th Congress, and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], who, since he has become a Member of the Senate, also has worked diligently seeking ratification by his great State. Both Senators have given every measure of aggressive cooperation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I, too, commend the distinguished Senator from Florida. It is not often that a unanimous vote is obtained in either House of the Wisconsin Legislature on an issue of such significance and basic controversialism. We pride ourselves on our individuality. So the merits of the proposal by the Senator from Florida is particularly conspicuous.

I think it also must be pointed out that both Houses of the Wisconsin Legislature are under Republican control. So as a Democratic Senator, I think I can say that this measure is truly a bipartisan effort.

The very important point of the announcement today is that there are now 27 States, as I understand, that have ratified the proposed amendment. That is now more than half of the States. We are moving toward the three-quarter mark.

The Senator from Florida particularly deserves credit for having pushed this approach to a most serious problem, which, in view of predictable opposition in parts of the country, is extraordinarily difficult to accomplish. The fact that this bill is moving along so well, 27 States having now ratified the amendment as of today, suggests that there is a surprisingly good chance of its becoming a part of the Constitution. I earnestly hope it does so. If it does it will be a triumph for justice as well as the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator. There is no lobby behind the effort. Not a nickel's worth of money from any source is pushing it. I am very happy to say that the activity and the aggressiveness of Senators have been effective in practically every one of the 27 States, including the State of Wisconsin, which have acted to date. I am increasingly grateful for the kind cooperation of my colleagues in this matter.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] for, I believe, one of the finest services in the field of civil rights that has been performed during my tenure in the Senate has been performed by him in connection with the poll tax amendment. As he knows, I am very proud of the fact that the State of Oregon was one of the early States that ratified the amendment. The Senator from Florida is deserving of the thanks of all of us who are very much concerned about the passage of much needed civil rights legislation. This was a very important step.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a moment, I wish to say that I appreciate deeply those more than generous comments.

I think the record already shows that I have expressed my deep appreciation to the senior Senator from Oregon and also to his junior colleague for their active and aggressive sponsorship of the ratification of this amendment by the Oregon Legislature, which occurred just over 2 months ago, on January 25, I believe. This is typical of the fact that supporters of this particular move have continued to follow it aggressively in such a way as to bring it impressively to the attention of their legislators, and, in many instances, to the attention of their Governors.

I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, I was not on the floor when the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] spoke in regard to the anti-poll-tax amendment; but I have reported to him, and I am now glad to report to the Senate, for myself, that the Pennsylvania Legislature has ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment, and Pennsylvania has thereby become the 26th State to do so. When the amendment was ratified by the Pennsylvania Legislature, there was only one opposing vote in the house of representatives, and there was no opposing vote in the senate.

So I am very glad to report this development in connection with the drive to do away with the poll tax—a drive which I have supported ever since the original proposal of this constitutional amendment.

CHANGING DEMANDS ON EDUCATION AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I indicated recently, it is my intention to bring to the attention of Senators the most helpful information in the fields of educational legislation compiled under the distinguished leadership of Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer in the publication of the Committee for Support of the Public Schools report entitled "Changing Demands on Education and Their Implications."

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks the chapters entitled "Education and Economics," "Education and Agricultural Productivity," "Education in the World Scene," and "Penalties of Educational Inequality" be printed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EDUCATION AND ECONOMICS

Adam Smith recognized that publicly supported education played a role in individual self-improvement and in wealth creation.[1] Other great economists, such as Ricardo, Mill, Marshall, and many more, gave attention to the economic value of education.[2] However, until recently, the consideration of the economic significance of education by economists has been incidental to their absorption in the roles of land, labor, and physical capital in achieving economic output.

Education and economic growth

Since World War II, economists have been giving increasing attention to factors involved in economic growth. This results from several developments, such as efforts to step up economic productivity in underdeveloped nations and to speed up the rate of economic growth in the United States—the latter having recently proceeded at a slower rate than that in a number of Western European countries and in the U.S.S.R.

Economists are developing scientific research techniques for measuring interrelations of education and economic growth. They have only begun studies that will permit exact estimates of the economic returns from investment in education.[3] The techniques for studying the economic significance of investment in human beings are extremely complex.[4]

---

[1] Vaizey, John. The Economics of Education. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962. Chapter 1, "What Economists Said About Education," pp. 15-25.

[2] Swearingen, Eugene L. "Education as an Investment." Financing the Changing School Program. (Compiled by National Education Association, Committee on Educational Finance.) Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1962, pp. 20–37.

Although the fact of correlation between amount of education and individual earnings is generally recognized, it is extremely difficult to determine just how much the greater amount of education is responsible for higher earnings. Some cynically claim that "it's not what you know but who you know" that determines a person's success. Many factors are involved—native ability and drive, connections, and the degree to which an occupation is unionized, to name a few.[5]

Attempts are being made to measure both the direct economic returns on investments in education to the individual and the indirect returns from investment in education to the national economy. Studies of the former type will be reviewed first.

Returns to the individual

What is the rate of return to the individual solely from investment in education? One effort to answer this complex question was made by Gary S. Becker for the National Bureau of Economic Research. His study, still under way, has yielded preliminary findings. It compares the life earnings of college graduates with those of persons of less education and relates the differential to the educational investment of these people.

The difference in earnings of urban white males as a return from investment in college education was found to be, after taxes, about 12.5 percent in 1940 and about 10 percent in 1950. Another calculation, with allowance for the public's outlay, before taxes, arrives at 9 percent. Becker also estimates returns in investment in private business and investment in college education and concludes they are not far apart.[6]

Vaizey summarizes the findings of Becker as follows:

"Becker calculated that for white urban males with high school education the return on educational costs, including income foregone, was 14.3 percent in 1939, and 19.2 percent after adjusting the income data for mortality and unemployment. For college education, from 1940 to 1955, adjusted for race, ability, unemployment and mortality, the return was 12.5 percent before tax." [7]

Another economist, Sidney C. Sufrin, draws the following conclusion from Becker's study:

"In short, Becker finds that without regard to other than economic values, e.g., personal satisfactions and enjoyments deriving from college education, and without the consideration of indirect economic effect, e.g., technological improvements made possible by a more skilled and knowledgeable fraction of the population, college education payoff about equals business investment payoff." [8]

In addition to the direct cash value of an education to the individual, there are indirect or diffused economic returns associated with investment in education that are largely left out of consideration when only returns from individual investment in education are considered. As Groves states:

"Studies which start with the individual and the impetus which education gives to his earning power ignore entirely the effect which his education may have on everybody's earning power." [9]

Let us next consider efforts to estimate the effect that education has on everybody's earning power, that is, economic production and growth.

Economic input and output

The growth in gross national product of the United States has not been at a rate as rapid as that of some European countries since World War II. However, it has been substantial in amount, and this growth has been on a higher economic base than that of Europe.

Gross national product in the United States rose from $285 billion in 1950 to $519 billion in 1961, and to $552 billion in the second quarter of 1962. In constant figures, in 1954 dollars, the rise in billions was from $318 in 1950 to $448 in 1961, and to $471 in the second quarter of 1962.[10]

Economists have had some difficulty in accounting for rises in production in the United States on the basis of traditional economic calculations as to inputs of labor and physical capital.

Apparently, the inputs of labor and capital are considerably less than the outputs realized. The amount of this difference is beginning to attract the attention of economists who are studying quantitative and qualitative factors affecting the growth of the economy of the United States. Some conclusions are becoming available.[11]

A study by the National Bureau of Economic Research found that between 1889 and 1957 the combined input index increased at an average rate of 1.9 percent per year, and the output index increased about 3.5 percent per year, leaving a residual increase of about 1.6 percent per year.[12]

While, according to economists, economic inputs need not necessarily equal outputs, the wide differences between the two as estimated above call for explanation.

Human capital

Theodore W. Schultz, former head of the Department of Economics of the University of Chicago, was one of the first to become interested in the wide differences between economic inputs and outputs. In his presidential address at the 1960 meeting of the American Economic Association, Schultz stated:

"Although it is obvious that people acquire useful skills and knowledge, it is not obvious that these skills and knowledge are a form of capital, that this capital is in substantial part a product of deliberate investment, that it has grown in Western societies at a much faster rate than conventional (nonhuman) capital, and that its growth may well be the most distinctive feature of the economic system. It has been widely observed that increases in national output have been large compared with increases of land, man-hours, and physical reproducible capital. Investment in human capital is probably the major explanation for this difference." [13]

Schultz's analysis explores "why economists have shied away from explicit analysis of investment in human capital" and concludes that this explains "many a puzzle about economic growth." [14] He then states:

"The failure to treat human resources explicitly as a form of capital fostered the retention of the classical notion of labor as a capacity to do manual work requiring little knowledge and skill, a capacity with which, according to this notion, laborers are endowed about equally. This notion of labor was wrong in the classical period and it is patently wrong now. Counting individuals who can and want to work and treating such a count as a measure of the quantity of an economic factor is no more meaningful than it would be to count the number of all manner of machines to determine their economic importance either as a stock of capital, or as a flow of production services." [15]

Later in his address, Schultz states that "investment in education * * * may well account for a substantial part of the otherwise unexplained rise in earnings." [16] On the basis of estimates that he offers, he concludes:

"On one set of assumptions, the unexplained part amounts to nearly three-fifths of the total increase between 1929 and 1956. How much of this unexplained increase in income represents a return to education in the labor force? A lower limit suggests that about three-tenths of it, and an upper limit does not rule out that more than one-half of it, came from this source. These estimates also imply that between 36 and 70 percent of the hitherto unexplained rise in the earnings of labor is explained by returns to the additional education of workers." [17]

Schultz gives this general conclusion: "Truly, the most distinctive feature of our economic system is the growth in human capital. Without it there would be only hard, manual work and poverty, except for those who have income from property." [18] He recognizes many complexities in arriving at scientific measures of the returns to an economy from investment in education. He also points out that, in improving our human capital, services other than education, such as those in the field of health, contribute to the stock of human capital.

Schultz suggests some tentative implications for social policy that arise from growing insight into the importance of investment in human capital. These include:

1. Removal of such hindrances to free choice of professions as racial and religious discrimination.
2. Long-term loans to students.
3. Larger investments in the health and education of disadvantaged Americans.
4. Retraining of workers displaced by technological changes.
5. Encouragement of able youths to invest in themselves, especially through higher education.

Among appraisals of recent studies of the economic importance of investment in education is that of Swearingen, dean of the College of Business of Oklahoma State University. He offers the following review:

"Many studies * * * show that the return on the investment in education pays economic dividends of approximately 10 percent with none of the costs allocated to consumption and with no consideration given to the cultural, political, and social benefits of education.

---

[3] Renshaw, Edward F. "Estimating the Returns to Education." Review of Economics and Statistics 42: 318–24; August 1960.

[4] Journal of Political Economy, Vol. 70, Supplement No. 5, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, October 1962. Copyright 1962 by the University of Chicago Press.

[5] Harris, Seymour E. More Resources for Education. New York: Harper & Row, 1960, pp. 71–72.

[6] Becker, Gary S., "Underinvestment in College Education." American Economic Review 50: 346–54; May 1960.

[7] Vaizey, op. cit., p. 43.

[8] Sufrin, Sidney C., "Issues in Federal Aid to Education." Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University, Press, 1962, p. 29.

[9] Groves, Harold M., "Education and Economic Growth." Washington, D.C.: Committee on Educational Finance, National Education Association, 1961, p. 36.

[10] Board of Governors of Federal Reserve System. Federal Reserve Bulletin. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, September 1962, p. 1230.

[11] Abramovitz, Moses. Resource and Output Trends in the United States Since 1870. Occasional Paper No. 52. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1956, 23 pp.

[12] Kendrick, John W. Productivity Trends in the United States. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961, p. 79. Copyright 1961 by Princeton University Press.

[13] Schultz, Theodore W. "Investment in Human Capital." American Economic Review 51: 1; March 1961.

[14] Ibid., p. 1.

[15] Ibid., p. 3.

[16] Ibid., p. 10.

[17] Ibid., p. 13.

[18] Ibid., p. 16.

"These studies, in my opinion, grossly underestimate the value to society of education. They place a value on only those qualities which affect the lifetime earnings of the individual. They overlook many factors which I believe to be very important. Just to list a few, what is the value to society of having: educated civic workers, educated mothers, educated neighbors, improved race relations (which seems to be related closely to education), reduction of poverty with consequent reduction in crime, mothers with some leisure time while their children are in school, the satisfaction which comes from developing one's talents during the educational process, an educated citizenry in the event of war, a citizenry that is literate, and a higher rate of economic growth for our society?[19]

"Note that any study which begins as an attempt to measure only those aspects of education which result in changes in the income of the individual will of necessity omit all of the foregoing benefits of education and many more. Nevertheless, even the studies which have focused only on the increased life earnings of the individual compared to the costs of education (both properly discounted) have shown that the return on the investment in education (human capital) is equal to or greater than the return on investment in physical capital."[20]

Although not exact in the scientific sense, there is empirical evidence concerning the returns from investment in education. Two areas of observation are considered in the next sections of this report—the growth in productivity of agriculture in the United States and the experience of nations, both those that are underdeveloped and those that are economically mature.

EDUCATION AND AGRICULTURE PRODUCTIVITY

The story of agricultural production in the United States is an amazing one. Agriculture has been the pace setter in productivity. The embarrassment of overproduction in the United States contrasts dramatically with the lack of sufficient food in many parts of the world.

Revolution on the farm

The greatest technological revolution in the United States has taken place on the farm. Along with remarkable gains in agricultural production have come such woes as what to do with our agricultural surplus and what to do with the rapidly displaced farm laborers who constitute a considerable part of the disadvantaged citizens in city slums.

"In 1870, more than half of the Nation's workers were engaged in agriculture. Today, only 1 worker in 12 makes his living from farming, either as a farm owner or as a laborer. The implications of this fact are enormous. Ninety years ago, the average farmer could supply food for only 6 people; in 1960, 1 farmer met the food needs of 26 people."[21]

Farm output, as measured against man-hours, increased 80 percent from 1948 to 1958. The annual cumulative rate of increase in productivity of agriculture was 6 percent as compared with 2.5 percent in the nonfarm sector.[22]

Such gains with continuing decreases in farm labor and acres cultivated are a remarkable economic achievement. Many factors have entered into it—new types of organization and machinery and, certainly, education.

In agriculture, there is probably the most comprehensive use of education found in any sector of the economy. Let us analyze some of the educational factors in the picture.

Literacy and general education

Although schools in rural regions lagged behind those in urban areas,[23] the typical U.S. farmer achieved literacy and some general education in the first half of the 19th century as a result of the battle fought and won in that period for free elementary education.

Education and agricultural research

In 1862, President Lincoln signed the Morrill Act providing for the establishment of institutions of higher education in all States, concerned with, but not limited to, the study of agricultural and mechanical arts.

These institutions had relatively little of a scientific nature to teach about agriculture. To remedy this situation, experimentation and research in agriculture were provided for by the Hatch Act of 1887. In 1914, provision was made for adult education, first in agriculture and home economics and later in other fields, under the Smith-Lever Act. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 provided, for high schools, vocational education in agriculture, trades and industries, and home economics.[24]

Education and agricultural productivity

In the foregoing legislation and subsequent acts extending education in these fields, one finds one of the most comprehensive programs for investment in human capital that history records. The farmers of the United States compose no ignorant or superstitious peasantry. For a century or more, they have enjoyed the benefits of—

1. Literacy and general education permitting access to written knowledge and the flexibility of mind which tends to welcome new knowledge.

2. Formal and specialized instruction beginning at the secondary level and continuing into the undergraduate and graduate levels of higher education.

3. Research and experimentation to provide a scientific basis for instruction and practice.

4. Provision for the rapid extension of new knowledge among those engaged in the industry.

Some economists have suggested that the reason that other major sectors of the economy have gained less rapidly in productivity than agriculture is that they have made less intensive use of the quartet of factors identified above.

Action for agriculture?

We might wish that our agricultural revolution had been wholly a matter of intelligent leadership and statesmanship. It appears, however, that it was largely the outcome of two factors: (1) war pressures (during which the Morrill Act of 1862 and the Vocational Education Act of 1917 were passed) and (2) certain rural political controls. Referring to the tremendous increases in agricultural production, Groves states:

"A plausible hypothesis is that here we had a politically favored area upon which were bestowed almost unlimited funds, both for research and dissemination of the results."[25]

One might wish that fortuitous circumstances had brought about equally effective use of education in the Nation's total development—economic and otherwise. Rather, several interests have blocked full use of the power of education in advancing the general cultural and economic growth of the United States.

The unfinished business in the agricultural sector is the rational action that its most rapid and most complete technological revolution demands. There must be use of, or limitation of, agricultural production and provisions for displaced workers.

Another type of empirical evidence bearing on the education-economic relationship comes from the correlation of investment in education and per capita production both in underdeveloped and in economically mature nations. The next section reviews evidence on this subject.

EDUCATION IN THE WORLD SCENE

The relation of education to economic growth is a matter of world-wide inquiry. It is of keen concern to the nations struggling to feed their hungry populations. The economically advanced nations are studying the role of education as a factor in stepping up the rate of economic growth. Some interesting facts are emerging.

Literacy and per capita income

There is high correlation in the nations of the world between literacy and economic productivity. One can approximately estimate the per capita income of a Nation by ascertaining the percentage of its population that is literate.

John Kenneth Galbraith, U.S. Ambassador to India, has pointed out that popular enlightenment opens men's minds to new methods, new techniques, and new desires.

"Apart from its cultural role, popular literacy is a highly efficient thing. Needless to say, it is also the mainspring of popular aspiration. As such it adds strongly to the desire for development."[26]

To be sure, literacy is only one element in economic growth. But it is significant that no nation with an illiterate population has achieved high productivity. All nations with literate populations have high per capita incomes.

Natural resources, education, and productivity

The natural resources of a nation do not determine its economic status. Table I shows that some nations rich in natural resources are poverty stricken. Others, such as Denmark and Switzerland, have meager natural resources but high per capita incomes. Both of these latter countries have made highly effective use of education.

Education and economic growth

Western Nations

How much is the superior economic status of Western nations due to provision for the education of their people? Was industrialization achieved first, and did it make it possible to finance education, or was the sequence reversed?

Mrs. Alva Myrdal, Swedish Ambassador to India, in 1960 reported her observations of the relation of education to economic growth in several nations of the West, including Denmark, Sweden, Germany, France, Great Britain, and the United States. In dealing with the relation of education to economic growth, she stated that "education has, in the nations that have advanced rapidly and firmly, been rather a precursor than a follower in the table of progress."

---

[19] Swearingen, Eugene L. "Education as an Investment." Financing the Changing School Program. Washington, D.C.: Committee on Educational Finance, National Education Association, 1962, pp. 34–35.

[20] Ibid., p. 35.

[21] U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Occupational Outlook Handbook, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961, p. 16.

[22] Groves, Harold M., Education and Economic Growth. Washington, D.C.: Committee on Educational Finance, National Education Association, 1961, p. 19.

[23] This lag is one source of some of the most severe social problems associated with illiteracy, unemployment, and crime, dealt with earlier in this report.

[24] Norton, John K. "Federal Relations to Education." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. (Edited by Chester W. Harris.) Third edition. New York: Macmillan Co., 1960, pp. 522–523.

[25] Groves, op. cit., p. 20.

[26] Galbraith, John Kenneth. Economic Development in Perspective. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962, p. 13.

TABLE I.—*Natural resources, education, and income*

Nation	Natural resources	Educational development	Per capita income, average 1952–54
Brazil	High	Low	$230
Colombia	do	do	250
Denmark	Low	High	750
Mexico	High	Low	220
New Zealand	do	High	1,000
Switzerland	Low	do	1,010
United States	High	do	1,870

Source: For per capita income (net national product at factor cost): National Industrial Conference Board, the Economic Almanac, 1958, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1958, p. 488. Source: For educational development: National Education Association, American Association of School Administrators, "Schools for a New World," 25th Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1947, pp. 26–30.

She gave particular attention to Denmark, since it has few natural resources besides its land and its people. She pointed out that—

"The industrial revolution in Danish agriculture could only have been attained because the Danish population was already rather thoroughly prepared by education. No other country had so early and so comprehensively instituted compulsory schooling as Denmark. Thus, when the great decision had to be taken about changing the nation's economy, the challenge could be met by a people who had already behind it a generation of practically universal literacy."[27]

The quick recovery of the nations of Western Europe after World War II is in sharp contrast to the lagging economic progress of the less-developed countries. The former nations had a large stock of human capital in the form of educated and trained citizens as an important factor in speeding their recovery. Looking to the future, the Western nations are taking realistic account of the role of education as a means to further developing their manpower.[28]

The recent Policy Conference on Economic Growth and Investment in Education identified a number of the products of education that are essential for economic growth. The following excerpts from the report of this Conference are illustrative:

"The importance of education as part of national policy has never attracted as much attention and been as widely discussed as it is today—in Europe as well as in North America. Present trends—political, economic, social and technical—are all focusing attention on the role education should and could play in a modern community.[29]

"Education is also more and more widely recognized as a means to economic growth which, since the end of the war, has everywhere been a paramount aim of national policy. In the underdeveloped countries, economic growth is necessary to alleviate widespread poverty. In the more advanced countries, economic growth has become a matter of competition, a yardstick for appraising the ability of different political systems to solve economic and social problems."[30]

U.S.S.R.

The rapid economic development of Communist Russia was in part the result of one of the most dynamic educational programs of all history. George S. Counts, in his prize-winning book, "The Challenge of Soviet Education," points out that—

"The Bolshevik leaders from the first have regarded organized education with utter seriousness, far surpassing in this respect the leaders of any free society on earth. Without their vast system of educational agencies the Bolsheviks would not be standing in the position of power which they occupy in the world today."[31]

William Benton, former U.S. Senator from Connecticut, has made four trips to the U.S.S.R. since 1955 and has given special attention to Soviet education. After his 1962 trip he reported that "the disparity between Russian dedication to education and our own is so grave that I come home a deeply worried citizen." He reported that Russia is not only "stealing the American dream of providing every child an equal opportunity for an education" in the elementary and secondary schools "but in higher education as well." He states that the "Soviet Union's most potent weapon may very well be her quietest weapon, education." Senator Benton warns that the cold war between the Soviet Union and the United States "is likely to turn on which society makes the best use of its potential educational resources."[32]

Asian Nations

Japan, with meager natural resources, nevertheless launched an educational program in the nineteenth century which, early in the twentieth century, resulted in a high level of literacy. Today, Japan has the highest per capita income of any Eastern nation.

The less-developed nations have yet to create the educated and trained human capital essential for high productivity. This lack is a major block to their economic growth.

India recognizes this fact. A. N. Khosla, a leading Indian engineer and member of India's influential Planning Commission, stated the situation thus:

"The wealth of a nation consists of its natural resources and the manpower to develop these resources. India has vast resources of land, water, and minerals. Its population will rise to 431 millions in 1961.

"This immense population is our biggest asset. It is also our biggest problem. Properly trained and directed, and employed with due sense of urgency, this manpower can work miracles in the economic development of this country. Neglected and unemployed or under-employed, it can bring about major social and political upheavals. The building up of the country's human resources is, therefore, our first task, and education has the most vital role to play in this task."[33]

Unmeasured products of education

It is probable that the most significant economic returns from investment in education are diffused and unmeasured qualities in the people of a nation, which in considerable degree are a product of nationwide education. Some of these are identified below.

Social and Political Stability

When the temper of a people is unstable and their decisions are frequently overturned by seizures of power, the climate for financial investment is not good. To the extent that education contributes to social and political stability, it provides an environment which encourages economic investment.

Achievement of Democratic Aims

The United States recognized early in its history that the development and maintenance of a free society require education for all. This factor was dealt with in the Policy Conference cited above as follows:

"Education has always been regarded as a vital factor in achieving the general aims of society, an instrument to make the democratic system more perfect. What is more recent—and has so far received less consideration—is the emergence of a concept of education as an important factor of economic policy."[34]

New Knowledge

New knowledge today is the stuff of progress and even of survival. Universities provide the highly educated personnel required for scientific inquiry. They are a major source of the fundamental research that is the basis of most applied research.

The Conference cited above stated that "there is one field in which investment in higher education is especially desirable: the highly profitable field of research."[35]

Scientific Outlook and Acceptance of Change

The citizens of a nation must understand the value of new knowledge and possess attitudes which permit it to be applied. If superstition and resistance to change stand in the way of applications of new knowledge to such fields as agriculture, industry, and health, progress is balked.

"One of the signs of a progressive economy is its ability to transfer a technical innovation, first from the laboratory to actual production, and then from one unit of production to another. The progress of underdeveloped and semideveloped countries is highly dependent on an acceleration of this transfer process. It is here that the role of education and the choice of the right kind of education can be so important."[36]

Highly Trained Specialists

General education and training throughout the whole population are essential ingredients of a modern society. But it is also of critical importance that there should be some who have specialized education of a high order.

"Education, and especially higher education, should aim at facilitating division of labor; it should prepare people to meet the demand for new specializations of function * * * specialization * * * means that people increasingly work in teams which contain complementary types of knowledge and skill. It is basic for such teamwork that the improved productivity of one member should increase the productivity of other members of the team."[37]

Leadership

Recent events have emphasized the importance of the role of scientific leadership. Modern nations, however, require first-rate leaders in many fields. For example, the importance of the trained entrepreneur is coming to be recognized. Men of insight and broad social understanding are required in government. In fact, advanced education is called for in nearly all fields. The quality and quantity of leaders are largely determined by the effectiveness of schools, colleges, universities, and other educational agencies.

---

[27] Norton, John K. "Education and Economic Development." Indian Journal of Educational Administration and Research 1: 13; Spring 1961.

[28] Vaizey, John. The Economics of Education. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962. Chapter 7, "Manpower," pp. 89–107.

[29] Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. "Targets for Education in Europe in 1970." Policy Conference on Economic Growth and Investment in Education. Report II. Paris: the Organization, 1962. p. 15.

[30] Ibid., p. 16.

[31] Counts, George S. "The Challenge of Soviet Education." New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1957. pp. 306–307.

[32] Benton, William. "Big Red Threat: Education." New York World Telegram, September 10–13, 1962.

[33] Khosla, A. N. Address at a meeting of the Indian Panel of Education, August 8–9, 1960.

See also Norton, op. cit., p. 10.

[34] Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, op. cit., p. 21.

[35] Ibid., p. 25.

[36] Ibid., p. 24.

[37] Ibid., pp. 24–25.

The ability to organize large numbers of workers for effective work is of growing importance in modern societies. The Conference cited above stated that "education at the leader level yields extra dividends all the way down the line." [38]

The Conference on Education in Relation to Economic Growth concluded that—

"Economic growth is generated not only by real capital in the form of tools and machinery, but also by men. And just as technological improvements increase the efficiency of machinery, so education increases the efficiency of manpower. Indeed, recent statistical investigations tend to show that the improvement in the "human factor" accounts for a major part of economic growth." [39]

Evidence is accumulating concerning positive effects of education in increasing production. There is also evidence that neglect of education has serious negative effects. The next section identifies some of the social and economic consequences of inadequate educational opportunity.

PENALTIES OF EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY

It is a shocking fact that the United States, with equal opportunity as one of its ideals, has failed to provide educational opportunity for all children. This failure and its social penalties have been pointed out by a series of studies made since World War I.

A project sponsored by Dwight D. Eisenhower when he was president of Columbia University pointed out that we were "squandering our human resource capital." This waste resulted from "the failure of our society to invest adequately in the development of its people, particularly its young people during their formative years." [40] This notable study took account of illiteracy as it was revealed in connection with military recruitment:

"World War II threw a searchlight on the deficiencies in the educational preparation of the young. Almost 2 million men out of the 18 million who were screened (1 out of every 9) were total or borderline illiterates.[41]

It was concluded that illiteracy remains a major national deficiency. When millions reach adulthood unable to read and write, it is obvious that there is gross denial of educational opportunity in some parts of the nation. Let us examine recent facts.

Illiteracy

According to the U.S. Bureau of the Census, approximately 2.85 million persons in the United States in 1959 were unable to read or write at all.[42] The U.S. Commissioner of Education, testifying in the 1962 Hearings of the House of Representatives regarding adult illiteracy, stated:

"Much of our adult illiteracy exists in States that find difficulty in supporting an adequate program of education for children and youth. In fact, States with the lowest level of support for general education tend markedly to show the largest number of educationally deprived adults. However, illiteracy is found throughout the Nation, which means that in some States it is imported, while in others it is home-grown. In the former, illiteracy is due to a failure at the adult education level; in the latter, it represents a failure to provide educational opportunity at the elementary and secondary levels. In either case, it is a condition which should not be tolerated in a democracy. It becomes, therefore, a national problem * * * illiteracy reflects one of two conditions. Either the individual has not had an opportunity to attend school, or he attended a poor school for a short period of time.

"According to a 1958–59 Office of Education survey * * * of 15,200 school systems studied, only 4,840 reported any type of adult education programs; and of these 4,840, only 160, or 3.3 per cent, offered instruction in basic literacy education to 47,500 adult illiterates." [43]

In addition to those who cannot read and write, there are millions who are designated as "functionally illiterate," who have completed less than 5 years of schooling and usually lack ability to make effective use of reading and writing.

According to the 1960 Census of Population, some 8.3 million persons aged 25 and over—more than 8 percent of the adult population—had completed less than 5 years of schooling. Of this number, 4.5 million were men, and 3.8 million were women.[44] These do not reside exclusively in one region. New York has 800,000 in this group; California, 505,000; and Illinois, 365,000. The corresponding numbers in each of the States of Kentucky, Michigan, New Jersey, and Ohio exceed 200,000. Many persons in such States, with less than 5 years of schooling, are migrants from areas with poor school systems. Among Negroes in the United States, the illiteracy rate is four times as high as among white people.

Many of our citizens fall far short of completing 6 years of schooling:

"In 1960 there were approximately 115 million persons in the 18-year-and-over age group * * * of these 11,350,000, or 10 per cent, had completed less than 6 years of schooling." [45]

In some cases, illiteracy results from lack of educational opportunity. But in many cases it is due to inadequate schooling resulting largely from nonenforcement of school attendance laws; oversized classes in which little attention is given to individual pupil needs; lack of remedial reading classes; and lack of special provisions for children of minority groups, migrant laborers, and other disadvantaged Americans.

The U.S. Commissioner of Education, testifying before a Congressional Hearing in 1962, reported that "it is now increasingly rare for children to avoid school completely," and that what happens is that some attend "a poor school for a short period of time." He stated:

"In seeking the major cause of continuing illiteracy, attention must henceforth be directed not so much to a lack of opportunity for any schooling but to a lack of adequate schooling." [46]

Social liabilities

Lack of schooling is associated with lower earning capacity, higher rates of unemployment, higher rejections from military service, and more dependence on public aid.[47]

Lower Earning Capacity

Employed workers with an 8th grade education or less have 65 percent of the incomes between $1,000 and $1,500 and 61 percent of the incomes between $1,500 and $2,500.[48]

Unemployment

Unskilled workers have the highest rates of unemployment and the lowest average level of education. A U.S. Department of Labor study of March 1959 showed an unemployment rate of 10 percent for workers with under 5 years completed, a rate of 9.8 percent for those with 5 to 7 years schooling, 4.8 percent for high school graduates, and 1.8 percent for college graduates.

When technological changes displace workers, those workers with little education are the most difficult to retrain for new jobs. Lacking educational background, they have less promise of benefiting from vocational education. They are likely to increase the already overcrowded ranks of casual labor or of the unemployed. Unemployment for long periods of time tends to make a person unemployable.

Rejection From Military Service

In World War II, some 400,000 illiterates were accepted for military service. The Armed Forces provided these men with the educational fundamentals necessary for useful service. Another 300,000 illiterates—equal to 20 army divisions—were rejected completely.

During the Korean war, 19 percent of all recruits were rejected from military service on grounds of educational deficiencies. From July 1950 to September 1961, over 900,000 draft registrants of 6 million examined were rejected on the basis of a mental test alone. This number was almost as great as the number of registrants disqualified on medical grounds. Low educational attainment was the largest single reason for rejection.[49]

Relief Rolls and Public Assistance

The U.S. Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, testifying before a congressional hearing in 1962, stated:

"There are 7¼ million persons in our affluent society receiving welfare payments today. Total annual Federal, State, and local expenditures for this purpose exceed $4.5 billion. Forty-five percent of all families with less than $2,000 annual income have a head of the family with less than an eighth-grade education. These families, in turn, constitute the source from which the public welfare rolls develop, when an individual becomes unemployed or sick or some other hazard occurs to him." [50]

Many studies show that recipients of public assistance are likely to be persons of low educational attainment. A 1957 study in New York, for example, revealed that almost one-fifth of the mothers on the aid to dependent children (ADC) rolls had not gone beyond the fifth grade. This study further showed that among families receiving general assistance, one-half of the family heads had completed no more than 6 years of schooling. Illinois reported in 1960 that one-fifth of the ADC mothers had not gone beyond the sixth grade. In Louisiana, in 1954, one-half of the ADC mothers and three-fourths of the fathers in the home had received only a fifth grade education or less.[51]

A recent Chicago study pinpointed the relation between lack of education and dependency on relief. The study tested a representative sample of relief recipients in Chicago. It found that 50.7 percent of those studied could not pass reading and vocabulary tests at the fifth grade achievement level. The conclusion was that the problems of public welfare stem from unemployment and economic and technological displacement and, most important, from relief recipients' lack of basic educational skills which are essential to compete in our modern society.

---

[38] Ibid., p. 25.

[39] Ibid., pp. 23–24.

[40] Ginzberg, Eli. Human Resources: The Wealth of the Nation. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1958, p. 53.

[41] Ibid., p. 54.

[42] Cohen, Wilbur J., "Adult Basic Education Act of 1962: Hearings Before the Committee on Education and Labor." U.S. 87th Congress, 2d session, House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, February 1962, p. 9.

[43] McMurrin, Sterling M., "Adult Basic Education Act of 1962," pp. 17–19.

[44] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. "Health, Education, and Welfare Indicators." Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, April 1962, p. v.

[45] Cohen, op. cit.

[46] McMurrin, op. cit., p. 20.

[47] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, op. cit., p. vi.

[48] Ibid., p. ix.

[49] Cohen, op cit, p. 12.

[50] Cohen, op. cit., p. 11.

[51] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, op cit., p. IX.

On the basis of the sample studied, it was concluded that more than one-half of the 225,000 able-bodied relief recipients of Cook County, Ill., were functionally illiterate. This county's relief bill for 282,000 recipients including the ill and the aged, is $16.5 million. According to Raymond M. Hilliard, director of Cook County Department of Public Aid:

"The cost of the community in dollars and wasted human resources will be disastrous if basic literacy education and job training are not provided." [52]

Social cost of inadequate schooling

The evidence is compelling that lack of schooling and poor schooling are associated with such social problems as low earning capacity, unemployment, rejection from military service, and dependence upon public relief in its various forms. This is not to claim that education alone can completely eliminate such major social liabilities. However, it appears that one of the priorities that must be included in a realistic program to eliminate, or at least sharply reduce, the mounting numbers on relief rolls is adequate educational opportunity for every child in the United States. This requires that there be a first-rate school available to every child, with a program fitted to his needs and capacity. There must also be strict enforcement of school attendance laws so that such factors as race, parental indifference, and social and economic status do not result in inadequate schooling.

Educational action to these ends is fully justified solely on the basis of our commitment to equality of opportunity. There is the additional fiscal consideration that it will probably cost less to provide adequate schooling for all than to pay for the rising relief expenditures, which are at least in part due to lack of such schooling.

It is not enough merely to achieve functional literacy in the elementary school. Far too many of those who reach the high school become dropouts before they receive the education and training required for employment and self-reliant citizenship. The next section deals with this problem.

FINANCING OF COLLEGIATE EDUCATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Director of the College and University Administration Branch of the Division of Higher Education of the Office of Education last November had published in the Sooner magazine an article covering the financing of collegiate education.

In view of the factual material contained in the article, in my judgment, Senators will find it most helpful as they consider education legislation in the 88th Congress.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINANCING YOUR CHILD IN COLLEGE—AN EDUCATIONAL EXPERT OFFERS ADVICE TO PARENTS WITH COLLEGE IN THEIR FUTURE

(By Ernest V. Hollis)

What does it cost to attend college? And where will the money come from? Perhaps you have read that it can cost anywhere from $500 to $5,000 a year to send a child to college these days. Do you wonder why there is this great range—and where you would get, say, $8,000 for the 4-year education of each of your children? If your children are young, are you alarmed at predictions that college costs will increase markedly in 5 years, and may actually double in 10 or 15?

The facts are sobering enough. But they should not produce the jitters or cause parents to panic. Through careful planning, a family can prepare to meet college expenses as easily as it prepares to buy a house, an automobile, or a major home appliance.

While it is safe to predict that all costs of attending college will increase each year between now and 1965, 1970, and 1975, all of the economic trends indicates that family income for most of us will increase proportionately. Although families will be paying more dollars each year toward the costs of a college education, in most cases they will not be paying an increasing proportion of the educational costs or devoting a larger fraction of their income to these purposes.

There is nothing mysterious about the costs of attending college. They break down into two segments. Educational costs, which are minor, are set by the college. But living costs, which are major, can be controlled to a large extent by the student and his family.

If we examine the two segments separately, we can then put them together to show total costs. But before we do, let it be clearly understood that all the comments below on costs and on sources of funds are limited to single, fulltime, resident, undergraduate college students. In public colleges, we will further restrict ourselves to costs for students who are residents of the State in which the institutions are located and who, therefore, do not pay the higher tuition charged to nonresidents. The story would be too complicated, and both costs and sources of funds would lose focus, if we included commuting and part-time students, married students, or those attending graduate or professional schools.

Educational costs—tuition, fees, books, educational equipment and supplies—are not the major part of the total expense of going to college. At public-supported colleges, educational costs average only one-sixth of the total that each student spends. At private colleges, where tuition is higher, these expenses will average only about one-third of the total. The student pays for only a portion of what it really costs his college—public or private—to provide his education. And, as a result, his educational expenses remain relatively low.

Although educational costs have risen from 6 to 9 percent each year since World War II—and 75 percent in the last decade—they began at a very low level indeed. And, despite some instances of very high tuition, the averages are still low enough to be within the reach of nearly everyone.

There are State universities where annual tuition and fees have reached $800 per student. Yet the average is still under $275.

And at 10 outstanding public universities, including California, Kentucky, Louisiana, and Texas, educational costs are still under $200 for State residents.

At private colleges, the student pays a larger share of what it costs the college to provide his educational program. But only at the less well managed institutions does he pay more than 60 percent of the actual educational cost. The rest is made up by each college from its endowment and current gifts. The average charge for tuition and fees at the superior private colleges was $768 in 1961–62, and the middle half of them charged from $565 to $980.

MOST PARENTS PREFER LESS HIGH LIVING AND MORE HIGH THINKING

What makes financing 4 years in college truly burdensome is the high cost of living—and, sometimes, the cost of high living. On a national average, living costs make up five-sixths of students expenses at public colleges, and two-thirds at private colleges. While most parents would prefer less high living and more high thinking, they do want their children housed comfortably, fed well, and provided with wholesome recreation, medical care, and other student services. All of this costs money. The truth is, we prefer it to the plain living of yesteryear.

Both the college and the student make decisions which determine the cost of living. Auxiliary facilities and services provided by the college, many of which contribute to education as well as to comfort and well-being, largely determine whether an institution has an atmosphere of relative austerity or of a country club. But living costs at any given institution are also governed by what the student and his family consider a reasonable budget.

A student on a luxury budget often spends three or four times as much as one on an economy budget. At the University of Illinois, for example, single undergraduate students spent in 1960 anywhere from $850 to $3,400, averaging $1,744. Only $376 of this was for tuition, fees, and other educational costs.

If we look just at the totals for tuition, fees, room, and board, omitting other incidental expenses for the moment, the 1961-62 figures ranged from a low of $600 in 67 public and 24 private colleges to a high of $2,000 in 6 public and 125 private colleges. The average of costs in 493 accredited public colleges was $913. In 886 private colleges, it was $1,392.

All these figures support the view that the essential costs of going to college are still within the reach of most families.

A superior undergraduate college education can cost a lot or a little today, and the same is likely to be true in the future. Let's take a look at how students and their parents are meeting these costs, and suggest some new ways for meeting them.

The man was right who said the easiest way to finance a college education is to choose parents who are in the upper income brackets or grandparents who established a trust fund for the purpose.

Less fortunate but more enterprising persons cut college expenses by choosing a superior college in a section of the country where costs are low. At least 300,000 undergraduates who do this are saving up to 30 percent of the total cost of attending college. A public or private college in New England or the Middle Atlantic States, for example, will cost much more than an institution of the same high standards in the South or Middle West. High school and college counselors can give leads to such information. The enterprising family can save hundreds of dollars by following them.

If a student does not choose to go where superior education is least expensive, another sure way of saving cash outlay is to stay home and become a commuting student. At least half of the undergraduates in the country live close enough to a college to save money in this way. But by doing so, they would lose the social growth inherent in a residential college. This and other decisions leading to the choice of a college cannot be made lightly, of course.

While the amount of money required for 4 years in college varies with such factors, the pattern of who provides it does not vary greatly. Parents of commuting students, for example, pay less in cash and more in kind; but they nevertheless provide about the same proportion of the student's total budget as do all other parents.

The most recent comprehensive report of where the money comes from was my study for 1952-53 (U.S. Office of Education Bulletin No. 9, 1957). Recent smaller studies indicate the patterns have not changed much since then. That study included 16,000 single undergraduate students in 110 public and private colleges in 41 States. It showed that 41 percent of the money came from the family and relatives, 26 percent from student earnings, 20 percent from assets (savings, etc.), 10 percent from scholarships, 1 percent from loans, and 2 percent from miscellaneous sources.

---

[52] New York Times, "Study of Relief Cites Illiteracy." New York Times, September 22, 1962, p. 27. Copyright by the New York Times. Reprinted by permission.

These figures are average, and they do not mean that all students received income from all of these sources. In fact, the studies show that only about 20 percent of all students receive any funds from scholarship sources, and that nearly 25 percent do not receive any funds from parents or other relatives. On the other hand, two-thirds of the men and half the women had income from work during the school year or the preceding summer.

The number of students who borrow money has increased markedly since Congress enacted the National Defense Education Act in 1958. For the school year 1960–61, under this act alone, 151,115 students borrowed $71 million. What's more, the liberal terms of the act regarding the making and repayment of loans have had an important influence on other student loan funds. At least 21 States now have substantial loan funds. Long-term, low-interest loans are also available from religious, labor, service, and philanthropic organizations. Banks and insurance companies are making commercial loans to students in increasing numbers, usually through parents or other adults. In 1961, banks alone reported making 13,000 educational loans amounting to $37.3 million.

But parents still provide a major portion of the money for college expenses, as they always have. Let us look at the factors which influence how much parents contribute, and how they manage to do so.

Lower income families tend to send their children to low-cost institutions, where they provide as large a portion of the total budget as a wealthier family contributes at a high-cost college. Too often this puts a B-plus student from a D-plus economic family into a C-minus college. The obvious immediate remedy is to let the student attend a superior college, contribute the same number of dollars, and let the student and the college makeup the balance through work opportunities, loans, and scholarships. The long-range remedy calls for a family investment plan that begins when the child enters elementary school, or before.

It is a greater error of judgment to send one's child to a shoddy college in order to save a few hundred dollars on a lifetime investment than it is to save a few dollars on a short-term investment in shoddy clothes. Yet parents are more prone to make the first than the second mistake. We tend to forget that during the first five of his productive years a student usually earns the difference in what it costs to attend a college that gives a superior education.

Once a student has been admitted to a college suited to his needs and capacities, the family contribution to his budget is determined by some combination of the following six factors, listed in the order of their importance: (1) family income, (2) parents' level of education, (3) the breadwinner's occupation, (4) sex of child, (5) the number of brothers or sisters now in college or who have recently been graduated, and (6) the number who may later attend college.

Level of income is obviously the most important of the six factors, but it does not operate alone. The parents' own education or occupation usually influence both how much money is earned and for what purposes it is spent.

A 1960–61 study of student economics by Prof. L. J. Lins at the University of Wisconsin explored some of the relationships of family income to the amounts spent for college. The study revealed a remarkable difference at each income level between the total college expenditures of in-State and out-of-State students. It also confirmed the fact that parents spend more to send daughters to the University of Wisconsin than to send sons. And it showed that student budgets rise gradually from austerity to luxury with family income.

TOO MANY B-PLUS STUDENTS ARE BEING PUT IN C-MINUS COLLEGES

The median college expenditures for students from Wisconsin families with incomes under $4,000 were $1,250 for men and $1,267 for women. At the other extreme, men students from Wisconsin families with incomes over $20,000 spent an average of $1,651, and women students $1,919. Men from out-of-State families in this bracket spent $2,270, and women $2,564.

Other studies show that the education and occupation of parents, especially at lower income levels, help determine whether qualified children will go to college, and how much of the family income will be used to assist them. In general, the more education parents have and the more culturally significant their occupations, the greater is their willingness to make sacrifices in order to help finance their children's college education.

How much parents pay toward college expenses depends also on how many children they have at about college age. Fewer than one-fifth of the couples with one child in college have one or more other children attending college at the same time. About one-third have older children who have previously attended college. But half of the families have younger children who are potential college students.

The average student with no brothers or sisters spends more than students who have them. In the University of Wisconsin study, for example, students with no brothers or sisters had budgets that averaged $1,775, and those with four or more siblings spent $1,390. The presence of one additional child to be put through college tends to reduce the average annual budget of a student by $100; of two children, by $175; three children, $250; and four or more additional children by at least an average of $350.

Parents provide two-fifths of the expenses of single undergraduate students. And most of them do so now on a sporadic, catch-as-catch-can basis—most frequently by cutting down on current family expenditures. About one-fourth of the parents say they make all their contributions from normal current income.

About half the students who enter college get 10 to 15 percent of their freshman and sophomore budgets from gifts and inheritances or from other family capital.

Parents can take on extra work to provide the necessary funds. The father can secure a second job, or the mother can take one on, or both. Thirty percent of parents report that part of the family contribution to college expenses comes from extra earnings by some family member other than the student.

More and more of those parents whose children are not yet of college age are committing themselves to comprehensive plans for saving money systematically for the college education of their children. Yet the number who are saving in a realistic way is still alarmingly low.

A Ford Foundation-sponsored survey made in 1959 showed about three-fifths of the parents whose children are not yet of college age have no plan at all to provide money for college expenses. According to this survey, 24 percent of parents have insurance programs to save money over a 10- to 15-year period before their children are of college age; 11 percent have savings in bank accounts; 6 percent have Government bonds; 4 percent have common stocks; and 4 percent have other types of plans.

But those who need such savings plans most are least likely to have them. Some 58 percent of parents in high income brackets have savings plans, averaging about $670 a year. Only 38 and 28 percent of those in average and below-average income brackets are saving about $130 and $100 a year, respectively, for college expenses. The average family with one child saves $140 per year for this purpose; with two children, $150; and with three or more children, $180.

Compare these figures with those given above for college costs, and you will see that families are not accumulating enough funds to meet two-fifths of the cost of 4 years in college (the current average family contribution), much less this portion of the increased costs expected by 1970 or 1975. There is an urgent need for those who are saving for college attendance to double the amount they now set aside. And there is an even more urgent need for the 60 percent not currently saving to devise plans.

As indicated above, parents who have savings plans rely largely on lending their money and accumulating interest. When asked in the Ford Foundation survey why they chose the plans they did, parents who are using insurance policies said they liked the regular forced payments, the protection in case of death, the fact that cashing the policies is discouraged, and the fact that payments are extended over a long period. Those using savings accounts reported they did so because this type of investment is easier, can be used for other things, pays a higher interest rate, and is safe. Those who prefer investing in Government bonds like them for reasons of safety, high interest, payroll deductions, patriotism, and because the money isn't readily available to be spent for other things.

Savings and loan associations, which now pay 4 to 4.75 percent and which guarantee deposits up to $10,000 through an agency of the Federal Government, provide another sound but relatively little-used method for long-term investment by those who put safety of principal above the risks of investing directly in the private enterprise system.

Those who invest in the economy directly to accumulate funds for college attendance, through common stocks or otherwise, do so primarily in the expectation of a higher return on the investment, and as a hedge against inflation. Because saving for college is a long-term investment, they believe it is not endangered by the short-range vagaries of the stock market. They say they prefer to invest in economy themselves, rather than to lend their money to someone else who will do so to his own profit.

One of the newer plans for saving to meet college costs is investment in the shares of mutual funds. This arrangement enables one to put his money in shares of a variety of portfolios of common stocks or of preferred stocks and bonds, and leave the management to qualified investors. There are some 250 mutual funds operating in the United States. They range all the way from funds emphasizing growth stocks, which may pay low dividends but may increase greatly in value in a few years, to funds based on portfolios of preferred stocks or bonds that produce relatively high dividends but have low growth potential.

It costs a lot to go to college today, and of course, it will cost more tomorrow. Yet parents who look realistically at college costs need not be alarmed. Student budgets are flexible, and they can be controlled to a remarkable extent by family desires and family circumstances. Nearly everyone can afford to invest in a college education, with careful planning in advance.

Such planning should lead to a systematic program of saving for the future college expenses of our children. Yet too few parents have such savings programs, and many of those who do are not saving enough.

Every parent owes it to his children to consider early where the money for college will come from. Few families in the Nation can see their children through college without sacrifice of some sort—either long-term or short. But the rewards are great, and of lifelong duration.

TAXES FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE BOY OR FOR THE IGNORANCE OF THE MAN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Commissioner of Education, on March 8, at a meeting in Chapel Hill, N.C., of the North Carolina Citizens Committee for Better Schools, set forth sincerely and eloquently the case for the President's comprehensive education bill. In doing so, he paid great tribute to the farseeing legislators of that State, who shared the convictions of many of us who seek enactment of sound educational legislation.

I was particularly struck by one quotation from North Carolina State Superintendent Charles Carroll which, in my judgment, cuts to the very heart of the case. Dr. Carroll said, in the course of his testimony before a legislative committee of the North Carolina Legislature in 1961:

> Every generation must decide whether it shall levy upon itself taxes to pay for the education of the boy or for the ignorance of the man.

This succinctly states the issue for it is our belief that through education lies our best hope in a technological age of reducing the social costs of unemployment for the States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dean Keppel's speech to which I have alluded be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Governor Sanford, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, this is my first official trip out of the Federal sanctuary as a representative of the administration, duly and properly confirmed in my appointment by the Senate. It is a pleasure and honor to be able to make this visit to a State which ranks among the leaders today for its commitment to education. No one has been more dedicated or more vigorous in advancing North Carolina in this field than Governor Sanford, and I believe that his warm reception by the assembled school superintendents of the country at their Atlantic City convention late in February showed both his ability to communicate this dedication and the fact that his reputation stretches beyond the boundaries of his own State.

We are equally grateful for another of your citizens who now serves with distinction as President Kennedy's Secretary of Commerce—Luther Hodges, the founder of your citizens committee, and in the Department I serve, Dr. Ellen Winston is the newly appointed Commissioner of Welfare. These are but a few of a long list of outstanding leaders from North Carolina.

Over half a century ago, one of the great champions of public education in this State phrased your concern and your convictions: "We are prospering as never before—our wealth increases, our industries multiply, our commerce extends, and among the owners of this wealth, this multiplying industry, this extending commerce, I have found no man who is unwilling to make the State stronger and better by liberal aid to the cause of education."

These were the words of Gov. Charles B. Aycock, the man who led North Carolina through one of its most stimulating periods of educational achievement. It is not extravagant to call Governor Aycock's era at the turn of the century a true renaissance of education in this State. It was a period which laid the foundation for the continuing progress which extends right into 1963.

The leadership of Governor Aycock is unquestioned; he followed a long tradition of laymen and educators who combined forces throughout the history of this State on behalf of all children. I could not begin to do justice in a short time to the many teachers and humanitarians back through the years who worked to bring this State to the forefront in education. But I cannot resist touching on three highlights which to me are significant in that they indicate the conviction and dedication of North Carolinians from colonial days onward.

In 1745, the citizens of Edenton acted through their assembly to authorize the erection of a public schoolhouse. A few years later, the assembly appropriated 6,000 pounds for "founding and endowing" a public school in the province.

This story does not have a happy ending, but it does perhaps contain a moral. The funds were shortly borrowed, but they were used for building forts in western Carolina and for paying troops to fight in the French and Indian wars. The question of priorities must have perplexed your ancestors, even as similar questions perplex us today.

The second landmark came in 1766, when citizens of New Bern enacted a law imposing a tax of one penny a gallon on all rum and other spiritous liquors imported into the Neuse River for a fund to pay for the education of 10 poor children annually and for a salary of 20 pounds a year to the master of the school. The tide was running early for tax-supported public education for the children of the new land.

Finally, article XLI of the State constitution, adopted in 1776, made clear beyond any doubt the determination of this State to provide for its youth. It provided: "That a school or schools shall be established by the legislature for the convenient instruction of youth, with such salaries to the masters, paid by the public, as may enable them to instruct at low prices; and all useful learning shall be duly encouraged and promoted in one or more universities."

In singling out these three events I do not mean to overlook the scores of related developments and educational victories which were won during the years—the rise of the private academies, the establishment of the State university system—nor do I wish to slight the heroic endeavors and vision of such men as Judge Archibald Murphey, who is justly called the father of the common schools, and Charles McIver and James Joyner, who worked so valiantly in the Aycock period to develop broad support for the schools and to revolutionize teacher education in the State.

Perhaps Superintendent Joyner captured the historical spirit of this State as well as anyone. In 1904, he observed that: "Mighty revolutions are always noiseless and must be wrought first in the minds and hearts and wills of the masses. I believe that such a revolution upon this question of the education of all the people is well underway in North Carolina."

The facts prove Mr. Joyner an excellent prophet. Within a 10-year period at the start of the new century, more than 1,200 schools were built in North Carolina—an average of one a day during the entire Aycock administration. Public school expenditures and the value of school property tripled; a month was added to the school year; teachers' salaries increased more than 50 percent; the sources of tax support were broadened.

Unfortunately, like any crusade, this one was bound to lose momentum; it could not be sustained at such a high level of activity. While there have inevitably been peaks and valleys in financial support for the schools, it is significant that in depression years, from 1931 to 1933, the State appropriations for public schools was not reduced, even though the collection of revenues fell some $22 million below estimates.

Through the intervening years, progress has been made in North Carolina and around the Nation. It has been heartening progress, but it has been irregular and not rapid enough to meet the demands of our time.

Your State superintendent, Charles Carroll, who follows the tradition of your State's leadership, recognizes the challenge of "unfinished business" and dealt with it in his speech last March to the North Carolina Education Association.

While paying just tribute to the achievements of legislators and educators in the past year, Superintendent Carroll felt constrained to describe major unsolved problems North Carolina faces. Among these he mentioned the dropout problem—the steady attrition of students from the first grade on, illiteracy, weaknesses in some areas of the curriculum, inadequate texts and related instructional materials. Finally, he cited the need for broadening the scope of public education to provide opportunities for all the diverse abilities and talents of children.

I do not mean to imply that Dr. Carroll was enveloped in gloom. You know him better than to suspect that. But his experience and wisdom have taught him to assess the situation on a realistic basis and to plan accordingly. He himself described the proposition much better than I can when he said to a legislative committee in 1961: "Every generation must decide whether it shall levy upon itself taxes to pay for the education of the boy or for the ignorance of the man."

This is exactly the question I shall raise with you today. Are we as citizens—joined in a worldwide struggle against man's traditional enemies of fear, hunger, confusion, and ignorance—prepared to unite in another crusade on behalf of a new generation?

Some 20 years ago Dr. Conant summarized his thoughts about the purpose of American education in a report to the Harvard Board of Overseers. I find his prescription eminently acceptable today. He said that the primary concern of American education was "to cultivate in the largest possible number of our future citizens an appreciation of both the responsibilities and the benefits which come to them because they are Americans and are free."

Ideally, each new generation in America is offered an opportunity for a fresh start, unencumbered by ties to the past, by inhibitions or restrictions of family or circumstances. Realistically, this doesn't always work out, as we so well know. Dr. Conant's latest study on the problems of slums and suburbs deals dramatically with some of the reasons why. For a number of complex reasons, the force of the locality exerts a discernible influence on the curriculum of many schools in the country and directly on the students themselves.

There is little doubt that pupils bring into the classroom with them more attitudes drawn from their homes and neighborhoods than they learn in school. These attitudes toward life and learning probably do more toward setting academic standards than the combined efforts of teachers, testing organizations, and publishers, or actions by regional or national educational agencies.

There is an extreme variety of attitudes, ranging from those of the underprivileged urban centers to those of the wealthy suburban compounds. There is the sheer preoccupation with survival in sections of the big cities. There is the tenseness and the drive for status among the professional families. And there are all the shades of attitudes and pressures in between.

Unfortunately, despite these variances, there is still a widespread tendency to think of our schools as more or less interchangeable from one community to the next and to feel that they can be measured by a fixed standard—like the percentage who go on to college, for instance. Rather, we should be seeking a moving standard of progress toward goals set by the needs of the individual, the domestic economy, and international demands facing the Nation—a standard moving toward even higher goals of quality.

Last year, over a million children were in overcrowded classrooms, and some 2 million others were studying under grossly substandard health and safety conditions. These are national problems which cross State boundaries and deserve national attention. Our population is highly mobile, with 1 family out of 5 moving each year, often across State lines.

As you have recognized so clearly in North Carolina, the problems of education cannot be dealt with on a piecemeal or isolated basis but must be considered in the whole, from the kindergarten through the graduate school. And they must be viewed in the context of the whole economy, whether it be statewide or nationwide. Just as you seek to advance and improve the quality and quantity of your system here, so we seek to advance the educational enterprise on a national scale.

About a year and a half ago, Governor Sanford pointed out that "if we neglect education, we block our growth economically and industrially; through education we open ways to agricultural, economic and industrial advancement that will improve our standard of living." Certainly your State is matching its plans with action, under the leadership of Governor Sanford and the State department of public instruction, in cooperation with leaders of secondary and higher education around the State. The new system of industrial education centers is an example of your progress, as is the movement to expand and diversify your whole higher education structure.

Earlier this year, President Kennedy, in his education message, reiterated similar concerns when he said: "For the Nation, increasing the quality and availability of education is vital to both our national security and our domestic well-being."

A growing body of evidence indicates that the development of human capital—particularly investment in education—has actually been more important as a source of economic growth than has the accumulation of physical capital. Education contributes directly to economic growth because it improves the quality of the labor force; it contributes indirectly but significantly because it is the source of the research scientists and engineers responsible for much of our technological advance.

It has been estimated, in fact, that in recent years our investment in education has been responsible for up to 40 percent of the Nation's growth and productivity. It is an investment which results in higher wages and greater purchasing power for the worker and in the new products and techniques which come from trained minds.

In our cooperative search for quality and expanded opportunities in education, we are at once confronted with the problem of numbers. It is a problem that persists at all levels. Our elementary and secondary schools are overcrowded; our colleges and universities are expecting a new wave of applications; our graduate and professional schools will face similar challenges shortly. During 1962, nearly 50 million were enrolled in our schools and colleges—over a fourth of the Nation. By the end of this decade, college enrollments are expected to double, and secondary schools will have a 50-percent growth.

The forces I have mentioned will have increasing influence on our planning. The population explosion will continue to have its effect on all levels of education throughout much of the remainder of the century. The mobility of this growing population will be of special import to States and localities facing also the usual problems of taxation and schoolhousing, not to mention the concomitant questions of finding and retaining qualified teachers, who themselves are subject to move under the pressures of money, standards, and opportunities for professional improvement.

Forces other than growth and mobility challenge us as well. In an age of space exploration and travel, vastly improved education is essential to give new meaning to our national purpose and strength. We have, in recent years, witnessed a literal explosion of knowledge—in the physical sciences, in mathematics, in discoveries on the earth's surface and in the seas around us. For the schools to assimilate and pass on this new storehouse of knowledge is in itself a sobering task, and we will need additional numbers of highly skilled teachers, along with new aids and materials to do the job.

Scientific developments, along with the complexities of modern life, have changed and are changing the whole structure of vocational education in this country, a structure which has, of course, been revised and extended since the basic Federal-State partnership was established in 1917. Familiar jobs and occupations have declined or disappeared, and new ones are emerging, requiring new or different preparation and large numbers of skilled workers.

We hear frequent reference to the problems of college preparation. No less urgent are the problems of providing adequate training opportunities for the 21 million young people now in grade school who will enter the labor market without a college degree in the 1960's. We must provide for these young people the kind of education and training opportunities suited to the changing times. We must also be planning for the training and retraining of additional millions of workers whose skills and technical knowledge must be updated, as well as those whose jobs may well disappear because of automation and economic change.

Implicit in much of what I have said thus far is the assumption that as individuals and as a nation we must be moving ahead to improve our educational system. I believe with conviction that there is an important and substantial role for the Federal Government in American education. This role has been evident since before the adoption of the Constitution, and, while it has been modified, clarified, amplified, and diversified, it has never been denied—not by the States which have joined the Federal Government in an effective partnership and not by the millions of Americans who have benefited from such programs as the Land Grant College Act, the GI bills of World War II and the Korean war, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

A variety of experiences in a number of individual and institutional grants, subsidy, and research programs through the years has amply demonstrated that the Federal Government quite properly assists educational progress and growth without Federal control. Federal participation should continue to be selective, stimulative, and, where possible, transitional.

With these principles in mind, and confronted with massive evidence of shortages and weaknesses facing education today, the Kennedy administration has recently proposed to the Congress a comprehensive and interrelated program of aid—a program which recognizes that the chain of education in our society must be strong in all of its links. I would like to sketch in the highlights of this program for you.

H.R. 3000, the proposed legislation on which a number of hearings have already been conducted by the House Committee on Education and Labor, is entitled the "National Education Improvement Act," and that is a rather accurate description of its intent.

It is a comprehensive program to meet selected and urgent needs of education at all levels, to promote quality education, expand opportunities, and to increase the capacity of our educational institutions, with the overall aim of providing for the Nation's needs in skilled manpower, national growth, and national security.

The bill seeks to provide new opportunities for individuals in higher education by expanding and extending the student loan and graduate fellowship programs of the NDEA. Additional funds would be made available under the loan program, which has helped bring about major changes in concepts of student financial aid and has opened up new opportunities for thousands of students. A new dimension would be added to the use of credit in meeting higher education costs by providing Federal Government insurance of long-term loans to students from families of moderate means. A considerable increase is proposed in the number of graduate fellowships available to help encourage and sustain those studying for advanced degrees in science and the humanities. Finally, the well established concept of encouraging our youth to help themselves would be supported by a proposal to provide additional, educationally related, work study opportunities for college students.

The bill would help institutions of higher education to expand and improve through loans for academic facility construction and grants for libraries, graduate school development and programs of technical education. Aid would be provided for the construction of public community and junior colleges—a matter of considerable interest to you at the moment in North Carolina.

Most of us would agree, I think, that the most significant factor in the learning process, next to the aptitude of the learner, is the quality of instruction. The bill is concerned with the essence of quality—the preparation and continued improvement of teachers. It seeks to broaden and improve programs of teacher preparation and inservice training, with special emphasis on the subjects to be taught or being taught. In addition, the bill would provide expanded and accelerated educational research and demonstration efforts.

Improved research and teacher training, however, are not enough if good teachers do not choose to enter or remain in the profession. We have heard much of salary problems, lack of incentives, and industry competition. We know that each year valued professional teachers leave the schools never to return.

The bill includes a cooperative approach to some of the key problems of public elementary and secondary education, including those of the teacher. Provisions are made to assist the States in undertaking, through their own State plans, selective and urgent improvements in the public schools. These would include substantial increases in the salaries of career teachers, increases in starting salaries that are exceedingly low, and increases in the salaries of teachers in economically disadvantaged districts; constructing classrooms in areas of critical and dangerous shortage; and initiating pilot, experimental, or demonstration projects to meet special educational problems, particularly in slums and depressed rural and urban areas.

In vocational education, the bill is designed to help alleviate and anticipate some of the situations arising from the changes in our industry and technology. By expanding the scope and level of vocational education programs now in effect, and by adding specialized grants-in-aid, I believe that the new proposals will strengthen the State and local efforts to train and retrain individuals in skills to fit them for our changing technology.

The bill also provides funds for preparing teachers of the handicapped and for research projects in the special education of such children.

Finally, the bill deals with the problems of providing education and library service for those who seek or require these beyond the regular formal years of schooling. It has become increasingly apparent that education does not and should not end, whether it be with a high school diploma or a master's degree. Many of our citizens, with different levels of formal education, now seek and need opportunities for continuing education in various fields. An estimated 8 million Americans 25 years of age and older have less than 5 years of schooling, and almost 23 million have less than an 8th grade education.

In order to help provide much greater opportunities for learning by adults, the new legislation would authorize grants to States for the expansion of university extension centers and would make additional grants to aid States in adult basic education programs. Special grants (in amendments to the existing Library Services Act) would enable States to expand facilities and services in both urban and rural libraries.

Today the demands of national security and economic growth have joined our traditional concern for equality of opportunity for the individual—a concern which you have cherished in North Carolina since the earliest days. We are, I think, experiencing a complete reassessment of the key role of education in our society because it serves not only the individual—it is essential to our way of our life and our security.

The schools and colleges and universities, the libraries and the laboratories that have served us so well in the past must be greatly strengthened and expanded to meet their future responsibilities. We rightly take pride in the freedom and independence of these institutions. The policy of the Federal Government, in planning its part in the effort we must make as a nation, must be such that, at the end of any program, the institutions are stronger and freer than they were at the start. I am profoundly convinced that independent institutions and freedom of learning and teaching are the fundamental basis of our society.

Educators themselves must be prepared to reassess positions that were taken under different circumstances. We are faced today by new facts that call for new solutions to old problems. As I see the situation, national security and economic growth now change the need for a Federal program in education from a desirable domestic goal to a deadly serious necessity. We have waited too long; we are face to face with a problem that must be solved at once or our national future will be in jeopardy.

Under such circumstances, the house of education must not be divided. Educators are citizens, and in our tradition we should voluntarily and gladly subordinate our particular interests to the larger good. We must be prepared to sacrifice long-standing hopes as well as long-standing hostilities. We must face up to economic and political realities. If we as a society are to make the forward leap in education that the times demand, he who trips us as we come to the place of the jump must have the national well-being on his conscience.

The administration's program as presented to the Congress is designed to combine the forces of education for their common task and to strengthen them for the heavy responsibilities they must bear. No one of us in the administration, I am sure, would claim that the interrelated proposals are so well formed that improvements are impossible. On the contrary, we actively seek criticism and will give the most serious consideration to proposals for change. But we do insist that the time has come in our history to face the whole problem, from preschool through adult education.

The proposed program, in my judgment, is more susceptible to the criticism of being too small rather than to the criticism of being too large. It takes political and economic reality into account. It is concerned with the undeniable facts of the needs of the economy and of the students and educational institutions. It was designed to deal with the equally undeniable facts of current opinions and judgments on sensitive areas of public policy. It calls upon many groups to sacrifice hopes of long standing; it asks of others that they accept policies on the form in which funds are provided or the categories of institutions to which they are limited, which they may regard as inadequate or even unfair.

Yet in elementary and secondary education I believe that there is substantial consensus among educators as well as the lay public that children in the public schools should be taught in safe and healthy surroundings, that their teachers should be well selected and well trained, that those teachers of high quality who wish to make teaching their lifelong career be provided with salaries high enough to make such a career possible and competitive with other professions, and that the shocking problem of slum schools in city or county should be solved at once.

The administration's program for the schools is aimed at these problems. It is based on a diagnosis of our educational health and prescribes medicines specific to the diseases that must be cured. On these matters it is reasonable to insist that all the forces of education have an obligation to unite—public and private, schools and colleges, humanists, and scientists alike.

I am proud as an educator to report to you that the clear majority of the members of my profession who have testified in recent weeks before the House Committee on Education and Labor have taken the larger view. They have subordinated their special interests and organizational policies to the greater good. We have, I believe, never had such harmony from the orchestra of education.

I am not so naive as to think that educators alone can create good legislation or have enough political power to pass it. This is as it should be. The common good requires a broader view than any one profession can expect to have, and the ultimate judgment is in the wisdom of the people and their elected representatives. Yet in a democracy it is clearly the privilege and the duty of the educator as a citizen to take an active part in bringing about public understanding of the relation of education to the society it serves.

If the educators are either silent or divided in their counsel, in the face of the difficulties besetting any legislation on education, it is not reasonable to expect that the public will take the necessary action. Educators cannot pass good legislation, but by their action or inaction they can keep it from passing. Let it not be said of our generation that we failed in our public duty.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the busy round of our daily duties, sometimes I fear we neglect to pay tribute to the fine work which is being done by the Library of Congress. Senators, I know, share my appreciation for the splendid service which that community of scholars provides to us. Without it, in many instances we would find ourselves handicapped by lack of information we badly need both in our work on the floor and for our constituents.

Sometimes, however, we forget that the Library as a scholastic enterprise services not only the Congress but the Nation. Key to this service is the dedicated work of many men and women who are experts in almost every area of human endeavor. The Library stands as one of the great symbols of the culture of our country.

Mr. President, I was moved to address the Senate on this subject today because I find that the Library of Congress is deeply appreciated by men and women back home who also avail themselves of this storehouse of knowledge. Mr. William H. Carlson, director of libraries at Oregon State University, paid tribute to the Library of Congress in a publication last February of an article entitled "Almost a Book." Because of the warmth of this tribute which, in my judgment, is sincerely deserved, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALMOST A BOOK

I range myself, completely and without equivocation, among the admirers of the Library of Congress. While this great Library is far, very far from gathering and organizing in usable form all man's recorded knowledge it comes closer, probably, to doing this than any other library in the world. It now has 12 million books on its more than 300 miles of shelves and is heading, likety-split, toward 13 million. It has, in addition, over 3 million photographic prints and negatives, well over 2 million pieces of music and is about to have 3 million maps. The collection and control of the recorded products of the human mind, in quantity, as carried on by the Library requires a staff of between 2,000 and 3,000 people and a budget surpassing that of our entire university. Managing all this is an administrative and intellectual problem complex in the extreme.

How and why has this Library grown great beyond other national libraries and how has it been able to achieve, largely within this present century, substantial stature beyond and above the sum of all its parts? There is the Congress of the United States, of course, which has made the necessary dollars available, adequately but never generously. Money has, of course, been an absolute essential. The Library, however, has not grown great merely by spending money and accumulating more and more books. Over and above this, as is always true of superior enterprises, has been the intelligence, gifts, insights and devotion of those at the controls and among the troops. We, as a nation, have been blessed and doubly blessed in the persons who have directed this great and growing enterprise down through the years.

It is significant that most people joining the staff of this Library in key positions and who have built the woof and warf and coloration, too, of its being, have remained with the Library on a lifelong career basis. In the earlier years this was at salaries which were woefully low, below even the low going rates of those years in the major university and public libraries of the land. Why did so many of these able people, best typified by Herbert Putnam, long time librarian, remain with the Library when they could easily have moved out at much greater salaries? Prestige perhaps was a factor, but if so it was a thing which they themselves were creating and of which they were the embodiment. Mostly, I would think, it must have been, and continues to be a sense of being constructively and fruitfully creative in the evolution of our modern voluminously articulate culture. Obviously with less imaginative and dedicated leadership the Library of Congress could never have attained its present high eminence, no matter how generous the budget. It could, indeed, under less able leadership, have become a chaotic intellectual jungleland.

Among the many wise and constructive things which the Library has done is to appoint, as honorary consultants, persons who have attained outstanding eminence in varied fields of culture. One such person has been our genius poet Robert Frost, currently recuperating from surgery and for whom we must all wish a complete and speedy recovery. It was with obvious pride and pleasure that Librarian Quincy Mumford last May set aside a Robert Frost Week in the Library during which he announced that Mr. Frost had accepted his invitation to serve a second 3-year term as Honorary Consultant in the Humanities. More than 600 people came, at the highlight of the week, to sit, quite literally, at the feet of the poet. Overflowing the available seats in Coolidge Auditorium, more than 50 of them were sitting on the floor.

The poet responded to this occasion with sincerity and characteristic charm of expression. His consultantship, he said, had been "one of the great things in my life." Through it he had become a friend of our now President John F. Kennedy. Replying to the audience applause which greeted the announcement of his reappointment Mr. Frost said: "This all started between Mr. Mumford and me as a sort of joke. I came down (as Consultant in Poetry) expecting to have nothing to do with the city—I came down to be one of the poets who tell other poets how not to write poetry * * * but I rebelled—I said I had come under a misunderstanding: I'd thought I was to be a poetry consultant in everything. But I got all mixed up in the Government, so somebody called me, the other day, a statesman. I've become a part of the Library, haven't I? Almost a book. If I act a little foolish tonight, pay no attention. It's just statesmanship."

Mr. Frost received a standing ovation when he entered and again when he had concluded reading from his poetry. Here with books all about in the wings, millions upon millions, this man, creator of some of the best ones, who felt himself to be a part of it all and "almost a book" was bringing dignity and the warm human touch to an enterprise which might well grow cold, possibly even surfeited and cynical, in the logistics of never ceasing annual consumption of square footage by mile after mile of books, of classification schemes, ever more complicated, of growing millions of catalog cards, of indexes upon indexes. How fortunate that those who manage this, the greatest library of them all, continue to invite gifted and learned men, Robert Frost and many others, to share their wisdom and contribute their insights not only to making the Library great but to keeping it warmly human.

Wm. H. Carlson,
Director of Libraries.

AWARD OF $10,000 BY INTERNATIONAL NICKEL CO. TO REED COLLEGE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, upon my return from Foreign Relations Committee assignments, I was pleased to find on my desk a letter under date of March 18, 1963, from Mr. Richard A. Cabell, vice president of the International Nickel Co., Inc., which stated:

> I think you will be interested to know that International Nickel has made a grant of $10,000 to Reed College in Portland, Oreg. Under the terms of the grant the authorities at Reed College are free to use the money for any educational project which they regard as worthy.
>
> This gift is a part of our continuing program of contributing to the support of leading private educational institutions.

This morning I wish to commend the International Nickel Co. and other great American corporations which have the forethought to give tangible evidence of the concern of their management for the colleges and universities of our Nation.

In my judgment, corporations such as the International Nickel Co. point the way to the Congress for meeting the needs of our schools at all levels. I congratulate Reed College upon receiving this unrestricted gift. I also congratulate the International Nickel Co. for having adopted this farsighted policy of educational support.

CATTLE PRICE DROP ON WESTERN MARKETS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on March 14 I brought to the attention of the U.S. Senate the fact that the price of fat cattle at western meatpacking houses had fallen drastically in the last 90 days. At that time I made known my intention to conduct an investigation into the causes behind that price drop to make sure that both the beef producer and the beef consumer were not being victimized by unfair or illegal price practices.

I have today some information which I would like to present as a first chapter in this investigation. This information is very enlightening, and I think will demonstrate some obvious reasons for additional investigation in this pricing area.

The people of my State have written to me, Mr. President, to indicate their concern that the price drop may have been caused by increasing imports of fresh and frozen meats. My investigation shows that the price of fat steers in the week of December 10 to 17 in the Denver market—which I am here using as a market very typical of the other markets in the area—was $29.50 per hundredweight and on January 17 that price had dropped to $25 per hundredweight. Yet during this time the importance of fresh and frozen beef dropped from 77,600,000 pounds to 52,200,000 pounds. Thus, we can see that the blame for this precipitate drop does not lie with the imports from foreign producers. Furthermore, I would point out that fresh and frozen meat does not compete with most of our fresh meat, but is rather used in the specialty lines such as hot dogs and processed meats.

I mentioned that on January 17 the price had fallen to $25 and by March 8 in the same Denver market the price was $22.50, so that over 90 days the price had fallen $7 a hundredweight.

During this same time, Mr. President, the price to the packer from the retailer for dressed beef had dropped from $45.50 per hundredweight to $38. And yet the retail price in a certain supermarket chain in this area did not drop at all, but remained at its average price of $68 per hundredweight. Taking into consideration the fact that from the average 1,000 pound steer the retailer will receive 480 pounds of dressed meat, the gross price spread between packer and retailer was $52.40 in the week December 10 to 17 and increased to $98.40 on March 8, which is an increase of $46 per animal. In other words, Mr. President, from every animal the western stockman sent to market he received $70 less at the end of this 90-day period while the chainstore was receiving $46 more from the sale of that same animal to the consuming public.

I have received word that just recently the retail price of beef is beginning to decrease slightly, but this reaction, it seems to me, is considerably delayed after the decrease in price to the beef producer.

And, Mr. President, when one considers that this chainstore had been using 3,000 head of cattle a week during this period, one will see that, multiplying the $46 per head by the number of cattle used, this chainstore increased its profit $138,000 each week while the farmer suffered a decrease in profit and and the consumer's price was not changed. And also, Mr. President, we must consider the facts of the vertical operation of some of these chainstores in controlling beef from the raising of the animal to the slaughtering to retailing which thus gives them a potent lever to affect the beef market as a whole. This same Denver chainstore at the beginning of this period, when prices were running from $29.50 to $30 per hundredweight, was buying on the open market 20 to 24 animals per week, but when the price started falling their purchases started increasing until at the point when prices had reached their lowest point they bought 1,250 head in a single week for slaughter. And since there was no sizable change in consumer demand, we can assume that to keep their meat counters from overflowing they must have withheld their own animals from slaughter.

It may be, Mr. President, that all these facts are a series of coincidences, but the fact that this change in the price of beef brought a $160,000 profit in the month of February alone to a single segment of the complete industry, while neither the producer nor the consumer shares in this trend, and that it took 16 months for the price to reach its December level and only 3 for it to drastically drop from that level, calls for a hard look at the facts behind these prices.

Ours is a free economy, Mr. President, with certain restraints, and these restraints were instituted over the years by the Congress to prevent abuses of our free enterprise system by those who would use positions of power or monopoly to take unfair advantage of those independent operators who have not the size or power to protect themselves.

The facts I have unearthed in this initial investigation, Mr. President, have convinced me beyond a doubt that a full-scale investigation into the origins of this price fluctuation should be conducted immediately. I have written to the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission to ask that such an investigation, with all the legal powers that organization possesses, be begun at once. I would also call to the attention of the appropriate committees in the Congress this set of rather incriminating facts and strongly urge that they begin an investigation immediately.

The public has a right to know whether these practices do or do not constitute a restraint of trade and an unfair use of power in our free marketplace. These may be strong charges, but I believe they are warranted by the facts presented so far. And I shall continue to use all the resources at my command to make sure that the producer and the consumer are receiving fair treatment in the marketplace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record after my remarks two letters which I have written. The first is to Mr. Rand Dixon, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and the second to the Honorable Allen J. Ellender, senior Senator from Louisiana and chairman of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Appropriations,
March 28, 1963.

Mr. Rand Dixon,
Chairman, Federal Trade Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Rand: As you well know, the price of fat cattle has fallen the past few months to such a degree that the situation which now prevails is most alarming. Prices which it took several months to build up to a degree of profitability for the producer have fallen so that all gains, as well as additional losses, have been sustained in a few short weeks. That this condition exists is to me outrageous and most shocking.

Our producers are consistently being told that it is imports of fresh and frozen meat products from abroad which cause this situation. I find this difficult to believe, however, since the month of the biggest drop in cattle prices—January 1963—was also the month that imports from abroad were reduced approximately 30 percent.

From my investigation of this matter, it certainly appears to me that the marketing practices of some of the large chainstores are to blame. The price of fat cattle has dropped $8 per hundredweight and yet there is no evidence to show that the retail price of meat at the stores has dropped at all. Parenthetically, to show how the chainstores have profited, the packers have also received greatly reduced prices for carcass beef. In order to assure not only the producer, but the public as well, of getting a fair deal from the price fluctuations, I feel the Federal Trade Commission should conduct a full-scale investigation into the marketing practices of the meat industry. This should include all phases of the industry, but greatest emphasis should be placed upon the vertical integration of the meat industry by some of the largest chain stores.

My recommendations would include full field investigations, the subpenaing of records, and the questioning of witnesses by your most highly trained investigators.

The time has come, in fact is long past due, when all the cards should be laid on the table. The public, because of its unfamiliarity with the subject matter, blames the producer for high prices; the producer tends to blame imports; packers are often caught in a squeeze between the two, and nothing is done to put the whole question in its proper perspective.

I hope the Commission will agree with me that this is a most serious matter which requires immediate attention and that you will launch a full scale investigation into the subject.

You can be sure that I shall cooperate in every way by bringing to your attention what information is available to me and the facilities of my office will be readily available to assist in anyway that we can.

Sincerely yours,
Gale W. McGee,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Appropriations,
March 28, 1963.

Hon. Allen J. Ellender,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Allen: You will recall my questioning of officials of the Agriculture Marketing Service, which includes the Packers and Stockyards Division, when they came before the Appropriations Subcommittee last Monday.

You can appreciate, I know, the problems facing the public as a whole, as well as the livestock producer, in this very serious question of disastrously falling livestock prices when the public receives no benefits therefrom.

In a letter today I have called upon the Federal Trade Commission to launch a full-scale investigation into this matter and since your committee has jurisdiction over the subject, it would be my hope you would take whatever steps you feel are compatible to bring this matter to light.

It seems disgraceful to me that when the price of a product continues to fall for months and months that the chain stores do nothing to pass the benefits on to the consumer.

In order to fully explore the subject matter, to determine whether or not the law as written is sufficient to handle the problems which arise, I feel congressional hearings are warranted. I hope you and the members of the Senate Agriculture Committee can agree with me and I shall be very happy to work with you in any way to bring about full knowledge and I hope corrective action on what I consider to be unfair practices.

Sincerely yours,
Gale W. McGee,
U.S. Senator.

CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL'S VIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON PROPOSED CONSUMER LEGISLATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, President Kennedy's Consumer Advisory Council has taken a close look at some of the consumer legislation currently before Congress and on Monday, March 25, issued its views and recommendations.

The Advisory Council has provided a valuable service in providing the American consumer with a voice in national affairs. I should like to elaborate on those services, but I realize that my enthusiasm might be a little suspect at this particular point, because the Council's latest report speaks approvingly of proposed legislation that I have introduced.

So, without further comment, I ask unanimous consent that the Advisory Council's March 15 report be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Executive Office
of the President,
Council of Economic Advisers,
Washington, D.C.

The Consumer Advisory Council, at its meeting on March 20–21, expressed its support of the principles and purposes of the Douglas truth-in-lending bill (S. 750) and recommended additional research into the manner in which families use credit and into the causes of their overextended use of credit lending to bankruptcy and debt adjustment; endorsed the principles and purposes of the Hart truth-in-packaging bill (S. 387); commended Government departments and agencies for the recent experiment in promoting the sale of consumer publications through selected post offices and recommended the extension of this program on a national scale.

The statements follow:

A. The Consumer Advisory Council supports the principles and purposes of the Douglas truth-in-lending bill (S. 750).

1. Such legislation will: (a) promote the right of consumers to have the facts they need to make rational, informed choices regarding credit usage; (b) protect the ethical and efficient businessman who wishes to fully disclose credit charges from those competitors whose charges are deceptively concealed; (c) reinvigorate price competition in the consumer credit market, and thereby contribute to the free enterprise system; (d) introduce a stabilizing, countercyclical element into the Nation's economy by making consumers aware of rising credit costs in boom times and declining credit costs during recessions; and (e) encourage consumers to shop for cheaper credit, thereby releasing funds for purchasing goods and services, thus buttressing the economy and consumer purchasing power.

2. The Council recognizes that excellent data on the use of credit in relation to the family life cycle and other family characteristics are available. There is, however, inadequate information about families' future needs and their techniques for assessing future needs so they can wisely use savings or credit. The committee recommends that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in consultation with the Secretaries of Labor, Agriculture, Commerce, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and others, undertake additional research into factors associated with families making informed assessments of future needs in relation to their savings and credit decisions.

3. The Council recommends that research be undertaken to develop hypotheses as to the causes of families' economic distress as a result of overextensive use of credit so as to formulate remedial and preventive measures, and for critical study of the means available through Government and private agencies by which consumers may secure relief from economic distress, and that research in this area be encouraged by the Departments of Justice, Commerce, Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, the Council of Economic Advisers, and others.

B. The Consumer Advisory Council endorses the principles and purposes of the Hart truth-in-packaging bill (S. 387).

1. We believe that legislation to bring order into the field of packaging is necessary at the present time, in the interest of both consumers and honest producers, and in

order to promote the effective, rational functioning of the American enterprise system. The need for such legislation has been made abundantly apparent by the testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee, and our own experience fully confirms the evidence there presented. Present legislation is inadequate to cope with the confusion and deception which has come to characterize the packaging of a large proportion of the goods sold to American consumers.

2. It is true that existing means of eliminating deceptive packaging are not being fully used. If manufacturers and distributors chose to use the simplified practice and commercial standards procedures of the Department of Commerce, they could eliminate much of the confusion in packaging by voluntary agreement, as was done with respect to many industrial products under the simplification and standardization program introduced by Herbert Hoover as Secretary of Commerce 40 years ago. But manufacturers and distributors have not taken advantage of this machinery and have, rather, continued to proliferate unnecessary variety and forms of packaging which impede intelligent consumer choice.

3. If the Food and Drug Administration had a larger budget, it might pursue more cases that could be identified as misbranding. The Federal Trade Commission, in the interest of fair competition, might institute cease and desist proceedings in additional cases involving packaging. But many practices which are quite legal at present contribute to the pattern of confusion and deception. And what is needed to break the pattern is a broad-scale attack on the problem as a whole, not merely a case-by-case pursuit of individual practicers of deception.

4. We endorse the bill's requirements with respect to the kinds of information which must be clearly and prominently displayed on the label and the prohibition of misleading words, phrases, illustrations, or price statements. We also endorse the authorization for the promulgation of regulations relating to permissible sizes and shapes of packages, standards for the designation of sizes and net quantity, and information as to ingredients and composition of commodities.

5. The proposed legislation is in line with the historic exercise of Government responsibility to provide a framework within which the American economy can operate rationally, in terms of honest competition and intelligent consumer choice. It is designed to meet the conditions of today, when the package has become the salesman for the vast multitude of complex goods. It carries out the well-established principles reflected in Government's establishment of weights and measures, protection of the public against fraud, promotion of fair competitive practices, establishment of standards of identity and quality, and requirements of labeling under the Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act. The Standard Container Acts of 1916 and 1928, and the Alcoholic Beverages Administration Act of 1936 have applied the kind of regulation proposed by this bill to the packaging of fruits and vegetables and of alcoholic beverages.

The bill authorizes the kind of regulations which other countries have found necessary and conducive to the proper functioning of their economies. Great Britain for 35 years has limited the packages of many standard foods to multiples of 2 ounces up to half a pound and multiples of 4 ounces up to 2 pounds. Canada's labeling requirements for foods, recently revised with the support of industry, correspond to the kinds of labeling requirements proposed by this bill.

6. We would like to see the bill strengthened in two respects: (a) We believe that regulations with respect to sizes and shapes of containers and related matters should be mandatory under the law with respect to items basic to the family budget and not left to the discretion of the Secretary of HEW or the Federal Trade Commission in their respective jurisdictions to determine whether they are necessary. The labeling provisions of the bill are mandatory, but it is precisely the multiplicity and irregularity of packages that prevent rational consumer choice and have brought the need for this legislation; (b) we believe that the bill should apply to as wide a range of consumer commodities as possible and therefore that the coverage should be broadened. In particular, we do not think that meat and meat products and materials used for the maintenance and repair of housing and home furnishings should be excluded.

7. With respect to enforcement, we think that the method of enforcement and the penalties should be the same for all commodities which come under the act regardless of which agency is responsible for them. The Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission have different procedures, neither of which wholly fits the needs of this bill. We believe that this bill should provide uniform, rapid and strong enforcement procedures, to be applied by both agencies with respect to the commodities in their respective fields.

C. The Consumer Advisory Council commends Government departments and agencies for the recent experiment in promoting the sale of consumer publications through selected post offices and recommends the extension of this program.

1. We commend the Government Printing Office and the Post Office and the numerous Federal departments and agencies involved in this notable experiment in making Government publications of interest to consumers more widely known and more easily available. We appreciate the fact that much effort and time went into this pilot project involving the preparation of a special list of 67 publications, an order form, displays in 100 post offices, and sale of documentary coupons in the post offices.

2. We note that at the end of the 90-day period of the pilot project the 100 post offices had distributed 225,483 of the price lists and order blanks. We think that this in itself is a worthwhile thing to have done. We assume that many persons were thereby informed for the first time of the availability of these publications.

3. We are not able to discern the effectiveness, in terms of selling more publications, of publicity which accompanied the displays in some of the cities. However, we believe that this publicity was useful in calling attention to the publications. From information supplied to us, we are not able to tell how the pattern of orders may vary by size of place, region, or type of post office.

4. While it is not possible to trace all of the orders arising out of this project, we note that the orders and sales directly attributable to it were as follows: The Government Printing Office received 4,066 orders with remittances and 746 returns which included no remittance, and sales of publications arising directly out of this program amounted to $6,066.33. (At an estimated average of 15 cents apiece, this is about 40,000 separate documents.) We note that this amount would, if projected to the 35,000 post offices, total over $2 million.

5. We recommend that, in the fall of 1963, this pilot-project be followed by a nationwide effort to make consumer publications more widely known, more easily available, utilizing most of the 35,000 post offices. We would expect that with national publicity these publications would be brought to the attention of millions of consumers.

6. We urge the Government Printing Office to issue on a regular schedule special lists of available Government publications of interest to consumers and to include order blanks and instructions which will simplify the ordering process to the greatest possible extent. We especially urge them to use the post offices to display and otherwise call attention to these publications.

7. We commend the Government Printing Office for its expanding campaign to make lists of publications available through public libraries, and urge them to facilitate displays of consumer publications in libraries, with particular emphasis on National Library Week, April 22–27.

8. The Consumer Advisory Council would be pleased to cooperate with the Government Printing Office by suggesting organizations with a mailing list which would be appropriate for promoting the sale of consumer publications.

9. We believe that one of the principal lessons to be learned from the pilot project is the lack of uniformity in the quality of publications and lack of coverage of many problem areas of interest to consumers. To improve the quality and coverage of topics we recommend that the Secretary of Agriculture explore the possibility of gaining wider distribution of cooperative extension bulletins of interest to all consumers in urban as well as in rural areas and that an effort be made by departments and agencies to: (a) produce more consumer publications each year; and (b) to fill the gaps in subject matter areas covered—for example, there are virtually no publications in the areas of household budgeting, insurance, consumer durable goods purchasing, or consumer credit.

THE NATION'S SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, last Friday night Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson addressed the National Rocket Club dinner here on the Nation's space program. I had the pleasure of hearing this fine speech as did hundreds of others in the audience.

As Chairman of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, Vice President Johnson has been doing a remarkable job of helping guide our space program toward its objectives. As he pointed out in his speech, which was very well received, we have achieved a number of important successes in space but continued success will require continued public support. He cautioned that this year will be one of "concentrated development" and that the year may bring Soviet space spectaculars. He urged "that we not be discouraged by publicized events but rather be stimulated to even greater efforts for the coming years."

I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson at the National Rocket Club Dinner, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., Friday, March 22, 1963

In recent weeks, others of the Marine Corps and of the administration have been engaging in the pastime of hiking together. Your honor guest and I have refrained from such hazardous practices. Instead, we have indulged in the pastime of eating together.

I assure you it is the colonel—and not the calories—that brings me here tonight. Certainly, one of the most pleasant—although unofficial—duties of the office I hold has been the privilege over the past year of

speaking at banquets honoring John Glenn. I am not sure whether he regards this as a pleasure, also. I understand the colonel has suggested that an extra tube of food be put aboard the capsule to the moon as a precaution against the possibility that when the first meal is being eaten there, the Vice President might show up to make a presentation.

Tonight—at this Goddard memorial dinner—it is appropriate for us to concern ourselves with the fundamental issues of our national space effort: the matter of public support for our public policy in this field.

This is an audience of experts—experts on the meaning and potential of the space age and on the needs of the space program of our country. Individually and collectively, you appreciate what a dynamic force the space program is for our economy. You know it means improved technology, greater security, a rising level of business activity, a higher standard of living for our people. Above all, you understand the essential fact that if the United States is to be a source of leadership for freedom tomorrow as it is today, we must succeed in our space efforts now during this decade.

In all realms of specialized knowledge, there is the ever-present danger of parochialism. Many of my scientist friends think that the most narrow and parochial men they know are engineers. Nearly all engineers I know think the same of scientists. But both scientists and engineers agree on one thing: nobody is more parochial and narrow and shortsighted than politicians.

I hardly need to say that some of my best friends are politicians. I can say of them that what you think of them, they in turn think of you. That is precisely the point to which my remarks tonight are addressed.

We are at a point in our national history in which the future capabilities of our country—and the future of our country's role as a leader of freedom—depend decisively upon both mutual understanding and mutual trust, as well as mutual comprehension, between the community of technology and the community of public affairs.

To say this—and to weigh the merits of each side—does not automatically lead to the conclusion that one side or the other is the right side. The concern of the space scientists for maintaining the schedule of space projects is right and proper—beyond dispute. The concerns of the political community for the implications of supporting those programs are no less right and proper—beyond dispute.

Between these viewpoints—each responsible, each prudent, each sincere and conscientious—there exists what we must frankly acknowledge to be a dollar gap. Those charged with responsibility for public policy know that the total space program has cost us about 20 cents a week per capita. They also know that in the near future the program may cost as much as 60 cents a week per capita. On the other hand, those in the technological community know that as a Nation we are spending more on cigarettes, alcohol or recreation than we do on space. Last year alone, Americans bet more on horse races than on space.

Personally, I believe—as I am sure you believe—that we must be concerned with where America finishes in the space race—and I am not content to bet on America merely to place or show—and certainly not to finish out of the money altogether.

In either case—from either viewpoint—the present period of preoccupation with the dollar aspects of space is symptomatic of a failure to bridge the gap of understanding between the two communities which are jointly responsible for our national success or failure in mankind's age of space. In the long term, dollars alone will not be the decisive factor of either our success or our failure. We shall succeed only in proportion to our understanding of what is at stake and of how the stakes of space relate to those qualities of our society and our heritage to which no dollar value can be attached.

Of those qualities, none is more priceless than the fact that in our representative democracy public policy must be an expression of the public's will and support. The technological community which understands the stakes of space has a responsibility, therefore, for helping the public to understand those stakes. Unless and until this is done, the technological community cannot justifiably be impatient with those who are chosen to represent and express the public's own will.

Throughout our national history, America has moved forward on waves of new invention. The individual inventors of 50 and 60 years ago have been uniquely honored as virtual national heroes in this century. They have become a part of our folklore—not to mention of our textbooks and motion pictures, as well. But we can only wonder what would have happened if Thomas Edison or Samuel Morse or Alexander Graham Bell had come to Congress and to the people and had asked for funds with which to invent an electric light bulb or a telegraph or a telephone.

We can imagine that the response would have been somewhat less than enthusiastic.

Today, the age of space is an infinitely more inventive age for America—and the world—than the era at the beginning of this century. Our national space program already has produced more than 3,000 new products and processes of private commercial potential. These achievements already are being put to work. Today's inventor is working on a much surer course—with a much greater certainty of what will be accomplished—than were the men who changed history by tinkering in their bicycle shops not so long ago.

Experimentation is still present in our efforts now but the factor of uncertainty has never been so small. We know what we are likely to do. We can be more certain of what our efforts are likely to produce. If there is a consistent pattern of error, it is error on the side of underestimation—not overestimation.

This simply means that we are able to tell the people more of where we are going and more of why we should go there. If we fail to do this, if we fail to utilize this greater capacity, then the responsibility for lack of public support will fall upon those who had the knowledge but failed to impart it to the people.

Along with the knowledge of our own capabilities and directions, we are also possessed of knowledge about the capabilities and directions of our principal competitors in the space adventure. I believe it is a part of our responsibility to keep the public better informed about the relative progress and capabilities of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Let us look at a few basic comparisons:

1. Rocket power: Today the Soviets have in operation more powerful rockets than do we. We are trying to catch up. We have under development much more powerful rockets than the Soviets now have in operation. But we must assume that the Soviets are likewise working to improve the power of their own rockets.

2. Number of successes: At the end of 1962, the United States had successfully orbited 120 payloads in space. This means that we have put about four times as many payloads into earth orbit as have the Soviets. But at the same time the smaller number of Soviet payloads have weighted substantially more than the total of our larger number of payloads.

3. Ratio of failures: We can say with reasonable assurance that the Soviets have had a ratio of successes to failures comparable to our own. Our failures as well as our successes are known to the world. The Soviets have announced their successes and concealed their failures. But the basic fact is that in both nations the reliability of launching vehicles has shown a remarkable and comparable increase. For example, through 1960, the United States had about one failure for each success. In 1961, the ratio of successes was 3 to 1. In 1962, the ratio reached 5 to 1.

4. Space applications: In utilizing space technology, to improve mankind's lot on earth, the United States is well ahead. Weather satellites, communication satellites, navigation satellites, and many other activities are measures of this. In this realm, the Soviet Union—despite the potential of its technology—is not choosing to compete.

5. Scientific information: Comparisons between the nations as to which has obtained the most useful scientific data cannot be exact. Both nations have done remarkably well. The United States is sharing much of its information with the world scientific community. The Soviet is more selective and secretive.

6. Manned flights: Soviet cosmonauts have put in more flying time than our astronauts. Certainly the U.S.S.R. is ahead in the total knowledge obtained from manned space flight.

7. Guidance and control: Both countries have made rapid progress in this technology. Last year's dual near-rendezvous launch by the Soviets is the outstanding single accomplishment by either nation, thus far. However, the United States has shown remarkable progress particularly in the Mariner shot and the Schirra flight.

We can say that competency is growing in the space programs of each nation. What space gap exists is not due to a lack of ability or resources on our part but exists because we started later and do not have a surplus of time.

The year of 1962 was a rewarding year for the United States in its space efforts. We demonstrated convincingly through both showcase successes and supporting scientific progress our ability to translate sound decisions into significant accomplishments. A gratifying number of historic successes were achieved by our efforts last year.

In this year of 1963, our program will be passing through a year of concentrated development. Concentrated development does not always produce spectacular events, and it is possible that our efforts may be overshadowed by Soviet space shots. I urge, therefore, that we not be discouraged by publicized events but rather be stimulated to even greater efforts for the coming years.

The United States is, at all times, cognizant of the fact of competition in the development of space technology. At the same time, neither the pattern nor the purposes of our program are controlled by other than our own national purposes to develop the peaceful uses of outer space. We do what we do in space because of our national faith, not our national fears. We proceed on the program scheduled because of our confidence, not because we are seeking to copy or duplicate what others have done or may do.

In the long prospect of the space age, our national efforts to this point are to the future as a minute is to a millennium. We cannot measure our continuing advance by the calendar. We are compressing generations of progress into month or even weeks of time.

This very speed at which the U.S. effort is moving makes it imperative that we not form tomorrow's goals on yesterday's thinking. It is also imperative that we not set our purposes by the narrow horizons of a dollar debate.

There would be no reason for us to be concerned with space at all except for the clear

> and compelling implications of space to those values of our system and our society for which no price is too great. Freedom is a sturdy plant, but it cannot grow and flower on this earth if the universe which envelops us is poisoned and contaminated by tyranny.
>
> If we are to be successful in freedom's cause, we must, as I have said, concern ourselves with bridging the gap between space science and political science. Nowhere else has science served freedom as nobly and abundantly as under our system. Likewise, nowhere else has the political system supported scientific inquiry and achievement more effectively or more understandingly. Our achievements of the past 5 years dramatically demonstrate both of these points.
>
> Americans now are able to be infinitely more confident about the future than in the first anxious days after Sputnik I in 1957. We can say now that on our present course there is no danger of a default by our Nation in space. We can also say with equal confidence that there is a growing prospect of decisive success of our free society in the competition to preserve the realms of space for the peaceful benefits of mankind in this century.
>
> In a day when machines can talk to each other and work with each other, it is neither too much to ask—nor too much to hope—that responsible men of the technological community and the political community can and will find their way to mutual understanding to assure our greater success in achieving the goals essential for our freedom.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JAMES L. McDEVITT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is with great personal sadness that I speak today of the passing of James L. McDevitt, director of the AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education. I knew Jim McDevitt over a span of many years. He was an able and devoted expert in the political field of the workingman. Under his guidance, COPE programs for the political education of the union membership resulted in a sharpened awareness of the responsibilities of citizenship.

Jim came up through the ranks of labor from humble beginnings as a plasterer. He never lost his down-to-earth understanding of the workingman's problems. He served his country in the Army in France in World War I and was always active in civic affairs, such as the Community Chest, the Red Cross, and various organizations to combat intolerance.

In 1948, the U.S. Labor Department called on his talents for international goals and he was designated to represent American workers at a World Safety Conference in Geneva.

These many tireless efforts kept Jim McDevitt constantly in harness. It is characteristic that death overtook him while he was hard at work at Oklahoma City in the midst of COPE's annual spring political tour of major cities from coast to coast.

I will miss Jim McDevitt as a friend and as a supporter. The labor movement will miss him. And in the broader sense, for his untiring efforts in his field, the Nation will miss him.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE SUPREME COURT'S DECISION IN THE TENNESSEE REAPPORTIONMENT CASE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Tuesday, March 26, was the first anniversary of the U.S. Supreme Court's historic decision in Baker against Carr, the Tennessee reapportionment case.

Very few of us could have imagined 1 year ago the immediate and widespread effect that this decision would have. Prior to this decision, the General Assembly of Tennessee had not been apportioned for 60 years, although the Constitution of the State of Tennessee provided that the legislature should be reapportioned every 10 years. As a consequence, the political influence of the growing urban areas lessened in proportion to the rural areas in Tennessee and in most areas of the Nation.

In a sense, however, this was counterbalanced by the extraordinary weight that a big city resident's vote often had regarding the election of a President. As Senator John F. Kennedy pointed out in the electoral college debate of 1956, the present unit system, whereby all of the electoral votes of a State go to the presidential candidate who carries that State, gives the "big city States," an inordinate voice in the nomination and election of presidential candidates.

For instance, a presidential candidate could theoretically win an election by carrying only 12 key States, and with a smaller popular vote than his opponent as has been the case in three elections. Prior to the recent reapportionment actions, this could be construed as a means to counterbalance the advantage that the rural voters had in the State legislatures.

Mr. President, on the first anniversary of the Tennessee reapportionment case, we find that this equilibrium between the urban and rural voters is rapidly changing. The urban voters are obtaining a greater voice in the selection of the members of State legislatures. Reapportionment cases have been filed in 36 States. Preliminary or final court actions have been handed down in 25 of these States. Cases are still pending in 31 States. And reapportionment plans have been passed by the legislatures of 15 States, with 11 additional States expecting early passage of new reapportionment acts.

In my own State of Tennessee, a special session of the legislature passed a reapportionment act last May, which was subsequently declared inadequate and unconstitutional by a Federal court. But a new reapportionment act was passed last week and, regardless of whether or not this act is upheld by the courts, it is only a matter of time until all the States reach a legislative apportionment which is satisfactory to the courts.

Meanwhile, Mr. President, nothing has been done to reform the archaic electoral college system, which gives such power to the heavily urbanized States in the election of a President.

As far as I know, neither President Kennedy nor anyone from his administration has spoken with regard to this matter since the Baker against Carr decision. I do not know whether he feels that the reapportionment of the State legislatures has proceeded to the point where adjustments should be made in the electoral college unit vote system.

But it seems to be apparent that reapportionment is causing a rapid and dramatic shift in the balance of power in most State legislatures, to the benefit of the urban voters. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I had scheduled hearings for Tuesday, April 9, to look into the extent of reapportionment in the various States, and the political effects to date. However, because of a meeting of the full committee on that date another date will be set later. We will try to project this reapportionment activity into the future, in order to determine if action should be taken to reform the electoral college system, so that a fair equilibrium will be maintained between our rural and urban citizens.

Finally, Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments plans to take immediate action to consider the six electoral college reform proposals which are now pending before it, so that a suitable proposal will be brought before the Senate for consideration during this session of the Congress.

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A PRIVATE CORPORATION TO DEVELOP A SUPERSONIC JET LINER

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I was shocked by a front page article in the Washington Post of Monday, March 25, which stated that the Federal Aviation Agency was considering the establishment of a private corporation to develop a supersonic jetliner. This report indicated that the FAA was investigating the use of a corporation similar to the Communications Satellite Corp. for the project.

The development of a supersonic jet airliner will involve a huge expense, probably well over $1 billion, and all or much of this expense will have to be borne by the Federal Government. The airlines and the aircraft manufacturers themselves have said that the Government must bear most of the cost, since the plane would, in a sense, be a national prestige item.

There is little doubt in my mind—though I know some others have a different opinion—that a jet airliner capable of flying at 3 times the speed of sound would eventually have valuable commercial uses, once developed. I am strongly in favor of our going ahead with the development, but I want to be sure that the interests of the Government will be fully protected.

Last year the ill-advised communications satellite bill established a private monopoly to operate the Nations' worldwide satellite communications system. The argument was made that a private corporation was needed at once if we were to keep pace with the Soviet Union, and that private capital would replace

Government expenditures in the development of communications satellites. The recent hearings before the Commerce and Space Committees have demonstrated the fallacy of this argument. The incorporators of the Space Satellite Corporation have come in to ask the Congress for many millions more in Government funds to finance research and development for the private firm, while a substantial part of the small amount of capital obtained from private sources will go to pay high salaries to the corporation's newly employed officers. Furthermore, it is now admitted that the development of a satellite system will be considerably farther in the future than Congress was led to believe.

I point out this sorry spectacle of the Satellite Corporation, which only confirms the fears expressed by the group of Senators who opposed the Satellite bill, because of indications that we may be headed for an even worse situation with supersonic jet airliners. Because of my concern lest we be confronted with another huge giveaway, accomplished through the creation of still another private monopoly, I called Mr. Najeeb Halaby, FAA Administrator, and discussed the matter with him. Mr. Halaby said that the newspaper story did not originate with him or anyone at the FAA. He said further that he, personally, was not committed to this particular way of developing the supersonic jet.

I was glad to gain the impression that Mr. Halaby thought a satellite type of corporation would not be recommended.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am very happy to yield now to the chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate the distinguished Senator's concern over the possibility of a corporate organization which would be supported by a vast amount of Federal research on the supersonic transport proposal. I read the story in the Washington Post, as the Senator did, and immediately checked on it with Mr. Halaby, the FAA Administrator. It is only one of the many ideas which must be examined to try to produce a united effort to avoid being left behind in the supersonic transport development.

As the Senator knows, France and England have formed a consortium to pool most of the aviation resources of the two great countries; and they plan to develop a supersonic transport which will fly at two times the speed of sound. Our research tentatively shows that three times the speed of sound will be the ideal speed for such an aircraft; that there is less air turbulence at that speed, and that less power is required; but such a development presents many problems that we have never experienced before. Mach 2 aircraft can be aluminum and utilize much the same type of construction as has been used in aircraft of speeds of mach 1, and up to mach 2. When we get into speeds of mach 3, there steel construction with honeycombed panels will be required, which will permit icy air in the substratosphere to cool such aircraft and make it possible for human beings to remain in the fuselage. Therefore, rather perplexing problems are presented.

We have been providing appropriations to enable the Federal Aviation Agency do preliminary work. We have appropriated several million dollars to enable the Agency, first, to ascertain the possibilities of such a supersonic aircraft; second, the type of materials to be required; third, to study the means by which we can pool our vast know-how in order to ascertain the means of developing an aircraft that will be the pace setter of transcontinental and transoceanic aviation of the future. It is a problem, because it will cost from $1 to $2 billion to produce the first supersonic transport with a mach 3 speed.

I do not believe, nor does Mr. Halaby, that this distinguished group of financiers are merely looking for ways and means to obtain Government help to build the aircraft.

As the Senator knows, the 707 jet airliner was developed as a result of the KC–135, the Air Force tanker. Most of our great planes have been developed largely as a result of Government contracts. The RS–70 being built by North American Aviation will provide much information, but it is not likely to be the super transport we want. We need new information on engines. This phase alone may cost $500 million to develop.

So there is involved a staggering cost that goes beyond the capability of an air frame manufacturer or any individual aviation engine manufacturer. If we could gear such a development to the needs of the Defense Department so that it could be developed as a part of our defense activities, the problem would be simple. But I am sure that the problem is much more complex.

I assure the Senator that the Federal Aviation Agency is not committed to a private corporation financed in large part by Government research. We are trying our best to find some agency of Government or means to bring about the research required to move forward with this vast project. We are going to find it a difficult task. The space satellite system will probably enrich the private corporation, because it has no long lines to maintain. It has no wires except those connected with the ground stations. While that space satellite system, from where it is at this time, may cost $10 million, $1 billion or more will have to be spent on the supersonic transport. It will be sold for about $25 million. Those who have studied the subject doubt whether there will be a market for more than 75 to 100 aircraft of the range and speed of a mach 3 plane, which will not be good for short distances. Therefore, a corporation organized to build this aircraft would be in difficulty, because it would not have any source of revenue after it had spent the necessary amount for the development of the aircraft.

The Aviation Subcommittee will certainly be glad to advise with the Senator if we reach the point of development where the proposed financing would be supported by research and development through an existing agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the able Senator from Oklahoma, who is an authority on aviation, for the explanation of what is involved and for his assurance that we are not going to be "taken for a ride" again, as we were in giving away the communications satellite to a private corporation, and having that private corportion call on the Government for continued money for research, when the proponents of the satellite bill said the private satellite corporation would do the research.

I ask the Senator if it is not true that the incorporators of the communications satellite corporation, are now asking the U.S. Government for a continued outlay for research; and did they not so testify before the Commerce Committee?

Mr. MONRONEY. This is not quite exactly in point. The senior Senator from Oklahoma questioned them, on confirmation, as to when they would be ready to put money up for research. Their answers were vague because they have not yet issued stock. I raised the point on the basis that the money they would make would be in connection with the secrets that research would unlock.

The incorporators, who are merely beginning the enterprise, do not know exactly when the system will be underway. Most of the research done has been done for governmental purposes, although the original communications satellite, the A.T. & T. satellite, was built without cost to the Government. The launching expense was paid for by A.T. & T. The Relay satellite, which is now in orbit, was a product of RCA. It will cost the space agency about $10 million.

Other space communications expenditures and programs have been sponsored. Most of those, however—for example, the so-called stationary or synchronous satellite—have been experiments primarily in satellite launching, and not so much in communications, since the stationary satellite had a very elementary communications beeper which would not transmit the type of signals—TV programs—that were obtained via Telstar.

The charge which I think should be made—and I am not so sure but that we should insist on its being carried as a debt of the communications corporation is in connection with the research programs that develop the communications part of the satellite. They should pay for the launching costs. The cost of the science of rocketry, however, is not related to communications alone.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The testimony may not have been taken before the Commerce Committee, but it was before the Space Committee, to the effect that the

Government was expected to put up the money.

In any event, as to the supersonic jetliner, the reporter who wrote the article is a competent and careful man, and he must have had something to go on.

An advisory group has been appointed by Mr. Halaby to investigate the problem and is expected to report its findings and recommendations to the FAA later this month. The members include a New York investment broker, a vice president of a large New York bank, an executive of a large manufacturing corporation, and the lawyer who drafted the corporate documents for the Communications Satellite Corp. In addition, there are representatives of three major airlines, two aircraft manufacturers, one airport, and an aeronautical laboratory. They are prominent and highly respected citizens and businessmen but I feel that it is unfortunate that the advisory group which Mr. Halaby designated does not represent a wider range of interests. There is a noticeable shortage of members who would normally be expected to represent the public interest in such an important matter. Mr. Halaby has assured me that he had to persuade these men to serve on this committee and that he would be glad to enlarge it with members who might have different points of view. I expect to recommend some.

The point is that we must stop assigning and giving away important interests of the U.S. Government, whether they be in the form of NASA patents or in the form of a communications satellite, or research on jetliners, to a private cartel type of arrangement which is immune from antitrust laws, and with respect to which no competition can be expected or would result. As a result, the private corporation would get the profits, and the taxpayers of the Nation would be putting up the money.

That is what happened in connection with the communications satellite. That is what is about to occur in NASA, in giving away NASA patents, which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is trying to stop.

That must have been in someone's mind in connection with the jet airliner; otherwise this competent reporter would not have written an article of this kind.

I am glad to have Mr. Halaby's word that this is not in his mind, but we shall have to wait and see.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is there some prospect, in the Senator's opinion, that the administration is going ahead and organizing another giant monopoly consortium similar to that which was set up by the Satellite Communications Act?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is what I was fearful of when I saw the article on the front page of the Washington Post.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional 5 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I called Mr. Halaby and suggested that he might wish to come to the Antitrust Subcommittee and talk about this proposed giveaway. He assured me that he was not committed to the giveaway principle, as I explained.

However, I was very much alarmed, because that seems to be the kind of thing that is referred to in this article, so far as the Government is concerned.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator have any knowledge as to the amount of money that we have spent in developing the space satellite communications after we were led to believe that a Government-created private monopoly was to carry on and foot all expenses in connection with satellite communications?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not have in mind the amount. Perhaps the Senator knows the exact amount. I know it amounts to several millions of dollars.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would rather not guess at it, but I believe it is many millions of dollars already. Does the Senator have any information which would lead him to the conclusion that the great haste that was shown in rushing through the establishment of the satellite communications monopoly has expedited space communication?

Mr. KEFAUVER. No. It has unquestionably retarded the development of space communications, because the corporation is not a going concern. The Government has not been able to carry on its work as expeditiously as it otherwise could have, and we are further behind because of the giveaway we perpetrated last year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Government is still paying, if I understand correctly, even though all the benefits will go to a private corporation at such time as something of benefit materializes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is correct. We do not want that to happen again if we can possibly help it.

The longstanding traditions of our antitrust laws have played a vital role in the development of our economy. We cannot afford to abandon our belief in competitive principles and adopt a philosophy which favors Government-sponsored monopoly under the delusion that the desire for scientific advance leaves us no alternative. While I was pleased to hear that Mr. Halaby did not feel that he and the FAA are committed to the idea of a Government-subsidized private corporation to develop the supersonic jetliner, I cannot avoid a feeling of deep concern in this matter. We need a strong affirmation of faith in a free enterprise society that can survive without the necessity of giveaway programs which are intended to turn over large portions of the public domain to private interests. I am certain that a great many Senators, not only those who opposed the Satellite bill originally, but also its supporters who have been disillusioned so quickly by the operation of the Satellite Corp., will follow the course of this supersonic jet project with great interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the list of the members of the advisory group which I received from Mr. Halaby's office by printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMBERS, SST ADVISORY GROUP (FAA)

Chairman: Gen. O. R. Cook, USAF retired, 510 Crosswoods Drive, Falls Church, Va., CL 6-4249.

Secretaries: Col. Dale D. Davis and Maj. D. I. Hackney, FAA employees, Washington, D.C., 112-2645.

Members: R. N. Duck, Trans World Airlines, 157 Brightwood Avenue, Westfield, N.J., AD 3-5078; F. T Fox, Los Angeles International Airport, 1 Roadway, Los Angeles 45, Calif., 646-6250; Charles Froesch, Eastern Air Lines, Eastern Air Lines Building, 10 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N.Y., YU 6-4500; W. B. Harding, Smith-Barney & Co., Inc., 20 Broad Street, New York 5, N.Y., DI 4-9600; William Littlewood, American Airlines, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C., EX 3-2080; J. P. Mitchell, First Chase Manhattan Bank, First Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York 15, N.Y., LI 2-3774; T. T. Wright, Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, 510 Hanshaw Road, Ithica, N.Y., AR 3-1082, Cornell, NF 2-7500; *Lloyd Cutler, attorney at law, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, Transportation Building, Room 616, 815 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C., 737-7474; *Charles B. Stauffacher, executive vice president, Continental Can Co., 633 Third Avenue, New York, 551-7000.

PROMISES AND PERFORMANCES OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we are now in the third year of the Kennedy administration and it might be well to look at the record of disparity between promise and performance of the administration.

I shall not dwell at length on the fiscal situation as compared with the last year of the Eisenhower administration, but do want to dwell at some length on the ever-increasing growth of Federal employment.

Speaking of the Eisenhower administration, on November 4, 1960, in Virginia, President Kennedy stated:

> This administration—

Meaning the Eisenhower administration—

> This administration was elected in 1952, on a commitment to reduce Federal spending to $60 billion a year; it is $73 billion. It has never been close to $60 billion. They have spent 46 percent more than Harry Truman spent. They have added 106,000 new Federal employees. I think it is about time the American people knew.

This additional 106,000 new Federal employees came into the Government over an 8-year period. Now we have had 127,000 additional employees added in the last 2 years.

---

*Accepted invitations to join the advisory group as of Mar. 26, 1963. Official letters of acceptance not yet received.

Let us look at the record of the present administration. It has been one long on promise and short on performance.

In the President's budget message submitted to Congress this year, we find the largest peacetime budget proposed in our Nation's history, reaching the astronomical figure of $98.8 billion, and in this message the President proclaimed a vigorous Federal job economy program.

I shall not dwell on the domestic and international expenditures as proposed in the budget but to state that they far exceed last year's appropriations and carry with them a planned deficit of $11.9 billion. This planned deficit will greatly exceed this figure if Congress votes the new programs proposed by the President and approves his proposals for a tax reduction—and could reach the astronomical figure of $14 to $16 billion on June 30, 1964.

The President in his message proclaimed a vigorous Federal job economy program, but a study of the budget calls for the addition of 36,500 more Government jobs during the next fiscal year. This 36,500 would be added on top of the 127,000 added since June 1961, when the present administration assumed full fiscal year control.

Since the Kennedy administration took took office, nearly 1 million Federal civilian employees have been hired. This figure includes the large number—over 400,000—hired to replace those who leave Federal employment every year, plus new Federal jobs made possible by increased spending programs.

According to the Civil Service Commission, the 1961 Federal civilian employee separation rate was 20.93 percent. See appendix I. Any statement on Federal employment trends must take this factor into consideration.

Average annual Federal civilian employment for 1960 was 2,430,000, including 36,000 temporary census workers. Using 18 percent as the separation rate—to avoid exaggeration and take transfers into account—at least 437,400 replacement employees had to be hired in 1961 just to maintain the 1960 Federal employment level. Thus, the administration not only managed to keep all positions filled, but increased annual employment by 11,000 to a total of 2,441,000. In 1962, just to stay even, 439,380 replacements had to be hired. The administration not only hired 439,380 replacements, but an additional 64,000 to raise the 1962 employment rate to 2,505,000. This is the highest annual employment figure since the Korean war period.

Thus, simply on the basis of annual employment averages, hiring under the Kennedy administration—that is, the combination of 876,780 replacements and 75,000 new positions—for 1961 and 1962 totaled at least 951,780. I refer Senators to appendix II—table of Federal employment statistics.

One way of curbing the Federal budget is to control Federal payrolls by a policy of not replacing every one of the 400,000 or more who leave Federal employment each year.

I think President Kennedy had this in mind when, on October 26, 1961, he issued the following directive to Cabinet officers and agency heads:

> I am also especially desirous that the number of Government employees be limited to the minimum consistent with getting the job done. There is no question that employment can be held substantially below the levels which would be possible under the funds authorized by the Congress if strong efforts are made to achieve increases in productivity and efficiency, to use better techniques of management and production, and to staff each activity with only the minimum number of employees needed to carry out our objectives. (Office of the White House, press secretary, Oct. 26, 1961.)

The Civil Service Commission and Budget Bureau were reported to be considering such a move last year, according to Joseph Young's "Federal Spotlight" column in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., September 17, 1962.

> The Civil Service Commission and the Budget Bureau feel that by better management and better work production programs, agencies can get along with less employees.
>
> CSC and Budget officials feel that this can be done without firing anyone. They feel that merely by not filling some of the numerous vacancies in Government that occur each year through regular turnover, a substantial reduction in jobs can be achieved.

A comparison of Federal civilian employment as of January 31, 1961, and January 31, 1963, shows an increase of 127,000. The fiscal 1964 budget provides for 36,500 new nondefense positions.

These facts and figures show that instead of reducing Government payrolls, the Kennedy administration has not only added thousands of employees to the payroll, but increased total payroll costs from 1960 from $13,242 million to $14,861 million in 1962.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD appendixes I and II to which I have heretofore referred.

There being no objection, the appendixes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPENDIX I

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., August 27, 1962.

Mr. DAVID S. TEEPLE,
Secretary and Staff Director, Republican Policy Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEEPLE: In reply to your letter of August 17, 1962, the annual separation rate for the U.S. Government during the fiscal year 1962 in the United States was 20.93 percent. This includes all types of separations from Federal agencies. If we eliminate transfers between agencies, terminations of temporary or excepted appointments and leave without pay, the rate would be 11.74 percent.

Rates for the component types of separations are:

Quits	8.24
Transfers	1.53
Discharge	.58
Reduction-in-force	.66
Termination	6.09
Displacement	.02
Extended leave without pay	1.57
Death, retirement, disability	2.24

Sincerely yours,
NICHOLAS J. OGANOVIC,
Deputy Executive Director.

APPENDIX II

Statistics on Federal civilian employment

A. AVERAGE ANNUAL EMPLOYMENT, 1959–62

Year	Total	Total payroll	Executive branch	Total payroll
	Thousands		*Thousands*	
1959	[1] 2,393	$12,541,000,000	2,366	$12,358,000,000
1960	[2] 2,430	13,242,000,000	[2] 2,403	13,052,000,000
1961	2,441	14,074,231,000	2,412	13,871,000,000
1962	2,505	14,861,000,000	2,475	14,647,000,000

[1] Central Intelligence Agency and National Security Agency figures excluded 1959 on.

[2] Includes 12-month average of 36,000 census positions.

Source: Civil Service Commission.

B. TOTAL EMPLOYMENT BY MONTH, JAN. 31, 1961–JAN. 31, 1963

Month	1961	1962	1963
January	2,368,800	2,445,600	2,495,400
February	2,374,200	2,453,800	----------
March	2,381,300	2,458,900	----------
April	2,394,000	2,471,100	----------
May	2,402,200	2,478,800	----------
June	2,435,800	2,514,200	----------
July	2,452,500	2,528,700	----------
August	2,461,900	2,530,100	----------
September	2,443,900	2,503,000	----------
October	2,446,400	2,500,700	----------
November	2,454,500	2,516,100	----------
December	2,672,900	2,659,600	----------

Source: Civil Service Commission.

C. SIGNIFICANT INCREASES AMONG DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Department or agency	Employment as of—			Increase 1963 over 1961
	Jan. 31, 1961	Jan. 31, 1962	Jan. 31, 1963	
Defense	1,032,905	1,060,063	1,064,110	31,205
Agriculture	86,716	91,312	101,017	14,301
Health, Education, and Welfare	65,433	73,347	77,521	12,088
Interior	50,909	54,026	61,595	10,686
Post Office	568,146	580,433	583,991	15,845
State	37,782	39,011	41,214	3,432
Treasury	77,027	80,763	85,073	8,046
FAA	40,038	43,315	45,256	5,218
NASA	16,212	19,796	26,210	9,998
TVA	14,831	18,429	17,608	2,777

Source: Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

RUMORS RELATING TO DOW AIR FORCE BASE, MAINE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, on January 10, 1963, I received an inquiry from Miss Nellie Penley of the Bangor, Maine, Daily News with regard to rumors that the 341st Air Refueling Squadron at Dow Air Force Base would be deactivated in 1963 and that the 71st Air Refueling Squadron would be converted into a KC-135 unit in January 1964. Miss Penley asked that I determine for her from the Air Force whether the rumors were accurate or not and any information pertinent to the rumors.

On January 15, 1963, I received a letter from the Air Force substantially confirming the rumors but placing the restricted status of "Confidential" on the letter and forbidding me from disclosing the information.

Over 2 months later, on March 27, 1963, I received a letter from the Air Force notifying me that this information would be given to the press that day and thus removing the "Confidential" and restricted status.

In these times when there is so much talk about "managed news" and "news leaks" in violation of security, I rather marvel that such a secret could be officially kept for over 2 months. It does illustrate that there is some congressional sense of security and restraint—that some members do not release information and make announcements in violation of administrative security as was the case in August 1962 on a nuclear submarine award to the Kittery Naval Shipyard.

But I am really perplexed as to how security was really involved in the matter of the 341st Air Refueling Squadron when the information was given covertly to the press by the Air Force in Bangor and yet withheld from the press for 2 months by the Air Force in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters of January 15, 1963, and March 27, 1963, from the Air Force to me be placed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of the Air Force,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1963.
Hon. Margaret Chase Smith,
U.S. Senate

Dear Senator Smith: Knowing of your personal interest in Dow Air Force Base, Maine, the Secretary has asked me to furnish you the following information.

For several years we have been engaged in a phased program of inactivating B-47 medium bomber units and their associated KC-97 air refuelers. The exact time schedule has been established considering the availability of newer weapon systems including the intercontinental ballistic missile force. During fiscal year 1963 we are inactivating some five B-47 wings and a number of KC-97 squadrons.

We now plan to inactivate the 341st Air Refueling Squadron at Dow Air Force Base in September 1963, reducing the base personnel strength by approximately 672 military and reducing the base aircraft complement by 20 KC-97 tankers. Other units at Dow are not affected by this action. These include the 6th Air Division Headquarters, the 71st Air Refueling Squadron, the 397th Bombardment Wing, the 75th Fighter Interceptor Squadron, the 30th Air Defense Missile Squadron (Bomarc) and the Maine National Guard Fighter Interceptor Squadron.

Shortly after this letter has been delivered to your office, we plan to make the above information available to the news media. If further facts would be useful to you, please let us know.

Sincerely,
Thomas G. Corbin,
Colonel, USAF,
Deputy Director, Legislative Liaison.

[Confidential]

Department of the Air Force,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1963.
Hon. Margaret Chase Smith,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Smith: This is in response to your inquiry in regard to the utilization of Dow Air Force Base, Maine.

For some time we have had a program to modernize the Strategic Air Command air refueling squadrons by replacing the propeller driven KC-97 aircraft with the KC-135 jet tanker. Our plans currently contemplate the reorganization of the 71st Air Refueling Squadron in April 1964 with the KC-135, and to deactivate the 341st squadron in September of 1963.

It is our normal practice to inform members of Congress on such actions as far in advance as possible and we plan to formalize an announcement on these units in the near future. Until this can be done, we request that you consider this information only on a classified basis.

We regret that speculation and rumor on the subject are occurring prior to our normal announcement process.

Sincerely,
Perry M. Hoisington II,
Major General, USAF,
Director, Legislative Liaison.

MIKE AWARD FOR 1963 PRESENTED TO STATION WSB, ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, last month radio station WSB, at Atlanta, the pioneer radio station of Georgia and the South, received one of the highest awards that can be attained in the broadcasting industry—the Mike Award for 1963, presented by the national chapter of Broadcast Pioneers.

WSB has recorded a notable list of firsts throughout its history of 40 years.

These include the South's first broadcast of an on-the-spot news event; the first daily reports on farm information, market news, and weather. WSB pioneered the first broadcast of baseball games, and offered the first nationally known opera and concert artists on live broadcasts. WSB presented the Nation's first diskjockey and the first broadcast of a complete, unedited church service. That program has continued throughout the life of the station.

WSB originated the musical chime device for station identification. This station gave the Nation its first marathon charity show and raised thousands of dollars for a worthwhile project.

It was on WSB that Henry Ford made his first radio appearance and metropolitan opera star, Rosa Ponselle, sang her first radio aria.

Since 1939, the remarkable progress and reputation for the highest standards of broadcasting belonging to WSB has been directed by J. Leonard Reinsch—Mr. Broadcasting in the South, indeed, the Nation.

As executive director of WSB and of other Cox Radio-TV properties, the genius of Leonard Reinsch has been recognized by not only the members of his industry but also by the highest leaders of our country.

He is now communications adviser to President Kennedy, and served in a similar capacity under President Truman. He is a loyal Democrat and has been called upon to coordinate and direct the vast communications network necessary for the national conventions of the Democratic Party.

I salute not only Leonard Reinsch but also all of the talented staff of radio station WSB, the Voice of the South, upon their signal honor and I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks, the speech delivered by Arthur Simon, president of Broadcasters Foundation, in presenting the award.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Presentation Remarks by Arthur Simon, President, Broadcasters' Foundation

I wish each of you could experience my gratification as president of the Broadcasters' Foundation. Your generosity, your enthusiasm, and your loyal support of the foundation has made each of us associated with it grateful to have had the opportunity to serve. Without you—and the many others who could not be here, but whose contributions we have received—the foundation could not exist. It is heartening to see this response. What we are doing for those less fortunate than we truly enhances our image as an industry dedicated to serving humanity off the air as well as on.

I cannot express adequately my deep sense of appreciation for the constant, untiring, and brillant leadership of Ward Quaal. He has been unbelievably generous—not only financially, but of his time and himself. To me it has been a rare privilege to have been able to work so closely with him.

I must give thanks also to Chet Huntley for his graciousness in appearing here tonight.

Another reward for my work with the foundation is the pleasure and honor in presenting the annual Mike Award. At your leisure take a look at your program which contains the story of its background. It does not confine itself to a single area of broadcasting accomplishment over the calendar year. The Mike Award goes to a station which has made enduring contributions in every phase of its operation over its entire lifespan.

WSB of Atlanta is just such a station. If you want overwhelming proof of this fact, then take a trip to Georgia—and the destination doesn't necessarily have to be Atlanta.

It can be Gainesville or Athens or Rabun Gap, because WSB's influence is far reaching throughout the entire State. People there remember when WSB went on the air in 1922 as the "Voice of the South." Some of them will tell you about the intervening years of expanding radio, and that upstart, television. And most of them will talk about the significant presence of WSB today. In short, the listeners and viewers of Georgia are impressed by the always current service WSB offers them.

One thing strikes me as most intriguing. Many of you who do business with WSB know this—it is the station's wonderfully gracious hospitality. The motif so artistically expressed by the white columns on your program is symbolic. I'm not telling you that on a sunny day in Georgia you'll find all the WSB people lolling on the spacious front porch of white columns sippin' mint juleps and a-calling out to Beauregard, the hound dog. Anybody who has that mental picture of business in booming Atlanta obviously hasn't been there in this century. What I referred to is the hospitality of the operation. It's an admirable spirit of good will toward all—a spirit I devoutly wish would spread throughout this Nation.

The high aims of WSB are carried out by effective and efficient leadership. Later you will meet key members of the of the WSB organization. Also under the Cox management are stations WHIO-AM-FM-TV in Dayton; WSOC-AM-FM-TV in Charlotte; WIOD-AM-FM-TV in Miami, along with the Atlanta stations. It is, in every sense of the word, one of the Nation's finest broadcasting groups.

The man in charge of the distinguished Cox group is James M. Cox, Jr., chairman of the board of these broadcasting properties and their other enterprises which include newspaper and community television. Mr.

Cox has advanced the outstanding broadcast associations begun by his father, the late Governor Cox of Ohio. The progress under Jim Cox's leadership is familiar to many of you. Certainly WSB has every right to be proud of its outstanding administration and management.

And now, I call on James M. Cox to come forward. [Pause.] The inscription on the award reads:

"For distinguished contribution to the art of broadcasting and in recognition of dedicated adherence to quality, integrity and responsibility in programing and management, inspiring industry leadership, pioneering in the art, the science, and in the service to the public. Made this 25th day of February 1963."

On behalf of the Broadcast Pioneers and the Broadcasters' Foundation, I take great pleasure in presenting to WSB this 1963 Mike Award.

THE DEPLORABLE CRIME RATE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the deplorable crime rate in the District of Columbia may become worse unless the Congress acts promptly to amend the law relating to voluntary admissions and confessions as laid down by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Mallory case.

On March 7, Senator Ervin, of North Carolina, with five cosponsors, introduced a bill to make voluntary admissions and confessions admissible in criminal proceedings and prosecutions in the courts of the United States and the District of Columbia. That bill is S. 1012.

A very similar measure was passed by both the House and the Senate in 1958 but at 4 a.m. on the morning that Congress adjourned on August 24, 1958, the conference report on the bill was killed by an objection raised by Senator Carroll, of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a statement outlining the history of that legislation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

H.R. 11477, 85th Congress, 2d Session

A special subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee held hearings on *Mallory* v. *U.S.*, 354 U.S. 449, on July 19, 25, August 1, 2, 22, and October 28, 1957.

On March 18, 1958, Congressman Willis, of Louisiana introduced H.R. 11477. The bill, as amended, would have added the following section to chapter 223, title 18, of the United States Code:

"3501. Admissibility of evidence—statements and confessions.

* * * * *

"§3501. Admissibility of evidence—statements and confessions.

"(a) Evidence, including statements and confessions, otherwise admissible, shall not be inadmissible solely because of [Senate Judiciary inserted the word "reasonable"] delay in taking an arrested person before a commissioner or other officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States.

"(b) No statement, including confession, made by an arrested person during an interrogation by a law-enforcement officer shall be admissible unless prior to such interrogation the arrested person had been advised that he is not required to make a statement and that any statement made by him may be used against him." [The conference committee inserted the provision: *"Provided,* That such delay is to be considered as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions."]

H.R. 11477 was reported by the House Judiciary Committee, without amendment (H. Rept. 1815), on May 27, 1958. It was considered by the House on June 30 and passed, without amendment, on July 2, 1958.

On July 17 and 30 a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee held hearings on H.R. 11477. The full committee reported the bill on August 8 (S. Rept. 2525) with the amendment that the word "reasonable" be inserted before the word "delay." The Senate passed H.R. 11477, as amended, on August 19.

The conference report was adopted by the House on August 23 (H. Rept. 2702). This report added to subsection (b) the phrase, *"Provided,* That such delay is to be considered as an element in determining the voluntary or involuntary nature of such statements or confessions."

The Senate, however, failed to adopt the conference report. Senator Carroll (at 4 a.m. on August 24, the morning Congress adjourned) objected to the bill, as amended, on the ground that the proviso represented new matter and, therefore, should not have been inserted by the conference committee.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the first eight pages of the House report on H.R. 11477. Mr. President, it is my earnest hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the Senate, will expedite action on this important aid to the Metropolitan Police to stem the mounting crime wave in our Nation's Capital which is a source of humiliation to decent citizens at home, and a just ground for condemnation by our foreign enemies.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 1815) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to provide for a statutory rule of evidence for the admissibility of statements and confessions in criminal proceedings in the courts of the United States, and to require a warning to an arrested person by law-enforcement officers prior to an interrogation. Such warning is made a condition precedent for the admission of statements or confessions into evidence. Accordingly, the bill amends the appropriate chapter, namely, chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, by adding at the end thereof a new section designated as section 3501.

HISTORY OF THE LEGISLATION

The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives in the last session of this Congress constituted a special subcommittee to study recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, including, among other things, decisions relating to the enforcement of Federal criminal laws. Among the decisions selected by the subcommittee for study and analysis was the decision rendered on June 24, 1957, in the case of *Mallory* v. *United States* (354 U.S. 449).

The subcommittee conducted lengthy hearings on the impact and ramification of the Court's ruling in the Mallory case. Witnesses included representatives of the Department of Justice and other Federal law-enforcement officers, such as the heads of the Park Police, Bureau of the Chief Postal Inspector, Post Office Department, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, chief of the Metropolitan Police Department for the District of Columbia, members of the bar of the District of Columbia, representatives of the National Association of Attorneys General, and Members of Congress who had introduced legislation designed to affect the decision of the Mallory case.

As part of its study, the subcommittee, while not having legislative jurisdiction over particular bills which had been introduced on this subject, nevertheless took into consideration various legislation proposed as a solution to the problem under study.

These bills and their authors are as follows:

H.R. 8521: Mr. Alexander.
H.R. 8596: Mr. Cramer.
H.R. 8600: Mr. Keating.
H.R. 8624: Mr. Poff.
H.R. 10775: Mr. Colmer.

These hearings were conducted during the 1st and 2d sessions of the 85th Congress.

At the conclusion of the hearings, the subcommittee then considered the evidence submitted to it during the course of the hearings and the above-mentioned legislative proposals. The subcommittee reached the conclusion that legislation was necessary to clarify the problem raised by the Mallory decision. It further decided on a specific legislative proposal which, in effect, overruled the holding in the Mallory case and in addition provided new safeguards to protect the rights of an arrested person. Its purpose in making such recommendation was to balance the rights of the individual with the rights of society itself in the field of law enforcement.

The subcommittee directed its chairman to make such a report to the full committee, which was done. The full committee accepted the report of the subcommittee and directed the subcommittee chairman to introduce a bill carrying out the legislative recommendation of the Special Subcommittee To Study Supreme Court Decisions. A bill was introduced, which is reported here by the subcommittee chairman. At the same time, a number of identical bills were introduced as follows:

H.R. 11467: Mr. Cramer.
H.R. 11468: Mr. Dowdy.
H.R. 11473: Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
H.R. 11481: Mr. Miller of New York.
H.R. 11483: Mr. Moore.
H.R. 11498: Mr. Forrester.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Prior to 1943, the Supreme Court of the United States had adhered to a long-established rule of evidence that a confession was admissible in evidence as long as it was freely and voluntarily given. In that year, however, in the cases of *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U.S. 332), *Anderson* v. *United States* (318 U.S. 350), the Court ruled that confessions obtained by police from a person unlawfully kept in custody could not be used against him at his trial. At that time there were on the statute books Federal laws requiring various Federal law-enforcement officers to bring arrested persons immediately or forthwith before an authorized committing magistrate or commissioner. The Supreme Court later, in the case of *United States* v. *Mitchell* (322 U.S. 65 (1944)), qualified its ruling in the McNabb case by holding that illegal detention did not justify the [rejection] of confessions unless they were the fruits of the illegal detention. In this latter case, the confession was admitted.

Following the McNabb decision, a series of bills somewhat similar to the bill herein reported were introduced in various Congresses. Finally, the House of Representatives passed a bill but it died in the Senate.

In 1948, in *Upshaw* v. *United States* (335 U.S. 410), the Supreme Court ruled inadmissible a confession and reversed the conviction based thereon because the defendant had confessed after being held for 30 hours without having been taken before a committing magistrate as required by rule 5(a) of the

Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. It is that same rule 5(a) that is involved in the Mallory decision.

In the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, preliminary draft, submitted May 3, 1943, to the Supreme Court, there was included a rule 5(b). However, there was strenuous opposition to the inclusion of the rule 5(b) and it was subsequently abandoned as unworkable, unnecessary, and inappropriate.

Rule 5(a) is as follows:

"Appearance before the Commissioner: An officer making an arrest under a warrant issued upon a complaint or any person making an arrest without a warrant shall take the arrested person without unnecessary delay before the nearest available commissioner or before any other nearby officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States. When a person arrested without a warrant is brought before a commissioner or other officer, a complaint shall be filed forthwith."

The proposed but rejected rule 5(b) purported to codify the so-called McNabb rule. It said that no statement by a defendant in response to interrogation by an officer or agent of the Government shall be admissible in evidence against him if the interrogation occurs while the defendant is held in custody in violation of the rule calling for arraignment without unnecessary delay.

The important question involved in *Mallory* v. *United States* was the interpretation of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and in particular rule 5(a).

The facts in the Mallory case were very simple ones. The defendant had been charged with rape which had occurred at 6 p.m. in the basement of an apartment house inhabited by the victim. There were no witnesses to the criminal attack and the perpetrator took the added precaution of attempting to disguise himself. Shortly after the commission of this crime, the defendant and one of his nephews disappeared from the apartment house wherein they resided and in which the crime had been committed. The defendant was apprehended the following day between 2 and 2:30 p.m. and was brought to headquarters, along with two nephews who were also suspects. Interrogation by police officers followed for approximately 30 to 45 minutes. All the suspects were held there until about 4 p.m. when they were asked to submit to a lie detector test and they agreed. The defendant was questioned shortly after 8 p.m. for almost 1½ hours of continuous interrogation. He subsequently admitted his guilt. At 10 p.m. he repeated his confession to other police officers who attempted to reach a U.S. commissioner in order to arraign him. Their efforts were fruitless. The defendant consented to a physical examination by a coroner who found no indication of physical or psychological coercion. After being confronted with the complaining witness the defendant again repeated his confession and at approximately midnight dictated it to a typist. He signed the confession and was arraigned the following morning.

The defendant was subsequently found guilty of the rape and his conviction was affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia (236 F. 2d. 701). That affirmance was reversed by the Supreme Court of the United States and the case was remanded to the District court where subsequently the indictment was dimissed and the defendant released.

In its opinion, the Supreme Court said:

"The scheme for initiating a Federal prosecution is plainly defined. The police may not arrest upon mere suspicion but only on probable cause." The next step in the proceeding is to arraign the arrested person before a judicial officer as quickly as possible so that he may be advised of his rights and so that the issue of probable cause may be promptly determined. The arrested person may, of course, be 'booked' by the police. But he is not to be taken to police headquarters in order to carry out a process of inquiry that lends itself, even if not so designed, to eliciting damaging statements to support the arrest and ultimately his guilt.

"The duty enjoined upon arresting officers to arraign 'without unnecessary delay' indicated that the command does not call for mechanical or automatic obedience. Circumstances may justify a brief delay between arrest and arraignment, as for instance, where the story volunteered by the accused is susceptible of quick verification through third parties. But the delay must not be of a nature to give opportunity for the extraction of a confession."

It is to be noted here that in the cases wherein the Supreme Court ruled these confessions inadmissible, it did so without reaching the constitutional question of the individual's constitutional rights.

In the Mallory case, the Court said:

"In order adequately to enforce the congressional requirement of prompt arraignment, it was deemed necessary to render inadmissible incriminating statements elicited from defendants during a period of unlawful detention."

The Court then cited the Upshaw case. Since the ruling in the Mallory case, the lower courts, and the court of appeals particularly in the District of Columbia, have had occasions to apply the rule in various cases. The District of Columbia has felt the greatest impact of the Mallory ruling. That is because of the nature of the common law crimes over which the Federal Government has jurisdiction within the confines of the District of Columbia. Those crimes are usually handled in the States by the local law enforcement agencies.

It is these common law crimes whose general nature lend themselves to the problem by which law enforcement officials are confronted by the Mallory decision. Crimes such as robbery, rape, even murder, are planned in secret and committed under circumstances which do not lend themselves to evidence of perpetration. These criminals take all precaution to avoid identification by their victims or other eye witnesses in order to avoid conviction for the crime. All too often in such cases there is no evidence for the police except a recounting of the event by the complaining witness. If the police as indicated by the Mallory decision are, in effect, prevented from conducting a proper and reasonable interrogation of suspects, law enforcement is faced with a serious challenge.

Law enforcement officials informed the committee that under the Mallory ruling as it has been applied in the lower courts, they are faced with serious obstacles in meeting their responsibility of enforcing the criminal laws. It is understandable that such officials should be concerned in the light of the broad general sweeping language employed by the Court in that case. It is indeed unfortunate that the Court left no guideposts or standards in its opinion as to the meaning of the phrase "unnecessary delay." It made reference to "booking" by the police but it added language as follows:

"He is not to be taken to police headquarters in order to carry out a process of inquiry that lends itself, even if not so designed, to eliciting damaging statements to support the arrest and ultimately his guilt."

The Court continued to say that this did not mean a command for mechanical or automatic obedience. It pointed out that circumstances might permit a brief delay in order to quickly verify a voluntary story by the accused, but then it added: "* * * the delay must not be of a nature to give opportunity for the extraction of a confession."

Such quotations are ample justification for the dilemma in which the police find themselves. There are many instances in the course of law enforcement when proper interrogation has resulted in clearing an accused person of a crime. The human frailty involved in the identification of a suspect is well known to all prosecutors and demands caution and substantiation: false accusations motivated by any one of many causes such as jealousy, spite, or hatred may result in an innocent person being falsely accused of a crime. There is also the problem raised by "the alibi." Interrogation in all these instances is necessary either to strike down or verify or substantiate them in order that the suspect be either charged with the crime or exonerated in accordance with the facts ascertained by the police. All of these instances involve justified delay and must entail reasonable interrogation. Yet, if the Mallory decision is permitted to stand, proper police procedure cannot be followed and criminals may go free while innocent people go to jail.

The passage of time between arrest and arraignment varies from case to case. Your committee is mindful of the dangers inherent in a long delay during that period of detention. It is, indeed, a time when the rights of an individual are very important to him and should be protected. Third-degree methods cannot be too strenuously condemned as they have been for many years and are today. All promises, threats, or intimidations which in any way render a confession on the part of an accused involuntarily are and should be condemned. Coercion, be it mental or physical, vitiates any confession since such a confession is not testimonially truthworthy which principle is basic and fundamental to the rule of evidence governing the admission of confession. In the Mallory case there is not a single scintilla of evidence of any coercion; Mallory confessed his crime freely and voluntarily and, moreover, he told the truth. He was and is guilty, but nevertheless he was not convicted because of the decision of the Supreme Court.

Such a condition, indeed, should not be permitted to continue, and it is the opinion of your committee that a statute to the effect that mere delay would not render inadmissible a confession or statement otherwise admissible is necessary and salutary in the field of Federal law enforcement. Such a provision does not take from the individual accused any rights whatsoever and, yet, at the same time it provides a reasonable and adequate safeguard to society itself against criminals.

The committee is cognizant of the fact that the concept of "unnecessary delay" is one that must be flexible, if it is to be adequate for the protection of both the accused and of society. It is the balance of these two conflicting interests that raises the most serious aspect of the overall problem. For that reason, by providing the added precaution in subsection (b) of the proposed bill, a proper balance, in the opinion of the committee, is achieved. The requisite of a warning by the police to the arrested person that anything he may say may be used against him and that he may not say anything if he so desires, adequately protects the individual's rights and places a restraint upon police procedure, a restraint that is reasonable; reasonable, because it adequately protects the arrested person's right and at the same time does not shackle proper law-enforcement techniques.

There are some individuals who would add to that subsection the right to counsel. However, your subcommittee considered such a proposal and rejected it. The right to the assignment of counsel in Federal courts does not appear to extend to proceedings at the stage of police interrogation or proceedings preliminary to indictment. Moreover, merely to advise a person as to his right to counsel would be an empty gesture if counsel was not provided for. The presence of counsel at that stage of the proceedings would entail the very same problem that has already plagued the police in attempting to locate proper officials in order to arraign the accused without unnecessary delay. It is the opinion of your committee, also, that the presence of counsel at that stage of the proceeding would provide other obstacles to proper law enforcement. The police would be confronted by the problem of having arrested one person, at the same time knowing and looking for three other suspects they would be compelled to sit idly by until counsel appeared. Obviously, such a condition could not be tolerated.

A Justice of the Supreme Court, namely Justice Jackson, once referred to the protections afforded by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights by saying: "* * * [they] represent the maximum restriction upon the power of organized society over the individual that are compatible with the maintenance or organized society itself."

He then said: "I doubt very much if they [these restrictions] require us to hold that the State may not take into custody and question one suspected reasonably of an unwitnessed murder. If it [the law] does, the people of this country must discipline themselves to seeing their police stand by helplessly while those suspected of murder prowl about unmolested. Is it a necessary price to pay for the fairness which we know as due process of law? And if not a necessary one, should it be demanded by this Court? I do not know the ultimate answers to these questions; but, for the present, I should not increase the handicap on society."

That quotation clearly reflects the attitude of the committee on this problem and its proposed solution. The solution is a fair one. It enhances the protection of both the State and the individual. It detracts nothing from the constitutional rights of the individual but on the contrary provides further safeguards for those rights by placing restriction on law-enforcing officials. At the same time, however, it accepts the rules of evidence that have governed criminal trials in this country for many years and which have proved themselves fair and just both to the people and to the individual defendants.

At its latest meeting, the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia adopted a resolution approving the principles contained in the bill H.R. 11477.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

The bill adds a new section to chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to provide a statutory rule for the admission of evidence—statements and confessions.

Subsection (a) of the new section states that evidence, including statements and confessions, otherwise admissible under the rules of evidence in a criminal proceeding in any court of the United States shall not be ruled inadmissible merely because there had been a delay in taking an arrested person before a commissioner or other officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States.

The effect of the language of this subsection is to restore the rules of evidence for the admission of statements and confessions into evidence. Prior to the McNabb-Mallory doctrine, confessions which were free and voluntary were admitted into evidence. However, as previously stated, that doctrine has altered the rule which the proposed legislation would restore. The language proposed would still permit a delay between arrest and arraignment to be a factor to be considered by both judge and jury as a standard to determine whether or not such statement or confession was free and voluntary. On the other hand, the mere passage of time in and of itself would not automatically cause a rejection of the statement or confession.

It is, of course, possible for coercion to be either mental or physical, and your committee realizes that. Therefore, it permits the judge and jury to consider the time element as a factor to be considered in determining the free and voluntary nature of a confession. It is believed that this provision is consistent with the underlying principle governing the admission of confessions in criminal cases; namely, is such evidence testimonially trustworthy, so as to aid the jury in determining the truth?

Subsection (b) of the new section provides that no statement, including a confession which has been made by an arrested person during the course of interrogation by a law-enforcement official, can be admitted into evidence in a criminal case unless two prior requisites have been fulfilled. The first requisite is that the arrested person, prior to interrogation, shall be advised by the law-enforcement officer that he is not required to make any statement. The second is that the law-enforcement officer must also state to the arrested person that he is not required to make a statement and if he does so, it may be used against him in a subsequent criminal prosecution.

The purpose of subsection (b) is to provide adequate safeguards for the rights of the arrested individual. Under this provision the burden would be on the Government to prove that these requirements have been fulfilled before any statement or confession otherwise admissible could be admitted into evidence in a criminal case. This provision, of course, would not change the rule of evidence as provided for in subsection (a), namely, that free and voluntary confessions otherwise admissible should be admitted and not rejected solely because of the delay in arrangement.

Section (b) of the bill is a technical amendment providing for the proper insertion of the title of the new section in the chapter analysis of chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code.

In view of the foregoing considerations, the committee recommends that the bill do pass.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, there is printed below in roman type without brackets existing law in which no change is proposed by the bill; new provisions proposed to be inserted are shown in black brackets:

"Chapter 223.—Witnesses and evidence

"Sec.

* * * * *

["3501. Admissibility of evidence—statements and confessions.]

* * * * *

["§ 3501. Admissibility of evidence—statements and confessions.]

["(a) Evidence, including statements and confessions, otherwise admissible, shall not be inadmissible solely because of delay in taking an arrested person before a commissioner or other officer empowered to commit persons charged with offenses against the laws of the United States.

["(b) No statement, including a confession, made by an arrested person during an interrogation by a law-enforcement officer shall be admissible unless prior to such interrogation the arrested person had been advised that he is not required to make a statement and that any statement made by him may be used against him.]

THE HOUSE OF GOOD TASTE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the goal of aiding the American people in their quest for more comfortable American living, which always has been in the forefront of the planning and work of the Congress, can be stimulated by providing the opportunity for people to see for themselves outstanding examples of tasteful home living.

As chairmen of the Senate and House Banking and Currency Subcommittees on Housing, Mr. RAINS and I believe this objective will be furthered by the New York World's Fair "House of Good Taste" exhibit for which we broke ground here yesterday.

We believe that, in light of the national concept embodied in this projected three-home community, it is fitting that the Nation's Capital should be the scene of its introduction.

This national concept is reflected by the fact that some 200 business firms from all sections of the country and their artisans are joining with 3 of the Nation's foremost architects to build this exhibit.

The millions of people who will visit these beautifully designed and furnished homes will recognize that, through the combined creativity of American industry and labor, the aspiration of every person for attractive home surroundings can be realized.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I have great respect and admiration for Gen. Lucius Clay. I thoroughly agree with his statement with respect to foreign aid, quoted by the Associated Press in a weekend interview, as follows:

> I feel a lot of money has been wasted. It's got to be tightened up. To continue to give economic assistance to countries that have done little or nothing to help themselves is throwing money away.

The Clay Committee submitted a list of countries and territories which are now receiving U.S. foreign aid. The number is 95.

Since July 1, 1945, when this foreign aid started, the United States has expended a gross total of more than $100 billion. This huge sum has contributed to the tremendous increase in our public debt and the $10 billion a year in interest which it is costing us.

There is an old saying that friendship can not be bought with money; and this is well demonstrated by the fact that France, which has accepted more of our foreign aid money than any other country—$9.4 billion—recently has shown a lack of friendship to both the United States and Great Britain. The French veto of British participation in the Common Market will have serious consequences.

The time has come for the United States to reassess our entire program of foreign aid expenditures throughout the world. We have been acting as policeman, Santa Claus, and banker for the free world for nearly 20 years. This can not be kept up without disaster.

The time has come when other free world nations must assume their share of this burden.

One example is the fact that we have nearly 800,000 troops abroad, at an average per capita cost of about $8,000. As a delegate to the November North Atlantic Treaty Organization meeting in Paris, I asked what nations had met their NATO troop quotas. The answer was the United States and Canada.

This is but one of many instances where the burden of protecting the free world is being carried unequally by the United States.

FOOD STAMP PLAN IN ILLINOIS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, through its Agricultural Marketing Service, is operating part of its experimental food stamp program in Franklin County, Ill. I am very pleased to report that this program has been very successful, and I present a report on the program's details for the information of the Senate, which will soon be considering the continuance, and I hope, expansion of the food stamp program. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1963.

To: Mabel Snyder, Office of the Secretary.
From: Roy W. Lennartson, Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service.
Subject: Information on food stamp program in Illinois.

At the present time, the food stamp program is operating only in Franklin County although a number of other areas in the State have expressed great interest in the program.

In January 1963, some 3,500 people participated in the food stamp program in Franklin County. They purchased over $56,000 in food coupons and received an additional $22,000 in supplemental or bonus coupons free of charge. The average value of the bonus coupons per person was $6.18 to assist those participating in obtaining a more nutritious diet.

Since the opening of the program in July of 1961—Franklin County was one of the original eight pilot areas—participating families have purchased a total of $1,182,000 worth of food coupons and have received an additional $642,000 in coupons free of charge. This has meant a net additional cash inflow of $642,000 to the county's retail food stores. Also, it has meant improved diets for families participating in the program. A survey of sales in a sample of retail food stores, before and after the program went into effect in Franklin County, showed an increase of almost 14 percent in sales of meat under the food stamp program.

A survey of household food consumption in two of the original pilot areas before and after the food stamp program became operative indicated that over 80 percent of the increased food purchasing power was spent for perishable, highly nutritious items such as meat, poultry, fish, milk, eggs, and fruits and vegetables.

Recipients of food coupons have better diets than similar low-income families not participating in the program. But they still do not eat as well as higher income groups.

Retail food store sales, measured in dollars, increased after the inauguration of the program—an average of 8 percent in the sample of stores surveyed.

In a survey of attitudes toward the program, more than 90 percent of the participating families expressed approval of the program, primarily because it offered a greater variety of food. Families of moderate and higher income not eligible for the program felt that low-income families should be enabled to obtain more and better food and approved of the food coupon approach; virtually all the retailers liked the program; so did the majority of local welfare workers and administrators.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have been impressed with the benefits the program has brought to participants in Franklin County, and on January 22, 1963, I wrote the director of the Food Distribution Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture, asking if Saline, Gallatin, and Pope Counties might participate in the program.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of my letter and the Department of Agriculture's reply of January 28, 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point to emphasize the fact that the program is still in the experimental stage.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 22, 1963.

Mr. HOWARD P. DAVIS,
Director, Food Distribution Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: I am very anxious to learn if Saline, Gallatin, and Pope Counties may participate in the food stamp plan. The unemployment figures in these counties are substantially higher than the national unemployment percentage and these counties are listed by the Area Redevelopment Administration as 5(a).

I would also appreciate learning the status of the pilot program throughout the United States. I believe it is doing a marvelous job of fulfilling its goals, and I am very anxious that Illinois participate to a greater degree in its operation.

With best wishes.

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., January 28, 1963.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: This will reply to your letter of January 22 to Mr. Howard P. Davis, Director, Food Distribution Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, requesting that consideration be given to including the counties of Saline, Gallatin, and Pope in the pilot food stamp program.

The program appears to be moving smoothly and effectively in those areas where it is in operation. As you know, President Kennedy in his budget message proposed the passage of legislation to continue the food stamp program and to finance it in fiscal year 1964 at the current level.

At the present time, the program is still in the experimental stage and we do not anticipate any further expansion during the pilot phase.

If the program is continued and if it is possible to make it available to additional areas, the counties you mentioned will be given serious consideration.

Although we do not yet have the results of the additional research being conducted on the program's acceptability and effectiveness, I am enclosing several publications you may find interesting as to what we learned in the course of the earlier research efforts.

Sincerely yours,

ROY W. LENNARTSON,
Associate Administrator.

FACTS WITH RESPECT TO FORTHCOMING WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in Columbia, Mo., recently 35 farmers, businessmen, and clergymen organized a Missouri Citizens Committee to present to the farm people of my State the facts with respect to the wheat referendum that will be held in May.

In this connection, and with the thought that other Senators might be interested in this effort, I ask unanimous consent that an article on this subject from the St. Louis Post Dispatch of March 9 be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSOURI GROUP FORMED TO URGE WHEAT PLAN OK

COLUMBIA, MO.—Thirty-three farmers and businessmen and two clergymen have organized a Missouri Citizens Wheat Committee to press for passage of wheat production controls at a referendum in May. The date for the referendum has not been set.

The committee, which was formed at a meeting here yesterday, warned that wheat prices would fall to $1 a bushel if controls are defeated. It said the wheat program guarantees a national average price of $2 a bushel.

Miller Hern, Rocheport farmer, Production Credit Association board member, and former county agricultural stabilization and conservation committee chairman, was named chairman of the wheat committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Members of the executive committee are: Dorr Ewing, Maryville, attorney and wheat producer; Gene Hutchison, Bolivar, wheat producer; James A. Schooling, Concordia, National Farmers Organization State legislative director and past president of the State Soil Districts Association.

Phil Smith, Williamsburg, livestock and grain farmer and former ASC Committee member; Howard Taylor, Essex, farmer and State Soil Districts Commission member; and James VanHouten, Clarence, grain farmer.

Committee members warned that rejection of the wheat program would bring an increase in production and a "ruinous low price" for the crop.

COMMITTEE'S JOB

"The wheat program, if adopted by the farmers in the May referendum, will maintain farm income, reduce the cost of the farm program and will cut the Government's wheat surplus," the committee said.

Members pointed out the committee's job is to make information on the alternatives to controls available to farmers and help them to determine how their individual farms would be affected.

"In our opinion, it is foolish and disastrous to increase the wheat acreage and production at a time when the Government now owns more than 1 billion bushels of wheat—the equivalent of a year's supply," the committee declared. The statement continued:

"We can only assume that any farmer that votes against the wheat referendum is doing so because he wants to seed more acres of wheat. The market, at the present time, does not justify an increase in wheat acreage. In addition, a defeat of the wheat program would adversely affect our entire feed grain program.

PRICE OF WHEAT IN BREAD

"Orderly production and marketing is essential for strong farm operation, be it large or small.

"The price of wheat is insignificant when considered in relation to the cost of bread to consumers. It has been said, for example, that the wrapper in some cases, might cost more than the wheat in a loaf of bread. This program will protect farm prices without increasing costs to consumers.

"The issue is one that concerns the pocketbook of farmers. We urge each farmer to make his decision on the basis of what it does to his individual farm."

Other members of the committee are: Tom Briggs, Macon, newspaper publisher and farmer; Glen Briscoe, New London, wheat producer, Garth Clinkscales, Boonville, rural banker; Robert Cullers, Trenton, banker and farmer.

L. A. Bockenstette, Pleasant Hill, wheat producer; Jim Briscoe, Tipton, livestock and grain farmer; John A. Childers, McFall, member, State committee, Farmers Home Administration, and past president, State Soil Districts Association; John Daugherty, Mound City, wheat producer.

MONSIGNOR HILDNER

Floyd Gander, Butler, general farmer; Harry Handley, Houstonia, wheat producer; William D. Hibler, Jr., Brunswick, member, State legislature and farmer; Msgr. George J. Hildner, Villa Ridge, rural priest and recipient of numerous soil conservation awards; Calvin Hollaway, Roscoe, farmer and former member, State ASC Committee, and former member, State legislature; H. F. (Hoot) Holland, Sheridan, farmer, member, State legislature, and oil distributor.

Alvin Huff, Reeds, farmer and former ASC committee member; Charles Lahr, PCA director and farm operator; Charles M. Massie, Hopkins, livestock and grain farmer and Farm Bureau member; Arthur Neuenschwander, Deepwater, general farmer and Missouri Farmers Association director.

Gene Nitch, Jackson, wheat producer; Gene Poirot, Golden City, conservationist; Luther Robertson, Lamar, general farmer; C. W. Sheppard, Warrensburg, wheat farmer and former member, State ASC Committee; Mace Smith, Sweet Springs, farmer; Rev. James Spainhower, Marshall, minister and member, State legislature.

Preston V. Walker, Clarence, farmer and vice chairman, State Soil District Commission; Owen Wise, McCredie, farmer and implement dealer; Elvis Besand, Perryville, general farmer and wheat producer, and Charles Walton, Qulin, wheat producer.

REIMBURSEMENT TO CERTAIN CITIES FOR PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS NEAR ARMY RESERVE INSTALLATIONS

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on February 4, 1963, I introduced S. 654, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to reimburse certain cities in the United States for expenses incurred by such cities in the construction of streets, sidewalks, and other public improvements adjacent to U.S. Army Reserve installations.

As part of my remarks beginning on page 1687 of the RECORD for that date, I included a list of cities to which this bill would apply. At that time, I noted that the list, supplied me by the Department of the Army, was in error in at least one instance; that I had asked the Department to verify the list.

On March 26 I received a letter and another up-to-date list from Col. R. E. Vollendorff in the Office of Legislative Liaison. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the letter, dated March 22, and the attached list be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 22, 1963.

Senator LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: On January 3, 1963, a list of Army Reserve center locations requiring offsite improvements was forwarded to you per your request.

Subsequent to that date it was indicated that the requirement for improvements at some specific locations were questionable. As a result field agencies were requested to make another survey so that the list could be checked for accuracy and brought up to date. This has been done and a revised list is forwarded herewith.

Attention is invited to the fact that while the improvements indicated are desirable, only those locations indicated by an asterisk have local community plans for improvements.

Sincerely,

R. E. VOLLENDORFF,
Colonel, GS Office, Chief of Legislative Liaison.

Army Reserve centers off-site improvements

Army area	Location	Off-site improvements	Estimated cost
1st	Penn-Yan, N.Y.	Sidewalk and drainage	$2,492
2d	Baltimore No. 1, Md.	Sidewalk	1,690
	Riverdale, Md.	Sidewalk improvement	1,000
	Wilmington, Del.	Sidewalks	1,040
	Seaford, Del.	Curbs, sidewalks	2,500
	Ripley, W. Va[1]	400 feet of 20-foot-wide blacktop	1,500
	Fairmont, W. Va.[1]	900 feet of 20-foot-wide blacktop	7,000
	Mansfield, Ohio	240 feet of 24-foot-wide blacktop	3,200
	St. Marys, Ohio	530 feet of 20-foot-wide blacktop	5,890
	Bethlehem, Pa.	Curbs and sidewalks	2,932
	Harrisburg, Pa.	do	6,405
	Philadelphia (No. 1), Pa.[1]	do	3,582
	Reading, Pa.	do	3,990
	Scranton, Pa.[1]	do	4,202
3d	Chattanooga, Tenn.	Installation of sidewalk, curb, and gutters.	2,200
4th	Harrison, Ark.	Improvements to streets abutting USAR-constructed centers.	4,000
	Ada, Okla.	do	11,000
	McAlester, Okla.[1]	do	17,592
	Las Cruces, N. Mex.	do	4,608
	Silver City, N. Mex.	do	4,800
	Harlingen, Tex.	do	7,800
	Amarillo, Tex.[1]	Improvements to streets abutting USAR constructed centers and storm sewer.	3,633
6th	Douglas, Ariz. (1973)	Curb, gutters, street paving	2,700
	Tucson, Ariz.[1]	Street paving, curbs, underground drainage.	3,900
	Phoenix, Ariz. (1973)	Curbs, gutters, and sidewalks	7,000
	Bakersfield, Calif.	Street paving and curbs	1,100
	Chico, Calif.	Sidewalk and drainage	3,500
	Fresno, Calif., (1973)	Curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and street paving.	2,000
	Modesto, Calif.	do	8,000
	San Jose, Calif.	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, street paving, and underground drainage.	10,000
	San Pablo, Calif.	Sidewalk and drainage	9,200
6th	Santa Cruz, Calif.	Sidewalk	$2,000
	Mountain View, Calif.	Curb, gutter	2,000
	Vallejo, Calif.	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, and street paving.	5,000
	Pasadena, Calif.	Curb, gutter, and sidewalk	1,200
	Van Nuys, Calif.	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, and street paving.	8,500
	Rexburg, Idaho[1]	do	5,700
	Glasgow, Mont.	do	7,200
	Helena, Mont.	do	6,000
	Las Vegas, Nev.[1]	do	10,100
	Reno, Nev.[1]	Sidewalk and street paving	6,000
	Corvallis, Oreg.	Sidewalk, curb, street paving, and drainage.	5,400
	Eugene, Oreg.	Sidewalk, street improvement	3,700
	Medford, Oreg.	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, street paving, and underground drainage.	27,000
	Portland (South), Oreg.	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, street paving.	9,100
	Portland (West), Oreg.	Street improvements and drainage	4,900
	Salem, Oreg.	Curb, gutter, street paving, and drainage.	6,000
	Ogden, Utah	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, and street paving.	8,200
	Provo, Utah[1]	Street paving	1,900
	Salt Lake City No. 1	Sidewalk	1,100
	Everett, Wash.	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, street paving, and drainage.	5,100
	Seattle, Wash.[1]	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, and street paving.	5,300
	Spokane, Wash.	Sidewalk	800
	Tacoma, Wash.	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, and street paving.	6,000
	Wenatchee, Wash.	Curb, gutter, sidewalk, street-paving, and drainage.	14,700
	Total estimated cost for United States.		303,356

---

[1] Projects with plans for improvements.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JAMES B. BIGGS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, good men choose many professions in which to spend their lives in service of their fellow men.

No profession is more demanding than the healing art of medicine, and none calls for greater talent, or greater sacrifice. It is heroic work that beckons heroic men to the selfless life of caring for the needs of old and young—ill and healthy—and sharing with them the sorrows and joys that are inherent in human lives. And within the medical profession, this is nowhere seen in greater degree than it is with the general practitioner—the smalltown and country doctor.

Such a man has served my hometown and his birthplace of Bowling Green for half a century. This week, Dr. James B. Biggs celebrates 50 years as a country doctor. Bowling Green and Pike County celebrate the anniversary with him. His fellow doctors are honoring him this week at the 105th annual meeting of the Missouri State Medical Association at Kansas City. These are well-deserved tributes to a professional career that spans more years than the entire lifetime of many here in the Senate today. They are also fitting testimonials to his ability and dedication that have been given to his neighbors for the years from the horse and buggy to the supersonic jet.

It is often said, Mr. President, that the country doctor is a symbol of what America is, and I submit, Dr. Jim Biggs is symbolic of the finest in the great profession of medicine.

TIPRO STATES ITS POSITION ON PROPOSED CHANGES IN OIL AND GAS TAX POLICY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association has compiled a thorough and highly significant report on the effects of proposed changes in U.S. oil and gas producers and land and mineral interest holders, and presented in behalf of 5,500 members of TIPRO.

The report includes charts which cannot be reproduced in the Record, but the explanation of these charts is included herein. This report, which was submitted to the House Committee on Ways and Means, concerns a vital segment of the American economy, and one which should not be weakened by any unwise legislation. I urge that this report be given careful study.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed at this point in the Record in its entirety.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement Before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., in re Proposed Changes in Oil and Gas Tax Policy, Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association, Austin, Tex., March 27, 1963

I. INTRODUCTION

Our appearance here is limited strictly to a presentation of the results of our study and evaluation as to the effects of the proposed changes in U.S. oil and gas tax policy upon nonintegrated domestic independent oil and gas producers and land and mineral interest holders. We speak on behalf of the approximate 5,500 members of the Texas Independent Producers and Royalty Owners Association.

While all four of the changes proposed in U.S. tax policy relating to oil and gas production have been given careful study, our testimony concentrates primarily upon those proposals on which we are able to provide firsthand evaluation as to probable effects upon a typical cross section of domestic independent producers and royalty owners. For obvious reasons we shall not attempt to duplicate the extensive testimony of others involving the history and justification of the principles upon which oil and gas production tax policy is based. Nor do we take a position on aspects of these hearings which do not directly affect domestic independent producers, realizing that other industry segments will concentrate largely on those provisions directly affecting them.

Before discussing the specific proposals, we believe it is important that we stress to the committee that such tax proposals must be weighed in full view of the seriously-depressed condition in which the domestic producing industry currently finds itself. For that purpose we have offered here some representative indices of oil and gas producing industry health, in order to underscore the basic presumption that there is a demonstrated need for increasing exploratory drilling if America is to maintain a safe relationship between proved reserves and domestic consumption in war or peace.

Insofar as the domestic producing segment of our industry is concerned, there is absolutely no doubt that any adverse change in tax policy at this time would prove particularly damaging to the nonintegrated domestic independent and directly contrary to the objectives cited by the administration both for this tax program and the mandatory oil import program.

Our survey indicates clearly that two of the tax changes as proposed would fall disproportionately upon the domestic independent producers and further accelerate the downward trend in exploration and drilling programs. Further, we believe our study provides evidence for the assumption that these proposals in particular would result in less rather than more Government revenue, while at the same time doing perhaps irreparable damage to the home-producing industry.

You may be sure that we have taken cognizance of the objectives which administration spokesmen have cited for the proposed changes in oil and gas tax policy. In particular we refer to the Treasury Department's published letter to Congressman Bruce Alger stating that the tax proposals are "designed to protect and, in important ways, to strengthen the position of the small producers," and that the recommendations concerning foreign operations and aggregation of properties "are limited almost exclusively to the very large oil companies receiving unintended benefits." We therefore feel certain that the President will not wish to insist upon proposals which evidence indicates to be inconsistent with stated objectives and which inevitably would depress further the search for new oil and gas reserves within this Nation.

In order to evaluate the effect of such proposals upon "the independent producer," it may be desirable to review the fundamental characteristics which distinguish the domestic independent producer from other industry segments and to define his particular role or function in the industry and the economy.

A. The independent producer and new tax burdens

The backbone of the industry's crude oil exploration and production is the independent producer and his royalty owners. But more than that, the independent—collectively large in numbers though individually small in size—preserves a competitive, free enterprise background for the whole industry.

While there are fewer than 50 large integrated major oil companies, there are thousands of independents and hundreds of thousands of royalty owners. In Texas alone there are approximately 6,000 producers and well over 200,000 owners of royalty interests in oil production.

What fundamental characteristics distinguish the particular role of the independent producer in the oil and gas industry?

The independent is the real "wildcatter" in the industry; he drills three-fourths of the Nation's wells. Since he is relatively small, maneuverable, and not bound by corporate policy—and, more important, is willing to assume heavy risk—the independent consistently finds oil where major companies declare there is none.

The independent is unintegrated; thus he is denied any opportunity to recoup losses—resulting either from inadequate crude prices or inadequate markets—through profits in transportation, refining, marketing, or importing.

The independent has no real say in determining the prices of his crude or the share of the market available to him. Unlike most goods, crude oil sells at purchaser posted prices and the producer must sell or be drained. Likewise, the volume of his sales depends upon purchaser nominations for crude in his area, which nominations constitute the dominant factor in determining market demand.

The independent is custodian of most of the country's marginal and stripper wells. Inasmuch as these wells constitute America's crowning achievement in conservation, and represent approximately 25 percent of proved U.S. reserves, these relatively uneconomic operations must be preserved; their abandonment would represent permanent loss of an irreplaceable natural resource.

Recognizing the vital role played by the domestic independent, then, it is next in order to determine whether he is currently in a position to absorb additional tax burden without impairing his vital function.

For this purpose, we call attention to accompanying charts I, II, and III which reflect a serious decline in representative indexes of producing industry health. A review of these industry indexes of deterioration would seem to establish an urgent need for providing additional incentives to the domestic independent producer, rather than consideration of any proposals which might adversely affect his tax status.

The economic plight of the domestic independent is particularly bad in Texas, a State struggling to maintain approximately two-thirds of the Nation's defense-vital reserve producing capacity and almost half the Nation's proved oil reserves. The rate of decline during the past 6 years results in large part from the fact that the oil import program has failed and is presently failing to limit the growth of imports to a stable ratio with the growth of either U.S. demand or U.S. oil production. Oil imports are currently at an alltime high, well in excess of levels prevailing last year when another record was set—current increases occurring in the face of a new Presidential proclamation which many characterized as an improvement over previous ones in terms of stabilizing import growth. In order to make room

for the disproportionate growth of imports, Texas as a prorating State has been compelled to reduce its production by some 466,000 barrels daily since 1956.

Crude oil prices, described by officials in the leading oil purchasing companies in 1957 as still too low, are substantially lower today. In this connection the last general crude oil price increase was in early 1957, and before that the last one was in 1953. When the approximate 30-cents per barrel increase was posted by the leading companies in 1957, top officials of those companies stated the urgent need for increasing, crude oil prices in the United States.[1] Yet, since 1957, there has been a steady erosion of crude oil prices in the United States—despite a steady rise in costs to producers accounted for in part that the number of wells drilled for each million barrels added to crude oil reserves has increased sharply.

Coincident with the drop in allowable production and declining crude prices were numerous other adverse developments which could have grave consequences for the future. The annual total of wells drilled in Texas has dropped since 1956 by 10,445, or 40.9 percent. Likewise the average number of rotary rigs in operation has decreased 381, or 40.1 percent, while crude oil well completions are down 36.6 percent.

Along with these reductions in activity have come numerous other State problems attributable to it, including a drop in oil and gas production employment by some 9.6 percent in the past 5 years. State tax revenue from this source has dropped $30 million annually, a cut of 19.3 percent.

While the injury is perhaps most dramatically reflected in Texas, the national scope of producing industry deterioration is readily apparent from the charts presented here.

It becomes unmistakably clear, therefore, that the domestic oil producing industry is in no position to absorb any additional tax burdens if the domestic independent is to fulfill his obligations to the national economy and security.

Along with Texas' indices already reviewed, chart I [not printed in Record] portrays several trends of decline in nationwide domestic producing industry operations. Since 1957, for example, U.S. crude prices have dropped 20 cents per barrel while costs of operations have continuously increased. In recent weeks some purchasing companies have initiated rounds of crude price cutting across the country.

Caught in an economic squeeze, the domestic producer has no alternative but to slash vital exploration activity. Since 1956 the annual drilling of wildcat wells has dropped steadily from 13,034 to 9,003 wells. Total wells drilled has decreased from 58,160 to 46,179 in 1962, and only 45,459 are projected for this year. These reductions have led to a drop in rotary drillings rigs in use from 2,648 to 1,636 which, in turn, means less industry capacity in the future to explore for domestic reserves.

This sharp reduction in exploration and drilling activity is already adversely affecting the volume of U.S. new oil discoveries. In 1962 new discoveries totaled 296 million barrels as compared with 467 million barrels in 1956.

Chart II [not printed in the Record] illustrates some of the direct employment problems resulting from the trends of deterioration shown in chart I. Hard-to-replace exploration and producing skills are being lost at alarming rates. Texas data indicates the Nation has already lost 1 out of every 15 domestic independent producers; more significantly, countless others have discontinued exploration activity.

Since 1957 at least one out of three seismographic crews which are required for oil and gas exploration have disbanded. The development of future professional and technical personnel needed to find and develop domestic oil has been slashed, as evidenced by a 50-percent drop in engineering students and a comparable drop in petroleum geologist trainees.

Rotary drilling contractors together with their highly trained and specialized drilling crews are also disappearing rapidly. More than one of four have left the business since 1956.

Counting all categories, more than 36,000 personnel have left the U.S. oil and gas producing industry since 1957.

Chart III [not printed in Record], pointing up the production-growth advantage enjoyed by American companies with foreign oil production, underscores the need for a policy of tax neutrality or equality as between foreign and domestic production.

While U.S. importers have expanded their oil production significantly since 1956, their strictly domestic producing competitors, particularly in Texas, have been denied any real share of U.S. market growth.

Major source areas for U.S. imports have enjoyed rapid production increase, ranging from 30 percent in Venezuela, to 42 percent in Canada, to 79 percent in the Mideast. By contrast, the United States as a whole is now only 2 percent above 1956 production levels, while Texas is more than 15 percent below.

Even if the import program had stabilized the growth of oil imports in relation to U.S. production growth, competitive advantages would remain for international companies. Restoring tax equality as between foreign and domestic production, therefore, appears both logical and necessary to preservation of a role for domestic oil independent producers.

II. EVALUATION OF THE SPECIFIC CHANGES PROPOSED IN OIL AND GAS TAX POLICY

Of the four specific proposals affecting the tax policy for oil and gas producers, our study supports the conclusion that the domestic independent producer would bear a disproportionately heavy share of the burden imposed through proposal No. 1, relating to intangible drilling and development expense, and proposal No. 2, relating to proceeds from mineral property sales. Following is a discussion of each of the four proposals, together with specific case references as to their application.

Proposal No. 1: Intangible drilling and de-development expense

For reasons which follow, we strongly oppose the proposal to require that producers carry over intangible drilling and development costs in excess of gross income during the year of discovery for the purpose of computing the 50 percent of net income limitation.

This proposal, in its practical effect, is in conflict with the objectives stated by the administration and is contrary to the accepted purpose and principle of the percentage depletion provision.

It would have a particularly damaging impact upon the domestic independent producer, and would force a further sharp curtailment in domestic exploration and development activity.

The preservation of marginal and stripper well properties, which represent the crowning achievement of petroleum industry conservation, would be severely damaged.

Smaller independent producers are concentrated primarily in exploration activity and in the operation of relatively marginal or "stripper" producing properties. It is upon these two areas that the impact of this proposal would fall heaviest, for reasons we shall detail. The conclusion is inescapable, therefore, that proposal No. 1 is inconsistent with the Treasury Department's stated objective "to protect and, in important ways, to strengthen the position of small producers." This conclusion is reinforced when consideration is given the fact that the more prolific producing properties both in the United States and abroad would be relatively unaffected.

In this regard, attention is called to the administration's recommendation for an overall study of percentage depletion. In line with this, the administration recommended no direct change in the 27½-percent rate for oil and gas pending conclusion of such study. Inasmuch as its proposal No. 1 would have the effect of reducing the percentage realized—particularly by independent producers who are already well below the average depletion realization for the industry as a whole—we feel that changes in the intangible expense factor should likewise await the comprehensive study.

We submit that these conclusions will be fully supported by any comprehensive study of the tax program as it affects the petroleum industry. We, therefore, respectfully urge that no change in tax policy respecting intangible drilling and development expensing be adopted.

This association has always welcomed any responsible study of percentage depletion. We are certain that such a study will amply support tax provisions as they apply to domestic independent producers, and in some respects may well show a need for liberalization; an example could be the need to eliminate the 50 percent income limit on marginal well operation.

In other words, proposal No. 1 should be evaluated in relation to the later overall study of percentage depletion, and not made in advance of such study—since it directly relates to the percentage depletion

---

[1] Following excerpts from testimony before the O'Mahoney antitrust subcommittee in 1957 reflect the prevailing view of the top executives of leading oil purchasing companies at that time:

M. J. Rathbone, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey: "Until the crude oil price increase of a few weeks ago, there had been no general increase in the price for almost 4 years. Meanwhile the per-barrel cost of finding and developing oil reserves in the United States had continued to rise. By last year they had reached a point where, in the judgment of many experienced oilmen, the price at which a barrel of crude was being sold was no longer adequate to meet the cost of replacing that barrel through new exploration and discovery. * * * The price of crude oil is important not only from the viewpoint of the consumer, the independent oil producer, and the integrated company, but also from the viewpoint of the national interest. If the price is not sufficient to encourage continued adequate exploration and development, America's economic health and security can be hurt."

W. K. Whiteford, president of Gulf Oil Corp., testified in part: "Gulf did not immediately meet the first crude price increase which was effective Jan. 3, 1957, although we had felt for months that a crude price increase was inevitable and justified."

B. Brewster Jennings, chairman of Socony-Mobil Oil Co., Inc., testified: "The price of crude oil must be at a level to encourage greater exploration, or the ratio is certain to decline further. The problem of costs has hit oil producers from several angles. I think this can be summarized by stating that oil producers have to drill an increasing number of wells to a greater average depth at higher cost per foot to find the same amount of oil. * * * Against this background a crude oil price advance had been inevitable for some time."

realized particularly for the smaller independents operating marginal domestic properties. Let us emphasize that domestic independents are concentrated in the two areas of industry operation which would be hardest hit by this proposal: domestic exploration and high cost marginal operations. Therefore, a disproportionate share of the $200 million anticipated new revenue from this proposal would be expected from that segment of the industry which the administration said was not the intended target. It should likewise be stressed that the effect would not be limited to imposing hardship on producers, but would inevitably show up in reduced domestic exploration and drilling in premature abandonment of high-cost marginal well properties and in loss of reserves and productive potential.

When the current rate for percentage depletion was first entered in the law, it more nearly covered the replacement costs of oil reserves than it does today. Replacement cost per barrel of domestic reserves now approximates $1.25, based on current sales of oil in the ground, whereas percentage depletion per barrel is at most 80 cents. Many companies today find the cost of replacing reserves through exploration to be much higher than this figure, which in itself accounts for the growing frequency of reserve purchases by major companies in preference to acquiring them by more drilling. This gap should be narrowed considerably if percentage depletion is to perform its tax purpose of adequately recognizing the producer's depletion of capital holdings.

Further evidence that independent producers as a group are hit hardest by this proposal lies in the fact that they already experience a much lower percentage depletion rate than do large, integrated companies with foreign operations as a result of the 50 percent net income limitation. The Treasury Department's own survey shows that the larger companies with worldwide operations average far closer to the full 27½ percent in their depletion rate than does the industry as a whole. Obviously, then, the reason the total producing industry averages approximately 23 percent is that most independent producers average perhaps less than 20 percent in their effective rate.

There is applicable here an arithmetic rule which states that when total expenses of operating a property exceed 45 percent of its gross income, the effective percentage depletion rate is reduced below 27½ percent as the result of applying the 50 percent of net income limit. This means that generally high cost marginal operations do not receive the full depletion rate. Consequently, neither do the independent producers who, as reflected by a recent study of the interstate oil compact, historically wind up with such marginal operations with high per-barrel production costs.

Table 1 illustrates this problem with data applying to a typical independent producer in this association's membership, herein referred to as producer A.

TABLE 1.—*Actual percentage of allowable depletion experienced by producer A, 1961*

Total properties	145.0
Number marginal properties [1]	73
Total average depletion taken (all properties) (percent)	[2] 22.8
Weighted average depletion taken on six typical marginal properties (percent)	15.4

[1] Defined as properties with expenses equal to 45 percent or more of gross income.

[2] Compares with 22.7 percent in 1958, 21.4 percent in 1959, and 20.7 percent in 1960.

In 27 years of operation, producer A in any one year has never been able to take the full statutory depletion allowance of 27½ percent on all its properties. This is directly due to the 50-percent net income limit. Since he, like most independent producers, has a large number of properties subject to this limit, he will feel the full brunt of any proposal that in effect lowers further the net income limit. The administration's proposal assures that the independent producer will have to reduce his exploration activity because he has no other course.

In his own words producer A sums up his problem as follows:

"The marginal income properties can least afford to be burdened with additional expenses, yet they make up a very large share of mine and other independent operators oil and gas interests. It looks to us, then, that rather than correcting an inequity, the proposed treatment of intangibles creates two inequities.

"First, it results in less income for drilling and exploration and second, it provides for a disproportionate amount of increased taxes from marginal income properties. As a corollary to the second item, premature abandonment of marginal income properties could be triggered. This would be directly opposed to conservation principles."

Producer B provides another typical illustration of how vulnerable the independent producer is to application of the administration's first proposal. He operates over 700 leases, several of which are located in 40 waterflood (secondary recovery) projects. Effective statutory depletion on income from all leases, including royalty income, is 16.39 percent. Among the 39 waterflood projects with normal production characteristics, the depletion average was only 12.7 percent for the producer's fiscal year ended September 30, 1962.

Finally, data applying to producer C in table 2 below supports directly the contention that producers concentrated primarily in Texas and other domestic producing areas suffering from depressed production allowables are hit the hardest by the net income proposal. The more depressed production levels become, the lower the rate of depletion realized by the producer. This is due to the fact that operating and fixed expenses do not drop in proportion to decrease in production. In other words, it costs about the same to produce 8 days a month as it would to produce 10, 18, or 30 days. Consequently, 50 percent of net income drops lower and lower, causing reduction in allowable depletion. The administration's proposal aggravates this situation. Furthermore, it would apply to more properties—even those capable of high production and a better net income picture—than would be the case in producing areas that do not restrict production output.

TABLE 2.—*Amount of allowable depletion taken by producer C on approximately 70 leases, 1957–61*

Year	Gross income	Amount depletion taken	Percent of gross income
1957	$1,016,854	$247,354	24.3
1958	691,270	168,595	24.4
1959	821,868	196,094	23.9
1960	652,816	154,020	23.6
1961	472,125	95,403	20.2

As a result, the domestic producing industry in Texas and the other key producing States which are shouldering almost entirely the defense-vital burden of reserve producing capacity would be hardest hit by this proposal. At the same time, the very heart of the Nation's exploration effort, which is conducted mostly by independent producers, would be placed in serious jeopardy.

It is for these many reasons that this association respectfully opposes proposal No. 1 in the tax bill.

Proposal No. 2: Taxation of proceeds from mineral property sales

The administration's second proposal applying to the oil and gas industry would convert from capital gain to ordinary income that portion of the proceeds from sale of mineral property equivalent to depletion taken up to total cost and intangible drilling expense.

Our study shows that, as in proposal No. 1, it is the typical independent producer who would become the primary target of this change.

Historically, domestic independent producers are the wildcatters who have discovered some three-fourths of the Nation's oil. They customarily then sell their interests in new oil and gas discoveries, in order to finance their future exploration. The motivation for this method of operation is simple—they must have risk capital to search for "the big discovery." This they cannot do if their assets and credit at the bank are tied up in developing discovered fields.

In effect, therefore, independents are in the business of capital appreciation, constantly finding and providing new capital in the form of reserves. Even though this is recognized to be a vital process in the maintenance of domestic reserves, and even though it is in serious need today of further stimulation, proposal No. 2 threatens the most serious injury to the role of the independent wildcatter.

States Wallace W. Wilson, vice president, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago and a previous witness before this committee:

"It is important to note that [this proposal] primarily would affect independent producers, since they constitute the principal sellers of oil and gas properties. [Operators] of this type are concerned principally with growth, and continuously reinvest the bulk of their available cash flow in exploration and the development of new properties. Their maximum potential gain is from the eventual sale of all or part of their developed production. Such sales normally are made after significant changes in opportunity, management, growth rate or economic health. The availability of a ready market for their producing properties provides a strong incentive for such companies to undertake programs involving substantial risk which, in the past, have added materially to this Nation's reserves and producing capacity. Any legislation which would hinder the ability of a producer to sell his assets on a basis consistent with present conditions will have far-reaching consequences deleterious to the industry as a whole."

Table 3 below illustrates a typical oil property sale by independent producers. The data indicates that this administration proposal would increase taxation of the sale by approximately 88 percent. This extra burden would guarantee a sharp reduction of such sales in the future, which in turn would further curtail exploration activity by independent producers, leading in turn to a decrease in future Government revenue.

The effect of this proposal would not be limited to reducing both future and present tax revenues, but it would also serve to further encourage mergers. Mergers, already at an alltime high, generally serve to narrow the competitive atmosphere of the domestic producing industry.

TABLE 3.—*Comparative computation of Federal income tax on sale of an oil or gas property under present rules and under the administration's proposal*

ASSUMED FACTS

Lease bonus	$16,000	Equipment costs	$150,000
Capitalized exploration cost	$4,000	Depletion allowed to date of sale	$340,000
		Depreciation allowed to date of sale	$125,000
Cost of the property	$20,000	Assumed effective rate of income tax on ordinary income (percent)	65
Intangible drilling costs	$300,000	Selling price of property	$500,000

COMPUTATION OF TAX, PRESENT BASIS

	Equipment	Minerals	Total
Selling price	$75,000	$425,000	$500,000
Less cost basis	25,000		25,000
Total gain	50,000	425,000	475,000
Ordinary income items: Depreciation to date of sale	50,000		50,000
Capital gain		425,000	425,000
Tax on ordinary income at 65 percent	32,500		32,500
Tax on capital gains at 25 percent		106,250	106,250
Total tax on sale, present basis			138,750

COMPUTATION OF TAX, PROPOSED BASIS

	Equipment	Minerals	Total
Selling price	$75,000	$425,000	$500,000
Less cost basis	25,000		25,000
Total gain	50,000	425,000	475,000
Ordinary income items:			
Depreciation to date of sale	$50,000		$50,000
Intangible drilling costs previously deducted		$300,000	300,000
Depletion deducted to extent of basis		20,000	20,000
Total ordinary income	50,000	320,000	370,000
Balance, capital gain		105,000	105,000
Tax on ordinary income at 65 percent	32,500	208,000	240,500
Tax on capital gain at 19.5 percent (65 percent of 30 percent of gain)		20,475	20,475
Total tax on sale, proposed basis	32,500	228,475	260,975
Total tax, present basis			138,750
Total increase under President's proposed rules			122,225
Percent increase in tax liability			88.1

Proponents of the capital gain conversion measure have noted that this new burden could be avoided by the stock transfer method of sale. Easily negotiable securities, however, are a characteristic of large, incorporated companies. Independent producers are primarily organized as individuals or partnerships and, therefore, would have no opportunity to avail themselves of this solution.

Yet another problem in this proposal affecting independent producers directly and causing the possible loss of oil reserves is that its provisions proportionately hit hardest the sale of high cost, marginal properties. One typical independent producer member describes it this way:

"Major companies with marginal properties involving high overhead and operating expenses at present often sell them to independent operators rather than plug the wells and shut down the field. The small operators can, by drastic economies and hard work, afford to continue to produce such properties which provide additional barrels of oil that would otherwise never be recovered.

"Turning to the specific effect of this proposal on such sales, assume company X owns a lease with a leasehold cost of $100,000 which has been entirely recovered through depletion. Assume further that it had an intangible development cost of $1 million. The lease has dropped to marginal production of 300 to 500 barrels per month and is no longer profitable to company X to operate. If this property were sold under the provisions of this proposal, company X would probably have no cost left in either the leasehold or the equipment and the total consideration which it might receive would be ordinary income, and, therefore, subject to ordinary income tax rates.

"This could easily result in premature abandonment and the loss of reserves which might be otherwise recovered, since the recovery and use of the equipment might result in an economic gain to the producer over what he would have realized had he sold the property and paid ordinary income tax thereon. Therefore, the natural consequence in many cases would be for company X to plug the wells and abandon the lease. As a result, the final 5 percent or so of recoverable reserves remain forever lost."

While our testimony deals primarily to the four administration tax proposals applying directly to the oil and gas producing industry, we wish to point out the combined adverse effect of the capital gain and the estate/gift tax proposals on the independent producer. The latter proposal by the administration would tax at long-term capital gain rates the net gains accrued on capital assets at the time of transfer at death or by gift. This constitutes an original attempt to tax unrealized income, which independent producers estimate usually amounts to 90 percent of their holdings.

If the new estate tax were put in effect, most independent producers would have to liquidate their reserve holdings prior to death to prevent severe erosion of their estate. This forced sale, however, would confront the producer with the provisions of the capital gains proposal, and he would be caught in a squeeze. Either way, the independent producer would be severely penalized for being in the business of capital appreciation or, in other words, the exploration for new oil and gas reserves.

For these reasons, this association strongly opposes the administration's proposal to convert portions of proceeds from mineral property sales from capital gain to ordinary income. As is the case in proposal No. 1, this proposal would most seriously injure the independent producer and his capacity to explore for domestic oil and gas reserves. Because this provision, in its practical effect, would prove contrary to the stated objectives of the measure before you, we submit that it should be eliminated from any bill which precedes the comprehensive study recommended. We have no doubt that a responsible overall study will show that this proposal as offered is contrary to the objectives of preserving a defense-vital domestic oil and gas producing industry.

Proposal No. 3: Aggregation of properties for percentage depletion purposes

Having reviewed the administration's proposal to require oil and gas producers to maintain individual producing properties on a separate accounting basis for purposes of computing allowable depletion and finding that its membership would remain virtually unaffected, this association takes no stand for or against the proposal.

Proposal No. 4: Tax changes applying to oil and gas produced abroad by American companies

The administration's fourth proposal relates to changes in tax treatment accorded American companies with foreign production.

Inasmuch as this association represents only domestic independent producers, our study was limited to effects of the tax proposals on domestic operations. Our concern, therefore, is with the need to restore equity in U.S. tax policy as between foreign and domestic producers. Treasury Secretary Dillon has emphasized that these changes are proposed as a matter of equity for domestic producers, to make sure that excess deductions on foreign operations are not carried back to lower taxes by companies which operate both here and abroad.

President Kennedy, in an earlier budget message recognizing that inequality does currently exist, called for "revision of the tax treatment of foreign income to serve the overall objective of tax neutrality between domestic and foreign operations."

We believe that "tax neutrality between domestic and foreign operation" is not only logical but absolutely essential if the domestic independent is to preserve his role in the U.S. oil and gas producing industry.

Inasmuch as action to restore tax equality could take several forms, it is not our purpose here to evaluate these administration proposals in relation to that objective. Our studies indicate that tax equality could be substantially achieved by according domestic independent producers treatment similar to the foreign tax credit now accorded foreign operations of American companies—including for example a dollar-for-dollar tax credit for all income and production taxes paid to State governments, ad valorem and other taxes paid local authorities, and for overriding royalties. Such tax credits, in practical effect, would correspond to the current tax-credit interpretation given payments by American oil companies to foreign countries.

Consequently, we take no position respecting proposal No. 4 specifically, but we do most strongly support appropriate steps to achieve tax equality as between foreign and domestic production.

AMBASSADOR TELLES CONTINUES TO WIN ACCOLADES FOR GOOD WORK IN COSTA RICA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the highly successful visit of President Kennedy to Central America continues to draw attention to the outstanding work in Costa Rica of Ambassador Raymond Telles, who was formerly mayor of the city of El Paso.

One newsman who was in Costa Rica, Robert E. Baskin, chief of the Washington bureau of the Dallas News, interviewed Ambassador Telles in Costa Rica while President Kennedy was there.

Ambassador Telles continues to reflect great credit not only on his country but on the Democratic administration that appointed him to this responsible post in which he so ably serves.

In his article, Mr. Baskin describes some of the work of Ambassador Telles in Costa Rica prior to the March gathering of seven Presidents.

Mr. Baskin wrote:

"There was a picture of him in the paper the other day," an associate reports, "showing him wearing a serape and riding a horse in a rainstorm in the back country. He was just out to visit some more villagers."

As an example of how one American ambassador serves his country, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the Sunday, March 24, article by Mr. Baskin captioned "Kennedy's University Visit Triumph for Tireless Texan."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Dallas Morning News, Mar. 24, 1963]

Texan in Washington—Kennedy's University Visit Triumph for Tireless Texan

(By Robert E. Baskin)

Washington.—"Occasionally," President Kennedy said last week at the University of Costa Rica, "universities are regarded as dangerous places for presidents, and we are grateful to you for your warm welcome."

Kennedy was the first American President ever to address a Latin American student body, and at the Costa Rican university he was cheered enthusiastically.

In other lands it might have been different. Latin American universities also too often provide the spark for violence and revolution, and an American president might have been in grave danger before students of many of them.

The man who proposed that Kennedy appear at the University of Costa Rica was a 47-year-old Texan of Latin American descent who is generally conceded to be doing a splendid job as our Ambassador to that friendly Republic.

He is Raymond L. Telles, former mayor of El Paso, an unpretentious, friendly man whose popularity in Costa Rica has increased our longstanding friendship there.

Telles' proposal for the appearance at the university met some strong opposition, however. There were fears that it might be the one occasion on the President's visit where at least minor disorders might occur.

But Telles knew the Costa Ricans, and he realized that such an appearance would provide a model of good behavior to other universities in the hemisphere. He was insistent, the visit was arranged, and the reception was a great success.

Student leaders, in a dignified little ceremony, presented the President with a letter outlining their views on inter-American relations. It was a measured, thoughtful document, devoid of emotionalism, and generally it supported the hemispheric policies of the United States. Kennedy received it with gratitude.

"I felt the visit was one of the most important things the President could do while he was here," Telles said just after seeing the President leave for home.

"The future leaders of this country will come from the university, and it was good for them to get to hear the President."

For Telles, the presidential visit meant lots of hard work, making preparations for the throng of people who poured into San Jose for the Central American Conference.

Things went off with few hitches, and the trip is clearly the most successful one the President has made abroad.

Telles, who speaks excellent Spanish, has made it his policy to get well acquainted with as many of the 1,300,000 Costa Ricans as he possibly can.

"I've been all over the country," he said, "and everyone has been friendly to me."

Associates say this is an understatement. The fact is, they say, that Telles has been in every nook and cranny of the republic and has received tumultuous cheers in many places.

"There was a picture of him in the paper the other day," an associate reports, "showing him wearing a serape and riding a horse in a rainstorm in the back country. He was just out to visit some more villagers."

Costa Rica has been in the forefront of hemisphere nations who demonstrate their friendship for the United States with deeds. Last fall Costa Rica led the way in the Organization of American States to set the stage for the American quarantine of Cuba.

Telles' job has been to maintain and improve the excellent relations between the two countries, and his role in San Jose is an important one to all Latin America.

His appointment—an American of Latin American descent assigned to a Latin American nation—was regarded in some State Department circles as an experiment. If it was an experiment, it has been successful one.

Telles was born in El Paso, September 5, 1915, and was graduated from International College in 1936 and attended Texas Western College in 1938.

He entered Government work in 1934, serving until 1941 as accountant with the U.S. Bureau of Prisons and again from 1947 to 1948 as an accountant.

In between, he enlisted in the Air Force in World War II and was named chief of Air Force lend-lease for Latin America. Later in the war he was on the special USAF mission to the Mexican air force.

Telles began his political career in 1948 when he was elected El Paso county clerk and held the office until 1957 when he won a race for mayor of El Paso, the job he held when he was named ambassador in 1961.

As an Air Force reservist, he keeps up his training, going down to Panama for Reserve schooling whenever he can break away from his ambassadorial duties.

Telles is married to the former Delfina Navarro and has two daughters, Cynthia Ann and Patricia Eugenia. The family has entered into Costa Rican life fully.

YOUNG OKLAHOMANS INTERESTED IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. President, the Oklahoma Farmers Union is sponsoring trips to Washington and New York for several exceptional young Oklahomans interested in agriculture. These young people have won State recognition for service with their respective organizations and delivered their championship speeches at the Farmers Union national convention in New York.

These outstanding young Oklahomans will provide the leadership of tomorrow, and I would like to have the speeches of three of them inserted in the Record at this time.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The 4-H Clubs and the Community

(By Linda Kay Mittelstet, Aline, Okla.)

From the quiet villages of the old to the modern cities of the new, people—regardless of color, race, or creed—are striving to promote good community living.

Sharing responsibility for community improvement is 1 of the 10 guideposts in 4-H Club work.

The emblem of the 4-H Club is the four-leaf clover which has long been considered a symbol of good luck and achievement. On each leaf of the clover there is a white H. The 4-H pledge expresses objectives and explains the ideals of the 4-H movement. The pledge is: I pledge my head to clearer thinking, my heart to greater loyalty, my hands to larger service, and my health to better living for my club, my community, and my country.

Four-H Club members work under the guidance of agricultural extension workers and local volunteer leaders of the community. Programs are based on needs and interest related to the home and communities. Each 4-H Club member performs such activities as growing livestock and crops or food preparation, and sewing, using the newer and better methods developed by the agricultural colleges. Generally these practices are adopted by the parents, thereby strengthening the ties between the parents and child by mutual interest.

More and more, the 4-H Club program stresses good citizenship. Through special projects, 4-H members study problems and are accepting the responsibility of increasing their usefulness to the community. Boys and girls learn through their club how democracy works. Each club is run democratically and decisions are made by majority rule.

A club member is interested in school work, home life, and strives to be a good family member. Belonging to a family means that there are things we must do for others as well as having things done for us. The family is most important because it reflects the home. The community is made up of homes, so if we want to have a better community, each home must teach by example. As we share in community activities and responsibilities, we become interested in other organizations and we are not too selfish to work with other groups, because we realize the importance of teamwork.

The kind of community life we have depends upon the activities, ideals and beliefs of the people who live in the community. We also know that every community has needs that are vital to the welfare of the group. These needs may be physical, such as property; social needs, such as school; or family organizations, such as the Oklahoma Farmers Union.

Our 4-H pledge emphasizes participation in whatever the community needs. Examples of such activities are landscaping the grounds of city parks, mental health drives, installing road markers to guide and welcome tourists to farm community areas or historical landmarks.

The sincerity of the purpose of 4-H and its progress in building character and citizenship points very definitely to the influence of 4-H training and its contribution to good community living.

To help lift the burden,
Point the better way,
Give vision to toil
And the hope of a better day.
To teach the larger life,
Encourage a soul
To still greater tasks,
A still higher goal;
To look beyond the plow,
Teach a man's full part
In community and town,
In assembly and mart,
Club work is training
Of greatest value, when
Its goal of achievement
Is the inspiration—The making of men.

My Organization, the Future Farmers of America, and How It Promotes Good Community Living

(By Myron L. Semrad, Waukomis, Okla.)

"I believe in the future of farming, with a faith born not of words but of deeds; in the promise of better days through better ways, even as the better things we now enjoy have come up to us through the struggle of former years."

I have just quoted to you from our FFA creed; a creed that each member subscribes to when he starts his FFA work. As you can see, we are not a group of young men living in the past, but with our eyes to the future as indicated by our FFA motto, and I quote:

"Learning To Do,
Doing To Learn,
Earning To Live,
Living To Serve."

These four short lines express the desire of each FFA members to learn more about his vocation, responsibility, and citizenship. We, as young leaders of tomorrow, realize that all these are essential in this day of sputniks and intercontinental missiles.

Just how, you might ask, does the FFA promote good community living? There are many ways that my organization promotes good community living.

First, let me show you the close relationship between the efforts of the FFA and the Farmers Union. Our organization was formed in the year 1928 to fill the need of a group of young farm boys. Let me repeat, to fill the need of a group of young farm boys, just as the Farmers Union was organized to promote good community living. So from the very beginning we feel that we have something in common with your organization.

Now, I would like to discuss with you the efforts of the FFA in promoting good community living.

Last year I was fortunate enough to be a member of the first place FFA stubble mulch judging team which represented my school in Waukomis, Okla. I participated in the stubble mulch program again this year. Through this program, we FFA members are learning better ways to conserve the soil. These new and highly improved soil conservation programs are the steppingstones of good community living.

Just think for a moment. Where would we be without the educated farmer? The answer is, we could not exist. How could we, without food? Therefore, the better conservation practices we present, the better our communities will be.

The very purpose of our FFA program of work each year, to develop cooperation, leadership, knowledge, and recreational activities, is the foundation for good community living. You members of the Farmers Union who have lived in your home communities for many years know the value of all these qualities I have just mentioned.

A new menace to the development of good community living is the fact that many of our prospective farm leaders of tomorrow are being lured away from a career in agriculture. This has been brought about by the glamorous role that has been developed around the field of science. We feel that this movement can be carried to such landslide proportions that the loss in this leadership may result in a serious setback for agriculture.

I cannot help but wonder what kind of world will I be living in 10 years from now? What will my home, farm, and community be, my job and my family? Will I have a place in this world of spaceships and missiles?

We, the Future Farmers of America, have been given a great challenge. We must meet this challenge if we are to preserve good community living and the security and happiness it stands for.

In conclusion, my friends, let us never forget that we, the Future Farmers of America, are considered the breadbasket of the world. Nations will look to us for leadership and food. Let us never forget the value of community life in this scientific age. Trips to the moon may be commonplace in a few years. Satellites will continue to circle our globe. But, community life must be preserved.

Yes, I am very proud, and feel that I have high standards to uphold when I don the blue and gold jacket of the FFA.

Let us seek divine guidance and knowledge, as we join hands with the Farmers Union to promote and preserve our American way of community living.

How the Rural Electric Cooperatives Promote Good Community Living

(By Dan Butler, Drummond, Okla.)

Let us go back 100 years ago. A candle is burning. That candle grows brighter and brighter. Look again. You see that this candle is a kerosene lamp. A lamp like many of our parents and grandparents grew up with, and that light grows brighter. And, as you look once more into time you see Franklin D. Roosevelt. It is 1933. Roosevelt is creating the Rural Electrification Administration to serve the farmers of this Nation. Now that lamp changes into a socket, a socket with a light bulb. But that light is dim for you see only 10 percent of the Nation's farmers have electricity. The cost is prohibitive.

Thus, with the signing of that executive order, the Rural Electrification Cooperatives, one of the greatest do-it-yourself programs in the history of the world, is started.

Our farmers help stretch those electric lines across our Nation. And today that light bulb glows brighter for now 95 percent of our farmers have electricity.

Who own these electric cooperatives? Is it a Government agency? These and many similar questions are asked daily.

In answer to these questions I reply, first, that the people who purchase electricity own the cooperatives. And, to the second; no, it is not a Government agency but the purest form of democratic free enterprise.

While the cooperative board of directors has borrowed thousands of dollars from the REA to provide you with good electric service, they have to pay it back with interest.

Imagine, if you can, what life would be like today without electricity. Imagine a world without refrigerators, radio, television, food mixers, and the hundreds of other electric items around the home.

Imagine, also, trying to perform the numerous farm chores without the help of electric water pumps, bunk feeders, welders, or grinders—just to mention a few. Practically every phase of farming is affected by electricity. It works in a thousand and one different ways to make your life easier and more enjoyable.

Electricity is beginning to cut farm labor costs. But the surface is barely scratched. New processes, equipment, and techniques need to be developed to reduce labor requirements and improve the quality of farm products.

When this is done, consumers as well as farmers will benefit. Modern agriculture will then be able to hold or reduce consumer costs of food and fiber and give extra quality as a bonus.

The Farmers Union organization has been one of the strongest supporters of the rural electrification program, and it is through their political help as well as their work with the farmers that the REC has made such tremendous progress during the last 28 years.

First a candle, then a lamp, now a light bulb. But look again. That light has become a torch. A torch of liberty.

THE TFX CONTROVERSY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, 1 month ago last Tuesday the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, opened its hearing on the controversial TFX plane contract award. For a time the legitimate aims of this inquiry were in danger of being lost in a sea of mutual recriminations. This week, however, there has been a healthy change in attitude on the part of all concerned, and I am certain that the inquiry will move ahead with dispatch under able leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Committee, Senator McClellan.

I call to my colleagues' attention the excellent article in this issue by the respected columnist Max Freedman, which appeared in the February 27 issue of the Washington Post. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Freedman's article be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The TFX Controversy

(By Max Freedman)

It is a strange sensation to move from the charges and accusations that have rolled through the press, in the dispute over the TFX contract, to the actual hearings of the Senate Investigating Committee.

As one studies the records of the hearings, it becomes very clear that the bitterness and anger which have marked this inquiry have greatly surprised the committee.

Nor can any observer, with no personal stake in this controversy, avoid the conclusion that the gage of battle was flung down by the Defense Department.

In the end Mr. McNamara may convince everyone that his decision is fully justified. But the merits of his case do not excuse the way it has been presented to the public. In its various public statements the Defense Department has been fretful, inconsistent, and provocative. It was not until it was stung that the committee struck back in self-defense. No one familiar with congressional committees could have expected it to do anything else.

There seems to be a general public impression that the committee is trying to discredit or destroy Mr. McNamara's usefulness as Defense Secretary. Those who hold this view would find it very hard indeed to point to a single sentence in the published record to justify such a charge against the committee.

In fact Senator McClellan spoke for the whole committee when he said the final report might well be a complete endorsement of Mr. McNamara's judgment in awarding the contract to General Dynamics instead of to Boeing.

At one point in his testimony Mr. Gilpatric, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, said "we were not misled, we were not entrapped, and we have no complaint in any sense over the conduct of this proceeding by the committee." Still later, in reply to Senator CURTIS' question, Mr. Gilpatric agreed that the committee had never called even one witness who could be described as a critic of Mr. McNamara.

Nor is there very much substance to the charge that Mr. McNamara's authority as civilian head of the Defense Department has been challenged and compromised. No one on the committee, or in Congress for that matter, questions the principle of civilian control.

On this particular point in the controversy Mr. Gilpatric has testified in these words: "I do not believe that this issue is a civilian-military issue.

"I don't think this is a question where the civilian authorities in the Pentagon and in the Department of Defense are at odds with the military. There were certain facets where we don't agree but it is not a civilian-military issue and therefore there isn't any basis for criticism of Mr. McNamara by the military in my judgment."

In the four evaluations which preceded Mr. McNamara's decision a total of 275,000 man-hours had been spent on the two proposals. These evaluations resulted in a clear and repeated preference for Boeing. Mr. McNamara reversed these recommendations for what seemed to him to be emphatic and sufficient reasons. Now he is explaining and defending that decision before a committee of the Senate that has been empowered to conduct such investigations. It should be added that on the evidence thus far the committee has learned that General Dynamics, which gained the contract, was given the preference by the Air Force on only three "performance criteria" while Boeing had the preference on 16 or 17 items. The committee has been unfairly criticized for an arbitrary interference with the Defense Department.

It would indeed have been open to censure if it had failed to start an investigation once these facts came to its notice.

Above all, it should always be remembered that many witnesses have yet to be heard, with some of the evidence dealing with classified matters. The best thing is to drop the invective on all sides and let the inquiry proceed fairly and fearlessly.

CITATIONS PRESENTED TO MAY CRAIG AND DON LARRABEE BY AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on March 13, the American Legion delegation from Maine presented citations for outstanding service to two veteran Maine journalists, May Craig who represents the Gannett papers of Maine, and Donald Larrabee, Washington correspondent of the Bangor Daily News.

I concur fully with the Legion's judgment that Mrs. Craig and Mr. Larrabee have made significant contributions in interpreting Washington events for the citizens of Maine clearly and factually.

Their job is difficult. They must cover all three branches of the Federal Government—executive, legislative, and judicial. But, they know Washington. They have had many years of experience. They know how to develop facts, how to write informative stories. Moreover, their reports are always fair and accurate. They do their job competently without either favoritism or prejudice.

I take pleasure in calling the attention of my colleagues to the Maine Legion's citations commending these two dedicated Maine journalists.

I ask unanimous consent that the two citations be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the citations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITATION TO DON LARRABEE FROM MAINE AMERICAN LEGION AT THE STATLER HOTEL, MARCH 13, 1963

The American Legion to Don Larrabee in grateful appreciation and recognition for his outstanding service in the field of journalism, this citation is awarded this 13th day of March, 1963, in Washington, D.C.

W. J. ROGERS,
National Executive Committeeman.
JAMES L. BOYLE,
Department Adjutant,
Department of Maine.
BERTRAND LAGUEUX,
Department Commander,
Department of Maine.

CITATION TO MAY CRAIG FROM MAINE AMERICAN LEGION AT THE STATLER HOTEL, MARCH 13, 1963

The American Legion to May Craig in grateful appreciation and recognition for her outstanding service in the field of journalism, this citation is awarded this 13th day of March, 1963, in Washington, D.C.

W. J. ROGERS,
National Executive Committeeman.
JAMES L. BOYLE,
Department Adjutant,
Department of Maine.
BERTRAND LAGUEUX,
Department Commander,
Department of Maine.

COMMUNITY COOPERATION IN OLEAN, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the city of Olean, N.Y., is fast becoming a symbol, in my State, for community cooperation. Because a group of citizens in Olean are determined to meet and overcome the challenge presented by decreasing job opportunities, they have banded together, at great personal sacrifice, to save an industry in their city.

Six weeks ago, the management of the Fibre Forming Co., in Olean announced a financial crisis and an inability to meet the payroll due at the end of the week. The 120 employees of the company were informed of this disheartening situation and presented with a plan to defer their pay envelopes temporarily. No one was laid off. The choice of whether or not to leave was left up to the individual workers themselves. Their response was anything but disheartening.

Only 5 of the 120 men and women left the company to look for other employment or to collect unemployment insurance. Fully 115 decided to stay on, virtually without pay, working to save their jobs and to keep this industry in Olean.

According to Robert W. Easley, president of local 22 of the American Federation of Grain Millers, the response has been overwhelming. Newspapers from all over America, from Sweden, Turkey, France, and Barbados carried the story. Employees painted their philosophy in large white letters on the outside wall of the factory. "We won't quit," they told the world. "Olean can't afford to let another plant close."

For 6 weeks they have held on to keep the company going. Although weekly cash receipts are divided up among the workers, this payment has averaged only about $15 a week—hardly even enough to get to work. The Grain Millers Union, which has organized the plant, is cooperating fully in the endeavor, and has declared a moratorium on dues and induction fees. Mr. Easley has devoted 10 weeks without pay to this plant because he and other members of the local have been so pleased by the fine labor-management relations which have always existed there. "This company," said Mr. Easley, "has the best ethnic principles of any company I know. Each man is hired and promoted without regard to his race, creed, or color, and we want to see this continue."

Although, as weeks have elapsed, some workers have been forced, because of family responsibilities, to leave the plant and apply for assistance or other jobs, dozens have remained. They are living on their savings and on hope—hope that loyalty, determination, and the American spirit of cooperation in time of trouble will pull them through. I salute these fine men and women of Olean, and assure them that all America admires their action and shares their hope.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleague in what he has said about the company at Olean, N.Y., Mr. Easley, who has been an absolutely remarkable union leader in that regard, the town, the town people, and the managers of this company, which has been a model for small business in the United States in its intrepidity and determination to drive hard for a constructive economic measure for Olean. I have been there. I have seen the plant. I have seen the workers. I have addressed them, as I am sure my colleague [Mr. KEATING] has. This action is a great source of gratification to me, as it is to my colleague.

We extend to them not only our felicitations for their tremendous courage, but our help and cooperation, which we have already given, and which I know we will give in any measure that is humanly possible to help in such fine determination as they have shown.

RESPONSE OF NATIONAL JEWISH WELFARE BOARD TO CUBAN CRISIS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in the midst of continuing tensions in the Caribbean area, it is noteworthy, I think, to point out that the measures taken by the U.S. Government to alert our military forces to the exigencies of the situation have had their counterpart in equally swift and decisive actions taken by civilian agencies which support our Armed Forces.

I refer specifically to those agencies which deal with the welfare of men and women in uniform, and the additional pressures which the Cuban crisis has put

on their programs. A report delivered to me from the National Jewish Welfare Board is typical of the way on which these organizations have rallied to the service of soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen who were redeployed to various areas of the country as the crisis developed. The National Jewish Welfare Board is the government-authorized agency for religious and morale services to Jewish personnel in our Armed Forces and their dependents, and it recruits, endorses, and serves Jewish Chaplains for the Military Establishment. It conducts a vast recreation and cultural leisure-time program for servicemen and their families and is a member of United Service Organizations, Inc.—USO. It also serves people of all ages in the civilian community as the national association of YM–YWHA's and Jewish Community Centers.

With the announcement by the President of the naval and air quarantine of Cuba, the National Jewish Welfare Board took a series of steps designed to ease the problems of servicemen and their dependents who were affected by the sudden shifting of military forces. The organization made an on-the-spot study of Jewish communities in the Southeastern United States to determine what local facilities were available to those coming into the area. The organization's affiliated Jewish Community Centers and other institutions such as synagogues were briefed on the possible needs which would arise.

The National Jewish Welfare Board's Commission on Jewish Chaplaincy contacted all civilian rabbis in the area who serve as auxiliary Jewish chaplains, outlining the probable additional religious and morale activities which would be required.

The organization's director in Balboa, Canal Zone, made a swing around Jewish communities in the Caribbean where the National Jewish Welfare Board has religious and morale programs for the military, to strengthen the potential in these communities.

Emergency services were supplied, including the finding of housing and other necessities, for families of Navy and Marine Corps personnel hurriedly evacuated by air from Guantanamo Bay on the eve of the announcement of the quarantine.

This reaction to a national need is nothing new in the history of the National Jewish Welfare Board, which was established early during World War I at the request of our Government for just this kind of service. Through two World Wars, Korea, and similar crises, this organization has established a memorable tradition for rising to emergency situations and for day-by-day constructive activity on behalf of the young men and women in our Armed Forces.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WELFARE SITUATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, all of us who have a deep concern for the District of Columbia are aware of its many problems and interested in working to solve them. Crime, discrimination, and unemployment loom large in the distressing picture. As a member of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, I have had firsthand knowledge in these areas, and know that many improvements can be made. I have, for example, recently cosponsored a bill offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] to provide fair employment legislation for the District. I intend to join in pressing for early enactment of that bill since I believe it is a meaningful first step in helping District residents to help themselves.

No one would deny, however, that one of the primary manifestations of Washington's malaise is the situation existing in the field of public welfare. A subject of continuing concern among experts is how to prevent a permanent welfare class. No one would abandon those who require the assistance of the community to meet their basic needs. At the same time there is a growing feeling that welfare aid in the District has not been administered in a manner which helps its beneficiaries to become self-sufficient. A permanent welfare class is not in keeping with human dignity or the traditions of our society. We must help those in need, but we must help them in a way which aids and encourages them to reconstruct their lives so they may become self-sufficient and self-supporting.

This problem is the subject of a recent comprehensive report prepared by the Public Welfare Crisis Committee of the Washington chapter, National Association of Social Workers under the direction of Dr. Daniel Thursz of Catholic University. I know that other Members of this body will be interested in the study since we are, in effect, the City Council of the District of Columbia, charged with governing a voteless citizenry. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, a summary of the committee's recommendations and an editorial from the Washington Post dealing with this subject.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS, METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON CHAPTER, SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Public Welfare Crisis Committee, on behalf of the Metropolitan Washington Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers, recommends:

(a) Assistance grants: A complete upward revision of the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare budget, based on current cost-of-living indexes, with a built-in clause to allow for increasing the total grant when there is a rise in the cost of living.

Elimination of the reduced allowance clause for families with four or more children. Since the grant schedules are too low to begin with, we see no need to cut them further.

Development of a program for emergency counseling and relief to take care of temporary situations of financial stress.

(b) The employable mother: A revision in the regulations so that each mother will have the right to determine whether the welfare of her children will best be served by her remaining at home or by taking employment. The mother who remains at home to give care to her children needs also to feel that she is a worthwhile citizen.

Regulations that facilitate temporary, part-time, or even full-time employment, but the initiative should come from the mother. In some cases, mothers will be able to assume limited employment. This initiative should be encouraged rather than penalized by reduction in grants. Coverage for costs due to employment should be allowed, including expenses for the care of children.

School age should not be regarded as a stage in development that frees a child from the need of parental control. Older children, including adolescents, require supervision—not in the same fashion, but to the same extent—as preschool children.

A revision of the regulations so as to emphasize the right of a child to his own parents in his own home. We believe that all resources of the community should be used to make this possible. Only as the parents themselves feel incompetent or the court finds them so, should placement away from home be considered a desirable plan for any child.

A completely new public assistance statement about the employability of mothers is needed. The basic philosophy on which the current regulations were made needs close reexamination. Current costs of adequate financial help should be measured against the potential cost to the community if adequate services are not provided now.

(c) The man-in-the-house rule: The abandonment of the 34 special eligibility factors which determine whether a man has a continuing relationship with a woman and her children. The presence or absence of the man, other than the legal husband, should not be a consideration in establishing eligibility for aid to dependent children. Rather, the important factor should be whether or not a family is able to meet its needs as determined by the public assistance budget.

When it is established that "the mother has a continuing association with a man, similar to that of husband and wife"—that the Department of Public Welfare provide financial grants to those of the mother's children who are not being supported by their natural fathers and who are not the children of the man in the house, unless he is willing and able to support them. The nonhusband living continuously as the family head should be responsible for the support of the mother and his children by her. The legal requirement that an absent father continue to have financial responsibility for his own children should be enforced.

To determine if the male head of the house is able to support the family, the Department of Public Welfare investigate and see how much he can earn and contribute with regularity. If it is determined that he is not able to provide full support for his children, then the Department should supplement the family's income to make it compatible with the aid to dependent children standard living scale.

That all financial resources of the family on public assistance be investigated periodically by the Department.

That the Department continuously ask for verification of the man's employment status. The Department has the right to expect the man to make all attempts to secure employment.

(d) Implementation of the national program in the District of Columbia: [A review of selected 1962 public welfare amendments affecting the administration of the aid to families of dependent children program has shown that the District of Columbia has not taken advantage of several provisions of Federal legislation which would be beneficial to the District and would strengthen the aid to dependent children program. For most of the changes in the Federal law, the District of Columbia already has the legal authority necessary to make them a part of the District's Public Assistance Program, and the Department of Public Welfare could put them into effect by administrative action.]

The following programs could be implemented by administrative action:

Extend the aid to dependent children program to children who are deprived of parental support and care because of the unemployment of a parent.

Extend social services to all aid to dependent children families by decreasing caseloads to the maximum of 60 recommended by the Federal Government, and by developing a program that would make possible frequent home visits and the working out of a case plan for each child that would give consideration to the family's needs in such aspects of life as health, housing, child care, management of limited funds, job training, education, etc. To be eligible for the 75 percent Federal financial participation, the Welfare Department must provide this minimum package of services by July 1, 1963.

Help to better prepare its staff to provide the social services described in the preceding recommendation through an organized program of in-service training and enabling staff to get the necessary technical and professional education while on educational leave from the agency. If plans for an organized training program are developed by July 1, 1963, the Welfare Department will be eligible for 75 percent Federal financial participation for the program.

Continue assistance under the aid to dependent children program to children who are removed from their homes by the courts because of the unsuitability of the home. This assistance could continue if children are placed in a foster home or in certain licensed, nonprofit, child-caring institutions.

Plan a program to provide day care for children who are not able to be under parental supervision during the day or for part of the day. With such a plan the District will be able to apply for Federal funds under the child welfare grant program. Funds are expected to be made available as part of a supplemental appropriation of Congress this year and the Welfare Department does not need further legislation to take advantage of this provision.

[The following recommendation would require congressional action to make it possible for the District to participate]: It is recommended that Congress give the District of Columbia legal authority to institute a community work and training program designed to increase the work skills of unemployed parents and to prepare children over 18 years of age in aid-to-dependent-children families for gainful employment.

(c) Staff and other services: Every Public Assistance Division worker be given a formal period of in-service training and orientation in a unit staffed by professional people. This course of study should be geared to instruct the workers in concepts of services to clients based on sound social work principles. While the committee feels that every Public Assistance Division worker would be best equipped to handle his difficult and complex job by acquiring a master's degree in social work, it recognizes that this is neither feasible nor practical at this stage.

Every effort be made by the Department to take advantage of available Federal funds to provide for the further training of workers in schools of social work so that the Department will have a larger number of workers with the master's degree in social work.

The agency develop differentiation in salaries and job responsibilities based on education and experience in order to provide workers with further incentives to additional learning.

The Department of Public Welfare and the schools of social work in the Washington area consider the development of courses and institutes specifically designed for the welfare worker during summers or evenings when workers may participate.

The National Association of Social Workers explores ways by which it can be useful in helping the welfare worker who does not have professional training become more closely aware of the profession's goals and principles.

(e) Staff and other services—Division of responsibilities: That the most qualified staff be assigned to intake services. We wish to emphasize the crucial nature of the intake service where the client for the first time meets a reaction to his request for aid. Here are needed the best trained and most experienced staff members whose jobs must include the following: (i) provide help to clients to secure the necessary documentation to determine eligibility; (ii) refer ineligible clients to alternative community resources; (iii) assign accepted clients to appropriate unit with continued care section.

That the caseload be reviewed in the continued care section in order to select special kinds of cases for intensive casework services and that these special cases be handled by the most qualified workers. The newer workers could begin with those clients needing a minimum of help in maintaining themselves and solving their problems.

That all supervisors in the Public Assistance Division should have professional training.

That investigators be used at the request of and be responsible to the caseworker when the caseworker sees the need for this type of help in determining certain kinds of facts. The committee cannot emphasize too strongly that investigators cannot in any way perform the rehabilitative function of the social workers. When caseloads are reduced to meet the standards of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and when the staff is training either in schools of social work or in programs within the Department, then fraud can be reduced.

The committee believes that the experience of other cities has proven the usefulness of other skills and disciplines to the client. These should include social group work, community organization, day care specialists, family planners, home economists, etc.

That the Department assume the responsibility to provide literacy and vocational training and guidance to the head of the household to enable him to become self-supporting, and a constructive example to his children.

(e) Staff and other services—Organization of the Department: the committee recommends the following steps to improve both the efficiency of the total agency and its rehabilitative function:

Integration of the categories of public assistance and child welfare so that one worker would be responsible for one family, its financial needs, and its related problems. This integration would assist in providing professional leadership for the Public Assistance Division.

Decentralization of the Department into small neighborhood units so that the worker would have his office in the area where his client lives. With this kind of opportunity to know his family, his way of life, the worker would better understand his needs. The present facilities used by the Department are totally inadequate for this type of service.

Limit the amount of administrative detail now handled by the welfare workers and increase the use of machines so that the workers can be released for the tasks for which they have been hired.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 6, 1963]

THE 46 SCANDALS

The great strength of the Crisis Committee's report on the Welfare Department lies in its collection of the stories of 46 families that this city abandoned to hunger because they could not meet the departmental regulations. It is a portrait drawn from life.

Here we have the mother of two small children who is denied relief as employable under a definition that shrugs off the impossibility of finding a job for her, or of finding care during the day for the children. The committee comments: "Whim rather than welfare can readily dictate the fate of children in a public assistance family, so long as the current policy is used as a base for practice."

Here we find the mother who was cut off relief because her landlord was a bachelor. Here also is the mother of 11 children who lost her relief because an adolescent daughter had an illegitimate baby. They were both victims of the man-in-the-house rule. That will be remembered as the rule permitting a mother on relief to have any number of affairs as long as they are kept completely transient, but prohibiting her from living with her husband. That rule has already generated an accumulation of degradation and misery for which this city will be doing penance for decades to come, but a morally careless city continues to enforce it.

The Crisis Committee was established by the local chapter of the National Association of Social Workers, under Dr. Thursz, of Catholic University, and provides a more professional analysis of the Department's errors than we have previously seen. It provides a deeply disquieting view into the Department itself. First among the causes of staff inefficiency and turnover, it cites the departmental policies that require caseworkers "to administer restrictive and unjust regulations, and to award below-minimum grants to clients, causing clients to enter into illicit ways of supplementing grants and concealing facts about the family situation." Last summer Senator Byrd of West Virginia ordered the Department to reduce its relief rolls by eliminating the very large number of cases there by fraud. Since the Department's staff is neither large enough nor experienced enough to weed out the illegal recipients, it is reducing the rolls by seizing any excuse, no matter how trivial, to deny help to impoverished families. "At this point," the Crisis Committee states, "the job is seen more as trying to see who should not receive assistance rather than seeing how it is possible to help those who need it. There is a 70-percent rejection rate here as opposed to 30 percent nationwide."

The Crisis Committee has accomplished the salutary purpose of prodding the city's conscience. The question is whether the city's conscience has not grown so flabby, by lack of exercise, that even these 46 cases of scandal can no longer rouse it from its normaly recumbent position.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bayh in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ESTABLISHMENT OF DOMESTIC PRODUCTION ALLOTMENT AND RESTORATION OF COTTON TO FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, for too many years now, the American cotton producers and the American cotton textile manufacturers have been suffering under the handicap of a ruinous two-price system for cotton that is threatening to destroy an important segment of our national economy.

Our cotton textile industry—in the mills and on the farms—cannot much

longer endure unless the Congress takes action to restore American cotton and American textiles to a competitive position in the marketplace of the world.

It is for this reason that I am today introducing new and badly needed legislation that will end this iniquitous two-price system—that will remove acreage restrictions from the cotton farmer—reduce costly warehouse surpluses—and enable our domestic mills once again to buy our own cotton as cheap as we sell it to foreign mills.

The bill, entitled the "Cotton Domestic Allotment Act," is designed to maintain the income of cotton producers, to permit cotton producers to grow and market cotton on a free enterprise basis, to protect the welfare of the consumers and of those engaged and employed in the manufacture of cotton textiles, and to encourage the exportation of cotton.

My purpose is to strike the shackles of acreage controls from the American cotton farmer, to free him to sell his product on a world market that can seek its own levels under the law of supply and demand, and yet to give him the protection of price support on the cotton grown for domestic consumption.

My purpose is to wipe out the 8½ cents a pound premium, the $42.50 a bale price differential American mills are forced to pay for American cotton over and above the price paid for American cotton by foreign mills.

This intolerable situation cries out for a remedy while the textile mills and the cotton farmers of the United States struggle for survival in a fierce world trade competition in which our own rules work against our own people.

Under the two-price system, American mills must pay 8½ cents a pound more for cotton than buyers overseas. This price differential for raw cotton, plus the advantage of cheap labor in foreign mills, is rapidly pricing the American cotton textile industry out of business.

With overseas mills able to buy cotton at $42.50 a bale less than American mills pay, the advantage is obvious. They are able to send their products into our markets and displace products made in the United States from American cotton.

Japanese and other foreign manufacturers have been able to turn U.S. cotton into textiles, ship them back to the United States, pay the tariff, and undersell American textiles.

Inevitably, the loss of a market for domestically made cotton textile products results in a loss of a market for American-grown cotton.

The cotton farmer suffers, the textile mill suffers, the textile worker suffers, and the Nation's economy suffers.

Already we see the disastrous results of this unjust, senseless situation. Imports of cotton products into this country have doubled since 1958, despite agreements negotiated with Japan and some other countries to restrain their textile shipments to the United States.

Hundreds of American mills have shut down, throwing thousands of workers out of jobs. Many other mills who have managed to stay in operation are turning more and more to the use of synthetic fibers.

Textile jobs in this country have fallen from more than one and a quarter million in 1947 to less than 840,000 last year.

In those mills which are still operating, the production of rayon and other manmade fibers has substantially increased under prices highly attractive in relation to the price of cotton.

Another result is that cotton surpluses are piling up in the warehouses. In spite of a national 1962 acreage allotment of 400,000 acres lower than 1961, a larger crop was produced, and the carryover next August will be up by about 2 million bales.

The Commodity Credit Corporation's cotton inventory went from $245 million at the end of 1961 to $811 million at the end of 1962. In addition, $706 million in cotton was under loan on December 31, 1962.

If no action is taken soon, some farm officials fear the stocks acquired under the price support program may rise to more than 8 million bales at the end of the marketing year, August 1, up from 4.7 million a year earlier.

This is what happens when the domestic manufacturers step up the use of manmade fibers, and foreign fabric makers buy larger and larger quantities of lower priced cotton produced in Africa and Asia.

What does this unhappy situation mean to the cotton farmers in this country? It means that under the national acreage allocation now in effect, which is the lowest ever established pursuant to the 1938 act, gross cotton returns to farmers are expected to be some $175 million less than those for the 1962 crop.

Twenty-five years ago, there were 2 million cotton producers in the United States on 1.5 million farms. Today the number of producers receiving cotton allotments is down to about 900,000; and we expect cotton to be planted this year on not more than 650,000 farms.

In an attempt to help the ailing cotton-textile industry, the Secretary of Agriculture requested the Tariff Commission to seek a solution to the problem, through the imposition of an import fee of 8½ cents a pound on the cotton content of textile imports, to offset the 8½-cent export subsidy.

The Tariff Commission rejected this proposal, however; and the inequitable two-price system continues to be a heavy burden upon the American textile industry.

One proposal has been to make payments to the American mills or cotton handlers in an amount sufficient to offset the 8½ cents a pound export subsidy. But for a long-range program this is not the answer, because it would add to the costs of the already burdened American taxpayer. Each 1-cent per pound payment would cost the Treasury another $45 million a year. Even the mills, themselves, do not seek it.

There is great merit in what William H. Ruffin, of Durham, N.C., president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, said recently when he declared:

> We ask only that American mills be enabled to buy American cotton at the same price paid by our foreign competitors. We have never sought a Government subsidy. We do not seek one now.
>
> A Government-created injustice exists, and its continuance is doing great harm to almost 2 million Americans who are employed by the textile and apparel industries, to cotton farmers, and to consumers.
>
> The injustice is the 8½ cents a pound difference between what American mills and foreign mills pay for U.S. cotton. This injustice cannot be remedied by halfway measures.

Mr. President, I concur in the sentiments expressed by the president of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute; and in the legislation I propose, this injustice will be remedied.

In order to help the American cotton farmer, the textile worker, the mill owner, the merchant, the consumer, and the taxpayer—in short, the national economy—I shall propose what I believe to be legislation best suited for our cotton industry from farm to mill to store to customer.

Mr. President, for many years—as a farmer, as Governor of my State, as a Member of this body, and as a member of the Committee on Agriculture—I have given the problems of cotton long and serious study.

It is my carefully considered judgment that the plan I shall propose is the program that will work best for all. I welcome my colleagues' support for it, and I welcome the support of all segments of the cotton industry.

Before going into details of the bill, I should like to give my colleagues some of the history and the background of the acreage controls which I seek to eliminate with this legislation, and the reasons such action is needed.

Cotton acreage controls were first imposed on the 1938 crop, and were continued for each crop through 1943. Allotments were suspended during the war and postwar years until the 1950 crop, when they were imposed again. The 1951, 1952, and 1953 crops were free of allotments. Beginning with the 1954 crop, acreage controls have been imposed on each crop up to the present. Thus, in this period of 25 years, acreage controls were applied to 16 crops of cotton.

The national allotments have varied all the way from 16 million acres, as presently in effect, to more than 26 million acres. This is a spread of some 10 million acres. The changes in the national allotment vary from one crop to another. Some of them have been very sharp changes, and are highly frustrating to farmers. Many farmers cannot soundly plan their crops until very late in the planting season until they know what their allotments will finally be after reapportionment of released allotments. The investment which farmers have in machinery, labor, and other expenses necessary to the production of a cotton crop is tremendous.

The farmers are entitled to a program that is more stable than has been the acreage-allotment program. They should have freer latitude in using their investments than is provided under acreage controls.

Under the acreage-allotment plan, we have seen the carryover of cotton reach a record high of 14.5 million bales. This record high was reached on August 1,

1956. A number of legislative and administrative piecemeal programs have been put into effect, in a desperate attempt to keep supplies in line with offtake. These, we well know, have been very expensive operations.

We strongly believe that if farmers are provided a program such as that contained in the bill I am introducing today, cotton producers can do a much better job of planning their operations from year to year, and better cultural methods will be employed to reduce production costs. The quality of our product will be improved.

In recent years, and again this year, I have introduced general farm legislation based on the principles of letting the farmer farm and taking the Government out of the business of buying, transporting, storing, and selling farm commodities. Under the present program the Government actually acts as a pawnbroker who deals in farm commodities.

The cotton bill which I am introducing today would eliminate acreage control and, instead, would assign to each farmer a farm domestic allotment expressed in terms of pounds or bales of cotton. Such allotment would represent the farm's fair share of estimated domestic consumption requirements. The bill would enable the Secretary to carry out a program under which the farmer would be permitted to market all of the cotton he produced and receive payments in cash or in kind for the cotton marketed within his domestic allotment. The payment would be equal to the difference between the price he received for such cotton and a percent of parity, determined by the Secretary, within ranges which would run from 70 to 90 percent of parity, and would vary according to the quantity of cotton marketed.

But the farmer would be free to produce and sell as much as he pleased, over and above his domestic quota, at world prices.

The ills and problems of cotton are so unique as to require separate legislation based on the same broad principle of my general farm legislation.

Such an approach for cotton, as well as for other commodities, would be simple and eliminate much redtape. It would eliminate the regimentation and dictation imposed by acreage controls. For example, the need for measuring the acreage of cotton on almost three-quarters of a million farms would be eliminated. Also, each farmer would no longer be required to carry a marketing card for use in identification of his own cotton.

Such an approach would let the farmer plant what he wants and sell it as he pleases and to whom he pleases. It would lead to the elimination of surpluses that glut the markets and stagnate the economy.

Such an approach would mean lower prices to both the consumer and industry and would put American cotton, both raw and processed, back on the world markets at competitive prices. In short, it would restore cotton to the free enterprise system.

Yet, it would give the farmers protection equivalent to labor's minimum wage and right to collective bargaining, and industry's tariff and Government contracts and subsidies.

Such an approach would mark a new and fresh start, which would release cotton from the bonds of past mistakes and abortive laws.

Here then, Mr. President, is this new approach that I propose in my Cotton Domestic Allotment Act of 1963:

The principal provisions of the bill are as follows:

First. Beginning with the 1964 crop, the Secretary of Agriculture would establish each year a national domestic allotment for cotton in a number of bales equal to the estimated domestic consumption of cotton for the marketing year beginning in the year in which the crop is produced.

Second. The national domestic allotment would be apportioned to the States, counties, and farms on a different basis for each of the first few years of the program. The general objective, however, would be to provide for such apportionment to be made as close as possible to the apportionment now in effect for acreage allotments, so as to maintain the same relationship between States, counties, and farms as exist under the present acreage allotment program.

Third. Beginning with the 1968 crop, the national allotment would be apportioned to States, counties and farms primarily on the basis of the average production within the respective allotments for the 3 preceding years.

Fourth. The State and county committees would be authorized to establish State and county reserves to the same extent and for the same purposes for which such reserves are established under the present cotton acreage allotment program. The bill would authorize the release of farm allotments to the county committee for use in increasing farm allotments in the county, and if such allotments could not be used in the county, they could be released to the State committee for use in other counties in the State. The State, county, and farm from which allotments are released would receive credit for the production of such released allotments for purposes of establishing future allotments for eligible old cotton farms.

Fifth. The bill would authorize price support for all cotton at a level between 50 and 60 percent of parity. On the basis of the current parity price, this would mean a level of support of between 20 and 24 cents per pound for all cotton produced in the United States.

Sixth. The bill provides a higher level of price support for cotton produced within the farm domestic allotment. The level of support on such cotton would be on 3 production intervals, and the Secretary would prescribe a level for that part of the production in each interval within the following ranges: 15 bales and less, not less than 80 or more than 90 percent of the parity price.

At the present parity level that would amount to 32 to 36 cents a pound. Sixteen to thirty bales, inclusive, not less than 75 or more than 85 percent of the parity price. And at the present parity level that would amount to 30 to 34 cents a pound. More than 30 bales, not less than 70 or more than 80 percent of the parity price. And at the present parity level that would amount to 28 to 32 cents a pound.

The price support on domestic allotment cotton could be made available through loans, purchases or other operations, including payments in cash or in kind to producers.

Seventh. Beginning August 1, 1964, the Commodity Credit Corporation will be authorized to sell upland cotton for unrestricted use at not less than 105 percent of the current support price available for all cotton—50 to 60 percent of parity—plus reasonable carrying charges.

Eighth. In the transition period of placing this act in operation, the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized and directed for the first year, ending July 31, 1964, as an emergency measure, to make payments-in-kind from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks to persons other than producers in amounts sufficient to remove the inequities of the two-price system to the domestic mills.

Mr. President, this is a brief statement of the principal provisions of the bill, but I shall submit a more lengthy analysis of the bill for those who would like more details.

I would now like to carefully compare this proposed Cotton Domestic Allotment Act with the present cotton program.

Today, the whole cotton industry, from the farm on which it is grown to the local gin, to the compress, to the final spinning of cotton in either domestic or foreign mill, is dominated by the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Domestic Allotment Act would restore the freedom of farmers to plant cotton, as they choose.

This is dramatically illustrated by the fact that under this bill there would be no need for farmers collectively to bind themselves in a referendum to mutual restrictions on their freedom to plant cotton.

Cotton buyers would be free to buy cotton. Cotton merchants would be free to merchandise cotton. Cotton warehousemen would compete freely for the business of storing privately owned cotton. Exporters would be free to export—without subsidy or other assistance and certainly without any hindrance from Government. Even the cotton exchanges in New Orleans and New York, almost forgotten in the kind of market we have had in the last few years, would come to life again.

Under the provisions of the present law, the Secretary of Agriculture last October was forced to reduce the national acreage allotment to the legal minimum for 1963. This will reduce farm income from cotton. The great cotton areas of the Mississippi delta, the high plains of Texas, and the three Western States will be particularly hurt by the sharp reduction in cotton acreage.

Price support for 1963 has been announced at a level unchanged from last year. However, under the present act, it is not likely that present levels of price support can be maintained indefinitely. Thus, under present legislation,

farm income from cotton would decline further in the years ahead. True, the 1949 act provides for price support from 65 to 90 percent of parity. But with cotton consumption steadily declining at current price relationships with synthetic fibers, 90 percent of parity under the existing law is a complete fiction. Even 80 percent of parity is a fiction under this act. Over the next few years, I doubt if a uniform level of price support as high as 75 percent could be maintained.

The Cotton Domestic Allotment Act would maintain gross farm income and do so indefinitely. It would certainly increase net farm income. It would provide for price support on the domestic allotment of from 70 to 90 percent of parity and from 80 to 90 percent of parity for the majority of growers; those who produce 15 bales or less. Under this bill, 90 percent of parity could be a reality rather than a fiction.

It would allow each producer to choose for himself whether he wishes to grow more cotton at a lower average return per bale or grow less cotton at a higher unit return. Each producer would be free to plant as much acreage to cotton as he likes. He would, however, know in advance that he would receive a specified level of price support on a specific number of bales. He would decide for himself how much cotton he wants to produce and how he wants to produce it.

It would not be necessary for him to devise elaborate and expensive skip-row schemes for producing his crop. He would not be forced to use his best land year after year without rotation. Having once decided how much cotton he wished to produce, he would then be free to produce his cotton in a way that for him would be most economical.

Under the Cotton Domestic Allotment Act, cotton spinning mills would once again spin cotton. Workers presently employed would go back on a full-time basis and workers now laid off would be reemployed. The whole textile industry would be revitalized by the renewed opportunity to compete with foreign textile mills on an even basis.

Mr. President, I welcome the support of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for this proposed legislation. I hope it will be passed by the Senate, approved also in the other body, and thus enacted by the Congress and signed into law by the President. I am confident it will save our cotton industry and restore cotton to its rightful position of competitive, free enterprise prosperity.

It is with this hope, Mr. President, that I herewith introduce my bill, and ask unanimous consent that it be read twice and appropriately referred, and that the text of the bill and the accompanying detailed analysis of it be printed in the Record at this juncture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1190) to maintain the income of cotton producers, to permit cotton producers to grow and market cotton on a free enterprise basis, to protect the welfare of consumers and of those engaged in the manufacture of cotton textiles, to encourage the exportation of cotton, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Talmadge (for himself and Mr. Humphrey), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Cotton Domestic Allotment Act."

Sec. 2. This Act shall be applicable to upland cotton beginning with the 1964 crop and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, except sections 301(a), 373, 375 and the provisions of Subtitle F of Title III thereof, shall not be applicable to upland cotton beginning with the 1964 crop.

DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT

Sec. 3(a). The Secretary shall proclaim, not later than December 15 of each calendar year, a national domestic allotment for the crop of cotton to be produced in the next calendar year of a number of bales of cotton which is estimated to result in the production of cotton within such allotment equal to the estimated domestic consumption of cotton for the marketing year beginning in the next calendar year.

(b)(1) For the 1964 and 1965 crops of cotton, the national domestic allotment shall be apportioned to the States for which a 1963 State acreage allotment was established under section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, on the basis of the number of bales of cotton determined for each State by converting such 1963 State acreage allotment (including the State's share of the national reserve) to a number of bales based on the average yield per acre of cotton for the State.

(2) For the 1966 crop of cotton, the national domestic allotment shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of the average number of bales obtained by dividing the sum of the following by three: (i) the number of bales used as the base for apportioning the 1964 national domestic allotment, adjusted for the State average yield, multiply by two, and (ii) the State production base for the 1964 crop of cotton. For purposes of this section, the "State production base" shall be the smaller of the State domestic allotment for the crop or the production within such State domestic allotment, adjusted for abnormal conditions adversely affecting plantings and yields of cotton and adjusted for farms regarded as having produced cotton. For purposes of this section, "farms regarded as having produced cotton" shall be farms deemed to have cotton planted or produced under any other provision of law, including subsection (f) of this section, and farms on which 75 per centum or more of the farm allotment was produced or regarded as having been produced under any other provision of law, including subsection (d)(3) and subsection (f) of this section, shall be deemed to have produced the entire farm allotment, and farms on which less than 75 per centum of the farm allotment was produced or regarded as having been produced under any other provision of law, including subsection (f) of this section, shall be deemed to have produced the average of the farm allotment and the production (actual and regarded as produced) on the farm.

(3) For the 1967 crop of cotton, the national domestic allotment shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of the average number of bales obtained by dividing the sum of the following by three: (i) the number of bales used as the base for apportioning the 1964 national domestic allotment, adjusted for the State average yield, and (ii) the sum of the 1964 and 1965 State production bases.

(4) For the 1968 and subsequent crops of cotton, the national domestic allotment shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of the average of the State production bases for the three years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the national domestic allotment is proclaimed.

(c) The State domestic allotment less any State reserve shall be apportioned to counties on the same basis as to years and conditions as is applicable to the State under subsection (b) of this section: *Provided,* That the State committee may reserve not to exceed 10 per centum of the State allotment which shall be used to make adjustments in county domestic allotments for trends in cotton production, for new farms, to correct inequities in farm allotments, and to prevent hardship.

(d)(1) For the 1964 crop of cotton, the county domestic allotment less any county reserve shall be apportioned to old cotton farms on the basis of the 1963 farm acreage allotment converted into production of cotton by multiplying such acreage allotment by the farm average yield: *Provided,* That if less than 75 percent of such acreage allotment was actually planted (or regarded as planted under the Soil Bank Act, the Great Plains program and the release and reapportionment provisions of subsection (m)(2) of section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended) the farm production base for 1963 shall be the production based on the average of the 1963 farm allotment and the acreage so planted or regarded as planted.

(2) For the 1965 and subsequent crops of cotton, the county domestic allotment less any county reserve shall be apportioned to old cotton farms on the basis of the farm domestic allotment established for the preceding crop of cotton: *Provided,* That if less than 75 percent of such farm domestic allotment was produced or regarded as produced, the farm production base shall be the production based on the average of such farm domestic allotment and the production (including any production regarded as produced) of cotton on the farm.

(3) The farm production base shall not be adjusted under this subsection if the Secretary determines that failure to plant or produce, as the case may be, at least 75 percent of the farm domestic allotment, or the farm acreage allotment for 1963, was due to conditions beyond the control of producers on the farm. Old cotton farm means a farm on which cotton has been produced (or regarded as planted to cotton or produced under any other provision of law except subsection (f) of this section and the provisions of subsection (m)(2) of section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended) pursuant to a farm allotment in any one of the three years immediately preceding the year for which a farm allotment is established.

(e) The county committee may reserve not to exceed 15 percent of the county domestic allotment which shall be used to make adjustments for new farms, to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship.

(f) The farm operator with the concurrence of the farm owner who is also a producer of cotton may release any part of the farm domestic allotment to the county committee for use in increasing farm allotments on other farms in the county. The county committee shall reapportion any such released allotment in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. If released allotment is not reapportioned in the county, the county committee shall transfer such allotment to the State committee for further transfer to other counties in the State. Any allotment released from a farm shall be regarded for purposes of establishing future State, county, and farm allotments as having been produced on the farm and in the county where the release was made except that this shall not operate to make the farm from which the allotment was released considered as having cotton production during the three year period for eligibility as an old cotton farm.

SEC. 4(a). For the purposes of this Act, the following terms are defined as follows:

(1) "United States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

(2) "State" includes the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

(3) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(4) "Person" means an individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or any agency of a State.

(5) "Bale of cotton" means a standard bale of five hundred pounds gross weight.

(6) "Marketing year" means the period beginning August 1 and ending July 31.

(7) "State average yield", "county average yield" and "farm average yield" shall be the average yield per acre of cotton for the State, county, or farm, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and changes in farming practices, during the three calendar years immediately preceding the year in which such yield is determined.

(8) "Farm" means such land as the Secretary prescribes by regulation to be constituted as a farm.

PRICE SUPPORT

SEC. 5. Section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended effective with the 1964 crop of upland cotton to read as follows:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 of this Act:

(a) Price support for each crop of upland cotton shall be made available to producers through loans, purchases, or other operations at such level not less than 50 per centum or more than 60 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines appropriate after consideration of the factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act and the price of cotton in world markets.

(b) Price support in addition to that provided in subsection (a) of this section shall be made available to producers of each crop of upland cotton through loans, purchases, or other operations, including payments in cash or in kind, on a quantity of cotton of such crop produced on each farm equal to the farm's domestic allotment for such crop established under the Cotton Domestic Allotment Act. The levels of price support on such cotton shall be determined by the Secretary within the ranges prescribed in the schedule below after consideration of the factors specified in section 401(b) of this Act.

Production intervals in terms of bales (standard bales of 500 pounds gross weight)	Level of support
15 bales and less	Not less than 80 or more than 90 per centum of the parity price.
16 to 30 bales, inclusive	Not less than 75 or more than 85 per centum of the parity price.
More than 30 bales	Not less than 70 per centum or more than 80 per centum of the parity price.

If a portion of the price support for any upland cotton is made available through payments to producers, the rate of payment shall be in an amount per pound of cotton which, when added to the average spot market price of middling one-inch cotton for the calendar week preceding the date of the marketing of the cotton with respect to which payment is made, as determined by the Secretary, or the level of support (converted to a middling one-inch basis) for such crop under subsection (a), whichever is higher, will provide a return to the producer equal to the applicable level of support (converted to a middling one-inch basis) under the schedule set out above. The Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers, including provision for sharing, on a fair and equitable basis, in payments under this section.

SEC. 6. Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting after the first proviso in the third sentence thereof the following proviso:

"*Provided further*, That beginning August 1, 1964, the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell upland cotton for unrestricted use at not less than 105 percent of the current support price established under section 103 (a) of this Act for upland cotton plus reasonable carrying charges."

SEC. 7. In order to maintain and expand domestic consumption of upland cotton produced in the United States and to prevent discrimination against the domestic users of such cotton, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, is authorized and directed for the period beginning with the date of enactment of this section and ending July 31, 1964, to make payments through the issuance of payment-in-kind certificates to persons other than the producers of such cotton, in such amounts and subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines will eliminate inequities due to differences in the cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users of such cotton, including such payments as may be necessary to make raw cotton in inventory available for consumption at prices consistent with the purposes of this section.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie on the desk until the conclusion of business next Wednesday, in order that any Members of the Senate who desire may cosponsor it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and analysis will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested.

The analysis presented by Mr. TALMADGE is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF A PROPOSED BILL TO ENACT THE COTTON DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

This bill would provide a program for establishing National, State, county, and farm domestic allotments for the 1964 and subsequent crops of upland cotton in terms of bales rather than acres of cotton. The amount of the national domestic allotment would approximate the estimated domestic consumption of cotton for the marketing year beginning in the year in which the crop is produced. The bill would also authorize price support on all cotton at a low level (50 to 60 percent of parity) which on the basis of the current parity price would probably range between 20 and 24 cents per pound of cotton. However, a higher level of support would be authorized on the farm domestic allotment and such support could be made available by payments in cash or in kind to producers.

The provisions of the bill provide as follows:

1. Section 1 provides that the act may be cited as the "Cotton Domestic Allotment Act."

2. Section 2 provides that the act is applicable to upland cotton beginning with 1964 crop. The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which provides for the present program of acreage allotments and marketing quotas for cotton would not be applicable except for certain sections relating to administration of the program. It should be noted that the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, remain applicable to marketing quotas and acreage allotments for extra long staple cotton.

3. Section 3 of the bill would provide different methods for apportioning the national domestic allotment to States, counties and farms for the first few years that the program was in effect. The purpose would be to provide for such apportionment to be made as close to the apportionment now in effect for acreage allotments so as to maintain the same relationship between States, counties, and farms as exists at the present time. Section 3(a) provides for the proclamation by the Secretary, not later than December 15 of each calendar year, of a national domestic allotment for the crop of cotton to be produced in the next calendar year of a number of bales of cotton (standard bales of 500 pounds gross weight) estimated to be produced within such allotment equal to the estimated domestic consumption of cotton for the marketing year beginning in the next calendar year. Marketing year is the period beginning August 1 and ending July 31.

4. Section 3(b)(1) provides for apportionment of the national allotment to the States for the 1964 and 1965 crops of cotton on the basis of the 1963 State acreage allotment. This is accomplished for each State by converting the 1963 State acreage allotment (including the State's share of the national reserve) established under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to a number of bales based on the average yield per acre of cotton for the State. The State average yield would be the average yield per acre of cotton for the State, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and changes in farming practices, during the 3 calendar years immediately preceding the year in which such yield was determined.

5. Section 3(b)(2) provides for apportionment of the national allotment to the States for the 1966 crop of cotton partly on the basis of the apportionment used for the 1964 crop of cotton and partly on the basis of the 1964 State production of cotton within the 1964 State allotment including production regarded as produced on farms releasing allotment and farms in the conservation reserve program, the Great Plains program, and the land use adjustment program. This is accomplished on the basis of the average number of bales contained by dividing by 3 the sum of the 1964 base used in section 3(b)(1) given a weight of 2, and the 1964 State production base. The State production base would be the smaller of the State domestic allotment or the production of such allotment, adjusted for abnormal conditions adversely affecting plantings and yields of cotton and for farms regarded as having produced cotton (includes farms in the conservation reserve program, Great Plains program, land use adjustment program under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, and farms releasing allotments under section 3(f) of this act.)

6. Section 3(b)(3) provides for apportionment of the national allotment to the States for the 1967 crop of cotton partly on the basis of the apportionment used for the 1964 crop of cotton and partly on the basis of the 1965 and 1966 State bases. This is accomplished on the basis of the average number of bales obtained by dividing by 3 the sum of the 1964 base used in section 3(b)(1) and the 1965 and 1966 State production bases.

7. Section 3(b)(4) provides for apportionment of the national domestic allotments to the States for the 1968 and subsequent crops of cotton on the basis of the average of the State production bases for the 3 years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the allotment is proclaimed.

8. Section 3(c) provides for apportionment of the State domestic allotment less any State reserve to counties on the same basis as to years and conditions as would be applicable to the State in the apportionment of the national allotment. The county average yield would be the average yield per acre of cotton for the county, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and changes in farming practices, during the 3 calendar years immediately preceding the year in which such yield was determined. The State committee could reserve not to exceed 10 percent of the State allotment in order to adjust county allotments for trends in cotton production, for new farms, to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship.

9. Section 3(d) provides for apportionment of the county allotment to farms by use of the 1963 farm acreage allotment for the 1964 crop converted to a production base, and for the 1965 and succeeding crops on the basis of the farm allotment for the preceding crop. The farm base would be reduced for failure to produce or release at least 75 percent of the farm allotment each year. Section 3(d)(1) provides for apportionment of the county domestic allotment to old cotton farms for the 1964 crop on the basis of the 1963 farm acreage allotment converted into production by multiplying such acreage by the farm average yield. Farm average yield would be determined in the same way as the State and county average yields. The farm production base so determined would be reduced to the average of the 1963 farm acreage allotment and the acreage actually planted or regarded as planted (under the Soil Bank Act, Great Plains program or release and reapportionment) if less than 75 percent of the 1963 farm acreage allotment was so planted or regarded as planted to cotton.

10. Section 3(d)(2) provides for apportionment of the county domestic allotment to old cotton farms for the 1965 and succeeding crops of cotton on the basis of the farm domestic allotment established for the preceding crop of cotton. The farm production base so determined would be reduced if less than 75 percent of the farm allotment was produced or regarded as produced (under any other provision of law and the release provisions in section 3(f)) to the average of the farm allotment and the production (actual plus regarded as produced) of cotton on the farm.

11. Section 3(d)(3) provides that the Secretary would determine whether the failure to plant or produce at least 75 percent of the farm allotment was due to conditions beyond the control of producers on the farm and if so, the farm production base would not be reduced for such failure. An old cotton farm would be a farm on which cotton has been produced (or regarded as planted or produced under any other provision of law except the release provisions of section 3(f)) pursuant to a farm allotment in any one of the 3 years immediately preceding the year for which a farm allotment was established.

12. Section 3(e) provides that the county committee could reserve not to exceed 15 percent of the county allotment for use on new farms and to correct inequities in farm allotments and to prevent hardship.

13. Section 3(f) provides for release of farm allotments to the county committee for use in increasing farm allotments on other farms in the county in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary. Unused released allotments in the county would be surrendered to the State committee for use in other counties in the State. The State, county, and farm from which allotment was released would receive credit for the producton of such released allotment for purposes of establishing future allotments except that release of allotment would not operate to establish eligibility as an old cotton farm.

14. Section 4 contains general definitions applicable to the act.

15. Section 5 provides for price support for upland cotton beginning with the 1964 crop by amending section 103 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. The level of price support for all cotton of a crop would be established by the Secretary at not less than 50 percent or more than 60 percent of the parity price therefor. The Secretary would take into consideration the price of cotton in world markets and the factors in section 401(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, in establishing such level of support. Additional price support would be made available on the cotton produced within the farm domestic allotment. The levels of support on such cotton would be on three production intervals and the Secretary would prescribe a level for each interval within the following ranges: 15 bales and less, not less than 80 or more than 90 percent of the parity price; 16 to 30 bales, inclusive, not less than 75 or more than 85 percent of the parity price; more than 30 bales, not less than 70 or more than 80 percent of the parity price.

Such additional price support could be made available through loans, purchases or other operations, including payments in cash or in kind. If a portion of the price support were made available through payments to producers, the rate of payment would be an amount which, when added to the average spot market price of Middling 1-inch cotton for the calendar week preceding the date of marketing or the level of regular price support converted to a Middling 1-inch basis, whichever was higher, would provide a return to the producer equal to the applicable level of support listed in the ranges above. The Secretary would be required to provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers in payments under this provision.

16. Section 6 provides in an amendment to section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, a grant of authority beginning August 1, 1964 to the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell upland cotton for unrestricted use at not less than 105 percent of the current support price available for all cotton plus reasonable carrying charges.

17. Section 7 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe rules and regulations under which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make payments in kind to persons, other than producers, to eliminate the inequities in the cost of raw cotton between domestic and foreign users. These payments are authorized from the date of enactment of this bill until July 31, 1964 in such amounts and under such terms as the Secretary may prescribe.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE: I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the presentation of this proposal by the Senator from Georgia. It is difficult, of course, to measure every item in it from merely listening to the proposal, but I wish to say that it seems to me the Senator has presented new thinking in a field in which it is badly needed. I earnestly hope the proposed legislation will be considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and that some program can be worked out.

I am of the opinion that the Senator certainly has given a very fine suggestion as to the line along which a program may be worked out. I commend him and congratulate him.

Mr. TALMADGE. I am grateful indeed for the remarks of my esteemed friend and colleague from Alabama. He and I have discussed the problems of the cotton farmers and the textile industry on many occasions. I know of no other Member of the Senate who has worked harder, more conscientiously, or more sincerely in the effort to do something about the grave problems confronting the cotton industry.

In my judgment, if we are to save cotton as a commodity for our farmers, if we are to save our textile employees, and the remainder of our textile industry, we must have a cotton program which, first, will let our farmers farm; second, will assure our farmers who produce cotton a fair share of the national income; and, third, will put our own commodities back on the world market at competitive prices.

I have checked the production figures on cotton. Thirty years ago the United States of America produced half the world's cotton. Now we produce 20 percent of the world's cotton. The reason is obvious. We have held a price umbrella over the rest of the world, and by imposing restrictions we have put our own cotton farmers—particularly the small farmers in the Southeastern States—out of business. While we have been reducing our production other nations have been expanding theirs. Now, the same thing is happening to textile employees and the textile industry. If Congress does not take some action to remedy the situation soon, cotton will rapidly become a thing of the past for our country.

I welcome the constructive thinking and support of my distinguished colleague.

I yield now to the distinguished and able Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the informative and provocative speech which the junior Senator from Georgia has made. I wonder if his bill would make any distinction in treatment of the small homestead farmer, to which the Senator has referred, and the large corporate farming operations in the area of irrigation which can operate profitably at a much smaller price than can the individual farmer.

Mr. TALMADGE. In reply, yes, the bill does make the distinction.

First let me say that if this bill becomes law, instead of having a cotton allotment in acres, as we now have, there will be an allocation in bales or pounds. As the able Senator from Tennessee knows, when an acre of cotton is alloted, it can mean 250 pounds of lint cotton in one section of the country or 1,500 pounds of lint cotton in another section of the country. This depends largely on whether irrigation is used, the fertility of the soil, the amount of fertilizer used, cultivation practices, and many other factors.

Under the proposed program we would allocate 10 million bales of cotton, based on a historic production basis, and the support price for the first 15 bales of production would be from 80 to 90 percent of parity, which, at the present party level, would be 32 to 36 cents a pound.

The second support category would fall within 16 to 30 bales, and the support price would be from 75 to 85 percent of parity, which, at present levels, would be 30 to 34 cents a pound.

Each farmer who produced over 30 bales, within the domestic allocation, would receive a support price of 28 to 32 cents a pound.

Then, any farmer who wanted to produce cotton for export over and above the domestic allocation program, could plant as much as he wanted to produce, any number of bales, and his support price would be approximately the world market price, which is about 20 to 24 cents a pound at the present time.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. Will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator omits, for the purpose of my question, the differentiation between the large and the homestead producer, is the Senator able to draw an analogy, contrast, or comparison in the bill which he proposes with respect to cotton and the legislation, the legal program, now in existence for sugar production in the United States?

Mr. TALMADGE. Yes. It is identically the same. It is a compensatory payment plan to the producer. We have it for the sugar producers. We have it for the wool producers. As the Senator knows, these programs have been extended time after time, and the majority of Senators on both sides of the aisle have no objection to them. In fact, we passed the Wool Act in the Senate a time or two without even a record vote, just by voice vote, because of the popularity of the program.

The reason it works so well is that the Government does not get in the business of acting as a pawnbroker for this commodity. Under present programs when the farmer fails to redeem the commodities, the Government finds itself in the possession of them. At the present time there are $8 billion worth of agricultural commodities in Government warehouses. The Government must not only warehouse them but must ship and sell the commodities, with all the attendant high cost. The disposal of surpluses in the warehouses is one of the most expensive items of running the Government. Last time I checked, the storage cost was about $1 billion a year. That is what brought on the Billie Sol Estes scandal. My proposal would get the Government out of all these attendant expenses and businesses.

I think the only justification there is for a price support program is the desire to put more money in the pockets of the farmers. When a program puts the farmers out of business, ruins the commodities which the Government is seeking to help, places employees in an untenable position, or liquidates many industries, with the attendant high cost to the taxpayers, I think it is about time to consider a better farm program.

I have talked with the Senator from Tennessee about this proposal. I know of his great interest in it, and I welcome his constructive interest.

A CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM WORTHY OF THE CENTENNIAL OF THE EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a number of Senators on both sides of the aisle have taken the floor in order to introduce various measures. I shall take the floor now to do likewise, and I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the floor to my colleagues, for that purpose, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. First I wish to read a joint statement of eight Senators who are participating today in the introduction of a series of civil rights bills based upon the legislative recommendations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. The statement reads as follows:

> The Civil Rights Commission was created to advise Congress and the President regarding the need for legislation to enforce constitutional guarantees. In accordance with its mandate, the Commission in its 1961 comprehensive reports made 27 recommendations for additional legislation in the fields of voting, education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice. Its reports on these subjects were thorough and objective, and its members spoke with a remarkable degree of unanimity.
>
> We regret that the President in his special message on civil rights last month—his first civil rights message in 2 years—did not implement the Commission's recommendations. The administration's proposals, while noteworthy since for the first time they go beyond the field of voting, fall far short of the Commission's recommendations and both national party platforms. This year of the centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation merits a more comprehensive program. If the President will not assume the leadership in getting through Congress urgently needed civil rights measures, we in Congress must take the initiative.
>
> The measures which we are today introducing are based upon the Commission's recommendations but are supplemented by strengthening provisions. We consider these proposals necessary to meet the ever-growing and fully justified demand of a substantial group of citizens that they be accorded all the privileges of first-class citizenship.

The eight Republican Senators who have joined in this statement are Senators Case of New Jersey, Fong of Hawaii, myself, my colleague from New York [Mr. Keating], Kuchel of California, Scott of Pennsylvania, Saltonstall of Massachusetts, and Beall of Maryland.

Summaries of the bills to be introduced are as follows:

I. EDUCATION

Senator Kuchel is the principal sponsor of the education bill. This bill requires every school board which has failed to achieve desegregation of all public schools to adopt and file with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare within 180 days a desegregation plan providing for at least first-step compliance commencing with the following school year. The Attorney General is authorized to institute a civil action for injunctive relief against a school board which violates the act, to protect all persons involved in school desegregation, and, in accordance with the part III provision deleted from the Civil Rights Act of 1957, to redress all deprivations of constitutional rights. Other provisions authorize financial and technical assistance to desegregating school districts; create a clearinghouse for information concerning desegregation and an advisory and conciliation service; apportion Federal aid to education in accordance with progress in desegregation, especially in impacted areas; and remove the separate-but-equal language from the Morrill Land Grant College Acts.

II. EMPLOYMENT

Senator Case is the principal sponsor of the employment bills. The first would establish a Federal Commission on Equality of Opportunity in Employment to prohibit, in interstate commerce, discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry. Another bill would authorize the Commission to encourage and enforce a policy of equal employment opportunity in Federal employment and employment under Government contracts and subcontracts, applicable to both employers and labor organizations; to withdraw Federal support and approval from apprenticeship and worker retraining programs and from State employment service which deny individuals an equal opportunity to participate on account of race, color, or creed; and to authorize the National Labor Relations Board to set aside representation elections in which appeals to race prejudice are made. The third bill would establish a Commission on Fair Employment Practices in the District of Columbia.

III. HOUSING

Senator Scott is the principal sponsor of the bills dealing with housing. The November 1962 Executive order to prohibit discrimination in housing failed to cover housing loans and mortgages handled by federally regulated financial institutions or FHA- and VA-financed housing constructed prior to issues of the order. Since such antidiscriminatory action was recommended by the Commission, the first bill calls for a study to determine what further executive or legislative action should be taken in this area and in the administration of the existing urban renewal program. A second bill would amend the provision enacted in 1962 in order to assure decent, safe, and sanitary housing to all eligible persons displaced by the Federal highway program, further implementing the Commission's recommendations.

IV. VOTING RIGHTS

Senator Keating is the principal sponsor of the bill dealing with voting rights. The bill establishes voter qualifications for State and Federal elections which would exclude practices and standards which the Commission has found are used to discriminate against Negro voters. It permits States to maintain literacy as a qualification but provides that 6 years of schooling shall

satisfy such requirements. It prohibits any arbitrary standards, practices, and procedures in connection with registration and voting, specifically including arbitrary inaction where there is a duty to act. It also contains provisions for the appointment of temporary voting referees in voting rights cases and for the expedition of such cases. A final section provides for the collection of reliable statistical information with regard to voting patterns.

V. ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

I am the principal sponsor of two measures to strengthen the laws on the administration of justice. In the first bill, more effective remedies are provided for penalizing unconstitutional official violence; local governmental units are made jointly liable with their officers who are found liable in police brutality cases under existing Federal law; protections now limited to certain Federal officers and members of the Armed Forces in the discharge of their duties are extended to cover additional Federal officers and all uniformed servicemen. The Attorney General is authorized to institute civil proceedings for injunctive relief to prevent exclusion of persons from jury service on account of race, color, or national origin and, in accordance with the part III provision deleted from the Civil Rights Act of 1957, to redress all deprivations of constitutional rights. The second bill would provide a Federal matching grant-in-aid program, administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in consultation with the Attorney General, to assist in the improvement of training, recruitment, and education of local and State police officers.

VI. PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

I am also the principal sponsor of bills relating to public accommodations. The first bill would prohibit discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin in any hotel, motel, or public place engaged in furnishing lodging, whose business affects interstate commerce. Violation of the act would be a misdemeanor, injured persons could bring civil actions for damages or for injunctive or other relief, and the Attorney General would be authorized to bring injunctive actions on behalf of the injured person. A second bill would eliminate the separate-but-equal provision from the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act.

VII. CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

Senator Saltonstall is the principal sponsor and Senator Fong is the principal cosponsor of the bill to make the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government and to broaden the scope of its duties. The bill would enable the Commission to serve as a national clearinghouse for information, and to provide advice and technical assistance to Government agencies, communities, industries, organizations, or individuals, in respect to equal protection of the laws, including but not limited to the fields of voting, education, housing, employment, public accommodations, transportation, and the administration of justice.

I now yield, under the unanimous-consent request, to my colleague the deputy minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel].

EQUALITY OF EDUCATION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the 1960 Republican Platform correctly recognized:

> Equality under law promises more than the equal right to vote and transcends mere relief from discrimination by Government. It becomes a reality only when all persons have equal opportunity, without distinction of race, religion, color or national origin, to acquire the essentials of life—housing, education and employment.

Our party and those of us who have joined together on the various measures which we have introduced today believe in this principle. By our actions and by our work we seek to make this promise a reality.

I salute the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and his colleague from New York [Mr. Keating], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Beall], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], and other Senators on this side of the aisle, and I hope Senators from the other side as well, who join in sponsoring this series of bills.

Discrimination is not limited to one area of our land. It must be faced alike in the North, South, East, and West. Nor is discrimination confined to members of the Negro race. In some parts of America it is against citizens of Mexican descent, or of Latin American descent, in other parts it is against the Indians. Discrimination is based not merely on race, but on religion and national origin as well. No matter in what invidious form it appears it affects those of white skin as well as those of dark skin, and irreparably harms our national conscience in the process. Basic to our constitutional heritage is a belief in equal protection of the laws. Basic to both the revolutionary spirit of the founding of our Republic as well as the founding of the Republican Party is a deep commitment to the equality of opportunity for all our citizens.

Equality of opportunity for education is a part of the law of this land. Segregated schools are illegal. Yet in America the law is being violated and flouted. Unequal opportunity for American youth in education continues in many places.

There can be no equality of opportunity without equality of education. In 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States acknowledged this truth in its historic desegregation decision, Brown against Board of Education of Topeka, when it stated:

> In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education.

The Court recognized this fact. Both political parties recognize this fact. I am convinced that the American people recognize this fact. Yet much progress remains to be done if we are to yet achieve the goal which the Court set almost a decade ago. That goal was "to effectuate a transition to a racially nondiscriminatory school system, with all deliberate speed."

At the end of the Eisenhower administration desegregation suits were pending which involved at least 39 school districts. But the pace has been slow often because the Government of the United States has not been clothed with either the program or the necessary legal alternatives to encourage progress in this difficult and controversial area.

Extensive hearings on education were held by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights which was established under President Eisenhower and continued under President Kennedy. This Commission reported its findings and recommendations in its 1961 report. It is largely those recommendations which my colleagues and I have offered in legislative form today.

The program which we suggest was specifically pledged in the 1960 Republican platform. There, members of my party pledged themselves first, to "propose legislation to authorize the Attorney General to bring actions for school desegregation in the name of the United States in appropriate cases, as when economic coercion or threat of physical harm is used to deter persons from going to court to establish their rights"; and second, to continue support of President Eisenhower's proposal "to extend Federal aid and technical assistance to schools which in good faith attempted to desegregate." Recognizing that civil rights is a responsibility not only of our States and communities, but is a national problem and responsibility as well, we stated that "the Federal Government should take the initiative in promoting intergroup conferences among those who, in their communities, are earnestly seeking solutions of the complex problems of desegregation—to the end that closed channels of communication may be opened, tensions eased, and a cooperative solution of local problems may be sought."

The Federal Equality of Education Act of 1963 which we present today would provide that following its enactment, all nondesegregated public school districts would have 180 days to file a desegregation plan with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This plan would include a specific timetable whereby with all deliberate speed each class, grade, school, and district within the jurisdiction of a particular school board would be desegregated. First-step compliance would have to be taken by the beginning of the first school year after the plan was submitted.

If the school board violated its obligations in carrying out this plan which they themselves had established, the Attorney General would be authorized to go into the local Federal district court and institute a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief including an application for an injunction in order to secure compliance. The Federal district court, in turn, would have the power to require the school board to adopt and implement the plan submitted under this act, implement another plan if the court thought that appropriate, or issue other orders to "most expeditiously achieve first-step compliance and desegregation with all deliberate speed."

I do not believe in this difficult area that it is enough merely to compel enforcement of the law of the land. Equally important, there must be a program to encourage compliance and to show how compliance can be most effectively attained. Thus, our legislation would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, upon application by the local school board, to make grants for a period of not more than 5 years so that specialists in desegregation problems could be employed, inservice training programs to deal with these problems established, and an improvement occur in the quality of teaching which has been affected by either inferior training or a lack of educational opportunity. Programs to identify talented and able students would also be possible.

School boards and local governments which were not subject to filing desegregation plans would also be eligible if such programs would carry forward the purpose of this legislation. In either case, such grants would have to be matched on a 50–50 basis. A $40 million authorization is provided.

For up to 5 years, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could assist school boards and local non-profit organizations in the training of school personnel and community leaders in techniques which are useful in solving desegregation problems.

In those cases, where a State or local government has withdrawn funds from a school district which is attempting to desegregate and financial assistance is not available from private institutions, it would be possible to secure a Federal loan which would be repaid once funds again became available.

Provision is also made in the bill to authorize the Commission on Civil Rights to collect and disseminate information on desegregation programs and procedures and to establish advisory and conciliation services which would assist local school officials in developing desegregation plans. So that the necessary statistical information be available, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be empowered to determine and publish annually the number and ethnic classification, by State and district, of all those enrolled in public educational institutions.

The various Federal grant-in-aid programs applicable to elementary and secondary education would be reduced if segregation was practiced. The amounts granted under the impacted area programs, which are operated under Public Laws 815 and 874, would be reduced in similar circumstances. Federal grants and loans to institutions of higher education could not be made if discrimination was practiced in enrolling students. A strong prohibition is provided against Federal intervention in the curriculum, administration, or personnel selection of an educational system.

In addition, the Attorney General would be authorized to take such action to protect those officials, parents, children, and others involved in such plans from physical injury, harassment, intimidation, or reprisal. Upon receipt of a signed complaint that an individual is being deprived or about to be deprived of equal protection of the laws and after a determination that commencement of litigation by the individual would either endanger or create danger of economic sanctions against the complainant, his family, counsel, or others, the Attorney General could institute a civil action on behalf of the United States.

Mr. President, it will be recalled that during the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, several of us fought vigorously to retain an effective part III in that act which would give the Attorney General the power to institute the type of civil action for preventive relief which I have just described. We were defeated on that occasion by a vote of 52 to 38. I am proud to recall that a majority of my party—25 Senators, in fact—supported a strong part III. While the 1961 Commission report does not recommend specifically the use of part III authority in the education field, I, and my colleagues who have joined me on this occasion, believe that such authority is essential if any progress is to be made.

In 1961, the Commission on Civil Rights reported that between 1954 and 1961—a period of 7 years—only 775 of 2,837 biracial school districts in the 17 Southern States that required racial segregation in public schools when the Brown decision was rendered, had taken any action to abolish racial segregation. By November 1962, 972 out of 3,058 districts in these 17 States had made a start; 10.5 million white children were in school in this area; 3.3 million Negro children were enrolled, but only 255,367 or 7.8 percent of them were enrolled in schools with white children as of last November.

There seems to be much deliberation and little speed. In the meantime, many in a generation of young Americans continue to suffer. In some areas, the public schools have long been closed. In still others, the confusion and tension which exists is equally intolerable.

America cannot afford the waste of uneducated youth as we enter an era of automation where the jobs will go to those who have completed at least a high school education. It is this situation which we seek to rectify in the legislation we propose today.

If we enact this measure—and I hope we will, and I believe we can—we shall have demonstrated to the entire world that we practice what we preach, and that equal treatment under law and equal opportunity for any young American, regardless of whether he is black or white, Christian or Jew, are constitutional guarantees which the representatives of the American people in Congress intend to see are observed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the full text of the bill and the findings and recommendations of the Commission on Civil Rights pertaining to education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the bill and the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1209) to establish a procedure for adoption and implementation of plans for the desegregation of public schools; to provide financial and technical assistance to facilitate desegregation of public schools; to restrict Federal financial aid for segregated public schools and institutions of higher education; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Equality of Education Act of 1963".

TITLE I—DESEGREGATION PLANS

SEC. 101. For purposes of this title and titles II, III, and IV of this Act—

(a) The term "desegregation" means the assignment of all students to public schools irrespective of their race or color. No assignment system in which race or color is a factor in the initial assignment of students to particular public schools shall be deemed to have achieved desegregation even though placement or other tests or transfers or other options may be available to change such assignment.

(b) The term "public school" means any elementary or secondary educational institution operated by a State, subdivision of a State, or governmental agency within a State, or operated principally or substantially from or through the use of governmental funds, or funds derived from a governmental source.

(c) The term "school board" means any agency or agencies, the members, agents, and employees thereof, and any other person or persons, authorized to determine, control, or direct the institutions, structures, or places at which particular students are assigned to or attend public school.

(d) The term "first-step compliance" means the affording of desegregated education to a substantial number of students at each public school within the jurisdiction of a school board.

(e) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

SEC. 102. Every school board which, on the date of the enactment of this Act, has failed to achieve desegregation of all public schools within its jurisdiction, shall adopt a desegregation plan as provided in section 103 and shall file such plan, within one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, with the Secretary.

SEC. 103. Every desegregation plan required under section 102 shall—

(1) provide for achieving desegregation of all public schools within the jurisdiction of the school board with all deliberate speed, pursuant to a schedule setting forth the time when and the manner in which desegregation is to be achieved for each class, grade, school, and district within the jurisdiction of the school board involved; and

(2) provide for at least first-step compliance not later than the commencement of the first school year which begins after the submission of such plan.

SEC. 104. Every school board required to adopt a desegregation plan pursuant to section 102 shall forthwith implement the same

in accordance with its terms immediately upon its adoption and thereafter continue its implementation in good faith and with all deliberate speed until desegregation is fully achieved in all public schools within its jurisdiction.

SEC. 105. Whenever any school board subject to the requirements of this title loses or relinquishes any of its authority over public schools formerly within its jurisdiction or its authority to assign students to schools within its jurisdiction, the duties prescribed in this title shall immediately devolve upon the person or persons to whom such authority has been transferred or relinquished.

SEC. 106. Wherever, because of overlapping or complementary jurisdiction, more than one school board is subject to the requirements of this title with respect to the same schools or students, the boards concerned shall exercise their obligations hereunder jointly.

SEC. 107. The requirements of this title shall not apply with respect to any public school which, on the date of enactment of this Act, is subject to a court order providing for or approving a desegregation plan for such public school.

SEC. 108 (a) In the event that a school board, or its successor as provided in section 105, subject to the requirements of this title has violated any of the obligations prescribed herein, the Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States in the United States district court for the district wherein such school board or its successor is located or meets, a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief including an application for an injunction or other order, against such school board or its successor. The court in which such action is instituted is authorized, upon finding that there has been a violation of this title, without limitation upon the grant of such other relief as may be appropriate under the circumstances, to require the school board or its successor (1) to adopt and implement a plan of school desegregation pursuant to the requirements of this title, (2) to implement any other school desegregation plan which the court may find appropriate and consistent with the requirements of this title, or (3) to issue such other orders and grant such other relief as will most expeditiously achieve first-step compliance and desegregation with all deliberate speed in the public schools under the jurisdiction of the school board or its successor.

(b) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over proceedings instituted under subsection (a), and shall exercise the same without regard to whether any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law shall have been exhausted, and in a manner calculated to achieve desegregation in accordance with the requirements of this title.

(c) The limitations provided in section 123(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 shall not be applicable to any civil action or other proceeding brought under the provisions of this section.

TITLE II—GRANTS TO SCHOOL BOARDS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS TO FACILITATE DESEGREGATION

SEC. 201. Whenever the Secretary determines that a desegregation plan submitted to him by a school board pursuant to section 102 meets the requirements of title I he is authorized, for the purpose of facilitating the carrying out of any such desegregation plan and upon receipt of application therefor, to make grants to such school board, or to the local government having authority to provide funds for such school board, to assist in meeting the costs he determines to be reasonably necessary for—

(1) employing specialists in problems incident to desegregation, and providing other assistance to develop understanding by parents, schoolchildren, and the general public of desegregation in order to reduce the possibility of community hostility or resistance to desegregation;

(2) providing in-service training to teachers, guidance counselors, and other school personnel for dealing with problems incident to desegregation; and

(3) establishing programs designed to identify and assist teachers who are handicapped in their professional endeavors as a result of inferior training or educational opportunity, and to identify and assist talented and able students who are handicapped in their scholastic efforts as a result of inferior educational opportunity.

SEC. 202. The Secretary is further authorized, for the purpose of facilitating the carrying out of desegregation in accordance with any desegregation plan provided or approved by a court, or of carrying out desegregation by any other school board not subject to the requirements of title I, to make grants to school boards, and local governments, to assist in meeting costs he determines to be reasonably necessary for the purposes enumerated in section 201.

SEC. 203. Each application made for a grant under this title shall provide such detailed breakdown of the measures for which financial assistance is sought as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe. Each grant under this title shall be made in such amounts and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe, except that a grant may be made only on condition that the applicant will, during the period for which the grant is made, expend for the same purpose or purposes for which the grant is made an amount of its own funds equal to the amount of the grant. In determining whether to make a grant, and in fixing the amount thereof and the terms and conditions on which it will be made, the Secretary shall take into consideration the amount available for grants under this title and the other applications which are pending before him; the financial condition of the applicant and the other resources available to it; the nature, extent, and gravity of its problems incident to desegregation; and such other factors as he finds relevant.

SEC. 204. Payments of grants under this title may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and at such intervals as the Secretary may determine. No payment of a grant shall be made to any school board, or to the local government having authority to provide funds for such school board, after the expiration of five years from the date of which a desegregation plan was submitted by such school board under section 102, or, in the case of a school board subject to a desegregation plan provided or approved by a court, after the expiration of five years from the date on which the court provided or approved such desegregation plan, or, in the case of any other school board not subject to the requirements of title I, after the expiration of five years from the date on which a program of desegregation was begun by such school board.

SEC. 205. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year in process on the date of the enactment of this Act and for each succeeding fiscal year, such sums, not exceeding $40,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary for making grants under the provisions of this title.

TITLE III—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE BY SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE WITH RESPECT TO DESEGREGATION PROBLEMS

SEC. 301. The Secretary is authorized, upon receipt of application therefor, to give technical assistance to school boards eligible for assistance under title II, and to local nonprofit organizations in the communities served by such school boards, in training school personnel and community leaders in techniques useful in solving desegregation problems, including training and other assistance in establishing home study programs for academically and culturally handicapped students. Such technical assistance may be given to any such school board, or local nonprofit organization, whether or not such school board or the local government having authority to provide funds for such school board has applied for or received a grant under title II.

SEC. 302. Technical assistance authorized by section 301 may be given by the Secretary by such means as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of such section. No technical assistance shall be given to any school board, or to any local nonprofit organization in the community served by such school board, after the expiration of five years from the date on which a desegregation plan was submitted by such school board under section 102, or, in the case of a school board subject to a desegregation plan provided or approved by a court, after the expiration of five years from the date on which the court provided or approved such desegregation plan, or, in the case of any other school board not subject to the requirements of title I, after the expiration of five years from the date on which a program of desegregation was begun by such school board.

TITLE IV—LOANS TO SCHOOL BOARDS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

SEC. 401. The Secretary is authorized, upon receipt of application therefor, to make loans—

(1) to any school board, if he finds that—

(A) part or all of the funds which would otherwise be available to such school board have been withheld or withdrawn by action of the State or local government because of the desegregation, in whole or in part, of one or more schools under the jurisdiction of such school board; and

(B) such school board has authority to receive and expend the proceeds of such loan; or

(2) to any local government within the jurisdiction of which any school board operates, if he finds that—

(A) part or all of the funds of such local government which would otherwise be available to such school board have been withheld or withdrawn by action of the State because of the desegregation, in whole or in part, of one or more schools under the jurisdiction of such school board; and

(B) such local government has authority to receive such loan and to make the proceeds thereof available for the use of such school board.

SEC. 402. (a) Loans may be made by the Secretary under section 401 to any school board or local government only if he is satisfied that the proceeds of such loans will be used for the same purposes for which the funds withheld or withdrawn would otherwise be used, and that such purposes are necessary for the operation and maintenance of the school system under the jurisdiction of such school board.

(b) Loans may be made by the Secretary under section 401 to any school board or local government only if he is satisfied that funds cannot be borrowed by such school board or local government, as the case may be, from private financial institutions.

SEC. 403. Any loan under section 401 shall be made upon such terms and conditions, not inconsistent with the provisions of this title, as the Secretary deems appropriate. Any such loan shall be repaid within such time as the Secretary prescribes after the funds withheld or withdrawn are restored to the school board or local government concerned, or after funds are available to such school board or local government by borrowing from private financial institutions.

SEC. 404. There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary for making loans under the provisions of this title.

TITLE V—ASSISTANCE BY COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS TO FACILITATE DESEGREGATION

SEC. 501. Part I of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 is amended by inserting after section 104 the following new section:

"ADDITIONAL DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 104A. In addition to the duties imposed by section 104(a), the Commission is authorized—

"(1) to collect and disseminate information concerning programs and procedures used by school districts in the various States to achieve an organization and operation of their schools in accordance with constitional requirements, including data as to the known effects of such programs and procedures on the quality of education and to the costs of such programs and procedures; and

"(2) to establish an advisory and conciliation service to assist local school officials in developing desegregation plans designed to meet constitutional requirements and local conditions, and to attempt to mediate and conciliate disputes between school officials and school patrons, upon the request of either, relating to desegregation of schools, including proposed plans for desegregation and the implementation of desegregation plans already in operation."

TITLE VI—RESTRICTIONS ON FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID FOR SEGREGATED PUBLIC SCHOOLS, COLLEGES, AND UNIVERSITIES

SEC. 601. (a) In the case of any program providing Federal grants-in-aid to the States for elementary or secondary education in public schools, the amount of such grant-in-aid for any fiscal year to any State shall be reduced in accordance with the provisions of this section if the head of the Federal department or agency administering such program determines, at the time of determining the amount of such grant-in-aid for such year, that the public elementary or secondary schools of any local educational agency in such State are operated in such a manner as to segregate pupils of any race or color. If the head of such department or agency determines at such time that all local educational agencies in such State practice such segregation in the operation of such schools, then such grant-in-aid shall only be 50 per centum of the amount it would have been but for the provisions of this section. If the head of such department or agency determines at such time that one or more local educational agencies in such State have initiated a program of desegregation, or do not practice segregation, in the operation of such schools, then such grant-in-aid shall be 50 per centum of the amount it would have been but for the provisions of this section, plus such proportion of the remaining 50 per centum as the number of pupils enrolled in the public elementary and secondary schools of all the local educational agencies which have initiated a program of desegregation, or do not practice segregation, bears to the number of pupils enrolled in all the public elementary and secondary schools in such State.

(b) For the purposes of this section—

(1) the term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State; and

(2) enrollments shall be determined on the basis of the latest reliable figures available to the department or agency head concerned.

SEC. 602. Whenever the Commissioner of Education finds (1) that Federal financial assistance is provided to any local educational agency for free public education, or the construction of school facilities for the provision of such education, under the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress; 20 U.S.C. 631–645), or the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress; 20 U.S.C. 236–244), and (2) that any public elementary or secondary school of any such local educational agency is operated in such a manner as to segregate pupils of any race or color, and such local educational agency has not initiated a program of desegregation in the operation of such schools, the Commissioner shall withhold 50 per centum of the amount of financial assistance such local educational agency would have received but for the provisions of this section.

SEC. 603. (a) The first section of the Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 417; 7 U.S.C. 322, 323), relating to college aid for agricultural and mechanical colleges, is amended by striking out all that follows "students" in the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a period: *Provided*, That any institution which was entitled to receive the benefits of such Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, shall be entitled to the benefits of such Act and subject to its provisions, as much as it would have been if it had been included under the Act of July 2, 1862.

(b) Sections 2, 3, and 4 of such Act (7 U.S.C. 324–326), are each amended by striking out ", or the institution for colored students,", "or other institutions", and ", or of institutions for colored students," each place those terms appear.

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to appropriations made under the Act of August 30, 1890, for fiscal years which begin after June 30, 1963.

SEC. 604. No Federal department or agency shall make any grant or loan to any publicly controlled college or university unless satisfactory proof is submitted to the head of such department or agency that such college or university does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin in accepting students for enrollment.

SEC. 605. Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

TITLE VII—PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUALS FROM BODILY HARM

SEC. 701. The Attorney General is authorized to take such action as may be necessary to protect—

(1) the members of any school board having under its jurisdiction one or more public schools which are desegregated or in which desegregation has been commenced;

(2) the officials, teachers, and other employees of any public school which is desegregated or in which desegregation has been commenced, or of any public school system of which any such public school is a part;

(3) children attending any such public school and the parents of such children; and

(4) any other individual assisting any such member, any such official, teacher, or other employee, or any such child or parent,

from physical injury and from harassment, intimidation, or reprisal by any person or group of persons.

TITLE VIII—ANNUAL SCHOOL SURVEYS

SEC. 801. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall conduct an annual survey to determine the number and ethnic classification of students enrolled in all public educational institutions in the United States. The Secretary shall prepare and publish each year data obtained from each annual survey setting forth the number and ethnic classification of students enrolled—

(1) in all public educational institutions in each State,

(2) in each elementary and secondary public educational institution in each school district, and the totals for each school district, and

(3) in each public institution of higher education in each State.

TITLE IX—PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUALS SEEKING RELIEF FROM DEPRIVATION OF EQUAL PROTECTION OF THE LAWS

SEC. 901. Part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 123. (a) Whenever the Attorney General receives a signed complaint that any person is being deprived of, or is about to be deprived of, the equal protection of the laws, and whenever the Attorney General certifies that, in his judgment, commencement of litigation by such person (1) may create the danger of injury to the person, family, or property of the complainant or of any other person with standing to bring such litigation, or of any counsel retained for purposes of such litigation, or (2) may create the danger of economic sanctions against the complainant or any other person named in (1), the Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action or other proper proceeding for relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order.

"(b) Whenever an action has been commenced in any court of the United States seeking relief from the deprivation of the equal protection of the laws, the Attorney General in the name of the United States may intervene in the action with all the rights of a party thereto if he certifies that, in his judgment, the maintenance of the action may result in any of the injuries or economic sanctions set forth in subsection (a).

"(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to deny, impair, or otherwise affect any right or authority of the Attorney General under existing law to institute or intervene in any action or proceeding.

"(d) In any proceeding under this section the United States shall be liable for costs the same as a private person. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether the party aggrieved shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law."

TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 1001. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impair any remedies already existing for the protection or enforcement of rights guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States, nor to prevent any individual or private organization from acting to enforce or safeguard any constitutional right in any manner now or hereafter permitted by law.

SEC. 1002. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 1003. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION'S FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON EDUCATION

FINDINGS

Need for Federal action to speed desegregation

1. Seven years after the Supreme Court's decision in the school segregation cases (May 17, 1954) only 775 of 2,837 biracial school districts in the 17 Southern States that required racial segregation in the public schools on that date had taken any action to abolish racial segregation. The school districts in which racial segregation is still maintained include all those in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina, all but one in Florida and but one in Louisiana, and a large percentage of those in Arkansas, North Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, and Texas.

2. In many of the school districts where some start has been made, actual desegregation is minimal. In fact only 7 percent of all Negroes enrolled in the public schools in the 17 Southern States attended school with white pupils in 1960–61, whereas 27 percent of the school districts have made some start toward compliance with constitutional requirements.

3. The trend observed in 1957–59 toward desegregation by court order rather than by voluntary action has continued. In 1959–61, 44 school districts initiated desegregation plans; 13 of those acted under court order and another 15 were at least pressured into action by pending suits or orders that could be extended to them.

4. In the Little Rock case the Supreme Court emphasized the duty of all school boards to abolish compulsory segregation in the public schools under their jurisdiction. The adoption of a desegregation plan is a necessary preliminary step. Nevertheless, in recent years such action has depended increasingly upon court orders.

5. Congressional specification of a time limit on the making and implementation of segregation plans would remove all doubt as to the duty of school boards to abolish segregation in their schools even in the absence of a court order and should speed the desegregation process. It would also make clear that enforcement of the commands of the Constitution is the concern not only of the judiciary, but of every branch of Government.

6. Federal funds in support of educational programs are granted to public-school systems which operate schools in a manner that denies pupils equal protection of the laws on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin.

7. Allotting to each State only 50 percent of any authorized grants-in-aid and prorating the remaining 50 percent in proportion to the percentage of pupils in desegregated school districts are compared to the total school population, would recognize the efforts of some States to bring the operation of their school systems into compliance with constitutional requirements and should spur other States to follow the same path. Under a proration formula proportionate effort would be recognized and wholly resistant States would not be totally penalized for their intransigence, since they would receive 50 percent of all authorized funds.

8. In the typical public-school case, several years elapse between the initial court decision and actual admission of Negro pupils on a nondiscriminatory basis. For example, in the following cases where admission was realized in September 1960 the first court decision came on the dates indicated: Houston, September 1958; New Orleans, February 1956; and in cases where admission has been ordered for September 1961; Atlanta, May 1958; Dallas, September 1955.

Need for Federal assistance

9. Even able Negro pupils entering a formerly white school from a segregated school may have problems of adjustment. Desegregation has focused attention on the gap between the scholastic achievement of the average white and the average Negro student of the same age and grade level.

10. Programs have been devised by public school systems and private organizations in northern, western and border States to afford minority group members a fairer chance to compete and to encourage them to aspire to and achieve higher scholastic levels. For the most part such programs have been developed with private financial aid. They have demonstrated that minority group members can achieve higher performance if the educational opportunity offered them is fitted to their particular needs.

11. Most of the programs studied by the Commission stress the minority group child's need for special counseling and guidance, remedial instruction, and stimulus to overcome the effect of past deprivations.

12. School systems might be more willing to undertake desegregation if Federal funds and technical assistance were available to provide the programs needed to close the cultural and academic gap.

13. The Legislature of Louisiana met in extraordinary and regular session almost continually during the school year 1960–61 in an attempt to prevent the desegregation of the New Orleans schools pursuant to the order of a Federal court. Its temporarily successful attempts to deny State funds to Orleans Parish School District, to cut off the salaries of teachers in the desegregated schools, and to prevent the school board from borrowing from the usual commercial sources, although later invalidated by a Federal court, greatly hampered, embarrassed and tended to demoralize the school officials, teachers and other personnel in carrying out their assigned duties throughout the school year.

14. The experience of Orleans Parish School District in 1960–61 shows the need of temporary outside financial assistance when a State attempts to cut off financial aid and credit to a school system trying to desegregate its schools in compliance with a Federal court order. Two other States (Arkansas and South Carolina) have laws for cutting off State aid to desegregating school districts and South Carolina has authorized two counties to cut off local funds.

15. Public education available to all children in all States, and compulsory school attendance for a minimal period averaging age 7 to 16 years, have contributed to the strength and unity of the Nation. The closing of public schools even temporarily, the diversion of State and local funds to tuition grants for private schooling, and the repeal of compulsory school attendance laws, threaten public education and the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

16. No Federal agency is charged with the duty of: disseminating information concerning desegregation plans, problems, and possible solutions; assisting local school officials in formulating plans to meet local conditions and constitutional requirements; or of using its good offices to mediate and conciliate disputes.

Need for Federal protection

17. The Attorney General of the United States in the period 1959–61 dilligently sought to forestall nullification of constitutional principles by State actions; to prevent evasion of Federal court orders; and to provide protection to Negro children assigned to formerly white schools. Nevertheless, disorder accompanied desegregation in New Orleans and white people supporting Federal law and order were not adequately protected by the Federal Government. No member of the rioting crowds in New Orleans was prosecuted for attempting by threats or force to prevent, obstruct, impede, or interfere with the performance of duties under the Federal court order to desegregate the New Orleans schools. (See the Civil Rights Act of 1960.)

18. In New Orleans white pupils attempting to attend desegregated schools and their parents were exposed to threats, loss of employment, harrassment, and persecution. They received no direct aid from the Federal Government and no protection was available to citizens groups working to keep the public schools open even if desegregated. In such situations Federal protection is needed to prevent private or official harassment and reprisals.

Education of dependents of military personnel

19. Many dependents of military personnel assigned to duty in Southern States have had to attend racially segregated public schools particularly in Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina where there are very few on-base schools.

20. No consistent overall policy as to the responsibility of the United States for the education of the children of military personnel in a manner consistent with constitutional principles appears to have been established by the executive branch. In a few places in the last 2 years agreement was reached with local school authorities to admit such children to offbase schools without regard to race; in many more places they still attend racially segregated schools. In one instance Negro plaintiffs had to bring suit in a Federal court to secure admission of their children to a school located on a military base.

21. Congress has recognized that the Federal Government has a particular responsibility to provide suitable education for the children of military personnel on active duty. Racially segregated public schools are in violation of the Constitution and, therefore, are unsuitable for the education of children of military personnel.

Financial aid to public libraries

22. Some public libraries in the 17 Southern States that receive Federal aid under the Library Services Act of 1956 serve whites but not Negroes; in others the segregated services for Negroes are greatly inferior to those for whites.

23. The Library Services Act of 1956 requires that all participating libraries shall provide free service to all residents of the communities they serve and also directs the Commissioner of Education to withhold Federal funds if he find that the administration of a State plan fails to comply with the requirements of the act.

Alleviation of academic handicaps

24. The deprivations that school segregation imposes on minority-group members tend to be perpetuated through inferior segregated colleges, devoted primarily to training graduates for teaching careers for the most part in segregated public schools. These deprivations raise problems not only in connection with the desegregation of school systems (see findings 9 to 11 supra), but in limiting the opportunities of individual minority-group students and teachers.

25. Educational programs as the precollege and graduate levels designed to identify and assist students and teachers of native talent could help to overcome the cumulative deprivations of the past; and would benefit the education system of the Nation.

Higher education

26. Federal support of higher educational institutions that do not comply with constitutional principles is unconscionable and should be terminated. There is no justification for delay in compliance with constitutional requirements in institutions of higher education.

School census by ethnic classification

27. A comprehensive nationwide study of equal protection of the laws in public education requires complete and accurate factual information as to the schools attended by all major ethnic groups, including, for example, Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans, as well as racial groups, such as Negroes and Orientals. An annual headcount in school districts, colleges, and universities

that would not be part of the permanent record of individual students would provide the data needed for evaluation of equal protection in educational institutions without exposing students to the risk of discrimination.

28. The New Rochelle case, affirmed by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and other lower court decisions, make it clear that denial of equal protection of the laws under the 14th amendment does not depend solely upon assignment to school by race. Information about racial segregation in northern schools, viewed in the light of the New Rochelle case and other decisions, indicates that denial of equal protection in public schools on the ground of race is a national, not regional problem.

29. Reliable data showing the ethnic composition of individual public schools and higher educational institutions would be helpful in studying practices in Northern, Western, and border States that may constitute a denial of equal protection of the laws.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Federal action to speed desegregation

Recommendation 1: That the Congress enact legislation making it the duty of every local school board which maintains any public school from which pupils are excluded on the basis of race, to file a plan for desegregation with a designated Federal agency within 6 months after the adoption of such legislation, said plan to call for at least a first step toward full compliance with the Supreme Court's decision in the school segregation cases at the beginning of the following school year, and complete desegregation as soon as practicable thereafter. Further, that Congress direct the Attorney General to take appropriate action to enforce this obligation.

Recommendation 2: That the Congress provide that any and all Federal grants-in-aid to the various States for educational programs in elementary and secondary public schools be allocated so that States wherein all school districts are operated on a nondiscriminatory basis shall receive the full amount computed under the applicable statutory formula; that States wherein no school districts are so operated shall receive only 50 percent of such funds; that States wherein school districts have initiated desegregation programs shall receive 50 percent of such sum plus the same proportion of the remaining 50 percent as the number of pupils enrolled in all school districts in the State which have initiated a program of desegregation bears to the total number of pupils enrolled in all school districts in the particular State which have a biracial school population.

Dissent to recommendation 2 by Commissioner Rankin

Although this recommendation does not provide for the withholding of all funds from public schools, its purpose is similar to that of the Powell amendment and its net effect might be punitive. I do not believe that schoolchildren should be made to suffer for the errors of their elders.

Recommendations requiring the withholding of funds from States which are not completely desegregated would warrant serious consideration only if there were no other way to achieve conformity with the Constitution without penalizing students. Many of the other recommendations in this report are designed to bring about desegregation without harming education.

Thus I dissent from recommendation 2 because I believe it to be unnecessary and potentially punitive.

Recommendation 3: That Congress consider the advisability of adopting measures to expedite the hearing and final determination of actions brought in Federal courts to secure admission to publicly controlled educational institutions without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin.[1]

Federal assistance to desegregating school districts

Recommendation 4: That the Congress enact legislation authorizing a Federal agency, upon request, to provide technical or financial assistance to local school systems at any time within 5 years after the initiation of a desegregation program, or to local citizens' groups attempting to help solve problems arising from such desegregation, in any of the following ways: (1) financial aid to school districts on a 50–50 matching basis for the employment of social workers, or specialists in desegregation problems, or for inservice training programs for teachers or guidance counselors; (2) technical assistance to school districts or citizens' groups to train school personnel or community leaders in techniques useful in solving desegregation problems, including the establishment of home study programs for the academically and culturally handicapped; provided, however, that the desegregation program and its execution shall have been found by the agency administering the program to meet constitutional requirements.

Recommendation 5: That the Congress enact legislation authorizing loans to local school districts from which State or local financial aid has been withdrawn as a result of desegregation, or whose ability to borrow funds from commercial sources has been cut off by State or local action, said loans to be repayable by the borrower upon the receipt of the State or local aid withheld or the restoration of commercial credit.

Recommendation 6: (a) That the President direct, or the Congress enact legislation authorizing, the Commission on Civil Rights, if extended, to serve as a clearinghouse to collect and disseminate information concerning programs and procedures used by school districts to achieve an organization and operation of their schools in accordance with constitutional principles, including data as to the known effects of such programs on the quality of education and the cost thereof; (b) That the Commission further be authorized to establish an advisory and conciliation service to assist local school officials in developing plans designed to meet constitutional requirements and local conditions, and to attempt to mediate and conciliate disputes between school officials and school patrons, upon the request of either, as to desegregation of schools—proposed plans for desegregation, or the implementation of plans already in operation. The Commission agrees that the use of such an advisory and conciliation service should not be a prerequisite to the bringing of legal action in a Federal court nor a ground for delay in the prosecution of a pending action; that its purpose is to obviate the necessity of legal action where possible and, in the case of pending suits, to speed, not delay, a final determination.[2]

Federal protection to school officials and citizens

Recommendation 7: That the President or the Congress direct the Attorney General to take such action as may be appropriate in any case where a school system is operating under a plan to bring it into conformance with the requirements of the 14th amendment, to protect the school board members carrying out such plan, supervisory officials and teachers in school systems executing the orders of such school boards, school children of both races attempting to attend schools affected by the plan and their parents, and citizens helping such children or their parents, from bodily harm, harassment, intimidation, and/or reprisal by officials or private persons.

Education of dependents of military personnel

Recommendation 8: That the President direct the Department of Defense to make a complete survey of the segregated-desegregated status of public schools attended by dependents of military personnel living on-base or in the absence of sufficient housing on-base, living in the vicinity of a base, and report its findings to him. Further, that insofar as such dependents are found to be attending compulsory racially segregated schools, the President instruct the Commissioner of Education to make suitable arrangements for their education in public schools or on-base schools open to all such dependents without discrimination because of color or race.

Aid to public libraries under Library Services Act

Recommendation 9: That the President direct the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to make a survey of the practices of all public libraries receiving Federal financial aid under the Library Services Act of 1956 to determine whether or not they are offering free service to all residents of the community as required by the terms of that law and by the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment of the Constitution. Further, that the Commissioner, as provided in the law granting such Federal aid, withhold Federal funds from States which include under the State plan libraries not serving all residents of the community or not serving all of them in a manner consonant with constitutional principles.

Alleviation of academic handicaps

Recommendation 10: That the Federal Government sponsor in the several States, upon their application therefor, educational programs designed to identify and assist teachers and students of native talent and ability who are handicapped professionally or scholastically as a result of inferior training or educational opportunity.[3]

Higher education

Recommendation 11: That the Federal Government, either by executive or by congressional action, take such measures as may be required to assure that funds under the various programs of Federal assistance to higher education are disbursed only to such publicly-controlled institutions of higher education as do not discriminate on grounds of race, color, religion or national origin.

The Commission agrees that in any such Federal action taken it should be stipulated that no Federal agency or official shall be given power to direct, supervise or control the administration, curricula or personnel of an institution operated and maintained by a State or a political subdivision thereof.[4]

---

[1] Recommendation 3 reaffirms in principle one made by the Commission in its Higher Education Report. At that time the Commission suggested the use of three-judge courts to expedite final determinations in desegregation cases at the college level. Since there are additional ways that desegregation cases may be expedited, the Commission has now framed its recommendation in general terms and expanded it to include desegregation cases at the elementary and secondary school levels as well.

[2] Recommendation 6 is similar to a recommendation made by the Commission in its 1959 report.

[3] Recommendation 10 reaffirms a recommendation made by the Commission in its higher education report.

[4] Recommendation II reaffirms without change one made in the Higher Education Report. Four Commissioners believe, however, that as a matter of sound public policy the same principle should be extended to privately controlled institutions.

School census by ethnic classification

Recommendation 12: That the President or the Congress direct a Federal agency or agencies to conduct an annual school survey to determine the number and ethnic classification of all students enrolled in all public educational institutions in the United States and compile such data by States, by school districts, by individual schools, and by individual institutions of higher education within each State.[5]

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for 7 calendar days, so that Senators who desire to cosponsor it may join with us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am most grateful to the distinguished Senator from California for his stirring, vital presentation of this very critical—indeed, dangerous—problem which confronts our Nation. I fear that people have heard about it for so long that they take too much for granted. The stirring words of the Senator from California will, I hope, arouse many persons from their self-delusion that this problem can continue year after year without the thorough attention which the proposed legislation seeks to give it. I am grateful to the Senator from California for his association in this very great cause.

Mr. President, under the reservation earlier agreed to, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey.

EQUALITY IN EMPLOYMENT

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York. I join with him in an expression of appreciation to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], one of the group of Senators who have joined in this effort. The eloquence of the Senator from California and his sincere fervor are extremely inspiring. We all share equally the concern which he has expressed with regard to education and in regard to the other areas of discrimination, prejudice, and segregation in American life, with which we are dealing collectively this afternoon.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and several other Senators, I introduce three bills which aim at the elimination of discrimination in another of these areas—employment.

Survey after survey has confirmed what has long been obvious. The nonwhite is the last hired and the first fired. The recent Manpower Report of the President contains some telling figures on this point.

According to the report:

> In 1962 nonwhites (nine-tenths of whom are Negroes) made up 11 percent of the labor force and 22 percent of the unemployed. On the average, there were 900,000 nonwhite workers without jobs in 1962, with an unemployment rate of 11 percent, more than twice that for white workers.

The difference is even more striking among adult men. The unemployment rate for the nonwhite adult was 2½ times—9.4 percent—higher than the rate—3.6 percent—for the white worker.

Some of the difference is undoubtedly due to the fact that Negroes are concentrated in occupations—unskilled farm and nonfarm labor, semiskilled production and service jobs—which are especially vulnerable to unemployment.

Limited education and training are also a factor. Discrimination in the educational opportunities available to the nonwhite handicaps him for life, putting him at the bottom of the ladder in the job world. Small wonder that the achievement of equal educational opportunities is a matter of overriding concern to our Negro citizens as is evidenced by our inclusion of this area in the package of proposed legislation which we are introducing this afternoon. But, while it is difficult to overestimate the urgency of rectifying this basic injustice, better educational opportunities are not the whole answer to the problem. With all due allowance for lesser education and training, the fact remains that all too often the Negro finds the door to employment closed to him simply because he is a Negro.

It is at this situation that the three bills I now introduce are aimed.

The first bill would prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry and would establish a Federal Commission on Equality of Opportunity in Employment.

The second bill would establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity to encourage and enforce a policy of equal opportunity in Federal employment and employment under Government contracts and subcontracts, applicable to both employers and labor organizations. It would also withdraw Federal support and approval from apprenticeship and worker training programs which deny individuals equal opportunity to participate therein and from State employment services which are operated on a segregated basis. Finally, it would authorize the National Labor Relations Board to set aside representation elections in which resort is made to appeals to race prejudice by either management or labor.

The third bill would establish a Commission on Fair Employment Practices in the District of Columbia.

The need for each of these measures has been fully demonstrated. They are generally in accord with the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission, as are a great majority of the provisions of the bills which we have joined in introducing this afternoon, recommendations based on painstaking investigation and hearings in virtually every section of the country. They would provide a statutory basis for action long overdue, not to speak of the vindication of the platforms of both the Republican and Democratic political parties.

I ask unanimous consent that the findings and recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission in its 1961 report on employment and the text of my bills be printed in full in the Record at the end of my remarks, and that the bills be permitted to lie at the desk through the close of business on Thursday, April 7, in order to permit other Senators who may wish to cosponsor these measures to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills, findings, and recommendations will be printed in the Record, and the bills will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Case (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1210. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion; color, national origin, or ancestry:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

"SHORT TITLE

"Section 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Federal Equality of Opportunity in Employment Act'.

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS OF POLICY

"Sec. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that, despite the continuing progress of our Nation, the practice of discrimination in employment against properly qualified persons because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is contrary to the American principles of liberty and of equality of opportunity, is incompatible with the Constitution, forces large segments of our population into substandard conditions of living, foments industrial strife and domestic unrest, deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production, endangers the national security and the general welfare, and adversely affects the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States.

"(b) The right to employment without discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is hereby recognized as and declared to be a civil right of all the people of the United States.

"(c) The Congress further declares that the succeeding provisions of this Act are necessary for the following purposes:

"(1) To remove obstructions to the free flow of commerce among the States and with foreign nations.

"(2) To insure the more complete and full enjoyment by all persons of the rights, privileges, and immunities secured and protected by the Constitution of the United States.

"(3) To advance toward fulfillment of the international treaty obligations imposed by the Charter of the United Nations upon the United States as a signatory thereof to promote 'universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.'

"DEFINITIONS

"Sec. 3. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'person' includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers, or any organized group of persons and any agency or instrumentality of the United States, including the District of Columbia, or of any Territory or possession thereof.

"(b) The term 'employer' means a person engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce having in his employ fifty or more individuals; any agency or instrumentality of the United States, including the District of Columbia, or of any Territory or possession thereof; and any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly; but shall not include any State or municipality or political subdivision thereof, or any religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian corporation or association, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, other than a labor organization.

---

[5] Recommendation 12 reaffirms a similar recommendation made by the Commission in its 1959 report. The Commission reemphasizes its position that this recommendation does not contemplate the establishment of school records by race or ethnic classification. The trend toward the elimination of such identification on student records should, in fact, be accelerated.

"(c) The term 'employment agency' means any person undertaking with or without compensation to procure employees or opportunities to work for an employer; but shall not include any State or municipality or political subdivision thereof, or any religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian corporation or association, if no part of the net earnings inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(d) The term 'labor organization' means any organization, having fifty or more members employed by any employer or employers, which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of collective bargaining or of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, terms or conditions of employment, or for other mutual aid or protection in connection with employment.

"(e) The term 'commerce' means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States; or between any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession; or between points in the same State, the District of Columbia, or any Territory or possession but through any point outside thereof.

"(f) The term 'affecting commerce' means in commerce, or burdening or obstructing commerce or the free flow of commerce.

"(g) The term 'Commission' means the Equality of Opportunity in Employment Commission, created by section 6 hereof.

"EXEMPTION

"Sec. 4. This Act shall not apply to any employer with respect to the employment of aliens outside the continental United States, its Territories and possessions.

"UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES DEFINED

"Sec. 5. (a) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

"(1) to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry;

"(2) to utilize in the hiring or recruitment of individuals for employment any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other source which discriminates against such individuals because of their race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry.

"(b) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employment agency to fail or refuse to properly classify or refer for employment, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual because of his race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry.

"(c) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for a labor organization—

"(1) to exclude or to expel from its membership, or otherwise to discriminate against, any individual or any employer because of the race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry of any individual;

"(2) to cause or attempt to force an employer to discriminate against an individual in violation of this section.

"(d) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer, employment agency, or labor organization to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person, because he has opposed any unlawful employment practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding under this Act.

"THE EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IN EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION

"Sec. 6. (a) There is hereby created a Commission to be known as the Equality of Opportunity in Employment Commission, which shall be composed of seven members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of one year, one for a term of two years, one for a term of three years, one for a term of four years, one for a term of five years, one for a term of six years, and one for a term of seven years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of seven years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Commission. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President upon notice and hearing for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

"(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Commission and three members thereof shall constitute a quorum.

"(c) The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noted.

"(d) The Commission shall at the close of each fiscal year report to the Congress and to the President concerning the cases it has heard; the decisions it has rendered; the names, salaries, and duties of all individuals in its employ and the moneys it has disbursed; and shall make such further reports on the cause of and means of eliminating discrimination and such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable.

"(e) Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary of $15,000 a year.

"(f) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet or exercise any or all of its powers at any other place and may establish such regional offices as it deems necessary. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such agents as it may designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States. Any such agent, other than a member of the Commission, designated to conduct a proceeding or a hearing shall be a resident of the judicial circuit, as defined in title 28, United States Code, chapter 3, section 41, within which the alleged unlawful employment practice occurred.

"(g) The Commission shall have power—

"(1) to appoint, in accordance with the Civil Service Act, rules, and regulations, such officers, agents, and employees, as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; attorneys appointed under this section may, at the direction of the Commission, appear for and represent the Commission in any case in court;

"(2) to cooperate with and utilize regional, State, local, and other agencies;

"(3) to furnish to persons subject to this Act such technical assistance as they may request to further their compliance with this Act or any order issued thereunder;

"(4) upon the request of any employer, whose employees or some of them refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of this Act, to assist in such effectuation by conciliation or other remedial action;

"(5) to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this Act and to make the results of such studies available to interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies; and

"(6) to create such local, State, or regional advisory and conciliation councils as in its judgment will aid in effectuating the purpose of this Act, and the Commission may empower them to study the problem or specific instances of discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry and to foster through community effort or otherwise good will, cooperation, and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population, and make recommendations to the Commission for the development of policies and procedures in general and in specific instances. Such advisory and concilation councils shall be composed of representative citizens resident of the area for which they are appointed, who shall serve without compensation, but shall receive transportaton and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C., sec. 73b–2), for persons serving without compensation; and the Commission may make provision for technical and clerical assistance to such councils and for the expenses of such assistance. The Commission may, to the extent it deems it necessary, provide by regulation for exemption of such persons from the operation of title 18 United States Code, sections 281, 283, 284, and 434. Such regulation may be issued without prior notice and hearing.

"PREVENTION OF UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

"Sec. 7. (a) The Commission is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unlawful employment practice as set forth in section 5. This power shall be exclusive, and shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, code, law, or otherwise: *Provided*, That an agreement between or among an employer or employers and a labor organization or labor organizations pertaining to discrimination in employment shall be enforcible in accordance with applicable law, but nothing contained therein shall be construed or permitted to foreclose the jurisdiction over any practice or occurrence granted the Commission by this Act: *Provided further*, That the Commission is empowered by agreement with any agency of any State, Territory, possession or local government, to cede, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed, to such agency jurisdiction over any cases or class of cases, if such agency, in the judgment of the Commission, has effective power to eliminate and prohibit discrimination in employment in such cases.

"(b) Whenever a sworn written charge has been filed by or on behalf of any person claiming to be aggrieved, or a written charge has been filed by a member of the Commission, that any person subject to the Act has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall investigate such charge and if it shall determine after such preliminary investigation that probable cause exists for crediting such written charge, it shall enedavor to eliminate any unlawful employment practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

"(c) If the Commission fails to effect the elimination of such unlawful practice and to obtain voluntary compliance with this Act, or in advance thereof if circumstances warrant, the Commission shall have power to issue and cause to be served upon any person charged with the commission of an unlawful employment practice (hereinafter called the 'respondent') a complaint stating the charges in that respect, together with a notice of hearing before the Commission, or a member thereof, or before a designated

agent, at a place therein fixed, not less than ten days after the service of such complaint. No complaint shall issue based upon any unlawful employment practice occurring more than one year prior to the filing of the charge with the Commission and the service of a copy thereof upon the respondent, unless the person aggrieved thereby was prevented from filing such charge by reason of service in the Armed Forces, in which event the period of military service shall not be included in computing the one-year period.

"(d) The respondent shall have the right to file a verified answer to such complaint and to appear at such hearing in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, to present evidence and to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

"(e) The Commission or the member or designated agent conducting such hearing shall have the power reasonably and fairly to amend any complaint, and the respondent shall have like power to amend its answer.

"(f) All testimony shall be taken under oath.

"(g) The member of the Commission who filed a charge shall not participate in a hearing thereon or in a trial thereof.

"(h) At the conclusion of a hearing before a member or designated agent of the Commission, such member or agent shall transfer the entire record thereof to the Commission, together with his recommended decision and copies thereof shall be served upon the parties. The Commission, or a panel of three qualified members designated by it to sit and act as the Commission in such case, shall afford the parties an opportunity to be heard on such record at a time and place to be specified upon reasonable notice. In its discretion, the Commission upon notice may take further testimony.

"(i) With the approval of the member or designated agent conducting the hearing, a case may be ended at any time prior to the transfer of the record thereof to the Commission by agreement between the parties for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms.

"(j) If, upon the preponderance of the evidence, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that the respondent engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person and other parties an order requiring such person to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees, with or without back pay (payable by the employer, employment agency, or labor organization, as the case may be, responsible for the discrimination), as will effectuate the policies of this Act: *Provided*, That interim earnings or amounts earnable with reasonable diligence by the person or persons discriminated against shall operate to reduce the back pay otherwise allowable. Such order may further require such respondent to make reports from time to time showing the extent to which it has complied with the order. If the Commission shall find that the respondent has not engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such person and other parties an order dismissing the complaint.

"(k) Until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the case may at any time be ended by agreement between the parties, approved by the Commission, for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms, and the Commission may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

"(l) The proceedings held pursuant to this section shall be conducted in conformity with the standards and limitations of sections 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"Sec. 8. (a) The Commission shall have power to petition any United States Court of Appeals or, if the court of appeals to which application might be made is in vacation, any district court within any circuit or district, respectively, wherein the unlawful employment practice in question occurred, or wherein the respondent resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and the order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(b) Upon such filing the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such respondent and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper and to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

"(c) No objection that has not been urged before the Commission, its member, or agent shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances.

"(d) The findings of the Commission with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive.

"(e) If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission, its member, or agent and to be made a part of the transcript.

"(f) The Commission may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings, which findings with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive, and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order.

"(g) The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals, if application was made to the district court or other United States court as hereinabove provided, and by the Supreme Court of the United States as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"(h) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission may obtain a review of such order in any United States court of appeals of the judicial circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person resides or transacts business or the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Commission and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding certified by the Commission, including the pleadings and testimony upon which the order complained of was entered and the findings and order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Commission under subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f), and shall have the same exclusive jurisdiction to grant to the Commission such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

"(i) Upon such filing by a person aggrieved the reviewing court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(j) The commencement of proceedings under this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commission's order.

"(k) When granting appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order, or making and entering a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part an order of the Commission, as provided in this section, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes', approved March 23, 1932 (29 U.S.C., title 29, secs. 101–115).

"(l) Petitions filed under this Act shall be heard expeditiously.

"INVESTIGATORY POWERS

"Sec. 9. (a) For the purpose of all investigations, proceedings, or hearings which the Commission deems necessary of such evidence may be required from any place in the Act, the Commission, or any member thereof, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any investigation, proceeding, or hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent conducting such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

"(b) Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the United States, including the District of Columbia, or any Territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

"(c) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under this Act, any district court within the jurisdiction of which the investigation, proceeding, or hearing is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring him to appear before the Commission, its member, or agent, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

"(d) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing documentary or other evidence in obedience to the subpena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying. The immunity herein provided shall extend only to natural persons so compelled to testify.

"(e) Any member of the Commission, or any agent designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

"(f) Complaints, orders, and other process and papers of the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, may be served either personally or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same setting forth the manner of such service shall be proof of the same, and the return post-office receipt or telegraph receipt therefor when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

"(g) All process of any court to which application may be made under this Act may be served in the judicial district wherein the defendant or other person required to be served resides or may be found.

"(h) The several departments and agencies of the Government, when directed by the President, shall furnish the Commission, upon its request, all records, papers, and information in their possession relating to any matter before the Commission.

"ENFORCEMENT OF ORDERS DIRECTED TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND CONTRACTORS

"Sec. 10. (a) The President is authorized to take such action as may be necessary (1) to conform fair employment practices within the Federal establishment with the policies of this Act, and (2) to provide that any Federal employee aggrieved by any employment practice of his employer must exhaust the administrative remedies prescribed by Executive order or regulations governing fair employment practices within the Federal establishment prior to seeking relief under the provisions of this Act. The provision of section 8 shall not apply with respect to an order of the Commission under section 7 directed to any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or of any Territory or possession thereof, or of the District of Columbia, or any officer or employee thereof. The Commission may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to obtain compliance with such orders.

"(b) The President shall have power to provide for the establishment of rules and regulations to prevent the committing or continuing of any unlawful employment practice as herein defined by any person who makes a contract with any agency or instrumentality of the United States (excluding any State or political subdivision thereof) or of any Territory or possession of the United States, which contract requires the employment of at least fifty individuals. Such rules and regulations shall be enforced by the Commission according to the procedure hereinbefore provided.

"NOTICES TO BE POSTED

"Sec. 11. (a) Every employer, employment agency, and labor organization, as the case may be, shall post and keep posted in conspicuous places upon its premises where notices to employees, applicants for employment, and members are customarily posted a notice to be prepared or approved by the Commission setting forth excerpts of this Act and such other relevant information which the Commission deems appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the Act.

"(b) A willful violation of this section shall be punishable by a fine of not less than $100 or more than $500 for each separate offense.

"VETERANS' PREFERENCE

"Sec. 12. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to repeal or modify any Federal, State, Territorial, or local law creating special rights or preference for veterans.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"Sec. 13. (a) The Commission shall have authority from time to time to issue, amend, or rescind suitable regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act. Regulations issued under this section shall be in conformity with the standards and limitations of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(b) If at any time after the issuance of any such regulation or any amendment or rescission thereof, there is passed a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress stating in substance that the Congress disapproves such regulation, amendment, or rescission, such disapproved regulation, amendment, or rescission shall not be effective after the date of the passage of such concurrent resolution.

"FORCIBLY RESISTING THE COMMISSION OR ITS REPRESENTATIVES

"Sec. 14. The provisions of section 111, title 18, United States Code, shall apply to officers, agents, and employees of the Commission in the performance of their official duties.

"SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

"Sec. 15. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"Sec. 16. This Act shall become effective sixty days after enactment, except that subsections 7 (c) to (l), inclusive, and section 8 shall become effective six months after enactment."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1211. A bill to establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity to encourage and enforce a policy of equal employment opportunity in Federal employment, in employment under Government contracts, and in employment in programs supported or in facilities constructed by Federal grants-in-aid; and for other purposes:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the 'Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1963.'

"TITLE I—COMMISSION ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

"Establishment of the Commission

"Sec. 101. There is hereby established a Commission to be known as the Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity (hereafter in this Act referred to as the 'Commission').

"Membership

"Sec. 102. The Commission shall be composed of—

"(1) the Vice President of the United States, who shall serve as Chairman;

"(2) the Secretary of Labor, who shall serve as Vice Chairman; and

"(3) not to exceed nine additional members who shall be appointed by, and serve at the pleasure of, the President. Not less than one-half of the members appointed under paragraph (3) shall be appointed from private life.

"Organization

"Sec. 103. (a) The Chairman shall preside at meetings of the Commission. The Vice Chairman shall have general supervision and direction of the work of the Commission and of the execution and implementation of the policies adopted by the Commission and of its orders and recommendations made pursuant thereto.

"(b) A quorum of the Commission shall consist of a majority of the members serving at any time.

"(c) The Commission shall meet upon the call of the Chairman and at such other times as may be provided by its rules and regulations.

"(d) The Commission shall adopt such rules and regulations as it determines necessary to govern its proceedings.

"(e) Each member of the Commission who is an officer or employee of the Government in addition to serving as a member of the Commission shall serve without additional compensation. Each member of the Commission appointed from private life shall receive $75 a day when engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Commission. Each member of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of his duties as a member of the Commission.

"(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission shall not be considered as service bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

"General duties

"Sec. 104. It shall be the duty of the Commission—

"(1) to encourage and enforce a policy of equal opportunity for employment in the civilian service of the Government and of equal opportunity for service in the Armed Forces of the United States, including all reserve components thereof; of equal opportunity for employment under Government contracts; and of equal opportunity for employment in programs supported or in facilities constructed, in whole or in part, by grants-in-aid made by the Government;

"(2) to encourage and enforce a policy of equal opportunity in the availability of, and the administration of, all training programs and recruitment and placement services provided by the Government or provided with funds or services furnished, in whole or in part, by the Government;

"(3) to encourage and enforce a policy of equal opportunity for membership in, and participation in the activities of, labor organizations, insofar as such membership or participation affects equal opportunity for employment, and terms and conditions of employment with the Government, with employers under Government contracts or under grants-in-aid made by the Government;

"(4) to encourage and promote educational programs by employer, labor, civic, educational, religious, and other nongovernmental groups in order to eliminate or reduce the basic causes of discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin;

"(5) to perform the duties and functions imposed on it by the provisions of this Act;

"(6) to submit, not later than February 1 of each year, a report to the President and the Congress setting forth its activities during the preceding calendar year and its recommendations, if any, for executive or legislative action, and to submit such special reports as the President or Congress may request or the Commission deems necessary; and

"(7) to perform such other duties and functions as may be prescribed, or delegated to it, by the President.

"Staff

"Sec. 105. (a) There shall be an Executive Vice Chairman of the Commission who shall be appointed by the President and who shall be ex officio a member of the Commission. The Executive Vice Chairman shall assist the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, and the members of the Commission and shall be responsible for carrying out the orders and recommendations of the Commission and for performing such other functions as the Commission may direct. The Executive Vice Chairman shall receive compensation at a rate prescribed by the President, but not in excess of the scheduled rate of basic compensation provided for grade GS–18 in the Classification Act of 1949.

"(b) The Commission is authorized to appoint, subject to the civil service laws and regulations, such other personnel as is necessary to enable it to carry out its functions and duties, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, and is authorized to procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 a day.

"(c) The Commission may procure, by contract or otherwise, the services of public and private organizations and institutions.

"Powers

"Sec. 106. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out its functions and duties, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee may deem advisable, and impose sanctions and penalties as set forth below. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, or such member.

"(b) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued under subsection (a), any district court of the United States or the United States court of any possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is being carried on or within the jurisdiction of which the person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a subcommittee thereof, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under inquiry; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

"(c) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions and duties. Each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or the Vice Chairman, and to cooperate with the Commission and to furnish it such assistance as it may require in carrying out its functions and duties.

"(d) The Commission is authorized to delegate to any officer, agency, or employee in the executive branch of the Government any function of the Commission under this Act, except the authority to promulgate rules and regulations of a general nature.

"(e) The Commission shall adopt such rules and regulations and issue such orders as it deems necessary and appropriate to achieve the purposes of this Act.

"TITLE II—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

"General

"Sec. 201. It shall be unlawful for any department or agency of the Federal Government to discriminate against any Federal employee or applicant for Federal employment, in the terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of race, color, religion, or national origin. Any such person who is aggrieved as a result of discrimination in violation of this section may file a complaint with such department or agency, or with the Commission.

"Enforcement and sanctions

"Sec. 202. (a) Each department and agency shall be primarily responsible for complying with the rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission with respect to nondiscrimination in employment. Each department and agency shall cooperate with the Commission, and furnish the Commission such information and assistance as it may require in the performance of its functions under this title. Each department and agency shall appoint or designate, from among its personnel, an officer or officers to be responsible for assuring equal employment opportunities.

"(b) The Commission may receive and cause to be investigated complaints by employees or prospective employees of a Government department or agency, which allege discrimination contrary to the provisions of this title or the rules and regulations issued herennder. The appropriate department or agency shall report to the Commission what action has been taken or is recommended with regard to such complaints.

"(c) If the Commission so directs, the Department or agency shall cease or desist discriminatory employment practices and take such affirmative action as in the judgment of the Commission shall effectuate the purposes of this Act, including, but not limited to, hiring, reinstatement, or upgrading of employees or the extension of nondiscriminatory terms, conditions, and privileges of employment.

"TITLE III—EMPLOYMENT UNDER GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

"Contract provisions

"Sec. 301. Except in the case of contracts exempted in accordance with section 302, all Government contracting agencies shall include in every Government contract entered into after the effective date of this Act such provisions as the Commission deems necessary and advisable to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

"Exemptions

"Sec. 302. The Commission may, when it deems that special circumstances in the national interest so require, exempt a contracting agency from the requirement of including the provisions prescribed under section 301 in any specific contract, subcontract, or purchase order. The Commission may, by rule or regulation, also exempt certain classes of contracts, subcontracts, or purchase orders (a) where work is to be or has been performed outside the United States and no recruitment of workers within the limits of the United States is involved; (b) for standard commercial supplies or raw materials; or (c) involving less than specified amounts of money or specified numbers of workers.

"Compliance reports

"Sec. 303. (a) Each contractor having a contract containing the provisions prescribed under section 301 shall file, and shall cause each of its subcontractors to file, compliance reports with the contracting agency, which will be subject to review by the Commission upon its request. Compliance reports shall be filed within such times and shall contain such information as to the practices, policies, programs, and employment statistics of the contractor and each subcontractor, and shall be in such form, as the Commission may prescribe.

"(b) Bidders or prospective contractors or subcontractors may be required to state whether they have participated in any previous contract subject to the provisions of this title, and in that event to submit, on behalf of themselves and their proposed subcontractors, compliance reports prior to or as an initial part of their bid or negotiation of a contract.

"(c) Whenever the contractor or subcontractor has a collective bargaining agreement or other contract or understanding with a labor union or other representative of workers, the compliance report shall include such information as to the labor union's or other representative's practices and policies affecting compliance as the Commission may prescribe. To the extent such information is within the exclusive possession of a labor union or other workers' representative and the labor union or representative refuses to furnish such information to the contractor, the contractor shall so certify to the contracting agency as part of its compliance report and shall set forth what efforts he has made to obtain such information.

"(d) The Commission may direct that any bidder or prospective contractor or subcontractor shall submit, as part of his compliance report, a statement in writing, signed by an authorized officer or agent of any labor union or other workers' representative with which the bidder or prospective contractor deals, together with supporting information, to the effect that such labor union's or representative's practices and policies do not discriminate on the grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin, and that the labor union or representative either will affirmatively cooperate, within the limits of its legal and contractual authority, in the implementation of the policy and provisions of this title or that it consents and agrees that recruitment, employment, and the terms and conditions of employment under the proposed contract shall be in accordance with the purposes and provisions of this title. In the event that the union or representative refuses to execute such a statement, the compliance report shall so certify and set forth what efforts have been made to secure such a statement.

"Labor unions

"Sec. 304. (a) The Commission shall use its best efforts, directly and through contracting agencies, contractors, State, and local officials and public and private agencies, and all other available instrumentalities, to cause any labor union, recruiting agency, or other representative of workers which is or may be engaged in work under Government contracts to cooperate with, and to comply in the implementation of, the purposes of this title.

"(b) The Commission may, to effectuate the purposes of subsection (a), hold hearings, public, or private, with respect to the practices and policies of any such labor organization. It shall from time to time submit special reports to the President concerning discriminatory practices and policies of any such labor organization, and may recommend remedial action if, in its judgment, such action is necessary or appropriate. It may also notify any Federal, State, or local agency of its conclusions and recommendations with respect to any such labor organization which in its judgment has failed to cooperate with the Commission, contracting agencies, contractors, or subcontractors in carrying out the purposes of this title.

"Enforcement

"SEC. 305. (a) Each contracting agency shall be primarily responsible for obtaining compliance with the rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission with respect to contracts entered into by such agency or its contractors. All contracting agencies shall comply with the Commission's rules in discharging their primary responsibility for securing compliance with the provisions of contracts and otherwise with the terms of this title and of the rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission. Each such agency shall cooperate with the Commission, and furnish the Commission such information and assistance as it may require in the performance of its functions under this title. Each such agency shall appoint or designate, from among the agency's personnel, compliance officers. It shall be the duty of such officers to seek compliance with the objectives of this title by conference, conciliation, mediation, or persuasion.

"(b) The Commission may itself investigate the employment practices of any Government contractor or subcontractor, or initiate such investigation by the appropriate contracting agency or through the Secretary of Labor, to determine whether or not the contract provisions prescribed under section 301 have been violated. Such investigation shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures established by the Commission, and the investigating agency shall report to the Commission any action taken or recommended.

"(c) The Commission may receive and cause to be investigated complaints by employees or prospective employees of a Government contractor or subcontractor which allege discrimination contrary to the contract provisions prescribed under section 301. The appropriate contracting agency or the Secretary of Labor, as the case may be, shall report to the Commission what action has been taken or is recommended with regard to such complaints.

"Sanctions and penalties

"SEC. 306. (a) In accordance with such rules, regulations, or orders as the Commission may adopt, the Commission or the appropriate contracting agency may:

"(1) Publish, or cause to be published, the names of contractors or unions which it has concluded have complied or have failed to comply with the provisions of this title or of the rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission.

"(2) Recommend to the Department of Justice that, in cases where there is substantial or material violation or the threat of substantial or material violation of the contract provisions prescribed under section 301, appropriate proceedings be brought to enforce those provisions, including the enjoining, within the limitations of applicable law, of organizations, indviduals, or groups who prevent directly or indirectly, or seek to prevent directly or indirectly, compliance with such provisions.

"(3) Recommend to the Department of Justice that criminal proceedings be brought for the furnishing of false information to any contracting agency or to the Commission, as the case may be.

"(4) Terminate, or cause to be terminated, any contract, or any portion or portions thereof, for failure of the contractor or subcontractor to comply with the nondiscrimination provisions of the contract. Contracts may be terminated absolutely or continuance of contracts may be conditioned upon a program for future compliance approved by the contracting agency.

"(5) Provide that any contracting agency shall refrain from entering into further contracts, or extensions or other modifications of existing contracts, with any noncomplying contractor, until such contractor has satisfied the Commission that he has established and will carry out personnel and employment policies in compliance with the provisions of this title.

"(b) Under rules and regulations prescribed by the Commission, each contracting agency shall make reasonable efforts within a reasonable time limitation to secure compliance with the contract provisions prescribed under section 301 by methods of conference, conciliation, mediation, and persuasion before proceedings shall be instituted under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section or before a contract shall be terminated in whole or in part under paragraph (4) of such subsection for failure of a contractor or subcontractor to comply with the contract provisions prescribed under section 301. No order shall be made under paragraph (5) of such subsection debarring a contractor from further Government contracts except after notice and hearing.

"(c) Any contracting agency taking any action authorized by subsection (a) of this section, whether on its own motion, or as directed by the Commission, or under the Commission's rules and regulations, shall promptly notify the Commission of such action or reasons for not acting. Where the Commission itself makes a determination under this section, it shall promptly notify the appropriate contracting agency of the action recommended. The agency shall take such action and shall report the results thereof to the Commission within such time as the Commission shall provide.

"(d) If the Commission so directs, contracting agencies shall not enter into contracts with any bidder or prospective contractor unless the bidder or prospective contractor has satisfactorily complied with the provisions of this title or submits a program for compliance acceptable to the Commission or, if the Commission so authorizes, to the contracting agency.

"(e) Whenever a contracting agency terminates a contract, or whenever a contractor has been debarred from further Government contracts, because of noncompliance with the contract provisions with regard to nondiscrimination, the Commission, or the contracting agency involved, shall promptly notify the Comptroller General of the United States.

"Certificates of merit

"SEC. 307. (a) The Commission may provide for issuance of a United States Government Certificate of Merit to employers or employee organizations which are or may hereafter be engaged in work under Government contracts, if the Commission is satisfied that the personnel and employment practices of the employer, or that the personnel, training, apprenticeship, membership, grievance and representation, upgrading and other practices and policies of the employee organization, conform to the purposes and provisions of this title.

"(b) Any Certificate of Merit may at any time be suspended or revoked by the Commission if the holder thereof, in the judgment of the Commission, has failed to comply with the provisions of this title.

"(c) The Commission may provide for the exemption of any employer or employee organization from any requirement for furnishing information as to compliance with the provisions of this title, if such employer or employee organization has been awarded a Certificate of Merit which has not been suspended or revoked.

"TITLE IV—EMPLOYMENT UNDER GOVERNMENT GRANTS

"Authority for Commission action

"SEC. 401. The Commission is authorized to provide, by rules and regulations, for the application of the provisions of title III of this Act, or as many of such provisions as it deems proper to carry out the purposes of this Act, to recipients of Federal grants-in-aid with respect to employment in programs created or supported or in facilities constructed, in whole or in part, by such grants-in-aid.

"TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO LABOR-MANAGEMENT ACTS

"Amendment to Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959

"SEC. 501. Section 101(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (29 U.S.C. 411(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" '(6) PROTECTION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN.—No labor organization shall refuse membership to, segregate, expel, or otherwise discriminate in terms or conditions of membership against any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin.'

"Amendments to Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947

"SEC. 502. (a) Section 9 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U.S.C. 159), is amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end of subsection (c) thereof:

" '(6) In any election where the Board finds that an employer, a labor organization or its agents, or an employee or group of employees appeals to prejudice on the basis of race, religion, color, or national origin in order to influence the result of such election, the Board is authorized to deny certification of the results thereof.'

"(b) Section 9 of such Act is further amended by adding the following new paragraph at the end of subsection (e) thereof:

" '(3) The Board is authorized to deny certification of the results of any election conducted pursuant to this subsection if the Board finds that an employer, a labor organization or its agents, or an employee or group of employees appeals to prejudice on the basis of race, religion, color, or national origin in order to influence the result of such election.'

"TITLE VI—WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL SUPPORT AND APPROVAL FROM STATE APPRENTICESHIP, WORKER RETRAINING, AND PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WHICH ARE OPERATED AS TO DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF RACE, RELIGION, COLOR, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN

"Apprenticeship programs

"SEC. 601. The Act entitled 'An Act to enable the Department of Labor to formulate and promote the furtherance of labor standards necessary to safeguard the welfare of apprentices and to cooperate with the States in the promotion of such standards', approved August 16, 1937 (29 U.S.C. 50–50b), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

" 'SEC. 5. Where an apprenticeship program is so organized or operated in any State as to discriminate in admission or participation on the basis of race, religion, color, or national origin, the Secretary of Labor shall not—

" '(1) formulate or promote, or cooperate with a State agency of such State or public or private enterprise or association in such State in the formulation or promotion, of any labor standards under the first section of this Act with respect to such apprenticeship program,

" '(2) issue any special certificate under section 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 214), with respect to an apprentice in such apprenticeship program,

" '(3) allow any variation, tolerance, or exemption to or from any of the provisions of the first section of the Walsh-Healey Act (41 U.S.C. 35), with respect to an apprentice in such apprenticeship program, or

" '(4) consider any laborer or mechanic as being in a class of workers in an apprenticeship program and eligible for wage payments as an apprentice, under the first section of the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U.S.C. 276a).'

"Worker retraining programs

"SEC. 602. (a) Whenever the head of any Federal department or agency administering a program of Federal support to the States with respect to occupational retraining programs in the States finds that any such State program is so organized or operated as to discriminate against any unemployed or underemployed person on the basis of race, religion, color, or national origin, the head of the Federal department or agency administering such program of Federal support shall withhold all such Federal support from such State program.

"(b) In the administration of any law which provides Federal retraining programs for unemployed or underemployed persons and which authorizes the utilization of State agencies or programs in carrying out the Federal program, no State agency or program shall be so utilized if the head of the Federal department or agency administering such law finds that such State agency discriminates against any unemployed or underemployed person on the basis of race, religion, color, or national origin, or that such State program is so organized or operated as to discriminate against any unemployed or underemployed person on the basis of race, religion, color, or national origin.

"Public employment programs

"SEC. 603. Section 5 of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the establishment of a national employment system and for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such system, and for other purposes', approved June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U.S.C. 49d), is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

" '(c) Whenever the Secretary shall find that any public employment office of a State is operated in such a manner (1) as to discriminate against any person because of his race, religion, color, or national origin, or (2) as to accept or process employment orders which are discriminatory on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin, the Secretary shall not issue any certificate to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to such State for the administration of its public employment offices.'

"TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Appropriations

"SEC. 701. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"Effect on State laws

"SEC. 702. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to exempt or relieve any person from any liability, duty, penalty, or punishment provided by any present or future law of any State or political subdivision of a State, other than any such law which purports to require or permit the doing of any act prohibited by this Act.

"(b) Where there is a State or local agency which has effective power to eliminate and prohibit discrimination in employment in cases covered by this Act, and the Commission determines the agency is effectively exercising such power, the Commission shall seek written agreements with the State or local agency under which the Commission shall refrain from bringing a civil action in any cases or class of cases referred to in such agreement. The Commission shall rescind any such agreement when it determines such agency no longer has such power, or is no longer effectively exercising such power.

"Effective date

"SEC. 703. This Act shall become effective ninety days after the date of its enactment."

To the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1212. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment in the District of Columbia because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'District of Columbia Fair Employment Practices Act'.

"FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds that denial of, or discrimination in, employment on account of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is contrary to the American ideal of equality of opportunity for all and is a major contributing cause to the unemployment of certain youth in the District of Columbia; and the Congress further finds that the alleviation of youth unemployment in the District of Columbia will materially reduce juvenile delinquency and youth crime therein.

"(b) The Congress declares that the succeeding provisions of this Act are necessary to prevent denial of, or discrimination in, employment in the District of Columbia because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry, and thereby to afford all youth equality of opportunity for employment in the District of Columbia.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

"(a) The term 'person' means any individual, partnership, corporation, or association.

"(b) The term 'employer' means a person having in his employ ten or more individuals; but shall not include any religious, sectarian, charitable, fraternal, social, or educational organization, other than a labor organization, if no part of the net earnings of such organization inures to the benefit of any individual or of any organization not excluded by this subsection.

"(c) The term 'employment agency' means any person undertaking with or without compensation to procure employees or opportunities to work for an employer; but shall not include any religious, sectarian, charitable, fraternal, social, or educational organization, if no part of the net earnings of such organization inures to the benefit of any individual or of any organization not excluded by this subsection.

"(d) The term 'labor organization' means any organization, having ten or more members employed by any employer or employers, which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of collective bargaining or of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, terms or conditions of employment, or for other mutual aid or protection in connection with employment.

"(e) The term 'Commission' means the District of Columbia Fair Employment Practices Commission created by section 5 hereof.

"UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

"SEC. 4. (a) It shall be an unlawful employment practice in the District of Columbia for an employer to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

"(b) It shall be an unlawful employment practice in the District of Columbia for an employment agency to fail, or to refuse, to classify properly or refer for employment any individual because of his race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

"(c) It shall be an unlawful employment practice in the District of Columbia for a labor organization to cause or attempt to force an employer to discriminate against any individual in violation of this Act.

"(d) It shall be an unlawful employment practice in the District of Columbia for any employer, employment agency, or labor organization to refuse to hire, to discharge, to expel, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual because he has opposed any unlawful employment practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding under this Act.

"THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION

"SEC. 5. (a) There is hereby created as an independent agency of the government of the District of Columbia a commission to be known as the District of Columbia Fair Employment Practices Commission, which shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of one year, one for a term of two years, one for a term of three years, one for a term of four years, and one for a term of five years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of five years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Commission. Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

"(b) The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noted.

"(c) The Commission shall, at the close of each fiscal year, submit to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for transmission by them to the Congress and to the President a report concerning the cases it has heard; the decisions it has rendered; the names, salaries, and duties of all individuals in its employ; and the moneys it has disbursed. The Commission may, from time to time, make such further reports on the causes of, and the means of eliminating, discrimination, and such recommendations for further legislation, as may appear desirable.

"(d) The Chairman of the Commission shall receive a salary of $18,500 a year. Each other member of the Commission shall receive a salary of $18,000 a year.

"(e) The Commission shall, subject to the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, have power to appoint such officers, agents, and employees as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Attorneys appointed under this section may, at the direction of the Commission, appear for and represent the Commission in any case in court.

"PROCEEDINGS BEFORE COMMISSION

"SEC. 6. (a) Whenever any individual believes that any employer, employment agency, or labor organization in the District of Columbia has engaged in any unlawful employment practice under this Act with respect to that individual, he may file a sworn written charge with the Commission in such manner and containing such information as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall by regulation prescribe. No charge based upon an unlawful employment practice occurring more than one year prior to the filing thereof shall be received by the Commission under this Act, unless the individual aggrieved thereby was prevented from filing such charge by reason of service in the Armed Forces, in which event the period of such service shall not be included in computing the one-year period.

"(b) Whenever a sworn written charge has been filed pursuant to this Act, the Commission shall investigate the alleged unlawful employment practice; and if the Commission shall determine that probable cause exists for crediting the written charge, it shall endeavor to eliminate such practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion.

"(c) If the Commission, acting pursuant to subsection (b), fails to eliminate an alleged unlawful employment practice under this Act, or in advance thereof if circumstances warrant, the Commission shall issue and cause to be served upon any person charged with the Commission of an unlawful employment practice (hereinafter in this section called the respondent) a complaint stating the practice charged. The respondent shall have the right, within ten days after service of the complaint, to file with the Commission a sworn written answer thereto.

"(d) The Commission shall, upon reasonable notice to the individual aggrieved by an alleged unlawful employment practice and to the respondent, holding a hearing on each complaint at a time not less than thirty days after the service of the complaint upon the respondent. The hearing may, at the direction of the Commission, be conducted by a single member thereof. The individual aggrieved and the respondent shall have the right to appear at such hearing in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, and to present evidence, and to examine and cross-examine witnesses. All testimony shall be taken under oath. Any member of the Commission may administer such oath and may examine any witness.

"(e) The Commission, or any member thereof, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any hearing under this Act. In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under this Act, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, upon application by the Commission, shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring him to appear before the Commission, or before any single member thereof conducting a hearing under this Act, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the hearing.

"(f) At the conclusion of a hearing conducted by a single member of the Commission, the members shall transfer the entire record thereof to the Commission, together with his findings of fact and recommendations for disposition of the charge. The Commission, before taking final action on such findings and recommendations, shall afford the individual aggrieved and the respondent an opportunity to be heard thereon at a time and place to be specified upon reasonable notice.

"(g) If the Commission shall find that the respondent engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on the respondent an order requiring the respondent to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including the hiring or reinstatement of the individual discriminated against, as may be necessary to eliminate the practice. Any person reinstated pursuant to this subsection may, in the discretion of the Commission, be awarded backpay (payable by the employer, employment agency, or labor organization, as the case may be, responsible for the discrimination): *Provided*, That interim earnings or amounts earnable with reasonable diligence by the individual discriminated against shall operate to reduce the backpay otherwise allowable. Such order may further require the respondent to make reports from time to time showing the extent to which it has complied with the order. If the Commission shall find that the respondent has not engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on the individual who filed the charge an order dismissing the complaint.

"(h) Complaints, orders, and other process and papers of the Commission, or of any member thereof, may be served either personally or by registered or certified mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual making service, setting forth the manner of such service, shall be proof of service; and the return post office receipt or telegraph receipt, when service is by registered or certified mail or by telegraph, shall be proof of service. Witnesses summoned before the Commission, or any member thereof, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

"(i) At any time prior to the issuance of an order by the Commission under subsection (g), a proceeding under this section may be terminated by agreement between the individual aggrieved and the respondent, with the approval of the Commission.

"(j) All proceedings held pursuant to this section shall conform with sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall have power to petition the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for the enforcement of a final order to the Commission and for appropriate temporary relief, and shall in conjunction therewith file in the court a certified transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and order of the Commission. Upon the filing of such a petition the court shall cause a copy thereof to be served upon the person to whom the final order of the Commission was issued, and thereupon shall have jurisdiction to grant such temporary relief as it deems just and proper and to make and enter an order enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

"(b) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission may obtain a review of such order in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside. Upon the filing of such a petition the court shall cause a copy thereof to be served upon the Commission, and thereupon the Commission shall file in the court a certified transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which the order complained of was entered and the findings and order of the Commission. Upon the filing of the entire record, the court shall have jurisdiction to grant such temporary relief as it deems just and proper and to make and enter an order enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

"(c) The findings of the Commission with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive.

"(d) If either party to any proceeding under this section shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, or any member thereof, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission or member and to be made a part of the transcript. The Commission may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed; and it shall file with the court such modified or new findings and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order.

"(e) All actions taken by the courts under this Act shall conform with section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act. When granting appropriate temporary relief or making and entering an order as provided in this section, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes', approved March 23, 1932 (U.S.C., title 29, secs. 101–115).

"NOTICES TO BE POSTED

"SEC. 8. (a) Every employer, employment agency, and labor organization, as the case may be, shall post and keep posted in conspicuous places upon its premises where notices to employees, applicants for employment, and members are customarily posted a notice to be prepared or approved by the Commission setting forth excerpts of this Act and such other relevant information which the Commission deems appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the Act.

"(b) A willful violation of this section shall be punishable by a fine of not less than $100 or more than $500 for each separate offense.

"RULES AND REGULATIONS

"SEC. 9. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have authority to issue from time to time such rules and regulations as they may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"VETERANS' PREFERENCE

"SEC. 10. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to repeal or modify any law of the District of Columbia or any law of the United States creating special rights or preference for veterans.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 11. This Act shall become effective ninety days after the date of its enactment."

The findings and recommendations presented by Mr. CASE are as follows:

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS REPORT NO. 3, 1961, ON EMPLOYMENT

FINDINGS

General

1. Although the occupational levels attained by Negroes have risen sharply during the past 20 years, Negro workers are still disproportionately concentrated in the ranks of the unskilled and semiskilled in both private and public employment. They are also disproportionately represented among the unemployed because of their concentration in unskilled and semiskilled jobs—those most severely affected by both cyclical and structural unemployment—and because Negro workers often have relatively low seniority. These difficulties are due in some degree to present or past discrimination in employment practices, in educational and training opportunities, or both.

2. Directly or indirectly, Federal funds create employment opportunities for millions in the civilian and military establishments of the Federal Government and in employment by Government contractors and grant-in-aid recipients. In addition, Federal funds provide training opportunities and placement services that directly affect employment opportunities. A policy of equal opportunity for all regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin has been declared with respect to some programs in each of these areas of Federal involvement in employment,

but that policy has yet to be made consistent or thoroughly effective.

Enforcement of Federal policy of equal employment opportunity

3. The principal enforcement agency for Federal policy in this field is the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. This Committee has already taken steps to overcome obstacles encountered by the former Committee on Government Employment Policy and the Committee on Government Contracts in administering past programs of nondiscriminatory employment. Among projects which could contribute substantially to the effectuation of the Federal nondiscrimination program are the following:

(a) Regular surveys of all Federal employment, in both the civilian and military establishments (including members of Reserve components), to show current patterns of minority group employment, participation in training programs, and methods used to recruit for, and fill, jobs;

(b) Appointment of full-time employment policy officers in all executive departments and major agencies, and the appointment of full-time contracts compliance officers in the principal contracting agencies, all to be thoroughly trained. by or under the supervision of the President's Committee, in the objectives, problems, and techniques for effectuating the Federal policy of nondiscriminatory employment. (In the largest agencies with substantial field establishments, the appointment of specially trained regional deputy employment policy officers and deputy contracts compliance officers may also be required.)

(c) Expansion of the program of the former Committee on Government Employment Policy of conducting conferences in various locations with local administrators, deputy employment policy officers, and line supervisers to explain the Federal program of nondiscriminatory employment and discuss the problems involved and the techniques for overcoming them;

(d) Establishing and maintaining a centralized list of current Government contractors and circulating it regularly to State employment offices;

(e) Reaffirming that, when Government contractors completely delegate to labor organizations the power of hiring, or of determining admission to apprenticeship training programs or other terms and conditions of employment, they will be held responsible for the discriminatory acts of the unions;

(f) Requesting the Secretary of Labor to require State employment offices to report to the Committee all discriminatory job orders placed by Federal agencies and Government contractors.

4. The Committee's potential effectiveness is, however, limited. Established only by Executive action, it is necessarily limited in budget and legal authority. Its jurisdiction over labor unions is indirect and tenuous. Its authority over employment created by grants-in-aid and over federally assisted training programs and recruitment services is not clearly defined.

Employment created by grants-in-aid

5. Grants-in-aid and contracts are similar in all pertinent respects, yet there is no uniform Federal policy requiring nondiscrimination in employment created by grant programs. Where such requirements are imposed, they have been undertaken on an agency-by-agency basis with little or no publicity or enforcement machinery.

6. In the absence of a uniform policy imposed from above, agency administrators, concerned primarily with carrying out the substance of their programs, give little consideration to the matter of nondiscriminatory employment. Many agencies are reluctant to take the initiative for fear of jeopardizing their appropriations.

7. It is not clear that unemployment under grants-in-aid is within the scope of Executive Order 10925, which established the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity and specifically prohibits discrimination in employment under Government contracts.

Armed Forces

8. Although the Armed Forces Reserves are theoretically subject to Executive Order 9981, providing for equality of opportunity in the armed services, there continue to be segregated Reserve units in some States and units in other States which completely exclude Negroes.

9. In some States, Negroes are excluded from National Guard units; in others segregated units are maintained.

10. Although the National Guard is financed principally with Federal funds and trains under the direction of the Department of Defense, the Federal Government has taken no action to require desegregation of National Guard units.

11. Current statistics regarding the representation of minority groups in the Armed Forces, the National Guard and the Reserves are not generally available. Since 1955 the Department of Defense has taken the position that integration in the military is an accomplished fact and that no public interest can be served by future reports on the subject.

Training and recruitment

12. When new opportunities in training or employment are made available to Negroes, there is often a dearth of qualified Negro applicants. Part of the problem is a lack of applicants resulting from the unwillingness of many Negroes to apply for jobs that have traditionally been closed to them or a lack of knowledge of such new openings. Another facet of the problem is a lack of adequately trained Negroes resulting from a shortage of training opportunities or lack of motivation on the part of Negroes to take training for jobs that may not be available to them.

13. Through the grant of substantial funds, the Federal Government participates in many training and recruitment programs. No program designed to eliminate discrimination in employment can be completely effective unless it includes efforts to eliminate discrimination in recruitment and training facilities.

14. Vocational training received through the public schools, and made possible by Federal grant funds, is the principal means of acquiring many of the basic industrial skills. The ability of Negroes to obtain employment in skilled jobs is often determined by the availability of these training programs.

15. Current policy of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, conditioning admission to vocational classes on an applicant's "chances of securing employment," tends to perpetuate discriminatory employment practices and is economically wasteful. Training opportunities for Negroes, limited to training for jobs currently available in the community rather than for future employment opportunities or opportunities in other communities, may be determined to a large extent by discriminatory hiring and referral practices of local employers and labor unions. Moreover, the jobs traditionally open to Negroes are generally the ones in which there is a growing surplus of labor. In the newer technical skills, on the other hand, where training is not generally available to Negroes, openings for qualified applicants are constantly increasing.

16. Distributive and part-time education are often denied to Negroes because they cannot obtain the employment required for these programs. Here again, discriminatory employment practices determine the availability of federally supported training.

17. Apprenticeship training could be an important means of fulfilling the increasing demand for skilled workmen and of helping minority groups emerge from their traditionally low economic status. However, present apprenticeship training programs are not training even enough craftsmen to replace those who retire, and Negroes constitute a disproportionately small minority of the inadequate number of workers being trained.

18. The nationwide paucity of participation by Negroes in apprenticeship training programs is caused by lack of qualified applicants and also by discriminatory practices of both labor organizations and employers, who control admission to such programs.

19. To overcome the lack of qualified minority group applicants when new job opportunities are opened, affirmative action is often necessary to encourage them to take the necessary training, to inform them of training and employment opportunities, and, by appointing or employing them in nontraditional jobs, to demonstrate that employment opportunities do exist.

20. Although the Federal Government bears the entire cost of administering State employment offices, it has done little to assure that the policies of the program—to encourage merit employment and to discourage employment discrimination—are being effectuated.

21. Federal money is being used to perpetuate discrimination in many State employment offices where segregated offices or services are maintained, employment office personnel are hired on a discriminatory basis, and where discriminatory job orders are accepted and filled or where nondiscriminatory orders are processed on a discriminatory basis.

22. Present methods of determining State employment office budgets, based primarily on the number of job placements made, encourage employment discrimination and discourage the "selling" of merit employment.

Labor organizations

23. The practices and policies of labor organizations are often vital to equality of employment opportunity. Internal union policies, governing membership and job referrals, are particularly important to the skilled craft unions, especially in the building trades, where membership is usually a condition of employment and a large proportion of hiring is done directly through the unions. External policies, expressed in collective bargaining, affect equal opportunity through the unions' power to negotiate terms and conditions of employment.

24. Membership and job referral practices of craft unions and hiring practices in the building and construction trades have hampered the effectiveness of the Government-contract nondiscrimination policy with respect to construction work undertaken for the Federal Government.

25. As the craft unions generally control admission to apprenticeship training programs, racial discrimination policies also operate to exclude Negroes from these programs.

26. Existing civil rights machinery within the AFL–CIO has not eliminated discriminatory practices and policies of some local unions.

27. Existing Federal law has little impact on the discriminatory practices of labor organizations. No law specifically prohibits unions from discriminating on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin in determining membership qualifications or job referrals.

28. Federal law does impose a duty of fair representation upon unions and presently proscribes discrimination in initial employment based on membership or nonmembership in a union. The NLRB, however, the Federal agency authorized to administer these provisions, has not effectively enforced

the duty of fair representation nor has it had a significant impact on the hiring and referral practices in the building and construction trades.

29. Although the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity has authority to deal with union discrimination, it lacks direct jurisdiction over labor organizations and the authority it has is limited to trade union practices affecting employment on Government contracts.

RECOMMENDATIONS

General

Recommendation 1: That Congress grant statutory authority to the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity or establish a similar agency—

(a) To encourage and enforce a policy of equal employment opportunity in all Federal employment, both civilian and military, and all employment created or supported by Government contracts and Federal grant funds.

(b) To promote and enforce a policy of equality of opportunity in the availability and administration of all federally assisted training programs and recruitment services.

(c) To encourage and enforce a policy of equal opportunity with respect to membership in or activities of labor organizations affecting equal employment opportunity or terms and conditions of employment with employers operating under Government contracts or Federal grants-in-aid.

Armed Forces

Recommendation 2: That the President issue an Executive order providing for equality of treatment and opportunity, without segregation or other barriers, for all applicants for or members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, including the National Guard and student training programs, without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin; and directing that an immediate survey, and report thereon, be made regarding Negro membership in the Armed Forces, the Armed Forces Reserves, the National Guard, and student training programs, including data, where appropriate, on branch of service, rank, type of job or assignment, years of service, and rates of pay.

Employment under grant-in-aid projects

Recommendation 3: That the President issue an Executive order making clear that employment supported by Federal grant funds is subject to the same nondiscrimination policy and the same requirements as those set forth in Executive order 10925 applicable to employment by Government contractors.

Training and recruitment

Recommendation 4: That Congress and the President take appropriate measures to encourage the fullest utilization of the Nation's manpower resources and to eliminate the waste of human resources inherent in the discriminatory denial of training and employment opportunities to minority group members by—

(a) Expanding and supplementing existing programs of Federal assistance to vocational education and apprenticeship training.

(b) Providing for retraining as well as training and for funds to enable jobless workers to move to areas where jobs are available and their skills are in demand.

(c) Providing that, as a condition of Federal assistance, all such programs be administered on a nondiscriminatory, nonsegregated basis; and

(d) Amending present regulations regarding admission to vocational classes to provide that admission be based on present and probable future national occupational needs rather than, as presently interpreted, on traditional and local needs and opportunities.

Recommendation 5: That, in order to encourage the fullest utilization of the Nation's manpower resources, Congress enact legislation to provide equality of training and employment opportunities for youths (aged 16 to 21), and particularly minority group youths, to assist them in obtaining employment and completing their education—

(a) Through a system of federally subsidized employment and training made available on a nondiscriminatory basis.

(b) Through the provision of funds for special placement services in the schools in connection with part-time and cooperative vocational education programs.

Recommendation 6: That the President direct that appropriate measures be taken for the conduct, on a continuing basis, of an affirmative program of dissemination of information—

(a) To make known the availability on a nondiscriminatory basis of jobs in the Federal Government and with Government contractors.

(b) To encourage all individuals to train for and apply for such jobs, and particularly those jobs where there is currently a shortage of qualified applicants.

Recommendation 7: That steps be taken, either by Executive or congressional action, to reaffirm and strengthen the Bureau of Employment Security policy, in rendering recruitment and placement services, of encouraging merit employment and assisting minority group members in overcoming obstacles to employment and in obtaining equal job opportunities. In this connection, consideration should be given to changing the method utilized to determine Federal appropriations to State employment offices, presently keyed primarily to the number of job placements made, to reflect other factors (such as the greater degree of difficulty and time involved in placing qualified minority group workers), so that the budgetary formula used will encourage rather than discourage referral on a nondiscriminatory basis. In addition, regulations and statements of policy with respect to the operation of State employment offices should be reexamined to insure that such regulations and statements conform to the overall USES policy of discouraging employment discrimination and encouraging merit employment.

Recommendation 8: That the President direct the Secretary of Labor to grant Federal funds for the operation of State employment offices only to those offices which offer their services to all, on a nonsegregated basis, and which refuse to accept and/or process discriminatory job orders.

Labor organizations

Recommendation 9: That Congress amend the Labor-Management and Disclosure Act of 1959 to include in title I thereof a provision that no labor organization shall refuse membership to, segregate, or expel any person because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from New Jersey for his magnificent and sincere speech. I value greatly our partnership in this most important effort. I know of no one who has spoken to this issue with the sincerity and the depth of almost religious conviction that the Senator from New Jersey has. Ever since he and I served in the House of Representatives—going back to 1947—it has been my great pleasure and personal honor to be associated with him in this civil rights struggle, about which—unfortunately—both of us have seen so little done during all these years.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from New York. I warmly reciprocate what he has said about our association. I certainly hope that, as he has stated, what we now urge will not be the subject of inaction, as has occurred so often in the past.

Mr. JAVITS. The fact that eight Senators have joined and the fact that many Members of the other body will be joining in the administration's bills constitute a good augury in regard to what will occur. So I believe we now have the answer; and I believe it is now more a matter of implementation, rather than of discovering the key which will unlock this door—and more so now than ever before. I am especially grateful to the Senator from New Jersey for our long and honorable association in connection with this matter.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], who will speak on the same measures.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I rise to introduce, on behalf of Senators Case, Fong, Javits, Keating, Kuchel, Beall, and myself, two bills dealing with civil rights in the field of housing.

I am happy to report that since early 1962, when I introduced legislation to implement the Civil Rights Commission's report on housing, several steps have been taken to reduce discrimination in housing and to provide relocation assistance to low-income families displaced by the operation of the Federal highway program. However, the scope of these measures has been limited; and my present proposals are meant to correct this.

In November 1962, the President issued an Executive order prohibiting discrimination in housing built, purchased, or financed with Federal assistance. This was a step in the right direction, but the step was too short, I fear. The order failed to cover loans and mortgages handled by federally regulated financial institutions. My first bill calls for a 1-year study by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, to determine the need for further antidiscrimination legislation or Executive action in this area and in the administration of the existing urban renewal program.

In 1961 the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights called on Federal supervisory agencies to exert their full authority in guaranteeing equal access to home mortgage credit. However, as of today, the four Federal agencies which supervise financial institutions—the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—have not required that the financial institutions they supervise incorporate in their policies explicit nondiscrimination clauses. Similarly, the Urban Renewal Administration has not effectively insisted upon nondiscrimination in connection with the program it administers.

The present administration's approach to the problem of housing discrimination has been too much a piecemeal operation. What is needed is an implementation of all the Civil Rights Commission's recommendations.

My second bill deals with the Federal highway program, which has been displacing a large number of low-income families. These families need relocation assistance, but there are indications that the assistance they are getting is inadequate. Since March 1962, when I first pointed out this inequity, a bill was passed to authorize payments to individuals, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations displaced by land acquisitions under Federal highway programs. But more than this is needed. The present program gives no assurance that decent, safe, and sanitary housing will be available.

I recommend that Congress consider amending the Highway Act of 1956 so that this program include assurance of decent, safe, and sanitary housing to all eligible persons.

I ask, Mr. President, that the legislation that I am introducing today be printed and made part of the Record; that the two bills lie on the table for 1 week, so that other Senators may join as cosponsors; and that the findings and recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission dealing with Federal supervision of mortgage lending institutions, urban renewal, and the Federal highway program be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill and resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and resolution, findings, recommendations, and program will be printed in the Record, and the bill and resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The bill (S. 1213) to assure decent, safe, and sanitary housing to families displaced by construction of highways forming a part of the Interstate System, introduced by Mr. Scott (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 133 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end of subsection (b) thereof the following new section:

"(c) Each agreement entered into under section 110 after the date of the enactment of this section between the Secretary and a State highway department for the construction of a project on the Interstate System shall contain clauses providing that the State shall

"(1) assure that there are, or are being provided, in areas within the locality of such project not generally less desirable than the area of such project in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of individuals and families displaced by the construction of such project, decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings, equal in number to the number of such displaced individuals and families, which are available to such displaced individuals and families and are reasonably accessible to their places of employment;

"(2) make relocation payments to eligible persons displaced by the construction of such project for their reasonable and necessary moving expenses.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to fulfill his obligations under agreements entered into under section 110 to reimburse the States for relocation payments to displaced eligible individuals made pursuant to the requirements of paragraph (2) of subsection (c)".

(b) Subsection (c) of Section 133 is hereby relettered subsection (d) and is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Secretary shall approve such relocation payments as may be made by a State highway department, or a local public agency acting as an agent for the State highway department for this purpose, to eligible persons for their reasonable and necessary moving expenses caused by their displacement from real property acquired for such project and shall reimburse the State for the full costs of relocation payments made pursuant to the requirements of paragraph (2) of subsection (c)".

(c) Subsections (d) and (c) of Section 133 are hereby relettered subsections "(e)" and "(f)" respectively.

The resolution (S. Res. 118) submitted by Mr. Scott (for himself and other Senators), was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to make a full and complete study for the purpose of determining—

(1) the feasibility and desirability of legislation requiring those financial institutions which are engaged in making real estate loans secured by residential property, and which are regulated or supervised by a Federal agency or instrumentality with respect to their lending practices, to make such loans in a manner which does not deny home mortgage credit to any person solely because of his race, creed, or color; and

(2) the need for additional legislation to insure the existence of decent, safe, and sanitary housing adequate to meet the needs of families displaced from urban renewal projects, and to facilitate the relocation of such families into such housing.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1963, through January 31, 1964, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided,* That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1964.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The findings, recommendations, and program were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Findings of U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

HOUSING

Federal supervision of mortgage lending institutions

14. Among the four Federal agencies that supervise financial institutions, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System acknowledge—at least implicitly—that racial and religious discrimination in mortgage lending does occur among the institutions they supervise. The Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation disclaim any knowledge of such discrimination.

15. All four of these Federal agencies appear to agree that outright discrimination—the denial of mortgage credit on the basis of race or religion alone—is improper.

16. All four of these Federal agencies enjoy prestige among the institutions they supervise, and much of their supervisory authority is exerted effectively through essentially informal means.

17. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board is the only one of these four Federal agencies that has adopted a policy opposing discrimination. It has indicated that its examiners will inquire into possible discrimination on the part of member savings and loan associations, and that where discrimination is found, countermeasures will be taken. There appears to be no good reason why the other three agencies should not take similar action.

18. None of these four agencies has attempted to require nondiscriminatory mortgage loan policies on the part of the financial institutions they supervise. There is a great need for these Federal supervisory agencies to exert their full authority to secure equal access to home mortgage credit, without which homeownership is virtually impossible.

19. The voluntary home mortgage credit program, a unique Government-private enterprise arrangement, constitutes recognition on the part of the mortgage lending community and the Federal Government that many minority group members suffer discrimination in the mortgage credit market. The program is an attempt to encourage equal treatment through essentially private means. Its successes are a tribute to the good faith of the private lending industry. But its failures are a sober reminder of the fundamental limitations of reliance upon good faith alone.

Urban renewal

20. The Urban Renewal Administration has not effectively insisted upon nondiscrimination in connection with the program it administers. In the urban renewal planning stage there is evidence that minority group members—those most often uprooted and displaced—are sometimes not represented in a meaningful way; that their representatives are relegated to subcommittees on minority housing problems and are not permitted to participate fully in planning the future of the communities of which they are a part.

21. In many instances Negroes and other minority group members are denied access to the housing built on urban renewal project areas—housing built with the assistance of substantial governmental subsidies.

22. The most significant failure of urban renewal has been in the matter of relocation. Negroes, facing the presently insurmountable obstacle of a restricted housing market, comprise a majority of urban renewal displacees. Present provisions have been inadequate to secure their relocation in decent, safe, and sanitary housing. Frequently one

blighted area is removed only to be replaced by another.

23. There are indications that the urban renewal program, designed to revitalize our cities, has actually diminished, by reason of failure to provide housing that is accessible to those who are displaced, the total housing inventory available to minority group members.

24. New programs of rehabilitation and conservation with emphasis on the preservation of existing housing rather than clearance and dislocation hold future promise of stability to central city residents, many of whom are Negroes and members of other minority groups.

Federal highway program

25. The federally financed interstate highway program is displacing large numbers of low-income families. Like urban renewal displacees, these families require relocation assistance. But unlike urban renewal displacees, they are not receiving it.

26. This Federal program does not presently require the assurance of decent, safe, and sanitary housing to persons so displaced, nor is there any provision for aid to displaced families in order to facilitate their movement to new homes. FHA section 221 housing available to all persons displaced by governmental action (as well as to low- and moderate-income families) does not meet these needs.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

HOUSING

Federal supervision of mortgage lending institutions

Recommendation 3: That the Federal Government, either by executive or by congressional action, take appropriate measures to require all financial institutions engaged in a mortgage loan business that are supervised by a Federal agency to conduct such business on a nondiscriminatory basis, and to direct all relevant Federal agencies to devise reasonable and effective implementing procedures.

Urban renewal

Recommendation 4: That the Federal Government, either by executive or by congressional action, take appropriate measures to require communities as a prerequisite to receiving Federal urban renewal assistance: (a) to assure that there is a supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing for displacees in fact adequate to the needs of the families displaced; and (b) to provide sufficient relocation facilities to assure the relocation of such displacees into decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings.

Recommendation 5: That the President direct the Urban Renewal Administration to require that each contract entered into between local public authorities and redevelopers contain a provision assuring access to reuse housing to all applicants regardless of race, creed, or color.

Federal highway program

Recommendation 6: That Congress amend the Highway Act of 1956 to require that in the administration of the interstate highway program, States assure decent, safe and sanitary housing to persons displaced by highway clearance; that in those localities where there are agencies administering relocation programs, such agencies be made responsible for the relocation of persons displaced by highway construction; and that Congress provide also for financial aid to displaced families in order to facilitate their movement to new homes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania, with whom I have also been associated for about the same length of time of my association with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. The profound political skill and the idealism which the Senator from Pennsylvania brings to this task honor us all, and particularly honor the cause. I am deeply gratified by our association. As I have stated, for 17 years, all of us have been very closely associated in this effort; and now it is high time that, finally, we become able to drive something effective through.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, by way of reminiscence, let me say to the senior Senator from New York that about 17 years ago the four Senators who have spoken most recently in this Chamber, and also the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], who is about to address the Senate, began their service in the other body; and, from the very beginning of that service, we have introduced a series of civil rights bills, during various administrations. We have met with both success and failure. We have continued without diminishing our efforts, and also without inconsistency, which is a parlous and difficult thing in the Congress.

I believe it worth noting here that first the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] moved from the House to the Senate, and he was followed by the two Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING] and by me. I hope that development justifies the inference that the people of our States have not disapproved of the fact that we have been in advance of and beyond the times and the general sentiment with the result that we have been permitted, by the grace of our constituents, to extend our services in the two bodies.

I believe that is worth noting, because from the moment that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] came to the Senate, I suspect it was the ambition of the remaining three of us to come over here to keep him company. We did not want the Senator from New Jersey to be alone in his pronounced and determined efforts in this regard. I am glad that today we have been able to report that at times 28, at other times 18, at still other times 23 and 26 Republicans of our rather small number have supported with sincerity and with great diligence the entire civil rights program.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to my colleague. I thank him very much.

Mr. President, I have the great honor and pleasure in yielding now to my junior colleague [Mr. KEATING].

(At this point Mr. BREWSTER took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

EQUALITY IN VOTING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, today those of us who are interested in a program of strengthening the civil rights of our citizens are renewing an effort which was made last year to bring before the Congress for consideration and action all of the legislative recommendations made by the Commission on Civil Rights in its reports on voting, education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice.

The Commission was established to advise the President and Congress on measures needed to protect Americans against all forms of unlawful and unconstitutional discrimination. Its life should be extended indefinitely, as is proposed in the measure introduced by our colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], so that it can proceed with its important work without the uncertainty and harassment which accompanies each of its extensions. It has done its job well despite the many obstacles in its path, and there is no justification for ignoring its important work.

The Commission, with a remarkable degree of unanimity, has exposed a wide gulf between many of our daily practices and the magnificent promises of our Constitution. We would not be keeping faith with the American people or the distinguished men who have contributed their time and wisdom to these problems if we failed to give the Commission's recommendations our full consideration.

In no sense is anyone bound by the Commission's recommendations. There are some measures which I favor, such as the proposal to give the Attorney General authority to bring civil injunctive suits in all cases involving deprivation of constitutional rights, which the Commission has not expressly endorsed. In this regard it may be appropriate to go beyond what the Commission has recommended, while in other respects we may wish to modify what the Commission has recommended. But in no case can we afford to ignore the proposals advanced by the Commission.

The bill of which I am principal sponsor, and of which Senators CASE, FONG, JAVITS, BEALL, KUCHEL, and SCOTT are cosponsors, deals with voting rights, but this is a joint effort, and I shall also cosponsor the bills being offered today by several of my colleagues on other phases of civil rights.

The exercise of the franchise has been called the key to civil rights progress, but in truth every one of the measures we are proposing is needed to help remove the barriers to equal opportunity and equal protection which now exists.

It is difficult to believe that anyone at this late date in our history would challenge the principle that no American should be denied the right to vote because of his race. Nevertheless, the Commission on Civil Rights has documented in its hearings and reports a shameful record of discrimination at the polls in many areas of our Nation. Its report chronicles numerous instances of economic reprisals, discriminatory purges, restrictive voter qualification laws and arbitrary registration procedures still used in a number of States to deny Negroes first-class citizenship.

There is no necessity at this time to review in detail the facts discussed in the Commission's reports on voting. Their impact is summarized extremely well in a speech by Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame and a distinguished member of the Commission, which is quoted in last year's hearings of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights:

Father Hesburgh said:

> There wasn't a man of us—

Speaking of the members of the Commission—

> who did not recognize that there were literally millions of people qualified to vote who were not able to vote and probably would not be able to vote for the next President of the United States, much less for their Senators, Congressmen and State officials. We had seen some of these people. These weren't units to us. They were flesh and blood people. Some of them were veterans with long months of oversea duty and decorations for valor in service. Some of the people were ministers. Some of them were college teachers. Some of them were lawyers, doctors. All of them were taxpayers. Some were mothers of families who were hard pressed to tell their children what it is to be a good American citizen when they could not vote themselves. All of them were decent, intelligent American people, and yet they could not cast their ballots for the President of the United States.
>
> Some had gone through incredible hardships in attempting to register and had been subjected to incredible indignities. I don't know if any of you in this room have had to go through this experience, but even vicariously we had to go through it in listening to their tales. They would go to a courthouse and instead of going in where the white people registered, they would have to go to a room in the back where they would stand in line from 6 in the morning until 2 in the afternoon, since only two were let in at a time. Then people with Ph. D.'s and master's degrees and high intelligence would sit down and copy like a schoolchild the first article or the second article of the Constitution. Then they would be asked the usual questions, make out the usual questionnaire, hand in a self-addressed envelope and hear nothing for 3 months. And then they would go back and do it over again, some of them five, six, or seven times, some of them standing in line 2 or 3 days until their turn came.

To deal with these shocking conditions the Commission recommended legislation to prohibit discriminatory qualifications for voting, establish an objective standard of literacy in States which imposed literacy tests as a qualification, outlaw interference with the right to vote, and obtain accurate statistics on voting patterns. These recommendations were reflected in a bill (S. 2979), which I introduced on March 13 of last year and which was cosponsored by Senators DOUGLAS, CLARK, JAVITS, HART, SCOTT, HUMPHREY, LONG of Missouri, CASE, DIRKSEN, MORSE, BUSH, KUCHEL, PROXMIRE, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey. This bill was the subject of hearings by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights during which some constructive amendments were suggested. Some of these amendments are reflected in the bill being introduced today, but it should be made clear that we would be receptive to other amendments to improve the effectiveness of this measure.

We have also attempted to reflect in the voting rights bill we are today introducing some of the recommendations made by the President in his Special Message on Civil Rights. These include provisions for the appointment of temporary voting referees under certain conditions, expedited treatment of voting rights suits, and a prohibition against the application of different standards or procedures to prospective voters. We have not included the President's recommendations on literacy tests because in our view the proposals of the Commission on this subject are entirely constitutional and would be much more effective.

We offer this bill in the firm belief that every possible legal step should be taken to curb abuses in the voting field. At the same time it must be recognized that these problems will not be solved simply by the passage of new laws. Vigorous enforcement of this measure and others already on the statute books will be as important as the terms of the law. The areas in which these provisions will have their greatest impact are also the areas in which the most flagrant cases of intimidation, repression, and reprisals have occurred. The Federal Government must extend full protection to the citizens in these areas if these measures are ever to serve a meaningful purpose. It will take more than either eloquent words or laws to cope with the cruel tactics of those who would deny their fellow Americans the most sacred privilege of any free person, the right to participate in the selection of his representatives.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that voting is only one of the several areas in which the Commission has made specific recommendations for executive and legislative action. It has not given this subject any higher priority than education, employment, housing or the administration of justice. In my judgment, all of these areas deserve a high priority in our legislative program, and all should be the basis for action during this session of Congress. We have been moving slowly and reluctantly in this field for too many years. The time for bold and effective action is long overdue and should not be further postponed.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators CASE, FONG, JAVITS, BEALL, KUCHEL, and SCOTT, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to further secure and protect the rights of citizens to vote in Federal and State elections.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be allowed to lie on the table for 1 week, so that other Senators who wish to do so may join as cosponsors.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the findings and recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission in its 1961 report on voting be printed in the RECORD following the text of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table, as requested, and the bill and findings and recommendations of the Commission will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1214) to further secure and protect the rights of citizens to vote in Federal and State elections, introduced by Mr. KEATING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Voting Rights Act of 1963".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds—

(a) that qualifications prescribed by State laws for voting, or registering to vote, in Federal and State elections, other than qualifications based upon age, residence, freedom from confinement, freedom from conviction of a crime, mental competency, and loyalty, are susceptible of use, and have been used, to deny citizens the right to vote, because of their race or color;

(b) that standards, practices and procedures applied to individuals of a race or color, which are different from the standards, practices, and procedures applied to individuals of another race or color, have been used to deny citizens the right to vote because of their race or color; and

(c) that the enactment of this Act by the Congress is necessary and proper to carry out the powers conferred upon it by the Constitution of the United States, and in particular by the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.

VOTER QUALIFICATIONS; LITERACY TESTS

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1971(a)), is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(a)", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) Except as provided in paragraph (3), the right of citizens of the United States to vote, to register or otherwise qualify to vote, and to have their vote counted in any general, special, or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of selecting or electing any candidate for elective office established by or under the Constitution or laws of the United States or of any State shall not be denied, abridged or interfered with by the United States or, by any State for any cause except for the following reasons, uniformly applied within the State and its political subdivisions to all persons:

"(A) inability to meet reasonable age requirements;

"(B) inability to meet reasonable requirements as to length of residence within the State and its political subdivisions;

"(C) legal confinement at the time of the election or registration;

"(D) conviction of a felony;

"(E) judgment of mental incompetency; and

"(F) refusal to subscribe to an oath of loyalty to the United States.

"(3) In any case in which under the laws of any State any examination, whether for literacy or otherwise, is administered in order to determine whether a person is qualified to vote, or to register to vote, and to have his vote counted in any general, special or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of selecting or electing any candidate for elective office established by or under the Constitution or laws of the United States or of such State, the successful completion of six or more grades of formal education at any public or accredited private school by such person, unless he has been adjudged mentally incompetent, shall satisfy all the requirements of any such examination. In the administration of any such examination, no standards, practices, or procedures shall be applied to any person which are different from the standards, practices or procedures which are applied to any other person to whom such examination is administered."

PROTECTION AGAINST ARBITRARY STANDARDS, PRACTICES, AND PROCEDURES

SEC. 4. (a) Subsection (b) of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1971(b)), is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(b)" and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall, in determining whether any individual is qualified under State law to vote, or to register to vote, and to have his vote counted in any election described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, apply, or threaten to apply, any standard, practice, or procedure which is different from the standards, practices, or procedures applied to any other individual. Nor shall any person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, deny, abridge, or interfere with, or threaten to deny, abridge, or interfere with, the right of any individual to vote, or to register to vote, and to have his vote counted in any election described in paragraph (1) of this subsection, because of any error or omission in any records or papers required by section 301 of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 to be retained and preserved, if such error of omission is not material in determining whether or not such individual is qualified under State law to vote, or to register to vote, or to have his vote counted in such election.

"(3) No person, whether acting under color of law or otherwise, shall by arbitrary action, or by arbitrary inaction (where there is a duty to act), deny, abridge, or interfere with, or threaten to deny, abridge, or interfere with, the right of any individual to vote, or to register to vote, and to have his vote counted, in any election described in paragraph (1) of this subsection."

(b) Subsection (e) of section 2004 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1971 (e)), is amended by striking out "subsection (a)" each place it appears in the first and last paragraphs thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a) or (b)".

INTERIM COURT ORDERS OF ELIGIBILITY TO VOTE

SEC. 5. Section 2004 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1971), is amended by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g), and by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) (1) After a proceeding has been instituted under subsection (c), upon request of the Attorney General and after notice to each party, the court may appoint a temporary voting referee if it finds that less than 15 per centum of the eligible persons within the affected area with respect to whom such proceeding was instituted under subsection (c) are registered to vote. Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the provisions in subsection (e) of this section with regard to voting referees shall be applicable to such temporary voting referees.

"(2) An order issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be effective until a judgment in the proceeding instituted pursuant to subsection (c) becomes final, but the court may at any stage of the proceeding modify or amend such order to effectuate the purposes of this section.

"(3) When used in this subsection, the terms 'vote' and 'affected area' have the meanings assigned to them by the last paragraph of subsection (e)."

PRECEDENCE FOR VOTING RIGHTS CASES

SEC. 6. (a) Chapter 111 of title 28 of the United States Code (general provisions relating to procedure) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1657. Precedence for voting rights cases

"The courts of the United States shall give precedence to, and shall assign for a hearing at the earliest practicable day, civil actions to recover damages or to secure equitable or other relief under any Act of Congress providing for the protection of the right to vote."

(b) The analysis of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1657. Precedence of voting rights cases."

COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF REGISTRATION AND VOTING STATISTICS

SEC. 7. (a) Subchapter III of chapter 3 of title 13 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 104. Registration and voting statistics

"(a) The Secretary shall collect and publish comprehensive information and statistics relating to the registration of voters in each State and the number of registered voters in each State who vote in elections held in such State. Insofar as it is possible to ascertain, such statistics shall include—

"(1) the number of persons of voting age in each State, classified by race, color, and national origin, who are eligible and registered to vote; and

"(2) the number of persons of each such classification who have voted in any election since January 1, 1960.

"(b) The information and statistics referred to in subsection (a) shall be collected at the same time as the taking of the census under section 141 of this title, except that the first collection shall be made as soon as possible after the date of the enactment of this section.

"(c) No person, other than an officer or employee of a State or political subdivision thereof acting in his official capacity, shall be compelled to give any information or answer any question for the purpose of enabling the Secretary to collect the information and statistics referred to in subsection (a). The provisions of subchapter II of chapter 7 of this title shall not apply with respect to the collection of information and statistics under this section."

(b) The analysis of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"104. Registration and voting statistics."

Findings and Recommendations in the 1961 Report on Voting of the Commission on Civil Rights

FINDINGS

General

1. There are reasonable grounds to believe that substantial numbers of Negro citizens are, or recently have been, denied the right to vote on grounds of race or color in about 100 counties in 8 Southern States: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee. Some denials of the right to vote occur by reason of discriminatory application of laws setting qualifications for voters. Other denials result from arbitrary and discriminatory procedures for the registration of voters; still others occur by reason of threats and intimidation, or the fear of retaliation.

2. Some States have given encouragement to such discriminatory denials of the right to vote. The Legislature of Louisiana, for instance, has fostered discrimination against Negro voters by the enactment of restrictive voter qualification laws and by the activities of its joint legislative committee working in cooperation with the Association of Citizens Councils of Louisiana. Mississippi has amended its voter qualification laws in such fashion as to permit, if not encourage, discrimination against the would-be Negro voter. The Alabama Legislature has tried unsuccessfully to eliminate Negro voters from the city of Tuskegee.

3. The U.S. Department of Justice has acted with vigor to apply the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960 to prevent racial discrimination in the franchise. As of August 4, 1961, it had brought suits to protect the right to vote in 15 counties in 5 States. Three of the cases had been successfully concluded, one case had been partially determined, and a fifth had been tried but was awaiting decision. The remainder were awaiting trial. In addition, as of August 1, 1961, the Department of Justice had made demands for the inspection of records under title III of the 1960 Civil Rights Act in 26 counties in 6 States.

4. On the basis of one suit which has been finally determined, it appears that the 1957 act provides as effective remedy in cases involving discriminatory purges of voters from the registration rolls. Decrees have also been obtained in suits involving discriminatory registration procedures.

5. The voting-referee provision of title VI of the 1960 Civil Rights Act has not yet been used as a remedy; but it appears that the mere availability of the remedy may have contributed to the effectiveness of the decrees actually entered by the courts in at least two cases.

6. Subsection (b) of 42 U.S.C. section 1971 (part of the 1957 Civil Rights Act) has not yet been fully tested. However, it appears to provide an effective means for dealing with economic reprisals to interfere with the efforts of Negroes to register and vote.

7. Title III of the 1960 act, the records-inspection provision, appears to be an extremely important investigative device for gathering information regarding some kinds of discriminatory denials of the right to vote.

8. Although the provisions of the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts are useful, however, they are necessarily limited means for removing racial discrimination from the franchise. Suits must proceed a single county at a time, and they are time-consuming, expensive, and difficult. Broader measures are required if denials of constitutional rights in this area are to be quickly eliminated.

Qualification of voters

9. A common technique of discriminating against would-be voters on racial grounds involves the discriminatory application of legal qualifications for voters. Among the qualifications used in this fashion are requirements that the voter be able to read and write; that he be able to give a satisfactory interpretation of the Constitution; that he be able to calculate his age to the day; and that he be of good character.

10. The U.S. Constitution leaves to the States the power to set the qualifications for voters in Federal, as well as State, elections. This power is not, however, unlimited. The 15th amendment prohibits the States from denying the right to vote to any citizen on grounds of race or color, and empowers the Congress to enforce this prohibition by appropriate legislation. Therefore, if Congress found that particular voter qualifications were applied by States in a manner that denied the right to vote on grounds of race, it would appear to have the power under the 15th amendment to enact legislation prohibiting the use of such qualifications. Section 5 of the 14th amendment similarly empowers Congress to enact appropriate legislation to enforce the provisions of that amendment. One of these provisions is section 2 of the 14th amendment, which authorizes Congress to reduce the congressional representation of any State in proportion as citizens of that State are denied the right to vote on any grounds other than age or conviction of a crime. The effect of these provisions of the 14th amendment may be to empower Congress to prohibit the use of any voter qualifications other than those specified.

Arbitrary interference with the right to vote

11. The right to vote is denied in some places not only by the discriminatory application of legal qualifications for voters (see finding 9), but in addition by the arbitrary or discriminatory application of various registration procedures, such as the following:

(a) The requirement of a specified number of registered voters as vouchers to identify would-be voters. This practice is particularly effective in disfranchising Negroes when there are no Negroes already registered, and no white will vouch for Negroes; or where a rule is enforced limiting the number of times a given voter may vouch for another.

(b) The imposition of other unduly technical requirements for identification of would-be voters.

(c) The rejection of applicants for registration, or the removal of voters from the rolls, on grounds of minor technical errors in the completion of required forms.

(d) Refusing or failing to notify registrants whether or not they have been registered.

(e) Imposing various forms of delay in the registration process.

(f) Applying any or all of the above to some would-be voters but not to others, or applying them differently to different persons.

(g) Providing assistance to some would-be voters but declining to provide it for others.

12. Practices of these sorts, used for the purpose of denying the right to vote on grounds of race, violate the 15th amendment and specific Federal law, and can be reached by suits brought by the U.S. Department of Justice. For such suits to be successful, however, it must be proven that the practices involve discrimination on racial grounds, and the very nature of the practices may sometimes make this proof difficult. Whether or not they are clearly racially discriminatory, such practices are arbitrary, and unjustifiably prevent some citizens from exercising the right to vote.

13. Similarly arbitrary practices, which may or may not be beyond the reach of existing legislation, may occur in places with permanent voter registration where, as a result of lawsuits or changes in policy, overtly discriminatory practices are abandoned, but extremely strict registration standards and procedures are applied to all new registrants. Even though there is no racial discrimination in the prospective application of such stringent standards, the effect of such a change in practice may be to perpetuate discrimination which has previously occurred: For if virtually all the eligible whites have already been registered, but Negroes have been discriminatorily kept from registering, then Negroes will bear the brunt of the difficulties imposed by the new and stringent registration requirements.

14. As regards Federal elections, Congress has the power to prohibit arbitrary as well as racially discriminatory practices which prevent citizens from exercising the right to vote.

Dilution of the right to vote

15. The malapportioned condition of State and congressional voting districts throughout the United States dilutes the right to vote of many citizens; in some States malapportionment of voting districts is compounded by the effect of discriminatory denials of the right to vote. Malapportionment, especially where it is exaggerated by racial disfranchisement, afflicts the very democratic process through which a reform of these conditions may be attained.

16. Although the courts in many cases are the only effective resort for remedying such malapportionment, Federal courts have expressed, on equitable grounds, extreme reluctance to provide a remedy.

17. Congress has in the past required that electoral districts for congressional elections be substantially equal in poplation. Insofar as inequalities in such districts deny equal protection of the laws under the 14th amendment, Congress could impose a similar requirement as to State elections.

Statistical information

18. Statistics showing registration and voting by race are of considerable value, not only in studying the electoral process in general, but as a starting point in examining problems of discrimination. In some cases these statistics may simply provide grounds for further investigation; in others, they may themselves be strong evidence of discrimination. This is the case, for instance, where Negroes constitute a majority of the population and yet none at all are registered to vote.

19. Registration statistics by race indicate that in 13 counties where Negroes are the majority of the population, none of them are registered to vote: Alabama (2 counties), Georgia (2 counties), Louisiana (4 counties), and Mississippi (5 counties).

20. Registration statistics by race are incomplete, unofficial, or unavailable for many States.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Qualification of voters

Recommendation 1: That Congress, acting under section 2 of the 15th amendment and sections 2 and 5 of the 14th amendment, (a) declare that voter qualifications other than age, residence, confinement, and conviction of a crime are susceptible of use, and have been used, to deny the right to vote on grounds of race and color; and (b) enact legislation providing that all citizens of the United States shall have a right to vote in Federal or State elections which shall not be denied or in any way abridged or interfered with by the United States or by any State for any cause except for inability to meet reasonable age or length-of-residence requirements uniformly applied to all presons within a State, legal confinement at the time of registration or election, or conviction of a felony; such right to vote to include the right to register or otherwise qualify to vote, and to have one's vote counted.

Dissent to recommendation 1 by Vice Chairman Storey

As pointed out in the 1959 report of this Commission, I strongly believe in the right of every qualified citizen of the United States, irrespective of his color, race, religion, or national origin, to register, vote, and have his vote counted. Full protection of these rights of suffrage by both State and Federal Governments is necessary and proper. However, I cannot join in so sweeping a recommendation as this.

Proposals to alter longstanding Federal-State relationships such as that incorporated in the Federal Constitution, declaring that the qualifications of electors shall be left to the several States, should not be made unless there is no alternative method to correct an existing evil. Such is not the case today.

The Federal Government has sufficient authority under the Constitution and the existing framework of laws to enable it effectively to deal with denials of the right to vote by reason of race, color, religion, and national origin.

The Civil Rights Act of 1957 authorized the Attorney General to institute civil suit in the Federal courts to prevent the denial of voting rights. The Civil Rights Act of 1960 provides that if in any such suit the court makes a finding that the denial of voting rights is pursuant to a pattern or practice, the court may appoint voting referees to register qualified persons denied this right by local election officials. The further denial of the right to vote to these persons so registered by the court-appointed voting referees constitutes contempt of court and is punishable accordingly. The vigor with which these Civil Rights Acts are applied will significantly affect the extent to which voting denial practices will be discontinued.

Many States have voting requirements more extensive than age or length of residence, incarceration, or felony convictions. These qualifications, having nothing to do with race, religion, or national origin, are an important element in preserving the sanctity of the ballot. They are specific disqualifications which are felt justifiable for the good of the State. Disqualifications of persons whose mental condition makes it impossible for them competently to exercise the discrimination necessary in voting has long been accepted. Many States disqualify paupers supported by municipal or county officials on the theory that these people are too easily exploitable by such officials for their own purposes. The security and purity of the ballot can be destroyed by permitting illiterates to vote. And as the English language is still the official language of the United States, there is good justification for States requiring that voters have at least a rudimentary knowledge of this language.

Dissent to recommendation 1 by Commissioner Rankin

I join in the dissenting statement of Vice Chairman Storey, but would add the following personal comment.

The 15th amendment has been a part of our Constitution for almost a century, and Congress has never interpreted it as a mandate to usurp the power of each State to determine the qualifications of electors.

In 1957 and again in 1960, Congress did enact legislation to provide protection of the right to register and vote without discrimination on grounds of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. It may be that further legislation will be required to reinforce the guarantees of the 15th amendment and of the 1957 and 1960 laws. But such measures should be kept within the well-recognized bounds of our Constitution and laws.

Our object must be compliance with the Constitution, not punishment, and for that reason I do not deem it wise to upset the balance of our Federal system to reach a result which can be achieved through less drastic means.

Recommendation 2.—That Congress enact legislation providing that in all elections in which, under State law, a literacy test, an understanding or interpretation test, or an educational test is administered to determine the qualifications of electors, it shall be sufficient for qualification that the elector have completed at least six grades of formal education.

Interference with the right to vote

Recommendation 3: That Congress amend subsection (b) of 42 U.S.C. 1971 to prohibit any arbitrary action or (where there is a duty to act) arbitrary inaction, which deprives or threatens to deprive any person of the right to register, vote, and have that vote counted in any Federal election.

Dilution of the right to vote

Recommendation 4: That Congress consider the advisability of enacting legislation (a) requiring that where voting districts are established within a State, for either Federal elections or State elections to any house of a State legislature which is elected on the basis of population, they shall be substantially equal in population; and (b) specifically granting the Federal courts jurisdiction of suits to enforce the requirements of the Constitution and of Federal law with regard to such electoral districts; but explicitly providing that such jurisdiction should not be deemed to preclude the jurisdiction of State courts to enforce rights provided under State law regarding such districts.

Statistical information

Recommendation 5: That Congress direct the Bureau of the Census promptly to initiate a nationwide compilation of registration and voting statistics, to include a count of persons of voting age in every State and territory by race, color, and national origin, who are registered to vote, and a determination of the extent to which such persons have voted since January 1, 1960; and requiring that the Bureau of the Census compile such information in each next succeeding decennial census, and at such other time or times as the Congress may direct.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have a very special feeling about the participation of my colleague [Mr. KEATING] in our total civil rights effort. He is a member of the Judiciary Committee, which will have in its care a number of these measures, which are as critically important as any proposed.

The Judiciary Committee has been, traditionally, the graveyard of civil rights measures. It is often frustrating and terribly difficult even to discuss or raise a civil rights matter in that committee. My colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] has, not only throughout his House service, where I served with him, but here as a member of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, represented us all in the deliberations of that committee, in respect to measures which often induce so frigid and cold an atmosphere, in such a way as to make us very proud of him for rendering what in my opinion is such signal service to the country and to the minorities who are concerned in relation to legislation of this character.

Our struggle is hardly in midcourse, let alone successful. Signaled by this group of bills which we are introducing now, I look forward again to almost heroic service of my colleague [Mr. KEATING] together with our other colleagues, both on our side and on the Democratic side, who are interested in this legislation, to see that, notwithstanding almost insuperable obstacles, something does happen, whether it actually comes out of committee, or whether the basis for legislation is created outside the committee.

I take great satisfaction for what he said this morning, and what he said when we held the press conference on this matter, that he expects that we shall at least have some hearings on the measures and that he himself is a member of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, where we have the best opportunity toward that end.

The majority leader, it will be recalled, only a relatively few days ago pledged himself to the same end. I believe that the country is tremendously fortunate that my colleague, the junior Senator from New York, has a place on this key committee and on its key Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. I look forward to the heroic service in this field which has been so characteristic of him.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I thank my colleague from New York for his very kind remarks. I consider myself fortunate to be a member of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, which has jurisdiction over the subject matter.

In my judgment, the members of that committee, as reconstituted in this Congress, are more favorable to action in this field than in the past. I anticipate that the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. ERVIN], although he might individually be opposed to these measures, will be fair to the members of the subcommittee, and if a request for hearings was made and supported by a majority of the subcommittee, we would have hearings.

My colleague has been very generous in his remarks. We have been engaged in this fight together ever since we were elected to the other body in January, 1947. Even during the 2-year period when my colleague was out of Congress, and served as the Attorney General of New York State, we have collaborated and worked together in this field. I am proud to again be associated with my colleague and the others who have joined us today in renewing these efforts for equal protection and equal opportunity for all our citizens.

He is, as everyone knows, a stanch fighter for constitutional rights and a leader in this field.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague very much. I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I should like merely to say that what the Senator from New York has said about our colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], is completely true. It is important to this cause that the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and a member of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. As he has gained seniority and, therefore, greater standing and a stronger voice on this committee, his presence there is all the more important. I wish I could foresee the time when the presence of a man like him on that key committee, dealing in this area, would not be important, but I cannot. I hope that for this session and for many years to come his stalwart and ever stronger voice will be available to us in this most important and strategic area of the Senate's machinery.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the Senator from New Jersey, and I associate myself fully with his remarks and his evaluation of the critical importance of Senator KEATING's service and his remaining a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, which deals with this issue.

Mr. KEATING. I do not wish to interfere with the progress of the remarks of my colleagues, but I must thank my dear friend, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, for his kind remarks. He, like the senior Senator from New York, has been in this fight perhaps longer than either of us. His service extends over a somewhat longer period. Everyone in this country knows of his devotion to this cause, and knows that when he gets his teeth into a subject like this he does not let go of it. He has his teeth in it now and they are in there, and we all hope that this fact will have the most effective results in producing legislation in this session of Congress.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank both Senators. I do not wish to detain the Senate very long, but I do wish to make a few observations upon this whole situation and on the bills which I am introducing and the bills which other Senators have introduced today.

EQUALITY IN ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE AND PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

The group of Republican Senators who are introducing civil rights measures today rely principally upon the findings and recommendations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. The revisions, as required by later developments, are not too major in character. The essential factor is that we are benefiting from and basing our case on the proven findings of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, whose members, notwithstanding an even division between the North and South—3 and 3, are remarkably unanimous in most of their findings. I believe that sustains strongly the justice and equity of our position. I believe it confounds those who would brand our effort as politics.

I have said before and I say again that an examination of the voting records in my State, in my own reelection in 1962, will show practically no difference in the districts heavily populated by Negroes with respect to the vote that I received; whereas, I hazard the opinion that in many Southern States, because of what we see in these campaigns and what has been argued back and forth, this is the predominant issue. So I respectfully submit that those who would claim that we are serving only the dictates of politics should look to their own glass houses before they throw stones, and should note that we are fully sustained on the merits and the facts by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

It will be recalled that last year a similar series of measures was introduced by a bipartisan group of Senators. I would be less than frank if I did not say that I am very unhappy about the fact that this year, unlike last year, we were unsuccessful in bringing about bipartisan sponsorship of this group of measures. While I understand that the President's special message on civil rights last month may have made some difference to our Democratic colleagues who introduced these measures with us before, I nonetheless wish that we could have had bipartisan sponsorship this year too, for the bipartisan tradition is very strong in civil rights. I have every expectation, however, that we will close ranks as civil rights measures come before us and indeed that some of the bills which are being introduced today by Republican Senators and which will remain on the desk for a week may be cosponsored by our Democratic colleagues, just as a number of us have already cosponsored the administration bill which has been introduced by Democratic Senators.

The President's special message on civil rights last month, his first after 2 years in office, was eloquent and valuable because its source alone underscored dramatically for the Nation and the world the importance of the civil rights struggle. It also coincides, appropriately, with a time of reassessment in that struggle, the centennial of the Emancipation Proclamation.

But, when matched against the record of that 100 years, which no unbiased observer could view with satisfaction, a helpful spirit and tone, by themselves, even emanating from the White House, clearly do not suffice. What is needed is a strong program, calling for meaningful legislative and executive action, and given the highest priority, which up to now the President has reserved for his tax cut program. I deeply believe that,

as important to our Nation's well-being as is the tax cut, a truly effective civil rights program is equally vital to our national well-being. Matched against the recommendations of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission and even the platforms of both parties in 1960, the President's special message does not represent either the strong program or the high priority.

I believe that the administration knows what is at stake here. In an article in the Saturday Evening Post last year, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, reporting on a world tour, described the importance of our Nation's civil rights record to our position in a restless world. He said:

> We cannot successfully portray ourselves as believing in the Constitution and freedom if at home we treat a portion of our population as inferiors.

The President repeated that thought in his special message. At my request the Council of Economic Advisers estimated last year that racial discrimination in its various forms costs our Nation $13 to $17 million annually. The cost in moral value and world repute is inestimably greater. And there are other losses and risks. A recent powerful work, "The Fire Next Time," by James Baldwin, describes with chilling effectiveness the extraordinary self-restraint that the Negro community in the United States has imposed upon itself during these last 100 years and the danger that, without a legal escape valve, the pressure of frustration may soon be unendurable and may explode in violence. The appeal of the Black Muslim movement should not be underestimated. Up to now about the only violence has come from whites; but there is no guarantee that this will remain the case.

Although the administration recognizes these losses and risks, it does not reflect its understanding of them by pressing for a substantial enough legislative program. The reluctance of the first 2 years has, happily, been tempered somewhat with the issuance of the Executive order on housing and the special message requesting more than the previous single voting bill. But the change has been made far less significant than it should be by the failure of Democratic leadership in the Senate to bring about reform of the cloture rule and the inadequacy of the President's legislative requests on civil rights.

I believe the President has been far too much inhibited by the fact that Members of the Senate from the South are the chairmen of 11 of the 17 standing committees of the Senate.

It is my hope that the action of the Republican Senators who are today introducing what we consider to be a meaningful civil rights legislative program will spur the administration to a meaningful response. The President's special message concludes by stating that:

> Other measures directed toward these same goals will be favorably commented on and supported, as they have in the past—and they will be signed, if enacted into law.

My view of the role of the administration in the field of civil rights is far more than that passive. It is my hope that these measures will be more than commented on favorably and not vetoed, but that in this Emancipation Proclamation Centennial year, they will be pressed for enactment by a bipartisan effort under strong Presidential leadership, which gives this program the priority it deserves.

During the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration, only one concrete legislative proposal was developed—the literacy test bill; emphasis was instead placed on executive action. During 1961 the administration asked for no civil rights legislation whatever, except the technical measure of extending the life of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. The recommended 2-year extension, itself the bare minimum proposal, was brought up as an amendment to an appropriation bill so that a two-thirds vote was required to suspend the rule against enacting legislation in a money measure, and attempts to lengthen the period or strengthen the Commission's powers were tabled on the motion of the leadership, just as were numerous other attempts during the year to pass civil rights measures in the only manner open to proponents, as amendments to other bills pending on the floor. The reason for scuttling all such attempts, either expressed or implied, was always that the filibuster would make such attempts futile and time consuming and lead nowhere.

At the end of 1961, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission issued a comprehensive series of 6 reports in the fields of voting, education, employment, housing, and administration of justice, which included specific findings of fact as to deprivations of constitutional rights in each of these fields and which set forth 27 recommendations for congressional action, as well as numerous other recommendations for additional executive action. Yet in 1962, the administration relented from its position against legislation only to the extent of two measures relating to voting, the sixth grade literacy test bill and elimination of the poll tax. These modest proposals were only two of five recommended by the Civil Rights Commission in the voting field alone, and since the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts had dealt with voting almost exclusively, they actually constituted only supplementary amendments to existing law. Yet even the literacy test measure failed of passage and was set aside after a desultory filibuster. The only "successful" action was approval of a constitutional amendment abolishing the poll tax in the four States in which it remains; attempts to do this by legislation, which is what the U.S. Civil Rights Commission recommended, were brushed aside, and the amendment remains to be ratified, although half the States have already acted. Those citizens of the four poll-tax States who otherwise would have voted in November 1962, were unable to do so despite congressional action because it was on a constitutional amendment not a law.

This brings the account to the present session of Congress, the beginning of the administration's third year. What intervened in those 2 years in the way of social change and the urgent need for meaningful civil rights legislation can be appraised by simply listing the high points of the news: months of tension and violence in Albany, Ga., were occasioned by peaceful demonstrations of Negroes who demanded only that the public facilities paid for in part by their own taxes be made available to them on an equal opportunity basis; some dozens of destitute Negro families were heartlessly induced to migrate to the North by segregationists who offered them the fare and suggested that jobs would be waiting for them there; and two persons were killed and others injured when James Meredith became, under court order, the first Negro to be enrolled in the University of Mississippi, the campus of which is still under Federal Guard.

At the beginning of the 88th Congress this year, the administration was presented with its first opportunity to bring its moral pressure to bear in the fight to change the filibuster rule, rule XXII of the Senate. It did not do so, I believe it is fair to say, although the President had exerted his influence to bring about a change in the size of the House Rules Committee, similarily a matter of the internal operations of a House of the Congress. It did not do so, although the Democratic Party platform in 1960 called for improved congressional procedures to safeguard majority rule, just as the Republican Party platform called for a change in rule XXII and other congressional procedures. The rules-change fight in the Senate failed despite the fact that a majority of 54 Senators signified in writing that they would have voted for a liberalization of the rule if they had been given an opportunity to vote on it; and despite the fact that a majority—though not two-thirds—voted to shut off the filibuster which blocked the rule change.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator mean to indicate for the RECORD that he believes the two parties in putting these planks into their platforms intended that the Executive should assert himself in the legislative branch, to the extent of attempting to influence the legislative branch to adopt rules different from those established in accordance with its own convictions and its own beliefs as to what would be proper?

Mr. JAVITS. I only believe that the President is the leader of his party, that he ran on the platform of the Democratic Party, that he was elected on that platform, that it is his duty to do everything within his power to make good the pledges contained in that platform, and that, as a result, he should do everything within his power to get a majority of the Members of this body to follow those pledges.

I am not enough of a psychologist to be able to determine whether Senators' actual beliefs and intentions are correctly indicated by their votes; but I assume that they are.

I point out that the President was successful when he intervened in the rules fight in the House of Representatives; but I also point out that the President did not choose to take action in connection with the rules fight in the Senate. I believe the President was sincere in his efforts in connection with the rules fight in the House, of course.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield again to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. So far as I am concerned, I see a great deal of difference between a situation in which the Executive leads in an attempt to carry out a platform pledge to which his party is committed—namely, a pledge to attempt to carry out a certain program—and an attempt by the President to interfere with the functioning of the legislative branch. The Constitution makes very clear that each House shall formulate its own rules and shall provide for the governance of itself.

After having watched for a good many years the formulation of the platform of at least one party, I do not believe it has ever been contemplated that the President would exert undue influence on the congressional members of his party, so as to require them to reenact or change or modify the rules of either House of Congress in a way which would differ from its own convictions.

I believe that the members of that party in each House who are strictly following their party's platform have some obligations on themselves; but, in my opinion, that is very different from an attempt by the Executive to break down the line of delineation between the legislative branch and the executive branch by asserting himself so as to attempt to have established rules for the conduct of the internal business of either House or of both Houses of the legislative branch, as to comply either with his own convictions or with a party declaration which is binding on him in the conduct of his executive duties; but, I think, this does nothing at all to change the very fine line of distinction, laid down in the Constitution, between executive duties and functions and those which pertain entirely to the legislative branch, such as the formulation of rules.

I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am glad to have yielded to the Senator from Florida, because he has helped me point up what I believe to be a very fundamental matter.

First of all, I did not write this plank into the platform of the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party wrote it into its platform; and that plank calls for changes in these procedures.

The President, as the head of his party, appealed to the minorities in this country—and all of us heard him do it—on the basis of the platform on which he was running. Therefore, in my opinion, we have both a right and a duty to call him to account.

In addition, the President did intervene directly in the House rules fight; and it seems to me that precedent makes very clear that he failed—and failed very definitely—to do anything about the rules fight in the Senate.

Second, the President himself intervened in the rules fight in the House; and the President must account for the fact that, although he intervened there, he did not intervene or do anything in connection with the rules fight in the Senate.

I think that is the best evidence. With all due respect to the Senator from Florida, that is the best evidence of what is called for from the President.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I join the Senator from New York in having the greatest of respect and affection for the Senator from Florida. However, I must point out that I think the logic of his position is rather weak. I think his argument proves too much.

It is true that the Constitution states that each House shall make its own rules. Certainly, the Constitution also states that each House shall pass upon proposed legislation. Yet, Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida agrees that it is appropriate for the President to exercise leadership, as the head of his party, in the enactment of legislation to which his party is committed by its national platform, then it must equally be true that in connection with other matters which are within the province of each branch of the legislative establishment—I refer to the formulation of rules—the same principle must apply.

For myself, I believe the President has an obligation, both as the leader of his party and as President—but now we are speaking particularly about the obligation he has as the leader of his party—to carry out, or to attempt to carry out, by his leadership of the executive branch and in the legislative branch his party's commitments, both in regard to substantive legislation and also in regard to what in the long run is much more important in this area, namely, the rules of the House and the rules of the Senate.

I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield once more to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to say that I do not believe that either party in formulating its platform—as Senators know, I have belonged to only one party, and I have attended the conferences of only one party—has ever included in its platform anything which indicated in the slightest that it wished to break down the fine separation, provided for in the Constitution, between the executive and the legislative branches. Yet that is exactly what is implied in the criticism being made by the distinguished Senator from New York, because if the Executive—not with direct reference to legislation, but with reference to the internal governance of the Senate—seeks to impress his own views and convictions and interpretations of what his party's platform means upon the members of his party who serve in the Senate, I think he would be doing just that, namely, breaking down the lines of separation, so clearly established by the Constitution, between the executive and the legislative branches.

In regard to the point which has been ably made by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, let me call attention to the fact that in the field of legislation the President has a definite responsibility. The Constitution requires him to communicate to Congress, at the beginning of each Congress, a message in regard to the state of the Nation. Under that custom and its implications, the President recommends legislation. He is required to pass upon legislation, namely, by deciding whether he will approve it or will veto it. If he vetoes it, the importance of his rôle is so great that a two-thirds vote by the Members of each House is required in order to override his veto. So the President is a full partner of the Congress in many ways in connection with legislation.

However, I know of no provision of the Constitution which in the slightest gives the President any right to prescribe for either House what should be the rules for the governance of the internal business of that House.

If such a provision existed, it would be a distinct departure from the lines of differentiation between legislative and executive branches, whether the Executive be a Republican or a Democrat. As I recall, the immediate predecessor of President Kennedy was also committed—if the adoption of such a platform as we are talking about would constitute such a commitment—to some changes in the rules, and he did not, as I recall it, attempt to exercise any such prerogative, if indeed, he had one. He would have been wrong if he had. I think it would be very wrong for any President ever to try to dictate to either House what its rules should be. It is the function of each House to determine how it shall transact its business. I differentiate completely, and I believe the Constitution differentiates completely, between the matter of making rules and regulations governing internal conduct and the matter of legislation, in which the Chief Executive has a very direct responsibility, as I have said. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

I point out, first, that President Eisenhower had no such platform pledge on which to run. That pledge was made in 1960 in the Republican platform, and the candidate was defeated. The Democratic candidate won on that platform, and he was pledged to improve the congressional procedures to safeguard majority rule.

Second, I point out—a point which I think the Senator from Florida has not answered—that the President is the leader of his party. We all understand that. It is generally acknowledged. I point out particularly that every argument the Senator has made was equally applicable to the House rules fight, and the President certainly participated in that.

Finally, we are not living in a dream world. We know that rule XXII has the most direct and effective effect upon proposed legislation in the Senate Chamber, including the very measures

with respect to which the President recently sent a message to Congress. It was a very important message. If the President is really sincere and serious about his message, he had better be sincere and serious about being the leader of his party and bringing about a change in rule XXII, because very little will happen as a result of his message unless there is some effective change in that rule or unless enough Senators will rally—as they have not previously done—to impose cloture after many weeks of debate on a civil rights measure.

That brings me to the point that whatever else I say today, I hope I may impress my colleagues and the country with the conviction that the most important civil rights vote to be cast between now and election day in 1964, perhaps thereafter, too, but certainly in that period, is a vote on cloture.

Let no one mistake that or be confused about it. Senators can vote any way they please on a dozen civil rights measures if we can ever get to a vote on them. It is the vote on cloture that counts. That statement applies to the vote which was cast in the Senate a few weeks ago, and it will apply to similar votes which I hope will be cast in the days ahead. I hope the people of the country who are interested in the issue will note that well. We are now speaking of the filibuster rule. The votes of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting are required to close debate. We cannot reach a vote on any meaningful civil rights measure unless the measure is cut and trimmed to suit Senators who are filibustering unless the proponents can muster a two-thirds majority. There will not be such a vote unless the people of the country understand that that is the key to civil rights legislation and that there is no other. This is the most important single civil rights vote that any Senator can cast.

With this background, the impact of the President's special message can be best evaluated. Switching its position at least in part the administration now expands its legislative requests: the President's 1963 message includes seven legislative proposals, apart from the routine extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission, which this time the administration requests for a period of 4, not 2, years, but also not permanently, though it was part of the Democratic national platform in 1960. Of the remaining seven proposals, four are again in the nature of supplementary amendments to the 1957 and 1960 acts. The literacy test proposal is offered once more; hopefully a more forceful case will be pressed by the administration so that doubts as to the constitutional basis for the provision, which were permitted to serve as a rallying point for the opposition, will not again becloud what is an excellent legal case. This time the administration adds to this request provisions generally making nondiscriminatory all standards for voting, whether of literacy or otherwise; granting preference on the court dockets to voting cases brought under the 1957 and 1960 acts; and providing for the interim appointment of voting referees during the pendency of such cases.

These additional refinements of the existing law are indeed welcome and helpful. But they are mighty small when matched against the total effort, certainly considering the rough course toward passage which any civil rights bill is likely to encounter.

The gross inadequacy of the statutory remedies at the disposal of the Department of Justice is best illustrated by what happens when Negroes attempt to register and vote even today, 100 years after the Emancipation Proclamation, 6 years afer passage of the 1957 Civil Rights Act, and almost 3 after the 1960 Civil Rights Act. Among other forms of terror and harassment, gunfire is directed at them, yet State authorities take no action whatever to prevent the incidents or punish the culprits. The most recent reported incidents, part of a long string of such incidents, began on the night of February 28, 1963, in Leflore County, Miss., when it is charged that white men from a moving car shot and seriously wounded a young Negro vote registration worker; since then a building used by registration workers has been burned; 2 nights ago the home of a registration worker as well as of an applicant to the University of Mississippi, was shot at; and only yesterday the violence erupted into a clash between a group of Negroes and local law enforcement officers.

In February I inquired of the Attorney General as to the suit which had been filed against the United States for an order directing the Department of Justice and other agencies of the Federal Government to take action against State law enforcement officials who interfere with Negro voter registration and voting in Mississippi. The Attorney General replied that "the Department of Justice is presently employing all the powers and authority available to it under Federal law to prevent interference with Negro voter registration activity and voting." The Attorney General then described 11 cases the Department has begun under the 1957 act in Mississippi; in one the Government was successful in enjoining the State from prosecuting a young registration worker in Walthall County for disturbing the peace; he had been hit over the head with a gun by the county registrar of voters when he brought local Negroes in to attempt registration. A second suit, in Greene County, was dismissed and is pending on appeal; a Negro school teacher, who had been a witness for the Government in a pending voting case, was dismissed from her teaching position because of it. The remaining nine cases, it is to be assumed, will go on—perhaps for years.

The administration's recommendations on voting, where their proposals are strongest, do not look heroic when set against the fact of the continued stubborn effort to deny Negroes the voting right in certain Southern States. A majority of the Civil Rights Commission in its 1961 voting report recommended legislation providing that all citizens shall have the right to register, vote, and have their votes counted, unabridged for any cause except inability to meet reasonable age or length-of-residence requirements uniformly applied, legal confinement, or conviction of a felony. The Commission unanimously recommended, in addition to substitution of the sixth-grade literacy test for voter registration in lieu of readily misapplied subjective tests, amendment of the 1957 act to prohibit any arbitrary action or, where there is a duty to act, inaction, which deprives anyone of the right to vote; and legislation directing the Bureau of the Census to making a nationwide survey of voting statistics; it also called for a congressional study of apportionment of legislative districting, which the Supreme Court ultimately dealt with in the landmark decision of Baker against Carr, another telling instance of the judiciary being forced into a policy area by the press of history in this field which the Congress seems almost totally unable to reflect. This much remains unadopted by the administration despite the fact that the Civil Rights Commission, charged by law with the duty to make such recommendations to the President and the Congress, has recommended them and despite the emphasis of both party platforms, and of the President's message,on the primacy of the right to vote.

A final word about Executive action in the voting field is in order. A conference held in February of this year at Notre Dame University by distinguished legal authorities outlined the obstructions used by a number of Southern communities to deny the vote to Negroes and described them as "massive intimidation calculated to induce acute personal insecurity." The group concluded that the courts now have ample power to deal with this, with which I and the Civil Rights Commission and the President and many others disagree, but I note that the group also concluded that:

> The Department of Justice must more urgently seek to bring its cases to trial, even over the reluctance of busy or unenthusiastic Federal judges. * * * The Government must seek not merely to unlock the doors of the voting booth for Negro citizens, but to open the doors as clearly as they were previously closed to Negro applicants. * * * Finally, the time has come for Federal recognition of power and obligation to assist by affirmative support the enfranchisement of Negro citizens.

The three remaining legislative proposals in the President's special message relate basically to education, and it is with much satisfaction that I found at last proposals in the President's message not only outside the area of voting but particularly in this area, which I have long felt to be the bedrock test of equal opportunity. I think it was most appropriate that, of all the discriminatory uses of public funds which might have been attacked first, it was in the area of public school desegregation that the new era of civil rights really began in 1954 with the Brown against Board of Education decision. But, ironically, here the pace of Federal action has been most sluggish. The only civil rights statutes since the Civil War, the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts, dealt with the right to vote; the President's Committee on

Equal Employment Opportunity first established by Executive order in 1953 was a first step in the employment area; the Executive order in housing last October began the Federal effort in housing; the old Civil Rights Acts of the Civil War period, inadequate as they are, were a first step in the administration of justice field. But in education, which is the key to all the rest, the effort has been almost wholly left at the Federal level to private suits brought one at a time, with the limited resources of parents backed by funds collected by the legal defense fund of the NAACP.

The Civil Rights Commission's 1961 report stated that:

> Seven years after the Supreme Court's decision only 775 of 2,837 biracial school districts in the 17 Southern States that required racial segregation in the public schools on that date had taken any action to abolish racial segregation.

It also found that:

> In many of the school districts where some start has been made, actual desegregation is minimal. In fact only 7 percent of all Negroes enrolled in the public schools in the 17 Southern States attended school with white pupils in 1960–61, whereas 27 percent of the school districts have made some start toward compliance with constitutional requirements.

In its more recent report "Civil Rights U.S.A.—Public School Southern States, 1962," the Commission amends its findings to add that desegregation is limited "to 25 percent of the Negro pupils enrolled in the school districts which, 8 years after the Supreme Court decision of 1954, have commenced desegregation of their school system or announced policies to that effect." Now the pattern has changed somewhat:

> The initial shock is over; school buildings are no longer dynamited; National Guardsmen no longer use bayonets to bar children from schools; and State legislatures no longer meet in special session to pour pounds of massive resistance into State statute books. Initial assignment of pupils by race, using pupil placement laws, dual school zone maps, and other means, and transfer provisions tied to race characterize the present trend.

The administration's reaction to this is a three-part proposal: technical and financial aid to school districts in the process of desegregating; elimination of the separate-but-equal language which shockingly remains on the books in the Morrill Land Grant College Acts; and expansion of the Civil Rights Commission so that it can act as a clearinghouse for information, advice, and technical assistance to any agency public or private which requests it. The last of these proposals is not limited in the special message to education, although in the 1961 Commission report on education it was a concomitant of the proposal to offer technical and financial assistance to desegregating school districts, where it will be most useful.

These proposals ignore the bulk of the Civil Rights Commission recommendations in this area. The key proposal of the Commission—and of the Democratic platform of 1960—was a requirement that every local school board which maintains any public school from which pupils are excluded on the basis of race, must file a plan for desegregation with a designated Federal agency within 6 months after the adoption of the legislation, the plan to call for at least a first step toward compliance with the Brown decision at the beginning of the following school year, and complete desegregation as soon as practicable thereafter. In their reports on similar legislation in 1962 both the Departments of Justice and of Health, Education, and Welfare favored such provisions.

The second vital recommendation in the Commission report and the Democratic platform which is ignored is the granting of power to the Attorney General to enforce the desegregation decision by appropriate civil actions in the Federal courts. Broadened to include enforcement of all constitutional rights, this was the famous part III of the 1957 act which was deleted under threat of filibuster. Finally, and perhaps most significantly, the Commission report recommended that 50 percent of Federal financial aid to elementary and secondary schools should be withheld where no desegregation has taken place and that a smaller proportion should be withheld where a program of desegregation has been initiated until it has been completed. Here the President recommended only elimination of the "separate-but-equal" clause in the Morrill Land Grant College Acts; but in the remaining and even more significant problems of Federal aid to segregated educational facilities—in impacted areas, particularly those in which children of military personnel are required to attend segregated public schools—the administration continues to rely on executive action. Yet just last year when testifying before a House of Representatives subcommittee, the then-Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare said that executive action was necessarily limited when Congress had not spoken: "if meaningful changes are to occur," he said, "if new, affirmative steps are to be taken, Congress must take legislative action." I agree. The proposed executive action is understood to involve having integrated school facilities built onbase for military dependents while leaving the segregated facilities offbase where they are. Criticism against this scheme, which has already been registered by civil rights groups, is not unwarranted, in my judgment. The question then remains, why has the administration not heeded its own position last year and the Civil Rights Commission recommendation and asked for meaningful legislation for this purpose? Or, if it now believes that executive action short of legislation is appropriate, why not adopt the Commission's recommendation by cutting down the Federal assistance in proportion to compliance with the Brown decision?

In regard to the part III power, the special message glosses over the Prince Edward County case, which has for the past 3 years presented the spectacle of a populous county adjacent to the Nation's Capital without a system of public education in order to frustrate the school desegregation order of the U.S. Supreme Court directed to this very county in the Brown case. When the schools were closed, the Justice Department attempted to assert an inherent right to intervene as a part in the suit brought privately; it failed in the district court and did not appeal. At this point the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit has permitted the Attorney General to appear as amicus curiae, or friend of the court. The President described this as having "intervened." The difference may appear technical to the layman but it is an important one. As a friend of the court the Attorney General's powers and responsibilities are limited to advising the court; he cannot call witnesses and marshal the evidence; the expense of prosecuting the case to the Supreme Court if necessary, which is estimated at $15,000 per pupil, is still the responsibility of the private plaintiff. There are too many segregated school districts, none of which will consider the decision in any other district's case binding upon it, for this haphazard and costly procedure.

This exhausts the administration's legislative proposals in this 100th year of emancipation. Apart from the shortfall in the voting area and particularly in the education field, there remain the subjects of employment, housing, administration of justice and public facilities. Many of these subjects were mentioned in the special message; none were deemed to warrant legislative proposals.

Yet, the Civil Rights Commission report in 1961 found that:

> Negro workers are still disproportionately concentrated in the ranks of the unskilled and semiskilled in both private and public employment. They are also disproportionately represented among the unemployed.

Since then the unemployment rate has risen to such alarming heights that the President has, quite properly, made economic measures to combat it the highest priority in his legislative program. The 1960 Democratic platform called for creation of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission, which would, according to legislation introduced in the Senate, cover all employment affected by interstate commerce and would have enforcement power in the Federal courts. The Civil Rights Commission recommended a statutory base for the existing President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, which would cover employment by the Federal Government, by those who contract with the Federal Government, in programs supported or in facilities constructed by Federal grants-in-aid, or by affected labor organizations. Instead of taking either of these courses, the President made much of the record of the existing Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, which is created by Executive order and has no power of subpena or real corrective power. But that record has been seriously questioned within the last year.

At one point there were reports in the press of conflicts of philosophies and personalities which were reputed to be impairing the effectiveness of the Committee. It was reported that the "plans for progress" program, a campaign of voluntary compliance which one of the

Committee members undertook to create, was giving employers an excuse for not complying in reality with the Executive order requiring nondiscrimination in hiring and promotion, and was in fact operating as a weakening substitute for the enforcement activities of the Committee itself. Since then both the member involved and the Staff Director have resigned. The merits of the situation are important as showing the need for Federal legislation, for either a full-scale FEPC or at least a statutory base defining the powers and duties of the President's Committee.

The Southern Regional Council made a survey of the plans for progress program in Atlanta, Ga., where 24 of the original 52 signers of the plans for progress had plants, offices or regional headquarters. The result of the survey, published in January, 1963, is that "the plans for progress were, for the regional office in Atlanta, largely meaningless." The report states:

> For every company which wants to keep its promise to the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, there are several which view the plans lightly—or who somehow believe that the program does not affect their Deep South operations. * * * To sum up, indications are that the interpretation of the voluntary and affirmative provisions of the program is being left to the individual signers themselves.

Even organizations, such as the AFL–CIO, which do not view the experience of the Committee's last 2 years as negatively as this judgment would indicate, nonetheless recommend that a Federal fair employment practices law is vitally needed and should be enacted.

Meanwhile questions have also been raised about other uses of Federal funds relating to employment. Apprenticeship training programs, the public employment offices established in the various States under Federal law; and now the new Manpower Training Act program have all been questioned as to whether equal opportunity has been, or in the case of the last, will be afforded. In a report to the President in August 1961, by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, the apprenticeship training and employment service programs were identified as denying equal opportunity. The Civil Rights Commission report of 1961 contained a finding as to all Federal funds for training and placement that a policy of equal opportunity "has yet to be made consistent or thoroughly effective." None of these programs was mentioned in the President's special message.

One final word should be said about the emphasis in the special message upon the drive to have the National Labor Relations Board take action against racial discrimination in unions as an unfair labor practice under existing law. The plan is an excellent one, but it should not delude anyone into believing that it is a substitute for a fair employment practices law; the great majority of employees in the United States, even in interstate commerce, is still nonunion, and the reach of the proposed drive is simply too short. In addition, the effect of such proceedings upon employers is still unknown.

The Executive order barring discrimination in Housing, issued by the "stroke of the pen" after almost 2 years of delay, fell far short of the Civil Rights Commission recommendation that it direct "all Federal agencies concerned with housing and with home mortgage credit to shape their policies and practices to make the maximum contribution" to the achievement of equal opportunity in housing. The Commission had found as a fact that:

> Of the many Federal agencies concerned with housing and home mortgage credit, none has attempted to exert more than a semblance of its authority to secure equal access to the housing benefits it administers, or to insure equal treatment from the mortgage lenders it supports and supervises.

The Executive order failed to reach: first, all housing constructed under contracts entered into prior to November 20, 1962, including public housing, FHA- and VA-insured housing, housing on urban renewal sites, and housing for the elderly and urban renewal projects whose preliminary contracts but not final loan and grant contracts were executed prior to November 20, 1962; and second, conventional mortgage loans not directly insured or guaranteed by the Federal Government, but made by institutions which operate under Federal supervision, such as those whose deposits are insured by FDIC or FSLIC. The areas covered by the order—FHA- and VA-insured mortgages—account for only approximately 25 percent of the total volume of residential financing.

The exclusion of these large areas in housing from the nondiscrimination order was not dictated by legal or constitutional incapacity. The 5th and 14th amendments to the Constitution bar the discriminatory use of Federal revenues for any purpose, including housing; and a constitutional mandate does not require an Executive order to make itself effective and therefore is not limited to prospective application, as would be legislation which affected previously incurred contract obligations.

I believe that the narrowness of the Executive order will not avoid difficulty, as the administration apparently hoped, but will instead, bring on further difficulty. Already there are reports in the press of a new development to open to Negroes housing not covered by the order, "dwell-ins" parallel to the sit-ins which have been so widely used in the lunch counter cases. The first efforts are planned for the North, because as one Negro leader says, "There are so many things in the South that take precedence over housing."

In addition, a Civil Rights Commission report issued last year called for special action in the field of housing in the District of Columbia, in addition to the general Executive order.

The final report of the 1961 series by the Civil Rights Commission concerned the administration of justice, which cuts across many of the other areas of civil rights because local police authorities are the principal contact between citizens, both Negro and white, and the legal structure of their communities. To this extent constitutional protections in the administration of justice are the concern of all citizens in all parts of the country. In those States in the South where that political and social structure is devoted to maintaining a system of segregation, it is the local police who principally sustain the State's policy. Where, for example, there is intimidation against Negroes who organize to attempt to register and vote, it is the local police who most effectively create and maintain the climate of fear, either affirmatively, by harassing arrests on trivial or unfounded charges or passively, by failing to prosecute private persons who commit acts of violence.

The recent sharp report by the Mississippi Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, consisting of citizens of Mississippi, both white and Negro, stated that:

> In all important areas of citizenship, a Negro in Mississippi receives substantially less than his due consideration as an American and as a Mississippian.

After listing a number of areas which bear this out, including hospitals, schools, jobs, voting, and even cemeteries, the committee devoted its entire report to police brutality, describing it as "a subject that has implications even more damaging to the principles of the American way of life than denial of the right to vote." The Committee said that what they found in their own State regarding police brutality was "a profound shock" to them. Even their factfinding efforts were, in their own words, "actively opposed by agents and instrumentalities of the State Government." The cases they describe are indeed shocking. As a result of their investigation the Committee recommended that the U.S. Civil Rights Commission hold hearings in Mississippi on a regular, periodic basis, that the Commission recommend additional legislation to the Congress, and that the President direct the Department of Justice to investigate every allegation of physical abuse of authority by State or local officials in that State "and institute criminal proceedings in all cases in which such action appears to be warranted, regardless of the prospects for convictions."

The President's message referred to incidents of harassment in discussing the right to vote; presumably his recommendations to amend the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts are intended to deal with these problems as if they all related to the right to vote. Yet the Civil Rights Commission devoted an entire volume in its 1961 reports to this subject and made four legislative recommendations: A grant-in-aid program to increase the professional quality of State and local police forces; amendment of the old Civil Rights Act provision, which made deprivation of another's civil rights a misdemeanor, so that it is effective; amendment of the provision which afforded a right of action so that it makes the local governmental entity whose employee is responsible for the deprivation of rights jointly liable, with the employee; and the granting of part III power to the Attorney General to prevent the exclusion of Negroes from jury service. The

President's proposals ignored these recommendations entirely.

A sixth area of Federal concern which has not been dealt with formally by any one Civil Rights Commission report to date, although I am advised that the Commission is looking into it, is public accommodations, which embraces both facilities supported in whole or in part by Federal or State funds, and facilities which are entirely privately supported and operated but which fall within the ambit of Federal jurisdiction over interstate commerce. Federal and State-supported facilities have been discussed in part in the education, employment, and housing areas. The issue arises in connection with each new Federal or State program as it becomes law. One additional aspect should be mentioned since it does not fall readily within any of those areas: The Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act contains the only other explicit segregation provision—separate but equal—apart from the already mentioned provision in the Morrill Land Grant College Acts. Why the President recommended the elimination of the latter provision but not the former is difficult for me to understand. The fact that the NAACP has brought suit in two hospital segregation cases does not offer a satisfactory distinction since the many suits in the education field would present an equal opportunity to avoid requesting legislation.

The special message devotes an entire section to public accommodations and describes a number of instances of real progress. It fails to note, however, that the desegregation of interstate bus and rail terminals was achieved under nondiscrimination clauses in existing law and that desegregation of airports was achieved only after repeated assaults were made by me on the Senate floor on appropriations for the airport terminal construction program. Racial incidents in national parks, forests, and other federally supported recreation areas are continually reported, I regret to note.

Problems continue to arise in connection with members of the armed services and their dependents. The issue of segregated schools has been discussed earlier. But the use of other public facilities, those financed by tax revenues and those simply open to the general public, remains an unsolved problem. A report issued this month by the South Dakota Advisory Committee to the U.S. Civil Rights Commission describes an ugly situation which developed in Rapid City as to servicemen from nearby Ellsworth Air Force Base. The committee found that most people in Rapid City, including its responsible leaders and officials, are against discriminatory practices, but it said concerted community action would be needed to head off the "forces of self-interest, ignorance, and bigotry." I am pleased to note that, since publication of the report, South Dakota has enacted a public accommodations antidiscrimination law.

The President last year appointed a Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces and the Civil Rights Commission has tackled the job of investigating the entire problem. It is my fervent hope that segregation in National Guard units throughout the South, another startling anachronism, will at last be ended.

But a greater problem is glossed over altogether, that of public facilities generally, in interstate commerce, including hotels, motels, and other such places providing lodging and services to travelers across State lines. The President notes, quite rightly, that:

> No act is more contrary to the spirit of our democracy and Constitution—or more rightly resented by a Negro citizen who seeks only equal treatment—than the barring of that citizen from restaurants, hotels, theaters, recreational areas, and other public accommodations and facilities.

But he offers no hope of a solution to that problem beyond banning segregation in the immediate bus, train and plane facilities, the national parks and forests, and space leased in Government buildings.

What about hotels and restaurants? Must we wait for repetitions of the incidents within the past 2 years of a high Federal official who is Negro being denied a room in a Texas hotel, or foreign diplomats being barred from entering restaurants along an interstate highway, constructed with 90 percent Federal funds? And if diplomats who are Negroes are to be protected by State Department "persuasion," how explain not protecting U.S. citizens who happen to be Negroes?

A recent very interesting article in the Hotel Monthly surveys racial and religious discrimination in the hotel industry and concludes, quite properly, that the "evolution" which is the result of State Department efforts regarding diplomats, the antidiscrimination public accommodation laws in effect in half the States, the trend toward attracting conventions, and the pressure of economics, is a slow process and that, unless the industry itself decides to do something about it, the Negro organizations may well make a strong public issue of it to the economic detriment of the industry. To me this is a healthy position for a trade journal to take. But it is also a powerful indictment of the subordinate and reluctant position of the Federal Government in the drive to achieve rights guaranteed by the Federal Constitution.

In my view, while identifying the problem, the President should also have recommended legislation to reach those facilities which are affected by interstate commerce. The National Labor Relations Board already applies the Federal labor laws to hotels which have substantial income from interstate commerce, so that the constitutional reach of Federal power is well established. That the statutory rights of employers and employees in such facilities should be more diligently protected than the constitutional rights of all American citizens to use those facilities is wholly unsupportable.

I therefore believe that advocates of civil rights legislation must wage a campaign throughout this year in order to build up support for a full-dress civil rights effort at the next opportunity, probably when the extension of the life of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, which expires this year, comes to the Senate floor. The crucial test will then come on cloture motions requiring a two-thirds vote to close debate on substantive civil rights amendments. Let no one in the United States mistake this fact: The most important civil rights vote cast by any Senator in 1963 and 1964 has been and will be his vote on a motion to close debate on a civil rights measure.

The first victory on a cloture motion on such a civil rights measure is the key which will unlock the iron gate which has for so long barred really important civil rights legislation. It will have brought the whole field of civil rights legislation into the second half of the 20th century, and we would then see really effective action in this field such as the national situation so much demands. I believe the best evidence of this prediction is the unprecedented desperation of the opposition to a rule XXII change by opponents of civil rights legislation at the opening of this session.

We on the other side advocate some really intensive and vigorous Presidential leadership. The President will go to the country again in 1964. He will appeal to the same groups which have heretofore supported him. They have supported him to a far greater extent than they have supported Republican candidates.

He owes them something in real American terms. It is our duty, at the very least, to see that if he is to seek their franchise, he should be brought face to face with what must be delivered as a result of it.

Let us remember that this does not involve only the President. It also involves the majority in the Congress. It involves the very committees which pass upon the very bills about which we are talking, which have Democratic Party majorities. A party obtains big things in our country when it wins a national election. At least it ought to give something in return, especially to those who are electing the members of that party in terms of national policy.

I have attempted to outline both the background and the possibilities which faced the President when he delivered his special message, and I have attempted to match against both the background and the possibilities the legislative measures which the President there proposed. I believe the conclusion inescapably to be drawn from that comparison is that the President has seriously neglected the most substantial part of the unanimous recommendations of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission and of his own party's platform. I do not question his good faith in what he has proposed, nor have I ever done so; nor do I question the importance of actions taken and to be taken in the executive department by the Attorney General and the President. But I deeply believe that the President has asked for so much less than those in a position of great responsibility—the members of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission—have proposed with great soberness and forethought; that his program is gravely inadequate to the need.

I say this particularly because this is the centennial of the Emancipation

Proclamation. The President's program does not measure up to what this event symbolizes: a great crusade for what common human decency has not yet provided, what a great Civil War has not yet provided, and what a century since then has not yet provided—equality of opportunity for Negroes in voting, education, employment, housing, the administration of justice, and public accommodations. I am proud to be among this group of Republicans who today introduce a series of bills based upon the Civil Rights Commission recommendations, which we believe to be a program which is worthy of the Emancipation Proclamation centennial.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may introduce out of order, for appropriate reference, for myself and Senators BEALL, CASE, FONG, KEATING, KUCHEL, and SCOTT, bills relating to the administration of justice; a bill to protect civil rights by providing criminal and civil remedies for unlawful violence, and for other purposes; and a bill to provide Federal assistance to State and local police forces through projects to develop and demonstrate more effective techniques and practices of law enforcement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD, along with the findings and recommendations of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

The bills, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1215. A bill to protect civil rights by providing criminal and civil remedies for unlawful official violence; and for other purposes:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That this Act may be cited as the 'Improvement of State and Local Justice Act'.

"Protection Against Violence Under Color of Law.

"Sec. 2. (a) Section 242 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting '(a)' immediately before 'Whoever', and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(b) Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, or regulation or custom knowingly performs any of the following acts depriving another person of any of the rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both:

"'(1) Subjecting any person to physical injury for an unlawful purpose;

"'(2) Subjecting any person to unnecessary force during the course of an arrest or while the person is being held in custody;

"'(3) Subjecting any person to violence or maliciously subjecting such person to unlawful restraint in the course of eliciting a confession to a crime or any other information;

"'(4) Subjecting any person to violence or unlawful restraint for the purpose of obtaining anything of value;

"'(5) Refusing to provide protection to any person from unlawful violence at the hands of private persons, knowing that such violence was planned or was then taking place; or

"'(6) Aiding or assisting private persons in any way to carry out acts of unlawful violence.'

"(b) The enactment of this section shall not be construed as indicating an intent on the part of the Congress to prevent any State, any possession or Commonwealth of the United States, or the District of Columbia, from exercising jurisdiction over any offense over which they would have jurisdiction in the absence of the enactment of this section.

"FEDERAL CIVIL REMEDIES FOR UNLAWFUL OFFICIAL VIOLENCE

"Sec. 3. Section 1979 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (42 U.S.C. 1983) is amended by inserting '(a)' immediately after 'Sec. 1979.', and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(b) Every city, county, or political subdivision of a State or territory which has in its employ a person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage of such State, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress to the same extent as the person employed is liable to the party injured.'

"PROTECTION OF FEDERAL OFFICERS AND UNIFORMED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES FROM INJURY AND THREATS

"Sec. 4. (a) Chapter 73 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end of such chapter the following new section:

"'§ 1510. Injuring or threatening to injure officers of the United States

"'Whoever, by force, intimidation, or threat, prevents or attempts to prevent any person from accepting or holding any office, trust, or place of confidence under the United States, or attempts to induce by like means any officer of the United States to leave the place where his duties as an officer are required to be performed; or whoever injures or attempts to injure or threatens to injure any such person or the property of such person on account of the lawful discharge of the duties of his office, or while such person is engaged in the lawful discharge thereof; or whoever injures or attempts to injure or threatens to injure the property of any such person so as to molest, interrupt, hinder, or impede such person in the discharge of his official duties shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than six years, or both.'

"(b) The analysis of chapter 73, immediately preceding section 1501 of title 18 of the United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'1510. Injuring or threatening to injure officers of the United States.'

"(c) Section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out 'officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard' and inserting in lieu thereof 'uniformed member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.'

"EXCLUSION OF MINORITY GROUP MEMBERS FROM JURY SERVICE

"Sec. 5(a) The Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief, including an application for injunction or other order, against any individual or individuals who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage of any State or political subdivision thereof, exclude any person or groups of persons from grand or petit jury service on account of their race, color, or national origin.

"(b) As used in subsection (a), the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

"SUITS BY UNITED STATES TO ENFORCE EQUAL PROTECTION OF LAWS

"Sec. 6. Part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'Sec. 123. (a) Whenever the Attorney General receives a signed complaint that any person is being deprived of, or is about to be deprived of, the equal protection of the laws, and whenever the Attorney General certifies that, in his judgment, commencement of litigation by such person (1) may create the danger of injury to the person, family, or property of the complainant or of any other person with standing to bring such litigation, or of any counsel retained for purposes of such litigation, or (2) may create the danger of economic sanctions against the complainant or any other person named in (1), the Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action or other proper proceeding for relief, including an application for a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order.

"'(b) Whenever an action has been commenced in any court of the United States seeking relief from the deprivation of the equal protection of the laws, the Attorney General in the name of the United States may intervene in the action with all the rights of a party thereto if he certifies that, in his judgment, the maintenance of the action may result in any of the injuries or economic sanctions set forth in subsection (a).

"'(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to deny, impair, or otherwise affect any right or authority of the Attorney General under existing law to institute or intervene in any action or proceeding.

"'(d) In any proceeding under this section the United States shall be liable for costs the same as a private person. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether the party aggrieved shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.'"

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1216. A bill to provide Federal assistance to State and local police forces through projects to develop and demonstrate more effective techniques and practices of law enforcement:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That this Act may be cited as the 'State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Act'.

"Sec. 2. (a) For the purpose of assisting in improving the professional competence of State and local police forces, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') is authorized to make grants for projects to develop or demonstrate techniques and practices which in his judgment will substantially contribute to the effectiveness of State and local law enforcement agencies, including (but not limited to) techniques and practices relating to law enforcement administration, the recruitment, training, and education of police officers, and improved cooperation among the various law enforcement agencies in the United States and between State and local law enforcement agencies and other public or nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions.

"(b) Such grants may be made to any State, local, or other public or nonprofit agency, organization, or institution; and to the extent he deems it appropriate, the

Secretary shall require the recipient of any grant to contribute money, facilities, or services for carrying out the project for which such grant was made.

"(c) The Secretary is further authorized to enter into contracts for any such projects with public or other agencies, organizations, or institutions, and with individuals.

"(d) The full amount (as determined by the Secretary) of any grant for a project made under this section shall be reserved from the appropriation for the fiscal year in which the grant is made; and payments on account of such grant in that and subsequent fiscal years may be made only from the amount so reserved.

"(e) Payments under this section may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, and shall be made on such conditions as he finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"Sec. 2. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the organization, administration, or personnel of any State or local police force or other law enforcement agency.

"Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may establish a Federal Advisory Committee on Police Procedures, Selection, and Training to advise him on the administration of this program. The Committee may elect officers and meet at the order of its Chairman. But its decisions will not bind the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on any matter.

"(b) Members of such Committee not otherwise in the employ of the United States, while attending meetings of the Committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $75 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Sec. 4. As used in this Act, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

"Sec. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

The findings and recommendations presented by Mr. Javits are as follows:

U.S. Civil Rights Commission Findings and Recommendations on the Administration of Justice

FINDINGS

Unlawful official violence

1. The actions of most policemen demonstrate that effective law enforcement is possible without the use of unlawful violence.

2. Nonetheless, police brutality by some State and local officers presents a serious and continuing problem in many parts of the United States. Both whites and Negroes are the victims, but Negroes are the victims of such brutality far more, proportionately, than any other group in American society.

3. While police connivance in violence by private persons is becoming less of a problem than in the past, such denials of equal protection still occur.

4. American citizens in some places live in fear of police violence and of mob violence with police connivance.

5. State and local officials—police commanders, prosecutors, and others in positions of authority—who have the immediate responsibility and most effective means for preventing such abuses sometimes do not use their powers. Police commanders at times take a protective attitude toward miscreant officers, and local prosecutors rarely bring criminal actions against them.

The professional quality of State and local police forces

6. The most effective "remedies" for illegal official violence are those that tend to prevent such misconduct rather than those which provide sanctions after the fact. The application of professional standards to the selection and training of policemen is one such preventive measure.

7. Complaints rarely are made against Federal police agents, in part because these officers have had professional training and have been selected according to professional standards.

8. The professional level is high in some State and local police forces also, but in many others it is low due to low pay, ineffective recruit selection standards and ineffective training programs.

9. The establishment of professional standards for police forces can be aided by such positive programs as good pay, high recruit selection standards, and training in scientific crime detection, in human relations, and in police administration. These programs would be encouraged by Federal financial assistance to police departments that seek the development of more effective selection standards and training courses.

Federal criminal remedies for unlawful official violence

10. Although many acts of violence by policemen are violations of constitutional rights and of Federal statutes, the Federal criminal sanctions for such misconduct have not proved to be effective remedies. This is due to difficulties inherent in the cases such as the problem of proof; to the policies and procedures of the Department of Justice; and to weaknesses of the statutes.

11. Among the policies and procedures of the Department of Justice that have hampered Federal criminal prosecutions for unlawful official violence have been excessive reliance on signed complaints from aggrieved individuals despite the fact that many victims of police misconduct are unaware of their rights, or fearful to press them; and tendency to close some cases without complete investigation; and deference to State authorities which results in withholding any investigation pending State action even at the risk of allowing evidence to grow stale.

12. FBI agents, charged with the duty of Civil Rights Acts investigations, are sometimes placed in a difficult position when they must investigate allegations of misconduct against local policemen. The cooperation of local officers is essential to the FBI in investigating and apprehending those who violate Federal criminal statutes not related to civil rights. Moreover, victims and witnesses of police misconduct are sometimes hesitant to give information to Federal authorities because of the cooperative relationship between the FBI and local policemen.

13. Since section 242, the principal criminal Federal Civil Rights Act defines only a misdemeanor, prosecution can be instituted by information (a sworn statement setting out the specific charges against the defendant) as well as by grand jury indictment. The former method avoids the delay and the hazard of one more hostile jury, involved in a presentment to a grand jury, and allows the facts to be brought to the attention of the affected community in a public trial. An information has been used by the Department of Justice only once and then successfully.

14. Difficulties also arise from the language of section 242, as interpreted by the Supreme Court in *Screws* v. *United States*. The requirement of "specific intent"—as opposed to the usual general criminal intent—for conviction under the statute severely limits the statute's applicability. Moreover, there is confusion among judges, jurors, and lawyers as to the meaning of specific intent. Some Federal trial judges have issued instructions to juries which seem to interpret specific intent more narrowly than is required by the Screws decision.

15. A more specific statute supplementary to section 242 spelling out certain conduct proscribed by the 14th amendment would more effectively protect the constitutional right to security of the person against official misconduct.

Federal civil remedies for unlawful official violence

16. The Federal civil rights acts providing civil liability for unlawful official violence have not proved to be effective remedies. Relatively few suits are filed under the principal civil statute, section 1983, which allows suits by the victims of police brutality against officers for monetary damages. Successful suits are rare.

17. One deterrent to the filing of civil suits is the fact that even if a victim of official violence sues successfully, few police officers are able to satisfy a substantial money judgment. This can be corrected by an amendment to section 1983 which would render counties, cities, and other local governmental entities liable for the misconduct of their policemen.[1]

Discriminatory exclusion of minority groups from jury service

18. The practice of excluding Negroes from juries on account of their race still persists in a few States. The burden of combating such racial exclusion from juries now rests entirely on private persons—almost invariably defendants in criminal trials.

19. Only criminal remedies are available to the Federal Government to combat unconstitutional jury exclusion. The Federal Government has successfully invoked a criminal statute only once, in the late 1870's.

20. Civil actions instituted in the name of the United States would constitute a more effective method of preventing discriminatory exclusion from juries.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The professional quality of State and local police forces

Recommendation 1: That Congress consider the advisability of enacting a program of grants-in-aid to assist State and local governments, upon their request, to increase the professional quality of their police forces. Such grants-in-aid might apply to the development and maintenance of (1) recruit selection tests and standards; (2) training programs in scientific crime detection; (3) training programs in constitutional rights and human relations; (4) college level schools of police administration; and (5) scholarship programs that assist policemen to receive training in schools of police administration.

Federal criminal remedies for unlawful official violence

Recommendation 2: That Congress consider the advisability of enacting a companion provision to section 242 of the U.S. Criminal Code which would make the penalties of that statute applicable to those who maliciously perform, under color of law, certain described acts including the following:

1. Subjecting any person to physical injury for an unlawful purpose.

2. Subjecting any person to unnecessary force during the course of an arrest or while the person is being held in custody.

3. Subjecting any person to violence or unlawful restraint in the course of eliciting a confession to a crime or any other information.

4. Subjecting any person to violence or unlawful restraint for the purpose of obtaining anything of value.

5. Refusing to provide protection to any person from unlawful violence at the hands of private persons, knowing that such violence was planned or was then taking place.

6. Aiding or assisting private persons in any way to carry out acts of unlawful violence.

Federal civil remedies for unlawful official violence

Recommendation 3: That Congress consider the advisability of amending section 1983 of title 42 of the United States Code to make any county government, city government, or other local governmental entity that employs officers who deprive persons of rights protected by that section, jointly liable with the officers to victims of such officers' misconduct.

Exclusion of minority group members from jury service

Recommendation 4: That Congress consider the advisability of empowering the Attorney General to bring civil proceedings to prevent the exclusion of persons from jury service on account of race, color, or national origin.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may introduce out of order, for appropriate reference, for myself and Senators Beall, Case, Fong, Keating, Kuchel, and Scott, bills relating to public accommodations: a bill to prohibit discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the furnishing of accommodations and facilities to any person at hotels or motels, the business of which affects interstate commerce; and a bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act to prohibit discrimination in any respect whatsoever on account of race, creed, or color in hospital facilities; and I also ask unanimous consent that these bills may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the Record.

To the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1217. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin in the furnishing of accommodations and facilities to any person at hotels or motels, the business of which affects interstate commerce:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) all persons shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations, advantages, privileges, services, and facilities of any hotel, motel, or other public place engaged in furnishing lodging, the business of which affects interstate commerce, subject only to conditions and limitations applicable alike to all persons, without discrimination or segregation based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

"(b) Whoever, being a proprietor, manager, or employee of any hotel, motel, or other public place engaged in furnishing lodging, the business of which affects interstate commerce, denies or attempts to deny to any person the full and equal enjoyment of any accommodation, advantage, privilege, service, or facility of such hotel, motel, or other public place, except for reasons applicable alike to persons of every race, color, religion, or national origin, or whoever incites or otherwise participates in such denial or attempt, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction, be subject to a fine of not to exceed $1,000 for each offense, and shall also be subject to suit by the injured person or by his estate, in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceedings for damages or preventive or declaratory or other relief. Any such suit or proceeding may be brought in any district court of the United States as constituted by chapter 5 of title 28, United States Code (28 U.S.C. 81 and the following), or the United States court of any territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, without regard to the sum or value of the matter in controversy, or in any State or territorial court of competent jurisdiction. Any such suit or proceeding for preventive or declaratory relief may be brought by the Attorney General for the United States, or in the name of the United States, but for the benefit of the real party in interest.

"(c) When used in this Act, the term "interstate commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any territory of the United States and any State or other territory, or between any foreign country and any State, territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1218. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act to prohibit discrimination in any respect whatsoever on account of race, creed, or color in hospital facilities:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That subsection (f) of section 622 of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"That the State plan shall provide for adequate hospital facilities for the people residing in a State, without discrimination in any respect whatsoever on account of race, creed, or color, and shall provide for adequate hospital facilities for persons unable to pay therefor. Such regulation shall require that before approval of any application for a hospital or addition to a hospital is recommended by a State agency, assurance shall be received by the State from the applicant that (1) such hospital or addition to a hospital will be made available to all persons residing in the territorial area of the applicant, without discrimination in any respect whatsoever on account of race, creed, or color; and (2) there will be made available in each such hospital or addition to a hospital a reasonable volume of hospital services to persons unable to pay therefor, but exception shall be made if such a requirement is not feasible from a financial standpoint."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in order to make the record consistent and complete for us all, I ask unanimous consent that all of the civil rights bills introduced today may lie on the desk for 1 week for additional cosponsors; and that they may all be printed in the Record at the time received and referred, along with the appropriate findings and recommendations of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator.

If I were to attempt to express adequately my appreciation for the leadership which the Senator from New York has given in this particular episode in our long and continued efforts, I would take longer than all of us have taken already in the development of our particular parts of this program.

I must say that in this, as in all other efforts of this sort, his persistence, his skill, his inexorable pursuit of the right and justice of this cause have been to me an inspiration and a great comfort as a Member of this body, as a close colleague of his, and most of all as an American. He has held the feet of all of us who are in positions of responsibility to the fire. He has made us face the situation again and again, much as many of us would like to turn away from it and much as perhaps the majority of the people of this country would like to turn away from it.

The Senator mentioned the article by Mr. Baldwin, now a book, I think. Who could read such a document without a deep stirring of conscience? Who could not at least appreciate faintly what the matter of discrimination and prejudice in the United States has meant to individual lives by the millions? Who could fail to feel a sense of responsibility for the destruction of the personalities, and oftentimes the lives, of millions of human beings by the system of segregation and discrimination which we have permitted to exist and which we in the Senate in many cases actively have helped to continue to exist?

For all the practical reasons the Senator from New York has cited, and above all for the great moral reason to which he has also given clear expression, we must make headway in this program.

The contribution by the senior Senator from New York today on the floor of the Senate in the development of this particular package of legislation and in the forward movement in this whole cause is an inspiration to all of his colleagues. I thank him for it.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from the depths of my heart for his generosity.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. I commend my colleague for a most eloquent and moving argument. I join with the Senator from New Jersey in gratitude for the leadership he has taken in this cause.

I wish to reinforce in the strongest possible language, Mr. President, the very valid point which my colleague has made—that the most important vote in the past as well as in the future in this Congress will be on the subject of cloture, on the subject of limiting debate. In my judgment, on the merits of most if not all of these civil rights measures

---

[1] *Lincoln County* v. *Luning*, 133 U.S. 529 (1890); *Hopkins* v. *Clemson Agricultural College*, 221 U.S. 636 (1911); *Frame* v. *City of New York*, 34 F. Supp. 194 (S.D. N.Y., 1940). Some States have statutes providing that the victims of mobs may sue the State in local courts for damages so incurred. An example is Ill. Rev. Stat., ch. 38, secs. 512–517 (1959). It is doubtful if liability could be extended by congressional action to State governments. *Hans* v. *Louisiana*, 134 U.S. 1 (1890); *Palmer* v. *Ohio*, 248 U.S. 32, 34 (1918); *In re State of New York*, 256 U.S. 490, 497 (1920); *Monaco* v. *Mississippi*, 292 U.S. 313, 328–30 (1934).

there is a majority—and there are perhaps votes to spare—as to the merits. There are certainly no votes to spare on the subject of terminating debate after some reasonable length of days.

That will be the crucial test. No one can escape it. No one can contend that he is a supporter of meaningful civil rights legislation if he is unwilling, after some reasonable length of time, to terminate the debate so that we can get on to a vote, as to which I express confidence—and I am sure my colleague agrees—there is sufficient strength to enact legislation. We just never can get to the vote, due to the obstructionist tactics of the opponents of any such legislation.

Therefore, the pinpoint of this argument is very important. My colleague has made a very effective address. He has effectively answered, conclusively and beyond any question of doubt, the questions raised with regard to his position during this debate. I commend him and I am proud to be joined shoulder to shoulder with him in this fight.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to my colleagues for their generosity and their kindness.

THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators Fong, Kuchel, Beall, Case, Cooper, Javits, Keating, Scott, and Pearson I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government. This bill would also broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission.

Granting permanent status to the Commission would provide a sound and efficient basis for its continued operation. In the difficult field of civil rights, the value of a permanent public agency entrusted with the responsibility for reporting the facts objectively is obvious. There is too much misinformation and misunderstanding in this important area. The Commission's work helps to reduce tensions and to promote responsible solutions when difficult problems arise. As an investigating and factfinding agency, the Civil Rights Commission performs many useful functions not duplicated by any other agency of the Federal Government. Its reports and studies have provided a basis for remedial action in cases involving action in civil rights, and have served to keep our citizens aware both of the progress made in this area and the problems which remain.

While my bill would give permanent status to the Commission, the Congress would retain the opportunity for regular review of its activities because the Commission would be coming before the Congress annually for appropriations.

This bill would enable the Civil Rights Commission to serve as a national clearinghouse for information and to provide advice and technical assistance to government agencies, communities, industries, organizations, or individuals, in respect to equal protection of the laws, including but not limited to the fields of voting, education, housing, employment, the use of public facilities, transportation, and the administration of justice.

The national clearinghouse function would permit groups to benefit from the experience of the Commission and from the information it has accumulated about how these problems have been solved in the past.

The Civil Rights Commission has made important contributions in promoting mutual understanding in the area of race relations since it was first organized in 1957. Unless action is taken the Commission will go out of existence November 8 of this year. That would be most unfortunate. I hope very much that the Congress will enact my bill so that the Commission can continue to render meaningful service to the country.

I ask that the bill be held at the desk until the end of business Thursday, April 4, so that other Senators who may wish to join in its sponsorship may have an opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and will be held at the desk, as requested.

The bill (S. 1219) to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Saltonstall (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Commission on Civil Rights Amendments Act of 1963".

Sec. 2. (a) Section 104(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975) is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(4) serve as a national clearinghouse for information, and provide advice and technical assistance to Government agencies, communities, industries, organizations or individuals, in respect to equal protection of the laws, including but not limited to the fields of voting, education, and the administration of justice."

(b) Section 104(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1975(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Commission shall, not later than January 31 of each year, submit a report to the President and the Congress setting forth its activities and findings during the preceding calendar year and its recommendations with respect thereto. The Commission may submit such other reports to the President and to the Congress at such times as the Commission and the President deem advisable."

(c) Subsection (c) of section 104 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1975 (c)) is hereby repealed.

Sec. 3. Section 105 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975d) as amended by section 401 of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (42 U.S.C. 1975d (h)) is amended by adding a new subsection at the end to read as follows:

"(i) The Commission shall have the power to make such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to state that there is such a commission in Massachusetts. I believe the law relating to it was enacted when I was Governor. It has worked out very satisfactorily. I believe the time has now come to make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent body in the Federal Government.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I am very proud to be a principal cosponsor with the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts of a bill to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission, and to broaden the scope and function of the Commission.

The Civil Rights Commission, an independent Federal agency, is scheduled to expire on November 30, 1963. Its life has been extended twice, in 1959, and again in 1961. Our bill proposes to extend its existence indefinitely.

Since its establishment by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the Commission has fulfilled its functions with great distinction. Through hearings, and through the issuance of periodic reports, it has helped to create across the Nation a climate of understanding and moderation. It has spotlighted and thus pointed up the many critical areas of civil rights which must yet be secured to all Americans.

Investigating deprivations of the right to vote, and denials of equal protection of the laws, in education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice, the Commission has pursued with diligence the areas in American life in which there exist practices inconsistent with the principles of democracy. It has issued reports and recommendations which have served as an effective guide for remedial action, both by the Congress and the Executive.

Our bill broadens the scope of the Commission's function by enabling the agency to serve as a clearing house for civil rights data. The Commission may offer its advice and technical assistance to anyone desiring an experienced and sympathetic forum. The Commission may then give its expert guidance in devising workable solutions and creating an atmosphere of understanding indispensable to peaceful and orderly progress.

But there remain many areas of unfinished business—areas of civil rights yet to be fully and adequately investigated. Because of this, our bill extends the life of the Commission indefinitely. There are at least three additional reasons to justify the Commission's more permanent and stable basis.

First, as an investigating and factfinding agency, the Commission performs a useful function not duplicated by another Federal department or agency. For example, it was on the basis of facts divulged during the Commission's 1958 hearings on voting rights that led to three constructive results: First, the enactment of the Civl Rights Act of 1960; Second, a bill which I have cosponsored with Senators Cooper and Dodd to protect the right of every American to vote; Three, a number of voting lawsuits initiated by the Justice Department.

Second, the value of the Commission's work, however, does not lie only in legislation, lawsuits or sanctions which may insue from its reports and recommenda-

tions. A public agency with continuing responsibility for bringing to light the facts is an absolute necessity. In no other area does misinformation and misunderstanding so quickly breed fear and confusion. The Commission's work helps reduce tensions and promote calm, reasonable solutions.

Third, an indefinite extension of the Commission would provide a sound and efficient basis for its continued operation, while leaving it subject to proper scrutiny by Congress. Clearly, there remain in the future many problem areas in civil rights which will require careful investigation and thoughtful recommendations. There can be no doubt that the Commission will have a continuing national function.

Yet, Congress will not lose any control over the agency by extending it indefinitely. The Commission will still be subject to a yearly review of its operations when it comes to Congress seeking appropriations. And, of course, even under an indefinite extension, Congress could still terminate the Commission's operations at any time.

The Federal Civil Rights Commission has repeatedly demonstrated its utility and effectiveness. It has established itself in our body politic as an expert agency, with the experience, capability and competence to contribute significantly in securing our constitutional guarantees to all Americans, regardless of nationality, race, or religion. I commend this bill to the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. To say anything further, Mr. President, would only depreciate the validity—in which I deeply believe—of what has already been said.

Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senate for its indulgence. I yield the floor.

FAY VERSUS NOIA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on Friday, March 15, I submitted, for myself and for the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], Senate Resolution 114 which, if adopted, would require that at least one of each two successive nominees confirmed by the Senate for Associate Justice of the Supreme Court shall have had at least 10 years of prior judicial service.

At that time, in discussing this resolution on the floor of the Senate, I stressed the necessity for sound judicial self-restraint which could be insured only by judicial experience attained by long years of painstaking study, research, and analysis. I pointed out then that the Conference of the Chief Justices of the State Supreme Courts, in a resolution adopted August 23, 1958, had urged that the Supreme court "in exercising the great powers confided to it for the determination of questions as to the allocation and extent of National and State powers, respectively, and as to the validity under the Federal Constitution of the exercise of powers reserved to the States, exercise one of the greatest of all judicial powers—the power of judicial self-restraint—by recognizing and giving effect to the difference between that which, on the one hand, the Constitution may prescribe or permit, and that which, on the other, a majority of the Supreme Court, as from time to time constituted, may deem desirable or undesirable, to the end that our system of federalism may continue to function with and through the preservation of local self-government."

I subscribed to that admonition then. I endorse it even more fervently today.

For, on March 18—just 3 days after I spoke—the Supreme Court handed down its decision in Fay against Noia—a decision which Mr. Justice Clark, in his dissenting opinion, accurately described as a "staggering blow" to the effective administration of criminal justice in State courts. As Mr. Justice Harlan stated, in his separate dissenting opinion, in which he was joined by both Mr. Justice Clark and Mr. Justice Stewart:

> This decision, both in its abrupt break with the past and in its consequences for the future, is one of the most disquieting that the Court has rendered in a long time.

I must admit that, on the facts, this was a hard case and that it perhaps forcefully illustrates the truth of the adage that "hard cases make bad law."

The facts were these: In 1942, Noia, with two others, was convicted of murder in Kings County, N.Y. The sole evidence against each defendant was his signed confession. His two codefendants appealed their convictions to the appellate division of the New York Supreme Court but Noia did not. While the appeals were unsuccessful, subsequent legal proceedings resulted in the release of Noia's codefendants on the ground that their confessions had been coerced and, therefore, their confessions were violative of the 14th amendment. The coercive nature of Noia's confession was conceded but, although aware of his right to appeal, he failed to exercise it. He thus remained in custody although his codefendants had long since been released and are now at liberty.

Thus, I make no complaint over the mere fact that Noia has now been granted his freedom. Perhaps a sound and meritorious case for executive clemency was presented. However, as a lawyer and as a firm believer in the reserved rights of the States, I am gravely disturbed by the "bad law" which the Court felt constrained to hand down—law which finds virtually no support from the prior decisions of the Court.

The case reached the Supreme Court as a result of Federal habeas corpus proceedings filed by Noia in the U.S. district court. That court denied relief because it failed to appear that Noia had exhausted the remedies available to him in the State courts. The circuit court of appeals reversed and the Supreme Court granted certiorari. The Court, in affirming the court of appeals, held: one, Federal courts have the power to grant habeas corpus relief despite Noia's failure to appeal; two, Noia's failure to appeal was not a failure to exhaust available State remedies since the appeal was no longer open to him when he filed his application for habeas corpus; and three, Noia's failure to appeal was not under the circumstances an intelligent and understanding waiver of his right of appeal which would justify the withholding of Federal habeas corpus relief.

To the layman, the implications of this decision may appear harmless. To the lawyer, and particularly to those charged with the administration of criminal justice in State courts, the implications assume enormous proportions. As was so well said by Mr. Justice Clark, the decision disrupts "the delicate balance of federalism so foremost in the minds of the Founding Fathers and so uniquely important in the field of law enforcement."

The situation in this case was that Noia was being detained as a result of a judgment of conviction in a Court having jurisdiction—a judgment which imparted verity. He had the procedural right of appeal to review his conviction—a right which he knowingly left unasserted. The judgment of conviction had long since become final. The judgment of detention was based upon an adequate and independent state ground, which, under all prior decisions, the Federal courts were required to respect. Finally, Noia had adequate opportunity to raise all Federal constitutional claims and to have them presented to and passed upon by the Federal courts if the relief sought was not obtained in the State court.

It is my considered opinion that the decision in question does not further law and order and the proper administration of justice. On the contrary, it undermines them because it interjects an uncertainty and instability into State criminal procedure which did not heretofore exist. Stripped of its legal verbiage, the decision simply means that regardless of the legality of an original conviction, regardless of the neglect of an available right of appeal, regardless of the constitutional safeguards provided by State procedures, a State judgment of conviction is never final but can be attacked collaterally and successfully a score or more years later by Federal habeas corpus proceedings.

Expressed another way, it means that after these many years the State court itself can be brought in and put on trial before the Supreme Court of the United States merely by the granting of the writ of certiorari. After the witnesses are no longer available, after the officials of the court are no longer available, at some indefinite future time, 10 or 25 years, the case is tried over and the court that tried the case is therefore put on trial.

This is but the latest of a long series of judicial steps which have chipped away at the reserved rights of the States and undermined the once sound concept of Federal-State judicial relations. The States surely have a vital stake in the administration of criminal justice and the right to develop and enforce their own judicial procedures, provided that they assure due process of law. Those rights, if not entirely destroyed, were certainly substantially curtailed by this decision.

I fear that we have once again witnessed a case involving the State-Federal system where the decision has been based on that which a majority of the Court has deemed desirable rather than on recognition of and respect for that which the Constitution prescribes or permits—a case, in short, in which judicial self-restraint went unexercised.

This case seriously disturbs the orderly disposition of State prosecutions and jeopardizes the finality of State convictions in utter disregard of procedural safeguards provided by the States which, until this decision, had been respected by the Federal courts.

This is another illustration of a departure from what we have always known as constitutional government and constitutional procedures.

Convicted criminals will be encouraged to say—when faced with a trial court conviction and long prison sentence—"Never mind the appeal. It will be futile. Just wait a few years and after a few key State witnesses have died and the trial is cold, I'll proceed in Federal court under habeas corpus."

The decision of March 18 creates a new procedure. It invites, in fact encourages, the substitution of habeas corpus in Federal court for an appeal in State courts.

It is a delayed-action bomb. Who is to know when a decision is final? Under Fay against Noia, no decision is ever final—it is always open to collateral attack in the Federal courts.

It creates an additional loophole making it even more difficult for the forces of law and order to prevail.

Any man is entitled to his day in court, but the phrase is singular, and not plural. Once a decision has been rendered and his right of appeal exhausted or ignored, the judgment is final.

If he chooses not to appeal, that is his decision. Many times this is a real advantage to him. In this case, a confessed murderer consciously decided not to appeal his life sentence. He was afraid—and for good reason—that a retrial might gain him a seat in the electric chair.

Mr. President, cases of this kind are not unusual. In my own practice and experience in court I have known many such cases.

But what do we have instead? The Supreme Court has handed him, and all convicted criminals who did not appeal their cases for similar reasons, another day in court, inviting an endless number of habeas corpus proceedings to clutter the already crowded docket of the Federal courts. And we have another severe and lasting blow to constitutional government and the enforcement of our State criminal laws.

That is the real tragedy of this holding.

One sentence of the dissenting opinion of Justice Clark stands out:

> Beyond question the Federal courts until today have had no power to release a prisoner in respondent Noia's predicament, there being no basis for such power in either the Constitution or the statute.

That is not my argument. That is not the argument that anyone is making. That is the voice of one justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, who exercised his responsibility in reaching a conclusion in this particular case. He says there is no basis for such power in either the Constitution or the statute. He says there is no basis for such power.

What gave the Court the power to render its decision "today" if it did not have the power yesterday? Was a constitutional amendment adopted overnight. Did Congress meet and hurriedly enact a statute? Neither of these things happened. I submit, Mr. President, that there is only one explanation. A majority of the Court decided to reach a certain result, because of special facts, and proceeded accordingly, in spite of longstanding precedents.

A hard case indeed makes "bad" law, and this case will surely rise to haunt the Court many times in the months and years to come.

I am not indifferent, of course, to individual, and personal justice in any case. This doubtless could have been a proper basis for executive clemency even after this party had decided to take his chances on the route that he had taken. Assuming there is some merit to his appeal for clemency, it was executive clemency that was indicated. This decision upsets long standing constitutional principles which have been followed heretofore.

If we assume for the purpose of discussion that Noia was erroneously convicted and entitled to freedom, we must remember that the authority for executive clemency was created to take care of situations where the courts are powerless to prevent a miscarriage of justice. This enables the governor of a State to act when he feels that there are overriding considerations demanding clemency.

It is not difficult to foresee the time, if the present trend continues, when a final decision of a State court—even the supreme court of a State—is given only passing notice and no more weight than the decision of a justice of the peace. A trial de novo under the guise of a habeas corpus proceeding in the Federal courts will be the rule rather than the exception.

In all candor, Mr. President, I say that not only does this decision present one more compelling reason for the adoption of S. Res. 114, but it makes it urgently necessary that the Congress enact remedial legislation to restore Federal habeas corpus proceedings to their proper place in our judicial system. On at least three occasions such legislation has been passed by the House of Representatives but has not been acted upon by the Senate. I am preparing a bill for presentation to the Senate and will introduce it in a few days.

In closing, Mr. President, I join with Mr. Justice Harlan in asserting the belief that, in Fay against Noia, "the Court has turned its back on history and struck a heavy blow at the foundations of our Federal system."

Mr. President, I close by adding only and repeating that far more is involved here than the merits of the case that was then before the Court. Far more is involved than merely one precedent of the Supreme Court. This involves more than a century of precedents. It involves a great principle of constitutional law and constitutional government. It strikes, in a manner, at the very vitals and the very foundations of our form of government under the constitutional provisions.

I have mentioned the possibility of passing a statute. Unless something is done to restore the stability of what Justice Harlan has called the foundations of our Federal system in this respect, then, as I pointed out heretofore, this precedent established here can run wild. I therefore predict that something will be done, and I say that something must be done, to restore the stability of the system that has served so well in the past and, in fact, is necessary under our form of government.

THE CLAY COMMITTEE REPORT ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to speak today on the subject of foreign aid, and I shall comment upon the report of the committee appointed by the President of the United States known as the Committee To Strengthen the Security of the Free World, headed by a distinguished American, Gen. Lucius D. Clay.

The report was made public last Saturday. On Thursday, March 21, I submitted in the Senate a concurrent resolution dealing with the subject of foreign aid.

After reading the report of the Clay Committee, I believe that the concurrent resolution which I submitted has even greater relevance to a strong foreign aid program.

Mr. President, I have supported the foreign aid program during my service in the Senate. Nevertheless, during the past several years I have voted for the foreign aid program with some reservations. My reservations do not arise from any change in my views regarding the necessity of a foreign aid program. I believe it is an important arm of our foreign policy. I believe it is necessary in our self-interest to open the avenues of association and trade with the developing countries, for we have had little association with many of them in our relatively short history as a Nation. In the harshest self-interest it is essential that we do not abandon the field to the Soviet Union—in countries which are desperately seeking aid. Looking around us today, and to the future, it is in our interest and the interest of those countries we assist that these nations shall remain free—free in the sense of being independent, sovereign nations, and free in holding democratic values.

Also, I have voted for aid because I believe our country—with all its troubles, yet rich among the countries of the world—has a humanitarian and spiritual duty to help those less favored.

My reservations and my doubts—and I think they are shared by many—on the foreign aid bill have arisen because of known facts and many doubts that the money we appropriate is not being as effectively used as it should and could be used. I believe the people of our country would feel better about foreign aid appropriations if they had assurance that they were being used as effectively as possible.

The report of the Clay Committee sustains the importance of a continuing program of foreign aid. I quote from the closing paragraph:

> Our examination of U.S. foreign assistance programs and consideration of them in this report has been based upon the sharp criterion of their value to the security of our country and of the free world. We would not express ourselves adequately, however, if we failed to note the further interests of our country and of our people in the purpose and effect of these programs. For this reason, we would point out that the need for development assistance and a U.S. interest in providing it would continue even if the cold war and all our outstanding political differences with the Communists were to be resolved tomorrow. This is so not merely because it is part of the American tradition to be concerned with the plight of those less fortunate than ourselves. This is so not merely because it is in our national self-interest to assure expanding markets for our production and reliable sources of supply of necessary raw materials. It is because the people of the United States hope to see a world which is prosperous and at peace that we believe those nations which are seriously striving to promote their own development should be helped by us and by our partners to create and maintain the conditions conducive to steady economic progress and improved social well-being within the framework of political freedom.
>
> Respectfully submitted.
>
> Lucius D. Clay, Chairman; Robert B. Anderson, Eugene R. Black, Clifford Hardin, Robert A. Lovett, Edward S. Mason, L. F. McCollum, Herman Phleger, Howard A. Rusk, M.D.

I particularly note the name of Hon. Eugene R. Black, former president of the World Bank, a man who has had vast experience in the field of foreign aid.

I believe the immediate result of this report will be a substantial reduction in the request made by the administration for its foreign aid program for fiscal year 1964. I believe also that it is probable that reductions will be made in future years unless the administration provides Congress and the country with information looking to the effectiveness of our program in each country—and I emphasize "each country"—because I do not believe that good programs in some countries, or the total program, should be undermined because of failures in some countries. I understand this to be the position of the Clay committee.

With this purpose in mind, I submitted to the Senate last week a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress, in substance, that the President should appoint small committees to assess in depth the foreign aid program in each of the countries which receives our aid. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Concurrent Resolution Introduced in the Senate by John Sherman Cooper on March 21, 1963

Whereas the United States has been engaged since World War II in programs of economic aid to other countries; and

Whereas an essential purpose of the United States in carrying out these programs has been to assist free countries in developing as quickly and effectively as possible, to the end that such countries may be able to raise the living standards of their peoples, achieve economic stability, and maintain and strengthen free institutions; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has appropriated approximately 66 billion dollars to the fulfillment of these objectives; and

Whereas the Congress does not have available to it the necessary information to enable it to evaluate the effectiveness of the aid extended by the United States to specific countries: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should appoint as quickly as possible a committee for each country receiving economic aid from the United States, composed of at least five members, including representatives of the public, to review and evaluate the development program of such country and to report to the President and to the Congress not later than January 1, 1964, their findings with respect to the following—

(1) whether the recipient country (a) has a practical national development program which affords a reasonable expectation that the objectives of such program will be attained, taking into consideration the human and natural resources and capabilities of the country, (b) is providing the maximum amount of self-help within its capabilities, and (c) has adopted the fiscal, administrative, and social reforms necessary to the success of such program;

(2) whether the specific projects to which United States aid is allocated will contribute materially to the fulfillment of the primary needs of the recipient country's development program, and to the purpose of the United States to assist in raising the standards of living of the people of the country; and

(3) such other matters as in their opinion will be useful to the Congress in its consideration of legislation authorizing or appropriating funds for financing foreign aid programs for 1965 and subsequent fiscal years.

Sec. 2. It is further the sense of Congress that such committees should be appointed first to review the development programs for the following countries, which have received approximately one-third of the assistance extended by the United States under foreign aid programs: Korea, India, Japan, China, Greece, Vietnam, Brazil, Pakistan, Turkey, Philippines, and Iran; and that legislation authorizing or appropriating funds for carrying out these programs for 1965 and subsequent fiscal years should not be enacted until the Congress has received and considered the reports referred to in this resolution.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, last year, when the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 was before the Senate, I submitted a similar proposal in the form of an amendment. It was adopted by the Senate. The amendment expressed the sense of the Senate that the President should appoint small committees to assess the foreign aid program in each country receiving aid from the United States. In the House-Senate conference, the amendment was stricken.

Also, in a speech I delivered in the Senate in 1960, I made a similar proposal, although I did not incorporate it in the form of an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act. On March 22, 1961, again speaking in the Senate, I made this statement:

> The administration should secure the assistance of the World Bank and other institutions to work with countries we aid in the formulation of the best developed plans. President Kennedy now has his greatest opportunity—one he may not have later—to work with recipient countries during the development of plans which have the greatest promise of success. We should not commit substantial sums for aid until such plans are developed.

So the proposal I have made in the concurrent resolution is not a new concept on my part. I have talked with officials in the Administration, and with members of the Clay Committee, outlining the purpose of the resolution which I have suggested should be adopted by Congress. If it is not adopted as a concurrent resolution, it should be considered by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and be incorporated in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1963.

I am very hopeful that the President, in the formulation of his message to Congress on foreign aid, will consider the proposal which is the substance of the resolution. It may be asked—and it should be asked—What is the substance of the resolution? What is its purpose? As I have said, the committee headed by General Clay has performed distinguished and creative work in a very short time in examining the basis and operation of our foreign aid program, pointing out both its values and its necessity, and also its defects. It is my judgment that if the defects are not corrected, and corrected quickly, we shall see a continuing effort in this country and in Congress to strike down the concept of foreign aid—indeed, to end the foreign aid program.

Reductions will be made, and ought to be made, until Congress has before it specific information regarding the foreign aid program in each country which receives aid. I have studied reports submitted by the various agencies which have administered foreign aid. I cannot even state the number of those agencies. I read yesterday that there have been 11 administrators of foreign aid since the inception of the program. Before I submitted my resolution, I looked through some of the reports to see if it was possible to ascertain any definite or clear information about the success or failure of the foreign aid program in any specific country. I must say that I do not believe the information can be found.

The purpose of my resolution is to secure needed information so that the aid program may achieve maximum effectiveness and survive. The information can be secured by small committees appraising in depth the foreign aid program in each country and reporting their findings to the President and to Congress by January 1, 1964. Some may say that reports cannot be made by January 1, 1964. In answer, let me say that the Clay committee has been working for only a few months, and I am sure it has not been in session all the time. But its members are men of ability, and knowing how to obtain information have been able to present to the country an important and effective report on the entire foreign aid program. If the Clay committee can make a survey of the complete foreign aid program in a few months, I believe that small committees, composed of able men, can report on the effectiveness of our foreign aid program in each country. This can be done, in respect to some countries, in 3 or 4 months. I believe the total job can be finished by January 1, 1964.

What would those committees be charged with determining? My resolution points out some of the questions which ought to be answered.

The committees would determine whether the development program of the country is suited to its capabilities and resources. If it is not, the program could not have any great chance of success, and our aid serves no effective purpose.

Further, the committees should determine whether the countries are providing maximum self-help, and are undertaking the administrative, fiscal, and social reforms without which it is doubtful that any foreign-aid program would succeed.

I know we cannot expect perfection; but certainly it is important to know whether these basic conditions are being met. I believe the report of the Clay committee sustains my contention that these questions should be answered and these conditions should be met.

I should like to refer to the section of the Clay Committee's report called "Country Planning." First, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Country Planning

> There is a difference between sound, forward-looking national budgeting in economic and social terms on the one hand and theoretical long-term national development planning as it is often encountered. Extrapolations of mathematical models based on questionable statistics for debatable base periods seem to have a way of going wrong, even when it is possible to find economists who agree with each other. Furthermore, these long-term projections have been of little or doubtful value and frequently have proved harmful by directing attention to the theory of economic development at the expense of its practical implementation. Sound governmental planning consists of establishing intelligent priorities for the public investment program and formulating a sensible and consistent set of public policies to encourage growth in the private sector. U.S. governmental officials and programs should strive for such utility and realism in the development planning they support and in which they cooperate.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the paragraph on country planning makes the same point—that the developing countries ought to formulate programs adapted to their resources and capabilities.

The Clay Commission report also states:

> The United States should be increasingly more specific on the self-help and reforms it seeks and do so on a country-by-country basis.

I do not believe we can ascertain whether our foreign aid program is successful in totals unless we know whether it is successful country by country.

Another purpose of the committees would be to look at the use of our foreign aid funds in each country.

The committees would assess the programs and the projects to which our funds are applied. I know, as is known by others of the Congress who have visited countries which we aid, that there is a tendency to establish American programs and projects which, although many of them have value, do not contribute substantially to the basic development of the country. Too many people are put to work on unnecessary projects. The committees could determine whether our aid is applied to projects that are substantially helpful to the basic development of the country, and if not, they could make recommendations to abolish unneeded programs and unneeded personnel. They could in a very positive way, make recommendations for the establishment of needed programs which would contribute substantially to the development of the country.

To give an illustration, I would say the basic need of any newly developing country is agriculture—to feed and to clothe its people. However, some countries, which naturally are seeking industrial development, fail to place sufficient importance on agriculture and its necessary development to supply food and clothing to the people. This is one type of determination which the committee could make.

Mr. President, last year, when I offered an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962, embodying my present proposals, members of the Foreign Relations Committee who were on the floor at the time were kind enough to say—and I remember statements by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] and the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson]—that they considered it an amendment with a valuable purpose. However, they raised questions concerning the cost of maintaining country committees and whether it would be possible to secure the number of members from private life who would be required for such committees.

As to the cost, it is possible that it might amount to half a million dollars, or perhaps a million dollars. But such a cost would be a minimal amount compared to the total our country spends each year on economic assistance—approximately $3 billion. And when considered in terms of the purpose of our foreign aid—to provide effective assistance to other free countries—the cost would be small indeed. Furthermore, it could be paid from the allocations made for each country.

As to the availability of personnel, each of the 25 to 40 committees I have suggested could be composed of, let us say, three men from the Federal Government and at least two men from private life. I would say that if 50 to 100 men in private life cannot be found to undertake this work for a few months, then our country is poor indeed.

Mr. President, there are precedents for my proposition. When the Marshall plan was enacted, the Congress wrote into the act a provision requiring a continuing examination of the programs in each country by a watchdog committee composed of Members of Congress. Representatives of the public and, I believe, representatives of the executive branch, had previously studied European foreign aid requirements. Last year, the Senate adopted an amendment similar to the resolution I now propose.

In 1959, the then Senator Kennedy and I introduced a joint resolution, which was passed by both Houses, providing for a review of our foreign aid programs in India and in Pakistan. As a result of the joint resolution, the State Department requested the World Bank to send three representatives to India and Pakistan. The World Bank sent Mr. Hermann J. Abs, of Germany, Sir Oliver Franks, of the United Kingdom, and the Honorable Joseph M. Dodge, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, of the United States. This Committee went to India and Pakistan, studied the programs there, and made recommendations. A very important result came from their recommendations—the formation of a consortium of several countries which have since contributed aid to the two countries, thereby helping India and Pakistan and sharing with the United States the total aid required.

Mr. President, let me say, in summary, that effective and distinguished as is the Committee headed by General Clay—which is composed of some of the country's ablest citizens—and effective as will be its reports on the subject of foreign aid, I do not believe we can have accurate information about the totality of our foreign aid program or its effectiveness in any country unless we have an assessment in depth for each country we aid. I suggest we start with the 11 countries that have received about one-third of the total of $66 billion which has been appropriated for economic aid.

These suggestions may not be liked by some of the newly developing countries, for they are jealous—and rightfully so—of their political and economic independence. But the countries we aid will respect us for insisting upon these conditions—for they will be benefited, and without loss of any independence. The administration and the Congress owe the duty to our people who support the foreign aid program, and to the people of the countries we aid, to see to it that our funds are used effectively and without waste—for the purpose of our aid program is to assist countries to achieve economic and social stability, to achieve better standards of living for their people, and to strengthen free institutions and democratic values.

It might be argued that some countries will go to the Soviet Union for aid. But many go to the Soviet Union anyway. I think the best answer to such countries is: "After consultation—going over your country's programs at the highest level—the United States has made the best decision possible concerning the extent and object of our aid. If the Soviet Union will help you further, that is a matter for your decision."

I am very happy that the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] and the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] have asked to join me as cosponsors of the resolution. I ask unanimous consent that their names be joined as cosponsors of my concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. I shall certainly be glad to have other Senators consider the resolution and join as sponsors. It will be at the desk until April 1.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. When the distinguished Senator from Kentucky submitted his resolution, he very generously, I believe, provided that it remain on the table until April 1 for cosponsors. I have asked that my name be added. I commend my colleague for the leadership which he has taken in that important field. I well remember the substance of the resolution which he offered as an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act. I was gratified that the amendment was adopted, and regretted that in conference it was eliminated. It seems to me that it is a very constructive approach to the problem.

As the Senator from Kentucky knows, I, like him, have been a consistent supporter of the foreign aid program over the years.

Sometimes there have been provisions of programs, and programs themselves, which have not been popular. But I have felt that, although mistakes have been made, generally the foreign aid program has served a constructive purpose. At this time there is increasing pressure for a more careful evaluation and for tightening up on some of the provisions of the program. I think the Clay Committee has performed a worthwhile service. One need not agree with every sentence in the report to make that statement. The members of the Committee are distinguished men. Many of them have had much experience in government and much experience with programs of foreign aid. The Committee is headed by one of the great Americans of our time, General Clay.

The Senator from Kentucky has sounded the right note in saying that the people themselves are insistent that the program be more carefully evaluated. The number of countries getting economic aid is being increased. In some countries the program has been very effective. In others it has not. When the money comes out of the pockets and the pay envelopes of Americans and is being sent to other nations, it is very important that the recipient countries themselves tighten up on their own finances, enact social reforms, and improve their taxation policies.

I am hopeful that the resolution of the distinguished Senator may receive early attention in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I express to the Senator my gratitude for the fine leadership which he has shown in this crucial area. I hope that if the resolution does not receive favorable action in committee, the Senator will offer it as an amendment when we consider the foreign assistance program. I feel it would be very helpful.

I would think that those in charge of the foreign aid program would welcome this constructive assistance from the Senator from Kentucky in the administration of the act, because it emanates, as we know, from an experienced man of good will and a supporter of the program. Therefore it is entitled, it seems to me, to great respect and great weight.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. I will offer the measure in the form of an amendment, if it is not considered as a resolution. It is, of course, possible that the Clay Committee itself may be instituting a country-by-country assessment. I have written to General Clay. I hope that the committee will favorably consider my resolution.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] in the remarks he just made with respect to the resolution submitted by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] and to add that I, too, think that the resolution would be a helpful type of legislation and needed legislation. It seems to me that the Clay Committee has rendered an outstanding service to our country. But, unfortunately, due to the amount of time that the committee had to work on its report, it could not possibly go into each and every country which is receiving foreign aid from the United States to the degree that is necessary in order to particularize its recommendations. The Senator from Kentucky now seeks to fill that gap. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky if I might be privileged to join with him as a cosponsor of the resolution.

Mr. COOPER. I would appreciate very much if the distinguished Senator from Iowa would join with me and the Senators from New York in the prosecution of the resolution.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator. Should the resolution, standing by itself, for some reason not receive the attention in the committee that it should receive, I will be more than happy to join with the Senator in supporting the resolution as an amendment at an appropriate time on the floor.

INCREASING FARM EFFICIENCY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on February 14 and 15, in Des Moines, Iowa, was held the annual National Farm Institute sponsored by the Agriculture Committee of the Greater Des Moines Chamber of Commerce. The National Farm Institute has become world renowned for its quality, because of the recommendations it frequently produces.

One of the outstanding papers at the recent institute was presented by Mr. Donald R. Kaldor of Iowa State University, on the subject of "Rising Farming Efficiency." This is a very useful paper, in that it discusses the makeup of farming efficiency and traces its development down through the past several years.

For example, Mr. Kaldor points out:

> After 1940, total output per unit of total input in farming increased at an average rate of 1.75 percent per year. Few, if any, countries of the world have experienced a higher or more persistent rate of increase in farming efficiency.

Another observation made by Mr. Kaldor is that "the amount of labor used per unit of output has declined by nearly 70 percent since 1940. Capital input per unit of output, however, has increased about 30 percent. While real labor cost per unit of output has declined, real capital cost per unit of output has increased. But total real cost per unit of output has diminished which is another way of saying that physical efficiency has increased" substantially, as his statistics point out. Another observation made by Mr. Kaldor is that:

> Nearly 90 percent of this increase can be attributed to rising efficiency and about 10 percent can be attributed to a larger total input of resources. Output in the total private economy more than doubled in this same period. However, only about 55 percent of this increase can be attributed to rising efficiency.

Finally, Mr. President, Mr. Kaldor states:

> Associated with rising farming efficiency has been a large increase in the output of farm products. In fact, rising efficiency has been reflected almost wholly in increases in output rather than in decreases in total input.

This accounts for the fact that there has been a declining farm population—a very substantial one, I might add, Mr. President, running to a total of almost 1.3 million people moving off the farms in only the past 2 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this splendid address may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Rising Farming Efficiency

(By Donald R. Kaldor, Iowa State University)

> Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the theme—"Agriculture in a Growing Economy"—selected for this the 25th annual National Farm Institute is a highly significant one. The farm industry's problems of economic imbalance have been created largely by forces associated with rapid economic growth. Greater understanding of the nature of economic development, the contribution of agriculture and the effects of growth on the farm industry is essential if we are to have consistent public policies that will help to solve our farm problems and foster economic progress. The understanding of economic growth needs to be deeper, more penetrating, and more specific, also more widely distributed among farmers, urban people, and local and national leaders. Public policies, in the end, can be no better than the knowledge and understanding of the people who make them. In a democracy, this is a lot of people.
>
> My assignment is to discuss rising farming efficiency. This is the complex process of discovery and application of scientific principles to the more and more intricate mechanisms for producing food and fiber. It is also the tedious and sometimes unpleasant process of reorganizing farms, changing the number of farms, shifting the location of production, adjusting the economies of rural communities and even changing the makeup of distant industries. There are many more known parts to the process but they are not all clearly understood yet.
>
> In the time available, I will try to provide some answers to four main questions: (1) How much increase in efficiency has there been in farming? (2) How does the rise in farming efficiency compare with the efficiency

gains in the rest of the economy? (3) What have been the principal sources of increased efficiency in farming? (4) What have been some of the consequences of rising farming efficiency for agriculture and for national economic growth? Before focusing on these questions, however, let us briefly consider what efficiency is and how it is measured.

MEANING OF EFFICIENCY

The dictionary says that efficiency is output divided by input, i.e., output per unit of input. Some of the measures of efficiency commonly used in the farm business are output per acre, milk production per cow, eggs per hen, and pigs raised per sow. In each case, some measure of output is divided by some measure of input to give output per unit of input.

But all of these measures and many more like them take account of only one kind of input. While they are useful for certain purposes, they are not reliable indicators of the efficiency of the whole production process. For example, output per acre takes account of land input only. If one wants to evaluate the efficiency of the corn enterprise, one must take account of not only the input of land but also the input of labor, power and machinery, fertilizer, seed, and so forth. Likewise, if one wants to evaluate the efficiency of production on a whole farm, one must take into account all of the outputs of products and all of the inputs of resources.

Since we are interested in the efficiency of the entire farm industry, the best measure of this will be one that takes account of the total output of farm products and the total input of land, labor, and capital used in farm production. Until quite recently, most of the figures on efficiency in various industries were based only on labor input. As a result of several recent studies, however, data are now available for both farm and nonfarm industries which take into account most of the measurable inputs and most of the measurable outputs. While these estimates have some limitations, they are quite adequate for indicating broad trends in efficiency.

TRENDS IN FARMING EFFICIENCY

The evidence indicates that during the past century there has been a large increase in efficiency in farming. Between 1870 and 1961, total output per unit of total input increased more than 120 percent or at a compound rate of slightly more than eight-tenths of 1 percent per year. In the same period, total output rose more than 440 percent or at an annual rate of nearly 1.9 percent. Total input of land, labor and capital increased about 146 percent or at a yearly rate of about 1 percent. Nearly 55 percent of the increase in total output over this period can be attributed to the larger volume of input and about 45 percent can be attributed to the rise in physical efficiency.

While the long-run trend in farming efficiency has been upward, the rate of increase has been changing. The data show that the rise in farming efficiency has picked up momentum in recent decades. From 1870 to 1911, total output per unit of total input increased at an annual rate of less than seven-tenths of 1 percent. During the following decade, which includes the period of World War I, efficiency in the farm industry actually declined. Although total output continued to rise, total input rose more than in proportion to the increase in output. Between 1920 and 1939, which included the period of the great depression, efficiency increased nearly nine-tenths of 1 percent per year. But in the next two decades, the rate almost doubled. After 1940, total output per unit of total input in farming increased at an average rate of 1.75 percent per year. Few, if any, countries of the world have experienced a higher or more persistent rate of increase in farming efficiency.

The upward trend in the rate of increase in farming efficiency is reflected in the changing role of increases in input in the expansion of farm output. In the period from 1870 to 1911, nearly 72 percent of the increase in farm output can be attributed to increases in total input of land, labor, and capital. Only 28 percent can be attributed to rising efficiency. But in the period since 1940, about 80 percent of the increase in output can be accounted for by rising efficiency, while only 20 percent can be accounted for by increases in total input. Between 1950 and 1961, farm output rose nearly 23 percent. Total input remained stable. So in the past decade, all of the increase in output can be accounted for by increases in physical efficiency and perhaps better than average weather.

The upward trend in efficiency has been accompanied by a striking change in the makeup of total input in farming. Since World War I, labor input has declined by almost 60 percent. Nearly three-fourths of this decline occurred after 1940. On the other hand, the input of capital items, largely purchased from other sectors of the economy, has increased greatly. Since 1920, input of mechanical power and machinery has risen over 200 percent. Use of fertilizer and lime has increased nearly 750 percent. And input of feed, seed, and livestock has expanded 350 percent. In sharp contrast to the big changes in labor and capital inputs, there has been only a slight increase in input of land and buildings since 1920. In recent years, cropland input has actually declined because of land retirement programs and competition from nonfarm uses.

In the early 1920's, nearly two-thirds of the total input of resources in farming consisted of labor. By 1957, this figure had dropped to less than a third. Capital items made up about a fourth of total input in 1920. In 1957, the capital share stood at more than 50 percent. On the other hand, the relative share of land and buildings in total input increased little, if any, during this period.

At the same time that land use has become more capital intensive it has become less labor intensive. Because of these offsetting changes, there has been little net effect on total input of labor and capital per unit of land. But the amount of labor used per unit of output has declined by nearly 70 percent since 1940. Capital input per unit of output, however, has increased about 30 percent. While real labor cost per unit of output has declined, real capital cost per unit of output has increased. But total real cost per unit of output has diminished which is another way of saying that physical efficiency has increased.

COMPARISON OF EFFICIENCY TRENDS IN FARMING AND OTHER INDUSTRIES

Although the trend in efficiency in farming has been upward, the rate of increase has not been as high as that in other industries making up the private (non-Government) economy. The margin of difference, however, seems to have been getting smaller as a result of the acceleration in farming efficiency in recent decades.

Over the period of nearly 70 years from 1889 to 1957, total output per unit of total input in the private economy, including the farm industry, rose at an average rate of about 1.7 percent per year. In the same period, efficiency in farming increased at an average rate of slightly less than 0.8 of 1 percent per year. Since farming is included in the private economy, the rate of increase for nonfarm industries must have been greater than 1.7 percent per year. Thus, the rate of increase in farming was less than 45 percent of the rate of increase in nonfarm industries. It appears that only a few nonfarm industries experienced a smaller rise in efficiency than farming in this period. Among these were coal mining, lumbering and leather manufacture.

When the 1889–1957 period is broken down into subperiods, the figures indicate that the differences between the rates of increase in farming and those in nonfarm industries have been getting smaller with the passage of time. In the period from 1889 to 1919, efficiency in the total private economy increased at an average rate of 1.3 percent per year, whereas that in farming rose not quite 0.3 of 1 percent per year. In this period, the rate of increase in farming was about 20 percent of the rate of increase in the total private economy.

In the 1919–1957 period, the average rate of increase in farming rose to about 0.7 of 1 percent per year, while that in the total private economy advanced to 1.9 percent per year. For this period, the rate of increase in farming was 37 percent of the rate of increase in the total private economy. From 1940 to 1957, the average rate of increase in farming rose to 1.6 percent per year, whereas that in the total private economy advanced to 2.3 percent per year. In this period, the rate of increase in farming was about 70 percent of the rate of increase in the total private economy. So although the rate of increase in efficiency has been smaller in farming than in nonfarm industries, the difference has been diminishing as efficiency in farming has accelerated in relation to that in nonfarm industries.

During the past two decades, rising efficiency has been a more important source of output expansion in the farm industry than in nonfarm industries. Between 1940 and 1957, farm output rose about 39 percent. Nearly 90 percent of this increase can be attributed to rising efficiency and about 10 percent can be attributed to a larger total input of resources. Output in the total private economy more than doubled in this same period. However, only about 55 percent of this increase can be attributed to rising efficiency. About 45 percent can be attributed to a larger total input, mostly of labor and capital.

The figures on output per unit of labor, in contrast to those on output per unit of total input, tell quite a different story, however. They show that the average product of labor has risen more in farming than in nonfarm industries. Between 1927 and 1957, output per man-hour in farming increased at an average rate of about 4.3 percent per year, whereas that in nonfarm industries rose less than 2.6 percent per year. The difference was even larger in the 1945–57 period, when output per man-hour rose over 6.5 percent per year in farming and less than 2.5 percent per year in nonfarm industries. While output has been rising in both farming and nonfarm industries, labor input has been declining rapidly in farming but it has been increasing in nonfarm industries. Part of the reason for the increase in labor input in nonfarm industries is that people have been leaving agriculture for nonfarm jobs.

In farming, the increase in output per man-hour has been accompanied by a decrease in output per unit of capital input as capital has been substituted for labor. As a result, overall efficiency in farming has not increased nearly as much as labor efficiency. For example, output per man-hour rose at an average rate of 6.5 percent per year in the 1945–57 period, but output per unit of total input increased only 1.8 percent per year. As noted later, the decline in labor input has been an essential part of the process of increasing farming efficiency.

SOURCES OF RISING FARMING EFFICIENCY

The rise in farming efficiency has been the result of numerous factors interacting within a general environment which has been favorable to change. It has been

closely interrelated with advance in efficiency in the total economy. In fact, most of the forces that have been operating to increase efficiency in farming also have been working to boost efficiency in nonfarm industries.

Underlying the advance in efficiency has been a strong desire of Americans generally for the income gains which rising efficiency makes possible. Because of the strong desire for higher incomes in the American culture, we have done many things which have encouraged greater farming efficiency.

For one thing, large public and private investments have been made in activities which directly or indirectly increase efficiency. As a people, we have placed a high value on truth and knowledge, partly because we have found that these things are important means to achieving a better life. As a result, large amounts of resources have been expended on the discovery of new knowledge and on the dissemination of existing knowledge. A substantial proportion of these resources have been devoted to agricultural research and educational activities.

In the public sector, these activities have been lodged largely in the land-grant universities and in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. These institutions have been doing basic research in the sciences and have been applying the results to the development of improved farming techniques. At the same time, our educational institutions have been busy raising the general level of knowledge of young people who enter farming, training more agricultural scientists and extending knowledge about farm technology and management to farm operators.

In the private sector, firms supplying farmers with power, machinery, fertilizer, feed, insecticides and other capital inputs also have been investing large sums in research and development activities. These investments have lead to more productive forms of capital and better methods of farming. In addition, these firms, together with farm magazines, newspapers and radio and TV stations, also have been engaged in the dissemination of information of farm technology and management.

These private and public activities have raised the quality of labor-management input in farming and have made it more productive. Since changes in quality are not taken into account in the measurement of total input, the results are reflected in an increase in efficiency. These activities also have set the stage for increases in the level of farm technology by making available more productive forms of capital inputs and information on improved farming practices.

Before the results of agricultural research and extension can be reflected in increased efficiency, however, the ideas and improved forms of capital must be actually utilized by farmers. If this is to happen, there must be an incentive to use the better technology. And in the many instances where adoption requires increased investment, there must be capital available to finance the use of improved practices. The incentive has been provided by a strong desire on the part of farm people to improve their incomes. For the individual farmer, better technology offers an opportunity for higher income by permitting output to rise in relation to total costs, thereby reducing costs per unit of output. For the early adopters, the use of better technology will increase income. For the late adopters, there may or may not be income improvement, depending on what happens to farm prices. Even if there is no income improvement for late adopters, they have an incentive to use the better technology to maintain their competitive position within the farm industry. In most rural communities, there have been some farmers who have been willing to assume the extra risk that frequently accompanies the early use of new farm practices. These early adopters have played an important role in the diffusion of new technology in the farm industry.

The funds to finance the introduction of better technology have come partly from farm families and partly from private and public credit institutions. The long-run improvement in farm family incomes has permitted greater savings and investment in the farm business. Much of this investment has flowed into new forms of capital input associated with advances in technology. The development of public and private financial institutions has made credit readily available on reasonable terms to finance the introduction of new technology requiring heavy outlays of capital. Partly because of the heavy dependence of farm investment on the level of farm family income, the rate of introduction of better technology has fluctuated with changes in the level of farm income. It was much lower during the depression years of the 1930's than during the prosperous years immediately following World War II.

Many of the advances in farm technology have had output increasing effects. This has been true for mechanical power and equipment, improved seed varieties and fertilizers, better feeding rations and improved cultural practices. While some of these have involved significant increases in total input, they have increased output more than in proportion to the increase in input so that efficiency has risen.

The expanded use of mechanical power and equipment has had important effects on both output and input. Nearly 90 million acres of cropland have been shifted from the production of farm produced power in the form of horses and mules to the production of crops for human consumption. This has had significant effects on market supplies and prices. Although mechanization has increased both gross farm output and net farm output, the increase in net farm output has been much larger. Net farm output is used in the measurement of efficiency. But the effect on efficiency has been partially offset by the increase in power and equipment. However, only a part of the increase in power and equipment has been reflected in an increase in total input because of laborsaving effects. On balance, total output has gone up more than total input with the result that efficiency has risen.

Increases in farming efficiency also have been stimulated by a growing division of labor and specialization within the farm industry. The increase in specialization has been of two main kinds: (1) greater product specialization among farms and (2) greater functional specialization between the farm sector and the nonfarm sectors of the economy. The first has involved the trend for most farms to produce fewer products but a larger volume of each. For example, at one time most farms in the Midwest had at least a few milk cows to provide a monthly cream check and milk for the farm family. Nowadays many of these farms have no milk cows and the families, along with urban families, get their milk from farms with perhaps 50 or more cows.

The second kind of specialization has involved the shift of functions once performed on farms to nonfarm industries. For example, before the introduction of the tractor, the farm industry produced all its own power. Now most of the power used on farms is produced by the farm equipment industry, the petroleum industry and the electric utility industry. Both kinds of specialization have been stimulated in part by technological progress. The increase in specialization has resulted in cost economics. Because of differences in resource characteristics and technology, costs of production vary among firms. By having products produced where they can be turned out at the lowest cost, fewer resources are needed to produce a given volume of output. In this way, specialization has contributed to rising physical efficiency.

Similarly, there have been important cost economies associated with changes in the resource mix used in the farm industry. Advances in farm technology have raised the productivity of capital inputs relative to the productivity of labor. At the same time, the price of labor has risen relative to the prices of capital inputs. In response to these developments, the industry has been adjusting its resource mix by using less labor input and more capital input. This adjustment has reduced production costs per unit of output because the industry is now using a smaller amount of the relatively less productive and more expensive input and a larger amount of the relatively more productive and cheaper input. As a result, total output per unit of total input has increased. As labor input has declined, output per man-hour has risen.

The shift in the labor-capital mix has been accompanied by other adjustments that have helped to increase efficiency. To reap the full economies of modern power and equipment, many farmers have needed more land. But in recent decades, the total amount of land in farms has been highly stable. With a stable amount of land, an increase in land per farm requires a reduction in the number of farms. And, of course, this is what has been happening. Farms have been consolidated and the land base per farm has been rising.

Land for farm consolidation has been made available by the normal processes of death and retirement and by operators who have decided to quit farming and take nonfarm jobs. Farmers wanting to increase their land base have competed among themselves and with beginning operators for this land. In the past decade, there has been a rapid increase in farm consolidations. This has been encouraged by a reduction in the number of new operators entering farming and by an increase in the number of operators who have quit to take nonfarm jobs. These changes, in turn, have been stimulated by a growing number of jobs at rising wages in nonfarm industries and by a decline in income earning opportunities in farming.

Recent studies indicate that efficiency increases when farms are consolidated. The units that disappear tend to be taken over by better managers using more up-to-date technology. Moreover, consolidation results in important cost economies, particularly in the use of machinery and labor. Generally, the amounts of these inputs used on the consolidated unit are less than the sum of the amounts used on the separate units before consolidation. While the inputs of some capital items such as fertilizer and commercial feed tend to rise, typically the net effect is a reduction in labor and capital input and an increase in output.

The main sources of rising farming efficiency may be summarized as follows: (1) an increase in the quality of labor-management input in farming, (2) improvements in production methods, (3) use of more productive forms of capital input, (4) a shift in the resource mix involving more capital and less labor, and (5) increased specialization.

SOME CONSEQUENCES OF RISING PHYSICAL EFFICIENCY

The rise in farming efficiency has made a large contribution to national economic growth and progress. But it has not been an unmixed blessing, particularly for rural people. As farmers have utilized the opportunities to increase efficiency generated largely by advances in technology and by developments affecting the form, quality and relative scarcity of production inputs, the characteristics of the farm industry and rural communities have been transformed. Farm output has increased and this has influenced prices and incomes. Farm population has declined. Strong adjustment pressures and serious problems of adaptation have been created. The consequences have been felt by people on farms and in villages, towns and cities throughout the Nation.

Associated with rising farming efficiency has been a large increase in the output of farm products. In fact, rising efficiency has been reflected almost wholly in increases in output rather than in decreases in total input. While there has been a large shift in the input mix—more capital and less labor, the total input of resources continued to grow until the early 1950's. Since 1952, total input appears to have declined slightly. Undoubtedly, part of this decline has been related to the land retirement programs.

When the individual farmer increases his efficiency by (say) adopting an improved cultural practice, he also will increase his net income. This may not be true when all farmers adopt the practice and total output increases, however. Unless conditions are just right, growing output can create some serious problems for the farm industry. Unless the demand for farm products rises sufficiently to absorb the increases in output at prices which cover the lower per unit costs made possible by rising efficiency, an output imbalance problem will be created and pressures will develop to transfer resources from farming to other industries.

Because consumer buying does not respond much to changes in farm prices, increases in output result in farm price declines which are proportionally greater than the increases in output. Consequently, gross income from the sale of the larger output falls. If labor and capital earnings in farming happened to be in line with those in other industries before the increase in output, they now will be lower. And there will be pressures on farm people to shift their labor and capital to nonfarm employments where earning opportunities are better.

A persistent tendency for farm output to push ahead of demand creates a transfer problem. This involves the shift of resources from farm production to other kinds of production which people want more of as indicated by the way they spend their incomes. Until this transfer problem disappears because of increases in farm demand, or is solved by a sufficient shift of resources, farm people will experience a decline in income and the contribution of rising farming efficiency to national income growth will not be fully realized.

In part, this is what has been happening in the farm industry, especially in the past decade. At times, farm output has grown more rapidly than the demand for farm products and this has exerted strong downward pressure on prices and incomes in farming. These pressures have been largely responsible for the origin and continuation of Government support programs. Since 1948, these programs have had a large tempering effect on farm prices and incomes.

Why is it that efficiency has been rising more rapidly in nonfarm industries than in farming and yet the problems of surpluses and low earnings generally have not been as large or as persistent in these industries? While many factors are involved in the answer to this question, there is one that stands out in relation to all others. This has to do with the changes in the structure of demand that occur when a rich country experiences economic progress or rising per capita income.

When people get richer, the proportion of income spent on different goods and services changes. The result is that demands grow at different rates in different industries. As Adam Smith remarked back in 1776, "The desire for food is limited in every man by the narrow capacity of the human stomach; but the desire for the conveniences and ornaments of building, dress, equipage and household furniture seems to have no certain boundary."

In general, when a rich country gets richer, the demand for farm products grows very slowly while the demand for most nonfarm goods and services increases much more rapidly. Numerous studies have shown this to be true. Thus, the increases in output that accompany rising efficiency can be much larger in most nonfarm industries than in farming before downward pressure is exerted on prices. Moreover, if a problem of excess capacity develops, rising demands will correct the problem sooner in most nonfarm industries than in farming.

Nevertheless, nonfarm industries have not been free of adjustment problems induced by rising efficiency. For example, mechanization, currently called automation, has created serious labor transfer problems in many nonfarm industries also. Frequently, these problems have given rise to major issues in labor-management disputes.

The main force behind the increase in the demand for farm products in the United States has been population growth. Growth of population has greatly reduced the size of the surplus and transfer problems created by rising farming efficiency. But it has not eliminated them and it is not likely to do so in the foreseeable future. It is worth noting that if population were to grow rapidly enough to eliminate these problems, the potential contribution of greater efficiency to higher incomes per capita also would disappear. It would mean that the income gains which greater farming efficiency makes possible would be used up in supporting more people rather than in raising incomes per person. If rising efficiency is to do the latter, excess resources in farming must find productive employment in other industries. For this to happen, there must be employment opportunities available in these industries.

Human resources have felt the brunt of the farm to nonfarm adjustment pressures created by rising farming efficiency. While the tendency for output to grow more rapidly than demand has exerted adjustment pressures on both labor and capital, the strength of these pressures has been greatly reduced by Government support programs. However, this has not been true of the pressures exerted by widespread use of labor-saving power and machinery. The substitution of capital for labor in farm production has exerted strong reallocation pressure on human resources. Developments associated with rising efficiency have greatly diminished income-earning opportunities for labor in farming. At the same time, opportunities in nonfarm industries have been expanding. The push and pull of these forces have induced a large decline in the input of both operator and family labor and hired labor.

The decline in the input of labor in farming has been reflected in a large drop in farm population, a rise in the number of farm operators holding nonfarm jobs and an increase in gainful employment of farm wives. In some rural communities, labor demands in nonfarm industries have risen so that some farm people have found jobs within commuting distance of the home farm. Owner-operators, usually on small farms, have continued to reside on the farm and have either carried on a part-time farming operation or rented out their land.

In many rural communities, however, labor demands in nonfarm industries have not expanded rapidly enough to absorb the natural increase in labor force and to provide jobs for people released from farming. As a result, people have moved to areas of more attractive employment opportunities. Some of these communities have experienced heavy losses of population. This has produced serious adjustment problems for local business firms, schools, churches and other private and public institutions. While demands for public services in these communities have declined, costs have frequently not come down in the same proportion so that the tax burden has increased.

While the communities losing population have been confronted with the most difficult adjustment problems, receiving communities also have felt the effects of the transfer of labor from farm to nonfarm employments. The receiving communities typically have been those experiencing rapid industrialization which has provided a growing number of attractive job opportunities. They frequently have been areas already showing the stresses and strains of rapid economic expansion and population growth. Demands have been rising for public services. Religious groups have found church facilities inadequate for growing memberships. Similar pressures have been exerted on business and social organizations. The influx of people from farms have added to these demands and pressures, although most of the population increase in these communities usually has come from natural increases and from the inmigration of nonfarm people.

While rising farming efficiency has created serious adjustment problems for rural people and communities, it also has made a large contribution to the general improvement in real incomes and levels of living in the United States. A rise in efficiency implies that less resources are needed to produce a given amount of output. By saving resources in farm production, rising farming efficiency has increased the total production potential of the economy. The real income gain has been taken partly in the form of a larger output of farm products, partly in the form of a larger output of nonfarm goods and services and partly in the form of more leisure time. American consumers have experienced an abundance and quality of food unprecedented in the history of man.

At times, however, too much of the income gain has been taken in the form of more farm output to give a well-balanced farm industry. As a result, surplus problems have arisen with depressing effects on the earnings of labor and capital in farming. And the increase in national income has not been as large as it could have been.

A few figures will help to illustrate the size of the savings in resources associated with rising farming efficiency. If the farm output of 1957 had been produced with the 1910 level of efficiency, it would have required roughly 50 percent more resources in farming than was actually used in 1957. With inputs valued at 1957 rates of return, the value of resources saved in 1957 amounted to over $16 billion. Without the gain in efficiency between 1910 and 1957, the total resource cost of the 1957 output of farm products would have been about $47 billion instead of only $31 billion. Because fewer resources were needed in farm production, more resources were available for nonfarm production. Therefore, total production in the economy was increased and there were more goods and services for everybody.

Despite surplus problems, the rise in farming efficiency has not prevented farm people from participating in the longrun growth in real national income. During the past half century, real farm income per family worker has more than doubled. This has been reflected in a large increase in the level of living of people on farms. There has been a reduction in the length of the average farm work day and much of the drudgery has been taken out of farming.

Several years ago, a study was made of the returns to labor-management and investment on some of Iowa's best organized farms. It indicated that under the price conditions induced by support programs during the mid-1950's returns of these top farms compared quite favorably with those in selected nonfarm employments. However, only a small proportion of Iowa's farms would fit this category. The study also showed that if prices had been at estimated free market levels during that period returns on these top farms would have been substantially below those in selected nonfarm employments.

The increase in farming efficiency has been spread very unevenly over the Nation's farms. Some farms and areas have experienced large increases in output per unit of input. Others have fallen behind. Some have lagged badly. Farms and areas with the largest increases in efficiency also have had the largest increases in farm family income. Because of the variation in efficiency gains, there has been wide variation in income growth. In some sections of the country, whole farming communities have failed to participate substantially in the longrun improvement in farm family income.

As a society, we have been far more ingenious in developing opportunities for increasing efficiency than in dealing with the adjustment problems which inevitably accompany the exploitation of these opportunities. Our economy has been geared up to produce efficiency increasing opportunities at a fast pace. Yet, we have largely assumed that the adjustment problems would take care of themselves. But they have not. As a result, people generally have failed to reap all of the income gains which these opportunities permit. Moreover, some individuals and groups have borne a disproportionate share of the costs associated with rising efficiency. While the benefits of rising efficiency are usually widely diffused over the population, the costs tend to be concentrated.

In the absence of effective social mechanisms for bringing costs and benefits into better balance, groups have developed their own protective schemes, sometimes with and sometimes without the help of government. While these provide some security for the groups concerned, they generally prevent or fail to encourage adjustments that are needed to realize the income gains from rising efficiency. Featherbedding type problems have not been limited to the railroad industry.

These efforts to minimize the costs of rising efficiency reflect a deep seated desire for stability and order in a rapidly changing economy. But man's desire for stability and order must be reconciled with his desire for income improvement. Sometimes it is possible to have more of both but not always. When it is not possible, a difficult choice has to be made.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Washington Evening Star for March 25, 1963, there appeared an article written Sylvia Porter entitled "Many Forfeit Benefits of Social Security."

This is a helpful article, because it points out to some people the fact that they may be eligible for Social Security benefits for which they did not realize they were eligible. It is also helpful in another respect.

Many people wonder why our social security system is threatened with bankruptcy, as is true of our Civil Service Retirement System, which the Civil Service Commission people have told us is threatened with bankruptcy by 1980. So, too, the social security system is threatened with bankruptcy because as of now it is more than $350 billion unfunded.

One wonders how it could be that our social security system could be in such bad shape. Sylvia Porter makes some comments which point up the reason.

She points out:

> While the social security tax has nearly doubled since the program began in 1937—climbing from a planned maximum employee contribution of $90 a year to the present maximum tax of $174 a year—in the same period the value of every benefit has tripled.

She also points to a case of a worker who has paid the maximum tax since the program began, who retired in January 1963 at the age of 65.

> This worker will have paid taxes of $1,584, his employer will have contributed an equal amount, bringing the total of social security taxes paid to $3,168. Against this tax contribution, consider that this worker and his 65-year-old wife—assuming normal life expectancy—can anticipate collecting $32,339 in benefits.

Mr. President, this is another reason why the Kennedy program for medicare financed by social security is, I believe, unsound. The social security system already is in a grievous enough situation without adding to the problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Sylvia Porter may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANY FORFEIT BENEFITS OF SOCIAL SECURITY

(By Sylvia Porter)

Thousands of Americans are today forfeiting a big bargain—their own paid-up social security benefits, pensions to which they are entitled but for which they have neglected to apply.

The Social Security Administration, at its Baltimore headquarters, is conducting a nationwide search for these individuals. It's actually trying to track down 1 million persons who are 65 or over who have not applied for their pensions. Of course, not all will be found to be eligible, but surveys to date indicate hundreds of thousands are.

This surprising statistic warrants nationwide publicity, for among this huge group are surely many who desperately need their benefits. There also is no doubt that benefits due to a worker who has retired recently or who retires now far exceed the amount of money he has paid in social security taxes.

While the social security tax has nearly doubled since the program began in 1937—climbing from a planned maximum employee contribution of $90 a year to the present maximum tax of $174 a year—in the same period the value of every benefit has tripled.

BENEFIT HAS JUMPED

The minimum monthly benefit for a worker retired at 65 has jumped from $10 to $40. The maximum has increased from $85 to as much as $254 for the family of a retired, deceased or disabled worker.

Consider a worker who paid the maximum tax since the program began and retired in January 1963, at 65. This worker will have paid taxes of $1,584, his employer will have contributed an equal amount, bringing the total of social security taxes paid to $3,168. Against this tax contribution, consider that this worker and his 65-year-old wife—assuming normal life expectancy—can anticipate collecting $32,339 in benefits.

SIGNIFICANT QUESTION

What are the reasons so many Americans are passing up the benefits? Social security officials figure there are five.

1. Many who have continued to work beyond the age of 65 and to earn fair amounts think they are not eligible to collect any benefits. This is not true. Under new, liberalized rules, they well may be able to draw at least part of the benefits which they would get if they quit. As an illustration, a man retired at 65 might receive $100 a month; if he continued to work instead, he could earn up to $2,600 a year and still get part of that $100. A man and wife at 65 can earn up to $3,260 a year and still get some benefits.

2. Many who have been turned down for benefits in the past because they didn't have enough work credits to qualify aren't aware that because of recent reductions in the amount of coverage needed to qualify, they may now be eligible. Under the new rules, a man born in 1892 or before needs only six quarters of coverage to be insured. For every year after 1892, he needs only one additional quarter. (If he was born in 1893, he would need seven quarters; in 1894, eight quarters, etc.) A woman born in 1895 or before also needs only six quarters of coverage to be insured and only one additional quarter for each year after 1895. The quarters can be earned at any time between January 1, 1937, and now.

WEALTH IS NO TEST

3. Many believe a person must be in need to get benefits. This is not true. You can be wealthy and still collect, for only earned income counts. Investment income, annuities, private pensions, dividends, interest, holdings of real estate—none of this counts.

4. Many who deducted a few years from their age when they originally took out their social security cards are now afraid they will be prosecuted or penalized if they confess their true age in order to collect their benefits. This fear is baseless. There is no penalty for giving a false age. If these individuals can present reasonable evidence of their true age—a birth certificate, voting or school record, insurance policy—they can collect.

5. Many disabled workers of any age and survivors of workers who died before reaching 65 are unaware that they may be entitled to lifetime benefits. These could amount to more than $50,000.

THE POSSIBILTY OF DEVALUATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the American Institute for Economic Research in its weekly research report for March 18 has a lead article entitled "How Close Are We to Devaluation?"

This excellent article calls attention to the fact that President Kennedy stated in his first state of the Union message that the United Sates would not "distort the value of the dollar in any fashion," and to emphasize this he added, "That is a commitment."

The article points out that while the President may very well have intended that no Executive action would be taken by him to devalue the dollar, other actions by the Congress and by the administrative branch of the Government could result in what is called devaluation de facto.

For example, we know that there is less than $16 billion in gold in our reserves. We know also that $12 billion of this is required to back up our currency. So there is less than $4 billion in gold available to meet commitments in case foreign creditors call for payment in gold rather than in dollars.

Unfortunately, foreign creditors own about $20 billion in credits against this gold. If only one-fifth of them called upon us for payment in gold rather than dollars, we would be in a very bad way.

The article points this out and indicates that if enough of these creditors called upon the United States for payment in gold and we were not able to deliver in gold, the result would be that the value of the American dollar would fall on the international exchange, and thus the dollar would be devalued de facto.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW CLOSE ARE WE TO DEVALUATION?

The question whether the United States will (or should) devalue the dollar received renewed attention early in March during a meeting in Washington of bankers, businessmen, and economists that was sponsored by the American Bankers Association. Four prominent economists suggested various measures that they believed would solve the problem of slow economic growth. According to Newsweek, the disagreement among them "would have been almost comic" if the problem had been less important.

It was Professor Samuelson, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who brought devaluation into the discussion. After stating that "militantly cheap and easy money," would solve the problem but that this could accelerate the flow of funds to foreign countries, he suggested that devaluation of the dollar be considered. "If the dollar is overvalued," he said, "running a sluggish, slow-growth economy is a remedy worse than the disease."

The significance of this revelation of Professor Samuelson' opinion hardly can be overestimated. During the past 2 years the administration's fiscal policies have reflected his ideas. From time to time news reports reveal that he has been consulted by the President. Moreover, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Walter Heller, was recommended for that post by Professor Samuelson, we understand. Dr. Heller as well as his asssociates among the President's Council of Economic Advisers apparently are in full accord and have long been in accord with Professor Samuelson.

Although President Kennedy has followed Dr. Heller's recommendation for increased spending, tax cuts, and large deficits, he has repeatedly opposed devaluation. In his first state of the Union message he flatly promised that the United States would not "distort the value of the dollar in any fashion." And to emphasize this he added, "That is a commitment." (In the prepared text of his speech the word "pledge" had been used.)

We do not doubt the President's word, but we doubt that he realized the magnitude of the Nation's balance of payments problem and the consequent threat to its gold stock or the nature of the task ahead. Now, 2 years later, with the dollar in even greater jeopardy, neither the President nor his economic advisers have shown any interest in measures that would permanently strengthen the dollar. On the contrary, they urge that the Government spend more and tax less, and reveal unconcern for huge and continuous deficits.

What the President may not have realized is that devaluation need not be a direct action on the part of the Executive or of Congress. As extravagant fiscal policies increase doubts abroad that the value of the dollar will be maintained, all that stands between us and devaluation is our gold stock, three-fourths of which is required as the basis of our domestic money-credit system. Any impediment placed in the way of a free outflow of gold to foreign governments and central banks, no matter how much or how little of our gold they might be demanding, would immediately cause claims on dollars to depreciate in foreign exchange markets throughout the world. The price of gold in terms of U.S. currency would rise, probably markedly, from its present parity of $35 an ounce; and thus the dollar would be devalued de facto.

We should like to hope that the history of devaluations had placed the President on guard against advice that if taken could lead to another one. (The United States devalued the dollar by about 40 percent in 1933–34.) Apparently it has not. That history is a sorry story of broken promises. Inevitably, it seems, finance ministers and chiefs of state feel obliged to deny the possibility of devaluation until almost the moment that it occurs. Two instances, from the many that could be cited, will illustrate this.

In September 1931, just before England went off the gold standard and the pound sterling lost about a fourth of its value overnight, the Governor of the Bank of England denied the possibility of such action. According to Benjamin M. Anderson: "On Friday, September 18, Doctor Vissering, head of the Netherlands Bank, phoned Montagu Norman of the Bank of England to inquire if it were safe for him to continue to hold sterling, and received unqualified assurance that England would remain on the gold standard. He held his sterling * * *. On Sunday, September 20, the announcement was made that England would abandon the gold standard * * *"[1] How many other such assurances were given at that time by bank and Government officials no one can know.

This technique of denial was used publicly on a grand scale by Sir Stafford Cripps, Chancellor of the British Exchequer, prior to a further devaluation of the pound, by 30 percent, on September 18, 1949. On at least 12 occasions prior to the time of the devaluation he made statements such as the following: "There will be no devaluation of the pound sterling." "Devaluation is neither advisable nor even possible in present conditions." "No one need fear devaluation of our currency in any circumstances." "The Government has not the slightest intention of devaluing the pound."[2]

How near or far off devaluation of the U.S. dollar may be, or whether it ever will occur, can only be conjectured. Short-run palliatives and expedients can delay it, and a return to sound fiscal and monetary policies could prevent it. That Professor Samuelson, whose views on Government finance have directly or indirectly influenced the President's thinking, should suggest devaluation as a measure deliberately to be considered, is cause for serious concern.

---

[1] "Economics and the Public Welfare," D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., New York, 1949, pp. 246–247.

[2] Henry Hazlitt, "What You Should Know About Inflation," D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., New York, 1960, pp. 22–23.

TWO MAJOR NATIONAL PROBLEMS IN PERSPECTIVE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the same weekly research report of the American Institute for Economic Research is an article entitled "Two Major National Problems in Perspective."

The article points to two problems which the institute considers to be our major national problems. One is the inequality of opportunity for our people. The other, to which the article refers as the most pressing problem, is that of getting money-credit affairs in order.

The article refers to the subtle deteriorating effects of prolonged inflation and gradual depreciation of a nation's monetary unit.

Mr. President, I think the article is very timely, because we know that we are in the midst of a creeping inflation. We know that during the past 2 years, while we were going into debt some $14 billion more, the American people's money lost $14 billion in purchasing power due to inflation. I agree that this is, indeed, our most pressing problem.

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO MAJOR NATIONAL PROBLEMS IN PERSPECTIVE

Perhaps the most important problem confronting the Nation over the longer run is that resulting from inequality of opportunity attributable to special privileges for some and the effective disinheritance of others. Fortunately, technological advances are providing new frontiers for industry similar in their leavening effects to the easy availability of free land during the first century of the Nation's existence.

We in the United States never experienced to a marked degree the degrading and deteriorating influences that were the lot of the underprivileged in Europe, for example, in the England of Dickens' time. Our free land in the West was a far more effective ameliorating influence than were the more distant areas of Canada and Australia for the English masses. Effectively disinherited from the land by the successive Enclosure Acts and forced into the cities as a resourceless proletariat, England's sons of sturdy yeomen became willing converts to socialism. That we shall be faced with pressing problems of this nature in the not too distant future seems probable; but, for the time being, the frontiers opened by scientific advances are postponing for us the need to grapple with that problem.

The most pressing problem confronting the United States today, as many of our readers are well aware, is that of getting its money-credit affairs in order. The Nation is well along on the path that France followed for five decades. The subtle deteriorating effects of prolonged inflation and gradual depreciation of a nation's monetary unit become striking when viewed in the perspective of decades rather than years. When the Federal Reserve System was formed in 1914, there was clear evidence in the congressional debates and elsewhere that the basic principles of sound commercial banking were recognized. A century of experience in England with the gold standard and sound banking had revealed lessons that were heeded when our central banking system was established. However, the deficit financing of two world wars, a New Deal, and of administrations since World War II have disregarded those principles and created a vast inflation, the effects of which already have been far reaching.

The problem of restoring a sound currency and shifting the economy from its present condition of marked inflation to a situation where sound commercial banking were the rule instead of the exception is one of great complexity and magnitude. If a beginning were made by a return to sound fiscal policies and by measures that would restore the complete gold standard, with fulfillment of the Government's promise to pay on demand as printed on each piece of currency, we should at last be moving in the right direction.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in line with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 noon on Monday, April 1.

The motion was agreed to; and, under the previous order, at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m., the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 1, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 28, 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Brewster H. Morris, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chad.

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

Alfred C. Dumouchel, of Rhode Island, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 5, with headquarters at Providence, R.I.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Allison, Adolphus R., Jr.
Anctil, Arthur O., Jr.
Arness, John A.
Baird, Robert M.
Baker, Robert F.
Baker, William J.
Bason, William M.
Beach, Thomas B.
Beeby, James L.
Benoit, Fred L., III
Betts, Gorcon D.
Biemer, James J.
Biser, Christopher H.
Bishop, Robert P.
Boname, John R.
Boop, Warren C., Jr.
Boring, Robert S.
Boucher, Wesley W.
Bouterie, Ronald L.
Brayton, John R., Jr.
Brighton, Carl T.
Broadley, Paul H.
Brooks, Herbert E.
Burr, John B.
Cagle, Donald R.
Cameron, Ronald R.
Chappelka, Alfred R., Jr.
Christian, Maynard S.
Coll, Edmonston F.
Collier, Terry M.
Comer, Ralph D.
Corbett, John R.
Cosgrove, Theodore J.
Cremona, Frederick J.
Cureton, Richard K.
Curtin, Thomas L.
Curtis, John W.
Damato, Nicholas A.
Davis, John W.
Davis, John S., Jr.
Deflebre, Bruce K., Jr.
Defries, Hugh O.
Dewey, Albert W., Jr.
Dolan, Michael F.
Dubeau, Ray A.
Durrance, Frederick Y., Jr.
Elliott, Robert C.
Evans, Fred S.
Fouty, William J.
Fresh, James W.
Gallent, James H.
Garcia, Nicholas A., III
Gard, Howard E.
Gilbert, Allyn E.
Gilson, Benjamin J.
Greaves, Edward D.
Hansbarger, Luther C.
Hansen, James E.
Harmeling, James G.
Harmon, Stanley D.
Haswell, John N.
Hauler, Donald R.
Hauser, Roger G.
Hayes, Jude R.
Hebert, James E.
Hicks, Jim F.
Hill, John B.
Hillis, Jon K.
Hoekzema, Arnold D.
Hoeffler, Dennis F.
Humbert, George F., Jr.
Inman, Charles E.
Irons, Howard S.
Jacobson, William A.
James, Stephen H.
Johnson, Bernett L., Jr.
Kasheta, John P., Jr.
Kendra, Stephen J.
Kent, Tommy S.
Kinkel, Donald M.
Klein, Edward W.
Knapp, Robert W.
Knox, Henry D.
Krepps, Arthur C., II
Langevin, Jack A.
Lansinger, Donald T.
Larcoque, Normand P.
Lee, Joseph D.
Livingston, William O.
Loew, Albert G., Jr.
MacCarty, Denton E.
Maddox, Spencer F., Jr.
Majure, Oscar L., Jr.
Martin, Richard W.
McCree, Douglas G.
McHale, James J., Jr.
McLear, William Z., III
McMahon, George J.
Meehan, William L.
Meredith, Robert C.
Merrill, Raymond E.
Metz, George E.
Mills, Dennis E.
Miner, Walter F.
Mitts, Murray G.
Modell, Jerome H.
Moquin, Ross B.
Morgan, Jacob R.
Mukomela, Arthur E.
Myers, Robert C.
Nieberding, Paul H.
Norton, Robert K.
Oldershaw, John B.
Olesijuk, Andrew
O'Neal, David M.
O'Neill, James F.
Onofrio, Burton M.
Oriordan, Joseph P.
Orr, Rex
Phillips, Donald M.
Phillips, Darwin D.
Pine, Harry L.
Poley, Richard W.
Posatko, Robert J.
Potvin, Louis E.
Powers, Samuel A.
Rack, William A.
Rogers, Richard L.
Rolen, Alvin C., Jr.
Rossi, Roscoe A.
Rust, Wilbur C.
Ryan, Richard R.
Sacks, Ellsworth J., Jr.
Saglio, Jack W.
Sand, Richard E.
Schaefer, David F.
Schaffer, Donald E.
Schmetz, Frank J., Jr.
Sexter, Mark S.
Shaffer, Bertrand N.
Sims, Norman L.
Sirois, Joseph L., Jr.
Smith, Jose C. S.
Smith, Ronald W.
Southworth, Alvin J.
Soybel, William M.
Spence, Kenneth F., Jr.
Steffenson, John L.
Steyn, Rolf W.
Stout, Bill D.
Strange, Robert E.
Svendsen, Fred J.
Sweeney, Lawrence
Theros, Elias P. G.
Thomason, Thomas L.
Thorp, James H. M.
Tolchin, Sidney
Torsney, Philip J., Jr.
Van Peenen, Peter F. D.
Voiss, Daniel V.
Walker, Robert E.
Wayne, Donald M.
Weibel, David C.
Weinshelbaum, Albert
Weitzman, Gerald
Williams, David L.
Woody, Ronald H., Jr.
York, Lowell T.

SUPPLY CORPS

Adair, Joseph P.
Alderman, Charles B.
Allinder, Joe A., Jr.
Almen, Richard E.
Ashton, Merton E., Jr.
Avary, James L.
Badger, George R.
Barr, Robert S.
Bates, Robert L.
Bell, John L., Jr.
Bledsoe, William M.
Bogorowski, Robert J.
Breit, James A.
Briggs, Irving G.
Brown, Boyd F., Jr.
Brown, Russell M.
Bruyneel, Louis K.
Bunker, Donald J.
Canon, Roscoe H., Jr.
Carberry, Raymund G., Jr.
Carpenter, Arthur J.
Carpenter, Charles F., Sr.
Causey, Bruce M., Jr.
Christensen, Harvey J.
Christopher, Robert N.
Clark, Roger S.
Coleman, Ernest B.
Collicott, Purnel L.
Connelly, Charles T.
Conner, Walter E.
Corn, James R.
Curtis, Richard E.
Davidson, William I.
Davis, Raymond P.
Davis, William W.
Dempster, Darrell D.
Derby, Francis A.
Donzell, Richard J.
Drabek, Stephen J.
Earl, Robert J.
Eastwood, William O., Jr.
Ebert, Scott W.
Faust, Delbert L.
Fiske, Leon S., Jr.
Floid, Robert E.
Flores, Joseph L.
Freese, Ralph F.
French, Robert C.
Gaddis, Glenn L.
Gallagher, Robert F.
Gapp, John J.
Garabedian, Edward J.
Giagni, Vincent J.
Gilmore, Roger W.
Gilpen, Franklin M.
Girod, Roy O.
Goodwin, Earl E.
Gray, Jack E.
Greenwood, Joseph L., Jr.
Gunther, Roy W.
Hendrickson, Richard
Hennessy, William J.
Henry, Gerald R.
Hodges, William J.
Hohenstein, Charles R.
Hopgood, Roy E.
Howe, Donald K., Jr.
Hubbard, Charles C.
Jacobs, Frank S.
Johnson, James R.
Johnson, Lloyd R.
Johnson, Richard L.
Jordan, Alva F., Jr.
Kemper, Darrell G.
Kenealy, William E., Jr.
King, Braxton R.
Kispert, Lane A.
Kling, Fred A.
Knox, Arthur F., Jr.
Kollios, Achilleas E.
Kreutzinger, Donald R.
Krukin, Lawrence E.
Kuhlmann, Dietrich H.
Lane, Anthony D.
Larson, Nelson S.
Larson, Rodney E.
Lashley, Ralph E., Jr.
Lathrop, Charles F.
Lazarus, Steven
Lemly, William D.
Lemma, Paul A.
Lenz, Allen J.
Lindsay, William E.
Livermore, Robert E.
Long, Charles W.
Lovell, Donald E.
Lovell, "W" "B"
Lyons, John J.
Maldonado, Teodosio
McCandless, Claude C., Jr.
McCrabb, Donald E.
McGee, James E.
McGillivary, Duncan P.
McNeill, Neil E.
Mercer, Dean S.
Mercier, Arthur G.
Merrick, Walter F.
Moore, Guy T.
Morehouse, Charles W.
Moyer, William R.
Nast, William E.
Newman, John F.
Normand, Robert L.
O'Donnell, Terrence F.
Olson, Harvey T.
O'Neil, Raymond L.
Ott, Matthew J.
Palmer, Donald R.
Paul, John W.
Perry, Robert P.
Petrie, Roland A.
Pomponio, Bruno A.
Rady, William J., Jr.
Ranken, John T., Jr.
Recher, Bernard L.
Ross, Orrin B.
Ross, William T., Jr.
Rothenberger, Donald J.
Salgado, Paul R.
Sansone, Joseph S., Jr.
Saukas, Augustine G.
Schanz, Thomas L.
Schlaufman, Louis C.
Schucker, Robert M.
Snyder, Earl L.
Steeg, Elvin H.
Stevenson, Robert G.
Stewart, George W., III
Stumbaugh, David C.
Taylor, Bayard A., Jr.
Taylor, James M.
Taylor, John B.
Temte, Knute P.
Tilton, Robert L.
Trimble, Philip
Vogel, Ralph H.
Vollmer, Merle J.
Wald, Stanley B.
Waldvogel, Henry J.
Walker, Elbridge, III
Weber, Robert J.
Weisend, John G.
White, Frank L.
Williams, Raymond L.
Williams, Rex M.
Wong, Ronald M.
Wood, Lee, Jr.
Woolley, Herbert T.
Young, Charles W.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Andress, Gene B.
Baker, Marvin D.
Beck, John T.
Bigler, Robert L.
Boreczky, John V.
Carpenter, Elbert N.
Chambliss, Carroll R.
Clardy, William J.
Clifford, William J.
Cortney, Kevin J.
Dodson, Leonard W., Jr.
Doyle, James F.
Dwyer, Richard K.
Fedje, Earl W.
Fitzgerald, Owen R.
Gillis, Edward F.
Goss, Hubert S., Jr.
Greenwood, Charles L.
Jensen, Andrew F., Jr.
Keenon, John C.
Kinlaw, Dennis C.
Kopp, George P., Jr.
League, William C.
McAlister, Fred R., Jr.
Miller, Stanley D.
Murphy, Milton G.
Newton, John G.
O'Connor, William B.
O'Gorman, Charles F.
Ondo, Michael A.
Ota, Peter I.
Phillips, Harold E.
Plank, David P. W.
Propst, Roy A., Jr.
Reagan, Ernest M., Jr.
Schneider, Otto
Seim, James E.
Snyder, Marvin E., Jr.
Stevenson, Neil M.
Swenson, William R.
Thornberry, Roy V., Jr.
Urbano, Francis J.
VanBeck, Alfred F.
Vanlaningham, Maurice R., Jr.
Vest, William T.
Warren, Robert H.
Wuebbens, Everett P.
Zemites, Joseph F.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Allen, Roy L.
Anderson, Warren H.
Barber, Horace M.
Belton, Edward H.
Billet, Donald F.
Bischof, Ernest J.
Blough, Loney L.
Bowers, Richard A.
Burger, Henry K.
Burns, William J., Jr.
Callahan, Edward F., Jr.
Carioti, Bruno M.
Cottingham, Edward L.
Crockett, Billy G.
Crowley, Irwin D., Jr.
Daniel, William F., Jr.
Deady, Ralph E.
Demidio, Joseph A.
Doyle, Thomas J.
Ecklund, Glenn L.
Erickson, James A.
Falk, Harvey A., Jr.
Gates, Charles W.
Hartell, William K.
Haynes, Howard H.
Haynes, Robert C.
Hines, John C.
Houghton, Robert J.
Hrnjez, Nicholas C.
Hughes, Edmund C.
Johnson, Durrell A.
Jones, Thomas K.
Lake, George
Lapolla, Joseph
Lawson, Leroy D.
Lewis, Frank H., Jr.
Mangan, Thomas J., Jr.
Mathews, Charles J.
Merica, Charles A.
Mitchell, Thomas J.
O'Brien, Thomas J.
O'Leary, John F.
Parrish, Oscar F., Jr.
Paulsen, Raymond E.
Pinch, William C.

Plante, George E.
Reese, Joseph L., Jr.
Reeves, Ronald B.
Robinson, Charles F.
Schellhardt, Richard H.
Scherer, Clark H., Jr.
Sherrod, Henry C., Jr.
Smith, George L.
Stewart, Stanley P., Jr.
Stultz, Bobby E.
Toliver, Jack M.
Trunz, Joseph P., Jr.
Tyhurst, James E.
Uhe, James L.
Verdi, Stanley N.
Wear, John R.
White, Robert K.
Wilson, Dean G.
Witkowski, John A., Jr.
Wolf, Robert B.
Yoshihara, Takeshi

DENTAL CORPS

Ackley, George W., Jr.
Allen, Robert W.
Barlow, Doil E.
Bodine, Theodore A., Jr.
Bodner, Joseph A., Jr.
Bottomley, William K.
Bradford, Paul L. J.
Bush, Richard D.
Carrothers, Richard L.
Charles, James H., Jr.
Christian, James T.
Cummings, Matthew R.
Cunningham, Charles J.
Davis, Malcolm S.
Dodds, Ronald N.
Driscoll, John M.
Edwards, Richard C.
Fenster, Robert K.
Firtell, David N.
Gibson, William V., Jr.
Gomer, Ronald M.
Good, Richard J.
Grimsley, William A., Jr.
Grove, David M.
Hale, William F.
Hanson, Richard K.
Hedge, Herbert R.
Herr, Albert
Kitzmiller, John S., Jr.
Landes, Robert P.
Lindsay, John S.
Mark, Leonard E.
Martin, William R.
McCann, Thomas, F.
Messer, Eugene J.
Miller, James E.
Moore, Robert E.
Muldrow, Lewis M.
Neagley, Ross L., Jr.
Petruccelli, Francis
Plump, Ellsworth H.
Selby, Vernice B.
Semler, Harry E., Jr.
Stanton, George A., Jr.
Stout, William A.
Strange, Charles G., Jr.
Stump, Thomas E.
Sugg, William E., Jr.
Tibbetts, Van R.
Trusz, Edward J.
Voyles, Wesley L.
Watson, William J.
Wilkie, Noel D.
Williams, Frederick B.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Adams, Chauncey C., Jr.
Arns, William E.
Ash, Lloyd M.
Bailey, Jack S.
Bauerschmidt, Alan D.
Becker, David E.
Beckwith, Joan M.
Campbell, Howard B.
Cook, Paul E.
Deberry, Patricia
Degrotte, Henry C., Jr.
Diener, Richard V.
Dobbs, George I.
Dunbar, Edward S.
Feith, Joseph
Furrey, William R.
George, Robert E.
Gilbert, Richard S.
Howard, John E.
Howard, Vaughn
Inman, Elmer E., Jr.
Jones, Philip E.
Jordan, Ray D.
Kelley, Donald R.
Nyman, George A.
Pribnow, James F.
Roach, Leon M.
Roller, Billie
Rowell, Dalton A.
Smith, Bill J.
Smith, Robert L.
Storms, Jack R.
Turner, David H.
Wagner, Carl M.
Wetzel, Orval B.
Wimberly, Clyde O.

NURSE CORPS

Alexiou, Grace E.
Allgaier, Hilda L.
Barry, Dorothy M.
Belair, Danya A.
Berkman, Virginia O.
Brannack, Elinor M.
Brogan, Mary A. M.
Burke, Lois E.
Burns, Patricia J.
Callahan, Dorothy H.
Cunningham, Alice T.
Daniels, Marvelle L.
Dewig, Winona M.
Dihl, Joann
Dowding, Dorothy P.
Durkin, Veronica A.
Fehmer, Delores A.
Ferguson, Miriam M.
Fischer, Eunice A.
Fisher, Mildred K.
Green, Dorothy J.
Halkowitz, Margaret M.
Harris, Vera
Helligso, Margaret A.
Hettinger, Jeanette M.
Hockenberger, Charlotte E.
Howard, Katherine A.
Job, Lucy A.
Kolongis, Dorothea C.
Lalley, Mary G.
Lane, Grace A.
Laning, Alice T.
Livirrie, Althea A.
Lorch, Elizabeth A.
Max, Helen R.
Maynard, Mary E.
McGinn, Mary A.
Middleton, Charlene
Miller, Grace E.
Motomatsu, Toshiko
Peterson, Eleanor V.
Peterson, Lee
Pinto, Marie L.
Porrello, Josephine B.
Rancourt, Beatrice A.
Redgate, Janet M.
Roberts, Catherine V.
Robichaud, Pauline H.
Ryan, Dorothy F.
Ryder, Dorothy J.
Schlosser, Joan M.
Schmaus, Stella M.
Shelton, Mildred L.
Slater, Beverly J.
Smith, Helen F.
Smith, Margaret A.
Staab, Patricia L.
Stack, Patricia J.
Toth, Jolene L.
Velker, Phyllis M.
Walker, Helen J.
Walsh, Elizabeth A.
Warren, Ellen G.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Abbott, Peter D.
Abdalla, Peter G.
Aber, John W., Jr.
Abercrombie, Gordon E.
Ackley, Frederick R., Jr.
Adam, Richard W.
Adams, Homer
Adams, Lloyd H.
Adamson, Frank M., Jr.
Adcock, John M., Jr.
Akens, Jerry D.
Alberghine, Peter
Albrecht, Carl J.
Alden, Michael G.
Alexander, Edward E., Jr.
Allen, Bobby D.
Allen, Earl A.
Allen, Kenneth H.
Allgood, Dempsey E.
Amesse, Arthur P.
Amidon, David M.
Amis, William B.
Anckonie, Alex, III
Anderson, Olaf C., Jr.
Anderson, Donald R.
Andrews, Dennis A.
Anton, Anthony A., Jr.
Arch, Wilbur R.
Armbruster, William A.
Armstrong, Roger W.
Armstrong, James K.
Arnold, James J., Jr.
Art, Raymond J.
Asafaylo, Richard J.
Ascher, David C.
Ashby, Robert D.
Asher, William M. L.
Assell, William L.
Atkins, Donald S.
Atkins, James L.
Atwood, Lewis H.
Auchy, George B.
Austin, Jack B.
Babcock, Donald D.
Bacon, Herbert C.
Bacon, Roger F., Sr.
Bagley, Aaron M.
Bagley, James E.
Bailey, Eric P.
Bailey, Ralph G.
Bainbridge, John K.
Baker, Edward B., Jr.
Baker, Herbert D.
Baker, Hobart R.
Baker, Leland W.
Baker, Robert E., Jr.
Bakewell, Wesley E.
Bakko, Douglas E.
Baldwin, Richard L.
Ball, Ronald F.
Ball, Stuart F.
Ballard, Duane C.
Ballard, Wallace L., Jr.
Banasky, Albert J.
Barber, Clyde C.
Bardtman, Robert J.
Barker, Donald R.
Barker, Fred J.
Barkman, William D.
Barnes, Charles L.
Barnes, John O.
Barnum, Gary L.
Barrett, Lewis E.
Bartleson, James T.
Bartlett, William D.
Baskin, Walter H.
Bassett, Melvin E.
Bast, James L.
Batchelor, Jon D.
Bates, Wilmer I.
Battaglini, Arnold R.
Battaglia, Carmen C.
Battenburg, John A.
Batts, William H., Jr.
Bauer, George J., Jr.
Bauer, Lawrence D.
Beachy, Lloyd H.
Beadle, Lee C.
Beam, James L.
Bearden, William F.
Bearden, Jay L.
Beasley, Robert H., Jr.
Beaton, Robert R.
Beatty, Arthur, Jr.
Beaudin, Francis X.
Beddard, John R.
Bednarek, Norbert H.
Beggs, Richard K.
Bell, Jack G.
Bell, Joe L.
Bell, John M.
Belsheim, Douglas W.
Belson, Douglas A.
Bender, Willis D.
Benevento, Eugene A.
Benninger, James E.
Benson, Kenneth R.
Berke, Lewis W.
Berkowitz, Howard V.
Berniklau, Vladimir V.
Bessire, Robert P.
Betts, Richard J.
Biard, Andrew C., Jr.
Bibler, Douglas R.
Biddle, Maxwell D., Jr.
Binkerd, Dale A.
Bishop, David K.
Bishop, Robert P.
Black, Donald L.
Black, Leroy G., II
Bladh, James C.
Blair, John E.
Bland, Joe R.
Blank, Clifton H.
Blasi, Donald T.
Blevins, Edward A.
Blevins, Richard S.
Blizzard, William E.
Bloch, Vernon C.
Blose, Larry E.
Blount, Charles W.
Boberg, Lloyd A.
Boehnke, Donald F.
Boissenin, William C.
Bolin, Norman C.
Bollenberg, Elmer F.
Bond, Douglas E.
Bond, Thomas H.
Booher, Timothy
Booth, Robert M.
Borde, Paul P.
Borkert, Robert L.
Boshoven, Robert L.
Bostwick, Sally L.
Boswell, Lexie B.
Bothwell, Michael P.
Bovey, Robert L.
Bowers, John M., Jr.
Bowley, George A.
Boyd, David H.
Boyd, Leo H.
Boyd, Roy H.
Boyle, Alonzo R.
Bozzo, Peter R.
Brackin, Charles A.
Bradley, Marlon D.
Bradshaw, Joe L.
Bradshaw, William F.
Brady, John R.
Brainerd, George E.
Branch, Daniel B., Jr.
Brandon, William R.
Brandt, Hans E., Jr.
Bransom, Frank H.
Brantuas, Joseph A.
Breeding, Donald C.
Bresch, Berton E.
Brewer, Ralph P.
Brewton, Burt
Brezina, Dennis W.
Bridges, Jack H.
Brien, George L., Jr.
Briggs, Robert P.
Brinkley, Otis H., Jr.
Britt, Joel H.
Broderick, William F.
Brodigan, Harold V.
Brolin, Edson C.
Bromwell, Kent S.
Brons, John C.
Brooks, Linton F.
Brooks, Thomas A.
Brown, Alan R.
Brown, Donald H.
Brown, Donald P.
Brown, Elmer
Brown, John J.
Brown, Larry J.
Brown, Michael J.
Brown, Thomas V.
Browne, Russell C., Jr.
Bruce, Jack
Bruce, Malvin D.
Bryan, Edward L. G.
Bryan, George B.
Buchanan, John C.
Buckel, Jerome
Buckley, Daniel L., Jr.
Buel, Roy D.
Bundarin, John P., Jr.
Bunte, Louis F.
Burau, Charles E.
Burchett, Jerome V.
Burgess, William S.
Burke, Lauren D.
Burke, Nolan R.
Burkett, Wayne C.
Burns, John M., Jr.
Burns, Thomas M., Jr.
Burns, William C.
Burroughs, Joseph G.
Burston, Robert
Bussell, Delmer H.
Butterfield, John A.
Buxton, Richard L.
Byng, Robert H.
Bynum, James A.
Byrne, Edward J.
Cade, John C.
Cadow, William S., Jr.
Cain, William T.
Cajthaml, Frank
Calder, James H.
Caldwell, James A.
Calhoon, Theodore H.
Callsen, Christian E.
Camilleri, Terrence J.
Campbell, Donald R.
Campbell, Wayne R.
Campbell, Ernest R.
Campbell, Hubert R.
Cant, Geoffrey D.
Caprio, Gabriel P.
Carlson, William C.
Carlson, Edgar L.
Carlson, Jack J.
Carpenter, Robert N.
Carr, Denham L.
Carr, John F.
Carr, John C.
Carr, Leo F.
Carr, Paul W.
Carter, Clyde A. L.
Carter, Frederick W., Jr.
Carter, James W.
Cartwright, James P.
Carwin, James P.
Casciato, Anthony C.
Case, Arnold J.
Castro, Alexander, Jr.
Catalano, Peter R.
Catcher, Charles W.
Cather, Edward W., II
Cave, George P.
Ceres, Robert L.
Chadwick, William H.
Chalecki, Stanley J.
Chamberlin, Philip R.
Chambers, John L., Sr.
Chance, John M.
Chandler, Thomas R.
Chandler, Ralph W.
Chapman, Michael K.
Chase, Donald A.
Cheek, William H.
Cheston, Daniel M., IV
Chew, William C.
Chidsey, John W.
Childress, Howard R.
Chipparoni, Elmer A.
Choate, Stephen L.
Christensen, Keith L.
Christenson, Edward O.
Christian, Richard A.
Christian, Ernest F.
Christopher, John R.
Christy, Ralph W.
Chulick, Joseph, Jr.
Ciboci, John W.
Claar, Harry L.
Clancy, Robert J.
Clapper, Gean P.
Clark, Donald H.
Clark, Halbert G.
Clark, Jackson S.
Clark, James C.
Clark, Kent R.
Clark, Maurice E.
Clark, Roger M.
Clark, William S.
Clausen, Carl O.
Clautice, William G.
Clayton, Thomas M., Jr.
Clement, Russell L.
Clement, Robert M.
Clements, Wilton R.
Clerico, Leo F.
Clift, Thomas A.
Cline, Donald L.
Cloninger, John W.
Clontz, Clarence E.
Coates, Dannie R.
Coats, Jack T.
Coats, Richard L.
Cobb, Loren H.
Cobb, Stanley M., Jr.
Cochran, Melvin A.
Cockley, Richard M.
Code, Ronald B.
Coffin, Robert H., Jr.
Cole, Okey, Jr.
Cole, William L.
Coleman, "M" "R"
Colias, George. C.
Collins, John F.
Collins, James E.
Columbo, Michael A., Jr.

Commons, Patrick, M.
Conger, William L.
Connolly, Raymond T.
Converse, Paul T.
Converse, Joseph I., Jr.
Cook, Morgan
Cooper, Finis E., Jr.,
Cooper, Michael B.
Copeland, Walter E.
Coppersmith, John D.
Copple, Jerald A.
Corbaley, Leonard H.
Corcoran, William R.
Cordy, Dalice W.
Corey, James W., Jr.
Cormack, James P.
Cornell, Henri V.
Cornett, Richard R.
Cornett, Charles R.
Corse, Carl D., Jr.
Cosky, Charles E.
Cossey, James D.
Costello, William G.
Cottom, Robert V.
Courtney, John J., Jr.
Coussens, Paul H.
Cover, Donald L.
Cowell, James P.
Cox, David L.
Cox, James A.
Cradit, Raymond H.
Crandall, Joel L., Jr.
Crawford, Jack
Crawford, Franklin E.
Crockett, William J.
Crowe, Norman H.
Crumpacker, John P.
Cuddy, John V.
Culbertson, Richard W.
Cullen, Richard C.
Culliton, James J.
Cummings, Francis L.
Cummings, James E.
Cummins, Melvin B.
Cunningham, Robert S.
Cunningham, William M.
Cunningham, Derwood D.
Curran, Thomas E.
Currie, Robert E.
Curtin, James M.
Curtis, Charles D.
Curtis, Guy H., III
Curtis, Ronald R.
Cusick, Roland R.
Cutler, Lee M.
Dachos, John
Daidone, Henry F.
Dale, Kenneth L.
Dalgliesh, William J. M.
Dalton, Dick N.
Daly, Bruce D.
Damm, Thomas P.
Damon, Richard W. H.
Danals, Dick A.
Danitschek, Carl N.
Darby, Robert M.
Dau, Ralph W.
Davis, Alden A.
Davis, Carl E.
Davis, Grady W., Jr.
Davis, Hugh M., Jr.
Davis, James T.
Davis, Joseph F.
Davis, Lawrence D.
Davis, Lloyd C.
Davis, Oscar B., Jr.
Davis, Richard S.
Davis, Robert J.
Davis, Wade L.
Dawdy, John R.
Dean, Francis J.
Dean, Robert J., Jr.
Dean, William L.
Deangelo, Joseph J.
Debuhr, Milton D.
Decesare, Armand G.
Defrancesco, John B., Jr.
Delaney, Carl R.
Delaura, John
Dellagiacoma, John
Delpercio, Michael, Jr.
Demarke, Joseph, III
Demoret, Russell W.
Deniston, David A.
Denotter, Clifford R.
Denton, William E.
Depaul, Anthony W., Jr.
Depew, John N.
Derickson, Richard B., III
Dickinson, Joshua C., III
Dilloway, Joseph E.
Dimpsey, Carbon P.
Dionne, Edgar W.
Dirvianskis, Arunas
Dobbs, Charles P.
Dodge, John F.
Doelger, David P.
Donovan, David A.
Donovan, Francis R.
Dornberg, Paul G.
Dortch, Edwin B.
Dorwart, Frederic G., Jr.
Dougard, Peter F.
Doyle, Ronald J.
Doyle, William J.
Drake, Terry C.
Drake, William B., Jr.
Drotleff, William C., Jr.
Drummond, Glen N., Jr.
Dube, Robert A.
Duffy, Michael D.
Dugas, Henry J.
Dunlop, James M.
Dunn, Donald R.
Dunn, James V.
Dupler, Larry N.
Durham, Hollis M.
Dutrow, Arthur N.
Dyke, David W.
Dziedzic, Walter T., Jr.
Dzurko, Thomas A.
Earner, Stephen J.
Eason, Middleton
Ecoff, James H.
Economides, Lester J.
Edgar, Richard B.
Edgerton, Everett W., Jr.
Edgerton, Robert L.
Edmisten, Edgar H.
Edmonds, James L.
Edwards, John A.
Edwards, "Z" "T"
Edwards, Linier L.
Effron, Herbert M.
Egan, Gerald E.
Eggleston, William W.
Ehlers, Ernest J.
Eichenlaub, Leon E.
Eidson, Clyde D.
Ekleberry, William D.
Ekstrom, John S.
Eldredge, Howard S.
Elliott, George M.
Ellis, Floyd W.
Ellis, Gary H.
Ellis, John C.
Ellison, Melvin R.
Embry, John H.
Emerich, Wilbur P.
Emerson, Fred C.
Engel, Nathaniel J.
Engel, Richard L.
Enochs, Jack M.
Eparvier, Norbert C.
Ericksen, Grover G.
Erickson, George E., Jr.
Ertl, Albert R.
Eskildsen, Leo A.
Estes, Clifford D.
Estes, Eugene H.
Estes, John A.
Evans, Lucian C.
Evans, Ralph E.
Evans, Stuart D.
Evans, Thomas W.
Evans, Victor C., Jr.
Everett, William H., III
Everette, Oliver G.
Evers, Richard E.
Eyman, Dale W.
Fagan, Christopher B.
Fagan, Christopher M.
Fahlstrom, Edward J.
Faith, Larry E.
Fallone, Paul R., Jr.
Fantasia, Biagio E.
Farley, Harold C., Jr.
Farrell, William T.
Featherstone, James F.
Fee, Milton O.
Feldthouse, Harry W.
Fendorf, Dale N.
Fernow, William F.
Ferraro, David B.
Ferris, Charles L.
Fey, Edwin C.
Field, Tylor, II
Fields, Walter S., III
Fiene, James R.
Fife, Robert R.
Finch, Jerry L.
Finerty, Martin J., Jr.
Finlen, James R.
Finley, Thomas M., Jr.
Finney, Ivan K.
Fischer, George J.
Fitzgerald, Michael E.
Fitzpatrick, Eugene E.
Flanagan, Walter B.
Flaningam, James D.
Flannery, William F.
Flikeid, Jack R.
Florence, Scott A.
Flynn, Martin R.
Flynn, Noel S.
Fogarty, Eugene P.
Fogle, William J.
Forbes, Raymond L., Jr.
Ford, John F.
Ford, Joseph P. P.
Forde, Jerome B.
Forsythe, Daniel H.
Fouts, Alan A.
Fowler, Charles B., Jr.
Fox, Dale
Fox, Loyd O., Jr.
Fox, Vern H., Jr.
Foxworth, Thomas G.
Franck, Homer L.
Frankhauser, Charles G.
Franklin, Larry B.
Frazier, Ross A.
Freckmann, Fred H.
Fredricksen, George J.
Freeborn, Guy H.
Freymann David G.
Fritsche, Kenneth W.
Fritz, Charles J.
Frye, David B.
Fryman, Wayne E.
Fuchs, Robert E.
Fulbright, Robert H.
Fuller, Edward M., III
Fuqua, James R., Jr.
Gabrielson, Robert L.
Gainer, Thomas H., Jr.
Gaither, John L.
Galyon, Thurlow A.
Gardner, Frank M., Jr
Garner, David L.
Garrett, Donald F.
Garrett, William B.
Garrigan, Kenneth J.
Garton, George B., Jr.
Garverick, Charles M.
Gates, Joseph D.
Gath, Bernard S.
Gaudet, John F.
Gavin, William H., Jr.
Gay, Joseph V.
Geddes, Donald R.
Geiger, Bernard R.
Geist, Gary Q.
Geitz, Melvin L.
Getz, Sidney L.
Gibson, Eugene E.
Gibson, Harry O., Jr.
Giddens, Robert G.
Gideons, Linwood
Gilbert, Charles W.
Gilhuly, John F.
Gillespie, Owen L.
Gillette, Raymond N.
Gilliam, Warren P.
Gilliland, Richard E.
Gilmer, David S.
Gingles, Donald D.
Gladieux, Bernard L., Jr.
Glaeser, John S.
Glaser, Francis E.
Glendon, Bernard P.
Glenn, Robert L.
Goans, George P.
Goggin, Ronald L.
Goldsmith, Norman E.
Goldsmith, Albert L., Jr.
Goldsmith, James B.
Golt, Ralph S.
Gomez, Alvaro R.
Goodman, Jess T.
Goodman, James C., Jr.
Gordon, Barry L.
Gordon, Milford I.
Gordon, Robert C.
Gordon, Samuel J.
Gorham, Milton R., Jr.
Gosen, Lawrence D.
Goslin, Ellis
Gosnell, James B.
Grace, John P.
Graham, Donald R.
Graham, James B.
Gray, John R., Jr.
Green, Baxter D., Jr.
Green, David L.
Green, Floyd A.
Green, John G.
Green, Patrick T.
Green, Raymond M.
Green, Robert B.
Grienenberger, John G.
Griffin, John R.
Griffin, John R., Jr.
Griffith, John G.
Griffith, Richard K.
Griffith, Nelson L.
Griggs, Otis, Jr.
Grise, James E.
Gromyko, Alexander F.
Gross, Paul E.
Gross, Robert B.
Grounds, Sylvester Q.
Groves, Frank
Guay, Paul E.
Guest, Frederick H.
Guilbault, Roland G.
Gurnon, Paul J.
Guthrie, Robert E., Jr.
Guthrie, Richard J.
Gwinn, Cornelius B., Jr.
Harbermas, Thomas W.
Haffey, James M.
Hafford, David A.
Hager, Raymond D., Jr.
Hagins, James M.
Hailey, Russell E.
Haines, Donald A.
Haizlip, Jack
Hakenewerth, Herbert P.
Hale, Thomas M., Jr.
Haley, Wayne J.
Haley, Willie E.
Hall, Arthur E.
Hall, Charles E.
Hall, Eugene M.
Hall, Kenneth T., Jr.
Hall, Lawrence J.
Hallahan, Richard A.
Halton, Nicholas H.
Hamel, Albert A.
Hamilton, Allan J.
Hamilton, Griffin F.
Hamilton, William E.
Hamilton, Maynard L.
Hamilton, Donald A.
Hammer, Robert W.
Hammond, Warren G. F. X.
Hammond, Carl W.
Hammond, Flaye M., III
Hamner, Robert C.
Haney, Donald E.
Hanford, James M.
Hanggeli, William H.
Hannan, Victor R.
Hansen, Lyle F.
Hansen, Ronald L.
Hanson, Martin P.
Harbin, Harry W.
Harbin, William W.
Hardie, James S.
Hardy, Brenton P.
Hardy, Earl L.
Hark, Donald L.
Harker, William P.
Harmuth, Robert K.
Harney, Walter J.
Harper, Raymond H.
Harper, William L.
Harris, Lloyd T., Jr.
Harris, Rex H.
Harrison, Robert G.
Hart, David A.
Harvey, Robert F.
Hassler, Thomas A.
Hatton, Samuel F.
Haukereid, Arvin L.
Havey, John J.
Hawkins, William J.
Hawkins, Henry B.
Hawthorne, John W.
Hayden, Robert P.
Hazelwood, James R.
Hearn, James J.
Heavey, James L.
Heckart, Harold
Heebner, Newell G.
Heegeman, James W.
Heiges, John M.
Held, William E., Jr.
Helms, Charles P.
Henderson, Harvey H.
Henderson, Joseph C.
Henderson, Thomas G.
Henderson, Keith A.
Henderson, Harold J., Jr.
Hendon, Charles R.
Hendrickson, Daniel L.
Hendry, David M.
Henry, Hugh L.
Hepner, Fred D.
Herman, John M., Jr.
Herman, William A.
Hernon, Donald M.
Hershey, Clair R.
Hewett, Marle D.
Heyden, Hanley E.
Hibler, John F.
Hicks, Jack D.
Hicks, William F.
Higbee, Gerald M.
Higginbotham, John D.
Hight, Jim T.
Higman, Darrell E.
Hildebrand, Wayne T.
Hill, Charles E.
Hill, Edward R.
Hill, Hassel, Jr.
Hill, Nordean T.
Hill, Oscar A.
Hilt, John W.
Hitchcock, Donald R.
Hoeft, Max D.
Hoever, Milton H.
Hoey, John H.
Hoff, Richard W.
Hoffman, Jesse W.
Holcomb, Charles E.
Holcomb, William D.
Holds, James H.
Hollandsworth, Robert D.
Holloway, Charles A.
Holmes, Donald D.
Holmes, James F.
Holsclaw, Charlie B.
Holt, Ben F., Jr.
Holt, Vaughn E.
Holts, Philip P.
Honadle, William J.
Honcharuk, John P.
Honsaker, Herschel M.
Hopkins, Granville J.
Hopkins, Richard G.
Horacek, Jerry L.
Horna, Gerald F.
Hotchkiss, James M.
Hougland, Charles A.
Houley, William P.
Howie, Charles E.
Hudacko, Charles T.
Hudgins, Christopher L.
Hudson, Robert D.
Huebner, Richard F.
Huetter, Harvey P.
Hufner, Frederick G., Jr.
Hughes, Audra L.
Hughes, Charles L., Jr.
Hughey, John L.
Humes, Charles B.
Hunt, William B.
Hunter, Richard W.
Hurd, Robert C.
Hurley, Michael J., Jr.
Hurst, Milton T.
Hutcheison, Henry L.
Hutchison, Charles H.
Hydinger, Robert M.
Ihly, Richard L.
Iler, Jack L.
Ingram, Earl L.
Inman, Walter E.
Israelson, Leroy D.
Isreal, Livingston B.
Ittner, Robert H.
Ives, Charles O.
Ivie, Francis M.
Jacanin, James M.
Jackmond, Arnold D.
Jacob, Jerry J.
Jacobson, Jerome B.
Jacoby, Cliffton G.
Jagoditsch, Harold L.
James, Johnny L.
James, Jon G.
James, Thomas M.
Janas, Edward S.
Jarvis, Thomas C.
Jaseph, Robert L.
Jazwienski, Theodore
Jenik, Allan R.
Jenner, Robert F.
Jesberg, Ronald H.
Jessen, Werner H.
Jewell, Charles W.
Jockel, Joseph A., Jr.
Johanson, Ronald J.
Johnson, Robert D.
Johnson, Ralph H.
Johnson, Peter A.
Johnson, Arlo J.
Johnson, Dennis L.
Johnson, Richard W.
Johnson, Roland R.

Johnson, Charles O.
Johnson, Raymond L.
Johnson, Garth W.
Johnson, Armer W.
Johnson, Manley L.
Johnston, Rodney K.
Johnston, George D., Jr.
Johnston, Silas G., Jr.
Jolley, "R" "V"
Jones, Cecil E., Jr.
Jones, Delbert C.
Jones, Frank, Jr.
Jones, George B.
Jones, Howard R., Jr.
Jones, Joseph F.
Jones, Orville D.
Jones, Roger E.
Jones, William R.
Joplin, Dock W.
Jordan, Floyd R.
Joynt, Patrick D.
Juber, Clarence W.
Juby, William S., Jr.
Junker, Delvin W.
Kallstrom, Lawrence W.
Kaluza, Theodore A.
Kambeitz, Raymond A.
Kanuch, John S.
Kapphahn, Gary J.
Karnes, Allen O.
Karr, Odie L.
Kass, Matthew A.
Kaszycki, Charles J.
Katz, Alfred C.
Katz, Donald L.
Kearns, Daniel W.
Kearns, James F.
Keats, Lawrence R.
Keay, Karl L.
Keck, Abner W., Jr.
Keegan, Joseph J.
Keeley, Joseph
Keene, Maurice E., Jr.
Keener, Thomas V.
Kehr, John H.
Kelley, John J., Jr.
Kelley, Thomas D.
Kelly, David S.
Kelly, Robert J.
Kelly, Thomas
Kelly, William H.
Kelton, Allan H.
Keske, Carl D.
Ketts, Harry C., III
Keyes, Bradley N.
Kight, James R.
Kight, Otis G.
Kihune, Robert K. U.
Kiland, Ingolf N., Jr.
Kimble, Charles D.
Kimmons, Carl E.
Kinch, Judson M.
King, Charles T.
King, John J.
King, John B.
King, Joseph F.
King, Maclellan E., Jr.
King, Philip M.
Kinnier, John W.
Kirchner, Robert A., Jr.
Kirk, Robert G.
Kiss, John W.
Kitts, William F.
Klapp, Anthony J.
Klappenbach, Edward W.
Klein, Donald G.
Klementz, Robert W.
Kline, Frank E.
Kline, Norman S.
Kling, Edwin R., Jr.
Kloepfer, Ronald M.
Klopfenstein, Ervin J.
Klorig, William N.
Klosky, Lowell H.
Kloster, Orville D.
Knachel, Robert E.
Knapp, Charles E.
Kneibert, Frederick D.
Knepp, Henry W., Jr.
Knox, Joe B.
Knox, Samuel J., Jr.
Kohler, Donald L.
Koke, Herbert E.
Kooistra, Robert W.
Kopp, Walter H. O.
Korrell, Harry J. F., Jr.
Koruga, Paul M.
Kowalski, August C. B.
Kozlowski, Charles C.
Kraft, Raymond A.
Krasts, Ilmars
Kreher, William J.
Krieger, Charles B.
Krieger, Elmer H. J.
Krischker, Allen L. J.
Krol, John A.
Krol, Richard M.
Kronberger, Robert S.
Krug, Charles D.
Krumm, Theodore G., Jr.
Kruzic, Victor C.
Kshimetski, John J.
Kubik, Bruce W.
Kubilus, Edward J.
Kuebler, Richard J.
Kuenzli, Joseph R.
Kuhn, Edward R.
Kuiper, Lammert, Jr.
Kull, John N., Jr.
Kurrus, John B.
Kurtz, Clarence L.
Kyle, Alan M.
Lacagnina, David H.
Lackey, James B.
Laferty, John D.
Lair, Graham P.
Lambert, Richard E.
Lampert, Donald W.
Lancaster, Jack
Lancaster, Edward A.
Landon, Walter E.
Langemo, James C.
Langenbach, Ross K., III
Langford, John A., Jr.
Langland, Jay E.
Laning, Clifford L.
Larch, Lynns J.
Larkin, Robert L., Jr.
Larose, Elliott F.
Larrabee, Walter I.
Larsen, John T.
Larson, Arvid G.
Larson, Donovan C.
Larson, Robert L.
Lathrop, Mitchell L.
Lauer, Dudley S.
Laufer, William H.
Law, Wilburn P.
Lawhead, Walter
Lawler, John T.
Lawrence, Albert M.
Lawson, John W.
Lazarchick, Frank T.
Leder, John F.
Lee, Arthur R.
Lee, Richard H.
Lee, Robert R.
Lee, Rodney B.
Leeds, John M.
Leeper, James R.
Lehmberg, George R., Jr.
Lekstrom, Lennart C.
Leon, Hayden L., Jr.
Leonard, James F.
Leshon, Angelo, Jr.
Lester, Robert F.
Levesque, Bertrand H.
Lewis, Harry E.
Lewis, Michael H.
Lewis, William F.
Lewis, William
Leyden, John J.
Liebmann, John E.
Liles, Don K.
Linderman, David R.
Lindgren, Carl L.
Lindsey, Billie F.
Link, Kent A.
Links, William E.
Linsley, Richard G.
Liss, Richard S.
Littlefield, Gordon M.
Lloyd, Charles H.
Lloyd, George T.
Lockwood, Wayne P.
Logalbo, Salvatore E.
Logan, Bartlett W.
Logan, Russell A., Jr.
Logan, Wallis M.
Logie, Robert W.
London, "J" Phillip
Long, Harry R.
Long, Thomas A., Jr.
Longfellow, William J., Jr.
Longtin, Frank J.
Lopes, Stanley P.
Lorang, Alphonse J.
Lovejoy, John E.
Loveless, Jerry M.
Lovell, Jack W.
Lovett, Irvin E.
Lowe, James R.
Lowey, Michael E.
Lowry, "J" "E"
Lozano, Johnnie B., Jr.
Luebke, Robert W.
Lukish, Thomas J.
Luna, Fred A.
Lund, Paul A.
Lutes, Charles W.
Lyon, Fred M.
Lysne, Howard C.
MacDonald, Bridgman A.
MacDougall, Donald B.
Mace, James A.
MacFarlane, Byron N.
MacGillivray, Kenneth A.
Mack, Norman
MacNeil, William R.
MacVean, Charles R.
Mahaffey, Joseph D.
Mahne, Lloyd J.
Main, Elwin N.
Malfer, Mario A.
Malloy, Bernard A.
Malone, Herbert L.
Manly, Harold P., Jr.
Mann, Timothy J.
Manning, Sidney E.
Mansfield, William D.
Maran, Anthony J.
Marbach, Louis R.
Marckfeld, William E.
Mardigian, Richard
Marinello, Anthony J.
Maris, Alan H.
Markowski, David L.
Marler, Marvin R.
Marlin, Melvin C.
Marsh, William B., Jr.
Marshall, Bruce C.
Marshall, Walter W.
Martin, James E.
Martin, Johnny N., Jr.
Martin, Richard L.
Martin, Robert L.
Martin, Robert H.
Martin, William P.
Martinovich, Frank J.
Marvin, Timothy H.
Marx, William D.
Mascall, John H.
Maschinski, Bernard A.
Mason, Albert T.
Mason, Frank V.
Mason, James B.
Massie, Branch R.
Masterbone, Joseph A., Jr.
Masters, David R.
Matthews, Duran H.
Matthews, James R.
Matticks, Basil F.
Maulin, William H.
Mauz, Henry H., Jr.
Mawhinney, Robert C.
Maxwell, Jasper M.
Maxwell, James E.
Maxwell, Wayne P.
May, Kenneth E.
Maynard, Michael D.
Mayo, Norman A.
McAnulty, John F.
McAree, William B., II
McBride, William F.
McCabe John J.
McCabe, William D., Jr.
McCann, Gerald L.
McCann, William E., Jr.
McCarthy, Edward H., Jr.
McCarthy, William J.
McClain, "J" "L"
McCleary, Paul E.
McClendon, James F. Jr.
McClurg, Theodore H., Jr.
McCord, Howard E., Jr.
McCoy, Raymond H.
McCubbins, Marvin B.
McDaniel, Jerry P.
McElhenny, James P., Jr.
McElroy, Robert W.
McEvers, James E.
McFarling, Robert M., Jr.
McGanka, Steven W.
McGann, Robert G.
McGlynn, Gerald J.
McGowen, William R.
McGrath, James G.
McGuire, Robert J.
McIntosh, William D. Jr.
McIntyre, Fred P.
McKenna, Peter D.
McKinney, Henry C.
McKinney, William E.
McKinney, Robert F.
McLarney, Edward F., Jr.
McLaughlin, Thomas E.
McLeod, Robert H.
McLoon, Charles A.
McMasters, James A.
McMichael, James G.
McMurry, Jerry C.
McNamara, John R.
McNamara, Thomas F., Jr.
McReynolds, Thomas P.
McVey, Charles J.
Meadows, Elliott O.
Meeks, Harman T.
Meiers, George C., Jr.
Melville, Karl W.
Mendel, Daniel L., Jr.
Menzies, Lawrence R.
Meredith, Francis M., II
Merz, Arthur
Messegee, James A.
Metzger, John M.
Meyers, Clement R., Jr.
Meyers, Robert O.
Michael, Robert D.
Michelsen, Lane R.
Mihelic, Toney
Milanowski, Edward J.
Milas, Forrest M.
Milhorn, Harvey H.
Miller, Alan C.
Miller, Charles P., III
Miller, Carl V., Jr.
Milligan, Richard D.
Millikan, Keith B.
Milner, Robert L.
Milwee, William I., Jr.
Miner, Dale L.
Minton, Joseph A.
Mitchell, Howard D.
Mitchell, John S., Jr.
Mitchell, Glenn H.
Mitchell, Herbert W.
Mixon, Tracy R.
Mixson, Riley D.
Moe, Richard B.
Moellmer, Karl A.
Mogol, Louis M.
Moncilovich, Milan
Monroe, Ira T.
Montgomery, Morris
Moon, Lester C.
Moons, Joseph F.
Moore, Gerald R.
Moore, Richard J.
Moore, Temple C., Jr.
Morgan, Alva E.
Morgan, Harry E., Jr.
Morgan, Henry A., Jr.
Morgan, Robert V.
Morisset, Herbert D.
Morrison, Alan B.
Morrison, George H.
Morrissey, James R., Jr.
Morrow, Benjamin H.
Morse, John P.
Morse, Raymond M.
Moses, Albert O.
Moynahan, Dennis M.
Mulkern, Kevin M.
Mullen, Lawrence G.
Mullvain, Harold E.
Mulrooney, Robert M.
Mundy, Jerome J.
Murphy, John R.
Murphy, James E.
Murphy, James A.
Murphy, James M. P.
Murray, Francis W.
Murray, John F.
Murray, William F., Jr.
Mustain, Kenneth A.
Myers, Karl
Nadeau, Joseph R. D.
Naef, Frederick E., Jr.
Nagel, Howard A.
Nagy, Joseph F.
Nash, John E.
Nave, Lincoln D., Jr.
Naylor, Howard W.
Neese, John F.
Neish, John F.
Nelis, Patrick J.
Nelson, Charles T.
Nelson, George A.
Nelson, Grady L.
Nelson, John P.
Nelson, Paul C.
Nelson, Robert A.
Newland, James E.
Newland, Kenneth T.
Newman, Errett D.
Newman, Irwin G.
Newquist, William A.
Newton, Carlos F.
Newton, Marple
Nicholls, Stanley K.
Nicholson, Daniel A.
Nicholson, John W.
Nickerson, Ellis L.
Nield, Van K.
Nielsen, Emanuel K.
Nisonger, Bliss E.
Nissler, Charles L.
Nobile, Liborio W.
Noble, Richard A.
Nolan, Charles G.
Nolan, Michael H.
Nolan, Thomas E.
Noland, Paul F.
Nole, Leonard J.
Nordwall, Bruce D.
Noreika, Richard J.
Norman, William P.
Norris, John T.
Norwood, David F.
Nourie, John R.
Nowatzki, Richard J.
Nunn, Silas O., III
Obsitnik, Vincent
O'Connell, Philip J., Jr.
O'Dell, Delbert W.
O'Hara, Charles W.
O'Hearn, David W., Jr.
Oistad, Byron J.
O'Keefe, Thomas A.
Olds, Frederick A.
Olita, Julius A.
Oliver, Robert G.
Olsen, James R.
Olson, Carl G.
Olson, Gerald D.
Olson, William A.
O'Malley, William J.
O'Neal, Herbert R.
O'Neil, William P.
Oneto, John C.
Orbovich, Michael M.
Orlovich, Peter
Orr, Francis A.
Osburn, David L.
Osburn, Marvin R.
Osgood, Franklin B.
Osswald, William C.
Oswald, Thomas H., Jr.
Ottino, William A.
Overman, Everett F., Jr.
Ovre, Leslie H.
Ovrom, Allan A., Jr.
Owen, Ernest R.
Owen, William R.
Owenby, Lester S.
Owens, Robert H.
Page, David A.
Page, Gilbert G.
Pagnillo, Richard J.
Paine, John A., Jr.
Paladino, Vincent T.
Palmer, Leslie N.
Palmer, Michael W.
Pampel, Alban, III
Parker, Robert C., Jr.
Parks, Tom H., Jr.
Parsons, Guy C., Jr.
Patten, John R.
Patterson, Larry L.
Paulsen, Paul H.
Pease, Charles C.
Pechauer, John N.
Peck, Roger L.
Peckham, Stanley D.
Pelkey, Frank D.
Peloquin, Alfred E.
Penman, Paul D.
Pennington, Donald E.
Perkins, Thomas M.
Perkins, Robert C., Jr.
Permenter, Lawrence F.
Perry, Albert H.
Perry, Chester A.
Person, James S., Jr.
Peters, Billy P.
Peters, Earl H.
Petersen, Jack E.
Peterson, Gerald L.
Peterson, Charles E.
Peterson, James A.
Petitt, Robert A.
Pfeifer, Robert D.
Phelps, Byron D.
Phelps, Leeman H.
Pheris, William E., IV
Pick, James D.
Pickle, Roy F.

Pierce, James C.
Pietras, Fred J.
Pizinger, Lawrence C.
Plantz, Ernest V.
Polson, "C" "L"
Poole, James K.
Poole, Richard W.
Poole, William W., Jr.
Popp, Irwin W.
Posner, Ernest G.
Potente, Estelito N.
Pound, Don P.
Powell, Bernard N.
Powell, Richard A.
Powers, Philip H.
Praetorius, Hugh M.
Prendergast, Robert L.
Prescott, Ronald G.
Previto, Leonard R.
Prevost, Stephen M.
Priest, John T.
Pringle, Stuart H., Jr.
Printup, Lloyd E.
Putnam, William M.
Pye, Horace L.
Pyle, Jackie C.
Quarles, Clifford E.
Quinley, Charles W.
Radecki, Richard A.
Rager, Philip J., Jr.
Rager, Richard R.
Rahming, John C.
Raines, William A.
Ramborger, James K.
Ramsay, Robert W., Jr.
Ramsey, James E.
Randolph, David E.
Rappolt, James F.
Raunig, Donald J.
Ray, Charles R.
Ray, Courtney D.
Read, Dennis E.
Reagan, Stanley D.
Reagan, Virgil B.
Reason, James E.
Recktenwald, John C.
Redburn, Billie H.
Redden, Edward G.
Reed, John H.
Reed, Travis B.
Reeder, John A.
Reefe, Clarence E.
Rees, Elbert G.
Rees, Gayle H.
Rees, Robert L.
Reeves, Roy M.
Regan, James D.
Reimann, Lyle F.
Remillard, Raymond A.
Render, Ronald W.
Renner, Ernest A.
Reppert, Thomas C.
Resare, Ronald A.
Reynolds, James G.
Reynolds, Philip W.
Reynolds, Frederick W., Jr.
Rheinhart, Eugene O.
Rhodes, Hugh W.
Rice, Leonard
Rice, Roy J.
Richard, Raymond
Richard, Harry S.
Richardson, Daniel C.
Richardson, William E.
Richardson, Arthur O
Richardson, Albert J.
Richmond, Elvin T.
Richmond, Norman W.
Richter, Herbert B.
Rickman, Wayne E.
Rickover, Robert J.
Rickwald, Ronald R.
Riddell, Robert A.
Riddle, Homer C.
Ridens, Jack M.
Riess, Daniel M.
Riley, Larry M.
Riley, Michael W.
Rine, Charles A.
Risch, Philip A., Jr.
Ritchie, Doyle E.
Rivers, Laroyce F., Jr.
Rivest, Omer E.
Robert, James R.
Roberts, Jack A.
Roberts, William E.
Roberts, Paul J.
Roberts, James N.
Roberts, George A.
Roberts, Thomas M.
Robertson, James
Robertson, John S.
Robinson, Richard L.
Robinson, Wayne
Robinson, Lesley T.
Rochholz, Lyle D.
Rodriguez, Ronald J.
Rodrigues, Laurentino
Roensch, Hans M., Jr.
Rogero, Berchman E., Jr.
Rogers, David N.
Rogers, Kenneth E.
Rogers, Will, Jr.
Rollins, Robert L.
Roper, John D.
Rosander, Roger E.
Roscoe, David R.
Rose, Clifford A., Jr.
Rose, Guy M.
Rosenberger, Glenn C.
Ross, Benjamin A.
Ross, Lawrence T.
Rossi, Louis F.
Rothermel, Kenneth W.
Rottgering, Charles D.
Rouse, Charles F., Jr.
Rowe, Robert E.
Rowland, Gilford G., Jr.
Royalty, Reed L.
Rucker, James B., Jr.
Runyan, James H.
Russell, Richard D.
Ruth, Allen R.
Ryan, Robert M.
Ryan, William C., Jr.
Sajdera, Robert M.
Sakuda, Paul S.
Salem, Edward R.
Salerni, Paul N.
Salrin, Orvis D., Jr.
Sampson, William J.
Sanders, Sheldon M.
Saner, Donald E.
Santos, Alfred J., Jr.
Savage, Robert L.
Savel, John J., Jr.
Savio, Leo J.
Sawhook, James L.
Saxton, Harold E.
Scent, Raymond J.
Schaper, Darwin E.
Schenfisch, Albert V.
Scherrer, Roy S.
Schexnayder, Bodin R.
Schiavone, Angelo A.
Schick, Bruce J.
Schiffner, Robert C.
Schlegel, Kurt A.
Schmidt, William R.
Schmidt, Frederick D.
Schnauffer, Patrick M., Jr.
Schneck, Don O.
Schneider, Jack L. C.
Schoneman, Elmer C.
Schrag, Larry P.
Schultz, John J.
Schultz, Philip D.
Schuyler, Paul G.
Schwartz, William G.
Scott, Albert T.
Scott, John P.
Scott, Lawrence S.
Scott, William M., Jr.
Scruggs, James M.
Sears, David F.
Seaton, Billy L.
Sedoris, Louis M.
Seeley, James R.
Seeley, Orland C., Jr.
Selland, Omar M.
Sellers, Gurley N., Jr.
Sells, John E.
Seltzer, James L.
Seredynski, John F.
Sessions, John F.
Seykowski, Donald W.
Shafer, Clark B.
Shafer, Lee E.
Sharp, James E.
Sharp, John J.
Sharples, Charles T.
Shealy, Paul L.
Shealy, Tirey D.
Shelton, Donald
Shenton, Scott S.
Sheppard, Furman L., Jr.
Sherman, Albert A.
Sheya, Lawrence J.
Shinn, Allen M., Jr.
Shiverdecker, David K.
Siebeking, Paul F., Jr.
Siembieda, John
Sigmund, Samuel W.
Sikes, Arthur D.
Sikes, John B.
Simmons, Dean M.
Simmons, George T.
Simon, James W.
Sims, James A.
Siple, Terrence E.
Skelton, Luther W., III
Skewes, Frank A.
Skinner, Melvyn R.
Slaven, John K.
Sledge, Villard C.
Slemp, Frederick A.
Slocum, "L" Wilson
Small, Fenwick R.
Smith, Arthur K., Jr.
Smith, Archie D.
Smith, Arthur J., Jr.
Smith, Arthur H.
Smith, Bradley N.
Smith, Clarence T.
Smith, Gary T.
Smith, Gibson P.
Smith, Gordon M.
Smith, James F.
Smith, James A., Jr.
Smith, John S.
Smith, Joseph T.
Smith, John G.
Smith, Philip G.
Smith, Rayburn R.
Smith, Richard D.
Smith, Robert L.
Smith, Robert P.
Smith, Stanley R.
Smith, William P.
Smoak, Robert M.
Smoot, William T.
Snipes, Stephen G.
Snyder, Stephen V.
Soals, Woodrow W.
Sole, James W.
Solms, William R.
Solomon, Donald L.
Somes, Timothy E.
Sopko, John R.
Sorensen, Thomas S.
Sorrie, James
Spille, Samuel J.
Sprecher, Herbert E., Jr.
Springer, Nelson C.
Spruell, Alfred, H., Jr.
Stafford, Earl A.
Stahel, Rudolf S.
Stanfield, Marcus K.
Stanford, David L.
Stanley, Walter L.
Stanton, Courtney W.
Staples, Henry E., Jr.
Starck, Robin L.
Starnes, Charles M.
Staszak, Richard S.
Steckler, Charles T.
Steed, Tom B.
Stephens, Daniel P.
Stephens, Kensel E.
Stewart, Francis J.
Stickelberger, Robert W.
Stiehm, Bruce G.
Stierwalt, Charles A.
Stillwell, William H.
Stimpson, Mark A.
Stitzel, David H., II
Stobbs, Emmett E.
Stoessl, Leslie
Stokoe, James H.
Storms, Robert B.
Stout, James C.
Stout, Peter C.
Strachwitz, Hubert J.
Straight, Donald O.
Stratton, Sylvan D.
Straub, John H.
Strickland, Robert L.
Strohsahl, George H., Jr.
Strommer, Frederick A.
Strysick, Richard B.
Sturtevant, Richard E.
Stutzer, William T.
Styles, Harold J.
Sudholz, Herman O.
Sullivan, Hamilton R.
Sullivan, David D.
Sullivan, John L.
Sullivan, Francis J.
Summerlin, Benjamin F.
Summerson, Richard B.
Summey, James W., III
Supersano, Raphael T.
Susag, Gary R.
Sutton, Troy J.
Swafford, William T.
Swaney, John L.
Swann, Oscar
Swazey, John M.
Szczypinski, Walter S., Jr.
Taber, David C.
Taft, James R.
Tahamont, David
Talbert, Lee R.
Tamony, Joseph M.
Tarpgaard, Peter T., Jr.
Taylor, Bruce A., Jr.
Taylor, Forrest T.
Taylor, James R.
Taylor, Richard I.
Temple, John W.
Temple, James W.
Templeton, Felix E.
Tenkhoff, Philip A.
Thompson, Fred E.
Thompson, James M.
Thompson, Stanley P.
Thompson, David R.
Threadgill, Carl G.
Thresher, Alfred A., II
Thursby, Cecil H.
Tibbetts, John W.
Tidd, James F.
Tiedmann, Hollie J., Jr.
Tighe, Jack L.
Tiller, Richard J.
Tilton, Allan P.
Timby, William H.
Tindall, Samuel J., Jr.
Tingle, Andrew J.
Tobin, James D.
Tobin, Wallace E., III
Todd, Bennett E., Jr.
Tomajczyk, Charles F., Jr.
Tomlinson, Rodney G.
Tonelli, Video V.
Tosloskie, John J.
Touchstone, Frederick F., Jr.
Touhey, Robert J.
Tracy, Leslie R.
Tremblay, Victor J.
Trimbach, Charles G.
Trimbur, Arthur F.
Trollope, Richard G.
Trossbach, Ronald O.
Troyer, David D.
Truax, Daniel M.
Truly, Richard H.
Tschida, Robert M.
Tuchscherer, Richard D.
Tucker, Henry C., III
Tuggle, Ralph E.
Turkington, William W., III
Turner, Gale N.
Turner, John W.
Turner, Tom D.
Tussing, Jearold A.
Tuthill, Donald L.
Udebrock, Jack H.
Umsted, Truxtun
Underwood, Arloff V.
Uriell, Harlan F.
Ussery, James D.
Valenti, Patrick C.
VanAllen, William M. D.
Vance, Earl D.
Vance, John W., III
VanCuran, Russell F.
VanDiver, William C.
Vangemert, Richard J.
VanNort, Peter S.
VanVeen, Francis A.
Varni, Gerard F.
Vasey, Robert C., III
Vasques, Ramon
Vaughan, Joseph S.
Vaughan, John S.
Vaughan, Ishamel W.
Vaughn, Carl E.
Vaughn, Thurman H.
Veazey, Sidney E.
Vedral, Charles, Jr.
Verheijen, Gerrit J., Jr.
Vincent, Charles D.
Vogt, John F.
Vogt, Larry G.
Volgenau, Douglas
Vollaire, Robert L.
Wagner, Robert C.
Waidley, William E.
Wainwright, Howard E.
Wainwright, Jonathan M.
Waldrup, James C.
Walker, Harry C.
Walker, Harley E., Jr.
Walker, John W.
Walker, Lee H.
Walker, Leo F.
Wall, Paul E.
Wallace, Michael W.
Wallace, Donald J. H.
Wallace, Eddie H.
Waller, James W.
Walls, Harold D., II
Walters, Arthur K., Jr.
Walters, Jimmy C.
Walton, Martin H.
Ward, John P.
Ward, Randall W.
Ward, Richard F.
Ward, Samuel R.
Wardlow, Louis B.
Ware, Downey M.
Ware, James R., Jr.
Warmunde, Aubrey H., Jr.
Warner, Calvin R.
Warson, Toby G.
Wasmund, Thomas L.
Watkins, William R.
Watson, Robert F.
Watt, John M., Jr.
Wayland, Henry P., Jr.
Weaver, Larry S.
Weaver, Woodrow W.
Webb, Obil J., Jr.
Webster, Edward C.
Wehner, Charles W.
Weikert, John P.
Wellborn, Raymond B.
Welsh, Joseph W.
Wermecke, John D.
Wesley, Terrell C., III
West, Norris R.
West, Terence H.
West, Ward L.
Westfahl, Richard K.
Weston, Robert M., Jr.
Weyhing, Edward J.
Wheatley, Gary F.
Wheaton, William C.
Wheeland, Paul P.
Wheeler, Herbert C.
Wheeler, James R.
Wheeler, Wayne H.
Whipps, Russell E.
Whitaker, Edson
White, Arlie R.
White, Bob P.
White, Henry M., Jr.
White, Robert E.
Whitehead, Verne B.
Whitemore, William F.
Whitt, Darnell M., II
Whitworth, Charles A.
Wice, Leroy P.
Wienandt, Melvin W.
Wigen, Richard A.
Wiggin, Charles C.
Wilcox, Arden J.
Wilderman, Alvin L.
Wile, Alan R., Jr.
Wiley, Bill B.
Wiley, Robert C.
Wilhelm, George C.
Wilkins, Perry
Wilkinson, Charles J.
Will, Raymond M.
Williams, Chester W., Jr.
Williams, Douglas D., Jr.
Williams, Gerald F.
Williams, James M.
Williams, John H., Jr.
Williams, John R.
Williams, Ralph Z.
Williams, Robert A.
Williams, Ronald E.
Williams, Thomas O., Jr.
Williams, Wayne N.
Williams, Windell V.
Williamson, James R.
Williamson, Mark H.
Williamson, Varnadore M.
Willihnganz, Paul W.
Willingham, Robert J., Jr.
Wilson, Alger L.
Wilson, Charles M., Jr.
Wilson, Clyde C.
Wilson, Eugene J.
Wilson, Herbert C.
Wilson, James P.
Wilson, Paul L.
Wilson, William R.
Winter, Richard F.
Winthrop, Griffith J.
Wireman, Paul H.
Wirth, Gerard H.
Wirth, William T.
Wiseman, Aaron D., Jr.

Wishchuk, John L.
Withers, John H.
Witt, Charles D.
Witzke, Bernard W.
Wixom, Barney D.
Wofford, Thomas M.
Wolfe, Don C.
Wolynies, Jon G.
Wommack, Roland R.
Wondolowski, Alexander A.
Wood, Avery G., Jr.
Woolley, William J.
Worley, Kenneth C., Jr.
Wortman, George E.
Wright, Perry W.
Wu, Theodore W., Jr.
Wynn, Walter P., Jr.
Yaworsky, William J.
Yeaman, Myrl A.
Yeaple, Donald S.
Yenchko, Raymond A.
Yerkes, George M.
Yoder, Max N.
York, Milton W.
Youmans, Grenville
Young, Carroll J.
Young, David S.
Young, Howard L., Jr.
Young, James T.
Young, Vernon O.
Youngmann, Kenneth C.
Zachary, William H., Jr.
Zanoni, Angelo J.
Zanzot, Warren L.
Zapalac, James C.
Zimmerman, Joseph G.
Zimmerman, Francis H.
Zimmerman, Harold W.
*Axtell, Lawrence H.
*Botkin, Harry L.
*Cauvet, Kenneth B.
*Chandler, David F.
*Clarke, Ronald E.
*Fox, James C.
*Fox, Richard A.
*Franks, Richard N.
*Gladding, Thomas, Jr.
*Haenze, Leroy R.
*Luce, Ralph W., III
*Martinez, James R.
*McAtee, Donald E.
*Michl, Daniel J.
*Miller, George A.
*Mink, Leon M.
*Mullin, George C.
*Parrish, Thomas D.
*Peters, Donald L.
*Pidgeon, Edward T., Jr.
*Ring, William R.
*Ruby, Scott M.
*Sandke, William K.
*Sawdey, Phillip G.
*Smith, Leon T.
*Stevick, Jerold C., Jr.
*Verney, George M.
*Wilson, Dennis K.
*Kirkpatrick, Milton W., Jr.
*Baker, Henry T.
*Blades, William R.
*Driscoll, Charles F.
*Durgin, Herbert P.
*Grosenbach, Glen R.
*Hutchison, William B.
*Kennedy, Richard
*Klotzner, Virgil M.
*Mitchell, Hillary M.
*Savage, Billy B.
*Smith, Henry B.
*Snyder, Carl L.
*Sorrell, Frederick L.
*Stith, Charles E.
*Tew, Louis M.
*Turner, Frank M.
*VonGenk, Henry E., Jr.
*Welk, Emil J., Jr.
*Wollard, Paul L.
*Arbuckle, William S.
*Cameron, Ronald D.
*Clarity, Michael G.
*Clegg, William L.
*Dafoe, James L.
*Forst, Ronald J.
*Foster, Robert G.
*Fullerton, George E., Jr.
*Furminger, Harry C.
*Hinkell, John W.
*Hodge, Don W.
*Hoene, Edward R.
*Hogan, Thomas W.
*Hope, Lawrence A., Jr.
*Iverson, Dale A.
*Kirk, Daniel K., Jr.
*Lavender, Carlos F.
*Luter, Thomas H.
*Maier, Peter T.
*Mangol, Frederick N.
*McCue, Jerome E.
*Messervy, Harold V.
*Moore, William B. Jr.
*Mosher, Norman G.
*Parker, Richard L.
*Pries, Robert E.
*Sherman, John M.
*Springer, Judson H.
*Sweeney, Charles J., Jr.
*Thomas, James P. L.
*Thorne, Charles E.
*Vaden, Thomas R.
*Webber, George E.
*Whitby, Ralph E., Jr.
*Alverson, William R.
*Applegate, Thomas M.
*Blake, Donald T.
*Boyle, Robert D.
*Bryson, William M.
*Chambers, Frank T.
*Dion, Malcolm C.
*Freeman, Melvin C.
*Haney, William C.
*Hargon, John B.
*Hylton, Robert M.
*Johnston, Joshua T. S.
*Katusha, David P.
*Kelley, Alfred S.
*Koontz, Albert P.
*Ledbetter, Elmer A.
*Lewis, Harry G.
*Loomis, Eugene O.
*Lowther, Donald E.
*Mars, Robert C.
*McGinnis, Fon C., Jr.
*Minteer, Glenn L.
*Montgomery, Robert G.
*Oliff, Graham K.
*Renwick, John M.
*Taylor, David E.
*Theodorides, Theodore
*Zietzke, William L.
*Briggs, Roger C.
*Collis, Charles D.
*Crowninshield, George W.
*Donnellan, Robert I.
*Dowd, John E., Jr.
*Fleming, James J.
*Foss, Donald M.
*Goodwin, Robert L., Jr.
*Hodge, Byron F.
*Hoech, Donald G.
*Hulson, Roger P.
*King, William K.
*Martin, David A.
*McCormick, Gerald J.
*McFerren, Robert W.
*Mendenhall, Carlos C., Jr.
*O'Neil, James M.
*Perrotti, Manuel V.
*Pottratz, Richard K.
*Sinclair, Donald L., Jr.
*Strong, Bruce W.
*Tola, Thomas J., Jr.
*Truax, Robert C.
*VanAtta, Jerry L.
*Venter, David G.
*VonEssen, William A.
*Anthony, Leland C.
*Badger, Patrick M., Jr.
*Bieber, Gene L.
*Crawford, Arthur G.
*Doane, Milton S.
*Greve, William H.
*Harding, Robert C.
*Houck, Jack C.
*Johnson, Bernie F.
*Lanam, Jackson M.
*Minick, William E.
*Selberg, Leroy P.
*Trigg, Beldon H.
*Wynn, Fulton R.
*Bishop, William J.
*Carpenter, John E.
*Edwards, Robert L.
*Gocke, Thomas A.
*Hacker, Benjamin T.
*Ives, David W.
*Johnson, Buddy C.
*Moreland, Robert D.
*Pinson, Firman L.
*Porter, Richard B.
*Shea, John J.
*Shelby, Lawrence T.
*Sisley, Dale L.
*Boltz, Norman D.
*Boone, Harold L.
*Brodie, Judson M., Jr.
*Carter, Burnett W.
*Conklin, Harold R.
*Graul, Julius G.
*Hansen, Philip V.
*Hibbs, Benjamin C.
*Inman, Willard D.
*Jensen, Russell J.
*Jones, Frank L.
*McDaniel, James G.
*Skjod, Chester J.
*Sobieck, Gerard A.
*Twyman, Dale E.
*Youngberg, Guy M.
*Andres, Charles G.
*Bailey, Fred W.
*Bair, James R.
*Bell, Billy C.
*Bishop, John W.
*Bleynat, Edward L.
*Bock, Karl F.
*Brown, Dale S., Jr.
*Carlson, Gilman R., Jr.
*Culbertson, Wylie J.
*Dougherty, "J" Alvin
*Driver, Ace C., Jr.
*Forman, William S.
*Fox, Sharon L.
*Galavotti, Edward L.
*Gracy, Ronald A.
*Jordan, Donald H.
*Kirsch, Walter J., III
*Kopec, Thad L.
*LeBlanc, Richard A.
*MacKinnon, Richard A.
*Maguire, John E.
*Mascola, Richard F., Jr.
*Mayden, Earl L.
*McCall, Ralph B.
*McClendon, Leigh A., III
*Meeker, Charles M.
*Moore, Craig B.
*Nelson, Donald E.
*Norris, Elliott W.
*Owen, John F.
*Petersen, Halvor N.
*Pippenger, William W.
*Richard, Roy A.
*Roach, Ronald G.
*Robinette, Hillary M.
*Schluntz, Frank R.
*Schweizer, Otto A., Jr.
*Stout, Richard D.
*Troncalli, Donald L.
*Warmbir, Kenneth M.
*Wright, William A.
*Brown, Boyd A.
*Laterza, Louis M.
*Glenn, Robert L.
*Hahn, Donald L.
*Lamer, Wayne L.
*Quigley, Joseph M.
*Sharpe, Phillip W.
*Wilcox, Guy I.
*Begg, Robert A.
*Bell, Jack L.
*Bender, Harold G.
*Bowlby, Carl A.
*Boyles, Allen D.
*Broomhead, Kenneth H.
*Diggs, Bernard W., Jr.
*Fries, William
*Holland, Richard P.
*Huntley, Herbert E.
*Jacobs, Eldon E.
*Joe, Lawrence P.
*Jones, William O.
*Lyman, Relle L.
*Milana, Philip A.
*Murphy, Arthur R.
*Runyon, Malcolm T., Jr.
*Smallwood, Roger C.
*Soohoo, Moo T.
*Sparkman, Delous R.
*Stuart, Frederick B.
*Tate, Kenneth P.
*Uber, William J.
*Wilkerson, John M.
*Been, John T., II
*Blanch, Robert F.
*Branchflower, Norman H., Jr.
*Davidson, Donald D.
*Franklin, Ernest C.
*Hall, Michael R.
*Hawes, John K.
*Kelley, Robert D.
*Milanytch, Nickolas I.
*Moore, Davil W.
*Nichols, James R.
*Poff, David E.
*Templeton, Robert N.
*Todaro, Fred M.
*Waters, Irving A., Jr.
*Wrightman, Carl A.
*Anderson, Harland D.
*Aspenwall, Albert M.
*Bland, Charles W.

SUPPLY CORPS

Armour, Robert C.
Arnold, James L.
Ashbacher, Allen F.
Austin, Robert R.
Aviiesalfaro, Bolivar, Jr.
Awada, James G.
Bailer, Carl A.
Ballard, William H., Jr.
Bayles, Ronald S.
Beck, Martin L.
Bell, Ronald M.
Bender, James L.
Bian, John W.
Billings, Thomas H.
Biver, David A.
Blackburn, Albert E.
Blackwell, Lind B.
Bloom, Jardine C.
Bohensky, Donald F.
Boltz, Jacob
Borders, Deforrest, Jr.
Bowman, Arnold R.
Branson, William H.
Brassington, Abram A.
Bray, John J., Jr.
Brinkerhoff, Clifford N.
Brock, Harry J., Jr.
Burden, David G.
Burnett, Chester I., Jr.
Bush, William J.
Byrd, James J.
Carter, William A.
Casasanto, Joseph
Chase, Thane "B"
Christensen, Thomas W.
Clemente, Vincent F.
Coenen, Walter D. E.
Cole, Peter S.
Cook, Bennie W.
Cooper, Donald R.
Corbett, Vergie E.
Cox, Marion H.
Crabtree, William H.
Crooks, Robert E., Jr.
Crosby, Alexander C.
Culbertson, Morris D.
Cullen, Donald D.
Cummings, Samuel R., III
Cunningham, John J., Jr.
Custis, John P.
Dare, Joseph C.
Davis, James M.
Dean, Claire T., Jr.
Dean, Robert W.
Dempsey, Edward J.
Denney, Jay R.
Desmarais, Normand D.
Ditmore, Carl A., Jr.
Drinnon, James W., Jr.
Dyches, James W.
Ebey, John R.
Edmondson, Aaron D.
Ellermeier, Joel D.
Endzel, Edward W.
Erickson, Roger C.
Evans, Albert F.
Evans, Steven H.
Farley, Arthur G.
Paul, David C.
Fedora, John
Felt, John D.
Fenwick, Charles L.
Flammger, Jerome T.
Foster, Thomas L.
Fournier, Alexander F., III
Francis, Thomas M.
Freeburg, Gene R.
Frizzell, Frank L., Jr.
Gantt, Lynn M.
Garner, Fred S.
Gau, Lawrence G.
Goodman, Jack R.
Gregorich, Kenneth J.
Groom, Robert W.
Grossman, Stephen Z.
Hadbavny, John W.
Halstead, Clyde R., Jr.
Hamlin, Rudolph B.
Hampton, Phillip W.
Hardin, Jonathon J., Jr.
Harris, Neal L.
Hay, Vernon M.
Heidelbaugh, Warren R.
Henion, Alan M.
Hessler, Blair
Hickey, Daniel F., Jr.
Higgins, Richard L.
Hollingshead, Richard A.
Howard, Robert L., Jr.
Hudalla, Anthony F.
Huddleston, Roy L.
Hulan, Milton T.
Hults, James A.
Inman, James E.
Jackson, Edward M.
Jackson, Leon A.
Jacroux, Paul E.
James, Robert C.
Jaminet, John A.
Jewett, Grey R., Jr.
Johnson, Edward M., Jr.
Jones, Bobby J.
Jones, Everett L., III
Jones, Ramon W.
Jones, Richard W.
Jordan, James C., Jr.
Julian, Gerald P.
Keiser, James A.
Keller, James G.
Kelly, James A.
Kenin, David
Kenly, William R.
Kennedy, Albert J.
Kenney, Thomas R.
Kitts, Willis M.
Knapp, Emmett J.
Koczur, Eugene
Koncar, William R.
Krakower, Matthew A.
Kraus, Joseph
Kreig, William C.
Krummel, John C.
Kruse, Marlin L.
Kubasch, Donley D.
Kwolek, John R.
Lamphear, Steven C.
Leber, Theodore T., Jr.
Leduc, Arthur R.
Ledwig, Donald E.
Lee, Richard H.
Leeson, Donald D.
Leisenring, Richard P.
Ligon, Samuel J., Jr.
Lindberg, Warren E.
Lokey, Leonard N., Jr.
Longshore, Richard E.
Lynam, Edward J.
Lytle, James A.
Machesky, John M.
Manly, Robert L.
Marble, Alfred C., Jr.
March, Frederick W.
Marshall, Solomon W., Jr.
Mazurek, Stanley F.
McAdams, William M.
McAllister, Dudley S., Jr.
McCarthy, Harold J.
McClure, Robert A.
McClurkin, David E.
McDowell, Charles I. T.
McGarvey, Richard L.
McGee, Bernard J.
McLeod, Billy L.
McWhorter, Fred O.
Meany, John P., Jr.
Medlin, James W.
Meginnis, Donald L.
Meier, John D.
Mezzio, George H.
Moore, John A.
Morrison, Roger T.
Murphy, Henry T., Jr.
Napier, William L.
Naughton, Robert E.

Neidel, John A.
Nettles, Lawrence J.
Newton, William A., Jr.
Noble, Francis E.
O'Brien, Daniel A.
O'Donnell, John P.
Ott, Thomas S.
Overman, Douglas R.
Parker, Charles E.
Parker, Donald W.
Parsons, Frank W.
Parsons, Stanley S.
Peck, Leo J.
Peters, Donald T.
Powell, William E., Jr.
Poxon, Howard W., Jr.
Prehodka, Theodore H.
Ransdell, Maurice G.
Ray, Harold P.
Ray, Harold L., Jr.
Reed, David A.
Reuscher, Edward J.
Riplog, Duane T.
Robie, Ralph L., Jr.
Ross, Edward A.
Roth, Jon B.
Rumpf, Robert L.
Rush, William G.
Salmon, Robert C.
Schleck, Peter J.
Schlenker, Robert L.
Schneider, Richard D.
Scruggs, Claude P.
Seeburger, John E., Jr.
Selgelid, Larry C.
Serafin, John R.
Sharron, Richard O.
Shaw, Jerry W.
Sherman, Byron G.
Sherwood, William C.
Shiels, John M.
Shorrock, Charles M.
Sleeth, Sterlen S., Jr.
Smellow, Edwin N.
Smith, Billy G.
Smith, William E.
Spage, Basil A.
Spearman, Wayne C.
Staats, Charles T.
Starbuck, George A.
Stauffer, John L.
Stehly, Frederick R.
Steidle, Robert E.
Stewart, Robert B.
Stigliano, Carmen N.
Stofanak, Matthew A.
Stone, William W.
Sturges, Michael S.
Sturhahn, David P.
Talbot, Cecil "J"
Tallant, Arnold
Thiss, Hoyt B., Jr.
Thompson, Donald D.
Thurn, Charles W.
Tribble, Arthur S.
Ubbink, Joseph T.
Vandoren, Harry K.
Vaughan, George F.
Verplaetse, Ronald A.
Vevoda, George L.
Villella, Conrad L.
Wadsworth, William T.
Walker, Samuel J.
Waller, Billy G.
Walther, Harrison N.
Webb, Robert D.
Weinsteger, Robert R.
Weiss, Frederick B.
Welsh, Gerald H.
Willen, Michael D.
Willett, Roy
Williams, John P.
Willis, Gerald W.
Wilmoth, James P., III
Wolcott, John N.
Wolff, Norman D.
Wood, Allen
Wood, Leonard L.
Wright, Joe B.
Yeager, Howard B.
Young, Adrian R.
Young, Emmett N.
Zschelle, Richard E.
Zuntag, Alexander E.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Annable, Weldon G., III
Austin, Donald R.
Barker, Walter R.
Bawden, Gordon W.
Bell, Warren M.
Bonham, Paul W., Jr.
Boothe, Allen P.
Bottger, George C.
Bottorff, David E.
Brabston, William N.
Bundy, Melvin D.
Butler, David E.
Currie, Wayne L.
Davis, Gene
Davis, Harry P., Jr.
Dettbarn, John L.
Doughty, Edward E.
Eaton, Clarence V.
Emsley, Thomas H.
Fauver, Edwin M., Jr.
Fogle, Fredric D.
Fraunces, George D.
Gill, David A.
Gunther, John A.
Hayes, Robert C.
Hendrick, Larry F.
Herig, William E., Jr.
Ives, Jon R.
Ivie, William M., Jr.
Jacobsen, John R.
Kau, Julian M. F.
Kelly, Clinton W., III
Kolar, Ronald E.
Lafond, John A.
Laton, Richard W.
Lewis, Quentin E. D.
Majure, Leyon M.
Martin, Roger G.
Marta, George A.
Matthews, William G.
McCorvey, Donald L., Jr.
McGee, George D.
Metz, Theodore D.
Mintun, James H., Jr.
Monarch, Delmont J., Jr.
Muir, Michael D.
Myers, Theodore S.
Naegele, Frederich D.
Osborn, James H.
Parisius, Philip J.
Patterson, Joe T., Jr.
Podbielski, Victor
Poole, Arthur S., Jr.
Preston, Robert L.
Scrabis, Joseph R.
Shackelford, Robert H., Jr.
Short, Roy E.
Sifferman, Donald J.
Smart, Robert D.
Smith, Theodore A.
Sporhase, George L. D.
Stangl, Herbert E. A.
Swistock, John R.
Tack, Curtis A.
Thornton, Paul A.
Tibbitts, Jonathan C., Jr.
Truesdell, Richard C.
Updegrove, Loyal R.
Wagner, David R.
Weiss, Ralph C.
Wells, Howard A., Jr.
Westdyke, Robert G.
Wisenbaker, Richard Y.
Wood, William L.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Anderson, Francis G., Jr.
Auton, William J.
Bagnall, Donald L.
Blake, John P.
Bleh, Harry W.
Boyle, John A., Jr.
Bristow, Bertram W.
Brugman, Arthur P.
Butler, Robert C.
Clayton, Walter H.
Cole, Charles C.
Conover, Fredric G.
Darr, Kenneth L.
Delaney, Thomas J.
Demo, James R.
Dewey, William A.
Egan, David J.
Erickson, Carl E.
Faherty, Francis X.
Fallers, Harry R., Jr.
Ferguson, Donald R.
Fitts, Marvin L.
Geiger, Robert E.
Godfrey, Walter A., Jr.
Graves, Joseph L.
Grice, Ruddie L.
Hammett, Gene L.
Harris, George S.
Harrison, Don C., Jr.
Hassey, Jasper T.
Hensle, Harold R.
Hinds, Robert B.
Hines, Kenneth F.
Hourihan, Catherine P.
Johnson, Ralph W.
Jones, Bob A., Jr.
Kenlon, Robert R.
Krollman, Richard W.
Lallberty, George W.
Lawson, Charles W.
Liming, John W., Jr.
Martin, Melton L.
McCullagh, Robert F.
Meltl, Eugene F.
Menges, Robert P.
Moran, Robert F.
Mountain, Charles R.
Mulrennan, John A., Jr.
Nelson, Jack A.
Pavlick, John E.
Pritchard, Glenn E.
Reeves, Donald E.
Reynolds, Joseph L.
Richardson, Fredric M.
Richardson, Langston E., Jr.
Roper, Charles A.
Schroeder, William H.
Scott, Jimmie D.
Spiegler, Joel B.
Spurgeon, Troy L.
Steil, James J.
Teague, Francis A., Jr.
Thompson, James C.
Tiller, Charles E.
Weidner, Wilfred L.
Wentworth, Richard L.
Wire, George W.
Wright, Donald N.
Zimmerman, Lonnie V.

NURSE CORPS

Arthur, Margaret J.
Baker, Mary E.
Dunn, Julie J.
Fillmore, Elizabeth J.
Kowaski, Gloria M. A.
Lockwood, Lavon R.
Lyter, Eleanor M.
Mann, Elizabeth M.
O'Brien, Carol E.
O'Neal, Eleanor D.
Ottoson, Joan
Peters, Edna L.
Schalz, Alice F.
Scott, Janet
Stravinsky, Joan F.
Warner, Patricia A.
Zatzariny, Tanya

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Commander, Line

*Aghassian, Lillian A.
*Casey, Eleanor M.
*Daller, Beatrice E.
*Streeter, Ruth M.

Commander, Supply Corps

*Aplin, Mary J.

Lieutenant Commander, Line

*Bradford, Alice V.
Brown, Mary L.
*Bryant, Bessie C.
*Ebeling, Mary S.
*Frawley, Mildred J.
*Hill, Betty J.
Hoy, Barbara J.
Hunn, Eleanor K.
*Koestline, Sarah E.
Mandt, Maxine A.
*McQuesten, Ruth B.
Way, Evelyn D.
*Whitfield, Ruth V.
Williamson, Mary L.

Lieutenant Commander, Supply Corps

*Tomsuden, Ruth M.

Lieutenant, Line

Allen, Barbara L.
Armstrong, Jan V.
Belanger, Walterine M.
Bole, Barbara
Bostwick, Sally L.
Duffy, Mary D.
Dupes, Yvonne M.
Hamil, Martha M.
Harris, Patricia A. N.
Kelly, Barbara J.
Kraemer, Barbara J.
Lips, Martha N.
Mooney, Kathryn M.
Moulton, Betty M.
Peterson, Doris A.
Roan, Berntelle
Roberts, Suzanne
Satow, Hiroko
Sherwood, Carol A.
Underwood, Shirley J.
Vail, Doris R.
Walters, Angalene F.
Williams, Greta A.
Yeoman, Marjorie A.

Edward P. Stone, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade).

Edward P. Stone, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps in the permanent grade of ensign.

Lt. (junior grade) Joseph H. Luallen, Jr., and Lt. (junior grade) Robert B. Young for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line subject to qualification therefor as provided by law. Both officers have been issued ad interim appointments.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant:

James C. Goodman
Stuart A. Merriken

Haywood H. Harrell, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant.

Robert A. Dropp, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the U.S. Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade).

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Roger A. Anderson
Charles C. Barcus
James C. Goodman
Cecil E. Myers, Jr.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign:

Roger A. Anderson
Charles C. Barcus
Kevin R. Keating
Cecil E. Myers, Jr.
Beverly S. Pankey
Leonard W. Schulz
Joseph M. Sullivan
James J. Wallace

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign:

Richard P. Doctor
Dennis J. Fitzgerald, Jr.
John J. Gallen, Jr.
Thomas D. Murtaugh

Robert A. Dropp, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the U.S. Navy in the permanent grade of ensign.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Binaghi, Joanne T.
Botzum, Diane
Bowden, Marilyn F.
Cate, Diana J.
Catlin, June M.
Coye, Beth F.
Delarot, Anna M.
Derrough, Lois A.
Emmett, Virginia A.
Fallon, Margaret A.
Gallagher, Kathleen O.
Hazard, Roberta L.
Hersley, Janet L.
Heustis, Rita J.
Hoag, Jean W.
Horton, Ethel L.
Huber, Katherine B.
Hurlbut, Bonny A.
Jones, Patricia
Metcalf, Maryjane H.
Mohorich, Helen M.
Ragan, Mary E.
Ragozzine, Carolyn M.
Rindlaub, Beverly M.
Rouse, Kay E.
Shea, Cynthia M.
Sherman, Linda K.
Smith, Karol A.
Staehlin, Marlene J.
Steffer, Barbara A.
Taylor, Mary E.
Watlington, Sarah J.
Ablowich, Dean A.
Adler, Alan B.
Affourtit, Daniel J., Jr.
Aldrich, William L.
Allen, Bert L.
Allen, James W.
Allen, Larry D.
Allen, Robert J.
Allison, Charles P., Jr.
Allison, Robert E.
Alrick, Richard D.
Amend, Robert J.
Ames, Albert M.
Anderson, James L.
Anderson, Charles E.
Anderson, Thomas M.
Anderson, Roger A.
Anderson, Robert E.
Anderson, Ira B.
Anderson, Dean T.
Anderson, Lewis G.
Anderson, James W.
Anthony, John A., III
Antonio, Robert J.
Aragona, Francis J.
Armes, Donald S.
Arms, Philip B., Jr.
Arrasmith, Thomas M., III

Ashbaugh, Charles I.
Ashley, Roger T.
Askren, Merlin G.
Atkinson, David E.
Aurell, Donald L.
Ausley, Paul C., Jr.
Averna, Vincent S.
Avore, Malcolm A.
Aycock, Charles B.
Ayers, John P.
Babcock, Ronald C.
Babcock, William L.
Babiash, William E.
Bacon, Daniel K.
Baesman, Richard F.
Bailey, Charles E., Jr.
Bailey, Edward W.
Bailey, Grover C., III
Bailey, Stanley J., Jr.
Baker, Arthur J., III
Baker, Joseph G.
Baker, Robert F.
Baker, Robert P.
Bales, Edward W.
Ball, Richard A.
Ballamy, William C.
Ballard, Gary D.
Ballard, James O., Jr.
Ballard, William C.
Ballinger, Roy G.
Ballou, Charles L.
Bancroft, William P.
Banister, Richard M.
Banks, Peter M.
Banks, Richard
Banner, David R.
Barber, Stephen W.
Barclay, William A.
Barcus, Charles C.
Bard, Stephen A.
Barell, John F.
Barnes, Harley H., Jr.
Barnes, James R.
Barney, Thomas McN.
Barns, David W.
Barnum, Daniel B
Barr, Charles T.
Barrett, Robert W.
Barringer, Larry E.
Barry, Kenneth R.
Bartels, Albert L.
Bartlett, William W.
Bartolett, Frank S., III
Barton, Glenn L.
Bartsch, Thomas J.
Bartusek, Marion E.
Bass, William F.
Bassett, James R.
Batchellor, John K., Jr.
Bates, Barry T.
Bates, George E., Jr.
Bates, Henry W.
Baublitz, John E.
Bauer, Roger A.
Baxley, Jarman G.
Bayley, Christopher T.
Beam, Henry H.
Beam, James C.
Beardshall, Elmer W., Jr.
Beatty, Thomas J.
Bee, Fred A.
Beebe, Bruce A.
Beguin, Stephen D.
Bell, Charles F.
Bell, Gary E.
Bell, Nolie L.
Bell, Robert W., Jr.
Benedict, George A.
Benge, Albert H.
Bengston, Robert G.
Bennett, Henry M.
Bennett, Roger L.
Binnigson, Lawrence A.
Benson, Jerome E.
Benson, Leo, III
Benson, Perry S.
Berberich, William D.
Berg, George W., Jr.
Berger, Walter E., III
Bergert, James W.
Berkowitz, Ross
Berreman, Robert C.
Berube, Raymond E., Jr.
Betterton, Don M.
Beveridge, Jerry D.
Beyers, Stephen J.
Bicknell, James N.
Bickum, Gilbert W.
Bidwell, Charles B.
Billings, Robert A.
Billings, David J.
Binder, Donald
Birchett, John A. K. III
Birtwistle, Richard, III
Bissell, Allen M.
Bittenbender, Karl C.
Black, Phillip R.
Black, Rudolph R.
Blacker, Richard W.
Blackford, Peter B.
Blair, Charles R.
Blanding, Richard L.
Blanke, Warren J., Jr.
Blankmeyer, Richard J.
Bliss, Robert B., II
Blockinger, Alvin F., Jr.
Blome, Dennis J.
Bloom, Norman C.
Bloore, John L.
Bobay, Gary J.
Bodenner, George E.
Bodie, Michael W.
Boecker, Donald V.
Boggs, Dallas B.
Bogle, Robert J.
Bolden, David R.
Bolinger, Charles W.
Bonnel, Gordon A.
Bonneville, Joseph E., Jr.
Bocher, David M.
Booth, Ronald J.
Boquist, Edwin R.
Bornemann, Alfred
Bos, Peter G.
Boswell, Freddie L., Jr.,
Bourke, Robert H.
Bowen, Dennis P.
Bowling, Weldon J.
Bowman, Peter B.
Bowman, Robert J.
Bowser, John V.
Boyer, Larry A.
Boyle, Francis J.
Braden, Morse S.
Bradley, Ronnie A.
Brady, John B.
Brandel, Roland E.
Brandon, John R.
Brandquist, Roland
Branson, Harry W., Jr.
Braun, Frank B.
Breckenridge, Donald R.
Breeding, Donald C.
Brenton, Robert J.
Brewer, Shelby T.
Bringhurst, William, Jr.
Briselden, Don J.
Broach, John C.
Broadfield, Donald E.
Broadwell, William R.
Broadwell, Ronald E.
Brockman, John L., Jr.
Brockway, Edwards L.
Broemser, Gary M.
Broerman, Neal J.
Brower, Robert L.
Brown, Charles K.
Brown, Clyde E.
Brown Elbert L., Jr.
Brown, Floyd W.
Brown, James M.
Brown, Marion L.
Brown, Ralph B.
Bruce, Estel E.
Bruce James W., Jr.
Bruntlett, Carl E.
Brust, Philip J.
Bryan, Timothy E.
Bryant, Cordis C.
Bubeck, Robert C.
Buchart, John R.
Buehler, Roy R.
Buenz, Peter R.
Bullock, James P.
Bundy, Jerry L.
Burdge, Ronald E.
Burhoe, John T.
Burke, Robert D.
Burnham, Robert C.
Burns, Daniel R.
Burns, David F.
Burns, Walter W., Jr.
Burroughs, Eugene S., III
Burton, Robert E.
Bush, Thomas O.
Butler, David E.
Butler, Harry P.
Butler, Marvin B.
Bybee, Raymon A.
Byrne, Barry J.
Byrne, Robert A.
Cadwell, George M., Jr.
Cain, Douglas M., III
Callahan, Thomas J.
Callaway, William E., Jr.
Calvert, Jack D.
Calvert, William R.
Cameron, Allan W.
Cameron, James J.
Carey, William F.
Carl, Robert B.
Carleton, Gerald B.
Carlson, Frederick P.
Carlson, Gary L.
Carlson, John A.
Carlson, Patrick J.
Carlson, William R.
Carpenter, John D., Jr.
Carr, Robert E.
Carson, Richard L.
Carter, Frederick T.
Carwin, Paul L.
Case, Calvin W.
Casey, Stephen H.
Caswell, Gordon C.
Cecil, John P.
Chabot, Peter G.
Chain, David A.
Chalifour, Clark L.
Chancy, Eugene J.
Chapman, Jay W.
Chenard, John H.
Chevalier, Paul E.
Chew, David G.
Chiles, Henry G., Jr.
Christopher, Charles E.
Ciocca, Michael A.
Claman, John S.
Clark, Daniel B.
Clark, Joseph A.
Clark, Kenneth G.
Clark, Theodore L.
Cler, Alfred J., Jr.
Cleveland, Spencer
Clexton, Edward W., Jr.
Clover, Glen E.
Cofer, Horace G.
Cogdell, Gary B.
Cogdill, Thomas J.
Colburn, Richard E.
Cole, Joseph D.
Colegrove, Robert J.
Coleman, Glenn W.
Colley, Michael C.
Collicott, Charles R.
Collier, Wilmer G., Jr.
Collins, Michael L.
Collins, Paul L., Jr.
Collins, Richard B., Jr.
Combemale, Jeanloup R.
Comeau, Charles R.
Conner, William T., Jr.
Connors, Charles W. B.
Cook, Charles I.
Coolican, Donald J.
Cooper, Jerry A.
Cooper, Paul W., Jr.
Corbeille, Reginald C.
Cordell, Glen D.
Correll, Robert A.
Correll, Robert D.
Cotterman, Andrew G.
Cottom, Robert V.
Coughlen, Thomas D.
Coughlin, Daniel T., Jr.
Counsil, William G.
Cover, Donald L.
Cowles, David E.
Cox, Charles J.
Cox, Larry G.
Cox, Lynn O.
Cox, Paul L.
Cox, Thaddeus C.
Crane, Jay V.
Craver, William D.
Crawford, John W.
Crawford, John C.
Crawford, Denis H.
Creutz, Charles
Crigler, Charles H.
Criste, David M.
Cromack, Dan
Cronfel, Ramsey L.
Crow, Hugh E.
Crowder, Thomas E.
Crowley, Daniel H., Jr.
Cumella, Walter S.
Cummings, Vincent P., Jr.
Cunningham, Glenn J.
Curtis, Grant R.
Curtis, Jon E.
Curtis, Thomas G.
Curtiss, Daniel J.
Dahlem, Francis E.
Dahlgren, Charles E.
Daily, Roger M.
Dalessio, Robert M.
Dalton, John B., Jr.
Damon, David W.
Danforth, William L.
Daschbach, Joseph F.
David, Robert T.
Davidson, William G., III
Davidson, Dennis M.
Davidson, Harry A.
Davies, Robert L.
Davis, Francis J.
Davis, George W.
Davis, John H.
Davis, Richard B.
Davis, Vibert H.
Decker, John P.
Dehaemer, Michael J.
Dehler, Richard F.
Delp, George D.
Delude, Howard D.
Dempsey, Richard E.
Dempster, Duncan F.
Denberger, Jerome N.
Denn, George E., Jr.
Derr, Thomas A.
Devine, Thomas W.
Dewerff, Duane L.
Diaz, David M., Jr.
Diemenderfer, John P.
Dietrich, Lawrence H.
Dietsch, Karl F.
Dillon, Martin C.
Dimitry, Theodore G.
Dimsdale, William
Dineen, James J.
Dirksen, John V.
Dix, Donald W.
Dobes, Joseph C.
Dobrosky, John
Dodson, Richard E.
Dodt, Robert W.
Doege, Arthur G.
Dolan, Peter B.
Dole, Burton A., Jr.
Donahue, Thomas M.
Donlan, Michael F.
Dorman, Leroy M.
Dostal, Ronald J.
Dougher, James B.
Dowell, George W., III
Draughon, Harry C., Jr.
Drummond, William K.
Drury, Bruce R.
Dudley, James I., Jr.
Duffy, Francis K.
Duffy, James F.
Duggan, Edward H., Jr.
Dunbar, Bartlett S.
Duncan, Angus F.
Dunn, James M.
Dunne, Lawrence E.
Durocher, Joseph W.
Dutton, Bruce M.
Earl, Frank S.
Earle, Ronald L., Jr.
Eayre, Dean C.
Eberlein, Bernard E.
Eddins, William R.
Edgerton, Justin R.
Eighme, Dean W.
Ellertsen, James T.
Ellett, Frank T.
Ellis, Martin A.
Embry, Hugh C.
Ericson, James A.
Ervin, James C., Jr.
Esslinger, Jon H.
Estes, Robert F.
Etchells, Edward J.
Evans, Homer D.
Evans, James R.
Evans, John E.
Evans, William R.
Everman, Leon E.
Falk, Dennis J.
Fallin, Thomas B.
Fang, George W.
Fay, Frederick O., Jr.
Febel, Joel W.
Fee, Jerome J.
Fell, David B., Jr.
Fenn, Michael R.
Fethke, Walter P., Jr.
Fetterman, Leroy W.
Fields, Floyd H., Jr.
Finkelstein, Milton M.
Finn, Harold B., III
Fischer, Charles F., II
Fisher, Robert A.
Fitzgerald, Thomas J.
Fitzgerald, Raymond N.
Fitzgerald, James F.
Flanigan, Alan H.
Flath, Eugene J.
Fleming, Charles H. Jr.
Fleming, Michael J.
Flesch, Robert W.
Fletcher, Thomas E.
Flint, James C.
Florence, Earle S.
Flynn, Edward J., Jr.
Flynn, Gerrish C.
Flynn, Henry M., Jr.
Foery, Donald G.
Foley, William H., Jr.
Folta, Kenneth D.
Folts, Roger H.
Foster, George H., Jr.
Foster, William L., Jr.
Fowler, Richard C.
Fox, Henry W.
Fox, James B., III
France, Donald J.
Frank, Robert A.
Franklin, David C.
Franklin, William N.
Freedman, Leonard A.
Freehill, Robert L.
Freeman, Michael H.
Freeman, Thomas G., Jr.
Freiberg, Harold M.
Friedlander, Robert L.
Friedmann, Alfred R.
Frost, Norman C., Jr.
Fussell, William R., Jr.
Gabbard, Thomas H.
Gage, Robert W.
Gage, Paul R.
Gagliardo, James E.
Gaines, Andrew L.
Gallagher, Michael T.
Galletti, Francis P.
Galloway, Earl W.
Gamba, Robert V.
Gans, Thomas G.
Gardner, Glenn D.
Gardner, Heisey E.
Garfield, Peter J.
Garman, Clair E.
Garver, Bruce M.
Gasser, Robert E.
Gassett, Will H.
Gast, Ronald E.
Gaut, Joseph W.
Gauthier, David P.
Gavlak, Michael W.
Gaydos, Cyril M.
Geer, David W.
Gehman, Thomas E.
Geiling, Terry L.
Geller, John B.
Geronime, Lee J.
Gershon, Jon J.
Gerth, Vernon W., Jr.
Geudtner, Richard A.
Gieseke, William D.
Gilbreath, David S.
Gillespie, William M.
Gillett, Lewis C., Jr.
Gilstrap, James R. L.
Gingles, William G.
Gingold, Joel E.
Gneckow, Gerald E.
Gniffke, Bruce A.
Godbold, Wilford D.
Godwin, Gordon T.
Gohara, Roy S.
Golden, Mark M.
Gonsalves, David
Goode, Sanchez
Goodrich, Walker R., Jr.
Gordon, Bradley W.
Gordon, Max H.
Gost, William J.
Gould, Daniel H.
Grafton, Donald L.
Grafton, Jay T.
Graham, William B.
Grant, Carroll D.
Gray, Peter H.
Green, Albert W., Jr.
Green, Conrad G.
Green, Lorin D.
Greenberg, Samuel J.
Gretter, Gary J.
Gridley, Robert H.
Griffin, Robert N.
Grisemer, Alan N.
Grossman, George S., III
Groth, John F.
Gulick, Roger K.
Gwinn, Richard H.
Hagelbarger, Ralph S.
Hagen, John M.
Hale, Frederick G.
Hall, Harry M., Jr.

Halloran, Stephen M.
Hallowell, Benjamin H., Jr.
Hamilton, William C., Jr.
Hamm, Roger G.
Hammond, Charles M., Jr.
Hamon, Richard W.
Hancock, James E.
Hand, David R.
Hankins, Jack T.
Hansen, Elgil L., Jr.
Hansen, Kirby W., Jr.
Hanson Ralph E., Jr.
Harden, Jon D.
Hardin, Bruce H.
Hardister, Rex J.
Hardt, William A.
Hargrave, Paul E.
Harkey, Erskine L., Jr.
Harlett, John C.
Harper, Richard T.
Harris, Carl E., Jr.
Harris, Henry F., Jr.
Harris, Richard A.
Harrison, William D.
Harrison, William L.
Hart, Irving H., III
Haskell, Richard D.
Hastie, William J.
Haubold, Samuel A.
Hauck, Kenneth H., Jr.
Haughton, David E.
Hauser, Gene W.
Hawkins, Robert I.
Hayes, James W.
Hays, John B.
Hays, Leonard C.
Hays, Russell O.
Hazucha, Paul C.
Heacock, Louis W.
Head, Thomas A.
Healy, Patrick R.
Heasley, Allen D.
Heath, David M.
Heckman, Ronald W.
Heger, Wayne F.
Hegg, Daniel R.
Heilpern, Roger F.
Heimann, Jack E.
Helmick, Edwin B.
Helms, David F.
Helms, Lawrence S.
Henderson, Boyd A.
Hennessey, John T.
Henning, Harold E.
Henry, James J., Jr.
Hepburn, Raymond G.
Herbein, John G.
Herkert, Richard H. H.
Herring, J. Michael
Hershdorfer, Gary A.
Hervey, John C., Jr.
Heuberger, Nathan A.
Heuser, Herman F.
Hewitt, John K.
Hickey, Dennis J., IV
Hicks, Robert W.
Hight, Bernice B., Jr.
Hilder, Lewis E.
Hill, Charles W., Jr.
Hill, James D.
Himmelein, Norman T.
Hinely, Elliott P.
Hinkel, Jay E.
Hixson, Harry F., Jr.
Hixson, John D.
Hoch, Robert G., Jr.
Hoecker, Richard G.
Hoffman, Drake A.
Hoffman, Joseph F., Jr.
Hogan, Robert T.
Hoke, John R., II
Holloway, Richard E.
Holmes, Walter M., Jr.
Holt, Albert C., II
Holtz, Robert S.
Hood, William S., Jr.
Hoppin, Thomas B.
Horn, Frank G.
Hornaday, Gregg W.
Hornsby, Michael D.
Horsch, Arthur R.
Hort, John A.
Horton, Jack O., Jr.
Horve, Leslie A.
Houghtlin, Robert G., Jr.
Houk, Donald R.
Hover, Fred B.
Howard, Albert O., Jr.
Howard, James R.
Howell, Norman B.
Hubbard, Charles W., Jr.
Hubbard, Terrence C.
Huber, Dan R.
Huber, Peter J.
Huberman, Benjamin
Hughes, Royston C.
Huhn, John H.
Hull, Charles E.
Hulvershorn, Frederick W.
Hungate, Joseph W.
Hunt, Frank M., Jr.
Hunt, George W., Jr.
Hunter, Raymond B.
Huntzinger, Kent S.
Hurlburt, Joseph S.
Husta, William
Hutchins, James R.
Hutchinson, Bruce R.
Hutt, Thomas E., Jr.
Hutton, Patrick H.
Hyde, Thomas A.
Ianucci, Robert J.
Ide, Charles H.
Ide, Henry C.
Ieuter, Fredric E.
Ilg, Raymond P.
Inderlied, William T., III
Ingram, David L.
Irons, Gary S.
Ivy, Richard G.
Jaap, Joseph D.
Jackson, Gerald W.
James, John D.
Jaye, James M., Jr.
Jeffreys, Robert E.
Jeffries, Henry C., Jr.
Jenkins, Dale A.
Jenkins, Wendal, L.
Jensen, James L., Jr.
Jensen, Robert E.
Jerding, Frederick N.
Johannesen, Robert E.
Johnsen, Donald C.
Johnson, Alfred E.
Johnson, Albert P., Jr.
Johnson, Clinton B.
Johnson, Donn R.
Johnson, Eugene H., Jr.
Johnson, Frederick B.
Johnson, Larry D.
Johnson, Michael O.
Johnson, Ronald E.
Johnson, Ronald B.
Johnston, Douglas M., Jr.
Johnston, James R.
Johnston, Lawrence H., Jr.
Jones, Carroll E.
Jones, David H.
Jones, Gordon S.
Jones, Jerry S.
Jones, Keith S.
Jones, Neil W.
Jones, Raymond G., Jr.
Jones, Ronald L.
Jones, Wallace E.
Jones, Walter R.
Joost, Rodney E.
Jordan, Alexander J., Jr.
Jordan, John L., Jr.
Judd, Deane D.
Juergens, Kenneth C.
Julian, Ronald H.
Justice, Billy D.
Kaelin, James N.
Kaeser, Harold G.
Kagy, Virgil C.
Kahler, Robert C.
Kalb, David G.
Kanady, Garland H., Jr.
Karampelas, Angelo N.
Karsten, Peter J.
Kau, Melvin E. M. K.
Kauffman, Lawrence B.
Kaufmann, Ed
Kay, Francis D.
Keck, Daniel N.
Kee, William D., Jr.
Kehm, William C.
Keister, Jamieson C.
Keithline, William W.
Kelikoa, Edward N.
Kelleher, Dermod
Keltner, Jackie L.
Kennedy, Eugene M.
Kenney, John M.
Kerlin, Roger L.
Kesler, Gene P.
Kessel, Glenn R.
Key, Paul L., II
Khoury, Charles R., Jr.
Killinger, Edwin E.
King, George H., Jr.
King, Jerry C.
King, Kenneth P.
Kinney, James R.
Kishel, Gene F.
Kistler, Michael W., Jr.
Knauer, Frederic S.
Knebel, Jack G.
Knippa, Larry D.
Knopf, Peter W.
Knorr, David J.
Knouse, Phillip K.
Knowles, Charles E.
Koberg, John A.
Koch, Charles E., II
Koener, Ronald S.
Koh, Barry
Kohlmeyer, Charles F.
Kohut, Joseph J.
Koon, Norman C.
Koontz, Ronald L.
Kopp, Elmer M., Jr.
Korte, Joseph N.
Kowall, Robert J.
Kramer, Harvey F.
Kreassig, Richard M.
Krese, Robert A.
Kristensen, Gail A.
Kromer, Ronald C.
Kroyer, George P.
Krulisch, Alan H.
Kubishen, Michael A.
Kujawa, Gail S.
Kunkle, Robert E.
Lafferty, Patrick J.
LaFrance, Marcus G.
Lake, John T.
Lamb, Jay W.
Lamb, Rufus, N., Jr.
Lammers, Lennis L.
Lamontagne, Richard R.
Land, Walter R.
Lane, John W.
Lane, Samuel D.
Lang, James R.
Lang, Joseph M., Jr.
Langdon, Stewart D.
Langen, Joseph H.
Lanham, Michael S.
Lansdowne, Alan E.
Lantz, Phillip E.
Larkin, Eugene F., Jr.
Larsen, Tom B.
Latimer, Peyton R.
Laudig, Larry B.
Laufer, William H.
Lavelle, John M.
Lavery, Richard J., III
Lawinski, Henry A.
Lawrence, Henry L. H., Jr.
Leader, John C.
Leahy, John F., III
Leathem, Douglas B.
Leduo, Ernest R.
Lee, Jerald K.
Lees, Michael J.
Legare, Thomas C. R., Jr.
Lehn, Richard M.
Leimonas, Sigitas
Leipold, Frederick J.
Lettington, Thomas F.
Levine, Emil H.
Levine, Jules I.
Levy, Edwin, Jr.
Lew, Girard T.
Lewis, Harry C.
Lewis, Porter, Jr.
Lewis, Roy T., Jr.
Lewis, William E., Jr.
Lindsey, James A.
Lineberger, William F.
Lippold, Walter J.
Little, Robert R.
Littlefield, James W.
Livingston, James M.
Lloyd, Roger M.
Lloyd, Roger W.
Lloyd, William B., Jr.
Logan, Alexander S.
Loiselle, Valmore J., Jr.
Long, Gaeton A., Jr.
Longaker, Harold L.
Longdon, Robert S.
Longmire, Thomas W.
Longton, Edward B.
Loveland, Kenneth W.
Lowe, Robert W.
Lowsley, Ivon H., Jr.
Loy, Donald L.
Ludwigsen, Charles M.
Lund, Frederick M.
Lunny, Robert M.
Luschen, Henry L.
Lusignan, John M.
Lynch, John F., Jr.
Lyons, Daniel B.
Macaulay, Andrew J.
Mace, James A.
MacKay, George W.
Macke, Richard C.
Mackey, Philip E.
Mackinnon, William B.
MacLeod, Kenneth L., III
Magnussen, Norman J.
Mahoney, Danno F.
Maines, Robert L.
Makovic, George S.
Malmberg, Norman R.
Malone, Harry P.
Malone, John P.
Manlove, James C.
Mann, Harry P.
Manning, William S.
Manser, Robert J.
Manuel, John F.
Marburger, George G., Jr.
Mares, David L.
Mariano, Gilbert T., Jr.
Markee, Neil D.
Marker, William J.
Markley, James L.
Marquis, David R.
Marr, George M.
Marsh, Fredrick G.
Marsh, James E., Jr.
Marsh, Lawrence E.
Marshall, John R.
Marshall, Ronald P.
Marti, Thomas J.
Martin, Clifford I.
Martin, Gay G., Jr.
Martin, Joseph R. R.
Martin, Robert E.
Martin, William B.
Maskell, Charles M.
Mason, Charles C.
Mason, Ronald R.
Mathews, Robert D.
Matouk, George F.
Matsushita, Tatsuo
Matthews, Robert S.
Matulka, Robert D.
Maxfield, Jack M.
Maxham, Lawrence A.
Maxson, Myrel L.
Maynard, Theodore W.
Mayo, John B., Jr.
Mazzan, Carl A., Jr.
McAfee, Robert E.
McAfee, Robert S.
McCabe, Michael J.
McCallum, Carl P.
McCartney, Roy S., Jr.
McCaskill, Charles E., Jr.
McClanahan, Ted
McClarren, Ralph G.
McCloskey, Terry J.
McClure, Thomas W.
McConnell, Robert C.
McConnell, James M.
McCormack, Harry A.
McCormick, William B.
McCormick, Walter S., Jr.
McCoourtney, Theo H., Jr.
McCoy, Jimmy H.
McCracken, William P.
McCracken, Robert F.
McCrork, John C., Jr.
McCullough, Robert P.
McCullough, Michael S.
McCullough, Larry D.
McCune, George B.
McDonald, Lee R.
McDonald, William M.
McDonnell, Lawrence J.
McDonough, Thomas F.
McDowell, Thomas N.
McDowell, Brian J.
McGargill, Mark
McGlasson, Ross
McGlathery, Monte N.
McGonegal, William F.
McHenry, Milton R.
McKean, Robert A., III
McKeown, Edward J., Jr.
McKinley, Douglas E.
McKinna, Michael D.
McKinney, Kenneth W.
McKinney, James B.
McKnight, Franklin D.
McLaurin, Leroy E., Jr.
McLean, James R., Jr.
McManus, Arthur T.
McNabb, John M.
McNaughton, William E.
McNeill, James B.
McQuiddy, David N., Jr.
McShea, Michael J.
McSurely, Hugh B.
Meagher, Maurice F., Jr.
Medaris, William W.
Mehl, Henry T.
Mehl, Wayne J.
Mehldau, Alan P.
Meinicke, Thomas A.
Meislahn, Harry P.
Mendelis, John C.
Mendenhall, Robert L.
Mengason, James
Menikheim, Douglas K.
Mercer, Benjamin F. III
Meredith, Richard B.
Merikangas, James R.
Merrick, Martin P.
Merrill, Michael H.
Mervine, Lowrie R.
Meyer, Robert A.
Meyer, William F.
Michael, Glen R.
Michel, Alan E.
Midas, Michael T., Jr.
Miles, Samuel A., II
Miller, Donald L.
Miller, George E.
Miller, Melvin D.
Miller, Richard A.
Miller, William E., Jr.
Milligan, Frank T.
Mills, Richard B.
Mims, Norman W., Jr.
Mitchell, William T.
Moerschel, David C.
Mongan, Thomas R.
Montague, Gerald F.
Montanaro, Joseph A.
Montgomery, David R.
Moore, David K.
Moore, Dennis A.
Moore, James O., III
Moore, Richard M., Jr.
Moore, Theodore C., Jr.
Moorehead, William S.
Morales, Alfonso H.
Moran, John P.
Moran, Maurice J.
Moran, Robert D.
Morey, Richard S.
Moroney, Charles C.
Morrissey, Jon E.
Morrow, Frederic I.
Moss, Ambler H., Jr.
Mott, Carleton E.
Mrazik, Albert
Mucha, Marvin F.
Mullin, William S.
Munger, Francis X.
Murray, Allan W.
Murray, John J.
Musolino, Joseph R.
Myers, Cecil E., Jr.
Myers, George C., Jr.
Naab, Geoffrey
Nagel, David J.
Neal, James J.
Neef, James V.
Neher, John D.
Nelson, Gerald A.
Nelson, Philip A.
Nelson, Roger E.
Nelson, Roger W.
Newhouse, Alan R.
Newman, Donald W.
Newman, Jack G.
Newton, Winston P.
Nitschke, Richard N.
Nixon, Murray C.
Noland, Robert F.
Norbeck, Carl S.
Norton, Paul S.
Nystrom, Robert E.
Oates, Kenneth L.
Oberlander, Clifford C.
O'Brien, George D., Jr.
O'Brien, Thomas
O'Brien, Thomas P.
O'Brien, Ward J.
O'Connell, Patrick G.
O'Connell, Robert T.
O'Farrell, James T.
Oldfather, Daniel O.

Olds, David D.
Olsen, William P.
Oney, James B.
Onken, Gene A.
Ortengren, Ralph W. Jr.
Ostrom, Kenneth R.
O'Sullivan, Paul K.
Otis, John W.
Otness, Phillip C.
Ott, Keith M.
Overly, Thomas L.
Overstreet, Macy E.
Overstrom, Ronald G.
Owens, Bruce H.
Owens, David C.
Pace, Joseph L.
Paletta, Joseph, Jr.,
Palmer, Walla R., Jr.
Pankratz, John M.
Panshin, Daniel A.
Papa, Henry W.
Parcells, Paul W.
Pariseau, Richard R.
Parker, Allen H.
Parker, Charles S.
Parkinson, David L.
Parlette, William T.
Parr, Clayton J.
Parry, Ira E., Jr.
Parsons, Edwin F., Jr.
Paskowitz, Selwyn S.
Pateas, Theodore N.
Paterson, Robert W.
Patterson, John W.
Patton, James H., Jr.
Paul, Michael F.
Paules, Granville E., III
Paulsen, Thomas D.
Pauole, Alvin H.
Peace, William H., III
Pearce, Robert G.
Peden, George B.
Peebles, Robert H.
Peek, Joseph H.
Peeples, Marshall A.
Pekala, Carl J.
Pendleton, Reid, Jr.
Penley, Dennis R.
Penman, James A.
Penn, Paul E.
Pepper, John E., Jr.
Pereira, Ronald M.
Perkins Richard A.
Perkins, Willis B., III
Perry, Lyman S. A.
Peters, Donald L.
Petersen, Peter M.
Petersen, Ted M.
Peterson, Harold A.
Peterson, Charles H.
Pethick, John A., II
Petty, Benny M.
Pezet, Walter A., III
Pfouts, John P.
Phelan, James E.
Phemister, Larry L.
Philbrick, James W., Jr.
Philhower, Peter P.
Phillipes, Peter M.
Phillippi, Frederick, Jr.
Phillips, Stephen L.
Phillips, Grady H.
Phillips, Henry L., Jr.
Phillips, Glen R.
Phipps, Rodney G.
Pieper, John W.
Pike, Robert P., Jr.
Pimm, Russell S.
Pingenot, Edward R.
Piritz, Ronald B.
Pitt, William M.
Pittman, Charles W., Jr.
Ploeger, Paul H., III
Plummer, Grant W.
Poindexter, Chris H.
Polk, Jack O., II
Pomrehn, Hugo P.
Poor, James S.
Porter, Jack R.
Porter, William M.
Potter, Roderick H.
Potterveld, Jan P.
Powell, George A.
Powell, William L., Jr.
Powers, Byron L., Jr.
Powers, Robert C.
Powers, Robert J.
Powers, Thomas J.
Prather, James T.
Pratt, Joel S.
Pratt, Michael W.
Prebola, George J.
Press, William A.
Previte, Francis I., Jr.
Price, Gary J.
Price, Harold R.
Pringle, Vernon E., Jr.
Proffitt, Norman A., Jr.
Provine, John C.
Prueske, Elmer W.
Przybylski, Raymond M.
Pugh, John S.
Pullen, Leonard A.
Quarterman, Joseph L., Jr.
Quasius, Robert F.
Queen, William E.
Ramsey, James B.
Ramsey, William F.
Rand, Kenneth R., Jr.
Ransom, Edward A.
Rathbun, Dennis K.
Raup, Thomas C.
Ravetta, Richard C.
Raymond, David A.
Raymond, Robert W.
Raymond, Robert L.
Raymond, William J.
Reece, James W.
Reed, Ross M.
Reeder, Hugh A.
Rees, Richard J.
Reese, Evan P.
Reese, Ronald M.
Reichle, Philip S.
Reid, William G.
Reinstra, Llewellyn R.
Reisenleiter, Vernon A., Jr.
Reitsch, Arthur G.
Renner, Robert R.
Rentfro, Russell, Jr.
Repp, John T.
Ressler, Paul M.
Reutelhuber, Jack C.
Reuter, Stewart E.
Reynolds, James C.
Rhinebeck, George C.
Rhoades, William W.
Rhodes, Forrest T.
Rhodes, Melton E., Jr.
Rhodes, Robert M.
Rice, William R.
Rich, William M.
Richardson, John M., Jr.
Richardson, John R.
Richey, Howard L.
Rickelman, John H.
Ridder, Wendell C.
Riddle, Peter E.
Riehm, Charles E., Jr.
Rietzke, Jon T.
Riley, Harold P.
Riley, John T.
Riley, Roy G.
Ringer, Warren C.
Rinnert, Henry J.
Roark, William M.
Roberts, Charles K.
Roberts, Ernest P.
Roberts, Rex G.
Robinson, Richard H.
Roche, James G.
Roeder, Bernard F., Jr.
Roemish, Eric M.
Rogers, George R.
Rogers, John E.
Rogers, John L.
Rogers, Raymond H.
Rogers, Roy L.
Rognlien, Robert P.
Rogus, Edward F.
Rohr, Robert C.
Romig, Phillip R., Jr.
Ronneberg, Earl F., Jr.
Roop, Charles W.
Rorem, John A.
Rosengren, Joseph R.
Ross, Jack W., III
Ross, Robert W.
Ross, William M., Jr.
Roth, Daniel M.
Rothschild, Stephen G.
Roudebush, Jackie L.
Rowley, James E.
Ruckersfeldt, George E.
Rudy, George H., III
Ruhsenberger, John F.
Rullman, Donald H.
Russell, Clifford S.
Russell, James H.
Russell, Jerry T.
Russo, John V.
Rutherford, Robert R.
Rutigliano, Louis J.
Ryan, Kevin T.
Ryan, Larry E.
Ryder, Albert
Saari, Colin H.
Sanders, Donald W.
Sanders, Loren L.
Sangster, Robert P.
Sarno, Lawrence F.
Sarnowski, Thomas J.
Saunders, Franklin H.
Savage, Kenneth D.
Scalf, Fred R., Jr.
Scarborough, John R., Jr.
Schaaf, Ronald L.
Schaefer, Joseph F., Jr.
Scheffer, Stephen J.
Schlicht, Donald L.
Schmer, Conrad J., Jr.
Schmidt, John A.
Schnabel, Walter F.
Schneeberger, Donald G.
Schneider, George T.
Schneider, Joseph D.
Schriefer, Luther F.
Schroeder, William A., III
Schroeder, Raymond C., Jr.
Schult, Richard W.
Schulz, Robert J.
Schweizer, Earle G., Jr.
Schwer, Frederick A., Jr.
Scoboria, Clarence P., III
Scott, John R.
Scott, Peter D.
Scoville, Frederick W.
Scruggs, Sidney L., III
Seabring, Robert C.
Seale, Eugene B.
Seaman, Stewart R.
Seaver, George A.
Seebirt, James E.
Seeley, Howard G.
Seitz, Howard G.
Seitz, Roger M.
Senhen, Linus A.
Senterfitt, John E.
Sessions, Thomas F. II
Sestric, Joseph L.
Seyler, Lloyd E., Jr.
Shade, Walter R., III
Shaffer, John G.
Shanahan, Robert M.
Shanley, Peter A.
Shanck, Michael E.
Sharp, Grant A.
Sharp, John B., Jr.
Shaw, Joe L.
Shaw, John F.
Shawkey, Richard S.
Shea, Brian M.
Shellenbarger, Michael E.
Shepard, Charles E.
Sheppard, Albert W., Jr.
Sherman, John M.
Shilling, Gordon L.
Shipp, Jimmie S.
Shiveley, Murle W.
Shoemaker, Hugh L.
Short, Richard H.
Shreckengaust, James A.
Shuell, Thomas J.
Shuler, Curtis R.
Shumway, Louis A.
Siebers, Karl J.
Silcox, Gordon B.
Silliman, Edwin L., Jr.
Simkins, John E., Jr.
Simon, Henry J.
Simpson, Frank T.
Siple, Terrence E.
Sipple, Howard L., Jr.
Skidgel, Gerald T.
Skillman, John W.
Slack, Charles E., III
Slezak, Norman L.
Smith, David W.
Smith, Edward H., Jr.
Smith, Hugh J., Jr.
Smith, James A. D.
Smith, John F.
Smith, Larry L.
Smith, Lawrence J.
Smith, Norman H.
Smith, Peter H.
Smith, Peter D.
Smith, Regis R.
Smith, Robert W.
Smith, Robert E.
Smith, Ronald C.
Smith, Roy C., IV
Smith, Thomas D.
Smith, Vance G.
Smithson, Alva P.
Smits, Walter I.
Snell Wendell D.
Sokolowski, Steven
Sollberger, Melvin H.
Sortor, James B.
Souval, Paul T.
Sovey, Paul L.
Space, Theodore M.
Sparks, Paul W.
Spearman, William R.
Spencer, Dan T., Jr.
Spencer, Edmund B.
Sperling, Harris
Staes, James P.
Stampfle, Richard A., Jr.
Stanley, Howard C.
Stanley, William M.
Stasko, Nicholas J.
Steele, Robert L.
Stephens, Laurence A.
Stevens, Rowland St., II
Stevenson, Robert G.
Stewart, Kelsey S.
Stewart, William J.
Stites, John, Jr.
Stoakley, Richard H.
Stone, David L.
Stratton, Russell E.
Stratton, Bobbie E.
Straus, Melville
Strawbridge, David A.
Stromberg, David P.
Strother, James F.
Stumbo, Stanley C.
Sturm, Edward J.
Sturm, Harold F., Jr.
Suddath, Jewel J., Jr.
Sullivan, Patrick H.
Sullivan, James E., Jr.
Super, Richard N.
Sur, Richard R.
Surles, Elzie R.
Surratt, Jon E.
Sutcliffe, William G.
Sutliff, Robert C., Jr.
Sutor, John K.
Swearengin, David E.
Syck, James M.
Tackney, Peter M.
Tadlock, James D.
Taff, Dennis V.
Tague, James R., Jr.
Tait, David N.
Tait, John H.
Tait, Thomas M.
Tallman, James R.
Taulbee, William H.
Taylor, Donald E.
Taylor, Frederick R.
Taylor, Nelson D.
Taylor, Paul D.
Taylor, Raynor A. K.
Taylor, Robert G.
Taylor, Thomas W.
Taylor, Turner W.
Taylor, William E.
Teal, Thomas H., III
Teemley, Ronald P.
Teigland, Stanley M.
Temple, Nicholas B.
Terry, Charles L.
Terry, Dennis H.
Terry, John R.
Terry, Thomas J., Jr.
Thames, Lewis H., Jr.
Thomas, Christopher R.
Thomas, Frank A.
Thomas, Grove N.
Thomas, Larry D.
Thomas, William E.
Thompson, Clifford K., Jr.
Thompson, Alton K.
Thorderson, John R.
Thorgerson, Eric J.
Tickle, Tommy R.
Tobin, Daniel J.
Tobin, Kiefer A.
Tolderlund, Douglas S.
Tollaksen, Duane M.
Tonkyro, Ronald H.
Tool, Stephen R.
Topham, Jonathan A.
Topp, David P.
Towle, Robert L.
Townsend, William J.
Traister, Robert E.
Tranchini, Joseph
Trandahl, Orlin E.
Treacy, Michael F.
Trebour, David A.
Treseder, Richard M.
Trimble, David C.
Troyer, Thomas L.
Truesdell, William M.
Trulli, Harry B.
Tucker, Robert E., Jr.
Tupaz, Jesus B.
Turner, Donald L.
Turner, Ellis L.
Twigg, David W.
Tyler, Donald K.
Ugoretz, Richard J.
Uhrhane, Francis J.
Underwood, Arloff V.
Vandenbroeck, Thomas A.
Vandiver, William C.
Vanness, Peter R.
Varady, Paul D.
Veazey, Richard F., Jr.
Verona, Francis M.
Verwers, Robert A.
Vied, Dennis H.
Violette, Jerome C.
Vogels, Richard H.
Vonfischer, Eduard L., III
Vonkleeck, John S., Jr.
Vonkolnitz, Henry Jr.
Vought, Kenneth E., Jr.
Wade, Joseph W., Jr.
Wagner, Edward F.
Walker, Arthur J.
Walker, Carl R.
Walker, Edward T., Jr.
Walker, Richard L.
Walker, Wilburn O.
Wallace, Richard W.
Walsh, Anthony L., Jr.
Walters, Robert M.
Wangeman, Charles E., Jr.
Ward, Sibley L., III
Wardle, Norval L.
Ware, Paul N.
Waterman, Larry W.
Watkins, Donald E.
Watrous, David
Watson, John W.
Watson, Judson D., Jr.
Watson, Louis H.
Watts, John H., III
Wax, Gary N.
Way, Thomas C.
Weaver, Milton W.
Webb, Lowell E.
Webb, Paul H.
Weber, Daniel D.
Weeks, George R., Jr.
Wegner, Arthur E.
Weinhardt, William J.
Wells, Rodney G.
Wendholt, Gregory W.
Wentzel, Richard D.
Wert, Peter K. W.
Wertheimer, Albert L.
Westbrook, John F.
Westerman, John P.
Westman, John A., Jr.
Whalen, Joseph M., II
Whalen, Thomas E.
Wheeler, Donald R.
Whelan, John F., Jr.
White, Charles E.
White, Lawrence W.
White, Stuart C.
White, Terence M.
White, Thomas L., Jr.
Whitely, John E., Jr.
Wichmann, Jay E.
Widergren, Robert D.
Wiegley, James R.
Wienandt, Melvin W.
Wigfall, George H., Jr.
Wiggins, David S.
Wilbur, Paul J.
Wilcox, Wayland E.
Wilgenbusch, Ronald C.
Willenbucher, Marshall R.
Willey, Marshall L.
Williams, John C.
Williams, Hugh T.
Williams, John R.
Williams, Peter L.
Williams, Morris B.
Williams, Douglas A.
Williams, John D.
Willsey, John M.
Wilsen, William A.
Wilson, Donald M.
Wilson, James A., Jr.
Wilson, James R.
Wilson, John O.
Wilson, Richard E.
Wilson, Richard V.
Wilson, Thomas E., Jr.
Wilson, William O.
Wiltgen, Robert M.
Wing, Thomas E.
Winter, Lloyd H., II

Wishart, Thomas T.
Witcher, Murray H., Jr.
Wolf, Thomas M.
Woodard, John S.
Woodbury, David E.
Woodward, John D.
Woolley, Dan A.
Worley, Edmond V., Jr.
Worley, William F.
Worthington, James T.
Wren, Robert P.
Wright, Hendon O.
Wynn, Hugh J.
Yeske, Lanny A.
Young, John R.
Young, Richard K.
Zeilinger, Ronald F.
Zeller, Raymond G.
Zierden, William E.
Zmorzenski, Frank P.
Zwick, Martin

SUPPLY CORPS

Anderle, "A" Donald
Anderson, Bruce R., Jr.
Antolini, Richard C.
Arendell, Russell W.
Armstrong, William G.
Aron, Daniel B.
Bachelder, Champe O.
Bailey, Edwin H.
Bain, William D.
Barber, John E.
Bathrick, Leeland M.
Baum, Kenneth A.
Beal, John S., Jr.
Beeman, Ray N., Jr.
Bennett, Donovan E.
Bentley, Richard G.
Bergman, Richard H.
Berkopec, Robert N.
Bessenger, Frank L., Jr.
Bickerstaff, David R.
Bierbaum, Dennis R.
Bingemer, Charles E.
Bloxom, Donald A.
Booth, William L.
Bosco, Joseph J.
Bosworth, Paul R.
Boyette, James B.
Brennan, Anthony C.
Bryant, James N.
Budill, Edward J., Jr.
Cameron, Edward L.
Carlson, John O.
Cartwright, William E., Jr.
Charlesworth, Stephen
Chavez, Jose
Christopherson, Duane A.
Ciccone, Thomas A., Jr.
Clark, Richard M.
Cleaver, Laird C.
Coombs, Frank A.
Coombs, Russell M.
Cooper, Robert A.
Cordle, Thomas L., Jr.
Cornett, Kenneth H.
Covington, Lawrence V.
Cox, Bobby W.
Cox, Ross L.
Craig, Glenn C.
Crawford, Robert L.
Crites, Robert C.
Cromer, David W.
Dachman, George W.
Demaio, Robert M.
Dent, George F.
Deters, William J.
Dieterle, Edward R.
Difilippo, Angelo E.
Doersch, Kirt D.
Doggett, John R., III
Dolina, John R.
Dowell, Richard E.
Draughon, Clyde O., Jr.
Dropp, Robert A.
Eason, David G.
Eckelberger, James E.
Eldridge, Robert M.
Emge, Neil K.
England, Forrest R.
Faistl, Frank R.
Fickling, Thomas N., Jr.
Fillmore, Norman B., Jr.
Finden, Paul S.
Fitzsimmons, Ted R.
Francois, Shirley J.
Fraser, Robert B.
Frasher, Burton K., III
Freeman, Donald S., Jr.
Frost, Don J.
Fry, Vance H.
Fulkerson, Melvin A.
Fulton, John H.
Ganz, James G.
Gear, James R.
Gerritz, Ellsworth K.
Gilchrist, Kenneth W.
Gillies, Tearle A.
Godbey, Donald E.
Goldsmith, Sydney
Goldtrap, Arthur C., Jr.
Gould, George A., III
Graf, Jon H.
Gramins, Thomas R.
Greenhalgh, John E.
Griffin, William L.
Griffith, Charles C.
Gunn, Robert H., Jr.
Hannan, James T., Jr.
Harris, Henry W. D.
Haugner, Alan R.
Hayes, Alan G., Jr.
Herndon, David L.
Hickey, William P.
Hinckley, William L.
Hodgdon, Paul L.
Horton, William E.
Howard, Richard N.
Huey, David A.
Kasputys, Joseph E.
Kiger, Charles R.
Kittock, Kenneth E.
Koerner, Wendell E., Jr.
Kuopus, Karl J.
Larson, Peter N.
Lary, Douglas J.
Latzer, Richard N.
Lavely, Lawrence W.
Lewis, Trevor C., Jr.
Liakos, Sotir
Lingle, Terry K.
Loustaunou, John C.
Lovett, Heyward M., Jr.
Nable, Marshall L.
Maguder, Henry J.
Mahelona, George L. P.
Marshall, Clyde M.
Matais, Joseph A.
Matthews, Phillip D.
McEachen, John G.
McVadon, Milner W.
McWhorter, Roy G.
Michael, Leslie W.
Mitchell, Willis A.
Mitchell, William J.
Mitman, Clifford, Jr.
Moore, James C., Jr.
Moroney, Charles B.
Moscoe, Donald E.
Mossman, Herbert J. A.
Muenster, William S.
Murphy, Robert A.
Nagano, Paul T.
Nicholson, Edwin F.
Nissalke, Alan J.
Nopper, Donald N.
Nordgren, Richard E.
Norman, Robert A.
Oakley, David W.
Osmon, Robert E.
Price, Robert E.
Raish, Richard C.
Reeves, Malcolm C., II
Richardson, Jon N.
Riddell, William B.
Robinson, James E.
Roesch, Frederick A.
Romney, Bruce S.
Sadtler, David R.
Santucci, John J.
Sargent, Dan W.
Sargent, John C.
Schaen, Frederic W.
Schmidt, John A.
Schroeder, James A.
Scott, Carl D.
Shedd, James F.
Shima, Larry J.
Shotton, Francis T., Jr.
Shoup, Stefan P.
Showley, Larry G.
Shughart, James N.
Simcox, John D.
Simmons, Charles J.
Smith, Andrew D.
Smith, Charles T.
Spratt, Robert E.
Spratt, Thomas J.
Sprenkle, Charles A.
Stallings, Paul E.
Stevens, Steven K.
Stevenson, Bill B.
Stewart, Robert W.
Stichter, Philip W.
Stilgebouer, Larry R.
Stone, Donald E.
Stone, Edward P.
Svagdys, Paul F.
Swan, Rodger A.
Swanson, John L.
Taylor, James H.
Uhles, James L.
VanHouten, George W.
VanPatten, David G.
Varner, Richard H.
Walker, Robert C.
Walsh, Martin J.
Weatherson, Harvey D.
Weber, Warren G.
White, Brents R.
Wild, Thomas R.
Williams, Royce S.
Withrow, Edward W., Jr.
Wolf, Ronald C.
Zagrosky, Joseph P.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Arcuni, Albert A.
Balloun, James S.
Blanchar, James H.
Bradford, Donald R.
Call, David A.
Campbell, Richard B.
Diamond, Stephen A.
Dittman, William H.
Doebler, James C.
Eber, Richard D.
Falk, Norman D.
Fasig, Edgar W., Jr.
Forney, David L.
Frankel, John A.
Frazier, William F.
Ginn, George H.
Greenwald, James M.
Groves, Stephen S., II
Hertzog, Larry R.
Jackson, Robert T., III
Jones, Robert S.
Kennedy, Robert J.
Kiefer, John C.
Kieffer, Alonzo R., III
Killen, William M.
Kurtz, David C.
Lewis, Herbert H., Jr.
Lowrey, Billy B.
McCurdy, Glen P.
Metzler, Jay C.
Mostoller, George M.
Mumford, Gerald W.
Norton, Richard E.
Parker, Robert D.
Peechatka, Farley
Pflugh, Willis C., Jr.
Porter, Michael D.
Purinton, Lucian B., II
Ramos, Joseph R.
Rathbone, John
Reynolds, Ralph R.
Ripa, Carl V.
Sahlman, Claire G.
Schaeffer, Richard A.
Shank, George E.
Sitnik, William A.
Smith, Myron E., Jr.
Ster, John W.
Tucker, Tracy C.
Vaughn, Kenneth A.
Vogel, Lawrence W.
Wells, James L.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Acord, Loren D.
Bacon Norman F., Sr.
Baumhofer, Anne H.
Bogdan, Raymond R.
Bromann, William H., Jr.
Cicero, Joseph D.
Craig, Donald R.
Despiegler, Gary D.
Dietlein, Donald R.
Erie, James R.
Foster, Harlan D.
Hagstrom, Verne W.
Lovin, Aubin H.
Metcalf, Lawrence P.
Ray, Paul T.
Reid, Donald H.
Robertson, James M.
Ruppe, James R.
Stalnaker, Mervin L.
Stewart, Shannon D.
Weems, Bailey E.

NURSE CORPS

Hvizdo, Barbara A.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer (W-2) subject to completion of service in grade as prescribed by law:

Bailey, Howard L.
Fortney, Doyle W.
Gohrband, Howard F., Jr.
Hardin, Billie R.
Kinnie, Phillip B., Jr.
Kitch, Dale
Landon, Stewart N.
McKinley, Robert N.
Pursel, John J.
Schardein, Edgar A.
Terry, Donald L.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grades indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Chief warrant officer, W-4

Bartow, Howard G.
Bateman, George E.
Bauer, Carl L.
Bernard, Charles B., III
Bowen, William D.
Breeding, Marion
Chambliss, Herbert P.
Chuckta, Samuel C.
Clark, Frederick E.
Collette, Wesley O.
Cooper, Andrew B.
Cornelison, Charles H.
Corpuz, Damaso
Coultas, Wilbur D.
Cruce, James E.
Daniels, Harold M.
Dickey, Joseph B.
Ebersole, Victor L.
Eggeling, Harvey B.
Emerson, Terrence H.
Epperson, Robert B.
Farrell, John M.
Field, Vernor
Felton, Donald A.
Ferguson, Marvin J.
Giuliani, Victor C.
Greene, Charles H.
Gronvold, Phillip S.
Hans, William E.
Hansen, Merwin G.
Hanseroth, Robert F.
Hofman, William H.
Holte, Ralph W.
Hunter, George J., Jr.
Jackson, Howard J.
Johnson, George W.
Klecky, Rudolph
Kurtz, Frank J.
Leech, Max L.
Lepard, John R.
Malone, Hal L.
Mason, Harold L.
McCarty, Garland M.
McLaughlin, Harold E.
Miller, Frank B.
Miller, Rudolph T.
Moriarty, Joseph E.
Olhausen, Milo J.
Pappano, Robert A. N.
Parker, Roy E.
Pasvogel, Lee
Pfeifer, Harold M.
Pressel, Frederick F.
Reed, Max B.
Roberts, Jack W.
Robinson, Herschel E.
Rodes, Henry A.
Rossitto, Salvator P.
Russo, Louis
Sadler, William H.
Santos, Joao C.
Schoenfelder, Elmer O.
Senkus, Stanley W., Jr.
Severance, Lewis C.
Simanowicz, Edmund
Smith, Daniel W.
Spence, William G.
Still, Harold L.
Teche, George P.
Thomas, Henry O.
Tindall, Glenice B.
Tresback, Roy E.
Truelove, Wesley J.
Ward, Robert H.
Winn, Victor F.
Wootton, Robert H.
Worthington, Foster
Yates, Henry C.

Chief warrant officer, W-3

Bodine, Allen D.
Bonnette, George R.
Brehm, Carl L.
Cagle, Otis H.
Coleman, Arthur J.
Cyr, Norman B.
Mastantuno, Joseph C.
Mendenhall, Bill
Pinto, Joseph A.
Rhodes, Donald M.
Robbins, Earl B.
Robinson, Eugene
SanFelippo, John J.
Schuler, Russell L.

Chief warrant officer, W-2

Agidius, Theodore H.
Allen, Raymond S.
Anderson, James C., Jr.
Arnett, William C.
Baca, Raymond W.
Bacha, Michael
Barratt, James F.
Bartholomew, Cornelius R.
Bates, Arthur H.
Beckley, Wendell
Beverly, Lynwood A.
Bilderback, William J.
Billodeau, John D.
Bishop, John F.
Blankman, Ernest R., Jr.
Block, Marvin G.
Bodge, George R.
Boesenhofer, Karl, Jr.
Bolling, Frederick M.
Booth, Thomas G.
Bostick, Daniel C.
Brockman, Edward B.
Brown, Albert L., Jr.
Budrevich, John P.
Bull, Charles H.
Burgett, Bernard E.
Burns, John C.
Butler, Henry C.
Butler, Kelly, Jr.
Carl, Charles L., Jr.
Carlson, Kenneth L., Jr.
Carr, Robert G.
Cassie, Lawrence
Cedarstaff, Carl A.
Chandler, Neil B.
Chastain, Edward C.
Clark, "J" "B"
Cochrane, James E.
Cote, Roland F.
Dick, Gene R.
Durland, Ray M.
Durren, Richard L.
Dyer, William J.
Early, George, Jr.
Erdner, Homer F.
Evans, Lockwood F.
Ferguson, John R.
Fickett, Lawrence E.
Friel, Joseph A., Jr.
Gall, Ernest R.
Ganey, Walter F.
Glass, William W.
Gonzalez, Ernest G.
Gray, James E.
Greenfield, William G.
Hafalund, Robert H.
Hagen, James E.
Haldeman, Leonard D.
Hendricks, Jack M.
Hillhouse, William C.
Hohe, Joseph D.
Holdridge, Oscar A.
Hogle, Walter D.
Huffman, James W.
Hughes, John C.
Hutchins, Elmer S., Jr.
Hyatt, Gerald C.
Isebrands, Arthur B.

James, Albert N.
James, Howard L.
Jensen, Dana C.
Johnson, Charles J.
Johnson, Roland L.
Jones, Willard E.
Julius, Paul A., Jr.
Kellner, Edward J.
King, Alfred E.
Kliem, Arnold W.
Kraft, James R.
Kubovsak, Joseph E.
Kulik, Charles A.
Kunold, Gerald J.
Lacy, Gene H.
Lamb, Gerald M.
Largent, Gilbert M.
Larrin, John A.
Lash, Don L.
Leduc, Donald E.
Lindholm, Garth F.
Malley, James O.
Mann, Arthur M., Jr.
Markward, George T.
Martin, Robert J.
McDonough, Francis J.
McLeod, John B.
Minard, Glenn F., Jr.
Minor, Robert G.
Mitchell, Robert F.
Munger, Robert H.
Murphy, William J.
Nadal, Jaime B.
Neely, Benjamin C.
Neil, Richard C.
Nelson, Warren H.
Newton, Killraine, Jr.
Nicholas, Robert H.
Nichols, William E.
Noble, Robert W.
Orr, Charles P.
Pace, James C., Jr.
Parrish, Solomon A.
Patton, Kuemen B.
Peak, Claude F.
Pehosh, Nicholas
Pendleton, Edmund P., Jr.
Peragine, Joseph V.
Perry, Roy L.
Peters, Randolph
Petersen, Donald L.
Porter, Stanley
Powell, Claudious A., Jr.
Powell, Morrison, Jr.
Preston, William J.
Price, Byron H.
Proctor, Marlow
Roberts, Alvin E.
Robinett, Homer E.
Robinson, Paul
Rodrigues, Leo L.
Rolland, William F.
Ross, Ralph
Saffell, Charles R.
Scarlett, Bernard
Schmidt, Christopher G., Jr.
Schneider, James M.
Schuman, Daniel D.
Shaffer, Charles T.
Shultz, Robert C.
Sluss, Charles S.
Smith, Charles S.
Smith, George D.
Stanton, Robert E.
Steadman, Joseph D.
Stowers, Bernard L.
Surber, Robert J.
Talley, Richard M.
Tarkington, Dewey A.
Taylor, Harley V.
Teagle, Fred J.
Teal, Roy A.
Tenerowicz, Walter J.
Thornley, Robert, Jr.
Turetz, Richard
Van Artsdalen, John P.
Vautier, Byron C.
Voelp, George J.
Wagner, Charles P., Jr.
Waller, James R.
Wheeler, Norman E.
Whitcomb, Winfield J.
Wilkes, Roy W.
Wilson, Joseph M.
Witte, Ernest R.
Woods, Kenneth W.
Wright, Benjamin W.
Yoder, Von C.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Battaglia, Carmen C.
Brooks, Thomas A.
Browne, Russell C., Jr.
Duffy, Michael D.
Dunlop, James M.
Effron, Herbert M.
Haines, Donald A.
Herman, William A.
Hill, Nordean T.
Jacanin, James M.
Jewell, Charles W.
Kappahahn, Gary J.
Leeper, James R.
McKinney, William E.
Parker, Robert C., Jr.
Ramsay, Robert W., Jr.
Siebeking, Paul F., Jr.
Storms, Robert B.
Wile, Alan R., Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

Rumpf, Robert L.
Starbuck, George A.
Wilmoth, James P., III.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Van Eaton, Clarence.

* Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3305:

To be colonels

Ackner, Ned E., O32452.
Adams, Burr E., O80359.
Akers, Norman E., O51673.
Albert, George E., O32279.
Alfrey, John, O19859.
Allen, Arthur W., Jr., O22034.
Arnold, Wilfred, Jr., O84539.
Arthur, John E., O32468.
Astrella, Theodore F., O42656.
Babcock, Bernard E., O44018.
Bacharach, Gustav M., O79694.
Bachman, Roger M., O22226.
Balish, Harry, O22218.
Balliett, Howard D., O22684.
Bane, John C., O21897.
Barber, Homer G., O22130.
Barker, Walter E., O22717.
Barnett, Tom W., O44164.
Barry, Robert B., Jr., O22674.
Barten, George A., O32605.
Baskin, John S., O22634.
Baum, John W., O38997.
Bayard, Robert F., O44169.
Beck, Donald C., O31329.
Beckedorff, Lawrence LeR., O21781.
Becker, Alexander, O32392.
Bedford, William H., O43926.
Bell, William W., O79737.
Billups, James S., Jr., O21932.
Bishop, James F., O22231.
Black, George W., O32192.
Boles, John K., Jr., O22025.
Booth, Cornell D., O52271.
Boswell, Charles B., O38976.
Bowen, Elba W., O32634.
Bowie, Richard T., O21921.
Bowman, James W., O38813.
Boy, Pierre D., O32297.
Boyce, Beryl L., O32400.
Boye, Frederic W., Jr., O21891.
Bradley, William T., O21768.
Brinker, Walter E., O21776.
Bristol, Matt C. C., Jr., O22027.
Brooks, Robert L., Jr., O44054.
Brown, Bevelle T., O32469.
Brown, Virgil G., O40398.
Brownfield, Albert R., Jr., O21905.
Brownfield, Page H., O40395.
Brubaker, William E., Jr., O32497.
Bruce, Thomas R., Jr., O32423.
Bruehl, Paul E., O32270.
Bruyere, Walter R., 3d, O22644.
Buckley, Thomas, O52429.
Buerkle, Bill, O52399.
Buntyn, James R., O83563.
Byrne, John D., O21837.
Calvert, George N., O43053.
Cameron, Harry F., Jr., O79698.
Camp, Robert H., O21798.
Campbell, Charles T., O32180.
Campbell, Guy L., O32616.
Campbell, Jim A., O52417.
Cannon, C. Craig, O39008.
Cannon, Linden K., Jr., O32509.
Cantrell, Charles, O22682.
Cantrell, James L., O21758.
Case, Charles C., Jr., O43824.
Cassaday, George C., O32658.
Cassidy, Robert F., O21783.
Chamblin, Francis A., O32255.
Chaney, Christopher W., O32496.
Chapla, Benjamin C., O22170.
Chapman, Warren C., O21939.
Cheek, Andrew R., O32306.
Chloupek, Laurence E., O44094.
Christy, John J., O44023.
Cleverly, Richard deF., O21862.
Clifford, Paul T., O22135.
Clowes, George C., O32367.
Collins, Charles E., Jr., O84043.
Collins, James L., Jr., O21788.
Collins, Kenneth W., O22169.
Conner, Haskett L., Jr., O21855.
Contole, William S., O79777.
Copeland, Kenneth W., O40177.
Corcoran, Charles A., O31721.
Cox, Amel L., O43971.
Coyne, Christopher C., O21879.
Crawford, Alfred H., Jr., O32229.
Crawford, Thomas M., O21983.
Cross, Leslie H., O22232.
Crossman, Raymond S., O32583.
Crouch, Robert L., Jr., O43777.
Cumming, William F., O79701.
Dameron, Ernest C., O32376.
Dantzker, Morris, O43992.
Davidson, Henry E., Jr., O32295.
Davidson, Phillip B., Jr., O21969.
Davis, Donald M., O52410.
Davis, Thomas W., 3d, O22059.
Davison, Michael S., O22051.
Dawley, Jay P., O21750.
D'Elosua, Ramon F., O43713.
Devore, Leland S., Jr., O32404.
Dewey, George C., O22191.
Dickson, Donald D., O32531.
Dietz, Carroll W., O21836.
Dill, Robert M., O32626.
Dillard, David S., O22175.
Dillender, Clyde M., Jr., O32671.
Dobson, John W., O21851.
Dodson, Minot B., O32660.
Dolvin, Welborn G., O21980.
Donaldson, William R., O22198.
Dougan, Murray D., O22221.
Downey, Stephen W., Jr., O22649.
Doyle, George K., O44000.
Drye, Clarence W., O52413.
Duckworth, George H., O32621.
Duffy, James R., O52428.
Duke, Charles M., O21753.
Dunloy, Deane A., O38825.
Dunn, Robert T., O32612.
Durbin, Paul J., O52110.
Durgin, Chesley F., O32363.
Dziuban, Stanley W., O21738.
Eason, Roderick D., O52420.
Eckland, Kenneth E., O32334.
Elfler, Charles W., O32614.
Eitt, Herbert E., O32477.
Erb, Herbert B., O40379.
Erickson, John L., O32434.
Etka, Dale L., O43898.
Ewell, Julian J., O21791.
Fairchild, Clarence G., O40396.
Fallen, Arthur J., Jr., O79705.
Farmer, Herman M., O44158.
Farrell, Norman, O21759.
Farren, James H., O32670.
Fisher, Norman E., O32435.
Florance, Charles W., Jr., O22119.
Fondren, William M., O32481.
Foster, Ralph L., O22669.
Fralish, John C., O32668.
Frasher, Ross P., O40401.
Fredericks, Charles G., O22092.
Freeman, Harlan M., O32409.
Friedman, Arthur L., O32474.
Frink, Albert W., O22192.
Gall, William O., O22664.
Gallagher, Edward J., O21775.
Gallagher, James D., O43958.
Geary, Edward M., O21887.
Gee, William C., O44027.
Genetti, Albert J., O22194.
George, William C., O21913.
Gettys, Charles M., O44181.
Gibbons, Ulrich G., O21874.
Gilbert, Vernon G., O21850.
Goodpaster, Andrew J., O21739.
Goodwin, David B., O21914.
Goodwin, Walton, 3d, O79706.
Gorn, John W., O22200.
Grace, William Van N., O40365.
Graeves, Raymond B., Jr., O32563.
Graham, Thomas A., Jr., O32231.
Grant, Walter H., O22093.
Gray, Norman, O40387.
Guenther, Edgar T., O32206.
Haberer, Walter J., O52278.
Hackett, Charles J., O21954.
Halley, Clem G., O40409.
Hale, William H., O22184.
Hamele, Louis F., O32610.
Hamlin, Joseph H., O52312.
Hanchin, Ralph J., O21895.
Hannum, Calvin S., O32428.
Hanson, Ellwood F., O52281.
Hargus, Lowell U., O30315.
Harper, Armistead R., O22738.
Harris, Robert C., O30529.
Harrold, Arthur K., O32417.
Hartman, Frank E., O21346.
Hartman, Henry M., Jr., O44177.
Hasselback, Frederick W., O22673.
Hassett, Burrell C., Jr., O38987.
Hastings, William H., O22658.
Hatchell, Henry C., O32200.
Hawkins, Wilson M., O22737.
Hayes, John J., O32309.

Heasty, Charles F., Jr., O22665.
Heiser, Joseph M., Jr., O43773.
Hennessey, James T., O32274.
Henry, William J., O21928.
Higgins, Walter M., Jr., O21987.
Hill, Hudson C., O32560.
Hill, Raymond D., O22645.
Hill, Robert J., Jr., O21933.
Hillis, William T., O40369.
Hilton, Wilbur S., O32643.
Hinternhoff, William A., O21844.
Hodges, Carroll B., O43751.
Hodges, Richard, O44065.
Hollis, Charles H., O38961.
Hollis, Joel McC., O22728.
Holmes, Sterling C., O22655.
Holmes, William W., O32247.
Hooper, Philip L., O32662.
Hoover, Lawrence M., O22193.
Hoskins, Harry D., Jr., O43846.
Hudgins, Seth F., O21947.
Hughes, William McC., O32322.
Husman, Donald L., O32431.
Hussey, William J. A., O22205.
Hutchinson, William S., Jr., O32611.
Hutson, Richard K., O32212.
Innes, William H., O43867.
Irby, Richard L., O22678.
Jacks, Fred W., Jr., O32407.
Janowski, Raymond A., O21869.
Jean, James N., O22632.
Jefferds, Jerome S., O52283.
Jeffrey, Paul R., O40358.
Johnson, Benjamin W., O52351.
Johnson, Harold O., O22635.
Johnson, James M., O52276.
Johnson, Jesse M., O51797.
Johnson, John G., O21929.
Johnson, Sterling R., O21873.
Jones, Gordon C., O32320.
Jones, James T., O32595.
Jordahn, Erik W., O44060.
Jordan, Ralph E., O21911.
Juskalian, George, O32371.
Kall, Samuel G., O22072.
Kaiser, William F., O52323.
Kaufman, Lee S., O32388.
Keisler, David S., O32657.
Keller, Fred B., Jr., O84540.
Keller, James H., O21871.
Kemp, Roger W., O83567.
Kenan, Thomas A., O22670.
Kendrick, Wallace McK., O32615.
Kent, Richard F., O22676.
Kerwin, Walter T., Jr., O21963.
Kinnard, Harry W. O., O21990.
Kinnison, Paul, O32581.
Kinsella, Harry F., O31424.
Kirby-Smith, Edmund, O21746.
Kitto, George L., O79709.
Kling, Carl V., O40366.
Knight, Darce R., O43887.
Kostanski, Henry S., O43755.
Kramer, Lyndon P., O40413.
Kreighbaum, Eugene C., O43883.
Krisman, Michael J., O21880.
Kulp, John C., Jr., O43768.
Kunzig, Louis A., Jr., O21741.
Kurtz, Josiah S., O22171.
Kyckelhahn, Russell H., O32467.
Laing, James A., O43929.
Lake, Gerald A., O43901.
La Mee, William S., 3d, O32364.
Lane, Barton G., Jr., O21876.
Larsen, Stanley R., O22094.
Lasche, Ernest P., O22073.
Lear, Frank L., O39007.
Lee, John G., O79631.
Lemmon, Johnson G., O22653.
Leonard, John W., O44056.
Lerette, Earle L., O22133.
Lerner, Gerald P., O32199.
Lerner, Jack L., O44103.
Lewis, Vernon L., O42628.
Liebmann, Ernst F., O44091.
Lilly, Roger M., O21924.
Lollis, Shelton E., O32575.
Long, Floyd K., O43778.
Long, Maurice E., O40422.
Luczak, Bernard R., O22196.
Lyle, James B., O32348.
MacDonald, Aleck F., O22685.
MacLeod, James F., O44036.
Mann, Thomas L., O22663.
Marlin, Raymond B., O21899.
Marlowe, Lon D., Jr., O32459.
Marsden, Henry H., Jr., O43643.
Marshall, John F., O32648.
Marshall, Oliver K., O22219.
Martens, Howard W., O32324.
Martin, Sidney T., O21772.
Martin, Talbert I., O43893.
Masters, Avery W., O22666.
Matteson, Victor E., O83569.
Mautz, Matthew C., O22729.
Maxwell, John B., 2d, O21942.
McCaffrey, William J., O22065.
McChristian, Joseph A., O21966.
McClellan, Harry W., O22173.
McConnell, Edward T., O21996.
McConnell, William J., O22052.
McCord, Max, O52355.
McCutchen, George, O40341.
McCutchen, Wilmot R., O21744.
McDaniel, Wallace A., O80363.
McGrath, Donald B., O32548.
McIntyre, William J., Jr., O44171.
McKnight, John T., O32439.
McMahon, Robert E., O22137.
McQuall, Robert P., O22651.
McWhinney, William W., O32450.
Medinnis, Charles L., O22023.
Merrill, Claude J., O22241.
Merritt, Harrison J., O32492.
Merritt, Hiram M., O32638.
Meyer, John H., O22179.
Micheau, Charles G., O32429.
Mildren, Frank T., O21992.
Miletich, Milton M., O32546.
Miller, Donald B., O22018.
Miller, Raymond O., O40404.
Mills, Francis B., O32544.
Mitchell, Arlo W., O43772.
Molloy, Robert W., O32526.
Montgomery, Morris B., O44162.
Moon, James W., O32540.
Moore, Louis R., Jr., O22662.
Morton, George C., O39010.
Mosheim, Emil L., O32272.
Mount, Charles McN., Jr., O21849.
Muir, James I., Jr., O21802.
Mulcahy, Patrick D., O22015.
Murray, Harry L., Jr., O22140.
Nanney, David Y., O21866.
Nestlerode, Howard E., Jr., O32282.
Newcomer, Francis K., Jr., O21898.
Nolan, Daniel A., Jr., O21988.
Norris, Jack K., O21865.
O'Brien, Francis W., O32196.
Olson, John E., O22125.
Page, Benjamin N., O32530.
Painter, Dean E., O22720.
Papa, Anthony E., O52294.
Pardue, Norman C., O40354.
Parsons, Charles J., Jr., O22183.
Patterson, William G., O32278.
Patterson, William H., O22110.
Paul, Thurston T., Jr., O32243.
Pavey, Kenneth G., O22207.
Pavick, John J., O21780.
Peacock, Earl G., O43873.
Penly, William J., O22300.
Perpich, Tony F., O32552.
Pershall, William R., O43825.
Pertl, Martin C., O40349.
Peterson, Carl A., O52344.
Petrilli, Frank J., O32433.
Pickett, George E., O21938.
Pierre, George H., Jr., O32258.
Pille, Roy F., O52311.
Pitney, Max L., O22721.
Pitts, Ogene, O44126.
Ploger, Robert R., O21760.
Pope, Lemuel E., O22646.
Powell, Maurice G., O40259.
Powers, James W., O83571.
Pray, John I., O22214.
Preiss, Hollis J., O81880.
Price, Hayden J., O39013.
Price, John W., O83572.
Price, William H., Jr., O21903.
Queenin, Hugh F., O40367.
Radtke, Kurt G., O22203.
Ragsdale, Gerald H., O22217.
Ralf, Earl W., O44037.
Redman, Charles L., Jr., O32311.
Reed, Arthur W., O21878.
Reese, Arthur W., O43818.
Reeves, Charles P., Jr., O43996.
Reeves, Charles W., O22223.
Reeves, Joseph R., O21820.
Register, William F., O43757.
Renaud, William E., O44131.
Requarth, Jack A., O22189.
Rhatigan, Edwin T., O52412.
Richards, Ira B., Jr., O22639.
Richardson, Richard L., O44002.
Richardson, Robert E., O80365.
Rippert, Jacob K., O22115.
Risley, Richard G., O32516.
Robbins, Edward S., O32636.
Robertson, Charles E., Jr., O51756.
Rodgers, Thomas A., O44010.
Rogers, James Le R., O22076.
Rollins, Albert F., O21823.
Roosa, James A., O22138.
Rosa, Robert J., O33078.
Roseborough, Morgan G., O22681.
Rousek, Charles, O44030.
Rundquist, Eric A., O43843.
Russell, Clyde R., O32478.
St. Clair, Howard B., O22017.
Samson, Charles P., O22204.
Sasse, Emil D., O32421.
Sawicki, Stanley J., O40215.
Saxe, Robert K., O43790.
Scannon, Anthony J., O32393.
Schellman, Robert H., O22002.
Schmidt, Herman A., O52322.
Schooley, Carl T., O22225.
Schrader, John R., Jr., O21818.
Schroeder, Edgar W., O22166.
Schwenk, James T. L., O22106.
Scott, John B., O32213.
Scroggs, John P., O21863.
Seaburn, Eugene T., O32314.
Seekins, Earl I., O32362.
Shacter, Jacob, O22724.
Shepard, Claude L., Jr., O21931.
Shepherd, James McM., O21868.
Shepherd, Joe R., O40380.
Sherrod, Lilbourne W., O40403.
Shigley, James N., O22222.
Shoemaker, Samuel E., O22661.
Showalter, Wilbur E., O21794.
Shultz, Vester M., O21974.
Simmerman, James S., O40376.
Simon, Lincoln A., O21961.
Skees, Hugh S., O79998.
Skillman, Charles S., O38969.
Slaughter, Donald F., O22202.
Sleeker, Elbert M., O22716.
Smith, Charles B., O22113.
Smith, Edward P., O22063.
Smith, Harry T., O22001.
Smith, Matthew C., O22038.
Smith, Richard S., O32305.
Smith, William C., O32572.
Snow, John R., O22659.
Spragins, Robert B., O22080.
Springer, Louis F., O79717.
Stark, Kenneth B., O32633.
Steckla, Paul R., O32366.
Steinkrauss, Albert M., O51843.
Stone, Laurence A., O40414.
Stover, William J., O31381.
Strickland, Arthur T., O44085.
Strong, Cecil H., O22725.
Studer, Robert W., O21786.
Sturm, Frederick A., O40185.
Sullivan, Robert E., O43745.
Surdyk, Eugene E., O80367.
Swatta, Frank A., O22237.
Tam, Donald R., O43933.
Taranto, Salvador F., O40372.
Taylor, James C., O30616.
Taylor, John F., O44143.
Taylor, Livingston N., Jr., O21853.
Teeters, Bernard G., O22081.
Thomason, Joel F., O21867.
Thompson, Harry M., O44098.
Thomte, Hubert D., O22633.
Trahan, Eugene A., O21967.
Trauger, Walter M., O44095.
Turner, David C., O43965.

Tutin, Bill J., O32381.
Tuttle, Paul V., O21896.
Ulans, Roman I., O52302.
Van Harlingen, William M., Jr., O22016.
Van Sickle, Clifford J., O32505.
Vann, Walter, MacR., O21822.
Von Rohr, Arthur D., O43774.
Walker, John W., O22011.
Walker, Leonard F., O31344.
Wallach, Marshall, O21977.
Walsh, Alyosius J., O51792.
Walsworth, William A., O32565.
Walton, Robert L., O22734.
Ward, Albert, N., Jr., O32491.
Wardrop, Raymond J., O44698.
Warner, George P., O32462.
Wasson, Frank J., Jr., O39011.
Waterman, Glen S., O22239.
Watson, Patrick B., O22727.
Watt, John, O21901.
Way, David W., O32341.
Webster, Montgomery, L., O21751.
Weigand, Jack L., O32315.
Welde, Glenn A., O40402.
Wendt, Walter W., O32190.
Werngren, Martin S., O39006.
West, William W., 3d, O21922.
Whiting, Roger, O32577.
Whitton, Joseph F., O51825.
Wickboldt, Walter C., O22047.
Wilcox, Leslie R., O32251.
Wilder, Samuel D., O44104.
Wilkins, James C., O44009.
Williams, Robert C., O40352.
Williams, Robert C., Jr., O22091.
Williams, Robert M., O22206.
Williams, Robert M., O21801.
Wilson, Harold G., O32370.
Wilson, Jasper J., O21829.
Wilson, Lawrence M., O38978.
Wilson, Woodrow W., O21755.
Winegar, Walter L., O21764.
Winton, George P., Jr., O21819.
Wisdom, Wiley B., O21985.
Witherspoon, William O., Jr., O40378.
Wolfe, Richard D., O21743.
Wolff, Paul B., O32645.
Wood, John E., Jr., O22210.
Woodward, Walden F., O22190.
Wyles, Eben R., O79719.
Yarnall, Kenneth L., O21864.
Zecca, Mario J., O32396.

To be colonels, Chaplain

Adams, Rowland C., O76783.
Chmielewski, Joseph S., O84139.
Donovan, Harold F., O26442.
Graves, Ned R., O43164.
Helm, Donald W., O79680.
Murphy, James B., O84235.
Pawlowicz, Theodore C., O92112.
Sugg, Walton G., Jr., O24358.

To be colonels, Medical Corps

Blair, Joseph R., O52007.
Campbell, Donald, O31122.
Cooch, Joseph W., O63707.
Cressler, John C., O25157.
Edwards, Walton M., O24377.
Giesecke, Carl G., O63469.
Goldstein, Joseph D., O62894.
Harris, John F., O58751.
Jennings, Hal B., Jr., O26995.
King, Everett G., O61170.
Miller, Sidney, O60015.
Moore, Bernard J., O58685.
Moring, John B., O25424.
Mulholland, Richard F., O31124.
Neiman, Watson E., O31072.
Noel, Philip J., Jr., O25164.
Plum, John B., O61929.
Ratcliffe, Harold E., O56840.
Scoles, Peter S., O63705.
Steele, Lowell R., O25167.
Tackett, Orville H., O58683.
Timmerman, Frederick W., O63210.
Weeks, Bertram A., O26368.
Ziperman, H. Haskell, O63149.
Zuelzer, Wilhelm A., O60730.

To be colonels, Dental Corps

Augsburger, Russell H., O24376.
Bascom, Perry W., O25171.
Bunnell, James B., Jr., O31074.
Burnett, George W., O39499.
Frank, Ogden M., O31101.
Irby, William B., O31035.
Lafitte, Herbert B., O48150.
Lister, Franklin S., O22747.
Madden, Raymond H., O30950.
McNelly, Justin E., O31026.
Montgomery, Lee E., O30958.
Olsen, Edmunds S., Jr., O31071.

To be colonels, Veterinary Corps

Allison, Aaron F., O31016.
Manges, Joseph D., O31055.
Sunderville, Edwin J., O23335.

To be colonels, Medical Service Corps

Adams, Harry J., O43191.
Anderson, Edward J., Jr., O31256.
Austin, Paul F., O43213.
Beeson, Walter L., O31143.
Brooks, Roy E., O31238.
Carilla, Thomas A., O40115.
Czaja, Rudolph P., O31267.
Davis, Chester H., O31182.
Hoover, Chris D., O37408.
LeMoon, Ralph G., O31264.
Miller, James B., O84031.
Roerig, Richard N., O43180.
Taro, Alfred L., O56882.
Thompson, Joseph C., O31250.
Wright, Elwood M., O31192.

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3304:

To be colonel, Army Nurse Corps

Ross, Edna E., N194.

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

To be lieutenant colonel, Army Nurse Corps

Morse, Mary F., N1417.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298:

To be first lieutenants

Okamura, Thomas N., O89568.
Van Amburg, Gordon D., O90569.

The following-named persons for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be colonel

Bacher, Robert M., O51045.

To be major, Army Nurse Corps

Berry, Alice E., N1882.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army, by transfer in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be colonel

Bush, Chester K. (MSC), O79643.

To be majors

Buto, Junichi (MSC), O80287.
Quigley, Calvin C. (MSC), O80318.
Rogers, O. B. (MSC), O80322.
Wagner, Donald L. (MSC), O84835.

To be captain

Forest, Philip E. (MSC), O75357.

To be first lieutenant

Lampe, Christian F., Jr. (MSC), O88415.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be majors

Godwin, Ralph R., O965353.
Padgett, Oscar M., Jr., O22062[illegible]2.

To be captains

Black, Vernon R., O1879936.
Booz, Donald V., II, O1937828.
Buckley, Paul R., O4009529.
Culpepper, Grady A., O1873133.
Pilbert, Frederic J., O4046670.
George, Ellsworth P., Jr., O2262542.
Herlihy, Francis P., O4010652.
Johnson, David L., O4026552.
Lawson, James C., O1937379.
Lenzi, Anthony F., O4025313.
Majikas, Donald J., O2014638.
McMahon, Richard J., O1874291.
Mahler, Paul P., O4074304.
Messer, Louis A., O4010982.
O'Malley, Robert M., O976055.
Pace, Daun A., O4059147.
Peterson, Franklin G., O4048286.
Pino, Amedeo R., O1927329.
Quinn, Joseph, O4074317.
Scales, David E., O4009302.
Snow, Don F., O4010994.
Stryker, Harm, O4063790.
Von Dach, Robert F., O1874516.
Walker, Alvin E., O4024999.

To be first lieutenants

Beckett, Jack A., O5205546.
Benson, Roy, Jr., O5307435.
Blue, Charles L., O5404024.
Boes, Richard W., O5302759.
Bower, Robert M., O5002891.
Carter, Bobby J., O5206613.
Garcia, Raymond J., O5207784.
McGrede, Aubrey J., O5402977.
Moller, Carl M., Jr., O4085225.
Payne, James C., O5405157.
Rogers, Robert C., O5704917.
Sellentin, Jerry L., O5509650.
Shachnow, Sidney, O5307530.
Sheldon, Thomas K., O5210217.
Sloan, Jimmy B., O5308536.
Smayda, William A., O5000266.
Spence, James, O5203822.
Stuart, James E. B., Jr., O5205125.
Sturdivant, Thurman O., III, O5302543.
Tunnell, William R., O5304390.
Warvi, Martin M., O5503917.
Watson, Charles W., O5303926.

To be second lieutenants

Burton, Lance J., O5212359.
Canarina, Arnold R., O5006405.
Davis, David L., O5315075.
Dzinich, Kurt S., O5513195.
Flatley, Thomas M., O5512322.
Hartley, Benjamin W., O5008841.
Johnston, Robert C., O5215205.
Jolley, Bobby L., O5312430.
King, Thomas R., O5511730.
Kope, Kermit G., Jr.
Kraemer, Robert P., O5217047.
Mahr, Walter C., O4065893.
McCarthy, William J., O5311573.
McGee, William J., O5007278.
Meyer, Richard A., O5315127.
Nartsissov, George, O5311380.
Orlov, William S., O5400191.
Ouellette, Robert J., O5007232.
Rizer, Gene C., O5511223.
Talmadge, Roger S., O5875256.
Thompson, Louis M., Jr., O5513938.
Valvo, Paul V., O5007758.
Walker, Larry T., O5311632.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294, and 3311:

To be major, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Rakas, Albert S., O1332864.

To be captain, Army Nurse Corps

Kingsley, Marthanne, N902331.

To be captains, Chaplain

Hoogland, John J., O5500527.
Ostrovsky, Jack, O2274685.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Cutner, Lawrence P., O3010407.
Goodman, Noel C., O4037566.

Harrison, Hollister S., NGO2298675.
Nelson, Darl D., O4041645.

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

Leven, Fred, Jr., O997953.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Dahlinger, Richard K., O2307792.
DePaul, Anthony K., O5208144.
Johnson, Bruce R. S., O5512447.
Murray, Robert E., O2306969.
Myers, Walter K., O2307791.
Nicewicz, Walter A., O5004656.
Stovall, James T., III, O2303738.
Tolman, Gareth W., O5403223.

To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps

Riddell, John R., O2305572.
Stumbo, Barney A., O5412307.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Bean, Samuel F., O2309220.
Binion, Gerald R., O5402212.
Brown, James H., O5304557.
Cook, Thomas L., O2309453.
DeLos Santos, Manuel T., O2305383.
Dierdorff, Edwin P., O5501821.
Dotin, Larry N., O2309186.
Gardner, Richard L., O5408291.
Harkins, Paul D., O5209776.
Hickman, Lynn E., O2309165.
Houston, Samuel D., O5400406.
Kilgus, Andrew H., O2309212.
Lewis, Charles W., O2305355.
Reinbold, Ronald G., O2309168.
Slahorek, George J., O5505882.
Vavrin, Charles R., O2309259.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Baker, Harlan H., Jr., O5404744.
Graydon, Donald M., O2299414.
Quillin, Robert M., O2297924.
Tatam, William M., O2289797.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Klainer, Joyce I., L2304975.

To be second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Daniel, Donna L., N5411508.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Capps, Joseph H., O5310197.
Harman, Richard B., O5511787.
Lemmers, Dean P., O5511643.
Spiker, James E., Jr., O2302488.

To be second lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Scribner, Elizabeth E., L5302047.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Bauer, Frank L.
Fobbs, Benjamin F.
Gessner, Donald R.
McCleary, Patrick J.
Ortolano, Alexander J.
Provost, John M.
Simpson, Arthur E.
Simpson, Gordon T.
Wold, Cordell O.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Alden, William M.
Allen, Richard F.
Andrews, William R., Jr.
Archie, Robert
Armstrong, Lester F.
Asplen, George H.
Augsburger, Grayson T.
Ayers, Robert S.
Baker, Carter G.
Barnett, William B.
Barron, Nicholas
Barron, William M.
Barrow, Joseph M.
Bashore, John F.
Bassett, Sterling P.
Batts, William M., III
Beechley, Bruce C.
Benavides, Gustavo O., Jr.
Bezner, Robert Z.
Blackstone, Jon C.
Bloch, Samuel A., Jr.
Boberg, Walter W.
Bode, Donald D., Jr.
Boling, Robert H., Jr.
Bolon, George
Bowles, Dallas L.
Bowman, Thomas E.
Bragg, Thomas B.
Braun, Sidney J.
Brennan, Thomas P.
Brokovich, Michael J.
Broussard, Allen
Brown, Gerald A.
Bryant, Thomas
Burke, Peter P.
Cannon, Hoyt E., Jr.
Carey, Roland
Castleberry, Pierce C., Jr.
Cawyer, Telefus B., II
Chambers, James E.
Christian, Stephen T., Jr.
Cibik, Dennis M.
Ciz-Madia, Joseph
Cochran, Larry W.
Collins, Jon D.
Comee, William C., Jr.
Cooke, David P.
Cooper, David E. K.
Couch, Jacob B., Jr.
Dalton, Thomas W., Jr.
Bardis, John J.
Darling, Roger L.
Dasher, Marcus, Jr.
Davidson, Edward L.
Dexter, Richard A.
Dishaw, John D.
Donchez, Alan L.
Donnell, Victor L.
Duerr, Hans
Dunn, Robert A.
Duplessis, Troy L., Jr.
Dwyer, Raymond M.
Eason, Michael G.
Erickson, Richard
Fabian, David R.
Fallis, Stanley R.
Finkleman, David
Fitzpatrick, Henry H.
Fogle, Philip R.
Foster, James H., Jr.
Frederick, Jonathan E.
Froehle, Harold A.
Garlock, Larry W.
Garrison, Stuart E.
Gary, Harley J.
Gasdek, Walter F.
Gavin, Laurence W.
Gentry, Mark O.
Gideon, Wilburn C.
Gilbert, Edwin J.
Gill, Vernon S.
Giovanola, John T.
Godfrey, Albert B.
Goodwin, Bobby A.
Gordon, Henry
Gosnell, Robert A.
Gray, Nicholas H.
Gray, Sam A.
Guest, Robert K.
Haisten, Robert W.
Hall, John Q.
Hammett, Jimmy S.
Harris, Alma F.
Hart, John L.
Hastings, John H.
Hatten, Larry P.
Herman, John D.
Hicks, Larry W.
Holland, William E.
Holtry, Anthony K.
Hoover, Glenn D., Jr.
Howard, Ralph E.
Hudgens, George T.
Hughes, Miles A., Jr.
Hulbert, Garlan A.
Ibanez, Armando
Inks, Thomas E.
Iwasaki, Robert H.
Jay, James R.
Jencks, Harlan W.
Jensen, Craig L.
John, Roger M.
Johnson, Leslie E.
Johnson, Roger A.
Johnston, Frederick W., III
Johnston, Robert E.
Jungbauer, David E.
Kaplan, Harvey T.
Kawaguchi, Stanley K.
Keller, Theodore W.
Keller, Tillman J., III
Kettlewell, Richard J.
Kirila, Michael R.
Kirkland, Joseph M.
Kleberg, John R.
Klein, Frank W., Jr.
Knake, Walter P.
Knight, Joseph A.
Koepp, David R.
Kress, James P.
Lange, Charles W., Jr.
Lasusky, Joseph J.
Lecky, William R., III
Lee, Paul A.
Lehmann, Lynn W.
Leideritz, James D.
Leishner, Stanley L.
Leonard, George R.
Leonard, Orth S.
Lerch, Paul S.
Leshanski, George P.
Lewis, Clarence I., Jr.
Lewis, Joe A.
Lingenfelter, Duane F.
Lister, Paul R.
Little, Douglas W.
Loesch, Herbert W., Jr.
Long, Samuel G., Jr.
Mahaffy, Paul D.
Maino, Michael M.
Major, James S.
Mann, Jay I.
Mann, Robert E.
Manning, James G., Jr.
Marlow, Willard E.
McCauley, William A.
McMillin, Stephen B.
McLennan, Norman J.
Meredith, Richard L.
Mills, Charles L.
Mix, Henry L.
Morey, Donald E.
Murphy, Edward H.
Nelson, Harold M.
Neuschwanger, David M.
Nibert, Lewis R.
Nicol, Alan B.
Noxon, Elwood R.
Odom, Robert A.
Paseman, Lloyd W.
Pedroza, Gregorio C.
Perrin, Richard T.
Personale, Robert E.
Pignato, John C.
Powers, Frank, Jr.
Prieto, Harry P., Jr.
Pruitt, Ronald O.
Redman, Michael C.
Reese, Arvel C.
Robinson, Crawford M.
Rothstein, Terry A.
Rye, Stephen T.
Saffron, Joseph P.
Salley, Hammond M.
Schofield, Dale W.
Seay, Thomas P.
Shangreaux, John D.
Shanholtz, James E.
Sharp, Frank W., Jr.
Shearer, Robert L.
Shirey, Wilbur C.
Shoffner, Amos G.
Shumaker, David I.
Singer, George D.
Smith, Paul M.
Smith, Warren A., Jr.
Smith, Wilbur L.
Spangler, Andrew M.
Spight, Thomas, Jr.
Stamey, Victor E.
Steadman, Kenneth A.
Strommer, Mathias A.
Szymanowicz, Philip B.
Taylor, Edwin L.
Taylor, William P.
Terrill, Joel B.
Terry, Elbridge W.
Tipka, Alan W.
Valentine, Kit J.
Vaughn, Ronald K.
Walsh, Cecil L.
Walz, Arthur H., Jr.
Weishaupt, Robert M.
Wells, Robert D., Jr.
White, Condell S.
Williams, Budge E.
Williams, Charles L.
Williams, John H.
Wilson, Daniel B.
Wilson, William C.
Wright, Alexander S., III
Yonts, Robert B., Jr.
Young, Ronald E.
Zumbro, Hugh M.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, March 28, 1963:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Bernard M. Decker, of Illinois, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Illinois.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mr. Virgil Gunlock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD R. FINNEGAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was very distressed to return home this past weekend and learn of the death of one of Chicago's most distinguished civic leaders, Mr. Virgil Gunlock, chairman of the Chicago Transit Authority. He was a man whose work for his city covered numerous public improvement projects and many other worthwhile efforts that truly made Chicago a better city in which to live.

Among his many services to the city of Chicago and its citizens were direction of the operations of Chicago's mass transportation system, prominent roles in such major programs as the digging of the two downtown Chicago subways, the construction of the system of expressways, and the development of the O'Hare International Airport. He was a most active member of the Chicago Planning Commission; and he also found time to participate in his neighborhood community groups, such as the Lincoln Park Community Conservation Association.

Virgil Gunlock was born May 18, 1905, on a farm near New Canton, Pike County, Ill. In 1927 he was graduated from the University of Illinois with high scholastic honors and a Bachelor of Science degree in civil engineering. While at the university, he was a member of the Big Ten championship wrestling team in 1926 and 1927. His first job after graduation was with the Chicago Sanitary District, where he worked for more than 10 years as an engineer. In 1938, when the city of Chicago started construction of the State Street subway, Gunlock was appointed resident engineer on the first subway contract. He advanced quickly to the position of chief subway engineer, and in 1945 was appointed commissioner of subways and superhighways and then become commissioner of public works in 1952.

Mr. Gunlock was named to the Chicago Transit Authority board in June 1954, by the late Mayor Martin H. Kennelly to replace the late Ralph Budd, who had retired as transit authority chairman. Mayor Daley named Mr. Gunlock to a full 7-year term on the Chicago Transit Authority board in 1959.

It was in the latter capacity that Mr. Gunlock made frequent trips to Washington to testify before House and Senate committees as an expert on mass transportation and its relationship to our big city problems. It was my pleasure last year to invite him to appear before the House Banking and Currency Committee, of which I was a member, when we were considering the Mass Transportation Act. Mr. Gunlock impressed the committee with his grasp of the problems confronting all big cities in grappling with the chaos and confusion in transporting our rapidly growing population in and out of large metropolitan areas every day. He was a man to get his ideas across and also to carry them out. I learned much from him in our discussions of the problems Chicago faced in this era of tremendous growth.

Every citizen of Chicago whether he knew Mr. Gunlock personally or not will feel the absence of him because he gave so much of his superior time and effort to help make Chicago a better city.

Acceptance Remarks by Representative Ben Reifel, of South Dakota, Vice President of Arrow, Inc., Acknowledging the Abbott Laboratories Gift of Paintings Depicting the Practice of Medicine by American Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Abbott Laboratories presented to Arrow, Inc., on March 6, 1963, a collection of 36 original paintings which effectively portray in the form of an art the pressing human problem of health and its maintenance among the American Indians. The Honorable BEN REIFEL, of South Dakota, my own distinguished Representative, delivered the acceptance address on behalf of Arrow, Inc., which is an organization working on behalf of the American Indian—health, education, housing, welfare, development, and crafts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article entitled "Acceptance Remarks by Congressman BEN REIFEL, of South Dakota, vice president of Arrow, Inc."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACCEPTANCE REMARKS BY CONGRESSMAN BEN REIFEL, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, VICE PRESIDENT OF ARROW, INC.

It is with both extreme pleasure and profound gratitude that I accept, on behalf of Arrow, this striking collection of paintings. It is refreshing to note that a pharmaceutical company such as Abbott is not only in the business of developing medicine for saving lives but, through its program of fine art, also enriches our lives.

I think it must be obvious to everyone here, on seeing the thrilling works of the four very talented artists commissioned by the Abbott Laboratories, that the results represent not only a significant contribution to the art world, but also to the enhancement of a better understanding of the American Indian in general and his health and medical problems in particular.

In fact, it was the development of a more realistic understanding which the people of Abbott were striving for when, 14 years ago, they sent their writer-artist teams across 20,000 miles of Indian reservation lands to portray Indian life as it then existed. Looking at these paintings today, there's little doubt that they have helped to achieve a better understanding, for the progress in Indian health care, a progress which could only have come about with increased understanding, has been striking.

Let me give you a few illustrations. In 1950, when these paintings were first reproduced in the Abbott Laboratories' magazine, What's New, the accompanying text revealed some shocking medical statistics. The death rate among Indians due to tuberculosis was then 10 times higher than it was for the non-Indian population. Today, that figure has been reduced to less than four times, and TB, no longer the scourge it was 14 years ago, now ranks ninth among causes of Indian death.

The same article also told of a tragically unbelievable infant mortality rate. Out of every 1,000 Indian babies born, 89 died. Today, that death rate has been reduced by more than half. And this, despite the fact that the Indian population is increasing more rapidly than the general population.

With disease rife and medical care at a minimum, how long could the American Indian so vividly portrayed in these paintings expect to live? This is a quotation from a Papago report cited in the article of 14 years ago: "Of approximately 260 infants born each year, one-fourth die within 12 months; at the age of 6 there are only 160 left; at the age of 18, only 125. The life expectancy of a Papago infant is 17 years."

Today, that Papago can expect to live 42 years.

Unquestionably, there has been tremendous progress in the medical and health care of the Indian, and today he can aspire to a life more nearly comparable to that of his fellow Americans. These paintings have contributed to that progress. So have many of you here this afternoon, and I would not wish to let this opportunity go by without acknowledging and commending the efforts of such Government agencies as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Department of Agriculture, the Interior Department, and the Division of Indian Health of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The cooperation of many private organizations working in the field of Indian welfare has provided a step up the ladder toward acceptable health standards. Much advancement is due to a sympathetic and farsighted Congress which saw and understood the need, and appropriated the funds necessary to make achievement possible. Perhaps most deserving of commendation are the Indians themselves who have struggled to bring about understanding, cooperation, and advancement among their own people.

We can look at these paintings today and feel justifiably proud of our progress. But we cannot look at them and feel complacent. Much still remains to be done.

It is true that the Indian infant mortality rate has been cut in half, but it is still twice that of the non-Indian population.

It is true that TB is no longer the leading cause of death among Indians, but the overall Indian death rate remains frighteningly higher than the death rate for the general population.

It is true that the Indian can expect to live longer, but his life expectancy still falls 20 years short of yours.

As you look at the colorful and articulate brush work in these paintings, you will read a story at once heartening and discouraging. It is a story of the great improvements that have been achieved, and the progress that is yet to be made. It is a story that must be told, and we hope to use these paintings in such a way that it will be.

They will remain displayed here tomorrow and we ask that you invite your friends to view them. Later, during the 1964 New York World's Fair, the works will be housed in the American Indian pavilion where they will bring their message to millions of Americans. What their specific future use beyond the fair will be, we do not yet know, but we would welcome suggestions from any of you here today which would assure that the story they have to tell remains prominent. For we of Arrow, along with all of you, I'm sure, look forward to the time when the true value of these paintings will be measured not by their portrayal of the work that remains to be done, but only by their creative beauty and their symbolization of a history of suffering that has passed.

We are indeed highly honored to be made permanent custodians of this valuable and unique collection. Thank you.

The Rise of Secularism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I I have been impressed by many columns written by Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones who is a syndicated columnist for the Washington Evening Star. The March 25, 1963, issue of the Star contains one of Mr. Jones' most outstanding columns entitled "Minority Rights Ad Absurdum: If Court Bars Baltimore School Prayer, How Far Can An 'Intolerant' Few Go?" I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that a newsletter I recently prepared on this subject be printed with this column in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY RIGHTS AD ABSURDUM—IF COURT BARS BALTIMORE SCHOOL PRAYER, HOW FAR CAN AN INTOLERANT FEW GO?

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

The U.S. Supreme Court now has under advisement another school prayer case, and if it hasn't learned anything since its decision on the New York regents prayer last fall it is likely to come up with another dizzy ruling.

The new suit came out of Baltimore, where a mother who is an avowed atheist sued the Baltimore School Board because a passage from the Old Testament and the Lord's Prayer were part of the daily opening exercises at her son's school.

When she complained in the lower court the school board promptly offered to let her son be excused from hearing the offensive words. But now the mother claims that this sets her son apart and subjects him to ridicule and abuse. She has demanded that no Bible readings or prayers be made in the hearing of any Maryland child while in public school.

Now some day the majority are going to get tired of being pushed around by the minority. Because we have moved into an era where the minority is demanding satisfaction for itself even where it interferes with the satisfaction of the majority. This can get absurd.

The overwhelming majority of Marylanders are not atheists and they think it is a good idea if their children listen to a few preachments. The Communists think so, too. They smother Russian and Chinese children with preachments, most of them from their pickled god, Lenin. Well, the Bible contains preachments. So do the Koran, the Zend Avesta and the sacred books of Budda—all filled with good advice to youth. But all but a handful of Americans subscribe to religious bodies that venerate the Old Testament.

Yet the angry lady in Baltimore holds that even though it is OK with the majority of Marylanders that her son duck out when the Bible is opened, his "rights" are being outraged. They will only be satisfied if all Marylanders agree to conform to her taboos. Otherwise, Maryland shall be damned as "intolerant."

Is it possible for the minority to be intolerant, too?

Both Houses of Congress open with prayer. Isn't this an affront to atheist citizens? Let's fire the chaplains.

On most of the coins and bills we carry there is the legend, "In God We Trust." Aren't we being cruel to sincere atheists in forcing them to purchase their groceries with this pious money?

The school assembly salutes the flag. The students stand with their hands over their hearts intoning the words—"this Nation under God * * *." Surely the cops should be called and the principal arrested.

School lunches offer meat. Meat is an abomination to honest vegetarians. Shall we, therefore, feed our children pea soup and yogurt?

Last December, three public schools in Sharon, Mass., removed all Christmas trees and Christmas decorations from their classrooms on the theory that they were an affront to Jewish students. Bye-bye Santa Claus, because St. Nicholas was a Christian saint. However, the Russians have shown us how we can still get our presents. We welcome Grandfather Frost. Merry Present-Giving Day.

And bye-bye to all the school Easter Bunnies. Easter is a Christian festival in which the resurrection of living things from the death of winter is symbolized by observance of the story of Christ's resurrection, which you may or may not believe. This has got to go. But on the other hand, the millinery business, the garment industry and the candymakers need something like Easter. So let's train our children to look forward to New-Hat-New-Dress-Chocolate-Egg Day.

We've got to clean up Thanksgiving, too. These silhouettes of obviously Protestant Pilgrim Fathers that we have the kindergarten kids cutting out are an insult to all other sects and religions. And the whole business is a slam at our atheists. For Thanksgiving means giving thanks to God. What shall we substitute? The United Nations?

American Negroes have properly battled for the right to live where they choose and go to school where they live. In some places the reluctant majority have had to be spanked. These rights have long been guaranteed there.

Yet, at the urging of the NAACP, Negroes are boycotting a school in northern New Jersey because 90 percent of the students are colored. Why? Because white families exercised what Negroes have been demanding, namely the right to move where they pleased. And they moved out of the neighborhood. So the Negroes are demanding that white children be driven back into that school.

It is one thing to insist that the majority accord a minority the rights the majority enjoys. This is justice. But it is another thing to chase the majority around the block with a stick, demanding that it behave in a way decreed by the minority.

We're getting close to that point. The tragedy is that a growing public consciousness of minority rights is likely to be soured by the arrogance of some minority leaders. This could set us back—way back.

The majority will stand just so much kicking.

STROM THURMOND REPORTS TO THE PEOPLE—THE RISE OF SECULARISM

On February 17, 1962, Dr. Billy Graham warned our Nation that "there is a movement gathering momentum in America to to take the traditional concept of God out of our national life."

Since that time we have witnessed a steady advance of progress being made in this country by the forces of secularism, those who would take God out of our national life. The most notable victory for the secularists came on June 25, 1962, when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled out a noncompulsory New York school prayer which merely acknowledged dependence upon Almighty God and requested His blessings on the children, their teachers, and their country. The prayer was found to be an attempt to establish a religion in conflict with the first amendment to the Constitution, which provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Millions of Americans protested the decision, and for a while it appeared that the Congress would be forced to overrule the decision, even if it meant amending the Constitution. The forces of secularism were quick, however, to counter the mass of public opposition through the propaganda devices of the so-called liberal news media and also with the blessings of many national leaders who hailed the decision as a victory for religious freedom. It was a victory of sorts for freedom, but a victory for freedom from religion rather than freedom of religion.

Since that decision, the secularists have scored new gains in their fight to eradicate public recognition of a Supreme Being. The singing of Christmas carols has been ended in some schools. During the past Christmas season, a group of secularists in New England were able to pressure some school principals into abolishing the Christmas tree from their schoolrooms. On January 5, 1963, two Protestant leaders, in an article in the Washington Post, called for acceptance of the establishment in America of a new religion, which they called secularism. Mr. Martin Marty called secularism "the fastest growing group in America."

Now pending before the U.S. Supreme Court are two cases which could give the secularists their greatest victory to date. Both are concerned with the right of a local school to permit its students to engage, without any compulsion, in the recitation of the Lord's Prayer and Bible reading in morning exercises. One case is from Maryland and the other is from Pennsylvania. Many other States permit their schools to have such exercises, including South Carolina, where most schools have a similar program.

The principal argument being made by the secularists is that their liberty is being compromised. Many of the same people who have done the most to destroy liberty in this country through support of centralization of power and softness toward the enemy are the most vocal in defense of absolute liberty in some areas. For instance, we are told that academic freedom is fostered when we permit communism to be taught in some of our institutions and also when Communists are invited to lecture on the campuses of America. Now we are being told that we must remove acknowledgement of God from our national life in order to appease secularists or atheists, who are not required to participate in these public school acknowledgments. These arguments overlook the important truth that, as our Constitution and other important national documents state, we derive our blessings of liberty from God, whether we call Him by the term of "Jehovah," "God," or "Divine Providence." When we scratch the Giver and Provider of our liberties from our national life, we likewise imperil those remaining vestiges of liberty and turn our Nation to secularism or even national atheism, as is required in Communist societies today.

I am repulsed by the false notion that we should destroy the pillars on which our liberties rest in order to advance some cause in the name of liberty. Such actions constitute a fraud and sham not only on God, but also on liberty itself and the people of America.

Address by Congressman Ross Bass at the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute, Inc., Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am delighted to insert in the RECORD an address by our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS]. This address was delivered at the 18th Annual Convention of the National Limestone Institute, at the Statler Hilton Hotel here in Washington, D.C.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN ROSS BASS AT THE 18TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL LIMESTONE INSTITUTE, INC., STATLER HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Thank you very much. I'm happy to be with you at the National Limestone Institute.

I was introduced as a former member of the Committee on Agriculture. I left the committee recently, but, as I leave I take with me an abiding and a keen interest in the affairs of agriculture because I represent a rural district in Tennessee, made up of 16 counties. We have a direct interest in almost every phase of agriculture in the United States that exists without either the use of extreme irrigation or tropical weather. Our agriculture is diversified, and for that reason, over a period of years, I have made an intense study of its programing and planning. Thus leaving the Committee on Agriculture is not due to my lack of interest. To the contrary, I felt that I could broaden the service that I have done in the Congress, and at the same time, still work with agriculture.

I was billed today as a speaker on conservation matters. I am not going to stick to that script entirely. Instead, I'm going to talk in the general field of agriculture, somewhat in the vein of a farewell address, or parting advice to my friends who make up the official family in the world of agriculture. I do not consider myself being a member of that official family any longer.

The 88th Congress has started its usual course of arguing over various facets of our organization and rules. Following the usual pattern, Congress got off to a slow start. This year the primary fight in the House of Representatives was on the Rules Committee. In the Senate, they are fighting about their rules, not the Rules Committee. The surprising thing that I have learned since I have been in Congress, is that there are so many experts in the lay field on the organization, and makeup of the Congress. The late, great and beloved Sam Rayburn, for whom I had the highest regard of any man in public life, told me in the last year of his life, "Ross, no man ever gets to know the rules of the House of Representatives. Therefore, regardless of who is Speaker of the House, he must have a good parliamentarian." Being familiar with the organization and the internal affairs of the Congress does not come without long experience and study. My surprise came about this year when I received advice from my constituents instructing me how I should vote on the size of the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives. And I don't believe that 1 out of 10,000 of them even knows what the Rules Committee in the House does. Having voted to enlarge the Rules Committee, will not have any effect on your everyday living. I think it was something that was important in the internal affairs, the domestic makeup of the House of Representatives, and I am glad we succeeded.

This year, we had two vacancies on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. For the first time in more than 25 years this became another internal fight in the House. I was a candidate for the Committee on Ways and Means. I had long wanted to serve on that committee. A gentleman from the State of Georgia, a gentleman from Virginia, and I were candidates for the Ways and Means Committee. Instead of it being worked out as it has been over a period of years where there was only one candidate for one vacancy or two candidates for two vacancies, we had a little fight among ourselves. It developed that I was fortunate enough to be elected; and, for that reason, I have left the Committee on Agriculture.

Being a new member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I shall say to you that I have not been there long enough to become an expert on taxes. Therefore, I shall not attempt to make a speech about taxes. The President is sending a message to Congress Thursday, the 24th, which will deal with his tax program for this Congress. He has recommended in his state of the Union message that we have a tax decrease. I am glad that I have become a member of the Committee on Ways and Means in the year when we can expect a tax cut instead of a tax raise. So, I will say that, in all probability, there will be some revisions, some adjustment downward in the taxing situation in the United States this year. Just how it will affect your interests, your industry, I cannot say. The President has recommended a decrease in the corporate taxes so that, as he stated, "The Federal Government would not be the major partner of corporations." Some of you men are in the larger corporations and some in the smaller ones, but you can expect a tax cut, I think, in both areas.

I cannot speak to you as an authority on agriculture; I cannot speak with authority on taxes. Having been on the Committee on Agriculture for the past 8 years I have never seen an expert on agriculture. In the 8 years I have been in the Congress, I do not believe there is a single man in the world who has the answer to the multiple problems that confront American agriculture. I have served under two Secretaries of Agriculture. I think they are both outstanding men. They are high-type, well-informed Americans, but I do not believe that the Great Man who walked on the shores of Galilee Himself could be the Secretary of Agriculture and please even a majority of the people involved in agriculture.

Therefore, as I leave the Committee on Agriculture, I would like to use this forum to make a few pertinent remarks relating to the agriculture situation in the United States at this time. Operating as you do on the fringe of agriculture, and being interested in the conservation programs of agriculture, I know you are interested in the overall picture and the influence agriculture has in the United States.

Conservation is a word that might well be used today in trying to cure some of the ills of agriculture. In my opinion, this is a great oasis that has gone dry. Only a few years ago agriculture constituted the greatest part of American industry, of the American economy. At the same time, it constituted a great part of the political influence in the United States. But, three things have happened in recent history which have caused agriculture to decline, both in its influence and its interest, as far as Americans are concerned.

I think the basic reason for the plight of agriculture today and particularly agriculture legislation can be found on Capitol Hill, in the House of Representatives. While making this statement, I want you to know that I am making the statement about myself because I was a part of this very situation. In my opinion, the influence of the Committee on Agriculture has declined immeasurably in the past 8 years. We say this in no uncertain terms recently. Let me illustrate. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I also become a member of the Democratic Committee on Committees. We completed the committee assignments on the Democratic side of the House this week.

When I was elected to Congress in 1954, it was my immediate concern and desire to become a member of the Committee on Agriculture. The chairman of the Committee on Committees at that time was the late Mr. Jere Cooper from Tennessee, who was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. The fact that my State happened to chair the committee was, I think, the reason I was able to secure a seat on the Agriculture Committee. We had, I think, five vacancies in the 84th Congress, January 1955, and we had about 30 applicants for the Committee on Agriculture. Many of them gave this as their first choice in committee assignments in that Congress. Last week when we met to give our committee assignments on the Democratic side of the House, there were six vacancies on the Committee on Agriculture—one Member of the Congress made this his primary choice and this was only because he could not get his colleague from the same State to go on the committee. He didn't really want to become a member, but he felt it was important to have a member from his State on agriculture. This means that the Committee on Agriculture 8 years ago had 5 vacancies and about 30 applicants and this time it wound up with 6 vacancies and 1 application.

This is a sad commentary on American agriculture. What has brought it about? First of all, the Committee on Agriculture, of which I was a part, is the most partisan group in the Congress. It is the most strongly divided committee on party lines that I have had the opportunity to observe during my service in the Congress. If Secretary Benson proposed something, then I would say that more than 90 percent of the members on the Democratic side were immediately against it, and the same situation in reverse exists with Secretary Freeman. If he proposes something, immediately the Republican side of the committee opposes it. So what happens? Last year in Congress, we ran a bill through the House of Representatives twice; watered it down both times; finally had to take everybody's views in the form of a compromise; and then we called it a great victory. This is how difficult it has become to legislate in the field of agriculture. Now, gentlemen, there are some reasons for this. The two reasons listed below are partially responsible for the one I just gave you.

The second reason for the decline in the field of agriculture is farm organizations. I am not going to term your organization a farm organization. I am talking about the major farm organizations that deal specifically with farmers, have farmers, or pretend to have farmers only, for their membership, and try to deal specifically in farm interests and farm legislation. I'm not talking about any one of them; I'm talking about all of them. I have never in all of my "put togethers," as we would say down in Tennessee, seen organizations that are as biased, so narrow, so prejudiced, and so selfish in my life. They are interested only in the following questions: Is this program mine? Did I get it through the Congress? Did I recommend it to the Secretary? Will it get me more members? Can I go back and tell our membership that we got this program through, good or bad, regardless of what it does or does not do? I think the greatest thing that could happen to agriculture today is to have a summit meeting of farm organizations, but I believe it would be easier for Charles de Gaulle, John F. Kennedy, and Mr. Khrushchev to sit down and agree on foreign policy than it would be for the heads of these organizations to get together on farm legislation.

I'm saying some things that sound depressing. They sound tragic. But from my observations, they are the truth. My advice to the official family of agriculture is to try to have some sort of an organization of organizations that would sincerely make an attempt to work out a program that all members could endorse before they recommend it to the Congress. They might lose some members next year; they might not have so much to go back and tell about "our program" or what "our President" said to the Committee on Agriculture, they might not even need a great statesman who could make speeches on things other than agriculture. You read more edicts today from the presidents of farm organizations on things like taxes, foreign aid, education, roadbuilding, and everything else than you do agriculture. This is partially responsible for the first reason I gave you.

Of course, the third reason is the decline in the political influence of the farmer on American life. There was a time, when I was a very young man, when 50 percent of the American population derived their income directly from the soil. Today only 9 percent of the American population actually work and make a living from agriculture, and part of them are composed of hobby farmers. Therefore, it only follows that the decline in the political influence is sensed in the Halls of Congress.

I just read where one of my good friends, who is a Senator and a Democrat, made a speech the other day on the farm situation. He said that all farm subsidies, all farm programs, should be wiped out. Last year we had an amendment on the floor of the House of Representatives, which would have cancelled the conservation programs, all payments; and, if I'm not mistaken, it received more than 100 votes. I am not sure how long it is going to be before that amendment would receive the necessary votes to pass and become law. So, as I have stated, I am a party to all of this. I am not telling you this to castigate anyone or try to condemn any particular part of American agriculture. I am telling you what situation exists in the Congress and in the country today. I'm telling you this only through the hope that you gentlemen who have influence on the fringes of agriculture can try to do something about the dilemma.

In parting, let me commend you and your organization on the work you have done. Certainly conservation, agriculture conservation, in which you play a great part, is of vital interest to us in the United States. We are damned with the greatest blessing in the world, surplus amounts of food and fiber. Where 9 percent of our population work in agriculture, we produce enough food and fiber to feed not only our country, but many, many other countries and much of the population of the rest of the world. To the contrary, in many countries, up to 85 percent of the population work on the farm today and they can't produce enough to feed and clothe their own people. We are blessed with ability to produce and your interests have been a part of this. So, I say to you, keep up the good work. Keep agriculture well supplied with the ingredients of conservation to keep damning us with this great blessing, because I hope I never see the day when we do not have enough food and fiber.

I thank you very much for the privilege of being with you.

Statement of Representative Claude Pepper, Democrat, of Florida, on H.R. 4663 and 4664 Before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, March 26, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CLAUDE PEPPER, DEMOCRAT, OF FLORIDA, ON H.R. 4663 AND 4664 BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, MARCH 26, 1963

Mr. Chairman, you know that I am deeply grateful to you and your subcommittee for giving me this opportunity to testify on H.R. 4663 and 4664, which I introduced in the House of Representatives on March 7, 1963.

Mr. Chairman, these two bills are identical to those introduced by Representative HARRIS, the honorable chairman of your full committee. All of our bills have the full endorsement of the present administration.

H.R. 4663 would authorize grants-in-aid to public and nonprofit institutions for the construction of centers for research in mental retardation and related aspects of human development, to assist in means of finding causes thereof and the means of prevention or means of ameliorating its effects. The bill would authorize $8 million for each of the fiscal years 1964–66 and $4 million for 1967 and for 1968 for this purpose. The Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service would administer the program and approve or disapprove applications for grants which could not exceed 75 percent of the necessary cost of construction.

H.R. 4663 would also authorize grants to public and nonprofit institutions for the construction of facilities for the care and treatment of the mentally retarded, including facilities connected with college and university hospitals or other appropriate parts of colleges or universities under State plans approved by the Surgeon General upon the basis of population, the extent of the need for the facilities and the financial needs of the respective States. Under the bill, $5 million would be appropriated for this purpose for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965 and $10 million for each of the next 4 years.

Title I of H.R. 4664 would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make allotments to States on the basis of approved plans for the construction of public and other nonprofit community mental health centers on the basis of appropriations determined by Congress beginning with the year ending June 30, 1965. The primary factors which the Secretary would take into account are population, the extent of the need for such centers in each State, and the financial needs of the respective States. Title II of the bill would authorize the Secretary to make grants to public or nonprofit institutions to which a grant was made under title I to meet the cost of the initial staffing of community mental health centers on the basis of appropriations determined by Congress. Any such grant may not exceed 75 percent of the staffing cost during the first 15 months, 60 percent for the next year, 45 and 30 percent, respectively, for the next 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, Congress recognized this problem during World War II. During the war I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, which made a study of the problems and needs with respect to mental illness and mental ill-health in the United States. That subcommittee held a number of hearings on the health needs of our veterans and our civilian population. In January 1945 the subcommittee issued its Interim Report No. 3 in which the staggering extent of mental illness was first disclosed. For example, the report pointed out that of 4,212,000 young men 18 to 37 years of age who were rejected for military duty by the selective service as of June 1, 1944, 1,282,800 or over 25 percent of the total rejected were for mental diseases and deficiencies. The report stated:

"It has long been known that approximately two-thirds of the illness encountered in general medical practice is essentially neuropsychiatric in origin and that half of the patients in hospitals at any one time are there because of serious mental disorders. Indeed, one may safely predict that in any group of 15-year-olds 1 out of 22 will some day be committed to a mental institution."

Our subcommittee recommended the establishment of community psychiatric clinics, hospitals in planned medical centers and for the training and education of professional personnel. It said:

"From a longer range point of view, the establishment of child-guidance clinics in all communities is urgently needed to prevent early social maladjustments."

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that in 1946 the chairman of your full committee then, the late Hon. Percy Priest, Representative from Tennessee, sponsored H.R. 4512, and I sponsored in the Senate S. 1160. These two bills were merged into Public Law 487 of the 79th Congress which authorized the establishment of the National Institute of Mental Health at Bethesda, a broad national program of research into the causes and prevention of mental ill-health, training of personnel in the treatment of psychiatric disorders with some experimental research in community mental health centers.

This act gave the impetus to Congress for a rapid growth in the appropriations for a national mental health program. This growth is reflected in the following figures of Federal funds provided in 1946, 1950, and 1963: 1946, $66,000; 1950, $10,019,000; and 1963, $143,599,000.

In 1949 Florida had only one State mental health hospital at Chattahoochee. It was 540 miles from Miami. It had at that time only 3,000 beds and 6,000 patients. Many patients from south Florida had to spend their time in Tampa jails during their travel to the hospital at Chattahoochee.

In the Miami area, there was only one nonpublic institution. It had no psychiatrist and no neurologist.

At the present time there are in addition to the State mental hospital at Chattahoochee, the South Florida Mental Hospital in West Hollywood just outside of Dade County, the Northeast State Hospital and the George Pierce Wood Memorial Hospital.

Dade County now has facilities at the Jackson Memorial Hospital, the above mentioned South Florida State Mental Hospital, a new day-care center at the Veterans' Facility at Coral Cables, a mental health department within the Dade County Health Department, and the Dade County Child Guidance Clinic.

But the record clearly shows that these facilities in Florida are wholly inadequate to meet the pressing needs in the field of mental health. The Florida Association for Mental Health pointed out in December, 1962:

"At Chattahoochee many patients are housed in substandard, unsafe, old buildings. It would be preferable to eliminate the need for these buildings than to replace them." The association recommended that facilities be provided for mentally retarded patients and special facilities for older nonpsychotic offenders.

The South Florida Mental Hospital at West Hollywood in December, 1962 had about 430 geriatric patients, one-third of the total. Of the 430, about one half are not really mentally ill, although they do suffer from mental lapses which are concomitant with old age. In addition 70 percent of those on the hospital's waiting list are in this category.

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that in the mental health appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, made by Congress, $4,200,000 was included to assist the States in developing broad State mental health care programs. The State of Florida has taken advantage of this appropriation by making use of a Federal grant thereunder for the development of a comprehensive program of mental health care in Florida.

Moreover, the American Psychiatric Association with the assistance of the State and local mental health groups made a survey and held hearings in Miami on July

I was introduced as a former member of the Committee on Agriculture. I left the committee recently, but, as I leave I take with me an abiding and a keen interest in the affairs of agriculture because I represent a rural district in Tennessee, made up of 16 counties. We have a direct interest in almost every phase of agriculture in the United States that exists without either the use of extreme irrigation or tropical weather. Our agriculture is diversified, and for that reason, over a period of years, I have made an intense study of its programing and planning. Thus leaving the Committee on Agriculture is not due to my lack of interest. To the contrary, I felt that I could broaden the service that I have done in the Congress, and at the same time, still work with agriculture.

I was billed today as a speaker on conservation matters. I am not going to stick to that script entirely. Instead, I'm going to talk in the general field of agriculture, somewhat in the vein of a farewell address, or parting advice to my friends who make up the official family in the world of agriculture. I do not consider myself being a member of that official family any longer.

The 88th Congress has started its usual course of arguing over various facets of our organization and rules. Following the usual pattern, Congress got off to a slow start. This year the primary fight in the House of Representatives was on the Rules Committee. In the Senate, they are fighting about their rules, not the Rules Committee. The surprising thing that I have learned since I have been in Congress, is that there are so many experts in the lay field on the organization, and makeup of the Congress. The late, great and beloved Sam Rayburn, for whom I had the highest regard of any man in public life, told me in the last year of his life, "Ross, no man ever gets to know the rules of the House of Representatives. Therefore, regardless of who is Speaker of the House, he must have a good parliamentarian." Being familiar with the organization and the internal affairs of the Congress does not come without long experience and study. My surprise came about this year when I received advice from my constituents instructing me how I should vote on the size of the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives. And I don't believe that 1 out of 10,000 of them even knows what the Rules Committee in the House does. Having voted to enlarge the Rules Committee, will not have any effect on your everyday living. I think it was something that was important in the internal affairs, the domestic makeup of the House of Representatives, and I am glad we succeeded.

This year, we had two vacancies on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. For the first time in more than 25 years this became another internal fight in the House. I was a candidate for the Committee on Ways and Means. I had long wanted to serve on that committee. A gentleman from the State of Georgia, a gentleman from Virginia, and I were candidates for the Ways and Means Committee. Instead of it being worked out as it has been over a period of years where there was only one candidate for one vacancy or two candidates for two vacancies, we had a little fight among ourselves. It developed that I was fortunate enough to be elected; and, for that reason, I have left the Committee on Agriculture.

Being a new member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I shall say to you that I have not been there long enough to become an expert on taxes. Therefore, I shall not attempt to make a speech about taxes. The President is sending a message to Congress Thursday, the 24th, which will deal with his tax program for this Congress. He has recommended in his state of the Union message that we have a tax decrease. I am glad that I have become a member of the Committee on Ways and Means in the year when we can expect a tax cut instead of a tax raise. So, I will say that, in all probability, there will be some revisions, some adjustment downward in the taxing situation in the United States this year. Just how it will affect your interests, your industry, I cannot say. The President has recommended a decrease in the corporate taxes so that, as he stated, "The Federal Government would not be the major partner of corporations." Some of you men are in the larger corporations and some in the smaller ones, but you can expect a tax cut, I think, in both areas.

I cannot speak to you as an authority on agriculture; I cannot speak with authority on taxes. Having been on the Committee on Agriculture for the past 8 years I have never seen an expert on agriculture. In the 8 years I have been in the Congress, I do not believe there is a single man in the world who has the answer to the multiple problems that confront American agriculture. I have served under two Secretaries of Agriculture. I think they are both outstanding men. They are high-type, well-informed Americans, but I do not believe that the Great Man who walked on the shores of Galilee Himself could be the Secretary of Agriculture and please even a majority of the people involved in agriculture.

Therefore, as I leave the Committee on Agriculture, I would like to use this forum to make a few pertinent remarks relating to the agriculture situation in the United States at this time. Operating as you do on the fringe of agriculture, and being interested in the conservation programs of agriculture, I know you are interested in the overall picture and the influence agriculture has in the United States.

Conservation is a word that might well be used today in trying to cure some of the ills of agriculture. In my opinion, this is a great oasis that has gone dry. Only a few years ago agriculture constituted the greatest part of American industry, of the American economy. At the same time, it constituted a great part of the political influence in the United States. But, three things have happened in recent history which have caused agriculture to decline, both in its influence and its interest, as far as Americans are concerned.

I think the basic reason for the plight of agriculture today and particularly agriculture legislation can be found on Capitol Hill, in the House of Representatives. While making this statement, I want you to know that I am making the statement about myself because I was a part of this very situation. In my opinion, the influence of the Committee on Agriculture has declined immeasurably in the past 8 years. We say this in no uncertain terms recently. Let me illustrate. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I also become a member of the Democratic Committee on Committees. We completed the committee assignments on the Democratic side of the House this week.

When I was elected to Congress in 1954, it was my immediate concern and desire to become a member of the Committee on Agriculture. The chairman of the Committee on Committees at that time was the late Mr. Jere Cooper from Tennessee, who was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. The fact that my State happened to chair the committee was, I think, the reason I was able to secure a seat on the Agriculture Committee. We had, I think, five vacancies in the 84th Congress, January 1955, and we had about 30 applicants for the Committee on Agriculture. Many of them gave this as their first choice in committee assignments in that Congress. Last week when we met to give our committee assignments on the Democratic side of the House, there were six vacancies on the Committee on Agriculture—one Member of the Congress made this his primary choice and this was only because he could not get his colleague from the same State to go on the committee. He didn't really want to become a member, but he felt it was important to have a member from his State on agriculture. This means that the Committee on Agriculture 8 years ago had 5 vacancies and about 30 applicants and this time it wound up with 6 vacancies and 1 application.

This is a sad commentary on American agriculture. What has brought it about? First of all, the Committee on Agriculture, of which I was a part, is the most partisan group in the Congress. It is the most strongly divided committee on party lines that I have had the opportunity to observe during my service in the Congress. If Secretary Benson proposed something, then I would say that more than 90 percent of the members on the Democratic side were immediately against it, and the same situation in reverse exists with Secretary Freeman. If he proposes something, immediately the Republican side of the committee opposes it. So what happens? Last year in Congress, we ran a bill through the House of Representatives twice; watered it down both times; finally had to take everybody's views in the form of a compromise; and then we called it a great victory. This is how difficult it has become to legislate in the field of agriculture. Now, gentlemen, there are some reasons for this. The two reasons listed below are partially responsible for the one I just gave you.

The second reason for the decline in the field of agriculture is farm organizations. I am not going to term your organization a farm organization. I am talking about the major farm organizations that deal specifically with farmers, have farmers, or pretend to have farmers only, for their membership, and try to deal specifically in farm interests and farm legislation. I'm not talking about any one of them; I'm talking about all of them. I have never in all of my "put togethers," as we would say down in Tennessee, seen organizations that are as biased, so narrow, so prejudiced, and so selfish in my life. They are interested only in the following questions: Is this program mine? Did I get it through the Congress? Did I recommend it to the Secretary? Will it get me more members? Can I go back and tell our membership that we got this program through, good or bad, regardless of what it does or does not do? I think the greatest thing that could happen to agriculture today is to have a summit meeting of farm organizations, but I believe it would be easier for Charles de Gaulle, John F. Kennedy, and Mr. Khrushchev to sit down and agree on foreign policy than it would be for the heads of these organizations to get together on farm legislation.

I'm saying some things that sound depressing. They sound tragic. But from my observations, they are the truth. My advice to the official family of agriculture is to try to have some sort of an organization of organizations that would sincerely make an attempt to work out a program that all members could endorse before they recommend it to the Congress. They might lose some members next year; they might not have so much to go back and tell about "our program" or what "our President" said to the Committee on Agriculture, they might not even need a great statesman who could make speeches on things other than agriculture. You read more edicts today from the presidents of farm organizations on things like taxes, foreign aid, education, roadbuilding, and everything else than you do agriculture. This is partially responsible for the first reason I gave you.

Of course, the third reason is the decline in the political influence of the farmer on

American life. There was a time, when I was a very young man, when 50 percent of the American population derived their income directly from the soil. Today only 9 percent of the American population actually work and make a living from agriculture, and part of them are composed of hobby farmers. Therefore, it only follows that the decline in the political influence is sensed in the Halls of Congress.

I just read where one of my good friends, who is a Senator and a Democrat, made a speech the other day on the farm situation. He said that all farm subsidies, all farm programs, should be wiped out. Last year we had an amendment on the floor of the House of Representatives, which would have cancelled the conservation programs, all payments; and, if I'm not mistaken, it received more than 100 votes. I am not sure how long it is going to be before that amendment would receive the necessary votes to pass and become law. So, as I have stated, I am a party to all of this. I am not telling you this to castigate anyone or try to condemn any particular part of American agriculture. I am telling you what situation exists in the Congress and in the country today. I'm telling you this only through the hope that you gentlemen who have influence on the fringes of agriculture can try to do something about the dilemma.

In parting, let me commend you and your organization on the work you have done. Certainly conservation, agriculture conservation, in which you play a great part, is of vital interest to us in the United States. We are damned with the greatest blessing in the world, surplus amounts of food and fiber. Where 9 percent of our population work in agriculture, we produce enough food and fiber to feed not only our country, but many, many other countries and much of the population of the rest of the world. To the contrary, in many countries, up to 85 percent of the population work on the farm today and they can't produce enough to feed and clothe their own people. We are blessed with ability to produce and your interests have been a part of this. So, I say to you, keep up the good work. Keep agriculture well supplied with the ingredients of conservation to keep damning us with this great blessing, because I hope I never see the day when we do not have enough food and fiber.

I thank you very much for the privilege of being with you.

Statement of Representative Claude Pepper, Democrat, of Florida, on H.R. 4663 and 4664 Before the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, March 26, 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CLAUDE PEPPER, DEMOCRAT, OF FLORIDA, ON H.R. 4663 AND 4664 BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, MARCH 26, 1963

Mr. Chairman, you know that I am deeply grateful to you and your subcommittee for giving me this opportunity to testify on H.R. 4663 and 4664, which I introduced in the House of Representatives on March 7, 1963.

Mr. Chairman, these two bills are identical to those introduced by Representative HARRIS, the honorable chairman of your full committee. All of our bills have the full endorsement of the present administration.

H.R. 4663 would authorize grants-in-aid to public and nonprofit institutions for the construction of centers for research in mental retardation and related aspects of human development, to assist in means of finding causes thereof and the means of prevention or means of ameliorating its effects. The bill would authorize $8 million for each of the fiscal years 1964–66 and $4 million for 1967 and for 1968 for this purpose. The Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service would administer the program and approve or disapprove applications for grants which could not exceed 75 percent of the necessary cost of construction.

H.R. 4663 would also authorize grants to public and nonprofit institutions for the construction of facilities for the care and treatment of the mentally retarded, including facilities connected with college and university hospitals or other appropriate parts of colleges or universities under State plans approved by the Surgeon General upon the basis of population, the extent of the need for the facilities and the financial needs of the respective States. Under the bill, $5 million would be appropriated for this purpose for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965 and $10 million for each of the next 4 years.

Title I of H.R. 4664 would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make allotments to States on the basis of approved plans for the construction of public and other nonprofit community mental health centers on the basis of appropriations determined by Congress beginning with the year ending June 30, 1965. The primary factors which the Secretary would take into account are population, the extent of the need for such centers in each State, and the financial needs of the respective States. Title II of the bill would authorize the Secretary to make grants to public or nonprofit institutions to which a grant was made under title I to meet the cost of the initial staffing of community mental health centers on the basis of appropriations determined by Congress. Any such grant may not exceed 75 percent of the staffing cost during the first 15 months, 60 percent for the next year, 45 and 30 percent, respectively, for the next 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, Congress recognized this problem during World War II. During the war I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Wartime Health and Education of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, which made a study of the problems and needs with respect to mental illness and mental ill-health in the United States. That subcommittee held a number of hearings on the health needs of our veterans and our civilian population. In January 1945 the subcommittee issued its Interim Report No. 3 in which the staggering extent of mental illness was first disclosed. For example, the report pointed out that of 4,212,000 young men 18 to 37 years of age who were rejected for military duty by the selective service as of June 1, 1944, 1,282,800 or over 25 percent of the total rejected were for mental diseases and deficiencies. The report stated:

"It has long been known that approximately two-thirds of the illness encountered in general medical practice is essentially neuropsychiatric in origin and that half of the patients in hospitals at any one time are there because of serious mental disorders. Indeed, one may safely predict that in any group of 15-year-olds 1 out of 22 will some day be committed to a mental institution."

Our subcommittee recommended the establishment of community psychiatric clinics, hospitals in planned medical centers and for the training and education of professional personnel. It said:

"From a longer range point of view, the establishment of child-guidance clinics in all communities is urgently needed to prevent early social maladjustments."

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that in 1946 the chairman of your full committee then, the late Hon. Percy Priest, Representative from Tennessee, sponsored H.R. 4512, and I sponsored in the Senate S. 1160. These two bills were merged into Public Law 487 of the 79th Congress which authorized the establishment of the National Institute of Mental Health at Bethesda, a broad national program of research into the causes and prevention of mental ill-health, training of personnel in the treatment of psychiatric disorders with some experimental research in community mental health centers.

This act gave the impetus to Congress for a rapid growth in the appropriations for a national mental health program. This growth is reflected in the following figures of Federal funds provided in 1946, 1950, and 1963: 1946, $66,000; 1950, $10,019,000; and 1963, $143,599,000.

In 1949 Florida had only one State mental health hospital at Chattahoochee. It was 540 miles from Miami. It had at that time only 3,000 beds and 6,000 patients. Many patients from south Florida had to spend their time in Tampa jails during their travel to the hospital at Chattahoochee.

In the Miami area, there was only one nonpublic institution. It had no psychiatrist and no neurologist.

At the present time there are in addition to the State mental hospital at Chattahoochee, the South Florida Mental Hospital in West Hollywood just outside of Dade County, the Northeast State Hospital and the George Pierce Wood Memorial Hospital.

Dade County now has facilities at the Jackson Memorial Hospital, the above mentioned South Florida State Mental Hospital, a new day-care center at the Veterans' Facility at Coral Cables, a mental health department within the Dade County Health Department, and the Dade County Child Guidance Clinic.

But the record clearly shows that these facilities in Florida are wholly inadequate to meet the pressing needs in the field of mental health. The Florida Association for Mental Health pointed out in December, 1962:

"At Chattahoochee many patients are housed in substandard, unsafe, old buildings. It would be preferable to eliminate the need for these buildings than to replace them." The association recommended that facilities be provided for mentally retarded patients and special facilities for older nonpsychotic offenders.

The South Florida Mental Hospital at West Hollywood in December, 1962 had about 430 geriatric patients, one-third of the total. Of the 430, about one half are not really mentally ill, although they do suffer from mental lapses which are concomitant with old age. In addition 70 percent of those on the hospital's waiting list are in this category.

You may recall, Mr. Chairman, that in the mental health appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, made by Congress, $4,200,000 was included to assist the States in developing broad State mental health care programs. The State of Florida has taken advantage of this appropriation by making use of a Federal grant thereunder for the development of a comprehensive program of mental health care in Florida.

Moreover, the American Psychiatric Association with the assistance of the State and local mental health groups made a survey and held hearings in Miami on July

25–27, 1962, and other hearings in Pensacola, Tallahassee, Jacksonville, Orlando, and Tampa. This survey was summarized in the October 1962 monthly bulletin of the Mental Health Society of Greater Miami expressing the need as follows:

"Facilities and services for the mentally ill and seriously disturbed children, more and better services for the patient coming out of the mental hospitals, low cost clinics, psychiatric services in general hospitals, day and night hospitals, more and better facilities for the senior citizen, psychiatric services in the courts, jails and stockades and probation services, better legal definitions of sane and insane, and more appropriations for training and research."

It also recommended that the seven different State units which now deal with mental illness should be combined into one State department of mental health, regional treatment centers for children, and community mental health centers. Similar recommendations have been made by the Florida Association for Mental Health.

Mr. Chairman, Florida, and particularly south Florida lacks the proper facilities for the proper care of the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. Federal facilities for all practical purposes do not exist in Florida. Almost all of the seriously mental sick veterans must be sent to the Veterans' hospitals at Augusta and Atlanta, Ga., and at Gulfport, Miss. These hospitals have long waiting lists.

In the 2-year period 1959–61 the following data shows that Florida expended less than 2 percent of the total State expenditures for the care and treatment of mentally ill persons. In the United States the comparable figure was about 3 percent.

The table at the end of my testimony with respect to all Florida State mental health hospitals and the South Florida Hospital clearly shows the inadequacy of mental health facilities in Florida.

The State of Florida and all the communities therein now spend per capita, respectively, $2.60 and 21 cents in 1960 in comparison with $5.19 and 36 cents for the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I need not relate the details or the data published by the Joint Information Services of the American Psychiatric Association and the National Association of Mental Health in its 1962 edition of 15 indices of mental health. These data show clearly the great need for expanded community health centers, for the staffing of these centers with highly trained professional personnel, and for the construction and servicing of facilities for the mentally retarded. Florida in these respects is highly deficient. It is my belief that the quicker Congress passes the legislation now before your subcommittee, the faster the comprehensive mental health programs will be able to get under way. Dade County needs it, Florida requires it, the national health and safety and defense demands it. We must move forward to conquer the great emergency created by existing mental ill health and the lack of facilities for treatment and prevention. I urge you strongly to report these bills out favorably at the earliest possible moment.

Data on Florida and south Florida State mental hospitals

	1959–61 budget	Number of patients	Patient-days	Cost per diem
Florida	$28, 923, 198	9, 466	6, 919, 039	$4. 180
South Florida	5, 209, 700	1, 018	743, 581	7. 006

	Estimated 1961–63 budget	Estimated number of patients	Estimated days	Estimated cost per diem
Florida	$38, 630, 483	10, 166	1, 638, 790	$5. 21
South Florida	7, 158, 206	1, 423	7, 420, 815	6. 89

Montoya Scores Smash Hit at Parliamentary Conference With Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the congressional delegation appointed to represent our Congress in meetings with members of the Mexican Congress has returned from the Parliamentary conference. Much good was accomplished. The fruits of better understanding were cultivated. Those of us who had the privilege and responsibility of representing our Congress in this series of meetings are certain that they were mutually beneficial. We feel that they have resulted in a better understanding among leaders of the Mexican Government of our position and our policy in certain very vital areas.

By any standard of measurement, one of the highlights of the entire conference was the forceful and stirring address delivered by our colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico, JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, at the final plenary session. Speaking in flawless Spanish, Congressman MONTOYA undeniably made a deep impression upon our hosts. In relatively few words, he presented our Nation's position, identifying it with the legitimate aims and aspirations of the Mexican people and pointing out the identity of interest we have in presenting in this hemisphere a strong and united front against the spread of communism. His remarks were enthusiastically applauded.

Since Congressman MONTOYA's address was heard not only by many leaders of the Mexican Government but also by a great number of interested citizens including professors and students from the University of Guanajuato who attended the final plenary session, it undoubtedly accomplished a great deal by way of developing a sympathetic understanding appreciation of the U.S. position. Under leave to extend my remarks, I take great pleasure in submitting herewith the English translation of this moving address:

LIBERTY CONCEIVED IN BLOOD

As we return to this great Republic for this the Third Parliamentary Conference between representatives of our respective Congresses, I cannot help but avail myself of the great honor and exalted privilege which attaches to one whose name is heir to a revolution such as yours here in Mexico. This great honor is further punctuated by the God-endowed opportunity to address you in the Spanish language which I first learned in the arms of my mother and which was emitted to my understanding by the palpitating caresses of my mother's heart and heritage.

I am proud to be an American and my heritage makes me appreciate with complete comprehension the great patriotism and heritage which adorns the liberty-loving people of this Republic—a nation consecrated by the blood of your patriots so that the winds of freedom and dignity would permeate the atmosphere to shelter your libertarian existence.

Abraham Lincoln gave sustenance to liberty in my country as Father Hidalgo and Benito Juarez forged the rivers of adversity and colonialism in order to mold a new life in yours.

Guanajuato was the altar from which Juarez presided over the liquidation of foreign rule—from which he infused new blood into the constricted and hungry veins of your determined people.

Liberty conceived in blood can endure only when it is dedicated to elevating the dignity of man. Only a people grateful for its sustenance and shelter can perpetuate it. Without this vital element, it would perish. Today, as we dedicate ourselves in the open fields of endeavor to promote the well-being of our compatriots, we are threatened by the empty propaganda of the Communist ideology. We have heard the utopian, yet hollow claims of communism. Its proponents have extolled the virtues of communism, yet if communism is so great, why must it be maintained by the bayonet? If it is so sacrosanct, why have 250,000 liberty-loving people abandoned Cuba? Why the Berlin wall? Why Hungary?

These are not the crops of freedom. These are not the bills of liberty. These are not the shelters of dignity. This is why your country and mine are on the frontline in our determination to eradicate this cancer from our midst. Our attack upon this disease must be both remedial and preventative.

The Organization of American States and the Alliance for Progress symbolize the dedication of this hemisphere to eradicate this menace to our liberties. In this struggle, our efforts must never cease, rather, they shall continue.

Freedom, preciously won, must not and shall not be buried in the graveyard of complacency. The lamp of liberty must burn to light the hopes of men everywhere. Our esteemed President, John F. Kennedy, and your great leader, Adolfo Lopez Mateos, are predestined to protect the legacy we have inherited from Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt in my country and from Benito Juarez in yours.

In our effort to nurture a better way of life, my country's people bear a heavy burden. Your people also shoulder a great responsibility. Since 1946, my country has extended the total sum of $1 billion in loans and grants to yours. That this was done within the framework of the good neighbor policy and reciprocal advantage no one can deny, but it is an accomplished fact.

Today, under the leadership of our great President, John F. Kennedy, and your great Chief Executive, Adolfo Lopez Mateos, we in this hemisphere are marching upon the road toward our mutual goals.

The Alliance for Progress has united the liberty-loving peoples of this hemisphere as brothers, proud to carry the torch of freedom to the tops of our mountains, led on by the rhythmic tones of the freedom bells which were tolled by Jefferson and Washington, and by Hidalgo and Juarez and the other great liberators of our glorious history. Our common effort and great sacrifice are destined and dedicated to insure the greater dignity of our peoples and the economic development of our sister nations in this hemisphere.

The Alianza is the soul of this movement. Its vital components are agrarian reform and internal fiscal responsibility. In this respect your country mirrors a great example of compliance. Much remains to be done and I am certain that we shall continue in our dedication to this task.

We will not allow our high purpose to be threatened from within or from without by those who would subvert our freedoms. Our people are still in mourning because of the blood spilled to insure that government is a servant of the people and not the master. With this lesson we cannot permit communism to become the master and oppressor of the people.

I compliment your great President, Adolfo Lopez Mateos, who leads you in this worthy struggle. I commend you, the great Representatives and Senators of this Republic, for your constructive efforts and high sense of duty.

On behalf of the American delegation, I thank you, your most able Governor, Juan Jose Landa, and the people of Mexico for the gracious hospitality which has insured the success of our joint endeavors.

Major Domestic Problems in the 1960's—Address by President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on last Saturday, March 23, the people of the city of Chicago were privileged to have as their guest the President of the United States. President Kennedy attended the dedication of Chicago's O'Hare International Airport and later addressed a civic luncheon. His remarks were an excellent discussion of the major domestic problems we face in the 1960's, and they deserve the study of every American. I ask unanimous consent that President Kennedy's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT A CIVIC LUNCHEON, CONRAD HILTON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. Mayor, your eminence, Rabbi Mann, Bishop Burrill, Senator Douglas, Mr. Logelin, Mr. Lee, distinguished guests, Mr. Smith, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to be in Chicago because I am struck every time I come by the strong public spirit which runs through this city in the determination to make Chicago second to none, and everything about Chicago to be the best, that men and women working together can provide. And also by the happy spirit of community effort which joins business, labor, the civic groups, and all the rest, in selling Chicago to the people of Chicago, to the country, and the world.

As Mr. Smith said, "All these things do not just happen; they are made to happen." And the reason they are made to happen, I think, in Chicago, is because of Mayor Daley. So I am glad to be here today.

I did not realize, which shows the advantage of getting out of Washington—I did not realize until I began to look up some of the details of O'Hare what an extraordinary effort this has been, the largest airport in the world here in the center of the United States. So I hope that Chicago will continue to tell its story, not only here but all across this country of what a great metropolis it is, its energy and vitality, and its commitment to the future. I don't think that there is any doubt that if this country continues to grow, if we can maintain a rate of economic vitality and prosperity, that Chicago will be among the leaders, and that the future of O'Hare Airport, named as the mayor has said after a great Chicagoan, who died a good many thousands of miles away from here, that Chicago and O'Hare will be symbolic of the progress of this country.

There is, I think, the central thesis, however, that we face serious problems in this country in the decade ahead if we are going to maintain that growth, and I want to mention one of those problems because I think it concerns us all, in government, in the city, the National Government, the State, labor, management, all of us as citizens. I think the No. 1 domestic concern of the United States is going to be in the 1960's; the question of jobs, jobs for a tidal wave of men and women who are going to be hitting our labor market in the next 5 years. It is a concern which requires the united effort of all of us. Some people may think it strange that jobs, which was the great issue of the thirties, when we were in a depresson, should also be the great concern of the sixties, when we enjoy a relative period of economic prosperity. The difficulty in the thirties was that there was an inordinately low supply of jobs for the men and women who wished to find work.

The difficulty now is the tremendously high manpower demand which exceeds the supply of jobs. But now, as then, every effort must be made by all of us to strengthen the economy so that we can find work for the people who want it. This involves not only Chicago in this country, but it involves our position of leadership in the world. Mr. Khrushchev has said that the hinge of history would move when he was able to demonstrate that his system could outproduce ours. The hinge of history will move if we are not able to find jobs for our people, not only during recessions, but also during periods of prosperity; and there are three reasons why I regard this as the number one problem we are going to face in this country in the coming years, and it is serious enough to warrant a careful examination by all of us to realize that it cannot be reduced by platitudes and hopes, and the effect of this problem is being felt and will be felt here in Chicago, Ill., and across the country. There are three reasons for it: First is the labor released by the revolution in farm technology. Agriculture has been this Nation's largest employer, engaging more people than steel, automobiles, and public utilities, and the transportation industries combined.

But now 1 farmer can produce the food and fiber needed for 25 Americans; compared to only seven at the turn of the century. New fertilizers, insecticides, research and all the rest have made this one of the great productive miracles of all time, has been one of the great stories for the United States around the world in contrast to the failure of our adversaries, but it is a fact that since 1947 our farms have increased their output 30 percent, at the very time that the manhours worked on those farms were cut in half. Farm employment during that period declined by 3 million, an average of 200,000 a year; comparable to the population of the city of Akron, Ohio, being thrown out of work every 12 months. In the last 2 years alone, farm employment dropped by a half million, while farm production and farm income were both rising. It is estimated that disturbing as it may sound, only 1 out of every 10 boys growing up on the farms of the United States will find a living in agriculture.

This leads us to the second growing tide of manpower, our Nation's youth. The crest of the postwar baby flood has swept through our elementary and secondary schools and is now about to engulf the labor force. Last year, for example, 2.8 million young Americans reached the age of 16. This year 3,800,000 will be coming into the labor market at that age. Altogether, in the 1960's, 26 million new young workers will enter the labor market, an increase of 40 percent over the 1950's, and a far greater number than this country has ever had to absorb and train in our history.

Already workers under the age of 25, although they comprise less than one-fifth of our labor force, constitute more than one-third of our unemployed. Last year, the unemployment rate for men age 25 and over was 4.4 percent. But for those age 20 to 24 it was 9 percent, and for those 14 to 19 it was a shocking 13 percent. Although young people are staying in school longer than their fathers, the rate of school dropouts, 4 out of every 10, is too high, for job openings for the untrained are declining, in factories, mines, farms and railroads, in the construction and service industries.

Moreover, the jobless rate is always highest among the unskilled. In our modern society, even high school graduates find that their skills are inadequate. But Labor Department surveys show that their rate of unemployment is at least far below that of school dropouts, not only in the year of leaving school, but in the later years.

The latest surveys also show that unemployment rates among college graduates are much lower than among those who come out of high school. But unfortuantely, only 1 out of every 10 finish college. In short, as challenging as it will be to provide, first, jobs for the 26 million new young workers entering the labor market in the 1960's, far more difficult will be the problem of absorbing the 7.5 million who will not even finish high school, including nearly 2½ million who will not even finish the eighth grade.

I ask you to mark these figures well, for youth unemployment poses one of the most expensive and explosive social and economic problems now facing this country and this city. In the last decade, for example, arrests of youth increased 86 percent. What will the figure be for the next decade when the net increase of potential young workers in the labor force rises to 15 times as fast as it did in the 1950's?

Finally, underlying all of these trends is the third phenomenon, both cursed and praised, and that is technological advance, known loosely by the name of automation. During the last 6 years, the Nation increased its manufacturing output by nearly 20 percent, but it did so with 800,000 fewer production workers, and the gain in white-collar jobs did not offset this loss. Since the Second World War, the real output of the private economy has risen 67 percent, with only a 3 percent rise in man-hours.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. Increasing productivity and advancing technological skills are essential to our ability to compete and to progress. But we also have an obligation to find the nearly 2 million jobs which are displaced by these advances.

This city is no stranger to any of these problems. You have seen your railroads laying off machinists and boilermarkers, as the proportion of diesel locomotives rose from less than 15 percent of all locomotives in 1947 to 97 percent today. You have seen your downstate coal mines laying off workers as new machinery makes it possible for 46 men to dig the coal that 100 men dug in 1947. And you have seen your steel mills employ 79 men to produce the steel products which required 100 men only 10 years ago. Chicago, I might add parenthetically, also proves the exception to this pattern since it now takes 10 men to manage the Cubs instead of 1.

This is not a blue-collar problem alone. Office and clerical workers are increasingly being displaced by automatic computers and processes. The Farm Home Administration of the U.S. Government processes 35 percent more loans per employee than it did only 2 years ago.

This administration intends to press ahead with Government economy, but we also have to find in the private economy jobs for these people who are willing.

All these trends you have seen in this city and State, workers displaced by automation, school dropouts roaming the streets, men looking for work who have left the farm, the mine, the factory, the railroad, or the distressed area. You have your share of jobless Negroes and women and older workers and all the rest, even though under Mayor Daley's hard-driving leadership this city is creating new jobs faster than almost any city in the country. The same is true on a larger scale of the Nation as a whole. Our civilian labor force grew by nearly 12 million during the last 15 years. But the number of jobs grew by only 10 million. In the last 5 years we saw an annual increase of only 175,000 private jobs, outside of agriculture, compared to 700,000 in each of the previous 10 years. Our total gross national product output grew at a rate of only 3 percent, while unemployment remained continuously above 5 percent. And last year's loss of man-hours, in terms of those willing but unable to find full-time work, was a staggering 1 billion work days, equivalent to shutting down the entire country with no production, no services, and no pay for over 3 weeks.

Some 14 million Americans had some unemployment in 1962, and 28 percent of last year's unemployed were out of work 15 weeks or longer. Fifteen percent were out of work a full 6 months or longer. This Nation must do better than that.

The trouble is that each of these figures grow worse, after each recession, and each one is bound to grow worse in the sixties as the labor force increases even faster, unless we take actions to reverse these trends and make the most of the manpower. Unless we step up our rate of growth, unless we create a supply of jobs which is more equal to the demand, our rate of unemployment will steadily and swiftly climb to the recession level of 7 percent, even without a recession. Without full employment, consumer markets are below their potential, without strong consumer demand plant capacity is not fully in use, without full plant utilization profit margins are reduced, without higher profits investment lags, and so the sagging spiral continues downward.

Our task is to reverse this spiral, to recognize it in the first place, and no single magic solution will solve all of our manpower problems. Above all, we need to release the brake of wartime tax rates which are now holding down growth at the very time we need more growth in order to create more jobs. Ten million dollars more in tax savings in the hands of American consumers and investors, as I have proposed to the Congress, will be multiplied many times in new markets, new equipment, new jobs, new payrolls, and then still more consumption and investment.

As this decade is unique in terms of the trends converging upon it, so is 1963 uniquely qualified to be the year that we cut Federal taxes. Inflationary pressures are at bay, no world crisis strains our resources, the dollar is strong, new investment incentives have been enacted, world war material prices are stable, and the number of idle men and machines can clearly absorb this expansion. But tax reduction alone is not enough if we are to attack unemployment in those areas and among those workers where the need is greatest.

Tax reduction alone will not employ the unskilled or bring business to a distressed area, and tax reduction alone is not, therefore, the only program we must put forward. To mention but a few, we urgently need to improve our schools and colleges, to reduce the number of dropouts, to reduce the number of unskilled workers, to keep young people out of the labor market until they are ready for the jobs which automation creates, instead of those it is sure to replace.

We urgently need a youth employment opportunities program to give young people training and job experience instead of hanging around the streets, out of work, and out of hope. We need to step up our efforts for aid to distressed areas, for the retraining of the unemployed, particularly in those areas where it has been chronic, for more security for our aged, for improving our housing and our transportation industries, and for ending race discrimination in education and employment, which helps increase, of course, the chronic unemployment of minority groups.

These are all controversial measures. There may possibly be others that are needed or others that are better, but at least it is a problem that we should all concentrate our attention on and not merely assume it is going to be settled if we ignore it.

O'Hare Airport was not built in that spirit and this problem will not be solved unless we concentrate the best energies of this country on the solution of a serious national problem. I have no doubt these problems will some day be solved. The question is will they be solved in ways which impoverish us, with restrictions on the work week, or inefficiency, or in competition, or will they be solved in ways which enrich us by expanding our economy and putting people to work.

The choice is up to us all, to you here in Chicago, to those of us in Washington, depends on the will of the people and the will of the Congress.

Twenty-five hundred years ago the Greek poet Alcaeus laid down the principle which best sums up the greatness of Chicago: "Not houses firmly roofed," he wrote, "or the stones of walls well builded, nay, nor canals and dockyards make the city—but men able to use their opportunities."

Chicago is blessed to have such men at their head, and my fervent hope is that the United States of America in meeting the needs of this decade will also be peopled by "men able to use their opportunities." Thank you.

San Francisco's Registered Voters Express Opinions in Congressman Mailliard's Survey on Controversial Legislative Matters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, some 18,000 of my San Francisco constituents have responded to my annual questionnaire mailed last month to every household containing one or more persons who registered for last November's election in California's Sixth Congressional District.

The following tabulation of the replies may interest my colleagues:

I. TAX REDUCTION AND THE NATIONAL DEBT

With an estimated budget deficit of $8.8 billion, the President has recommended tax reduction and reform programs estimated to create a budget deficit of $11.9 billion next year. These measures are intended to stimulate the economy to produce greater revenues in future years. Some of the most important questions to be decided follow. Do you want to:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
A. Maintain existing tax rates and expenditure patterns?	19	66	15
B. Maintain existing expenditure patterns but enact tax reduction and reform measures including—			
1. Reduction of individual income tax rates from the present 20 to 91-percent range to 14 to 65 percent, decreasing revenues by $11,000,000,000?	55	33	12
2. Limiting itemized deductions, including charitable contributions, to those in excess of 5 percent of adjusted gross income?	34	52	14
3. Reduction of corporation tax rates from 52 percent to 47 percent, decreasing revenues by $2,600,000,000?	43	43	14
4. Elimination of $50 exclusion and 4 percent credit on dividends?	23	60	17
C. Reduce the budget deficit by cutting expenditures for—			
1. Foreign aid to America's allies and underdeveloped countries?	66	26	8
2. American farm price supports and surplus storage?	80	13	7
3. Other domestic programs, i.e., welfare benefits and low-income housing?	50	40	10

II. MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Two basic plans will probably be considered by the 88th Congress. Do you favor a plan—

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
A. Managed by privately owned insurance companies with the Government paying the premiums of those who could not afford to pay themselves?	47	39	14
B. Managed by the Government and financed by greater social security taxes?	38	51	11

III. LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Recent strikes in the defense, maritime, and publishing industries have cast doubt on the effectiveness of present labor laws. Would you favor new laws to—

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
A. Compel Government arbitration with a decision binding to both parties in disputes declared by the President to endanger national welfare?	64	27	9
B. Subject labor unions to antitrust legislation on the same basis as corporations?	80	14	6

IV. FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Do you favor Federal aid to—

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
A. College and postgraduate education?	51	42	7
B. Grade and high school education:			
1. For general operations including teachers' salaries?	31	60	9
2. For classrooms and equipment only?	32	53	15

Our Naval Shipyards in Time of Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New Hampshire and I both represent the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, one of the most outstanding naval facilities in the United States. The skilled craftsmanship of Portsmouth shipbuilders has been a joint Maine-New Hampshire tradition since Revolutionary times. The Polaris missile bearing submarines *Abraham Lincoln, John Adams,* and *Nathaniel Greene* either have been or are being constucted at the Portsmouth yard.

Because of the role of the naval shipyard in safeguarding our Nation's security, I am pleased to call your attention to the junior Senator from New Hampshire's remarks before the East Coast District Metal Trades Council on March 11, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator McINTYRE's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NAVAL SHIPYARDS IN TIMES OF CHALLENGE

(An address by U.S. Senator TOM McINTYRE, of New Hampshire, to the East Coast District Metal Trades Council, Washington, D.C., March 11, 1963)

Mr. President, distinguished guests, and members of the East Coast District Metal Trades Council, I am delighted to be with you today to discuss naval shipyards and their importance in keeping America strong. This Nation's response to the military and economic challenges of the Communist empire is an effort of unparalleled complexity and scope. The greatest military machine in the history of the world is poised in constant readiness to meet any test at any time. We have designed an electronic web to scan the earth from outer space and to penetrate under the sea. We are this moment designing weapon systems to counter military threats whose nature cannot yet be predicted with certainty.

Across the face of the world our technical and aid missions are challenging the forces of superstition and neglect, trying at the same time to outrace glib Communist promises of quick industrialization and easy progress. More than a million Americans are serving overseas on military duty, Peace Corps projects, volunteer health services, religious missions, and in other ways. This effort—beyond compare in the history of mankind—requires the utmost in resourcefulness, endurance, and imagination from Americans.

This Government's efforts on behalf of freedom involve many high-priority industrial, construction and research efforts. One of these I would like to mention by way of introduction to the problems of public policy confronting the naval shipyards. The greatest project of its kind ever undertaken in the United States is the construction of missile and rocket launch facilities. The preparation of sites for Atlas, Titan and Minuteman missiles involves 100,000 square miles of land. More than 400,000 people are actively engaged in this gigantic effort, which will cost more than $700 million in this fiscal year alone. At the same time, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is building huge static test facilities, and the enormous launch complex at Cape Canaveral. Testing and launching of the Saturn, Nova and Apollo rocket systems will be accomplished on facilities for which Congress appropriated some $500 million in the current fiscal year. These projects are urgent. They are important to our national security. Delay cannot be tolerated. The cooperation of industry, Government and most particularly labor has been essential.

Two years ago, the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, of which I have since become a member, disclosed startling facts about strikes and work stoppages on the national missile sites. Senator McCLELLAN, chairman of the subcommittee, called some of the practices which were uncovered both reprehensible and astounding. The conflicts between labor and management, aggravated by jurisdictional disputes, seriously crippled the all-important aerospace efforts of the Defense Department and the space agency. What was needed most urgently in this troubled situation? It was a spirit of cooperation and the active interest of all parties in achieving the No. 1 objective—the security of the United States of America.

In May of 1961, President Kennedy created the Missile Sites Labor Commission. Under the effective guidance of the Department of Labor, and with the splendid cooperation of George Meany and Walter Reuther, the number of days lost due to strikes on missile sites began a steady decline. The 1960 figure was 1 day lost out of 96. In 1961 the loss was 1 day out of 1,100. And by 1962, only 1 day was lost out of 2,200. The sense of responsibility and discipline which we associate with national security, combined with the outstanding record of cooperation among all parties, led to gratifying results. It is precisely this combination of responsibility to our national security objectives and sound labor-management relations that is so important to our naval shipyards. It is about the need of national security and the problems which may be created by labor unrest that I want to speak today.

While the missile and space program occupies the headlines, it must not be forgotten that our navy yards are vitally important for the Nation's security and would be overlooked at our peril. It is true today as it has been down through history that there can be no substitute for seapower. But in this nuclear age the seas have changed. No longer are they a barrier behind which we can feel safe from the intrusion of foreign aggressors. The seas have become highways which knit the world together, and it is therefore essential that we protect our national interests everywhere on the waters, from Antarctica to the North Pacific.

Our need for the Navy, our dependence, upon it, is clear. The pressing question is how best we can maintain it at full strength and combat readiness. We have been successful in times past of world conflict, having had time to tool up before entering World War I or reaching full strength in World War II. But in Korea there was no time. Our ability to put 600 ships to sea quickly was a decisive element in our strength. Those ships had to be there on the spot which they were needed. And now the need for speed is with us even more. Our Navy must be ever ready, and it is our naval shipyards that guarantee our readiness. The yards and their loyal and devoted workers stand today among the sentinels of our liberty.

The naval shipyards are basic to our strength for other reasons. They are subject to unified command with the fleets they serve. They maintain facilities and capabilities which, while they might not be economical in a profit-type organization, permit the Navy to take on any job with adequate reserves. Naval shipyards carry an extensive inventory of spare parts and shipboard equipment. You, as experienced shipyarders, are well aware of the importance of our readiness to our Navy.

A second element that makes the shipyards so important from the standpoint of national security, is their status as home ports for ships in the fleet. Naval bases provide ship's personnel opportunities for training, recreation, medical and dental care and other needed services. Above all, they give the men an opportunity to have a home life. The morale of our sailors is greatly heightened by the knowledge that they can keep their families near home ports. No one will argue with the right of these men who are serving our Nation, to have a home. It is a right we must recognize and preserve.

Still a third important contribution made by the naval shipyards arises from their close connection with the naval laboratories operated by the Bureau of Ships. As I study the achievements of today's Navy, I am amazed by their complexity. For instance, I learned that aboard a Polaris submarine there are upwards of 50 computers, of some 20 different types. The development of High Point and other water-skimming hydrofoils of immense speeds indicates the shape our Navy may take in the years ahead. I have come to realize the importance of uniting ship repair and construction with advanced research under common management.

There is yet another way, perhaps somewhat more intangible, in which shipyards contribute significantly to our national safety. As a representative of the State of New Hampshire, I am indeed proud of the long and distinguished history of the Portsmouth Shipyard which was authorized by Congress in an appropriation act of 1799. The first warship to fly the flag of the United States—the *Ranger* commanded by John Paul Jones—was built at Portsmouth. This tradition is ever in the minds of our shipyard workers. The exceptional morale of the Navy yards, their proven ability to meet the needs of the Nation again and again, and their tradition of excellence are factors of great importance in keeping existing organizations strong. A tradition this deep and real is precious to our American heritage.

But it is not the shipyards alone. The tremendous force that keeps the yards strong is the workers. Government workers, of course, are denied the right to strike. In a way this prohibition increases the reliability of the shipyards. But I would like to discuss the positive side of Government's employee-management relations. The employee who is denied the right to strike, I believe, certainly has a right to have just as great a voice in discussing working conditions as he would have otherwise. He ought not to be penalized because he is using his craft to help build the instruments of our security.

For years the chaotic procedures governing employee-management relations have been the Achilles heel of the Federal service, denying to the people the efficiency and improvement they have every right to expect. The voice of the Government worker must be heard, and it must be heeded to the greatest possible degree.

President Kennedy in June of 1961 instructed the Secretary of Labor to head a task force to work out new arrangements for employee relations in the Federal service. The President's Executive order of January 17, 1962 recognized for the first time the Federal employee's right to seek exclusive recognition through a unit to represent him in actual negotiations. This right to negotiate, is now extended where a unit achieves majority recognition. An organization receiving 30-percent recognition is entitled to be consulted on matters of interest to employees. The public interest in this field of improving employee-management relations is strong. The need is acute, I am gratified that we have begun to meet the need.

The Federal employee has not won the right to strike or the right to seek wage increases, other than by congressional action. But negotiations may now take place in such areas as working conditions, promotion standards, grievance procedures, transfers and demotions.

Let us not forget that the Executive order is still very new and much remains to be worked out. For example, it may take some time to work out guidelines for unit recognition. It would not be realistic, for instance, to insist that no unit smaller than an entire installation could be recognized. I think the last few months have witnessed more and more flexibility on the part of the Defense Department and other Federal agencies in encouraging the recognition of smaller groups within installations.

Of course, the first decision has yet to come down from an arbitrator at the top level of appeal in the Labor Department. Once we have a series of decisions, discussions on this point can be renewed if necessary. Meanwhile, like most other Members of Congress, I will wait with interest to see what policies emerge.

The organization of labor unions in our naval shipyards stretches back to the beginning of the last century. You must be very proud of that tradition and the vital part played by your members in meeting the challenges of their jobs. The new voice given your organizations by the Executive order will, I am certain, lead to many improvements in shipyard work. And it will yet be another source of strength. It will serve the national security interest and the Government's obligations to its employees. The Kennedy administration has in my estimation taken a long step forward in the direction of the finest type of relations with the Federal employee.

The most important point I could make here today would be to emphasize the combination of national security and sound labor organization in our naval shipyards. You are all aware, I am sure, that a campaign is underway to discredit the naval shipyards. The commercial yards are eagerly seeking a greater share of naval ship-repair work. It is their claim that tax-financed navy yards are driving them out of business by taking an undue share of repair work. Let's examine their claims in some detail—particularly from the standpoint of labor, peace, and the national security.

First, there can be no doubt that the assets which make the naval shipyards so important to the Nation are largely lacking in the commercial yards. Moving a ship from yard to yard denies it a home port, with the related important facilities we discussed earlier. The commercial yards are not integrated with naval command and lack the resulting readiness so vital in these troubled times. And the commercial yards are subject to delays arising from labor-management difficulties.

The agreements under which the shipbuilding and repair unions are now operating were concluded in 1960. The 3-year agreements expire this year, and we have yet to see whether harmful and dangerous interruptions to naval construction and repair will occur. But let us take a look at a few examples of what has happened during the life of the present agreements.

In 1960 strikes at one leading east coast commercial yard tied up work on 10 Navy ships.

In 1961 12 strikes involving 6,900 workers resulted in 124,000 idle man-days in the shipbuilding and repair industry.

In 1962 a strike in an eastern shipyard delayed the Polaris program for 10 days, despite the urgent priorities of putting nuclear submarines to sea.

This is not to criticize the labor record of our commercial yards, which in many respects has been excellent. But the danger of work stoppage is one the Secretary of the Navy must have the authority to weigh in assigning urgent modernization work. It is shocking to realize, in this year of contract expiration that efforts are underway to tie his hands, to deny the Navy the flexibility and discretion it must have in dealing with the uncertainties of schedules in commercial yards.

In fact, if the Navy did not have the ability to allocate its work after a day-to-day assessment of the labor situation, the strike threat in the commercial shipyards could well increase. As it is now, labor, management, and the Government have an equal interest in steady working conditions and the speedy settlement of difficulties in commercial yards. This balance should not be upset by hasty action dictated by short-term self-interest.

It is the natural and legitimate aim of the commercial yards to seek business. But where the national security is involved, and the good name of our naval shipyards is involved, the public has a right to the truth. Naval shipyards are not unfair competition. The Navy is not the enemy of private business. In fact, before a decision in 1951 to send a definite amount of repair work to private yards, the commercial shipyards did not have any share in modernization and repair. And, of course the private yards always have had the lion's share of initial construction.

More recently, one-quarter of repair and modernization—amounting to $159 million in the last fiscal year—has been allocated to the commercial yards. Thirty-seven private firms have participated in a construction and conversion program worth more than $4 billion since the end of World War II.

But this has not satisfied the commercial yards. They want to cut deeper and deeper into the share of work now being done so efficiently and expertly by the naval shipyards. Two bills now before the House Armed Services Committee would give the private yards a whopping 75 percent of the Navy's conversion and repair work. These bills, introduced by Representatives William Colmer, of Mississippi, and Alvin O'Konski, of Wisconsin, present a real threat to the naval shipyards and the job they are doing to aid in the Nation's defense.

The history of last year's military appropriation bill bears ample evidence of just how real is the danger to the naval shipyards. In April of 1962, the House Appropriations Committee reported out a bill directing that no more than 65 percent of the repair, alteration, and conversion of naval vessels be carried out at naval shipyards—although close to 75 percent was then being done at these Government installations.

Chairman Carl Vinson, a seasoned and astute student of our military needs, led the floor fight against the restriction. This provision could have led to a reduction of 5,000 workers in the naval yards, as well as weakening the management ability of the Secretary of the Navy. On April 18, Chairman Vinson offered an amendment to strike out the 65 to 35 provision. This amendment was defeated in the House by a standing vote of 130 to 64.

In the Senate, where the bill was reported June 8, the committee took the teeth out of the 35-percent requirement by permitting the President to disregard the requirement if he determined it "to be inconsistent with the public interest, based on urgency * * * capability and economy." In conference between the House and Senate, the Secretary of Defense was authorized to ignore the 35-percent requirement if it imposed delays or additional expense. It was by this narrow margin, then, that the attack on the naval shipyards was in part defeated. But this attack has not subsided. Those who would damage the whole structure of our naval shipyards are still at work.

One of the least publicized but more obvious reasons for the campaign of the private shipyards has been the decline in commercial shipbuilding and repair. Private yard employment on Navy work has increased from 26,000 in 1957 to more than 50,000 today, while overall employment in those yards decreased from 127,000 to 117,000 over the same period. It is the decline in commercial work, and not any weakness in the Navy's program, that has provoked the attack on the naval shipyards. This is important to remember in our fight to keep the naval shipyards operating at full force.

There was a time when 90 percent of our American exports and imports were carried in American merchantmen. But our early failure to build steel ships, inept Government management of the commercial fleet after World War I, and an off-and-on mail subsidy weakened the commercial fleet. By 1938, 90 percent of our fleet was thought to be obsolete.

The 1936 Shipping Act regulations for subsidized operations are so restrictive, that few shipowners have participated. The losses of American Export Lines on the construction of the *Independence* and the *Constitution* did little to raise the confidence of American operators. The construction subsidy has not helped the American yards as much as it might due to Government mismanagement and restrictive regulations. The remedy for these very real problems lies with the Maritime Administration and the Shipping Act—not in attacks on the navy yards.

World trade grew by 6 percent last year, and there are many opportunities for American ships. I am more than willing to work for the future of the merchant fleet, once the leading industry in my own State of New Hampshire.

But it is short-sighted in the extreme to attempt to cure the ills of this industry by threatening the very foundations of the naval shipyards whose history is interwoven with the growth and security of this Nation. I shall devote my energies as a Member of the U.S. Senate to promoting this country's security and honoring the inspiring traditions of its naval shipyards.

Results of Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, because of its general interest I should like to publish a portion of my newsletter which was released today:

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Thousands of fifth district constituents responded to my recent poll requesting their opinions on some of the issues to come before Congress this year. It was extremely gratifying that almost 18,000 people took the trouble to reply. Many sent letters expanding on the answers they had given in the form, which included some 17 questions.

The replies indicate a 17 percent response, since I sent the questionnaire to just over 100,000 homes. Of those responding, 63 percent were listed as registered Republicans, 5 percent were Democrats, and 32 percent were Independents. I plan later to release the responses by party breakdown. The following is the final total tabulation without respect to party affiliation:

QUESTIONNAIRE, 1963

Do you favor:

1. Reducing Federal income taxes: (a) Geared to reduction in Federal expenditures, 83 percent; (b) Without a reduction in Federal expenditures, 11 percent; (c) No response (presumably against a tax cut), 6 percent.

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
2. Increasing your social security taxes to finance hospital and nursing home costs for those over 65?	35	58	7
3. Federal aid for construction of—			
A. Public primary and secondary school facilities?	49	43	8
B. Private primary and secondary school facilities?	12	75	13
C. College academic facilities?	42	46	12
4. Federal aid for public school teachers' salaries?	22	72	6
5. Federal scholarships for higher education?	55	38	7
6. Legislation providing tax credits for parents paying college tuition	70	25	5
7. Legislation requiring secret ballot of union members before strike can be called	93	3	4
8. Federal aid for commuter railroads	39	47	14
9. Creation of a Department of Urban Affairs	22	58	20
10. Establishment of Domestic Peace Corps	35	50	15
11. Increased pay for military personnel	42	37	21
12. Increased pay for Members of Congress	17	62	21
13. Optional nondenominational religious activities (prayers, bible reading, etc.) in public schools	79	14	7
14. A strong United Nations fully supported by all member nations	85	9	6
15. Aid to underdeveloped countries that are—			
A. Pro-Western?	72	16	12
B. Nonalined (neutral)?	34	44	22
16. Do you prefer the services provided by the Federal Government to—			
Percent			
Be increased 10			
Be decreased 53			
Remain at present level 31			
No response 6			
If your answer favors increased services, are you willing to pay increased Federal taxes to obtain them?	63	30	7
17. What is your opinion of the President's record on—			
A. Domestic matters: *Percent*			
Good 18			
Fair 44			
Poor 34			
No response 4			
B. Foreign affairs:			
Good 24			
Fair 41			
Poor 31			
No response 4			

Connecticut Shares in Important Anniversary of Greek Orthodox Church of United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when there is a great stirring in the interest of unity among Christians throughout the world, I believe that it is appropriate for this House to take notice of an anniversary which is a significant one for an important part of the church of Christ.

This year marks the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Seminary of the Greek Orthodox Church of the United States. I am proud to say that my own State of Connecticut shares in this anniversary in an important way, because it was in Pomfret, Conn., that the seminary was established. This is the wellspring from which have come the American-trained clergy to serve the faithful of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America.

In 1947 the seminary was transferred from Connecticut to Brookline, Mass., where presently it has a student body of 80 young men, with a faculty of 20.

Until the founding of the seminary, the million and a quarter persons who comprise the Greek Archdiocese depended on the Patriarchal Seminary of Constantinople and on the Theological School of the University of Athens for their clergymen.

The need for American-trained Orthodox clergymen became increasingly acute, until, in 1937, a tract of land and buildings were acquired in Pomfret, under the leadership of the then Archbishop Athenagoras of North and South America, now ecumenical patriarch of the Greek-Eastern Orthodox Church and first recognized among all equals of the rank at Istanbul, Turkey. The first dean appointed was another Athenagoras, the late Athenagoras Cavvadas, bishop of Boston and later archbishop of England and central Europe.

In its 25 years of service to God, the seminary has graduated 264 students, of whom 225 have been ordained as priests of the Greek Orthodox Church, and are now serving the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America. More than one-third of the graduates have received further degrees from colleges, universities and theological schools.

The Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, which they serve, has 380 churches in its jurisdiction, in nearly all of the countries of the Western Hemisphere. There are 14 churches of the archdiocese in my own State of Connecticut.

The zeal and the pioneer spirit in education, religion, and in patriotism, of the two holy men who were the founders of the Greek Orthodox Seminary, and all of those who were associated with them and who assisted them through the past quarter of a century have made possible a rich contribution to the religious and cultural life of the people in our own State and in our own country as well as all of the Western World.

JEC Holds Defense Procurement Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Defense Procurement Subcommittee of the Joint House-Senate Economic Committee began 3 days of hearings into the economic impact of military procurement and supply. These hearings, scheduled for today, Friday, and Monday, will help move forward the job of the Joint Economic Committee of giving insight into our Nation's economy and the factors of importance to it. I believe it is important that all of the Members of Congress know of the existence and purpose of this study.

The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, Mr. Douglas, who chairs this subcommittee, recently issued a press release on the scope of the background papers that have been prepared for the hearing and the scope of the hearing itself. To give a better idea of the areas into which the subcommittee will be looking, the Joint Economic Committee press release follows:

Congress of the United States,
Joint Economic Committee,
March 25, 1963.

Senator Paul H. Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee, today released a committee print entitled "Background Materials on Economic Aspects of Military Procurement and Supply," March 1963. This updates a similar publication of the subcommittee that came out in February 1960.

These materials have been prepared for the subcommittee hearings which were announced March 21 and are scheduled for March 28, 29, and April 1, 1963.

Among the materials are:

MAGNITUDE OF OPERATIONS

Military real and personal property holdings have increased from $155 billion at the end of fiscal year 1960 to $165 billion at the end of fiscal 1962, an increase of $10 billion.

Personal property holdings have increased about $7 billion in that time, to $128 billion.

Expenditures for Department of Defense military functions were 8.7 percent of the gross national product at the end of fiscal 1962 compared to 8.5 percent the year prior.

From June 30, 1959 to June 30, 1962, the number of civilian personnel had decreased by 3,127, but with a payroll increase of $523 million.

The Department of Defense supply systems had unissued stores inventories costing $41 billion at the end of fiscal 1962. Eleven billion dollars (27 percent) of this was in the mobilization reserves.

The net value of military procurements during fiscal 1962 was $27.8 billion—up $3.5 billion from the previous year.

One State (California) had 23.9 percent of procurement actions and 27 States had less than 1 percent each.

The 100 largest prime contractors had 72.3 percent of the military prime contract awards (fiscal 1962).

Negotiated procurement amounted to 86.7 percent in fiscal 1962 compared to 86.9 percent in the fiscal year 1961.

Savings of 25 percent result when items can be "broken out" from more complex equipment and bought competitively.

There are $13 billion of excess and long stocks in military inventories.

The total surplus property disposals dropped from $6.791 billion in fiscal 1961 to $4.061 billion in fiscal 1962. The percent of total gross proceeds to acquisition cost was 3.87.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS—GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (GAO)

An index and digest of 207 GAO reports to Congress on the militiary procurement, supply and related subjects.

A report by the GAO on "Uneconomical Procurement of Certain Aircraft Engine Bearings by the Navy."

OTHER REPORTS

A progress report on organization, accomplishments, and programs of the Defense Supply Agency.

A statement by Secretary McNamara on the Department of Defense's 5-year cost reduction program.

Two case studies (one from GAO) dealing with the mobilization reserves.

Legal background and agreements affecting the General Services Administration and the Department of Defense relationships.

Oglethorpe University Basketball Team Places Third in the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, my alma mater, Oglethorpe University, near Atlanta, Ga., has recently appeared in some favorable headlines. Its basketball team, under the expert direction of Coach Garland Pinholster, finished third in the Nation in the NCAA small college division. Oglethorpe University, with just 400 students, was the smallest of all small colleges competing for the national championship.

Coach Pinholster, long recognized as one of the finest young coaches in the United States and author of three best-selling books on basketball, was selected as head coach of the Small College All-Stars for the Pan-American Games' playoffs next week in Kansas City. He was chosen over more than 700 other coaches in the NCAA and over more than 700 in the NAIA.

Coach Pinholster, who also serves as athletic director of Oglethorpe, has been named "Coach of the Year" in Georgia four times during his 7-year college career. His teams have been to two national tournaments and have won five other regional or conference championships.

At the same time, Oglethorpe University players have maintained an excellent scholastic record, averaging in the eighties as a team. This is a remarkable achievement in a college noted foremost for its academic standards.

Coach Pinholster and Oglethorpe University were featured on a national television program last year commemorating the 75th anniversary of basketball.

Coach Pinholster and Oglethorpe's "Stormy Petrels" have earned their places in the sun.

They have proved that victory need not come at the expense of high educational standards.

Cotton Industry in Life-and-Death Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perplexing problems confronting our economy today is a solution of the cotton problem. The House Committee on Agriculture has been working on cotton legislation and our Subcommittee on Cotton started hearings back in December of last year, to bring out legislation that would have applied to this crop year. Our efforts to make the legislation effective in 1963 have not been successful up to this time; the difficulties facing the cotton industry have not been resolved.

Recently, on March 22, the distinguished chairman of our House Committee on Agriculture, Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, was the principal speaker before the annual convention of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, and the address he presented to that group of mill owners and operators and textile manufacturers outlines the scope of our studies and the differences still existing before we can hope to bring legislation to the floor. Mr. COOLEY outlined the history of the problem, explained the position of the committee, and concludes with his own personal suggestions for a solution.

I believe that Members will find the entire speech enlightening and informative, and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include Chairman COOLEY's remarks delivered on that occasion:

REMARKS OF HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE THE CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN TEXTILE MANUFACTURERS INSTITUTE, HOLLYWOOD, FLA., MARCH 22, 1963

COTTON INDUSTRY IN LIFE AND DEATH STRUGGLE

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I acknowledge with great gratitude the kind and gracious remarks of my friend Charlie Cannon. He has presented me to this great audience in fine fashion and in complimentary terms. Mr. Cannon has been referred to as "Cotton Cannon." In my opinion he is worth his weight in gold to the cotton industry of America. In the cotton industry he has always stood like the Rock of Gibraltar, and has been a beacon light.

I am delighted to be here with many close personal friends, and to have the privilege of meeting so many nice people. Bill Ruffin, your distinguished president, whom I have known since childhood and whose friendship I have cherished through the years, was very kind to invite me to this convention, and to arrange for me to have a part on this program. I am also very happy to be here with my friends Bob Stevens, Gordon McCabe, Bob Jackson, Charlie Myers, Rea Blake, Bob Coker, and others, all of whom are devoted to the institutions of freedom. They are courageous men of vision—they are not cry babies. When Charlie Cannon, Bob Stevens, Charlie Myers admit that they are in trouble, it is time for all of us to take notice.

Yesterday I heard with great interest the speeches delivered by Bill Ruffin, and our great Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon. With their permission, I shall insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to perpetuate for posterity, the wisdom of their remarks. I shall also insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Bob Stevens' acknowledgment which emphasizes the fact that "Rome is burning."

I am grateful to all of you for the warmth and cordiality of the welcome accorded us and the hospitality and many courtesies extended to us during our sojourn here. I am very happy to have the privilege of discussing with you some of the problems in which all of us have a community of interest.

BIG BUSINESS

Agriculture is the biggest business in America in dollar value involved and people employed, and the cotton industry is the biggest part of American agriculture. Perhaps more than 10 million persons—almost one-sixth of the Nation's labor force—is engaged in the production of cotton, in ginning, marketing, transporting, milling, and in the manufacture and merchandising of cotton goods.

Cotton is competing with synthetic fibers. I do not like synthetics in cotton anymore than I do synthetics in tobacco. I do not want synthetic socks, shirts or shorts and I certainly do not want synthetic sheets, towels, or pillow cases. Neither do I want alfalfa to take the place of tobacco. Personally, I do not like filter-tip cigarettes. I agree with Edward R. Murrow—a chain smoker—when he said that to smoke a filter cigarette was like kissing a beautiful girl through a nylon veil.

Cotton maintained the financial integrity of the United States before the world for perhaps a century or more prior to World War I. The white fleece from southern fields up into this century accounted for approximately one-third of all U.S. exports, of crops and industrial products combined.

Cotton still comprises about 20 percent of all our agricultural exports and 5 percent of the total shipments abroad from agriculture and industry.

No one crop has had such an intimate relationship to the well-being and, indeed, the culture of so many Americans.

Cotton relates directly, through exports, to the flow of dollars back to the United States, amounting in years past to around $1 billion a year—dollars returning to the United States to balance against the huge sums we provide in foreign aid and in payment for imports of goods from abroad.

Thus it is plain to see: Government policy relating to cotton goes far beyond the immediate interests of the cotton farmer—it goes far, far beyond the immediate interests of you cotton manufacturers.

THE CRISIS

Gentlemen, I have opened these remarks in a way intended to impress upon you the importance of cotton—in terms of the Nation's economy, in terms of our Nation's balance of payments and financial strength in the world, and in terms of the well-being of millions of our citizens.

We are here in a serious purpose, a very serious and critical purpose.

Cotton is now in a life or death struggle.

Cotton is assailed, and is losing ground, on two fronts:

1. A flood of cheap textiles is flowing in from abroad, displacing the goods produced by our own workers and demoralizing the domestic markets for our textile industry.

2. Synthetic fibers make devastating inroads into markets where cotton never before has been seriously challenged.

Generally, these losing battles for cotton are explained, though oversimplified, by blaming the imports upon the two-price system—one price for our own mills and a lesser price for competing mills abroad; and by a high price for cotton here at home, in relationship to the lower competing price of rayon.

We have been aware of this approaching struggle for a number of years. Some of us in and out of Congress have tried to do something to forestall and avoid the crisis that is now upon us. But our efforts have been subjected to pressures, strains, and warps.

THE DESTINY OF COTTON

I shall not need to dwell at any length upon the fix we are in. You people are painfully aware of this. So are the people who produce the cotton that you spin.

A quarter of a century ago, U.S. cotton was the dominant factor in the world fiber market. This is no longer true. U.S. cotton faces competition from foreign-grown cotton and a host of man-made fibers.

Thirty years ago, if we exclude wool, silk, and linen, which do not directly compete with cotton on a price basis, cotton enjoyed about 93 percent of the total fiber market, with rayon and acetate accounting for the remainder. In 1961, the latest year for which comparable information is available, cotton had only 66.5 percent. In other words, cotton holds only two-thirds of the market in which it competes directly.

In the last 12 years, cotton has dropped from 30 pounds consumed annually by each individual in the United States to 22 pounds. Man-made fibers today account for over one-third of this market.

Seven years ago we were faced with the virtual loss of our export markets. U.S. cotton stocks on August 1, 1956, were at the record level of 14½ million bales. Our exports were only 2¼ million bales in 1955. Foreign cotton and rayon producers were taking over our markets by moving their products into consumption at prices lower than ours. From 1948 to 1955, cotton acreage in the free foreign world increased more than 60 percent. Foreign rayon production rose 2½ times.

We met this with our export program in 1956 that made American cotton available for export at competitive world prices. From 1956 through 1960 the rise in foreign cotton acreage and foreign rayon production were practically halted. Our exports during the last 7 years have averaged to about 6 million bales annually.

We are now faced with the identical situation in our domestic markets that we confronted in our export markets.

Between December 1960 and December 1962 cotton has suffered a total competitive loss of 1,150,000 bales. Over this period consumption of rayon in cotton-type spinning mills rose 63 percent. Consumption of dacron and similar-type fibers rose 118 percent. For the past 14 months, cotton's share of the fiber consumed on the cotton spinning system has declined every single month.

Rayon's price advantage to the textile mill over cotton was about 6 cents a pound in early 1960. Cotton's superior quality overcame this disadvantage. In its competitive fight with rayon, cotton was making gains. In the first half of 1960, the rayon industry cut the price of rayon staple fiber 4 cents per pound. On the other hand the price support for U.S. cotton was raised in February 1961. This resulted in a 3½-cent rise in prices from January to October of that year. Rayon's net mill cost advantage over cotton rose to about 14 cents per pound.

Cotton textile imports have increased sharply. In 1962, they reached a record 650,000 equivalent bales of cotton compared with 100,000 bales in 1954. Imports of cotton textile products over the past 4 years have had an average annual increase of 100,000 bales.

The deteriorating cotton situation is sharply increasing Government costs. Two years ago, CCC's investment was about $300 million. Today it has increased to over $1½ billion.

It is plain to all of us that American cotton is rapidly losing markets—both at home and abroad. Domestic consumption and exports during the current season are estimated at the lowest level since the 1958–59 season. This will be the third straight year of decline.

The Department of Agriculture currently is forecasting a carryover of around 10 million bales on August 1, 1964, up about 2¼ million bales from last year.

AN ADMONITION

This is the sad and sorry situation as of now.

The responsibility lies in many directions and rests upon many people. The House Committee on Agriculture and I, personally have worked long and hard to avoid the crisis now at hand. We may not have done always the right thing at the right time. But we have worked against very great odds, being ever handicapped by the lack of unity among farm organizations, among farmers themselves, and in the textile industry generally, as to the direction we should pursue.

All of us no doubt must bear some of the blame. I suggest that you in the manufacturing end of the cotton examine what you might have done, or now can do, differently.

Right here I want to speak to you frankly.

I am deeply disturbed by your headlong rush into the use of synthetic fibers.

I believe you are playing with a time bomb. You may get hurt. You may get hurt badly.

Is it not significant to you that the greatest increase in competitive imports of cotton goods has occurred simultaneously with your increases in blends of rayon with cotton and your presentation of these blends and mixtures into markets where consumers have preferred and asked only for cotton? Maybe you might say you are blending to compete pricewise with cheap cotton goods from abroad. But is there not a valid question as to whether foreign goods are moving, or will move into and take over our markets for quality cotton goods, as these markets are abandoned by you here who favor various blends, mixtures, and adulterations?

Let me admonish you that you—the textile industry of this country—may rue the day if ever the American consumer gets the idea that she must look for a foreign trademark, from Europe or from Asia, to be assured of getting a sheet, a towel, a piece of fabric, or a shirt, made of pure, unblended, unmixed and unadulterated cotton.

I submit that this is something for you to think upon.

A NEW START

The cotton industry—all of us—farmer and the miller—must make a new start. We must commence from where we are and from where we stand.

I want a cotton program to accomplish these things:

1. Fair and stable income for the cotton farmer;

2. Protection of the livelihood of the millions of workers associated with cotton;

3. A healthy cotton trade and merchandising system;

4. An efficient and prosperous cotton textile industry, and

5. A fair share of the world cotton market.

I fully understand these objectives can only be accomplished by a return to a one-price system for cotton. I know that otherwise cotton's markets will deteriorate unless we move in this direction and I know a competitive position for the cotton fiber will expand markets and put cotton back where it should be. Now, I have said all along that it is useless for me to consider this matter further until the textile industry, the producers and the administration can get together.

I realize that the textile industry has taken a firm position for an immediate return to one price for cotton. As you well know, this was also my position and was embodied in my bill, H.R. 2000. However, as we all know, subsequent developments have made it impossible to secure enactment of this legislation. In recent weeks I have spent a great deal of time conferring with the President, the Secretary of Agriculture and his associates in the Department, leaders of cotton producer groups and other branches of the industry, in an effort to find a practicable approach that would get the job done and upon which general agreement might be reached. At this time I would like to suggest for your consideration and the consideration of all others involved what seems to me to be the best solution to this problem. Here are my specific proposals:

(1) Effective upon the enactment of legislation and until August 1, 1964, the Secretary of Agriculture be authorized to make payments in kind that would move as far as possible toward a one-price system for cotton within the budgetary limitations already prescribed. In order to prevent market disruption, this payment would also be made on raw cotton in consuming establishments on date of enactment.

(2) Beginning August 1, 1964, and thereafter U.S. cotton would be made available to American mills at the same price as it is made available to foreign mills under existing law.

(3) Beginning with the 1964 crop the national marketing quota would be not less than the average off-take (domestic consumption and exports) for the 5 cotton-marketing years immediately preceding the year for which the determination is being made. It is only logical that our minimum production goal for a given year should be related to a historical average of consumption rather than estimates of potential off-take on a year-to-year basis. Under this provision our minimum acreage allotment for 1964 would be approximately 17 million acres.

If additional consumption indicates a production above the minimum, this should be equitably apportioned between an increase in the national allotment and an acreage reserved for producers who desire to grow cotton above their individual share of the national allotment for the world market at world prices.

(4) Immediately upon enactment of this legislation the Commodity Credit Corporation should be directed to make available to the Agricultural Research Service of the Department not less than $10 million annually to be devoted to research designed to reduce the cost of producing cotton. This section of the legislation should also provide that as unit costs of producing cotton are reduced the price support would be lowered accordingly, thereby reducing the cost to the Government without impairing farmers' net incomes.

I want to emphasize the extreme importance of this matter of research to reduce our production costs and also I wish to emphasize the fact that we do have extremely promising opportunities to actually reduce cost of producing cotton. We have documented testimony before our cotton subcommittee by the Director of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department, the director of research for numerous State experiment stations and private industry that cost reductions in excess of 10 cents per pound are feasible and can be attained in a reasonable number of years. The plain fact is that research offers the only permanent solution to the problem.

Unless everybody gives a little there will be no legislation and up to this point I have not seen any sign of anybody giving, but if this is not done our markets will deteriorate.

As you no doubt are aware, the House committee is divided sharply along political lines, and unless Democrats on the committee are in virtually unanimous agreement, it is not likely that we shall have any legislation at all.

CONGRESS OUR LAST HOPE

Congress is our last hope, and this is our situation. Not only in our Committee on Agriculture, but in the House, there is not one Republican vote we can count for sure, on legislation now being proposed to deal with our desperate problems.

We have exhausted every other recourse.

We first tried through the Office of Emergency Planning to bring into action the emergency powers of the President to stem the flow of foreign textiles into this country. Everybody admits it is an outrage that foreign mills can buy our cotton at 8½ cents a pound cheaper than our own mills, and then send unlimited amounts of their cheap cotton goods into our markets. But we failed to get action.

We went before the Tariff Commission seeking import quotas and import fees to check this rising flow of foreign textiles. But again we failed.

We went the route of an 18-nation agreement, to bring within reason the shipment of foreign textiles into our markets. But this has been far from effective.

Thus rejected, we have turned again to the Congress.

We in the Committee on Agriculture recognized the urgency of the situation, and our Cotton Subcommittee began work last fall to have legislation ready for action immediately upon the convening of the 88th Congress in January. Meanwhile, the Advisory Committee on Cotton appointed by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman was working to find a meeting of minds among cotton producers. People in the textile industry were putting their heads together, for the same purpose.

This concerted effort was an inspiration full of promise.

I soon got the impression that everyone was agreed, from Houston and California to Boston, on the proposition that we would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments-in-kind, in a way to erase and remove the two-price cotton system as a burden upon our own textile industry.

When the new Congress was only a few days old, I introduced H.R. 2000, to provide payments-in-kind in such a manner as to remove the 8½-cents-a-pound advantage to foreign mills, gained through the export subsidy, and to assure our industry a fair competitive position.

Moreover, by reducing the price to our mills to the world price of cotton, I expected that cotton would be freed of the competitive disadvantages that now so strongly favor the synthetic fibers and pose such a great threat to the total production and use of cotton in our domestic markets.

But I found later to my amazement that the administration was not willing to pay the 8½ cents to completely equalize the price situation, but would support payments-in-kind only to the extent of 4 to 6 cents a pound.

Meanwhile, in a bill introduced by Chairman E. C. GATHINGS of the Cotton Subcommittee, and by amendments offered in our committee, we had before us a proposal for overplanting of cotton by farmers who were willing to take the world price for cotton on acreage they tilled above their allotments. We had also a proposal for a far-reaching program of research into ways and means of bringing down the cost of producing cotton, with the long-term view of reducing the price of cotton to place this fiber in a fairer competitive position with synthetics.

Confronting a stalemate, I had prepared by the committee staff and was ready to introduce a bill, containing the overplant and research provisions, but giving the Secretary of Agriculture discretion in determining the level of the payments-in-kind—instead of insisting upon the full payments of 8½ cents per pound.

I very soon learned that this was unacceptable to the textile industry—that is, to you people here.

THE SITUATION TODAY

You are a discriminating, and a brilliant audience. In full consideration of this, I had hoped to bring to you more than an exercise in language. I wanted to lay before you a program for the good of all of us—a program that the Congress could enact swiftly, so that we could get on with the job of putting cotton back where it should be. However, all is yet confusion.

Nevertheless there are two things I have said that I want to repeat here in this forum. I implore you to listen carefully.

When I found on February 21 that the textile manufacturing industry would not support legislation that provided anything less than a full subsidy representing the difference between the domestic price and the world price for cotton, I issued a statement to the press, and I quote from that statement:

"I have decided not to introduce a new bill until all segments of the cotton industry and the administration can reach an agreement and indicate a willingness to support legislation to carry the agreement into effect."

That is my position today.

In a public appearance on March 9, I said this:

"There is danger that the Nation's farm program will collapse, setting off a severe depression in the general economy. Great difficulties now confront the House Committee on Agriculture in writing legislation to deal with an urgency in cotton resulting from the flood of foreign textiles moving into our markets and from the severe competition of synthetic fibers for markets formerly held entirely by cotton. This effort to remove the inequity suffered by the textile industry has been blocked by partisan politics and by the opposition of one farm organization. However, I expect a cotton bill will be taken to the House floor for a vote.

"I think that if this effort to do justice to our textile industry and to cotton farmers is defeated, no other farm legislation will be forthcoming at this session of the Congress. This would be the beginning of the end for farm programs."

That is the situation today.

Let me say to this distinguished group that to end farm price and production adjustment programs would bring on a terrible farm depression. This would be reflected quickly in a downturn for the entire economy.

Certainly the collapse of the farm program would mean cheaper cotton, at least for a while. But if you younger men in textiles think that in itself is good, I suggest you consult with some of your older colleagues, on what a mess they were in when cotton was 5 cents a pound.

In these circumstances, and in all the confusion on cotton policy, I can leave with you but one message, and this is the message: You must insist upon, and there must be, a meeting of minds. There must be agreement upon policy. Whatever it takes to bring together the views and the positions of honorable men, this must be done. Cotton legislation must come out of this Congress.

The consequences of failure are too dismal to contemplate.

In parting, I assure you I shall be pleased to work with you in your own self-interest, and in the interest of our farmers, and in the interest of the millions of other people who are bound to cotton for their well-being, and for the health of our economy and for the power of our country. I wish you Godspeed.

The Challenges of Tomorrow's Industrial Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, 1963, the Diocesan Labor College, Buffalo, N.Y., celebrated a quarter century of education in the field of labor-management relations. On this silver jubilee celebration, the bishop award ceremonies were incorporated.

The opening remarks, made by Very Rev. Msgr. Stanley A. Kulpinski, diocesan director of the Labor College follow:

THE CHALLENGES OF TOMORROW'S INDUSTRIAL LIFE

The faculty, the alumni and graduates of the diocesan labor schools graciously welcome your presence at the silver jubilee graduation and bishop's award ceremonies.

A silver jubilee is a special occasion. It reflects a quarter of a century of cooperation and efforts of various fields of endeavor.

At a moment like this, our first impulse is to send a great prayer of gratitude to God Almighty through St. Joseph, the patron saint of the working people. It is only through the power of Almighty God, guiding us, inspiring, illuminating our minds, protecting us, leading us ever on, unswervingly, toward proper goals, filling us with divine courage and strength and tenacity and perseverance that we are able to stand before

you today having you share with us the joy of this jubilee.

At a time like this we must also bring to our grateful recollection the persons who initiated this divine work. First on the list is His Excellency the late Most Reverend John A. Duffy, who gave permission and encouraged Rt. Rev. Msgr. John P. Boland to establish the labor college. Monsignor Boland must be given credit not only for founding this college, but also for his prophetic vision, where he foresaw the service and the need such a unique institution will fulfill for the community of western New York. Then came a succession of bishops who personally nourished the continuation of this work; viz, His Eminence the late Cardinal O'Hara and of recent beloved memory, His Excellency Bishop Joseph A. Burke and now present with us His Excellency Most Rev. Leo R. Smith.

Hundreds of persons went through the portals of this school, some to learn and others to teach. Time does not permit us to mention by name those on the previous teaching staffs who gave of their time and efforts and money, whose self-dedication was an inspiration to their students. We bow our heads in reverent memory to those amongst us on the faculty who have already passed to their eternal reward. Their names and their self-dedicated teaching will live on in the hearts of their living students. Just to mention a few, the late Jack Cassidy—a sales executive from Alleghany Ludlum, the late Henry Manka—on the grievance committee of United Rubber Workers Local 135, the late Congressman Radwan—all made self-sacrificing contributions to this cause.

Ours is a unique institution, perhaps even regarded as peculiar in the minds of some. It is not accredited, that is, it does not give college credit. It does not create specialists for any particular profession as such. It does not give any homework to its students. It holds no examinations.

Yet as the graduates who will come to get their diplomas will prove it attracts persons from all walks of industrial life, from the president of a company to the lowest classified factory laborer.

The secret is that this diocesan labor college teaches an industrial way of life that has been verified to be successful not only for the last 25 years but for the last 70 years.

The students are taught in such a manner that what they learn on Monday evening at the college they can immediately put into practical use next day on the factory floor, business conference room, or a union meeting.

To be more specific this school insists that it is not enough to know the technicalities of industrial relations but that in order to bring harmonious and just relations between labor and management and the community the whole man, the complete man must be educated with special emphasis on his heart, his conscience, his immortal soul. That is why one subject is always compulsory to all, that is, Industrial Ethics; this subject is based on the Pope's Encyclicals especially now on the latest Encyclical of Pope John XXIII, "Mater Et Magistra," which Encyclicals in turn are based on the Ten Commandments of God—acceptable to Catholic, Protestant, and Jew.

We believe that the answer to the challenges of tomorrow's industrial life will be found, not so much on the field of technical scientific programs, but on the bedrock moral principles as found in Pope John's Encyclical "Christianity and Social Progress."

As Pope John puts it, "The recognition and respect of a moral order that is valid for all, which recognizes its foundation in God, the protector and defender, distributor of goods, riches, and mercy, and the terrible avenger of injustice and inequality from Whom no one can flee."

The following awards were then presented:

The Bishop's Plaque, the highest honor that the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College can bestow, was awarded Sunday to three Buffalo men at the college's 25th anniversary dinner.

They are: William J. Ryan, assistant executive director, United Fund of Buffalo and Erie County, for his leadership among labor groups in support of the fund;

Martin A. Wersing, mediator in the State Mediation Board's Buffalo District office, for promoting labor-management peace;

J. Edmund Kelly, Jr., Buffalo Evening News labor reporter, for consistently excellent and unbiased reporting.

Special silver jubilee plaques went to Joseph A. Beirne, Chevy Chase, Md., international president of the Communications Workers of America (AFL–CIO), for enlightened labor leadership.

COURSES PROVIDED

Edgar F. Kaiser, president, Kaiser Industries Corp., Oakland, Calif., for promoting labor-management peace and for inaugurating a sharing-of-savings plan. His administrative assistant, Norman E. Nicholson, accepted his award.

Mr. Kelly's citation read:

For serious guardianship of the code of journalistic ethics; for skill, courage, and prudence in positive reporting of the total industrial picture—an example of correctness in truth and justice.

Mr. Wersing's read:

For contributions in achieving the prospect of labor and management working together for the benefit of both in an atmosphere of mutual respect.

CONTRIBUTIONS NOTED

Mr. Ryan's read:

For a distinguished and outstanding service to the industrial community of Erie County and dedicated stewardship to the common man.

Mr. Kaiser's read:

For his contributions to the changing American economy in the cherished traditions of the free enterprise system and free collective bargaining—his effort to eliminate the need for long negotiations or strikes and sharing with the workers the gains from new processes—for a full generation of personal achievement as an outstanding, intrepid American.

Mr. Beirne's read:

For his inspiring, enlightened leadership in the American labor movement, in promoting the social principles of justice and charity—for his more than 25 years' devotion to organized labor—for his militancy in preserving the democratic way of life based on the dignity of man—for his unending campaign to unite all segments of society for the common welfare of all.

PRAISE FOR CITIZENS

In accepting the plaque, Mr. Kelly said:

I shall cherish this award not only for its own significance but also for the memories which attach to it.

It will remind me of the many fine, decent, conscientious people whom it has been my pleasure to meet in the unions, companies, and government services in the Buffalo area.

It will remind me, too, of the great newspaper I am privileged to represent—a newspaper which, in the highest traditions of journalism, has always permitted me freely to report local labor-management news as objectively as possible and which has always gladly given me the broadest possible freedom in commenting upon the labor-management scene in my signed column.

ADULT COURSES PROVIDED

Finally, and importantly, this award will remind me always of the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College—an institution whose efforts in behalf of order and justice ennoble our community.

For this award then, and for the memories it will mean, I am humbly and sincerely grateful.

The college provides adults educational courses in labor-management relations, labor history, industrial ethics, collective bargaining, job evaluation, and public speaking.

The Most Reverend Leo R. Smith, administrator, Catholic diocese of Buffalo, who presented the bishop's plaque, said in the world of automation there is danger man may forget about God.

There is danger to religion that methods of technology may make truth unimportant.

URGES ABSOLUTE STANDARDS

It is up to not only the church but every one interested in humanity to devote some thought to the problem. The longer we live in a technological world, the longer we realize the limits of human knowledge.

The bishop concluded with a plea for absolute standards of good and evil for men to live by.

TWO JOIN IN TRIBUTES

Mayor Kowal presented keys to the City of Buffalo to Mr. Beirne and to Mr. Nicholson for Mr. Kaiser, Common Council Majority Leader Stanley A. Makowski presented an engrossed resolution passed by the council in commemoration of the anniversary to Monsignor Kulpinski.

Mr. Nicholson said the plan to share savings will result in payments to workers even though the Kaiser Co. is losing money this year. He noted its basic premise is that no one should lose his job as a result of any laborsaving devices installed.

DISCARDS SPEECH

New-product manufacture and retraining will be utilized in an effort to employ workers on new jobs, he said. Difficulties in the plan will be worked out through negotiation.

Mr. Beirne discarded a prepared speech to stress his conviction the American worker's strength lies in his belief in God, in the family and in our Nation. He said the greatest enemy is communism.

The Communications Workers' president predicted that, while the laws and economies of our democracy and the Communist nations might draw closer together, there is one unbridgeable gap—belief in God and in human kind.

Mr. Beirne noted that the world is changing and labor and management cannot cling to the views they held in the 1930's.

HAILS ENCOURAGEMENTS

He said the fact labor leaders did not strike to win "does not mean we have become soft or that we have sold out."

He warned against compulsory arbitration, advising that a third party also might be called in to regulate profits and production.

Mr. Beirne concluded with a tribute to the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College for encouraging adults to think for themselves in fields where there was an opportunity to provide justice.

Erie County executive, Edward A. Rath, expressed his felicitations which follow:

May I extend the official greetings of the county of Erie and my own personal greetings to you on the occasion of the silver jubilee celebration of the Diocesan Labor College.

This dinner tonight with the attendance here of people representing every segment of our community testifies to the high regard that all of us have for the excellent work in this very vital area of human relations which you have done in the 25 years since your founding. Twenty-five years ago the labor movement in this country was making an excellent beginning in bringing into the ranks of organized labor millions of people including those in the unskilled classes. The aims and objectives of this movement designed as they were to bring about better and safer working conditions, improved wage scales, and all those things which are consonant with the inherent dignity of man had and have the overwhelming support of enlightened persons everywhere. But with the increasing membership of unions, it was imperative that some individuals or organization should be ready to train persons in the movement to their new responsibilities and opportunities. It was this purpose that the Diocesan Labor College has fulfilled so ably and well in our own particular community. Yours has been an excellent record. You have our hearty congratulations and best wishes for an even greater future.

Thank you.

It was my pleasure to pay high tribute to the college for its outstanding work and its contributions to the labor-management relations in the Niagara Frontier.

I would like to include a telegram sent by President John F. Kennedy to Monsignor Kulpinski on the occasion of the silver jubilee celebration.

MARCH 9, 1963.

Very Rev. Msgr. STANLEY A. KULPINSKI,
Buffalo Diocesan Labor College,
Silver Jubilee Banquet,
Lafayette Hotel, Buffalo, N.Y.:

I am very pleased to extend congratulations and warm best wishes to the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College on the occasion of its 25th anniversary. I would also like to commend you for the contribution you are making to labor-management affairs by awarding such a distinguished member of the business community as Edgar Kaiser your Bishop's Plaque for industrial statesmanship. Too often, attention is focused on failure in labor-management relations rather than achievement.

In honoring Edgar Kaiser, you acknowledge the achievement of one whose industrial leadership benefits the entire community, whose confidence in the process of collective bargaining has strengthened it, and whose vision has yielded programs for meeting the challenges of technological change.

To Monsignor Kulpinski, Edgar Kaiser, and to all participating in the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College silver jubilee go my very best wishes.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The program began with the advancement of colors by the Adam Plewäcki American Legion Post, Buffalo; the National Anthem was sung by Mr. James Wolford, business agent; and the invocation was given by Rev. Gerald R. Forton, associate director of the college.

The master of ceremonies was Mr. Edward J. Kanowski, director of public relations, Diocesan Labor College, United Fund.

His Excellency, Bishop Leo R. Smith, was introduced by Mr. Henry J. Osinski, and the benediction was given by Rev. William Grau, director, Lackawanna Labor School, Lackawanna, N.Y.

On March 9, 1963, an editorial appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., commenting on one of the recipients of an award. The editorial follows:

MERITED AWARD

J. Edmund Kelly, Jr., labor reporter of the Buffalo Evening News, will receive one of four plaques for outstanding contributions to labor at the silver jubilee dinner of the Buffalo Diocesan Labor College tomorrow evening.

He is cited for "consistently excellent and unbiased reporting in the field of labor-management relations." He has been on the labor "beat" for 12 years and his column "Ed Kelly's Comment on Labor" appears in the weekend edition of the News. Coming as it does from the Labor College—a unique institution dedicated to promoting ethical conduct and moral values in relationship between management and employees—the award is extremely gratifying to the News and a merited tribute to a fine reporter.

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN, VICTOR WICKERSHAM, REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON

MARCH 1963.

DEAR FRIEND: March was a busy legislative month, with the House taking action on several important bills. I voted for the defense authorization bill, including an extra appropriation for greater development of the manned supersonic bomber. The manned bomber will play a vital part in our defense structure for many years. With the new defense appropriations, our country stands stronger than ever before, on land, sea, and in the air. In line with this, I also voted to extend the military draft another 4 years. For our internal security against the spread of communism, I voted for an appropriation to the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Federal money poured into the Sixth District during March, with $144,440 going to Altus for a new National Guard armory, $64,000 for Mangum's new water system, and $10,571 to Riverside Indian School at Anadarko for remodeling of the fieldhouse.

It was a pleasure to assist cotton farmers, gins, cottonseed oil mills, and compresses in my district by protesting any change in policy in storing Government cotton. I hope that the present policy of negotiating rates will be in effect for a long time. It will benefit the local cotton interests.

Although the proposed Deep Fork project in central Oklahoma is not in my district, I joined the other members of the Oklahoma delegation in support of the project at a hearing in Oklahoma City. When the project is completed, Oklahoma's greatest dreams will be realities.

A prominent resident of the Sixth District, Mrs. E. Lee Ozbirn of Sentinel, was honored in Washington in March for her contributions to the Outdoor Advertising Association's film, "In More Ways Than One."

In order to keep residents better informed on matters affecting their interests, I am presenting a series of monthly 5-minute radio and television programs featuring interviews with prominent Washington officials in Government. Response to the first two programs has been very good. Interviews have been held with Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and former Under Secretary of State, now Ambassador to West Germany, George McGhee. My April program will feature an interview with Mr. Floyd Dominy, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, who will discuss the present status of proposed Bureau of Reclamation water projects in my district.

It was a privilege to help secure permission from the Government for district court at Mangum to use the Federal district courtroom. For some time, the district courtroom has been unusable and the graciousness of the Government in allowing a State court to use the courtroom is appreciated.

My award for "letter of the month" goes to a woman who wrote me, "About 20 years ago you asked me if I knew of anyone who might be interested in going to the U.S. Naval Academy and these many years later I am answering you." I am always glad to help constituents, even if it takes 20 years just to get the request.

If I may be of service to you at any time, just phone, wire, or write.

Cordially your friend,
VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
Member of Congress.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, World War I provided an opportunity for the suppressed nationals under czarist Russian control to strive for national identity. One of these ethnic groups, the Byelorussians, had never before experienced sovereignty. As a part of Lithuania, they had formed a powerful unit within the empire, extending their influence to such an extent that the Lithuanians used the Byelorussian tongue as the official language of their court. When joined with Poland to form the greater Lithuanian-Polish empire, Polish supplanted Byelorussian as the official idiom. With its dominance diminished, the Province became only a name.

In its expansion westward, Russia was able to annex the territory in 1795 and changed its name to the northwestern territory. The spirit of nationalism was not extinguished, though, by this apparent move to obliterate all which was not Russian. In 1906 the first Byelorussian weekly appeared, but was immediately suppressed. Not until the World War and the fall of the czarist government did the Byelorussian people achieve their hopes and ambitions. Although occupied by the German troops in 1915, nationalist fervor soon reached overwhelming proportions. Permitted

to establish their own local government, the National Council proclaimed, on March 25, 1918, an independent republic.

With the collapse and retreat of the German Army, the newly sovereign nation was left to the mercy of the Soviet forces. Proclaiming on January 1, 1919, a Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Red army soon occupied all the land belonging to the stricken state. But Polish troops attacked and conquered almost half of the contested territory. As in war, so was it partitioned in peace. In March 1921, Soviet Russia and Poland divided what was once the independent republic.

Today, the Soviet Union controls the entire area, having reconquered the Polish western half during World War II. There is a Byelorussian Republic in existence, a part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It was even a charter member of the United Nations. Yet it is a sovereign state in name only. Control emanates directly from the Soviet Government in Moscow.

We in the United States, who are the champions of democracy and freedom, honor the Byelorussians who fled from persecution and terror by saluting on March 25, the 45th anniversary of the true independence of their country, and hope that the Byelorussians will once more be able to enjoy democratic rights and privileges under an independent and sovereign government of their own creation.

Medicare for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I recently received from one of my constituents a copy of a notice which he had received from his insurance company informing him that, due to his age, his quarterly rates for health insurance were to be nearly doubled—from $12.48 to $23.93.

The text of the notice from the insurance company follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1963.

Re health insurance policy No. —. (Anniversary date April 10, 1963.)

DEAR POLICYHOLDER: You are aware that medical costs have increased considerably during the past few years and there is every indication they will continue to do so.

During this time we have not had a general rate increase to policyholders because we have maintained our operating costs at the lowest possible level commensurate with efficiency.

We are now paying out more in benefits and expenses than we are collecting in premium. This makes it necessary to increase our rates generally in accordance with the attained age of each policyholder. Because of this fact, beginning with the above anniversary date of your policy, the premium will be the amount shown below. You will be pleased to know that we have not reduced any of your benefits.

We regret the necessity of this action and solicit your understanding.

Very truly yours,
——— ———,
Chief Underwriter, Group Health Insurance Department.

Quarterly $23.93.

The policyholder receiving this notice was 64 years of age and his main source of income was a $89.90 monthly social security check.

I cite this case because it is typical of the situation faced every day by a growing number of Americans who find at a period in their life when they are most in need of medical benefits that they are least able to pay for these benefits. This case is but another that points to the system. The enactment of such a program of medical assistance to the elderly financed through the social security system. The enactment of such a program would enable all Americans to pay the cost of their future medical care during their working years when they are best able to meet these costs.

Latin Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, as you know, my distinguished colleague, Representative DANTE FASCELL, of the Fourth Congressional District of Florida, and myself conducted hearings in Miami at our own expense on March 14 and 15 with regard to the problems created in our county by the absorption of Cuban refugees fleeing Castro and communism.

Many suggestions were made at the hearings about approaches to solving the problems which are created by the absorption of many thousands of these fine people.

Paramount in the minds of many of our local people, who have earned a Nation's gratitude for extending open arms to these people, is the need for increased resettlement of the overflow to many other parts of the Nation. This has been the key phrase used, so far as I can determine, in regard to resettlement—"to other parts of the Nation."

I should like to invite attention of the House to a proposal I have made to the Honorable John Thomas, Director of the Cuban refugee program for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I respectfully invite my colleagues to explore with me a new approach which could have a tremendous impact in combating the efforts of Castro and Moscow to "brainwash" our good friends in other Latin American nations:

MARCH 28, 1963.

Hon. JOHN THOMAS,
Director, Cuban Refugee Program, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: You are aware of course, of the growing public sentiment in Miami for increased emphasis on relocation of refugees from Castro's communism to other parts of the United States to relieve the pressure on our area which has been caused by the absorption of so many of these fine people.

I am aware, of course, that the Department has done a commendable job to date in transferring more than 50,000 of the refugees to other parts of the Nation. It was pointed out at our Miami hearings, you will recall, that many of the refugees return to Miami because of its geographic location to Cuba; because of the climate and because of the desire to be close to people of their own tongue and social customs. A strong underlying motive, of course, has been the compelling desire by these people to do something actively to rid the hemisphere of Castro and to free their homeland. To a large extent, they are frustrated in this area because of limitations on their activity.

It occurred to me that we might develop an original program to put the energies of these active people to work in an all-out psychological and intellectual "cold war" against Castro and communism. These people, many, many of them, could be our first line of offense in building public opinion throughout the Latin American and South American countries against Castro's current effort to export communism to those countries and infect other nations with the long-range plan by Moscow to infiltrate and bring about the downfall of these nations.

The President's outstanding Peace Corps program has done much to help the people of Latin America, as it has throughout the world, and to let the people of many nations see democracy in action.

I want to explore with you a plan for creation of a Latin Peace Corps under the Cuban refugee program with the following objectives:

1. To provide a program under which Cuban refugees could volunteer for assignment to Latin American nations to tell the story as eyewitnesses about what has happened and what is happening in Cuba.
2. The program should be devised so that their skills can be used according to their occupations in such fields as teaching, medicine, law, writing, and engineering.
3. Those volunteering under the Latin Peace Corps program would receive benefits comparable to those they now qualify for as refugees while on assignment.

It seems to me that this approach would have a strong appeal to thousands of these people who want to do something actively to fight Castro and communism. This approach to "resettlement" is one that should have considerable appeal to the refugee colony in Miami, and an approach which could be useful to our country.

I respect your experience as an expert in the field of resettlement activities based on your 18-year career, and solicit your opinion, and suggestions with regard to the creation of a Latin Peace Corps as described above.

Kindest regards, and
Always sincerely,
CLAUDE PEPPER,
Member of Congress.

Preservation of Birthplace of Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 4963, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by purchase, donation, or with donated funds the site of the Jacob Graff House in Philadelphia for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park. The city, State, and various patriotic groups, including the Philadelphia Continental Chapter of the Sons of the American Revolution, are supporting efforts to restore this famous house where Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence.

Independence National Historical Park, still in process of improvement and completion, has been described by the Park Service as "the greatest concentration of historic buildings and sites in the United States." The annual number of visitors to this shrine of our Nation and its founders is in the millions. The principal section of the park covers a one-block-wide area extending from Sixth to Second Streets. The adjacent site of the Graff House at the southwest corner of Market and South Seventh Streets is strategically located for addition to this basic area.

This bill which I have introduced will have, I hope, the wholehearted support of Congress and of Americans throughout our country. The preservation and development of a site of such nationwide historic significance in the establishment of the American Republic transcends local boundaries. The birthplace of the Declaration of Independence may well be termed one of the basic cornerstones of such a national shrine.

Address of the Honorable Wayne Morse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following remarks of our distinguished colleague in the other body, the senior Senator from Oregon, Mr. Morse.

The commonsense of Senator Morse in evaluating foreign affairs strikes me as of value to all of us. His remarks about our relationship to our European allies are applicable to the other nations of the world also. In a recent speech before the annual dinner of Bnai Zion, Ambassador Philip Klutznick came to virtually the same conclusions about what that relationship should be: a working together of friends. We are not interested in supporting Europe or any other entity if they do not want our assistance and we do not want their cooperation if they are unwilling to give it.

Senator Morse's remarks follow:

Remarks of Senator Wayne Morse, of Oregon, U.S. Senate, February 14, 1963

On January 16, I spoke here about some of the original purposes of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and why I believe those original purposes have largely been achieved. It was, and is, my contention that if NATO is to continue to be worthwhile to the United States, it must be forged into a new alliance with new purposes. Yet at this turning point, a loud and very important objection to a broadening of the Atlantic alliance is being heard from France, one of its principal members.

Since my earlier remarks were prepared and delivered before President de Gaulle's press conference was available for study, I would like to add some further reflections on what I think our situation is, judged from the attitudes expressed by President de Gaulle.

CONTENTION THAT UNITED STATES MAY NOT DEFEND EUROPE

One of his major contentions is that Western Europe cannot depend upon the United States to come to her aid with nuclear weapons, and that therefore Europe must have her own nuclear arsenal and France in particular needs a nuclear arsenal under her exclusive control.

Yet in the history of the 20th century, France has not been able to defend herself, much less anyone else. The United States and Britain have twice in my lifetime gone to France to defend her against an invader; the last time, France was liberated by these British and Americans who she now claims cannot be relied on.

Another fact of the history of Europe in the 20th century has been that if any one nation is going to dominate Western Europe, it is probably going to be Germany, and not France at all. Indeed, had France been left to her own devices in the last 20 years, or 50 years, she would very likely be a province of Germany, along with much of the rest of Europe.

It is my personal opinion that De Gaulle and France are kidding themselves if they think the hegemony of a Western European entity would remain very long in France.

And what of current history? It is a fact that there are more than twice as many U.S. ground troops under the common defense command of NATO right now than there are French forces. France is today the chief delinquent in the common defense of Western Europe. As I have already pointed out, the $9.4 billion in American aid which she has received since the end of World War II is the largest sum we have furnished any country and is in large part responsible for the economic and military strength which now enables President de Gaulle to flex his muscles.

In short, it is France and not the United States that has yet to make good on its existing pledges to participate in the common defense of Europe. I frankly see nothing in the recent past, the present, or the future which supports any contention that the United States is unreliable, compared to France, in its willingness to use its strength to defend and protect the freedom of others.

CONTENTION THAT AMERICANIZATION OF EUROPE IS UNDESIRABLE

A second contention widely attributed to De Gaulle as a reason for his feeling that Europe should exclude the United States from its political, military, and economic organization is a dread of the Americanization of Europe.

To him, this is said to imply mass production, mass marketing, and perhaps a loss of the sense of individuality and the loss of a sense of history.

But the United States became the richest and most powerful nation in the world by virtue of its vast unified market and the use of mass techniques in the production and distribution of goods.

And the Common Market of Europe was itself created to bring the same advantages to Europe. That is what the Common Market is for. It, too, will have a vast and even more populous market than exists in the United States. If it serves the purpose for which it was created, it, too, will expand its mass production and mass marketing techniques.

President de Gaulle and those who share his view cannot avoid this trend by keeping either Britain or the United States out of Europe. They can only avoid it by breaking up the Common Market and retaining their small, family-sized business operations serving a small local market.

REAL OBJECTIVE IS POLITICAL LEADERSHIP

To my mind, at least, these allegations offered in explanation of De Gaulle's policy are excuses, not reasons. They do not withstand the light of reason. They are excuses De Gaulle is offering in the hope of convincing others to accept his real objective, and that is to achieve for France the political leadership of Western Europe.

Perhaps some nations which would reject so bald a statement of the French objective are gullible enough to accept one of the other arguments put forward by France and by individuals in other nations who support her position.

WHERE WE GO FROM HERE IS PRIMARILY UP TO EUROPE

The future degree of closeness in relations between the United States and Western Europe now turns not upon a U.S. decision but upon a European decision. Our intentions and our objectives are clear. They have been supported by American blood and by more than $41 billion in American money. Our disinclination to dominate Europe is evidenced by the fact that we could easily have done so in 1945, but we did not.

Instead, it was our policy to make Europe strong, free, and independent. To carry out that policy we instituted the Marshall plan and later participated to the hilt in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Thanks in no small part to these instruments, Western Europe is now in a position to select her own future course of action.

It does not seem to me that there is anything we can offer Europe that we have not already delivered, or offered. Europe has the choice of welding itself into a new community, either with the United States and Britain, or without them. If it is without them, such a community will presumably be under French-German hegemony.

Either way, the United States will be able to take care of itself. I shall not repeat the many advantages that would flow to us from a loosening of our ties with Europe, if that is her choice. The financial advantage alone would be substantial.

NO REASON TO TRY TO OUTBID FRANCE

Above all, I am not interested in any American policy of trying to outbid France for the leadership of Europe. Our only interest in that continent is that she be free of Communist domination, just as that is our interest in nations elsewhere in the world. If Europe can now do that for herself without further help from us, so much the better for the United States.

A "third force" in Europe would suit this policy adequately, even though we might prefer a closer relationship in which our partners would carry a full share of the financial and military load.

The main point of American interest, in my opinion, is simply that European cooperation is not so important to us that we must go on paying for it forever. If Portugal and Spain, for example, now want to raise the price on American bases in their lands, we are better off to withdraw and let those countries submit their demands to De Gaulle, instead.

When our Deputy Defense Secretary Gilpatric goes to Spain, I hope that he will include on his agenda a study of how quickly we could close our air bases in Spain, and a review of possible alternative sites for basing Polaris submarines in the Mediterranean area.

A future for America free from further special obligations to Europe does not frighten me at all. The prospect of a military withdrawal on our part, and the withdrawal of our military privileges in Europe on its part, does not frighten me at all. Our defenses there are for the protection of Europe, not of the United States. If she no longer wants or needs that protection, I see no reason whatever for us to stay.

This is primarily a European decision, too, because the major confrontation with the Soviet Union is in Europe. If Europeans have more confidence in leaders of their own nations in the reaching of political decisions with Russia to the extent of excluding American leaders, then I have no objection to that, either. Berlin and the two Germanys, which are the main points of conflict, are, after all, in Europe and not in the United States. If Europeans want to handle that problem themselves, I see no reason for the United States to object to letting them handle it.

There are already being heard the voices of timidity which counsel a policy of staying on in Europe by ignoring the French challenge and trying to work around De Gaulle. They warn against any hint that U.S. aid, U.S. trade, and U.S. forces in Europe are in any way affected by the talk of a third force, apparently on the assumption that if we ignore it and offer enough to the other nations of Europe, they will choose us rather than France.

I reject such an approach entirely. For my part, I am emphatically opposed to keeping American forces in Europe if they are not wanted, not needed, and not matched. I am emphatically opposed to further financial aid to nations that seek to exclude the United States from the economic, military, and political life of Western nations.

It is nonsense to say that discussion of a U.S. withdrawal would be a threat on our part, or that it would tend to prove that De Gaulle is right and that we cannot be depended upon. We have already proved that we can be depended upon. It is no threat to say that if De Gaulle's concept is accepted, then the United States will have no further business in Europe. Our withdrawal in such a case is not a threat; it is more of a fact.

SAME FACTORS APPLY TO CANADA

In many ways; we find ourselves in the same situation with regard to Canada.

Here again, you hear counsels of timidity, and warnings that our relations with Canada must be left to the diplomats. I could not disagree more. That advice is an insult to the free people of Canada and to the free people of the United States.

As the political campaign in Canada proceeds, I very much hope there will be a great deal of discussion of her past, present, and future relations with this country. In both countries, our governments are but servants of our people. An alliance between diplomats only, is worse than no alliance at all, where democratic nations are concerned.

American politicians and American voters have a deep interest in our relations with Canada and we should talk about them. The same goes for Canadian voters and Canadian politicians and even more so, now that they are embarked on an election campaign.

To pass judgment on the future of their country, Canadians have to know what Americans think, just as we have to know what they think. I do not fear any Canadian election result that follows a full discussion of our relations on both sides of the border. I do fear a decision that may flow from ignorance of U.S. views.

NEED FOR WIDE PUBLIC DISCUSSION

The same is true of all the Atlantic allies.

Let us face up to the fact that we are all at a turning point. Our NATO alliance has, in my opinion, served its original purposes and served them well. The Atlantic countries have more than recovered from World War II; in the material sense, we are all better off than we were before the war, despite its horrors and its terrible destruction.

We have done very well working together for one common purpose. But none of us is quite sure whether we want to continue the partnership in pursuit of new purposes.

This is a time for wide public discussion of foreign policy within every nation of the Atlantic alliance. I would like to see a lot more of it here. I hope it will be a key issue in the Canadian election. I would like to hear more opinions from West Germany, from Britain, and from France, as well as from the other members of NATO.

This is not a matter that can be left to diplomats, nor to a few insiders in each country. This is a time for each of us to air our complaints, to explain our changing interests, and our hopes for the future. It is a time for getting grievances off our chests, and for exploring each other's interests to see whether—and how—they can be accommodated.

I think we need to do that, and to do it in public, if we are to know whether there is still a community of interest among the Atlantic nations that can form the basis for a new alliance.

Just as war is too important to leave to the generals, so a major alliance is too important to leave to the diplomats. Let neither the generals nor the diplomats ever forget that they are dealing with self-governing people in these nations. In Norway, in Italy, in Belgium, in Canada, in the United States, and each other member nation, the people must understand and support the general objectives of an alliance.

The American people have the right to know whether any further investment in the defenses of Europe, and further reliance on joint defenses with Canada, are going to be matched and shared by Europeans and Canadians. If not, then we must get busy revamping our military and economic policies accordingly.

Homes To Be on Exhibit in New York World Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, it is altogether fitting that a prominent feature of the New York World Fair should be housing. This week it was my pleasure to assist in a groundbreaking ceremony for three homes which are to be built at the fair as an American showcase for the construction industry, for the home furnishing industry, and for countless related industries upon which home ownership and home maintenance are dependent.

As chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, I joined with my friend and colleague, Senator John Sparkman, who is chairman of the Senate Housing Subcommittee, to break ground for the construction of these fair homes. They will be known as "The House of Good Taste" exhibit and millions of people will view them as examples of how Americans live as a result of the initiative of a free enterprise system and a democratic form of government.

I understand that over 200 business firms are represented in these homes and the many products which this exhibit will display should be a stimulus to better housing and better living for all who view them.

I believe that the "House of Good Taste" will be a highlight of next year's great exposition and I hope that all of us in Congress will have an opportunity to visit it.

Now Is the Time To Outlaw All Deficit Spending by the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Senate's highly respected and distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] has recently made a very eloquent and sound radio address over the "Manion Forum" which is broadcast over hundreds of radio stations across this country. I have just received a transcript of the Senator's address, which is entitled "Now Is the Time To Outlaw All Deficit Spending by the Federal Government." I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Now Is the Time To Outlaw All Deficit Spending by the Federal Government

Dean Manion. Did you ever see a dream walking—or a nightmare galloping around your bedroom? For your health's sake I hope not. But to simulate this experience, you need only to listen to some officials of the Kennedy administration who have been testifying before congressional committees in favor of the President's tax and spending proposals.

If you close your eyes while you are listening you may well believe that you have been lifted into the fantastic "Ministry of Truth" which is used to make fact out of fiction in George Orwell's horrible fantasy "1984." You may remember that the book "1984" is Orwell's grim and ghastly picture of our world when all of it has been reduced to the complete control of Communist dictatorship.

A basic ingredient of this Red establishment is the official reversal of every elemental concept of fact and truth that civilized people have accepted since the beginning of recorded time. In "1984," this reversal is enforced by the promulgation of a complete new Red vocabulary in which "war" is called "peace." "Truth" is regarded as "falsehood" and "slavery" is translated as "freedom."

In "1984," the end result of this transformation of language and ideas is called "newspeak" and this dictionary of the diabolical dictatorship is a horrible thing to behold. Nevertheless, the recent testimony of administration officials is definitely suggestive of a "newspeak" arithmetic which Congress is now being asked to buy, believe, and adopt.

For instance, these witnesses have testified that it is a good thing for the Federal Government to spend more than it takes in. They predict that the resultive debts and deficits will be a blessing to our economy in the form of full and profitable employment for the American people. Their solution for our business troubles is sweet and simple; namely, reduce Federal taxes and increase Federal spending. In the light of all that we have previously learned about addition, subtraction, profit and loss, this testimony presents a deeply moving picture of Alice in Orwell's bureaucratic Wonderland of 1984.

But these witnesses hold high and important positions in our Government. They are serious, dedicated, and determined. Their testimony is backed up by the immeasurable force and pervasive pressures of the presidential administration which has demonstrated its ability to bring congressional votes into the administration lineup—commonsense and simple arithmetic to the contrary notwithstanding.

For a Congressman or a Senator to stand up and be counted against the full power of the Presidential Office requires moral and political courage of the very highest order. Measure therefore if you can the character and integrity of a Senator who is a distinguished leader of the President's political party but who, nevertheless, takes the leadership against administration policy when that policy violates that Senator's solid conception of fiscal responsibility and the best interests of this country.

When you have done that you will have taken the measure of a truly great American statesman, HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia. Senator BYRD, welcome back to the "Manion Forum."

Senator BYRD. Thank you, Dean Manion, for the kind personal remarks in your gracious introduction.

You have asked me to discuss briefly expenditures and taxes and expenditure control and tax reduction. I don't know a better place to start than with the attitude of the new Federal Budget Director, Mr. Kermit Gordon, who has been testifying at the Capitol.

In effect, Mr. Gordon told a congressional committee that a balanced budget would lead to increased unemployment and general economic decline. He said this would happen whether we reduced Federal expenditures to meet tax collections or increase taxes to meet expenditures.

I submit that a man who thinks a balanced budget would be a catastrophe does not have the frame of mind to direct the budget of the United States. He should be removed from his office.

A budget director's function is to balance our fiscal affairs in the Federal budget—and defend it—not destroy it. It seems that Mr. Gordon has fallen for the fallacies of too many of the so-called economists who are counseling Government officials. They say that balancing the budget is still a goal, but to balance it any time soon would make us poor because there would be no Federal deficit to make us rich. And, to make us richer faster, they think the Government should create bigger deficits by spending more and cutting taxes at the same time.

Such ideas as these, which are being expressed by Mr. Gordon and other Government economists, sound like John Maynard Keynes and Gunnar Myrdal rolled into one. They don't sound like men looking for new frontiers—they sound like Rip van Winkle. They must have been taking a long nap.

We all know the Federal Government has run a deficit in 26 of the last 32 years. If Federal deficits would provide work and make us rich, everyone should have been employed and rich before now. Instead, we still have unemployed and we have a $305 billion debt—and the administration says it must go higher. If we don't get crackpot economists out of Federal fiscal positions and get sound men in them, the American system will be lost.

So much for the academic theories and prognostications of the self-styled economists—I'll just talk in terms of simple facts. Federal taxes are high—too high—as every taxpayer knows, and, they should be reduced.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, nothing would give me more pleasure than to report a bill for responsible tax reduction. But, as we all know, the basic reason for Federal taxes is to meet Federal expenditures. If Federal taxes are too high—and they are—it is basically because Federal expenditures are too high.

It is true that Federal tax collections totaling 80-odd billion dollars are at their alltime peak. But Federal expenditures, which will exceed $100 billion next year, are higher.

This simpy means that we are going further into debt each year by the amount that expenditures exceed tax reduction. We now owe in Federal debt alone more than $300 billion, and this debt is costing us $10 billion a year in interest.

By simple arithmetic we know that 4 percent interest on debt, compounded semiannually, doubles the principal in 17½ years. For the sake of our children, responsible people must begin to think of reducing this burden of debt we are leaving to them.

ONLY YOU—THROUGH CONGRESS—CAN CUT EXPENDITURES

But, the administration in Washington proposes to cut taxes and raise expenditures while we are already running a deficit. This simply means that we would go another dollar deeper in debt for every dollar we take in tax reduction. Short of grave national emergency, this would be sheer fiscal irresponsibility and most of us, deep down in our hearts, know it.

Yet, a sound and responsible tax cut could be made possible by first cutting out unnecessary Federal expenditures. Admittedly, this is made more difficult by the fact that the President says that Federal expenditures must and will rise.

This leaves it up to Congress to cut expenditures without assistance from the executive branch, if not against its opposition. If Congress is to cut expenditures under these circumstances, it will need both the demand and active support of everyone in this audience and more effective procedures in its actions on appropriation measures.

I shall conclude with some remarks concerning public demand and support for reduction in expenditures. But, first let me report that I have introduced what is known as the Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 to limit expenditures.

Congress now acts on appropriations but it does not limit annual expenditures where money is available for more than 1 year. Under the resolution an annual expenditure limit would be fixed on every expenditure including "back door" items.

Congress now acts on appropriations in a dozen or more bills over a period of months, never seeing the whole at any one time. Under the resolution every expenditure would be brought under one cover and limited.

Under this procedure the expenditures allowed could be added up at the end of the bill and checked against estimated revenues. By this direct expenditure control Congress can make deficit financing illegal or unlawful.

With or without tax reduction, direct expenditure control has become an obvious and urgent need. I hope the resolution will be adopted, or that the objective of the resolution will be accomplished otherwise. Public demand can bring this about. And, public demand and support for expenditure reduction can bring that about, too.

CONGRESS WILL ACCEDE TO YOUR DEMANDS

The principles and fundamentals which have made this a great Nation have been dangerously undermined in the past 30 years. But, great power still resides in the people. If you exert that power for sound government, the government will be made sound. If the people in this audience want sound and responsible tax reduction, you must use your power for expenditure reduction first.

As a Member of the Senate for 30 years, I can tell you that your Representatives and Senators will respond to your demand. Most Members of Congress want to vote for sound government. What is lacking too often is your support.

Sound and responsible tax reduction is an issue affecting every citizen. It can be had if expenditures are cut accordingly. If the public demands and supports sufficient expenditures reduction first, sound tax reduction will surely follow.

I greatly appreciate the opportunity of being on this program.

Dean MANION. Thank you, Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia.

I am sure that this convincing appeal for popular support in your fight for commonsense in the fiscal management of our Federal Government will bring an enthusiastic response from this audience.

I and millions of your fellow Americans are deeply grateful to you, sir, for your courageous and scholarly leadership in the truly desperate cause of a sound and solvent Government for the United States. Let me assure you that what you have said here today will be reprinted and repeated thousands of times throughout this country during this crucial congressional debate.

My friends, passage of Senator BYRD's pending Senate Resolution 12 will frustrate the economic "Pied Pipers of the Washington Wonderland" and nail down the solvency of this country once and for all. Remember what this distinguished and experienced Senator has said; namely, "If you exert your power for sound government the Government will be made sound."

Literally, this puts upon you and me and each of us a frightful but inescapable personal responsibility. In substance, Senator BYRD has said that, in the last analysis you are the director of the budget for the United States.

You hold the key to the U.S. Treasury. You can sell this country down the river of debts and deficits or you can save the solvency of the United States by making proper use of this great speech by Senator BYRD, now. This is the time for decision; what are you going to do about it?

Mrs. Martha Frances Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to salute a gracious and talented journalist from the Fifth District of Georgia. Mrs. Martha Frances Brown has distinguished herself in the field of journalism. As editor of the weekly newspapers, the Tri-County Graphic and the North De Kalb Record, Mrs. Brown has been the recipient of numerous awards.

Her latest award was presented by the Georgia Conference of Social Welware "in appreciation of Mrs. Brown's interest and concern for a local social problem and in recognition of her outstanding service in writing a series of articles in her community weekly newspaper." Mrs. Elizabeth Marshall, chairman of the conference journalism awards, made the presentation.

Mrs. Brown, who was cited in 1961 by the Dixie Business magazine for "public service in reporting," recently authored a series of articles dealing with the needs of Lynwood Park, an area in De Kalb County.

Mrs. Brown is a native of Atlanta and a graduate of the Henry W. Grady School of Journalism of the University of Georgia. She has been editor of the North De Kalb Record since 1948.

Other series written by Mrs. Brown deal with traffic and zoning problems, the need for accurate registration lists in various communities, the need for citizen participation in civic affairs, and many others directed at helping the communities served by her newspaper.

This recent series of stories written by Mrs. Brown is a fine example of the vitality of the weekly newspaper, the dedication of weekly editors, and the service that weeklies can perform.

Tribute to Prince Jonah Kalanianaole, of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. GILL

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, March 26, marked the 92d anniversary of the birth of Prince Jonah Kalanianaole who served as Delegate to the Congress of the United States from the Territory of Hawaii for nine successive terms from 1903 to 1922.

Prince Kuhio, as he was generally known, was not only an influential leader of his Hawaiian people but he was also a most effective representative of our new Pacific territory in its early and formative years. The Prince was a link with Hawaii's past; he had been a loyal supporter of the Hawaiian monarchy during the revolutionary troubles of the 1890's. It is greatly to his credit and his sense of statesmanship that he was able to translate his loyalty to an independent nation, the Kingdom of Hawaii, into long and effective representation of the new Territory of Hawaii in the Congress of the United States. Prince Kuhio was a link with the past, but he was also a prophet of the future; it was Kuhio in 1919 who introduced the first Hawaii statehood bill in the Congress.

In Hawaii Kuhio's memory is still bright, particularly among the older citizens—the kamaainas, if you will. One of the brightest accomplishments of Kuhio, in the memory of many, was his introduction and passage of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920. For years Kuhio had led the fight to put Hawaii's people back on the land that had been theirs to use in the ancient days. The Prince recognized the need, under modern Western society, for the independent freeholder. To own a bit of land on which to raise your family or from which to draw your sustenance, is a basic building block of the free American society.

Perhaps history will record that one of the tragic ironies of Prince Kuhio's political career was that he died before he could see his Hawaiian Homes Act put into effect. I am afraid history will also record that his crowning effort has not been used in the manner which he must have desired. Perhaps history will record that Kuhio's opponents, the large land users, have in the years since his death exercised influence over the administration of the law is such a way as to render its programs relatively ineffective. Kuhio's dream lives on, but its execution has lagged.

Now, in Hawaii, in the new State that Prince Kuhio envisioned, we live in a day removed from many of the political forces and tactics of 1920; yet many of the same problems still remain. The need for the freeholder is still with us in Hawaii. I hope that those of us in Hawaii who revere the memory of Prince Kuhio will apply his vision to the present day Hawaii and work all the harder to insure that all of Hawaii's people—and there are many more of them now—will be given their free American right to own the land on which their homes rest, and to make their way in a free and fluid economy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to digress for a moment from the mainstream of these remarks to note an action of this House today which relates in a very real way to the problem of land ownership in Hawaii, and in a very substantial way to the freeholder problem which bedeviled Prince Kuhio during much of his public life.

On this day the House has given final approval to H.R. 1597, sponsored by Congressman FRIEDEL. Certainly the Friedel bill has an indirect but definite effect on the unique and widespread leaseholding system in Hawaii. If the State of Hawaii passes a lease-redemption law similar to that in existence in the State of Maryland, H.R. 1597 will allow many residential leaseholders in Hawaii the right to deduct their lease payments in the same manner as they now deduct interest on a mortgage.

The passage of H.R. 1597 today gives great impetus to the passage of the Maryland-type ground rent law now before the Legislature of the State of Hawaii. Passage of this law will give the ever-growing number of residential leaseholders the option, enforced by statute, to buy the land on which their homes are built. It is not a radical measure; it provides for a slow, evolutionary development of fee-simple ownership of houselots; it adequately protects the rights of the large holders and will insure their receipt of compensation which in many cases will be hundreds of times what the land cost them in the first place.

The timing of the final passage of this bill in the first session of the House since the anniversary of Prince Kuhio's birth is both coincidental and fortuitous. History does not record how the Prince might have voted on this measure today, had he been able to vote. But history is replete with his many efforts to open the lands of Hawaii to homesteaders and to keep large tracts from being concentrated in the hands of those who would keep the people from owning and using the land. Kuhio's action in 1908 and 1910 in backing changes in the Hawaii Organic Act to facilitate homesteading, and his opposition to the appointment in 1911 of Governor Frear because of alleged maladministration of these homestead laws, are strong indications of his real concern for the fate of the freeholder of the need for the small man to own a portion of his native soil.

There have been many misuses in the history of our Territory and State of the memory of Prince Kuhio and the things for which he stood. Often the trustees of some of the large landholding entities have attempted to use the name of the native Hawaiians and the memory of their early leaders, such as Kuhio, to protect the narrow and selfish financial control that monopolistic landownership gives them. I do not want to be party to the misuse of Kuhio's memory today. However I do feel that in the context of history the Prince, were he living today, would applaud the passage of the Friedel measure and the encouragement it will give to the ownership of land by the small homeowner in his native Hawaii.

Thank you for an opportunity to pay homage to a great Hawaiian and a great leader of the Territory of Hawaii.

Administration and Other Comments on Obscene Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe the membership of the Congress will find of interest an exchange of correspondence in regard to the great problem in this country of controlling the pornographic and obscene material, especially as it pertains to young people.

A few days ago I had occasion to write to the President and to urge him to exert the great leadership which he has at his command in order to assist the many citizens and Government officials who are working in this area. A copy of my letter of March 7 follows and the reply from the administration is also printed.

Following this exchange of correspondence, I will include a copy of the latest report from Operation Yorkville, which is a communitywide nondenominational civic endeavor in New York City, which is aimed at stopping the flow of obscene literature. I would mention to my colleagues that Operation Yorkville and other similar groups across the country are very concerned about this problem, and they have pressed endorsement of two of the major bills in this field which I have had the privilege of sponsoring, H.R. 319 and H.R. 470.

March 7, 1963.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I am sure your office has been increasingly aware in recent months of the concern which Americans—especially parents—feel over the obscene material which passes through the mail or is distributed over and under the counter and which finds its way into the hands of our youth.

Indeed, your Attorney General just a few days ago met with leaders of one group which is dedicated to action in this field, Operation Yorkville, from New York City. I know there is concern within official circles over this problem.

As a member of the House Postal Operations Subcommittee and its ranking minority member for three Congresses, I am well aware of the work of the Post Office Department, Bureau of Customs, and Department of Justice. Unfortunately, there is a limit as to what can be accomplished by the most sincere and dedicated official, be he local, State or Federal. That limit is drawn by court decisions as to what constitutes obscene material. Increasingly in recent years, court decisions have allowed greater laxity and license in printed matter. I do not need to mention recent "literature" which has been held not obscene and thus mailable.

This problem is an acute one. Leading experts have testified that there is a direct causal relationship between obscene material and the startling increase in sex crimes and juvenile delinquency. J. Edgar Hoover has said, "We know that an overwhelmingly large number of sex crimes is associated with pornography. We know that sex criminals read it, are clearly influenced by it * * *. I believe that if we can eliminate the distribution of such items among impressionable school-age children, we shall greatly reduce our frightening sex-crime rate."

The late Dr. Benjamin Karpman, chief psychotherapist at St. Elizabeths Hospital, left no doubt as to his conclusions: "There is a very direct relationship between juvenile delinquency, sex crimes, and pornographic literature."

And finally, I refer to an appearance before the Postal Operations Subcommittee by Dr. Nicholas G. Frignito, medical director and chief neuropsychiatrist, county court of Philadelphia, in late 1961. He said: "In too many instances the increase in sexual offenses was traced to the persistent and constant exposure to obscenity in all media of communication. The reading of erotica is not a harmless psychological aphrodisiac; it is a serious danger and threat to morality."

These authorities are certainly competent enough to convince me that the control of obscene material will be a significant factor in the control of juvenile crime.

Thus the problem is that much material is allowed in the mails and on the newsstands legally, even though it offends the morals and sense of decency of nearly everyone. However, there is a remedy, and it is simply public opinion.

No publisher will stay in business, nor will his filthy wares be distributed or displayed when public opinon runs strongly against him. Committees of both Houses of Congress have cooperated with such groups as the Citizens for Decent Literature, church leaders, community groups such as Operation Yorkville, and anyone else who is willing to lend leadership in this fight.

I think that a strong statement by you, Mr. President, would be a vital part of this fight. As a parent, as a man of Christian training and background, as one who encourages the good literature of which we have an abundance available, and as the President of the United States, you have the opportunity available to no one else to encourage those who emphasize the good in literature and condemn the filth to the trash pile, to encourage the youth to ignore the peddlers of such filthy matter, and to set a climate which will encourage the courts to recognize the existing moral climate in this country is considerably higher than some rulings have seemed to indicate.

I believe it most appropriate to suggest that you send a special message to the Congress on this matter, encompassing legislative recommendations and calling attention to the scope of the problem, recommending at the least urgent study at all levels of government. In the event they will be of some use to you in this regard, I enclose copies of two bills I have sponsored in this field. The Commission approach is one which a number of Members of both Houses have favored, while the approach in H.R. 319 is one which grew out of hearings in the Postal Operations Subcommittee.

I appeal to you to examine this issue through your personal staff and through the departments of government, but to give serious thought to personal participation in the nationwide effort to end this traffic in filth. It has been said that pornographic material in the hands of the young is as dangerous as dope; one attacks the body, the other the mind.

With every good wish, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
Glenn Cunningham,
Member of Congress.

Executive Office of the President,
Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.

Hon. Glenn Cunningham,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Cunningham: This is in reply to your letter of March 7, 1963, to the President concerning the distribution of obscene material to young people.

As you recognize, the President and this administration have shared in the widespread awareness of the problem your letter deals with. Interested executive branch agencies are in the process of reviewing legislative proposals to deal with noxious and obscene material preparatory to reporting to the congressional committees concerned.

There are substantial differences of view, however, as to what organized efforts—governmental or private—should be undertaken to cope with the problem. This situation undoubtedly stems in part from the wide diffusion of responsibility for dealing with the problem; it is at once a matter of concern for families, community organizations and churches, State and local governments, and the Federal Government. In part, too, the differences grow out of the wide range of views as to what is "obscene and noxious," with questions of free speech, censorship, and civil liberties involved.

These concerns are, of course, as basic to our Nation and our society as the matters dealt with in your letter, and the continuing search for effective methods of dealing with the problem of obscenity must be carried on without jeopardy to our free institutions.

Thank you for your thoughtful views on this important subject.

Sincerely yours,
Phillip S. Hughes,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

Operation Yorkville,
New York, N.Y.

Operation Yorkville, the fast-paced New York City community campaign organized to combat the $2 billion "cesspool publication" racket, this week received the endorsement of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller.

In a letter to Rev. William T. Wood, S.J., cofounder of the movement along with Dr. Julius Neumann, rabbi of the Congregation Zichron Moshe, and Rev. Robert E. Wiltenburg, pastor of Immanuel Evangelical Lutheran Church, Governor Rockefeller said: "My sincere compliments to you and to all others engaged in the laudable purpose of Operation Yorkville. The vending of obscene literature is odious in the eyes of all civilized people and about as low an occupation as human greed can undertake. You are to be commended for your plan to conduct a campaign of moral suasion to remind citizens and storekeepers alike of their responsibilities to youth and parents of the vicinity."

New York City Police Commissioner Murphy also expressed interest in Operation Yorkville this week. At his invitation, a member of the executive committee of Operation Yorkville, attended a 1-hour meeting with the commissioner and his staff, at which they discussed the enforcement of existing antiobscenity laws.

Latest to offer Operation Yorkville cooperation is the New York County American Legion. Mr. Peter Massimino, chairman of the Americanism committee, said this week that his goal is to bring a resolution to the national convention of the American Legion, enlisting the support of over 3 million Legionnaires throughout the Nation.

Operation Yorkville's "Petition the President for Action" campaign, begun March 4 at a meeting of area community leaders, continues to gain in momentum. To date, thousands of letters and wires have been sent to the President, expressing shock at the massive waves of pornographic literature flooding America, informing him of the dangerous effects it is having on the physical and mental fitness of our youth, and the resultant anxiety of parents, and finally, urging him to action.

Latest to sign group telegrams were people attending Operation Yorkville meetings at Cornell Medical Center and Hunter College.

Mrs. Maude Greenwell Faris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I announce to the House the passing of one of the fine citizens of my home city in Ogden—Mrs. Maude Greenwell Faris.

Mrs. Faris died quietly at something after 2 o'clock Thursday morning, March 21, 1963. On February 24, friends and acquaintances had observed her 85th birthday. Her husband, the late Philip Arthur Faris, passed away in Ogden on February 24, 1954. As an Ogden businessman, he was well known to many.

In this day and age, I think we may be inclined to pass by over lightly the lesson and example to us all in the lives of such as Maude Greenwell Faris. Hers was not the eventful sort of earthly existence that moves quickly into the history books; instead, it was the quiet resolve of her life to live well with friends and neighbors, to be true mother to her family and abiding helpmate to her husband. At an early age, she was trained in music and for it and the rich bounties of her church she was always deeply grateful.

Her family—and particularly her mother—dared and faced much to make their home in Ogden, Utah. And I think it well to recall that the life span of Maude Greenwell Faris and her father covered a period of a century and a quarter.

Ambrose Greenwell was born September 29, 1838, in Dunton-Bassett, Leicestershire, England where generations of Greenwells had lived before him. His wife—Elizabeth Brinkley Hill, was born July 29, 1835, at Wolverhampton, not far distant. At Walsall in Staffordshire he was baptized at the age of 19 into the Church of Latter-day Saints—the Mormon Church. In 1855 he was ordained an elder. His wife had been baptized at an earlier age—14. They were married in 1853.

In 1854 the young couple came to the United States and for 4½ years lived in Philadelphia. There they met two Utah emissaries, William H. Wright and Carl G. Maeser, who were instrumental in their moving West.

At White Cloud, Mo., a son was born to Elizabeth Hill Greenwell. Four weeks later, their party started west across the plains to Utah—under direction of Capt. James "Big Jim" Brown. Carrying her child and with her 3-year-old son at her side, she walked the entire distance—900 miles—arriving with her husband and party in Salt Lake City on August 28, 1859.

Her husband—Ambrose Greenwell—was a familiar figure in Ogden business circles thereafter for nearly 40 years. He opened a meat market there in 1860. His business prospered and in 1869 he built a two-story brick business building, the Greenwell Market. He died on October 27, 1898, and is buried at Ogden.

Of their children, Maude Greenwell was born February 24, 1878. She attended local schools. Soon after her 20th birthday, on May 3, 1898, she married Philip Arthur Faris, an Idaho Falls, Idaho, businessman. After their marriage she went to live for a time in Idaho Falls where Mr. Faris was in the employ of the banking and general merchandise firm of Anderson Brothers. Thereafter, the couple removed to Ogden. Mr. Faris, as a buyer for the firm of Taylor-Wright, in Ogden, was well known for his attentive, businesslike and gentle ways. He had many friends.

Mr. Faris' people had long been residents of the United States. He himself was born at Time in Pike County, Ill., July 13, 1873, a son of Elijah Faris—who served in an Illinois regiment with Union forces later prominent in the siege of Vicksburg, Miss. Elijah Faris was born near Georgetown, Brown County, Ohio, an area in which members of his family had been resident since before 1778 when that region was a portion of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

Philip Arthur and Maude Greenwell Faris were blessed with many children and grandchildren. To them all I have expressed the sympathy—in their most recent loss—of this House.

Among the surviving children is Mrs. Leonard Davidson of 560 24th Street, Ogden, Utah. Mr. and Mrs. Davidson have been outstanding members of my hometown. Mr. Davidson was a conscientious member of the Ogden Board of Education for many years, during which time great strides forward were made in building new schools and in the improvement of teaching. He also has been and is now very active in the Weber County Safety Committee, which has done much to promote good safety practices in our area.

Among the recent staff employees of the U.S. Senate is a member of Mrs. Faris' family. George W. Seidl, who formerly served on the staff of Senator Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah, is the husband of Louise Hoggan Seidl, whose mother—Mrs. Ellis R. Hoggan, of 1324 Walcott Street, Ogden, Utah—is the former Marjorie J. Faris, a daughter of Philip Arthur and Maude Greenwell Faris.

Bishop Oxnam: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, America recently lost one of its most eminent clergymen, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam. His death creates a void in the ranks of the progressive churchmen of this Nation. No one will be able to match the dedication with which he worked for the highest principles of Christian brotherhood and social reform.

A complete list of Bishop Oxnam's interests, activities, and honors would probably fill an entire page in this Record. Therefore, I shall only briefly outline some of his major accomplishments. He was a native Californian, studied at the University of Southern California, and was ordained in 1916. Shortly thereafter, he founded the Church of All Nations in Los Angeles and was its pastor and director for 10 years. During this time he taught at his alma mater and later at Boston University. He became president of De Pauw University in 1928 and served in that capacity for 8 years. In 1936 he became the youngest bishop in the Methodist Church, at 44. He was successively bishop in Omaha, Boston, New York, and Washington.

During his 8 years in Washington, Bishop Oxnam performed some of his finest services to his church. He took a special interest in American University and it made some of its greatest strides under his leadership. At his urging, the School of International Service was established and the Westminster (Md.) Theological Seminary relocated on the campus of the university, where it is now known as Wesley Seminary. In recognition of Bishop Oxnam's work in its behalf, the chapel of the seminary is named for him.

The bishop devoted his life to the goals of the Methodist Church and played an important role in many of the organizations which advanced them. He served as president of the World Council of Churches, vice president of the National Council of Churches, and president of the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church.

Despite being engaged in a wide range of activities, Bishop Oxnam never lost touch with the human problems of his congregation. His concern with these matters and the energy with which he tackled them are shown by the fact that during his first 2 years as bishop in Washington he visited each of the 1,700 ministers in the Middle Atlantic States area.

Bishop Oxnam was a fearless and forthright advocate for the causes in which he believed. He was a stanch defender of individual freedom. As such, he was an ardent foe of the House Un-American Activities Committee. He was attacked by the committee and demanded a hearing to refute the charges against him. This hearing was held on July 21, 1953, and lasted far into the night. In his statement, Bishop Oxnam pointed out that the committee, by issuing unverified and unevaluated releases and then refusing to accept responsibility for the accuracy of these statements violated basic principles of honesty and fair dealing. He also objected to the false and biased manner in which the information concerning him had been compiled.

One of Bishop Oxnam's friends related a story to me about his appearance before the committee which illustrates how this man imbued all those around him with his righteousness and zeal. When the committee recessed for dinner, the bishop took a taxi to a nearby restaurant. When he left the restaurant a short while later, the same taxi was waiting to return him to the hearing. When Bishop Oxnam asked the driver why he had waited for him, the driver replied that he knew that the bishop was testifying before the committee and thought that he might need some support. He said that since the bishop was speaking for him and millions of others, he felt that this was the least he could do. The driver refused to accept any payment for the ride back to the hearing.

Bishop Oxnam completely cleared himself of every charge against him and finally, at 12:20 the next morning, on motion of my recently deceased colleague, Congressman Doyle, the committee voted unanimously that its records show that Bishop Oxnam "has no record of any Communist Party membership or affiliation."

After 44 years of service, Bishop Oxnam retired in 1960. I can find no more fitting summation of his life and work than the words of his successor in Washington, Bishop John Wesley Lord. He said that Bishop Oxnam was "one of the 'summit souls' with whom God on occasion blesses mankind."

Managed News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion concerning the news policy of this administration. Many of us are convinced the American public has been misled by spokesmen for this administration in repeated efforts to present the most favorable image through a tightly managed news policy.

The gentleman from Kansas, Hon. William Avery, discussed managed news, completely and objectively, at a recent meeting of the Kansas Federation of Collegiate Young Republicans, March 2, at Hutchinson, Kans. I submit his remarks for the benefit of those who may be interested in the right to know:

Managed News

Each mistake the Kennedy administration has made could very well be the subject matter of a full-length speech and would further provide enough topics for a speech every day for the remainder of the New Frontier—January 1965. I can tell you for sure that there are quite a number of Republicans in Washington, and I think across the Nation, who intend to point out these blunders to the voters and taxpayers of America. It is always the responsibility of the minority to point out policy differences and philosophical diversities from the majority party. This is not just to be partisan for the sake of being partisan, but to give the voters in a democracy a clear choice on issues.

In the last few months of the Kennedy administration, this responsibility becomes almost awesome because of the almost successful attempt of the Kennedy administration to manage and sometimes misrepresent the news. This operation of news management did not suddenly commence, as it was initially just a projection of the magnificent job of public relations and selling that was done on candidate Kennedy himself in the 1960 election. With the services of some most intelligent and resourceful public relations representatives, the Kennedy family image was projected widely and favorably to the people of this Nation. The campaign managers did not overlook one small opportunity, all the way from Caroline's admittedly attractive appearance, even to the President's appearing forceful in a rocking chair. The latter accomplishment, I assure you, required a great deal of skill.

This very cozy and admittedly effective public relations presentation of the New Frontiersmen suddenly lost some luster after the Cuban invasion but took a different turn during the tense moments last fall during the Cuban crisis. On October 30, Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, told reporters that "news flowing from actions taken by the Government is part of the weaponry." Reducing this combination of words down to an understandable premise means that the Kennedy family had decided it is quite all right for them to use the dignity and the official news media from the White House to portray or to indicate a favorable result or conclusion as justified in the interests of national security.

Now at the outset, I think we will all recognize that certainly it is not in the best interest of our Nation during an emergency to make all information and intelligence known to news sources and thereby to our adversaries. This is just as axiomatic as not revealing a bridge hand to your opponents. But you don't want a bridge partner who indicates he was dealt aces when they were indeed only "jacks." In times of war or even during international bargaining, it is obviously necessary to reveal only as much information as can be helpful in obtaining the objective that is being sought. This is a much different context, however, than misrepresenting what now appear to have been well-known facts, not only to our adversaries, but to the American people themselves.

It is perhaps more dignified to refer to this manipulation as "managed" news, but managed news in many instances is misrepresented news. If the question has presented itself as to what I am referring, there are quite a number of known instances of so-called managed news, and it appears that each day there is being revealed another basic incident associated with the Cuban crisis whereby the American people were not told the truth.

You will recall the controversy over the air cover that was alleged to have been promised the Cuban invaders on their ill-fated mission at the Bay of Pigs. The official Pentagon news sources were rather vague as to whether or not air cover had been promised, and who called it off at the critical hour. Then recently, Attorney General Robert Kennedy took it upon himself to announce to the Nation that no air cover had been promised. A careful review of all the incidents revealed that he was trying to misrepresent the whole incident by a play on words. "Air cover" for the invading troops apparently had not been assured, but at least two air strikes preceding the invasion to disable Castro's aircraft had been promised. One was made. It is the opinion of most observers in Washington that the effect of calling off the second air strike permitted Castro's small air force to riddle the invaders as they attempted to land on the beach.

And then you have learned just this week, not from the White House, not from the Pentagon, or not from any official source, but from Senator Dirksen, the minority leader of the Senate, that four American pilots were killed in this poorly managed operation. Again, the New Frontier made no mention of American citizens being involved until this announcement was made, and then it was confirmed by Majority Leader Mansfield.

You are generally familiar with the successive allegations by Senator Keating last fall and again this month over the extent of the Communist military strength in Castro's Cuba. It can be categorically stated that Senator Keating's charges were immediately denied by White House sources, but then subsequently admitted to be generally true. I do not believe that our official intelligence sources, either the Central Intelligence Agency or any branch of the service, is so inefficient or so incapable of performance that this same information would not have been known to the administration spokesmen. If our military intelligence is so inept, it needs a complete reorganization. It is a sad state of affairs when information that finally affects our very national security must be obtained from voluntary and unofficial sources, and we are told that these facts were not known to the military or to the policymakers in the administration.

This list could be added onto almost indefinitely. But the important point that I want to make is that now responsible people in the Washington press corps, as well as a large number of Members of the House and of the Senate, are not sure how to interpret any official administration announcement. This should not be interpreted as being only a partisan point of view, and I am the first to confess that I personally hope it is a conclusion that has been reached by many persons with no political affiliation. It has been commented upon by one very close to the Kennedy family themselves.

Arthur Krock was chief of the Washington bureau for the New York Times for 21 years. Mr. Krock is the recipient of two Pulitzer prizes and a citation that is equivalent to a third. He described himself as "absolutely personally fond of President Kennedy and a long-time friend of the entire Kennedy family." Despite this personal attachment to the Kennedys, his professional ethics prompted him to speak out last week. In a cynical statement, he denounced the attempt to manage news by President John F. Kennedy and his associates. The Associated Press quoted him as saying "that the weapon of news management has been improperly used to inflate success or gloss over error in the aftermath of half-won showdowns—such as President Kennedy's with respect to the Soviet rearmament of Cuba." Mr. Krock further accuses Mr. Kennedy of creating a false impression last fall that a balanced budget was in prospect. He charges administration officials with anonymous prevarication on such subjects as the balance-of-payments problem, which Krock says is "visibly growing worse."

Mr. Krock is critical of the working press themselves for being overwhelmed by this unorthodox operation. He completed his criticism by saying that "for any degree to which this project has been successful, the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself."

These are very serious indictments indeed, and similar charges were apparently brushed off by most persons as the usual political criticism until the cryptic article by the senior New York Times reporter. This had caused quite a lot of reflection on the part of Members of Congress, and I think the working Washington press corps.

This criticism, supplemented by a Republican comment, has not taken place without results. The first printed report was that a retreat had been arranged by White House Secretary Pierre Salinger and representatives of the working press and organizations representing the various news media. This so-called retreat is to take place next week, and I understand that this is an attempt on the part of White House policymakers to either explain or apologize to the press for the apparent arrogance of White House and administration spokesmen. I thought there was an amusing note in the press release. Although we have a committee in the House known as the Moss "Right To Know Committee," the administration wants these representatives of all news media gathered for a briefing session, for which, it was announced, "No news coverage permitted." In other words, if the administration has a confession to make, they want to make it on a classified basis and not confess their mistakes to the public.

When I left Washington, the last episode in this rather sordid tale was an answer from the assistant White House press secretary to a question if Mr. Kennedy had any expletives to announce after reading the Arthur Krock story. The press secretary's reply was "Yes, but I wouldn't want to pass them on to you." The word expletive was a new one to me, but its meaning was rather clear from the way it was employed in this story. To confirm my interpretation of it, I did refer to the dictionary. As you might imagine, the explanation was an "oath" or "exclamation." In other words, the President was not favorably impressed by the

comments made about his administration's responsibility in the news, even from a personal friend.

There is one further facet to this entire matter that I think should be mentioned in connection with the management of news. You have read for the past several weeks of the objection of administration spokesmen to the criticism of responsible Republicans on the handling of the Cuban debacle, the breakdown of the Common Market negotiations, and the obvious meddling of Mr. Kennedy in the affairs of our neighbor Canada. You have read that the Republicans are urged not to be critical of the foreign policy of this administration and to adhere to the principle of a bipartisan foreign policy that allegedly has been the practice since World War II.

Now in theory, this sounds rather commendable indeed, as we would like to believe the old axiom that our political differences in this country stop "at the water's edge." This would certainly be an ideal situation, if it could be attained, and under certain circumstances it could become a reality. On every major foreign policy decision during the Eisenhower administration, responsible leaders of the Democratic Party were briefed and consulted with before a decision had been finally reached or an announcement had been finally made. Under such a procedure, there would be a bipartisan or a nonpartisan foreign policy, because the minority would have had some responsibility in developing this policy. Just because the leaders of the House and Senate are called down to the White House to be advised of a major foreign policy action a few minutes before it is given to the press, does not make it a bipartisan foreign policy in any sense of the word, but only a slight consideration in deference to their position for information.

Since the development and administration of foreign policy is the prerogative of the Executive under the Constitution, I can find no fault with the present practice of this administration. But if it is to be made solely by the majority party, then the majority party and its leaders must take full responsibility and not expect to be immune to criticisms for blunders.

And I wonder how long are the memories of some Democrats. You might get the impression from reading news releases from Washington that criticism of the Kennedy mistakes in the field of foreign policy is something entirely new in national politics. If our memories were no longer than theirs, we might initially feel that we had become overly partisan and that our criticism was not in good taste nor in the public interest. Just let me comment that the mighty elephant was not chosen for our party simply by mere accident. Elephants are reputed to have long and accurate memories, and so it is the Republicans who recognize them as their emblems. With this capacity to remember, I would like to submit to you some examples of Democratic bipartisan support of foreign policy previous to and during the 1960 election campaign. Here are just a few:

1. Advisory Council of the Democratic National Committee, May 5, 1957: "The Eisenhower-Dulles administration of our foreign affairs has substituted improvisations for policy, appeasement for leadership, posturing for deeds and advertising slogans for information."

2. John F. Kennedy, New York, October 20, 1960: "* * * under Republican leadership our prestige has fallen so low that our Latin American allies are no longer willing to follow our leadership in the fight against communism in this hemisphere."

3. Adlai Stevenson, May 20, 1960, to a Cook County Democratic Committee dinner: "But we handed Khrushchev the crowbar and the sledge hammer to wreck the meeting. Without our series of blunders, Mr. Khrushchev would not have had a pretext for making his impossible demand and wild charges. Let there be no mistake about that either."

4. Chicago Tribune, shortly after the U-2 incident, quoted Senator Fulbright:

"The American Government's 'attitude of smug self-righteousness,' following disclosure of the U-2 episode, in Fulbright's opinion, 'must have been unbearably provocative to the Soviet Government and contributed substantially to the violent and intemperate bad manners of Khrushchev in Paris.' "

And I have documentation of many other such examples.

Although this is obviously a political meeting and this is a political speech, I want to summarize as an American citizen.

The danger to American institutions has not historically come from a political campaign nor a political wrangling that takes place during any administration. This has been the history of our democratic system since it was founded almost 200 years ago. The real danger that I see from the distortion and management of news that has become a symbol of this administration is that such manipulation could very easily mark the beginning to the end of a constitutional guarantee, the freedom of the press. It is a fine line indeed that separates suppression of news, management of the news, and official propaganda doctrine. I would hope and I feel confident that the ethical and moral responsibility of the working press will restore reliable and free news reporting to all the conventional news media and that one of the great institutions of America, freedom of the press, will be restored to its rightful position in the conscience of this Nation.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—Congressional Record, volume 107, part 3, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3518–3544.

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the Record:

March 12, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: We would like it to be on record that we strongly urge you to submit to your committee and vote in favor of the Flood resolution (House Resolution 14). The captive nations that are enslaved under Russia certainly could use any support from our country.

A special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would be invaluable.

Please give the Flood resolution your support.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
American-Ukrainian Citizens Club.
Stamford, Conn.

Hartford, Conn., *March 12, 1963.*

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: I am taking the liberty in urging you to submit the Flood resolution (House Resolution 14) to vote by your committee.

A Committee on Captive Nations will play an important role to counteract Soviet propaganda in regard to equality of human and religious rights of nations now oppressed by Russian imperialism.

Guided by the importance of such a committee, may I ask for your favorable support to the Flood resolution.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
Myron W. Zielyk, Ph. D.

March 12, 1963.

Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: In the interest of the Ukrainian Congress Committee Branch in Cohoes, I earnestly ask you to favorably consider the Flood Resolution (House Resolution 14). A Committee on Captive Nations is very important for us, Americans, at the present time, when everywhere Communistic Russia has been calling for "national liberation" in Africa and Asia. We, as a democratic power, have not done everything in our ability to aid the enslaved non-Russian nations in their fight for greater freedom.

A Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would indeed help to supply much needed information concerning the status and want of independence among the captive nations. Added sources of knowledge have proven to be of great value in this particular branch of work.

Therefore, we once again urge you, Congressman Smith, to consider and support the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
Julian Bachynsky,
Secretary, Congress Committee Branch in Cohoes.
Michael Kuchar,
President, Ukrainian Congress Committee Branch in Cohoes.

St. Louis, Mo., *February 14, 1963.*
Congressman Daniel Flood,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Flood: I would like to receive from you information re Permanent Captive Nations Committee and a résumé, if possible, of any action (effective action) which has been taken to free these slaves of the international Communist conspiracy, almost one billion of them.

What is the present status of the Permanent Captive Nations Committee? Who are the members?

Thank you very much.

Very truly yours,

D. Grant.

St. Paul, Minn., *March 15, 1963.*
Hon. Howard Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: I am writing to you in regards to the House Resolution 14, presented by Congressman Daniel J. Flood. I strongly urge you to present this resolution before your committee with your favorable comment.

We know that Soviet Russia is our enemy. In order to combat the enemy, we must know him, his weaknesses especially. Recent information and statements emanating from our State Department showed such an abysmal ignorance in this respect that it is simply appalling. We cannot win the cold war with such a knowledge of our enemy.

An objective and impartial study conducted by the Congressional Committee on Captive Nations will supply the sorely needed information which will be of a great help to our State Department in forming a dynamic and winning foreign policy.

I sincerely urge you, dear Congressman Smith, to submit the House Resolution 14 to vote in your committee with your favorable support.

Sincerely yours,

Myrna H. Haydak.

Dear Congressman Flood: I think that all who understand the actual situation in Eastern Europe, deeply appreciate your interest in the question of captive nations. The only way to avoid becoming a "captive nation" ourselves is to study the questions and to form a real winning policy.

Most sincerely,

M. H. Haydak.

Hartford, Conn., *March 11, 1963.*
Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: In the name of our 250 members we are taking liberty to urge you to submit the Flood resolution (House Resolution 14) to vote by your committee and to give it your favorable opinion.

Your qualified support to the Flood resolution, Mr. Chairman, will be most gratefully appreciated. We thank you.

Respectfully yours,
Ukrainian American Citizen Club in Hartford.

Pittsfield, Mass., *March 18, 1693.*
Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: A Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would give our people—our country—the unbiased truth on the submerged nations, which will be of enormous aid in carrying out foreign and worldwide policy, in turn to make this world a better place to live in.

We, the undersigned, urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to a vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration.

Respectfully yours,

Ukrainian National Association Brotherhood No. 150: Walter J. Huska, President; John Tormesosky, Secretary; Wierj Saurij, Stanley Smichesko, John Nipordnt, Stephen Nekorhuk, Mrs. Anna Smichesko, Thomas Kinnas, Rev. G. Ans Whaj, Michael W. Janewyy, Walter W. Kopychak.

March 19, 1963.
Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dan: Thank you so much for sending me the booklet on the 45th anniversary of the Ukraine's independence, and I surely will make every effort to be on the floor on March 27 when you discuss the resolutions proposing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

With warm personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

D. R. Matthews,
Member of Congress.

Philanthropic Contributions by One American Corporation, the Polish National Alliance, Have Benefited American Education in the Amount of More Than $5 Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
of
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
of illinois
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is generally agreed among the people of our Nation that our greatest single resource for the continuance of democracy is the intellectual capacity of our Nation's citizens.

We Americans have developed institutions of higher learning which not only manifest the culture of America but also are a source of inspiration throughout the world.

I am very proud to call my colleagues' attention to the fact that the Polish National Alliance, the largest Polish-American fraternal organization in the world, which has its headquarters in Chicago but which has local chapters in virtually every community of the United States, has contributed more than $5 million to Alliance College, which is supported by the Polish National Alliance, in Cambridge Springs, Pa.

This vast contribution by the Polish National Alliance to maintain an excellent institution of higher learning should be a source of satisfaction to all Americans. Through its efforts to help Alliance College, the Polish National Alliance manifests an abiding desire to help maintain educational standards in the United States unequaled anywhere in the world. These impressive contributions by the Polish National Alliance reflect again what a tremendous impact this imposing organization has exerted on the development of our Nation.

The Polish National Alliance stands as a beacon for Americans of Polish descent to help guide them to those attributes which have made America a citadel of hope for people throughout the world.

Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish National Alliance, and Mr. Edward Kozmor, censor of this fine fraternal organization, have worked arduously toward helping Alliance College become one of the finest institutions of higher learning in America. The entire membership of the Polish National Alliance joins these two dedicated officers in helping provide young Americans these impressive educational opportunities in a setting just south of Erie, Pa., which inspires great appreciation of nature's beauty.

Alliance College lies in a lovely valley of the Allegheny Mountains. Before World War II the free Government of Poland sent thousands of evergreen saplings which have grown into giant trees and transform the entire Alliance College campus into a virtual wonderland. It is in this beautiful setting blessed by nature that students pursue their intellectual curiosities.

Alliance College stands today as a living monument to the high ideals espoused by the Polish National Alliance and its membership. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that the early Polish settlers who landed with Captain Smith in Jamestown in 1608 would have found great pride in knowing that some day their successors on the American Continent would make such an impressive contribution to the educational and cultural growth of America.

Following is a list of contributions made by the Polish National Alliance to Alliance College. From the time the college was founded until 1929, the Polish National Alliance had given the college $1,595,190.58. Annual gifts thereafter amounted to:

1930	119, 985. 78
1931	124, 496. 28
1932	124, 377. 04
1933	116, 149. 70
1934	116, 995. 60
1935	110, 946. 34
1936	133, 449. 21
1937	126, 229. 58
1938	129, 032. 77
1939	122, 814. 03
1940	82, 240. 37
1941	76, 497. 72
1942	76, 143. 68
1943	80, 511. 33
1944	81, 486. 93
1945	83, 894. 03
1946	85, 588. 14
1947	83, 816. 48
1948	135, 208. 75
1949	78, 650. 07
1950	80, 515. 73
1951	92, 249. 08
1952	123, 079. 46
1953	119, 069. 70
1954	119, 161. 12
1955	115, 732. 92
1956	164, 026. 69
1957	113, 713. 40
1958	108, 363. 24
1959	109, 360. 24
1960	128, 765. 08
1961	126, 244. 50
1962	143, 027. 05
Total from 1912 through Dec. 31, 1962	5, 227, 012. 62

This impressive list of contributions clearly demonstrates how one American corporation, composed largely of the sons and daughters of immigrants from Poland, contributed to America's educational needs. I trust we can all agree that so long as private corporations such as the Polish National Alliance continue contributing toward the educational needs of this country, our future is secure. Only through intellectual achievement can Americans demonstrate to the people of the world that indeed our system of government offers the greatest degree of hope for mankind.

Deepest Regret and a Great Loss Is Felt by All Veterans and Members of the American Legion in the Passing of a Truly Great American, "Brad" Taylor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
of
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
of louisiana
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I was grieved to learn of the sudden death of Bradley R. Taylor, of Rhinelander, Wis., who during his lifetime probably contributed more than any other Legionnaire to the success and influence of the American Legion. It has been my extreme good fortune to have known and have the wonderful opportunity to be associated with this outstanding American for more than the 20 years that I have been in Congress.

Throughout our association I developed a great affection, a great respect, and a great admiration for him as a leader and champion of our American way of life. He was one of the most unselfish human beings I have ever known, and he worked hard at his private business for twofold purpose: to take care of the financial needs of his family, and next to provide for his expenses involved in devoting a great deal of time and effort to helping the American Legion and thereby being extremely beneficial in assisting all veterans in their many and varied problems. His work with the Legion was one of dedication. It was his main interest and actually his whole life.

He traveled constantly, anywhere and everywhere, in all parts of the United States to further the American Legion and served on many of its most important committees.

He was one of the most modest and generous persons I have ever known, never wanting anything for himself but always wanting to further the work of the American Legion and the veterans of the United States. He was held in the highest esteem by his fellow Legionnaires not only in Wisconsin but throughout the United States. Among those with whom he was closely associated in Legion Work was Col. Roscoe Turner, one of the most famous fliers of all times, Hon. Louis Johnson, former Secretary of Defense, Hon. Monroe Johnson, former Chairman of Interstate Commerce Commission, Gen. Louis Renfrow, Hon. Earl Cocke, past national commander, now a member of the World Bank as U.S. representative, former Congressman Tom Miller, of Reno, Nev., and countless other Legion officials and great Americans.

While he was always doing something for someone, working unceasingly for the American Legion, he was made an honorary colonel and honorary citizen by the Governors of the States of Kentucky, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Texas, Indiana, and Louisiana. In Wisconsin, he was a member of the Wisconsin Aeronautics Board, a member of several governmental boards, and a delegate in 1958 to the White House Conference on National Security.

Brad Taylor was born in Rhinelander, Wis., in 1895 and attended public schools there, following which he attended the University of Kansas and the University of Wisconsin. His high sense of patriotism and love for his country was clearly demonstrated when with only one semester remaining to obtain his college degree, he left college and volunteered in the Army in World War I ending up with a very distinguished and outstanding record. Throughout his life this attribute characterized his every official act in public and private life.

Where the United States or the American Legion was involved, no job was too small or too large for Brad Taylor to attempt. Some of his accomplishments were not only outstanding but amazing and when he thought he was right, he had the tenacity of a bulldog to fight his way to an ultimate and successful conclusion.

The American Legion, Rhinelander, Wis., and the United States will miss Brad Taylor as well as many of my colleagues who knew him intimately. We will all miss him, his inspiration, his love of life, his devotion to his family and friends, his courage, his integrity, his effervescent personality, and his diligent efforts in behalf of the American Legion, the organization which he truly loved.

When I attended his funeral recently in Rhinelander, Wis., he was mourned by hundreds of his townspeople and his many colleagues with whom he was associated in the Congregational Church, the Masonic Lodge, the Elks, the Rotary Club, the American Legion, the Disabled Veterans of America, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mrs. Morrison and I extend to his lovely and devoted wife, his 2 sons and daughter, and his 11 grandchildren our deepest sympathy with a feeling that the many wonderful memories of Brad Taylor will live on forever and be a constant source of comfort to them in the days to come.

Having the friendship of Brad Taylor not only has been a great inspiration that has made me a better Congressman than I would have been, but his friendship over the years had a great influence on me, made me a better man. I know that he has affected so many in the same respect. As I look back over his life, and realize the great love and devotion for his family, his amazing capacity for friendship for so many people, and his years of unselfish devotion and work for the American Legion, I feel that he has certainly earned the title of not only a great American, but justifiably could be given the title of "Mr. American Legion."

Of him and others like Brad Taylor a poet once said:

> Lives of great men all remind us
> We can make our lives sublime,
> And, departing, leave behind us
> Footprints on the sands of time.

Nothing More Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
of
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
of ohio
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the longstanding events in connection with the annual St. Patrick's Day observance in Cleveland, Ohio, is the civic luncheon given under the auspices of the Irish Good Fellowship Club. It was my pleasure to address that gathering of outstanding Cleveland citizens on March 17.

Under leave previously granted, I insert in the Congressional Record the address I delivered on that occasion:

> It is the custom of the Irish, when in clan encamped, to speak with candor and frankness, to examine the state of Irish affairs, and to recognize the dangers to the commonweal.
>
> We are now in clan encamped. A happy St. Patrick's Day is the password and I pass it to all here gathered, sons of the clan and their friends.
>
> The state of Irish affairs in the American encampment reflects a steady advancement of our welfare, of our opportunities, and of our hopes. With this goes a corresponding increase in our responsibilities for all those things that have made our life in the United States such a full and happy one. We accept those increased responsibilities in the same spirit that we accept the many blessings of life in the United States. We Irish have learned well that the good life must be earned and it cannot be maintained without a willingness to sacrifice and to participate actively in the conduct of our public affairs.
>
> It is timely to recall that the Irish began to participate in our public affairs at the earliest point in the history of our Nation. A quick look at the Revolutionary War period will reveal that at least one-third of Washington's Army was composed of Irish volunteers.
>
> The Irish have always had an unbreakable attachment to the cause of human freedom. The teachings of St. Patrick left upon them the strongest marks of Christian tradition and it was only natural that their feelings about the rights of all men to be free should be foremost in their attitude towards all things. The Irish came to the United States to secure freedom, denied them in their homeland by an alien occupier. They were quick to identify themselves with freedom's cause in the United States where opportunity was given to them and to all others to exercise it. This they recognized as the greatest asset of our country and their dedication to it has been complete in each generation. And the Irish contribution to our Nation has been noteworthy in peace as well as war.
>
> Life in the United States was not always ideal for the Irish. When the heaviest waves of Irish immigrants reached our

shores, a wave of discrimination and exploitation broke out against them. On the whole, they were improverished people—many were illiterate, having been denied the opportunity of learning by the alien occupier of their homeland. This made them objects of exploitation. At the peak of this particular period, employment opportunities of the Irish were limited by a campaign of prejudice. This took the form of public notices known as NINA—meaning—no Irish need apply.

Under these adverse circumstances the Irish did not call out for legislation to remove this prejudice. They did not ask to be recognized as a martyred minority. They did not cry out discrimination at every turn, rather, they set out to prove their worth to the Nation. They wove their worth into the fabric of our Nation and they won by the sweat of their brows the right of equal opportunity, which is all any real Irishman ever asked for because that was all he ever needed.

The harder the Irish were pressed or abused—yes, persecuted, the greater became their mark on any country to which they emigrated, and the countries are many. The United States is no exception to their truism of history.

Those who contemplate an attack or assault upon the Irish because of their heritage would do well to remember this lesson of history, and let us, as Irish, never forget that if we grow soft and too contented with our lot, unmindful of our public responsibilities, that assault will surely follow.

Human freedom, so dear to the heart of the Irish, is in serious jeopardy throughout the world today. Indeed we are witnessing a world crisis in which the forces of organized paganism are seeking to overthrow all civilized life and to turn back the pages of history to the age of barbarians. This threat emanates from Moscow, the historic seat of despotism which has threatened the existence of Christian Europe for over five centuries.

The world of our times moves from crisis to crisis. First it is Greece and Turkey, then Berlin, then it is Korea, then it is Vietnam, and now it is Cuba. The United States has been called upon to defend the cause of freedom on farflung fronts. Until recent years that struggle seemed a long way from our shores. There was a tranquility and a comfort of peace in the Western Hemisphere which no other part of the world enjoyed. Now that peace and tranquility has been broken by the Russian occupation of Cuba and the direct threat which this poses to all the nations in the Western Hemisphere.

Let us make no mistake about this problem—Cuba is a threat to the security of the United States. The Russians have now established a military, political, espionage, and propaganda beachhead on all the affairs of the Western Hemisphere. That threat can not long be tolerated.

When the Russians were caught redhanded in Cuba, President Kennedy met this challenge head on. A sea and air blockade of Cuba accompanied his demand that the Russians forthwith withdraw from their Cuban beachhead. The United States was fully prepared to face any consequences resulting from this action and President Kennedy warned the Russians that any attempt on their part to use their Cuban missiles against the United States or any nation of the Western Hemisphere would be met with a full retaliatory response on the Soviet Union. It is no exaggeration to say the President's stand thoroughly frightened the Russians whose only real strength is bluff and blackmail. That is why they lost no time in admitting their treacherous act and in promising to withdraw their military equipment and forces from Cuba under open, onsite inspection. It was clear in a matter of 48 hours that the United States had won a decisive victory over the Russians, that the Russian bluff could not be backed up, that their bluster of rattling atomic bombs was as phony as all their other claims.

When the victory was won, when we should have picked up all the marbles, the voices of accommodation, of weakness, and of fainthearted men, argued that the door should be left open for the Russians to make a facesaving retreat. Those voices prevailed in the councils of Government and the victory won slipped away as the Russians used the door, opened for their graceful retreat, as a means of solidifying their position in Cuba and to default on their promises made when all the chips were down.

Two weeks ago former President Truman made this astute observation about the manner in which President Kennedy handled the Cuban crisis. I quote: "It again smoked out the Russian capacity for bluff and their hit-and-run type of international piracy." The Russian empire is weak. It is shot through with internal tensions. Ninety million Russians are sitting atop an empire which is a powder keg ready to explode from the human force of the several hundred million non-Russian captives within it.

The Russian pagans try desperately to hide their vulnerabilities from Western eyes. That is why they carry on a massive propaganda program of bluff and buster. That propaganda program is devoted to war, the threat of war and the specter of thermonuclear desolation. The Russians believe they can frighten the councils of free men, that they can impose upon our Nation a political paralysis marked by indecision, fear to take risks and a willingness to accept accommodation with evil. In my judgment the dangers of political paralysis of freemen are far more serious than the dangers of a nuclear war. Today we possess what has been demonstrated to be a frightening superiority over the Russian pagans. But we have yet to demonstrate our willingness to use this power as a shield for political action calculated to ignite the human powder keg on which the Russian empire rests.

President Kennedy is not only confronted by the Russian druids in the Kremlin, he is also confronted with a beachhead of Russian druids in our State Department. The Russian druids in Washington have openly defended the right of the Russian pagans to persecute the Christian nations of eastern Europe. They have denied, as a matter of policy, the right of national self-determination to many great eastern European Christian nations now in Russian bondage. Specifically, I refer to Ukraine, Georgia, and Armenia. Concurrently, these same druids of American foreign policy are asking that the great Christian nations of central Europe such as captive Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Czechoslovakia and others seek an accommodation with the evil forces of communism through what is known as the policy of political evolution. Those druids of high policy believe the Russian barbarians are the untouchables of international life.

How different was the approach of St. Patrick in his contest with the Druids of Ireland. He too was confronted with the pagan philosophy of might makes right and to the victor belongs the spoils. The Druids of Ireland were the high priests of that philosophy. Patrick did not seek accommodation with them. His purpose was to expose them as fakers and to convince their followers that Christianity was the way of their salvation. St. Patrick walked this dangerous course alone, with but a handful of faithful followers. He knew not fear—he feared no man or men. He was supremely confident in the purpose of his high mission. The Druids once exposed fell from favor and the door was opened for St. Patrick to lead the Irish race out of the wilderness of pagan life.

The spirit of St. Patrick is needed today if we are to turn back and ultimately to defeat the hordes of paganism which now threaten the ramparts of all civilization. Nothing less can save us from war or political paralysis, but nothing more is needed to prevent war and to win a universal peace worthy of the name.

Dillon and Stevens Address Textile Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 28, 1963

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the American Textile Manufacturers Institute held its annual meeting last week at Hollywood Beach, Fla. Among the distinguished persons to address the textile manufacturers were the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Robert T. Stevens, president, J. P. Stevens, Inc., a former Secretary of the Army and one of the foremost men in textiles.

Secretary Dillon presented a clear and concise discussion of tax reform, and Mr. Stevens responded with forceful references to the present difficulties of the textile industry resulting from cotton pricing policies. With the consent of the House, I am inserting in the RECORD the speech delivered by Mr. Dillon and excerpts from the remarks of Mr. Stevens:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Last month nearly 5 million Americans who were actively seeking jobs could not find them. More than 6 percent of our labor force was unemployed. Those are dark statistics, and they cast a long shadow over our future—as was made quite clear in the recent testimony of President W. P. Gullander of the National Association of Manufacturers before the House Ways and Means Committee. President Gullander pointed out that, should our economy create new jobs no faster than it has over the past 5 years, then by 1970 our unemployment rate would climb to a shocking 12.7 percent.

This would be the terrible cost, in human terms, of our lagging growth rate—to say nothing of the cost in idle plant capacity, lower Government revenues, and unrealized business profits.

Such a situation would inevitably create irresistible pressures for the Federal Government to play an increasingly larger role in our economy to compensate for the failure of the private sector to meet the basic needs of our people. That prospect, I can assure you, is no more attractive to those of us in Government than it is to you in private industry. Therefore, the President has proposed a major overhaul of our outmoded tax system designed to get our free enterprise system back on the track at full speed so that it can provide more jobs, increased productive capacity, and higher profits.

The President's proposal for a broad, top-to-bottom cut in our tax rates has met with a remarkably favorable response. There is a growing national consensus that our economy must be released from the shackles of an income tax structure that, having outlived its usefulness in restraining the inflationary tendencies of wartime, is now stifling our growth. For example, during

the month-long public hearings on the President's tax proposals before the House Ways and Means Committee in Washington not one single witness has so far disagreed with the need for significant rate cuts. Since the testimony has been primarily concerned with the important details of the tax program, such as the manner in which the forthcoming rate reduction should be applied or the difficulties involved in various suggestions for structural reform, the remarkable and equally important unanimity of support for significant rate reductions has sometimes been obscured. As you know, the American Textile Manufacturers Institute joins in this consensus. Such support greatly eases the always difficult and time-consuming task of tax reform.

Tax reform is a matter of deep concern to this administration. One of its very first acts was to recommend a tax credit for new investment designed to stimulate business modernization and expansion—a credit that would help to give American businessmen the same sort of tax incentives long enjoyed by many of their foreign competitors. You will recall the surprising difficulties we encountered in obtaining acceptance of this concept, which was new to our tax system, but had well proved its worth to our competitors overseas. Your support was crucial in writing the investment credit into law.

Coming from an enterprising and forward looking industry such as yours, support for a new concept was no surprise. The vitality of the textile industry has been amply demonstrated during the past year by its quick reaction to depreciation reform and the investment credit. You will recall that the Treasury, in accordance with the President's desire to give special attention to your difficult problems, put more liberal depreciation rates into effect for the textile industry in the fall of 1961, 9 months before the promulgation of the overall reform.

Your response was dramatic. Your expenditures during 1962 on new plant and equipment, excluding apparel, were $110 million, or 22 percent higher than in the previous year, whereas in the Nation's manufacturing industries as a whole expenditures increased by only 7 percent. And for the current quarter, your estimates of capital expenditures total $150 million—15 percent or $20 million higher than your actual expenditures in the first quarter of last year, again compared to a 7-percent increase for all manufacturing industries.

And now, following your lead, manufacturing industries as a whole are beginning to respond to depreciation reform and the investment credit. Corporate appropriations and new orders for all types of plant and equipment are mounting, foreshadowing an early and substantial increase in overall plant and equipment expenditures.

But important as they are, and will continue to be, depreciation reform and the investment credit were only a significant first step in the administration's efforts to achieve a free market economy that could perform more nearly and more consistently at capacity levels.

Consider, for a moment, the direct effect of the President's tax program on the incentives for business investment: The combined effect of the 7-percent investment credit and depreciation reform was to lower business tax liabilities by a total of $2.5 billion. President Kennedy's proposal to lower the corporate tax rate from 52 to 47 percent by 1965 will reduce those liabilities by another $2.5 billion. This total reduction of $5 billion a year in business tax liabilities will not only increase cash flow, but will also increase the profitability of business, hence offering a strong double stimulus to the incentives for investment that are the very foundation of our market economy.

But business will benefit perhaps even more from other measures in the tax program. The reductions in personal rates will lower the taxes of millions of small firms which operate as individual proprietorships or partnerships, thus providing these businesses with additional internally generated funds to finance their expansion and modernization. In addition, the reductions in individual rates will raise the incentives for increased personal effort and risk-taking and will enlarge outside sources of money for business investment—directly through the stock purchases of individuals, and indirectly through their savings deposits and insurance policies.

The proposed reductions in the personal income tax would also greatly increase consumer demand which is the basic justification for any steady and long-range rise in business output. As leaders of an industry which depends heavily upon consumer demand, you are particularly well aware of how strongly business investment decisions turn upon present sales volumes and future sales prospects. Several weeks ago in Philadelphia, the president of Botany Industries predicted that if the proposed tax cuts become effective by July 1 of this year they could well result in a boom year for consumer goods industries. In fact, if as a result of the proposed tax program our economy approaches estimated levels of full employment output, then by the first quarter of 1966 we could expect annual personal consumption expenditures for clothing and shoes to be $2 to $2.5 billion, or some 7 percent higher than it would otherwise be.

But to describe separately the impact of rate reductions upon consumer demand and investment incentives ignores the fact that, in our complex economy, these reductions would interact continually upon each other. Increased consumer demand creates greater investment which, in turn, creates additional jobs and profits and further demand for both consumer goods and investment. Through this kind of interaction the President's tax program would release within the economy its own inherent powers for expansion and would reinvigorate the marketplace—the prime mover in our economic growth.

Our economy is undeniably growing, and we have made genuine progress over the past 2 years. But we are gaining far too little ground toward our goal of a full employment economy at near capacity levels. Last year, for example, we set new records in nearly every area of aggregate economic activity. Yet, in effect, we marked time in our rates of employment and capacity utilization.

Our record of five postwar recessions—two within the past 5 years—should drive home the fact that we cannot continue indefinitely at our present rate of growth without increasing the risk of recession and magnifying its impact should it occur. Certainly no one would predict a recession in the near future. But it would be a foolhardy man indeed who would rashly refuse to provide against its occurrence. Such provision is inherent in the President's tax program by the very fact that it offers a strong and permanent stimulus to the forces for growth within the economy.

For that reason, also, the President's tax program offers us an essential element of any long-range, realistic answer to the problem of Federal deficits. For, if we have learned anything from our postwar economic record, we have learned that our deficits result more from underproduction by the economy than from spending by the Government. In fiscal 1959, to cite an extreme example, an anticipated budget surplus of $466 million became, as a result of a recession, an actual deficit of $12.4 billion.

The lesson is clear: With our heavy burden of free world leadership in the cold war—a war that only last fall threatened to grow very hot indeed—we simply cannot hope to achieve balanced budgets unless our economy operates at full capacity. Paradoxical as it may seem to some, lower tax rates can bring us larger Government revenues from an economy operating at full speed, than can our present repressive rate structure from an economy that is prevented by that very rate structure from ever reaching its full potential. That is why today true fiscal responsibility demands a reduction in our tax burden.

Certainly no one welcomes the prospect of a deficit in this fiscal year and the next. The administration had hoped to present its tax program in conjunction with a balanced budget. But the growth of our economy has simply not kept pace with our increased national needs, and particularly with the needs forced upon us by considerations of national security. It can easily be demonstrated that if our economy had operated at relatively full capacity since 1957, the past 5 years would have shown an overall budget surplus, rather than the $30 billion deficit we have actually incurred.

The administration has presented its tax reduction program together with a budget for fiscal year 1964 in which civilian programs were stringently held below the levels of the current fiscal year. The entire budget increase was in response to the demands of defense, space, and interest on the national debt—demands which have accounted for nearly 73 percent of the total expenditure increases that have occurred during this administration. The President has also accompanied his tax proposals with a firm commitment that, as the tax cut becomes effective and the economy expands in response, a substantial part of the resulting revenue increases must go toward eliminating budgetary deficits until balance is once more achieved.

This program of expenditure control is an integral part of the President's tax recommendations. It is a practical program to seek out and eliminate soft spots in the budget. This is the responsible way to cut spending. It contrasts sharply with the extravagant claims we have recently been hearing so much of—claims that meat ax budget cuts are possible; claims that have a habit of vanishing into thin air when the time for action comes.

The President is making good on his pledge. He is already translating it into action. Since the submission of his 1964 budget only 2 months ago, he has sent to the Congress revisions which reduce his fiscal year 1964 requests by $126 million, and his 1963 requests by $236 million, or a total reduction of $362 million. These substantial cuts stand in sharp contrast to the recent action of the House of Representatives in increasing the authorization for defense expenditures over and above the President's recommendations.

Built into the tax program itself are two vital safeguards again an excessive budgetary impact: the phasing of the program over a 3-year period, and the revenue-raising reforms. As a result of these two measures—and particularly the reforms—the tax program is able to offer rate reductions far larger than would otherwise be acceptable.

The way to achieve the largest possible rate cuts—and thus the greatest economic stimulus—within the limits of fiscal responsibility, is to combine them with base-broadening tax reforms. And that is exactly what the President's program will do. The only fiscally responsible alternative—as I pointed out to the House Ways and Means Committee, and as was so clearly recognized in the recommendations submitted on your behalf by Mr. C. E. Connelly, chairman of your tax committee—would be a substantially smaller reduction in rates than the President has recommended. Whether at the bottom of the scale, at the top, in the middle, or all along, tax rates simply could not come down as much as we had hoped.

While talking of structural reforms, I should also point out that many of the reforms—those, for example, that involve income-averaging, deductibility of moving expenses, more favorable tax treatment of expenditures on equipment used in research and development—would either relieve hardship or encourage economic growth.

In addition, when we consider tax revision we cannot lightly dismiss the ever-present need for equity and simplicity. A number of the provisions in our current tax code are justified primarily by our oppressively high rate structure. Since lower rates would remove the main reason for their existence, we have recommended that they be modified or repealed.

The President's program represents a fair balance between the goals of revenue, growth, equity, and simplicity. It does not satisfy those who have long recommended far-reaching reforms that would radically alter the nature of our tax system. Neither does it satisfy those who have cried for a "quickie" tax cut with no consideration for anything else. The President's program is a rounded program, a moderate program. Coupled with firm but realistic expenditure control, it can generate a strong upward lift throughout our economy, while still adhering to the requirements of fiscal responsibility.

Through a balanced combination of increased incentives to invest, and increased consumer demand, it will permit our citizens to produce more, earn more, buy more, and invest more. In this way it can set us well on the way toward achieving our major long-range economic aim: a free market economy which utilizes all of its abundant resources of men, money, and machines, and which offers to every American the incentives and the opportunities to prosper in accordance with his capacities.

Excerpts From Remarks by Robert T. Stevens

Mr. Secretary, permit me to say once more how honored we are to have you with us and we know, certainly I know, and appreciate your efforts looking toward a more dynamic American economy in the overall picture of the world situation as being in the final analysis the best defense not only of the United States but also of the free world.

I would like if I may to make an observation in regard to your remarks which I have heard for the first time as you made them in their reference to the commitment of the President to budgetary and fiscal policy. I like them and believe in them exactly as you have said them for us.

I think, however, in this presence it is not out of order in the most respectful manner, Mr. Secretary, to say and express the hope that you will carry back with you the fact that there are Presidential commitments in respect to the problems of this industry. Personally I am deeply satisfied the President intends to carry these out, but many others in this room will join me in feeling that it is surprising, if not astonishing, that the Chief Executive Officer of our great country, the President of the United States, has been unable for one reason or another, to carry out up to this time, the commitments which he made in good faith and which he stands behind today and which are now approaching the 2-year-old mark. So that I sincerely hope, Mr. Secretary, you can carry back with you the respectful, the constructive and the sincere thinking of this group of people in the textile business that we do have the faith. We know he will discharge this obligation. But, frankly, Rome is burning.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 50: 7: *The Lord God will help us, therefore we shall not be confounded.*

O Thou God of all grace and goodness, we rejoice that Thou art always willing and able to aid the vast multitudes who feel that they are victims in the relentless grip of a conspiracy of wicked circumstances.

We earnestly beseech Thee to give Thy strength to those who are bearing heavy burdens and Thy sympathy to hearts that are throbbing with an aching loneliness.

Grant that we also may help mankind cultivate faith and fortitude in order that the strain and stress of life may be more tolerable for them.

May we aspire to make a worthy contribution to the moral and spiritual welfare of our beloved country, enabling it to be triumphant in these days of trouble and confusion.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 28, 1963, was read and approved.

SANCTUARY FOR CUBAN PATRIOTS

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is disturbing to me that the United States is taking measures to prevent Cuban patriots from taking sanctuary in any area of the Carribbean after launching attacks upon the Communist regime in Cuba.

Are we to be in the fantastic position of not only eliminating the possibility of invading Cuba ourselves, but also of insuring that the Cuban patriots will not be allowed to liberate themselves?

Are we to abandon permanently the freedom-craving people of Cuba?

The United States accepted the principle of sanctuary when we allowed the Red Chinese to attack us from across the Yalu River in Korea. We accept the principle of sanctuary in South Vietnam when we allow the Communists to escape across the border into North Vietnam. The aggressors in Angola were permitted to escape across the Congo River into the Congo Republic. When France was locked in conflict in Algeria, they permitted the revolutionaries sanctuary in Tunisia. And, finally, Cuba has been established as the Communist sanctuary from which to subvert all of South and Central America.

What a double standard we have.

JUDICIAL REFORM

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, in the 87th Congress there was enacted as section 29 of the Revenue Act of 1962 a provision permitting a deduction under section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code for contributions made after December 31, 1961, to nonprofit organizations supporting or opposing the reorganization of the State judiciary in referendums to be held during the calendar year 1962. The purpose of the legislation was to permit the deduction of contributions to nonprofit organizations which had been established in Illinois and other States seeking to reorganize and improve their judicial systems. Since it was not deemed necessary for the provision to be made a permanent part of the Internal Revenue Code, its effect was limited to referendums taking place in the calendar year 1962.

A similar organization, known as the Ohio Citizens Better Courts Committee, Inc., has been incorporated to promote a program of judicial reform in the State of Ohio. Insofar as I know, the situation is in all respects similar to that which led to the enactment of the provision last year. In order that the judicial reform movement might have the same treatment in the State of Ohio, I am introducing a bill to extend the amendment embodied in section 29 of the Revenue Act of 1962, to referendums occurring during the calendar year 1963. I am advised that in addition to Ohio, there are also several other States where similar programs are under consideration. The amendment would likewise be helpful to the movement in those States.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for calling the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEAFNESS IN BOTH EARS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 199) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after "having only light perception," each place it appears therein the following: "or deafness of both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction,".

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second month which begins after the date of its enactment.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has long maintained a system of statutory awards for compensating veterans who have specified service-connected disabilities, the award being in addition to the basic rate of compensation. For example, a veteran who has lost an arm above the elbow could be rated at 80 percent resulting in the monthly payment of basic compensation in the amount of $170. In addition to this amount he would receive as a result of the statutory award law $47, making his total monthly compensation $217.

Under the current schedule for rating disabilities total deafness is ratable at 80-percent disabling, which results in compensation for wartime cases of $170 monthly. This present 80-percent rate is a reduction ordered by the Administrator from the previous 100-percent rating. This action was taken some months ago. The passage of this legislation would result in the veteran who suffers from total deafness receiving $170 monthly for his wartime disability plus $47 to make a total of $217.

The committee believes total deafness should be rated as totally disabling and takes this means of at least partially rectifying what it considers to be an error.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that there are approximately 1,200 cases who would be eligible for this statutory award at a minimum additional cost of $666,000 the first year. There would be a slight increase each year for the succeeding 4 years.

An identical purpose bill passed the House in the 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses but failed of approval in the other body.

Washington, D.C.,
April 1, 1963.

Olin E. Teague,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C.:

There are some 1,200 veterans suffering from total deafness of both ears as a result of their service-incurred disabilities, but are rated less than total. H.R. 199 will correct this inequity. Veterans of Foreign Wars urges favorable consideration and approval by House of H.R. 199.

Francis W. Stover,
Director, National Legislative Service.

April 1, 1963.

Hon. Olin E. Teague,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Disabled American Veterans support the provisions of H.R. 199 which will provide a statutory award of $47 monthly to veterans for the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears. This bill has been one of our legislative objectives for several years. We urge early passage of this measure by the House of Representatives.

Charles L. Huber,
National Director for Legislation,
Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 199. This bill, reported unanimously by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, would provide an additional payment of $47 monthly for veterans having the service-incurred disability of deafness of both ears. Monthly rates of compensation for service connected disabilities are paid in accordance with a fixed schedule. The fixed rating schedule is based on 10 levels of disability ranging from 10 to 100 percent. In addition, the Congress has provided special statutory awards of certain seriously disabling conditions, usually involving loss of use of an extremity or a body function. For example, an amputation in the upper third of the thigh enjoys a rating of 80 percent under the basic schedule. This entitles the veteran to payments of $170 monthly. In such cases, however, a special statutory award entitles veterans so disabled to an additional $47 monthly.

Heretofore the veteran who was afflicted with a complete loss of hearing in both ears received only the compensation payment resulting from 80-percent disability. This bill will provide an additional statutory award of $47 monthly for veterans who are thus disabled. Because this is a serious disability and because it imposes a severe handicap both economically and socially upon those afflicted, it merits the favorable consideration of this body. The Veterans' Administration has estimated that there are 1,200 cases at a minimum additional cost of $666,000 the first fiscal year.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATUTORY AWARD FOR APHONIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 214) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on the previous bill as well as on this proposed legislation I wish to call to the attention of the House that the President's Bureau of the Budget specifically recommended against the enactment of both proposals. These two bills have been on the Consent Calendar for a number of weeks. They have been passed over heretofore in 1963. I have on several occasions asked that they be passed over.

I feel that the House should know that if these bills are permitted to go through and be enacted by the House that they are being considered and approved contrary to the recommendation of the President and his Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Veterans' Affairs Committee constantly finds itself between the Bureau of the Budget and veterans' organizations. The request of the Veterans' Administration is generally for nothing in the way of legislation which involves any substantial cost, be it under a Republican administration or a Democratic administration. On the other hand the requests of veterans' groups run into billions. Our committee makes a very serious and honest attempt to screen these bills and bring to the floor only those bills that a great majority of the House will consider to be deserving. Our committee tries desperately not to bring politics into the veterans' programs; and I would say further, Mr. Speaker, that I do not consider it necessarily the duty of the committee either to rubberstamp or to disagree with what the executive branch says it wants in the way of legislation. I think further our committee has made an honest and sincere attempt to bring only meritorious legislation to the floor of the House.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the current Veterans' Administration schedule for rating disabilities provides that complete organic aphonia—loss of speech—with constant inability to communicate by speech will be rated as totally disabling with compensation payable in the total amount of $250 a month. H.R. 214 provides that the statutory award rate—$47—now applicable for other appropriate disabilities for a specific loss shall be added to the total rate. This $47 a month allowance would mean that the veteran would receive $297 monthly if this bill is enacted into law. The Veterans' Administration indicates there are only 20 known cases meeting the criteria of this bill. The annual cost would be approximately $11,000. An identical bill passed the House of Representatives in the 87th Congress but failed in the other body. I urge its passage today.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to say as one who has formerly asked that this bill and the previous bill be passed over without prejudice, that it was without any thought of personalities whatsoever. We recognize that the Veterans' Affairs Committee and its distinguished chairman give these matters very serious consideration, but we as official objectors are guided by certain rules that have been set up. In that connection we do so not in the capacity of judges of the merits of the legislation or its wisdom, or the wisdom of the committee in reporting it out, but rather to see that the safeguards set up are observed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I certainly do not want to be interpreted as dealing in personalities. I realize that the official objectors are governed by rules and that their objections are not based on personal considerations.

Mr. PELLY. I am sure I speak for all on this side of the aisle when I say that we have great respect for the chairman of the distinguished Committee on Veterans Affairs, and in that capacity we appreciate that he has problems and we want to help him if we can.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, as the gentleman and my good friend from Texas well knows, I have traditionally and consistently supported him on the top controversial issues that he himself has had to tackle in connection with veterans' legislation. I intend in the future to be guided substantially by his good judgment and sound reasoning on such legislation.

I only brought up what the Bureau of the Budget has recommended in these two cases, and in others, because in recent weeks I personally have received communications from people all over the country inferring that I and several others on the objectors committee, were the only roadblocks to the enactment of this legislation. The truth is that the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration have both recommended against enactment of the two bills I specifically mentioned. We on the objectors committee, under our rules and regulations, do have policies that we are supposed to follow.

In defense of these policies it is fair to point out from time to time what the attitude of the administration is on specific legislative matters. There are other bills that will probably go through today where the administration has recommended against enactment. We have tried to prevent them from enactment under the Consent Calendar process, but we are realistic now that they are scheduled under suspension of the rules.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague].

How much money are we talking about annually in connection with this H.R. 214?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Eleven thousand two hundred and eighty dollars a year involving 20 known cases.

Mr. FOREMAN. How much were we talking about on H.R. 199? I know we passed that. But can the gentleman give me a figure on that?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Twelve hundred cases, and probably about $666,000 a year.

Mr. FOREMAN. The point I wish to bring out here is that, as pointed out by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], this is above and beyond the requested budget of the administration. I am proud to be a friend of the veterans and the various fine veterans' organizations, but I believe that we are all concerned about our deficit spending and our continuing growing debt. We are adding to this tremendous unprecedented budget by adding these continually growing costs to our Government. I very much question the advisability of continuing this sort of thing, adding to a budget that we pretty well all agree on is too high as it is now. I think it would be a good idea to bring out as these bills come along how much additional money we are talking about above what the President has requested.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There will be a statement in the Record on each bill telling the exact number of cases and the cost as estimated by the VA. I sincerely hope my good friend from Texas, as we go down the road in this Congress and we get bills involving billions, will take the same attitude he is taking on a little bill like this.

Mr. FOREMAN. The gentleman may rest assured that, whether it runs into the billions or the thousands of dollars, I am just frugal and conservative enough to be concerned over an additional dollar in our budget as I am of millions of dollars, and that is why I am so concerned about these bills here today that are being proposed to be passed and adding to our budget deficit. I question very much the advisability of this House approving these bills. Many of my best friends are members of the VFW, American Legion, Veterans of World War I and other such organizations and they, like me, are more than passively concerned about our growing tax rate and increased Government spending programs.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If the gentleman will take a little trip over to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and look at the bills we have and look at the requests we have and see what we report, I think he will give the committee credit for doing a pretty good job. Last year we passed a total of 39 bills, involving perhaps as much as $200 million—the compensation bill alone amounted to $98 million. Yet the American Legion and other veterans groups said that the Congress did nothing that we could be proud of or take credit for as far as legislation is concerned. That is the kind of thing we run into.

Mr. FOREMAN. I commend the committee for holding down as many as they have; I think they have done a fine job here, substantially 95 percent pure, but we wish it could be 100 percent pure, so to speak, and to cut out all that are not absolutely necessary. I accept the decision of the committee here. I think the committee has endeavored to judiciously look out for the best interests of our veterans and I commend them on the job they are doing. I am just pointing out that I question very much the advisability of the committee to bring out bills, whether they have requests for a million or a billion dollars or any percentage of that, if it is above and beyond that which the President has requested and if they are not absolutely necessary.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There were 39 bills enacted into law last year and nearly all passed unanimously. Any Member could have stood up and objected to any of those bills on the Consent Calendar. When we bring up bills on the Consent Calendar, all you have to do to stop consideration is to object.

Mr. FOREMAN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after "having only light perception," each place it appears the following: "or has suffered complete organic aphonia with constant inability to communicate by speech,".

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the current schedule for rating disabilities provides that complete organic aphonia—loss of speech—with constant inability to communicate by speech will be rated as totally disabling with compensation payable in the total amount of $250 a month. This bill provides that the statutory award rate—$47—now applicable for other appropriate disabilities for a specific loss shall be added to the total rate. This $47 a month allowance would mean that the veteran would receive $297 monthly if this bill is enacted into law.

Hearings on a similar proposal, somewhat broader, were held before the Compensation and Pension Subcommittee in the first session of the 87th Congress.

The Veterans' Administration indicates that there are only 20 known cases involving complete organic aphonia meeting the criteria of this bill, which means that the annual cost would be $11,280.

An identical bill passed the House in the 87th Congress, but failed of approval in the other body.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 1, 1963.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

Some 20 veterans have permanent loss of vocal cords and speech. H.R. 214 will provide additional compensation for this most deserving group with very deserving service-incurred conditions. Veterans of Foreign Wars urges speedy passage of this bill.

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

APRIL 1, 1963.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The Disabled American Veterans support the provisions of H.R. 214 which will provide a statutory award of $47 monthly to those veterans suffering the service-connected loss or loss of use of both vocal chords, with resulting complete aphonia and constant inability to communicate by speech. This bill has been one of our legislative objectives for several years. We urge early passage of this measure by the House of Representatives.

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director for Legislation, Disabled American Veterans.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW MODIFIED LIFE PLAN FOR NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE POLICYHOLDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 220) to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That effective January 1, 1964, section 704 of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately before "Insurance"; and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) Under such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate a policy of participating insurance may be converted to or exchanged for insurance issued under this subsection on a modified life plan. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be on the same terms and conditions as the insurance which it replaces, except (1) the premium rates for such insurance shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality and interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum; (2) all cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values shall be based on the 1958 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality and interest at the rate of 3 per centum per annum; and (3) at the end of the day preceding the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured the face value of the modified life insurance policy or the amount of extended term insurance thereunder shall be automatically reduced by one-half thereof, without any reduction in premium.

"(c) Under such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate, a policy of nonparticipating insurance may be converted to or exchanged for insurance issued under this subsection on a modified life plan. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be on the same terms and conditions as the insurance which it replaces, except that (1) term insurance issued under section 621 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 shall be deemed for the purposes of this subsection to have been issued under section 723(b) of this title; and (2) at the end of the day preceding the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured the face value of the modified life insurance policy or the amount of extended term insurance thereunder shall be automatically reduced by one-half thereof, without any reduction in premium. Any person eligible for insurance under section 722(a) of this title may be granted a modified life insurance policy under this subsection which, subject to exception (2) above, shall be issued on the same terms and conditions specified in section 722(a).

"(d) Any insured whose modified life insurance policy is in force by payment or waiver of premiums on the day before his sixty-fifth birthday may upon written application and payment of premiums made before such birthday be granted National Service Life Insurance, on an ordinary life plan, without physical examination, in an amount of not less than $500, in multiples of $250, but not in excess of one-half of the face amount of the modified life insurance policy in force on the day before his sixty-fifth birthday. Insurance issued under this subsection shall be effective on the sixty-fifth birthday of the insured. The premium rate, cash, loan, paid-up, and extended values on the ordinary life insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on the same mortality tables and interest rates as the insurance issued under the modified life policy. Settlements on policies involving annuities on insurance issued under this subsection shall be based on the same mortality or annuity tables and interest rates as such settlements on the modified life policy. If the insured is totally disabled on the day before his sixty-fifth birthday and premiums on his modified life insurance policy are being waived under section 712 of this title or he is entitled on that date to waiver under such section he shall be automatically granted the maximum amount of insurance authorized under this subsection and premiums on such insurance shall be waived during the continuous total disability of the insured."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter and a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill, effective January 1, 1964, seeks to provide a new plan of national service life insurance, generally designated as a modified life plan, which would be offered primarily to World War II term policyholders as a substitute for their present term policies. It provides for the same amount of protection as they have today, with two modifications—the amount of the premium would not increase each 5 years as is true of all national service life insurance term contracts, and at age 65 the value of the policy would be reduced in half. However, the policyholder at age 65 would have the option, if he desired and elected to do so, to maintain the other half of the policy which he would otherwise lose by paying for the insurance at the premium rate for the attained age and without medical examination.

The bill is favored by the Veterans' Administration.

The effect of this insurance, insofar as premiums are concerned, is shown in the table reproduced below:

Age	Annual premium for the modified life plan	Annual premium present rates		Level premium after age 66	
		5-year level premium term	Ordinary life	If 50-percent face continued	If 100-percent face continued
30	$9.83	$8.41	$18.47	$9.83	$43.22
35	11.72	9.00	21.31	11.72	45.11
40	14.09	10.06	25.10	14.09	47.48
45	17.17	11.72	30.07	17.17	50.56
50	20.84	15.04	36.94	20.84	54.23
55	25.22	20.95	46.53	25.22	58.61
65		47.00	78.97		

This bill is the culmination of a continuing interest on the part of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Veterans' Administration in preventing World War II policyholders from suffering the same fate of their World War I brothers in the term insurance field. The rates of premium chargeable today on term policies of World War I or World War II veterans whose ages are in the late sixties and seventies are so high as to make the maintenance of the policies almost prohibitive, and certainly uneconomical. As an example, the committee had recently called to its attention the case of a veteran age 78, who is paying $1,200 annual premium on a $10,000 policy. He had already exceeded in premiums paid the face value of the policy, but he needs the protection for his wife in the event of his death and thus had no alternative except to continue the payment of premiums.

The Veterans' Administration has indicated that the total first 5-year administrative cost of this legislation would be $846,000; the first-year administrative cost would be $206,000.

An identical purpose bill passed the House in the 86th Congress, but an amendment of the Senate was not finally resolved. In the 87th Congress an identical bill passed the House but became involved in the other, in an unrelated controversial matter which prevented ultimate approval.

APRIL 1, 1963.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The Disabled American Veterans support the provisions of H.R. 220 which will permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan. We urge early passage of this measure by the House of Representatives.

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director for Legislation, Disabled American Veterans.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *April 1, 1963.*

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Veterans of Foreign Wars supports H.R. 220 which will provide a new national service life insurance plan. Three million veterans still holding term policies will have added inducement and opportunity to convert to permanent plan thus preventing possible hardship in later years. Veterans of Foreign Wars urges speedy approval of H.R. 220.

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR DIRECTORS AT VETERANS' AFFAIRS INSTALLATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 228) to amend section 4111 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of directors and chief of staff of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, at the request of another Member, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There is a gentleman who is very knowledgeable concerning this bill that could not be here today who asked that it be not taken up, and if it is so proper, I ask unanimous consent that it be taken from the suspension calendar also.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not have to call it up.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 243) to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(k) if the veteran, as the result of service-connected disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or one or more creative organs, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, the rate of compensation therefor shall be $47 per month for each such loss or loss of use independent of any other compensation provided in subsections (a) through (j), or subsection (s), of this section but in no event to exceed $340 per month; and in the event of anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or one or more creative organs, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subsections (l) through (n) of this section, the rate of compensation shall be increased by $47 per month for each such loss or loss of use, but in no event to exceed $525 per month;".

SEC. 2. Any increased compensation authorized by the amendment made by the first section of this Act shall be effective as of the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, existing law authorizes basic rates of compensation which are paid according to degree of disability. For example, in wartime cases basic rates range from $20 for a 10-percent disability to $250 monthly for total disability. In addition, certain statutory awards are authorized for specific disabilities. Among such awards is the payment of an allowance of $47 per month—in wartime cases—in addition to the basic rate applicable, where the veteran has lost the use of a hand, a foot, both buttocks, an eye, or creative organ. However, unless the veteran has a combination of disabilities for which a specific award of $340—or higher but not exceeding $525—is payable, he may receive only one additional allowance of $47 for the mentioned specific losses even though he may have more than one such loss.

This bill would authorize the payment of the additional allowance for each such loss, in addition to the basic rate of compensation. For example, a veteran with the loss of an eye and a hand may now receive only one allowance of $47 in addition to the basic rate of compensation based on the combined degree of disability. Enactment of the bill will authorize in such a case an allowance of $94—2 times $47—in addition to the basic rate. Under the amended bill, however, the total payment in any case may not exceed $340 and the loss of more than one creative organ would, for this purpose, be considered a single "loss." In peacetime cases the rates are 80 percent of the above-mentioned rates.

The VA estimates that about 440 veterans would benefit from the bill's enactment at a cost of about $225,000 for each of the first 5 years.

An identical purpose bill was reported by the committee in the 83d Congress and in the 84th, 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses, passed the House but failed passage in the Senate.

APRIL 1, 1963.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The Disabled American Veterans support the provisions of H.R. 243 which will provide a statutory award of $47 monthly to those veterans suffering the service-connected for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein. This bill has been one of our legislative objectives for several years. We urge early passage of this measure by the House of Representatives.

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director for Legislation, Disabled American Veterans.

WASHINGTON, *D.C.*
April 1, 1963.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Certain blind veterans who have also suffered the loss of a lower extremity will be provided assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing under H.R. 243. An estimated 50 veterans with this combination of service-incurred disabilities will be the beneficiaries of this bill. Veterans of Foreign Wars urges speedy passage of this most meritorious legislation.

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARAPLEGIC HOUSING PROGRAM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 248) to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain blind veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of a lower extremity.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (2) of section 801 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out ", and such permanent and total disability is such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of a wheelchair," and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to expand the paraplegic housing program—the program which provides for a $10,000 grant for severely disabled veterans in acquiring specially equipped homes made necessary because of their peculiar difficulties.

At the present time veterans with service-connected disabilities of all wars and peacetime are eligible if they meet the following criteria: They are permanently and totally disabled due first, to the loss or loss of use of both lower extremities so as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or wheelchairs; or second, blind in both eyes, having only light perception, plus loss or loss of use of one lower extremity, and in such condition as to preclude locomotion without the aid of a wheelchair.

The bill deletes the requirement in category 2 mentioned above so as to permit a blind veteran to obtain this grant even though he is able to move about without the aid of a wheelchair.

The law provides that payment shall not exceed $10,000 in any event and permits payment of 50 percent of the total cost to the veteran of a home for special fixtures or movable facilities.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that there are less than 50 veterans now on the compensation rolls with a disability of blindness and loss or loss of use of one lower extremity. An unknown number of these, whose disabilities are such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of a wheelchair, have been granted, or are eligible for, assistance under existing law. The balance would become eligible under the provisions of H.R. 248. It is improbable that all of these would apply and qualify for this benefit in the first year. Therefore the total benefit cost of the bill, if enacted, would be substantially less than $500,000 the first year. Additional cost for later years would be quite small because new cases with the prescribed disabilities would be rare.

An identical bill passed the House in the 87th Congress but failed of approval in the other body.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOSPITALIZATION IN PHILIPPINES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 249) to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask someone if the bill provides for the purchase of hospital supplies or medicines for this hospital in the Philippines?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It permits them to buy some medicines and permits them to exchange medicines subject to a contract being negotiated between the two Governments.

Mr. GROSS. This facility is used for the care of patients who are not service-connected cases?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If the gentleman will yield further, I shall be happy to answer that question.

Mr. GROSS. In other words the Federal Government of this country then, and the taxpayers, will be buying medicines for private citizens of the Philippines, is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. They can only buy medicines for service-connected patients—Commonwealth army and U.S. veterans. It is true that the hospital may treat the few, and I will say very few, private cases.

Mr. GROSS. Will they differentiate between the use of medical supplies and equipment as between former servicemen and private patients?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The legislation specifies that this medicine which is bought pursuant to the contract will only be used for service-connected patients.

Mr. GROSS. And, when does the gentleman think that the Federal Government of this country will discontinue appropriating for this purpose?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. As the gentleman from Iowa knows, the gentleman from Texas has not been a strong supporter of the foreign aid program. But to have a nicely going, efficiently run, fine hospital in that part of the world that can be used as a medical center that in the opinion of the gentleman from Texas is about as good foreign aid as could be participated in by this country. I am for this program and very much so.

Mr. GROSS. We gave the Philippines some $73 million last year, and we gave them close to $500 million at the end of the war. It seems to me we have been doing a pretty good job by way of foreign aid to that country.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I will say to the gentleman that this involves a cost not expected to exceed $2 million for 5 years and not more than $500,000 in any one fiscal year. This bill is an extension of 5 years.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 632 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "five consecutive fiscal years", and inserting in lieu thereof "ten consecutive fiscal years,"; and by inserting before the period at the end of such sentence "ending before July 1, 1963, nor $500,000 for any one fiscal year beginning on or after such date".

With the following committee amendment:

Add the following new section at the end of the bill:

"SEC. 2. Section 632 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'Such agreement may also provide that during the contract period specified in paragraph (1) of this section, payments for hospital care and for medical services provided to Commonwealth Army veterans or to United States veterans may consist in whole or in part of available medicines, medical supplies and equipment furnished by the Administrator to the Veterans Memorial Hospital at valuations therefor as determined by the Administrator. The Administrator is authorized to furnish through the revolving supply fund, pursuant to section 5011 of this title, such medicines, medical supplies and equipment as necessary for this purpose and to use therefor, as applicable, appropriations available for such payments.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to extend for another 5 years the program for reimbursement of the Philippine Government covering hospitalization for service-connected veterans of the Commonwealth Army who served with the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II. It would, at the same time, extend the program for outpatient care for this same group of service-connected veterans of that Commonwealth Army. The present program expires on June 30, 1963, and the existing law contains a $2 million ceiling for any one fiscal year on payments covering hospitalization and related travel.

This bill places a $500,000 ceiling on hospital payments for any fiscal year after 1963. The cost would not exceed $350,000 for fiscal year 1963, and the entire cost for the additional full 5 years would probably be less than $2 million.

The committee amendment would permit payments for hospital and medical services provided for Commonwealth Army service-connected veterans or U.S. service-connected veterans partly in the form of medicines and medical supplies. However, this arrangement would require an agreement between the two Governments and is by no means a mandate that this procedure must be followed.

The Veterans' Administration recommends favorable action on the proposal.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bills just passed which have come from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RENEWAL OF CERTAIN WATER SUPPLY CONTRACTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 131) to provide for the renewal of certain municipal, domestic, and industrial water supply contracts entered into under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall, upon request of the other party to any long-term contract for municipal, domestic, or industrial water supply hereafter entered into under clause (2) in the proviso to the first sentence of section 9, subsection (c), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1195, 43 U.S.C. 485h), include provision for renewal thereof subject to renegotiation of (1) the charges set forth in the contract in the light of circumstances prevailing at the time of renewal and (2) any other matters with respect to which the right to renegotiate is reserved in the contract. Any right of renewal shall be exercised within such reasonable time prior to the expiration of the contract as the parties shall have agreed upon and set forth therein.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall also, upon like request, provide in any such long-term contract or in any contract entered into under clause (1) of the proviso aforesaid that the other party to the contract shall, during the term of the contract and of any renewal thereof and subject to fulfillment of all obligations thereunder, have a first right (to which right the holders of any other type of contract for municipal, domestic, or industrial water supply shall be subordinate) to a stated share or quantity of the project's available water supply for beneficial use for the purposes stated in the contract.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is hereby authorized to negotiate amendments to existing contracts entered into pursuant to the first sentence of section 9, subsection (c), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to conform said contracts to the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 4. As used in this Act, the term "long-term contract" means any contract the term of which is more than ten years.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 11, after the words "first right" insert "for the purposes stated in the contract".

Page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out "available water supply for beneficial use for the purposes stated in the contract." and insert in lieu thereof "water supply available for municipal, domestic, or industrial use."

Page 2, line 16, after the word "authorized" insert ", upon request by the other party,".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF CADMIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 307) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an identical Senate bill, S. 1089, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately two million pounds of cadmium now held in the national stockpile. Such disposition may be made without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, relating to dispositions on the basis of a revised determination pursuant to section 2 of said Act, to the effect that no such disposition shall be made until six months after publication in the Federal Register and transmission to the Congress and to the Armed Services Committees thereof of a notice of the proposed disposition.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of H.R. 307, I would very much like to praise the House Armed Services Committee and its Subcommittee No. 2 for its prompt action in bringing this bill to the floor for our consideration today.

Members of this committee realized the emergency faced in the metal-plating industry because of the shortage of this important metal, and have moved quickly and thoroughly to release adequate amounts from our overstocked Federal stockpiles so that the current shortage can be eased.

The cadmium situation in private industry has been going from bad to worse over the past few months, and only prompt action by our Federal Government can cure the situation.

Last May, a number of small firms in the Detroit, Mich., area called to my attention the difficulty they had experienced in obtaining an adequate supply of this essential metal.

Cadmium is a necessity in certain types of metal plating. It does not take large amounts to adequately protect metal parts from rust, but this little bit is essential.

For instance, our automobiles have a great deal of cadmium plating on important parts. Because of this plating, your automobiles will last longer, run better and cost you less in the long run in the months and years ahead.

To a great degree, this plating process is carried on by small businesses which employ between 30 and 100 people. In some cases, small firms have their own plating plants which they use to treat the parts and components they supply to industry. In other cases, firms specialize only in plating. They are totally dependent upon an adequate supply of cadmium. If they do not have the raw materials to do the job, they go out of business.

A year or so ago, the price of cadmium per pound ranged from about $1.60 to $1.80. In the space of a few short months, the price rose to $2.50 to $3.50 a pound. Some firms could not obtain an adequate supply at any price. Others have been able to obtain only a small fraction of their needs.

These firms have been forced to work on a day-to-day basis, depending upon the supply of the metal they were able to obtain. Some have had to lay off employees and curtail production.

Last June, I introduced H.R. 11972, which was referred to the House Armed Services Committee for consideration. The chairman of the committee requested reports from interested Federal agencies. However, these reports—even though they were favorable—were not received by the committee until after the House Armed Services Committee had finished its business for the year and Members of Congress were concluding their legislative work so that they could attempt to come back to Congress this year.

On the 1st day of this 1st session of the 88th Congress, I introduced H.R. 307, a bill identical to H.R. 11972 of last year. Further, I requested the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee to hold hearings at an early date.

The chairman, Mr. Vinson, and the subcommittee chairman, Mr. Philbin, have been more than cooperative. Prompt action was taken in holding hearings, and both the subcommittee and the full committee agreed that the bill should stand as it was originally written.

Favorable reports were forthcoming from both the General Services Administration and the Office of Emergency Planning, and the Bureau of the the Budget stated that it had no objections to the submission of the favorable reports.

I might say that these reports, along with favorable subcommittee and committee consideration, were forthcoming in record time, for which industry is greatly appreciative.

Further, the Senate recently took action by passing S. 1089, a bill identical to H.R. 307.

There is little doubt in anyone's mind, I am sure, of the desperate situation in which cadmium users find themselves throughout our Nation. Further, there is little doubt that Federal stockpiles are exceedingly excessive.

As of January 1, 1963, the Federal Government held 10,829,640 pounds in the national stockpile and another 7,448,989 pounds in the supplemental barter stockpile. This totals a tremendous 18,278,629 pounds.

Our maximum objective for cadmium under the terms of the strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) is 6,500,000 pounds. This means that the amount of cadmium our Federal Government has in excess of its needs, in case of a 3-year war, is 11,778,629 pounds.

The President has often urged the Congress to assist in getting this Nation moving again. I submit that one of the anchors around the neck of economic progress is a cadmium anchor of no small proportions.

Supplies of goods essential to industry and our Nation's economic growth are being held up because of a shortage of cadmium caused by a near Federal monopoly on the supply available.

In some cases, manufacturers have been forced to turn to more expensive or less satisfactory means of plating metal products, which has resulted in a sometimes inferior end product at a higher price for the consumer.

Since the introduction of my bills on this subject, I have received a number of letters from firms engaged in the metal plating industry.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a few short statements in these letters.

Mr. W. K. Lomason, president, Douglas & Lomason Co., Detroit, Mich., wrote me:

> We use approximately 1,000 pounds of the metal per month in our Detroit plant. On the face of it, this does not seem like a large amount. However, it is used to protect metals from corrosion, and the parts plated generally become parts of larger assemblies and, therefore, without the cadmium, the entire assembly is held up.
>
> We find the premium between the $1.60 normal price and the $2.50 gray market price represents a significant item in our pricing of these assemblies. Employment is also important. If the cadmium situation is not relieved, it threatens the jobs of approximately 15 people directly in this plant.

Another from Mr. J. H. Butcher, president, Butcher & Hart Manufacturing Co., Altoona, Pa., states:

> May I offer my congratulations to you on submitting your bill for some sort of action on the ridiculous situation in the cadmium market.
>
> When a user such as we must go all the way to British Columbia, Canada, to secure cadmium anodes, there is something fundamentally wrong. This letter is written as an operator of a captive plating operation used to plate our own products, most of which go into the automobile and parts manufacture in your own State.

And I might add in the automobiles which you and your constituents purchase.

Letters such as these are repeated many times, not only in my own mail but in the mail of many Members of Congress.

Rather than improving, the cadmium supply situation is getting worse. The only hope we have of keeping these small businessmen in operation is for the Federal Government to turn loose at least a portion of the supplies it now has on hand over and above its anticipated

needs in case of war. Release of some of this metal will ease a desperate need. After all, it will do no good to have this metal in stockpile and then find we have killed off the industry which can turn it into finished goods.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 307, a bill to release 2 million pounds of cadmium from the Government stockpile. Cadmium has been in serious short supply for many months now, and as a result has caused a real hardship to metal finishers in the United States. In January of 1962 I have been informed that cadmium could be purchased for the going market price of $1.10 a pound. Recently, the price had been pushed as high as $2.10 a pound, and in some instances, an extensive gray market for this important commodity had developed, and it was being quoted at prices as high as $3.75 per pound.

The significance of these inflated prices lies in the fact that the metal finishers and manufacturers who use cadmium have been unable to pass along this added cost to their customers. This, in turn, has made it very difficult for many of these manufacturers, including a number of small businessmen, to remain competitive in what is a very competitive market.

In my district are a number of companies who manufacture screws, builder's hardware, and a wide variety of fasteners. All of these concerns have informed me that a shortage of cadmium has produced great hardship.

It is my understanding that the Federal Government has more than 10 million pounds of Cadmium in excess of its stockpile requirements. There is, therefore, no reason in my opinion why this bill should not receive the enthusiastic endorsement of every Member of the House. I think that the situation which I have described is further evidence of the fact that while it is quite proper and necessary for the Government to maintain a stockpile reserve of critical and strategic materials this program needs close scrutiny and periodic review to avoid piling up unwarranted surpluses.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely urge every Member of the House to consider favorably this piece of legislation. Our failure to concur in the passage of this bill would simply mean a continuation of the present black market in this important item with a resultant unfortunate effect on manufacturers, businessmen, and ultimately the consuming public itself.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 307, was laid on the table.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make certain that action upon this legislation, just concluded, is clearly understood to be in accordance with the legislative history made on this floor on March 18, 1963.

At pages 4397 and 4398 of the Congressional Record for that date, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price] made it clear that this is not pilot legislation to establish a pattern for future stockpile disposals.

The gentleman from Illinois also assured Members of this body that the Armed Services Committee is determined to see that definite guidelines are followed as set forth in the committee report, and those guidelines were made a part of the Record on March 18.

With this record clearly established as a safeguard for our domestic minerals industry, we can proceed to authorization of this cadmium disposal with assurance and confidence that it will not be disruptive of our domestic minerals economy. I deeply appreciate the committee's foresight in this direction.

RELEASING THE RIGHT IN CERTAIN STREETS IN HEYBURN, IDAHO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1087) to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That any right, title, or interest of the United States in and to streets that were dedicated upon the filing of the townsite plat for Heyburn, Idaho, a reclamation townsite established pursuant to the Act of April 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 116), as amended, and that adjoin lands which have been sold, which streets have been vacated, or any street that may hereafter be vacated within the original townsite of Heyburn, Idaho, is hereby released and quitclaimed to the adjoining owners by the United States.
>
> Sec. 2. The clause included in patent numbered 1048499, issued by the United States to the village of Heyburn on July 27, 1931, providing for reversion of title to the United States is hereby repealed, and any right, title, or interest of the United States in and to Lincoln Boulevard or any street hereafter to be vacated within said townsite adjoining the lands described in said patent is hereby released.

With the following committee amendment:

> Page 2, lines 3 to 9, inclusive, strike out all of section 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following language:
>
> "Sec. 2. The clause included in patent numbered 1048499, issued by the United States to the village of Heyburn on July 27, 1931, providing for reversion of title to the United States is hereby repealed, and any right, title, or interest of the United States in and to Lincoln Boulevard is hereby released to the adjoining landowners. If any street is hereafter vacated within said townsite, title to said street shall revert to the adjoining landowners."

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. Harding: On page 2, line 13, after the word "repealed" change the comma to a period and strike out the remainder of the committee amendment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, has this amendment been agreed to by the committee?

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Michigan, the amendment has been agreed to by the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor].

Mr. FORD. There is no conflict in the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Idaho and the committee amendment?

Mr. HARDING. There is no conflict.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Harding: Page 2, lines 1 and 2, after the word "released", strike out "and quitclaimed to the adjoining owners by the United States."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

I should like to ask, has this amendment also been cleared with the minority?

Mr. HARDING. This amendment has also been cleared with the minority.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. These amendments have been cleared by those members of the committee who had any question about the legislation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAIMS—TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1988) to provide for the settlement of claims of certain residents of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I note on page 5 of the report that the United Nations, that Tower of Babel in New York, takes an interest in matter of the payment to these people in the Pacific; they apparently have been prodding the U.S. taxpayers to take care of this item more expeditiously. I wonder if that polyglot organization in New York will apply the same pressure for expedition among its own members to pay for the Emergency Force in the Congo and the Emergency Force in the Middle East, as well as regular assessments for support of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I think members of the United Nations would be in much better business if, instead of prodding the Government of the United States and the taxpayers of the United States to pay for the damages to these people in the Pacific, they attended to their own business and let us run the financial business of this Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby assumes compassionate responsibility to compensate inhabitants of the Rongelap Atoll, in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, for radiation exposures sustained by them as a result of a thermonuclear detonation at Bikini Atoll in the Marshall Islands on March 1, 1954.

Sec. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated for such purpose out of the Treasury of the United States the sum of $950,000 to remain available until expended under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter referred to as the "Secretary") for the general benefit of the affected inhabitants of Rongelap. The Secretary may segregate a portion of the sum for each affected individual, and hold it in trust for the individual or his heirs or legatees (hereinafter referred to as the "beneficiary" or "beneficiaries"), subject to the provisions of this Act. The amounts segregated and held by the Secretary in trust for individual beneficiaries, and the unsegregated balance, shall, if invested by him, be invested in a manner that in his judgment is prudent.

Sec. 3. (a) The interest or dividends earned from each trust held for an individual beneficiary shall be paid at least annually by the Secretary to such beneficiary. When, in the opinion of the Secretary, there appears to be a substantial benefit to be derived therefrom by any beneficiary, the Secretary may, upon request of the beneficiary, and under such conditions as he may deem appropriate, make the principal sum, or any part thereof, available for expenditure by such beneficiary. Any payment under this subsection may be made directly to a beneficiary who is twenty-one years of age or older. In the case of a beneficiary who is less than twenty-one years of age or who is, in the opinion of the Secretary, mentally incompetent, payment may be made in the discretion of the Secretary to the beneficiary, a parent, relative, other person, or institution for his benefit.

(b) The principal, interest, and dividends from funds held for the general benefit of the affected inhabitants of Rongelap shall be used for such purposes as the Secretary deems appropriate.

Sec. 4. A trust for an individual beneficiary created pursuant to this Act may be terminated by the Secretary at any time, and if after reasonable search the beneficiary cannot be located, the principal and accumulated interest and dividends may be added to the unsegregated balance of the funds held for the general benefit of the affected inhabitants of Rongelap.

Sec. 5. The Secretary is authorized to pay reasonable attorney fees for legal services rendered on behalf of a beneficiary, or beneficiaries, prior to the date of enactment of this Act. Such fees shall be paid out of the funds authorized to be appropriated in section 2 of this Act, but the total of such fees paid shall not exceed 5 per centum of the appropriated funds.

Sec. 6. The decisions of the Secretary in carrying out the provisions of this Act shall be final and not subject to review.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND IN TRUST FOR THE OGLALA SIOUX INDIAN TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 844) to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

To declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 5,422.68 acres of land in South Dakota that have been used for the benefit of the Oglala Community School and have been determined excess to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, together with the improvements thereon, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation. Such land is described as follows:

(a) 1,040 acres; northeast quarter section 15; west half section 16; south half and the northeast quarter and the south half northwest quarter section 17, township 35 north, range 43 west, sixth principal meridian.

(b) 180.47 acres; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, section 20, and lot 4, section 21, township 35 north, range 43 west, sixth principal meridian.

(c) 80 acres; south half northeast quarter section 15, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(d) 36.32 acres; lot 3, section 21, township 35 north, range 43 west, sixth principal meridian.

(e) 602.57 acres; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, east half west half, southeast quarter section 18; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, section 19, township 35 north, range 43 west, sixth principal meridian.

(f) 683.81 acres; south half, northeast quarter section 13; lots 1 and 2, section 23; lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, section 24, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(g) 960 acres; all section 8; southwest quarter section 9, north half northwest quarter section 17, east half northeast quarter section 18, township 35 north, range 43 west, sixth principal meridian.

(h) 266.79 acres; southwest quarter northwest quarter, west half southwest quarter section 14, east half southeast quarter, section 15; lot 1 section 22; lot 4 section 23, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(i) 760 acres; east half section 10; west half section 11; northwest quarter northwest quarter section 14; north half northeast quarter section 15, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(j) 153.62 acres; east half southwest quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter section 14, lot 3, section 23, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(k) 160 acres; southeast quarter section 14, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(l) 339.10 acres; east half northwest, east half southwest, west half southeast, section 15, lots 2, 3, and 4, section 22, township 35 north, range 44 west, sixth principal meridian.

(m) 160 acres; southwest quarter, section 17, township 35 north, range 41 west, sixth principal meridian.

Sec. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 17, strike out the word "determined" and insert "determine".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND IN TRUST FOR THE OGLALA SIOUX TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 845) to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the land described herein and heretofore used as a site for the Wakpamni Lake Day School on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota which has been determined excess to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, together with the improvements thereon, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation. The land is described as the east half northeast quarter northeast quarter, section 9 and the west half northwest quarter northwest quarter, section 10, township 35 north, range 41 west, sixth principal meridian, South Dakota.

Sec. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT MOJAVE INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2635) to amend the act of August 9, 1955, for the purpose of including the Fort Mojave Indian Reservation among reservations excepted from the 25-year lease limitations.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 1 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 539), as amended (25 U.S.C. 415), is hereby further amended by deleting the words "and on" and inserting in lieu thereof the words, ", the Fort Mojave Reservation, and".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following language: "That the second sentence of section 1 of the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 539), as amended (25 U.S.C. 415), is hereby further amended by inserting the words 'the Fort Mojave Reservation,' after the words 'the Southern Ute Reservation,'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RIVERTON RECLAMATION PROJECT, WYOMING

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4423) permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That pending completion of a repayment contract or the enactment of other legislation providing for the furnishing of water to lands of the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming, the Secretary is authorized to continue to furnish water to the lands in such division, during calendar year 1963, as under the provisions of section 9, subsection (d) (1), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1195; 43 U.S.C. 485h(d)) but without regard to the time limitation therein specified. Water shall be furnished upon individual applications accompanied by payments of $4 per acre for the first three acre-feet per acre with water in excess of that amount at $2 per acre-foot. The portion of the operation and maintenance costs in excess of the total of such payments is hereby declared to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight, April 1, 1963, to file a report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriations bill for 1964.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PILLION reserved all points of order on the bill.

DUAL RATE CONTRACTS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4555) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87–346, relating to dual rate contracts.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act of October 3, 1961 (Public Law 87–346; 76 Stat. 762), is amended as follows:

(a) By striking the words "of not to exceed one year after such filing" from the next to last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "but not beyond April 3, 1964".

(b) By striking the word "year" from the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the word "period".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BILLS REGARDING VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 220. H.R. 220 will permit the conversion or exchange of term policies of national service life insurance to a new modified plan. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has long been interested in perfecting a formula that would prevent the World War II term policyholder from experiencing the same difficulty as World War I veterans in the term insurance field. Term insurance sold by the Government to veterans is 5-year level premium term—that is, every 5 years it must be renewed with the premium being based on the then attained age.

The gradually increasing rates under this insurance make the cost of maintaining a policy extremely prohibitive as a veteran advances in years. For example, a World War I veteran who renews his term insurance at age 65 must pay an annual premium of $467.80 on a $10,000 policy. At age 70 the premium jumps to $727.70 annually. To prevent in the case of World War II veterans what has already taken place with respect to the term insurance for World War I veterans, the committee has reported H.R. 220. It will provide a new plan of national service life insurance to be offered to World War II term policyholders as a substitute for their present term policies. The premium on the new insurance would remain at the same level throughout the life of the insured. At age 65, however, the face value of the policy would be reduced in half. At age 65 the policyholder would, if he so desired, continue in force that half of the policy which he would otherwise lose by paying the premium rate for his then attained age without medical examination.

To demonstrate how the new plan would work let us compare the premium rates for a World War II veteran at age 45. At the present time, holding his $10,000 term insurance policy, he pays an annual premium of $117.20. At age 50 the insurance is renewable for 5 more years at an annual premium of $150.40. At age 55 the cost is $209.50 for the next 5 years. At age 60 the premium becomes $307.80 annually and at age 65, $470 annually. At age 70 the premium jumps to $731.60 annually.

Under the modified life plan we are considering today, this same veteran at age 45 would convert his insurance to the new plan and pay $171.70 annually for the rest of his life. Upon reaching age 65 the face value of the policy would be reduced to $5,000. If he so desired, the veteran could elect to retain the full $10,000 policy at an annual premium of $505.60 for the rest of his life.

The Veterans' Administration has estimated that there are about 3 million national service life insurance policyholders who are continuing their insurance on the term plan. The enactment of H.R. 220 will alleviate the problem for these men as they attain the advanced ages where term premium rates become progressively more burdensome with each renewal. In addition, it will provide permanent plan insurance at a lower premium rate than existing permanent plans of insurance. The Veterans' Administration has estimated the administrative cost of this proposal for the first year at $206,000. The first 5-year total cost is estimated at $846,000.

Similar legislation passed the House in the 86th and 87th Congresses. The insurance provided by this bill would become available January 1, 1964.

H.R. 243

H.R. 243 would authorize the Veterans' Administration to pay a statutory award for each service-connected loss, or loss of use, of a limb.

Under existing law the Veterans' Administration is authorized to pay statutory awards in varying amounts for different combinations of anatomical loss or loss of use of extremities, creative organs, buttocks, or eyes. Because of the language of the statute, a group of approximately 440 veterans who have suffered two of these disabilities are paid a statutory award for only one.

For example, the veteran who suffers the loss of an eye or an arm or a leg is entitled to a $47 monthly award. If he has lost both an arm and leg he is entitled to a statutory award which, in effect, compensates him for each such loss. If he suffered the loss of all three, an arm, a leg, and an eye, he would receive a greater statutory award compensating him for this combination of disabilities. If he had the peculiar misfortune to suffer the loss of an eye in combination with an arm or a leg the statutory award would only compensate him for one of these conditions. To further illustrate this disparity in the law, take the case of three veterans, one having lost an eye, one having lost a leg, and the third having lost an eye and a leg. All three of these veterans would be entitled to the same statutory award of $47 monthly because of the language contained in the statute. There are approximately 440 veterans affected. The Veterans' Administration has estimated that this disparity in the law can be corrected at an annual cost of $225,000 for the first 5 years. I believe the bill has merit and urge its passage.

H.R. 248

H.R. 248 will amend that portion of the law which authorizes a $10,000 grant for severely disabled veterans in acquiring specially equipped homes made necessary because of the nature of their disability.

At the present time, veterans with service-connected disabilities are eligible for this grant if they are permanently and totally disabled due to the loss or loss of use of both lower extremities so as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or wheelchairs, or are blind in both eyes and have lost or lost the use of one lower extremity and are in such condition to preclude locomotion without the aid of a wheelchair.

H.R. 248 would delete the requirement that blind veterans who have lost a lower extremity be confined to a wheelchair to qualify for this benefit. This group has suffered severe disabilities, and they encounter difficulty in the manipulation of their artificial limbs beyond that encountered by sighted veterans, because they are not able to direct their steps with the accuracy which vision permits. The Veterans' Administration estimates there are less than 50 veterans now on the compensation rolls who have sustained this peculiar combination of disabilities. An unknown number of these are confined to wheelchairs and have been granted or are eligible for assistance under existing law. The cost estimate is substantially less than $500,000 the first year. The cost later would be quite small, because new cases with this combination of disabilities would be rare.

I urge its favorable consideration.

INCREASED PAYMENTS FOR PARENTS AND CHILDREN OF CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 211) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 411(b)(2) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$25" and inserting in lieu thereof "$28".

SEC. 2. Section 413 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "$70" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "$77";

(2) by striking out "$100" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "$110";

(3) by striking out "$130" in paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "$143"; and

(4) by striking out "25" in paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "$28".

SEC. 3. Section 414 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "$25" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$28";

(2) by striking out "$70" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$77"; and

(3) by striking out "$35" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "$39".

SEC. 4. (a) Column II of the table contained in subsection (b) of section 415 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$75" and inserting in lieu thereof "$83"; by striking out "$60" and inserting in lieu thereof "$66"; by striking out "$45" and inserting in lieu thereof "$50"; by striking out "$30" and inserting in lieu thereof "$33"; and by striking out "$15" and inserting in lieu thereof "$17".

(b) Column II of the tables contained in subsections (c) and (d) of such section 415 are each amended by striking out "$50" and inserting in lieu thereof "$55"; by striking out "$40" and inserting in lieu thereof "$44"; by striking out "$30" and inserting in lieu thereof "$33"; by striking out "$20" and inserting in lieu thereof "$22"; and by striking out "$10" and inserting in lieu thereof "$11".

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is a second demanded?

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill increases by 10 percent—with fractions rounded off to next higher dollar—the monthly rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable for eligible parents and children of veterans dying of service-connected causes.

The President in his budget message indicated general support for legislation of this type.

The effect of this legislation is as shown in the tables below—italic indicates rates in H.R. 211:

Rates of dependency and indemnity compensation to widows, children, and parents for service-connected death occurring on or after Jan. 1, 1957 [1] [2]

Widows [3] and children	Children, no widow
Widow alone: $112 per month, plus 12 per centum of basic pay of deceased husband, with total amount adjusted to next highest dollar. Rates range from $122 in an E–1 case with less than 2 years' service to $316 in case of an O–10 with over 30 years' service. If deceased was serving as Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or Commandant of the Marine Corps, regardless of cumulative years of service the widow's rate is $337.	Children under age 18: 1 child, $70 (*$77*). 2 children, $100 (*$110*) (equally divided). 3 children, $130 (*$143*) (equally divided), plus $25 (*$28*) for each child in excess of 3 (equally divided).
Widow and 1 child under age 18: Same as amount payable to widow alone	Child age 18 or above who became permanently incapable of self-support prior to that age: $95 (*$106*) (basic $70 (*$77*) rate increased by $25 (*$28*); total rate with $25 (*$28*) supplement variable where there are other children).
Widow and 2 or more children under age 18: Same rate as that payable to widow alone with following exception: Where total amount payable under the Railroad Retirement Act or Social Security Act, or under sec. 412 of title 38, U.S.C. (veterans' benefits), based upon an assumed fully and currently insured status, is less than $128, the compensation payable to widow by VA increased by $25 (*$28*) for each child in excess of 1, but the total increase may not exceed the difference between the amounts payable under the above and $128.	Child or children ages 18 to 21 attending school: Same as basic rate payable to children under age 18 where there is no widow. (Payment barred if child commences program of war orphans' educational assistance.)
Widow and child or children age 18 and above permanently incapable of self-support where incapacity began under age 18: Regular widow's rate payable to widow, plus $70 (*$77*) for each such child payable to child.	
Widow and child or children age 18 but under 21 attending school: Regular widow's rate payable to widow, plus $35 (*$39*) payable to each such child. (Payment barred if child commences program of war orphans' educational assistance.)	

See footnotes at end of table.

1 PARENT ONLY

Total annual income		Monthly rate
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$750	$75 (*$85*)
$750	$1,000	60 (*66*)
$1,000	$1,250	45 (*50*)
$1,250	$1,500	30 (*33*)
$1,500	$1,750	15 (*17*)
$1,750		0

2 PARENTS LIVING TOGETHER [4]

Combined annual income		Monthly rate to each
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$1,000	$50 (*$55*)
$1,000	$1,350	40 (*44*)
$1,350	$1,700	30 (*33*)
$1,700	$2,050	20 (*22*)
$2,050	$2,400	10 (*11*)
$2,400		0

2 PARENTS NOT LIVING TOGETHER

Total annual income of parent		Individual rate
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$750	$50 (*$55*)
$750	$1,000	40 (*44*)
$1,000	$1,250	30 (*33*)
$1,250	$1,500	20 (*22*)
$1,500	$1,750	10 (*11*)
$1,750		0

---

[1] Persons eligible for death compensation based on death occurring before Jan. 1, 1957, may, under certain conditions, apply for and receive dependency and indemnity compensation.

[2] Except in certain missing persons cases the dependents of veterans who die on or after May 1, 1957, while their life-insurance premiums are waived pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 724 (formerly sec. 622 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended) are not eligible to receive dependency and indemnity compensation but may be paid death compensation notwithstanding the fact the death occurred after Dec. 31, 1956.

[3] The term "widow" includes the widower of any female veteran if such widower is incapable of self-maintenance and was permanently incapable of self-support due to physical or mental disability at the time of the veteran's death.

[4] Applies also to remarried parent living with spouse, with income of spouse counted.

The VA estimates that the bill would benefit the first year 44,900 children at a cost of $3,082,000—sections 2 and 3—and 30,900 parents at a cost of $1,743,000—section 4. Data on which to base the first year's estimate of cost of section 1 of the bill are not readily available but it is estimated it would not exceed $209,000. The total first year's additional cost of the bill would thus be approximately $5 million. It is believed that the additional cost will decrease slightly for the next 4 years.

The VA favors the bill. There has been no increase for this group since January 1, 1957.

APRIL 1, 1963.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The Disabled American Veterans support the provisions of H.R. 211 which will provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans. We urge early passage of this measure by the House of Representatives.

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director for Legislation, Disabled American Veterans.

Washington, D.C., April 1, 1963.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chief, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Veterans of Foreign Wars urges favorable consideration of H.R. 211, which will increase rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans. Estimated 45,000 children and 31,000 parents have not received compensation increase since 1957, although cost of living has increased more than 11 percent. This group is long overdue for this increase. Urge immediate passage of H.R. 211.

FRANCES W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 211. This bill will increase the monthly rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable for parents and children of veterans dying from service-connected causes. Dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows is geared to basic active service pay. Whenever military pay is increased the rate of dependency and indemnity for widows is automatically increased. This is based upon the formula of $112 plus 12 percent of the basic pay of the deceased husband. Other classes of survivors, specifically children and parents, do not participate in this automatic adjustment. Instead, they receive a flat payment established by law.

Military pay was last increased on June 1, 1958. The widows' rates, of course, were adjusted at that time. The Armed Services Committee, as I understand it, is presently considering legislation to increase the basic pay of the military. Widows of veterans dying from service-connected causes will, of course, participate in any increase enacted into law.

Parents and children of deceased service-connected veterans, however, are not so fortunate. If their rate of compensation is to be increased, it must be accomplished directly by congressional action. H.R. 211 proposes to do exactly that. The rate of payment for these groups has remained constant since the Serviceman's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act became effective on January 1, 1957. The Consumer Price Index, reflecting the increased cost of living, has risen 11.3 percent since the Survivor Benefits Act became law. This bill will increase by 10 percent the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for these groups not geared to military pay. The Veterans' Administration has estimated the first year cost of the bill at approximately $5 million with a slight decrease in this figure for each of the next 4 years. I believe this legislation is justified and urge that it be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 211?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CUBAN LIBERATION MOVEMENT

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today sent the following telegram to the President of the United States:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

We must end the harassment, which this Government has carried on, of liberty-loving anti-Castro forces in Cuba and in other lands. While we cannot violate international law, we must recognize that these exiles and rebels represent the real voice of Cuba, and should not be constantly handicapped by our Immigration and Justice Department authorities.

Congressman AUGUST E. JOHANSEN.

If my message actually reaches the President's desk I hope he will give it the thoughtful and respectful consideration its authorship deserves.

I say this because my telegram, in its entirety, is a verbatim quotation of a public statement made in Johnstown, Pa., October 15, 1960, by Democratic Presidential Nominee John F. Kennedy.

Now that the Kennedy administration has, over the past weekend, imposed completely unprecedented restrictions on the Cuban exiles, where do we—or they—go from here?

Will the next logical step be imposition by the United States of a total blockade of Cuban exile forces and a complete ban on any Cuban liberation activities "launched, manned or equipped" from any Western Hemisphere base?

Are we preparing to enforce the Communist "peace" of Castro and the Soviet Union in Cuba—by armed might, if necessary?

Where is our "peace at any price" policy leading us?

Is the President's statement of September 13, 1962, "We shall continue to work with Cuban refugee leaders who are dedicated as we are to that Nation's future return to freedom," now a dead letter?

I call attention of the House to the irony of an Associated Press report from Havana appearing in the morning newspapers. It quotes Castro as saying that it will take only "a few more weeks" to wipe out remaining rebels operating on Cuban territory.

And I also include, without comment, the following page 1 editorial from the March 24, 1963, issue of the Worker, official organ of the Communist Party U.S.A.

Killers on the Loose

The outlaws responsible for the murderous hit-and-run attacks on Cuba see such forays as paving the way for invasion of U.S. Armed Forces.

In such a war the corpses of American boys would pave the road to restoring exploitation in Cuba.

The State Department has repudiated the attacks as "irresponsible" and "ineffective." But there is reason to believe that there are forces within the Pentagon who are supporting such incursions.

There is only one way to end once and for all the threat of war in the Caribbean. That is for the President to declare unequivocally that, whatever the official view of the Government of the United States is with respect to socialism, it desires to live in peace with Cuba. The Cuban Government has often declared that it wants peaceful relations with the United States.

Such a declaration by the Kennedy administration, and its enforcement within the Pentagon and the CIA, would have the overwhelming support of the American people.

It would expose the war hawks as betrayers of our lives and our security, and would prevent our land being used as the base for Batista-type killers who want to drown the new Cuba in blood, and to restore the old exploitation.

THE WHEAT FARMERS' REFERENDUM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, an apparent, and unfortunate, misunderstanding of a major action by the 87th Congress has recently come to my attention. A deliberate effort is being made to lead farmers to believe the Congress was not serious when it passed the wheat program as part of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. It is being implied that the Congress will enact new legislation on wheat in the event the wheat referendum is turned down.

It was the intent and purpose of the 87th Congress to make the 1964 wheat program a permanent and continuing program. It was passed on that basis. The law provides for a referendum again in 1964, and in subsequent years.

In any referendum, there is always the possibility that one-third or more of the voting farmers will vote against production restrictions, even at the expense of assured higher prices. For 25 years Congress has recognized this possibility and has always provided for a stopgap program to prevent complete price and production disaster.

In the case of the 1964 wheat program, this stopgap is 50 percent of parity price supports—$1.25 per bushel—providing the individual farmer complies with the same acreage restrictions that he would have under the original program.

If one-third or more of the voting farmers vote "no" on May 21, then this alternative stopgap provision automatically goes into effect for 1964. A rejection does not mean the program has been repealed.

Another national wheat referendum will then be called in 1964 to decide what the program will be for 1965.

In all the discussion and deliberation in committees and on the floor of both Houses prior to the passage of this program in the 87th Congress, it was clearly and unmistakably the intent and purpose of Congress that this program shall remain in continuing effect and that no further legislation would be needed and that none should be expected. The decision from here on out would be left entirely to wheatgrowers.

The 1964 wheat program provides wheatgrowers with clear and unmistakable economic choices in this referendum. They should make their decision on this basis, and no other. They could be sorely disappointed if they went to the referendum polls on May 21 with unfounded hopes that Congress would or could pass new wheat legislation in time for the 1964 crop year if they vote "no" on the attractive income and production stabilization provisions of this program.

Wheatgrowers should understand that no individual—in or out of Congress—has the power or authority to deliver on irresponsible statements. The wheat farmers have a choice under the law, and in my judgment the Congress will take them at their word. I am convinced that there will be no new wheat legislation this year.

WHEAT LEGISLATION

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to hear the statement just made by the distinguished majority leader which has sort of political connotations, let me say. I want to predict right here and now that if and when the wheat referendum is voted down, the Members of the majority party in the Congress and its leadership will fall all over themselves to enact wheat legislation before this session of the Congress adjourns.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. I trust the gentleman is not referring to the majority leader as the House of Representatives in his last statement?

Mr. HOEVEN. That remains to be seen. I have heard a lot of talk about what will happen if the wheat referendum is voted down. This is nothing but a lot of political propaganda to force a favorable vote in the referendum. I still stand by my prediction that the majority leadership in this House and the majority party in general are not going to permit Congress to adjourn without enacting suitable and necessary wheat legislation, if the referendum fails. The Democrats are too smart politicians to let this happen. Let us be honest about it and not fool the wheat farmers.

A REGIONAL RESEARCH CENTER FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the establishment of a regional research center for rural development. My bill proposes that the center be established at Richfield, Utah. Our rural areas need attention and we need some scientific, objective information, concerning rural problems if we are to provide 20th century answers for them.

The center would conduct studies of unemployment and underemployment in rural communities. One of the important functions of this center would be to prepare and analyze data on manpower, agricultural, natural, and other resources in selected rural communities to determine the extent to which these resources are being utilized. The entire program would be geared to the search for new economic opportunities for rural America.

We need to study and evaluate the migration from farm to city. Today more than 36 percent of all farm families have incomes of less than $2,000 per year, and 75 percent of them have less than $5,000.

In Utah for example, 13 of our 29 counties have lost population in the last 10 years while the State's population as a whole has increased more than 30 percent. These 13 counties are all rural and together comprise nearly half the land area of Utah.

Important resources are often overlooked—that is the low-production farm areas often have underdeveloped recreational resources and tourism which have a potential for employing large numbers of persons within the area.

An inventory must be made of the present and potential labor force in an area. The search for new industrial and service opportunities must be geared to the composition of the local labor force.

Richfield, Utah, is an ideal location for such a center. This city of 4,412 population is located in the heart of central Utah, being near the geographical center of the State. But, also, this is the approximate center of the 11 western continental States of the United States.

In addition to the geographical location of Richfield, it is also within easy reach of four colleges in southern and central Utah—Carbon College at Price; Snow College at Ephraim; the College of Southern Utah at Cedar City; and Dixie College at St. George. And not far distant is Brigham Young University, the largest university in the intermountain West.

The details of staffing such a research center can be worked out in consultation with the Extension Service and with the Office of Rural Areas Development of the Department of Agriculture.

It is my conviction that a research center for rural development would serve a vital purpose in ascertaining the specific causes in a scientific manner of the decline of our rural counties. But, more important, it would serve to discover means for reinvigorating our rural communities, which are the backbone of our Nation.

A center could be established by the Secretary of Agriculture, under broad powers given him for administration of research programs. Or it could be established by congressional action. I am introducing my bill so as to open up both possible avenues of approach.

ENLARGING KINGS CANYON NATIONAL PARK

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to add the Cedar Grove and Tehipite Valley areas to Kings Canyon National Park.

The two areas now are portions of the Sequoia and the Sierra National Forests extending like fingers into Kings Canyon Park. Cedar Grove is on the South Fork of the Kings River in the main Kings Canyon. Tehipite Valley lies on the Middle Fork of the Kings River.

Althought the areas have outstanding scenic and recreational value, worthy of preservation as portions of the park, they were excluded when Kings Canyon National Park was created in 1940 because at that time the Kings River had not been developed for control of floods and conservation of irrigation water and Cedar Grove and Tehipite Valley were considered potential reservoir sites.

I think it was entirely proper in 1940 to exclude these areas from the park, because they should be devoted to their highest beneficial use and, as it then appeared, this could well have been flood control and water storage reservoirs.

However, construction of Pine Flat Dam was authorized in 1944 and it has been built and is in operation. In recent years additional water storage has been provided by reservoirs constructed by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. We also have Millerton and power reservoirs on the San Joaquin River and Terminus and Success Dams on the Kaweah and Tule Rivers, all contributing to a solution of the flood problem in the valley areas where their waters intermingle.

The time has come when we should take a new look at the present and future use of the Cedar Grove and Tehipite Valley areas in light of river development since 1940 and greatly increased national park and recreation needs and my bill would bring the subject into the open for full discussion and decision.

I feel there is a great deal of evidence supporting the view that more water storage on the Kings River is not economically justified for irrigation needs. While it is true some electric power could be generated, such use could well be incompatible with primary operation of the river to provide maximum satisfaction of irrigation requirements. In any event, there are alternate sources of electric power, so that we do not need to sacrifice the scenic and recreational values of these areas because of power requirements which could not be otherwise met. All of these considerations have led me to the view that the highest use of Tehipite and Cedar Grove lies in now adding them to the national park of which they are logical, natural and essential parts.

Our population increase and explosive demand for outdoor recreation in California have generated two difficult problems in the conservation field. We must protect and preserve adequate wilderness areas and regions which, because of their scenic grandeur, have been set aside as national parks. At the same time, we must provide safe roads and sufficient public facilities for the millions of citizens who want to enjoy our parks and the more limited number able to reach wilderness areas.

Cedar Grove is the actual heart of Kings Canyon National Park. It is the only portion of the great canyon which can be reached by highway and it lies surrounded by the majestic ramparts, peaks and cliffs which inspired creation of the park. It is so inescapably a part of the park and so artificially a part of the Sequoia National Forest that the National Park Service and the Forest Service long since agreed that even under its present forest status, it would be administered by the park service. Similarly, the magnificent Tehipite Valley, under forest jurisdiction, is a relatively unprotected "sore thumb" projected into the grand sweep of high ranges, peaks and domes justifying the northern portion of the park.

It is the uncertainty of ultimate jurisdiction over these valleys that is preventing their urgently needed development for public use. The National Park Service cannot inaugurate any program for permanent protection and regulated use of Cedar Grove until it is a part of the park. Thus, visitors now traverse the long and beautiful road into Kings Canyon to find virtually no provision for their accommodation when they reach what they believe to be the heart of the park. Tehipite Valley is neither fish nor fowl, kept in suspended animation by indecision. It is my belief, we need to take earliest action to protect and provide permissible use of these scenic and recreational national resources.

I well realize there are sincere persons with dedicated interest in the welfare and problems of our valley and mountains who may disagree with my views. Establishing the highest use of our natural resources is always a matter of judgment and is properly a matter of discussion, for we must weigh the facts and the relative values involved. In a sense, all these values are "selfish" because one use, such as that embraced in preservation of our parks for the enjoyment and inspiration of present and future generations, may well be incompatible with other possible uses to provide essential services to the public, such as water to provide food, power for our people, lumber for housing or minerals we need. I have little patience with those who dismiss as "selfish" all interests except their own.

It is my intention to ask for committee hearings on my proposal as early as necessary reports and recommendations can be obtained. All interested persons should be provided opportunity to present their views, and it will be up to the committee and the Congress to arrive at a considered judgment. Naturally, I hope this will provide for the addition of these beautiful and essential areas to Kings Canyon National Park.

AMEND HIGHWAY-USE TAX

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to amend the highway-use tax provisions of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956. This act of 1956 imposed a tax on the use of certain highway motor vehicles having a taxable gross weight in excess of 26,000 pounds. The tax levied is at the rate of $1.50 a year for each 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight. The Internal Revenue Code Amendments of 1961 increased this rate to $3 a year for each 1,000 pounds gross weight. Consequently, the owner of a truck with a gross weight of 26,000 pounds or more must pay a minimum of $78 in taxes per year. This tax liability is incurred even though the owner of the vehicle does not use it as an indispensable part of his primary business and it also applies to those who may seldom operate the vehicle on a federally aided highway on such primary hauls as from farm to market or from logging camp to sawmill.

The bill which I am introducing, Mr. Speaker, would provide for the abatement of certain penalties and interest otherwise payable with respect to the highway-use tax in the case of a motor vehicle used primarily for hauling unprocessed farm and forest products from place of production to a market or processing point.

Many of the small truckers have brought to my attention the heavy burden which falls upon them when they find that now they must pay highway-use back taxes from July 1, 1956, to the present. Many of these small operators were unaware that this highway-use tax existed. Small operators that they are, they usually do not hold memberships in an association which would bring this information to their attention. Furthermore, the Internal Revenue Service in the past had no direct contact with these operators so that they might bring this tax liability to their attention. The result is that many of these small loggers and farmers are faced with delinquent tax claims plus penalty and interest for a tax they knew nothing about. It is true that ignorance of the law is no excuse, but in this case, the sufficiency of the public information apparently can be questioned.

For the past year or so, the Internal Revenue Service has been conducting a broad-scale enforcement check and instances have arisen where a small trucker has been assessed a total of over $3,000 in back taxes together with 25-percent penalties and 6-percent interest. Waiving the penalty and interest on these assessments where ignorance and lack of sufficient notification by the Internal Revenue Service and no wrongful intention are involved would be the just thing to do, especially since enforcement of the tax payment was apparently neglected for a considerable period of time.

Mr. Speaker, the urgency of this situation certainly requires that my proposal be given favorable consideration by the Congress at the earliest possible time. Following is the text of my bill as introduced today:

H.R. 5343

A bill to provide for the abatement of certain penalties and interest otherwise payable with respect to the highway use tax in the case of certain motor vehicles used primarily for hauling unprocessed farm and forest products from their place of production to market or mill

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no penalty (including interest, additions to the penalty, and additional amounts) shall be assessed or collected, under section 6601 or 6672 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 or under any other provision of law, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act on account of the failure of any person to pay the tax imposed by section 4481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on the use of any highway motor vehicle for any taxable period beginning on or after July 1, 1956, and ending before July 1, 1963, if such person or his duly authorized representative, within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, submits to the Secretary or his delegate—

(1) a sworn statement that he was unaware of, and did not willfully evade, such tax; and

(2) satisfactory proof that during the taxable period or periods involved at least 80 per cent of the use of such vehicle consisted of—

(A) transportation of unprocessed and raw farm products from the place of production to market, where such transportation constituted the first haul of such products, or

(B) transportation of logs, pulpwood, or other raw and unfinished forest products from the place of production to an assembly yard, railhead, or mill, where such transportation constituted the first haul of such products, or

(C) a combination of transportation described in subparagraphs (A) and (B).

If any such penalty has been assessed and not collected prior to the date of the enactment of this Act, or is assessed on or after such date, the assessment shall be abated; and if such penalty is collected by the United States on or after such date the amount so collected shall be paid back as a penalty collected without authority.

BILLION-DOLLAR-A-WEEK CLUB

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last a preliminary release was put out on these remarks that I am making today. After reviewing this over the weekend, I saw fit to make a few changes and, therefore, I am putting out a revised release today.

Mr. Speaker, the "Billion-Dollar-a-Week Club" in the Pentagon has poured another $560,000 down the drain. Today I am going to detail for you how it was done. This is the latest in a long series of cases I have developed that prove the waste in defense spending. It is also more evidence that legislation such as my H.R. 4409 and H.R. 5258 should be reported by the proper committees and acted upon by this House.

During this session of Congress, I have presented many simple cases of waste. This has been done in an effort to acquaint Members with just a few of the complicated details that surround military procurement. Today's case, however, is different. It took over 4 months to develop, involved many hours of study, investigation, and interrogation, and is more fully and completely documented by industry by the Air Force and by an arm of Congress.

I want to say to my colleagues that if I had ordered a case tailor made to fit my legislative recommendations, I doubt that I could find one contract that embodies more of the abuses that have needlessly skyrocketed our defense budget past $55 billion a year.

I have nicknamed the chairborne bureaucrats in the Pentagon who spend all this money "The-Billion-Dollar-a-Week Club" because they spend that much and more in the name of national defense and consistently waste 25 percent and more of all the money they disburse.

Here, in one Air Force contract for $2,948,680, is the personification of the ways in which this profligate waste comes about. Here can be found profit-padding of the rankest variety; incredibly bad contract administration by the military; development of a unit by a manufacturer at a purported loss so that it could "lock up" future contracts at fat profits and finally, a new twist—revival, in effect, of the totally discredited cost-plus contract. Also involved in this case is pressure of the most subtle sort, insidiously exerted in an effort to have me drop it. This pressure came from people in, as well as out of, Government.

This story started to unfold October 5, 1962, after I drew the attention of the House to two Air Force contracts awarded to Craig Systems, Inc., of Lawrence, Mass. Both contracts were for production of units of the MRN-12, a small airport control tower on wheels. In my remarks on the floor, I called attention to the great difference in unit price between the first contract and the second. I suggested this was another illustration of the penalties to taxpayers that stemmed from sole-source purchasing. I noted that these two contracts might well be audited by the General Accounting Office, which has been of invaluable assistance to my entire procurement study.

After my presentation, an unusual occurrence took place. A firm came to me personally and took exception to my findings. I was told that criticism of the contrast in these two contracts was a mistake. On the earlier contract, the explanation went, the Government furnished virtually all electronic equipment that went inside the shelter van. On the second contract, Craig Systems had to buy and install all this equipment. Thus, on the first purchase Craig merely supplied the shell, while on the second, so I was told, it supplied everything. This accounted for the difference in price of $24,000 per unit for the first purchase and $121,000 each for the second.

This contention caused me great concern. A Member of this House can speak to the Nation from the floor. He can do great good, has the power to do unintentional harm, and has the responsibility to be right. Therefore, if Craig Systems was right in its contention, then I had wronged the company and owed it an apology. In this spirit I began an intensive study into all facets of these two purchases, particularly the last one, where the Air Force is paying $121,000 each for the units.

At the same time, at the firm's request, I decided to delay asking the General Accounting Office to audit the contracts. Today, after scores of hours of work, my reexamination is complete.

Mr. Speaker, I was in error last October—but not in the manner I feared. I have found far more wrong with these contracts than I ever suspected. Craig Systems' main contention that the unit cost difference between the two contracts was due almost entirely to the fact that equipment was purchased on the second buy which had been furnished by the Government on the first, is simply not true. My facts show that the Air Force has allowed itself and the taxpayers to be overcharged by as much as 19 percent for this second contract. My facts show:

First, that in buying equipment that was formerly Government-furnished,

Craig frequently paid prices well above what the Government was itself paying for the identical equipment at the same time in other military procurements. This tactic not only increased the total contract cost, but also raised the figure against which Craig's percentage of profit was to be figured, thus increasing direct profits.

That situation makes this nothing less than a cost-plus contract in the thinnest of disguises. When a contractor is told to go out and spend what is needed to build an item, is permitted to pay exorbitant prices and then is allowed to add his profits and other charges on top of all that, I say it is the old cost-plus-a-percentage-of-profit deal from A to Z. And in case any colleague may have forgotten, this type of contract has been strictly prohibited since July 1, 1949. But, Mr. Speaker, this cost-plus-contract phenomenon is only the beginning. "You ain't seen nothin yet," as Al Jolson used to say.

Second, a total of 43 components, formerly Government furnished, was purchased by Craig on the second contract. Virtually every one of these 43 was substantially marked up—this to arrive at a "unit price" charged the Government for these components. Thus, these components were bought at higher prices than the Government was paying, and then an additional percentage was added on.

Third, after accomplishing this twofold inflation, there was now applied to these components another set of percentages for engineering, manufacturing and labor burden, and a burden for production. Thus the cost took another big step upward.

Fourth, Craig was next permitted to levy a healthy 16 percent to the costs already amassed in steps 1 through 3. This 16 percent was to cover so-called general and administrative expenses.

Fifth, the final step that topped off this towering pyramid of profit was a 6.5 percent of profit on items purchased and a 10-percent profit on direct costs to Craig. This was all computed on the basis of the total of the inflated purchase prices plus all the percentages mentioned in steps 1 through 4.

It is incredible that Air Force procurement officials would have allowed this to happen, but, as I will soon show, they actually encourage such goings on.

They have, themselves, made my case that it is time for a special joint committee of this Congress to ride herd on sole-source and negotiated contracts.

In very brief form, Mr. Speaker, I have revealed what my 4-month study of this procurement has uncovered. I have complied with a request for courtesy by the firm involved, but the delays are at an end. I am now forwarding a request for a full-scale audit to the Comptroller General. The facts are so apparent that an audit is plainly mandatory.

But far more than an audit is needed. The Air Force should be ordered to make a full examination and explanation of the circumstances surrounding this contract. The Congress and the American people have a right to know if our top Defense Department officials realize and condone this sort of procurement procedure. Whether they do or not, it is time for Congress to clean house of those who allow this waste to continue and to change administrative procedures and regulations under which this criminal waste goes on.

Mr. Speaker, I am today also forwarding my file on this case to the Department of Justice with a recommendation that the FBI investigate the entire matter, including relationships between Craig Systems and certain personnel at Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N.Y., who originated and administered this procurement. There has to be a reason for all the wrongs I have uncovered in my study of this procurement, and this reason must be exposed. If this sounds strong, I hope you will now bear with me as I cite in detail the incredible developments that have led me to request this sort of action.

Mr. Speaker, on December 19, 1962, Craig Systems supplied me with prices it charged the Government for each of the 43 components that had formerly been Government furnished. Later it supplied me with copies of purchase orders for each component and a tabulation of what was actually paid suppliers for them.

Comparison showed that while Craig charged the Government $68,705, it paid only $57,056 for the same components, an average markup of 20.4 percent. It also showed individual markups as high as 200 percent.

Next, I made a random spotcheck on more than one-fourth of the 43 components Craig bought. Vocally and in writing the company had told me that while prices for these items might seem high, this was unavoidable since much of "the equipment had not been produced since approximately 1954." This made it necessary for many of the suppliers to tool up especially to produce the relatively small quantity Craig required, I was told.

Mr. Speaker, this representation was as full of holes as a swiss cheese. My random spotcheck covered 12 of 43 components. In 11 of those cases the equipment was in production for the Government during the very period Craig was lining up suppliers. A twelfth item was in ample supply in Government warehouses. In those 11 cases, Government records prove Craig paid an average of 31 percent more for the equipment than the Government was paying at the same time. Mark that percentage—31 percent.

Now, what does this means in dollars and cents

Craig Systems paid $10,281.92 for those 11 components. They could have been obtained from other suppliers already building the same equipment for the Government for $6,875.92. Projecting that 31 percent possible savings against a total of $57,056 a unit paid for the 43 components by Craig reveals that the equipment could have been bought for $39,010. In other words, Craig paid $18,046.81 per unit more for purchased components than necessary and then pyramided markups, burdens, charges, and profit margins on top.

Using a conservative approach, what should unit prices of this equipment have been, based on these projected figures? Well, 16 percent of the wasted $18,046.81 is $2,887.36—this general and administrative overcharge boosts the waste to $20,933. Taking 6.5 percent of that gives $1,360 per unit overcharge for Craig's profit on purchased parts. Added to the earlier figure, it totals $22,293, and that does not include "burdens" for engineering, labor, manufacturing, and production which would certainly raise the waste factor to at least $23,000 per unit for a unit priced at $121,000.

Keep in mind that this includes only profit computed at 6.5 percent. Craig charged 10-percent profit on some of the direct costs involved. Note also that Craig is still allowed its 20-percent markup.

What this means is simply that each unit of the MRN-12 cost the Air Force, and the taxpayer, 19 percent more than necessary by conservative estimate.

This contract was actually a two-part contract. One called for production of 14 MRN-12 units. The second part called for production of 20 "modification kits"—equipment consisting of some of the 43 components and other equipment needed to update earlier MRN-12 models produced by Craig.

Why modification kits costing $62,376 each were needed when the total cost of all 43 components was $68,705 is another question the GAO should resolve. However, since $49,353 of the modification kit cost of $62,376 is represented by subcontracted items, the percentage of waste involved here could be expected to be higher than the 19 percent for the full MRN-12. Projecting only the conservative 19 percent figure against these kits as well as against part 1 of the contract, it will be seen that of the $2,948,680 spent, approximately $560,249—or over half a million dollars—was wasted.

Calculating 6.5 percent profit permitted Craig on purchase parts, an excess profit of $36,416 will be uncovered. On this entire contract, Craig is taking profits of $155,270.92 on subcontracted or purchased parts alone. The correct profits should be $118,854, and the percentage of excess here totals 30 percent.

Mr. Speaker, when costs are 19 percent too high and profits 30 percent too high, what can you call it but scalping the taxpayer in the name of national security? And what can you say about the department of government that tolerates this criminal abuse?

That is the essence of my study. Now to the explanations:

First, What was Craig's reaction when told that purchased components could have been bought 31 percent cheaper? Their Washington attorney, Mr. Charles Colson, answered in my office, "Hindsight is better than foresight." Quite an answer coming from an attorney representing a competent manufacturer of equipment for our Nation's defense.

Expanding, Mr. Colson said Craig had to "screen dozens of suppliers" in a hurry to find the best source, taking weeks of effort by Craig's full purchasing staff. Here again, the statement does not hold water. There are, according to Government records, just 31 suppliers used by Craig for the 43 components. The Air Force supplied Craig with a list naming these firms. So, much of the work was already done.

Much more important, in just 1 day with my limited resources, I was able to spotcheck the supplier situation on the 12 items chosen at random. Could not Craig have equaled this? Furthermore, the Army maintains an index system at its Fort Monmouth, N.J., Signal Corps installation containing data on every electronics item bought by the military. This system lists the name of the most recent producer or current producer and price paid. Similar indexes exist elsewhere. Craig had access to these.

Second, what about the 20.4-percent markup? Strictly normal was the answer. I was urged to take into account the "tremendous purchasing problems," work—never explained—that had to be done on these components once received, and the expense of installation. My question was and is, if that is what the markup is for, then why the charges for engineering, manufacturing, and production labor? And what does that 16 percent for general and administrative expense cover?

Third, what of the fact that the purchased parts comprise only $68,705 of the $97,000 difference between the first contract—$24,000 per unit—and the second—$121,000 per unit? The flimsiness of the answer to this is startling. Craig's contention repeated until this time is that it is losing money on this contract. Mr. Colson and another spokesman insisted that the cost of the shelter, plus the cost of components formerly Government furnished, plus the cost of new equipment replacing old, plus the various profit factors actually come to $137,000 per unit, while Craig gets only $121,000 each. Therefore, Craig claims it loses $16,000 a unit and the Government gets a bargain. Again, as full of holes as a swiss cheese.

Craig is actually getting less per unit for this equipment than it originally asked. But at the start of negotiations, its first offer, presumably including profit, was for $134,000 per unit, $3,000 less than the company now says it needs to break even.

Furthermore, $24,000 was paid for a complete MRN–12 in 1956, and that figure included all costs of engineering and the installing of equipment. Yet, when Craig purchases all components involved it says part of the cost differential includes the cost of engineering and installing the equipment—a differential already covered in the original $24,000 for this equipment.

Fourth, what of the excess profits this firm seems to be reaping? As I expected, the flag is waved to and fro—briskly—on this one. The tactic of explaining away inefficiency and incompetency on grounds of patriotism and national security is quickly adopted.

Here Craig told me that if it is making a profit—on one hand it says it is not, but on the other says it may be, after all, making money—it is only making up for losses it experienced on the development contracts.

This is a pattern that is followed throughout this sole source purchasing. They simply get the camel's nose under the tent through developing it, and they contend that they develop it at a loss. They contend that that is within the price quoted, and that they have a right to make up for that loss.

C. J. Kvasnak, formerly Craig's vice president in charge of Government contracts, said Craig lost money in the early 1950's on this equipment. Therefore, he said—expressing a view widely adhered to by military contractors and contract administrators—Craig was entitled to make up some of these losses through profits on future contracts.

Not only is this one of the most horrible fallacies of our time, but it is also a proposition to which the Defense Department often subscribes, and it costs billions each year. Secretary of Defense McNamara, the chairman of the board of the "Billion Dollar a Week Club," is a man who I sincerely believe is trying to cut defense purchasing costs. He proudly called attention to the fact that the Defense Department is with increasing frequency requiring contractors to spend their own money to develop military material, Mr. Speaker, this is false economy at its worst—the epitome of "penny wise and pound foolish."

American industry is entitled to be compensated for any product it develops. Uncle Sam cannot get and should not demand "something for nothing." The history of research and development contracts is unarguable. The firm that does the "R. & D." work inevitably gets the first production contract, and at a price that more than repays it for "R. & D." losses. But that is only the beginning.

In procurement after procurement I have studied, a first contract leads to a second, a third and more contracts based on all sorts of justifications. And, just as inevitably, when a future contract is forced into competitive bidding, the price tumbles to one-half, one-third, or less of the price charged by the developer.

Mr. Speaker, that is in keeping with a study which I made on dozens of other cases during the past 12 months. In practically every instance, when the item was procured by competitive bidding, the prices dropped from one-half to one-third. Even though the original producer had all the testing devices, had all the jigs, had the patterns and had the know-how, they still charged more than twice what was bid competitively.

I say it is time we started paying industry a fair price for R. & D., and it is time we stopped buying the whole cloth out of which the phony excuses for high profits on defense projects are cut—such as the one advanced in this case by Craig Systems.

Now, let us turn to the Air Force. Why was Craig Systems given a sole-source award when the MRN–12 was developed years ago and, in fact, was offered for competitive procurement before? Why was Craig ordered to purchase the 43 formerly Government-furnished components at what turned out to be exorbitant prices?

Col. W. B. Mann, Acting Deputy Commander of the Rome Air Materiel Area, Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N.Y., said the Air Force first checked its own inventories and current contracts and found it didn't have these components available. Then, the Air Force said, the project officer, Mr. John Guba, checked with the "Navy, Signal Corps, and Chemical Corps as to availability," but found none could meet the Air Force "urgent" delivery schedule.

That allegation is incredible in the light of my own spotcheck. It will be interesting to see what documentation the Air Force produces to back up its claim that interservice checks were made. If they were, indeed, made, how is it that a lone Congressman can determine who is producing what and where and for how much when the services themselves cannot find the same answers?

Next, it should be asked why the Air Force itself didn't handle procurement of the 43 components and ship them to Craig. Two reasons were given to me by the Air Force. First, it would have taken too much effort by Air Force personnel to handle the job—a ridiculous excuse.

That is laughable. Second, the Air Force explained, "We could not accommodate the risk of delivery slippages—from subcontractors—which had been experienced on Project Four Wheel"—the name given the first two purchases of the MRN–12.

The Air Force complained that on the earlier MRN–12 contracts "we suffered extreme delays attempting to acquire the components for that system through the appropriate military services." It listed eight ways in what it called a "thorough tabulation" in which delivery of the 43 components had been SNAFU'd when it tried to do the job the Air Force way. It concluded by saying that:

> Because of the lack of control, numerous delays, unavailability of necessary quantities of equipment and for many other reasons, it was the recommendation of all concerned to procure * * * any facilities with the contractor providing the equipment.

If you will read what I just said again, you can distill it down into one word—"INCOMPETENCE." In capital letters. Quite clearly, the Air Force is saying "we cannot do the job." I cannot tell you I take any pride in reporting that the Air Force while engaged in wasting $560,000 explains it could not handle the job in such a way that it could have saved the money because it was incompetent. As a matter of fact, I do not think the rest of the Air Force would subscribe to that reasoning, even though Griffiss states it as perfectly normal.

For example, in site construction and development of the Minuteman instant ICBM, the Air Force received and deserved national attention for a spectacular job of organization and coordination. It procured all the parts and the sites and got them all together in the right place at the right time. Yet, when a similar, though much smaller, problem confronts the chairborne pilots at Griffiss, they, in effect, plead incompetence and let the contractor do it, even if it costs the taxpayer an extra 19 percent.

Even more interesting was Air Force's reasoning for giving the contract sole source to Craig. Stripped of the boiler plate and gobbledygook, the reason for the sole-source award boils down to one word—urgency.

The Air Force said no other firm could meet the rigid schedule of delivery it set up—out of "necessity," of course. That "urgent" requirement meant a sole-source award in June 1962 for a basic need which was originally stated in April 1961.

Now, let us see how competent Craig was. The Air Force says it could not assemble different components because of urgent time factors so it left the job to Craig. Let us see what Craig's performance record was like.

That contract, signed June 5, 1962, specified first delivery of the contract items within 6 months. In short, the Air Force had to start getting these control centers in 6 months. That was the sole reason for the sole-source award—urgency.

Now, in March 1963, how is this "urgent requirement" being met?

I can tell you off the record that it is being met just like many other urgent sole-source requirements have been met. It was simply an excuse to give the contract to the right company.

By mid-March, according to the delivery schedule, Craig was supposed to have delivered 10 of 14 MRN–12's and 17 of 20 modification kits. According to a report to me dated March 14, 1963, and signed by Col. George E. Harrington, deputy commander of ROAMA, one MRN–12 was delivered in December and one was delivered in February. That shows how well Craig Systems has fulfilled the role laid out for it by the Air Force when it sole-sourced this contract.

Even this does not faze the peaceful paper pilots at Griffiss. In an explanation that does not explain a thing, Colonel Harrington says Craig Systems had funding difficulties beyond its control, but he assured me that despite the fact Craig is now months behind schedule, it will be only 30 days late in delivery of the total quantity. I hope Colonel Harrington's foresight is better now than when the contract was sole-sourced to Craig.

That, then, Mr. Speaker, is the case of the MRN–12 as my analysis developed it. But it is not all of the story, and I want the Members of this House to know the full story—page, chapter, verse, and line.

From the outset of its contact with my office, Craig was determined to head off an audit by GAO. Such an audit would disrupt their activities and place a needless expense on the Government, they said. They persisted in this line until early this month, when their tactics changed.

The new line was, "have us audited, if you will, but do not mention the case on the House floor until the GAO completes its audit." I cannot accept this course of action for the following reasons:

First, what I am turning over to GAO and Justice is fact, not opinion. I am not asking for a determination of conditions but a determination of the extent of conditions.

These facts are not at issue: First, other suppliers were in production with much of this equipment at lower prices at the same time Craig was setting up its purchases. These firms' contract delivery schedules and unit prices are clear and are being turned over to the proper authorities; second, Craig marked up prices on these components by 2 percent; third, Craig charged additional burdens for engineering, manufacturing, and production work; fourth, Craig was permitted to stick in a fat 16 percent for general and administrative costs; fifth, Craig reaped a 6.5-percent profit on purchased parts and a 10-percent profit on direct costs.

An audit by GAO will not diminish these facts nor the fact that Craig is now far behind in delivery schedules to meet a so-called urgent need.

Second, delaying publicity on this situation could harm the national interest since there are, in this one contract, illustrations of several widespread problems.

The Congress must make every effort to correct these problems through legislation which I shall soon discuss. Like audits, these remedies take time, and while that time is consumed, the taxpayers are being taken for billions of dollars a year.

At the same time, it is possible that focusing the spotlight of publicity and exposure on some of the more blatant examples of these abuses will act as a deterrent to others who engage in or tolerate such activity.

Finally, there is a third reason. It has been 6 months since Craig Systems was put on notice that its activity was under study. With 6 months to prepare for auditors, I feel it mandatory that the American public know the facts as they exist before the auditors step in.

I suggested earlier in my presentation that pressure has been forced on me to halt this inquiry. The approaches have been several. For months I was told that if I examined all the facts I would be satisfied the contracts were not unusual. This I did in painstaking fashion, as the file will show. I was not satisfied and said so. Then other pressures were applied.

Next it was suggested that it would be unfair to disclose the facts before a GAO audit could be completed. This was followed by the warning that a firm's good name might be hurt in a community where it is respected—a firm well known to industry and Government. While I acknowledge this firm is indeed well known, it has recently come to my attention that its reputation goes somewhat further than it has stated.

This firm, it develops, has an interesting history of problems with Government procurement and law enforcement agencies, particularly with the Signal Corps at Fort Monmouth. I am prepared to go into a complete discussion of that history if anyone so desires.

After the "good name" pressure had been applied, Mr. Colson, Craig's attorney, suggested I would be premature in attacking the contract since he contended the price of the June 1962 contract is "redeterminable" if the Air Force finds Craig's costs are too high. I wish I could report at one point in this presentation that something said by Mr. Colson was true, but, to put it politely, this was another misstatement. The Air Force says it is a fixed-price contract, not subject to negotiation.

Finally, after all of this had failed to deter me, Mr. Colson turned to veiled threats. It was suggested by him that because I had used volunteer assistance in this study, there was a "serious impropriety" involved. Though I believed this viewpoint to be patently ridiculous, I asked the Department of Justice during a conference for its opinion. The reaction of attorneys in the Department's Criminal Division was to laugh, literally. Of course, there was no impropriety, they said.

The chief assistance in this investigation was provided by Charles Nicodemus of the Chicago Daily News, the same newsman whose work led directly to the arrest and Federal indictment of two high-ranking Signal Corps civilian officials at Fort Monmouth, N.J., last year. For his part in this investigation, Mr. Nicodemus was personally and publicly commended by Attorney General Robert Kennedy. Incidentally, Mr. Nicodemus is still cooperating with the Department of Justice and certain agencies of Congress in continuing his newspaper's commendable interest in this field.

I, therefore, have welcomed his assistance and knowledge in this and other investigations. In this case, however, Mr. Nicodemus chose to use the "nom de plume" of Charles Nichols, a name he has used in radio work and free-lance writing. This was done to make sure that he was free to work with Craig Systems personnel. When dealing with the Air Force and Justice Department, however, pains were taken to make it clear to Air Force congressional liaison officers just who Mr. Nicodemus was and the assistance he was providing.

Craig Systems has intimated it is unhappy that Mr. Nicodemus was permitted to participate in this analysis, perhaps because of his intimate knowledge of the procurement picture at Fort Monmouth. This does not surprise me, but I wish to state at this time that the Chicago Daily News never prints any information—confidential or otherwise—that comes to me during an investigation until it has first appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That, Craig Systems has been told, so there can be no question of confidences involved.

My presentation here today is an indication of what I think of all these pressures.

Again, I wish to stress that it is not my goal to present a critique of just one firm or person here today. Craig Systems was not operating in a vacuum.

It was playing the ball game under the rules set down by the military, with perhaps a few refinements of its own. Thus, if there is blame to be placed here, it must be borne principally by the Air Force. Its own regulations foster abuses such as those I have outlined here today, for example:

First, it is the Air Force which awarded the development contract for the MRN–12 to Craig Systems on which Craig says it lost money.

Second, it is the Air Force which handed out the latest sole-source contract on grounds of urgency and then defended the contractor when he fell behind schedule.

Third, it is the Air Force that permitted Craig to buy components formerly furnished by the Government at exorbitant prices.

Fourth, it is the Air Force, through a set of unrealistic "pricing objectives," which permitted wholesale waste in this latest procurement.

Fifth, it is the Air Force that permitted a 20-percent markup on prices of purchased components, plus imposition of additional burdens for engineering, manufacturing, labor, and production.

Sixth, it is the Air Force that permitted an incredible charge of 16 percent for administrative and general expenses, in addition to all the earlier charges.

Seventh, it is the Air Force that permitted profits of 6.532 percent and 10 percent on top of this whole wasteful pyramid.

Eighth, and I predict it will be the Air Force that defends Craig Systems' performance on this contract most aggressively.

Why do we have mistakes, incompetency, abuses such as these? Why do the Air Force and other services permit, indeed, encourage them?

Some mistakes are just that—matters of judgment where a procurement official errs. In such cases, however, the services must learn to admit their mistakes publicly and to right their wrongs. Continued protection of incompetent middle-grade military and civil servants by the top civilian and military brass creates a "guarantee of immunity" atmosphere that encourages some officials, and happily they are in the minority—to make mistakes that are not honest ones. And why should they not, when they know that their bosses all the way to the top will protect them? We all know the rule of the Pentagon—"Protect your own—right or wrong—he's one of you."

What are the inducements offered by contractors in return for services rendered by chairborne civil and military servants who actually control the massive majority of defense money spent by the "Billion Dollar a Week Club"? What do these men get, these men who make key technical and policy decisions that are rubber-stamped all the way to the top?

The rewards run from outright bribes, such as at Fort Monmouth, to offers of jobs in civilian life. They range from lavish 3-hour lunches and all-night dinners, with booze, and all the trimmings, to gratuities such as fur coats and deep freezes.

These are the pressures and influence, sub rosa, that result every day in negotiated and sole-source contracts handed out without any true justification at prices that penalize the taxpayer—abuses such as I have detailed today. It is because of the extent of these abuses in the case of the MRN–12 that I am asking the FBI to examine the relationships between contractor and Government officials involved in this case. And it is because of these abuses that I must request a full and complete audit by the General Accounting Office, as well as a full investigation by the Secretary of Defense of the Air Force personnel and policies involved.

Probably in the eyes of the Defense Department, this study will disclose nothing irregular in the administration or performance of these contracts. But if the waste and the abuses are not wrong in the eyes of the Air Force, and they clearly should be, then it is time we obtain legislation which clearly will correct the wrong.

Such legislation is embodied in two bills I have introduced. One would give the General Accounting Office the right to intervene in advance of the award of a negotiated contract when it is apparent the circumstances justifying a sole-source or negotiated award are not supported by the facts. This is the same power GAO now has in the realm of competitive bidding.

The second bill would among other things, create a joint "blue ribbon" committee of the Congress to act as a watchdog over negotiated contracts and recommend legislation to curb the abuses. Only such a nonpartisan committee, properly organized, can have the power to take hold of this situation, give it the cleansing publicity it merits and bring about needed changes in Defense procurement procedures. This, I am sure, would reduce markedly the number of sole-source contracts and save the taxpayer billions each year.

As a source of expert opinion on the benefit to be gained from cutting down on sole-source contracts, I go to the top man himself—Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. He said emphatically last year that if more competitive bidding can be introduced he could save 25 cents of every dollar spent for national defense. Mr. Speaker, on a Defense budget of $55 billion, that is over $13 billion.

In the face of an opportunity such as this, Congress will be delinquent if it fails to explore every possible legislative avenue for capitalizing on this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the first proposal of my two pieces of legislation is one with which many Members are familiar. It is part of what was known for years as the Hébert amendment, a revision of the Armed Forces Procurement Regulations sponsored by my distinguished colleague from Louisiana.

Last session, after years of trying, the Hébert amendment was passed, but a very critical section was killed in the other body. That is the section I have introduced and intend to push for enactment.

On every hand, we hear "cut the budget," "cut expenditures," "tighten up the purse strings," but we might as well be fighting windmills unless we have the right tools. My version of the Hébert amendment, plus my H.R. 4409, will put some teeth into our part of the fight. If such legislation had been passed last year, we would be seeing results right now, and we would be having less of the abuses by middle-grade chair flyers in the Pentagon.

Mr. Speaker, the abuses I have spoken of today must be stopped, and I have introduced the legislation to stop them. It is up to the Congress now. If it truly wants to save money, here is the chance.

In conclusion, I wish to state I have documentation—much more lengthy than I have detailed here today—from industry, Air Force, GAO, and from other sources for every fact I have stated. I have names that are unnamed, and I will be happy to provide them if there is any question by any Member of this House at any time.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I am very happy to be present at this forthright presentation on the part of my Indiana colleague. I compliment him. I know he has given many months of effort in his earnest desire to see that we get a good product at a proper cost for our Defense Department. I know he has brought to the attention not only of the House but of the whole American public, the necessity for closer surveillance and the correct application of the rules of proper procurement. I compliment him and thank him for his very able presentation.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Thank you.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I would also like to commend the gentleman from Indiana on his very thorough and important study of procurement practices. As a Member of the Congress from the Chicago area, I have followed with a great deal of interest the work which you have done along with the reporter from the Chicago Daily News, Mr. Nicodemus. I want to assure you that I am pleased both as a Member of Congress and as a taxpayer to see you take this great interest in procurement practices and policies in an attempt to correct some of the abuses and errors that have been made in the past.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I thank you very kindly. If you recall, there was a contract finally arrived at with Webcor Co., of Chicago. Webcor is a very competent company and produced, on competitive bid, a product for less than 50 percent of what the Government was paying for it via sole source.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I would like to join my colleagues in congratulating the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wilson]. I am aware of his fine work in the program of procurement for the Department of Defense. It certainly has been most appreciated by me. I have read many newspaper articles, magazine articles, and statements in the press, seen them on television, and heard them on radio, and I realize very fully the wonderful work he is doing. I think the effort by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wilson], on this program has in the past, and will in the future, result in savings of millions of dollars to the American taxpayers. Certainly when we realize that this Nation is spending something over $50 billion each year in defense it is the responsibility of this Congress to carefully scrutinize all future contracts. So I congratulate my good friend and colleague from Indiana on his work.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman.

SURPLUS CREAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. Albert]. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Harvey] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Government and American dairy farmers are being shamefully used by foreign nations which are currently dumping their surplus cream on the American market. These cream shipments which are highlighted in the press as a market development program by New Zealand are only serving to replace cream being produced by American farmers and which is in surplus. This loss of cream markets which has been taking place since early October forces American farmers to make their cream into butter for sale to Commodity Credit Corporation under the price support program. Dairymen are losing approximately 15 cents per pound butterfat and the Government is purchasing the butter at a cost of about 60 cents per pound under the price support program.

Our present experience with cream imports is but one of many instances in recent years under similar circumstances. These imports, if not illegal, certainly run contrary to the intent and purpose of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act which just last year was incorporated into the 1962 Trade Agreement Act as an expression of the U.S. Congress. Section 22 is intended to restrict imports of dairy products as an adjunct to the effective operation of the price support program.

Domestic dairy prices, even at present low levels, are far above prices at which surplus dairy products of other countries are sold in the world market. Without the effective application of section 22, the price support program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is adversely affected. Unless imports of dairy products are restricted, the U.S. Government will find itself buying the surplus not only of American farmers but of farmers throughout the world.

Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act provides the mechanism for restricting imports of dairy products so that the price levels maintained under the support program can effectively serve the interests of U.S. dairy farmers within minimum costs. Section 22 gives the Tariff Commission full authority to restrict the import of dairy products. The difficulty lies not only in a weak law but in lax administration of the law. The present problem of imported cream is no different than has plagued the dairy industry and USDA with respect to other products imported in circumvention of the law over a period of several years. In spite of repeated efforts to obtain full hearings and proper and timely rulings by the Tariff Commission, the amount of dairy-product imports has continued to mount. The needless importing of dairy products, already in surplus within the United States, is inconsistent with the intent of Congress as expressed by section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. It is inconsistent with the intent of Congress as expressed by the Agricultural Act of 1949. And it is inconsistent with attempts to hold the cost of supporting U.S. agricultural prices to a minimum.

Certainly the Tariff Commission or the administration cannot be blind to the consequence of failure to properly restrict the imports of dairy products as intended by section 22.

If dairy product imports are necessary in the interests of international relations, let us say so and then provide a mechanism wherein they can enter through the front door rather than by circumvention of American law. If dairy product imports are necessary in the interests of international relations, let their costs be charged to international relations and not to the costs of supporting prices for American dairy farmers. If dairy products are to enter the country, even though we have more than enough, let them enter under regulations which are clear and which will afford opportunity for all of our foreign friends to participate on an equitable basis. The present importation of cream is an outright circumvention of U.S. law and should not be tolerated by the U.S. Government.

THE LOGAN FLOOD DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Hechler] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, a gurgling roar outside Herman Lunsford's window warned him on the black, rainy night of March 11 that Buffalo Creek was on the rampage. He was just getting ready at 10 p.m. to drive to his job as chief electrician of the Island Creek Coal Co., in Amherstdale, W. Va.

Lunsford opened the door and gasped. Buffalo Creek was literally creeping toward his door. Mrs. Lunsford let out a sudden cry: "It is coming through on the floor." Hastily, Herman Lunsford tried to move the sofa and a few valuables upstairs.

"It may be worse than last year; it may even be as bad as 1957," he thought. It turned out to be much worse. The water relentlessly rose up the stairs.

At two minutes before midnight, the lights suddenly went out. Lunsford collected his family, waded through several feet of water to high ground where he had parked his car. It was the first of four nights the Lunsfords slept in their car.

Along with several other tributaries, Buffalo Creek empties into the Guyandotte River, and it was the main stem of the Guyandotte which rose up and struck Logan its most staggering blow.

Over in Stollings, just a couple of miles outside the county seat city of Logan, Leslie Browning's phone rang at 10:30 p.m. His next door neighbor was crying. "Will it be bad?" she asked. "I will see," he said, rushing out to where the river was rising. He drove a 6-foot stake into the ground to measure the rise of the river. In the brief span of 5 minutes, the water rose 21 inches on the stake, spelling danger. Browning serves as chairman of the Flood Control Committee of the Logan Chamber of Commerce. He felt what was coming. Hastily, he backed his truck up to the door, loaded in as much as he dared, then threw his wife over his shoulders and waded through the water. Slipping the fan belt off the motor, he barely chugged through before the thundering Guyandotte began to pick up houses, garages, gas pumps, drive-in restaurants, and telephone poles and toss them around like so many toothpicks.

TWO DEATHS RESULT

Others were not as fortunate as Lunsford and Browning. Over in the railroad center of Peach Creek, Walter Kendall struggled with some heavy furniture as he tried to help his neighbors move their belongings away from the flood waters. Kendall collapsed. A Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. engine and caboose rushed him to the hospital, but he had already passed away from a heart attack.

The receding floodwaters revealed the death of a 65-year-old Negro, Andrew Roberson, who was drowned in the Billy Goat Junction section of Mount Gay.

Countless others were rescued from second-story windows and the rooftops of their fast flooding homes. Hurry calls went out to Charleston and Point Pleasant to rush Army ducks to aid in the rescue efforts.

ALMOST 4 FEET AN HOUR

The Guyandotte River was meandering along at a depth of 5.1 feet at 7 p.m. on the evening of March 11. There had been a very hard rain all day, and by 9 p.m. the river had inched up to 6.5 feet. By the time most folks were getting ready for bed, it did not seem the danger would be great. "D.J.", WSAZ's weather girl, reported on the 11 p.m. weather out of Huntington that some tributary streams might overflow their banks, but the general tone of the report served to calm the people. After all, flood stage was 20 feet on the river. Still, the level leaped from 8.5 feet at 10 p.m. to 12.1 feet at 11 p.m.

Over in Man, the rising water in the hollow near Joe Manko's house washed over the road about 9 p.m., signaling the start of trouble. One of Joe Blair's men sent word he had been cut off by a slide. The phones started ringing everywhere, and people began streaming up to higher ground, clutching whatever they could carry. In Burgess Addition along Huff Creek the water struck with explosive force.

MAYOR CUDDEN TAKES THE REINS

Meanwhile, back in the city of Logan, a confident mayor and his wife had gone to bed. Dr. H. H. Cudden, 65-year-old osteopath, was looking forward to a good night of rest before the municipal primary election the next day. In a city which is about 4 to 1 registered Democratic, Mayor Cudden as a Republican was unopposed in the primary but was getting ready for another interesting race in the general election. "I guess it was about 12:30 or 1 o'clock in the morning when the telephone started ringing," Dr. Cudden said. Folks up in Wyoming County and in the vicinity of Logan began to sound the alarm. By 1 a.m. the river had reached flood stage, and Mayor Cudden was down at city hall, mobilizing the police, firemen, and rescue workers. The primary election was called off the next day; most polling places were flooded and inaccessible. Mayor Cudden stayed up all night to direct rescue efforts.

By daylight, the flood height of the 1957 flood had been surpassed and the rampaging river rolled on to crest at 31.7 feet—11.7 feet over flood stage—at 10 a.m. Downstream at Chapmanville and Big Creek, walls of water raced down the streets, tearing up houses from their foundations, buckling the floors, ruining bedding and furniture. Master Sergeant St. Clair, Army recruiting officer, telephoned his commanding officer in Beckley and said: "We have a job to do which is more important than getting people into the Army." Sergeant St. Clair's wife did not see her husband for days, as the hard driving noncommissioned officer set up rescue efforts in Chapmanville and became a one man Red Cross until regular disaster relief showed up on the scene. From Mallory to Sharples, from Omar to Verdunville, there were many heroes on Monday and Tuesday as people joined hands in the face of the cruelest disaster which has ever hit Logan County.

TREMENDOUS DESTRUCTION

By Tuesday afternoon, the waters started to fall, but not before they had taken a heavy toll in property damages. There was the White Tower Inn, owned by Rush Jeffrey, wiped out, and then Jeffrey's own home demolished when it crashed against the Henlawson Bridge. At Freeman's grocery and Staton's Grocery in Peach Creek, a thick, black, gummy, coal sludge rose 4 feet high and ruined everything on the shelves. Kroger's, A. & P., and many other groceries and supermarkets lost thousands of dollars' worth of food and provisions. Beautiful lawns in Mitchell Heights, Justice Addition, South Man, and in every residential section of the county were covered with several inches of slimy mud and debris. The grit and the grime ruined hundreds of automobiles, adding machines, and equipment all over town. Cleaning up his Logan News printing plant on the banks of the Guyandotte, Editor Roscoe Spence found it was like scraping cosmolene off a hundred Army rifles.

County Road Supt. Harold Hale and his State road commission men started right to work on the cleanup. The Civil Defense men under Jim Singleton did their part. The State police, Red Cross, Department of Welfare—ADCU workers—and other agencies did yeoman work. The water, gas, power, and telephone companies really had a job to do, and they responded tremendously.

CONTAMINATED WATER SYSTEM

In some areas like Logan, the water system became contaminated and milk trucks from Charleston and Huntington brought in water in gallon jugs. Huntington citizens and business houses donated several 40,000-pound truckloads of food and clothing; Huntingtonians had not forgotten their hour of misery in 1937, before they got the protection of a floodwall. From all over the area, assistance poured in.

Through the leadership of Senator Robert C. Byrd, a group of Federal officials from the Corps of Engineers, Office of Emergency Planning, Community Facilities Administration and Small Business Administration visited Logan County the day after the flood. Along with Senator Jennings Randolph and Governor W. W. Barron, various other emergency measures were instituted. Last Monday, the Small Business Administration set up an office to advance 3 percent loans up to 20 years to businesses and homeowners damaged by the flood.

THOSE GREAT WILDCATS

All the schools in Logan County were closed during the entire week of the flood. Many of the schools were being used as temporary shelters for those washed out of their homes. The Logan High School Wildcats, although they had started off the season with a losing streak, suddenly found themselves in the thick of the fight for the West Virginia class A basketball championship. With their schedules disrupted and little chance to rest or practice, the basketball team set off for Charleston on Friday and Saturday of the week of the flood. A thousand Logan fans forgot their troubles and went along. "It is about time we got back to more important things," they said. Logan High's basketball team upset Huntington East High School on Friday night and then went on to beat favored St. Albans handily on Saturday night, thus moving on to the finals of the State basketball tournament.

Three weeks ago today, Mr. Speaker, this grave disaster struck Logan County. We are now going into what is perhaps the most critical period in Logan's recovery. The disaster workers are withdrawing. People have stopped sending food and clothing. Most people have moved back into their damaged homes. Many have already shown the strength of Hercules in cleaning the Augean stables of Logan. As the outsiders and the sightseers go back home and leave Logan County to its own devices, great dangers lurk in the present apathy.

At this point let me back up a little and tell you about this great county which has already outstripped "the Free State of McDowell"—McDowell County—as the largest coal-producing county in the United States of America. Times were once very rich in Logan County, as the coal miners and the loggers and their employers did a booming business. Saturday night in Logan was a boisterous, roisterous affair which left the citizenry limp, but the merchants rich. When automation and the dieselization of the railroads cut deeply into mine payrolls, the older unemployed stalked the streets or eked out a meager existence in the small coal towns. The younger people started to leave the area in droves. Last Thursday, while down at Cape Canaveral for the fourth straight test flight of Saturn, I was amazed at the number of young Logan alumni who are working for the space and missile programs in Florida. Between 1950 and 1960, Logan County lost 10,000 of its people—mainly young people who did not have the ties or property commitments which might force them to stay.

A NEW CIVIC DETERMINATION

Yet in the last 2 years, there has been a great stirring in Logan, a civic determination to provide new economic opportunities for young people, a new spirit in the schools, and remarkable progress under the leadership of enlightened people. The Logan County Development Corp. was formed, and raised a quarter of a million dollars by popular subscription with the idea of bringing in a new industry. There was a tremendous campaign through the newspapers, over the radio, through the service clubs, and elsewhere. You could not resist that kind of enthusiasm, and one day while passing through Logan I put in $500 myself to buy stock in the new development corporation. With the stock subscriptions, they built a garment factory which now employs several hundred people. This is a wonderful story of local initiative at work.

Further illustrative of the spirit of Logan is the fact that in 1961 their Community Chest drive was oversubscribed by 6 percent—which is quite remarkable in an area where the average yearly personal income is $1,737. The combined efforts of the local citizenry, with a great boost from the State, resulted in the opening of the 3,082-acre Chief Logan Recreation Area. Spurred by the Woman's Club, a cleanup and beautification campaign resulted in designation of Logan as one of the first seven counties to pass the qualification

tests in Governor Barron's statewide cleanup program.

THE TOP AWARD IN THE NATION

Capping the climax of these efforts, on June 28, 1962, the Logan Woman's Club was honored with the top award in the Nation—a $10,000 award by the General Federation of Woman's Clubs, for the most outstanding program of successful community improvement in the entire country.

Another evidence of the basic strength of Logan County is the caliber of the teaching in the public schools. Each summer, I sponsor a "Week in Washington" contest which enables a number of high school juniors to spend a week working in my Washington congressional office. We have had winners from Logan, Man, Chapmanville and Sharples High Schools in Logan County, and I am deeply impressed with the superior quality of these students, their good motivation, and their sound principles. In order to test a wider sample, and to get some idea of the nature of the teaching in Logan, I have visited a large number of schools—all the way from the one-room school in nearly-inaccessible Madison Creek, to the four high schools and all the junior high schools. I have also met with classes in several grade schools. I am deeply impressed with the teachers, and also with the good equipment which the board of education is trying to provide.

STUDENT BOOKS DESTROYED

Mr. Speaker, as you can see, Logan County was just experiencing an upswing economically and in other ways when the disastrous March 11 flood swept in, to use the words of one reporter, "like a giant greasy fist," which dealt a blow to the solar plexus. At Logan East End Junior High School, where the students have to purchase their own textbooks, close to $7,000 worth of books were destroyed in the lockers of the students. These are losses which neither the Red Cross, the State, the Federal Government, nor the school system can do anything about; it means that these students are just out of luck, out of pocket, out of an opportunity to wind up the school year with the books they bought with their hard-earned money. I certainly hope that I will be able to go out and pass the hat to raise some money to help these students buy their lost books, Mr. Speaker. If anyone feels in the mood, checks can be written to Thomas Orr, superintendent of schools, Logan, W. Va., and that might start the ball rolling. I hope if these words get to Logan County that the people of Logan realize that I am only asking for contributions from outside the county, since the people of Logan have been through enough already.

Aside from the losses in student books at Logan East End Junior High, where there was 7 or 8 feet of water, complete libraries and valuable reference books were lost in Logan East Grade School, Stollings, Switzer, Big Creek and Mount Gay Schools. The cost of replacing these losses runs to over $30,000. In addition, lots of valuable equipment was washed away or damaged beyond repair. Reimbursement will be made for some of this, but a crippling blow has been dealt to a progressive school system at a time in the school term when the schools can ill afford it. I do hope that friends of West Virginia can open their hearts and their pocketbooks sufficiently so that the Logan schools can at least get part way back to where they were before the flood. In my remarks, of course, I have not even mentioned buckled floors, structural damage, and other heavy damages to the schools for which we may still be able to qualify for assistance under Public Law 875.

WE NEED THE JUSTICE DAM

Now I come to perhaps the most important portion of my remarks, referring to the future. Last year, after some debate, the Congress authorized construction of the Justice Dam on the Guyandotte River, a $70 million structure. The authorization was not passed until late in the session, and I regret that Congress did not see fit to appropriate funds for the start of advance engineering and design. In January of this year, the President recommended $150,000 for advance engineering and design. I believe it is imperative to double that amount to equal the Corps of Engineers' capability of $300,000, thereby speeding up construction and completion of this essential dam by 1 year. It is vital to the lives and property of the people in the Guyandotte Valley that the Justice Dam be built at the earliest possible time. Col. Harrington Cochran, Huntington, district engineer, has stated that construction of the Justice Dam would have cut the flood crest 3 weeks ago by 11 or 12 feet—meaning that the damage would have been very minor, if at all. Fortunately, the Area Redevelopment Administration has advanced $10,000 to enable aerial photography and mapping to be completed this spring before the foliage comes out.

Mr. Speaker, I know my friends in Logan County will also be happy to know that I am urging a speedup in the two proposed dams on Twelvepole Creek at East Lynn and Beech Fork in Wayne County. Last year and this year, the flood waters of Twelvepole Creek caused extensive damage on the edge of Logan. I therefore hope that early action will be taken to complete the preconstruction planning on these two structures. The cost-benefit ratio on the East Lynn structure is 1.8 to 1, and on Beech Fork is 1.5 to 1, and the two dams can be completed for a total cost of $25 million—a good investment.

INTERIM MEASURES NEEDED

Yet even if we work at top speed and under the best possible circumstances, these projects cannot be completed before 1968. Therefore, it is necessary to take certain interim measures. I would hope that the Corps of Engineers can move forward with snagging, clearing and straightening the channels of the Guyandotte and its tributaries, and take such other measures as may be necessary to provide at least temporary protection prior to the construction of the Justice Dam.

Finally, I think the time has come to give some serious thought to the issue of Federally guaranteed flood or disaster insurance. These people should be given some opportunity to apply for low premium insurance, with the Federal Government helping to spread the risk.

THE GREATNESS OF THE PEOPLE OF LOGAN

In closing, Mr. Speaker, once again I wish to pay tribute to the people of Logan. They are the most wonderful people on God's green earth. The disaster which struck them also brought out the best in them. There was Chapmanville Councilman "Fishpond" Chambers, roaming the flooded streets of his town in an Army duck, carrying people to safety. There was Charlie Hylton of the Logan Banner, helping people and putting out a daily newspaper at the same time. Then there was Gene Smith, principal of the Man Junior High School, mobilizing his teachers and pupils to set up an emergency shelter at the school. Then there was Circuit Judge C. C. Chambers' wife, hard at work supervising disaster evacuees temporarily housed in the Logan Junior High on the hill. There were thousands more who proved that the greatest acts of unselfishness occur when human beings are in trouble.

But they also proved to me that the spirit of Logan will never be broken.

CUTTING THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the President's $100 billion budget and his planned Federal deficit there are those who hold differing views as to whether the Congress can prudently effect economies. On this subject I will start my remarks today by saying that traditionally Presidents defend their recommended budgets but who can say that Government agencies and departments do not invariably ask for more than is needed. When estimates are made up it is common practice to anticipate congressional cuts. The question is not as to whether Congress can cut appropriations; rather it is a question of how much reduction to make. It is a matter of where to cut and how much.

Here is a specific example of what I mean. Take the case of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. President Kennedy's proposed budget for this Agency was for $5.7 billion which represented a 60-percent increase in new spending authority.

When Mr. Webb, the director of this agency testified before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I asked him about the difference between this $5.7 billion request and the $5.2 billion which he said was one of the budget suggestions he has made to the President. Specifically I asked what effect the $500 million difference would have had on the overall space exploration program. His answer in so many words was that the lower amount would require a deacceleration of the manned space flight program. He said this slowdown could mean, for example, that the United States might not be able to land a man on the moon before 1970.

Mr. Speaker, if that is indeed what is involved, I would say we might well consider saving the $500 million. It seems to me the priority of justifying a tax cut by reduced spending comes before a speedup in reaching the moon, and let me emphasize I feel that a cut in spending is necessary in order to justify a cut in taxes. I think it essential to support a policy of reducing expenditures.

I do not intend to make a lot of loose statements about budget cutting. Actions, not words, are what is needed. But I fully support the Republican position that new spending authority asked by President Kennedy for such purposes as space, foreign aid and agriculture—just to name a few—can be reduced by several billions of dollars. Such economies in expending the taxpayers' money would substantially reduce the 1964 deficit. That to me is absolutely a must.

I am sure many of the Democratic Members of the House are just as alarmed as Republicans at the prospect of a staggering increase in the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, what I am talking about in the nature of reduced spending is not idle talk. As I announced previously, I shall try to obtain a record vote on each measure as it comes up having to do with expenditures and then the public can ascertain which Congressmen practiced economy and which ones voted to increase the deficit.

The President's budget can be cut substantially and thereby a tax reduction to stimulate and strengthen the economy can be made on a sound fiscally responsible basis.

Republicans have been challenged by the President to show where cuts in his budget can be made. I am willing, Mr. Speaker, to let the record of this Congress spell out the answer to this challenge and, of course, it will have to include many votes against newly proposed programs which entail increased Federal spending—spending of money, I might add, which we do not have in the Treasury and which I feel should not be added to the burden of debt we are placing on future generations of Americans.

With the growth in Government spending during the past 2 years it is time to hold the line. The administration said big Government and massive Federal spending on public works would get the economy on the move. It did not work. Now we are told with massive spending there should be a tax cut.

In my opinion the Government should cut 1964 spending by at least $5 billion and then reduce business taxes in a like amount. Under this formula I am sure a wave of confidence and prosperity would result, with a substantial net gain in revenue to the Federal Treasury and with long-range benefit to the national economy.

WASTE CAUSED BY INEFFECTIVE REPAIR PARTS SUPPORT FOR COMBAT-SUPPORT VEHICLES BY THE ARMY TANK-AUTOMOTIVE CENTER AT DETROIT, MICH.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Army is wasting the taxpayers money as though it were chaff to be thrown to the winds. When I was advised of the Army's decision to close down the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center in Newark, Del., in 1961, I was really impressed at that time by what I thought were sincere and logical reasons and evaluations designed to save the taxpayers' dollars. I was always skeptical of the basic motives for moving the tank plant from Delaware to Detroit, Mich. to be operated by the same contractor, but I was convinced by the Army that efficiency was the prime motive.

Apparently, I was mistaken in my judgment in 1961, for now I find that this blackout of a going defense tank plant in Delaware and the transfer of its programs to Detroit has caused the taxpayers a loss of $500,000 in its first year of operation.

The Department of the Army closed down the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center, Newark, Del., and transferred its activities to the Army Tank-Automotive Center, at Detroit, Mich.

Members of Congress and its committees were assured these steps would result in increased efficiency and greater combat power and readiness.

Little consideration was given by the Army to the economic effects of these moves upon the employees, suppliers, and other business enterprises who had made the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center at Newark, Del., such an important defense facility.

The Comptroller General of the United States recently completed and this month submitted a report to the Congress regarding a review of the ineffective repair parts support for combat and combat-support vehicles by the Army Tank-Automotive Center at Detroit.

It would appear, from this report, that the Congress may have been oversold by the Department of the Army as to the benefits which would accrue from the transfer of the activities away from the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center.

Joseph Campbell, the Comptroller General of the United States, in the covering letter of his report, which he sent to the President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army, said:

MARCH 14, 1963.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

Enclosed is our report on ineffective repair parts support for combat and combat-support vehicles, by the Army Tank-Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

Our review of repair parts support disclosed that lack of repair parts in the Army supply system contributed to the reduction in the combat readiness of certain of the Army's combat and combat-support vehicles. Furthermore, the lack of repair parts was the primary reason for the incurrence of unnecessary costs of at least $500,000 during fiscal year 1961 by emergency procurements of parts locally that are normally procured centrally at lower prices. The management deficiencies that we identified as factors primarily responsible for the lack of repair parts were (1) delays in awarding contracts after procurement decisions were made, (2) delays in determining whether to procure, and (3) delays in determining needs for parts.

In commenting on the matters in this report, the Army appeared to minimize the significance of our findings, advising that the Army Tank-Automotive Center was managing 81,000 line items and at no time during the period June 30, 1959, through December 31, 1961, did the number of out-of-stock items exceed 1.24 percent. We found that there are only 12,500 active and critical line items controlled by the Center. Although these items should have received priority management attention, we found that as of December 31, 1961, 1,010, or 8 percent of these more essential items were out of stock.

The Army agreed with our facts and advised us that corrective action was being taken in the deficient areas noted during our review. However, the effort of the Army to minimize the significance of the extent to which the Center was unable to provide a timely supply of parts for combat and combat-support vehicles suggests that the deficiencies we have identified may not receive appropriate management attention. These parts which can have a significant effect on material readiness and combat capability of Army forces deserve thorough administrative surveillance to insure adequate repair parts support. We plan to review the effectiveness of the actions taken by the Army in subsequent reviews of repair parts support for combat and combat-support vehicles.

Copies of this report are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Army.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

It would seem that the $500,000 in unnecessary costs during fiscal year 1961, which the General Accounting Office study disclosed, practically wiped out any savings which the Army promised to make by closing the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center.

But, of course, this is not the worst part of the matter, for the combat readiness of American forces was drastically reduced and at a very critical time during this cold war period.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, the facts uncovered by the Comptroller General took place immediately prior to and during the crisis with Cuba when we were as close to a major war as we have been since the end of World War II.

I think it behooves everyone in this House, and the Senate, and especially members of the appropriate committees, to look into this situation and to hold the Department of the Army to account.

I include the following information from the March 1963 report of the Comptroller General of the United States as a part of my remarks:

1. GAO finding: The combat readiness of the Army's combat and combat support vehicles was reduced because of the lack of repair parts.

2. GAO conclusion: The lack of repair parts impaired the effectiveness of the Army's combat and combat support vehicles. The ordnance system was consistently out-of-stock on substantial quantities of active repair parts and this condition had directly contributed to deadlined vehicles at Army installations throughout the world.

3. GAO recommendation: (a) Steps be taken including the purification of usage data, to provide better assurance that supply control studies are made in a timely manner.

(b) Procedures be established for reviewing past supply and procurement actions for the purpose of determining why stocks of repair parts line items reached a critical level so that appropriate measures can be taken to minimize the recurrence of the same situations.

4. (a) Facts presented by GAO: (1) The report cites that GAO reviews during 1960 of six troop installations in the United States and the 8th U.S. Army in Korea disclosed that the lack of about 550 different repair part line items was deadlining about 600 vehicles. Examples are provided with respect to impaired equipment conditions which prevailed in Korea and at Ft. Bragg and Ft. Knox during the period from September 1959 to August 1960.

(2) Consistent with shortages noted at the troop installations, the review found that Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command was usually out-of-stock on a substantial number of the approximately 12,500 active repair part line items, at 30 June 1961, considered essential for the operation of combat and combat support vehicles. Over the period from mid-1959 to the end of 1961, the number of active out-of-stock items ranged from 268 to 1,010, a substantial portion of which were considered combat essential. Some outstanding orders had remained unfilled for more than a year, including those for two examples cited of items having application to combat and combat support vehicles. As of September 10, 1961, Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command had 15,662 orders outstanding for repair parts, 1,034 of which were for parts needed to remove vehicles from deadline.

(b) Additional facts:

(1) During and prior to fiscal year 1961, Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command lacked the manpower and operating funds to enable it to hold the number of out-of-stock items at or below 1 percent of its active line items. Not until fiscal year 1962 were additional personnel spaces and operating funds provided to assist toward accomplishment of this objective.

(2) In February 1960 the flow of Army stock fund money was interrupted by a reduction in the Army stock fund operating program because stock fund sales did not materialize at the level programed. The reduction resulted in a suspension of approximately $10 million in central procurement actions in various stages of completion, including opened and unopened bids and unfinalized negotiated actions. This also increased the leadtime for subsequent procurement actions by 90 days or more.

5. Department of the Army position:

(a) Concur in the findings as to the conditions which heretofore existed at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command and as to the conclusions regarding their adverse impact on the effectiveness of certain of the Army's equipment. Also concur in the recommendations.

(b) As mentioned in the report, there were 81,000 Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command repair parts line items in the Ordnance supply system with an inventory at nine CONUS depots and oversea installations valued at $861 million. An operation of this magnitude encounters many serious and complex problems even under ideal conditions and circumstances, not the least of which is the availability of adequate personnel and funds. The lack of adequate manpower and operating funds at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command, together with the described temporary suspension of fund availability for Army stock fund procurements, were among the main factors which contributed to the out-of-stock position of many of the active repair parts line items and precluded the full accomplishment of the Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command and Army objective of providing timely support to troop units.

(c) Concurrently with the provision of increased personnel spaces and operating funds for supply management operations, early in fiscal year 1962 Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command effected internal transfers of additional personnel from other activities. Utilization of electronic data processing techniques was increased in supply studies involving the $1,000-$5,000 annual issue range and this has served to free supply analysts from considerable detail, thus providing more capability to improve the analyses of replenishment requirements. The assignment of additional analysts, for which spaces have been allocated, will further assist in improving the quality of the analysis function. Additionally, a study is in process as to the feasibility of increasing the use of electronic data processing for high dollar issue items in order to further free analysts from detail and thereby improve the quality of supply control studies.

(d) Some improvement has already been noted in the timely performance of supply control studies and it is considered that an even greater and more significant improvement will be realized during the current fiscal year. However, the anticipated loss of experienced personnel in fiscal year 1963 may adversely affect this effort.

(e) Procedures have been placed into effect at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command to implement the GAO recommendations. Quality of demand data available at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command having improved, instructions were issued requiring commodity analysts to use recurring demands for establishing the average quarterly demand. Effective September 23, 1961, each supply control study was to include a historical summary, basic for average quarterly demand. A procedure (task list No. 710–14–2, revision 1—Supply Control Summary and Analysis Records, dated October 20, 1961) was established to review this summary. To complete implementation of the first GAO recommendation, all high and medium dollar items had to be reviewed. At the time of the GAO study, such an immediate review was impractical. However, since each of the items is studied on a 6-month cycle, each has now been reviewed under the revised procedures and the GAO recommendation is now deemed implemented.

(f) The same procedure requires the compilation of the data covered by the second GAO recommendation. Forecasts of supply demands are now required to be routinely measured against actual supply demands in computation of average quarterly demand.

(g) We are continuing to study this area and will present additional facts, which may be developed, in our response to the final report.

1. GAO finding: Unnecessary procurement costs were incurred due to lack of repair parts.

2. GAO conclusion: Based on the results of its review at Red River Arsenal and its limited review at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command, the GAO estimates that the Ordnance depots in the United States were incurring unnecessary procurement costs of more than $500,000 annually. It was concluded that these depot procurements were necessitated by Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command's inability to provide required repair parts to the depots and troop installations in a timely manner for application to deadlined vehicles and to depot vehicle rebuild programs.

3. GAO recommendations:

a. Steps be taken, including the purification of usage data, to provide better assurance that supply control studies are made in a timely manner.

b. Procedures be established to insure that procurement action is promptly initiated when a control study indicates that such action is necessary.

c. Controls be established to insure that contracts for repair parts are awarded promptly and that, in those instances where procurement is urgent, the contracting procedures be expedited.

d. When procurement is not initiated at the time a control study shows the item to be in a critical supply position, the decision not to procure be fully documented and approved by a responsible official.

e. Procedures be established for reviewing past supply and procurement actions for the purpose of determining why stocks of repair parts line items reached a critical level so that appropriate measures can be taken to minimize the recurrence of the same situations.

4. Facts presented by GAO:

a. At least 6 of the 50 repair parts reviewed at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command had been procured by various depots at average prices ranging from 21 to 251 percent higher than the prices paid by Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command for the same items. A summary of 49 separate procurements of these six items was provided to demonstrate increased cost of over $25,000, or 45 percent higher than prices available to Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command through volume procurement. Two additional examples are cited of items procured by two depots at prices ranging from 26 to 164 percent higher than those paid by Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command.

b. Additionally, Red River Arsenal was selected for a test of the extent of the questioned practice. The review, which was limited to individual procurements in excess of $500, disclosed that during fiscal year 1961 the arsenal paid $113,000, or 46 percent, more than Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command would have paid for the same items through centralized procurement. On the basis of this test, plus the observation that Red River Arsenal activity represented only 15 percent of the procurements reviewed, the GAO estimated that the nine ordnance depots in the United States were incurring unnecessary costs of over $500,000 annually in their procurement of centrally procurable items.

5. DA position:

a. Concur in the findings of fact. With regard to the GAO estimate that over $500,000 in unnecessary costs were incurred as a result of the lack of central procurement, it must be emphasized that this is merely an estimate based upon a limited review and that only a more comprehensive examination of local procurement at all the depots would verify the accuracy of this estimate. Concur in the recommendations.

b. The need for local procurement was a direct result of the out-of-stock position. Under the circumstances, existing at the time, it is considered that the need to keep combat and combat support vehicles operative and to reduce or avoid deadlining of this equipment warranted the increased costs.

c. Actions leading to more effective central supply management and procurement, as indicated in position statements on other GAO findings, will serve to reduce local procurement at higher costs.

d. We are continuing to study this area and will present additional facts, which may be developed, in our response to the final report.

1. GAO finding: Failure to award procurements in a timely manner was a contributing cause to the unavailability of repair parts.

2. GAO conclusion: Long unanticipated and largely avoidable delays, after procurements were initiated, contributed to the resulting out-of-stock position of hundreds of active items of supply.

3. GAO recommendations:

a. Procedures be established to insure that procurement action is promptly initiated when a control study indicates that such action is necessary.

b. Controls be established to insure that contracts for repair parts are awarded promptly and that, in those instances where procurement is urgent, the contracting procedures be expedited.

4. a. Facts presented by GAO:

(1) Test of 103 procurements disclosed that only 23, or 22 percent, were awarded within the administrative leadtime of 90 to 120 days established by Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command. A review of 1869 procurement actions, other than small purchases, disclosed that, on 852 of these actions, over 120 days elapsed between the time procurement personnel were advised to initiate procurement action and the dates contracts were awarded.

(2) Test of 38 procurement requests disclosed it took an average of 27 days for supply personnel to advise procurement personnel to initiate procurement action.

(3) Test of about 50 repair parts showed that, in 9 instances involving 17 procurement actions, the actual time lapse between date of supply control study and date of contract far exceeded the administrative leadtime; one cited case involving 28 months. In 4 cases of successive contracts involving 12 procurement actions, the actual time lapse ranged from 68 to as much as 372 days. Only four of these procurement actions were accomplished within the established administrative lead time.

b. Additional facts:

(1) In several of the procurement actions, delays arose because of Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command efforts to reduce the volume of noncompetitive procurement. The use of competitive procurement on items previously bought from established producers calls for more exact technical data than previously needed. Inexperienced producers are prone to submit technically questionable bids which must be closely scrutinized to determine responsiveness. Delays thus encountered cannot be anticipated.

5. DA position:

a. Concur in the findings presented, subject however to the mitigating circumstances described above as the underlying causes which existed in several of the cited instances of delay. Concur in the conclusion, except that, as explained, some of the delays were unavoidable. Concur in the recommendations.

b. Supply management procedures (Task List No. 710-45-2 (milstrip) Supply Control—High Dollar Supply Control Studies, dated June 29, 1962) now require forwarding of a procurement requisition within 14 days from the date of the supply study generating it.

c. Administrative lead times, as established, were merely target estimates rather than estimates of the actual time expected to be needed. Target estimate lead time is no longer used. Case-by-case estimates are now being based upon all known information regarding parts purchases and any troubles that can be anticipated. An additional 30 days has been added to cover supply management time and to provide a cushion against unexpected delay.

d. Out-of-stock items are now plainly marked and are walked through, as far as possible, on an expedited basis.

e. Since purchasing delays were mostly those which could not and cannot be anticipated, it is considered that the actions by Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command, in reducing the requisition forwarding time to 14 days and in providing adequate lead time for unexpected contingencies at the supply study point, will serve to effect timely awards of procurement and thus avoid depletion of stocks before contract deliveries are received.

f. We are continuing to study this area and will present additional facts, which may be developed, in our response to the final report.

1. GAO finding: Procurements not initiated when shown to be needed by supply control studies were a second contributing cause to the unavailability of repair parts.

a. GAO conclusion: When finally initiated, procurements were too late to prevent repair parts from going out of stock before replenishment could be obtained. This resulted in deadlined combat and combat support vehicles because of lack of repair parts.

3. GAO recommendations:

a. Procedures be established to insure that procurement action is promptly initiated when a control study indicates that such action is necessary.

b. When procurement is not initiated at the time a control study shows the item to be in a critical supply position, the decision not to procure be fully documented and approved by a responsible official.

4. a. Facts presented by GAO:

Of 395 supply control studies reviewed, 283, or 72 percent, showed procurements were necessary. However, only 126 of the studies resulted in procurement being initiated and almost half of these were initiated too late to prevent repair parts from going out of stock. Four examples were cited.

b. Additional facts:

(1) In February 1960 a program adjustment reduced ASF funding at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command which forced a temporary suspension of all replenishment procurement. Supply studies which had been made at that time could not be followed up by procurement requisitions until the program was reappraised.

(2) Supervisory personnel responsible for making procurement decisions were overloaded by having to guide 23 analysts each. The need for closer supervision was recognized by Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command in November 1960 and corrective measures were instituted.

5. DA position:

a. Concur in the findings and conclusion. Concur in the recommendations, in general, subject to qualification. There are circumstances under which procurement should not follow where a supply study indicates a need for stock replenishment. These include situations where requirements can be met by overhaul of unserviceable repairable assets; where recorded demands are questionable, until the questionable aspects have been resolved; and where cyclic studies show insignificant quantities are required.

b. The ASF program reduction compelled an immediate cutoff of central purchase, local purchase, and reimbursement for returns. This resulted in out-of-stock position of many critical items and adversely affected the combat readiness of combat and combat support equipment in troop units. No similar drastic program change has since been imposed.

c. The overloading of supervisors has been corrected and each supervisor is now responsible for only nine analyses. Current instructions at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command (task list No. 735-10-2 (milstrip)—supply control, dated June 29, 1962) require each supervisor to review each supply study and approve or disapprove action recommended by the respective commodity analysts.

d. It is considered that the reduction in ASF funding restrictions, the addition of more personnel as described in another finding hereunder and the formalized instructions have served to improve procurement results at Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command, illustrated by the fact that 26,000 lines having a value of $202 million were procured in fiscal year 1962, compared with 12,000 lines valued at $76 million procured in fiscal year 1961.

e. We are continuing to study this area and will present additional facts, which may be developed, in our response to the final report.

1. GAO findings: Reorder warning point was understated and represented a third contributing cause to the unavailability of repair parts.

2. GAO conclusion: The understatement of reorder warning point resulted in supply of repair parts becoming critical by the time they were studied and procurement action initiated.

3. GAO recommendation: None. The report acknowledged that, after GAO had advised Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command officials of the deficiencies noted, Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command promptly issued new procedures to be followed which, with adequate supervision, should minimize recurrence of the problem.

4. Facts presented by GAO: Of 61 reorder warning points computations reviewed on 22 repair parts, 26 computations affecting 13 repair parts were understated. Six examples were cited. In January 1961 GAO advised Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command supply officials of deficiencies stemming from the failure of supply analysts to furnish total procurement leadtime to the electronic data processing computer, and from the analysts' incorrect computation of requirements.

5. DA position:

a. Concur in the findings and conclusion. There were no recommendations.

b. Revised procedures were placed in use in January 1961 and were later refined and incorporated into task list No. 735-10-3 (Milstrip)—financial inventory accounting, June 29, 1962. The electronic data processing computer now computes monthly demands and, using this data, automatically recalculates an updated reorder warning point each month.

c. It is considered that the computer calculation will eliminate errors of the type found in the review. Additionally, case-by-case estimates of administrative leadtime should further assist in assuring that supply studies will be made before a critical point is reached.

Mr. Speaker, one of the scant actions of this 88th Congress during the first 3 months of the 1st session, was the passage of H.R. 2440, a bill to authorize appropriation of funds for fiscal year 1964 for procurement, research, development, test, and evaluation of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. The House Armed Forces Committee added $134 million for nuclear submarines, and $363,700,000 for RS–70 planes. The House followed the recommendations of the committee, and the President's budget request was increased by $497,700,000. At the same time, a House Armed Services Subcommittee voted to increase the military pay bill by $500 million. What really concerns me is how we can ever reduce defense costs when our most conservative colleagues, who talk so loudly about budget cutting, vote to support the defense industry lobbyists who come before the Congress each year and cry so loudly for more and more billions. I know this bothers our able Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, who has been under heavy attack for his decisions which, if we support them, can save billions of dollars in defense costs. After one such attack recently he said, in a speech to a meeting of the Advertising Council in Washington, according to the Baltimore Sun of March 14, 1963:

> The man who made that attack yesterday is a member of the committee that added $1,100 million to the Defense budget. I don't think it is right when we have a man to support an irresponsible action in adding $1 billion to the budget that is not needed and then criticize the responsible official who took out the billion.

Mr. Speaker, the phased out Lenape Ordnance Modification Center at Newark, Del., eliminated 500 highly skilled defense workers when it closed in 1961. This plant cost the taxpayers $5 million to build and equip. Today, the Federal Government has not yet been able to recover one nickel. Why? Well, for one reason, because the Army, representing the Government in this instance, does not own the ground on which the plant was built. I ask you, my colleagues, how would you like to build a $5 million house on ground that you do not own or even have a long-term lease for?

TOO BUSY TO RETIRE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Harding] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, Idaho's first citizen in the minds of thousands of our citizens is U.S. District Judge Chase A. Clark.

Judge Clark started his law practice in Mackay, Idaho, in 1904 and went on to serve in both houses of the State legislature and as mayor of Idaho Falls. Later he became one of our most outstanding Governors. I know that in my short career in public life I have been greatly encouraged by the example set by this outstanding man, and have benefited from his counsel and advice.

Judge Clark is also the father-in-law of our distinguished senior Senator from Idaho. One of the more satisfying experiences I have received from serving in the Congress has been the close association that Mrs. Harding and I have enjoyed with Senator Frank Church and his lovely wife, Bethine, the daughter of this distinguished jurist and public servant.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to include at this point in the Record an article which was printed in the Boise, Idaho, Daily Statesman, on Friday, March 15, commenting on Judge Clark's 80th birthday and his life of accomplishment.

The article follows:

Too Busy To Retire—Judge Chase Clark Starts 21st Year on U.S. Bench; Recalls Appointment by Late President Roosevelt

When the Boise Federal Building personnel started arriving for work this morning, striding along was a spry and smiling young man of 80, showing up for his day's work. Greeted on all sides by coworkers and fellowtownsmen, Federal Judge Chase A. Clark was starting his 21st year on the Federal bench, stretching out a determination to keep busy rather than accept a deserved Federal retirement at a $22,500 salary.

The legal problem that confronted Judge Clark on his anniversary day had to do with an estate problem involving minor children. That kind of legal challenge will keep the venerable jurist busy for most of the morning. Every detail will receive careful attention. Judge Clark happens to be one of the kindest men ever to sit in any court. The children are in good hands.

His legal work out of the way, Judge Clark will have a heavy calendar as friends come by to congratulate him, not only for his long period of service, but for the great personal trait that has kept him in his assignment, monthly in the Boise court but in special work in Federal courts all over the Nation. Just last month Judge Clark was presiding judge in Federal court at Phoenix.

Asked why he continued working long after his retirement age 10 years ago when he was 70, Judge Clark said:

"I could have retired when I was 70. My salary would have come along just the same the rest of my life. I'm really working for nothing but I love my work.

"No one has suggested that I retire. A person is not able to judge himself correctly. I figure I have enough friends who, if they thought I was in my dotage, they'd come and tell me. They haven't."

Judge Clark is perhaps as well and favorably known as any other Idaho citizen. His Idaho career was climaxed by a term as Governor from 1940 to 1943. He has served in both Idaho legislative houses, and was mayor of Idaho Falls when he was elected the State's chief executive. He started his law career in Mackay in 1904 when he was 21. Later he practiced law at Hailey.

"How did I get this job?" Judge Clark was asked.

"I happened to be in Washington while I was Governor trying to get some Federal money into Idaho. I had an appointment with President Roosevelt. I was going to talk about getting the Navy into Pend Oreille. As I was going into the White House an Associated Press man came up and showed me a dispatch which said Judge Charles Cavanaugh had resigned as Idaho's Federal judge.

"I went in and talked to the President about the money matter and when I got up to leave I said 'Mr. President, I note that the Federal bench in Idaho is to be vacant. Why don't you give me that job?'

"The President replied: 'All right, Chase, you can have it.' "

I was appointed March 15, 1943. And I've been in this nice office ever since.

Some observations from the judge:

On being a legislator: "In the legislature in 1913 there weren't any problems at all. It was just a question of getting some money for Custer County. In 1932 in the senate it was different. Very strenuous. Relief for the unemployed was the problem."

On his daily life: "I'm busy here in my office. The work is most of my life. I get up at 7:30, earlier if I have a problem on my mind.

Most satisfying experience: "In 20 years on the bench I have admitted more than 2,000 citizens to citizenship. This is my biggest thrill. I am also satisfied by the fact that men who have been convicted in my court and placed on probation have made good a hundred percent. This is a great thing. It is forgotten they were ever in trouble."

Most interesting case: "Not one. Many. During the war a lot of men came into court to get their jobs back after fighting the war. We saw to it."

The lawyers obligation: "The lawyer must render public service. I believe lawyers give more service gratis than any other profession. I have found them very conscientious in their work."

About young people: "I urge young folks to seek the job they feel they would like. A paycheck isn't most important. Young folks are getting along as well today as they did when I was one of them."

Politics: "I have always been a Democrat. I believe all a person needs to be is a loyal American. Politics is no good if it goes over everything else."

Judge Clark's job has not only made him a familiar figure in Idaho. He is often assigned to sit in for judges in other States. Doing this he has traveled to Alaska, Hawaii, North Carolina, Virginia, Pennsylvania, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Arizona, and California.

The judge was married to Mrs. Clark, the former Jean Burnett, of Mackay, in Mackay 57 years ago.

"Our golden wedding anniversary," he said, "was a great day. Every day is a great day."

"Jean told me not to have my picture taken smoking a pipe so I didn't. Don't wear your glasses, either," she said.

"Which reminds me," he recollected. "I didn't have to put them on to pass my last driving test."

FISCAL SOCIALISM

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, today's issue of the Wall Street Journal contains a very learned and perceptive analysis of the fiscal developments that have occurred during the time that the Kennedy administration took office in January 1961.

It will be recalled that during the course of the inaugural proceedings the American people were admonished to inquire what they could give to their Government rather than what Government could give to them. Those stirring, if not particularly original words received a very favorable public reaction indicating a willingness on the part of the American people to respond to leadership that would instill fiscal integrity and sound economics in programs and policies of the Federal Government. Unfortunately, that leadership has not been forthcoming and instead the American people have been subjected to a revival of the tired, unimaginative, and unworkable theories of the New Deal.

The Wall Street Journal article by Prof. Wilhelm Roepke constitutes a major contribution to the literature pertaining to America's fiscal policy. I have in the past repeatedly pointed out that Federal, State, and local taxes in our Nation take one-third of the total net national product. I have gone on to suggest that this statistic presents an alarming measurement of the extent to which we have gone in socializing the efforts of our citizens. Many people do not recognize that the social planners who have failed in their efforts to bring about socialism by political change have, to a very large extent in the last three decades, accomplished their purpose by fiscal policy that entails spiraling Government taxation, unrestrained budget expenditures and mounting public indebtness. The result of their successful endeavors has been to bring about a degree of fiscal socialism not generally recognized. Mr. Speaker, I will as a part of my remarks include Professor Roepke's article as contained in the Wall Street Journal.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 1, 1963]

WASHINGTON'S ECONOMICS: A GERMAN SCHOLAR SEES NATION MOVING INTO FISCAL SOCIALISM

(By Wilhelm Roepke)

(NOTE.—This article, originally written in German, has been adapted by Prof. Patrick M. Boarman of Bucknell University. Professor Roepke, a long-time student of the American economy, left Germany when Hitler came to power. Since 1937, he has been on the faculty of the Graduate School of International Studies of the University of Geneva in Switzerland. He is the author of "Economics of the Free Society," translated by Professor Boarman and recently published in this country by Henry Regnery Co.)

Thirty years ago, I published an article severely criticizing the economic policies then being pursued by President Roosevelt in the name of a "New Deal." "The grave question arises," so my article concluded, "of what will become of us all when the economically most powerful country in the world allows itself to be led by anticapitalist slogans to certain ruin."

If, today, one were to subject the economic policies of the Kennedy administration to a similar analysis, the criticism would doubtless be less severe. It is hardly possible to equate what the New Frontier has thus far accomplished with the upheaval of the American economy engineered by Roosevelt. But enough has been done to warrant deep concern. Of particular interest to the economist is the fact that the overall policies of the Kennedy administration, including those pursued in the arena of world politics, are shaped to an unusual degree by specific economic theories. It is these theories which help explain, in particular, the clear defeats which the administration's economic program has thus far suffered.

It is worthy of note, to begin with, that the two principal problems which confronted the Kennedy administration at its inception are still unsolved. The deficit in the balance of payments and the associated gold loss still continue, nor is there any evidence that the ship of the American economy is any nearer than before to the open waters of full employment and full production. Both of these phenomena, however, are intimately interrelated.

SHIFTING THE BLAME

Where a country suffers from a balance-of-payments deficit, there is always a strong temptation—and the Kennedy administration has succumbed to it to a degree—to shift the burden of the blame, if not to unlucky juxtapositions of the stars, then to other countries. The weakness of the dollar is attributed not to discrepancies between cost and price levels in the United States and abroad, especially in respect to internationally traded goods, but to excessive capital exports. From this the conclusion is easily drawn that the dollar is less in need of an internal policy of strict monetary and fiscal discipline than of a reduction of the burden on the balance of payments stemming from capital exports. To help in the accomplishment of the latter objective, proposals are advanced which would restrain the outflow by exchange control, discriminatory taxation of foreign earnings, and other drastic devices which have little in common with a free enterprise economy. Simultaneously, other countries are cordially (and sometimes not so cordially) invited to assume an increased share of the U.S. burden of defense and foreign aid.

The theory is seductive in its simplicity. A country suffering from a balance-of-payments deficit, no matter how rich (and the United States remains far and away the country with the richest endowment of capital) must curtail its export of capital. Corresponding to this is the view that a country "enjoying" a balance-of-payments surplus, however capital-poor it may be (West Germany, for example), must on this very account strive to achieve a net export of capital. The truth is that the one argument is as untenable as the other, for in both cases disturbances of external equilibrium are wrongly identified with changes in internal capital wealth. What is needful is that a country adjust its balance of payments (by means of appropriate internal policies) to its capital resources, not its capital resources to its balance of payments.

THE WAGE SPIRAL

The root cause of the balance-of-payments difficulties of the United States is the internal wage and fiscal inflation which has been allowed to develop in that country. The official assurances that these sources of inflation have been stopped up carry little conviction because both wage inflation and budget deficits financed by bank reserves rather than by genuine savings have increased uninterruptedly. It is not sufficient in the American case merely to hold wage increases within the limits which the Government has designated as politically feasible or socially desirable. What is necessary is that wage increases be held well below productivity increases; realistically, they should be suspended altogether. But in fact a number of the most powerful American unions have not even managed to hold their wage demands within the administration's "guidelines."

It is the labor unions, in the final analysis, which must be accounted responsible for the fact that wages for the past 5 years have been pushed higher, in spite of persistently high levels of unemployment, placing the American monetary authorities in the perpetual dilemma either of accepting the unemployment caused by high wages or of overcoming it by inflation. The intemperance of the American unions, in turn, is bolstered both by the administration's policy of deliberately favoring labor and by its overall economic philosophy. The latter is based for the most part on monetary expansionism of an extreme type, distilled from a schematic and mechanical Keynesianism. Almost routinely, the managers of the New Frontier look upon any and all economic problems as ultimately solvable by an increase in the level of effective demand.

It is no accident that the principal architect of the administration's economic policy, Prof. Walter Heller, is the same person who in 1953 urgently advised the Bonn Government to cure the then substantial unemployment in West Germany—unemployment which was clearly due to a shortage of capital and hence definitely not of the "Keynesian" variety—with a bold program of monetary expansion. His advice, had it been followed, would have pushed the young German market economy ineluctably to its doom over the cliffs of inflation. The Heller philosophy, which the West Germans fortunately rejected, is one characterized by a perpetual impatience to give free rein to the money creating mechanisms of society. Obsessed by fear of deflation, it is blind to the danger of inflation which persists undiminished in the almost ritually recurring "rounds" of wage increases. Nor is the danger of inflation any less serious because it emerges in the American case in conjunction with unemployment and business pessimism. Indeed, it is precisely in this combination that it is most to be feared.

It is not easy to restore the world's confidence in a currency which has suffered, as the dollar has, from protracted illness. Even the support for the dollar provided by the international community, as indubitable a sign as it is of the price which other countries are prepared to pay to underwrite the "key currrency," cannot dispel the disturbing possibility which has been summed up in a famous phrase of Talleyrand's: "A ministry which needs support is a ministry which will fail." Of decisive importance, therefore, is the overcoming of the basic deficit itself.

EMBERS MAY FLAME UP

Doubtless the current inflationary tendencies in Europe will ease the task of the Americans in moving in an anti-inflationary direction. The probability is then that the balance-of-payments deficit will be reduced, providing other circumstances are favorable. But to the extent that this hoped-for development does in fact take place, there arises the danger that under the double influence of labor union monopoly and the doctrinaire pursuit of ever higher levels of "effective demand," the embers of American inflation, now only glimmering under the ashes, will again flame up. In this case, international confidence in the dollar will again decline, possibly to a critical degree.

The danger of a too-precipitate expansion of demand is the more serious where the belief persists that only in this way can the unsatisfactory domestic performance of the economy be improved. The forces involved in economic growth and prosperity are much more complex than is suggested in such a simple model. Thus, there can be little doubt that the functioning of the American economy has been slowed both by the relative shrinkage of profits, itself a result of increases in wages in a period of relative stagnation and underutilization of capacity, and by uncertainties about the future engendered by the attitudes and practices of the Kennedy administration.

In particular, the ruthless use of Government power to roll back the price increases with which United States Steel had attempted to compensate for increased labor costs constituted a step in the direction of a controlled economy and "repressed inflation." As such, it was a severe blow to public confidence. To the inevitable hazards of daily economic life, including those imposed by unbridled labor power, was added a vast and continuing uncertainty respecting the Government's readiness to accept the outcome of market processes. In short, the frustrations experienced under Roosevelt's New Deal, which failed in spite of years of effort to generate genuine economic expansion and prosperity, have reappeared on the New Frontier.

RISE OF FISCAL SOCIALISM

The similarity between the "New Deal" and "New Frontier" finds expression not only in the general decline in business confidence which the latter has provoked but in an openly defiant glorification of "big government" and in the fiscal megalomania which serves this questionable ideal.

We have to do here with an approach to economic problems which may be described as fiscal socialism. Increasingly, it has come to the fore as the key technique of the Socialist program in the developed countries as the classical goals of socialism—socialization of private property and planned economy—have diminished in attractiveness. In a recent session of the West German Parliament, the budget expert of the Socialist Party was moved to remark that "the continuous enlargement of the Government budget is a fact which will shock only the naive members of the population." The observation itself, however, marks merely the continuance of a tradition which began with the Jacobins of the French Revolution.

The Kennedy administration stands clearly in this general tradition, as its pronouncements amply attest, and in this respect too it is continuing Roosevelt's New Deal. A prominent explorer on the New Frontier, John Kenneth Galbraith, has furnished in his widely read book, "The Affluent Society," a theory in behalf of fiscal giantism whose stylistic elegance, if not its logic, has seduced many. Seldom has the conviction that government expenditures insure a wiser use of the people's income been put forward with such disarming candor. But Mr. Galbraith notwithstanding, the elephantiasis of contemporary government expenditures in general, and those of the United States in particular, is verily a pathological process. In it is expressed the tendency for the increasingly centralized state of our times to surround like a parasitical vine both society and economy and, by sapping the strength of the latter, to deny itself the means of life.

Clearly, there are limits to the process of continuing growth of government, limits which may be exceeded only by eroding and ultimately destroying the spiritual, political democratic society.

ROSTOW'S THEORY

The role played by theories of this sort in the shaping of American policy is evident as well as in the esteem in which the administration holds the economist and economic historian, Walt W. Rostow. In his famed essay, "The Stages of Economic Growth," Rostow argues that the prime forces moving a country through the several stages of economic development are technology and capital formation. Carried forward by the engine of capital investment, the economy ultimately reaches a stage at which it "takes off" like an airplane from the ground. The developmental process is allegedly the same everywhere. Germany and the United States in the past, or Canada and the Soviet Union at present—all are subjected to precisely similar mechanisms of growth.

When the stage of takeoff has been reached, a country will rise with increasing speed toward economic maturity and level off at the stage of "high mass consumption." In turn, economic maturity and the transition to mass prosperity (and here the economic hypothesis subtly becomes a determinant of world policy) are accompanied by "democratization" and "liberalization." This is a process, it is implied, which of itself will serve to brake the political expansionism of the Communist countries. The latter, that is to say, will grow directly from their teens into settled middle age—a development which is to be awaited with patience and forebearance. Time is on the side of reason and freedom; anticommunism which takes communism at its face value is mere hysteria.

If this theory is to be set in its proper framework, it must be remembered that the genuine progressive, believing mankind to be on the road to the millenium, finds in communism a most disturbing challenge to his Weltanschauung. His irresistible desire is to fit it somehow or other into his optimistic vision of the future. He is forever on a search for new theories calculated to demonstrate the innocuousness of communism's satanic drive to overturn and enslave the world. For communism then ceases to be an affront to progressivist optimism; on the contrary, it emerges as a comrade in arms in the march toward progress.

Such theories of Communist innocuousness, it is safe to say, have played a more important role in the advance of communism to its present power than has the whole panoply of Communist tanks, rockets, and divisions. Rostow's theory, in particular, constitutes little more than a new version of Rooseveltian illusionism in the dress of economic determinism (a determinism which is not nearly as far removed from that of Marx as Professor Rostow seems to think). But even as an economic hypothesis, it cannot stand. To see in an increase in the merely technical accouterments of the economy the ultimate engine of economic development, is to confess to the crassest form of materialism in which everything spiritual, political, and moral is robbed of its decisive role in the life of society. But the most egregious and alarming defect of the Rostovian growth model is its total indifference to the kind of economic system within which growth occurs.

HOW THE RICH GOT RICH

Progress in science and technology and increases in physical capital are necessary but by no means sufficient conditions for improvement in the welfare of the peoples of the world. The rich countries of today are rich because to these necessary conditions is added the further condition of a specific economic system functioning within a specific legal and philosophical framework. But the economic system of which we speak is none other than the market economy; the framework we have in mind is none other than the assemblage of spiritual, moral, and political postulates upon which such an economic system depends. Only those unwilling to face facts can deny that prosperity for the masses in any real sense is found today only within that sharply defined area which is constituted of the fully developed industrial countries of the free world.

While the one-sided economism of current theory is remarkable enough, its political purblindness is downright menacing. Its unforgivable error is its disregard of the essence of communism as a cultural, social, and political system imbued with the apocalyptic messianism and expansionism of a pseudo-religion. Communism remains a highly active volcano. It is the mark of a dangerous naivete to regard it as extinct (and hence something to be turned into a sort of tourist attraction) merely because it occasionally stops spewing out ashes and lava. To reduce it to a mere technique of industrial growth is as absurd as to downgrade national socialism to a method by which Germany was provided with a network of autobahns.

So it is that false economic theories can terminate in national and in international policies which must end not only in bitter disappointment but in increased peril for the still free half of humanity. And this is excuse enough for an economist to step outside his accustomed pursuits to enter a protest and a warning.

A BILL TO PERMIT THE ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSALIST WOMEN AND THE ALLIANCE OF UNITARIAN WOMEN TO MERGE

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which will permit the Association of Universalist Women and the Alliance of Unitarian Women to merge. This action is made necessary by the previous merger of the Unitarian and Universalist churches. To avoid the necessity of obtaining judicial interpretations of past and present gifts and legacies, the two groups will consolidate and the property now owned by the two groups will, after merger, become the property of the new organization.

Congressional participation in this procedure is required because the Universalist group is incorporated in the District of Columbia. The Unitarian group is incorporated in Massachusetts, and similar action by the State legislature has already been initiated.

UNITED STATES SIDING WITH COMMUNISTS

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, impossible as it may seem, it now appears likely that the United States will protect Castro from the Cuban exile armed attacks in their valiant efforts to free their beloved homeland and their enslaved fellow citizens.

The tortuous logic employed by the President and the State Department relies heavily on the President's contention that these armed attacks do not weaken Castro and communism's stranglehold on Cuba, but on the contrary, strengthen them. This reasoning, of course, is fallacious but by taking this position we are now in the position of doing these things. First, siding with Castro against the exiled Cuban patriots; second, alining ourselves with Castro-Khrushchev policies to the detriment of the enslaved people and the exiles, so much so that our policy may indeed be manipulated in the future by Khrushchev's dictation to Castro whose wishes are then relayed to us; third, a slowdown in our demands for demilitarization of Cuba, including the return of Russian soldiers and military arms; fourth, the recognition, if not invitation, for Russia to provide armed escorts for its vessels for shipping to Cuba.

In short, we are not only condoning the presence of internationally dominated communism under Khrushchev to maintain its beachhead in Cuba but are giving military protection to this base for subversion of the rest of Latin and South America. In all of this, we are crushing the hopes of the Cuban patriots without and within Cuba who seek to throw off the Communist tyrants, the puppet Castro and Big Boss Khrushchev.

This shameful and unbelievable situation is the result of watchful waiting, drifting, and a refusal to uphold the Monroe Doctrine, to blockade Cuba, and to free Cuba from the Communists, as the last and present administrations have promised to do.

How far the United States has fallen in its leadership, and uncompromising dedication to the preservation of liberty for all people.

The course of victory, freedom, preservation of U.S. sovereignty, and strengthening of the free world is not easy but is a course we must chart and follow now or surely fall under Communist domination. We must reimpose the Monore Doctrine. We must blockade Cuba. We must encourage Cuban patriots within and without Cuba to throw off their Communist leaders. We must do this now or Latin and South America will fall, country by country, until the United States stands alone in the Western Hemisphere. If the subversion of Latin and South America continues, God forbid, through our supine inactivity the day of fait accompli will be at hand and the ultimatum of Khrushchev leading world communism will be delivered when we stand alone in our Hemisphere. We dare not continue the present drift and lack of a firm aggressive policy. Time is short, but prompt action can save us and the other nations of this hemisphere.

CAPITALISM VERSUS SOCIALISM-COMMUNISM

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the clash between capitalism and socialism will be resolved with only one system winning. The systems are incompatible. Fuzzy intellectuals as would-be scholars, do-gooders, one-worlders lose sight of basic principles, as does Khrushchev and fellow Communists. The Socialists and Communists lose sight of the most fundamental proposition—we are dealing with human beings, not animals or slaves, all philosophies to the contrary notwithstanding.

Human beings work best with incentives, for themselves, and their loved ones. This is happiness, and all men yearn for it. The ones who refuse to recognize this are the power-seeking would-be dictators, social planners, manipulators, tyrants, czars, and others wishing to control the masses. Capitalism will win because men and women will work harder for themselves and their loved ones than they will for government.

The United States has proven this. Other societies in other times have proved this. Socialistic experiments have all failed. Yet many in our enlightened era have not learned the obvious truths of a free society, whose economic system must be capitalism, the essence of freedom and accompanying human happiness. Freedom, happiness, prosperity, self-achievement, high standard of living, cultural development, all are inextricably interwoven and go together in the capitalistic system. The profit motive is good; it is human. Profits are the reward for effort in capitalism, and the profitmaker is happy in his success and freedom to achieve. The only achievement in socialism to be equated with happiness is the absence of punishment when one does as told to do by government order.

The simple truths of capitalism—freedom, the reward for effort, ingenuity, hustle, and sweat, are forgotten as social planners conceive more ideal societies. Their mistakes are in forgetting human nature and in trying to prescribe the activities of their fellow mortals as though in planning they are endowed with godlike wisdom, and that others will happily accept their orders instead of resenting them and refusing to perform as planned.

It is simple when viewed objectively. Human beings want to be free, want to do what they want, and resent being dictated to or forced to work for others not by their choice.

So the battle, still joined, will be solved, with or without many people knowing the nature of the struggle. It is my hope that my colleagues and our constituents will see the nature of the struggle and help assure the successful victory of capitalism instead of losing by default as Federal planners put it over on them. In this vein I want to include the study of "Capitalism and Communism" in the Wall Street Journal of March 22, 1963:

CAPITALISM AND COMMUNISM

(By Edmund K. Faltermayer)

MOSCOW.—"I suppose it could be said," a Russian cautiously declares at the end of a long dinner debate with an American here, "that our system is becoming more like yours and yours like ours."

Though it comes from a citizen of Khrushchev's Russia, this statement is remarkably similar to a sentiment increasingly heard in the West these days: That the differences between the Soviet and American systems are narrowing, and that the two will eventually blur into some sort of hybrid system.

Superficially, some developments on both sides of the Iron Curtain suggest a narrowing of the gap. The Russian above cites such things as social security in the United States and France's postwar experiments with economic planning. His American acquaintance counters by listing some recent Soviet developments.

First, there is the feud with Red China, in which the Russians have taken a more tolerant line toward the capitalist world. Second, there is Premier Nikita Khrushchev's recent injunction to his economic chiefs, to "learn from the capitalists" how to solve some of their problems. And there is the new economic ferment: Some soviet economists have advocated a partial decontrolling of the country's socialized industry and wider use of of the capitalistic profit motive to spur production.

DE GAULLE'S VISION

Whether or not Russia is moving toward capitalism—or only appearing to do so—is of importance. If a genuine evolution is under way, it would make possible real East-West coexistence instead of the present uneasy truce. But if the trends within Russia are only an illusion, they might cause the West to lower its guard prematurely. Even now, President Kennedy's grand design of a close-knit Atlantic community alined against Russia is threatened by French President de Gaulle's rival vision of an independent Europe, stretching ultimately "from the Atlantic to the Urals."

Underlying that vision is the general's belief that the Russians are gradually becoming Westernized. Reports of capitalistic or other liberalizing tendencies in the U.S.S.R. lend support to this theory. Moreover, the notion of an ultimate ideological compromise appeals to many European pacifists who think East-West differences have been exaggerated.

Nevertheless, a meeting of the two systems somewhere in between does not appear very likely—at least not as long as the present generation of Soviet rulers remains in power.

For one thing, most of the moving would have to be done by Russia and not by the West. Indeed, there is considerable doubt whether the West has moved in Russia's direction at all. The welfare state legislation of the American New Deal, for example, had it roots not in Bolshevik Russia but in the Germany of the 1880's, where ultraconservative Chancellor Bismarck pushed through a social security system to steal the thunder of the Social Democrats. As for the future, the United States is in no mood to go very far in the direction of Russia's 100-percent socialized economy. Nobody in the United States—not even the most extreme liberal—is talking of nationalizing anything.

Even in socialistic Western Europe, the big wave of nationalization is over. State takeovers to date have been limited mainly to basic industries producing a homogeneous product and relatively easy to administer—railroads, utilities, and banks. The economic planning that goes on in France is utterly different from Russia's. Carried out in a spirit of cooperation between government and private industry, it is limited to capital investment and is not strictly compulsory.

In short, there appears to be a sticking point beyond which the Western democracies will not go in any supposed "evolution" toward the Soviet model.

If the West is unlikely to "move" toward Russia, the latter seems equally disinclined

to move toward the West. For the men in the Kremlin, too, there is a sticking point: Relaxation of control over every phase of Soviet life from poetry-writing to pig-farming. Unsure of popular support and intent on overtaking the United States, Russia's rulers cannot, in their own view, leave anything to chance. The economy is completely state controlled. Industry, trade, and agriculture, for all practical purposes, belong to the state as surely as the Army and Post Office Department belong to the U.S. Government.

Then what about those recent developments that suggest Russia is moving down the road toward capitalism?

The feud with Red China is the least convincing bit of evidence, for it centers more on the inevitability of war than on future internal developments in Russia. The fact that Mr. Khrushchev considers coexistence with the West necessary in an era of thermonuclear weapons has not dimmed his belief that capitalism will be buried through peaceful competition and subversion.

Mr. K's injunction to Russia's economic chiefs to learn from the capitalists is somewhat more intriguing. It indicates a new appreciation of areas in which Western practice is superior to Russia's, e.g., in standardizing components, eliminating the duplication of production facilities, and junking obsolete machinery. But this hardly means Mr. Khrushchev wants to remodel his economy extensively along capitalist lines.

Generally, when the Soviet Premier praises capitalist accomplishments, he is trying to goad his subordinates into outdoing the capitalists—but by socialist means. If private businessmen in the West do certain things well, he recently declared, "then the planned, socialist system can even more successfully use its inherent advantages to speed the technological progress of production, and to increase the output of products and improve their quality."

If this sounds like so much hot air, it nevertheless illustrates Mr. K's unwavering belief that socialism will prove superior in the long run. As far as he is concerned, Russia is not moving toward capitalism but further away from it, hopefully to "pure communism" sometime after 1980.

LIBERMAN'S PROPOSALS

Many in the West see a more hopeful sign of evolution in the new economic ferment in Russia. In particular, they cite the proposals of Y. G. Liberman, the Kharkov economics professor, to grant more powers to Russia's tightly reined factory directors and to let the pursuit of profits boost production and raise the quality of goods. The men in the Kremlin may think Russia is moving toward pure communism, these Western observers say, but it's more likely that they will be forced to make some "capitalistic" changes in their system long before 1980.

Unquestionably, Professor Liberman's proposals, if adopted, could mark a first step down the road toward some sort of Western-style market economy. The fact that his and other proposals have been printed at all shows that an important "thaw" is taking place in Soviet economic thinking. But there is no guarantee the Liberman scheme will ever be adopted. And even if it is, it would still leave the hard-core features of the Soviet system—state ownership of all production facilities, central planning, wage and price controls, and political dictatorship—intact.

Indeed, Professor Liberman's proposals are "capitalistic" only in the sense that the one rational direction in which Russia's system can go is toward increased delegation of power to the man on the spot. Yet despite their mildness, there's plenty of opposition. Even O. Antonov, the aircraft designer who has praised some of capitalism's features, warns self-righteously in a recent issue of Izvestia that profits, "taken by themselves" as an indicator of efficiency—as Professor Liberman proposes—"are, I would say, commercial and in practice sometimes mercenary."

There's a far more important objection. Some Western analysts—and probably many Russians—doubt the proposals would work without more decontrol than the Kharkov professor has called for. For example, price control and centrally planned distribution might have to be abolished or at least relaxed before factory directors would really get interested in maximizing profits. Otherwise, how could they shop around for raw materials or haggle over prices?

IMPLICATIONS FOR PARTY MEN

All this must raise fearsome implications for many Russians. For the various controls over the Soviet economy reinforce each other. Take some of them away, and the others are weakened. To some conservative Communists, any harmless-looking proposal to prune away red tape is really a bid by the economists and professional managers to take over. Since they might do a better job than is being done now, there would be less need for trouble-shooting by the local Communist Party officials who constantly look over their shoulders—and thus enable Moscow politicians to control Russia's economy.

Thus, few drastic changes are likely as long as Mr. Khrushchev rules Russia, short of a major economic catastrophe analogous to the 1929 stock market crash and subsequent depression in the United States. The men deemed most likely to succeed Mr. K. undoubtedly share his fear of introducing any real spontaneity into the system. Indeed, when the going gets rough the Soviet leaders are just as likely to tighten the screws as loosen them. The creation of a new Supreme Economic Council, announced last week, apparently will tighten control somewhat.

Even if some liberalization takes place later on—and this isn't precluded by the latest action—the sticking point would quickly be reached. In the arts, this seems to have happened already. Early this month Mr. Khrushchev told Russia's writers and artists, who have been increasingly bold of late, that they will not be allowed to create whatever they please.

Ultimately, perhaps when a new generation comes to power in Russia, true evolution toward capitalism may begin. But for the foreseeable future, barring a popular uprising which most observers consider unlikely, talk of the two systems "moving closer together" is largely wishful thinking.

CUBAN CAVES

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished former Ambassador to Mexico, the Honorable Robert C. Hill, sent me a copy of an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of March 30, 1963.

Entitled "The Secret Caves of Cuba," the editorial comments on the possibility of "underground Soviet submarine bases in Cuba."

The Honorable Robert C. Hill greatly distinguished himself as our Ambassador to the Mexican Republic. He made many friends for the United States.

While others were beguiled by Fidel Castro, Ambassador Hill was alert to the threat posed by the bearded demagog. He deserves recognition and appreciation by all Americans for his devoted service to our country.

The editorial follows:

THE SECRET CAVES OF CUBA

As many geologists have known for years, and many so-called intelligence experts are beginning to discover, the island of Cuba is honeycombed with thousands of underground caves. Many of these caves, as the geology textbooks point out, open directly on the sea. It is quite possible for a Soviet submarine to steam directly into some of these caves.

Cuban refugees and exiles have warned our Government for 3 years that the caves of Cuba have been the scene of mysterious and possibly sinister activity. Curiously, when Castro took over, Antonio Nuñez Jiménez, Cuba's leading spelunker (a person who explores caves), was appointed to a top Government position. Some of the Cuban exiles now in this country actually worked in these caves, cleaning them and pouring concrete. Then they were barred from further work in the caves. Today, if reports of the refugees can be believed—and we should not be quick to doubt them—the entrances to many of these caves are heavily fortified and no Cubans, not even top-level military personnel, are permitted near them. Whole villages have been relocated away from the caves. The caves are guarded by military personnel of the Soviet Union or satellite soldiers, reportedly including Czechs.

What is inside these caves? The exiles and refugees say some of them contain intermediate-range ballistic missiles, complete with guidance and launching systems. Other caves, they charge, house Soviet-built and Soviet-manned supersonic jet fighters, any of which could be easily converted to carry nuclear weapons. At least five of the caves, those opening on the sea, are said to be complete, operational Soviet submarine bases. Appearing before a congressional committee recently, the Army's Chief of Intelligence, Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch, said, "From the large volume and frequency of reports concerning the underground storage of ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft, it is certain that there is considerably activity in connection with underground installations through the island. In numerous caves, reports indicate that this activity is being carried out solely by Soviet personnel and that Cubans, including highly placed military officers, are not permitted access."

"There are several thousand caves in Cuba," General Fitch continued, "and many have been used for storage over the years. With the reported addition of dehumidification and air-conditioning equipment, many would be suited to storage of both large and delicate electronic items. Aerial photography has further revealed the extension of roads to known and suspected cave locations. In view of the shortage of aboveground facilities and the requirement for storage of the large amounts of military supplies and equipment believed to be in Cuba, and the relatively simple adaptation of caves for this purpose, it is considered highly probable that much military equipment and supplies are being stored underground."

General Fitch does not believe that the Soviets have installed intermediate-range ballistic missiles in the caves, as the exiles insist. He says, "While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis, it is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems tha: were in Cuba at the time the quarantine was imposed." General Fitch, an Army man, did not comment on the possibility of underground Soviet submarine bases in Cuba. Thus far, our Navy experts have remained silent on this point.

To date the Government's intelligence-gathering activities in Cuba have inspired little confidence. Defense Secretary McNamara's theatrical television briefing raised a good many more questions than it answered. Moreover, McNamara recently admitted that, when the going got tough, CIA surveillance aircraft were inadequate to cope with Cuba and airplanes of the Strategic Air Command had to be pressed into service. But even those skilled SAC recon experts cannot photograph the inside of a cave. If the Soviets do not even permit the "highly placed military" of Cuba near the caves we would doubt that our CIA men have penetrated them either. Thus, it seems to us that we really don't know what might be inside the caves. We think it is dangerous to assume that they do not contain IRBM missiles and submarine pens.

If, as the exiles contend, the caves are loaded with IRBM's and submarine facilities, then Cuba, in fact, has become a Soviet Gibraltar. Only a few Soviet IRBM's in Cuba dangerously tilt the balance of power in Soviet favor. If the Soviets are allowed to operate Polaris-type submarines from Cuban bases, the Reds can attain a serious "third force" threat, with only one-third the number of nuclear submarines required to operate from Soviet home bases. This is the grave threat of the caves of Cuba.

To Americans, the important point is that we do not know what the caves conceal. We think it is vital that our Government find out, beyond doubt, and soon. Having failed once to listen to the warnings of Cuban exiles, it seems to us the Government now has an obligation to disprove their present charge, by whatever means are necessary, including force.

FARM SUBSIDIES—FACT AND FICTION

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Hoeven] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, American farmers are often unfairly criticized by people in our urban areas who do not quite understand the problems of our agricultural population. This is often due to poor public relations and, hence, I am always pleased when someone comes up with the facts and truth about expenditures in the Department of Agriculture. A splendid article by Lauren Soth appeared recently in the Des Moines (Iowa) Sunday Register, and it is worthy of note and attention. I wish to include it herewith as part of my remarks:

Farm Subsidies—Fact and Fiction

(By Lauren Soth)

How much Federal subsidy does agriculture receive?

Those who oppose farm programs, price supports, and payments to farmers usually label as farm subsidy the entire U.S. Department of Agriculture budget, which recently has been running around $6 to $7 billion per year. And, by using a little arithmetic, such a figure can be made to seem outlandish Federal spending for farmers.

The last census showed 3.7 million farms in the United States. Divide that into $7 billion and you get nearly $2,000 of Fedral expenditure per farm.

If you eliminate the 1.6 million noncommercial farms (those with total sales less than $2,500), that leaves only about 2 million real farms and it appears that Uncle Sam is spending $3,500 for each one of them.

Farmers and their leaders have tried to explain that everything in the USDA budget is not of benefit to farmers. However, the exaggeration of farm subsidies still goes on.

Recently, Senator Herman Talmadge (Democrat, of Georgia), got the Department of Agriculture to break down its proposed budget for the fiscal year beginning next July to identify expenditures which are not subsidies to farmers. This breakdown is shown in the accompanying table.

Only the $2,606 million shown in the last part of the table can be properly called farm subsidy.

It is true, of course, that the exports of food at cutrate prices and donations of food to foreign countries benefit agriculture. But foreign aid in money also benefits certain U.S. industries. The foreign recipients use the dollars to buy machinery and other goods in the United States. The food-for-peace program is foreign aid and should be classed as such in the Federal budget, just as other grants or loans to foreign countries are.

It is also true that food distribution programs, including the food stamp plan, are of some benefit to farmers, although in this case the benefit is very small. But the main benefit is to poor people in this country who receive balanced diets they could not otherwise obtain.

One of the biggest illusions of all is that the vast programs of agricultural research, education, and technical assistance are of primary advantage to the farmer.

These public efforts to stimulate more efficient farm production help the consumer directly by lowering the cost of food.

Individual farmers who adopt new methods first tend to gain a temporary benefit from them. But, in the long run, farmers as a group actually suffer a cut in income from this advance of productivity.

The reason for this is that, in a rich country, demand for food is highly inelastic. A 5-percent increase in total output of food in this country results in a 20-percent reduction in price. Thus, a larger supply sells for less gross revenue.

Programs which tend to stimulate more farm output, therefore, are not a subsidy to farmers but to consumers.

This is the basic reason why production controls, price supports, and other subsidies are necessary. In a sense, the expenditures in the last section of the accompanying table are a consequence of the expenditures for research and education just above them.

If the Government only spent money for farm research and education, the farmer's income would slide downhill rapidly. There is no way that the individual farmer can protect himself against the oversupply and low-price situation. What he does by himself has no effect on the market, so he must produce as much as he can at all times.

When farmers can work together to discipline themselves to restrain production and marketing, they can develop bargaining power to hold their own in an inelastic demand situation. Some small commodity groups do this with the help of Government marketing orders and agreements. The big sectors of farming, however, such as wheat, cotton, feed grains-livestock, have to rely on more direct Government action to either (1) offset the effects of lower market prices through subsidies or (2) help farmers keep production in check.

That the work of USDA is not entirely for the benefit of farmers is shown by a study prepared by Walter W. Wilcox, economist for the Library of Congress.

Wilcox calculated that food costs today are $4 to $6 billion a year less than they would be if prices of farm products had risen as much as prices in other parts of the economy in the last 8 years. This amounts to a saving of about $100 per family.

These savings may be compared with average costs of farm income-support programs of $1.9 billion per year in 1953–54 and $2.6 billion per year in 1961 and 1962.

It would appear from these figures that the U.S. consumer has been doing very well, on balance, between expenditures for farm subsidies and expenditures which reduce the cost of food. Perhaps the Department of Agriculture should be renamed the Department of Food and Agriculture.

It is as much a consumer's agency in the food field as a farmer's agency.

Proposed USDA budget

PROGRAMS WHICH BENEFIT GENERAL PUBLIC	
Food distribution programs:	*In millions*
Purchase of surplus agricultural commodities	$164
Pilot food stamp plan	51
School lunch program	182
Special milk program	102
Total	499
Programs having foreign relations and defense aspects:	
Sales of surplus farm commodities for foreign currencies	1,282
Emergency famine relief to friendly peoples	246
International wheat agreement	72
Transfer of bartered materials to supplemental stockpile	62
Payments to Veterans' Administration and armed services for milk and dairy products used in excess of normal requirements	40
Value of foreign currencies used by Defense Department for military housing and long-term supply contracts	284
Defense food stockpiling	30
Total	2,016
Investment in REA and FHA loans, which are subject to repayment	448
Long-range programs for improvement of agricultural resources, including research, meat inspection, disease and pest control, market development and services, protection of soil and water resources, and forest and public land management:	
Forest Service	311
Agricultural Research Service	195
Soil Conservation Service	195
Extension Service	77
Cooperative State Experiment Station Service	40
Agricultural Marketing Service, marketing research	43
Farmers Home Administration salaries and expenses	39
Expenses and staff offices for other agencies, including Rural Electrification Administration (REA), and Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC)	94
	994
Total	3,957
PROGRAMS FOR STABILIZING FARM INCOME	
Agricultural conservation program	214
Conservation reserve program	294
Land-use adjustment program	27
CCC price support, supply and related programs (less payments to VA and armed services for dairy products used in excess of normal requirements)	787
Grain acreage diversion payments	400
Grain price support payments	581
National Wool Act program	106
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service expenses	115
Sugar Act program	84
Total	2,608
Grand total	6,565

CINCINNATUS' WORDS OF WISDOM AND CAUTION ON TOTALITARIAN DESPOTISM

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pillion] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, Miss Taylor Caldwell, of Buffalo, N.Y., is an internationally famous American novelist, the author of many bestsellers.

She has a profound understanding of the philosophical, human and political fallacies and deceptions contained in the Soviet-directed Communist drive for the destruction of the free world. She is a dedicated defender of our liberties, an ardent Conservative, a true liberatarian.

Miss Caldwell recently wrote to me expressing her alarm over the tax reforms recommended in President Kennedy's budget message. Her letter was especially critical of the increased taxes that would be imposed upon the middle class of our citizens by the proposal to limit present deductible items for interest, charity, property and State taxes. In my answer, I expressed my opposition to the President's recommendations for these tax increases.

Miss Caldwell's letter enclosed portions of the speech of Cincinnatus, delivered in the Roman Senate, 300 B.C.

Cincinnatus perceived and eloquently stated that a free nation begins to perish when its citizens place their faith in men instead of in principles and laws. Today, there is a concerted effort being made to destroy the faith of our people in the U.S. Constitution and in the U.S. Congress. There is a subverting effort underway to condition the minds of our people for the acceptance of an all-planned, all-wise, all-powerful totalitarian Federal Government. The process is one of usurpation of power and misinterpretation of the purpose of the U.S. Constitution.

I believe that the words of wisdom and caution, contained in the following speech of Cincinnatus are especially applicable, today.

The speech follows:

Speech of Cincinnatus, "Father of His Country," Delivered to the Roman Senate, 300 B.C., When He Was Called Upon To Save Rome From Her Enemies

My dear fellow countrymen, you have imposed upon me an honor and a terrible obligation and faith for which I am little fitted, for no man is worthy of the devotion of his people. Worthiness resides in no man, and let that nation beware which discovers itself regarding its temporal ruler as a divinity, fawning upon him, delighting in news of his comings and goings, reverencing him, listening to his words as though they rolled down from Olympus with the sound of thunder, ostracizing those who differ from him, raising up their voices like trumpets hailing all that he does, and deluding themselves that he is superior to those who have elevated him by vote or in the name of emergency.

For such a people have taken upon themselves the aspects of slaves. They have greatly injured their ruler by persuading him he is more than a man and that he does not possess their own evils and follies and weaknesses. If he becomes arrogant and oppressive this is the crime of his people, the crime above all other crimes, for they have endangered his stature as a man and have aroused in him base passions and have afflicted him with the wrath of God, who will have no rivals. Much has been written in history of the sufferings of nations under tyrants, but where does one read that the tyrant is the victim of his people and therefore more to be pitied? If, in your history, long after I am dust, you raise up a tyrant to destroy and enslave and terrify you, say not to him: "You have betrayed and imprisoned and tormented us beyond endurance." Say, rather to him: "Forgive us."

God, in His wisdom and knowledge and understanding has created infinite diversity among men, so that no man shall think or act or speak in the exact manner of his brother. This variety is our shield, our fortress, our wall, our immortal protection against despots, against error, against weakness, and evil. In argument, in difference, in dialog and in freedom of speech and in all liberty, the truth will emerge concerning man's duty and man's God. But let no ruler of mere flesh, unsanctified and in all ignorance no matter his learning, shout in your presence, "I alone am truth, and you shall believe it and speak no word against it." For truth comes only from God, the possessor of our days, the guardian of our nights, the ultimate receiver of our souls, the giver of our breath, the Light of our spirit.

No nation has ever perished until it has said, "My faith is in men, and he whom I have placed upon the throne which I have built with my own hands is the repository of wisdom and justice, and he I shall obey without question and with my heart's great loyalty and devotion. He is my law, and I delight in him, and bow my head before him." There are times of dire emergency when power is given to one man, but that time must be limited, and that man's days scanned sleeplessly lest he be devoured by ambition, and be a mischief.

You have called me from my peaceful fields and my household to save you. I shall, in the fear of God and in the wisdom with which He sees fit to endow me, serve you with courage and steadfastness and faith, and shall deliver you. But I implore you to let me go when my service has been rendered. For no man is worthy of the trust of his fellows, not even I, nor those who will come after me. For men are ambitious and their hearts are evil.

And now let us take up our duty and gird our strength and lift up our shields and our swords in defense of our country. Let us be men and not cowards. If death is our portion then we shall have died honorably and in the name of liberty, and we shall have delivered our children. War and struggle are indeed monstrous trials, but never must they be avoided for a year of uneasy peace or an era of compromise with evil. It is better to die on one's feet, fighting for freedom, than to live on one's knees as a slave. It is better to eat the dust than the bread of despotism. It is better to expire as a man.

Let us now to our arms, as freemen and Romans.

(Source: Vatican Library, Rome.)

NATIONAL BEAUTY CAREER DAYS

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. Frances P. Bolton] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the National American Cosmetology Schools, for the third consecutive year, have designated the second week in April—April 7 through 13—as National Beauty Career Days. A constituent of mine, Mrs. Grace Talarico, of Cleveland, is the chairman of the National Beauty Career Days Committee. The purpose of this special week is to make teenagers and adults more aware of career opportunities in the beauty industry.

Twenty-four hundred beauty culture school owners work closely with vocational guidance counselors in junior high schools, high schools, and government agencies to assist the teenager in acquiring salable skills in today's complex labor market. During the week in April which has been set aside, an educational program will be conducted and an open invitation will be issued to high school counselors, teenage groups and parents to visit their community cosmetology schools, to inspect the facilities and gain first-hand information regarding the advantages of a career in cosmetology.

There are many people who do not realize the great impact which the beauty industry has on our national economy. It contributes well in excess of $1 billion a year to our gross national product. There are more than 200,000 beauty salons located in every State in the Union, employing more than a half million operators classified as cosmetologists, hairdressers, and beauticians. Each operator must comply with State board regulations which usually require from 1,000 to 2,500 hours of practical and academic training. In addition to the operators there are more than 1,500 beauty supply dealers and more than 2,400 beauty culture schools which supply and service the industry.

Mr. Speaker, the beauty industry is to be congratulated for their foresightedness in setting aside this week to call attention to the advantages to teenagers and others of acquiring this particular skill. Otherwise many of these young people would have the problem of facing the competitive labor market as unskilled workers.

PROBLEMS IN COMBATING USE OF THE MAILS BY DISTRIBUTORS OF PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIAL

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I wish to direct the attention of the Members to the continued problem our Nation faces in our efforts to combat the use of the mails by distributors of pornographic material. Additional legislation is needed in this field, and I am hopeful that our committee will continue the necessary research to provide the Post Office Department with effective legal weapons with which to halt the purveyors of smut.

Filth peddling today produces billions of dollars a year in income to persons involved in its distribution, despite all efforts of the Post Office and local authorities to stamp it out. The suppression of traffic in obscenity is a tremendous and never-ending problem and the ill effects that it causes are tragically visible among thousands of children across the country.

The chief problem we on the committee have encountered in our investigations of this subject over many years is an overtolerance—amounting often to apathy—on the part of the public. Major effort, therefore, has been directed to developing a public awareness that smut and obscenity are a very real danger and can strike every home, even though an individual may have escaped thus far.

A second part of the problem is the adverse press that tends to block correct measures. Any public official, legislative group, or private organization risks the brand of "censor" or "professional do-gooder" in recommending positive legislation or administrative action.

A third handicap has been the very tolerant attitude of some courts—particularly in metropolitan areas where much smut originates—evidencing a serious miscalculation of the extent and the danger of smut peddling, as well as of the moral temper of the public.

Both Postmaster General Day and his predecessor, Postmaster General Summerfield, have cited the obscenity racket as a half-billion-dollar-a-year business.

Keeping smut out of the mails, even with stronger laws originated by our committee, demands an ever larger share of time, money, and manpower of the postal service each year. Incidentally, I wish to credit both Postmaster General Day and former Postmaster General Summerfield for their effective and determined efforts to combat the use of the mails by peddlers of smut.

I direct your attention to House Appropriation hearings on the postal budget for 1964 which highlights this condition. Assistant Postmaster General Frederick C. Belen testified—page 107:

> At the close of fiscal year 1962, the inspection service had a backlog of about 5,000 cases involving the transmittal of obscene matter in the mails. This is over and beyond the normal carryover and represents the equivalent of 18 man-years of work. It is apparent that at least five additional inspectors must be assigned to investigate the transmittal of obscene matter in the mails.

I commend the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman Gary, of the Appropriations Subcommittee, and point to his comments—page 128—with respect to imports of smut:

> Frankly, I did not fully realize the importance of this program [of the postal service] until our recent trip to New York. * * * there is a pronounced effort to flood this country with communistic materials and also with pornographic materials from outside countries.
>
> We were told that one country has been collecting approximately $10 million a year from the pornographic material being shipped into this country.

The Post Office Department's General Counsel cited the difficulty in coping with purveyors of smut who, when they are about to be caught, change their names and addresses to circumvent prosecution.

He cited the dual attack of the postal service and the customs service on obscenity of domestic and foreign origin, and some of the effective steps being taken to combat the evil. His description of procedure—page 130—indicates how tedious and costly and how sometimes frustrating their best efforts are. Controlling obscene imports at New York alone requires 12 full-time postal employees, in addition to the customs officials.

The venue law, which permits prosecution of obscenity offenders at destination of their mailings, as well as at origin points, has been tremendously helpful, because the community moral attitudes where the material does its harm are considerably better than in some metropolitan points of origin. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee developed and wrote this legislation, and referred it to the Judiciary Committee, because it provides strong criminal penalties.

The chief postal inspector submitted a chart—page 133 of the hearings—showing fine progress in combating smut mailings, but the whole tenor of the hearings is that efforts must be redoubled to protect the public.

I also direct your attention to an interesting sidelight of the unified effort at Federal level—page 133—concerning arrangements between our postal service and the National Central Interpol Office in The Hague. Successful prosecution of foreign smut mailers under this arrangement, and under similar arrangements with nations which are members of the Universal Postal Union, should help keep foreign obscenity out.

Finally, the main operating problem is lack of adequate manpower. Cooperation by an informed citizenry can be a tremendous aid. Any citizen who finds obscenity moving through the mails should report it promptly to his local postmaster or law enforcement officials, just as he would report any other crime. If he does so, he may well be striking the first blow in defense of his own home and children—since many of the filth merchants direct their "pornography for profit" efforts at our children and young people.

However, we must realize that this issue is important and must be met, since it so adversely affects the lives of thousands of youngsters. Thousands and thousands of children throughout our country in the largest city and the smallest village are the targets of pornographic peddlers and their lives may be twisted and perverted if they become addicted to the clever little magazines and related material that reaches them through the mail or just as often available over the counter of local stores.

We have an obligation to cooperate through legislative enactment in providing the Post Office Department with weapons to effectively fight this battle in this field. We then have an additional responsibility to help arouse public opinion, which can be a vital force for good in halting this consistent attack on our moral standards. The family, the community, private groups and government must work together in this field to develop an effective, consistent antiobscenity program, and in turn, to develop additional leadership to expand the use of better reading materials, while eliminating the flow of filth from our Nation.

THE SECRET CAVES OF CUBA

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great voices of America is the Saturday Evening Post. Its editorials have long expressed the interest and concern of a great number of our people. Such an editorial is that of the issue of March 30, 1963 entitled "The Secret Caves of Cuba."

As this editorial so well points out, there are such caves and we do not know what is in them. However, we do know that for years Soviet Communists have been working on and in them with concrete. We also know that there have been shipped to Cuba all manner of military equipment. Finally, we know that wherever Communists are at work, they are not peddling sewing kits.

No longer is Cuba a question of laissez faire. Nor is our problem there confined to whether or not the "guestimates" of administration officials, that heavy missiles have been removed by the Russians, are so. Cuba in Communist hands is an acute threat to American security and survival on account of submarine bases alone, to say nothing of missiles or propaganda. Astride the whole Caribbean and strategically located on America's soft underside we cannot and we must not tolerate Communist control of Cuba.

As the Saturday Evening Post editorial so well emphasizes, the U.S. Government, acting for our people, "now has an obligation to disprove—the claims that offensive weaponry is presently hidden in Cuban caves—by whatever means are necessary, including force."

This, I have urged for more than 3 years.

The editorial reads as follows:

> THE SECRET CAVES OF CUBA
>
> As many geologists have known for years, and many so-called intelligence experts are beginning to discover, the island of Cuba is honeycombed with thousands of underground caves. Many of these caves, as the geology textbooks point out, open directly on the sea. It is quite possible for a Soviet submarine to steam directly into some of these caves.
>
> Cuban refugees and exiles have warned our Government for 3 years that the caves of Cuba have been the scene of mysterious and possibly sinister activity. Curiously, when Castro took over, Antonio Nuñez Jiménez, Cuba's leading spelunker (a person who explores caves), was appointed to a top government position. Some of the Cuban exiles now in this country actually worked in these caves, cleaning them and pouring concrete. Then they were barred from further work in the caves. Today, if reports of the refugees can be believed—and we should not be quick to doubt them—the entrances to many of these caves are heavily fortified and no Cubans, not even top-level military personnel, are permitted near them. Whole villages have been relocated away from the caves. The caves are guarded by military personnel of the Soviet Union or satellite soldiers, reportedly including Czechs.
>
> What is inside these caves? The exiles and refugees say some of them contain intermediate-range ballistic missiles, complete with guidance and launching systems. Other caves, they charge, house Soviet-built and Soviet-manned supersonic jet fighters, any of which could be easily converted to carry nuclear weapons. At least five of the caves, those opening on the sea, are said to be complete, operational Soviet submarine bases. Appearing before a congressional committee recently, the Army's Chief of Intelligence, Maj. Gen. Alva R. Fitch said, "From the large volume and frequency of reports concerning the underground storage of ammunition, supplies, vehicles, and even aircraft, it is certain that there is considerable activity in connection with underground installations through the island. In numerous caves, reports indicate that this activity is being carried out solely by Soviet personnel and that Cubans, including highly placed military officers, are not permitted access.
>
> "There are several thousand caves in Cuba," General Fitch continued, "and many have been used for storage over the years. With the reported addition of dehumidification and air-conditioning equipment, many would be suited to storage of both large and delicate electronic items. Aerial photography has further revealed the extension of roads to known and suspect cave locations. In view of the shortage of aboveground facilities and the requirement for storage of the large amounts of military supplies and equipment believed to be in Cuba, and the relativley simple adaptation of caves for this purpose, it is considered highly probable that much military equipment and supplies are being stored underground."
>
> General Fitch does not believe that the Soviets have installed intermediate-range ballistic missiles in the caves, as the exiles insist. He says, "While all such reports receive exhaustive analysis, it is our belief that the Soviets did, in fact, remove all strategic weapons systems that were in Cuba at the time the quarantine was imposed." General Fitch, an Army man, did not comment on the possibility of underground Soviet submarine bases in Cuba. Thus far, our Navy experts have remained silent on this point.
>
> To date the Government's intelligence-gathering activities in Cuba have inspired little confidence. Defense Secretary McNamara's theatrical television briefing raised a good many more questions than it answered. Moreover, McNamara recently admitted that, when the going got tough, CIA surveillance aircraft were inadequate to cope with Cuba and airplanes of the Strategic Air Command had to be pressed into service. But even those skilled SAC recon experts cannot photograph the inside of a cave. If the Soviets do not even permit the "highly placed military" of Cuba near the caves we would doubt that our CIA men have penetrated them either. Thus, it seems to us that we really don't know what might be inside the caves. We think it is dangerous to assume that they do not contain IRBM missiles and submarine pens.
>
> If, as the exiles contend, the caves are loaded with IRBM's and submarine facilities, then Cuba, in fact, has become a Soviet Gibraltar. Only a few Soviet IRBM's in Cuba dangerously tilt the balance of power in Soviet favor. If the Soviets are allowed to operate Polaris-type submarines from Cuban bases, the Reds can attain a serious "third force" threat, with only one-third the number of nuclear submarines required to operate from Soviet home bases. This is the grave threat of the caves of Cuba.
>
> To Americans, the important point is that we do not know what the caves conceal. We think it is vital that our Government find out, beyond doubt, and soon. Having failed once to listen to the warnings of Cuban exiles, it seems to us the Government now has an obligation to disprove their present charge, by whatever means are necessary, including force.

BILL PROPOSED TO STRENGTHEN IMMIGRATION LAWS TO PREVENT U.S. CITIZENS FROM GOING TO CUBA FOR SUBVERSIVE PURPOSES

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, for 2 weeks now I have waged an effort to prevail upon the Justice and State Departments to close the open door to subversion in the Americas through Mexico City to Cuba, but so far unsuccessfully.

I have called to the attention of the State Department and the House Un-American Activities Committee the fact that some 97 U.S. citizens, during a period of only 6 months during 1962, went to Cuba through Mexico, since the ban on such travel dated January 16, 1961, was issued by the State Department and I have turned these names over to the House Un-American Activities Committee, having been advised that this list has been denied the committee for reasons which I cannot understand.

The House Un-American Activities Committee advises that it is engaged in a full-scale investigation of the matter in that my cursory examination of the list indicated that a number of those going to Cuba have known Communist backgrounds and are continuing to participate in support of Communist-front organizations, including the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, the Medicine for Cuba Committee, and the July 26 movement.

I also have placed in the Record evidence that a number of those who have gone to Cuba have publicly advertised this fact in the Worker, with announcements of speechmaking programs about Cuba, the funds from which are to be used to finance the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Despite these public announcements, only one prosecution has taken place.

We are calling upon all nations in this hemisphere to try to close this open door of subversion and we look a little silly in so doing while at the same time permitting our own citizens not only to go to Cuba but to use information gained there to sell Castro's communism in the United States and to finance Communist-front organizations working for Castro in the United States.

I find this situation completely intolerable and I again call upon the Justice and State Departments to prosecute these Communist sympathizers who have openly and notoriously violated the law and to do all it can to close this door permanently.

I am today introducing a bill which I believe will tighten travel restrictions as they relate to persons, particularly U.S. citizens, who travel to or interrupt their journeys in transit through any country with which the United States does not maintain diplomatic relations, making this specifically a crime when the President of the United States has declared that such travel should be prohibited in the best interests of the United States. This latter limitation obviously would make it applicable to Cuba and would perhaps also help bring about clarification of rules and regulations relating to other countries whose governments we do not recognize.

The further purpose of this bill is hopefully to get this general issue before the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee so that amendments to the basic law can be considered while at the same time House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Committee consider the possible subversive impact of these visits within this country.

I am also placing in the Record for the first time the list of the number of people who have gone to Cuba from other countries during this same 6-month period in 1962. This list indicates the extent to which countries in the Americas permit the flow of people, numbers of them known subversives, to Cuba, and, again, I say I am confident this information is correct in that the basic source of the information comes from the manifests of the planes of Cubana Airlines. The list, which is self-explanatory, indicates a total of

3,447 have traveled to Cuba from other countries, including 265 from Russia and its satellites.

The list follows:

Canada	81
United States	99
Total	180
Argentina	229
Bolivia	51
Brazil	80
Colombia	15
Costa Rica	47
Cuba	435
Chile	126
Ecuador	67
El Salvador	70
Guatemala	78
Honduras	229
Mexico	443
Nicaragua	14
Panama	49
Paraguay	27
Dominican Republic	2
Uruguay	122
Venezuela	7
Total	2,135
From undetermined nationalities, total	646
Russia and satellites	265
Other countries outside of this hemisphere	221
Total	1,132
Grand total	3,447

I again call for the closing of this open door of subversion and call for early hearings and favorable action on legislation of this nature.

It will be my intention, your invitation of the Senate Internal Security Committee, to appear before that committee on Wednesday to present this evidence and other matters—this list of names having been denied even this committee by the executive branch to date.

OUR FISCAL PROBLEM

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Harvey] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the President, unintentionally I am sure, has placed our fiscal problem in the proper perspective when he referred to those who oppose his planned deficits as being possessed of a puritan ethic.

Dr. Elton Trueblood, of Earlham College in Indiana, recently defended those who do posses a "puritan ethic" very effectively in the publication Quaker Life, April 1963.

Under unanimous consent, I include his article in the body of the Record, as follows:

The Puritan Ethic

(By Elton Trueblood)

Walter Heller, chief economic adviser to President Kennedy, has given it out as his judgment that one of the chief barriers to be overcome is that of the puritan ethic. By this he means that adherence to the ethic of the days when America was young is wholly inapplicable in our time. It would, he thinks, be far easier to put across the idea of spending ourselves into prosperity if only an antiquated philosophy did not persist as an intellectual anachronism. Running a big deficit is the right thing to do, we are told, but some people are still so old fashioned that they do not know this. Among those of whom Heller speaks with such obvious condescension are a good many Quakers.

This approach would not be very disturbing if it came from a mere private citizen, for each person has a right to his opinion, but it is highly disturbing when it comes from those who are among the chief architects of national policy. We can be grateful to Heller in that he helps the public to understand the character of the challenge which the economic advisers are presenting. What we have on our hands is not mere economic theory, but rather a proposed alteration of our basic philosophy. We are foolish if we do not become aroused when the philosophy which helped to make our country great is spoken of with contempt.

The President says that his policy of cutting taxes by $10 billion, while expenses rise, is attacked on both the right and the left. What he needs to know is that it is deeply disturbing to some who do not belong to either the right or the left. We are not ashamed of the puritan ethic, which means trying to live within our income, and we refuse to feel out of date just because some man with access to the White House says so. I do not especially enjoy paying.

I am well aware of the argument given, to the effect that the alternative to a huge deficit is a depression, with the consequence of an even larger deficit. I am aware of this because this is what the President and his key advisers keep saying. Whether this is true or not I do not know, but I do know that an economy in which these are the only alternatives is terribly sick. Imagine the richest country of the world admitting that it cannot avoid a depression except by a deliberate plan of deficit financing, to burden its descendants. Already we pay $10 billion a year to finance our debt. As the debt rises, as is promised, this amount will increase greatly. One does not have to be very wise to envisage a time when the total debt will be fantastic. Certainly it will be if we add to it substantially in allegedly good times.

The danger is very great, a danger which any person ought to be able to see, even if he is a doctrinaire economist. Consider, for example, how a similar policy has practically ruined Brazil. Both reason and experience should warn us, but those who command the headlines seem impervious to both. Perhaps it is the desire to be popular and to stay in power that is really at work. People always love a gift, even if the source of the gift is their own money. The basic issue may not be primarily economic; it may be moral. The awful thought is that demagogues tend to win, particularly in the short run.

CLAY REPORT IS OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fuqua] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, throughout this great Nation of ours, the press and the people are discussing and studying the foreign aid report of the Clay committee, submitted by a 10-man committee named by President Kennedy and headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay. Let me say that I believe this study and report represents one of the finest actions taken since I have been a Member of the Congress.

I think President Kennedy should be commended for having named this committee of outstanding Americans to reassess our foreign aid program. It has long been my conviction that we needed to reassess the role we are playing in our foreign aid program, to seek out those areas where our funds are being wasted, and eliminate these, and where the goals of this Nation are being met, to bolster our programs.

The report aptly noted that even with due consideration for improvements, much remains to be accomplished, that we are attempting too much in too many places and that a higher quality of reduced quantity of our diffuse aid effort in certain countries could produce more.

Particularly do I support the part of the report which stated that we cannot indefinitely continue commitments at the present rate to the 95 countries and territories which are now receiving our economic and military assistance. Substantial tightening up and sharpening of objectives in terms of national interest are necessary.

The point which impresses me most about the report is in calling for a definition of American objectives. We seek to aid those nations which seek to help themselves, to make the reforms which would make their lands productive and free for their peoples. In Latin America for example, we must insist that the leaders of these nations mobilize their internal forces to develop their economy, for promises are not enough, and failure to meet these commitments should be accompanied by reduction or complete elimination of aid to those nations which fail to meet these guidelines.

I think it should be particularly noted that we seek not enslavement, but freedom. Our aid programs should be designed to bolster the economies of nations which have the capacity and the determination to build a strong free economy of free men. For us to do less is sheer folly.

The Clay Report in my opinion is a great contribution. It brings into sharp focus for the American people the accomplishments and the failings of our aid programs over the past two decades. I think it should be carefully studied and considered, and that the Congress and the Administration should make a concerted effort to define our goals. We should call strongly on those other free world nations, which we have helped pull up by their bootstraps from the ravages of war and which are now self-sufficient, to pay their fair share of such programs which are vital to all of us. And finally, we should begin to cut the huge expenditures which this Nation has been making, in some cases unwisely, for foreign aid.

NASSER'S RAPALLO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, last week I brought to the attention of the House the appalling situation in the Middle East where the Egyptian military and missile buildup has been supplemented through the past several years by the U.S.S.R. and is now being aided by West Germans. I add sadly that this buildup has been facilitated to a tremendous degree by our own economic assistance program favoring Dictator Nasser, which has made possible a diversion of Egypt's own resources to facilitate this offensive arms buildup.

I am particularly concerned over the flagrant irony of the apparent collaboration by the West German Government with the "Castro of the Nile," Colonel Nasser. I say irony because it is Nasser's own boast that he intends to obliterate the tiny state of Israel which has been the haven of hundred of thousands of Jews, victims of the tyranny of Hitler's Germany. The appalling thing to me is the condoning of the work of ex-Nazi rocket scientists and other Germans in Egypt by our Government through its "whitewash" of West Germany in this connection.

West Germany is our partner in the NATO Alliance. We certainly can speak out and demand responsible and moral behavior. The State Department has so far merely sought to minimize, excuse, and justify the notorious German role in Egypt.

If West Germany is truly devoted to freedom and is a trustworthy partner of America, it behooves our Government to intercede. Civilization can certainly expect the West Germans to heed in the light of the German allegations that they regret the barbarism of the Nazi era. If West Germany ignores the dictates of humanity on this issue, her role on other matters involving peace and security will bear closer scrutiny.

The world has forgotten neither the German-Russian Treaty of Rapallo nor the German-Soviet pact that followed. History could again be in the making and, in this connection, I wish to refer fellow Members to the following instructive editorial from the Baltimore Sun:

Nasser's Rapallo

Mrs. Golda Meir, the Israel Foreign Minister, is understandably concerned over the production of rockets by the United Arab Republic, because Israel is the prime target for the weapons if they are ever turned loose. However, her protest to the Bonn Government over the participation of German nationals in Arab rocket research isn't likely to be very effective. Bonn has known for years that Cairo was a haven for former Nazis; it has been aware of the financial rewards available there to scientists; it could not have been blind to the manufacture in Germany of precision parts destined for Egypt. Yet the only German ever censured for advising Cairo was fired as a matter of conflict of interest: Prof. Eugen Saenger had been director of a Bonn-financed research institute.

Bonn offers a reasonable explanation. Its citizens are free and have a right to seek employment where they wish. It is a flexible principle, because a West German who elected to accept an appointment in East German rocketry undoubtedly would be chalked up as a turncoat. But Cairo is not an enemy power, and Bonn has every wish to curry Arab favor. It will offer no offense to Nasser.

To the student of German history Mrs. Meir's complaint is nonetheless a challenge to review military developments of the 1920's. Then, under the Versailles Treaty, German rearmament was supposedly controlled, just as now there are limitations on German weapons under the more permissive Western European Union. The German-Russian Treaty of Rapallo, however, allowed German troops to train on Soviet soil. It may not have been significant in the later buildup of the Wehrmacht, but the opportunity to circumvent Versailles at least had been afforded. The Cairo research allows German scientists to operate with considerably more freedom than on German soil. A Germany suddenly disenchanted with the West could recall these men to the service of the fatherland. In Germany's present respectability the prospect is no threat, but it is a shadow on the horizon of history, perhaps no larger than a man's hand, but disturbing all the same.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Hechler, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Sikes, for 15 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. Pelly, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Harding, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. Flood (at the request of Mrs. Green of Oregon), for 120 minutes, on Tuesday, April 9, 1963.

Mr. McDowell (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Harrison), for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Hechler.

Mr. Teague of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Matsunaga.

Mr. O'Hara of Illinois and to include related material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. White) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Garmatz.

Mr. Fogarty.

Mr. Burke.

Mr. Flood.

Mr. Waggonner.

Mr. Evins.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Harrison) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Siler.

Mr. Utt.

Mr. Alger in two instances.

Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Findley.

Mr. Moore.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1597. An act relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, April 2, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

614. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for fiscal year 1964 involving decreases in the amount of $8,994,000 for the U.S. Information Agency (H. Doc. No. 92); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

615. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

616. A letter from the president, D.C. Transit System, Inc., transmitting a report covering operations of D.C. Transit System, Inc. for the year ended December 31, 1962, pursuant to the act of Congress approved March 4, 1913 (Public Law 435); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

617. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of a report on the audits of Government Services, Inc., and its employee retirement and benefit trust fund and supplemental pension plan for the year ended December 31, 1962, pursuant to the request of the corporation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

618. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of excessive costs of a fire extinguisher replacement program in the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

619. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the uneconomical utilization and premature disposal of aircraft spark plugs by the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

620. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the Post Office Department practice of furnishing utilities for certain vending machines operated by postal employee groups in Government owned or leased buildings; to the Committee on Government Operations.

621. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected aspects of certain Atomic Energy Commission negotiated fixed-price contracts for the procurement of virgin lithium from the American Lithium Chemicals, Inc., the Foote Mineral Co., and the Lithium Corp. of America, Inc.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

622. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Government Printing Office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962; to the Committee on Government Operations.

623. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the overpricing of spare parts and modification kits purchased from Hazeltine Corp., Little Neck, N.Y., by Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., under Department of the Navy cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract NOas 56–987c; to the Committee on Government Operations.

624. A letter from the secretary, National Trust for Historic Preservation, transmitting the annual report of the National Trust for Historic Preservation for the year ended June 30, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 408, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

625. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relating to the King Hill Irrigation District of Elmore County, Idaho, which has applied for a loan pertaining to a project proposal, pursuant to section 4(c) of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

626. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relating to the St. John Irrigating Co. of Malad, Idaho, which has applied for a loan pertaining to a project proposal, pursuant to section 4(c) of the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

627. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office, U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

628. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report showing grants for basic scientific research made by the Department of Defense to nonprofit institutions in calendar year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 85–934; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3574. A bill to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Cuddeback Lake Air Force Range, Calif., for defense purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 5366. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTION

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 5312. A bill to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 5313. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 5314. A bill to make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 5315. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of April 16, 1934, as amended by the act of June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 5316. A bill to amend section 29 of the Revenue Act of 1962, relating to the deduction for income tax purposes of contributions to certain organizations for judicial reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 5317. A bill to provide for the establishment of a regional research center for rural redevelopment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 5318. A bill to extend for 1 additional year the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 5319. A bill to establish a program for the Government purchase and resale of domestically produced, newly mined processed mica and mica ore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 5320. A bill to amend section 215 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 5321. A bill changing Memorial Day to the last Monday of May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5322. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code in order to provide the death penalty for the sale of narcotics to children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 5323. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other educational expenses paid by him, whether for his own education or for the education of his spouse or a dependent or any other individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H.R. 5324. A bill to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 5325. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 5326. A bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 5327. A bill to amend section 309(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 to require that petitions for intervention be filed not more than 30 days after publication of the hearing issues in the Federal Register; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 5328. A bill to amend provisions relative to compensatory time, overtime, and holidays in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 5329. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 5330. A bill to promote the cause of criminal justice by providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5331. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit restraints of trade carried into effect through the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities distributed in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB (by request):

H.R. 5332. A bill to permit certain retired military personnel to receive pension or compensation concurrently with the receipt of retired pay if they have attained the age of 72 and are not entitled to Social Security benefits based upon military service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 5333. A bill to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 5334. A bill to provide for the admission in evidence of certain confessions in the criminal cases in the District of Columbia and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5335. A bill to authorize judicial officers to require the giving of evidence relating to crimes committed in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5336. A bill to amend the law relating to material and necessary witnesses to crimes committed in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5337. A bill to increase the partial pay of educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia who are on leave of absence for educational improvement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5338. A bill to enact the Uniform Commercial Code for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 5339. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the statehood of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5340. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the admission of the State of Indiana to the United States to be celebrated in 1966; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 5341. A bill to increase the supply of available investment capital for the financing of sales and rental housing by extending to certain corporate obligations Federal Housing Administration insurance benefits similar to those available for mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5342. A bill to authorize the Association of Universalist Women to consolidate with the Alliance of Unitarian Women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 5343. A bill to provide for the abatement of certain penalties and interest otherwise payable with respect to the highway use tax in the case of certain motor vehicles used primarily for hauling unprocessed farm and forest products from their place of production to market or mill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 5344. A bill—Public Education Improvement Act of 1963; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 5345. A bill to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 5346. A bill to add certain lands to the Kings Canyon National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 5347. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 5348. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury shall be bound by decisions of certain Federal courts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELTNER:

H.R. 5349. A bill to amend section 131 of title 23 of the United States Code to extend for an additional 2 years the period during which certain agreements can be entered into relating to the regulation of advertising along rights-of-way on the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GARY:

H.R. 5366. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.J. Res. 361. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim September 17 of each year General von Steuben Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the birth of Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.J. Res. 362. Joint resolution to request the President to negotiate with the Mexican Government for the purpose of setting up a Joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H.J. Res. 363. Joint resolution to prohibit the strip mining of coal in the Allegheny and other national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.J. Res. 364. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the establishment of a Court of the Union, which shall review the exercise of power or jurisdiction by the Supreme Court in certain cases upon demand of the legislatures of five noncontiguous States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.J. Res. 365. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the establishment of a Court of the Union, which shall review the exercise of power or jurisdiction by the Supreme Court in certain cases upon demand of the legislatures of five noncontiguous States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.J. Res. 366. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the establishment of a Court of the Union, which shall review the exercise of power or justification by the Supreme Court in certain cases upon demand of the legislatures of five noncontiguous States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution authorizing a summer recess for the first session of the 88th Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. Con. Res. 124. Concurrent resolution expressing the determination of the United States with respect to the matter of general disarmament and arms control; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution saluting "Uncle Sam" Wilson of Troy, N.Y., as the progenitor of America's national symbol of "Uncle Sam"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. Res. 302. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to pending Federal legislation on gold mining development; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to reconsideration of any plans for the relocation of the Denver Mint, and to consider expanding the present Denver Mint to meet the increased production requirements of the U.S. mint; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to extending the northern terminus of the Interstate and Defense Highway System in Maine from Houlton to some point located on the northern boundary of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging early completion of spot bank stabilization and erosion control adjacent to the Missouri River; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting Congress to designate the impoundment created by Garrison Dam as Lake Sakakawea; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the President of the United States to consider the need for another White House Conference on Education and that he consider requesting Congress to enact legislation providing for such Conference in 1965; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting consideration of legislation for the construction of farm-to-market roads as an integral part of the reclamation project for the balance of the Columbia Basin development program, and to accept the financial responsibility therefor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H.R. 5350. A bill for the relief of Gizella Erenyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 5351. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease certain real property at Camp Atterbury, Ind.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 5352. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret L. Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5353. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James McAleese, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5354. A bill for the relief of Samir Zoghby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 5355. A bill for the relief of Miss Katarzyna Szydziak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5356. A bill for the relief of Gabriel and Angelina D'Orsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 5357. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Gomez Lipana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5358 A bill for the relief of Lona Rinehart Bailey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5359. A bill for the relief of George Steve Eraklianos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 5360. A bill for the relief of Comdr. Gardiner Luce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 5361. A bill for the relief of Khurshed Bhumgara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 5362. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ayako Matsumoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 5363. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sharon Tyner Govatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 5364. A bill for the relief of Maddalena Haas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 5365. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sally Annette Solano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.J. Res. 367. Joint resolution to authorize the presentation of an Air Force Medal of Recognition to Maj. Gen. Benjamin D. Foulois, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the third calendar quarter of 1962 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $156. E. (9) $282.07.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7,520.67.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,975.16. E. (9) $1,975.16.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $12,414.34. E. (9) $12,414.34.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $853.10. E. (9) $1,498.73.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2,522.72.

A. American Nurses Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,630.42. E. (9) $5,630.42.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,432. E. (9) $3,368.75.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Stock Yards Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $900.

A. American Thrift Assembly, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $469.50. E. (9) $11,228.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $677.04.

A. American Yugoslav Claims Committee, 42–57 Parsons Boulevard, Flushing, N.Y.
D. (6) $105. E. (9) $211.83.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. John Arens, 500 Westchester Avenue, White Plains, N.Y.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $616.58.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., 800 Investors Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $155.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $11.08.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,725. E. (9) $40.88.

A. Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,218.71.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $25.

A. Atlantic, Gulf & Great Lakes Shipbuilding Association, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. A. Ayares, Mountain Avenue, Murray Hill, N.J.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $739.37.

A. Gibbs L. Baker, Esq., 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Tunaboat Association, 1 Tuna Lane, San Diego, Calif.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $131.94.

A. Raymond Maxfield Barnes, 305 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Natural Gas Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $231. E. (9) $156.75.

A. Ralph O. Beck, 2801 Coconut Avenue, Honolulu, Hawaii.
B. Hawaiian Telephone Co., Post Office Box 2200, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 607 South Pine, Tacoma, Wash.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, et al.
E. (9) $143.81.

A. C. Morgan Bissette, 3200 34th Street South, St. Petersburg, Fla.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,626.55.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink & Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $579.90.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Florence I. Broadwell, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,942.34.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors & Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,015. E. (9) $1,015.

A. Charles H. Brown, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,334.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Colonial Sugar Refining Co., Ltd., Nausori, Suva, Fiji.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $1,875.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $146.85.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $102.16.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $15.40.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,230.76. E. (9) $323.08.

A. Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,452.16.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8325 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Carretta & Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Advertising Specialty National Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and Advertising Specialty Guild International, 620 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $749.06. E. (9) $749.06.

A. Carretta & Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $548.50.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. R. R. Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

A. C-E-I-R, Inc., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $513.60.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carol MacI. Chrisney, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $386.05. E. (9) $40.75.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Dental Association, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,250.

A. Alexander K. Christie, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,551.59. E. (9) $300.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.
D. (6) $8,971. E. (9) $14,358.06.

A. Charles Patrick Clark, 500 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Long Beach Federal Savings & Loan Association, 328 Long Beach Boulevard, Long Beach, Calif.

A. Charles Patrick Clark, 500 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. B. Rapaport & Son, Inc., Central Street, Post Office Box 169, Windsor, Conn.

A. Henry J. Clay, Esq., 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. The Realty Committee on Taxation, 660 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,000.

A. Nicholas S. Collins, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $220. E. (9) $17.04.

A. Paul G. Collins, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $42.15.

A. Committee for Export Expansion Through Subsidiaries Abroad, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,480.03. E. (9) $42,161.67.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Edward M. Corneaby, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, Labor Organization, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,101.61.

A. Don Costa, 3517 Brandon Avenue, Roanoke, Va.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington D.C.
E. (9) $883.36.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,315.63. E. (9) $25,315.63.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $619.92. E. (9) $619.92.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers' Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.
D. (6) $527.50. E. (9) $527.50.

A. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
E. (9) $79.32.

A. Mrs. Warren E. Cox, 2808 South Ives Street, Arlington, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents & Teachers, 700 North Rush Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $15.11.

A. Joseph M. Creed, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bakers Association, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $35.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Louis S. Damiani, Box 54, Gatun, C.Z.
B. Canal Zone Central Labor Union & Metal Trades Council, Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.
D. (6) $2,346.67. E. (9) $2,768.

A. Charles A. Darnell, 1917 11th Avenue, Huntington, W. Va.
B. Sheet Metal Workers International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,756.25. E. (9) $131.25.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tulelake Irrigation District, Post Office Box 787, Tulelake, Calif.
E. (9) $113.61.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westlands Water District, Post Office Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $2,312.18. E. (9) $512.18.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,325.

A. Division of Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $12,314.66.

A. J. D. Durand, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $520. E. (9) $59.44.

A. Robert A. Durfee, Jr., 321 Middlefield Road, Menlo Park, Calif.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. James B. Dyess, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,990. E. (9) $1,990.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,404. E. (9) $752.95.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $901.17. E. (9) $29.05.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, General Manager, National Star Route Mail Carriers Assn., 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $762.

A. Robert L. Farrington, 411 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Republic of China, Chinese Government Procurement & Services Mission, 50 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $88. E. (9) $118.28.

A. Mello G. Fish, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $300.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) $1,365.40.

A. George R. Frankovich, Providence, R.I., and Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America, Inc., 207–11 Sheraton-Biltmore,

Providence, R.I., and Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,125. E. (9) $444.66.

A. Elizabeth S. Freret, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. C-E-I-R, Inc., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $480. E. (9) $3.60.

A. Malcolm H. Frost, 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George Milan Fuller, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $314.45.

A. E. P. Gaines, Jr.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,273.74. E. (9) $355.73.

A. James W. Grady, Jr., 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Clair P. Guess, Jr., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. W. C. Hammerle, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $991.74.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $38.01.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) $13.67.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Wool Trade Association, 155 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station S, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $72.05.

A. Lester R. Hill, 432 South Curson East, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $427.55.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. A. D. Holmes, Jr., Gallion, Ala.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $2,649.99.

A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Automatic Merchandising Association, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) 228.75. E. (9) $12.

A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., Mills Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Joe L. Howell, Jr., 3800 U.S. Highway 51 North, Jackson, Miss.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $888.64.

A. Floyd E. Huffman, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $576.05. E. (9) $23.30.

A. John M. Hurley, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Fred G. Hussey, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 24 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
B. Richard F. Bates, et al.
E. (9) $405.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5.

A. Institute of High Fidelity Manufacturers, Inc., 516 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,558.08.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,989.53.

A. Charles E. Jackson, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Fisheries Institute, 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $735.40.

A. Margaret E. Jenkins, 30 Deerpath, Norgate, Roslyn Heights, Long Island, N.Y.

A. Charles B. Jennings, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Stock Yards Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400.

A. William T. Jobe, 1901 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Ice Association, 1901 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $688.87. E. (9) $23.40.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James E. Jones, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Max H. Jordan, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $845.73. E. (9) $43.15.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William F. Kenney, New York, N.Y.
B. Shell Oil Company, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, 1022 Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Joseph T. King, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Equipment Distributor & Sprinkler Irrigation Association.
E. (9) $696.44.

A. George W. Koch, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert M. Koch.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $30.

A. Ronald Korsan, 5343 Main Street, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,650.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Company, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $5,307.75. E. (9) $7,313.06.

A. Alan Latman, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2,761.11.

A. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 918 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,582. E. (9) $2,364.

A. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) $10.38.

A. Herrick K. Lidstone, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Colon Free Zone.
D. (6) $3,400. E. (9) $303.40.

A. R. C. Longmire, Pauls Valley, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Joseph M. Lovci, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,325.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,049.99. E. (9) $656.43.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Edward R. Luter, 805 North Washington, Wheaton, Ill.
B. Committee for Export Expansion Through Subsidiaries Abroad, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $39.65.

A. William A. McClintock, Jr., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.

B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $71.23.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 500 Main Street, Deer Lodge, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $781.26. E. (9) $733.17.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,463.96. E. (9) $229.31.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $686.01.

A. John W. MacKay, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,166.66. E. (9) $100.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,850. E. (9) $1,088.76.

A. Philip F. Maguire, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comision de Defensa del Azucar y Fomento de la Cana, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic.
D. (6) $12,000. E. (9) $562.33.

A. H. N. Mallon, 1522 Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Dresser Industries, Inc., Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $68.05.

A. James D. Mann, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Private Truck Council of America, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America, Inc., 207-11 Sheraton-Biltmore Hotel, Providence, R.I.
D. (6) $28,910. E. (9) $1,573.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $2,899.98. E. (9) $665.93.

A. Paul V. Martenson, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. V. & R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Albert E. May, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $280. E. (9) $99.54.

A. Arnold Mayer, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen of N.A., 2800 North Sheridan Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,530. E. (9) $375.

A. Ross A. Messer, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $218.12.

A. John R. Miles.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Textile Association, The Maytag Co., Theisen-Clemens Co., and Abitibi Power Paper Co.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. John R. Minor, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $750.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,199.17.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $12.05.

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Joseph J. Mulhern, 11 Pemberton Square, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $1,119.85.

A. Bernard R. Mullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
D. (6) $2,730.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John T. Murphy, 808 North Third Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,568.93.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Postmasters of the United States, 348 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,440.64. E. (9) $1,710.

A. National Association of Post Office & General Service Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,413.85. E. (9) $2,460.87.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10,135.69.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and

1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,235. E. (9) $2,235.

A. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $679.14. E. (9) $513.75.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1422 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21,950.71. E. (9) $882.50.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,990. E. (9) $1,990.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $373,183.51. E. (9) $4,402.20.

A. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,225. E. (9) $2,685.43.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $62,000. E. (9) $58,294.52.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, 99 University Place, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5,000.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $422,937.90. E. (9) $2,598.29.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $121,937.23. E. (9) $14,925.73.

A. National Federation of Independent Businesses, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,071.85. E. (9) $15,071.85.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $20,137.85.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,163. E. (9) $2,163.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $812.47.

A. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,682.10. E. (9) $12,482.50.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $14,781.50. E. (9) $12,371.32.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $266. E. (9) $840.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,780.13. E. (9) $7,776.69.

A. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $4,922.90.

A. National Small Business Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,562.52.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $54,323.14. E. (9) $2,336.81.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,886.09. E. (9) $6,950.37.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $23,347. E. (9) $3,565.91.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $489.53.

A. Stanley D. Noble, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $686.88. E. (9) $482.23.

A. Charles M. Noone, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $353.50

A. Walter O. Noreen, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $100.

A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Iver M. Olson, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $216.36.

A. Samuel Omasta.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles O'Neill, Jr., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $103.05.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $3,490.58.

A. Vaux Owen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,692.04. E. (9) $2.90.

A. George F. Parrish, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association.
E. (9) $315.

A. Edmund E. Pendleton, Jr., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $750.

A. George C. Pendleton, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. County Supervisors Association of California, 1100 Elks Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $750.

A. Hart Perry, 10 MacDougal Alley, New York, N.Y.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corporation, 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $130.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $9,282.55. E. (9) $1,350.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $347.50. E. (9) $5.

A. Product Development International, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Product Development International, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sharp & Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, 1211 South Brighton, Dallas, Tex.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $1.95.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicaragua Sugar Estates, Ltd., Managua, Nicaragua.
D. (6) $16,500. E. (9) $162.30.

A. Gordon M. Quarnstrom, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., et al.
D. (6) $13,249.97. E. (9) $7,119.90.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $8.25. E. (9) $20.21.

A. J. A. Ransford, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co.

A. Philip Alexander Ray, International Building, San Francisco, Calif.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Post Office Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $784.55. E. (9) $634.55.

A. Realty Committee on Taxation, 660 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $12,576.64.

A. Robert H. Reiter, 1311 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Kollsman Industries, Inc., 2005 North Hawthorne Avenue, Melrose Park, Ill.
E. (9) $51.05.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. James H. Rowe, Jr., and Richard C. O'Hare, 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Haytian American Sugar Co., S.A., Port-au-Prince, Haiti.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco, et al.

A. Fred J. Scanlan, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fleet Reserve Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $350.

A. Ernest Schein, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Distribuidora de Azucares S.A., Ingenios Independientes Ltd., Compania Azucarera del Valle, Bogotá, Colombia.
D. (6) $25,196.97. E. (9) $196.97.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,380.02. E. (9) $416.62.

A. William L. Shea, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Delhi-Taylor Oil Corp., Fidelity Union Tower, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $300.

A. David Silvergleid, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Union, 509 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,166.66. E. (9) $100.

A. Silverstein & Mullens, 1000 Bender Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Silverstein & Mullens, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Rossmoor Leisure World, Seal Beach, Calif.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.
E. (9) $220.

A. Theodore A. Serrill, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Editorial Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $204.42.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 710 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,732.79. E. (9) $776.15.

A. Charles B. Sonneborn.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington. D.C.
E. (9) $8.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, Esq., 1100 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobilhome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $324.17.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $819.98. E. (9) $1,085.43.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers' Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
E. (9) $634.55.

A. Frank S. Steele, Box 1453, Valdosta, Ga.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $350.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $35. E. (9) $1.20.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $12.

A. Luther C. Steward, Jr., 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,577.60. E. (9) $45.55.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,965.78. E. (9) $4,091.25.

A. Harry Stewart, 321 Middlefield Road, Menlo Park, Calif.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Association To Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa; Association of Landowners of Okinawa, Naha, Okinawa.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers' Association, No. 11, 3-Chome, Denma-cho, Akasaka, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of American Importers, Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.; Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York, Inc., 30 Church Street, New York, N.Y.; Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers' Association, Tokyo, Japan.
E. (9) $200.

A. Stitt & Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Nozaki Associates, Inc., 4 Albany Street, New York, N.Y.; Mitsubishi International Corp., 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.; Ajinomoto Co. of New York, 30 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federation of American Scientists, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Sam S. Studebaker, Tipp City, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association of the United States, 261 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $472. E. (9) $472.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $495. E. (9) $23.36.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,110.

A. Bert Tollefson, Jr., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $4,157.17.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 608 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,987.15. E. (9) $2,156.95.

A. Mrs. Hattie B. Trazenfeld, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gladys B. Uhl, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Joseph Napolitan Associates, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,674.59.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,354.02.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,300. E. (9) $2,300.

A. Arvin E. Upton, 1821 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee on Radiation Protection & Measurements, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,260.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $164.23.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 213 Slade Run Drive, Falls Church, Va.
B. Known heirs of Levi B. Gritts, deceased.

A. Veterans of World War I, U.S.A., Inc., 40 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.

A. The Voice of the People in Action, 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
B. Dr. Russell Forrest Egner.
D. (6) $441. E. (9) $452.26.

A. T. M. Walters, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,321.81.

A. Merrill A. Watson, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $455.79.

A. George E. Weaver, 530 East Elizabeth Street, Fort Collins, Colo.
B. National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $128.86.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $14,328.69. E. (9) $14.35.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 706 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,564.21. E. (9) $4,564.21.

A. Laurens Williams, Esq., 602 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Service Insurance Companies, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $500.

A. Laurens Williams, Esq., 602 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Co., Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $7.

A. Laurens Williams, Esq., 602 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Variable Annuity Life Insurance Company of America, Washington, D.C., and The Prudential Life Insurance Company of America, Newark, N.J.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $6.

A. W. A. Williams, Jr., Santa Fe, N. Mex.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. H. L. Wingate, Box 7, Pelham, Ga.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $350.

A. John H. Young, 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1962:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------- ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">P</td><td colspan="4">QUARTER</td></tr>
<tr><td>1st</td><td>2d</td><td>3d</td><td>4th</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">(Mark one square only)</td></tr>
</table>

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:
1. State name, address, and nature of business.
2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(*a*) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(*c*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $--------Dues and assessments
2. $--------Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $--------Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $--------Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $--------Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)

6. $--------TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $--------Received during previous Quarters of calendar year

8. $--------TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $--------TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $--------Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $--------Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $--------"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": --------

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	(*"Period"* from Jan. 1 through ----------------, 19----)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(*a*) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $--------Public relations and advertising services
2. $--------Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $--------Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $--------Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $--------Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $--------Telephone and telegraph
7. $--------Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $--------All other expenditures

9. $--------TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $--------Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $--------TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $--------TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $--------Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $--------Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

PAGE 2

A. Clarence G. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. V. J. Adduci, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,828. E. (9) $1,212.93.

A. Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,040.93. E. (9) $5,040.93.

A. Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

A. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 703 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $759.18.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $773.95.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,106.30. E. (9) $4,106.30.

A. George Venable Allen, 4730 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads in Tennessee.

A. Nicholas E. Allen & Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 128 East 14th Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $90.

A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A Edwin N. Altman.
B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700.

A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employes of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7,405.18.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Council for Technical Products, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $30,799. E. (9) $30,799.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.
E (9) $39,625.47.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,987.39. E. (9) $14,641.19.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $11,559.10. E. (9) $6,331.18.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Justice Association, Inc., Defense Highway, Gambrills, Md.
D. (6) $2. E. (9) $2.

A. American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $184.13. E. (9) $29,218.42.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $263.80. E. (9) $58.50.

A. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,400.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $7,945.63.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $27,565.77. E. (9) $4,933.45.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.
D. (6) $5,777.89. E. (9) $5,777.89.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $553.06. E. (9) $553.06.

A. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,109.78. E. (9) $8,521.51.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York. N.Y.
D. (6) $1,690. E. (9) $10,905.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $101,575.94. E. (9) $4,058.23.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,971.21. E. (9) $1,971.21.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, Westfield, Mass.
D. (6) $14.88.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $9,678.90. E. (9) $9,678.90.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,455. E. (9) $1,212.27.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. Larry Andrews, 1411 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Antivivisection Society, 1411 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard H. Anthony, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. W. B. Ardery, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp.; 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. Sinclair Armstrong, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. United States Trust Company of New York, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $1.08.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,197.92.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $375.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,624.27. E. (9) $1,624.27.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,467.61. E. (9) $2,267.61.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $375.

A. Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $100.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Aeronautical Services Association, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $54.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers Express & Station Employees.
D. (6) $1,044.80. E. (9) $732.45.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $253.39.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,040.

A. Raymond Maxfield Barnes, 305 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Natural Gas Co., 2223 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $231. E. (9) $137.65.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $65.05.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Osmero L. Bartelli, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insurance Co. of North America, and Life Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $154. E. (9) $36.30.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Roy Battles, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Becker & Greenwald, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bulk Carriers, Inc., 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $131.70.

A. Daniel S. Bedell, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,202. E. (9) $1,153.64.

A. John H. Beidler, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,682. E. (9) $80.64.

A. John H. Beidler, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,682. E. (9) $80.64.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $24.42.

A. Charles A. Betts, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles C. Bevis, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,440. E. (9) $314.40.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hudson Biery, 4017 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 4017 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, et al.
E. (9) $1,431.65.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $55.11.

A. John H. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $126.39. E. (9) $57.02.

A. W. G. Blewett, 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Peabody Coal Co., 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1815 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,081.25. E. (9) $592.72.

A. Fred F. Bockmon, 405 Luhrs Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Benjamin W. Boley, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Geothermal, Inc., International Building, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. Joseph Borkin, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York World's Fair 1964–1965 Corp., Flushing Meadow Park, Post Office Box 1964, Flushing, N.Y.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $135. E. (9) $1.01.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink & Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $238.78.

A. Richard Breed, 10 Prince Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. American Council for Technical Products, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Fred T. Bridges, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cooperage Producers of America, Inc., 705 Woodruff Building, Springfield, Mo.
D. (6) $7,200. E. (9) $7,200.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. George Bronz, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Coras Trachtala, Dublin, Ireland.
D. (6) $10,800. E. (9) $2.37.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $474.42.

A. Bryant C. Brown, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,233.33. E. (9) $13.22.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $436.11.

A. Robert W. Bruce, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $26.36.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $23.83.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P.O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Norman D. Burch, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $60.65.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., and National Federation Industrial Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, P.O. Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $19,246.75. E. (9) $275.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $105. E. (9) $105.

A. David Burpee, Fordhook Farms, Doylestown, Pa.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,999.99.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1212 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $49.87.

A. William B. Burton, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1703 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 2403 East 75th Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $13.82.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $60.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $408.55.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. John T. Carlton, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James R. Carnes, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,300. E. (9) $177.60.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8325 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. H. Allen Carroll, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $60.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Con-Gas Service Corp., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Albert E. Carter, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $829.45.

A. Clarence B. Carter, P. O. Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, P. O. Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

A. Eugene C. Carusi, 520 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $20.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $440. E. (9) $419.03.

A. Alger B. Chapman, Jr., 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $171.08.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associacion Mexicana de Empacadores de Fresa, AC., Venustiano Carranza 48–50 Piso, Mexico 1, D.F., Mexico.
E. (9) $1.50.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hawaiian Botanical Gardens Foundation, Inc., 1527 Keeaumoku Street, Honolulu, Hawaii.
E. (9) $1.50.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Jeppesen and Co., 8025 East 40th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $26.84.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Eastern Transmission Corp., P.O. Box 1189, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $12.16.

A. Chapman & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S.A de C.V., Baldoras No. 36, Primer Piso, Mexico, D.F., Mexico.
D. (6) $8,750. E. (9) $45.58.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
E. (9) $237.72.

A. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $27.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $5,423.98. E. (9) $3,478.15.

A. Alexander K. Christie, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,551.59. E. (9) $300.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 710 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,374.26. E. (9) $10,912.57.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $954. E. (9) $299.20.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Henry J. Clay, 120 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. The Realty Committee on Taxation, 660 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb & Steen, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Savage Arms Co., Westfield, Mass.
D. (6) $150.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $312.50. E. (9) $74.71.

A. Joseph Coakley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building Service Employees International Union, 155 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Junius E. Cobean, Sr., 109 East Windsor Avenue, Alexandria, Va.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Co. Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $75.56.

A. Coles & Goartner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $204.36.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 840 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Committee on Constructive Price, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $13,901.45.

A. R. T. Compton, 918 16th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. George W. Cooley, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward Cooper.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John Shepherd Cooper, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas and Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $579. E. (9) $1,721.

A. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward M. Corneaby, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamstera, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,373.05.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Mutual Savings Institutions, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,402.22.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $747.30. E. (9) $747.30.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $132.73. E. (9) $132.73.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $6.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ave-Templeton.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Fourteen cement companies.
D. (6) $1,215.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution, 1955 Legislature, P.O. Box 3170, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Cuban-American Sugar Co., 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Dyestuffs & Chemicals, Inc., 2307 North 11th Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Business Machines Corp., 590 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. A. P. Møller, 8 Kongens Nytorv, Copenhagen, Denmark.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Raleigh Industries of America, Inc., 1168 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Mass.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Travelers Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

A. A. Harry Crane, 303 New England Building, Topeka, Kans.
B. Southern Railway System, Washington, D.C., and National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,500.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 840 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. C. B. Culpepper, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

A. John Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,682. E. (9) $654.30.

A. Bryce Curry, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Bernard Cushman, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Louis S. Damiani, Box 54, Gatun, Canal Zone.
B. Canal Zone Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council, Box 471, Balboa Heights, Canal Zone.
D. (6) $771.45. E. (9) $931.

A. D. C. Daniel, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. N. R. Danielian, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles A. Darnell, 1917 11th Avenue, Huntington, W. Va.
B. Sheet Metal Workers International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,438.93.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Clarence A. Davis, 525 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr.

A. Lowell Davis, 601 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.
D. (6) $88. E. (9) $88.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., Chicago, Ill.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Corp. of America, 375 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Laundry-Dry Cleaning Association of D.C., 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Corp. of America, 375 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Finance Conference, Inc., 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $299.03.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Automotive Service Industry Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cummins-Chicago Corp., 4740 Ravenswood Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Glenview State Bank, 1825 Glenview Road, Glenview, Ill.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 220 Central Building, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,102.50.

A. Joe T. Dickerson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,687.50. E. (9) $251.48.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $3,046.08. E. (9) $421.08.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tulelake Irrigation District, P.O. Box 787, Tulelake, Calif.
D. (6) $17.82. E. (9) $17.82.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westlands Water District, P.O. Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $1,990.17. E. (9) $190.17.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $4,874.30.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2,325.

A. Robert H. Distelhorst, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $240.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $19,322.51. E. (9) $21,082.23.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $131.25. E. (9) $17.52.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Newark, N.J.
D. (6) $900.

A. Donoghue, Ragan & Mason, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Seatrain Lines, Inc., 595 River Road, Edgewater, N.J.
D. (6) $900.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $137.50.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $34.25.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,215.41. E. (9) $120.

A. Dresser Industries, Inc., Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

A. Ben DuBois, Sauk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. William E. Dunn, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $675.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5.16. E. (9) $172.67.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. Walter A. Edward, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., Raleigh, N.C.
B. North Carolina Railroad Association, Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.
D. (6) $3125.04. E. (9) $37.96.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $206. E. (9) $56.75.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,404. E. (9) $296.87.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $59.50. E. (9) $5.94.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $60.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $15,000.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $364.57.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Coachella Valley County Water District, Coachella, Calif.

D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $2,400.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.

D. (6) $1,800.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.

D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $3,000.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 600 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $307.70. E. (9) $36.40.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $22.60.

A. Clinton Fair, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,682. E. (9) $174.91.

A. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

E. (9) $966.93.

A. Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $49,946.43. E. (9) $25,033.38.

A. Robert L. Farrington, 411 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Republic of China, 50 Church Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Federation of Regular Taxpayers, Route 4, Box 26, Hastings, Mich.

D. (6) $62. E. (9) $217.15.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $3500. E. (9) $500.

A. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

A. Joe G. Fender, 2033 Norfolk Street, Houston, Tex.

B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

D. (6) $1,565.39.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La., et al.

A. Maxwell Field, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.

B. New England Shoe & Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.

D. (6) $400. E. (9) $69.55.

A. Mello G. Fish, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $300.

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Con-Gas Service Corp., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.

E. (9) $1,800.

A. Fordyce, Mayne, Hartman, Renard & Stribling, 506 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

B. National Rejectors, Inc., 5100 San Francisco Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.

D. (6) $3,025. E. (9) $3,873.38.

A. James W. Foristel, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,425. E. (9) $149.02.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John G. Fox, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $81.

A. George R. Frankovich, Providence, R.I., and Washington, D.C.

B. Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America, Inc., 207–11 Sheraton-Biltmore Hotel, Providence, R.I., and Jewelry Industry Tax Committee Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $737.

A. T. Paul Freeland, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Latex Corp., Dover, Del.

D. (6) $600.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberger, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

E. (9) $1,500.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $18,372.64. E. (9) $6,575.22.

A. Malcolm H. Frost, 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. West Coast Steamship Co., 601 Board of Trade Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. George Milan Fuller, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $230.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.

D. (6) $500.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Mauritius Sugar Syndicate, Port Louis, Mauritius.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $25.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Aubrey Gates, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $170.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. The Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $3,000.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Jay W. Glasmann, 306 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Burnham Enersen, 351 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

E. (9) $40.73.

A. Glen Alden Corp., 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $5,000.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employes' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,197.97. E. (9) $8,173.42.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

D. (6) $1,177.22. E. (9) $1,177.22.

A. Gravelle, Whitlock, Markey & Tait, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Structural Clay Products Industry Depletion Committee, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $8.48.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $45. E. (9) $1.43.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. Clair P. Guess, Jr., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Smelting & Refining Co., et al.

D. (6) $4,875. E. (9) $1,450.

A. Terry Gunn, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $970.56.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $954. E. (9) $224.56.

A. Louis P. Haffer, 703 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Air Freight Forwarders Association, 703 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Hal H. Hale, 419 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. G. Hall, Detroit, Mich.

B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $4,500.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Felt Manufacturers Council of the Northern Textile Association, 80 Federal Street, Boston, Mass.

D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $157.10.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles A. Hamilton, 777 14th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $100. E. (9) $54.55.

A. W. C. Hammerle, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Transportation Association of America.

A. C. L. Hancock, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y., and Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,000.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Mrs. Mildred B. Harman, 212 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $720. E. (9) $377.49.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. National Economic Council, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 500 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

B. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) $1,853.25. E. (9) $349,23.

A. Walter H. Hasty, Jr., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $4.50.

A. James L. Hatcher, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $2,030.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hays and Hays, 920 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) $3,411.95. E. (9) $440.08.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $52.85.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $175. E. (9) $78.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hedrick and Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Miro Quesada 376, Lima, Peru.

E. (9) $269.92.

A. Hedrick and Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee on Constructive Price, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $72.66.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $875. E. (9) $1,918.25.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,338.30. E. (9) $213.30.

A. John K. Herbert, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $574.71.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 801 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $263.60. E. (9) $263.60.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $35.10.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) $10,000.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

E. (9) $17.20.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. New York Wool Trade Association, 155 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station S, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $109.80.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $496.25.

A. Robert L. Higgins, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John W. Hight, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $100. E. (9) $50.55.

A. James A. Hirshfield, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, USMC (ret.), 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $22.15.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $100.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Fuller Holloway, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $6,425. E. (9) $569.01.

A. A. D. Holmes, Jr., Gallion, Ala.

B. National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York N.Y.

A. Lawrence W. Horning, 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. New York Central Railroad Co., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Warehousemen's Association.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

E. (9) $3,374.30.

A. W. T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $2.40.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.

B. Richard F. Bates, Edward S. Cohen, J. I. Meltzer, and James Kousen.

E. (9) $329.

A. Elmer P. Hutter, Post Office Box 2255, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $5.

A. William J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.

B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $2.40.

A. Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,525.20. E. (9) $6,525.20.

A. Evan S. Ingels, Oakwood Lane, Greenwich, Conn.

B. Time, Inc., Time & Life Building, Rockefeller Center, N.Y.

D. (6) $935. E. (9) $1,075.

A. Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, Inc., 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $300. E. (9) $0.50.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,924.03.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $2,500.

A. Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $2.65.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

E. (9) $835.96.

A. Walter K. Jaenicke, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

E. (9) $35.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,681.96. E. (9) $32.15.

A. Mrs. Margaret E. Jenkins, 30 Deerpath, Norgate, Roslyn Heights, Long Island, N.Y.

B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.

B. H. S. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn., et al.

D. (6) $2,250.33. E. (9) $2.92.

A. Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 727 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $7,000. E. (9) $6,495.94.

A. Peter D. Joers, 810 Whittington, Hot Springs, Ark.

B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $181.68. E. (9) $52.50.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,548.70. E. (9) $192.35.

A. Ned Johnston, 4309 Saul Road, Kensington, Md.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Geo. Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.

B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. James E. Jones, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $10.52.

A. Edwin W. Kaler, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

D. (6) $50.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $4,375. (9) $754.40.

A. Karelsen & Karelsen, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Howard B. Keck, 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. The Superior Oil Co., 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

E. (9) $300.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. West Coast Life Insurance Co., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. James C. Kelley, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusets Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John T. Kelly, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. David W. Kendall, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. David W. Kendall, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $281.45.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, P.O. Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Southern California Edison Co., P.O. Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $1,526.96. E. (9) $1,499.38.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $246.25.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $106.25.

A. Ludlow King, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $725.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman, 1100 Sixth Street SW., Washington, D.C., and 535 San Luis Road, Berkeley, Calif.

D. (6) $785. E. (9) $785.

A. S. F. Kirby, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $425.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

D. (6) $285. E. (9) $25.79.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert M. Koch, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $7.20.

A. A. W. Koehler, 3275 Beech Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Germaine Krettek, The Coronet, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.

B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $3,256.20.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $869.25.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,850.84. E. (9) $7,432.78.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750.

A. Alan Latman, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $681.41. E. (9) $303.95.

A. Thomas B. Lawrence, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.

D. (6) $650.

A. Warren Lawrence, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $125. E. (9) $25.

A. Philip P. Leahy, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $40.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $29.38. E. (9) $134.18.

A. Leonard F. Lee, 402 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $42. E. (9) $152.05.

A. Legislative Committee, International Economic Policy Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $160.95.

A. Richard T. Leonard, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $411.

A. Lawrence S. Lesser, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Alfred Hiebler, 654 Oakley Place, Oradell, N.J., et al.
D. (6) $333.34. E. (9) $14.79.

A. Roy T. Lester, M.D., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,175. E. (9) $19.65.

A. John R. Lewis, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $841.40.

A. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) $4.50.

A. Herrick K. Lidstone, 477 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Colon Free Zone, Republic of Panama, Colon, Panama.
E. (9) $49.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,627.69. E. (9) $2,627.69.

A. Lawrence J. Linck & Co., 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $786.46.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,640. E. (9) $814.09.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $255. E. (9) $14.64.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Long, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America.
D. (6) $1,300. E. (9) $53.

A. Paul H. Long, Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Encyclopedia Britannica, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Fifth Avenue and 82d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph M. Lovci, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,325.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $19.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $12.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Medical Corp., 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $6.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Breck P. McAllister, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees
D. (6) $3,054.10. E. (9) $37.60.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Coca-Cola Export Corp., 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $8,000. E. (9) $141.48.

A. Angus H. McDonald.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,400. E. (9) $190.04.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,304.85. E. (9) $300.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Co's., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 500 Main Street, Deer Lodge, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $260.42. E. (9) $233.95.

A. William F. McKenna, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $15.41. E. (9) $4.85.

A. William F. McKenna, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,150.

A. Patrick H. McLaughlin, 1741 DeSales Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Glen Alden Corp., 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. C. W. McMillan, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $4,249.88. E. (9) $532.96.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $81.25. E. (9) $2.46.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $206.32.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. REA Express, 219 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,487.50. E. (9) $657.52.

A. John H. MacVey, 803 Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Dr. Hans J. V. Tiedemann, Post Office Box 16, Kyobashi Post Office, Tokyo, Japan.
D. (6) $9,500. E. (9) $7,166.67.

A. Philip F. Maguire, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Commission de Defensa del Azucar y Fomentò de la Cana, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic.
E. (9) $10.35.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $145.15.

A. D. L. Manion, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $537.50.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $2,475.

A. Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America Inc., 207–11 Sheraton-Biltmore Hotel, Providence, R.I.
D. (6) $19,368. E. (9) $5,157.

A. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,152.28. E. (9) $63.21.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,052.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. David M. Marsh, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Casualty & Surety Companies, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $252.62. E. (9) $316.42.

A. Paul V. Martenson, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Drew Martin, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $478.55.

A. Thomas A. Martin, 510 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,159. E. (9) $34.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building and Construction Trades Department, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $1,633.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, and Mechanical Contractors Association.

A. P. H. Mathews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $256.39. E. (9) $205.61.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $37.50. E. (9) $4.15.

A. Joe G. Matthews, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. J. D. Mayson, Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Dresser Industries, Inc., Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.

A. George E. Meagher, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees.
D. (6) $2,152.50. E. (9) $7.90.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,505.

A. Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mehler, Ives & Smollar, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Mehler, Ives & Smollar, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ferro Corp., et al.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1,505.22.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Shawano, Wis., and 912 University Building, Syracuse, N.Y.

A. C. R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 930 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $50.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Dale Miller, 377 Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $143.40.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $825.

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Baltimore and Charles Streets, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $115.84.

A. Cecil Morgan, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Reciprocal Insurance Association, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $1,730. E. (9) $105.10.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., The American Road, Dearborn, Mich.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Sperry and Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $70.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $1,025. E. (9) $4,113.74.

A. Bernard R. Mullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
D. (6) $2,730.

A. Vincent S. Mullaney, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $121.62.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Ray R. Murdock.
B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $900.

A. Robert F. Murphy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Anti-Vivisection Society, 1411 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Chain Drug Stores, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $13,750. E. (9) $13.25.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $609.20. E. (9) $7,929.09.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $8,845.73.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $565.85. E. (9) $565.85.

A. National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, P.O. Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $7,305.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $440.22. E. (9) $465.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1422 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $23,899.80. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,068.78. E. (9) $10,068.78.

A. National Bureau for Lathing and Plastering, Inc., 755 NADA Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,198.90.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600,747.98. E. (9) $6,812.84.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 200 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $451.91.

A. National Conference of Nonprofit Shipping Association, Inc., 26 Auburn Avenue, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $2,877.50.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,818.12. E. (9) $2,818.12.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $35.60. E. (9) $425.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,165.91. E. (9) $617.76.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,480.71. E. (9) $13,480.71.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,407.30. E. (9) $2,155.78.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Member Associations of the League.
D. (6) $5,207.34. E. (9) $2,490.32.

A. National Life and Accident Insurance Co., Nashville, Tenn.
E. (9) $19.60.

A. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $612. E. (9) $612.

A. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $5,468.86. E. (9) $2,249.13.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,164.88. E. (9) $5,193.22.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,483.10. E. (9) $2,483.10.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $798.62.

A. National Parking Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,182. E. (9) $11,482.90.

A. National Rejectors, Inc., 5100 San Francisco Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Walter R. Mayne, 506 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,025. E. (9) $3,783.38.

A. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $934.68. E. (9) $934.68.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $5,383.86.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $475.18. E. (9) $7,618.71.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $728.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $62,828.67. E. (9) $4,885.39.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $40. E. (9) $40

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $735.64. E. (9) $1,093.41.

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C
D. (6) $8,275. E. (9) $11,647.57

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,950.02. E. (9) $4,413.67.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. James W. Rouse & Co., Inc., 14 West Saratoga Street, Baltimore, Md., et al.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $424.03.

A. New England Shoe and Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $469.55. E. (9) $469.55.

A. Mrs. Sarah H. Newman.
B. National Consumers League, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,650.

A. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,528.15. E. (9) $1,352.81.

A. Stanley D. Noble, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $305.28. E. (9) $310.71.

A. Charles M. Noone, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $476.47.

A. T. A. Nooner, Jr., 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $4.90.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. E. M. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $40.

A. Brice O'Brien, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. John F. O'Connor, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,374.96. E. (9) $353.15.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles O'Hara, Post Office Box 413, North Miami Beach, Fla.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $57.53.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Oliver & Donnally, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,267.50. E. (9) $149.71.

A. Samuel Omasta, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2.40.

A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $165.

A. John A. Overholt, 10315 Kensington Parkway, Kensington, Md.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,076.95. E. (9) $32.05.

A. Edwin F. Padberg, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Walter Page, 912 University Building, Syracuse, N.Y.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Holcombe Parkes, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9,750.

A. James D. Parriott, Jr., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. Marathon Oil Co., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. James G. Patton.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,415.25. E. (9) $1,611.30.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $37.72.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $127.40.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
D. (6) $200.

A. Ervin L. Peterson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $43.50.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $21.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6)$3,515. E. (9) $3,515.

A. Tom Pickett, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $36.67.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $825.

A. Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.
E. (9) $200.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $42,444.62. E. (9) $1,350.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. James K. Polk, Esq., 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas W. Power, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Restaurant Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $200.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $347.50.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insular Lumber Company, 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $1.50.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicaragua Sugar Estates, Ltd., Managua, Nicaragua.
E. (9) $153.67.

A. L. C. Pyle, 1410 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.
D. (6) $200.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., et al.
D. (6) $8,250.01. E. (9) $7,753.34.

A. Cushman S. Radebaugh, Box 1928, Orlando, Fla.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $81.01.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $117.65.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $44. E. (9) $61.69.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $44. E. (9) $61.69.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $42.70.

A. J. A. Ransford, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Company.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Drawer 747, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $1,188.38. E. (9) $1,038.38.

A. Realty Committee on Taxation, 660 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stanley Rector, 520 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Creameries Association, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,299.97. E. (9) $4,942.42.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive, Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas railroads.

A. Herbert S. Reid, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $639.10.

A. Louis H. Renfrow, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the U.S., 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $63,462.41.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,964.60. E. (9) $9,424.17.

A. F. Marion Rhodes, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Cotton Exchange, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $423.56.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
B. Louisiana railroads.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company, 112 East Washington Street, Bloomington, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $194.06.

A. Richard J. Riddick, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.03. E. (9) $333.37.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $58.75.

A. James F. Rill, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Steadman, Collier & Shannon, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Clyde F. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Aveue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $180.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Cos., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $375.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $5,260.

A. T. J. Ross and Associates, Inc., 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,500. E. (9) $6,253.91.

A. C. C. Rouse, Jr., 1410 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.
D. (6) $150.

A. Edmond F. Rovner, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. James H. Rowe, Jr., and Richard C. O'Hare, 1120 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Haytian American Sugar Co., S.A., Port au Prince, Haiti.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $623.22. E. (9) $198.49.

A. Oswald Ryan, 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Traffic Control Association, 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $8.95.

A. William H. Ryan, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.36. E. (9) $60.

A. Kermit B. Rykken, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 508 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $257.19.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,600.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James D. Secrest, 1721 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Electronic Industries Association, 1721 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred G. Seig, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $480. E. (9) $48.70.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $32.30.

A. David C. Sharman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 21 Bank Street, Lebanon, N.H.
D. (6) $2,151.57. E. (9) $512.45.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $302.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $300.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $97.41.

A. David A. Shepard, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.

A. Max Shine, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $992.50. E. (9) $20.

A. Richard C. Shipman.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,108.86. E. (9) $67.70.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 508 International Trade Mart, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $700.

A. Silver Users Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $1,076.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. Harold S. Skinner, Post Office Box 2197, Houston, Tex.
B. Continental Oil Co.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.
E. (9) $220.

A. Harold Slater, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,312.50. E. (9) $105.48.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,812.50. E. (9) $7.20.

A. Carleton D. Smith, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Radio Corp. of America, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $112.

A. James R. Smith, 1060 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $4,650.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 710 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,671.41. E. (9) $2,349.05.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $61.88.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $275.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,716.34.

A. J. R. Snyder, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,316.25. E. (9) $2,549.55.

A. Charles B. Sonneborn, 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Limestone Institute, Inc., 210 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $2.80.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $31,144.20. E. (9) $4,715.24.

A. Southwestern Peanut Shellers' Association, Box 747, Durant, Okla.
E. (9) $1,038.38.

A. William W. Spear, 214 National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $830. E. (9) $147.15.

A. Steadman, Collier & Shannon, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Steadman, Collier & Shannon, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tool and Fine Steel Industry Committee, Reading, Pa.
D. (6) $375.

A. Frank S. Steele, Box 1453, Valdosta, Ga.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $350.

A. Mrs. C. Q. L. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $70. E. (9) $2.50.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Owners, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $90.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart (Annalee), 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20,470.64. E. (9) $6,782.32.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

A. Francis W. Stover, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $266.58.

A. O. R. Strackbein.
B. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $923.08.

A. O. R. Strackbein.
B. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture & Labor on Import-Export Policy, 315 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Ronnie J. Straw, 1000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 827 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Structural Clay Products Industry, 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. Sam S. Studebaker, Tipp City, Ohio.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Verne R. Sullivan, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.
B. The Farmers' Educational & Co-operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dwight D. Taylor, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Margaret K. Taylor, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Christy Thomas and Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of River & Harbor Contractors, 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $126.62.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $265.10.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Cooperative League of USA, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capital Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,529.01. E. (9) $1,700.87.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $27.15.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $9.50.

A. Dick Tullis, 307 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.
B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $750.

A. John W. Turner, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L.E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Range Association, 375 North Fulton Street, Fresno, Calif.
E. (9) $6.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $665.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,331.05.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $244,011.67. E. (9) $18,118.33.

A. U.S. Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $28,659.72.

A. U.S. Trust Co. of New York, 45 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Universal Exchange, P.O. Box 2782, Orlando, Fla.
E. (9) $690.44.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,249.91. E. (9) $15.

A. Thomas M. Venables, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $82.12. E. (9) $6.30.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Voice of the People in Action, The Society of the People, Inc., 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
B. Dr. Russell Forrest Egner.
E. (9) $634.65.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $119.50. E. (9) $0.06.

A. William A. Walton, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. F. S. Wardwell, 130 Holmes Avenue, Darien, Conn.
B. Pitney-Bowes, Inc., Stamford, Conn.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,891.44. E. (9) $2,206.31.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $7,310. E. (9) $10.06.

A. George E. Weaver, 530 East Elizabeth Street, Fort Collins, Colo.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $5.65.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $49.73.

A. William H. Webb, LaSalle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,813.04. E. (9) $527.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $99.89.

A. Donald Francis White, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,174.97. E. (9) $104.15.

A. Marc A. White, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Whyte, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Gulf Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 501 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $0.29.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana.
E. (9) $2.40.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sugar Producers Association of El Salvador, San Salvador.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $601.08.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. Harding deC. Williams, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; and 1300 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,583.50. E. (9) $194.18.

A. Robert E. Williams, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $64.85.

A. W. A. Williams, Jr., Santa Fe, N. Mex.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,833. E. (9) $45.45.

A. Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, 616 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Columbia Gas System Service Corp., 120 East 41st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Clark L. Wilson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consultant to Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $278.92.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,776.92.

A. Henry B. Wilson, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co. and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $65.

A. H. L. Wingate, Box 7, Pelham, Ga.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $350.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Venlo Wolfsohn, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $0.50.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $50.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Alexander W. Wuerker, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $542. E. (9) $65.80.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $144.

A. John H. Young, 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromine & Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1962:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19...... ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

A. Allen, Murden & Nystrom, Inc., 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of European Shipowners, Post Office Box 47, Bremen, Germany, and New York Advisory Group, 29 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

—

A. Monroe Butler, 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. The Superior Oil Co., 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

—

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

—

A. Council of Mutual Savings Institutions, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

—

A. Louise S. Damiani, Post Office Box 54, Gatun, C.Z.

B. Canal Zone Central Labor Union & Metal Trades Council, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.

—

A. Michael B. Deans, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Automotive Service Industry Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

—

A. Ely, Duncan & Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Taxpayers Association of Leland Township Summer Home Owners, Inc., Box 215, Leland, Mich.

—

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

—

A. General Council of British Shipping, 3/6, Bury Court, St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3.

—

A. John F. Griner, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Life Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

—

A. Irvin A. Hoff, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

—

A. Charles B. Jennings, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Stockyards Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

—

A. Kenneth C. Landry, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

—

A. James B. Lennon, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

—

A. Joseph M. Lovci, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

—

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Government Employes' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

—

A. Missouri Railroad Committee, 906 Olive, St. Louis, Mo.

—

A. G. Merrill Moody, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

—

A. Norman Paige, 1001 Grant Street, Gary, Ind.

B. The Anderson Company, 1001 Grant Street, Gary, Ind.

—

A. Robert A. Peerless, 5501 Southwest 40th Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

—

A. Richard N. Philleo, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

—

A. Lawrence D. Reedy, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Association of Advertising Agencies, Inc., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

—

A. J. T. Rutherford, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

—

A. William H. Scheick, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

—

A. John L. Sullivan, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Cos., 1927 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

—

A. B. J. Viviano, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

—

A. Richard W. Wilson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 1, 1963

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Most Reverend Archbishop Vasili, of the Byelorussian Autocephalic Orthodox Church in the United States, offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost; Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we, Thy children, humbly bow and glorify Thy divine grace and offer our profound gratitude for the abundant blessings Thou hast bestowed upon America and her people.

We entreat Thee, our Saviour, to bless our beloved President, to strengthen and assist him in his endeavor for freedom all over the world. Bless our Vice President; grant courage and wisdom to the Members of the Senate, this temple of peace, freedom, and justice.

Eternal God and Redeemer, Thou hast instilled in our hearts at birth the desire to live as free human beings. We beseech Thee today, on the 45th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Byelorussia, to lift Thy benevolent countenance on this enslaved nation, and to sustain them with hope of freedom from the brute, godless force, and tortures of the inhuman rulers.

Almighty God and Father of all nations, we pray to Thee that the Byelorussian nation and all other nations in captivity may have soon Thy blessed freedom, that they may assume their rightful place among the free nations of the world under Thy universal guidance, care, love, and righteousness.

We humbly bow our heads before Thee, our God and Saviour, and faithfully implore Thee: Accept this, our prayer; bless the United States of America and Byelorussia.

May Thy glorious name, our God and Father, through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord, in the unity of the Holy Ghost live, reign, and shine in our hearts and be blessed now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 28, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 282) designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our Flag";

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of a wall map of the United States;

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of "How Our Laws Are Made" as a House document; and

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the Constitution of the United States, with an analytic index and ancillaries regarding proposed amendments.

The message further announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1089) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 1597) relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 282) designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our Flag":

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the publication entitled 'Our Flag', published by the Office of Armed Services Information and Education, Department of Defense, be printed with illustrations as a House document; and that three hundred thousand additional copies be printed, of which two hundred thousand shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and one hundred thousand shall be for the use of the Senate."

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of a wall map of the United States:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That there be compiled and printed fifty-nine thousand three hundred and fifty copies of a wall map of the United States, prepared cooperatively by the Bureau of Land Management and the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior, showing information, including historical data, concerning public surveys, reservations, and other appropriate dedications of land of the United States, to be printed on a single sheet, approximately three and one-half feet by five and one-half feet, of which forty-three thousand nine hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and fifteen thousand four hundred and fifty copies for the use of the Senate."

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of "How Our Laws Are Made" as a House document:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the brochure entitled 'How Our Laws Are Made', by Doctor Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, as set out in House Document 136 of the Eighty-seventh Congress, be printed as a House document, with emendations by the author and with a foreword by Honorable Edwin E. Willis; and that there be printed one hundred and thirty-two thousand additional copies to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of ninety days after which the unused balance shall revert to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"Sec. 2. There shall be printed thirty thousand nine hundred additional copies of such document for the use of the Senate."

H. Con. Res. 119. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the Constitution of the United States, with an analytical index and ancillaries regarding proposed amendments:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That there is authorized to be printed as a House document the Constitution of the United States, with an analytical index and ancillaries regarding proposed amendments, prepared by Representative Emanuel Celler, of New York, and that twenty-five thousand additional copies be printed, of which five thousand shall be for the use of the House Committee on the Judiciary and the balance prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives."

CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the call of the legislative calendar was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the executive calendar, beginning with the new reports.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

PROTOCOL TO AMEND THE CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive D, 88th Congress, 1st session, a protocol to amend the Convention on International Civil Aviation, signed on September 15, 1962, transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States; that the protocol and the message from the President be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the protocol dated at Rome September 15, 1962, to amend the Convention on International Civil Aviation done at Chicago on December 7, 1944. The protocol was approved at Rome on September 14, 1962, by the Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization during its 14th session and signed by the President and the Secretary General of the Assembly on September 15, 1962.

The protocol, embodying a proposed amendment to article 48(a) of the Convention, increases the number of requests from contracting states required to convene an extraordinary meeting of the Assembly from 10 contracting States to not less than one-fifth of the total number of contracting states.

I also transmit herewith, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State regarding the protocol.

John F. Kennedy.

April 1, 1963.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) certified copy of the protocol dated at Rome September 15, 1962, relating to an amendment to the Convention on International Civil Aviation.)

CONVENTION ON EXTRADITION WITH ISRAEL—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive E, 88th Congress, 1st session, a convention on extradition with Israel, signed on December 10, 1962, transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States; that the convention and the message from the President be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a convention on extradition between the Government of United States of America and the Government of the State of Israel, signed at Washington December 10, 1962.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report made to me by the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

John F. Kennedy.

The White House, *April 1, 1963.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) convention of extradition between the United States and Israel, signed December 10, 1962.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the new reports, will be stated.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Fred Gates, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, it was with a great feeling of personal satisfaction today that I

joined with my colleagues in confirming the nomination to the Post Office Advisory Board of Mr. Fred Gates, of Minneapolis. Mr. Gates has been a valued and trusted counselor of both Senators from Minnesota for many years. His unselfish dedication to the public welfare, his generosity to those less fortunate, his strong sense of civic duty, and his absolute integrity have earned him the respect and friendship of all who know him. A strong family man and a pillar of his church, Mr. Gates exemplifies the type of American businessman who carries his ideals and principles into the everyday life of business. As secretary and one of the founders of the Minnesota Senatorial Businessmen's Advisory Committee, Mr. Gates has provided leadership to a group of more than 250 Minnesota businessmen who regularly meet with and make recommendations on public policy to Minnesota's two U.S. Senators.

The Lebanese-American community throughout America will also no doubt be pleased at the honor which has been given them by President Kennedy's choice of one of their most respected and beloved members.

Minnesota is deeply honored to have another of its sons serving on an important advisory board of the Federal Government, and I can assure you, Mr. President, that in Mr. Fred Gates, the Postmaster General has acquired an adviser who shares with him his strong interest in efficiency and economy. Indeed, over the period of two decades in which I have spent in the public service, I can honestly state that I know of no man who is more passionately devoted to the principle of economy nor more bitterly opposed to waste. Mr. Gates is a man of high standards, as much for himself as for his friends and colleagues, and I know that he will advise the authorities of the Post Office Department in as candid and fearless a manner as he has always been accustomed to do in other matters relating to the public welfare.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO DUAL RATE CONTRACTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 70, Senate bill 1035.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87–346, relating to dual rate contracts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there is no opposition to the bill. It has been cleared on both sides and with all parties known to be interested.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the report on the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 79) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The bill would extend for 1 year (to April 3, 1964) the period during which the Federal Maritime Commission is required by the provisions of Public Law 87–346 to approve, disapprove, cancel, or modify, existing dual rate contracts in use in the waterborne foreign commerce of the United States.

It would amend section 3 of the act by striking the words "of not to exceed one year after such filing" from the next to last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "but not beyond April 3, 1964", and by striking the word "year" from the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the word "period".

REASON FOR THE BILL

Public Law 87–346, enacted on October 3, 1961, authorized ocean common carriers and conferences thereof serving the foreign commerce of the United States to enter into "effective and fair" dual rate contracts with shippers and consignees. To insure that the contracts would be fair to all concerned, Congress set a number of strict standards which these agreements must meet, and provided that all dual rate contracts in effect at the time of enactment would continue in effect, under certain conditions.

First, parties to the agreements were given 6 months, to April 3, 1962, to modify the existing agreements and bring them into compliance with the new standards established, and to submit the agreements as modified to the Federal Maritime Commission for approval. The act further provided that all such modified agreements submitted for approval would be lawful for a further period of not to exceed a year, within which period the Commission was directed to approve, disapprove, cancel, or modify the agreements and amendments in accordance with the provisions of the act.

To a new Commission, which had been established less than 2 months previously and was still in the throes of organization, the assignment handed them was simply beyond the capacity of the limited staff available. The volume and diversity of comments from carriers and shippers in the necessary rulemaking procedures were enormous, and these all had to be considered in relation to previous practices and procedures of some 40 years standing.

Additionally, the act required that all common carriers affected by these changed standards must file tariffs of their rates, in the form and manner prescribed by the Commission, and the Commission was directed to disapprove any such rate upon a finding, after hearing, that such rate is so unreasonably high or low as to be detrimental to the commerce of the United States.

Public Law 87–254, enacted September 19, 1961, compounded the Commission's regulatory duties by providing for the licensing of ocean freight forwarders, necessitating further extensive rulemaking procedures.

During the fiscal year 1962, the first year of the Commission's operations, the average employment was 125. Recognition by the administration and by Congress that the Commission was inadequately staffed to perform the heavy regulatory duties entailed by Public Law 87–326 particularly, is evidenced by the record. Funds were provided for fiscal 1963 to permit an average employment of approximately 212 persons; and an average staff of 282, more than double the original figure, is requested in the budget for fiscal 1964.

The Department of Justice has advised orally that it is raising no objection to enactment.

The statement of the Federal Maritime Commission which accompanied the request for introduction of the bill follows:

"The bill would extend the period during which the Federal Maritime Commission shall approve, disapprove, cancel, or modify existing dual rate contracts in use in our waterborne foreign commerce for a period of 1 year.

"By Public Law 87–346 Congress imposed comprehensive requirements which must be included in dual rate contracts. Section 3 of Public Law 87–346 provides that all existing dual rate contracts which were lawful on the date that the law was enacted, if modified to comply with the requirements of Public Law 87–346 within 6 months (April 3, 1962), would remain lawful for a period not to exceed 1 year (April 3, 1963).

"The section provided that the Commission within such year approve, disapprove, cancel, or modify such contract in accordance with the new requirement contained in that Public Law.

"On or about April 3, 1962, amendments to some 60 dual rate contracts were filed with the Commission pursuant to the foregoing statutory provisions.

"As required by law, by appropriate notice in the Federal Register the Commission requested the views of interested persons. Comments were received from many interested parties, particularly shippers, exporters, and importers which raised objection to many of the amendments proposed, and requested an opportunity to be heard as provided by Public Law 87–346 before the Commission took action to approve, disapprove, cancel, or modify the contracts.

"In accordance with the desires of Congress as expressed in the House and Senate committee reports on the bill which became Public Law 87–346, the Commission has also undertaken to a formal rulemaking proceeding to deal with certain matters which, to some extent, were left unsolved by the public law. This rulemaking proceeding must, of necessity, be closely coordinated with the 60 individual contract proceedings.

"In order to afford all persons the rights accorded to them under the procedures set out in Public Law 87–346 and in view of the many complex questions which unavoidably flow from the Commission's attempt to accord due weight to the many and diverse interests represented in these matters, additional time is needed to allow the Commission to discharge its responsibility in approving, disapproving, canceling, or modifying the amended contracts. The bill would extend until April 3, 1964, the time by which the Commission must pass upon the lawfulness of all current contracts; and, while it is our serious hope and intention that the matter will be disposed of short of that time, prudence suggests that the April 3, 1964, date would not be unreasonable."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act of October 3, 1961 (Public Law 87–346; 76 Stat. 762), is amended as follows:

"(a) By striking the words 'of not to exceed one year after such filing' from the next to last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof 'but not beyond April 3, 1964.'

"(b) By striking the word 'year' from the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'period'."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Report on Review of Selected Aspects of Certain Atomic Energy Commission Negotiated Fixed-Price Contracts

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected aspects of certain Atomic Energy Commission negotiated fixed-price contracts for the procurement of lithium hydroxide monohydrate, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Recreation and Other Selected Land-Use Activities, Forest Service

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of recreation and other selected land-use activities, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Commitment of Certain Persons to St. Elizabeths Hospital, District of Columbia

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the provisions of this act of October 11, 1949, 63 Stat. 759, Ch. 672 (32 D.C.C. 417), to authorize the commitment of persons of unsound mind found on Federal reservations in Loudoun County, Va., to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper) to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Tort Claims Paid by Housing and Home Finance Agency

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Agency, for the calendar year 1962; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Resolution 13

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alabama (both houses thereof concurring therein), That this legislature respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'Article —

" 'Section 1. Upon demand of the legislatures of five States, no two of which shall share any common boundary, made within 2 years after the rendition of any judgment of the Supreme Court relating to the rights reserved to the States or to the people by this Constitution, such judgment shall be reviewed by a court composed of the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States to be known as the Court of the Union. The sole issue before the Court of the Union shall be whether the power or jurisdiction sought to be exercised on the part of the United States is a power granted to it under this Constitution.

" 'Sec. 2. Three-fourths of the Justices of the Court of the Union shall constitute a quorum, but it shall require concurrence of a majority of the entire Court to reverse a decision of the Supreme Court. In event of incapacity of the chief justice of the highest court of any State to sit upon the Court of the Union, his place shall be filled by another justice of such State court selected by affirmative vote of a majority of its membership.

" 'Sec. 3. On the first Monday of the third calendar month following the ratification of this amendment, the chief justices of the highest courts of the several States shall convene at the National Capital, at which time the Court of the Union shall be organized and shall adopt rules governing its procedure.

" 'Sec. 4. Decisions of the Court of the Union upon matters within its jurisdiction shall be final and shall not thereafter be overruled by any court and may be changed only by an amendment of this Constitution.

" 'Sec. 5. The Congress shall make provision for the housing of the Court of the Union and the expenses of its operation.

" 'Sec. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission;' be it further

"Resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to January 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and, be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"(Adopted by the house of representatives March 12, 1963. Concurred in and adopted by the senate March 13, 1963. Approved by the Governor March 18, 1963.)"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 1963 Ex–8

"Whereas continuing construction, projected to cost up to $60 million during the next 5 years, is planned by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation on additional irrigation blocks of the Columbia Basin project within Franklin County; and

"Whereas previous bond issues for farm-to-market roads in irrigation blocks within the county have been exhausted; and

"Whereas Franklin County is without financial resources or bonding capacity to meet new farm-to-market road costs in these new areas: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate, That the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of Interior, be requested to consider the construction of farm-to-market roads as an integral part of the reclamation project for the balance of the Columbia Basin development program, and to accept the financial responsibility therefor; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of the senate to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Stewart L. Udall, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Ward Bowden,

"Secretary of the Senate."

REPORT ENTITLED "INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 84)

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I have the privilege to file with the Senate the report of its Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 359 of the 87th Congress, 2d session.

In taking up its responsibility of investigating the intergovernmental relations between the United States and the States and municipalities, the subcommittee focused its attention on an ancient American problem. "How to achieve a more perfect Union" has been the oldest and most challenging of all the political questions that have tested the wisdom of American statesmen. Long before the establishment of our Republic and even before the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, Americans were grappling with the problems of intergovernmental relations. Most of the American arguments that were raised between 1763 and 1775 in the heat of the debate with the mother country dealt with the overriding problem of imperial federalism. After the Revolution, the debate continued on this side of the Atlantic. The central question, however, remained one of intergovernmental relations. With the drafting and ratification of the U.S. Constitution, a satisfactory balance was struck between the need for central strength and regulation on the one hand, and the value of local freedom of action on the other. This rejection of the confederal and unitary extremes established federalism as the master principle in this field for all subsequent generations of Americans.

In hammering out the pragmatic decisions that gave rise to our Federal system, the Founding Fathers devised a new constitutional principle that was ultimately recognized as one of America's greatest contributions to the art of government. Since the establishment of our Federal Union, nearly all of our major domestic controversies have taken the form of disputes over the legitimate constitutional position or activities of the States or the National Government. This ever-present attempt to effect a new adjustment stems from the fact that yesterday's equilibrium may have become today's imbalance. Our habit of confining these debates to the framework of the U.S. Constitution highlights an unusual feature of our Federal system. In most other countries, such basic controversies would have produced philosophic tracts, rather than constitutional briefs. I am of the opinion that the history of these conflicts provides us with a valuable perspective with which to view our present Federal-State-local trouble spots.

What is most striking about the adversaries in these historic encounters is the flexibility with which they have adopted a nationalist position at one point in time and the so-called States rights position at another. The great geographic regions of our country, the major political parties—including the Federalists, both conservatives and liberals, and our great economic interest groups—have all failed to pursue consistent policies with respect to Federal-State relationships. Recognition of the remarkable ease with which groups have shifted their positions on this cardinal problem of domestic American politics dramatizes the dynamism of our Federal system and the essential neutrality of the Federal principle.

With reference to contemporary problems, I am confident that there would be less tendency to elevate the difficulties in our Federal-State-local relationships to the level of abstract slogans, if we were more aware that many of labor's centralizing arguments of today were those of business yesterday and that the liberals' States' rights positions of yesterday are the staples of the conservative case today. To put it differently, the pat ideological formulas for a more perfect Union that have been heard of late should be put aside and a sober consideration of the political proposals advanced by the U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and the House and Senate Subcommittees on Intergovernmental Relations substituted. In the long run, meaningful action, not political polemics, will strengthen our Federal system.

With this realistic attitude in mind, the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations began operations in September 1962, pursuant to Senate Resolution 357, 87th Congress, 2d session. Under this resolution, the subcommittee was authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and to review the legislative recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and other legislative proposals dealing with intergovernmental relations which are referred by the parent committee.

In meeting these broad responsibilities during its first 5 months of existence, the subcommittee addressed itself to the fundamental problem of determining what objectives should be sought in the field of intergovernmental relations that would best reflect the will of the American people. Two basic devices have been employed to identify these objectives. The subcommittee has held 3 days of hearings on general problems of Federal-State-local relations and on the role of the Federal Government in metropolitan areas. Using another technique, it has undertaken the widespread circulation of a questionnaire dealing with major intergovernmental problems. As a separate consideration, the subcommittee, acting for the full committee, has held 3 days of hearings on proposals for the disposition of Ellis Island in New York. Due to the subcommittee's late establishment, action on bills referred to it was impossible.

At this point, permit me to summarize the detailed account of activities contained in this report.

The first hearing of the subcommittee on September 18 was in the form of a panel discussion on intergovernmental relations problems, with participants representing major State and local business organizations. The purpose of this hearing was to get the views of these experts on what could be done to improve our Federal system. This was a preliminary exploration designed to serve as the basis for future extensive hearings, to be carried out in the field during the 88th Congress.

On September 26 the subcommittee held a preliminary hearing on five bills relating to the disposition and future utilization of Ellis Island. These bills were introduced by Senators SPARKMAN, CASE, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Testimony was received from these Senators as well as from Senators KEATING and JAVITS, and from representatives of the General Services Administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. On December 6 and 7 the subcommittee held public hearings in New York City, at which 27 witnesses testified on behalf of 10 different utilization proposals. The subcommittee now hopes to proceed to discuss possible congressional action on the subject.

On December 13 and 14, hearings were held on the role of the Federal Government in metropolitan areas. Witnesses were members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, representing all levels of government. A thoroughgoing examination was attempted of the complex intergovernmental relationships involved in governing our metropolitan areas. Special attention was given to bills pending before the Senate to improve the metropolitan area planning process. Considerable attention was given to possible steps that might be taken to increase the role of the States in metropolitan area planning and development.

In early fall, an extensive questionnaire was prepared, after consultation with experts. It was distributed to 6,000 State and local officials and other authorities in the field. This questionnaire touched on problems in the areas of grants-in-aid, taxation and revenue, metropolitan areas, and general issues of Federal-State-local involvement. About 300 returns had been received as of January 7, but preliminary evaluations reveal some attitudes and opinions which will be of considerable assistance to the subcommittee in its deliberations on the legislative proposals referred to it. Efforts to increase the returns are being carried out by followup contacts. As a result, over a hundred additional replies have been received. These are being tabulated and analyzed.

In examining intergovernmental relations, the subcommittee has attempted to maintain an objective viewpoint, and the report was written in this spirit. We are confident that the activities carried out by the subcommittee during the first 5 months of its existence will serve as the basis for invigorating our Federal system through legislation and investigations during the 88th Congress.

In order to give my colleagues an opportunity to review the highlights of the subcommittee report, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed and the press release covering the filing of the report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Maine; and, without objection, the press release will be printed in the RECORD.

The press release presented by Mr. MUSKIE is as follows:

WASHINGTON, April 1.—A Senate subcommittee put a price tag today of between $11 and $14 billions annually on the combined cost of intergovernmental activities involving Federal, State, and local operations—a crazy quilt of relationships described by the chairman, Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Democrat, of Maine, as "the hidden dimension of government."

Declaring that much of its present shape and impact is wrapped in mystery, the Senate probers nonetheless gave a tentative but emphatic endorsement to the federalist concept as a continuing and effective system of government for the United States.

In its first interim report to the Senate for the full Committee on Government Operations, the new Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations pointed out that the "hidden dimension" makes a major impact on all Americans through its involvement in highways, housing, public assistance, hospitals, airports, public health, unemployment compensation, education, agricultural extension, and waste treatment facilities.

"Performing almost as a fourth branch of government in meeting the needs of our people," Senator MUSKIE said, "it nonetheless has no direct electorate, operates from no set perspective, is under no special control, and moves in no particular direction."

"The world of intergovernmental relations is represented by no policymaking body," he continued. "There is no executive, no judiciary, and no legislature." And it is significant to note, he said, that "no governmental authority is prepared to provide any specific data on the subject" although "a substantial amount of our governmental expenditures is involved in these programs every year." Because of its interim nature, the report does not attempt to break down or analyze today's cost estimate of $11 or $14 billion, however.

The subcommittee report—signed by the chairman and its four other members, Senators SAM J. ERVIN, JR., of North Carolina, and HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, Democrats, and Senators KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, and CARL T. CURTIS, of Nebraska, Republicans—further defines its continuing mission as the identification of the hidden dimension—"to understand what it is, what its potential is, and in what direction it is moving."

The Senate probers reveal they are concentrating first on four major areas: Federal grants-in-aid which alone, subcommittee figures estimate, will cost over $10 billion in $1964; taxation and revenues; metropolitan areas, and other general problems.

To supplement its relatively limited ability to amass vast detail through public hearings, the Muskie subcommittee will rely on the results of a massive questionnaire composed of more than 100 inquiries which has now been distributed to 400 State officials, 800 school boards, 1,900 county officials, 1,600 city managers, 900 mayors, and 400 professors and other experts on intergovernmental relations.

By the start of this year, subcommittee staff experts said, over 300 replies had already been elicited and partly tabulated. "The ultimate tabulation, analysis, and evaluation," Senator Muskie observed, "will yield a body of competent judgments never heretofore available and reflecting an expertise that will go light-years beyond the opinion sampling possible through the forum of the public hearing alone."

Some hint of things to come as the Muskie subcommittee pursues its mission can be found in its preliminary analysis of answers to the questionnaire already received. These indicate that:

A clear and surprising majority of respondents oppose any further concessions in the direction of making Federal grants-in-aid serve a greater equalizing function than they do now as between low- and high-income States.

There is a general lack of strong criticism of the Hatch Act or the merit system requirements associated with such grants.

There is an unanticipated consistency among State and local recipients indicating basic satisfaction with requirements imposed for aid grants.

There is overwhelming endorsement of periodic review of Federal grants-in-aid by Congress even where termination of some grants might be threatened, a large percentage holding that this procedure would either improve the grants' effectiveness or lead to strengthening revisions in meeting new problems.

There is a strong and continuing interest in efforts to readjust the total tax base among the several levels of government which has shifted in the past half century from a 63-percent aggregate levied by State and local governments to a 70-percent aggregate levied by the Federal Government.

Respondents to date favor by 2 to 1 a Federal tax credit for income levies paid to State and local governments and an equally strong 2-to-1 sentiment for reducing State limitations on the borrowing and taxing powers of local governments to an absolute minimum.

There is overwhelming 5-to-1 endorsement in principle of Federal payments in lieu of taxes for the encroachment of Federal buildings in local jurisdictions and an even greater, 6 to 1, vote urging continuation of the tax-exempt status of State and local debt obligations.

The Muskie subcommittee concluded by promising "to give close attention to all proposals dealing with a proper balance of functions and revenues between levels of government. But, at the same time, we recognize that in the present-day operations of the Federal system a better solution than the strict division of functions or revenue sources might be found in the improvement of cooperative devices designed to enable each level to share in the whole governmental activity involved to the extent that it is capable.

"While we recognize that our efforts to promote cooperation and coordination may not meet with immediate success in every case, nonetheless the subcommittee is optimistic about the future of federalism. It has shown remarkable resiliency as a governmental form despite the centralizing pressures which stem from technological progress as well as from competition from totalitarian systems of government. It is our belief that this system still best serves the needs of our country and will continue to enable the United States to balance the requirements of freedom and security in the most effective way."

REPORT ENTITLED "IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 85)

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 263, 87th Congress, 2d session, as amended, submitted a report entitled "Immigration and Naturalization," which was ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1230. A bill for the relief of Carlton M. Richardson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1231. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to a handicapped individual for expenses of transportation to and from work; to allow an additional exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is physically or mentally incapacitated and unable to work; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 1232. A bill to amend the Federal property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes;

S. 1233. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes; and

S. 1234. A bill to amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McClellan when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1235. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to include street systems in rural communities in the Federal-aid secondary system; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEATING:

S. 1236. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for tuition and fees paid by an individual in providing an education for himself, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1237. A bill for the relief of Kaloyan D. Kaloyanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1238. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the purposes for which surplus personal property may be donated; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1239. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous or unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899, as amended; and

S. 1240. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1892 (27 Stat. 42), as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1241. A bill to require annual reports instead of quarterly reports under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself and Mr. Curtis):

S. 1242. A bill to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the North Loup division, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1243. A bill to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1244. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in or adjacent to the International Peace Garden at Dunseith, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mrs. Smith) (by request):

S. 1245. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation; construction of facilities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1246. A bill to amend chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and the granting of immunity in connection therewith;

S. 1247. A bill for the relief of Konstantine N. Portaritis; and

S. 1248. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Markos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. Bayh):

S. 1249. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false invoicing, and false advertising of decorative wood and simulated wood products; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

TAX DEDUCTIONS AND EXEMPTIONS FOR HANDICAPPED

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which allows income tax deductions and exemptions to handicapped individuals and to those who support such individuals.

My bill would aid handicapped persons in meeting expenses of transportation to and from work. Many persons who have lost the use of one or both legs, or both arms, or who suffer some other physical disability, can utilize the usual means of public transportation only with undue hardship and danger. Therefore, such persons must pay for special automobiles or other devices to perform their regular jobs. My bill would allow an income tax deduction to cover such expenses.

Secondly, the bill would give an additional tax exemption for a taxpayer who is a handicapped individual himself, or who has a handicapped spouse or dependent. This exemption would be

applicable in cases where the disability prevented the individual from taking care of himself.

Mr. President, the provisions of my bill are not meant to be, in any sense, gratuities. I recognize that most handicapped individuals have faced their problems with courage that should be a source of inspiration and pride for us all. However, the hard luck they have had has its inevitable financial counterpart. By passing this bill Congress would help them to hold positions of responsibility in their communities, and would in some degree, compensate for the extra difficulties involved in pursuing a productive, useful occupation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1231) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction to a handicapped individual for expenses of transportation to and from work; to allow an additional exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is physically or mentally incapacitated and unable to work; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Scott, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO PROCUREMENT OF PROPERTY AND NONPERSONAL SERVICES BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, so as to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes. It is being introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services as a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1963.

According to the Administrator, the primary purpose of the bill is to make the modern code of procurement procedures contained in title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 directly applicable by statute to executive agencies of the Government not now so covered.

The bill also proposes certain less significant improvements in procurement. It would exclude the procurement of personal services from the operation of title III, which is essentially a property management code of procedures. It would make certain limitations of section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949—concerning fees of cost-type contracts, contingent fees, examination of records, et cetera—applicable to contracts negotiated by executive agencies under any law, not only those under title III.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate from the Administrator of General Services, dated January 30, 1963, which sets forth additional justification and background on the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1232) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McClellan, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McClellan is as follows:

General Services Administration,
Washington, D.C., January 30, 1963.

Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There is enclosed for consideration a draft bill "To amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to make title III thereof directly applicable to procurement of property and nonpersonal services by executive agencies, and for other purposes."

Section 201 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 includes the provision that the Administrator of General Services shall prescribe for executive agencies policies and methods of procurement and supply of personal property and nonpersonal services. Section 205(c) of that act provides that he shall prescribe regulations he deems necessary to effectuate his functions under the act, and that the head of each executive agency shall issue orders and directives necessary to carry out such regulations.

The primary purpose of this legislative proposal is to make the procurement procedures specified in title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 directly applicable to executive agencies. Presently the use of all title III procedures is permissive with most executive agencies under a general delegation of authority to such agencies made by the Administrator of General Services on March 26, 1962 (27 F.R. 3017).

Procedures corresponding to those of title III already apply to procurement by the Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (10 U.S.C. 2303(a)). Accordingly, section 1 of the draft bill recognizes this existing authority as well as other authority of agencies to procure without regard to all or part of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as provided, for example, in section 602(d) of that act.

Title III represents a modernized code of procedures for procurement by the Government of property and nonpersonal services. It concerns such matters as advertising, negotiation, small business, antitrust laws, covenant against contingent fees, cost-plus and incentive-type contracting, examination of contractors' books and records, and advance payments. Chapter 137 of title 10 cf the United States Code (derived from the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947) provides a similar version of this code for the Armed Forces and NASA. For agencies which do not use title III procedures pursuant to the delegation of authority made by the Administrator of General Services, or which do not come within chapter 137 of title 10 of the code, the only general legislative procurement-procedure directive is section 3709 of the Revised Statutes. Section 3709 merely requires formal advertising for procurement for the Government, except in certain specified cases. It is narrow and limited in application, and silent as to other important facets of procurement procedure, such as those provided in title III and chapter 137.

Section 302(a) of title III, as originally enacted in 1949, contained a rather circumscribed authorization to the Administrator of General Services to make delegations of title III authority to other executive agencies. This authorization was subject to a narrow construction, and under it but few delegations were made, which were, for the most part, of limited nature. However, Public Law 85–800, approved August 28, 1958, amended section 302(a) by liberalizing the authority of the Administrator to permit the use of title III by executive agencies, in order to promote uniformity and simplification in their procurement procedures. Accordingly, the Administrator on March 10, 1959 (F.R. Mar. 17, 1959, 24 F.R. 1921; reissued Mar. 26, 1962, 27 F.R. 3017, Mar. 30, 1962), issued a delegation of authority to executive agencies to use title III. This delegation of authority does not require executive agencies to use the procurement procedures under title III but leaves this use permissive. On the same date he established the Federal procurement regulations system (24 F.R. 1933), which is now codified in subtitle A of title 41 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

A section-by-section analysis of the draft bill is attached hereto. For the reasons enumerated in this letter and in the attachment, GSA recommends early enactment of the proposed bill. Enactment of this proposed legislation would not affect the budgetary requirements of the General Services Administration or of any other agency.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this legislative proposal to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

Bernard L. Boutin,
Administrator.

Attachment

The first section of the enclosed bill extends title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377, 393; 41 U.S.C. 251 ff.) directly to all executive agencies, except the agencies and activities specified in title 10, United States Code, section 2303(a), and is, therefore, the logical extension of this law to complement what has already been achieved in systematizing Government procurement. It would thus provide a common legislative foundation for uniform procurement practices by agencies under regulations prescribed by the Administrator. Until such controlling regulations are issued by the Administrator on any given aspect, agencies would apply the statutory powers in accordance with their own proper interpretation.

In addition, the section makes clear that the limited exemptions specified in section 602(d) of the 1949 act, or in any other law, are not eliminated by this section, but provides that Revised Statutes section 3709 and 3710, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5 and 8), shall remain applicable to such exempt procurements in the absence of authority to procure without advertising or without regard to said section 3709. Thus, an agency which properly exempts itself from all or any part of the act will not thereby obtain the right to negotiate contracts as distinguished from having to formally advertise although it may do so to the extent that it has negotiating authority under other law.

Section 2(a) of the draft bill deletes from paragraph (4) of section 302(c) of the act the reference to "personal" services and would limit the negotiation authorization of the paragraph to the procurement of "nonpersonal" services. As more fully explained in connection with section 6 of the draft bill, this amendment would bring the paragraph in line with the policy of Congress in assigning property management responsibilities to the Administrator of General Services.

Section 2(b) of the bill would add "section 304 shall apply to such purchases and contracts" to paragraph (15) of section 302(c). The effect of this addition would be to make the restrictions of section 304, which are applicable to contracts negotiated under paragraphs (1) to (14) of section 302(c) similarly applicable to contracts negotiated under paragraph (15). The restrictions in section 304 pertain to limitations on the use of cost-type contracts, inclusion of a covenant against contingent fees, inclusion of an examination of records clause, etc. The amendment, therefore, would provide uniformity in the requirements applicable to negotiated contracts.

Section 3 of the draft bill would interpolate in section 307(a) of the act a reference to section 205(d) of the act. This is a technical amendment applying only to the Administrator of General Services. It is intended to make clear that his authority to delegate under title III does not include authority to delegate authority to issue policy regulations applicable to executive agencies. Accordingly, the "implementing regulations" of section 302(a) mentioned in section 1 of this draft bill, for example, could be issued only by the Administrator.

By section 4 of the bill, which is purely technical, the second sentence of section 307(b) of the act would be deleted. Presently, this sentence provides that the power of the Administrator to make the delegations and determinations specified in section 302 (a) shall be delegable only to the Deputy Administrator or to the chief official of any principal organizational unit of the General Services Administration. Deletion of this provision is appropriate because the proposed amendment of section 302(a), contained in section 1 of the draft bill, eliminates the references to delegation now contained in the text of section 302(a).

Section 5 of the bill, amending section 310 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, is likewise technical. It is ancillary to section 1 of the draft bill amending section 302(a).

The proposed amendment of section 310 provides that neither sections 3709 and 3710 nor section 3735 of the Revised Statutes shall apply to the procurement of property or nonpersonal services made by any executive agency pursuant to title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act. Revised Statutes sections 3709 and 3710 are the General Statutes (dating from 1861 and 1868, respectively) requiring formal advertising for procurement of supplies and services for the Government, except in specified cases. Revised Statutes section 3735, dating from 1868, prohibits executive departments from making contracts for stationery or other supplies for a longer term than 1 year. Sections 3709 and 3735 are already, under the present text of section 310(a), made inapplicable to procurement by GSA and, within the scope of authority delegated by the Administrator, to any other executive agency. Similar provisions apply to the armed services, the Coast Guard, and NASA (10 U.S.C. 2314). The broadened application of title III, in particular, section 303, to executive agencies makes continued applicability of section 3710 superfluous.

The amendment would delete reference to two other statutory provisions now stated by section 310(a) to be inapplicable to procurement under title III; namely, sections 1 and 2 of the act of October 10, 1940, 54 Stat. 1109, as amended (41 U.S.C. 6 and 6a), which set forth certain exemptions from Revised Statutes, section 3709. Said section 1 has been repealed (section 1 (98)–(105), 65 Stat. 705, October 31, 1951). Under the terms of the amendments proposed by the bill, reference to section 2 is no longer necessary.

By virtue of section 310 as proposed for amendment in this bill, exemptions from the requirements of Revised Statutes, section 3709 (and 3710), heretofore given to agencies which are not exempt from the provisions of title III, whether or not these statutory authorizations expressly refer to section 3709 (and 3710), are preserved by constituting these as exceptions from the advertising requirements of sections 302(c) (and 303) of the act pursuant to section 302(c)(15), as proposed for amendment in section 2(b) of this bill.

Under this amendment, however, contracts negotiated under such exemptions are subject to the restrictions of section 304 of the act, made applicable by the proposed amendment to section 302(c)(15) unless exemption from section 304 is available and asserted pursuant to section 602(d) of this act or other law. The application of section 304, however, is considered primarily technical since agencies have generally observed most of the limitations contained therein either as a matter of policy or under GSA or agency regulations.

Section 6 of the bill would amend title III by inserting "nonpersonal" before "services" throughout the title. Section 1 of the bill already proposes such a change in section 302(a) of the act, section 2(a) in section 302(c)(4), and section 6 in section 310. The effect of these changes would be to conform the authority of the Administrator to the policy stated by Congress in section 2 of the act (to provide a system for the procurement and supply of personal property and "nonpersonal services") and to the responsibility vested in the Administrator by section 201(a) of the act (to prescribe policies and methods of procurement and supply of personal property and "nonpersonal services").

With respect to services, it seems clear that the efficiency and economy sought to be accomplished through the regulatory activity of the Administrator can better be found in the field of nonpersonal services, more akin to property management, than in the field of personal services procurement. In connection with section 2(a) of the bill, it should be noted that section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (item 4) will be available to executive agencies for procuring personal services by negotiated methods. The first sentence of section 304(b) of the act is explicitly not affected by section 7 of the bill in order to preserve for personal services contracts the 6 percent maximum fee limitation applicable to contracts for architectural and engineering services.

Section 7 of the draft bill would amend section 602(d) of the act to include references to the Postmaster General's present authority with respect to the leasing and acquisition of real property and the Secretary of the Interior's authority with respect to procurement for program operations under the Bonneville power project. The bill thus recognizes and confirms the special and exceptional procurement authority over these matters which has hitherto been conferred by law (16 U.S.C. 832(a)(f); 39 U.S.C. 2102, 2103(a)(2), 2114). It is understood that administrative and housekeeping items are excluded from the term "program operations" and that, to the extent that these procurement programs would not be impaired by compliance with the Administrator's regulations, such regulations will be observed, as heretofore contemplated by the Congress and the President (H. Rept. 670, 81st Cong., 1st sess., 28; Presidential directive of July 1, 1949, 14 Fed. Reg. 3699).

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO CONTRACTS FOR INSPECTION, MAINTENANCE, AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN EQUIPMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes. It is being introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services as a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1963.

According to the Administrator, the purpose of this bill is to permit greater economy, safety, and efficiency in the maintenance and operation of Federal buildings by authorizing the General Services Administration to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of equipment and equipment systems in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate from the Administrator of General Services, dated March 1, 1963, which sets forth additional justification and background on the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1233) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McClellan, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McClellan is as follows:

General Services Administration,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1963.
Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Transmitted herewith for referral to the appropriate committee is a draft bill prepared by the General Services Administration "To amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance and repair of fixed equipment in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1963.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to permit greater economy, safety and efficiency in the maintenance and operation of Federal buildings by authorizing the General Services Administration to enter into contracts necessary for the inspection, maintenance and repair of fixed equipment and equipment systems in Federal buildings for periods not to exceed 5 years.

The fixed equipment systems intended to be covered by the proposed legislation together with comments justifying enactment of the proposal are set forth in more detail in the attachment hereto.

With respect to the fiscal effects of the enactment of this proposal, it is believed that substantial savings would inure to the benefit of the Government. However, the extent of these savings cannot be measured at this time because long-term contracts for such services have not been consummated in the past.

For the reasons stated above, prompt and favorable consideration of the enclosed draft bill is recommended.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
Bernard L. Boutin,
Administrator.

Attachment

The fixed equipment systems intended to be covered by this measure include heating, refrigeration, ventilation, air conditioning, electrical, vertical transportation, plumbing, fire protection, watchman, fuel and pneumatic tube systems installed in Federal buildings. Typical items common to these systems are the following: boilers, stokers, and oil burners; compressors, chillers, and cooling towers; fans, airhandlers, and induction units; transformers, motors, generators, high voltage switchgear, and interior distribution wiring; pumps, piping, and water tanks; fire alarms and watchman central recorders; fuel tanks, and lines; blowers and tube stations; and elevators and escalators. Such systems are relatively complex and costly and require continuous inspection, maintenance, and repair (when necessary) of such a character that they can be operated efficiently, with the greatest possible safety, with a minimum of service interruption, for the longest possible time economically justifiable.

A substantial part of the servicing of this equipment is subject to being performed for the Government by contracting with firms which specialize in the various aspects thereof. It would be very advantageous to the Government if more of this servicing could be contracted out. There are several reasons for this.

For one thing, the Government in many localities has been unable to employ, or to retain for any length of time those employed, the necessary number of specially trained skilled craftsmen, and supervisors with know-how, to perform the work because of local labor market conditions.

For another, by contracting for this work the Government is relieved of the added costs and difficulties inherent in purchasing, transporting and storing innumerable spare parts and other supplies which would otherwise be necessary, as well as arranging for the availability of such spare parts and other supplies promptly when and where needed in the many Federal buildings throughout the country, not infrequently on an emergency basis.

For a third, even assuming that the Government could obtain and retain the necessary skilled craftsmen at all locations, the amount of such service work required at any given time for any given Federal building varies to such an extent that it would be most difficult, if not impossible, in many small isolated locations, to schedule the work so that the skilled craftsmen employed by the Government would be fully employed on the one hand, or that, on the other hand, there are sufficient skilled craftsmen available to handle the work on other occasions when unpredictable and urgent heavy demands for their services may arise to service particular buildings.

For these reasons, and because of other problems, some of which are indicated hereinafter, the usual practice of private industry is to enter into long-term contracts with specialty firms for such services.

Under present law, Government contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of such equipment may be entered into for only 1 year. It is believed that authority to contract for a longer period will yield lower costs and more efficient and satisfactory service and operations.

It has been our experience that many contractors do not fully carry out their obligations under 1-year contracts with us for equipment inspection, maintenance and repair, as hidden deficiencies in such maintenance show up later, often after the contract has expired and a new contractor is on the job. Because of their inherently latent nature, it is most difficult to prove whether the deficiencies in performance under such contracts are attributable to one short-term contractor or to another, at least to the extent that the Government can obtain appropriate damages or other relief in a court of law, or before an administrative tribunal, for the failure of a contractor to properly perform such a maintenance contract. As one consequence, the Government has had to bear the cost of remedying such deficiencies. Another consequence has been that our equipment has not been operable, because of shutdown time for repairs, more frequently and for longer periods than it should be. Thus, we have been handicapped in properly protecting the Government's interests.

Another somewhat different type of situation which has confronted us is that, when a yearly contract for the servicing of new equipment is involved, a contractor will bid low and thus be awarded contracts seriatim for 2 or 3 years to service this new equipment. But, when the contractor decides that the time has come when his hidden neglect in maintenance no longer can be concealed, possibly about the third or fourth year of its life, he will refrain from bidding on future contracts. It is considered that authority to enter into contracts to service this equipment for a maximum of 5 years will do much to alleviate this type of situation, as most major defects in maintenance will show up in a 5-year period. Under a 5-year contract, the contractor will have a much greater incentive to perform proper maintenance during the early years of the life of equipment than under a 1-year contract. And, under a 5-year contract, even if a contractor neglects the maintenance during the early years, his neglect can much more easily be charged against him than it could be under a 1-year contract, as such a contractor could not sit back with the thought that the Government would have great difficulty in proving that he, rather than his successor contractor, was responsible therefor.

Another benefit to the Government which would flow from the grant of authority to enter into such 5-year contracts is that, in many cases, lower prices could be obtained under one contract for 5 years as contrasted with those obtainable under five contracts for 1 year each. Under the longer term contract, contractors would be able to arrange for longer range, bigger volume purchasing of supplies and spare parts, and otherwise more economical operations. An important fringe benefit would be the greater time a contractor's personnel would have to become acquainted with the characteristics of the particular pieces of equipment which were being serviced, including the relationship of such equipment to the structural and other characteristics of the buildings in which it is located, or in connection with which it is used, and the detailed nature of the circumstances under which it must be operated. Each new contractor under an annual contract arrangement has to organize for the job and train his employees for the particular tasks required by the contract, thus sacrificing to some extent the efficiency that results from experience in actually performing the work.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO THE CERTIFICATION OF CERTAIN FACTS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records, and for other purposes. It is being introduced at the request of the Administrator of General Services as a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1963.

The proposed legislation would amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, by granting authority to certain Government officials to authorize the Administrator of General Services to certify to facts and make administrative determinations on the basis of information contained in records transferred from their agencies to the General Services Administration. The Administrator of General Services would be authorized to delegate and authorize redelegation of such authority under the provisions of subsection 205(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate from the Administrator of General Services, dated March 4, 1963, which sets forth additional justification and background on the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1234) to amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McClellan, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. McClellan is as follows:

General Services Administration,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1963.
Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as

amended, regarding certification of facts based upon transferred records."

This proposal is a part of the legislative program of the General Services Administration for 1963.

The proposed legislation would amend subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, by granting authority to certain Government officials to authorize the Administrator of General Services to certify to facts and make administrative determinations on the basis of information contained in records transferred from their agencies to the General Services Administration. The Administrator of General Services would be authorized to delegate and authorize redelegation of such authority under the provisions of subsection 205(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

Subsection 506(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 authorizes any official of the Federal Government, who is authorized to certify to facts on the basis of records in his custody, to continue to certify to facts contained in records which have been transferred by him or his predecessors to the General Services Administration. Under the present law the Administrator of General Services has no authority to execute certifications contemplated by this proposal, but can only certify as to the literal terms of the original document.

Since the establishment of Federal records centers, large quantities of Federal records have been transferred to these centers. Federal records centers are established and maintained by General Services Administration under statutory authority (63 Stat. 583; 40 U.S.C. 395). These centers now hold over one-third of all Federal records. The volume of requests for certifications has increased correspondingly with the growth of the Federal records centers. Approximately 3 million inquiries regarding records in the custody of the Administrator of General Services are received at the Federal Records Centers annually. As a consequence, GSA has found it necessary to staff the centers with competent and professionally trained personnel, who have developed a knowledge and sense of responsibility comparable to that of the personnel of the agencies which created the records. In many instances, GSA personnel at the records centers may be more familiar with the records than currently employed personnel of the record-creating agency, since records center personnel are continuously servicing these records.

The present method of processing requests for certifications provides that records center personnel conduct a search for the records, prepare the legal certification for signature, and transmit the documentation to the designated official in the record-creating agency for signature. This procedure is obviously time consuming and cumbersome. The proposed legislation would permit the record-creating agency to delegate the certifying authority to the Administrator of General Services in those instances where it appears that such action is in the best interest of the United States. Enactment of the legislation would in most cases relieve Federal agencies of a routine and perfunctory function and would eliminate unnecessary duplication of effort.

As a matter of practice Federal records center personnel are the only individuals who have the necessary certifying knowledge with regard to facts contained in records of defunct agencies which have been transferred to the Federal records centers.

The enactment of the proposed legislation would not require the expenditures of additional Federal funds. In fact, it would reduce duplication of effort and its enactment should result in economies.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
Administrator.

DEDUCTION OF EDUCATIONAL FEES AND TUITION FROM FEDERAL INCOME TAX

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to enable individuals to deduct educational expenses for themselves or their dependents up to the amount of $300 per person per taxable year.

Mr. President, for many years the Congress has had before it a wide variety of proposed legislation to grant some form of tax relief to those who must bear great cost and sacrifice in getting an education, both their own and for their children. Many such bills are again before the Congress this year. I am adding my own bill for consideration because of my very strong feeling that, from among all the measures advanced, there should be able to be devised a happy formula for tax relief—one that will prove capable of encouraging educational expenditure by lightening the financial sacrifices involved, yet not causing too severe a drain upon Treasury revenues, which is one of the considerations that has been at the source of Treasury Department opposition in the past. It is my belief that the bill I am offering hits upon the right formula.

A sound tax revision program, Mr. President, is a matter of high priority in the 88th Congress; I certainly regard it to be at or near the very top. The prime objective we are, or should be, striving for is a program capable of generating the long-term economic growth essential to our very national survival. The ingredients for growth stimulation are many. But, in my judgment, there is no more important ingredient than assuring that we bring out all the great potential capabilities of our people, especially our young people, for leading a productive and rewarding life.

Our society is changing fast. The skills of yesteryear are the liabilities of today. However, the educational opportunities open today are the touchstone of the more satisfying life of tomorrow. No effort should be spared, no policy device overlooked, to foster the investment in education that will multiply into dividends for our people and our Nation in the years ahead.

The Federal Government should encourage individuals to invest in education by permitting any taxpayer who makes educational outlays for himself, his children, or other dependents, to take a tax deduction for at least part of these expenses. I have limited the amount which may be deducted under the terms of this bill to $300 per individual. Personally, I favor a much larger figure. I recognize that good education does not come cheap, and that these days many indirect and associated costs of education can far exceed tuition and fees alone. However, if larger deductions were permitted, huge revenue losses to the Treasury would ensue. Bills proposing larger deductions, or even tax credits, for educational expenses, that are now pending in the Congress, I believe have little realistic chance of success from this standpoint. Therefore, I have felt compelled to restrict my proposal to a $300 deduction for direct expenditures for tuition and fees to an educational institution.

Any recognized educational institution to which such payments are made would qualify the taxpayer for the deduction. This would include not only colleges and universities, but also private schools, parochial schools, technical training schools, summer schools; in short, almost any place of learning. The deduction would not apply, however, in behalf of persons who receive direct grants from States or communities under State laws designed to evade or circumvent school desegregation.

The bill I am introducing today is identical to my bill, S. 792, in the 87th Congress. It is my firm belief that in this Congress, where tax legislation looms as the most important single issue, there is no excuse for not devoting earnest attention to the legitimate and widespread demand for some sort of relief for educational expenses. It is, at the very least, as important to consider as, for example, the proposed 5-percent floor plan under itemized deductions, which would have not a favorable, but an adverse, effect on educational investment by limiting the present full deductibility of taxpayer contributions to recognized institutions of learning.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1236) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow a deduction for tuition and fees paid by an individual in providing an education for himself, his spouse, and his dependents, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section 217 as 218, and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"Sec. 217. Tuition and fees paid to educational institutions.

"ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction amounts paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year to an educational institution for tuition and fees for the attendance of the taxpayer, his spouse, or a dependent at such educational institution.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) EACH INDIVIDUAL.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for amounts paid during the taxable year for tuition and fees with respect to any one individual only to the extent that such amounts do not exceed $300.

"(2) SPOUSE.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for amounts paid during the taxable year for tuition and fees for the spouse of the taxpayer only if—

"(A) the taxpayer is entitled to an exemption for his spouse under section 151(b) for the taxable year, or

"(B) the taxpayer files a joint return with his spouse under section 6013 for the taxable year.

"(c) REDUCTION FOR CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS.—Amounts paid for tuition and fees with respect to any individual which (but for this subsection) would be taken into account under subsection (a) shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, be reduced by any amounts received by or for such individual during the taxable year as a scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which under section 117 is not includible in gross income.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) DEPENDENT.—The term 'dependent' has the meaning assigned it by section 152(a).

"(2) EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term 'educational institution' has the meaning assigned to it by section 151(e)(4).

"(e) EXCEPTIONS.—

"(1) TRADE OR BUSINESS EXPENSES.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount paid which is allowable as a deduction under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses).

"(2) INDIVIDUALS RECEIVING STATE OR LOCAL FINANCIAL AID TO AVOID DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount paid for any individual with respect to whom any payment is made by a State or local government under a State or local law providing for the payment of grants for children who attend private schools in the area of their residence, or who attend public or private schools away from the area of their residence, if it is determined that the purpose of the State or local law is to provide financial assistance—

"(A) for the education of children in an area where any public school is closed to avoid compliance with the decisions of the courts of the United States with respect to segregation in public schools, or

"(B) for the education of children in an area where public schools are open and have complied with such decisions (whether or not such compliance was pursuant to a specific order of a court of the United States) whose parents or guardians do not wish them to attend a school which is part of a school system in which any school has complied with such decisions.

For purposes of this paragraph, any State or local law granting concessions with respect to State or local taxes for amounts paid by parents or guardians in providing an education for children residing in an area described in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be treated as a State or local law providing for the payment of grants for such children."

(b) The table of sections for such part is amended by striking out:

"Sec. 217. Cross references."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"Sec. 217. Tuition and fees paid to educational institutions.

"Sec. 218. Cross references."

SEC. 2. Section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the definition of adjusted gross income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) TUITION AND FEES PAID TO EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.—The deduction allowed by section 217 (relating to tuition and fees paid to educational institutions)."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1962.

DONATION OF FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY TO STATE AGENCIES FOR PUBLIC RECREATION, ETC.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to permit the donation of surplus Federal personal property to State agencies for public recreation, park, historic monuments, the promotion of fish and wildlife management, and development activities.

This bill amends the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to enable the Federal Government to donate surplus property to State park agencies. The Secretary of the Interior would be charged with implementing this expanded authority.

The thousands of State parks throughout the United States play a vital role in the outdoor recreation activities of our people. These activities are recognized as essential to the health and vitality of the Nation. As was recently noted in the document, "Outdoor Recreation for America":

> For at its best, outdoor activity, whether undertaken lightly or with the serious intent of the perfectionist, is essentially a "renewing" experience—a refreshing change from the workaday world.
>
> This is true no matter what an individual actually chooses to do in the outdoors. As long as the activity is freely chosen—because it is refreshing and interesting to do—then it serves the basic function of recreation—the task of re-creating human vitality. Latent energy is tapped, unused powers of the body, mind and spirit are employed, the imagination works on fresh material, and when all these things occur, the individual returns to his work with a sense of renewal.
>
> This use of leisure is important to the health of individuals and to the health of the Nation. The physical vigor of a nation is as much a part of its strength as good education.

In 1960 the States managed approximately 85 percent of the total number of recreation areas in the Nation. However, the Federal Government managed about 84 percent of the number of recreation acres. Further, visitations to State park areas were 254 million as compared to that of 79 million to the national parks. By correlating these figures it can be determined that State park areas have a density of use which is 14 times greater than that in national parks.

One of the major problems, one common to all States, is the matter of adequate financing. If the Congress would make State park agencies eligible to receive Federal surplus personal property, it would be a step in the right direction in allowing these agencies to stretch their already limited budgets. Thus, indirectly, enlarged and improved services could be rendered to the millions of visitors to the State parks throughout this Nation.

Even though several of the Federal executive agencies, by administrative action, have added other recipients than education, health, and civil defense as authorized by Congress, the State park agencies have never been given this privilege. My legislation would correct this situation.

I introduced similar legislation in the 87th Congress—S. 3581. In a letter to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Comptroller General suggested several technical amendments to S. 3581. These suggestions have been incorporated in the present version.

The National Conference on State Parks has fully endorsed this legislation. Representative RICHARD E. LANKFORD has introduced similar legislation in the House of Representatives.

The pressure of the use of State parks continues to grow rapidly. This legislation provides one significant way in which the Federal Government can assist the States in meeting this surging demand for outdoor recreational facilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk through April 8 for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 1238) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to the purposes for which surplus personal property may be donated, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(j)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting, immediately after the words "public health,", the words "public recreation, park, or historic monuments, the promotion of fish and wildlife management and development activities,"; and

(2) by striking out "or (4)", and inserting in lieu thereof "(4), or (5)".

(b) The third sentence of paragraph (2) of section 203(j) of such Act is amended by striking out the words "or paragraph (4)", and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the words "paragraph (4), or paragraph (5)".

(c) Section 203(j) of such Act is further amended as follows:

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) thereof as paragraphs (6), (7), and (8), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (4) thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) Determination whether such surplus property (except surplus property allocated in conformity with paragraph (2) of this subsection) is usable and necessary for purposes of public recreation, park, or historic monuments or fish and wildlife management and development, including research, in any State shall be made by the Secretary of the Interior, who shall allocate such property on the basis of need and utilization for transfer by the Administrator to such State agency for distribution to agencies or instrumentalities of that State or to political subdivisions thereof for use for public recreation, park, or historic monument purposes, or for fish and wildlife management and development purposes. No such property shall be transferred to any State agency until the Secretary of the Interior has received from such State agency a certification that such property is usable and needed for public recreation, park, or historic monument purposes, or for fish and wildlife management and development purposes, within the State, and until the Secretary has determined that such State agency has conformed to minimum standards of operation prescribed by the Secretary for the disposal of surplus property."

(d) The paragraph redesignated by this section as paragraph (6) of section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, is amended—

(1) by striking out the word "and" where it first appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof a comma;

(2) by inserting therein, immediately after the words "Federal Civil Defense Administrator", a comma and the words "and the Secretary of the Interior"; and

(3) by striking out the words "or paragraph (4)", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "paragraph (4), or paragraph (5)".

SEC. 2. Subparagraph (2)(C) of section 203(k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(k)), is amended by inserting therein, immediately after the words "for the benefit of the public", a comma and the words "or for use for fish and wildlife management and development activities".

SEC. 3. Section 203(n) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(n)), is amended—

(1) by inserting in the first sentence thereof, immediately after the words "the Federal Civil Defense Administrator.", the words "the Secretary of the Interior";

(2) by striking out in the first sentence thereof the words "either such officer", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any such officer";

(3) by striking out in the second sentence thereof the words "or the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, or the Secretary of the Interior,";

(4) by striking out in the third sentence thereof the words "purposes of education, public health, or civil defense, or for research for any such purpose, pursuant to subsection (j)(3) or (j)(4) of this section,", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any purpose specified in paragraph (3), (4), or (5) of subsection (j)"; and

(5) by striking out the words "the Secretary or the Director" wherever they appear in the third and fourth sentences thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "the Secretary or Director concerned".

CONSUMER PROTECTION IS PROPOSED FOR HARDWOOD LABELING

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to protect consumers of hardwood or simulated hardwood products.

On April 27, 1961, in the 87th Congress, 1st session, Mr. President, I introduced this bill as S. 1724. Hearings were held before the Senate Committee on Commerce August 10, 11, and 13, 1962, during the 2d session of the 87th Congress. At these hearings it was noted by the Federal Trade Commission that certain wording, phrasing, and other changes should be made. The bill, which I introduce today, I am pleased to state, has incorporated those suggestions which were made by the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. President, I originally introduced this bill because of many complaints I received regarding products, purported to be of wood, such as furniture, radio and television cabinets, and other cabinets, or decorative articles, which in reality were composed of composition material, plastic, wood fiber, or even metal. This situation still exists today.

These articles had been finished to look in color, grain, and beauty like decorative wood.

It is my understanding that the Federal Trade Commission, over the years, has also received complaints alleging deception in the sale of products finished to imitate decorative hardwood.

This bill, I hasten to point out, merely requires that such products be labeled to indicate the true common name of the tree that produced the wood and what finish is being imitated.

Mr. President, because other Senators have indicated interest in this proposed legislation, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of my remarks the bill be printed; and I also ask unanimous consent that it lie on the table until Thursday, April 11, 1963, so that other Members of the Senate may join in sponsoring it; and I ask that the name of my colleague, the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] be included as a cosponsor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 1249) to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false invoicing, and false advertising of decorative wood and simulated wood products, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. BAYH), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Decorative Wood and Simulated Wood Products Labeling Act."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) the term "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation association, business trust, or any organized group of any of the foregoing;

(b) the term "wood" means any timber product retaining its natural growth structure;

(c) the term "simulated wood product" means any product or part of a product made wholly or substantially of any material other than wood, including, but not restricted to, wood fiber, glass, vegetable fiber, plaster, plastic, metal, paper, film, and molded or extruded material, which in its finished, treated or processed state has the appearance or is in imitation of, or purports to be wood; and such term also includes products made of wood, the exposed surface of which has been printed or otherwise treated to provide the appearance of a figure pattern other than the natural growth structure;

(d) the term "decorative wood" means any wood or wood product whether in the form of veneer, plywood, flooring, lumber, manufactured product, or other form, the face of which has been varnished, shellacked, lacquered, stained, or otherwise finished or processed to display the natural wood grain, figure, or growth character;

(e) the term "exposed surface" or "exposed parts", as applied to a decorative wood or simulated wood product, means those parts of the product which are exposed to view when the product is installed or placed in normal position;

(f) the term "label" or "labeling" means any label, stamp, tag, mark, brand or other identification affixed to a decorative wood or simulated wood product or to the immediate packaging of such product;

(g) the term "invoice" means a written account, memorandum, list, catalog, sales slip, or invoice, which is issued in connection with any commercial dealing or transaction in decorative wood or simulated wood product transported or delivered to a purchaser, consignee, factor, bailee, correspondent, or agent;

(h) the term "Federal Trade Commission Act" means the Act entitled "An Act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes", approved September 26, 1914, as amended; and

(i) the term "commerce" means commerce between any State, territory, or possession of the United States, Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State, territory, possession, Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof; or within any territory or possession, or Puerto Rico or the District of Columbia.

MISBRANDING, FALSE ADVERTISING, OR FALSE INVOICING DECLARED UNLAWFUL

SEC. 3. (a) The introduction or manufacture for introduction into commerce, or the sale, advertising, promoting or offering for sale in commerce, or the transportation or distribution in commerce, of any decorative wood or simulated wood product which is misbranded, or falsely or deceptively advertised, or falsely or deceptively invoiced (excepting sales slips or invoices issued by retail stores), within the meaning of this Act or the rules and regulations prescribed under section 8, is unlawful and shall be an unfair method of competition, and an unfair and deceptive act or practice, in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(b) The sale, advertising, offering for sale, transportation, or distribution, of any decorative wood or simulated wood product which has been shipped and received in commerce, and which is misbranded or falsely or deceptively advertised, or falsely or deceptively invoiced (excepting sales slips or invoices issued by retail stores), within the meaning of this Act or the rules and regulations prescribed under section 8, is unlawful and shall be an unfair method of competition, and an unfair and deceptive act or practice, in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(c) Except as provided in subsection (d) of this section, it shall be unlawful to remove or mutilate, or cause or participate in the removal or mutilation of, prior to the time any decorative wood or simulated wood product is sold and thereafter delivered to the ultimate purchasing consumer, any label required by this Act to be affixed to such decorative wood or simulated wood product, and any person violating this subsection is guilty of an unfair method of competition, and an unfair or deceptive act or practice, in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(d) Any person introducing, selling, advertising, or offering for sale, in commerce, or processing for commerce, a decorative wood or simulated wood product, or any person selling, advertising, offering for sale, or processing a decorative wood or simulated wood product which has been shipped and received in commerce, may substitute for the

label affixed to such product pursuant to section 4 of this Act, a label conforming to the requirements of such section. Any person substituting a label shall keep such records as will show the information set forth on the label that he removed and the name or names of the person or persons from whom such decorative wood or simulated wood product was received, and shall preserve such records for at least three years. Neglect or refusal to maintain and preserve such records is unlawful, and any person who shall fail to maintain and preserve such records shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each day of such failure, which shall accrue to the United States and be recoverable by a civil action. Any person substituting a label who shall fail to keep and preserve such records, or who shall by such substitution misbrand a decorative wood or simulated wood product. shall be guilty of an unfair method of competition, and an unfair or deceptive act or practice, in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(e) Subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not apply to any common carrier, contract carrier, or freight forwarder with respect to a decorative wood or simulated wood product handled and shipped, transported, or delivered by it in commerce in the ordinary course of business.

MISBRANDING DECORATIVE WOOD AND SIMULATED WOOD PRODUCTS

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this Act, a decorative wood or simulated wood product shall be deemed to be misbranded—

(1) if it is falsely or deceptively labeled or otherwise falsely or deceptively identified, or if the label contains any form of misrepresentation or deception, directly or by implication, with respect to such decorative wood or simulated wood product, or is misleading in any respect; or

(2) if there is not affixed to such decorative wood or simulated wood product a label (flooring and moulding may be labeled by the bundle or package) showing in words and figures plainly legible the labeling information required by this Act, including the true common name of the wood actually contained in the exposed surfaces of the decorative wood product, or the true name or composition of the simulated wood product comprising the exposed surfaces of the product, provided that where the exposed surface is made of veneer, laminate or plywood construction, such exposed surface construction shall be clearly indicated by such additional words showing that it is veneer, laminate or of plywood construction, as the case may be, and provided that where the exposed surface has been printed or otherwise treated to reveal an artificial wood grain or figure pattern this fact shall be clearly indicated; or

(3) if the label contains the name or names of any wood or purported wood not contained in the product, unless accompanied by language clearly indicating that the figure pattern is simulated; or

(4) if the label does not show the name or the identification number issued and registered by the Commission of the person or persons who manufactured such decorative wood or simulated wood product.

FALSE ADVERTISING AND INVOICING OF DECORATIVE WOOD AND SIMULATED WOOD PRODUCTS

SEC. 5. (a) For the purposes of this Act, a decorative wood or simulated wood product shall be deemed to be falsely or deceptively advertised if any advertisement, representation, public announcement, or notice which is intended to or does aid, promote, or assist, directly or indirectly in the sale or offering for sale or marketing of such decorative wood or simulated wood product (1) shows wood species names not actually present on the exposed surface of the decorative wood or simulated wood product, unless accompanied by language clearly indicating that the figure pattern is simulated, or (2) indicates either veneer or solid construction where such is not the case, or (3) shows other than the true name or names and true composition of the exposed parts of the simulated wood product, or (4) is false, deceptive or misleading in any respect.

(b) For the purposes of this Act, a decorative wood or simulated wood product shall be deemed to be falsely or deceptively invoiced (excepting sales slips or invoices issued by retail stores) if no invoice is issued, or if issued, such invoice (1) does not show the true name or names of the wood forming the exposed surface of the wood product, or (2) does not reveal that the exposed surfaces of such product are of veneer, laminate or plywood construction, or (3) does not reveal the true name or composition of the simulated wood product forming the exposed parts of the product or article, or (4) does not reveal the presence of any printed or otherwise processed artificial wood grain or figure pattern, or (5) is false, deceptive or misleading in any respect.

EXCLUSION OF MISBRANDED OR FALSELY INVOICED DECORATIVE WOOD AND SIMULATED WOOD PRODUCTS

SEC. 6. (a) Decorative wood and simulated wood products imported into the United States shall be labeled so as not to be misbranded within the meaning of section 4 of this Act; and all invoices of such products required under title IV of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall set forth, in addition to the matters therein specified, information conforming with the requirements of section 5(b) of this Act, which information shall be included in the invoices prior to their certification under the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

(b) The falsification of, or failure to set forth, said information in said invoices, or the falsification or perjury of the consignee's declaration provided for in the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, insofar as it relates to said information, shall be an unfair method of competition, and an unfair and deceptive act or practice, in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act; and any person who falsifies, or fails to set forth, said information in said invoices, or who falsifies or perjures said consignee's declaration insofar as it relates to said information, may thenceforth be prohibited by the Federal Trade Commission from importing, or participating in the importation of, any decorative wood or simulated wood product into the United States except upon filing bond with the Secretary of the Treasury in a sum double the value of said product, and any duty thereon, conditioned upon compliance with the provisions of this section.

(c) A verified statement from the manufacturer, producer of, or dealer in, imported decorative wood or simulated wood products showing information required under the provisions of this Act may be required under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

DECORATIVE WOOD NAME GUIDE

SEC. 7. (a) The Federal Trade Commission shall, within nine months from the date of enactment of this Act, after holding public hearings, issue a register setting forth the names of decorative woods, which register shall be known as the Decorative Wood Name Guide. The names used shall be the true English names for the respective wood, except that in the absence of a true English name for a wood or where a wood has for at least twenty-five years been known generically in the market of the United States by a commercial or trade name, the Commission may use such name when deemed by the Commission to properly identify the wood in the United States, with or without qualifying or explanatory terms.

(b) The Commission may, from time to time, after holding public hearings, add to or delete from such register the name or names of any wood.

(c) When the name of any wood connotes a geographical origin or significance other than the true country or place of origin, the Commission may require that whenever the name is used such qualifying or explanatory words or statements as it may deem necessary be also used in order to prevent the likelihood of confusion or deception.

(d) The name or names of the decorative wood used in the label required under section 4 of this Act shall be such as are set forth in the Decorative Wood Name Guide provided for under this section.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE ACT

SEC. 8. (a)(1) Except as otherwise specifically provided or required herein, the Act shall be enforced by the Federal Trade Commission under rules, regulations, and procedure provided for pursuant to the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(2) The Commission is authorized and directed to prevent any person from violating the provisions of sections 3, 4, 5, and 10(b) of this Act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this Act; and any such person violating any provision of said sections of this Act shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in said Federal Trade Commission Act as though the applicable terms and provisions of the said Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this Act.

(b) The Commission is authorized and directed to prescribe rules and regulations governing the manner and form of disclosing information required by this Act, and such further rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for purposes of administration and enforcement of this Act. The Commission is authorized to exclude from the provisions of this Act any specific types or kinds of decorative wood or simulated wood products because of their being of such small size or inconsequential character as not of public interest or not necessary to be covered for protection of the purchasing public.

(c) The Commission is authorized (1) to cause inspections, analyses, tests, and examinations to be made of any decorative wood products or of any simulated wood products subject to this Act; and (2) to cooperate, on matters related to the purpose of this Act, with any department or agency of the Government; with any State, territory, Puerto Rico, or possession, or with the District of Columbia; or with any department, agency, or political subdivision thereof; or with any person.

(d)(1) Every manufacturer or importer of decorative wood products or simulated wood products shall maintain proper records showing the information required by this Act with respect to all decorative wood products and simulated wood products handled by him, and shall preserve such records for at least three years.

(2) The neglect or refusal to maintain and preserve such records is unlawful, and any such manufacturer or importer who neglects or refuses to maintain and preserve such records shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100 for each day of such failure which shall accrue to the United States and be recoverable by a civil action.

CONDEMNATION AND INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 9. (a)(1) Any decorative wood or simulated wood product shall be liable to be proceeded against in the district court of the United States for the district in which found, and to be seized for confiscation by process of libel for condemnation, if the Federal Trade Commission has reason to believe such decorative wood or simulated wood product is being manufactured or held for shipment or shipped, or held for sale or exchange after shipment, in commerce, in violation of the provisions of this Act, and if after notice from the Commission the provisions of this Act with respect to such decorative wood or simulated wood product are not shown to be complied with. Proceedings in such libel cases shall conform as nearly as may be to suits in rem in admiralty, and may be brought by the Commission.

(2) If such decorative wood or simulated wood product is condemned by the court, it shall be disposed of, in the discretion of the court, by destruction, by sale, by delivery to the owner or claimant thereof upon payment of legal costs and charges and upon execution of good and sufficient bond to the effect that such product will not be disposed of until properly marked, advertised, and invoiced, as required under the provisions of this Act, or by such charitable disposition as the court may deem proper. If such decorative wood or simulated wood product is disposed of by sale, the proceeds, less legal costs and charges, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(b) Whenever the Commission has reason to believe that—

(1) any person is violating, or is about to violate, section 3, 4, 5, or 10(b) of this Act; and

(2) it would be in the public interest to enjoin such violation until complaint is issued by the Commission under the Federal Trade Commission Act and such complaint dismissed by the Commission or set aside by the court on review, or until order to cease and desist made thereon by the Commission has become final within the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Commission may bring suit in the district court of the United States for the district in which such person resides or transacts business, to enjoin such violation, and upon proper showing a temporary injunction or restraining order shall be granted without bond.

GUARANTY

SEC. 10. (a) No person shall be guilty under section 3 if he establishes a guaranty received in good faith signed by and containing the name and address of the person residing in the United States by whom the decorative wood or simulated wood product guaranteed was manufactured or by whom it was imported, that said product is not misbranded or that it is not falsely advertised or invoiced under the provisions of this Act. Such guaranty shall be either (1) a separate guaranty specifically designating the decorative wood or simulated wood product guaranteed, in which case it may be on the invoice or other paper relating to such decorative wood or simulated wood product; or (2) a continuing guaranty filed with the Commission applicable to any decorative wood or simulated wood product manufactured or imported by said guarantor, in such form as the Commission by rules and regulations may prescribe.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to furnish with respect to any decorative wood or simulated wood product, a false or deceptive guaranty (except a person relying upon a guaranty to the same effect received in good faith signed by and containing the name and address of the person residing in the United States by whom the decorative wood or simulated wood product guaranteed was manufactured or by whom it was imported) with reason to believe the decorative wood or simulated wood product falsely or deceptively guaranteed may be introduced, sold, transported, or distributed in commerce, and any person who violates the provisions of this subsection is guilty of an unfair method of competition, and an unfair or deceptive act or practice, in commerce, within the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

CRIMINAL PENALTY

SEC. 11. (a) Any person who wilfully violates section 3, 4, 5, or 10(b) of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined not more than $5,000, or be imprisoned not more than one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

(b) Whenever the Commission has reason to believe any person is guilty of a misdemeanor under this section, it shall certify all pertinent facts to the Attorney General, whose duty it shall be to cause appropriate proceedings to be brought for the enforcement of the provisions of this section against such person.

APPLICATION OF EXISTING LAWS

SEC. 12. The provisions of this Act shall be held to be in addition to, and not in substitution for or limitation of, the provisions of any other Act of Congress.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 13. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of such provision to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 14. This Act shall take effect one year after the date of its enactment.

MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TOWER (for himself and Mr. BENNETT) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them jointly, to the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LAUSCHE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 6, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LAUSCHE submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 6, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 6, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment reported by Mr. MAGNUSON from the Committee on Commerce, in the nature of a substitute, to Senate bill 6, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SCOTT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 6, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations may extend the time for filing reports concerning last year's work to June 30, 1963.

There are three reports which involve, first, the Department of Agriculture handling of the pooled cotton allotments of Billie Sol Estes; second, the pyramiding of profits and costs in the missile procurement program; and third, the American Guild of Variety Artists. These reports have been drafted and will be submitted for study by the committee members in the immediate future.

On February 6 the Senate granted an extention of the time for filing these reports until April 1. It was believed then that this would be sufficient time to complete work on these reports. Since then, it has developed that additional time will be necessary in order that adequate study may be given by the committee members. Accordingly, I ask for this additional extention.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might be permitted to join as a cosponsor of the bill S. 829, introduced by the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, to provide for marketing quotas on Irish potatoes through the establishment of acreage allotments. I feel that this bill represents a constructive approach to the problems faced by our potato producers, and I would urge most favorable action on the bill by the appropriate committee, namely, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and by the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A FOREIGN SERVICE ACADEMY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 865, to establish a Foreign Service Academy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPEAL OF SECTION 13A OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] be added as a cosponsor of the bill S. 1161, to repeal section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bill:

Authority of March 25, 1963:

S. 1183. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that synthetic detergents manufactured for use in the United States or imported for use in the United States comply with certain standards of decomposability: Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. MAGNUSON.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, to express the sense of Congress that the President appoint a committee to evaluate our foreign aid program in each country and report its finding to the President and Congress remain at the desk until April 5 for additional cosponsors. The concurrent resolution was originally ordered to lie on the desk until the close of business today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON AREA REDEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRODUCTION AND STABILIZATION OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to announce the beginning of hearings on S. 1163, a bill to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act.

The hearings will begin at 2 p.m. Monday, April 22, 1963, in room 5302, New Senate Office Building and will continue on the following days of that week in the morning.

All persons who wish to appear and testify on this bill are requested to notify Mr. Jonathan Lindley, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4–3121, extension 3921.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany, and Roger Hilsman, Jr., of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

PRESS RELEASE OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a press release issued March 30 by the Committee on Foreign Relations announcing that on April 4 and 5 public hearings would begin on S. 865, a bill to establish a National Academy of Foreign Affairs.

Any individual or organization wishing to present testimony on S. 865 should contact the committee clerk, Mr. Darrell St. Claire, room S-116, the Capitol.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

On April 4 and 5 the Committee on Foreign Relations plans to begin public hearings on S. 865, an administration bill to provide for the establishment of a National Academy of Foreign Affairs, which was introduced by Senator SYMINGTON on February 20, 1963.

Cosponsors of S. 865 are Senators SALTONSTALL, BAYH, BOGGS, BYRD of West Virginia, CLARK, ENGLE, GRUENING, HUMPHREY, INOUYE, LONG of Missouri, MANSFIELD, MCGEE, MOSS, NEUBERGER, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, SMATHERS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YARBOROUGH, MONRONEY, FONG, HART, MCINTYRE, BREWSTER, and JAVITS.

Any individual or organization wishing to present testimony on S. 865 should contact without delay the chief clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Darrell St. Claire, room S-116, the Capitol.

The hearings will be held in room 4221, New Senate Office Building, and will begin at 10:30 a.m.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Louis M. Janelle, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. attorney, district of New Hampshire, term of 4 years, vice William H. Craig, Jr., resigned.

Paul G. April, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. marshal, district of New Hampshire, term of 4 years, vice Royal Dion, resigned.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Monday, April 8, 1963, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

CAPT. EDWARD J. DWIGHT, JR., FIRST NEGRO SELECTED AS TRAINEE FOR MANNED SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, we are proud that the first Negro to be selected as a trainee for the U.S. manned space program is from the great State of Kansas.

It is particularly pleasing in view of Kansas' early history. The issue in the Kansas statehood controversy was whether it was to be admitted as a free State or a slave State. For several years the issue was bitterly fought; and, in the final analysis, the people of Kansas, with their usual good judgment, insisted on human rights and human freedoms. As a result of this, our motto carries the Latin words "Ad Astra Per Aspera," which means "To the Stars Through Difficulty."

The Kansan selected as trainee for the manned space flight is Capt. Edward J. Dwight, Jr., of Kansas City, Kans. His parents are Mr. and Mrs. Edward J. Dwight, of Kansas City, Kans. Captain Dwight is stationed at Edwards Air Force Base, Calif., is married, and has two children.

Captain Dwight received his education in the Kansas City, Kans., grade school, high school, and the Kansas City Junior College. He joined the Air Force in August 1953, and in 1955 was commissioned as a pilot at Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz. It was at this base he completed his college work—partly through night classes—at Arizona State University.

He served 2 years in Japan as a B–57 bomber pilot, followed by about 3½ years at Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif. Some months ago he was assigned to the test pilot school at Edwards Air Force Base.

Upon being notified of his selection as a trainee for the manned space program, Captain Dwight stated that he hoped some day to become an astronaut.

I ask unanimous consent that a biographical sketch of Capt. Edward J. Dwight, Jr., be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Full name: Capt. Edward J. Dwight, Jr.

Claim to fame: First Negro selected as trainee for manned space flight.

Home: Edwards Air Force Base, Calif.

Birthday: 1934.

Education: Kansas City Junior College, graduated with honors in track in 1953. Earlier was track and football star at Ward High School in Kansas City, Kans. After joining Air Force and winning his wings at Williams Air Force Base, Ariz., in 1955, completed college training through night classes at Arizona State University in Tempe. Eight months ago, assigned to test pilot school at Edwards Air Force Base.

Jobs: B–57 bomber pilot.

Family: Parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edward J. Dwight, of Kansas City, Kans. Wife, Sue, and two children, Tina Sheree, 7 and Edward III, 5. Four sisters, one of whom is Sister Martin Mary, first Negro woman to become a Sister of Charity.

Hobbies: Besides flying, he is active in both the Knights of Columbus and the Holy Name Society. He is a devout Catholic and his wife is a convert.

Ambition: To become an astronaut.

THE CLAY COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the recent report to the President by the Committee To Strengthen the Security of the Free World, the Lucius D. Clay Committee, has lately been the subject of much discussion. I think the Clay report lays down guidelines both for improving and for reducing the cost of our foreign aid program.

After a careful study, the Committee has indicated certain areas of our foreign aid program which should either be reduced or be terminated. I certainly endorse many of the Committee's observations, and I am hopeful that Congress will carefully consider its recommendations. I am gratified to find that one of these recommendations conforms with my efforts, during the last 2 years, to terminate further military assistance, on a grant basis, to the prosperous nations of Western Europe. The Committee says:

> Elsewhere in Europe, except in Greece and Turkey, there is no apparent need for further military or economic assistance other than for the fulfillment of existing commitments.

Mr. President, I hope Congress will support an amendment, which I intend to offer again this year to the Foreign Assistance Act, which would accomplish this purpose.

I have supported the foreign aid program as indispensable to our national survival in this precarious world. But the American people are becoming increasingly impatient with its shortcomings. As I said 2 years ago on the floor of the Senate:

> Their resentment today can lead to reaction tomorrow so widespread as to fill these Halls, and the White House as well, with men who would sever our world commitments and would withdraw the United States into a lingering, lethal, and last isolation.

The objective of the Clay report is to work such improvement in our foreign aid program as to assure its continuing public support.

In closing, I want to emphasize that I think the Clay report gives the foreign aid program—and the present administrators—a basic vote of confidence. Max Freedman's article in the Washington Post of March 25, 1963, analyzed the report, and the author carefully pointed out that the recommendations made were offered as an attempt to strengthen foreign aid, by establishing certain new standards, without hampering many established principles essential to an effective foreign aid program. Roscoe Drummond, writing for the same newspaper on March 28, 1963, also made a careful analysis of the real meaning and impact of the Clay report. Mr. Drummond, like Mr. Freedman, wrote that what the Committee really wants to accomplish is "an assistance program of reduced scope and thereby more concentrated where it will do the most good."

I think the articles by both of these writers help to correctly intrepret the Clay report. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that both articles be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 25, 1963]

Foreign Aid Report

(By Max Freedman)

In essence, the Committee headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay has given the foreign aid program a qualified vote of confidence. No doubt some critics will try to use some passages in the report to discredit the whole program, as George Meany has suggested in his interesting but largely irrelevant dissent; but they cannot succeed unless the Committee's analysis and recommendations are ignored or twisted. The Committee has tried to save and strengthen the program by setting up new standards without doing violence to many established principles which have guided foreign aid.

The Committee deserves praise for recognizing that some objections brought against foreign aid, in Congress and outside, are neither spiteful nor stupid but are wise and necessary. There is no concession, of course, to the extremists who deliver a root-and-branch attack on foreign aid as a major part of American policy.

But the Committee expresses the genuine public concern over the details of the program and the way in which aid has been administered in some countries. There will be particular agreement with the passages which suggest that far greater emphasis be given to the capacity of recipient governments to carry out reforms as the price of aid.

Equally welcome is the forthright recommendation that the United States should cancel or reduce aid without fear that such a change of policy would drive these nations into neutralism or communism.

This increased emphasis on American freedom of action, in areas where many governments have come to look upon American help almost as a matter of right, has already been foreshadowed in statements by the administration. But the Committee has made both explicit and challenging what has often been muffled in official declarations.

Like President Kennedy, but again with more urgent emphasis, the Committee has called upon the industrial nations of the Western World to carry a larger share of the burden of aid. Particularly important is its recommendation that these nations should pool some of their aid programs and administer them under international auspices. For this purpose a new agency might be created with membership limited to free nations so that no Communist veto or opposition could cut across agreed decisions.

This kind of economic purpose could give new meaning and direction to the NATO countries which, with nations like Japan and Australia, would inevitably sustain the heaviest commitment. It certainly is a suggestion worth exploring.

Very controversial but by no means unconvincing for that reason is the recommendation that the United States should limit itself to a marginal role in providing aid for Africa, leaving the bulk of the work to be done by Britain and France.

It is this part of the report which goes beyond the technical evaluation of foreign aid and touches basic issues in foreign policy. There is no evidence that the views of the State Department were given careful weight before this recommendation was advanced. At all events, the Department should have the chance to present its case in the context of the completed report before any new departure in African policy is authorized.

The members of the Committee refused to be drawn into a debate over whether India or Pakistan deserves the higher American priority. They wisely recognized that both are essential to Western security and therefore should be supported not only by the United States but by other governments opposed to Communist China's expansion in Asia.

The Committee might have spoken in even stronger terms in asking for a delayed judgment on the success of the Alliance for Progress. It is utterly unreasonable to expect swift triumphs in Latin America when the task of reform and progess has been attempted after years of wasteful neglect.

Within the restraints of courtesy and responsibility the Committee has spoken very plainly, even at the risk of offending some nations. But the real test will come in the way Administrator Bell and other officials of the aid program respond to these recommendations. It should therefore be noted that the Committee has expressed confidence in these men and has spoken in special praise of Mr. Bell.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 19, 1963]

The Clay Report

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The most constructive and controversial, the most massively misunderstood but still widely supported program of the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations is foreign aid—military and economic.

Because foreign aid is complex, spread all over the world, and its fruits slow to appear, it is understandable that most people do not know how much is being spent where and why. It is, therefore, all the more significant that popular support for foreign aid, as found in the Gallup surveys, is higher today than at any time in the past 9 years.

But now a new factor is being added to the debate over military and development aid. This new factor of uncertain impact is the Clay report—a review, a reappraisal, and a series of recommendations by a Commission appointed by the President of 10 experienced private citizens and headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay.

Did I refer to the "uncertain impact" of the Clay report? Well—

Representative Otto Passman, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman of the Foreign Aid Subcommittee on Appropriations, who wants to cut the heart out of the foreign aid program—and always has wanted to—thinks another star ought to be pinned on the general's shoulder.

President Kennedy, whose budget calls for a billion-dollar increase in foreign aid spending, says he is "grateful" to General Clay, is pleased with the report.

Let's look at the report, not merely at what others say about it.

The Clay Committee unanimously supports the principle of military and development aid, calls it essential.

It describes the foreign aid programs as of great value to the national interest and to national security.

It wants these programs continued substantially.

The report endorses the competence and approach of the new aid administrator, David Bell, former Director of the Budget.

The Clay Committee's central criticism is this:

"We believe that we are attempting too much for too many and that a higher quality and reduced quantity of our defense aid effort in certain countries could accomplish more."

The Committee wants an assistance program of reduced scope and thereby more concentrated where it will do the most good. It favors terminating aid to countries not ready to use it effectively or failing to do their part in their own development. It warns against aid for international political purposes.

General Clay and his blue-ribbon panel propose no meat-ax cuts in the appropriation. They propose no $1.5 billion reduction, as some have mistakenly reported. The report says that the present program can accomplish its purposes with a cut of a half-billion phased out over 3 years and that its discriminating guidelines should permit a trimming of the proposed $1 billion increase in the new budget.

This is sound and sensible. The Clay report is far nearer the President's position than it is to the anti-foreign-aid views of Representative Passman.

COMPLETION OF 50TH YEAR OF SERVICE BY EVERARD H. SMITH, CLERK OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, 1 year ago today other members of the Appropriations Committee and I brought to the attention of the Senate the commencement of the 50th year of the most commendable service to that committee and to the country by Mr. Everard H. Smith.

That year now having come to a conclusion, I will not again attempt to state the nature and quality of the assistance he has rendered during these 50 years, the past 25 of which he has served as chief clerk of the committee. Rather, I wish simply—on behalf of all the committee members and myself as chairman—to express profound appreciation for the splendid association which we have enjoyed with Everard during many of these years, to congratulate him upon the attainment of such a distinguished record of public service during so long a period, and to convey to him our affectionate good wishes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, today marks the 50th anniversary of Everard Smith as an employee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. As chief clerk of this important committee of the Congress, Everard, as he is fondly known to all of us who have been honored and privileged to work with him, has seen the work of the committee evolve from what might be described as a one-man staff operation to today's complex division of the staff work among many people. He has not only seen the Senate come to this more practical and effective professional staff approach to its work, but he has had a guiding hand in its formulation. As a result of this professional staff type approach, the Senate Appropriations Committee has been able to handle its work much more effectively.

If one were to attempt to single out the greatest attribute of this outstanding public servant, it would be his ability to quietly and effectively master legislative problems which are charged with legal difficulties and complicated by the personal pressures of opponents and proponents of these measures. Certainly no one carries in his mind a greater store of knowledge on appropriations matters and the many precedents which bear on them than Everard Smith.

Through the years Everard has been a tireless worker. His whole life has been given to his job. For this the Senate—and indeed the whole country—will always be indebted to him—a wise, effective, public servant, counsellor, and friend. I congratulate Everard on attaining this remarkable milestone in a life of public service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a statement by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall] in relation to the service of Everard Smith.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Saltonstall

On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the service of our friend, Everard Smith as a member of the Appropriations Committee staff, I should like to take the opportunity to add my voice in praise of this dedicated public servant. If one were to select all of the attributes that a professional staff man should have, Everard Smith would embody them all.

Everard became an employee of the Senate about a year after Chairman Hayden came to Congress. One-fifth of the present Members of the Senate had not yet been born. Since that time, he has rendered distinguished and efficient service to the Senate and has made a significant contribution to the effectiveness of the Appropriations Committee. Through the years he has served as teacher, counselor, and friend to all who have served in this body. He has been generous in spending time with new Members of the Senate and of the Appropriations Committee, as well as senior Members. All soon have come to recognize his intelligence, his calm judgment, and his deep feeling for the Senate as an institution. He has at his grasp a wealth of information on what is probably the most complicated subject in all of our legislative endeavors, the appropriations process.

Everard has been my good friend and adviser since I first became a member of the Appropriations Committee. I value our relationship highly and I am proud to pay tribute on this occasion to his many fine qualities and to his years of distinguished service to the Senate.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it is an extreme pleasure for me to join in paying a well-deserved tribute to Everard H. Smith, who today celebrates his 50th year of service on Capitol Hill.

As clerk of the Senate Appropriations Committee his responsibilities are heavy; yet he carries them with the same painstaking diligence that has characterized his entire career spanning a half century of service to this body.

Everard Smith entered the employ of the Senate as an assistant clerk of the Appropriations Committee on April 1, 1913. At that time the entire staff included, in addition to himself, a chief clerk and a typist. During the ensuing years Everard Smith has handled appropriations totaling many billions of dollars. His efficiency and his deep dedication to duty are hallmarks of this most remarkable man.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee who has had the opportunity to benefit from Everard Smith's knowledge and friendly cooperation, I am delighted to salute him on this notable occasion.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am delighted to join my colleagues, with whom I am honored to serve on the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in recognizing the half century of public service to the American people and to our committee which has been completed on this day by our chief clerk, Everard Smith. He is tireless and dedicated in his work. All of us, I am sure, are appreciative of this. I wish him many more years of effectiveness to the Senate and the Nation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to join the distinguished chairman [Mr. Hayden] and other members of the Appropriations Committee in saluting the chief clerk of the committee, Everard Smith, on his golden anniversary of service to the committee, to the Senate, and to the Nation.

It is difficult to grasp the fact that there is only one member of the Senate still sitting in this body who was in the Congress when Everard Smith began his long and immensely useful career of public service. He has accumulated, through the years, an invaluable store of experience in dealing with the most complex and exacting legislation which comes before the Congress. It is out of this store of experience and out of his own intrinsic professional wisdom that Everard Smith has lightened the burdens and otherwise assisted, in every appropriate way, the work of many members of the committee through the decades. As the most junior member of the Appropriations Committee, I wish to join with the most senior and with others in between in recognition of Everard Smith's outstanding service to the Senate and to the public at this milestone in his distinguished career.

TORNADO

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, weather, good and bad, is a vital force affecting all of us. Most of the time we do not notice the weather. When we do, it is usually because weather is a cause of some discomfort.

But on occasion the weather, or the forces of nature which determine our weather, get out of hand. And we experience disastrous results.

In my part of the country—South Dakota—the weather "got out of hand" last May. We are located on the fringe area of tornado alley. But last May it seemed as if our State became the heart of this vast area subjected to the summer tornadoes which have been a source of much concern.

The story of what happened last May is reported in the April 1963 issue of the Reader's Digest. The author is Helen Rezatto, freelance writer and part-time English instructor at South Dakota State College.

I bring this article before the Senate as a matter of interest pertaining to a measure which I have introduced. This bill is S. 132 and its purpose is to establish a National Weather Council.

The late Senator Francis Case authored this measure in the last Congress. No action was taken on the bill and I have again introduced it.

A National Weather Council would promote programs of atmospheric, meteorological, and weather research to advance and expedite knowledge of the weather, its development and trends, as well as give thorough study to modification or control programs.

The spine-tingling narrative of Mrs. Rezatto demonstrates, I believe, just one of the problems of weather to which such a council could devote its study.

Through the work of such a council it might be possible someday to alleviate the fears of the people of the Midwest over tornadoes through the achievement of some program or some discovery which would stop such a storm before it started.

Experiments have already been made in this direction and I am confident that with the assistance of a council as outlined in my bill, S. 132, the impossible could very well become the possible in the area of weather control and modification.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the body of the Record at this point, the story by Mrs. Rezatto appearing in the Reader's Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

One Week of Horror on the Great Plains

(By Helen Rezatto)

(For days on end last May one tornado after another rampaged across South Dakota, spreading desolation.)

It was raining lightly on May 14, 1962, and spring showers are always welcome on the Great Plains. Farmer Emil Ziebart of Ethan, a town in southeastern South Dakota, glanced at the churning clouds massing in the southwest. He decided there was just time to plow another furrow before supper.

Nearing the end of the round, he checked the sky again. A grayish-black cloud wall about a half-mile wide loomed over his neighbor's grove. Below it hung a funnel-shaped mass, tapering toward the earth. Then suddenly, as he stared, horrified, the trees disappeared, flicked up as easily as a vacuum cleaner sucks up dust specks.

He jerked the plow from the earth and turned the tractor toward home. Behind him, advancing, the cavernous cloud mouth gaped hungrily.

He jumped from the tractor, raced toward the shelter belt on the west side of his farmyard, dived headfirst through the wire fence and grabbed the nearest tree trunk. There was a strange, ominous silence. Emil Ziebart gasped for breath in the weighted, Stygian air. He could hear only the pounding of his heart. Then there was a stupendous Niagara of sound and he felt a heavy blow on his back. He dug his face into the ground as the tornado roared over him.

Soon the black, omnivorous wall, the pressure, the horrendous noise were gone. Ziebart raised his head slowly. The top of the tree he was clutching was not there. Uprooted trees lay grotesquely like piles of rotting weeds, their roots hanging limp. Twisted, spiky pieces of tin, shattered lumber, an overturned corn picker, huge drifts of last year's cornstalks, dead chickens—all lay in chaotic heaps as far as he could see. Beside him was a naked pheasant, only its remaining neck plumage identifying the lifeless form.

Dazed, Ziebart stood up. He shook his head. Something was wrong. He must be confused about directions, he decided. Where were the barn, the silo, the granary, the chickenhouses—all his buildings? Gone. There was nothing standing, just mountains of debris.

Fearfully, he peered beyond for his house. He saw the remains of the front steps, leading up into empty space. Then he saw his home, completely lifted from the foundation, jammed against the tortured trees, roof fragments dangling pitifully like shattered human limbs. And his family?

He scrambled drunkenly over the littered mess. "Oh God. They're dead. It's taken everything. They're gone." It was the immemorial cry of man against nature's cruelty.

Emeline Ziebart had not turned on the radio or TV that May afternoon, and so did not hear the tornado warnings. While her freshly baked banana cake cooled on the kitchen table, she put several loaves of bread into the oven. She noticed it was sprinkling outside. Suddenly, an explosive crash startled her. The house shuddered convulsively; windows popped out.

"Tornado," she shouted. "Joey, Diane, run for the basement."

The three dashed wildly into the basement and crouched beneath the stairs, 7-year-old Joey between his mother and his sister, Diane, 17. Instinctively, Mrs. Ziebart pushed Joey down flat, she and Diane protecting his body with theirs. Superhuman powers pressed them viciously against the cement floor.

Then—was it 1 minute later, or 5—everything was quiet. The tornado had passed over them, its suction taking even their hiding place, the stairs. Above them was the open sky. Wreckage surrounded them—the washing machine, tubs, heavy pipes, severed electric cables, lumber—and mud everywhere. As they clambered out of the basement into the yard, fears flashed through Emeline Ziebart's mind: Where was Emil? Crushed beneath the tractor? Dashed to pieces in the field?

Suddenly she saw her husband—and he saw them at the same moment. He began to run, stumbling over the rubble. The four met and silently clung to one another. It was Diane who spoke first: "Thank God, we're all alive."

Solicitous neighbors drove the Ziebarts to the hospital where they were treated for shock and minor injuries. They spent a sleepless night with relatives.

Next morning the Ziebarts gazed stricken at the junkyard that once had been their well-kept farm. There was not even a fence; surviving cattle, frightened and injured, roamed for miles. In the topsy-turvy house, what furniture was left was broken and covered with filth; in the once shiny steel kitchen the electric stove lay on its side, spilling out the bread which had never baked. Strangely, the banana cake was gone; the pillager had gobbled it but left the pan.

Meanwhile, a few miles northeast, at the Anthony Schoenfelder farm, the same raging demon completely destroyed every outbuilding, but left the house on its foundation. During the attack, Schoenfelder had held the door closed against the mighty adversary until his wife and 12 children could escape to the basement. Mary Ann, the oldest girl, was planning a June wedding; her wedding dress was snatched from the living room floor, where it had been spread out for alterations, and torn to shreds. The scraps were found entangled in the silo wreckage.

The next day a second twister stalked into tiny Roswell, S. Dak., climaxing a wrathful 100-mile journey. Heralding its approach, hailstones, large as baseballs, pounded Joseph Hanson's trailer-home. Hanson, a filling-station operator, picked up his two children, Charles, 3, and Mark, 5, and set them on the couch beside his wife, 8 months pregnant. He tried to enfold them all in his arms. Then for an instant he felt weightless—suspended in space. The trailer seemed to flip over and over in slow motion. There was an explosion caused by the vacuum in the vortex of the twister. Everything blew out, including the four people.

Hanson picked himself from the sticky, littered ground. He saw a small human form rolling by like a tumbleweed; frantic, he reached for it. It was Charles, the 3-year-old. Hanson saw Mark, screaming, trying to stand up near a deadly powerline, coiled snakelike on the highway. "Don't move," the father shouted. He stood upright, holding one hysterical child. Their shoes were gone, their clothes shredded. His pregnant wife ran barefoot toward the older boy. The Hansons gathered their scattered family together. Unbelievably, they were all safe. Later, pieces of the trailer were found a mile away.

The Ziebarts, the Schoenfelders, the Hansons, plus many more, were victims of a series of giant punches which knocked out southeastern South Dakota during 1 week last May. This area is on the northwest edge of "tornado alley," the boundless reaches of the Great Plains stretching from the Gulf of Mexico to Canada. Here these violent revolving storms strike more frequently than anywhere else in the world.

A tornado is formed when cold dry air from the West or Northwest moves over warm, moist air from the South or Southwest. Under certain conditions this clashing of air masses causes the warm air to rise rapidly, sets up a revolving atmospheric motion (counterclockwise in the Northern Hemisphere). In the center of a tornado the low-pressure area is a partial vacuum. Inside the funnel-shaped cloud, the speed of the whirling wind is estimated to be between 200 and 500 miles per hour. The tornado cloud itself travels relatively slowly, from 20 to 45 miles an hour, usually from the southwest to the northeast.

Because of the extreme wind velocity, violent uprushing air currents, and the partial vacuum in the vortex, a tornado is capable of fantastic behavior. It can swerve in circles, go straight, U-turn, hop, skip, jump, or even suddenly disintegrate.

During the week of horror last May, the South Dakota tornadoes descended erratically every day, sometimes ravaging a wide area, sometimes only an isolated section. On May 21, exactly a week after the first disaster, Emil Ziebart, along with a poultry buyer and some helpers, was rounding up his remaining chickens. When hail and rain torrents slashed at them, Ziebart said, "Don't worry, a tornado never strikes the same place twice."

He was wrong. A funnel slithered toward them. "Let's go," Ziebart yelled. Jumping into their cars, the men headed north, then east, then back again west, outracing the writhing formation.

Afterward, they saw that the previously bashed-in combine had been flipped over again, and the 40-foot-long silo chute had disappeared. Ziebart said grimly, "Looks like that devil thought he forgot something."

There is no accounting for the vagaries of these diabolical horrors, ruthless, yet sometimes relenting. A trucker on Highway 47 near Gregory, S. Dak., driving ahead of a serpentine funnel, kept watch in his rearview mirror as the tornado slashed, hacked and chewed up a quarter mile of asphalt road right behind him—before it veered off into a field.

At Lake Andes, where five funnels were counted in 1 day, the savage foray clawed off part of the schoolhouse roof, crushed the school kitchen and dining room—after school hours. But a gelatin salad, not even quivering, was found intact. Ripping through the kitchen of another house, a twister swept eggs from the refrigerator, smashed them onto the floor, dumped mud inside the box, then slammed the door closed. In a beauty shop, the thief sucked bills from a cash-register drawer that had been closed; the money was found two rooms away—but the money drawer was found still closed.

The twisting terrors of the frightful week in May left many homeless, wrecked hundreds of buildings, tore up miles of telephone and powerlines, uprooted countless trees, killed many animals. Southeastern South Dakota was faced with a seemingly hopeless cleanup and rebuilding chore.

Teamwork helped. Food, shelter, clothing and money were provided for the storm victims. But the greatest comfort of all was the sympathy and kindness given by the fortunate to the less fortunate. When Mary Ann Schoenfelder, the girl who lost her wedding dress, was married last June, she wore a bridal gown presented to her by the townspeople of Ethan. Joseph Hanson, whose uninsured trailer blew apart, felt better when the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, neighbors and unknown benefactors gave his family money, clothes, food—even playthings for the two little boys—and paid the first month's rent on a new trailer. Best of all, healthy Miss Jo Ann arrived a month later, apparently unruffled by her prenatal experience.

Emil Ziebart sold his remaining livestock, bought a house trailer and moved his family back to the desolate scene of two tornadoes. His eyes blazed with the indomitable courage of the Dakota pioneer: "The crops look pretty good—and we're all thankful to the Almighty just to be alive."

After the week was over, many others felt the same way. A number of clergymen offered grateful thanks to a merciful God for what was an almost unbelievable blessing: Not one person was seriously injured; not one human life was lost.

GRAFTON, W. VA., ALL AMERICA CITY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in these times when local unemployment is such a pressing problem to our Nation, I am happy to be able to report to the Senate that the city of Grafton, in my State of West Virginia, has just been given national recognition for setting an example of how a depressed community can pull itself up by its own bootstraps.

The honor has come in the form of an All America City Award, jointly conferred by Look magazine and the National Municipal League. Look has just informed me by letter that nationwide recognition of Grafton's achievement will be made in the April 23 issue of Look, appearing on the newsstands April 9.

Grafton is a small city that I know well. It is located in the rugged mining country of the Tygart River Valley. For the past several decades it has been struggling with the twin woes of waning industry and dwindling population. In 1930 this historic county seat had a population of 7,737. By 1940 it had dropped to 7,431. In 1950 it was down to 7,365. In 1958, following a series of economic setbacks, Grafton seemed on the verge of a catastrophic decline. The story of how this West Virginia city pulled itself back on its feet is a heartwarming one.

Grafton's crisis of 1958 was precipitated when the city's major industry, a glass plant, shut down, throwing nearly 500 men out of work. Then a large pottery manufacturer went out of business. Railway employment slumped badly. The citizens of Grafton could read the handwriting on the wall. Unless something was done about the declining economy, they might soon be living in a ghost town.

But they did do something about it. Responsible local citizens formed the Grafton Area Development Council, whose "Operation Survival" was dedicated to the task of attracting new industry to Grafton. Volunteer workers took an inventory of the labor skills available locally and $30,000 in voluntary subscriptions was raised for developing industrial sites. The city's physical appearance was improved with new paving of streets, modernization of buildings, and razing of slum areas.

The reward of all this civic endeavor is the presence today of two new major industries in Grafton, and the hope of a third one arriving soon. Unemployment has been reduced, and the community spirit is up. National recognition of this sturdy West Virginia fighting spirit has come now in the form of an All America Award for civic leadership. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter sent to me by Look magazine announcing the award printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Look,
New York, N.Y., March 19, 1963.

Senator Robert C. Byrd, of West Virginia,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Byrd: It is our pleasure to bring you the good news that a city in West Virginia—Grafton—has just been awarded the title of "All America City."

The award goes to Grafton for the vigorous action of its citizens in bringing about major civic improvements, and thus setting an example of good citizenship to the Nation.

The All America Cities Awards are given each year to 11 U.S. communities selected by a jury of distinguished citizens and experts on government impaneled by the National Municipal League, which is the cosponsor with Look magazine of the annual awards competition. The All America City program is now in its 15th year.

The names of the winners have just been released to the press, and the story of the winning cities will appear in the April 23 issue of Look, on the newsstands April 9.

Look feels privileged to announce the names of this fine new team of All America Cities. I am enclosing a set of advance tear sheets of the Look article as I am sure you will be interested to know the basis of the award which has been conferred on another of the communities in your State.

Sincerely yours,

Jane Douglas,
Coordinator of Civic Programs.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS AND RESOLUTIONS OF ARKANSAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the 64th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, which adjourned recently, adopted a number of resolutions which I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate. The first is a house concurrent resolution, offered by Representative Bill Wells of Bradley County, petitioning the Congress to reject the proposed changes in capital gains treatment of timber sales.

A house resolution, offered by Representative C. B. Nance, Jr., of Crittenden County, urged that certain action be taken against foreign lumber imports in order to improve the competitive position of the domestic lumber industry.

A resolution, offered by Representative Ode Maddox of Montgomery County, asked that the Federal Government study the feasibility of providing certain idle Federal land to veterans for homebuilding purposes.

The general assembly also approved a house concurrent resolution, authored by Representative Hugh Hackler, urging the Congress to enact H.R. 2918, a bill introduced by my congressman, James W. Trimble, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to preserve the Wolf House in Baxter County, Ark., as a National Historic Site.

I ask unanimous consent that all of these measures be printed at this point in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolutions and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 30

Resolution petitioning Congress to reject the changes in timber taxation proposed by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon

Whereas capital gains tax treatment of timber under the Internal Revenue Code has been the major factor responsible for the vast progress of Arkansas in forest management and the growth of forest resources during the past half century; and

Whereas the substantial elimination of capital gains treatment for the owners of forest lands would constitute the most severe setback in this generation to the growth of forest products; and

Whereas the jobs of thousands of employees and many hundreds of communities are affected by the forest industries of Arkansas and are jeopardized by the proposed elimination of capital gains treatment of timber: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 64th General Assembly of Arkansas, the Senate concurring therein:

Section 1. The General Assembly of Arkansas hereby petitions the Congress of the United States to defeat and reject the extreme and harmful changes in timber taxation proposed by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on February 6, 1963.

Sec. 2. The secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to each member of the Arkansas congressional delegation, to the President of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon.

House Resolution

Whereas there is no shortage of timber for the production of lumber and related items in the United States; and

Whereas there is a need to increase the cut from overmature forests to prevent excessive loss from decay, disease and other causes; and

Whereas U.S. lumber manufacturing firms pay the highest wages and provide working conditions equal to or better than similar firms in other countries; and

Whereas lumber manufacturing firms in the United States are losing their home markets to foreign firms, especially Canada, due to advantages such as depreciated currency, low stumpage rates, noncompetitive bidding, less costly and restrictive forest practices, lower wage rates, high tariff rates on lumber shipped to Canada, low charter rates for coastal and intercoastal shipping, and cooperative government; and

Whereas, lumber imports from Canada are increasing yearly at an alarming rate and now constitute about one-sixth of the annual consumption of lumber in the United States; and

Whereas unemployment in the lumber industry of the United States is increasing with resultant loss of wages to the workers, loss of taxes and income to taxing bodies and communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 64th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, That the Congress and President of the United States are respectfully petitioned to give immediate attention to, and request action necessary, to place the lumber industry of the United States on an equitable and competitive basis with foreign manufacturers through the use of a quota system or other means, including the requirement that imported lumber be marked to show the country of origin, to the end that domestic manufacturers are not placed at a disadvantage with resultant loss of markets, reduction of employment, loss of taxes and deterioration of communities; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Arkansas delegation to the Congress of the United States.

C. B. Nance, Jr.

House Resolution 3

Whereas the Federal Government has many thousand acres of Federal lands which are lying idle and are not being used in connection with any existing Federal projects; and

Whereas many veterans are of limited means and do not have adequate funds for the purpose of acquiring lands and building a house thereupon for a home; and

Whereas it is believed that idle nonprofit Federal lands should be made available to veterans for the purpose of building homes: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 64th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, That the Arkansas House of Representatives hereby requests the Federal Government to study the feasibility of granting idle nonprofit Federal lands to veterans for the purpose of building homes thereon; and be it further

Resolved, That upon adoption hereof a copy of this resolution shall be furnished, by the chief clerk of the house of representatives, to the U.S. Veterans' Administration in Washington, D.C., and to each member of the Arkansas congressional delegation.

——— Maddox.

House Concurrent Resolution 37

Resolution urging Congress to adopt pending legislation to preserve and designate the Wolf House at Norfolk, Ark., as the "Wolf House National Historic Site"

Whereas Maj. Jacob Wolf, territorial Indian agent of the United States, built a structure of square hewn logs more than 154 years ago on a beautiful site in the town of Norfork, Baxter County, Ark.; and

Whereas this 154-year-old structure still proudly overlooks the confluence of the Northfork and White Rivers and affords one of the most beautiful scenic views of the Ozarks; and

Whereas said building served as the first courthouse in north central Arkansas for many years when the area was a territory prior to 1836 when Arkansas became a State; and

Whereas the earliest histories of north central Arkansas trace back to meetings in this historic building; and

Whereas the Wolf House was a landmark at the northeast corner of the Cherokee Nation before Arkansas was admitted to the Union and said building was the meetingplace for Sam Houston, James Bowie, and other noted figures of territorial days; and

Whereas this historic house is deteriorating and is in need of restoration; and

Whereas Congressman James W. Trimble has introduced legislation, H.R. 2918, in the Congress of the United States to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate for preservation as the "Wolf House National Historic Site" and authorizes appropriation of funds for said purposes; and

Whereas the preservation of this famous historic site is vital and important not only to the residents and people of the great State of Arkansas, but also to people throughout the United States who visit the beautiful Ozarks and fish in the trout-laden, beautiful, crystal clear, cold waters of Northfork and White Rivers in the vicinity of this historic shrine—the Wolf House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 64th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the Senate concurring therein):

Section 1. The General Assembly of Arkansas hereby urges the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of Interior to adopt the legislation authored by Hon. James W. Trimble to designate and preserve as "the Wolf House National Historic Site" at Norfork, Baxter County, Ark., together with such adoining property as the Secretary may determine necessary; and be it further

Resolved, That the State of Arkansas will cooperate in whatever manner possible with the United States to accomplish the establishment of this historic shrine.

Sec. 2. The secretary of state of the State of Arkansas is hereby directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States and to each member of the Arkansas delegation in the U.S. Congress.

Approved March 20, 1963.

THE GROWTH OF FEDERAL POWER

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as my colleagues well know, I have repeatedly expressed my concern over the growth of Federal power. My concern has increased under the present administration because it has seemed to me that with the type of individuals now in charge of the various power agencies, the pace of expanding Federal power at the expense of private enterprise will be greatly increased.

My fears have not been without substantiation. Nevertheless, these individuals I am referring to are operating today with a subtlety and skill unmatched by their predecessors who also wanted to see the Federal Government dominant in the field of power. Because of this skill and subtlety I refer to, it has not always been apparent to the public just exactly how insidiously the growth of Federal power is being promoted today. These officials are guarded in their statements and talk in soothing terms about the need for cooperation, the need for public and private power working together and the need for utilizing all our resources in order to meet the country's power needs. They say, in effect, "we are not out to scuttle private power, we only want to work with them."

Well, Mr. President, I am not one of those who has been fooled by this soothing talk. And I imagine there are still a few others who are also acutely aware of the true nature of this campaign.

I have recently become familiar with a most remarkable document which I want to draw to the attention of my colleagues because in this document the objectives and intent of the administration with respect to Federal power stand clearly revealed. The document I refer to is the brief filed by the Department of Interior before the Federal Power Commission in the case of the High Mountain Sheep Dam on the Snake River in Idaho. In this case a Federal Power Commission Examiner last October 8 recommended the granting of a license to an investor-owned utility, the Pacific Northwest Power Co., for construction of this project. The brief by the Department of Interior takes exception to this action by the Federal Power Commission Examiner on the grounds that this project should be reserved for Federal construction. This brief can be freely summarized on one sentence: Investor-owned companies in the Pacific Northwest no longer have the right to build their own powerplants.

Let me give you a few quotes from this brief.

It states:

> In the past the Federal Columbia River power system has been the basic wholesaler of power in the region. * * * Now in the present case it is proposed that additional wholesalers be brought into the region * * *. These wholesalers propose to sell to customers presently buying Federal power. It is inconceivable that either one of the new wholesale power agencies could be licensed without further reducing the gross and net revenues of Bonneville Power Administration.
>
> If Bonneville Power Administration deficits continue the Federal system will find it increasingly difficult to fulfill its distinctive role of providing an ample power supply at lowest cost and with widespread availability * * *. The overall effect of further deterioration of the position of the Federal power system would ultimately be reflected in the productivity and general economy of the Pacific Northwest.

Later in the brief there are these comments:

> The cardinal principle which governs the operation of an electric power system is that all interconnected generating plants should be operated as if one utility owned the entire system. * * * If all the plants in the system belong to the United States, they can be operated to meet a common objective * * *. Operation of the project primarily for the benefit of its owners would be in inherent conflict with fully integrated system operation. Any further Balkanization of the Pacific Northwest power system will limit the economic growth of the region and decrease beneficial effects of any increment to the system. The disintegration of the system's ownership would hasten the ultimate disintegration of the system itself.

Mr. President, I cannot read into these statements any interpretation other than the one I have cited; namely, in the Pacific Northwest there is no longer room for private enterprise in the power field.

This brief is incredible in many respects. As my colleagues know, the Bonneville Power Administration has been losing money steadily for the last few years and expects to lose a good many million dollars more over the next few years. This Interior Department brief attributes these losses to the fact that the private utilities in the area have had the unmitigated gall to put in their own generating capacity instead of buying it from the Federal Government.

It has long been a favorite argument of the public power supporters to say that the Federal Government must build projects because there is a power shortage in this or that region. It does not matter what facts are produced to disprove this, they just keep saying power shortage over and over again like a cracked record. Well, let me tell you something. The only area of the United States where in recent years there has been a demonstrable power shortage was in the Pacific Northwest, where there is the biggest collection in the country of Federal and public power projects. Private enterprise built some projects that solved the question of the power shortage in that area and now comes the Department of Interior claiming that Bonneville is losing money because the private power companies put in some capacity of their own.

I wonder, Mr. President, if the Department of Interior will ever show the same concern for private companies if they should find themselves losing money because of the competition from subsidized Federal power.

It is no secret that I have opposed the unfair Government competition with our free enterprise system with all of the inequities of below-cost Government financing and freedom from taxation. I have also recognized the trend and danger of an ever-increasing Government role in the electric power business. Of course, I have known that the proponents of Government power have promoted its expansion and I have also known that these same people opposed investor-owned company development of our natural resources, although the benefits of such developments accrue to the public. But, Mr. President, I never thought that the Interior Department would be so bold as to openly state what many of us have known for a long time—that is, their objective is expansion of Federal power to the exclusion of investor-owned development. But here the Interior Department has come out in the open by publicly stating what it has long intended, but publicly denied, and that is that the Government and only the Government should be permitted to expand power production in the Pacific Northwest.

Interior seems to feel that investor-owned development of additional power in the Pacific Northwest is going to jeopardize the financial status of Government developments. The Bonneville Power Administration is selling power, and has been for years, at the cheapest rate of any place in the United States. In fact, its rate is nearly half the rate charged by the Tennessee Valley Authority, which is held up as the outstanding adventure into the realm of socialism. Bonneville is selling power at about $2\frac{3}{10}$ mills per kilowatt hour. In many sections of the country it costs about three times that amount just to produce power with fuel-fired plants. If Bonneville is losing money, and it certainly is, I wonder why the thought of increasing rates above the ridiculously low price it is now charging has never entered the minds of those charged with the responsibility of disposing of Government power in that area.

One thing that is of great concern today, Mr. President, is the utter disregard the Interior Department, under which the Bureau of Reclamation operates, shows toward the reclamation of lands. Oh, they favor the reclamation of lands if such reclamation appears to be a part of expanding the Federal power system, but reclamation is its secondary and not its primary consideration. There is a limit of money available to the West for Federal development and if this money is to be expended on power developments, where is the money for reclamation coming from? Although the revenues from the sale of electric power in the Pacific Northwest were to be used for assistance in financing reclamation developments in that area, if the Bonneville Power Administration is to continue losing money on its power operations, where is the help to reclamation coming from?

One of my great concerns is for the central Arizona project in my native State. We desperately need water for continuing development. It is going to be expensive to bring additional water into Arizona. That we all know. But where is the money coming from for that development if the Interior Department and Bureau are going to continue seeking huge appropriations from the Federal Treasury to construct power projects? The High Mountain Sheep development would cost hundreds of millions of dollars. It is a power project, pure and simple—a power project that investor-owned electric companies are ready to build at no cost to the Federal Government. Construction by the investor-owned companies would provide every advantage to the area that Government construction would provide. Something we seem to forget is that consumers buying power from investor-financed companies are citizens of this country and are entitled to the same privileges as other citizens. If the investor-owned companies can provide an economical source of power, the benefits accrue to their consumers. Are their customers to be put into a second-class-citizen category?

Mr. President, the more I see of Interior's machinations in the electric power field, the more convinced I become that the people responsible for the operation of the Department are determined that the Government, with Interior, of course, playing the leading role, shall dominate the power industry in this country.

Mr. President, if we are willing to take off the blindfolds and look this question straight in the eye, I am sure that others will come to the same conclusion I have and also realize it is time for us to get this question straightened out. If it is the desire of the people of this country to socialize one of our basic industries, let us face the question squarely and not let a handful of bureaucrats lead us blindfolded into a situation that would destroy our free enterprise system.

MANAGED NEWS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, in view of the widespread public interest in the subject of managed news, I wish to bring to the attention of Senators two articles of particular significance.

One appears in the April issue of the Atlantic Monthly. It is entitled "Managed News—Our Peacetime Censorship." The author is the distinguished military analyst of the New York Times, Hanson W. Baldwin.

The other article is by the able analyst and columnist, Roscoe Drummond, which appeared in the Washington Post on March 29, 1963.

I ask unanimous consent that the two articles be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordred to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Atlantic Monthly magazine, April 1963]

Managed News: Our Peacetime Censorship

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

(Note.—"The blatant methods used by the administration and its tampering with the news deserve considerably more criticism and discussion than they have received," says Hanson W. Baldwin, the military analyst for the New York Times. In the article which follows, Mr. Baldwin describes these methods and points out the danger of Government manipulation of the news.)

The problem of reconciling security and freedom is not new to the Kennedy administration. It existed when the Nation was young, and it has troubled every era of our history. But it has become acute only since the end of World War II, when the twin threats of the atomic age and the Communist conspiracy have posed the greatest dangers to national security in our history. There has been, in the last two decades, an inevitable growth of Government secrecy in an age when man has the power to destroy himself and in an era when an aggressive, expansionist communism poses hidden dangers, with its secret subversions, to the body politic. The pressure ever since 1945 has been clearly on the side of more secrecy.

This pressure has been greatly increased by the tremendously strengthened influence in Government of the Federal police power (the FBI and especially the Central Intelligence Agency) and of the "intelligence mentality," which tends to enshrine secrecy as an abstract good. A significant growth in the power of the Presidency and in the size, power, and centralization of the executive branch—checked only slightly during Eisenhower's administration by his concept of a Congress which proposed, a President who disposed—has strengthened the wall of secrecy which has gradually been built around Government.

The trend poses some long-term dangers. James Madison noted in the Virginia Convention of June 16, 1788: "Since the general civilization of mankind, I believe there are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachments of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpation." It is the "gradual and silent encroachments" upon many past concepts of press freedoms that have greatly troubled close observers of the Kennedy administration.

John F. Kennedy, during his first 2 years in office, has proved to be, in his press conferences and rocking chair chats, an articulate, winning, and persuasive President. He and his administration have been extremely sensitive to the public image of the man and the office as mirrored by the press and other public relations media.

Despite this sensitivity (or perhaps because of it), despite the President's highly articulate phrases, there is a major question about the methods employed in the administration's public relations policies, a doubt that the people are really being taken into the confidence of the President to the same degree that they were during World War II and Korea.

This vigorous and cocky young administration has provided the yeast of the New Frontier, which, mixed into the dangerous ferment of our times, has produced, in the opinion of many newsmen, some astonishing examples of news repression and distortion, management and control, and pressures and propaganda.

It should be emphasized that news management is not new with this administration. It has been attempted and sometimes practiced successfully in the past, often with a Madison Avenue flair and heavy overtones of propaganda, by various Presidents, by the individual armed services, and by other executive departments. It can even be argued that some degree of news management may be necessary in the last half of the 20th century, when nuclear weapons and Communist conquests pose unparalleled dangers to democracy. But the Kennedy administration has shown a sensitivity to criticism, a readiness to resent it, and a willingness to use unorthodox methods to meet it that have troubled many people. The elimination of the New York Herald Tribune, leading Republican critic of the New Frontier, from the list of papers subscribed to by the White House was but the surface symptom of a widespread administration attitude. The management and manipulation of news at the source have been publicly defended by a minor administration official who nevertheless was clearly voicing the views of the administration.

THE USE OF THE FBI

What form has this control and management and manipulation taken? The first and most dangerous form has been the freewheeling use of Federal police power to investigate leaks.

FBI agents have been employed in at least half a dozen separate instances in the past 2 years in investigations of the sources of news stories. Investigations of this sort are not new with the Kennedy regime. The Eisenhower administration several times used the Federal sleuths in attempts to detect the sources of stories published by various papers. But Mr. Kennedy has called upon the FBI far more frequently in cases of this sort than any prior President, and the methods used by the FBI in this administration, though sometimes repudiated or apologized for later, have smacked of totalitarianism rather than of democratic government.

Federal agents have visited the homes of reporters and newspaper employees in attempts to question them about their sources. Reporters say they have been shadowed in the corridors of the Pentagon, and many newspapermen, as well as military officers and Government officials, believe their phones have been tapped.

Newsmen who have experienced "the treatment" include some of the most highly respected reporters in Washington, men like Lloyd Norman of Newsweek, a thorough, careful, and discreet veteran of Pentagon coverage; John Richard Frykland, who covers the Pentagon, and Earl Voss, the State Department, for the Washington Evening Star; and many others.

In all these cases the newsmen concerned have told the FBI in effect that their sources were their business. But this has not prevented extensive, intimidating FBI investigations involving checks into the newsmen's contacts, friendships, and associations. These investigations have ranged throughout the Pentagon, the State Department, and other executive branches of Government, and far afield outside Government. And Mr. Kennedy has been the first President to send the FBI into the Pentagon, superseding the services' own investigative and internal security agencies.

FBI agents have questioned civilian officials and commissioned officers of all ranks, from the major junior rank to three- and four-star generals and admirals. The interrogations have been detailed and sometimes hectoring; junior officers have even been threatened with lie detector tests. To men who have devoted a lifetime of loyal service to their country and who, their commissions read, are worthy of "special trust and confidence," such treatment is demeaning and destructive of morale.

The administration says that these investigations are intended solely to plug leaks and to prevent disclosures inimical to the Nation's security, and are not directed in any way against a free press. Nor are they intended, it is claimed, to downgrade the status of the officer corps. Yet the stories which have produced FBI investigations have nearly always dealt with subjects and facts fully known to the Russians and to many others besides; few if any of these stories have harmed the Nation's security. Usually, however, they have been embarrassing to the administration for one reason or another; often newsmen have divulged information before the administration was ready to announce it. In several cases, official ire was aroused because many top-ranking Government officials who by intent or bureaucratic inefficiency had been left in outer darkness first learned the facts from published stories.

Regardless of the avowed intent or ostensible purpose of the FBI investigations, the methods used—visits of agents to the homes of newspaper employees, the chivying and tacit threatening of Government employees and officers, tapping of telephone lines, and shadowing of reporters—have had, as they almost certainly were intended to have, an intimidating and restricting effect. The kind, the amount, and the character of news, particularly military news, available to the public has been reduced.

THE PERSONAL APPROACH

The second method employed in the past 2 years to control or shape the news is the frequent use by high administration officials, including the President himself, of the personal reprimand, request, admonition, complaint, or compliment. The direct approach to working newsmen or to editors or publishers is not, of course, new with this administration, but the frequent participation of the President himself in such approaches is unusual. The President reads widely; quite often he picks up the telephone to chide, complain, or praise a reporter or editor for a story which has irked or pleased him.

The inclusion of correspondents, editors, publishers, and commentators on the President's appointment calendar or the White House guest list is another tacit form (a Washington status symbol) of attempting to influence the news. In this administration such favorites are expecting to be sympathetic, not too critical; otherwise they may be cast, along with the Herald Tribune, into outer darkness.

Some of the President's advisers, particularly the Attorney General, Theodore Sorensen, and Pierre Salinger, are even quicker on the trigger: they frequently complain or cajole; some say they have even tacitly threatened. In one instance, when a Washington newspaper published an editorial which declared that the facts available to it did not entirely agree with the President's public account of the incident, Salinger telephoned an executive of the paper and wanted to know whether the paper was calling the President a liar.

The President, the Attorney General, and others have frequently inveighed to visitors about criticism of the New Frontier, and the President has sometimes utilized Cabinet meetings as a forum for his complaints.

When Charles J. V. Murphy, respected and experienced Washington correspondent for Fortune magazine, published in the September 1961 Fortune a complete and thorough account of the Laotian and Bay of Pigs fiascoes, his article was denounced by the President personally at a press conference. General Maxwell D. Taylor was then sent to New York with a bill of complaints to see Henry Luce. He was politely received, but when he was all through, astonishment was expressed at the picayune nature of the objections. Later, Murphy, a colonel in the Air Force Reserve who for years has had a mobilization assignment in the office of the Air Chief of Staff, found that under pressure the Air Force had been compelled to shift him to a minor post elsewhere.

RESTRICTING THE NEWS

A most important method of controlling and restricting the news is the tremendous centralization of authority that has been effected by this administration. There has been a trend in this direction ever since World War II, but under Kennedy the process of centralizing and restricting authority for releasing news has gone very much further than it has ever gone in the past. Despite the global responsibilities of the Armed Forces and the tremendous size of our Government, an attempt, at least partially successful, has been made to control from Washington the nature, the kind, and even the details of news released in Saigon, Okinawa, Alaska, or Frankfurt. In the Pentagon the discretion and responsibility of the individual services and of the subordinate commands have been so greatly curtailed by restrictions that even the simplest kind of release requires clearance by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, Arthur Sylvester. In the State Department the control is not so tight, but it is nevertheless less flexible than in the past.

Both Departments carry out the public relations policies and also the detailed instructions of the White House. The White House, in respect to news, does not really mean Pierre Salinger, the President's press secretary. Salinger is not one of the inner circle, and the basic policies are established by Sorensen, McGeorge Bundy, the Attorney General, or the President himself. The press and public affairs assistants in this administration have none of the concepts of their predecessors; they do not really represent the public's right to know, nor do they play any major role in the development of public relations policies. They are rather mouthpieces of the administration.

UNDER GUISE OF SECURITY

The Cuban crisis revealed still another means of controlling the flow of news vital to the people. This was achieved quite simply, under the guise of security, by blocking the press from access to the sources of news. Restrictions that exceeded those of World War II or Korea prevented the press, radio, and television from covering the "quarantine," or blockading, fleet or from visiting our beleaguered base at Guantanamo until the immediate crisis ended. Stringent rules were put into effect in the Pentagon and State Department, which funneled all official statements through a Pentagon or State Department spokesman.

In the Pentagon the secretaries of the individual services were bypassed, and Assistant Secretary Sylvester issued an order which required the presence of a third person during any interview with a news media representative, or, alternatively, the filing of a report by the person interviewed, summarizing the subjects discussed and identifying the interviewer. A similar though less drastic rule was applied in the State Department, but after strenuous objections from newspapermen, it has been lifted. As

this is written, the Pentagon rule is still in effect. It has had, and was bound to have (as it was intended to), a restrictive effect upon the kind and character of news emanating from the Pentagon. This simple measure, with its implications of punitive action if someone treads on forbidden ground, has gone a long way toward restricting news to the "Poppa knows best" kind, to stories and data which the Government wants to release.

THE CALCULATED LEAK

Still another tactic used frequently by this administration in its attempts to shape the news and to achieve its ends is the calculated leak, the carefully disseminated canard or half-truth from someone close to the throne. This, too, is not new, but the crudity and the frequency of its use in recent years are exceptional. The account in the Saturday Evening Post by Stewart Alsop and Charles Bartlett which purported to depict the alleged "softness" of Adlai Stevenson during the 1962 Cuban crisis was but the most recent of several such episodes.

All of them had the same earmarks: a favored reporter close to the President was given high-level background information for publication. The publication of this information did not commit the President, but in each instance it certainly weakened the position of the victim; in fact, it cut the ground from under his feet. Chester Bowles was the first to feel this snickersnee between his ribs; later the Joint Chiefs of Staff, collectively, and Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, its chairman, got somewhat less severe treatment. Then it was Stevenson's turn. The beauty of this gambit, the gambit of the calculated leak, is that the President, if he wants to, can disavow the article (he was loyal enough to Bartlett, his old friend, not to do so), but it will do its work nonetheless.

DELIBERATE FALSEHOOD

A corollary to the calculated leak is what might be called the policy of the open door. This was utilized to the maximum after the steel-price-rise controversy, and particularly after the successful termination of the Cuban crisis of 1962. The word is spread by the White House that the administration will be glad to open some doors to favored news media so that the full background story of the days of crisis can be told exclusively in the Blaptown Bugle.

After the October 1962 Cuban crisis, a rash of "now it can be told" stories, each purporting to give the inside story, each claiming an exclusive quality, appeared in the Saturday Evening Post, Time, Life, the Reader's Digest, Look, and a number of daily papers. A few writers were careful to state that this was an administration account, that the full story would have to await history.

This kind of shaping and manipulation of the news—utilizing the lure of inside information, the open door, exclusive interviews, and off-the-record appointments—is old hat to official Washington. But in degree and kind, and particularly in the slanting of the released information to enhance the image of the President, it is unusual in this administration.

There was a time when the word of the Government was its bond; the people could have faith, allowing for mistakes and erroneous interpretations, in what Washington told them. Public confidence has been severely shaken many times since World War II; the U-2 case exposed the dangers of governmental falsehood for all to see.

But the Kennedy administration does not appear to have learned from these past horrible examples. During the Cuban crisis and at other times, the successful restrictions upon news coverage and the centralization of authority for releasing news enabled various Government spokesmen, particularly those in the Pentagon, to withhold or slant at will, or in some cases, without expert advice, to make unintentional mistakes. Only later did some of the public come to realize that a picture had been painted differing from reality.

CUBA: PROPAGANDA VERSUS NEWS

During the Cuban crisis the details of what was going on were limited to brief generalizations from the White House and the reading of terse announcements by a "Pentagon spokesman." The Pentagon did not announce hailing of the first ship passing through the blockade until after it had been announced by a Congressman; the first photographs of the missile sites in Cuba were released in London. Pentagon spokesmen denied, at a time when the facts were in hand, any knowledge of the removal of 42 Soviet missiles from Cuba until it was announced on a television program a day later.

The crisis also produced from a civilian spokesman, unhindered by or disdaining military knowledge, statements which were grossly inaccurate. Some of these restrictions and mistakes can be extenuated on the grounds of crisis. Certainly the Nation's press, as it showed at the time of crisis, willingly withheld detailed news of military movements until the crisis had ended. But many of the news restrictions and much of the news management imposed by the Kennedy administration as ostensibly temporary measures remain in effect. Few Americans realize that Cuba is far stronger militarily than it was prior to the crisis; that there are still thousands of Soviet troops on the island, hundreds of tanks, scores of jet fighters, and many of the latest type of ground-to-air missiles. Castro and the Russians know the details of Russian military strength on Cuba; some of our allies know them; but for many weeks the American people were kept in darkness.

In other words, an aura of propaganda has surrounded the Government's public presentation of the Cuban situation since the beginning. The major political and psychological victory achieved by the Kennedy administration in its dramatic confrontation with Premier Khrushchev has not been balanced by a calm assessment of the negative aspects: the greatly increased military strength of the Communist-Castro regime; the possibility, even the probability, that some long-range missiles are still concealed in Cuba; the likelihood that Cuba, like the albatross in "The Ancient Mariner," will hang around the neck of U.S. foreign policy for an indefinite future.

CANCELLATION OF SKYBOLT

The Skybolt missile issue provided another example of distorted news handling. To hear Pentagon spokesmen talk one would gather, inaccurately, that the Skybolt development program was far behind schedule, that all of its initial tests had failed, that it was a technical dud. There was no reference to the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff favored continued development of the missile, that an air-launched ballistic missile coupled with a nuclear-powered aircraft and a navigational satellite to help fix the launching plane's exact position in space offered a growth potential of tremendous importance for the future, and that the missile's development program was approximately on schedule.

The cancellation of the Skybolt could be fairly defended and explained on a cost basis; it presented an addition to the Nation's nuclear-delivery armory, an armory that was already extensive and that had the capability of overkilling Soviet Russia many times. But the adverse political effects in Britain were discounted, and the strategic advantages and technical capabilities of the Skybolt were deliberately downgraded. The result was a distorted picture as far as official Government statements were concerned.

INFORMATION IS POWER

What does all this add up to? Is it merely, as some editors have maintained, the gripings of a lazy press, too slothful to penetrate the bureaucratic maze in Washington, too conscious of the newspaper's privileged place in American life, unaware of its own irresponsibility? Is it simply another chapter in the conflict between the President and the press?

This question is best answered in the words of Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. Mr. Sylvester executes policy; he does not set it. But his actions and his words are never lightly chosen; they represent administration and White House policy. If they did not, Mr. Sylvester would long ago have been sacrificed, as others in the Pentagon and elsewhere have been.

Mr. Sylvester has twice discussed publicly, once in an interview and once in a speech, his (the Government's) concept of the role of a free press in a democracy. He told the Associated Press some months ago that "news generated by the action of the Government as to content and timing are part of the arsenal of weaponry that a President has." He defended the Government's management, control and restriction of the flow of the news so that a free press might speak "in one voice to your adversary." Later, in a speech to the New York Chapter of the Sigma Delta Chi journalism fraternity, Mr. Sylvester declared, "It is the Government's inherent right to lie if necessary to save itself when faced with nuclear disaster; this is basic." He added that the Defense Department would continue to use news to further the aims of American foreign policy, because "information is power." This is strange language from a man with more than 20 years of newspaper experience, 16 years of it in Washington, D.C.

There are many familiar and foreboding nuances in Mr. Sylvester's phrases. They are a direct reflection of the "intelligence mentality," which has steadily increased in influence in Washington since the war, and which also holds that information is power and must therefore be hedged around with secrecy and safeguards.

His reference to news as a weapon echoes some of the old debates that heralded the permanent establishment as an arm of Government of the Voice of America and the U.S. Information Agency. The press expressed fears then that the participation of Government in the dissemination of news to foreign countries might well become, as indeed it was bound to become, the use of news to further American foreign policy; that is, the management, control, and direction of the news toward a specific purpose, the propaganda or the slant which a free press rightly fears. This same concept, then viewed as a support for our foreign policy, but for oversea export only, has now been, in Mr. Sylvester's words, applied to the domestic regulation of the news.

THE DANGERS OF SECRECY

What are the dangers and the adverse effects of such management, restriction, and manipulation of the news? One of them is internal. The mania for secrecy often prevents the right hand of government from knowing what the left hand is doing. The dissemination of information on a so-called "need to know" basis has led to the compartmentalization of facts and background, with consequent increased expense, loss of time, and sometimes inchoate government actions, which have cost us dearly. Undue secrecy not only makes for inefficient government; it protects inefficiency and hides corruption.

The second result is the adverse effect upon the morale of government employees and the armed services and their relatives. News about their doings, even though carefully sieved when necessary so as to reveal no vital information to a potential enemy, is not only conducive to morale, but it represents a right of the American people, whose sons are doing the fighting and sometimes the dying.

A corollary danger is that many of the carefully built-up channels of cooperation between press and Government established during and since World War II by careful selection and training of Government information officers are tending to break down. The concepts, finally established in World War II despite the objections and suspicions of the old order, that the "press is on our side, too," and that "honesty is the best policy" have been taught to successive generations of commanding officers, officials, and public information officers at service and civilian schools ever since the war. Recent governmental policies make a mockery of these tried and tested principles, and the centralization of authority, the close control over the release of news make many public information officers of great capability errand boys, parrots of administration mouthpieces.

The fundamental case against the kind of news management, restriction, control, and censorship which has been practiced recently is, quite simply, that it impairs the constitutional rights of a free press and hence poses a potential danger to our form of democratic and representative government. No people can be really free if its press is spoon-fed with government pap or if the news which provides a democracy with the rationale for its actions is so controlled, restricted, managed, or censored that it cannot be published.

The blatant methods used by the administration and its tampering with the news deserve considerably more criticism and discussion than they have received.

Representative JOHN E. MOSS, of California, Democratic chairman of a special House Subcommitee on Government Information, who has been one of the critics, pointed out, quite correctly, that the Nation's press should lead the discussion. He viewed with some concern the restrictions imposed on the press on the coverage of underground nuclear tests in Nevada, secrecy about military space activities, a blackout of information about Soviet satellite efforts, and the manner and method of applying various news guidelines suggested by the administration during the Cuban crisis. "We have in the past few weeks," Mr. Moss said in late November, "experienced a degree of Government news management which is unique in peacetime."

Three newspaper organizations—the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the American Newspaper Publishers Association, and the National Editorial Association—have discussed the Government's restrictions and have warned against possible consequences: "We are concerned lest Government * * * look upon news of what the Government is doing, not as an honest report of what happened, but as a means to some desired end." The Nation will suffer "if it departs from its own tradition to imitate a totalitarian enemy, by regarding news not as news but as a weapon or other instrument of national policy."

The services and the technical press, which are familiar in detail with many of the military subjects that have been surrounded by a paper curtain in the Pentagon, have been particularly outspoken in their criticism. Their basic point is that the Government has withheld and is still withholding from the American people large amounts of pertinent information about which the Russian Government is fully informerd.

THE OBLIGATION OF THE PRESS

Is the press free from blame? Of course not. Too large a section of it, seduced by the friendship of the political high-and-mighty in Washington, by the blandishments of power or fame, or by the hope of scoops, color the news or pull their punches. Others, slothful by nature, have accepted the ease of the Government handout. And there are the reckless and irresponsible, who rush into print without first weighing the consequences of what they write in the balance of the national interest and on the scales of history. Yet none of these evils can be cured, save at a far greater cost, by restricting, managing, or controlling the news.

If we are to have a free press in a democracy, there are bound to be leaks; in fact, it is imperative that enterprising reporters continue to break through the wall of secrecy around government. When no leaks occur, I shall really begin to worry.

The fundamental obligation of a free press is to serve as a monitor of government. It must owe nothing, save fairness and truthfulness, to any administration. Its ultimate loyalty must not be to any government or any party in or out of office, but to the Nation, to the greatest good of the greatest number. In turn, the Government must recognize this higher loyalty and obligation and must understand that the American press has as great a stake in the welfare of the country and its security as the administration and that its responsibility for informing, for monitoring, for criticizing is paramount.

This does not mean, of course, that freedom is license. Time after time, in instance after instance, every responsible newspaper has withheld, temporarily or permanently, information that in its judgment would be inimical, if published, to the best interests of the Nation. But time after time newspapers have printed information that to the Pentagon or the State Department is classified. And sometimes the press has been wrong in its judgments.

Generalization about this issue is not possible. Each case has to be judged on its merits and the pros and cons weighed on the scales of the national interest. During World War II many of my articles were picked up by enemy propagandists and broadcast back to the United States or its fighting men in partial or distorted form. But critical articles which described the poor management and inefficiency of some of our replacement depots in Italy, the inadequacy of our tanks, and the perilous situation in the South Pacific during the early phases of the Guadalcanal campaign produced remedial action.

It can be argued, with some cogency, that things have changed since World War II and that in a world where nuclear suicide is possible, all information must be safeguarded. It is true that irresponsibility, sensationalism, and occasionally real breaches of security—all of them evils of a free press—may cause disproportionate damage in the atomic age. Yet it is also true that undue secrecy can pose greater perils.

Responsible newspapermen, for instance, will avoid, unless the Government approves it, the publication of detailed technical specifications of a new weapon, new radar, or other militarily useful devices if their publication would enable a potential enemy to crib from our developments. Yet even in such cases no clear line can be drawn in this scientific age, for scientific freedom and scientific development imply the free publication and exchange of virtually all scientific data. Normally, unless there are other counterbalancing considerations, the responsible reporter will avoid printing intelligence data with such exactitude and detail as to pinpoint the source of the information, unless that source is already known to a potential enemy or can be easily deduced. Similarly, commonsense requires the withholding—in areas of combat, like South Vietnam—of news of planned military operations before they actually occur. The responsible newspaperman may also withhold, in delicate and critical situations, detailed discussions of contingency plans or the exact status of secret negotiations.

To decide whether to print or not to print is never easy, for there is no general guideline save the common good. In the age of megaton bombs, secret intelligence apparatus, and Communist plots there is clearly an ill-defined no-man's-land, a fuzzy boundary between what is and is not fit to print. The Government, like the press, is bound to grope through the fog of insecurity in this technological age; both are bound to make mistakes. It is not the isolated mistake but the pattern of attempted news management and control in the first 2 years of the Kennedy administration that is cause for concern.

There are two rules that can serve the Nation well. The first is that honesty, as full and complete as possible, is in the long run the best policy for governments as well as individuals. The second is that the artificial curbs and restrictions, the tacit censorship over the news that have existed should be removed. Contracts, official and unofficial, formal and informal, between government and press at all levels should be encouraged, not monitored or discouraged or limited.

If the ultimate power is to continue to rest in the people, the people's need to know must be filled by the press. Except in the case of formal military censorship in time of war, the press itself, with that great diversity of judgment which is the salvation of democracy, must decide what it will publish. Otherwise, its freedom, and ultimately the freedom of us all, is a mockery. Needless to say, this judgment should always be exercised—most of all in the atomic age—with a great sense of responsibility and dedication to the common good. News is not a commodity, but an inherent democratic right and a public trust.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 29, 1963]

DEFENSE VERSUS POLITICS: WHAT MCNAMARA COULD DO

(By Roscoe Drummond)

When the Federal Government takes $60 billion a year from the pockets of the American taxpayers for defense and space, it is imperative that the country and the Congress accept the integrity of the decisions which are being made as to how and where that money is being spent.

If there is any one arm of the Government, more than any other, which has to be as pure as Caesar's wife, above the very suspicion of scandal, free from politics, free from the appearance of politics, free from the smell of politics, it is the Department of Defense.

The long line of distinguished Secretaries of Defense—from James Forrestal, Robert Lovett, Gen. George Marshall to Neil McElroy, Thomas Gates, and Robert McNamara—shows that it is the intention that it should be this way.

There is no doubt in my mind that Secretary McNamara and his chief deputy, Roswell Gilpatric, are exercising objective and businesslike judgment in awarding the vast defense contracts regardless of who gets hurt or who get helped.

But are there no valid suspicions, no circumstances which at times suggest that politics, favoritism, and influence are busily at work?

There are such suspicions, there are such circumstances, and they can well reach a point where they will erode confidence in the integrity of the Defense Department's decision-making.

Secretary McNamara is himself partly to blame.

How can the Defense Department expect to persuade the country that it is not influenced by politics in letting contracts when it participates in the pernicious practice of giving advance information, mostly to Democratic Members of Congress, so that they can announce the contracts affecting their States and thus calculatedly create the impression that their political influence brought these Government contracts to their constituents?

There is every reason to count McNamara as a man of integrity as well as large ability. But he is recklessly throwing away some of the trust in his integrity by tolerating a practice which deliberately spreads the very impression he is most seeking to avoid.

Senator EDWARD KENNEDY in Massachusetts and Gov. Edmund Brown in California are not the only Democrats who campaigned last fall on the promise that, with their party in power in Washington, they could do more for their States.

President Kennedy himself set the pattern. In West Virginia, urging the reelection of a Democratic Congressman, the President noted that the State was getting four times as much defense money as it was in 1960. In Pennsylvania, he stressed that prime-contract awards were up 50 percent and appealed for the election of Democratic gubernatorial candidate Richardson Dilworth so that this collaboration could continue.

Neither Mr. Kennedy nor other Democrats have any patent on this noxious practice of feeding advance news of defense contracts to politicians so they can use the information to misinform their constituents of how influential they are. It was done during the Eisenhower administration. It is one of the longstanding vices of Government.

But it's bad—and getting worse. If Secretary McNamara and others, who have the most say in awarding billions of dollars every year to Government contractors, do not put an end to it, they are going to erode the confidence in their integrity which is their most precious possession.

They simply can't preserve the substance of nonpolitical decisionmaking when they allow it to be poisoned by the appearance of political decisionmaking.

The President may be reluctant. The politicians will be annoyed. The most political minded in the White House will probably be furious. But McNamara could say, This must end—and get away with it. He needs to do so, I believe, if he is to escape a gathering and miasmic mess.

TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce another major convert to the cause of truth in lending, the bill which 20 members of the Senate have sponsored to require the full disclosure to consumers of the costs of personal credit.

On Friday, March 22 the American Banker, the leading trade newspaper for the commercial banking and finance industry, published an excellent article by their Washington editor strongly supporting the truth in lending bill.

Moreover, the American Banker article ably refutes the objections that the American Bankers Association has raised against the truth in lending bill. I certainly hope that this editorial foreshadows a reversal of the American Bankers Association's present opposition to the truth in lending bill. I know that the editorial in the American Banker newspaper reflects the sentiments of the many individual bankers who have privately expressed their support for this bill to me, and I now hope that the American Bankers Association will join the other leaders in the consumer lending industry—credit unions, mutual savings banks, and savings and loan associations—in supporting our efforts to enact the truth-in-lending bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the American Banker article be printed immediately folllowing my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Banker, Mar. 22, 1963]

TODAY: HONEST CREDIT DOLLAR—THE CASE FOR DISCLOSURE

(By Raoul D. Edwards)

WASHINGTON.—Through the ages, the question of interest has occupied a great part in the minds of men. Credit is a commodity—although the early Christians considered it, instead, an evil—and in most eras and ethics, within most ethical frameworks, credit has been considered to have its rightful place.

What that price should be has been debatable. In the earlier years of the industrial revolution, however, there gradually revolved a business oriented feeling that 6 percent was a normal justifiable rate for the then-standard business loan. of short-term orientation. There have been—and still are—times and places where rates go much higher. But in this country, at least 6 percent has become the effective, and in many cases the legal, ceiling.

This, however, came about during a period when the average man did not use credit, when the installment loan was unheard of. As newer types of loan came to the fore, it was discovered by lenders that the added risks and added work involved in such loans demanded higher rates.

Because of the belief that 6 percent was the justifiable maximum, lenders were forced to express new concepts in interest. The discount and add-on, revolving credit, and other types of interest expression have grown more dominant in recent years.

This, of course, creates problems. Many new users of credit are not sophisticated; they will not take the hard look at rates which the businessman will, and they are not able to solve the complex methods of interest rate expression that are current in much of the lending activity of the Nation. In some instances, these new users of credit are being imposed upon, especially on the retail level.

Taking a long, hard, second look at the "truth in lending" proposal of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, we are inclined to believe that this measure not only makes sense, but is in the interest of the commercial banking industry and the public.

Those who know that we support the dual banking system, and the careful system of checks and balances which comprises this Nation's safeguard against too-rigid or too-domineering controls of the National Government, may feel that this is a departure from the concept of States rights and thoughtful decentralization of controls.

Were the States doing the job Senator DOUGLAS intends his bill to do, we might go along with this; but the States are not doing that particular job, and we are inclined to think that Senator DOUGLAS is right in insisting the job must be done.

There is no valid reason for maintaining that a borrower should not have an accurate and understandable outline of what credit is costing him. Credit—the use of money—in a sense is a product, and today, when banks and other lenders are actively competing for customers who are relatively unsophisticated, it is proper that the person buying the use of money should know what it costs him.

Banks in general do a much better job of informing people as to these costs than do most lenders. Banks, at least, supply the borrower with the dollar amount of the interest charged, and they supply a rate accurate on the original balance.

But many other lenders not only present exceedingly complicated rate structures, but in many cases hid substantial portions of the interest costs in various types of charges. Furthermore, there are some credit sellers, notably in retail stores, who never give a breakdown as to what constitutes the cost of an item, and what constitutes the cost of credit.

Anyone who carefully hid, or refused to disclose, the cost of a product, would wind up going out of business. Why, then, should credit be any different?

The charge is leveled that the Douglas proposal, if approved, would create a new and vast OPA-style Federal supervisory body. Not so. The bill assigns to the Federal Reserve Board the task of writing regulations governing accurate reporting of interest, and delineation of guidelines. But the bill does not set up any machinery to administer, supervise, examine, or control. It specifically holds that the only recourse will be by action brought by an individual borrower in civil action in the courts.

The charge is further leveled that there will be a large expense to business, and to banking. Actually, most banks are geared to do this already. They, in most cases, do provide the actual interest figure, and rate books are in existence which would enable a bank to supply the average interest cost on the average unpaid balance, for any installment note. The same in large part is true of other lenders.

With regard to this, banks will be under far less pressure to change than will retail lenders, auto firms, and the like, many of which supply no adequate information of any sort. "Costs so much a month"—what part of what is the cost of money and what is the cost for the car?

There have been charges that this bill will prove inflexible and harmful to some industries. Yet the bill specifically gives the Fed the flexibility to write regulations which will fit each industry as regulated, and which will allow for unusual situations. It is not a rigid approach.

Finally we come to the States rights objection. In only one State is any specific requirement that true costs be disclosed part of the law; that is Wisconsin. Many States have excellent laws now, laws which protect the borrower. But these laws do not provide for any way in which unsophisticated borrowers—which is to say, the vast majority of borrowers—will be able to compare credit costs or even accurately know what they are.

And the bill, as written specifically disclaims any intent to change any law; it specifically states that neither a creditor nor a borrower may escape State law or responsibilities under a contract because of this law, with the sole exception that the creditor is subject to penalties if he is shown to have failed to disclose, accurately and fully, costs of credit. A civil court so holds.

The bill seems a good one, if it remains as written, with a valid objective, and without any features which will create any damage to the banking industry or to any honest grantor of credit. Indeed, to commercial banking, the bill might prove to have a positive advantage, since, as Senator DOUGLAS points out, bank rates compare quite favorably with those of most other lenders. Bankers know this now, but as rates are skillfully hidden today, the general public does not. Under full disclosure, the general public could not help but find this out, and banks all over the country could carry out to a greater degree their objective of "full service" banking to their communities.

TRAVELING ART EXHIBIT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, last spring, working closely with Mr. John Walker, Director of the National Gallery of Art, I undertook an experiment in Rhode Island of bringing great art to our people. Because it has proved a very real success, I strongly recommend that a similar program be started on a nationwide basis.

Mr. Walker and Mr. Grose Evans, curator of the Index of American Design, prepared for me a collection of 16 collotype reproductions of great Renaissance paintings. These were shipped to Rhode Island where I arranged to have them exhibited in 19 city and town halls throughout the State for a period of 2 weeks each. They were deliberately scheduled in the city and town halls, because my purpose was not so much to attract art lovers to yet another exhibition, as it was to bring great art to the attention of thousands who might not otherwise make the effort to see it. I am happy to say that both of these purposes seem to have been accomplished.

On June 7, 1962, the traveling exhibition had its first opening in the city hall in Providence. There was broad press and television coverage which led to a large degree of popular interest. Since that day, the exhibit has traveled to 18 other cities and towns and I am proud to say has met with enthusiastic approval in virtually every community. I have received numerous telephone calls and letters praising the exhibit, both from public officials and from interested citizens. Many expressed the desire to purchase similar reproductions. Although it is of course difficult to pinpoint the exact number of people who viewed the exhibition, our unofficial estimate is upward of 15,000. To my mind, these facts serve as adequate testimony that the cause of art appreciation has been enriched. It is for this reason that I should like to see similar exhibitions inaugurated throughout the country.

There were naturally minor difficulties attendant upon a new program of this type. These have been called to the attention of the National Gallery, and I have been assured that they can be easily solved. The only problem that I would foresee in a national scheduling would be one of logistics. In my State, the paintings were driven from town hall to town hall in a station wagon. I can understand that the distinguished Senators from California or Illinois might have difficulty with this mode of transportation. But I am certain that some other financially reasonable method of transportation can be arranged in these larger States.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to Mr. Walker and Mr. Evans whose wholehearted cooperation was vital to the success of Operation Traveling Art. I think that together we have rendered benefit to many citizens in Rhode Island. I believe it would be to the cultural and esthetic interest of the United States to render this benefit to all our citizens.

Following is the list of paintings included in the traveling exhibition in Rhode Island: Bellini, "Madonna and Child in a Landscape"; Botticelli, "The Adoration of the Magi"; Agnolo Bronzino, "A Young Woman and Her Little Boy"; Duccio Di Buoninsegoa, "The Calling of the Apostles"; Giovanni Battista Tiepolo, "Madonna of the Goldfinch", and "Apollo Pursuing Daphne"; Giorgione, "Adoration of the Shepherds"; Francesco Guardi, "View on the Cannaregio, Venice"; Pietro Perugino, "Crucifixion With Saints"; Ralphael, "Alba Madonna," "Saint George and the Dragon," and "The Small Cowper Madonna"; Canaletto, "Venice," "The Quay of the Piazetta," and "The Square of St. Mark's"; Ercole Roberti, "Giovanni II and Ginevera Bentivoglio"; Tintoretto, "Christ at the Sea of Galilee."

The following schedule was in effect: June 7–18, Providence City Hall; Pawtucket City Hall, June 20–July 3; Burnside Memorial Building, Bristol, July 6–20; Barrington Town Hall July 23–August 3; Westerly Town Council Chamber, August 6–20; Narragansett Library, August 22–September 5; Newport City Hall, September 7–21; Coventry Town House, September 24–October 8; East Greenwich Library, October 10–24; Warwick City Hall, October 26–November 9; West Warwick Town Tall, November 13–27; Johnston Town Hall, November 29–December 13; Scituate Town Hall, December 17–31; Cranston City Hall, January 3–17; East Providence City Hall, January 21–February 4; Central Falls City Hall, February 6–20; Cumberland Town Hall, February 23–March 8; Woonsocket City Hall, March 11–March 25; Cranston City Hall, March 27–April 10.

WILL CLAYTON, FORMER ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE, WINS BROTHERHOOD AWARD

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Houston, Tex., chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews has presented a brotherhood award to a distinguished American, Mr. W. L. Clayton.

Mr. Clayton, statesman, philanthropist, former public servant as Under Secretary of State, and a cofounder of Anderson, Clayton & Co., the subject of a fine biography, the chief architect of the Marshall plan, now has a prized interfaith award to add to his long list of honors.

I ask unanimous consent that the following news articles concerning the latest honor to come to Mr. Clayton be placed in the RECORD: An article entitled "Will Clayton Gets Interfaith Award," published in the Houston Post of March 15, 1963; and an article entitled "Clayton Receives Plaque at Brotherhood Gathering," published in the Houston Chronicle of March 15, 1963:

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston Chronicle, Mar. 15, 1963]

CLAYTON RECEIVES PLAQUE AT BROTHERHOOD GATHERING

(By Nelson Antosh)

William L. Clayton, an 83-year-old Houstonian who has long studied problems of the world and man, was honored Thursday night for his contributions to interfaith understanding.

District Judge Wilmer Hunt, a Catholic, presented a plaque to Clayton, a Protestant, before 850 persons attending the 14th annual Brotherhood Award dinner of the Houston Chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in the Shamrock Hilton Hotel.

The Houston chapter meets annually to honor Houstonians for their work in bringing people of different religions together.

"We pay tribute tonight to a man who has risen from the genteel poverty of a Mississippi cotton farm to the opulence of an international merchant, a man whose public life extends from a deputy court clerk to Under Secretary of State, and a man whose capacity for work brought him from a court reporter at 15 to the strong, fit, much-traveled world leader at 83 that he is today," Hunt said.

"Houston has been no stranger to his benevolence," Hunt added. He cited Clayton's work for churches, educational institutions, cultural societies, hospitals, and slum clearance.

"He has a real and continuing part in the great drama of our time," Hunt said. The plaque cited "distinguished service in the field of human relations."

Brooks Hays, former Arkansas Congressman and now special assistant to President Kennedy, was the guest speaker.

"Clayton is unique in that he symbolizes the concern for both sound domestic and international movements," Hays said.

He also said there "ought to be a wall between church and state. But a free commerce of ideas must be maintained across that wall.

"If we are to fulfill the hopes of the world, we must first fulfill our own faith," Hays said.

Clayton, of 5300 Caroline, is board chairman and a cofounder of Anderson, Clayton & Co., world's largest cotton merchandising firm.

He was Assistant Secretary of Commerce from 1942-44, Assistant Secretary of State in 1944–45 and Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs in 1945–47. Clayton has also served the Government in a number of advisory capacities.

He is a member of the Common Market Committee of the Atlantic Institute and the National Export Expansion Council by appointment of President Kennedy.

Houston oilman, R. E. (Bob) Smith, Chevy Chase, was banquet chairman.

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 15, 1963]

WILL CLAYTON GETS INTERFAITH AWARD

(By Bill Barron)

W. L. Clayton, the Mississippi farmboy who became an international merchant, received the Houston Chapter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews' 14th annual Brotherhood Award Thursday night "for distinguished service in the field of human relations."

About 850 people gathered in the Emerald Room of the Shamrock Hilton for an interfaith dinner to pay tribute to the 83-year-old Houstonian, who is former Under Secretary of State and cofounder of Anderson, Clayton & Co., the world's largest merchandising firm.

"He has a real and continuing part in the great drama of our time," said District Judge Wilmer Hunt who presented the award to Clayton.

Judge Hunt said Clayton "has preached what is so difficult for us to understand—that our safe ways of life are in danger in a world which is capsuled both in time and space and where continued peace the world over is not possible unless every part of the world enjoys to a significant degree the benefits of its civilization and a share of its bounty."

The award is given annually by chapters of National Conference of Christians and Jews, which was founded in 1928 to promote understanding and cooperation among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews.

Judge Hunt introduced Clayton, who received a long, standing ovation from those attending the dinner.

"There is much that is wrong in the world, and obviously perfect brotherhood, which means the elimination of all bigotry from the minds and hearts of men, is far in the future, but I believe we are on our way," Clayton said in accepting the award.

"I do not have to go back so far as my boyhood days to realize the great transformation which has come into the minds and hearts of the American people in this matter of brotherhood," he said.

He said the election of a Catholic President was evidence of this.

R. E. (Bob) Smith, Houston oilman, presided as program chairman at the dinner and Brooks Hays, special assistant to President Kennedy, was the guest speaker.

Hays, who is former president of the Southern Baptist Convention and a former Arkansas Congressman, told the group that "there must be openings in the wall of separation of church and State" to allow for more understanding.

"We must work hard," Hays said, "to see that minorities, racial and religious, feel at home."

He called Clayton "a great internationalist" and a symbol of the concern of leadership on international as well as domestic stability.

Clayton, a member of the Common Market Committee of the Atlantic Institute, was appointed to the National Export Expansion Council last year by President Kennedy.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION DOES FINE WORK IN TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have been asked to have printed in the RECORD an address which I delivered at Malakoff, in Henderson County, Tex., last Saturday, March 30, at the Texas Clay Tile Co. dedication.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD to show the great achievements of the Area Redevelopment Administration in one section of our country.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION BUILDS NEW HOPE AND NEW JOBS

(Speech by U.S. Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH at the dedication ceremony of Texas Clay Tile, Inc., in Malakoff, Henderson County, at 10 a.m., Saturday, March 30, 1931)

Chairman Hawn, fellow Texans, fellow Henderson Countians, fellow Americans, friends, and neighbors, it is a great privilege to me to come back to my ancestral home county for this dedication of and to progress. In this county, I was born and reared and lived and voted until I was 24 years of age. These were the formative years of my life.

In participating in this dedication ceremony for this great industrial project here at Malakoff in Henderson County, I rejoice with you that my home county has trained its vision to the future. It is looking forward, not backward, in the determination of you people to grow with our State and Nation, in the mainstream of American life.

During the hearings in the 87th Congress on Senate bill 1, the principal author being that great Senator PAUL DOUGLAS from Illinois, and which I cosponsored and which created the Area Redevelopment Administration, I predicted that this bill would be one of the soundest examples of congressional action of recent times. Now, a little over a year and a half later, the fantastic ARA program in Texas proves the soundness of that earlier prediction. And this has happened in spite of the strongly organized opposition to the program. I can recall the organized opposition which called on many local chambers of commerce, urging every town and hamlet to stay away from that awful Federal program.

Coached hecklers directed out of Washington and New York, crawled into public meetings in east Texas in 1961 and 1962, to read prepared propaganda in the form of questions, which the opponents of A.R.A. hoped would embarrass the speakers who were attempting to tell the community leaders what tools the Federal Government had finally—under the Kennedy administration—made available to them, so that they could improve their economy and provide jobs for the thousands of unemployed and underemployed in east Texas. You will also recall the critical and violent editorials of one segment of the Texas press, fighting this beneficial law and its implementation.

It was during this struggle to get A.R.A. going in our State that I requested the Coordinator for Texas, Mr. Raymond C. Morrison, to meet me in my Austin office. He came late one night. It so happened that there was a small group even in Henderson County, my own home county, trying desperately to block the sincere efforts of our friends to make use of this Federal program.

Many here in Henderson County will remember that I called them at night between 10 o'clock and midnight, to tell them what was going on—that a small but powerful economic group was trying to take this great benefit away from them by organization and propaganda, and that unless east Texans got up and took an interest in the real development of their area, they would miss the best opportunity they had ever had to forge ahead economically through the establishment of new industries.

And these friends of mine did act—they crowded the courthouse at Athens at a later meeting and demanded that an organization be created to prepare an overall economic development plan for their county, our county. This county gave me my opportunity in life; I want to see it possible for it to offer opportunities to many other boys and girls, young men and women.

This new modern Texas Clay Tile plant is an example of area redevelopment in action. Built with a Federal loan of $422,500, a participating bank loan of a little over $100,000 by the National Bank of Commerce of Dallas, Tex., and with the rest of the funds raised here locally at Malakoff, to make up this $650,000 project, this new completed plant we dedicate today will give steady work to 60 more men. Much credit is due Dan Royall, Jr., and E. H. Gatlin, Jr., for their leadership in pushing all of this to completion.

Had they failed and had many others failed, there would be no modern $650,000 brick and tile plant in Malakoff—the finest in the world. And there would not be new jobs for more citizens of this area. There would be no expansion to the Norman Pottery Co. at Athens—there would be no synthetic marble plant and no southwest design office furniture plant in Jacksonville—no east Texas mineral survey by the bureau of economic geology of the University of Texas—no industrial park in Clarksville—no pickle plant in Detroit, Tex.—no Caddo Lake project which is destined to open up a whole new worldwide industry by making cattle feed and fertilizer out of algae that had gotten so thick the fishermen stopped fishing in what was once the most popular fishing spot in Texas. And had we not won the battle, there would be no possibility of an $11 million tire plant in Texarkana—no possibility of a $20 million steel plant in Cherokee County—or a $30 million Texas newsprint plant in Jasper County.

These are but a few of the great industries planning to come into east Texas. Some of the recently approved industrial projects, and many more being considered, will revolutionize traditional products. For example, the audioelectronics plant under construction at Crockett, Tex., will manufacture a training instrument that will enable common labor to perform semiskilled jobs. A new plant planning to move to Mount Vernon will revolutionize the old air-conditioning methods. The ARA pipeline is now full and within the near future new plants will spring up all over the designated areas of our State, east Texas, and the Rio Grande section.

One of the great leaders of east Texas is Arthur Temple, of Diboll, president of Southern Pine Lumber Co., who has said: "Those who want to sit or do nothing—get out of the way of the rest, as we are on the move. The way some of you talk, you would think our Government was controlled by the Russians." And so now the Temple interests are on the move with many new industries presently on the drawing board.

Fellow Texans, we are witnessing the industrial rebirth of east Texas, and the many other designated ARA areas. This is truly the renaissance of east Texas. I have said that ARA is the Magna Carta of the small town and this I believe you agree is true. I do not need to tell you that this vast area of east Texas has lost around 100,000 good citizens during the last 10 years. That is 10,000 people a year. Where did they go? They went to Dallas, Houston, or Beaumont, or other Texas cities. A few left the State, but for the most part, these former neighbors of yours added to the congestion of Texas cities, mainly Dallas and Houston.

My friends, the big towns have gotten bigger and the small towns have gotten smaller with resultant serious problems at both ends. No one has yet solved the problems of bumper-to-bumper traffic and juvenile delinquency—so common in our big urban centers. While this has been going on, the smaller towns and rural areas have witnessed the tragedy of no jobs and outmigration, boarded-up schools, closed churches, vacant stores and with it all despair and hopelessness. Look about you today. There is a different picture. There is hope and optimism with new job-creating industries. And this has happened in the short span of a little over a year and a half. This Malakoff area is in the middle of an Athens-to-Trinidad area that is growing in one industrial complex from the Trinity River to the heart of the county.

In my opinion, there is no more beautiful section of the United States than east Texas and every bit of it is accessible by some of the finest highways in the world. Soon there will be three magnificent new lakes built within some of the finest forests in the world; 600,000 acres of these timbered lands are within our well run national forests in Texas.

It is my conservative opinion that these forests and lakes, McGee Bend, Toledo Bend, and Livingston, will attract millions of tourists a year. Nearly 90 million tourists visited the national parks last year. It is because of this that ARA has approved a $700,000 motor hotel for Woodville and a $500,000 motel for Naples. These are being built with local community stock sales, bank loans, and a loan from ARA. The East Texas Tourist Association is organized to promote east Texas and the increase in tourism will demand more and more facilities of all sorts.

There will be magnificent resort hotels on these new lakes. These will contribute greatly to the economic uplift of all the counties. New and expanded cultural activities in the field of music, arts and crafts, sports and drama, will develop and these will bring thousands from the big cities to this playground of the Southwest. The balance of trade will be more favorable to east Texas.

For decades Henderson County has been building its own lakes, until we can now call our own home county "A land of lakes."

All this is happening despite opposition by those who gave way to groundless fears. If all our people will put away their fears and take counsel of their hopes and aims for progress and prosperity and full employment, think how much faster this vast improvement would come. If everybody worked at it, it would gallop home.

Under the ARA program, Federal money is loaned on a security to build private plants where the project is feasible, as in the case of this clay-tile plant. No U.S. money is given away to private plants. But in the field of public improvements, where the town or county is unable to build a water or sewage system or other public improvement, alone, then ARA, in event of feasibility, will make a matching grant, giving part of the money while the local town, city, county, or district puts up the matching money to build the badly needed public facility. It is a sound program.

I congratulate Henderson County in its leadership in area redevelopment. The Area Redevelopment Act was the first act of President John F. Kennedy's New Frontier for economic progress for whole areas of America. As I have stated, the Area Redevelopment Act provides for Federal repayable loans to private industries, and also matching grants to public authorities. These types of capital investment and industrial feasibility know-how, advanced by the Area Redevelopment Administration, will enable the east Texas counties to offer jobs at home attractive to the youth of east Texas. My native east Texas has a rich soil, ample rainfall, fast-growing forests, abundant supplies of the fuel minerals—oil, gas, and lignite.

Its labor is not surpassed in the whole world. All that was needed was the know-how and capital to bring all the rich resources, human and natural, into a productive combination, in order to halt the flight of the population, and build a rich economy at home. No longer will east Texas be an underdeveloped area, either in Texas or the Nation.

For more than a century, Henderson County has helped develop the farsighted leaders who have built Texas. Of the five statesmen of Texas history—Stephen F. Austin, Sam Houston, John H. Reagan, Jim Hogg, and O. M. Roberts, three got their governmental start and public push in Henderson County. John H. Reagan, "the old Roman," began here, as a surveyor, a young lawyer over at Old Buffalo on the Trinity, now a ghost town, and as a district judge. O. M. Roberts, "the old alcade," was elected district judge of this district and held court under an old oak tree on the courthouse square at Athens. Jim Hogg, "the great Commoner," won his first district office as district attorney with the help of a large Henderson County vote, and helped build his fame in the Athens courthouse, on the road to his immortal fame.

In this day, as in past generations, the forward-looking people of Henderson County are moving again. I am extremely proud of you.

Let me remind you that ARA with its attractive industrial financing program, has nearly $150 million in new potential industries for Texas. This means that the Federal program is speeding up the normal industrial expansion by many times. Through the efforts of the coordinator, investors, management and idea men, are getting together to build new plants with the ARA long-term, low-interest loans. The Texas ARA office is a beehive of activity. It is really a nerve center for one of the most significant total developments of any region in the world today. This is exciting and thrilling, for involved in this is the welfare of not only east Texans and Texans, but our whole country as well. And I believe that our area coordinator for Texas, Ray Morrison, is the ablest ARA coordinator in the Nation.

We are now engaged in building a new and modern industrial plant, capable of competing with any other in the world. Through this we will not only put our people to work, but we shall save our freedom.

We will make America strong by our acts and deeds and words. This last best hope of the earth must prosper, for the safety of freedom and liberty everywhere is at stake.

America is more than a country, it is a faith and a hope and a dream. There has always been an unquestioned belief, that here in this new world, as the shackles and servitudes of the past were put away, there would arise a great and glorious society. You here are helping build that great and glorious society. Here mankind can reach up to a higher stone on the road of human progress. In that spirit and in that belief, we dedicate this plant.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET COULD AND SHOULD BE CUT

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release prepared by me entitled "The Federal Budget Could and Should Be Cut."

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEDERAL BUDGET COULD AND SHOULD BE CUT

If Congress does not cut the President's budget, as submitted January 17, Federal agencies in fiscal year 1964, beginning July 1, 1963, would be authorized to obligate and spend public money to a total of $195.1 billion.

This sum is almost beyond comprehension. But the facts are:

	Billions
The President requested new appropriations and other obligational authority (such as back-door spending) totaling	$107.9
This is in addition to unspent balances carried over in appropriations and other obligational authority (such as back-door spending) enacted in prior years totaling	87.2
Total available to obligate and spend	195.1

This authority to obligate and spend $195.1 billion in public money, as provided in the President's budget now pending in Congress, is shown by principal agencies and departments in the following table:

Authority to obligate and spend, fiscal year 1964, as proposed in President's January budget message

[In millions of dollars]

Departments and agencies	Unexpended balance, start of year	New obligational authority requested	Total availability
Executive Office of the President	2	33	35
Funds appropriated to the President (except for foreign aid)	782	24	806
Foreign aid	21,273	5,408	26,681
Military assistance	(2,360)	(1,480)	(3,840)
Economic and other assistance	(18,913)	(3,928)	(22,841)
Department of Agriculture	3,011	7,929	10,940
Department of Commerce	1,106	965	2,071
Department of Defense:			
Military functions	30,817	52,181	82,998
Civil functions	343	1,146	1,489
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	2,280	7,158	9,438
Department of the Interior	519	1,279	1,798
Department of Justice	34	355	389
Department of Labor	335	527	862
Post Office Department	377	565	942
Department of State	98	362	460
Department of the Treasury	420	11,297	11,717
Atomic Energy Commission	1,469	2,893	4,362
Federal Aviation Agency	550	810	1,360
General Services Administration	620	659	1,279
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,497	829	13,326
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	2,431	5,712	8,143
Veterans' Administration	888	5,580	6,468
National Science Foundation	303	589	892
Small Business Administration	325	215	540
Tennessee Valley Authority	562	44	606
Other executive branch	6,037	1,150	7,187
Legislative and judicial branches	77	218	295
Total	87,157	107,927	195,084

TO SPEND $98.8 BILLION

From this $195.1 billion total in authorizations to obligate and spend public money, the President in his budget message said Federal agencies during the coming year would actually spend, in terms of checks issued, $98.8 billion.

Of this $98.8 billion in actual spending, $42.4 billion would be spent out of old balances being carried over, and $56.4 billion would be spent from new 1964 appropriations and other authority to obligate and spend public money now pending before Congress.

APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE CUTS

There are more than 800 budget accounts from which expenditures would be made in fiscal year 1964. They show funds requested in the new budget, balances carried over from prior years, or both.

Examination and evaluation of each of these accounts leads to the conclusion that (1) the President's budget requests for $107.9 billion in new appropriation and other spending authority could and should be reduced by at least $12 billion. This would reduce the total to not more than $95.9 billion, and (2) the President estimated that $98.8 billion actually would be

spent in fiscal year 1964 from both the old balances and the new funds. This estimate could and should be reduced by at least $7.1 billion with actual expenditures held to not more than $91.7 billion.

These reductions in tabular form follow:

Summary of suggested reductions, fiscal year 1964

[In billions of dollars]

	January budget requests	Suggested reductions	Total, after reductions
Appropriations and other new obligational authority	107.9	12.0	95.9
Expenditures	98.8	7.1	91.7

SALE OF STOCKPILE EXCESSES

More than a year ago, in a news conference on January 31, 1962, the President expressed astonishment at the fact that the Government had overstockpiled so-called strategic and critical materials to the extent of $3.4 billion.

Since that time a special Senate committee has completed an investigation of the strategic and critical stockpile situation, and it is to be assumed that a special commission named by the President has made similar progress.

But these stockpile excesses to date have not been reduced. They are as large now as they were when the President brought the matter forcefully to public attention. They must be disposed of in a manner not to disrupt markets; but a start should be made.

The President in January this year estimated Federal revenue in the coming fiscal year at $89.6 billion, exclusive of proposed tax revisions and reductions. Proceeds from the sale of excess stockpile materials could and should be used to increase Treasury receipts.

If general fund receipts were increased by substantial sales of strategic and critical stockpile excesses, and expenditures were held to $91.7 billion or less as suggested, the Federal budget could be brought into virtual balance, without tax reduction.

APPROPRIATIONS

Neither war nor depression emergency confronts us at this time. The President, in his economic report to Congress, January 21, 1963, (p. XII) said: "I do not expect a fifth postwar recession to interrupt our progress in 1963." He repeated this view on March 21.

But his budget requests for the coming fiscal year, totaling $107.9 billion in new spending authority, are unprecedented in peace or depresssion—or any other time except in the peak of World War II. They contemplate no effort to balance the budget in the foreseeable future. The debt is climbing well above $300 billion.

Restoration of confidence in the Nation's fiscal position is sorely needed at home and abroad. At home 100-cent dollars (on the 1939 index) are now worth about 45 cents; and foreigners are continuing to withdraw our gold at a dangerous rate.

Substantial reduction in the budget requests, which are pending before Congress for action in the next few months, and efficient control of necessary Federal expenditures would be moves to serve the purpose of restoring confidence in Federal fiscal stability.

The reductions totaling $12 billion in new appropriations and other expenditure authorizations suggested in this statement should be regarded as the minimum to be desired. They are based on the following considerations:

1. Relative need for the program or objective involved.
2. Could and should the program or objective be eliminated or reduced in view of the deadening deficit and debt position of the Federal Government.
3. Specific policy laid down by Congress.
4. Unexpended balances already available in appropriations and other obligational authority enacted in prior years.

Appropriation reductions

Generally, the $12 billion of suggested reductions in budget requests for new appropriations and other authority for Federal agencies to obligate and spend public money may be summarized categorically as follows:

	Billions
Foreign aid (including payroll costs)	$3.3
Federal civilian payroll costs (excluding foreign aid)	1.4
Proposed new programs and projects	2.2
Waste, extravagance and inefficiency (along with nonessential and postponable programs, projects, construction, etc.)	5.1
Total, appropriation reductions	12.0

These reductions are the sum of those which would be made on an account-by-account basis throughout the budget. They are totaled by principal departments and agencies as follows:

Suggested appropriation reductions by departments and agencies

[In thousands of dollars]

Departments and agencies	Fiscal year 1962 actual	Fiscal year 1963 estimated	Fiscal year 1964 January request	Suggested reduction	Fiscal year 1964 after reduction
Executive Office of the President	26,507	23,608	32,888	10,403	22,485
Funds appropriated to President (except foreign aid)	53,350	929,200	24,100	75	24,025
Foreign aid:					
Military assistance, funds appropriated to President	1,577,000	1,325,000	1,480,000	976,800	503,200
Economic assistance	2,936,809	7,063,225	3,927,932	2,362,547	1,565,385
Funds appropriated to President:					
Grants and loans	(2,337,600)	(2,603,722)	(3,465,025)	(2,286,917)	(1,178,108)
International financial institutions	(171,656)	(2,121,656)	(111,656)	(25,000)	(86,656)
Peace Corps	(30,000)	(58,550)	(108,000)	(49,450)	(58,550)
Export-Import Bank		(2,000,000)			
Other programs (Agriculture, Commerce, and State)	(397,553)	(279,297)	(243,251)	(1,180)	(242,071)
Department of Agriculture	7,013,183	6,502,560	7,929,012	280,338	7,648,674
Department of Commerce	827,412	796,888	964,572	322,647	641,925
Department of Defense, military functions	48,170,275	49,961,119	52,180,637	2,080,447	50,100,190
Department of Defense, civil functions	1,015,784	1,092,517	1,145,629	129,693	1,015,936
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	4,628,904	5,392,638	7,157,545	2,431,490	4,726,055
Department of Interior	928,637	1,129,810	1,278,595	245,828	1,032,767
Department of Justice	297,156	318,288	355,306	60,806	294,500
Department of Labor	643,645	351,292	527,220	226,432	300,788
Post Office Department	874,160	806,461	564,964	564,964	
Department of State	308,168	409,382	361,985	95,431	266,554
Department of the Treasury	10,204,088	10,820,721	11,297,032	33,524	11,263,508
Atomic Energy Commission	2,547,338	3,134,738	2,893,000	68,700	2,824,300
Federal Aviation Agency	728,863	755,503	810,100	75,560	734,540
General Services Administration	606,244	631,458	658,719	104,683	554,036
Housing and Home Finance Agency	861,291	797,524	829,410	223,640	605,770
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	1,824,930	3,673,313	5,712,000	600,300	5,111,700
Veterans' Administration	5,447,110	5,594,746	5,580,262	50,425	5,529,837
Other: executive branch	1,153,117	1,455,754	1,998,428	1,056,807	941,621
Legislative and judicial branches	188,338	226,263	217,876	32	217,844
Grand total	92,862,309	103,192,008	107,927,212	12,001,572	95,925,640

Unexpended balances

A hard look at unexpended balances, totaling $87.2 billion, already available for expenditure by virtually every major agency and department of the Government (shown at the outset) is the first requirement in consideration of every request for new funds.

Some of these balances could and should be rescinded. The firmness of obligations shown against many of them cannot be taken for granted. This is particularly true in accounts like those for foreign aid funds appropriated to the President.

Exclusive of any new funds that may be granted, balances alone range from $34 million for a major agency like the Department of Justice to $21.3 billion for foreign aid, and $30.8 billion for the military functions of the Department of Defense.

If new appropriations and other spending authority were added in the amounts requested, total funds available to executive agencies would range from $389 million for the Department of Justice to $26.7 billion for foreign aid, and $83 billion for military functions.

From the opening table in this statement it may be seen that balances in accounts for foreign aid should be given special attention. They total $21.3 billion in all accounts. And to this the President's budget requests for all foreign aid programs would add $5.4 billion in new spending authority for a total of $26.7 billion.

Funds for foreign aid generally are made available in four areas: regular funds appropriated to the President for economic and military assistance and the Peace Corps; authorizations for international financial institutions; spending authority for Export-Import Bank; and appropriations, etc., for regular departments which become involved.

The balances totaling $21.3 billion in all foreign aid accounts together with new budget requests totaling $5.4 billion would make up this tremendous sum of $26.7 billion available for foreign aid in the coming year, under budget recommendations:

	Billions
Funds appropriated to the President for military and economic assistance grants and loans, and Peace Corps	$12.0
Funds authorized for international financial institutions	8.0
Funds authorized for Export-Import Bank activities	$6.4
Funds authorized for regular departments	0.3
Total foreign aid	26.7

This $26.7 billion in foreign aid funds, in terms of unexpended balances and new budget requests, is shown by programs in the following table:

Foreign aid spending authority, fiscal year 1964

[In millions of dollars]

Programs	Unexpended balance, start of year			New obligational authority	Total availability
	Obligated	Unobligated	Total		
Military assistance:					
Appropriations to President	944	30	974	1,480	2,454
"Reservations" in Defense Department	1,385		1,385		1,385
Total, military assistance	2,329	30	2,360	1,480	3,840
Economic and other assistance:					
Appropriations to President:					
Grants and loans	4,082	482	4,564	3,465	8,029
Peace Corps	30		30	108	138
Inter-American Development Bank		200	200	50	250
International Development Association				62	62
Economic and other assistance—Con.					
Appropriations to President—Con.					
International Monetary Fund		2,000	2,000		2,000
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development		5,715	5,715		5,715
Export-Import Bank	1,806	4,552	6,358		6,358
Department of Agriculture		31	31	215	246
Department of Commerce	13		13	16	29
Department of State	3		3	12	15
Total, economic assistance	5,933	12,980	18,913	3,928	22,841
Total, foreign aid	8,263	13,010	21,273	5,408	26,681

Of the $26.7 billion available for foreign aid, $14.3 billion is in the nature of backdoor spending authority (authority to spend from public debt receipts) for the International Monetary Fund, International Bank, Export-Import Bank, and the foreign investment guarantee program.

It should be noted further that there is a budget request for $2 billion in new backdoor spending authority for Export-Import Bank, but it is shown as a supplemental authorization for fiscal year 1963. This affects the balance for next year, but not the 1964 requests for new spending authority.

There is a 1964 budget request for $215 million for the Agriculture Department, but it is to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for expenditures already made. And there is $28 million in requests for expenditures by Commerce and State Departments, but contract authority and treaties are involved.

Foreign aid cut

The Commerce Department foreign grants and credits report of December 1962 (p. S–5) shows that from 1945 through June 1962, the United States spent a gross total of $105 billion in foreign aid. With current year expenditures, the total will approach $110 billion.

This $110 billion has gone out through grants, so-called loans, and other means to more than 100 nations and foreign areas reaching to the four corners of the earth. This Nation has played Santa Claus, banker, and policeman for the free world for 17 years.

There is no doubt about the fact that this foreign aid has contributed to our continuing deficits, the great increase in our debt, the high cost of our interest, and the need for high taxes. How long will it continue? There will always be those who will take the money.

We have experienced the ingratitude of some nations which have not hesitated to accept the largesse of our assistance and, as time goes on, the situation will grow worse, unless we sharpen our attitude. The time to start curtailing overall foreign aid is past due.

I suggest that the 1964 budget requests for $5.4 billion in new foreign aid funds be reduced by at least $3.3 billion. This would be a 66 percent reduction in new funds. It would leave $23.4 billion—$2.1 billion in new authorizations, and $21.3 billion in balances.

This foreign aid reduction would be in new funds to be appropriated to the President for military and economic assistance, the Peace Corps, and the Inter-American Development Bank. In addition, I shall vote against the 1963 supplemental bill for $2 billion more in Export-Import Bank funds.

Payroll cut

The $1.1 billion Federal pay raise act, signed last October 11, said:

"The departments and agencies, establishments and corporations in the executive branch shall absorb the costs of the increases in basic compensation provided by this act to the fullest extent possible without seriously affecting the immediate execution of essential functions."

Instead of absorbing the pay raise, the budget shows that over the 2-year period, beginning last July 1, payroll costs will rise $1.8 billion, and the number of civilians employed by the Federal Government will rise by 86,000.

The Federal civilian payroll last year cost $14 billion. This year it is running at the rate of $15 billion. And next year it may be estimated at $15.8 billion.

Federal civilian employment in the year ended last June 30 totaled 2,484,654. The budget estimates employment this year at 2,534,041, and shows it for next year at 2,570,533.

The increase is general throughout the civilian agencies and departments. For example: National Aeronautics and Space Administration up 39.7 percent; Agriculture Department up 10 percent; Health, Education, and Welfare Department up 15.5 percent; Interior Department up 16.6 percent; Labor Department up 21.9 percent; Treasury Department up 10.4 percent; General Services Administration up 19.2 percent; Housing and Home Finance Agency up 11.6 percent; U.S. Information Agency up 12.5 percent.

And it is of special interest to note that in this year and next Commerce Department employment is up 15.5 percent. A year ago the Secretary of Commerce told a congressional committee that his Department could save tremendous sums by "doing away with jobs that ought not to be there."

When the statutory policy laid down by Congress in the pay raise act is applied to every budget account from which Federal civilian employment is paid, it can be concluded that Federal civilian payroll costs could and should be reduced by at least $1.5 billion.

Attrition among Federal employees through voluntary resignation, retirement, and death is running at the rate of 300,000 a year, and Federal employee pay is averaging about $5,800 a year. Absorbing the pay raise should be possible without impairment of essential functions.

Reductions in civilian payroll costs, based on account-by-account examination conforming to the policy fixed by Congress, are summarized categorically in the following table:

Reductions in civilian payroll costs for fiscal year 1964

[In thousands of dollars]

Category	January budget requests	Suggested reduction	Fiscal year 1964 after reduction
National security (including military, atomic energy, and other defense-related activities)	6,509,520	319,027	6,190,493
Foreign aid (including Export-Import Bank)	153,277	52,833	100,444
International affairs (including USIA)	233,183	38,935	194,248
Domestic-civilian	8,896,676	1,049,139	7,847,537
Total	15,792,656	1,459,934	14,332,722

New program cuts

Some 200 actions and proposals involving increased Federal obligation of public money and credit can be documented in Presidential communications to Congress in the past 2 years; 30 or more new programs and projects appear in January requests for initial funds.

Exclusive of new construction starts under old programs these new programs are in the budget for $2.2 billion in appropriations and other spending authority, and it is estimated that they would spend $0.7 billion in fiscal year 1964.

First year authorizations and expenditures for new programs almost invariably are small. They finance establishment of the organization, and open the doors for increased expenditures in the future. Among the new proposals are:

New proposals, fiscal year 1964, requested in the President's January budget message

[In thousands of dollars]

Proposals	New obligational authority	Expenditure estimates
Land-use adjustment program	27,000	27,000
Rural housing programs	107,350	56,850
Defense food stockpiling	30,000	30,000
Civil defense programs	220,800	107,500
New education program	1,215,170	143,600
Hospital construction, area planning grants	35,000	5,000
Aid to medical education	31,352	9,314
Grants for comprehensive maternal and child health	17,250	17,237
Educational television facilities	7,000	7,000
Outdoor recreation fund	25,000	8,000
Youth employment opportunities	100,000	60,000
Urban transportation assistance	100,000	10,000
Comparability pay adjustment	200,000	200,000
Other	40,772	30,195
Total	2,159,694	711,696

Some of these new proposals, such as a new Federal building for a National Agricultural Library which are included among the items in the preceding table, may be desirable, but they can wait until some other time when the Federal Government is not backed up against the wall of continuing deficits and rising debt.

And some of the new programs, such as urban transportation assistance are primarily matters of local and State concern. The Federal Government has no more money than the localities and the States for financing solutions to the problem.

It is suggested that all of these proposals for new programs and projects be eliminated or postponed. Requested appropriations and other spending authorizations in fiscal year 1964 would be reduced by $2.2 billion, and expenditures would be reduced by $0.7 billion.

Waste cuts

Perhaps there are some public works which may be desirable under better financial conditions, but it is suggested that starting any new construction projects under any program financed through the general fund of the Treasury, not absolutely essential at this time, be delayed until the Federal Government is in better financial position.

Federal highway projects are financed out of the highway trust fund, and are not involved in the deficit difficulties being experienced by the general fund of the Treasury. Therefore they are excluded from this discussion.

Exclusive of highways and projects related to military functions, new direct Federal civil public works alone proposed in the 1964 budget would cost more than $3 billion to complete (budget documents, p. 380). Funds for these projects in 1964 are in numerous accounts throughout the budget.

The budget proposals for new appropriations and other spending authority totaling $107.9 billion could and should be reduced by upward of a billion dollars through postponing starts on new public works projects which are not urgent.

In addition, for economy and efficiency, and elimination of waste and extravagance, the $12 billion reduction in appropriation and other spending authority includes a 10-percent cut in new money for Federal civilian construction projects already underway.

Along with all other civilian construction projects, this would apply to those of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This agency is requesting $800 million for this purpose to be added to $780 million in its construction account balance. The reduction in new funds for the construction item would be $80 million. There would still be $1.5 billion in new funds and balances.

I am suggesting also that employment by this agency be held to the current year's level. In the year ending last June 30 it employed 23,686 persons. Employment this year is more than 29,000 and next year it is estimated at 33,100.

This would be an increase of nearly 10,000 or 39.7 percent in 2 years. Payroll costs last year were $165 million. This year they are estimated at $240 million. Holding the payroll at this year's level would reduce appropriation requests by $59 million.

Space agency funds appear in two budget accounts. Through both accounts it is spending $2.4 billion this year. It will start the coming year, on July 1, with $2.4 billion in balances, and it is asking for $5.7 billion in new funds.

With new appropriations as requested, it would have a total of $8.1 billion. I suggest reduction in new funds for construction and personnel totaling $0.6 billion. The reduced total would still be $7.5 billion.

Including 1964 funds the Space Agency has programed $8¼ billion for the man on the moon project alone. Far more will be spent, of course. The total cost has been estimated at all the way from $20 to $40 billion.

For an agency with so much money to spend, which is putting great emphasis on sending a man to the moon, constant and rigid policing against extravagance, waste, inefficiency must be a primary requirement at every level of administration.

Certainly we must provide adequate defense for this Nation, but neither the space agency nor the military is sacrosanct. Demands upon them for achievement of objectives are not license to tolerate waste, extravagance, or inefficiency.

Balances in accounts for the Space Agency and military functions on July 1 will total $33.2 billion. Together they are asking for $57.9 billion in new funds. This would give them a total of $91.1 billion. Together they expect to spend $55.2 billion in the coming year.

The President has requested $52.2 billion in new spending authority for military functions alone. This would be in addition to $30.8 billion in balances. The total available would be $83 billion. Expenditures for military functions next year are estimated at $51 billion.

I suggest reductions of at least $2.1 billion in new appropriations and other spending authority for military functions. The total remaining available for expenditure after such a reduction would be $80.9 billion—$50.1 billion in new funds and $30.8 billion in balances.

Waste, extravagance, and inefficiency in the military is obvious to most citizens who will look. More of it can be documented. For example, in the past few weeks the Comptroller General of the United States has reported:

"Military services are paying about $15 million a year in pay, allowances, and reenlistment bonuses to personnel with records of continued misconduct and/or inefficiency who are permitted to reenlist."

"Repair and maintenance of noncombat vehicles in the Department of Defense is costing $66 million a year more than it should * * * because of inefficiency in maintenance operations in the Army and Air Force."

These items of $15 million and $66 million are relatively small in terms of a military budget of a half-a-hundred-billion dollars. But they can be multiplied over and over again in similar cases of waste, extravagance, and inefficiency.

On an account-by-account basis, I suggest reduction in every category of military appropriations except retired pay and claims. I suggest reducing military pay funds by 2 percent and, with certain exceptions, reducing everything else by at least 3 percent.

The exceptions are military housing, the Secretary's emergency research fund and civil defense. All funds for new military housing would be eliminated and the remaining military housing funds cut 10 percent. The Secretary's $150 million emergency research fund would be cut by a flat $50 million.

Budget requests for civil defense total $300 million in all military accounts. I suggest reduction of $275 million, including the new Federal shelter construction program. This anticipates elimination of the program, and leaves only enough to liquidate outstanding obligations. If this program is vital, funds requested are not enough. If it is not vital, it should be eliminated.

The budget claim of $750 million saving in the Department of Defense this year is noted, and so is the belief by the Secretary of Defense that he can save billions a year.

But the fact remains that both expenditures and new spending authority for military functions are increasing by about $4 billion in 2 years. Claims that the increases are being reduced are not enough. Solid reductions in appropriations and other spending authorizations are needed.

There are increasing signs and complaints of waste, extravagance, and inefficiency in research grant programs under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the National Science Foundation, and elsewhere throughout the Government. These programs appear to be in real need of efficient administration.

Based on my own examination to date, I suggest that new funds for research grants, fellowships, etc., throughout the Government should be sharply reduced. For example, medical research programs under HEW for fiscal year 1964 are proposed at $900 million—an increase of $300 million or 33 percent over fiscal year 1962. I would suggest that these programs be held to the 1962 level.

Reasons for such suggestions as these with respect to reductions for economy and efficiency, and elimination of waste and extravagance can be documented in scores of the 800 budget accounts, exclusive of payroll, construction, foreign aid, etc.

There is no doubt about the fact that the $107.9 billion in requests for new appropriations and other obligational authority could and should be reduced by at least $5.1 billion in the interest of efficiency, and economy, and the elimination of waste and extravagance (along with nonessential and postponable programs, projects, construction, etc.).

EXPENDITURES

The basic reason for Federal taxes is to meet Federal expenditures. And Federal expenditures, under the Constitution, are made pursuant to appropriations enacted by law. Federal taxes are too high, but Federal appropriations and expenditures are higher.

Federal expenditures have exceeded the revenue in 27 of the last 33 years. Over this period the Federal debt has been increased from $16.2 to 304 billion; and interest on the debt has risen from $659 million to $10 billion a year.

The danger of inflation always lurks in Federal deficit financing. It is there now. The purchasing power of the dollar has dropped in every year since 1955. There will be another deficit next year unless expenditures are held to the level of revenue.

Deficits are determined by the excess of annual expenditures over annual revenue. Expenditures are made pursuant to appropriations enacted by law. Obviously the first thing to do is reduce new appropriations and other spending authority.

But with $87.2 billion of balances in prior appropriations and other spending authority already available before the first dollar of new spending authority is enacted, something more than cutting new appropriations and other spending authority needs to be done.

Cutting appropriations will directly reduce annual expenditures in accounts where there are no balances, and where annual appropriations do not exceed annual expenditures. But cutting appropriations does not necessarily reduce annual expenditures from accounts where any other situation exists.

Congress could rescind balances; and I think it should in many cases. It could enact an annual expenditure limitation on each appropriation account; I think it should, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, now pending before the Rules Committee, would provide for this.

Otherwise, effective reduction of annual expenditures from accounts where balances exist, and in instances where appropriations exceed estimated expenditures, must be left largely to administrative control in the executive branch.

There was a $3.9 billion deficit in fiscal year 1961. There was a $6.4 billion deficit last year. There will be a $9 billion deficit this year. Another deficit next year of $10 billion or more would produce a 4-year combined deficit of $30 billion.

Under these circumstances there is urgent and obvious need for the administration and the Congress to join in a concerted and effective effort to reduce Federal expenditures to meet realistic revenue estimates for the coming year.

My own examination and evaluation of the spending objectives represented in the more than 800 budget accounts leads to the conclusion that new appropriations and other spending authority could and should be cut by at least $12 billion from the $107.9 billion budget request to $95.9 billion.

Similar examination and evaluation, considering actual spending in the coming year under firmly obligated balances and other prior commitments, leads to the conclusion that expenditures in the year beginning July 1 could and should be reduced by at least $7.1 billion from budget estimates of $98.8 billion to $91.7 billion. The $7.1 billion reduction includes $1.8 billion in military functions and $0.4 billion in the Space Agency.

And there is no doubt that, under combined and sympathetic effort by both the legislative and the executive branches, Federal spending next year could and should be reduced still more without impairment of any essential Federal function.

Meanwhile, I suggest minimum reductions in expenditures which may be categorically summarized as follows:

	Billions
Foreign aid (including payroll costs)	$1.3
Federal civilian payroll costs (excluding foreign aid)	1.4
Proposed new programs and projects	.7
Waste, extravagance and inefficiency (along with nonessential and postponable programs, projects, construction, etc.)	3.7
Total expenditure reduction	7.1

These suggested expenditure reductions, as applied to Federal departments and principal agencies, are shown in the following table:

Suggested expenditure reductions by departments and agencies

[In thousands of dollars]

Departments and agencies	Fiscal year 1962 actual	Fiscal year 1963 estimated	Fiscal year 1964 estimated	Suggested reduction	Fiscal year 1964 after reduction
Executive Office of the President	28, 993	24, 713	31, 496	8, 986	22, 510
Funds appropriated to President (except foreign aid)	33, 220	340, 077	433, 365	197, 175	236, 190
Foreign aid:					
Military assistance, funds appropriated to President	1, 390, 011	1, 750, 000	1, 450, 000	478, 500	971, 500
Economic assistance	2, 371, 745	2, 261, 657	2, 116, 949	824, 744	1, 292, 205
Funds appropriated to the President:					
Grants and loans	(1, 836, 297)	(2, 100, 000)	(2, 300, 000)	(764, 974)	(1, 535, 026)
International financial institutions	(171, 656)	(121, 656)	(111, 656)	(25, 000)	(86, 656)
Peace Corps	(11, 409)	(47, 000)	(80, 000)	(33, 000)	(47, 000)
Export-Import Bank	(101, 087)	(−224, 253)	(−647, 000)	(600)	(−647, 600)
Other programs (Agriculture, Commerce, and State)	(251, 296)	(217, 254)	(272, 293)	(1, 170)	(271, 123)
Department of Agriculture	6, 426, 745	7, 208, 496	6, 319, 353	244, 314	6, 075, 039
Department of Commerce	585, 791	736, 370	881, 957	108, 304	773, 653
Department of Defense, military functions	46, 815, 362	48, 300, 000	51, 000, 000	1, 819, 689	49, 180, 311
Department of Defense, civil functions	999, 337	1, 105, 664	1, 140, 345	139, 689	1, 000, 656
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	4, 215, 450	5, 047, 540	5, 742, 092	905, 243	4, 836, 849
Department of Interior	907, 816	1, 054, 000	1, 165, 000	190, 660	974, 340
Department of Justice	294, 441	316, 805	336, 956	44, 612	292, 344
Department of Labor	619, 796	238, 715	433, 230	136, 589	296, 641
Post Office Department	796, 876	802, 461	553, 524	579, 464	−25, 940
Department of State	305, 426	442, 820	347, 504	70, 824	276, 680
Department of the Treasury	10, 173, 006	10, 811, 464	11, 232, 247	27, 314	11, 204, 933
Atomic Energy Commission	2, 805, 631	2, 870, 000	2, 850, 000	67, 900	2, 782, 100
Federal Aviation Agency	698, 410	790, 915	801, 000	66, 320	734, 680
General Services Administration	444, 893	532, 246	594, 392	74, 848	519, 544
Housing and Home Finance Agency	739, 327	1, 088, 396	695, 337	50, 013	645, 324
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	1, 257, 048	2, 400, 000	4, 200, 000	421, 200	3, 778, 800
Veterans' Administration	5, 391, 592	5, 532, 182	5, 470, 072	29, 704	5, 440, 368
Other:					
Other executive branch	908, 069	988, 742	1, 462, 764	603, 957	858, 807
Legislative and judicial branches	210, 457	223, 430	224, 023	41	223, 982
Total	88, 419, 442	94, 956, 693	99, 481, 606	7, 090, 090	92, 391, 516
Deduct interfund transactions	−632, 656	−646, 132	−679, 243		−679, 243
Grand total	87, 786, 786	94, 310, 561	98, 802, 363	7, 090, 090	91, 712, 273

Reasons and justifications for these suggested expenditure reductions follow generally the same pattern already described with respect to suggested reductions in the new appropriations and other authority to obligate public money.

The highly publicized Budget claim that domestic-civilian expenditure estimates, exclusive of military, space and interest, have been "severely" limited and in the overall reduced, has been noted and carefully checked.

The fact is that—exclusive of 80-odd accounts in military, space and interest—the budget shows some 450 expenditure items increased in the coming year as compared with the current year level, against some 250 reduced. About 40 items are in approximately the same amounts.

Too many of the so-called reductions, such as those anticipating the sale of Export-Import Bank loans, and mortgages held by the Federal National Mortgage Association are questionable. They represent no restraint on Federal expenditures. And these are not the only questionable so-called reductions.

Expenditures for "agriculture and agricultural resources" have gone up in every fiscal year since 1960, but the budget for the coming year estimates that they will be reduced by $1 billion.

As a matter of fact, actual budget figures show categorical increases outside of military, space and interest, as follows:

	Millions
Natural resources up	$123
Commerce and transportation up	63
Health, labor and welfare up	698
Education up	$176
General government up	154
Allowances for pay adjustments, etc.	300
Total	1, 514

Domestic-civilian expenditures have increased in every year since the end of the Korean war in fiscal year 1954. Exclusive of space and interest they have risen more than $7 billion since fiscal year 1960.

The record of Federal expenditures, by category, for the past 5 years is shown in the following table:

Federal expenditures, fiscal years 1960–64, broken categorically to show national security, foreign aid, etc., and domestic, civilian

[In millions of dollars]

Category	1960 actual	1961 actual	1962 actual	1963 estimate	1964 estimate
National security:					
Military functions	41, 215	43, 227	46, 815	48, 300	51, 000
Atomic energy	2, 623	2, 713	2, 806	2, 870	2, 850
Defense related activities	244	104	92	84	133
Total, national security	44, 082	46, 044	49, 713	51, 254	53, 983
Foreign aid:					
Military assistance	1, 609	1, 449	1, 390	1, 750	1, 450
Economic and other	1, 477	2, 126	2, 372	2, 262	2, 117
Total, foreign aid	3, 086	3, 575	3, 762	4, 012	3, 567
International affairs	354	374	446	613	563
Total, other than domestic, civilian	47, 522	49, 993	53, 921	55, 878	58, 112
Domestic, civilian:					
Space research and technology	401	744	1, 257	2, 400	4, 200
Agriculture and agricultural resources	4, 882	5, 173	5, 895	6, 731	5, 696
Domestic, civilian—Continued					
Natural resources	1, 714	2, 006	2, 147	2, 380	2, 503
Commerce and transportation	1, 963	2, 573	2, 774	3, 325	3, 388
Housing and community development	122	320	349	525	276
Health, labor, and welfare	3, 690	4, 244	4, 524	4, 915	5, 613
Education	866	943	1, 076	1, 361	1, 537
Veterans' benefits and services	5, 266	5, 414	5, 403	5, 545	5, 484
Interest	9, 266	9, 050	9, 198	9, 782	10, 103
General Government	1, 542	1, 709	1, 875	2, 041	2, 195
Allowances for pay adjustments and contingencies				75	375
Total, domestic, civilian	29, 711	32, 176	34, 499	39, 079	41, 369
Grand total	77, 233	82, 169	88, 420	94, 957	99, 481
Deduct interfund transactions	−694	−654	−633	−646	−679
Total	76, 539	81, 515	87, 787	94, 311	98, 802

In view of the continuing and worsening deficit financing state of Federal fiscal affairs, the excessive spending record over the years, and the size and character of the President's January spending proposals for the coming year, I earnestly suggest that the $107.9 billion in budget requests for new appropriations and other spending authority now pending before Congress be reduced by a minimum of $12 billion, and the $98.8 billion budget expenditure estimate for the fiscal year beginning July 1 be reduced by a minimum of $7.1 billion.

OPERATIONS OF INTERIOR DEPARTMENT UNDER SALINE WATER ACT OF 1952

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, because of the intense interest that the Senate has always shown in the progress of the program to make fresh water from saline and brackish sources, I ask unanimous consent that the letter summarizing the operations of the Department of Saline Water for calendar year 1962 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1963.
Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Operations of the Department of the Interior during calendar year 1962 under the Saline Water Act of 1952 (Public Law 448, 82d Cong., 2d sess., as amended) are summarized in this letter which is my report required by the act. More detailed information is given in the "Saline Water Conversion Report for 1962" of the Office of Saline Water.

Under the provisions of the Anderson-Aspinall Act (Public Law 87–295), the Department's effort to develop economical methods for the desalination of sea or brackish water has been rapidly expanded, with greater emphasis being placed on basic and applied research for the development of new or improved processes.

In 1962, the Basic Research Division of the Office of Saline Water awarded 51 contracts with a total value of $3,059,823, compared to 38 contracts with a value of $376,983 in 1961. Fifty-six contracts awarded by the Processes Development Division totaled $4,259,940, compared to 26 contracts amounting to $1,336,028 in the previous year. Thus, in just 1 year, the level of effort in basic research has been increased 711 percent, and the applied research activities expanded by 219 percent.

This Nation's leadership in research for low-cost conversion of saline water to fresh was highlighted March 10, when over 4,000 people gathered on Point Loma, near San Diego, Calif., for the dedication of the 1-million-gallon-per-day saline water conversion demonstration plant.

The Point Loma plant is the third to be completed under the Department of the Interior's program to demonstrate the reliability, engineering, operating, and economic potentials of the most promising of presently-known processes.

The first such plant, now operating at Freeport, Tex., and providing that city with high-quality fresh water to supplement its natural sources of supply, also has a capacity of 1 million gallons of water per day. The second plant, located at Webster, S. Dak., serves that city with 250,000 gallons per day by converting brackish well water to fresh.

The State of California, through its department of water resources, provided 50 percent of the $1,608,000 construction cost of the Point Loma plant. Water produced by this plant is sold to the city of San Diego.

A $1,794,000 contract for the construction of a fourth plant was awarded by the Office of Saline Water on April 5, 1962. Located at Roswell, N. Mex., the plant is designed to desalt brackish underground water to fresh at the rate of 1 million gallons per day. Ground breaking ceremonies for this plant were conducted on July 10, 1962. Construction is proceeding on schedule with completion of the plant anticipated in April 1963.

A cornerstone inscribed with a quotation by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, "Experimentation Is the Mother of Progress," was set on August 3, to mark the initiation of construction of a saline water conversion research and development test station on land donated to the Department by the State of North Carolina at Wrightsville Beach. A $825,000 construction contract provided for necessary test station facilities, such as a boiler plant, sea water intake lines, utilities supply, office building, maintenance building, a pilot plants test area, and related installations.

Construction of the pilot plants test station was virtually complete at the end of the year, and process development contracts had been let for three pilot plants which will be operated at the station to develop new or improved saline water conversion processes. The first of these, a 37,000-gallon-per-day unit based on a thin-film evaporator process, is scheduled to be in operation in March 1963. The second plant will have a 10,000-gallon-per-day capacity to develop a new hydrate process for demineralizing sea water, and the third facility will be a 15,000-gallon-per-day freezing process pilot plant.

A complete evaluation of the current status of freeze-demineralization processes has determined that the objectives of the Office of Saline Water to exploit to the fullest this promising desalination method can best be achieved through the construction and operation of a large pilot plant which will incorporate the most advanced experimental features and flexibility of design. Negotiations are currently underway, and a contract will be awarded early in 1963 for a

200,000-gallon-per-day research and development pilot plant for the accelerated development of freezing processes. This plant will fully qualify under the demonstration plant program.

Solar distillation sea water conversion pilot plants are in operation at Daytona Beach, Fla.; Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.; and the University of Arizona, at Tucson. Electrodialysis pilot plants are being operated for the Office of Saline Water by the Bureau of Reclamation, Denver, Colo.; a distillation and a freezing process pilot plant are under test at Wrightsville Beach, N.C.; an experimental program to partially soften sea water by cation exchange as a method to reduce formation of scale in a sea water evaporator was tested with good results in a 5,000-gallon-per-day pilot plant at Freeport, Tex.; valuable data was obtained from the operation of a 35,000-gallon-per-day freezing process pilot plant at St. Petersburg, Fla.; and the heat-exchange system without a metallic heat-exchange surface was under development in a 48,000-gallon-per-day single stage vapor reheat distillation pilot plant at San Jose, Calif.

A new and significant basic research program linking the Department of the Interior's saline water conversion activities with the Atomic Energy Commission's Oak Ridge National Laboratory was launched during the year. Scientists have increasingly realized what a complicated substance water is, particularly when it is mixed with salts, and how little we know about it. Continued progress toward economical saline water conversion is likely to depend on finding out much more than we know now about the behavior of salt and water solutions. Through a transfer of $365,000 to initiate this program, the scientists and engineers of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, are working for the first time on a nonatomic problem, by applying their skill and experience, in separating dissolved substances from each other, to a basic research study of the chemical properties of water and the technology of materials in aqueous solution.

During the year the first research-and-development contract to an oversea contractor was awarded to an English firm, serving to indicate the growing international interest and effort to develop economical conversion processes to meet the ever-increasing worldwide demand for fresh water. Other research proposals from firms outside the United States have been received and are being considered for financial support.

On March 28, the Department of the Interior sponsored a 1-day conference on saline water conversion. Nine technical papers were presented by Office of Saline Water contractors. C. F. MacGowan, Director of the Office of Saline Water, who arranged the successful program which attracted over 500 persons, provided me the opportunity to make the opening remarks. Others who participated in the conference included Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; former Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman; Under Secretary of the Interior James K. Carr; Assistant Secretary for Water and Power Kenneth Holum; and the Science Adviser to the Secretary, Dr. Roger Revelle. The large attendance at this meeting underscores the growing interest in the potential benefits to be gained through the development of economical conversion processes.

Through correspondence and visits, a marked increase in interest in the U.S. desalination effort by foreign nations was noted during the year. Closer liaison with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's Parliamentarians Conference was established. The Rapporteur of the Scientific and Technical Committee of the Parliamentarians Conference has accepted an invitation to visit the United States to inspect our saline water conversion research and development projects.

Several new or improved processes now under development will soon be ready for demonstration plant programing, and processes already being tested in demonstration plants are being studied for use in plants of larger capacity. While these plants will be erected primarily to advance the science and technology in the field of saline water conversion, they will also provide a substantial amount of supplemental water for cities and communities, either in the United States or in foreign lands, where urgent problems of providing adequate fresh water exist.

In cities where there is no alternative source from which water can be obtained at a cost appreciably less than the cost of converted saline water, the Department of the Interior is interested in entering into cooperative arrangements whereby the Department and the city would share on an equal basis, both the capital cost and operation and maintenance, with the city to take over the plant at the end of the demonstration period and operate it without further Federal subsidy.

The provisions of section 4b of the Anderson-Aspinall Act were interpreted by the Solicitor of Interior in Opinion M–36637, dated May 7, 1962, to require that patents on inventions resulting from research and development work financed under the act be available to the general public without royalty or other restriction. Some contractors have protested this patent policy, but maximum patent rights are being obtained for the benefit of the general public.

The sea water conversion demonstration plants now being operated by the Office of Saline Water are producing fresh water in the range of $1–$1.25 per thousand gallons. As the new technology that has been developed is incorporated in multimillion gallons per day plants, the present cost of conversion will be reduced to 60 cents per thousand gallons or less—a price that will make fresh water from the ocean an economically competitive source of fresh water for many of the world's water-short areas.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———,
Secretary of the Interior.

THE 325TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LANDING OF SWEDISH SETTLERS AT THE ROCKS, WILMINGTON, DEL.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the city of Wilmington, Del., has just completed a 2-day celebration of the 325th anniversary of the landing of Swedish settlers at The Rocks in Wilmington.

The ties between this country and Sweden have long been close, and this celebration not only emphasized those ties but strengthened them.

Prince Bertil, of Sweden, headed a visiting delegation from his country, while Vice President JOHNSON, representing President Kennedy, was gracious enough to appear Friday at the key ceremony at The Rocks.

The Prince was making his second appearance at a ceremony marking the landing of the Swedes. Twenty-five years ago he represented his father, the present King Gustav VI Adolf, at ceremonies attended by President Roosevelt.

A few words of history:

Two small ships, the *Kalmar Nyckel* and the *Fogel Grip*, landed at Wilmington three and a quarter centuries ago. Both had survived perilous crossings from Sweden.

They reached the Delaware River about the middle of March 1638, and soon after cast anchor before a ledge of rocks within the confines of the present city of Wilmington.

A salute of two guns notified the Indians that white men had come up the river. Later five chiefs of the Leni-Lenape Confederation agreed to sell their land to the colonists, who were headed by Peter Minuit.

The Swedish coat of arms was sent aloft on a pole and the land ceremoniously taken by the settlers as New Sweden. A fort then built at this spot was named in honor of the young queen, Christina.

Thus began the first permanent settlement in what is now Delaware. It was also the first permanent settlement in the Delaware Valley.

From this start came a stream of valuable contributions to the life of the young country—in culture, literature, industry, and statesmanship, not to mention a tradition of warmth and friendship.

I am pleased to say that the city of Wilmington and the State of Delaware responded wholeheartedly to the opportunity to mark this 325th anniversary. City and State officials did all they could to make their Swedish visitors welcome. Citizens were caught up in the spirit of the occasion and turned out in large numbers for the ceremonies.

Wilmington is a sister city of Kalmar, Sweden, and at a special program in the city council rooms Thursday night, city officials and representatives of Kalmar pledged a lasting friendship. Both Kalmar and Wilmington were officially cited at this time by the American Municipal League for their promotion of international friendship.

On Friday, a representative of organized labor in Sweden, Erik Johansson, president of Kalmar Local 39 of Municipal Workers, exchanged gifts and official greetings with Clement J. Lemon, president of the Delaware State Labor Council.

All in all, it was a wonderful time, a fitting celebration of a significant historical event in our country's, and Delaware's, early history.

While in Delaware, by the way, Prince Bertil was the guest of Mrs. Thomas E. Brittingham, Jr., of near Centerville, who is well known in Sweden because she and her late husband established scholarships for Scandinavian youths for study in American colleges.

Mr. President, the entire Swedish jubilee was an outstanding success and well worthy of recognition. I would like at this time to insert at this point in the RECORD the speeches of Prince Bertil and Vice President JOHNSON at The Rocks, as well as a proclamation by Mayor John E. Babiarz, editorials from the Wilmington Morning News and Evening Journal, a column by Morning News Columnist Bill Frank, and a Morning News story of March 30 summarizing the whole affair.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF PRINCE BERTIL, OF SWEDEN, AT FORT CHRISTINA MONUMENT, WILMINGTON, DEL., MARCH 29

Today, near the ledge upon which the Swedish colonists of 1638 first stepped ashore in America, I bring you, as I did 25 years ago, a heartfelt message of good will and friendship from the people of Sweden. I know that my father, King Gustav Adolf, and Queen Louise are with us in their thoughts.

We representatives from Sweden feel greatly honored by the presence of the Vice President of the United States. Your participation, Mr. JOHNSON, effectively underlines the importance of this occasion. The Governor of Delaware represents further evidence, as well as a direct connection with the traditions that bring us together.

Twenty-five years is a rather long period in human life. In a world of rapid change, it is also a respectable span in the history of civilization. This, I believe, is one of the main reasons why we have assembled again to commemorate the founding of the Swedish settlements on the banks of the Delaware, 325 years ago.

By thus stopping for a moment and listening to the past, we pay homage to an audacious and farsighted venture, to the statesmen who planned it, and to the pioneers who participated in it. We are also reminded of common roots and ancient bonds, and of the encouragements and responsibilities that this heritage implies.

The settlers of the little colony on the lower Delaware laid the first visible foundation for a friendship between Sweden and the United States that has never been broken. It has been strengthened by millions of family ties. An association of this type combines stability and challenge. The present era offers great opportunities for increasingly active mutual relations in many fields.

The Fort Christina Monument's new status as a national historical site will be deeply appreciated in Sweden. Through me, the Swedish people also extend its gratitude to the authorities and historical organizations in the State of Delaware and the city of Wilmington, for everything that has been done to preserve the landmarks of the Swedish colonial period.

The Swedish people's own contribution to the Fort Christina Monument, which was presented in 1938 to the State of Delaware and the people of the United States, will also, I trust, gain in meaning as the years go by. May the ship that carried the first Swedish colonists to the Delaware Valley, *The Key of Kalmar*, sail forever as a symbol of powerful bonds and the lasting possibilities of friendship.

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, PLAQUE PRESENTATION, FORT CHRISTINA MONUMENT, WILMINGTON, DEL., FRIDAY, MARCH 29, 1963

Your Royal Highness, Your Excellencies, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is my high honor to be here today as the personal representative of the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy. On behalf of the President—and all Americans—it is my added privilege and pleasure to welcome for these ceremonies, Your Royal Highness.

We are especially grateful, Your Royal Highness, that you have returned to be with us for this occasion, just as you were here 25 years ago on the 300th anniversary of the arrival of the first Swedish settlers in America.

In a real sense, our purpose in gathering today is not to commemorate age but to celebrate youth. If 325 years is ancient as time is measured by the lives of men, that same span is brief as time is measured in the lives of nations.

We of the United States are ever mindful of our Nation's youth. We are also ever mindful of the strength we have been permitted to build and the leadership we have been privileged to provide to the cause of freedom during the years allotted to us. We realize fully that our accomplishments have been feasible only because our heritage has been so greatly enriched by the contributions of many peoples from many lands who chose to make these shores the home for their aspirations to be free and to build a better life for themselves and their children.

We cannot, in fairness and honesty, weigh the contribution of any one people above that of others. But this we do know and this we can say: In the building of the industrial strength of our land, few areas have contributed so much—and none has contributed more—than this development in the valley of the Delaware where citizens from Sweden, and also from Finland, were the brave pioneers.

Many regions of our Nation have been enriched by the contributions by Swedish settlers. But here along the Delaware the special qualities of character and resourcefulness of those who came to us from the northern countries have contributed to the building of a memorable and impressive modern monument.

It is fitting that this epic phase of our heritage should be permanently commemorated by this monument built by funds subscribed from 200,000 Swedes. In 1638, the journey of the first handful of brave and daring explorers from Sweden required 3 months to cross the Atlantic. Today, that same Atlantic can be crossed in less than 6 hours. This is fittingly symbolic of the ties between our two countries which have always been friendly and which have grown closer and closer with the passing years.

It is my great pleasure now to present this bronze plaque to designate this Fort Christina Monument as a national historic site.

PROCLAMATION BY THE CITY OF WILMINGTON, DEL.

Whereas it is fitting that each generation be reminded of the struggles and sacrifices of those who made possible this blessed land of liberty and freedom; and

Whereas among those who built well for future posterity were the men from Sweden under Peter Minuit who landed at The Rocks, purchased land from the Indians, established their claim, and then set forth to develop it for the benefit of all who came to this part of the New World; and

Whereas new effort has been made to establish contact with men and women of modern day Sweden through sponsorship of Kalmar as a sister city; and

Whereas this method of communication has opened a new era of friendship, trade relations, and an increased desire to know each other better—

Now, therefore, I, John E. Babiarz, mayor of the city of Wilmington, Del., and honorary chairman of the Greater Wilmington Sister City Civic Committee, do hereby decree that Thursday, March 28, 1963, be proclaimed as Kalmar Day in Wilmington.

I further declare that in concert with His Excellency Governor Elbert N. Carvel, of the State of Delaware, who has proclaimed that Friday, March 29, 1963, be set aside as provided by State law to mark this significant anniversary, that the city of Wilmington wholeheartedly joins in observing Swedish Colonial Day.

I further urge that all citizens extend the hand of friendship to Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON and his Royal Highness Prince Bertil of Sweden and other foreign dignitaries who will gather here to honor the memories of their forefathers after 325 memorable years.

May the days of March 28–29, 1963, become as vividly impressed on the minds of all of us as was the day of June 27, 1938, when the tercentenary of the landing of the New Sweden Company was so ably observed.

JOHN E. BABIARZ,
Mayor.

[From the Wilmington Morning News, Mar. 24, 1963]

SKAAL, FRIENDLY SWEDES

(We are indebted to Olaf G. Sundin, president of the Hiab Co., of Wilmington, for the Swedish translation of this editorial.)

Three and a quarter centuries ago, Sweden planted a colony on the shores of the river called Christina. This became the first permanent European settlement in the Delaware Valley.

The Swedish colony didn't last too long but its wholesome influence has been part of this Delaware Valley ever since. The first Swedes brought with them their standards of fairplay, justice, and religious devotion—all now part of our American way of life.

Today, we, as the residents of what was New Sweden 325 years ago, welcome visitors from old Sweden—with the same friendship their ancestors received from the aborigines who once lived here.

We who now dwell in the Delaware Valley and on the shores of the Christina and Delaware Rivers are indebted to the Swedes of olden times. This is intertwined with our present day affection for the visiting Swedes of today.

We hope their stay in our State and city will be enjoyable and that out of this 325th anniversary jubilee will come a greater enrichment of American-Swedish friendship.

To our friends from Sweden, we raise our glass and say, "Skaal."

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Evening Journal, Mar. 27, 1963]

"VALLKOMMEN TILL DELAWARE"

To our Swedish visitors coming to America as friends, we say, "Welcome to Delaware."

Here in Wilmington the city and State authorities and the history-minded societies cannot, of course, attempt to reproduce Delaware's Swedish tercentenary celebration of 1938. But the warmth of the welcome is just as great as it was on a June day 25 years ago.

Nobody, certainly, would wish to see repetition of anything like the 8 inches of rain that fell on Prince Bertil and President Franklin D. Roosevelt that day.

Mr. Roosevelt nevertheless put it well that soggy day by the Christina when he said:

"'To this spot came the pioneers of Swedish blood. But in the succeeding centuries tens of thousands of others have come to our shores and added their strength and their fine qualities of citizenship to the American Nation. In every phase of our history, in every endeavor—in commerce and industry, in science and art, in agriculture, in education and religion, in statecraft and government, they have well played their part."

The Swedish-born John Ericsson is credited with inventing the screw propeller and designing the *Monitor* that defeated the *Merrimac* in Hampton Roads in 1862. The poet and historian, Carl Sandburg, born of Swedish parents, at 86 embodies today one of Sweden's major cultural contributions to America. Because of Sandburg, America knows Abraham Lincoln better.

Of late we have been told on good authority that the Swedish settlers brought to these shores that famous type of early American architecture, the log cabin. State Archivist Leon de Valinger, Jr., presiding at ceremonies at the Rocks, can be pardoned if he finds some way to mention the Delaware log cabin he had moved to the State museum in Dover.

Nor let it be forgot that the Swedish settlers left no bloody record of battling the Indians along the Delaware. Swedish Governors were given orders not to use force on any persons—native or transplanted—except in self-defense.

What clear marks of Delaware's early Swedish settlers are still to be found? Not a great deal, maybe. Besides the creek named for the young queen there is the creek called Shellpot—from Skoldpadde (turtle). Delaware watermen—muskrat trappers and the like—call the common freshwater terrapin a "skillpot" without knowing they are using just about the only Swedish word still in the rural vernacular.

But for the chief and most enduring link with our Swedish past we must look down East Seventh Street to Old Swedes Church, where Swedish was the language used by a succession of 10 Swedish Lutheran ministers, among them Israel Acrelius, who wrote a history of New Sweden. As well as at the Rocks, the ceremonies at Old Swedes, amid the mossy old gravestones, can serve to connect once more, for us all, the past and the future on both sides of the Atlantic.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News, Mar. 29, 1963]

THEY THINK WE'RE WONDERFUL

(By Bill Frank)

OK, so you are disgusted with Wilmington as your native city, and you think your city is this and that and something else.

Well, my friends, wait a minute. Yesterday I was eavesdropping on some of the visiting Swedes who were talking about Wilmington.

So let's get a bit of their views:

First, there's Olle Nyman, he's basically a public relations man, and he's here with the exhibit from the old Swedish warship, *Vasa*, that sank in 1628 and was raised in the Stockholm harbor 2 years ago.

Nyman was telling some of his fellow Swedes, "I must say Wilmington backed us all the way. Everywhere I went, people were willing to help."

And of course, the very biggest bit of help that Nyman got was from the Delaware Air National Guard through the courtesy of Maj. Gen. Joseph J. Scannell, adjutant general.

There was this huge Vasa cannon over in Seattle.

It had to be moved to Wilmington for the opening of the Wilmington Swedish celebration.

General Scannell was approached. He said "Yes, the Air National Guard will lift it and deliver it."

No sooner said than done.

In case you didn't know, practically all of Sweden's officialdom is talking about this good will gesture.

Also from Nyman:

"I wouldn't dare leave this cannon in Stockholm unguarded. Yet, here I leave it in Wilmington for about 10 days, all by itself in Rodney Square, and nothing happens to it."

When I heard this, I looked at Nyman as if to say, "Look, friend, you don't have to spread the jam that thick on the bread."

So I asked around among other Swedes. They confirmed what Nyman said—it would have been dangerous to have left a Vasa cannon unguarded in a Stockholm square for any length of time.

What would have happened to it there?

Swedes shrugged their shoulders and said, "Well, it wouldn't have been good for the cannon."

"So you see," said Nyman, "here in your Wilmington, we leave this cannon unguarded and nothing happens. Wonderful city—your Wilmington."

Is Wilmington unkempt?

A few Swedes told me not to worry about that.

"All cities are unkempt these days," they said. "You should see some of our cities in the redevelopment process."

What about our historical sites?

"We have the same problem," a Swede from Kalmar told me. "We are trying to save them and there are those so-called progressive people who think old buildings stand in the way of progress."

Traffic?

Tage Forsberg, of Kalmar, one of Sweden's leading editors, looked at Wednesday's afternoon traffic jam and was thrilled.

"Magnificent," he said.

To him, traffic jams mean business.

Wednesday night, Mayor and Mrs. John E. Babiarz entertained some officials from Kalmar at their home.

From the Babiarz home, they could see the heavy shopping traffic.

The mayor was trying to explain about the heavy traffic and the problems of controlling it and all that.

But the officials of Kalmar pushed his explanations aside and said,

"This is wonderful. Lovely heavy traffic. We would love to have it all in Kalmar."

So that's how it goes. We look down our noses at our hometown; visitors gasp and rave.

Before this Wilmington Swedish jubilee comes and goes, a few comments about our mayor and Miles Frederick.

I've watched Mayor Babiarz get into the preparations for the celebration and I want to testify that he was up to the challenge and then some.

He caught the real spirit of the celebration; he was able to delegate authority and yet keep control of the whole situation so that practically nothing went wrong.

He displayed a finesse that was most unusual and he needed very little prodding in latching onto an idea and pushing it through to a conclusion.

As for Miles Frederick, I don't know how he manages to scamper around from post to post and still come up with some breath.

Frederick was the public-relations workhorse of this event.

And he had a time trying to keep two newspapers happy with their respective releases; trying to smooth over ruffled feelings of committee members and their kin and kith.

We don't have decorations for civilians in Wilmington but there ought to be a special one for Miles Frederick: "The Order of the Job Well Done."

[From the Wilmington Morning News, Mar. 30, 1963]

L. B. J. REMINDS JUBILEE NATION IS STILL YOUNG

Wilmington ended its 2-day salute to its 325-year past with a reminder of the Nation's youth among countries of the world from Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON yesterday.

"If 325 years is ancient as time is measured by the lives of men, that same span is brief as time is measured in the lives of nations," said JOHNSON.

"We of the United States are ever-mindful of our Nation's youth. We are also ever-mindful of the strength we have been privileged to provide to the cause of freedom during the years allotted to us."

The Vice President—who arrived late and left early—spoke briefly at a ceremony at The Rocks in which he presented a bronze plaque designating Fort Christiana Monument as a national historic landmark.

Yesterday was the anniversary of the landing of the Swedes at The Rocks on March 29, 1638, and the presentation was the high water mark of Wilmington's 2-day salute for the occasion.

It was a day which started with a luncheon in the Hotel Du Pont at 1 p.m. and ended with a dinner late last night at Longwood Gardens.

The sun remained at its brilliant best for the second day of the celebration, in sharp contrast to the heavy rain of the tercentenary celebration 25 years ago, a point repeatedly brought up by Sweden's Prince Bertil.

The ceremony at The Rocks was the heart of the 2-day program, and the most colorful.

In addition to the Vice President and Prince Bertil, it was attended by Ambassador Gunnar Jarring, of Sweden, Ambassador Richard R. Seppala, of Finland, the State's complete congressional delegation, officials of Sweden's Province of Jonkoping and Wilmington's sister of Kalmar, members of the State judiciary, the general assembly, city officials, and leading members of the clergy.

Crows lined the long walk into the small park dominated by the Carl Milles Monument; the American Rifles of the Delaware National Guard, dressed in their colorful colonial garb, and the Guard band provided additional color.

It was a program of short speeches, laying of wreaths, and exchanges of gifts, but three parts of the ceremony stood out:

The designation of Fort Christiana Monument and the nearby Old Swedes Church as national historic landmarks, with citations and bronze plaques designating them as such presented by the Vice President.

Acceptance by Gov. Elbert N. Carvel of a 200-year-old Swedish log cabin, transplanted from Price's Corner and completely restored in the park, as a gift from Mr. and Mrs. Harvey C. Fenimore, of Hockessin.

Dedication of the Hendrickson House on the Old Swedes property. The small stone house, built in 1690, was moved from its original site in Ridley Township, Pa., and rebuilt here.

The Vice President, originally scheduled to arrive at 11:30 a.m., didn't reach the Greater Wilmington Airport until 2:20 p.m. because of the special meeting of the National Security Council yesterday. He had to leave in the middle of the Old Swedes ceremony because of another commitment in Washington.

Four wreaths were laid at the monument—one each from Sweden, Finland, Wilmington and the Delaware Swedish Colonial Society. The latter, as was pointed out by the society president, Dr. Victor D. Washburn, is a custom carried out every year.

The succession of gift exchanging started Thursday continued yesterday, including the presentation of sterling silver plates to Vice President Johnson and Prince Bertil by Governor Carvel.

There was an overflow attendance in the Gold Ballroom of the Hotel Du Pont for the luncheon given by Mayor John E. Babiarz and city council.

After its late start, it proceeded smoothly, with a talk by Prince Bertil and the reading of Johnson's speech by William Owen of the State Department's section for Sweden and Finland.

Gifts were exchanged at the luncheon, as well.

The 2-day Delaware celebration ended on Pennsylvania soil, with the dinner at Longwood Gardens held as the annual meeting of the Delaware Swedish Society.

Approximately 250 attended the affair in the dining hall behind the Longwood Conservatory. Formal dress was optional, but the atmosphere was relaxed and informal.

Gifts were exchanged here, too, with the sculpture, "Sprite of the Brandywine," executed by Charles C. Parks presented to

Kalmar, and the society receiving a huge piece of crystal containing the key to Kalmar. Prince Bertil received a pewter bronze plaque from the society.

CAUSE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, 6.1 percent of the American labor force is out of work today. This is a shocking commentary on the inability of our economy to provide for our people. Although the present administration in Washington does not classify this period as one of recession, yet, be it remembered that at the bottom of the past recession—February of 1961—6.9 percent of the work force was unemployed.

In my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the situation is far worse. There, 9.3 percent of the labor force is unemployed. Fifty-seven of our sixty-seven counties are classified as depressed areas.

I have discussed this matter in the Senate before and have made several proposals. I am urging the administration in Washington to issue a new Executive order that would require the U.S. Government to buy a larger proportion of its purchases from American producers.

I recently proposed also that companies in depressed areas get percentage advantages when they bid on Government contracts.

Today I would like to call to the attention of the Senate another problem which is aggravating the excessively high rate of unemployment in the United States and contributing to depressed economic conditions: the dumping of foreign steel on the American market.

For the past 5 years American steel producers have been hurt badly by imports of foreign steel. From 1.1 million tons in 1957, U.S. imports of steel had climbed by last year to 4.1 million tons.

It has been estimated that this rise in imports and the accompanying drop in U.S. steel exports have eliminated the jobs of 50,000 American steelworkers.

If the growing importation of steel products to the United States were attributed only to a superior quality of foreign steel, or to a universally lower price, there would be little ground for complaint.

Americans know that foreign workers get paid less. In 1961, for instance, American steelworkers drew $3.99 an hour in pay and benefits, while Luxembourg millhands, the highest paid in Europe, averaged only $1.47 per hour.

But American producers are willing to take their chances in the marketplace. They count on greater efficiency, greater productivity, and the high quality of our products to offset most of the lower wages in other countries.

However, in many instances this has not been possible because foreign steel is being unloaded at prices fixed by foreign cartels—prices which are substantially below those charged in the producers' home markets.

This is called dumping. As defined in international trade agreements, dumping occurs when a producer sells his products in a foreign country at a price below the one he charges in his own country and so low as to be injurious to producers in the foreign country.

As David J. McDonald, president of the United Steelworkers of America, said recently:

> The United Steelworkers of America believe in free trade under fair conditions. We are certain that, under such conditions, our steel industry can compete effectively with foreign steel companies under the labor contract standards we strive to maintain.
>
> But dumping is another matter which is of grave import to the United Steelworkers of America. If foreign producers are unloading excessive tonnage on the American market at prices unjustifiably under those set for their own domestic or other foreign consumers, then the statutory prohibition against such alleged activities should and must be invoked.
>
> No American steelworker should be confronted with the prospect of unemployment because of unfair trade practices by foreign producers.

The steel industry has recently turned to the Government for help under the law.

Last fall seven companies—Armco, Bethlehem, Colorado Fuel & Iron, Detroit Steel, Jones & Laughlin, Republic, and Youngstown Sheet & Tube—charged that producers in Japan, West Germany, France, and Belgium-Luxembourg were selling wire rods in the U.S. market at prices below those in effect in their home markets.

United States Steel lodged several complaints against producers in the United Kingdom, West Germany, Belgium-Luxembourg, France, and Japan on welded steel pipe. Kaiser Steel has lodged complaints against the Japanese sales of hot rolled sheets. And, most recently, United States Steel charged that producers in Japan are dumping commercial quality cold-rolled carbon steel sheets in the United States at prices as much as $40 per net ton under those charged Japanese consumers.

The U.S. Treasury has ruled in favor of the American complaints against mills in Belgium and Luxembourg on wire rods.

It is an open secret that dumping is going on and foreign producers are filing complaints against one another. The European Coal and Steel Community has lodged charges against Japanese and British producers, and the British have made charges against producers in other countries.

All of these countries have signed the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, known as GATT, which explicitly condemns dumping. All nations of the free world recognize that dumping is harmful and must be controlled.

I commend the American companies for filing their complaints under existing law because I am confident that they will be able to halt some of the dumping that is now going on.

But I believe that the Antidumping Act itself needs tightening and I have been in touch with the majority whip, Senator HUMPHREY, about legislation to accomplish that end. The Senator from Minnesota and I have sponsored this legislation before and I am hopeful that we can introduce legislation again in view of the most recent developments in this area.

I do not fear for American producers when the competition is legitimate. This may be hard to handle, but it is a fair and just development of the marketplace, and Americans have always faced such things squarely and come off pretty well.

But the situation in steel today is something else again. I believe it is the duty of the Congress to be sure that American producers, working without the sponsorship of their Government and working without the controls of cartels, will have at least an equal chance to compete.

REFORMS IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, since the introduction of my bill (S. 87) to effect urgently needed reforms in the area of labor-management relations, my mail has brought many interesting communications on various aspects of the subject. There has been a great deal of questioning about the meaning and scope of section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, and especially concerning how it deals with the so-called agency shop, a form of compulsory unionism now being widely mentioned in the Nation's press. It is my purpose here to cite the record on 14(b).

There is no question at all that Congress, in 14(b), intended to recognize that States have the right to outlaw "agency shop" arrangements—in which employees of a company who do not wish to join and support the union are forced nevertheless to pay initiation and monthly fees to the union or be fired.

Section 14(b) says:

> Nothing in this act [Taft-Hartley] shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or Territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or Territorial law.

On page 6675 of the June 6, 1947 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is recorded the following statement on section 14(b) by Senator Robert A. Taft, sponsor of the Taft-Hartley legislation in the Senate, and a member of the Senate-House conference which approved the final version:

> Many States have enacted laws or adopted constitutional provisions to make all forms of compulsory unionism in such States illegal. As stated in the report accompanying the Senate committee bill, it was not the intent to deprive the States of that power.

Mr. President, this clearly leaves no room for question on the intent of Congress in its enactment of section 14(b).

But the intent to provide full States' rights in legislating on all forms of compulsory unionism is further emphasized in other segments of the legislative history of section 14(b). For instance, the report of the managers on the part of the House stated—with reference to section 13 of the House bill, H.R. 3020, and section 14 of the conference committee amendments:

> Under the House bill there was included a new section 13 of the National Labor Relations Act to assure that nothing in the

> act was to be construed as authorizing any closed shop, union shop, maintenance of membership, or other forms of compulsory unionism agreement in any State where the execution of such agreement would be contrary to State law. Many States have enacted laws or adopted constitutional provisions to make all forms of compulsory unionism in those States illegal. It was never the intention of the National Labor Relations Act, as is disclosed by the legislative history of that act, to preempt the field in this regard so as to deprive the States of their powers to prevent compulsory unionism. To make certain that there should be no question about this, section 13 was included in the House bill. The conference agreement, in section 14(b), contains a provision having the same effect.

This House statement may be found on page 6378 of the June 4, 1947, Congressional Record.

There are two other pertinent statements on the intent of section 14(b). House report No. 245, 80th Congress, page 34, states:

> The United States expressly declares the subject of compulsory unionism one that the States may regulate concurrently with the United States, notwithstanding that the agreements affect commerce, and notwithstanding that the State laws limit compulsory unionism more drastically than does Federal law.

House Conference Report No. 510, 80th Congress, states:

> Under the House bill there was included a new section, 14(b), of the National Labor Relations Act to assure nothing in the act was to be construed as authorizing any closed shop, union shop, maintenance of membership, or other form of compulsory unionism agreement in any State where the execution of such agreements would be contrary to State law.

It is noteworthy that when section 14(b) was being debated and enacted in the Congress, 11 States already had right-to-work laws which were legal under explicit policy expressions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and all the other Federal legislation in this area that followed. Six of the State laws, among the 11, specifically spelled out prohibitions against all forms of compulsory unionism, including what is now called "agency shop." The recognition by Congress of the right of States to have these laws was, in my opinion, merely a recognition of one of our great constitutional bulwarks, the governmental precept of States' rights. This is why in my proposal to effect a comprehensive reformation in labor-management relations, with Senate bill 87, I have recognized this basic principle of our republican form of government, States' rights. My bill, in the area of union membership provisions, merely enunciates the national policy of individual freedom, freedom of choice. It leaves to the individual State the decision whether it wishes to authorize any form of compulsory unionism.

BOY BUILDER TO SOLVE SCHOOL DROPOUTS ON A LOCAL LEVEL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we have been reading and hearing much lately about the dropouts in our schools. The community of Bloomington, Ind., which is also the home of Indiana University, is making a sincere local effort to solve their problem of school dropouts.

The program, which has been designed to solve this problem is one worthy of the attention of the Members of the Senate, and I want to take this opportunity to explain how this program works.

The local citizenry has organized Boy Builders, Inc., which has been operating actively for about 6 months. It got its greatest boost, however, when recently the Eli Lilly Endowment, Inc., granted $30,000 toward an operating budget.

Boy Builders immediate objective is to provide an in-between program for the boy who is legally permitted to drop out of public school, but is limited in his vocational opportunities.

Each boy in the program will have an individual tutor or counselor, to whom he will look for guidance and assistance.

The vocational program will provide the boys a chance to work under the supervision of skilled instructors and craftsmen primarily in the house construction industry. At the same time, although he will not be forced to complete his high school education, he will have an opportunity to participate in a broad course of diversified education leading to high school graduation.

I am pleased to be a member of the national board of sponsors of this organization, along with such other distinguished persons as the Governor of Indiana, Matthew E. Welsh; the Lieutenant Governor, Richard O. Risteine; William G. Bray, Congressman of Indiana's Seventh District; Dr. Herman B. Wells, chancellor of Indiana University; Dr. Daniel Schreiber of the National Education Association, Dr. Arthur S. Daniels, Dr. Harold G. Shane, both of Indiana University; Dr. Robert J. Havighurst, University of Chicago, and Dr. Lindley J. Stiles, of the University of Wisconsin.

This meritorious program, it is hoped, will spread throughout the Nation, since this problem is a national one.

A recent news story in the Bloomington, Ind., Daily Herald-Telephone, describes this program in detail. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this news story be printed at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the news story was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Boy Builders Receive $30,000 From Lilly Fund—National Recognition Expected for Project

A grant of $30,000 from Lilly Endowment, Inc., of Indianapolis to Boy Builders of Bloomington, Inc., was announced today by Charles G. Curry, president of Boy Builders.

The grant marks the first step toward obtaining an operating budget for an organization that is expected to attract national attention.

Although organization of Boy Builders here has been carried on actively for the last 6 months, today's announcement of the grant brings the program into public focus for the first time.

"This grant is all the more remarkable to us," said Curry, "because we are just 6 days short of being 6 months old."

"It is unusual," Curry added, "for a new organization to have its application processed this rapidly. It seems to me that this speaks well of the work done by our board of directors and the advisory board of consultants."

"We have had the assistance of nearly 200 different persons in the organization of this prototype for school dropouts," Curry said.

Edward J. Kuntz, Boy Builders Foundation committee chairman, said, "The foundation committee of Boy Builders is certainly encouraged with this grant from Lilly. The foundation committee, composed of Sarkes Tarzian, Dr. Herman B Wells, and William S. Armstrong, endeavored to find foundations whose interests were covered by our proposed project.

"We are particularly pleased that the Lilly Endowment, Inc., an Indiana foundation, was the first to be contacted by the committee and also the first to award a grant," Kuntz said.

Boy Builders here, said Dr. Robert J. Havighurst, University of Chicago professor of education who has agreed to serve on the national board of sponsors, "is just the kind of project that ought to be picked up by local communities all over the country."

Announcement of the Lilly grant today also brought this comment from John S. Lynn, secretary and general manager of the Lilly Endownment: "This is a vote of confidence in the program projected by Boy Builders of Bloomington. We are pleased to have a part in the development of this new program."

The Boy Builders immediate objective is to provide an inbetween program for the boy who is legally permitted to drop out of public school at the age of 16, but is limited in his vocational opportunities until he is 18 years old because of insurance and compensation regulations.

The program here takes on additional importance because the school dropout problem has only recently been brought into national focus.

Bloomington will be watched closely in coming months by other communities—and local, State and Federal governmental agencies—concerned with the same problem.

It will also offer an opportunity for both undergraduate and graduate students attending Indiana University from all over the world to observe a program which provides a practical program for dealing with the problems of educational deficiencies.

There are no restrictions placed on membership in Boy Builders of Bloomington, Inc. Any boy 16 years of age or older is eligible for membership in the organization. Unlimited opportunities are available to boys regardless of race, religion, creed, or degree of academic and vocational deficiency through Boy Builders.

The boys are involved in a comprehensive program beyond the normal concept of a 5-day week regular school program. Each boy will have an opportunity to indicate his individual needs through a series of tests and evaluations to be administered by professionally trained faculty and staff members of Indiana University.

Each boy will have an individual tutor or counselor, using the wives of faculty members or retired teachers, to whom he will look for guidance and assistance. A broad course of diversified cooperative education leading to high school graduation is being projected through educational channels from the local to the State level. No boy will be forced to complete the required academic work, but it will be available to any boy who desires to better himself by working in a program of study designed to award him a high school diploma.

The vocational program will center around the house construction industry. Each boy will have an opportunity to work in all areas under the direction and instruction of skilled craftsmen and instructors. He will start with the preparation of the ground for footers and foundations and continue through to the capping of the chimney and the landscaping of the grounds.

The program is designed to offer a preapprenticeship program which may lead to acceptance as an apprentice in the trade of his choice when he becomes 18 years of age and can satisfy the entrance requirements for apprenticeship training. Boys whose manual dexterity or mental ability prohibit entrance into skilled apprenticeship programs will be directed toward employment commensurate with their abilities.

The boys will not be paid salaries, but will be taught the value of service as the houses will be built for, and with the help of, young married couples within the community who otherwise would not be financially able to build or purchase a house. It will embody a self-help plan, again under skilled craftsmen, which will permit the young couple to build up a "sweet equity" of their own. Although the boys will not be paid, each will receive a personal allowance of $5 a week. Hot lunches will be furnished. Clothing and shoes will be furnished. Foster homes will be provided where needed. Those who wish to engage in sports may be members of basketball, softball, bowling teams, etc. Clothes, equipment, fees, etc. will be paid by the organization.

Each boy will receive regular medical, dental, and optical examinations and checkups. Several different kinds of insurance, including health and accident, are carried on each member of the organization. Saturday will be "outside work day" and assistance will be given to the boys who wish to earn additional money. The hourly rate has been established at $1.25. The work must be within the framework of what the State regulations will permit.

In addition to Curry, other officers of Boy Builders are Dr. Kuntz, vice president; Ralph J. Nelson, treasurer; M. E. Klootwyk, assistant treasurer; William C. Reed, Jr., secretary; George L. Bower, Sr., Bruce B. Temple, and Tarzian, directors, and Dr. Jack B. Fellows, executive administrator.

The group's national board of sponsors includes Congressman William G. Bray, Dr. Arthur S. Daniels, of Indiana University; Dr. Daniel Schreiber, of the National Education Association; Dr. Harold G. Shane, of Indiana University; Dr. Lindley J. Stiles, of the University of Wisconsin; Dr. Herman B Wells, of Indiana University; Senator Vance Hartke, and Gov. Matthew E. Welsh.

There are 33 local persons on the advisory council.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 69, Senate bill 6, and that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments, on page 3, line 7, after the word "their", to strike out "instrumentalities, and mass transportation companies both public and private," and insert "instrumentalities"; in line 21, after the word "areas", to strike out "(including commuter service into or between such areas)"; in line 24, after the word "areas.", to insert "Assistance may be provided for land and improvements acquired or constructed in advance of such use, if the Administrator obtains adequate assurance of repayment of the assistance where the land and improvements are not in fact put to the proposed use within a reasonable period of time."; on page 4, line 11, after the word "the", to strike out "legal" and insert "legal,"; on page 5, after line 15, to insert:

> (c) No loan shall be made under this section for any project for which a grant is made under this section, except grants made for relocation payments in accordance with section 7(b). Loans under this section shall be subject to the restrictions and limitations set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 202(b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955. The authority provided in section 203 of such amendments to obtain funds for loans under clause (2) of section 202(a) of such amendments shall (except for undisbursed loan commitments) hereafter be exercised by the Administrator (without regard to the proviso in section 202(d) of such amendments) solely to obtain funds for loans under this section.

On page 6, after line 3, to insert:

> (d) Section 203(a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the third sentence a semicolon and the following: "except that notes or other obligations issued by the Administrator to the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain funds to provide financial assistance under section 202(a)(2) (as modified by section 3(c) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963) shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of the current average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance by the Administrator of the notes or other obligations".

On page 7, line 3, after the word "enterprise.", to insert "Where facilities and equipment are to be acquired which are already being used in mass transportation service in the urban area, the program must provide that they shall be so improved (through modernization, extension, addition, or otherwise) that they will better serve the transportation needs of the area."; on page 8, after line 6, to strike out:

> (c) No loan shall be made under section 3 for any project for which a grant is made under that section, except grants made for relocation payments in accordance with section 7(b). Loans under section 3 shall be subject to the restrictions and limitations set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 202(b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955. The authority provided in section 203 of such amendments to obtain funds for loans under clause (2) of section 202(a) of such amendments shall (except for undisbursed loan commitments) hereafter be exercised by the Administrator solely to obtain funds for loans under section 3 of this Act.

On page 9, line 23, after the word "service,", to strike out "and" and insert "or"; on page 12, line 13, after the word "assisted", to strike out "highways, the Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce shall consult on general urban transportation policies and programs and shall exchange information on proposed projects in urban areas" and insert "highways (including the acquisition of land and the acquisition or construction of improvements in advance of such use), the Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce shall consult on general urban transportation policies and programs and shall exchange information and otherwise cooperate with respect to the planning, financing, and construction of proposed projects in urban areas"; at the top of page 13, to strike out:

> INTERSTATE COMPACTS TO IMPLEMENT COMPREHENSIVE URBAN PLANNING
>
> Sec. 9. Section 701(f) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows:
>
> "(f) The consent of the Congress is hereby given to any two or more States to enter into compacts or other agreements, not in conflict with any law of the United States, for cooperative efforts and mutual assistance (including the establishment of such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable) for comprehensive planning for the physical growth and development of interstate, metropolitan, or other urban areas, or for carrying out mass transportation programs and other measures determined to be necessary for such growth and development."

At the beginning of line 16, to change the section number from "10" to "9"; on page 15, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "(but not including charter or sightseeing service) and moving over prescribed routes" and insert "and moving over prescribed routes, but does not include charter or sightseeing service, or aircraft or steamship service (other than ferrying service)"; after line 20, to strike out:

> (e) Grants made under section 3 (other than relocation payments in accordance with section 7(b)) for projects in any one State shall not exceed in the aggregate 12½ per centum of the amount of grant funds authorized in section 4(b), except that the Administrator (without regard to the foregoing limitation) may make additional grants in accordance with section 4 aggregating not to exceed 10 per centum of such amount.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

> (e) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, contracts for grants under section 3 (other than relocation payments in accordance with section 7(b)) for projects in any one State shall not exceed in the aggregate $12,500,000 which limit shall be increased by $25,000,000 on July 1, 1964, and by $25,000,000 on July 1, 1965. The Administrator may make additional contracts for such grants (subject to the limitations prescribed in section 4(b)) aggregating not to exceed $50,000,000, but such additional contracts for grants for projects in any one State shall not exceed in the aggregate $5,000,000. In the case of any project undertaken in two or more States, in accordance with a duly approved compact or other agreement, the Administrator may apply the foregoing limitations by allocating any portion of the grants contracted for such project to any one or more of such States.

On page 16, after line 19, to insert:

(f) The Administrator shall make an annual report to the President for submission to the Congress on the administration of this Act. Such report shall indicate to whom financial assistance has been extended pursuant to this Act, the purposes for which such assistance is to be utilized, and the amounts involved, and may include such other information, comments, and recommendations as the Administrator deems appropriate.

On page 17, at the beginning of line 4, to change the section number from "11" to "10"; in line 11, after the word "as", to strike out "amended, and every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be" and insert "amended"; at the top of page 18, to insert:

(c) It shall be a condition of the granting of any assistance or the financing of any project under this Act that fair and equitable arrangements are made, as determined by the Administrator after consultation with and the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees affected by such assistance or financing. Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary for (1) the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including continuation of pension rights and benefits) under existing collective bargaining agreements; (2) the encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights; (3) the protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment; (4) priority of employment or reemployment of employees terminated or laid off; and (5) paid training or retraining programs. The contract for the granting of any such assistance shall specify the terms and conditions of such protective arrangements.

And, at the beginning of line 20, to change the section number from "12" to "11"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress finds—

(1) that the predominant part of the Nation's population is located in its rapidly expanding metropolitan and other urban areas, which generally cross the boundary lines of local jurisdictions and often extend into two or more States;

(2) that the welfare and vitality of urban areas, the satisfactory movement of people and goods within such areas, and the effectiveness of housing, urban renewal, highway, and other federally aided programs are being jeopardized by the deterioration of inadequate provision of urban transportation facilities and services, the intensification of traffic congestion, and the lack of coordinated transportation and other development planning on a comprehensive and continuing basis; and

(3) that Federal financial assistance for the development of efficient and coordinated mass transportation systems is essential to the solution of these urban problems.

(b) The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to assist in the development of improved mass transportation facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods, with the cooperation of mass transportation companies both public and private;

(2) to encourage the planning and establishment of areawide urban mass transportation systems needed for economical and desirable urban development, with the cooperation of mass transportation companies both public and private; and

(3) to provide assistance to State and local governments and their instrumentalities in financing such systems, to be operated by public or private mass transportation companies as determined by local needs.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Sec. 3. (a) In accordance with the provisions of this Act, the Administrator is authorized to make grants or loans (directly, through the purchase of securities or equipment trust certificates, or otherwise) to assist States and local public bodies and agencies thereof, and mass transportation companies both public and private, in financing the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, and improvement of facilities and equipment for use, by operation or lease or otherwise, in mass transportation service in urban areas and in coordinating such service with highway and other transportation in such areas. Assistance may be provided for land and improvements acquired or constructed in advance of such use, if the Administrator obtains adequate assurance of repayment of the assistance where the land and improvements are not in fact put to the proposed use within a reasonable period of time. Eligible facilities and equipment may include land (but not public highways), buses and other rolling stock, and any other real or personal property needed for an efficient and coordinated mass transportation system. No grant or loan shall be provided under this section unless the Administrator determines that the applicant (which in no case shall be a private company) has or will have (1) the legal, financial, and technical capacity to carry out the proposed project, and (2) satisfactory continuing control, through operation or lease or otherwise, over the use of the facilities and equipment. The applicant shall, with respect to private mass transportation companies, give full consideration to the exercise of such continuing control through the appropriate existing governmental regulatory agency authorized to issue to the operating company, in the form of certificates of public convenience and necessity, franchises, or other indicia of operating authority, the authority to operate as a private mass transportation company. No such funds shall be used for payment of ordinary governmental or nonproject operating expenses.

(b) No grant or loan shall be made under this section to any State or local public body or agency thereof for the purpose of acquiring the facilities or other property of a private transit enterprise operating buses or similar motor vehicles, or providing by contract or otherwise for the operation of buses in competition with an existing transit company, unless the applicant has certified to the Administrator that (1) a grant or loan for such purposes is essential to the program, proposed or under active preparation, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area, (2) such program, to the maximum extent feasible, provides for the participation of private mass transportation companies, and (3) just and adequate compensation will be paid to such companies for acquisition of their franchises or property to the extent required by applicable State or local laws.

(c) No loan shall be made under this section for any project for which a grant is made under this section, except grants made for relocation payments in accordance with section 7(b). Loans under this section shall be subject to the restrictions and limitations set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 202(b) of the Housing Amendments of 1955. The authority provided in section 203 of such amendments to obtain funds for loans under clause (2) of section 202(a) of such amendments shall (except for undisbursed loan commitments) hereafter be exercised by the Administrator (without regard to the proviso in section 202(d) of such amendments) solely to obtain funds for loans under this section.

(d) Section 203(a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by inserting before the period at the end of the third sentence a semicolon and the following: "except that notes or other obligations issued by the Administrator to the Secretary of the Treasury to obtain funds to provide financial assistance under section 202(a)(2) (as modified by section 3(c) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963) shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury on the basis of the current average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance by the Administrator of the notes or other obligations".

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

Sec. 4. (a) Except as specified in section 5, no Federal financial assistance shall be provided pursuant to section 3 unless the Administrator determines that the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought are needed for carrying out a program, meeting criteria established by him, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area, and are necessary for the sound, economic, and desirable development of such area. Such a program shall encourage, to the maximum extent feasible, the participation of private enterprise. Where facilities and equipment are to be acquired which are already being used in mass transportation service in the urban area, the program must provide that they shall be so improved (through modernization, extension, addition, or otherwise) that they will better serve the transportation needs of the area. The Administrator shall estimate what portion of the cost of a project to be assisted under section 3 of this Act cannot be reasonably financed from revenues—which portion shall hereinafter be called net project cost. The Federal grant for such a project shall not exceed two-thirds of the net project cost. The remainder of the net project cost shall be provided, in cash, from sources other than Federal funds, and no refund or reduction of that portion so provided shall be made at any time unless there is at the same time a refund of a proportional amount of the Federal grant.

(b) The Administrator may contract to make grants pursuant to this Act aggregating not to exceed $100,000,000, which limit shall be increased by $200,000,000 on July 1, 1964, and by $200,000,000 on July 1, 1965. The Administrator is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to make advance or progress payments on account of any grant contracted to be made pursuant to this Act. The faith of the United States is solemnly pledged to the payment of all grants contracted for under this Act, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amounts necessary to provide for such payments.

EMERGENCY PROGRAM

Sec. 5. Prior to July 1, 1966, Federal financial assistance may be provided pursuant to section 3 where (1) the program for the development of a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system, referred to in section 4(a), is under active preparation although not yet completed, (2) the

facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought can reasonably be expected to be required for such a system, and (3) there is an urgent need for their preservation or provision. The Federal grant for such a project shall not exceed one-half of the net project cost: *Provided,* That where a Federal grant is made on such a one-half basis, and the planning requirements specified in section 4(a) are fully met within a three-year period after the execution of the grant agreement, an additional grant may then be made to the applicant equal to one-sixth of the net project cost. The remainder of the net project cost shall be provided, in cash, from sources other than Federal funds, and no refund or reduction of that portion so provided shall be made at any time unless there is at the same time a refund of a proportional amount of the Federal grant.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

Sec. 6. (a) The Administrator is authorized to undertake research, development, and demonstration projects in all phases of urban mass transportation (including the development, testing, and demonstration of new facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods) which he determines will assist in the reduction of urban transportation needs, the improvement of mass transportation service, or the contribution of such service toward meeting total urban transportation needs at minimum cost. He may undertake such projects independently or by contract (including working agreements with other Federal departments and agencies). In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Administrator is authorized to request and receive such information or data as he deems appropriate from public or private sources.

(b) The Administrator may make available to finance projects under this section not to exceed $10,000,000 of the mass transportation grant authorization provided in section 4(b), which limit shall be increased to $20,000,000 on July 1, 1964, and to $30,000,000 on July 1, 1965. In addition, notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 of this Act or of section 103(b) of the Housing Act of 1949, the unobligated balance of the amount available for mass transportation demonstration grants pursuant to the proviso in such section 103(b) shall be available solely for financing projects under this section.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall limit any authority of the Administrator under section 602 of the Housing Act of 1956 or any other provision of law.

RELOCATION REQUIREMENTS AND PAYMENTS

Sec. 7. (a) No financial assistance shall be extended to any project under section 3 unless the Administrator determines that an adequate relocation program is being carried on for families displaced by the project and that there are being or will be provided (in the same area or in other areas generally not less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of the displaced families) an equal number of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings available to those displaced families and reasonably accessible to their places of employment.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, financial assistance extended to any project under section 3 may include grants for relocation payments, as herein defined. Such grants may be in addition to other financial assistance for the project under section 3, and no part of the amount of such relocation payments shall be required to be contributed as a local grant. The term "relocation payments" means payments by the applicant to individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations for their reasonable and necessary moving expenses and any actual direct losses of property except goodwill or profit, for which reimbursement or compensation is not otherwise made, resulting from their displacement by the project. Such payments shall be made subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Administrator, and shall not exceed $200 in the case of an individual or family, or $3,000 (or if greater, the total certified actual moving expenses) in the case of a business concern or nonprofit organization. Such rules and regulations may include provisions authorizing payment to individuals and families of fixed amounts (not to exceed $200 in any case) in lieu of their respective reasonable and necessary moving expenses and actual direct losses of property.

COORDINATION OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR HIGHWAYS AND FOR MASS TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

Sec. 8. In order to assure coordination of highway and railway and other mass transportation planning and development programs in urban areas, particularly with respect to the provision of mass transportation facilities in connection with federally assisted highways (including the acquisition of land and the acquisition or construction of improvements in advance of such use), the Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce shall consult on general urban transportation policies and programs and shall exchange information and otherwise cooperate with respect to the planning, financing, and construction of proposed projects in urban areas.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 9. (a) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this Act, the Administrator shall (in addition to any authority otherwise vested in him) have the functions, powers, and duties set forth in section 402, except subsections (c)(2) and (f), of the Housing Act of 1950. Funds obtained or held by the Administrator in connection with the performance of his functions under this Act shall be available for the administrative expenses of the Administrator in connection with the performance of such functions.

(b) All contracts for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of facilities and equipment in furtherance of the purposes for which a loan or grant is made under this Act, entered into by applicants under other than competitive bidding procedures as defined by the Administrator, shall provide that the Administrator and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall, for the purpose of audit and examination, have access to any books, documents, papers, and records of the contracting parties that are pertinent to the operations or activities under such contracts.

(c) As used in this Act—

(1) the term "States" means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the possessions of the United States;

(2) the term "local public bodies" includes municipalities and other political subdivisions of States; public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States; and public corporations, boards, and commissions established under the laws of any State;

(3) the term "Administrator" means the Housing and Home Finance Administrator;

(4) the term "urban area" means any area that includes a municipality or other built-up place which is appropriate, in the judgment of the Administrator, for a public transportation system to serve commuters or others in the locality taking into consideration the local patterns and trends of urban growth; and

(5) the term "mass transportation" means transportation by bus or rail or other conveyance, either publicly or privately owned, serving the general public and moving over prescribed routes, but does not include charter or sightseeing service, or aircraft or steamship service (other than ferrying service).

(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the funds necessary to carry out all functions under this Act except loans under section 3. All funds appropriated under this Act for other than administrative expenses shall remain available until expended.

(e) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, contracts for grants under section 3 (other than relocation payments in accordance with section 7(b)) for projects in any one State shall not exceed in the aggregate $12,500,000 which limit shall be increased by $25,000,000 on July 1, 1964, and by $25,000,000 on July 1, 1965. The Administrator may make additional contracts for such grants (subject to the limitations prescribed in section 4(b)) aggregating not to exceed $50,000,000, but such additional contracts for grants for projects in any one State shall not exceed in the aggregate $5,000,000. In the case of any project undertaken in two or more States, in accordance with a duly approved compact or other agreement, the Administrator may apply the foregoing limitations by allocating any portion of the grants contracted for such project to any one or more of such States.

(f) The Administrator shall make an annual report to the President for submission to the Congress on the administration of this Act. Such report shall indicate to whom financial assistance has been extended pursuant to this Act, the purposes for which such assistance is to utilized, and the amounts involved, and may include such other information, comments, and recommendations as the Administrator deems appropriate.

LABOR STANDARDS

Sec. 10. (a) The Administrator shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of construction work financed with the assistance of loans or grants under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended. The Administrator shall not approve any such loan or grant without first obtaining adequate assurance that these labor standards will be maintained upon the construction work.

(b) The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in subsection (a), the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176, 64 Stat. 1267, 5 U.S.C. 133z–15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (48 Stat. 948, 40 U.S.C. 276c).

(c) It shall be a condition of the granting of any assistance or the financing of any project under this Act that fair and equitable arrangements are made, as determined by the Administrator after consultation with and the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees affected by such assistance or financing. Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary for (1) the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including continuation of pension rights and benefits) under existing collective bargaining agreements; (2) the encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights; (3) the protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment; (4) priority of employment or reemployment of employees terminated or laid off; and (5) paid training or retraining programs. The contract for the granting of any such assistance shall specify the terms and conditions of such protective arrangements.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

SEC. 11. In providing financial assistance to any project under section 3, the Administrator shall take into consideration whether the facilities and equipment to be acquired, constructed, reconstructed, or improved will be designed and equipped to prevent and control air pollution in accordance with any criteria established for this purpose by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of the pending bill (S. 6) staff members of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Subcommittee on Housing may be admitted to the floor of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE HONORABLE HARRY FLOOD BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the highest and most meritorious attributes a man can possess are absolute integrity, absolute honesty, and absolute courage. The Honorable Harry Flood Byrd, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, has these qualities, and he is indeed one of the true statesmen of all time. His State and Nation owe him a lasting debt of gratitude.

In the words of William S. White, the respected Washington columnist, writing in the April issue of the Reader's Digest:

> Harry Byrd symbolizes a vanishing era of public men who stood to the end in awareness that their true and ultimate responsibility was to country and history.

All who have served with Senator Byrd in this body know that Mr. White wrote with great truth. The Senator from Virginia has been dedicated, courageous, and forthright throughout all of his outstanding service in the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. White's tribute to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Meet the Honorable Harry (the Rare) Byrd

(By William S. White)

(Even those who disagree with his policies cannot help liking and admiring the patriarch from Virginia as a man of integrity and courage.)

A veteran Congressman said recently, "There are three parties in the U.S. Senate—the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, and the party of Harry Byrd. Harry is far too fond of the old Democratic Party ever to leave it, and he is too old-fashioned a southern gentleman ever to join the Republican Party. So, he has his own party—the Byrd-Democratic Party."

Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia, is the Senate's southern conservative patriarch. Some of his colleagues think of him as a force of reaction and pennypinching; others think of him as the last, best guard over the Federal Treasury, the last, best hope against Federal intervention in State and local affairs. But all of them think of Harry Byrd as a man of absolute integrity, absolute honesty, absolute courage.

Why absolute integrity? Because he votes as he believes. Why absolute honesty? Because he says what he believes, and only what he believes. Why absolute courage? Because no mere part-time valor can arm any man to vote invariably, and to speak invariably, only upon his own convictions.

Two years ago when the Senate voted on the Kennedy administration's proposal to extend unemployment insurance, Byrd lost, by only two votes, his fight to preserve the principle of State responsibility for the administration and distribution of the funds. But he did not, as a lesser man might, take the narrow defeat as a personal rebuke and go off sulking. Byrd, confident that his convictions were right, stayed on the floor. When the Senate clerk had called the last name and it was apparent how the vote had gone, Senators who had opposed him went to Byrd's front-row desk to congratulate him for his fortitude.

This respect for Byrd is bipartisan. When, after years of Democratic Party rule in Congress, the Republicans won a majority and the right to name committee chairmen in 1947 and 1953, they asked Byrd to remain as chairman of the House-Senate Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, which he had been instrumental in setting up in 1941. "That's Byrd's committee and he should keep on running it," one Republican explained. Today, the committee is one of the best sources of information about Government spending. Byrd, with 21 years as chairman, has been head of a congressional committee for a longer unbroken time than any other man in history.

Byrd is a true aristocrat, perhaps the last in the Senate and one of a nostalgic few remaining on the U.S. political scene. The name Byrd has been written across all the pages of Virginia's history since 1674. Yet, like many aristocrats, Byrd seems unconscious of his status. A thrifty man who has a horror of any kind of show, he could be picked as the least well-dressed Member on the Senate floor. He drives only low-priced automobiles. He buckets around his vast apple orchards in the Shenandoah Valley (he is the largest individual grower in the world) and around his hometown of Berryville in khaki pants and shirt like a farmer on the way to the general store.

Byrd's sole visible symbol of status is his white-pillared country house, Rosemont, which surmounts Berryville like a manor house over an English village. When, and very rarely, Byrd entertains at Rosemont (always in the spring, when the apple blossoms cover the hills), "H. F. Byrd," the apple grower, and Harry Flood Byrd, the U.S. Senator, become simply Byrd of Rosemont. In these moments Byrd is dressed for the role of southern squire, usually in white linen gleaming against his reddish, apple-cheeked face and his blue, amused eyes.

But Byrd's public life is his real life, and has been for 55 of his 75 years. His father, Richard Evelyn Byrd (the late admiral and explorer of the same name was Harry Byrd's younger brother), had sat with such absorption as speaker of the Virginia House of Delegates that he had neglected both his law practice and the small family fortune bound up in the Winchester Star. The Star had become so debt ridden that the elder Byrd had about decided to liquidate it. But Harry Byrd, although only 15, asked permission to quit high school and have a go at the paper.

His first problem was a heavy indebtedness to the firm that supplied the newsprint. He persuaded that firm to send newsprint c.o.d.—1 day's supply at a time. By day-and-night collection of bills owed the Star and by working as manager of the local Bell Telephone office, young Harry managed to pay for each shipment of paper as it arrived. And, finally, through his managerial skill, all back bills, too, were paid, and the newspaper became solvent.

But from early boyhood Harry Byrd had meant to be a public man. He was elected to the Winchester City Council before he was 21, to the State senate at 27, and was Governor of Virginia at 38. He has been a U.S. Senator since 1933, the year in which Franklin D. Roosevelt entered the White House.

In the years since he left the Virginia statehouse, Byrd has had some little hand, as he puts it, in the election of nine Governors of Virginia. Eight have been Byrd men—men who in general have shared his philosophy of fiscal prudence and belief in the maintenance of worthwhile traditions.

The Byrd organization is no Tammany Hall, no machine like the one the Republicans once had in Pennsylvania. It is variously described as an association of like-minded men (by its friends) and as Harry Byrd's steamroller (by his enemies). In the organization there are no direct ukases from on high; Byrd does not personally pick who is to run for what office. Still, when election time comes around, everybody in Virginia knows how the Senator feels. Byrd himself says, "For the success that I have had and the organization has had, there is, I think, one very simple explanation: I have always been conservative and it has always been conservative."

The catalyst that formed the organization came in 1923, when Virginia was torn by a debate over how to pay for badly needed highways. Byrd, as a State senator, advocated building modern roads; but unlike his opponents he felt the $50 million cost should be paid as the roads were built rather than by floating a bond issue. Resolving to carry the decision to the people, he slogged through muddy roads to nearly every city and village in the State. Byrd's proposal was simple: "Pull the farmers out of the mud, but do it sanely through a pay-as-you-go gasoline tax." The voters were convinced; the proposal for a bond issue was defeated, and Byrd became the logical choice for Governor.

As chief executive, Byrd streamlined the State constitution until it became a model studied throughout the the United States. He changed a $1,900,000 budget deficit into a $5,700,000 surplus. He persuaded the legislature to pass a tough law that ended lynching in Virginia. He lured new industry, and put Virginia on such a sound financial basis that, while it now ranks well above the national average in growth, expenditures for education, and percentage of surfaced highways, it has virtually no State debt.

Never has the organization been remotely accused of corruption. One of Byrd's few orders (decisions he calls them) to the organization was to resist the slightest touch of influence peddling. Indeed, Byrd's own antagonism to influence peddling is so marked as to seem to more relaxed politicians almost an obsession. For example, when President Eisenhower named Charles E. Wilson, of General Motors, as Secretary of Defense in 1952, nearly all of Washington assumed that Wilson would have no trouble in being confirmed by the Senate. But Byrd, though a strongly probusiness politician, read the conflict-of-interest laws to say that Wilson must sell his stock in General Motors, which held large contracts with the Defense Department.

There was a hard deadlock between these two hardminded men. Other Senators wanted a compromise; Byrd would have none of it. Wilson threatened to go over the Senate's head with a television appeal to the country. (What he meant was to go over Byrd's head.) Byrd told him, "Mr. Wilson, I do hope you won't do that. It would be very bad—for you." Wilson finally sold his stock.

Byrd's insistence on budget balancing, on pay-as-you-go, and his hostility to the spread of Federal powers often irritate his colleagues, but they could hardly imagine the Senate without him. In 1958 he announced that he was retiring. Mrs. Byrd had been ill, and he had promised her that he would not run again. There was an outpouring of genuine regret in the U.S. Senate, but the General Assembly of Virginia did more than regret. It passed a resolution, the first of its kind, calling on him to reconsider. "The general welfare of the entire United States and Virginia demands his continued service," the resolution concluded.

Byrd, bearing his promise in mind, went to Mrs. Byrd with the assembly's request. She herself wrote a letter to the assembly: "I have looked forward to my husband's retirement, but I do not feel that my hope should obstruct the judgment of those better informed than I who think he can render a public service in these trying days."

So Byrd ran again for the U.S. Senate. His favorite corner there is the finance committee, of which he is chairman. He fights a cheerful but endless rearguard action against too much spending, too much foreign economic aid, too much intrusion by the Federal power. His arguments, in brief, almost offhand speeches, are never stilled.

Hundreds of major legislative actions in the fiscal field over the years have borne the imprint of Byad's thrifty hand. The soundness of the social security system, for one, represents an enduring Byrd victory. From the enactment of the law in 1935, Byrd was dissatisfied with it, because it promised billions of dollars in pensions but offered no guaranteed means for paying the bill. He wanted nothing less than a pay-as-you-go plan—and 4 years later, in 1939, Congress accepted a Byrd amendment for pay-as-you-go.

Seventeen years later, when the Eisenhower administration proposed the vast multibillion-dollar highway program now in the process of lacing this country, Byrd returned to the same principle. Eisenhower and George M. Humphrey, then Secretary of the Treasury, wanted to finance the system with a bond issue which would augment the already mountainous Federal debt. Byrd told them, "Roads, yes, gentlemen. Bonds, no, gentlemen." When the Federal Highway Act of 1956 was finally adopted, it carried Byrd's pay-as-you-go financing plan.

He fights doggedly even on small items. When in 1945 the time came for President Franklin D. Roosevelt's fourth inauguration, Byrd was chairman of the Inaugural Committee. Congress appropriated for the occasion $25,000, to Byrd an ample sum. F.D.R., who had conducted polite but relentless warfare for years with the Senator, observed one night to friends: "Old Harry is so worried about money, I think I shall simply announce that I want nothing from him for the inauguration—not even his precious $25,000."

Byrd calmly took the President at his word. He issued orders to the Inaugural Committee to return the $25,000 to the Federal Treasury. Roosevelt paid for the chicken a la king inaugural luncheon out of regular White House funds.

Byrd has always assumed that because he means a thing when he says it, other public men mean what they say. Demagogery is utterly foreign to him; he never hides his motives or apologizes for his actions. "I just go on my regular course," Byrd was quoted by Time. "I don't claim to have any special virtues at all. I just vote for what I think is right."

Truman once said that there were "too many Byrds" in the Senate. But there is only one Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia; and there will not soon, if ever, be another. Issues are endlessly debatable; but character is not. And Harry Byrd symbolizes a vanishing era of public men who stood to the end in awareness that their true and ultimate responsibility was to country and history.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, it has become commonplace for the criminal conduct of individuals to be blamed on the ills of society, particularly in our large cities and here in the crime-ridden District of Columbia.

To subscribe to this doctrine is to deny that the individual has any control whatsoever over his actions, and to believe that man is a soulless being without any sense of what is right and what is wrong. It is to believe that if Abraham Lincoln were alive today he would grow up to be a rogue of the worst sort. Poor Abe, so underprivileged that he never had adequate schooling or proper housing, and without social workers to show him the way, never really had a chance.

However, no one told him this, and he persevered and determinedly set out to improve himself and to achieve the highest honor that can come to a citizen of this country.

The shortcomings of our society have for so long borne the brunt of the blame for the sins of man that it is refreshing, indeed, when someone puts the matter in its proper perspective, as was done March 28 in a letter to the Washington Evening Star by Elsie King Moreland.

With great truth, it is noted that only weak and irresponsible individuals will result from putting the blame on society for their behavior. It is time that individuals renew faith in themselves as masters of their fate, and act in accordance with responsible citizenship.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Why Blame Society for Sins of Individuals?

Human behavior, which was once motivated by the individual's concept of right or wrong, has now become a kind of reflex action, controlled by causes and forces beyond the individual's reach. The sins of the fathers and of society are his formidable inheritance, which he must accept and endure.

A whole new science, based on this idea, has come into being. For every form of behavior, from a temper tantrum to a vicious murder, there is a precise cause or blame, says this science. And matching one with the other has become as simple as matching a spool of thread with a piece of fabric. A rape, a robbery, or a murder is committed, and before the individual is fingerprinted and booked, we have been given the exact cause of the particular crime. If the exact cause is not readily available, there is always society to blame, or the individual's immediate community, or, in some instances, the region of his birth. Never, but never, must the individual responsible for the behavior be blamed. Indeed, it would almost appear that his participation or involvement in the crime is hardly more than that of an innocent bystander.

Shakespeare, in "King Lear," has Edmund say of evaders: "This is the excellent foppery of the world, that when we are sick in fortune—often the surfeit of our own behavior—we make guilty of our disasters the sun, the moon, and the stars: As if we were villains by necessity, fools by heavenly compulsion, knaves, thieves, and treachers, by spherical predominance; drunkards, liars, and adulterers, by an enforced obedience of planetary influence."

At the present time, planetary influence does not appear to be on the approved list of causes, but we can be sure that sooner or later the sun, the moon, and the stars will be made guilty of some of modern man's disasters. However, another type of influence appears to have been added, not to the causes perhaps, but to the justifications for some forms of behavior. This influence has to do with numbers, or the statistical approach to ethics. The old idea that right is right if nobody is right and wrong is wrong if everybody is wrong has been changed to wrong is right if everybody does it, or is doing it at a given time.

A well-known legislator recently justified some of his behavior with this new influence of numbers. He was just doing what everybody was doing, he said, no more, no less. Another legislator, apparently also using the statistical approach, is reported to have stated, in connection with the stadium riot, that he knew of worse riots in the Midwest. It is not quite clear what this statement was supposed to show or to prove, but if everybody does it is the criterion, then we are left to wonder what influence statistical evidence of riots in other parts of the country may do to this form of behavior.

It would be difficult to assess the potentialities for evil in this idea of removing from the individual all responsibility for his behavior. It underwrites crime, and subsidizes sin. It robs the individual of self-restraint, self-reliance, and self-respect, and makes him an automaton, his actions determined or predetermined by forces over which he has no control. It gives every juvenile a built-in alibi, and puts a gun, a knife or a club in his hand, and, says "Go out and have fun—you are not responsible." If there is any doubt that this approach to behavior is wrong, it can be quickly dispelled by considering the ever-increasing rate of crime, delinquency, illegitimacy, and other related social problems.

There are no villains by necessity. No one becomes a criminal or delinquent except through his own choice. The line which separates right from wrong may not be as sharply drawn today, but the majority of those with average intelligence know when they have crossed it. The boy who throws a rock through a window knows he is doing wrong. If not, why does he run? Studies of crime and delinquency show that there are no exact causes which can be applied to particular crimes or behavior. There are only factors which may or may not influence certain individuals. Each responds in his own way to a given situation.

The society which produces a panhandler and a purse snatcher will also produce an Andrew Carnegie and a Henry Ford. The circumstances which produce a coward will also produce a hero. The sinking of the Titanic produced a number of both. The poverty which produces a criminal will also produce an Abraham Lincoln and a George Washington Carver. The same environment—race, early surroundings, college and the study of science—which produced Julius Rosenberg also produced Jonas Salk. The same parents who produced Al (Scarface) Capone also produced his brother, Richard J. (Two-Gun) Hart, who, as a marshal and an Indian agent in Nebraska, enforced the law for 30 years. True, he changed his name, but by any other name, his heredity was exactly the same.

Those who blame society for an individual's behavior are themselves creating a society of weak and irresponsible individuals. Making society guilty is an admission that the individual is not capable of choosing or controlling his behavior. No man is free who is not the master of his fate. If his fate is determined by society, or any other force outside himself, he is not the master, and he is not free. Let those who excuse and blame ponder this. Will they have a free and responsible citizen who can choose and control his own destiny? Or will they have one who is a slave of circumstances and conditions, without any sense of responsibility for his own life or the community in which he lives? They must decide on one or the other. They cannot have both.

Elsie King Moreland.

POLITICAL CLEARANCE FOR STUDENT SUMMER JOBS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, recently I received an inquiry about a disturbing report that student summer jobs in Washington were being controlled by the administration for political purposes. Reports that applicants were being subjected to clearance through the New Frontier political machine were brought to my attention.

I immediately made inquiry through the Civil Service Commission and was assured both by phone and by letter that there had been—to quote Civil Service—"no departure from past policies or practices in employing students."

The writer, Chairman John W. Macy, Jr., continued with the reassuring words:

> Any political clearances for appointments to positions in the competitive service, either permanent or temporary are clearly prohibited by the Civil Service Act, rules, and regulations.

I realize the repetition involved in reading Chairman Macy's letter in full, but to avoid any chance of pulling his statements out of context I will quote the full letter at this point in my remarks:

> Dear Senator Simpson: This is in reply to your letter of March 12, 1963, in behalf of Mrs. Pollyann Lucas, 167 South 12th East, Salt Lake City, Utah, who asks about summer employment in the Federal service.
>
> Let me assure you that there has been no departure from past policies or practices in employing students or other persons for temporary periods during the summer. Pamphlet 45 has been reissued (a copy is enclosed) to set forth the summer employment opportunities known to the Civil Service Commission and the procedures to be followed by applicants interested in such opportunities. Any political clearances for appointments to positions in the competitive service, either permanent or temporary, are clearly prohibited by the Civil Service Act, rules, and regulations. The Commission will promptly investigate any specific charge that such prohibitions have been violated.
>
> Your enclosure is returned.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> John W. Macy, Jr.,
> *Chairman.*

Despite the abuses of power politics that I have witnessed in my brief tenure in the Senate, this letter did seem quite explicit and I in turn assured Mrs. Lucas that her trepidation was without cause and that no politics figured in the summer jobs.

At this same time the administration testified before the House Civil Service Committee that there was certainly no political patronage involved and that White House interest in the program was predicated on the most noble of motives; simply to set up the summer student seminars. The fears of all who questioned the patronage reports were thus quickly assuaged.

Senators can imagine my surprise Sunday when I read in the newspaper that the official publication of the National Federation of College Democrats had unveiled this play for the cruel hoax that it is. In an article last week the paper informed its readers that responsibility for summer employment jobs had been transferred to the White House.

We learn that each applicant is to write his Congressman for his recommendation and then forward it to the White House patronage clerk who will ascertain the political thinking of the students.

I submit, Mr. President, that this is the rankest type of vicious manipulation of the 10,000 students who are honestly seeking summer jobs in Washington, and of the Civil Service Commission, which is obviously in the dark about the situation.

In its insatiable drive to twist a political advantage from every event, program, and person the administration has violated the civil service law as explained by Mr. Macy and it is attempting to turn a nonpartisan student employment program into a campaign device for the New Frontier.

The American people are witnessing the antics of an administration that plays politics with everything from students to Cuban refugees to an agency of its own Government.

It is patent now that the White House will subtly reject applications of students who are not deemed compatible with the New Frontier grand design.

In his note of reassurance Chairman Macy takes note of the prompt investigation of any reports such as this usurpation of civil service employment. Here we have a clear-cut case for such an investigation before Washington is surfeited with a summer youth corps which is unwittingly giving some Democrat Congressman a boost for reelection, at the taxpayers' expense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred, written by Mr. Young, may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

College Democrats Are Told How To Get Summer Government Job

(By Joseph Young)

The Kennedy administration's disavowal of political patronage intent in the filling of student summer jobs in Government is sharply contradicted by one of the Democratic Party's own publications—the National College Democrat.

Only last Thursday, administration officials told the House Civil Service Committee that there was no political patronage involved and that the only interest the White House had in these jobs was in planning the student seminars which are held in connection with the summer employment.

However, the National College Democrat, the official publication of the National Federation of College Young Democrats, has this to say in its current issue:

"You may have noticed in recent newspaper stories that responsibility for such summer jobs has been transferred to the White House.

"The Young Democrats division has checked out what this means for you.

FORM TO WHITE HOUSE

"We have been recommended to suggest the following procedure. Write to your Senator or Congressman, asking him for a form 57. When you return it, ask him to enclose an accompanying letter of recommendation and to forward it with the form 57 to Mrs. Dorothy Davies at the White House."

Mrs. Davies is an assistant to Kenneth O'Donnell, special assistant to President Kennedy, and is handling Government summer employment for the White House.

The Democratic student publication mentions that "Washington's summertime lure is 'getting to' many college Young Democrats this time of the year."

With such competition among the Young Democrats, it reminded them that a political letter of recommendation to the White House from one's Senator or Congressman may not be a "guarantee" of getting a summer job. It urges the Young Democrats to follow up "any personal leads you may have" in pursuing a Government job.

The article concludes by reminding the Young Democrats that if they have any further questions they should contact Jim Hunt, the college director of the Democratic National Committee.

AN APRIL FOOL'S DAY NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it is an unfortunate coincidence that the Congress chose April Fool's Day to fool the American people concerning the size of the national debt.

Pursuant to an act of Congress, the papers will solemnly announce that today the ceiling on the debt drops from $308 billion to $305 billion, leaving the impression that there has been a marked reduction in the size of the debt, which, of course, is not true. For purposes of flexibility, the Treasury in recent years has been insisting upon a debt ceiling of at least $3 billion above the actual debt at any given time. As of today, the actual debt is $303,171,874,612.20. The Treasury had planned to ask Congress to provide a ceiling above $308 billion, but abandoned the plan when it became apparent that a bitter fight over the debt ceiling would mitigate against the chances of an income tax cut.

April is the month of the largest payment of personal income taxes and the Treasury feels there will be sufficient funds to meet current bills for the next 2 months under a debt limit of $305 billion prior to June 25, when under existing law the debt ceiling will drop to $300 billion, the Treasury will be forced to ask for legislative action to increase the debt ceiling. We do not know the exact figure that the Treasury will request, but in view of the fact that the Treasury Department anticipates a deficit of about $12 billion for the next

fiscal year and probably just as much for the following fiscal year, there are many who now believe that the Treasury will ask Congress to fix the new ceiling at $320 billion. The budget estimate for interest on the present debt is $9,400 million, but if Congress concurs in the planned deficits for the next 2 fiscal years, the carrying charge on the national debt will soon be close to $1 billion a month.

On this April Fool's Day, it is pertinent to point out that almost one-third of our monumental national debt has been created by the money we have loaned and given to foreign nations since the end of World War II.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a tabulation of those loans and grants which were published in the last issue of Time magazine. That tabulation shows how much each foreign country has received, making a total of $97,674,700,000. Whatever the accomplishments of foreign aid have been, the cost has been tremendous. We must review all further requests in this field.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Where the Money Went

The breakdown of military and economic aid given to foreign countries and groupings from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1962. An asterisk indicates classified military aid that is included in the regional totals:

[In millions of dollars]

	Economic	Military	Total
Europe:			
Austria	1,173.8		1,173.8
Belgium-Luxembourg	739.5	1,256.4	1,995.9
Denmark	300.3	605.3	905.6
France	5,175.6	4,262.4	9,438.0
West Germany	4,047.5	951.9	4,999.4
Berlin	131.0		131.0
Iceland	70.2		70.2
Ireland	146.2		146.2
Italy	3,463.3	2,292.5	5,755.8
The Netherlands	1,288.6	1,252.8	2,481.4
Norway	349.8	797.0	1,146.8
Poland	522.6		522.6
Portugal	152.1	336.6	488.7
Spain	1,173.6	537.7	1,711.3
Sweden	108.9		108.9
United Kingdom	7,668.2	1,045.0	9,713.2
Yugoslavia	1,703.0	693.9	2,396.9
Regional [1]	718.4	1,908.6	2,627.0
Total	28,872.7	15,939.8	44,812.5
Far East:			
Burma	95.4		95.4
Cambodia	248.6	85.9	331.5
Nationalist China	2,051.6	2,376.7	4,428.3
Hong Kong	30.4		30.4
Indochina region [2]	825.6	709.6	1,535.2
Indonesia	670.9		670.9
Japan	2,660.7	1,033.1	3,693.8
Korea	3,431.4	2,002.2	5,433.6
Laos	291.9	169.8	461.7
Malaya	23.2		23.2
Philippines	1,334.4	418.8	1,753.2
Thailand	336.1	417.8	753.9
Vietnam	1,699.3	742.4	2,441.7
SEATO	1.8		1.8
Regional	41.9	461.1	503.0
Total	13,743.2	8,417.3	22,160.5
Middle East and south Asia:			
Cyprus	16.9		16.9
Greece	1,784.8	1,602.8	3,387.6
Iran	732.3	577.9	1,310.2
Iraq	21.6	46.1	67.7
Israel	874.7	3.0	877.7
Jordan	325.2	24.1	349.3
Lebanon	80.4	8.6	89.0
Saudi Arabia	46.6	*	46.6
Syria	75.8		75.8
Turkey	1,581.3	2,288.0	3,869.3
United Arab Republic (Egypt)	628.6		628.6
Middle East, etc.—Con.			
Yemen	22.9		22.9
CENTO	27.4		27.4
Afghanistan	216.8	2.8	219.6
Ceylon	79.7		79.7
India	3,952.0		3,952.0
Nepal	48.4		48.4
Pakistan	1,889.6	*	1,889.6
Indus Basin [3]	33.8		33.8
Regional	139.4	713.0	852.4
Total	12,577.7	5,266.2	17,843.9
Latin America:			
Argentina	596.5	44.0	640.5
Bolivia	254.9	3.5	258.4
Brazil	1,736.8	215.9	1,952.7
Chile	675.6	62.2	737.8
Colombia	360.7	47.8	408.5
Costa Rica	89.1	.8	89.9
Cuba	41.5	10.6	52.1
Dominican Republic	39.3	6.1	45.4
Ecuador	113.1	25.2	138.3
El Salvador	39.6	1.1	40.7
Guatemala	158.2	4.4	162.6
Haiti	94.6	6.2	100.8
Honduras	43.0	2.3	45.3
Jamaica	8.8		8.8
Mexico	760.7	6.2	766.9
Nicaragua	65.1	3.8	68.9
Panama	99.9	.9	100.8
Paraguay	57.9	1.4	59.3
Peru	387.1	83.6	470.7
Uruguay	58.7	29.5	88.2
Venezuela	220.9	52.9	273.8
West Indies	22.5		22.5
British Guiana	3.5		3.5
British Honduras	2.4		2.4
Surinam	3.4		3.4
Regional	262.0	7.4	269.4
Total	6,195.5	616.1	6,811.6
Africa:			
Algeria	15.0		15.0
Cameroon	15.3	.3	15.6
Central African Republic	.2		.2
Chad	.4		.4
Congo (Brazzaville)	1.3		1.3
Congo (Léopoldville)	94.6		94.6
Dahomey	5.6		5.6
Ethiopia	117.8	67.5	185.3
Gabon	.5		.5
Ghana	156.5		156.5
Guinea	14.3		14.3
Ivory Coast	4.6		4.6
Kenya	18.5		18.5
Liberia	127.2	4.3	131.5
Libya	187.2	4.5	191.7
Malagasy	1.3		1.3
Mali	5.1	1.0	6.1
Mauritania	1.6		1.6
Morocco	352.0	*	352.0
Niger	3.2		3.2
Nigeria	43.6		43.6
Rhodesia-Nyasaland	36.1		36.1
Ruanda-Urundi	6.1		6.1
Senegal	4.6		4.6
Sierra Leone	3.5		3.5
Somali	27.4		27.4
Sudan	65.0		65.0
Tanganyika	17.6		17.6
Togo	5.8		5.8
Tunisia	293.3	*	293.3
Uganda	5.2		5.2
Upper Volta	3.2		3.2
Zanzibar	.1		.1
Other French possessions	6.0		6.0
Other Portuguese possessions	12.8		12.8
Other British possessions	.9		.9
Regional	11.1	34.3	45.4
Total	1,661.7	112.0	1,776.6
Nonregional [4]	3,561.4	708.0	4,269.4
Total	66,615.2	31,059.5	97,674.7

[1] "Regional" expenditures include multilateral programs in given areas; in Europe "Regional" also includes contributions to NATO.

[2] Aid given before Indo-China was given up by France in 1954.

[3] India, Pakistan, and other nations' participation in the Indus River project.

[4] Includes international bodies such as the United Nations and the International Labor Organization.

Source: Time, Mar. 29, 1963.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, April Fool's Day is a good day to remind those who are now contributing to their Government the largest percentage of their earned income of any free nation in modern times that the shibboleth of our State Department, "foreign aid with no strings attached," has actually meant foreign aid with little regard to a return to the American taxpayer.

April Fool's Day is likewise a good day to warn every man, woman, and child that, unless we take courageous steps to end deficit financing, there will come an April Fool's Day when they will learn to their sorrow that inflation has eroded the value of their life savings to a point where their insurance policies, savings accounts, and savings bonds are worthless. This has happened in many countries. It can happen here, unless we take steps to prevent inflation. We must take those steps, beginning today.

FREEDOM HOUSE POSITION ON CUBA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a full page advertisement which appeared in the March 25 edition of the Washington Post concerning a relatively new organization known as the Freedom House. Under the very able leadership of Roscoe Drummond, who is chairman of the board of trustees, the Freedom House is dedicated to the principles of peace and liberty throughout the world. Through their educational program, conducted by means of mass media, the Freedom House attempts to alert the public to any threats to our security and, in addition, it makes positive recommendations for action.

Mr. President, in this most recent advertisement, the situation now existing in Cuba is discussed. The advertisement correctly points out the bipartisan areas of agreement—first, to eliminate the Soviet political and military base in Cuba; second, to prevent the spread of Communist subversion and terrorism to other countries in Latin America; and third, to liberate Cuba from the terror of Castro's police state. The Freedom House puts forth six viable propositions which they believe are fundamental to a satisfactory solution to the Cuban matter—a solution in the best interests of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks here today the text of the advertisement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Free Cuba

A Communist Cuba is intolerable. It is intolerable to America for reasons which bear upon our security. But beyond that, there are other concerns which must move freemen.

Communist Cuba has betrayed 6 million people who won their freedom from the Batista dictatorship.

It has deprived them of a free press and the right to vote.

It has imprisoned more than 100,000 Cubans for suspected antipathy to communism.

It has compelled a quarter of a million to flee their homeland. An additional 180,000 await transportation and countless others wish to escape the reign of terror.

It has become the first Soviet satellite in the Americas. Even if we could be certain that every offensive military weapon has been removed from Cuba, there would remain the most effective offensive weapon of the 20th century: aggressive communism.

Freedom House holds it imperative that Americans close ranks to meet that threat.

The leaders of both parties appear to agree on these objectives of U.S. policy: (a) eliminate the Soviet political and military base in Cuba, (b) prevent the spread of Castro-Communist subversion, sabotage and guerrilla warfare, and (c) liberate the Cuban people from the terror of Castro's police state.

The issue before us, therefore, is not whether to move toward these goals, but how and when. Only the President, who has full access to the facts, can determine the character and timing of actions that will meet hemispheric and global requirements.

Freedom House believes, however, that public acceptance of the following propositions is basic for a viable solution:

1. The heart of the issue is the existence of a Communist regime in Cuba, serving as a Soviet political and military base for the purpose of multiplying Soviet satellites in this hemisphere.

The Soviets have helped to make Cuba a major training center and staging area for armies of Communist agents and guerrillas.

They have made Cuba the No. 1 military power in Latin America as a direct threat against weaker republics, which could generate an arms race with serious economic and political consequences.

2. The solution of the area's grievous social and economic problems will become increasingly difficult if not impossible to achieve should Cuba continue as a base for Communist penetration.

Under rising pressure from Communist Cuba, no Latin American government can be sure from one day to the next that it can maintain the peace and order necessary to carry out its social and economic plans. This could doom the Alliance for Progress.

The spread of the Castro-Communist infection is inclining influential Latin Americans to reach for the traditional solution of rightwing military dictatorship. Communists would welcome that as a step toward their seizure of power.

3. The nature of the threat requires that we be as much concerned with the security and freedom of our neighbors and allies as we are with our own.

A narrow interpretation of our national security suggesting that we will only take great risks to protect our own territory is bound to breed uncertainty. Some Latin Americans are already beginning to say: if the United States is unable or unwilling to repel this Communist menace we may have to fend for ourselves and somehow come to terms with it.

4. It is important to act and to time our action in consultation with our allies to assure maximum unity of the Organization of American States and the Atlantic Alliance.

Such action is authorized in the 1947 Rio Treaty which applies the U.N. Charter provision for self defense to the Organization of American States (OAS).

The resolutions adopted at Punta del Este in 1962 focus this doctrine on Cuba and call for individual and collective measures to counteract the continued intervention in this hemisphere of the Sino-Soviet Powers.

While preparing for action, we must not downgrade the danger. Nor should we defer to the timid members of the OAS in making decisions. The confidence of those who are under attack would thus be shaken; further provocations and miscalculations would be invited.

5. Failure to follow up initial success jeopardizes the gain and can lead to a setback.

The forceful and prudent U.S. action in the missile crisis induced Khrushchev to back away from his gamble. His credibility as well as the influence of Castro and Communism were considerably diminished. But these gains have since been partly dissipated.

Communists and their sympathizers can now make headway in Latin American trade unions, in universities and among the discontented generally. Growing uncertainty is causing flights of capital and discouraging investments sorely needed to get the Alliance for Progress moving.

6. The uncompromising assertion of our bipartisan objectives by word and deed is vital in rallying support for measures to realize our goals.

Our determination to see Cuba free and independent can be demonstrated now by helping qualified Cuban refugees to prepare themselves for democratic leadership. They should be given a chance to use their language and skills in the struggle for freedom throughout Latin America.

Our commitment to prevent the spread of Castroism should be implemented in cooperation with the threatened countries by working out unified defenses against the infiltration of Communist propagandists, terrorists and guerrillas. Their movements should be more effectively controlled and freedom fighters trained to counter their tactics.

We are confronted with a clear and present danger of more "Cubas" in Latin America. To turn the tide, we must not permit preoccupation with risks to impose paralysis on action. Consideration of this issue must not degenerate into a partisan wrangle.

An alliance for freedom is indispensable to the success of the Alliance for Progress. To that end Americans north and south of the Rio Grande should unite in a movement for a free Cuba.

FREEDOM HOUSE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Roscoe Drummond, Chairman; Harry D. Gideonse, president; Leo Cherne, chairman, executive committee; Harry J. Carman, George B. Ford, honorary chairman; Rex Stout, treasurer; Mrs. Henry Gale, assistant treasurer; George Field, executive director; Herbert Agar, Irving Brown, Ernest Cuneo, Christopher Emmet, Arthur J. Goldsmith, Nathaniel L. Goldstein, Mrs. Andrew Jackson, Jacob K. Javits, Maxwell A. Kriendler, John V. Lindsay, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Dwayne Orton, Mrs. Bonaro Overstreet, Rudolph Rathaus, Whitelaw Reid, John R. Richardson, Jr., Elizabeth M. Riley, Francis E. Rivers, Mrs. Kermit Roosevelt, Elmo Roper, Eric Sevareid, Whitney North Seymour, Mrs. Caroline K. Simon, Nathaniel Singer, Gerald L. Steibel, Herbert Bayard Swope, Jr., James J. Wadsworth, William L. White, Roy Wilkins.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE DOWNSTATE NEW YORK DIVISION OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the ruthless murder of 14,000 Polish officers 23 years ago was recently commemorated by the downstate New York division of the Polish American Congress. This brutal act of genocide committed by Soviet NKVD agents in 1940 still remains unpunished, and, at the present time, Poland still remains the exploited victim of Soviet imperialism, subjugated to the force and terror of Communist tyranny. In my judgment, the United States—in fact, the entire free world—cannot afford to neglect the hopes and ideals of these freedom-loving people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the downstate New York division of the Polish American Congress be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas 1,200 American friends of the cause of a free Poland are assembled this 10th day of March 1963, in the Polish National Hall, 19 St. Marks Place, New York, under the auspices of the Downstate New York division of the Polish American Congress, for the purpose of commemorating the 23d anniversary of the brutal murder of 14,000 Polish officers, professors, scientists, priests, and other leaders of Polish life in the Katyn Forest of Russia; and

Whereas a special congressional committee following the conduct of hearings in the United States and Europe, found substantial evidence that this infamous crime was committed by Soviet NKVD agents in the spring of 1940; and

Whereas the U.S. Congress forwarded these findings to the Secretary of State requesting him that all of the evidence produced at these hearings as well as the record be transmitted to the Geneva Assembly of the United Nations; and

Whereas the then Secretary of State failed to pass on these findings and this evidence to the Assembly of the United Nations; and

Whereas this murder at Katyn perpetuated by Soviet Russia and constituting one of the worst acts of genocide in the recent history of mankind still remains to be formally brought to the attention of the Assembly of the United Nations: It is hereby

Resolved, That the perpetrators of this crime must be punished; that the continued evasion by free nations of their responsibility to Poland, their loyal ally during World War II must cease; that we join with every friend of liberty in a continuing effort to bring to justice those who were responsible for this massacre; and be it further

Resolved, That this meeting calls upon the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, the Honorable J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable Thomas E. Morgan, chairman of the House Foreign Relations Committee, the Honorable Jacob K. Javits and the Honorable Kenneth B. Keating, U.S. Senators from New York, to make every effort to bring the findings of the special congressional committee investigating the Katyn massacre to the attention of the Assembly of the United Nations, with the demand that the perpetrators of this crime be punished in order that the ideals of justice may be made to prevail.

WLADYSLAW BORZECKI,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.
FELIKS POPLAWSKI,
EDWARD WITANOWSKI.

RIGHTS-OF-WAY FOR ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION LINES OVER FEDERAL LANDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall speak briefly this afternoon on two subjects: First, dealing with the problems arising in connection with the granting of rights-of-way for electric transmission lines over Federal lands; and second, dealing with some of the problems that are arising in connection with what I consider to be, under international law, illegal conduct on the part of certain Cuban exiles in the United States.

Turning to the first subject matter first, I was very happy to learn that last weekend the Interior and Agriculture Departments gave final approval to new regulations governing the granting of

rights-of-way for electric transmission lines over Federal lands. Secretaries Udall and Freeman have demonstrated that it is possible to protect the public interest in spite of the pressure of utility interests which want free access to the public domain.

Last week the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] submitted for the the RECORD a column from Newsweek entitled "Whose Lands Are These?" written by Mr. Raymond Moley. It was in response to the announcement of the two secretaries on granting rights-of-way for electric transmission lines over public lands that Mr. Moley wrote his article.

Mr. Moley was talking about the public lands; and if I did not know him better I would have expected from the title to hear that the public lands belong to the people of the United States, through their Government.

This is not the way Mr. Moley sees it. He viewed the public domain as the property of the private power companies.

Referring to Mr. Moley's column, Senator SIMPSON expressed the fear that the private utilities may be forced to "importune" the Government for "the right of existence" if the new regulations go into effect, requiring the companies to wheel Government power when excess capacity is available.

Mr. Moley goes even further and says that a Government policy attaching conditions to the granting of rights-of-way across these public lands would, "in effect, be violations of primary rights of property."

That is very interesting language—"primary rights of property." Whenever I read that sort of language, I am always looking for the definition. That is what we call the use of an emotional sanction. The question may be asked, "What is meant by 'primary rights of property'?" What do they accomplish?

This is a very interesting journalistic technique. It involves the use of phrases that can be characterized as emotional sanctions that stir the thalamus rather than the cortex.

When we start dealing with "primary rights of property," we must deal with legal definitions.

As I say, Mr. Moley talks about "violation of primary rights of property."

This is curious reasoning indeed. The proposed regulations were in effect in pretty much the same form from 1948 and 1954 and during that period some 84 rights-of-way were granted to utilities which willingly, if not cheerfully, agreed in return to carry Government power where excess capacity was available. It was not until the heyday of the Eisenhower "partnership" with the private utilities that the regulations were rescinded, under circumstances which needed the careful scrutiny which they received from a congressional committee.

Senator SIMPSON says that in imposing a wheeling requirement in exchange for a right-of-way across the Federal lands the Government is somehow violating the sanctity of company property. Or, as he said, the power companies "are seeking to build a house in which the Federal Government demands the right of entry as a building prerequisite."

If a fellow came to me and asked for permission to build a road across my farm, I might give him permission to do so if it did not damage the farm unduly. If I were a hard-headed business man, I might sock him with a substantial bill for the valuable right-of-way. At the very least, I feel sure that I would ask permission for me and my family to use the road, since it crossed our property. Only if I were in an exceptionally generous mood would I agree to use this road only at times when it would not inconvenience him.

In my view, the Interior and Agriculture Departments have adopted the generous view, in proposing that only excess capacity would be used to carry Government power, capacity not needed by the utility for its own deliveries.

What could be fairer? What could be more equitable?

Let us not forget for one moment that these lands belong to the people of the United States and are held in trust for them by their government. In asking permission to construct transmission lines over them, the power companies are asking a favor of no small magnitude.

Mr. Moley remarks in his column that "for such easements and rights-of-way, they—the power companies—pay to the Federal Treasury."

Mr. Moley does not say how much they pay. That is quite understandable, because it is so little that it would damage his argument rather than strengthen it. It is a token payment, roughly covering the cost of administering the permit. To compare these payments with the cost of acquiring right-of-way from private owners of land, possibly resorting to time-consuming condemnation proceedings, indicates the magnitude of the gift which these companies receive when they are permitted to build lines across the public domain.

And let us take a look at these allegedly onerous conditions which they must accept along with the gift:

First, the Government reserves the right to use excess capacity in the lines to transmit power—at its own expense. Second, where additional capacity is needed, the Government would have the right to add it, again at Government expense. And, third, where the proposed private transmission lines would conflict with the power-marketing program of the United States, companies could be refused permission to cross public lands but not, it should be pointed out, permission to build the lines elsewhere. In other words, the companies may build duplicating lines if they will, but not on Government land.

I fail to see how the first or second conditions could damage the utility companies in any way, except in weakening their monopoly position in some areas. Their power moves first, and in a manner to be determined wholly by the company.

But let us examine this monopoly question. The top spokesman for Pacific Gas & Electric Co., in hearings on this question back in 1955, said frankly that P.G. & E. did not want to wheel Government electricity because "there is no reason why in my opinion we should permit our lines to be used to enable the Government to take away our customers."

Here we get to the heart of the matter. That spokesman was the company's executive vice president, Mr. Gerdes, and the customers he was talking about were the so-called preference customers, entitled by law to first call on power from the Central Valley project in California. With the wheeling requirement, as with Federal transmission lines, these municipalities and rural electric cooperatives could contract directly with the Government for power from the Federal projects. Without wheeling or transmission, the preference customers were obliged to buy their wholesale power from P.G. & E., at P.G. & E. prices, at the very moment the power company itself was enjoying low-cost Central Valley power. The congressional intent to pass along the benefits of this power to nonprofit groups was frustrated because a single utility controlled the transmission system.

Mr. Gerdes testified that his company reluctantly agreed to wheel Federal power, by agreement, in 1951, and subsequently the General Accounting Office found the deal most beneficial to the company, if not to Uncle Sam.

It was brought out during the same hearings, which were conducted by the Subcommittee on Public Works and Resources of the House Government Operations Committee, that virtually every major power company in the West took part in the effort to get the transmission line regulations repealed in 1954. He named them—Montana Power Co., Utah Power & Light Co., Colorado Public Service Co., Portland General Electric Co., the California Pacific Utilities Co., Washington Water Power Co., Public Service Co. of New Mexico, Arizona Public Service Co., Pacific Power & Light Co., California Electric Power Co., Southern California Edison Co., and perhaps some others. He explained that the list comprised "the principal electric companies in the western part of the United States where the lands are in substantial part owned by the Federal Government"—hearings, "Certain Activities Regarding Power," Department of the Interior, "Changes in Power Line Regulations," page 438.

Representatives of these companies got together to prepare a list of changes which they thought Interior should make in its regulations, you will recall, and the result was a memorandum, drafted in the offices of Idaho Power Co., and left on the most appropriate desk in the Interior Department by Herman Kruse, Pacific Gas & Electric's chief Washington lobbyist.

The memorandum was adopted—as the Chudoff subcommittee described it in its report:

> The changes in the regulations * * * were adopted by the Interior Department verbatim from an anonymous document delivered personally without a covering letter or memorandum by a registered lobbyist of

> the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to the then Solicitor and now Undersecretary of the Interior, Clarence A. Davis, following Mr. Davis' request to the lobbyist to secure for him the views of the western electric utility companies on the changes they would like to see in the regulations * * *. The anonymous document was prepared in the office of the Idaho Power Co., following consultations among the utility company attorneys.

Idaho Power presumably played a key role because in essence the wheeling requirement came out of a dispute between Idaho Power and the Government. It began in the late 1940's when the Bureau of Reclamation and Bonneville Power Administration studied the possibility of bringing low-cost power into southeast Idaho to make feasible the development of Idaho's rich phosphate reserves. The two agencies came up with a proposal that the United States construct, own, and operate a transmission line across southern Idaho in order to bring low-cost power into the area. Within a few weeks after this proposal was made, Idaho Power applied to the Bureau of Land Management for a right-of-way easement over public lands to permit construction of the identical 230-kilovolt line proposed in the Bonneville-Bureau report. The Interior Department proposed that the Government would grant the right-of-way on condition that it would reserve the right to transmit Federal power over any unused capacity of the line upon payment of an equitable share of the operation and maintenance costs. This led to issuance of a general regulation embodying the terms of the proposal to Idaho Power.

The company refused to go along, withdrew its request for a right-of-way permit, and instead asked the Federal Power Commission to approve the 230-kilovolt line as a project line for the 70,000-kilowatt Bliss project. At the Interior Department's request, the Bliss license included a similar wheeling provision in the license, and the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the validity of the provision.

Meanwhile, the regulation remained in effect, and as I mentioned earlier, some 84 rights-of-way were granted, subject to the wheeling requirement.

So much for the wheeling requirement. The third condition which is imposed by the new regulations seems to be entirely noncontroversial, in my opinion. It states that where the proposed private transmission lines would conflict with the power-marketing program of the United States, companies could be refused permission to cross public lands.

This could require the companies to relocate their lines in order to build them on private property, or it could lead to a healthy reconsideration of plans in order to provide the most economical delivery for government and private customers alike. In any case, I believe that just as I could turn down a request to build a road through my front lawn the Agriculture and Interior Departments have the right to prevent unnecessary duplication of lines, which after all will mean unnecessary despoilation of the public lands.

The key here, however does not lie in the new regulations. The Departments have a broad authority to protect the public lands, conferred in several rights-of-way statutes.

A joint statement issued recently by both Departments, announcing final approval of the regulations, said it this way:

> Both Departments have general authority to grant or deny rights-of-way over Government lands in the public interest. The purpose of the new regulations is to make clear that the two Departments intend to exercise this authority in acting upon rights-of-way and to condition the granting of rights-of-way on the applicant's making surplus transmission capacity available for wheeling power for the Government. The Department of the Interior relies extensively upon wheeling arrangements with other utility systems to carry out the congressional intent of delivering Federal power to public bodies and cooperative customers at lowest rates consistent with sound business principles.

In my view the Departments have not only the authority, but also the responsibility to "grant or deny rights-of-way over Government lands in the public interest," Mr. Moley to the contrary notwithstanding. I commend the Departments for making it clear that they intend to exercise this responsibility. Whose lands are these? They belong to the American people, Mr. Moley, and our Government is exercising its trust in their behalf.

Mr. President, I would have Mr. Moley well understand that. For 18 years I have served in the Senate, in part as a watchdog, seeking to protect the users of public preference power. It has been a tough fight. It is not over, for periodically the selfish interests of this country which want to put private interests above the public interest try to make a raid through various mouth organs such as, in this instance, Mr. Moley, writing for Newsweek, whose record has been a rather shabby one over the years in defense of the selfish interests of private utilities of this country. But so long as I sit at this desk, I intend, when this kind of propaganda is given to the American people, to answer it.

In my judgment, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior are deserving of the sincere thanks of the American people for the new regulations which they have issued. They are really, after all, a revival of old regulations to protect the interests of the public against an attempt by the private utility combine in this country to turn the public domain, belonging to all the people, into their own private domain.

I want Mr. Moley to know that if this is the beginning of a new fight in defense of the best interests of the public power preference users of the country, I welcome it, as I have in the past, when the fight has been made on the floor of the Senate to protect the interests of the users under the public preference clause.

Mr. President, on a related matter, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record testimony which I gave today before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs concerning the Pacific Northwest intertie power line.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Senator Wayne Morse Before Senate Interior Committee on S. 1007, April 1, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to submit this statement in support of S. 1007, a bill to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority. The following factors are of great importance and I trust they will receive serious consideration by the committee:

1. The Pacific Northwest's economic growth—past, present, and potential—is inseparably linked with the development of Federal hydroelectric power. In his statement to this committee last year, Bonneville Power Administrator Luce most adequately delineated the importance of Federal power in our region. He stated:

"For years industries in the Pacific Northwest have been important customers of the Federal system. Their purchases have varied from more than 60 percent of the energy sold by Bonneville Power Administration in 1945 to an average of approximately 36 percent during the past 4 years. Their original plant investment is more than $350 million. Their plant replacement cost would be double that figure. They employ 15,000 Pacific Northwest citizens directly and another 30,000 indirectly. The utility of those plants and the thousands of jobs which they have made possible are directly dependent upon the maintenance of a low-cost power supply. If Pacific Northwest Federal power—and that area has no low-cost alternative—is diverted to other regions, many of these industries would have to stop production. The Nation would not gain by shutting down these plants in order to export the power from the Pacific Northwest, and the impact on that region would be catastrophic."

2. Prime income-producing activities in the Pacific Northwest are lumber, agriculture, and tourism. All three are subject to the whims of weather. All three exhibit severe seasonal fluctuations and are highly sensitive to business cycles. Lumber and agriculture are presently confronted by serious problems and are subject to drastic fluctuations due to demand in elasticity and international marketing problems. Electroprocess industries provide stable payrolls. Low-cost power compensates for our long distances from major markets and supplies industrial incentive for creation of new jobs.

3. Water is the source of our electricity. We have no proven reserves of gas or oil, and known coal resources are limited. Approximately 96 percent of our firm energy capability is hydro and about 62 percent of this hydro is owned and operated by the Federal Government. No other area in the country is so dependent on hydropower and, only the Tennessee Valley exceeds this region in percentage of federally owned generation.

4. The people of the Pacific Northwest are paying off the Federal Government's power investment there—with interest. To date they have returned to the Treasury over three-fourths of a billion dollars.

5. An electrical interconnection between the Pacific Northwest and California was outlined as early as 1935 by the Pacific Northwest Regional Planning Commission, which included a representative of the State of Oregon. With the knowledge that such transmission link is technically and economically feasible, the Department of the Interior has this year requested $24 million

to begin construction of this extra-high-voltage line.

6. A common-carrier, high-capacity interconnection linking the electrical systems of the two regions will provide enormous benefits to both areas. With public and private electric systems participating and with optimum facilities, it is currently estimated benefits would exceed costs by a ratio of more than three to one. The economic benefits which would accrue to BPA would restore Bonneville's surplus repayment picture, open a market for nonfirm, dump power, and provide a means by which the Pacific Northwest could obtain additional firm power when needed in the future.

7. The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has long recognized the need for proper protection of the interests of power consumers in any energy or capacity interchange involving Federal power. In a resolution of June 21, 1960, the committee requested that no contract be made for transfer of BPA power to California pending completion of further studies and consideration of legislation to preserve the position of BPA customers in the Northwest. I joined with other Northwest Senators in asking the then Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton to act in accordance with that resolution.

8. Interconnection of the Northwest and Southwest by major transmission facilities will soon be a reality. Already the Bonneville Power Administration has received six offers to build all or part of the extra-high-voltage line. A Federal request for an appropriation of $24 million to begin construction of a Federal intertie is now before Congress. New technology has made it possible to use such lines to transmit power from northern Washington to southern California.

A solution to the problem pointed up by hearings held by your committee in 1959 and 1960 should insure two things: It must (a) protect against raiding the resources of one region to make rich another and (b) provide for an orderly and equitable share of benefits between regions. I believe that maximum mutual advantage can be achieved without Balkanization and without doing violence to traditional power marketing policies.

Integrated operation can produce benefits for individual electric systems which are impossible with isolated operation. Power pooling in the Northwest provides a practical demonstration of this fact. Coordination has produced benefits impossible of achievement by power producers operating singly, and this has been accomplished without infringement upon the basic rights and responsibilities of particular utilities. Technology has increased the opportunities for mutually advantageous cooperation. Organization and operational patterns must keep pace.

In 1962, similar legislation was considered by this committee, and passed by the Senate. At that time, Mr. Luce informed the committee, of the exhaustive review which preceded the submission of this proposal by the Department of the Interior. The bill has wide support, including the general backing of private and public utilities throughout the Northwest, and has received bipartisan support in Congress. The committee in its study of this legislation gave full consideration to the comments of residents of the Northwest last year when S. 3153 was acted upon favorably. I know that the committee will reiterate its positive position of last year, and act favorably on S. 1007 in recognition of the vital stake of the people of the Northwest in the ultimate decision of Congress on this matter.

The good of the Northwest, Southwest, and in fact the whole Nation will be served by establishing ground rules which will permit cooperation and coordination in use of our surplus electrical energy resources for the maximum benefit of all.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Florida if he wishes to have me yield to him, without my losing the floor, so that he may make an announcement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief announcement relative to the ratification of the anti-poll-tax amendment by two additional States. I realize the distinguished Senator from Oregon has finished one of his subjects. Before he proceeds to another, I wonder if he would yield to me for the time necessary to make the announcement and to respond to the comments which Senators may wish to make.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as is my custom, I am delighted to yield to a colleague in a situation such as this. Without losing my right to the floor, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

RATIFICATION OF ANTI-POLL-TAX AMENDMENT BY KANSAS AND MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that two additional States have ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment which would eliminate the payment of a poll tax or any other tax as a requirement for voting for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senators or Representatives in Congress.

These two States, I am delighted to note, are Kansas and Massachusetts. This brings the number of States whose legislatures have ratified this most important amendment to the Constitution to 29. As Members of the Senate are aware—for a constitutional amendment to become valid—article V of the Constitution requires ratification by three-fourths of the States of the Union or 38.

Mr. President, the Kansas Senate, on March 21, ratified the anti-poll-tax amendment by a vote of 24 to 8, the the Kansas House having previously ratified the amendment on March 14 by a vote of 111 to 0.

I wish to express my profound appreciation to my distinguished colleagues from Kansas, Senator Carlson, who cosponsored and supported my resolution to passage in the Senate and has worked diligently in seeking its ratification by his State's legislature, and Senator Pearson, who supported my resolution in the Senate and has likewise directed his efforts toward ratification by the legislature of his State.

I should like to add that his predecessor, Senator Schoeppel, was among the 67 cosponsors of my resolution, but passed away prior to its passage by the Congress and its submission to the States. His distinguished successor, Senator Pearson, has continued to give leadership in this important field.

In the case of Massachusetts, the assembly of that State's legislature approved the anti-poll-tax amendment on last Thursday, March 28, by a vote of 223 to 0, completing ratification by Massachusetts, the Senate having previously approved the measure on March 27 by a vote of 36 to 0.

I am, indeed, indebted to both the distinguished Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall and Mr. Kennedy] for their leadership in this matter. Senator Saltonstall cosponsored, and supported my resolution in the Senate, and lent his assistance toward ratification of the amendment by the Massachusetts Legislature, and Senator Kennedy has been most helpful since he became a Member of this body in securing the gratifying action which I am announcing today. I wish to thank Senator Kennedy very much for having gone to the trouble personally to send word to me from Massachusetts on Friday about the action taken unanimously by the legislature of his great Commonwealth.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Florida for his very kind and gracious remarks. I am delighted, as well, that Massachusetts gave the very fine bipartisan support to the amendment, such as we have seen exhibited by so many other States.

I wish to join with the score of voices from this body in commending the outstanding work which has been done by the distinguished Senator from Florida. It has been an honor for me to be able to work with him on this important amendment, and to render what small assistance we have been able to provide.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I express my deep appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. In my humble judgment, if he continues in the path of service which he is following—having been so helpful, constructive, nonpartisan, and, I think, truly patriotic in this matter—he will achieve a great record as a Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in connection with the good news of today, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the very fine letter written by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] to the editor of the Washington Post, the letter having been published in last Thursday's edition of that newspaper, on March 28. I particularly appreciate the statement in his letter to the Washington Post that the demise of the poll tax in Tennessee has resulted in a "healthy increase in the percentage of voter participation" in his State. I found the same thing to be true in Florida, after Florida eliminated the State poll tax requirement in 1937. I again congratulate the distinguished Senator from Tennessee upon his leadership in this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Adding Coup de Grace

> As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I read with interest your editorial of March 22 applauding the fact that 24 States have now approved the proposed 24th or anti-poll-tax amendment to the U.S. Constitution.
>
> I expect that many readers were intrigued by the map which you printed, showing the State of Tennessee, which was the first Southern State to approve the amendment, surrounded by other States that have not yet done so. This is no legislative accident, but is in keeping with the progressive traditions of Tennessee, and with a historic stubborn anti-poll-tax sentiment among Tennesseans.
>
> The Tennessee Legislature first voted to eliminate the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in 1943. This was frustrated by a decision of the Supreme Court of Tennessee, which held the act unconstitutional. In 1953, this court decision was overruled by an amendment to the State constitution which finally eliminated the poll tax requirement.
>
> Since the demise of the poll tax restriction in Tennessee, there has been a healthy increase in the percentage of voter participation, and I am proud that our legislature has approved the amendment to eliminate this voting restriction from the Nation as a whole.
>
> Estes Kefauver,
> *Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments.*

Mr. **KEFAUVER**. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. **HOLLAND**. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. **KEFAUVER**. I wish again to congratulate the Senator from Florida for his leadership on behalf of the ratification of the 24th amendment. As he has stated, there is no organized group or paid lobby behind this effort. The great success of the proposed amendment has been due to the interest of all Members of the Senate and the interest which we have been able to generate in our own States through the Governors and members of the legislatures.

I am very happy that Tennessee was the 25th State to ratify the amendment. At that time I said that a large part of the credit was due the Governor, Hon. Frank Clement, and two members of the general assembly, who took the lead in behalf of ratification, Senator Robert C. Taylor, of Nashville; and Representative Ray R. Baird, of Rockwood.

I am proud of the fact that Tennessee was the 25th State—and the only State in that section of the country—to ratify the amendment. I am also proud that this action was taken by overwhelming majorities in both the senate and the house of representatives.

Mr. **HOLLAND**. Mr. President, again I thank my distinguished friend, who, himself, has been so greatly responsible for the action taken by his State.

Mr. President, yesterday there was published in the Florida Times-Union, of Jacksonville, Fla., a fine article written by John Chadwick, of the Associated Press. It is a well written, factual summation of the situation in regard to this amendment; and the article states, in a more comprehensive manner than anything else I have seen, the situation at this time. With 29 States having ratified the amendment and with ratification by 9 more required to complete action on this important proposal—and it will be difficult to get them all, this year—the picture is fully painted by Mr. Chadwick in his article. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Anti-Poll-Tax Amendment Needs Ratification by Nine More States," be printed at this point in the Record, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Anti-Poll-Tax Amendment Needs Ratification by Nine More States

> Washington, March 30.—Will an anti-poll-tax amendment be written into the Constitution before next year's elections?
>
> The proposed amendment, approved by Congress last summer, must be ratified by the legislatures of 38 of the 50 States to become effective.
>
> As of today, it has been ratified by 29 States. This leaves 9 to go, with 15 other State legislatures now in session or to be in session before the end of the year.
>
> SIX STATES OPPOSED
>
> What's the outlook in these 15 States? In six of them, ratification is unlikely. Backers of the amendment are not counting on approval by Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, or Texas.
>
> This means the other nine States all must ratify if the amendment is to become effective this year.
>
> In three of these States, Arizona, Iowa, and Missouri, one branch of the legislature has approved the amendment but not the other. In Delaware, Maine, Nebraska, New Hampshire, and Oklahoma neither house has acted yet. The Florida Legislature doesn't meet until next week.
>
> HOLLAND OPTIMISTIC
>
> Senator Spessard L. Holland, Democrat, of Florida, chief sponsor of the amendment, said today he regards as excellent the prospects for ratification by the Florida Legislature.
>
> The amendment would outlaw payment of a poll tax, or any other tax, as a requirement for voting in presidential or congressional elections.
>
> Only five States—Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia—now make poll tax payments a requirement for voting.
>
> Holland first introduced an anti-poll-tax amendment in 1949 and has been plugging for it ever since.
>
> The Senate approved the amendment by a 77 to 16 vote last March 27 and the House by a 294 to 86 vote August 27.
>
> Holland says that abolishing the poll tax will make an important contribution to better government by bringing about greater participation of qualified voters.
>
> DEPLORES PRICE IN VOTE
>
> "I have strongly felt for many years that the voter who is otherwise qualified should not have a price set upon his right to participate in the selection of his national leaders," he says.
>
> "Nor do I believe that the qualified citizen's right to vote in a national election should be abridged or denied because of his failure through poverty or oversight to pay a poll tax or any other tax."
>
> His fight against the poll tax goes back to his days as a State legislator. He played a key role in Florida's elimination of its poll tax in 1937 when he was a member of the State senate.
>
> But Holland, like other Southerners in Congress, battled bills introduced year after year by civil rights advocates to wipe out the poll tax by statute.
>
> Illinois was the first State to ratify Holland's amendment, completing action last November 14. Since then it has been ratified by the Legislatures of New Jersey, Oregon, Montana, West Virginia, New York, Maryland, California, Indiana, Rhode Island, Michigan, Alaska, Ohio, Idaho, Hawaii, New Mexico, Utah, Minnesota, North Dakota, Colorado, Vermont, Washington, Nevada, Tennessee, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, and Kansas.
>
> The Mississippi Legislature is the only one that has voted to reject the amendment, but the Legislatures of South Dakota, Wyoming, and Arkansas adjourned this year without acting on it.
>
> Holland told the Senate the other day that the legislatures of 9 States had ratified the amendment unanimously and that in 12 other States either the house or the senate ratified without a dissenting vote.
>
> The closest vote was in the Montana house, where ratification was voted 56 to 37. But the Montana Senate voted for ratification 51 to 4.
>
> Holland has credited Senate colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, with yeoman service in bringing the amendment to the attention of State officials and urging its ratification.
>
> But he told the Senate that "there is no lobby behind the effort. Not a nickel's worth of money from any source in pushing it."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, again I thank the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] for his courtesy, which I have learned to expect from him during all these years of friendly association. He is always courteous to his colleagues, and particularly to his seatmate, the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that from day to day I await with great anticipation the reports by the Senator from Florida on the progress which his anti-poll-tax amendment is making throughout the country.

As I have said before, and I repeat today, one of the greatest contributions to the civil rights issue, and one which is completely helpful in connection with a most important part of it, is made by the Senator's anti-poll-tax amendment. Certainly their right to vote is a civil right which is completely basic to freedom for Americans. In that connection, the anti-poll-tax amendment is most important.

I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that although, as usual, he speaks with considerable understatement when he discusses the prospects for incorporation of his anti-poll-tax amendment in the U.S. Constitution, I venture to predict—dangerous though prediction is—that his amendment will be ratified by a sufficient number of States and will become part of the Constitution of our country at a very early date.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon always overwhelms me.

As he knows, I am very greatly interested in the right to vote, and have been for many years. In that connection, I found that even in my own State, literally thousands of citizens were prevented from voting, either by penury or by other circumstances, when we had a poll tax. Certainly it is most important that every citizen, whatever his circumstances, have an opportunity to vote for electors for President and Vice President and for Senators and Representatives in Congress; and certainly his right to vote will be protected if this amendment is ratified by a sufficient number of States and becomes part of the U.S. Constitution.

So, all of us are very much interested in having it ratified. No one has helped more in that connection than the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is quite correct when he says that all of us are very much interested in having the amendment ratified. Whenever exercise of the right to vote is made difficult of attainment by any citizen, of whatever color, full citizenship rights are denied him. So I believe it most important that every American citizen be given ample opportunity to exercise the precious right to cast a free ballot.

ACTIVITY OF CUBAN REFUGEES AND THEIR RECENT FORAYS AGAINST CUBA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, events of recent days have brought to the fore a matter which has largely been ignored in this country, although it can cause painful consequences if it is ignored any longer. That is the activity of the Cuban refugees and their recent forays against Cuba.

Not much has been said about the fact that since the Castro government took power, some 250,000 Cubans have come to the United States, nearly all of them simply as guests of the United States. They are not here under immigration quotas, but are outside them. They are here in a form of asylum, despite the fact that it has never been a normal practice for the United States to receive political refugees, except as immigrants who have come to live here as permanent residents.

As noted in Hackworth's Digest of International Law—volume II, page 622:

> The Government of the United States has strongly disapproved of the principle of asylum as such and has declined to recognize or subscribe to it as a part of international law.

Yet about 95 percent of the registered Cuban refugees over the past 2 years have entered this country under a visa waiver, and are on parole here.

The provision of law which authorizes such a proceeding is section 212(d)(5), which reads:

> The Attorney General may in his discretion parole into the United States temporarily under such conditions as he may prescribe for emergency reasons or for reasons deemed strictly in the public interest any alien applying for admission to the United States, but such parole of such alien shall not be regarded as an admission of the alien and when the purposes of such parole shall, in the opinion of the Attorney General, have been served the alien shall forthwith return or be returned to the custody from which he was paroled and thereafter his case shall continue to be dealt with in the same manner as that of any other applicant for admission to the United States.

There appears in the same statute, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, the following provision, just a few paragraphs after the provision I have already cited:

> Whenever the President finds that the entry of any aliens or of any class of aliens into the United States would be detrimental to the interests of the United States, he may by proclamation, and for such period as he shall deem necessary, suspend the entry of all aliens or any class of aliens as immigrants or nonimmigrants, or impose on the entry of aliens any restrictions he may deem to be appropriate.

We know that the use of the mass parole provided by the 1952 act, although contrary to American practice, and quite unique in our history, was completely justified on humanitarian grounds alone.

We have done more than merely admit these people. Over three-quarters of them have sought and have received cash assistance. Thus far, the Federal Government has spent more than $50 million in direct financial aid. The cost of medical care, educational benefits, and other items is not counted in that total. The current rate of grant assistance is running at about $2½ million each month.

Because of the difficulties experienced in handling this sudden influx into the Miami area, over 50,000 refugees have resettled in other parts of the United States. Many of them have obtained jobs, with the help of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I do not question for a moment the good faith of all the Cuban refugees. They have been grateful for our assistance, and in many cases, have repaid our financial help as soon as they were able to do so.

But it is also true that all of them are here on a temporary basis, under special regulation. Save for an early wholesale return to Cuba, their status in time will have to be regulated by special legislation by the U.S. Congress.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF CUBAN REFUGEES

While they are here, however, it is not amiss to remind them that they are expected to observe all the laws, and to respect the foreign policy objectives of the United States.

Nor is it for Cuban refugees to determine U.S. foreign policy. It is not for Cuban refugees to attempt to determine American foreign policy. It is for Cuban refugees never to forget for one moment that they are here as our guests. We are providing them with a sanctuary. We are providing them with protection. They are not in the United States with any rights, legally or morally, to use the territory of the United States for activities aimed at implicating American foreign policy in situations that might very well lead to war.

I wish to stress that point by way of digression, because I know that what I am now saying will not be music to some ears. The responsibility for American foreign policy rests with the American Government and not with Cuban refugees.

One of the most important, and most critical of these foreign policy objectives is the removal of the forces of the Soviet Union from the island of Cuba. The type of raid on Cuba which has been carried on recently is certainly more of a display, built up by publicity and advertising, than a genuine assault on the Russo-Cuban armed forces in Cuba; it does nothing to hurt or diminish those forces. But it certainly gives the Russians a justification for remaining to protect Cuba.

Similarly, the raids give Castro justification for increasing his indigenous armed forces, and for taking sterner measures against the Cuban people.

Yet in neither case do the raids inflict any real damage or harm upon either the Castro forces or the Russians.

There is the even more important consideration that the repercussions of raids planned and staged by the Cuban refugees will bring patrol actions that will draw American forces into the picture. The shooting at U.S. ships on the high seas is one ramification of this possibility. Increasing measures taken by the Russo-Cubans against the raids will, sooner or later, be directed against Americans, either civilian or military, who may have every right to be where they are, but who will nonetheless feel the brunt of these defense measures by Cuba.

The repercussions of these raids, in other words, will undoubtedly have to be borne by the United States and not by the Cuban exiles at all. It is here where the real danger of them lies. In the end, the confrontation between ourselves and the Soviet Union could build into proportions that would once again threaten us and the world with war.

I do not rule out the possibility that such a confrontation could again occur. But if we are forced into such a situation, it should be on behalf of ourselves and not because we were forced into it by a hotheaded group of guests in our own house.

It is not outside the realm of possibility that such a climax is exactly what the exiles' raids are designed to bring about. One cannot help but wonder what the real objective of the raids may be, when it is so evident that they are completely inconsequential in their military effects.

A final reason why the raids are harmful to American foreign policy interests is the bad precedent they set for other exiles in the hemisphere. So long as these raids have any connotation of American support, approval, or even permission, they encourage exiles from other Caribbean countries to begin the same type of operation in order to return to power.

We know that conditions in Haiti parallel those in Cuba; there are Haitian exiles in the United States, too, who may be encouraged to undertake raids against Haiti. And who is to say but what the change of government in Guatemala may create a faction of exiles seeking to overthrow its new military regime.

The Caribbean is too unstable to permit the United States to become the home base of dissident elements from any of its member countries. If we ever do become such a base, we will become hopelessly entangled in the web of Caribbean politics.

STATUTES LIMITING INTERFERENCE IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

We have many statutes on the books which restrict Americans and noncitizens alike from engaging in expeditions against other countries. One of these is the Neutrality Act which reads in part:

> Whoever, within the United States, knowingly begins or sets on foot or provides or prepares a means for or furnishes the money for, or takes part in, any military or naval expedition or enterprise to be carried on from thence against the territory or domination of any foreign prince, or state, or of any colony, district, or people with whom the United States is at peace, shall be fined not more than $3,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

Some of the Cuban exile raiders claim they have violated no law because they jumped off from islands not belonging to the United States.

But we know they left from the United States as individuals and returned to the United States when the raids were over. I wrote to the Attorney General of the United States on March 20 about one of these raids and the application to it of this section of the law, section 960 of title 18 of the United States Code.

I shall read the letter into the record.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Alaska?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I am much impressed with the cogency and logic of the Senator's argument. I have seldom found myself in disagreement with his public policies. But I wonder if he does not have a little sympathy for or understanding of people who have a burning conviction, people who are frustrated here, and are waiting on a policy of liberation which does not seem to eventuate. They would like to do something to bring it about even at the sacrifice of their own lives. History is full of the exploits of brave people who have been ready to die in fighting tyranny—tyranny of the kind that exists in Cuba. What shall we do about those people who are willing to risk their lives to strike a blow for freedom—the kind of freedom which we would like to see restored in Cuba? Is there not something to be said on that side?

Mr. MORSE. Not a thing. Not a single thing can be said on the side of people who desire to use a sanctuary in the United States to endanger 180 million Americans by following a course of action as exiles which they cannot reconcile with international law, and which may very well determine whether or not we engage in war or remain at peace. I favor a settlement of the Cuban issue, but not by a group of self-appointed diplomats to whom we have given sanctuary in the United States, and who obviously are seeking to follow a course of action that could very well embroil the United States in war.

I shall tell the Senate what I would have done down at the Roger Smith Hotel the other day when two of the exiles held a press conference at which they boasted to the world of the raid they had just carried out in Caribbean waters. I would have had them met with U.S. marshals.

Mr. GRUENING. I am not concerned about what a group of diplomats meeting in a hotel far from the firing line might do, but I think there is something to be said for young men who are so determined, who have seen such atrocities as those committed by the Castro regime in Cuba, who are willing to risk their own lives to go down there and strike a blow for freedom. I doubt whether such individual actions would imperil the safety of 180 million Americans.

Mr. MORSE. Of course it is going to imperil the safety of 180 million Americans. Suppose they sink a Russian ship. Suppose they sink a U.S. ship. I have not forgotten my history, about the sinking of the Maine. Does the Senator think that would not increase the possibilities and dangers of war?

I wish to say that American foreign policy must be run by America and not by Cuban exiles to any degree whatsoever.

If they were so anxious to die for freedom they could have stayed in Cuba.

Mr. GRUENING. They would either be shot or imprisoned in Cuba, and they would not be very effective, if either dead or imprisoned.

Mr. MORSE. There are many patriotic Cubans who are still in Cuba, in the Oriente Mountains, fighting for freedom in Cuba.

I do not object to the giving of sanctuary to those who want to leave Cuba, but I am objecting to Cuban exiles using the United States as a base, to the embarrassment of American foreign policy.

Mr. GRUENING. Is the Senator's objection that they returned to the United States after striking a blow for freedom? In other words, if they were to stay in Cuba and fight for the underground, would that meet the Senator's test?

Mr. MORSE. If they stayed in Cuba they would not be involving the United States, through their activities, in difficulties with Cuba.

We will handle Castro. But so far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, the Cuban exiles in the United States should be told by the U.S. Department of Justice, as I shall point out in a moment in my manuscript, that we are going to enforce the law governing their sanctuary in the United States. If they do not like that, they can leave the United States. They have no right to stay in the United States and proceed to follow a course of action which jeopardizes American foreign policy.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator's objection seems to be that they leave the United States and then come back to the United States. Suppose they should leave the United States and go to Cuba and fight in the underground. Would that still be objectionable to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. I think it would have been preferable if they had stayed there in the first place.

Mr. GRUENING. At the time, perhaps they did not realize we would not be able to be successful in the effort at the Bay of Pigs.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator means they did not realize we would not go to war.

Mr. GRUENING. No; that we would not give the support necessary to enable them to win.

Mr. MORSE. I do not take the position that we must have a bloody victory over Castro to defeat him. We will have a bloody victory over Castro if he forces us into a war, but I do not propose to let the Cuban refugees force us into a war with Castro.

We must reach that decision on the basis of our own independent judgment, as the people in charge of the Government of the United States, and not by way of collusive activities in which the Cuban refugees are engaging. There is no question, when we read their statements to the press, that what they want is a war between the United States and Cuba. That is what they are after.

It is the position of the senior Senator from Oregon that we must meet the Communist threat. We must continue our efforts. We must contain the Communist threat. We must continue, as the President did last October, to make it clear to Castro and to Khrushchev, "If you cross the line of defense into the area of aggression, then we will proceed immediately to protect our security."

But I do not propose to sit in the Senate in silence while a group of Cuban exiles in this country engages in various activities designed to embarrass American foreign policy.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I agree with the premise of the Senator from Oregon that no group has the right to decide extra-legally what shall be the foreign policy of the United States, and this must be true with respect to Cuba. It follows that Cuban exiles have no authority to take action—sympathetic as we are toward their plight and their cause—to decide what our policy and course of action shall be respecting Cuba.

I must say that what troubles me is that the action of the Cuban exiles is a part of a series of provocations and events that are a source of continuing danger. There are provocations which come from the other side, from Castro. Only recently American ships have been fired on by MIG planes, and we can anticipate that there will be additional provocations—firings upon American ships, and the mounting of subversions and even aggressions by Castroites against the countries of Latin America.

Though I do not speak directly to the Senator's point, I affirm the statement which I made in the Senate on February 11. I believe the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba provides to Castro the authority and backing, which will result in reckless provocations and continuing subversion against Latin American countries.

I hold that the United States ought to have a clear policy—which I do not think it has now—and it should be that we will not accept the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba, or any place else in this

hemisphere. It is their presence which gives authority to Castro, which will lead him to reckless actions, and increases the danger of war.

I am sure that the President is trying to secure the removal of Soviet troops, as Khrushchev promised, but we may reach the point where there will be a deadlock and the Soviets will not withdraw. Then I believe we would have to take sterner measures.

What I have said is not quite upon the Senator's point. I agree with the Senator's point that Cuban exiles cannot be allowed to make policy for the United States. But I would see greater hope for a Cuban solution if we insist that the United States will not accept the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba and this hemisphere.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky, if I correctly understand him, that we are in agreement that American foreign policy vis-a-vis Cuba should be carried out by the United States, so far as our part in it is concerned, and that the Cuban exiles should not be allowed to assume any power of intervention in the determination of that foreign policy.

Secondly, I wish to say that no one could be more concerned about the presence of Soviet troops in Cuba than the senior Senator from Oregon. My Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs—in fact, the whole Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate—is greatly concerned about it.

I wish to say that the President of the United States, in my judgment, is doing a magnificent job of leadership and international statesmanship in his international negotiations with the Russians concerning that matter.

However, there is one ugly fact to be faced. In mentioning it, I do not want to be interpreted as implying that we should in any way retreat from our position in connection with Russian troops in Cuba. But there is one ugly fact which we must face, and that is that under international law a Communist nation has the same sovereign rights as a free nation; and a Communist nation has the same sovereign right to negotiate its treaties, agreements, understandings, and alliances.

I have not yet exhausted the analysis of the international law concept concerning Russian troops in Cuba and their right to be there, so far as the relationship between Castro and Khrushchev is concerned; but I am satisfied that we should exhaust every possible resource of diplomacy in trying to arrive at an arrangement for their removal. The Cuban exile raids are not going to help such diplomatic negotiations. As I said earlier in my speech, we must watch both Castro and Khrushchev for excuses and alibis. They will seize upon every rationalization they can for delaying or suspending negotiations looking toward an agreement.

This afternoon I am only making the plea that the Cuban exiles understand clearly from the U.S. Government that they must conform to their obligations under sanctuary, and that they cannot be allowed to continue to pursue a course of action that could be interpreted by anyone as creating a critical situation which might very well lead to armed conflict.

I think the Senator from Kentucky is perfectly correct in stating that there will be many incidents. The shooting at an American ship the other day followed the Alpha 66 raid. The fact that we were not responsible for the Alpha 66 raid is not going to stop Castro and Khrushchev from saying that we were. That kind of propaganda, which the Russians are able to disseminate about the world, puts us in a very embarrassing situation.

The other night a group of us were discussing the subject, and the question was asked, "What would happen in a discussion of this situation in the United Nations, where the contention is made by the Red bloc, and by other countries which are not Communist countries, that we have the responsibility for doing a better job than is being done, to hold the Cuban exiles in check while we give them protection or sanctuary in this country?"

My plea today is that we make clear, not only to the Cuban refugees, but to the world, that we are going to conduct our own foreign policy, and that we will not tolerate any meddling with it or intervention in it by a group of patriotic Cuban exiles who would like very much to have armed intervention in Cuba on the part of the United States.

I had referred to a letter which I wrote to the Attorney General under date of March 20. It outlines in part the position of the senior Senator from Oregon.

I stated in that letter:

> Dear Mr. Attorney General: I have called my office staff from Costa Rica, asking them to obtain for me certain information concerning the recent attack on Cuba by a refugee group, and asking that a letter be sent to you over my signature, posing some specific questions about it.
>
> As you know, the Department of Justice is responsible for the enforcement of section 960 of title 18 of the United States Code, which provides: "Whoever, within the United States, knowingly begins or sets on foot or provides or prepares a means for or furnishes the money for, or takes part in, any military or naval expedition or enterprise to be carried on from thence against the territory or domination of any foreign prince, or state, or of any colony, district, or people with whom the United States is at peace, shall be fined not more than $3,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both."
>
> I would like to know whether the Department has ascertained the facts of the raid on Cuba claimed to have been carried out by the groups called Alpha 66 and the Second National Front of Escambray, widely reported in the press on March 19 and 20.
>
> 1. From where was this expedition begun?
> 2. Who financed it?
> 3. From what country were its weapons obtained?
> 4. Why were its participants admitted to the United States after the raid?
> 5. If the leaders Vazquez and Veciana reside in Miami, as reported in the press, does Section 960 apply to them, irrespective of the takeoff point of the raid itself?
> 6. On what kind of visa are these men admitted to the United States?
>
> I would also like to know what general steps the Immigration and Naturalization Service takes to enforce the statutes against this type of activity when it is carried on by Cuban refugees.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> Wayne Morse.

I have not yet received a reply; but I am pleased and gratified to read of the steps taken over the weekend to curb the adventurers among the exiles.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my speech the following articles and editorials:

First, an article entitled "Raid on Soviet Camp in Cuba Disturbs United States," written by Murrey Marder and published in the Washington Post under date of March 20. This article deals with the conference held by the Cuban refugees at the Roger Smith Hotel after they came back and announced to the country their course of action.

As I stated in Costa Rica, in a confidential conference with American officials, I thought they ought to be met by U.S. marshals, because in my judgment they stood in violation of their right to sanctuary; and I think we should put a stop to that kind of misuse of the right of sanctuary.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial entitled "Dangerous Game," published in the Washington Evening Star of March 29, 1963; an article entitled "Controlling the Cuban Exiles," written by William S. White and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 29, 1963; an editorial entitled "Caught in the Vise," published in the Washington Post of March 30, 1963; an article enitled "Cuban Exiles Angered by U.S. Restrictions," written by Theodore Ediger, and published in the Washington Post of April 1, 1963; an editorial entitled "The Coup in Guatemala," published in the New York Times of April 1, 1963; and an article entitled "United States Curbs Miami Exiles To Prevent Raids on Cuba," published in the New York Times of April 1, 1963.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the articles and editorials may be printed in the Record, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with that material in the Record, I congratulate the Attorney General for the course of action he has taken over the weekend and the steps he has enunciated, aimed at bringing the Cuban exiles within the framework of their sanctuary rights, and notifying them of the intention of this Government to confine them to the framework of their sanctuary rights.

In addition to the condition put upon the parole of many of these persons under the authority residing in the Attorney General which I cited at the beginning of these remarks, several other statutes have application and it would seem they are being invoked.

One relates to the illegal exportation of war materials, and is found in section 401 of title 22.

It states:

> Whenever an attempt is made to export or ship from or take out of the United States any arms or munitions of war or other articles in violation of law, or whenever it is known or there shall be probable cause to believe that any arms or munitions of war or other articles are intended to be or are being or have been exported or removed from the United States in violation of law, the Secretary of the Treasury, or any person duly authorized for the purpose by the President, may seize and detain any vessel, vehicle, or aircraft containing the same or which has been or is being used in exporting or attempting to export such arms or munitions of war or other articles.

It is my hope that the Customs Bureau will stringently enforce this section.

There has also been brought to my attention section 215 of the 1952 Immigration and Nationality Act, which provides for control of travel outside the country by aliens and citizens in time of war or national emergency. Under this section, it would be illegal to enter or leave the United States without a valid passport, unless under exceptions or exemptions set forth by the President. The penalty for violation of this section is a $5,000 fine or 5 years in jail, or both.

The national emergency proclaimed in 1950 during the Korean conflict remains in effect and brings section 215 into full force.

Still another international obligation we are bound to observe is the Convention on Duties and Rights of States in the Event of Civil Strife, signed at Havana in 1928 by the Inter-American Conference.

Article I reads:

> The contracting states bind themselves to observe the following rules with regard to civil strife in another one of them:
>
> 1. To use all means at their disposal to prevent the inhabitants of their territory, nationals or aliens, from participating in, gathering elements, crossing the boundary or sailing from their territory for the purpose of starting or promoting civil strife.
>
> 2. To disarm and intern every rebel force crossing their boundaries, the expenses of internment to be borne by the state where public order may have been disturbed. The arms found in the hands of the rebels may be seized, and withdrawn by the government of the country granting asylum, to be returned, once the struggle has ended, to the state in civil strife.
>
> 3. To forbid the traffic in arms and war materiel, except when intended for the government, while the belligerency of the rebels has not been recognized, in which latter case the rules of neutrality shall be applied.
>
> 4. To prevent that within their jurisdiction there be equipped, armed, or adapted for warlike purposes any vessel intended to operate in favor of the rebellion. (46 Stat. 2749; entered into force for the United States May 21, 1930.)

Also involved in this matter is article 15 of the Charter of the Organization of American States, to which we are signatories, which states:

> No state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other states. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the state or against its political, economic, and cultural elements. (TIAS 2361; entered into force for the United States, Dec. 13, 1951.)

I would hope that the exile community itself would understand the importance to the United States of living up to these treaty obligations, and of maintaining in the hands of our President and his administration complete control of American policy regarding Cuba. We simply cannot allow a faction of the exile group to take that control out of our hands.

What I have said with respect to the raids also applies to the statements made by some Cuban refugees about the Bay of Pigs affair, and about current conditions in Cuba. I have become increasingly of the opinion that many of these individuals have found that any statement made by a Cuban on these subjects will be snapped up by the American press, whether it is said in ignorance or in full knowledge of the truth.

What the Cubans know as facts about conditions in Cuba should be reported to the proper U.S. authorities.

On the floor of the Senate a few weeks ago I indicated that one of these exile groups had gotten in touch with me and had offered to supply me with what were described as very important photographs, photographs which would show that certain things were going on in Cuba which could not be reconciled with announced policies of the Government of the United States.

I said, "Take them to the CIA and the Department of State. Do not be bringing them to a politician in the U.S. Senate. It is our job, under the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution, to give our Government advice and consent in regard to foreign affairs in regard to the official policies of our Government."

It would be unfortunate, Mr. President, if we established a pattern whereby exiles in this country could think that they could submit to us information which they claimed was sound information and use that in an attempt to embarrass the official foreign policy of the United States.

I do not like to say it, but it is true—and I say it because, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I know that we have been briefed sufficiently to know it to be true—that a considerable amount of the information which is offered by Cuban refugees is not reliable, is not true. Much of it is propaganda. Much of it is designed to bring about their desires.

The Cuban refugees owe it to the State Department and to the White House to submit any material they have through the channels which have jurisdiction and primary responsibility over American foreign policy and over our relationships with Cuba.

What they are only guessing at, or what they would like Americans to think is going on in Cuba, is better kept to themselves.

I realize that many American newspapers are as culpable in this respect as are the refugees from whence come many of these stories, which might better be labeled rumors.

In short, I want to remind the American public, the Cubans in this country, and the administration, that aside from the dictates of what constitutes appropriate behavior on the part of refugees enjoying asylum in the United States, the Federal Government is amply clothed with power to forestall actions by the exiles which conflict with American policy. I am very pleased that the agencies of the Federal Government are beginning to make use of the statutes giving them this authority. I surely hope they will continue to see to it that the Cuban exiles conduct themselves in conformity with U.S. law and U.S. foreign policy objectives.

One closing word about the United States-Cuba situation. I was one of the congressional delegates from the Senate, along with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], to the Punta del Este Conference in January of 1962. Many people are still not fully aware of the commitments the United States undertook in the pact of Punta del Este. We have kept faith with those commitments.

When we were at Costa Rica a few weeks ago, it was interesting to take note of the attitude of some of the Central American Presidents, after they had been briefed by the President of the United States on the commitments we are already carrying out in connection with the Punta del Este pact. Reading some of the quoted statements attributed to some of our friends in Central America, it seems that apparently they have been unaware of the fact that we have been maintaining a vigilant surveillance by water and by air in protection of the Western Hemisphere from any attempted threat on the part of the Castro regime to export from Cuba Russian arms sent through Cuba or attempted to be sent through Cuba into the Western Hemisphere. They apparently were unaware of the 24-hour vigilance and surveillance in international waters by various segments of the American naval forces. All are on the alert to protect the Western Hemisphere, including the United States, from any threat to the security of the free nations of this hemisphere.

Apparently they had not been fully informed of the air surveillance that we have been maintaining in defense of the security of the Western Hemisphere, including that of the United States. The Kennedy administration is thoroughly familiar with and greatly concerned about the threat of communism in the Western Hemisphere via Cuba and Russia.

Mr. President, it is important that we stay within the framework of international law, so that we can maintain our allies and can prove to the world, as we proved it to the world last October, that

we move only when our opponent violates our right of security.

I say again, as I have said so many times before, that the American people have every reason to have complete confidence in the handling of the Cuban crisis by the President of the United States. The President is deserving of the wholehearted support of patriotic Americans in his insistence that we follow a course of action such as has been announced over the weekend in connection with conducting American foreign policy by ourselves and for ourselves. We should not permit a group of exiles who have been given sanctuary in this country to engage in provocative acts which could very well lead to a serious crisis in the Caribbean, a crisis which might endanger the peace of the world.

Oh, I know it has been said that this position is some form of appeasement of Castro. Nonsense. Let us take a look at what is happening inside Cuba. We must present to the American people the facts concerning the policy of containment which we have been following with respect to Cuba. According to the best information our intelligence provides, the economic productive capacity of Cuba is down some 66 percent. Cuba is in a bad way internally. In my judgment, we ought to continue to follow the course of no economic intercourse with Cuba, and call upon our friendly allies among the free nations to understand that they have some moral duty in the cause of freedom to see to it that they do not strengthen the economic sinews of Cuba.

I believe that if we maintain the kind of vigilance that the President is maintaining, it will not be too far in the future when the people of Cuba recognize that there is no hope under communism and under the false leadership that Castro is giving them.

Of one thing the senior Senator from Oregon is certain: We cannot justify, from the standpoint of the foreign policy interest of the American people, permitting a group of exiles in this country to superimpose themselves as intervenors in the direction of American foreign policy.

I close by congratulating the Attorney General for the course of action he has taken over the weekend in calling to the attention of the exiles and the American people our position with respect to our determination to carry out our international law obligations.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 20, 1963]

CASUALTIES PUT AT DOZEN: RAID ON SOVIET CAMP IN CUBA DISTURBS UNITED STATES

(By Murrey Marder)

Cuban exile leaders claimed here yesterday that anti-Castro commando units inflicted more than a dozen Russian casualties in a dawn attack Monday on a Soviet military camp and a Soviet ship at a Cuban port.

The raid, which could turn into a major international incident, was openly discussed at a news conference at the Roger Smith Hotel. The raid was carried out in the name of two Cuban exile revolutionary groups that have announced similar hit-and-run attacks in the past—Alpha 66 and the Second National Front of Escambray.

Just before the news conference, the United States denounced these irresponsible and ineffective forays.

They "serve to increase the difficulty of dealing with the unsatisfactory situation which now exists in the Caribbean," said the State Department.

"The U.S. Government is strongly opposed to hit-and-run attacks on Cuba by splinter refugee groups," said the statement. "It has stated repeatedly that such raids do not weaken the grip of the Castro regime in Cuba. Indeed they may strengthen it.

"Nothing we have heard of the latest incident changes our judgment on this matter. * * * The U.S. Government is investigating fully to determine whether any violation of U.S. law is involved."

As in the past, the Cuban exiles' spokesmen stressed that none of the attacks were mounted from U.S. territory. U.S. officials yesterday said neither Central Intelligence Agency nor any other arm of the American Government was involved with Monday's raid.

In the Cuban crisis that brought the United States and the Soviet Union to the edge of war last October, Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev wrote President Kennedy that piratic attacks on Cuba justified the Soviet decision to supply Cuba the defense means missiles which you describe as offensive.

RED REACTION MODERATE

Up to last night, the Soviet reaction to the new raid was relatively moderate.

Moscow radio charged that anti-Castro revolutionaries staged a "new provocation" in an attack on the Cuban coast. But Moscow radio made no mention of Russian casualties or attacks on a Soviet vessel or personnel.

The Fidel Castro government, after a daylong silence, last night also admitted the raid, United Press International reported.

But the Cuban regime did not confirm that any Russians had been killed or wounded as claimed by the raiders.

A communique from the Armed Forces Ministry, broadcast by Havana radio and heard in Miami, blamed the United States directly for the attack.

Spokesmen at yesterday's news conference were Antonio Veciana, 33, described as "coordinator" of Alpha 66 and Cecilio J. Vazquez, representing the Second National Front of Escambray.

They distributed a mimeographed paper entitled "War Communique 4," issued "in the Caribbean area" by a Maj. Eloy Gatiarres Menoyo.

It said that at dawn on Monday, commando units in two boats "attacked a Russian encampment located at Isabela de Sagua's port, on the north central coast of Cuba," which the group previously raided on October 8, when they said they captured a Russian and Cuban flag and Czech weapons.

DREW RETURN FIRE

In Monday's raid the exile groups said the attackers drew return fire "from the coast guards, the custom house and trenches of the Russian encampment." A Russian merchant ship anchored in the bay opened fire, and return machinegun and cannon fire from Alpha 66 hit the Soviet ship's smokestack and bridge. "As a result the Russian ship was seriously damaged" it was claimed and "the estimates of casualties of Russians (on ship and ashore) was more than a dozen." Two commandos were reported lightly wounded.

This demonstrated, the exiles claimed, "that the Cubans have the ability, the courage and the strength to overthrow the Communist government of Havana if given the necessary support of the free nations of the Western Hemisphere; especially the people of the United States and the Cubans themselves."

Veciana and Vazquez, who said they live in Miami, spoke through an interpreter and said in answer to questions, that:

The raiding operation lasted 45 minutes, and some of the men went ashore.

They believe the raids have "a physical and economic impact upon the Castro regime * * * leading to discontent and internal action in Cuba against the present regime."

FURTHER RAIDS PLANNED

Neither United States nor British territory is used in the raiders' secret base of operations; further raids are contemplated.

No attempt was made by the United States to block their news conference yesterday, or to hamper their activities. Asked if they believe their raids conform with U.S. policy they replied they "are not sure of the present policy in reference to these things."

The men said they and their organizations are registered with the Justice Department under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. A Justice spokesman said last night that officials of the two groups "talked with us," but at present no active registration statements are on file.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 29, 1963]

DANGEROUS GAME

The hit-and-run attacks by Cuban exiles and the counterharassment of American shipping by planes based in Cuba add up to a dangerous kind of game in which someone, sooner or later, is going to get hurt.

The Cuban exiles who attacked a Russian freighter off the coast of Cuba Tuesday night doubtless were inspired by what they considered to be patriotic motives. But actually they were behaving like juveniles, irresponsible and ineffectively.

The same thing goes for the pilots of the Mig planes, which, unquestionably are based in Cuba. Last February two of these planes fired in the general direction of an American shrimp boat. Yesterday two other planes, presumably Mig's, fired machinegun bursts near the U.S. MS *Floridian* in international waters. Since the *Floridian* is 360 feet long, it is obvious that the aircraft, one of which flew in quite low, were not trying to hit the vessel. Nevertheless, this sort of thing is a serious business, and it can lead to serious consequences—as Castro will find out if it continues.

Our own Government has condemned the hit-and-run raids by the Cuban exiles, and, as far as we know, it is not responsible for them. We suspect, however, that our officials could find the means to put a stop to these attacks. And we think they should do so.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 29, 1963]

CONTROLLING THE CUBAN EXILES—RAIDS ARE BELIEVED LIKELY TO ENTRENCH CASTRO AND DEFEAT THEIR PURPOSE

(By William S. White)

Though it is a harsh thing to have to say, the fact is that a means must be found for bringing into control the anti-Castro Cuban exiles in this country.

This is one of those painfully paradoxical occasions in the cold war when honorable and patriotic but foolish efforts to strike at the common foe of international communism are far more dangerous to the common cause than no action at all.

Pinprick exile Cuban raids upon Soviet shipping in Cuban waters, and upon the shore positions of Castro himself, have got to stop, for all these reasons:

1. They are wholly ineffectual and serve only to help entrench rather than to weaken Fidel Castro. They permit him to present himself to the Cuban people as their protector from foreign attack, and beyond doubt will retard rather than advance that

hoped-for day when the Cuban people will have had enough of him.

2. They are both fatally weak and fatally irresponsible. There will be no gettting rid of Castro, in a heavily armed island fortress, by small and gallant but also pointless sorties against a ship here or there, a coastal position there and yonder. When and if military forces go after Mr. Castro from offshore, they ought to go in overwhelming force, or not at all.

Surely, we have learned this terrible lesson from the abortive invasion by Cuban exiles in the spring of 1961. All this accomplished was the unnecessary expenditure of good lives and an unnecessary loss in American prestige. If and when the big blow is to be put in against Mr. Castro it must be put in at the decision of the United States and not of its exile guests, welcome among us though they are.

3. They embarrass the conduct of the foreign policy of the United States by its only rightful conductor, the U.S. Government, itself. No matter how galling the present situation—and galling it is, indeed—no set of foreigners granted sanctuary by the United States has the right to involve this country indirectly in military adventures which this country has not sanctioned and—worse yet—which in any case will do nobody but the Communist enemy any good.

4. They—these unauthorized attacks—may give the Russians some excuse to refuse to withdraw the balance of their troops in Cuba. Though it is true they have no business whatever being there in the first place, it is also true that American policy does not now contemplate any forcible effort to remove them. This being the bedrock reality, there is no sense in needlessly muddying the diplomatic waters in this affair, having in mind that we are not in any event ready at this point to go beyond diplomatic into military action.

Apart from all this, there lies upon the U.S. Government a heavy responsibility not to allow cruelly false hopes of early deliverance to rise among the Cuban people. To our lasting national shame, we encouraged just such cruelly false hopes among the Hungarians nearly a decade ago. And the end of it all was to bloody the streets of Budapest with the broken bodies of Hungarian patriots who died waiting for the deliverance that never came.

There is an old expression from back in frontier days that only a fool draws a gun unless he really means to use it. We cannot escape it that the world—and not merely the Soviet Union—can be led to believe that through others we are drawing a popgun we don't mean to use. If there is one thing worse than no action by a great power it is the puerile action of sending, or appearing to send, a boy to do a man's job.

The State Department's repeated admonitions against these hit-and-run sorties, therefore, deserve everybody's support—and the support of Cuban hardliners most of all. To this columnist's knowledge, the most authentic hardliners in both Congress and administration well know this. It is the time for them to speak up, unpopular though the message may be.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 30, 1963]

CAUGHT IN THE VISE

The hit-and-run raids on Fidel Castro's Cuba stir the blood but also chill the mind. The latest foray by Cuban exiles again puts the United States in an intolerable dilemma. What is President Kennedy to do? If he retaliates fiercely against Cuban exiles, he puts the United States in the hapless position of being the guarantor of Mr. Castro's regime. The Cuban Prime Minister presides over a despotic totalitarian government—and why should we protect Mr. Castro from the wrath of his fellow citizens who want to terrorize a foreign force occupying the island?

And yet it must be understood that these free-booting raids could place the United States on the first step of an escalator leading to a massive confrontation. Suppose, in retaliation, the Cuban regime begins shooting at our reconnaissance planes that regularly scrutinize the island. The United States would have no alternative but to fire back—and at this point the escalator could begin moving up.

The Cuban Government has denied that the planes which fired across the bow of the American ship *Floridian* did so on orders, but this kind of reprisal might occur in any ascending scale of military measures and countermeasures. Even an unintended move in violation of orders might set forces in motion that would be beyond recall by the time corrections and apologies were made.

What makes the problem more grievous is that the pained denials of the State Department do little good at all. The Soviet Union, if it wishes, can insist that the CIA is covertly supporting the raids; to prove that this is not the case is about as difficult as it would be for Mr. Kennedy to prove that Soviet troops have completely evacuated from Cuba. Even in times past, diplomatic denials about encouraging revolutions elsewhere have occasioned skeptical hoots. Today, the word "volunteer" itself is usually bracketed by quotation marks in reporting what the other fellow claims.

But the problem of the raiders remains. It is disquieting to recall—as Edmund Taylor reminds us again in his "Fall of the Dynasties"—that the ghastly tragedy of World War I was set in motion by a high-minded terrorist in the Balkans. It is against this nightmare that the United States must balance the demands of prudence and the claims of conscience.

Surely the Government has no reasonable alternative but to disavow the raids and to investigate the incidents in order to determine if any U.S. laws were violated. Whatever the Cubans do in retaliation, let us keep our heads and sense of proportion. The primary appeal should be to the Soviet Union and not to the Cubans—and the appeal must be for a removal of Russian forces.

These forces are a provocative presence. They do not protect Mr. Castro as much as they expose the Soviet Union to the risk of having Russian prestige involved in a national struggle between Cubans. Every incident that occurs throws into more vivid relief the terrible hazards involved in trying to sustain a Soviet military outpost on an island so vulnerable to uncontrollable hit-and-run raids. It is this circumstance that provides the kindling for a conflagration.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 1, 1963]

CUBAN EXILES ANGERED BY U.S. RESTRICTIONS

(By Theodore Ediger)

MIAMI, March 31.—Exiles reacted angrily today to U.S. Government restrictions designed to halt commando raids on Fidel Castro's Cuba.

Some exile leaders were especially critical of orders prohibiting 18 exiles from leaving the Miami area. The orders were issued yesterday to persons considered prospective raiders.

The 18 received notices from U.S. Immigration agents not to leave Dade County, a 2,500-square-mile area including Miami and environs, or the continental United States.

Edwin Guthman, public information officer for the Justice Department, said the notices were issued following a meeting in Miami of representatives of the Coast Guard, the State Department, the Customs Bureau, the FBI and the Immigration Service.

Guthman did not identify the Cubans but said some of the 18 were admitted to the United States as permanent residents. Others of the group, he said, are on parole status as refugees.

He said if they violate the restriction, they will be detained by the Immigration Service, a branch of the Justice Department.

Immigration authorities indicated more orders might be issued.

Exile organizations went into emergency session to discuss plans.

Commandos L., whose attack on a Russian vessel off Cuba's north shore last week appeared to have brought the issue to a head, declined comment pending study of the situation.

A spokesman for the Second National Front of Escambray, and Alpha 66, merged organizations which raided a Russian encampment in Cuba 2 weeks ago, declared, "We are continuing the fight."

A member noted that their chief, Eloy Gutierrez Menoyo, was safe from U.S. directives at the moment. He is directing operations from a Carribean base.

"We violate no U.S. laws," the member said. "We never operate from American soil."

Antonio Veciana, coordinator, and Armando Fleites, secretary general of the combined groups, were among those handed restriction orders.

Jose Antonio Lanusa, spokesman for another group, the Revolutionary Student Directorate, said:

"If these restrictive orders are going to completely snuff out any outside action against Castro, internal rebellion will become almost impossible in Cuba."

DEPEND ON RAIDS

Lanusa said his group had learned from underground contacts in Cuba that they depend greatly on raids as an impetus for uprising.

"The restrictions will undoubtedly cause many heartaches in Cuba," he added.

Pedro Luis Diaz Lanz, Castro's former air force chief, who created headlines with leaflet raids over Cuba in 1960, said he and several associates had received restriction notices.

He declared such action means the Kennedy administration has decided on a policy of coexistence with Castro.

Immigration authorities said the notices went only to persons who have participated or plan to participate in raids.

The Cuban Revolutionary Council, headed by Jose Miro Cardona, and formed in 1961 to mount the unsuccessful Bay of Pigs invasion, was not included.

An exile leader who did not want his name mentioned, said of the U.S. action:

"This is the last straw. No invasion, no government in exile, no jobs, and now no more attacks on Castro. It looks as if Castro has won."

Two notices were served by Immigration agents. One by the Department of Justice expressed sympathy for the exiles' cause, but added, "this does not mean that we are prepared to see our own laws violated with impunity, or to tolerate activities which might provoke armed reprisals."

The other said the exiles' parole into the United States would be violated if they left Dade County. Also, that their departure from the United States could mean $5,000 fines or 5 years' imprisonment or both.

BRITAIN TO COOPERATE

Meanwhile, it was learned that the British Government has agreed "to do anything possible to prevent the use of British territory for illicit purposes," United Press International reported.

The statement referred to a U.S. request for the British to increase surveil-

lance of isolated keys in the Bahama Islands north of Cuba, which raiders are suspected of using as bases for launching raids.

U.S. officials confirmed that the British Government had agreed to increase its vigilance in the Caribbean. There was no elaboration, but informed sources in London said the British frigate *Londonderry* had been ordered from Bermuda to patrol the region.

For its part, the United States was reported to be strengthening its Coast Guard sea and air patrols to guard against forays launched from Florida or U.S. Territories in the Caribbean.

United Press International also reported that the FBI is investigating Cuban refugee groups in the Miami area to determine who is backing their efforts. In addition, immigration authorities were intensifying checks of Cuban refugee movements.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1963]

THE COUP IN GUATEMALA

The military coup in Guatemala spells danger for all of Central America and will send shock waves deep into South America. Every indication points to this as an example of the sort of reaction by the extreme right that all authorities on Latin America have been fearing. It is an attempt to answer the leftism symbolized by Fidelismo but is a swing to the other extreme. The irony and the danger are that such a reaction will play straight into the hands of the Fidelistas and of Latin-American communism.

The Guatemalan military clique had indicated in recent weeks that it would act if ex-President Juan José Arévalo was allowed back into the country to campaign for the presidency. Dr. Arévalo returned Friday night. The armed forces seized the opportunity "to defend Guatemala from the threat of communism," as they put it.

An idea of how far to the right the new chief executive, Colonel Peralta, and his group are can be gleaned from the fact that they accuse President Ydigoras of "complacency in dealing with communism." It was President Ydigoras who arranged for the training of the Cuban exiles for the Bay of Pigs invasion and whose presidential career has virtually been based on his anti-Fidelismo.

President Kennedy certainly would not want to condone, let alone support, a straightforward, old-fashioned, military dictatorial extreme rightwing coup in Guatemala. Whether he does or not, the coup was a blow to democracy in Latin America.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1963]

UNITED STATES CURBS MIAMI EXILES TO PREVENT RAIDS ON CUBA

WASHINGTON, March 31.—The Government moved today to enforce its policy of preventing Cuban refugees from using U.S. territory to organize or launch raids against Cuba. The Justice Department placed restrictions on 18 Cubans in the Miami area.

In some cases they were ordered not to leave Dade County, in which Miami is situated, and in others not to leave the United States.

The Department did not disclose the names of those restricted. Dispatches from Miami confirmed that some members of two exile groups already involved in raids had been given the restriction orders. These were the Alpha 66 and the Second Front of Escambray groups.

VIOLATORS FACE ARREST

Violation of the orders, issued through the Immigration and Naturalization Service, could be enforced by arrest or deportation.

In its announcement yesterday that it planned to take "every step necessary" to prevent raids, the Government expressed sympathy for the anti-Castro cause. But it said it could tolerate no activities that might provoke reprisals against American forces.

Yesterday's announcement was made by the State and Justice Departments. It did not specify what the measures would be to guard against new hit-and-run attacks on Cuba. Today's action by the Justice Department revealed one step.

RAIDS TRACED TO BAHAMAS

In addition, officials said, they expect the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Coast Guard to increase their surveillance of Cuban refugee circles, of the Florida coastline and the waters between the United States and Cuba.

It was understood that some of the small boats used by raiding groups had been tracked and might be seized in the next few days. The Coast Guard can challenge the seaworthiness of any vessel and presumably will check on suspicious craft by invoking this right.

Information available now about the two attacks on Soviet ships in Cuban ports in the last 2 weeks suggests that the raids were not launched from American soil, the Government said yesterday.

But its statement promised further investigation. The statement avoided the question of whether the expeditions were supplied with men or materials from the United States.

Some of the recent raids, it has been established, were launched from some of the smaller islands of the British Bahamas group. However, the participants did not live there and their expeditions almost certainly originated elsewhere.

American surveillance efforts will be coordinated with the British Government.

The administration's dilemma was reflected in the careful wording of yesterday's statement. Washington fears that, should the exile attacks continue, the Soviet Union and Cuba would be provoked to retaliate, either against American shipping in the Caribbean or against the American reconnaissance planes that now fly over Cuba daily with impunity.

But because it has encouraged Cubans to work for the overthrow of Premier Fidel Castro, the administration has hesitated to harass or take sanctions against the anti-Castro fighters.

However, the refugee raiders have been exceptionally resourceful in carrying through attacks that have damaged Soviet merchant ships in Cuban ports.

Because of this President Kennedy and his advisers have therefore decided to do everything possible to discourage and prevent continuation of the refugees' raids.

The United States will not, however, take responsibility for events in Cuba or her territorial waters.

THE POLICY ANNOUNCEMENT

The following is the text of yesterday's statements by the State and Justice Departments:

"The position of the U.S. Government regarding hit-and-run attacks by Cuban refugee groups against Soviet ships and other targets in Cuba have been made perfectly clear by the President and Secretary of State. These attacks are neither supported nor condoned by this Government. The President has pointed out that they may have effects opposite to those presumably intended by those who carry them out; that is, they may strengthen the Soviet position in Cuba rather than weaken it, tighten Communist controls rather than loosen them.

"For preliminary evidence suggests that these raids have not in fact been launched from the territory of the United States. However, the FBI and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, with the cooperation of the Coast Guard and Customs Service, are intensifying their investigations.

"We intend to take every step necessary to insure that such raids are not launched, manned or equipped on U.S. territory.

"The sympathy of this Government and the American people is with those Cubans who hope to see their country freed from Communist control. We understand that these raids reflect the deep frustration of men who want to get back to their homeland, to a Cuba that is independent.

"But this understanding does not mean that we are prepared to see our own laws violated with impunity or to tolerate activities which might provoke armed reprisals, the brunt of which would be borne by the Armed Forces of the United States."

RESOLUTION OF OREGON SENATE AND HOUSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Senate Joint Memorial 7 of the Oregon Legislature, pertaining to Rogue River Basin project, and House Joint Memorial 13, of the Oregon Legislature, relating to the livestock slaughtering and processing industry, together with covering letters of the Oregon secretary of state.

There being no objection, the letters and memorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALEM, OREG.,
March 25, 1963.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As directed by the 52d Legislative Assembly of Oregon, I transmit herewith a certified copy of Senate Joint Memorial 7, pertaining to the Rogue River Basin project, a memorial enacted by our legislative assembly now in session.

Respectfully,

HOWELL APPLING, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

ENROLLED SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

Resolution introduced by Senators Chapman, Newbry, Potts; Representatives Back, Bazett, Branchfield, Dellenback, and Redden

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Rogue Basin project has been authorized by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the Rogue Basin project is a comprehensive river basin development plan providing for the maximum feasible benefits from flood control, fishery improvement, irrigation, recreation, municipal water supply and power production; and

Whereas the present low water flow and present high water temperatures threaten the continued existence of valuable anadromous fisheries; and

Whereas repeated winter floods destroy valuable property and prevent development; and

Whereas the Rogue Basin is highly populated and a growing area primarily dependent on the timber industry; and

Whereas the timber production of the area is stable and its employment decreasing because of increasing efficiency; and

Whereas the need for a more broadly based economy and increased employment opportunity is urgent; and

Whereas the construction and operation of the Rogue Basin project would restore the fisheries, broaden the economy, increase employment in the State of Oregon and provide flood control; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, That:

1. The Congress of the United States is urged to provide for a supplemental appropriation for the Rogue Basin project in the amount of $50,000 to be used by the Corps of Army Engineers for final planning in the fiscal year of 1963.

2. The Congress of the United States is urged to provide an appropriation of $365,000 for the Corps of Engineers to be used for final planning, site acquisition, and construction of the Rogue Basin project for the fiscal year of 1964.

3. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by senate March 12, 1963.

DALE HENDERSON,
Secretary of Senate.
BEN MUSA,
President of Senate.

Adopted by house March 15, 1963.

CLARENCE BARTON,
Speaker of House.

SALEM, OREG.,
March 27, 1963.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As directed by the 52d Legislative Assembly of Oregon, I transmit herewith a certified copy of House Joint Memorial 13, a memorial enacted by our legislative assembly now in session.

Respectfully,
HOWELL APPLING, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

ENROLLED HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 13

Resolution introduced by Representatives McKinnis, Flitcraft, Hansell, and Senators Hopkins, Leth

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the livestock slaughtering and processing industry is essential to the economy of the State of Oregon and the Western United States; and

Whereas a historic and economically vital formula on the cost of transportation of fresh meats as compared to livestock, westbound from the Midwest, has been destroyed by the imposition of freight rates discriminatory to livestock processing plants in Oregon; and

Whereas under this historic formula the rates for transportation of fresh meats were approximately one and one-half times higher than the rates for transportation of livestock westbound from the Midwest; and

Whereas due to the imposition of discriminatory freight rates the fresh meat freight rate has been undercut, to a present formula of 1 to 1, which makes it prohibitive for Oregon packers to ship livestock from the fat livestock markets of the Midwest to Oregon for local slaughter; and

Whereas the livestock slaughtering and processing industry of Oregon has already declined as a direct result of prior rate reductions forcing severe unemployment and loss of markets for livestock producers and feeders; and

Whereas the public utility commissioner of the State of Oregon, the director of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Oregon, the leaders in the meat-producing industry, the leaders of management in the processing industry and leaders of labor in the meat-handling industry, and allied fields, have gone on record to seek adjustment in these detrimental freight rates, without success: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, That:

1. The Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States and the Honorable Secretary of Commerce to take those steps as may be necessary to restore the historic freight rate formula that has existed between westbound livestock and meat and thereby prevent further economic hardship to the broad based livestock industry of Oregon which is threatened by undercutting freight rate practices now permitted by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

2. The secretary of State shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by house February 14, 1963.

CECIL L. EDWARDS,
Chief Clerk of House.
CLARENCE BARTON,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate March 14, 1963.

BEN MUSA,
President of Senate.

LET US ACT TO STOP OUR MOUNTING UNEMPLOYMENT: LET US ACT TO SOLVE OUR NO. 1 PROBLEM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, unemployment is our No. 1 economic and social problem. This is not only my own view but the view of one who is far more important in any effort to do something about it. These are the words of none other than our President, John F. Kennedy.

Frankly, I would say that it is America's No. 1 problem, No. 2 problem, and No. 3 problem. In my view it overshadows all others. Unemployment has just reached a new high—in other words, we are not gaining, we are not conquering unemployment but are dropping behind. Action—effective action, prompt action—is imperative.

Let us bear in mind constantly that the 6.1 percent current unemployment is not just a statistic. It means personal disaster, fear, sorrow, want, often broken homes, and all the other tragic consequences of joblessness in millions of families. And this in America. America the affluent. America the prosperous.

In other words, tackling unemployment should take precedence, priority, and action before anything and everything else at home.

The United States is the wealthiest nation on earth. We are constantly reminded of it. As a result of it, we are requested annually to appropriate billions of dollars for foreign aid, and when there are those who differ with some of the ways this foreign aid has been administered, we are suspected of the heinous offense of being anti-foreign aid.

A reasonable and constructive critique of the administration of our foreign aid by a very distinguished committee of outstanding Americans, all committed to foreign aid, headed by Lucius Clay, comes under violent attack by a local newspaper and by others who feel that almost any amount spent abroad, no matter how spent and for whom, is justifiable, but who apparently do not have, or at least do not exhibit, a corresponding concern for the tragic plight of over 5 million of our own unemployed fellow American citizens and their families. While our foreign aid program is seeking to relieve the plight of the unemployed, the undernourished and the otherwise disadvantaged and others in 95 foreign countries, what about our own American unemployed? Moreover, unless we diminish our unemployment at home, unless we shore up our domestic economy, unless we get it moving, we will be unable to keep up with our commitments abroad. Our strength is not merely military. It rests in no less degree, indeed in even greater degree in the health and vitality of our economy.

Let me quote at this point exactly what the President said in his March 11 manpower report to the Congress:

> Unemployment is our No. 1 economic problem. It wastes the lives of men and women, depriving both them and the Nation. Our continued underuse of human and physical capacity is costing us some $30 to $40 billion of additional goods and services annually. This means a considerably lower standard of living than we would otherwise enjoy. More seriously—ominously—it means we are doing less than our best in staffing ourselves in the struggle for freedom at home and abroad that now commands our energies and resources on an unprecedented scale, and in ever more demanding forms.

Believing that something should be and must be done about it, and speedily, I introduced, on March 19, a bill to increase the amount available for an accelerated public works program from $900 million to $2.6 billion, with a number of distinguished cosponsors who included: Senators BARTLETT, KEFAUVER, METCALF, MORSE, CANNON, NEUBERGER, RANDOLPH, and YARBOROUGH.

There are some among us who may think that this is not a necessary expenditure. I feel it is absolutely essential. The facts are that we have an accumulated backlog of ready public works—desirable projects—and others which could be brought into realization, which would more than absorb the $2½ billion which my proposal envisages—public works programs suited to the needs of every community, but not merely employ people in the project's locale. The impetus to employment from such projects reaches back through our entire economic structure, into the factories, into the fields, forests, and mines where the raw materials are produced. The further accelerated public works provision galvanizes, stimulates, and revitalize our now regrettably sluggish economy.

I shall ask for an early hearing on this legislation and trust it will have overwhelming support in both Houses. We cannot continue to act as the leader of the world politically, economically, and socially if we fail, as we are failing, in meeting this number one problem at home—the disaster and tragedy of unemployment—a problem which if it continues unsolved will impair our efforts at world leadership.

In this connection, an excellent leading editorial entitled: "America the Backward?" appears in the March 30 issue of the New Republic. It deals largely with this issue—our continued and increasing unemployment. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA THE BACKWARD?

Unemployment is our No. 1 economic problem. It wastes the lives of men and women, depriving both them and the Nation. Our continued underuse of human and physical capacity is costing us some $30 to $40 billion of additional goods and services annually. This means a considerably lower standard of living than we would otherwise enjoy. More seriously—ominously—it means we are doing less than our best in staffing ourselves in the struggle for freedom at home and abroad that now commands our energies and resources on an unprecedented scale, and in ever more demanding forms." Thus spoke the President in his March 11 manpower report to Congress.

What are the facts? In 1962 ten million more people were employed than in 1947, a gain of 17 percent over 15 years, but during the same period the labor force grew by 13 million, or 21 percent. Since 1957 the jobless rate has averaged 5½ percent (6.1 percent as of the latest count), compared to 4 percent in immediately previous years. It was 5½ percent in 1962, a year of "recovery," which suggests that the next downturn will shoot the jobless rate to new heights. Those out of work stay out longer and longer. Between 1957 and 1962, unemployment for 15 weeks or more went up 100 percent; unemployment for 6 months or more 150 percent; and these figures do not take into account workers who are on the job (not by choice) less than a normal workweek. Nor do total unemployment figures show the special penalties imposed on particular groups—younger and older people, non-white workers, workers in declining or unstable industries or in depressed areas, and unskilled workers generally. For example, the jobless rate for nonfarm, unskilled laborers is 12 percent; for the semiskilled, it is 8 per cent. And in their impersonal neutrality, such figures conceal the human reality: millions of individuals deprived of a productive role, many of whom are responsible for feeding, clothing, educating, and entertaining children, and keeping them well.

The whole economy limps along at a tired pace. Average annual growth of gross national product over the last 5 years has been about 2.9 percent, as against the 3½ to 4 percent of former years.

There will always be some unemployed: people change jobs; one season is better than another in certain lines of work. Full employment, therefore, amounts to having an equal number of people looking for jobs and of jobs looking for people. The administration has not specified how much unemployment would be acceptable in this sense, but the Economic Report of the President suggests that if an interim goal of 4 percent were to be reached by the end of 1963, 3.1 million new jobs would be needed, plus additional ones to absorb workers being displaced by technical progress. This means an 8- to 9-percent boost in gross national product, at constant prices. Furthermore, just keeping the unemployment rate where it is would require a 3½ percent rise in Gross national product. If the present average rate of growth is maintained, unemployment will rise further by the end of 1963, and in the next 5 years it will exceed 7 percent. Apparently the United States is moving from a situation justifying concern to one warranting alarm.

Some steps have been taken to reduce structural unemployment. The Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 is designed to rejuvenate economically depressed areas and has provisions for worker retraining; the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 has broader provisions for retraining and relocation assistance; and there are similar provisions in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, though these will not have any effect until 1964 or thereafter. The number in retraining programs thus far is unimpressive (in the two active programs some 37,000 workers), but the programs may pick up speed.

Serious questions have to be asked, however. What skills can workers be retrained for which will be in demand? Industrial jobs in the future will differ from those of the past. The need of manufacturers for unskilled workers is rapidly diminishing; technicians, engineers, teachers, public administrators, and specialists in new skilled tasks like computer programing are what will be sought. Retraining can only make a marginal contribution here.

The President has made other suggestions. He would extend unemployment compensation, improve methods for identifying impending job dislocations and job opportunities nationally, establish a Youth Corps reminiscent of the old CCC. He has also asked for a civilian industrial technology program which would give a kind of point 4 technical assistance to lagging business, but his requested appropriation of $8.7 million is small. To facilitate labor mobility, Mr. Kennedy wants to eliminate from taxation the reimbursements paid new employees for their moving expenses by business. But this helps those who need it least. It is the unskilled and semiskilled, whose moving expenses are not reimbursed by employers, who need tax deductions for their moving costs.

Hemmed in—so he has calculated—by a variety of hostile political forces and not wanting to be thought a prophet of gloom and doom, Mr. Kennedy chose to phase a tax cut over 36 months, and to avoid really extensive discussion of other needed remedies for the sickness of the economy. As a consequence, we may well find the situation worsening in the next 18 months. In 1962, the New Republic dissented from the prevailing opinion that a tax cut was then premature. We dissent now from the administration view that a cut phased over 3 years will do the trick. It must come sooner, be large enough—at least $10 billion—and have most of its effect by the end of next year, or better, in the 12 months beginning this July. Anything less will discredit—because it will not produce predicted results—the very theory of compensatory economics the President wishes to prove.

Can nothing be done in the next month or so to enact the kind of tax revision that will make a substantial difference? A new initiative could come from Congress at even this late juncture. The Joint Economic Committee's stand in favor of a much bigger cut in 1963 is one hopeful development. The Congress could rescue the President from his fears of the Congress by stepping up tax reduction, as well as by approving other parts of the administration's recovery program.

However, even if Congress performs heroically in this session, we cannot assume a healthy economy through the next decade. Technological development has brought with it a steadily declining requirement for new capital expenditures. To put it in another way, we are getting more output for a relatively smaller amount of money spent on plant and equipment. Add to this the fact that there is today a large amount of underused plant capacity, so that production can increase considerably without much new capital outlay.

Moreover, expansion supported primarily by more investment in the kinds of industries which have been so prominent in the past will be less than vigorous. New sources of demand for consumer goods and new sources of demand for substantial investment will have to be found. Serious consideration must be given, therefore, to encouraging industries which could lead growth in the way that railroads, steel and automobiles did in an earlier time. The best contender for a big push at this time is the construction industry. The Nation needs a face lifting, particularly in its more blighted areas, and transportation needs modernizing. Such reconstruction would, moreover, absorb the very unskilled and uneducated workers now seeking jobs.

Some are of the opinion that the American economy is so well developed that we cannot expect it to attain the high growth rate it once had. That is the gospel of American affluence. But if it is true (and it is not; the United States is underdeveloped—socially, esthetically, intellectually, as well as materially), then a choice has to be faced. Either we find new outlets for the widening pool of unemployed, or we accept permanent responsibility for the support of the unskilled and uneducated, and pay the high social cost of their alienation from a community that says, "We don't need you."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask further consent that the statement I made in the RECORD when I introduced this legislation, which I entitled: "Let Us Try To Do as Much for the Folks at Home as for Those Abroad—Let Us Get the U.S. Economy Moving—Let Us Tackle Our Mounting Unemployment Realistically," be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET US TRY TO DO AS MUCH FOR THE FOLKS AT HOME AS FOR THOSE ABROAD; LET US GET THE U.S. ECONOMY MOVING; LET US TACKLE OUR MOUNTING UNEMPLOYMENT REALISTICALLY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks and that the bill lie at the desk until the close of business on March 28 so as to give those of my colleagues who wish to do so an opportunity to cosponsor this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; will lie at the desk as requested; and, without objection, will be printed as requested.

(See exhibit I.)

The bill (S. 1121) to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Accelerated Public Works Act (Public Law 87–658) introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I believe that my introduction of this bill will not come as a surprise.

On April 25, 1962, when S. 2965 was reported by the Senate Committee on Public

Works, of which I am a member, I filed separate views in which I clearly predicted that the sum authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of the bill—$900 million—was insufficient to do the job.

Mr. President, I wish I could stand here today and admit that my prediction was wrong—that the amount authorized to be appropriated had been sufficient—and that the serious pockets of chronic unemployment throughout the Nation had been eradicated or significantly decreased.

Eleven months ago, in my separate views, I stated:

"However, the amount is, in my opinion, hardly sufficient to meet the economic strain now being experienced in certain areas of the Nation."

At that time, I referred to my proposed amendment to raise the amount authorized to be appropriated to less than half the amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance—namely, $2,645 million.

I stated at that time, Mr. President:

"In my humble opinion, no situation is more tragic than that of men and women unemployed who wish to work and cannot find it. In my humble opinion, no situation is more paradoxical than that this wealthiest country on earth, which has poured out $100 billion in the last decade and a half to help foreign countries, and proposes to spend even greater sums in the future for the same purpose, cannot meet its primary obligation to its own people.

"I am merely proposing, by this amendment, to offer a fraction for the relief of economic distress and the creation of employment for our fellow Americans of what we have been doing or are asked to do—and will doubtless continue to do—in far larger measure for inhabitants of 100 foreign countries."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my separate views to S. 2965 be printed in full at the conclusion of these remarks.

The Vice President. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit II.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, it may be that my suggested amendment focused attention on the insufficiency of the amount authorized to be appropriated and was instrumental in increasing that amount from $600 million to $900 million. But even that amount has not proven to be sufficient.

On March 7, the Department of Labor reported that the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate in February increased to 6.1 percent of the civilian labor force. This was up from 5.8 percent in January, despite the fact that customarily there is little change in the unemployment rate from January to February. The February 1962 rate was 5.6 percent.

This means, Mr. President, that in February 1963, 4,918,000—nearly 5 million—men and women were seeking employment and could not find it.

This continued chronic unemployment cannot be permitted to endure. The time has come for a massive effort to make taxpayers out of these tax consumers. They seek work. Let us give them work.

I said last year it was no time for half-measures.

It is even less a time for half-measures this year.

Consider, Mr. President, what continued unemployment does to a man and his family. Continued want and deprivation do not reaffirm a man's faith in the strength of our economic system.

And yet, Mr. President, that system is strong—as strong as it ever was. Our problem is to take sufficiently energetic steps at the correct time. Let us not do too little too late.

I cannot help but feel, Mr. President, that we did just that last year. Who can say what the results would now be if last year we had authorized the appropriation of three times the amount authorized under the accelerated public works program? How many of the nearly 5 million unemployed today would now be gainfully employed? How many of this nearly 5 million unemployed would today be taxpayers instead of tax consumers? How many of the families of these men and women would today have been able to hold their heads high and say that their fathers or mothers were gainfully employed and they were not dependent on handouts?

Mr. President, we will not be able to meet a serious unemployment problem with half measures, or with quarter measures. We tried it last year and it did not work.

Now one of the arguments advanced last year against my proposal to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the accelerated public works measure was that the States could not possibly spend all that money.

In an effort to prove this argument fallacious, I wrote all the States having areas of chronic unemployment asking how much could be spent on worthwhile public works projects.

The Vice President. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. Humphrey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alaska may have 5 more minutes.

The Vice President. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Gruening. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, when I reported to the Senate on May 17, 1962, on the responses received up to that date—only 12 States—fewer than one-fourth of the total number—indicated that they could use $1,566 million.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my remarks on that date and some of the exhibits inserted in the Congressional Record at that time, be inserted in the Congressional Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Vice President. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit III.)

Mr. Gruening. I stated at that time:

"The question which each and every one of us must ask himself is this: Am I prepared to give to the unemployed of the depressed areas of Gadsden, Ala.; Anchorage, Alaska; Camden, Ark.; Modesto, Calif.; Bristol, Conn.; Carrollton, Ga.; Cairo-Metropolis, Ill.; Evansville, Ind.; Pittsburg, Kans.; Paducah, Ky.; Hammond, La.; Biddeford-Sanford, Maine; Cumberland, Md.; Lowell, Mass.; Detroit, Mich.; Duluth, Minn.; Washington, Mo.; Butte, Mont.; Atlantic City, N.J.; Schenectady, N.Y.; Fayetteville, N.C.; Portsmouth-Chillicothe, Ohio; Muskogee, Okla.; Altoona, Pa.; Providence, R.I.; Conway, S.C.; Greenville, Tenn.; Laredo, Tex.; Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Va.; Aberdeen, Wash.; Charleston, W. Va.; and La Crosse, Wis., the same opportunity that has been given to the unemployed in Sudan to work on a highway construction project involving 1.8 million American dollars, or the unemployed in Yemen to work on a highway construction project involving 3 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Republic of China to work on the Ku-Kwan hydroelectric project involving 2.5 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Philippines to work on a port facilities and harbor improvement project involving 3.2 million American dollars?

"For myself the answer is abundantly clear. If I am expected to take care of the unemployed abroad with American dollars, then I can do no less than take care of the unemployed here at home first and just as adequately."

I am again today addressing to the Governors of all the States having serious pockets of chronic unemployment, a letter requesting the information as to the public works projects ready to go upon which unemployed men and women can be put to work.

At the appropriate time, I shall report to the Senate Committee on Public Works and to the Senate the results of this inquiry.

But I have no doubt at all that we shall find that there can be spent on useful, needed public works projects, throughout the land, more than the sum of $2,645 million which I propose to authorize to be appropriated for the accelerated public works program. In view of the $900 million already authorized, this is only an increase of $1,745 million.

As a matter of fact, the Honorable William L. Batt, Jr., Administrator, Area Redevelopment Administration, at a press conference on February 8, 1963, stated that at the end of January, the backlog of applications for funds for projects expected to meet program standards was $1,069 million. In addition, new projects were coming in at the rate of $300 million every month or $3,600 million per year.

It is not, therefore, a question of whether the money can be well spent in putting American unemployed men and women to work. The worthy projects exist. The necessary projects exist.

The question is: Are we willing to make the effort to get America rolling—to give America the shot in the arm it needs to get it rolling—to make an all-out effort to stimulate the American economy at the level required to drastically reduce these pockets of chronic unemployment?

For myself, I can only see an affirmative answer.

For myself, I can say only that when one considers what we are doing in the way of assisting the economies of countries abroad, there can be no question about our doing at least as much here at home for our own unemployed—for our chronically unemployed.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Congressional Record at the conclusion of my remarks excerpts from Mr. Batt's press conference and a list of unemployed percentages.

The Vice President. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit IV.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, my amendment expresses the amount authorized as the equivalent authorized to be appropriated for the following economic foreign aid purposes:

	Million
Sec. 202: Development loan fund	$1,500
Sec. 212: Development grants	380
Sec. 402: Supporting assistance	465
Sec. 451(a): Contingency fund	300
Total	2,645

The Vice President. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. Humphrey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for an additional minute.

The Vice President. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, I have drafted my amendment in this fashion, Mr. President, rather than expressing the sum in figures, because I desire to call attention to the fact that we are granting this same sum—and indeed more in various other ways—to aid the economies of foreign countries—to reduce the unemployment problem in foreign countries—and that we literally cannot afford to continue to do that unless we do at least as much for the unemployed here at home.

Mr. Humphrey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. Gruening. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. Humphrey. I wish to commend the Senator on his initiative, and I wish to assure the Senator that a number of his colleagues, as he well knows, have joined in reexamining the entire accelerated public works program. The President has submitted a supplemental request of $500 million under last year's authorization, which is sorely needed. In fact, the local communities have set aside by bond issue the necessary funds for local community cooperation, as prescribed by law. I am convinced that we could well use a substantially larger sum of money, at least double what we did last year, for the accelerated public works program, to meet the necessities of existing projects which are already funded and already prepared and already designed by the local jurisdictions.

I assure the Senator that he will have my cooperation. I know that I can expect from him the same kind of cooperation, as we met together shortly to get at the new program of accelerated public works.

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. No Member of the Senate has been more concerned about the unemployment problem, this tragic situation which is not a mere statistic but affects the lives and happiness and welfare of millions of Americans, or has shown more concern about getting the economy moving again, than the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota.

EXHIBIT I

A BILL TO INCREASE THE AMOUNT AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED TO CARRY OUT THE PROVISIONS OF THE ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS ACT (PUBLIC LAW 87-658)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 87-658 (76 Stat. 541), approved September 14, 1962, is hereby amended by striking out the words "the sums of $900,000,000" in section 3(b), thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 402, and 451(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended."

EXHIBIT II

SEPARATE VIEWS OF MR. GRUENING

I voted to report favorably S. 2965 providing for both a standby program of public works and an immediate program of public works for which an appropriation of $600 million was authorized.

It is my belief that much more than the authorized $600 million is needed and could usefully be used to put the unemployed back to work.

In a statement distributed to the members of the Public Works Committee, I stated:

"On March 27, 1962, the able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, introduced an amendment to S. 2965, a bill to provide standby authority to accelerate public works program of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies. The amendment would authorize the appropriation of $600 million for an immediate public works program.

"I commend the Senator from New Mexico for his foresight in submitting such an amendment.

"However, the amount is, in my opinion, hardly sufficient to meet the economic strain now being experienced in certain areas of the Nation.

"Accordingly, I now offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, raising the amount authorized to be appropriated for a program of immediate public works to the same amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance.

"It does seem to me that we should be willing to spend at least as much at home to take care of our own economically distressed areas as we are willing to spend abroad for aiding foreign economically distressed areas.

"My amendment does not, I admit, do equal justice as between foreign and domestic programs. Under the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, only one appropriation is authorized, namely, the sum of $600 million. Under my amendment, the limit of this one-time appropriation would be raised to the limit authorized in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the Development Loan Fund (sec. 202), the development grants and technical cooperation (sec. 212), supporting assistance (sec. 402), and contingency fund (sec. 451). Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1962 and the 4 succeeding fiscal years the total sum of $7.5 billion. My proposal is much more modest. In setting the limit to the amount that would be authorized for our immediate public works program, I have used only the figure of $1.5 billion—the amount authorized for the fiscal year 1963 only.

"My amendment would increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the immediate public works program to $2,645 million, computed as follows:

	Millions
"Sec. 202—Development Loan Fund	$1,500
Sec. 212—Development grants	380
Sec. 401—Supporting assistance	465
Sec. 451—Contingency fund	300
Total	2,645

"In proposing this increase in the amount authorized to be appropriated, I have used only the authorizations contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. I have not considered the amounts of U.S. funds made available abroad through such lending agencies as the World Bank, Export-Import Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, etc. Billions of American dollars have been and are being channeled abroad through these agencies. In many cases, the so-called loans are not loans at all but grants.

"In my humble opinion, no situation is more tragic than that of men and women unemployed who wish to work and cannot find it. In my humble opinion, no situation is more paradoxical than that this wealthiest country on earth, which has poured out $100 billion in the last decade and a half to help foreign countries, and proposes to spend even greater sums in the future for the same purpose, cannot meet its primary obligation to its own people.

"I am merely proposing, by this amendment, to offer a fraction for the relief of economic distress and the creation of employment for our fellow Americans of what we have been doing or are asked to do—and will doubtless continue to do—in far larger measure for inhabitants of 100 foreign countries.

"My amendment is as follows:

"On page 2, line 24, delete the words 'the sum of $600,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provision of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended'."

In order to insure prompt action on this vitally needed measure by the Senate, I did not press my amendment in committee but must reserve my position on the amount authorized for an immediate program of public works when this bill is considered in the Senate.

EXHIBIT III

LET US JUST ONCE DO AT LEAST HALF AS MUCH FOR THE FOLKS AT HOME AS FOR THOSE IN FOREIGN LANDS

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 2965—the emergency public works bill—which it is my intention to call up at the appropriate time.

The amendment is simple.

It raises the amounts authorized to be appropriated for emergency public works from $600 million to "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202—for the fiscal year 1963—212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961." Those are the exact words of my proposed amendment. However, in order that my colleagues may have the amendment before them in customary form, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Presiding Officer. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record, as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, I have previously served notice of my intention to offer this amendment in my individual views in the committee's report on S. 2965. I ask unanimous consent that those views be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, my amendment seeks only to place our domestic program for alleviating unemployment in a position of equality with what we are doing abroad. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, even if my amendment is adopted—and I sincerely trust that it will be—there still will not be equality.

The amendment which I propose would raise the maximum authorized to be appropriated for the program of emergency public works from $600 to $2,645 million computed as follows:

Sec. 202—Development Loan Fund (for fiscal year 1963 only)	$1,500,000,000
Sec. 212—Development grants	380,000,000
Sec. 401—Supporting assistance	465,000,000
Sec. 451—Contingency fund	300,000,000
Total	2,645,000,000

Actually the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, authorizes the appropriation of much more than $2,645 million for foreign economic aid. Actually, for the 5 fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 1963, section 202 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 authorizes the appropriation of $1,500 million for each of these fiscal years or a total of $7,500 million for the 5.

Thus, even with the adoption of my amendment, there would be authorized to be appropriated for this one-shot program of emergency public works to help our own unemployed only about one-third of the amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic aid under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

I wish to make it crystal clear that my amendment does not affect or apply to the standby provisions of S. 2965. Actually, it can be said that my amendment moves up the $2 billion authorized for a program of standby public works to the emergency program and says in effect that emergency intended to be met by the standby program is upon us now.

And, considering the all too many pockets of depression of the United States, that is by no means an exaggeration.

We cannot accurately judge the human misery stalking our land by looking at the overall rate of unemployment.

During the week ending April 28, 1962, insured unemployment in Nome, Alaska, was 33.5 percent. It was no comfort to the unemployed worker in Nome to know that the national rate of insured unemployment during the same week was 4.3 percent.

The unemployed worker in Fairbanks—insured unemployment rate 17.9 percent—could derive little comfort from the fact that the Congress was talking about standby public works when things get worse.

How much worse must it get, Mr. President, before the Congress acts to relieve to the extent possible unemployment in the numerous pockets throughout the Nation?

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks a table, prepared by my office, of unemployment in Alaska for the week ending April 28, 1962. These figures have been derived from the Labor Market Bulletin issued by the Alaska Department of Labor.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, this is no time to stand by. This is a time for bold, decisive action. In my opinion, nothing can be more heartrending than a man—a husband and a father—who cannot find work to support himself and family even though, week after week after week, he trudges wearily from door to door seeking such work. It is distressing for single men with no family responsibilities.

Dr. Kenneth Galbraith has written an excellent book entitled "Our Affluent Society" showing that more people in the United States are now living at a higher standard than ever before. I agree with the picture he has drawn in his book and I am happy that it is so.

But in rejoicing at the greater affluence of more and more of our people, let us not overlook the almost one-fourth of our Nation who are living in abject poverty without hope for the future or for their children's future unless prompt and intelligent measures are taken at once. The plight of these 40 million Americans is graphically pictured in a recent book by Mr. Michael Harrington, entitled "The Other America," published by Macmillan Co. this year. I commend it highly to my colleagues for it brings to our attention forcefully the need for immediate action—and action on a scale commensurate with the size of the problem.

As long as this problem exists for some 40 million Americans it is our inescapable duty to face it and to eliminate it as far as it is humanly possible. Our obligation to these Americans, in my judgment, supersedes aid for impoverished people in other lands. Moreover we shall be able to help these people in foreign countries all the better if we raise our own living standards and put an end to the costly wastes of chronic unemployment.

In this—the richest of all lands—such a situation cannot and should not be tolerated.

Nor should we meet an emergency situation with halfway measures. We should not delude the people of the Nation. We must bring to bear on a solution of this problem all the resources that are needed. To do less is little better than doing nothing at all. To do less would be to disappoint millions of unemployed men and women throughout the country who are looking to Congress for action now.

According to the report from the Area Redevelopment Agency of the Department of Commerce as of May 1, 1962, 933 areas in the United States are designated as eligible to take part in the area redevelopment program. These are divided as follows: 148 urban-industrial areas; 735 rural and small labor markets; and 50 Indian reservations.

These areas have a population of 34.7 million people and a labor force of 13.2 million. Of the latter 1.4 million are unemployed. Thus these areas have 19 percent of the Nation's population and 19 percent of the Nation's labor force, but they have 31 percent of the unemployed of the country.

Now what is proposed to meet the persistent high rate of unemployment of these 933 areas throughout the Nation?

It is proposed in S. 2965 to authorize the appropriation of $2 billion for a program of public works on a standby basis, usable only if the total unemployment in the Nation rises to a predetermined figure. In addition, it is proposed to authorize the appropriation of an additional $600 million for an emergency, immediate public works program. This sum averages about $600 for each man and woman unemployed in these designated areas, assuming the entire amount is spent on wages, which, of course, will not be the case.

My amendment would quadruple that sum.

That quadrupled sum would be much more realistic considering the magnitude and the urgency of the problem.

I wish to make it absolutely clear that my proposal would not take a single penny from the foreign aid program. It merely uses the particular wording to point up the fact that we would be spending on this one-shot, emergency program here at home far less than we are spending abroad for economic aid.

The foreign aid program would continue as now authorized and the money appropriated for that program would remain intact, if Congress approves.

I know that the question will be raised: can the sum you propose to spend on public works within 27 months actually be spent by the States economically and efficiently within that period of time.

It should be raised, and answered, because I do not want to propose anything here that would lead to wasteful expenditure of Federal funds. I know that none of my colleagues want to do so either.

But I do know that along with me many of my colleagues are concerned that we do enough to meet the problems of persistent unemployment in the 933 designated areas throughout the country.

In order to obtain the answer, I wired the Governors of the 50 States of the Nation and asked them the question and asked them to be specific in their replies. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my telegram to the Governors of the States be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, I have to date received replies from the Governors of only 12 States who have indicated that they are ready to go with public works projects totaling $1.6 billion.

I also ask unanimous consent that the detailed replies received from the Governors of these States be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. Gruening. Mr. President, let no one here delude himself.

We shall either spend this $2,645 million on constructive investments in the future economic strength of the United States—in schools, hospitals, roads, sewer and water works, dams, airports and the like—or we shall spend that and much more in the next 27 months and in the years to come in unemployment compensation and in welfare payments, and suffer the loss of tax revenue which fuller employment will generate.

We cannot long neglect our own resources—human and natural—while building the resources of foreign nations. At stake is not our willingness to continue to aid the less-developed countries; at stake is our ability to continue without at the same time renewing our own strength.

We can renew that strength by a program of public investments of the magnitude which I propose by my amendment.

In the years 1955–61, we have granted to foreign nations for foreign economic aid projects of exactly the same type as would be constructed under my amendment millions upon millions of American dollars.

Can we afford to do less for our own people at a time when many of the areas of our Nation are so hard pressed?

Can we afford to do less for the unemployed of the United States when we are doing so much for the unemployed and others abroad?

As one reads about the flight of capital from Latin America one cannot but compare the lack of faith of the rich of those nations with the abiding faith of our unemployed who are willing to pitch in and work but lack only the opportunity to work.

I ask, Mr. President, for an additional $2 billion to give our own citizens the same chance that we have given and are giving to the citizens of other lands.

The question which each and every one of us must ask himself is this: Am I prepared to give to the unemployed of the depressed areas of Gadsden, Ala.; Anchorage, Alaska; Camden, Ark.; Modesto, Calif.; Bristol, Conn.; Carrollton, Ga.; Cairo-Metropolis, Ill.; Evansville, Ind.; Pittsburg, Kans.; Paducah, Ky.; Hammond, La.; Biddeford-Sanford, Maine; Cumberland, Md.; Lowell, Mass.; Detroit, Mich.; Duluth, Minn.; Washington, Mo.; Butte, Mont.; Atlantic City, N.J.; Schenectady, N.Y.; Fayetteville, N.C.; Portsmouth-Chillicothe, Ohio; Muskogee, Okla.; Altoona, Pa.; Providence, R.I.; Conway, S.C.; Greeneville, Tenn.; Laredo, Tex.; Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Va.; Aberdeen, Wash.; Charleston, W. Va.; and La Crosse, Wis., the same opportunity that has been given to the unemployed in Sudan to work on a highway construction project involving 1.8 million American dollars, or the unemployed in Yemen to work on a highway construction project involving 3 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Republic of China to work on the KuKwan hydroelectric project involving 2.5 million American dollars, or to the unemployed in the Philippines to work on a port facilities and harbor improvement project involving 3.2 million American dollars?

For myself, Mr. President, the answer is abundantly clear. If I am expected to take care of the unemployed abroad with American dollars then I can do no less than take care of the unemployed here at home first and just as adequately.

Mr. President, to date I have received replies from Governors of the following States giving the amounts which they could use for public works which could be completed in 27 months:

State:	*Amount*
Alabama	$50,500,000
Alaska	64,184,400
California	183,000,000
Colorado	20,926,000
Connecticut	28,545,000
Hawaii	24,111,912
Maryland	92,590,000
Michigan	639,000,000
Nevada	4,968,000
Ohio	329,259,645
Washington	40,000,000
West Virginia	89,155,950

It is obvious from even this response that in all the States at least four times the amount of funds which I propose could be spent on useful public works projects to relieve unemployment in areas of chronic unemployment.

My proposal is really a very modest one considering the need.

Exhibit 1

On page 10, line 2, and on page 11, line 1, delete the words "the sum of $600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended".

Exhibit 2

Separate Views of Mr. Gruening

I voted to report favorably S. 2965 providing for both a standby program of public works and an immediate program of public works for which an appropriation of $600 million was authorized.

It is my belief that much more than the authorized $600 million is needed and could usefully be used to put the unemployed back to work.

In a statement distributed to the members of the Public Works Committee, I stated:

"On March 27, 1962, the able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, introduced an amendment to S. 2965, a bill to provide standby authority to accelerate public works program of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies. The amendment would authorize the appropriation of $600 million for an immediate public works program.

"I commend the Senator from New Mexico for his foresight in submitting such an amendment.

"However, the amount is, in my opinion, hardly sufficient to meet the economic strain now being experienced in certain areas of the Nation.

"Accordingly, I now offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, raising the amount authorized to be appropriated for a program of immediate public works to the same amount authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance.

"It does seem to me that we should be willing to spend at least as much at home to take care of our own economically distressed areas as we are willing to spend abroad for aiding foreign economically distressed areas.

"My amendment does not, I admit, do equal justice as between foreign and domestic programs. Under the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Chavez, only one appropriation is authorized, namely, the sum of $600 million. Under my amendment, the limit of this one-time appropriation would be raised to the limit authorized in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the Development Loan Fund (sec. 202), the development grants and technical cooperation (sec. 212), supporting assistance (sec. 402), and contingency fund (sec. 451). Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1962 and the 4 succeeding fiscal years the total sum of $7.5 billion. My proposal is much more modest. In setting the limit to the amount that would be authorized for our immediate public works program, I have used only the figure of $1.5 billion—the amount authorized for the fiscal year 1963 only.

"My amendment would increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the immediate public works program to $2,645 million, computed as follows:

Sec. 202—Development Loan Fund	$1,500,000,000
Sec. 212—Development grants	380,000,000
Sec. 401—Supporting assistance	465,000,000
Sec. 451—Contingency fund	300,000,000
Total	2,645,000,000

"In proposing this increase in the amount authorized to be appropriated, I have used only the authorizations contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. I have not considered the amounts of U.S. funds made available abroad through such lending agencies as the World Bank, Export-Import Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, etc. Billions of American dollars have been and are being channeled abroad through these agencies. In many cases, the so-called loans are not loans at all but grants.

"In my humble opinion, no situation is more tragic than that of men and women unemployed who wish to work and cannot find it. In my humble opinion, no situation is more paradoxical than that this wealthiest country on earth, which has poured out $100 billion in the last decade and a half to help foreign countries, and proposes to spend even greater sums in the future for the same purpose, cannot meet its primary obligation to its own people.

"I am merely proposing, by this amendment, to offer a fraction for the relief of economic distress and the creation of employment for our fellow Americans of what we have been doing or are asked to do—and will doubtless continue to do—in far larger measure for inhabitants of 100 foreign countries.

"My amendment is as follows:

"On page 2, line 24, delete the words 'the sum of $600,000,000' and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance under the provisions of sections 202 (for the fiscal year 1963), 212, 401, and 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended'."

In order to insure prompt action on this vitally needed measure by the Senate, I did not press my amendment in committee but must reserve my position on the amount authorized for an immediate program of public works when this bill is considered in the Senate.

Ernest Gruening.

Exhibit 3

Private industry insured unemployment rates by administrative area and industry

By administrative area	This week (Apr. 28, 1962)		Last week (Apr. 21, 1962)		Year ago (Apr. 29, 1961)	
	Weeks claimed	IUR[1]	Weeks claimed	IUR[1]	Weeks claimed	IUR[1]
State	5,322	16.2	5,699	17.4	6,500	19.9
Anchorage	3,006	16.7	3,198	17.8	3,315	18.4
Fairbanks	1,220	17.9	1,322	19.3	1,664	27.6
Juneau	282	10.5	294	10.9	328	11.5
Ketchikan	276	10.3	302	11.3	500	15.9
Nome	177	33.5	201	38.0	207	33.3
Petersburg	274	34.7	297	37.6	312	40.9
Sitka	88	7.2	85	7.0	165	13.8

By industry	This week (Apr. 28, 1962)		Last week (Apr. 21, 1962)		Year ago (Apr. 29, 1961)	
	Weeks claimed	IUR[1]	Weeks claimed	IUR[1]	Weeks claimed	IUR[1]
Total	5,322	16.2	5,699	17.4	5,600	19.9
Mining	201	17.4	257	22.3	310	27.6
Construction	2,044	45.0	2,238	49.3	2,706	46.6
Manufacturing	1,035	19.7	985	18.8	1,232	21.5
Transportation and utilities	462	6.6	542	7.7	502	8.3
Trade	503	6.2	571	7.0	627	8.3
Finance	56	3.7	51	3.4	80	5.7
Service and other	1,021	19.8	1,055	20.5	1,043	21.0

[1] Insured unemployment rate.

Exhibit 4

April 18, 1962.

Senate Public Works Committee today reported emergency public works bill authorizing appropriation of $600 million for one-shot effort for public works projects in economically distressed areas. As member of committee, I expressed concern that sum authorized was totally inadequate to meet Nation's needs. Would appreciate your writing me as soon as possible giving me as much information as possible concerning public works projects in economically distressed areas of your State which could be completed in 27 months, giving estimated costs and man-hours of work which would be provided.

Exhibit 5

State of Alaska,
Juneau, May 2, 1962.

Hon. Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: We have gathered the following information from the Alaska Department of Public Works.

Of the approximately $388,812,748 listed as capital improvement needs for the next 6 years, approximately $99 million would be paid for by the State of Alaska, exclusive of any Federal moneys made available under Federal grant-in-aid programs. A summary of this $388,812,748 program is set forth on page 8 of the attached document, "A Capital Improvement Program for the State of Alaska, 1962–68." Projects which are to be financed in whole or part from State or local funds are summarized on pages 11 through 17.

As you can see, we have a considerable inventory of buildings, structures, and improvements that should be built. We do not have a great many projects ready to be advertised at this time, but we should be able to add to the list fairly quickly providing that we can obtain Housing and Home Finance Agency advances for advance planning and providing that the various bonding proposals pass. With the incentive provided by a public works act, such as S.

295, the State could prepare a number of the more uncomplicated projects, such as classroom additions to State-operated schools, small State-operated schools for contract, and make application for Housing and Home Finance Agency planning advances and grants for the more extensive projects. Actually, we are now working on a number of applications for HHFA advances and grants for the planning and design of a number of State-operated schools and various facilities at the University of Alaska.

Accordingly, the following list of projects which are designed, are being designed, or will be designed in next year, very substantially understates our ability to utilize S. 2965 in carrying out the purpose of that act. In this connection, I should note that the capital improvement program is a conservative document. In preparing the capital improvement program many needed projects were deleted to hold the program within the State's ability to finance.

The projects which probably most nearly qualify for immediate consideration under a standby public works act are:

1. The International Airport Terminal buildings projects at Anchorage and Fairbanks, representing a value of $3.8 million and $1.8 million, respectively, are fully complete and ready for bidding.

2. Projects which are now in the planning stage with design completion anticipated before August of this year are Salcha Elementary School ($160,000), Eagle River School addition ($288,000), Soldotna School addition ($183,000), and Glen Allen refrigeration and foundation ($55,000). Funds for these projects have been provided under the 1962–63 State education budget. The total for these schools is $686,000.

3. At present, three applications are being prepared for submittal to the Housing and Home Finance Agency for an "Advance for Public Works Planning." If approved, funds would be available to complete architectural-engineering design for the Ninilchik School addition ($400,000), the Metlakatla Elementary School ($600,000), and the Fort Yukon School addition ($260,000). Approximately 5 months will be required before these projects would be "set to go." The total for these schools is $1,260,000.

4. The following schools might be ready for contract this year if the $5 million bond issue for State operated schools passes:

Ambler School	$55,000
Eagle River (further classroom addition)	52,000
Delta Junction	516,000
Homer	554,000
Tanana	252,000
North Kenai	554,000
Sterling	150,000
Chugiak High School	1,200,000
McGrath	78,000
Brown's Ct	160,000
Fortuna Ledge	78,000
Total	3,649,000

NOTE.—The legislature appropriated $75,000 for planning and design for Chugiak High School. Some preliminary work has already been done on this project.

5. The vocational school at Nome, although funded under a $1,500,000 general obligation bond authorization, is another project which could qualify. Final plans could be completed within 5 months.

6. If the $7,200,000 bonding program for the University of Alaska passes, money will be available for the construction of an addition to the engineering and physical sciences building, a biological sciences and renewable resources building, completion of the university's new heating plant, and other related facilities.

7. Invitations to bid on the construction of fire and crash stations at the Anchorage and Fairbanks International Airports, approximately $180,000 each will be advertised this June.

8. A $160,000 addition to the Miner and Minerals Building in Anchorage may be erected in the 1963 construction season.

9. Proposed water and harbors projects scheduled for the 1962 and 1963 construction seasons which are not yet under contract are:

Angoon, docks	$50,000
Cordova, floats	50,000
Craig, dock	40,000
Douglas, floats	45,000
Homer, floats	65,000
Hydaburg dock	25,000
Hyder, float	7,500
Klawock, dock approach	40,000
Kodiak, floats	30,000
Ninilchik, floats	23,000
Seldovia, floats	65,000
Seward, floats	46,000
Valdez, floats	38,000
Wrangell, floats	31,000
Total	555,500

NOTE.—Considerable work has been done on some of the foregoing projects or is now underway. Since this work is already contracted out, it is not reflected in the above estimated cost figures. Other projects which are now under contract are also not reflected.

10. The following bush airfields are programed for construction in the 1962 and 1963 construction seasons:

New Stuyahok	$15,000
Alitak	50,000
Anvik	15,000
Buckland	10,000
Chevak	15,000
Circle City	7,500
Egegik	20,000
False Pass	10,000
Goodnews	10,000
Holikachuk	15,000
Kasaan	5,000
Koliganek	10,000
Koyukuk	15,000
McCarthy	49,000
Metlakatla	5,000
Nulato	25,000
Ouzinkie	30,000
Pilot Point	15,000
Quinhagak	5,000
Russian Mission	15,000
Shakeluk	7,400
Shungnak	10,000
Stebbins-St. Michael	10,000
Tanunak	15,000
Togiak	10,000
Total	393,900

I have omitted mention of projects planned for our annual $37 to $40 million Federal aid highway program and the Federal aid airport program. I gather that these programs will not be affected by the proposed standby public works act.

If I can supplement any of this information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

GARY THURLOW,
Executive Assistant.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *May 17, 1962.*

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.:

In reply to your telegram of April 18, it is estimated that the State of California could initiate and accelerate $183 million in public works projects and complete them within a period of 27 months. These projects would utilize an estimated 18 million man-hours of labor at the job site.

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of California.

OLYMPIA, WASH., *May 2, 1962.*

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Review of public works of our State indicates that nearly $400 million would be needed for the completion of the total public works projects contemplated in the next 3 to 4 years in economically distressed areas when limited to projects believed to have a completion date within a 27-month period. The total would amount approximately to $40 million. This latter figure would represent specific items such as buildings, utilities, etc. The larger figure given would include such items as dam completion, the canal possibility, atomic generation of electric power, and steam generation coal plants.

ALBERT D. ROSELLINI,
Governor of Washington.

THE STATE OF NEVADA,
Carson City, April 27, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Public Works Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am happy to supply the information you requested in your recent telegram regarding the emergency public works bill.

The accompanying data, compiled by our department of highways, relates to roadway construction contemplated or underway in the counties of Lincoln and Mineral, the two Nevada counties officially recognized by the Federal Government as depressed under the area redevelopment program.

I trust the enclosed data provides you with the information you desire. If I can be of any further service, please let me know.

Cordially,

GRANT SAWYER,
Governor.

Road contracts to be completed within approximately the next 27 months, Lincoln and Mineral Counties, Nev.

	Estimated construction cost	Estimated man-hours
Lincoln County:		
Project S-544(10) U.S. 93 from 14 miles southeast to 1 mile north of Alamo (15 miles)	$1,600,000	150,000
Project S-544(9) U.S. 93 from 14 miles to 22 miles southeast of Alamo (8 miles)	700,000	63,000
Project F-008-1(3) SR 25, from 2d St. to 6th St. in Panaca (0.5 mile)	70,000	7,000
Subtotal	2,370,000	220,000
Mineral County:		
Project F-004-1(3) U.S. 6 from 8.6 miles east of California-Nevada State line to 3.5 miles east of Basalt (6.7 miles) (construction underway)	948,000	86,000
Project F-004-1(4) U.S. 6 from California-Nevada State line to 8.6 miles east (8.6 miles) (construction underway)	1,100,000	99,000
Project S-525(1) FAS 525 from Nevada-Scheelite mine north to U.S. 50 (19.1 miles) (25 percent of this project in Mineral County)	550,000	52,000
Subtotal	2,598,000	237,000
Grand total	4,968,000	457,000

STATE OF COLORADO,
Denver, April 27, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: In response to your telegram of April 18, we are enclosing a list of public works projects in Colorado redevelopment areas that reportedly could be initiated and completed in 27 months subject to availability of funds.

This information was accumulated through contact with various city and county officials and State agencies.

We are not entirely familiar with the criteria for eligibility to participate under the terms of the proposed legislation or with the legislative definition of public works. We have not, therefore, attempted to evaluate whether or not all of the listed projects could qualify for assistance under the proposed legislation.

We were not able to obtain an assessment of the man-hours of work which would be provided by the projects as engineering studies are not available in connection with most of the proposals.

Very truly yours,

STEVE MCNICHOLS.

List of public works projects in redevelopment areas that could be initiated and completed in 27 months if funds were available as reported by various city and county officials and projects listed by the game and fish department

Area		Description	Estimated cost
County	City		
Alamosa		Water service to East Alamosa	$250,000
		Community youth center	200,000
		Addition to county courthouse	150,000
		Storm sewer and curb and gutter for East Alamosa	50,000
		Dike and river work on Rio Grande through city of Alamosa	50,000
		Total	700,000
	Alamosa	Paving city streets	386,000
		Extending airport runway	40,000
		New water well, mains, and extensions	100,000
		Enlarge sewer lagoons	50,000
		Storm sewer, South Alamosa	60,000
		Sanitary sewer system; new major trunkline	330,000
		Total	966,000
		Total, Alamosa County	1,666,000
Clear Creek		Georgetown Reservoir	360,000
	Idaho Springs	Shortwave communication system for city and county	8,000
		City street paving	75,000
		Sewage disposal plant	20,000
		Total	103,000
	Georgetown	Sewage disposal plant and collection system	100,000
		Develop Georgetown Lake as recreational area	225,000
		Rebuild water distribution system	100,000
		Total	425,000
		Total, Clear Creek County	888,000
Conejos		No county projects reported	
	Antonito	75 low-cost dwellings for transient workers	400,000
		Waterline	60,000
		Sewer system	180,000
		Total	640,000
	La Jara	No projects reported	
		Total, Conejos County	640,000
Costilla		County courthouse and jail	225,000
		County shops	100,000
		Fort Garland community building	35,000
		Hospital addition	50,000
		San Luis Water and Sanitation District sewage system	[1]
		Total	410,000
	Blanca	Water and sanitation system	[1]
		Total, Costilla County	410,000
Gilpin		Improvement, Corona Pass Rd	225,000
	Blackhawk	Water system and sewage disposal plant	75,000
	Central City	Water system and sewage disposal plant	100,000
		Recreational development, park, etc	25,000
		Total	125,000
		Total, Gilpin County	425,000
Huerfano		County courthouse and jail	1,000,000
		Surfacing county roads to ski and other scenic areas	239,000
		Acquisition and development of irrigation system for development of recreational facilities for Huerfano-Cucharas area.	3,000,000
		Waterfowl development	110,000
		Total	4,349,000
	La Veta	Expansion of sewer collection system and disposal plant	40,000
		Water filter plant	65,000
		Total	105,000
	Walsenburg	Sewage disposal plant	158,000
		Street paving, curbs, gutters, and storm sewer system	500,000
		Rebuilding and extending waterlines	100,000
		Purchase and install watermeters	108,000
		Extension of sewerlines	42,000
		Rebuilding electric distribution system and expanding electric production facilities	1,500,000
		City park recreational area	50,000
		Mine museum	18,000
		Senior high school	750,000
		Total	3,226,000
		Total, Huerfano County	7,680,000

[1] No estimate.

List of public works projects in redevelopment areas that could be initiated and completed in 27 months if funds were available as reported by various city and county officials and projects listed by the game and fish department—Continued

Area		Description	Estimated cost
County	City		
Las Animas		Grade and pave Cucharas Pass for 12 miles	$1,000,000
		Construction of 2-mile connecting roads between 2 State highways	40,000
		Recreational development at fairgrounds	50,000
		Pave connecting road from Aguilar to Highway 111	200,000
		Develop mountain recreation area	100,000
		Enlargement of North Lake	100,000
		Enlargement of Mountain Lake	200,000
		Alkali Creek Reservoir	100,000
		New road construction, North Fork, Purgatoire River	50,000
		Total	1,840,000
	Aguilar	Filter plant and water distribution system	200,000
	Cokedale	Pave streets	50,000
		Water distribution and storage	300,000
		Total	350,000
	Trinidad	New sewage lines and disposal plant	627,000
		Animas St. Bridge over Purgatoire River	230,000
		Rebuild water distribution system and water storage facilities	2,230,000
		Curb and gutter and paving	1,500,000
		Garbage, refuse, and disposal	40,000
		Police and fire building	200,000
		Development of Monument Lake Recreational Area	2,000,000
		Total	6,827,000
		Total, Las Animas County	9,217,000
		Grand total	20,926,000

THE STATE OF OHIO,
Columbus, April 27, 1962.

The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Mr. E. S. Preston, director of highways, has estimated that in the 20 counties which have been declared as distressed areas, that his department could have the capacity to develop plans and complete $250 million worth of highway construction projects in the next 27 months. There is now under construction in the same area 102 miles of highways estimated to cost $79,797,000. He further estimates that the $250 million highway construction program would generate 28 million man-hours of work.

This area, I think, will be benefited immeasurably by the improvement of the highway situation which I think contributes very largely to the chronic depression that exists. If it is difficult to move man and materials into a community, then this community does not lend itself to industrial or economic development. Other programs can be of assistance, but there is no program that can be more helpful and is as basic as is the improvement of the manner of transportation.

I have asked our director of public works to also report on the necessities of this area with reference to public works generally and, as soon as those figures are available, we will make them available to you.

With all best personal wishes to you, I am,

Sincerely,

MICHAEL V. DISALLE,
Governor.

Ohio Department of Natural Resources—Public works projects for economic distressed areas in Ohio

Project	Description	County	Total cost	Labor, man-hours	Department's priority	Annual economic benefits	Remarks
Ohio Brush Creek Reservoir	Recreation and water supply	Adams	$3,530,700	321,920	3	$3,000,000	Construction plans needed.
Brush Creek and Shawnee State Forests.	Timber stand improvement, roads and trails, structures.	do	442,060	268,350	1	(1)	
Trimble water system	Villge distribution system	Athens	60,000	4,081	1	5,000	Plans complete.
Strouds Run State Park development.	Buildings, water and sewer, camping, swimming beach, roads and parking, docks and ramps, reforestation.	do	600,000	50,000	3	50,000	Estimate 10,000 annual increase park attendance. Dow Lake in this park is an attraction which far exceeds facilities available.
Watterloo, Gifford, and Athens Park State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails, structures	do	74,011	45,260	1	(1)	
Belmont Lake	Road relocation	Belmont	205,000	17,083	1		Plans complete.
Barkcamp State Park	Buildings, water and sewer, roads and parking, docks and ramps, reforestation, camping, picnic areas.	do	700,000	58,000	3	500,000	New park with lake ready for filling except for road relocation. Would serve transient trade using Interstate 70.
White Oak Reservoir	Recreation and water supply	Brown	3,106,783	121,872	3	1,500,000	Construction plans needed.
Stonelick State Park development	Camping area	Clermont	250,000	20,833	1	150,000	Construction plans complete.
Salt Fork Reservoir	Water supply and recreation	Guernsey	2,157,600	206,757	1	4,000,000	Construction plans complete. Includes road relocation and land needed.
Hocking State Park development	Camping area	Hocking	257,000	21,417	1	100,000	Plans complete.
Hocking and Tar Hollow State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	244,215	138,650	1	(1)	
Richland Furnace State Forest	do	Jackson	426,000	252,000	1	(1)	
Dean State Forest	TSI, roads and trails	Lawrence	48,500	30,000	1	(1)	
Forked Run State Park development	Camping area	Meigs	70,000	5,833	1	50,000	Do.
	Buildings, roads and parking, reforestation.	do	75,000	6,000	3		
Shade River State Forest	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	94,825	41,370	1	(1)	
Burr Oak State Park development	Camping area	Morgan	110,000	9,167	1	75,000	Do.
Wolf Run Reservoir	Water supply and recreation	Noble	577,830	48,153	2	500,000	Need construction plans.
Pike State Forest	TSI, roads and trails structures	Pike	416,800	243,900	1	(1)	
Ross County Lake	Recreation	Ross	400,000	25,000	1	50,000	Feasibility report being completed.
Scioto Trail and Tar Hollow State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	526,600	329,300	1	(1)	
Shawnee Recreational Area	Construct 3 impoundments and reconstruct another for recreation.	Scioto	506,933	42,245	2	150,000	Need construction plans.
Shawnee and Brush Creek State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails structures	do	1,322,400	813,900	1	(1)	
Lake Hope State Park development	Camping area	Vinton	$86,000	7,167	1	150,000	Plans complete.
	Cabins, water and sewer, swimming pool, roads and parking.	do	1,300,000	108,000	3	320,000	Estimate of 64,000 annual increase in park attendance.
Wheelabout Reservoir	Recreational impoundment	do	130,000	6,667	2	150,000	Construction plans needed.

See footnote at end of table.

Ohio Department of Natural Resources—Public work projects for economic distressed areas in Ohio—Continued

Project	Description	County	Total cost	Labor, man-hours	Department's priority	Annual economic benefits	Remarks
Zaleski and Tar Hollow State Forests.	TSI, roads and trails, structures	Vinton	$533,343	320,225	1	(1)	
Muskingum River locks and dams	Repairs to locks and dams 1 to 8, inclusive for recreation and commerce.	Washington	677,870	56,489	1	$233,000	Construction plans needed. Preliminary design on No. 6 completed.
	Fishermen's access and boat ramps at 8 lock and dam pools.	do	20,000	2,000	1	48,000	These facilities would accommodate 16,000 fishermen per year.
Total			18,855,645	3,582,369			

[1] The improvement of the timber stands on State forests will not result in immediate financial returns to the community except for the wages paid to local workers; however, ample benefits will be enjoyed in future years. Timber stand improvement includes tree planting, pruning crop trees, thinning dense stands, and removal of cull trees and vines. The increases in value to the remaining stand will result from more rapid growth and higher quality timber. Under Ohio conditions, this improvement will often double the volume of wood produced. The cutting and fabricating of the raw materials will support local industries and attract new users of wood to these dependable sources of supply. Recreational benefits will accrue also. Wild land under intensive forest management produces maximum populations of wildlife.

OHIO

Project cost summary by counties

Adams	$136,050
Athens	19,280,700
Belmont	989,630
Brown	114,080
Clermont	61,050
Gallia	7,597,360
Guernsey	3,268,563
Highland	19,080
Hocking	1,460,860
Jackson	19,080
Lawrence	101,360
Meigs	536,360
Monroe	19,080
Morgan	903,360
Noble	229,080
Pike	81,080
Portage	17,517,223
Ross	137,080
Scioto	2,580,360
Vinton	972,050
Washington	557,510
Southeast Ohio	3,823,709
Total	60,404,705

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
Lansing, April 19, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The Senate Public Works Committee's approval of President Kennedy's $2.6 billion public works program to combat unemployment is encouraging. With 268,000 workers, 9.2 percent of our labor force, currently unemployed in our State, we feel the need of this legislation is eminent.

You ask for information concerning Michigan's ability to participate in the $600 million immediate effect provision of the program.

We currently have 53 areas in our State that qualify under this legislation as area redevelopment or eligible labor surplus areas. In an analysis I recently conducted, I found that we are ready to embark upon capital improvement programs totaling $639 million that would provide approximately 60,000 man-years of employment. These figures were developed only from those projects in Michigan that can meet the limitations of the $600 million proposal. They constitute, if anything, an understatement of the volume of activity that could be started in Michigan without delay.

While we have not projected our figures to a period longer than 12 months, it is our belief that the backlog of public works projects that could be initiated at the present time in Michigan would certainly absorb any extension of the time and financial limits of the program.

Concerning the time duration of the project, I urge the House Public Works Committee to grant a flexible time limit for project duration. Due to weather conditions in Michigan, a limit of 12 months would prohibit the initiation of some public works projects that might otherwise qualify.

My statement to the House Committee on Public Works contains a detailed breakdown of the type of projects we could initiate in Michigan. I am enclosing a copy of this statement for your information.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. SWAINSON,
Governor.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, April 26, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: The following is a list of public works projects as requested in your telegram of April 18:

Ansonia area:	
Ansonia-Derby flood control project	$6,000,000
Street and road reclassification project	250,000
Sewage disposal plant	1,000,000
Additional recreational facilities	100,000
Reconstruction of Route 34 in Derby from 3d St. to A St	200,000
Reconstruction of 0.2 mile of Route 115 and railroad underpass, Maple St. to Broad St., town of Seymour	1,000,000
Reconstruction of 1.5 miles of Route 115 in Derby and Ansonia from Route 34 to Colburn St	800,000
Bristol area:	
City hall (Bristol)	1,630,000
Civic center (Bristol)	450,000
Fire station (Bristol)	250,000
City streets (Bristol)	2,000,000
Sewage treatment plant (Bristol)	2,535,000
Airport (town of Plymouth)	500,000
Industrial park (town of Plymouth)	500,000
Construction of truck climbing lane on Route 69, Bristol	205,000
Widening approximately 1 mile of Route 6, Bristol, in Jerome Ave. vicinity	250,000
Extension of truck climbing lane on Route 6 in Plymouth from end of 1962 construction to vicinity of Todd Hollow Rd	100,000
Correcting sight line on Route 6, in Plymouth, in the vicinity of Orchard and Kellogg Sts	150,000
Danielson (town of Killingly) area:	
Sewer treatment plant and pumping station (Killingly)	800,000
Town dump and incinerator (Killingly and Putnam jointly)	700,000
Downtown renewal project (Killingly)	3,000,000
Danielson (town of Killingly) area:	
Town roads drainage and repair (Killingly)	$100,000
Sewage facilities and disposal (Plainfield)	500,000
Recreational project	150,000
Correction of sight line on Route 169, 1 mile south of Brooklyn town line	75,000
Reconstruction of 1.2 miles of Route 171 from Thompson town line to Quinebaug River	400,000
Reconstruction of 2.6 miles of Route 169 in Pomfret and Woodstock from Route 44 to Route 171	700,000
Reconstruction of Maple St., Killingly, from Route 6 to Route 101	375,000
Reconstruction of Route 12 south of Route 6 underpass	200,000
Reconstruction of Route 12 in Putnam and Thompson from 300 feet south of Route 12 to 0.5 mile north of Route 193	4,500,000
Resurfacing of Main St., Killingly	100,000

The estimated cost of the above-listed projects is $28,545,000 including $19,865,000 in local projects and $8,680,000 in State highway department projects.

Sincerely,

JOHN DEMPSEY,
Governor.

STATE OF MARYLAND,
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
Annapolis, Md., April 25, 1962.

The Honorable ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Governor Tawes has asked me to reply to your telegram of April 18 regarding possible public works projects in persistent labor surplus areas of Maryland.

To date we have been able to learn of 23 projects in such areas whose total cost is estimated at approximately $92,590,000. It is estimated that total man-hours would exceed 15,600,000.

The single most expensive project would be the relocation of U.S. Route 40 as a 4-lane highway for a distance of 112 miles from Hancock, Md., to Washington County, Pa. This would traverse five labor surplus counties. The estimated construction cost for the entire highway, exclusive of right-of-way acquisition, is $84,400,000 providing an estimated 15,275,000 man-hours of work.

The most critical Allegany County project is the construction of a new Pinto Bridge and improvement of the road from the bridge to U.S. 220. The existing bridge is wholly inadequate for the movement of employees to and from the Allegany Ballistics Laboratory and efficient delivery of some materials to the plant. The estimated cost for this project is $1 million involving 100,000 man-hours.

There are at least four projects in Washington County including the proposed North-East Highway at a cost of $400,000 and 75,000 man-hours. A new water transmission main from Williamsport to Hagerstown would cost $1,450,000. There is no estimate of the number of man-hours. A project involving sewer system extensions in Hagerstown and other Washington County towns would cost $3,500,000. Again there is no estimate of man-hours. Sewer and water main extensions and highway improvements to a proposed industrial park would cost $670,000. The number of man-hours is unknown at this time. The total cost of these Washington County projects is $6,020,000. Man-hours were computed for only one of the four projects; i.e., 75,000 man-hours.

Seventeen projects for the city of Cambridge in Dorchester County were proposed and a tabulation is enclosed. The total cost is $1,070,000 involving 196,800 man-hours.

We are also endeavoring to uncover other appropriate projects and will forward details next week.

I hope this information will be useful and please wire or phone if additional details are required.

Cordially,

Robert M. Sparks,
Chief, Business and Industrial Development.

City of Cambridge, Md.—List of projects which could be completed in 27 months

No. and name of project	Approximate cost	Approximate labor-hours
1. Improvements to Race St.	$19,000	4,000
2. Streets and utilities, Plaza Park, pt 1	18,500	4,000
3. Improvements to Maryland Ave.	12,000	3,200
4. Extension of Goodwill Ave.	13,500	3,500
5. Streets and utilities, Parkside subdivision	33,000	6,000
6. Sewage pumping station, Stone Boundary development	20,000	3,800
7. Bozarth Farms area, drainage	33,000	6,000
8. Improvements to sewage system, Jimson Rd	33,000	6,000
9. Repair shop and garage, public works department	9,000	2,400
10. Sewer, storm water separation, Fairmount Ave	70,000	12,000
11. Improvements to Leonards Lane	80,000	14,000
12. Drainage improvements, Dorchester Ave	24,000	4,300
13. Drainage improvements, Phillips Ave, Robbins St	30,000	5,400
14. Sludge disposal units, sewage treatment plant	200,000	40,000
15. Improvements to water distribution system	340,000	58,000
16. Woods Rd. to wire cloth intercepting sewer	100,000	18,000
17. New 1,000,000-gallon-per-day well	35,000	6,200
Total	1,070,000	196,800

State of Alabama,
Department of Industrial Relations,
Montgomery, April 23, 1962.

Hon. **Ernest Gruening,**
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: At the request of Governor Patterson, I am pleased to furnish the information requested in your telegram of April 18, 1962, regarding emergency public works which might be completed in Alabama in 27 months.

Both the State highway department and the State conservation department, which would be largely responsible for emergency public works, made estimates and plans some time ago. Engineering has been completed and it is believed all projects could be commenced within 6 months.

The following estimates, in broad categories, cover proposed projects in those areas declared economically depressed:

County roads and bridges	$3,500,000
State highways	8,000,000
Interstate highways	20,000,000
Reforestation, water, and wildlife conservation, State parks, fire control	19,000,000
Total	50,500,000

Man-hours are estimated as:

Highway and roads	3,000,000
Conservation projects	6,000,000
Total	9,000,000

The Governor is in agreement that the suggested authorization would be very inadequate, particularly, if such funds are allocated to the States on the usual pro rata basis.

Sincerely yours,

Ralph R. Williams,
Director of Industrial Relations.

State of West Virginia,
Charleston, May 3, 1962.

Hon. **Ernest Gruening,**
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: This will acknowledge receipt of your telegram of April 18, 1962, concerning proposed public works projects in West Virginia.

I would first like to inform you of the situation with regard to public works projects in West Virginia and to give you some information relative to specific projects which could be accomplished under the proposed program.

At the present time, the State of West Virginia has a public works program based on the aid to dependent children of the unemployed program. We have elected to participate in this program with a stipulation that each recipient who receives assistance will work for that assistance. As of March 30, 12,600 men were employed under this program. As you know, this program is financed by both the Federal and State Governments on a matching basis, the State paying 30 percent of the cost and the Federal Government paying 70 percent.

One shortcoming of this program is that only individuals who are married with dependent children qualify. No employment is made available under this program for individuals who are not married or individuals who are married and have no children or whose children are grown.

Three million dollars in State funds have been appropriated for the coming fiscal year for emergency employment. I may, as chief executive, use these funds to match any Federal funds which may become available for the relief of unemployment. This, of course, means that should the aid to dependent children of the unemployed program be continued at the Federal level, these funds may be used for participation in that program.

It is my understanding that the public works plan proposed by President Kennedy will make Federal money available to various State and local governmental units on a 50–50 matching basis. I would like to strongly urge that consideration be given to a more favorable matching ratio in favor of State and local governments.

A program with a 90-percent Federal, 10-percent State matching ratio would provide employment for approximately 7,000 to 12,000 persons. As only $3 million are available in State funds for matching purposes, a 50–50 matching ratio would only provide employment for 1,500 to 2,400 persons. These figures assume expenditures for material and equipment of 20 to 50 percent.

Enclosed you will find proposed projects from our State department of natural resources and from our State road commission. I would like to emphasize that these projects are only a sample of those projects which can be undertaken and completed within 27 months under this program and which would qualify under the rules and regulations of such program. It is anticipated that many projects at the community level, both county and municipal, would be submitted for accomplishment.

Again let me express my desire that Federal money be made available at less cost to the States.

I sincerely hope that this information meets your needs and that you will give every consideration possible to the suggestions which I have outlined. If I may assist you in any way or provide any additional information, do not hesitate to contact me at any time.

Yours truly,

W. W. Barron,
Governor.

State of Hawaii,
Honolulu, May 2, 1962.

The Honorable **Ernest Gruening,**
Senator from Alaska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Gruening: This is in reply to your recent cablegram wherein you requested information on public works projects which could be completed during the next 27 months in our economically distressed area (Hawaii County). The attached tabulation gives information on gross construction costs by major types of functions and the estimated number of man-hours needed to complete the projects. These represent projects which are currently authorized or those for which authorization begins on July 1, 1962, for the new fiscal year. It is estimated that all of these will be completed during the 27-month time period you cited.

I have not seen a copy of the proposed emergency public works bill. Hence, it is not possible to say if all projects included in this tabulation would be eligible for financial assistance. As you know, highways and airports now receive Federal grants. Perhaps these projects would not be eligible for further aid. It would also be of value to know if such financial assistance would be in the form of interest-free loans or grants. The mechanics of the proposed bill may affect an area's willingness to participate in the program

Hawaii's public works program for the coming fiscal year is the largest in our history. Part of the reason for this scale of State public works is to stabilize our employment situation. However, all of us recognize that public works construction alone will not solve our Nation's unemployment problem. Increased public works construction is only one tool of many that must be utilized to spur the growth of our economy. The Area Redevelopment Act and the program of retraining unemployed persons are examples of other actions that will help. Some areas will continue to suffer chronic unemployment until new economic activities are introduced. The private sector of the Nation's economy must maintain a vigorous growth if public efforts to solve unemployment are to be successful. Thus, any public works program should be accompanied by vigorous efforts to encourage and promote increased employment through new permanent job opportunities.

I hope this provides you with the information you need. However, if I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

William F. Quinn,
Governor of Hawaii.

Authorized State public works located in economically distressed areas of the State of Hawaii (Hawaii County only)

I. Public works division (miscellaneous public buildings and the State's share of a sewage treatment plant):	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$1,351,412
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	122,184
II. Airports division:	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$3,500,000
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	320,000
III. Harbors division:	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$3,855,000
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	617,000
IV. Highways division:	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$14,427,500
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	1,978,000
V. Land and natural resources department (land development, parks, water development, forestry, fish, and game):	
(a) Estimated construction costs	$978,000
(b) Estimated man-hours of work	136,500
Total estimated construction costs	$24,111,912
Total estimated man-hours of work	3,173,684

Exhibit IV

Press Conference of Hon. William L. Batt, Jr., Administrator, Area Redevelopment Administration

Mr. **Batt.** Now in terms of numbers the area redevelopment areas comprise about 1,000 counties in the United States, and in terms of numbers again the blue areas or the areas that are in only for public works comprise only 100. But these are much bigger cities, by and large. There are about the same number in the blue areas as there are in all the red areas.

The arithmetic works out a little something like this—let me see if I can recall it. In the areas taken together, these red areas and the blue areas, we have about a third of the country's population, about a third of the country's labor force, and over half of the country's unemployment. They are, of course, the areas of longtime labor surplus, the ones we work with, the coal towns, the textile towns, the iron towns, the Great Lakes, the lumber towns, Pacific Northwest, Indian reservations in the Southwest, and the cotton textile towns in the Southeast. You know the economics of them.

Now over 2,900 projects representing $361 million of Federal funds and an estimated $125 million more of State and local funds—because you remember the communities have got to match this 50–50—$361 million of Federal funds and an estimated $125 million more of State and local funds are in various stages. Some are actually underway, some are being planned, some are just in the process of approval.

Approximately 580,000 man-months of direct employment will be generated by all these projects with the same number of man-months of additional employment based on the normal ratio of direct to indirect labor on public works projects.

Now of the total, Federal agencies are using $110 million of this total $361 million for direct Federal projects for such purposes as conservation work in our national forests and wildlife ranges, medical and sanitary facilities on Indian reservations, modernization and extension of small post offices, and other authorized public works.

That is about 30 percent of the funds that have been allocated to Federal agencies who do their own construction substantially. That, of course, is 100 percent Federal.

The agencies we are talking about are the Forest Service, the Agriculture Department, the Bureau of Indian Affairs of Interior, several others in Interior; Bureau of Reclamation, Corps of Engineers.

The largest, Paul, are Interior and Agriculture?

Mr. **Southwick.** Yes.

Mr. **Batt.** Now the larger share, the 70-percent share, $251 million, has been earmarked for State and local projects. You see, the Congress said to give priority to the stuff that comes out of the communities, and this has been committed for waterworks and water pollution control, for sewers, streets, hospitals, libraries, for police and fire stations, for public buildings, and many other types of needed community facilities for which communities put up matching funds.

About 50 percent of all the applications to CFA over here, Community Facilities Administration, are for sewer and water lines. I personally never realized how many communities didn't have any sewerlines or any waterlines.

The response from local governments has been gratifyingly quick, demonstrating the strong desire of local communities to alleviate unemployment, and to get these public works built.

Our latest available figures, at the end of January, disclosed the following applications, expected to meet program standards, are on hand: Over in HHFA, CFA, $274 million. This is the backlog. This we haven't gotten to yet. HEW—and this is administered by the Public Health Service, waste treatment works $218 million, and hospitals $127 million, for a total backlog of $1,069 million.

And let me say parenthetically—this isn't in the printed statement—they are coming in at the rate of about $300 million every month.

Is that a fair statement, Paul?

The President is sending to Congress, sent to Congress yesterday a supplemental appropriation of $500 million to carry on this program. This sum was forecast in the 1964 budget recently transmitted to the Congress, and will exhaust the $900 million authorized in the accelerated Public Works Act.

It is clear, therefore, that there are already on hand more than enough applications for Federal and local projects to use up the funds authorized by the Congress for this program. Accordingly, the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are suspending the accelerated public works program except for those especially hard-hit areas which have already been allowed matching ratios in excess of 50 percent. This is a relative handful of areas, about 20 percent of the total, where the unemployment is so severe that Congress directed us to provide matching ratios higher than 50 percent, going up to a total of 75 percent.

While applications from all areas will continue to be accepted and dated as to time of receipt, they will receive no further processing unless they are located in the hardest hit areas referred to previously.

Status of APW projects approved, by type of project, as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

State	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months on-site employment
Alabama	41	$4,254	7,028
Alaska	16	2,699	1,928
Arizona	15	2,935	4,192
Arkansas	60	1,274	2,542
California	62	6,916	8,732
Colorado	16	1,630	2,362
Connecticut	19	1,602	2,412
Delaware	2	93	223
Florida	25	3,099	5,407
Georgia	36	4,012	4,981
Hawaii	1	134	1,752
Idaho	37	2,367	2,645
Illinois	49	3,234	5,331
Indiana	25	1,758	3,413
Kansas	3	115	193
Kentucky	61	4,629	8,486
Louisiana	29	6,126	14,055
Maine	1	360	432
Maryland	3	158	583
Massachusetts	15	4,036	5,946
Michigan	111	15,814	20,952
Minnesota	41	4,196	6,230
Mississippi	27	2,302	5,611
Missouri	65	4,254	4,784
Montana	31	1,616	2,573
Nebraska	5	596	827
Nevada	2	200	276
New Hampshire	3	420	528
New Jersey	20	8,632	13,869
New Mexico	57	3,347	4,256
New York	28	6,284	7,130
North Carolina	46	3,032	5,370
North Dakota	2	275	528
Ohio	32	6,097	8,816
Oklahoma	23	3,430	7,944
Oregon	36	3,357	4,220
Pennsylvania	80	15,829	20,757
Rhode Island	6	2,786	2,196
South Carolina	20	1,400	1,524
South Dakota	3	650	1,104
Tennessee	32	5,538	14,112
Texas	27	2,627	4,808
Utah	34	1,211	1,746
Vermont	1	366	878
Virginia	11	100	209
Washington	46	4,144	3,281
West Virginia	56	6,017	5,365
Wisconsin	37	1,110	2,812
Wyoming	8	384	382
Puerto Rico	10	721	607
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

Status of APW projects approved, by agency and bureau, as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

Agency and bureau	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months on-site employment
Agriculture: Forest Service	741	$14,961	21,192
Army: Corps of Engineers	55	9,392	10,304
Commerce: Bureau of Public Roads	34	8,141	5,436
Health, Education, and Welfare: Public Health Service	181	40,004	56,951
Housing and Home Finance Agency: Community Facilities Administration	352	72,969	118,383
Interior:			
Bureau of Land Management	11	1,972	2,784
Bureau of Indian Affairs	19	5,701	9,984
National Park Service	10	1,736	5,310
Commercial Fisheries	1	380	540
Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	12	2,910	5,454
Total, Interior	53	12,699	24,072
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

Status of APW projects approved, by type of area, as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

Area	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months onsite employment
5(a)	340	$51,088	67,599
5(b)	809	49,771	76,607
5(br)	20	5,310	9,296
LS	247	51,997	82,836
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

Status of APW projects approved by States as of Dec. 15, 1962

[Dollars in thousands]

Type	Number of projects	Estimated APW cost	Estimated man-months onsite employment
Construction and improvements:			
Hospital and health facilities	72	$21,639	31,598
Administrative building	47	12,627	19,774
All other buildings	44	5,340	6,914
Road and streets	261	20,965	24,171
Airports	5	1,374	2,448
Water, sewage, facilities and other utilities	192	41,651	70,416
Waste treatment works	113	19,503	27,562
Recreational facilities	50	9,337	15,667
Water resources projects	15	3,355	3,626
Fish and wildlife facilities	9	2,180	4,662
All other construction	234	7,766	9,010
Repairs: All types of repairs	170	7,100	9,809
Conservation measures: All types of conservation	204	5,329	10,681
Grand total	1,416	158,166	236,338

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session for today, it adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as the debate on this measure begins——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield, if it is understood that in doing so, he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield, with that understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, before the debate on the pending measure—the Mass Transportation Act of 1963—begins, I should like to make a few observations.

This is not the first time the Senate has been called upon to consider legislation to help urban areas with their transit needs. Senators will recall that in 1960, a mass transportation bill, that is, S. 3278, was considered and passed by the Senate. No action, however, was taken on that bill by the House of Representatives.

In 1961, provision was made on a temporary basis, as a part of omnibus housing legislation—that is, Public Law 87–70—for Federal assistance to communities to help solve mass transportation problems. It was understood at the time that the loan and demonstration grant funds provided in the 1961 legislation would be for only a temporary period, pending further study by the administration, for the purpose of preparing a plan for a long-range and comprehensive federally assisted urban mass transportation program.

The study was completed in late December 1961; and, based upon its findings, recommendations were drawn by the administration and were presented to the Congress by the President on April 5, 1962. Subsequently, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee considered pending mass transportation legislation, and favorably reported a committee bill, S. 3615. Senators will recall that this measure was then referred to the Commerce Committee. S. 3615 was reported by that committee without comment. No further action was taken on S. 3615 during the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

During the closing days of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, Congress did, however, extend, by Senate Joint Resolution 235, the temporary program for a 6-month period. At present, this program will expire on June 30, 1963.

This is the fourth year that we have been called upon to provide a means of meeting mass transportation needs of our people. During these 4 years, more than 35 days have been devoted to receiving testimony on mass transportation legislation. The testimony on this subject received from witnesses who appeared before the Senate committees fills nearly 3,000 pages of the hearings. Members of the Banking and Currency Committee alone have spent 16 days in executive session, in deliberating on mass transportation legislation.

I point out these statistics in order to show the vast amount of time and the deliberate consideration which have been given by the Senate to mass transportation legislation.

Mr. President, it is time that we face up to the question of whether Congress intends to take any action to help serve the transportation needs of our country. There is no doubt that the mass transportation industry in this Nation faces a real crisis; and the longer we delay in recognizing this fact, the greater will be the cost to our people, our towns and cities, and to the entire economy of the Nation.

I should like to use two examples to illustrate my point. First, many private companies are finding it extremely difficult to meet the operating expenses of existing facilities, and they are finding it almost prohibitive to finance new capital improvements required in order to meet expansion requirements. Caught in the squeeze of rising capital and operating costs and declining patronage, many private companies must resort to raising fares, trimming service, and deferred maintenance—which simply drives away more riders and accelerates the downward spiral. These declines in riding, with their resulting serious financial impact, have caused the abandonment of many transit companies in recent years. One regrettable consequence of this trend is that many communities have abandoned mass transit rights-of-way. It is possible that if the Congress had acted to establish a permanent mass transportation system in 1960, 1961, or 1962, many of these rights-of-way might have been saved.

Today, if these communities desire to reestablish a local mass transportation system, we can be assured that rights-of-way will be redeemed or replaced only at very heavy cost.

Second, during the mass transportation hearings of 1962, the committee was informed by the American Transit Association about the number of transit companies abandoned since January 1, 1954. Again, during the 1963 hearings, the association's witness presented the same information, but of course, updated by 10 months. During this 10-month period, 20 transit companies were abandoned. The witness further stated that many companies presently in existence are on the verge of being abandoned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the table by the American Transit Association which supports my statement.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary, by States, showing the number of U.S. transit companies sold or abandoned from Jan. 1, 1954, to Feb. 1, 1963

State	Number of companies sold	Number of companies abandoned	Total sales and abandonments
Alabama	1	0	1
Arizona	3	0	3
Arkansas	3	8	11
California	10	11	21
Colorado	4	7	11
Connecticut	5	3	8
Delaware	1	0	1
District of Columbia	2	0	2
Florida	10	5	15
Georgia	5	5	10
Idaho	1	3	4
Illinois	5	14	19
Indiana	9	14	23
Iowa	4	3	7
Kansas	3	4	7
Kentucky	6	2	8
Louisiana	2	0	2
Maine	2	3	5
Maryland	3	3	6
Massachusetts	7	3	10
Michigan	17	8	25
Minnesota	1	2	3
Mississippi	1	2	3
Missouri	4	2	6
Montana	5	4	9
Nebraska	0	6	6
New Hampshire	2	1	3
New Jersey	5	3	8
New Mexico	2	1	3
New York	21	14	35
North Carolina	7	3	10
North Dakota	1	0	1
Ohio	18	14	32
Oklahoma	3	3	6
Oregon	8	7	15
Pennsylvania	19	7	26
Rhode Island	2	0	2
South Carolina	1	1	2
South Dakota	2	0	2
Tennessee	4	0	4
Texas	10	14	24
Virginia	2	3	5
Washington	8	3	11
West Virginia	1	2	3
Wisconsin	11	4	15
Wyoming	2	2	4
Total	243	194	437

Summary, by years, of the number of U.S. transit companies sold or abandoned from Jan. 1, 1954, to Feb. 1, 1963

	Number of companies sold	Number of companies abandoned	Total sales and abandonments
1954	29	19	48
1955	27	26	53
1956	17	29	46
1957	27	20	47
1958	35	19	54
1959	29	28	57
1960	21	13	34
1961	23	9	32
1962	23	21	44
1963 (to Feb. 1, 1963)	1	1	2
Date not available	11	9	20
Total	243	194	437

Source: American Transit Association.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, it would be foolish to assume that the program proposed by S. 6 would save all the transit systems that are on the brink of abandonment, but each one that is prevented from "going under" will save that many jobs, will keep that many rights-of-way open, and will help to avoid an economic decline in the local area.

The bill reported by the committee, that is, S. 6, is basically the same bill that the Banking and Currency Committee reported to the Senate last year. Last session the committee deliberated mass transportation legislation over a 3½-month period prior to reporting the bill to the Senate. During that period the committee very painstakingly considered all the objections of those who presented their views. I believe the committee, by amending the bill, met the majority of these objections.

For example, during the last session of the Congress, those representing private mass transportation companies expressed grave concern that the legislation did not permit them to participate in the proposed program. Although these representatives were mistaken in their interpretation, and were assured on many occasions that they could participate in the program, the committee very carefully wrote into the bill the so-called private operator amendments. These amendments were retained in S. 6 this year.

In addition, during the last session many voiced concern that the bill would provide assistance for large cities only. Others voiced concern that the bill gave the Administrator broad and unlimited powers. Some said the legislation would provide assistance to uneconomical systems. Others stated that the legislation provided for rail-type transit only, ignoring bus systems, and so on. The committee squarely faced each of these objections and, in my opinion, resolved these matters satisfactorily.

This year, witnesses from labor organizations expressed concern that the proposed legislation would first, promote automation thus causing a loss of jobs; and, second, imperil the rights and privileges of those now employed in existing private transportation companies. Members of the Banking and Currency Committee are just as sensitive to unemployment and the rights and privileges of employees as are any other groups in this body, and the committee was most sympathetic to the plight of those presently engaged in mass transit service. The committee added an amendment to S. 6 in order to help safeguard the rights and privileges of those now employed by transit companies in communities where such projects are assisted or financed under the bill. It is my opinion that this amendment provides ample protection to those who might be affected by this legislation.

Mr. President, like any measure that comes before the Senate, S. 6 does not satisfy every Member nor does it satisfy every individual group who is concerned with mass transportation problems. Quite frankly, I have reservations about some of the provisions of the bill. However, I believe that S. 6, in general, is a sound bill and that it will go a long way toward serving the mass transportation needs of this Nation and our people.

I should like now to explain the major features of the bill.

Very generally, S. 6, as amended by the committee, is designed to establish, in place of the temporary mass transportation program authorized by the Congress in 1961, a long-range Federal program to assist State and local bodies, and agencies thereof, to provide the kind of mass transportation facilities necessary for the orderly growth and development of urban communities. Basically, the bill provides for a program of Federal loans and grants to supplement State and local funds to finance the capital facilities and equipment needed for the extension and improvement of comprehensively planned urban mass transportation systems. These systems could be either publicly or privately operated.

The major features of the bill are as follows:

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

Federal grants would be provided for mass transportation facilities and equipment, including land and improvements acquired or constructed in advance of use, with strict planning requirements, including the preparation of an areawide transportation plan as a part of comprehensive planning for the development of the urban area. To the extent that projects cannot be financed from estimated revenues, Federal grants could be made for two-thirds of the remaining cost—"the net project cost." Local grants would be required for the other one-third. Part or all of the Federal and local grant could later be repaid from any surplus revenues.

Federal loans, limited to the amount authorized for mass transportation loans under existing law, would be authorized for projects where loans cannot be obtained privately on reasonable terms, if such loans would make effective mass transportation possible without grant assistance.

EMERGENCY 3-YEAR PROGRAM

For a 3-year period, Federal loans and grants could be made on an emergency basis, with less strict planning requirements but with a one-half rather than two-thirds Federal grant. The remaining one-sixth Federal grant would be available if full planning requirements are met within 3 years from the date of the grant agreement.

FINANCING FOR LONG-RANGE AND EMERGENCY PROGRAMS

Contract authorization would be provided for grants of $500 million over a 3-year period in the following manner: $100 million upon enactment, $200 million on July 1, 1964, and another $200 million on July 1, 1965. The present $50 million loan authority would be retained, but without expiration date.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

A research, development, and demonstration program would be authorized, to apply to all phases of urban mass transportation, in place of the present demonstration grant program. This program would be financed through the present $25 million demonstration grant authority, plus up to $30 million of the new $500 million grant authority.

RELOCATION PROVISIONS

An adequate relocation program for families displaced by each project would be required; and Federal grants for relocation payments to individuals, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations would be authorized similar to those applicable to the Housing Agency's urban renewal program.

Mr. President, those are the major features of the pending measure. For a more detailed analysis of S. 6, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a section-by-section summary of the Mass Transportation Act of 1963.

There being no objection, the section-by-section analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

Section 1. Title of bill: "Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963."

Section 2. (a) Findings and (b) purposes.

Section 3. Federal financial assistance:

(a) Eligibility for assistance: Eligible applicants: States and local public bodies and agencies thereof. Applicants must have (1) the legal, financial, and technical capacity to carry out proposed project, and (2) satisfactory continuing control of use of facilities and equipment; but shall give full consideration to such control being exercised by an existing regulatory agency with respect to private companies.

Eligible projects: Facilities and equipment, acquired, constructed, reconstructed, and improved, for use in mass transportation service in urban areas and in coordinating such services with highway and other transportation in such areas. Federal assistance authorized for advance acquisition of land and improvements provided assurances received for repayment if not put in use in reasonable time.

Eligible facilities and equipment: Any real or personal property including land (but not public highways), buses, and other rolling stock needed for an efficient and coordinated mass transportation system.

(b) Protection of rights of private bus and motor companies: No grant or loan shall be made for a project involving acquisition of facilities or property of private enterprise motor transit systems unless—

(1) Such assistance is essential to the program for a unified coordinated urban transportation system;

(2) The program provides for participation of private mass transportation companies to the maximum extent feasible; and

(3) Just compensation will be paid to such companies for their franchises or property to the extent required by applicable State or local laws.

(c) Loan authorization: Extends for an indefinite period the $50 million Treasury borrowing authority under existing law. Loans are subject to restrictions and limitations as provided by the public facility loan program (a term of 40 years).

Loans would be authorized for projects where private loans cannot be obtained on reasonable terms if such loans would make effective mass transportation possible without grant assistance.

(d) Interest rate formula: Establishes a new rate of interest to be paid by the Administrator to the Secretary of the Treasury for funds with which to make mass transportation loans. Under the new formula the current interest rate to the consumer would be 4⅜ percent.

Section 4. Long-range program:

(a) Planning requirements: Complete preparation of a program for a unified coordinated urban mass transportation system as a part of a comprehensively planned development of the urban area encouraging, to the maximum extent feasible, the participation of private enterprise.

Acquisition of existing systems: Federal assistance only if improvements made to serve better the transportation needs of the community.

Grant formula—Federal share: Two-thirds of net project cost (that portion of project cost that cannot be financed on reasonable terms from revenues).

Local share: One-third of net project cost in cash from sources other than Federal funds. Refund permitted provided a proportionate share is made of Federal share.

(b) Granting authorization: Authorizes Administrator to enter into contracts for grants of up to $100 million upon enactment; an additional $200 million on July 1, 1964; and an additional $200 million on July 1, 1965. Full faith and credit of United States pledged upon contract appropriations for payments authorized.

Section 5. Emergency program:

Eligible facilities and equipment: Same as the items listed in section 3 above, provided, there is an urgent need for their preservation or provision and such items can reasonably be expected to be required for a long-range program.

Federal share: One-half of net project cost (defined same as in section 4(a) above) or two-thirds if conditions of long-range program are met within 3 years after execution of grant contract.

Financing: Grants or loans may be used to finance emergency program. Funds would come from the same authorizations described in section 4 above.

Expiration date: No emergency project may be entered into on or after July 1, 1966.

Section 6. Research, development, and demonstration programs:

(a) Eligibility: The Administrator is authorized to undertake development and demonstration projects for all phases of urban mass transportation which will result in (1) the improvement of mass transportation service, or (2) in meeting total transportation needs at minimum costs.

(b) Financing: The unobligated balance of the present $25 million demonstration grant authority would be made available to finance such projects, plus up to $30 million of the new $500 million grant authority under section 4 above.

Section 7. Relocation requirements and payments:

(a) Relocation program: Requires adequate relocation for families displaced by mass transportation programs as a prerequisite for financial assistance.

(b) Relocation payments: Requires payment of not to exceed $200 to families, or $3,000 (or if greater, total certified actual moving expense) to businesses or nonprofit organizations for relocation expenses. Federal Government to reimburse applicant for full amount of relocation expenses.

Section 8. Coordination of Federal assistance for highways and mass transportation facilities:

Requires Administrator of HHFA and Secretary of Commerce to consult, cooperate, and exchange information on all urban transportation policies and programs.

Section 9. General provisions:

(a) Gives HHFA Administrator the necessary functions, powers, and duties to carry out the purposes of the bill.

(b) Empowers the Administrator and the Comptroller General or their representatives to have access to and audit the books and records of all pertinent contracting parties.

(c) Defines certain terms applicable to the act.

(d) Authorizes funds to be appropriated for administrative expenses of program and funds appropriated for other than administrative expenses shall remain available until expended.

(e) Provides a grant limitation of $12.5 million to any State until June 30, 1964. The limit would then increase to $37.5 million after June 30, 1964, and to $62.5 million after June 30, 1965, except that the limit for any State could be increased at any time by $5 million, if these specific increases do not exceed $50 million. Further provides that in case a project is undertaken in two or more States, in accordance with a compact or other agreement, the Administrator may, subject to the overall limits set forth above, allocate any portion of the grant for the project to any one or more of such States.

(f) Requires the President to submit annual reports to the Congress which shall include among other things (1) to whom financial assistance has been extended, (2) the purpose for which the assistance is to be utilized, (3) amounts involved, and (4) such other information, comments, and recommendations as the Administrator deems appropriate.

Section 10. Labor Standards:

(a) Makes applicable the prevailing wage-scale provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act.

(b) Gives the Secretary of Labor authority to issue regulations and provide for enforcement of labor standards.

(c) Requires as a condition of Federal assistance that fair and equitable arrangements be made to protect the rights of employees (including collective bargaining rights, pension rights, priority of employment privileges, retraining programs, and protection against worsening of their employment position).

Section 11. Air-pollution control:

Provides that Administrator, in approving grants and loans, shall take into consideration whether facilities and equipment will be designed or equipped to prevent and control air pollution in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I reiterate that S. 6 is a good bill and that it will help to serve the transit needs of our people. I am hopeful that the measure will receive favorable consideration by the Senate, by the House of Representatives, and will be signed into law by the President.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For the purpose of making the record clear as to the purport of the bill, I should like to ask the Senator a few questions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the terms of the bill, is it a fact that every community in the United States with a plan for the development of mass transportation, having a population of 2,500 or more, would be eligible to receive grants with which to buy buses, rolling equipment, parking lots, buildings, and other facilities?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Technically, the answer is "Yes." I invite the Senator's attention to the language on page 15 of S. 6:

> The term "urban area" means any area that includes a municipality or other built-up place which is appropriate, in the judgment of the Administrator, for a public transportation system to serve commuters or others in the locality taking into consideration the local patterns and trends of urban growth.

Mr. President, this is a matter on which a good deal of time was spent in discussion in the committee. I did not wish to see a bill the benefits of which would be limited to half a dozen, or even a dozen, large cities.

Testimony was presented before our committee to the effect that a great many smaller cities have lost their transit systems. Certainly such smaller cities and towns should be eligible for assistance.

An urban area is defined by the Bureau of the Census to be any built-up place with a population of 2,500 or more. That is the reason why I say that technically the answer to the Senator's question is "Yes." Practically, I do not believe it is proper to assume that any such program as that would be carried out.

We would make these areas eligible, but we would place the discretion in the Administrator to handle the program in such a way as to solve mass transit problems.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Administrator of HHFA would have the discretion to determine to which community grants would be madę, within the definition of the term "urban area," as read by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That language is—

> The term area "urban area" means any area that includes a municipality—

So municipalities would be entitled to grants—

> or other built-up place which is appropriate, in the judgment of the Administrator.

I ask the Senator what limitations are provided anywhere in the bill with respect to the Administrator exercising his discretion concerning the community to which he would grant the money.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not see how Congress could be expected to spell out the communities that are to be eligible under the act. Discretion for administering the program must be left with somebody. We felt in this instance that it was best to leave the discretion with the person who was to administer the act.

There could be a relatively small city a few miles from a big one—or a place where people live a good many miles from their area of work—where perhaps a mass transit system was needed to tie the communities together; that is, to give the people commuter service. Should such smaller areas be ruled out arbitrarily?

If such situations should arise, we tried to provide broad enough authority to link up communities of this nature. Under the provisions of S. 6, the Administrator has discretion to do so. I do not see how we could grant assistance more fairly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The answer is that there are no limitations on the Administrator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The good judgment and discretion of the Administrator would be exercised within the terms of the act as a whole.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is that not a dangerous method of writing laws, to say that the Administrator may do whatever he wishes?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder how the Senator from Ohio would do it. Would the Senator designate the cities of New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles, St. Louis, Cleveland, and a few others to participate in the urban transit program, leaving out the smaller cities, which, perhaps, are as badly in need as are the big cities?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am not disputing that aspect of it. My position is that it is a hazardous thing to allow the changing minds of changing Administrators to determine to whom aid shall or shall not be given.

The Senator from Alabama asked me a question about how I would write the language. It is my understanding that New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Newark are begging for the gift. So to procure the support of the small communities in the Nation the language was so written that they would be tempted to support it in the belief that they would be given aid.

I ask the Senator from Alabama how many municipalities there are in the United States?

Mr. SPARKMAN, I cannot say, because I do not know.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand there are 15,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly I am not willing to admit that the language of the bill was either written or changed in order to get the smaller communities to come in. They were in first. They were in ahead of time.

For my own part, I insisted, and others on the committee insisted, that if we were to have a bill at all, smaller cities and communities were to be eligible to participate in the program.

The Senator might be interested to know that during the time the experimental program on the statute books—for 2 years—a total of 227 cities in 44 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico have made inquiries about the mass transportation demonstration and loan programs enacted as a part of the 1961 Omnibus Housing Act. The only States from which inquiries have not been received are Delaware, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah and Wyoming.

There is a great deal of need for mass transportation systems throughout the country as has been indicated by the inquiries made.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I appreciate those statistics, but I wish to point out that in the hearings which I attended of the Committee on Banking and Currency the question was thrown to me:

> Do you know the city of Findlay? The city of Upper Arlington? Is it not a fact they have no mass transportation at all?

It is a fact that they do not have it, but they do not need it, and they do not want it.

I should like to do a little questioning on the matter of demonstration grants. Does the Senator from Alabama know which demonstrations have been completed?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sorry; I did not hear the question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Tests are being made throughout the country to determine how the transportation problem will be solved.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. Demonstration grants are made.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Demonstration grants.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I call the Senator's attention to the demonstration grants in Massachusetts. The Federal Government put up $3,600,000 and the Massachusetts Transit Authority put up $1,800,000 to ascertain how they could get the people to give up using their automobiles and begin using railroads. So a contract was made with the Boston & Maine Railroad, under which the railroad was paid $2,200,000 in 1 year. The Boston & Maine Railroad reduced its fare from $1.99 to $1.10, and increased the frequency of service. The results showed that the Boston & Maine Railroad picked up 7,000 passengers a day, supposedly taking them off the highways and out of their automobiles.

My question is: Does the Senator from Alabama know how much taxpayers' money goes each day to the Boston & Maine Railroad to pick up those 7,000 passengers from the highways?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The taxpayers are paying $7,000 a day to the Boston & Maine, and they are being paid out of this program. My query is, Where has the demonstration been made showing that the program proposed in the bill will work out as contemplated? Where has a demonstration been completed?

Mr. SPARKMAN. There have been several demonstrations programs, as is shown commencing on page 9 of the report which accompanies the bill. We discuss some of the demonstrations programs on that page. For instance, at the bottom of page 9, reference is made to the demonstration program in Detroit. We also refer to one in Massachusetts and another one in Philadelphia. Three specific examples are set out.

Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that I think we must do more than merely consider what may happen within a matter of days or weeks, or even months. I think everyone knows that traffic on the highways is becoming so heavy that the highways simply cannot carry it.

The Senator has spoken of using taxpayers' money on railroads in an attempt to work out the transportation problem. I was wondering how much of the taxpayers' money is spent on an interstate highway running parallel to a railroad, or, if not parallel to the railroad, perhaps through another section of the State. We are spending enormous sums of money in this area. The Senator from Ohio knows that today, even with all the new highway construction, our roads and highways are becoming overloaded to an alarming extent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I continue?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me yield to the Senator from New Jersey first.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. This is germane to the discussion of the Massachusetts reference. It was just about a year ago that the State of Massachusetts announced that on an 11-mile stretch of highway, from U.S. 128 into the center of Boston, an expenditure of $118 million had been made.

Mr. SPARKMAN. How much of that was Federal funds?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. This is a State project, but, of course, we all know the extent of Federal participation in the Interstate Highway System, a program of $41 billion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The answer is 90 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It is on a 90–10 basis, 90 percent Federal money, 10 percent local money; and $20 billion of that $41 billion is being spent in urban areas and the rest all over the country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Picking up where the Senator from Alabama left off, I submit no tests have been made anywhere that demonstrate people will be induced not to use their automobiles but to use railroads, buses, and other rapid transit.

Tests are now being made in Massachusetts and in Memphis, Tenn. The Detroit test was negligible. It was a $200,000 sort of study. One test was completed on the monorail in Seattle. That was a $10,000 test.

The question is: Who can, by demonstration, point out that I, or the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], or the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], for example, will be induced to give up using automobiles and instead ride on buses or railroads to go in or out of town? I would like to have any one of the proponents point out one study that has been completed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I pointed out that studies are listed on page 9 of the report to accompany S. 6. I do not know of any projects that have been completed to the extent questioned by the Senator. I do not know whether the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] knows of such instances or not.

But, are we going to wait before we make efforts to meet these problems until we know the answer to this question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think we ought to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If so, I do not see how we are ever going to keep up with the needs of a throbbing, growing, more prosperous country, the people of which are moving from place to place, as Americans seem to like to do.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have read the studies that have been made——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator let me interrupt?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am somewhat puzzled by the questions of the Senator from Ohio regarding the timeliness of this legislation, because, he, himself, is the author of a mass transportation bill, S. 807. I have it before me.

If I may revert to the definition of urban areas which might be eligible by a mass transportation program, then I might say that the provisions in Senate bill 6 are certainly not as broad as those in S. 807. The Senator has this language in his bill:

> The term "local public or private transit agency" means—
>
> (A) any State, or any county, city, political subdivision of a State, or public corporation created by State law, which is authorized by State law to acquire, construct, complete, develop, own, operate, and maintain a mass rapid transit system.

Certainly that definition is much broader than is the one contained in the pending bill. The bill of the Senator from Ohio contemplates assistance for mass transportation in a way which indicates that he apparently feels a need for a program. There would be no greater need for help under the plan provided in his bill than there is in our bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to comment on that statement. My bill contemplates guaranteeing the loans——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the Senator knows——

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I complete my statement?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator knows that an amendment will be offered which we propose to accept, that would provide for the guarantee of bonds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My bill contemplates an authorization of a $50 million revolving fund, which is to be used to guarantee borrowings made by local transit companies; and before a guarantee can be given, the local transit company must agree to charge rates of fares adequate to produce revenues to (a) pay the operating expenses; (b) pay the interest on the borrowing; (c) pay the principal.

Fifty million dollars is involved in my bill on a guaranteed loan basis. However, the bill of the administration and the Senator from New Jersey contemplates a $500 million gift program. I cannot see how the proponents of Senate bill 6 can argue that my bill is more extravagant. It can be argued that under my bill private companies and municipal transit systems and country transit systems can be beneficiaries. I submit, however, that the bill of the administration and the Senator from New Jersey provides that no one can get this money for nothing except governmentally operated plants. Private enterprise can get it if it goes through the governmental plant and applies to the Federal Government.

The point I wish to make is that the pending bill is the machinery to drive private transit systems out of existence. They will only be able to get help if they come through a public body. The public body will have the private systems by the throat. They will be able to say to them, "You will get help if you will comply with what we want."

On that score, that broadness of my bill, I respectfully submit, is intended to stop the Fabianists from pushing the private enterprise system of mass transportation into public, nationalized operations. I wish the Senator would comment on that statement, because I believe it is pertinent.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that I did not say his bill was more extravagant. I did not use that term. I said that, so far as the areas to which it would apply are concerned, the Senator's bill was much broader than S. 6, because the Senator from Ohio's bill applies to any incorporated area.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Where the State would authorize the operation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I admit that the Senator's bill is one of guaranteeing. As I said, as a matter of fact, the Commerce Committee, of which the Senator from Ohio is a member, will offer an amendment to provide for that method of financing in this measure. I believe it is a method very close to what the Senator's bill provides.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator explain the amendments that were made, under which the Federal Government will direct the transit systems on collective bargaining, and other labor situations?

Mr. SPARKMAN. First let me get back to the private enterprise situation. As a matter of fact, the Senator will find provisions in S. 6 which show our concern for private enterprise. In my statement I set out that last year we wrote in provisions, and it was largely at my insistence that those provisions were carried forward in the bill this year, to take care of privately owned mass transportation companies. If the Senator will look at page 5 of S. 6, he will find this language set out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What line is that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Page 5, line 10. I am commencing in the middle of a sentence:

> such program, to the maximum extent feasible, provides for the participation of private mass transportation companies.

Then on page 7, at the top of the page, starting at the end of line 1:

> Such a program shall encourage, to the maximum extent feasible, the participation of private enterprise.

Now let me turn to the other matter, with respect to the public body, which the Senator has mentioned. I am sure the Senator will realize that some agency must have supervision—someone must be responsible for the comprehensive planning. As a matter of fact, all transit companies are supervised in one way or another. There is always some kind of regulatory body in the picture. Let us take the situation right here in the District of Columbia. We have set up an agency in the Federal Government, which lends assistance to and supervises the mass transportation system of this urban area. I do not know the administrative procedure of how loans or grants would be handled for the District under the bill, but certainly if the transit system in the metropolitan Washington area applied for assistance under S. 6, the application would be eligible. I do not know how the application would be made, or how it would be handled. However, there would have to be some agency to supervise and to oversee the mass transportation program which evolved. That is all we provide in the bill. We are not trying to socialize industry or force private industry out. As a matter of fact, we wrote that provision into the bill for the very purpose of preventing that effect.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On page 4, line 4, this language appears:

> Eligible facilities and equipment may include land (but not public highways), buses and other rolling stock, and any other real or personal property needed for an efficient and coordinated mass transportation system. No grant or loan shall be provided under this section unless the Administrator determines that the applicant (which in no case shall be a private company

Why has it been stipulated that in no case shall the applicant be a private company?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator read on about one sentence further and pick up on line 14? The language reads:

> The applicant shall, with respect to private mass transportation companies, give full consideration to the exercise of such continuing control through the appropriate existing governmental regulatory agency authorized to issue to the operating company, in the form of certificates of public convenience and necessity, franchises, or other indicia of operating authority, the authority to operate as a private mass transportation company.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe we agree on that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe that answers the question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Application must be made through a public authority.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Not through a private company.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I am sure the Senator would agree to that procedure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the Senator's estimate of the full cost of this bill, by way of grants, to the taxpayers of the United States?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would prefer it if the Senator would wait until the presentation is made from the Commerce Committee, because the amendment to it he offered completely rewrites this language of S. 6. A member of the committee who will present the committee version will be able to give the cost. I know only from talking with the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that he believes that the guarantee principle will completely resolve the problem. He believes that there will be very little cost to the Federal Government, if any. I am not saying that on my own responsibility, but only based upon what he has said. The amendment to be offered derives somewhat from the Senator's bill. I will not say it is identical with it. It is somewhat similar to the provision in the Senator's bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would like to say at this point that the Administrator of HHFA testified that it will cost from $4 billion to $6 billion before we are through. In my judgment, it will cost $8 billion. I repeat: $8 billion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, I do not know where this cost figure comes from. It seems to me to be pulled out of the air.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Oh, no.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Under the plan that was suggested in the bill introduced by the Senator from Ohio and adopted by the Commerce Committee, which I understand is to be accepted here, I am sure——

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is not my bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the Senator would not provide any such subsidy program as that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is not my bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am referring to S. 807, which the Senator from Ohio introduced. This formula was in his bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Not the original $50 million.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Committee on Commerce adopted it; we are going to adopt it; so it seems to me that we are swinging right into line with the Senator from Ohio, who, I am sure, would not provide for any such expensive financing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My bill provided for a $50 million loan guarantee program. The administration's bill provides $500 million for 3 years.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is a grant.

Mr. LAUSCHE. A grant; a gift.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the Committee on Commerce was not content with $50 million or $500 million. They said they would give $1 billion. So the bill of the Committee on Commerce provides $500 million for grants and $500 million for guaranteed loans. I was glad to get out of the meeting for fear they would jump the amount up to $2 billion. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the so-called mass transportation bill as it exists would extend further, over the country, the massive paternal hand of the Federal Government. It would deal a heavy blow to the concept and practice of separation of powers and functions between State governments and the Federal Government.

Supporters claim the bill will set in being a plan whereby the traffic problems in the congested areas of our Nation will be solved. However, the bill contains provisions which would confer czaristic powers on the HHFA Administrator, leaving too much to his arbitrary will and discretion. The bill is devoid of appropriate limitations; it is lacking in proper control.

The total cost of the program as established under S. 6 is only a start. In the 1962 committee hearings on a similar bill, a survey report made by the HHFA and the Department of Commerce conceded that $9.8 billion would be needed to alleviate urban transportation needs in the major cities. This near $10 billion estimate is not mine; it is that of the Agency which is going to administer the program. The $500 million S. 6 calls for is nothing more than a foot in the door, and is conceded as such by witness after witness. This $500 million is a mere drop in the bucket compared with the total future cost.

Most of the witnesses who testified for the bill were from the large cities. They knew what they were talking about concerning costs of mass transportation. They have had experience with such costs. This knowledge has been gained through experience in their respective areas. Many witnesses, by and large, felt that cities and States simply could not meet the problem headon and solve their own problems; that the cost was too much for the cities and States to bear themselves.

The witnesses from the metropolitan areas were certainly correct when they testified as to the tremendous cost of the program, but they were in error when they testified that cities and States themselves could not solve the cost problem. Consider what San Francisco has just done. Residents of the San Francisco Bay area approved, last November, a $792 million bond issue to finance their own transit system, a brandnew one quite complex in nature. That mass transit system will be financed partly through a property tax approved by the Bay area voters themselves. It is my understanding that Los Angeles, planning for a new and complex and costly mass transit system, will use farebox revenue as one of the primary sources of necessary funds.

One witness estimated that his city could use $200 million, another $300 million, another $100 million, and on and on. The $500 million in S. 6 will not go far—just far enough to open the door for an ultimate expenditure of $10 billion. The $500 million in S. 6 will go just far enough to keep communities and States from solving their own problems and meeting their own needs by discouraging local initiative.

Many smaller cities and towns are solving or planning to solve their own problems. The Committee on Commerce has heard a number of witnesses testify and present statements showing how the transportation problems in their respective areas are being met.

The bill before the Senate, S. 6, has undoubtedly already stifled incentive in various communities throughout the country. If there is one thing this country does not need, it is a program that will force communities and States to be even more dependent upon Federal aid from Washington, particularly at this time. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the Federal Government is encountering opposition to aid programs—stiff opposition in some cases—from States which feel that they can solve and work with problems within their own borders much better and much more effectively than can Washington. This opposition is coming from States which have Republican Governors and States which have Democrat Governors. This increased interest at the State level should lead to more efficiency, to lower costs, to better administration and control. Let us encourage communities and States to solve their own problems, let us not discourage them. Federal involvement in local and State affairs will always reduce and, in some cases, destroy initiative on the part of local and State governments in seeking to solve their own problems.

Although I am not generally regarded as favorable to trade union demands, I have always maintained cordial relations with the representatives of labor in my own State. We believe in treating each other fairly, and in giving each other the right to be heard, the opportunity to be heard.

The trade unions were not afforded the time to express themselves before the committee on the amendment with which they were most concerned. Labor's fears did not exist last year or the year before. They supported and endorsed this legislation at that time, but because of the public acquisition of a private transit system, or more properly systems, in Dade County, Fla., problems that labor might face under this legislation were suddenly brought to light, so labor requested, and rightly so, the opportunity to present their views before the committee.

On March 8, the Secretary of Labor offered an amendment to the mass transportation bill. Labor representatives testified immediately afterward without knowing fully what the Secretary's position would be. The labor representatives did present an amendment a day or so later, which was considered along with the Secretary's proposals in executive session. But labor was not given any opportunity to testify further.

The labor section of this bill is one of the most important, and certainly those whom the bill will directly affect should, in fact, be encouraged to inform the proper committee of Congress of their feelings. I have received telegrams and correspondence and personal messages, as I am sure many other Senators have, both from labor leaders and individual union members, who say they are opposed to the bill. These messages have come from those who certainly have a great interest in the varied effects of the proposed legislation.

There is another matter related to the labor section of the bill which is extremely important.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield with respect to the question of labor?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I wonder whether the Senator would feel that adequate consultation can be had with interested groups both in public hearings and in private discussion.

Mr. TOWER. I am not certain I understand what the Senator means.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As the Senator knows, the committee has closed its hearings. We did not have labor spokesmen appear again at the public hearings of our committee; but we know that in the legislative process more than public hearings are held. There is the day-to-day work with persons who have vital interests. I am sure the Senator is aware that that is one of the legislative processes of Congress.

Mr. TOWER. I understand that when we are working under pressure and are anxious to pass legislation, sometimes we treat matters a little more cursorily than when we have more leisure in which to consider measures.

The fact is that there was a substantial body of testimony on the bill prior to the inclusion of this amendment, but none from labor subsequent to the inclusion of the amendment. It is not a part of the formal hearings on the bill.

I would be hypocritical if I said that I am a great champion of trade union leadership; nevertheless, I believe that the representatives of organized labor have a right to be heard. I have never denied anyone a fair hearing, as I think anyone on either side of the fence will testify. I think the representatives of labor should have the opportunity to testify.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Since the record was closed, persons of great ability in the Senate and representing affected labor unions have been in discussion day and night. The Senate is meeting on Monday afternoon. I know that some Members of the Senate burned more than the midnight oil last night with Mr. Cushman, who spoke for the amalgamated union. If all these problems are resolved, and perhaps with an amendment tomorrow, to the satisfaction of all concerned, I shall be happy indeed to share the Senator's joy in that fact.

Mr. TOWER. I am not expressing any joy; let there be no mistake about it. I am, however, stating the argument against the bill. I think it is a valid argument against the bill. Whether I intend to support labor's demands or not, labor still has the right to make its demands and the right to be heard.

I was not aware that there was in the making some rapprochement between some of the proponents of the bill and organized labor; and I shall be very much interested to see what the outcome is.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In regard to labor's being heard, I wish to say the Senator from Texas will recall that the Secretary of Labor did not testify before our committee until nearly the end of the hearings. The labor organizations which had manifested an interest in the proposed legislation had been given ample opportunity to appear before that time; but they told us they did not wish to appear until after the Secretary had testified. So they followed the Secretary immediately, as the Senator will recall, and did testify in regard to the amendment the Secretary had proposed. They told us very frankly that they did not believe it was sufficient. They said they did not believe it went far enough. The Senator will recall that I asked them whether it would be agreeable to them to submit their proposal to us in writing.

So far as I know—and I was chairman of the subcommittee—no one representing the labor organizations asked for a subsequent hearing. Apparently the representatives who were there were well pleased with the opportunity they had to submit a memorandum following their testimony and to submit a specific amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Let me say that it was not my intention to infer or to imply that either the Senator from Alabama or the Senator from New Jersey intentionally was trying to deny anyone a hearing. Certainly that was not my intention, and I hope my remarks will not be construed in that way.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course not. No representative of labor who was present requested a hearing in addition to those we held.

Mr. TOWER. Actually, they testified on the next to the last day. I believe the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] testified on the last day when testimony was taken.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. I believe they testified on Thursday, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] testified on the following Monday.

Mr. TOWER. However, even if they had not asked to testify, I think it would have been wise on our part to see what was their comment on the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If they had wished to return on Monday and to testify then, we could have heard them then. But no such request was made.

Mr. TOWER. Probably there was very little time for them to make a survey of the effect on the unions or their constituents, and to obtain a reaction. In any case, the reaction since that time has been negative. It seems to me that perhaps it would have been in the best interests of the proponents of the measure to have allowed more time for the representatives of labor to consider this provision.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I wonder whether the Senator from Texas will describe what he believes to be labor's anxieties about this measure.

Mr. TOWER. They feel that it does not go far enough in protecting existing bargaining rights, pension rights, and so forth—any number of things. I think that is rather clearly indicated by the proposal made by labor which is included in the committee's hearings.

Another matter relating to the labor section is extremely important. A number of States have, in one form or another, restrictions prohibiting certain labor activities by employees of the State and its political subdivisions. Would Federal assistance be given to States whose labor laws conflict with the labor provision in this bill? Would the labor provisions in this bill supersede the laws of the various States? The Secretary of Labor indicated there would be no superseding of State law, but said the question of whether there would be an effect was a somewhat different question. However, in section 10(c)(2) of the bill, in the language referring to the enforcement of the prevention of curtailment of collective bargaining rights by the HHFA Administrator, the words "to the extent not inconsistent with State or local law"—approved in subcommittee—were deleted from the bill in full committee. From this, one can only assume that this measure could be enforced in a manner not consistent with State or local law. Texas law prohibits the State or its political subdivisions from entering into a collective-bargaining contract with a labor organization in respect to wages, hours, or conditions of employment of public employees; and any such contracts shall be null and void. It is further declared to be against the public policy of the State of Texas for any such official or group of officials to recognize a labor organization as the bargaining agent for any group of employees. It is my understanding there are similar laws in several of the States. At any rate, this probable conflict with State labor laws is a most important consideration in connection with this bill. It is a matter that should be gone into in detail before the proper committee, in order to determine the effect of the labor provisions of the bill upon our State laws.

Secretary Wirtz, in referring in his testimony to the situation in Dade County—where, as I have mentioned, there was a loss of collective-bargaining rights, due to the establishment of a new transit system operated by the municipality—said that in the application of Senate bill 6 to situations of that kind:

> There would be a question that would have to be squarely faced, as to whether or not Federal funds should be used in connection with a situation of that kind, unless better arrangements could be worked out for the preservation of collective bargaining rights.

Will State laws be superseded, if not in one way, in another? The question is certainly raised as to whether the Administrator will be forced to deny assistance to certain States. Or would he deny assistance to certain States only until they changed their laws? The point is not at all clear, because no testimony was made available to the committee after the deletion of the words "not inconsistent with State or local law."

Senate bill 6 lacks economic justification and basis. I feel that the local and State governments are in as good a position, if not a better one, to finance their own transportation needs. States are certainly better agents to solve mass transit problems than is the Federal Government. I do not, of course, recommend that local governments be enlarged to include suburban areas, unless the residents of these areas desire to be so included; but I point out that for the purpose of solving specific problems, some metropolitan areas have organized in this manner. There are also in existence interstate compacts dealing with urban projects, such as the one creating the New York Port Authority.

Testimony presented before the committee showed that 194 transit companies have been abandoned since January 1954. The primary cause for these abandonments is that these systems are simply not performing the function desired by persons in the areas they serve. As a witness so aptly pointed out last year, the transit systems did not leave the people; the people left the transit systems.

Is modernization the answer? When people stopped using transit systems, they sometimes stopped using systems that were modern at that time.

It is held that improved, new mass-transit systems will mean less automobile use, and traffic congestion will be curtailed or eliminated. But there is no assurance; there was not brought out in the committee hearings any real evidence that new and improved mass-transit facilities would cause a significant number of people, now commuting in automobiles, to abandon their private vehicles in favor of mass transit. We must look at the primary reason for the use of the automobile by the commuter. The primary reason is convenience. The versatility of the automobile makes its use so desirable. There is no type of mass-transit system to duplicate this versatility and this convenience. Let me quote from a study—made by Northwestern University—relating to competition between the two; that is, between the bus system and the private automobile:

> For example, if a man said his next best alternative to using his own car was the bus, and now for this group of people—call them this population of bus users, meaning the bus is their next best alternative—supposing you want to get them to give up the use of the car and go to the bus, since they have named it their second best alternative. Well, for a 0 fare, in this case, for bus, you would divert 13 percent of them. At a −10-cent fare you would divert 24 percent of them. At a −20-cent fare, you would divert 37 percent of them. In other words, if you provided free transportation to these people you would divert 13 percent of them from the use of their automobile for the use of the bus; if you paid them 10 cents to ride the bus, you would divert 24 percent of them. If you paid them 20 cents each, you would divert 37 percent of them from the use of their private automobiles to the bus systems. These people would rather use their own automobile, which to them is more convenient, than to ride the buses.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is meant by the term "zero fare"?

Mr. TOWER. That is to say, no fare charged at all. In other words, it is a free ride.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the passenger were given a free ride, would it be termed "zero fare"?

Mr. TOWER. With the offer of a free ride, 13 percent of riders would be diverted to buses. The ride would not cost the passengers anything. At a minus 10-cent fare, 24 percent of the passengers would be diverted. That is to say, if each passenger were paid 10 cents to ride the bus, 24 percent of those who travel would be diverted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Has that result been determined in an actual demonstration through making bus rides free and actually paying people 10 cents to ride them?

Mr. TOWER. It was determined by asking them questions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What study is that?

Mr. TOWER. The study was made by Northwestern University, and the report was placed in the RECORD by the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Dr. Moses made the study. He concluded that ample time was not available for him to finish it. The quotations referred to by the Senator from Texas are correct. Dr. Moses, however, went still further. He pointed out how much people would have to be paid in order to get them out of automobiles and into buses or railroads.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Will the Senator identify Dr. Moses? What Dr. Moses?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Dr. Moses is professor of transportation at Northwestern University, and was employed to make the study.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Who paid him?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Federal Government. The U.S. Government paid him. I believe that the Department of Commerce or the H.H.F.A. paid him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is the Senator sure of that?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am sure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Bureau of Public Roads?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Ford Foundation and the Government hired him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The automobile associations?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No, not the automobile associations. If the Senator will examine the record, he will find that Dr. Moses was to submit his report to the Federal Government. He testified that people would have to be paid in order to get them out of automobiles and into bus and railroad transportation.

Mr. TOWER. In all candor, I do not maintain that the study has a monopoly on truth, but at least it is a study that has been made. Whether it is 100 percent accurate or not I do not know. I do not know of any survey that has ever been 100 percent accurate. I remember that a Gallup poll predicted a Dewey victory in 1948. Predictions are never entirely accurate, of course, but they are indicators. In any case, there is no study to show that improved facilities would cause people to abandon automobiles in great numbers.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to read from the transcript of the hearings of last year. Dr. Moses is director of research at the Northwestern University Transportation Center, Evanston, Ill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. In a brief study made in Detroit, which is contained in our report, it was shown that riders were diverted from automobiles to buses—3,000 riders were picked up, which represented an increase of 12 percent. That was described by the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The study was only a brief one, and probably not as long as it should have been.

Experience in the Boston, Mass., area was even more dramatic. Again, as a study, it is an infant. But the Boston and Maine demonstration indicates that perhaps 2,000 automobiles have been taken from the highways when people were diverted from highway travel to the Boston & Maine Railroad. The Senator knows what 2,000 automobiles mean. It is about one lane of traffic 5 or 6 miles long, at least, bumper to bumper. It represents a great deal of valuable land in the downtown section of our cities which is used merely as parking lots for automobiles.

To get some idea, by way of comparison, of the space required for the number of cars on Capitol Hill, the staff of the Senate and all committees are allocated 836 parking spaces. We all know how much open land is taken and how much it cost to build the new Senate garage, too.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I shall yield in a moment.

I point out to the Senator from New Jersey that enterprising Texans build skyscrapers for parking facilities, which takes care of the land usage problem. We stack them. And we in Texas have much more space available than do people in New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Would it not be better in downtown sections of cities to have productive people, rather than idle automobiles, stacked in those skyscrapers?

Mr. TOWER. A skyscraper race is going on in Dallas to see who can go highest. We are going up.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Tall Texans need tall buildings. I appreciate that.

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to read from the transcript of the testimony taken September 17, 18, 19, and 20, 1962, on the bill S. 3615. I asked Dr. Moses the following question:

> For whom have you made studies? Have you made any for the Federal Bureau of Public Roads?

Dr. Moses replied:

> Yes; this study which I referred to was partially financed by the Bureau of Public Roads.

So I repeat unequivocally that Dr. Moses and Northwestern University were employed in part by the Bureau of Public Roads. Dr. Moses gave the testimony to which the Senator from Texas is now referring.

In relation to the Boston & Maine demonstration, 2,000 automobiles were taken off roads and 7,000 passengers were added to the Boston & Maine Railroad. But for each passenger the cost was a dollar a day. So in the Boston & Maine demonstration, in order to get people to give up their automobiles, they had to be paid a dollar a day. If we could carry that load, well enough. But I do not believe we could.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may make a comment on that statement?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. When an automobile is brought into a city, it represents a heavy cost to the city. The city of Philadelphia has estimated that per capita annual expenditures for all the care and attention necessary, from policemen to streets and roads, is approximately $140 a year. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. TOWER. To get the remainder of the study into the RECORD, we noted that a minus 10-cent fare would divert 24 percent. At a minus 20-cent fare, 37 percent would be diverted. In other words, if we paid people 20 cents a person, we could divert 37 percent of the people from their automobiles. That is what the Northwestern study showed. It is interesting. I think it should be brought to the attention of Senators who are considering the measure.

I am not opposed to mass transit systems, neither do I believe are others of those who are not supporting the proposed legislation. Nor do we deny substantial need for improvement. But I question the contention that the problems of mass transportation create a national crisis which it is the Federal Government's responsibility to solve.

Taxes should be levied on a sound and equitable basis. The benefit principle, by which users or recipients of the service would pay for the service according to the benefit received, is not present here.

Proponents expressed many times in the hearings that the highways are being subsidized, and therefore mass transit should be subsidized. There is, in fact, no comparison between the two—that is, between highway financing and the proposed mass transit financing. The major difference is of course apparent. Those who receive the benefits from highway use provide to the Government funds through gasoline taxes and other user taxes. In highway use, those who receive the benefits are paying for the facilities.

The major metropolitan areas are the wealthiest areas in the country. They enjoy high per capita income. It has not been proven that they lack the resources to meet their own needs.

Some sort of feasibility study, including reasonable alternative schedules should be undertaken to determine whether or not proposed improvements are actually in the interest of the public.

One serious objection to this bill is the lack of consideration given the Comptroller General. His recommendations were largely ignored. These were embodied in a letter from the Comptroller dated March 8, 1963, and received by members of the Banking and Currency Committee on March 12, the date that the committee met in executive session intending to take final action on the bill. Among the Comptroller's recommendations were matters which I considered to be extremely important to the drafting of proper legislation. One thing the Comptroller found, for example, was that if the administration's concept is fully implemented in this bill, projects might receive Federal and non-Federal grants equal to nearly 100 percent of a project cost.

The Comptroller, of course, supported the concept of annual appropriations instead of the contract authority, the financing aspect embodied in the present bill. I believe, as the Comptroller pointed out, that the Government programs should be able to withstand the tests of recurring congressional scrutiny. In this case, even the administration called for annual appropriations. Contract authority provision here is nothing more than a type of back-door financing. There are actually no limitations on the funds here, because the U.S. Treasury is pledged to pay whatever the administration commits.

In summary, Mr. President, I am of the opinion that there is no national crisis in mass transit to the extent that the entire country should be asked to sacrifice, in these times of high taxes and deficit spending, so that the larger cities can be relieved of their responsibilities. We should be making plans to curtail our spending, instead of plans to increase it. This drastic Federal program is not needed.

The business leaders throughout the country feel that this vast new Federal giveaway is unnecessary.

In summing up, Mr. President, again I point out that the bill would do nothing but tend to destroy local initiative and responsibilities. The communities will be less likely to work to meet their own problems, as long as they know that they can come to Washington to get Federal money to help finance the solving of these problems.

The bill is very loosely drawn. It leaves too much to the arbitrary whim and discretion of the administrator of HHFA.

Many of those who testified for the bill candidly said that this was to be only the beginning, that they anticipated much more money would be needed in the future. So, in the long run, it would cost us many, many times more than $500 million.

There is also the possibility that the program under the bill could be used for political purposes. Although I would not imply that anyone in the immediate future might do that, conceivably some administration some day might see this as an advantageous instrument to promote its own political welfare.

Mr. President, it is my fervent hope that the bill will be defeated.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Texas to say that the passage of the bill would tend to destroy the initiative of local communities as to trying to solve their own problems?

Mr. TOWER. It is my belief that it would. Some people testified to this effect. The man who testified for the United States Chamber of Commerce indicated that that was his fear.

Since there has been so much talk about some sort of mass transportation subsidization, a lot of cities have waited around to see how much Federal money will be available before proceeding on their own.

I think passage of the bill definitely would tend to stifle and discourage local and individual initiative and responsibility.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to point out to the Senator that in 1962, when Mr. John C. Kohl, the Assistant Administrator of HHFA, testified, I asked him the question, "How many loans have you made under the $30 million appropriation?" And he answered, "Two; one of $6 million and the other of $5 million." I then asked him, "How much money do you have left for lending purposes?" And he answered, "$19 million." I asked, "Are there any efforts being made now to borrow out of that $19 million?" His answer was, "No." I asked, "Why not?" The answer he gave was, "Because the grant prospects came into the picture early this year."

Up until 1962 there were loans. In 1962 the talk began about gifts. The more the gifts came into the picture the smaller the number of local transit systems which wished to borrow.

In Cleveland, my home city, five members of the board by a vote of 3 to 2 decided to extend their own rapid transit system from Cleveland out to the airport. They learned that gifts were to come from Washington, so they changed their decision.

Mr. Gasper A. Corso, one of the members of the Cleveland Transit Board, testified, in answer to my question, "Did any one of the members of the board who changed his mind state why his mind was changed?" that he changed his mind because, "It would be foolish to borrow when you can get it for nothing." This is in substance what he said, though not an exact quotation.

I submit that the bill would corrupt the morals of individuals in our home States who have the responsibility of trying to solve their own problems. It has already done so. No one has made application for loans. Why should they?

I should like to quote again from the testimony by Mr. Kohl:

> I think any prudent management would wait and see which way financing could be worked out most effectively.

As between borrowing and receiving for nothing, Mr. Kohl implied that prudent management would say, "Let us wait until it comes to us a gift."

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I think it would be timely to make certain observations on how, in the proposed legislation, we have taken account of the criticisms by the Comptroller General, and there is more to come.

I know the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, is seeking recognition. Those of us on the committee who are proponents of the legislation have the deepest of affection, respect, and gratitude for our chairman who, notwithstanding opposition to the bill, has made every possible effort that could be made to give us an opportunity to advance the bill which we support.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TOWER. I yield further to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in my understanding that San Francisco voted some $690 million or more to solve its own problem?

Mr. TOWER. To solve its own problem, $792 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What about Los Angeles? Does Los Angeles have anything on the ballot now with respect to a 15-percent ad valorem tax, in order to solve its problem?

Mr. TOWER. The Senator is correct. They have supported the ad valorem tax, as well, to finance the system.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Did a private enterprise install a system in Houston, Texas, which is now self-sustaining? Is the Senator familiar with that situation?

Mr. TOWER. Is the Senator referring to the one in Houston or the one in Fort Worth?

Mr. LAUSCHE. This particular company owns two systems, one in Texas and one in Kansas. The head of those systems testified before our committee.

Mr. TOWER. That is true. I might note that the chamber of commerce of the city of Houston has notified me it believes Houston can resolve its own mass transportation problems without assistance from the Federal Government.

Houston is a burgeoning industrial area. It is moving out. More satellite towns are springing up. Once-sleepy country towns have become dormitory towns. Of course, there are problems as to getting people in and out of the city and the various industrial centers surrounding it.

The leaders of the city of Houston have informed me that Houston can and will resolve its own problems.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am referring to Mr. Bernard E. Calkins, president of the Rapid Transit Lines, Inc., Houston, Tex., and also president of the Rapid Transit Lines, Inc., Wichita, Kans.

Mr. TOWER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When he testified, he said that he took over those systems and has made them a going concern.

If the Senator will yield further, he also testified that he has had the cooperation of public officials in allowing him to charge a rate or fare that would make the business a success.

I respectfully submit that where they have not been able to operate on a self-sustaining basis, it has been because of interference of the local public officials in not permitting the operators to charge rates of fares that would be self-sustaining. Subsidies were granted by the local officials. Now they come to us and say, "You join us in these subsidies." I am not going to agree to be one of the joiners in such a program.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator for his statement, especially the reference to the situation in Houston. Just as so often happens when man tries to upset the balance of nature, when the politicians start interfering by regulating a system, trouble usually results. This fact may account for loss of revenues and abandonment of services, because the operators were proscribed from charging fares necessary to meet costs.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I was mayor of Cleveland when the city acquired the Cleveland Rapid Transit System. A charter was adopted taking out of the city council the right to fix fares. It was done because I knew that, if the city council fixed fares, at every election there would be promises of fare reductions, and the inevitable result would have been a denial of the fiscal stability of that system.

As a result of the adoption of the charter, which took from the city councilmen the power to fix fares, that system has been self-sustaining. The city of Cleveland bought that system for $17½ million, paid for it out of the fare boxes, borrowed $30 million to extend the rapid transit system, and the city is now paying off the obligation on the borrowed $30 million.

I submit that back home they can solve the problems if there is a purpose to do so.

Mr. TOWER. I agree with the Senator from Ohio.

Before I yield the floor, I should like to join the Senator from New Jersey in what he said about the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. He has been very fair and cooperative with both the proponents and opponents of the measure. We are deeply grateful to him. He has shown a great spirit of fair play and cooperation, which we all appreciate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I commend my colleague from Texas on his frank, forthright statement opposing Federal subsidization of local mass transit systems.

Few would argue that the flow of traffic in large metropolitan areas is without problems. I personally am not aware of any phase of our economy or society which is devoid of problems.

At a time when many American people are greatly in favor of a tax reduction—but only on the condition that Federal expenditures be held to a minimum—it does not seem proper to begin massive programs which admittedly are just a beginning and are intended to expand into all urban areas.

Some expenditures included in the Federal budget are very important and are properly matters which can be best performed on a Federal level. This is not true of local transit systems.

Mass transportation problems are of a local nature. Many communities have systems which are both adequate and profitable. Such communities, through their own efforts, solve any problems which may arise. Transportation districts can be and have been organized to solve problems that cover an area larger than the local area. In some cases, these districts cross county and State boundaries. The problem is one that can better be solved by those who are close to it than by a Federal agency.

It has been claimed by representatives of the large cities that mass transportation needs have outstripped the present resources of the cities and States. These claims infer that the Federal Government is more able to make such expenditures. We should remember that any expenditure made by the Federal Government must be provided by residents of all States and localities in the form of increased taxes. The funds would be taken from the people to Washington, reduced by whatever costs are incurred to administer the proposed mass transit bill, and then returned to selected metropolitan areas. Quite obviously, there would be a transfer of income and buying power in such transactions.

If this program were to be approved, those in the more sparsely populated hinterland areas of the country would be required to subsidize those in metropolitan centers—centers which already have higher per capita income and are more financially able to solve their own problems than are the rural areas which often have far more acute, though different, problems of their own to solve.

The claim of those who support this program has historically been that they stand for more equality in income and living standards. Yet this measure would have an opposite effect and would result in greater inequities between geographical areas and place an added burden on the less prosperous regions of our country.

Proponents have repeatedly claimed that our great metropolitan centers are losing population and industry and that, therefore, their local tax base is being impaired. I am of the opinion that the move from large cities to other, less congested areas is not primarily because of inadequate transportation, but has been caused by such factors as dirt, crime, poor living conditions, decay, and other undesirable conditions.

There is no evidence to suggest that the trend away from the central city is detrimental to the welfare of the citizens or the economy of the United States as a whole. Some communities have benefited greatly from the relocation of industrial facilities. Movement of industry, no doubt, has resulted in more modern, more efficient, and more productive facilities—as well as more pleasant and safer working conditions. Decentralization of new factories and offices has required increased investment and thus created greater employment opportunities for the whole economy.

Should communities which have received benefit from the trend away from the central city subsidize new mass transit programs whose purpose would be to give a competitive advantage to the large cities?

It is my position that the Federal Government's responsibility does not extend to a point of preserving the tax base of any group of individual cities or areas at the expense of others.

It seems only reasonable that if mass transit systems will be of benefit to the metropolitan area socially and economically, these areas should be willing to pay for them. If such monetary and nonmonetary benefits to the central cities are not sufficient to warrant this investment, then it would be difficult to justify a Federal subsidy for such transit systems on any basis of national benefit.

No evidence has been presented which proves that the establishment of a new modernized and improved mass transit facility would cause automobile users to leave their cars home and use mass transit. On the contrary, information developed in the hearings and from still uncompleted studies indicates that to cause a significant shift from automobiles, it would be necessary actually to pay people to use the mass transit systems. There is no known economically feasible system today that can equal the versatility and convenience of the automobile in providing the transportation needs of our metropolitan areas.

Now, to consider the amount of employment that could be created by the investment in new mass transit systems: Nearly every witness who was specifically asked the question by proponents of mass transit subsidies said that improvement and modernization of transit equipment, facilities, and service would be likely to increase employment in the transit system. How could one answer other than affirmative? This, however, is no indication that such a move would produce more overall employment in the economy than would be generated without new or improved transit systems.

If one were to assume that the transit systems were established, were successful, and that a significant number of automobile users would use the mass transit instead of their autos, this would mean a decrease in production and sales of petroleum products, tires, and other automotive items. Great numbers of employees would find themselves not needed in these industries. We have reason to believe that establishment of mass transit systems could actually decrease significantly the aggregate of employment and thus add to the problem of unemployment, which is already at a dangerously high level.

In addition to the loss of jobs, we must consider the possible loss of millions of dollars of annual revenue now provided by State and Federal gasoline taxes. The tax per gallon, which is already about 30 percent of the total price, would then necessarily have to be increased in order to collect sufficient revenue to build and maintain highway systems throughout the country.

It seems unwise, to say the least, to penalize a transit system which is obviously preferred by the American people in order to install one which proponents apparently admit will not have sufficient support to pay its own way. In this the American way to allocate resources?

In a free society such as ours, the desires of the people determine allocation of resources. Each time a dollar is spent, a choice is made and a vote is cast for the item on which it is spent. This, of course, is primarily what determines what is produced, who produces it, and for whom it is produced.

Over the recent years, more and more prospective users have voted against mass transit systems. As a result, some systems that existed a few decades ago have been discontinued; and others are having a difficult time operating profitably. This has occurred because the services offered have not been desired by a sufficient number of the residents of the areas in which they served. Have the mass transit bill's proponents abandoned the American philosophy that the people are able to decide for themselves how they would like to spend their income? Is it the purpose of these planners to eventually take the decisions of such matters away from the people? I sincerely hope not. But the evidence seems to indicate such a trend.

Proponents of Federal subsidization of mass transit systems claim that a person is not consistent in his views if he supports the Federal interstate highway program but does not support the mass transit bill. This is not necessarily true. Funds used for highway construction and maintenance are provided either by the local areas which receive benefit from the highways or through gasoline or other user taxes. Thus, the highway program is not subsidized by those who do not want it. It is financed by those who gain benefits from its existence.

There was a time when people used mass transportation facilities to a great extent. With the coming of the automobile, however, they discovered that individual private transportation was more convenient; and, as would be expected, a gradual change began to take place. As more automobiles were purchased, less use was made of mass transit facilities. The only way to attract automobile commuters away from their automobiles is to offer a new program which, in itself, is more desirable than the one they are presently using.

I am not against mass transit systems. If the people in our metropolitan areas desire such systems and are willing to support them, certainly they should exist and complement individual automobile transportation.

As I stated in the beginning of my remarks, we all know that we do have transportation problems in our metropolitan areas. I have also stated that I think the present mass transit bill should be rejected.

Now, lest I be accused of being only negative in my remarks, let me take a few minutes to offer several positive suggestions.

Without committing myself to the assumption that the whole problem of mass transit is a proper area for Federal participation, I suggest that the present bill should be rejected and a new and opposite approach be taken which, in my opinion—if Federal participation is proper—would lead to a more satisfactory solution.

The present bill sets down no really effective guidelines for the development of community programs. It could set up a whole series of hastily conceived programs, whose approval by the administrator could commit the Federal Government to an unknown and unmeasured obligation. It could also set in motion programs which might have to be changed, even abandoned, because they have not been adequately checked through in advance.

Instead of the grab-bag approach, I suggest that the problems of each community are different and that if action on our part is necessary, it should take the form of separate programs tailored to the needs and resources of each community that applies for help—but only after all of the basic facts in each case have been developed. To be specific, I suggest that if Congress considers any bill at the present time, it should be a bill setting forth guidelines for the preparation of applications by individual communities for Federal participation in carefully developed and feasible programs.

With that in mind and without attempting to write the specific legislation, because I think that is impossible to do on the floor of the Senate, let me suggest for your consideration some of the features of this alternative:

First. Each community desiring Federal help should be encouraged and required to prepare, at the community level, a plan designed to take care of its mass transit problems for a period of time at least as long as the duration of the debt that would be created to finance it.

Second. Such a plan obviously should include the use of existing transit systems, both public and private, if they are to be continued, as well as necessary improvements in their facilities and service pattern envisioned or projected to the end of the period covered. It should also include definite proposals for any new types of mass transit which the planners believe would be needed and adequate to supplement existing systems.

Third. In the preparation of any such plan, the pattern of employee participation and the preservation and/or extension of their rights as employees should be completely developed.

Fourth. Each plan should also develop the program for financing this particular system to the end of the planning period. It should include: (a) the extent of private financing for the participation, (b) local public financing, (c) the extent and pattern of Federal financing, including Federal grants in cases where the problem is created by the impact of employees of Federal agencies, and (d) Federal loans to the extent that they may be needed.

In view of the amendments suggested by the Commerce Committee with respect to Federal guarantees, in no case should such Federal loans and grants or guarantees equal more than 50 percent of the total cost.

Fifth. The bill should provide that any Federal loans made would receive interest at a rate equal to the average cost of Federal obligations with a term comparable to the repayment schedule proposed in the plan.

Sixth. The mass transit plan should also include any other items necessary to demonstrate its complete feasibility. Among such items would be: (a) a definite breakdown of development and operating costs, (b) projected use rates based on reasonable population and economic growth rates, (c) estimated income to be produced by user fares, (d) the proposed system's capability to provide effective, economical transit service for the period covered, and (e) its ability to pay new obligations which it creates.

Seventh. After the details of the plan have been worked out at the local level by cooperation of all interested participants and they have accepted and approved its feasibility, it should be submitted to the voters of the community, either as a referendum or as a referendum plus an approval of the bond issues required to finance the local public participation in the plan. Unless 51 percent of those eligible to vote on it will approve the plan, it should not be considered by any Federal agency as an appropriate proposal for Federal participation.

Eighth. After the plan has been approved by 51 percent or more of the eligible voters, then a bill could be introduced in Congress authorizing specific Federal participation in accordance with the terms of the plan. Such a bill could then be handled by Congress in the normal way. It could be circulated among the Federal agencies involved for their report, including a check on its claimed feasibility, and then be set for hearings and consideration by the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee. If approved by Congress, it would have the same status as any other bill to authorize appropriations.

A second bill would then go through the appropriations process in the regular pattern, and such funds could be appropriated year by year as would be necessary to carry out the plan.

The argument might be raised that this proposal would give Congress too much work. A reviewing agency should be set up in an appropriate department in the executive branch of Government and given authority to approve applications up to a certain size—say, for example, $1 million—leaving Congress the power to reject that approval within 60 days, but requiring affirmative approval by Congress of all applications above the set maximum. This would eliminate the charge that to operate on this basis would overburden Congress. Actually, there are only about a dozen giant cities whose possible drain on the Federal Treasury would be very large, and these themselves are so large that they should be specifically reviewed.

An approach such as I have outlined would parallel the approach now taken by reclamation projects and other programs in which Federal participation is necessary but on which a repayment, in part at least, is expected. Such a program would recognize that each community faces a different problem and, therefore, requires a different solution. It would give Congress some assurance that the proposed solution is feasible and would permit Congress to review and, if necessary, amend the recommended amount of Federal participation. It would still leave the local community with the initiative, responsibility, and opportunity to set up its own plan without political interference from Washington. Congress also would know in advance, before it started on any program, the ultimate amount for which it was obligating the Federal taxpayers.

It is my opinion that the present bill should be rejected, because nobody really knows what it means. The remarkable unanimity of opposition which ranges from the conservatives to the international officials of the unions that might be involved, as well as the officials of the AFL–CIO Federation, demonstrates this.

I hope Congress will reject the present bill and give those who are sincerely concerned with a mass transit problem an opportunity to present new legislation based on the kind of pattern I have suggested.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] is in receipt of comments relating to the Urban Transit Development Act of 1963 and the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963, prepared by Herbert Mohring and Oswald Brownlee, of the Department of Economics, University of Minnesota. The Senator from Ohio and I believe that this is an excellent document, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the RECORD following our remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS RELATING TO THE URBAN TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1963 AND THE URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

(By Herbert Mohring and Oswald Brownlee, Department of Economics, University of Minnesota)

The proposed Urban Transit Development Act and the Urban Mass Transportation Act raise three very important questions: (1) Are subsidies to urban transportation activities desirable? If so, (2) what role should the Federal Government play in providing these subsidies and what form should they take? (3) What agency of the Federal Government should administer whatever programs dealing with this subject may be adopted?

To state our position on these questions briefly, a decline in patronage, particularly during periods other than morning and afternoon rush hours, has brought about marked deteriorations in the financial positions of many mass transit systems. Taken by itself, this financial deterioration does not, in our view, justify any type of temporary subsidy program. Even if transit subsidies were deemed desirable, the effects of a temporary program probably would not be lasting. In large measure, the decline in public transit patronage reflects a basic shift in consumer tastes—a shift that is likely to continue in the absence of permanent countervailing action. The very serious inadequacies that presently do and perhaps inevitably must exist in transportation pricing procedures—might provide a sound economic basis for a permanent subsidy program. Even if an economic justification for transit subsidies could be found, however, it would seem preferable to have local rather than Federal Government agencies assume responsibility. Communities can reasonably be expected to be less profligate in their use of dollars that cost them a dollar each than of dollars which, as is the case with the Urban Mass Transportation Act, would have a direct cost to them of only 33 cents. Furthermore, the residents of say, Houston, have little interest in the transit system of New York and vice versa.

Any Federal action as may be taken in support of mass transportation should, we feel, not be taken in isolation but rather within the broader framework of metropolitan transportation as a whole. The specific agency that should be made responsible is not a matter that we feel ourselves competent to judge.

To elaborate, greatly increased real incomes and technological improvements have combined during the last half century to change the automobile from an expensive toy into a convenience well within the reach of the great majority of American families. For a growing proportion of the population, the convenience and time savings associated with automobile transportation have more than made up for its higher dollar costs. As a result, mass transportation patronage has declined.

Two further ramifications of the increase in auto ownership have been detrimental to mass transit service, patronage, and financing. First, the automobile has led to profound changes in the structure of urban areas. Residential population densities have diminished—the much commented upon phenomenon of suburban sprawl. In relative if not absolute terms, commercial and industrial activity has become decentralized. As a result of these changes in urban structure, the demand for service along individual mass transit routes has diminished. Service frequencies have therefore declined. Further shifts from mass to private transportation have therefore inevitably resulted.

Second, the financial problems of mass transportation systems have been compounded by the uneven character of the shift from public to private transportation. Indeed, there is good reason to argue that the financial crisis currently besetting mass transportation systems stems not so much from a decline in patronage per se as from a decline in patronage at the wrong time of day. On most transit systems, the loss in patronage has been concentrated mainly during offpeak hours. Indeed, on many systems, patronage during morning and afternoon rush hours has experienced little if any decline. As a result, the average load factor on mass transit vehicles has declined steadily—a growing proportion of the capacity necessary to meet peakload demands goes unutilized during the remainder of the day.

Clearly, a substantial permanent subsidy program would eliminate the financial plight of public transportation system. Indeed, by enabling provision of more frequent service at lower prices, subsidies might serve to halt and perhaps even to reverse the decline in mass transit patronage. A substantial research effort might succeed in devising vehicles that could provide rapid, frequent service on low density routes at low cost. Barring this seemingly unlikely possibility, however, it seems doubtful that the effects of a temporary subsidy program would prove lasting. After all, the mass transit crisis is not of recent origin, but has been developing for the better part of half a century. It seems likely that the conditions responsible for this crisis could be reversed, if at all, only by committing substantial resources to the task over a substantial period of time.

Furthermore, even if there were some way of assuring that these conditions could be reversed, there is serious doubt in our minds that doing so would be socially desirable, for the soruce of the crisis is the various ramifications of an apparently growing preference for the speed and convenience—flexibility—afforded by private passenger vehicles. Consumers are willing to pay for such flexibility.

There is, however, one attribute of metropolitan transportation and, indeed, transportation in general, the ramifications of which might serve to justify permanent subsidies to mass transit systems. This attribute is the fact that both presently employed and, very likely, feasible alternative means of charging for the use of transportation facilities do not adequately reflect the costs of providing these facilities. The capacity requirements for transportation facilities in urban areas are determined by morning and afternoon rush-hour demands. If these two peaks did not exist, capacity requirements and hence the costs of providing transportation facilities would be substantially lower than is presently the case. For this reason, if each traveler were to be charged the costs incurred in serving him—the costs that would be saved if his trip were not made—peak hour travelers would pay substantially higher prices for trips than would offpeak travelers. Clearly, our present system of transportation-user charges does not possess this seemingly desirable characteristic. Public transportation fares typically do not differentiate between peak and offpeak loads. Similarly, the level of such highway user charges as gasoline taxes and license fees is not appreciably affected by the time at which private passenger vehicle operators make trips.

The imposition of higher peak than offpeak transit fares and highway user charges would very likely make a substantial contribution toward alleviating the present crisis in mass transit financing. Also, by discouraging nonwork trips at peak hours and encouraging car pools and perhaps the staggering of business opening and closing hours, such a pricing system would reduce the highway expenditures required to alleviate peak hour congestion problems.

Charging peak hour mass transit patrons approximately the cost of providing them with service would be a comparatively easy task. Levying cost-based user tolls on private passenger vehicle operators would be considerably more difficult, however. A very imperfect approximation to cost-based charges is perhaps the most that could be hoped for. If this is in fact the case, a permanent mass transit subsidy program might well prove economically justifiable. That is, a permanent subsidy for peak hour mass transit service might be required to minimize the money and time costs of metropolitan transportation. Unfortunately, the word "might" must be emphasized. To our knowledge, no one has as yet undertaken the substantial research effort required to determine the nature of optimum metropolitan transportation systems and user charges on these systems when cost-based tolls cannot be levied.

Whether the organization responsible for administering the research and other programs that may develop out of these acts should be the HHFA, the Department of Commerce, or yet a third agency is not a matter about which we feel competent to make recommendations. We do, however, strongly recommend that the agency given responsibility for these programs be authorized to deal with urban transportation as an integrated whole rather than exclusively with public transportation. In dealing with any problem, an integrated rather than a piecemeal approach seems preferable. In this case, the desirability of an integrated approach is reinforced by the great difficulties involved in establishing a genuinely cost-based system of user charges.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I had to leave the floor briefly while the Senator was speaking. I heard enough, however, to get the impression that the Senator from Utah proposes a very thorough study and planning and local acceptance of new mass transportation problems at the local level. Is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. It is my proposal that we approach mass transportation problems the way we in the West approach reclamation problems. We expect each large community to study its own program and develop a proposal which would fit that community, have it checked for feasibility, and demonstrate that the people in the community approve of it.

Each large community would submit a separate bill, which would give Congress a chance to check the feasibility of the project, authorize it, and then appropriate funds for it. The approach taken by S. 6 is to set up a fund and permit the communities to come to Washington and try to persuade the Administrator to give them a share of the fund, without any knowledge on the part of Congress of how far the programs could eventually go.

The bill now provides $500 million. This amount would not provide new mass transit systems for all our giant communities. Again, as in the case of reclamation projects, I think if there were a separate plan for each community, planned at least to the end of the obligation, Congress would be able to pass more intelligently on the advisability of approving such a plan.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Ultimately, there will be two major measures on which the Senate can work its will—S. 6 with the amendments added by the Committee on Commerce, and the substitute for it as proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Under S. 6, the administration's program, no applicant can be a participant in the grant program without a comprehensive plan for the urban area covered. That is provided by the proposed legislation.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand that; but the difference between the approach of S. 6 and the approach I have recommended is that under my proposal if a community like New York or Chicago developed a pattern or a plan, Congress would review the specific plan, not some appointee in the HHFA, because we are dealing here with billions of dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Not under the plan which is before us.

Mr. BENNETT. No; because the bill provides only $500 million. But the mass transit problems of all our giant cities will not be solved with $500 million. I am sure the Senator from New Jersey realizes that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We know there are urban renewal programs and public housing and community facilities programs, and that each year or so we vote on the legislation and do what we can to improve it within the national budgetary limits. We know we have not succeeded, and that more work remains to be done.

I think the only area in which we have been truly successful is one in which there has been massive Federal spending. On the domestic scene, I am sure the Senator from Utah would agree that we have succeeded in providing an abundance in agriculture, and that has been due to the expenditure of billions of dollars of taxes raised.

Mr. BENNETT. I am afraid I cannot agree that we have succeeded in agriculture. We have succeeded in piling up agricultural surpluses which have cost billions of dollars as a result of high price supports which continue to plague us.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. When we started land-grant colleges and the research on avian leucosis, and all the rest, were we not as a nation expressing the necessity of an abundance of food, and have we not an abundance of food?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; we have too much of an abundance.

The difference between my approach to mass transit and the approach of S. 6 is that I feel that we should see each of the programs through to the end. The Senator from New Jersey says that we have a large urban renewal program and that we do the best we can with it. The mass transit problem is a specific problem.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There is a problem; the Senator is saying that?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes; there is no question about it. There are so many people to move. There is a different pattern and a different combination of facilities in a city like New York, with its waterfronts, than in a city like Chicago.

I think we would be able to legislate more intelligently if Congress passed on the plans of the giant cities and appropriated no funds until we had approved the plans which were before us, than if we simply said we were going to set up a $500 million fund and accept applications. We might get started on a number of plans, and it would be a long time before we knew whether we had provided enough money to permit a comprehensive program, or had merely provided enough to clean up the cars in the subway.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It seems to me that the Senator from Utah has given this subject much thought. I am sure it reflects an understanding of the need for vastly improved mass transportation facilities. However, I would pause at this point, where the decision for local transit depends so much on a decision in Washington. It seems to me that back home is where the method of working our way through to a more efficient local transportation system can best be determined.

Mr. BENNETT. I suggest that the plans be developed locally, with no Washington interference.

Under S. 6 the decision will be made by an appointee in the Housing and Home Finance Administration. I suggest that Congress pass upon mass transit programs, much as we now insist on passing upon each large reclamation project.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. My final observation is that we do not know what would happen to local initiative if the folks back home knew they had to move through Congress with its mysterious labyrinth.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah has had the experience of steering a billion-dollar reclamation project through Congress. It takes a lot of doing.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Perhaps we should have had the Senator from Utah on our side. The bill provides only $500 million for all the Nation. What was the billion-dollar project which the Senator steered through Congress?

Mr. BENNETT. The upper Colorado storage project, which will take 50 years to complete.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is any New Jersey money involved in that particular billion-dollar project?

Mr. BENNETT. First, let me say that most of that billion dollars of Federal money will be repaid by farmers and communities in the West, who will be furnished with the water which the project will develop.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. When will repayments be made?

Mr. BENNETT. They will start as soon as the power units begin to operate within the next year or two. Some of the repayments will run as long as 50 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. How long has the project been under construction?

Mr. BENNETT. It was approved in 1955—7 years ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I had better check my voting record. Perhaps I voted for that project.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. What the Senator is suggesting is not that we replace the development of plans locally with the development of plans in Washington, but simply that Congress approve such plans. Do I correctly understand that the Senator proposes to substitute for the arbitrary whim and discretion of one man the will of Congress?

Mr. BENNETT. In programs that are large enough to require congressional action. I have put a floor under the proposal. This would enable smaller communities to present their plans without the involvement of Congress.

Mr. TOWER. Is not the Senator aware that during the testimony on the bill several witnesses contended that $500 million would be a drop in the bucket, and that the communities would be returning to Congress for more money? Therefore, this program could mushroom into an extremely expensive one. Indeed, the Senator from New Jersey has indicated that he is prepared to accept an amendment suggested by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] which would already double, or perhaps triple, the amount provided by the bill, and to provide an extra $100 million for revenue bonds. If there is any substantial amount of defaulting, the amount could well be in excess of $500 million.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I can speak briefly on the bill because my views are set forth in the committee report, which are available to all Members of the Senate.

Before taking up specific objections, I wish to refer to the last statement made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio about how they made the transit system in Cleveland pay its way. Last October I had the pleasure of visiting for a few days in the former capital of Brazil, the beautiful city of Rio.

I learned, on that visit, that the Government owns the railroads, the utilities, shipping, and a great many other facilities. The Government took over the railroads from the British, when those railroads were paying good dividends. Now those same railroads are losing $300 million a year, and we have helped to pay those losses. Some of the other losses have been paid by the simple device of printing money.

I was interested in the transit system that the Government had worked out for Rio. I was told that 1 million workers a day come into Rio to work, but live in the outskirts or in rural areas. The Government decided that the rural area from which the workers came to work in Rio was a distance of 45 miles out of Rio. So the Government fixed the rate for transporting those workers at one-third of 1 cent for 45 miles. The people voted for that. Anybody in Brazil who is 18 years old and can write his name can vote. Of course, the Government took care of the workers. They were uneasy about their situation when the Government took over the railroads.

So an amendment to the bill which took over the railroads was adopted, providing that if a member of the union had worked for the railroad for 6 years, he had a job for life. Everybody was happy. The workers and the union were taken care of. Those working in Rio were taken care of.

The only trouble is that they are losing $300 million a year.

When the officials of Brazil came here to get a new loan, they said that they were going to have some fiscal reforms. I asked the Ambassador, "What about the railroads?" He said, "We are going to increase the fares 400 percent." I asked him, "Is that so? What will they be?" He said, "Instead of one-third of 1 percent for 45 miles, it is going to be a cent and a half for 45 miles."

I am sure the Senator will agree with me that they are not going to solve the problem with that solution.

Now I wish to take up the specific objections to the bill.

I oppose S. 6, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963.

I do not think the program proposed by this bill is timely or necessary or well considered.

I

This is no time to start new spending programs running into the hundreds of millions and billions of dollars.

The bill would set up an urban mass transportation program involving $500 million of grants in the first 3 years and, in addition, extension of the $50 million borrowing authority already authorized under existing law.

The authorization of $500 million in S. 6 is not realistic. I am convinced that nothing short of an expenditure of $5 billion will show an appreciable effect upon traffic problems now existing in some of our great metropolitan areas. In fact, I understand that, according to a study made last year by Government officials—which for reasons best known to themselves they have refused to release—the cost of solving these traffic problems was so tremendous, this proposal was utterly impracticable.

An indication of the probable cost is shown by the experiment with the Boston and Maine Railroad. This road was given a subsidy of over $2 million a year for passenger service, in return for which it agreed to run more trains and charge lower fares. The number of former highway users who are now using that train service is too inconsequential to affect traffic congestion, and yet that subsidy is costing taxpayers about $1 a day for each passenger being carried under the subsidy program.

On March 7, 1963, I made a statement in the Senate on the subject of sound fiscal policies. I pointed out that we can expect a deficit this year of $10 to $12 billion without a tax cut, and that the President has proposed a tax cut which would reduce the Government's income by some $10 billion. I indicated my opposition to the proposed tax cut because of the deficit we are already experiencing, and I suggested ways for the

President to save some $6 billion from the 1964 budget. Elimination of the proposed urban mass transportation program from the 1964 budget was one of my suggestions.

I can well understand why any man would prefer to live in the country rather than in a city like New York. Some years ago, I had an offer of employment in New York which would have paid me three times what I had ever earned in my life. But there was not enough money in all the banks in New York to induce me to leave the shadows of the Blue Ridge Mountains in which I had been reared and to give up the hunting and fishing which I enjoyed from my boyhood days.

Naturally, thousands of those who work in the city would prefer to live in the country. But there is no cheap or easy way for them to get means of transportation which would be both comfortable and quick. Why should the taxpayers of the Nation furnish billions of dollars to provide transportation to people who want to live in the country and work in the city? The answer, of course, is that they should not.

II

This vast new program is one more step in the process of transferring all power and all authority to the Federal Government, and eliminating all State and local power and authority.

Under the bill, Federal aid would be advanced directly to localities and the States would be bypassed. Federal intervention in local affairs would be greatly broadened. To begin with, Federal control over local mass transit systems, including schedules of transit fares, would be increased. And Federal control over all urban development would be a prerequisite to any aid under the bill. Section 4 of the bill provides that Federal aid can be provided only if "the Administrator determines that the facilities and equipment for which the assistance is sought are needed for carrying out a program, meeting criteria established by him, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area, and are necessary for the sound, economic, and desirable development of such area."

Federal money brings Federal control. This is the case with Federal programs. Federal loans to college students brought with it a statutory requirement of a loyalty oath. This has since been removed, by congressional action, after strong protests from many of the Nation's leading colleges and universities. Federal participation in FHA and VA mortgage insurance has brought with it a requirement, not based on statute but only on a Presidential decree, relating to the use and disposition of such housing. Some of us disliked the educational loyalty oath. Some of us dislike the housing Executive order. But everyone, whether they like or dislike the particular form of Federal control involved, must recognize that Federal controls go along with Federal funds.

State highway departments, State unemployment insurance agencies, and other State agencies subsidized by the Federal Government will bear witness to the fact that Federal controls accompany Federal money.

It is inevitable for Federal funds to bring Federal control, to the extent necessary to make sure that the Federal funds are, in fact, being spent for the purposes intended. And human nature being what it is, there will always be added pressure to use Federal funds appropriated for one purpose to help in carrying out some other unrelated purpose. As an example of this, I need only remind Senators of the use of Federal procurement and the Federal contracting authority to establish set-asides to help small business—here at least there was a statute authorizing this—to help relieve unemployment and to aid depressed areas, and to change employment practices. In fact, rumor even tells us that the Federal procurement powers, and other equally flexible powers, were used to force reduction of steel prices and to encourage contributions of drugs for Cuba.

The only way to avoid Federal control which inevitably accompanies Federal funds is not to start a Federal program.

III

The bill would finance both the grant program and the lending program through forms of back-door financing.

On this ground alone I would oppose the bill, regardless of any of the other provisions.

The bill extends the existing loan program now operating with the benefit of a $50 million borrowing authority.

The Administrator would be given authority to sign contracts committing the Government for the $500 million grant program. In other words, the Administrator would have a free hand to write contracts providing for these grants in advance of any appropriations. The appropriations committees would have no alternative but to grant the appropriations necessary to carry out these contracts, because the bill expressly pledges the faith of the United States to their payment.

Back door financing raises serious constitutional questions. In addition, it is, in my judgment, extremely poor practice. When Congress authorizes a huge spending program, the funds necessary should be provided by annual appropriations. This not only has the advantage of giving Congress a yearly review of what has been accomplished and what is expected to be done in the coming year; it also puts the public on notice as to the effect of the spending on the budget and the national debt. Projects financed by back door financing add to the annual deficit and the national debt just as much as projects financed by the appropriations process, but Congress has lost control.

IV

The bill is loosely drawn, ignoring the recommendations of the Comptroller General designed to prevent waste of funds.

The Comptroller General's letter—hearings, pages 40 to 45, 484—lists many respects in which he considers the bill deficient in providing protection to the Federal Government. For example, the Comptroller General points out—hearings, page 41—that if the administration's concept of the method of financing is fully implemented, "most projects will receive Federal and non-Federal grants equal to nearly 100 percent of a project cost."

The Comptroller General also recommended—hearings, page 43—that the bill should contain requirements for legally enforceable commitments for local grant contributions and appropriate controls to protect the Federal Government's interest in the event of default or failure to complete a project. On numerous occasions, the Comptroller General has made similar recommendations and has pointed out the results of not getting such provisions—Comptroller General's annual report for fiscal year 1962, page 192; report to the Congress dated April 13, 1962, B–118754; report to the Congress dated October 31, 1962, B–118754.

The Comptroller General has also recommended—hearings, page 44—that the bill should be amended to make it clear that the HHFA's determination as to its own administrative expenses should not be final, but should be subject to audit and settlement by the Comptroller General in accordance with the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, and the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

V

The bill contains new and untested labor-management provisions, in an attempt to alleviate the unfortunate results of this program to transit employees.

This huge new Federal program is likely to result in the development and use of automated equipment which might throw hundreds or thousands of workers out of their jobs. The program is also likely—in fact it seems to be designed—to encourage municipalities to take over private transportation systems. Employees of such systems would become Government employees and, in many States, would no longer have some or all of the benefits of collective bargaining.

The Labor Department has submitted a proposal to meet these problems. The unions have submitted a counter proposal. The bill attempts to reconcile the proposals of the Labor Department and the unions. The views of the private transportation systems and the municipalities which would be affected by these proposals have not been obtained on any of these proposals.

This is, in my opinion, an illustration of the kinds of problems which we can expect when the Federal Government undertakes a vast new program in fields which are now handled by State and local governments.

In my judgment, this is a matter which should be carefully considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. But whether or not the bill is referred to another committee, I am opposed to it for the reasons given above.

The general subject of Federal subsidies has been studied by the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government, of which David J. Mays, a great

constitutional lawyer, is chairman, and James L. Kilpatrick, one of the outstanding editors of the Nation, is chairman of publications. That commission recently issued a brochure entitled "Federal Subsidies—The Facts and the Fiction," in which it recommended a calm appraisal, on its merits, of each new proposal for a Federal subsidy. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of that brochure be printed in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the brochure was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SUBSIDIES—THE FACTS AND THE FICTION

In selecting a title for this paper, the Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government has purposely given preference to the term, "Federal subsidies," over the more commonly used term, "Federal grants-in-aid." We believe that the commonly used term is misleading, because the word "grant" implies a gift. The implication is erroneous in this instance. Furthermore, the word "aid" implies that the grantor is in a superior position, offering gratuitous assistance to some needy individual or institution. That implication, also, is erroneous in this instance. Thus we have selected the term "Federal subsidies" as more accurately describing the subject to be discussed.

Reduced to its simplest terms, a Federal subsidy originates and operates in the following manner. A Member of Congress, or a member of the administration, decides that a specified service is a desirable one and that a law establishing a program to provide the service should be enacted. A case in point is the Vaccination Assistance Act of 1962, which is supposed to provide immunization against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus. Congressman OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas, was of the opinion that such a program would be advantageous to the people of the United States. Presumably, he examined existing legislation in the 50 States, and concluded that it was inadequate. He, therefore, introduced a bill, H.R. 10541, that would authorize subsidies to States or localities planning immunization programs. The bill was debated briefly in the House of Representatives, with only 60-odd Members present, and passed July 26, 1962, on a voice vote. Several Members of the House made the point that passage of the bill would inject the Federal Government into an area of activity that properly should be reserved to the States and the local governments, but their arguments were in vain.[1]

The bill went to the Senate where it was approved without a hearing by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It was passed by the Senate on a voice vote, without debate, on October 4, 1962. On October 23, 1962, the President signed the bill authorizing $36 million to be distributed to States and localities by the U.S. Surgeon General during the next 3 years.

This is a fair example of how a Federal subsidy comes into existence. A need is asserted (usually for a very worthwhile purpose), a law is passed, and the money becomes available from the Federal Treasury.

WHO PAYS?

In the rush to accomplish this worthwhile objective, a number of important, and in some cases controlling, factors are overlooked. The most obvious error is the failure on the part of many legislators and administrators to observe that the money to finance the program must come from the people of the United States. Yet this is the most easily observable principle in all of Government: if the Federal Government is to subsidize a program, the taxpayers of the Nation must put the money in the Federal Treasury for that purpose. If the United States is to have a $36 million federally subsidized vaccination program, the people of the United States must pay to Uncle Sam $36 million in taxes, in addition to what they are now paying.

A related and similarly overlooked fact is that the people frequently have to pay additional State and local taxes in order to receive the Federal subsidies for which they have already been taxed at the Federal level. The reason is that two-thirds of all Federal subsidies are available only on what is called a matching basis. This means that State and local governments have to put up some specified percentage of their own funds in order to receive the subsidy from the Federal Government. But the taxpayer who provides funds for State and local governments is the same taxpayer who provides funds for the Federal Government, so the people actually have to pay increased State and local taxes in order to receive Federal subsidies that they were taxed to provide.

These are matters affecting the pocketbook, and they are not trifling matters. In 1960 total expenses of these subsidy programs amounted to $12 billion, or $66 for every man, woman and child in this Nation. For an average family of four, that means yearly taxes in the amount of $264 to maintain Federal subsidies and the matching funds required to receive these subsidies.

A BROADER TAX BASE

A second obvious error is the belief that the Federal Government is better situated financially to initiate and maintain these programs than are the States and localities. One frequently hears proponents of Federal subsidies maintain that the Federal Government has a broader taxing base than State and local governments. This argument is at best misleading. The States have basically the same tax resources that are available to the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, the States had power to levy direct taxes on income, the primary source of Government revenue, long before the Federal Government was given that power. The sales tax, real estate tax, personal property tax and other taxes of less general use and acceptance are all available to State and local governments. There are some taxes used by the Federal Government that are not employed by State and local governments, and vice versa, but this does not justify the statement that the Federal Government has a broader taxing power than the States and local governments.

It quite possibly would be accurate to say that the Federal Government can more easily increase taxes than can State and local governments. This appears to be true, since the Federal Government now collects income taxes ranging from 20 percent to 91 percent of net income, while State governments, with the same taxing capability, have limited their income taxes generally to the 1 percent to 10 percent range. The reason for this would seem to be that the State governments are close to the people and are more sensitive to the popular demand for economy, while the Federal Government with its gigantic bureaus is separated from the people by long distances and by massive tangles of redtape.

Accordingly, it may be suggested that the "superior taxing power" of the Federal Government rests not upon a broader tax base, but upon the Federal Government's ability to increase taxes with relative impunity.[2] Phrased in another manner, the Congress is less subject to control of the people than are State and local governments. Do the proponents of Federal subsidies really mean that such spending programs should be passed upon by the legislative body that is least responsible to the people? Such a proposition would have found little support among the founders of this country, and should find little support among our people today.

SUPERIOR BORROWING POSITION

A related argument in favor of Federal subsidies is that the Federal Government occupies a borrowing position superior to that of the States and local governments. On close analysis, this argument falls of its own weight. The Federal indebtedness as of June 30, 1961, amounted to $289 billion. This sum is equivalent to 67.2 percent of national income. State debt is only 4.7 percent, and local debt is only 12.8 percent, of national income. Since 1932, the Federal debt has increased about four times as rapidly as State and local debt combined. In the decade from 1952 through 1961, the States as a whole showed surpluses of revenue over expenditure in 6 of the 10 years, with an overall deficit of only $300 million for the period. The Federal Government showed surpluses in only 3 of the 10 years, with an overall deficit of more than $35 billion. As a rule State and local governments make provision for the systematic repayment of their debt obligations. The failure of the Federal Government to make such provisions may go far in explaining our huge Federal debt.

As of June 30, 1961, States and local governments had made loans to the Federal Government totaling $18.7 billion. Far from being in a superior borrowing position, it is apparent that the Federal Government actually is in a borrowing position inferior to that of the States and the local governments.[3]

INEQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION

Proponents of the many Federal subsidy programs have promoted the idea that these subsidies result in an equitable distribution of tax funds. Nothing could be further from the truth. For example, Federal subsidies returned to the State of Delaware during 1959 amounted to only 40 cents per dollar of taxes paid by Delaware citizens in support of the subsidy programs. The taxpayer in Mississippi received $4.18 for the dollar that he paid for the same purpose. The taxpayer in Connecticut received only 43 cents for his dollar, while the taxpayer in Arkansas received $3.35. A comparable situation exists in other States: The citizen of New Jersey receives 44 cents for his dollar; in New Mexico, the citizen receives $2.97 for each dollar. The New Jersey Taxpayer reports that in 1960 that State lost $143.1 million through Federal taxes that were spent for subsidies to other States. Pennsylvania lost $125.6 million; New York lost $206.5 million; Virginia lost $6.3 million. Some States, of course, showed a profit at the expense of the others. All things considered, it would be rather difficult to devise a more inequitable system of tax distribution.

---

[1] Representative Durno, of Oregon, who is also a doctor, had this to say: "I think this is a continuing program, or it will be, and if the Congress proposes to adopt this kind of a program, it should be continuing. I think it is going to be an expansive program which is going to involve a lot more diseases. I don't think that it is the dollars in this bill or the medicine in this bill that is the answer. I think the answer is a continuation and an acceleration and an extension of the program of public health, and those public programs should originate at the county level and at the State level more than at the Federal level" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 9, pp. 11744–11745).

Representative MARTIN, of Nebraska, noted that he had sent a questionnaire on this matter to his constituents and that 73 percent of the replies were in opposition to an appropriation of Federal money for this program (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 9, pp. 11743–11744).

Representative DOMINICK, of Colorado, said, "For the life of me, I cannot understand why it is necessary for the Federal Government to get into this realm." He then entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the Denver Post which related in detail the plan that had been developed and used successfully in that locality, without Federal assistance (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 108, pt. 9, pp. 117444–11745).

[2] In 1961, 67 percent of all taxes collected in the United States went into the Federal Treasury. The States received only 16 cents and the local governments only 17 cents of each tax dollar.

[3] See the appendix at the end of this paper for the figures upon which the comparisons of this section are based.

FEDERAL CONTROL

One of the greatest illusions perpetrated by proponents of Federal subsidies is that control over the expenditure of funds is left in the hands of the States and localities concerned. While it would appear practical for control of the subsidy programs to be vested in those governments closest to the people and most closely connected with the operation of the programs, this is not the case at all. To the contrary, it is a fact that regulation by Congress and by Federal administrative agencies is a normal incident of each subsidy program. This regulation extends to policy and operation questions, as well as to financial considerations.

The result is that both the States and the local governments are rapidly becoming subordinate units of the Federal Government. Programs of a purely local nature, financed by taxes collected from the people in the locality, are in effect operated and controlled by the Federal Government in Washington.

A recent case from Ohio will serve to illustrate the point. In that State, employers had paid to the Federal Government $30 million in taxes for the administration of an unemployment compensation program. Of this amount, $17 million was to be returned to the State for the purpose of making unemployment compensation payments to qualified persons in Ohio. The Federal Department of Labor threatened to withhold the $17 million from the State of Ohio pending that State's adoption of two procedural rules. The money in question had been collected from Ohio. It was to be spent in Ohio by an administrative agency of that State. The program under which the money was to be distributed had been approved by the Ohio courts. Ohio's unemployment compensation administration had been in operation for over 22 years and in the last 5 years alone had handled 95,684 cases without a complaint. Yet the Federal Department of Labor proposed to penalize the State of Ohio $17 million for failure to comply with federally established regulations for the distribution of this money. It is quite apparent that State and local governments are not left free to establish programs they believe proper with Federal subsidies. To the contrary, it appears that Federal regulation of an essential function touches upon its most minute detail and in at least some cases operates to the detriment of the people affected.

It is common knowledge, of course, that in urban renewal programs, Federal regulations touch upon virtually all areas of activity, including wages, hours of work, public housing, and a great many other items.

The area of farm subsidies is now so tangled and chaotic that it is difficult even for Members of Congress to understand what is taking place, but one thing is certain: The farmer is subjected to more Federal regulation in practically every area of his enterprise than he has ever been subjected to before.

In public welfare programs, where Federal subsidies play an all-important role, a summary and analysis of Federal-State regulations covers over 250 pages. A summary of Federal laws regulating urban renewal covers 62 pages.

In speaking against a proposed program of Federal subsidies for colleges and universities, John A. Howard, president of Rockford College, Ill., is quoted as saying, "Any legislation which gives money away must have some restrictions to insure that the money is spent for the intended purpose." Furthermore, if the program is adopted, "the Federal Government, which proposes to underwrite a third of the cost of construction and provide substantial scholarships to students, will become in one congressional vote the largest single customer of all private colleges and a substantial customer of all public ones."

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST ACT

Surely the most harmful and the most deceptive argument used in favor of Federal subsidies is typified in the statement, "The Federal Government must perform those functions that the State and local governments will not perform." This statement and its several variations are directly contrary to the U.S. Constitution, for they mean that any State power not used, or, in the opinion of the Federal Government, improperly used by a State, is conferred upon the Federal Government. The 10th amendment to the Constitution provides to the contrary, that 'The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." If a State legislature considers, for example, a State vaccination act, and passes such an act, this is perfectly proper. On the other hand, if a State legislature rejects such an act or fails to consider such an act, this does not confer on the Federal Government power to consider a vaccination act for all the States. As a matter of fact, the Constitution implicitly denies such a power in the Federal Government, though the Supreme Court has in recent years held to the contrary.

One of the basic purposes of the Fathers of this Nation in establishing a Union that left the States free to handle their internal problems was to permit a diversity of experiment on the proper solution of complex problems. Thus in the prevention of contageous diseases, New York might decide that a statewide voluntary public vaccination program offers the best chance for success. Oregon might decide that each town, city, or county should be left free to establish its own program. Arizona might determine that people uncoerced by State pressure, and free of taxes to support such State programs, could best care for their own needs. If one plan proved better than the others, and equally suitable to most areas of the country, presumably that plan would be adopted by most States. Perhaps different plans would have varying appeal to different areas of the country. And if one plan proved detrimental to the interests of the people, that plan would be avoided, and its ill effects confined to the State that had attempted it. But with federally subsidized programs covering the entire Nation, the opportunity for experiment is curtailed, and we are reduced to an all-or-nothing situation. This is a far cry from Supreme Court Justice Harlan's observation that one of the great strengths of our Federal system of government is that we have in the 50 States 50 separate laboratories for social experiment.

Another basic purpose accomplished by reserving to the States the power to deal with their internal problems was the keeping of government as close to the people as possible. It was believed by the authors of our Constitution that the creation of an all-powerful Central Government would lead to restrictions on the liberty of the people. With this in mind, the Central Government was given power to act only in those cases when it was necessary or extraordinarily desirable for all the States to act as a single unit. With extreme caution, the powers to be exercised by the Central Government were expressly set forth in the Constitution, and the Congress was given power to do those things necessary and proper to give effect to the expressly enumerated powers. Those powers not given the Central Government were reserved to the States, and the authors of our Constitution went so far as to have this basic principle explicitly stated in the 10th amendment. In this manner they guaranteed, or thought they guaranteed, for all times that all functions of government except those specifically delegated in the Constitution should be performed by those bodies of government closest to the people, the States. Jefferson, Madison, and those other authors of liberty as we have known it understood that government kept close under the watchful eyes of the people is good government; they knew that an all-powerful Central Government far from the watchful eyes of the people could become careless, incautious in the expenditure of public money, and unjust.

A POWERFUL HAND

Today the Federal Government, by managing more than 90 Federal subsidy programs accounting for the expenditure of $12 billion, is extending a powerful hand into the affairs of all the States, all the local governments, and every citizen in this country. Power feeds upon power, and the staggering growth of the subsidy programs in the last few decades attests to the increased power of the Federal Government over our day-to-day lives. "A power over a man's subsistence amounts to a power over his will." [4]

The commission does not maintain that all Federal subsidies are unnecessary and without constitutional justification. Some of these programs clearly fall within a proper interpretation of the power of Congress to maintain armies and navies, or within other powers delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution. But a great number of the subsidy programs, costing billions of dollars in tax funds each year, do not fall within any power granted to the Federal Government, and many improper programs are proposed each year. The inevitable result of continued expansion of Federal power in this field is the creation of an all-powerful Central Government that substantially controls the life of each citizen.

The waste, inefficiency and corruption found in many of the subsidy programs only emphasize the need for change. Practically every day brings a new report of wasted welfare payments, scandal in agricultural subsidies, or questionable dealings in urban renewal projects. As we surrender more of our freedom to high Federal taxes, we receive in return more waste, inefficiency and corruption. The situation is not improved by the fact that our Government officials may be making their best effort—if the program itself is faulty honest administration cannot cure the defect.

A FIRST STEP

As a first step toward solution of this difficult problem, the commission recommends that all citizens and their representatives in Government calmly consider on its merits each new proposal for a Federal subsidy. Any proposed Federal subsidy concerning a matter that can be solved within the framework of city, county, or State government should be rejected. Furthermore, any proposed program that does not reasonably fall within one of the powers delegated by the Constitution to the Federal Government should be rejected. If this is done and done faithfully, the normal course of events will bring about a reexamination of the more unnecessary existing subsidy programs. The industrial States of the North and Midwest will begin to understand that by a balanced program for reducing Federal subsidies they can actually improve their State programs and at the same time reduce the tax burden on their citizens. And perhaps it is not too much to expect that the Federal Government, as it is partially relieved of the expensive subsidy burden, may relieve the taxpayer of a portion of his burden.

MARCH 1963.

---

[4] The Federalist No. 79, at 497 (Wright ed. 1961) (Hamilton) (italics in original).

APPENDIX

Figures relating to comparison of the relative debt position of Federal, State, and local governments; latest comparisons are for the year 1961:

	Billion
National income for 1961	[1] $430.2
Federal debt in 1932	[3] 19.5
Federal debt in 1961	[2] 289.0
State debt in 1932	[3] 2.8
State debt in 1961	[4] 20.0
Local debt in 1932	[3] 16.4
Local debt in 1961	[4] 55.0

State surpluses (+) and deficits (−) of general revenue over expenditure, 1952–61: [5]

	Billion
1952	+$1.0
1953	+1.1
1954	+.1
1955	−.7
1956	+.5
1957	+.4
1958	−1.9
1959	−1.9
1960	+1.2
1961	−.1

Federal surpluses (+) and deficits (−), 1952–61 [6] (excluding trust funds):

	Billion
1952	−$4.0
1953	−9.4
1954	−3.1
1955	−4.2
1956	+1.6
1957	+1.6
1958	−2.8
1959	−12.4
1960	+1.2
1961	−3.9

State and local governments held $18.7 billion in securities issued by the Federal Government as of June 30, 1961.[7]

[1] Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1962, p. 312.

[2] Annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962, p. 380.

[3] Historical Statistics of the United States, U.S. Bureau of the Census, pp. 728–730.

[4] Summary of Governmental Finances for 1961, U.S. Bureau of the Census, p. 24.

[5] Compendium of State Government Finances in 1961, U.S. Bureau of the Census, p. 1.

[6] Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1961, p. 415.

[7] Id at p. 98.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, it seems to me that I should make a statement concerning my objections to the mass transportation bill. There appear to be numerous objections, and they have been rather clearly outlined, it seems to me, by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and the Senator from Virginia Mr. [ROBERTSON].

However, there are two main objections which I believe deserve emphasis. The first involves the statement of the Senator from Virginia the other day that there will be available for expenditure in the next fiscal year $195 billion, an inconceivable sum, if all of this administration's recommendations are added to existing but unexpended appropriations.

In this statement the Senator from Virginia also indicated that the deficit for fiscal 1964, if the proposed tax cut becomes effective, will be $15 to $18 billion, the largest in our peacetime history.

How can we, as responsible representatives of the people, obligate our constituents to an initial charge of $500 million, as anticipated in the pending bill, and to a program which over the years will undoubtedly cost about $10 billion before it is concluded?

To find proof of this latter computation, all we need do is to look at the recent San Francisco private effort, in which a bond issue of $792 million was authorized by the voters for this one area. We can also look at the majority report of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which states:

> It would be a mistake to conclude that mass transportation is a problem of concern only to larger areas.
>
> The American Transit Association, however, estimates that there are about 70 cities of 25,000 population or more which have no public transportation service at all.
>
> The proposed Federal program is designed to help assist in the solution of mass transportation problems wherever they occur in large cities or in small ones.

It seems to me that this is definite proof that the purpose and the intent of the proposed program is to go far beyond the initial $500 million which is presented in the pending bill.

The other major objection, which I believe is of great importance, is the uncontrolled authority which is given to the Federal Administrator to spend these enormous sums of money wherever he may decide in his discretion is best, and in local areas not generally considered as a Federal responsibility. This will create a race for influence with the Administrator, as well as a deterrent to local initiative, both of which could be sharply harmful to the integrity of governmental service, to the growth of local responsible government, and another detriment to economic growth and planning.

As I said in my additional views, printed in the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and in summary of my objections, at a time of serious national fiscal problems, it is unwise to thrust down the throats of the taxpayers a bill which, first, gives uncontrolled power to an Administrator to spend $500 million without congressional supervision; second, is opposed in its present form by responsible business and labor groups; third, will be only the beginning in an enormously expensive program as evidenced by the fact that San Francisco alone has obligated its own citizens to spend more than $792 million; fourth, fails to meet legal and logical objections of the General Accounting Office; fifth, fails to recognize far more constructive approaches to the problem; sixth, results in the Government borrowing money at relatively high interest rates while distributing the funds without interest; and, seventh, injects the Federal Government directly into local municipal governmental affairs.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this is an unwise move for us to make at this time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill 6.

I also send two other amendments to the desk to the same bill, S .6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair). The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 14, 1963, the Committee on Commerce considered the bill, S. 6, as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency and as discussed heretofore.

The Subcommittee on Surface Transportation held hearings for several days. During these hearings certain amendments were developed which we propose to offer later insofar as S. 6 is concerned. We believe they will meet a number of objections that have been discussed on the floor of the Senate and which seem, to the members of the Committee on Commerce, to be advisable in order to report a bill which will meet the needs that are evident, insofar as this general program of mass transportation is concerned, and which will, at the same time, provide adequate safeguards insofar as Government participation is concerned.

The proposals which the Committee on Commerce will offer in the nature of a substitute bill are five in number. They will achieve the following objectives:

The first amendment relates to the method of financing as proposed in the initial form of S. 6. The first amendment proposed by the Committee on Commerce would provide for an authorization and an apporpriation in an attempt to get away from the so-called backdoor spending provision which S. 6 now appears to provide.

It will be noted that S. 6 contains a specific money figure, on the assumption that the Administrator can enter into a contract once he has the authority under the bill, and could limit the amount to $12.5 million for any one State as a maximum figure during the first year. In view of the fact that the proposed amendment to be offered by the Committee on Commerce will require a direct appropriation, and the appropriation may be less than the authorized contractual authority granted the Administrator, we propose to change the $12.5 million to a limit of 12½ percent.

Therefore, if the appropriation is less than that requested, the maximum authorization would still be limited to the 12½ percent figure.

Proposed amendment No. 2 to S. 6 would require the Administrator to consult with the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to projects affecting interstate transportation, and further requires the Administrator and the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission to exchange information, and otherwise to cooperate with respect to such projects.

This comes about by reason of the fact that a number of projects obviously will involve interstate transportation as well as intrastate transportation in attempting to resolve this very serious problem of mass transportation.

Our proposed amendment No. 3 would provide, that the applicant would operate in accordance with the presentation made by the local authority. If, after a grant shall have been authorized with respect to that project, a change were effected in the rate schedule, a change which the Administrator determined would substantially reduce the revenues from the project and lessen the chances for economically sound operation, the recipient would be notified. Thereafter, the Administrator would not be authorized to extend any assistance under any law administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, except assistance pursuant to a commitment entered into prior to such notice.

This limitation would effectively eliminate further financing, in whole or in part, of any project to be undertaken in that area, under such authority, until the Administrator determined that the schedules by the local operator had been revised or other action had been taken so as to permit an economically sound operation.

This limitation would discourage a municipality or other public body from making a presentation to the Administrator in order to get assistance, and then taking action which would result in an uneconomical operation, which would, of course, be a detriment to this kind of program and a detriment to the agency concerned. If such action were taken without local assistance being given to make up for such inefficient or uneconomical operation, future aid would be withheld.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I have some question about this particular amendment. Most of the mass transit bodies that I know of have their rates determined and fixed by a State public utility commission. As I understand the proposed amendment, it would, at least indirectly, give the Administrator a power of veto over what the public utility commission in a State could do. The Administrator could simply say, "The public utility commission may have authorized the rates, but we do not believe the rates are correct; therefore, we will not provide any more Federal grants or loans."

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to respond to the Senator from Colorado on that point. If he will notice, the amendment is specifically directed toward a change which might occur after a grant or loan had been made. In other words, in order to get assistance, an applicant must apply to the Administrator and say, "This is what we proposed to do in the way of service; this is the rate structure we propose to put into effect." On that basis the Administrator would then be able to grant the relief requested, whether in the form of a loan or a direct grant, under the substitute bill proposed by the Committee on Commerce.

Then, if at a later date the local body made a change, a change which would make the operation of the operating agency uneconomical, the Administrator would be authorized to withhold further aid under these types of programs.

Mr. DOMINICK. I understand that; but this is the specific thing about which I am concerned: Suppose a body submits a rate upon which a loan or a grant is made, and it goes into operation. Then suppose it finds, or thinks it has found, a method by which it can increase its revenues. The operator then goes before the public utility commission and gets approval of a new rate structure.

The Administrator, in his own discretion, determines that the new rate will have just the reverse effect, so he says to the operator, "If you go through with this change, we will not provide any more Federal loans or grants." In effect, the Administrator thus has the right of veto of a rate schedule which has been approved by the public utilities commission.

Mr. CANNON. The Administrator does not automatically disapprove a rate or notify a recipient if any kind of change is made. The Senator will notice the language provides:

> If, at any time after the making of such grant with respect to such project, a change is effected in such schedule which the Administrator determines will substantially reduce revenues from the project and lessen the chances for an economically sound operation, he shall so notify the recipient of such grant.

Let us suppose an operating agency tries to reduce rates and gets approval from the local governing body to put the new rates into effect. He would not necessarily be notified immediately by the Administrator. I am sure the Administrator would give the operating agency, if it thought the change in rates would improve its posture so far as overall revenues were concerned, a chance to operate and see whether the new rates were more economically sound. If they turned out not to be sound, and simply reduced operating revenues, then the Administrator would be in a position to notify the recipient of the grant that he was giving them an opportunity to take corrective action. If the operating agency did not take corrective action, then the Administrator would be authorized not to extend any assistance under any law administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, except in pursuance of a commitment which had already been made.

Mr. DOMINICK. I really do not intend to get into a debate on this question. I merely point out that the wording of the amendment gives the Administrator the sole discretion to decide whether some operation is proving uneconomical or not. There is no after-the-fact decision on the basis of actual operation. What the Senator from Nevada is saying is that the Administrator makes the determination whether a certain rate will substantially reduce revenues. The point I make is that this authority in effect gives the Administrator a veto over what a public utility commission does.

Mr. CANNON. I cannot agree with the conclusion of the Senator. I point out, further, that the local operating agency has to appear before the Administrator and make a representation, and on the basis of that representation would be given assistance. We are simply trying to insure, by the amendment, that once the assistance has been received, the operator cannot arbitrarily and indiscriminately change the position which it represented to the Administrator it was going to carry out. If the position is changed, then the Administrator is authorized to withhold further aid, except so far as aid may already have been committed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In that connection, I notice in the report the statement by the Committee on Commerce, on page 10.

> By "projects" your committee is referring to area programs involving a local government or agency thereof.

I realize that that would include programs such as urban renewal, public housing, and projects of that type. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct, so far as urban renewal projects are concerned.

Mr. SPARKMAN. These are projects which would be sponsored by political subdivisions. I want to be certain that one other program administered by the HHFA is not included. It seems to me that the committee does not intend to include it. That is the college housing program.

Ordinarily, college housing would not be connected with cities or political subdivisions. It is possible that it could be, but I would certainly want it understood that college housing—dormitories and buildings of that kind, intended for colleges—would not be interfered with.

Mr. CANNON. I assure the Senator from Alabama that it is certainly not the intention of the committee to include the college housing program in this particular provision.

In regard to the first part of the Senator's question, I direct his attention to this part of the committee report:

> If corrective action (which might involve various forms of relief including a direct local subsidy) is not taken, the Administrator shall cut off all future assistance administered by the HHFA (except pursuant to prior commitments) for projects in the area involved.

In that connection, I emphasize the words "except pursuant to prior commitments," because I think they would cover urban transit plans.

In any event, college housing would be omitted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad to have that statement.

Mr. CANNON. And that is the intention.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. From this colloquy between the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Alabama, do I correctly understand that if a transit plan is in jeopardy because of a change in rates, the Administrator would then notify the HHFA not only to cut off all loans to the transit body, but also to cut off all other Federal administrative programs which might be going on in that whole area?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator from Colorado is correct in part. For projects which have not been commenced "the Administrator shall cut off all future assistance administered by the HHFA (except pursuant to prior commitments) for projects in the area involved."

Mr. DOMINICK. In other words, if the transit body does something the Administrator does not like, the area will be blackballed?

Mr. CANNON. No; that is not correct. The Administrator must adhere to specific guidelines, rather than simply oppose something he does not like.

In that connection I point out the following language:

> However, should the schedule of fares be so altered after the grant has been received, and the Administrator finds that the transit system will not thereafter be able to operate on a sound economic basis—

That would be after the fact, rather than before—

> then the Administrator would so notify the recipient of the grant.

The grant is made only on the basis of representations which have been made to the Administrator by the local transit body. If it changes its mind and proceeds to take action which makes the operation uneconomical, as defined herein, then the Administrator would take the action outlined in the proposed amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. But the effect of the action would be to cut off all aid to programs under the HHFA?

Mr. CANNON. Well, as I pointed out to the Senator from Alabama, that is not quite correct.

Unless corrective action is taken at the local level, it is intended to cut off all future assistance administered by the HHFA. But, as I indicated, it is not intended to cut off college housing or FHA guarantees or things of that nature.

Insofar as the proposed fourth amendment is concerned, Mr. President, it provides that:

> (c) No Federal assistance under this act shall be extended to any State or local public body or agency thereof to assist any private mass transportation company unless the Administrator is assured that the State or States and the local public bodies or agencies thereof in the area covered by a proposed project have afforded the company every feasible relief, compatible with their own fiscal responsibilities, including, but not necessarily limited to, relinquishment of real property taxes, personal property taxes and franchise taxes; and no grant or loan shall be made under this section to any State or local public body or agency thereof to assist a public mass transportation company or any division or segment of its operations when one or more other divisions or segments are operating profitably unless the Administrator is assured that the transfer of funds from one division or segment to another would not be compatible with the maintenance of a coordinated mass transportation system in the area covered by the proposed project.

One reason for that amendment is that the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission testified at great length before our subcommittee concerning a case which was considered by that body over a 3-year period—from 1956 until 1959. The findings in the case indicated nine specific areas in which relief could and should be given, in order to try to resolve the mass transportation problems or the general transportation problems, insofar as public transportation is concerned. It was obvious to the members of our subcommittee and to the members of the full committee that in many instances local bodies were in difficulty with their mass transportation systems, and yet had not provided relief such as was recommended in the case to which I have referred; for example, relinquishment of franchise taxes or the relinquishment of real property taxes or personal property taxes.

It was the feeling of the full committee, I believe, and certainly it was the feeling of the subcommittee, that an attempt should first be made to try to solve the problem at the local level—as was stated today here on the floor. In other words, the local bodies should first try to do the job themselves. With that, we are in accord.

I do not personally agree with some of the Senators who have spoken today, in that I do not believe that the local bodies can always solve the problem. In some instances, they cannot. But this amendment is an attempt to write into law a provision requiring them first to try to solve the problem at the local level, by granting such relief as had been recommended by the Interstate Commerce Commission and by many other experts in this field, in order to try to assist in solving the problem at the local level.

The fifth amendment, as proposed, is the so-called guaranteed-loan provision. We had before us and under consideration a bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. It was along the lines of a bill introduced last year by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE]. The purpose of the bill was to try to solve this problem through federally guaranteed loans.

I think it is obvious that if the local agencies can solve their problem through the guaranteed-loan provision, that would be more desirable. As a result, the committee has proposed an amendment which would authorize the Federal Government to guarantee loans of the public body, up to an amount not to exceed $500 million, as set forth in the amendment. Of course this is only a contingent liability. In the amendment we have provided for one-fourth of 1 percent as a reserve, which should build up over a period of time, to enable them to handle the administration of this provision, and perhaps as a reserve fund to cover contingent losses which might occur thereafter.

The amendment also requires the local agency or local body to first attempt to come under a guaranteed-loan provision, if it can do so. The Administrator would have to review the picture from the standpoint of the eligibility of the applicant, and would have to determine whether it could qualify for a guaranteed loan. If it could, that would be the first type of relief to be provided.

If it could not qualify for a guaranteed loan, then—and only then—it would become eligible to proceed under the grant provision of the bill, as set forth at the present time in Senate bill 6 and in the amendment in the nature of a substitute which we propose to offer.

One of the objections raised during the consideration of the guaranteed-loan provision was based on the fact that local agencies were not required to contribute. The Banking and Currency Committee considered this provision. We have attempted to act upon that point by requiring a contribution of 25 percent at the local level and 75 percent at the Federal level.

So the contribution provision is covered in the proposed amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Last year, when the suggestion was first made that the bill reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency be considered by the Committee on Commerce, my attitude was the attitude of Sir Balthazar Gerbier expressed in 1662 when he said:

> Too many cooks spoil the broth.

I believe I had the same attitude this year. But the gentle persuasion of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] prevailed with me, as it always has, and I am now glad that the measure did go to the Committee on Commerce. I am particularly happy that it received the deep and comprehensive consideration of the Senator from Nevada. Now I believe my attitude is best expressed as Plato is reported to have stated:

> If you will attend to me, two together will be searching, and so mayhap we shall find what we seek.

My feeling—and I believe it is the feeling of all Senators who serve on the Subcommittee on Housing—is that the measure has been helped greatly by the suggestions proposed by the Committee on Commerce. I know that at the proper time we as a committee will be accepting ideas of the Committee on Commerce.

Of course, there will be some questions that we shall desire to clear up. The first question that I have deals with fare levels. Historically we know what has happened in transit systems. As costs rise and, indeed, as ridership declines, fares are increased, which begets a further decline in service.

I am sure it was not the intention of those who proposed the part of the amendment referred to, to take from transit authorities the necessary flexibility to deal with such situations, and to seek and find ways that would encourage people back to the use of transit facilities, or encourage people to continue using such facilities.

Mr. CANNON. The record is quite clear. It is certainly hoped that every effort would be made to try to resolve that problem, which is certainly serious. It is a problem that is not being met in many areas, and it cannot be met in those areas without some type of Federal assistance. Certainly we do not take an inflexible position insofar as fares are concerned, or other methods of trying to encourage greater use of facilities and thereby provide greater and better service.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am reassured. The next amendment about which I desired briefly to inquire relates to State and local tax relief or other relief mentioned in the amendment. The Senator knows that, particularly in connection with rapid transit and commuter railroads, there are cities which are gathering places, either at the terminal or the makeup point of the transit facilities. At such points we have large areas of concentration of land and facilities devoted to the transportation system, be it commuter rail or rapid transit, or even buses. Such communities have a great measure of responsibility in terms of local public service and all the things that go into local government. Of course, the beneficiaries would be the rapid transit terminal or whatever other system there might be. Those systems would feed it through multiple jurisdictions of government to people in the commuting range as far out as 50 miles in some cases. If heavy demand were made at the terminal for relief, an undue burden would be saddled on one city for the benefit of all the riders on the line.

I am wondering whether in the proposed language there is not the necessary flexibility and whether the local demand met by the amendment could not be met in other ways? Perhaps it could be done by way of a State contribution in lieu of taxes. In such cases it would not be the terminal city that would apply. It would be a broader part of government, such as an authority. In my State it would probably be the State government.

Mr. CANNON. First, the administrator would have certain discretion.

Second, the proposal would not prohibit a State or a local agency from granting a subsidy to try to give some relief, rather than to place the burden strictly on the tax base. In the type of situation which the Senator has indicated, I am certain the record will indicate very clearly that in a number of instances there has not been granted enough relief at the local level to try to create some incentive to try to resolve the overall problem.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. In the judgment of the Senator, the local level could be the local level of application. Perhaps it would be the State level.

Mr. CANNON. It could be at the State level. In many instances, it might be at the State level. In some instances, I presume it could be beyond the State level. There might be a joint operation in two or more States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am very grateful to the Senator for his amplifications and observations. In connection with the provision that the bonds would not carry a tax exemption, there might be fear that a precedent would be established that would cut deeply into the historical pattern of financing at the local level. I know that such is not the intention or expectation of the Senator, and that he sees the situation as a case sui generis.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Senator for bringing up that point. I had not completed my explanation. I intended to cover that one particular provision. One of the other features of the guaranteed bond proposal is a provision that they would not be tax exempt. That provision departs from the usual and customary theory of tax exemption in dealing with municipal bonds. That is in nowise intended to be a precedent for the taxation of municipal bonds, and I, for one, would oppose entering into the field of taxation of municipal bonds generally.

That is a different area entirely. The Federal Government would be asked to guarantee the bonds of the local transportation authority. They might therefore be able to market their bonds at a lesser interest rate than would be possible on the open market today. In my opinion, the private investment segment of our country would be induced to come in under that type of proposal. Such participation is necessary if we are to solve the overall problem, because of its magnitude. But again I say that that is nowise intended to be a precedent. It is intended to be exactly the opposite. A non-tax-exempt provision would be established solely by reason of the fact that the Federal Government would be coming into the picture as a guarantor, just as the Federal Government enters into the picture in FHA and VA guarantee provisions. In both those situations, interest is not exempt from taxation. That is the specific reason why we are trying not to get into that area in the present case.

Also, if a guarantee provision were allowed on tax exempt bonds, in effect it would place the bonds in a better position from the standpoint of salability than those of the Federal Government.

That, of course, would place the local agencies in an unfair competitive position insofar as the sale of Government securities is concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If they were tax exempt?

Mr. CANNON. If they were tax exempt.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The measure introduced by the Senator from Ohio, I believe S. 807, was a guarantee of loan bill. I believe the Senator has introduced it as another substitute. This is a guarantee approach. It specifies, however, a revolving fund for the payout of any guaranteed loan in total or partial default. The revolving fund, as I understand, would be $50 million.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I see no revolving fund in the measure advanced by the Senator from Nevada. I note there would be an authorized total amount for guarantee of $500 million. If this were spelled out in terms of the amount of money which had to be in a revolving fund for payout on possible default over a period of the life of bonds, 30 to 50 years, I would compute the requirement to be a revolving fund of a negligible amount. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. I could not answer the Senator as to how to equate this into a relative figure compared with a revolving fund. I simply say that the $500 million authorization is to be a maximum amount of guarantee for which the Federal Government could obligate itself, under the circumstances, if the bill should pass. This would mean that the Federal Government would have a contingent liability, if it guaranteed $500 million in bonds, of the full amount.

Certainly, the only way that would equate itself into an actual payout would be if every applicant defaulted on the payment of the bonds over the entire life of the bonds, which would be over a very substantial number of years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I believe the potential annual loss, assuming total default, could be computed. I hope that before we complete consideration of this problem tomorrow we can at least have an estimate of an annual possibility. That would be very helpful for Senators, I am sure. The $500 million is the limit of possible guarantees. The annual amount which possibly could be paid out, when one expresses it, is not nearly as terrifying, and of course we expect the guarantee program to be fully self-supporting.

Mr. CANNON. I do not know that it would be fair to say that one could equate this general type of guaranteed loan to an FHA or VA guaranteed loan, insofar as the payout experience is concerned, because this would involve a lending to a public body, while under the FHA and VA guaranteed loan provisions the loans are made to private individuals. The situations are somewhat different.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I think that over the evening recess perhaps we can give the problem to the actuaries, to see if it can be put in some frame of comparison.

Mr. CANNON. I shall be happy to check, to see if we can find some basis which is reasonably accurate for an estimate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Subsection (c) of section 3 of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is, I understand, the subsection which deals with the tax relief which would be sought in the local and State communities.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is there any other provision in the proposal which would deal with tax relief that should be sought?

Mr. CANNON. So far as I know, it is entirely covered under subsection (c) of section 3.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On page 5?

Mr. CANNON. Commencing on page 5 of the amendment in the nature of a substitute to be proposed for S. 6.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I direct the Senator's attention to subsection (c), from which I read:

> No Federal assistance under this Act shall be extended to any State or local public body or agency thereof to assist any private mass transportation company unless the Administrator is assured that the State or States and the local public bodies or agencies thereof in the area covered by a proposed project have afforded the company every feasible relief, compatible with their own fiscal responsibilities, including, but not necessarily limited to, relinquishment of real property taxes, personal property taxes and franchise taxes;

Am I correct in the understanding that as a prerequisite to the right of obtaining any relief, the Administrator would have to be satisfied that, on a local and State level, tax relief had been granted compatible with the fiscal responsibilities of the local government?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct; though not necessarily tax relief. It could be some other relief. A subsidy might be granted in lieu of tax relief. The tax relief would apply only when they were attempting to assist a private mass transportation company as distinguished from a local or municipal government owned system.

Mr. LAUSCHE. One thing bothers me about the language. How could it become equally operative throughout the whole country, when one of the conditions would be that tax relief or other relief "compatible with their own fiscal responsibilities" would be granted?

I have in mind the fact that there are different tax laws in various States. I have in mind also the fact that some communities are strong in money, while others are weak. How could we be assured that there would be equal operation of the law throughout the country? I am exploring the question.

Mr. CANNON. I could not assure the Senator that this would result in absolute equality in every instance, because the situations might be different. There might be a different tax base. The transit company in one State might be taxed a little more than one in a neighboring State, for example, yet the programs could still be "compatible with their own fiscal responsibilities."

One of the purposes of the proposal is to insure that the local government would not simply "skim the cream" off the top of the taxes received from the private operator, and then use only a portion of that amount to meet the Federal grant requirements. If they were to request relief from the Federal Government, then they in turn would have to plow back whatever they were getting out of the transportation company, to try to solve the problem at the local level.

That is the intent. I presume that in each instance it would require a very careful review by the Administrator. Of course, the entire program would be subject to periodic review by the Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My fear, again, is that there is given to the Administrator a discretionary power to determine whether the tax or other relief granted has been compatible with local fiscal responsibilities. It gives him a discretion which in my opinion he will be unable to apply equally throughout the Nation. That is my own fear of that provision of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. I simply say that there are general guidelines which can be used in this type of situation, and that is evident, as an example, from the testimony given by the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission when he testified concerning the passenger deficit investigation. One of the recommendations they made was that the local bodies grant this type of relief, consistent with their financial responsibility.

I presume there are general guidelines which would be applicable, but to give an assurance of absolute equality of treatment of an applicant in Ohio as compared to an applicant in New Jersey I do not believe is any more possible than to give an assurance of absolute equality in any type of program that involves a different application of State and local law.

Mr. President, I am open to further questions any Senator desires to ask. If there are no questions, I shall yield the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The proposals of tax relief made by the Interstate Commerce Commission were also made by other agencies of the Government dealing with the manner in which the problem should be solved.

Mr. CANNON. A number of studies have been made of this particular problem. It is evident that some States and some local bodies have not met their responsibilities, in attempting to solve the problem themselves, in the eyes of those bodies that have made reports on this subject and in the eyes of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The testimony shows a number of studies have been made. In most of them one of the methods recommended for solving the problem is that the Federal Government should grant tax relief by not siphoning off the income derived by transit companies through tax remissions made by local and State governments, and also that direct tax relief and other relief be provided by local and State governments.

Am I correct in that statement, so far as the Senator from Nevada understands?

Mr. CANNON. I understand that is the recommendation which has been made by some of the reporting bodies.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I intend to discuss that subject tomorrow.

Mr. CANNON. I yield the floor.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF VERMONT LEGISLATURE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me long enough to introduce into the RECORD a joint resolution from the Vermont Legislature?

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on March 6 the U.S. Internal Revenue Service announced its intention to emasculate several of the most efficient internal revenue State offices and transfer them to offices in bigger cities.

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD a joint resolution enacted by the Vermont Legislature expressing its views on this proposal.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 17

Joint resolution relating to the U.S. Internal Revenue Service offices in Burlington, Vt.

Whereas on March 6, 1963, the U.S. Internal Revenue Service announced that it proposes to eliminate the district offices in Burlington, Vt., and maintain there only a field office; and

Whereas this action will result in substantially diminished service to the citizens of Vermont, making it necessary for them to travel considerable distances for personal interviews with officials of the Internal Revenue Service in a large number of cases: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the General Assembly of the State of Vermont opposes the proposed action and the resulting loss of service to the taxpayers of the State; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to Hon. George D. Aiken, Hon. Winston L. Prouty, and Hon. Robert T. Stafford, as well as to Hon. Mortimer Caplin, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Approved: March 26, 1963.

DOUBLE TALK—DOUBLE SPEND

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, officials of the Department of the Army have programed two new Army Reserve Centers at Columbus, Ohio, for 1963, at a cost of more than $1,200,000. Each of these units will have a complement of 600 men.

I have been informed that at the present time consideration is being given to the location of these centers. Although no final decision has been made regarding them, it is reported that the Department of the Army is seriously contemplating purchasing two new sites in Columbus, or in surrounding Franklin County, for this purpose. Those who are guilty of promoting this sort of program would be guilty of wasting more than $1,200,000 of our taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, the Fort Hayes Military Reservation at Columbus, Ohio, is to be abandoned by the Army in 1965. This installation covers over 70 acres of land in the heart of the city of Columbus. It is easily accessible from all parts of the city and from all parts of Franklin County. It is already the property of the U.S. Government.

It would be an unconscionable action if taxpayers' money were spent for land for two new training centers, when this excellent location, already owned by the Federal Government, is available.

Mr. President, this excellent installation, which has been owned for many, many years by the Federal Government, was useful in the past, but is being "phased out", as the military use the term. You see, Mr. President, in Pentagonese it would be too simple to say "phased out." At any rate, this fine acreage in the heart of Columbus, Ohio, is definitely to be abandoned by the Federal Government.

We talk about saving taxpayers' money. Here is one place where we can do that very easily by turning over, for use for these training centers, only a small section of the 70-acre property at Fort Hayes.

There is no reason why a part of the Fort Hayes reservation could not be set apart for these training centers, in fact, why are two training centers needed? As I have said before, Fort Hayes is an ideal location for this purpose. These units could be combined and built on federally owned property at Fort Hayes. That would not cause inconvenience to reservists in the Columbus area. At the same time it would save thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, I for one, cannot understand how, at a time when we are trying to keep the budget within limits, we would condone a manifest waste of the taxpayers' money, like the one being considered in this instance. I have written to Secretary of the Army Vance, and strongly protested any such move.

I couched my letter in forceful language in order to indicate my amazement at the contemplation of such a waste of the taxpayers' money. I hope Secretary Vance and other top officials of the Department of the Army will carefully scrutinize this situation. I am sure that once they are aware of the facts, the proposed purchase of new sites will be discarded. The Defense Department has millions of acres of surplus land throughout the Nation. This land should be utilized whenever possible, before the Federal Government purchases unneeded additional land. The scheme seems to be to buy additional land in Columbus at an inflated price. I denounce this proposal as a fantastic, unthinkable raid upon our Federal Treasury. I will oppose this to the uttermost.

Mr. President, Don E. Weaver, outstanding editor of the Columbus Citizen-Journal, recently wrote an excellent and persuasive article regarding this proposed boondoggle. His article is entitled "Fort Hayes—Double Talk, Double Spend." It is a fine example of responsible journalism at its best, and Mr. Weaver is to be congratulated on his attempt to save the taxpayers' money. I commend this article to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORT HAYES—DOUBLE TALK, DOUBLE SPEND

(By Don E. Weaver)

Early this week Mayor Westlake announced that the Army intends to build two Reserve training centers in Columbus, at a cost of over $1,200,000.

Three days later the mayor said that since the Army is going to give up old Fort Hayes, he has asked the General Services Administration to give it to the city for parking or a city storage lot.

This is a close-home illustration of why Government costs so much.

If the Army needs two new training centers and is also going to give up century-old Fort Hayes, why not use Fort Hayes for the new training center and save the cost of buying more land and taking it off the tax duplicate?

A Washington checkup indicates the Army already is taking second thought and may do just this.

We have had ample evidence that the military's right hand often doesn't know what its left hand is doing. Such may be the case here.

There is said to be an Army plan for 1,700 Reserve centers across the country.

The Defense Department has millions of acres of surplus land. It should be utilized, rather than buying more for new programs.

Of course the abandonment of Fort Hayes—opened in the Civil War—has been hot and cold for years. Now the Army is supposed to be giving it up in 1965.

Mayor Westlake's vague proposals for parking lots, storage or maybe recreation aren't very high uses for Fort Hayes' 70 acres of good level land, strategically located at an interchange. On the completed expressway it will be one of the most accessible sites in Columbus.

As Mayor Westlake admitted, the State of Ohio will have first call on Fort Hayes if and when it finally is abandoned for Federal use. And we think the State could utilize it for higher purposes than parking, storage or a neighborhood playground.

Ohio State University faces a mighty expansion problem. Plans are forming for an Ohio Research and Development center. The Ohio Historical Society Museum owned by the State and not part of the university, nevertheless stands on the campus at the main entrance, occupying space badly needed by OSU.

At the same time, Ohio has made a start toward a State archives center—and after 150 years Ohio certainly needs it—by taking over the old Governor's mansion on Broad Street. This is valuable land, but far from ideal for an archives center. All or part of Fort Hayes' 70 acres could be used for the related history and archives functions of the State, thus releasing to the university a site it badly needs and allowing sale for private—and taxable—use the old mansion site.

At all levels of government we've had a tendency continually to acquire new lands and buildings, also more debt, without getting full value from the old or obsolete facilities. For example, the old State blind and deaf schools, replaced years ago by new schools on newly acquired land. These valuable sites in the heart of the city could be restored to the tax duplicate if auctioned to private ownership and use.

The Army is vague as usual about its plans for new training centers. But Mayor Westlake indicated the sites, which he declined to name if he knows them, may require extension of water and sewer services. True or not, it sounds typical.

Ignore the readily available, the already owned, and go out and spend a lot more tax dollars getting more land and building new buildings.

Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, of Ohio, is one who has sounded a warning against unnecessary spending for these research centers when Fort Hayes is available.

We hope Senator LAUSCHE, always a vociferous advocate of Government economy, and Representative SAMUEL L. DEVINE, of Franklin County, who also testifies for conservative spending, will add their voices and their efforts to the prevention of costly squandering.

A million dollars may be peanuts to the tax eaters, but it's a lot of money to us taxpayers digging deep to pay the bill before April 15.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama has discussed the major provisions of this legislation, and on many occasions I have spoken of the need for this bill—the staggering traffic congestion that is choking so many of our cities, and costing the Nation between $6 and $8 billion a year in loss of time and wages, traffic accidents, and loss of business, to say nothing of the exhaustion of our energies, both physical and emotional, by the traffic jams we face daily.

We all know that traffic congestion is discouraging private investment in the revitalization of our cities. We know that our transit systems are seriously deteriorated, and that deterioration is forcing the construction of more and more high-cost highways in the cities to compensate. We know that great numbers of people—perhaps up to 40 percent of the population in both large and small cities—are highly dependent on public transportation because they are too old, too young, too poor or even too afraid to drive an automobile.

To me the problem is so clear and so serious that it hardly needs further discussion.

Even the strongest opponents of Federal action in that field concedes the existence of the problem. We saw an example of that in the earlier statement of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. On several occasions the U.S. Chamber of Commerce conceded the point in testimony and in responses to questioning. So I do not think I need add anything more to that question.

I would, however, like to make some comments with respect to certain objections that have been raised against the bill now before the Senate, which I had the honor of sponsoring with 22 other Senators from both sides of the aisle and from most parts of the country.

I am especially happy over the broad bipartisan support the proposed legislation has received this year and in past years. I desire my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to know our appreciation and our full knowledge of the value of their support and assistance in connection with this measure.

I am only sorry that the late distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. Styles Bridges, is not here today, for he was likewise a strong supporter of this legislation when he was in the Senate. I recall in 1961, he made this statement:

> I trust that before this session of the Congress is concluded, we shall be able to say that in the field of domestic problems, one of the most aggravating and serious was that of mass transportation, and that this Congress recognized it and passed legislation necessary to alleviate this important and critical problem.

Senator Bridges was deeply respected, and his loss is deeply regretted. However, he did live to see a start at meeting the problem, because in 1961 the temporary emergency program with which we have been working was adopted. That program was the forerunner of the measure now before the Senate. When Senator Styles Bridges spoke, he spoke in the noblest tradition of his most beautiful and rugged State.

Those of us who served in the House of Representatives were inspired as we sat in that Chamber and observed the words etched in marble behind the Speaker's stand:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its power, build up its institutions, promote all of its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

That is a quotation from another great man from New Hampshire—Daniel Webster.

THE COST

Mr. President, we all know that there is a great deal of talk this year about the size of Federal spending, and I agree we should try to eliminate every possible waste and economize where we can without doing injury to the security or welfare of the Nation.

But I say flatly and firmly that there is no shortcut to economy through the defeat of this proposed legislation.

We have asked the people of this Nation to pay $41 billion in taxes for the construction of the interstate highway program. About $20 billion of that amount will be going into urban highway construction.

We simply cannot evade the fact that there are certain periods of the day—2 hours in the morning and 2 hours in the evening—when the working population of this Nation must move to get to and from work. Many of those people now use public transportation, and many more would use it, if it were modern, convenient, quick, and reasonably priced. But more and more of those people are being forced into their automobiles for rush-hour commutation because we have allowed our bus and and rail transit systems to deteriorate and decline.

If we do not spend a modest amount to preserve and improve essential rail and bus transit service, the taxpayers will only end up paying far more in taxes to build the highways that will be necessary to compensate for the decline and loss of transit service.

The American Municipal Association has estimated that if five cities—New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Cleveland, and Chicago— were to lose just their rail commuter service, it would cost more than $17 billion to move a comparable number of people by automobile.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to stress the point the Senator has made that, in the long run, the bill would save the public money. If we in the greater Philadelphia metropolitan area, using the funds made available by the bill, can complete the mass transit plan which has already been agreed upon in substance, we will save future generations of taxpayers tens of millions—even as much as $100 million—in the cost of extra expressways, automobile highways and truck highways, which would otherwise have to be built. As long as 10 years ago, when I was mayor of Philadelphia, the cost of 1 mile of our Delaware Expressway, which is not yet built, was $17 million. I am sure that cost is substantially higher today. Yet, until we can get the modern equipment and the necessary Federal financing, we have unused and unavailable a network of railroads which could be utilized to bring more than 100,000 people, in and out and around the metropolitan area every day.

So the Senator from New Jersey is quite correct, when he says that the very modest expenditures which are contemplated by the bill would, in the end, pay for themselves many times over in saving the cost of highways which would otherwise become necessary.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I could not more completely agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania. Those who address themselves to the question of the economy and feel that the bill is uneconomical could not, in my judgment, be further from the truth.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder if the Senator has contemplated a comment by the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Wirtz, in testimony before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on which the Senator from New Jersey and I both serve, in connection with the youth employment bill, which I hope will be taken up and passed when the bill relating to mass transportation is disposed of. The Senator will recall that Mr. Wirtz pointed out that the amount called for by that bill, which is slightly in excess of $100 million, would have been spent for the defense program since 6 o'clock the night before to 10 a.m., when Mr. Wirtz was testifying.

I invite the attention of my friend from New Jersey to the fact that the mass transit bill would authorize the expenditure of $500 million over a 3-year period. Does the Senator recall how much of that money was in loans and how much in grants?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It is all in grants.

Mr. CLARK. All grant money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The grant program is $500 million. In addition, the bill contemplates carrying forward the loan program which was approved in 1961.

Mr. CLARK. So the $500 million for the grant program represents total expenditures over a 3-year period equivalent to one-half of 1 week's expenditures for the defense program, on which we are now spending at the rate of $1 billion a week. So we ought to view the question of expenditure in some perspective. This is a subject which the Senator from New Jersey has well said involves the life and the continued well-being of our cities and, indeed, many of our towns, too. We hesitate on grounds of economy to spend as much for the purposes for which the bill is intended over a period of 3 years as we are spending in 1 week for the defense program. I believe that if Senators were generally aware of that fact, some of the opposition to the bill on the ground that we cannot afford the program would be dissipated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator has stated the case even more dramatically than I have.

Two pages of a newspaper published last Wednesday carried two interesting stories. One story related:

> Senate trouble predicted for the transit bill.

The newspaper article contained a story on that subject.

On the other page, in two columns, was listed a total contract authority for defense in the sum of $890 million; $385 million of that amount was for the Dyna-Soar space glider. In the newspaper story the statement appeared:

> Of course, it is not known whether this will be a final vehicle in our space effort.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. In other words, we might spend $385 million for it and then junk it. The Senator and I have not been willing to "short cut" on defense. All we are saying is, "Let us make a beginning of national strength in the urban areas of this country, where truly we are facing decay."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I agree completely with what the Senator says. I think the example he has given is excellent.

Aside from the defense program, it has always seemed to me to be slightly more important to get the hard-working American citizens back and forth and in and out of Camden, Newark, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh, than to get a man on the moon. I am quite ready to put a man on the moon when we can afford to do it, after having taken care of some of our domestic needs.

I suggest to Senators who are interested in economy that a good, hard look at the space program should be taken before they vote against a modest expenditure to give adequate services to American citizens who are earning the money which makes it possible to have a defense program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. I agree with him.

Mr. President, I continue with my remarks on this subject.

In addition to the added highway expenditure that will be necessary if we do not preserve and modernize essential urban transit service, we have the problems and costs of providing enough parking space for all the automobiles, the loss of tax ratable property, the dislocation of families, the added traffic control and street maintenance costs.

In my judgment, much of this pain and confusion is inevitable, for urban highways will always be essential to meet a variety of needs that public transportation will never be able to meet. The automobile is here to stay, but we cannot handle the crush of rushhour travel by highways and automobiles alone.

What we are trying to do is get a little balance, to improve rail and bus transit to help supplement our efforts to handle the rushhour problem.

And no one that I know of disputes the need for a balanced and coordinated urban transportation system, using all modes of transportation to the best natural advantage.

But how in the world can we get balance when the Federal Government provides 90 percent of the cost of highway construction and provides nothing for the improvement of transit?

So I say that there is no shortcut to economy. If we do not provide the modest help proposed here, we will end up paying far more to move people some other way—for move they must, and move they will during the rush hours.

And the expenditures proposed in S. 6 are modest.

The $100 million expenditure proposed for the first year is only $30 million more than it cost to build less than 3 miles of a highway loop in the city of Cleveland, Ohio. It is exactly the same amount that it will take to build little more than 1 mile of highway across lower Manhattan.

A FOOT IN THE DOOR?

At this point, I can almost hear the thoughts of some Senators:

> Ah yes, $100 million the first year, but this is just the foot in the door, the nose in the tent, the drop in the bucket. It can't begin to do the job, and the program will balloon to gigantic proportions in later years.

We will hear—as we have already heard—that San Francisco is building a $792 million rapid transit system. We will hear that Los Angeles is planning a $600 million system, that Washington is planning a $790 million system. So how can this proposed $500 million expenditure be anything else but a drop in the bucket that will expand enormously in later years?

For that reason, I want to make a special plea to every Senator to study the way this program would actually work.

Let me emphasize that the Federal aid would not cover two-thirds of the cost of constructing any transit system or project.

We are not proposing to provide free transportation service.

The riders of every transit system will be paying for the service they get. All we are saying is that we cannot put the entire burden of capital costs on the farebox. To do so would require higher and higher fares, producing fewer and fewer riders. This defeats the whole purpose of transit service which is to attract riders, especially during rush hours.

So this bill proposes that the Federal Government share up to two-thirds of the net project cost; that is, the gap between the cost of the project and the amount that can be reasonably financed with bonds sold to private investors and supported by revenues from the farebox.

And how large could this gap be?

Well, let me give an actual example of a typical net project cost in the construction of a new rapid transit project, which of course involves a higher capital cost than would a project involving buses.

The Delaware River Port Authority has received permission to build a 12-mile high-speed rapid transit line between Philadelphia and Camden at a cost of about $55 million. Approximately $25 million of the cost will be covered by bonds sold to private investors supported by the estimated revenues from the farebox. This would leave a net project cost, in this instance, of $30 million, which the authority is planning to provide locally out of surplus reserve funds.

If these surplus funds did not exist, and if the project was undertaken under this program, the Federal share would hypothetically be $20 million, which could be spread over the construction period of the project, thus further reducing the impact on the program.

In other words, the Federal assistance is designed to serve as "seed money" to stimulate far larger amounts of local and private financing.

And the more experience and confidence the private investors get under this program, the more risk they will be willing to assume, and the less burden there will be on the Federal Government.

So the amounts provided in this bill are not just a drop in the bucket.

There is no reason to believe that the program must balloon to vast heights in later years.

But I am sure, before this debate is over, we will hear this called a $9 billion bill.

Let me emphasize that this figure was never the estimated Federal cost of this program.

This was the estimate of total national need over a 10-year period to improve and modernize the Nation's transit systems.

Now let us take that figure and analyze it a little bit.

First, a certain portion of that amount will never apply for Federal assistance, and another portion will be found ineligible for assistance, for one reason or another.

These amounts alone could be very substantial, but let us just say for the sake of discussion that it totals $1 billion, leaving us with a figure of $8 billion.

Out of that $8 billion, we then have to subtract the amount that can be financed out of the fare box. In the example I gave, the fare box covered almost 50 percent of the total cost, and this percentage could be substantially higher in many types of projects.

So it would not be unreasonable to earmark $4 billion for private financing.

This would leave us with a net project cost of $4 billion, and a potential Federal contribution of $2.6 billion over a 10-year period, which amounts to $260 million a year.

I believe I have been conservative in this analysis, and still the level of funding would not be substantially higher than the level proposed in this bill.

And I need not add that when the authority in this bill terminates at the end of 3 years, Congress will decide whether the program has been successful and whether it should be continued or dropped, reduced or enlarged. On top of that, the program will be subject to annual review by the Appropriations Committees of both Houses.

DO WE HAVE THE MONEY?

Mr. President, I know that some Senators will still feel that at this time in our Nation's economic life we cannot afford even this modest amount of expenditure.

We all know that the Federal Government is faced with a high level of spending. We are faced with the prospect of a deficit in this fiscal year. We are faced with the possibility of a tax cut and so we hear that we must slam the lid on Federal expenditures. In fact, some are even going so far as to argue that we must take the meat axe to all kinds of existing vital programs.

Mr. President, this is not just a fiscal and economic problem we are talking about. The real issue facing the Senate is whether we have any faith and confidence in this Nation.

It is easy to bewail the state of the Union and run down the Federal Government. But I think it is about time that we gave a little credit to the people and the representatives of this country.

We are the greatest and strongest Nation in the world. I think we ought to be proud of that fact. I do not think it befits our stature in the world today to talk as though we believe the economic strength of this country is on the verge of collapse.

Thirty years ago, we weathered a tremendous depression. We weathered $50 billion deficits a year during the Second World War. We weathered the dire predictions of gloomy pessimists after the war, that we could not possibly adjust from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

Throughout the fifties we weathered constant predictions that inflation was going to ruin the Nation, yet prices today are more stable than they have been in years. And all the while, wages have been increasing, and the people of this Nation are enjoying a degree of prosperity unknown to any other nation in the world.

Mr. President, I think we ought to be proud of this Nation and the accomplishments of the American people over the last 30 years of turmoil and strife. I do not think we ought to be going around talking as though the day of economic doom is just around the corner. It is not just around the corner. The fiscal strength of this Nation is in good shape, despite what some people say.

We hear them say that the Federal debt has increased to ruinous heights. It is large. It is about $300 billion.

But the fact is that the Federal debt is only 11 percent higher than it was in 1946. The fact is that State and local government debt has increased over 300 percent in the same period of time.

The fact is that private debt in this country today is twice as large as the Federal debt and it has also been increasing at a far more rapid rate than the Federal debt.

Mr. President, businessmen of this country know that to borrow for their own expansion is a sign of health and not weakness. It is a sign of faith in the future of their own business. It enables them to obtain today what they would otherwise have to wait years for, and in the process they help stimulate the economic growth of the Nation in all kinds of direct and indirect ways.

The same thing is true when the Federal Government invests in the future economic growth of the Nation.

Because, Mr. President, the only way we are going to meet the challenge of communism over the long run, and convince the world that they do not have to trade their freedom for the promise of three square meals a day is to show the world that we can meet the pressing economic and social problems that we face in an atmosphere of political freedom through the democratic process.

I do not think there is any reason for us to act like a band of frightened and timid men. If we do not have faith and confidence in the future of our Nation and in our ability to meet our own social and economic problems, I think we might as well give up.

Yet, we tremble over the size of the Federal debt when in fact it is decreasing and not increasing as a percentage of our gross national production. It is decreasing and not increasing as a burden on the American people. In 1946 the national debt amounted to about $2,000 for every person in the country. Today that debt is less than $1,600 per person.

And the same thing is true of Federal spending. Certainly Federal spending has risen over the years, but again, in relation to the gross national product, it has remained virtually stable for the last decade.

I do not think these trends in debt or expenditures give cause for alarm. I think the economy of this country is in good hands and is being managed in a sound and prudent manner. I think the most critical problem facing us today is not spending, or deficits, or inflation.

I think the most pressing problem today is the growing gap in a large number of vital public needs, from education to unemployment to urban transportation.

I think the longer we neglect these problems, the weaker a nation we are going to be.

This bill is one modest effort to meet one serious public need. The expenditure of $500 million over the next 3 years will trigger a combined Federal, local, and private investment of more than $1¼ billion in the improvement of this Nation's mass transit system.

The beneficial effect of this program on employment will be tremendous. Without this program, neither the local nor private investment will be made. Unemployment on our rail and bus transit systems will continue to decline at the present alarming rate of more than 35 percent in the last 10 years.

LOCAL INITIATIVE

Mr. President, this brings me to another charge that has been made against this bill—that this is going to destroy local initiative and responsibility.

But the whole history of transit decline and deterioration is proof that local and private initiative is not enough. Some Federal help is essential if there is to be any meaningful local initiative.

This scare word about local initiative has been hurled at just about every Federal activity ever initiated. But does anyone contend that the passage of the accelerated public-works program last year destroyed local initiative?

I do not think I have ever seen a program in recent years that has stimulated more interest, activity, and local initiative than this accelerated public-works program. The same thing is true of urban renewal.

Would anyone argue that we would have as many cities actively working to eliminate their slums and revitalize their cities as we have today if it were not for the urban renewal program?

Would any Senator say that the programs of the F.H.A. have destroyed the initiative of the homebuilders of this Nation? Would anyone say that the aid we are giving under the Federal Airport Act has destroyed local initiative in meeting the growing needs of the jet age?

Does anyone feel that the communities receiving help under the school impacted aid program have lost their initiative in meeting the educational needs in their communities? The answer to all of these questions is clearly and absolutely—no.

When you get down to cases, it becomes clear that we are dealing with a hollow slogan.

RURAL VERSUS URBAN BURDEN

Mr. President, one of the most unjust accusations that has been leveled against this program is the charge that we are forcing the people in the small towns and rural parts of the Nation to pay for the solution of a big city problem.

In the first place, this is not just a big city problem. Over the last 4 years of hearings on this legislation we have heard from cities and towns across the Nation—from east to west and north to south. We have heard from cities as large as New York and towns as small as Laurel, Miss.

We have heard from communities from Cocoa, Fla., to Seattle, Wash.

So this is not just a big city problem. There are plenty of smaller towns that have their share of traffic congestion. There are plenty of towns that have either no public transportation service or totally inadequate transit service despite the large number of people who depend on public transportation to meet their travel needs.

Mr. President, this is a rich nation, but not everyone in the United States has the luxury of an automobile. There are plenty of elderly people living on extremely low incomes who have become virtual hermits because they can no longer afford or cannot drive an automobile and who do not have adequate public transportation service.

We have people who are too young to drive or disabled or who for one reason or another do not wish to use their automobiles.

We have lots of moderate income families living out in the suburbs with only one car that must be used by the husband to get to work leaving the wife stranded without transportation.

We have plenty of families with two jobs and only one car who are deeply troubled by the inadequacies of our public transportation service.

The American Transit Association estimates that nearly 70 cities in the United States with populations of more than 25,000 are without any public transportation systems. Since 1954 more than 400 transit companies, mostly in small communities, have been sold or abandoned and this has almost invariably resulted in a drastic reduction in service.

This has been especially hard on our smaller communities which are trying to attract new industry and revitalize their business centers.

Since the enactment of the mass transit program in 1962 the Housing Agency has received inquiries or requests for assistance from about 250 cities and towns from 44 different States. So this is not just a big city problem and this bill is not forcing a burden on the smaller towns and rural areas of the Nation to help solve the problems of wealthy big cities. Because they are not wealthy.

The cities of this Nation are facing a financial crisis of the greatest magnitude. They may have a lot of industry but they also have a lot of slums. They have social and economic costs that are unknown to the smaller towns and rural areas of the Nation.

Their tax bases are declining. Their slums are spreading and welfare costs are rising. While their per capita income may be greater than it is in the smaller towns of the Nation, so are the costs of living.

The fact is that the cities of this Nation simply do not have the resources to do this job alone. If they did, they would not be asking the Federal Government for help because they do not like the redtape involved any more than anyone else does.

And I would not want this discussion to end without pointing out that while the cities of the Nation account for about 75 percent of the economic productivity of the Nation they also pay the lion's share of the taxes.

I cannot help but recall the vivid statement made by an official of Philadelphia when he said:

> From 1924 to 1954 residents of the city contributed $384 million to the State motor license fund for highway costs. We received back $82 million and so paid $302 million to get the farmers out of the mud.

And the fact is that the Federal Government has been doing precisely the same thing for years and years.

Mr. President, I can tell Senators that urban taxpayers of New Jersey tell me often enough how they are paying more than $2 in Federal taxes for every dollar they get back. And where has that missing dollar been going? It has been going into agriculture, into water projects, into reclamation projects and a lot of other programs that do not benefit New Jersey.

But I have supported many of these programs that do not directly benefit New Jersey because they help make a stronger nation.

All we are asking for here is a little bit back.

And, Mr. President, I want to say that if we do not soon start solving some of the urgent and growing problems facing the urban areas of this country we are going to be a weaker nation and the urban areas are going to be poorer and poorer and we are going to be sending less and less to the smaller States of this Nation to help them meet their problems.

Mr. President, I earnestly hope the Members of the Senate will heed this plea. We need this bill. The Nation needs it, and I hope it will pass by a decisive margin.

FALSITY OF COMMUNIST ASSERTION REGARDING ON-SITE INSPECTIONS UNDER A TEST BAN TREATY

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on March 28, 1963, I spoke on this floor and expressed concern over an assertion made at the Geneva Conference by Delegate Tsarapkin that it was the United States and not the Soviet Union which originally offered to settle for three on-site inspections under a test ban treaty.

I have received a letter dated March 29, 1963, signed by Mr. William C. Foster, the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This letter repudiates the statement made by the Soviet delegate. I believe that it is appropriate and right that Mr. Foster's letter be incorporated in the Congressional Record.

This illustrates once more that lying is part of the Communist technique and that the Communist propagandistic claims cannot be relied upon. It would seem to me that we should not enter into any negotiations with them on the subject of disarmament because they cannot be relied upon.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Foster's letter be printed in full.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

March 29, 1963.

The Honorable Carl T. Curtis,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Curtis: On March 28, 1963, you indicated in a statement on the floor of the Senate your concern over an assertion made at the Geneva Conference by Soviet Delegate Tsarapkin that it was the United States and not the Soviet Union which originally offered to settle for three annual onsite inspections under a test ban treaty. You said: "If what the Soviet delegate says is true, our delegates have made a dangerous and potentially disastrous retreat."

I assure you, Senator Curtis, that this allegation, which has also been made by other Soviet officials, is not true. As early as December 28, 1962, in reply to a letter from Chairman Khrushchev, President Kennedy stated:

"With respect to the number of on-site inspections there appears to have been some misunderstanding. Your impression seems to be that Ambassador Dean told Deputy Minister Kuznetsov that the United States might be prepared to accept an annual number of on-site inspections between 2 and 4. Ambassador Dean advises me that the only number which he mentioned in his discussions with Deputy Minister Kuznetsov was a number between 8 and 10."

This exchange of correspondence between President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev on the possibility of negotiating a nuclear test ban agreement was reported in the press.

The Soviet assertion was repeated by Mr. Kuznetsov at the February 20, 1963, meeting of the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference. In reply, Delegate Godber from the United Kingdom said:

"* * * our Soviet colleague spoke this morning of the West's having in fact suggested two to three inspections; he said the Soviet Union accepted that and therefore we should now be able to agree. Well, he knows perfectly well that is not the case. The matter has been expounded with absolute clarity, and I am sure all other delegations around this table are fully cognizant of what the West did propose, and indeed it would be strange, even if the Soviet Union had been under that misapprehension, if it still were, because as early as President Kennedy's reply to Premier Khrushchev the matter was made abundantly clear."

Later, at the same meeting, I made the following statement:

"I think it is perfectly clear that the official numbers put forth by the United States and the United Kingdom were expressed in President Kennedy's letter of December 28, 1962; and in no official manner have they ever been two to three on the part of either of our delegations."

Again, at the March 1, 1963, meeting at Geneva, I commented on the matter again at greater length:

"The Soviet delegation has alleged, in presenting its position on on-site inspection, that Mr. Arthur H. Dean suggested as acceptable two to four on-site inspections annually at some point during informal discussions with Mr. Kuznetsov in New York last autumn. That is not the case. Here is the record. On October 30, Mr. Dean, accompanied by Mr. Akalovsky of the U.S. delegation, called on Mr. Kuznetsov in New York. The conversation centered primarily on current General Assembly matters, and the test ban problem was discussed briefly and only in general terms. Mr. Kuznetsov reaffirmed the position held by the Soviet Union at that time, denying the need for on-site inspection and stating that such inspection was unacceptable to the Soviet Union. Mr. Dean stressed the U.S. desire to engage in serious negotiations for a test ban. He further expressed the view that some mutually satisfactory arrangement to cover cessation of testing in all environments, while providing assurances against clandestine tests underground, should be possible. In that connection he said that the United States had in mind a small number of onsite inspections but did not mention any specific figure. Thus, the Soviet claim that Mr. Dean offered two to four inspections on October 30, is inaccurate.

"They met next on November 7 at Mr. Kuznetsov's initiative, at the Soviet Mission in New York. Again Mr. Dean was accompanied by Mr. Akalovsky. Reading from a prepared text and stating that he was acting on instructions, Mr. Kuznetsov reviewed the Soviet position on the test ban—a position which still excluded any onsite inspection on Soviet territory.

"Mr. Dean reemphasized the U.S. position that onsite inspections were necessary and that their number was related to the number of unidentified seismic events. He also said that, because of the progress achieved under the Vela research program, the United States might be prepared to accept something like 8 to 10 onsite inspections, and 8 to 10 nationally-manned control posts under international supervision. Mr. Dean observed that 90 percent of the territory of the Soviet Union was aseismic and suggested the possibility of subdividing Soviet territory into seismic and aseismic areas. He remarked that U.S. scientists believed that if two control posts were located in the aseismic portion of the heartland of the Soviet Union, and eight in the seismic areas, only very few inspections might be required in the aseismic areas.

"After the meeting Mr. Timerbaev, a member of the Soviet mission who also attended the meeting, approached Mr. Akalovsky to check Mr. Dean's remarks about the number of nationally manned stations and of onsite inspections. Mr. Akalovsky referred Mr. Timerbaev to what Mr. Dean had said, with Mr. Timerbaev repeating the number of 8 to 10 onsite inspections and Mr. Akalovsky confirming the accuracy of his account.

"Consequently, there are no grounds for doubt about the numbers mentioned by Mr. Dean and that makes subsequent claims by Soviet representatives that, on October 30, Mr. Dean had in fact mentioned the two to four figure quite surprising. Both U.S. participants in those meetings confirm the facts which I have just given to this conference."

My statements denying the Soviet allegations were also given press coverage.

I am sorry that you were unaware of these statements refuting the propagandistic claims of the Soviet officials.

Sincerely,

William C. Foster.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on what the Senator from Nebraska has said. I am perfectly confident in my own mind that Mr. Foster's denial of the validity of the charge made by the Soviet delegate is correct.

I was at Geneva during November and December, as an observer at the Disarmament Conference, and I had occasion to discuss then, and later with Mr. Arthur Dean, our principal negotiator, the charge which even then was being made—it was made more specifically later—that the Americans had agreed to three onsite inspections as the basis for the treaty. Mr. Dean told me categorically—and I believe him—that this was not the case, that the Soviet Union misrepresented his stand, that he had never made such a suggestion or been authorized to do so.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator for yielding.

When I received Mr. Foster's note I felt a responsibility to put it in the Record, because it clearly repudiates the Soviet position.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend.

THE U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly about a short statement made on March 21 by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] with respect to the integrity of the officials of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. I advised the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] that I intended to speak on this subject, and he indicated that he felt no desire to be

present in the Chamber when I made this statement.

On that date the junior Senator from Arizona implied that the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was "guilty of crass dishonesty" by the "issuance of deliberately false and misleading information."

Those are quotations from what the Senator said. I quote further:

> Either the Disarmament Agency is guilty of crass dishonesty in its dealings with the press or the reporters who wrote the stories about the Disarmament Agency's denial are guilty of completely misunderstanding what the agency was talking about.

Again, he said:

> But I do not doubt that the issuance of deliberately false and misleading information, and then blaming the conclusions stemming from that information on reporters—may be the newest brand of news management.

While the Senator did not make a flat accusation of dishonesty, it is quite clear that some irony can be drawn from the fact that the Associated Press story as to what the Senator had said, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald the next morning, was under the headline "Untruth Laid to Arms Unit by Goldwater."

The first paragraph of the news story stated:

> Senator Barry Goldwater, Republican, of Arizona, yesterday accused the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency of putting out deliberately false information about a proposal for a joint United States-Russian burning of bombers.

This was not exactly accurate either but I am sure the Senator from Arizona would vehemently deny a charge of news management.

This altercation arose when the Senator posed the following question at a recent speech:

> Is it true that there are plans in the making to give up 30 of our B-47 bombers along with 30 Russian Badgers—that there would then be a gigantic bonfire in which all of these weapons would be destroyed for the benefit of mankind?

Two days later the press reported:

> United States disarmament officials deny that any plan has been shaped for reciprocal burning of bombers by the United States and the Soviet Union.

This was the first paragraph of a story headlined "Administration Denies Bomber-Burning Plan." The story went on to quote an Agency spokesman as saying the Senator may have confused this with a proposal calling for mutual destruction of 30 percent of all basic weapons as outlined in a treaty outline on general disarmament which the United States presented in Geneva last summer. The following two paragraphs concluded the story:

> The spokesman said that in view of the failure of this broad proposal, there has been some internal discussion within the Government of less ambitious programs as first steps toward a general program which seems many years away. But, he said, none of these proposals has even been agreed upon internally, let alone offered to the Russians. He noted that destruction of 30 B-47's and 30 Badgers—both obsolescent bombers—would be no more than a token gesture, in any event since there are many hundreds of each type in service.

This story, which appeared in the papers on Monday, March 11, was based on telephone conversations between reporters and the Agency spokesman.

These conversations took place on Sunday, March 10. On Monday morning, March 11, the Agency representative who spoke to the press the day before, felt after reading the morning papers that his earlier comments to news correspondents evidently had not been clearly understood. To clarify any misunderstanding, the Agency at noon that day released the following statement through the State Department:

> The U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has over the past months engaged in several internal studies, in cooperation with other pertinent agencies, to consider the feasibility of proposing separate limited disarmament measures which might develop the first steps towards disarmament consistent with national security. These various studies are still taking place. The appropriate agencies, including the Department of Defense, are participating in these studies. None, other than the measure to reduce the risks of war, has been presented to the Geneva Disarmament Conference.
>
> The possibility of a simultaneous reduction of B-47's and Russian Badgers is one such study taking place within the U.S. Government. No such proposal, however, has been discussed with the Soviet Union or presented at the Geneva Disarmament Conference.
>
> Any such proposals receiving Presidential approval would first be discussed with the appropriate Members of Congress before submission at Geneva.

The same day, Secretary Rusk, when questioned about the news reports in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, explained the apparent misunderstanding and commented on the study. Yet, the Senator from Arizona, as what I suggest is a part of a determined effort to discredit the Agency, implied it was guilty of crass dishonesty in denying his assertion that such a mutual plane burning proposal was under consideration and not correcting this alleged "denial" even after Secretary Rusk had explained it. This was simply not the case, and I submit that the Senator's charge was inaccurate and unwarranted.

Mr. President, what does all this come down to? I suggest four points.

The first is that the Disarmament Agency did not deny the existence of a plan for reciprocal destruction of obsolete bombers. Anyone who took the trouble to acquaint himself with the facts could come to no other conclusion. When first asked, Agency officials stated that the plan had not been put in final shape; that it had not been "shaped." The following day, they made it clear that the plan was under consideration as a part of a broader package proposal, although no decision had been reached to propose it to the Soviets.

Why should the Disarmament Agency undertake to deny that such a proposal was under consideration when, in fact, it had been discussed with Members of the Senate, including Members of the Foreign Relations Committee? It is utterly incredible that such a denial would be made. In fact, it was not made. All that was said was that the proposal had not been "shaped" to the point where it had either been agreed upon or submitted to the Russians.

My second point is that it is a disservice to the cause of peace to imply that honorable men patriotically and intelligently serving their country are either guilty of crass dishonesty or are being misunderstood by reporters. Neither charge is true. The first suggestion is inaccurate; the second is just plain wrong.

It has been my privilege to be associated quite closely with the distinguished men who head our Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Mr. William Foster, Director of the Agency, has had a long career in public service. He has done yeoman work in the field of disarmament. He is a man of complete integrity, who deserves the confidence of the Congress and the country. Frankly, I resent it when Members of this body cast aspersions on either his patriotism or integrity, or that of his fine associates, Mr. Adrian Fisher, Dr. Long, of Cornell University, and Mr. George Bunn, General Counsel of the Agency. These men should be supported by Congress, and not torn to pieces on unfair charges that they are not representing their country with patriotism and integrity.

My third point is that nobody in the Agency ever said the plan to burn obsolete bombers was not under consideration. Such a charge is at complete variance from the facts.

Aside from the question of who told the truth, and it is clear to me that the Agency told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth—I pose these questions:

What public purpose is served by questioning the integrity of able, conscientious, honest public service? I say none.

Second, what public purpose is served by ridiculing the efforts of the ACDA to implement the policy of the President of the United States? What is that policy? It is our fixed and determined policy to work unceasingly for total and complete disarmament under enforceable world law—to challenge Russia to a peace race, and not an arms race.

The effort to cast doubt on the able men who are doing their best to carry that policy into effect is, in my judgment, a very real disservice to the cause of peace.

I am confident that the President speaks for the overwhelming majority of the American people when he says we mean to negotiate with the Russians. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis], who said that we cannot trust the Russians, but I say proposals which are in their self-interest and in our own interest, under a treaty which gives adequate inspection and gives arms control, can constitute a small step toward removing the heavy burden of arms, and we can thereby make some effort to remove the threat of nuclear terror under which we now live; and we can make a step toward having the kind of world in which our children and grandchildren can grow up in reasonable safety and with some assurance that they will live out their lifespan. I hope that in the future these enlightened and patriotic public servants will receive more support and less criticism in their efforts to do something to advance the cause of humanity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the Senator from Pennsylvania for his remarks. I knew of his speech. I have been listening to the final part of his address in support of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and in particular the Director of that Agency and his staff. The Senator has spoken my sentiments. I assure him that the Senator's words of encouragement mean a great deal to those who are working in the field of arms control and disarmament. I know the Senator's speech will mean a great deal to the Agency Director, the President, and the American people, because the story of what the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency is attempting to do and the proposals being advanced by the President and the officers of this Government at Geneva is a story that is not understood; that, regrettably, is not fully reported; and that, regrettably, is often distorted. The Senator from Pennsylvania has made a real contribution in setting the record straight.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his kind words and comments. I point out that the Senator from Minnesota, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has rendered yeoman service in support of the President's program and in defending the able agents whom the President has appointed, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to follow up on our national policy. I regret that the elaborate and fine speeches the Senator from Minnesota has been making in this regard have received much less attention than what has been said by certain other Members in this body, or by individuals on the outside, who derogate our efforts to obtain a just and lasting peace.

THE WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I generally have supported most farm programs, because I saw no other alternative to some of the serious commodity problems.

I was an enthusiastic supporter of Secretary Freeman's voluntary feed grain program and the 1962 and 1963 wheat programs. They have proved eminently successful in helping to maintain income and reduce surpluses. I was most happy to learn recently that as a result of these programs, we now are saving over $900,000 a day in storage and handling charges on grain we no longer hold.

I supported the 1964 wheat program for the same reasons. It seemed to me a workable and sensible solution to a problem that was becoming increasingly unmanageable.

I am confident that if wheatgrowers study the economic benefits they will receive under this program, they will approve it in the May 21 referendum.

However, should they reject it, the legislation provides that they will have an opportunity next year to consider the same decisions. My vote last year was based on the belief that farmers should have an opportunity to make a choice. I believe this feeling is shared by my colleagues; and, speaking for myself, I see no need to consider new legislation on wheat this year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 21 the wheatgrowers of this country will for the first time have the opportunity to vote for the kind of wheat program they have discussed and worked for and supported for more than 30 years. Many farmers remember the legislative struggles of the 1920's when the McNary-Haugen bill was passed twice by a rural-minded Congress and twice vetoed by President Coolidge.

Again in 1956, Congress approved essentially the same wheat program in the omnibus farm bill which was vetoed by President Eisenhower.

Wheatgrowers achieved a substantial victory when the modernized version of the domestic parity wheat program was included in the Agricultural Act of 1962.

The members of the Senate and House Agriculture Committees voted for it.

The Members of the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives voted for it.

President Kennedy signed it into law.

Now the question goes before the farmers themselves. If two-thirds of the growers vote "yes" in the forthcoming wheat referendum, they will bring into operation a grassroots program, devised by farmers, won by farmers, to be administered by farmers.

In this referendum, farmers will be asked to make the most important economic decision since 1933, when the first Agricultural Adjustment Act was passed. Since the decision is strictly economic—directly affecting the farmer's income—this decision should be made on the basis of fact and not fiction—reason and not fear—information and not ignorance.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I commend the Senator from Minnesota for the statement he is making about the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962. I supported the enactment of that measure even though I come from a largely industrial State, because I liked its approach and the effort to meet the total problems of rural America. I am confident that there is much in the 1962 Farm Act which will benefit my State in the years to come. I hope that in due course the overwhelming majority of farmers of my State will be persuaded that that is the case. They are not at the moment persuaded, but I hope they will be, because it is the truth.

I supported the wheat program because it is a sound approach to a problem that was before the Senate even before I came here. I believe that the 1964 wheat program will provide a fair level of income for wheatgrowers and at the same time reduce unnecessary and costly surpluses, which have caused considerable resentment among my constituents. However, I believe it will be good for Pennsylvania, because it will save money for the taxpayers of Pennsylvania by reducing surpluses, which are costing the taxpayers of the Nation too much money.

I hear reports that if farmers reject the program in the forthcoming wheat referendum, Congress will enact a better wheat program. This I hesitate to believe. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota is better qualified than I to speak on that subject, but it seems to me that, in the first place, a rejection of the program in this referendum does not repeal the 1964 wheat program. It was passed as continuing legislation. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CLARK. It provides that another referendum may be considered again in 1964, and in the years ahead.

In the second place, if wheat farmers turn down the program, I can only interpret this as meaning they do not want a program. I could not support new wheat legislation if the farmer did not want it. If we do not have new wheat legislation, I suspect that the wheat farmers will be a good deal worse off than they are now. Am I correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Unfortunately, there are those who would like to turn this referendum into a political contest, or a test of a farmer's loyalty to a farm organization, or somehow present it as a controversy over civil rights for farmers. There are even those who are saying this is a kind of civil war between the wheat farmers of the North and the wheat farmers of the South—of the East against the West.

All of this is ridiculous.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, coming from the other side of the Delaware, I echo the sentiments expressed by my neighbor and friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

I have in my office some letters from constituents, a couple of farm publications and some pamphlets from various organizations—all claiming that Congress will pass new what legislation in the event the 1964 wheat program is rejected in this year's referendum.

All I can say is that either these people are completely unaware of the prevailing attitude of this Congress toward new farm legislation, or completely naive as to what it takes to get any kind of legislation through Congress.

In the last session, we gave wheatgrowers a good program—the best one I ever have seen since coming to Washington. The program provides for a referendum. The farmers can approve or reject it—that is their business. This is a choice they must make. It is the same choice they have had since 1952.

I hope wheat farmers will vote on the merits of the program and not on some

unlikely possibility that the Congress will pass a new program should the referendum fail.

If wheat farmers vote not to have a good wheat program, I do not intend to vote for a program which would not be as good for the farmer or the taxpayer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. The Senator from New Jersey is one of those who helped us on the basic legislation. I believe it is fair to say that New Jersey is certainly not one of the large wheat-producing States of the Union. Nevertheless, the Senator from New Jersey saw fit to give the wheat farmers of America an opportunity to improve their economic situation. The Senator's vote was deeply appreciated by the farmers of Minnesota and the farmers of the Midwest generally, with whom, I believe, I am rather well acquainted.

I am hopeful the farmers will heed the words of their friends from the eastern seaboard, particularly the words of the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Pennsylvania. The Senator from Pennsylvania also was one of those who supported this important agricultural legislation. They cast votes in the national interest and for the Nation's economic welfare without regard to the welfare of a particular State.

This is the kind of statesmanship the Nation appreciates.

The stakes in the referendum are these: A "yes" vote will result in a high level of income for wheat farmers and the orderly disposal of wheat surpluses. A "no" vote will mean runaway production, exceptionally low prices and more surpluses.

And there is another factor deserving close consideration. If this program is approved, the uncertainty surrounding wheat programs will be over. Growers will know how to plan for years ahead, not just for months ahead.

In the unlikely event that farmers vote against their own best interests in this referendum, "dollar" wheat very well could be the result.

A few years ago, in two separate studies made by economists from the top land-grant colleges in the Nation—one study for the Joint Economic Committee and one for the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—it was found that the price of wheat could go as low as 93 cents a bushel with uncontrolled production.

I think there is no disagreement among the supporters and the opponents of the 1964 wheat program that, if it should be turned down in the referendum, wheat acreage would increase to at least 65 million acres and production would go to 1.5 billion bushels.

Since with uncontrolled production there would be no effective price support and no storage loan program for farmers, the glut of wheat would have no place to go but to the market. Economic chaos would result.

A few weeks ago, North Dakota State University released a study of the effects for North Dakota of a "yes" or "no" vote in this referendum. The study produced some remarkable and disturbing figures.

The university economists found that North Dakota wheatgrowers would conservatively lose $68 million in income in the event a "no" vote carried.

Additionally, the study revealed that if a "no" vote prevailed, wheat farmers in western North Dakota would have to get $1.73 a bushel and increase their acreage 30 percent to end up with the same gross wheat income they would get under the 1964 wheat program. Central North Dakota wheat farmers would have to get $1.80 a bushel and Red River Valley farmers would have to get $1.70 a bushel.

Even the opponents of the program who are urging a "no" vote never have predicted that wheat prices would be higher than $1.40 if the referendum fails. The North Dakota study shows that figure to be too high—even for high-quality spring wheat.

These are convincing and conclusive dollar-and-cents arguments in favor of a "yes" vote. I am convinced that when farmers get the facts, instead of the fiction, they will agree in overwhelming numbers.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. There appears to be a determined effort underway to mislead farmers into believing that the Congress will consider new wheat legislation this year if the May 21 referendum proposal is not carried.

If my recollection is correct, I voted against the proposed farm legislation the year before, but the farm legislation enacted last year was supported by me and other Senators as a practical program leading to a reduction of the costly and unnecessary wheat surpluses.

This program provided the wheat farmer with a choice, which is reasonable and fair. It provided the means, for those who wished to have protection for farm price supports, to agree to accept controls of acreage. Or, if the farmers did not want controls, then they had to accept a withdrawal of support. It provided a means for the farmers to decide one way or the other.

As I have said, this program gave the wheat farmers a choice which is reasonable and fair: either controls with supports, or no support and no controls.

It also provided that, regardless of his decision in the referendum this year, the wheat farmer would have another opportunity next year to vote in another referendum, after seeing the effect of his decision this year.

Therefore, in my view, there is no need for further wheat legislation this year, regardless of the outcome of the referendum.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, expressions such as the Senator from Rhode Island has just made, together with those of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], indicate to me that the arguments which are being made across the land, that if farmers reject the wheat referendum, the thing to do is to come back to Congress and they will get a new program, are without merit.

As a friend of agriculture—and I do not believe anyone can honestly contend that this is not a true friendship—I believe farmers ought to listen very carefully to the words of Senators who have voted with them and have voted for the farm programs to help farmers, but who do not themselves have particularly large farm constituencies. We cannot always expect Senators who come from States such as Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, and other States where there are not large farm populations, to stand up, time after time, and support farm programs, if the farmers themselves are going to reject them.

So I make appeal today to farmers to vote "yes" in the referendum, because I think it is in the Nation's interest and in the farmers' interest. I am convinced, from the statistical and economic studies I have seen thus far, that it is in the interest of the entire free world. It adds strength to our country. It has a way of leveling off production to meet the requirements at home and abroad. The referendum surely will provide relief to the American taxpayer.

There are some who would have farmers believe that if a "no" vote prevails, Congress will pass new wheat legislation. But the wheat legislation passed by Congress last year is long-range, continuing legislation—legislation that provides an alternative program of 50 percent of parity price supports to those farmers who stay within their allotments, should the referendum fail. It also provides that in 1964 farmers again would have the opportunity to vote in referendum for or against the wheat certificate plan. Therefore, I doubt very much that Congress would pass any interim, stop-gap, relief-type program, since the possibility of a "no" vote in the referendum already has been dealt with.

Regardless of my personal views, or what I am personally seeking to do as a Senator from the Midwest, I think I owe it to my friends in agriculture to tell them that we had a hard fight last year, a close battle to get the farm legislation we now have. If we have to go through another battle, with Members of Congress seeing a good program defeated in referendum, I doubt whether there will be any progress at all or any action by Congress.

It seems to me the prevailing attitude of Congress is if wheat farmers reject the 1964 wheat program it is because they prefer the alternative in the law. An increasing number of nonfarm Congressmen and Senators are weary—even exasperated—with the problem of wheat surpluses. The political facts are that farmers must get city support for farm legislation if it is to be enacted—and the prospect for any new action on wheat is unlikely at this time.

We are exceedingly grateful to Senators who come from predominantly urban States for their willingness to support the farm program. I think it was a good illustration of statesmanship and unselfish concern for the farmers of the

Nation, and indeed a wise decision on the part of Senators and Representatives.

Every Member of Congress, every farm organization, every person and organization interested in and dependent upon the prosperity of farmers, should cooperate in seeing that farmers get the facts and all the information necessary to make a wise decision in this referendum.

I support the referendum. I urge farmers to vote "yes." I am happy to say that most midwestern Senators, regardless of party, have made such a declaration. Senators from North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota have urged, regardless of our differences politically, that farmers vote "yes" in the wheat referendum. We believe it is the wisest and most prudent vote, a vote which will help the farmer, the community, and, indeed, the entire Nation.

I am convinced that if the farmers can get the facts, such as the University of North Dakota has recently made available, on an objective, nonpartisan basis, the wheat farmers will approve the 1964 wheat program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a letter from President Kennedy to Mr. M. W. Thatcher, chairman of the National Wheat Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. Thatcher also is general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association in St. Paul, Minn., and president of the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, which is holding its annual convention in Washington, D.C., this week.

The President, in his letter, reiterates what he has said on previous occasions, that no new wheat legislation was intended or is needed this year. I join with the President in commending Mr. Thatcher and the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives on their work in presenting to rural America the most complete and accurate information available in connection with the forthcoming wheat referendum.

The National Wheat Committee consists of leaders of several farm organizations and of wheat producers of America. The committee, without partisanship, since it is comprised of Democrats and Republicans, is attempting to bring the facts concerning the wheat referendum to the American farmer. It is doing this of its own accord, at its own expense, in the interest of the Nation and in the interest of the wheat producer as well.

I hope this measure of concern over the plight of agriculture and the opportunities which farmers now have in terms of the wheat referendum will command the attention of American farmers.

EXHIBIT 1

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1963.

Mr. M. W. THATCHER,
President, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR MR. THATCHER: You and the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives are to be commended on the leadership you have taken, not only with regard to cooperative marketing of grain, but on other public issues affecting farm families. Your leadership in establishing the National Wheat Committee to inform farmers about the 1964 wheat referendum is the most recent example of your concern, and that of your federation, with larger matters of public policy.

In this referendum, farmers will decide on the wheat program for 1964. The decision they make will determine the price they receive for their crop next year.

This is a straight economic issue. It was presented to the Congress as an economic issue of importance to the farmer, consumer, and taxpayer, and the Congress acted upon it as such. It is a continuing program, and, whatever the result of this referendum, another referendum will be held next year for the 1965 crop.

There has been some speculation recently that the Congress might consider new wheat legislation this year if the referendum should not be approved. Had the Congress intended new legislation to be considered as an alternative to wheat marketing quotas, I believe it would have so provided. Instead, Congress provided a stopgap program of 50 percent of parity ($1.25 a bushel wheat) for those who elect to observe allotments if the referendum should fail in 1963. It also provided an opportunity for the wheat farmer to vote again in 1964 after he had a chance to see what happened under the stopgap program. It is clear, then, that no new wheat legislation was intended or is needed this year.

The stakes in the referendum on May 21 are the incomes of thousands of farm families in 1964. The Department of Agriculture estimates that total income from wheat production in the United States in 1964 will be some $700 million more with a "yes" vote than with a "no" vote. A recent report from North Dakota State University shows that net farm income in that State would be reduced by $68 million if the wheat program is not approved by farmers. Typical wheat farms in North Dakota would have their income cut in half.

The prosperity and well-being of many Midwest and Northwest communities depend, therefore, upon the extent to which farmers are informed on the issues in the coming wheat referendum. Farm equipment manufacturers, sellers of farm supplies, and businessmen up and down the main streets of every rural town have a stake in a favorable vote on the wheat program.

I believe the work you and the federation are doing to make sure that the wheat farmer understands the economic issues involved will contribute to the trend of progress now underway in agriculture.

Best wishes for a successful convention.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

REPORT TO FARMERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a news letter which I circulated among farmers in Minnesota. It pertains to the President's farm message to Congress and the efforts made by this administration to improve the agricultural economy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS RECEIVES FARM MESSAGE

President Kennedy's farm message to the Congress this year contains good news for rural America. It was an honor to be asked by the President to work on this message, and share with Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and the White House some of the views I have held on agricultural policy for many years. Here is what the President had to say:

"Net farm income for all of 1962 was $1.2 billion a year more than it was in 1960. Gross farm income is $2.7 billion higher.

"Average net income per farm has risen 18 percent, from $2,961 to $3,500, the highest level in our history.

"The increase in farm income has generated added business for rural industries and farm communities, putting millions of dollars into Main Street cash registers and adding at least 200,000 jobs to the national economy.

"At the same time, Government stockpiles of surplus grain have been reduced by 929 million bushels from their 1961 peak.

"And finally, over this same 2-year period, the proportion of consumer income required to purchase food has declined to the lowest ratio in history—19 percent of take-home pay."

FEED GRAINS

The President called for new feed grains legislation which will take advantage of the experience gained under the 1961, 1962, and 1963 programs. He said it should be a voluntary program, be flexible enough to meet varying conditions and needs, and be based upon the same basic principles which have proven successful in the last 2 years.

The 1961 and 1962 feed grains programs were successful. The 1963 program, which contains the new feature of a direct payment to cooperators, is an improvement. I suggested this revision for the 1963 crop year, and it is this type of program—a permanent, voluntary, direct payment program—that I will propose and support for the 1964 and subsequent crop years.

DAIRY PRODUCTS

The American dairy industry, from producer to distributor, received well deserved commendation from President Kennedy in his farm message. The Chief Executive pointed out that any American family can depend upon the availability of pure, nutritious milk and dairy products anywhere in the United States. "This accomplishment is the product of hard work, skill and know-how and heavy capital investment," the President said.

President Kennedy stressed, however, the urgent need for new dairy legislation, emphasizing there is little prospect for any improvement in dairy farmers' income or substantial reduction in Government cost unless a new program is passed.

I am pleased that the President accepted my recommendation and asked Congress to apply the successful principles of voluntary supply management to the dairy industry. He called for a program under which cooperating producers would receive price supports through market prices and direct payments.

I will, during this session of Congress, work for passage of a dairy program designed to improve farm income, to reduce the surplus, and make greater use of our dairy products at home and abroad.

WHEAT

President Kennedy called for "an affirmative vote in the forthcoming wheat referendum, to be held under the permanent legislation enacted by the Congress last year. Failure to approve the wheat program," the President said, "will leave the wheat farmer without either supply management or effective price supports * * *. New legislation for wheat is neither necessary nor feasible this year."

In a Senate speech this year I called upon the producers of wheat to cast an affirmative vote in the wheat referendum, stating that approval is in the farmers' interest and in the national interest. The permanent wheat program—the so-called wheat certificate plan—passed by the Congress last year, is

a good wheat program. Under it, the national marketing quota will be about 1.2 billion bushels, and the national acreage allotment will be between 49 and 50 million acres. Most individual farm allotments for the 1964 crop will be the same as allotments for the 1962 crop and each farmer will know his farm allotment before the referendum. It may be identical to the allotment he had in 1962.

Price support for wheat will be about $2 a bushel and will apply to about 925 million bushels, 86 percent of the expected crop of 1,070 million bushels. Price support for the remainder of the crop will be about $1.30 a bushel. Advance diversion payments will be made at the time of signup. It is anticipated that production of special crops, such as safflower, sunflower, and castor beans will be authorized on diverted acreage. Wheat production on feed grain acreage will be authorized if there is a feed grain program in effect for 1964.

The total value of wheat production under the 1964 program will be at the high 1961–62 levels—overall more than $2.3 billion. Relative to other sectors of agriculture, wheat farmers will continue to have a very favorable income. If the referendum is defeated, gross income from wheat will be $700 million less than with a favorable vote, despite a wheat harvest of 65 million acres. This would shatter any hopes for prosperity in nearly every county seat town in 10 or 15 major wheat States, including Minnesota. The economy of the entire Corn Belt, and ultimately the great livestock producing States, is linked to the outcome of the wheat referendum.

SUGAR

Hard work, patience, and persistence have paid off with my announcement that a new sugarbeet processing factory will begin operations in the Red River Valley in 1965. The $18 million plant will be built by the American Crystal Sugar Co. in Drayton, N. Dak., and will process sugarbeets grown on an initial 12,000 acres in Kittson and Marshall Counties. I spent countless hours last year in talks with representatives of our Government and of the sugar industry in an effort to get a meeting of the minds on a new sugar bill. The success of these negotiations resulted in the Sugar Act of 1962, which provides a greater share of the domestic market to our own sugar producers, including those in northwest Minnesota.

FOOD FOR PEACE

Richard W. Reuter, who replaced South Dakota Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN as director of the food-for-peace program, submitted an encouraging report recently on the program and outlook for 1963.

Mr. Reuter said under food-for-peace emergency feeding activities, U.S. food currently is reaching an average of 92 million people a day in more than 100 countries throughout the world, an increase of 9 million compared with a year ago. He also declared:

"Sales of foodstuffs and other agricultural commodities for foreign currencies under the program were 50 percent greater in the last 6 months of 1962 than in the previous 6-month period—having totaled 15.6 million metric tons to 19 nations for the foreign currency equivalent of $886 million; and

Six agreements were signed for the sale of agricultural commodities for dollars payable over a span of years, the total of $51.9 million, including ocean transportation costs, representing a 15-percent increase over the previous 6 months.

I introduced the concept of food for peace 5 years ago at a time the negative attitude of "surplus disposal" was causing ill will among people of our own country and our neighbors abroad. Through food for peace this negative attitude has been replaced with the positive approach of using our abundance of food and fiber to aid those less fortunate then ourselves.

The food donations, Mr. Reuter said in his report, "are bringing new life and hope" to needy people throughout the world while the sales programs "are proving to be a unique weapon for waging war upon economic backwardness, and also help for developing future commercial markets for U.S. agricultural commodities."

RURAL AREA DEVELOPMENT

Here are the highlights of President Kennedy's recommendations:

Rural housing loans put on an insured basis in order to increase volume and reduce demands on the Federal budget. Loans to farmers and rural residents for high school, vocational and higher education. Expand the permissible size of small watershed projects.

Provisions to keep conservation reserve land from reverting to crops when contracts expire. Lift the $10 million limit in the 1962 farm bill on the pilot land adjustment program.

The Department of Agriculture, in addition to the President's recommendations, is considering its own requests:

More loan authority for rural facilities such as access roads, community halls, and swimming pools.

Increase the ceiling on volume of insured farm ownership loans from the present $200 million to $250 million. My bill last year raised the limit from $150 million to $200 million.

A commission on rural life similar to Theodore Roosevelt's of more than 50 years ago.

FOOD STAMP PLAN

In view of the widespread and enthusiastic acceptance, and the beneficial results of my food stamp program, President Kennedy has recommended that enabling legislation be enacted to permit its progressive expansion into all areas of the Nation where conditions warrant its establishment. Under this program, food stamps are issued to the needy and used by them for purchases at the local stores. It currently is in effect in three Minnesota counties—St. Louis, Itasca, and Carlton. My mail indicates strong support for this program and a desire on the part of many county officials for its expansion to their areas.

FARMERS' WEEK

I will introduce a bill in the Senate this year to set aside the first week in spring each year as Farmers' Week. Such a week would serve to call attention to the American people the farmers' contribution to the strength and resources of our country. It is entirely appropriate that the farmers of America should be singled out, as are our other working men and women, for their highly successful efforts in making this Nation the best fed on earth at the lowest cost.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

In a recent Senate speech I asked that the Farmers Home Administration be given an additional $50 million for operating loans for the remainder of this fiscal year. There is an urgent need for these funds to be appropriated in order to help farmers buy equipment, livestock, feed, and fertilizer this spring. I will continue to urge that the FHA be given sufficient funds to adequately meet the credit needs of our deserving farm families.

FOOD RESERVES

I will introduce legislation this year which will set up a commission responsible to the President, and reporting through him to the Congress, to study the entire subject of necessary reserves of food. This is a matter of the greatest national and international importance. Such a commission could greatly assist the Congress in establishing legislative guidelines to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Department of Defense, to the Department of State, and to the National Security Agency on the need, management and location of supplies in the national interest and in the interest of the free people of all nations.

EXPORTS AND THE COMMON MARKET

Exports of farm commodities reached a record $5.1 billion in fiscal year 1962. Dollar markets abroad for the products of our farms have been expanded to a total of $3.5 billion, and thus constitute a significant factor in our balance of payments.

In his farm message, President Kennedy paid tribute to the American farmer as "one of our best foreign exchange earners." "It is our firm policy," the President said, "to maintain and expand these exports." After pointing out that we have a special problem of maintaining access to the European Common Market for some of our important agricultural commodities, the President added this significant statement:

"This Government intends to take every step necessary to protect the full rights due American agricultural exports. We have impressed on our trading partners the vital necessity of a fair agreement as an essential first part of the broad scale negotiations to be undertaken under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962."

We will be hearing a lot about the Common Market in the days to come. The strong words of the President, the outstanding battle being waged by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman on behalf of rural America, and the concern of the Congress in maintaining and increasing agricultural exports, provide a ray of hope for the future of American agricultural products in international trade.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

CURTAILMENT OF USE OF VITAMIN K_3

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement relative to the removal from the market of a highly questionable ingredient which had been used in certain multivitamin capsules. The removal was accomplished only last week. The Food and Drug Administration has prepared an order to rescind the temporary extension of a food additive petition on vitamin K_3.

I mention this subject because as chairman of a subcommittee, I have been holding hearings on matters relating to the Food and Drug Administration, particularly those relating to certain drugs which may not have been sufficiently tested and scrutinized as required under Food and Drug regulations. So I submit a release I issued March 28, following our hearings on the questionable vitamin K_3.

The Food and Drug Administration still has a long way to go in achieving greater scientific and administrative excellence in connection with its programs; but I am happy to report it is making progress. From time to time I have reported to the Senate on the proposed National Drug Information Clearinghouse to conduct interagency studies on drug research and regulation. I shall continue to do so in the days ahead. I also will continue to submit brief progress reports on the protection of the public health, on our efforts to secure safe and efficacious drugs and on the efforts we in the subcommittee have been making to improve the administrative structure of the Food and Drug Administration.

Today, I merely wish to say that there is improvement, and that we have reasons to feel encouraged.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HUMPHREY PREDICTS "CONSUMER VICTORY" ON "QUESTIONABLE" VITAMIN IMPLICATED IN INJURY OF NEWBORN

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, predicted "consumer victory shortly" over a "questionable" ingredient which appears in certain multivitamin capsules, given to pregnant women.

The Food and Drug Administration, he said, is reportedly preparing an order to rescind temporary extension of a food additive petition on vitamin K_3.

Last week, a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee, of which HUMPHREY is chairman, heard testimony, implicating this particular vitamin in possible damage to the newborn.

HUMPHREY stated that he will present "additional strong evidence" on dangers of the drug in a Senate speech on Friday.

Dr. John O. Nestor, a pediatrician employed by FDA, had charged that use of the vitamin in prenatal supplements may result in some instances in "brain damage, spasticity, and death" to the newborn.

Nestor stated that the drug, Menadione, appears on the market in 50 to 70 products, many of which can be purchased without a prescription. He contended that nonmedical officials in FDA's Division of Nutrition and Pharmacology had overruled the Agency's Bureau of Medicine on use of the drug. The non-M.D.'s, he asserted, "overlook that a pregnant woman carries a fetus and that babies are sometimes born with jaundice."

HUMPHREY stated that the vitamin K_3 case now appears "even more incredible than it did at the outset."

"It was, first, curious that nonmedical officers in FDA chose to fight so long and so tenaciously, despite thick folders full of medical evidence from nongovernmental sources pointing to dangers of vitamin K_3."

He continued, "many of these nonmedical officers in FDA are outstanding scientists in other fields, and their acting in the best of faith has never been and is not questioned."

"But now," said HUMPHREY, "we learn that, in the same Federal Department, the National Institutes of Health (which know more about prenatal injury than any other source) had also publicly expressed concern over vitamin K_3."

The subcommittee "has just learned," he said, "that 2½ months before Dr. Nestor testified, the National Institute for Neurological Diseases and Blindness had included in an 84-page report a brief but solid criticism of the practice of giving high doses of vitamin K_3 to pregnant women."

This Neurological Institute comment, HUMPHREY added, "offers another illustration of the soundness of the subcommittee in insisting upon closer, prompter and more continuing cooperation between the Food and Drug Administration, the National Institutes of Health, and other Federal agencies."

FDA, he said, may now attempt to pass off prospective elimination of vitamin K_3 as an allegedly routine action. "The fact is," he continued, "that it has taken a behind-the-scenes battle of more than a year and a public airing of the situation to get FDA to act decisively."

HUMPHREY said that he had further confirmed that another drug, Mylicon, which Dr. Nestor had forced from the market as a pediatric drug, is still unfortunately being sold for infant use.

The company, making the product, had admittedly marketed it without applying through standard new drug application procedure. The company had contended that the product was "physiologically inert" and was generally regarded as safe. Following Dr. Nestor's complaint with regard to use by infants, the company had agreed to remove the drug's specific claim for use for infant colic. The company stated publicly, moreover, that it ceased to promote the product for infants.

HUMPHREY, however, announced that after public testimony, Dr. Nestor, in purchasing Mylicon at a nearby drugstore, found that the product was only available, in that instance, in the very form in which it is likeliest to be used for infants; namely, as drops. In addition, said HUMPHREY, an upstate New York mother wrote him that, as recently as 2 weeks ago, her doctor prescribed the drug for her 5-month-old baby. We were shocked and heartsick, the mother wrote, when she heard of Dr. Nestor's statement that the drug's safety for babies had not been proved and deeply grateful for the subcommittee's inquiry.

HUMPHREY concluded on Mylicon, "the net effect of all FDA's and the company's actions is that a drug, not specifically cleared as to safety for babies, is still used for babies, because there is no specific word of caution against such use, and, indeed, because there is ambiguous wording which might contribute to such use."

In other developments, HUMPHREY stated:

(a) He is informing the Food and Drug Administration that the subcommittee will expect "as soon as feasible its detailed written reactions" to criticisms offered in last week's hearings.

(b) The Senate subcommittee will schedule future hearings only after its staff has examined FDA files on drugs criticized by Dr. Nestor, as well as "on certain other cases" and subcommittee members have received the facts.

HUMPHREY commended the interest of Dr. Luther Terry, Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, in a proposed National Drug Information Clearinghouse.

The Minnesota Senator praised the "dedicated activity" of Terry's Assistant for Science Information, Dr. F. Ellis Kelsey. He is the husband of Dr. Frances Kelsey who prevented the commercial marketing of thalidomide in the United States.

"A Drug Clearinghouse," HUMPHREY concluded, "could help increase the use of the vast number of safe, efficacious drugs; it could help minimize the use of whatever drugs are not safe and/or efficacious.

"The Clearinghouse could help further raise the high and well-justified confidence of the American people in the healing arts, including pharmaceutical science."

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow, at 11 o'clock a.m., in accordance with the order previously entered.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 2, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 1, 1963:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George C. McGhee, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany.

STATE DEPARTMENT

Roger Hilsman, Jr., of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 1, 1963:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Fred Gates, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Floyd H. Erickson, Ahwahnee.
E. Vernon Putnam, Arbuckle.
Joy L. Fansler, Big Pine.
Carl W. Fischer, Jr., Camarillo.
Laura B. Morgan, Clayton.
Clayton F. Malling, El Cerrito.
Alice O. Mills, Finley.
Joe R. Edde, Five Points.
Nathaniel R. Evans, Fortuna.
Robert M. Lee, Freedom.
Frances M. Reed, Glen Ellen.
Ralph E. Lozano, Greenville.
Jack J. Snyder, Harbor City.
Louis L. Brunnemer, Los Molinos.
John F. Bushell, Oakland.
Nancy C. Avery, Pacoima.
Edgar L. King, Stratford.
Lee B. Downs, Whittier.

DELAWARE

Thomas Holcomb, New Castle.

FLORIDA

Myria M. Bishop, Archer.
Ross C. Marler, Destin.
Ruth A. Childers, Florahome.
J. Donald Carter, Fort Myers Beach.
Daniel D. Clements, Land O'Lakes.
William C. Hurston, Laurel Hill.
A. Edward Hoyt, Port Richey.

ILLINOIS

James C. Hobbs, Abingdon.
Eugene J. Tafel, Algonquin.
Charles E. Resch, Anna.
Peter W. Bast, Ashland.
Lola M. Baumunk, Bardolph.
Clemit T. Peifer, Beecher City.
Marvin H. Stewart, Brighton.
Orville E. Van Brocklin, Caledonia.
Lee Bush, Cambria.
Maynard R. Koltz, Capron.
Joseph F. Alfeld, Carrollton.
Marvin C. McCulley, Chatham.
James T. Bobbit, Dalton City.
Mabel J. Atkins, Dawson.
Joel F. Parker, Divernon.
Verna H. Welsh, Durand.
Arthur L. Lawrence, East Alton.
Richard C. Hazer, Elizabeth.
Robert A. Smith, Elvaston.
Clifford L. Lehman, Eureka.
William H. Haycraft, Franklin.
George C. Cavanaugh, Gillespie.
Charles J. Nash, Greenville.
Edythe A. Grover, Hamburg.
Russell W. Martin, Hanover.
Paul D. Jordan, Herscher.
L. Dale Wingo, Kenney.
Carl H. Vaughn, Kinderhook.
Dona J. Beard, Leaf River.
Richard J. Thilmony, Loda.
Donald W. Ferris, Marshall.
Haven W. Hammond, Martinsville.
Leroy M. Smith, McHenry.
Ora K. Reid, Media.
Betty J. Jones, Mound City.
John R. Ryan, Mundelein.
Morris A. Mettendorf, Neoga.
Anton Macrowski, Jr., North Chicago.
C. Kenneth Sizemore, Paris.
Vincent E. Stephenson, Pittsfield.
Norbert W. Haberer, Pocahontas.
Leo A. Hayes, Ramsey.
Henry W. Roehrkasse, Red Bud.
Charles F. Schultz, Reynolds.

Owen A. Reimer, Roscoe.
Curtis J. German, Rossville.
Leonard M. Koeberlein, St. Elmo.
Wendell L. Smith, Sandwich.
G. Kenneth Furrer, San Jose.
W. Rex Butler, Saybrook.
G. Clark Ewing, Sheldon.
Ralph F. Bennett, Sidell.
William J. Murphy, Stockton.
Kenneth B. Lorenson, Sullivan.
Gerald A. Melvin, Tamaroa.
Cornelius L. DiPlotti, Taylorville.
Edwin B. Wirth, Techny.
William E. Morgan, Tennessee.
Dorothy E. Anderson, Thomasboro.
Donovan O. Hutchins, Viola.
John R. Graves, Virginia.
Warden D. White, Wayne City.
Eldon R. Bristow, Waynesville.
Thomas A. Wood, Wheaton.
James T. Shinnebarger, Williamsville.
Harold G. Minor, Windsor.
Ruth P. Spraggins, Yale.

KANSAS

Henry L. Smith, Abilene.
Donald I. Beamgard, Atwood.
Joseph B. Nick, Basehor.
Virgil W. McCune, Benton.
Francis R. Gorman, Chapman.
Fred A. Riggs, Cottonwood Falls.
Myrl H. Kliesen, Dodge City.
Harold D. Brown, Eureka.
Herbert P. Franz, Goessel.
Donald E. Plank, Iuka.
Burgess L. Stephenson, Leoti.
Robert W. Foster, Sterling.
Daryl M. Ford, Valley Falls.

LOUISIANA

Rhea L. McIlveene, Cotton Valley.
Nelson J. Falcon, Duson.
Rowland C. Regan, Egan.
Lloyd E. Chachere, Eunice.
Phillip A. Hanks, Greensburg.
William E. Scott, Lake Providence.
Chester L. Guidry, Morse.
Cecile B. Cheramie, Paradis.
Frances B. Farmer, Princeton.
Marvin E. Schauf, St. Joseph.

MICHIGAN

Florence W. Letvennow, Atlantic Mine.
Stennette E. Walsworth, Augusta.
Robert E. Mohr, Clinton.
James M. Mahoney, Decatur.
William H. Schwartz, Flint.
Allen J. Dahl, Iron River.
John W. Kelly, Manistique.
Leslie C. Willer, Marion.
Leo E. Osterberg, Pleasant Lake.
John H. Brule, Watervliet.

MINNESOTA

Marvin G. Loeck, Balaton.
M. Wallace Post, Cottonwood.
William J. Pattinson, Currie.
Charles G. Lenz, Ellsworth.
Audrey A. Johnson, Esko.
Earl W. Dressen, Green Isle.
Virgil R. Buffington, Kenyon.
Walter A. Dietz, Mapleton.
Fred M. Colwell, Morton.
Eugenie A. Wollum, Porter.
Harold A. Legatt, Rice.
Loren L. Marsden, St. James.
Chester L. Stimpert, Sleepy Eye.
Gordon W. Friesen, Solway.
Bertrand H. Strandlund, Stacy.
Dellin F. Segar, Wells.

MISSOURI

Albert D. Teter, Callao.
Griffith E. Benson, Chillicothe.
Lewis D. Baldwin, Collins.
Charles A. Reed, Concordia.
Johnnie Moyer, Jr., Corder.
John W. Volker, Craig.
Kenneth W. Alexander, Greentop.
Walter E. Bamman, Jacksonville.
George E. Bennett, Purdy.
Herbert L. Coggin, Republic.
William B. Bales, St. Peters.
Clyde E. Maxwell, Thompson.
Barclay T. Cortelyou, Troy.
James M. Crighton, Willard.

NEVADA

Maxine A. Anderson, Verdi.

NORTH CAROLINA

J. Preston Andrews, Jr., Bahama.
L. Hubert Collins, Brunswick.
Patricia S. Fipps, Clarendon.
Josephine D. Riggs, Cove City.
George B. Herndon, Fayetteville.
Henderson W. Haire, Garner.
Edward K. Leggett, Hobgood.
Helen H. Huggins, Laurel Hill.
Louis E. Bottiglier, Lillington.
Giles F. Bryson, Marble.

NORTH DAKOTA

Robert E. Fischer, Hague.
William L. Arenstein, Washburn.

OHIO

Kathryn E. Peters, Arcadia.
Louise E. Hoover, Bascom.
Herbert G. Wright, Grand Rapids.
Kenneth W. Gerber, Kidron.
Frances M. Adams, Ludlow Falls.
Mabel M. Bendetta, Malvern.
Russell E. Yackee, Martin.
Paul L. Casci, Middleport.
John W. Sharick, Nankin.
Emmet F. Millard, Oregonia.
Ruth E. Kenny, Paris.
Josephine E. Pittenger, Pavonia.
Wesley D. Wickline, Rio Grande.
Billy H. Ten Eyck, Vanburen.
Harold A. Schonhardt, Venice.
Kenneth H. Haynes, Whitehouse.

OREGON

Ned Palmer, Dayton.
Vernon E. Stewart, Haines.
Orval R. Layton, Lakeview.
Joseph L. Dall, Nyssa.
Eva L. Albert, Trail.
Bernice M. Ladd, Tualatin.
Laura A. Wassenmiller, Tygh Valley.

PUERTO RICO

Sixto G. Mercado, Isabela.

SOUTH CAROLINA

J. Lawton Harper, Estill.
Ralph E. Edenfield, North Augusta.
William D. Russell, Ware Shoals.

SOUTH DAKOTA

William C. Feather, Marty.
Wanda M. Humiston, Oelrichs.
Virgil C. Guderian, Waubay.

TENNESSEE

Robert E. Harris, Kingston Springs.
Roscoe M. Hill, Luttrell.
William A. Roberts, Newport.
James H. Armstrong, Rogersville.
Gladys I. Price, St. Bethlehem.
John E. Griffith, South Pittsburg.

TEXAS

Thomas H. Journeay, Angleton.
Marjorie W. Duncan, Bedias.
Thava H. Brown, Canutillo.
Oscar R. Hawkins, Crawford.
A. Earl Beck, Dumas.
James J. Kaster, El Paso.
Anna L. Franklin, Fort Hancock.
Clarence E. Garrett, Pittsburg.
Mary L. Rutherford, Putnam.
Elmo W. Ullrich, Randolph Air Force Base.
Milton H. Elliott, Shallowater.
Bertha L. Delz, Texon.

UTAH

Harry J. Bigelow, Kamas.

VIRGINIA

Alfred P. Tirelis, Alberta.
Robert J. Sturgis, Belle Haven.
Doran W. Fary, Deltaville.
Annie D. Berry, Madison.
Hume P. Doyle, McKenney.
John G. Mizell, Richmond.
Charles M. Mastin, Spotsylvania.

WEST VIRGINIA

Maynard W. Weaver, Arthurdale.
Robert F. Wilson, Decota.
Kenneth L. Taylor, Hopemont.
Fletcher E. Andrews, Proctor.
Clyde E. McClung, Reedy.
Dennis P. Stanley, Superior.
Ross White, Weston.
Benjamin F. Lowe, Jr., Yolyn.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

West Virginia Is Proud of Goodyear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, as you drive along Route 2, the Ohio River Road, midway between Huntington and Point Pleasant, W. Va., you reach one of the most modern industrial facilities in the entire region, the $12 million plant of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

There are great industrial opportunities in the booming Ohio River valley, and few concerns have taken better advantage of these opportunities than Goodyear. Half a dozen years ago, the electric news streaked through West Virginia that Goodyear planned to construct a new plant at Apple Grove, devoted to some strange new products which seemed a far cry from the automobile tires which our fathers always associated with Goodyear.

ACCIDENTAL DISCOVERY

Actually, the Goodyear chemists 20 years ago were bent over their test tubes and microscopes in a restless laboratory search for a fiber which would make an improved cord for tires. When the chemists came up with their answers, they came close to being fired because they produced fibers which were useless for making tire cord. Fortunately, the moguls of Goodyear told them: "Go on back to your test tubes and see what you have produced." Out of this polyester research came a new polyester resin. The researchers never dreamed they would be producing something which might revolutionize the textile industry and the building industry.

The magic new products were Vitel, a resin from which manmade, synthetic fibers are spun; and Videne, a laminating film with tough, resistant qualities.

The Appalachian Electric Power Co., which has done so much aggressive work for West Virginia industrial development, negotiated the sale of a 300-acre tract along the Ohio River so that Goodyear could have the elbow room to manufacture these new products. It scarcely seems possible that less than 5 years ago, on May 15 1958, ground was broken at Apple Grove, W. Va., for the new Goodyear plant. As a bulldozer took a tentative bite from the rich soil to symbolize the groundbreaking, national, State, local and industrial leaders were there to point to the significance of the great event. They were mighty men, men of vision, some of whom have moved upward to greater responsibilities, some whom God has called to eternal duties. There was George E. Hervey, district manager of the Appalachian Power Co., whose magnificent achievements in the Point Pleasant region are too numerous to mention. Mr. Hervey leaves today for an even more challenging assignment in flood-torn Logan, W. Va. There was the late U.S. Senator John D. Hoblitzell, Jr., a tireless, dedicated worker for greater industrial development in West Virginia. Point Pleasant was also represented by Mayor B. W. Krodel and Chamber of Commerce President John Hushion. Jack Lloyd, aggressive young industrial development representative of the Appalachian Electric Power Co., who has also moved up the ladder of responsibility, was present, as was Stanley C. Higgins representing Governor Underwood. And then there was the boldly imaginative Goodyear plant manager, Swedish-born Oka Carlson.

WHY WEST VIRGINIA?

We asked why Goodyear would decide to locate in West Virginia. The answer was that West Virginia provided the best river, rail, and truck transportation facilities, a good labor supply, and a good geographic location for distribution of the Goodyear product.

Work proceeded rapidly on the five-story main building, which provides 100,000 square feet of floorspace. Four years ago, in 1959, production got underway. The miracle in the Ohio Valley actually happened. Spreading over the level acres once devoted to a truck farm, the mighty industrial facility was in production.

One of the fairly obvious but much talked-about discoveries which the Goodyear plant managers made was that West Virginians proved to be conscientious, steady, dependable, and highly productive employees. Some of them drive great distances to get to Apple Grove. Many of them live in Point Pleasant, that warm and fast-thriving community 15 miles north. Enriching Point Pleasant with their energy and community spirit was a new group of Goodyear plant executives, who played an important role in civic activities.

Steady employment was provided for 120 workers, and the Point Pleasant plant built up to provide a yearly payroll of $850,000. The Vitel produced at the Point Pleasant plant is utilized by Beaunit Mills, Inc., which produces Vycron, for extensive use in shirts, suits, dresses, and other textile products. The Videne laminating film is used to laminate textiles, metal, wood, paper and plastics. Important new uses in the housing construction industry may multiply the production of Videne in the coming months.

A NEW EXPANSION PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that the Point Pleasant plant has just started an expansion program which will increase capacity by 50 percent. The construction of these additional facilities will start right away. It is expected that the expansion will be completed by September. These new process facilities are being added in order to boost the production of what is called pelletized resin, from which manmade fibers are spun for clothing and other textiles. This expansion signals another forward surge of activity in the industrial Ohio Valley.

West Virginia is proud of Goodyear. West Virginia is proud of the new industrial growth in the Point Pleasant area, which adds up to a brighter future for the people of Mason County and the Ohio Valley.

A Bill To Permit Deductions for Federal Income Tax Purposes to Persons Who Are Paying Educational Expenses at the Primary, Secondary, or Undergraduate College or University Levels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to permit deductions for Federal income tax purposes to persons who are paying educational expenses at the primary, secondary, or undergraduate college or university levels. I am convinced this legislation is timely in terms of national economic and educational objectives. It is in the national interest that all young people complete the highest level of education of which they are capable. Through their educational attainments these students will benefit themselves and the Nation and improve their ability to contribute to our society and our economy. Those citizens who support the public schools through taxation and also bear the burden of educating their children in private schools and colleges are entitled to some relief for the double expenses they bear on behalf of education.

The growing demands of our society for educated citizens makes it desirable for persons of moderate income to provide the highest level of education possible for their children. Many students of high ability are forced to discontinue their education for financial reasons. We must recognize the national importance of encouraging and assisting able students to remain in school and to go on to and graduate from college.

In the United States, we have consistently raised the level of educational opportunities. We provide not only the teachers and buildings but also public transportation of students and in many cases books and supplies as well. We have done these things because our youth require educational opportunity to meet the increasing complexity of society. The world continues to grow more complex. The educational levels that led to intellectual maturity yesterday do not go far enough today. There has been a continuous upgrading of jobs. The increasing use of the products of scientific technology clearly calls for a higher degree of education and technical skill in every line of work. The bill I have introduced is one means of providing an incentive for remaining in school and some tax relief for those who must finance the costs of this education.

To encourage increased investment in our advancing economy, it has long been our practice to provide for tax-free recovery of income-producing capital outlays through allowances for depreciation and replacement. By the same principle, the tax treatment of investment in education should be at least as liberal as it is for investment in capital goods, since education is at least as important a basis for producing income as is investment in physical capital.

For some years, we have provided for tax deductions by professional individuals who must upgrade their educational training in order to meet the rising educational requirements of the work they are already doing. There should be some tax relief to encourage investment in the education of those preparing to enter the trades and professions, especially since the amount of education required at the threshold level of most professions is rapidly increasing—and must continue to increase—to provide for the flexibility and adaptability needed to cope with our advancing technology.

My bill restricts its tax deductions to tuition and fees, books and supplies, and the cost of living away from home when necessary. The limitation to not more than $200 per month for each month of enrollment is a safeguard to prevent abuses by those who might choose expensive preparatory schools and colleges.

While tax relief would accrue before the individual receives income from the investment in education, it must be pointed out that in the long run increased individual incomes would more than offset initial tax income foregone in allowing deductions for amounts invested in education. Studies have shown that the median income of families with heads having 4 or more years of college is almost 40 percent higher than the median income of families with heads whose education stopped with completion of high school. Also, the high school graduate earns about 27 percent more than does the eighth-grade graduate during his peak earning years. Obviously, then, education is an income-producing investment, and whatever tax relief we grant to encourage it will not only contribute to the economic progress

of the Nation but will be more than recovered out of taxes on increased future earnings.

It is currently estimated that about 40 percent of the students who enter college go on to graduate in regular progression from the institution of first registration, that another 20 percent transfer or return at a later date to complete the requirements for graduation, and that about 40 percent withdraw and never finish. Financial difficulties are reported to be among the chief reasons for dropping out, especially in the loss of the better students. This impetus to stay in school would also tend to encourage high school students to complete their secondary education in many cases in preparation for higher education. It is presently estimated that almost 40 percent of pupils who reach the fifth grade do not graduate from high school. A college graduate earns about $175,000 more in his lifetime than a high school graduate, and a high school graduate earns about $50,000 more than an eighth-grade graduate, according to recent estimates. If the provisions of this bill are successful in salvaging a fraction of those students who fail to graduate from high school and continue through a higher education because of financial difficulties, the loss of tax revenue will eventually be offset and conceivably the amendment would improve the overall position of the Treasury.

House Resolution 14: Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. During the 87th Congress it was known as House Resolution 211, and earlier this year I reintroduced it and in the present 88th Congress it is known as House Resolution 14.

Mr. Speaker, there are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 107, part 3, pages 3518–3544, "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee."

The popular response to House Resolution 211, now House Resolution 14, has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our citizens to House Resolution 14 in the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 20, 1963.
Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Thank you for your letter of March 20 and the enclosed brochure on the 45th anniversary of the Ukraine's independence.

I will indeed find it useful as a reference source and appreciate your thoughtfulness in sending it to me.

Regards.

Sincerely,

BILL STINSON,
U.S. Representative.

P.S.—I shall support you in this.

PITTSFIELD, MASS., *March 18, 1963.*
Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: On behalf of our organization, we urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee.

A Special Committee on Captive Nations would with honor and truth understand and present to the world, knowledge and information as to the plight of submerged nations. This in turn, will aid our Government, our peoples, and our foreign policy.

Respectfully yours,

AMELIA STEFEUNCK,
President.
EUGENIA TYMESUK,
Secretary.

UKRAINIAN CENTER, INC.,
Passaic, N.J., March 13, 1963.
Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Enclosed please find a copy of a letter sent to Congressman HOWARD W. SMITH in which we ask him to submit to vote on his committee your resolution (H. Res. 14) for establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations.

Very truly yours,

JOHN CHOMKO,
President of the Ukrainian Center, Inc., in Passaic, N.J.

UKRAINIAN CENTER, INC.,
Passaic, N.J., March 13, 1963.
Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of the Ukrainian Center, Inc. in Passaic, N.J., we urge you to submit the Flood resolution calling for the formation of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations to vote by your committee.

The creation of this Special House Committee on Captive Nations at this particular time would serve in a most effective manner to combat Red propaganda concerning Western imperialism and would serve as vital reservoir of the true knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which would be very helpful to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We wish to thank you in advance, sir, for anything that you can do in supporting the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN CHOMKO,
President of Ukrainian Center, Inc., in Passaic, N.J.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 18, 1963.*
Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: This land of Washington has always been the only hope for many enslaved nations in their struggle for liberty and human rights denied to them by tyranny of communism.

To keep this hope alive we urge you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration.

The creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a reservoir of true knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations and will help the American people to recognize the true dangers of Communist aggression.

We strongly urge you, Congressman SMITH, to give your full and qualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee.

Thank you.

Respectfully yours,

ANATOL LYSYJ, M.D.
Mrs. DARIA LYSYJ.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 15, 1963.
Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: We understand that Congressman FLOOD presented a resolution (H. Res. 14) concerning establishment of a congressional Committee on Captive Nations. We urge you to submit this resolution to vote by your committee. We also sincerely ask you to give it your favorable consideration.

The necessity of establishing such a committee is evident from the fact that even in our State Department there is a confusion concerning the situation in Eastern Europe. The information given in 158 issue of the State Department Research News Letter on the Soviet Union and the letters of Secretary Rusk to your committee in connection with the proposed establishment of Captive Nations Committee are a good illustration to this.

While the Soviet Union has been deceitfully championing the cause of national liberation in Africa and Asia, we as a nation are not doing much to help the enslaved and captive non-Russian nations, constituting a decided weakness of the Soviet totalitarian empire.

The objective study performed by the proposed congressional Committee on Captive Nations will tremendously help in bringing the authentic information for our State Department and will clarify the confusion in the minds of American public concerning the true situation behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

We sincerely urge you, Congressman SMITH, to give your full and qualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM DOMBROWSKY,
President.
MYKOLA DERBUSH,
Secretary.

St. John's Society,
Hartford, Conn., March 11, 1963.
Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: On behalf of the 600 members of the St. John's Society in Hartford we urge you to submit the resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee.

The fact that many millions of peoples behind the Iron Curtain are enslaved by Russian imperialism today cannot be overlooked by those who are now enjoying freedom which is one of the blessings of our democracy.

It is our opinion that nations which have lost their political and cultural independence became subjugated by Russian imperialism now taking form of communism deserve to be helped in their continuous struggle for independence which is also an incorporation of their beloved freedom and democracy.

Your qualified support to the Flood resolution, Congressman Smith, will be most gratefully appreciated. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
Walter Wasylenko,
Chairman.
Stanley Homotiuk,
Secretary.

Pittsfield, Mass., *March 18, 1963.*
Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: With regard to the creation of a Special Captive Nations Committee in the House of Representatives, we strongly urge your support, and to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to a vote by your committee.

A Special Committee on Captive Nations would be of great value and we hope you will give it your favorable consideration.

Respectfully yours,
Ukrainian-American Men's Club.
William Nykonchuh,
President.
Stanley F. Smichuko,
Secretary.
William Howe,
John Jormoroskey,
Walter J. Huska,
Michael W. Janswyez,
Walter W. Kopychok.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1963.
Hon. Daniel J. Flood,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dan: Many thanks for your letter dated March 20 together with the brochure on the 45th anniversary of Ukraine's independence.

Be assured of my cooperation.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Cordially,
Abraham J. Multer.

Hartford, *March 11, 1963.*
Hon. Howard W. Smith,
Chairman, House Rules Committee,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Smith: The members of the Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc. Branch 5 in Hartford, Conn., appeals to you to submit the Flood resolution (H. Res. 14) to vote by your committee and ask you to give it your favorable consideration. Such a Committee on Captive Nations is vitally important both for our Government and the American people at large. While Communist imperialist Russia pose as "defenders of liberation of the Asian and African nations from colonialism," but at the same time they practice the worst possible form of colonial oppression and enslavement over the non-Russian nations under their domination and use all and every means at the disposal of their cruel and totalitarian regime to suppress and strangle every manifestation and aspiration of these non-Russian nations to freedom and national independence.

Existence of a special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives would become a real reservoir of true and unbiased knowledge and information on the plight of the captive nations, which knowledge will be of vital importance to our Government in carrying out its foreign policy.

We strongly urge you, Congressman Smith, to give your full and qualified support to the Flood resolution in your Rules Committee. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,
Alexandre Rudzinsky,
President.

Grafton, W. Va.: The Town That Refused To Die—Now an All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are all doubtless aware of the All America Cities Awards given each year to 11 U.S. communities selected by a jury of distinguished citizens and experts on government impaneled by the National Municipal League which is the cosponsor with Look magazine of the annual awards competition. This program is now in its 15th year.

This year, I am happy to report, Grafton, W. Va., was chosen as one of these cities, along with Allentown, Pa.; Bartlesville, Okla.; Boston, Mass.; Chattanooga, Tenn.; Dade County, Fla.; Grand Junction, Colo.; High Point, N.C.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Quincy, Ill.; and San Diego, Calif.

No individual is more pleased than I at the honor bestowed on Grafton, for since it is located in my first congressional district, I have worked very closely with Grafton's officials in dealing with the problems confronting the community. Therefore, I have more than a passing interest in her accomplishments.

Many of you will remember that Grafton is the town that refused to die. In 1958, its only major industry, a glass plant, closed its doors, forcing 480 people out of work. This came close on the heels of the closing of a large pottery and a drastic drop in local railroad employment. But Grafton citizens were determined to keep their town alive, whatever the cost, and on a bitterly cold December day, more than 2,000 women turned out in an Operation Survival parade.

Forward-looking civic leaders formed the 1,300-member Grafton Area Development Council to attract industry, and the Tygart Valley Development Association, armed with $30,000 in voluntary subscriptions, began to develop industrial sites. Local women took a labor inventory, listing skills available in Grafton.

Efforts were made to improve the town's physical appearance. Streets were paved, sidewalks repaired, storefronts modernized and 54 condemned houses were torn down.

Two new industries did come into Grafton and there is a good prospect that a third will follow. I am especially elated at this for I have attempted to aid and direct civic leaders in their attempts to interest industry in locating in Grafton.

Today Grafton's unemployment problem is far from solved, but we all feel that "things are looking up." The indomitable spirit that refused to let Grafton die will find ways and means to restore her to a healthy, thriving city.

We are grateful for this opportunity to bring Grafton to the attention of all the Nation. Industries desiring to relocate should capitalize on this strong will to survive and grow.

I commend Grafton again for its devotion to the cause of industrial development and civic improvement, and recommend its recipe for recovery to other cities which may find themselves in distress.

Welcome South, Mr. Chisholm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, on February 25 of this year, I inserted an editorial in the Record taken from the Daily Reveille, written and edited by the students of Louisiana State University. The title of the editorial was, "Is Ellender Wrong?"

The editorial, written by Colin Chisholm, a student at the university, dealt with the remarks of the senior Senator from Louisiana, the Honorable Allen J. Ellender, who had questioned the wisdom of our foreign giveaway program. It contained the following statement:

> Ellender, in a few choice words, said what probably a majority of Americans have been thinking for many years, that African nations are simply not ready for self-government.

I inserted the editorial because I was impressed by the young writer's obvious ability to cut through the verbiage and the fog of uncertainty surrounding our giveaway program and to see right to the heart of the matter. His display of clearmindedness was worthy of note by all of us here in the House.

Since that time, I have received a letter from Mr. Chisholm thanking me for sending him a copy of the insertion. His brief reply is equally worthy of note. Again he has shown that same instinct for stripping away the smug, the obvious and the false to find the truth hidden away in the center.

A hundred writers have written scores of thousands of words, particularly in the past two decades, on a subject to which most of them were ill prepared to address themselves: the South and its so-called conditions and problems.

Here, in 200 words, Mr. Chisholm tells of doing what few, if any, of these self-appointed savants have ever done: investigated these conditions and problems for themselves with a mind uncluttered with muddled presuppositions.

His two paragraph summation is a brilliant statement in which I would not want to change a single word:

> Before coming to Louisiana, I had lived for 20 years in the State of Colorado. I was born and raised there. During the time I lived there I was filled with the usual ballyhoo about the South and the conditions that were supposed to exist there. When I had finally had enough, I decided to come to the South and take a look for myself.
>
> Since the day I first came to Louisiana, I have fallen in love with the State and its people. I have made many friends over the past 2 years. The kind of friends that are lasting and ready and willing to help with any sort of problem I might have; something I could not find in my native State. I have found employment, not on the second or third try, but on the first attempt; something I had been unable to do in my native State. Illusion after illusion about the South has been shattered before me and I have grown to love Louisiana more and more as each day passes by. I plan to remain in Louisiana, to marry and raise my family here and to establish my own business here someday in the not-so-far-off future. I am most happy to be able to say that on September 13, 1963, I will be able to register to vote as a citizen of the State of Louisiana. It is also my pleasure to say that my parents, also native Coloradans, will move into a new home in Pascagoula, Miss., this summer after some 62 years of residence in the West.

I would like to welcome this young man to Louisiana, though selfishly I know he could serve the State and the South better by returning to those parts of the Nation where these illusions and delusions are still held and still, sadly, passed on from one generation to another. He would make the South an illustrious missionary.

Welcome south, Mr. Chisholm.

Prayers Asked for the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church, the Most Reverend Arthur Lichtenberger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Episcopalians and non-Episcopalians alike throughout the Nation were saddened last week to hear that the presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church, the Most Reverend Arthur Lichtenberger, is suffering from Parkinson's disease, and will in all likelihood have to retire at the next convention of the Episcopal Church to be held in St. Louis next year.

The Episcopal diocese of Springfield covers a substantial part of my congressional district, and it is with deep pride that I noted that our newly consecrated bishop, the Right Reverend Albert A. Chambers, was the first Episcopal bishop in our country to ask for diocesanwide home and public prayers for the ailing Episcopal presiding bishop.

The leadership of Bishop Chambers is typical of the firm and constructive things he has done since he was consecrated October 1, 1962, as the bishop of Springfield by Presiding Bishop Lichtenberger.

I join the many members of Bishop Chambers' Church and his friends in commending the diocese of Springfield's leadership in this matter, and I hope that the example being set in Illinois will be followed in other parts of the country.

In a statement the Right Reverend Albert A. Chambers, bishop of Illinois, said:

> Like the human body, the holy, catholic, and apostolic church, of which the Episcopal Church is a living part, suffers when one of its key members suffers from a disabling disease. Since the church is moreover the communion of saints, we ought to pray for one another, even as the faithful of other ages pray for us.

Opportunities for Small Business in Export Trade Are Being Expanded and Significantly Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the House Small Business Committee last week held extensive hearings on the organization and operations of the Small Business Administration, including the opportunities for small business in foreign trade.

It is significant to point out that small business is continuing to increase in both number and dollar volume of participation in export trade and that although this increase is encouraging much more needs to be done, not only in the interest of promoting the sale and export of American manufactured products abroad, but also because of our balance-of-payments situation.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my weekly newsletter, Capitol Comments, which discusses our committee hearings be reprinted in the Record.

My newsletter follows:

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE HOLDS IMPORTANT HEARINGS

(Capitol Comments by Joe L. Evins, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee)

With the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee having completed hearings on budget requests except for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and with the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee not scheduled to begin hearings on the TVA and the Corps of Engineers budgets until after Easter, this week provided an excellent opportunity for the House Small Business Committee to hold hearings on the organization and operation of the Small Business Administration and to develop information on the opportunities for small business in foreign trade.

With the passage of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 there were dire predictions that the lowering of tariffs made possible by this bill would adversely affect many small businesses and that many would fail because of foreign competition.

As chairman of the House Small Business Committee, I felt that it was very important that we hold hearings on the effect of the European Economic Community on small business and gather information on what effect the implementation of the Trade Expansion Act might have on the small business sector of the economy. Our committee felt that it was also extremely important to document for small businesses the foreign trade opportunities that are open to them and the means by which small businesses might most effectively use these foreign trade avenues.

Among the several top Government officials which presented testimony to the committee were John Horne, Administrator, Small Business Administration; Jack N. Behrman, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic and International Business; Ben David Dorfman, Chairman, U.S. Tariff Commission; Harold F. Linder, President and Chairman of the Board of Export-Import Bank; Draper Daniels, National Export Expansion Coordinator; G. Griffith Johnson, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs; Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

Testimony showed that the various agencies and departments of our Government are vitally concerned with expanding our foreign trade and with increasing the opportunities of small business to participate in foreign trade. Mr. Daniels, who has the responsibility of coordinating all parts and phases of the export expansion program, pointed out that through governmental assistance and encouragement 1,197 new exporters were introduced to international trade last year. He also stated that 36,000 businessmen attended export seminars in 1962 and that he estimates at least 85 percent of these businessmen were small businessmen.

Testimony indicated that our various Government agencies are doing a creditable job in expanding foreign trade but more must be done. Expanding our foreign trade so as to provide a stimulus to our economy and to help in solving the balance of payment problem is one of the most important tasks facing us today. Small business should be encouraged and helped to participate in foreign trade to the fullest extent possible and I so pointed out to agency, bureau, and department heads which appeared before our committee.

Gross Replies to Editorial on Churchill Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, although not mentioned by name, my colleague, H. R. Gross of Iowa, and I were referred to in an editorial carried by the Des Moines, Iowa, Register on March 14, 1963, because we had voted against granting honorary citizenship to Sir Winston Churchill.

Congressman Gross submitted a letter to the editor of the Register which rebuts the position of the editorial that a "sense of shame" should be felt for the action of two Members of the Iowa delegation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that Congressman Gross' letter to the editor appear in the Record.

The letter follows:

GROSS REPLIES TO EDITORIAL ON CHURCHILL CITIZENSHIP

To the Editor:

In your March 14 editorial, concerning action of the House in granting honorary U.S. citizenship to Winston Churchill, you state in part: "We feel a sense of shame at the bad manners and ill grace of one Iowa Congressman who asked whether this gesture was designed to influence an extension of the British debt to the United States. We regret that another Iowa Congressman voted against the honor, though he at least did it on a matter of principle, believing it would set a bad precedent."

Had the editorial writer taken the trouble to refer to the Congressional Record (Mar. 12, 1963, p. 3995), he would have found abundant proof that I opposed this legislation on the grounds of a bad precedent as well as questioning its influence on another suspension of all payments (interest and principal) on the multibillion dollar loan which the then Prime Minister Churchill negotiated following World War II.

Again referring to the Congressional Record (Mar. 12, 1963, p. 3996) I said: "Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to detract from the leadership Mr. Churchill gave to the British Isles and the Commonwealth during World War II, but this, as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee frankly admits, would be an unprecedented action. This apparently would be a granting of U.S. citizenship, no matter how limited, on a basis accorded no other citizen of a foreign country in the history of this Republic. Who will be the next?"

On the walls of the House are two huge portraits: of George Washington and of General Lafayette. No citizen of a foreign country made a greater contribution to the creation of this Republic than did Lafayette. Not only did he give of his military and diplomatic talents, providing the invaluable help of the French Government to the revolution, but he gave of his personal fortune. Yet throughout the years Congress never bestowed any form of citizenship upon Lafayette.

It should also be pointed out that, only 5 years ago, when approached on the subject of honorary U.S. citizenship, Mr. Churchill made it plain that he would refuse. What was the reason for his change of mind? Having been repulsed by Churchill himself, what motivated Congress to reinitiate this action? Is U.S. citizenship, honorary or otherwise, a commodity to be dealt out on the basis of whimsy?

Britain's debt to this country is some $13 billion as a result of obligations incurred in World War I and subsequent thereto. Payments on the $4 billion "loan," which Mr. Churchill negotiated shortly after World War II, and which were suspended by Congress for 8 years, must be resumed in the near future or another extension voted. Is there anyone gullible enough to think that the British have any intention of paying the full $4 billion, much less $13 billion?

And it can well be noted here that some 10 years ago the Churchill influence was instrumental in prevailing upon the U.S. Government to relinquish its interest in more than $1 billion in counterpart and similar funds which were then applied to retirement of the British internal debt.

Churchill once said in effect: "I have not been selected as the King's First Minister to liquidate the British Empire." As a nationalist and spokesman for Britannia he has few equals. Neither has he had many peers in his ability to open the doors of the U.S. Treasury.

If, as the Register laments, it be "bad manners and ill grace" to protest a very bad precedent and at the same time question the influence that such a precedent may have indirectly upon the debtridden taxpayers of Iowa and the Nation, then so be it.—H. R. Gross, U.S. Representative, Third Iowa District, Washington, D.C.

(Editor's Note.—Lafayette and all of his male heirs were granted citizenship by Maryland and Virginia before the union was formed and so automatically became full U.S. citizens.)

The 442d Combat Team: Hawaii's Gift to America's Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, last week veterans of the famed 442d Regimental Combat Team celebrated in Honolulu the 20th anniversary of their organization.

It was on March 18, 1943, at historic Iolani Palace in Honolulu that 2,600 volunteers, all Americans of Japanese ancestry, were sworn in en masse into the Army of the United States. They were later to be joined by more than 1,000 other Nisei who had volunteered from behind barbed wire fences of the so-called relocation centers to form the 442d Regimental Combat Team.

Before the call for volunteers was issued, the quota for Hawaii was set at 1,500 men. Within a few days after the call was issued, more than 10,000 had volunteered, the first of whom was Joseph Itagaki, who died of a heart attack almost to the day on the 20th anniversary of his volunteering, and the best known of whom is your former colleague and now U.S. Senator Daniel K. Inouye.

This tremendous and almost unbelievable response helped to quelch the talk of evacuating all of Japanese ancestry from Hawaii, and the Army boosted Hawaii's quota to 2,875 men.

On the mainland United States the Army experienced an even more remarkable response. From within the confines of concentration camps more than 3,000 men wearing Japanese faces had volunteered to serve the country whose Government had placed them behind barbed-wire fences despite their American citizenship. Among them was the first volunteer of them all, Mike Masaoka, described by Reader's Digest as the "most successful lobbyist" on Capitol Hill, and his four brothers, Hank, Tad, Ike, and Ben.

The Army's decision to organize the 442d was largely based on its observations of another Japanese-American outfit which had been organized about a year earlier on June 2, 1942, and which was in training at Camp McCoy, Wis., and Camp Shelby, Miss.—the 100th Infantry Battalion—separate—of which I was a member, and which subsequently became the first battalion of the 442d Regiment.

Together on the battlefields of Europe, men of the 100th Battalion and the 442d Regimental Combat Team won the respect and admiration of all who knew them. Gen. Mark Clark referred to them as "the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States." They had fought for and died for ideals which they had learned to uphold in the democratic process. They had died so others could have a better world in which to live—men like Private Kawano, my messenger, who, in his last few words on earth, told me in effect:

> Well, Lieutenant, I know I'm going to die, but I have no regrets. I know that as a result of my dying, those of us who will go home and our folks back home will be recognized as true Americans and will live a better life.

The veterans of the 442d Combat Team and the 100th Battalion and, lest we forget, of the Military Intelligence Service, irrefutably proved on the fields of battle through sacrifice of blood and life that Americanism is a matter of the heart and mind and not of race or color, as President Franklin D. Roosevelt so aptly stated.

Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of the people of Hawaii, I call your attention to Hawaii's gift to America's heritage, the 442d Regimental Combat Team, on the occasion of its 20th anniversary.

One of the Most Dramatic Moments in All Industry—The Honorable Leonor K. Sullivan Christens the SS "Export Champion," and Explains Its Significance to Our Nation's Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as ranking member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, and as a Member of Congress who for 16 years has had the honor of representing a district which includes one of the greatest ports in the world, the port of Baltimore, I have had occasion frequently to attend the launchings of new ships for merchant marine and Navy. A launching is always a most impressive event, and represents the culmination of many man-hours of labor and of great investments of funds in creating a new ship which will carry the American flag on the high seas.

Customarily, a charming lady smashes a bottle of champagne against the bow as the ship slides down the ways, and

then, later, she expresses her pride in the vessel.

A ship launching which I attended last Thursday in Chester, Pa., was another such occasion, but with a very significant difference. The ship was the SS *Export Champion*, built by Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., for the American Export Lines—one of our sister ships of 12,528 deadweight tons, with a cargo capacity of 800,000 cubic feet, a speed of 18½ knots, rated horsepower of 13,750, and overall length of 493 feet. The four ships display an unusual profile for cargo vessels, with an engine-aft arrangement for maximum cargo carrying capacity. J. J. Henry Co., Inc., was the naval architectural firm for the four ships, which have General Electric cross compound steam turbine main engines with double reduction gears, and 20-foot diameter, 5-blade propellers revolving at 110 revolutions per minute.

These are outstanding cargo ships, and are part of our subsidized American flag-merchant marine. The SS *Export Champion* is designed for use on trade route No. 10—line B—U.S. Atlantic/Mediterranean and Black Seas—freight service.

CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN ACTS AS SPONSOR

I said the ship launching Thursday of the SS *Export Champion* was an occasion similar to many others I have witnessed, but with a very significant difference. As is customary, a charming lady smashed a bottle of champagne against the bow at the exact split second, and then later expressed her pride in the vessel. The lady who performed the important role of sponsor of the SS *Export Champion* was our own colleague in the House of Representatives, and my esteemed colleague, a senior member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentlewoman from Missouri, the Honorable Leonor K. Sullivan, and it was her participation which made this an unusual occasion.

Mrs. Sullivan not only performed the customary tasks assigned to a sponsor of a ship, but made an outstanding address following the launching, and discussed the importance of this ship, and of our entire American-flag merchant marine to the people of the United States. Never before, to my knowledge, has the sponsor of a cargo vessel been a woman with as great an understanding of the significance of the event to our Nation as the conscientious and well-informed Congresswoman from Missouri, who is now serving for the 11th year on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and is chairman of the Subcommittee on the Panama Canal.

Mrs. Sullivan described the moment when the ship started on its way to deep water as "one of the most dramatic moments in all industry." I think it was a very apt description, and, as she performed the sponsoring rites, she made me proud, as all of us in the House of Representatives would have been proud, at that moment.

Later, in her remarks following the launching, she made me even prouder of her as a colleague in the Congress for her eloquent and informative talk. I want to share that pride with the rest of the Members, Mr. Speaker, and so I submit the text of Congresswoman Sullivan's address, for inclusion as part of my remarks in the Congressional Record, as follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, FOLLOWING LAUNCHING OF SS "EXPORT CHAMPION," SUN SHIPYARD, CHESTER, PA., THURSDAY AFTERNOON, MARCH 28, 1963

My wish today—my prayer—in christening the SS *Export Champion* is that all who serve aboard this vessel in the years ahead will always have the same pride of identification with her that we will always have as a result of participating in her launching.

The men and women of Sun Ship, who have devoted nearly 1 million man-hours of skilled hard work in transforming assorted lengths and shapes of steel and pipe and other materials into a rugged, fast, seaworthy carrier of the cargoes of world commerce, cannot help but be deeply proud of their handiwork, and I congratulate them for the excellence of their labors.

And to Admiral Will and his associates of American Export Lines, there is the pride of seeing their industrial vision become a reality here, in seeing a great project for the expansion of a great shipping line come to fruition in the form of the fourth ship in this unusual new design.

As a woman who has just enjoyed one of the great privileges traditionally reserved to women—the opportunity to officiate at one of the most dramatic moments in all industry—the moment when a high-and-dry hull suddenly begins its plunge into deep water and its emergence as a ship—I shall always treasure my memories of that moment, and relive again and again the glorious experience of christening a fine ship.

My pride of identification with this ship goes even deeper than that, however, for the SS *Export Champion*, which I shall always regard now as a personal possession I have merely placed on loan to its operators, symbolizes for me the entire American merchant marine, with which I have become closely familiar during 10 years in Congress as a member of the committee of the House of Representatives which has legislative jurisdiction over merchant marine affairs. In that capacity, I have attended numerous launchings for a variety of vessels, and have invariably been thrilled when the champagne crashed against the bow, and the blocks were battered away, and the ship slowly moved, and then raced down the ways. But thanks to those who have given me the privilege today of sponsoring the *Export Champion*, the merchant marine will hereafter always be symbolized for me by this one vessel. I shall watch for the reports of her comings and goings. Each time she returns to home port from her travels in the Mediterranean or Black Sea, I shall have the feeling that "my ship has come in."

The SS *Export Champion* belongs, in a sense, to all of the American people, as do all of our vessels in the subsidized American-flag merchant marine. Congress is providing currently about $300 million a year for assistance in the construction of such ships, and in their operation. But this is no gift, no handout, to a few ship builders or fleet operators. This is an investment by the people of the United States in a major arm of national defense, the bridge of ships which helped so decisively in the winning of World War II, the ships which today speed our cargoes to our troops abroad, and to friends and allies around the world—modern ships, fast ships, designed for today's needs, including the possible needs of wartime military support. The so-called subsidies are necessary in order to enable American enterprise to compete on a more equal basis with foreign firms in both the operation of and the construction of our merchant ships. Otherwise, our flag would virtually disappear from the masts of the world's cargo ships. And there are reciprocal requirements: The operator must provide for the periodic, systematic replacement of ships on a long-range basis, and must agree to return to the Government a share of profits exceeding a specified level.

Above all, he must operate under the American flag, which means under conditions of employment and safety on the high seas which far exceed those of any other maritime power. Incidentally, our merchant marine employs more than 200,000 people from every section of this country, at wages equal to the best in American industry as a whole.

But lest we fall into the mistake of considering these programs of aid to the merchant marine and to those who work in related activities as an expensive drain on our Treasury and our economy, it should be realized that the economic aspects constitute a two-way street; for instance, this industry, including seagoing, shoreside, shipbuilding, and ship repair segments, contributes better than $5 billion annually to the U.S. economy, and helps to reduce the deficit in our balance of payments by between $600 million and $1 billion a year. And, of course, such an industry and its employees pay very, very substantial Federal taxes.

These are facts I had to learn 10 years ago as a midwestern Member of Congress serving on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I was, and am, from Missouri, and had to be shown. And I was shown. I have always supported the American merchant marine in their united efforts to obtain legislation needed to expand and strengthen this industry.

Is it any wonder, then, that I am deeply proud, highly honored, and profoundly moved by the privilege I have had today to sponsor a great new addition to the American-flag fleet? The SS *Export Champion*, long before any cargo is loaded into her holds, already carries our great pride in the role she will fulfill.

May this ship, a true champion always, and those who man her, meet their forthcoming challenges of time and space and the elements with resolute confidence born of the strength you have built into her solid steel hull. And may each voyage not only be undertaken with eager excitement, but also be completed in harmony, and with full success.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following newsletter of March 30, 1963:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman Bruce Alger, Fifth District, Texas)

TAX HEARINGS CONCLUDED

The hearings on the President's tax recommendations are concluded. For the time involved a good record of pros and cons has been made. All witnesses agreed on the need for a tax cut. Few approved of the tax hikes, called structural reforms. The background for these hearings was the least favorable possible. The President and his Secretary of the Treasury recognized no relationship between Federal spending and tax revenue.

that is, the balancing of income and outgo. On the contrary, the premise of planned deficit underlay the recommendations, although periodic lipservice was paid to fiscal integrity and Government self-discipline. Comic relief, although hollow as a bad joke, was provided by Budget Director Gordon, who spoke of the tight or strict budget of $122.5 billion, $20 billion more than the budget for fiscal 1961 inherited when Mr. Kennedy took office. The President's goals of (1) economic growth, (2) freeing of investment funds, (3) curing unemployment, (4) increasing consumer purchasing power, according to the witnesses, were, separately and collectively, contradicted by the tax recommendations. The results would be: (1) Growth would be impeded; (2) investment funds would be less fluid; (3) unemployment would result in industry after industry; and (4) consumer purchasing power would drop.

Secretary of the Treasury Dillon threatened a Presidential veto if the reforms did not accompany the rate changes. The President promptly contradicted this, agreeing to postpone reforms consideration. The President disavowed tax legislation consideration as related to recession, then reversed himself warning of possible recession if we failed to accept his recommendations. The witnesses repudiated this threat, saying that acceptance of the President's recommendations could aid in bringing on recession. Some, the bravest, bluntest, agreed that the recommendations showed an appalling lack of knowledge of the industries involved. Generally, there was agreement that (1) high tax rates intensified the tax inequities involved; (2) the recommendations would result in a shift of present tax burden from lower to middle income groups. Some areas of disagreement were (1) disallowing the first 5 percent of itemized deductions for individual income tax computation; (2) taxing as ordinary income (instead of capital gains) (a) lump-sum pension distribution, (b) real estate gains, (c) stock options when exercised, (d) sale of timber; (3) change depletion allowance on mineral resources; (4) capital gain treatment of assets at time of death or gift (treating both as though a sale).

ADMINISTRATION CONFUSED

The contradictions, ignorance and/or misrepresentations by the President and his advisers will now undoubtedly result in further reversals, repudiations and new proposals, so that it is impossible to forecast with any certainty at this time, what the outcome will be. My prediction, most tentative, is that no tax changes will result this year but a strong chance of tax rate change next year, an election year. It is my hope that rate adjustment will be of the Baker-Herlong-Alger bill type, a several year transition bill tied to a balanced budget reducing individual rates from the present rates of 20 percent to 91 percent to 15 percent to 42 percent; corporation taxes 52 percent to 42 percent with more realistic depreciation rates. My ultimate goal is the flat percentage tax which would result in everyone paying the percent necessary to balance the budget and retire a percentage of the debt, or a rate of tax approximately 20 percent of income with reduction possible as Government spending decreases.

GOLD SQUEEZE

H.R. 4413, a bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, because of a transfer tax in it, came before the Ways and Means Committee this week. Since the Treasury (through the Banking and Currency Committee) proposes to demonitize silver, except for coinage, it is proposed that the transfer or transaction tax be repealed. While this 1934 Act is obsolete and undoubtedly should be repealed, the spectre of devaluation of our currency looms now in front of us. The Treasury now proposes that $1 bills, silver certificates, be retired and replaced by $1 Federal Reserve notes (compare a $1 and $5 bill), backed by gold. Here's the hitch—the silver certificate is worth the face value in precious metal (silver), the Federal Reserve note is worth only 25 percent in precious metal (gold), and the latter is not redeemable in gold as is the silver certificate in silver. Unquestionably, this is devaluation of our currency. The new 25 percent gold backing will require approximately $35 million per year additional gold be earmarked to add to the $11.7 billion undergirding our total currency. As this official gold reserve underpinning goes up our gold outflow continues, a sort of gold squeeze. At our current rate of outflow of $100 million per month, money devaluation (by reducing gold backing of currency) is less than 4 years away. In addition, the liquid liabilities of foreign nations totals now about $24 billion. In the last 2 years of 1961 and 1962 our gold outflow was $1,748 million ($1.7 billion) and the increase of foreign liquid liabilities was $4,640 million ($4.64 billion). Liquid liabilities are convertible into our gold, at the pleasure of foreign banks (a privilege not extended by our Government to United States citizens). As the world's banker any so-called run on the bank by foreign nations would wipe out the precious metal backing of our money. Then, only the good faith of our Government would undergird our money and there is always some question in the minds of people, at home and abroad, over our fiscal responsibility, in view of our debt and deficit financing policies. It is of some significance to note that free societies that have fallen always tampered with the value of their money. Is this to be our fate? What do you think?

GREED MAY COST US OUR FREEDOM

We, as a Nation, are spending ourselves into bankruptcy. If the people and Congress do not soon begin to exercise some self-discipline and reduce Federal spending, we may, indeed, witness the death of our Republic in our lifetime. The cause of our astronomical Federal spending spree is simple, everyone has his hand out. Attached to this week's newsletter is an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing some remarks I made in the House pointing out the danger we face.

KEEPING THE PEOPLE INFORMED

It is my firm belief that the survival of this Republic depends upon an alert and informed citizenry. To help in getting the facts to the people I make weekly television and radio reports. On television, channel 8, WFAA at 10:15 a.m. Sunday. (For April 7 only, the program will be presented at 1:15 p.m.) Check your favorite radio station in Dallas for the time of my radio report.

Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson's Address Before the National Rocket Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to include the text of the Vice President's address before the National Rocket Club dinner, held March 22, 1963.

I think it points up the need for this country's continued efforts in the field of space and the need for a greater understanding between our scientific, civil, and legislative communities:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON

In recent weeks, others of the Marine Corps and of the administration have been engaging in the pastime of hiking together. Your honor guest and I have refrained from such hazardous practices. Instead, we have indulged in the pastime of eating together.

I assure you it is the colonel—and not the calories—that brings me here tonight. Certainly, one of the most pleasant—although unofficial—duties of the office I hold has been the privilege over the past year of speaking at banquets honoring John Glenn. I am not sure whether he regards this as a pleasure, also. I understand the colonel has suggested that an extra tube of food be put aboard the capsule to the moon as a precaution against the possibility that when the first meal is being eaten there, the Vice President might show up to make a presentation.

Tonight, at this Goddard memorial dinner, it is appropriate for us to concern ourselves with the fundamental issue of our national space effort: the matter of public support for our public policy in this field.

This is an audience of experts—experts on the meaning and potential of the space age and on the needs of the space program of our country. Individually and collectively, you appreciate what a dynamic force the space program is for our economy. You know it means improved technology, greater security, a rising level of business activity, a higher standard of living for our people. Above all, you understand the essential fact that if the United States is to be a source of leadership for freedom tomorrow as it is today, we must succeed in our space efforts now during this decade.

In all realms of specialized knowledge, there is the ever-present danger of parochialism. Many of my scientist friends think that the most narrow and parochial men they know are engineers. Nearly all engineers I know think the same of scientists. But both scientists and engineers agree on one thing: nobody is more parochial and narrow and shortsighted than politicians.

I hardly need to say that some of my best friends are politicians. I can say of them that what you think of them, they in turn think of you. That is precisely the point to which my remarks tonight are addressed.

We are at a point in our national history in which the future capabilities of our country, and the future of our country's role as a leader of freedom, depend decisively upon both mutual understanding and mutual trust, as well as mutual comprehension, between the community of technology and the community of public affairs.

To say this, and to weigh the merits of each side, does not automatically lead to the conclusion that one side or the other is the right side. The concern of the space scientists for maintaining the schedule of space projects is right and proper—beyond dispute. The concerns of the political community for the implications of supporting those programs are no less right and proper—beyond dispute.

Between these viewpoints—each responsible, each prudent, each sincere and conscientious—there exists what we must frankly acknowledge to be a dollar gap. Those charged with responsibility for public policy know that the total space program has cost us about 20 cents a week per capita. They also know that in the near future the program may cost as much as 60 cents a week per capita. On the other hand, those in the technological community know that as a nation we are spending more on cigarettes, alcohol or recreation than we do on space. Last year alone, Americans bet more on horse races than on space.

Personally, I believe—as I am sure you believe—that we must be concerned with where America finishes in the space race; and I am not content to bet on America merely to place or show, and certainly not to finish out of the money altogether.

In either case, from either viewpoint, the present period of preoccupation with the dollar aspects of space is symptomatic of a failure to bridge the gap of understanding between the two communities which are jointly responsible for our national success or failure in mankind's age of space. In the long term, dollars alone will not be the decisive factor of either our success or our failure. We shall succeed only in proportion to our understanding of what is at stake and of how the stakes of space relate to those qualities of our society and our heritage to which no dollar value can be attached.

Of those qualities, none is more priceless than the fact that in our representative democracy public policy must be an expression of the public's will and support. The technological community which understands the stakes of space has a responsibility, therefore, for helping the public to understand those stakes. Unless and until this is done, the technological community cannot justifiably be impatient with those who are chosen to represent and express the public's own will.

Throughout our national history America has moved forward on waves of new invention. The individual inventors of 50 and 60 years ago have been uniquely honored as virtual national heroes in this century. They have become a part of our folklore—not to mention of our textbooks and motion pictures, as well. But we can only wonder what would have happened if Thomas Edison or Samuel Morse or Alexander Graham Bell had come to Congress and to the people and had asked for funds with which to invent an electric light bulb or a telegraph or a telephone.

We can imagine that the response would have been somewhat less than enthusiastic.

Today, the age of space is an infinitely more inventive age for America—and the world—than the era at the beginning of this century. Our national space program already has produced more than 3,000 new products and processes of private commercial potential. These achievements already are being put to work. Today's inventor is working on a much surer course, with a much greater certainty of what will be accomplished, than were the men who changed history by tinkering in their bicycle shops not so long ago.

Experimentation is still present in our efforts now but the factor of uncertainty has never been so small. We know what we are likely to do. We can be more certain of what our efforts are likely to produce. If there is a consistent pattern of error, it is error on the side of underestimation—not overestimation.

This simply means that we are able to tell the people more of where we are going and more of why we should go there. If we fail to do this, if we fail to utilize this greater capacity, then the responsibility for lack of public support will fall upon those who had the knowledge but failed to impart it to the people.

Along with the knowledge of our own capabilities and directions, we are also possessed of knowledge about the capabilities and directions of our principal competitors in the space adventure. I believe it is a part of our responsibility to keep the public better informed about the relative progress and capabilities of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Let us look at a few basic comparisons:

1. Rocket power; Today the Soviets have in operation more powerful rockets than do we. We are trying to catch up. We have under development much more powerful rockets than the Soviets now have in operation. But we must assume that the Soviets are likewise working to improve the power of their own rockets.

2. Number of successes: At the end of 1962, the United States had successfully orbited 120 payloads in space. This means that we have put about four times as many payloads into earth orbit as have the Soviets. But at the same time the smaller number of Soviet payloads have weighed substantially more than the total of our larger number of payloads.

3. Ratio of failures: We can say with reasonable assurance that the Soviets have had a ratio of successes to failure comparable to our own. Our failures as well as our successes are known to the world. The Soviets have announced their successes and concealed their failures. But the basic fact is that in both nations the reliability of launching vehicles has shown a remarkable and comparable increase. For example, through 1960, the United States had about one failure for each success. In 1961, the ratio of successes was 3 to 1. In 1962, the ratio reached 5 to 1.

4. Space applications: In utilizing space technology, to improve mankind's lot on earth, the United States is well ahead. Weather satellites, communication satellites, navigation satellites, and many other activities are measures of this. In this realm, the Soviet Union—despite the potential of its technology—is not choosing to compete.

5. Scientific information: Comparisons between the nations as to which has obtained the most useful scientific data cannot be exact. Both nations have done remarkably well. The United States is sharing much of its information with the world scientific community. The Soviet is more selective and secretive.

6. Manned flights: Soviet cosmonauts have put in more flying time than our astronauts. Certainly the U.S.S.R. is ahead in the total knowledge obtained from manned space flight.

7. Guidance and control: Both countries have made rapid progress in this technology. Last year's dual near-rendezvous launch by the Soviets is the outstanding single accomplishment by either nation, thus far. However, the United States has shown remarkable progress particularly in the Mariner shot and the Schirra flight.

We can say that competency is growing in the space programs of each nation. What space gap exists is not due to a lack of ability or resources on our part but exists because we started later and do not have a surplus of time.

The year of 1962 was a rewarding year for the United States in its space efforts. We demonstrated convincingly through both showcase successes and supporting scientific progress our ability to translate sound decisions into significant accomplishments. A gratifying number of historic successes were achieved by our efforts last year.

In this year of 1963, our program will be passing through a year of concentrated development. Concentrated development does not always produce spectacular events, and it is possible that our efforts may be overshadowed by Soviet space shots. I urge, therefore, that we not be discouraged by publicized events but rather be stimulated to even greater efforts for the coming years.

The United States is, at all times, cognizant of the fact of competition in the development of space technology. At the same time, neither the pattern nor the purposes of our program are controlled by other than our own national purposes to develop the peaceful uses of outer space. We do what we do in space because of our national faith, not our national fears. We proceed on the program scheduled because of our confidence, not because we are seeking to copy or duplicate what others have done or may do.

In the long prospect of the space age, our national efforts to this point are to the future as a minute is to a millennium. We cannot measure our continuing advance by the calendar. We are compressing generations of progress into months or even weeks of time.

This very speed at which the U.S. effort is moving makes it imperative that we not form tomorrow's goals on yesterday's thinking. It is also imperative that we not set our purposes by the narrow horizons of a dollar debate.

There would be no reason for us to be concerned with space at all except for the clear and compelling implications of space to those values of our system and our society for which no price is too great. Freedom is a sturdy plant, but it cannot grow and flower on this earth if the universe which envelops us is poisoned and contaminated by tyranny.

If we are to be successful in freedom's cause, we must, as I have said, concern ourselves with bridging the gap between space science and political science. Nowhere else has science served freedom as nobly and abundantly as under our system. Likewise, nowhere else has the political system supported scientific inquiry and achievement more effectively or more understandingly. Our achievements of the past 5 years dramatically demonstrate both of these points.

Americans now are able to be infinitely more confident about the future than in the first anxious days after Sputnik I in 1957. We can say now that on our present course there is no danger of a default by our Nation in space. We can also say with equal confidence that there is a growing prospect of decisive success for our free society in the competition to preserve the realms of space for the peaceful benefits or mankind in this century.

In a day when machines can talk to each other and work with each other, it is neither too much to ask—nor too much to hope—that responsible men of the technological comunity and the political community can and will find their way to mutual understanding to assure our greater success in achieving the goals essential for our freedom.

Award to Constantine N. Kangles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in Chicago recently, a group of distinguished Americans received the Good American Award from the Chicago Committee of One Hundred, a civic organization devoted to the promotion of better human relations. The award is conferred on those "who champion the cause of equal human relations and who practice the basic principles of American democracy without expecting recognition or reward," according to Ernest R. Rather, president of the Chicago Committee of One Hundred.

There is one recipient of this award, Constantine N. Kangles, to whom I should like to bring special attention. I do this because the very scope of his activities and the magnitude of his efforts have brightened the lives of many individuals, directly and indirectly.

Constantine Kangles is a Chicago attorney and a master in chancery of the Superior Court of Cook County, Ill. I think that he is a very remarkable man. In our age of automation and complexity which is still suffering from some barbaric customs he is in the tradition of the renaissance man. He is both contemplative and active. His vocation as a practitioner of the science of the law has not detracted from his love of literature and the fine arts. But what distinguishes him, above all other things, is his devotion to his fellow man. Constantine Kangles is representative of other Americans like him; who, through our history, have fought to preserve and protect our system of law and justice; our institutions of religious expression, culture and education; our thriving commerce and industry; and, above all, the basic human rights of equality of opportunity for all citizens, regardless of race, creed, or national origin.

This devotion to human rights is probably the most important activity in which all of us can engage. Representing a district such as mine, in which we are trying to break down the last vestiges of discrimination; and as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa; I know how vital it is that we bring full rights of citizenship to all Americans as speedily as possible, not only because it is right and just, but because it is necessary if we are to continue to be the leader of the free world and if we are to hold the respect of Afro-Asian nations to whom second-class citizenship in America is most repulsive.

Constantine Kangles, in every phase of his life, has striven to bring us closer to our American ideal. Although he is of Greek descent and has been active in Hellenic organizations, the Justice for Cyprus Committee and the Greek Orthodox Welfare Foundation, much of his work as an individual and as an attorney has been directed toward improving the conditions in Latin America. Before President Kennedy had taken office and brought to our attention the vast problems of our sister republics, Kangles had been directly working to solve many of these problems and has recently been instrumental in the release of Americans and others imprisoned in Cuba, and in handling many matters involving Latin Americans seeking political asylum.

In the city of Chicago and the State of Illinois, where he resides and practices most of the time, Mr. Kangles has constantly worked to open up the opportunities for employment for individuals who have been discriminated against for prejudicial reasons. He was an articulate proponent of the first fair employment practices bill to be passed into law in 1961.

As I indicated before, Constantine Kangles bears resemblance to the Renaissance man, or to Jefferson and Franklin, to whom we Americans can proudly refer. His activities have not been solely directed toward seeking equality but also toward creating the type of atmosphere in which life is robust, healthy, and harmonious. And so, much of his effort has been in behalf of educational institutions—North Park College, Loyola University, Chicago, the Chicago-Kent College of Law and Clark University to name the few in which he is most active. He was also a cochairman of the Chicago Committee for the Harry S. Truman Library and is a member of the Bishop Sheil Foundation.

Last year he was appointed by President Kennedy as a member-at-large of the National Advisory Council to the Small Business Administration established to evaluate the effectiveness of Government programs.

I could go on to speak of his activities in Masonic organizations on behalf of children and the crippled. Or of his interest in the strength of our system of government by his participation in the affairs of the Democratic Party.

Let me conclude, however, in speaking of Mr. Kangles on the occasion of his receiving the Good American Award, that his interests and his energies have pervaded many of our most worthwhile activities, and his dedication to his fellow human beings should stand as an inspiration to those who have been associated with him, to those who have benefitted from his hard work, to those who read this tribute, and to us as we try to do our best in insuring peace, prosperity, and good health for our Nation, and indeed, for all mankind.

A $1,000 Reward Offered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, here is a good chance for someone among our foreign aid spenders to make himself $1,000 in cold cash, provided he can put his finger on the very words in our Federal Constitution specifically authorizing this gigantic, backbreaking, nation-ruining, inflationary, ineffective foreign aid adventure that has already cost our country $100 billion since its inception. I now make this cash offer to President Kennedy, Chief Justice Warren, Secretary of State Rusk, or any Member of Congress who will point out to me the constitutional words giving this kind of legal authority to any officials whatever in our government of the people.

I have always voted against every single dime of this unconstitutional outpouring of the resources of our people. And so I now challenge all those who have so faithfully supported it from year to year to show me, though I do not hail from Missouri, whereby they have derived their just power from the consent of the governed so as to have enabled them to take a total of $555 from each man, woman, and child in America, over the years, and broadcast that bounty throughout the world, frequently among communistic countries.

BUT DEAN RUSK SAYS

The latest statement from Secretary Rusk about this piece of outlawry says that any failure to keep up this foreign aid program right now might cause us to lose Vietnam. Now when did we ever have Vietnam? Where is the official sanction for making Vietnam a state or territory of the United States? And if we do lose that which we do not have, how could it possibly matter? Are those jungles in southeast Asia really necessary to our survival? Do they furnish additional war potential to the Kremlin? Do they have atomic powered submarines or long-range missiles? Is Vietnam such a suitable locale in which the sons of American parents may die that we must continue to pour our blood and money into that distant territory thousands of miles from our shores? Frankly, we all know the Vietnamese would not recognize any democracy, or care about it, if they should meet it out on the sweet highway to paradise.

We may indeed lose Vietnam. But truthfully we have already lost Vietnam. And yet we know we never did have it in the first place, if we just tell the simple truth about the whole matter.

WHAT A JOKE

You may recall that recently someone in our Government accused the ruling authority down in Brazil of being soft on communism, or words to that effect. And immediately the Brazilians jumped up and said, "If you are going to insult us in that manner, we will just stop taking all your foreign aid." And then we calmed down considerably and said, "Now do not get ruffled, just be good boys and keep on taking our aid and another shipment will soon be on the way." What a joke when you have to apologize for telling the blunt truth and when you even have to beg some foreign nation to take your handouts.

And then also what a joke it is whenever some little, struggling county or city down in Kentucky, Tennessee, or Georgia could not come to Washington on its hands and knees and get enough money to build a small bridge or a dam from these very "Constitution disregarding" authorities who would yet hasten to pour out millions of your cash dollars before sunrise tomorrow to help keep India "neutral." Why not let India be unneutral? She will eventually learn all about communism regardless of our pattern of behavior. In fact, she has already learned, even before the recent ides of March, has she not?

Mr. Speaker, I will never be very much of a governmental economizer here in Congress until and unless we see fit to prefer an American bridge or a Kentucky dam over and above the building of an airfield over yonder in Afghanistan.

And did you know—yes, of course, you must know—that we have given several billions of dollars to foreign powers to help reduce their national debts and balance their budgets? And yet in order to do this we had to increase our own national debt and unbalance our own budget. Ours is the largest national debt on earth. It is even larger than the combined debt of all those receiving our

foreign aid. But we just go blithely and bounteously along on our merry way toward national and fiscal destruction. Will I vote this week to add on the increased $500 million for accelerated public works? Of course, I will. My simple motto declares, "Millions for the near east we call eastern Kentucky and not one additional dime for the near east we might call East Germany." Maybe you really did not know we had already spent several millions on communist East Germany. But it is true. Just look at the dismal record and you will see SILER has not infringed on the Ninth Commandment against false witnessing.

Mr. Speaker, you well know that Rome lasted only as long as there were real Romans interested in Rome. Now it is equally true, I believe, that America will only last as long as there are real Americans interested in America.

Well, I will be hanging around with my checkbook ready to give $1,000 to anyone who will show me some rhetoric in the Federal Constitution about like these words: "And shall have power to make appropriations for the use and benefit of other foreign nations." My address here in Washington is 209 House Office Building and I will be ready, willing, and able if you will only "point out them words."

Is It Fact or Fancy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my "Washington Report" of March 29, 1963, together with the attached reprint from the Civic Center Sun of Los Angeles, Calif., August 31, 1951.

The articles follow:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

This report could well be entitled "Is It Fact or Fancy?" My recent report on Exercise Water Moccasin III produced a torrent of inquiries, and some condemnation, from people who like to play games. I have no objection to training some of the officers of our allies. I do not consider that Communist Indonesia is an ally, but rather a member within the Communist orbit whose attacks are leveled against our allies, Great Britain and Holland. Liberia is not a NATO ally, but is a member of the U.N. as is Indonesia. Therefore, the Operation Water Moccasin III took on somewhat the nature of a United Nations operation.

I was fully aware that similar operations had been conducted in this country over a long period of time, but the original plan for Water Moccasin II was much greater than was actually carried out. An Army release dated January 14, 1963, stated that "between 2,500 and 3,000 men will participate." Subsequent releases reduced the figure to 1,000 and the final Army release indicated something under 600 participants, scattered over 1½ million acres of land.

I am unalterably opposed to subjecting the civilian population to massive psychological, counterinsurgency warfare. I objected to the military secrecy surrounding the operation, and I recalled a similar operation in California in the summer of 1951, when the "U.N. Military Government" took over Culver City and arrested the mayor and established martial law. Included as a part of this report is an additional reprint covering the Culver City operation and the "United Nations Forces Military Government Proclamation No. 1" which is reprinted in full, and which should be read by all patriotic Americans.

In May of this year, there will be a similar operation in the State of Washington entitled "Coulee Crest." This operation will be started by a special forces unit which is now in the area. In a picture and interview with four members of the special forces unit, which appeared in the Wenatchee, (Wash.) Daily World, of March 12, 1963, it is interesting to note that these men wear the type berets such as those worn in the Katanga takeover by the U.N. forces. From now on, however, and during the maneuvers, these men will be wearing civilian clothes. They will be underground agents for the "red army" which will try to gain control of Wenatchee, Wash., from the "blue army." This special underground unit will call on civilians to hide them and to transport them to points of demolition, and will urge that they not be turned over to the Army.

My question is, how will a resident know whether the man knocking at the door is a part of the maneuver or whether he is a robber, seeking to gain admission to the home, or actually a foreign spy requesting transportation to a demolition site such as a bridge or a hydroelectric power plant? It is simply more psychological warfare practiced on the American civilian population.

During a similar action in Lampasas, Tex., on April 3, 1952, we are informed on excellent authority that greenclad aggressor troops took over the city, a ranching town of 5,000 people, closed churches, bullied teachers and set up concentration camps. Businessmen were arrested; brief one-sided trials, minus habeas corpus, were conducted; and guards were posted in school classrooms. An AP dispatch for April 3 said in part:

"But the staged action almost became actual drama when one student and two troopers forgot it was only makebelieve. 'Ain't nobody going to make me get up,' cried John Snell, 17, his face beef red. One of the paratroopers shoved the butt of his rifle within inches of Snell's face and snarled, 'You want this butt placed in your teeth? Get up.' "

There can be only two reasons for this type of operation, both of them bad. The first is that our defenses are weak because of the abandonment of our first-strike capabilities, which are the only war deterrent we have had, plus the fact that we are dismantling our missile bases around the world and programing a unilateral disarmament in general, which by 1970 will place us at the absolute mercy of Russia.

The second is that we are probing the resistance of the American people to an internal takeover, fantastic as that may seem, although the present tendency is to deliver this country into the tender hands of the U.N. peacekeeping army. I recall that Abraham Lincoln said, "If this Nation is ever destroyed, it will be from within, not from without."

A MOCK MILITARY GOVERNMENT TAKEOVER OR REHEARSAL FOR THE REAL THING IN THE UNITED STATES?

The Army Military Government Reserve units "occupied" nine small cities around Los Angeles in July 1951. The "guinea pig" village taken over sometime prior to these nine was the fashionable winter resort of Palm Springs.

The press in Palm Springs, referring to these military government summer maneuvers for the reservists, said that the action was thought to be one of the first of its kind in the country.

This first-of-its-kind exercise, conducted by an authority whose title has as alien a ring as ever was heard in a republic; namely, military government, was carried on one weekend in September 1950.

COINCIDENCE?

Is it coincidence that this military government resembles the recent legislation for universal military training?

The date of September 1950 places these military government maneuvers 9 months before the passage of the present universal military training legislation whose hidden provisions make possible the military dictatorship of the United States.

SLICK TRICK? TRIAL BALLOON?

Was the military so sure of its dictatorial powers that it pushed the dateline forward by 9 months in a tryout, under the guise of maneuvers, which could show how somnolent or submissive the American public was?

The press reports indicated that during the proceedings in Palm Springs the civilian activities were taken over, the mayor and city manager jailed, and all persons in the town over 16 were to be registered for "labor uses."

This act of regimenting civilians for labor service has its counterpart in the universal military training bill.

Senate bill 1 (unamended) called for all citizens to be trained for civilian as well as military service so that there might be a ready reservoir to fill the military and civilian needs of the Nation.

Provisions such as these plainly would make possible permanent labor service (regimentation) for civilians in the United States, not in some faroff Liliput.

SOOTHING SYRUP

Of course, these military government takeovers are presumably for action in some distant lands. To assure the nervous Nellies that it could never happen here, the Culver City press, during the takeover of that area, carried a single line stating that such action would not operate in the United States.

Phooey.

A UNITED NATIONS FORCE

At Palm Springs maneuvers in 1950 the Stars and Stripes were accompanied by a newly-designed flag intended for use of the unit, according to report.

This new flag was blue, not unlike the United Nations flag, and had a center design. Only, not the world with a wreath around it.

However by July 1951 the military government took over the Huntington Park area boldly in the name of the "United Nations Forces Military Government of Agressi." Agressi is the name of a mythical state contrived by these "summer project" pranksters.

Where does fun end and military dictatorship take over? When the emergency arises?

We recall that world government advocates continually refer to "the rule of law," "world law," regulation "by law." What law? Universal military law?

We likewise remember that world government advocates tell us that the international system will operate directly upon the individual wherever he is.

Do you like to be operated upon directly by that international debating society known as the U.N. which conducted its continuing conversations at Lake Success while our boys died at the 38th parallel in Korea?

WHAT CONCLUSION?

What attitude are we, the everyday God-fearing Americans who love our Republic, to assume toward a hitherto unheard of military government in the United States?

Has not the day come when we are to stand up and be counted for our country? Are we afraid?

The scripture says, "Be ye strong, therefore, and let not your hands be weak: for your work shall be rewarded" (II Chronicles 15: 7).

UNITED NATIONS FORCE OR FARCE?

HUNTINGTON PARK.—Military government occupancy of Huntington Park last week aroused indignation from many responsible sources and many local people expressed misgivings over such a development. All concerned were outspoken regarding the Bulletin's coverage of the so-called occupation and it is believed that this newspaper was the only one, at least locally, to feature the seizure proclamation.

Huntington Park, South Gate, Los Angeles, Eagle Rock, and Hollywood guardians of freedom obtained hundreds of extra copies of the Bulletin and it is known that officials in Washington, D.C., have been deluged with telegrams and letters protesting the invasion.

It has been stated that the entire program of occupancy of Huntington Park, South Gate, Culver City, Long Beach, Torrance, Hawthorne, Compton, Redondo Beach, and other cities was planned at an Army officers' meeting at which prominent civilian law enforcers were present.

The original idea, it is believed, was for the maneuver to be conducted without previous or advance warning. Since it was impossible to keep the idea secret, reports state, it was decided to inform the public of this.

Observers have pointed out that military men are being taken into governmental departments with alarming rapidity and many locals believe seizure to be a forerunner of events to come unless immediate precautions are taken.

There is a definite indication that Huntington Park city officials and those of other cities will not permit a repetition of this maneuver this year, next year, or otherwise unless circumstances beyond their control compel them to do so.

They agree that if it was purely a tactical maneuver for the education of Army personnel it has merit, but if it is the beginning of any other procedure it is dangerous.

In the meantime the Bulletin will watch the picture closely to see if the seizure is, as many irate readers believe, the Army's lesson to civilians.

UNITED NATIONS FORCES MILITARY GOVERNMENT OF AGRESSI

Proclamation No. 1

To the People of Agressi:

Whereas in prosecuting the war against Agressi, it has become necessary for the armed forces of the United Nations under my command, to occupy this town, adjacent areas, and other portions of Agressi, and

Whereas it is the policy of the armed forces of the United Nations not to make war upon the civilian inhabitants of the occupied territory but to protect them in the peaceful exercise of their legitimate pursuits, insofar as the exigencies of war and their own behavior will permit, and

Whereas in order to preserve law and order and to provide for the safety and welfare both of the forces under my command and of yourselves, it is necessary to establish military government in the occupied territory: Now, therefore,

I, Jones Smithman, general, U.S. Army, commanding U.S. Forces Oceania, and Military Governor of Agressi, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the United Nations Security Council, do hereby proclaim as follows:

I

All powers of government and jurisdiction in the occupied territory and over the inhabitants thereof, and final administrative responsibility are vested in me as Commanding General of the Forces of Occupation and as Military Governor of United Nations Forces, Military Government of Agressi is hereby established to exercise these powers under my direction.

II

All persons in the occupied territory will obey promptly all orders given by me or under my authority and must not commit any act hostile to the forces under my command or helpful to the Agressi forces; must not commit acts of violence or acts which may disturb public order in any way.

III

Your existing customs, religious beliefs and property rights will be fully respected and your existing laws will remain in force and effect except insofar as it may be necessary for me in the exercise of my powers and duties to change them by proclamation or order issued by me or under my direction.

IV

All Agressi civil and criminal courts and all universities, schools and educational establishments will be closed until further order of United Nations Forces Military Governor of Agressi.

V

All administrative and police officials of towns, cities, counties and States and all other Government and municipal functionaries and employees, and all officers and employees of State, municipal or other public services, except such officials and political leaders as are removed by, or under my direction, are required to continue in the performance of their duties subject to my direction or the direction of such of the officers of the armed forces of the United Nations as may be deputed for the purpose.

VI

So long as you remain peaceable and comply with the orders of the forces of occupation, you will be subject to no greater interference than is made necessary by war conditions, and may go about your normal vocations without fear.

VII

Further proclamation, orders and regulations will be issued by me or under my authority from time to time. They will state what is further required of you, and what you are forbidden to do, and will be displayed in courthouses, city halls, or other public places.

VIII

In case of conflict or ambiguity between the English text of his proclamation or any other proclamation, order, or regulation issued under my authority, and any translations thereof, the English text is to prevail.

JONES SMITHMAN,
Commanding United Nations Forces Oceania, General, United States Army, Military Governor of Agressi.

The Black Watch To Be at Quincy, Mass., Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues here in the U.S. House of Representatives the following letter which I have received from the office of the Canadian Consulate General signed by the Honorable S. D. Hemsley.

CANADIAN CONSULATE GENERAL,
BOSTON, MASS.,
January 15, 1963.

MR. JAMES A. BURKE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURKE: I am sure that you will be glad to know that agreement has been reached at last for a marching detachment and band of the 3d Battalion, the Black Watch (Royal Highland Regiment) of Canada to be present at the Memorial Day services to be held on May 30 of this year in Quincy.

Those in Quincy who are concerned with this operation have been advised of this decision and they are, I understand, now working out arrangements with the commanding officer in Montreal.

I can only add how glad I am that the unit will be coming down, for I am sure that many new friendships—stemming from the old valuable associations—will result from it.

With my kindest regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

S. D. HEMSLEY,
Consul General.

The above information has been received in a very enthusiastic way not only by the citizens of my congressional district but throughout the entire New England area.

The purpose is to honor the Americans who served with the 236th Battalion, MacLean Kilties of America, during World War I, from the Greater Boston area, under the command of Lt. Col. Percy Guthrie. Permission was granted by the United States for Lieutenant Colonel Guthrie to come from Canada and recruit men from the Greater Boston area, for the 236th Battalion, known as the MacLean Kilties of America.

Invitations were sent in November 1961, by Sfc. James Johnston, U.S. Army recruiter in Quincy, at the request of the city of Quincy, the Quincy Veterans Council, and the Royal Canadian Legion to possibly obtain a unit from the Royal Black Watch (R.H.R.) of Canada, to participate in the Veterans Day parade, November 11, 1962, in honor of those Americans who served in the MacLean Kilties, many of whom were transferred into the Royal Black Watch upon their arrival overseas, during World War I. However, they notified Sergeant Johnston, that they were laying away their old colors on that day, and were unable to accept the invitation. However, an invitation was extended to Sergeant Johnston and Sgt. George J. Matta to be the guest of the 3d Battalion, stationed at Montreal, Canada, when the regiment received their new colors on the 8th of June 1962. Arrangements were made by Congressman JAMES A. BURKE, 11th Congressional District, to assure every assistance possible during their visit.

Due to the great disappointment of all concerned, Sergeant Johnston was again asked to try to obtain the same Black Watch unit for the Memorial Day parade and exercises, to be held in the city of Quincy on May 30, 1963. This time, with the assistance of the Canadian Consulate General, Mr. S. D. Hemsley, and by the Deputy Minister for External Affairs from Ottawa, Canada, Sergeant Johnston was notified by Mr. Hemsley on January 9, 1963, that the Canadian Government has accepted the invitation and a contingent from the 3d Battalion, Royal Black Watch (R.H.R.), to include 70 men of all ranks, would handle the commitment for the Memorial Day parade. Also the keen interest of the visiting unit and the enthusiasm here in the city of Quincy and the

Greater Boston area is certainly a sign of good will. This was the result of a continuous effort which lasted over a year.

A committee has been formed to welcome the Royal Black Watch (R.H.R.) on the evening of May 29, 1963, by having a military ball, which is to be held at the Massachusetts National Guard Armory, 1000 Hancock Street, Quincy, Mass., starting at 8 p.m. This will include many Federal, State, and local dignitaries.

On Memorial Day 1963, a preparade ceremony will be held in front of city hall in Quincy, starting at 9 a.m. This will include playing of both national anthems and raising of both national colors, also the inspection of the Royal Black Watch (R.H.R.) and the U.S. Army honor guard. Wreaths will be laid in the tomb of the second and sixth Presidents of the United States, John Adams and John Quincy Adams. Upon completion of the short ceremony, both units will proceed to School Street, Quincy, the starting point for the main parade. The parade will proceed to the Mount Wollaston Cemetery for the main Memorial Day exercises.

Arrangements have been made to billet the unit at the President City Motel, 845 Hancock Street, Quincy, and messed at a local U.S. Army installation.

The advanced party is scheduled to arrive 8 hours prior to main unit. A welcome committee will be present. When information is received as to approximate time and place of arrival the proper authorities will be notified.

It is anticipated due to the large population of Canadians residing in the Greater Boston area a large turnout can be expected.

ASSISTANCE

Decorations for the National Guard armory and Memorial Day parade, will be arranged by Mr. Richard Koch, park and recreation division, city of Quincy.

Billeting and messing arranged by the U.S. Army, recruiting station, Quincy.

Publicity: U.S. Army recruiting main station, army base, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. Gertrude Whitney, chairman, Royal Canadian Legion; Mr. John Harding, cochairman, Royal Canadian Legion; Mr. Thomas F. Blasi, sergeant of arms, Quincy Veterans Council; Mr. Ron Redquest, Royal Canadian Legion; Mr. Percy N. Lane, reporter, Quincy Patriot Ledger; Mr. Henry Bosworth, reporter, Herald-Traveler, Boston, Mass.; and Mr. Herb Fontaine, announcer, radio station WJDA, Quincy, Mass.

Master of ceremonies, Mr. James Asher, of radio station WJDA, Quincy, Mass.

Commander Mr. Francis S. MacKenzie, of the Quincy Veterans Council, ex officio all committees.

Royal Black Watch (R.H.R.) committee: past commander, Veterans Council, Mr. David Alexander, chairman; Sfc. James Johnston, U.S. Army recruiting, cochairman; M. Sgt. George J. Matta, U. S. Army recruiting, cochairman; past commander, American Legion Post No. 95, Quincy, Thomas F. Blasi, sergeant at arms; Mrs. Grace M. Blasi, deputy sheriff of Norfolk County, secretary; Rev. Thomas J. Tierney, director of music; and Mr. Alec Smith, city of Quincy auditor.

Canadian: Comdr. James Fraser, Royal Canadian Legion, Eastern States Command; Past Comdr. Dave Boucher; Mr. John Harding, Royal Canadian Legion, publicity; Mr. John Tompson, Royal Canadian Legion; Mrs. Gertrude Whitney, secretary; Alfred Walker, former 236th Battalion; Kent Brydle, treasurer and ticket chairman; and Douglas Cummings, former 236th Battalion.

Main Memorial Day parade committee: Comdr. Francis S. MacKenzie, Quincy Veterans Council; Past Comdr. Charles N. Ross, Quincy Veterans Council, chairman; Sgt. James Johnston, U.S. Army recruiting, Quincy, cochairman; Arthur I. Senter, and John Wipfler.

Aides to the distinguished guests, unknown at this time.

Invited dignitaries and guests for military ball, tentative list: President John F. Kennedy, Congressman James A. Burke, Governor of Massachusetts Endicott Peabody, Mayor Amelio Della Chiesa, S. D. Hemsley, Canadian Consulate General of Boston, Mass., Quincy City Council, Comdr. Francis S. MacKenzie, Quincy Veterans Council, Comdr. James Fraser, Royal Canadian Legion, Eastern States Command, clergy, military representatives, living members of the 236th Battalion and Royal Black Watch, and Gold Star Mothers.

Mr. Speaker, in a few years the famous Black Watch will be 250 years old. That is a long time to sustain a reputation of distinction; but that is what the soldiers of the Black Watch have done. Famous for their outstanding military performance, their honor, bravery, and devotion, as soldiers they have ever been considered exemplary. Long since a regiment, the Black Watch originated in 1725, formed from a group of four companies of Scotch Highlanders for the purpose of preserving order in the area.

It is interesting that from the first the Black Watch was a distinctive group. The companies were composed of men of good family, who were eager to bear arms and to wear the Highland dress, both of which practices had been forbidden by law since the Scotch uprising against the English in 1715. The name Black Watch originated partly from the dark hues of the Highland tartan of which their kilts were made. To this day the particular dark blue and green plaid is a favorite and bears the name of the regiment. Their bright scarlet jackets are the British red.

The British, quick to perceive the superior character of these independent Highland companies, added four more, forming them into a regiment. In 1739 the Black Watch became a part of the regular British Army.

From the beginning the Black Watch was noted for its shining example of loyalty, courage, and endurance. It has maintained that reputation throughout its brilliant history. A mere listing of the battle honors won by this regiment fills a closely printed page. They date from 1759, "Guadaloupe," and during World War I were so numerous that a selection had to be made to emblazon them on the King's or Regimental Colors. Among them is one for "North America," for their achievements during the French and Indian Wars.

The Black Watch fought with distinction in numerous campaigns in India, in the Indies, in France against Napoleon—notably at Waterloo—and in the Crimea. They fought in South Africa before and in the 1850's, and again in the Boer War in 1899–1902. They gained 69 battle honors in World War I. During World War II the itinerary of the 6th Battalion alone starts at Perth and, covering various parts of England, includes Dunkirk—the very name is now synonymous with heroism—France, Belgium, and back to the Isle of Wight, to defend England, then on to north Africa, Egypt, Italy, and Greece.

The 6th Battalion was but one of those of the Black Watch which took part in almost every theater and nearly every principal campaign of World War II. Besides the early days in Belgium and France, there were Somaliland, Crete, the defense of Tobruk, in the Middle East, Gibraltar, the conquest of north Africa from El Alamein to Tripoli, the capture of Sicily and the Italian campaigns, back to the fierce struggle at Normandy, the crossing of the Rhine and on to the German capitulation. In the Far East, Burma and Malaya are some of the milestones passed by units of the Black Watch in the long trek to victory over all the King's enemies.

The fine reputation of the Black Watch has been enhanced in every war that the British have fought since 1725. They have earned the highest praise for unstinted good work, for gallantry. Their untarnished record of high achievement has been attributed to the continuous spirit of trust and good fellowship which has united all ranks of the regiment since its earliest days. In an officer's "History of the Black Watch" he comments that history shows that it was this spirit which inspired the great victories and sustained the heroes and filled the hearts of those who gave their lives in the service of their King, their country, and their regiment.

Unconstitutional Usurpation of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 1, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include in the RECORD the text of a speech made by my good friend and our colleague, the gentleman from California, JAMES UTT. I believe every Member of Congress should make it a point to seriously study Mr. UTT's views in connection with his Liberty Amendment which would return the power of government to the people and reinstitute the constitutional limited government envisioned by our Founding Fathers.

Briefly, the Liberty Amendment would, first, take Federal Government out of all activities except those specified in the Constitution; second, keep the Government from reentering such activity through later agreements, laws, edicts, or treaties; third, liquidate Government-in-business assets, properties, and facilities within 3 years; and fourth, at the end of 3 years repeal Federal personal income taxes.

I am sure my colleagues will agree that the basic struggle in the world today is between capitalism and socialism. Which of these two philosophies will prevail will determine if your children will live in a free country with unlimited opportunities for all, or as subjects in a federally controlled dictatorship. For added emphasis to the very fine talk by Congressman UTT, I would like to emphasize some major points he has made.

We ought to recall George Washington's warning that, if government "is not controlled, it will destroy you."

The Federal doctrine of preempting authority over a field—that is, subversive activities—usurps State prerogatives. The doctrine can carry into every field of activity until there is no State. UTT recalled a plan some years ago which envisioned the demise of States into nine territories, each run by three bureaucrats.

Bureaucracy is the invisible government which really governs the country. There are more administrative laws on the books than there are statutory laws passed by Congress.

These bureaus control 20 percent of America's industrial capacity, compete on a tax-free basis, and cost taxpayers $20 billion a year in subsidies.

After defining the understood restrictions on Federal Government written into the 9th and 10th Amendments—personal and States' rights—Mr. UTT pinpointed events which inspired the Liberty Amendment:

Attorney General Francis Biddle—1941–45 under F.D.R.—justified Justice Department intervention in a Chicago stockholders' fight by claiming "the Government can do anything not specifically prohibited to it by the Constitution."

UTT said the first part of the Liberty Amendment was to return to the principle that the Government can do only what is provided by the Constitution.

The second and third parts are to protect against time and inaction eroding the bill's intent.

The fourth part was written in 1957 when it was shown that the reduction in Government spending would offset the $45 billion personal income tax revenue.

Congressman UTT's speech in full follows:

REMARKS OF HON. JAMES B. UTT, OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a very great privilege and honor to be invited to address this meeting. Especially am I honored by the very kind invitation of my distinguished colleague and outstanding citizen of your great State, the Honorable ELMER HOFFMAN, for whom I have a high regard and deep affection.

The subject matter of my talk is somewhat controversial, and I know there are many here today who disagree with my position. To them may I say that I respect the sincerity of their convictions and hope that I may be able to shed some convincing light upon a grossly misunderstood subject. I only ask that the same respect for my sincerity be granted to me in return.

I have never demanded that people conform to my political philosophy, but, having been born an American, and expecting to die as an American, and in between the dignity of birth and the glory of death, I intend to live my life as an American. I have always adhered to the moral absolute that if something is right it is right, though all men think that it is wrong, and if something is wrong it is wrong, though all men believe it to be right.

Your most distinguished citizen, Abraham Lincoln, expressed that moral absolute in this manner: "If I am right, history will vindicate me, and if I am wrong, all of the angels in Heaven cannot justify me." And surely Abraham Lincoln had far more difficult decisions to make than any of us will ever be called upon to decide. But in these days of rapid communication, mass media, economic and political pressure groups, many of these decisions are difficult.

A hundred years ago, a great Civil War was being fought to test whether a nation conceived in liberty could long endure. Today, we are engaged in another civil war testing the same premise. It is not a hot war, but a cold war, which can be just as deadly. During that hundred years, the poles of the compass have swung in a 180° arc. At that time it was a question of whether or not the sovereignty of a State or a group of States transcended the sovereignty of the Union. That conflict was resolved in favor of the Union. The conflict today is whether or not the sovereignty of the Union transcends the sovereignty of the States which created the Union. That conflict has yet to be resolved.

Our Founding Fathers were well aware that man's eternal enemy was government, whether that government was a dictatorship, a benevolent monarchy, a democracy, or a republic. Usurpation of power is the natural trend of every government. George Washington expressed it in these words: "Government is like a fire, which, if it is properly controlled, will light your homes and cook your food and run your factories, but if it is not controlled, it will destroy you."

Based on this concept, the Government of the United States was founded upon a Constitution of delegated powers with checks and balances of the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. Beyond these three checks and balances against usurpation of power, the rights of the sovereign States were well defined in the 10th amendment, which reads as follows: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

There were no inherent powers derived from the Constitution to the Federal Government. The powers were specific, enumerated, and limited. Government is not wisdom, it is not benevolent, it is plain brute force.

Washington, in his farewell address, said: "If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way in which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation, for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use itself can at any time yield."

The Federal Government has ignored many of the provisions of the Constitution, while the sovereign States have condoned this usurpation of power, not realizing that these invasions of State sovereignty would lead to the ultimate subjugation of the States. On this I will have more to say later. Suffice for the moment to say that the liberty amendment is the vehicle which will return to the States their rightful possession of power.

There is only one basic issue, national and international, and that is socialism versus capitalism. They are incompatible, they cannot coexist, and only one system can or will survive the current conflict.

The graduated income tax, as provided in the 16th amendment, is the most deadly weapon in the arsenal of socialism. Its genesis rests firmly in the philosophy of Marx and Engels, two men dedicated to the destruction of capitalism. Capitalism is the American way of life, and let's quit apologizing for it. Why should we have a guilt complex over the system which in a century and a half brought this Nation from a weak and unimpressive beginning to the highest plateau of economic production, military strength, and the highest standard of living known to man?

America as a nation seems to have something of a guilt complex over our success, and feels that we are obligated to scatter our substance all over the world. This theory flies in the face of the parable of the talents, and violates the admonition that we should not cast our pearls before swine, "lest they turn again and rend you."

I should like to address a few remarks to the doctrine of preemption. This important subject attains its highest magnitude as it relates to the several States, and my remarks are especially directed to State legislators who may be present.

It is a doctrine that has too long been endured by the States. It reached its height in an opinion rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Steve Nelson. Nelson had been convicted under the anti-Communist laws of the State of Pennsylvania. The Supreme Court held that the antisubversive laws of Pennsylvania or any other State had been nullified by the passage of the Smith Act, a Federal law in the field of antisubversive activities. There was no question as to the fact of Nelson's guilt, but the Supreme Court opinion held that no one could be prosecuted under State antisubversion laws, as Congress had preempted the field of antisubversion.

California had convicted the now-famous "Hollywood ten" for violation of our State antisyndicalism laws which had been on our State statute books for more than half a century. These 10 convicted Communists were released because of the Supreme Court decision.

In the Smith Act, there was not one paragraph, not one line, not one word, to indicate that Congress intended to preempt the field of antisubversion to the exclusion of the States. The Supreme Court decision, therefore, was a usurpation of legislative power by the judicial branch of our Government, and should not be tolerated.

For 5 years, Congress has been attempting to pass legislation to the effect that, if any Federal law did not specifically state that it was the intent of Congress to preempt any field of legislation, that field was not preempted. The Senate has refused to go along with the House on two separate occasions. I bring this to your attention to show to you what can and may happen in any other field of State legislation, especially in the field of taxation, which surely is one of the attributes of State sovereignty.

The insatiable demand for Federal revenue, not only to run the constitutional governmental processes, but to make grants to the States so that the Federal Government can extend its control over the States, may very well cause the Supreme Court to rule that Congress has preempted the field of income taxes, next the gift tax, next the estate or inheritance tax, and even sales and excise taxes. This would deprive the States of most of their sources of revenue to provide the necessary State government, the State school systems, and other services. The States will then have to turn to Uncle Sam for financial assistance to administer State programs in accordance with Federal standards.

Federal grants to the States are like a blood transfusion in which you draw the blood from the right arm and transfuse it into the left arm, losing at least 15 percent in the transfer.

Examples of this Federal control are evident on every hand. The State of California could administer its welfare programs for half of the sum which it is now spending if our legislature were free to set up its own standards, but they have been warned by Federal administrators that if they do not conform to Federal standards, they can get no more money from the Federal Government.

Just last week, the U.S. Supreme Court rendered a far-reaching decision requiring that State criminal proceedings conform to Federal standards, and opening up purely State matters to the jurisdiction of the Federal courts.

May I direct your attention to the fact that the Federal Government has strayed from constitutional provisions and prohibitions of power in many other fields. Article I, section 8, paragraph 17 of the Constitution reads as follows:

"To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings;"

The Federal Government has no right to acquire land in any State without the consent of the legislature of that State, and even then it must be acquired by purchase. The price is not important. As an example, the Federal Government acquired the San Francisco Presidio with the consent of our legislature for the sum of $1. This property happens to be worth over $300 million today, but at least the acquisition fell within the constitutional provisions.

It was not until the admission of the State of Ohio that the Federal Government began to withhold the land which the Government owned when the State was a territory. In California, the Federal Government has withheld and acquired nearly half of our land area—in Nevada, nearly 90 percent. The Federal Government not only withheld the land, it withheld the natural resources on the land, and now even claims the rain and snow that falls on those lands.

The Federal Government now owns and controls 20 percent of our industrial capacity, engaging in business activities not permitted to it by the Constitution. I have here a fact sheet published by Willis E. Stone, chairman of the National Committee for Economic Freedom, 6413 Franklin Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. Fact sheet No. 1 lists 700 corporate activities, competing with private industry on a tax-free basis, which cost the American taxpayers $20 billion a year in subsidies.

The liberty amendment provides that these corporations shall be sold to private industry and further provides that natural resources which rightfully belong to the States or to various State compacts shall be returned to the States or to the compacting States.

Some of these corporations have been returned to private industry. The synthetic rubber industry, formerly owned as a monopoly by the Government, has been sold to private industry. While owned as a Federal Government monopoly, this business was losing money, but private industry has turned it into a profitable venture, producing better rubber, and contributing millions of dollars in taxes. While the synthetic rubber program was sold at a profit, others are a total loss. Some of them will bring from 5 to 50 cents on the dollar, but, even if they were given away, the taxpayer would save money.

Some of these corporations we don't have to worry about any more. For instance, the Cuban Nickel Company "grand design" which cost the American taxpayers $100 million plus an annual loss, was taken over by Castro. Little did he know that it was bankrupting the American taxpayer and that it will probably bankrupt him.

The abaca production and sales program will be phased out this year at a total loss. This was our great experiment in growing hemp in Latin America, and was a dismal failure. It wasn't very good hemp, and could not be sold on the open market. But they did sell it, and guess who bought it? We did. Yes, one agency bought it from another agency—the strategic stockpile bought it, and we had to build a warehouse to put the stuff in while it rotted.

Incidentally, the Federal Government has a strategic stockpile which cost us $8 billion to say nothing of the annual rental for storage. We have more than 20 years' supply of tungsten, and, believe it or not, we are still buying it.

Your tax dollars built the Rama road through the jungles of Nicaragua. It originally cost $12 million. It is interesting to note that it starts nowhere and ends nowhere. So, after it was built, Congress appropriated $3 million to survey the road. It would seem to me that it should have been surveyed first. When they surveyed the road, they found that the jungle had overgrown it, and so they are building it over again, at a cost of $24 million this time around.

The Texas City tin smelter has been sold to private industry, and has gone from the red into the black.

Your tax dollars helped to give a new look to the Eskimo igloo. It started out as a lending program for igloos, but it didn't work out very well, so it was turned into the Alaska housing project, which was just as bad. Then they tied it with seven other lending programs into one great liquidation program of about $2½ billion; $1½ billion has been lost with no recovery possible. Of the other billion dollars, about 70 percent has been recovered, and the balance is now being written off.

The Alaskan Railroad is another pet Federal project. Even tax and interest free, it is losing money, and should be sold or given to the State of Alaska, who probably won't take it on a bet. This railroad does have one distinction, however, it is the only railroad in the world that had a steamheated tunnel, with a small settlement inside to run it. The only trouble was, when the train came along, they had to open the doors, and everything got cold again. This was easily resolved. They routed the railroad around the tunnel. I could go on for hours regaling you with these stupid, costly projects, but I must hasten on.

The easy availability of revenue from the graduated income tax feeds the fires of bureaucracy, and supports foolish and unnecessary projects. Bureaucracy is the invisible government which really governs the country. There are more administrative laws on the books than there are statutory laws passed by the Congress. The bureaucrats are men you have never seen. They govern without the consent of the people, and you cannot recall them from office.

You have heard of the "tree that grew in Brooklyn." I want to tell you about the tree that grows in Washington. The seed is planted by a new program calling for a very small expenditure, and then proceeds to proliferate like a cottonwood tree. May I cite you an example or two?

In 1948 there was an appropriation for the National Institutes of Health of $3,776,311. This has now grown to $166 million. They have so much money that they are at a loss as to how and where to spend it, so here are a few of the activities of the National Institutes of Health:

"Empirical tests of a theory of interpersonal behavior, $17,250.

"Juvenile delinquency in Japanese-American population, $50,180."

That's an insult to the Japanese-American people, as that is one group in which I have never been able to find juvenile delinquency.

"A stereotactic atlas of the beagle brain, $9,775.

"Role of behavior of frontal monkeys, $15,998."

I could suggest a fertile field for that one.

"The establishment and maintenance of a monkey colony, $13,816.

"Initiation and support of a colony of baboons, $61,985."

These are just a few of the examples of waste and the duplication of what is now being carried on by private research.

I received a bulletin from the Department of Agriculture which was most enlightening. It told me that if I dropped a ripe tomato it would bruise more easily than a coconut, and that if I dropped it twice it would be very badly bruised. That was a real production in genius.

In a bill just passed by the Senate, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was made official. It was pictured as a small Bureau with a moderate budget. Last year it started with $28,000 and 15 employees. This year, it jumped to $1,100,000 with 95 employees, and next year it is requesting $2,462,000 with 218 employees. If you project that for 10 years, the cost will exceed $24 million annually with over 2,000 employees.

Here is the ultimate in bureaucracy: There used to be a room in one of the Federal buildings in Washington which had this legend stenciled on the door: "4156—General Services Administration, region 3; Public Building Service, Building Improvement Division, utility room, custodial." It was a broomcloset.

When Richard Nixon was Vice President of the United States and considered by many not to be the most popular man in the world, he was assigned two Secret Service men. Now we have what is regarded as a very popular Vice President, but two Secret Service men are not enough to guard him. He now has 18 and is asking for 36 for the coming year, at a total cost of about $300,000.

Without debating the pros and cons of the Peace Corps, I think you should know that, without the knowledge or consent of Congress, we now have an International Secretariat for the Peace Corps at a cost of $150,000 a year. Congress did not appropriate the money. It was simply given to the Peace Corps by the State Department, which is always complaining about a shortage of appropriations.

You will recall that I said there were no inherent powers derived from the Constitution. For 150 years this was the accepted understanding by everyone, and it was not until the Justice Department intervened in a stockholders' fight in Chicago, and threw Sewell Avery, long-time president of Montgomery Ward, bodily out of his office, that the concept changed. At that time, the action was justified by Attorney General Francis Biddle when he said that Government can do anything not specifically prohibited to it by the Constitution. This was one of the most outstanding pronouncements ever made, and had the effect of reversing the idea that the Federal Government was a government of limited and specific delegations of power.

Fortunately, when President Truman, relying on this statement, attempted to take over the steel mills, under the guise of "implied or inherent powers" as delineated by Attorney General Biddle, he received a stinging rebuke by Judge Pine who rendered the opinion in the case, stating that there were no implied or inherent powers derived from the Constitution. Still the Federal Government persists in operating on supposed inherent powers. It was the action and statement of Attorney General Biddle that started the liberty amendment.

The liberty amendment will not add to, nor subtract from, the powers delegated under the Constitution, but has for its purpose the restoration of government to its original, fundamental and basic purposes. The liberty amendment is in four sections.

"Section 1. The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution." Now this language is very clear in section 1. It prohibits that which had been implied for prohibition. When Mr. Biddle said that the Government can do anything not specifically prohibited to it, he reversed the intent and purpose of the 9th and 10th Amendments. The Ninth Amendment says that the enumeration of certain rights in the Constitution does not deny nor disparage others retained by the people. The 10th amendment is a little more explicit, but it deals with powers reserved to the States and to the people. Attorney General Biddle reversed this in his viewpoint. Now, we have the problem of knowing that law is, as Aaron Burr said, "whatever is boldly asserted and plausibly maintained." Law is the way it is enforced. And this is what we are living under. If we don't like it, there are three things we can do about it. We can either live with it, or violate it, or change it. And if we want to restore the Constitution, we are going to have to change and alter the interpretations and get it back to a fundamental base. And the liberty amendment's first section does exactly this, because, if you read it again, the Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise, except as specified in the Constitution. These are clear, definitive terms, and the last six words, "except as specified in the Constitution," reconfirm every delegation of power and authority contained in the Constitution, but it has the capacity to retrieve all that has been usurped. And, as Washington said, it is this usurpation of power that is our danger.

Now, to defend this constitutional arrangement of this first section from the same erosion that has happened to other parts of the Constitution, we have added section 2. Section 2 says the Constitution or laws of any State, or the laws of the United States, shall not be subject to the terms of any foreign or domestic agreement which would abrogate this amendment. In other words, it is protected from any group of people, or combination of groups, foreign or domestic, or both, that might at any time, by edict, invade this constitutional provision and alter it. This is a simple protective device, but it works.

Section 3 describes the time limit for the liquidation and transfer of these properties to the States and local jurisdiction, and to private enterprise where it is deemed best. Section 3 says that the activities of the U.S. Government which violate the intent and purpose of this amendment shall, within a period of 3 years from the date of the ratification of this amendment, be liquidated, and the properties and facilities affected shall be sold.

That was all of the language of the liberty amendment for a long while. It wasn't until 1957, when we had documented the fact of the scope of these invasions upon our private enterprise system, and could clearly identify the potential savings under the terms of these first three sections, that we even talked about the taxation problem. We recognized the truism that, if you cut a dollar off the spending, you cut the dollar off the need for taxation, and when you cut enough off the spending proclivities of the Federal Government, you have cut all of the need off for this particular tax which was applied in 1913. We proved by 1957 that the potential savings under the terms of the first three sections of the Liberty Amendment were adequate to offset the loss of revenue that would result from the repeal of the 16th Amendment.

On June 10, 1957, the language of the fourth section was added to the liberty amendment. It provides: "Three years after the ratification of this amendment the 16th article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States shall stand repealed and thereafter Congress shall not levy taxes on personal incomes, estates, and/or gifts."

Taxing and spending are so interlocked that they cannot be separated. The more you tax the more you spend, or the more you spend the more you tax. That is a truism.

Contrary to the popular concept, the repeal of the 16th amendment does not repeal the tax on corporations. The corporation tax is not an income tax but is an excise tax which was passed in 1909, and held constitutional prior to the adoption of the 16th amendment. The repeal of the 16th amendment simply repeals the personal graduated income tax and the graduated gift and estate tax. This would mean that $45 billion now collected from this source would be retained by the people, increasing purchasing power, and eliminating many controls burdened upon the individual.

The question uppermost in your mind is, How can the Federal Government function with the loss of this $45 billion?

Disposal of the assets which I consider to be held by the Federal Government in violation of the Constitution would produce from $60 to $70 billion, which would reduce the national debt by that amount, and result in an annual interest saving of nearly $2.5 billion.

There would be an annual saving of more than $20 billion now being paid out in subsidies to maintain the various unconstitutional Federal activities.

There would be an annual saving of $5 billion in the Federal payroll when the persons employed by the Government corporations are transferred to private industry.

There would be an additional $8 to $10 billion annual saving by the elimination of goods, services, and facilities now required to support this payroll.

There would be a $2 billion saving by eliminating foreign economic grants and credits. There would be at least $4 billion additional revenue generated from the sale of 20 percent of our industrial capacity to private enterprise.

There would be an additional $5 billion revenue generated by extending the corporation excise tax to unincorporated businesses to place them on an equal competitive basis.

These savings, plus the additional revenues generated, are equal to a total of $46½ billion annually, or a complete offset for the elimination of the personal income tax.

For years, my opponents at election time have charged me with wanting to sell the U.S. Post Office Department, shipyards, and even the Defense Department, because I introduced and support the Liberty Amendment. Now let's look at the facts. The Liberty Amendment in the first section states: "The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution." What are these exceptions? Article I of the Constitution provides among other things, for the Congress to establish post offices and post roads, to coin money, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, and to acquire land from the States for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings. But my opponents have never taken the trouble to examine the Constitution.

The question has been raised from time to time as to the status of our national parks under the Liberty Amendment. For example, Yosemite is a national park in California. This park was acquired by the Federal Government without constitutional authority, as the Government did not have the consent of our State legislature, nor did they purchase it. Under the Liberty Amendment, the Federal Government would have to make arrangements either to relinquish this park to the State of California, who could, if they wished, sell it back to the Federal Government for $1, and grant the Federal Government exclusive jurisdiction. On the other hand, it can become a State park, and I can say to you that there is not a State park in California that is not operated more cheaply and efficiently for the benefit of all people than any national park. So you see, there are two alternatives.

I have been questioned about the disposition of the dams and hydroelectric facilities owned by the Federal Government. Their status would be simplified, and most of them are, or should be, self-liquidating. The impounded water belongs to the States, and the Federal Government would own the dams as trustee in perpetuity for the benefit of the people of the State or the compacting States. For example, Hoover Dam would be held in trust for the seven compacting States by the Federal Government and the financial obligation would be paid off in the same manner in which it is now being liquidated.

When it became apparent that the people in the States were looking upon the liberty amendment with favor as a vehicle to recapture their sovereign rights, the U.S. Senate caused to be printed and widely distributed what is known as Senate Document No. 5. This document has little, if any, authenticity. It is impossible to find out who prepared it, and it has been thoroughly debunked. The printing was authorized by the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

The document does not address itself to the liberty amendment, but to some other fantastic subject matter. It is a scare-head document to frighten the people as to the dire results of limiting the graduated income tax. The document boldly states that the liberty amendment would repeal the corporation taxes, which of course, it would not. The front page of the document boldly states that the subject matter deals with the proposals to repeal the 16th Amendment, and then it proceeds for 26 pages to a subject matter not closely related to the liberty amendment, and purports to warn the people that our defense posture would be ruined for lack of money to support it. On page 5 the heading is "Proposals for a Constitutional Limitation of Federal Taxing Powers." The document then states that the elimination of Federal income, estate and gift taxes would cost the Federal Government $6.5 billion. Apparently those who drafted this document are unaware of the fact that corporation taxes are in the form of excise taxes, because they included the tax revenue from corporations in this figure. They then proceed to discuss various proposals for limiting rates of income taxes. All of their computations include corporation tax revenue.

While it is impossible to get important Senate documents that are out of print, such as Edward Hunter's testimony on Communist psychological warfare, there was no hesitation on the part of the Senate to reprint 50,000 copies of Senate Document No. 5 and get them into the hands of the legislators of the 50 States. U.S. News & World Report played up the Senate document in one of its issues 2 years ago, and when I took them to task for the falseness of this document, their simple reply was, "We have a right to rely on a Senate document."

I am happy to report that some Members of the Senate have become alarmed over the rapid intrusion of the Federal Government into the private sector of industry, and on March 14 of this year Senate bill 1093 was introduced by Senator Bennett, Republican, of Utah; Senator McClellan, Democrat, of Arkansas; Senator Mundt, Republican, of South Dakota; Senator Byrd, Democrat, of

Virginia; Senator Williams, Republican, of Delaware; Senator Thurmond, Democrat, of South Carolina; Senator Tower, Republican, of Texas; Senator Miller, Republican, of Iowa, and Senator Dirksen, your own Senator from Illinois.

The title of this bill is "A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes." That is the greatest breakthrough we have had for the liberty amendment to date.

The liberty amendment is properly sponsored by the National Committee for Economic Freedom. You cannot have human freedom without economic freedom. They are one and inseparable, and all of us who believe in human freedom must preserve economic freedom.

Several years ago it was proposed that the States should be eliminated. There was a map designed by a former Secretary of the Interior based on the idea that State governments will cease to exist, as a matter of economy, and that, by having them cease to exist, government would be transferred to regional authorities—nine of them—with three appointed administrators in each of them to govern all of the affairs within the regional authority. That would mean that 27 men appointed by the President would constitute our entire governing body. That program was temporarily put aside, but it still simmers on the back burner, and the Department of the Interior is still rapidly increasing its vast domain.

If the liberty amendment is not adopted, the various States will cease to be sovereign. The counties and cities within the States will lose their sovereignty, and the State legislatures will become mere errand boys for a vast and monolithic Federal Government. Action must be taken positively and promptly to put the Federal Government in its constitutional place and thus preserve a Union of 50 sovereign States.

For this reason, I have again introduced House Joint Resolution 23, known as the liberty amendment to the Constitution, with a firm conviction that he who is governed best is governed least. In order to attain this amendment, all good Americans should give it active support by urging their State legislature to adopt a resolution in support of the liberty amendment.

SENATE

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, who revealest Thyself in the true, the pure, and the lovely, grant us an awareness of Thy undergirding, taking the dimness of our souls away, as for demanding days we seek Thy guidance for the tangled ways we tread.

We come with gratitude for the love that our indifference cannot discourage, and for the patience that our wayward folly cannot exhaust. Though our faces are shadowed by the tragedies that darken the earth, we lift them in faith to the light that no darkness can put out.

In this day freighted with human destiny, vouchsafe to us, we pray, such a vision of our needy world with all its yawning divisions and its poisoning suspicions, and yet with its dawning sense of world brotherhood, that the decisions that are here made may never have to be reversed by those who come after us.

As we spend our years as a tale that is told, may it be to the last page a record of work well done, of duty faced without expediency, of honor unsullied, and of beckoning far horizons that we have not yet attained.

And when there comes the twilight and evening star and journey's end, and our work here is done, grant us a safe lodging, a holy rest, and peace at the last.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1963.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. Lee Metcalf, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 1, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 131. An act to provide for the renewal of certain municipal, domestic, and industrial water supply contracts entered into under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes;

H.R. 199. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears;

H.R. 211. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans;

H.R. 214. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia;

H.R. 220. An act to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan;

H.R. 243. An act to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein;

H.R. 248. An act to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain blind veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of a lower extremity;

H.R. 249. An act to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans;

H.R. 844. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation;

H.R. 845. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation;

H.R. 1087. An act to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve;

H.R. 1988. An act to provide for the settlement of claims of certain residents of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

H.R. 2635. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, for the purpose of including the Fort Mojave Indian Reservation among reservations excepted from the 25-year lease limitations; and

H.R. 4423. An act permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1089) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 131. An act to provide for the renewal of certain municipal, domestic, and industrial water supply contracts entered into under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes;

H.R. 844. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation;

H.R. 845. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation;

H.R. 1087. An act to release the right, title, or interest, if any, of the United States in certain streets in the village of Heyburn, Idaho, and to repeal the reverter in patent for public reserve;

H.R. 1988. An act to provide for the settlement of claims of certain residents of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

H.R. 2635. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, for the purpose of including the Fort Mojave Indian Reservation among reservations excepted from the 25-year lease limitations; and

H.R. 4423. An act permitting the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the third division, Riverton reclamation project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 199. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears;

H.R. 211. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to children and parents of deceased veterans;

H.R. 214. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia;

H.R. 220. An act to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan; and

H.R. 243. An act to amend section 314(k) of title 38, United States Code, to authorize payment of statutory awards for each anatomical loss or loss of use specified therein; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 248. An act to amend section 801 of title 38, United States Code, to provide assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing for certain blind veterans who have suffered the loss or loss of use of a lower extremity; and

H.R. 249. An act to amend section 632 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for an extension of the program of grants-in-aid to the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of certain veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. **Mansfield**, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. **Mansfield**, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Judiciary Committee.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of the Government Operations Committee.

The District of Columbia Committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Amendment of Small Business Act

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report of D.C. Transit System, Inc.

A letter from the president, D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company, for the year ended December 31, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report on the Effectiveness of the Educational and Cultural Exchange Program of the U.S. Department of State

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the effectiveness of the educational and cultural exchange program of the U.S. Department of State (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Grants for Basic Scientific Research

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on grants for basic scientific research, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Audit Report on Government Printing Office

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Government Printing Office, fiscal year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Audit Reports on Government Services, Inc. and Government Services, Inc.'s Employee Retirement and Benefit Trust Fund and Supplemental Pension Plan

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, audit reports on Government Services, Inc., and Government Services, Inc.'s employee retirement and benefit trust fund and supplemental pension plan, year ended December 31, 1962 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Uneconomical Utilization and Premature Disposal of Aircraft Spark Plugs by Department of the Air Force

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of uneconomical utilization and premature disposal of aircraft spark plugs by the Department of the Air Force, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Post Office Department Practice of Furnishing Utilities for Certain Vending Machines Operated by Postal Employee Groups

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of Post Office Department practice of furnishing utilities for certain vending machines operated by postal employee groups, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Overpricing of Spare Parts and Modification Kits Purchased From Hazeltine Corp., Little Neck, N.Y.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the overpricing of spare parts and modification kits purchased from Hazeltine Corp., Little Neck, N.Y., by Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp. under Department of the Navy cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract No. as 56–987c, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report on Review of Excessive Costs of a Fire Extinguisher Replacement Program in the Department of the Army

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of excessive costs of a fire extinguisher replacement program in the Department of the Army, dated March 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Management of Certain Lands Administered by the Secretary of the Interior

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize and direct that certain lands exclusively administered by the Secretary of the Interior be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Reports on Receipt of Applications for Loans Under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that the St. John Irrigating Co. of Malad, Idaho, has applied for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular affairs.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that the King Hill Irrigation District of Elmore County, Idaho, has applied for a loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report of National Trust for Historic Preservation

A letter from the Secretary, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Trust, for the calendar year 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Consolidation of Judicial Districts of South Carolina

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Resolution 17

"Joint resolution relating to pending Federal legislation on gold mining development

"Whereas gold production in our Nation, now at an all time low, is essential to the

stability of the monetary system of the United States; and

"Whereas use of gold for industrial and commercial purposes has increased to more than 3 million ounces annually and is still increasing; and

"Whereas mining production of gold has been only 1,500,000 ounces, the deficit being made up by sales from the Nation's monetary reserve; and

"Whereas it is evident that the gold miners of this Nation need higher prices to produce gold; and

"Whereas an increase in the dollar price of gold may interfere with international monetary policy, but incentive payments for newly mined gold from domestic gold mines would not; and

"Whereas such an incentive would reopen closed gold mines and restore lost jobs, particularly in the State of Alaska which is in need of such an industrial incentive to bring back a great Alaskan industry; and

"Whereas the passage of H.R. 1095 now pending before Congress will provide the incentive for a great new gold mining development and still protect the monetary stability of the United States; and

"Whereas H.R. 1095 has been endorsed by the Mining Advisory Committee of the Western Governor's Conference: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully urged to take favorable action on H.R. 1095; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President and President of the Senate; Hon. John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; Hon. Wayne Aspinall, Chairman, House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Hon. Henry M. Jackson, Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and the Members of the Alaskan delegation to Congress.

"Passed by the house March 20, 1963.

"Bruce Kendall,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Attest:

"Patricia R. Slack,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*

"Passed by the senate March 22, 1963.

"Frank Peratrovich,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:

"Evelyn K. Stevenson,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"By the Governor:

"William A. Egan,
"*Governor of Alaska.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Joint Memorial 12

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States to reconsider any plans for the relocation of the Denver Mint, and to consider expanding the present Denver Mint to meet the increased production requirements of the U.S. Mint

"Whereas the relocation of the Denver Mint has been proposed as a solution to the problem of meeting the increased coinage requirements of the United States; and

"Whereas the forecast of total domestic coinage requirements for the fiscal years 1964 through 1966 is 4.1 billion coins per year, and the requirement is forecast to increase steadily until it reaches 7 billion coins per year by 1975; and

"Whereas although the Denver Mint and the Philadelphia Mint operating during the fiscal year 1962 produced a combined total of 3.6 billion coins, of which 2.5 billion coins were minted in Denver, the present facilities of both mints are not adequate to meet the forecast needs; and

"Whereas a study was undertaken to determine the feasibility of different alternative solutions to the problem of increasing minting requirements, and in connection with such study, Arthur D. Little, Inc. has published to the Director, Bureau of the Budget, entitled 'Production Facilities of the U.S. Mint,' in which the existing mint facilities were evaluated; and

"Whereas the report disclosed: That the Denver Mint produces coins at a cost of $0.30 per thousand less than the Philadelphia Mint; that the cost of securing land for the expansion of the Philadelphia Mint would be great, while the property for the expansion of the Denver Mint has already been acquired; that the Philadelphia Mint is limited by existing structure to a production of about 1.2 billion coins per year less than the Denver Mint could produce with only the addition of certain equipment; that the transportation costs for a single mint would be significantly higher than for multiple location mints: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 44th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein)*, That the Congress and the President of the United States be hereby respectfully requested to reconsider any plans for relocating the Denver Mint, and to consider the expansion of the Denver Mint as the most economical and feasible solution to the problem of increased coinage needs; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Members of Congress from the State of Colorado.

"John D. Vanderhoof,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"Donald H. Henderson,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*
"Robert L. Knous,
"*President of the Senate.*
"Mildred H. Cresswell,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Joint Resolution—

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to extend the northern terminus of the Interstate and Defense Highway System in Maine from Houlton to some point located on the northern boundary of the State of Maine

"Whereas it has been recognized that the Nation's economy and the Nation's security require the construction of a National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; and

"Whereas the primary responsibility for construction of such a system rests in the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the objective is to complete the presently designated National System by 1972; and

"Whereas the people of Maine through appropriate action have deemed it essential that the highways of this State be integrated into the Interstate and Defense System; and

"Whereas the Department of Defense of the U.S. Government has extensive defense installations in northern Aroostook County; namely, Loring Air Force Base located in Limestone, Maine, and supplemental installations to this base also located in the general area of northern Aroostook County, in the State of Maine: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we, your memorialists, recommend and urge to the Congress of the United States that appropriate actions be taken to require the Department of Commerce through the Bureau of Public Roads to relocate the northern terminus of the Interstate and Defense Highway System in Maine from Houlton to some point on the northern boundary of the State of Maine which would more adequately serve the more heavily populated areas of central and northern Aroostook County and would provide additional highway facilities for defense installations in northern Aroostook County; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial, duly attested by the secretary of State, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress and to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

"Read and adopted in senate chamber, March 26, 1963.

"Chester T. Winslow,
"*Secretary.*

"Read and adopted in the house of representatives, March 27, 1963.

"Harvey R. Pease,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"Paul A. MacDonald,
"*Secretary of State.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Enrolled Senate Joint Memorial 7

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas the Rogue Basin project has been authorized by the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas the Rogue Basin project is a comprehensive river basin development plan providing for the maximum feasible benefits from flood control, fishery improvement, irrigation, recreation, municipal water supply and power production; and

"Whereas the present low waterflow and present high water temperatures threaten the continued existence of valuable anadromous fisheries; and

"Whereas repeated winter floods destroy valuable property and prevent development; and

"Whereas the Rogue Basin is highly populated and a growing area primarily dependent on the timber industry; and

"Whereas the timber production of the area is stable and its employment decreasing because of increasing efficiency; and

"Whereas the need for a more broadly based economy and increased employment opportunity is urgent; and

"Whereas the construction and operation of the Rogue Basin project would restore the fisheries, broaden the economy, increase employment in the State of Oregon and provide flood control: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:*

"1. The Congress of the United States is urged to provide for a supplemental appropriation for the Rogue Basin project in the amount of $50,000 to be used by the Corps of Army Engineers for final planning in the fiscal year of 1963.

"2. The Congress of the United States is urged to provide an appropriation of $365,000 for the Corps of Engineers to be used for final planning, site acquisition and construction of the Rogue Basin project for the fiscal year of 1964.

"3. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

"Adopted by senate March 12, 1963.

"Dale C. Henderson,
"Secretary of Senate.
"Ben Musa,
"President of Senate.

"Adopted by house March 15, 1963.

"Clarence Barton,
"Speaker of House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Enrolled House Joint Memorial 13

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas the livestock slaughtering and processing industry is essential to the economy of the State of Oregon and the Western United States; and

"Whereas a historic and economically vital formula on the cost of transportation of fresh meats as compared to livestock, westbound from the Midwest, has been destroyed by the imposition of freight rates discriminatory to livestock processing plants in Oregon; and

"Whereas under this historic formula the rates for transportation of fresh meats were approximately 1½ times higher than the rates for transportation of livestock westbound from the Midwest; and

"Whereas due to the imposition of discriminatory freight rates the fresh meat freight rate has been undercut, to a present formula of 1 to 1, which makes it prohibitive for Oregon packers to ship livestock from the fat livestock markets of the Midwest to Oregon for local slaughter; and

"Whereas the livestock slaughtering and processing industry of Oregon has already declined as a direct result of prior rate reductions forcing severe unemployment and loss of markets for livestock producers and feeders; and

"Whereas the Public Utility Commissioner of the State of Oregon, the Director of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Oregon, the leaders in the meat producing industry, the leaders of management in the processing industry, and leaders of labor in the meat handling industry, and allied fields, have gone on record to seek adjustment in these detrimental freight rates, without success: Now therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

"1. The Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States and the Honorable Secretary of Commerce to take those steps as may be necessary to restore the historic freight rate formula that has existed between westbound livestock and meat and thereby prevent further economic hardship to the broad based livestock industry of Oregon which is threatened by undercutting freight rate practices now permitted by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

"2. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

"Adopted by house February 14, 1963.

"Cecil L. Edwards,
"Chief Clerk of House.
"Clarence Barton,
"Speaker of House.

"Adopted by senate March 14, 1963.

"Ben Musa,
"President of Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Joint Resolution No. 1

"Joint resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the qualifications of electors

"The General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby resolves as follows:

" 'Section 1. The proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing as follows:

" ' "Article—

" ' "Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President for electors for President or Vice President or for Senator or Representative in Congress shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.

" ' "Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation" is hereby ratified by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

" 'Sec. 2. A certified copy of the foregoing resolution shall be forwarded to the Administrator of General Services in accordance with section one hundred six (b) title one United States Code and also to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.'

"R. P. Stimmel,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.
"W. Stuart Helm,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"Raymond P. Shafer,
"President, Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Resolution 1963 Ex–13

"Whereas the recently executed amendatory repayment contracts of the Quincy, South, and East Irrigation Districts provide for the completion of the project to the original 1 million acres; and

"Whereas the President's budget allows for less than $4 million for Columbia Basin project construction; and

"Whereas this amount is not sufficient to begin any new work; and

"Whereas facilities to deliver water to block 81 are complete; and

"Whereas this block would be a substantial addition to the project, contains 15,000 acres in 132 full-time farm units; and

"Whereas an increase in the budget for Columbia Basin project construction of $1,700,000 dollars would be required for the 1964 fiscal year to bring in block 81 and continue the orderly development of the project; and

"Whereas undue fluctuations in the construction budget necessitate deletions and additions to the Bureau staff resulting in a less efficient expenditure of funds; and

"Whereas basin communities and facilities are geared to a reasonable level of project development; and

"Whereas a consistent level of development encourages processors and industry to establish in the basin: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the members of the senate respectfully urge the budget for construction of the Columbia Basin project be increased by the Public Works Committee of the Congress to an amount that will insure the orderly development of the project and the beginning of new work during the 1964 fiscal year as outlined herein; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate shall transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Members of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Attest:

"Ward Bowden,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Resolution 1963 Ex–11

"Whereas President Dwight D. Eisenhower in his state of the Union message January 7, 1954, called for a White House Conference on Education; and

"Whereas this unprecedented citizen study of elementary and secondary school needs, involving more than a half million American people in local, county, regional, and State conferences and 2,000 participants in the White House Conference, held November 28 to December 1, 1955, demonstrated a desire and capacity to meet the major problems facing American education; and

"Whereas the traditional decennial White House Conferences on Children and Youth having played an extraordinary role in mobilizing public and professional opinion for more effective work with children and youth, there is a parallel need for a continuing process for the solving of problems in and improvement of education; and

"Whereas during these intervening years since the first White House Conference on Education in 1955, the problems of education have been multiplying with our expanding technology, the impact of automation upon employment and the intensity of the cold war; and

"Whereas there is immediate need for focus on such problems as identification of potential high school dropouts and preventive programs, non-college-bound and nonvocational youth, community colleges, the gifted, the handicapped, the impact of instructional technology such as instructional television and programed learning, increased research for improvement in education, and the relation of education to the achievement of national goals; and

"Whereas education is a priority concern in the minds of the public who recognize that the future of our Nation depends upon how well we provide an education for all children and youth: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate, That this body respectfully request that the President of the United States consider the need for another White House Conference on Education and that he consider requesting that the Congress enact legislation providing for such a Conference on Education for 1965, the decennial anniversary of the first such conference; and be it further

"Resolved, That this body respectfully request Congress to enact the necessary legislation for such a conference; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of the senate to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Washington.

"Attest:

"Ward Bowden,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Whereas the people of the State of Washington take great pride in the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard with its 65 years of building, converting, and repairing the ships of the U.S. Fleet; and

"Whereas this naval shipyard at Bremerton, Wash. has been rated No. 1 of its class in speed, efficiency, and economy throughout the entire Nation; and

"Whereas the maintenance of this fine naval shipyard has been of incomparable aid in the successful termination of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and serves this Nation in readiness in such crises as recently encountered over Berlin and Cuba; and

"Whereas this naval shipyard which has been home port to thousands of young men from all parts of the Nation has as such contributed many fine citizens to this State; and

"Whereas the skills and training received by employees at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard has been an important asset to the economy of this State when such employees have moved into other phases of industry: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives commend the personnel, military and civil, of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton, Wash., for their past and present contributions to the citizens of this State and this Nation, their dedication to the security of this Nation, and a performance in speed, efficiency, and economy unmatched elsewhere in these United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house transmit copies of this house resolution to the officials in command of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Attest:

"S. R. Holcomb,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Whereas the President of the United States has recently requested the Congress to establish a National Academy of Foreign Affairs to train American Foreign Service personnel for the multitude of tasks which confront them throughout the world; and

"Whereas such a proposed National Academy of Foreign Affairs would provide schools for the personnel of all governmental agencies in the United States involved in the formulation, direction, and furtherance of our national goals and foreign policy, and would have graduate school status with a tentative student body of approximately 1,000 student officials; and

"Whereas the present Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State would be incorporated into the National Academy of Foreign Affairs, which would also be open to Army, Navy, and Air Force officers whose military assignments involve the formulation, direction, and furtherance of our national goals and foreign policy; and

"Whereas by concentrating such training in one Academy there could be provided an essential unity of purpose and action so that all of these operations can be coordinated into a harmonious whole; and

"Whereas the proposed National Academy of Foreign Affairs would command respect throughout the Government, in academic communities, and with all knowledgeable persons concerned with U.S. foreign policy and oversea operations of our diplomatic and Foreign Service officers; and would provide the United States with added skill and strength to meet and overcome the continuously more complex problems of the cold war, and would be a source of pride and stability for freemen everywhere; and

"Whereas the cost of such an academy would be extremely small as compared to the cost of other service academies, and would provide the potential for a far greater dollar-for-dollar return on the cost of operation than these Academies: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, That we do hereby express our approval and support for the recommendation of the President of the United States that Congress establish a National Academy of Foreign Affairs, and do hereby urge prompt approval of this needed educational facility; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the house to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Attest:

"S. R. Holcomb,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas continuing construction, projected to cost up to $60 million during the next 5 years, is planned by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation on additional irrigation blocks of the Columbia Basin project within Franklin County; and

"Whereas previous bond issues for farm-to-market roads in irrigation blocks within the county have been exhausted; and

"Whereas Franklin County is without financial resources or bonding capacity to meet new farm-to-market road costs in these new areas: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of Interior, be requested to consider the construction of farm-to-market roads as an integral part of the reclamation project for the balance of the Columbia Basin development program, and to accept the financial responsibility therefor; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the chief clerk of the house to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Attest:

"S. R. Holcomb,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL LUTHERAN COUNCIL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a resolution adopted by the National Lutheran Council of the City of New York, relating to the United Nations.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution on the United Nations

The National Lutheran Council, having received the memorandum of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs regarding selected actions of the 17th Assembly of the United Nations and taking note that the United Nations has continued to serve effectively as:

(a) a forum for world opinion, where representatives of more than 100 nations express their positions and share in decisions on matters of world concern;

(b) a meetingplace for the discussion and resolution of international tensions, and as a center of influence toward the orderly reduction of armaments and the peaceful uses of nuclear power;

(c) an agency through which the nations have been able to establish peacemaking and peacekeeping machinery, whereby in some instances serious threats of worldwide conflict have been reduced;

(d) a channel of cooperation among the nations for scientific study and technological advance;

(e) a coordinator and administrator of efforts being made to assist developing nations through the "decade of development," the U.N. Special Fund, Expanded Program of Technical Assistance, regional economic commissions, and in other ways;

(f) a primary force in mounting an organized attack on disease through the World Health Organization, and on hunger through the Food and Agriculture Organization and the freedom-from-hunger campaign;

(g) a means of developing a world conscience against injustice, inequality, and inhumanity through the formulation of covenants on human rights, including religious liberty, freedom, the status of women, and other matters, and as a vehicle for specific assistance to victims of international disputes, such as the Arab refugees; and

(h) a symbol of the God-given aspirations of men toward responsible international conduct and more brotherly relationships among men;

1. Expresses its gratitude for the United Nations not only as a forum of world opinion and a useful instrument of national policy, but also as an agency which is making a significant contribution to the welfare of mankind.

2. Encourages the Government of the United States to continue its strong support of the United Nations as a means of interpreting and extending the ideals of our Nation in an international setting, as an effective way of making a contribution toward the alleviation of human suffering, and as a major factor contributing to the development of more peaceful, just, and orderly relationships among nations and peoples.

3. Commends those representatives of both the religious and secular press and the broadcast media who have made responsible efforts to interpret the United Nations and its work, and in view of the importance of understanding this principal organ of international cooperation, encourages them to continue and intensify such efforts.

4. Recognizes the service and dedication of the many Christians who along with others are fulfilling their vocations and serving humanity by working in or with the United Nations, and remembers in particular that two gifted and courageous sons of the Lutheran Church, Count Folke Bernadotte and Dag Hammarskjold, have given their lives in this service.

5. Calls upon Christians in our land to make greater efforts to know and understand the United Nations, its strengths and weaknesses, its problems and achievements, to the end that intelligent and prayerful support may be given to the efforts of nations to regulate their affairs for the best interests of all humanity.

Whereas the present immigration policy of the United States was framed in a completely different international situation and setting than now prevails in the world; and

Whereas a bill was introduced in the U.S. Senate in the 87th Congress which included provisions which in a large measure would adjust and correct our present immigration policy in such important respects as: (1) Providing for an allocation of immigration quotas from countries outside the Western Hemisphere on a basis which is more equitable and less discriminatory; (2) facilitating reunion of separated families; (3) further opening the way for the immigration of persons with special skills; and (4) providing for the regular admission of specific numbers of refugee persons (without the enactment of special legislation in each instance); and

Whereas these goals are in substantial accord with the expressed convictions of the

National Lutheran Council, based upon extensive and careful study of the issues involved in immigration policy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Lutheran Council express the hope that these same principles and goals will be embodied in legislation enacted by the Congress in its current session.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.R. 4374. An act to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America (Rept. No. 86); and

H.J. Res. 282. A joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes (Rept. No. 87).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H.R. 4715. An act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc. (Rept. No. 105).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 74. A bill for the relief of Dr. Olga Marie Ferrer (Rept. No. 88);

S. 93. A bill for the relief of Flora Romano Torre (Rept. No. 89);

S. 196. A bill for the relief of Carnetta Germaine Thomas Hunte (Rept. No. 90);

S. 213. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Schillaci (Rept. No. 91);

S. 292. A bill for the relief of Yoo Chul Soo (Rept. No. 92);

S. 310. A bill for the relief of Kaino Hely Auzis (Rept. No. 93);

S. 504. A bill for the relief of Domenico Martino (Rept. No. 94);

S. 686. A bill for the relief of Millie Gail Mesa (Rept. No. 95);

S. 715. A bill for the relief of Laszlo Janos Buchwald (Rept. No. 96);

S. 822. A bill for the relief of Elvira Ciccotelli (Rept. No. 97); and

S. 866. A bill for the relief of Enrico Petrucci; (Rept. No. 98).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 72. A bill for he relief of Jozsef Pozsonyi and his wife, Agnes Pozsonyi, and their minor child, Ildiko Pozsonyi (Rept. No. 99):

S. 206. A bill for the relief of Chang Ah Lung (Rept. No. 100):

S. 215. A bill for the relief of Mannor Lee (Rept. No. 101); and

S. 671. A bill for the relief of Mirhan Gazarian (Rept. No. 102).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 752. A bill for the relief of Janos Kardos (Rept. No. 103).

THIRTEENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 104)

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Select Committee on Small Business, submitted the 13th annual report of that committee, which was ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James A. Carr, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Board of Parole.

By Mr. BAYH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Homer Lester Benson, of Indiana, to be a member of the Board of Parole.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1250. A bill to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls; and

S. 1251. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mrs. Neuberger when she introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. Javits):

S. 1252. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Keating when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1253. A bill to amend section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes; and

S. 1254. A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage, and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1255. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1256. A bill for the relief of Lt. John F. McPhail, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. Smathers):

S. 1257. A bill to amend section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act to provide that certain areas within the United States having a large number of Cuban refugees shall be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1258. A bill for the relief of Peter K. Bechtold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1259. A bill for the relief of Albert L. Santer; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1260. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

THE CHEMICAL PESTICIDES COORDINATION ACT

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, had there been no DDT to administer to the war-racked city of Naples at the close of World War II, there is little doubt that the populace of that doleful city would shortly have been decimated by the ravages of typhus. Today, through the use of chemical insecticides, typhus, yellow fever, and malaria, man's ancient and dismal scourges, are rapidly disappearing throughout the world.

Were it not for modern pesticides—the collective term for the vast family of chemical insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, miticides, rodenticides, and soil fumigants—our agricultural resources would be fearfully inadequate to the task of sustaining an expanding world population at acceptable standards of living and health.

Yet today, instead of symbolizing man's triumph over a hostile environment, the term "pesticide" is far more likely to evoke a harsh image of poisoned wildlife, polluted streams, and uncontrollable genetic mutation. Is this image grounded in fact, or is it the product of distortion and rumor?

Several years ago the director of the Oregon State Department of Agriculture dismissed as "insignificant" the hazards of pesticide use.

I am not so certain. Recent events in Oregon alone strongly suggest that a truly monumental risk is inherent in the indiscriminate broadcasting of pesticides. Nearly 400,000 silver salmon fingerlings in a rearing pond in the Columbia River gorge recently perished as a direct result of an overzealous antimosquito spraying campaign conducted by agents of the county, the State highway department, and the Union Pacific Railroad; a campaign evidencing an astonishing lack of coordination among the agencies concerned.

Another example in my region is the destruction of waterfowl stricken by the runoff of pesticide residues from heavily sprayed agricultural lands in the Tule Lake and Upper and Lower Klamath Lakes in northern California and southern Oregon. Yet the Klamath reclamation project, whose rich agricultural lands were the source of this pollution, represents a singular achievement in the reclamation of barren, unproductive desert.

It is essential that we strike the critical balance between the lifegiving products and the life-destroying byproducts of pesticide use, that the crusade of the agriculturalist for an agriculturally antiseptic environment be tempered by the scientifically documented viewpoint of the conservationist, the resource analyst, and the biologist.

During the hearings conducted by the House Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation in May 1960, representatives of State wildlife agencies furnished damaging evidence of the needless destruction of fish and wildlife by the application of chemicals too toxic, in quantities larger than necessary, put in the wrong places, in the wrong seasons, and by the wrong devices.

An official statement by the Southeastern Association of Game and Fish

Commissioners revealed a disturbing pattern of noncooperation and nonconsultation between Federal agencies responsible for chemical pesticide programing and wildlife agencies:

> The control workers of agriculture have usually failed to consult or cooperate with or to inform the State and Federal wildlife agencies which have primary responsibility for the conservation and management of fish and wildlife and have generally disputed the findings and ignored the recommendations of State and Federal wildlife agencies.

Moreover, there is evidence that following such consultations as actually occurred—usually after the fact—the recommendations of the wildlife agencies are publicly ridiculed and often ignored entirely.

There is virtually unanimous support among conservation officials and organizations for meaningful coordination between pesticide users and wildlife agencies. The National Wildlife Federation, the National Audubon Society, the Animal Welfare Institute, the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Council of State Garden Clubs, the National Wildland News have all in the past endorsed legislation leading to this goal.

Congressman Dingell, of Michigan, long a leader in advancing the cause of sound conservation principles in the Congress, has introduced legislation in the House which I believe will greatly promote the sound and sane employment of pesticides. The Chemical Pesticides Coordination Act would require advance consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and, through such Service, with the head of the particular State wildlife agency, before the start of any Federal pesticide program. This legislation would serve to insure—not the elimination of chemical pesticide use—but the least destructive use consonant with the needs of animal and plant pest control.

I therefore introduce for appropriate reference the Chemical Pesticides Coordination Act and a second bill to augment present programs of research into the biological effects of pesticide use and the dissemination of information relating to the effects of pesticides.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these bills be printed at the close of my remarks and this bill lay over for 5 legislative days for cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the Record, and will remain at the desk as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bills, introduced by Mrs. Neuberger, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

8. 1250. A bill to provide for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State wildlife agencies before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for mass biological controls.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Chemical Pesticides Coordination Act."

Sec. 2. No officer or agency of the Federal Government shall initiate or provide any financial or other assistance for any program involving the use of any chemical insecticide, herbicide, fungicide, rodenticide, or other chemical for the purpose of eradicating or controlling animal or plant pests until such officer or agency has consulted with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and through such Service, with the head of the agency exercising administration over the wildlife resources of each State to be affected by the program.

Sec. 3. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall advise the officers and agencies consulting with it, as required by section 2, of the damage to wildlife resources which might result from any proposed program. Such Service shall cooperate with such Federal officers and agencies in developing programs involving the use of chemical insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, rodenticides, or other methods for the purpose of eradicating or controlling any animal or plant pest, with a view to achieving the results desired while minimizing the undesirable effects of the program on the wildlife resources of the area. In the event any Federal officer or agency shall fail to take any action recommended by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, such Service shall make a report thereof without delay to the Congress for referral to the appropriate committees.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of the Interior may, by regulations make exceptions from the application of this Act where, by reason of the limited nature of the program or by reason of the proved harmlessness of the chemical involved, little or no damage to wildlife resources could result from the program.

Sec. 5. Any Federal department or agency, in submitting requests to the Congress for appropriations for programs involving the use of chemical insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, rodenticides, or other chemicals for the eradication or control of any animal or plant pest, shall accompany such request by a full description of the proposed program, including the comments and recommendations of the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

Sec. 6. This Act shall take effect one year from the effective date hereof.

S. 1251. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1958, in order to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife from the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and pesticides.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act of August 1, 1958 (16 U.S.C. 742d–1), is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "That" and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) On the basis of the studies carried on pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit information to the Secretary of Agriculture as to how, in the use of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, or pesticides, injury to fish and wildlife can be prevented or minimized and the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall require that such information or warning pertinent to any insecticide, herbicide, fungicide, or pesticide shall appear on the label of each package of such insecticide, herbicide, fungicide, or pesticide, as the case may be, which is required to be labeled under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 135–135K)."

Sec. 2. The Act of August 1, 1958 (72 Stat. 479), as amended by the Act of September 16, 1959 (73 Stat. 563), is amended by deleting section 2 and by inserting new sections 2 and 3 as follows:

"Sec. 2. The Secretary is authorized—

"(1) to conduct a program of evaluating chemicals proposed for use as pesticides for the purposes of determining whether the chemicals are harmful or hazardous to the Nation's fish and wildlife resources;

"(2) to distribute to interested persons and agencies, both public and private, data collected under this Act showing the effects of pesticides; and

"(3) to construct, operate, and maintain facilities, including laboratories, necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

"Sec. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the one hundred and eightieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. Javits] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System.

In 1956 the Federal Aid Highway Act provided that the Interstate Highway System would consist of approximately 41,000 miles of unified, modern highways for the entire Nation. The Federal share of the costs for this 41,000 miles was set at between 90 and 95 percent, with the State contributing only 5 to 10 percent.

The original Interstate System was laid out in 1944. Around 1947, New York State, as well as many other States, did not feel that it could wait any longer for Congress to make appropriations available to build a system. It felt it must proceed with the construction of highways that had been delayed because of the war and for other reasons.

In New York State, for instance, about 580 miles, principally on the New York State Thruway, were constructed without any Federal funds of any sort. The cost was well over $1 billion, even then, in the mid-1950's.

Under the total allocation of 41,000 miles in the Interstate Highway System, New York State received 1,227.2 miles. After the allocations had been made it was decided not to duplicate satisfactory roads that could be incorporated into the system. This was good planning and good judgment. Duplication is wasteful.

Up to this point everything was fine. However, New York State and other progressive States were then penalized because they had had the prudence, the initiative, the foresight, and the ability to proceed on their own. From New York State's allocation of 1,227.2 miles was subtracted approximately 580 miles, principally for the New York State Thruway, which were incorporated into the Interstate Highway System.

It does not seem right that these progressive States should have to forfeit a portion of their allocation because they did not wait for a Federal handout but proceeded on their own to construct a great deal of mileage now designated as Interstate.

This is inequity.

The injustice would be rectified by this bill to permit substitute mileage to be added to existing overall plans. It would give all States their true allocation. New York State would then be allowed to add its approximately 580 miles of badly needed miles of highways to the interstate routes.

There are many areas in New York State which do not have adequate interstate highways to fulfill the need. The people of New York State are substantial contributors to Federal highway use taxes. Yet they must be doubly taxed for the roads they desperately need by tolls and by use taxes. Continued efforts to secure a portion of the unallocated interstate mileage for the southern tier expressway for the Binghamton to Lake Erie section have been turned down.

If these critical needs did not still exist, I would be content with the matter as it now stands, for New York State is an independent State. It always moves forward in every way possible without Federal doles. It does not sit back and wait for handouts. But this is no reason for it to be denied its fair taxpaying share in areas where it needs assistance. Self-progress should not be punished. Initiative should not be thwarted.

This bill would enable New York State and many other States to construct badly needed roads that would add to the overall national requirements. It would provide needed work for the unemployed and be of assistance to our lagging economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed following my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1252) to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System, introduced by Mr. Keating (for himself and Mr. Javits), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter I of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 132. Designation of additional routes for Interstate System

"(a) In the case of each State having a toll road, bridge, or tunnel, the construction of which was completed after August 2, 1947, and which was approved by the Secretary as part of the Interstate System before January 1, 1959, the Secretary shall, on application by the State, approve as part of the Interstate System, other routes within such State designated in accordance with section 103 of this title, which do not exceed in length the number of miles of all such toll roads, bridges, and tunnels within such State. The total of all Federal funds payable under this title for all routes in a State approved under this subsection as part of the Interstate System shall not exceed 90 per centum of the depreciated cost to that State of all completed and partially completed toll roads, bridges, and tunnels, the construction of which was completed after August 2, 1947, and which were approved by the Secretary as part of the Interstate System before January 1, 1959, as such depreciated cost is established in table A–5a on pages 28 and 29 of House Document numbered 301, Eighty-fifth Congress, plus a percentage of the remaining 10 per centum of such depreciated cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 per centum of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area, except that the total Federal funds payable for all routes approved under this subsection in any one State as part of the Interstate System shall not exceed 95 per centum of such depreciated cost.

"(b) In the case of each State having a free road, bridge, or tunnel, the construction of which was completed after August 2, 1947, and which was approved by the Secretary as a part of the Interstate System before January 1, 1959, the Secretary shall, upon application by the State, approve as part of the Interstate System, other routes within such State designated in accordance with section 103 of this title which do not exceed in length the number of miles of all such free roads, bridges, and tunnels within such State. The total of all Federal funds payable under this title for all routes in a State approved under this subsection as part of the Interstate System shall not exceed (1) 90 per centum of the depreciated cost to that State of all completed and partially completed free roads, bridges, and tunnels, the construction of which was completed after August 2, 1947, and which were approved by the Secretary as part of the Interstate System before January 1, 1959, as such depreciated cost is established in table A–5b on pages 30 and 31 of House Document Numbered 301, Eighty-fifth Congress, plus a percentage of the remaining 10 per centum of such depreciated cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 per centum of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area, except that the total Federal funds payable under this title for all routes approved under this subsection in any one State as part of the Interstate System shall not exceed 95 per centum of such depreciated cost, (2) less all amounts received as the Federal share on account of such free highways, bridges, or tunnels under any provision of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), or of any Act amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto."

Sec. 2. Subsection (d) of section 103 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and "plus the total of all mileage approved as part of the Interstate System under section 132 of this title."

Sec. 3. Paragraph 5 of subsection (b) of section 104 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by striking out the last sentence.

Sec. 4. The analysis of chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"132. Designation of additional routes for Interstate System."

WORLD WAR I VETERANS' PENSION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing a $100-a-month pension for all honorably discharged veterans of World War I.

World War I veterans have never received benefits comparable to those given to veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. They left their homes and families to fight for their country just as did the young men in our later conflicts. But, when they returned there were no educational programs such as the GI bill which benefited World War II veterans. There was no program to assist them in buying new homes.

Today these same veterans are older men, most of them in their sixties. The majority of them are retired and living on small fixed incomes. Because of their ages or for health reasons, few are employed or employable.

Our country has done well by the veterans of World War II and Korea. But, I do not think it is asking too much for our Nation to give compensation to those veterans of World War I who were excluded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1260) to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to grant a pension of $100 per month to all honorably discharged veterans of World War I, introduced by Mr. Hartke, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MASS TRANSPORTATION ~~ACT OF~~ 1963—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 6, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOMINICK submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the amendment of Mr. Magnuson, No. 11, in the nature of a substitute to Senate bill 6, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. ENGLE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1163) to amend certain provisions of the Area Redevelopment Act, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

TEMPORARY SUSPENSION OF DUTY ON CORKBOARD INSULATION AND CORK STOPPERS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KEATING submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 2053) to provide for the temporary suspension of the duty on corkboard insulation and on cork stoppers, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be added as cosponsors of my bill (S. 920) to amend sections 303 and 310 of the Communications Act of 1934.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be added as a cosponsor of my military pay equalization bill S. 401.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] be included as a cosponsor of S. 1.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the bill is about to be reported by the committee. I ask that the name of the Senator from Massachusetts be added to the bill as it is reported by the committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, many expressions of support are coming to me for the truth-in-packaging bill, S. 387. The recent series of hearings has served to remove the fears of some manufacturers and to solidify sentiment for effective remedies of conditions that tend to deceive the consumer and bring confusion to the marketplace. The distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] has informed me of his warm support of the bill and has asked that he be listed as a consponsor.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McIntyre] be listed as a coauthor of S. 387.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] be added as a cosponsor of the bill, S. 747, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, inadvertently the names of two cosponsors were omitted from the first printing of S. 1117, a bill to extend the life and broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission on Civil Rights.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] be added, at its next printing, as cosponsors of S. 1117.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 2, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1089) to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina:

Address by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson delivered at a Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner in Raleigh, N.C., on March 30, 1963.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Editorial from the Greenville (S.C.) News of March 29, 1963. Newsletter by him dated April 1, 1963.

By Mr. HARTKE:

Address delivered by Vice President Lyndon Johnson at the Big Brother dinner, Washington, D.C., on March 29, 1963.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address delivered by him at the Greater Moorhead Day Celebration at Moorhead, Minn., on March 22, on the subject of American agriculture.

TRADE EXPANSION ACT—U.S. AGRICULTURE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am quite disturbed over Common Market efforts to cut our American trade by erecting high tariff barriers. What is happening now is that the ingenuity and efficiency of our industry is backfiring on us: After years of technological improvement so that our products can undersell those in European nations, high tariff walls are now being built so that some of our products will be virtually excluded from European markets.

Sales of U.S. farm products amount to nearly $5½ billion in exports. The U.S. Government must promote and protect the interest of American agriculture abroad if the new Trade Expansion Act is to live up to its name.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the text of a resolution adopted by the New York State Horticultural Society at the recent annual meeting, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Trade Expansion Act—U.S. Agriculture

Whereas Western Europe, with its six-nation European Common Market, and with pending membership of associate membership of increasing numbers of nations, are evolving a market bloc second to none other in the world;

Whereas they are eliminating or drastically reducing intramember tariff and other regulatory restrictions and are adopting common external tariff and other regulatory restrictions for trade relations with nonmember nations;

Whereas there is evidenced by the Common Market nations a trend to establishing higher common external tariffs and other restrictions for trade with nonmember nations than existed prior to development of the EEC; and

Whereas our newly approved U.S. Trade Expansion Act provides for greater trade negotiating authority by our Government, with greater bargaining authority and broader and more liberal powers to make concessions in U.S. tariffs and other regulations in the interest of greater free world trade and in exchange for greater access to various other markets in the world.

Whereas the impact or the economy of the United States by both the European Common Market and our new Trade Expansion Act, separately and/or in interchanging effects, is potentially at an alltime high and of extremely critical importance to our agricultural industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the New York State Horticultural Society, That we urge with all emphasis possible that highly competent agricultural industry advisory counsel be retained by our Government trade negotiating representatives to assist in protecting and expanding the best interests of our U.S. agricultural and our national economy; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of New York.

INSPECTION OF PLANT MATERIAL FROM OTHER COUNTRIES

It is being proposed by the Federal Government that quarantine 37 be amended to permit the inspection of plant materials in the country of origin instead of at the port of entry. This is dangerous because it increases the possibility of the introduction of plant pests presently not known to be in the United States. This is vital to the agriculture of New York State because of our large seaports and airports and because we have 375 miles of sea coast adjacent to the St. Lawrence Seaway, Lake Ontario, and Lake Erie.

We recommend that no plant material be brought into this country without inspection at the port of entry.

RESOLUTION OF BUFFALO COMMON COUNCIL ON COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Senate a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo urging that Columbus Day, October 12, be made a legal holiday.

I am pleased to be cosponsor of a U.S. Senate resolution to achieve this end. Among all the great men whose accomplishments have gone into the making of this Nation, none showed greater initiative, greater determination, and greater courage than Christopher Columbus, the Genoese captain, who discovered this hemisphere. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

RESOLUTION 162

Resolution—Columbus Day, October 12

Whereas the birthdate of the great Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus, October 12, is observed as a legal or public holiday in 30 of the States; and

Whereas there presently is a bill pending before the U.S. Senate asking for the enactment of Columbus Day, October 12, as a Federal holiday; and

Whereas the bill has received such great support from many organizations and communities throughout the United States, and that there are now about 34 U.S. Senators who are cosponsors of said bill: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this common council memorialize and urge the U.S. Congress, on behalf of the people of the city of Buffalo, to pass the bill which would make Columbus Day, October 12, a Federal legal holiday; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to both Houses of the Congress and to our respective two U.S. Senators from New York State and our Congressmen from this area.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL'S THOUGHTFUL APPRAISAL OF FARMERS' PLIGHT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal is a newspaper which has appraised the situation of the American farmer with considerable independent criticism. It has not favored substantial subsidy programs. In view of this attitude, I think an analysis which was made in the Milwaukee Journal last Sunday of the plight of the Wisconsin dairy farmer is extraordinarily interesting. It is a very careful, convincing analysis of the great difficulty which the Wisconsin farmer has in making a go of his operation, in spite of the fact that he is extremely efficient, has a great investment, and works very hard.

In an editorial, the Milwaukee Journal calculates that the average farmer in Wisconsin has an income of 88 cents an hour. I think this is a disgraceful income, judged by any measure, especially for people who invested $40,000 or so per farm and have established remarkable efficiency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "State Farm Problem, Too," published in the Milwaukee Journal of Sunday, March 31, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATE FARM PROBLEM, TOO

Although some groups continue to demand that farming as a way of life be preserved, there is increasing evidence that farmers themselves are making decisions about their future on an economic rather than a sentimental basis.

This was typified in a recent series of articles by Loren H. Osman in the Journal. They involved a Dane County dairyman who called it quits this spring. Although a cut above the average, this farmer backed away from a $40,000 investment to buy a farm. He had exhausted the possibilities of tenant farming, he felt. At 38, he chose to sell out and start over in another occupation.

Such moves aren't easy for the farm family which loves its independence and the out of doors. But the alternative often is more distressing: A load of debts, inadequate opportunities for the children, long hours with low returns.

Agricultural economists report that eastern Wisconsin grade A dairy farmers, some of the top operators in the State, have an average investment of $62,350. Yet they net only $6,938 on their investment and labor.

Interest, at current rates, runs to $3,429, leaving $3,509 for family labor, a worker and a half per farm. That's only 88 cents an hour.

Wisconsin farmers average only $3,252 in net returns last year, about $250 under the national average.

While the State concerns itself about industrial problems, here is another area to study. Are there new income possibilities, new marketing methods, which might help matters?

Although the State's dairymen, with their tradition of good husbandry, are not keeping pace nationally, their economic future is tied closely to national policies. Chances of major dairy legislation in this congressional session are not good. Farmers face a continuance of milk prices at the 75 percent of parity minimum. Some Congressmen are ready to drop them further.

Meanwhile, Wisconsin is losing 3,000 farmers a year, now is down to 130,000. Ten years ago, there were 161,000 Wisconsin farmers. The farm exodus picked up considerably since the war. In 1935, there were 200,000 farmers in the State; by 1940, the number had dropped to 193,000.

Ways must be found to ease our disappearing farmers into the labor market, either in home grown industries or through retraining for urban jobs.

A small start has been made through the area redevelopment act program. Local communities, which need the social and economic contributions these families can make, also should turn to this problem.

Rural vitality is as important in Wisconsin's future as urban vitality. With planning, it can be maintained, even if we can't keep them down on the farm.

SCHOOLING OF WORKING AGE GROUP IN HAWAII

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, not long ago, the people of Hawaii were shocked and concerned to learn that the Census Bureau rated Hawaii as third highest State in the Nation in illiteracy.

The Hawaii State Department of Economic Development has just completed an analysis of Census Bureau official census data for 1960 which puts the situation in better perspective.

Census Bureau figures show that Hawaii's people are generally better educated than the national average.

Nearly 45 percent of Hawaii's population over 14 years of age graduated from high school; only 40 percent for the United States as a whole.

Seven and two-tenths percent of Hawaii's people finished at least 4 years of college, as against the U.S. average of 6.5 percent.

The average number of years of schooling for people 14 years and older was 11.2 years in Hawaii, but only 10.6 years for the entire United States.

At the critical "dropout" age of 16 or 17 years, nearly 88 percent of Hawaii's boys and girls were in school, whereas the national average was only 81 percent.

Four years or more of high school were completed by 52.5 percent of Hawaii's population in the 14–44 age group and 49.4 percent in the 14–54 age group, compared with 18.6 percent in the age group 55 or older.

Evidence of Hawaii's impressive progress in overcoming illiteracy appear in the figures on the percentage of persons who have not completed any years of schooling and those who have completed only from 1 to 6 years.

Of those in the 14–24 age group, 0.4 percent had completed no years of schooling; of the 25–34 age group, 0.5 percent; of the 35–44 age group, 1.1 percent; of the 45–54 age group, 7.4 percent; and in the age 55 and older group, 22 percent.

Of those in the 14–24 age group, 1.5 percent completed only from 1 to 6 years of school in Hawaii; of the 25–34 age group, 2.9 percent; of the 35–44 age group, 8.4 percent; of the 45–54 age group, 24.4 percent; and of the 55-plus age group, 36.4 percent.

In other words, of those in the 14–24 age group, 98.1 percent completed 7 years or more of schooling; of the 25–34 age group, 96.6 percent completed 7 years or more; of the 35–44 age group, 90.5 percent; of the 45–54 age group, 68.2 percent; and of the 55-plus age group, 41.6 percent.

Historical reasons related to the influx of immigrants from abroad during the late 1800's and early 1900's account in large part for the higher percentages of little or no schooling in the older age groups in Hawaii.

What these figures show, I believe, is that Hawaii is making good headway toward wiping out illiteracy. Our record in the younger age groups is good. We must always do better, and I am confident that we will do better.

To correct any misimpressions that may have been created by the Census Bureau's ranking Hawaii third among the States in illiteracy, I ask unanimous consent that these tables to which I have referred be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the Record.

Years of schooling completed—Potential labor force, State of Hawaii, 1960

Years schooling completed	Age 14 to 44	Age 14 to 54	Years schooling completed	Age 14 to 44	Age 14 to 54
Total population in age group	300,345	359,794	4 years high school	110,258	121,233
None	1,924	6,355	1 to 3 years college	25,833	29,561
1 to 6 years	12,008	26,530	4 years college	12,899	15,828
7 to 8 years	43,507	56,460	5 years or more college	8,564	11,097
1 to 3 years high school	85,370	92,748	With 4 years high school or more ......percent	52.5	49.4

Source: U.S. Census of Population, 1960, "Detailed Characteristics—Hawaii." From combined data for urban, rural, nonfarm, and rural farm population given in table 103, pp. 13–136.

Years of schooling completed—Selected age groups—Number of persons over 14 years of age, State of Hawaii, 1960

Years schooling completed	Age 14 to 24	Age 25 to 34	Age 35 to 44	Age 45 to 54	Age 55 and over	Years schooling completed	Age 14 to 24	Age 25 to 34	Age 35 to 44	Age 45 to 54	Age 55 and over
Total population in age group	117,585	93,578	89,182	59,449	66,701	4 years high school	35,959	42,709	31,590	10,975	6,312
None	492	462	970	4,431	14,677	1 to 3 years college	9,026	9,110	7,697	3,728	2,481
1 to 6 years	1,797	2,714	7,479	14,522	24,317	4 years college	2,241	6,266	4,392	2,929	2,077
7 to 8 years	19,640	8,002	15,865	12,953	10,966	5 years or more college	613	4,384	3,567	2,533	1,530
1 to 3 years high school	47,817	19,931	17,622	7,378	4,341	With 4 years high school or more..percent	40.7	66.7	52.9	34.0	18.6

Source: U.S. Census of Population 1960, "Detailed Characteristics—Hawaii." From combined data for urban, rural, nonfarm, and rural farm population given in table 103, pp. 13–136.

Years of schooling completed—Selected age groups—Expressed as percent of population in group, State of Hawaii, 1960

Years schooling completed	Age 14 to 24	Age 25 to 34	Age 35 to 44	Age 45 to 54	Age 55 and over	Years schooling completed	Age 14 to 24	Age 25 to 34	Age 35 to 44	Age 45 to 54	Age 55 and over
Total population in age group	117,585	93,578	89,182	59,449	66,701	4 years high school ......percent	30.6	45.6	35.4	18.5	9.5
None ......percent	0.4	0.5	1.1	7.4	22.0	1 to 3 years college ......do	7.7	9.7	8.6	6.3	3.7
1 to 6 years ......do	1.5	2.9	8.4	24.4	36.4	4 years college ......do	1.9	6.7	4.9	4.9	3.1
7 to 8 years ......do	16.7	8.6	17.8	21.8	16.4	5 years or more college ......do	.5	4.7	4.0	4.3	2.3
1 to 3 years high school ......do	40.7	21.3	19.8	12.4	6.5	With 4 years high school or more...do	40.7	66.7	52.9	34.0	18.6

Source: U.S. Census of Population, 1960, "Detailed Characteristics—Hawaii." From combined data for urban, rural, nonfarm, and rural farm population given in table 103, pp. 13–136.

FLAT GLASS INDUSTRY IMPORTANT TO ECONOMIC WELL-BEING OF WEST VIRGINIA AND ITS WORKERS—IMPORTS FROM COMMUNIST COUNTRIES DETRIMENTAL TO DOMESTIC PRODUCTION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in commenting on the pending bill S. 1100, to limit the import of flat glass from Communist countries, I call attention to the latest available figures from the U.S. Department of Labor confirming that national unemployment has again exceeded the critical 6-percent level.

In West Virginia, which I am privileged to represent in the U.S. Senate, from information supplied by the State department of employment security for the week ending March 23, 1963, the present number of insured unemployed is approximately 2,700 more than on the same date in 1962. This does not include others who are unemployed and may be trying to obtain work but are ineligible for unemployment insurance because they have not entered the labor market.

The flat glass industry is of significant importance to the economy of our State. There are four plants in West Virginia. The largest is the Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co. in Charleston—Kanawha City—which has a total employment of 1,233. In 1955, the number of workers was 1,850, showing a decrease of 617 employees.

A further breakdown of employment figures in this factory discloses that in 1955 the total number of production and maintenance workers was 1,417.

As of March 6, 1963, there were 845 employees, or a decrease of almost one-half of the 1955 number.

The figures are not available for the other three plants which are the Adamston Flat Glass Co., the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., and the Rolland Glass Co., all located in Clarksburg, W. Va. I am advised that employment has constantly declined in these operations.

Mr. President, unemployment in West Virginia is of continuing concern to me. I have worked to mitigate unemployment in cooperation with my colleague, Senator Robert C. Byrd, and the other members of the West Virginia delegation. The administration, by developing such programs as public works acceleration and area redevelopment, is trying to deal effectively with the problem. We shall continue to work diligently toward the growth of production.

We will also work to alleviate unemployment and prevent a further decline in loss of job opportunities. For this reason, I have joined with Senator Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania, and other colleagues in cosponsoring S. 1100 to prevent the importation of flat glass which is the product of any country or area dominated or controlled by communism. Early enactment of this measure would prevent further damage to the American flat glass industry and help to protect the jobs that are urgently needed to maintain our own economy.

I ask that an explanatory letter from the president of the Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., George P. MacNichol, Jr., and a table of U.S. imports of window glass, 1961 and 1962—from the Bureau of Census, U.S. Department of Commerce—be included as a part of the record.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LIBBEY-OWENS-FORD GLASS CO.,
Toledo, Ohio, March 20, 1963.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR RANDOLPH: Senator Scott, of Pennsylvania, has been asked that a bill introduced by him (S. 1100) be left on the table for 10 days to permit other Senators to cosponsor it. This bill would seek to limit the imports of flat glass from Communist countries. As a corporate constituent of yours (as you will recall, Libby-Owens-Ford has a factory in Charleston), I commend your favorable attention to that bill.

Enclosed is a table of window glass imports, 1962 against 1961. As is apparent, the increase in window glass tariffs proclaimed last year by the President and effective since June 18, 1962, has not proved a deterrent to producers in free enterprise countries. With lower labor and other cost advantages, they still find the United States a profitable market to exploit. Specifically, I call your attention to imports, 1962 against 1961, from Belgium (up 42.3 percent), France (up 17.3 percent), United Kingdom (up 15.3 percent), and West Germany (up 25.4 percent).

More ominous to us, however, and I should think to these European nations is the figure for U.S.S.R.: up 62.6 percent.

The substantial increases on the part of friendly European countries may indicate that a share of the business which was placed with Communist countries might have been enjoyed by them as well as, hopefully, U.S producers, if restrictions against the importation of Communist glass had been in effect. From the commercial point of view, I can assure you that it is preferable to compete with manufacturers who, even though they enjoy cost advantages, must sell their produce at a profit, rather than with factories whose prices are governed by political expediency. And from the point of view of U.S. foreign policy, it seems desirable that such business as is placed abroad be placed with friendly rather than unfriendly countries.

Sincerely yours,
George P. MacNichol, Jr.,
President.

U.S. imports of window glass, 1961 and 1962, by country of origin

	1961		1962		Percent change, 1961-62
	Pounds	Percent of United States	Pounds	Percent of United States	
Reduced rate countries:					
Austria	2,415,893	0.7	2,921,875	0.6	+20.9
Belgium	107,154,500	28.9	152,481,592	32.7	+42.3
Canada	9,403,717	2.5	6,913,738	1.5	−26.5
Colombia	22,256	0			
Denmark	142,843	0	152,519	0	+6.8
Finland	7,707,738	2.1	10,514,244	2.3	+36.4
France	29,211,557	7.9	34,271,895	7.3	+17.3
Greece	921,167	.3	4,990,267	1.1	+441.7
Hong Kong	110,951	0	1,704	0	−98.5
Israel	768,380	.2	1,459,061	.3	+89.9
Italy	7,234,131	1.9	6,559,167	1.4	−9.3
Japan	57,831,276	15.6	59,169,716	12.7	+2.3
Korean Republic			1,293,288	.3	
Mexico	8,443,378	2.3	12,679,732	2.7	+50.2
Netherlands	444,064	.1	417,219	.1	−6.0
Norway	1,496,214	.4			
Philippine Republic	409,205	.1			
Poland	1,576	0	1,874,955	.4	+118,869.2
Portugal	107,833	0	5,183,357	1.1	+4,706.8
Spain	1,141,660	.3	4,066,614	.9	+256.2
Reduced rate countries—Con.					
Sweden	18,953,316	5.1	12,339,896	2.6	−34.9
Switzerland	146,287	0	63,326	0	−56.7
Taiwan	8,944,734	2.4	12,783,374	2.7	+42.9
Turkey			396,850	.1	
United Kingdom	44,528,218	12.0	51,337,300	11.0	+15.3
Uruguay	12,502	0			
West Germany	38,524,621	10.4	48,292,027	10.4	+25.4
Yugoslavia	46,487	0	648,762	.1	+1,295.6
Total	346,124,504	93.2	430,812,478	92.3	+24.5
Full rate countries:					
Czechoslovakia	13,360,383	3.6	14,365,124	3.1	+7.5
East Germany	1,361,941	.4	1,172,299	.3	−13.9
Rumania	105,013	0	2,974,539	.6	+2,732.5
U.S.S.R.	10,491,048	2.8	17,053,955	3.7	+62.6
Total	25,318,385	6.8	35,565,917	7.7	+40.5
Grand total	371,442,880	100.0	466,378,395	100.0	+25.6

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census.

MARTINSBURG, W. VA., PLANT OF CORNING GLASS WORKS SCHEDULED FOR EXPANSION—CORNING OFFICIALS HELPFUL IN SENATE HEARING ON EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK FOR WOMEN

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, West Virginians are gratified that officials of the Corning Glass Works have decided to institute a program of substantial expansion at their Martinsburg plant, in the eastern panhandle section of our State. Plant Manager Robert A. Sanders has announced that the addition to existing facilities amounts to 10,000 square feet, and will be used to house additional manufacturing equipment.

We are gratified that the leaders of Corning Glass Works are continuing to demonstrate their faith in the capabilities and stability of the citizens of West Virginia. During the 3 years in which Corning has operated its factory in Berkeley County, that respected firm has become more than just an industrial trade name—it has taken on the character of a trusted member of the community; one vitally concerned with local projects and anxious to participate in projects of civic improvement. In short, the relationship established between Corning and the citizens of Martinsburg is one of mutual regard. Both realize that they are working together to create not only a commercial product of value to millions, but a happy and successful community that is an integral part of American prosperity.

An editorial in the March 12, 1963, issue of the Martinsburg Journal stated: "Corning, we have found out, is also a good citizen in addition to being merely a good employer. If you notice, there is never a community improvement project undertaken where either or both Corning company financial contributions or Corning employee assistance does not play an important part."

The editor goes on to write that "The meeting of Corning and Martinsburg was love at first sight with an industrial marriage resulting in an uninterrupted honeymoon over the past 3 years."

And, Corning Glass Works is being constructive in other areas of public interest as well. In today's hearing before the Subcommittee on Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member, E. G. Hester, director of industrial relations research for Corning Glass Works, gave important and effective information. Testifying on S. 910, the equal pay bill for women for equal work, Mr. Hester indicated his company's longtime concern for equal employment opportunity for women, and pointed out that Corning presently employs female workers at virtually all levels of its vast industrial complex, including executive and managerial positions.

During his testimony it was my pleasure to question Mr. Hester as to the number of persons employed by Corning Glass Works in the State of West Virginia, and the number of women so employed. He replied that 300 of the 750 employees in Corning's Parkersburg, W. Va., plant are women; at Martinsburg, W. Va., 175 out of 495 are women; about 10 of the 56 employees of the facility at Buckhannon, W. Va., are women, as are 70 to 80 of the citizens now working at the Paden City works.

From these figures it is clear that the Corning Glass Works has become an integral part of the economy and welfare of our State, a fact which has earned the gratitude, respect and loyalty of all West Virginians. We are grateful to Mr. Hester for his lucid and helpful testimony before the Labor Subcommittee. Likewise, commendations are due William J. Belknap, Corning's director of Government services, for his counsel and cooperation during our study of this vital question. Both of these men have given meaningful assistance to those attempting to bring forth effective legislation which will benefit all Americans.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a few days ago I and a number of my colleagues introduced a package of legislative proposals dealing with civil rights. These measures were based upon the recommendations of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, the Commission established to advise the President and the Congress of the steps necessary to assure all Americans of the rights to which each of us, whatever our race, color, or religion, is entitled under the Constitution.

The response to our action has been most encouraging. Clearly there is widespread awareness of the need for legislation. For too long the Congress has put off facing up to its responsibilities in this field.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial from the New York Times of April 2, 1963, entitled "Reminder on Civil Rights," an editorial from the Newark Evening News of March 29, 1963, entitled "Up the Hill Again," and an editorial entitled "Politics and Promises" from the Washington Post of April 1, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 2, 1963]

Reminder on Civil Rights

A group of Senate Republicans has introduced a sheaf of civil rights bills which top anything we have seen thus far in the new Congress. New York's two Senators, Javits

and Keating, are in this group. So are Case of New Jersey, Scott of Pennsylvania, Saltonstall of Massachusetts, Kuchel of California, Beall of Maryland and Fong of Hawaii.

The bills these gentlemen have introduced would do many useful things: give the Commission on Civil Rights permanent status; outlaw discriminating practices at the polls; do the same thing in federally financed housing projects; penalize discrimination in Federal employment, and enforce a more rapid pace in the achievement of school desegregation.

It is easy enough to dismiss all this as a political gesture, designed to embarrass the Kennedy administration. But the fact remains that, while President Kennedy sent a civil rights message to Congress on February 28, he has not followed it up with concrete legislative proposals. The Republicans now have.

[From the Newark Evening News, Mar. 29, 1963]

Up the Hill Again

What has become an annual pilgrimage up Capitol Hill in behalf of effective civil rights legislation once more has been undertaken by New Jersey's Senator Case and a small band of liberal Senators.

They seek nothing more radical than the rights which the Constitution and moral decency assure to all citizens. Yet how far from realization we remain is evidenced by the treatment of Negros engaged in a southern voter registration drive and by bullets fired into the home of a youth who wants to enter the University of Mississippi.

Proposed by Senator Case and seven of his Republican colleagues are Federal safeguards against discrimination in employment, housing, education, public accommodations, and polling places. President Kennedy agreed to the need for more equitable treatment in each of these fields in the program he proposed earlier this month.

But where the President generalized, the Senators specify. They want the Attorney General empowered to institute suit against the violation of any civil right, not just voting rights. They also propose a Federal commission to enforce fair employment practices, Federal technical assistance to schools seeking to desegregate and more equitable access to home mortgage credit.

The possibility of enactment concededly is slim. No one knows this better than the sponsoring Senators. For they are veterans of the campaign to break the filibuster rule that smothers civil rights legislation in Southern oratory. But they mean to keep trying and that is to their credit.

Beaten before, they return unbowed.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 1, 1963]

Politics and Promises

Republican Senators Case, Fong, Javits, Keating, Kuchel, and Scott have introduced a comprehensive set of bills designed to eradicate racial discrimination in the areas of voting rights, education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice. We think it is scarcely too much to say that if these bills were enacted and effectively administered they would serve to solve the most vexing and disfiguring of American domestic problems. They would confer on American Negroes the first-class citizenship promised to them by the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments nearly a full century ago.

These Republican proposals are radical in the sense that they go to the root of the race problem and seek to excise it by treating all men equally regardless of color. But they are not at all radical in the sense of being novel. One need not search very far to find their antecedents. All these proposals are set forth as solemn promises in the Republican Party platform for 1960. All these proposals are also set forth as solemn promises in the Democratic Party platform of 1960. It would be hard to say which platform trumpets the promises more appealingly and melodiously. But it is easy to say that the promises are as yet unfulfilled.

They are not unrealizable. They are not visionary. Indeed, the Republican platform of 1960 said of them that "each of the following pledges is practical and within realistic reach. They are serious—not cynical—pledges made to result in maximum progress." The Democratic platform asserted that "the time has come to assure equal access for all Americans to all areas of community life, including voting booths, schoolrooms, jobs, housing, and public facilities." The Democrats were then seeking the Presidency and so their platform included an observation that "what is now required is effective moral and political leadership by the whole executive branch of our Government to make equal opportunity a living reality for all Americans."

For all the loftiness of purpose and sincerity of concern among the half dozen Republican sponsors of the civil rights measures pledged by the two major political parties, no one, we suppose, seriously expects any of these bills to be enacted into law in the 88th Congress. The chances are against any of them even coming to a vote in both Houses of Congress.

SOUTH DAKOTA IMPLEMENTS KERR-MILLS ACT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the session of the South Dakota Legislature just completed there was enacted legislation implementing in South Dakota the Kerr-Mills Act. The action taken in South Dakota which is now law is unique in two ways in that it was taken under the authority of Public Law 87–543 enacted by the Congress last year and provides funds to finance a pilot or demonstration program. The South Dakota statute also establishes a prepayment system of operation in this area.

This is indeed another milestone in bringing the benefits of the Kerr-Mills program to the people of this country. According to my information there were 25 States in addition to Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands which had implemented the law by December 1962. Since that time 3 States, including South Dakota have approved similar laws and 13 others were considering bills of this type during the sessions of their individual legislatures.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a résumé of South Dakota's Kerr-Mills implementation program and a copy of the bill as it was enacted and signed into law by the Governor of South Dakota.

There being no objection, the résumé and bill were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It was the feeling of the legislature that many States had jumped into a program without any accurate estimate of the total needs. Several of these have found that their appropriations far exceeded the demand for fund utilization.

A pilot program will determine within a short time, the number of needy persons, the extent of their needs, and will provide a more accurate determination of the cost of a full program.

The South Dakota State Medical Association took the position that any program for persons in the near-needy or medically indigent area should be treated as nearly akin to their more fortunate (and solvent) confreres as possible. Those persons having resources protect themselves against the cost of medical-surgical and hospital care with prepaid Blue Cross-Blue Shield or insurance contracts so it was determined that persons who turned to the Kerr-Mills program as a resource should receive comparable benefits. The legislative committee studying the problem concurred in this view and a bill was drafted and introduced by Representative Ellen Bliss, Sioux Falls, chairman of the house committee on health and welfare.

The bill was signed into law by Governor Archie Gubbrud and becomes effective on July 1 or when the plan receives approval of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, whichever is later.

The law empowers the State department of public welfare to set up a program to qualify for Federal funds and provides that—

1. A person to be eligible for aid must not be a recipient of old-age assistance when he applies, must be unable to pay for medical or remedial care, must not have an average annual income of $1,500 or more, or $1,800 for a married couple, and must not have a net worth of $10,000 or more. If available funds are insufficient, the department may set lower limits on income and resources but may not go above these specified limits.

2. The department is empowered to accept applications and determine eligibility of those who apply. All individuals wishing to do so shall receive an opportunity to apply and assistance is to be furnished with reasonable promptness to those who are eligible.

3. The department may appoint county advisory committees to assist in recommending selection of applicants. Basic intent of this provision is to keep a local flavor to the selection where needs are best known.

4. The welfare department shall contract with Blue Cross and Blue Shield or licensed insurance companies to purchase prepaid health coverage which shall include the following:

Hospitalization is to be limited to 30 days per admission in semiprivate or ward accommodations. Said provision includes a $25 deductible clause, outpatient hospital care and services. Physicians' services are limited to 12 office calls per fiscal year and to medical calls, surgical, and other services in a hospital for 30 days per admission. Laboratory, X-ray, and other special procedures may be limited to $100 per fiscal year. The latter procedures are subject to a $10 deductible clause. Physicians must agree in writing to participate in the plan.

5. A provision is made for the insurance company or Blue Cross-Blue Shield plan to operate without profit or loss. A contingency fund was established to not only take care of the possibility of loss, but to provide services for individuals not on the program whose illness makes them eligible.

6. The usual provisions are included in the law which makes it effective simultaneously in all political subdivisions, prohibits payment by the recipient of enrollment fees as a condition of eligibility, reserves the State department of welfare the right to cancel a contract within 30 days' written notice, provides safeguards against use and disclosure of information concerning applicants for or recipients of assistance, and provides a penalty for fraudulent information given by the applicant.

The program, as adopted by the legislature, has the endorsement of the State medical association, the State hospital association, and other health organizations. The prepayment aspect of the plan and the pilot program aspect of the plan which will curtail high administrative costs, met with high favor from most legislators and other individuals involved.

House Bill 510

An act authorizing the State public welfare department to establish a medical aid to the aged program, and to purchase medical care and hospitalization contracts for recipients of medical care to the aged; empowering public welfare commission to establish rules, regulations, and income and net worth qualifications for the operation of the program

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota:

Section 1. In addition to the authority and duties granted to the State department of public welfare in chapter 55.36 of the South Dakota Code of 1939, and all laws amendatory thereof, the State department of public welfare is granted the following power:

(1) To qualify for Federal money under the provisions of title 1 of the Federal Social Security Act, as amended, pertaining to the provision of medical assistance in behalf of individuals 65 years of age or over who are not recipients of old-age assistance at the time of application and who are unable to pay for needed medical or remedial care services;

(2) To establish reasonable standards consistent with the objectives of title 1 of the Social Security Act, as amended, for determining eligibility of individuals for such medical assistance and the extent of such assistance: *Provided, however,* That such medical assistance shall not be made available to any individual who has had an average income, during the preceding 12-month period prior to the submission of an application for such assistance, of $1,500 or more, nor to a married couple having an average income of $1,800 or more, or at the time of application, a net worth of more than $10.000. *Provided, however,* That the State public welfare commission may by resolution lower, but may not increase such income and net worth qualifications, as herein established, if the commission concludes that insufficient funds are available to provide medical care to the medically indigent aged;

(3) To accept applications for medical assistance for the aged from any individual who deems himself eligible for assistance under the terms of this act, to determine such individual's eligibility or ineligibility for such assistance in accordance with rules and regulations adopted for such purpose by the State public welfare commission;

(4) To certify the medical indigency of any individual who applies and qualifies for medical assistance under the terms of this act and the period of eligibility;

(5) To appoint in any county a county advisory committee on medical aid to the aged consisting of not less than three nor more than five members. The members of such committees shall be residents of the county for which appointed, shall serve without compensation except for actual expenses incurred in the attendance at meetings within the limitations fixed by the department of public welfare, and shall serve at the pleasure of the department.

Sec. 2. The State department shall purchase, in behalf of individuals certified as medically indigent under section 1 of this act, medical care and hospitalization contracts from corporations licensed to operate either under SDC 1960 Supp. 31.17A or SDC 1960 Supp. 31.17B, or "company" as defined in subsection (6) of SDC 31.0101, operating under a certificate of authority issued by the South Dakota Department of Insurance, and provided that the responsibility of such corporations or company for payment of hospital services incurred by such medical indigent individual shall be as follows:

1. For contracted inpatient hospital care and services provided in semiprivate or ward accommodations during a period of eligibility and for a period of 30 days for each admission less $25 per admission.

2. For contracted outpatient hospital care and services provided during the period of eligibility.

It is provided further that the responsibility of such corporations or company for the payment of contracted physician services incurred by such medically indigent individual, provided such physician agrees, in writing, to participate in such prepayment plan shall be as follows:

1. For calls, and services provided in connection with such calls, including injectible drugs, or other material provided by the physician and administered in connection with such calls. During the period of eligibility, except for inpatient hospital services by a physician in any appropriate place including the physician's office or clinic, the patient's home, nursing home, or outpatient department of a hospital, such calls may not exceed a total of 12 during any fiscal year period;

2. For contracted laboratory procedures, X-ray procedures, and other special procedures in the physician's office provided during the period of eligibility by a physician, less the first $10 for such services, provided that the total cost of such services may be limited to $100 during any fiscal year period;

3. For contracted medical calls and services in a hospital provided during the period of eligibility by a physician for a period of 30 days for each admission.

It is provided further that no profit nor loss shall accrue to the contractors and when such corporations or company anticipate a loss from such program, immediate renegotiation to decrease levels of service or utilize the medical aid to the aged contingency fund, as hereinafter provided, shall be initiated and completed within 30 days of notice by the contractor.

Inasmuch as State and Federal funds are the source of all moneys for the medical aid to the aged program, the contractors shall not be liable for payment of State insurance premium taxes for operation of this program.

Sec. 3. Any prepayment contract purchased by the State department in behalf of medically indigent individuals shall incorporate the following provisions:

1. It shall be effective simultaneously in all political subdivisions of the State and the benefits of said contract shall include residents of this State who are temporarily absent;

2. It shall prohibit payment by the recipient of enrollment fees, premiums, and similar charges as a condition of eligibility;

3. It reserves to the State department the right and authority to administer or supervise the administration of such contract or to cancel it upon 30 days' written notice of such cancellation without liability after the effective date of said cancellation other than for cases incurred prior to the date of such cancellation;

4. It shall provide safeguards against use and disclosure of information concerning applicants for or recipients of assistance, except for purposes directly connected with the administration of the contract.

Sec. 4. The State public welfare commission shall adopt rules and regulations requiring the following:

1. An opportunity for a fair hearing before the State department of public welfare by any individual whose claim for assistance is denied or not acted upon with reasonable promptness;

2. Methods of administration deemed necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the State plan, including the adoption of a merit system for personnel;

3. The filing of necessary reports to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

4. Safeguards against use and disclosure of information concerning applicants for or recipients of assistance, except for the purpose directly concerned with the administration of the plan;

5. All individuals wishing to do so receive an opportunity to apply for assistance, and assistance is to be furnished with reasonable promptness to those who are eligible and certify such individual as medically indigent for the purpose of any contract entered into by the State department of public welfare; and

6. Such reports on premium costs, recipients counts, utilization data, and similar administrative matters necessary to be fully accountable for the expenditure of public funds.

Sec. 5. The authority contained in this act shall become effective upon the approval or acceptance for Federal participation of a South Dakota medical aid to the aged plan by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the provisions of title 1 of the Social Security Act pertaining to medical assistance to the aged, but not prior to the effective date of this act.

Sec. 6. There is hereby created a fund to be known as the medical assistance for the aged contingency fund to serve as a contingency fund to meet emergency disbursements as hereinafter provided by the State department of public welfare, not to be included in the general appropriations which provide for the ordinary operational expenses of the medical assistance for the aged program administered by the State public welfare commission, and to be used for the purpose of carrying into effect the objectives of said program. No part of this fund shall revert to the general fund.

Sec. 7. When, in the course of normal administration of a medical assistance for the aged program, the State department of public welfare shall realize a temporary deficit in the general operating expenditures of medical assistance funds, such deficit may be removed by said department, with the approval of the State public welfare commission, by withdrawal of contingency fund reserves or so much thereof as may be necessary. Withdrawals of said fund shall be disbursed on warrants drawn by the State Auditor on vouchers submitted by the public welfare department and approved by the State welfare commission.

Sec. 8. The term "medical assistance" and "medical or remedial care" as used in this act shall be deemed to include all of the services described in section 1385 of title 42, U.S.C.A.

Sec. 9. 1. Whoever knowingly obtains or attempts to obtain or aids or abets any person in obtaining medical assistance for the aged to which he is not entitled, medical assistance for the aged greater than that to which he is justly entitled, by means of false statement or representation, or by impersonation or other fraudulent device, or by failure to supply the State Department with full and accurate information at the time of application for medical assistance for the aged or promptly thereafter, whenever changes in the extent or amount of income or eligibility occur, or

2. Whoever aids or abets in buying, concealing, or in any way disposing of the property of a recipient of assistance, with the intent to defeat the purposes of this act, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not to exceed $500 or by imprisonment in the county jail not to exceed 3 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Approved March 11, 1963.

ASSAULT ON CONGRESS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, last night's Washington Evening Star—the April 1 issue—contained a most perceptive piece by the noted political columnist, Mr. William S. White, in which he comments on the current effort being made to further usurp the power of the Congress.

Mr. White describes this effort as an "assault of the sixties upon the last home of representative government, Congress."

I would go a step further and define these attempts as brazen moves to radicalize the Congress into something which was exactly the opposite intention of the inspired authors of our Constitution.

With the convening of the 88th Congress, 1st session, we were witness to and participants in the struggle to dilute the power, the rights, and the obligations of the Senate as set forth in the Constitution.

What happened this winter was merely one battle in the apparent never-ending attempt to reduce not only the Senate but the Congress to no better status than that enjoyed by a dangling puppet responsive only to the whims of modern-day stringpullers whose concept of government has scant allowance for the rights of individuals and no room at all for dissent.

Mr. President, Bill White has been on the Washington scene a long time. Most of us recall when he was the Senate correspondent for the New York Times and later the Times chief congressional correspondent.

He is no mere casual observer of the Congress; in fact, if one were to compile a list of what might be termed "expert students" of the Congress—and particularly the Senate—the name of Bill White would be high among that group.

So it is with this background of Mr. White's in mind that I call to the attention of the Senate his discussion of the constant attempts being made to diminish the role of Congress in our system of government, a system of government, I might add, which stands in danger of destruction, in my opinion, should the efforts to mute the voice of the people—the Congress—achieve success.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include Mr. White's article in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Assault on Congress Charged

(By William S. White)

The most vehement attack upon Congress as an institution since the first Roosevelt New Deal—when for a time it seemed that the just and constitutional powers of the National Legislature might be forever destroyed—is now being mounted.

The old assault of the thirties was led by a President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who wanted to have it all his own way, all at once. There was some small color of justification then. For the country was in a massive and malignant depression in which it appeared to some good men who were too much afraid and too much in a hurry that the alternative to a thoroughly cowed and docile Congress might be mobs in the streets.

For the new assault of the sixties there is no justification whatever, save the self-justification of unreasonably demanding pressure groups which see in Congress constitutional right to reject their proposals simply some evil denial of what, in their own minds alone, is best for the Republic.

LEFT LEADERSHIP

This new assault of the sixties upon the last home of representative government, Congress, is being led by a combination of leftwing men and forces, almost all of them Democratic and some of them actually Members of Congress.

Their objective of all objectives is to pressure the present Democratic President, John F. Kennedy, to join them in discrediting the actions, the procedures and sometimes even the motives of a currently Democratic Congress.

These forces have, in every instance, two things in common.

In 2 years of the Kennedy administration their legislative desires have repeatedly been frustrated by their own simple inability to marshal an effective majority for them.

And in 2 years of the Kennedy administration they have repeatedly been unable to force Congress to agree to change itself and its procedures in such a way as to forward the adoption of those desires over the manifest objections of a majority in Congress and the country.

Thus, unable to win the game under the rules, they demand changes in the rules. Thus, unable to persuade the public to back their notions and bills, and convinced of the infinite righteousness of those notions and bills, they conclude that only some giant conspiracy, or some dreadful weakness in Congress, is to blame for their own minority ineffectuality.

They follow the classic pattern of well-intentioned reformers. They know for a fact that what they propose is good for the people. When the people and the people's forum, Congress, refuse those proposals, it is, in their minds, the Congress which is wrong and the people who are deluded and defrauded.

NEW DOUBLETALK

They have evolved a whole new jargon in which old words have new meanings. The defeat of their measures in Congress becomes not merely defeat but obstructionism. The inability of the present President to persuade Congress to do everything he wants—where what he wants is suitably liberal—becomes not merely ordinary disagreement, but deadlock.

Congressional unwillingness to listen overmuch to them automatically means that Congress is foolish—or worse. Congress undoubtedly hesitant and plodding present pace is, to them, not simply an obvious reflection that Congress prefers just now to go slow. It is, instead, some large and glitteringly frightful thing like a paralysis of Government.

To them, to go slow is automatically to go wrong—if not worse. To them, deliberation becomes defiance; caution becomes cravenness; dissent from them becomes conspiracy; the refusal of a congressional majority to surrender to a minority becomes the capital crime of not moving the country forward.

But whose country is it? And who is to define forward?

CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF BOSTON COLLEGE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, Boston College, one of this country's leading institutions for higher learning, is celebrating the 100th anniversary of its founding this year. A formal ceremony commemorating this occasion was held at the Chestnut Hill, Mass., campus on Sunday, March 31, 1963.

It is appropriate that recognition be made of this event for Boston College has, since its inception, made a substantial contribution to the academic, cultural, economic and social fabric of the community and Nation. That this is so is due primarily to the philosophy of Boston College which emphasizes the importance and value of liberal arts and its influence in the development of moral and spiritual values. A corollary to this is the development of the intellect, an understanding and appreciation of human values, and the proper regard for individual rights.

It is the application of such a philosophy which has enabled Boston College to achieve preeminence as a significant and positive force in its relatively brief span of existence. The standard incorporated on the official seal of Boston College is "Ever To Excel." This motto has characterized the impressive record of this institution.

Boston College is today, in every respect, a university. There are presently 12 colleges, including 5 postgraduate and professional schools within the university. The original small college of liberal arts consisting of 22 students has matured into the third largest Catholic university in the United States with an enrollment of approximately 10,000 students.

Three out of five living alumni of Boston College are serving their community in education, government, medicine, nursing, religion, and social work. It is interesting to observe that one out of every five attorneys admitted to practice law in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts over the past 10 years is a graduate of the Boston College Law School; one out of every six physicians in Greater Boston is a graduate of Boston College.

The contribution made by Boston College to the life of the community is evident by various programs conducted at the university. Annual citizens' seminars on economic difficulties bring together civic leaders who discuss methods for solving common problems. The law school forums have sponsored discussions by professional experts on the legal ramifications of social problems within a community. The school of Education has inaugurated special programs for the teaching of the mentally retarded and of the blind. A weekly television program, sponsored by the College of Business Administration, has focused public attention upon such subjects as urban renewal, State and municipal finances, transportation and housing.

This is indeed an impressive record. I compliment Boston College on the occasion of the centennial of its founding for its many achievements. I wish it continued success in the years ahead.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR SUPPORT OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the noted humanitarian, lecturer, author, and social worker, Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, has accepted the responsibility of becoming chairman of the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools. Joining her on the executive board of this organization are Dr. Harold Taylor, former president of Sarah Lawrence College; the Honorable William Benton, a great and distinguished former colleague who so ably represented Connecticut in this Chamber; Gen. Omar N. Bradley; the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, ex-Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; the well known author, John Hersey; the Honorable Mary C. Kohler, who served with distinction for 15 years on the bench of the San Francisco, Calif., juvenile court; James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union; and Mr. John I. Snyder, Jr., member of the board of trustees for the Committee for Economic Development. Mr. David E. Scoll serves the organization as secretary-treasurer.

This group of distinguished American educators and public servants, in preparation for the first national conference of the national committee which will be held April 7, 8, and 9 here in Washington, has prepared a report entitled "Changing Demands on Education and Their Fiscal Implications." In the foreword to the report, Mrs. Meyer eloquently voices the committee's goals. I ask unanimous consent that the foreword to the report be printed at this point in my remarks.

Mr. President, if is my intention from time to time to bring segments of this report to the attention of my colleagues through insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, since in my judgment the information contained in it will be most helpful to us in accomplishing our legislative duties in the field of education during this session of the Congress.

In pursuance of this objective, I ask unanimous consent that the chapters entitled "Field of This Report," "Technological Change and Automation," and "Education and Earnings" be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD

The hope of our free society lies in the public schools. It is here that the society of tomorrow begins to take shape; here that the spark, the strength, the character of our democracy is generated.

The National Committee for Support of the Public Schools was organized in January 1962 by a bipartisan group of community leaders who believe that the survival and progress of the United States depend as never before upon full development of our human resources. That our school system is a good one is unquestionably true. It is equally true that it has not kept pace with the mounting demands of the times.

A much stronger national determination to improve the scope and quality of public education is urgently needed. Accordingly, the committee has these objectives:

1. To publicize individual and social benefits which accrue from investment in the right kind and amount of public education.
2. To focus public attention on individual and social problems associated with inadequate schooling of a considerable percent of citizens.
3. To point out areas of educational policy and action essential for full development of human resources.
4. To identify fiscal action essential to adequate financial support for effective public education at all levels, from kindergarten through grade 14.

The public school problem challenges each member of every community. Efforts to develop a system of public education to meet the demands of today and tomorrow should be based on fact and on thoughtful deliberation. Accordingly, the committee's program emphasizes factual studies, believing that people will act when they are fully informed.

This report, "Changing Demands on Education and Their Fiscal Implications," is the committee's first effort to increase understanding and to stimulate organized effort on behalf of public schools throughout the country. We hope that it will lead many citizens to examine carefully the urgency and the dimensions of the school problem and to unite in a common effort to make more effective use of education in developing our human resources.

AGNES E. MEYER,
Chairman, National Committee for Support of the Public Schools.

FIELD OF THIS REPORT—I

This report is concerned primarily with the interrelations of education and economics as they affect the well-being of the individual and the Nation. This emphasis in no sense implies that economic considerations should predominate in determining the purposes and content of public education.

The fact is, however, that regardless of the point of view one takes concerning this public service, it is costing a lot of money and, according to careful estimates, will cost more with each passing year.

This fact tends to evoke two differing reactions. One point of view, whicle acknowledging that values accrue to society from quality education, maintains that expenditures for public schools fall on the consumption side of the economic ledger. This point of view holds that taxes decrease the amount of capital available for investment. Hence, public school expenditures are something on which we must "save" if investment and economic growth are not to be hampered.

Another point of view that has received increasing attention in recent years is one that maintains that wise expenditure for education is economic investment. By developing human resources through education and other services such as health programs, a stock of human capital is built up which is an essential ingredient of a productive and viable economy.

The point of view of this report is that expenditure for good schools is both a high order of consumption and an essential form of investment. This should be taken into account in determining what amounts may wisely be budgeted for public education.

Education for intellectual development and for informed and perceptive minds was never needed more than it is today. The danger is that when education is thought of solely in these lofty and noble terms it is likely to suffer financial limitations which will prevent full achievement of both its intellectual and its economic goals. The latter cannot be ignored in a nation such as the United States, in which world leadership and even survival depend upon economic power.

Accordingly, this report explores the economics of education from several approaches. It deals with these questions:

1. What are some of the major demands of modern technology on the public schools?
2. What is the relation of education to individual earnings?
3. What new insights and evidences are economists developing concerning education as investment in human capital and as a factor in national economic growth?
4. What is the effect of education when its full power is focused on a particular segment of production?
5. What are the individual and social penalties resulting from denial of adequate schooling to a considerable percentage of our population?
6. What are some of the requisites for the development of a system of public education which is right in amount and kind?
7. Has the financial support of public schools been sufficiently responsive to the demands made upon them?
8. What expenditures will be required in the future for the effective development of public schools?
9. What are some of the fiscal actions required to provide adequate financing for public education?

Information on such questions as the foregoing does not provide easy answers to the problem of what amount should be expended for public education in a particular locality, in a State or in the Nation as a whole. They do constitute one basis for decision in the complex process of budgeting funds for public schools.

TECHNOLOGICAL CHANGE AND AUTOMATION—II

Research, the application of new knowledge to industrial processes, and automation are remaking the economy of the United States. The scope and rapidity of this change are bringing about what some have called the second industrial revolution. The impacts of this revolution are profound for education. It is imperative that schools and colleges respond to the new and changing demands being made upon them.

Occupational trends

Professional and Technical Workers

One of the most persistent occupational trends in the United States is the growing demand for workers with increased general education and advanced technical and professional training. A college degree is required even for admission to training for a mounting number of callings.[1] Many business concerns look upon a college degree as the minimum requirement for employment in positions that lead to the more attractive types of work.

The fastest growing occupations are those that require larger amounts of general education and advanced technical and professional training.

The 1960 U.S. Census Report states that "professional and technical personnel, the most highly educated of all workers, are increasing fastest." The following are figures for 1950–70:

	Millions
1950	5
1960	7.5
1970 (estimated)	10

Professional and technical workers in 1950 were 8 percent of the employed population. By 1970, this percentage will be well over 12.5.[2]

Skilled and Semiskilled Workers

Below the professional and technical occupations in amount of training required are those designated as skilled and semiskilled. Both are growing in number, but the skilled occupations are growing more rapidly than the semiskilled.[3]

Unskilled Workers

The percent of the employed population now classified as unskilled will continue to decline.

The least skilled of all workers do the hardest physical work, except perhaps farm laborers, and are usually the lowest paid. Over the past half century their place in the labor force has dropped from 12.5 percent to less than 6 percent in 1960. In numbers, the need for unskilled workers will remain about the same during the coming decade, but their proportion in the labor force will continue to drop—to less than 5 percent by 1970.[4]

---

[1] U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Occupational Outlook Handbook," Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961, p. 29.

[2] Ibid., p. 24.

[3] Ibid., pp. 22–25.

[4] Ibid., p. 26.

Figure 1 shows the trend for three occupational groups from 1900 to 1960 and estimates the trend to 1975. The group with the highest training (professional and technical workers) composes a rapidly rising percentage of the work force. The percentages of the work force classified as farm workers and industrial laborers are rapidly declining.

FIG. 1.—*Occupational distribution of workers*

[Percent of all workers]

Professional and technical:	
1900	4.39
1920	5.4
1940	7.5
1950	8.6
1960	11.2
1975	14.0
Farm:	
1900	37.5
1920	27.0
1940	17.4
1950	11.8
1960	8.1
1975	5.3
Laborers (industrial):	
1900	12.5
1920	11.6
1940	9.4
1950	6.6
1960	5.5
1975	4.4

Sources: Data for 1900–50 from Kaplan, David L., and Casey, M. Claire. "Occupational Trends in the United States, 1900 to 1950." U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Working Paper No. 5. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1958. Table 2, p. 7. Data for 1960 and 1975 from the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Actual 1900–1960 and estimated 1975.

Farm Workers

Farm workers made up 53 percent of the total labor force in 1870; by 1970 they will represent only about 6 percent. The greatest technological revolution in the United States has taken place in agriculture.

In 1870, the number of farmers and farm workers was about 7 million. It reached a peak of 11.5 million around 1910.

By 1950, the number of farm workers had declined to 7 million (12 percent of the labor force), the same number as 80 years before, even though the Nation's population had increased almost fourfold and the quantity of farm products by 4.5 times.

This downward trend in the number of farm workers continued during the 1950–60 decade. In 1960, only 5.9 million farmers and farm laborers were in the labor force; by 1970, the total will have dropped still further, to about 5 million, only 6 percent of the labor force, a ninefold drop in 100 years.[5]

The impact of the reduction in the number of farmworkers is far greater in some States than in others. This is how it is in Mississippi:

The 1960 census shows that over half the farm population of Mississippi has moved to urban centers in the past 10 years, and also about 75 percent of the population lives in urban centers, so we need fewer and fewer farmers, and industrialization is demanding more education. To just get out there and plow a mule, you know, like it has been in Mississippi up until a few years ago, could be done without being able to read and write. But, now we have come to the time that something is going to have to be done about this thing because it requires skills and education that haven't been required before. And it is an emergency.[6]

Industrial Workers

The following examples are illustrative of the present condition of industrial workers:

Because of technological change, about 200,000 production jobs have been eliminated in recent years in the aircraft industry alone.

Productivity (or output per man-hour) in the soft coal industry rose 96 percent since World War II, but employment fell by 262,700.

Steel production in 1960 was almost the same as in 1950, but employment declined by 80,000, or 14 percent.

Employment in the manufacture of refrigerators and washing machines has fallen 18 percent, and employment in instrument production has fallen 15 percent in the last 7 years.[7]

In the highly automated chemical industry, the number of production jobs has fallen 3 percent since 1956, while output has soared 27 percent. Though steel capacity has increased 20 percent since 1955, the number of men needed to operate the industry's plants—even at full capacity—has dropped 17,000. Auto employment slid from a peak of 746,000 in boom 1955 to 614,000 in November 1961.

Since the meat industry's 1956 employment peak, 28,000 workers have lost their jobs, despite a production increase of 3 percent. Bakery jobs have been in a steady decline from 174,000 in 1954 to 163,000 in 1960.[8]

Employment in railroad jobs fell from a total of 1,400,000 in 1947 to 730,000 in 1961—a drop of 670,000. Technological shifts (the diesel displacement of steam was a large factor) and dwindling business in the postwar period are what worked this occupational upheaval in the Nation's railroads.[9]

Changing composition of the labor force

White-Collar and Blue-Collar Jobs

The growing demand for highly trained and skilled personnel and the declining demand for unskilled workers have brought about a major transition in the composition of the labor force.

In 1956, for the first time in the Nation's history, professional, managerial, office, and sales workers outnumbered craftsmen, operatives, and laborers. The startling import of this continuing trend can be fully realized only when we remember that in 1910 the number of white-collar jobs was less than half the blue-collar jobs; now they have left the blue-collars behind, and by 1970 they will be 25 percent greater than blue-collars.[10]

Employment of Women

Another major occupational change concerns the employment of women. It is estimated that during the 1960's the number of women working for salaries and wages will rise at nearly twice the rate for men. By 1970, women workers will number 30 million and will constitute one-third of the labor force. At least two of every five women aged 20–65 will be gainfully employed in 1970.[11]

The growing demand for skilled, semiprofessional, and professional workers can be met in part by capitalizing the potential talents of our womanpower. The considerable percentage of women who lack training required for better-paid jobs are the last untapped reservoir of unspecialized brainpower.

Gains and problems of technological change

Technological change has brought highly significant gains and has also created serious problems, as illustrated below.

Hours and Character of Work

On the gain side is a sharp decline in the number of hours per workweek. The hours in the average workweek declined from 70 in 1850 to 60 in 1900 and to just under 40 in 1960, as shown in figure 2 [not printed in RECORD].

There has also been a marked change in the nature of work. Fewer and fewer workers are engaged in hard manual labor. Gerard Piel describes this change as follows:

"During the past 25 years our technology entered upon the era of automatic production. The real work of extracting nature's bounty from soil and rock and transforming it into goods is no longer done by human muscles, and less and less by human nervous systems. It is done by mechanical energy, by machines under control of artificial nervous systems, by chemicals, and by such subtle arts as applied genetics."

"While the impact of these developments upon industry has attracted most of the attention, their impact upon agriculture has amounted to a revolution."[12]

Per Capita Production

The length of the average workweek has sharply declined. Hard manual work is the lot of a decreasing minority of our labor force. Nevertheless, productivity per capita has sharply increased in the United States.

Between 1929 and 1962 our population grew 53 percent, while our gross national product, in constant (1954) dollars, grew 159 percent. The result is the high standard of living of our affluent society and the economic power that is a major deterrent to foreign aggression.

Technology has brought great gains and also has given rise to serious problems. A major problem is the imbalance between the type of labor force our new technology increasingly requires and the skills and qualifications of large numbers of workers in our present labor force. Far too many receive inadequate education and meager training, while the demand grows for broader education and more specialized skills.

School Dropouts and Elderly Workers

A great variety of unskilled jobs, which youngsters formerly filled at least as stepping stones to something better,[13] or which elderly workers filled, are now disappearing. For example, in New York City alone, there are 40,000 fewer elevator operators as a result of the use of automatic elevators. Each year there will be proportionately fewer openings for the unskilled workers.

Unfilled New Jobs

At the same time that thousands of jobs are being wiped out, new ones are being created in areas unknown only a few years ago. Many of these jobs are unfilled for lack of qualified workers. It is not that there are not jobs to be filled but that there are not enough people with the training required to fill them.[14]

---

[5] Ibid., pp. 16–17.

[6] Williams, W. E., supervisor of adult education, Mississippi State Department of Education. Testimony before U.S. 87th Cong., House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor, 1962.

[7] U.S. 87th Cong., 1st sess., House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation. "Impact of Automation on Employment," Washington, D.C.; Government Printing Office, 1961, 23 pp.

[8] Time, "The Automation Jobless—Not Fired, Just Not Hired." Time 77: 69; Feb. 24, 1961.

For further data see U.S. 87th Cong., op. cit.

[9] From a study by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, October 1962.

[10] U.S. Department of Labor, op. cit., p. 23.

[11] U.S. Department of Labor. "Manpower Challenge of the 1960's." Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961. p. 7.

[12] Piel, Gerard, "Can Our Economy Stand Disarmament?" Atlantic Monthly 210: 37; September 1962.

[13] President Kennedy, speaking recently on behalf of the youth employment opportunity bill stated that "we have in this country 1 million boys and girls who are out of school and out of work. In the next 8 years of this decade, according to some predictions, we are going to have 8 million boys and girls who are going to leave school before they finish, and they are going to be looking for work. They are going to be unskilled, and they may have trouble finding jobs."

Costs of Unemployment

These conditions add up to a hard core of unemployed workers. The insidious growth of unemployment is one of the most critical problems confronting our economic system.

Economic losses from unemployment are never regained. The social costs of unemployment are even greater than the economic losses. The discouragement and frustration of able-bodied men and women, eager to work but unable to find employment, cannot be measured in dollars any more than can the distress of their families. Prolonged unemployment contributes to further unemployment, since human capital deteriorates when it is idle. Unemployment impairs the skills that workers have acquired. It also contributes to family distintegration, crime, and other social ills.[15]

The evils of unemployment afflict all age groups in our labor force. Unemployment is especially high among out-of-school teenagers. This is undoubtedly one of the factors responsible for juvenile delinquency. Unemployment among men from age 20 to age 60 or 65 afflicts both the unemployed man and the other members of his family. Many qualified persons aged 60 and older are ready and able to work, but are denied employment.

Proposed cures for unemployment

There appears to be general agreement that a greatly expanded program for training and retraining the work force is essential if unemployment is to be lessened. There is disagreement about whether such a program is enough. William Glazier states that there is a persistent hard core of unemployed workers, which grew from fewer than 500,000 persons in 1953 to about 2 million at the beginning of 1960. He writes:

"The number has continued to grow. Technological change, decline in some industries and growth in others, shifts in the geographical locations of plants, and changes in consumer demand have caused these many millions of workers to be unemployed and have kept them that way. They are the victims of growth and progress in the American economy.

"The consequential shifts in the structure of industry have left behind a growing pool of unskilled and semiskilled workers handicapped by the limits of a grade school education, equipped with years of routine production-work experience, and burdened with families to support. Many are members of minority groups. In addition, there are the young people under 22 years of age, who have the highest unemployment rate of any group in the Nation today; half of them have still to get their first jobs. They are largely untrained for employment.

"The paradox * * * is that all over the Nation jobs go unfilled. * * * There seems to be no lack of people on the one hand or unfilled jobs on the other; what appears to be lacking is people with sufficient training and the right skills. The jobless worker, in the wrong place with the wrong skills and aptitudes, has become the fall guy. * * *

"As a social objective, training or retraining employed and unemployed persons is much to be desired. It would improve the employability of workers, open up more attractive and higher paid job opportunities, and raise the productive level of the entire Nation. The debatable issue is the appropriateness of retraining as a remedy for the current chronic unemployment." [16]

Positive Measures

Various measures have been suggested so that automation can increase productivity without creating serious unemployment. Some would slow down the pace of automation to a rate that would decrease the amount of labor displacement and joblessness. In some industries, featherbedding is defended as preferable to unemployment.

There is disagreement about how far retraining of those dispossessed of their jobs can be accepted as a solution for technological unemployment.

Regardless of one's point of view on these problems, modern technology and automation are here to stay. They are a stepped-up stage of the industrial revolution through which the output from an hour of labor has constantly been increased. If the United States should attempt to turn back or to stop the clock in this regard, it would lose its paramount economic position in today's competitive world.

The problem is not a new one. At a faster pace than in the past, we must discover the means whereby the rising productivity and standard of living, which are the fruits of technological progress, may be enjoyed without suffering the evil of unemployment and the ills that it breeds.[17]

Governmental Action

Various types of governmental action to alleviate unemployment are being considered, and some are being put into effect. Among the steps that have been suggested for government to take in dealing with chronic unemployment are these:

1. Objective and thorough study to determine the extent, location, and underlying causes of chronic unemployment.

2. Strengthened programs of vocational and technical training to help the untrained become proficient and to retrain those whose original skills are no longer needed.

3. Better information about employment opportunities in other areas of a given State or elsewhere in the country.

4. Industrial development programs on local and regional bases.

The first large-scale effort of the Federal Government to meet the problems posed by automation and unemployment is the $430 million manpower development and training bill which became a law on March 15, 1962. It authorized $100 million in Federal funds for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, and $165 million in each of the 2 succeeding years, with States matching the Federal funds in the third year. More than 1 million persons are expected to benefit during the 3-year program. Priority is to go to unemployed persons and to farm families having net incomes of less than $1,200 per year.[18]

It is outside the scope of this report to appraise the many proposals that have been made and the actions that are being taken to alleviate unemployment. The important fact is that there is general agreement that education has a major role to play in working toward this end.

Modern economy

Ours is an economy that would be unable to operate without a growing percentage of educated workers. Schools, colleges, and graduate schools, by responding to the demands for an ever more highly educated labor force, make a major and indispensable contribution to economic growth.

This, to be sure, is only one of the purposes of education, but it is an important one. "Occupational Outlook Handbook" states the situation as follows:

"The nature of one's job determines in large measure the nature of one's life. Young people who have acquired a skill or a good basic education will have a better chance at interesting work, good wages, steady employment, and greater satisfaction in life in general. Getting as much education and training as one's ability and circumstances permit should, therefore, be high on the list of things to be done by today's youth." [19]

Current conditions indicate that the educated are most in demand and least likely to be unemployed in periods of either high or low economic activity. Under present trends, there appears to be little danger of overeducating our population, especially if effective guidance results in as close a matching as foresight will permit of the number trained and the number needed in each field.

One answer to the obsolescence of skills caused by technological change is reeducation and retraining of displaced workers.

Youths out of school and out of work present a different problem. The need is for cooperative work-training programs between schools and industry, which postpone the entry of these youths into the labor market until they are equipped with marketable skills.

Report of the 21st American Assembly

The final report of the 21st American Assembly on Automation and Technological Change states that to prepare our labor force for the needs of the new technology, we must further improve our educational standards generally and—

1. Increase substantially the number of scientists, engineers, teachers, doctors, and others in the professions.

2. Develop management personnel equipped with the background needed to understand the social and economic consequences of the new technology and with the capacity to adapt technology to the achievement of greater productivity.

3. Expand training programs for technicians and assistants to engineers, scientists, and other professional personnel.

4. Upgrade and modernize the skills of craftsmen and other workers.

5. Improve the quality of the elementary and secondary educational systems, giving particular attention to the basic skills of reading and mathematics, which provide the foundation for all later education and training, and increase the productivity of our education through new techniques.[20]

Range of New Demands

The following points from several sources suggest new demands which schools and colleges must meet:

1. The work force must be both broadly educated as citizens and highly trained as workers if they are to comprehend and adjust to current and future technological change. People must learn to face the necessity for geographical and occupational transfers; low levels of education and training limit mobility and increase insecurity.

2. An adequate supply of professional and technical people must be trained to meet the growing needs. In recent years practically every field has been hampered by a shortage of scientists and engineers, of managers and competent administrators, of trained researchers, teachers, skilled craftsmen, and technicians.[21]

---

[14] Buckingham, Walter, "The Impending Educational Revolution." Occasional Paper No. 1, Washington, D.C.: Project on the Educational Implications of Automation, National Education Association, 1961, p. 3.

[15] U.S. 87th Cong., op. cit., p. 14.

[16] Glazier, William. "Automation and Joblessness." Atlantic Monthly 210: 44–45; August 1962.

[17] See the following collection of 20 articles reprinted from Monthly Labor Review. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. "Impact of Automation." Bulletin No. 1287. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960, 114 pp.

[18] NEA Journal. "News and Trends." NEA Journal 15: 4; April 1962.

[19] U.S. Department of Labor, "Occupational Outlook Handbook," p. 28.

[20] Reported in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 6, 1962.

3. Vocational education must be geared to visible and continuing changes. Vocational education has been slow in adapting to changing needs, operating too much within the boundaries of concepts formulated around the time of World War I.

4. There should be much more careful planning of women's education to take account of the thousands who enter upon lifelong careers and the rising proportion of women who enter gainful employment before marriage and again after their children are in school or are past school age. To permit more and more women to enter the labor market without adequate training would be disadvantageous to them and to the economy.

5. How leisure time is used will determine whether technological progress and the shorter work day and week serve cultural, moral, and spiritual values as well as material ends. This calls for greater emphasis on education aimed at wise use of leisure time.

6. A more adequate educational and vocational guidance must be offered part-time and full-time junior and senior high school students and community college, junior college, and 4-year college students.

7. Education must be a lifelong process. Lifelong learning is a new imperative. To survive as productive members of our society and even to enjoy the opportunities offered by the promise of additional leisure will require additional knowledge and lifelong learning.

"It should be made clear to every worker in the land that the price of holding a job will increasingly depend on continuing education throughout the entire working life of the individual." [22]

How to deal with technological unemployment is a controversial issue. It is clear, however, that there is need for a labor force with constantly rising levels of general education and occupational training.

Schools will be involved in varying degrees in dealing with technological unemployment. In some cases, such as the elimination of illiteracy, the primary responsibility will rest on a system of public education that makes it impossible for a normal child to reach maturity lacking the ability to read and write. On the other hand, the retraining of adult workers, unemployed because of automation and other factors beyond the control of the individual, will require the involvement of schools to a lesser extent. Doubtless this retraining will require the cooperation of management and labor, certain types of governmental action, and understanding on the part of the community as a whole. Such cooperative action will not be easy to accomplish. But to permit the full impact of automation and other elements in the technological revolution to fall upon the individual worker without appropriate response would be folly with the gravest social consequences.

Fiscal implications

Substantial increases will be required in the financial support of education if it is to play its role in meeting our economy's rising demand for workers with more and better education and training and its role in providing certain types of education to reduce unemployment resulting from automation and technological change.

Whether this additional cost can and will be met will to a considerable degree depend upon the public's conception of the economic significance of education. The next sections of this report bear on this question.

EDUCATION AND EARNINGS—III

The correlation between amount of education and average earnings of individuals has caught the interest of economists. Leaving aside for the moment the issue of whether there is causal relationship between the two, and recognizing the complexity of the factors involved, let us look at the facts.

Education and average annual earnings

Studies as early as 1917 and many dated subsequently have shown that "persons with larger amounts of schooling generally have larger earnings." [23]

The most recent comprehensive figures on this relationship are those of Miller.[24] His findings show that in 1958 average earnings for males 25 years of age and over, associated with varying years of schooling, were as follows:

Less than 8 years	$2,551
8 years	3,769
High school, 1 to 3 years	4,618
High school, 4 years	5,567
College, 1 to 3 years	6,966
College, 4 years and more	9,206

Miller notes the regularity which marks the correlation between education and higher earnings. He finds "that in every year for which data are presented, the completion of an additional level of schooling was associated with higher average incomes for men. This finding parallels that obtained in numerous other studies of the relationship between education and income dating back to the early part of this century. Although the income levels have changed considerably during the past 20 years, the basic relationship between the extent of schooling and income appears to have remained the same." [25]

Education and lifetime earnings

Estimates of lifetime incomes, related to amount of education, are more significant than those for 1 year. Miller's study by complex computations produces derived figures for lifetime earnings from age 18 to death of individuals in the United States in different educational groups. Figure 3 is based on calculations from Miller's study. Miller, commenting on his estimates, states:

"Additional schooling is associated with a very substantial increase in lifetime income. On the basis of conditions in 1958, an elementary school graduate could expect to receive during his lifetime about $52,000 (or two-fifths) more income, on the average, than the person who had no schooling or who terminated his formal education before completing the eighth grade. The difference between the expected lifetime income of the average elementary school and high school graduate was equally striking. In 1958, the average elementary school graduate could expect a lifetime income of about $182,000, as compared to about $258,000 for the average high school graduate. The expected income differential associated with the 4 years of high school education therefore amounts to about $76,000, or 42 percent." [26]

FIG. 3.—*Estimated earnings from age 18 to death and years of schooling completed*

Elementary:	
Less than 8 years	$129,764
8 years	181,695
High school:	
1 to 3 years	211,193
4 years	257,557
College:	
1 to 3 years	315,504
4 years or more	435,242

NOTE.—The above data are based on arithmetic mean for males, 1958.

Source: Miller, Herman P., "Annual and Lifetime Income in Relation to Education." American Economic Review 50:21; December 1960.

Miller points out that many complex factors, other than education, are associated with the higher lifetime earnings of those with higher levels of education. For example, "Since a college degree is the 'open sesame' to many, if not most, high-paying jobs, it should come as no surprise that the greatest income gains associated with additional schooling appear at the college level." [27] Miller claims no direct causal relation between lifetime incomes and education. The conclusions of his study are these:

"This study largely represents an attempt to ascertain if the marked increase in the number and proportion of high school and college graduates during the past generation has been associated with a reduction in income differentials for these groups. * * *

"The figures show that despite large relative reductions in the supply of workers whose schooling did not extend beyond the eighth grade, this group had smaller relative income gains than high school graduates. On the other hand, the large relative increase in the supply of college-trained workers did not adversely affect their relative income position. On this basis it is concluded that the demand for more highly educated workers has kept pace with the increased supply of such workers, and, as a result, their relative income position has not changed. The fact that the proportion of men employed in professional and managerial work—the two major outlets for college-trained men—increased by 50 percent during the past generation suggests that industry has absorbed the increased flow of graduates from our universities." [28]

Demand for educated personnel

Some economists have argued that differentials in earnings associated with different amounts of education eventually will be reduced. It has been predicted that persistent increases in the supply of college-trained students will so flood the market that many of them will eventually be doomed to economic disappointment after graduation. No such trend is discernible in the period since 1939.

It is doubtless true that a prolonged economic depression would result in an oversupply of college graduates. There was an oversupply of nearly all classes of workers in the 1930's, but unemployment was less among trained than unskilled workers. The unskilled are the first to be laid off and last to be employed.

If one assumes prolonged depressions, when the economy comes near to dead center, there will be periods of unemployment and lowered earnings by persons with all levels of education. If one assumes economic activity even as vigorous as that of the United States since World War II, then there is an increasing demand for highly trained persons and a declining demand for the unskilled.

---

[21] Cassell, Frank H. "Changing Manpower Needs." NEA Journal 51: 55; April 1962.

[22] Clark, Harold, "Education in Our Complex Society." NEA Journal 51:52, April 1962.

[23] Norton, John K., "Education and Economic Well-Being in American Democracy." Washington, D.C.: Educational Policies Commission, National Education Association, 1940, pp. 115–121.

[24] Miller, Herman P., "Annual and Lifetime Income in Relation to Education." American Economic Review 50: 5; December 1960.

[25] Ibid., p. 4.

[26] Ibid., p. 22.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid., p. 24.

A substantial stepping up of economic activity immediately requires more trained workers. During World War II, there was a serious shortage of workers in many occupations. Many public and private vocational schools ran two and sometimes three shifts and trained 13 million workers in response to the needs of the war period.

Today, there is a continuing shortage of many types of highly educated personnel. For example, the Federal Government finds it extremely difficult to fill civilian posts calling for highly trained persons.

The military demands an increasing percent of trained personnel. Most rejections for military service are among those with little schooling. Once, a young man was urged to "join the Navy and see the world." Now, he is urged to join the Armed Forces to obtain training and education available in hundreds of fields, provided directly by the military or in cooperation with educational institutions.

It is possible that agreement for substantial reduction of armaments would result in temporary oversupply of professional, technical, and skilled workers. Such a situation would require vigorous action in order to absorb this personnel in production for consumption rather than production for military preparedness.[29] However, dire predictions of unemployment and economic depression to follow the end of World War II were not fulfilled.

Under present trends, there appears to be little danger of overeducating our population, especially if effective guidance results in as close a matching as foresight will permit of the number trained and the number needed in each field.

Conclusions

It can be concluded from the facts to date that persons with larger amounts of education earn larger incomes. Even though the general level of schooling has continued to rise during the past generation, the substantial differentials between the earnings of those with less schooling and those with more schooling, at both the high school and the college levels, have continued to hold. The demand for highly trained technical and professional personnel continues to grow.

Just how much the higher earnings of those with more schooling are due solely to their larger amounts of education has yet to be determined. A number of economists are seeking objective answers to this question. They are also exploring the relation of the development of human capital to economic growth. The next section reviews their findings on this important question.

"FULL SPEED AHEAD"—ADDRESS BY CLYDE T. ELLIS, GENERAL MANAGER, NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for more than 25 years the rural electric program, financed by REA, has been recognized as an unquestioned success. Members of Congress who support this program can feel justly proud of its accomplishments. I consider it one of the greatest living success stories in modern American annals.

There are those who say that REA's work is nearly finished. They say, "Nearly all farms in the country now have electric lights, so what more is there for REA to do?" Anyone familiar with the electric industry knows that the demand for electricity in the country is doubling every 10 years and on the rural systems about every 7 years. A doubling of demand necessitates the installation of heavier conductor, transformers, and the like; this represents large capital outlays. Failure to meet this demand is to fail to meet the needs of rural people for adequate and reliable electric power.

Men with foresight have made it possible for the rural electric systems of the country to meet rural America's needs in the past. The REA program has had good leadership. The list of Administrators includes men of foresight and undoubted ability such as John Carmody, Claude Wickard, and the present able and energetic Administrator, Norman Clapp.

If one were to name the man who has done the most to mold and guide the rural electric program there would be no other choice than to name my good friend, a former Member of Congress, Clyde T. Ellis, long the general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. For more than 20 years Clyde Ellis has provided continuity of leadership that has assured the growth and success of the rural electric cooperatives. He has led them in one successful campaign after another against the forces of the power companies which would spread their monopolistic control over the areas pioneered and developed by the small but courageous rural systems.

More than 95 percent of all of the REA-financed associations in the country belong to National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and more than 7,000 of these systems' managers and directors, and other rural leaders attended the association's 21st annual meeting in Las Vegas, Nev., in January of this year.

Clyde Ellis gave a ringing address; he did not rest on past successes, rather he focused the attention of his association's representatives on the more important role of the program in the future. That role includes more than just maintaining good electric service in our own rural areas. It includes exporting the REA idea to other areas in the Western Hemisphere.

In many Central and South American countries rural development is the most promising bulwark against the growing pressures of communism. It deserves our full support.

I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD the most inspiring address by a great American, Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FULL SPEED AHEAD

The theme of this meeting is: "Rural Electrification—Important to America's Strength."

This is the story we want to tell—more of the future than of the past. We want the Nation to be aware of the continuing, increasingly important role our systems are playing in the modern society.

I. RECAST THE IMAGE

I want to recommend to you a program of action, beyond anything we have done yet, for getting us on the offensive with a positive living story. I want us to proudly hold up our heads like men, roll up our sleeves and get started full speed ahead. We must recast the image of rural electrification.

Too many people, even some of our friends, think and talk of us in terms of the depression-day programs of the thirties. Too many of us think and talk in terms of the dead past. We recite our glorious success in lighting the darkness of rural America and virtually ignore the tremendous contribution we are making now and will make to the total strength of the Nation.

We shall be judged now and in the future, not on what we have done, but on what we are doing today and shall do tomorrow.

What we're doing today

What are we doing today? We are serving 10 percent of the population and perhaps over three-fourths of the landmass of the country—the difficult part.

We are serving the breadbasket of the world, and partly because of our service the American farmer produces more food of higher quality at lower prices to consumers than any farmer anywhere in all of history.

We are serving more than 80,000 rural schools and churches.

We are employing directly more than 28,000 people with an annual payroll of more than $140 million, and much of this employment is right in the middle of some of the most depressed areas in America, where employment and income really count.

We are providing a yardstick for determining what electricity should cost, and every electric consumer in America benefits from that.

And because we are extending the benefits of electricity to so many millions of people, we have created a new billion-dollar-a-year market, still growing, for electric appliances and equipment. Most of this is made in the cities and gives jobs to city people, and to those in all the related fields of mining, transportation, and marketing.

All this that we are doing is new, a completely new sector of the economy.

We are serving directly hundreds of defense installations, all vital to the security of this Nation—missile bases of all types, missile and satellite tracking stations, radar and navigation control stations, even in the remotest areas—that help protect all America.

Throughout the United States we are taking the lead in rural areas development projects, just as we took the lead in getting the area development programs established. Rural areas development and the Area Redevelopment Administration have already achieved remarkable success and they're just getting started.

There is something more here, too—in our rural electric program—something which in the longer reach of history may be even more important than our tangible accomplishments. We are extending the cooperative, private ownership of electric systems to more than 5 million American households. Every consumer member of a rural electric system and every citizen of a local power district has one vote in the conduct of its affairs and the establishment of its policies. This is democracy at its finest, and this is the cause which America seeks to carry to the other nations of the world.

The REA pattern

In the highest Government circles in Washington this is becoming known as the REA pattern. As you know, we are being asked by the Agency for International Development (AID) of the State Department to

---

[29] Piel, Gerard. "Can Our Economy Stand Disarmament?" Atlantic Monthly 210: 35–40; September 1962.

lend our experience and know-how to the task of helping the critically important developing countries establish rural electrification cooperatives of their own.

Last November National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and AID signed a reimbursable agreement in President Kennedy's office whereby National Rural Electric Cooperative Association is coordinating your efforts in this area. On that occasion, the President was highly complimentary of you and the rural electrification program as it is being carried out in this country and as you will now help others, and he underscored its importance to the Nation by saying, "I think this can be very important, in fact, one of the most significant actions taken by the AID agency."

For our part, all of us are proud, as Americans, that the country is turning to our program in a time of crisis as a significant weapon for democracy in the worldwide struggle with communism.

All of these, and many others, are things rural electric systems are doing today. The rural electrics are dynamic organizations, geared to the needs of the present in their own communities and responsive to the needs of the United States of America.

And they are ready, willing and able to go full speed ahead to meet the needs and challenges of tomorrow. They are prepared to serve their areas completely—and I mean provide the leadership and serve anything and everything that needs serving in those areas.

II. DEVELOP ALLIES

The second part of the program I want to present to you this morning deals with developing allies among other consumer groups. We've given lip service to this in the past, but unfortunately little has been done beyond the valuable work performed constantly through ECIC—the Electric Consumers Information Committee—in Washington.

If our program is to go full speed ahead, we must take other action now, to develop and hold all possible allies. To do this, we must identify our interests with those of consumers everywhere in a positive manner, urban as well as rural. To get and keep consumer support in the urban areas we must join with all loyal organized consumer groups in a drive against high electric rates everywhere. The desire for low cost electricity is something we share with all other consumer-oriented groups. We must take to them the story of the ridiculous padding that goes into the rate base of the cost-plus power company operations.

I recommend that every system and statewide take steps to establish a local and State counterpart of our national Electric Consumers Information Committee, now. This will provide a vehicle for bringing together on a local and statewide basis all consumer groups which have a natural interest in low cost power. This has already been done with some success in a few States. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and the national Electric Consumers Information Committee are ready to assist all of you with any organizational details.

Electric consumers are being overcharged by well over a billion dollars a year by the monopoly power companies, and next to nothing is ever done about it. Under our present system of regulation, next to nothing can be done about it.

Our economists have compared the allowable rate of return for 38 large electric utilities with their actual rate of return between 1956 and 1960, inclusively. They calculate the total overcharge by just these companies during this 5-year period at $1,259,043,000—and this is only part of it. Incidentally, if the people of Nevada are interested, the total overcharge during this period by the Nevada Power Co. is calculated at $8,290,000—assuming that 6 percent is a fair rate of return. No wonder it can afford to build spite lines in the desert to try to kill Amargosa.

Here is how it works. A rate, usually suggested by the power company, is fixed by a regulatory commission which is supposed to give the company a certain rate of return, or profit, over and above all operating costs and taxes. But almost always the company gets the rates fixed so high that it earns considerably more than the allowable rate of return.

Most commissions are in effect powerless to do anything about this. The company keeps it.

I propose that we join with other consumer organizations in demanding a congressional investigation of power company overcharges, and in supporting State and Federal legislation to give commissions the power to make them do it—make them in some way return these overcharges to their consumers.

This might be done in part by an amendment to the Federal Power Act to provide that all earnings in excess of a fair rate of return must be used in the public interests as provided by the commission. This would require the Federal Power Commission to check into power company earnings each year. Such an FPC amendment could apply, of course, only to interstate and wholesale power sales. State commissions need similar legislation to cover retail sales.

If a commission should find it not feasible to require a company to actually return the excess to each consumer—though this would be the most desirable—then the commission might treat the excess profits as capital contributed by the consumer, and deduct them from the rate base. This would help bring about a reduction in rates, including wholesale rates to rural electrics.

Now is an excellent time to call for a congressional investigation and to try for reform legislation. There is mounting evidence that consumers are beginning to rebel against high electric rates. In November, the Boston Herald demanded editorially that the new Governor of Massachusetts do something about the high power rates in New England.

A few weeks later a group of industrialists in New York City charged publicly that industrial expansion there is being and would be seriously slowed unless the wall of unreasonable power rates is lowered as soon as possible.

As people everywhere constantly use more power in their homes and businesses and industries, as people realize that power is a rapidly growing cost factor in everything they consume, I predict a rising interest and concern about power rates. So now is the time to move, full speed.

III. GO ON THE PUBLIC-INTEREST OFFENSIVE—FULL SPEED

I have suggested we go on the offensive full speed with a positive story, and I've outlined some proven techniques. I have suggested we recruit all possible allies in a broad program of assisting not only ourselves but electric consumers of the cities too, and I have suggested how it might be done. Now I suggest we go on the offensive to reverse or reform certain trends and practices of the Nation's power industry that are not in the public interest.

I believe it's in the public interest for the rural electrics to have legal protection against these territorial raids, whether they be in the form of a sellout or piracy of individual loads. In several States you have demonstrated that some sort of protective, fairplay legislation can be passed. I recommend that, in every State where such protection does not exist, you move through your statewide to achieve it and that you give your statewide resources it needs to do the job. If Idaho could do it—and Arkansas, Wisconsin, Oklahoma, and other States—then so can the rest of you who need it.

And I think the time has come, too, when we should call on our lawyers and legislative experts to make further efforts to determine what types of Federal territorial protection, legislative and otherwise, are possible.

In another area of the public interest, I believe the consumer groups have a real stake in joining us to get repeal of the vast subsidies now flowing to the power companies under the fast tax writeoff schemes, including that absurd 3-percent tax credit subsidy Congress gave the power companies last year. Even the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. testified against that one, although it would have meant a $75 million annual windfall for the company. A.T. & T. said it would be an outright subsidy for something a utility was supposed to do anyway.

But the power companies were right in there fighting for it. They don't share such concern for the taxpayer any more than they do for the ratepayer.

I don't have to document to this audience that REA, the Interior Department, the Corps of Engineers, TVA, and the Federal Power Commission are not all going in exactly the same direction on matters affecting us. We have become increasingly disturbed by the actions of the Federal Power Commission.

The latest and most alarming is FPC's very recent decision to declare the rural electric co-ops to be public utilities and to exercise jurisdiction over many G. & T. cooperatives and some distribution systems. FPC's action promises to give us all the disadvantages of being public utilities without giving any of the advantages. This action, unless reversed, could throw us to the mercy of the power companies and give them everything they've sought against us but failed to get through normal processes—prolonged public hearings on our loans and wholesale rates, review and appeal to the courts of every FPC decision they don't like.

I believe it is now necessary and in the public interest that the administration exert more leadership and solidarity of purpose in the interest of an abundant supply of electric power in the economy at low cost, for everybody. Somehow we have just got to help get the various agencies of the administration going in the same direction—the right direction—on power.

The President of the United States has called several White House conferences to get people together and crystallize policy in several other areas, such as recreation, conservation, and education.

You have already made suggestions in this direction, with respect to power, in the regional meetings, even when the need was less urgent. Therefore, in your behalf, I now ask the President to call a White House conference on electric energy at the earliest possible time, to include all sources of energy and every segment of electric power generation and distribution.

I won't dwell this morning on other aspects of our public interest legislative program which we have explored together in the past. Your policy is clear in support of regional interties and common carrier transmission lines, and we will be in there fighting for them. We will also do everything we possibly can to secure authorizations and funds for the water resources development projects which you support but which have not been realized as yet.

In the session of Congress just begun, we expect the hardest fight in years—even tougher than last year—on REA loan funds, particularly for generation and transmission. And we must drive again, I believe, for the loan account bookkeeping arrangement to give us credit for the loan funds we repay.

Great battles lie ahead for us. Ever more rapidly changing times make our chances of continuing success more difficult each year.

CURBING THE CUBAN EXILES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a very good editorial from the New York Herald Tribune entitled "We Have To Curb the Cuban Exiles."

Since my speech of yesterday urging a strict enforcement of our laws against the irresponsible conduct of Cuban exiles, manifested through their raids on Cuban and Russian shipping from our shores, I have received many calls and messages agreeing completely with my speech.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

We Have To Curb the Cuban Exiles

The dissatisfaction of the Cuban exiles over U.S. Government efforts to curb their raids by sea against Castro and his Russian exiles is evident and understandable. To them, anything that harasses communism in the Caribbean is legitimate and necessary, and many Americans sympathize with that attitude and the actions that flow from it. But the reasons why Washington is backing its disapprobation of the raids with stringent enforcement of American neutrality statutes are sound and compelling.

The raids have not, and, under present circumstances, cannot have any real effect in weakening either Castro's hold on Cuba or the Soviet Union's hold on Castro. They are pinpricks. And while the same may be said for anti-Castro guerrilla attacks in Cuba itself, the raids are taking place at sea—that is, in an area where policing becomes an international, rather than a municipal, obligation.

The law of the sea regarding military activity by those who do not act under the commission of a legal, recognized government is very ancient and very stern. To put no finer point on it, such activity is piracy.

To be sure, in recent years there has been a tendency to condone illegal acts committed on the high seas (as well as in the air) when these are politically motivated. The granting of asylum by Brazil to the terrorists who seized a Venezuelan freighter is a case in point. But the trend is not a healthy one for those who travel by sea or in the international air on their lawful occasions. And in the particular case of Cuba, seaborne raids by exiles pose a special danger to the United States.

Some of those exiles undoubtedly would like to precipitate an armed conflict between the United States and Castro's forces as the surest way in which to free Cuba. Some of Castro's officers, if not the dictator himself, are not averse to raising the temperature of the Caribbean in order to keep Russian troops in the island and bring back the Soviet missiles. And the Soviet Union itself, after backing down on the missile question, might well wish to assert itself on an issue in which international law is on its side.

This could mean a succession of incidents and reprisals in which the United States might lose its freedom of action and be forced into hostilities over acts as meaningless in themselves as the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand that precipitated World War I. That would be intolerable.

Surely Washington can acquire the information, as it has the means, to prevent a type of anti-Castro activity that cannot benefit the cause of a free America and could set the world aflame.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. Keating] spoke last Sunday evening, March 31, 1963, before the opening dinner of the biennial meeting of the B'nai B'rith Women at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.

In his remarks, Senator Keating, one of the Nation's most respected champions of equal rights, called for an end of discrimination against women and chronicled the increasingly important role which women are playing in all phases of our national life.

The B'nai B'rith Women have been concerned throughout their history with problems of equal rights and equal justice.

It was fitting that Senator Keating, with his magnificent record in this field, should have been chosen to address this outstanding organization.

His pertinent and eloquent remarks, will be of interest to many Members of the Senate, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Keating Urges Progress in Ending Discrimination Against Women

It is appropriate, I feel, that your dynamic organization should meet here in Washington. Washington is the old-fashioned town meeting of America's years of birth and growth—a town meeting magnified in size, but unchanged in essence. Under the dome of the Capitol, as under the roof of the old town hall, the voice of the people is heard—the will of the people is made manifest.

This home of our National Government is the beating heart of the body politic we call our Republic.

It keeps in constant, unending flow, to the remotest reaches of this vast Nation, the lifeblood of our historic traditions of freedom and human dignity. And just as the heart takes its strength from the body, only to return it, so does government take its strength from the body of citizens—180 million Americans—who are America. Many life forces flow into the mainstream of our national life to create the surging power of that mainstream.

B'nai B'rith is a manifestation, a living, vital manifestation of the great life force that is the Jewish people.

Your own personal involvement in the future of humanity, in the fate of humanity, is a reflection of a centuries-old acceptance by the Jewish faith of the concept that life is not perfect but perfectible, and that its perfectibility is not the mission of leaders and governments alone, but of individual citizens.

It may well be said that the stream of history is like the sea. Some generations are privileged to travel an ocean of time that is, in a sense, a life cruise on serene waters, unmarred by the storms of war, unaffected by sudden convulsive disturbances of tremendous social change or of political tides that threaten to engulf and sink the very ship of human freedom.

Our voyage today is not serene. It would be false to paint calm into the sea of life on which we are embarked. This is not a pleasure cruise but a sea trial that will call for our full reserves of courage of the heart, sharpness of the mind, and dedication of the spirit.

For we stand at a point in history where no man, no woman has stood before. Consider with me for a moment what makes this year of 1963 an unparalleled year in the history of human destiny.

In vast areas of Africa and in parts of Asia the long silent centuries have come to an end.

The bugles of freedom have blown. Nations rise literally before our eyes, like giants long deep in sleep, and they bring a new dimension to history, a new challenge to the free nations of the world.

And their people are no longer remote from us. In the arithmetic of time and space we used to think of them as light years away. But today they are only a heartbeat distant. The drums of their destiny resound in our ears—because it is a common destiny that we share—the destiny of humanity on this earth. What happens in the Congo, or in southeast Asia doesn't merely happen to the Congolese, to the Laotians, to the people of South Vietnam. It happens to us. It is a shaping force in our lives. Victory or defeat for the common cause of the dignity of man in those areas in victory or defeat in our lives, in our destinies.

The world is full of areas of ferment and change—Europe, the Middle East—Latin America—wherever we spin the globe we touch points of the vast combat area where freedom fights tyranny, where the present fights the past—and all this against the ominous background of man's new-found power to destroy the very civilization he has built up over centuries of time.

Now this is a less spectacular phenomenon of history that I should like to discuss with you briefly today. This is the new role, the more dynamic, more meaningful, more decisive role that women are playing in the shaping of our present and in the creating of our future. As I said, it is not a spectacular phenomenon, because it is a growth rather than an explosion, a developing factor rather than an achieved reality. But this slow revolution is nevertheless a revolution—and its implications are great, its promise is great.

Time was—and within our time—when the only possible award to a woman was—shall I say—a Good Housekeeping Award—in the sense that her preeminent and accepted role was that of wife and mother. Careers were the vested interest of the male of the species. Marriage, maternity, and homemaking, all important as they are, were the only futures to which the average woman could aspire.

But the revolution is here. The sleeping beauty that is womanhood has awakened—awakened to the challenge of life, the opportunities of life, to the new dimensions of interest that make the world a matter of concern as well as the home, that direct her energies to new channels of participation in the life of the community, of the Nation, of the globe.

I spoke of this change as a slow revolution yet in the light of the silent centuries of women's noninvolvement in life beyond the home, much, indeed, has happened in the little more than four decades since American women were accorded the vote. Since that historic acceptance by the male of a two-power world, the ladies have amply proven that they are fully capable of accepting the rights and discharging the responsibilities of active and affirmative participation in the life of this Nation. American women have made outstanding contributions to business, labor, and the professions as well as to government and politics.

It strikes me as more than a mere coincidence that the era of the great forward strides in our national progress—in fields of social advance, of education, of closer international cooperation has, in fact, occurred during the 42 years that the vote has been accorded to—and used by—the women of our land. I say "used by" pointedly, for in the 1960 national election, is is estimated that as many women voted as did men, perhaps a few more.

The fact is, of course, that you members of the fair sex did not look upon the vote as an adornment, as a bouquet thrown to you by a nation of gallant males.

You accepted it for what it is—not an end, but a means to an end—and you made use of it with this purpose in mind.

For what did the women want? They wanted an end to illiteracy—something less than a 72-hour week for women workers—an end to child labor—a lower death rate for mothers and infants—clean milk, clean streets, pure food. These and much more.

They wanted equal guardianship for their children and they wanted to serve on juries. They wanted honest elections and shorter ballots. They wanted consolidated schools and the control of venereal diseases. They wanted better libraries and compulsory school attendance laws.

They wanted protection of dependent, delinquent, neglected, and handicapped children and they wanted better ways to nominate candidates for office. They wanted freer trade among nations and they wanted independent citizenship of women. They wanted the abolition of the spoils system and the strengthening of civil service.

They got most of these things and more besides. They didn't do it simply by mentioning their wishes to their city councilmen, their State assemblymen or their Congressmen. They studied and they worked and they were politically effective.

Now the fact remains—the disturbing yet not disheartening fact—that despite the change in the status of women, in the role of women, in the influence and impact of women in our national life, there remain areas of disparity, of discrimination which are, if I may so put it, the battlefields of the present and the future in this campaign to take sex out of citizenship, to make opportunity no longer a closed corporation.

In this connection, merely to cite the Federal service, 76.1 percent of women were—at the most recent calculation—in the five lowest salary grades, earning less than $4,500—while only 25.1 percent of the men earned this little.

At the other end of the spectrum, let us look at the figures on high salaries. In spite of the fact that approximately 1 out of every 3 Federal white collar workers is a woman most of them don't reach the high salary levels. In grade 18, for example, which is the highest civil service grade, there are 254 men and 3 women. In grade 17 there are 561 men and 8 women; grade 16, 1,271 men and 13 women; grade 15, 11,159 men and 162 women.

Now, parenthetically, let me brag a little and say that out of the seven of my own top people, on the professional staff three are women—which, I feel, illustrates rather forcibly my personal stand in this matter.

On the debit side, as well, are other facts of life that women are forced to live with in our Nation. They are not eligible to serve on juries in Mississippi, Alabama, and South Carolina. In Texas a married woman cannot go into business for herself without the permission of the court. In four of our States, a husband has complete control over his wife's holdings.

I used the term battleground in appraising the all-too-often secondary role assigned to women, and I think it is appropriate, because women like yourselves—the women of B'nai B'rith, and so many other dynamic groups, are not passive, but militant, in extending the frontiers of involvement, of service, of acceptance that the male sex persists in defending.

This defense is what I firmly believe to be a rear guard action that is not fated to succeed.

Indeed, its success would be a failure, in a sense, insofar as the broad concept of democracy and freedom truly has meaning. It would be a failure as well because it would deny this Nation the use of the great sources of strength, of skill, of talent, of spiritual force, that lie—let me, as a man confess it—under the pretty hats and in the dedicated hearts of the sex that men call gentle—while secretly respecting its strength.

To me one of the signal contributions of American women to the life of our times is the active concern they are showing in the vast and complex housekeeping chore represented by the problems, the challenges, the dangers of the world in which we live. Through the medium of organizations like your own, through clubs, committees, study groups and citizen associations, you have extended the searchlight of your interest, your concern, until it now ranges the world.

If I would pay a special tribute to you women of B'nai B'rith today, it is not in a spirit of rising to the occasion—but of recognizing the fact that you women—in a very special, in a very meaningful way, have risen to the occasion that history has created—the occasion to lift hearts and voices to make this a world closer to our concept of what it means to be a member of the community of man.

After all, the dignity of man and of woman is not something we can sit home and wait for—like a letter we hope has been written—a letter we hope will arrive.

On the contrary, the forward movement of humanity to new levels of justice, of freedom, comes only when human effort, human will, human resolve push it forward—when the human spirit stops accepting the world as it is, and fights for the better world it finds in its dreams, in its hopes—in its heart.

The cause of B'nai B'rith is a great and stirring cause—because it is the cause of humanity, the cause of brotherhood, the cause of free men who seek to give freedom an ever richer meaning, an ever-extending dominion.

This cause you honor and enrich by your dedication was born of a great and ancient faith. It was born deep in the hearts and in the history of the Jewish people. It is as old as that spirit of brotherhood, which was, in a sense, the birthmark of that splended and courageous people.

I have been several times, either six or seven, to Israel. I know it not merely as a place on the map. Having seen it, I know it for what it is—a page in history—a page written in bold, brave letters by a bold, brave people—a page that tells what man can achieve on this earth when his spirit, his will, his mind and his muscle are committed to creating the substance of reality out of the challenge of a dream.

And it is because I know Israel and its people—it is because I know the great spiritual and intellectual enrichment our Nation has received from its Jewish citizens—and it is because I know the magnificent role and achievements of B'nai B'rith that I feel proud and privileged to be with you here today.

One may well say that any victory over prejudice is a victory for us all—for our Nation—for humanity. The battle is not easy. At times it seems almost hopeless, but there is a candle of courage that leads us on, because we know that we are building, however slowly, greater mansions for the spirit of man—that we are building a world where freedom does not come in colors, in creeds, in sizes, or in half portions—but is the common heritage, the common pride, the common glory of us all.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE U.S. CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record two editorials discussing the series of civil rights bills, which a group of Republican Senators, including myself, introduced last Thursday to implement the legislative recommendations of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission and the platform pledges of both major parties in 1960. The editorials, one from the New York Times this morning, the other from the Washington Post yesterday, underscore fairly both the broad scope of our bills and their significance.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 2, 1963]

Reminder on Civil Rights

A group of Senate Republicans has introduced a sheaf of civil rights bills which top anything we have seen thus far in the new Congress. New York's two Senators, Javits and Keating, are in this group. So are Case of New Jersey; Scott of Pennsylvania; Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Kuchel, of California; Beall, of Maryland; and Fong, of Hawaii.

The bills these gentlemen have introduced would do many useful things: Give the Commission on Civil Rights permanent status; outlaw discriminating practices at the polls; do the same thing in federally financed housing projects; penalize discrimination in Federal employment, and enforce a more rapid pace in the achievement of school desegregation.

It is easy enough to dismiss all this as a political gesture, designed to embarrass the Kennedy administration. But the fact remains that, while President Kennedy sent a civil rights message to Congress on February 28, he has not followed it up with concrete legislative proposals. The Republicans now have.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 1. 1963]

Politics and Promises

Republican Senators Case, Fong, Javits, Keating, Kuchel, and Scott have introduced a comprehensive set of bills designed to eradicate racial discrimination in the areas of voting rights, education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice. We think it is scarcely too much to say that if these bills were enacted and effectively administered they would serve to solve the most vexing and disfiguring of American domestic problems. They would confer on American Negroes the first-class citizenship promised to them by the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments nearly a full century ago.

These Republican proposals are radical in the sense that they go to the root of the race problem and seek to excise it by treating all men equally regardless of color. But they are not at all radical in the sense of being novel. One need not search very far to find their antecedents. All these proposals are set forth as solemn promises in the Republican Party platform for 1960. All these proposals are also set forth as solemn promises in the Democratic platform of 1960. It would be hard to say which platform trumpets the promises more appealingly and melodiously. But it is easy to say that the promises are as yet unfulfilled.

They are not unrealizable. They are not visionary. Indeed, the Republican platform of 1960 said of them that "each of the following pledges is practical and within realistic reach. They are serious—not cynical—pledges made to result in maximum progress." The Democratic platform asserted that "the time has come to assure equal access for all Americans to all areas of community life, including voting booths, schoolrooms, jobs, housing, and public facilities." The Democrats were then seeking the Presidency and so their platform included an observation that "what is now required is effective moral and political leadership by the whole executive branch of our Government to make equal opportunity a living reality for all Americans."

For all the loftiness of purpose and sincerity of concern among the half dozen Republican sponsors of the civil rights measures pledged by the two major political parties, no one, we suppose, seriously expects any of these bills to be enacted into law in the 88th Congress. The chances are against any of them even coming to a vote in both Houses of Congress.

THE IRON CURTAIN

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, there has come to my attention an outstanding book review printed in the Catholic Transcript, the archdiocesan newspaper of Connecticut. The review concerned the new book by Harry and Bonaro Overstreet, "The Iron Curtain," and was written by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John S. Kennedy, an outstanding scholar, lecturer, writer, and churchman, who is the editor of the Catholic Transcript.

Monsignor Kennedy points out how the Overstreet book traces the origin of the Iron Curtain under Lenin, its development under Stalin, and its perpetuation and refinement under Khrushchev. The books points out that the absolute control over information, travel, and communication which the Communist Party exercises over the people in its grasp is essential to the preservation of the Communist system. Should the Kremlin ever become unable to practice a ceaseless brainwashing of the Russian people, or to prevent these people from getting information from the outside, their system could not survive.

The Overstreets point out that the free world should make a constant target of the Iron Curtain. In Monsignor Kennedy's words:

> The authors strongly urge organized action against the Iron Curtain. World public opinion, they maintain, should be brought to bear against the barricade set up by the Communists. "It is high time," they say, "for totalitarian communism to be confronted not by random questions and expostulations but by an informed and tenacious demand that it show cause for its need to operate behind a barrier of electrified barbed wire, minefields, guard towers, jamming stations, press censorship, and travel restrictions."
>
> They list specific demands which should be voiced endlessly and tirelessly, and which they believe are bound to have profound impact. If the free world focuses attention on the Iron Curtain by every possible means and on every possible occasion, this device so useful to the Communists is bound to be less so.

I congratulate Harry and Bonaro Overstreet, whom I am proud to know and number among my friends, for another profound and valuable contribution to the understanding of communism by the people of the free world, and I commend Monsignor Kennedy, also a valued friend, for his unusually perceptive and illuminating book review.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Khrushchev's Curtain," by Msgr. John S. Kennedy, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KHRUSHCHEV'S CURTAIN

(By Rev. John S. Kennedy)

Harry and Bonaro Overstreet, who, a few years ago, produced an invaluable handbook on communism, now turn their attention to one of the principal features of the Communist empire, "The Iron Curtain" (Norton. $4.50). The name, of course, was coined by Winston Churchill in 1946, but the reality, although denied by the Soviets, has functioned since the days of Lenin and ever must remain, in the Overstreets' judgment, an integral feature of the Communist system.

The Iron Curtain, they aver, is unique in human history. No other nation has ever devised a more complex and complete barrier between itself and the outside world. It constitutes a concrete definition of what communism takes to be the proper relationship between its sphere and the realm of freedom. It consists not merely of the artificial physical barriers which run unbroken for some 6,000 miles between the Artic Ocean and Iran, but also of travel restrictions, censorship, radio jamming, the rewriting of history, and so on. Its maintenance is phenomenally costly, but the Communists are ready to pay any price for this absolute necessity.

It proclaims that there is irreconcilable enmity between the Communist concepts and practices and all others. It also proclaims the Communist insistence on totalitarian control of its subjects and on their isolation from, and immunization against, ideas other than the Communist and persons holding such ideas.

The Iron Curtain has two purposes: first, to keep in—that is, "to keep the people where the party wants them to be and to keep them subject to influences of the party's choosing until they can be brought to the point where they will feel free in adhering to the party line;" secondly, to keep out—that is, "to make the party the supreme arbiter of contacts between the two orbits."

Since the Iron Curtain was so designated for the first time during Stalin's rule, it may be thought of as having been brought into being by him. The Overstreets show that it existed before he came to power. Nor did it cease to be when he died. Khrushchev is commonly credited with having somewhat liberalized contacts between the Communist and non-Communist worlds. But he has done nothing of the sort. The Overstreets think that Khrushchev has as tight a grip on his people as did Stalin, but exercises it by less obvious, if no less effective, means.

The party now has extremely efficient and far-reaching psychological controls. It "has the machinery it needs for enacting total watchfulness and total interference in private lives." In the social laboratory which Khrushchev runs, man is being redesigned. And this is not done by brainwashing. Rather, it is done, first, by making everyone and everything utterly dependent on the party; the party has a monopoly of the ways of making a living, of rewards and punishments, of access to education, work opportunities, living space. Secondly, and even more tellingly, the private aspects of life are all but eliminated and existence is so thoroughly socialized as to convince a person that he is the creature of the collectivity, with no intrinsic, individual significance or value and no recourse.

The authors maintain that the characteristic Russian makeup has been an invaluable asset to the successive dictators in their design. They cite, for example, the Russians' immemorial experience and expectation of being rigorously ruled from the top; their penchant for the emotional and practical security of group life; their "preference for rigidly dichotomized either-or formulations and an accompanying contempt for qualifying phrases"; their ingrained conviction that Russia's destiny is to "civilize" the whole world. The "new Soviet man," then, is simply the old Russian newly disciplined.

But for all Khrushchev's success in this respect, the Overstreets feel that time is working against his—or his successor's—indefinitely maintaining tight control over the people. It is not only that every dictatorship undergoes an erosion of its powers, not only that crises in production inevitably recur in the Soviet system, it is also, for example, that there has emerged a class of experts in science and technology. This type, as well as the multiplication of it, is requisite to both the economy and the defense of the U.S.S.R. And the expert will not be as amenable as simpler folk to strict control.

Another factor which disrupts the closed world of communism is the conflict which has broken out within the Communist bloc. This is altogether at odds with Marxist doctrine, which flatly declares that such friction is an impossibility. But its existence is by now notorious, and the fiction that the Communist world is a monolith has been irreparably shattered.

Resurgent nationalism has manifested itself in the satellites, the most striking example being Poland. And although Soviet force could once stamp out any such unwanted development, its utility has been severely reduced, as witness tiny Albania's defying Khrushchev and doing so with impunity.

More meaningful, however, are the Yugoslav-U.S.S.R. and the China-U.S.S.R. quarrels. The history of Tito's assertion of some measure of independence is recapitulated. It began in 1948, hence has been at work for 15 years. Stalin resorted to every sort of pressure to crush it, but to no avail. Khrushchev has assiduously courted Tito, and at present the two countries have drawn closer. But the Overstreets interpret this as indicating merely that "Yugoslavia feels firmly enough grounded in its autonomous rights to enter into as much cooperation with the Soviet Union as its national interests dictate."

The story of the split between China and Russia is much more interesting and consequential. Mao Tse-tung followed Stalin's plan for Communist conquest of China, only to have it fail. He then devised his own scheme of procedure, and this succeeded. Thus, from the start of the Communist ascendancy in China, the leader was his own strategist and tactician, not taking orders from Moscow, but relying on his own methods. And this has left Mao with the conviction that his way is the right one for communism's conquest of the world.

The cleavage and rivalry between Khrushchev and Mao are, then, real and extreme. The two are in competition for leadership of the Communist world and for hegemony over the new nations, such as those in Africa. Polycentric communism is here to stay, the Overstreets conclude, and uniformity behind the Iron Curtain is now no longer possible.

The authors strongly urge organized action against the Iron Curtain. World public opinion, they maintain, should be brought to bear against the barricade set up by the Communists. "It is high time," they say, "for totalitarian communism to be confronted not by random questions and expostulations but by an informed and tenacious demand that it 'show cause' for its need to operate behind a barrier of electrified barbed wire, mine fields, guard towers, jamming stations, press censorship, and travel restrictions."

They list specific demands which should be voiced endlessly and tirelessly, and which they believe are bound to have profound impact. If the free world focuses attention on the Iron Curtain by every possible means and on every possible occasion, this device so useful to the Communists is bound to be less so.

In addition to its main line of argument, this book presents many occasional observations on the Communist system which are thought provoking. Its tone is calm, its manner objective, and its reasoning cogent. It is a valuable contribution to the understanding of the enemy we face, and who, smiling or frowning, remains implacably an enemy.

SAFETY IN FLYING

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, member airlines of the National Air Carrier Association established a record in 1962 that was unequaled by any other segment of the American airline industry by flying more than a billion passenger-miles without an accident involving injury or loss of life, according to figures released by the Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington, D.C.

This perfect safety record for 1962 compares with two other segments of the U.S. airline industry as follows: First, the certificated all-cargo airlines flew 946,638,000 revenue passenger-miles under charter and sustained 3 accidents with 121 fatalities; and, second, the certificated domestic trunk airlines flew 32,059,681,000 revenue passenger-miles and sustained 4 accidents with 158 fatalities. All of the figures used are from official records of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

These supplemental airlines, all Government and civilian contract carriers, also maintained a perfect safety record during the year 1961. In fact, CAB records show that the seven members of NACA have operated an average of 15 years with only one accident involving loss of life.

In addition to flying 1,063,398,000 passenger-miles during the year 1962—more than 75 percent of all presently certificated supplemental airline passenger-miles flown—the seven members also flew 259,881,632 cargo ton-miles safely, to almost every part of the world.

The members of the National Air Carrier Association—NACA—are: American Flyers Airline Corp., Fort Worth, Tex.; Capitol Airways, Inc., Nashville, Tenn.; Modern Air Transport, Inc., Trenton, N.J.; Overseas National Airways, Washington, D.C.; Saturn Airways, Inc., Miami, Fla.; Southern Air Transport, Inc., Miami, Fla.; and World Airways, Oakland, Calif.

The seven members of NACA hold all requisite permits from the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Military Air Transport Service with respect to both operating authority and safety requirements.

These are the same rules under which the scheduled airlines, the scheduled aircargo carriers, and other certificated segments of the U.S. airline industry operate charter trips. In addition to these normal governmental operating and safety requirements, NACA members impose on themselves even more stringent safety rules, violation of which can mean being dropped from the association.

NACA functions as a normal trade association in behalf of its members and also provides a single source of procurement of charter air transportation—both passenger and freight.

In establishing their perfect safety record for 1962, CAB reports show that NACA members transported within the continental limits of the United States and overseas a total of 396,955 passengers, military and civilian. The passengers ranged from soldiers moved for the Cuban crisis to lodge members of Eastern Star.

Total revenue miles flown were 30,796,548 and the total operating revenue of the seven companies was $60,887,961, of which $50,664,630 was in Department of Defense contracts.

NACA members have gross assets of $35,868,324. By the autumn of 1963, these assets will have more than doubled due to the acquisition of new jet aircraft now scheduled for delivery.

The combined total employees of NACA members is 1,139, operating more than 100 aircraft.

These aircraft range from C–46's carrying vital cargo loads to the Caribbean to the most modern jet turboprop airlines. This summer one of the NACA members, World Airways, will receive three Boeing 707–320C jets. The 320C is a convertible cargo-passenger plane with the longest range of any commercial jet—6,500 miles—and World is the first airline anywhere to buy them.

Another NACA member, Capitol Airways, will accept delivery this summer on a Douglas DC–8F jetliner.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statistical table prepared by the National Air Carrier Association, relating to this matter.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table I

	Revenue-miles	Revenue passengers	Passenger-miles	Cargo ton-miles
American Flyers Airline Corp	954,518	39,645	41,664,000	4,536,670
Capitol Airways, Inc	11,214,806	69,790	258,721,000	93,332,126
Modern Air Transport, Inc	325,747	17,776	18,379,000	1,875,080
Overseas National Airways	3,244,911	96,386	249,280,000	26,245,658
Saturn Airways, Inc	530,360	21,312	33,566,000	3,815,445
Southern Air Transport, Inc	3,271,024	87,417	97,662,000	19,848,759
World Airways, Inc	11,255,182	64,629	364,126,000	110,227,894
Total	30,796,548	396,955	1,063,398,000	259,881,632

Table II

	Defense contracts	Total operating revenue	Total assets
American Flyers Airline Corp	$1,633,291	$2,206,865	$689,567
Capitol Airways, Inc	14,911,657	18,775,194	16,143,750
Modern Air Transport, Inc	913,448	1,005,491	351,409
Overseas National Airways	6,160,785	8,439,293	1,993,282
Saturn Airways, Inc	781,888	1,417,285	913,599
Southern Air Transport, Inc	4,824,834	5,733,821	2,244,041
World Airways, Inc	21,438,727	23,308,012	13,532,676
Total	50,664,630	60,887,961	35,868,324

MGM-CINERAMA COMMENDED ON "HOW THE WEST WAS WON"

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the other evening many Members of this body and the House were guests at the premier performance in Washington of the new motion picture, "How the West Was Won."

This is a spectacular tribute to the brave men and women who helped make this country great. Parts of it were filmed only a few miles from my home in Indiana.

The screenplay took up five related, but distinct, periods—the early days of the Ohio Valley, the covered wagon and gold rush, the Civil War, building of the transcontinental railroad and the development of roads. My own State, Indiana, was, of course, a part of two of these phases. All of them opened the West.

I wish to commend Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer and the Cinerama Co. for their work in creating this magnificent historical document. They should be pleased with the results of this undertaking. Those who see the film will be justly proud of the heritage we have in America.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and be made the pending business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. **NEUBERGER**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. Mr. President, I support the mass transportation bill not merely because the commuters of Connecticut need it—which they do—not merely because the New York metropolitan area must have it—which it must—and not merely because commuter transportation is one of the most serious problems facing our Nation.

I speak for the mass transportation bill because of its importance to the Senate itself, because of its importance to the legislative process, and because of its importance to the lawmaking function of our Federal Government.

For this bill will put to the test—as will no other bill before the Congress—whether the lawmaking process of our Government is going to work in the national interest, or whether it is going to founder on the shoals of State and regional self-seeking.

This bill requires us to decide whether we are lawmakers for a nation or ambassadors from the States to the Nation's Capitol.

Let us face the facts: In this debate we have been told that the bill should be rejected, because there are some States where mass transportation is of little concern. "What good does this bill do for my State?" That is the question asked or implied by much of what has been said here.

To those who ask that question, I answer: This bill is good for the Nation, and for that reason should be supported by every State.

We have become a nation of cities, and the trend toward urban living will continue. If we are to legislate for the needs of today and tomorrow, if we are to preserve in an urban future the great human values which flourished so successfully in our rural past, we must concern ourselves with the grave ills that threaten our cities with premature deterioration.

I ask no Senator to support a bill he believes harmful to his State. But if Senators reject a bill because it helps solve a national problem which is more serious in other States than their own, then our Federal Government is in serious danger.

We became a nation when the representatives of our States realized that selfish provincialism must be replaced by constructive cooperation. History shows that we are weakened as a nation when we fail to cooperate in solving problems that reach beyond the borders of our separate States.

Let no one mistake the serious implications in the attack upon the mass transportation bill.

If votes are withheld by States that have little or no present need for Federal funds for commuters, where do these States expect to find support for their own urgent needs? If State benefit becomes the test, why should the representatives of metropolitan America spend their constituents' money for the needs of rural America? If State benefit becomes the test, where will the votes be found to reclaim the lands of the vast Southwest; to develop the mighty power potential of the Northwest; to provide rural electrification for the Southeast; to insure farm income in the Midwest?

Opposition to this bill would not only be short-sighted in the national interest, it would be economically shortsighted as well. If the cities do not receive help for their commuter problems, they may not help the rest of the country with their votes—and they certainly will not be as able to help the rest of the country with their money.

We are told the Nation cannot afford this bill—that our national revenues will not permit this amount of spending. The facts are just the opposite. Our national revenues require this amount of spending. The revenues of our country will decline if our cities cannot continue their crucial role in the economy of this Nation.

The New York metropolitan area and the other large urban areas of the Nation are the hubs around which turn the industry, finance and commerce of these United States.

They are the high income areas—indeed, much of the opposition to the bill dwells on this fact—but they are also income-generating areas; from them stems the wherewithal for the industry—the mining—the agriculture of our entire country.

Yet today our great cities, and their suburbs, are in need. They are being strangled—choked to death—for lack of adequate mass transportation.

We have before us now a bill which would take a giant step forward in providing this mass transportation.

Will the rest of the country, so dependent on our cities, refuse them aid now in their hour of need?

The Federal Government—representing all our people—cannot ignore this question. The continued economic vitality and growth of our urban areas is essential to our national welfare. Indeed, the welfare of all our citizens directly depends upon the commerce and industry of our great cities.

This commerce and industry generate economic activity which in turn produces profit taxable for Federal income purposes. From these funds come Federal programs to aid the peanutgrower in the South and the corngrower in the Midwest. From these funds come Federal irrigation and reclamation projects to make the deserts of the West bloom and the farmlands of the Midwest prosper. From these funds come the electrification programs that have changed the living standards of rural America.

Most of our Federal programs, even those programs in which the cities do participate, are usually weighted in favor of rural America. Each dollar put up by a rural State for public welfare, for example, is matched by far more Federal money than the dollar put up by an industrial State.

We citizens of the industrial urban States have for years gladly supported programs to help our fellow Americans who happen to live in less affluent parts of our country.

The people of the States of Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey, for instance, in fiscal 1962 paid almost one quarter of the total Federal tax collection for that year. Yet Federal aid payments to these States and their local units of government and individual citizens amounted to about one-tenth of the total Federal payments throughout the Nation.

These three States alone—Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey—are paying 25 percent of the bill and receiving 10 percent of the return. They do not begrudge this arrangement; they do not bemoan this discrepancy—though many of our residents find it increasingly difficult to justify. These States can continue to do their share—in reality more than their share—in recognition of their responsibilities under our Federal form of government. They will continue their payments unless shortsighted opposition to legislation such as the bill before us kills the goose that is laying the golden eggs for the Nation.

Our opponents are saying, "It's every State for itself and the Devil take the underrepresented hindmost." This is a dangerous slogan for the Nation and ultimately for every single State.

This bill must stand or fall on its merit, its worth not to any one State or any one group of States but its worth—its necessity—for the entire Nation and its growth.

These are days when a very large proportion of our attention is directed to the great issues that confront us throughout the world. I do not minimize these matters. Of course they require our urgent attention. But we must also meet the urgencies that confront us here at home.

High on that domestic agenda of unfinished business is safe, convenient, and economic transportation for the commuters of this country, and the sane and healthy development of our cities and suburbs. This is a priority item. We need it now. We needed it yesterday—indeed, the day before yesterday.

Today we are spending billions to reach the moon while we just talk about spending millions to move commuters in and out of our great cities. Only last week a high ranking official of NASA estimated the cost of the first roundtrip of Americans to the moon's surface to be $20 billion. And that is the cost only of those activities directly related to realizing the goal of landing on the moon by 1970. The goal is laudable, but I believe that getting to work and getting home again is just as important as getting to the moon.

Let me tell Senators what this legislation means to the commuting areas of Connecticut which I represent and to the entire tristate region of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. The future of the New York metropolitan area depends on the success of its mass transportation system, and in this region rail service must play the key role.

Where Detroit's auto production, Chicago's metal manufacture, or southern California's aerospace industries lie outside their central business districts, in New York there is a high concentration of key economic decisionmakers in a relatively few acres of real estate on the island of Manhattan, and a very heavy movement of workers in and out of that area every day.

Not only is the area small and the size of the total contribution of New York's goods and services great, but many of its activities cannot be duplicated elsewhere. It is the home of the American theater and opera and the cradle and marketplace of all the arts. Nowhere else in the world are so many of the nation-serving functions so readily available. Nowhere else can so many different leaders communicate face to face: corporation executives, financial advisers, lending institutions, leading law firms, advertising men, management consultants.

Clearly, this Connecticut-New York-New Jersey region plays a vital and irreplaceable role as the largest single industrial, business, and cultural center of the Nation. The main key to the successful functioning of this marvelous urban complex is to get the people into these beehives of activity in the morning and back to home at night.

And the best means of accomplishing this goal is through rail mass transit commuter service. Anyone who thinks more highways can do the whole job in this region just is not being realistic. Already, because of lack of good and flexible rail commuter service, a vast new population of automobiles, rather than people, is daily poured into downtown Manhattan. The automobile requires about 300 square feet of parking space, three times as much as a person requires for office space or commercial area.

If the present highways are not capable of handling the peak traffic to New York in the morning and evening hours, what are we going to do? Build more highways? Take more property off the tax rolls? Place a greater burden on remaining property owners for essential services to which they are entitled? Pump more carbon monoxide into the atmosphere? The cost of acquiring land for rights-of-way and the costs of construction are skyrocketing.

Safe and efficient mass transportation is essential if city dwellers are to live in true communities, and to enjoy the sense of neighborhood which characterized American life in the small towns in which most of us grew up. Without it, families will remain isolated from the cultural advantages which lie at the heart of the city. Without it, city streets will deteriorate into parking garages. Without it, the rich and the poor will lead increasingly separate lives—and this will be a marked departure from the democratic life in which we were brought up. Without it, adjacent communities will become utterly isolated from each other.

What are we going to do with the cars which are brought into the city?

Mr. **TOWER**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. **TOWER**. I believe that when the Senator testified before the committee he said that actually what is proposed to be spent now is only a start, and really not enough.

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. Truthfully, I agree with that, I say to the Senator.

Mr. **TOWER**. Then actually, when we consider that the immediate needs over the next few years would be an amount of about $10 billion, the bill before the Senate could not resolve all the problems for us, could it?

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. No. But I say to the distinguished Senator that we must make a start at some time. The longer we wait the more we compound the problems facing our Nation. Since some 70 percent of the people today live in the urban centers of the United States, each delay of each year means more crowding and crowding, to strangle the economic life of urban America. Therefore, I say that a start must be made and must be made now. I believe that America is too late in starting at the present time, and tomorrow will be still later.

Mr. **TOWER**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. I am glad to yield.

Mr. **TOWER**. The Senator anticipates, then, that we face only a start and that we shall have to subsequently adopt additional measures authorizing much vaster sums for transportation?

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. I would have to say, in all truth, to the Senator from Texas, that this is only a start. I would anticipate that considerably more money will be needed to solve the problem. But I believe this is a very important investment for America, because, as I said previously, this measure allows America to generate productivity, wealth, and taxes which will go to support all the processes of our Government, whereas we would lose much if we choked off the productivity and life of our Nation.

Mr. **TOWER**. I thank the Senator.

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. People can be piled 30, 40, or 50 stories high, but cars cannot be piled that way. The streets are already choked with traffic so that not only does it impede the flow of commuter traffic, with attendant delays and hazards, but it interferes with the essential local city traffic, impedes necessary deliveries, slows down emergency services such as fire apparatus and ambulances, and makes it difficult to get to stations and airports.

Mass rail transportation must carry more of the load. But, in order to attract commuters to this service, it must be frequent, convenient, comfortable, and reasonably priced. This the railroads of the area cannot afford to do on their own. They are financially weak—our own New Haven Railroad is bankrupt—and they cannot modernize and support what amounts to a true public service out of other revenues.

An already bankrupt railroad cannot continue to add almost $6 million in commuter service losses annually to its present debt. The interest and labors of the Governors of Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey have helped, but the States alone cannot provide a long-range cure.

The very nature of the mass transit problem in the great urban areas requires major financial aid by the Federal Government. Many of us dislike increased Government participation or further subsidization of any phase of our economy.

But national needs require national effort. That effort must be supported at all levels—private, local, State, and Federal. The Founding Fathers recognized that States could not deal with matters involving interstate movement beyond their jurisdictions and that inconsistent, independent action by the several States could hamper and burden regional and national progress. Indeed, this recognition is one of the factors that impelled them to draft the Constitution and form a federal union.

The Federal Government has been aiding transportation in this country for a long time. In many areas the size of the support has reached major proportions.

Federal funds build interstate highways, construct airports, dredge harbors, improve river navigation, and, in one way or another, aid many of the carriers that use these facilities.

Federal dollars have made it possible to drive across the Nation in days, to fly across the Nation in hours, to move cargo on inland waterways faster than ever before. What we need are Federal dollars devoted exclusively to the problem of moving large numbers of commuters in and out of the great urban centers of this Nation.

And each Federal dollar spent on this program will benefit more people per day than any other form of Federal aid which has ever been given to any form of transportation.

Yet we are told that State and local resources are sufficient to solve this problem. But who makes that assertion? Have governors come here and said, "We will send to our legislatures budget requests for millions in new spending authority for mass transit"? Have members of State legislatures come here and said, "We will vote to increase States taxes to pay for modern commuter service"? I know of no such testimony.

It is easy to say what can be done when you do not have the responsibility for doing it. It is easy for the national chamber of commerce to assure us that State and local revenues are sufficient. But in what State has the chamber recommended higher taxes to produce this revenue? And how many local chambers of commerce along the New Haven-New York commuter run agree that Federal funds are not necessary?

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. **LAUSCHE**. If the Governors and legislatures of the States and the mayors and councilmen of the cities do not believe that there should be remissions made of taxes and grants made by the Government, how does the Senator from Connecticut come to the conclusion that

that which the local officials refuse to do, the Federal Government should do, with its $305 billion debt, with its inability to balance the budget, and with all the other fiscal problems confronting the Government?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I shall be pleased to answer the distinguished Senator from Ohio, who, like me, was the Governor of a great State. I do not believe the great State of Ohio is much different from other States in this land of ours. The truth is that the States of our Nation are rurally dominated in the State legislatures. One of the great tragedies of America and one of the reasons why the Federal Government is involved in so many of these programs is the fact that the States refuse to face the great problems of a changing America. It is these rurally dominated legislatures which close their eyes and do not pay heed to the crying needs of the cities. It is this rural domination throughout the 50 States that makes it impossible for the States to face those problems.

Why does the Congress come into this problem? Because the Congress of the United States looks at the problems with perspective and a philosophy about the growth of America and realizes that these problems must be solved. If the States do not solve these problems because of the rural domination in their legislatures, we must come to the U.S. Congress to help solve them. I am not trying, here in the Congress, to solve a problem which is purely local, but when we deal with the needs of our people and the growth of America, and when we deal with matters of interstate commerce, there is definitely a role for the Federal Government.

In my State the problem we have with transportation is not a Connecticut problem. If it were merely a local problem, Connecticut would be handling it. But the problem of the 30,000 people who go out of Fairfield County every morning, get on the train and go to New York City, and those same 30,000 people who leave New York City in the evening and go back to Connecticut, is not merely a Connecticut problem.

This same problem is multiplied many times in the State of the Senator from New Jersey, where many, many more thousands are affected. The same thing happens in all the great metropolitan complexes.

What surprises me today is the great resistance to this bill in view of the fact that all over the Nation there are these great metropolitan complexes, and when Congress has provided a great amount of money in the way of subsidies for all forms of transportation except one; namely, the railroads. It is surprising because we have provided millions of dollars to give aid to airlines, shipping, highways, and harbors, but refuse to give this kind of aid.

I wish to make another statement to the Senator from Ohio, because, as a former Governor, he realizes the problems involved in our highway systems. I read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with interest, and I noted the comment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, for whom I have the highest respect, concerning what proof there is that people will give up use of the automobile. I say the proof is that we are so choking our highways that soon we will not be able to use them. If the problem in the State of Ohio is the same as that in Connecticut, and perhaps every other State, we cannot build highways fast enough to take care of the people using the highways.

Does the Senator want to see, not many years from now, the time come when we will have nothing but concrete roadways and amacite roads, without a blade of grass or space for people to live in? That is what we are coming to. This is an effort to provide economical, efficient transportation, and in so doing we will save billions of dollars in highway construction, by not having such a great need for additional highway systems.

Congress has voted a series of appropriations, amounting eventually to $41 billion, for the Federal highway system. The Federal Government pays 90 cents for every dollar spent, to match the 10 cents the States pay. If the Federal Government can put up 90 cents to match every 10 cents provided by the States for roads, I cannot understand why we cannot vote for two-thirds matching grants to help build a mass transportation system which will move the same people who now use the roads. The highways cannot do the whole job. To the extent we can help solve the problem, we will make it unnecessary to appropriate additional huge sums of money for interstate roads.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My question was why the people do not help solve the problem back home, and the Senator answered that the State legislatures are dominated by rural representatives.

We have many rural States, and in some instances, the argument of the Senator from Connecticut may be correct. However, I wish to point out to the Senator from Connecticut, for whom I have the highest regard, that when this idea with respect to Federal aid to the local transit systems had its inception, there appeared before the Commerce Committee Hon. Raymond R. Tucker, mayor of St. Louis, Hon. Richardson Dilworth, mayor of Philadelphia, Hon. Robert Wagner, mayor of New York City, Gov. David Lawrence, of Pennsylvania, Hon. Anthony J. Celebrezze, mayor of Cleveland, and James Symes, of the Pennsylvania Railroad, as well as George Alpert, of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. I should like to read what Mr. Alpert said. He is the president of what the Senator from Connecticut has identified as the defunct Hartford Railroad.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The former president.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The former president; yes. Mr. Alpert testified before the committee. He said:

> Municipalities find it difficult, some of them, to do a great deal for us. Take taxation, for example. The city of Boston taxes us to the queen's taste.

If the Senator from Connecticut knows Mr. Alpert, he can easily identify that to be Mr. Alpert's language.

> The city of Boston taxes us to the queen's taste. Our South Station, one of our two terminals in Boston, is assessed for $12,200,000. It was built in 1897 for about $15 million. And here 60 years later it is still assessed for $12,200,000, which is supposed to be its fair value.
>
> The fact that we have been trying for 3 years to get somebody to buy it for $4 million doesn't seem to be relevant, but it is assessed for $12,200,000.

This is Mr. Alpert still speaking:

> This is a statement I know that you will find hard to believe. Our tax rate in Boston is $101.20 per thousand dollars. So that on an assessment of 300 percent of the value, at a rate of $101 a thousand, this is confiscatory.

That New Haven Railroad is paying to Boston a tax of $1,200,000 a year on this one building, which it is willing to sell for $4 million. How does the Senator from Connecticut explain the refusal of the city of Boston to take care of that problem? I might say that Boston, according to the witnesses who appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee, seems to be one of the main proponents of this multibillion-dollar giveaway scheme.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I shall be pleased to answer the question of the distinguished Senator from Ohio by saying that in my opinion, if those facts are correct, the continuation of such a policy by Boston would be sheer stupidity. There is no justification whatever for Boston or any city or any State to continue to carry out such a policy.

In recognition of what this means, let me give the Senator from Ohio an example in our own State of Connecticut. Starting in 1961, Connecticut gave up its gross revenue tax, which had produced $1.2 million a year. Towns levy property taxes, but only on nonoperating property, and that totals less than $100,000 in all of the State.

The State of Connecticut pays the railroad one-half million dollars each year, starting in 1961, for maintenance of bridges, crossings, and other property. Thus there is no State tax on the New York, New Haven & Hartford of any sort, and no city tax of any sort, with the exception of the $100,000, which is spread through the 169 towns where the railroad might own a piece of commercial property.

It would seem to me that the Housing Administrator should, in the exercise of his discretion, make a condition, before any of these grants are made to public bodies, that some tax relief be granted. There is absolutely no justification for relief being granted without the States and municipalities doing their part.

My contention is that this should not be entirely a Federal obligation. This is an obligation of the cities and States, who must bear a part of the burden. However, that burden is so great, and the national interest is so vitally involved here, that there is distinctly a role for the Federal Government to play. This is of vital importance to the security of our whole Nation. It is not only important to Cincinnati and Cleveland and New York and Fairfield County in Connecticut and New Jersey, but it is important also for all of the 50 States, because the rural States, to which the Senator from Ohio has referred, are the States which are the beneficiaries of the great revenue-producing States such as the States the Senator and I represent.

I do not begrudge, as a Senator from the State of Connecticut, the money we generate in tax revenue being used to help America grow, and to make sure that even the least prosperous State will get the benefit the State of Connecticut gets.

It would be tragic indeed if these States, whose growth is generated by the tax revenue from the Senator's State and my State, were to kill the goose that lays the golden egg by refusing to recognize the economic problems our States have in generating the revenues that are so essential to the growth of America.

The Senator speaks about the national debt. The debt will go sky high, and will go even higher, if the people who work in New York City, for example, and live in the suburbs, cannot get back and forth to work. That is what will happen if we break down this complex.

There are those who decry all this and who say they prefer a rural America, and prefer not to have an urbanized America. However, we cannot stop, and is impossible to stop, the normal growth that is taking place in the United States. We must recognize that we are no longer 13 rural States on the eastern seaboard, but that we are a vital nation of people who have moved into cities. The cities are becoming heavily populated, and they will represent the bulk of the population of America. It would indeed be shortsighted for the least populated States, whose representatives come here year in and year out, to receive substance and benefit with the assistance of Senators from the larger and industrial States, to now say, "What does this do for my State?" I hope the time will never come when every measure that is decided here is decided by the yeas and nays depending on "What does my State get out of it?" It would be a sad day for the future of our country if that were to happen.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I should like to say that the Commerce Committee amendments, with all due respect to the Committee on Banking and Currency, have improved the bill and have strengthened the bill. On page 5, subsection (c) reads:

> (c) No Federal assistance under this act shall be extended to any State or local public body or agency thereof to assist any private mass transportation company unless the Administrator is assured that the State or States and the local public bodies or agencies thereof in the area covered by a proposed project have afforded the company every feasible relief, compatible with their own fiscal responsibilities, including, but not necessarily limited to, relinquishment of real property taxes, personal property taxes, and franchise taxes;

Therefore, if the city of Boston comes to the Administrator for help under this bill, and if the Housing Administrator notes this outrageous action on the part of Boston, it may not get relief.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am thoroughly familiar with that language. I discussed it yesterday. I will not repeat my views today. However, it is of a very flexible nature. The State of Connecticut and, I believe also—is there another State that has entered into some sort of agreement to provide tax relief?

Mr. RIBICOFF. New York and Rhode Island.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Rhode Island. I would like to point out that beginning in 1959, and especially in 1960, recommendations were made that, instead of coming to the Federal Government for grants, the attempt should be made to try to solve the problems back home.

I wish to read now the testimony given at the hearing of February 16, 1960, when Symes and Alpert and the mayors appeared. They said they had developed a four-point program.

First, they said a national policy should be established by Congress for a balanced, coordinated transportation system; second, that the Federal, State, and local governments should be asked to develop rational tax policies for the railroads.

The railroads were begging Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, and Boston for relief. It was not until 1961 that some thought was given to that petition. I respectfully submit that while those three States have given some relief, Massachusetts gave very, very little. Most of the States have given no relief. An effort ought to be made to see what will happen under the recommendation for State relief.

Mr. RIBICOFF. When that recommendation was made, I was Governor of Connecticut. The Legislature of Connecticut meets in odd years, not in even years. The next meeting of the State legislature, which took place in 1961, less than 1 short year from that period, granted all this tax relief and gave up its taxes on the railroad.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What did that amount to?

Mr. RIBICOFF. For Connecticut, it amounted to $1,200,000 a year. In addition to removing their tax obligation, we gave a subsidy of another half million dollars a year to enable the railroad to repair its trestles and bridges. So the State of Connecticut has acted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That amounted to $1,200,000?

Mr. RIBICOFF. It amounted to $1,200,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the program under consideration now will cost the Federal taxpayers $6 billion, according to some estimates; probably $8 billion, according to others.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I should say the United States could not make a better investment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator from Connecticut subscribe to that expenditure?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I subscribe to that expenditure. We do not quarrel, do we, in the U.S. Senate about spending $41 billion for an Interstate Highway System to move people across State lines? That is what is proposed to be done in this instance, when we are talking about a transportation problem, and are spending $41 billion to move people across State lines in automobiles. I cannot see why we cannot justify spending, even granting the Senator's figures, some $6 billion over 3 years to move people across State lines by means of mass transportation.

I want to see something remain of our cities and suburbs; but if we build highways to take care of the vast growth in automobile traffic, we shall have nothing left to tax. That is what we are coming to.

Everywhere we go in America we find that highways—and they are needed—are tearing down cities, destroying taxable property, and invading rural America, until we see one ribbon of concrete after another ribbon of concrete.

We are talking not only about the economic life of the country, but of the esthetics of the country, as well. Let us save a part of America and bring people back to the cities. I think it will not be possible to prevent the increase in the number of crowded highways unless we pass a bill such as has been developed and is now before Congress in the form of the Mass Transportation Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Connecticut will concede, will he not, that for the building of highways, the users of highways pay taxes on the purchase of gasoline, tires, and automobile accessories? These taxes are placed in a trust fund, in order that the building of the highway system may be self sustaining.

But the bill sponsored by the administration contemplates that all citizens shall pay money out of the general taxes to relieve, as the Senator from Connecticut has said, New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and other places which are said to have metropolitan problems.

Mr. RIBICOFF. With all due respect to the Senator from Ohio, I should say nothing of the sort. A tax is a tax, no matter what it is called, whether it is an income tax, a sales tax or a tax on gasoline and tires. The tax still comes out of the taxpayer's pocket.

What we are asking for out of the general revenues is exactly the same as Congress votes, year in and year out, in rivers and harbors legislation.

The funds which are appropriated constantly, year in and year out, for the improvement of rivers and harbors, comes from the general revenue. If the Federal Government can spend the taxpayers' money to widen rivers, deepen channels, and dredge harbors, then, for heaven's sake, why may it not spend some of the Federal revenue to move people into and out of the cities? I think it is a shortsighted attitude to neglect the problems of the cities.

We live in a changing America. We are 37 years away from the 21st century. The time has come for many of us to stop and realize that we are approaching the 21st century, and not continue to argue and talk as if we were in the middle of the 19th century.

Great problems face our country. We ought to realize that America is moving ahead; that we are not the rural America of past years. We must recognize the needs and problems that have arisen from the fact that we have become an urbanized Nation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I regret that I must disagree vehemently with the Senator from Connecticut when he says there is no difference between the taxes collected to build up a trust fund for the highway building program and the taxes which are generally assessed throughout the country. There is a trust fund. When I pay a gasoline tax, it is a user's tax. But under the proposed program, there will be nothing of that nature. The funds will come out of the general taxpayers' pockets. That is considerably different from paying a user's tax.

I come from a large city. I know what that means. Cincinnati is not asking for this benefit. There is not a single city in Ohio which is asking for it, except Cleveland; and Cleveland began to ask for it only when it learned that there was to be a gift program.

I point out how the giving away of money corrupts the morals of the people. Cleveland decided to build a transit system on its own initiative. Taxes were voted. Highways were ordered to be rebuilt. Cleveland was going forward with a project to extend rapid transit. The vote was 3 to 2 in favor of going forward on a local basis. Then word came from Washington that there was to be a giveaway program. What happened? The officials of Cleveland changed their judgment. One of the members of the board said, "If the Government is planning to give the money away, why should we spend our own money?" So they changed their vote, and now they are waiting to see whether the Federal Government will say, "We will give you the money; do not borrow it. Do not try to do the job yourself. The good Government in Washington, through the U.S. Congress, will give you what you need." I cannot subscribe to that policy.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I simply wish to close on this note in the debate with the Senator from Ohio. He has not answered the question as to rivers and harbors legislation, which benefits the various States. I imagine the great State of Ohio was the beneficiary of the rivers and harbors program as it affects the Ohio River and many other rivers in his State, and also the Great Lakes. Funds for those projects come out of the general revenues, I am sure. I do not begrudge the use of such funds, when they are necessary, to widen or deepen the Ohio River, or when they are necessary to make the streams of his State more navigable, or are necessary to improve navigation on the Great Lakes. I think that is fine. But those funds come out of the general revenue.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with that statement. But I have been fighting subsidies to the airlines. I have been seeking to impose a user's tax on the inland waterways. I have been seeking equality of treatment for the railroads. But I do not want to have equality of treatment achieved by pushing the Federal Government still deeper into the subsidy field. That is where I part from the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I am about to conclude my remarks. We have been told that no Federal funds are needed for mass transit throughout the Nation because in San Francisco the voters approved a bond issue to finance a rapid transit system for that city. Does it also follow that the Nation can do without Federal funds for the Interstate Highway System because Connecticut voted bonds for the Connecticut Turnpike before 90–10 matching funds became available? If that argument had prevailed in 1956, we would not have our interstate highways across the Nation today. If the argument prevails today, what will become of our cities in 1970?

The Federal funds are desperately needed for States and regions with major commuter problems, and should be used in whatever way the State or region wants to use the money. Each State or region faces its own problems in mass transportation. No single answer can or should come from Washington. In the New York metropolitan area, we would use the funds primarily for rail service, for that is our greatest need.

The only earmarking on the funds would be their use solely for commuter transit. The method of transportation would be the choice of the State or regional authority applying for the funds.

The bill before us meets the need head on. It is vitally needed, and should be passed at this session of Congress.

Mr. President, defeat of this bill would be a tragedy for the commuters of this country and for the lawmaking process of our Government. Its passage will help insure the strength and vitality of our Nation, the growth of our economy, and the preservation of our traditional values in urban America.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Connecticut on his speech. It is his first speech of major significance in this body. I think it has cleared up many of the questions which have been in the minds of many of us, especially those of us who come from not exactly rural areas, but certainly not urban areas—areas in the Rocky Mountain West.

The Senator from Connecticut has a distinguished record—first, as a Member of the House of Representatives, in which body I had the pleasure and the privilege of serving with him, and also, incidentally, on the same committee.

The Senator from Connecticut has been the Governor of his State. Therefore, he has first-hand, personal knowledge of the problems which confront an extremely crowded area.

The Senator from Connecticut has been a member of the President's Cabinet, and thus has become more fully aware—on the national level—of the problems which he saw as a State Governor.

And now the Senator from Connecticut is a Member of this body; and he has given us the definite benefit of his wide and varied experience.

As a spokesman in this respect for the approximately 70 percent of our population who live in urban areas, the Senator from Connecticut has done a magnificent job. I commend him for the clarity of the statement he has made, and also for the fact that he has "laid it on the line," so to speak, insofar as the needs of those who live in these areas are concerned.

I must state, in all honesty, that the Senator from Connecticut was not speaking for only the State of Connecticut. Instead, he was speaking for all the States which are in a similar situation.

I was very much impressed by the Senator's statement that he hopes the day will not come when Senators will think only of how a particular piece of legislation will affect their own States, and will vote only on that basis. Of course, that is a factor which all of us must never forget; we must always keep it in mind. But just as we are Senators from a particular State, so are we Senators of the United States; and on that basis we have to consider the interests of the Nation as a whole.

This is one area in which those of us who come from the least populous States can do something to give the consideration which is due to the part of the country in which 70 percent of the population live—70 percent of the population who have no Cabinet representation or no status as such, but who, in my opinion, are entitled to as much consideration as the farmers, who comprise 9 percent of the population.

This is a good bill. The Senator from Connecticut has made a good and a sound case in favor of it; and I compliment him on the clarity of his statement and on the dispatch he has shown.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to add my word of commendation of the Senator from Connecticut for the very fine presentation he has made on the pending measure.

In the course of the hearings on the bill, one of the finest and clearest statements made to us was made by the Senator from Connecticut. I am very much pleased to hear him follow it up here on the floor of the Senate while the bill is under consideration by this body.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I certainly join our senior leaders in applauding the eloquent statement the Senator from Connecticut has made. No one could speak with greater knowledge of the problems of urban transportation. The statement of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has certainly been most helpful to the Senate; and I hope that Senators who are not present at this time will read in the Record the statement the Senator from Connecticut has made. If there is time for that to be done before the final vote is taken, it will be most helpful.

I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut one or two questions.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We have heard many statements to the effect that urban transportation is a local problem, and that local answers should be found. Many persons have asked, "What has the Federal Government to do with it?"

Let me ask the Senator from Connecticut whether the principal commuter line in Connecticut is the New York & New Haven Railroad.

Mr. RIBICOFF. It is the only commuter line which can possibly transport people to work from one of the most important segments of the State of Connecticut to New York, and then return them home.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It passes through many towns and cities as the commuters journey from Fairfield County to New York, does it not?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes. It taps a county with a population of approximately 600,000, then passes through Westchester County, N.Y., which is heavily populated, and then reaches New York City. Therefore, perhaps one and half-million persons—both in New York and Connecticut—depend upon this railroad for their daily transportation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Can any town, city, county, or State really accomplish anything to meet the problems of this railroad in the absence of a regional plan for it?

Mr. RIBICOFF. That would be impossible. New York by itself could not do the job. Connecticut by itself could not do the job, either, because this railroad crosses State lines.

This fact points up the great problem which exists in many of the urban centers of the Nation, because by using mass transportation and fast transportation, people cross State lines to go to work and then to return home.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. So far as local initiative is concerned, have not the three States—Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey—joined in a transportation committee?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes; and they are studying the question of working together on this problem.

After having worked on this problem with Governor Harriman, Governor Meyner, and Governor Rockefeller, and after having watched the Governors who have succeeded us in these three States, it is my considered judgment that all three of these States are more than willing to do their share. I know that Connecticut is; I know that New Jersey is; and I know that New York is. But because of the fact that three States are involved, and also because of the fact that their transportation problems are indissolubly tied together, it becomes absolutely necessary for the Federal Government to play a role. Furthermore, if any problem affects interstate commerce, this is a classic example.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is the situation of these three States unique; or is their situation similar to that of other States, in terms of fiscal policy, fiscal hardship, rising debt, rising cost, and increasing pressures to meet the public needs?

Mr. RIBICOFF. There is no question that their situation is not unique. I think it will be found that the tax rates and the debts of the States and the cities have risen entirely out of proportion to their share of the Federal taxes and the Federal debt. Although debt is to be decried, the fact remains that these States and cities are very hard pressed in this field. I think the important factor to be considered is that here we have an opportunity to create wealth, because these commuters are not going on joyrides. They are traveling to work, and they must arrive on time. Thus they have an opportunity to earn income; and, in that way, taxes which help pay the bills of the entire Nation are generated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. When the Senator returns to his beautiful State, I wonder if he hears the taxpayers' associations and others lament that Congress has been approving programs to benefit the Southwest, the West, and the Northwest, while the State of Connecticut is sending $2 to Washington and getting $1 back.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I have not been in this body long enough to have heard such complaints, but I anticipate that I shall hear them with increasing frequency as the years go by. There is no question that what the Senator has said is becoming an almost universal cry of dissatisfaction. Every time a program is approved, whether it is a program related to agriculture, reclamation, or another type of water project, there is lack of understanding and an irritation concerning the expenditures. That is why I have pleaded with Senators to recognize the problems of our State and the fact that we in our State are generating the tax dollars to help such projects. All we ask is that Senators take into consideration the fact that we have a unified and interdependent America, and that a Senator should not look at every problem from the standpoint of how the program would help his own State. If we are to start adopting that kind of philosophy and voting that way, the consequences will be tragic for the future growth of our Nation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I do not know whether it is because those of us from the populous Northeast have a greater understanding or that our friends from rural States are men of greater persuasion, but it is a fact that again and again we from the cities have voted for reclamation, water conservation, and other similar projects, and we receive precious little for the cities.

We are talking about a bill that would provide $100 million for the first year for a national transportation program.

The senior Senator from Utah reminded us of a great program that he guided through the Senate some years ago. I believe that the program provided $1 billion for a reclamation project in the Upper Colorado. The Senator said it was in 1955. I refreshed my recollection and discovered that I voted for that program in March 1956. In view of the budgetary situation, perhaps the Senator from Connecticut and I will have to sharpen our pencils. If we cannot strengthen our Nation at the urban level with the amount of money that is so desperately needed, will we have enough for a $1 billion reclamation project?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I hope that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey and I will never adopt that philosophy.

I do not believe in the philosophy of retaliation. I understand the problems of the respective States. I want the West to grow. I want to see growth in the South, the Midwest, and the North, because the growth of each State helps all other States. My only plea is that Senators from States which are the beneficiaries of such programs have the same philosophy that we have, and understand that the proposal would be a part of our growth and our very sustenance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is my philosophy, too.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I point out that the project that has been referred to was a self-amortized project. I further point out that the issue is not a rural-versus-urban issue. I have made a survey of every city in my State having a population in excess of 50,000, and I have found that every one has expressed opposition to the bill. The survey included Houston, Tex., which is the heart of a complex of an area containing 2 million people. The cities are by no means unanimously in favor of the bill. The representative of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce testified that their survey showed a majority of their constituents were opposed to the measure.

Mr. RIBICOFF. In answer to the Senator from Texas, I should like to say that while those cities may be opposed to the proposed program, they are in favor of many projects in the rivers and harbors program of which they are beneficiaries and the cities in our State are not.

This is the problem on which I plead for the understanding of the distinguished Senator from Texas. I should like the Senator to understand that while the cities in his community might reject the program, denying a need for the type of help proposed, they plead for other types of help which are a drain on the Federal Treasury. Senators who are opposed to the bill go to the Federal Treasury for money to support measures which help their States.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Have the urban areas of New York, Connecticut, and New Jersay never received any benefit from rivers and harbors legislation?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes, but in an infinitesimal amount compared to what has been received by other States of our Nation in the more rural areas. I have no objection to those programs. I am for building up rural America. All I ask is that rural America understand the problems and needs of urban America.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. TOWER. At some future date will the Senator from Connecticut join me in an effort to take the Government out of the business of subsidizing agriculture? I would be happy to cooperate with him in such a project, recognizing the great outlays for agriculture. However, I point out that only 25 percent of our agrarian economy is subsidized.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I would be pleased to discuss the subject with the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. First, I wish to congratulate my good friend from Connecticut for a magnificent major maiden effort as a Senator in support of proposed legislation which is as vitally important to my State as it is to his. We have come to expect from the former Governor of Connecticut and the former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the same incisive ability to go to the heart of a problem, and the same understanding of the problems of others, as he showed clearly in the address he has just completed. The Senate is indeed fortunate to have the junior Senator from Connecticut in its midst, fighting for proposals that will make America strong at home as well as abroad.

I should like to ask the Senator a few questions. Is it not clear to the Senator from Connecticut that one of the three vital elements which would preserve the health, integrity, and indeed, the continuance and prosperity of our cities, middle sized as well as large, is an ability to move people and goods in, around, and through metropolitan communities with a minimum of delay and a maximum of expedition?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CLARK. I believe my friend will agree that the other two problems confronting the great metropolitan areas are in the fields of housing and water.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. CLARK. In the housing field and in the water field is it not true that the Federal Government has already intervened on a mass scale to assure health in our metropolitan communities in connection with those two great services which they so much need?

Mr. RIBICOFF. We might as well face the fact that in the future there will be increasing demands for recognition of the problems of urban America. We shall hear increasing debates in behalf of such developments. We have neglected those problems on a national scale, and neglected them to our peril.

Perhaps there are those who are fearful of facing the consequences of those problems, but we dare not refuse to face them. The problems of urban America relating to human rights are upon us today. They concern juvenile delinquency, health, medicare, air pollution, and transportation. Not wanting them to exist does not mean that they will go away. No great nation such as ours can allow itself to be choked off by failure of the national legislative body to recognize the needs of our people and to tackle the problems that face us. In future years the Congress will face more and more of such problems. Perhaps we do not like them, but we must be honest with one another and recognize that they exist. The Congress will have to deal with them.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. CLARK. Was it not true in the Senator's wide experience as Governor of the great State of Connecticut, as was the case in my experience as mayor of Philadelphia, that, dealing with the problem of shelter and housing—residential, commercial, and industrial—it became clear perhaps 15 or 20 years ago that we could not provide a healthy shelter situation in our cities without intervention by the Federal Government through the FHA, through the urban renewal program, and through the public housing program?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. It is not true that in each instance it was necessary to bring the credit of the Federal Government to bear, because private enterprise was unable to construct adequate housing at a profit to take care of the needs of the people?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Not only is the Senator's statement correct, but also this fact is amply shown in the case of mass transportation. Time and again I have had occasion to talk with bankers, investment counselors, and insurance companies about the prospects for obtaining private money for the field of mass transportation. The response has been unanimous, to the effect that there is no profit in mass transportation, and that no sound private investment would be justified. Consequently, the great resources of investment from private sources do not go into this field.

If there is a national need—which there is—if private means cannot take care of this need; if local means cannot take care of this need; and if State means cannot take care of this need; we as a nation cannot allow the need to go neglected. This is where the Federal role comes into play, because it is an absolute necessity to take care of a basic need facing the Nation.

Mr. CLARK. I ask my friend if he has not looked with profit at page 5 of the committee report from the Committee on Banking and Currency, where there is set forth a summary, by States, of the number of U.S. transit companies which have been sold or abandoned in the past 9 years. I invite my friend's attention to the fact that in Connecticut five have been sold and three abandoned. In Pennsylvania 19 companies have been sold and 7 have been abandoned.

Has it not been my friend's experience that it is becoming increasingly difficult, and in some areas absolutely impossible, for private transit companies either to operate at a profit or to render the service required by the inhabitants of the districts they serve?

Mr. RIBICOFF. There is no question about it.

Mr. CLARK. I ask my friend one more question. I am sure that he—the same as I—has always supported the Federal road program which is under the A-B-C sections and which provides for 50-percent Federal subsidy for the major highway systems within the States, and also the Federal Interstate Highway System, which calls for the Federal Government to put up $9 for every interstate road built for every $1 put up by a State or local authority.

I ask my friend how he could justify that vast expenditure of Federal money for highways, supported by the overwhelming majority of the Members of the Senate, and then fight this bill, which is intended to provide mass transit for the same people at a far lesser cost both to the Federal Government and the individual taxpayers.

Mr. RIBICOFF. To do so would be most illogical.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his remarks.

Mr. DODD subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today my distinguished colleague from Connecticut, Senator Ribicoff, made his maiden speech on the floor of the Senate. Unfortunately I was detained at a committee meeting at the time. I have read every word of this outstanding speech.

Senator Ribicoff spoke of the compelling need of our State and of our region for a Federal program to promote the development of mass commuter transportation. Senator Ribicoff's speech was eloquent, incisive, and statesmanlike. It was essentially an appeal to our colleagues from other sections of the country to show the same concern and sympathy for our problems as those of us from the Northeast and other urban areas have shown for problems of agriculture, reclamation, public power, rural electrification, and other programs essential to the development of those regions.

Senator Ribicoff pointed out that Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey pay 25 percent of the Nation's taxes and in turn receive only 10 percent of Federal expenditures.

He pointed out that we are willing to do this because what is good for the Nation as a whole is good for Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey. But now we have an urgent need, a need shared by great urban areas throughout the country, and we have a just claim upon support from the whole Nation.

I congratulate Senator Ribicoff on the first of many distinguished addresses to this body. It is a real personal pleasure for me to have this good friend and this great public servant as my colleague in the Senate.

HONORARY CITIZENSHIP FOR SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, by direction and by authority of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that out of order I may call up for immediate consideration H.R. 4374, which is a bill to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 4374) to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest that Senators who may wish to proclaim the merits and great attributes of Winston Churchill withhold their remarks until some time tomorrow, in order that the Senate may get on with the business of the day.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Was the bill reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 4374) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH subsequently said: Mr. President, I am gratified by the overwhelming response to the proposals presented by the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] and other Members of the Congress to accord honorary citizenship to Sir Winston Churchill of Great Britain. It was a genuine privilege to have joined in the cosponsorship of legislation to bring this deserved honor to a gallant gentleman and an esteemed leader of freemen.

It is pleasing to recall, too, that the West Virginia Legislature, on February 22, 1963, adopted a resolution bestowing on Sir Winston Churchill the title of "Honorary Citizen of the State of West Virginia."

Sir Winston Churchill is not only a most distinguished elder statesman and citizen of Great Britain, but, indeed, he is now about to become officially an honorary citizen of the United States. In a larger sense we can honor this courageous and inspiring leader during the strife and turmoil of two World Wars as truly a citizen of the world.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], I wish to suggest that the committee amendments be agreed to at this time. Then there will be a clean bill before the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the pending bill may be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—it will be understood, of course, that all rights are to be preserved?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. As I understand, under the procedures of the Senate, the bill before us would be considered as if a clean bill, and amendments would be in order to all parts of the bill.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I did not hear the request.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I asked unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to, so that the bill can be considered as a clean bill, and amendments may be offered to the whole bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I call up the amendment in the nature of a substitute to S. 6, as reported by the Senator from Washington [Mr Magnuson] from the Committee on Commerce, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be agreed to and thereafter be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the measure which the Senator from California is offering is the one that has a $500 million grant provision and a $500 million guarantee loan program in it. Is that correct?

Mr. ENGLE. The Senator is correct. It is the substitute offered by the Senate Committee on Commerce. If the request is granted, it will then be a substitute under the number of the bill offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] and will be subject, of course, to further amendment, and all rights will be protected. This is a procedural step.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is this the bill that picked up my $50 million guarantee program, which another Senator raised to $100 million, and still another raised to $500 million, at which time I quit?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is what happened. I proposed $50 million. Another Senator said $100 million. Finally, a third Senator said $500 million.

Mr. ENGLE. That was for the guarantee bond program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And I said I had better get out.

Mr. ENGLE. We adopted the principle sponsored so vigorously by the Senator from Ohio; we merely expanded it.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that we will be treating this proposal as an original bill, and it would be subject to amendment just as an original bill would be. Is that correct?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes. It is a procedural step for the purpose of getting the matter before the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, if the request is agreed to, amendments can be offered to the substitute, as I understand. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. May an amendment be offered to one of those amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Further reserving the right to object—and I am certainly not going to object—I wonder what the substitute does in terms of the guarantee and the $500 million guarantee authority. It is not a reduction of the authority to guarantee that was in the original proposal of the Senator from Ohio. As I understand his approach, he provided a revolving fund, and that amount would have permitted a guarantee of over $1 billion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Over $1 billion.

Mr. ENGLE. I will leave it to the Senator from Ohio to answer.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will answer that question. My bill provided for a $50 million guarantee loan fund for 1 year. I want to repeat what I said previously. In the committee a Senator said, "Raise it to $100 million." Then out of a clear sky another Senator said, "Raise it to $500 million." I did not know what it was going to jump to and I got out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. I want to say categorically that my bill provided a guarantee loan fund to be appropriated, not by financing out of the back door, $50 million for 1 year. The amended bill provides a $500 million authorization.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator is talking about a revolving fund that would be used to pay off what was guaranteed. We are talking about apples and oranges, not the same thing.

Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. ENGLE. This is a procedural matter. It places the amendment in the nature of a substitute to S. 6 before the Senate for the purpose of amendment, and the Senator from Ohio and all other Senators can either vote against it or amend it; but what it does is put us in a position to operate upon this particular legislative proposal.

I ask unanimous consent to have it adopted. As I said to the Senator, it is a procedural step. He has a right to offer his amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I repeat the question. The measure offered by the Senator from California comes as a new bill, subject to amendment in accordance with the regular rule. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am opposed to these mass transportation bills, both the original proposal and the proposal as proposed to be modified.

EXCESSIVE COST OF BILL

I can see the advantages these bills may have, and it may be that they will bring some assistance to hard-pressed commuters in our cities. Residents of our cities need and deserve Federal assistance. I have supported urban renewal programs. I think the record on urban renewal has been a good one. I intend to support it in the future.

I think we have to recognize several things about the pending bill, however; in the first place its enormous cost. To begin with, only as a starter, and I stress the words "as a starter," the bill provides $500 million in outright grants over the next 3 years. As the Senator from Ohio has mentioned, it is a $1 billion bill, in view of the additional $500 million guarantee. I think a realistic appraisal suggests that it is going to cost as much as $1 billion or more a year in the future.

The need for the bill in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Boston, and many other cities has been stressed before our Banking and Currency Committee. There has not been any showing that this need cannot be met locally if there is a desire to do it.

SAN FRANCISCO PROVIDES $729 MILLION WITHOUT FEDERAL HELP

The fact is that San Francisco has already found that it can engage in one of the most ambitious and extensive transportation programs in the country, a program costing $792 million for this relatively middle-sized city, which will finance the entire cost itself. If San Francisco can do it, I cannot understand why other cities cannot do it.

It is said that these commuters need assistance. I think they do. But, after all, those who commute from rural areas to large cities have incomes that exceed the national average income, and if anybody can afford to pay the cost of the service, it seems to me the commuters can do so.

The point has been raised by the able Senator from New Jersey that at least in 3 States, New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, there is a complicated interstate problem and that only the Federal Government can move in and solve the problem. At least, that has been the implication.

Authorities have been established in the past, along with interstate compacts, to solve similar problems. Why not this problem? For example, the Illinois-Wisconsin-Indiana area and the great New York metropolitan area suggest this kind of reasonable approach. We have had experience with this kind of problem in the past, and it has worked. The money is there. The income is there. San Francisco has shown, it seems to me, that it can be done.

Sure, the sacrifices and the burdens are great, but I think, on the basis of what we have learned in the hearings, this problem can be solved and solved locally.

In view of the enormous size of our budget and the need of keeping Federal spending as low as possible, to support a new program that will become a multi-billion-dollar program in a short time is a serious mistake.

I have a series of amendments I want to offer to the bill. Because of the complicated legislative maneuvering, it has been very difficult for me to draft the amendments, not knowing which bill was going to be before the Senate, and therefore what line or page my amendments would refer to.

I ask unanimous consent that I may introduce my amendments later on in the day, before, say, 6 o'clock, even if the Senate adjourns, and that the amendments can be printed and be available for introduction as printed tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

PROXMIRE AMENDMENTS CARRY OUT COMPTROLLER GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, these are amendments all of which were recommended by the Comptroller General, all of which will safeguard the interest of the Federal Treasury, some of which can save the Federal Government many millions of dollars. One amendment, for instance, provides for renegotiation if a Federal project grant turns out to result in an excessive, unjustified profit for the local transit company. This gives an opportunity for the Federal Government to reclaim some of its grant.

These recommendations by the Comptroller General make a good deal of sense to me, and they will make a great deal of sense to Senators, regardless of their position on the bill, if they will listen to the arguments in support of the amendments with an open mind. They will, in my opinion, improve the bill substantially in this regard.

THE WAUSAU STORY; CASE HISTORY OF ADVANTAGE OF LOCAL FINANCING

Mr. President, my prime objection to the pending bill is that it eliminates the discipline which it is necessary to have in order to insure efficiency in transit operations.

I believe that a classic example of what I have in mind is provided by what transpired in Wausau, Wis., between 1955 and 1959. It shows the importance of efficiency. It shows the importance of the cruel, painful, and tough adjustments which local businessmen and local transit authorities often must make if they are to have a profitable operation.

ECONOMIC PRESSURE FORCED LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR EFFICIENCY

The Wausau, Wis., Transit System was operated between 1955 and 1958 at a loss which exceeded $6,000 each year. The operation was absentee-owned by persons who lived in Chicago, Ill. The local businessmen, in the period from 1954 to 1957, made an exhaustive analysis of the whole situation locally and made a thorough study of transit operations all over the country. They then brought in some very tough and difficult recommendations—tough for the people who lived there and for the people who operated the transit system.

The story of what happened in Wausau indicates what will happen to a system if it is left alone and no Federal subsidy is provided to meet the very difficult economic exigencies in connection with the survival of our free enterprise system.

In the first place, the transit system curtailed its service by one-third; in other words, that it eliminated one-third of its operation.

In the second place, it reduced its time of operation, to provide operation only from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m.; the 6 to 9:30 p.m. service was dropped. Sunday morning service was eliminated.

The city council, which provides the money for the Wausau school system, was persuaded to agree to an increase in the fares, charged to the local property taxpayers, for students who were being transported by bus owned by this transit system. The fare was increased from 12½ to 16½ cents.

EFFICIENCY ADJUSTMENTS IMPOSSIBLE WITH FEDERAL HANDOUTS

I believe that all of these very tough and difficult adjustments would have been impossible if a Federal subsidy program had been in effect and if it had been possible for the local authorities to turn to the Federal Government for assistance.

Incidentally, the increase in the fares was approved by the Wisconsin Public Service Commission.

In addition, it was necessary, in order to keep operating and in order to provide for the necessary transportation facilities and buses, to borrow money. Local businessmen loaned $2,500. The school board loaned another $2,500. Other local money was raised. It was raised on the basis of local people who had a direct, immediate, and personal knowledge of the transit operation.

During this period the transit system went through as difficult and as rocky a time as can be imagined. The transit system owed $22,000, which was a great deal of money for such a small system. Most of it was owed to the Internal Revenue Service. The Internal Revenue Service came within an eyelash of foreclosing on the property.

There was a period during which the transit system lacked cash to meet its payroll. There was a strike threat. The transit system almost came to the point of halting its operations. It was difficult to get spare parts to continue operations. A petition was filed by the owners of the transit system to abandon operations. That petition was denied by the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin.

WAUSAU ACHIEVES SUCCESS

Because of the painful but necessary economies in operation which were instituted, based on the pressure of economic necessity, this transit system slowly and gradually solved its problems itself.

Now it is expanding its service. It has found credit with which to buy new equipment. It found that credit locally. It has new local open lines of credit. It is successful. It is making a small profit each year. That profit is beginning to grow.

In the words of Mr. Delmar Drum, of the Wausau Chamber of Commerce;

> We feel very strongly that our problem was a local problem and one that only can be effectively dealt with at the local level. Financing was just a small part of this thing. It is the cooperation between people and understanding between the various organizations and people that really was the reason for the success.

I believe, if we consider the situation in Wausau, Wis., we must know that, after all, if Wausau had been in the position of being able to get a substantial grant from the Federal Government, money which would not have to be returned to the Federal Government, there would have been an entirely different course of action followed in Wausau. It would not have streamlined its operations, including working rules, to make it more efficient. There would not have been the realization of the importance of cooperation to provide a more efficient operation.

It was the pressures of economic necessity which drove this operation to self reliance and success, not by subsidy, but by efficient and profitable operation. It accomplished what was needed in Wausau to the satisfaction of all the people involved. Incidentally, the cutting back of service and the increase in the fares did not result in complaints in Wausau. If a subsidy had been involved, there would have been very vehement protest.

BILL PUTS BIG INCENTIVE ON ELABORATE TRANSIT PROGRAMS

This is a good fiscal reason why I believe the bill is unsound in its terms. The bill provides, in the grant section, that the Federal Government shall contribute two-thirds of the net project cost.

This means that if it is possible to finance, say, a $10 million program out of revenues, and the local authorities have the choice or the alternative of having simply a $10 million operation with no Federal gift or a very elaborate $40 million operation with a $20 million giveaway there is a real incentive for going for a big, substantial operation.

Let us assume this program becomes as big as everyone assures us it will, a multibillion dollar operation.

Now assume that a particular transit company has a net income available for buying facilities, and so forth, after all operating costs of $10 million a year. Let us say that this is considered adequate to finance a $100 million transit program that will do the basic transportation job. In the city council debate there are local boosters who argue, "Let us make our city really bloom. We ought to have an elaborate subway system, or perhaps a monorail, or some other very attractive transit to bring people in from all the surrounding territory. Of course this is going to cost more. It is going to cost $400 million."

However, of the additional $300 million over the basic $100 million, the Federal Government will pay $200 million, and we will only have to pay $100 million. The argument will be that employment can be provided through this elaborate system, and profit can be made through additional business, surely during the construction period itself.

The argument can be made that all this additional business and additional profit will be made by the local people. With local pressures such an argument can be very convincing, indeed.

INCENTIVE TO PUSH COST ON TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

There is the further provision in the proposed legislation, which was spotted by the Comptroller General, which makes makes the net project cost system especially vulnerable to exploitation.

Let us say in this hypothetical situation that although the local authorities in their hearts recognize they would have $10 million left over after covering operating expenses, they still might like to persuade the Federal Government to put up as much as possible, not one-half of the total project cost, not two-thirds of what they would calculate the net project cost to be, but two-thirds of the whole project cost. What would they have to do in order to achieve that purpose? They would have to convince the Administrator that probably there would be no substantial amount available over the cost of operation. Therefore, in this $400 million project the Federal Government has to come in with $270 million, and the local people will put up not $200 million, but $130 million, of which $100 million is in reality financed out of fare box net revenue. Local taxpayers chip in $30 million and get $270 million or nine times that much in Federal money.

Now there is a tremendous incentive for local transit authorities to make this case. It is extremely difficult for the Administrator to find anything else, because in all these cases we have to make all kinds of extraordinarily difficult assumptions as to the number of people who will use a new transportation system, what amount of fare they will be willing to pay, and a number of other assumptions that can provide almost any answer one wants.

On this basis, if the local transit people advise the Federal Government that they will not have any excess above their operating cost, the Federal Government if convinced will come in with $270 million of the $400 million cost. Then what will happen? As the Comptroller General points out, although the local transit company is making a substantial amount, the Federal $270 million is gone for good. It may be possible for the local people to finance a $10 million operation. There is no possibility for renegotiation, which the Comptroller General urges, and there is no possibility of the Federal Government getting its money back. So there is every incentive for the local people to make a showing that they cannot do more than cover the cost of operation and thus, in effect, require a maximum contribution from the Federal Government.

My main point, which I wish to reiterate, is that there is every incentive in every city council to go for the big elaborate, costly operation, rather than a simple system which can be financed out of farebox revenues. Why? Because the Federal Government will come in on the big one, and the Federal Government will contribute nothing if the operation can be financed locally out of farebox revenues.

The distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], in his very fine maiden speech, talked, as did the Senator from Pennsylvania and other Senators, about the importance of the planning subsidy that will be paid for highway construction. The fact is that at the present time our cities and urban areas gain greatly by this subsidy. I quote from page 12 of the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency:

> Under the present $41 billion Federal-aid highway program, approximately $20 billion will be spent for the Interstate System in urban areas. In addition, on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems the expenditures for streets and expressways in urban areas runs into hundreds of millions of dollars every year. For example, Congress has authorized for this program $925 million for fiscal year 1963, 25 percent of which is earmarked specifically for urban portions.

This is a novel protest. The people who want these funds for the big cities are saying, "We are getting such heavy subsidies from the Federal Government, that we are building too many roads into our cities."

The argument is that they are getting so many automobiles into the cities that more and more valuable urban locations are needed for parking space. This ties up the cities in traffic jams, so it is necessary to have a separate subsidy which will enable people to come into the cities by buses at lower cost.

This is a quite novel, intriguing kind of argument. I suppose if the subsidy to transit systems becomes more and more generous, the advocates of highway building will come along and say, "We need to balance this out. We need a larger subsidy for highways." Obviously, it would be possible to become involved in a vicious circle.

The argument was made, on the basis of a very careful study at Northwestern University, that it is highly questionable that a low, subsidized fare will necessarily result in an increase in the number of people who will not take their automobiles into the cities, but will travel by the transit systems. It may well result in more people using the transit systems, people who use it little or not at all now. In some instances—as the Boston experiments show—it will. But whether those who have come into the city before by automobile will stop coming by automobile, and come in by bus transportation, is, I submit, questionable. The Northwestern University study shows that it is necessary to reduce the fare to zero, or even to minus 10 cents or 25 cents, to get any significant increase in the number of people who will use a transit system. Obviously, if that kind of incentive is needed, it will not be possible to get it.

WHY SUBSIDIZE MASS CONCENTRATION?

There is a basic assumption in the bill that the central metropolitan area needs an additional subsidy, beyond the urban renewal subsidy, in order to get more people to live in the central city, to work in the central city, and to shop in the central city.

Is this assumption reasonable? I think that from the standpoint of national defense and the economic standpoint there should be at least equal opportunity, economically, for people to live outside cities, to obtain the great advantages of living in wider spaces. The kind of artificial incentive provided in the bill, it seems to me, would concentrate the population in a way which I think we could argue strongly is unhealthy and unwise. I think at the very least we can say that the Federal Government should not use its enormous power and its great financial ability to increase artificially the size, activity, and business in the central cities, the big cities, as compared with smaller areas.

To sum up, there are very definite, clearcut, obvious local advantages, as every Senator knows, in having an operation paid for on the basis of local financing. If a subsidy is needed, it should be paid for out of the local imposition of taxes in the area. There is a great advantage in that. I think the Wausau story is a perfectly valid one, one which could be applied in hundreds of cities throughout the country.

Some of the transit systems have been abandoned, and perhaps they should have been abandoned. If there is enough will and ingenuity in the cities to keep them going, they will be kept going. If not, why should the Federal taxpayer subsidize them.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate, and to stress it, the fact that the Comptroller General had a whole series of objections to the bill, most of which have not been included in the amended bill and have been given no consideration. I expect to offer some of the amendments tomorrow to take care of the Comptroller General's proposals.

Finally, I think we should recognize that the net project cost conception in the bill places a very heavy artificial, unnatural, uneconomic incentive on the building of big, elaborate transportation operations and discourages operations which can be financed locally from local revenues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the urban mass transportation bill is costly—one of the most costly domestic programs ever considered by the American Congress.

It is wasteful.

It is autocratic.

It is political.

It is loosely and carelessly drawn.

And it is unnecessary.

The original bill calls for $500 million for grants. The Commerce Committee amendment added $500 million in guaranteed loans. Thus, this is now a billion dollar program. But this is merely a drop in the bucket. Its most ardent supporters estimate it will cost $2½ billion over the next 10 years. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, who will administer it, testified that the cost might reach $5 billion. In other testimony the cost was estimated to be $10 billion in 10 years. After having watched these programs mushroom, I find that it is always safe to expect the highest figure.

Let us make no mistake; our action on this bill will be decisive. If it is enacted, it will launch the Federal Government on a new spending program involving billions of dollars. If the bill is enacted, it will dash the hopes for reducing the Federal budget. If enacted it will mean that probably we shall have no tax cut, or that we shall have a tax cut so slight that it will be utterly ineffective in providing jobs and stimulating the national economy.

The bill is a beautiful example of waste. It specifically provides subsidies only for transportation systems which are economically unsound and have no hope of being self-supporting. It has long been said that the sure way for any nation in the world to secure American foreign aid is to furnish evidence that it is in danger of going Communist. The only way for a city to get Federal transportation aid under this bill is to make sure that its transit systems are bound to lose money. Thus, the measure discourages prudence and rewards waste.

It is autocratic, in that it makes a czar of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator. There are no real safeguards or legislative guidelines in the bill. The Administrator could give away millions of dollars—and ultimately billions—to whom he chose. Furthermore, he could force the agency of the city or community to adopt a plan and a rate structure acceptable to him, and to him alone. If they failed to comply with his wishes, he could not only cease extending Federal grants or loans; he could also stop all forms of assistance to the area from his agency, which would mean cutting off slum clearance, urban redevelopment, and any other program which had been in effect, no matter how long it had been in effect or no matter how well administered it had been. Has there ever been a greater example of naked, ruthless Federal power?

By the same token, the bill gives unlimited opportunity for politics. There are no priorities or standards for selecting the beneficiaries out of the long lines of applicants. It is a political grab-bag, pure and simple. Without impugning the motives of the present or the future occupants of the Administrator's chair, the bill would confer a power that would be almost irresistible; and the money would likely be distributed where it would do the most good when the votes were counted.

The bill is loosely and carelessly drawn in other respects than the lack of priorities, standards, or guidelines. The definition of "urban area" would permit, according to testimony, as many as 17,000 built-up localities to qualify. Under the language of the bill, the Administrator could give aid to freight distribution systems which did not carry a single passenger. The bill has constantly been referred to as a 3-year bill. Yet it has no termination date; and in one section it specifically refers to a long-range program.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. Certainly.

Mr. TOWER. Is the Senator from New Hampshire aware that in the testimony submitted before the Banking and Currency Committee, witness after witness testified that the bill would be only a start, and that the intention was to expand the program very greatly?

As a matter of fact, just this morning, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] said he anticipates that the bill would be only a start.

So could we not be getting into billions of dollars of expenditures?

Mr. COTTON. I think it would be inevitable that we would be getting into billions of dollars of expenditures. I think this program would be absolutely bound to grow—and to grow even beyond the limits of our imagination today.

The only restrictions of the bill on the mode of transportation—and I am referring to some of the parts of the bill which do not indicate careful draftsmanship and workmanship—is that it shall be over prescribed routes, open to all the public, and not by air. Under that definition, almost everything could qualify, even moving sidewalks and elevators.

Does the need justify the huge expenditure involved? The evidence seems to indicate that the need is decreasing, rather than increasing. The Federal Highway Administrator testified before our Commerce Committee that 45 percent of the interstate highway funds are being spent in urban areas, and that spectacular progress is being made in the construction of freeways or freeway systems in cities. He noted that in Detroit the opening of its freeways has reduced traffic volume on adjacent streets by as much as 34 percent; and in Boston, travel on some streets has been speeded up as much as 50 percent by diversion of traffic through high-speed, high-capacity central arteries. This highway program is financed almost entirely by user charges, in the form of gasoline and other taxes, imposed on the motorists who use them. The "passing through" traffic is rapidly being diverted by adequate bypasses. More important than this, however, is the change of the location of jobs and population. The moving of industries into the country and the establishment of market centers in the suburbs are annually reducing the traffic into central business districts. The shopper goes to the suburbs; the clerks who serve them are moved there, too.

Considerable light is thrown on this situation by a report entitled "Technology and Urban Transportation," by John R. Meyer, of Harvard University; John F. Kain, of the Rand Corp.; and Martin Wohl, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The report was prepared at the request of the White House; and, to my mind, at least, it takes on added significance from the fact that Professor Meyer has been a White House consultant, and Professor Wohl is a Commerce Department consultant on transportation matters.

The report notes that evening rush-hour traffic leaving downtown Detroit has declined by about 8 percent over the 10-year period ending in 1953. In Chicago, the rush-hour traffic leaving the downtown area has declined over the last 10 years, despite a 20-percent increase in the population of the metropolitan area, and despite the continued existence, and even expansion, of a well-developed rapid transit system. In Minneapolis, there has been a steady decline in the number of people entering the central business district each day—a decline which has amounted to 16 percent since 1947. In New York City, a 10-percent decline has occurred between 1948 and 1956 in the number of people daily entering downtown Manhattan, and other examples are cited.

As the report points out, the growing decentralization of our major cities poses major problems for mass transit enterprises. Indeed, it states that "the best future public system may not be mass transportation as conventionally conducted in the past." Personally, I have a suspicion that most Americans are likely to continue driving to work until someone invents a transit system that will pull into his driveway, take him to work at a time he chooses to leave, and stop at the bakery or drycleaners on the way home.

Mass transportation service in most urban areas has been declining in recent years. In the 4-year period from 1956 to 1960, the number of passengers carried by buses and streetcars declined by 22 percent. And since 1954, about 195 transit companies have been abandoned. Proponents of this bill see in these facts a crisis in urban transportation, and contend that they prove the need for Federal subsidies. If we had followed this line of reasoning 50 years ago, we might still have Federal subsidies for hitching posts and horse watering troughs.

In the light of this evidence, how can we even think of throwing away our chances of conquering the twin giants of the 88th Congress—economy and tax reduction? That is what the passage of this bill, in any form, is bound to do.

As the Senate approaches a vote on the urban transportation bill, let Senators make no mistake. The bill would launch the first of new programs. Speaking for myself, I believe that the President of the United States, when he spoke of spurring our sluggish economy and making sure that the Nation will grow and move, made a most constructive proposal by stating that we must find a way to reduce the restrictions of the tax burden. The words I am about to use may not have been the President's words. I will take responsibility for them. We must find some way to reduce the tax burden, especially on the jobmaking industries. I hope to be able to support such a tax reduction. I want to be able to support it even if we are unable to prune the existing budget as substantially as we might hope.

But as surely as day follows night, if we launch and inaugurate new spending programs in this year of our Lord 1963, we shall be utterly unable to enact a bill that would relieve the tax burden and would give the spur to our economy that we so badly need.

Mr. President, if we enact the proposal, the first program to be submitted, should our action be followed by approval in the other body, we shall have "crossed the Rubicon." We shall have enacted the first of the big spending bills, and we shall be sounding the death knell to any hope of really constructive achievement in the 88th Congress toward spurring our Nation's economy.

I shall vote against S. 6, and I urge the Senate to reject it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I must yield first to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey because he spoke first.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I asked the Senator to yield for perhaps what is not a germane question. However, we are talking during the relaxed luncheon hour and, I gather, we have not adopted a rule of germaneness.

I wish to ask my friend and part-time neighbor one or two questions to correct a rather fuzzy recollection of mine.

As the Senator knows, I am a property-owning taxpayer at a little place called Tamworth in the great State of New Hampshire. When the Senate business, or lack of business, permits, my wife, children, and I travel to our place for a few days—and, in recent years, it has literally been a few days.

When we were there in the fall—I believe, though it may have been the spring of 1960—I saw the picture of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire in the local newspaper. It depicted his presence at the dedication of a dam in the State of New Hampshire. The former Vice President was with the Senator, as I recall. I desired to attend the dedication, but I concluded that perhaps, coming from this side of the aisle, I would put a pall on an otherwise very happy occasion.

The first question I wish to ask the Senator is in relation to that dedication. What dam was it? Was it the Hopkinton?

Mr. COTTON. I believe that was the ground-breaking ceremony of the Hopkinton-Everett Dam, a flood control project.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is that a local or a State project?

Mr. COTTON. That is a Federal project.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Involving Federal funds only?

Mr. COTTON. Practically totally, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The purpose of the dam is purely flood control?

Mr. COTTON. I think that is a correct statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What will be the cost to the national taxpayers of that dam?

Mr. COTTON. I cannot recall those figures.

Let me say first, we are most happy to have the distinguished Senator from New Jersey in New Hampshire as a part-time resident of the beautiful town of Tamworth, which was once graced by an ex-President of the United States, Grover Cleveland. Grover Cleveland was a pretty hardheaded, tightfisted conservative Democrat of the old school.

I was waiting for the point of the question of the Senator.

If there is anything inconsistent in opposing a new program on mass transportation and permitting the building of a dam for the protection of life from floods, a program which is paid for by Federal funds, but which is for the benefit not only of one State but of several, and which is designed to hold back the floodwaters from Massachusetts—we New Hampshire people are very solicitous about Massachusetts these days—first, I see no analogy. Second, I add that whatever would be the merits or demerits of past programs, my principal point is that this is not the time to start a new one.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Then I gather that it is implied in the Senator's statement that he recognizes that a need has been stated. We are not meeting our requirements in transportation, and particularly in mass transportation in urban areas.

Mr. COTTON. Oh, no. If the Senator listened to what I said, I think he would realize that one of my principal points was that the need, if there is such need for mass transportation—I did not say Federal—is on the decrease rather than the increase, for the reasons stated.

I have heard repeatedly on the floor of the Senate the comment made by friends of mine for whom I have the most profound respect that we who live in the small, sparsely populated States of this country ought to contribute to the solving of the problems of the metropolitan, thickly populated areas of the great States because—and I ask Senators to listen to this, Mr. President—because those great States pay so much of the taxes, such a huge proportion of the taxes, and more taxes than we pay.

The logic of that has always escaped me. I do not feel a need for contributing to the Kennedys or the Rockefellers or the Vanderbilts from my meager bank account because they pay more taxes than I do. They pay more taxes because they have more money.

As I have listened to the words of the Governor of New York, Mr. Rockefeller; to the words of a distinguished former Governor of New York, Mr. Averell Harriman; to the words of the mayor of New York City, Mr. Wagner; unless I am grossly deceived, the treasury of the great State of New York is in a far, far better condition than is the Federal Treasury. New York is in a far better condition to cope with such transit problems, as it may have, peculiar to the State. I can see no rhyme or reason for making this a Federal problem and reaching into the pockets of the people in my State and in other States across this broad land to finance these things.

Why, one can follow one street in Greater Boston, from south Boston through to the northern extremity of what is known as Greater Boston, and one can find more wealth and taxable property on that street than exists in the entire State which I represent.

When we are asked to finance a Federal mass transit program to help those who are in absolutely the best possible condition to help themselves, and when there is written into the bill a provision that they cannot be helped unless they can show they are inefficient and losing money, and when there is written into the bill a provision to create a czar in Washington, D.C., why, the bill becomes the most glaring example of Federal domination of States and of local communities that I have seen, I think, in all the years I have served in the Congress.

That is what I am talking about. I do not say that there is no transit problem. But I say, first, that it is being blown up, though it is on the decrease; and, second, that the Federal Government, in this particular year when we are straining every nerve to hold the line, when we are not going to be able to inject some real life blood into the veins of this country unless we reduce the budget and, above all, refrain from plunging into new expenditures, should not engage in such an activity at this time.

Mr. President, I feel that I must yield to the Senator from Ohio, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator would yield for one observation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I do not wish to make this into an argument, but I respectfully ask the Senator from New Hampshire to read the Record for April 1, 1963, at page 5338, at his leisure, since there appear the statements of two of his former colleagues from New Hampshire, who spoke quite to the contrary.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I am glad the distinguished Senator raised that question. I was beginning to fear that he would not do so. I did read the quotation in the Record. It was incredible to me, after having been a lifelong friend and associate of the late Senator Bridges, and after having served with him in the Congress for 14 years and in this body for 7 years.

It was also incredible to me that he should be quoted as one of the fathers and sponsors of Federal mass transportation, so incredible that I thought there must be something wrong. Therefore, before I came to the Chamber to take the floor, I looked up the Record.

As Al Smith said, "Let's look at the record."

I found that on June 8, 1961, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], who is now on his feet hoping for an opportunity to ask a question, offered an amendment to the housing bill to strike out the authorization for mass transit demonstration grants, and on that there was a yea-and-nay vote.

I find that there were four absentees from this body who were paired as desiring to be recorded as voting for the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, which was against the mass transit proposal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I wish to read the names first. Those four were Senators Aiken, Allott, Bridges, and Goldwater.

I noticed that my distinguished friend from New Jersey quoted something which the late Senator Bridges had said. I noticed also that he quoted some words from Daniel Webster, and referred to him as that other great statesman from New Hampshire. Those words appear, I believe, in the House of Representatives.

I was in the House when that Chamber was rededicated, and I read that with some amusement. I remember turning to a friend of mine and saying, "They must have searched for days and days and days, to take out of context something which the great Webster said which was absolutely applicable to the New Deal and to the New Frontier; and they finally found something, a rather innocuous statement that we should develop our country, that we should develop its resources and we should improve opportunities, and so forth and so on."

Those are all very praiseworthy sentiments. Good heavens, the New Frontier and the New Deal are not the only people who believe in their country and who want to see it developed.

Daniel Webster would turn over in his grave if he could hear the words he used interpreted as bearing out a system of complete government support and government control over the people of this country.

I could not find the text from whence the Senator from New Jersey took the words of my late friend Styles Bridges. I am sure he did it most sincerely. He was a friend of Styles Bridges. He loved him and respected him. He would not take advantage of one who is not here to answer for himself.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. May I clarify that?

Mr. COTTON. I know that Styles Bridges voted against the mass transit proposal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The answer is that he did not. The late Senator Styles Bridges was a sponsor of the mass transportation bill that year. He was absent and not voting on the one vote. That was with respect to a demonstration program. That was not the bill.

Mr. COTTON. He must have been very much less than enthusiastic about mass transportation when he voted against it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The statement which I quoted was from his testimony, submitted to the committee in the hearings on the bill.

Mr. COTTON. The only vote he cast was against it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There was only one vote taken, and he did not vote.

Mr. COTTON. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There was only one vote taken, and he did not vote.

Mr. COTTON. He was paired, and it was announced that he was against the experimental mass transportation proposal. I do not get that impression from the Senator's quote, put in the Record yesterday.

Whatever may be the facts, I am not my brother's keeper. I was a Member of the Senate at that time. I spoke and I voted as I speak and shall vote today. I shall continue to speak and to vote the same when the solvency of my country is at stake. Whatever the late Senator Bridges may have said or done, the fact is that we who are living have our duty to perform.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If I have done nothing else, I have brought forth the great eloquence of our friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. And the Senator has caused his friend from New Hampshire to do a little homework, to find out how the late Senator Bridges voted.

I am sorry to have made the Senator wait so long, and I yield with pleasure to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from New Hampshire made the statement that this program is a new one by way of subsidization. Will the Senator elaborate on that statement?

Mr. COTTON. I am not sure that I quite understand the Senator's question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from New Hampshire has said that we are entering into a new field of governmental activity.

Mr. COTTON. I mean exactly this: Despite this experimental bill, when the Federal Government assumes the burden of financing to the extent of 66⅔ percent on grants and 75 percent on guaranteed loans for mass transportation, we are certainly entering a field that we have not penetrated beyond the outer crust before, and we are starting on a program that will go down a long, long, expensive road. That is what I meant.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We are entering into a field of subsidizing mass transportation, and that is a field in which the Federal Government has not been until this time.

Mr. COTTON. Other than the mere scratching of the surface. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator refers to the program of 2 years ago.

Mr. COTTON. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But the program of 2 years ago, against which I believe Senator Bridges voted, provided that there shall be loans, and not grants. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. COTTON. I think that is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Two years ago we provided $12½ million to be available to local transportation systems to make tests of how they might improve their service. I have a letter here from the American Municipal Association stating they represent 13,000 municipal governments and they support this bill.

Is it not a fact that, under the language of the bill, every municipal government within the Nation, having a population of 2,500 or more, will be made eligible to get grants from the Federal Government?

Mr. COTTON. That is certainly correct, if they are willing to surrender their birthright in that respect to the Federal Government.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, they will be able to come to the Federal Government and say, "We cannot finance our own systems. We need financial help. We want to buy buses. We want to buy buildings." And if they have an overall transportation plan, they will become eligible for a Federal Government gift.

Mr. COTTON. They will become eligible if the all-powerful Housing Administrator approves of the plan and likes the color of their hair and decides that he will put them on the eligible list.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from New Hampshire has spoken of the "all-powerful" Director of the HHFA. Does he mean by that statement that it will depend upon what he thinks has been done by the local communities, and, in the final word, he will be able to say either, "Yes, you get the money," or "No, you do not get it"?

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from New Hampshire means exactly that. This bill is the most amazing bill, if I can read English, that I have ever seen in this body, because it does not set up any guidelines. It does not set up any criteria of any importance in determining eligibility. It simply provides that the Administrator of the Housing Agency, if he approves of a plan presented to the Agency by the city or community, if he chooses to do so, at his own will or pleasure, can put them on the list and can decide to give them grants or afford them guaranteed loans. Then those local governments cannot change their plans without his permission, and if they do not behave and stay in line according to his precepts, he withdraws his approval, and when he withdraws his approval that city is completely starved of everything that his Agency does. They get nothing for urban renewal. They get nothing for slum clearance. They are just outcasts—and at the will and pleasure of one bureaucrat.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have been interested in the Senator's statement that in this year when people are asking for a tax cut we are entering into a new program of subsidizing. I wonder if the Senator from New Hampshire can make an observation on this statement? Those Members of the Senate who are speaking most vigorously for a tax cut are the ones who are speaking most vehemently for this new spending program.

Mr. COTTON. The only observation the Senator from New Hampshire would make in reply to the very pertinent inquiry of the Senator from Ohio is that what he says is true—that, in most respects, the same Senators are supporting this bill who are supporting the President and asking for a tax cut. I would say that up to the present moment, looking back at all history, they are affording on the floor of the Senate and to the country the greatest demonstration of one's trying to have his cake and eat it, too. It just cannot possibly happen.

Even if we should pass this and other new programs to launch new spending programs and then, heedless of all laws of economics, should pass a tax cut—and, as I remember, the President's recommendation is a tax cut that will be applied consecutively over 3 years—before the first year was completed we would be engulfed in such an avalanche of spending, inflation, debt, and fiscal irresponsibility, that the taxes would go back into effect, and more taxes would go into effect than had been taken off. Does the Senator from Ohio agree with that statement?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Of course I agree with it. I am, frankly, deeply amazed by those who are going to the people of the country and saying, "We will get you a tax cut. We want to help you in your financial distress." They are reaching ears that in many instances are listening and believing. But these people do not know that the ones who are talking about a tax cut are following a course of conduct that makes a tax cut impossible and, if passed, would make it practically criminal.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator has put his finger on the real issue before the Senate and before the Congress. I am one who has always been thankful that we have in the Senate a man with the convictions and the clarity of vision and the power to speak and stand for those convictions that have always characterized my friend from Ohio. I pray God that the Senate, when it comes to vote, will rise to the occasion and that we will not pronounce the doom of the real program that the country needs in the 88th Congress by frittering away our resources with such a bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I get letters from citizens of Ohio stating, "I am amazed that you are against a tax cut."

I answer them by saying: "I favor a tax cut. I have been trying to follow a course of action in the 6 years that I have been in the Senate that would make a tax cut possible. I now will vote for the tax cut if we will reduce expenses."

This is not the way to reduce expenses. The pending bill means that we will get into a new field. We have heard the Administrator of HHFA testify that it would cost not less than $4 billion and probably $6 billion. I believe it will cost $8 billion to $10 billion before we get through. Yet there are men who profess to be friends of the public who are promising a tax cut, entering into this extravagant and unjustified program.

Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to repeat what I said twice this morning. When we considered the new part of the bill, I had a $50 million guarantee loan provision in it. One of my associates said, "Make it $100 million." Then someone else said, "Make it $500 million."

So what began in the bill as a $50-million-a-year program, has now risen to a $500-million grant and a $500-million-guarantee loan program.

The argument was made a moment ago that we must save the country, and that the way to save it is to send to Boston and New York and Philadelphia and Newark money with which to subsidize street transportation. To those who argue that way I say, "The way to save the country is to quit the spending programs. That is how we will save the country, not otherwise."

I thank the Senator.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator for his contribution in the form of his very pertinent observations. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, during the last year and a half or 2 years I believe I have spoken to as many undergraduate bodies and university bodies as any other Member of the Senate. It was something I liked to do, because I have had certain political extracurricular activities to perform during the last 2 or 3 years. It was something which I felt I should do. It is interesting to me that only one generation ago, when I graduated from college, in 1929—I believe that is one generation ago—the total Federal budget was about 40 percent or less than 40 percent of what the interest is today on our national debt. These young men and young women who are starting out to earn a living and starting out to pay taxes are faced with a national debt which is 2½ times the cost of the Government when I got out of college.

For this reason I believe we, as Members of the Senate, must exercise a degree of selectivity in the new programs which we undertake. We must establish priorities. I believe that we, who have been Members of Congress for a period of years, recognize the impossibility of curtailing or restraining programs which are established, for our whole social and economic life has been geared to these programs. If we eliminate one, whether it is good or bad, we upset some segment of our economy.

Now we are faced with a hundred-billion-dollar budget; in fact, it is $107 billion in obligational authority. We are now faced with a demand for lower taxes.

It seems to me that this puts extra emphasis on our responsibility to be selective, to establish priorities.

I would be the last to say that there is not a great problem in our metropolitan areas with respect to commuter transportation. One does not have to live in New York City, one need only to visit there occasionally, as I do, to know that this problem exists. However, there are many other problems. We have the problem of unemployment, especially among our young people. We have the problem of surplus agricultural products. We have the flood control problem. We have a great number of problems.

It seems to me that some of these problems must be solved locally. It is our obligation, as national representatives of the National Congress to exercise our best judgment, and only adopt those new programs which are absolutely essential and which are a Federal responsibility.

I know that the example of San Francisco has been given, that San Francisco has authorized a bond issue in excess of three-quarters of a billion dollars, whose chief purpose is to solve this problem in their community.

I do not see how we can continue to go down that road.

About 8 months ago, during the busy days of the last Congress, I went home to Louisville for the weekend, or what was left of the weekend. My oldest grandson reminded me that I had forgotten his birthday, which indeed I had. So I said, "All right, get in the car." I took him down to the toy store in the suburban area in which he lives. Of course, he wanted everything in the store. That is a natural reaction for a young child. I finally convinced him that he could have any one item in the store, that I did not care which one it was, but that he had to make a decision. He had a very difficult decision to make. However, he had to exercise some degree of selectivity. I might say that I am happy that he could not read the price tags, because I came out of it pretty well.

The fact remains that it is our responsibility to establish priorities and to exercise a degree of selectivity. Uncle Sam cannot do it all at home or abroad. I was glad that the President sent us a message today in which he cuts down his former request for foreign aid. Unless I am misled by the political signs, it will be further cut.

Here, in this instance, I know there is a problem. However, I believe there is a cheaper and a better solution than to turn this thing over, as it is done in this very loosely drawn bill, to the Federal Government.

COMMISSION TO REVISE THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, out of order, I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that it may be received and appropriately referred, a bill to establish a Commission to revise the antitrust laws of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1255) for the establishment of a Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws of the United States, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the minority of the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am a member, unanimously recommended this measure in the committee's 1963 report, issued on March 13.

Our antitrust laws were written in the 1890's, and they have not been reviewed in a comprehensive manner in 20 years. It is my belief that in certain of their applications, they are having an adverse effect upon U.S. productivity, on our long-range economic growth, on trade, and on foreign investment and foreign economic policy generally.

Furthermore, the Supreme Court decisions applying the "rule of reason," under which antitrust laws are interpreted and which really represent, in a sense, the very regulations under which we expect business to proceed, come too late in many such situations to enable the Government and business to deal adequately with our national interest.

I point out that so much emphasis has been placed on tax reduction this year that there is an impression that it is the sole needed remedy for the Nation's economic ills.

But other important actions must be taken at the same time, and other things must be done, if we are to bring our economy into that area of growth and productivity which we must have to deal with endemic unemployment.

I have urged that we deal with strikes, with modern technology, and automation. I urge also that we deal with bringing the antitrust laws more into line with the needs of our Nation. We cannot afford to continue to stumble along with an antitrust policy created for an almost entirely different world than the one in which we live today. Much of our antitrust laws is valid, but much needs to be revised, too.

I should like to outline a number of compelling situations which dramatically underscore the need for a review and revision of the antitrust laws.

First. The repeated vacillation of a series of successive administrations on Middle East oil consortia in the Iranian oil case underscores the need for greater assurance on the part of U.S. industry as to the position which the Attorney General will take at a time far enough in the future to permit the long-range planning necessarily involved in important and complex industrial and financial actions. The need for greater definiteness which is so forcefully demonstrated in the Iranian oil case is equally applicable to domestic applications of the antitrust laws.

Second. Extraterritorial application of the antitrust laws has become a matter of particular concern for U.S. business in relation to the developing antitrust laws of the European Economic Community. There is a grave danger that the emerging Common Market antitrust policy may afford European firms a degree of flexibility which will render U.S. business uncompetitive. Our serious balance-of-payment problems and the concomitant need to increase U.S. exports strongly demonstrate the need for a reappraisal of our antitrust policies and in particular the extraterritorial application of those policies to U.S. companies.

Third. A special and difficult case of extraterritorial application is that of Western inability to counteract the Soviet trade offensive which is becoming more widely recognized every day. The particular need for guidelines in combatting economic warfare was recognized in section 708 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, which gave the Attorney General of the United States power to exempt agreements from the antitrust laws—that is, as between competitors—where he found that the defense benefits of the transaction would outweigh the anticompetitive aspects. Almost without comment, the Congress in 1955 repealed so much of section 708 as authorized the exemption in regard to nonmilitary goods. As a result the foreign oil agreement, one of several civilian agreements entered into prior to 1955, cannot now be repeated, although the Soviet oil offensive has been stepped up to proportions which are causing increasingly greater alarm in the West. As recently as last fall, the National Petroleum Council, a joint industry-government group, in a comprehensive report concluded that Soviet oil exports to Western European nations had reached alarming proportions and that "concerted effort by the leading countries of the free world" was required. Such cooperative action might well demand the kind of antitrust exemption powers which the Congress eliminated from the Defense Production Act in 1955. The limited scope of the export promotion exemption of the Webb-Pomerene Export Trade Act of 1918 would also be a relevant subject for study in this connection.

Fourth. Another area where extraterritorial application of the antitrust laws requires study is that of potential United States and European private enterprise cooperation for development of underdeveloped nations.

The President of the United States in his message on foreign aid, sent to Congress only today, made a statement which is one of the most significant I have ever seen in a foreign aid message to Congress.

He says:

> The primary new initiative in this year's program relates to our increased efforts to encourage the investment of private capital in the underdeveloped countries.

That is a campaign in which I have been engaged for 17 years. I am glad to see, at long last, that the full impact of it is being realized at the top level. If we are to do that, we shall also have to devise some means by which people will not be prosecuted under the antitrust laws if they actually pursue a national policy which the President asks us to adopt. No one is looking for untrammeled authority for business to do anything it pleases; on the contrary, any implementation of this policy will, I am

sure, involve the tightest, strictest supervision and control. There is considerable difference between saying that what is permitted must be done in the public interest, and having laws which prohibit its being done at all. Such laws are really getting in our way, causing us to stumble over our own feet, in a way which now requires review.

Fifth. What took place in the development of the Communications Satellite Corporation during the last session of Congress highlighted another important area to which a commission such as I propose would undoubtedly devote study—the possibility of wide-scale joint cooperative efforts by Government and industry in partially public, partially private, corporations to undertake vast ventures in the realm of space and atomic technology. The size and complexity of the subject matter and the public interest involved in such undertakings may make wholly private ownership unfeasible, and the productive capacity of private enterprise and technological risks involved make wholly public ownership unsatisfactory. Numerous other potential applications of this novel and very hopeful technique make a thorough study of antitrust implications highly important, particularly in view of the strong attack on the Communications Satellite Corporation measure made by a minority of Senators on antitrust grounds.

The list of critical cases which the proposed Commission would be charged with studying could be elaborated at much greater length. But these are some of the major areas of concern.

My bill calls for a bipartisan, 12-member Commission, composed of the widest spectrum of membership, including four Members of Congress, two members of the executive branch, and six experts from the private sector. The Commission will undertake a review of all the antitrust laws of the United States, along the lines of the Temporary National Economic Commission which undertook a similar study, at congressional direction, in 1940, 23 years ago. Unfortunately, that effort was eclipsed by the beginning of World War II. No similar study has been undertaken since that time except for the more limited Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws in 1955, 8 years ago.

When one considers that the Sherman Act dates from 1890 and the Clayton Act from 1914, and that the last major study was undertaken more than 20 years ago, it seems clear that the time has come for the kind of broad-based analysis which the proposed Commission would be most capable of providing. This is especially true in view of the fact that we want to stimulate and accelerate our growth rate and the progress of our economy. This activity is one of its major, inherent factors.

We have very important and excellent antitrust and monopoly subcommittees of the Committees on the Judiciary of both the Senate and the House. They are generally engaged in the process of review and revision of the antitrust laws. However, their efforts are not, of course, comparable with the analysis in depth which an independent commission of the kind to which I refer can provide. Participation on the Commission by Members of Congress, and, of course, the opportunity for ultimate action by Congress on the Commission's recommendations, insure that Congress will retain full control of the formulation of policy in this area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may remain at the desk for additional sponsorship until the end of this week.

I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will remain at the desk until the end of this week; and without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The text of the bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to promote the economy of the United States, to increase the efficiency of United States business (which is defined to include management, labor, investors, farmers, and consumers), to improve quality, stabilize prices, and increase output and real wages, to promote the free flow of goods and services to the American people and to enable United States business to play its proper role in the preservation and development of freedom and well-being at home and abroad by (1) strengthening the laws prohibiting monopoly and unreasonable restraints on trade and commerce; (2) clarifying standards of conduct deemed unlawful under the antitrust laws in domestic and foreign business; (3) adjusting the antitrust policies of the Federal Government as they affect the productivity and long-range economic growth of the United States and United States foreign trade, investment, and economic policy; (4) eliminating conflicts in policy and inconsistencies in the said antitrust laws as interpreted by the courts and administrative agencies; (5) providing limits upon the responsibility under said laws of business for acts performed at the request of duly authorized United States Government authorities; (6) revising Federal antitrust laws, the effect of which is to impair initiative and business development in the public interest; (7) coordinating the activities of the Government in relation to the administration and enforcement of the antitrust laws; and (8) improving the methods and procedures of administration and enforcement of such laws.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON REVISION OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Sec. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the policies set forth in section 1 of this Act, there is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Revision of the Antitrust Laws (in this Act referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 3. (a) Number and Appointment.—The Commission shall be composed of twelve members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life.

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life.

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) Political Affiliation.—Of each class of two members mentioned in subsection (a), not more than one member shall be from each of the two major political parties.

(c) Vacancies.—Vacancies in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

Sec. 5. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 6. (a) Members of Congress.—Members of Congress, who are members of the Commission, shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members From the Executive Branch.—Any member of the Commission who is in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary not exceeding $22,500; and he shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members From Private Life.—The members from private life shall each receive not exceeding $75 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 7. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 9. Sixty days after the submission to Congress of the report provided for in section 10(b), the Commission shall cease to exist.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 10. (a) Investigation.—The Commission for the purpose of recommending to the Congress measures required under and amendments to the antitrust laws to accomplish the policy declared in section 1 of this Act, and other measures deemed by the Commission necessary or appropriate thereto shall study and investigate and shall hear evidence with a view toward determining, but without limitation, (1) the effect of the existing price systems and pricing policies of trade and industry upon the general level of trade, employment, profits, production, and consumption; (2) the effect and operation of existing antitrust statutes as interpreted by and administered under judicial decisions and administrative regulations, decisions, and orders, upon competition, price levels, employment, profits, production, and consumption; (3) the extent and causes of concentration of economic power and financial control and their effect on competition and the public interest; and (4) the capability of trade and industry to assist our Nation in meeting its responsibilities at home and abroad.

(b) REPORT.—The Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress on or before February 1, 1965, and may submit interim reports prior thereto.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 11. (a)(1) HEARINGS.—The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out its functions and duties, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, or such member.

(2) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection, any district court of the United States or the United States court of any possession, or the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is being carried on or within the jurisdiction of which the person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Attorney General of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a subcommittee thereof, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under inquiry; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

(b) OFFICIAL DATA.—Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this Act.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the number of studies into the problems of the aging now in progress is an indication of the interest which this situation has aroused. Economic factors as well as medical services, physical facilities, and health care are aspects of the problem which must be studied and analysed on a continuing basis.

One study is currently underway by the National Committee on Health Care of the Aged which was organized at my suggestion. Its report, which is likely to have an impact on the health care legislation now before the Congress, is expected to be ready early in May. The membership of this Committee is representative of interested and qualified groups and consists of Dr. Arthur Flemming, former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, now president of Oregon University, Chairman; Marion B. Folsom, also a former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, now director of Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N.Y.; Dr. Vernon W. Lippard, dean of Yale Medical School, New Haven, Conn.; Thomas Tierney, executive vice president, Colorado Hospital Service, Denver, Colo.; Dr. Arthur Larson, former Director of USIA, now professor at Duke University, Durham, N.C.; Russell A. Nelson, director of Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, Md.; Dr. Dickinson W. Richards, emeritus professor of medicine, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, New York City; Dr. Russell Lee, Palo Alto Clinic, Calif.; Hubert Young, vice president, Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.; Dr. James Dixon, president, Antioch College, Ohio; John C. Leslie, vice president, Pan American Airways, New York City; Winslow Carlton, health consultant, New York City; and Dr. Howard Bost, of the University of Kentucky, Executive Director of the Committee.

I do not think enough attention has been given to the organization of this body; and in the sense that people may look forward to and may expect this report—which of course will be available to all the public—I call attention to the fact that this group is in being, and I also call attention to those who are members of it and to the problems with which it will deal.

I hope that when the National Committee on Health Care for the Aging makes its report, it will immediately be made available to all Members of Congress, and that it may be a real guide as to whether the bill which I and a number of other Republican Senators have introduced or the Anderson-Javits bill of last session or the administration's bill or some other plan is the best. But I am confident that the report will be a very important milestone in this field; and I think the members of the group are very representative professional and lay persons who have undertaken this very large task. It will take about a year to complete. They have held an enormous number of meetings; and certainly they are entitled to be known, and certainly they are entitled to the respect of all of us for the job they have undertaken. So we eagerly await the result of their work.

Another group at work on this subject is the Health Information Foundation, which became affiliated with the University of Chicago in 1962. It has recently released an analysis of the national health situation and the needs which will have to be met in order to provide for the changing medical picture of our population. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an analysis by the Health Information Foundation and a report of its own future plans, entitled "Current Problems in Hospital and Medical Administration," which was released on March 11, 1963.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CURRENT PROBLEMS IN HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION

The maintenance of health and the reduction of disease and impairment is important to the public welfare. This country has excellent medical resources. The services of hospitals and other medical personnel are being used to a greater extent than at any time in the past. Health levels in the country are at the highest point in history, but there is an insistent demand for improvement.

There is continual examination of medical services. Questions are raised as to whether the total national cost is too great, whether services are broadly available to all, whether care is organized on the most efficient basis, whether the public is able to pay for needed care, and whether the quality of education and the number of people being trained is adequate. Similarly, question is raised as to the adequacy and distribution of physical facilities.

Questions raised about the efficiency of hospital and medical care are given urgency by the increasing costs of service. This country in 1962 spent $30 billion or 5.8 percent of gross national product. This contrasts with expenditures of $3.6 billion or 3.4 percent in 1928–29.

There is need for additional research to provide facts needed for decision on major national policy issues. Programs of the Federal Government are being formulated which will materially affect future developments. Expanded Federal support is contemplated for medical research, for planning and construction of hospital facilities, for the support of group practice units, for medical, dental and nursing schools and for the purchase of hospital services for all older people.

The non-governmental sector of the health field, representing three-quarters of all expenditures, is moving forward. But voluntary health insurance, in spite of its rapid growth, has not reached desirable goals in enrollment and extent of benefits. Beds available are inadequate in numbers but are increasing rapidly, but without exact knowledge as to the number needed in general hospitals and in institutions for the care of long-term illness such as mental hospitals and nursing homes. The practice of medicine is becoming increasingly institutionalized, but with no agreement as to the best methods for organizing practice in or out of the hospital.

A better educated public is using medical care more intelligently and is spending an increasing proportion of greater incomes for such services. Unresolved is the portion of personal expenditures which should be covered by health insurance. Disease patterns are changing. The infectious diseases are better controlled, but the population is aging with a greater incidence of chronic disease and a concomitant increase in demand for care. In the face of increasing public use of services, there is criticism of overuse by some segments of the population and acknowledged underuse and lack of availability for others.

The importance of medical care, the rapidly shifting patterns for the provision of care, and the increasing demand for service all point to the need for a university center which can contribute new knowledge and better trained people to assist in planning hospital and medical services for the future. Crucial to the future is the development of the proper organization and administration of the hospital and medical establishment.

FUTURE PLANS FOR THE FOUNDATION

The University of Chicago has many resources to draw on to broaden the program of the Health Information Foundation. The foundation's concern is with improved understanding of the social and economic aspects of medical care. Members of the faculty in a number of departments have varying degrees of interest in this field. The foundation provides focus for such interest and its staff can often be helpful. Faculty from other departments also are of assistance with research carried on by the staff of the foundation. The involvement staff in teaching makes immediate use of knowledge gained through research.

The University of Chicago has one of the leading medical schools in the country. Discussions with members of the medical faculty indicate interest in broadening the curriculum of that school to provide pertinent courses in preventive medicine. There are a number of doctoral students in several schools within the university, doing their dissertation in the hospital and medical care field, who have come to the research staff of the foundation for assistance and guidance. In addition, students are applying for enrollment in the Ph. D. program of the graduate school of business for study under the guidance of the staff of the foundation.

Plans for the future are now being formulated. It seems clear that there is need for a core staff within the foundation. Such a staff needs to be drawn from several disciplines. Working together as staff of the foundation will provide an opportunity for interaction and for a broad approach to the complex problems of the field of hospital and medical care. The core staff should be small in number. Each should have teaching and research interests. Each should, over time, be responsible for a number of research projects.

The foundation's director of research is a medical sociologist, and that discipline is represented by another member of the staff who is concerned with the organization of research. A sociologist experienced in survey research has just been appointed to the staff of the foundation and the faculty of the graduate school of business, and as associate study director in the National Opinion Research Center, which is affiliated with the University of Chicago.

The hospital and medical care field involves many professionals—physicians concerned with very diverse specialties, scientists with a background in physics, mathematics, and many others, and in addition, nurses and other technical workers trained for some aspect of patient care. Patient care often involves all of these specialties, and effective care is dependent on joint efforts in an organized setting operating in a harmonious and cooperative manner. Hospitals and other medical care organizations present a primary challenge to management. Behavioral scientists have been increasingly concerned with research which will shed light on interpersonal and group relationships. A foundation staff drawn from these disciplines can continue to make substantial contribution to better understanding of how people work together most effectively in the care of patients.

The foundation staff should also include an experienced medical economist. A faculty committee is seeking an economist of stature with an interest in medical care, for appointment to the faculty of the graduate school of business and the staff of the foundation.

The economy of the medical care field needs continuing study if national decisions are to be made on the basis of fact. Medical care expenditures, the product of use and price, are under searching public review and criticism. Wise public decision requires more economic analysis of these factors. Such analysis will definitely affect public policy decisions, particularly as to the place of government. Economic analysis can also improve efficiency in the delivery of quality hospital and medical care.

Discussions are progressing with the appropriate representatives of the faculty of the medical school for the appointment of a physician to that faculty and to the staff of the foundation. Research on hospital and medical care, to be effective, requires the participation of a physician with primary responsibility for certain types of research and for consultation on research by other members of the staff from the social sciences.

A physician staff member would have responsibility for teaching preventive medicine in the medical school. Jointly with social scientists there would be opportunity in teaching to provide a broad range of information on the social and economic aspects of medical care, all of which would be pertinent to some degree for medical students, the students in the graduate program in hospital administration and for doctoral students concentrating on the field of hospital and medical care administration.

Increased expenditures for hospital and medical care have raised questions about the quality of service. Increased costs can be explained only as it is demonstrated that the quality of service is satisfactory. Study of the quality of hospital and medical care is complex and requires a multidisciplinary approach. Elementary to the consideration of quality is the service rendered by the physician. Research in this area, to be effective, requires participation by physicians respected by their profession and experienced in research in the use and quality of medical care.

There is also need for the appointment of a faculty member to the graduate school of business interested in the field of operations research and willing to be concerned with improving the efficiency of operation of hospitals and other medical organizations. As possible, such an individual should be added to the faculty and to the staff of the foundation.

The increased cost of care in hospitals and other medical care organizations emphasizes the need for concentrated attention in improving efficiency in the planning and operation of institutional services. Operations research in medical care is being developed in a few universities and is the most promising approach to fundamental examination for improved efficiency of hospital operation.

The foundation will not, in all likelihood, be able to assemble more than a limited number of such senior study directors. It is, however, one of the strengths of the university setting that such a staff will be active members of the faculty of the appropriate school involved both in teaching and research.

THE CENTER FOR HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION

The University of Chicago presently contemplates the development of a Center for Hospital and Medical Administration to operate as a unit of the graduate school of business, to include the activities of the Health Information Foundation, the graduate program in hospital administration, a doctoral program in the graduate school of business with hospital and medical administration as a field of concentration, and with teaching responsibilities in the medical school.

The Center for Hospital and Medical Administration, with the key staff contemplated, has an opportunity on an interdisciplinary basis to extend and deepen the original purposes of the Health Information Foundation and the graduate program in hospital administration in both research and teaching. Such a staff will develop courses for students in a master's degree program in hospital administration. Some courses would have content equally valuable for medical students and for doctoral students who are preparing to do teaching and research in the hospital and medical care field. Advanced education at the doctoral level should also be valuable as preparation for hospital and medical administrators who might contribute the leadership needed if the field is to be efficiently organized to meet its full potential in the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of disease.

The Health Information Foundation has been generally recognized as contributing useful, factual information for the health field. Research projects financed or directed by the foundation have developed new and consequential information. From the first the foundation has endeavored through a public education program to distribute widely pertinent information. The foundation has also helped develop the emerging field of social and economic research in health.

Funds are available from private foundations and from Government for the support of specific research projects, but success in developing the Center for Hospital and Medical Administration is dependent on support not now available through the usual resources of the university. The pharmaceutical industry, at the time of affiliation, transferred to the university funds which will be helpful in developing the Center but inadequate to give assurance of support on a stable basis.

The University of Chicago, building on the going program of the Health Information Foundation, can become a center under nongovernmental auspices which will have significant impact on the development of medical and hospital care in this country. With adequate support, the Center will be concerned with research and teaching in the interests of a better understanding of our system of medical care. Public education actually carried on by the foundation will be continued. The entire program should be supportive of the original intent of the sponsors of the foundation. Namely, that a well informed public will make the needed investment in medical care, maintaining a proper balance between support from Government and from the private sector of the economy, a balance which has to date assured a free flow of funds for the needed expansion of medical care services and at the same time permitted the flexibility which has encouraged high quality care.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to direct my attention to the pending bill.

I favor the bill, and I shall vote for it.

I must say that I have been surprised to notice that in some newspaper accounts it has been stated that "the bill is facing solid Republican opposition."

Mr. President, I know of no such "solid opposition." I shall vote for the bill; and, in my judgment, other Senators on this side of the aisle will also vote for the bill. So it disturbs me to read such statements about some "solid Republican opposition," because in my opinion millions of Americans, in cities large and small, in the great metropolitan complexes of the Nation, will be much interested in the vote on the bill.

The bill will affect vitally the 70 percent of the Nation's population which now lives in the urban areas. In fact, this percentage is increasing. Most of these people have dismal daily experiences with commuting and transportation problems. It is almost literally true that metropolitan complexes are strangling in the toils of impossible transportation facilities. These include overcrowded facilities, frustrating delays, inadequate service, bottlenecks, and so forth.

So certainly it would be most unfortunate and most misleading if there were published any statements to the effect that a monolithic approach was being made by the members of my party in the Senate to this very, very serious problem.

Mr. President, in discussing the merits of the bill, let me state that it is a fact that communication and transportation systems of the kind we are discussing—commuter systems, and so forth—are involved in grave difficulties, and more and more it is being found that if they are going to charge any sort of economic fares, they cannot be maintained as municipal services strictly in the realm of private enterprise. In one way or another, municipalities which have been interested in such means of transportation must help with them if they are to be maintained. So the bill really signalizes greater participation by such municipalities in the consolidation of systems, in the modernization of systems, and, indeed, in their ownership and operation, whether actually or by contract, in order to make sure that they continue and that these growing metropolitan complexes do not become completely anarchic through dependence on automobile transportation. I have previously joined the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] in supporting this bill. I have done so on previous occasions, and I do so now. It is well known that the individual automobile—considering the road space it uses, and so forth—is, on the whole, a very uneconomic means of solving the transportation problems of the metropolitan complexes.

So, first of all, the bill signalizes the fact that there will be greater community participation, at the governmental level, and so forth, in helping all these areas face their great transportation problems. Through many other programs they have been helped in many other ways by the Federal Government. Among those programs are those which deal with unemployment, so this is one of the essential characteristics of the bill.

One of the points which always is made in connection with such measures is that it will give someone "a free ride" or "a handout." But, Mr. President, that will depend upon the administration of the program. On the other hand, among the members of the Banking and Currency Committee are some very clear-sighted Senators, including Senators on my side of the aisle who are opposing the bill, who, I am sure, will "ride herd"—and I pledge that I will do so, too—in order to make sure that the administration of the bill will not be profligate. So, Mr. President, it is clear that the program will not become unduly costly. The cost will depend very largely upon the action we take. It is clear that the bill as it now stands will authorize appropriations in the amount of half a billion dollars; and another half a billion dollars will be added if we accept the amendments proposed by the Commerce Committee. I refer to its amendments which authorize guaranteed bonds—which, incidentally the distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], recommended, although he made very clear that that does not mean he is committed to the bill.

I am in favor of getting the municipalities or the States to carry the load insofar as they can, although superficially that would increase the money tag on the bill. But it is important that we note that if the cost of the program were to tend to get out of hand, we would not have to make further appropriations or to authorize additional appropriations.

In addition, it is said that the program is "new." However, I feel very strongly that if we were to adopt a rule that, because of our economic exigencies, we would not approve any new program, we would be in very grave trouble and would show a parochialism and a narrowness of outlook which the country does not expect of us.

Many persons point out the necessity for economy, particularly in view of the $56 billion of estimated expenditures for the national defense. However, I do not think those estimates are sacrosanct, and I would join in voting for any cuts which may be possible. In addition, it is felt—and this was acted on in the other body—that the national defense does not actually require total appropriations of $56 million. As a result, economies could very well result.

Likewise so, I have joined other Senators in voting to make reductions in the funds for agricultural programs and in those for programs in the field of health, in view of the fact that all the money proposed could not be used, and that if the entire amount requested were to be placed in the pipeline, much of it would be wasted.

In short, Mr. President, we cannot well adopt the doctrinaire point of view that we will not vote for any new programs, regardless of what may be involved. In my opinion, one of the most important features of the bill is that it will make possible a new approach to mass transportation.

I do not believe we have begun to approach the potentialities of innovation, invention, research and development in that field and, because it is an unprofitable field. Because in many cases it is a burden even upon municipalities it is a proper area for consideration. Great numbers of people are involved. There are great concentrations of population in metropolitan centers. If they are really strangled, traffic-wise and communications-wise, it is most unwise from the point of view of the national interest, in terms of either communications within these metropolitan complexes or the undue concentration of population to disregard the problem. The people do not have the transportation means to enable them to spread out.

So there is a vital national interest. There is a vital public interest which well deserves the support of the Congress.

I do not hold that we can write the bill off because it can be said superficially that the people who are interested in it are largely in New York, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Boston, Washington or Baltimore. What is wrong with that, when those complexes represent the overwhelming taxpaying majority of the United States.

So I hope that Senators will take a sympathetic look at the proposed legislation. That does not mean that the door would be closed to any amendment. I am not pledged to vote for the bill with every line and word contained in it. At a meeting this morning one of our colleagues pointed out that there may be much wider power in the administrator in respect to cutting off aid when certain conditions occur in a particular project than anybody had in mind or wished to accept. That provision can properly be amended. I think the fundamental concept is essential. I think it is right. I think it will serve a basic and important element of our population, which urgently needs help in this regard.

People are looking to us to take an interest in our people in the cities and to have some solicitude for them, I hope very much that the members of my party will look with open eyes and open mind on this particular measure. I am confident that they will.

Again I repeat what I have previously said. When the votes are counted, I believe it will be found that there is no "solid Republican opposition," to the measure, which I consider to be highly desirable for the people in the cities. They represent the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States.

NATIONAL HARMONY WEEK

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at the direction and request of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to call up for immediate consideration House Joint Resolution 282, which was reported earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 282) designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as National Harmony Week, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on April 15 the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartette Singing in America, Inc., will observe the 25th anniversary of the founding of this organization. The organization has extended to all corners of the country. Members have entertained in schools and hospitals, and everywhere they have rendered a very useful service.

I think it was Shakespeare who once remarked:

> The man that hath no music in himself,
> Nor is not moved with concord of sweet
> sounds,
> Is fit for treasons, stratagems and spoils;
> The motions of his spirit are dull as night,
> And his affections dark as Erebus:
> Let no such man be trusted. Mark the
> music.

I used to do a little barber shop quartet singing myself once upon a time, and I know the glories of its cadences, the lilting music, and the inspiration we find in such lyrics and melodies as "Down by the Old Mill Stream," "Back Home in Indiana," or "Sweet Adeline."

So may their tribe increase and may their glories flourish.

The measure is a House joint resolution. I asked the President to issue a proclamation. Under the act of Congress a 6-day period would be designated as National Harmony Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 282) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the action of the Congress of the United States in authorizing the President of the United States to issue a proclamation declaring Winston Churchill to be an honorary citizen of the United States of America will be greeted with acclaim throughout the free world, and by the governing officials of all countries of the world which are now engaged in the grim struggle against Communist aggression.

In the entire history of mankind, very few individuals have made as many notable contributions to their times as has Winston Churchill in the 20th century. The entire world is indebted to him for his leadership in the struggle of free men and women, first against nazism and fascism, and then against communism. He is one of those honored few whose names themselves speak for their achievements.

As a writer, an historian, and an orator, he is, indeed, one of the great masters of all time in the use of the English language. He has earned for himself a place among the literary giants of the English-speaking world.

In addition, Winston Churchill has manifested his greatness and his patriotism in such a manner that a thousand years from now people in far places will recall his life and say of him that, in the dark hour of Nazi aggression, under his leadership, the peoples of the world were restored to their simple dignity as creatures of God.

Many years ago—in fact, in the latter part of December 1941, following Pearl Harbor—as Representative at Large from the State of Ohio, I sat within a few feet of Mr. Churchill and heard him tell a joint meeting of the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives that his father was an Englishman and his mother an American and had that situation been reversed and had his father been an American and his mother an Englishwoman—he hoped and believed he would be sitting there in his own right as an American citizen.

I remember also on that occasion when he was denouncing that day of infamy, December 7, 1941, he said:

> We Anglo-Saxons will teach them a lesson that they and the world will never forget.

He fulfilled that pledge.

Mr. President, on August 9, 1962, I introduced a joint resolution which would have authorized the President to issue a proclamation declaring Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States. This was the first resolution introduced for this purpose. My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and other Senators joined me as coauthors. That joint resolution was reintroduced on the opening day for receiving resolutions and bills in the present Congress.

Mr. President, the facts are that on July 23, 1962, only a short time before the joint resolution was introduced in this Chamber by me and cosponsored by my colleague [Mr. LAUSCHE] and other Senators, the Plain Dealer, a great newspaper in Cleveland, Ohio, and in our Nation, published an excellent article on Winston Churchill. The article was entitled, "Hero of Two Nations." Its author was Kay Halle.

Miss Halle is one of the outstanding women in the United States. She is a personable television and radio commentator, a journalist, an author, and a world traveler of note. Not only is she at the present time one of the world's outstanding women, but also during World War II she served her country in an executive capacity in the Office of Strategic Services. In recent years she has been serving the administration as a member of President Kennedy's Advisory Committee on the Arts.

Miss Halle, of Cleveland, Ohio, first met Winston Churchill in 1931. At that time she was writing a column from London for the Cleveland News. During her stay in England in the following years, she spent many weekends at Chartwell with the Churchill family. She recalled those years, 30 years later, in her article published in the Plain Dealer.

In that article she wrote of the contribution and the service which Winston Churchill had rendered to his nation, to the United States and, in fact, to all the nations of the free world. She suggested that it would be fitting if the President of the United States, under an act of Congress, should bestow upon Winston Churchill honorary citizenship of this country.

When the word goes out from Washington that the President of the United States has issued such a proclamation—and it will be issued very shortly, due to the authorization by both bodies of the Congress—it will be a fitting honor, and, I fear, one of the final honors which will come to this great citizen of the world.

I invite attention, Mr. President, to the fact that although many resolutions have been introduced in both bodies to confer honorary citizenship upon Winston Churchill, we should recall at this time that Kay Halle of Ohio was the person who first suggested that this be done.

We can all take some satisfaction that this action, without precedent in the history of our country, has taken place; and that, in his final days on this earth, Winston Churchill, former Prime Minister of England, former leader of the free world, is an honorary citizen of the United States.

Mr. LAUSCHE and Mr. DIRKSEN addressed the Chair.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield first to my distinguished senior colleague.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I merely wish to commend my colleague for the beautiful remarks he has made with respect to Sir Winston Churchill. I was glad to join him in sponsorship of the measure. I am prouder now, knowing that the objective is reaching its achievement, to be a sponsor along with him of this very fine measure. I commend him for the remarks he has made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should afford full credit to the distinguished Senators from Ohio and West Virginia for having introduced the measures in the Senate.

I was directed by the Committee on the Judiciary this morning to report the House bill and ask for its passage, because the Senate bill carried a preamble. Since there was a variance as between texts, the Senate bill would have had to go to conference. Time was of the essence. Therefore, we submitted the House version, and the bill was passed today.

I am deeply grateful to my friend from Ohio for having taken cognizance of this matter quite some time ago.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The distinguished minority leader has, from the beginning, been enthusiastic in his support of this measure, and all Americans can be grateful to him for the fact that, largely due to his leadership, this action was taken today.

The bill will go immediately to the White House, and very shortly Winston Churchill will be made an honorary citizen of the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Since the Constitution of the United States allows for no titles of nobility, I think the record ought to show that, here, he will be Mr. Winston Churchill.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I agree. Like the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I have no truck with titles of nobility.

THE SITUATION IN GREENWOOD, MISS.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly concerning the situation at Greenwood, Miss., largely a factual statement, and I prefer not to yield until I have finished my brief statement, at which time I shall be glad to yield.

The public statements about the situation at Greenwood made by outside agitators and picked up and circulated by the newspapers, radio, and television, have painted a very unfair and wholly misleading picture.

I am not saying the newspapers gave slanted accounts—certainly not all of them—but the statements themselves were slanted, and as reflected through this medium, gave a very unfair and wholly misleading picture. Also, these statements are an unjust vilification of the fine people and public officials of Greenwood and Leflore County.

The facts are simple. The people of Greenwood are the innocent victims of organized pressure groups imported into Greenwood from outside Mississippi, hundreds and thousands of miles away. Under the guise of assisting the local Negro people in registering to vote, these professional troublemakers have organized one of the most bitter hate campaigns ever devised in this country. In conducting these meetings, they have gone out of their way to flaunt their organized mobs and publicize their intentions to secure the widest possible public notice and to create all possible resentment. In short, they have purposely inflamed the public mind, through their meetings, their organized mob marches on the courthouse, and their wild charges and speeches. They have misled not only the local Negroes they profess to be assisting, but they have misled the people of the Nation into believing there is a wholesale effort on the part of local city and county officials to prevent the local Negroes from registering to vote.

The fact, however, is that the circuit clerk, Mrs. Martha Turner Lamb, a fine public official, has received the applications for registration offered by those who presented themselves.

If I may add a statement at this point, it should not be in order for mobs of people to congregate and push themselves as a group into the office of any public official, much less the office of a lady public official; and it should not be in order to do so anywhere, and make immediate demands on the lady official, or any other official, so far as that is concerned, for immediate mass attention and immediate favorable response to their requests, whatever they may be. If we have reached the point where that is the rule to be followed, we have reached the point where we no longer have law and government.

Those found by Mrs. Lamb to be qualified for registration, according to the laws of the State of Mississippi, have been registered. The office of the circuit clerk, the registrar, is open each day. Each day, a number of qualified applicants have been registered. Last week, during 1 day alone, I am advised that 50 Negro applicants were actually registered to vote.

I do not know that all 50 had applied that day—there has to be an examination—but I am told that at least that many were put on the rolls that day. Others registered as late as yesterday.

Of course, the law does not permit any organized group, white or Negro, to form in the middle of a public street in the business district of the city of Greenwood, blocking, traffic and disturbing the peace and good order of the community, and march shouting to the courthouse, creating further violence every step of the way.

And of course, this is what the officials of the city of Greenwood have stopped. They have the legal duty and responsibility to maintain law and order, to quell disturbances, to keep traffic moving and to arrest those disturbing the peace. They have not interfered with an attempt of any person to enter the courthouse or the county registrar's office, individually or in small groups, to make an application to register to vote.

But, in the face of these facts, the Justice Department has filed a suit, with many requests for the court to enter orders against the local officials.

The Justice Department should stop its well-known practice of filing suits right and left whenever a member of some minority group makes an allegation unsupported by proof, and contrary to the facts. The Federal Government does not have a monopoly on protecting constitutional rights. Under the facts, it has no authority whatever in this matter in the city of Greenwood. Our State and local governments have the responsibility for maintaining law and order; and Greenwood, Miss., and Leflore County are doing this very thing under the most difficult circumstances.

The law-abiding citizens of a peaceful community like Greenwood rightfully look to their local public officials to maintain law and order and to protect them from unlawful invasions and breaches of the peace.

In connection with this very suit, I should like to turn briefly, not merely to what I might say about the situation, but to what Judge Claude F. Clayton said yesterday at the regular term of court in Mississippi, in passing on the application of the Justice Department for a temporary restraining order against these very officers I have been talking about.

Judge Clayton is one of the outstanding Federal judges in the entire Nation. I assure my colleagues that I know Judge Clayton personally, and have known him for a long time. He is an experienced, able judge. He had served on the bench before he was appointed a Federal judge. He is a man of firm convictions. He is resolute by nature. He has the greatest professional pride and also the highest judicial pride. He represents integrity on and off the bench.

As I have said, in hearing this matter yesterday, on a temporary basis, Judge Clayton very properly ruled that the request of the Justice Department was not sufficient to "warrant trampling on the rights" of these officials, and he refused to take any action pending a full hearing on the merits on Thursday of this week.

In announcing his action, Judge Clayton said:

> I detest any action on the part of anyone which interferes in any way with any right of any person which is given and protected by law.
>
> This includes the right to register and the right to vote, provided the standards now rightfully established by the laws of the State of Mississippi are met.
>
> These are the rights which belong to all of us. These are the rights which belong to the city of Greenwood, its officials and its police officers and to the officers of Leflore County.

Mayor Charles E. Sampson, of Greenwood, has rightfully announced his intention to keep law and order in Greenwood. Mayor Sampson and City Commissioners B. A. Hammond and W. G. Mize, Jr., have done an outstanding job in dealing with this most difficult situation.

The chief of police, Curtis Lary, has taken precautions to prevent breaches of the peace, and has repeatedly made a public announcement to these groups, as follows:

> Because of present public excitement resulting from recent events here, it is considered necessary to peace and order that no large organized groups be allowed on the streets of Greenwood. Therefore, you must disperse. If it is your purpose to go to the courthouse to apply for voter registration, you will not be prevented from doing so but in order to insure that there will be no breach of the peace you must proceed in smaller groups.

This is a step which is absolutely necessary in order to maintain law and order under the most difficult circumstances and tremendous provocation.

The real issue is whether unwanted and unwelcome outside organizers, vote peddlers and pressure groups will be permitted to invade a peaceful community for the sole purpose of creating turmoil and disturbing the peace.

These professional troublemakers are not interested in Greenwood, in Leflore County, or in Mississippi. Nor are they truly interested in the welfare of the Negro citizens of that community. Nor are they welcome or wanted by either race. Their sole purpose is to create strife and discord and to overturn the peaceful and harmonious cooperation among the people of the two races built up over generations.

These people, representing the so-called Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, CORE, and other notorious busybodies, had hardly parked their cars in Greenwood before they were sending telegrams to Washington calling for Federal troops.

As is usual in such cases, once the trouble starts these paid professional agitators will be satisfied and will move on elsewhere to start new battles and new tensions, leaving behind them the turmoil and unrest they were paid to create. Unfortunately, they also will leave to the local people of both races the hopeless task of repairing the damage and attempting to restore the peaceful and harmonious cooperation between the races built up over the years.

The people of Greenwood are not responsible for the situation in which they find themselves. They have acted in good faith, with remarkable patience and admirable restraint, under the most extreme provocation.

I am confident the duly constituted law enforcement officers of the city of Greenwood and Leflore County will continue to maintain law and order.

To the degree that I have kept in touch with these gentlemen during this ordeal, I can say that they are carrying this added responsibility, and have uniformly obtained certain assurances which were supported by action from day to day.

I think the public will soon realize what is happening and will no longer follow these schemes of publicity and building up of false issues and the carrying out of such planned provocation.

Instead of the Federal Government filing suits against local authorities, if

they are going to be there at all, they ought to be standing side by side or at least encouraging them to follow a pattern of their own law as made by the legislature and as written in the regular constitutional way and in the processes of self-government, and to maintain law and order and orderly processes of government in that way.

Heretofore all the complaint has been directed to the charge that local forces do not maintain law and order. In this case the entire pattern has been within the processes of the law, according to the statutes, and action through duly constituted authority.

If that is not protection through local government and self-government and representative government and free government, I do not know where we can turn for an example of it.

I warn the people of this Nation against taking a superficial and surface impression, artificially created. They should look to the facts and determine the real issues and to get down to the heart of the problem.

Instead of condemning, we should commend. I believe that the filing of suits of injunction against all the officers is an invitation to violence and an invitation for some group outside the law to act for themselves.

I hope that this matter will be reconsidered. In the meantime I urge the people of the city of Greenwood and the county of Leflore, through their officials, to stand their ground and continue, of course, to follow their course as in the past.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. As my colleague realizes, there has been no allegation that an attempt has been made to prevent people from registering.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. I have not had an opportunity to read the bill of particulars in the suit that has been filed. Perhaps the Senator has.

Mr. EASTLAND. There has been no allegation of that kind; in fact, 300 persons have applied to register in the past few days. Those who are qualified will be registered. There is no such contention as has been suggested. Outside agitators from New York and other areas talk to Negroes and say, "If you want to get relief, if you want to get social security, if you want to get commodities, come with us." Then they take them in a body and parade them down the street, demonstrating and stopping all traffic, walking through red lights, and being taken to the courthouse. The only obstacle has been that they cannot demonstrate, they cannot stop traffic, they cannot violate the the ordinances of that city. When they reach the courthouse they can go to the clerk's office at any time and make their application, as provided by the laws of our State.

Judge Clayton is a great lawyer. I agree with my colleague that he is one of the great judges of this country. Charley Sampson, the mayor, has rendered distinguished service. The chief of police has done a good job. The city attorney has done a good job. There is no allegation anywhere that an attempt has been made to prevent these people from applying for registration. In fact, they have come forward by the hundreds to do so. They have been there at the instance of outside agitators who say, "You cannot get relief, you cannot get social security, you cannot get commodities unless you follow us, and follow us down the main street, against red lights, and deprive the citizens of the city of the right to govern their own affairs."

The suit which the Department of Justice has filed is not a voting rights suit. The question is, Can the people maintain order on the streets of their own city?

Mr. STENNIS. Through their own officials.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course; through their own officials. That is the test. Judge Clayton was eminently correct in his decision.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank my colleague.

This situation can come close to home in the case of each of us in Washington in our official offices. It can come much closer home than anyone might think. Only last week some of this same group that is in Greenwood, Miss.—perhaps not the same individuals, but individuals with the same connections—showed up in our offices in the Senate Office Building, to parade and picket and make a show. The way we learned about the probable presence of these people in our offices was through the members of the Senate Press Gallery, who called and said, "Have they gotten there?"

The response was, "Whom are you talking about?"

We were told, "We have been called by this group and they said they were going to picket your offices."

The purpose is to make a show of publicity, to create a disturbance, and to create a false issue, merely to carry a point or to create a disturbance and mislead the American people.

It is pitiful to me—and I say this with the greatest respect to our news media—that items like this can be instantly picked up and publicized in every living room or drawing room, and on every newsstand all over the Nation, causing the public to fall victims to such misleading tactics and to planning of this kind.

It is a severe strain upon free government.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I live close to the city of Greenwood. I was in Greenwood several days last week. I speak with firsthand knowledge. This demonstration had not caught on. There is not the tension in Greenwood that has been pictured in the eastern press. The movement is not supported by a majority of the Negro race or by a majority of the white race; in fact, it is condemned by a majority of the Negro race. The Justice Department action was merely an attempt to rescue a drowning baby. It is not possible to get citizens of the Negro race from the city of Greenwood to participate. So the instigators have gone into the rural areas and have contacted Negroes who want commodities and have said, "Join with us, and we will lead you to the promised land, provided you march down the street, obstruct traffic, walk a red light, and go to the courthouse."

Those acts of walking down the street and obstructing traffic are the heart of the suit that has been filed.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

The officers, the board of aldermen, the mayor, the police, the city attorney, and others, are due the commendations and the appreciation of the whole body of people of the Nation, especially those who appreciate the difficulty that is always present when any kind of agitation starts which would try to pit the races one against the other.

I feel certain that every Senator, if he understood the situation, would join with me in heartily commending the action taken by those officials. I hope they will continue their pattern of conduct; I believe they will.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 94)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EDMONDSON in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For message from the President, see House proceedings of today).

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield for that purpose?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield for that purpose, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That will be the understanding. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have agreed to yield to the Senator from Alaska, with the understanding that I will not lose my place on the floor.

WHY STAND IN THE WAY OF CUBA'S FREEDOM FIGHTERS?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, yesterday, while the able senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] was criticizing the Cuban refugees for their raids on Castro's Cuba, I engaged in a colloquy with him in which I expressed my sympathy for, and understanding of, these courageous freedom fighters who feel impelled at the risk of their lives to strike whatever blows they can at Castro's totalitarian tyranny and its ruthless and bloody suppression of the liberties of the Cuban people.

While I did not engage in a lengthy discussion with the Senator, who was making his customarily effective presentation of the legal and other aspects of these raids, condemning them unqualifiedly, I sought to indicate my view that there was another side to this issue, and that I was not convinced of the correctness of his view and of the position which the administration appears to be taking that these raids should at all costs be prevented by the United States.

I was therefore interested to note in this morning's Washington Post a column entitled "The Cuban Raids," with the subtitle "Why Stand in the Way?" written by Roscoe Drummond. The article expresses a view with which I find myself in general accord. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Cuban Raids—Why Stand in the Way?

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Many Americans must feel both confused and frustrated by the difference between what the administration says about Castro's Cuba and what it does.

Unquestionably President Kennedy seeks the goal of a "free Cuba." He told the released Cuban invasion prisoners on their return to Florida that he was confident their battalion flag would fly victoriously in Havana.

But when those Cubans hit at the Castro and Soviet forces, the President wants them to stop it.

Vice President Lyndon Johnson tells the graduating class of the Inter-American Defense College that we "cannot be content until communism is gone from Cuba."

But when the Cuban refugees, who are intent upon wresting their freedom from those who have taken it from them, take action to do something about it, the highest officials of the administration express only disapproval.

Thus far President Kennedy has given no adequate explanation as to why he does not want the anti-Castro Cubans to fight the Castro-Soviet forces at any point they can make contact.

Until the administration makes a more persuasive case against the Cuban refugee's harassing their oppressors every chance they get, my instinct is on the side of the refugees.

I think a good case can be made that the refugee raids are useful and that we ought not to discourage them or stand in the way.

We say we want the Castro regime overthrown. We say that only the Cuban people can bring it about. With those two conditions, who is to begin the process unless it is the Cuban refugees?

You may believe that the hit-and-run raids are only insignificant, hectoring pinpricks. So were Castro's first hit-and-run attacks on Batista. The only way to begin is to begin.

Remember Hungary? Surely any prudent man could have told the latent and fermenting Hungarian freedom fighters that it would be fantastically foolhardy for them to consider attacking the occupying Soviet tanks with their bare fists and handmade grenades. But they did. You couldn't have prevented them. And despite the ultimate repression, it was a revolt for freedom which was worth all the bravery that went into it. Hungary is better off today for it.

Admittedly there are risks for the United States in the Cuban hit-and-run raids. Castro might sink an American boat in a spasm of anger. But might it not be better to deal with such an incident than to say that the Cuban freedom fighters must not decide how they shall fight for their freedom?

The administration has said it "will not be content until the last of Soviet forces are withdrawn from Cuban soil." It can be honestly argued that the refugee raids may provide an excuse for Moscow to keep Soviet troops in Cuba. The opposite may be nearer the truth. Is it likely that finding things calm in Cuba will provide any incentive for Khrushchev to call his troops home?

In 1960 Mr. Kennedy proposed that we would do more to help the Cuban resisters both inside and outside Cuba. Now that the refugees are regaining their morale after the Bay of Pigs, it seems ironic, at the very least, that the United States should send the FBI and the Coast Guard after them.

Telling the Cuban resisters what not to do isn't going to further the cause of a free Cuba. If the administration is convinced that the Cuban refugees are doing it wrong, then at the very least it should be making suggestions and helping them to do it right.

THE SITUATION IN GREENWOOD, MISS.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield, provided he does not lose the floor?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have been informed that while I was at lunch, the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] made a statement on the Senate floor which at least brings into question the propriety of the action taken by the Attorney General of the United States in connection with the situation in Greenwood, Leflore County, Miss., where the United States is seeking to enjoin local authorities from interfering with a petition by the local citizenry—Negroes, to be precise—for the redress of grievances.

I express my approval of the action of the Attorney General in instituting the suit. I think it was his manifest duty to do so, in view of the fact that constitutional rights are brought into question, including the right of petition for the redress of grievances by constituted authorities. I approve very much of the Attorney General's taking this action.

As a matter of general principle, I have very deep faith in the processes of the law and the courts. I have argued this point before, and I do so again. In the face of situations which have such incendiary possibilities as in this particular area about which the press has written so much, the chances will be very much better for the processes of order and tranquillity if an individual citizen feels that tongue may be given for his grievances through the courts, and that there is a possibility of redress.

The Attorney General is in this civil injunction suit proceeding under section 1971 of title 42 of the United States Code, which was part of the Civil Rights Act of 1957. The important thing, which I wish to emphasize, is that here is an outlet, here is a substitute for either the effort which the marchers are making or the efforts to stop them which are being made by the police and other municipal authorities. In an area where there are the raw materials of violence, the capability of the courts to act in situations of this kind is designed to head them off and to give, as I say, an outlet, a tongue, to every man's grievance.

Therefore, I have always favored strongly the so-called part III in regard to civil rights, so that the Attorney General might sue in representative cases; and I feel very deeply that this is the way to save ourselves from the dangers involved in such situations—dangers which we have already seen erupt into violence, not only like that which occurred at Oxford, Miss., where marshals and troops are employed, but also the danger involved when people are fired on while they are in their homes and the danger involved when buildings are burned. This is no tea party. This situation is very, very dangerous, in terms of the future of the Nation. So anything we can do to give it a peaceful outlet—and I think recourse to the courts is the most logical and most desirable procedure—we should encourage.

Although I respect, and indeed would fight for, the right of the Senator from Mississippi to say whatever he believes he should say, I also feel it my duty to juxtapose to the general thrust of the statement of the Senator from Mississippi—as I understand it from what I have been told by my assistants who heard him make it—this statement of my own position.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from New York that, if I correctly understood him, I am glad he did not substantially contradict the facts I related in regard to the registration—in other words, that the applications were being received and were being passed on, without denying any person the right to file his application in an orderly way and to have it passed on. The Senator from New York does not know of any exception to that general statement, does he?

Mr. JAVITS. I was addressing myself to what we have read in the press about the action of the police and other authorities in blocking and breaking up any march by a number of persons—for example, on one day last week by a group of some 100, and on another by a group of some 42. It is claimed—and the courts will try it out—that in the community there is a climate of intimidation which runs counter to the fundamental provisions of the 1957 Civil Rights Act which prohibit interference with any effort to register and to vote. I say to

the Senator from Mississippi that the courts will decide as to that.

For myself, I believe that the path of constitutional propriety is to permit people to march peaceably in order to petition for redress of their grievances.

But the fundamental point I make now is even more limited than that. I only say that if we do not want violence—and I know of no Senator who does want it—in my opinion, people must have an outlet. So I think litigation of this character is a proper and sensible outlet; and I hope very much the Attorney General will prosecute this suit with speed and with diligence.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, let me say that it would be one thing to bring a suit if someone had been denied an opportunity to file an application or to take the examination or to register, or even had protested and had been arrested on that account, or if someone wanted to test the legality of an arrest. But this is a broadside lawsuit, in the absence of an application by anyone to have the law-enforcement machinery used to enjoin such action. It has not been charged that there has been a violation of anyone's right. It is to that point that I addressed my remarks.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I only say that when it appears that in a particular community it would be unhealthy for some persons to register and to vote, the U.S. Government has a right to take action. In my opinion, those who at least seemingly make the situation look unhealthy have the burden to withdraw such barriers.

So I think the Attorney General is taking action in that situation; and I am glad he is doing so by means of action of that kind.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY—PLAN WITH SOVIET UNION FOR RECIPROCAL BURNING OF OBSOLETE BOMBERS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, at this time I see on the floor the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark]. Therefore, I wish to refer now, briefly, to a statement he made yesterday.

Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], had a number of remarks to make about my efforts to get a straight story from the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency on its plan with the Soviet Union for the reciprocal burning of obsolete bombers. He charged me with doing a "disservice to the cause of peace" by implying that officials of the Disarmament Agency are either guilty of crass dishonesty or are being misunderstood by newspaper reporters. He then went on to make out a case for the fact that the Disarmament Agency officials were misunderstood by newspaper reporters.

Mr. President, the whole episode goes back to March 9, when, in a speech I made in Aurora, Ill., I asked whether it was true that plans were in the making for the reciprocal burning of 30 American B–47's and 30 Russian Badgers, in a giant disarmament demonstration. On March 11, wire service stories which appeared in the newspapers reported:

> U.S. Disarmament officials deny that any plan has been shaped for reciprocal burning of bombers by the United States and the Soviet Union.

Now let me quote the reference by the Senator from Pennslyvania to the denial story, in his remarks on the floor yesterday. He said:

> This story which appeared in the papers on Monday, March 11, was based on telephone conversations between reporters and the Agency spokesman. These conversations took place on Sunday, March 10. On Monday morning, March 11, the Agency representative who spoke to the press the day before felt after reading the morning papers that his earlier comments to the newspaper correspondents evidently had not been clearly understood. To clarify any misunderstanding the agency at noon that day released the following statement through the State Department.

The statement referred to by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] was that the Disarmament Agency had been engaged in several internal studies, and that among them was the possibility of a simultaneous reduction of B–47's and Russian Badgers.

Before I proceed, Mr. President, let me quote from a press release which the Senator from Pennsylvania issued yesterday in support of his remarks on the floor. Here is what it said, in part:

> It is a disservice to the cause of peace to imply that honorable men patriotically and intelligently serving their country are either guilty of crass dishonesty or are being misunderstood by reporters. Neither charge is true. The first suggestion is inaccurate; the second, just plain wrong.

Mr. President, if my suggestion that Disarmament officials are being misunderstood by reporters is "just plain wrong," as the Senator from Pennsylvania claimed, why is it necessary for him to defend the denial story which was based on the conversations with the Disarmament official? Why is it necessary for the Senator from Pennsylvania to point out that, after reading the newspapers, the Disarmament official decided that he had not been clearly understood?

Another point I should like to raise right here is that if—as the Senator from Pennsylvania contended—the Disarmament official hastened to issue a statement clarifying the situation at noon on March 11, why did the press release referred to carry the date of March 12? Could it be that the testimony of Secretary of State Dean Rusk before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 11 prodded the Disarmament official to issue a clarification on March 12? In that testimony, Secretary Rusk told the committee that the bomber-destruction plan had been under study and consideration, and that the stories about a denial from the Disarmament Agency must have stemmed from a misunderstanding.

Another point made in the press release by the Senator from Pennsylvania was that the Disarmament Agency told the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth about the bomber-destruction plan. This raises several questions.

First. If the Disarmament Agency had told the whole truth—including the fact that the bomber-destruction plan about which I inquired had been under discussion—is it likely that competent newspapermen would have been so lacking in understanding that they would have taken that statement to be a flat denial of the plan?

Second. Why did it take the Disarmament Agency 3 days to tell the whole truth?

I submit that the fact remains that I asked a perfectly legitimate question, based on solid information; and the Disarmament Agency answered it in a fashion that caused most newspapers in the United States to publish headlines to the effect that the Government had denied the existence of a bomber-destruction plan. The fact also remains that the Disarmament Agency apparently did not get around to trying to correct this impression until after Secretary of State Rusk had testified that the denial story was erroneous. With the flow of news being what it is today, of course, the Agency's clarification never saw the light of day in any newspaper I read. So the public was left with the impression that the question I had put to the administration had no basis in fact. I say this was as neat an operation in news management—whether wittingly or unwittingly—as any I have witnessed since the New Frontier came into office.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to place in the Record two newspaper stories, one from the Washington Post of March 11, 1963, entitled "Plan To Burn 30 Bombers Hotly Denied," and the other from the Washington Star of the same date, entitled "Administration Denies Bomber-Burning Plan."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 11, 1963]

Plan To Burn 30 Bombers Hotly Denied

U.S. disarmament officials denied yesterday that any plan has been shaped for reciprocal burning of bombers by the United States and the Soviet Union.

The disavowal of such plans came as a result of a speech given in Illinois Saturday by Senator Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, a spokesman for Republican conservatism and a frequent critic of U.S. disarmament negotiations.

Goldwater asked, "Is it true that there are plans in the making to give up 30 of our B–47 bombers along with 30 Russian Badgers—that there then would be a gigantic bonfire in which all these weapons would be destroyed for the benefit of mankind?"

Goldwater said, "I have heard that the administration is seriously considering a pool with Russia to destroy weapons, item for item." He added this would be "stupid (and) ridiculous."

A spokesman for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency said he is puzzled by Goldwater's reference to 30 bombers and hazarded a guess that the Senator might have been confusing it with the figures in a proposed general disarmament treaty suggested by the United States at Geneva last summer.

That draft called for mutual destruction of 30 percent of all basic weapons in the first phase of a move toward general and complete disarmament.

> The proposals never got anywhere and one of the chief obstacles was, the spokesman said, that while the Russians agreed that there should be mutual inspection of the destruction of weapons, they rejected further inspection to determine what arms remained. The U.S. position was that there could be no destruction without the right of followup inspection.
>
> The spokesman said that in view of the failure of this broad proposal, there has been some internal discussion within the Government of less ambitious programs as first steps toward a general program which seems many years away.
>
> But, he said, none of these proposals has even been agreed upon internally, let alone offered to the Russians. He noted that destruction of 30 B-47's and 30 Badgers would be no more than a token gesture, in any event, since there are many hundreds of each type in service.

> [From the Washington Star, Mar. 11, 1963]
>
> ### Administration Denies Bomber-Burning Plan
>
> U.S. disarmament officials deny that any plan has been shaped for reciprocal burning of bombers by the United States and the Soviet Union.
>
> The disavowal of such plans came as a result of a speech given in Illinois Saturday by Senator Goldwater of Arizona, a spokesman for Republican conservatism and a frequent critic of U.S. disarmament negotiations.
>
> Senator Goldwater asked, "Is it true that there are plans in the making to give up 30 of our B-47 bombers along with 30 Russian Badgers—that there then would be a gigantic bonfire in which all these weapons would be destroyed for the benefit of mankind?"
>
> #### GOLDWATER STATEMENT
>
> Senator Goldwater said, "I have heard that the administration is seriously considering a pool with Russia to destroy weapons, item for item." He added this would be "stupid (and) ridiculous."
>
> A spokesman for the U.S. Arms Control trol and Disarmament Agency said yesterday he is puzzled by Senator Goldwater's reference to 30 bombers and hazarded a guess that the Senator might have been confusing it with the figures in a proposed general disarmament treaty suggested by the United States at Geneva last summer.
>
> That draft called for mutual destruction of 30 percent of all basic weapons in the first phase of a move toward general and complete disarmament.
>
> The proposals never got anywhere and one of the chief obstacles was, the spokesman said, that while the Russians agreed that there should be mutual inspection of the destruction of weapons, they rejected further inspection to determine what arms remained. The U.S. position was that there could be no destruction without the right of followup inspection.
>
> #### INTERNAL DISCUSSION
>
> The spokesman said that in view of the failure of this broad proposal, there has been some internal discussion within the Government of less ambitious programs as first steps toward a general program which seems many years away.
>
> But, he said, none of these proposals has even been agreed upon internally, let alone offered to the Russians. He noted that destruction of 30 B-47s and 30 Badgers—both obsolescent bombers—would be no more than a token gesture in any event since there are many hundreds of each type in service.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I listened with interest to the comments made by my good friend from Arizona. As a result of what he has said, I should like to ask him whether he is still of the view that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency executives were guilty of crass dishonesty by the issuance of deliberately false and misleading information.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I must say to my good friend from Pennsylvania that, unless we both admit that the newspaper people in this country cannot understand the English language, the executives were guilty of what I charged them with. The press must have telephoned them on Sunday after my speech on Saturday night, because on Monday morning newspaper stories were published in both the morning and evening newspapers, in which the headlines stated "Plan to Burn 30 Bombers Hotly Denied" and "Administration Denies Bomber Burning Plan."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, does the Senator yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I take it, then, that my friend from Arizona is still of the view that Mr. William Foster, who must bear the ultimate responsibility for what is done by subordinates in his Agency, and the other chief executives of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, are guilty of crass dishonesty, having issued deliberately false and misleading information.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If they accept the responsibility for the statement to the press on Sunday, I must make that statement.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. In the light of what the Senator from Arizona said on March 21, what I said yesterday, and what he and I have said today, I contend that we ought to let the record rest where it is. I reiterate everything I said yesterday. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I could not be happier than to let the matter rest. But I think it would be an injustice to the American people if what I have said had not been called to their attention. I say to my friend from Pennsylvania that the impression was so widespread that a newspaperman who is an old personal friend of mine took me to task sharply in a newspaper in California, pointing out that I was going off halfcocked, not knowing what I was speaking about. In effect, the denial by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency made me out to be a liar, although those words were not the terms used.

I think we have served our purpose. I still contend that the original release from the Agency on the Sunday following my speech was erroneous. I must consider that it was purposely erroneous because it was retracted and changed 2 days later.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to inquire of the Chair if I am correct in my assumption that during my absence earlier today the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] on behalf of the Committee on Commerce was accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. By unanimous consent, the Senate agreed to the amendment proposed by the Commerce Committee as a substitute for the bill (S. 6) as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, as amended, for the purpose of further amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of permitting me to determine whether a quorum is present?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I shall be happy to yield for that purpose, if I do not lose the floor.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arizona may be permitted to yield to me for the purpose of determining the presence of a quorum without his losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 20 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 26, beginning with line 6, it is proposed to strike out everything through line 23.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, for years I have based my opposition to Federal aid to education in part on the ground that Federal assistance inevitably leads to Federal control over the activity assisted.

No better example of the manner in which Federal domination follows the Federal purse strings has recently come before this body than the mass transportation bill we are debating today. Both

S. 6, reported by the Banking and Currency Committee, and the Magnuson substitute, approved by the Commerce Committee, contains a provision requiring as a condition precedent to the granting of any Federal assistance or financing of any project that arrangements be made by the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees affected by such assistance or financing.

Mr. President, I read the language from the bill:

> Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to—

I suggest that this is the pertinent and important language—

> without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary for (1) the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including continuation of pension rights and benefits) under existing collective bargaining agreements; (2) the encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights; (3) the protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment; (4) priority of employment or reemployment of employees terminated or laid off; and (5) paid training or retraining programs.

Mr. President, it should be fully understood that the language contained in section 10(c) of S. 6 and section 19(c) of the Magnuson substitute would place State and local governments and their subordinate agencies under the control, domination, and authority of the Federal Government with respect to their dealings and agreements with their own employees.

The enactment of this provision would represent a complete reversal of the public policy of the United States, which for over a quarter of a century, as enunciated in the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act, has specifically excluded, by definition, any State or political subdivision thereof from all obligations imposed by the Federal Labor-Management Relations Act, including the requirement to bargain collectively with representatives of its employees. Both the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act have long recognized the right of the States, local governments, and communities to regulate and manage their affairs and their arrangements with their employees free from Federal interference and control.

I might say in this connection, Mr. President, that many States have laws which prevent bargaining with unions in the area of public employment. This section of the bill would preempt such laws and such ordinances as passed pertinent thereto by the local authorities.

If my amendment should fail, I believe it would be advisable to refer this particular provision to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, so that the committee might give due consideration to such a far-reaching and novel proposal.

I do not believe it is proper to legislate in the field of labor in a mass transportation bill or, in fact, in any other type of bill; and I believe that historically the Senate has been very circumspect in paying attention to the prerogatives of the several committees.

If this subject had been given adequate discussion in the committee hearings there might have been some answer to the problem. I have been reading the transcript of the hearings. I noticed that Mr. Wirtz, the Secretary of Labor, as shown in his testimony, on page 308, gave to the bill the language which I have read, with the exclusion of "without being limited to".

In looking for further comments on this particular subject, I found that the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] questioned Mr. Wirtz, as shown on page 312. I quote the question by the Senator from Texas:

> I was particularly interested, because in my State it is prohibited by law for public employees to strike. And this would not affect that?

This is the answer which was given by the Secretary of Labor. It is a rather fuzzy answer, I must say.

> Secretary Wirtz. When you say "not affect" it, that would be a somewhat broader question. Surely on the question of superseding—I say "surely"; to the best of my knowledge—that is true. Now, whether there would be an effect I think is a somewhat different question.
>
> It is my understanding it could not change those laws. Now, I assume that this kind of provision would require the facing up to some problems which would be presented in that situation. I think they could be worked out.
>
> But I should like it quite clear that I think that there could be no superseding here of the State law.

That is not very conclusive language from the Secretary of Labor. I wish he had pursued the subject further and had been better advised on it, because it is my understanding that prior to the obtaining of any loan or grant under the terms of the bill all the provisions of the bill must be met. One of those conditions is the continuance of any collective bargaining arrangements which may have been made with a private transportation company which is about to be taken over by the local community, which means by the Federal Government.

This being true, if the language remains in the bill, the bargaining arrangements—which are quite unlimited because of the language reading "without being limited to"—would be so broad, in my opinion, as to allow the local employees engaged in transportation to strike if they felt a strike were necessary against the local government, or, in fact, against the Federal Government, because an arm of the Federal Government would be involved in it.

I have no objection to local employees having bargaining rights. I object violently to any employee of any government having the right to strike. I will defend the right to strike of any worker except those who are engaged in work for the Government. I do not believe they should ever be allowed this right, and they are not allowed this right under the Taft-Hartley law, section 2, paragraph (2), of which provides in part:

> The term "employer" includes any person acting as an agent of an employer, directly or indirectly, but shall not include the United States or any wholly owned Government corporation, or any Federal Reserve bank, or any State or political subdivision thereof,"

This same idea is perpetuated throughout our labor laws.

In the Fair Labor Standards Act, as amended, under section 3, "Definitions," subparagraph (d), it provides that:

> "Employer" includes any person acting directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to an employee, but shall not include the United States or any State or political subdivision of that State.

If this language remains in the bill, I am afraid we shall again be preempting established State laws, city ordinances, county ordinances or laws, whichever pertain.

As I said a moment ago, if the local government wishes to extend the collective bargaining rights, wages, working conditions, and so forth, with no right to strike, that is up to the local government, be it city, county, or State; but if the United States moved in with the language contained in subsection (c) of section 19, it would have the effect, I believe, of preempting State law in this area.

I wanted to bring this subject to the attention of my colleagues, because I could not believe that most of us would like to see that happen. I think this provision was put into the bill without adequate hearings or discussions. Had there been discussions, I feel certain that the very capable chairman of the subcommittee would have suggested that it go over to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on which he also serves so well.

That is all the discussion I care to make on this subject. It is a very plain case. Shall we preempt State and local law by the proposed act, or shall we allow State and local governments to grant that right if they so desire, or withhold it if they do not wish to grant it, without the right being preempted by the Federal Government?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Is the Senator aware that in the subcommittee, when the bill was being considered, a provision was included following the word "rights" in line 17 of page 26, "to the extent not inconsistent with State or local law"? In other words, the section read, "The encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights to the extent not inconsistent with State or local law." In full committee, the phrase "to the extent not inconsistent with State or local law was deleted."

Under those conditions, could it not be considered that it was the legislative intent that the laws of the States should be overridden and superseded?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Whether that was the intent or not, the result of the language of this section, to which I have referred, and to which I have offered my amendment, certainly would preempt local and State law. It cannot be read any other way. Even the Secretary was very fuzzy on this point. He did not think it would. We cannot take the Secretary's thoughts as binding in law and legislative intent. As I read the language, it would absolutely preempt State and local law.

Mr. TOWER. Furthermore, there was no testimony from the Administrator as to whether or not he thinks the language supersedes State or local law; and, after all, it is the Administrator who is going to make these decisions.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is absolutely correct. I said earlier, when the point was called to my attention by one of the witnesses who testified, that I was concerned about it. I was hopeful that the committee would drop the language and let the Labor and Public Welfare Committee study it. I have not followed it "down the road" far enough to know, but I have the feeling that this language could destroy the purpose of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. I am not a lawyer, but I have to follow my lawyers' advice, and they are pursuing this subject. But certainly, if we make interstate business what heretofore has been intrastate business, because we impose Federal jurisdiction, it may be that the application of section 14(b) cannot be applied to what is purely local business.

I feel that this provision goes much further than the committee realized, and further than many other Senators realize.

Mr. TOWER. I have it on the authority of a lawyer that it is an assault on section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Is the Senator aware of the fact that many States have laws that prohibit political subdivisions from recognizing unions as bargaining agents with reference to strikes and picketing? This provision would knock those laws into a cocked hat. I believe that 20 States have some kind of prohibition against strikes against public utilities. The proposed act would supersede those laws. At the very least, the Administrator could lay down, as a condition for giving aid, the condition that a State should have to revise its laws or make an exception to its laws to accommodate this program.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I invite the Senator's attention to the language of subsection (c) of section 19; namely:

> It shall be a condition of the granting of any assistance or the financing of any project under this Act that fair and equitable arrangements are made, as determined by the Administrator after consultation with and the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor.

I do not see any mention in that language of local, county, or State government. The condition of the granting of assistance is that these conditions, as a minimum, must be complied with.

As I have said, the language reads, "Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to," and while strikes are not mentioned, the language "without being limited to" is used. Then we go through every other operation of collective bargaining; and, as I have said, if it is the desire of the State or local government to grant that right, after it has become wedded to the Federal Government, it may do so. But let the local governments decide that question. Let not the Congress of the United States preempt State laws.

I do not think it is so important that we should continue to tear down further what I consider to be the great bastion of the 10th amendment, or the rights of States.

The rights under the Labor-Management Act have been granted and protected time and time again. This body overrode a Presidential veto which attempted to strike out section 14(b). Section 14(b) is one of the most important parts of the Labor Act. Of course, it is a target of organized labor. I do not believe this body or the other body should be partners in the crime of destroying the Labor-Management Act without adequate consultation with the appropriate committee.

Mr. TOWER. In practical effect, so far as the implementation of the law is concerned, it will not be Congress, but one man, who will have in his hands the power to abrogate, supersede, or nullify existing laws of State and local governments; namely, the Administrator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is correct. He would have to have the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, which would not be very difficult to obtain.

Mr. TOWER. No; not likely.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have been trying to analyze the language contained in subsection (c) to determine how far the Administrator could go in the imposition of working conditions and wages upon a city which might take over a private company under the proposed act. Let us assume that there is a private transit company which is shaky in its finances, and it is decided that a public transit company shall take it over. As a prerequisite to the right to obtain money from the Federal Government, the Administrator would first have to make provision for the preservation of the rights, privileges, and benefits under existing collective bargaining agreements.

Am I correct in my understanding that that would mean that the city or the public body taking over the shaky transit system would have to continue the collective bargaining agreement?

Mr. GOLDWATER. My answer to my good friend from Ohio is "Yes"; that they would come under the provisions of this language, even including the right to strike. If they were employed in a private transit company, they would retain those rights in Government employment by the language "without being limited to," and even without the language "as determined by the Administrator" they certainly would get into this area.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, to summarize, the Administrator would have the power to say, "Your application for aid will be denied unless you agree to collective bargaining and unless you agree that the right to strike against the municipality or other public body shall be granted"?

Mr. GOLDWATER. My answer again would have to be "Yes." It would be whatever the Administrator determined in each and every case. However, I certainly understand this language to mean that anything that is of a collective bargaining nature, including working conditions, hours, and wages, and pension rights, and so forth, including the right to strike, would go into the public body once it was transferred from the private sector.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Going to item 2, on line 16, he would have to make provision for the encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights. It is my understanding that the Secretary of Labor went one point further on that item, and he urged that this item 2 be retained as follows: I am now reading from page 308 of the testimony. He urged the "prevention of curtailment of collective bargaining rights." That language is in italicized type on page 308. The Secretary of Labor wanted to add a provision which would prevent the curtailment of collective bargaining rights. Obviously the committee did not go that far on that subject.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator will yield for an observation, the committee wisely did not accept that language, but I believe the language "without being limited to" very adequately replaces that suggested language.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Item 1 achieves what item 2 may not achieve. Let us go to item 3:

> The protection of individual employees against worsening of their positions with respect to their employment.

My inquiry is, let us assume that featherbedding caused the shakiness of the private transportation system's finances, and the public body takes it over and wants to eliminate that featherbedding. Could it be done under the language of this bill?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No. In the testimony, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] elicited from Secretary Wirtz this answer:

> Senator SPARKMAN. In other words, this would conform here with that?

He was referring to the Supreme Court decision on featherbedding.

> Secretary WIRTZ. Yes.

We have only the Secretary's own personal feelings there. There was no testimony by the Solicitor. No cases were brought up to prove that. Nothing was said except the word "yes." All the language that the Senator has read so far would, in my opinion, negate that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Well, to me it is rather clear that if he must make provision for the protection of individual employees against the worsening of their positions with respect to their employment, he could prohibit the elimination of their featherbedding jobs. I do not believe there is any question about subparagraph 3 meaning that very thing.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Ohio is a lawyer, and I have great respect for his ability. I am merely a layman. I have a divided opinion as to whether the Supreme Court decision could overrule the Administrator, or whether they might even go so far as to determine that this is intrastate, and thus keep it from under that decision. However, I would have the same fear the Senator

from Ohio entertains, that this could be done.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Supreme Court decision against featherbedding was made in the absence of statute. The Supreme Court said that the company has a right to determine how they will employ their employees. Here we have a Federal statute in contemplation which provides that the Administrator shall not worsen the positions. Therefore we have a completely different situation from that which prevailed in the Supreme Court case.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me see if I understand the Senator's contention. If there is featherbedding which is being practiced, and the company is transferred to the ownership of a municipality, and they cannot worsen the working conditions, they cannot, therefore, eliminate featherbedding. Is that correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct. That is the force of the language in the bill.

On line 19, the language reads:

> Priority of employment or reemployment of employees terminated or laid of.

That means that the Administrator will have to make provisions for the granting of priorities in rehiring of employees laid off.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then No. 5: "Paid training or retraining programs." That is understandable.

Now my question is, Does this not mean that the Federal Government, as a prerequisite to the making of these grants, can impose conditions of employment as the Administrator sees fit, conforming with the language that we have just read?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes, he can. I might add that these conditions of employment could be against existing Federal law. In other words, we could, by the adoption of this language, in one area of employment in our country go against not only the Labor-Management Relations Act, but also against the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As I understand, the language which the Senator from Arizona and I have been discussing has nothing to do with the general language contained in the Davis-Bacon Act. Is that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad the Senator has brought up that point. This in no way affects the application of the Davis-Bacon Act. It in no way interferes with the action of the Secretary of Labor in this general field of jobs involving Federal funds. That is contained in paragraph (a) of section 19. My amendment in no way affects that. My amendment merely gets at what I think is a back-door way of destroying certain parts of our labor laws and destroying State and local autonomy.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have not studied this item. Perhaps the Senator from Arizona has. Is there any other statute on the Federal books in connection with grants which contains a provision that seeks to give the Federal Government the right to establish working conditions?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If there is, I am not aware of it. I am informed that, outside the Davis-Bacon Act, there is no other law that can be applied. This then could become a precedent, and it could become an established part of any grant-in-aid program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would the Senator allow me to put a question to the sponsor of the bill, to ask whether there is any statute on the Federal books which now, as a condition to obtaining grants, imposes working conditions?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Well, we have referred to the Davis-Bacon Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We have conceded that. However, is there any other statute anywhere that imposes such conditions as a prerequisite to the obtaining of grants?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There are some areas that we all know of, where there is a Federal program, and where as a result of the Federal program individuals are adversely affected in working conditions, provision is made for training and retraining, and priority of employment.

The answer is "Yes." If by Federal action a man's working situation is worsened, we think it is fair and equitable to take care of him. That is true in the trade expansion program; certainly it is true in the railroad field, where mergers and consolidations have been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. I am sure there are other areas, too.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That does not apply to grants. My question deals with grants. Is there a Federal statute today which provides that unless these working conditions are introduced, the aid will not be provided?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I do not know if there are any. I cannot answer the Senator's question. If we never did anything for the first time, we would all be living back in the times and the dress of revolutionary days, never having left New Hampshire.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the Senator from New Jersey. Does he not believe it would have been much wiser to have had the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare hold hearings on this particular section? This section has a very heavy effect upon cities and communities.

Several men who testified before the Senator's committee told me about this. Two of them were mayors. They expressed great concern over the fact that this language was being made a part of a mass transportation bill, when it so vitally affected all sectors of the employment problems of local governments. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare might well have agreed to this language. However, I believe it is so vital and important that it should not be included in a bill which is aimed as a solution of transportation problems.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am sure that every measure of any importance is of interest to one or more committees other than the principal committee. We know that the bill under consideration has been thoroughly studied by two committees. Perhaps the Committee on Finance would be interested in the part of the bill relating to financing, and other committees might have a minute interest in the bill also.

This provision is truly ancillary to the thrust of the transportation program. It is only included in the interest of fairness and equity. If as a result of the expenditure of Federal funds, a railroad employee having a lifetime of contributions to a pension system were to lose it because his railroad was taken over by the public, that would be grossly unfair. This provision protects those rights which have been hard earned and enables them to continue.

The legislative history has to be corrected, however, because if the bill shall be enacted, we must have a record that will show that the bill does not preempt State law; it does not control or dominate with irrevocable authority local situations. The bill provides for the encouragement of collective bargaining. That does not put the force of a mandate on a community. Although I am a lawyer, I am rather rusty for lack of practice. However, I do not believe we can pass a law which would change State law; and we do not attempt to do so. The bill encourages collective bargaining.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield, that I may ask a question of the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MILLER. Is it the intention, so far as the Senator from New Jersey and the committee are concerned, to the best of the Senator's knowledge, that the provision which is the subject of the amendment of the Senator from Arizona shall not be inconsistent with State law?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is that another way of saying that it cannot preempt or be a substitute for State law?

Mr. MILLER. I should think so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is my answer. It was the same answer the Secretary of Labor gave to the committee.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield, that I may propound a further question to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. TOWER. If that is the case, why did we strike from the bill, reported by the Committee on Commerce, on page 26, line 17, the collective bargaining section: "to the extent not inconsistent with State or local law"?

If it is our intent not to be inconsistent with State or local law, why was that provision deleted?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The answer is very simple. The provision should not have been included in the first place. If we had not made a mistake in the first place by doing what was unnecessary, it would not have been necessary to delete that provision.

Mr. TOWER. I still do not understand the point in taking it out if, as the Senator has said, it is not the intent to be inconsistent with State law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Must we, in every paragraph of every bill, say, "The action under the authority of this legislation shall be in conformity with the Constitution of the United States"?

Mr. TOWER. What reflects legislative intent more clearly than the language which was deleted from the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am sure the Senator knows that if one makes a mistake, he should not try to preserve it. In our legislative history, shall we magnify a mistake which we made together?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield? I think I can suggest something which will perhaps clarify this point.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That was not the only change. I call the attention of the Senator from Texas to the fact that lifting the words "not inconsistent with State law," was not the only change that was made. The language was worded differently. We rewrote it to read "The encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights." The way it was originally written, with the words "not inconsistent with State law," it was virtually a mandate to continue collective bargaining rights not inconsistent with State law. The committee decided that it would be better simply to use the words "encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights."

Mr. TOWER. It would have been better if we had recognized that the trade unions do not appreciate this particular provision: "To the extent not inconsistent with State or local law."

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe the trade unions came in on that change one way or the other.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I point out to the Senator from Alabama that we would not need that second provision. We already have the language "the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits, including continuation of pension rights and benefits, under existing collective bargaining agreements."

The provision "the encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights" is redundant. I do not see that anything has been added. That provision could be eliminated. The language has been complicated.

The fact that the provision "not inconsistent with State or local laws" has been deleted does not have any effect.

My whole point is that we are attempting a major alteration in the Nation's labor laws, and are seeking to do it through a subsection in a mass transportation act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think there is a distinction. The language to which I was calling attention referred specifically to collective bargaining rights. The one to which the Senator from Alabama refers is "the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits, including continuation of pension rights and benefits, under existing collective bargaining agreements." That relates to agreements which are already in existence.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is the only place we worry about. The present State and local laws, in many cases, prevent certain kinds of bargaining. Mostly, such laws prevent striking. State and local governments provide for bargaining for working conditions mostly, but do not include the right to strike.

The preservation of rights under existing collective bargaining agreements is repeated:

> The encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights.

I am not arguing one point against another. I am arguing that the entire approach should not be in the bill; that if it is desirous to have such legislation, it should come as a major alteration to the existing labor-management act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There may very well be duplication; I do not know. I know that the language was written, it was done clearly with the idea that while there would be an encouragement of a continuation of collective bargaining rights, it was not intended to supersede State laws. I believe the questioning of the Secretary of Labor indicates our concern about that. It was not our intention to supersede State laws, and we do not intend, I am sure, to do so. We do not believe that the language has that effect.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If we are to depend on the Secretary's testimony for legislative history, neither side has much of a leg to stand on, because this language is about as fuzzy-wuzzy as any I have ever tried to read. It reads like some of the texts on proper punctuation, because when one gets through reading it, it is just a lot of language.

Mr. TOWER. Actually, the Secretary was testifying on the basis of the language he submitted to the committee, not the language which was finally provided in the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I admit that in reading the Secretary's answer, there is a chance of someone's misunderstanding it. But if the entire statement is read, I think we find that he clearly said it will not supersede State laws.

He was asked, "Does it affect them?" He replied, "That is different"—and it is. If it has any effect whatever on them, that would be covered by the word "effect." I think the Secretary was splitting hairs when he tried to make that distinction. Of course, it might have an effect upon State laws; but even in that connection he repeated his statement that it will not supersede or displace or override them.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me read what Secretary Wirtz said, as it appears on page 313. His statement was made in answer to a question by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]:

> But I should like it quite clear that I think that there could be no superseding here of the State law.

But that is not a statement on which one could rely with any conviction. He merely said he thought there could be no superseding of State law.

I may point out to the Senator from Alabama that this is one of the reasons why I grow so much concerned about this matter—namely, when I find that both of the committees are attempting to have the Senate legislate in a very sensitive field and thus amend legislation which has taken over 30 years to develop—a field so sensitive, indeed, that we do not dare deal with it on the floor.

So I think the bill should properly have been referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Alabama has a right-to-work law, under section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; and so does Arizona. Some persons believe that a back-door attempt to get at section 14(b) is being made.

The only statements to which I can refer in connection with this matter are some rather limited ones by Secretary Wirtz. The hearings on the other phases are quite complete; but this matter is entirely different, and is one in regard to a legislative field which is so sensitive that neither the Republicans nor the Democrats dare deal with it here on the floor—in other words, the question of how far the Federal Government can go in stamping out rights and laws of local governments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me point out that at another place Secretary Wirtz said "surely" this amendment would not supersede State laws.

Mr. GOLDWATER. On what page is that statement to be found?

Mr. SPARKMAN. On page 312, near the bottom.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But he added "to the best of my knowledge."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, he said "to the best of my knowledge—that is true."

But aside from this, that is something new. We tried to work out what we regarded as fair protection of the workers, without in any way trying to change the ruling of the Supreme Court on featherbedding.

The Senator noted that I was careful to inquire about that—and at the same time without superseding or doing away with State laws. I believe we did make sure of that. I believe we have worked out about as good a provision as could be obtained.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I must say that my experience in 11 years of service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in hearing testimony in regard to this delicate field, does not make me feel assured about this matter. Secretary Wirtz said, "to the best of my knowledge—that is true." The entire sentence reads as follows:

> Surely on the question of superseding—I say "surely"; to the best of my knowledge—that is true.

But if in the mind of the Secretary of Labor there is a question about the effect, I suggest that we should hold some rather deep and long hearings on this subject. The floor of the Senate is not the proper place for the original consideration of amendments to the labor-management relations law.

I shall not argue this matter sentence by sentence and word by word. I merely state that this is not the proper forum for such action on the national labor relations law. Therefore, I suggest that

the bill be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I do not know of any necessity to engage in a mad rush to bring about a change in this situation. Perhaps after further study is made I shall change my mind—although I may not. At any rate, I wish to learn more about this matter.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Did the Senator from Arizona say there is no mad rush to have this bill passed?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes. I see no reason why we should be in a great rush to give the President an Easter egg. I would just as soon give him a Fourth of July firecracker, or perhaps a piece of Thanksgiving pumpkin pie. This is a very important measure, and I do not believe we have to pass it in the next few weeks.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then I heard the Senator correctly.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Ohio certainly did.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me say that never before have I begged as fervently as I did to have the bill referred to the Commerce Committee, where it rightfully belongs. Finally, I was given about 10 working days in which to deal with the bill.

I assure the Senator that there is an intense rush to have the bill passed; that is my interpretation of the situation. I regret that in that respect I must disagree with the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Oh, no; the Senator from Ohio does not disagree with me. I said there is no mad rush to have the bill passed; but perhaps I should say there is no mad rush on the part of the Senator from Arizona. I think the Senator from Ohio should also hear more testimony about the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think there is an attempt to give the President an Easter present.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. After listening to the debate, it seems to me that we should be able to agree on an amendment. If I correctly understood the statements of the Senator from Alabama, the Senator from New Jersey, and apparently those of the other members of the committee, the intention is that anything done under this section of the bill shall not be inconsistent with State law. I believe that the provisions set forth in paragraph (c) have some merit. It seems to me that if we can do this consistent with State law, without superseding it, that will be desirable—in other words, to seek to preserve the rights, privileges, and benefits of those affected by this legislation and also the priority of employment and the pay for training or retraining programs.

If it is agreed that these are desirable provisions, on the one hand, and yet, on the other hand, that they should not be inconsistent with State law, it seems to me we merely have to insert a provision to the effect that these provisions shall not be inconsistent with State law.

If what I have proposed seems reasonable, I should like to ask the Senator whether it would be well to change the amendment, as follows:

In line 10, following the comma, insert the words "and consistent with the laws of the State in which the project or a portion of the project is located" so that paragraph (c) will then read, in part, as follows:

> (c) It shall be a condition of the granting of any assistance or the financing of any project under this Act that fair and equitable arrangements are made, as determined by the Administrator, after consultation with and the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, and consistent with the laws of the State in which the project or a portion of the project is located, to protect the interests—

And so forth. It seems to me that if we could adopt such language, we could reach an agreement. I think that such a provision would make very clear what we desire. Then we could get on with consideration of the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the point that I believe my friend from Iowa misses is that any provision at all of the type to which I have referred in the bill might affect a part of the Labor-Management Act and a part of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

I have serious concern that it could affect section 14(b) regardless of how the bill might be amended, other than striking the entire provision. Should we write in language "consistent with State laws," I point out that there may be States—though I do not know if there are any such—that already have right-to-work laws but have no laws applying in that field. So "consistent with State law" would open wide the field for destruction of that section of the Taft-Hartley Act. I would much prefer to get the feeling of the Senate on the elimination of the entire subsection, and if I fail in my endeavor, if the Senator from Iowa then wishes to offer his amendment, I would be perfectly happy to go along with it. I would like to have an expression of the Senate on my proposal to eliminate the entire provision.

Mr. MILLER. I share with my friend from Arizona his concern about amending section 14(b) through a back door. While I do not claim any expertise in the field of labor law, it seems to me that it would be clearly inconsistent with a State law which covers the subject of union shops to permit the Administrator, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, to act contrary to legislation in a State on that point in the face of language such as that which would provide:

> These equitable arrangements must be approved by the Administrator, the Secretary of Labor, and be consistent with the laws of the State in which the project, or a portion of the project, is located.

To have something like that happen would do violence to plain language. I suggest that if an attempt were made by the Administrator to take such action, a very successful case could be brought by the aggrieved parties.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, politics and lawmaking are arts of compromise, I suppose. I do not believe any language should be in the bill relative to that subject because it is not needed. Not only is it not needed, but also any language that we might insert would be dangerous to the existing law of a State, and a failure to recognize the right of the States in that field. It is also wrong to legislate in this sensitive and delicate field on another piece of proposed legislation. We are very careful about that when we refrain from legislating on many subjects, and when we in this body respect the prerogatives of the other body by not introducing and acting upon appropriation bills.

I merely point out that in principle the entire section is wrong, in this or any other bill. If the provision would be a good thing for the laboring people of our country, for the States, and for management, it should come before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and we should have adequate hearings on the measure.

I do not argue that the language proposed by the President might not be good in another case. But my particular objection is to the inclusion of any language of that type in a bill of this kind. If it is the desire of the Senate to have it, it should be included in a separate piece of legislation coming from the appropriate committee after proper study. With all due respect to the committee—and I have the utmost regard for all members of the committee—we could not call Secretary Wirtz's wobbly opinion of his own words testimony on which some future court or some future lawyer could lean. If we were to lean on such testimony, it would be like leaning on an old, rotten fence, which is likely to fall down because there is nothing to hold it up.

Much as I respect the Senator from Iowa, I shall not accept his amendment because I think the subject is a matter of law principle. It is a matter of Senate principle. Do we or do we not believe that we should amend the Labor-Management Act by a section appearing in a law that has absolutely no relationship to the act to which I have referred?

Mr. President, I have no further argument to offer on the amendment. I am ready to vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I feel that the debate has been useful. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] expressed the intention of the committee, which was necessary in this legislative debate. But lost in the discussion is the fact that while a few workers might be adversely affected, in the net there would be a great stimulus to the return to the railroads of workers who have been furloughed. There would be more employment in transit on the buses. So far as working people in transit are concerned, there is great hope for them in the proposed legislation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I could not agree more fully with the Senator. If the bill is passed, it should stimulate employment. But that has no bearing on the subject we have been discussing today. I believe there are 42 cities in the United States with a population of 300,000 or more that already have bargaining agreements with transportation unions. I am not concerned that the collective bargaining arrangements would be disturbed in the cities. I think they would continue. I do not wish to amend a very important law by the proposed back-door method.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have a unanimous-consent request to make. I hope that all bases have been touched.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow 1½ hours be allotted for consideration of the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche]; that 1 hour be allotted for the consideration of all other amendments, to be divided 30 minutes to each side; and that 6 hours be allotted for consideration of the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have a rather serious official mission abroad which will take me away Thursday night. I am sure the Senator is aware of it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am.

Mr. JAVITS. What is the intention of the leadership with respect to concluding consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It should be concluded by Thursday.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. I must leave about 4:30 or 5 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We shall do our best to finish. If necessary, the Senate can meet early on Thursday. Unfortunately, some proud fathers in this body must look after some princesses until the noon hour tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MANSFIELD. I missed one base.

Mr. GORE. I do not have an important mission abroad, but I have an important engagement in Tennessee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would be of equal importance.

Mr. GORE. Tennessee is not foreign territory. I was hoping the vote would come either tomorrow or on Friday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It could come tomorrow. We cannot tell. The pending request will give us an opportunity to sound out sentiment among Senators.

Mr. GORE. I think I am being sounded out on the vote. Under the circumstances, I object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is withdrawn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Goldwater] to strike out subsection (c) of section 19.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Mechem] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 63, as follows:

[No. 28 Leg.]

YEAS—27

Allott
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Goldwater
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Robertson
Simpson
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—63

Aiken
Anderson
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Engle
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Bartlett
Bayh
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, La.
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Beall
Bible
Monroney
Morse
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—10

Hayden
Hickenlooper
Kefauver
Magnuson
McGee
Mechem
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Smathers

So Mr. Goldwater's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe that this time I have not touched all bases, but I am not absolutely certain. Nevertheless, I should like now to renew the unanimous-consent agreement I sought previous to the yea-and-nay vote; but that instead of 6 hours of debate on the bill, I ask that there be substituted 4 hours of debate on the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. How much time will that allow on amendments?

Mr. MANSFIELD. One hour on all amendments, except 1½ hours on the Lausche amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Senator believe that we can finish with the bill some time Thursday evening?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We will do our very best.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator mean that we will do our very best to finish by Thursday or by tomorrow evening, if we can?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Tomorrow. We will do our very best to finish tomorrow.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. May I inquire whether it is the intention of the distinguished majority leader to hold the Senate in late session tomorrow evening in order to vote on the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope it will not be necessary, because of a commitment.

Mr. KEATING. I might say that I have a very important speaking commitment in New York tomorrow evening. I will be glad to stay as late as necessary, but would appreciate the majority leader's guidance as to what may be expected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, I believe the rest of us have a very important dinner engagement tomorrow night, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this evening it adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] and myself I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 26, line 10, after the comma, it is proposed to insert the following: "and consistent with the laws of the State in which the project or a portion of the project is located."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that 20 minutes of debate be allotted to the pending amendment, 10 minutes to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am trying to clarify with the majority leader whether any more yea-and-nay votes will be had this evening.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, during the discussion of the amendment of the Senator from Arizona I pointed out that it seemed to me, from the discussion that had been held on the amendment, most of us were in agreement that the points covered on page 26 of the bill, in section (c), are desirable. Furthermore, the opinion was expressed very strongly by the managers of the bill that there was no intention that State law be usurped or that anything be done under this section of the bill that would be contrary to State law.

The purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas and myself is merely to state what has been stated on the floor by the managers of the bill, and nothing else. The purpose is merely to write into the bill, so that we will have no question whatever, that the intention that has been expressed on the floor will be in the law and will be so interpreted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let us suppose that a project extends into two States. Does that mean that the law will be different in one State from what it is in the other State?

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator for making that inquiry. The amendment is designed to cover that subject. The language of the amendment provides that nothing shall be done by the Administrator——

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, may we have order? We cannot hear the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MILLER. The language of the amendment makes it clear that nothing shall be done by the Administrator which will be inconsistent with the State law in the State in which the project or a portion of the project is located.

The intention, of course, is that where there is a multi-State project, as, for example, a project in New Jersey and New York, the State law with respect to the portion of the project in New York would control, and the State law of New Jersey with respect to the portion of the project located in New Jersey would control.

In other words, we have tried in this simple amendment to express very clearly what I am sure is the intention of the sponsors of the bill and what the Secretary of Labor himself expressed was the legal meaning of the bill, but as to which he could not say definitely, because the language was not there.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I believe this is a good amendment. The intent has generally been expressed that we are not trying to break State law, we are not trying to supersede or nullify State law. Therefore, there does not seem to me to be any reason why we cannot provide specifically in the bill that our intent is not to supersede State law, and include a provision that the language will apply insofar as it is consistent with the laws of the States. That is the least we can do if in reality it is our intent not to try to nullify State laws.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, this proposition was discussed in connection with a previous amendment. It seems to me that we have one or two very simple propositions. If the requirement of the amendment that the program be consistent with State law is tantamount to meaning that the program cannot supersede or preempt or override State law, this is, in my judgment, a dangerous amendment, for one very important reason: It is unnecessary to include it at this point, because it gives the clear implication that it is needed. If the provision is needed, we will find, day after day in this Chamber, that it will have to be put in on the record made on this bill. I believe it is good doctrine that one should never write into legislation what clearly is unnecessary; to do so opens a dangerous precedent for the future. That is simply my position.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator recognizes that the mere opinion of the Secretary of Labor regarding the interpretation of the language of the bill would not stand up in court. What really counts in court is what the law provides. Now we have a chance, merely by adopting a simple amendment, to make certain, beyond any shadow of a doubt, what we are seeking to do.

The Secretary of Labor was honest in his statement. He indicated that what he was saying was his opinion. He "thought." He "felt sure." He "felt sure that was the way the law would be construed." He covered himself by making certain that he could not speak as a judge.

We are trying to make the language clear, so that there will not be any litigation and no question about the meaning.

If I gained the correct impression from what both the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Alabama said, the intention is exactly what the amendment provides. All we are trying to do is to make the intent certain, beyond a question of a doubt; and all that is necessary is to adopt a very simple amendment.

There is no intention to weaken the bill. Actually, this gives the section the effect which we seek. The provisions of this section are desirable provisions; at the same time, we want to make certain that the desirability is consistent with State laws.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It has been expressed that the Secretary of Labor did not express himself strongly in his language to the effect that this provision could not supersede State law. He said, "I think," and "I believe"; but it must be remembered that there is no one off the bench in this country in whom we can have more reliance for opinions on the language of labor law than Secretary Willard Wirtz, who has had a lifetime of practice in this field and is acknowledged to be one of the great labor leaders of the country. When he says, "I believe this is true," I will believe that it is true.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I will support the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower].

The Secretary of Labor stated in ambiguous terms that the language of the bill as now written could not impose conditions as a prerequisite to the right to a grant, if those conditions were in conflict with State law.

A reading of the language of the bill indicates to me that the Secretary of Labor made a statement that could not be supported by the language herein written. His answer was of a doubtful nature. His language was "if" and "but."

The proposal of the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Texas is to write into the bill language which will clearly carry into effect the purposes enunciated by the sponsor of the bill and others who support it. The language that is contemplated being written into the bill would appear on page 26, line 10, and reads:

> with and the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, and consistent with the laws of the State in which the project or a portion of the project is located.

The amendment contemplates that whatever conditions the Administrator shall impose must be consistent with the laws of the State in which the project is situated. I believe the amendment should be adopted. We ought not to leave the question in doubt. The language proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] clearly sets forth the intent that no conditions will be imposed which will be in conflict with the laws of the State in which the project is located.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York as much time as he may require.

Mr. JAVITS. I will take 3 minutes, if that is agreeable, to speak in opposition to the amendment.

The reason I oppose the amendment is that I believe the provisions with respect to labor are in balance now, so far as Senators like myself are concerned. I should like to state my understanding of the situation and why I believe the amendment will complicate it rather than improve it.

My understanding of the amendment is that the Secretary of Labor, under the bill, cannot supersede State law. If State law makes it impossible for the employees of municipal transit systems to bargain collectively, then it makes it impossible. There is nothing in the bill that can override it. Indeed, I doubt that the Constitution will permit it, and I doubt that it can be done under any phase of the Taft-Hartley law.

However, what it does, by not mentioning the proposition, is to enable the Secretary of Labor and the Housing Administrator, to go into a State where a right-to-work law or some other law deprives the municipal employees—that is, employees of the transit system—of collective bargaining rights. Perhaps because the Administrator has money to give out, some States may be induced to make some accommodation on that score by the necessary exemption from the law or any interstate compact entered into with other States.

Therefore, we have a balanced scheme. We do not override the law; at the same time, we do not compel the Federal Government to go in where the law is adverse to the interest of labor and labor's own point of view, and perhaps also even give encouragement to exempt a situation of this kind where the State desires to get this type of Federal help.

I think that is giving something on both sides, while at the same time not giving the Administrator instructions, which is what the amendment would do, that he must go into such States, notwithstanding the fact that the municipal transit system workers might be deprived of collective bargaining rights.

Therefore, I believe the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

It does not seem to me that every State having a right-to-work law necessarily creates an unfavorable climate. Texas is a right-to-work State, and Texas has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country.

What this amendment is primarily addressed to is the fact that many States have laws relative to public employees. For example, in Texas a political subdivision is prohibited from recognizing a union as a bargaining agent. Public employees are prohibited from striking or picketing. These are the things we are concerned about in right-to-work laws.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Missouri (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson]. If the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson] were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was resumed and concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 29 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Allott
Bennett
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Goldwater
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Johnston
Jordon, Idaho
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
McIntyre
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—52

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kennedy
Kuchel
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGovern
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—12

Byrd, Va.
Fulbright
Hickenlooper
Kefauver
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McGee
Moss
Muskie
Neuberger
Robertson
Smathers

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT THAT TIME LIMITATION START AT THE CONVENING OF THE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time limitation previously agreed to start at the convening of the session tomorrow, and not at the conclusion of the morning hour or the regular business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That on Wednesday, April 3, 1963, upon the meeting of the Senate, a yea-and-nay vote be taken on the Tower amendment No. 12 to S. 6, the Urban Transportation Act of 1963, and that during the further consideration of the said bill, debate on any amendment (except the substitute amendment (No. 18) to be offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] which is to be limited to 1½ hours), motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal. (April 2, 1963.)

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 12 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 12, it is proposed after "rights" to insert "to the extent not inconsistent with State or local law".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 10 minutes be allotted to the amendment, 5 minutes to be under the control of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] and 5 minutes to be under the control of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, by way of explanation, the amendment that I propose is one that was written into the bill in the subcommittee and was stricken out in the meeting of the full committee. The amendment would merely affect only one small provision of section 19, subsection (c). It would provide that the provision for the encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights would be not inconsistent with State law. It would affect only one of the many things that are listed here—preservation of rights, privileges and benefits under collective bargaining agreements, and so forth. It would apply only to the encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights. All I seek to do is to protect the laws of States which provide that political subdivisions may not recognize unions as bargaining agents.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the amendment really contains the same provision contained in the amendment just acted upon by the Senate.

Mr. TOWER. The amendment previously acted upon would have covered all of the so-called rights enumerated. The present amendment would cover only one. It would cover only the right pertaining to collective bargaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It seeks to accomplish the same objective?

Mr. TOWER. It seeks to accomplish the same objective.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Then the debate can be shorter; but it is the same debate.

Mr. TOWER. The amendment is addressed, however, to only one of the enumerated rights, whereas the other amendment was more comprehensive and addressed to all of them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that the amendment would eliminate from the bill the present provision that a State, or a portion of a State, to obtain a grant of help under this particular bill, would have to waive the applicable provision of State law, even if it provided a right-to-work provision by constitution? Would it have to negate that as a condition to bringing itself under the provisions of the bill?

Mr. TOWER. The provision is as follows:

> The Administrator after consultation with and the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees affected by such assistance or financing will make "protective arrangements."

The language continues:

> Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to—

One of the enumerated protective arrangements is—

> the encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights.

Such encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights would have to be consistent with the State law, if my amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would that not mean, unless the amendment is agreed to, that in a State which has a right-to-work provision under its constitution, the city which is seeking an advantage of Federal largesse under the bill would have to agree in advance that the provisions of the State constitution should be inoperative?

Mr. TOWER. It would have to make an exception to its own laws, if the Administrator decided this was a condition for giving aid.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement. My reasoning is the same as it was with respect to the previous amendment.

To provide specifically that the rights could not be inconsistent with State law would be to imply that without such language there is the possibility of the program being inconsistent with State law, which we know is not the fact. If the language is put in, it seems to me, while it might seem a small matter in respect to this bill, it would set a precedent for other legislation, which I think would be dangerous.

The provision is that there shall be encouragement of the continuation of collective bargaining rights. I do not see how encouragement could ever be inconsistent with any law—a local law, a State law, or a constitution. Encouragement relates to hope.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I invite the attention of the Senator from Florida.

I shall vote for this amendment because I think it is clarifying in nature, but I am not at all in agreement with the suggestion made by the Senator from Florida as to what the effect would be if the amendment were not added. All the way through our consideration of the bill our purpose was to draft provisions which were not inconsistent with State law. We repeated that statement over and over. We have repeated it on the floor this afternoon. It was not intended that the language was to supersede or override State law in any way whatsoever.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall vote for the amendment because I think it would make the language more clear. That was our intention all the way through. The testimony bears it out.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that the Senator thinks the inclusion of these words would carry out the intention of preserving and protecting State right-to-work laws?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think it would.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall vote as the Senator from Alabama indicates.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I still cannot understand how one could definitely say that the provisions of the bill would not be inconsistent with State law, when the bill has not been enacted and tested in the courts.

I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to make a brief statement while many Senators are in the Chamber.

The provision allowing the Administrator to establish conditions in working relations as a prerequisite to the right to obtain a grant is a completely new philosophy in government. Up until now there has been the right to impose the Walsh-Healey Act and the Davis-Bacon Act. If and when the bill is passed, any local or State government which wishes a grant will have to bow to the conditions of labor-management relations imposed by the Congress.

I say to Senators, "You are joining the movement to drive collective bargaining into State governments."

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] (putting the question).

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Texas said he would not ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas is not asking for the yeas and nays. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, there was a commitment made that there would not be a yea-and-nay vote. I should like to vote "yea."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to explain the situation. The Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] stated at the beginning that he would ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment. Then he indicated that he would ask for a voice vote.

The only reason why I have raised the question—and of course, any Senator can ask for a yea-and-nay vote—is that I believe both leaders informed Members on both sides of the aisle that it was their understanding that there would not be a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment, but only a voice vote.

That statement is made by way of explanation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Could we have the vote tomorrow morning?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator have any objection to a request for a division?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at all. I have no objection to a request for a yea-and-nay vote. I am merely trying to explain the position of the leadership in this regard, for we have unintentionally created an impression that there would be no yea-and-nay vote, and we may have been wrong in so doing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I request a division.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, if a yea-and-nay vote is ordered, that the vote be taken at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, immediately after the morning hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, with that understanding I now ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK and **Mr. ELLENDER** addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I should like to send to the desk, to be considered as an amendment to the bill after the vote is taken on the Tower amendment. I should like to have the yeas and nays taken tomorrow on this particular amendment, which does not deal with a labor problem, but deals with another situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a point of order. I do not think the Senator is in order in requesting a yea and nay vote on his amendment at this time, because the amendment is not the pending question. I assure the Senator that when his amendment becomes the pending question tomorrow we shall be delighted to assist him in having the yeas and nays ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Montana.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts.

EDUCATION FOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I introduced on Thursday, March 28, S. 1222, a bill to strengthen and improve vocational education in this country in the belief that this is a sensible, long-range method of alleviating the unemployment problem and at the same time easing the continuing shock to our economy caused by rapid technological changes.

I also offer it as an alternative to the youth employment bill (S. 1), which claims to answer in part the unemployment problem for youth, but which in fact only postpones facing this problem. And it is a costly postponement, in terms of wasted opportunity for young people as well as in dollars. We can afford to spend neither foolishly.

Statistics tell the story pretty well. The latest rate of unemployment for February is 6.1 percent, the first time the rate has topped 6 percent since December of 1961.

But even this figure is misleading if we consider the plight of the young adults who are unemployed. That rate is 2½ times the overall rate. In our present employment revolution the young and untrained citizens of our country are finding it increasingly difficult to find work.

The picture does not look any brighter as we look ahead. We have coming into the labor force between 1960 and 1970 some 26 million young people, many of whom will find no jobs available for them because they do not have the skills employers need.

That is the paradox in today's unemployment situation. At the same time that the President calls unemployment "our No. 1 economic problem," the "help wanted" columns of our newspapers are filled with offers of jobs. But employers have difficulty filling their needs. There simply are not enough trained people to go around.

The report of Secretary of Labor Wirtz last month on research and training activities under the Manpower Development and Training Act points up this situation.

In talking about the program under this act, the Secretary says:

> It is particularly concerned with the anomaly of persistent unemployment amid shortages of workers qualified to fill existing job openings.
>
> This failure to mesh available jobs with available jobseekers is the result of economic developments which have been operating for some time—

He continues:

> Among these developments are: the emergence of new industries and products and the decline of older ones; the impact of new technologies, notably automation; shifts in the location of industries; shifts in market demands; the effects of foreign competition; and the entry of vast numbers of youth into the labor force.

In a later published statement, the Secretary comments about the need "to work out a complete new kind of training program, one which is going to involve integration of the system of education with the new demands of the job market. That is going to involve a much heavier demand on our facilities for vocational education," he said.

Some steps have been taken to solve this gap between available jobs and qualified applicants. The Manpower Development and Training Act just mentioned, which I supported last year, is one step, and a good one. There are other avenues for supplying the skills necessary for persons to get jobs. I am impressed with the opportunity a young man has in signing up for a training program in the military service, for instance.

But the chief source of trained jobseekers must come from an expanded, broad program of vocational training, or, as I prefer to call it, education for employment. Consider again these young people of our Nation who are entering adulthood. Some have completed high school but have decided not to continue their education. Others have dropped out of school for one reason or another as soon as they reached the minimum legal age for leaving school. There are few places ready to accept these youth in our rapidly changing labor market. Unskilled labor is needed less and less as machines take over much of the drudgery of industry.

These young people I speak of are simply not prepared, by today's standards, to get and hold a well-paying job. And the problem will almost surely get worse. "Automation" is still a new word in our vocabulary, and its tremendous effects need the searching examination which could be gained through a White House conference, which would be called if a bill I introduced earlier in the session were passed.

There is before the Congress a bill, S. 1, which seeks to answer in part the unemployment question. Proponents of the youth employment bill say this CCC-type measure will not only give jobs to young men but will provide "useful work experience opportunities" to aid them in finding jobs when they leave the Youth Conservation Corps. A second feature of the bill would provide State and local area employment under various levels of government. In effect, the young men would be doing jobs which do not now exist, and which, if they did exist, would not have attracted regular workers, anyway.

Frankly, if this were the early 1930's, I would vote for such a measure. But this is 30 years later and conditions are far different than they were then. At that time there was a desperation which caused men to welcome the chance for any employment at all. The Nation's economy was staggering.

Today we have a variety of economic cushions which help support a man and his family. We are also in the midst of a prosperous era.

Proponents of the bill cite its beneficial provisions as far as reducing juvenile delinquency and helping this country's needed conservation projects are concerned. As long as the measure is voluntary, however—and I do not see how it could be otherwise—there is going to be great difficulty attracting to it that segment of our young population which causes our delinquency problems. We should be getting some help in this area as a result of the Juvenile Delinquency Act passed by the Congress last year, and signed by the President last September 22. As for conservation, I would sooner support increased appropriations for existing agencies to carry out needed conservation work than to have gangs of inexperienced young men attempting the projects on a Youth Conservation Corps basis.

These two aspects of the bill—curbing delinquency and aiding conservation—are really side issues. The administration calls it a youth employment bill. Employment is the big problem. The chief trouble with the administration's proposal is that it simply postpones a long-range solution by putting thousands of young men on the Federal payroll. Regardless of what the bill's proponents say, I cannot understand how this outdoor work would give a young man the marketable skills he needs in today's job market.

Let me quickly say that I understand how the purpose of the bill can attract support. Who does not want something done to help these young people find jobs? But let us see that they have something to offer so they can both find jobs and keep them.

We come down, then, to a fairly simple proposition: Give these young men, and young women too, I must emphasize, the skills they need to fill the job opportunities. Give them a greater chance to learn to earn.

I realize this has the sound of an oversimplification. And it lacks the definite prospect of putting a specific number of people immediately to work, as would occur if the youth employment bill were passed and we were successful in recruiting young people for both the conservation and local employment job areas.

However, look at the alternatives. On the one hand, there is a new Federal sub-agency which, like most agencies, is bound to grow. There is a depression-type program operating at a time when this country is the model of successful free enterprise in the world. And there is at best a temporary solution to a grave and vexing problem which will only get worse if it is not faced squarely.

Simply, my bill provides for an expanded and improved vocational education system through cooperation with State vocational agencies on a matching fund basis. The purpose of the bill is plain: to help people get jobs by providing greater opportunities to learn saleable skills.

The amount of money provided—$150 million—is approximately $100 million more than is now being spent under existing Federal laws providing vocational education aid. I am in large part guided, in setting this figure, by the informed estimate of the National Vocational Education Association that this is as much as could be effectively utilized the first year.

At present the annual investment in vocational education in this country amounts to $250 million, with $117 million from local funds, $89 million from State funds, and $48 million from Federal funds.

Let me also mention this. My bill would not destroy any of the programs set up under the time-tested George-Barden Act of 1946. Instead, it updates vocational education legislation since that time and allows for expanded vocational education programs.

It is important at this point to emphasize that vocational education should not be thought of as applying only to highly skilled or technical trades. We need a wide range of skills taught in our schools—especially in the clerical, sales, and service fields which the Department of Labor's just-issued "Report on Manpower, Requirements, Resources, Utilization, and Training" shows to be growing rapidly. The summary report by the panel of consultants on vocational education, appointed at the President's request, also stresses the need for training in office and distributive education occupations. This report, issued last year, also calls for a broader vocational agriculture program.

We must see that persons in the "slow learner" category in our schools get at least a general preparation for employment. This is a group which I am afraid has often been overlooked.

One new type of vocational education facility is the area vocational-technical center which can serve a number of high schools. By concentrating tools and other training aids in one place and serving a large number of students, it is possible to provide the up-to-date instruction needed. We have an admirable example of this type of institution operating in Sussex County, Del., and I know a vocational-technical center can be a boon not only to the students themselves but to an area's economy.

While the provisions of this bill are intended principally to benefit the young people who are entering the work force, including school dropouts, it also allows for vocational training for older persons who are unemployed, in need of increasing their skills, or who have never worked but now find a need to do so.

A relatively small portion of the Nation's education budget is now spent on vocational education but at least the programs are sufficiently established to provide a firm basis for expanded training. Other ways of providing job training, effective as they might be in a limited way, do not have the broad base of a varied vocational education program administered by State vocational education departments which best know local conditions and employment opportunities.

I would like to point out that vocational education is not being proposed as a cure-all. Stimulation of our economy by one means or another will create additional jobs. But the point has to be emphasized that jobs alone are not the answer. We must have trained people to fill them and that is what I hope will be brought about through passage of the bill which I am introducing.

To further point up my contention of the need for training to fill the jobs, I would like to have inserted in the Record at this point a thoughtful editorial from the March 14 issue of the great newspaper, the Christian Science Monitor. It is entitled "Employment: The Challenge."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EMPLOYMENT: THE CHALLENGE

"The most pressing internal challenge before the Nation today," says President Kennedy, "is the achievement of full employment in the United States."

The analysis he and his advisers make is relatively familiar: Since 1957 the number of new jobs created annually has been only half as great as during the preceding decade—an increase of half a million jobs a year—not enough to employ the million new workers coming into the labor market each year.

Yet this is only one side of the picture. On the other are columns, even pages, of "help wanted" advertisements in local and metropolitan newspapers, lists of unfilled jobs at employment agencies, and employers who have given up trying to find certain skills.

This is not to say that large numbers of Americans are dodging work, though there probably are abuses of unemployment compensation to match the cases in which benefits ought to be lengthened. But many young Americans, whether through their own indolence or by public neglect, are not getting the vocational training needed to equip them with skills for today's jobs. And older workers lack the retraining that would make new companies want to take them on.

Lester Velie explored this situation in a trenchant article in the January Reader's Digest entitled, "Why Can't Johnny Get a Job?" He found thousands of well-paid jobs going begging but at the same time one out of every five boys between 16 and 19 looking for work without finding it. Why?

Mainly because Americans have permitted an appalling obsolescence in their trades and commercial high schools over the last 25 to 50 years. With emphasis on university degrees, "the job needs of the majority who will drop out or won't go beyond high school are largely neglected," says Mr. Velie. Only 4 percent of public school funds go for vocational training.

Vocational education has lacked status, equipment and manpower. For years, vocational instructors were left out of local teachers' associations. The ancient ovens in a baker's school or the battered gages in a metalworking shop would not train pupils for yesterday's jobs, let alone tomorrow's. And the pay offered to an instructor in plumbing or bricklaying was far below the going rate in the trade.

America will never meet its employment problem this way. Conservation corps and domestic peace corps might help a little. A cut in Federal income tax rates might help more broadly. And for a little while an easy money or lavish spending policy might help—though that way can lie "boom and bust."

But it would not take astronomical amounts of money to improve the country's vocational education establishment, certainly not as compared with Skybolts and moon shots. It would take some revision of the law passed in 1917 under which aid to vocational education still is distributed among American States with more emphasis on dressmaking and farmwork than on modern factory employment. It would take also a great deal of local attention to high school shop and commercial training.

But it might do more to solve unemployment than economic gimmicks.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I think that an expanded vocational education program is a practical, long-range way to attack the unemployment problem, especially as it affects the young people of our Nation. I hope that my colleagues will give this proposal their close attention and I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the text of the bill (S. 1222) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Education for Employment Act of 1963".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

Sec. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to authorize Federal matching grants to States to assist them in expanding and improving their programs of vocational education. These expanded and improved programs are to help provide the skills necessary for persons to get jobs. The programs are for students in high school, persons who have completed or discontinued their formal education and are preparing to enter the labor market, and persons who are already in the labor market but want to upgrade their skills or learn new ones. The programs are to be related to actual or anticipated opportunities for useful and remunerative employment.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1963

Sec. 3. The Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, 15aaa–15ggg), is amended to read as follows:

"SHORT TITLE

"Section 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Vocational Education Act of 1963'.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, $150,000,000, and such sums as the Congress may determine for each of the next four fiscal years, for the purpose of making grants as provided in this Act.

"ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

"Sec. 3. (a) Ninety-five per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the number of persons in the various age groups needing vocational education and the per capita income in the respective States as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year—

"(1) an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged five to nineteen, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

"(2) an amount which bears the same ratio to 20 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty to twenty-four, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

"(3) an amount which bears the same ratio to 15 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the product of the population aged twenty-five to sixty-five, inclusive, in the State in the preceding fiscal year and the State's allotment ratio bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States; plus

"(4) an amount which bears the same ratio to 10 per centum of the sums so appropriated for such year, as the sum of the amounts allotted to the State under subsections (1), (2), and (3) for such year bears to the sum of the amount allotted to all the States under subsections (1), (2), and (3) for such year.

The allotment to any State for any fiscal year computed pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this subsection which is less than the total amount apportioned to such State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, under the Vocational Education Act of 1946, and supplementary vocational education Acts shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the allotments so computed for each of the remaining States, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any of such remaining States from thereby being reduced to less than the amount apportioned to such remaining State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, under such Act or Acts.

"(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year for carrying out the State's plan approved under section 5 shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under such subsection for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use under the approved plan of such State for such year and the total of such reductions shall be similarly realloted among the States not suffering such a reduction. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during such year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

"(c) (1) The 'allotment ratio' for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income for the State by the per capita income for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75, (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be .75, and (iii) the allotment ratio of any State shall be .50 for any fiscal year if the Commissioner finds that the cost of education in such State exceeds the median of such costs in all the States by a factor of 2 or more as determined by him on the basis of an index of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the States as determined for such fiscal year under section 15(6) of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 645) (relating to Federal school construction assistance in federally affected areas), or, in the Commissioner's discretion, on the basis of such index and such other statistics and data as the Commissioner shall deem adequate and appropriate.

"(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner for each fiscal year, between July 1 and September 30 of the preceding fiscal year, except that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, such allotment ratios shall be promulgated as soon as possible after the enactment of the Vocational Education Act Amendment of 1963. Allotment ratios shall be computed on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes for a State and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for the three most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data is available from the Department of Commerce.

"(3) The term 'per capita income' for a State or for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for any fiscal year, means the total personal income for such State, and for all such States, respectively, in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year, divided by the population of such State, and of all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

"(4) The total population and the population of particular age groups of a State or of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the latest available estimates furnished by the Department of Commerce.

"USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

"Sec. 4. (a) A State's allotment under section 3 may be used, in accordance with its approved State plan, for any or all of the following purposes:

"(1) Vocational education for persons attending high school;

"(2) Vocational education for persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time study in preparation for entering the labor market;

"(3) Vocational education for persons (other than persons who are receiving training allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (Public Law 87–415)) who have already entered the labor market and who need training or retraining to achieve stability or advancement in employment;

"(4) Vocational education for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education program;

"(5) Construction of area vocational education school facilities;

"(6) Ancillary services and activities to assure quality in all vocational education programs, such as in-service teacher training and supervision, program evaluation, special demonstration and experimental programs, development of instructional materials, and State administration and leadership.

"(b) Five per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 2 for each fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner to make grants to State boards designated under section 5(a)(1), or with the approval of such board in any State, to local education agencies, and to other public or nonprofit private agencies or institutions in such State, to pay part of the cost of experimental, developmental, or pilot programs developed by such boards, agencies, or institutions and designed to meet the special vocational education needs of youths, particularly youths in economically depressed communities, who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education programs.

"STATE PLANS

"Sec. 5. (a) A State which desires to receive its allotments of Federal funds under this Act shall submit through its State board for vocational education, designated or created pursuant to section 5 of the Smith-Hughes Act (the Act approved February 23, 1917 (39 Stat. 929)), (hereinafter referred to as the 'State board') to the Commissioner a State plan, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

"(1) designates the State board as the sole agency for administration of the State plan, or for supervision of the administration thereof by local educational agencies;

"(2) sets forth the policies and procedures to be followed by the State in allocating each such allotment among the various uses set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) of section 4(a), and in allocating Federal funds to local educational agencies in the State, which policies and procedures insure that due consideration will be given to the relative vocational education needs of all groups in all communities in the State, and that Federal funds made available under this Act will be so used as to supplement, and, to the extent practical, increase the amounts of State or local funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the uses set forth in section 4(a), and in no case supplant such State or local funds;

"(3) provides minimum qualifications for teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, directors and others having responsibilities under the State plan;

"(4) provides for consultation with, and utilization of, the public employment services, including use of counseling and guidance services and use of occupational information supplied by such services in determining whether there is a reasonable expectation of employment in the occupations for which persons are to be trained;

"(5) sets forth procedures for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this Act;

"(6) provides assurance that the requirements of section 7 will be complied with on all construction projects in the State assisted under this part;

"(7) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this Act, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve a State plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), and shall not finally disspprove a State plan except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State board.

"(c) Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), any State which desires to receive a portion of its allotments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, or for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, or for each of such fiscal years, equal to the total amount apportioned to such State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, may do so if the State board files with Commissioner, at such time or times as the Commissioner may by regulation prescribe, a request in writing that the State plan approved by the Commissioner under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts be deemed the State's approved plan for purposes of this Act. Such State plan shall be deemed to be the plan of the State approved under this section for the purpose of entitling the State to such portion of such allotments for such year or years unless and until (1) such request is withdrawn by the State, or (2) such State plan or the State's administration thereof is determined by the Commissioner not to conform with the requirements of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, or (3) the Commissioner approves a State plan of the State pursuant to subsection (b) of this section.

"(d) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State board finds that—

"(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (b) or (c), or

"(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this Act (or, in his discretion, further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, the Commissioner shall make no further payments to such State under this Act (or shall limit payments to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

"(e) A State board administering a State plan approved under subsection (b) or (c) which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (b), (c), or (d) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record the Commissioner may modify or set aside his action. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"Sec. 6. (a) Any amount paid to a State from its allotment under section 3 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, shall be paid on condition that there shall be expended for such year, in accordance with the State plan approved under section 5, an amount in State or local funds, or both, which at least equals the amount expended for vocational education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, under the State's plan approved under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts.

"(b) Subject to the limitations in section 4(b), the portion of a State's allotment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for each succeeding year, allocated under the approved State plan for each of the purposes set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (6) of section 4(a) shall be available for paying one-half of the State's expenditures under such plan for such year for each such purpose.

"(c) The portion of a State's allotment for any fiscal year allocated under the approved State plan for the purpose set forth in paragraph (5) of section 4(a) shall be available for paying not to exceed one-half of the cost of construction of each area vocational education school facility project.

"(d) Payments of Federal funds allotted to a State under section 3 to States which have State plans approved under section 5 (as adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner in advance on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditures by the States of the funds so allotted.

"LABOR STANDARDS

"Sec. 7. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5), and (b) shall receive overtime compensation in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Contract Work Hours Standards Act (Public Law 87–581). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"DEFINITIONS

"Sec. 8. For the purposes of this Act—

"(1) The term 'vocational education' means vocational or technical training or retraining which is given in schools or classes (including field or laboratory work incidental thereto) under public supervision and control or under contract with a State or local educational agency, and is conducted as part of a program designed to fit individuals for useful employment as skilled workers or technicians in recognized occupations (including the occupations vocational training for which was assisted by Federal funds under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 and supplementary vocational education Acts, but excluding such occupations as the Commissioner determines, and specifies in regulations, to be generally considered professional or as requiring a baccalaureate or higher degree). Such term includes vocational guidance in connection with such training, the in-service training of teachers, teacher-trainers, supervisors, and directors for such training, travel of students and vocational education personnel, and the acquisition and maintenance and repair of instructional supplies, teaching aids and equipment, but does not include the construction or initial equipment of buildings or the acquisition or rental of land.

"(2) The term 'area vocational education school' means a school (A) principally used for the provision of vocational education to high school students, or to persons who have completed or left high school and who are available for full-time or part-time study in preparation for entering, or improving their situation in, the labor market, or to both such students and such persons, and (B) available to all residents of the State or of an area thereof designated and approved by the State board administering a State plan approved under section 5.

"(3) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.

"(4) The term 'State' includes in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

"(5) The term 'local educational agency' means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision in a State.

"(6) The term 'school facilities' means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment) and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvement) on which such facilities are constructed. Such term shall not include any facility intended primarily for events for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

"(7) The term 'high school' does not include any grade beyond grade 12.

"(8) The term 'Vocational Education Act of 1946' means the Vocational Education Act of 1946, as amended (20 U.S.C. 15i–15m, 15o–15q, 15aa–15jj, 15aaa–15ggg), in effect immediately prior to the enactment of the Education for Employment Act of 1963.

"(9) The term 'supplementary vocational education Acts' means section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U.S.C. 30) (relating to vocational education in Puerto Rico), the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 31–33) (relating to vocational education in the Virgin Islands), section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (20 U.S.C. 34) (relating to vocational education in Guam), all as in effect immediately prior to the enactment of the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1963.

"FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION PROHIBITED

"SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system."

SEC. 5. Section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U.S.C. 30) (relating to vocational education in Puerto Rico), the Act of March 18, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 31–33) (relating to vocational education in the Virgin Islands), and section 9 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (20 U.S.C. 34) (relating to vocational education in Guam), are hereby repealed.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have studied S. 6, the urban mass transportation bill, reported by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. I have also reviewed the amendments to be offered as a substitute for S. 6, reported by the Committee on Commerce. I find myself in total disagreement with the bill, as well as the proposed substitute.

I am opposed to this legislation on several grounds, most of which have been discussed and pointed out by the minority views of the members from both committees that considered the problem. I have found the criticisms, particularly those of my distinguished colleagues, Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia, and Senator PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, cogent and to the point. I am in full agreement with their thinking. In addition to the points they have raised in opposition to this bill, I would like to go one step further.

There is one main objection which should be raised to this legislation, but so far I have not seen it voiced by any of the dissenting members of the two committees which had this bill under their consideration. I shall get to that point further in this discussion.

First, let us consider some of the many objections that have been raised. High on this list is the excessive cost that is attached to this proposal. I note that S. 6 calls for an expenditure of between $500 and $650 million over the next 3 years. This is quite a large sum. It becomes particularly large when we consider the precarious budgetary condition in which our country finds itself today.

Over the last 25 years, the floodwaters of debt have slowly risen up to the chin of the American taxpayer. They are much like the fabled Tantalus of Greek mythology. It will be recalled that poor Tantalus was floating in a pool of water while just out of his reach was a limb by which he might pull himself up to dry land and safety if he could reach it. Each time he reached, however, the water would recede and make his effort in vain. Tantalus would try and try to pull himself from the water, but each time he failed.

Our Government has tried and tried to pull itself from the floodwaters of debt, but each time it has failed. Each year the promise of a balanced budget has hung just out of our reach. Each year, the promise that the debt will be reduced has been held before us, but like Tantalus, we never seem to gain it.

I do not believe that the floodwaters of debt will recede from the chin of the American taxpayer in the foreseeable future, but I, for one, intend to do everything possible to put these floodwaters back in the channels of fiscal responsibility. We have all heard much talk of budget cutting, yet when we come down to individual items, the talk seems to dissipate into thin air. Oh, yes, I know it well—how well I know it. I have spoken out continually and conscientiously for an intelligent and adequate program of economy. Yet, when support is needed and I knock on the door, nobody is at home.

Today, we are being asked to authorize $650 million of transportation aid to the large cities of our Nation. We are faced with this proposal even though the Federal Government is currently saddled with a $300 billion debt and even though we are scheduled to increase that debt during the current fiscal year by $10 billion. I do not believe the cities we are being asked to give assistance are in any such financial condition, at least I hope they are not, for if so, it does indeed bode ill for the Nation.

The $500 million expenditure envisioned in this bill is but a drop in the bucket of what this program, if adopted, will ultimately cost. I note this statement on page 6 of the majority statement of the Committee on Banking and Currency:

> Total capital requirements for mass transportation in the next decade were estimated at $9.8 billion by the Institute of Public Administration in its 1961 report to the Secretary of Commerce and the Housing Administrator. The estimates were rough approximations, but they were based on intensive study of published information and on-the-spot investigations in 26 urban regions. The $9.6 billion estimate was made up of the following: $2.8 billion for already planned new systems; $1.7 billion for extensions of existing systems; $4.3 billion for rehabilitation and replacement; and $1 billion for new projects being considered for initiation in the next decade. For all these purposes, the costs of rights-of-way and structures were estimated at $6.4 billion and rolling stock at $3.4 billion.
>
> Although the maximum theoretical Federal contribution of the total estimated $9.8 billion need could be $6.3 billion over a 10-year period, this assumes that Federal assistance will be sought for every single project, that every single application will meet the tests of soundness, feasibility, and consistency with the planning requirements of the bill. It also assumes that no part of the total cost can be privately financed with revenue bonds supported by the fare box.

I note that the majority of the committee assumes that the expense to the Federal Government will not be anywhere near the $6.3 billion figure quoted above. I find this assumption extremely faulty. According to the report, it is stated that Federal assistance will not be sought by every city seeking a solution to its transportation difficulties. Experience has proved, I believe, that those cities which will not seek such assistance if this bill becomes law and if this assistance becomes available, will be very few indeed. As an illustration of this, I might point out an example quoted on page 6 in the majority report. The report says:

> The Delaware Port Authority is constructing a high-speed rapid transit line between Philadelphia and Camden to cost about $55 million. Approximately $25 million will be met from the fare box, leaving a gap or net project cost of about $30 million, which the authority is prepared to provide from its own reserve funds.

I would like to repeat those last four words—"its own reserve funds."

In other words, Mr. President, the Delaware Port Authority, a local body, has moved to meet the transportation requirements of the Philadelphia-Camden complex, a local area. The local need is being met by the local people and this is the way it should be. I do not believe that the Delaware Port Authority would have acted to solve this problem on its own in using its own funds if Federal money were available.

That represents my second main objection to this bill. In addition to it being extremely costly to the Federal Government, with every expectation that the cost will double, triple, and quadruple in the forthcoming years, the bill puts the long hand of the Federal Government into one more local area where it does not belong. Urban transportation is a local problem, which is open to local solution. There is no need for a gigantic Federal program to step in with its financing and, naturally enough, with its control. I think the evidence clearly indicates that where there are urban transportation problems and where those problems are great enough, the local community will stir itself to find solutions. I turn again to the majority report to find justification for this view.

On page 9 of the report, the majority cites a situation prevailing in Pensacola, Fla. The transit company there is operating with 22 buses, mostly old. It has been suffering from a drop in patronage over the last 5 years and last year lost about $8,000. I now quote two paragraphs from that portion of the report:

> Company officials estimate that if the city of Pensacola were to purchase 18 new air-conditioned buses costing about $160,000 and lease them to the company with repayment over the life of the equipment, this would produce a savings of $10,000 in maintenance and $35,000 in depreciation savings from nonownership of the equipment thus eliminating their present deficit.
>
> Based on their knowledge of the reversal of ridership in San Antonio when air-conditioned buses were installed, these officials believe they would also be able to halt the decline in their ridership which, if accomplished, would enable them to stay in business indefinitely without further assistance.

I now ask why the city of Pensacola, Fla., could not issue revenue bonds, set aside part of its tax revenue, give tax reductions or exemptions to this local transit company, in order to raise the funds which apparently are needed for the transportation system. The majority says that "any Federal assistance rendered in this situation would be of significant help." Naturally it would be of help. Anywhere we make cheap money available with a minimum of justification, we can be of significant help.

A second example which the majority cites as showing where this bill is needed is analyzed by Senator ROBERTSON in his dissenting view. I refer to the example of the Boston & Maine Railroad, which the committee says is "showing results which are attracting nationwide attention." The Senator from Virginia analyzes this example on page 39 as follows:

> An indication of the probable cost is shown by the experiment with the Boston & Maine Railroad. This road was given a subsidy of over $2 million a year for passenger service in return for which it agreed to run more trains and charge lower fares. The number of former highway users who are now using that train service is too inconsequential to affect traffic congestion, and yet that subsidy is costing taxpayers about $1 a day for each passenger being carried under the subsidy program.

I submit that any subsidy which is costing taxpayers about $1 a day for each subsidized passenger should attract nationwide attention.

My good friend from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], goes on to point out that many, many people in the cities would prefer to live in the country; at the same time the money to be made in the city is usually much greater than that to be made in the country. As a result, every individual must weigh in the balance whether he or she prefers city or country life. Some choose to live in the country and work in the city and these people make up the tides of humanity which flow and ebb over our city streets in the morning and evening. In effect, they are trying to have their cake and eat it too. Many of them have learned to their consternation that this cake is not so sweet and tempting as the frosting of country life and city wages make it appear. As a result, they are now calling upon Uncle Sugar to supply the sweetening in the form of cash.

Thus far, my criticism of this proposed legislation has been based, first, on the cost, which is almost certain to grow substantially greater over the next few years. We have seen that the $500 million expenditure represents a very small part of the $10 billion estimated need. I have not gone into the subject of backdoor financing which is contained in S. 6. That provision alone would be more than sufficient to warrant my opposition to this measure.

Secondly, I am opposed to the bill on the grounds that it is a further invasion of local rights and local responsibility on the part of the all-powerful Federal Government. My friend the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] goes into this aspect in detail in his dissenting view. He points out that several cities have attacked this problem on their own with gratifying results. He notes that during the hearings on this measure there was "no showing that our great cities are so lacking in financial resources that they are incapable of solving their own problems." He also says:

> It is possible that some cities may find that they desire mass transportation systems that cannot be financed by charging those who will use the system. In this case, as in Boston, San Francisco, and other cities, they may decide on a locally financed subsidy. But if this is inadequate, why should the Federal Government be called upon to pick up the bill for whatever economically unfeasible system of transportation local authorities may decide on?

He continues further to point out that there is built into this legislation incentives that will work in favor of elaborate, expensive investments that cannot be justified on the basis of what users can afford or will pay. He makes plain that—

> The most serious shortcoming of this program is that it will surely tend to discourage the hard, tough job of streamlining transportation operation to meet the necessities of population, location, income, work schedules. The political pressure for uneconomic schedules, and unjustifiably low fares is sure to increase with "Uncle Sugar" picking up the tab for two-thirds of additional investment costs.

But, Mr. President, though these criticisms are all extremely valid, they do not touch upon one of the most serious aspects or objections that I find in this bill. In my view, the most dangerous feature of this legislation is that it will put the Government into a large scale program of subsidizing transportation. It will set a precedent that can easily be extended; it will extend from the cities to the suburbs and grow until it reaches all across the country. With the Government subsidy will come Government control, and with Government control will come Government ownership. I have no doubt that many of the central planners in our Government cheerfully envision this prospect. They are looking for the day when a little group of men sitting behind mahogany desks here in Washington can control, by managerial edict, every facet of the transportation system which stretches across this great continent. To bring this plan into being, a start must be made somewhere, and I believe that the cities were chosen to form a first battleground.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the proposed legislation on the above grounds and because, in my opinion, it represents the first battleground in the fight for Federal control of our transportation system.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY TO MEET DURING SENATE SESSION ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS AT 10 A.M. WEDNESDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to have it clearly understood that at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning the Senate will vote. Not only will the Senate convene at 10 o'clock, but it will also be voting at 10 o'clock. The officers of the Senate will notify Senators between the hours of 9 and 10 o'clock that a vote will take place at 10 o'clock, so that all Senators can be present and accounted for.

A PROGRESS REPORT ON PROTECTION OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND HELPING TO ASSURE SAFE, EFFICACIOUS DRUGS—FDA STILL HAS A LONG WAY TO GO TOWARD SCIENTIFIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXCELLENCE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday I stated that I would report to the Senate on the protection of public health and the efforts which are being made in Congress, particularly in the Subcommittee on Reorganization, to improve the administrative action and structure of the Food and Drug Administration.

I note today that the Food and Drug Administration has made considerable progress in meeting the standards and goals we have outlined. For this I wish to commend them.

From time to time, I have reported to the Senate on the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee's study of "Interagency Coordination in Drug Research and Regulation." I shall do so once again today. I feel that the Senate and the Nation are entitled to a current account of what is being done in their behalf.

The views which I shall express are my own, based on evidence compiled by the subcommittee. On technical issues, the best medical judgment has been sought, since, as laymen, we do not attempt to render technical judgment.

It will be recalled that, on March 20 and 21, 1963, our subcommittee resumed its hearings. The subcommittee heard seven witnesses. The first—Dr. John Nestor—testified concerning his personal experiences as a medical officer in the New Drug Division, Food and Drug Administration. Six other witnesses followed.

ISSUES WITHIN FDA

I shall speak today almost exclusively as regards the issues raised by Dr. Nestor. His comments involved serious allegations about inadequacies inside the Food and Drug Administration. The agency and the Nation are, therefore, entitled to a further report.

THE SIX OTHER ISSUES DISCUSSED

I shall have more to say in the future about the comments of the other six witnesses.

But, briefly, let me list the six topics which they individually discussed:

First. Reorganization of the Food and Drug Administration and strengthening of policies of the Bureau of Medicine—Dr. Charles May.

Second. Avoidance of excessive use of psychotropic drugs by noninstitutional patients, and recognition of the extravagance and unsoundness of certain claims—Dr. Fritz Freyhan.

Third. Avoidance of overuse of antibiotics—Dr. Hobart Reiman.

Fourth. Improvement of clinical testing of drugs—Dr. Walter Modell.

Fifth. Improvement in standards of drugs for infants under 2—Dr. Norman Kretchmer.

Sixth. Reestablishment of a physician-to-physician, 24-hour-a-day, long-distance telephone communication service like the former mediphone—Dr. Cortez Enloe.

Each of these witnesses was selected with care. Each is a physician, recognized by his peers. None has less than a decade-and-a-half of medical experience. Each has repeatedly presented his views before the medical community, in significant articles, papers and statements. Each merited the further attention of the Senate and the forum of public opinion. Each commented on issues involving medical communication; that is, on improved exchange of information on safe, efficacious drugs, or on the side effects of drugs—or on a certain number of unsafe, ineffective, or useless drugs.

TESTIMONY SUBSTANTIATED ON THREE DIFFERENT BASES

Now, as regards Dr. Nestor, let me state the following.

Thirteen days have elapsed since his comments on March 20. During this time, the subcommittee has received additional strong evidence of the soundness of his presentation. This evidence has consisted of three types of support:

(a) Actions taken by the Food and Drug Administration itself, and by companies which produce certain drugs criticized by Dr. Nestor.

(b) The inability of the agency in its initial rebuttal to challenge successfully a single major point which he made.

(c) Additional information compiled by the subcommittee from other sources, from letters, telephones calls, visits and the medical literature.

ACTIONS TAKEN ON THREE DRUGS, AS URGED BY DR. NESTOR

First, as regards subsequent actions, let these facts be noted. Three of the drugs mentioned on March 20 by Dr. Nestor were: Menadione—vitamin K_3; Coldaid; PRN. In the last 10 days, action has occurred on all three, in a manner which had been urged by Dr. Nestor. Thus:

(a) In the March 28 Federal Register, pages 3051–3052, the Food and Drug Administration, after a 60-day waiting period, rescinded the right to include vitamin K_3 in prenatal supplements. FDA stated:

> The petition did not establish the safety of Menadione for this use.

(b) The day after Dr. Nestor's testimony, Coldaid, an antihistamine, which had never been cleared as a new-drug application, was withdrawn by the company. A week and a half before his testimony, Dr. Nestor had written to the company, notifying it to file for a new-drug application.

(c) The day after his testimony, the company which had produced PRN, an antihistamine which has also been used as a form of tranquilizer, voluntarily withdrew its new-drug application.

These were no small actions; each was highly significant in its own way.

Two of the actions, Menadione and PRN, had been long in the making; each action had, unfortunately, been needlessly delayed; each action—when it came—represented an advance in the protection of the public health.

The record shows and the record will further show—that Dr. Nestor's testimony was right on each of the three types of issues involved in these three drugs.

THE KEY ISSUE OF WHEN DOES FDA ACT

Of the three, the FDA action on vitamin K_3 was, of course, the most important.

In this action, as in virtually all actions involving the public health, the key question for the Senate to consider is: "Was the right decision taken by the Food and Drug Administration at the right time?"

Please note that to make the right decision, but tardily, is to risk the public health.

ACTION AT "TURTLELIKE" PACE

FDA ultimately did make the right decision. But it proceeded at a turtlelike pace.

Let it be carefully noted that FDA does have to satisfy detailed requirements of law. FDA does have to accord producers and owners of a drug their prerogatives under due process of law; that is unquestioned. But, within this statutory and administrative framework, FDA's supreme obligation is to the public health; FDA could have acted and should have acted with greater speed.

The food additive law—Public Law 85–929—has been on the statute books since September 6, 1958. That was 4½ years ago. To be sure, it does take a considerable time to begin implementation of a new law; 4½ years, nonetheless, is a long time.

The Menadione issue, itself, has been actively pending for well over a year.

What does a year really mean? For one thing, it means that 4¼ million American babies were born during that time period. It means that an uncounted number of pregnant women—nobody knows how many—might have taken vitamin K_3 on a prescription or over-the-counter basis. Dr. Nestor testified Menadione is present in 50 to 70 products.

Time is obviously of the essence in protecting the public health, particularly the health of pregnant women.

Exactly where and how time was needlessly lost can be spelled out only after exhaustive analysis of the file which is within FDA's own possession. But, our review of the chronology has already confirmed a needless loss in time, at several key junctures.

REPEATED WARNINGS IN MEDICAL LITERATURE

The regrettable timelag speaks particularly eloquently against this background—within a year of the enactment of the food additive law, the literature of medical science began to contain warning after warning against use of vitamin K_3 by pregnant women, particularly in high dosages.

The warnings were not merely in obscure journals; they were in the leading journals of the land, such as Pediatrics.

As in the case of most such medical comments, many of the authors invariably urged "more study" of vitamin K's hazards; the dangers were not regarded as absolutely conclusive. But, for that matter, scientists, with their usual reserve, may urge more study even when evidence mounts very sizably. For example, even after thousands of European babies were born deformed and apparently from thalidomide, there were still some scientists who sought definitive proof.

That was their prerogative.

But a regulatory agency cannot wait indefinitely for more study.

BURDEN OF PROOF WAS ON MANUFACTURER

For here is the crucial fact: The burden of proof was not on FDA to prove vitamin K_3 was unsafe. The burden of proof rested exactly to the contrary—that is, on the manufacturers to prove it was safe.

How could they prove it was safe if article after article contended it was potentially or actually harmful?

And, how could so much resistance within FDA be justified when the only pediatrician in the agency stated emphatically—over a year ago—that the medical literature contained adequate warning of hazard?

SENATOR HILL'S COMMENTS IN 1958

In the legislative history of the enactment of the law, we find the report by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as presented by its distinguished chairman, Senator HILL, on August 18, 1958. In reporting the amended version of H.R. 13254, 85th Congress, Senator HILL stated on page 6:

> Safety requires proof of a reasonable certainty that no harm will result from the proposed use of an additive.

He added:

> The safety of a given additive involves informed judgments based on educated estimates by scientists and experts of the anticipated ingestion of an additive by man and animals under likely patterns of use.

A WARNING IN 1959

But, if we look at the "educated estimates" of scientists, we see that their estimates ran precisely in the direction against use of Menadione, particularly at high dosages.

In Pediatrics, 23: 553, 1959, I repeat, 1959, J. F. Lucey and R. G. Dolan wrote:

> The assumption has been made that this is a harmless prenatal vitamin. It is being widely and needlessly used. This certainly does not seem wise.

That was 3 years—or, one might say, three times 4¼ million baby births—ago.

NINDB REPORT 4 MONTHS AGO

Here, however, is another crucial point. In December 1962 the National Neurological Institute prepared for the House Committee on Appropriations an 84-page report, describing the perinatal collaborative research project. The report is formally titled, "Report on a Collaborative Project for the Study of Cerebral Palsy. Mental Retardation, and Other Neurological and Sensory Disorders of Childhood." This is what the report states on page 26:

> In the last few years, it has become a practice to add Menadione to prenatal supplements, in dosages of 1–3 mg. daily. This dosage exceeds several fold that considered to be safe for the newborn, and since it is taken daily for many months by pregnant women, the question arises as to whether the Menadione taken by the mother is a factor in the hyperbilirubinemia or jaundice of her offspring.

The report goes on to say:

> The approach to the resolution of this question requires an adequately controlled clinical study.

On March 27, 1963, Dr. Richard L. Masland, Director of the National Institute for Neurological Diseases and Blindness wrote, in response to my request:

> In one of our collaborating institutions, a controlled study of the effect of Vitamin K in pregnancy already is underway. We consider this type of investigation to be one of the important potential areas of contribution of the collaborative project.

He was referring, of course, to the perinatal collaborative research project, the greatest in the world, I may add.

I am delighted this additional study is underway. But, the Federal regulatory process should not have to wait for study after study, particularly when the studies should have been made in the first place before the temporary petition was submitted by the manufacturers and allowed by FDA.

The question is: in the future, will FDA resolve reasonable doubts in favor of the public, including unborn babies?

The President of the United States has launched the greatest program in history to protect unborn babies. And I want FDA to become a real, operating part of that program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as appendix A, certain additional comments from the medical literature as regards Menadione.

There being no objection, appendix A was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPENDIX A

[Reprinted from Pediatrics, vol. 28, No. 3 September 1961]

VITAMIN K COMPOUNDS AND THE WATER-SOLUBLE ANALOGS—USE IN THERAPY AND PROPHYLAXIS IN PEDIATRICS

The present report concerns the nature and functions of natural vitamin K compounds and of some synthetic naphthoquinone derivatives, referred to as vitamin K analogs. The report emphasizes the use of these compounds in pediatrics, especially for prevention and treatment of hemorrhagic disease of the newborn. The demonstration that water-soluble analogs of vitamin K may be toxic for the newborn infant makes it imperative that these substances be used judiciously.

However, it seems impossible as yet to specify a maternal dose that will be both effective and safe for the newborn infant. It is not yet possible to specify a dose and route of administration of vitamin K for the woman in labor that will provide effective and safe prophylaxis for the infant.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

For reasons mentioned, it is recommended that vitamin K prophylaxis be administered to the infant after birth rather than prenatally through administration to the mother.

[From Pediatrics, June 1962]

HYPERBILIRUBINEMIA OF THE NEWBORN AND PRENATAL ADMINISTRATION OF VITAMINS

To the EDITOR:

It is now admitted that hyperbilirubinemia suffices to produce kernicterus in the neonate. Therefore, the prophylaxis of kernicterus parallels that of hyperbilirubinemia. Any factor thought to favor or induce hyperbilirubinemia commands full investigation. Among the different pharmacologic agents responsible for the production of hyperbilirubinemia, the administration of large doses of vitamin K or its precursors to the newborn has been incriminated in many instances.

Recently, I have come across two cases in which the ingestion by the mother of a multivitamin preparation containing 0.5 milligrams of vitamin K daily up to the morning of delivery was followed by the development of hyperbilirubinemia high enough in one case to necessitate two exchange transfusions.

RAYMOND G. D'ADESKY, M.D.
MARQUETTE, MICH.

(Editorial comment: Implicit in Dr. d'Adesky's letter is the common problem of identifying and assessing any single cause of neonatal hyperbilirubinemia. Perhaps the greatest difficulty is to ascertain in a given infant that any one of several factors, especially the iatrogenic, is not responsible. The problem is aggravated by nagging doubts as to whether all potential factors are yet identified.)

[From American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Mar. 15, 1963]

ARTICLE BY MIRIAM G. WILSON, M.D., ON "THE EFFECT OF MATERNAL MEDICATIONS UPON THE FETUS AND THE NEWBORN INFANT"

(By Miriam G. Wilson, M.D., Department of Pediatrics, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.)

Until recently, fetal effects of maternal medications have been studied primarily in relationship to congenital anomalies. Although teratogenic or potentially teratogenic effects continue to be of interest, increasing attention is being given to other fetal alterations showing administration of medication to the mother. Stimulating such study has been the relatively recent evidence that the placenta is not an effective barrier between the maternal and the fetal circulations. Substances found in the mother's blood, including proteins of large molecular size and red blood cells, may be transferred to the fetus. Whether or not placental transfer is of clinical significance for the infant needs to be determined for many different medications.

Another reason why maternal medications are being more carefully evaluated is that as fetal and neonatal physiological processes have become better understood, neonatal drug metabolism is found to be quite complex. The relationship of kernicterus and hyperbilirubinemia has encouraged investigation of the metabolism of many substances in addition to bilirubin. These studies have yielded information about the participating enzyme systems and individual variation in drug detoxification and excretion among infants of different ages. Drug metabolism may be a greater problem in the newborn infant because of drug competition for enzyme systems that are also very likely immature and inefficient. Further complicating the problem of neonatal drug metabolism, many new medications used in the management of pregnant women have become available, particularly tranquilizers, antihypertensives, diuretics, synthetic narcotics, and antibacterial agents. The effect of these substances on the fetus is not well known. Many drugs, harmless for the pregnant woman, may have unforeseen and undesirable effects on the fetus. In addition to the medications used for obstetrical conditions, a large number of drugs have contributed to the improved medical management of seriously or chronically ill pregnant women. More of these women, consequently, are now able to be delivered of viable infants, with medical complications, in some instances, attributed to maternal drug therapy. The important social problem of narcotic addiction, which does not spare the young pregnant woman, has also contributed to perinatal morbidity and mortality.

Some of the reasons for the increasing attention to fetal effects of maternal medication have been reviewed. Since the placenta is known to be an ineffective barrier between the maternal and fetal circulations, any drug dangerous to the infant may be considered potentially dangerous to the fetus when given to the mother. Certain specific medications known or suspected to show fetal or neonatal effects will be discussed.

SYNTHETIC VITAMIN K, NAPHTHALENE, AND OTHER DRUGS CAUSING HEMOLYSIS

Certain drugs are associated with increased jaundice and hyperbilirubinemia in the newborn infant, thus exposing him to an increased risk of kernicterus. Synthetic analogs of vitamin K, which contain the radical naphthoquinone, have resulted in neonatal hyperbilirubinemia when administered in large amounts. Menaphthone dipotassium bisulfate, a synthetic vitamin K preparation used in England, has not resulted in hyperbilirubinemia in premature infants, when given in total doses of 60 milligrams during the first 48 hours of life. The danger of synthetic vitamin K, when given to the mother before delivery, was not appreciated until Lucey and Dolan noticed in their hospital morbidity review an unusually high incidence of exchange transfusions in premature infants. Further review of the cases disclosed that certain mothers, just before delivery, had received menadione sodium bisulfite in high parenteral doses in the range of 70 milligrams. A disproportionately high number of their newborn infants had serum bilirubin levels above 20 milligrams percent, followed by exchange transfusions in almost all instances.

Hyperbilirubinemia following the administration of synthetic vitamin K is probably due primarily to increased red blood cell hemolysis. The manner in which hemolysis is produced in newborn infants is very similar to that seen in individuals whose red blood cells are genetically susceptible to hemolysis by fava beans and certain drugs. Hemolytic anemia in such susceptible individuals may follow exposure to naphthalene, which is similar in chemical structure to synthetic vitamin K, and to drugs such as primaquine, nitrofurantoin, phenylhydrazine sulfonamides, and other aniline derivatives. The extreme sensitivity of certain newborn infants to naphthalene is evident from some of the dramatic cases reported. For example, hemolytic anemia occurred in the newborn infant of a mother who ate mothballs during pregnancy to satisfy an inordinate craving for flavor. Another newborn infant had acute hemolytic anemia following the use of diapers that had been stored in mothballs.

The red blood cells of individuals susceptible to hemolysis from exposure to chemical agents appear to be genetically abnormal in that they are deficient in certain enzymes, such as glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase, which in turn maintains glutathione contained within the red blood cell in a reduced state. Reduced glutathione, in turn, protects the cellular hemoglobin from toxic effects by various drugs. Zinkham and Childs have observed that neonatal red blood cells incubated with vitamin K analogs show decreased glutathione and subsequent hemolysis. Neonatal hyperbilirubinemia from synthetic vitamin K, as well as from the enhanced sensitivity of the genetically predisposed individual, may be due to a glutathione instability of the red blood cells.

The dangerous ill effects observed when synthetic vitamin K preparations are given to newborn infants probably depend on cumulative effects. In one study, hyperbilirubinemia was not observed when as large an amount as 25 milligrams of vitamin K_1 was given intravenously the first day, but when the same total amount was given orally in five divided doses at 3-hour intervals, hyperbilirubinemia was found. Studies have not shown the hemoglobin to be decreased proportionately with the degree of hyperbilirubinemia. It has been suggested that the usual laboratory measurement of hemoglobin will not be affected unless the bilirubinemia is marked.

Some evidence suggests, in addition, that vitamin K analogs are hepatotoxic, especially in "sensitive" indviduals, including premature infants as well as patients with hepatitis. Hepatic damage has been observed in dogs given menadione sodium bisulfite in large doses (15 to 40 milligrams per kilogram per day for 15 days). Following synthetic vitamin K administration, serum bilirubin values have increased in patients with early hepatitis. As a further complication, vitamin K analogs may be partially excreted as glucuronides and, therefore, compete with bilirubin for the glucuronyl transferase hepatic enzyme system. Synthetic vitamin K substances, therefore, may produce hyperbilirubinemia in the newborn infant in at least two and possibly three ways.

[From Pediatric Herald, vol. No. 9, November 1962]

Drug Toxicity in Neonate Is Key to Suspicion of Fetal Risk

Chicago.—Drug toxicity in the neonatal period often provides a good index of suspicion of fetal risk, physicians were told here during a discussion of placental transfer of noxious agents.

Addressing the annual session of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Dr. Sidney Q. Cohlan, associate professor of pediatrics at New York University School of Medicine, said a painful awareness has recently developed that the fetus and newborn infant may respond very differently, sometimes with calamitous results, to the rapidly proliferating therapeutic agents.

EFFECT OF DRUGS

In a review of drugs that may induce morbidity in the fetus, he said fetal toxicity, by and large, parallels the known side effects in the newborn and mother. After discussing thalidomide, he made these comments on other specific agents:

Vitamin K's disputed role in the prevention of hemorrhagic disease of the newborn makes its routine prenatal administration open to question. "Certainly where the advent of prematurity is a possibility, prenatal use of vitamin K is a potential hazard."

OTHER DRUGS: COLDAID AND PRN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let us turn briefly to the other two drugs I mentioned at the outset.

With regard to Coldaid, the Food and Drug Administration had this to say in its public statement of March 21, 1963.

> Coldaid: This is an antihistamine preparation for the common cold. It was not regarded as a new drug in the reduced dosage in which it is being distributed until quite recently.
>
> The firm has been advised that it may not be distributed without a new drug application for the symptoms of the common cold.

It was Dr. Nestor who so "advised" the firm, as of March 8, 1963.

> The company had, in effect, marketed Coldaid at one dosage—without a new drug application; it had then come in with a new drug application so as to market it at a higher dosage. Under the circumstances, Dr. Nestor did not see how the original, uncleared, drug dosage could be allowed on the market while review was being made of a brand new application at a higher dosage.

The company has now withdrawn Coldaid, albeit "under vigorous protest."

I shall have more to say in the future about this matter of: (a) appearance of drugs on the market which do not receive the clearance of new drug applications.

(b) the inadequate procedure within FDA to prevent such marketing in the first place or to take prompt remedial action, once it is noted.

The issue of what is or is not a "new drug" is often exceedingly difficult and complex. A private decision may and often is made in perfect good faith that a drug is not a new drug; that, however, is not the paramount issue. The issue is: the establishment of a sound Federal system which will minimize possible hazard to the public.

I turn now to PRN—the trade name for Phenyltoloxamine. Of this product, FDA stated on March 21:

> Dr. Nestor asserts that one drug, PRN, was allowed on the market without the necessary chronic toxicity studies. Animal studies with the drug on dogs were regarded as adequate by our Division of Pharmacology and Bureau of Medicine. As an extra precaution, long-term rat studies were requested. This drug has not been distributed since 1961. It was discontinued because it was not profitable. No evidence that we have seen calls into question the original judgment on the drug.

Here are the real facts, as information reaches me:

(a) The original new drug application for PRN was made effective in 1957 with the understanding and condition that the company perform certain long-term chronic toxicity studies in rats and report the results to FDA.

The firm never sent these studies in until Dr. Nestor demanded them, some months ago. When the studies were received, the data raised considerable doubt as to whether the long-term toxicity testing established safety.

(b) Whether a drug is profitable or is being "pushed" by a company at any given time is hardly the question which should be of determinative interest to FDA. What should be of interest was that the company's new drug application was still effective. That was the crucial fact; it was so crucial that: (a) the company owning PRN authorized another company to use its files so as to remarket the drug; and (b) Dr. Nestor has strong doubts over some 25 new drug applications which also contain the same chemical ingredient, but at lower dosages. All of these new drug applications are now effective; the prescription and nonprescription drugs are now on the market. The whole files of these related new drug applications must now be reviewed, in the light of doubt over PRN.

SAFETY OF SERIES OF DRUGS MAY COLLAPSE LIKE "HOUSE OF CARDS"

I emphasize this last point. FDA approval of one drug may and does often serve as the foundation for approval of a whole series of drugs. If the safety of the first drug comes under a "medical cloud," so to speak, the other drugs' "evidence of safety" may also come under the same cloud.

I do not attempt to judge whether this or any other drug is safe or unsafe. I have merely described the doubts in the minds of medical and pharmacological officers. The fact that proof of safety does not exist does not, of course, mean that proof of harm exists.

But it can happen and has happened that a group of drugs, once thought "safe," collapses like a "house of cards," when the "foundation drug," so to speak, on which all others were based, is recognized as unsafe.

Unfortunately, I may add, the Food and Drug Administration does not have a satisfactory cross-indexing system as regards the thousands of drugs and chemical entities, reflected in new drug applications.

FDA's admittedly awesome burden becomes even more burdensome because it

has not equipped itself with the modern means, electronic data processing equipment, to handle its staggering load.

SUBCOMMITTEE'S FUTURE PROCEDURE

I shall not at this time attempt to detail a number of other serious aspects on individual drugs.

I shall merely say that the subcommittee will continue to proceed in an orderly fashion to get the facts and in fairness to all concerned.

I am inviting FDA's written reactions in as much detail as it wishes to express—to the criticisms made in the March 20, and for that matter in the March 21 hearings.

These written reactions will be studied in the light of facts to be gained from direct study of FDA files by the subcommittee's own staff.

I am content to let the facts—or lack of facts—in FDA's full files speak for themselves, adding only such evaluation as is necessary to provide a summarized but rounded picture. This subcommittee has always "done its homework." We prepare carefully. I have stated nothing in my public or private comments which is not backed up by solid medical documentation.

The subcommittee now confronts so many "leads" that it cannot reschedule public hearings until after the additional facts have been traced on which to base the soundest possible hearings.

It had been my hope to hold additional hearings on April 11. That is not feasible if full justice is to be done to the enormous amount of factual material involved. The subcommittee has, it should be noted, many other important obligations.

On this particular subject, we will want to hear from the American Medical Association and possibly other witnesses, either before or after official Health, Education, and Welfare Department testimony. A date for resumption of the hearings will be announced at the earliest practicable opportunity.

I may say, in addition, that we have a very considerable residue of material which we would have taken up at the March 20–21 hearings, had time permitted. We have covered only a fraction of the material already in our files—material of the type which commands the attention of the Congress and of the Nation.

VIEWS ARE PRO-FDA AND PRODRUG THERAPY

These views are presented with the goal of serving the health of the American people.

The views are based on deep convictions which are prohealth, pro-FDA, and prodrug therapy. But my convictions require frankness; we dare not ignore persistent conditions which are harmful to the best interests of health, of FDA, and the cause of pharmaceutical science.

The only purpose in identifying these conditions is to effect improvements. My goal is to help build a stronger, sounder FDA, a stronger sounder program of drug research, drug testing, drug evaluation, drug communication.

My goal is a Federal medical community—of 10 or so health agencies—which work together instead of living in separate worlds, as they have to so considerable an extent heretofore.

SUMMARY

How may we summarize the situation at this point?

First. The Food and Drug Administration still has a long way to go toward scientific and administrative excellence within the Bureau of Medicine and between that and other bureaus.

Second. There are twin dangers ahead but at opposite poles. At one extreme is the danger, feared by the pharmaceutical industry and, indeed, by many outstanding medical researchers—the fear that a Federal bureaucracy will grip the over 2,000 clinical investigations underway and that drug progress may be stifled; there is the fear that excessive caution, a tendency to panic, may doom otherwise worthwhile drugs whose value outweighs their risk.

The opposite danger, feared by the strongest supporters of the drug amendments of 1962, is that the letter and spirit of the new regulations may become dead letters, because of what they fear will be a continued, permissive attitude on the part of the Food and Drug Administration.

Either a dead hand of bureaucracy or a dead law would be intolerable, so far as I am concerned.

I cannot reiterate too strongly that we need to maintain a sense of perspective, a sense of balance, on drugs.

Fortunately, within the Food and Drug Administration there are some signs that neither of the above extremes will take place. I welcome such signs.

Third. The Food and Drug Administration will not make satisfactory progress toward excellence until it realistically recognizes its shortcomings of the past.

We must be assured that the blunders of the past are not repeated in the future. When I say "blunders," I refer to the tragic, inept handling of drugs such as Marsalid, MER/29, Altafur, and so forth, which took an awful toll in human suffering. The subcommittee is now publishing the chronologies of the Food and Drug Administration of actions on these drugs.

NEW YORK POST EDITORIAL COMMENDS SENATE DRUG HEARINGS

Mr. President, I believe that my colleagues will be interested in an editorial which appeared in the Monday, March 25, 1963, issue of the New York Post. The editorial commended the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee hearings. It concluded with the sound suggestion to the Nation "This is no time to take a sleeping pill."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Humphrey's Drug Hearing

The Senate could not have a more knowledgeable man heading an investigation of drug marketing safeguards than Hubert Humphrey, of Minnesota. A pharmacist himself before he turned to politics, Humphrey is in a uniquely informed position to evaluate the testimony being presented before his subcommittee.

In one of the developments, the FDA is challenging the testimony of its medical officer, Dr. John O. Nestor, who said it has overruled expert medical opinion and permitted the sale of potentially dangerous drugs.

Humphrey says he is unimpressed by the denials. The FDA will have a chance to defend itself at a public hearing in the near future when Commissioner Larrick and his associates will be subjected to cross-examination.

The Kefauver-Harris drug-reform bill, enacted by Congress last year, is a good measure, but its effectiveness depends on the way it is administered by the FDA. Without an infusion of new blood, Senators Kefauver and Douglas warned at the time, it was doubtful the FDA would apply the new regulations forcefully.

The main purpose of the Humphrey hearings is to revitalize the FDA by replacing tired old bureaucrats with scientist-administrators. It will only be achieved if the public pays attention.

This is no time to take a sleeping pill.

SUBCOMMITTEE'S FAIRNESS TO DRUG COMPANIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to make one additional point. It will be noted that in all of my prepared statements, I have identified drugs only by the name of the drug itself, and not by the name of the company.

Whenever one of these drug names is mentioned, however, I suppose that it is inevitable that the press will call to identify which company produces the particular drug. When we have been asked that question, we have suggested the names of standard medical publications where the information can be found, or have suggested that inquirers contact the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, the American Pharmaceutical Association, or other authoritative sources, or, if a press service urgently needed the information, we have provided the data directly.

In the hearings on March 20 and 21, it was, likewise, almost inevitable that the names of individual drug companies came out in the back-and-forth discussion.

Throughout this entire effort, however, we have endeavored to be absolutely fair. If any company has any reason to question the facts or policy assertions or conclusions expressed in the course of the subcommittee's work, I want to invite that company to file a statement with the subcommittee. We will then consider how to handle the matter in the fairest way possible. If it turns out that the subcommittee's record should be amended or supplemented in any way, shape, or form, we will be glad to do so.

I do not want the hearings or the testimony taken there to do any injustice. I want it clearly understood that if, perchance, any witness makes a statement which later does not turn out to be creditable or which cannot be verified, I want the record at that point amended so that the pharmaceutical manufacturer or the company which manufactured the drug will be given every opportunity in the record, as early as possible, to refute erroneous testimony. It is not the desire of the subcommittee chairman or of the subcommittee to do any injury whatsoever to any legitimate manufacturer or to any doctor or to any scientist or, indeed, to the Food and Drug Administration. We would like every company to recognize that our continued interest is in advancing the cause of pharmaceutical science.

Time and again I have been pleased to state that the American pharmaceutical industry is second to none in the world in its high standards; it is second to none, in comparison with foreign drug industries, in its contributions to research; it is second to none in its philanthropic efforts; it is second to none in the public services it has rendered.

At this point I note that the ship SS *Hope* has been supplied with literally hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of drugs, free of charge, from the American pharmaceutical manufacturers themselves, a fine organization representing some of the best companies in America. Dr. Austin Smith, who represents the pharmaceutical manufacturers, is considered to be one of the outstanding men in his profession. He is a very competent scientist, and is a man of the highest integrity.

The pharmaceutical industry faces problems which I have publicly identified and will continue to identify. The industry is entitled to fair play and respect, as is every American citizen or company; and that is precisely what we have been pleased to accord it, and will continue to accord it.

I may say that I would be particularly interested in reasonable treatment to the smaller drug enterprises which, in this highly competitive industry, inevitably face particularly difficult problems.

The subcommittee's focus, in any event, is on Federal activities. We are the Committee on Government Operations, and our stress is on what our U.S. agencies do or do not do, have done or have not done.

I repeat that I am going to pursue this inquiry without fear or favor, because we are dealing with a subject which affects the life, the well-being, the happiness, and the health of every American citizen; and I think it is the sworn duty of a Member of Congress to pursue his responsibilities and obligations with fairness, but with fearlessness; with prudence, to be sure; but also with a sense of public dedication. I shall attempt to live up to this standard.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HART. There is no doubt in the mind of any of us, Mr. President, that that is precisely the course which the hearings under the leadership of the Senator from Minnesota will follow; and that is consistent with his course for many years in the Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, I continue with my statement:

Fourth. The Food and Drug Administration needs frankness from its friends; but it also needs their support for adequate resources. The Food and Drug Administration must have more manpower, better salaries for manpower, better space, better equipment.

It would be cruel and unfair to ignore the enormous handicaps under which the Food and Drug Administration has labored. In many respects, the Bureaus of the Food and Drug Administration have done a remarkable job, considering the limitations imposed upon them. But, in other respects—including those I have enumerated—the Food and Drug Administration has made its own problems, or has failed to deal with its own problems.

Fifth. The Food and Drug Administration must have a topnotch Director of the Bureau of Medicine, and soon. A vacancy in so crucial a position for a period of as long as 1 year is indefensible. The Bureau has inevitably drifted like a ship without a rudder. The Commissioner had sought to fill the vacancy; but apparently the matter has been out of his hands.

Sixth. The Food and Drug Administration will never be able to do its job adequately until it is able to call on, and does call on, the resources of the U.S. Government and of the professional community. It has yet to do so. Other agencies have given it little attention. The U.S. Public Health Service and the Food and Drug Administration have acted like an indifferent married couple; they know they should "stay married," but they prefer to observe the union with gestures, instead of with real meaning.

As to private medical science, the Food and Drug Administration is beginning now, fortunately, to call on more private consultants, but still on a relatively spasmodic, ad hoc basis.

Seventh, The future of the Food and Drug Administration depends on this agency's personnel—their caliber, their morale, their leadership. It is they who will determine whether the agency will achieve true excellence.

The day must come when the existing nucleus of the Food and Drug Administration, of outstanding scientists, of dedicated inspectors, and of other personnel will modernize their own agency.

The day must come when the personnel of the Food and Drug Administration enjoy a reputation second to none in the esteem of the American people. This Nation is already deeply in the debt of Food and Drug Administration for many faithful services. The problem now is to extend this record into the other areas where even the agency's strongest partisan should be willing to concede the need for improvement.

A NEW HONOR TO COMMISSIONER LARRICK

Next month, at its annual meeting, in Bal Harbour, Fla., the American Pharmaceutical Association will bestow honorary membership upon Commissioner George Larrick.

Last year, it was my pleasure to receive the same honor, along with Sir Hugh Linstead, president of the International Pharmaceutical Federation.

I congratulate Commissioner Larrick upon this latest in a series of honors during his long career.

The Federal issues which I have raised and which I will continue to raise are issues of fact and policy. They are not, and never have been, issues of personalities.

The pharmacists, the M.D.'s, the Ph. D.'s, and other professionals who have written to me enthusiastically from all parts of the Nation have demonstrated their awareness of my desire to advance in a fair and objective manner the best interest of the healing arts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD: (a) An additional statement which I have prepared in regard to a goal I have long fought for—a national drug information clearinghouse. I include an excellent Washington Post editorial on this subject. (b) One of innumerable letters received from overseas—this one from Prof. Dr. W. Kroll, of the Federal Chamber of German Physicians, responding to my inquiry as regards collection of information on adverse reactions. (c) Finally, an article published in the distinguished periodical, the Reporter, of March 28, 1963. The article was written by one of the most knowledgeable journalists in the land on this subject—Mr. Morton Mintz. It was Mr. Mintz' story on Dr. Frances Kelsey and thalidomide, as published in the Washington Post, which triggered an incredibly beneficial chain reaction for protection of the public health. Mr. Mintz has subsequently and deservedly received the Heywood Broun and George Polk Awards for his reportorial feats.

There being no objection, the statement, the letter, and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY—AN IMPORTANT MILESTONE IN PROTECTING THE PUBLIC HEALTH: PROPOSAL FOR A CENTRALIZED DRUG-DATA INFORMATION SYSTEM

On Thursday, March 21, the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations heard important testimony on, among other topics, the critical need for a centralized system of drug information.

Coincidentally, that very morning, I received an advance copy of a welcome statement which was to be delivered that day before the National Federation of Science Abstracting and Indexing Services.

The statement was prepared by F. Ellis Kelsey, Ph. D., Special Assistant for Science Information to the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service. Dr. Ellis Kelsey is the husband of Dr. Frances Kelsey, the medical officer of the Food and Drug Administration who has been honored for her success in preventing the commercial introduction of thalidomide into the United States.

In his statement, Dr. Ellis Kelsey proposed the establishment of a National Drug Information Clearinghouse.

The full text of Dr. Kelsey's excellent speech will be printed within the subcommittee hearing record, volume III.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ELLIS KELSEY

I should like to congratulate Ellis Kelsey for his vision and enterprise.

It will be recalled that it was he who had arranged, on behalf of the Surgeon General, Dr. Terry, the successful Conference on Health Communications, held at Airlie, Va., in November 1962.

I had personally urged the calling of such a conference in a public statement [1] 6 months earlier on May 14, 1962.

---

[1] Release, Senate, May 4, 1962, "An Action Program for Strengthening Medical Information and Communication."

OPPORTUNITY CONFRONTING SURGEON GENERAL

It is gratifying to note that Surgeon General Terry is moving ahead expeditiously in this field of better communication.

The Surgeon General confronts many other problems and challenges. We, of the Congress and of the Nation, expect a great deal of him.

But, I believe that if he and his staff continue to spearhead this particular drive, we will all have great reason to be proud of the results which will accrue to medical and pharmaceutical science.

PROBLEMS OF A CLEARINGHOUSE

Bringing Dr. Kelsey's proposal into reality will require men, money, material, and time.

A "clearinghouse" implies cooperative arrangements between a wide variety of sources, both as to input and output. These sources would have to include, for example, the Food and Drug Administration, the National Institutes of Health, the National Library of Medicine, the Veterans' Administration and other agencies, as well as a wide variety of nongovernmental sources—the American Medical Association, specialty medical organizations, pharmaceutical companies (to the extent they feel it feasible, without endangering their proprietary rights) the American Pharmaceutical Association, and others.

The time to proceed on this effort is now. Too much time has already needlessly elapsed. Much of that time was lost, speaking very frankly, because the leading Federal agencies were, for so long, relatively indifferent to the problem.

The medical research agencies contended this was "not a research function"; the medical care agencies contended it was "not a service function"; most agencies looked to private efforts; private sources looked to supplemental Government efforts.

Month after month, year after year, I personally reiterated to all of them—in statements in committee, on the Senate floor, in the press and before public assemblies—the absolute importance of affirmative action.

What does the record show?

Who actually did what and when?

Who did not do what and when?

Let us see a few of the principal actions, step by step, over the past 2 years.

A 2-YEAR CHRONOLOGY 1961–63

June 20, 1961, I testify before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the need for centralized abstracting-indexing on all drugs.[2]

I point out that only the National Heart Institute is centrally abstract indexing its drug literature. I point out further the duplication and waste which occur when, entirely independently, other institutes or other sources later scan the very same journals for information on similar or other drugs.

March 20, 1962, I write to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, pointing out that there is still no comprehensive, departmentwide information system.[3]

August 1962, at hearings of the Senate Reorganization Subcommittee the Director of the National Institutes of Health concedes that only three of the then seven categorical institutes have a substantial drug information program. NIH reveals no plans as regards the other four institutes, nor plans for an overall interinstitute system, such as I had urged.

August 15, 1962, Senate Reorganization Subcommittee gathers information on the operation of Mediphone, Inc. For 4 months this service had provided 24-hour-a-day, physician-to-physician information on any of 9,000 drugs—on contraindications, toxicity, side effects, etc.[4]

September 21, 1962, the Director of the National Institutes of Health announces at our hearings the beginning of a more comprehensive drug information program.[5]

November 5–8, 1962, Surgeon General's Conference on Health Communication takes place, but fails to recommend a "drug information management system," such as was mentioned in a preconference working document.[6] The conference does urge "cooperation of all groups, governmental and nongovernmental, concerned with drug information" to establish a "worldwide drug information system." [7]

January 10, 1963, a panel on information of the President's Science Advisory Committee issues a comprehensive report.[8] It suggests that each NIH institute "consider establishing what would amount to a very elaborate specialized information center with services available to the entire biomedical community." This would include drug and nondrug areas and is precisely what I have been recommending for 2 years.

January 23, 1963, a specialized panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee comments on the great potentialities of computers in the life sciences. It states that "new information technologies would appear ideally suited to prompt recording, analyzing and reporting of any untoward effects" from drugs.[9]

March 16, 1963, Senate Reorganization Subcommittee releases [10] report, "The Nature and Magnitude of Drug Literature." The report, prepared by the National Library of Medicine at the subcommittee's request, estimates that 200,000 original papers in the pharmaceutical literature are prepared annually and describes other problems of elusive drug information.

March 20, 21, 1963, witnesses testify at Reorganization Subcommittee hearings on imperative necessity for improvement in drug information and evaluation resources.[11] The former head of Mediphone estimates that—for $200,000—he could provide its type of service on a contract basis to Federal agencies and the Nation's scientific community. He reports, however, virtually no previous interest in Mediphone on the part of any agency but the Veterans' Administration.

A LARGER SYSTEM OF SYSTEMS

This is where we now stand. Obviously, we still have a long way to go. But, let's not lose any more time. Let representatives of the principal drug information sources—the generators, packagers and users—work out together a common program.

And, let them plan it, as Dr. Kelsey rightly urged, as a part of a much larger, i.e. drug and nondrug health clearinghouse system.

To that I may add, let the clearinghouse for health sciences be recognized as an integral part of an overall system for all the sciences—the physical, social, mathematic, engineering and life sciences.

This is no idle dream. The fact is that parts of an "all-science" system already exist and are already functioning, but on relatively uncoordinated, disuniform basis. I refer to:

The very modern NASA system.

The system of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The system of the Armed Services Technical Information Agency.

The Science Information Exchange, etc.

The present patchwork should be transformed into a rational "system of systems," such as this subcommittee—its members and staff—have long proposed.

GREAT POTENTIAL ON USEFUL DRUGS

I predict that there will be a drug information clearinghouse and that it will be a great boon to medicine and to pharmaceutical science.

It should be pointed out, too, that in much of the advance thinking about a clearinghouse, its value has been mentioned as a means of calling attention to adverse drug reactions. The fact of the matter is, however, that the clearinghouse could serve for just the opposite objective also. It could and would call prompt attention to the beneficial effects of the vast number of efficacious and safe drugs.

And, it would provide varied information for the widest variety of audiences—for basic and applied researchers, administrators, drug companies, practitioners, pharmacists, other members of the healing arts, etc.

The clearinghouse could help further raise the high and well-justified confidence of the American people in the healing arts, including pharmaceutical science.

The type of dedication which Ellis Kelsey has evidenced should be paralleled by dedication on the part of all sources whose cooperation will be so vitally necessary. Exactly where the clearinghouse or system of clearinghouses will be established, under whose auspices, whose financing, whose "language" system, etc.—are important but hardly insoluble problems. Let us get on with the task.

[From The Washington (D.C.) Post,
Mar. 28, 1963]

AID TO HEALTH

The creation of a national drug information clearinghouse is a necessity if the public is to be given ample protection in this age of rapid development of new medicines. Many agencies are now assembling information about new and old drugs, but often one does not know what the others are doing. It is said that the National Library of Medicine collects drug information from 2,200 medical journals, but 1,800 other medical journals are not screened for this purpose. The mountains of information available in many different places will be of only limited service until it can be brought together in one place and systematically classified.

Perhaps the greatest use of the proposed clearinghouse will be made by the Food and Drug Administration. With its extended authority to pass on the efficacy as well as the safety of drugs, the Food and Drug Administration would doubtless have to create a drug information center of its own if one were not otherwise available. In addition the center should be of enormous value to the National Institutes of Health, the American Medical Association, the American Pharmaceutical Association, the drug-manufacturing companies and innumerable health agencies.

The net effect should be to hasten the detection of any harmful effects of drugs still in the experimental stage. On the other hand, the center could serve to speed the dissemination of information about new, safe and highly efficacious drugs. The large potential of the proposed clearinghouse has been fully explored in the hearings conducted by Senator HUMPHREY. No one appears to be in opposition. It remains for Congress to provide the funds, admittedly a sizable sum, to make this essential aid to health a reality.

---

[2] Reprinted in Senate Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, hearings on "Inter-Agency Coordination in Drug Research and Regulation," pt. 1, p. 140.

[3] Ibid., pp. 141–143.

[4] "Inter-Agency Coordination in Drug Research and Regulation," pt. 2, pp. 591–604.

[5] Senate Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, "Inter-Agency Coordination of Information," pt. I, pp. 115 ff.

[6] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Surgeon General's Conference on Health Communications," February 1963, p. 24.

[7] Ibid, p. 13.

[8] President's Science Advisory Committee, "Science, Government, and Information," The White House, p. 49.

[9] President's Science Advisory Committee, Life Sciences Panel, "Some New Technologies and Their Promise for the Life Sciences," The White House, p. 5.

[10] Release, House, Mar. 5, 1963.

[11] "Interagency Coordination of Drug Research and Regulation," pt. 3 (to be printed).

ARZNEIMITTELKOMMISSION DER
DEUTSCHEN ÄRZ TESCHAFT,
Göttingen, March 26, 1963.

Mr. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Chairman, U.S. Senate International Health Study, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY. The president of the Bundesärztekammer, Dr. Fromm, has sent us your letter of February 13 concerning the system of collecting informations on adverse effects of drugs and a warning service of the Federal Chamber of Physicians.

I have the honor to inform you. that the first steps to this system had already been done before the thalidomide tragedy had happened. It was after the spring meeting of the German Society of Internal Medicine in April 1961, that the drug committee of the Federal Chamber of Physicians published a proclamation asking all doctors to send any observation on adverse drug effects to the office of the drug committee. The publication of the proclamation has been repeated several times and is now going to be changed to a continuous publication in the journal "Ärztliche Mitteilungen" of the Federal Chamber of Physicians. At the same time we are now preparing a very simple form to be filled in by the doctors to make it as easy as possible for them to give the informations.

Since 1961 several warnings have been given to the doctors on serious side effects of drugs and in other cases we have urgently asked the manufacturers to give more detailed information on the side effects of certain drugs.

The activity of the drug committee in collecting information of side effects is now considerably intensified. Some time ago we have also contacted Dr. Norman DeNosaquo, secretary of the Section on Adverse Reactions of the Council on Drugs, Chicago, for exchange of informations. An exchange of informations is also being prepared with the members of the European Economic Community and will work as soon as in these countries a system of collecting informations and warning has been established.

Sincerely yours,
Prof. Dr. DR. W. KOLL.

[From the Reporter, Mar. 28, 1963]

NEW DRUGS: IS GOVERNMENT SUPERVISION ADEQUATE?

(By Morton Mintz)

"The more we have examined the handling of the new drugs by the Food and Drug Administration," HUBERT H. HUMPHREY told the Senate last October, "the more we have been surprised, shocked and disappointed. Often, testing has been going on in a manner which should have sent shivers down the spine of the medical profession—drugs intended for use by victims of chronic disease—day after day, year after year—were released by FDA even before—I repeat—before—chronic toxicity tests had been completed on animals * * * shocking reports of injuries and deaths to test patients, as received by drug companies, have often gone unreported to FDA, or have been downgraded by skillfully contrived half-truths, or have been reported accurately to FDA, but virtually ignored. Drugs have been approved which FDA now admits should never have been approved. Drugs have been kept on the market long after FDA admits they should have been eliminated * * *."

Senator HUMPHREY made these disclosures on October 3, 1962, just as the Kefauver-Harris drug-reform bill was being enacted into law. Many of its provisions, such as the requirement that experimental drugs be properly tested on animals before being tested on human beings, go a long way toward correcting the drug abuses that have been making headlines since Senator KEFAUVER began his investigation of the drug industry 3 years ago. Under the new law, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) can order a drug off the market instantly if there is evidence that it is an imminent hazard to the public health; drug companies must list the side effects of their products in their advertising; and a new drug must be proved effective as well as safe before it can be marketed. Furthermore, physicians must obtain the consent of patients before giving them experimental drugs, unless this is deemed not feasible or not in the patient's interest.

The FDA, moreover, has been given greater powers for factory inspection and quality control. In addition, tighter regulations for human testing proposed last summer by Anthony J. Celebrezze, the new Secretary of HEW, went into effect this February. These require that the FDA must be notified of all clinical (human) trials of new drugs, and that the FDA must be kept fully informed of what happens during testing. The clinical testing must be properly planned and executed by qualified investigators, and again must be based on adequate animal studies.

But the effectiveness of the new law and of the regulations depends greatly on the organization that exists to administer them. Senator HUMPHREY, the only licensed pharmacist in Congress, is beginning hearings on the FDA this month, but the Senate majority whip has already gathered enough evidence in the preliminary investigation by his Government Reorganization Subcommittee to cast grave doubts on the agency's use of the power it already had, let alone its ability to exercise more. And Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, far from being encouraged found in the belated issuance of the new HEW regulations "an unparalleled example of bureaucratic inertia." The fact is that the FDA could have issued them at any time since 1938.

That year marked the passage of the first significant drug-safety legislation since the FDA was established 56 years ago. It resulted from the disastrous carelessness of a manufacturer who the year before had marketed sulfanilamide in liquid form, using an automobile antifreeze as the solvent. More than a hundred people died. The 1938 law prohibited the sale of any new drug unless the FDA allowed an application for it to become effective. The FDA's decision was to be based on its evaluation of the animal and clinical testing reported by the manufacturer in his application. It was ruled that human testing was to be under the direction of an expert "qualified by scientific training and experience to investigate the safety of drugs." The FDA, however, has never set standards for an "expert," on the debatable ground that to do so would interfere in the practice of medicine. Even if this premise could not be challenged, the fact is that clinical testing is sometimes performed by research scientists who are not physicians. The new HEW regulations, moreover, set higher standards for the initial clinical tests than for those which follow, and their adoption by the FDA would seem to imply that the FDA agrees that it had some rights to set standards without interfering in the practice of medicine. Though FDA Commissioner George P. Larrick has complained that he could not find a consensus on the definition of an "expert," he has never asked professional or industry groups to help him obtain agreement and arrive at workable definitions. Nor did the FDA regulate or require reports on drug testing on humans.

The FDA was concerned only with the testing done on drugs for which marketing applications were filed. Currently, the agency receives an average of 375 new-drug applications a year, but manufacturers have been testing four to five times as many without reporting them. In 1959 alone, manufacturers tested 1,900 new drugs on humans. Since the Second World War the drug industry has expanded tremendously, and 90 percent of today's prescriptions are for drugs that were unavailable 20 years ago. Meanwhile, qualified investigators are in increasingly short supply, and some manufacturers have decided that the mere possession of an M.D. or Ph. D. degree in basic medical science is sufficient for clinical testing. "Nobody knows," HUMPHREY told the Senate, "how many thousands of drugs have been tested, have caused harm, have been shelved, and never reported, never discussed * * * the most dangerous part of the iceberg has lain below the surface."

OF MICE AND MEN

Though the new regulations finally require that the FDA be informed hereafter on all clinical testing while it is in progress, its past performance in evaluating the relatively few medical-research reports it did get has not been reassuring. Even less reassuring has been its anesthetized response to various cries of alarm.

"We firmly deny," Commissioner Larrick told Senator KEFAUVER's subcommittee in June 1960, "that new drug applications have been allowed to become effective on the basis of inadequate laboratory and clinical investigation work." The 61-year-old Commissioner has been with the FDA for 40 years. In 1955, a year after he became head of the agency, a citizens advisory committee had found cause to urge the FDA to develop better methods for evaluating new drugs. In June 1960, Dr. Barbara Moulton, a former FDA medical officer, testified before the Kefauver subcommittee that the situation was "extremely dangerous," in October of the same year she presented extensive evidence to document her charge, and in September a special committee of the National Academy of Sciences National Research Council called for remedial action "with the least possible delay."

In July 1961, Dr. Louis Lasagna of Johns Hopkins University gave the Kefauver subcommittee some insight into the quality of animal testing that sometimes preceded the clinical testing: "I have been approached to start human testing of a drug," he said, "with the only information available being the amount of drug necessary to kill 50 percent of mice receiving the drug in one intravenous dose."

There were warnings from the agency itself. In October 1961, an FDA statistician, drawing on 13 years' experience, said in a paper presented at a conference of FDA's top officials: "* * * the low quality of research data in NDA's (new-drug applications) is general and not isolated. Unfortunately for the medical officers, they must within short periods of time make decisions one way or another * * * they are forced to gamble; the information which they need to reduce almost to zero the risks of an incorrect decision too often is unavailable to them, because of weaknesses in research methods * * *."

But such criticism had little real impact on the FDA hierarchy or their superiors in HEW—until the scandal about the thalidomide sleeping pill. A number of details in that story, as brought out by Senator HUMPHREY's subcommittee, amply illustrate the shortcomings of FDA'S head-in-the-sand posture about drug testing.

Smith, Kline & French Laboratories of Philadelphia tested thalidomide in 1956–57, without any reported deformities resulting among 875 patients. Not having required

that it be informed, the FDA knew nothing of this until March 1962. In September 1960, the William S. Merrell Co. of Cincinnati filed an application to market the sedative. It came out later that Merrell and three other subsidiaries of Richardson-Merrell, Inc., ultimately distributed 2.5 million thalidomide tablets to 1,267 physicians for experimental use.

About a month after Merrell had first applied to the FDA, it issued to its sales force a manual on how to present physicians with its clinical-testing program for Kevadon, its brand name for thalidomide. "You can assure your doctors that they need not report results if they don't want to," the manual stated, "but that we, naturally, would like to know of their results. Be sure to tell them that we may send them report forms or reminder letters, but these are strictly reminders, and they need not reply. Let them know the basic clinical research on Kevadon has been done.

"Don't get involved by selling a basic clinical research program instead of Kevadon," the manual continued. "Appeal to the doctor's ego—we think he is important enough to be selected as one of the first to use Kevadon in that section of the country. Don't forget that you are a salesman, a professional salesman."

Perhaps such an approach to testing helps explain why the former Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, Dr. William S. Middleton, has found that "the desultory returns from over 1,200 physicians * * * could have no scientific significance or validity." "Yet," he added, "this formula for deriving new drug introduction and acceptance has obtained for many years." When the FDA finally investigated last summer, it discovered that only 276 of the 1,267 physicians had reported to Merrell in writing on their clinical trials, and further, that at least one-fifth had not signed the statement of investigative qualifications that FDA regulations required the manufacturers to obtain.

On November 29, 1961, a year after the company had filed its application with the FDA, Merrell learned from West Germany that thalidomide had been associated with birth deformities. The next morning it notified Dr. Frances O. Kelsey of the FDA, who had been withholding approval of the drug. At that point, Commissioner Larrick could have issued a public warning—the very course recommended by Dr. Herman I. Chinn, our deputy scientific attaché in Bonn, in a dispatch relayed to the FDA and HEW in January 1962. Larrick, however, chose to let the company handle the matter.

Why the FDA didn't undertake an immediate effort then to retrieve the drug puzzled Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, among others. He asked Commissioner Larrick during the preliminary investigation by HUMPHREY's subcommittee, what happened when Dr. Kelsey got the information.

JAVITS: "Then did you just talk to the company in general?"

LARRICK: "It was not conclusively proved at that stage."

JAVITS: "When was it?"

LARRICK: "There was strong circumstantial—there would be people who would give you an argument about it now . . . who would say that the problem here has been exaggerated."

Larrick admitted that the FDA could accomplish the retrieval of drugs more effectively than any company, but added that he was "not quarreling" with what Merrell did.

What Merrell did, according to its own report cited by HUMPHREY's subcommittee, was send a warning letter in early December, 1961, to its "active" thalidomide investigators, although the FDA was unaware that they represented only one-tenth of the physicians who had received the experimental tablets. Three months later, Merrell and its affiliates finally wrote all of them asking them to destroy or return the remaining supplies. "At the time," Commissioner Larrick said later, "I thought that was sufficient."

That it was not sufficient has become by now a familiar story. After reports published in mid-July of Dr. Kelsey's achievement in blocking the application of thalidomide, the FDA embarked on a crash program to ferret out the unsuspected numbers of tablets that had got into the hands of the public. A month later, the FDA, finding that substantial quantities were still at large, had to plead with the public to clean out medicine chests and flush all unidentified pills down the toilet. Nearly 21,000 persons in this country had obtained thalidomide from both foreign and domestic sources, and at least 9 women who took it during pregnancy bore babies without arms and legs.

DRUGS ON THE MARKET

Recently the FDA has decided that it does have a quarrel with Merrell, and it has asked the company to show cause why its method of distributing the thalidomide tablets should not be referred to the Justice Department for possible legal action. Thalidomide, at least, was never allowed to go on the market. Other drugs that had to be recalled were. One was Marsilid, and in its case the FDA displayed what can be called remarkable patience in dealing with its manufacturer, Hoffmann-La Roche of Nutley, N.J. Marsilid was first approved in 1955 for use, with limitations, in treating critical cases of tuberculosis. Later it was found to have effect as a psychic energizer, or "happiness pill," and the company applied for a supplemental new-drug application for its use in treating mental depression. But Marsilid also was associated with 246 known cases of hepatitis (liver damage), 53 of which resulted in death. At least 400,000 patients used it. Hoffmann-La Roche, it would seem from the account given HUMPHREY's subcommittee by the FDA, was rather casual in reporting some of the hazards of Marsilid. Although it received the first reports of deaths and injuries in connection with the drug in September 1957, it did not mention liver damage to the FDA until half a year later, in February 1958, when it asked permission to change the label. By the end of 1958, the adverse reports on a variety of side effects were mounting and the drug company asked for another supplementary new-drug application under which a brochure listing new restrictions on its use would accompany the drug. The FDA, in turn, suggested a strong warning to be printed in bold type on the label.

The strong warning was not put on, however, and during the next year the company continued to market the drug. Nonetheless, the FDA approved the supplemental new-drug application in January 1960. Seven months later, it renewed its request for the stricter warning label. Finally, in September 1960, its request was complied with, but the sale of Marsilid under a proper warning label was short-lived. It was withdrawn from the market the next January, because, as the FDA put it, "drugs with similar therapeutic usefulness but with greater safety were available."

But these drugs had been available and marketed since 1959. Moreover, the five Veterans' Administration hospitals that had tested Marsilid had discarded it much earlier, between December 1958, and June 1960, because of reports of "severe liver damage," "excessive toxicity" and—in a hospital system with more psychiatric patients than any other in the world—"limited usefulness."

Why did the FDA permit Marsilid to remain on sale until 1961? Larrick's explanation is that it was regarded as valuable in "near deathbed cases" but this was true only initially when it was used to treat tuberculosis, not mental depression.

Larrick has said that he is "proud" of the FDA's handling of Marsilid. Dr. Moulton, on the other hand, seemed prouder of the press when she testified about an earlier request to change the label. Marsilid's hazards, she said, "were well known in the Bureau of Medicine long before the newspapers began to carry reports on the subject. When this occurred there was prompt if not entirely effective action by FDA to revise the labeling. Prior to the newspaper publicity, however, we raised our voices in vain."

Another drug that had to be withdrawn from the market was MER/29, a Merrell product intended to reduce the amount of cholesterol in the blood, although the role of cholesterol in heart disease is controversial. Senator HUMPHREY has called the FDA's handling of the application for this drug "shocking * * * a sharp indictment of the FDA itself—its laxity, its tardiness in seeking to remove the drug from the market, its failure to protect the public interest."

The new drug application for MER/29 was filed in July 1959, and was assigned to a 32-year-old FDA physician who had only recently completed his residency in internal medicine. He was promptly contacted by Merrell's F. Joseph Murray. "The company was extremely anxious to get the drug on the market," the young man recalled. However, the report of the FDA pharmacologists on MER/29 was unfavorable. And, the physician said, he was aware that scientists at the National Institutes of Health were concerned about MER/29's effects. (Later, their research showed that in blocking the formation of cholesterol, MER/29 largely defeated its purpose by causing an abnormal accumulation in the blood vessels of a related fatty substance, desmosterol.) The FDA physician felt the MER/29 might be helpful in dealing with arteriosclerosis. Nonetheless, he repeatedly held back approval by judging the application incomplete because it failed "to report clinical studies in full details." But 22 days after he again made such a judgment, on April 19, 1960, FDA's young medical officer let MER/29 be marketed—before, according to Senator HUMPHREY, the "full details" were in, and even though he regarded its value as "theoretical." The new drug went on sale, not because its effectiveness against heart disease and arteriosclerosis had been established but "solely on the evidence of safety."

By September 1960, the FDA had so many disturbing reports about the effects of the drug—cataracts, baldness, changes in hair and skin color—that it asked Merrell to submit a supplemental NDA and to revise the label to warn against use of MER/29 in women of child-bearing age. Meanwhile the adverse reports continued to pour in. On November 16, 1961, FDA scientists recommended that the drug be withdrawn, but the FDA administrators did not suspend the application. For a total of 2 years the Merrell product, heavily advertised in medical journals, was profitably sold as a prescription drug and taken by more than 300,000 persons. Then in March 1962, by sheer accident, the FDA learned, as it reported to HUMPHREY's subcommittee that reassuring data in the NDA from tests on monkeys "had been falsified." The FDA investigation of this has been followed up by a Federal grand jury. In April, Merrell recalled the drug. In May, Larrick cited clinical evidence showing "that the drug was unsafe" and suspended the application. In August, the FDA admitted that the decision to allow marketing had been a mistake.

That decision was made 2 months before Larrick had told the Kefauver subcommittee that it "is extremely improbable" that falsified data would not arouse the FDA's suspicion, and "categorically" denied that the review of new-drug applications "may in some instances have been superficial." The criterion for release of a drug, he said, is whether "the good in saving lives and alleviating suffering clearly outweighs the hazards."

By a curious aspect of the FDA's decision-making machinery, approval of a new-drug application can be given by a medical officer "on his own initiative, without review by any of his colleagues," according to Dr. Moulton. And as Commissioner Larrick has testified, the medical officer's decision "represents an institutional decision that the drug is safe for use under the conditions and in the dosages prescribed in the labeling." But when a medical officer believed a drug to be unsafe and wanted to deny its approval, the situation was different. According to Dr. Moulton, he had to have "the unanimous support of the Chief of the New Drug Division, the Director of the Bureau of Medicine, the Commissioner, and usually also the Director of the Bureau of Enforcement and the General Counsel's office." The agency statistician described an FDA physician's plight quite well in the internal report already cited. "The medical officer," he said, "is in an untenable position because if he were to adopt the view that an application were incomplete unless the research supporting it were properly conducted, he would pass few applications. But this would result in a major shift in FDA policy, and have a far-reaching effect on a major industry. Clearly, a shift of this magnitude is not to be made by the medical officers."

In view of the medical officer's responsibilities, however, it seems strange, as Senator Humphrey points out, that the physician handling the NDA for MER/29 "never consulted with the National Institutes of Health before the drug went on the market. Nor did NIH initiate such consultation," although it "has been supporting considerable research on cholesterol-lowering substances."

This lack of communication between two branches within HEW particularly irritated Senator Humphrey, who for years has been trying to bring about a systematic exchange of drug data between the FDA, the hospital systems of the Public Health Service and the Defense Department, and the NIH, which "has the greatest pool of drug research information in the world." He has found "little systematic communication," even among the institutes of the NIH. The thalidomide scandal has brought Senator Humphrey some measure of success, however. The NIH, for example, is now methodically feeding the FDA the result of an electronic data processing survey of 50,000 pregnancy case histories, yet NIH's Director acknowledges that he is "not at all certain we would have done" precisely that if the thalidomide story had not been publicized.

As for the FDA itself, Humphrey claims that its high officials "have apparently been content" to let the agency "stagnate as a scientific backwater" despite the "deep interest of a few extremely talented M.D.'s and pharmacologists." The FDA's isolation has made it dependent, in many cases, on plain luck. The "falsified" MER/29 monkey data came to FDA's attention only because an FDA inspector happened to ride in a car pool with the husband of a woman who had quit her job in Merrell's animal research laboratories. Dr. Kelsey's determination to block the marketing of thalidomide was decisively hardened because she "chanced" to read a letter to the editor of one of the world's 4,000 medical journals, a letter that associated the drug with peripheral neuritis.

Humphrey considers it "a miracle that we learn as much as we do." Though many sources—such as pharmaceutical companies, the FDA, hospitals, the Veterans' Administration, and the NIH—compile data on reactions, they do not cooperate "to any real extent" with each other. According to Humphrey, the individual clinician "tends to be so busy that often his reports are a fraction of what they might be. This is a crucial point; it explains in part a tendency to overvalue fragmentary favorable reports." Although the FDA itself has had a small reporting program, involving at most 150 out of the Nation's 6,000 hospitals, Humphrey's subcommittee has "yet to find anyone who has substantially used this program or anyone at the reporting end who had received useful 'feed-back' from it."

Consequently, Humphrey found it "incredible" that the FDA had not made "systematic use" of outside consultants. Although the agency supplied him with a "nominally" long list of outside consultations Humphrey found it "completely misleading." "It pretends that an isolated telephone call or letter or short visit for a curbstone—I emphasize—curbstone judgment represented 'consultation.' I am surprised," he continued, "* * * that FDA states consultation has 'routinely' occurred. The men * * * inside the agency who have fought and begged for outside consultation * * * have been discouraged at worst, or ignored at best, from above."

PRESSURE AND PERSUASION

The atmosphere inside the agency apparently has been one of considerable discouragement from above, accompanied by constant harassment from some drug manufacturers. Dr. Moulton has told of cases in which orders came "from above" for medical officers to certify drugs about which they had doubts, the justification being that the manufacturers should "be in a much better position to judge their safety." She contended that in many of its activities the FDA had become "merely a service bureau" for the drug industry.

Dr. Moulton has also complained that manufacturers' representatives spend "3 or 4 days a week in the New Drug Branch offices, arguing each point step by step, wanting to know and being told exactly where the application is at all times and which chemists and which pharmacologists are assisting in its review."

One physician who worked on the application for Marsilid, the "happiness pill" associated with hepatitis, left the FDA shortly thereafter to work for Marsilid's manufacturer, Hoffmann-La Roche. The letter he authorized, while in the FDA, to warn prescribing physicians about Marsilid's side effects did not impress Dr. Moulton, who informed the Kefauver subcommittee that "the important facts were obscured by so much irrelevant material that it failed to serve as an effective warning."

The FDA's involvement with the industry was brought home forcibly by the disclosures that the head of its Division of Antibiotics, Henry Welch, was writing articles for professional journals that brought him a profit, as Senator Douglas told Congress last summer, of "approximately $288,000 * * * from the firms he was supposed to be regulating." Dr. Welch was allowed to resign in 1960, when the Kefauver subcommittee fully explored the matter, but even then, as Kefauver found, his superiors "were derelict in the performance of their duty * * * they whitewashed it. He was not even asked by FDA's top officials how much his 'honorariums' as he called them, amounted to. That was an outrageous conflict of interest." The matter is now before a grand jury.

When the new-drug bill was passed in Congress, both Senator Kefauver and Senator Douglas voiced their concern about the ability of the FDA to administer it, and both called for "an infusion of new blood." Senator Humphrey has made it clear that he has "little reason for confidence in the policy echelons of FDA," but does not attack Commissioner Larrick personally; indeed he calls him "a faithful and dedicated public servant." Last October, however, a second Citizens Advisory Committee, reporting on a year-long study of the FDA, recommended that its top posts should "no longer * * * be held primarily by persons whose backgrounds have been as inspectors, but should include scientists with broad experience as well." The Commissioner's post was specifically included. Larrick, who is not a college graduate, joined the FDA as an inspector in 1923 and rose through the ranks, becoming Commissioner in 1954. His Deputy Commissioner started as an inspector in 1925.

But the chairman of the Citizens Committee, George Y. Harvey, who has since become a consultant to HEW on FDA matters, blunted what appeared to be a committee attack on Larrick. He told a press conference that the report was directed "to the future," and that Larrick could carry out its recommendations if he takes them "to heart and attracts the right kind of people."

Attracting and holding the right kind of people may prove exceedingly difficult. Dr. Moulton had quit in disgust so that she could speak out. A former scientific director, Dr. Paul L. Day, found life at the FDA impossible after he had criticized the agency for its "lack of sufficient vision of its proper role in the protection of the health of the American people" and "courage to present, adequately, a bold program." He resigned.

In a recent reorganization, Dr. Kelsey was promoted to head a new Investigational Drug Branch, and she has received from the President the Nation's highest honor for distinguished Federal civilian service. But generally, FDA medical officers have been overworked in thankless, glamorless, paper-pushing jobs. Under the new regulations and the Kefauver-Harris law they will get hundreds of thousands of additional reports a year. More physicians have recently been recruited for the Bureau of Medicine—22 in February—but there will still be too few specialists to evaluate the highly specialized material that will be flooding in, and they still do not have an effective consulting service.

To attract and hold top scientists to the Bureau, Larrick could have pushed for FDA's own research program, as Dr. Day recommended. Larrick could have pressed for exemption of more physicians from civil service salary restrictions, and he could have tried hard to make working conditions more attractive. He did neither.

Since 1957, while enforcement and other FDA branches have stayed put in the HEW Building, the Bureau of Medicine has been shifted from a formers nurses' dormitory near the city incinerator to ramshackle structures that were not air-conditioned, and from those to a World War II temporary building.

All of these quarters were distant from the Division of Pharmacology, whose work is integral with the Bureau of Medicine because it evaluates the animal testing in new-drug applications. Yet, as of early March, the Bureau was destined to be moved once more, this time to a converted automobile-servicing garage in one of the most crime-ridden precincts of Washington and at least a mile from the Division of Pharmacology and other FDA scientists with whom the Bureau physicians should consult.

Congress has long treated the FDA shabbily, but Humphrey has said that the price of generous treatment will be a demand for "men with drive, with initiative * * * not just 'going by the book,' by the letter of the law, but by its spirit, its tone, its fundamental purpose."

HEW is assuming that it can put new life into the FDA by teaching the old watchdog new tricks, but in and out of Congress this approach is considered excessively optimistic in view of the past handling of drug problems. Critics believe the FDA can become the great, vital agency Humphrey envisions only if the old watchdogs are replaced by a new breed of scientist-administrators.

The hearings by Senator Humphrey's Government Reorganization Subcommittee this month and next will be followed by more hearings in the House. But it remains to be seen whether the FDA can continue to ignore criticism as it has in the past, or if Dr. Moulton will continue to stand by her testimony of 1960 that "hundreds of people, not merely in this country, suffer daily, and many die because the Food and Drug Administration has failed utterly in its solemn task of enforcing those sections of the law dealing with the safety and misbranding of drugs * * *."

THE GIANT CANADA GOOSE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my intention yesterday to call to the attention of the Senate a human interest story. At this time I shall take only a few moments to do so.

I had hoped to announce to the Senate, yesterday, that the world's largest goose, the giant Canada, which for over 30 years was thought to be extinct, has been rediscovered in Minnesota. These huge geese, which range in weight from 15 to 19 pounds, were found by Dr. Harold Hanson, of the Illinois Natural History Survey. Dr. Hanson, in cooperation with personnel of the Minnesota Department of Conservation and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Bureau of Sport, Fisheries and Wildlife, trapped approximately 200 of the birds, for examination and banding.

I am sure this will come as welcome news to sportsmen throughout the country. It also will be a source of joy to the membership of the Midwest Goose Association. Our Minnesota town of Sleepy Eye was privileged to be host to that association when it held its annual meeting January 10.

The flock of giant geese has been roosting on Silver Lake, which is in a Rochester park. The present nesting grounds of this giant goose are not known with certainty; but small scattered populations are believed to nest in the Dakotas, in western Minnesota, and in Manitoba. Returns from birds banded this winter may shed further light on the location of the present breeding grounds.

The giant Canada goose was well known to a past generation of hunters in the northern prairie States. In 1951, Jean Delacour, the internationally known waterfowl authority, supported the findings of James Moffitt, America's foremost student of geese, by describing and naming the giant Canada goose after it was thought to be extinct.

We in Minnesota are inclined to boast a bit about our North Star State. Our forefathers built a great and growing commonwealth out of the beautiful and fertile wilderness they found there. The rediscovery in Minnesota of the giant Canada goose is just one of many significant occurrences involving our great State which give us even more reason to do a little bragging.

We are very proud of the fact that our State provides very wholesome recreation. It is one of the fine hunting areas in the United States; and we are particularly proud of the fish, the fowl, and the other wildlife which make possible some of the most enjoyable outdoor sports activities which America is privileged to have.

Let this be notice to historians of the future that on Silver Lake, in Rochester, Minn., a lake kept partly open by the discharge of warm water from a nearby electric generating plant, it was discovered that the giant goose not only is still among us, but even appears to have a sizable population that is adapting to man's changes of environment.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come at this time before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn, in accordance with the previous order, until tomorrow, at 10 a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 3, 1963, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 2, 1963:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. John Lawrence Ryan, Jr., O16451, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grades as follows:

Lt. Gen. Theodore William Parker, O18369, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the grade of general.

Maj. Gen. Harold Keith Johnson, O19187, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), in the grade of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Creighton William Abrams, Jr., O20296, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), in the grade of lieutenant general.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. Edward W. Snedeker, U.S. Marine Corps, when retired, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

Having designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Maj. Gen. Frederick L. Wieseman, U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 2, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Colossians 3: 14: *Above all these things put on love, which is the bond of perfectness.*

Almighty God, our Father, who art the same, yesterday, today, and forever, amid all the miseries and mutations of time, grant that our hearts may be the sanctuaries of Thy love.

May we feel the wealth and warmth of Thy love and seek to make it the commanding and controlling factor and force in our daily life.

Inspire us to discover in these critical and confused days that love is the one cardinal virtue that will cast out fear and constrain us to rise above all cold and rebellious tempers of spirit.

Hear us for the sake of our Lord who walked the road of the loving heart. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4374. An act to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; and

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1035. An act to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. Johnston and Mr. Carlson members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the Report of the Archivist of the United States Numbered 63–9.

CUBAN ANTI-CASTRO GROUPS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, U.S. policy to discourage Cuban exile raids on Castro's seacoast is a complete contradiction of our national goals.

It is true that the Government must uphold U.S. neutrality laws. However, this Nation has no right to interfere with the operations of foreign-based anti-Castro Cubans. Furthermore, the United States is not responsible for foreign-based raids against Communist Cuba.

It is argued that these hit-and-run raids have little significance. This argument is false. Hit-and-run tactics signaled the beginning of Castro's rise to power. The Communists are using these same tactics even now to subvert Latin America.

The Cuban Communists do not want war in the Caribbean, and they have backed down with an apology for firing on a U.S. boat last Saturday. Freeing Cuba is a job for Cubans, and I certainly hope the United States will encourage them to do it.

BLOCKADE OF COMMUNIST CUBA

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, at last the United States and Great Britain have established a blockade of Cuba, but, unfortunately, the United States seems to have lost sight of its values and traditions, for through this blockade our country is protecting Castro from those Cuban exiles who yearn to return freedom to their homeland. I find it extremely hard to understand why we are actually protecting a Communist government and suppressing the activities of people who are fighting to rid Cuba of the Communist menace. This is a complete reversal from our policy of aiding the anti-Castro invasion just 2 years ago. How foolish it is to take steps which permit communism to survive in Cuba when we all realize that Cuba is the chief steppingstone to the establishment of communism throughout Central and South America. Our excuse for protecting Castro seems weak, indeed, when we glance back at our own history of fighting for freedom and human rights. It seems to me that the attacks launched against the Communist Cuba would have a terrific morale-boosting effect on those patriots still in Cuba, who with sufficient evidence of support could rid their country of communism.

How can any of our South American allies gain confidence in the policies of the United States when with one hand we tell the anti-Castro forces that we want them to free their homeland while with the other hand we take steps to insure that they will not? To make matters worse, we are now playing the role of informant against the Cuban patriots as well as protector for Castro.

In my opinion, the administration has failed to understand our demands for a blockade of Cuba, for what we are demanding was a blockade of Communist Cuba, not a blockade of freedom.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MUTUAL DEFENSE AND ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 94)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

"Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war," wrote Milton. And no peacetime victory in history has been as far reaching in its impact, nor served the cause of freedom so well, as the victories scored in the last 17 years by this Nation's mutual defense and assistance programs. These victories have been, in the main, quiet instead of dramatic. Their aim has been, not to gain territories for the United States or support in the United Nations, but to preserve freedom and hope, and to prevent tyranny and subversion, in dozens of key nations all over the world.

The United States today is spending over 10 percent of its gross national product on programs primarily aimed at improving our national security. Somewhat less than one-twelfth of this amount, and less than 0.7 percent of our GNP, goes into the mutual assistance program: roughly half for economic development, and half for military and other short-term assistance. The contribution of this program to our national interest clearly outweighs its cost. The richest nation in the world would surely be justified in spending less than 1 percent of its national income on assistance to its less fortunate sister nations solely as a matter of international responsibility; but inasmuch as these programs are not merely the right thing to do, but clearly in our national self-interest, all criticisms should be placed in that perspective. That our aid programs can be improved is not a matter of debate. But that our aid programs serve both our national traditions and our national interest is beyond all reasonable doubt.

History records that our aid programs to Turkey and Greece were the crucial element that enabled Turkey to stand up against heavyhanded Soviet pressures, Greece to put down Communist aggression and both to re-create stable societies and to move forward in the direction of economic and social growth.

History records that the Marshall plan made it possible for the nations of Western Europe, including the United Kingdom, to recover from the devastation of the world's most destructive war, to rebuild military strength, to withstand the expansionist thrust of Stalinist Russia, and to embark on an economic renaissance which has made Western Europe the second greatest and richest industrial complex in the world today—a vital center of free world strength, itself now contributing to the growth and strength of less developed countries.

History records that our military and economic assistance to nations on the frontiers of the Communist world—such as Iran, Pakistan, India, Vietnam, and free China—has enabled threatened peoples to stay free and independent, when they otherwise would have either been overrun by aggressive Communist power or fallen victim of utter chaos, poverty, and despair.

History records that our contributions to international aid have been the critical factor in the growth of a whole family of international financial institutions and agencies, playing an ever more important role in the ceaseless war against want and the struggle for growth and freedom.

And, finally, history will record that today our technical assistance and development loans are giving hope where hope was lacking, sparking action where life was static, and stimulating progress around the earth—simultaneously supporting the military security of the free world, helping to erect barriers against the growth of communism where those barriers count the most, helping to build the kind of world community of independent, self-supporting nations in which we want to live, and helping to serve the deep American urge to extend a generous hand to those working toward a better life for themselves and their children.

Despite noisy opposition from the very first days—despite dire predictions that foreign aid would bankrupt the Republic—despite warnings that the Marshall plan and successor programs were "throwing our money down a rathole"—despite great practical difficulties and some mistakes and disappointments—the fact is that our aid programs generally and consistently have done what they were expected to do.

Freedom is not on the run anywhere in the world—not in Europe, Asia, Africa, or Latin America—as it might well have been without U.S. aid. And we now know that freedom—all freedom, including our own—is diminished when other countries fall under Communist domination, as in China in 1949, North Vietnam and the northern provinces of Laos in 1954, and Cuba in 1959. Freedom, all freedom, is threatened by the subtle, varied and unceasing Communist efforts at subversion in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Asia. And the prospect for freedom is also endangered or eroded in countries which see no hope—no hope for a better

life based on economic progress, education, social justice and the development of stable institutions. These are the frontiers of freedom which our military and economic aid programs seek to advance; and in so doing, they serve our deepest national interest.

This view has been held by three successive Presidents—Democratic and Republican alike.

It has been endorsed by a bipartisan majority of nine successive Congresses.

It has been supported for 17 years by a bipartisan majority of the American people.

And it has only recently been reconfirmed by a distinguished committee of private citizens, headed by Gen. Lucius Clay and including Messrs. Robert Anderson, Eugene Black, Clifford Hardin, Robert Lovett, Edward Mason, L. F. McCollum, George Meany, Herman Phleger, and Howard Rusk. Their report stated:

> We believe these programs, properly conceived and implemented, to be essential to the security of our Nation and necessary to the exercise of its worldwide responsibilities.

There is, in short, a national consensus of many years standing on the vital importance of these programs. The principle and purpose of U.S. assistance to less secure and less fortunate nations are not and cannot be seriously in doubt.

II. PRESENT NEEDS

The question now is: What about the future? In the perspective of these past gains, what is the dimension of present needs, what are our opportunities, and what changes do we face at this juncture in world history?

I believe it is a crucial juncture. Our world is near the climax of a historic convulsion. A tidal wave of national independence has nearly finished its sweep through lands which contain one out of every three people in the world. The industrial and scientific revolution is spreading to the far corners of the earth. And two irreconcilable views of the value, the rights, and the role of the individual human being confront the peoples of the world.

In some 80 developing nations, countless large and small decisions will be made in the days and months and years ahead—decisions which, taken together, will establish the economic and social system, determine the political leadership, shape the political practices, and mold the structure of the institutions which will promote either consent or coercion for one-third of humanity. And these decisions will drastically affect the shape of the world in which our children grow to maturity.

Africa is stirring restlessly to consolidate its independence and to make that independence meaningful for its people through economic and social development. The people of America have affirmed and reaffirmed their sympathy with these objectives.

Free Asia is responding resolutely to the political, economic, and military challenge of Communist China's relentless efforts to dominate the continent.

Latin America is striving to take decisive steps toward effective democracy—amid the turbulence of rapid social change and the menace of Communist subversion.

The United States—the richest and most powerful of all peoples, a nation committed to the independence of nations and to a better life for all peoples—can no more stand aside in this climactic age of decision than we can withdraw from the community of free nations. Our effort is not merely symbolic. It is addressed to our vital security interests.

It is in this context that I hope the American people through their representatives in Congress will consider our request this year for foreign aid funds designed carefully and explicitly to meet these specific challenges. This is not a wearisome burden. It is a new chapter in our involvement in a continuously vital struggle—the most challenging and constructive effort ever undertaken by man on behalf of freedom and his fellow man.

III. OBJECTIVES FOR IMPROVEMENT

In a changing world, our programs of mutual defense and assistance must be kept under constant review. My recommendations herein reflect the work of the Clay Committee, the scrutiny undertaken by the new Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and the experience gained in our first full year of administering the new and improved program enacted by the Congress in 1961. There is fundamental agreement throughout these reviews: that these assistance programs are of great value to our deepest national interest—that their basic concepts and organization, as embodied in the existing legislation, are properly conceived—that progress has been made and is being made in translating these concepts into action—but that much still remains to be done to improve our performance and make the best possible use of these programs.

In addition, there is fundamental agreement in all these reviews regarding six key recommendations for the future.

Objective No. 1: To apply stricter standards of selectivity and self-help in aiding developing countries. This objective was given special attention by the Committee To Strengthen the Security of the Free World (the Clay report), which estimated that the application of such criteria could result in substantial savings in selected programs over the next 1 to 3 years.

Considerable progress has already been made along these lines. While the number of former colonies achieving independence has lengthened the total list of countries receiving assistance, 80 percent of all economic assistance now goes to only 20 countries; and military assistance is even more narrowly concentrated. The proportion of development loans, as contrasted with outright grants, has increased from 10 to 60 percent. We have placed all our development lending on a dollar repayable basis; and this year we are increasing our efforts, as the Clay committee recommended, to tailor our loan terms so that interest rates and maturities will reflect to a greater extent the differences in the ability of different countries to service debt.

In the Alliance for Progress in particular, and increasingly in other aid programs, emphasis is placed upon self-help and self-reform by the recipients themselves, using our aid as a catalyst for progress and not as a handout. Finally, in addition to emphasizing primarily economic rather than military assistance, wherever conditions permit, we are taking a sharp new look at both the size and purpose of those local military forces which receive our assistance. Our increased stress on internal security and civic action in military assistance is in keeping with our experience that in developing countries, military forces can have an important economic as well as protective role to play. For example, in Latin America, in fiscal year 1963, military assistance funds allocated for the support of engineer, medical, and other civic action type units more than doubled.

Objective No. 2: To achieve a reduction and ultimate elimination of U.S. assistance by enabling nations to stand on their own as rapidly as possible. Both this Nation and the countries we help have a stake in their reaching the point of self-sustaining growth—the point where they no longer require external aid to maintain their independence. Our goal is not an arbitrary cutoff date but the earliest possible "take off" date—the date when their economies will have been launched with sufficient momentum to enable them to become self-supporting, requiring only the same normal sources of external financing to meet expanding capital needs that this country required for many decades.

For some, this goal is near at hand, insofar as economic assistance is concerned. For others, more time will be needed. But in all cases, specific programs leading to self-support should be set and priorities established—including those steps which must be taken by the recipient countries and all others who are willing to help them.

The record clearly shows that foreign aid is not an endless or unchanging process. Fifteen years ago, our assistance went almost entirely to the advanced countries of Europe and Japan; today it is directed almost entirely to the developing world. Ten years ago most of our assistance was given to shoring up military forces and unstable economies; today this kind of aid has been cut in half, and our assistance goes increasingly toward economic development. There are still, however, important cases where there has been no diminution in the Communist military threat, and both military and economic aid are still required. Such cases range from relatively stabilized frontiers, as in Korea and Turkey, to areas of active aggression, such as Vietnam.

Objective No. 3: To secure the increased participation of other industrialized nations in sharing the cost of international development assistance. The United States is no longer alone in aiding the developing countries, and its proportionate share of the burden is diminishing. The flow of funds from other industrialized countries—now totaling on the order of $2 billion a year—is expected to continue; and we expect to work more closely with these other countries in order to make the most effective use of our joint efforts. In addition, the international lending and technical assistance agencies—to which we contribute heavily—have expanded the schedule and scope of their operations; and we look forward to supplementing those resources selectively in conjunction with increased contributions from other nations. We will continue to work with our allies, urging them to increase their assistance efforts and to extend assistance on terms less burdensome to the developing countries.

Objective No. 4: To lighten any adverse impact of the aid program on our own balance of payments and economy. A few years ago, more than half of U.S. economic aid funds were spent abroad, contributing to the drain on our dollars and gold. Of our current commitments, over 80 percent will be spent in the United States, contributing to the growth of our economy and employment opportunities. This proportion is rising as further measures are being taken to this end. I might add that our balance-of-payments position today is being significantly helped by the repayment of loans made to European countries under the Marshall plan and by the Export-Import Bank. I am confident that in the future, as income in the less-developed countries rises, we will similarly benefit from the loans we are now making to them.

Our economy is also being helped by the expansion of commercial exports to countries whose present growth and prosperity were spurred by U.S. economic assistance in earlier years. Over the last decade, our exports to Western Europe and the United Kingdom have more than doubled, and our exports to Japan have increased fourfold. Similarly, we can look forward to a future widening of trade opportunities in those countries whose economic development we are currently assisting.

In addition, our food for peace program is increasingly using our agricultural commodities to stimulate the economic growth of developing nations and to assist in achieving other U.S. foreign policy goals. As the economies of developing nations improve, we are encouraging them to shift from foreign currency to cash sales or to dollar credit sales for these commodities.

The relative burden of our assistance programs has been steadily reduced—from some 2 percent of our national product at the beginning of the Marshall plan to seven-tenths of 1 percent today—from 11.5 percent of the Federal budget in 1949 to 4 percent today.

Although these figures indicate that our aid programs cost, in relative terms, considerably less today than they did 10 or 15 years ago, we are continuing our efforts to improve the effectiveness of these programs and increase the return on every dollar invested. Personnel, procedures, and administration are being improved. A number of field missions have been closed, scaled down, or merged into embassies or regional offices. These efforts toward greater efficiency and economy are being accelerated under the new Administrator.

Objective No. 5: To continue to assist in the defense of countries under threat of external and internal Communist attack. Our military assistance program has been an essential element in keeping the boundary of Soviet and Chinese military power relatively stable for over a decade. Without its protection the substantial economic progress made by underdeveloped countries along the Sino-Soviet periphery would hardly have been possible. As these countries build economic strength, they will be able to assume more of the burden of their defense. But we must not assume that military assistance to these countries—or to others primarily exposed to subversive internal attack—can be ended in the foreseeable future. On the contrary, while it will be possible to reduce and terminate some programs, we should anticipate the need for new and expanded programs.

India is a case in point. The wisdom of earlier U.S. aid in helping the Indian subcontinent's considerable and fruitful efforts toward progress and stability can hardly now be in question. The threat made plain by the Chinese attack on India last fall may require additional efforts on our part to help bolster the security of this crucial area, assuming these efforts can be matched in an appropriate way by the efforts of India and Pakistan.

But overall, the magnitude of military assistance is small in relation to our national security expenditures; in this fiscal year it amounts to about 3 percent of our defense budget.

Dollar for dollar—

Said the Clay Committee with particular reference to the border areas—

> these programs contribute more to the security of the free world than corresponding expenditures in our defense appropriations. These countries are providing more than 2 million armed men ready, for the most part, for any emergency.

Clearly, if this program did not exist, our defense budget would undoubtedly have to be increased substantially to provide an equivalent contribution to the free world's defense.

Objective No. 6: To increase the role of private investment and other non-Federal resources in assisting developing nations. In recent months, important new steps have been taken to mobilize on behalf of this program the competence of a variety of nongovernmental organizations and individuals in this country. Cooperatives and savings and loan associations have been very active in establishing similar institutions abroad, particularly in Latin America. Our land-grant and other universities are establishing better working relationships with our programs to assist oversea rural development. Already there are 37 U.S. universities and land-grant institutions at work in Latin America, for example, with a substantial increase expected during the coming year. Public and private leaders from the State of California are exploring with their counterparts in Chile how the talents and resources of a particular State can be more directly channeled toward assisting a particular country. Labor unions, foundations, trade associations, professional societies, and many others likewise possess skills and resources which we are drawing upon increasingly—in order to engage in a more systematic and meaningful way, in this vital nation-building process, the whole complex of private and public institutions upon which our own national life depends. For at the heart of the modernization process lies the central problem of creating, adapting, and improving the institutions which any modern society will need.

IV. PRIVATE INVESTMENT

The primary new initiative in this year's program relates to our increased efforts to encourage the investment of private capital in the underdeveloped countries. Already considerable progress has been made fostering U.S. private investment through the use of investment guaranties—with over $900 million now outstanding—and by means of cost-sharing on investment surveys, loans of local currencies, and other measures provided under existing law. During the first half of this fiscal year alone, $7.7 million in local currencies have been loaned to private business firms.

I believe much more should be done, however, both administratively through more vigorous action by the Agency for International Development, and legislatively by the Congress. Administratively, our ambassadors and missions abroad, in their negotiations with the less developed countries, are being directed to urge more forcefully the importance of making full use of private resources and improving the climate for private investment, both domestic, and foreign. In particular, I am concerned that the investment guaranty program is not fully operative in some countries because of the failure of their governments to execute the normal intergovernmental agreements relating to investment guaranties.

In addition, the Agency for International Development will also strengthen and enlarge its own activities relating to private enterprise—both its efforts to assist in the development of vigorous private economies in the developing countries, and its facilities for mobilizing and assisting the capital and skills of private business in contributing to economic development.

Legislatively, I am recommending the following:

(a) An amendment to the Internal Revenue Code for a trial period to grant U.S. taxpayers a tax credit for new investments in developing countries, which should also apply to some extent to reinvestments of their earnings in those countries. Such a credit, by making possible an increased rate of return, should substantially encourage additional private investment in the developing countries. The U.S. businessmen's committee for the Alliance for Progress has recommended the adoption of such a measure.

(b) Amendments in the investment guaranty provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act designed to enlarge and clarify the guaranty program.

Economic and social growth cannot be accomplished by governments alone. The effective participation of an enlightened U.S. businessman, especially in partnership with private interests in the developing country, brings not only his investment but his technological and management skills into the process of development. His successful participation in turn helps create that climate of confidence which is so critical in attracting and holding vital external and internal capital. We welcome and encourage initiatives being taken in the private sector in Latin America to accelerate industrial growth and hope that similar cooperative efforts will be established with other developing countries.

V. THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

In a special sense, the achievements of the Alliance for Progress in the coming years will be the measure of our determination, our ideals, and our wisdom. Here in this hemisphere, in this last year, our resourcefulness as a people was challenged in the clearest terms. We moved at once to resist the threat of aggressive nuclear weapons in Cuba, and we found the nations of Latin America at our side. They, like ourselves, were brought to a new awareness of the danger of permitting the poverty and despair of a whole people to continue long anywhere in this continent.

Had the needs of the people of Cuba been met in the pre-Castro period—their need for food, for housing, for education, for jobs, above all, for a democratic responsibility in the fulfillment of their own hopes—there would have been no Castro, no missiles in Cuba, and no need for Cuba's neighbors to incur the immense risks of resistance to threatened aggression from that island.

There is but one way to avoid being faced with similar dilemmas in the future. It is to bring about in all the countries of Latin America the conditions of hope, in which the peoples of this continent will know that they can shape a better future for themselves, not through obeying the inhumane commands of an alien and cynical ideology, but through personal self-expression, individual judgment, and the acts of responsible citizenship.

As Americans, we have long recognized the legitimacy of these aspirations; in recent months we have been able to see, as never before, their urgency and, I believe, the concrete means for their realization.

In less than 2 years, the 10-year program of the Alliance for Progress has become more than an idea and more than a commitment of governments. The necessary initial effort to develop plans, to organize institutions, to test and experiment has itself required and achieved a new dedication—a new dedication to intelligent compromise between old and new ways of life. In the long run, it is this effort and not the threat of communism—that will determine the fate of freedom in the Western Hemisphere.

These years have not been easy ones for any group in Latin America. A similar change in the fundamental orientation of our own society would have been no easier. The difficulty of the changes to be brought about makes all the more heartening the success of many nations of Latin America in achieving reforms which will make their fundamental economic and social structures both more efficient and more equitable.

Some striking accomplishments, moreover, are already visible. New housing is being expanded in most countries of the region. Educational facilities are growing rapidly. Road construction, particularly in agricultural areas, is accelerating at a rapid pace. With U.S. funds, over 2 million textbooks are being distributed to combat the illiteracy of nearly half of the 210 million people of Latin America. In the countries of the Alliance for Progress, the diets of 8 million children and mothers are being supplemented with U.S. food for peace, and this figure should reach nearly 16 million by next year.

In trouble-ridden northeast Brazil, under an agreement with the State of Rio Grande do Norte, a program is underway to train 3,000 teachers, build 1,000 classrooms, 10 vocational schools, 8 normal schools, and 4 teacher training centers. A $30 million slum clearance project is underway in Venezuela. In Bogotá, Colombia, the site of the old airport is becoming a new city for 71,000 persons who are building their own homes with support from the Social Progress Trust Fund.

This year I received a letter from Senor Argemil Plazas Garcia whom I met in Bogotá upon the dedication of an Alianza housing project. He writes:

> Today I am living in the house with my 13 children, and we are very happy to be free of such poverty and no longer to be moving around like outcasts. Now we have dignity and freedom. * * * My wife, my children, and I are writing you this humble letter, to express to you the warm gratitude of such Colombian friends who now have a home in which they can live happily.

Of even greater long-range importance, a number of beginnings in self-help and reforms are now evident.

Since 1961, 11 Latin American countries—Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, Chile, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Mexico, Panama, and Venezuela—have made structural reforms in their tax systems. Twelve countries have improved their income tax laws and administration.

New large-scale programs for improved land use and land reform have been undertaken in Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, and two States in Brazil. More limited plans are being carried out in Chile, Colombia, Panama, Uruguay, and Central America.

Six Latin American countries—Colombia, Chile, Bolivia, Honduras, Mexico, and Venezuela—have submitted development programs to the Panel of Experts of the Organization of American States. The Panel has evaluated and reported on the first three and will soon offer its views on the balance.

Viewed against the background of decades of neglect—or, at most, intermittent bursts of attention to basic problems—the start that has been made is encouraging. Perhaps most significant of all is a change in the hearts and minds of the people—a growing will to develop their countries. We can only help Latin Americans to save themselves. It is for this reason that the increasing determination of the peoples of the region to build modern societies is heartening. And it is for this reason that responsible leadership in Latin America must respond to this popular will with a greater sense of urgency and purpose, lest aspirations turn into frustrations and hope turn into despair. Pending reform legislation must be enacted, statutes already on the books must be enforced, and mechanisms for carrying out programs must be organized and invigorated. These steps are not easy, as we know from our own experience, but they must be taken.

Our own intention is to concentrate our support in Latin America on those countries adhering to the principles established in the Charter of Punta del Este, and to work with our neighbors to indicate more precisely the particular policy changes, reforms, and other self-help measures which are necessary to make our assistance effective and the Alliance a success. The Clay Committee recommendation that we continue to expand our efforts to encourage economic integration within the region and the expansion of trade among the countries of Latin America has great merit. The determination of the Central American Presidents to move boldly in this direction impressed me greatly during my recent meeting with them in San Jose, Costa Rica; and the Agency for International Development has already established a regional office in Central America, is giving support to a regional development bank and has participated in regional trade conferences.

A beginning has been made in the first 2 years of the Alliance; but the job that is still ahead must be tackled with continuing urgency. Many of the ingredients for a successful decade are at hand, and the fundamental course for the future is clear. It remains for all parties to the Alliance to provide the continuous will and effort needed to move steadily along that course.

VI. THIS YEAR'S AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION

Translating the foregoing facts and principles into program costs and appropriations, based on the application of the standards set forth above and affirmed by the Clay Committee, yields the following results:

First, upward of $200 million of economic assistance funds now available are expected to be saved and not used in the present fiscal year, and upward of $100 million of these unused funds will remain available for lending in the future;

Second, in addition to the savings carried forward into next year, close review has indicated a number of reductions that can be made in the original budget estimates for economic and military assistance without serious damage to the national interest.

Together these factors permit a reduction in the original budget estimates from $4.9 to $4.5 billion. This amount reflects anticipated reductions in military and economic assistance to a number of countries, in line with these standards and recommendations, and unavoidable increases to others. The principal net increases proposed in 1964 appropriations are the following:

An additional $325 million for lending in Latin America—$125 million through the Agency for International Development and $200 million through the Social Progress Trust Fund, administered for the United States by the Inter-American Development Bank (for which no appropriation was needed in fiscal year 1963 because a 2-year appropriation had been made the year before);

An additional $85 million for lending elsewhere in the world, mostly in countries such as India, Pakistan, and Nigeria which are meeting those high standards of self-help and fiscal and economic progress which permit our aid to be directed toward ultimate full self-support;

An additional $80 million for military aid, including the increased requirements for India (but still far below the fiscal 1961 level); and

An additional $50 million for the contingency fund, which provides a flexibility indispensable to our security. We cannot ignore the possibility that new threats similar to those in Laos or Vietnam might arise in areas which now look calm, or that new opportunities will open up to achieve major gains in the cause of freedom. Foreign aid policy can no more be static than foreign policy itself.

I believe that it is necessary and desirable that these funds be provided by the Congress to meet program needs and to be available for program opportunities. Funds which are not required under the increasingly selective program and performance standards of our assistance programs will, as in this year, not be spent or committed.

The legislative amendments which I am forwarding herewith carry forward the basic structure and intent of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. No fundamental changes in this legislative structure now appear to be required.

One relatively minor change I am proposing is for a separate authorization for the appropriation of funds to assist American schools and hospitals abroad. A number of these schools sponsored by Americans have been most successful in the developing countries in providing an education built upon American standards. Until now some assistance has been made available to these schools from general economic aid funds, but this is becoming increasingly inappropriate. Separate authorization and appropriations would be used to help these schools carry out long-term programs to establish themselves on a sounder financial footing, becoming gradually independent, if at all possible, of U.S. Government support.

Finally, I am requesting the Congress in this legislation to amend that section of the Trade Expansion Act which requires the denial of equal tariff treatment to imports from Poland and Yugoslavia. It is appropriate that this amendment should be incorporated in this bill since it is my conviction that trade and other forms of normal relations constitute a sounder basis than aid for our future relationship with these countries.

VII. CONCLUSION

In closing, let me again emphasize the overriding importance of the efforts in which we are engaged.

At this point in history we can look back to many successes in the struggle to preserve freedom. Our Nation is still daily winning unseen victories in the fight against Communist subversion in the slums and hamlets, in the hospitals and schools, and in the offices of governments across a world bent on lifting itself. Two centuries of pioneering and growth must be telescoped into decades and even years. This is a field of action for which our history has prepared us, to which our aspirations have drawn us, and into which our national interest moves us.

Around the world cracks in the monolithic apparatus of our adversary are there for all to see. This, for the American people, is a time for vision, for patience, for work, and for wisdom. For better or worse, we are the pacesetters. Freedom's leader cannot flag or falter, or another runner will set the pace.

We have dared to label the sixties the "Decade of Development." But it is not the eloquence of our slogans, but the quality of our endurance, which will determine whether this generation of Americans deserves the leadership which history has thrust upon us.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 2, 1963*.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the sorry spectacle of throwing money away to solve problems is best demonstrated by our foreign aid programs, via the President's message.

The President says "Peace hath her victories, no less renown'd than war" quoting Milton about the peacetime victory of our foreign giveaway. The President should be quoting the hard-pressed patriotic taxpayers who want the battle of the budget to be won, who expects a victory in fiscal responsibility, who needs the security of sound currency and a government oriented around freedom and capitalism, not regimentation and socialism.

The people of the United States believe morally and spiritually in the importance and dignity of human beings, in God-given rights, and they are tired of our exporting gross materialism, of granting aid to dictators who subjugate the people with our aid, who teach socialism and downgrade capitalistic freedom.

People are tired of shipping food and supplies to other nations who transship them to enemies, even as Poland aided North Vietnam, whose people are busy killing American men.

Our taxpayers are tired of the farce of aiding Socialists and Communists in the name of Christian charity, and saddling the debt on our children of the future.

How can our aid to Yugoslavia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the U.N., which then dispenses our money further, help protect capitalism and freedom in the life or death struggle of our society against this alien philosophy? How can our people be helped by borrowing money to give it away? How do we strengthen the United States when we aid neutrals like India that turn against us? How stupid does the President think we Americans are?

The President says:

> Our Nation is still daily winning unseen victories in the fight against Communist subversion.

How tragic. Those with eyes that cannot see. We are losing our shirts financially in our giveaway programs, which are threatening our currency, undermining out entire economy, endangering the entire free world which has looked to us for leadership.

And we are losing, in spite of our tremendous outpouring of over $100 billion since World War II. Indeed, communism is now on our doorstep in Cuba, and we are permitting the subversion of all of Central and South America. Has foreign aid prevented this—or has it encouraged communism's expansion—or does not our annual foreign aid make any difference?

Well, there is the proof. We borrowed $100 billion since 1945 to give it away, and Khrushchev and worldwide communism controls Cuba 90 miles from the United States. Now, who is kidding whom?

The President's choice of words is interesting. In his closing paragraph he says, "But it is not the eloquence of our slogans, but the quality of our endurance, which will determine whether this generation of Americans deserves the leadership which history has thrust upon us." Look at the slogans, this bill is now "free world defenses and assistance programs," not a foreign aid bill. New Frontier replaced the tired old New Deal and Fair Deal. The Peace Corps, foreign and domestic, is more foreign aid abroad, and CCC, Civilian Conservation Corps at home. The campaign slogans "missile gap" turned out, not to be a gap at all. The "fallen prestige" label of the Eisenhower foreign policy, which now seems utterly virtuous by comparison, replaced with the no-policy of the New Frontier. And so it goes. Slogans are all we are being given, as a poor substitute for vigorous policy at home and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, if treason is defined as "giving aid and comfort to the enemy," how can we give aid to Communists and Socialists? Are they enemies or not? They mean to bury us.

If we believe in self-determination for nations, how can we, through foreign aid, "jimmy" up the economies and programs

of other nations? If we are spiritually motivated, how can we set out to buy the world with dollars, to buy friends? If we believe in charity, how can we take money from taxpayers through force, and threatened jail sentences, to give to dictators and governments who misuse the money, who relabel the goods, who build bank deposits in Switzerland in individual names?

If we love freedom, why do we subsidize the enslavement of others through gifts to their governments?

Why cannot we proudly, unapologetically, brand ourselves freedom-loving, capitalistic, sovereign, and help others by precept and example; not by robbing them of their own initiative, inventiveness, and self-respect as we pour money into their economies?

The foreign aid that will help will be those programs conceived, created, and financed by each nation according to their own level of development and preference. We could sell our services, for value received, in helping others in projects when they ask us. No gifts are needed. More dislike us for our giving, than appreciate it, and we rob them of their pride and independence as well as foul up their economies.

The President says "leadership which history has thrust upon us." What does that mean? Our leadership was earned, not thrust upon us, earned by sweat, by ingenuity, by hustle and so we grew economically strong with the highest standard of living.

We earned it. It was not given to us. The good Lord gave us the opportunity and we took matters into our own hands.

All we can do to help others is to set a good example. No gifts. Build American industries and trade, brag about capitalism and free enterprise and individual freedom—to sink or swim. Capitalism deserves to be bragged about. Our people are energetic, hard working, thrifty, and believe in the private and free market of supply and demand. Let us show it off to the world. Let us not apologize for it, or pretend we do not know our own strength. No gifts, just get up and go. A good example: finer homes, cars, refrigerators, school buildings—all produced privately by free people—capitalistic entrepreneurs.

Finally, if there be some who want power for themselves in leadership positions through foreign aid let us not reward them in the United States or abroad. Our "Republic within a democracy" is limited government, of limited power. Let us not build our Government so powerful we are subjugated. Let us not give aid to other governments which subjugate their peoples. Foreign aid or free world defense and assistance programs must be stopped now.

THE BUYING AND SELLING OF COMMUNIST-MADE MERCHANDISE AT REQUEST OF STATE AND COMMERCE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post, in a story written by Phillip Warden, reports that two of the Nation's largest department stores are buying and selling Communist-made merchandise at the request of the State and Commerce Departments. One of the stores is Macy's, in New York, the other is Davison-Paxon Co., in Atlanta, Ga.

In recent years the Federal Government has been interfering in private business to an unreasonable extent. The Federal Big Brother attitude is being extended by the Kennedy administration way beyond anything seen in America in recent decades. It is getting so that, whether as a creditor, lender, observer, regulator, or law enforcer, the Federal Government is a silent partner in everybody's business. This is harmful to individual initiative. It is contrary to cultivation of the independence and driving force that helped to create this great Nation. It is time that the balance wheel started to swing back toward less Government interference in private affairs.

But there is one field in which the Federal Government has no business at all telling the private businesses what to do and what not to do. This is in the field of patriotism. The Departments of State and Commerce have no right to ask any business, even such a big one as R. H. Macy Co., to trade in Communist-made goods. Neither has R. H. Macy Co. any obligation to abide by such requests.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is unpatriotic and anti-American for American stores to stock in trade goods that are the product of Communist slave labor. I say that it is the solemn obligation of all business, including Macy's, to decline Government requests of this nature. I say it is close to a sin to put Communist goods on American shelves to undersell American products because the men and women making those goods are not paid a fair wage for their hours of slave labor.

The State Department and the Commerce Department should know better than to make such a request. Once again we see evidence of the dismal fact that the Kennedy administration just does not realize that communism is the mortal enemy of the United States and seeks to destroy us. Trading with communism only helps communism to be stronger. The trade will not make friends for us. It only spreads wider our international reputation for being suckers. Once again, it is the responsibility of this Congress, acting through the proper committees, to find out who is responsible in the Department of State and in the Department of Commerce for requesting America's private business to trade with Communists.

Such governmental policies are not only incredibly stupid; they are tainted with yellow. In the President's message to Congress today he requests amendment to the Trade Expansion Act in favor of imports from Communist satellites Poland and Yugoslavia. This is just more of the same stupidity. Congress, for America, should deny this request.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

DAVID H. FORMAN AND JULIA FORMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1544) for the relief of David H. Forman and Julia Forman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to David H. Forman and Julia Forman, his wife, of Maricopa County, Arizona, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of land in the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 2, township 1 north, range 3 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, described as follows: Beginning at a point on the north line of the said northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 2, said point being south 89 degrees 54 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 661.37 feet from the northeast corner of said section 2; thence south 0 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 33 feet to the true point of beginning; thence south 0 degrees 20 minutes 30 second east a distance of 111.08 feet to a point on the north right-of-way line of the Appropriators Canal; thence south 47 degrees 38 minutes 45 seconds, east, along said north right-of-way line, a distance of 81.78 feet; thence south 0 degrees 22 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 63.05 feet; thence north 47 degrees 38 minutes 45 seconds west, parallel to the south right-of-way line of said Appropriators Canal, a distance of 190.90 feet; thence north 0 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 100.57 feet to a point 33 feet south of the north line of said northeast quarter northeast quarter; thence north 89 degrees 54 minutes 30 seconds east, parallel to the north line of said northeast quarter northeast quarter a distance of 80.06 feet to the point of beginning. Subject to an easement to the city of Phoenix for sewer purposes within the right-of-way of the said Appropriators Canal.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That consent is hereby given that a civil action may be instituted against the United States within one year after the date of enactment of this Act by or on behalf of David H. Forman and Julia Forman in the United States District Court for the District of Arizona to determine their right, title, and interest in and to a parcel of land in the northeast quarter of section 2, township 1 north, range 3 east, Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Maricopa County, Arizona, described as follows: Beginning at a point on the north line of the said northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 2, said point being south 89 degrees 54 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 661.37 feet from the northeast corner of said section 2; thence south 0 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 33 feet to the true point of beginning; thence south 0 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 111.08 feet to a point on the north right-of-way line of the Appropriators Canal;

thence south 47 degrees 38 minutes 45 seconds east, along said north right-of-way line, a distance of 81.78 feet; thence south 0 degrees 22 minutes 30 seconds east a distance of 63.05 feet; thence north 47 degrees 38 minutes 45 seconds west, parallel to the south right-of-way line of said Appropriators Canal, a distance of 190.90 feet; thence north 0 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds west a distance of 100.57 feet to a point 33 feet south of the north line of said northeast quarter northeast quarter; thence north 89 degrees 54 minutes 30 seconds east, parallel to the north line of said northeast quarter northeast quarter, a distance of 80.06 feet to the point of beginning."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize David H. Forman and Julia Forman to bring suit against the United States to determine title to certain lands in Maricopa County, Ariz."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEWIS S. CASS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2291) regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall reinstate the homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass (Anchorage Numbered 031055) that was canceled because at the time the entry was made the land was in a withdrawn status, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to process the entry in accordance with the applicable provisions of law, subject to such modification of time requirements as he deems equitable in view of the prior cancellation of the entry.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEY LAND IN VICINITY OF UNALAKLEET, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2294) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue, subject to the provisions of section 2, to Mrs. William E. Beltz a patent in fee (exclusive of oil, gas, and other mineral rights) to the following described tract of land, together with all buildings and other improvements thereon, situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska: Post numbered 1 located on left limit of North River on sandbar approximately 400 feet east of the North River Bridge; thence 2,640 feet in an easterly direction following the river upstream to a narrow slough and following the slough to post numbered 2; thence 2,640 feet in a southerly direction (through timber) to post numbered 3; thence 2,640 feet in a westerly direction to post numbered 4 located on the bank of the North River; thence upstream in a northerly direction back to post numbered 1 approximately 2,640 feet from post numbered 4; such land being the same land described in the homestead settlement claim (No. F–023595) of the late William E. Beltz.

SEC. 2. The patent shall be subject to outstanding gravel permits and rights-of-way, the patent may be issued only after payment of the fees that the deceased entryman would have been required to pay, and the patent shall be based upon a survey made without cost to Mrs. Beltz.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICHOLAS E. VILLAREAL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1230) for the relief of Nicholas E. Villareal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Nicholas E. Villareal, 342 West Beechwood, Pinedale, Califorina, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States all interest and costs on the sum of $322 representing the total of allotment payments made to his mother, Mrs. Carmen T. Estrella, in the period from January 1, 1948, to April 30, 1949, inclusive, which have been ruled to have been overpayments because no deductions were made from his Army pay in accordance with the authorizations he executed directing that the proper deductions be made from his pay in order that a class F allotment would be paid to his mother.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COL. FRANK D. SCHWIKERT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3623) for the relief of Col. Frank D. Schwikert, U.S. Air Force.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MAJ. LEONARD H. POTTERBAUM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3625) for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

RONNIE E. HUNTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3626) for the relief of Ronnie E. Hunter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle the claim of Ronnie E. Hunter, 6512 Lake Stellacoom Avenue, Tacoma 99, Washington, for reimbursement of expenses incurred incident to the employment of expert witnesses to testify in his behalf at a special court-martial trial held at McChord Air Force Base, Washington, on August 18 and 21, 1961, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim the sum of $200. There is hereby appropriated the sum of $200 for payment of said claim.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR C. BERRY AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3627) for the relief of Arthur C. Berry and others.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 2 OF PRIVATE LAW 87–673

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1535) to amend section 2 of Private Law 87–673.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of October 23, 1962 (Private Law 87–673), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "For the purposes of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Mehmet Vecihi Kalaycioglu shall be held and considered to have complied with the residential and physical presence requirements of that section of the said Act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Hemphill] rise?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I shall not object, I make this reservation in order to call the attention of the House to House Document No. 90, a communication from the President of the United States. In essence, this communication states that the cost of claims and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, enacted by the Congress last year, amounted to about $17 million. This amount is not related dollar by dollar to private claim bills, but no doubt a substantial portion of it is a result of bills passed under the procedure we have on the floor of the House today, the calling of the Private Calendar.

So the Private Calendar is not just a perfunctory procedure that we go

through. It does represent a substantial cost to the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES, FISCAL YEAR 1964

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Harrison] and one-half of the time to be controlled by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am just wondering why on a bill involving something like $5 billion, the first departmental appropriation bill that we have up for our consideration, and the House having no further business between now and next Thursday, why should there not be an ample amount of time for Members who wish to talk on the subject of the budget have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I shall not make any objection, if that is the decision of the gentleman in charge of the bill. If that is the case, it is all right, but I still do not understand just why when the House has nothing else to do there should not be ample time for a little talk about this situation of the Federal budget not only with reference to this bill, but on other bills that will come later on.

Mr. KIRWAN. May I point out to my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, that this bill does not call for even $1 billion to say nothing of $5 billion, which is the amount mentioned by the gentleman. The amount involved here is only $935 million.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I probably have another bill in mind, but the amount involved in this bill does amount to quite a bit of money in anybody's book.

Mr. KIRWAN. It is a lot of money, but this budget has been well trimmed and furthermore the activities covered here take in quite a bit in revenues. The amount that will be received is $787 million, and as a result the bill costs only about $150 million.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not complaining about your bill, but I am wondering why there should be so much haste here when the House is not doing anything else.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, will the gentleman ask for 3 hours and, if the time is not used, of course, it can be yielded back.

Mr. KIRWAN. I would not have any objection even if we talk here until the next Fourth of July.

Mr. GROSS. That is fine, then how about making it 3 hours?

Mr. KIRWAN. I have no objection to that. It is all right with me.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited not to exceed 3 hours, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Harrison] and one-half of the time by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, with Mr. Price in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent request, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Harrison] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I asked for only 2 hours general debate on the bill is because that is all we thought would be needed. Only a very few Members indicated a desire to use time. I have no objection to the Members talking as long as they want on whatever subject they want, but to talk about the bill.

I want to thank the members of the subcommittee for their cooperation in processing this bill. Their attendance at the hearings was almost 100 percent and everyone worked hard. The new members gave much time and close attention to everything we had to do. The gentleman from Wyoming, who is the ranking minority member, was new to the job but made outstanding contributions and was always most cooperative.

If you go to a ball park you find a fellow just inside the gates wanting to sell you a program so you can identify what is going on at the ball park. The same thing applies at a racetrack or a football game. There is a good report on this bill, a very good one. That is why I ask everyone to read the report, for those who did not sit through the hearings will get a great deal of information from it.

In 1896 when I started to work, the last year of Grover Cleveland's administration, I knew America like very few people knew it. In 1896 it took less than $500 million to run this country. There were 92 million people in America at that time. In 1940 we had 132 million people in the country, and now we have 180 million people. It is obvious what this has meant in the expansion of requirements that have to be met with this bill, involving everything from mapping to provisions for millions of visitors to our parks. For example, over $266 million is now required for the education, health, and welfare of the Indians.

Very few people have any good idea of the Indian problem unless they have lived in an area where there are Indian reservations. We have had some 400 ironclad contracts with the Indians and I do not think we ever kept 1. If we do not keep contracts with the people who owned this country what chance have we got trying to please the rest of the world?

It was my job to go down to the South Pacific a year ago last November and when I got down there the first school I saw with the American flag flying on it did not have one bench in it, one chair, or one desk. Our enemies realize this. All they have to do is take the hearings on the Interior Department appropriations. We have owned American Samoa for many years and this year we graduated the first high school students—never a college student. No wonder parts of the world are shocked when they hear us say we are the greatest race on earth. Now we are providing funds in this bill to correct the neglect in American Samoa and the trust territory.

This bill is cut approximately 9 percent and the interesting thing about it is that this bill is cut $21 million below the chamber of commerce recommendation.

Now, if I had my way, and if the Nation were in a better financial situation, this bill would call for $2 or $3 billion, because there is not a man or woman in this room who does not know we have robbed and looted the greatest country in the world for 300 years, all the way from Maine to California. One of our great Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt, established the Reclamation Act of 1902. He was the savior of this country. It stopped them from robbing and looting. But all the money we spent on America from 1902 to 1932 on reclamation was about $300 million to save the greatest country in the world.

Here is a bill that produces revenues of $787 million, largely offsetting the $935 million that you are appropriating. If the rest of the bills were like it we would have money in the bank.

You cannot continue to have this country go forward and not spend a few dollars on its natural resources.

There are some problems of overlapping in agency and department programs. That is why I asked you to look at the report. There are 8 different departments and 19 agencies that have gone into the study of water. Can you imagine, 19 agencies have gone into the study of water? With budget requests totaling over $76 million.

When I tell you that it is a good bill, I mean it is a good bill.

You hear a lot of people say, "I wish we could go back to the olden days." Here is a picture that shows what happened during the olden days. This was taken in 1896. Th oldest boy working in the breaker was 9 years of age and the youngest was 7. He got 3½ cents an hour. And, notice the breaker boss. You cannot see his body, but you can see his hands. In one hand he has a club and in the other a mace. That is what he beat you with. A camera does not lie. That is the olden days. That was America when we were not spending a dime on ourselves, and it has not changed much down through the years, when you look at the objections at every turn of the road when we try to help mankind or try to improve this country. You always find people objecting and denouncing things that are good for America. But, life was good to me; the country was good to me; my Maker was good to me, very, very good.

You will notice in this bill that the Park Service is trying to buy 5,000 more acres in the Everglades when they have 1,300,000 acres already and should be budgeting its request on urgent items. And, again, they are trying to buy more land across the Potomac River from George Washington's home. We took care of the essential purchase at Mockley Point last year. We have appraisals on land in that area running as high as $12,000 an acre.

I defy any man in this room to say he voted to spend $12,000 an acre for land to protect the view from Mt. Vernon. This view is not going to be disturbed anyway.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to look back and again ask the Members to reflect upon our forests and our streams. For instance, the Susquehanna River in the early 1890's I recall quite vividly. As a boy on a steamboat which traveled that river between Harrisburg and other points. Today you cannot run a canoe on it. There has been a great eroding and filling in that river, and all of the rivers in America. When you undertake to correct this and spend the money, oh, the howling and the growling that comes about.

Mr. Chairman, we would not have this budget in here today if the Congress down through the years had done its job. We did not in the Committee on Appropriations pass the authorizing legislation providing for the programs for which we are now asked to appropriate money. It was the Congress that passed it and not the Committee on Appropriations. We have no authorizing rights. Everything in this bill was passed by the Congress of the United States. Some of the Members who voted for its passage are now complaining about the cost involved. We cannot blame the people down the street for this. This is the result of action on the floor of the U.S. Congress. The Congress passed the bill. Some want us to buy almost one-third of America for parks and wet lands. We already have over 500 million acres of land under the control of the Department of the Interior. Look at the money we are wasting buying additional land when we have so much land now that we do not know what to do with it. But, we are grinding out the authorizations.

Mr. Chairman, we may have been a little slow in getting this bill before the House for action, but when it comes in here, the bill is as nearly correct and right as we can make it. I urge the Members to get a copy of the report and take a look at it. In my opinion any time a committee of the Congress brings a bill out of the committee in the amount of $21 million less than the chamber of commerce suggested, that committee is doing a good job.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. By what amount is this bill below the spending level for this agency last year?

Mr. KIRWAN. The bill is only $9,242,200 or 1 percent, over the current year. One item of increase is to improve education in the trust islands. The authorizing committee authorized over $15 million for this purpose in the trust islands. We did not authorize this. However, this is the law.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, what is it below the budget?

Mr. KIRWAN. It is $92.8 million below the budget. We cut that much out of it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has made an excellent statement with respect to employment in the Department of the Interior which statement is to be found on page 49 of the committee hearings. However, I would ask the gentleman if his committee increased the number of employees and, if so, by how many?

Mr. KIRWAN. We added something like 796 employees, a 1 percent increase. We cut out 2,679, a 5-percent reduction in the total.

The increase is for teachers for the Indian schools, trust territory, mapping, parks, and all those items in the budgets. The committee did not authorize that, the Congress did.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but this again gets back to the innocuousness of an authorization bill. The gentleman from Ohio, I am sure, does not believe that any authorization bill coming to the House of Representatives is innocuous simply because it is an authorization bill; is that not correct?

Mr. KIRWAN. Within the total, we had to provide an increase of $22.5 million for forest access roads because of the new contract authority in the Federal-aid Highway Act. That we have nothing to do with. It is back-door spending. Probably the bill would be millions less if it were not for the fact that we have no control over the contract authorizations, such as highway spending, and so on. What we are faced with is that we owe the money and have to pay it according to the law. If it were not for that, this bill would be way below the bill of last year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, on the subject of the pay increase bill, does the gentleman have in mind the amount of increase in the bill that was necessary because of that pay increase bill?

Mr. KIRWAN. They asked for over $13 million and we cut the pay increase item 40 percent. They will have to take care of that themselves.

Mr. GROSS. That is, the amount that they asked to fund the pay increase of last year?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct. We cut it 40 percent.

Mr. GROSS. On the assumption that by attrition and by greater productivity they could take up that 40 percent?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. They will have to find ways and means.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman is acquainted with the Randall report last year which said that the entire pay increase in all agencies and departments of Government would be taken care of through greater productivity.

Mr. KIRWAN. We have cut employees each year.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman's committee cut it 40 percent, but there is still a 60-percent increase for that purpose in the bill?

Mr. KIRWAN. Was it the Committee on Appropriations that authorized the pay increase? The gentleman knows that is not so.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I have a question I would like the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee to answer for the record. I should be surprised if the information is available without some research, but I think Members of the House and the people of the country ought to know the vast amount of money that is being spent by the executive departments traveling all over the United States and throughout the world. Nothing has impressed me more in our hearings in the Independent Offices Subcommittee than the constant and continuous requests for increased funds to finance travel. Would it be possible before this debate is concluded, sometime during the afternoon, for the chairman to have some information placed in the RECORD indicating how much money there is in this bill for travel?

Mr. KIRWAN. We cut the travel item in two agencies that did not live up to our requests in the last bill. We censured them in this bill. That is what I am trying to tell the gentleman, this is a good bill.

Mr. JONAS. I think it is a good bill and intend to vote for it. I want to congratulate publicly the subcommittee on making substantial cuts.

Mr. KIRWAN. There were only two agencies in this bill that did not conform to the committee's request last year and cut out travel. We censured those two agencies for not doing so.

Mr. JONAS. It is a question of control and how much travel is involved.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. We have asked the agencies to exercise strict control on travel. I will say this about travel; one of the wealthiest men I know used to denounce me every time I took a trip. He finally retired from business and went around the world. He sent me a letter saying, "I know that you have my letters on file and I would like to have them sent back to me. All my life I was a businessman, but after my trip around the world I found out that you do not make enough trips, you and the rest of your friends in Congress, to see what is becoming of the American dollar and the American boy. Every time you make one of those trips somebody in the press denounces you for going on a junket."

It takes a man of courage to make one of those trips to find out what becomes of the boy and the dollar.

Mr. JONAS. I agree. I think we ought to have closer examination and investigation of places where the public money is being spent. I have never hesitated to take trips when they can serve a useful purpose.

Mr. KIRWAN. But you have to do it.

Mr. JONAS. The congressional branch of the Government is subjected to most of the criticism, but I think somewhere along the line the record ought to show how much travel is being done by members of the executive branch. I know it would be a difficult thing to pull it all together in one lump sum in a bill as big as this is. We are going to make an effort to do it in the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. I will be glad to do it in this bill and every bill to find out how much travel is going up.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ULLMAN. I commend my friend from Ohio for another very fine conservation statement. I know how deeply he feels about the soil, the forests, and the land of America. I know he knows that in the years to come we are going to have some 300 million people living in this country. I commend him for the many hours of work he and his committee have put in on this bill. There is no finer or more worthwhile expenditure in the whole budget than the amount he has in this Interior Department Appropriations bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman from Ohio has made a very good point in regard to the authorization by the legislative committee, but I want to remind our colleagues that the legislative committee also has a problem in this regard. Take for instance the Cape Cod National Seashore Park. Under the leadership of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] this committee no longer writes an open-end bill. There is always a specific dollar amount in the bill.

When the committee asked the people who were sponsoring this legislation from the administrative branch how much this would cost they said it would cost $14 million. This year when the Park Service came to the committee of the gentleman from Ohio they said, "I think we estimated the entire cost at around $20 million." You see it has gone up $6 million from the time they told our committee $14 million. But if we take the average figures that have been paid for land to this point and look at the amount of land that is left to buy there, we will spend not $20 million but in the neighborhood of $50 to $60 million to acquire all this property.

What I am asking the gentleman is whether he does not think that we might have a little more honesty in the estimated appraised value of these properties we are acquiring when the bills are before the Congress in the first place.

Mr. KIRWAN. Certainly. I know what the gentleman is talking about. A few years ago they said most of the people were going to donate easements on their land on a particular project and that $1,600 an acre would be the most we would have to pay for the land to be purchased. If I were on the committee I would do the same as the committee did, I would vote it out as they did, without a dissenting vote. But when it came before the Committee on Appropriations the lawyer representing some of the people who were supposed to donate the land said, "Do you think we are crazy? We are not donating a foot of this land." That is not what they said to the authorizing committee. I am not blaming them. Now the waterfront property comes up to $12,000 an acre. But that is not what we were told. It is when they come before the Committee on Appropriations that we get the truth. It all looks pretty when they come in front of you, but when they come in front of the Appropriations Committee and they have a lawyer in there they say, "No, we won't donate a foot of this land."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman on bringing before the Congress what I think is a very good bill. I am very pleased I can be a member of this committee. It is a pleasure to work with both the majority and minority members of the committee.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the two clerks of this committee, Eugene Wilhelm and his assistant, Carson Culp. They know the Department of the Interior and related agencies from A to Z, and I know the chairman knows that they have been a great help to the committee.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. I, too, wish to commend the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee. In my opinion, they have reported out a very realistic bill. I think in light of conditions as they are in the Nation at the present time, perhaps, this is about all that can be logically spent for the purposes set forth.

I particularly wish to commend the chairman and the committee for his and the committee's willingness to work with the authorizing committee. This has been a relationship that has developed within the last few years. It makes it much easier for the authorizing committee to know the problems of the appropriating committee. I am sure that in some instances it makes it much easier for the appropriating committee to understand the difficulties under which the authorizing committees work. I think the gentleman from Ohio has made a very good statement. I do not know how you keep these evils of the private-enterprise system from working as they sometimes do. It is my opinion that when we authorize some of these park facilities, the people who appear before the authorizing committee are honest, and they are sincere in the position that they take and in the statements they make, but as soon as the authorization has been approved, then the people who want to make money move in and boost up the prices and make it almost impossible to follow through on a satisfactory legislative procedure.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the appropriating process that they just leave some of these facilities unappropriated, for after they reach the authorized sum of money, and let us see if we cannot get some of this operation back on a sound financial basis. It has only been in recent years that we have tried to close up these open-end authorizations, and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House is one of the few committees that endeavors to do this. We do not get the job done, apparently, but there is this about it, everybody in this body can understand what has happened since the time of the authorization, and the appropriation and the construction that takes place thereafter in many of the activities, even in what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has to undertake, some of these programs, because they have had open-end authorizations, have grown from 1 installation to 23 installations. I am referring now, of course, to the Bureau of Mines. Perhaps the work that they do is satisfactory. Perhaps it is reasonably necessary. But certainly this body has the right to know every time a new facility has to be constructed. This has not been the case in the past. I commend the gentleman for the fine work that he has done not only in this instance but in the past.

Mr. KIRWAN. Please understand I am not condemning any of the witnesses who come before your committee or any authorizing committee or before the Committee on Appropriations.

But, Mr. Chairman, let us see about this bill. The amount recommended for 1964 is $935,690,200. This year appropriations are estimated at $926,448,000. In other words, this is $9.2 million, or 1 percent, over 1963, including the pending supplementals. The bill is $92.8 million, or 9 percent, below the budget estimate.

The revenues generated by activities in the bill are estimated at over $787 million, an increase of $7 million.

We made a 40-percent cut in requests for the increased 1964 Pay Act costs. No new construction starts of research facilities or vessels were allowed, which represented a cut of about $11,337,000.

Requests for additional research funds totalling $15.7 million were cut $7.8 million, or 50 percent, allowing only the items placed in the highest priority by the bureaus.

All requests for additional passenger motor vehicles, were disallowed, except for 25 school buses.

Per diem allowances for consultants were held to $75 per day.

The limitation on the unit cost of employee housing was continued at $20,000.

Travel limitations were placed on two bureaus which did not take effective action to control expenditures as requested by the committee last year.

We have disallowed 2,679 positions or 80 percent of the requested increase of 3,475 permanent positions. This is a 5-percent cut in the total positions requested. The increase of 796 permanent positions allowed represents an increase of only 1 percent.

We would like to have cut out all new personnel, but we must provide expanded operations as follows:

Education and welfare and health of the Indians. There will be an additional 1,245 pupils to care for in Indian boarding and day schools, and an increase of 21,965 patient days in Indian hospitals.

It is estimated there will be 217 million visitors to the national parks and forests this year, an increase of 11 million.

Major budget increases allowed in the bill include an increase of $8.9 million for the education, welfare, health, and economic development of the Indians. This is $8.4 million less than requested.

An increase of $5.7 million for Geological Survey, which is $4.3 million less than requested, for additional topographic and geologic mapping and water resources investigations.

An increase of $2.4 million for saline water research, a reduction of $500,000.

An increase of $22.5 million for forest access roads, a cut of $6.4 million.

An increase of $9.1 million for the Smithsonian Institution, including $5.4 million for remodeling the old Patent Office Building.

It is desired to preserve the old Patent Office Building because of the associations with great people and events in our history. The additional funds for the Smithsonian Institution are needed because so many of their activities are scattered in different buildings and they should be concentrated in one place. They want to get into this building which the Civil Service Commission is vacating to take up permanent quarters in their new office building.

I hope when we start reading the bill the Members present will remember that this is one of the best bills the committee has brought in, at least during my 21 years on the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has not yet said anything about the fish tank down here. I know we have appropriated something over $300,000 to get blueprints for the tank.

Mr. KIRWAN. I think enough was said about it last year.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, no. I just want to help the gentleman cut the bill a little more.

Mr. KIRWAN. No. Now, just let me tell you something. They opened up an aquarium in Philadelphia recently. They are charging $2 admission for an adult and $1 for children under 18. It is planned to charge only 60 cents here and with the millions of visitors to the Nation's Capital the entire cost, as required by the authorization, will be repaid.

Mr. GROSS. I will not buy that at all.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might use.

Mr. Chairman, when the Department of the Interior and related agencies bill came before our committee, I must confess I was shocked to note that the Department asked for a 14.5-percent increase over their budget in 1963. It is no secret that I am one of those so-called conservatives. I join with many Members on my side of the aisle who feel that this country of ours is in a very serious financial situation, and that Congress, because it is the duty of the Congress, must make an effort to eliminate unnecessary domestic expenditures, reduce our continuing deficit spending, get back on a balanced budget, and make some honest attempt to pay our national debt. If this is not done, there is no question but what in years to come our survival will be much in doubt.

I was pleased to find that the welfare of our country and the need and desires to save money was not a partisan issue. I want to pay tribute to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], for his willingness and his desire to see that proper and substantial cuts are made in the spending requests of the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service.

I want to commend the other majority members of the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], who also went along with my colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL], and myself in a desire to be perfectly fair in cutting this bill; perfectly fair in giving the Department the money they might need and should have without crucifying them or hurting their program, yet at the same time eliminating all of that money which we feel is unnecessary and which is now wasted.

It is no secret that over the years the Department has come before the Congress and asked for more money than they actually hoped to get. I do not believe there is an appropriation bill submitted to the Congress that cannot be cut, and I think they should be cut. It is our duty here in this body to see that the proper cuts are made and that the proper allocations are made to keep the departments in line and to see that they can continue the work they have to do.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. A discussion was engaged in about the rising cost of travel in the Department of the Interior. If my facts are straight, the Department of Defense, about a year ago, due to an Executive order which required that all personnel traveling by air at Government expense do so at the lowest available fare. I realize you cannot legislate in an appropriation bill. What would the gentleman think about the appropriation bill being amended to require that the personnel of the Department of the Interior using funds for air travel may do so only at the lowest available fare?

Mr. HARRISON. I will say to the gentleman that I certainly agree with his thinking. But, if he will check our record of the hearings, he will find that that point was brought out, particularly by the chairman, and that on many occasions a directive or instructions were issued to the different departments to use the economy class fare instead of first class. I think under the circumstances, in view of the hearings and the instructions given, that it would not be necessary to amend the bill this year. Of course, if they do not comply with those requests, then I think it would be in order next year to see that it is written in there so that they could not violate it in any way. There were some departments who did not take care of their travel in the proper way, and we specifically provided that they could not go over the amount that was allowed or spend any more money than allocated for that particular service.

Mr. FINDLEY. Am I correct in assuming, then, that it is departmentwide policy today that air travel be at the lowest available rate?

Mr. HARRISON. At the lowest economical rate. I assume they would use the economy rate rather than first-class travel.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRISON. Throughout our hearings our committee gave very thorough consideration to the requests of each of the departments. The hearings are lengthy, as you can tell from the volume of the hearings, and I think that we came up with a very fair figure as far as the amount which the committee allowed for the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service. We did make a cut of 9 percent. We think that is a very substantial cut. We think, however, it is a justified cut. The total cut of the amount requested was $92,818,800. We also made a substantial cut in the number of new employees which the departments requested. There was a request for 3,475 new employees, an increase of 6 percent. We allowed an increase of 1 percent or 796 employees. And, they were designated for certain areas, such as health and other areas of that type, so that they were not spread all over the agency.

I might point out that the Bureau of Land Management wanted 198 new positions. They were all disallowed. The Bureau of Mines wanted 139; all disallowed. Forest Service, 427; turned down. Indian Affairs asked for 664 to serve 1,245 new pupils, and they were allowed 47. I think our cut in employment is substantial, but I think the Department can operate on that basis. I think they will not be crippled in any way.

One thing that we found in our hearings is that there is a tendency—I know it is not only with these departments but with others—to use the word "research" to secure money from the Congress. We found that there were over 20 agencies engaged in water research, and we eliminated the Bureau of Mines from going into new research of ocean water, because that agency had no business there. And, I only hope that over the years Congress will take a much closer look at the question of research and try to avoid duplication in the different departments, and if research is necessary, for heaven's sake let us put it in those agencies that now handle it but not have duplication, because with duplication there is an excessive waste of the public's money.

I might say that I recognize the fact that there are many people who say we did not cut enough. There are probably many people who say we cut too much. There will be many people who say we did not put our cuts in the right place.

I think we did a good job. I think the committee worked hard and conscientiously. I am proud of the results that we have achieved.

Mr. Chairman, I might say very frankly to the members of the committee that I would have been most happy if we could have found other places to reduce, especially in view of the necessity to pinch every penny we can in this country, to really reduce every unnecessary expense, whether it be good or not, particularly if it is not needed at this particular time.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope if those things are found that they will be eliminated, but our feeling was that some of the funds that were left in the bill were the result of actions by legislative committees of the House of Representatives. They were programs which had been previously authorized and we felt we could not eliminate them. However, it will be your duty and your obligation and your prerogative here on the floor of the House to reduce those if you so desire.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have a very fair bill. I think it represents a substantial cut. I feel that if other departments receive the same cuts we will make a very substantial dent in the Federal expenditures for fiscal 1964.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the distinguished gentlemen of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee and particularly the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and also the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. HARRISON]. I am greatly pleased with the increased appropriation of $100,000 for expansion of pesticide-wildlife studies under the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. This is a vital and important area and I urge that immediate action be undertaken lest we have a series of silent springs. It is of the utmost importance that we move quickly and do everything that we can to control this major problem which confronts all of humanity. In another area, I am pleased with the $30,000 appropriation for the cooperative fishery unit at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst. With a strong professional staff already available there, I am sure important investigational work will be done immediately.

Mr. HARRISON. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. I might say to the gentleman that I too am very proud of the cuts we have made. I might say if we had not made substantial cuts I would have personally been in here with a minority report. But I also want to say in deference to our chairman and the cooperation which I received from the chairman and the majority members, and the fact that we did make substantial cuts and cuts which I thought were proper, certainly prevented me from even considering a minority report. I certainly will stand on the report which we have presented as being one which I think is a good report and one which should be approved.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in commending the subcommittee for reducing this budget by something like 9 percent. I think this is clear evidence that the information we have been getting—and most of it has been coming from the executive branch—that this budget was so tight it could not be cut is not true. I hope this is something which will give stimulus to other subcommittees to try to strive for further reductions. I think such cuts can be made and can be made in a way that they will not in any way damage the best interests of the United States either here or abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the subcommittee, and I certainly hope with all this publicity we are getting on the budget that this will be the initiative whereby we reduce it further. I feel it can be reduced in other areas as well as what the members of this subcommittee have done here.

Mr. HARRISON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, this is an historic occasion for the gentleman from South Dakota. I happen to be a member of a tribe that is being covered by the appropriation which is contained in this bill. I want here to express my deep appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], for his continued and deep interest in the welfare of the American Indian in this country.

I also want to express my appreciation at this point to the Members on my side and the leadership which enabled me to be assigned to the Committee on Appropriations. It was doubly difficult for me to scrutinize every item contained in this appropriation bill for the reason that I spent almost a quarter of a century as an employee in the Department of the Interior, and I was familiar with the work. I was familiar with the work of each of the sections, branches, and bureaus and I knew the fine job that is done by the employees in those agencies. Of course, each wants to do an outstanding job and each can find many worthwhile things to do. But in a time such as we are in now, when we feel that we ought to get our budgetary arrangements in better shape, it was with some reluctance, knowing the job that needs to be done with our resources, that needs to be done with our people in order that we shall leave in a day ahead a better America for all who are yet to come, I was delighted to find the chairman of our subcommittee and the ranking minority member concerned with bringing the budget requests within some semblance of balance between the needs and the cost to our country.

So we find almost a 10-percent cut, agreed to by both sides alike, as the thing to do. I feel we have here a bill that has cut back in those areas that can be cut back without damage to our country and without harm to the people who will be affected. I feel that it is an excellent bill.

We have devoted a great deal of time in committee, with the help of the staff, to cut wherever it seemed possible to cut without doing harm to our country.

And so I am hopeful that when the debate finally ends we will be in sufficient agreement so that we can accept this bill as it is. I am sure, as was pointed out by the ranking minority member of our subcommittee that there are those who feel that there should be a greater cut and there are those who feel that we cut too much. But it has been our best judgment that this is a bill that we can defend here on the House floor.

We have joined together in bringing about the cuts that we think it can stand and leave our country with the kind of service that can be provided by the Department of the Interior and keep it a good and a going country.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, as I am sure almost every Member of this House knows I was a member of this Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of the Interior for many years.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. JENSEN. I am delighted to yield to my good friend from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I cannot pass up the opportunity to say something for the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Appropriations. We all know our able and distinguished, hard working friend, Congressman JENSEN. We have all known him for many years. I do not think there is a finer man in this House, or any place else; or a harder working

Member, one more dedicated to the people of his district and the Nation.

As well as I recall, Ben, if I may call him that affectionately, and our able friend from Ohio, Mr. Kirwan, have worked together on this bill for 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, what a tremendous job they have done. I hope the best of everything for our able friend from Iowa [Mr. Jensen]. I want to listen very carefully to what he says, because whenever he takes the floor and talks, it is worthy of the attention of the membership of the House.

Ben, I wish you well, and I hope you live to be as old as I am, and that will make you only 34.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank my esteemed friend from Texas [Mr. Thomas] for his kind words. I feel I am not entitled to all the praise he has just showered on me, but we are all vain, you know, so I thank you, Al.

I was about to say that I served on this subcommittee for the Interior Department appropriations for a period of 20 years. I found it necessary during this session of Congress to yield my membership on that committee in order to make a place for a new member on the Appropriations Committee. It has proven that my appointment of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Harrison] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel] has borne out my contention that they would be valuable Members of this House to serve on this very important committee.

The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Harrison] was a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for several years and as such he became very well acquainted with all the ramifications of the Department of the Interior in all its facets. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel] was an area director of the Indian Service for many years, and as such he is familiar with most every agency of the Interior Department. They have served on this committee in the most commendable manner during this session.

I want to compliment the chairman of this committee, my friend from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan]. I served with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan] on this subcommittee 20 years. Some think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan] is a liberal spender. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan] knows that we must head off this unconscionable spending of the American people's tax dollars, or soon our dollars, the dollars in our pockets, will be very greatly depreciated in purchasing power.

This bill comes to the floor of the House reduced over 9 percent, making a dollarwise cut of $92,818,800 below the President's budget.

Every dollar in this bill is for America and the American people, for the preservation and the conservation of our priceless topsoil, our forests and all our natural resources. In this bill is appropriated funds for recreation, for the Fish and Wildlife Service, and for the national parks and numerous other agencies.

Most important of all is the preservation and conservation of our most precious natural resource—our children. I plead guilty, my colleagues, to being quite liberal in helping to appropriate for recreation, for the Fish and Wildlife Service and for the National Park Service. And why do I do that? Because I know that for example last year over 200 million people visited our lakes, our parks and forests. What does that mean? That means that mothers and fathers took their children to the great outdoors where they communed with nature. Nature, as you know, is God's business. These children by going to the great outdoors commune with nature and become interested in all the things that are natural. When they become natural, they become practical. When they become practical, they become good children and they grow up to be fine men and women. There is an old adage, my friends, which is just as true today as when the words were first uttered, "Take your boy hunting, and you will never have to hunt for your boy." Child delinquency is greatly reduced among children whose parents take their children to the great outdoors. So I shall not have it on my conscience nor will the members of this committee have it on their conscience that they have been a party to more child delinquency. The cost is a small fraction of 1 percent of the money wasted across the seven seas. I only wish we would put greater emphasis on clubs that would spend their time taking our American boys and girls to the great outdoors. In time child delinquency would dwindle to a minimum, if every American boy and girl could be taken by their parents or by people who are interested in children to the great outdoors. There is hardly such a thing as child delinquency among children whose parents take them hunting and fishing, boating and swimming.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk now about the education of our Indian children. When Glenn Emmons took over the directorship of the Indian Bureau in 1953, there were over 20,000 Indian children of school age without a teacher or a schoolroom. Today there are less than 2,500 Indian children without school facilities and that fine record has been made at minimum cost. We must continue to live up, as best we can, to the treaty which Uncle Sam made with the American Indians which was that we would furnish a schoolroom and a teacher for every 35 Indian children. We are now trying hard to live up to that treaty Mr. Chairman. I have always reserved the right to vote for any amendment that I felt was justified, which is introduced to any appropriation bill or any legislative bill. I reserve that right today. But I do say in all sincerity that the members of this committee and their great clerk, Gene Wilhelm, and his fine associate, Carson Culp, have done a good job, and I compliment them for it. I am happy that this bill comes to the floor with a cut of $92,818,800 below the President's budget.

I thank you.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. Hansen].

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the Appropriations Committee, I would like to commend and congratulate Chairman Kirwan for the fair and impartial manner in which his subcommittee hearings were conducted and for this same fairness in the preparation of the Committee's final report. Chairman Kirwan has an intimate grasp of the problems facing the agencies whose budgets were under consideration; his understanding of the general budget situation was a realistic one and it is a privilege and a pleasure to serve here.

I should also like to pay tribute to my committee colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Denton], the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. Harrison], and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel].

I want also to mention the work of the helpful and capable staff, Eugene Wilhelm and Carson Culp, who assisted us so skillfully and knowledgeably.

This is a luxurious budget. As finally approved by the committee the bill appropriates $936,690,200 of which $597,860,200 is for the Department of the Interior and $337,830,000 for related agencies which represents a cut of $95,423,200 from that suggested by the Bureau of the Budget. However, today's bill will continue existing services at present levels, allowing only increases with the highest justification.

The bill appropriates $37.5 million more for 1964 than was available during the 1963 fiscal year. Most of this increase is explained by the additional $8,400,000 suggested for the Trust Territory Schools and the additional $22,500,000 suggested for forest access roads.

As Members of the House of Representatives know, the lumber industry throughout the Nation is faced with many problems. This is particularly so this year in the Pacific Northwest. The Appropriations Committee in its deliberations recognized this fact by increasing the amount appropriated for forest access roads from $37½ to $60 million.

The committee realized that the hurricane winds last October 12 in the Pacific Northwest resulting in a blowdown of about 11 billion board feet of prime timber, about 2 billion of which was on Federal lands, justified increases in funds to build roads on which this timber could be taken out of the woods. The committee realized also that a major factor to be considered was the necessity of removing ripe timber from the woods before fire and insect infestation endangered forests in the entire Northwest.

Among the other important programs so essential to the entire Nation in the field of forestry is that of research in the many major categories. For example one of the great problems is in the field of seeding and in the development of research to find better methods relative to wild-animal damage to small newly planted trees.

Not long ago I had a letter from Mr. Bill Hagenstein of the Western Forestry Association, in which he listed several case histories, and these I call to your attention now:

CASE HISTORY NO. 1

One example of this is a 957-acre area within the 1951 Forks Burn in Clallam County. This area was planted with 2-year-old Douglas-fir in November and December of 1957 to an average density of 650 trees per acre. All seedlings had been previously treated with animal repellents to discourage damage by wildlife. Reports from planting crews and company foresters observed herds of elk in the area immediately after planting, and upon inspection found extensive damage to the planted seedlings, large numbers of which had been completely pulled from the ground. Seven months later an intensive inspection indicated seedling survival was only 20 percent of those planted. This survey also indicated that the remaining trees were 53 percent damaged by animals. The financial loss on this one area is outlined here:

Cost of planting at $19 per acre	$18,183.00
Approximate cost of seedlings at $4 per acre	3,828.00
Total cost of project	22,011.00
Cost per acre	23.00
Loss of wildlife (80 percent)	17,608.00
Dollar loss per acre	18.40

In addition to elk, deer and mountain beaver were contributors to the seedling loss. This is one example of what has occurred to various degrees on 2,897 acres of ——— ownership in the Forks Burn planted between 1958 and 1961. As a result, hand planting, as a means of obtaining adequate reforestation in the Forks Burn, has been discontinued.

CASE HISTORY NO. 2

Area scarified in 1958–59 and planted in 1958–59, Clatsop

Elk activity here this past winter is probably the heaviest ever seen concentrated in an area. This plantation after scarification is severely browsed, in fact, to my eye is practically a total loss. Bordering area, containing some Douglas-fir planted in 1953 which was replanted in this 1958–59 season is equally struck. Evidence of heavy elk use is demonstrated by close cropping of herbacious brush, grasses, and conifer trees, runs and tracks and beds.

Also, bordering the scarified-planted area is ground where alder encroached on 1953 plantings. This was sprayed by helicopter in the summer of 1959; and some of ground containing closed canopy alder was replanted in the 1959–60 season. Elk damage is severe here also. A staked survival row was checked from the 1959–60 planting. Following are the results:

TABLE I

Planted species	Number stakes	Thrifty number	Weak number	Dead number	Missing number	Percent survival
Sitka-spruce	24	5	10	3	6	62.5
Douglas-fir	19	0	9	5	5	47.5
Total or average	43	5	19	8	11	55.8

The above determines survival as is, but does not indicate the serious condition of 66.7 percent of the living trees. As follows:

TABLE II

	Number Sitka-spruce	Percent of total	Number Douglas-fir	Percent of total
1. Dead (undetermined)	1	4.2	0	0
2. Killed; tree found pulled out, or stub found without foliage	2	8.3	5	26.3
3. Missing; no complete evidence, but probably elk pullups	6	25.0	5	26.3
4. Heavy, close cropped; trees not likely to survive	7	29.2	6	31.6
5. Medium, leader clipped, but tree should survive	1	4.2	3	15.8
6. Light, leader tip clipped; tree not impaired	3	12.5	0	0
7. Underaged	4	16.6	0	0
Total	24		19	

Table II illustrates more conclusively the fate of this plantation by exactly categorizing each tree of the staked row examined. For example:

While table I shows 47.5-percent survival for Douglas-fir, actually only 15.8 percent of the trees will survive. Sitka spruce shows 62.5-percent survival, but only 33.3 percent will survive. And these trees will only survive if browsing ceases. It also illustrates that under severe conditions, spruce may be browsed, but not to the extent of Douglas-fir.

CASE HISTORY NO. 3

Reforestation on various company lands

Section 19, township 14 south, range 4 east: Hand seeded Douglas-fir and poison bait, 1954; hand planted Douglas-fir, 1958.

Sections 19 and 30, township 14 south, range 4 east: Hand seeded Douglas-fir, 1957; hand planted Douglas-fir, 1959.

Section 25, township 14 south, range 3 east: Hand planted Douglas-fir, 1954.

Section 25 and 26, township 14 south, range 3 east: Hand planted Douglas-fir, 1954; hand planted Douglas-fir, 1958.

Section 23, township 14 south, range 3 east: South half aerial seeded Douglas-fir and poison bait, 1951; portion of south half hand planted Douglas-fir, 1952; portion of southeast quarter hand seeded Douglas-fir, 1955; portion of southeast quarter hand planted Douglas-fir, 1959.

Section 26, township 14 south, range 3 east: West half, northwest quarter hand seeded Noble-fir, 1955; east half, northwest quarter hand seeded Douglas-fir, 1955; northwest quarter, southwest quarter seeded Douglas-fir, 1958; northwest quarter, southwest quarter aerial seeded Douglas-fir, 1959.

Section 22, township 14 south, range 3 east: South half aerial seeded Douglas-fir and poison bait, 1951; northwest quarter and west half, northeast quarter aerial poison baited, 1951; northeast quarter and north half, southeast quarter hand planted Douglas-fir, 1957; south half, north half, northeast quarter hand seeded Ponderosa Pine, 1959; north half, north half, northeast quarter hand planted Douglas-fir, 1960.

Section 16 township 14 south, range 3 east: No reforestation work.

Section 9, township 14 south, range 3 east: West half, northwest quarter, northeast quarter hand planted Douglas-fir, 1954; scarified area in northeast quarter hand planted Douglas-fir, 1959.

Section 5, township 14 south, range 3 east: North half hand planted Douglas-fir, 1954.

It was recognized in this bill that acceleration of the process of providing educational facilities in the trust territories is more than justified, indeed is a necessity.

Recognition of the lag in elementary education among the young people in the trust territories led to the start of an accelerated elementary education program in 1963. The future of these people in a modern world depends largely upon the education they will obtain in their school systems. Certainly everything we can do to help these young people prepare for the future is our responsibility.

It is true in the territories as well as in our own Nation, that an educated person is a more responsible and productive person.

I want to mention also the appropriation requested for the Fish and Wildlife Service wherein funds requested for this agency are allocations of money to preserve and improve our fish resources. Many of our people depend upon fish for their livelihood and in view of the rapidly increasing population in our Nation it is absolutely essential that these important sources of food be protected and expanded. There is, of course, another aspect to this and that is the sport fishing industry. Millions of our fellow Americans relax with a fishing rod in their hand, and a great industry has been built around sport fishing.

Related to this preservation of our fishing industry is the work of the Bureau of Land Management. The appropriation bill allocates many millions of dollars to this agency. All of it to be used in making our Nation better. Millions of acres of Government land are managed by this agency. Thousands of acres of rangeland are being reseeded. Thousands more will be planted in trees and other crops. Soil conservation projects are underway. Certainly it is to the interest of this generation and to those in the future that this agency be given adequate funds to do the job assigned to it.

When discussing appropriation measures we cannot fail to mention money being used to improve the lives of our Indian citizens. The Bureau of Indian Affairs have under their care and supervision Indian tribes throughout the Nation. Money appropriated today will be used to prepare our Indian citizens for a more active participation in the life of their communities, States, and our Nation. Health standards will be improved, infant mortality decreased, the lifespan lengthened, educational needs fulfilled. Opening new and broadened opportunities for the Indian is a necessity if they are to achieve the full benefits of United States citizenship.

Again, my congratulations, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. Haley].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to commend the gentleman from Ohio and his fine committee for a job well done. He always does a fine job on that committee. I think he has made substantial reductions that will not disrupt any essential function of this Government. I wish it had been possible for him to make a few more. I hope every chairman as he comes along with an appropriation bill during this session of Congress will fall in line and do as well for the American taxpayer as the gentleman from Ohio has done.

I want to disagree, however, a little bit with the gentleman on Indians. I yield to no person in this Congress in the matter of sympathy for the American Indian. I think I know the American Indian possibly better than any man or woman in this great body, except perhaps the gentleman from South Dakota, BEN REIFEL. I have headed the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for a little over 8 years. I think I have visited every Indian reservation in America. I have wondered as I traveled about and wonder still if the Members of this Congress really know how much benefit the American Indian is obtaining from the tremendous amounts of money we are expending in his behalf. In 1954 the requested appropriations for the Indian Bureau were $103 million.

The expenditures were somewhat less than $85 million. The items contained in the present budget amount to $266,533,300, an increase in the last 10 years of approximately $181 million against an expression of the Congress of the United States that we wanted, as rapidly as possible, to make the Indian self-supporting and get him off the backs of the American people.

This Indian problem is not a new one. It has been with us since we became a nation. However, following the instructions of the Congress in the last 10 years, 13 tribes have been terminated, with a total population or a total number of 13,382.

I think there is a policy here in the Congress, it is not only in this particular bill but in every bill that you bring here or that we bring here, to look at the requested budget and not look back and see what the increases have been over the years and trying to find out where these tremendous sums of money are going.

Yes, I am sympathetic to the little Indian child, but I may say to my friend from Ohio, we have less children today going to Indian schools than we had 10 years ago. I say that nobody can challenge that, because as we move along on this program we are asking the State to take over the teaching of the Indian children.

In my State of Florida, where we have been operating Indian schools in the past, we do not operate them any more. We make an agreement with the local school authorities of those counties nearest the Indian reservation, and they take over the education of the Indian children at less than half the amount that was necessary to maintain Indian schools.

I do not blame this committee for this tremendous increase, I do not blame any chairman of the Appropriations Committee for bringing in a bill, to do what? To take care of the obligations that Congress has authorized, has obligated you to move forward on. Yes, as the chairman, Mr. ASPINALL, said just a while ago, we try in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to have the people downtown, when they present a bill to that committee, tell us what it is going to cost. Every committee of the Congress should do that. If we did that we would find that in order to get additional money they would follow along. I assure you that in any of these programs you will be lucky if you get out of them with no less than twice the amount that they asked for. So it is not the fault or responsibility of this committee to cut beyond certain essentials. It is up to the Congress of the United States. You say you control the purse strings, you should control the purse strings, but do not lay the thing in this committee's lap. When you authorize programs, when you pass bills on this floor, find out what they are going to cost, put a ceiling on them, and make them come back and tell you if they have made a mistake. I assure you 75 percent of the time they will be coming back to this Congress and saying, "Oh, we made a mistake this time. We have expended more money. The project is about one-third to one-half complete, and we must have additional money."

Mr. Chairman, I again want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for doing the job, but I want to say to you that I think every person in this Congress, every chairman in this Congress should, when he brings a bill up, make them lay it on the line and let us find out what we are expending it for, and let us not let the people downtown tell us how to run the appropriations of this great Congress.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, it is ironic—and that is a charitable word—it is ironic that today we have a message on foreign aid on the same day we consider appropriations for the American Indian. Have your Alianza Para Progreso, if you wish, but for heaven's sake may we also have in the words of the Ogallala-Sioux "Toe ka'ta Kee'ya-un yampi-wolakota," a treaty of progress for the American Indian.

The voluminous hearings on the appropriations bill before the House include many statements expressing great satisfaction with the Federal Government's Indian program. It is not my purpose to charge anyone with incompetence or malfeasance. Nor is it my purpose to pose as an expert on Indian affairs. I have lived with Indians and close to Indians and have a continuing interest in the Indian which took me to several reservations and settlements last autumn and winter.

When one reads the other side of testimony before the Appropriations Committee, and witnesses first hand, the conditions on our Indian reservations, I cannot avoid the conclusion that our program for development of the American Indian has been a miserable failure. There are many who can take credit for trying to help the Indian. We all must share the blame for the lack of constructive results.

Bear two basic facts in mind:

There are now 380,000 Indians for which the Bureau is responsible. The Bureau was established in 1849.

On page 842 of the hearings note that 95 percent of the Indian children in the boarding schools come from non-English-speaking homes.

On page 844, note:

> It is estimated that 65,000 Indian families are living in housing far below decent minimum standards. Many are living in tar-paper shacks, grass wickiups, etc., under extreme climatic conditions.

On page 845, we quote:

> Our experience over a period of years has shown a steady annual increase in the number of people receiving general assistance.

On page 1468, find this comment:

> Medicine men are still active on some of the reservations and at times the Indians place a great deal of faith in their ability in the healing arts, in conflict with medical treatment as we know it. * * * A language barrier still exists * * * which makes it difficult to communicate with many of the beneficiaries and requires the use of interpreters. * * * Approximately 60 percent of the Navajo and 35 percent of the Papago do not speak English.
>
> Tens of thousands have only polluted water to drink and use. Even this must be hauled long distances.

On 1472, find this table, indicating the Indian mortality rate compared to those of all races in the country: Infant deaths are listed as less than two times greater except for Alaska natives where the rate is about 2.5 greater. There is some excuse for the latter.

Infections diseases—rates per 100,000 population—Indian excluding Alaskan 4 times greater. Gastroenteric diseases, Indian nearly 7 times greater. Influenza and pneumonia over 2 times greater.

Supplement these statistics with figures from 1487:

> Up to the time the Indian infant leaves the hospital after birth, the rates of death are comparable to all races. However, when he leaves the hospital and goes to his Indian home he is subjected to marked unsanitary conditions, poor housing, poor nutrition, crowding, and all the adverse things that we find in the Indian community. As a result, we see the death rate among the Indiana between the ages of 28 days to 11 months is 4 times greater than it is in all races.

These statements of fact, are quotations from personnel of the Indian Bureau and the Public Health Service.

How can we be proud of a 110-year record which leaves so much to be desired?

Nor can we complain about a lack of personnel. The chairman of the subcommittee reports on page 841 that investigations reveal 5,800 employees for educating approximately 42,000 Indian students. This represents a ration of one employee assigned to the educational activity for every seven Indian pupils.

Nor can the blame be laid at the feet of the Appropriations Committee which has provided generous funds through the period. In fact, we have provided for expenditures repeatedly which were used impractically.

The Federal Government proposes to spend many hundreds of thousands of

dollars in one area for the purpose of attracting industry to make jobs for reservation Indians. This is part of a reservoir project. Yet, one can find only a handful of Indians employed today on the vast projects right on the Indian reservation. Every level of labor skills is needed on the project. Yet, practically no Indians are employed.

Nearby is an Indian resettlement. It is a shameful huddle of tents, log cabins, and disreputable shacks. Sometime—sometime, a new town will be built. But for many months, the Indians are relocated on a dusty flat where there is no plumbing, there are no streets, there is no community lighting. There is a well, the water of which I would not drink. As a matter of fact, the make-shift well was condemned late last fall because of the presence of infectious disease. I suppose we should give credit to the State health authorities which closed the well. I cannot give credit to those who provided what I term unequivocably, an unsatisfactory supply of water.

There is, in an adjacent area, a clinic where the doctor serves the people 1 day a week. The day I visited was the appointed day for the medical visit. The doctor was present for a half hour, then left. I assume he had other duties. There was no note indicating he would be back. The Indian lady who walked a long distance carrying a child which she thought needed medical attention, simply started to walk away when she found the clinic unattended.

Elsewhere in America we fight segregation. With the Indians, we promote it. Except for a limited number of major crimes, an Indian judge provides justice.

One Indian judge I know has a fourth grade education. She is a fine woman. She is ambitious. She loves her people. But if she sentences an Indian for a violation which falls under her jurisdiction, there is no court of appeal except the Indian tribal council. Hers is a court apart. Of course, this procedure is in accordance with a treaty or agreement. It is inviolate. Yet, we violate another treaty on the same reservation, by taking land and water rights from the Indian.

There has been progress in some subject areas in various geographic areas. Yet, the general condition of the American Indian is a disgrace and a tragedy.

I compliment those who sincerely try to do something about this situation. I cannot agree that our record is good. Nothing short of a complete redirection of our effort will alter the situation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In 1849, that was the Old Frontier; was it not?

Mr. KYL. I would assume so.

Mr. GROSS. And, if the gentleman will yield further, the New Frontier in 1963 cannot waste a minute to get hundreds of millions of dollars down to South America, to the Congo, Africa, Ghana—you name it—and they are ready to go there with money to take care of the underdeveloped countries in those areas; is that about right?

Mr. KYL. I would assume so.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to add my commendation of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and members of his subcommittee for producing this wonderful bill, this great report and these 1800 pages of hearings.

Perhaps the developments of the past 3 weeks may have focused my attention a little more sharply on some of the bad effects of strip mining, because 3 weeks ago today, as a result of much of this strip mining in West Virginia and Kentucky our floods were made much more serious, and caused a great deal more damage. I wish each Member of the House could have been with me to the Staton Brothers Grocery Store and the Freeman Supermarket in Peach Creek, and numerous other areas of Logan County, W. Va., to see the damage done by this black, gummy, sludgy substance that came down out of the tributaries, which resulted I believe largely from the kind of strip mining which is going on in our coal producing States. Strip mining not only affects the mined areas, but makes it mighty tough on those for miles downstream from the strip mining operation.

Why cannot the Department of Interior do more about this? There are 500,000 acres, as I understand it, of abandoned and unreclaimed strip mining land in the coal-producing States. These lands place an increased tax burden on the whole area. They present health and safety hazards. They contribute soil erosion and stream pollution. And 103,000 of these acres are in the State of West Virginia.

What can be done about this strip mining? I am very deeply impressed with the thoroughness with which the committee has gone into this subject, citing the examples of what the Soil Conservation Service, the Forest Service, and the Tennessee Valley Authority are already doing in this area. This is really not duplication. The Soil Conservation Service is obligated to protect the soil. TVA has a particular geographical area to which it devotes its energies. The Forest Service has to plant trees. But who is going to provide the leadership in order that we can do something about reclaiming these strip mining lands? It is an insult to God and nature to gouge out our beautiful hillsides, not only ruining the landscape but also making vast areas more vulnerable to floods.

I simply throw up my hands in despair and ask the question of whoever could answer it: Who can do something about this terrible situation in strip mining?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I can understand the interest of the gentleman from West Virginia, but I wish to advise him that this matter is not going unstudied as far as the Congress is concerned. We had legislation before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs during the last Congress. We had people from various States who appeared before the committee and we had members of our committee who visited some of these areas.

We find that the States themselves and the authorities are not united in what they think is necessary to help take care of the situation. Neither are the representatives of industry. I can say that we have not finished our studies. We still have legislation before our committee and we shall continue to try to find the answer. It is the feeling of some of us that the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior does not have any specific authority for this work. That is the reason why the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] and others of our committee have asked the committee to take further notice of the condition which the gentleman so forcefully brings to our mind.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado. I hope that aggressive efforts may be made to rehabilitate and reclaim these lands after strip mining has been completed, and I hope that the Federal Government in cooperation with the States and private industry can work harder toward this end.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee is again recommending that the House break faith with those who have worked to preserve the view from Mount Vernon, George Washington's home.

Less than 2 years ago, a bill which I introduced to preserve the Mount Vernon view passed the House without a dissenting vote.

Senator CLINTON ANDERSON's companion bill, passed the Senate without a dissenting vote, and those bills became Public Law 87–362.

Just a year ago, the Appropriations Committee recommended the disallowance of the funds to implement this law. The House, and the Senate, again without a dissenting vote, approved $213,000 to begin acquisition of land, as recommended by the joint conference committee.

In spite of this, the Appropriations Committee recommends that we disallow any funds. The committee advances the same reasons as last year.

These so-called reasons are, that no actions are planned in this area which would detract from the present view of Mount Vernon, that the area is under adequate planning and zoning controls, that the cost will be far greater than estimated, and that the local jurisdiction should make a park at this site.

As I did just 1 year ago, I must again correct the RECORD so that the House may have the true facts.

To take the committee's last point first—that the purposes should be the responsibility of the local jurisdiction—as a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I can again assure the House that the record is entirely clear. This is not a local bill passed to provide a park for local citizens. The

Interior Committee recommended Public Law 87–362 to protect the view from Mount Vernon for the millions of visitors who come to that shrine from all over America and all over the free world.

The Appropriations Committee again makes the point that it knows of "no evidence that any action is planned that would in any way detract from the present view from Mount Vernon." The committee again this year has chosen to ignore testimony, and repeated statements that the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission desires to locate a sewage plant within the confines of the area covered by Public Law 87–362.

The committee then re-recites the presence of adequate zoning. From testimony which it has, the committee must be aware that the adequate zoning they refer to allows development of 10,000 square feet lots under the rural residential category, and that the local zoning laws have no control over such agencies as the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, who have the power of eminent domain over land, even if it is directly across from Mount Vernon.

At this point the committee suggests that the generous donations by patriotic foundations of 350 acres along the Potomac and an additional 151 acres already donated on the south shore of Picataway Creek, coupled with the donation of scenic easements on hundreds of acres by scores of private citizens without cost to the Government, justifies the Congress going back on its commitments.

The committee's recommendations, if followed by the House, it will allow the three to five farmers who claim their farmland is worth $12,000 per acre—a rather high price for farmland—to make a real killing. If the House allows the committee's recommendations, the farmers' land will be surrounded with lands donated without cost to the Federal Government, and protected by easements donated to the Federal Government. The committee wants these farmers to be free to proceed with high-density development within the area protected by Public Law 87–362, and the committee would have the House disregard the scores of individuals, and the organizations who have donated their land, or the rights to their land generously and patriotically.

I am afraid that the committee was outrageously bamboozled by the paid representative who testified for the farmers. This representative summarily dismissed the Interior Department's estimate of $1,600 per acre. The committee now reports to the House "the committee can now find no basis for this estimate."

I call to your attention the fact that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee received testimony from the Interior Department and reported to the House that the $1,600 price was based on the most recent transactions in the area between a willing seller and an informed buyer. This report and the testimony is, and has been, available to the Appropriations Committee.

The Appropriations Committee report then shows how completely the paid representative of the three to five farmers took them in. This representative gave the following unsubstantiated testimony:

> Up-to-date appraisals indicate the acquisition cost may run $12,000 per acre instead of the $1,600 per acre estimated by the Interior Department.

The committee solemnly advises the House "it is evident from recent appriasals running as high as $12,000 an acre in this general area that a considerable increase in authorization would be required."

The committee has thrown out the testimony of the Interior Department based on the most recent comparable sales in the area covered by Public Law 87–362 and substituted the unsubstantiated opinion of the paid representative who believes his clients will want more money for their land.

The House is aware that these three to five farmers last year found time—between crops no doubt—to subject the House and the Senate to a barrage of letters distorting the facts, attacking our colleague Frances Bolton, attacking the landowners in the area who have agreed to donate land and easements, attacking the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association of the Union—and even suggesting that Mount Vernon be condemned—as well as other organizations who have supported this measure.

A few days ago, after our colleague Frances Bolton had left the witness chair, where she testified for this appropriation, and the hearing room, she was subjected to an attack by Mr. William Edison Owen, the paid representative of the farmers. This attack which grossly distorted the truth provided, as I have pointed out, some of the basis for the committee report. The House will be able to judge the testimony of Mr. Owen from the following excerpt from Frances Bolton's statement:

> Mr. Owen having attempted to show that the Moyaone Association is working with ulterior, selfish and profitmaking motives, then indicates that the cost of acquisition by the Government of his clients' land may run $12,000 per acre instead of the $1,600 per acre estimated by the Interior Department. This, the committee may consider is rather expensive land for farming.
>
> The members of this committee should know that the acreage owned by Mr. Owen's identified clients, is, according to the Department of the Interior, currency assessed by the tax assessor of Prince Georges County at figures between $28 and $52 per acre.
>
> Thus, Mr. Owen would have the committee believe that the property of one of his clients valued by the tax assessor at $6,000 should be purchased by the Government for $1,380,000; and another client whose property has an assessed value of $8,000 would sell to the Government for $2,676,000 and still another client's land assessed at a value of $3,100 should bring $1,547,000 from the Department of the Interior.
>
> Thus, Mr. Owen calls upon the Appropriations Committee to believe his identified client's lands with a valuation set by the assessor of Prince Georges County at $16,100 should cost the Interior Department $5,603,000 or a selling price of 35,000 percent higher than assessed valuation.

It is on the basis of Mr. Owen's grossly inflated figures and flimsy evidence that the Appropriations Committee advises the House:

> A considerable increase in authorization would be required if the Federal Government were to purchase the remaining acreage in question.

I can only say that if the Appropriations Committee's dilatory tactics prevail, the price may ultimately rise to some figure like that presented by the committee.

Meanwhile, I urge the House not to stand idly by, but to act now to preserve this view so important to Mount Vernon, which, unless we act, most certainly will give way to high density development.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. DENTON. I would advise the gentleman that it was appraised by J. Randall Walcroft. He said there were 10.446 acres in this tract, and appraised it on January 28, 1963, as valued at $120,113.

Mr. SAYLOR. Last year the appropriations committee broke faith with the Congress. At the time we brought in the authorizing bill they led us to believe the money would be forthcoming, and I call upon the Appropriations Committee now to put the money back and acquire these lands now.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck], the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps I should first assure everyone that the few remarks I want to make at this time certainly are not partisan in nature. I should like also to suggest at the outset that I am very happy that the appropriation bills are beginning to come before the House, because we all know that these are matters that must be disposed of before we can adjourn sine die. As far as I am concerned I think it is highly desirable that we dispose of as many of these appropriation bills as we can before the end of the fiscal year.

Last January, I think about the middle of the month, we received from the executive branch of the Government, the budget for the next fiscal year It was right around $108 billion in new obligational authority, and that is what is generally referred to as the budget. I think a great many people were honestly and genuinely concerned about these spending proposals that were therein contained, and I say that advisedly when I refer to the fact that people here in the Congress on both sides of the aisle, and I can say it without regard to the political situation in the country, felt that we ought to do something about it if we had any regard for the welfare and the security of our country. Many of us thought that if we could make cuts we should make them. We felt that there were certain dangers inherent in excessive Government spending. As the leader on my side and being in the minority, I have recognized from the beginning, and I say again, that whatever must be done should be done on a bipartisan basis, because no matter what determination we might make on our side of the aisle as to

cuts that might be made, if we did not have some Members on the other side who feel the same way we do we would not get very far.

I have also said, and I say again, that it is the obligation of all of us to look this budget over very carefully and to cut it wherever we deem it can and should be cut.

I talk to the people once in a while on television, on the radio and personally. Earlier this year I appeared on a television program called "Meet the Press."

That was on February 6, last. Some of those reporters were quite insistent on inquiring about the budget. I took the position then that it should be cut, and I have maintained that position since that time in public and private statements and conversations.

On our side, the Republican side, we thought it might be well for us, having regard to the fact that whatever is accomplished must be on a bipartisan basis, to be able to do what we could to make the contribution in the direction I have been talking about, and that many of us have been talking about.

We started meetings with some of our members on the committee and with our legislative committee members. We set up a task force about which you have read and heard, headed by the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. Bow]. We got some expert advice from people knowledgeable on matters covered by this budget, and I think it is fair to say that weeks and weeks of hard, diligent work, and effort have gone into this study. We have gone through the budget line by line. It was no hit and miss operation.

I recognize, of course, that some people shout when you talk about cutting the budget, "You cannot cut the budget. Sure, Congress controls the purse strings, but this is something you just cannot cut."

If anyone should take that position, may I say, in my opinion it is a negative, defeatist attitude that I do not find expressed here on the floor of the House today.

Some people have said, "Give us a bill of particulars." We have the bill of particulars, but the time and the place to talk about the bill of particulars will come along as we progress further in this session.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that there is alarm in the country about the spending that is proposed for the next fiscal year. I say people are alarmed and I think the mail all of us are getting is pretty clear proof that the people are expecting us to cut this budget wherever we can.

Having said as much, I am happy to see that the President has already cut, on his own direction, $142 million from his requested budget; and, if my memory serves me correctly, the budget was often referred to as a hard budget right down to minimums. The message we heard today takes $640 million out of the foreign assistance program.

May I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and the people who work with you, you have cut $93 million from this budget request. The target some of us had set was something over $100 million of a reduction.

So, in my opinion, this proves what can be done. Whether or not more cuts can be made, I do not know. There is a place or two I may be able to find I could vote to take something further out. But what has been done in connection with this bill, in my opinion, proves that the Congress can make some substantial reductions in the budget, and I hope as we go along we can continue to do that very thing.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to talk a little bit more about the general budget and our fiscal situation than I do about this particular bill, which was the reason I suggested we might have a little more time.

First let me say that I think this committee has done quite a comprehensive and laudable job on the question of reducing expenditures on projects in these appropriation bills that can be dispensed with or postponed. This bill represents a cut of $93 million in the requested budget. It is still, however, $37 million over the budget of last year. I would hope that this committee's action on this bill has set a percentage example for all of the appropriation bills that are going to come along later. They have cut 9 percent below the budget request. Now, that is very substantial progress, and I do not want anything I may say here to be taken as being in anywise critical of the splendid work of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan], and his able assistants on the subcommittees.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with a very large budget. Now, just remember that the budget of 2 years ago was $81 billion. You are asked this year to appropriate $107 billion.

Now, if you take a pencil, you can very readily ascertain that in those 2 years we have increased the requested budgets by 34 percent at a time when the country needs to cut its taxes. Now, we are all interested in cutting taxes. The country wants a tax cut. It would be good for the economy of the country. But, there are many of us and there are many people in this Nation who feel that you cannot properly cut your revenues by tax reduction at the same time that you are increasing your expenditures and have to borrow the money to operate your budget every year. Now, I think we have to consider that in every appropriation bill that comes up, because everybody is hungering and thirsting for a tax bill that is less confiscatory than the one we have now. I expect all of you know substantial business people as I do who have reached the point in the confiscatory nature of their income taxes that they have just about decided that they will take what they have made and go home and sit down and put it in a sock and just not contribute further to the economy of this country. And, that is bad. We ought to do something, but how are you going to do it when you are constantly increasing your expenditures every year and at the same time undertake to reduce your taxes? Now, that is not commonsense, and the people of America are commonsense people, and they do not want that sort of an arrangement. So, I am deeply interested, as I know other Members are, in reducing all of these bills as much as we can without hurting the economy of the country. I do not think you will find a bill that comes before you that has not worthy and commendable projects in it that we can well postpone for a year or two or until we are in better shape to do so.

This bill in my judgment, with all due respect and with all my compliments to the committee, is no exception to the rule that somewhere there is some fat that can be cut out, or can be postponed.

Mr. Chairman, I refer particularly to the subject of ducks. There is a provision in this bill for a program on ducks. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan] has said, he did not authorize it. This Congress authorized it. In this bill there is an item of $10 million for a program to acquire some—I think it is 1 million—when I get into these figures I get all balled up—acres of land that is either already marshland or is going to be converted into marshland for the use of migratory ducks to go back and sit down on and spend the winter. Now, I wonder. The ducks have been right patient with us. I wonder if they would not be willing to wait a year or two. I do not think it would do the duck hunters much harm. I am an old duck hunter myself. I cannot think of any more uncomfortable pursuit than hunting ducks in the middle of a snowstorm, sitting out in the middle of a river, hoping one is going to fly over. But, nevertheless, it is a very popular sport. I am sympathetic with the sport. But I think we could postpone that $10 million. As a matter of fact, I think the committee probably felt a little that same way because the figure was supposed to have been $12 million in the budget, and they cut it to $10 million.

That program was authorized by this Congress. I reckon I was sitting around here somewhere when we did it, because I do not remember it. However, it authorized a program involving over $100 million to buy over 1 million acres of land in North and South Dakota and Minnesota. I do not know why they want to buy land in Minnesota. Minnesota advertises itself as the State of Ten Thousand Lakes. That looks like it would take up enough of the State so that they would not want to be building any more duck ponds. But, nevertheless, we are going to build duck ponds in the State of Ten Thousand Lakes.

Mr. Chairman, in the Dakotas many thousands of acres can be bought there. Perhaps, they do not have so many lakes, because I notice from the figure they will have a good deal more ponds to be built than Minnesota. I also understand from what reading I have been able to do on the subject that North and South Dakota are saying "Now, hold a while; we do not want all our farmland turned into marshes to feed the ducks in the wintertime, so that they can fly down south and these rebels are going to shoot them all." They would rather have the farmland up there.

So, there is a good reason to postpone this appropriation, and let us wait a little bit until we are in better shape to do this.

I think even the duck hunters would appreciate it if we created here an atmosphere conducive to a tax reduction than to have a few more ducks. They cannot shoot but two of them in a day, anyway. So let us think about that when this bill is taken up for a vote.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, along that line, does not the gentleman think we might also postpone the $10 million fish tank to be built along the Potomac and for which planning money is provided in this bill?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know about fish in tanks, but I have not seen anything in the bill about that.

Mr. GROSS. It is in there, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] does not seem to realize that the bill said that it would not cost the taxpayers a dime; that is the point.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. There is a gentleman on the floor who once told the House that the Washington Stadium would not cost the taxpayers a dime, either.

Mr. KIRWAN. I did not say anything about the stadium. The stadium and this aquarium are two different things. The law requires that the aquarium pay back all costs of planning and construction.

Mr. GROSS. Let me suggest that the gentleman not stake his reputation on the statement that the aquarium will pay for itself in 5 years.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would not change the subject to fish. I want to talk about ducks.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman that even if you cannot use this $10 million it will not absolutely stop this program because in the authorization authority is given to use the receipts from duck stamps, which I understand amount to about $4 million; and you can use that to acquire some of these ponds up in Minnesota or South Dakota or wherever they are; is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman is entirely right. But we got off ducks onto fish and I had not reached that point. This authorization that calls for $100 million for duck-pond renewal is supposed to be paid for out of what is called the duck stamp tax. That is supposed to yield $4 million a year. So when I said that this bill carried $10 million for duck ponds that did not include the $4 million that they get out of the duck stamps each year, and which receipts are supposed to be used to liquidate this other expense.

Let us do it the way it was contemplated in the bill, instead of trying to have a crash program to inundate half of Minnesota or North and South Dakota. Let us do it the way it was intended to do it. Let the $4 million from the duck stamp money go each year, as it is going this year, but let us cut out this $10 million and show the people of this country that we are going to cut the fat out of these bills wherever we can find it. I do not believe that this committee, which has done such a fine job on this bill, is going to object too strenuously to the elimination of that section.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Snyder] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened intently to the debate on H.R. 5279 and read the report of the committee amounting to some 46 pages, but I still have many reservations, I understand that no record vote was had because many do not want to go on record on this bill. This I do not understand.

I appreciate the fact that the committee has cut out $92,818,800 worth of fat from this bill. I am glad to join with my colleagues in supporting amendments which have cut another $6,600,000 from the bill. I also supported the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Florida, which would have eliminated another $11 million had they passed.

This bill as amended still is almost $31 million over the current appropriation. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the Department of the Interior and the related agencies have not suffered for lack of money in the current budget.

Included in this $31 million is 796 new civilian Federal employees, the cost of which I cannot accurately determine from the report. The titles and groupings in the report make it impossible to determine all the fat in this appropriation, but some of it is indicated to me by comparison with this current year's authorization.

I cannot in good conscious support the expenditures of $310,000 for planning of the fish aquarium which will ultimately cost the taxpayers $10 million. It is said it would not cost a cent—but a third of a million is being spent today—and it is the taxpayers money. I must agree with Judge Smith that $10 million for the creation of wetlands for duck refuges, while admirable, is not essential. Could not the Department of Agriculture quit paying for draining such lands and alleviate the problem?

Apparently this Congress is more interested in ducks than people—in fowls than taxpayers. People in my State could use some flood control projects rather than this "bird money." There is already $4 million available for this work from the sale of Federal hunting stamps. Let us get our fiscal affairs in order and spend our money—if we must—on our people, not the birds and foreign enemy countries. This $10 million for the birds is an increase of $3 million over the current year.

I see salaries for the Office of Saline Water are up $2,400,000, while operating expenses are down $150,000.

It appears to be more and higher paid employees to do less work. Salaries of the Office of the Solicitor are up $138,000; salaries of the Office of the Secretary are up $301,000; salaries of the Commission of Fine Arts up $8,000; salaries of the National Planning Commission are up $2[illegible]00 and the salaries and expenses of [illegible]e Smithsonian Institution up $2,[illegible]000.

Mr. Chairman, I ask why this appropriation cannot be cut further. Sir, if this is an example of a hard budget, I would hate to see a soft one.

I suppose that without a record vote which I desired that this statement is indicative of my stand, I am willing to be counted.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Alger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I do not hesitate to express my disapproval of H.R. 5279 making appropriation for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964. I refuse to support any spending program that exceeds last year's astronomical increase which led to a tremendous deficit. Not only should we cut back the bill to last year's level, which means eliminating the increase of 796 new positions and $37,508,000, but we should cut the expenditures 5 percent or even 10 percent below last year. In either of these cases, I would vote for passage of the bill.

The committee report gives us adequate reasons for disapproving this bill and I commend the committee for those moments of blunt forthrightness. Here are some examples why this bill should not be passed:

First. The duplication of the overlapping agencies conducting research, including the seven agencies conducting research in reduction of evaporation and transpiration, the nine agencies studying flow in natural and artificial and open channels, and the eight departments of the oceanographic program.

Second. The request for increase in personnel of 3,475 when reduced to 796 is still an increase rather than a reduction.

Third. The limitation of cost per unit of employees housing of $20,000 is too high.

Fourth. The income-producing receipts of Government should further reduce the need for new appropriations.

Indeed an effort should be made further to get Government out of business, wherever possible.

Fifth. The request for the Bureau of Indian Affairs of additional outside funds from the Area Redevelopment Administration and through accelerated public works funds warrants further study in the pyramiding of appropriations.

Sixth. General administrative expenses should not be increased by $64,000 over the 1963 appropriation.

Seventh. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should not receive $762,900 more than last year.

Eighth. The Office of Oil and Gas should not receive further increase of $51,000 for increased requirements under the administration of the oil import program.

These specific examples, Mr. Chairman, are but a few of the reasons why I cannot agree to support this program and suggest that further economies can be made. There is no way to cut spending without economizing; namely, cutting expenditures. Pretty speeches and good intentions will not get the job done. At a time of deficit financing and the danger of continuing inflation and gold outflow, the latter being so serious that money devaluation is just around the corner, there is no excuse for passing an appropriation bill increasing expenditures over last year. As I said earlier, last year's expenditures should be reduced.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I was, of course, disappointed that the Committee on Appropriations decided to delete from H.R. 5279 the $2 million which was proposed for the use of Project Gasoline. However, I am pleased to note the references in the report which have been made by the committee that such action was merely deferred without prejudice, pending the review being conducted by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

This project is both notable and worthy. It has been suggested by Mr. Samuel G. Lasky, Assistant Director of the Office of Coal Research, in hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee, that we are at a point in this Nation where research thus far would indicate that gasoline could be made from coal—100-octane gasoline—at 13.6 cents per gallon. Observations have been further made that this is competitive with the refinery price of gasoline made from petroleum.

To continue research at its present rate in this field would indicate than 10 to 15 years would be consumed before a breakthrough could be obtained. The suggestion by the Office of Coal Research that they be permitted to enter into a contract to hasten or accelerate this research seems to me to be of tremendous importance, especially since they feel that a breakthrough could be accomplished within 3 or 4 years. This could have a powerful impact in every coal-producing State in this country.

We have had before us from various committees of the House programs which have as their purpose resurrecting the economies of the depressed areas of our country, which are situated for the most part in the coal-producing States, in which great sums of money are committed for many of these programs which have been of little value or help in meeting the problem. It, therefore, seems reasonable to me that this Project Gasoline should be approved because when the breakthrough is obtained, coal-producing States and their economies will begin to move without the necessity of any pump priming by the Federal Government. We will again be self-sufficient; we will again have the opportunity to maintain our personal dignity and to shake the image of despair that surrounds us all.

I am pleased that the subcommittee chairman is sympathetic with this project, and I am hopeful that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the authorizing committee in this instance, will report favorably in the not-too-distant future on this project in order that the moneys might be made available in conference on this appropriation bill so that not a moment may be lost in realizing results from this venture.

The $2 million that was requested in this instance is a budgeted item. It has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. What I am asking the Congress today is not inconsistent with the budget presentation. Therefore, I respectfully request the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to move with deliberate speed in approving this project.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a newspaper article.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call our colleagues' attention to one very important section of this bill we are considering today—the section which would provide $2 million to begin land acquisition and development for the Point Reyes National Seashore.

Last year, after thorough investigation and consideration, Congress approved the bill, which I had cosponsored, to create this seashore—an area which the National Park Service has described as possessing a combination of scenic, recreation, and scientific interests found nowhere else in this country so near a large center of population.

Unfortunately, Congress adjourned last year without providing funds to begin land acquisition and development. Land developers and speculators, however, have not waited. Their advertisements, in fact, are encouraging people to purchase lots in "one of America's most sensational and exclusive communities—in the very heart of one of your country's newest and most gorgeous national parks."

Not only are land values being inflated by this speculation—an inflation which can only increase the eventual cost of this park to the people of the United States—but the valuable natural resource which Congress sought to preserve is being whittled away and destroyed.

Mr. Chairman, this relatively small amount of money—this $2 million—is an investment in the future of our country. It is an investment which will pay rich dividends in education and in recreation for countless future generations of Americans. It is an investment which is within our power to make today, but which if we further delay, may be lost forever.

Now, Buy a Dream Lot in the Proposed Point Reyes National Seashore—Spectacular Drake's Bay Estates

Now available: 45 dramatic view lots on gently sloping hills a stone's throw from the bay.

From $5,500; as low as 10 percent down; easy terms.

A few marvelous beach sites—right on the historic shores of famed Drake's Bay.

Join one of America's most sensational and exclusive communities in the very heart of one of your country's newest and most gorgeous proposed national parks.

People do live in national parks. Hundreds, for example, own private property and homes in Yosemite National Park. Drake's Bay Estates dream sites have been going, going—$600,000 worth of spectacular lots have been sold to date, with $300,000 spent on exclusive homes—all-year, summer or winter retreats—deep in nature's solitude yet only 45 minutes from San Rafael. Unsurpassed swimming, boating, beachcombing, trout fishing, horseback riding.

All public utilities are in, as well as 5 miles of smooth paved roads.

Act now. Call, write, or visit for full particulars, prices, and attractive brochures.

Drake's Beach Estates, Inc.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

Management and investigations of resources

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; operation of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); and maintenance of the herd of longhorned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; $29,879,400.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Saylor: Page 24, line 3, after the figure "$29,879,400", strike out the period and insert a comma and the following proviso: "of which not to exceed $30,000 shall be used to establish a cooperative fishery unit at Pennsylvania State University."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will not cost any money. It will not cost $30,000. All it does is make sure that a part of the $29,879,400 be allocated to Pennsylvania State University for conducting a fisheries cooperative unit authorized in accordance with Public Law 686 of the 86th Congress. The units authorized by this law are now in operation in 14 different universities. I think the great university which originally started the fishing research in the eastern part of the United States should be included. I just ask that the Secretary of the Interior be directed to use a portion of this $29 million to establish one of these research centers in Pennsylvania.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, while this committee was holding its meetings during the past several weeks, there were three Members who appeared before the committee from three different States, New York, Massachusetts, and Montana, requesting cooperative fishery units and the committee graciously gave them $30,000 for each State. Now here is a gentleman, a fine gentleman, who not 10 minutes ago gave a lengthy talk and, yet, he did not appear before the committee with his request. The gentleman says it would not cost a dime? It will cost $30,000, which would have to be taken from some other budgeted project. He did not come before the committee, but now to come here in the well of the House and tell a group of intelligent men to take $30,000 out of some other project and put it into something that he wants, I think is asking too much.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would just like to say, if I had known that my Pennsylvania State University did not have this facility, I would have appeared before the committee. This morning I received a letter from the Pennsylvania State University informing me of the fact that they did not have such a facility, and they wanted to know whether or not it was possible. That is the first I knew about it. Of course, this is not in my district but it is in my State, and therefore at the first opportunity I had I asked the Members of the House to see that of the $29 million, $30,000 is expended for the University of the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. KIRWAN. I think a great deal of Penn State University. Pennsylvania is my home State. I was born and raised there. But, if the university did not know enough about this until the hearings on the bill were closed and the bill was reported out, that in my opinion makes it even worse.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment is voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 24, line 3, strike the figure "$29,879,400" and insert "$29,829,400."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee why, with respect to getting this $10 million fish tank underway, he put the planning money in two places in the bill?

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, let me correct the gentleman. This is not a tank. The people of science who know about this will tell you that there will not be any tank in it. If you have not heard, the people downtown can tell you.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman can describe it any way he wants to.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am not describing it. They are describing it downtown.

Mr. GROSS. Then let us call it a gilt-edged, fur-lined fishpond.

Mr. KIRWAN. You can call it whatever you want to call it, but do not call it a tank.

Mr. GROSS. What I am trying to get at is why did you put planning money in two places in the bill and in two places in the report? This is planning money that you are asking for; $50,000 is covered by this amendment and then in the next provision of the bill you have $260,000 for planning. Why is it in two places in the bill?

Mr. KIRWAN. Because we are putting in the planning and the construction items. The construction goes under the GSA.

Mr. GROSS. But this is all planning money. There is a total of $310,000 to plan for this fish tank. Why do you not put it all in one place?

Mr. KIRWAN. Because this is for the commission that is appointed. This $50,000 is not for planning. It is for the commission that is appointed.

Mr. GROSS. This bill is still $37 million-plus more than was spent on the Interior Department last year. To be sure, there is a cut in the budget request, but that was the administration's asking price, and it is always ballooned and inflated. There is still fat in this bill and some of it is represented by the planning for the $10 million aquarium or glorified fish tank. This is something that can wait, as the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Smith has stated with respect to some of the duck ponds; this can wait for a year, or 2, or 3, or 4, if necessary. Let us cut out money for the fish tank this year, and try to get our financial house in order.

Then I assure the gentleman from Ohio that I will give real serious consideration to his fish tank. As a matter of fact, we might give consideration right now to putting some of his fish in the swimming pool in that marble pyramid on Independence Avenue known as the new, new House Office Building. There might be some two-legged fish there, too, but that would be all right. Let them swim with the finny tribes.

So I hope you will support my amendment. It takes $50,000 of the planning money out. Then we should adopt the next amendment which will take $260,000 out. This would be a nice substantial saving.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

CAN WE AFFORD IT?

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Chairman, as I review and study this appropriations bill, H.R. 5279, setting forth appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, I am faced with mixed and anxious emotions. There is much good in this bill. There are many justified and worthwhile projects.

I can conscientiously support this bill in many instances, such as the many good projects included for our American Indians, the preservation of our wonderful natural resources, the support of our fine national parks, our Fish and Wildlife Service and others.

But I very seriously question the soundness and advisability of including some of the items that are provided for in this bill. I specifically point to such costly projects as the $310,000 appropriation to initiate planning for the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium, estimated to cost a projected total cost of $10 million. It is difficult indeed for me to support such a bill as we have before us today with such irresponsibility as this when our country and our people are faced with a deficit spending program and record high budget. This, gentlemen, just is not consistent, sound, responsible business policy to spend this kind of money for such a project as this high-priced fish tank.

Further, I cannot support the kind of thinking that provides $10 million for winter or summer quarters for ducks. This migratory bird conservation account is something that I believe we can put off until we have surplus money enough to put in such a project.

In this all-inclusive bill, under the appropriations for the Office of Saline Water the appropriation for salaries is increased $2.4 million over the 1963 fiscal year while the costs of operation and maintenance in this division is reduced by $150,000. Apparently they will have less to do in 1964, but they need more people to do it. There are many other similar programs in this bill that can, or should, be eliminated, or at least postponed until we can afford them.

This bill calls for an additional 796 new employees in the Department of the Interior and an increase of $37,508,200 over their 1963 budget. At a time when this Nation and our people are facing an alltime-record-high budget and the resulting deficit spending, I cannot in good conscience, or in the interest of sound, responsible government, support this bill as it stands.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan] made a statement, to be found on page 49 of the hearings, about employment in the Department of the Interior and how it had been going up. He made an excellent statement. Yet in this bill he provides the money for an advisory board and a director to start construction of his glorified fish tank. In other words, he is deliberately putting more bureaucrats on the payrolls. Creation of another director means the creation of a staff of secretaries and advisers to the director, and so on and so forth. So on the one hand the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan] properly castigates the Department of the Interior for increasing employment, but on the other hand he, himself, calls for an addition to the bureaucracy.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my good friend from Iowa, and he is my good friend, if he read what the dean of science at the Minnesota University said as to the benefits received by the public from the $10 million we gave to the science exhibit at the Seattle World Fair. He said that in the 16 months the science building proved to be a tremendous attraction and was visited by millions of people, adults and children, and proved to be immensely worthwhile.

There are several million students coming to Washington every year. The only aquarium we have in the city is a disgrace to the Nation, a disgrace to the greatest capital in the world. This is going to be the greatest aquarium in the world.

That man, who knows more than I know, and most people, went on to tell what this is going to do for education and science and it is not going to cost the U.S. taxpayers a dime.

The opposition to the aquarium bill misled the public when they said the cost would be saddled on the taxpayers. They did not make clear it would pay for itself through admission fees.

I am telling you this is one of the best bills that ever came before the Congress of the United States. No wonder we are fighting. It is not going to cost the taxpayers a dime. That is why I am asking you here today to vote for this bill. In the center of Moscow there is an excellent aquarium. We have one down in the basement of the Department of Commerce Building. It amounts to nothing. This will be a great asset to the Nation's Capital and will be of great interest and value.

I hope this amendment is voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 63, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, $3,678,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 24, line 9. strike the figure "$3,678,000" and insert "$3,418,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply take out $260,000 of planning money for the gentleman from Ohio's fish tank down on Hains Point on the Potomac River. I do not know exactly what the gentleman meant a little while ago when he said that this proposition had not cost anybody anything. No, it has not cost anybody anything because up to this point no money has been extracted from the busted Federal Treasury to start the planning for this thing. I assume that is what he meant when he said it had not cost anything. However, it is about to cost $310,000 to get it off the ground unless this amendment is adopted. It was not many years ago that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] came to the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to get an authorization to hire Government experts to raise carp down in the rice paddies of Arkansas. I wonder how that carp deal is coming along.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the House can do the taxpayers a good turn here this afternoon by accepting my amendment and thus saving another $260,000 to start a project that will eventually lead to the spending of at least $10 million—a project that can well be delayed until the Federal Government can get its financial house in order. As I said last year when this subject first came before the House, there are 10,000 or 10 million better and more essential ways to spend this money.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from Iowa has stated these two items will cost the taxpayers $310,000. Now, the law says that every dime has to be paid back to the U.S. Government for the planning, the construction, and all other expenses connected with it. Ten million tourists come to this city annually. They spend a million dollars a day here and they will be satisfied to pay to visit this National Fisheries Center. I repeat, in the city of Philadelphia they are charging $2 now for adults to get into the new quarium and $1 for the children. The admission fee will be only 60 cents here. So these appropriations will be repaid and I hope this amendment is voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

For an advance to the Migratory bird conservation account, as authorized by the Act of October 4, 1961 (16 U.S.C. 715k-3, 5), $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Smith of Virginia: On page 24, strike out all of lines 10 through 14.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides for striking out the item that I spoke about a little while ago which is $10 million to buy land to inundate for duck ponds for the wild ducks to stay on during the winter months. Now, the item reads as follows:

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

And this is what I want to strike out:

For an advance to the Migratory bird conservation account, as authorized by the Act of October 4, 1961 (16 U.S.C. 715K-3, 5), $10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Note that that provides for an advance on this program. The program, as I stated previously, was supposed to be paid for out of the proceeds of the duck stamps which are sold to duck hunters and which has been and is now estimated at $4 million a year.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very expensive program into which we are going, or that we are now into. My sole reason for offering this amendment is that in this time of an unbalanced budget when we are seeking to cut unnecessary expenses, to cut expenses that can be well postponed to a future date, that we cut out this $10 million and help to bring this bill back more closely to the expenditures of the year previously.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I want to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the gentleman from Virginia. I believe the gentleman's position in this area is just exactly correct, and if we are going to do anything in regard to the budget we can do it wisely here with very little problem to anyone involved. I wish to say to the gentleman from Virginia that I am going to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when this authorization passed the House of Representatives the year before last, it called for the expenditure of $15 million a year to be spent on the wetlands. Now, perhaps, I might be in sympathy with some of the things which the gentleman from Virginia has said, but nevertheless that is the law. It called for $15 million a year. When the budget estimate of $12 million came up for our consideration we cut the budget request by $2 million. They asked for $3 million less than the law provided and we cut it $2 million more. I thought we did very well on the cut.

Mr. Chairman, I again repeat that on the floor of this Congress the Members of Congress of the United States—the west, the east, the north, and the south—all voted for this legislation. Now we come along 2 years after and we deny ourselves—not some country in Europe—and go against what we voted for previously.

Mr. Chairman, I shall always remember the story of one of our officials who had moved some pictures off the wall at one of the American Embassies. One of the career men said to him, "They will not like that here." The official replied, "Oh, but there are a lot of boys home in the barbershops who will like them." That remarks applies in exactly the same way with reference to this bill. There are a lot of boys home in the barbershops who have contributed to this wetlands problem through purchase of stamps and payment of excise taxes, and we ought to give them a little protection and give them a little run for their money.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is defeated.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I might say that if this amendment is adopted it will be a very serious blow to our conservation efforts in the acquisition of wildlife refuges. We have a program of acquisition that is spread over the next 10 years and the money appropriated in this bill is simply a loan; it will be subject to repayment from the duck stamp funds.

As a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission I sincerely hope this amendment will be defeated in order that our acquisition program may go ahead.

Mr. KIRWAN. I hope this amendment is voted down.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for the statement he has made. He has been entirely consistent in calling the attention of Congress to the fact that a few years ago, if the Members of the House had not liked it, then was the time to vote against it and not now. All your committee is doing is to implement the law that Congress passed.

I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to speak against an amendment that is intended to save money, and that is offered by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith], who I am sure is sincere in offering his amendment. But I want to point out to the House that when this public law was passed, it was about the most popular bill that came before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in that session of Congress. The Audubon Society and all the clubs in America that are interested in migratory waterfowl or birds or fish wrote to the committee in support of the legislation that was then pending before the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, millions of dollars have been spent by clubs and organizations throughout the country to arrest the growing disappearance of the hatching grounds of migratory birds. This bill is for the preservation of those grounds, not to build fishponds or duckponds, but to preserve the wetlands on the northern borders of the States that are next to Canada. Millions of dollars have been spent by private citizens of the United States to buy lands in Canada for the propagation of migratory waterfowl.

The duck stamp is not the only tax that is imposed on the hunter, boys 16 and 18 years old and men up to 65 who participate in this sport. They pay the ammunition tax, the gun tax, the hunting tax of the State, and so forth. And it all goes into funds for the protection and propagation of migratory birds and wildlife.

This is necessary because the decrease, by the actual count of the Fish and Wildlife Service, shows that unless something is done it will only be a few years, Mr. Chairman, when you will not see a canvasback or a mallard or birds of that kind down in Virginia, in the southern part of the country, along the Chesapeake and the Atlantic coast, the middle flyway through Mississippi and the Pacific flyway.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to associate myself with my distinguished friend from North Carolina in the remarks he has made, as well as with my colleague and member of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Karsten]. I have been on this Commission now for the past several years and I think it is very constructive work—the propagation of our wildlife. I feel that this investment which will ultimately be repaid is a very wise one. I want to say that I concur in the recommendations of the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from Missouri as far as migratory bird conservation is concerned.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, it is my desire to see an increase in migratory birds rather than their extinction—should this amendment carry and the wetlands therefore not be preserved—it will only be a few years before all breeding grounds will disappear. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out, this is not an expenditure, but it is a loan on the part of the Government. This wetlands program is financed by the duck stamp. By the programs of the Department of Agriculture, we are draining wetlands, the habitat of the ducks, and we are losing ducks on account of that. This program proposes that we set up permanent wetlands. If this amendment is adopted it would cost a good deal of money because the land would be drained and then we would have to buy land and set it up as wetlands again. I know of one State where they have drained wetlands, and now they are talking about buying them and reestablish them for a duck refuge. They have drained the land and now they are talking about setting it up as wetland again. Congress passed this law. We reduced the request by $2 million. I think it will be pennywise and pound foolish to adopt this amendment, because this enables the Commission to buy this land before it is drained. If you do not do that, you will have to buy up land after it has been drained and put it back to its wetland condition, if you want to keep the ducks.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have a high regard for the author of this amendment, but I am sure he does not understand what his amendment does to the legislation before the Congress. This appropriation was authorized by a unanimous vote of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. This legislation came about because the migratory waterfowl are approaching the lowest limits in history. Duck limits are falling to a point where it is hardly worth the trouble for a duck hunter to go out.

In 1936 or thereabouts when the Migratory Water Fowl Treaty was signed between the United States, Canada, and Mexico it was determined we needed 12,500,000 acres of land in which to care for the migratory waterfowl of this Nation. Subsequently an analysis was made of the rate at which wetlands were being acquired. It was found it would take 330 years for the United States to acquire the needed wetlands at the rate we were acquiring them. As a result of this a loan program was set up which is the subject of the appropriation for $10 million which the gentleman seeks to strike.

This cut is not a cut of an appropriation which will not be paid back, this is a loan program. This money, every nickel of it, will be paid back by the duck hunters of the United States who will purchase migratory waterfowl hunting stamps, the proceeds of which will go to pay back this $10 million loan.

The fact is that unless this money is authorized and appropriated by Congress, we may very well be seeing the last days in which we and our friends may hunt waterfowl on this continent. In the next few years we will have a population growth that will stagger anything gone before. By 1980 we will have 285 million people. For houses, roads, shopping centers, and municipal use we are taking 1 million acres a year from our lands. That is the equivalent of the acreage of Yellowstone National Park. A lot of this land is coming from draining waterfowl habitat. The purpose of this appropriation is to see that we acquire this desperately needed land in the time remaining. Land costs are going up, population is exploding, and the swamps, the habitats of the migratory waterfowl of this Nation, are being done away with at an accelerated pace. Unless the Congress appropriates the money to carry out the purposes of this law, that was unanimously enacted by this Congress not long back, you and I will be responsibile to our constituents for having helped to destroy the migratory waterfowl resources of this country. What are these resources, and what is their value?

First of all, according to the studies of the Patman-Robertson Act, they bring in better than $1 billion a year in expenditures for food, lodging, clothing, and from the sale of firearms, equipment, and ammunition. This is an enormous benefit to our country. Over and above this, hunter expenditures are mainstays of the economy of large portions of this country. Duck-hunting revenues derived from catering to duck hunters furnish a very important portion of the economy in many parts of this country. Most of us in this Congress have enjoyed the sight of migratory waterfowl. These refuges provide the population of this country with an opportunity for outdoor recreation. Just last year this Congress passed a piece of legislation authorizing the public recreational uses of these refuges bought through duck stamp purchases. This is an additional benefit that goes to all of our constituents. The principal author of this legislation was a minority Member of this body from

Iowa [Mr. Jensen]. What I am saying to the House today is—do not be pennywise and pound foolish. This is the last opportunity the United States will have to acquire these wetlands. They are being drained at a fantastic pace. The limited bag limits that we have on migratory waterfowl today will be very generous when we contrast them to what we will have in the future unless we act now to save the habitat on which these waterfowl, a national treasure and a trust for the future are absolutely dependent.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to joint with the chairman of our subcommittee in opposition to this amendment. Although, of course, I am very sympathetic to any move to save additional money in this bill, I want to again point out that under the terms of H.R. 7391, which is now Public Law 87–383, this House and the Congress passed legislation which provided for an appropriation for a 7-year period beginning with fiscal year 1962 not to exceed $105 million. If the $105 million was divided by 7 years, it would mean an appropriation this year of $15 million. The committee has recommended $10 million instead of $15 million. If this appropriation is not given this year and unless the legislation is repealed or changed, we are merely stirring up trouble for ourselves in years to come because we are going to have to double, perhaps next year or the year after, the amount of money requested under this law which is now in effect. I regret very much that the money is necessary. I would much prefer to see it not appropriated. But I think the committee did the right thing in allowing the $10 million. I hope the amendment will not carry.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known that my State of Arkansas is, perhaps, the greatest or one of the greatest duck-hunting areas in the United States. I know we can get a great deal of amusement out of talking about the ducks and the duck population, but I want to emphasize what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Bonner] said.

I suppose there are several hundred million dollars that have been spent by citizens and organizations and businesses in the construction and provision of duck hunting facilities and so forth throughout this great country of ours.

Stuttgart, Ark., is probably the duck capital of the world. I do not know how much money is needed in the wetlands to provide the necessary habitat. But, Mr. Chairman, let me give you, just for one moment, a little information affecting this important program.

The ducks go back to the North when the winter season is over, and contrary to what the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the author of the amendment, suggested a moment ago, they do not go back there in wintertime, they go back in the summertime for the purpose of propagation.

Twenty-five years ago, let me remind you, the legal limit in my own State was 25 a day; 25 years ago any one individual could legally kill 25 ducks a day during the season with 2 days' possession. That continued for many years. For years now the legal limit was four per day and 2 days' possession. Everybody knows of the drought in Canada and in the northern parts of the country in the last few years. Let me remind you that 2 years ago the legal limit in my State that one could kill during duck season was 2 a day and 2 days' limit.

Let me remind you further, and this House, that because of the condition that exists—I do not know anything about it up in Canada and the northern part of the country—but I know what the result is. In my State last year the legal limit on this, one of the greatest sports in this country, was one duck a day, and 2 days' possession. From what has been going on for the last several years, in the last 20 years, I do know that something needs to be done. I wish I had more information as to what is needed in this program; $4 million goes into the fund from duck stamps, but I want to say that last year we lost thousands or perhaps hundreds of thousands of dollars from people not buying duck stamps, because they could not kill ducks. I did not buy a duck stamp last year, for the first time I cannot remember when, because it was not worth it to go out for the purpose of trying to kill one duck a day. Year before last I did, and then the limit was only two, and I must say I had a very hard time getting even the limit of two. That shows you how scarce they were last year. I think we will have more this year and next. I hope so.

One of the objectives I have had in mind, and I want to say this in all sincerity to every Member of this House, is that I hope someday, if I may have the privilege of staying here that long, that we will get enough ducks and the Secretary of the Interior will set a limit and that we will have an increase in the limit per day so that I and the delegation from my State and our friends from my State can legally get enough wild ducks to bring them to Washington and have them served in the House restaurant to every Member of this Congress.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when legislation to acquire wetlands was first introduced and came before the Fish and Wildlife Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee it was proposed to finance the program through back-door spending; in other words, the money could be borrowed from the Treasury to carry out the program of conservation looking to an increase of our duck population.

By arrangement in our committee, that financing was changed to the appropriation process. The reason I take the floor at this time is to indicate that had this legislation passed as it was originally introduced, the Department could have simply gone to the Treasury and borrowed $15 million for acquiring these wetlands without having to come to the Congress.

The point I want to make today is that by coming to the Appropriations Committee careful scrutiny has been made as to the needs of this program. The committee has cut $2 million off of it. In allowing money they are fulfilling a responsibility that the House created originally when we passed the authorizing legislation.

I do not think anybody wants to cut down on the budget more than I do, but I feel in this instance the Congress adopted a program and we have to meet that commitment; therefore, it seems to me that we should carry out the recommendation of the very fine committee that brings this legislation to us. I am therefore with regret going to oppose this amendment and then will support the bill.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to get the ducks in a row here and find out exactly what we are doing.

It is a very popular program; I recognize that. I have participated in duck hunting myself. It is a great outdoor recreation, there is no question about that, but there are some facts that ought to be pointed out so that we know exactly what we are doing.

It is estimated—and I have the official records here—that this program before you are through with it will cost $457,500,000. The income from duck stamps today is $4 million a year. If you take it on this basis it is going to be over 100 years or more before there is an attempt to pay this off. The States of North Dakota and South Dakota have not yet approved the land acquisition plan as required by the Wetlands Act. What the gentleman from Virginia has done here is simply to say we can delay this for a while because of the fiscal situation of our country.

I hope when you sit in the duckblind waiting for the ducks to come by, as you take 5, 10, or 15 minutes, whatever it may be, that each minute while you sit there you will realize that $19,000 a minute is being paid on the national debt. I hope you will realize what you are really faced with, and that it is going to be a question of whether the ducks are going to fly or whether your Nation goes bankrupt. It seems to me it is time we began to think about the condition of the country.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I want to ask a question. As I see the testimony of Daniel Janzen, Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, one of the reasons for this outlay or this appropriation is that the Department of Agriculture has been spending public money in order to help drain land so that the natural habitat is nonexistent. Now we find that the Department of the Interior asks for millions of dollars for acquiring additional lands in order to provide waterfowl with the natural habitat that the Department of Agriculture is eliminating.

Is that the way the gentleman understands it?

Mr. BOW. I think that is true. It is said this is not going to cost anything because these are loans that are to be paid back. But they are interest-free loans. You are not paying any interest. Do not tell me it is not costing us anything. When we lend money at this time interest free, at least the interest is costing the American taxpayers something.

I join with the gentleman from Virginia. This is one of those programs that may be put over for a year or two. Do not forget, as I said, as we wait for the ducks to fly, there is the $19,000 a minute on the national debt.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. With reference to paying this money back, how do we know it is going to be paid back? The only way it will ever be paid back will be over a good many years on which you get this $4 million a year, when this program is finished, to pay on it, if enough people buy the duck stamps. It is a nebulous question as to whether any of it is ever going to be repaid.

Mr. BOW. This provides for land acquisition of 4.5 million acres at $269 million; a basic minimum for levees, pools, roads, and fencing, $188.5 million. We are not dealing with a small item; this is a big item. Let us take a good, hard look at it. Let us find out whether we are justified in a program of this kind and whether, under present financing methods, which will take 115 to 120 years, we will put that additional mortgage on the backs of our children and grandchildren. It is time for us to make up our minds whether we are for ducks or whether we are for grandchildren and for fiscal responsibility in this country.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to any Member in this House when it comes to a desire to lower this budget, but personally I do not believe that this is the proper place to do it. What will happen if we do not purchase this land at the present time? You need not look into your crystal ball to know what is going to happen if we wait for several years as has just been suggested. The Department of Agriculture is going to reclaim this land, and instead of spending $10 million to acquire it we will probably spend $100 million and pay subsidies to raise more farm surpluses. I personally think this is a good investment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Smith of Virginia) there were—ayes 107, noes 105.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Smith of Virginia and Mr. Denton.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 121, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

For expenses necessary to carry out section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, approved May 28, 1956 (16 U.S.C. 568e), $1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gibbons: On page 32, strike out lines 21 through 25.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I realize the ducks have gotten in a row around here, but this is not a duck amendment, this is an amendment based on frugality. We have had talk of the old frontier, and of the New Frontier and all kinds of frontiers discussed here today.

I would hesitate to try to improve on the excellent work this committee of the House has done on this bill. I have read this committee report through thoroughly. I think it is a very fine report in general. But I have had some experience in a State legislature in matching this type of funds on this type of program. I would say without fear of challenge that with this $1 million that is to be saved here: not one tree will fail to be planted that otherwise would not be planted if the $1 million were spent or not. This is a good time for the Congress to say that in the planting of trees on non-Federal lands as this appropriation proposes, that trees should either be planted by private enterprises, who reap the harvest from the tree farms, or they should be paid for by the States. This is one of those cooperative Federal-State programs for which I think there is no use. For those of you who are for trees, I say there are 183 million other dollars in this appropriation bill that will adequately take care of all the trees. This is just a $1 million cut in this budget that will practice a little frontier frugality instead of frontier spending.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

REMODELING OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION BUILDING

For an additional amount for necessary expenses of preparing plans and specifications for remodeling the Civil Service Commission Building to make it suitable to house certain art galleries of the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by the Act of March 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 68), including construction and not to exceed $25,000, for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $5,465,000.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Rogers of Texas: On page 39, strike out all of lines 1 through 9, inclusive.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend the committee on an excellent job in cutting the appropriation request in this bill. As a matter of fact, it created a lot of hard work for members of the committee in searching for something else to cut out, and I want to commend them highly for the great work they have done.

I hesitate to offer this amendment because I may be falsely accused of lacking proper respect for things cultural. But it has to do with striking out some money that is to be used for remodeling the Old Patent Office Building out of which the Civil Service Commission is moving. The remodeling is to be accomplished with the goal of putting into that building, which occupies 2 blocks in the center of the District of Columbia, in downtown Washington, valuable portraits and other works of art. I do not want anyone to think that I am not appreciative of the inspirational qualities of great art. I do indeed feel that the proper preservation and display of the Nation's art treasures is an important thing for our people. But I think that at this time and under the circumstances, this Government should not spend almost $6 million to create a gallery in downtown Washington for still another display of works of art. If that building is to be vacant, I think it could be better used for housing some of the essential operations of the Government. I certainly do not criticize the committee for leaving this item in, but I think the membership of the Congress should have an opportunity to express an opinion at this time on this particular item.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the gentleman from Texas in support of his amendment. It is absolutely unthinkable that this Government would spend $5½ million to remodel into a portrait gallery a structure occupying two full city blocks in the heart of Washington, D.C., when this same Government is spending millions of dollars a year on rent in private commercial buildings throughout the city to house overflow personnel from the various departments and agencies. How can you do this? If we must have such outfits as the Peace Corps, both domestic and international, put them into this Government-owned building as well as other overflow agencies. We are just completing a new Smithsonian Institution—a huge new building I mean to say—and yet you are telling us here today you do not have room for those portraits in the new building. How can this be possible in view of the huge structure that is being built down there? Do not do this to the taxpayers of this country. Do not remodel this usable office building when there is such an acute need for office space. Do not do this to the taxpayers.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Do I understand this would put the Government in the portrait holding business, that is, put the Government itself in that business?

Mr. GROSS. I assume it would.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. And, therefore, from now on, this would put us in the museum business in addition to the Smithsonian Institution that we already have?

Mr. GROSS. I understand these portraits are already in the Smithsonian Institution or at least a part of them are. I see no reason why, if you want a portrait gallery, one of the old Smithsonian buildings cannot be used for that purpose? Do not spend $5½ million to tear out the insides of this office building that can and should be used for the purpose for which it was intended. Let us try to save the taxpayers these millions of dollars.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, much as I admire the chairman and members of the Appropriations Subcommittee, I must disagree with them on this issue.

At this time when money is scarce at all levels of government, when our economy is hard pressed, when our unemployment is a matter of major concern to all—in short, at a time when our country must utilize every dollar to its maximum, I cannot go along with the start of a $10 million addition to the beauties of our capital when these funds can be so much better employed elsewhere.

Thus, I must oppose the inclusion of planning money for the Aquarium as suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, and others.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the gentleman from Iowa picking on me. I did not authorize this.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know that I accused the gentleman or any other member of the committee.

Mr. KIRWAN. Let me explain who is on the Board of Regents. It is not I who is deciding this. Sitting in the chancellor's chair on the Board of Regents is the Chief Justice of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. That is no recommendation for what you are doing.

Mr. KIRWAN. Next to him is the president of the largest bank in Washington, and next to him there are a half dozen scientists; then Senator Anderson, Senator Saltonstall and Representatives Bow and Cannon. I happen to be on that Board of Regents myself, and the Board of Regents adopted this. They are for it. We have millions of dollars' worth of art and no adequate space to display it.

The committee thought these funds were justified so we could bring these priceless collections out of the storage barns and other places, where they could be cared for and displayed. Are you opposed to protecting them?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Let them stay in the barns until we balance the budget. Think of the solvency of the Government.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman calls that economy. We just had the Mona Lisa on exhibition here in the city and people came from all over the country to see that picture. The pictures we want to protect are valuable acquisitions of our Government and are of interest to many.

I hope the committee certainly will vote this amendment down.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. Perhaps some of the gentlemen do not realize that the building the gentleman is talking about is one of the most historic buildings in the city of Washington and, as I said, it has been declared a national monument.

Mr. KIRWAN. Not only in Washington, but one of the most historic in the world.

Mr. MILLER of California. There is a great history to this building. When the British burned Washington this is one of the first buildings they went to. The curator of that building persuaded the commander of the British soldiers to spare the building in the name of science.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I wish to make this statement: I do not want to destroy the building, I am just trying to remodel it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Gross moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, nobody wants to destroy this building; let us get this straight; nobody wants to destroy it. All I am saying, and I am sure that goes for the gentleman from Texas too, is that we do not want it remodeled into a portrait gallery. Leave it as it presently exists and use it as an office building. Let the portraits stay in storage until we can balance the Federal budget and get out of the financial situation we are in.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Rogers of Texas) there were ayes 112, noes 106.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL AIR MUSEUM

For necessary expenses of preparing plans and specifications for the construction of a suitable building for a National Air Museum for the use of the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by the Act of September 6, 1958 (20 U.S.C. 77b note), and not to exceed $60,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $1,600,000.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gibbons: On page 39, line 18, strike out lines 18 through line 2 on page 40.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to save $1,600,000 of architects' fees and planning costs for a National Air Museum that no one knows how much it will cost.

This, I believe, is something that could certainly and wisely be postponed at this time. We have a lot of airplanes. We have air museums in this country at this time. Certainly this is one of the things that we can postpone until we are able to get the budget balanced.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this was authorized on September 6, 1958. The Board of Regents has recommended this planning appropriation, the completed plans must be submitted to Congress for authorization of construction before any construction funds are appropriated.

Smithsonian has accumulated the world's largest and finest collections of historic air and spacecraft, engines, rockets, and so forth.

Less than 10 percent of the collection is now on display in a World War I hangar and in overhead areas in the Arts and Industries Building. The remainder of the collection is, of necessity, in storage.

Over 38,000 visitors in 1 day tried to get into the World War I hangar last year. There were nearly 1 million visitors during last July and August.

I do not care how you vote. That is up to you. But you are not going to save anything. You are just postponing it, and that could make it more costly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), as amended (72 Stat. 1769), $100,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I note on page 41, $100,000 for the Civil War Centennial Commission. How much have we put into the Civil War Centennial Commission up to this point, and how much longer will it go on?

Mr. KIRWAN. About 1 more year.

Mr. GROSS. Another year?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. That does not take into consideration financing the present operation in Mississippi?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is all; 1 year.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Price, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5279) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Johansen moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5279 to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO EXTEND THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 3 OF PUBLIC LAW 87–346, RELATING TO DUAL-RATE CONTRACTS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87–346, relating to dual-rate contracts. An identical bill to H.R. 4555, passed the House on yesterday.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act of October 3, 1961 (Public Law 87–346; 76 Stat. 762), is amended as follows:

(a) By striking the words "of not to exceed one year after such filing" from the next to last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "but not beyond April 3, 1964."

(b) By striking the word "year" from the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the word "period".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings by which the bill (H.R. 4555) was passed were vacated, and that bill was laid on the table.

SOIL AND WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT BILL

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture Department in recent years has entered many new fields through programs authorized by the Congress. I cite the rural areas development program which is doing so much to revitalize many small rural communities. In a recent statement before the Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman outlined the objectives of the rural areas development program.

According to Secretary Freeman, this program seeks to fulfill several high priority national goals, which he described as follows:

First. To give direction, purpose, and hope to rural America as it adjusts to rapid changes;

Second. To readjust the rural land-use patterns, making more land available for the increasing needs of outdoor recreation and open spaces, while decreasing cropland areas:

Third. To fully protect and develop the Nation's renewable resources of soil, water, forests, fish and wildlife, and open spaces;

Fourth. To encourage more rapid rural industrialization and expansion of commercial enterprise in rural areas to provide new employment and other nonfarm economic opportunities;

Fifth. To eliminate the causes of rural poverty;

Sixth. To strengthen the family farm pattern of American agriculture, insuring an efficient and productive source of food and fiber in a way that increased efficiency does not bring less income to the producer.

Another new USDA program, Mr. Speaker, was authorized by Congress last year. This is the public recreational development of watershed projects under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962.

This program permits the Agriculture Department to help create, enlarge, or improve bodies of water within watershed projects to assist in developing recreational areas bordering the water.

Up to 50 percent of the cost of land, easements, and rights-of-way, construction and minimum basic facilities needed for public access may be paid the Agriculture Department. Land bordering the reservoirs developed under this program could be used for picnicking, camping, hunting, or other outdoor uses with the Department being able to provide local sponsors with funds to cover up to half the land costs. In addition, the Department would help local sponsors pay for the land inundated for recreational purposes.

Among minimum basic facilities which could be cost-shared are boat docks and ramps, beach development, parking lots, public water supply, sanitary facilities, planting, and other shoreline or area improvements, roads and trails, other similar facilities needed for public health, safety, access to, and use of the recreational areas.

Since the Congress, in these new nonfarm programs, has recognized the need for greater utilization of the special skills, resources, and facilities of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, and because of the growing interest of many communities in Massachusetts in conservation activities and the formation of local conservation commissions under the authority of a State law passed a few years ago, I am introducing in the House today a bill calling for increased participation of the Soil Conservation Service in such nonagricultural fields as the protection, development, and use of land in urban areas and the utilization of soil and water resources in these areas.

Many Massachusetts towns are taking advantage of the Massachusetts law which authorizes the establishment of local conservation commissions. In fact, this law has already enabled some towns to make desirable changes in land use through the cooperation and assistance of the Soil Conservation Service.

One community, the town of Hanover, has already gained favorable nationwide publicity through its community planning program prepared in cooperation with the Massachusetts Department of Commerce and the Soil Conservation Service. One of the features of the program is the remarkable use of scientific soil and water information, largely supplied by surveyors of the Soil Conservation Service, who made an acre-by-acre inventory of the town's resources.

Hanover has issued a planning document which is serving as a guide to other communities with similar problems. The plan features detailed maps of the town's natural resources which are helping the community in making decisions regarding future potentials and limitations in land use. In addition, the plan contains nine special soils maps rendered in colors and symbols to serve as guidelines in determining boundaries and locations of community facilities.

In previous years, Hanover had made random use of available soils information for construction projects, sewage disposal areas, and related activities, but now with the aid of the soil conservation experts the community has prepared a most helpful document outlining the quantity and quality of its natural terrain.

Most Massachusetts towns are not as fortunate as Hanover with its completed survey and, as a result, are seriously handicapped by the lack of soils information—the very same type of soils information made available from a soil survey used as a basis for a farm conservation plan. Some of these communities are becoming aware that the Soil Conservation Service can make available the same basic data for the development of land capabilities. Consequently, more and more local conservation commissions are turning to soil conservation officials for guidance on the best land use and water management. Local conservation commissions are learning that these same Agriculture Department officials can render expert assistance on proper land spacing, clean water, and other necessities in their rapidly expanding urban areas.

To meet the growing demand from urban areas for these special aids available from the Soil Conservation Service, I am introducing legislation directing the Secretary of Agriculture to provide technical help on community projects dealing with soil, land use, and water problems. Early approval of my bill would help many small communities to complete their development plans.

It has become apparent in my State and elsewhere that basic soils information is needed for good decisions on the lands to be used for industrial plants, housing developments, shopping centers, highways, and schools. My bill would strengthen the national soil program and I urge the early consideration of my proposal by my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district there are parts of five soil conservation districts—the Northeast Worcester County Soil Conservation District with the district office in Sterling, the Northwest Worcester County Soil Conservation District with an office in Barre, the Southern Worcester County Soil Conservation District with an office in Rochdale, the Middlesex Soil Conservation District with an office in Concord, and the Norfolk Soil Conservation District with its headquarters in Walpole.

When originally established, these districts dealt primarily with farmers on erosion control, drainage, and land improvements. With additional technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service, the districts have expanded their programs to include assistance on watershed planning and flood prevention.

While our farmers have continued to receive direct help on their conservation problems, there has arisen in recent years a greater need for assistance from the communities within these districts with the result that the soil conservation staff is faced with a much greater challenge and a growing demand for technical assistance.

Many sections of my district, now one of the largest in the State with nearly 450,000 people, are experiencing large population increases. These rapidly growing towns are trying desperately to decide on their future development. They are confronted with intense pressures on their natural resources with almost daily growing demands for land for industrial plants, parking lots, highways, housing developments, and schools.

Local officials are doing their best to meet the urgent problems of increasing population and industrialization and still retain the more desirable aspects of country living, but they are finding that the whole character of the town is changing. These officials must make important decisions on how much good farmland can be retained for agriculture, how to utilize wetlands and woodlands as open green areas with water developments for recreation and wildlife.

Recognition of these special problems has brought about a new development in my State with the establishment of conservation commissions by many communities. Nearly 30 have already been established in my district alone and it is expected the total number in the State will soon reach 200.

These conservation commissions are working intensively on inventories of their towns' natural resources and are helping to develop plans for greenbelts and wildlife preservation. In increasing numbers, the commissions are turning to the Soil Conservation Districts for help on the technical features of their soil and water management problems. Increasing requests for Federal assistance are reaching me in recent months and I am cooperating fully with many town officials in seeking for their communities Soil Conservation Service help on a large number of drainage and water problems.

I have previously addressed the House on the value and importance of the watershed program of the Soil Conservation Service. This program has been of great assistance to many Massachusetts communities which suffered losses in the 1955 floods.

There have been two watershed work plans developed in my district under the Small Watersheds Act with the State and the towns in each watershed contributing toward the total costs. The first is the Suasco project, named after the Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord Rivers in the watershed, which is being developed at an estimated cost of $1,660,000 of which $650,000 will be paid by the State, the towns benefiting and the local landowners.

The second is the upper Quaboag project with a total estimated cost of $2,750,000, of which about $1 million will be borne by the State, local towns, and landowners. The watershed plan for this project was completed in the summer of 1961. After careful review by the House and Senate Agriculture Committees, upper Quaboag was authorized for construction last September.

The upper Quaboag project consists of a dike, some channel enlargement and eight reservoirs, three of which are multiple purpose. The work will also provide fish and wildlife habitat improvement, recreation, and flood prevention. The State plans to add recreation benefits to one reservoir, while the town of Leicester plans to add municipal water supply to another reservoir in the group.

There are three great ponds in the watershed that will be greatly improved because the water level will not be raised to a great extent in time of flooding.

The upper Quaboag watershed project is located in the western end of my district with work earmarked for Shaw Brook in Spencer and Leicester, Turkey Hill Brook in Spencer, Meadow Brook in New Braintree, and Kittredge Brook in Spencer. The balance of the work will be done in towns lost to the Third District as a result of the congressional redistricting last year: Meadow Brook in North Brookfield, Sucker Brook in West Brookfield, Lamberton Brook in Warren, Horsepond Brook in Brookfield, and Rice Reservoir in Brookfield.

The project also calls for a concrete dike along the East Brookfield River in East Brookfield to protect industrial plants and stream channel improvements along the Quaboag, beginning in Warren and extending into West Brookfield to provide flood protection to industrial and residential areas at the Quaboag marshes and Quaboag and Quacumquasit Ponds.

The Suasco project with 7 dams and reservoirs when completed will provide flood protection and other benefits to a 31-town area extending from Shrewsbury to Lowell. As planned, Suasco calls for seven dams—one each in Shrewsbury and Westboro, two in Berlin, and three in Northboro.

The Suasco work is being carried out by the Middlesex and Northern Worcester County Soil Conservation Districts, the Massachusetts Water Resources Commission, and the Soil Conservation Service.

The Suasco watershed project is among the first to be approved for Massachusetts under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954. When completed, the project will help reduce and control floodwaters at key points on the Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord Rivers and their tributaries. The project starts at the Assabet River in Northboro and extends to the junctions of the Sudbury and Concord Rivers in Concord, then to the Merrimack River in Lowell. In all some 377 square miles of watershed are involved with the flood prevention work designed to help these Third District communities, some of which were added to my district as a result of the redistricting last year: Maynard, Upton, Marlboro, Boxboro, Sherborn, Berlin, Littleton, Westford, Harvard, Clinton, Acton, Bolton, Holliston, Stow, Natick, and Hudson.

Other towns included in the Suasco watershed are: Carlisle, Lincoln, Framingham, Shrewsbury, Chelmsford, Sudbury, Grafton, Tewksbury, Weston, Ashland, Westboro, Billerica, Wayland, Southboro, Boylston, Bedford, Concord, Hopkinton, and Northboro.

The watershed program is one of several important Federal programs administered by the Soil Conservation Service. Another is the National Cooperative Soil Survey, which is helping to provide basic soils information to many of our towns on a cost-sharing basis.

Four towns in my district have initiated action to share costs with the Soil Conservation Service for the basic soil interpretations they need—Sterling, Millis, Littleton, and Acton. Of the 351 towns in Massachusetts, it is estimated at least half have urgent need for soils information.

This is a worthwhile program which deserves the support of the Congress, Mr.

Speaker. My bill would help to improve and strengthen this national program.

For instance, my district has about 790,000 acres and only 132,000 acres have been soil surveyed. Completed soil survey maps are needed right now in Massachusetts, but the mapping job for my State is currently projected for completion by 1985, based upon current appropriations.

A large number of land use and water problems are being solved by many communities in my State in cooperation with the Soil Conservation Service and the Soil Conservation Districts. It has been demonstrated that the skills developed in handling soil, land use, and water problems on farms can be applied directly in many cases to similar problems on nonfarmland. My bill would provide greater authority to the soil conservation districts and the Soil Conservation Service in making available their skills to the many communities in my State and in the Nation which could benefit considerably from these needed services.

As an illustration, I cite the town of Spencer in my district, which recently suffered the loss of its main industry through the relocation of a shoe factory to the nearby town of North Brookfield. Town officials have requested the Soil Conservation Service to provide water and flooding facts on a commercial development on great meadows adjacent to the Seven Mile River and Hare Brook near Route 9.

The town has a sewage plant in the area, which needs to be enlarged. The town has asked for information on the extent of flooding to be expected in the area after the upper Quaboag watershed project is installed. This information is needed to help control building in the area.

I have been assured that the Soil Conservation Service will make the necessary studies for Spencer as soon as personnel can be detailed to this work from other activities.

Under the provisions of my bill, the Soil Conservation Service and the Soil Conservation Districts would be able to cope more efficiently and rapidly with the many demands for technical assistance in land and water use problems reaching them from many communities.

The Soil Conservation Service is very active in Worcester County and agricultural conservation program work in this county represents the largest share of Federal aid to farmers in Massachusets. In all, there are about 258,000 acres of farmland in the county. Farmers employ some 16,000 workers and do about a $27 million annual business. Farming is a most important part of the Worcester County economic picture.

However, as in other urban areas, Worcester County farms are changing year by year. Recent farm censuses show that farm land has decreased about 100,000 acres in a 5-year period. Individual farms with an average $27,000 value are growing larger and are largely mechanized.

The full text of my bill follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the rapid expansion of the Nation's urban areas, resulting in the discontinuance of farming operations on large areas of agricultural land and the consequent serious deterioration of such agricultural land and other land through erosion by wind and water, and shifting uses of agricultural and other land in other nonagricultural use areas, are causing severe problems concerning needed changes in the use of such land and the effects of such changes on the protection, development, and utilization of the soil and water resources of such areas; and that it is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should cooperate with States and other public agencies for the purpose of providing assistance in planning for such changes in land use and for the protection, development, and utilization of the soil and water resources of such areas, and thereby assist in preserving and protecting the Nation's soil and water resources.

SEC. 2. In order to cooperate with and assist States and their political subdivisions, soil and water conservation districts, regional, State and local planning boards and commissions, and other public agencies in planning for orderly adjustments in the use of land in the Nation's rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas and for the protection, development, and utilization of the soil and water resources of such areas, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, upon the request of the State or other public agency, to—

(1) make investigations and surveys in connection with the classification and mapping of soils in such areas;

(2) make studies necessary for the interpretation of such soil surveys or other applicable surveys made by or available to the Secretary;

(3) furnish technical and advisory assistance in connection with such planning; and

(4) obtain the cooperation and assistance of other Federal agencies in carrying out the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the puropses of this Act, such sums to remain available until expended.

COLLEGE EXPENSES SHOULD BE TAX DEDUCTIBLE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide a tax deduction for the expenses of higher education incurred by either full- or part-time students or their parents.

The rising costs of higher education prevent many capable students from continuing their studies. During the past decade, tuition fees have risen some 86 percent, putting such opportunities far beyond the reach of many unable to meet these expenses. The legislation which I have introduced would include deductions for the costs of ordinary living expenses as well as the cost of books and tuition.

College and university enrollment is expected to increase some 30 percent by 1965, and 66 percent by 1970. The impact of these figures can be readily seen in Florida, where we are building new facilities and enlarging present ones to keep pace with our expanding industrial and social needs.

However, as a nation, we should not concentrate solely on technical education, but should strive to provide the facilities necessary to produce well-rounded citizens. Our national survival may well depend on this Nation's ability to train its most precious resource—brainpower.

Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that this legislation to provide tax deductions for education expenses would accomplish the desired results through rewarding individual initiative rather than relying on comprehensive Federal assistance. This principle seems more in keeping with our national goals, and by the adoption of this legislation I have introduced today we will achieve these goals efficiently instead of adding to our already overburdening programs of Federal spending.

CUBAN COMMUNIST SUBVERSION IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the threat which the Cuban Communist government poses to the Western Hemisphere is one of the most serious this Nation has had to face. But face it we must.

Those of us from the great State of Florida are keenly aware of this cancerous sore which festers only 90 miles off our State's shore. We have absorbed thousands of Cuban refugees fleeing from Communist tyranny, and particularly do the people of the Miami area see firsthand the misery and despair, the anguish and the heartbreak, of the people of this once proud and free land.

For these remarks I do not wish to dwell upon the tyranny of the Batista regime, only to say that what the Cuban people now suffer is far worse than anything seen under that dictatorship. And neither can be condoned. What we must deal with now is the present crisis, the existence of a Cuban Government under the domination of communism, an international godless plague.

I have said on many occasions that I fear far more the subversion which is promulgated by the Cuban Communist dictatorship than I do the remaining Soviet troops on that island.

For international communism has gained a foothold, and unless rooted out, will infest another Latin American nation, and then possibly another. This is the threat we face, and one which we must meet.

I was proud of our President when he pledged to the Cuban freedom fighters in Miami recently that their battle flag would be returned to them in a free Havana. This should be the pledge of all Americans.

Recent events have again brought into sharp focus the dangers of the subversive activities of Cuban communism in

the Western Hemisphere. These dangers challenge not only the United States, in its quest for peace and security, but every one of our Central and South American neighbors, and the entire free world.

For our Latin American neighbors are more vulnerable than we to these activities, which have as their objective the overthrow of governments and the installation of Soviet-dominated puppet regimes similar to that of Fidel Castro.

We in the Congress, and the American people, concerned as we are with the security of our great Nation, must maintain an awareness of the nature and scope of these activities. Toward this end, the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee recently held hearings on "Castro-Communist Subversion in the Western Hemisphere." I recommend highly to all Members that they study the report of these hearings.

For my part, I would like to point out some of the things I have learned recently about this threat, in the hope that such information might in some way contribute to the full realization of this threat.

First, I would like to remind my colleagues of some of the techniques of subversion which are being employed throughout the hemisphere by the Cuban-based Sino-Soviet Communist movement. Recruitment and training of new adherents to the revolutionary line are prime activities of Communist agents in every country in the Western Hemisphere, including probably the United States. Recruits are normally sent to primary training schools first, and then on a basis of performance and reliability, may be sent to further centers for training activities of all kinds: Leaders, orators and propagandists; experts in sabotage, espionage, and terrorism in all its forms; specialists in the handling of arms and radio equipment, in guerrilla warfare, and so forth. Recruitment is carried on preferably among students, teachers, workers, artists, and writers. Some selected few students of subversion are sent on to advanced schools, where courses may last a maximum of 3 years. These schools refine the skills and techniques learned earlier, and train the man or woman as a party functionary. On an even higher level, there are schools in Russia and other bloc countries where personnel are trained to occupy key posts in the party or other allied agencies.

The next Communist technique employed in Latin America is infiltration into previously selected organizations and institutes in order, progressively and methodically, to gain absolute direction and control of them. Infiltration is undertaken in any social class, in government agencies, social and cultural centers, student groups, labor unions, and even in armed forces. The priority and magnitude of that infiltration will depend on the facilities found, the environment in which action is taken, and the aim being sought.

Another Communist technique being used in Latin America as elsewhere is called psychological penetration. An effort is made to attract and convert indifferent people by exploiting the contradictions present in every organized society and the justified longings to resolve them. Attractive material easily accessible to the masses is prepared, and the penetration is carried out through the constant utterance and repetition of slogans adapted to the situation, as well as the affirmation of carefully chosen topics.

Next, dislocation, or weakening of the social structure, is pursued by the Communists. Freedom to congregate, the right to strike, and other liberties granted by democracy are abused; laws are labeled as antidemocratic or dictatorial, and the authorities are criticized and attacked as being solely responsible for the situation. All kinds of arms are employed and offenses are perpetrated against individuals and public and private property, thereby inciting violent action on the part of the police or the Army, which serves the Communists' ultimate ends of portraying the regime as oppressive.

Finally, through a process of proper organization, a military apparatus of growing complexity is created. Action, or shock teams, are first created which engage in hand fighting, sabotage, or acts of terror. We have seen Communist efforts in Venezuela to pass from this stage to the next, that of organized guerrilla warfare, culminating in the takeover of strategic areas, and finally, the overthrow of the local government.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, all of these are the techniques of Communist subversion, and Cuba is the Western Hemisphere headquarters for training in these techniques. A series of schools and training centers have been set up there in which instruction is given not only to Cubans but to nationals from many other Latin American countries. There are perhaps a dozen of these schools in Cuba, some of them under Russian instructors. At least a thousand persons came to Cuba from Latin America during 1962 for training of this type. And as Mr. John A. McCone, Director of the CIA stated to the subcommittee:

> In essence, Castro tells revolutionaries from other Latin American countries: "Come to Cuba; we will pay your way, we will train you in underground organization techniques, in guerrilla warfare, in sabotage, and in terrorism. We will see to it that you get back to your homeland.
>
> "Once you are there, we will keep in touch with you, give you progaganda support, send you propaganda materials for your movement, training aids to expand your guerrilla forces, secret communication methods, and perhaps funds and specialized demolition equipment."

There have been organized, in addition to all this, groups whose purpose it is to facilitate the carrying of subversion to Latin America. Such groups as the Board of Liberation for Central America and the Caribbean, the Latin American Youth Organization, the Free Latin American Association, and others perform this function of spreading the Castro doctrine. A series of meetings, conferences, and congresses has been held in Cuba to give Communists and their sympathizers from other Latin American countries a good excuse to go to Cuba for training or for strategy discussions and integration.

This is a grave problem, perhaps the most serious threat to the United States and the Western Hemisphere we have ever witnessed. It cannot be minimized, it cannot be swept under a rug. We must marshal the full resources of this Nation, and that of all Latin America, to meet this threat. So long as this threat of Cuban Communist subversion remains, this hemisphere is in grave danger. We must meet this threat with bold and vigorous action, for in my opinion, the free and abundant life which we seek for all men can never be achieved in this hemisphere so long as this threat remains.

ROGUE BASIN PROJECT FREIGHT RATE DIFFERENTIAL BETWEEN MEAT AND LIVESTOCK

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] and myself, I wish to place in the RECORD a certified copy of Senate Joint Memorial 7 pertaining to the Rogue Basin project and House Joint Memorial 13 pertaining to the historic freight rate differential between meat and livestock. These memorials were enacted by the Oregon Legislative Assembly now in biennial session at Salem, the State capital.

Both these matters are of crucial importance to the State of Oregon. The Members of the Oregon congressional delegation are pleased to bring the memorials to the attention of this House.

ENROLLED SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

Introduced by Senators Chapman, Newbry, Potts; Representatives Back, Bazett, Branchfield, Dellenback and Redden

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Rogue Basin project has been authorized by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the Rogue Basin project is a comprehensive river basin development plan providing for the maximum feasible benefits from flood control, fishery improvement, irrigation, recreation, municipal water supply and power production; and

Whereas the present low water flow and present high water temperatures threaten the continued existence of valuable anadromous fisheries; and

Whereas repeated winter floods destroy valuable property and prevent development; and

Whereas the Rogue Basin is highly populated and a growing area primarily dependent on the timber industry; and

Whereas the timber production of the area is stable and its employment decreasing because of increasing efficiency; and

Whereas the need for a more broadly based economy and increased employment opportunity is urgent; and

Whereas the construction and operation of the Rogue Basin project would restore the fisheries, broaden the economy, increase employment in the State of Oregon and provide flood control: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Congress of the United States is urged to provide for a supplemental appropriation for the Rogue Basin project in the amount of $50,000 to be used by the Corps of Army Engineers for final planning in the fiscal year of 1963.

2. The Congress of the United States is urged to provide an appropriation of $365,000 for the Corps of Engineers to be used for final planning, site acquisition and construction of the Rogue Basin project for the fiscal year of 1964.

3. The secretary of state shall send a copy of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by senate March 12, 1963.

DALE A. HENDERSON,
Secretary of Senate.
BEN MUSA,
President of Senate.

Adopted by house March 15, 1963.

CLARENCE BARTON,
Speaker of House.

ENROLLED HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 13

Introduced by Representatives McKinnis, Flitcraft, Hansell and Senators Hopkins, Leth

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 52d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the livestock slaughtering and processing industry is essential to the economy of the State of Oregon and the Western United States; and

Whereas a historic and economically vital formula on the cost of transportation of fresh meats as compared to livestock, westbound from the Midwest, has been destroyed by the imposition of freight rates discriminatory to livestock processing plants in Oregon; and

Whereas under this historic formula the rates for transportation of fresh meats were approximately one and one-half times higher than the rates for transportation of livestock westbound from the Midwest; and

Whereas due to the imposition of discriminatory freight rates the fresh meat freight rate has been undercut, to a present formula of one to one, which makes it prohibitive for Oregon packers to ship livestock from the fat livestock markets of the Midwest to Oregon for local slaughter; and

Whereas the livestock slaughtering and processing industry of Oregon has already declined as a direct result of prior rate reductions forcing severe unemployment and loss of markets for livestock producers and feeders; and

Whereas the Public Utility Commissioner of the State of Oregon, the Director of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Oregon, the leaders in the meat producing industry, the leaders of management in the processing industry and leaders of labor in the meat handling industry, and allied fields, have gone on record to seek adjustment in these detrimental freight rates, without success: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon:

1. The Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States and the Honorable Secretary of Commerce to take those steps as may be necessary to restore the historic freight rate formula that has existed between westbound livestock and meat and thereby prevent further economic hardship to the broad based livestock industry of Oregon which is threatened by undercutting freight rate practices now permitted by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

2. The Secretary of State shall send a copy of this memorial to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by house February 14, 1963.

CECIL L. EDWARDS,
Chief Clerk of House.
CLARENCE BARTON,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate March 14, 1963.

BEN MUSA,
President of Senate.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have read with interest in recent weeks several theories that have been advanced on the manner in which the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery should be organized and operated. A matter of growing concern is the fate of the seven Veterans' Administration area medical offices, each presently responsible for the supervision of a group of VA hospitals, domiciliaries, and outpatient clinics located in several States. Just recently, the Director of each of these area medical offices was transferred with a small staff to the Veterans' Administration central office in Washington. Meanwhile, the staff of specialists and technicians making up the area medical office continues to function in its field location. How the Area Medical Director can supervise his staff of specialists from Washington more efficiently than was previously possible from an adjoining office is a mystery to me. I sincerely hope that this move does not represent the first step in the complete elimination of area medical offices.

I have been privileged to receive a communication from Adm. Joel T. Boone, former Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, expressing his views on this subject and the high quality of Veterans' Administration medicine in general. Admiral Boone is eminently qualified to speak on all matters affecting Veterans' Administration medicine. His background is rich with experience in the practice of medicine both on the field of combat under enemy fire and in peacetime in some of the finest naval hospitals in the Nation. Not only is he eminently qualified in the practice of medicine but he has proved to be an extremely capable administrator in his many assignments of increasing administrative responsibility in the U.S. Naval Hospital System culminated by 4 years as the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration.

Admiral Boone is a native of St. Clair, Pa. He was educated at Mercersberg Academy and the Hahnemann Medical College in Philadelphia. He began a distinguished naval career in 1914, served in combat with the Marines in Haiti in 1915, and in France during World War II. For extraordinary heroism, conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity while serving with the U.S. Marines in actual conflict with the enemy in France in July of 1918, he was awarded the highest honor this Nation can bestow upon a serviceman, the Congressional Medal of Honor. He holds the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star with five Oak Leaf Clusters and the Purple Heart with two Oak Leaf Clusters for wounds received in action. As medical officer of the presidential yacht for several years he treated Presidents Harding and Coolidge. As White House physician, he attended President Hoover, and for a brief period, President Roosevelt. He has held posts as chief medical officer of a single ship as well as an entire fleet. He has directed the operations of a single hospital as well as all hospitals in a naval district. He has served as General Medical Inspector for all hospitals in the entire naval system. In 1947, Admiral Boone directed a medical survey of the coal industry.

This survey devoted to medical problems encountered by coal miners and conditions affecting health in coal mines has been responsible for improving conditions for workers not only in the coal industry but in many other industries as well.

Shortly after his retirement from naval service in December of 1950 Admiral Boone assumed the responsibility of directing the nationwide network of Veterans' Administration hospitals and medical facilities. During the next 4 years he devoted all of his many talents and boundless energy to making the Veterans' Administration hospital program the greatest system of high quality medical care this country has ever known.

Admiral Boone, in his letter, shares my concern lest the Veterans' Administration medical program which has been labeled "second to none" and which he played a prominent role in establishing, deteriorate in any manner.

The letter follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
March 21, 1963.

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: In compliance with your request, I submit a statement herewith, dealing with the area medical directors and area medical offices of the Veterans' Administration.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senate, of March 4, 1963, pages 3504–3507, published a speech by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, titled "Maintenance of Highest Medical Standards in Veterans' Administration," in which he, with obvious concern and at length, expressed an obvious deep concern as to an action taken by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in establishing offices in the central office of the Veterans' Administration

here in Washington for the seven area medical directors. Then on March 11, 1963, Congressman ALBERT THOMAS, chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, made a speech in the House of Representatives in which he made special references to the area medical offices and the methods of function of the area medical directors and their respective staffs. The final paragraph of Congressman THOMAS' speech states: "The Administrator has recently moved the area medical directors and their staffs into Washington. This is a good first step, but does not go far enough. This layer should be eliminated entirely and the area medical directors and their staffs should be reassigned to the various hospitals, so they can practice medicine. The veterans throughout the country will profit by this move."

It would seem from the above statement that Congressman THOMAS is unaware that some members of area medical staffs are nonmedical personnel and hence are not qualified as practitioners of medicine.

To one who knows, from long association with and experience in dealing with the Veterans' Administration's medical and hospital program directly and indirectly, Congressman THOMAS' statement is shocking to me. Predicated on my knowledge and experience which has included day-to-day supervision and operation of the Veterans' Administration's medical and hospital program for a statutory 4-year term of office, I can readily foresee that, if such a proposal were enacted, it would: first, seriously cause deterioration of the program and; then, destruction of it as a medical and hospital program, which is not excelled by any other medical and hospital program in the United States and, as far as is known, throughout the world.

My relationship with the Veterans' Bureau and the Veterans' Administration covers a span of 43 years. As far back as early 1920, when I was an assistant to the Surgeon General of the Navy following my duty with combat forces in France in World War I, one of my duties was a liaison officer with the then Veterans' Bureau. A request was made to the Surgeon General of the Navy by the then Chief Medical Officer of the Veterans' Bureau to release me from my duty with the Suregon General for reassignment to duty with the Veterans' Bureau as the Deputy Chief Medical Officer. I declined this proffer of an administrative position outside of the Navy, but continued for the next 2 years in a liaison capacity with the Veterans' Bureau.

Over the years from time to time I had various and sundry relationships with the Veterans' Bureau and subsequently, when established, with the Veterans' Administration. It was on March 1, 1951, that I was sworn in as Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration. I had accepted a proffer of appointment very reluctantly, having been urged to do so from the highest authority in Government, against my wishes and desires, but I would add parenthetically that I am indeed immeasurably gratified that I accepted the position, for it gave me an opportunity to supervise the reputedly largest medical and hospital program in the world and required of me a most challenging and vital opportunity to serve again my country and the veterans of it, with many of whom I had served when they were in the Armed Forces in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

As the Veterans' Administration at the time of my appointment was under a senatorial investigation, to which Senator HUMPHREY made extensive reference in the Senate on March 4, 1963, he being the chairman of a subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Commitee of the Senate, I entered upon my duties as Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration when the place was "on fire," "exploding," and "under attack." I could not have assumed these new duties at a more difficult and harassing period. It is not regarded as immodest to refer in passing to the adjustments successfully made in the medical and hospital program and the very substantial progress that was made during my 4 years of supervision of the program. I believe the record will strongly evidence that during that 4-year period the program was put on an even keel, and that substantial strengthening of the foundations of the program was attained, so that notable progress was able to be accomplished in the following 8 years under the able direction of my successor, Dr. William S. Middleton, who retired from that office February 28, 1963. He raised the therapeutic and educational measures to a high plane by his wide experience as an educator and by his knowledge and long interest in medical research. Instead of attacks on the program from various and sundry quarters and much criticism of it, as well from many varied sources when I assumed the office of Chief Medical Director in 1951, there is now no criticism to any substantial degree. There is valid evidence that the Veterans' Administration on medical and hospital program is now accepted as a way of life. Recently an article was published in the Atlantic Monthly and more recently excerpts of it in the Reader's Digest by a young physician whose only contact with the Veterans' Administration was as a resident in three hospitals for a period of a few months. The refutations of the aforementioned article by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Gleason, and the recent Chief Medical Director, Dr. Middleton, explode any validity to the articles. On the contrary, the Veterans' Administration's medical and hospital program is praised and acclaimed, and, because of its accomplishments and attainments, it has become the guidepost in medicine.

The initial and modern organizational structure of the Veterans' Administration's medical and hospital program was developed and put in operation by the then Chief Medical Director, Maj. Gen. Paul M. Hawley, Medical Corps, U.S. Army, retired. The then Administrator of Veterans' Affairs was Gen. Omar N. Bradley, U.S. Army. The modern program was formulated and established in 1946 and has, therefore, been in operation 17 years. General Hawley was succeeded by Dr. Paul B. Magnuson as Chief Medical Director, who under General Hawley had been Assistant Chief Medical Director for Research and Education. He took a vital part in the concept and formulation of the modern program and contributed very importantly to it. I succeeded Dr. Magnuson and, as I have said, I in turn was succeeded by Dr. Middleton. We four physicians covered a continuous span of 17 years as Chief Medical Directors.

To my personal knowledge, General Hawley, Dr. Magnuson, Dr. Middleton, and I are absolutely opposed to the December 3, 1962, decision of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to locate the seven area medical directors and two members of their staffs in central office with the majority by far of their staffs remaining in the field offices of the area medical directors in their respective assigned geographical areas. Each of us feels that such a move will, quite the contrary to the Administrator's public announcement, make for less efficiency in operation and will not affect economy but will increase the cost of the operational functions of area medical directors and add to their exacting labors and further disperse their geographical responsibilities. The convictions of us four former Chief Medical Directors, predicated on experience, would seem valid when there are to be maintained two sets of offices for the area medical directors, which will require them to travel more and enforce multiplying communication expenses to carry out their wide range of functions throughout their areas and to and from central office. I have not been able to ascertain any medical advice that has been utilized in the decision made to establish offices for the area medical directors in central office.

The Veterans' Administration medical and hospital program, and I might add that it includes the broad program of hometown medical care, is a national program and not in any sense a local one. The hospitals and clinics constitute a system of treatment centers. The domiciliary program is also a part of that medical system. Veterans' Administration hospitals and clinics are not isolated community institutions. They are in marked contrast to a private, community, university, fraternal, religious, or any other operated hospital. The Veterans' Administration hospital and clinic and domiciliary and the hometown care program, which reaches practically every hamlet of the Nation and rural areas, must be a coordinated program and one supervised and directed other than according to the whim of an individual hospital director. An army cannot be run by a company, brigade, regimental, or division commander acting independently, but they must be under central supervision, direction, and control. If you had each individual hospital director of a Veterans' Administration hospital acting independently, there would be in existence a comparable detached organizational structure like the Congolese or Haitian armies, as I knew the latter in 1915, organized and directed under multiple, separate chiefs, unrelated one to the other.

Returning to Congressman THOMAS' proposal, there must be an awareness that budgetmaking—a very vital procedure—as applied in the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery and its subdivisions, begins in individual wards and sundry offices of a Veterans' Administration hospital and clinic. The initially foreseen requirements then are reviewed by the chiefs of the various services; then by the hospital or clinic director; the area medical director makes the analytical comparisons and recommends adjustments of each medical facility's budget submissions in his area; in turn, the budgets are transmitted to central office where the Chief Medical Director analyzes, screens, and modifies the budgets from the field and consolidates them together with the budget requirements for the operations of his subdivisions of central office before they are forwarded to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The Administrator and his budget staff review the submitted budget from the Department of Medicine and Surgery and make an overall budget for the Veterans' Administration which is then submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration and submission to the Congress. It will, therefore, be seen that the budgets of all the various field medical facilities and the central offices of the Department of Medicine and Surgery must be a coordinated budget. From the beginning of its formulation until final review and adoption, many modifications take place in it, predicated on area and other overall broader analysis by officials in higher echelons with wider viewpoint than an individual hospital director who cannot, naturally, but be influenced by local desires and requirements as he is able to appraise them. The area medical director has the responsibility, with his knowledge as the area field coordinator, to review the budgets uninfluenced by individual hospital appraisement. He makes recommendations for adjustment in the individual hospital budget up or down. His screening, reviewing, and making recommended modifications of individual hospital or clinic budgets prepares them for central office consideration.

Dr. Middleton and I have observed in the past that area medical directors are "the eyes and ears of the Chief Medical Director in the field" and as the coordinators of the Department of Medicine and Surgery field activities. I do not believe I ever went into the various Veterans' Administration areas without having the respective area medical directors accompany me to the medical and hospital facilities within and throughout their areas. I was very dependent on the knowledge they possessed and their familiarity with and acquaintanceship with the institutions, the members of staffs, the universities, the deans and faculty of the medical schools in their respective areas with which the Veterans' Administration is affiliated, with the sundry consultants, and with the adjacent community life in the areas where Veterans' Administration hospitals are located; also with local and State veterans' organizations, chamber of commerce groups, church groups, and volunteer people who serve in various capacities in the medical and hospital field programs. The area medical directors and their staffs and offices are in close contact with the local and State medical and dental societies which together with the medical and dental schools create the atmosphere for and assist vitally in professional recruitment for the Veterans' Administration. In many instances the area offices' staff contacts the families of patients cared for in clinics and institutionalized in the Veterans' Administration hospitals and domiciliary facilities in their areas. They have a definite relationship with the extensive hometown care program which is a service of inestimable value to veteran patients who are entitled to such service. The area medical offices are readily available to investigate complaints of disciplinary infractions and to ascertain information of a wide variety and nature. Area medical directors were indispensable to me in bearing my heavy responsibility as Chief Medical Director. In a large measure they provided information and a knowledge needed in the conduct of my high office. I am thoroughly convinced that I could not have functioned without them, dispersed as they are throughout the Nation.

It has been gratifying to me to have heard Mr. Gleason express his belief in and the need for area medical offices and that he not only supports the existence of seven, but that he would favor an increase in the number. He granted that, as an example of inadequate coverage, the area medical director with headquarters in San Francisco had too large a coverage (its area is from Canada to the Mexican border and besides the States of Washington, Oregon, and California; it includes the States of Nevada, Utah, and Arizona). Experience has demonstrated that this area should be divided into two areas. When the Booz, Allen, & Hamilton management consultant firm of Chicago made a study of the Veterans' Administration in 1951, it recommended that there be established 20 area medical offices. As Chief Medical Director, I felt 10 should be the maximum. Six was the original number. Some time subsequent to the Booz, Allen, & Hamilton study, and additional area medical office was established.

Due to circumstances unfortunately arising in recent weeks and months, I have reason to be very deeply concerned as to the continuance of the superb medical care provided for veterans as has been now attained. If the medical and hospital program is not maintained on the highest level, the best trained and most competent professional personnel will not be participants in it. It is foreseen that medical and dental schools would not continue their highly effective affiliations with the program. Were this to happen, there would follow the termination of the residency and other outstanding teaching programs; Veterans' Administration medical research would vanish and the program would revert to an earlier deplorable quality of medical care of the veterans, such as preceded the modern program established in 1946. Should that reversion in medical care eventuate, the ill veteran would be cruelly victimized. The progressive advances in medical science, so materially assisted and promoted by the Veterans' Administration, would not only be severely handicapped, but real damage to it would be a consequence. The integration of private and governmental medicine, as applied at the Veterans' Administration, is unique. Wherein there was skepticism when such a combine was created, time has proved its wisdom, and its success as a medical and hospital program has been acclaimed. This wedlock in medicine has justified the claim that Veterans' Administration medicine is second to none. It will require positive action upon the part of those who have the power and authority to require that that descriptive phrase is a reality in every sense of its meaning.

I am sure you will agree that the present Veterans' Administration medical and hospital program must be safeguarded and provisions maintained for its function on the present high plateau.

You well know of my devotion and dedication to the veterans of our country. When in 1956 at the American Legion national convention, in Los Angeles, I was awarded its Distinguished Service Medal and in the final declaration of my prepared response to the presentation address made, I said:

"I have many times pledged the veterans of this country my support—not in mere words but in positive action. I believe the record will evidence that I have stood firm as one of their constant champions. I here again pledge to you that I shall remain faithful—with you—to our association as comrades-in-arms in every deserving cause pertaining to the American veterans. Standing before you today is a most meaningful and memorable experience for me.

"With the new honor you have bestowed upon me comes greater responsibility. With each honor I have been fortunate to receive over the years, I have been ever conscious of my added responsibility to give a better and fuller account of myself to my countrymen. I, here now, in the presense of this great assembly of patriotic Americans, so pledge myself so long as God gives me strength and life."

With my kindest wishes, I am,
Very sincerely,
JOEL T. BOONE.

DR. JEROME B. WIESNER: EXPERT SCIENTIST AND EXPERT WITNESS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as sponsor of the legislation which created the Office of Coal Research, I was particularly interested in this week's hearings conducted by the Mines and Mining Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. Such a review of the operations and activity of the Office of Coal Research is important in alerting Congress to the necessity of intensifying the coal research effort. At the same time, Office of Coal Research personnel and participating organizations and their employees may be assured that Congress has confidence in their efforts to develop new and expanded uses for coal.

I thank the chairman and those of the subcommittee who devoted so much of their time to the hearings. Attendance by members, many of whom represent constituencies far removed from coal regions, indicated a general desire to assist in the resurgence of coal and with it improvement of economic conditions in depressed mining areas.

The legislation setting up the Office of Coal Research was fashioned and nurtured by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the 86th Congress. It had the unanimous support of the committee, whose membership at that time included the present Secretary of the Interior. All of us—and every other Member of Congress who had a voice in its passage—are interested in the success of the coal research program. The testimony presented this week gives every evidence that this hope will be realized.

Mr. Speaker, one witness to whom I should like to pay special commendation for his lucid and forthright testimony is Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, director of the Office of Science and Technology. He presented a brief but inclusive statement pointing out the necessity of coal research and development. He pointed out that only an infinitesimal amount of research expenditures have been applied to research on America's most abundant energy resource as compared with the totals—by both government and private industry—directed into other fields of science and technology.

In response to questions, Dr. Wiesner was never evasive. No equivocation. No oratorical embellishments. Under unanimous consent, I include his written statement in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY DR. JEROME B. WIESNER

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am pleased to accept your invitation to appear before the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining during your hearings on coal technology and prospects. I should like to point out at the beginning that I am not here to discuss coal research in detail. It may be possible, however, for me to shed some light on broader energy research and development considerations now before the country in which coal plays a highly significant role.

Under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962, establishing the Office of Science and Technology, I am available to advise the President with respect to the review, integration and coordination of major activities in science and technology. Hence, I share the responsibility for looking broadly at the needs for research and development in the energy field to assure a balanced research and development effort that will best serve the national energy needs in future years, making the best use of natural, human, technological, and economic resources.

In response to recommendations submitted by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the President in mid-February directed that a comprehensive interdepartmental study be undertaken of the development and utilization of our total energy resources, in order to arrive at a judgment as to the most effective allocation of our research and development efforts.

The study is to be concerned with such matters as the possible effects of major research efforts on the economics of various energy sources or on improved transmission methods for energy; the size and characteristics of future demands for energy; possible price trends for fuels; and available alternative technical approaches to the problem of supplying the long-term energy requirements of the Nation.

Some of the questions we shall be trying to answer include these: What is the general rationale for investment of research and development funds? On what basis can research and development priorities be assigned? Under what conditions is such investment economically justified? What guidelines should be used to determine balance in the total national energy research and development program?

At a more specific level, we shall of course be looking for those research and development opportunities which seem to offer the most attractive possible payoffs, in both the short and the longer range.

The Interdepartmental Energy Study is under the direction of the Secretaries of Commerce, Defense, and the Interior; the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Federal Power Commission; and the Directors of the Bureau of the Budget, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Science and Technology, and the Office of Emergency Planning. I am the chairman of the steering group, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers is the vice chairman.

The study will of course be conducted in full awareness of the other important studies either recently completed or now underway by a number of organizations, including the Interior Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, and the Federal Council for Science and Technology.

As the Administration confronts this whole major question of development and conservation of energy resources, it is acutely aware that the amount and allocation of Federal research and development in the energy field will affect the efficiency of various components of our energy system, and, consequently, the rate and pattern of our national economic growth. We would like to know more than we do, for example, about where the most fruitful opportunities may lie in generation methods, high voltage transmission, coal pipelines, gasification and liquefaction of coal, recovery of petroleum from oil shales and tar sands, the use of integral trains and other improvements in transportation and the possible use of superconductors in generation and transmission and equipment.

Inasmuch as we have only just embarked on the interdepartmental energy study, I have had little occasion as yet to review specifically the state of the art in coal technology and prospects for research and development in this field, as compared with efforts in other facets of our energy system. My Office has of course been generally aware of the work of the Bureau of Mines and the Office of Coal Research in the Department of the Interior.

The amount of coal research—supported by some $11 million per year of Federal funds and about $9 million of private funds—is small when compared with research and development expenditures in civilian atomic power ($250 million per year) and in oil and gas ($300 million per year). As I indicated earlier, the interdepartmental energy study should throw fresh light on this question of allocation of research and development resources. However, it is my impression that financial support is not the only significant factor in coal research. Among other factors that need to be taken into consideration are: availability of research manpower and means for diffusing technological innovation through the coal industry and related enterprises.

As far as the direction for coal research is concerned, my present impression—subject to review as the interdepartmental energy study proceeds—is that development of economic liquefaction and gasification processes, as well as more economic transportation methods, both for fuel and electricity, would produce the greatest economic benefits for the coal industry. In this context, I am encouraged by the philosophy of the Department of the Interior whose coal research program aims at investigating the technical-economic feasibility of a mining and manufacturing complex whose end products—beside coal—would also include liquid and gaseous fuels and other chemical byproducts. Such systematic treatment of coal as a raw material to be processed into a variety of end products could lead to a new, broader, and invigorated concept of the coal industry.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Wiesner's appearance was so refreshing that I decided to look into the background of this unique type of witness. I find that his extraordinary background, and his educational, industrial, and governmental experience easily qualify him to be so deliberate and specific on any questions which may be put to him.

In studying an article devoted to Dr. Wiesner's life and accomplishments in the New Yorker magazine, I am led to conclude that there could very likely be a wide crevice between his and my political and economic philosophies, yet his testimony this week convinced me that here is a sincere and knowledgeable public servant who is a far cry from the ordinary bureaucrat whose testimony invariably is based on the need for more funds, more personnel, and more authority for his own office.

My first acquaintance with Dr. Wiesner's work was through his February 20 statement to the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. I found it to be terse, lucid, and to the point, with emphasis on commonsense in the conduct of the Atomic Energy Commission's civilian nuclear power program. I concluded at that time that the coal industry of this country might be in for more favorable treatment as a consequence of Dr. Wiesner's activities, not because he is looking primarily for new media of assisting an oppressed industry, but because of his objectivity and understanding of the energy resources, requirements, and potentials of our country.

Dr. Wiesner told the Joint Committee that he has been directed by the President to chair a steering group charged with the responsibility of conducting an interdepartmental energy study. Members of Congress who represent constituencies where conventional fuels are important economic factors will look forward to the progress and completion of this study, particularly because Dr. Wiesner has pointed out that the last AEC report to the President did not take into consideration the possible effect of additional research efforts on the economics of nonnuclear energy sources or on improvement of transmission methods for energy produced by either nuclear or nonnuclear means.

As I observed during the Mines and Mining Subcommittee hearings this week, if the discovery of coal in America had been delayed for two centuries, it would be much easier to obtain appropriations for research into this magic fuel. The country has been enamoured of possibilities offered by the atom and for 15 years Treasury funds have been made available for the purpose of finding a method of producing cheap electricity.

Before inserting the Wiesner statement on atomic energy, I should like to mention parenthetically that the magazine article to which I have referred, mentioned that President Kennedy's Special Assistant for Science and Technology is married to a former resident of Johnstown, Pa. Since Johnstown is also my hometown and is in the 22d District of Pennsylvania, my research into the background of Dr. Wiesner was all the more fruitful:

The above-mentioned statement follows:

TESTIMONY BY DR. JEROME B. WIESNER BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, U.S. CONGRESS, SECTION 202 HEARINGS, FEBRUARY 20, 1963

Mr. Chairman, members of the Joint Committee, I am pleased to accept your invitation to testify at this year's "202" hearings on the development, state, and growth of the atomic industry.

I would like to point out that the larger problem of research underlying the development and utilization of natural resources, including energy resources, has engaged the attention of the Federal Council for Science and Technology. Under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1962 establishing the Office of Science and Technology I am available to advise the President with respect to the review, integration, and coordination of major activities in science and technology. Hence, I share the responsibility for looking broadly at the needs for research and development in the energy field to assure a balanced research and development effort that will best serve the national energy needs in future years, making the best use of natural, human, and economic resources.

You have asked me to comment specifically on the report on "Civilian Nuclear Power," prepared by the AEC last year at the request of the President. I should like to do that and then to discuss briefly some plans for following up on that study. This is a very useful report, representing much effort and thought on the part of the Commission and the other groups whose studies it reflects. The report proposes a pattern for nuclear power development, several aspects of which I feel are generally appropriate.

For example, it seems clear that breeder reactors will be essential to utilize our uranium resources efficiently. Since breeders can eventually multiply the energy available from uranium manifold, this opportunity for long-range conservation of nuclear fuels should, of course, be explored. There is important emphasis in the AEC report on the development of this technology.

It is probably also true that a highly selective development effort on certain converter reactors is appropriate during the interval before breeders become commercially available.

Drs. Seaborg and Haworth have discussed these aspects of the report in detail, so I would like to concentrate my observations on a broader point: the relationship of atomic energy, as discussed in the AEC report, to other energy sources.

In transmitting the report to the President, Chairman Seaborg pointed out that the Commission had concentrated on nuclear power questions, and did not consider it appropriate to cover in that report the possible effect of additional research efforts on the economics of nonnuclear energy sources, or on improved transmission methods for energy produced by either nuclear or nonnuclear means.

As a result, the President has before him a highly interesting and significant report, but one which needs to be viewed in the broader context of our total energy picture.

Also available are recently completed studies which relate to the energy question by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, and the Federal Council for Science and Technology. A study of the electric power requirements has additionally been undertaken by the Federal Power Commission.

Following his receipt of the Atomic Energy Commission report, the President requested recommendations for the most effective way to consider the questions which were left unanswered by the Commission. In addition, the President requested recommendations for dealing with the broader economic questions which are implicit in the Commission's report and the other reports, such as the size and characteristics of future demands for energy, possible price trends for fuels, and available complementary technical approaches to the problem of supplying the long-term energy requirements of the Nation.

In response to recommendations submitted by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the President has now directed that a comprehensive interdepartmental study be undertaken of the development and utilization of our total energy resources, in order to arrive at a judgment as to the most effective allocation of our research and development efforts.

The participants in this interdepartmental energy study are to be the Secretaries of Commerce and the Interior; the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Federal Power Commission; and the Directors of the Bureau of the Budget, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Science and Technology, and the Office of Emergency Planning. I am to be the Chairman of the steering group, and the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers is to be the Vice Chairman.

As the administration confronts this whole major question of development and conservation of energy resources, it is acutely aware that the amount and allocation of Federal research and development in the energy field will affect the efficiency of various components of our energy system, and, consequently, the rate and pattern of our national economic growth.

Among the questions which need to be answered is one of major interest to this group, i.e., what degree of urgency the Nation should attach to nuclear power development, in the light of the projected availability of conventional energy resources, which should last well into the next century.

We also need to have some indication of what improvements in availability and economical use of nonnuclear fuels might result from increased investment of research and development funds. We would like to know more than we do, for example, about where the most fruitful opportunities may lie, not only in nuclear and other generation methods, but in high voltage transmission, the use of superconductors in generation and transmission equipment, very large conventional or nuclear plants, coal pipelines, gasification and liquefaction of coal, recovery of petroleum from oil shales and tar sands, and the use of integral trains and other improvements in transportation. We are also interested in the related problem of desalination of water and how this might affect the economics of power generation, both nuclear and nonnuclear, if purified water and power are produced together.

I am sure that the results of this examination cannot affect the basic need for long-term preparedness to meet energy requirements through nuclear power, nor can they affect the fundamental importance of conservation of resources which the AEC has so explicitly recognized. It is our hope, however, that this study will provide a perspective to judge both the desirable level of effort and programs proposed by the AEC and other Government agencies in the development of our energy resources.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I took this time to discuss H.R. 5131, the Youth Conservation Corps bill, which the Committee on Education and Labor recently approved. The bill shortly will be before the House Committee on Rules.

On March 31, 1933, the Congress responded to President Roosevelt's message asking for power to create a Civilian Conservation Corps and on April 5 the President established it by Executive order. There had been no precedent for the establishment of a Corps of this type in American history. In that message the President stated:

> I propose to create a Civilian Conservation Corps to be used in simple work, not interfering with normal employment, but confining itself to forestry, the prevention of soil erosion, flood control, and similar projects.

Now 30 years later, we face a specialized unemployment problem of our youth. We do not have as many people out of employment today as we had back in 1933 but the unemployment in the age group between 16 and 21 perhaps is greater today than in 1933. In December 1962, we had in excess of 700,000 young people between the ages of 16 and 21 that were not in school and were unemployed. An 800,000 figure would perhaps be more accurate because there are no figures for the unemployed youngster who does not go about looking for work but we all know there are many in this particular group. Twenty-six percent of this unemployed group of youngsters are high school graduates. Of the dropouts in the 1960's it has been estimated that 2½ million of these youngsters between the ages of 16 and 21 will not have completed the 8th grade. The unemployment rate among this age group is more than three times the unemployment rate in the adult population.

For several years many of the Members have been exerting every effort to enact legislation patterned after the old Civilian Conservation Corps, particularly the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman Blatnik, and the distinguished gentleman from Florida, Congressman Sikes. This year legislation was introduced by the gentleman from Florida, Congressman Sikes, and the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman Blatnik, along with many other Members in the Congress including myself, to authorize the establishment of the Youth Conservation Corps which we feel is the best and most economical method of meeting this unemployment problem among the youth of the country, and at the same time will advance the conservation and recreational programs in our national forests and national parks. This legislation also authorizes State and community youth employment programs for State and local public facilities.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Record at this point an analysis of both titles I and II prepared by the U.S. Department of Labor analyzing the principal provisions of S. 1 and H.R. 5131, as amended by the House and Senate committees, and letters from the National Education Association, American Personnel and Guidance Association, Department of Rural Education of the National Education Association, and the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, urging approval of youth corps legislation:

Principal Provisions of S. 1 and H.R. 5131 as Amended by House and Senate Committees

The bill contains two titles—the first of which would establish a Youth Conservation Corps; the second, State and community employment program. Both programs [1] are designed to provide modest paying jobs to the increasing problem of unemployed youth 16 through 21 years of age. Authorized program levels are in approximate accord with the President's January 1963 budget message for first year of operation. The House bill authorizes $100 million; the Senate version authorized $120 million.

THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

1. A Youth Conservation Corps is established within the Department of Labor for the purpose of performing needed conservation work under the direct supervision of the Federal conservation agencies.

2. Young men 16 through 21 will be eligible for enrollment in the Corps for a minimum period of 6 months. Reenrollment will be permitted up to a maximum of 2 years. During their enrollment they will be paid $60 per month (slightly higher on reenrollment), receive board, lodging, clothing, and other necessities.

3. Training and basic educational skills will be provided through arrangements made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with local school authorities.

4. The House bill provides an allotment formula based upon the male population in the age group in each of the States. The Senate version provides that 50 percent of the enrollees are to be selected on the basis of population figures and 50 percent to be selected by the Secretary on the basis of high unemployment. Selection of the enrollees will be made by the State employment services which in turn will endeavor to find jobs in private industry upon the conclusion of the enrollment.

5. The Corps will be administered by a Director, nominated by the President, acting through an interdepartmental committee consisting of the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, Health, Education, and Welfare, and (in the House version) the General Services Administration. The Director of the Corps will represent the Secretary of Labor.

6. Appropriations in the two versions differ. The Senate bill has a first year appropriation of $60 million, with subsequent years to be determined by the Congress. The House version sets maximum appropriations of $50 million the first year, $100 million the second year, $150 million the third year, $200 million for the fourth, and thereafter to be determined by the Congress. For the first year the number of enrollees will not exceed 15,000; thereafter the number at one time shall not exceed 60,000.

STATE AND COMMUNITY YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM

1. Through the use of 50–50 matching grants, public or private nonprofit agencies will be permitted to pay the costs of programs for the employment of youngsters for useful full-time or part-time work not now being performed by regular employees. The funds are available for any combination of useful work linked with schooling or training, or special school programs including work-study programs.

2. Young men or women between the ages of 16 through 21 are eligible for jobs under the program.

3. The program is designed to depend on local initiative. Thus local groups such as educators, welfare officials, and private agencies will together draw up plans for employment programs. These plans will then be submitted for the approval of the Secretary of Labor to assure compliance with requirements set forth in the bill.

4. Employment opportunities authorized by the program would include service in schools, hospitals, libraries, welfare agencies, children's homes, courts, in public programs relating to park improvement, playgrounds, and in private community activities such as the Visiting Nurse Association, Boy Scouts, and so on. Amendments to the administration's bill, made both in the House and the Senate versions, provide additional moneys for the establishment of Youth Conservation Corps type programs by States on State parks and forests.

5. The House version of the bill appropriates $50 million the first year, $80 million the second, and $110 million the third year, the program to terminate thereafter. The number of enrollees is not stated but would depend upon the makeup of individual programs and the size of appropriations. The Senate bill provides for a first-year appropriation of $60 million, with the subsequent 4 years to be determined by the Congress. The Senate bill version provides that the enrollees shall not exceed the equivalent of 60,000 enrollees during the first year, and thereafter the number determined by the appropriations.

National Education Association,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1963.
Hon. Carl Perkins,
Chairman, General Subcommittee on Education, House Education and Labor Committee, Old House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Perkins: It is encouraging that the Youth Employment Act, which you are considering as H.R. 5131, has made the progress it has toward legislative enactment, and I hope that the Congress will proceed now without delay to final passage.

The National Education Association regards this legislation as promising an important contribution toward the problems of our disadvantaged youth, so many of whom have dropped out of school without adequate preparation for life. The future for most of them will be bleak indeed unless we can find some way of retrieving these lost talents.

We are impressed with the educational benefits contemplated in this proposal—the requirement in title I, providing for a Youth Conservation Corps, that State and local educational authorities are to establish educational programs, in cooperation with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the maximum extent possible, and in title II the provision for local area employment which may provide the incentive needed by many to stay in school or return to school, or to acquire useful work experience.

The problem to which this legislation addresses itself is, we think, one of the most serious before the Nation today and one which will require action on many fronts for its resolution. There are 11.6 million young people in our high schools this year and, if recent experience is our guide, one-third of them (more than 3.5 million) will not graduate.

Measured against the size of the problem, the Youth Employment Act cannot be considered a panacea, but surely it will be worth the effort to make a start, and a good start, toward its solution.

Sincerely,
Hazel Blanchard,
President.

American Personnel and
Guidance Association,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1963.
Hon. Carl Perkins,
Chairman, General Subcommittee on Education, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Chairman: Because of the urgency of the situation I am writing you again about the Youth Employment Act of 1963 (H.R. 5131). The time for action on this important social and educational matter is now. Perhaps never in our Nation's history has such a large segment of our young men and women faced so bleak an employment outlook as today. Efforts at solving this perplexing social problem are long overdue. H.R. 5131 will not provide all the help that is needed, nor will it solve all the problems. But, it is an important first step in putting forth a positive plan of action. There are several very important reasons why this legislation is so badly needed. May I relate to you again the major strengths of this bill as they occur to this association.

OPPORTUNITY

Many of the young men, 16 through 21, who are unemployed today, have never held a job for an extended period of time. They have never been out of the very city that holds them captive. Many are completely unaware of the world about them—much less the great challenge and opportunity that is America. They badly need an opportunity for gainful employment in order that they can lift their horizons beyond the narrow concrete canyon that now is home to them. For a young man out of work for extended periods of time, a chance to work may be the greatest boost he will receive in his lifetime.

WORK IN NATURAL RESOURCES

The opportunity to work as provided in this bill will be a great support to thousands of young men. The additional benefits from title I—the Youth Conservation Corps—with its provisions for healthful outdoor training and employment is highly commendable. The need for development and conservation in our parks and forests has been stated so well by experts in the field that it should only be called attention to here. These young men can be given a real sense of social contribution by working in the beautiful parks and forests of this Nation. Many of them have never seen the scenic wonders of our land and the very opportunity to learn and earn in this setting should accrue a great blessing to both this Nation and the young men involved. Both natural resources—youth and our land and forests—are important.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

The recent manpower report of the President stated that the unemployment rate in 1962 for boys 14 to 19 was about 13 percent and 9 percent for those in their early twenties while men 25 or over had an unemployment rate of 4 percent. This is an appalling situation. The truth is that things are not going to get better with the passing of time. These youth need more education and opportunities for employment now. Both are important. The lack of education, for many, is the basic cause of their unemployment. This bill makes an attack on this dual problem. These men need special educational programs for their age group and maturity level. Among them are many who can be skilled technicians or creative artisans if given the chance. They need a lift to get back on the right track of education again—while they work and earn. For many thousands of young men who can take advantage of this act the education benefits can prove to be equal to or more important than the employment opportunities.

An important aspect of this educational program will be the counseling provided for the enrollees. These young men need to be made aware of their human potential and the present and future opportunities that are available to them in this highly technical and complex world in which we live. A strong professional counseling program in this Youth Employment Act will give greatest possible meaning to the education and the training.

SOMEONE CARES

A young man out of school and out of work—a part of a core of long-term unemployed (15 weeks or more)—begins to wonder if his neighbors, his city, State or Nation won't reach out to support his desire to be a useful productive American citizen. Basically, these young men want to work, but many (and the number is growing) simply cannot find work with their educational skill and maturity level. They must be given a chance. This Nation must demonstrate to these hundreds of thousands of unemployed youth under 22 years of age that someone does care whether they have the opportunity for useful and productive employment and a fresh start on an educational program. The social and economic devastation of this prolonged unemployment can be very critical for these young people. This Nation needs the help of these young men, and these young men need the help of this Nation.

We urge you to continue to provide the strong leadership this bill needs for successful passage. Your interest and past support places thousands of Americans in your debt.

Cordially yours,
Arthur A. Hitchcock,
Executive Director.

National Educational Association,
Department of Rural Education,
Washington D.C., April 2, 1963.
Hon. Carl Perkins,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Perkins: Congratulations on your leadership in bringing H.R. 5131, the Youth Employment Act, to the attention of the Congress as you are doing today.

Rural youth and young adults are often the victims of our changing economic and social structure. The chronic inadequate financing of public education has been particularly devastating in rural areas. This condition, coupled with the decrease in opportunity for work on the farm because of increased mechanization, has resulted in a migration of unskilled rural youth to urban areas, where they too often join the ranks of the chronic unemployed.

While as a rural group we obviously applaud the purposes of title I of H.R. 5131 providing for a Youth Conservation Corps, we are equally enthusiastic about title II, the local area youth employment program. Title I is limited to opportunities for young men. Title II would provide opportunities for both young men and young women. Our society requires increasing vocational competence from all of its citizens, not only for the benefit of society, but perhaps more importantly for the self-respect and self-fulfillment of the individuals concerned. We believe that service in the Youth Conservation Corps can be a fine experience for young men. We commend the authors of this bill for their concern for conservation of natural resources, a special interest of our department. But we emphasize that a youth conservation program cannot be complete if it ignores those young people who will spend their lives in the urban areas and who will profit most from on-the-job public service employment training programs. We urge, as we did last year, that the committee not fail to see all of the youth because of the trees.

---

[1] These programs are to be distinguished from proposals for a Domestic Peace Corps which will be manned by adult volunteers whose special talents and educational qualifications will be utilized to provide leadership to local volunteer service.

We are particularly pleased that H.R. 5131 contains the explicit provision that training and basic education skills will be provided through arrangements made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with the local school authorities.

The department of rural education, NEA, representing the county superintendents of this Nation, supports H.R. 5131 and urges the Congress to approve the bill as presented. We believe this is a realistic approach to the present problems of youth employment.

Sincerely,

Robert, M. Isenberg,
Executive Secretary.

The American Association for
Health, Physical Education, Recreation,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1963.

Hon. Carl D. Perkins,
Chairman, General Subcommittee on Education, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Perkins: The American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation urges you and your committee to support and call for the early enactment of H.R. 5131, the Youth Employment Act of 1963.

Our association was organized in 1885. It has over 34,000 members and is a department of the National Education Association. It is also the largest professional organization in America serving the fields of health, physical education, and recreation.

We feel that the two titles of this bill—one providing for a Youth Conservation Corps, and the other for a local area youth employment program—are equally important to make possible the greatly needed opportunities for youth employment. The useful work on projects which would be accomplished under the provisions of this bill would also contribute greatly to the conservation and development of natural resources throughout the Nation.

We are especially pleased that section 104 (2) under title I provides that enrollees of the Youth Conservation Corps may be utilized by agencies responsible for developing, managing, and protecting recreational areas. The increasing shortage of recreational areas and facilities is a critical national problem which must be solved in order to provide adequate recreational opportunities for all citizens.

We are also happy to see that section 104 (4) under title I provides that to the maximum extent practicable, educational programs shall be provided by State and local educational authorities under agreement with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Our association urges the support of your committee in calling on the House of Representatives to pass H.R. 5131 without delay.

Sincerely yours,

Jackson M. Anderson,
Assistant Executive Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, some of our friends on the other side of the aisle have suggested that a Federal program aimed to provide employment to the young men and women of the country is an expensive way to meet the present problem facing these youngsters. They propose instead a substantial increase in the size of the vocational education plan on the theory that those who are unemployed need skills before they become capable of getting jobs.

I do not think that anybody can find me in second place on behalf of the cause of vocational education. These past 2 weeks, indeed, I have been the chairman of a subcommittee examining the needs of vocational education and listening to the overwhelming testimony in its behalf—testimony, in fact, from administration witnesses who have said that vocational education has been neglected in the struggle for the local education dollar; has been receiving the least able of the students; has been making out with obsolete machinery and with salary scales which are unable to compete with modern industry. I have, moreover, introduced H.R. 4955 which would aid vocational education to an even greater extent than the aid proposed by the administration. I have in my State and, indeed, in my own district one of the greatest vocational schools of the entire Nation, the Mayo Vocational School, and my most ardent wish is that all Americans have the opportunity to attend an area vocational school with the reputation and record of accomplishment which Mayo has demonstrated almost since its founding. Only very few States, North Carolina, Louisiana, California, and Connecticut have a sufficient organization of public vocational schooling to do the job Mayo is doing for my district. To rectify these deficiencies will require an enormous commitment of public resources.

But I think we should ask ourselves whether vocational education is the answer for the 800,000 young men and women between 16 and 21 who are this very day out of school and looking for work. The Secretary of Labor testified that there was an additional 200,000 who were out of school and not looking for work because they knew the task was futile—they lacked the qualifications which their experience had already told them were necessary before an employer would consider them for employment.

Bear in mind that the 800,000 of today will be on the increase tomorrow. In 1960 the monthly average, apart from vacation months, was 450,000, about one-half of what it is today. During 1963 the first wave of postwar births will become 16 years of age. In this very year 3,700,000 young boys and girls will become 16 years of age compared to the 2,700,000 who become 16 during 1962. Thus, for those who will drop out, who will start looking for jobs at 16 we are certain to be presented with a sudden new increase in the number of such youngsters.

At the very moment in time when the flood of new entrants into the labor force confronts us, another event is occurring in the manpower field. All of us know that the farm boy is being driven into the city because of the rapid technological developments taking place in agriculture. We all know that the number of odd jobs, unskilled jobs if you will, is decreasing. We know that the youngster who might have been an elevator operator or an errand boy finds such opportunities increasingly scarce because of the advance of automation. The Secretary said we are facing a future where the unskilled jobs will be done by machine. Department of Labor projections for the next 15 years show clearly that in a steeply rising labor force the number of unskilled jobs likely to be available will remain stable whereas all the growth in the labor force will be absorbed in the skilled or semiskilled areas.

We have had disastrous spring floods in Kentucky and in many other States in the country. When one swollen river meets another and the two combine, the confluence of these rivers flood the land below and it is this kind of situation which I am trying to describe. It is this kind of situation which committee members from the other side of the aisle during discussions of the Youth Employment Act are attempting to solve by vocational training, as though this institution could handle the vast problems of youthful unemployment in the immediate future.

Given 10 years of development of school construction, of rising teacher salaries, of recruitment of manpower, in short a crash program for education plan, some of the job of saving wasting manpower might be accomplished, but only under these circumstances.

But the task immediately ahead cannot be done solely by vocational education and their leaders, as I will describe, say as much. The job ahead must deal with existing conditions and predictable ones of high youth unemployment. The school dropout picture, reflecting over a period of years considerable progress when applied to the increasing supply of youngsters, shows the actual number of dropouts remaining constant. Moreover these youngsters are dropping out of vocational schools as well as regular schools. The problem is that the courses being offered are insufficient to insure their attention. They are not motivated for learning to work—their experiences in school or in their environment have turned them away from the path to a productive livelihood. Good vocational schooling for youngsters requires levels of accomplishment in a host of related subjects comparable to a high school degree.

The Manpower Development and Training Act passed last year has to date approved projects which total 30,000 trainees. When the matter was checked recently it was discovered that approximately 25 percent of the total were for the age group 16 through 21, the topic of our concern this afternoon. Many of these youngsters were eligible for the adult training allowances because they were already heads of families and had been in the labor force 3 years. Perhaps more important are the difficulties which the Department of Labor encountered in stimulating special programs for youth, the kinds of programs which the Congress asked the Secretary of Labor to give his special attention in view of the kinds of unemployment figures which I have already described. To

date hardly a half dozen of such programs have been developed covering less than 500 trainees. The Manpower Development and Training Act and the Area Redevelopment Act are neither of them geared to the broad range programs required for our youth. They are chiefly used for those who have become unemployed and require retraining in order to resume beneficial and satisfactory employment in a new job.

The Secretary of Labor and numerous other witnesses made the point that what most of those youngsters who are now unemployed needed was actual experience in work, the kind of experience which enables an employer when considering the employment application of an applicant to ascertain for himself from the previous employer what he can expect. He wants to know whether the applicant has worked regularly, understands the discipline of promptness, of fitting in with the operations of others on the job. The vocational education programs do not give such answers. The Manpower Development and Training Act to the extent that it permits on-the-job training will give such answers to the employer who is cooperating in giving training, but for this employer the trainee is already his own prospective employee.

In quite different ways the two programs proposed by the Youth Employment Act provide unique experience to the persons for whom they are devised. In the case of the Youth Conservation Corps the money spent can be considered well spent for conservation purposes. The $4,000 per year per enrollee, despite some losses in efficiency, compares very favorably to the productivity of a regular employee performing similar conservation work, and if such is the fact the benefits to the young men who will be in the program will become a valuable byproduct. The healing values of camp experience, of work in a constructive purpose is the testimony of the old CCC and many of the persons who today deal with youngsters in the camp programs of many States.

The State and community employment programs on the other hand will be able to relate additional schooling with actual work experience. The work study programs and experiments in many school districts have proved their worth and such programs will receive substantial support when this bill is enacted. Indeed many youngsters will be able to receive vocational education for part of the day and work at a constructive, useful job financially supported by title II of the Youth Employment Act. In this very clear way the rebuilding of vocational education is related to activity under this bill but at the same time quite clearly complementary to it and in no way overlapping in its benefits.

Mr. Speaker, training under the vocational education program meets the needs of the fairly able kid, but only reaches to a limited degree the type of youngster we are trying to reach under the Youth Corps legislation.

Vocational education programs in general do not satisfy the needs of a sixth-, seventh-, eighth-grade school dropout, until this type of youngster has taken some camp training where he will be given an opportunity to test his aptitude and preference for various types of work. Then he may be given related training to the type of work most suitable to this particular youngster and from there take vocational training.

Much of the vocational training is largely post high school. Title VIII of the National Defense Education Act, training highly skilled technicians is largely a post high school program. The Smith-Hughes Act and George-Barden Act, as far as home economics and agriculture are concerned start with the ninth grade, and go through some post high school work. In trade and industrial education, most of the programs start in the 10th grade. Many of these programs are likewise post high school. The distributive occupations which have to do with merchandising, retailing, and wholesaling on a cooperative basis, usually require 10th grade and go through high school, and much of this is post high school.

I have gone to the trouble of lifting from the vocational education hearings the testimony of a group of experts representing American vocational education, who appeared before the General Subcommittee on Education on Wednesday and Friday of last week. They are Dr. Milo J. Peterson, president of the American Vocational Association; Dr. William B. Logan, professor of education at Ohio State University and member of the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education; Mr. James Patton, assistant superintendent of public instruction, Kentucky Department of Education; Dr. Burr E. Coe, director, Middlesex County Vocational and Technical High School of New Brunswick, N.J.; Dr. Mayor D. Mobley, executive secretary, American Vocational Association, Washington, D.C.; Dr. C. W. Patrick, president of San Diego Junior College, San Diego, Calif.; and Dr. Albert Jochen, assistant commissioner of education, vocational division, Trenton, N.J. These gentlemen are experts in the field and their testimony was to the effect that the dropout would benefit immensely from camp experience.

I think the Members of the Congress will be interested in the views of these outstanding vocational experts on the proposed Youth Corps legislation. These gentlemen support the youth camp approach and give their reasons. I have lifted out of the record the pertinent part of the testimony of these gentlemen, and under unanimous consent include them in the Record at this point. These statements are taken from the stenographic transcript of hearings, General Subcommittee on Education, March 27, 1963, commencing at the top of page 258, and extending through page 273:

Mr. Perkins. I will address this question to all of the speakers.

On these 700,000 dropouts primarily from high school and grade school between the ages of 16 to 21 years, assuming that you had these expanded facilities today, how many of these dropouts do you figure that you may be able to train or retrain?

This is problematical, we all know it, but you people are specialists in this field and we have to get some views of the specialists. I would just like to get that in general. I want the comments from all of you, any of you.

Mr. Patton. Could I make a comment on that? I want to back up a bit to discuss the dropout generally as it applies in Kentucky, our home State.

At the present time, or this last year, we only had 14 vocational schools, 1,700 dropouts. On the face of that we had about 37 percent, generally, 37 to 40 percent from year to year dropping out of school.

You can see just how small a dent we are making on it at the present time.

Of course, we need the facilities and equipment to do the total job. But I visited the Kentucky Business, the institution that serves the delinquents and I found more than 400 people in that institution and in the interest of the committee that were there at the institution, we found that everyone we talked to despised the school that they last attended. They didn't like the school, they didn't like the teacher. They would become a dropout and then a delinquent and then confined to an institution.

Now, it stands to reason that there is a large group of these people that could have been salvaged in the work camp situation.

I am old enough to have been able to find out and to have experienced the outstanding contribution the CCC camp made for many of our youths in Kentucky.

Mr. Perkins. You feel with this kind of dropout they are usually unqualified to enter vocational education and the CCC or something patterned after the old Civilian Conservation Corps would be satisfactory?

Mr. Patton. Yes. The very fact you are subjected to discipline and go to bed at a certain time and you associate with the group and you would develop certain work habits and it is certainly beneficial as a prerequisite to any education.

Mr. Perkins. You would say that would be a prerequisite to vocational education?

Mr. Patton. It would be.

Mr. Perkins. I would like to hear the comment of the gentleman here from California, just comment on that one point.

Mr. Patrick. I would agree, in general, with the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky, and it seems to me that the expansion of the program of vocational education into areas—do you want us to expand on both ends of the spectrum? We talked this morning about great need for technical education and there is also a need for expansion in the lower level of vocational education, the service occupations and semiskilled occupations that have had to be filled by the completely unskilled man and now requires skills.

It would seem to me, and I am sure that the expansion of the vocational program at those lower levels would reduce considerably the number of youth that might need to be served by such a camp, but the failure to do both of these things in the face of any major lack of full employment will create idle youths, which we know, in our urban communities, can be a devastating and dangerous program.

Mr. Perkins. But the first thing with an unemployed youngster who does not have the background to enter vocational education, a job will usually put an entirely different light into that youngster's life; am I correct?

Mr. Patrick. Yes, sir; there is no question about that. We are constantly aware of that and we are, I think, convinced we can do more in vocational education to help some of these less able youngsters and the provisions in 4955—there are provisions that may make it specifically possible to help these specially or socially handicapped groups that might not otherwise have been accommodated in our past programs since we are in the central area of vocational training.

Mr. PERKINS. I understand one of the greatest drawbacks, perhaps "handicaps" is the better terminology—to the so-called manpower legislation enacted last year is the functional illiteracy problem they are running into in administering the program to get more of these youngsters and I am just speaking about the youngster, to get more of the youngsters into training.

Mr. PATRICK. This is equally true of the adults too, Mr. Chairman. I am more familiar with what we have been doing to remedy illiteracy in adults. This has been a major problem in our own community.

We sometimes don't like to face these facts but there are a significant proportion of people who are functionally illiterate in some of our major urban communities and in some of our enlightened States such as California.

We have continued to have a major problem in adult education in reaching these people. The year before last the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego published a booklet at their expense urging these people to come back to evening schools. Many of them were recent dropouts. Half of the high school graduates at one of the adult high schools has dropped out of the regular schools within the last 3 years.

The chamber of commerce felt they had to spend the money to urge people to attend adult education because the surveys conducted by the Department of Labor, in which we cooperated, revealed that a significant amount of unemployment was simply due to functional illiteracy of these people and we have tremendous support for this kind of people from both management and labor in our community where we have highly technological industries in the aircraft, missile and electronics fields which simply can't use these people.

Mr. PERKINS. From experience, the 16-year-old dropouts we find are unqualified under the present setup to get into vocational education and 9 times out of 10, they don't want to go back to school or some other school where they have already dropped out, am I correct in that statement?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes, I would agree. I also feel that in some instances this is due to a lack of vocational programs in occupational—I would almost call it occupational programs in the schools in which he has been attending.

We can remedy some by increasing the programs and there will still be an additional corps of the individuals to whom you will refer for some other kind of work experience, job experience, camp experience, that it will be extremely beneficial.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Mobley.

Mr. MOBLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention, if I may, for the sake of the record, that in your bill, H.R. 4955, on page 7, item 4, describing what money can be used for this, as one of the things you have vocational education for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps, that require training programs adapted to the special needs of such persons.

I can conceive of a program that would be, or that some of this money could be used for the youth who are enrolled in the domestic corps, whereby once they get work, then through persuasion of the appropriate officials working with that particular program, they would be induced to enroll in vocational programs and here you are making it available. You are making money available that can be used.

Mr. PERKINS. Do you not think the type of youngster I am talking about, Mr. Mobley, who has dropped out, say, 17 years of age and assume he has an eighth grade diploma and is loitering on the streets and not doing anything and his habits are bad, do you not think if he took camp training for 6 months or a year and in connection with that camp training got some kind of related training he is interested in, automobile mechanics, or masonry, and if he did some masonry work under appropriate supervision, do you not think that when he had completed his enrollment and with that experience, then you have developed that youngster to the point that he is better qualified to meet just what you are talking about under this vocational educational framework?

Mr. MOBLEY. I agree most wholeheartedly with that.

I would like to remind you, like Mr. Patton I am old enough to remember the NYA program and the CCC program and I had a lot to do with it. We cooperated wholeheartedly with those agencies when in existence and they did a lot of good. There is no question in my mind about that.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Peterson, I would like to have your comments.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I doubt if there is much I can add to what has been said except to concur and add special emphasis to this type of training or experience or change of environment for the type of individual you were describing.

I think as a special need which requires a special circumstance to correct, if it is ever going to be corrected, it is not going to be done by putting them back into the same situation or even into a similar one in a different school in the same community. There has to be a saturation point. He has to change his attitude. He has to develop some different ideas and he is not going to do that if you just let him be where he is.

I think that would be the part that strikes me as the most significant in this program.

Mr. PERKINS. You cannot think of any better way to do it than a camp program and conservation work?

Mr. PETERSON. When you think of the young man from an urban area and I think it is safe to assume less than the most desirable part of the urban center, a complete change of environment that this provides can't help but be beneficial.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Logan, I want your comments.

Mr. LOGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to refer to a quotation given in the panel report at page 5, comment from the study made by Wilbur B. Brookover and Sigmund Nozal, "A Sociological Analysis of Vocational Education in the United States":

"Reference to your comment on skilled training and reading, writing, and arithmetic, skills in reading, mathematics, and other general educational fields are essential for acquiring specific vocational competence at the higher levels of education needed for many occupations."

There is a longer quotation than that here, but I will be glad to turn this over to the clerk.

But during the study made by the panel of consultants, the committees visited one of the high schools in the United States and I would prefer not to identify the specific area right at the present time. We saw there some very bad conditions in classrooms of people who were ill prepared for going out and getting a job and holding a job but the job being done was excellent, but if those boys could have been taken out to the wide open spaces and taken out of the atmosphere of the area in which they were housed, I think it would have been greatly beneficial to them.

We saw an excellent job being done by teachers there. We saw them teaching the ruler, by referring to the large spaces and the small spaces, if you please, instead of an eighth of an inch, a quarter of an inch—they said "the large spaces" and "the small spaces." And they were able to raise the level of the skills of those young men considerably.

But on the other hand, it was costing this school system $20,000 a year just to keep the doors of the building open. That is not upkeep, if you please.

Mr. PERKINS. Assuming that this camp program, at the most, even if you had to provide new housing, would only cost $4,000 per enrollee, would you say that was a good investment in this type of a dropout that we are talking about?

Mr. LOGAN. It is an investment in people and when you can make a person, raise him up through the proper application, bring him up to the level that he comes back and holds his head up and he lives as an acceptable citizen in the community and is proud of what he is doing, I would say it is a real good investment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Brown.

Mr. BROWN. I was interested in the comment made about previous experience in training of youth in these camp situations which was made by you, I think. You do not anticipate, I presume, there would be any problem today in providing adequate vocational instruction for the scale of program that we are contemplating here?

Mr. MOBLEY. Yes, there would, unless we can get more money. The vocational funds today are pledged right down to the last penny.

I think if Mr. PERKIN's bill is enacted into law and money is made available, there will be no trouble.

I would like to give you, if I may, an experience we had in my home State. I worked very closely with the head of the NYA back all through the years that it was in operation. Mr. Jones, now of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was in charge of the program in my home State at the time and we worked very closely. We worked on a program whereby these young people were brought into centers for work. They worked a half of each day and then we gave them vocational education and general education. Some of them needed to read and write, learn to read and write, some were acquiring skills at the same time and it was a very fine program.

It was a very fine program. We trained hundreds of people and at the same time they learned good work habits.

Mr. BROWN. But there is the type of thing that is contemplated in the title II section of this youth employment bill, these so-called local areas employment.

Mr. MOBLEY. Yes.

Mr. BROWN. And I am very interested to know you have had experience and I presume, therefore, you see no mechanical difficulties if the money can be provided to provide the type of educational program we are talking about.

Mr. MOBLEY. Yes. That is one reason I called attention to this provision in Mr. PERKIN's bill, because it provides the money for doing this and we can vary it. The language is such you wouldn't have to surrender the standards as you have in some other courses. You can develop the program to meet the particular needs.

So I anticipate no trouble at all in that respect.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you.

Mr. PERKINS. Any further questions?

Mr. BROWN. Not right now.

Mr. PERKINS. Now, Mr. Patton, you wish to further comment on this question? You have had experience in this, am I correct?

Mr. PATTON. When I was director of the State vocational program. We had tremendous responsibility for attempting to adjust the young man who comes to school so that he would be ready to accept vocational training and the 8 years that I participated there in the study of the people that completed this, we had a higher percentage of dropouts from that vocational school among the very young that were not ready for such training.

Now, if these people had had a chance, let me say many of them had been roving the streets and had developed a poor attitude toward school and someone had gotten hold of them and said if they would come into the vocational school probably something would be done. But he could not, we were not in a position to break down that attitude and break down that social culture that they had been living in in the short period of time to get them ready for vocational training.

So if they had had a work experience situation like the camp proposal that you are thinking about, it would probably have salvaged many of these young people that we were unable to do anything with at that particular time.

Now, if we had had a larger counseling staff and if we had had sufficient funds to put them into an orientation program for a period of months to give them individual attention, we might have been able to hold them but we didn't have that kind of facilities, we didn't have that kind of leadership, we didn't have that kind of personnel.

Now, if this bill could be enacted into law, and if your camp bills were enacted into law, I believe we can begin to make a dent upon this social problem of the youth of this country, but otherwise, I think it is going to be a cancer that is going to eat the heart out of America unless we come to grips with it.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Peterson.

Mr. PETERSON. I would like to make this further comment. As we think ahead to the implementation of this type of program I think we must come back again to the fact that in order to do this job we have to have the kind of provisions for vocational educational education so that we will have a qualified corps of instructors to do the vocational training and counseling that will be needed.

But to do one without the other, I think you will fail in achieving the objective of either.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Mobley.

Mr. MOBLEY. I would like to make this comment. I studied your youth opportunities bill, and we are very glad indeed that you have as one of your provisions that any vocational or educational work that is carried on incidental in connection with on-the-job training, would be done through consultation and working with the HEW and through State and local educational authorities.

I think you know that most educators don't agree on too many things but there is one thing they do agree on, they don't want the Federal Government running the schools.

Mr. PERKINS. May I say to you, Mr. Mobley, it is the intention of the committee, and Mr. Brown is on the committee, to wholeheartedly see that the Federal Government does not run the schools. This is to be worked out with the State educational people and 9 times out of 10 it would be the vocational educational people in the State and, if not, it would be the State department of education. The bill so provides.

Mr. MOBLEY. Yes, and I want to commend you for having that clause in the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. That provision will remain in the bill. I can visualize where the vocational educational people, assuming that the Youth Conservation Corps bill is enacted, will play a very important role in developing that youth so he can make a contribution to the country and help expand the economy in the long run.

Mr. MOBLEY. Mr. Chairman, could I add one other thing?

You were mentioning about the cost. One of the things I think we must always keep in mind, too, is unless you salvage a youth they may cost you a lot more than $4,000 a year in terms of crime and juvenile delinquency.

Mr. BROWN. That is a good thought. It just occurred to me, as you were discussing it, that it is very well known you can go into our penal institutions and acquire very quickly certain skills and attitudes that are very difficult to overcome and it seems to me with vocational training and the healthful atmosphere we are contemplating in some of these programs, it will have the opposite effect and make useful citizens out of these people.

Are there any other comments from any of you gentlemen on this?

I am not sure what the chairman proposes to do about continuing the testimony but he will be back in a minute.

Mr. LOGAN. May I make this comment? In regard to giving instruction for these people who are handicapped in various ways, no matter what it might be, that type of instructor that you get is not easy to find and he is hard to train. It takes a long time to prepare him for this, because he not only has to know how to work with the skills, but develop those skills in an entirely different manner, in which we already have textbooks prepared to give him guidance and so forth, and he also has to know the psychological facets of working with these kids that many times are not written down in books.

Mr. BROWN. Yes, I have been very much concerned in California, about the development of programs which would involve these handicaps or marginally employed people and it is necessary to have a high degree of skill to accomplish this job and frequently it takes a shelter type of situation, which is not normally available. Yet if we make the effort to utilize these resources, we are going to tap a potential which is not a total deadweight and cost to society and put it into production.

Mr. Speaker, following are also statements of Dr. Albert Jochen, assistant commissioner of education, vocational division, Trenton, N.J., taken from his testimony before the General Subcommittee on Education, March 29, appearing in the stenographic transcript of hearings commencing on page 439 and extending through page 445; also his statement beginning on page 453 and ending on page 454:

Mr. PERKINS. I am thinking about the youngster 16 or 17 who has never had a job. He is unemployed. He has a sixth, seventh, or eighth grade education. There are no courses in your vocational school, I mean there are no training programs there for that type of youngster under present facilities?

Mr. JOCHEN. Yes, sir, there are, but they are very limited. In the city of Trenton we have one program in the garment industry area, it has to do with the needle trades, double needle, single needle, closing machines, and that kind of thing. These people are referred by the Employment Security Division to the schools and we call it a type C.

Now, there is a possibility under the George-Barden Act of conducting type C programs. Our problems in New Jersey are these. Our problem is that at the present time we are reimbursing the local district for shop teachers' salary only because we have no other funds. According to the law, we could reimburse every vocational teacher, but we are so limited in Federal funds that we can only reimburse the shop or laboratory teacher and we are down now to where we are reimbursing at 6 percent of his salary. We don't have any money.

Mr. PERKINS. You say, though, any assistance you give these school dropouts, 17 or 18 years of age, sixth, seventh, eighth grade education, is very minor.

Mr. JOCHEN. It is; not because we want it to be but because of circumstances, financial.

Mr. PERKINS. But assuming one of these youngsters had dropped out of school at sixth grade level, 17 years of age, you may say that he dropped out of vocational educational school, would you not suggest that that youngster be put into a different environment and enrolled in a camp for a period of 6 months or a year and find out while he is in the camp what particular trade he is perhaps interested in and may take some related training in camp, and then after he came out of that period of enrollment with some new work habits and this related training, that he would be much more adaptable to vocational training of this type?

Mr. JOCHEN. I would think that that would certainly be worth experimenting with and looking at.

We have a Johnstone Training Center where they are doing some research at the State level in this area.

However, it is limited to youngsters who have gotten into trouble, they have become delinquent.

Mr. PERKINS. I am talking now about the youngsters who have dropped out of school, at the seventh or eighth grade level, where there are no jobs available. Would you suggest that camp life, enrollment for a period of 6 to 12 months, doing conservation work in the forest, and maybe some mental work, and taking some basic educational training in the meantime would be perhaps the most useful program that you could provide for that youngster to get him back on the road to get an education?

Mr. JOCHEN. Well, I would certainly feel that this would be most important to try. We have done some work with these people. You have an economic factor, you have a sociological factor. If they were brought back into the same environment, many times without giving them an opportunity of changing that, this could be very harmful.

I would want to see, too, what I believe in in this sense, that the program, if they were in the camp, was really and truly realistic in terms of the need of these people so that they would not again be frustrated by failure.

Mr. PERKINS. Be well-planned work?

Mr. JOCHEN. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Under park rangers and supervisors who really know their business?

Mr. JOCHEN. I certainly would like to see it tried. I would not mind making contributions in that direction if necessary.

Mr. PERKINS. You remember the old Civilian Conservation Corps, do you not?

Mr. JOCHEN. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. What is your idea of a corps of that type for youngsters and dropouts in school for a camp patterned after the CCC school?

Mr. JOCHEN. I think if I could organize, do a lot of good planning in developing the curricula and the socioeconomic kinds of things you want to train these people in and the social adjustments and develop it carefully and get the right kind of people running it, to me this is really wonderful. It might be the first time that some of these people had ever been out under trees and worked.

If you have ever been up to Cornell University and walked through Enfield Glen, you still see carved into the sides of the walls there CCC, No. so and so. I often thought this probably was the first time a youngster was ever out under the sky, he made something that he enjoyed that otherwise would never be there.

This glen is a beautiful thing. I have wondered if we could not look up some of those people and find out from them what they thought of the education and training they got under the program.

I also feel this way, though, that I would not want such a program to make the people locally feel now that the obligations that they really should have are not to be continued. In other words, too frequently you know we are very glad, we say, well, now, somebody else is taking care of this and we don't have the problem any more.

That would not be true. I think there should be close tieup.

Mr. Perkins. The responsibility would still be here. I think when that youngster gets some training in this camp, gets some experiences in the camp from camp life, that that would qualify him to take vocational education in something he is interested in and prepare himself for life and make a great contribution to the economy of the country. Those are my personal views.

Mr. Jochen. I worked in the NYA, which was a little bit like the CCC. I have seen some of the CCC camps, so I am not unfamiliar with what was done to these people. It literally improved their health and outlook.

We fail to recognize, some of us, that just eating habits are not the same. There are some nationalities who do not ever sit down as a family and eat. You eat when you are hungry. There is a little food cooking all the time.

I think they have to see some of these other things. They also have to be taught the importance of understanding the ethic and the sociological backgrounds of their parents so that there is a closer and warmer feeling there because you live in one world at home and when you go to school you are in another world lots of times. The two worlds should not be too far apart so that you build a barrier between the youngster and his family.

I would hope that we would recognize this in the program. If I wanted to destroy democracy the first step I would take is lick the home. I would break up and disintegrate the home and then I could more easily destroy democracy.

I would hope whatever we do in the CCC or the Youth Camp, it would strengthen the home, would build toward stronger homes, because to me these are the foundations upon which democracy is built.

Now maybe I can jump some of this Mr. Chairman; it will be in the Record even if I don't read it.

Mr. Perkins. I think you are giving the committee here wonderful testimony, especially with all your experience and background in the field of vocational-technical education.

Digressing just for a minute, how many youngsters, I am speaking of the dropouts, do you feel that you have enrolled in your vocational educational schools in New Jersey with sixth and seventh grade education, if any?

Mr. Jochen. Out of 34,000 almost 3,500 youth and adults, and I would have to give you a calculated guess.

Mr. Perkins. Now I am speaking of the dropouts, sixth and seventh graders.

Mr. Jochen. But whether they are youth or adult.

Mr. Perkins. No, just the youth and sixth and seventh graders, unemployed.

Mr. Jochen. Mr. Chairman, I would say that we don't have more than probably 60 in the whole State in such programs at the present time which are type C programs. There might be 60 to 70 such students.

Mr. Perkins. Thank you very much.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Are you contemplating merely the kind of work the young people did during the existence of the Conservation Corps, or planning some kind of training and also going into industry to see that when they are trained they get jobs?

Mr. PERKINS. We are contemplating work very similar to that which was performed during the days of the Civilian Conservation Corps, such as conservation work along with related training and other appropriate educational and vocational training.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I was afraid of that.

Mr. PERKINS. They will get related training. They will get vocational education, and basic education where it is needed.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Are you making it very clear that this has no relation to the International Peace Corps?

Mr. PERKINS. We are making it clear that this work has no relation to the International Peace Corps.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I hope you do make that very clear.

Mr. PERKINS. It is entirely a domestic corps, and we cut the pattern under the old Civilian Conservation Corps and under the National Youth Administration for these programs under both titles 1 and 2.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the Youth Conservation Corps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'Brien of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, like most of you I lived through the big depression during the 1930's and along with you I can testify how that period was not just an economic depression—it was also a period of depression in the hearts of men; a period of dried-up hopes and wasted abilities.

Our Government in that period wrestled mightily with the many economic and human problems of that day. The New Deal period was one of the new starts, new plans, new efforts. Some of these worked wonders, others worked not so well. Some were received eagerly by a desperate citizenship, others were received with misgivings and often made the butt of many a popular joke or ridiculing statement.

But there was one venture on the part of the planners of that period which was received with acclaim, and which I have yet to hear criticized. That was the Civilian Conservation Corps, the CCC.

The CCC enjoyed a status in the minds of people then that perhaps no other government agency could equal, not even the popular and valuable National Youth Administration.

The CCC was never associated with the leafrakers of other projects of that period. The CCC was spoken of as the "Tree Army," for on its introduction that is what we were told it would do—using Army equipment, clothes, and blankets—an army of our dispossessed youth were going to go out and plant trees.

But the CCC did much more than plant trees and instead of being a pseudo army, those men became men whose dignity had been reclaimed, whose hopes had been restored. They came home on furloughs, and I remember well the popular comments of that time upon seeing tanned, khaki-clad boys come home and showing in their very walk what had happened to them. They had earned a few bucks, they often had learned a new skill, most important they had found that the country cared, and they wanted to tell about what they had been doing.

What did they do? What they did still stands in Texas. They changed the face of many parts of our State. They put in roads where no roads existed before, they ditched land which never before had this treatment. They went into the Big Bend country on the Rio Grande long before that area became a national park and put in trails and opened up the splendors of that mountainous country of Texas which stands 3,000 feet above Denver, Colo. They built simple, useful things that still stand and are being used in the State parks of Texas.

You asked me why I am excited by this bill and why I extoll these virtues of the old CCC. It is because you can drive around my State and still see the evidence of the good works those young men did. Now, I submit to you that whenever organization and a little help can create things that stand and are useful and are enjoyed by two generations of our people, no one can say this is a public waste.

I have every reason to believe that a renewal of the concept and program of the CCC as proposed in this H.R. 1890, and in my own bill on the same subject, H.R. 1918, will result in the same kind of good works as we had 30 years ago. I believe, also, that the American public will embrace and support this program.

It is particularly good that the concept of this proposed program has been broadened so as to provide in its title II for a program of local area employment. This is necessary, if for no other reason, in recognition of that fundamental change that has come about in our country in the last 30 years with the shift of our population from rural areas to urban centers. This bill recognizes that any "tree army" of the future can be well engaged in helping to chop out some of the underbrush that surrounds areas of deficiency in our public services.

This is more of a youth development bill than anything else, and I support it.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I think that both sides of the aisle now recognize that the time is past due for some type of remedial action to at least stem the swelling tide of youth unemployment.

I doubt that many, regardless of political philosophy, will take issue with the President when in his recent manpower report he said:

> One of every seven youngsters between the ages of 16 and 21 now out of school is also out of work. Both lack of work opportunity and lack of suitable preparation are involved in this situation—and are combining to spread frustration and disillusion among large numbers of young people.

The area of disagreement, I believe, is how to meet and solve this growing problem.

Some of our Republican friends say that the solution lies in an expansion of the Manpower Development and Training Act passed last year, and in an expanded program of vocational training. By and large those who propose this approach can see little or no merit in the Youth Employment Act, because they contend, nothing in this proposed legislation will train our youths to qualify them for jobs in this age of rapid technical advance and automation.

And, in a limited sense—a very limited sense—this is true.

But, it is also true that not all of our youth—and not all of us here in this Chamber—have the necessary aptitude for this type of training, even assuming we have the educational background for it.

Job training, like education in general, is hard to evaluate. It depends on many things—intangibles—such as ability, aptitude and initiative, to mention but a few.

In the final analysis, only economic expansion will sharply increase job openings and provide adequate employment opportunities, including opportunities for many of our youths who are now rejected from the work force because of a lack of adequate job skills. The President, of course, has recognized this, and this is why the Congress now has before it proposals from the administration for tax cuts and tax reforms and for better educational opportunities.

An equally important part of the administration's package is the Youth Employment Act—because it will do something now for some of the 7.5 million youngsters who, statistics tell us, will drop out of school in this decade without having graduated from high school.

Experience under the Manpower Development and Retraining Act and under some State and local training programs seems to indicate that many of our unemployed have not had the necessary basic education to benefit either from retraining or from what we understand as vocational training.

I recently read that in some of the State programs, authorities follow the principle of avoiding the jobless who have records of being unable to hold any jobs. To the extent that this may be true, what chance does such a program offer a youth who cannot get a job because of his lack of skill?

The two-part program—the Youth Conservation Corps and the community youth employment program—contained in the Youth Employment Act of 1963 offer a present hope for at least a limited number of our unemployed youth.

In a very real sense, this legislation, if enacted, will provide work opportunities in areas that can be training grounds for future employment.

We know this is true in the Youth Conservation Corps program because of our highly successful experience with the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's. And, on the basis of expert testimony we have every reason to believe it will be true in the community youth employment program.

Also, on the basis of what the experts tell us and what we know from experience, this legislation will give those youngsters fortunate enough to participate in these programs some practical work habits coupled with actual job experience and not infrequently a realization of the importance of further education, either at the vocational level or possibly in completing high school and even going on to further studies in college.

As I view it, the Youth Employment Act is necessary to serve a group who now through no fault of their own cannot take advantage of other aids, such as vocational training and the various retraining programs. It is part of a package which is as important as any other and without it, all of us—especially those who could benefit from it—will be the losers.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to note that the youth employment bill has become a matter of renewed interest in this session of Congress, and am particularly pleased that this interest should be heightened by the 30th anniversary of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Between 1933 and 1942 this conservation program employed over 2½ million young people. The present Youth Conservation Corps section of the bill offers some of the same advantages.

This legislation can make a good start on the solutions to two major American dilemmas—conservation of our great resources and youth unemployment. On the one hand, we have nearly one-third of this great Nation which is still owned by the Federal Government—and on the other hand we will have 2 million unemployed young people between the ages of 16 and 21 by summertime. This bill brings the conservation needs of the one factor into some sort of balance with the labor availability of the other.

Much was said at the House and Senate hearings on this bill about city slums, juvenile delinquents and the needs of city and urban area youth. Rural youth faces some of the same problems. There are now over 250,000 rural school dropouts, and this number is decreasing. There are also young people from rural depressed areas who need extra training if they are to become taxpayers instead of tax users In many sectors of farming, new methods and machinery have forced young people off the farms where they learned unskilled jobs in the first place. In short, some of the problems facing our rural youngsters can be met by this bill.

I note that in addition to the general work to be undertaken by the Youth Conservation Corps, there will be educational classes and programs under the auspices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Trades and skills such as plumbing, painting, welding, radio, surveying, machine operating, masonry, and game management are some of the likely profits of this bill, if the success of the CCC can be used as a yardstick.

While it is probably true that only a limited number of enrollees will gain specific skills from the Youth Conservation Corps, it is also true that others will find doing useful work improves their disposition toward getting further training and becoming useful citizens in the labor market. Title II of this legislation will permit States to participate in the conservation of State, county, and local lands, which come to over 110 million acres across the country. It will also permit States to lighten the load of local youth unemployment.

There seems to be little doubt in anyone's mind as to the moral and social benefits of this proposed program. But let us look at the other side of the coin—money. Will this program pay for itself in dollars and cents? I believe that it will, partly in immediate benefits and partly in accrued benefits over the next 30 years.

The Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture estimates that this Nation loses over $1 billion per year from forest fires—this figure includes watershed damage as well as timber loss. The Forest Service also estimates that the Youth Conservation Corps could reduce these losses by 10 percent—or a saving of just over $100 million per year. The total saving in the life of the Corps, as now envisioned, would be one-half a million dollars, or more, that is enough to defray a goodly portion of the cost. The rest of the cost might well be defrayed in 30 years by the new timber that is planted while the Corps is in action. Even now, timber that the CCC planted is being harvested. I have confined my example to a narrow field, but as you are aware, there are other immediate and accrued benefits from such a program that can be determined in dollars and cents.

Title II offers an opportunity for local communities to form a hard core of young people working for community improvement. In rural areas there is just as strong a need for this kind of work as there is in city slums. Many potential spots for timber farms are now simply lying fallow while they could be put to a great conservation use.

In conclusion, gentlemen, let me say I am convinced that this legislation is much needed. We are working for its speedy passage—so that some of the brunt of this coming summer's unemployment among youth can be borne more easily.

Mr. Speaker, in short, how we live and what we have in the year 2000 is being shaped today—we must therefore make every possible effort to conserve our two greatest assets—human and natural resources.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have joined Congressman Carl Perkins and several others of my very distinguished colleagues to request today's 2-hour special order on the Youth Employment Act of 1963 to bring before the whole Nation the deplorable and unwholesome unemployment situation which is driving large numbers of our young people to discontent, dismay, and all too frequently to criminal destruction.

As Attorney General Kennedy recently pointed out:

> Acts of crime and delinquency are common among youth frustrated in their search for success in customary channels.

The current figures on high school dropouts and youth unemployment have a direct bearing on the appalling rise in the juvenile delinquency rate. Dropout figures just for the year 1961 are staggering. In the fall term of that year there were 10.8 million students enrolled in grades 9 through 12 of our public and nonpublic schools. Of these

10.8 million students, a fantastic 2.5 million dropped out during the year. Our annual dropout rate per 1,000 students, according to the 1961 figures, reached an incredible apex of 40 percent. Perhaps even more illustrative, and probably even less known, is the fact that annually 900,000 of our high school seniors drop out of school before graduation.

In direct relation to these destressing statistics on school dropouts, the figures on overall youth unemployment have been spiraling. Right now the level of youth unemployment in the Nation is more than twice the national average. And in my own State of Minnesota, where the total rate of unemployment is 8.2 percent, the rate of youth unemployment is a disordinate 20 percent.

Previously, in societies where youthful disturbances erupted, there were sufficient diversive channels open to the youngsters so that their discontent and misdirected energies were soon constructively used by the society. The system of apprenticeship took young men off the streets and taught them a trade toward which they soon began to develop the pride handed down from generation to generation. The guilds provided an appropriate inlet for youthful vitality and talent and an excellent outlet for the products of these two.

Yet in 20th century America there is no such specific and obvious method of deploying the potentialities of a large segment of our young people. This poses a distinct paradox in a country which has long been noted as a land of opportunity for all. Time was when any man who had the proper ambition and a sufficient amount of aspiration could achieve great things. Many of our humblest citizens have given us our proudest heritage; many of our most underprivileged have risen to contribute to the whole Nation. The opportunities were abundant.

But the America of today is far more complex and much more industrialized than the little Nation which boldly declared its competence for freedom to an imperial master, and then rose to take that freedom. Today's America still offers vast opportunities, but she offers them to men who have long had the freedom to expand their knowledge and to improve their knowledge and to improve their methods of producing. In other words, she offers opportunities today to those whose experience and skills have kept pace with her national growth and achievements. As Attorney General Robert Kennedy remarked in his testimony before the House General Subcommittee on Education:

> The opportunities to work are just as great and challenging today as ever before. But to get the same chance today, requires greater knowledge and greater skill.

Unfortunately, not all of our people have kept pace. All too often our young men and women, minimally educated and inexperienced, have found the doors to opportunity shut in their faces. They have felt unneeded and unwanted by their communities and by their country. They need training, motivation, and above all, they need hope. We must show them that this Nation has need of them and has a place for them.

Once before when our society experienced great social unrest and lack of direction, especially among the young, America had the imagination and the ingenuity to meet the challenge immediately and directly. I refer, of course, to the establishment of the CCC during the darkest days this country has ever undergone—the depression days of the thirties. Despite the enormity of the challenge they provided, our young people found themselves cared for and provided for by a concerned Nation. During its years of operation—from 1933 until 1942—the CCC not only provided food, shelter, and clothing for the discouraged young men who were idly roaming the country and contributing to its problems, it more importantly provided them with an incentive to learn marketable skills, to seek further education, and ultimately to become constructive members of society.

As an educational adviser to the CCC, I personally saw the excellent effects the corps had on its enrollees as well as the profound contribution made to our national conservation program. One of my good friends, Frank E. Smith, Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, has sent me a most informative letter, which I ask permission to insert at the end of my statement, outlining the benefits accruing to the people of Tennessee and the Nation from CCC work in just that one area. These statistics could be multiplied over and over and the examples of national benefits which could be drawn from the length and breadth of this country.

The work of the CCC gave us a heritage which has increased in value over the years. CCC'ers planted 3 million acres of trees, cleared 4 million acres of wooded land, and saved millions of acres of grassland from erosion. They made our national parks and forests places of refuge and refreshment for millions of our citizens to enjoy.

But since 1942 we have been letting this priceless investment decay. We have reaped the pleasure provided by the CCC, and we should preserve and increase that inheritance for our own children. Today the $13.2 billion reserve of conservation projects which has been accumulating represents a dual opportunity for us: First, to allay the youth unemployment problem with which we are faced by putting some of our energetic youngsters to work on these conservation programs; and, second, to offer to our Nation's children a heritage of health and beauty through a completed conservation schedule.

Public works in conservation have many economic impacts. They are concentrated in rural areas where other kinds of employment are lacking and where underemployment is high. They can be started rapidly and stopped if labor shortages develop. Most of the purchasing power is released in small communities where it has a large proportional impact. Because of the increased resource productivity, assets of value for permanent / community improvement and more future employment are created.

And, of course, we cannot forget the young men and women not geographically situated so as to take advantage of the experience and stimulus provided through conservation programs. We must provide them with opportunities to further their education and their vocational training so that they will possess sufficient experience and skills to meet the challenges provided by today's labor market. Urban technology, by abolishing the only jobs they might be able to fulfill without previous training and experience—has deprived our mid-century American young people of an essential ingredient for developing maturity—the opportunity of learning and performing constructive and meaningful work. The challenge we must meet in the 1960's is that of using our national inventiveness, which we have long applied to making life easier, to make life more hopeful for those who have been adversely affected by the changes in industry and society.

I firmly believe that the Youth Employment Act of 1963 is one excellent mode of meeting this challenge. I ask that all of us in the Congress rally in full support of the sons and daughters of this Nation. Now that the need is apparent and the initial step of the remedy so clearly defined, I am hopeful that the Congress will speedily offer our young people the deserved promise of a productive and significant future by swiftly approving the Youth Employment Act of 1963.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., March 1, 1963.

The Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: At your suggestion, I have prepared an evaluation of the Civilian Conservation Corps program in the TVA area. During the nine years of operation of the CCC program, a number of camps were assigned to the TVA, at one time as high as 25, and a variety of work was carried on. I think one of the most significant results of this program is the fact that the average gross return to landowners from timber sales is going to be at least one million dollars per year. Not many years will be needed to repay the entire cost of the CCC program in the area.

One of the principal items of work was a large-scale reforestation program specifically aimed at eroding land generally considered worthless at the time. The TVA-CCC tree planting resulted in the following:

Private land reforested	70,000
TVA land reforested	40,000
Total acres reforested	110,000

Of this 110,000 acres, 73,000 acres are still in young stands of growing timber today. The difference in acreage is caused by a number of reasons, including land-use conversion, fire, insect and disease, and the planting of improper species for the site in use.

There are many lasting benefits to the region from the plantations established by the CCC, however. Some of the more important ones are:

INCOME FOR LANDOWNERS—$1 MILLION EACH YEAR

CCC plantings are just now reaching the age (25 years) where landowners are receiving significant dollar returns. Based on

averages developed from intensively studied individual cases, they are now producing wood from thinnings, worth about $5 per acre per year to the landowner. Projected over a 50-year rotation, average gross return per acre per year is computed to be $15. Therefore, 73,000 acres of CCC plantations are returning, or will return, to landowners $1 million per year.

BASE FOR INDUSTRY—NEW PAPERMILLS

Two paper companies have built plants on the Tennessee River in the past 10 years at a capital investment of $144 million. An important consideration in the location of these mills was the extensive area of established pine plantations. Each year CCC plantings can be expected to yield 73,000 cords of wood for the paper industry, resulting in manufactured products worth about $7,300,000. (During a recent 5-year period, one mill paid $200,000 for some 60,000 cords of wood thinned from 6,400 acres of TVA land planted by CCC crews.)

JOBS FOR PEOPLE—730 NEW FULL-TIME JOBS

Foresters estimate that each 1,000 acres of planted pines create the base for 10 new full-time woods and industry jobs. Trees planted by the CCC are therefore providing year-around employment for 730 men. This means over $3 million to the region's industrial payroll.

SOIL EROSION CONTROL

A 1961 survey showed almost 95 percent of the CCC plantings effectively controlled erosion.

REFORESTATION IDEA PROMOTED

In 1934 tree planting was a novel idea in the Tennessee Valley. Landowners were skeptical. Persuading them to reclaim eroded lands was often difficult, even though it cost them nothing. Early CCC plantings, and the obviously good results, were effective advertising. The idea spread and the reforestation rate accelerated. Landowners gradually assumed responsibility for doing the job. To date they have reforested 633,000 additional acres in valley counties.

EFFECTIVE FIRE PREVENTION

Woods burning was a common practice in the valley in the 1930's. An estimated 10 percent of the total forest land burned each year. The problem was an uninformed and unsympathetic citizenry. Growing, green plantations became a powerful influence in changing attitudes toward fire control. One very effective aid was tree planting. Landowners who owned tree plantations developed a desire to protect them, and this interest gradually spread from plantations to natural stands of trees. Today the annual burn is less than one-half of 1 percent.

Cordially,

FRANK E. SMITH,
Director.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, the 31st of March, marked the 30th anniversary of an event which by its inception has had far-reaching implications for our Nation. The event of which I speak was the signing of legislation by my father, then President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, creating the Civilian Conservation Corps. Today it gives me a great deal of pleasure not only to participate in saluting the creation and accomplishments of the CCC, but also to discuss our present need for similar legislation such as that presently pending—the Youth Employment Act of 1963.

Most of us can easily recall those dark and dreary days of the early 1930's. Our country was involved in an agonizing struggle to preserve itself from collapse; unemployment, with its resulting byproducts, was rampant, and no one dared to venture a guess as to how much longer chaotic conditions would be tolerated by the people without a catastrophic eruption on their part.

It was these unprecedented problems which moved President Roosevelt to remark, in his first inaugural address on March 4, 1933:

> The only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes efforts to convert retreat into advance.

The state of affairs at that time demanded dynamic leadership and imaginative programs. As a result, the Civilian Conservation Corps was born amid a great deal of skepticism. But as was expected, the skeptics were proved wrong.

From its creation on March 31, 1933, to the day of its termination on June 30, 1942, the CCC had enrolled about 3 million young men. It had achieved its objective of training unemployed young men for private jobs while restoring the country's depleted natural resources through the advancement of an orderly program of useful public works. Over 1,500 camps were established to carry out the projects planned by the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, projects such as structural improvements, transportation improvement, erosion control, flood control, irrigation, drainage, forest culture, forest protection, landscaping, and numerous others. As a result of that labor, we are today privileged to enjoy the benefits and pleasures of our national parks, forests, and recreational facilities. I should also like to mention incidentally that it was my great privilege during 1937 and 1938, while serving as secretary to the President, to count among my duties the task of coordinating among the various departments the work of the CCC, which was at that time under the able leadership of Mr. Robert Fechner, Director.

While today we rightfully applaud the contribution of the CCC, we would be derelict in our responsibilities to our children and the generations unborn should we not take some action to meet our current critical conservation and youth unemployment problems. On the one hand our conservation needs range from improving streams, stocking fish, check dams, planting of trees, food and cover planting to improvement of truck trails, access roads, service buildings, and recreational facilities It has been estimated that it would cost over $11 billion to make these improvements. On the other hand, unemployment among our youth runs 2½ times the national average, and approximately 7½ million will be leaving school during the 1960's without graduating. Furthermore, in 1962 there was an average of about 700,000 youths between the ages of 16 and 21 who were out of school and out of work.

Mr. Speaker, the plight of our youth is incredible, in view of the fact that we pride ourselves on being an affluent society. It took great vision and courage to meet the conditions of the 1930's. Are we not equal to the occasion now? The enactment of the Youth Employment Act will prove that we are.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, one cannot discuss the problems of our youth without paying tribute to the outstanding efforts of my good friend and colleague the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK. His recognition of the specific problems facing the young people of our land and his determination to seek their solution in a sound and rewarding manner has been a constant source of inspiration to all of us who are charged with this responsibility.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on General Education on which I have the honor to sit with him, on the great leadership that he has given in the preparation of this much needed legislation, the youth employment bill.

Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD the text of the following statements by the following Members: The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SENNER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. GILL], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN], the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STAEBLER], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, We are gathered here today to ask ourselves what we can do for the youth of our country. We are convoked here this afternoon to determine whether we can answer the challenge of the young man out of high school and looking vainly for work; the plaint of the teenage girl who wants to contribute to society but who finds the doors shut coldly in her face; the reproach of the frustrated teenage lad whose only avenue of expression is rebellion that ends in crime; the indictment of a generation whose creativity, productiveness, and aspirations are barricaded by the walls of inertia, indifference, and automation. We are convened today to measure our inventiveness, our wisdom, and our courage against the crisis of youth in the sixties.

In their cold, relentless way, the oft-cited statistics relate the tragic tale of young boys and girls who desert the schoolroom; who become immersed in wrongdoing; who find only half a job, or, still worse, no job at all; and whose plight finds no sympathy, no champion, no hope. Can we relegate to some dark, musty corner of our collective national conscience the youthful delinquent, the laborer without work, the schoolboy without education?

Can we afford the price of our inaction? We are paying a heavy fee in welfare cases, in unemployment compensation, in correctional institutions. But the greatest burden we bear is in the inestimable loss to our present and future society in the productive talents that go untapped and in the stifled idealism of youth that goes unchanneled. If the mortgage of the past is awesome, then the price of redemption cannot be too great.

In an earlier crucible of national need, a man of great fortitude and vision set in motion a program of urgent and imaginative response to the needs of a people in despair. Now more than a generation has elapsed and we are again faced with a dilemma of national proportions. We are challenged to offer hope and to present opportunities. The youth of our country demand and I urge that the Congress speedily proffer our young people the deserved promise of a productive and significant future by swiftly approving the Youth Employment Act of 1963.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, unemployment is tragic for all, but its impact is especially heavy on those advancing in age and young people trying to enter the labor force for the first time. Too few of us realize that unemployment hits our young people, between 16 and 21, in far greater proportions than any other group in our population. Imagine the plight of the untrained, unskilled youngster wanting a job—who wants to be self-supporting, who wants to make a contribution to society—but who finds the door closed to him. It is very disquieting to see the effect these repeated rejections have on a youngster taking his first venture into the working life of our complex society. Today's youngster out of school and out of a job is faced with staggering economic and emotional problems. We just need to scan a few statistics to see the situation we presently face, a situation which is growing in alarming numbers daily.

> Out-of-school youths between the ages of 16 and 21 comprise 7 percent of the labor force but 18 percent of the unemployed.
>
> During this decade some 26 million youngsters will enter the job market. It is estimated that 7½ million of these youngsters will have dropped out of school without having graduated from high school.

Providing job opportunities for these youngsters is one of the major domestic economic-social problems of this day. Without proper guidance and help these youngsters are likely to fall into a life of dependency and waste. With proper guidance and help these youngsters can become responsible, self-supporting citizens who will make a major contribution to their community and to our economy.

We have yet another resource which is suffering from years of neglect—our natural resources. Since the end of the CCC days there has been accumulating a tremendous backlog of work that must be done to save our great natural resources. There currently exists an $8 billion backlog of conservation work.

If these untrained, unskilled, out-of-school, out-of-work youths are given the opportunity to work on conservation projects in our national forests and parks, public lands, Indian reservations, reclamation lands, and fish and wildlife refuges, we will have made a substantial contribution to the Nation's most important resource—our youngsters. And the youngsters will have made an equally substantial contribution toward the conservation of the Nation's natural resources. After 6 months of healthy outdoor work these young boys should have a sense of accomplishment and a solid foundation to become responsible self-supporting citizens. Their first-hand work experience on conservation projects will have given them the variety of skills, the maturity, and the responsibility needed in today's society to find a respectable and suitable job. These youths will then be ready and able to compete effectively in a labor market in which their special training and experience will be appreciated.

Other youths between 16 and 21 could make a very satisfying contribution to local public service activities through work in schools, libraries, hospitals, welfare agencies, playgrounds, and other community projects. While contributing to the community work in such an environment would likely inspire the youngster on to additional education and training on a more professional level.

Legislation is most urgently needed to unite the creation of job opportunities for unemployed youngsters with the pressing need for conservation and development of our natural resources.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in his Chicago speech some 10 days ago, the President said that:

> The No. 1 domestic concern of the United States is going to be in the 1960's the question of jobs, jobs for a tidal wave of men and women who are going to be hitting our labor market in the next 5 years. It is a concern which requires the united effort of all of us.

Perhaps, we can get a better idea of this "tidal wave of men and women" to whom the President refers when we realize that about 2½ million young men and women—in the 16-to-21 age bracket—will join the labor force each year during this decade.

These 26 million youngsters will represent an increase in the work force of 40 percent over the 1950's, and, as the President said:

> A greater number than this country has ever had to absorb and train in our history.

Now, no one needs to dwell on the difficulty in finding jobs in today's labor market. In this age of technological advance, and with automation, computers and other electronic marvels, a college degree is no longer the guarantee to a job it once was. But what about those youngsters coming into the labor market who have been limited to a high school education, or the 7.5 million of our youth who have not finished high school, including the some 2.5 million who have not even finished grade school.

If left to their own devices, and all too frequently this seems to be the case, we know pretty well what will happen. In the last decade juvenile delinquency cases in the courts more than doubled. Arrests of youths increased 86 percent, until they numbered 1 million arrests a year in 1960.

Now, no one contends that any single program will resolve the problems of unemployment, particularly the problems of youth unemployment. But, the Youth Employment Act of 1963, together with the President's proposals for tax reform and tax reduction, the programs of aid for distressed areas, for retraining, and the proposals of increased vocational training will go a long way toward meeting the need.

It seems to me that the group we are trying to reach in the Youth Employment Act of 1963 is a special group. For the most part, it is made up of young men and women who have achieved little or no success, either in school, their home, or in their community. Their only success is the failure they have achieved, with the result that they are fearful of attacking any responsibility, let alone a job.

They need to learn how to work, how to take orders, how to get along with their fellow man and how to carry out an assigned task. These things which we consider as elementary breed self-confidence and give these youths the encouragement many need to go back to school, to take up some type of vocational training or to profit from the several programs available for retraining.

In my opinion, the incentives offered by the Youth Employment Act for further education cannot be overstated. The National Committee on Youth Employment has estimated that in 10 years a minimum of 2 years of junior college or a technical school training will replace the high school diploma as a basic requirement for work.

This estimate would seem to be borne out by a survey of the Department of Labor, indicative that job opportunities in such areas as farming, mining, construction work, and manual labor are declining while jobs in the scientific and technical fields continue to expand. Greater opportunities can be expected for teachers, social workers, statisticians, draftsmen, mechanics of all types, servicemen and repairmen.

This listing points up one very important fact. Automation has and will no doubt continue to decrease work opportunities in exactly those fields in which unskilled youngsters once found jobs—often their first jobs.

Today's youth unemployment problem poses, as the President has said, one of the most expensive and most explosive social and economic problems now facing the country.

The Youth Employment Act may very well furnish for those fortunate enough to participate, the bridge to better citizenship and to a status of taxpayer rather than tax recipient of the tax dollar.

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that on the eve of floor consideration of the youth employment bill, we note that the 30th anniversary of the signing of legislation by President Roosevelt creating the Civilian Conservation Corps.

I well remember the days of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and the CCC boys who came to Arizona with the program from many Eastern States.

Many of them stayed in Arizona, and some are now leaders in their communities. Just offhand, I can think of school superintendents, newspaper editors, and sales executives, who first came to Arizona with the CCC's.

The work they did still stands as a monument to the program. Many forest roads were built by these boys which would have been years in developing without their work. Their work in national parks and monuments in Arizona was a great push forward for the national park system, and I am sure many of the CCC boys had their first acquaintance with the end of a shovel in fighting forest fires in northern Arizona.

Youth unemployment is now as serious a problem as it was during the 1930's. This fact was brilliantly outlined by the President during his message to this body on the Nation's youth.

The Youth Employment Act will give many thousands of currently unemployed young people a chance to find employment, and to acquire skills and work experience that will give them a solid start in their working lives.

Personally, I believe that even with this act, we, as a nation, are doing too little too late. A dollar spent for constructive pursuits is better than a dollar spent for corrective measures.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on this subject which is of tremendous importance and which should be of great concern to all Members of this body.

I am strongly in favor of the administration's bill, based upon the President's recommendations, the Youth Employment Act of 1963. I am hopeful that the Congress will proceed with speed and diligence to take favorable action on the measure, so that its programs can be put into effect as soon as possible. I introduced House bill 2396, to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps, and urged the House Committee on Education and Labor to approve the administration's bill, which also provides for a Youth Conservation Corps.

It is a tragic fact that there is a "lost" generation growing up in our great country with no skills and little hope; it is estimated that today there are about 700,000 young people looking for jobs, and jobs are unavailable to them. New York alone has at least 32,700 boys aged 16 to 23 years who are so discouraged at the "lack of opportunity" that they have given up looking for work. This year, 3,800,000 young people will be coming into the labor market. It is expected that 26 million new young workers will enter the labor market in the 1960's, an increase of 40 percent over the 1950's, a far greater number than this country has ever had to absorb and train in our history. We are told that already workers under the age of 25, although they comprise less than one-fifth of our labor force, constitute more than one-third of our unemployed.

The President recently stated that youth unemployment poses one of the most expensive and explosive social and economic problems now facing our country. We know that the jobless rate is always highest among the unskilled. A high percentage are school dropouts, who need the opportunity to work if they are to be saved from a life of delinquency and crime. These out of school and out of work young people wish to become useful and necessary members of society. We must spare no efforts to assist our young people over the period of adjustment when they have stopped being students but have not yet found their place as workers. Mobilization for Youth on New York's Lower East Side, which operates under grants from the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, has proved conclusively that youths want to work; they much prefer employment to idleness and the evils created by idleness; they need to feel useful and wanted.

The problem is nationwide and so extensive that a Federal program, Federal leadership, and Federal funds must be provided. State and local agencies cannot provide all the help required. Communities cannot meet the problems alone; the fullest Federal assistance possible must be given if we are to meet the problems in a constructive manner and if we are to develop and conserve the human resources represented by the army of young people now denied employment and usefulness.

The Youth Conservation Corps has aroused great interest among school and youth officials as well as the youth of our Nation; it would put young men to work in our national and State forests, tackling the huge backlog of needed conservation work. They would also receive weekly training and basic educational skills would be taught. The local area youth employment program would provide a method for increasing employability of young men and at the same time would give them useful work to do.

Many thousands of young people exist under terrible conditions in the slums of our cities; many belong to minority groups and suffer from discrimination and total lack of job opportunities; they live without hope and their futures are bleak. Certainly, these countless young people must be given a helping hand and hope for a brighter future, the gratification brought by employment, and the opportunity to take their places as working, respected, members of their communities. When we take a boy out of an atmosphere of defeat and slum existence and furnish him with the guidance of people who care about him, we provide him with hope and incentive.

To what avail is it to create for ourselves a strong Nation from a military standpoint when we permit our very foundations to crumble—for the future strength of our Nation is truly dependent upon our youth; our young people are our future. It must be our aim now to help and save our young people from idleness and feelings of rejection and futility, to direct them along the path of industrious living and good citizenship, to give them pride in their heritage as citizens of our great Naton.

Our duty is clear; this Congress must take favorable action on the Youth Employment Act without delay.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope that the Members of this Congress will recognize the critical need for the Youth Employment Act of 1963 just as the 73d Congress gave approval 30 years ago to the Civilian Conservation Corps which accomplished so much for the good of the Nation. During the years of its existence from 1933 to 1942, the Civilian Conservation Corps helped meet two of our greatest national needs: the protection and preservation of our youth and our natural resources. Today, we are again confronted with a tragic waste of our young people, our lands, and forests, and we must take positive action to salvage these precious resources.

There are many complex social problems facing young people today. The world is changing at a pace never before experienced. The years preceding adulthood are, it seems to me, even more crucial and bewildering today than they were for you or me.

The period of youth is after all a brief turn of the carousel when you reach for the golden ring—only the stakes are infinitely higher. Instead of trying for a free ride you are reaching for your life. So much concerning your social, economic, and intellectual development and attainments in the years to come depends upon the opportunities and experiences you encounter at this time.

A little good fortune during the formative years will often be felt for a lifetime. The same is true of a little misfortune. The main purpose of the Youth Employment Act, I believe, is to supply a little more good fortune and at least a little less misfortune in the lives of those among our Nation's youth who are in need of help along these lines.

All of us are familiar with the appalling and alarming statistics on juvenile delinquency, unemployment rates among youth, and school dropouts. These are serious problems now, and their dimensions are bound to increase in the immediate future with the population tidal wave that is about to sweep across the 16- to 22-year-old age group. We can expect to have three-fourths of a million more 16 year olds in the country this year than we had in 1962, or an increase of over 25 percent, and the increase in this age group will be maintained for the decades ahead owing to the stepped-up birth rate we have had since World War II.

For these reasons, effective measures must be taken now at all levels of responsible authority to eliminate as far as possible the situations which are the occasions for the development of problems involving juvenile delinquency, dropouts, and the rest in our increasingly complex machine age. The youth employment program would give our young people training and job experience and hope for the future.

I would like to emphasize that I envision the programs provided by the bills—both the Youth Conservation Corps provided in title I and the local area youth employment programs in title II—not as methods of handling juvenile delinquency problems, but as furnishing means to prevent them. The experience of the CCC in the 1930's bears out the result that can be achieved in this regard. It seems almost inevitable to me that an idle youngster from the city streets will benefit physically, morally, and spiritually from the experiences and training he will receive as a member of the Youth Conservation Corps proposed by this legislation. For some it will provide not only worthwhile health activity, but direct them in establishing principles of self-discipline and self-reliance—opportunities which might not otherwise visit them.

The local area youth employment programs established under title II of the bills have a little different purpose. In these programs emphasis will be placed on making it possible for youth—both boys and girls—who might otherwise drop out to continue in school.

The local community employment programs will, like the YCC, result in benefits both to society and to the youngsters who are employed. They will be working in hospitals, libraries, and public and private welfare and recreation agencies, doing jobs that in most cases would not otherwise be done. There are ample safeguards that only worthwhile types of employment will be undertaken, that regular workers will not be displaced, and that just compensation will be paid to the young people employed.

The Civilian Conservation Corps proved a sound investment; so will the YCC. It has been said before, but it bears repeating: our youth truly are the first resource of the Nation. We cannot afford not to make a sound investment in their future. As the President stated in his message on the Nation's youth:

> This Nation—facing increasingly complex economic, social, and international challenges—is increasingly dependent on the opportunities, capabilities, and vitality of those who are soon to bear its chief responsibilities.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, during the 1960's about 7.5 million American boys and girls will drop out of school before graduation from high school. Almost one-third of these are not expected to graduate from grade school.

This situation constitutes a major problem in American society. Corrective measures must be taken to meet it.

One major step toward alleviation of this situation is contemplated in the Youth Conservation Corps program. It will give several thousand young men hope for the future, and a sense of accomplishment in learning how to work and live together in the out of doors—getting the feel of the sky and the trees and the water—learning self-respect and learning to respect others.

One great difficulty faced by social workers throughout the country is attempting to rehabilitate young people in tenderloin neighborhoods. These young people in great proportion have dropped out of school, have never held a job, never learned how to work, even if they had a job. Because of the conditions of their upbringing, they are resentful, hopeless and antisocial.

This era of rapid technological change has brought with it increasing demands for skill, education, and technical know-how from the youth who are now and will be entering the labor market in ever increasing numbers.

Under the existing condition of 6 million unemployed in the United States, the proportion of young people out of work is far higher to the total number of unemployed than among older groups. This would be true, even if we had full employment. There will be thousands of youngsters facing the future, undereducated, undertrained, and lacking proper motivation to improve their lot because of the conditions of their lives spent in a jungle world.

What could be a more hopeful beginning step to meet at least part of this total problem than to give thousands of our young men the upbuilding experience of helping to learn how to work, to learn that the work he is doing will motivate him to seek further training and education, after having spent his tour of duty in helping to upbuild the natural resources of his own country?

What better way of showing these youngsters that their country cares for them as part of the precious human resources of the oncoming generation, as well as for the land and water heritage which he has helped protect for his own and his children's use and enjoyment?

There is a need today for the Congress to realize that it has a major responsibility for America's youth and for America's resources. Passage of this legislation, in my opinion, will constitute a long forward step in the proper demonstration that Congress has the vision and foresight to move now.

It is my strong conviction, that the Youth Conservation Corps will make for itself a record of achievement that will emulate that of its predecessor—the Civilian Conservation Corps.

It is also my strong conviction that the success of this modern CCC program will be such as to make it imperative to enlarge it from its pilot status and spread its benefits over many thousands more young men who will make their contributions now and in the future to strengthen this Nation's democratic institutions as workers and citizens.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join a large number of my colleagues in sponsoring the Youth Employment Act of 1963.

The Youth Conservation Corps and Hometown Youth Corps proposals are good news for the 23,000 Minnesota young people who are out of school and out of work. I hope my district, Minneapolis, will be among the first to qualify and take advantage of this bill when it becomes law.

Congress must enact a tax cut as first priority action for stimulating employment. A growing economy will do more than anything else to help youth find work. Second, President Kennedy's program for educational improvement will upgrade the skills of our young people. The Youth Employment Act is a third vital step this Congress can take to help.

MINNESOTA GOVERNOR'S ADVISORY COUNCIL ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH ENDORSES YOUTH EMPLOYMENT ACT

The Minnesota Governor's Advisory Council on Children and Youth has passed a resolution endorsing the Youth Employment Act.

They report that the rate of unemployment among young people in Minneapolis is 20 percent, compared with an overall rate of 8 percent unemployed in the State. The jobless rate for youth is 2½ times higher than the average.

The advisory council has 256 members from throughout the State. The council resolution stated:

> Only immediate action can prevent further deterioration in the character, moral fiber, and attitudes of these young people. Adoption by Congress of the Youth Employment Act is one important step that can be taken to aid the out of school, out of work young people.

SENATOR HUMPHREY, REPRESENTATIVE BLATNIK HAVE PUSHED FOR THIS LEGISLATION FOR YEARS

I am proud that two fellow Minnesotans have spearheaded the drive for this legislation for many years. JOHN BLATNIK introduced a version of this bill as H.R. 1 on the opening day of this session, January 9, 1963. In the Senate, HUBERT HUMPHREY introduced this bill as S. 1 last January.

WHAT TYPE OF JOBS?

Senator HUMPHREY's statement at the committee hearing in February answers a very important question—what type of jobs will be available to the enrollees in these programs? Let me quote the Senator:

> Let me cite some of the specific jobs that would have to be done by YCC enrollees: building fences, carpentry work, planting trees, driving trucks and tractors, stringing telephone lines, painting camps, jackhammer jobs, fighting forest fires, fighting blister rust, surveying, machine maintenance, pick and shovel work, laying brick and stone, mixing cement, camp maintenance work, etc. Some of the work will be hard manual labor; other aspects of the work program will consist of more advanced and skilled training.

Those who sign up for jobs with the local public service agencies would find work available as secretaries, hospital and laboratory technicians, kitchen assistants, playground workers, gardeners, truckdrivers, office helpers, athletic instructors, maintenance employees, according to Senator HUMPHREY.

In both cases the bill provides that a program of training and education would supplement the work program.

SELF-CONFIDENCE AND SELF-RESPECT FOR YOUTH

Jobs in the Youth Conservation Corps or in the Hometown Corps for these young people will give them self-confidence and self-respect. They will learn responsibility and punctuality. They will learn how to work with others and how to take orders. This work experience will improve their chances of holding steady jobs on their own.

Up to 60,000 youths could enroll in the Youth Conservation Corps and many thousands in the Hometown Youth Corps. The YCC would be employed wholly on Federal projects in national parks, reservations, and forests. The local employment programs would be initiated by the State or local community.

Mr. Speaker, we need this bill, and I hope that the House will soon have the opportunity to act on it.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago on March 31, 1933, President Franklin Roosevelt signed the legislation creating the Civilian Conservation Corps. Today, 30 years later, much of the work that was done and the trees that were planted are part of the resources of this Nation; today, many of the boys who were taken from the streets and farms to do this work are constructive and important members of our society. The saying, "The evil men do lives after them; the good is often buried with their bones," does not apply to the Civilian Conservation Corps. Its benefits in both human and natural resources have repaid its cost manifold in the years since 1933.

Shortly we will be asked to consider a modern counterpart to the Civilian Conservation Corps. There are many who will say that the need for such a bill today is not what it was in the 1930's; that conditions have changed; that what was permissible in the depths of a national depression is not advisable in times of relative prosperity.

The fallacy of these arguments lies in the inevitable inability of some of the opponents of the new program to understand the pressing needs of the future as they are reflected in the society of today.

It is true that we do not have the mass unemployment of the 1930's, and certainly we hope we never do again. But we do have unemployment of a far more insidious type; it is the unemployment of youth. This unemployment is insidious not only because young people are involved; it is dangerous and destructive because so many of these idle youth will never be really employable.

These youth will not be able, in many cases, to find work even of the most menial type. The reservoir of unskilled jobs in this country is rapidly running dry. It requires a far higher level of training today to get and hold a decent job than it did at the time the Civilian Conservation Corps was operating.

Those who object to the new program generally agree with this; they say the new legislation is useless because it does not provide enough training in specific skills.

There is reason for concern over this argument. But the gentlemen who raise it miss a vital point: you cannot train a person who has no desire to be trained. It is the unfortunate fact that in many of our large cities, and many of our rural areas as well, there is a growing group of young Americans who have, in effect, given up. They have never had the surroundings or the family background to give them the desire to stay in school, to undertake the necessary training that will make them constructive citizens. These are the young unemployed, unemployables. There are perhaps a million or so of them.

It was the restless surge of unemployed and relatively hopeless youth that formed the backbone of Hitler's storm troopers; it is this same aimless and often rootless group in our country which accounts for much of the crime and delinquency.

This new revival of the CCC is aimed at this group of our youth. It would provide not so much employment as the desire for employment; not so much training as the motivation for training. If a reasonable number of these young people, in a new, healthy, and more stimulating environment, develop a desire to improve themselves and become constructive citizens this legislation will have served its purpose. Once the desire for improvement is there, other legislation, including present proposals for vocation education, will be needed to supply the refined skills so much in demand in today's labor market.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, we need this bill very badly. The chief trouble right now is that it barely scratches the surface. If only 15,000 young men are provided for under the Youth Conservation Corps title of the act, this will mean only 4 per county in the State of West Virginia. In some respects, this takes on the aspect of scholarships.

However, it may be that getting the camps ready and starting the program on a sound basis necessitates such a modest start. In any event, I am completely sold that this program—no matter how small—must get started, and I am confident it will, in the future, prove to be one of the big factors in making a dent in our youth unemployment problem.

The problem of youth unemployment is just as serious in the rural areas as it is in the urban areas of the Nation. During the period between 1950 and 1960 when the State of West Virginia lost 7.2 percent of its population, a total of 145,131 persons, many West Virginians became alarmed to realize that of these 145,131 persons, 28,572 were our young people between the ages of 18 and 21. In 1960, we had in West Virginia 22.8 percent fewer young persons in the 18 to 21 age bracket than we had in 1950.

I believe the principle of the Youth Employment Act is the most thrilling development since the establishment of the Peace Corps. It may not be as important as education legislation. But youth employment certainly comes a close second to education.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk in these halls about fiscal responsibility. It occurs to me that the most irresponsible thing we could do fiscally would be to sit on our hands and fail to take measures to save what could be a lost generation. The fiscally responsible thing to do is to invest a small amount in a program which will pay rich dividends in a stronger America, as our young people develop a sense of responsibility, new skills, and help not only improve our natural resources, but also learn the great lessons of service to their home communities.

I have cited one figure often, but I believe it illustrates the plight of our young people in West Virginia. I might say that I first got an inkling of this while listening to the then Republican Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable Cecil H. Underwood, in a provocative address to the Huntington Elks. Right after the Korean conflict, West Virginia paid a bonus to its Korean war veterans, and when it came time to mail out the checks, it was discovered that 44.3 percent of the bonus checks went to out-of-State addresses—thus indicating that the cream of our young work force was leaving West Virginia because they found superior economic opportunities elsewhere.

Today, West Virginia has developed into a laboratory to determine whether the American economic system can flourish. Although nationwide in the past 2 years, the high school dropout rate declined, in West Virginia the dropout rate in the high schools rose. Not only that, but the national dropout percentage for 1962 was 30.2 percent and for West Virginia it was 40.1 percent.

Recently, the Secretary of Labor reported a very ominous figure: in West Virginia, unemployment of male youths between 16 and 21 in April 1960 was 19.4 percent. The national average in this age bracket is only 10.8 percent. Unemployment in this age group in the Nation is 2½ times the national average, but in West Virginia it is 4½ times the national average.

The Youth Employment Act would offer our young people hope for the future and would give them a chance to perform useful activities which would benefit both themselves and their State. The Federal land in West Virginia totals 950,000 acres, and State-owned land 220,000 acres. We have 19 State parks, 9 State forests, and 12 hunting areas.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that this measure receives overwhelming approval. On this 30th anniversary of the Civilian Conservation Corps I urge my colleagues to mark this celebration by uniting behind the Youth Employment Act.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, March 31, 1963, marks the 30th anniversary of signing of legislation by President Roosevelt creating the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Once again we draw from the ideas of that ever great American, the late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who 30 years ago signed the Emergency Conservation Act (48 Stat. 22) creating the Civilian Conservation Corps. President Roosevelt, signed this act in the presence of Senator Walsh, and Representative Ramspeck, who had piloted the act through Congress. President Roosevelt stated the proposal of his program as follows:

> This Nation asks for action, and action now. Our greatest primary task is to put people to work. This is no unsolvable problem if we face it wisely and courageously. It can be accomplished in part by direct recruiting by the Government itself, treating the task as we would treat the emergency of a war, but at the same time through this employment, accomplishing greatly needed projects to stimulate and reorganize the use of our natural resources.

Again on March 1, 1962, another great American, President John F. Kennedy in a message to the Congress said:

> As our population expands, as our industrial output increases, and as rising productivity makes possible increased enjoyment of leisure time, the obligation to make the most efficient and beneficial use of our natural resources becomes correspondingly greater. The standard of living we enjoy, greater than any other nation in history, is attributable in large measure to the wide variety and rich abundance of this country's physical resources. But these resources are

> not inexhaustible, nor do they automatically replenish themselves.

While the Nation's imagination seems to have enlightened our youth to the idea of working without regular pay in the underdeveloped nations, through the program of a Peace Corps, it is regrettable that it has somewhat cast a shadow on another important proposal for harnessing the energies of our youth, through a Youth Conservation Corps on our homefront.

Today as then a similar crisis exists. There are over 469,000 young men from 16 to 20 unemployed, and by 1965 we shall have 40 percent more persons under 20 in our labor force. By then an additional 800,000 young people will be job hunting. In February 1963, the jobless rate for all ages was 6.1 percent, whereas for those in the 14 to 19 age bracket it was 15.6 percent—more than twice the national average.

These statistics add up to trouble—a shocking waste of young lives and a scandalous waste of the taxpayers' money in fruitless efforts to seal off nonrehabilitable young people from the rest of society. And with the crop of war babies now coming of age, the problem becomes ever more acute. More and more young men are in the 16- to 20-year age bracket, and more and more of them who are dropping out of school cannot find employment.

Young men who have dropped out of school and cannot find jobs find it all too easy to end up in trouble. Trouble not only for themselves, but trouble for society.

The economic waste from this unemployment, although serious, is insignificant compared to the damage which may be done to the jobless individuals and to society. Are we to ignore our most important resource, a human resource, our American youth?

In the past 19 years, our population has shot upward at a tremendous rate. The demand for recreation areas has spiraled with it. The projected estimated needs for wood and wood products by our growing population for the year 2000 indicates a record high demand. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Board reported that while population is booming, recreation land is dwindling.

Recently the Department of Agriculture announced that within a few short years, approximately 50 million acres of agricultural producing land will be retired. Foresters estimate that another 275 million acres need replanting to become productive again and to provide against flood and erosion. Some 300 million acres of farmland need rebuilding. Are we to rehabilitate?

Mr. Speaker, wise investment in a resource program today will return vast dividends tomorrow, and failure to act now may be opportunities lost forever. Our country has been generous with us in this regard, and we cannot now ignore her needs for future development.

The Youth Conservation Corps provided for in title I of this bill—H.R. 5131—now being considered would make worthwhile contributions in the improvement of our land and water resources as well as our human resources as represented by our unemployed young men. Both types of resources are very much in need of our attention. We cannot afford to fail to at least make a start this year on this program which is designed to do something worthwhile in enhancing both our natural resources and our human resources for our and their benefit.

There has been some criticism of the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's by opponents of the proposed Youth Conservation Corps. I believe these critics have not been fully informed regarding the accomplishments of the CCC. In my State of Montana there were an average of 24 camps in operation throughout the 9 years of the program. The results of their work are still evident in many places, and glowing comments are frequently heard regarding the good that program did for the young men enrolled in it and the worthwhile conservation work they accomplished. More than 22,000 young men from the State of Montana and enrollees from other States obtained beneficial work experience coupled with on-the-job and other training to better prepare them to make a living and contribute to society as a whole.

We still have a big backlog of worthwhile work to do on the federally owned conservation lands of this Nation to protect them, put facilities on them, revegetate and otherwise make them more productive for the multiple uses for which they are adapted—all for the benefit of the people of this country.

In my State there are 16,635,000 acres of national forest land administered by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture and nearly 9 million acres administered by the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

These 25,500,000 acres of Federal land would provide a very large reservoir of work suitable for YCC enrollees.

The development program for the national forests for the 10-year period 1963–72 includes an estimated workload of high priority jobs suitable for YCC enrollees amounting to 29,000 man-years. This would provide employment for 10 years for 2,900 enrollees on national forests alone.

The work would consist of such things as timber stand improvement and reforestation, construction and maintenance of recreation facilities, seeding of rangeland, construction of fences and stock water facilities, erosion control and other watershed improvement work, improvement and development of wildlife habitat, fire hazard reduction, construction and maintenance of structures for fire and general purposes, and road and trail construction and maintenance. This backlog of work is inventoried and ready to undertake in amounts dependent upon the size and locations of youth corps camps.

Some of this work would produce returns in one form or another almost immediately. Others would result in increased financial returns in 10, 20, or more years to the Government, local industry, local labor force, and local businesses in general. Local businesses would gain from the patronage of fishermen, hunters, and families seeking recreation from the improved facilities which would be constructed by enrollees. City and farm and ranch users of water should benefit from the improved watershed conditions created by erosion control, range seeding, tree planting, and other special watershed work.

The work, the camp and outdoor atmosphere, the on-the-job training, and other training and knowing that something worthwhile is being accomplished should fire the imagination and ambition of a high percentage of the young men enrolled in this program. These young unemployed men need our support. Let us give the YCC program a chance to be of help.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago almost to the day, the Civilian Conservation Corps was created to provide employment opportunities for the youthful unemployed of the thirties. In addition, its purpose was to do needed developmental work to improve our soil, water, range, and forest resources. The CCC had a life of over 9 years, extending from April 1933 to June 1942—6 months after Pearl Harbor. Every State in the Union benefited from this program. More than $76 million was spent in my State of Washington, and I am sure our soil, water, and forest resources were improved in value by an amount equal to, if not exceding, this figure. In addition, more than 40,000 enrollees from the State of Washington and many young men from other States occupied at some time the 43 camps in my State. They benefited tremendously from the work experience and training received during their period of enrollment.

Today we are considering, in title I of H.R. 5131, a program called the Youth Conservation Corps. The need and opportunity for improvement work on our soil, water, range, and forest resources are great. The unemployment and training needs of our young men of 16 to 21 years of age are also very great. Enactment of the bill would go far toward accomplishing both objectives.

In my State of Washington, on our national forest lands, amounting to 9,668,000 acres, there is an estimated 22,000 man-years of high priority resource development and protection project work that could be accomplished by a Youth Conservation Corps program. This would provide employment for as many as 22,000 enrollees for a period of 10 years.

The work would consist of such things as timber stand improvement and reforestation, construction, and maintenance of recreation facilities, seeding of rangeland, construction of fences and stock water facilities, erosion control and other watershed improvement work, improvement and development of wildlife habitat, fire hazard reduction, construction and maintenance of structures for fire and general purposes, and road and trail construction and maintenance. This backlog of work is inventoried and ready to undertake in amounts dependent upon the size and locations of youth corps camps.

A good share of this work would be timber stand improvement and tree planting which can be expected to return substantially more over a period of years than the cost of the work. The construction and improvement of family type recreational facilities and improvements in fish and wildlife habitat are other very important types of work on the national forest land in Washington which could be performed by YCC enrollees. The expenditures made each year in the local communities by the families using these facilities are expected to equal the cost of the initial construction. The revegetation of rangeland and such other work as fence construction and livestock water developments can be of considerable benefit to the local livestock industry. Soil erosion control and other special watershed work planned for enrollees, coupled with tree planting and range seeding, can make major contributions to our water resources. The fire hazard reduction and construction and maintenance of fire control and general purpose facilities would be of important assistance in protecting from fire and in managing the valuable timber, recreational, wildlife, range, and watershed resources of the nearly 10 million acres of forest land in the State of Washington.

What I have said about work and training opportunities on national forest land in my State and the benefits to our land, water, range, and forest resources is equally applicable to many other States and also to conservation lands administered by the Department of the Interior. The benefits to the youth of the Nation will accrue to every State in the Nation.

Our State in 1961 passed a youth conservation corps bill. The State of Washington is in a position to cooperate with the Federal Government in the employment of young men for improvement of our natural resources.

It established itself as a project which provided useful work for many of our unemployed youth. It rehabilitated boys and it has enhanced the value of our State.

I might mention that Howard Martin of Camas, Wash., now a member of the State Parks and Recreation Commission testifies to the effectiveness of such a youth program. He was a member of the Civil Conservation Corps in the 1930's. He said in a letter to me:

> I wish the old gang could go back to Minnesota with me and see what the millions of trees look like today, that we planted in the thirties. I had this pleasure 5 years ago.

On July 16, 1961, the Seattle Daily Times carried a lead editorial. Its title was "Wasted Years of Youth." The editorial pointed out that our Nation was facing a problem which was growing more critical each year. The numbers of our young people are increasing rapidly. The opportunities for gainful employment are not increasing as fast. I should like to quote some paragraphs from that editorial:

> Unemployment is tragic at any age. But in the case of youth, the long-range effects—the acquiring of habits of aimlessness and shiftlessness that could persist a lifetime—could be especially detrimental.
>
> Action on this problem should not be a matter of partisan politics or something to be put off until an election year.

Mr. STAEBLER. Mr. Speaker, this country of ours has two great natural resources. One is our forests, parks, rangeland, wildlife areas and other public lands—222 million acres of land that provide recreation and outdoor experience for millions of people. The second is the talent and energies and potentialities of our young people, upon whom we must depend to keep strong the values and progress our history as a free people has brought us.

But these two natural resources, without which we cannot advance or even maintain the bases of our strength and economy, are being wastefully neglected at the time we need them most. While we give attention to many other projects, we shunt off into the lowest priority category the glaring needs of our physical and human resources, which are the real building material of this country.

Thirty years ago this month, with a different set of national priorities, an ambitious undertaking was set into motion to link together the problems of these two resources. When the Civilian Conservation Corps was set up in 1933, no one dreamed of the popular success and tangible achievements that would come out of its 10 years of existence. There were literally millions of young people—the "unwanted" of a feeble economy—who were out of school and out of work, with no place to go, nowhere to turn. Many of the more than 2 million of these people who went into the CCC literally went on to become leaders in our business, industrial, and political community. The lives of virtually all of them were changed. They came from varying backgrounds, but they all found certain things in common in the CCC—new degrees of self-respect, pride in accomplishment, confidence in their own ability, and a sense of being part of a growing and broadening process. Practically every boy who spent time in a CCC camp came out a better man, with more self-confidence in himself and more skills.

In addition to developing the human resources of 2 million young men, the CCC accomplished a major task in the development of our precious and irreplaceable natural resources. CCC enrollees planted nearly 3 billion trees, built 1 million miles of roads and trails, constructed over 85,000 miles of telephone lines, erected 4,000 fire towers, and 100,000 buildings and bridges. More than 4 million acres of forest land were improved as a protection against fire. The value of this work on public land alone has been estimated by forestry and park officials at more than $1.5 billion. This is a staggering achievement; a monument to a farsighted program that will stand for years.

Today, many of the problems that prompted the establishment of the CCC are mounting again. The passage of time has seen our conservation needs spiral, as our natural resources drop in the national list of priorities. There is a backlog of needed and useful conservation projects that are programed and mapped out of close to $8 billion. We cannot undertake all of these projects at once, as pressing as they are, but we can surely, by turning the public spotlight upon them, demonstrate the urgency of many of them. Let us look at some of these conservation needs. We need the reforestation of 28 million acres, the establishment and refurbishing of recreational facilities on National and State parks, timber stand improvement for 140 million acres, the expansion of fire protection for 200 million acres, brush clearing and revegetation over large parts of 200 million acres of Federal grazing districts and forest lands, and the establishment of wildlife habitat and structural improvements on wildlife refuges. This is by no means an exhaustive listing of needed projects. If we neglect our natural resources and ignore basic conservation, we will pay the toll of this neglect for centuries to come.

The neglect of our natural resources, as appalling as it has been, does not approach the gross neglect of our human resources. The relentless advance of automation has brought not only benefit but hardship as well, and few groups feel the brunt of this as much as our young people. Unemployment has risen to intolerable levels throughout the country, and deserves the greatest attention we can give it. Unemployment among the youth of our country has become a major boil on the body politic. In Detroit, for example, it has been estimated that close to 30 percent of the young people between 16 and 21 are unemployed. A survey in Detroit found that 3 years after the graduation of the class of 1958 of one of our public high schools, 48 percent of the graduates had not managed to find any employment whatsoever.

George Edwards, Detroit police commissioner, who then was a justice of Michigan Supreme Court after serving 5 years as a juvenile judge, had this to say:

> The young man who leaves high school with no place to go in terms of employment loses some of his own self-respect. He gains a great deal of hostility toward the society in which he lives if that society does not make useful employment available to him. These two things put together may well be sufficient to push him over the line from the ordinary useful citizen who obeys the law into the youthful hoodlum who becomes the real "I hate everybody" kid whom we dealt with over and over again in the juvenile courts.

One need not take great pains to dramatize this situation. It is a drama which should not be played out on the street corners or in the courts. Let us go back from the garish headlines and the grim statistics about youth and look further at the experience of the CCC. A 1938 study entitled "The CCC Through the Eyes of 272 Boys" states in its conclusions the opinion that:

> The values which these 272 boys received from their camp experience seem to fall into two general classifications: those having to do with the more or less concrete factors of improved physical health, increased weight, and financial gains, and those having to do with the intangible but significant factors of greater maturity, increased self-confidence, and general security. As we review the experiences and comments of these boys, we are

> impressed with the values from which many of them benefited but we are impressed, too, by the responsibility placed on the individual boy for seeing and obtaining these values. * * *

The experience of the CCC showed also that there were more than psychological benefits from the service. CCC "graduates" found a much easier time securing employment than did those young men who did not take part. Studies have shown that employers found them better and more skillful workers. CCC work was not merely manual labor; surveying, carpentry, and machine work were only a few of the skills gained by CCC enrollees.

It is neither nostalgia nor the rosy view of retrospective vision that prompts this praise for the many achievements of the CCC. There was a massive need for the program, and it met that need in an outstanding way. There is, I submit, an equal need today. The "social dynamite" of the out of school and unemployed youth is a fact that should prod us into immediate action. The unmet conservation needs of our natural resources is also a fact. The CCC coupled these needs in a dynamic and successful program. The Youth Conservation Corps should be an equally ambitious successor.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues from so many different parts of the country—East and West, urban and rural—in support of a Youth Conservation Corps. Coming from eastern Oregon, an area that is rich with natural resources that could so profitably utilize the conservation efforts of these young men, I have a particular reason to be a strong advocate of this measure. I am a sponsor of the legislation in this Congress just as I was in the 87th Congress. But I think my colleagues will find that members from urban areas advocate this legislation just as earnestly. I want to emphasize that the YCC bill encompasses a two-way program: increased opportunities for our young men combined with sound investment in our priceless resource heritage—a program that will return double dividends in the form of enriched lives and the more complete use of our human resources, in addition to the more efficient and economic management of our material resources of land, wood, and water.

Even since last year there has been a very decided and noticeable shift of sentiment in favor of this proposal. More and more people realize the tremendous need for a YCC program. I want to particularly commend our colleague from Kentucky, the Honorable CARL PERKINS, for the leadership he has shown in building the record for this legislation. Congressman PERKINS and his subcommittee have done a very effective job in shaping the details of the legislation. The bill that has been reported out of committee, H.R. 5131, is different from the original measure introduced. Many of these changes were the result of the subcommittee's holding long hours of hearings where they heard spokesmen for a variety of viewpoints.

The problem of unemployment among our young men has reached a point of urgency not experienced since the thirties. Young men from 16 to 21, the age group that would be affected by this legislation, make up 8.6 percent of the male civilian labor force while having an unemployment rate of 20.7 percent. About 700,000 of our young men are now out of school and out of work. I want to point out that these are February 1963 figures and so in no way reflect the great numbers of young men who normally look for jobs in the summer. The problem will become worse and not better. We can expect 26 million young men and women to enter the labor market in the 1960's as compared with 19 million in the 1950's. Of these 26 million, 7½ million are not expected to finish high school. They will pile up helplessly against the rising barriers to unskilled labor in our ever-advancing economy.

I consider this legislation to have the greatest economic importance. We on the Ways and Means Committee are now wrestling with the difficult question of restructuring the tax system to give our economy the stimulus that is needed to attain the proper rate of sound economic growth. These problems are technical and complex and the decisions to be made require a great deal of time. But even after the tax program is passed, the economy will need time to react to the new stimuli and the changed conditions. A Youth Conservation Corps is a program we need now.

A YCC program has not only economic but social urgency. Jobs have become increasingly difficult to obtain because of automation and the great influx into the labor market of young men born during the war years. It is not surprising that juvenile delinquency has greatly increased in the last few years when so many boys who have left school have been unable to get work. This program would help bridge that gap between high school graduation and the first job. The YCC would provide training and educational services to better prepare these young men to obtain jobs when they complete their enrollments. As one who grew up in the Pacific Northwest, I have had firsthand knowledge of outdoor living. I can assure my colleagues that it is not a romanticism to say that to live and work in our beautiful mountains and forests contributes to a person's health, both of mind and body.

Countless people in my district, who got their first start in life in the old Civilian Conservation Corps, have told me that they strongly advocate a similar program as an ideal way to help today's young men to get started on the right track. Though inspired by the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's, this bill is an altered version of the old CCC designed to meet the problems of today. I would want to emphasize that this is not a program urged because of sentimental memories of the past, but because of the urgent needs of the present. Recent pilot programs in my own State testify to the great success that such a program would have. The 1961 session of the Oregon Legislature passed legislation similar to this bill that aided our counties in setting up summer programs where young men could do conservation work in our parks and forests. Numerous county officials, juvenile judges, and county commissioners, have written to tell me that this pilot program has been a great success and have urged that we institute such a program on the national level.

The need for conservation work is just as pressing, if not more so, than 30 years ago. Since the 1930's we have had a tremendous increase in the use of our national forests alone.. The number of visitors has tripled in just the last 10 years. As the Civilian Conservation Corps did in the past, the Youth Conservation Corps would work on developing recreation areas, planting trees, building dams, brush removal, and the countless other needed conservation measures. In my own State of Oregon we had nearly 28,000 young men serving in the average of 51 CCC camps that were in existence during the thirties. In trips through my own congressional district I often come across examples of the lasting conservation work that these young men accomplished.

The Interior and Agriculture Departments who are responsible for the management of our natural resources have outlined the great backlog of much-needed conservation work in which young men could very effectively participate. As just one example, the Department of Agriculture has informed me that 43,000 man-years of work are needed in just the national forests in my own State. I would add that much work is also needed in State parks and forests and the other types of Federal projects such as national parks, reservoirs and Indian reservations. My colleagues know that I have consistently fought to expand the Federal Government's role in resource conservation. In the past I have urged increased appropriations out of the Treasury for conservation activities because I felt they would help guarantee our Nation's future security and prosperity while returning dividends in the form of increased Government revenues. The effective conservation and management of our natural resources is an area that we have too long neglected. In a YCC program we have an opportunity to start meeting the present backlog of conservation work which is estimated to cost $12.2 billion dollars. Very frankly a YCC program would help to accomplish vitally needed conservation work at much lower costs.

In summary this is a desirable program just on a cost-accounting basis. But a Youth Conservation Corps would return double dividends by conserving both our material and human resources. I consider this to be a sound and imaginative program—one in the best tradition of our Nation's approach to vital problems.

In view of these vital needs, I want to urge my colleagues that they work for speedy enactment of as strong a YCC program as possible. We have a great opportunity here to help in the conservation of our national resources, but there is no doubt that a Youth Conservation Corps would help in conserving an even more important national resource—our youth.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to address myself to a grave national problem, the gathering storm represented by millions of young people between the ages of 16 and 21 who are neglected in our "affluent society." Unemployment among this group is practically three times the national average, which is itself a burden upon our society. In December 1962 there were 1,200,000 boys and girls from 16 to 24 years of age who were looking for work. For most of these, it has proved a fruitless search. An economy with as large a residue of unemployed adults as ours cannot easily find places for those young people with few skills and little training.

Unemployment at any age for any person is demoralizing, frightening and embittering. For youth who experience prolonged joblessness or a series of dead-end jobs broken by long periods of unemployment, it can only create attitudes, work habits, and loss of motivation which can deeply affect a young person throughout his whole adult life. Dr. James Conant has graphically pointed out this problem by saying:

> I am deeply disturbed by the implications that widespread unemployment among the youth of our big cities has for the future of our society.
>
> Although the causes of juvenile delinquency are complex, and there is no one solution, employment opportunities are clearly important. A youth who has dropped out of school and never has had a full-time job is not likely to become a constructive citizen of his community. Quite the contrary.
>
> As a frustrated individual, he is quite likely to be antisocial and rebellious and may well become a juvenile delinquent. The adverse influence of the street is largely a consequence of gangs of such youths, out of school and unemployed.
>
> I submit that the existence in the slums of our large cities of thousands of youths age 16 to 21 who are both out of school and out of work is an explosive situation. It is social dynamite.

I believe that a constructive and imaginative solution must be started now, if we are not to reap a bitter harvest among our young people.

Mr. Speaker, the district I have the honor to represent has no great forests, no expanses of lakes and wildlife and ranges. It would be, I think, a great benefit to thousands of young people whose lives and outlooks are bounded by concrete to participate in a program of needed conservation work similar to that undertaken in the past by the Civilian Conservation Corps. The CCC was an ambitious experiment that fully justified the hopes of all those who helped start it. One example of this justification is provided by a man who was closely connected with the CCC during its whole life, and who is now the Director of the National Park Service. Conrad Wirth, in his final report to Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, said that:

> Working out of doors, regular hours, and plenty of good, wholesome food did wonders for the boys at one of the most critical growing periods of their lives.

The impact of outdoor life upon young people, I think, cannot be overstated. A recent study in Minnesota, comparing delinquent youths who participated in a forestry camp with a matched group remaining in a more conventional correctional institution, reports significantly greater improvement among the campers. I do not suggest that a program comparable to the CCC should be thought of as a solution to the complex problem of juvenile delinquency, for it is bound up in the whole fabric of our society. But I do feel strongly that applying the energies and talents of our young people to the many unmet conservation needs that abound across the country can contribute to both their development and the development of our natural resources.

A recent study conducted for the New York City Youth Board reveals that New York City has at least 76,800 out-of-school and unemployed youth. Difficulty in finding and holding jobs hits most heavily school dropouts and young people in minority groups, particularly Puerto Ricans and Negroes. A local area youth employment program, if instituted on an adequate basis, could help many of these young people find work. But giving these youngsters a job outside of their present environment for a period of 6 months to 2 years can go a long way toward giving them a self-reliant outlook on life and the beginning of skills that can help them gain later employment. Anyone who has traveled through our magnificent national forests and parks can understand the effect doing hard and useful work in them would have upon young men accustomed to roaming through the streets of cities where the doors of employment remain closed. The experience of the CCC camps of the 1930's demonstrates how boys were made into men who became useful and productive members of society. The work that needs to be done is there. Since the CCC built recreation facilities and roads and trials, much of this construction has undergone substantial deterioration. The almost tenfold increase in the use of these facilities, coupled with the lack of funds and manpower in many areas to maintain them, has meant that a tremendous backlog of rehabilitation work has accumulated. In this kind of outdoor atmosphere the socially useful and productive nature of this work can benefit thousands of young men.

Mr. Speaker, April 17 will be the 30th anniversary of the establishment of the first CCC camp in the George Washington National Forest in Virginia. Thirty years ago the whole of American society was out of focus, and the need for the CCC program was obvious. Today, our general affluence tends to shield from our vision the soft spots in our society. It is hard for many people to comprehend the meaning of our hard-core social problems, which cannot be wished away or pushed out of sight. In the 1930's the impact of idleness on the young people was readily apparent, and the CCC as a solution was easy to understand. Thirty years later the need for a similar approach to the problem of youth unemployment should be apparent to all except those who believe that idleness is voluntary. We have a choice as to how we will meet this problem. We can spend our money for unemployment compensation for young people, for courts, law enforcement agencies and penal institutions; or we can spend it on a constructive program to attack our unmet conservation needs utilizing the energies and talents of our young people.

In its 9 years of existence the CCC provided immeasurable benefit to both our natural resources and our young men. To the 3 million young men enrolled in CCC camps, it offered discipline, the experience of healthful and body-building outdoor living, and training in a wide variety of skills. The success of many of the CCC enrollees in obtaining jobs after their camp service is directly attributable to the skills they picked up in the camps. The lasting benefits of the CCC—the millions of acres of trees planted, wildlife protected, the thousands of trails, bridges and campgrounds built—are impressive evidence of the intrinsic worth of the CCC program. The program also had lasting benefits that are not so tangible. These are the human assets reaped by the 3 million CCC graduates. Let me refer again to the words of Conrad Wirth, one of the Nation's great conservation figures, who said:

> Working in the open, with nature, brings optimum beneficial results to an individual which are almost impossible to obtain elsewhere. It builds the body and the mind; it teaches the basic principles of existence; and it creates an understanding of what must be done to protect and properly use natural resources.

No one program can completely excise the cause of youth unemployment and the social ills that attend this unemployment. It will take a variety of imaginative and boldly conceived programs to treat both the roots and the branches of the problems afflicting our youth. The CCC showed to the Nation one constructive avenue into which the energies of young people could be put. A modern version of the Corps, designed to meet the needs of our vast and expanding number of unemployed youth, can accomplish a great deal in the conservation of both our natural and our human resources.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent as well to insert in the RECORD the text of an excellent and informative statement by a former Member of this body, the Honorable Frank E. Smith, now Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, with respect to the operation of the CCC program in the TVA region.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., March 1, 1963.

Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: At your suggestion, I have prepared an evaluation of the Civilian Conservation Corps program in the TVA area. During the 9 years of operation of the CCC program, a number of camps were assigned to the TVA, at one time as high as 25, and a variety of work was carried on. I think one of the most significant results of this program is the fact that the average gross return to landowners from timber sales is going to be at least $1 million per year.

Not many years will be needed to repay the entire cost of the CCC program in the area.

One of the principal items of work was a large-scale reforestation program specifically aimed at eroding land generally considered worthless at the time. The TVA–CCC tree planting resulted in the following:

Private land reforested	70,000
TVA land reforested	40,000
Total acres reforested	110,000

Of this 110,000 acres, 73,000 acres are still in young stands of growing timber today. The difference in acreage is caused by a number of reasons, including land-use conversion, fire, insect and disease, and the planting of improper species for the site in use.

There are many lasting benefits to the region from the plantations established by the CCC, however. Some of the more important ones are:

Income for landowners, $1 million each year: CCC plantings are just now reaching the age (25 years) where landowners are receiving significant dollar returns. Based on averages developed from intensively studied individual cases, they are now producing wood from thinnings, worth about $5 per acre per year to the landowner. Projected over a 50-year rotation, average gross return per acre per year is computed to be $15. Therefore, 73,000 acres of CCC plantations are returning, or will return, to landowners $1 million per year.

Base for industry; new papermills: Two paper companies have built plants on the Tennessee River in the past 10 years at a capital investment of $144 million. An important consideration in the location of these mills was the extensive area of established pine plantations. Each year CCC plantings can be expected to yield 73,000 cords of wood for the paper industry, resulting in manufactured products worth about $7,300,000. (During a recent 5-year period, one mill paid $200,000 for some 60,000 cords of wood thinned from 6,400 acres of TVA land planted by CCC crews.)

Jobs for people; 730 full-time jobs: Foresters estimate that each 1,000 acres of planted pines create the base for 10 new full-time woods and industry jobs. Trees planted by the CCC are therefore providing year-round employment for 730 men. This means over $3 million of the region's industrial payroll.

Soil erosion control: A 1961 survey showed almost 95 percent of the CCC plantings effectively controlled erosion.

Reforestation idea promoted: In 1934 tree planting was a novel idea in the Tennessee Valley. Landowners were skeptical. Persuading them to reclaim eroded lands was often difficult, even though it cost them nothing. Early CCC plantings, and the obviously good results, were effective advertising. The idea spread and the reforestation rate accelerated. Landowners gradually assumed responsibility for doing the job. To date they have reforested 633,000 additional acres in valley counties.

Effective fire prevention: Wood burning was a common practice in the valley in the 1930's. An estimated 10 percent of the total forest land burned each year. The problem was an uninformed and unsympathetic citizenry. Growing, green plantations became a powerful influence in changing attitudes toward fire control. One very effective aid was tree planting. Landowners who owned tree plantations developed a desire to protect them, and this interest gradually spread from plantations to natural stands of trees. Today the annual burn is less than one-half of 1 percent.

Cordially,

Frank E. Smith,
Director.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record the text of an article from the magazine Business Week of February 16, 1963, entitled "Coming: A Crisis for Young Workers."

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

COMING: A CRISIS FOR YOUNG WORKERS

Imagine two locomotives careening toward each other at full speed. One represents the economic trends that have reduced job opportunities for young workers so drastically that unemployment among them is now twice the national average. The other represents the 26 million young workers who will enter the labor market before 1970. The two are about to collide—with potentially alarming results for both the Nation's economy and its politics.

SOBER SURVEY

The sober source for this sensational picture is a Labor Department manpower study, prepared for the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy. Most of its background material is well known: the overall growth in unemployment levels; the rise in long-term unemployment; the concentration of unemployment among the blue collared, unskilled, and nonwhite. But where the study looks into the future, it contains dynamite.

Between 1960 and 1970, the number of working youngsters aged 14 to 24 is expected to increase by more than 6 million—compared to an increase of less than 400,000 during the previous decade. This will bring the total number in this age group to 26 million. Yet in 1962 the unemployment rate for worker in this age group was about double the national average of 5½ percent.

In effect, almost every trend in the labor market is now operating to the young worker's disadvantage:

The shift from blue- to white-collar jobs, related to the shift from goods to services in the economy. The proportion of all workers in goods-producing industries fell from 51 percent in 1947 to 42 percent in 1962.

The shift from unskilled to skilled jobs within the blue-collar segment. Technological innovation has tended to upgrade jobs where it did not abolish them.

The shift from farm to nonagricultural jobs. Farm employment dropped more than 3 million between 1947 and 1962.

NO ENTRY

The net result is a scarcity of those bottom-rung jobs that were once the young worker's traditional entry into the labor market. Today's high school graduate with no special training finds few unoccupied jobs he can step into and use as a stepping stone to the next job up.

The high school dropout is in an even worse position—an estimated 30 percent of all youngsters beginning work in the 1960's will be dropouts.

On the other hand, those occupations that are growing fastest—the professional and technical specialties—require so much training that a person is out of the younger worker class before he begins work.

Moreover, the huge sums spent for research and development ($14 billion in 1960–61 compared to $5 billion in 1953–54) will accelerate these trends.

STIFF CHALLENGE

As the Labor Department sees it, the country will need:

Some 13 million more jobs by 1970 to keep up with labor force growth alone.

Two million additional jobs annually to offset technological advances.

This is a stiff enough challenge for an economy that has averaged only 258,000 in annual job growth for the past 5 years (464,000 new nonfarm jobs minus 206,000 lost on the farm). But, in addition, the new jobs will have to be matched up with a labor force bulging in those categories hardest to employ—principally young workers. Or else.

History, rather than the Labor Department, suggests alternatives: the depression, Hitler's Germany—created in great part by unemployed young Germany. Presumably such possibilities underlie President Kennedy's proposed Youth Conservation Corps. The chances are they will underlie many political and economic moves before the decade is over.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, these youngsters who are out of school and out of work and who are discouraged because they are virtually unemployable will benefit immensely from the Youth Conservation Corps. They do not intend to go back to school where they have already dropped out. They need to get away from their environment in many instances, and the chance to break away from depressing environments for a new life in conservation work will attract many boys who cannot be reached otherwise. These youngsters will have an opportunity to live in a well-regulated camp and to work in many fields. They will be in camps operated under direct leadership of forest and park rangers, wildlife management specialists and our soil conservationists. The bill should be passed at the earliest possible date.

THE APPROPRIATIONS BUDGET FOR 1964

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain tables and extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished minority leader in debate on the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior alluded to the fact that there is a Republican task force which has been organized for the purpose of undertaking to reduce appropriations in the budget for the next fiscal year.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that on March 4 the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] issued a press release in which he announced that a House Republican task force had found ways to cut as much as $15 billion from the budget. On March 5 the Washington Post published this account of the group's press session.

I quote:

> A House Republican study group announced yesterday it has found projects costing $10 to $15 billion which can and should be cut from appropriations requested for next year. The group of senior GOP members of the Appropriations Committee told a news conference that their study of the budget, assisted by Maurice H. Stans, Budget Director during the Eisenhower administration, showed such cuts both feasible and urgent.

The Post account then identifies the gentleman from Ohio as the source of the statement.

And then added, and I quote again:

> The Republicans did not specify where cuts should be made. They said they had compiled a list but did not want to appear to be prejudging testimony still to be given before the Appropriations Committee.

The Post then adds this statement:

> House Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK suggested that Republicans submit a bill of particulars.

Mr. Speaker, the Speaker of the House and others on this side of the aisle have been asking for a bill of particulars every day since this statement was made. But all we have been able to get are claims that the budget can be cut up to $15 billion. We have seen a vague letter from former President Eisenhower encouraging budget cutters, but we have received no bill of particulars.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman made reference to this Eisenhower letter which has gotten rather wide circulation. I think it might be well that somewhere this should be made a part of the Record. I would like to refer to it, if the gentleman will permit me. One of the many things that former President Eisenhower mentioned was the defense items in the budget. This morning in the Washington Post in a column written by the distinguished journalist, Mr. Walter Lippmann, that whole matter is discussed. I will quote just one paragraph from Mr. Lippmann's article. He said:

> On the first question, that the defense budget should be cut from the Kennedy level to the Eisenhower level, the General must know that the prospects are poor. For defense, this Congress wants to spend more, not less, than do President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara. Congress would be horrified at going back to the Eisenhower level. Indeed, the controversies which are raging around the "McNamara monarchy" all originate in his refusal to spend money that certain officers, politicians, and contractors want to have spent.

The article continues:

> General Eisenhower knows that. He learned it when he was President, and his valedictory on television will long be remembered for its warning that "in the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military industrial complex.

The other item mentioned in former President Eisenhower's letter, and I have it before me, is the space program, and he used the expression, if I remember it correctly, that this was a "spongy" request—whatever that means.

I have here the Evening Star published as of today, Washington, Tuesday, April 2. The headline is:

> Reds Fire Moon Research Shot

Then the article goes on:

> Space vehicle due at target (meaning the moon) in 3½ days.

Then it goes on to describe this vehicle which weighs over 3,000 pounds. The essence of this, as I see it, is that we should cut back, according to President Eisenhower's letter between $10 and $12 billion. I say that probably the net result of it would be to give the Soviet bloc a commanding superiority in the whole progrom of space research.

I do not believe this administration or, for that matter, the American people, want to do that. The Eisenhower administration spent $180 million more than was spent in the 8 years of the Truman administration despite the fact that the Korean war was fought during the administration of President Truman.

With all the conversation about debt, the Eisenhower years increased the national debt by over $20 billion. I will say that these Republican budget directors ought to be well-qualified because one of them presided over the biggest peacetime deficit in history in the Eisenhower administration which approached almost $13 billion.

One of the other matters this Eisenhower letter talks about is children. I do not find anyone who does not relish talking about children. I have three children and two grandchildren. I want most of all for them to live in a free country; I want them to have the opportunity to participate in a free society.

When we talk about children, one of the real problems confronting this Nation today involves young people; and the idea that we turn our backs on them and do nothing seems to be part of the Republican philosophy and has been as long as I have been around here. That certainly, as I can see it, is not helpful to the children of the country.

I am told that today there are 46 million people in the United States under the age of 18 years, and that within a very few years there will be 70 million under 18 years of age. We have an unemployment rate ranging almost to 6 percent, but when you look at the young people, the unemployment rate is much higher than 6 percent; it is way above 6 percent.

So I say it is very easy for the Republicans to use these catch phrases, but it is pretty difficult to support positive and constructive programs.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana, and I would ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana may incorporate the articles to which he made reference.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the article by the distinguished journalist, Walter Lippmann, from the Washington Post of Tuesday, April 2, is as follows:

MONEY AND THE MOON

(By Walter Lippmann)

General Eisenhower has gone on record in favor of a cut of $10 or $12 billion in the Government's authority to make contracts which will be paid for as the missiles and the ships and the like are manufactured. While this is unlikely to make any substantial reduction in this year's spending, it would make a substantial difference in later years. General Eisenhower does not himself specify what the cut should be, being as he says out of touch with the details. But he takes his figures from his last two budget directors—Messrs. Stans and Brundage.

Although it is not likely to happen, it would be most enlightening if Messrs. Stans and Brundage would present their recommendations in detail and engage in a bout of reciprocal questioning and answering with Mr. Gordon, the present Kennedy budget director. Unless something of the sort can be arranged, the country will be subjected to conflicting assertions which never meet head on. This will add to the befuddlement which so far has been the outstanding production of this session of Congress.

But even without such a confrontation of views, there are in General Eisenhower's letter to Representative HALLECK two very large and very important statements of policy. One is that the defense budget can be reduced down to something like the last Eisenhower defense budget for fiscal 1962. General Eisenhower does not support, because he thinks it unnecessary, the Kennedy enlargement of our strategic and of our conventional forces. It would be interesting to hear him argue, not merely assert, this very important proposition.

General Eisenhower's second difference of policy is on the program to put a man on the moon and get him back again before 1970. This is, as he says, a crash program which is spectacular but too costly. Here too is an iscue which ought to be debated.

On the first question, that the defense budget should be cut from the Kennedy level to the Eisenhower level, the general must know that the prospects are poor. For defense, this Congress wants to spend more, not less, than do President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara. Congress would be horrified at going back to the Eisenhower level. Indeed, the controversies which are raging around the "McNamara monarchy" all originate in his refusal to spend money that certain officers, politicians, and contractors want to have spent.

General Eisenhower knows that. He learned it when he was President and his valedictory on television will long be remembered for its warning that "in the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex."

Believing that, General Eisenhower ought to take a long, close look at the embattled Secretary of Defense, and he should ask himself whether the root of Secretary McNamara's troubles is not that he has the will and the known-how and the guts to bring military spending under rational control. If Mr. McNamara is overwhelmed, General Eisenhower can give up for lost any serious notion that military spending will be cut back.

As to putting a man on the moon, the real question, I believe, is not whether it is too expensive. The real question is whether the country would support a gigantic research and scientific exploration in outer space if it were not prodded by the fear that the Russians will get to the moon first and lured by the prize of being the first ourselves to get there. What General Eisenhower thinks, so it seems, is that we should "demonstrate commonsense" about the prod and the lure. We should spend less and take more time and let the Russians win the race to the moon if they can afford it.

No doubt the winner in the race will have great prestige and to many people the world over, he will look temporarily like a superman. But as the first man on the moon is followed by the second man on the moon, winning the race will be not much more than a 9-day's wonder. Most emphatically, it will not decide the course of history.

What does matter greatly is that since we have the technological capacity we should promote the research and the exploration into the nature of the universe. We do not know what we shall learn when we can place our laboratories and our instruments out beyond the envelope of the earth's atmosphere. But we shall know more than we can know now about the reality of which we are a part. In physics, chemistry, and biology we may be opening up a new world.

It is one of the melancholy facts of political life that the good is not often sought for goodness' sake. Men are not easily moved to serve so great a purpose as the revolutionary increase of knowledge. So we have to be prodded by the fear of being second and lured by the desire to be first.

Mr. Speaker, the article in the Evening Star of Tuesday, March 2, to which I referred earlier is as follows:

REDS FIRE MOON RESEARCH SHOT—SPACE VEHICLE DUE AT TARGET IN 3½ DAYS—3,130-POUND CRAFT SENT UNMANNED OFF PLATFORM IN ORBIT

MOSCOW, April 2.—The Soviet Union today fired a 3,130-pound interplanetary research station toward the moon, Moscow radio reported.

The radio said the unmanned space vehicle is scheduled to reach the moon in 3½ days.

A statement by the Soviet news agency Tass said the launching was part of the Soviet program for exploration of outer space and planets of the solar system.

FUNCTIONS NORMALLY

"All the apparatus on board the automatic station functioned normally," Tass reported.

The radio report said the interplanetary station—called Moon-4—was shot from an orbiting space platform.

The use of such unmanned devices is a preliminary to attempts to land men on the moon, a goal of both Soviet and United States Governments.

The Chief of the U.S. space agency, James E. Webb, has estimated at something under $20 billion the cost of landing the first Americans on the moon by 1970.

RESEARCH DEVICES

The American National Aeronautics and Space Administration is promoting a surveyor project which would soft-land instrument packages on the moon, to include some shots which would orbit that planet and not land.

The Russian device appeared to have a research mission of this type.

"The observation of the flight of the station, the determination of the parameters of its trajectory, the reception of scientific information are carried out by a special measuring complex on the territory of the Soviet Union," Tass said.

It gave the moon probe's last position as over the Yellow Sea.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to proceed. When I reach the Committee on Science and Astronautics I will yield.

Mr. Speaker, I now insert the article in its entirety in the RECORD. This is insert No. 1.

The Speaker and others on this side of the aisle have been asking for a bill of particulars every day since this statement was made. But all we have gotten have been more unsubstantiated claims that the budget can be cut up to $15 billion. We have seen a vague letter from former President Eisenhower encouraging the budget cutters, but we have received no bill of particulars.

It would seem that a study group that includes senior Republican members of the Committee on Appropriations could produce such a bill—particularly after all the ballyhoo that has accompanied its operations.

The truth is that the only way a $15 billion cut can be made is to cut into the real muscle of indispensable functions of Government.

Using the total 1964 budget as a base, it is obvious that interest costs totaling $10.1 billion cannot be reduced.

It can also be assumed that a reduction of this size involves elimination of the new programs proposed by the President, which, except for military pay increases, total $1.8 billion in 1964.

And therefore the remaining $96 billion budget requests would have to be cut by $13.2 billion.

Faced with prolonged silence, we have been compelled—in the public interest—to make our own analysis of precisely how the Republicans would propose to cut the $13.2 billion. We have been forced to do this because there has been not even one statement explaining how a $15 billion cut would affect our space program, our defense program, our domestic programs.

Incidentally, the man upon whom the Republicans are reportedly relying for advice in their budget cutting, the gentleman who served as a budget director during the Eisenhower administration, Maurice Stans, is certainly well versed in Republican finances. He saw a highly publicized $500 million anticipated surplus in 1959 become a $12.5 billion deficit.

We have carefully analyzed the budget.

Working along guidelines discussed with the fiscal experts, we have apportioned the $15 billion reduction on an equitable basis between the departments, the new and continuing programs, and functions. At this point, I insert into the record material describing exactly how we arrived at our equitable apportionment. This is insert No. 2, insert No. 2 having been discarded.

We have asked for details because the American people want to know just what services the Republicans want to curtail. They want to know just what functions the Republicans intend to wipe out. They want to know just what new programs the Republicans would eliminate.

But no news has been forthcoming.

There have been some concrete indications by Republican leaders as to just where they intend to apply the knife, and we have considered those indications in making our analysis.

For instance, it is clear that they intend to slash deeply, or eliminate entirely, programs that are keyed to the welfare of the American people. Most of us on this side of the aisle favor the youth employment bill and the Youth Conservation Corps, most of our friends across the aisle are opposed.

I have been told that one distinguished Republican leader called the Youth Conservation Corps a—and I quote—a "Youth Waste Corps" unquote.

It is clear from the record the Republicans intend to eliminate or cut down programs vitally needed by millions of Americans—programs which have been supported by Democratic administrations and Democratic Congresses for more than a score of years.

They refuse to face the problems that beset us today.

They refuse to admit the 20th century is here.

They want to turn the clock back.

Like an ostrich, they stick their heads in the sands, oblivious to the problems that swirl around their feet.

They would ignore the millions of older people who live in constant dread of disastrous hospital bills. They scream "socialized medicine" when anyone attempts to help these older people.

They ignore the millions of children who grub out inferior educations in overcrowded classrooms. They scream federal control when we attempt to help these children.

They ignore the millions of young people who need guidance, employment, and training. They ridicule efforts to help our youth by saying we want to send them off into the woods to play.

They ignore the fact that millions of Americans need more doctors and dentists in their communities. The village council is working on that problem, they say.

Now let us consider the careful analysis we have made.

Exactly what will it mean to make a $15 billion cut in the budget?

If our friends across the aisle are really sincere in what they say they intend to do they will have to take this course. Aside from new programs and interest charges, they must cut: $7,756 billion in the area of national defense; $620 million in the area of international affairs and finance; $784 million allocated for space research and technology; $987 million allocated for our agricultural programs and resources; $357 million for preservation and development of our natural resources; $424 million allocated to commerce and transportation functions; $69 million for housing and community development; $242 million for education; $796 million for health, labor, and welfare; $768 million for veterans benefits and services; $312 million for General Government; $28 million allowed for pay adjustment; and $34 million for contingencies.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Seven hundred million dollars taken out of the space program is going to delay the goal that has been set for that program for many years in the future. It is interesting to note that the gentleman who made this statement, a former President of the United States, speaks about this spongy program, but he had some spongy talk during his own administration.

You will remember after Sputnik was put up that startled the world, Engine Charlie said that he could see no value in putting a basketball into the sky. But basketballs in the sky will represent a new system of communication worldwide, a new system of weather announcement that will bring credit to the whole program. If we want to retard the program, this is the way to do it.

We were shocked when the Russians orbited two astronauts and showed the capability of bringing these two people within 2 miles of one another, one being orbited some 24 hours after the other. When this capability was shown, we were shocked, just as we were shocked when Sputnik went up.

The future of this country lies in its science and technology. Going to the moon is part of the full scheme. It is the techniques that are developed there which will serve the whole program, and having established a goal, if we are to keep that goal we are going to need the space money that has been allotted.

And I would like to point out the international prestige that goes with that. International prestige at this time is important.

Who was sent to Argentina? The Vostok capsule and the Russian cosmonauts. Now they send them around the world, to China, to build up the prestige that they need in these countries. And, I am sure if any of you followed closely the triumphal trip that Colonel Glenn made into Africa and other places where they lined up to see him and to see his capsule, you would appreciate this value to us.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. The distinguished chairman of the committee is making a most important statement. He talks about prestige. I would like to ask the gentleman what in his opinion would be the effect on, No. 1, our own country and, No. 2, upon world affairs if the Russians succeeded in reaching the moon and, for that matter, if they put a planet in outer space before we do?

Mr. MILLER of California. I do not think there would be any question about it, just as Sputnik was the thing that first revitalized them; that it would revitalize their position and reestablish their position in many parts of the world, particularly among the new emerging nations, and it would be a great setback for this country if that thing happened.

Mr. BOGGS. Does the gentleman think that Mr. Maurice Stans would then congratulate the leadership in this body in reducing the budget so that this would put the Russians on the moon sooner?

Mr. MILLER of California. I do not know what he would do, but I am conscious of the fact that this program has the support of the American people. I am not conscious of anyone who during the last campaign advocated slicing the space budget lost out, but I know of at least one man who voted against it, for reasons that only he knows, that is no longer a Member of this body.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentlemen for his contribution.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes; I must yield to the minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Apparently there is quite a discussion going on here about the budget, and we had a little action on the budget today which was, to me, highly satisfactory. As I indicated earlier, we accomplished a real substantial reduction by a couple of amendments that were adopted here with substantial Republican support. The savings that are now involved in this first appropriation bill come right up to the target we had set with respect to this bill.

I understand some references have been made to a letter addressed to me by former President Eisenhower. I do not care how much you undertake to belittle his advice to the American people, but believe me that advice will be listened to. Now, beyond that I shall not undertake to reply in detail to some of the things that have been said. I just hope the gentleman from Oklahoma, my counterpart on the majority side, whom I have the highest respect and admiration for, will agree with me that after we have a chance to look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and see just what has been said here, why, possibly some of us will have something to say a little further.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like first to respond to the distinguished minority leader by saying that I think it is the duty of the Congress to survey every item and to scrutinize every item in the budget and make cuts where practical. We are trying to analyze the results of a cut across the board based on some of the figures that have appeared in newspapers and apparently have been given out by members of the so-called task force.

May I say that no one holds the distinguished minority leader in higher esteem than I. With reference to his last statement, I might say, however, that all we say here will be available in the RECORD for the inspection and scrutiny of all who want to read it, and we would like to see the bill of particulars made equally available to us.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say to the gentleman that the bill of particulars is right in that large envelope. The gentleman would undoubtedly be very happy if the gentleman could have a real good look at that. But I say right now that the gentleman is not about to. I said earlier today in the debate that we have a bill of particulars that has been looked over by conscientious Members of this body and by able people throughout this country who stand for what we know the majority of the people of this country want, which is to do away with deficit spending. If we are going to pursue that——

Mr. ALBERT. If I may respond further, I think a matter as important as the budget of the United States, is important enough that any suggestions relating to it should be made a matter of public record at the earliest posible date so that all those who are interested in making a contribution with respect to it will have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I have no intention of belittling General Eisenhower. The letter to which I referred was given wide distribution by the distinguished minority leader. I first saw it in the discussion that the minority leader, the majority leader, and myself participated in last Friday. But this letter makes serious charges. A portion of the second paragraph of the Eisenhower letter reads as follows:

> Moreover, I am particularly concerned in this situation for our children. If we irresponsibly keep on passing them our bills they will inherit not a free country with bright opportunities, but a vast wasteland of debt and financial chaos.

We would be less than responsible if we did not reply to that kind of language. Nobody is belittling the former President. We are simply presenting the point of view of the administration in power which has responsibility for the Government of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the entire letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter follows:

(Text of a letter from former President Dwight D. Eisenhower in response to a letter[1] from Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK. Mr. Eisenhower's letter was made public by Mr. HALLECK following a meeting of the Republican Committee on Budget Reduction headed by Representative FRANK BOW of Ohio.)

PALM DESERT, CALIF.,
March 26, 1963.

DEAR CHARLIE: Replying to your letter, I start by stating my conviction that if the Government is to accept deliberately a massive deficit, and then simultaneously embark upon lavish new spending and a huge tax cut, the Nation is headed for trouble. If we do this we will convict ourselves of fiscal recklessness and a failure to heed the plain lessons of history.

Moreover, I am particularly concerned, in this situation, for our children. If we irresponsibly keep on passing them our bills, they will inherit, not a free country with bright opportunities, but a vast wasteland of debt and financial chaos. Our youngsters have the right to expect more from us than a confession of our unreadiness or inability to pay for the things we demand from our government.

Of course, there is no compulsion upon us to be so foolish. I believe the new spending programs in the pending budget can be drastically reduced without hurting a single essential function and still leave the level of Federal operations billions higher than I thought necessary only 2 years ago.

My last budget—for fiscal 1962—called for authority to spend $81 billion. The 1964 budget before you asks for $108 billion. Such a pyramiding of programs will inevitably create higher and higher spending in coming years and more and more difficulty in ever bringing our finances into balance. If this $27 billion increase were cut in half, we would still have the fastest growing budget we have ever had in peacetime. Cuts of that magnitude would seem to be both reasonable and desirable, if only we will keep in mind the adverse consequences of failing to make them.

---

[1] Text of Halleck letter to General Eisenhower, March 25, 1963:

"As you undoubtedly are aware, there is a great deal of concern here in the Congress on the part of both Democrats and Republicans about the spending proposals in the President's budget.

"Having in mind your vast experience both as a military leader and as our Nation's Chief Executive and realizing your continuing interest in the affairs of government, many of us feel that an expression of your views on this matter would be most helpful."

Take defense—up $10 billion in 2 years. In my view, it is almost incredible to say this program cannot be safely pared. The defense budget I left behind provided amply for our security. Even allowing for costly developments since then, I have no doubt that the enormous defense sums can well stand a judicious and sizable pruning.

The space program, in my opinion, is downright spongy. This is an area where we particularly need to demonstrate some commonsense. Specifically, I have never believed that a spectacular dash to the moon, vastly deepening our debt, is worth the added tax burden it will eventually impose upon our citizens. This result should be achieved as a natural outgrowth of demonstrably valuable space operations. But having made this into a crash program, we are unavoidably wasting enormous sums. I suggest that our enthusiasm here be tempered in the interest of fiscal soundness.

I am sure there are many other areas in the voluminous budget where substantial economies can be made, to the great benefit of the Nation.

May I stress this point: there is not a trace of partisanship in the views here expressed. Responsible government is not a partisan issue. Leading citizens, in both parties in and out of government, have most emphatically stated that they share similar convictions. Among these are my last two Budget Directors, whom I asked to appraise the pending programs, because I am not now in a position to specify the detailed reductions that can be made. They believe that a cut of $10 or $12 billion in spending authority would be practicable, without injuring any necessary activity. I agree with them that, at the very least, major surgery on the proposed programs, old and new, is a necessary accompaniment to a cut in taxes.

My hope is that our countrymen will grow indignant enough over these dangers to our country's future to make their views vigorously known to you gentlemen in the Congress. If this does come to pass, then we will face the happy prospect of reducing spending, reducing taxes, and looking after our children's tomorrow all at the same time.

With warm personal regard,

As ever,

Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I did not mean to say that you were belittling the former President of the United States. I do not think I used that word.

Mr. BOGGS. Yes, you did, I hate to say.

Mr. HALLECK. If I did, I am going to stand on it. But beyond that, as I said, I do not think General Eisenhower—former President Eisenhower—needs too much defense at my hands, although I am willing to take on that defense at any time. I am going to see to it tomorrow that his letter goes in the Congressional Record, whether you put it in piecemeal or not. I do not know.

Mr. BOGGS. I have already put it in.

Mr. HALLECK. Have you put it in the Congressional Record?

Mr. BOGGS. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. That is very good, then, because I had planned to do that today in connection with the bill which we had under consideration. But I thought possibly it might be considered too partisan. So I refrained from putting it in the Record. But if you put it in, then all I can say is I commend you for putting it in.

May I say further, and then I shall discontinue my part of this discussion, because after all, as I said earlier, this is not the time to undertake to carry on this debate from our side, and that we will in due time have some further things to say about this matter of excessive spending in the budget; may I say I am absolutely sure that those of us who are trying to cut out excessive wasteful spending are supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I think the overwhelming majority of the American people are for cutting out wasteful spending. But our analysis of this matter indicates that if the kinds of cuts that have been publicized are made we are going to cut out some spending that I am sure the American people think is very desirable.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. This is not a question of personalities insofar as General Eisenhower is concerned. I think General Eisenhower is a fine gentleman, and I like him very much. I supported President Eisenhower when he was President oftentimes more than the members of his own party, both in committee and on the floor of the House. So I am not making any attack on General Eisenhower. I am dealing with this letter which he wrote, which I consider a vague document which says nothing. And also I am surprised that the minority leader would have what he calls a bill of particulars which he will not reveal for the benefit of the American people. If he has a bill of particulars I think it is important that the American people know what it is.

Just one other point, because I think what we are doing here is very important in making this record. Let us talk about this business of what we have left our children and what we are going to leave our children. Aside from the $180 billion increased expenditures under the Eisenhower administration, and the more than $20 billion they added to the national debt, in 1958 we had a deficit in our balance of payments of $3.5 billion. In 1959 it was $3.7 billion. In 1960 it was $3.9 billion. In 1961 it was $2.5 billion and in 1962 it was down to $1.9 billion.

This affects the flow of gold from the United States of America and it has a vital aspect in our so-called fiscal responsibility and the fiscal stability of our Government. I do not think this is something that the former President can be particularly proud of.

In addition to that he talks about our children, and about a dollar that is worthless. We have had more price stability in the last year than we have had at any time in the recent past. I think it is probably impossible to have total price stability in a growing country. I know the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] is very knowledgeable on this subject; we serve together. But here are the figures. This is the wholesale price index.

Mr. CURTIS. How about taking the Consumer Price Index? That is what the people have to pay.

Mr. BOGGS. U.S. wholesale and consumer prices have remained more stable in the last 2 years than those of any other major industrial country on earth, except Canada.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the figures will show that that is not a true statement. The President used that, I might say, last year in his TV address to the Nation. I took the floor of the House to put the correct figures in. I think that we should have the correct figures from the Consumer Price Index. Then anyone can see that that is not a true statement.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, let us consider some of these figures in more detail.

First, the $7.7 billion reduction in defense expenditures.

There would be an immediate loss of three Army Reserve divisions. There would be a real reduction in the Army's ability to provide modern equipment for the remaining forces.

The Nation's ability to react to such crises as the Cuban threat would be sharply reduced. The general capability of the United States to project its power quickly into strategic situations around the world would be reduced.

The Navy's ability to wage antisubmarine warfare would be crippled—as would its capability of maintaining the Polaris submarine force at a level needed to accomplish its deterrent purpose.

The shipbuilding and ship conversion program would be reduced by one-fourth.

There would be a steep reduction in aircraft procurement for the Navy.

The readiness of the fleet would be impaired.

Our Strategic Air Force would be cut back.

The Minuteman missile force would face curtailment at a time when the Soviet Union is continuing to build its intercontinental ballistic missile force.

Nine squadrons in our Continental Defense Command would be eliminated, reducing our capability in that area.

Gaps would be created in our perimeter defense.

Tactical Air Force squadrons would be reduced as would our airlift squadrons.

This is a black picture.

This is a gamble with the future of America I am not prepared to take.

We would be handing the Soviet Union a deck stacked against us in any future encounter.

In short, we would be a weakened nation.

The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Miller] has discussed the effect of a cut of $784 million in the space program. Under leave previously obtained I shall merely insert my remarks on that particular point.

The Republican slash would reduce our $5.7 billion space budget by $784 million.

Inevitably, a cut this size would have to hit our effort to be the first nation to land on the moon.

The reason is simply that the biggest chunks of our space budget are for projects such the the three-man Apollo spacecraft which would make the landing, and for advanced boosters like Saturn V, which will send Apollo toward the moon.

A total of $1.2 billion has been budgeted for Apollo, and $733 million for Saturn, our workhorse in space.

No money could be cut from Project Mercury, which has already put three Americans into orbit, because that effort is nearing completion. And the Gemini project's two-man space efforts are fully planned already, so massive cuts cannot be made there.

The kind of money they are talking about would have to come from Apollo and Saturn V. There is no other possibility.

In all, the Republican cuts would postpone until some time in the 1970's our hopes for landing a man on the moon, and would destroy America's chances of being first in space.

I now insert into the Record a more specific description of the harm that the budget cutters would do to the space program. This is insert No. 4.

Now let us examine another area where the Republican ax would cut deeply: natural resources.

The reduction there would be $357 million.

The Corps of Engineers would sustain a $149 million slash.

This is an operation dear to the hearts of all Congressmen, as can be seen by the record.

Construction projects totaling $23.7 million would be eliminated. These include 32 major projects and 38 small projects.

Another 44 major projects—scheduled for construction this year—would be deleted, saving an estimated $97 million.

And contract awards on some projects already underway would be held up, saving another $28 million.

I remind the House that these Republican savers would not only kill vital projects, but for every $30,000 they chop from the Corps of Engineers budget, our calculations show that they will place one more American on the unemployed list—a list that is a costly moral and financial burden for this Nation.

A more detailed summary of this phase is now inserted into the Record. This is insert No. 5.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORHEAD. I want to commend the gentleman for pointing out that these cuts are cuts in really the muscle or indispensable functions of government. The gentleman would, of course, support cuts in expenditures that were not necessary, of the type the Secretary of Defense described in his testimony before the Joint Economic Committee. He described how he had shaved the defense budget by some $13 billion by improved procedures, how he proposed to save up to $3.4 billion in the future in changes in procedure, in procurement, in further reliance on competitive bids as composed to cost-plus contracts. As a member on the Military Operations Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, I am personally very interested in the efficiencies proposed by the Secretary.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman. He has made a real contribution. Whenever savings can be made that will not cut into the muscle of Government operations of course we are all for them.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I with several other members of that committee have been working long and hard to try to bring some appropriation bills out here that we think will cut to the bone; but this is what we run into.

Item after item after item comes in from these various agencies increasing this year's budget over last year as the result of acts of this Congress. These are new services required of these agencies, and they bring us the bill for them. When I check back on the record I find that most of the items we are forced to add to the appropriation bills this year passed unanimously.

Who is trying to kid the American people? Are these folks who are trying to make these cuts in the budget really sincere? If they are, why were they not around here when some of these bills that force us to raise the budget passed the House without opposition? The way it figures out, because of the acts of the last Congress we are going to have to increase this year's budget by $2.5 billion, just to break even this year with what we did last year, and that takes no account of the increase in the mail volume and other things over which the Government has no control.

It seems to me that when a charge is made here that this increase is irresponsible it is a reflection on the Committee on Appropriations. Having worked on that committee for several years, I know of no group in or out of Congress more responsible for bringing responsible bills before the Congress than that committee. I think they are the most expert of all. I fail to see how we can pass bill after bill after bill requiring extra costs to the Government, without any opposition, and then expect appropriation bills to come in cut below what they were the year before. I think that is so foolish, such a fake idea, that there is going to be a lot of budget cutting when it is impossible to do it, that I think that idea is not going to take with the American people. When you analyze the budget and the acts of the Congress that require these expenditures, you will find that 75 percent of them are not for the committee to cut. We are all for economy, but the most foolish economy is to be penny wise and pound foolish. I hope this House does not do anything like that.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our distinguished majority leader for having brought this entire subject of the budget into such clear and sharp focus.

Most of us would like nothing better than to be able somehow to reduce the cost of government dramatically if it were possible to do so without causing truly essential Government services to suffer.

Unfortunately, it is not easy. In fact, really spectacular reductions in the operating expenses of our Government could be achieved only at the price of rather severe curtailments in our military strength. This is true because approximately 80 percent of our entire Federal budget goes in one way and another to pay for past wars and to maintain our readiness in the hope that, by being prepared, we can prevent a future war.

Only about 20 cents of the Federal tax dollar remains to perform the entire broad spectrum of wholly nonmilitary Federal activities. This is the first thing we must recognize when we begin to sharpen our budget-cutting scissors.

Certainly it is the responsibility of Congress to eliminate every vestige of waste or extravagance that can be found. Clearly we have the duty to root out as ruthlessly as possible any duplication, overlapping, or inefficiency that can be found.

This we have been doing and will, I am sure, continue to do.

A few years ago, I joined with other Members in the sponsorship of several proposals embodying major recommendations of the Hoover Commission. A number of these bills passed, and we are enjoying today the rather substantial economies they made possible.

The military has made great strides in the consolidation of warehousing space and hundreds of millions have been saved. Disposal of surplus commodities has been toughened up and military procurement practices have been centralized and unified at considerable savings.

Each year since I have been in Congress, the lawmaking branch in its appropriations process has made substantial cuts in certain Presidential budget requests. This has been true in both Republican and Democratic administrations.

Yet the myth persists that a great, uncontrollable orgy of waste is going on. Some people appear to believe that Congress should approach the delicate and difficult and complex business of Federal appropriations with an indiscriminate meat ax rather than with a surgeon's instrument.

Broad and generalized charges are repeated, but the facts do not substantiate them. One such charge has been that our Government is dashing headlong into what its critics call a welfare state. Yet the facts do not bear this out. As a proportion of the Federal budget, welfare type expenditures have declined markedly over the past generation. Just 25 years ago, welfare programs of various types accounted for 44 percent of our total Federal budget. Today, they account for only some 6 or 7 percent.

Another charge has been that the Government is developing what the critics call a vast horde of Federal bureaucrats. Once again, the facts do not support the allegation. In 1946, out of every 1,000 American citizens 19 were civilian employees of the Federal Government. Today, the ratio has been reduced to 13 out of every 1,000. And of this 13, 6 are civilian employees of our armed services.

Unquestionably the basic underlying reason for the size of our Federal budget is the world in which we live. Whether we like it or not, the mantle of world leadership has fallen to our shoulders. For this, we pay a price. It is basically the price of providing the shield and the armor of freedom itself.

Out of each Federal tax dollar, about 61 cents go for our current military effort and for our space effort. We do this because we know that we live in a day when only the strong can stay free.

The next largest single item in the budget is the fixed interest charge on the national debt which claims approximately 11 cents of each Federal tax dollar. Most of this debt, of course, was accumulated during World War II.

A third big item is the veterans program in all its facets, which represents some 6 cents of the tax dollar for those services to widows and orphans, veterans' hospitals, and similar programs by which a grateful Nation has attempted to demonstrate that it appreciates the sacrifices of those who gave of their wholeness in defense of our country.

Add these three together, and the conclusion is unmistakable. War and the continuing competition with world communism account for the lion's share of our Federal outlays. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara is working valiantly to provide a lean, hard-hitting Defense Establishment. He has made remarkable strides in trimming away all the fat that he can find. Yet there is a limit to what can be done in this line while still upholding our military responsibilities. No thinking person wants the Congress to take unnecessary chances with our military strength. We would be derelict in our duty indeed were we to place this land of ours at the mercy of those who have no mercy.

Let us by all means eliminate every item of waste that can be found. But let us not be stampeded into rash actions. Let us proceed in a statesmanlike fashion. Let us keep this matter in its rightful perspective. For it would avail us nothing if we were to save even several billion dollars and let the cause of freedom fail.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his very fine statement. It is in line with the point I am trying to make.

We have heard these statements about the possibility of cutting out $13 billion. Analyze it any way you wish, we cannot do it without hurting national defense and other programs which serve the American people which we cannot afford to cut out.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our distinguished majority leader. The information he brings us is particularly helpful.

I am sure the membership on the majority side is as interested in economy as is any member of the minority. I noticed with some sadness a statement recently in the Wall Street Journal entitled "Economy, Anyone?" And it went on to say:

"Some budget cutters in Congress seek more funds for pet projects."

I noticed with particular interest this particular comment in the Wall Street Journal. They pointed out a simple fact that should be printed with this story. The opening paragraph of this story reads as follows:

> An Indiana Congressman pressures a committee of the House to add $25 million to the budget to help build a deepwater port in his district.

A Virginia lawmaker introduces legislation for a $39 million James Madison memorial building here in the Nation's Capital. Some Virginia economizer is mentioned as seeking a $50 million Patent Office in his own district.

The whole text of this seems to support the idea that these economizers rush to the floor and support economy in the other fellow's district, but even the loudest criers for economy still push for more spending for their own districts, States, or special interests.

One of the economizers from Indiana seeks $25 million of the taxpayers' money for a deepwater port in his district that serves no useful purpose in northern Indiana because Chicago and a number of other ports can adequately take care of the need. This is not economy.

I am deeply saddened that some of my Indiana colleagues on the minority side are not present for I would like to enter into a colloquy with them about this project.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. In connection with these documents that have been mentioned and with special reference to the letter which the minority leader has given such emphasis—the letter from the former President of the United States—some of the distinguished members of the Republican Party, some who have held office in the Republican Party, one of whom was Republican National Committee chairman, have said that these estimates of how much the budget might be cut were way out of line. As a matter of fact, his estimate was about $3 billion, as a practical matter. So it is quite evident that even within the Republican Party they know that this projected cut of $13 billion is wholly unrealistic and actually threatens the security of the United States.

I am glad to see that some of the distinguished members of the Republican Party are in disagreement with the former President.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his statement; and now I would like to continue.

Now let us turn to the Department of the Interior, another operation in which many of us are vitally interested. An estimated $153 million must be cut from that budget if the Republican's $15 billion goal is to be reached—far more than even the deep cuts sought by the appropriations committee last week.

A total of 26,735 man-years of employment would be lost. The budget of the Bureau of Land Management would be reduced by $4.4 million; the National Park Service, by $48.4 million; the Bureau of Reclamation by $27.5 million; the Bureau of Indian Affairs by $34.9 million—and the slashes go down into the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife; the Bonneville Power Administration; and the Southwestern Power Administration.

The Bureau of Land Management would be compelled to kill construction programs planned in a number of States—including Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Wyoming.

The National Park Service would be forced to take similar steps. Work planned in parks in Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands—and other States—work planned in those States would be halted by the Republican budget busters.

The same is true for the other bureaus in the Department of the Interior.

A more detailed listing is now inserted in the Record. This is insert No. 6.

The Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture would have its effectiveness drastically reduced. A detailed breakdown of the effects of the $45 million cut there is now placed in the Record. This is insert No. 7.

Now let us look at the rest of Agriculture.

A 15-percent budget cut must come under the Republican plan.

A total of $5.7 billion of the $7.2 billion agricultural budget request for 1964 must be used for previous commitments.

This leaves only $1.5 billion from which to make the proposed Republican cuts.

Thus, an overall 15-percent cut for the Department as a whole would leave only $511 million for the following programs:

Research, education, soil and water conservation, meat and poultry inspection, plant and animal disease and pest control, marketing services, food distribution, crop insurance, REA loans, and flood protection.

Such a severe cut would mean closing down most research laboratories and disbanding their highly trained staffs.

It would mean cutting Federal support for the Cooperative Extension Services by nearly $1 million a State and firing an average of 700 extension workers in each State, or one or more in each county in the Nation.

It would mean eliminating 38 million acres of soil surveys, about two man-years of technical assistance of each of the 2,900 soil conservation districts, and substantially slowing down 11 major flood prevention projects.

And it would mean:

Eliminating or drastically reducing the 700 crop and livestock estimate reports essential for the computation of parity prices.

Shutting down several hundred Federal meat and poultry inspection houses.

Eliminating electric service to 76,000 new rural customers and new or improved service to 99,000 rural subscribers.

Eliminating crop insurance programs from 700 counties and depriving more than a quarter of a million farmers of crop insurance protection for which they are willing to pay.

Stopping work in the eradication of plant and animal diseases and pest control, such as brucellosis, tuberculosis, hog cholera, cattle tick, Japanese beetle and sweet potato weevil to name a few.

Reducing by $90 million the amount of food distributed through the States to needy persons, including 10 million schoolchildren and more than 5 million persons in institutions and homes.

Reducing the food stamp program assistance by $25 million—enough to assist 200,000 needy persons in 23 economically depressed areas.

Curtailing watershed projects in Michigan and many other States.

At this point, I place insert No. 7 into the Record, giving an itemized description of the harm budget cutters would do to watershed and flood control projects.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I know that the gentleman is going to insert in the Record insertion 5 which details some of the public works projects affected by this cut.

I recall coming here in the 83d Congress. For the first 2 years I sat on the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service. The Public Works Committee at that time was chairmaned by a member of the opposition party. I recall the arguments used in those days about this is no time to have any new starts because we were in the Korean war, and we should not get into these particular projects at that time.

The Congress went along. I joined the Committee on Appropriations 2 years later, and we did start some new projects. I think it is pennywise and pound foolish to have this kind of a program, a program which says we ought to have no new starts because this is not the time to do it. Savage waters and floods are not the respecter of time at all. So we held off building public works projects. I am not talking about deepening harbors, rivers, and the channels of some rivers around the country. I am talking about strictly flood control projects.

So we held off. We did not build the projects. But the storms came. They came in 1955, they came a couple of years thereafter. We lost lives, we lost property, and I say any bill of particulars which details a $145 million slash in the Engineers' budget is risking lives and the protection of property.

There are listed in the gentleman's insertion over 125 projects which will be stopped, either during construction or no new plants.

I think the membership of this House ought to go slow in this particular area. There are many other areas, too, with which I am concerned, the area with respect to the accelerated public works program, the Housing Home Agency programs. I sit on the subcommittee that makes money available to the agency, and I sit on the committee that makes available money for the Federal Aviation Agency. I am happy to see the distinguished and great chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce sitting here. The bill of particulars will cut $111 million from this agency. Detailed for expenditure in fiscal 1964 is $755 million for the Federal Aviation Agency. Of that figure $127 million goes toward facilities and equipment. That is, the kind of things that make air traffic safe in the United States. When you start to cut these you get into an area where I think you endanger the lives and property of people who fly on these planes and the people who live underneath them.

I think this dialogue is good, not for the purpose of getting into an argument with the party of opposition but only for the purpose of letting the people of America know that there are areas detailed by the opposition that are dangerous areas in which to cut.

I hope that the membership of the House will read this dialogue and the insertions that the distinguished majority leader will put in here in detail, showing the areas that will be cut if we would follow the advice of the distinguished former President of the United States and also some of those who serve in this body.

I think it is a record that the people of this Nation ought to read, and the membership of this House ought to read.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his very splendid contribution to this discussion.

And now let us consider the $796 million reduction in the area of health, labor, and welfare.

A total of $697 million would be chopped out of the budget of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department.

The Food and Drug Administration would have its capacity to protect consumers reduced sharply. Its ability to implement and enforce the new drug safeguards would be hit a body blow.

The Republican ax would drop on the Nation's schoolchildren.

Literally millions of youngsters would be deprived of school lunch and milk programs.

By whacking $39 million out of the $284 million of new authority requested for these programs, we would be forced to cut them by 14 percent.

The results:

There will be 381 million fewer meals served to schoolchildren.

There will be 417 million fewer half-pints of milk distributed.

The lunch program will drop 2.2 million children, an average of 40,000 per State.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I want to particularly commend the gentleman for his comments on this point. There are three areas that the gentleman comments on which particularly deserve attention. The first is the item which the gentleman discussed in regard to the proposal of our Republican brothers to reduce the food stamp program which would be required by the projected cuts and eliminate some 200,000 needy persons in 23 economically depressed areas. This would be a cruelty and a hardship on these people of almost unbelievable dimensions and deprive these people in a very real sense of a good, wholesome, and stable diet. More than this, it would impose a terrific additional servitude on the welfare payments of these communities which are forced to bear the load and the hardship which these agencies have to carry. Now, over and above this is another item of particular importance, and that is, from what our Republican brothers have indicated, it becomes plain that there would be a reduction, according to their plans, in the force of the Food and Drug Administration to protect the consumers. This is a particularly sensitive area. During the last session of the Congress we passed legislation which imposed a tremendous responsibility on the Food and Drug Administration which, coupled with previous enactments dealing with food additives and with color additives and now with additional policing responsibility in the field of drugs, requires a tremendous increase in the staff of the Food and Drug Administration to provide the level of protection that is needed.

The Food and Drug Administration requires this money not only to protect the people but to give industry the kind of service it requires, to see to it that the industry has the kind of quick service and the quick clearance of these substances which enables industry to make changes and which would enable the industry to market the products at an accelerated rate, possibly new drugs, which might result in a tremendous saving of life, and to give the Food and Drug Administration the kind of staff, technically competent staff, to accept or to reject new drugs which may have side effects of the most dreadful sort upon those who would receive them. This is one of the things that was particularly obvious in the drug hearings in the Senate and in our own committee in the last session of the Congress, and that is lack of adequate personnel. The Food and Drug Administration is incapable of giving the people of this country the kind of protection they need and giving the industry the kind of service it needs unless they have adequate personnel. Over and above this, which I think is particularly important, is the direct action that the Republican projected program would have on young people. For example, it can be anticipated from their program, as the gentleman pointed out, that something like $16.9 million in cash payments to the States, an average of about $300,000 per State, would be eliminated from the school lunch program. Many of our children in this country today have no opportunity to have a good, warm lunch, sufficiently balanced and good in body except that which they receive through their school lunch program. This is something else that our Republican friends would do to us and do to the people in every part of the country in their pennywise and pound-foolish advocacy of reduction, so I particularly commend my friend for his comments today.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes, briefly.

Mr. CURTIS. It is hard to have those wild statements go by unchallenged. Of course, you can dream up everything that is most attractive to the public such as the school lunch program and say that the Republicans are out to wipe it out. There is no evidence of that. There are no plans along those lines.

Mr. Speaker, I might say, and I will have my 20 minutes to respond, what we are trying to do is to hold the budget and expenditures to the level of fiscal year 1963, which reflects an increase of $18 billion in a period of 3 years in Federal expenditures, from $81 billion, as compared to an $11 billion increase in the previous 6 years. Here is what we are trying to do, and to bring out these very attractive programs you are demonstrating exactly, I might say to the majority leader, why it is necessary to keep within our own confines our itemizations, otherwise you will stir up every pressure group in the United States to try to prevent it.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I want to point out that the cutback of funds for the food stamp program would have dreadful effects in my community. We are about to commence the program on May 1. Some 68,000 recipients of this program in my community are waiting for the benefits which are going to supplement their very low relief allocations.

Mr. Speaker, in my community as a result of the policies of the State government which is not responding to the needs of the local communities, the family allowances for relief have been cut back to 60 percent of the need. This matter of the food stamp supplementation is absolutely imperative. We are one of the new communities involved in this program. We would suffer dreadfully if it were cut back at this time.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in order to reorient this discussion and to bring it back to the issue with which it was begun, I would like again to quote from the Washington Post, which purportedly on March 5 published the account of a Republican task force press session, and this is the quote:

> A House Republican study group announced yesterday that it has found projects costing $10 billion to $15 billion which can and should be cut from appropriations requested for next year.

Now, of course, that means that from $10 billion to $15 billion has got to give from somewhere in the budget. What I have been trying to do is to apply such cuts to the President's budget.

Mr. Speaker, I see the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in the Chamber, and I would like to say that the Federal Aviation Agency would suffer a cut of $111 million, eliminating over 1,100 operating and planned facilities required for the safety of air traffic control if a total cut of $15 billion is applied to that Agency.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to also join in complimenting our distinguished majority leader in bringing to the attention of the House this realistic discussion of this highly sensitive and what has been so well described as complicated national budget.

The gentleman mentioned something about proposed reductions in our Federal aviation program. I have not seen the bill of particulars. I do not know just what services are to be reduced. I am concerned about any attempted reduction in the total funds to the extent mentioned by our distinguished majority leader affecting this service, because I think we should remind ourselves, each one of us, that not only are the lives of millions and millions of people who utilize the commercial airlines services of this country, but it has only been 4 years ago or a little more that, in an effort to try to bring about greater safety, authority to control the military aviation program was given to the Federal Aviation Agency and a substantial part of the funds to which the gentleman refers here is made necessary because of the increased responsibility that has been shifted from our military program to the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. Speaker, I think each one of us had better give long and careful and thoughtful consideration before we attempt to do anything that would endanger the lives of our people who are going to use these services. Whether we like it or not, they are going to use them in the future, and I for one will be watching what happens. I am confident that the Committee on Appropriations is going to take that into consideration, as did the gentleman from Massachusetts a moment ago so well expressed in his comments to the Members of the House.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his very fine contribution.

Twelve thousand schools, child-care centers, summer camps, and other nonprofit groups will be dropped from the milk program, an average of over 250 per State.

For the benefit of our Republican colleagues, I will present the financial savings to the Federal Government.

We would save $16.9 million in cash payments to States—an average of more than $300,000 a State—on the lunch program; and $14.2 million—an average of $284,000—on the milk program. I, for one, will not look upon those savings with pride.

A $50 million reduction in the Department of Labor budget would reduce appropriations for State employment services by $25 million, thus destroying 4,800 jobs. Also, it would cut $25 million from the Manpower Development and Training Act, thus preventing 22,400 workers from getting retraining. I insert a State-by-State breakdown of these disastrous economies into the RECORD. This is insert No. 8.

I turn to the field of commerce and transportation, where the Republican reduction must total $424 million.

ARA was established to eliminate pockets of depression that affect 35 million people in 1,000 areas. The 15-percent reduction in the Department of Commerce budget would reduce the allocation for the Area Redevelopment Administration by $28.5 million. This would mean 10,000 fewer jobs would be created in 1964. The regions hardest hit by this job killing are listed in insert No. 9, hereby placed into the RECORD.

A total of $500 million needed to supplement the existing accelerated public works program would be cut. Looking at this supplemental appropriation, we see that for every million dollars deleted from this program, 1,600 man-months of employment are lost.

The $500 million would provide approximately 120,000 man-years of employment. If we turn our backs on this appropriation, we turn our backs on communities that have already drawn plans for needed public works projects. We turn our backs on the unemployed because they are concentrated in those areas.

A State-by-State list of past accelerated public works achievements is hereby inserted into the RECORD. This is insert No. 10.

Ship construction would be cut by $16.5 million.

A total of $37 million would be cut from the Weather Bureau, from the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and other agencies that provide scientific information essential to transportation—particularly aviation—and our defense and space programs. Details of this $37 million cut are listed in insert No. 11, now placed in the RECORD.

The budget of the Federal Aviation Agency would be cut by $111 million, eliminating over 1,100 operating and planned facilities required for the safety of air traffic.

Communities like West Chicago, Ill.; Evansville, Ind.; Abilene, Tex.; and Utica, N.Y., would be among the 100 American communities where airport traffic control towers would be closed out.

Seventy instrument landing systems and 50 approach light systems also would be destroyed.

Elimination of radar procedures designed to prevent midair collision would be forced.

And hundreds of communities would be deprived of Federal assistance in making airport improvements.

The aviation industry contributes nearly $12 billion annually to the gross national product. It depends upon public confidence. I now place a list of the GOP targets into the RECORD. This is insert No. 12.

And now let us talk about the Post Office Department and its modest $78 million prorated reduction.

The effect of that reduction will be felt in Grand Rapids, Mich.; in Canton, Ohio; in Rensselaer, Ind.; in Pekin, Ill.; in Nashville, Tenn.; in Chicago, in Detroit, in San Francisco, in New York City, in Boston, in Denver—in other cities and towns across the nation.

Extension of daily city delivery service to approximately 1 million new homes and small businesses which normally would receive such service would stop.

Rural delivery service would be frozen through fiscal 1964, and all Saturday rural deliveries would be stopped.

The day-to-day handling of mail in every major city in the United States would be seriously crippled due to no further purchases of all mail-handling equipment, such as postage meters, facer cancelers.

The Post Office Department's research and engineering program would be wiped out.

Let us look at another vital governmental function, one that would suffer a $50 million slash in the Republican bloodletting.

The Coast Guard would be compelled to make its reductions in its replacement budget because of fixed items in other categories.

In other words, replacement of obsolescent ships, buildings, and other facilities would be halted.

The Coast Guard's ability to perform its functions would be threatened, as indicated by insert No. 13, which I now place in the RECORD.

Another small, but vital agency is the Small Business Administration.

Its prorated share of the Republican cut would be $30 million.

Many field and regional offices would be closed. For example, offices in Maine, Virginia, and Texas would be shut down.

Its loans to small businesses would be reduced, both in size and volume. It could accept no more loan applications for fiscal year 1964. Its relationship with commercial banks would be damaged.

Insert No. 14, a list of areas that could be hit by an SBA cut, is placed into the RECORD.

The Civil Aeronautics Board would be compelled to make its $10 million slash by eliminating airline subsidies for flight frequencies, so fares would be jacked up.

Let us discuss the effect of a $55 million reduction in the housing and community development activities of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

This would mean a one-third reduction in public facility loans, in loans for housing for the elderly, and in loans to families dislocated by Federal projects.

This would mean that 70 small communities would be deprived of financial assistance in construction of essential water and sewer systems.

It would mean that 15 projects for the elderly—with facilities for 1,650 housing units—would be deleted.

And the cut in the loans for persons displaced by urban renewal and other Federal aid projects would mean that 2,250 families could not obtain financing they need for homes. Again, there is a group that needs help the most, would be hurt the most.

Mr. Speaker, we move to another major category:

Education, which would be reduced by $242 million.

Vocational education would be cut in half.

National defense fellowships would be reduced from 1,500 to 750.

Cooperative research programs would be cut by 69 percent.

The assistance to libraries would be cut in half.

Training of teachers for the mentally retarded would be curtailed.

The slash of $81 million in the National Science Foundation would be a blow to our requirements for highly trained technical manpower.

And I want to say parenthetically here—as the President pointed out in his message to Congress on education on last January 29—that Soviet institutions of higher learning are graduating three times as many engineers and four times as many physicians as we are.

Thousands of promising students would be deprived of fellowships they need to continue their education.

Expansion and modernization of science and engineering facilities would be halted.

The training of teachers would be slowed at a time when they will be needed to meet the demands caused by the enrollment in colleges of the 1946 baby boom.

Vital research programs would be stalled.

The college housing program would be curtailed by $41 million, resulting in cancellation of 30 college housing projects. This would mean that about 8,000 students may be denied a college education because of a shortage of dormitory space.

Construction of schools for our Indian population would be hard hit. In Alaska, for example, construction of eight schools by the Bureau of Indian Affairs would be called off. Others would be blocked in Arizona.

Now for another major area: international affairs and finance. The total reduction here would be $620 million.

Of that figure, $476 million would come out of the Agency for International Development—and this is substantially more than any reasonable review of that budget would permit.

The State Department would be cut $50 million, U.S. Information Agency by $30 million, the food-for-peace program by $30 million, and the Peace Corps budget by $15 million.

Now let us examine the effect on the Veterans' Administration.

A prorated $740 million reduction in appropriations for the Veterans' Administration—its share of the proposed $15 billion reduction—would have these effects:

First. Twenty-two thousand, nine hundred and sixty-five jobs would be cut out.

Second. Many regional offices would be abolished. Divisions in others would have to be consolidated.

Third. Services would be reduced because of the reduced personnel. Work could not be processed as it should. Huge backlogs would develop.

Fourth. The loss of physicians, medical administrators, engineers, nurses, statisticians, and other professional or skilled employees would hamper present medical programs, hinder planning.

Fifth. A 50-percent decrease in the medical research program would result in dismissal of 1,500 skilled research people. Their activities include research in medicine, surgery, psychiatry, neurology, problems of the aging, and pulmonary diseases. Research would be eliminated or curtailed in cancer, arteriosclerosis, use of tranquilizers in psychiatry, coronary heart disease surgery, and the automatic processing of heart tracings.

Sixth. Eight hospitals would be closed, eliminating medical care for 30,000 patients.

Seventh. Construction of seven new hospitals with 5,260 beds would be deferred. Modernization of 15 old hospitals with 18,088 beds would be delayed, as would 41 improvement projects in 37 other hospitals. No new research facilities would be built.

Eighth. No commitments would be made to help provide loans on 19,700 homes in areas of short money supply.

Ninth. Payments to 800,000 of the Nation's pensioners with service-connected disabilities would be eliminated. Pensions to 1 million disabled veterans and 800,000 widows and orphans would be cut by $60 a year.

Tenth. An estimated 200,000 veterans would be denied admission to hospitals during the year. This load would be shifted to already overtaxed State and local hospitals.

The loss of VA employees would include these positions:

Medical administration and miscellaneous: 165 positions, including 57 construction specialists.

Medical and prosthetic research: 1,500 skilled investigators.

Medical care: 18,500 employees, including 2,200 nurses and 900 physicians.

Insert No. 15, now placed in the RECORD, provides a clear idea of the cities and towns hardest hit by curtailment of the Veterans' Administration hospital program.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the excellent speech being made by the majority leader has pointed up in many, many cases the fundamental weakness in this shotgun approach which has been adopted from the other side of the aisle with regard to the proposed budget reduction.

While each and every one of us has a stake in seeing that sensible reductions are made, I think we have an equally important stake in seeing that we keep faith with the people of America in the obligations which we have undertaken. And certainly this field which has just been mentioned by the distinguished majority leader of the effect upon our Veterans' Administration program is an excellent example of this.

If we go down the line with the proposed reductions to include the Veterans' Administration program in it, if we cut off the needed new hospital facilities that must be built to meet the requirements of our veteran population, if we cut down upon the services which are essential to the veterans, to the pensioners who are dependent upon the assistance from the Government for their very livelihood, if we take these steps in the veterans program certainly we break faith with the veterans of America just as we would be breaking faith with the schools of America and with the small communities of America and with the States of America if we cut back upon programs to which this Government has become firmly committed.

The proposed $15 billion cut would require inevitably a breach of faith with the American people upon more than a score of different vital fronts in our country.

I certainly join the gentleman in the hope that we will have this so-called bill of particulars at the earliest possible hour.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank my colleague for his fine contribution.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I am sure it is pretty clear from what is being said on this side that the Members here do not object to cutting the budget. What has been done with respect to the bill we had on the floor today indicates that. Here is the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations where the budget was cut by the committee some 9 percent. I am certain the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill that will be here on Thursday will contain not a light cut but a substantial reduction. I am sure this will hold true in a number of areas.

Those of us who sit on the Committee on Appropriations are screening all of the requests of the various agencies. There is not a question about the fact that we will bring bills to this floor here that will have substantial cuts. But when they talk about a $10- to $15-billion cut, then they get up to the stratosphere. This is absolutely unreasonable. This is fiscal irresponsibility.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Edmondson] a moment ago pointed to the cut in the Veterans' Administration budget. The budget for the Veterans' Administration this year amounts to about $5.3 billion. At least two-thirds of that budget is composed of fixed charges, compensations and pensions, the money that we pay to educate the GI's. All of this is occasioned by legislation passed almost unanimously by this House. When you cut $740 million out of this budget you are really hurting this agency.

The high in employment in the Veterans' Administration occurred in 1946 when the Veterans' Administration reported 226,000 employees. This year, that figure has been reduced substantially. The Veterans' Administration in 1963 reported total employment of 173,000. I think this is good. This is action by both sides of the aisle. I have no quarrel with that. I say it is good. But I do say that those who believe this budget can be cut from $10 to $15 billion place a sense of irresponsibility on the Members who serve on the Committee on Appropriations. I think that committee has shown it does a good job wehn the job has to be done. The bills brought to this floor by the subcommittees and the full Committee on Appropriations will show that there is real responsibility on the part of the Members who serve on that committee, both on this side and the other side.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. The point I want to make, and I think the gentleman has made it clearly, is that if you make this 10-percent cut, which would involve not adding any new obligational authority, then, if you cut 10 percent from a $108-billion budget you have a cut of from $10 to $15 billion. Let the Appropriations Committee continue as it did today and drop it out, and we have our answer.

Mr. BOLAND. The problem is, and I think the gentleman from Missouri recognizes it, is that you cannot go into a meat-ax approach by just cutting 10 percent. The members of the Committee on Appropriations and all Members who sit in this Chamber will cut where the cuts ought to come. But when you say willy-nilly we are going to cut 10 percent, this is a bad approach. I think you have to place some faith in the members of the Committee on Appropriations and you have to trust their judgment. This will happen in connection with all of the bills that will be brought to the floor, but this committee is not going to sit down and say, "We will knock 10 percent off here and 10 percent off there and 10 percent off the total amount." You just cannot do it. That is fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree with that. All I am pointing out is that the Committee on Appropriations did cut this 10 percent, and if we project it across the $108 billion request for new obligational authority you have your $11 billion.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, on that point, and I think it is highly important, the second appropriation bill, which has just been reported and is being scheduled for consideration Thursday, contains a reduction of only 2 or 3 percent. That total would be a fraction of 1 percent of the total Federal budget.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman's point is well taken.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. This is the very essence of what we are talking about. With reference to this idea of an across-the-board cut, you have to start off by admitting that you cannot cut the interest on the national debt. You cannot cut it 10 percent. You cannot cut it 5 percent. You cannot cut it 1 percent. You cannot cut it at all.

Now if you apply 10 percent to the Defense Establishment, 10 percent of $55 billion would be $5½ billion. That would be sheer folly.

The gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, just talked about using the meatax on agencies like the Federal Aviation Agency which would mean cutting out the aviation control towers and radar equipment and the other things that make it possible for you to fly safely.

So I predict—and I saw the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Halleck] with a brown envelope under his arm, and I am sorry he is not here—he talked about a bill of particulars, which was a great secret. We counted on a bill of particulars from the Republicans. But it is going to be just like the gentleman in the other body pointed out this morning, the recommendation of our distinguished former President Eisenhower is drastic and is not responsive to the conditions of the day.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, this is probably the first time that a woman ever had any difficulty in getting the last word on something.

I would like to associate myself with Congressman Boggs, that the Committee on Appropriations worked very hard to cut items. More than 50 people appeared in public hearings. Fifty members of the public, and not one person appearing offered any cuts nor did they offer any opportunity to make cuts nor did they show any desire for cuts. And when certain items were not included in the appropriation bill, they informed various of us Members that they were going over to the other body to have them put in over there. I may say that these people who want these research facilities and so on added to the bill are not Democrats. We would enjoy having them, but we know that there are certain limitations.

I do want to point out one thing. Mr. Boland has discussed the harbors and flood control programs. I want to say that on the west coast, we face the problem of keeping our trade facilities always in order. Many of us last year were able to support a trade bill because a great part of our district is based on trade. Of course, it is necessary to carry

on that trade through the ever-protective work on the harbors and rivers, particularly in the channel deepening programs. In my own district and in Mrs. Green's district and in the rest of Oregon, and in the upper river it is necessary to have channel deepening in order to bring in any shipping whatsoever. If you curtail that shipping, you are curtailing the economy of our section of the country, and you will be putting more people out of work than are out of work at the present time. So I am very happy, may I say to the distinguished majority leader, that you are calling these facts to our attention today. I do not think the people in the West would for a moment want to go along on any program that would prevent the deepening of the Columbia River or the improvement of the harbors which mean more trade.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentlewoman very much for the very fine statement she has made.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I am sorry to interfere with the majority leader's exercise, but I would like to ask one question. I would like to be clear on this: Have you or any members of your party seen this so-called bill of particulars?

Mr. ALBERT. I have not. We have asked for it. The Speaker of the House has asked the Republican task force to produce it, but up to now it has not been produced.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I have not seen it either, but the reason I asked the question of the distinguished majority leader is simply this. As I have listened to the exercise put on by the majority leader and his people, I have been under the impression that they had seen it and that they were specifically rebutting the Republican position. In other words, if they do not know what the Republican position is, how can they rebut the Republican position? I am really confused about that.

Mr. ALBERT. The answer to that is simply this. A task force purportedly issued a press release in which it stated up to $15 billion could be cut. We have applied that cut across the agencies and these are the results—that is all there is to it. That is all there is to it.

Mr. CLEVELAND. You people have done the prorating. You have not seen the bill of particulars.

Mr. ALBERT. We have no other way to approach the problem. We have done this in a pro rata way in those places where fixed budgetary items are not included.

Mr. CLEVELAND. It is your pro rata, it is not the Republican pro rata. You have not seen the bill of particulars.

Mr. ALBERT. No, it is prorating a very big Republican estimate.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. The point is that every Republican statement we have had except the statement made by the two gentlemen from the other body to whom I referred a moment ago talked about a cut of from $10 to $15 billion. They were ridiculous. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Jensen], if my recollection serves me correctly, said the budget could be cut between $10 and $15 billion, while former President Eisenhower in the letter which the minority leader put into such great circulation and which I have put in the Record, said it was between $10 and $12 billion. We asked the minority leader for a bill of particulars.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the majority leader for his very excellent presentation of a very important matter. I do not know of any matter that so deeply affects this great Nation of ours than does this legislative budget.

To make a meat-ax cut of $15 billion is not only going to severely hurt the defense of this Nation of ours, but will affect the lives of all our people, every segment of our economy, and this indirectly will be harmful throughout the free world.

I listened very attentively to the chairman of the Space Subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. Miller]. He talked about what the setback to the space program would be. I think we learned a terrible and a devastating lesson when we got behind with our missile program by waiting and cutting back the budget and letting the Russians get ahead of us with sputnik.

This particular so-called Republican $15 billion cut, this meat-ax approach would cut almost a billion dollars out of agriculture. But getting back to our space program, in 15 States they would cut something like 65,000 jobs, where 65,000 people would be taken from jobs where people are now employed.

They are working on this vast scientific program right now. They will be told: "Well, we have spent a lot of money getting ready in this program, but you cannot work any longer, you are cut back, you are curtailed"; "the Republican budget meat ax got your job." In my own home State of Louisiana some 6,000 employees would be dismissed from the Saturn project at the vast Michand plant in New Orleans and Slidell, which is one of the most important, and so regarded by all the scientists in America and throughout the entire world, as one of the most important space projects at this period in the entire world. This project will send men to the moon unless the budget is cut.

There are some 15 or 16 States that are directly affected, and many more indirectly affected in this space program where present employees would be discharged with this Republican budget cut.

This idea of people coming up here and saying that they are for economy in Government and for cutting useless expenditures is not a monopoly. I think there are just as many Democrats on this side who are for economy in Government as there are Republicans on that side. But on the other hand you have to realize that this is a great Nation and that we are fighting for our own survival to continue as a great free Nation. If we are going to do that we are going to have to take care of our national defense. Why, when you talk about a $15 billion cut, why do you not say $25 billion? Why do you not make it $50 billion? It is just as easy to say "cut $50 billion" as it is to say "cut $15 billion." You Republicans can go back home and tell your folks the situation as it has been outlined here and tell them that you were for cutting it back $50 billion but were not successful; it will be just as easy to use the figure $50 billion as it is to use the figure $15 billion. You have got to face reality and you have to face it when you say $15 billion. And to make that much of a cutback you are going to hurt and severely damage the defense of these United States, you are going to hurt the farmers of this Nation, you are going to cut back practically every farm program, every flood control program and every forestry program and on and on cutting out so many vastly needed programs.

With this $15 billion meat-ax approach you Republicans would cut almost a billion dollars from our farm program.

In other words, if you do that, under the name of economy, you are going to take it right off the skin of the farmers' backs. That is where it is coming from. At the same time you are taking funds that should go into the development of our natural resources and reforestation, taking care of our forests and improving our Nation.

You Republicans say we should not have this unemployment in one breath and then you say in the next breath you want a meat-ax curtailment of $15 billion so you will have thousands more unemployed. If you have any consistency at all in your soul you have got to admit you are advocating more and more unemployment, doing a far greater disservice to the unemployment problem than you are in trying to solve it.

I represent the city of Baton Rouge, La., that just got a $5 million post office and Federal Court Building. We have been waiting for 10 years for that. Those postal employees have been working in the back yard and when it rained they had to get a tarpaulin and put it over the back of the place. They asked me for years why the delay? I told them that we can get only a few new buildings each year in the United States. They say we have to cut the budget, cut down the appropriations. So we just have a few new buildings each year. This Federal building that went to Baton Rouge, capital of the State, was 10 years overdue.

I think there are only 20 such buildings authorized by the Congress this past session, yet over 200 cities in America have qualified for the same type of building, depending upon the proportion and size of each city. Yet of the 200 cities that were eligible only 20 cities got a public building, the other 180 had to wait.

You say wait. Wait for what? How long are we going to have to wait? You get only 20 out of 200. A lot of us will not be around when that last city on the list finally gets its building, a Federal building or post office, that it desperately needs now. And if you cut this budget we will not get the 20 that were recently authorized.

I just want to read off a few that will be canceled. There are Republicans as well as Democrats who live in these States and cities where you are going to get disastrous results if you cut $15 billion. You are going to cut construction of so many buildings. This cut would force the GSA to drop the following construction projects:

Arizona—Tucson—$344,000. You just will not let them have a $344,000 building that is already programed.

Arkansas—Pine Bluff—Post office and courthouse, $2,391,000. Gone with the budget cut.

California—Fresno—Courthouse and Federal office building, $5,400,000. Same.

Idaho—Boise—Courthouse and Federal office building, $7,500,000. Same.

That's just a few—there are many more in other States that will be eliminated also.

And there are others in every part of the country, including those that need it the most.

Cleveland, Ohio, needs a much larger building, and they certainly need it badly, but with this $15 billion cut theirs is eliminated also.

The idea is if you are going to take the meat-ax approach, and you chop so many people up, it does not make any difference what city is affected or what part of the country it is, how bad it is needed or what it is needed for; your building just vanishes into the thin air with the budget cut.

I want to say something when it comes to the defense of the country. I do not think anybody on either side of the aisle has a monopoly on patriotism or a monopoly on economy. I think I am just as much for economy or as patriotic as any Member of Congress.

I can remember when economy was practiced a little bit too much; it was before I came to Congress. Some Members took the meat-ax approach by saying, "Why should we fortify Guam?" Those that voted against fortifying Guam, some did not get reelected when Pearl Harbor came along. It was a terrible lesson and those who want to use the meat-ax $15-billion-budget-cut approach can profit by the failure to fortify Guam in the early 1940's because some thought then it was more important to both balance and cut the budget than to fortify Guam.

And who does not want to help the farmer? I think many of us sincerely want to help the farmer, but how can some help the farmer by wanting to curtail his program and at the same time try to make the farmer believe that you are helping him? So, the farmer has his product going out the gate and everybody makes a profit out of it as it goes to the market to the final consumer. But, what about the farmer who has produced it? Who is protecting him? It is not the people that want to cut $15 billion in a meat-ax approach on this appropriation bill and on the agricultural appropriation bill, where flood control, reforestation, watershed, and many agricultural projects will be cut almost a billion dollars.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MORRISON. I say in conclusion, and I beg your pardon for using so much of your time, here you can see just exactly the people that say they want to help the farmer. Well, here is a chance to keep their word and see that the program is not curtailed and see that this almost $1 billion is not meat-axed out of it, which would set the farmer, the farm program, and the people of this country back years and years with such a disastrous result that we could probably never overcome our devastation.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I have been very interested in the valiant attempt of our great majority leader to elicit from our friends across the aisle on the minority side the most closely guarded top secret in Washington which apparently is, What is the content of this $15 billion budget cut?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, that is the only secret that has not leaked out in Washington in recent weeks.

Mr. REUSS. That seems to be true, and I have been trying for the life of me to see how this secret can be so well kept. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this $15 billion cut is apparently the brainchild of the six-man Republican task force, and I also call the gentleman's attention to a story which appeared just a day or two ago in the Wall Street Journal, certainly not a Democratic paper, in which it says that of the six-man House Republican task force masterminding force, to cut the President's money request, four Members have been urging additional unbudgeted funds to the appropriation bills that we are now considering. I ask the gentleman, could it be that the reluctance of the minority leadership to disclose the $15 billion figure is because 66⅔ percent, 4 out of 6, of the Republican task force, are apparently budget busters themselves?

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman answers his own question.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I wanted only to add to the colloquy that has been going on between the distinguished majority leader and others my own personal experience that is analogous to what the gentleman from Wisconsin has just said, because last week I went back home to the second largest city in my congressional district to announce the site of a new post office in that district which the people of that community, especially the members of the business community, had long been trying to get and had not been able to, although having a Republican President and a Republican Congressman had still not been able to bring to fruition.

But I was happy to be able to announce that they were going to get this new post office. One of the reasons I had pointed out was that I had had such great support in my own efforts from members of the business community and especially members of the chamber of commerce of this particular community.

I pointed out at a chamber of commerce-sponsored luncheon last Friday in the city of Elkhart, Ind., the fact that I had had a lot of letters from some members of that organization urging that we cut the President's budget, but I had not had one single letter from any citizen of that community and specifically from any member of the Elkhart, Ind., Chamber of Commerce, urging that the item for the construction of a new post office in Elkhart, Ind., should be deleted.

Mr. Speaker, I could cite other instances which have to do with other Members of this body in other districts, but I shall restrain myself and give only this personal instance of the example to which my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss] has already made reference.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman for a brief statement.

Mr. HALL. I would like to say to the majority leader that I am not nearly as enthusiastic about the exercise of the gentleman and his cohorts as some of the Members on the other side of the aisle have been, nor would I predict, with a 3-to-2 majority on the other side of the aisle, the outcome of the various task forces. But I would certainly say that this is one of the best organized fishing expeditions that I have ever seen.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the majority leader that the armed services procurement bill has already passed. That record will stand on its own and for itself.

Mr. Speaker, I regret the invective and the inferences that have been used about an across-the-board, meat-ax type of cut. Although realizing that this is the wrong bait in the fishing expedition, I will say that the task force will in due time, as the distinguished minority leader has said, bring out these various items to prove to the satisfaction of the people of our Nation the differential between the President of our Nation's speech on a Monday in January in his state of the Union message, and its utter inconsistencies the following Thursday in the budget message.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if an effort to cut $10 to $15 billion is successful, it will be a real threat to our economic stability.

It would mean more people out of work at a time when unemployment still is a critical problem.

It would be an economic shock and depressant at a time when the economy needs a stimulant.

It would mean that a policy of America last would prevail.

An America last in economic growth.

An America last in education.

An America last in defense.

An America last in assistance to its young people.

In the world today, in the competition with the Soviet Union, an America second is an America last.

We cannot afford to be anything but first.

Our freedom, our safety, our security, and the security of the free world depend upon our being first in defense, first in space, first in education, first in medical care, first in all things vital to the fabric of a great nation.

They would hamstring our space effort. "Why rush to the moon?" they ask.

They are like the skeptics who scoffed at Christopher Columbus. They are like the short-range seers of that day who informed Columbus with a knowing smile that the earth was flat and that he would surely come tumbling off the edge if he persisted in sailing on.

They are the ones who looked at the tiny light that traced the path of Russia's first satellite and said, "Why worry about basketballs in the sky?"

I turn to the prorated $312 million reduction in general government.

A total of $114 million would be lopped off the Treasury budget.

The first effect would be the loss of something like $600 million in taxes, brought about by the reduced effectiveness of the Internal Revenue Service which would sustain a $110 million reduction.

The level of the operation of Internal Revenue Service would be cut back to 1960.

In terms of manpower, the cut would eliminate 12,000 man-years.

The division which investigates crime and tax fraud would be reduced.

The collection organization would be damaged.

The data processing master file system would be virtually halted.

The Narcotics Bureau's budget cut of $1 million would reduce its ability to control the illicit drug traffic.

A reduction of $86 million in the budget of General Services Administration would mean cancellation of construction projects totaling that amount in 10 cities. Also, it should be remembered that for every $15,000 taken out of General Services Administration's budget, one civilian job dies.

I place insert No. 16 into the Record, a list of the projects and the 10 cities.

The Justice Department would be hit by a $48 million cut. This will mean a substantial reduction in positions and a corresponding loss in effectiveness.

Now this does not include the many new programs which the Republicans have made doubly clear are in line for emasculation. That would come also.

The proposed Education Improvement Act would be paralyzed by a $1.215 billion slash.

The youth employment opportunities bill would be knocked flat on its back with a $100 million cut.

The $195 million needed for civil defense shelters would be knocked out.

Another $100 million needed to shore up our mass transportation systems in metropolitan areas would be deleted with gusto.

The rural housing guarantee program, medical education, maternal and child health, the campaign against mental illness and mental retardation—all these will die if the budget cutters have their way.

If they were successful, they must assume an awesome responsibility because their budget knife would have plunged deep into the heart of America's most urgent needs. This budget bloodletting would only mean destruction of these vital programs.

They rattle their political sabers and then they call for broad reductions in defense expenditures. They are like Janus, the old Roman god. Janus had two faces. One looked ahead. One looked behind. You never knew which way Janus was heading or which face to listen to.

Now is not the time to stop.

Now is the time to go, to move ahead.

Now is the time to believe in America, to believe in its resilience, to believe in its people.

We believe that we must meet our Nation's problems, that we must move ahead at a faster pace.

We believe that, at the same time, we must act to stimulate our economy, step up purchasing power, encourage business investment, broaden our industrial base, create more jobs—and bring the day nearer when a balanced economy will mean a balanced budget.

To accept the Republican position would be to shift the country into reverse gear at a time when it needs to shift into high gear.

I have presented a broad picture of what the false economists ask us to do to America.

And I have given some details regarding the specific effects this irresponsible budget slashing would have on the farms, towns and cities of this Nation.

We must repel this attempt to turn the clock back, an attempt that would make America last.

We must recognize our obligations, our responsibilities.

Insert No. 1

GOP in House Sees $15 Billion Cuts Feasible

(By Richard L. Lyons)

A House Republican study group announced yesterday that it has found projects costing $10 billion to $15 billion which can and should be cut from appropriations requested for next year.

The group of senior GOP members of the Appropriations Committee told a news conference that their study of the budget assisted by Maurice H. Stans, Budget Director during the Eisenhower administration, showed such cuts both feasible and urgent.

Without cuts of this dimension, said Republican Frank T. Bow, of Ohio, chances that Congress will approve a tax cut this year "will be almost nil."

The Republican did not specify where the cuts should be made. They said they had compiled a list but did not want to appear to be prejudging testimony still to be given to the Appropriations Committee.

House Speaker John W. McCormack suggested that Republicans "submit a bill of particulars" before asking Democrats to join their drive on spending.

House GOP leader Charles A. Halleck, of Indiana, had suggested previously that $3 billion might be cut from the defense budget, $1 billion from each service branch. Representative Melvin R. Laird, Republican, of Wisconsin, member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, said sizable amounts could be saved if the Pentagon would require competitive bids for all purchases.

Bow suggested that cuts could be made in the space program and foreign aid. He also listed guidelines for making across-the-board savings. They include holding down new jobs, requiring departments to absorb pay raises effective next January, postponing nonemergency construction and new programs, and cutting down low-priority current programs.

The cuts proposed would be in the $108 billion new spending authority requested, not in the $98.8 billion spending budget where $11.9 billion deficit is expected by the administration. Part of the spending budget will be financed by money appropriated in previous years, but Bow estimated the GOP's proposed cuts would reduce the deficit by $4 to $6 billion.

Major budget-cutting crusades have a habit of bogging down because of the complexity of the budget process, and the stake that all parts of the economy have acquired in Federal spending.

Asked if Members of Congress would give up public works projects for their districts to save money, Representative Ben F. Jensen, of Iowa, senior Republican on the Appropriations Committee, said he was sure they would.

The cry to cut the budget has picked up steam this year from the combination of a planned deficit, a proposed tax cut and the need to raise the debt ceiling.

The administration has asked that the debt ceiling, which is scheduled to drop April 1, be kept at $308 billion for the rest of the year ending June 30. It will come back later with a request to increase the ceiling to about $320 billion. The House Ways and Means Committee has delayed action on the temporary $308 billion request. Republicans aparently are using the threat of a bruising floor fight to try to hold down spending during the rest of this fiscal year.

At the House Ways and Means Committee's tax hearings yesterday, Roswell Magill, Under Secretary of the Treasury 25 years ago, urged Congress to discard the administration's tax reforms and make more modest cuts in taxes. Proposed reforms would wash out much of the tax relief, Magill said. He also urged tighter control over spending.

Insert No. 2

Apportionment of the Republican $15 Billion Proposal—New Obligational Authority for Fiscal 1964. Where Can $15 Billion Be Cut?

The Republicans have claimed that $15 billion can be cut from the President's request for fiscal year 1964 new obligational authority, but refuse to specify where cuts totaling this amount could be made.

Using the total 1964 budget request of $107.9 billion as a base, it is obvious that interest costs totaling $10.1 billion cannot be reduced. It can also be assumed that a reduction of the size contemplated involves the elimination of major new programs proposed by the President, which except for military pay increases, total $1.8 billion in 1964. The remaining $96 billion of budget requests would thus have to be cut by $13.2 billion. Since no indication is given of how this would be accomplished, it is reasonable to assume that it would be done on a pro rata basis, across the board, with programs and agencies being reduced according to the proportions which they represent of the total.

The figures:

[In millions]

Total estimated requests	$107,927
Assume interest payments cannot (or will not) be cut	10,103
Remainder	97,824
Assume major new programs proposed by the President will be cut (or be in list of cuts), except for military pay:	
New education program	1,215
Youth employment opportunities	100
Civil defense shelters	195
Urban mass transportation	100
Medical education (34) and Hill-Burton hospital modification to permit renovation and modernization of older general hospitals, etc. (35)	69

[In millions]

Assume major new programs, etc.—Continued	
Maternal and child health, including mental retardation, etc	$19
Land and water conservation fund	25
Rural housing guarantee program (to eventually shift direct loans to private banks)	100
Total, above new programs	1,823
Remainder	96,000

This remainder allocates by function as shown in column 3, below. If the remaining cut needed to reach $15 billion were allocated the same way, the reductions would be as shown in column 4. Amounts in millions:

Function	New obligational authority			
	Total in budget (1)	New programs listed above (2)	Remainder (3)	Added cuts needed for $15,000,000,000 total (4)
National defense	$56,702	$195	$56,507	$7,756
International affairs and finance	4,514		4,514	620
Space research and technology	5,712		5,712	784
Agriculture and agricultural resources	7,289	100	7,189	987
Natural resources	2,628	25	2,603	357
Commerce and transportation	3,091		3,091	424
Housing and community development	599	100	499	69
Health, labor, and welfare	5,984	188	5,796	796
Education	2,983	1,215	1,768	242
Veterans' benefits and services	5,594		5,594	768
General government	2,277		2,277	312
Allowances:				
For pay adjustment	200		200	28
For contingencies	250		250	34
Total (excluding interest)	97,824	1,823	96,000	13,177

Breakdown by agency of reductions in NOA needed for $15 billion total,[1] selected functions

[In millions]

	Reduction needed
International affairs and finance:	
Agency for International Development	$476
State Department	50
U.S. Information Agency	30
Department of Agriculture (title II, Public Law 480)	30
Peace Corps	15
Other	19
Total	620
Natural resources:	
Corps of Engineers	149
Department of Interior	153
Department of Agriculture (Forest Service)	45
Tennessee Valley Authority	6
Other	4
Total	357
Commerce and transportation:	
Department of Commerce	132
Federal Aviation Agency	111
Post Office	78
Coast Guard (Treasury)	50
Small Business Administration	30
Civil Aeronautics Board	18
Other regulatory agencies	10
Total	424

Breakdown by agency of reductions in NOA needed for $15 billion total,[1] selected functions—Continued

[In millions]

	Reduction needed
Health, labor, and welfare:	
Health, Education, and Welfare	$697
Labor Department	50
Department of Agriculture (school lunch and special milk programs)	39
Other	10
Total	796
Education:	
Health, Education, and Welfare	$101
National Science Foundation	81
Housing and Home Finance Agency (college housing loans)	41
Department of Interior (Indian education	13
Other	6
Total	242
General Government:	
Treasury (Internal Revenue Service, etc.)	114
General Services Administration	86
Department of Justice	48
Legislative branch	17
Judiciary	9
Other	38
Total	312

[1] Excluding interest and major new programs proposed by the President.

INSERT NO. 3

A $784 million slash in NASA budget—the consequences:

Summary of employment reductions by location

	Jobs
Alabama	1,600
California	9,220
Colorado	1,000
Connecticut	290
Kansas	250
Florida	3,200
Louisiana	6,340
Mississippi	800
Massachusetts	1,220
Minnesota	770
New York	1,890
Alaska	50
Missouri	1,800
Texas	800
Wisconsin	800
Iowa	600
Subtotal (identifiable contractor locations)	30,730
Various (unidentified by locations)[1]	35,000
Total	65,730

[1] Identification by State is available only for large prime and first tier subcontractors. The effects of the proposed reduction on the employment plans of lower tier subcontractors, venders and suppliers is approximately 35,000.

NASA—The budget-cutters' job toll on major contractors

Project	Major prime or subcontractor	Location	Employment reduction
Gemini	McDonnell	St. Louis, Mo	1,800
	Rocketdyne	Canoga Park, Calif	100
	AiResearch	Los Angeles, Calif	50
	IBM	Owego, N.Y	50
	Lockheed	Sunnyvale, Calif	600
	Convair	San Diego, Calif	800
	Martin	Denver, Colo	1,000
Apollo	NAA	Downey, Calif	3,600
	NAA subcontractors:		
	Minneapolis-Honeywell.	Minneapolis, Minn	720
	Collins	Cedar Rapids, Iowa	600
	Pratt & Whitney	East Hartford, Conn	290
	Aerojet-General	Sacramento, Calif	140
	Avco Corp	Massachusetts	120
	Northrop	Newbury, Calif	160
	AiResearch	Van Nuys, Calif	300
	Marquardt	do	140
	Grumman	Bethpage, N.Y	1,600
	MIT	Cambridge, Mass	400
	AC Spark Plug	Milwaukee, Wis	800
	Raytheon	Bedford, Mass	400
	Kollsman	Elmhurst, N.Y	240
	Chrysler	New Orleans, La	1,120
	Douglas	Santa Monica, Calif	960
Saturn I development	Chrysler	New Orleans, La	1,400
	Douglas	Santa Monica, Calif	600
Saturn IB development	Chrysler	New Orleans, La	1,000
	Douglas		300
Saturn V development	Boeing	New Orleans, La	1,500
	do	Wichita, Kans	500
	NAA	Downey, Calif	550
	do	Tulsa, Okla	50
	Douglas	Santa Monica, Calif	1,000
	Rocketdyne (NAA) F-1	Canoga Park, Calif	200
GSE and other		Various	1,500
C. of F.:			
Launch operations center		Florida	300
Marshall Space Flight Center		Alabama	200
Mississippi test facility		Mississippi	800
Various			720
Center support costs:			
Launch operations center		Florida	200
Marshall Space Flight Center		Alabama	1,400
Manned spacecraft center		Texas	800
Other			300

INSERT NO. 4

CORPS OF ENGINEERS PROJECTS

(Pending and incomplete projects that would be killed or held up by $149 million reduction)

Alabama: Paint Rock River; Mobile Harbor; Eufaula National Wildlife Refuge lands.

Arizona: Alamo Reservoir; Tucson diversion channel.

Arkansas: Arkansas River and tributaries: Navigation locks and dams; Gillham Reservoir; Ouachita and Black Rivers; Bull Shoals Reservoir Units 7, 8; Greers Ferry Reservoir; Narrows Dam (Third power unit); Helena Harbor, Ark.

California: New Hogan Reservoir; Russian River Reservoir; Sacramento River flood control; Bear Creek; Camanche Reservation; Oroville Reservoir; Sacramento River bank protection; Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff; Ventura-Pierpoint area (reimbursement); Walnut Creek; Duck Creek.

Connecticut: East Branch Reservoir; Hancock Brook Reservoir; Northfield Brook Reservoir; West Thompson Reservoir; Cedar to Silver Beach (reimbursement); Stamford; Westport; Milford Harbor.

Florida: International Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami; Apalachicola River; Bakers Haulover Inlet; Miami Harbor, 1960 act; Canaveral Harbor; Garrison Bight, Key West; Cat Point Channel, Boca Ciega.

Georgia: Savannah Harbor, Kings Island turning basin; Walter F. George Lock and Dam, Eufaula National Wildlife Refuge lands.

Hawaii: Wailoa Stream; Manele Bay, Lanai.

Idaho: Bruces Eddy Reservoir; Boise Valley (Columbia River local protection); Mission-Lapwai.

Illinois: Clear Creek drainage and levee; Sid Simpson (Beardstown); Shelbyville Reservoir; Calumet River and Harbor; Mt. Carmel; Mouth of Sangamon River; Warsaw Harbor.

Indiana: Huntington Reservoir; Levee Unit 5, Wabash River; English; Calumet River and Harbor.

Iowa: Little Sioux River; Van Meter.

Kansas: Pomona Reservoir; Perry Reservoir; Marion Reservoir; Florence.

Kentucky: Barren River Reservoir; Corbin; Green River Reservoir; Grayson Reservoir; Little Sinking Creek.

Louisiana: New Orleans to Venice, Hurricane protection; Big Choctaw Bayou; Bayou Nicholas.

Maine: Portland Harbor, deepen to 45 feet; Searsport Harbor; Kennebuck River.

Maryland: St. Michaels Harbor; Nan Cove.

Massachusetts: Chicopee Falls, Mass.; Three Rivers; Conant Brook Reservoir; Plymouth Town Beach.

Michigan: Detroit River, Trenton Channel; Saginaw River.

Minnesota: Duluth Superior Harbor, outer harbor; Marshall; Winona; Harriett Island Harbor, St. Paul.

Mississippi: Jackson and East Jackson.

Missouri: Canton; Cape Girardeau; South River Drainage District; Stockton Reservoir; Mississippi River at Clarksville; Sandy Slough; Gregory Drainage District.

New Jersey: Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea; anchorages at Reedy Point, Deepwater Point, and enlarging Marcus Hook and Mantus Creek anchorages, New Jersey; Raritan Bay, Sandy Hook Bay.

New Mexico: Socorro.

New York: Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point; Buffalo Harbor (1960 act) and Flushing Bay and Creek (1962 act); Herkimer; Rochester Harbor; Buttermilk Channel; Fire Island Inlet; Lackawanna.

North Carolina: Wrightsville Beach; Pamlico Sound to Rodanthe; Cedar Island Bay; Core Creek.

Ohio: Astabula Harbor (1960 act); Sandusky Harbor; Toledo Harbor (1950, 1958, and 1960 acts); Racine Locks and Dam.

Oklahoma: Short Mountain Lock and Dam; Cherry and Red Fork Creeks, Tulsa; Arkansas River and Tributaries, navigation locks and dams.

Oregon: Blue River reservoirs; Yaquina Bay and Harbor; Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers, 35 and 40 feet; Fern Ridge Reservoir modification; Columbia River alternate barge channel, Interstate Bridge-Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash.

Pennsylvania: Dam 4, Monongahela River, Bethlehem; Elkland; Robinson Run, Oakdale; Trout Run, Portage.

Puerto Rico: San Juan Harbor.

Rhode Island: Lower Woonsocket; Pawtuxet Cove.

Tennessee: Cordell Hull Dam; J. Percy Priest; Woodland Street Bridge.

Texas: Bardwell Reservoir; Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway; Deepening to 40 and 42 feet; Proctor Reservoir; Sabine-Neches Waterway; Big Fossil Creek; Fort Worth Floodway (West Fork Extension).

Virginia: Norfolk.

Washington; Little Goose Lock and Dam; Sammamish River; Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers, 35- and 40-foot projects; Port Townsend; Zintel Canyon, Kenewick; Connell; Vancouver-Columbia River alternate barge channel, interstate bridge Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash.

West Virginia: Racine Locks and Dam.

Wisconsin: Bay City Harbor; Pepin Harbor; Manitowoc County Shore, Revetment; Eau Galle River.

Wyoming; Jackson Hole.

Mississippi River and tributaries: Wolf River and tributaries; Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries; Cache River.

INSERT NO. 5

These are Interior projects that would be blocked by the proposed budget reduction of $153 million.

Alabama (National Park Service) construction: Horeshoe Bend National Military Park; Natchez Trace Parkway (see also Mississippi and Tennessee) maintenance and rehabilitation.

Alaska (National Park Service) construction: Glacier Bay National Monument; Mount McKinley National Park; Sitka National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management construction: Galena, fire control station. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries construction projects: Design exploratory fishing vessel; design research vessel. Bureau of Indian Affairs construction, buildings and utilities: Koliganek Day School, Elim Day School, Goodnews Bay Day School, Kasigluk Day School, Circle Day School, Grayling Day School, Barrow High School, Kotzebue High School; road construction.

Arizona (National Park Service) construction: Casa Grande National Monument; Chiricahua National Monument; Grand Canyon National Park; Lake Mead National Recreation Area (see also Nevada); Navajo National Monument; Petrified Forest National Park; Saguaro National Monument; Southwest Archeological Center; Tonto National Monument; Tuzigoot National Monument; Wupatki and Sunset Crater National Monuments; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management construction program: Hualpai Mountain Recreation Area; roads (Chloride-Tipton, Black Rock Mountain); operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Reclamation: Gila: South Gila collection drains; additions, Welton-Mohawk pumping plant; Glen Canyon (Arizona-Utah), general property; Flagstaff-Pinnacle Peak No. 2 transmission line; Glen Canyon-Flagstaff No. 2 transmission line. Bureau of Indian Affairs construction, buildings and utilities: Sells gas system, Phoenix shop building, Kaibeto Boarding School, Shonto Boarding School; irrigation systems: Colorado River, Fort Apache, San Carlos, surveys and planning; road construction.

Arkansas (National Park Service) construction: Arkansas Post National Memorial; Hot Springs National Park; Pea Ridge National Military Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Southwestern Power Administration construction projects: Jonesboro-Idalia 154 transmission line; Jonesboro substation addition.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife construction projects: Kelso Fish Farming Station.

California (National Park Service) construction: Cabrillo National Monument; Death Valley National Monument; Lassen Volcanic National Park; Muir Woods National Monument; Point Reyes National Seashore; Sequoia-Kings Canyons National Park; Yosemite National Park; Whiskeytown Recreation Area; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management contruction program, recreational facilities: Owens Valley Recreation Area, 3 sites; roads; Barrel Springs, grading 7 miles; Red Mountain, grading, 4 miles; Brock Gulch, grading .4 miles; Sheldon Creek, grading, 2 miles; Big Jackass Creek, grading, 4 miles; operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife construction projects: Kern-Pixley National Wildlife Refuge. Geological Survey construction projects: Rock Laboratory, Menlo Park; special facilities, Menlo Park (planning). Bureau of Indian Affairs construction, irrigation systems: Big Pine; Morongo; X–L Ranch; surveys and planning; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation project and major features, Central Valley: irrigation development; channels, levees, and floodworks (Federal part); Corning water distribution system; Pacific coast intertie; forebay pump plant intake channel; forebay pump plant.

Colorado (National Park Service) construction: Bents Old Fort National Historic Site; Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument; Colorado National Monument; Dinosaur National Monument (see also Utah); Great Sand Dunes National Monument; Hovenweep National Monument (see also Utah); Mesa Verde National Park; Rocky Mountain National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management construction program, buildings, Craig district office; recreation, Five Points Places and Droway Waters Recreation Sites; roads, Trident Mesa, grading 10 miles; operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Geological survey construction projects: Nuclear research, Denver; special facilities, Denver (planning). Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife construction projects: Denver National Wildlife Research Center; Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge. Bureau of Indian Affairs construction: Irrigation systems, Pine River; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, Florida participating project: Permanent operating facilities; O. & M. housing; Fryingpan-Arkansas (new project start).

Florida (National Park Service) construction: Castillo de San Marcos National Monument; Everglades National Park; Fort Caroline National Memorial; Fort Jefferson National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries construction project: Design research laboratory; road construction.

Georgia (National Park Service) construction: Fort Frederica National Monument, Fort Pulaski National Monument, Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Hawaii (National Park Service) construction: City of Refuge National Historic Park, National Battlefield Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Idaho (National Park Service) construction: Craters of the Moon National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management construction program; buildings: Bennett Mountain Lookout, Squaw Butte Lookout, Burley warehouse and fire office, Salmon office expansion and warehouse; recreation: Salmon River Recreation Area, three sites; roads: Deep Creek, grading 13 miles; Big-Knox-Bull, grading 6 miles; Herd Creek, grading 3 miles; Bell Mountain, grading 3 miles; bridges, five; Big Butte-Arco Road, surfacing 9 miles. Bureau of Land Management construction program, buildings (see above): operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries construction project, Columbia River fisheries development. Bureau of Indian Affairs construction, irrigation systems, Fort Hall; road construction, Bonneville Power Administration construction projects: Transformer additions; replacements and minor capital additions.

Indiana (National Park Service) construction: Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial.

Kentucky (National Park Service) construction: Mammoth Cave National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Louisiana (National Park Service) construction: Chalmette National Historic Site; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Maine (National Park Service) construction: Acadia National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Maryland (National Park Service) construction: Antietam National Battlefield Site and Cemetery, Baltimore-Washington Parkway, Catoctin Mountain Park, C. & O. Canal National Monument, Fort McHenry National Monument, George Washington Memorial Parkway (see also Virginia); maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; construction: Patuxent Research Center.

Massachusetts (National Park Service) construction; Cape Code National Seashore, Adams National Historic Site, Minute Man National Historic Site, Salem Maritime National Historic Site; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Michigan (National Park Service) construction: Isle Royale National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries construction project: Equipment for research laboratory. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildfish construction: Jordan River Fish Hatchery.

Minnesota (National Park Service) construction: Grand Portage National Monument; Pipestone National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife construction: Agassiz National Wildlife Refuge. Bureau of Indian Affairs, road construction.

Mississippi (National Park Service) construction: Natchez Trace Parkway (see also Alabama and Tennessee); Vicksburg National Military Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, construction project: Design research vessel. Bureau of Indian Affairs construction: Buildings and utilities, Central High School; road construction.

Missouri (National Park Service) construction: Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Southwestern Power Administration, construction projects: Carthage substation addition; Idalia substation addition.

Montana (National Park Service) construction: Custer Battlefield National Monument; Glacier National Park; Yellowstone National Park (see also Wyoming); maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management, construction program; recreational facilities; Madison River Recreation Area; roads; operating programs; soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Range; Medicine Lake National Wildlife Refuge. Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction; irrigation systems; annual contract payments: Blackfeet, Crow, Fort Beldnap, Fort Peck; surveys and planning. Bureau of Reclamation, projects and major features: East Bench Unit, Missouri River Basin; O. & M. housing; Lovell-Yellowtail transmission line (Wyoming-Montana); Yellowtail Unit, Missouri River Basin; Yellowtail Afterbay Dam. Bonneville Power Administration, construction projects: General structures and improvements, preliminary engineering, transformer additions, replacements and minor capital additions.

Nebraska (National Park Service) maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, construction: Desoto National Wildlife Refuge. Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction: Road. Bureau of Reclamation, projects and major features, Frenchman-Cambridge Division, Missouri River Basin; Frenchman Creek channelization; Dunlap substation.

Nevada (National Park Service) construction: Lake Mead National Recreation Area (see also Arizona); maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management, recreation: Red Rock Canyon Recreation Area; roads: Mount Wilson, grading 9 miles; operating program: soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Indian Affairs, irrigation systems: Duck Valley, Fort McDermott, Moopa, Pyramid Lake; road construction.

New Jersey (National Park Service) construction: Edison Laboratory National Monument; Morristown National Historic Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries, construction: Sandy Hook Fishery Research.

New Mexico (National Park Service) construction: Bandelier National Monument; Carlsbad Caverns National Park; Chaco Canyon National Monument; Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management, roads: Rio Puerco road system; operating program: soil aid moisture conservation. Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction, buildings and utilities, Chasgai Boarding School; irrigation systems: Mescalero, Hogback, Navajo project, Middle Rio Grande Pueblos, miscellaneous pueblos, surveys and planning; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major features, Rio Grande recreational facilities (new start); San Juan-Chama participating project (Colorado-New Mexico; new start).

New York (National Park Service) construction: Federal Hall National Memorial; Hamilton Grange National Memorial; Sagamore Hills National Historic Site; Saratoga National Historical Park; Statue of Liberty National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, construction: Montezuma National Wildlife Range.

North Carolina (National Park Service) construction: Blue Ridge Parkway (see also Virginia); Cape Hatteras National Seashore; Fort Raleigh National Historic Site; Great Smoky Mountains National Park (see Tennessee); maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Indian Affairs, road construction.

North Dakota (National Park Service) construction: International Peace Garden; Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Indian Affairs, road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major features: Fargo substation additions; Hillsboro substation; Jamestown-Watertown transmission line (North Dakota-South Dakota); Northwood substation.

Ohio (National Park Service) construction: Perry's Victory National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, construction project: Design research vessel.

Oklahoma (National Park Service) maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction, irrigation systems, surveys and planning; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major feature: Arbuckle (new project start).

Oregon (National Park Service) construction: Crater Park National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management, construction, buildings, Riddle Mountain Lookout; recreation, Steens Mountain Recreation Area, seven sites; roads, Steens Mountain, surfacing, 9 miles; Grizzly, grading, 4 miles; Hampton Buttes, grading, 18 miles; Beatty's Butte, grading, 7 miles; Rudio Mountain, grading, 4 miles; Vale project road system; operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, construction project, Columbia River fisheries development. Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction, irrigation systems, survey and planning; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major feature, Rogue River basin, Agate Dam (new project start); Vale, Bully Creek extension; minimum health and safety facilities. Bonneville Power Administration, construction projects, John Day-Keeler; Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest interconnection; Fairview Brandon No. 2; Dorena service; McMinnville service.

Pennsylvania (National Park Service) construction: Gloria Dei (Old Swedes') Church National Historic Site; Hopewell Village National Historic Site; Independence National Historic Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Mines, construction projects: Brucetown research facilities.

South Carolina (National Park Service) maintenance and rehabilitation.

South Dakota (National Park Service) construction: Badlands National Monument; Mount Rushmore National Monument; Wind Cave National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, construction, Waubay National Wildlife Refuge; Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge; Lake Andes National Wildlife Refuge. Bureau of Indian Affairs, road construction.

Tennessee (National Park Service) construction: Andrew Johnson National Monument; Great Smoky Mountains National Park (see also North Carolina); Natchez Trace Parkway (see also Alabama and Mississippi); Shiloh National Military Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Texas (National Park Service) construction: Big Bend National Park; Fort Davis National Historic Site; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, construction project; research vessel. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major feature, Canadian River: Main aqueduct pumping plants; main aqueduct, Pipelines Canyon to Lamesa.

Utah (National Park Service) construction: Arches National Monument; Bryce Canyon National Park; Capitol Reef National Monument; Dinosaur National Monument (see also Colorado); Hovenweep National Monument (see also Colorado); Natural Bridges National Monument; Timpanogos Cave National Monument; Zion National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management, construction program, buildings, Vernal warehouse; Escalante warehouse; roads, 50-Mile Mountain, grading 2 miles; operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, construction projects, Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge, Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction, irrigation systems. Uintah and Ouray; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major features; Emery participating project, Swazey diversion dam; Weber Basin, East Canyon Dam, Warren Canal and laterals.

Virginia (National Park Service) construction: Appomattox Court House National Historic Park; Blue Ridge Parkway (see also North Carolina); Custis Lee Mansion National Memorial; George Washington Memorial Parkway (see also Maryland); Jones Point Park; Manassas National Battlefield Park; Petersburg National Military Park; Prince William Forest Park; Shenandoah National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Washington (National Park Service) construction: Mount Rainier National Park; Olympic National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, construction projects: Columbia River fisheries development; research vessel; design of research vessel. Bureau of Indian Affairs, road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major feature: Spokane Valley (new project start). Bonneville Power Administration, construction projects: Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest interconnection; system reactive facilities; Puget Sound area service; Bangor-Fairmount; Grand Coulee-Okanogan; Sappho area service; transformer additions.

West Virginia (National Park Service) construction: Harpers Ferry, National Monument; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Wyoming (National Park Service) construction: Fort Laramie National Historic Site; Grand Teton National Park; Yellowstone National Park (see also Montana); maintenance and rehabilitation. Bureau of Land Management, construction program, roads: Green Mountain, grading 2 miles; Shirley Mountain, grading 5 miles; operating program, soil and moisture conservation. Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction, irrigation systems: Wind River; road construction. Bureau of Reclamation, project and major feature: Glenrock-Glendo transmission line; Lyman substation and taplines; Lyman participating project (new project start); Seedskadee participating project—upper west side pumping plant, east side canals and laterals, west side canal and laterals.

District of Columbia (National Park Service) construction: National Capital Parks; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Puerto Rico (N.P.D.), construction: San Juan National Historic Site; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Virgin Islands (National Park Service) construction: Virgin Islands National Park; maintenance and rehabilitation.

Various States (National Park Service) construction: Planning, general rehabilitation, and interpretive exhibits. Bureau of Land Management, construction programs, roads. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, construction projects, unmanned buoys, advance planning.

Insert No. 6

ESTIMATED PROGRAM REDUCTION DUE TO $45 MILLION CUT IN FOREST SERVICE BUDGET

Alabama: 9 million board feet timber cut; 760 acres, reforestation (Fed. st. pri.) $25,000 road construction; $60,000, research; 70 employment loss (Fed. st. pri.).

Alaska: 54 million board feet timber cut; 20 acres, reforestation, $250,000 road construction; $60,000 research; 150 employment loss.

Arizona: 44 million board feet timber cut; 180 acres reforestation; $410,000 road construction; $105,000 research; 470 employment loss.

Arkansas: 25 million board feet timber cut; 3,100 acres reforestation; $75,000 road construction; $60,000 research; 150 employment loss.

California: 270 million board feet timber cut; 3,700 acre reforestation; $1,960,000 road construction; $275,000 research; 2,000 employment loss.

Colorado: 23 million board feet timber cut; 630 acres reforestation; $720,000 road construction; $75,000 research; 670 employment loss.

Connecticut: — million board feet timber cut; 160 acres reforestation; $——— road construction; $35,000 research; 10 employment loss.

Delaware: — million board feet timber cut; 50 acres reforestation; $——— road construction; $——— research; —employment loss.

District of Columbia: — million board feet timber cut; — acres reforestation; $——— road construction; $260,000 research; 170 employment loss.

Florida: 12 million board feet timber cut; 6,700 acres reforestation; $45,000 road construction; $70,000 research; 60 employment loss.

Georgia: 8 million board feet timber cut; 6,400 acres reforestation; $80,000 road constuction; $100,000 research; 170 employment loss.

Hawaii: — million board feet timber cut; 200 acres reforestation; $——— road construction; $5,000 research; — employment loss.

Idaho: 117 million board feet timber cut; 1,440 acres reforestration; $1,110,000 road construction; $50,000 research; 1,240 employment loss.

Illinois: — million board feet timber cut; 220 acres reforestation; $15,000 road construction; $65,000 research; 30 employment loss.

Indiana: — million board feet; 460 acres reforestation; $15,000 road construction; $10,000 research; 20 employment loss.

Iowa: — million board feet timber cut; — acres reforestation; $— road construction; $10,000 research; — employment loss.

Kansas: — million board feet timber cut; 60 acres reforestation; $— road construction; $— research; — employment loss.

Kentucky: 4 million board feet timber cut; 2,400 acres reforestation; $40,000 road construction; $35,000 research; 80 employment loss.

Louisiana: 12 million board feet timber cut; 3,700 acres reforestation; $45,000 road construction; $80,000 research; 130 employment loss.

Maine: — million board feet timber cut; 800 acres reforestation; $5,000 road construction; $20,000 research; 10 employment loss.

Maryland: — million board feet timber cut; 550 acres reforestation; $— road construction; $55,000 research; 10 employment loss.

Massachusetts: — million board feet timber cut; 160 acres reforestation; $— road construction; $5,000 research; 10 employment loss.

Michigan: 21 million board feet timber cut; 5,700 acres reforestation; $190,000 road construction; $50,000 research; 200 employment loss.

Minnesota: 21 million board feet timber cut; 5,300 acres reforestation; $210,000 road construction; $95,000 research; 180 employment loss.

Mississippi: 22 million board feet timber cut; 11,900 acres reforestation; $65,000 road construction; $140,000 research; 190 employment loss.

Missouri: 5 million board feet timber cut; 1,000 acres reforestation; $50,000 road construction; $35,000 research; 80 employment loss.

Montana: 90 million board feet timber cut; 550 acres reforestation; $690,000 road construction; $115,000 research; 910 employment loss.

Nebraskai: — million board feet timber cut; 20 acres reforestation; $20,000 road construction; $10,000 research; 30 employment loss.

Nevada: — million board feet timber cut; — acres reforestation; $125,000 road construction; $5,000 research; 80 employment loss.

New Hampshire: 3 million board feet timber cut; 170 acres reforestation; $30,000 road construction; $30,000 research; 60 employment loss.

New Jersey: — million board feet timber cut; 70 acres reforestation; $— road construction; $15,000 research; — employment loss.

New Mexico: 24 million board feet timber cut; 100 acres reforestation; $280,000 road construction; $35,000 research; 440 employment loss.

New York: — million board feet timber cut; 2,900 acres reforestation; $— road construction; $10,000 research; — employment loss.

North Carolina: 9 million board feet timber cut; 3,600 acres reforestation; $80,000 road construction; $155,000 research; 130 employment loss.

North Dakota: — million board feet timber cut; — acres reforestation; $— road construction; $10,000 research; 10 employment loss.

Ohio: — million board feet timber cut; 1,000 acres reforestation; $10,000 road construction; $70,000 research; 80 employment loss.

Oklahoma: — million board feet timber cut; 280 acres reforestation; $10,000 road construction; $— research; 20 employment loss.

Oregon: 440 million board feet timber cut; 10,500 acres reforestation; $1,960,000 road construction; $195,000 research; 1,500 employment loss.

Pennsylvania: 4 million board feet timber cut; 2,700 acres reforestation; $40,000 road construction; $55,000 research; 140 employment loss.

Puerto Rico: — million board feet timber cut; 230 acres reforestation; $30,000 road construction; $30,000 research; 10 employment loss.

Rhode Island: — million board feet timber cut; 40 acres reforestation; $ — road construction; $— research; — employment loss.

South Carolina: 14 million board feet timber cut; 8,400 acres reforestation; $30,000 road construction; $30,000 research; 80 employment loss.

South Dakota: 7 million board feet timber cut; 170 acres reforestation; $80,000 road construction; $20,000 research; 140 employment loss.

Tennessee: 6 million board feet timber cut; 2,700 acres reforestation; $60,000 road construction; $10,000 research; 50 employment loss.

Texas: 16 million board feet timber cut; 1,750 acres reforestation; $30,000 road construction; $25,000 research; 80 employment loss.

Utah: 11 million board fee timber cut; 230 acres reforestation; $300,000 road construction; $75,000 research; 390 employment loss.

Vermont: — millions of board feet timber cut; — acres reforestation; $30,000 road construction; $15,000 research; 40 employment loss.

Virginia: 6 million board feet timber cut; 450 acres reforestation; $65,000 road construction; $10,000 research; 140 employment loss.

Washington: 232 million board feet timber cut; 5,300 acres reforestation; $1,180,000 road construction; $60,000 research; 780 employment loss.

West Virginia: 5 million board feet timber cut; 1,900 acres reforestation; $50,000 road construction; $40,000 research; 100 employment loss.

Wisconsin: 11 million board feet timber cut; 1,350 acres reforestation; $120,000 road construction; $545,000 research; 300 employment loss.

Wyoming: 15 million board feet timber cut; 4,500 acres reforestation; $250,000 road construction; $15,000 research; 440 employment loss.

Total: 1,540 million board feet timber cut; 104,500 acres reforestation; $10,179,000 road construction; $3,335,000 research; 12,000 employment loss.

INSERT NO. 7

Flood control and watershed projects, pending or in progress, the bulk of which would be stopped by a $987 million budget reduction in the Agriculture Department.

Alabama: Watershed projects: Big Prairie, Bristow's Creek, High Pine Creek, Hurricane Creek, Lost Creek, Powell Creek, Terrapin Creek, Town Creek, Crowdabout Creek, Bib Nance Creek.

Arizona: Watershed: Apache Junction-Gilbert, Florence area, Frye Creek-Stockton Wash, Magma.

Arkansas: Watershed: Arkansas City, Big Creek, Caney Creek, Chicot, Desha and Drew, Crooked Bayou, East Fork, Point Remove, Flat Creek, Fourche Bayou, Grady Gould, Kelso-Rohwer, Muddy Fork of Illinois River, Randolph-Walnut Lake, Upper Culotches Bay, West Fork Point Remove, Tupelo Bayou, Poteau River.

California: Flood Control: Los Angeles, Santa Ynez. Watershed: Adobe Creek, Buena Vista Creek, Central Sonoma, Escondido Creek, Marsh-Kellogg, Napa River, Ulatis Creek.

Colorado: Watershed: Coalbank, Arroyos, Franktown Parker Tributaries of Cherry Creek, Indian Wash, Limon, Roatcap Wash, Vineland Area Tributary to Arkansas River.

Connecticut: Watershed: Blackberry River, Furnace Branch-Middle River, North Branch Park River, South Branch Park River.

Delaware: Watershed: Upper Nanticoke River.

Florida: Watershed: Fisheating Creek Marsh, North St. Lucie River Drainage District, Pine Barren Creek, Sarasota West Coast, Sebastian River Drainage District, South Sumter, Taylor Creek, Upper Josephine-Jackson Creek, Upper Tampa Bay, Istokpoga Marsh, Jumper Creek.

Georgia: Flood Control: Coosa. Watershed: Bishop Creek, Bull Creek, Fort Creek, Hazel Creek, head of Little Tennessee River, Little Satilla, Little Tallapoosa, Marbury Creek, Middle Fork Broad River, Mill Creek, North Broad River, Potato Creek, Rocky Comfort Creek, Sandy Creek, South River, Tobesofkee Creek.

Hawaii: Watershed: Puukapo, Waianae Iki, Waianae Nui, Naalebo.

Idaho: Watershed: Cedar Creek.

Illinois: Watershed: Big Blue, Hog River-Pig Creek, Scattering Fork, Seven Mile Creek, Shoal Creek.

Indiana: Watershed: Boggs Creek, Busseron, French Lick Creek, Lattas Creek, Little Wea, Middle Fork Anderson River, Prairie Creek, West Creek, Dewitt Creek.

Iowa: Flood control: Little Sioux.

Watershed: Badger Creek, Bee-Jay, Big Park, Big Wyacondah, Crooked Creek, David's Creek, Davis-Battle Creek, Held, Hound Dog Creek, Indian Creek, Mill Picayune, Moulton, Pierce Creek, Pony Creek, Rocky Branch Creek, Ryan-Henchal, Stennett-Red Oak Creek.

Kansas: Watershed: Andale, Beek Creek, Fall River, Frog Creek, Middle Caney, Nebo Creek, Silver Creek, Spring Creek, Twin Caney, Upper Verdigris, Walnut Creek, Whiskey Creeks.

Kentucky: Watershed: Beaver Creek, Big Muddy, Big Reedy Creek, Buck Creek, Caney Creek, Canoe Creek, Crab Orchard, Cypress Creek, Donaldson Creek, East Fork Clarks River, East Fork Pond River, Humphrey-Clanton Creek, Little Kentucky River, Meadow Creek, Mud River, North Fork Little River, Obion Creek, W. Fork Clarks River, W. Ford Pond River.

Louisiana: Watershed: Bayou Blue, Bayou Dupont, Bayou Folse, Bayou Rapides, North Tensas, Pleasant Valley, Big Ditch and Scarbroughs Creek, Upper Bayou Nezpique.

Maine: Watershed: Libby Brook.

Maryland: Flood control: Potomac River. Watershed: Ninepin Branch, Aydelotte, Gilbert Run, Little Creek, Little Youghiogheny, Long Marsh, Upper Rock Creek.

Massachusetts: Watershed: Baiting Brook, Powdermill Brook, SuAsCo, Upper Quaboag.

Michigan: Watershed: Little Black River, Little River, Misteguay Creek, Muskrat Creek, North Branch Mill Creek, South Branch Cass River.

Minnesota: Flood control: Little Sioux. Watershed: Bear Valley, Coon Creek, Middle Fork of Two River, North Branch of Two River, Zippel Creek.

Mississippi: Flood control: Little Tallahatchie, Yazoo. Watershed: Beasha Creek, Bentonia, Buck Island Bayou, Central Bogue Phalia, Chiwapa Creek, Gray's Creek, Muddy Creek, Mulberry Creek, Persimmon-Burnt Corn Creek, Second, Shammack Creek, Tackett Creek, Tallahalla Creek, Upper Bogue Phalia, West Hatchie, Upper Quiver River.

Missouri: Watershed: East Fork of Big Creek, Hoover-Frankum, 102 river tributaries, Panther Creek, Platte river tributaries, South Fork of Blackwater, Tabo Creek Calalhan.

Montanta: Watershed: Box Elder Creek, Whitehall.

Nebraska: Watershed: Antelope Creek, Big Indian, Bowman-Spring, Buckley Creek, Gering Balley, Mud Creek, Oak-Middle Creek, Plattsmouth, Plum Creek, Wildhorse, Wilson Creek, Bellwood, Bear-Pierce-Cedar.

Nevada: Watershed: Upper Meadow Valley Wash, Virgin Valley.

New Hampshire: Watershed: Olivarian Brook, Souhegan River (Mass.).

New Jersey: Watershed: Paulins Kill, Pine Mount Creek, Repaupo Creek, Stony Brook, Town Bank, River Cove.

New Mexico: Watershed: Apache-Brazito Mesquite, Fillmore Arroyas, Hackberry Draw, Saltpeter Creek, Santa Cruz River, Tortugas Arroyo, Case Draw.

New York: Flood control: Buffalo Creek. Watershed: Conewango Creek, Cowaselon Creek, Genegantslet Creek, Ischua Creek, Naticoke Creek, Upper Five Mile Creek.

North Carolina: Watershed: Broad Creek, Gum Neck, Abbotts Creek, Ahoskie Creek, Bear Creek, Conetoe Creek, Cutawhiskie Creek, Deep Creek (Yadkin), Grindle Creek, Horse Swamp-Flat Swamp, Moccasin Creek, Muddy Creek, Pollock Swamp, Town Fork Creek, Turner Creek, Mosley Creek-Tracey Swamp.

North Dakota: Watershed: Elm River, Lower Forest River, Middle-South Branch Forest River, North Branch Forest River, Swan-Buffalo Creek, Tewaukon (S.D.), Wild Rice Creek (S. Dak.).

Ohio: Watershed: Chippewa Creek, Dick's Creek-Little Muddy, East Fork Buck Creek, Marsh Run, Upper Wabash.

Oklahoma: Flood control: Washita. Watershed: Bear, Fall, and Coon Creeks, Bib Wewoka, Cache Creek, Caney-Coon Creek, Cottonwood Creek, Delaware Creek, Fourche Maline Creek, Haikey Creek, Boggy Creek, Little Deep Fork Creek, Little Wewoka-Graves Creek, Long Branch, Sandy Creek, Sallisaw Creek, Salt Creek, Squaw Creek, Stillwater Creek, upper Black Bear Creek, upper Blue River, upper Clear Boggy Creek, upper Red Rock Creek, Wagon Creek, Whitegrass-Waterhole Creek.

Oregon: Watershed: Beaver Creek, Little Pudding River, Lynx Hollow, Middle Fork Hood River, Skipanon River, Willakenzie.

Pennsylvania: Flood control: Potomac. Watershed: Brandywine Creek, Del., Brodhead Creek, Dunlap Creek, Greene-Dreher, Kaercher Creek, Lackawaxen tributaries, Little Schuylkill River, Mill Creek, Mill Run, North Fork Cowanesque River, Sandy Creek, Saul-Mathay, Briar Creek, Martin Creek.

South Carolina: Watershed: Broadmouth Creek, Brushy Creek, Coneross Creek, Duncan Creek, Fishing Creek, Hills Creek, Huff Creek, Thicketty Creek, Wateree Creek, Backswamp, Lynches Lake Camp Branch.

South Dakota: Watershed: Brule Creek, Green Creek, Marne Creek, Pattee Creek, Silver Creek, Turkey Ridge Creek.

Tennessee: Flood control: Coosa, Watershed: Bear Creek, Cane Creek, Cub Creek, Cypress Creek, Hardin Creek, Houser Creek, Jennings Creek, Johnson Creek, Lick Creek, Line Creek (Ky.), Meridian Creek, Pine Creek, Porters Creek (Miss.), Reelfoot Indian Creek (Ky.), Thompson Creek, Proctor Creek, Indian Creek (Miss.).

Texas: Flood control: Colorado (middle), Trinity, Washita. Watershed: Agua Dulce, Auds Creek, Caney Creek, Chiltipin-San Fernando Creek, Cummins Creek, East Bay Bayou, East Keechie, Kent Creek, Kickapoo Creek, Knob Creek, Langford Creek, lower Brushy Creek, lower Plum Creek, Madden Arroyo, Martinez Creek, northeast tributaries of Leon River, Olmitos-Garcias Creek, Plum Creek, Ramirez Creek, Salado Creek, San Diego-Rosita Creeks, Sulpher Creek, Tehuacana Creek, Town Branch, upper Brushy Creek, upper Lake Fork, upper Las Moras Creek, Valley Creek, York Creek.

Vermont: Watershed: Neshobe.

Utah: Watershed: American Fork-Dry Creek, Blue Creek-Howell, Miller Biglow, North Fork of Ogden River, North Sanpete.

Virginia: Flood control—Potomac. Watershed: Beautiful Run, Beaver Creek, Buffalo Creek, Leatherwood Creek, Little River, Marrowbone, Muddy Creek, Roanoke Creek, White Oak Run, Johns Creek, Horsepasture.

Washington: Watershed—French Creek, Lacamas Creek Tributaries, Marshland.

West Virginia: Flood control—Potomac. Watershed: Bonds Creek, Crush Creek, Harmon Creek (Pa.), Polk Creek, Saltlick Creek, Upper Decker.

Wisconsin: Watershed—Bad Axe, Bay City, Bogus Creek, Coon Creek, Garden Valley (Rose Valley), Lost Creek, Mill Creek, South Nelson, Trout Run Creek, Twin Parks, West Fork Kickapoo.

Wyoming: Watershed: Arnold Drain, Boulder Lake, London Flats-Bovee, North Fork Powder River.

Puerto Rico: Watershed—Anasco River, Guayanes.

INSERT NO. 8

A reduction of $25 million in Grants to States for Unemployment Compensation and Employment Service Administration would require a reduction in State staffs of about 4,800 positions and the closing of many small services. Clearly this would mean a deterioration in service to unemployment insurance claimants.

The figures:

Effect of $25,000,000 reduction on employment security operations

State	Estimated loss in positions	Number of offices to be closed
Alabama	69	8
Alaska	15	3
Arizona	54	8
Arkansas	51	7
California	484	10
Colorado	58	10
Connecticut	65	1
Delaware	14	1
District of Columbia	30	0
Florida	100	2
Georgia	72	4
Hawaii	16	1
Guam	0	0
Idaho	30	8
Illinois	225	2
Indiana	85	2
Iowa	64	12
Kansas	53	10
Kentucky	54	3
Louisiana	63	4
Maine	28	5
Maryland	77	3
Massachusetts	166	3
Michigan	185	20
Minnesota	83	12
Mississippi	50	8
Missouri	110	8
Montana	32	7
Nebraska	34	6
Nevada	17	3
New Hampshire	17	2
New Jersey	200	1
New Mexico	32	6
New York	575	10
North Carolina	92	10
North Dakota	21	4
Ohio	177	8
Oklahoma	60	6
Oregon	61	6
Pennsylvania	360	7
Puerto Rico	41	0
Rhode Island	41	1
South Carolina	53	8
South Dakota	24	6
Tennessee	61	6
Texas	240	14
Utah	33	3
Vermont	21	6
Virginia	66	8
Virgin Islands	1	0
Washington	32	5
West Virginia	50	5
Wisconsin	70	3
Wyoming	20	6

Manpower development and training activities: Effects on the allocation to States in dollars and numbers of trainees by a $25,000,000 reduction in the President's budget request

	Dollars	Number trainees
Alabama	420,160	380
Alaska	49,440	45
Arizona	123,520	112
Arkansas	271,840	246
California	2,496,800	2,262
Colorado	172,960	157
Connecticut	346,080	314
Delaware	49,440	45
District of Columbia	123,520	112
Florida	568,640	515
Georgia	494,400	448
Guam	5,710	5
Hawaii	74,240	67
Idaho	74,240	67
Illinois	1,211,360	1,098
Indiana	543,840	493
Iowa	271,840	246
Kansas	222,400	202
Kentucky	494,400	448
Louisiana	420,160	380
Maine	148,320	134
Maryland	346,080	314
Massachusetts	716,960	650
Michigan	1,285,440	1,165
Minnesota	420,160	380
Mississippi	296,640	269
Missouri	568,640	515
Montana	98,880	90
Nebraska	148,320	134
Nevada	49,440	45
New Hampshire	74,240	67
New Jersey	889,920	806
New Mexico	98,880	90
New York	2,595,680	2,352
North Carolina	593,280	538
North Dakota	74,240	67
Ohio	1,409,120	1,277
Oklahoma	271,840	246
Oregon	247,200	224
Pennsylvania	2,076,480	1,882
Puerto Rico	222,400	202
Rhode Island	148,320	134
South Carolina	271,840	246
South Dakota	74,240	67
Tennessee	494,400	448
Texas	939,360	851
Utah	98,880	90
Vermont	49,440	45
Virginia	346,080	314
Virgin Islands	5,220	5
Washington	420,160	380
West Virginia	321,440	291
Wisconsin	444,960	403
Wyoming	49,440	45
U.S. total	25,000,000	22,400

INSERT NO. 9

A 15-percent cut reduction in the Area Redevelopment Administration would mean a loss of an estimated 10,000 jobs that could have been created in 1964. These jobs break down this way:

Northeast region (Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virgin Islands)	2,500
Lake States (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin)	2,000
Appalachian (Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia)	1,000
Southeast (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina)	2,500
Northwest (Alaska, Idaho, Iowa, Colorado, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington, Wyoming)	500
Southwest (Arizona, California, Hawaii, Missouri, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah)	1,500

INSERT NO. 10

Examples of pending projects scheduled for elimination if the President's $500 million supplemental request for accelerated public works is cut out.

ALABAMA

1. Graysville's $399,000 application for a new sewer system with 399 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Grant's $665,000 request for a new water system generating 665 man-months of labor.

3. Bullock County's $225,000 application for a new 30-bed nursing home creating 225 man-months of labor.

ALASKA

1. Dillingham's $269,000 application for a new water system generating 269 man-months of on-site labor.

2. North Pole's $220,000 request for a new sewer system creating 220 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Central Kenai Peninsula's $750,000 application for a new 20-bed general hospital generating 750 man-months of on-site labor.

ARIZONA

1. Parker's $139,000 application for a new water system generating 139 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Hopi Indian Reservation request for $180,000 community sewer and water system, 180 man-months of on-site labor.

3. U.S. Forest Service $119,000 construction of recreational facilities, 180 man-months of on-site labor, Sitegreaves National Forest.

ARKANSAS

1. McGehee's $300,000, new city hospital, 300 man-months on-site labor.

2. Leola's $70,000, APW funds, new water system, 70 man-months on-site labor.

3. Hazen's $112,000, new sewer system, 112 man-months on-site labor.

CALIFORNIA

1. San Diego Mercy Hospital, $1,997,000 to replace hospital, possible 2,000 man-months on-site labor.

2. Manteca's $348,000, new sewer system, 348 man-months on-site labor.

3. Orange Cove's $10,000 new water system, 10 man-months of on-site labor.

COLORADO

1. Alamoso Community Hospital's $713,000, 28-bed addition, 713 man-months on-site labor.

2. Trindad's $295,000 new electric system, 295 man-months on-site labor.

3. San Luis' $19,000 new harbor facilities, 19 man-months on-site labor.

CONNECTICUT

1. Bristol's $160,000 new sewer system, 160 man-months on-site labor.

2. Watertown's $141,000 water system, 141 man-months on-site labor.

3. Ansonia's $650,000, sewage treatment plant, 650 man-months on-site labor.

DELAWARE

1. Dover's $227,000 sewer system, 227 man-months on-site labor.

2. Greenwood's $87,500 sewage treatment plant and interceptor sewer, 87.5 man-months on-site labor.

FLORIDA

1. Margate's $25,000 new bridges, 25 man-months on-site labor.

2. Florida City's $330,000 new waste treatment plant, 330 man-months on-site labor.

3. Jackson Memorial Hospital (Miami), $1,500,000, 252-bed addition 1,500 man-months on-site labor.

GEORGIA

1. Shellman's $5,000 new sewer system, 5 man-months on-site labor.

2. Martin's $45,000 water system, 45 man-months on-site labor.

3. Wrightsville's $90,000 sewage treatment plant and interceptor sewer, 90 man-months on-site labor.

HAWAII

1. Hilo's $10,000 water system, 10 man-months on-site labor.

2. Hawaii County's $2,800,000 sewage treatment works, 2,800 man-months on-site labor.

IDAHO

1. Grangeville's $13,000 water system, 13 man-months on-site labor.

2. Plummer's $34,000 sewage system, 34 man-months on-site labor.

3. Bonner's Ferry, $75,000 for stabilization pond and outfall sewer, 75 man-months on-site labor.

ILLINOIS

1. Panama's $9,000, water system, 9 man-months on-site labor.

2. Bartelso's $108,000 water system, 108 man-months on-site labor.

3. Farmersville's $92,000 waste treatment plant, 92 man-months on-site labor.

4. Pocahontas' $91,500, sewage treatment works, 91.5 man-months on-site labor.

5. Richland Memorial Hospital, (Olney), $175,000 an addition and remodeling, 150 man-months on-site labor.

INDIANA

1. Charlestown's $35,000, sewer system, 35 man-months on-site labor.

2. Spurgeon's $83,000 water system, 83 man-months on-site labor.

3. Harrison County Hospital (Corydon) $150,000, an addition and remodeling, 150 man-months on-site labor.

IOWA

1. Centerville's $379,000 sewer system, 379 man-months on-site labor.

2. Moravia's $30,000, sewage treatment plant, 30 man-months on-site labor.

KANSAS

1. Arama's $154,000 sewer system, 154 man-months on-site labor.

2. Pittsburgh's $452,000, water system, 452 man-months on-site labor.

3. Walnut's $36,200, stabilization pond and out fall sewer, 36.2 man-months on-site labor.

KENTUCKY

1. Jackson's $85,000, water system, 85 man-months on-site labor.

2. Martin's $80,000 new sewer system, 80 man-months on-site labor.

3. Butler's $47,500, sewage treatment plant, 47.5 man-months on-site labor.

4. Pendleton County Hospital (Falmouth), $250,000 new hospital, 250 man-months on-site labor.

LOUISIANA

1. Estherwood's $85,000 new water system, 85 man-months on-site labor.

2. Dubach's $183,000 sewer system, 183 man-months on-site labor.

3. Opelousas' $448,600 sewage treatment plant, 448.6 man-months on-site labor.

4. West Carroll Parish Hospital (Oak Grove) $200,000 25-bed hospital, 200 man-months on-site labor.

MAINE

1. Madawaska's $39,000 new water system, 39 man-months on-site labor.

2. Saco City's $300,000 sewer system, 300 man-months on-site labor.

3. Webber Hospital (Biddeford) $200,000, an addition, 200 man-months on-site labor.

MARYLAND

1. Cumberland's $75,000 sewer system, 75 man-months on-site labor.

2. Cresaptown's $61,000 sewage treatment plant, 61 man-months on-site labor.

MASSACHUSETTS

1. Gloucester's $304,000 sewer system, 304 man-months on-site labor.

2. East Longmeadow's $173,000 new water system, 173 man-months on-site labor.

3. Amesbury Hospital (Amesbury) $400,000, 18-bed addition, 400 man-months on-site labor.

MICHIGAN

1. Tecumseh's application for $80,000 for a new sewer system generating 80 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Manistique's request for $86,000 for a new water system creating 86 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Bottsford Hospital in Farmington application for $225,000 for a new 45-bed general hospital generating 225 man-months of on-site labor.

4. Sagula's application for $12,500 for a sewage treatment plant creating 12.5 man-months of on-site labor.

MINNESOTA

1. Cook's application for $55,000 for a new waste treatment plant generating 55 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Bemidji's request for $33,000 for a new water system creating 33 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Evansville's application for $64,000 for a new sewer system generating 64 man-months of on-site labor.

4. St. Luke's Hospital in Duluth application for $1,939,500 for the replacement of 168 hospital beds creating 1,939.5 man-months of on-site labor.

MISSISSIPPI

1. Okolona's application for $183,000 for water system additions generating 183 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Prentiss' request for $6,000 for a new sewer system creating 6 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Humphrey's County Hospital in Belzoni application for $2,250 to replace flammable ceilings in corridors generating 2 man-months of on-site labor.

MISSOURI

1. Grandin's application for $50,000 for a new water system creating 50 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Mayview's request for $71,000 for a new sewer system generating 71 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Gainesville's application for $9,700 for a stabilization pond creating 9.7 man-months of on-site labor.

MONTANA

1. Polson City's application for $49,000 for a new sewer system generating 49 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Culbertson's request for $84,000 for a new water system creating 84 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Eureka Community Hospital application for $240,000 for a new hospital generating 240 man-months of on-site labor.

NEBRASKA

1. Sargent's application for $164,000 for the improvement of city streets creating 164 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Litchfield Village's request for $20,000 for a new sewer system generating 20 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Good Samaritan Hospital in Kearney application for $728,250 for a new hospital creating 728.3 man-months of on-site labor.

NEVADA

1. U.S. Forest Service application for $50,000 to construct recreational facilities on roads in the Inyo National Forest generating 74 man-months of on-site labor.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Littleton's application for $202,000 for a sewage treatment plant creating 202 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Mary Hitchcock Memorial Hospital in Hanover request for $350,000 for an addition generating 350 man-months of on-site labor.

NEW JERSEY

1. Driebelle Borough's application for $39,000 for a new water system creating 39 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Bordentown's application for $9,000 for a new sewer system generating 9 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Cinnamins Township request for $14,000 for the repair and improvement of community buildings creating 14 man-months of on-site labor.

4. Community Memorial Hospital in Toms River request for $75,000 for alterations generating 75 man-months of on-site labor.

NEW MEXICO

1. Raton's application for $325,000 for a new water system generating 325 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Wagon Mound's request for $254,000 for a new sewer system creating 254 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Espanola Hospital's application for $33,000 for expansion of X-ray and laboratory facilities generating 33 man-months of on-site labor.

NEW YORK

1. Waddington's application for $45,000 for a new sewer system creating 45 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Tonawanda's application for $225,000 for a new water system generating 225 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Lake Placid-Saranac Lake Hospital in Ray Brook's application for $900,000 for a new hospital to replace two existing hospitals creating 900 man-months of on-site labor.

4. Sharon Springs' request for $70,500 for additions to the sewage treatment plant generating 70.5 man-hours of on-site labor.

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Henderson's application for $13,000 for a new sewer system creating 13 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Highlands' request for $122,000 for a new water system generating 122 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Wautauga's application for $825,000 for a new 100-bed general hospital creating 825 man-months of on-site labor.

NORTH DAKOTA

1. Fort Totten Indian Reservation's application for $28,000 for individual water and waste systems generating 28 man-months of on-site labor.

OHIO

1. Brookside's application for $5,000 for a new sewer system creating 5 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Jackson's request for $50,000 for a new waste treatment plant generating 50 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Union Township's application for $81,000 for a new water system creating 81 man-months of on-site labor.

4. Holzer Hospital in Gallipolis' application for $600,000 for the installation of a cobalt unit creating 600 man-months of on-site labor.

5. Clarksburg's request for $30,000 for a sewage treatment plant generating 30 man-months of on-site labor.

OKLAHOMA

1. Dewar's application for $48,000 for a new sewer creating 48 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Crowder's request for $17,000 for a new water system generating 17 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Sequoyah County Memorial Hospital in Sallisaw request for $198,000 for a new 28-bed general hospital creating 198 man-months of on-site labor.

OREGON

1. Gearhart City's application for $30,000 for a new water system generating 30 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Maupin's request for $63,000 for a new sewer system creating 63 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Presbyterian Intercommunity Hospital in Klamath Falls application for $1,333,000 for a new 131-bed general hospital generating 1,333 man-months of on-site labor.

PENNSYLVANIA

1. Brownsville Hospital's request for $1,800,000 for a new hospital creating 1,800 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Applewood's application for $21,000 for a new sewage treatment plant generating 21 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Borough of Aspinwall request for $13,000 for new water storage creating 13 man-months of on-site labor.

4. Center Township's application for $10,000 for a new sewer system generating 10 man-months of on-site labor.

5. Wilkes-Barre's application for $10,000 for new bridges creating 10 man-months of on-site labor.

RHODE ISLAND

1. Warwick's application for $75,000 for a new water system generating 75 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Narragansett's request for $142,000 for a new sewer system creating 142 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Mercy Hospital in Woonsocket application for $816,573 for a new hospital generating 816.6 man-months of on-site labor.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. Williston's application for $51,000 for a new sewer system creating 51 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Lodge's request for $47,000 for a new water system generating 47 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Cherokee County Memorial Hospital in Gaffney application for $141,894 for new and expanded service facilities creating 141.9 man-months of on-site labor.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Wakpala application for $5,000 for a stabilization pond generating 5 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Fort Pierre's request for $28,500 for a sewage treatment plant creating 28.5 man-months of on-site labor.

TENNESSEE

1. Rutledge's application for $85,000 for a new sewer system generating 85 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Bethel Springs' request for $32,000 for a new water system creating 32 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Bradley County Hospital in Cleveland request for $8,320 to expand service areas generating 8.3 man-months of on-site labor.

TEXAS

1. Douglassville's application for $61,000 for a new water system creating 61 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Wells' request for $50,000 for new gas storage generating 50 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Alba's application for $52,000 for a new sewer system creating 52 man-months of on-site labor.

4. Mother Frances in Tyler application for $757,050 for an addition of 134 general beds and 19 mental beds, generating 757.1 man-months of on-site labor.

UTAH

1. Wellington's application for $36,000 for a new water system creating 36 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Payson City's request for $42,000 for a new sewer system generating 42 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Utah Valley Hospital in Provo request for $90,000 for remodeling the 240-bed general hospital creating 90 man-months of on-site labor.

VERMONT

1. Island Pond's request for $180,000 for a sewage treatment plant generating 180 man-months of on-site labor.

VIRGINIA

1. Big Stone Gap's application for $561,000 for a new water system creating 561 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Wise's request for $57,000 for a new sewer system generating 57 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Gate City's request for $65,400 for a sewage treatment plant creating 65.4 man-months of on-site labor.

WASHINGTON

1. Centralia's application for $138,000 for a new water system generating 138 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Lynden's request for $125,000 for a new sewer system creating 125 man-months of on-site labor.

3. St. Anthony Hospital in Wenatchee request for $113,318 for a new hospital of 46 beds to replace an unsuitable structure, generating 113.3 man-months of on-site labor.

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Glasgow's application for $15,000 for a new water system creating 15 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Summers County Hospital in Hinton application for $1,486,708 for a new 50-bed hospital generating 1,486.7 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Milton's request for $29,000 for a stabilization pond creating 29 man-months of on-site labor.

4. Belmont's application for $30,000 for a sewage treatment plant generating 30 man-months of on-site labor.

WISCONSIN

1. West Salem's application for $47,000 for a new water system creating 47 man-months of on-site labor.

2. Stevens Point's request for $48,000 for a new sewer system generating 48 man-months of on-site labor.

3. Marinette General Hospital application for $200,000 for an addition of 40 beds creating 200 man-months of on-site labor.

WYOMING

1. Deaver's application for $32,000 for a new water system generating 32 man-months of on-site labor.

2. U.S. Forest Service request for $60,000 to construct recreational facilities and buildings in the Targhee National Forest generating 90 man-months of on-site labor.

INSERT NO. 11

Itemized list of crippling budget cut in Weather Bureau and other related activities.

ALABAMA

Weather Bureau: Decommission short-range radar at Montgomery, Huntsville, Birmingham, and Mobile. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Montgomery.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Elimination of one class II ship and one class IV ship will effect the probable bids of Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co. of Mobile; and the Mobile Ship Repair, Inc., of Mobile.

Maritime Transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, at Alabama Drydock & Shipbuilding Co. of Mobile.

ALASKA

Weather Bureau: Close four-man station at Cordova. Reduce five man field office from full 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12-hour coverage at St. Paul Island. Reduce six-man field office from 24 to 12 hours at Yakutat, Barter Island, Bethel, Cold Bay, Juneau, Kotzebuc, and McGrath.

ARKANSAS

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Texarkana. Decommission short-range radar at Fort Smith.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

ARIZONA

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Prescott. Close four-man station at Yuma. Reduce five-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Flagstaff.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

CALIFORNIA

Weather Bureau: Close two-man stations at Mt. Shasta, Sandburg, and Blue Canyon. Close three-man stations at Bishop, Eureka, and Alamoso. Reduce five-man field offices from full 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12-hour-a-day coverage at San Francisco (downtown office), Bakersfield, and Point Arguello. Reduce six-man field offices from 24 to 12 hours at Long Beach, Red Bluff, and Santa Maria. Close the weather office at Stockton. Decommission short-range weather radars at Eureka. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Santa Monica.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Sea Space, Inc., of Palo Alto, and National Engineering Science Co. of Pasadena. Elimination of one class III ship and one class IV ship that would affect the following probable bidders: Bethlehem Steel Co. of San Francisco; Harbor Boat Building Co. of Terminal Island; National Steel and Shipbuilding Co. of San Diego.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contracts, due to deletion of 3 of the 17 planned replacement ships, at one or more of the following yards: Bethlehem Steel Co. of San Francisco; National Steel and Shipbuilding Co. of San Diego; Todd Shipyards of San Pedro.

COLORADO

Weather Bureau: Decommission short-range radar at Pueblo. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Denver. Eliminate procurement of communications recording equipment for relaying meteorological satellite data at Denver.

CONNECTICUT

Weather Bureau: Close three-man station at New Haven. Reduce five-man station from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Bridgeport. Decommission short-range radar at Hartford.

DELAWARE

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Weather Bureau: Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day. Cancel procurement and installation of weather data loggers at Dulles Airport.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Georgetown University; Computer Usage Co. and IBM.

FLORIDA

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Pensacola. Close three-man station at Fort Myers. Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day service to 12 hours a day at West Palm Beach and Orlando. Cancel procurement and installation of weather data loggers at Miami.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Florida State University.

GEORGIA

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station in Valdosta. Close two-man station at Rome and Thomasville. Close three-man station at Columbus. Decommission short-range radar in Macon, Atlanta, and Savannah.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

HAWAII

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for the University of Hawaii.

IDAHO

Weather Bureau: Close four-man station at Lewiston. Reduce six-man station from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Pocatello.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

ILLINOIS

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Cairo. Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Rockford. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Peoria. Eliminate procurement of communications recording equipment for relaying meteorological satellite data at Chicago. Cancel new wind measuring equipment at Quincy.

INDIANA

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at South Bend. Decommission short-range radar at Fort Wayne and Indianapolis.

IOWA

Weather Bureau: Close three-man station at Dubuque. Reduce five-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Waterloo. Reduce six-man field office same amount at Burlington. Decommission short-range radar at Burlington.

KANSAS

Weather Bureau: Close the weather office at Concordia. Decommission short-range radar at Concordia, Goodland, Topeka, and Dodge City. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Topeka.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

KENTUCKY

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Lexington. Decommission short-range radar at Louisville.

LOUISIANA

Weather Bureau: Reduce five-man field office from 24-hours-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Alexandria. Decommission short-range radar at Baton Rouge and Shreveport. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Shreveport. Cancel procurement and installation of weather data loggers at New Orleans.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Louisiana State University.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, by the Avondale Shipyards, Inc., of New Orleans.

MAINE

Weather Bureau: Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Portland.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, by the Bath Iron Works of Bath.

MARYLAND

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Frederick.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State.

National Bureau of Standards: Deferral of special purpose laboratories at Gaithersburg.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, at Bethlehem Steel Co. Shipbuilding Division at Sparrows Point, and Maryland Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., of Baltimore. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for the Johns Hopkins University, of Baltimore.

MASSACHUSETTS

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Pittsfield. Reduce five-man location from 24 hours a day to 12 hours a day at Boston (downtown office). Decommission short-range radar at Boston and Worcester. Eliminate procurement of communications recording equipment for relaying meteorological satelliate data at Boston. Reduce five-man station from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Boston. Reduce six-man station same amount at Worcester.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contracts, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, at the Bethlehem Steel Co., shipbuilding division, at Quincy.

MICHIGAN

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Escanaba. Close three-man station at Alpena. Close four-man station at Marquette. Reduce five-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Detroit City Airport. Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Detroit (Willow Run Airport). Eliminate forecasting station at Detroit. Decommission short-range radar at Flint and Muskegon. Cancel new wind measuring equipment at Kalamazoo.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of the 17 planned replacement ships, at Defoe Shipbuilding Corp. of Bay City.

MINNESOTA

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Rochester. Decommission short-range radar at Rochester. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at International Falls.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

MISSISSIPPI

Weather Bureau: Close three-man station at Vicksburg. Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Meridian. Decommission short-range radar at Meridian and Jackson.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, by the Ingalls Shipping Corp., of Pascagoula.

MISSOURI

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24 hours a day coverage to 12 hours a day at Kansas City. Decommission short-range radar at Columbia. Close three-man station at St. Joseph. Decommission short-range radar at Springfield.

MONTANA

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Kalistell and Havre. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Great Falls.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

NEBRASKA

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Valentine. Close four-man stations at Lincoln and Norfolk. Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Scottsbluff. Decommission short-range radar at North Platte, Scottsbluff and Norfolk.

NEVADA

Weather Bureau: Close three-man station in Elko.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Weather Bureau: Close four-man station at Concord.

NEW JERSEY

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Trenton.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, at New York Shipbuilding Co. of Camden.

NEW MEXICO

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station in Ratan. Close two-man station in Clayton. Close three-man station at Silver City and Roswell.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State.

National Bureau of Standards: Eliminate procurement of scientific equipment worth $740,000.

NEW YORK

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man station from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at La Guardia Airport. Decommission short-range radar at Rochester, Binghamton, and Albany. Reduce upper-air soundings from four a day to two a day at New York City.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Columbia University in New York City.

NORTH CAROLINA

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Asheville (downtown office) and Winston-Salem. Close the weather office in Greensboro. Decommission short-range radar at Raleigh.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Elimination of one class III ship and one class IV ship will effect the probable bid of the Barbour Boat Works, Inc., of New Bern.

NORTH DAKOTA

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station in Devils Lake. Close three-man station in Williston.

OHIO

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Sandusky. Close three-man station at Mansfield. Eliminate forecasting station operation at Cincinnati. Decommission short-range weather radars at Akron, Cleveland, Columbus. Reduce upper-air soundings from four a day to two a day at Dayton.

Maritime Transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contracts, due to deletion of 3 of the 17 planned replacement ships at one or more of the following yards: American Shipbuilding Co. of Lorain; American Ship Building Co. of Toledo.

OKLAHOMA

Weather Bureau: Decommission short-range radar at Tulsa.

OREGON

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Meacham and Sexton Summit. Close three-man station at Roseburg. Close four-man stations in Burns and Eugene. Reduce five-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Astoria. Decommission short-range weather radar and cancel new wind-measuring equipment at Astoria.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State. Elimination of one class III ship and one class IV ship that could affect the following probable bidder: Williamette Iron and Steel Co., of Portland, and Gunderson Bros. Engineering Corp., of Portland.

PENNSYLVANIA

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Lancaster. Close two-man station at Reading. Reduce five-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Erie. Reduce six-man station same amount at Pittsburgh (downtown office), Scranton, and Williamsport. Decommission short-range weather radar at Pittsburgh. Cancel new wind-measuring equipment at Bradford.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contracts, due to deletion of 3 of the 17 planned replacement ships, at Sun Shipbuilding and Drydock Co. of Chester.

RHODE ISLAND

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Block Island.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Weather Bureau: Close the weather station at Florence. Decommission short-range radar at Columbia. Cancel new wind-measuring equipment at Anderson.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Huron. Decommission short-range radar at Sioux Falls.

TENNESSEE

Weather Bureau: Close three-man station in Memphis (downtown office). Reduce five-man field office from 24 hours a day to 12 hours a day in Bristol. Decommission short-range radar at Nashville and Memphis.

TEXAS

Weather Bureau: Close three-man station at Victoria, and Galveston airport. Reduce six-man station from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Lubbock and San Angelo. Eliminate forecasting station at El Paso. Close weather offices at Dallas and Laredo. Decommission short-range radar at Abilene, Austin, Corpus Christi, Houston, Lubbock, Midland, Port Arthur, San Antonio, San Angelo, Waco, and Wichita Falls. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at San Antonio, Amarillo, and Fort Worth. Cancel procurement and installation of weather data loggers at Fort Worth and Houston.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State. Eliminate research and development contracts and grants slated for Texas Instruments, Inc., of Dallas. Elimination of one class III ship and one class IV ship that would affect the probable bid of Levington Shipbuilding Co., of Orange.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contract, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, at Bethlehem Steel Co., shipbuilding division, at Beaumont.

UTAH

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station in Milford. Close three-man station in Wendover. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day in Salt Lake City.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State.

VERMONT

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

VIRGINIA

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Cape Henry. Close three-man station at Lynchburg. Decommission short-range weather radar at Richmond. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Norfolk.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey party in the State. Elimination of one class III ship and one class IV ship could affect the bid of the Norfolk Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp. of Norfolk. Eliminate research and development grants slated for the American Scientific Corp. of Alexandria.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contracts, due to deletion of 3 of the 17 planned replacement ships, at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., of Newport News.

WASHINGTON

Weather Bureau: Close two-man station at Walla Walla. Close three-man station at Stampede Pass. Reduce 6-man station from 24-hour-a-day coverage to 12 hours a day at Seattle (Boeing Field) and Yakima. Close the weather office at Olympia. Decommission short-range radar at Tatoosh Island. Reduce upper air soundings from four a day to two a day at Olympia. Cancel procurement and installation of weather data loggers at Seattle. Eliminate procurement of communications recording equipment for relaying meteorological satellite data at Seattle.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

WEST INDIES

Weather Bureau: Reduce six-man field office from 24 hours a day to 12 hours a day and decommission short-range radar at Swan Island.

WEST VIRGINIA

Weather Bureau: Close one-man station at Parkersburg. Reduce five-man field office from 24 hours a day to 12 hours a day at Elkins. Close the weather office at Beckley.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Elimination of one class III ship and one class IV ship that would affect the probable bid of the Marietta Manufacturing Co. of Point Pleasant.

WISCONSIN

Weather Bureau: Close four-man station at La Crosse. Decommission short-range radar at Madison.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

Maritime transportation: Possible loss of shipbuilding contracts, due to deletion of 3 of 17 planned replacement ships, at the Chistie Corp. of Sturgeon Bay; the Fraser-Nelson Shipbuilding & Drydock Co. of Superior; and Manitowoc Shipbuilding, Inc., of Manitowoc.

WYOMING

Weather Bureau: Close four-man station at Sheridan.

Coast and Geodetic Survey: Eliminate field survey parties in the State.

INSERT NO. 12

A $110 million reduction in Federal Aviation Agency budget would mean that these facilities and services currently provided would be discontinued: 100 airport traffic control towers; 70 instrument landing systems; 50 approach light systems.

These could not be built: 583 facilities to assure greater degree of safety; i.e., airport traffic control towers, airport surveillance radars, omnidirectional radio ranges and distance measuring equipments, instrument landing systems, and airport approach light systems.

A large percentage of the 400 airports requiring improvements for which sponsors have available funds to match the U.S. share would be affected.

Listed facilities are existing or planned. Existing would be discontinued and planned would be blocked by the $110 million budget cut.

ALABAMA

Anniston: Distance measuring equipment.

Eufaula: Distance measuring equipment.

Evergreen: Distance measuring equipment.

Huntsville: Distance measuring equipment.

Mobile: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Montgomery: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Birmingham: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Dothan: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Mobile: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Muscle Shoals: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Tuscaloosa: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Butler: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Birmingham: Visual approach slope indicator.

ALASKA

Anchorage, Lake Hood: Airport traffic control tower.

Fairbanks:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

King Salmon:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

Annette:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Juneau: Airport traffic control tower.

Anchorage: Air route traffic control center.

Fairbanks: Air route traffic control center.

Cordova: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Homer: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Gustavus: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Anchorage: Radar bright display equipment.

Fairbanks: Radar bright display equipment.

Annette: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Bettles: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Big Lake: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Dillingham: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Hinchinbrook: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Nome: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Tanana: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Unalakleet: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

ARIZONA

Phoenix:

Air route traffic control center.

Airport surveillance radar.

Douglas: Distance measuring equipment.

Drake: Distance measuring equipment.

Flagstaff: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Gila Bend: Remote communications outlet.

San Simon: Air navigation equipment.

Tuba City: Air navigation equipment.

Yuma: Air navigation equipment.

ARKANSAS

Fort Smith:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

Hot Springs: Airport traffic control tower.

Fayetteville: Long-range radar.

Fort Smith: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Little Rock: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

El Dorado: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Fort Smith: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Harrison: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Pine Bluff: Doppler direction finding equipment.

CALIFORNIA

Oxnard: Airport traffic control tower.

Stockton:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Palmdale: Airport traffic control tower.

Los Angeles: Air route traffic control center.

Oakland (Fremont): Air route traffic control center operating aircraft movement information service sector.

San Jose (Reid's Hillview): Control tower.

Avenal: Distance measuring equipment.

Goffs: Distance measuring equipment.

Fort Jones: Distance measuring equipment.

Lake Tahoe: Distance measuring equipment.

Los Banos: Distance measuring equipment.

Chico: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Marysville: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Santa Rosa: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Arcata: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Bakersfield: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Los Angeles: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Monterey: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

San Diego: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Santa Barbara: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Stockton: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Los Angeles: Radar bright display equipment.

Oakland: Radar bright display equipment (two units).

Burbank: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Long Beach: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Oakland: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Sacramento: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

San Francisco: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Bakersfield: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Fresno: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Imperial: Doppler direction findings equipment.

Needles: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Palmdale: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Sacramento: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Burbank: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Palm Springs: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Porterville: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Santa Monica: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Visalia: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Avenal: Air navigation equipment.

Palmdale: Air navigation equipment.

San Diego: Air navigation equipment.

Oxnard: Instrument landing system.

San Jose: Instrument landing system.

San Francisco: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing (second facility).

COLORADO

Grand Junction:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.

Pueblo:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Denver: Air route traffic control center.

Hugo: Distance measuring equipment.

Thurman: Distance measuring equipment.

Cortez: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Grand Junction: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Pueblo: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Hugo: Air-ground communications.

Denver: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Akron: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Grand Junction: Doppler direction finding equipment.

CONNECTICUT

New London (Groton): VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Windsor Locks:
Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
Instrument landing system (second facility).
New standard approach light system with sequence flashing (second facility).

DELAWARE

New Castle:
Airport traffic control tower.
Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

FLORIDA

Pensacola:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Sarasota, Bradenton: Airport traffic control tower.

Daytona Beach:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.

St. Petersburg:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Jacksonville (Hilliard): Air route traffic control center.

Miami: Air route traffic control center.

Melbourne: Control tower.

Miami (Opa-Locka): Control tower.

Biscayne Bay: Distance measuring equipment.

Daytona Beach: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Orlando: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Pensacola: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Tallahassee: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Miami: Radar equipment.

Miami (Opa-Locka): New tower service.

Jacksonville: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

West Palm Beach: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Gainesville: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Key West: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Tallahassee: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Vero Beach: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Crestview: Air navigation equipment.

Gainesville: Air navigation equipment.

Key West: Air navigation equipment.

Lakeview: Air navigation equipment.

Vero Beach: Air navigation equipment.

Miami: VHF omnidirectional test facility.

Orlando: VHF omnidirectional test facility.

Jacksonville: Conversion to standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

GEORGIA

Atlanta (Hampton): Air route traffic control center.

Brunswick: Distance measuring equipment.

Columbus: Distance measuring equipment.

La Grange: Distance measuring equipment.

Royston: Distance measuring equipment.

Atlanta No. 2: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Augusta: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Columbus: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Macon: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Savannah:
Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
Doppler direction finding equipment.

Baxley: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Jessup: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Waycross: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Augusta: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Columbus: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

Atlanta:
Visual approach slope indicator.
Short approach light system.

HAWAII

Kahului: Airport traffic control tower.

Hilo: Airport traffic control tower.

Honolulu: Air route traffic control center.

Kamuela: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Honolulu: Airport traffic control.

Hilo: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Kahului: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Honolulu: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Kona: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Hilo: Instrument landing system.

Honolulu: Runway end identification lights.

Hilo: Standard approach light system.

IDAHO

Idaho Falls: Airport traffic control tower.

Pocatello:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.

Twin Falls: Distance measuring equipment.

Boise: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Pocatello: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Gooding: Air-ground communications.

Burley: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Idaho Falls: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Mullan: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Dubois: Air navigation equipment.

Mullen Pass: Air navigation equipment.

Boise: Conversion to standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

Pocatello: Short approach light system.

ILLINOIS

West Chicago: Airport traffic control tower.

Champaign: Airport traffic control tower.

Chicago: Air route traffic control center.

Bible Grove: Distance measuring equipment.

Bradford: Distance measuring equipment.

Samsville: Distance measuring equipment.

Galesburg: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Marion: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Chicago (Midway 13): Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Moline: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Peoria: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Quincy: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Springfield: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Bloomington: Air-ground communications.

Chicago: Radar bright display equipment.

Chicago (O'Hare): Precision approach radar (second facility).

Chicago (Midway): Traffic control radar beacon.

Quincy: Droppler direction finding equipment.

Bradford: Air navigation equipment.

Champaign: Instrument landing system.

Chicago (Meigs): Instrument landing system.

Chicago (Midway): New standard approach light system with sequence flashing (2d facility).

Chicago (Meigs): Visual approach slope indicator.

Chicago (O'Hare): Short approach light system.

Champaign: Standard approach light system.

Chicago (O'Hare): Standard approach light system.

INDIANA

Evansville:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.

Terre Haute:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.

Indianapolis: Air route traffic control center.

Nabb: Distance measuring equipment.

Richmond: Distance measuring equipment.

Wolflake: Distance measuring equipment.

Fort Wayne: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Indianapolis: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Muncie: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Indianapolis: Instrument landing system (2d facility).

West Lafayette: Instrument landing system.

Evansville: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

Terre Haute: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

Indianapolis: Standard approach light system.

IOWA

Cedar Rapids:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.

Waterloo:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Sioux City:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Dubuque: Distance measuring equipment.

Sioux City: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Waterloo: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Des Moines: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Cedar Rapids: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Des Moines: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Mason City: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Des Moines: Runway end identification lights.

Sioux City: Runway end identification lights.

KANSAS

Hutchinson:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Russell: Distance measuring equipment.

Wichita: Distance measuring equipment.

Topeka: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Garden City:
Long range radar.
Air traffic control radar beacon.
Doppler direction finding equipment.

Hill City: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Salina: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Centropolis: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Medicine Lodge: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Wilsey: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Hill City: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Wichita: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Topeka: Conversion to standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

KENTUCKY

York: Distance measuring equipment.

Covington:
Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.
Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Bowling Green: Doppler direction finding equipment.

London: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Paducah: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Highway: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Whitesburg: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Covington:
Instrument landing system (second facility).
Visual approach slope indicator.

LOUISIANA

Shreveport, downtown: Airport traffic control tower.

Shreveport, greater:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Monroe:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.

Lake Charles:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

New Orleans: Air route traffic control center.

Alexandria: Long-range radar.

Baton Rouge: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Monroe: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Shreveport: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

New Orleans: Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Lafayette: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Monroe: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Alexandria:
VHF omnidirectional radio range.
Air navigation equipment.

Lake Charles: Air navigation equipment.

New Orelans: Standard approach light system.

MAINE

Portland:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Bucks Harbor: Long-range radar.

Auburn-Lewiston: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Portland: Equipment to improve relability of existing instrument landing system.

South Bangor: Center air-ground peripheral communications outlet.

Millinocket: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Presque Isle: Tactical air navigation equipment.

MARYLAND

Nottingham: Distance measuring equipment.

Baltimore: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Andrews: Air-ground communcations.

Salisbury: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Ridgely: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Salisbury: Air navigation equipment.

Snow Hill: Air navigation equipment.

Baltimore: Instrument landing system (second facility).
New standard approach light system with sequence flashing (second facility).
Runway end identification lights (two facilities).

MASSACHUSETTS

Worcester:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.

New Bedford:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Westfield: Airport traffic control tower.

Hyannis:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Nantucket:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.

Boston (Nashua): Air route traffic control center.

Chester: Distance measuring equipment.

Hyannis: Distance measuring equipment.

Westfield: Distance measuring equipment.

Bedford: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Boston: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

New Bedford: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Worcester: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Bedford: Visual approach slope indicator.

Boston:
Visual approach slope indicator.
Short approach light system.

MICHIGAN

Flint:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Muskegon:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.
Approach light system.

Kalamazoo:
Airport traffic control tower.
Approach light system.

Battle Creek:
Airport traffic control tower.
Instrument landing system.

Jackson: Airport traffic control tower.

Detroit:
Air route traffic control center.
Airport surveillance radar.

Saginaw: Distance measuring equipment.

Traverse City: Distance measuring equipment.

Detroit (Willow Run): Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Lansing: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Muskegon: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Saulte Ste. Marie: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Alpena: Air-ground communications.

Battle Creek: Separate control tower.

Grand Rapids: Separate control tower.

Detroit (Willow Run): Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Grand Rapids: Separate flight service station.

Battle Creek: Remote communications outlet.

Marquette: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Saginaw: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Saulte Ste. Marie: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Traverse City: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Alpena: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Grand Rapids: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Detroit: Instrument landing system.

Battle Creek: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

Detroit, Metropolitan: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing (second facility).

Grand Rapids: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

MINNESOTA

Duluth:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

Rochester:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

Minneapolis: Air route traffic control center operating aircraft movement information service sector.

Farmington: Distance measuring equipment.

Minneapolis: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Bemidji: Air-ground communications.

St. Paul (Holman): New tower service.

Duluth: Separate control tower.

Redwood Falls: Doppler direction finding equipment.

St. Paul (Holman): VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Minneapolis: Visual approach slope indicator.

MISSISSIPPI

Gulfport:

Airport traffic control tower.

Distance measuring equipment.

Hattiesburg: Distance measuring equipment.

Holly Springs: Distance measuring equipment.

Greenville: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Meridian: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Jackson: Airport surveillance radar.

Greenwood: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Laurel: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Greenwood: Air navigation equipment.

McComb: Air navigation equipment.

Jackson: VHF omnidirectional test facility.

MISSOURI

Springfield:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

St. Joseph:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Kansas City: Air route traffic control center operating aircraft movement information service sector.

St. Louis: Air route traffic control center operating Aircraft Movement Information Service sector.

Macon: Distance measuring equipment.

Readsville: Distance measuring equipment.

Cape Girardeau: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Jefferson City: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Joplin: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Springfield: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

St. Joseph: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

St. Louis: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Marysville: Air-ground communications.

Kansas City:

Radar bright display equipment (2 units).

Airport traffic control radar beacon.

Vichy: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Butler· Air navigation equipment.

St. Louis: Instrument landing system (2d facility).

Joplin: New standard approach light system with sequence flashing.

St. Louis:

New standard approach light system with sequence flashing (2d facility).

Visual approach slope indicator.

Short approach light system.

MONTANA

Helena: Airport traffic control tower.

Great Falls: Air route traffic control center.

Miles City: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Great Falls: Air navigation equipment.

Lewiston: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Whitehall: Tactical air navigation equipment.

NEBRASKA

Chadron: Distance measuring equipment.

Sidney: Distance measuring equipment.

Lincoln: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Scottsbluff: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Omaha: Runway end identification lights.

NEVADA

Tonopah: Long range radar.

Reno: Airport surveillance radar.

Sod House: Distance measuring equipment.

Wells: Distance measuring equipment.

Wilson Creek: Distance measuring equipment.

Reno: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Las Vegas: Air-ground communications.

Reno:

Separate control tower.

Separate flight service station.

Battle Mountain: Remote communications outlet.

Elko: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Ely: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Las Vegas: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Lovelock: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Tonopah: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Beatty: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Reno: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Tonopah: Tactical air navigation equipment.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Keene: Distance measuring equipment.

Lebanon: Distance measuring equipment.

Laconia: Terminal VHF radio direction range.

Concord: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Manchester: Air navigation equipment.

NEW JERSEY

Atlantic City:

Airport traffic control tower.

Instrument landing system.

Approach light system.

Trenton: Airport traffic control tower.

Newark: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Teterboro: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

Ship Bottom: Air-ground communications.

Teterboro: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Trenton: Instrument landing system.

NEW MEXICO

Roswell: Airport traffic control tower.

Santa Fe: Airport traffic control tower.

Hobbs: Airport traffic control tower.

Albuquerque: Air route traffic control center.

Carlsbad: Distance measuring equipment.

Corona: Distance measuring equipment.

Crownpoint: Distance measuring equipment.

Deming: Distance measuring equipment.

Hobbs: Distance measuring equipment.

Otto: Distance measuring equipment.

Pinon: Distance measuring equipment.

Texico: Distance measuring equipment.

Gallup: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Silver City/Hurley: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Albuquerque: Radar bright display equipment.

Deming: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Farmington: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Las Vegas: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Roswell: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Tucumcari: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Zuni: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Grants: Air navigation equipment.

Roswell: Air navigation equipment.

Texico: Air navigation equipment.

Truth or Consequences: Air navigation equipment.

NEW YORK

Elmira, Binghamton, Utica: Airport traffic control tower instrument landing system.

Niagara Falls: Approach light system.

Islip: Airport traffic control tower instrument landing system.

New York (Jamaica): Airport traffic control center operation, aircraft movement information service.

White Plains: Airport surveillance radars.

De Lancey, Dunkirk, New York (LaGuardia), Utica, Watertown: Distance measuring equipment.

Ogdensburg, Saranac Lake: Terminal VHF radio directional ranges.

Binghamton, Buffalo, Islip, New York (Idlewild), Niagara Falls, Peconic, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, White Plains: Equipment to improve the reliability of instrument landing systems.

Buffalo: Air traffic control radar beacon.

Albany, Buffalo, Elmira, Watertown: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Plattsburg: Tactical air navigation equipment.

New York (Idlewild): Instrument landing system (3d facility): New standards approach light system, runway end identification lights, and visual approach slope indicators.

NORTH CAROLINA

Asheville: Airport traffic control tower; instrument landing system.

Wilmington: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Fayetteville: Airport traffic control tower.

Pinehurst: Distance measuring equipment.

Wilmington and Winston-Salem: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Hickory, New Bern, and Rocky Mount: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Fayetteville: Instrument landing system.

Winston-Salem: Short approach light system.

NORTH DAKOTA

Fargo and Bismarck: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Jamestown and Williston: Distance measuring equipment.

Grand Forks and Minot: SAGE sector ARTC centers.

Dickinson and Minot: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Pembina: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

OHIO

Mansfield: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Cleveland (Oberlin): Aircraft traffic control center operating aircraft movement information service.

Newcomerstown: Establish long distance measuring equipment.

Cleveland, Columbus, Mansfield, Toledo, Youngstown: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Cleveland: Radar bright display epuipment and Air Traffic control radar beacon.

Findlay, Zanesville: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Akron-Canton, Columbus, Toledo: Runway end identification lights.

Cleveland: Short approach light system.

OKLAHOMA

Tulsa (Riverside): Control tower.

Hobart and Sayre: Distance measuring equipment.

Guyman and Stillwater: Establish terminal VHF radio directional ranges.

Ardmore, Hobart, Ponca City, McAlester: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Tulsa: Instrument landing system (second facility).

OREGON

Pendleton: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach lights.

Hillsboro: Establish control tower.

North Bend: Distance measuring equipment.

Eugene, Klamath Falls, Pendleton: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

The Dalles: Doppler direction finding equipment.

PENNSYLVANIA

Erie: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Allentown: Same.

Wilkes-Barre: Same.

Williamsport: Airport traffic control tower and instrument landing system.

Lancaster and Slate Run: Distance measuring equipment.

Erie, Reading and Wilkes-Barre: Improved reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

North Mountain: Air-ground communications (second facility).

Lancaster: New tower service.

Philadelphia and Pittsburgh: Air traffic control radar beacon.

Pittsburgh-Allegheny: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Bradford, Harrisburg, Phillipsburg, Wilkes-Barre: Doppler equipment.

Pittsburgh: Instrument landing system (second facility).

Erie, Pittsburgh, (Allegheny): Runway end identification lights.

RHODE ISLAND

Providence: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing system.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Greenville: Airport traffic control tower. Instrument landing system.

Spartanburg: Airport traffic control tower.

Columbia: Establish airport surveillance radars.

Myrtle Beach: Distance measuring equipment.

Charleston, Columbia Greenville, Spartanburg: Equipment to improve existing instrument landing systems.

Anderson, Myrtle Beach: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Allendale, Columbia, Florence: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Charleston: New standard approach light system.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Brookings: High frequency radio directional range.

Huron, Sioux Falls: Equipment to improve reliability of instrument landing systems.

Aberdeen, Pierre: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Bruce: Air navigation facilities.

Aberdeen, Rapid City: Tactical air navigation equipment.

TENNESSEE

Bristol: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Memphis: Aircraft traffic control center operating and aircraft movement information service.

Chattanooga: Airport surveillance radar.

Graham: Establish distance measuring equipment.

Clarksville (Outlaw): Very high frequency radio directional range.

Knoxville: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Tri-Cities: Tower resulting from separation of combined station-tower.

Knoxville, Memphis, Nashville: Air traffic control radar beacon.

Crossville, Jackson: Doppler direction finding equipment.

TEXAS

Amarillo: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Corpus Christi: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Abilene: Same.

San Angelo: Airport traffic control tower, and instrument landing system.

Plainview: Airport traffic control tower.

Longview: Airport traffic control tower, and instrument landing system.

San Antonio, Stinson: Airport traffic control tower.

College Station: Airport traffic control tower.

Brownsville: Airport traffic control tower, and instrument landing system.

El Paso, Fort Worth, San Antonio: Airport traffic control center operating, and aircraft movement information service.

Amarillo: Long-range radar.

Beaumont, Britton, Childress, College Station, Eagle Lake, Guthrie, Hudspeth, Llano, Newman, Quitman: Establish distance measuring equipment.

Abilene, Amarillo, Austin, Brownsville, El Paso, Houston, Lubbock, Midland, San Antonio, Tyler, Wichita Falls: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Forth Worth (Amon Carter Field) and Houston: Air Traffic Control radar beacon.

Lubbock, San Angelo: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Alice, Austin, Childress, College Station, Cotulla, Dalhart, Galveston, Lufkin, McAllen, Wink: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Abilene, Galveston, Lufkin, Palacios, San Angelo, Wink: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Houston: (Second) instrument landing system.

UTAH

Salt Lake City: Airport Traffic Control Center operating and aircraft movement information service.

Myton: Establish distance measuring equipment.

Vernal: Establish terminal VHF Radio direction range.

Salt Lake City: Air traffic control radar beacon.

Cedar City and Delta: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Cedar City: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Bonneville, Bryce Canyon, Myton, Provo: Tactical air navigation equipment.

VERMONT

Burlington: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, approach light system, long-range radar, distance measuring equipment, and equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Montpelier: Doppler direction finding equipment, runway end identification lines.

VIRGINIA

Newport News: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing system, and approach light system.

Roanoke: Airport traffic control tower.

Lynchburg: Airport traffic control tower.

Lawrenceville and Richmond: Distance measuring equipment.

Staunton: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Newport News: Equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Dunn Loring: Air ground communications (second).

Blackstone: Remote communications outlet.

Charlottesville and Newport News: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Front Royal and Pulaski: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Charlottesville and Lynchburg: Instrument landing systems.

Roanoke: Runway end identification lines (second and third facilities).

WASHINGTON

Yakima: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing systems, approach light system, and equipment to improve reliability of existing instrument landing systems.

Seattle: Airport traffic control center operating Aircraft Movement Information Service and radar bright display equipment.

Ephrata and Hoquiam: Distance measuring equipment.

Pullman and Moscow: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Bellingham: Air-ground communications and Doppler direction finding equipment.

Seattle-Takoma: Air traffic control radar beacon and instrument landing systems.

Hoquiam and Walla Walla: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Walla Walla: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Seattle-Boeing: New approach light system.

WEST VIRGINIA

Huntington and Wheeling: Airport traffic control tower, instrument landing systems, and approach light system.

Beckley and Bluefield: Distance measuring equipment.

Elkins: Remote communications.

Bluefield and Huntington: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Charleston and Wheeling: Runway end identification lights.

WISCONSIN

Appleton and Manitowac: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Rhinelander: Air-ground communications.

Eau Claire, Green Bay, and Milwaukee: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Milwaukee-Racine: VHF omnidirectional radio range.

Milwaukee: Instrument landing system.

WYOMING

Cody: Terminal VHF radio directional range.

Rock River: Air-ground communications.

Rawlings, Rock Springs, Sheridan, Worland, and Casper: Doppler direction finding equipment.

Crazy Woman: Tactical air navigation equipment.

Insert No. 13

COAST GUARD

The following items would be eliminated if the proposed Coast Guard budget[1] were cut by $50 million:

1. Replacement of 1 large high endurance cutter (to be constructed by bid)	$14,000,000
2. Replacement of 2 medium reserve cutters (to be constructed by bid)	7,500,000
3. Replacement of 6 tenders (to be constructed by bid)	5,600,000
4. Replacement of 2 tenders and moorings to service Missouri River (to be constructed by bid)	1,174,000
5. Replacement of Tacan navigational equipment to service communications on cutters	2,200,000
6. Elimination of proposal to establish Astoria, Oreg., air detachment	1,249,000
7. Construction of air station, Boston	2,243,000
8. Construction of 24 family quarters for air detachment, Annette Island, Alaska	1,124,000
9. Relocation of air station, Miami to Opa-Locka, Fla.	1,115,000
10. Construction of microwave tower and laboratory, Wildwood, N.J	84,000
11. Construction and improvement of lifeboat station, Fort Macon, N.C	459,000
12. Eliminate proposal for establishment of search and rescue facility, Brookings, Oreg	560,000
13. Eliminate construction of moorings at Mayport, Fla., and Juneau, Alaska	650,000
14. Rebuilding of primary radio station, Miami, Fla	900,000
15. Eliminate improvements at Coast Guard bases and yard: Terminal Island, Calif., Ketchikan, Alaska, Sand Island, Honolulu, Coast Guard Yard, Curtis Bay, Md	1,783,000
16. Eliminate 1964 phase of Academy improvement program, New London, Conn., and improvements on Reserve Training Center, Yorktown, Va., and receiving station, Cape May, N.J	2,317,000
17. Curtailment of procurement of helicopters, aids to navigation projects, construction, and improvement of shore stations	7,006,000
Total	50,000,000

Insert No. 14

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

A $30 million budget cut in the Small Business Administration would mean that field and regional offices ~~would be closed~~. Typical of this type are the following:

Alaska: Anchorage.

Georgia: Atlanta.

Illinois: Chicago.

Kentucky: Louisville.

Missouri: St. Louis.

Montana: Helena.

Nebraska: Omaha.

Oregon: Portland.

Pennsylvania: Philadelphia.

Rhode Island: Providence.

South Dakota: Sioux Falls.

Texas: Marshall and Houston.

Washington: Spokane.

Puerto Rico: Santurce.

Insert No. 15

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A 15 percent reduction in the Veterans' Administration budget would mean closing from 7 to 10 hospitals; deferring planning and construction on seven others and curtailing the hospital modernization program.

This would adversely affect the quality of hospital care and the economies, including the construction industry, in these States and communities.

Alabama: Tuskegee.

California: Long Beach, Los Angeles, Palo Alto, and San Francisco.

Florida: Gainesville.

Illinois: Danville and Hines.

Indiana: Fort Wayne and Indianapolis.

Kansas: Wichita.

Kentucky: Fort Thomas and Louisville.

Maryland: Perry Point.

Massachusetts: Bedford.

Michigan: Saginaw.

Missouri: Excelsior Springs.

Nebraska: Grand Island.

New York: Castle Point and Northport, Long Island.

North Carolina: Oteen.

Ohio: Cincinnati.

Oregon: Portland.

Pennsylvania: Aspinwall, Coatesville, and Erie.

Puerto Rico: San Juan.

South Dakota: Fort Meade.

Texas: Temple.

Vermont: White River Junction.

Virginia: Roanoke.

Washington: Seattle.

West Virginia: Martinsburg.

Insert No. 16

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

An $86 million cut would force GSA to drop the following construction projects:

Arizona: Tucson—border patrol station headquarters	$344,000
Arkansas: Pine Bluff—post office, courthouse	2,391,000
California: Fresno—courthouse, Federal office building	5,400,000
Idaho: Boise—courthouse, Federal office building	7,505,000
Maryland: Baltimore—Federal office building (increase)	13,706,000
Nevada: Las Vegas—courthouse, Federal office building	4,772,000
New Hampshire: Portsmouth—post office, Federal office building	2,396,000
Ohio: Cleveland—Federal office building	41,223,000
South Carolina: Charleston	2,903,000
Texas: Fort Worth	15,664,000

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the Record an article from the Christian Science Monitor describing the testimony of the Secretary of Defense before the Joint Economic Committee, together with that testimony itself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Reforms Outlined: McNamara Lists Savings

(By Juan Cameron)

Washington.—Dull are terms such as "logistics management improvement" and "CPFF" contracts.

Yet Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara told Congress this past week such bureaucratese is the key to whittling down the $50-billion defense budget by $3.5 billion in the next 3 years.

In an appearance before the House-Senate Economic Committee that had strong political overtones, the embattled Defense Department chief bared the record of past spending mistakes that cost the taxpayer billions.

And, to the pointed bipartisan applause of Chairman Senator Paul Douglas, and William Proxmire, Democrats and Representative Thomas Curtis, Republican, the former Ford Motor Co. president outlined his program of management reform.

THIRTEEN BILLION DOLLARS SAVED

In a crisp, youthful voice, the sleek-haired Defense Secretary told how he had shaved $13 billion off the 1963–64 new spending requests of the military services.

And he rattled off how through increased emphasis on competitive bidding, centralized purchasing, combined operations, and elimination of "wasteful and inefficient" cost plus fixed fee (CPFF) contracts he hopes to pare defense costs by $1.9 billion in fiscal 1963 and $3.4 billion by fiscal 1965.

In pointed reference to the current TFX hearings before another Senate committee led by Arkansas Senator John McClellan, Senator Douglas said: "I consider you to be a great Secretary of Defense, a man who understands the intricate problems in these areas and has had the courage—and some of your actions have taken great courage—to act upon them."

ECONOMIES LISTED

Better procurement policies can affect substantially a major portion of the $50 billion defense budget. Roughly $20 billion of the Department's budget today goes toward payrolls, the remainder to logistics, which includes everything from the controversial $6 billion TFX design, to butcher smocks, belt buckles, and exercise bloomers.

Mr. McNamara ticked off the chief areas of savings thus:

Shifting from noncompetitive to competitive bids can save 25 cents on each dollar. By fiscal 1965 competitive bids will cover $1.9 billion of defense purchases against $700 million today with savings estimated at $500 million annually.

Reduction in cost plus fixed fee contracts from 23.3 percent today to 12 percent by fiscal 1965, with eventual savings of $700 million.

Arbitrary cuts in Department of Defense civilian 1 million-man employment on the basis of estimated gains in Department productivity. Reductions of 10,000 planned by fiscal 1964.

Closing of some 258 military installations in the United States and 58 overseas and release of 45,000 employees. "Good progress" made to date on program schedules to save $440 million annually by fiscal 1965.

Consolidation of military communications, headquarters intelligence operations, real estate management and equipment maintenance. The latter alone to produce savings of $300 million annually by 1965.

Joint supply and service purchasing—including eliminating buying of 18 different types of butcher smocks—which will reduce inventories by $232 million this year, an additional $112 million in fiscal 1964.

Joint equipment, such as the TFX aircraft, that over the life cycle of the aircraft will save $1 billion in development, production, and operating costs.

BUILDING BLOCKS

He confirmed that the huge and expanding defense expenditures on research and development and sophisticated weapon systems did not lend themselves to competitive bidding.

But his philosophy in these expensive fields is to make sure the "technical building blocks"—acquired in research, exploratory, and advance development—are available before large-scale weapon systems are undertaken.

The failure to develop these building blocks before "metal is bent" has been one of the major causes of waste and inefficiency in defense spending, Mr. McNamara told the Douglas group.

Some examples:

Some $1 billion and 15 years spent on a nuclear-powered aircraft before it was terminated in 1961. No efficient reactor was available.

Four hundred and fifty million dollars on the P–6–M jet-powered flying boat put into production before basic design problems were solved. Terminated August 1959.

Eighty million dollars on automatic decoy missile Goose that was found incompatible with concept of "fail safe" under which manned bombers automatically return to base unless specifically ordered to continue on target.

Eighty million dollars on radio telescope at Sugar Grove, W. Va., before technical problems were solved. Terminated July 1962.

Statement by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara Before the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee, March 28, 1963

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it is indeed a pleasure for me to come before this committee for the first time to discuss the progress made by the Department of Defense in improving the economy and efficiency of its procurement and logistics operations. The Subcommittee on Defense Procurement of the Joint Economic Committee is among the pioneers in this effort. To the continuing interest and prodding of this and other committees of the Congress, we owe much of the progress achieved in this area over the last 10 years. The personal interest and warm support of the chairman and Mr. Curtis and the other members of the committee have been a source of strength to me in my efforts to bring about improvements in our logistics management, many of which stem directly from the committee's recommendations.

As the members of this committee well know, it is extremely difficult to change the traditional way of doing things in the Defense Establishment. Many of the actions we have taken during the last 2 years to improve the management of our procurement and logistics operations were recommended by this and other committees of the Congress and by various nongovernmental committees and commissions, 10 and even 15 years ago. For example, the reorganization of the Army technical services, which we put into effect last year, had been recommended to the President by Secretary of Defense Lovett in 1952 with the comment that "A reorganizaion of the technical services would be no more painful than backing into a buzz saw, but I believe that it is long overdue."

Resistance to change is not unique to the Defense Department. This same problem is also found in almost any large business organization. Change means that people have to relearn the way they are doing things and this is always a painful and time-consuming process, whether in defense logistics or private business.

The term "logistics," in its broadest application, encompasses the entire spectrum of activity beginning with research and development and extending through procurement, production, construction of facilities, deployment, supply, maintenance, transportation, etc., and ending with the disposal of surplus materiel and facilities. In this sense, our logistics operations account for about three-quarters of the total Defense budget. Looked at in another way—our total payroll for active duty, reserve and retired military personnel and all civilian personnel accounts for roughly two-fifths of our total budget, with the balance (about $30 billion out of a total of $50 billion) accounted for by the purchase of goods and services of all kinds, that is, research and development; the procurement of weapons, equipment, spares and other consumables; military construction; maintenance; utilities; etc.

Truly important savings in defense expenditures can be achieved only by attacking this entire spectrum of logistics activities, and that is precisely what we are trying to do. Decisions in the development phase of a weapons system will affect not only the cost of development but also the cost of production and operation of the system throughout its life. As this subcommittee noted in one of its recent reports, "It is apparent that two identical items can be procured, stored, inventoried, issued and maintained in a common way much more economically and efficiently than can two different items." Yet, each new weapon or piece of equipment that enters the inventory brings with it thousands of new and different items of spares and supporting equipment. That is why any serious attempt to reduce the number of different items in our logistics system and thereby reduce costs, must begin in the research and development phase.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The research and development phase itself can be broken down into a number of significant sequential steps:

1. Research (basic and applied): The effort directed toward the expansion of knowledge in such fields as the physical and environmental sciences, i.e., mathematics, physics, psychology, biology and the medical sciences.

2. Exploratory developments: Work directed toward the solution of specific military problems, but stopping short of the actual development of experimental hardware for technical or operational testing.

3. Advanced developments: Projects which have advanced to a point where the development of experimental hardware for technical or operational testing is required, prior to the determination of whether the item should be designed or engineered for eventual service use.

4. Engineering developments: Developments which are being engineered for service use, but which have not as yet been approved for production and deployment.

5. Operational systems development: Continued development, test, evaluation, and design improvement of projects which have already entered the production-deployment stage.

It is from the first three categories—research, exploratory, and advanced developments—that we acquire the technical building blocks, i.e., the new technologies, and critical components, that we need for major systems development. We cannot do a proper job of engineering development, least of all operational systems development, unless these building blocks are available. Lack of attention to this principle in the past has been one of the major causes of waste and inefficiency in the research and development program. All too often large-scale weapon system developments, and even production programs, have been undertaken before we had clearly defined what was wanted and before we had clearly determined that there existed a suitable technological base on which to draw in developing a system. And, all too often insufficient attention has been paid to how a proposed weapon system would be used; what it would cost; and, finally, whether the contribution the weapon could make to our military capability would be worth the cost. Let me give you a few examples to illustrate this point.

Nuclear-powered aircraft

Here is a case where a major development program was undertaken before a suitable technological base had been created. Nearly 15 years and about $1 billion had been devoted to the nuclear-powered aircraft project before it was terminated in 1961. Throughout its history the program was characterized by attempts to find shortcuts to early flight. Only a relatively small fraction of the money expended was applied to the really critical pacing item, namely the development of an efficient reactor with a potentially high performance. Most of the funds were consumed in aircraft and weapon system design, in trying to develop turbine machinery, aircraft components, radiation resistant tires and oils, and for the construction of various facilities, many of which would be needed only in support of a flight test program. The powerplant development was oriented primarily to the goal of early flight, an approach which yielded little, if any, potential for further growth into a militarily useful system. Neither of the two powerplants under development at the time the project was canceled held any great promise as practical propulsion units. Both would have required very large aircraft with limited speed and altitude characteristics; and involving severe operational and ground handling problems and hazards. Thus, due to the lack of the pacing item, it is highly unlikely that we would ever have obtained anything useful from a military point of view, had we continued the project.

The P–6–M jet-powered flying boat

Here is a case where a project was advanced into the production phase long before even the basic design problems were solved. The project was started in 1951 to meet an anticipated requirement for a fast, mine-laying, jet-powered seaplane, capable of flying at transonic speeds at sea level and at high altitudes, with an ability to take off and land in 6- to 8-foot waves and carry a payload of 30,000 pounds over a range of 900 miles. Even though various model tests conducted in 1953 and 1954 disclosed a number of serious design deficiencies, the development was continued. Further technical deficiencies were disclosed during flight tests in 1955 and 1956. Nevertheless, the first production contract for operational aircraft was placed in late 1956. By the time this project was terminated in August 1959, the Government had expended almost $450 million, of which more than $200 million was spent on the production contract. Even then, most of the technical problems had still not been solved.

SM–73—Goose aerodynamic decoy missile

Here is a case where the operational use of a weapon was not clearly foreseen prior to the commencement of full system development. The project was started in June 1955 and terminated in December 1958 at the cost to the Government of about $80 million. The Goose was essentially a pilotless aircraft which was designed to fly at about the speed of a B–52 and appear on enemy radar as a manned bomber. The operational concept called for launching Goose at the same time the manned bombers took off. However, the manned bombers could be recalled and returned to their bases, but the Goose could not be recovered once it was launched. Thus the Goose was incompatible with the new concept of positive control (under which the bombers automatically return to base unless specifically directed to continue to target) and had to be abandoned.

---

[1] It is assumed that the entire Coast Guard budget cut would come from its modernization program since other portions of its budget do not contain items susceptible to any sizable reductions.

Construction of a radio telescope at Sugar Grove, W. Va.

Here is a case where the construction of an extremely complex research facility was started before all of the technical problems had been thoroughly studied. Construction of this radio telescope, known as the Big Dish, was decided upon in the fiscal year 1959 budget at which time its total cost was estimated at $80 million. Two years later the cost estimate had risen to $135 million and to preclude a further increase, the House Appropriations Committee established this amount as a ceiling on the project. By the spring of 1962 it was clear that the cost would amount to $190 to $200 million, without any assurance the facility would meet the originally stated requirements. In the light of this, and other factors, the project was terminated last July at a cost to the Government of about $70 million.

PROGRAM DEFINITION

In order to minimize such problems in the future we are now following the practice of inaugurating large system development projects only after completion of what we call a program definition phase. This is the phase in which we, together with our contractors, do our thinking and planning—before we start bending metal."

Very briefly, the program definition phase begins with the solicitation of proposals from industry and involves a number of early study contracts whose purpose is simply to define the program, prior to authorizing full-scale development. In the early stages of the program definition phase we do not attempt to establish rigorous specifications, preferring to encourage initiative and innovation on the part of our contractors or contractor teams. Indeed, where competing approaches present an unusually difficult choice, we may support more than one approach throughout the whole program definition period.

Working together, a contractor team can explore in depth the many unknowns which are present in any new effort. They can accomplish the overall system design, define the subsystems and major components, and begin the early stages of laboratory experimentation and design. Most important, they can identify the critical problems and make good estimates of how long and how much money it will take to solve them.

With this information at hand, we are in a much better position to decide whether or not to proceed with full-scale development. And if we decide on full-scale development, the basic scientific and management team will have already been established, with a visible history of successful collaboration during the program definition phase. Finally, it will be possible to make the decision for full-scale effort with far greater assurance that the cost estimates are sound, that the performance of the system will meet the promise, and that the military requirement will be filled at the time needed.

Prior planning, and even feasibility testing of pacing components, are a lot cheaper than having to reorient, stretch out, or terminate expensive projects after they have been started. There are, of course, exceptions to this general rule. Where a development can add a new and unique dimension to our military capability like the A- and H-bombs and the ICBM, great costs and risks are justified. But such cases are rare. The typical development promises, if successful, to achieve a capability that can also be achieved in other ways or represents an improvement of but modest proportions in our total military capability. In these cases the urgency is not as great and the employment of a more measured and orderly approach to development and production is fully justified. In fact, I have observed that in most cases careful and comprehensive prior planning actually saves time as well as money and results in more effective and more dependable weapons.

Another major source of waste, as I noted earlier, is the parallel development of projects and systems designed for the same general mission. The cost of developing new aircraft today is reckoned in the hundreds of millions of dollars. In the case of the B–70, the development of three prototype aircraft will probably cost us about $1.5 billion and they will still not be designed as operational vehicles. The cost of developing a new major missile system is even higher. We have invested well over $1 billion in the Nike-Zeus already and the Atlas and Titan developments ran well over $2 billion each. Even the cost of developing a new aircraft engine to the point of production is about $150 million.

But this is only the beginning of the increased cost. If two models are produced where one could do the job, the cost of production is also increased. Two production lines instead of one must be set up and tooled and the economies of large-scale, repetitive production are lost, thus significantly increasing the cost per unit. Two separate pipelines of spares and unique support equipment instead of one must be established in the logistics system, with all the additional costs involved. And, finally, two sets of obsolete spares and support equipment instead of one will eventually have to be disposed of when the end item is finally phased out of the inventory. We have on hand, at this very moment, more than $12 billion of "Excess and long supply" items in our inventories, excluding the billions of dollars of surplus and obsolete major end items which have to be disposed of each year. Thus there are very great economic incentives for reducing the number of different weapon systems and major items of equipment in our inventories.

NIKE-TALOS CONTROVERSY

Yet the record is replete with instances of duplicate developments. One of the most memorable cases of parallel weapon projects conducted under the auspices of different services was the Nike-Talos controversy. The land-based Talos, an Air Force-sponsored adaptation of the Navy shipborne Talos, was directly competitive with the Army's Nike-B (later the Nike-Hercules) development, the follow-on effort to the Nike-Ajax. The history of this controversy was complicated by the roles and missions issue which need not concern us in this context. What is of interest here, however, is the fact that these parallel developments proceeded right up to the point where both were about to be produced and deployed.

At this point, however, Congress balked at the prospect of such an obvious duplication and refused to authorize the use of construction funds for Talos until the Department of Defense completed an evaluation of the two systems and came forth with specific recommendations. As the report of the Senate Armed Services Committee stated: "The committee concluded that both the Army and Air Force are assigned overlapping roles and missions in the antiaircraft and continental air defense fields. The committee believes that unless concise responsibilities are assigned, duplication of weapon systems costing in the multibillion-dollar ranges might result and that such duplication would obviously be too costly as well as inexcusable from a military standpoint." Faced with this mandate, responsibility for land-based Talos was transferred to the Army in the fall of 1957. Following an evaluation study, the Army canceled the project in July of 1958 at a cost to the Government of $118 million.

I know that I need not burden this committee with a recitation of the Thor-Jupiter controversy which involved essentially the same kind of issue.

MULTIPLE AIRCRAFT ENGINE DEVELOPMENT

Another area in which unnecessary duplication has long existed is in jet aircraft engine development. While there may have been a justification in the early stages for a large number of different projects, jet engine technology has now reached a point where parallel development is no longer justified. Indeed, the time has come where we should make use, whenever possible, of engines already developed. This we have done in the case of the new C–141 cargo transport aircraft. Here we had a choice of developing an entirely new engine, which would probably have given this aircraft perhaps a 2- to 3-percent improvement in overall performance, or of using an already developed engine, the TF–33, at a saving in development costs alone of well over $100 million. Considering the additional saving which will accrue in production costs and later in supply and maintenance costs, it was clear that we should use the TF–33 engine.

MULTIPLE FIGHTER AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENTS

One of the most costly areas of duplication has been that of fighter aircraft. For example, in the 1955–58 period there were no less than four aircraft under development to perform the fighter mission—two in the Navy and two in the Air Force. The Navy aircraft were the F4H–1 and the F8U–3. The Air Force aircraft were the F–105 and the F–107. One might argue that there were special requirements associated with Air Force and Navy missions which necessitated basically different aircraft. Even so both the F4H–1 and the F8U–3 were, as the House Appropriations Committee noted in its report on the 1958 defense appropriation bill, "all-weather fighters with approximately the same mission and operational characteristics." Accordingly, the committee directed the Navy to "take prompt action to decide which of these aircraft it will place in production. This should be accomplished at an earlier date and with fewer test and evaluation aircraft than is presently scheduled." The Navy eventually chose the F4H–1 for production, but by the time the F8U–3 development was terminated, it had cost the Government over $136 million.

In the case of the Air Force, the F–107 was terminated at a cost of about $85 million. Even so, two of the four aircraft, the F4H and the F–105, were actually placed in production. A comprehensive analysis of these two production programs in 1961 convinced me that one aircraft, the F4H, could meet the need of the Air Force as well as the Navy, and do it better than the F–105. Accordingly, further procurement of the F–105 has been terminated and the F4H, now designated the F–4, will be bought for both the Air Force and the Navy. In addition, I have assigned supply management responsibilities for all spare parts and components peculiar to the F–4 aircraft to the Department of the Air Force and I have asked the Air Force and the Navy to develop and submit to me, for my approval, joint plans for the maintenance of this aircraft.

TFX

Perhaps the most important single action we have taken thus far to reduce the number of different weapon systems in our inventory is the TFX, which has been so prominent in the news of late. This aircraft development is designed to provide a replacement for the F–4. Instead of developing and producing two separate aircraft, one for the Navy and another for the Air Force, as was done in the case of the F–105 and the F4H, we decided to develop and produce one aircraft which would meet the requirements of both services. Admittedly, this is not a simple undertaking. The development of a major weapon system to meet the requirements of more than one service is something of a precedent in the Department of Defense. It took more than a year and a half and tens of thousands of manhours of intensive study by both the Defense Department and industry to perfect this plan.

Yet it should be clear to all who are interested in economy and efficiency in the Defense Establishment that we can no longer afford to undertake major development projects to meet unilateral service requirements where a single project can meet the requirements of more than one service. The additional costs involved are much too great. From here on out, we must seek to develop weapon systems to perform a military task, and if it so happens that more than one service has the same task then they will be required, as a general rule, to use the same weapon system wherever this can be accomplished without compromising essential military requirements. Where operational conditions vary, as for example, in attack carrier operations, the minimum number of changes in the common system will be made to accommodate these differences.

This is the principle involved and I think everyone will agree it is an entirely sound one. While one might argue as to precisely how much one system would save as compared with two, I believe everyone would agree that the saving in logistics costs, as I am using the term here today, cannot help but be very substantial. In the case of the TFX we believe these savings will amount to at least a billion dollars in development, production, and operating costs over the life cycle of this aircraft.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE COST REDUCTION PROGRAM

Because of the great uncertainties inherent in research and development, we have not attempted to establish precise monetary savings targets for that part of the "logistics spectrum," as we have for procurement, production, construction, supply, maintenance, transportation, etc. For the latter, we have established specific time-phased Defense Department goals for some 24 areas of logistics management. Selected goals in turn have been established for the military departments and defense agencies (i.e., DSA and DCA) so that our key logistics managers know exactly what is expected of them. These goals are admittedly ambitious and will be achieved only if all management levels in the Defense Department give them continuing, high priority attention. Accordingly, the service Secretaries and agency heads have been directed to make a monthly or quarterly review of progress achieved and to report the results to my office. These reports are audited by the Comptroller, both with regard to the goals and the progress against them.

The current cost reduction goals are summarized in the attached table. The last two columns show the goals reported to the President last July. Management improvement actions instituted in 1962 and planned for fiscal year 1963 should ultimately produce annual savings of about $1.9 billion. Our goal for end fiscal year 1965 is to initiate actions which will increase the rate of savings to about $3.5 billion a year. These are higher goals than those reported to the President, but I believe they can be achieved with a real effort on the part of all concerned.

Mr. Morris will discuss these goals in detail later and give you an up-to-date progress report on their attainment. What I would like to do at this time is to discuss some of the basic concepts and principles upon which these objectives have been developed.

BUYING ONLY WHAT WE NEED

Before we can intelligently decide what to buy, we must first determine precisely what is needed, and what is needed must be directly related to realistic and soundly conceived military plans and policies. All too often in the past, materiel requirements were determined on the basis of unrealistic military plans which themselves reflected the wide divergence of views among the services as to the probable nature of a future war. For example, the Air Force, planning essentially for a short nuclear war, was not buying enough combat consumables to support the Army in a conventional limited war. And the Army, envisioning a long, large-scale general war, was generating requirements so large as to be useless in planning its actual procurement programs. As a result, serious imbalances developed in the stocks of weapons, equipment, and combat consumables held by different services and even within the inventories of a single service.

Therefore, one of my first actions in the logistics management area was to insure that the requirements calculations for our major combat items were soundly based on unified contingency planning and realistic, attainable logistics objectives. By redefining our logistics objectives to accord with approved Defense Department-wide contingency plans we were able to reduce our total stated materiel requirements by some $24 billion. By setting out realistic goals that could be achieved within a reasonable period of time, we have been able to assure that the readiness levels of all related elements of the military forces are raised together and maintained in balance, one with another.

The first step was taken in 1961, in connection with the development of the fiscal year 1963 budget, with the establishment of a specific procurement objective for a large number of important items needed to insure that all of our forces could engage in sustained nonnuclear combat operations for a reasonable period of time. In the 1964 budget, now before the Congress, we propose to take another step to a still higher level of readiness, but again with an eye to the balance among all the related elements of the forces.

In moving toward this goal, we are giving priority to those items in which we are most seriously short, and to those new items which offer large improvements in combat effectiveness in relation to their cost. Modernization simply for its own sake is a luxury we cannot afford. Only by carefully husbanding our resources can we insure that all of our essential material requirements are met and that all of our forces are supplied and equipped, on a balanced basis, and are able to carry out the plans we have set for them.

We are also taking steps to get away from the use of often arbitrary and wasteful rule-of-thumb measures for determining pipeline requirements. Instead of simply adopting a standard factor for pipeline computations, we must, at least in the case of high cost, major end items and components, determine quantitative requirements on an item-by-item basis. We must explore every opportunity to shorten leadtimes by using our transportation resources more effectively, by taking steps to increase the post D-day production potential, etc. It is obvious that very great savings are possible if we are able to reduce the pipeline requirements without adversely affecting combat readiness. Let me give you a specific example: in the case of the M–88 tank recovery vehicle, we found that the substitution of a fully adequate transit pipeline factor of 55 days for the previously used arbitrary factor of 120 days enabled us to realize savings of $12.5 million on just this one item. These actions not only reduce procurement requirements, they also reduce storage and maintenance costs for the entire operational life of the item and, eventually, the amount of surplus which has to be disposed of.

The problem of setting sound requirement standards for major items of equipment is admittedly difficult; however, in the area of supply inventories the logistics management problem becomes far more complicated. This complexity is caused primarily by the great number and diversity of the items involved—nearly 4 million different items, having a value of $40.6 billion, currently being carried in our supply system. Because these items are so numerous and diverse, we simply must decentralize their management. However, when we do so, we then encounter the tendency of each echelon in the supply system to introduce unilateral safety factors into its requirement calculations. The final result, of course, is that the computed requirement often grossly overstates true needs. To improve the soundness of our supply item requirement calculations, we are undertaking a series of management improvement actions such as wider application of automatic data processing equipment, the increased use of fast logistics communication links, and the continuous review and redefinition of safety factors in our requirements computations.

It is not enough to determine simply the quantitative requirements for equipment and supplies. We must also determine the qualitative requirements as well. There is no point in paying for performance or quality features that are not needed to accomplish the essential military task. In any meaningful sense, procurement of excessive quality, which we call gold plating, is just as wasteful as procurement of excessive quantities. While it is understandable that an item costing $1,000 may perform more effectively than another costing half as much, we must always make a judgment as to whether the additional performance is worth the doubled cost. This will always be a most difficult area, since informed judgment is required in all such determinations. It is an area, however, in which we have only just scratched the surface of potential management improvement and in which we feel that substantial additional savings can be made in the future.

CONSOLIDATION OF COMMON SUPPLY AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES

In order to be sure that we are buying only what we need we must know exactly what we already have on hand and on order; and this, in an organization as huge, diverse, and far flung as the Defense Department is far from a simple problem. This is particularly true with regard to long supply and excess items, one of the most galling and troublesome areas of logistics management. Instances of one service buying items that are being disposed of by another are, to the taxpayer, the most unexplainable and inexcusable kind of waste. Yet this problem can never be entirely avoided as long as you have different parts of the organization buying and managing the same items. One solution, of course, is to have only one element of the organization purchase and manage all commonly used supplies and services, wherever centralized procurement is indicated. And this has been the solution long favored by many Members of the Congress.

The trend toward the consolidation of the logistics functions, including the procurement of common items of supply and services, has been underway in the Defense Establishment for a long time. Certainly, since the end of World War II, the sentiment, especially within the Congress, for faster progress toward consolidation grew markedly stronger. Following the Unification Act, the problem of overlapping logistics functions in the Defense Department drew the repeated attention and criticism of the Congress. Beginning with the recommendations of the Bonner subcommittee in 1952, the efforts of members of this committee in effecting passage of the O'Mahoney amendment to the 1953 Defense appropriation bill and later the McCormack-Curtis amendment to the Reorganization Act of 1958, Congress continually prodded the Department in the direction of truly unified logistics management.

The Defense Establishment, however, moved very cautiously toward that objective with various improvisations such as coordinated procurement, joint procurement agencies, and later the establishment of single managers for common supplies and services and the creation of certain Defense-wide coordinating agencies such as the Armed Forces Supply Support Center. These improvisations, however, did not get to the core of the problem—the need for a single agency charged with the responsibility for procuring and managing all commonly used and centrally procured supplies and services.

I remember a presentation made to me back in 1961 dealing with the lack of standardization in the clothing area. Each service, for example, was buying a different type of butcher smock, each in several sizes—a total of 18 different inventory items. Today we stock only two types in fewer sizes—a total of seven different inventory items. You all know the story of the belt buckles and the exercise bloomers.

Thus one of the first and most pressing tasks I had to face when I assumed the Office of the Secretary of Defense was the solution of this long-standing problem of the management of common supplies and services. In reviewing the efforts that had been made since World War II, I concluded that this problem must be attacked head on. It seemed clear to me, as it had to this committee for many years, that only through the establishment of a separate, single supply support agency could we ever hope to find a lasting solution. The result was the creation of the Defense Supply Agency, which now does the buying, the stocking, and where necessary, the surplus disposal of a wide range of commonly used supplies and services. Within its area of responsibility, it will greatly help to insure that we buy only what we need.

Already, the new Agency has made possible a personnel reduction of 3,700 in the fiscal year 1964 budget with an operations and maintenance saving of $33 million. Inventory is expected to be reduced by $232 million during the current fiscal year with a further reduction of $112 million in fiscal year 1964. DSA now handles about 1 million supply items but the number of different storage points is being reduced from 77 to 11.

The basic principle that there should be a single agency to procure and manage common items of supply or services for all users is, as this committee has repeatedly pointed out, as valid for the Government as a whole as it is for the Department of Defense. Therefore, in our own efforts to obtain greater efficiency through the consolidation of common logistics support activities, we should not restrict ourselves to Defense agencies alone. Whenever we find that it is more economical to use the capabilities or facilities of other Government agencies, with no loss in military effectiveness, and at the same or less cost, we should not and have not hesitated to do so. The General Services Administration annually buys for us about $770 million of common-use items such as office supplies, furniture and automatic data processing equipment. This agency also helps us in the screening and disposal of surplus property, in the leasing and maintenance of real property, the storage of records, the purchase of utilities, etc.

BUYING AT THE LOWEST SOUND PRICE

Once we have determined what it is we need to buy, the next problem is to procure it at the lowest sound price considering, of course, quality and delivery dates. For over 100 years, formal advertising has been the preferred method of Government procurement. This method not only insures that the price discipline of the competitive system is harnessed to the advantage of the Government but it also minimizes the risk of bias and preferential treatment in the awarding of contracts. However, since the end of World War II only a small portion of defense procurement has been awarded on a formally advertised basis. To a major extent this was unavoidable, as only conventional classes of equipment and supplies, purchased repetitively in volume, lend themselves fully to procurement by this method.

Formal advertising is inappropriate for virtually all research and development work and for the acquisition of many of today's sophisticated weapon systems, where it is impossible to draw up detailed specifications in advance and make firm fixed-price contracts, with selection based on price alone. Moreover, there are a number of other situations where formal advertising is not applicable by law; for example, small business set-asides, small purchases (under $2,500), emergency purchases, the procurement of perishable subsistence, and items subject to military security classification. These, too, serve to reduce the portion of defense procurement that can be accomplished through formal advertising.

Notwithstanding these limitations, we are making a vigorous effort to expand the use of formal advertising. In this connection, the so-called two-step procurement procedure recently approved by the GAO should prove extremely helpful where precise design is not as important as specific performance characteristics. Under this procedure bidders are first asked to submit proposals to meet specific performance criteria without providing a price quotation. These proposals are then examined by the Government engineers and buyers, and those which meet the desired performance characteristics are approved. In the second step, bidders whose products have been approved then submit sealed bids and the contract is awarded to the lowest responsible bidder under the formal advertising procedure.

INCREASING PRICE COMPETITION

But the fact that for much of our procurement we cannot rely on formal advertising does not mean that we should not demand and facilitate competition for defense contracts. This, in fact, has been one of my principal objectives, not only in the procurement area but also in research and development.

One way in which we can increase competition is to minimize sole-source procurement wherein, for example, we automatically buy spares and spare parts from the original producer of the end item. By breaking out these spares from the main contract we can procure them separately through competitive procedures. This, of course, entails the identification of the spares or spare parts, the preparation of procurement specifications and the seeking out of sources of supply in order to permit competitive bidding. In this effort, we have concentrated first on the high dollar value items already in the defense supply system. Now we are seeking to apply this technique to new items as they enter the supply system and to develop uniform procedures for screening and identifying such items in current and future procurements.

We are also trying to introduce competition at an earlier stage in our procurement process at the point where a new item is ready to be moved from development into production. If successful, this would enable us to avoid paying a price premium on the first large-scale production buy. But use of this method does open up a whole series of new and difficult problems. In order to introduce competition early in the procurement cycle, we must see to it that the necessary drawings and technical data are produced during the development phase so that they may be available at the time the first procurement is made. This is not always possible, especially where time is critical or where the design is still subject to major change. Also, where large engineering and tooling costs are involved, it is unlikely that any new source would be able to compete successfully against the development contractor who may have already completed a large part of the production engineering and tooling.

Experience has demonstrated that very large savings can be achieved by increasing competition. We estimate these savings at about 25 cents on each dollar shifted from noncompetitive to competitive procurement and this is the basis upon which we have computed the savings of nearly $500 million per year to be achieved by fiscal year 1965.

REDUCTION IN COST-PLUS-FIXED-FEE CONTRACTS

It has long been recognized that cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts usually provide no incentive for economy, or superior performance. Nevertheless, in recent years, an increasing share of our procurement has been carried out under cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts, rising from about 13 percent in 1952 to nearly 38 percent during the first 9 months of 1961. To some extent this shift to cost-plus-fixed-fee contracting was unavoidable because of the exploding technology of the 1950's which introduced unprecedented complexity and sophistication in our equipment.

However, even where firm fixed-price contracting is not feasible, penalties and rewards can still be utilized. There are other techniques available through which we can provide incentives to the Defense contractor to perform economically and efficiently. The most important method is the use of incentive contracts in which the contractor's fee is increased if he betters the target price or target performance goals, or conversely, is reduced or eliminated entirely if he fails to meet the contract targets. By fiscal year 1965, we hope to reduce cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts to about 12½ percent of our total contract awards, with an eventual annual savings of nearly $700 million. Already in the first 8 months of the current fiscal year we have reduced the cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts to about 23.3 percent of the total as compared to 38 percent in the first 9 months of 1961.

REDUCING OPERATING COSTS

An equally important part of our cost reduction program is our effort to reduce the day-to-day costs of operating the Defense Establishment. One important aspect of this effort has been our program for the closing of unneeded bases and installations. To date, we have announced plans to close or reduce in scope some 330 activities, of which 72 are located overseas and 258 within the United States. As Assistant Secretary Morris will report in detail later, good progress has been made in carrying out these announced closures and continued studies are being made to identify additional installations and bases that can be reduced or closed in future years. We expect by the end of fiscal year 1965 to have initiated actions which will eventually save over $440 million per year. Progress to date is shown in the table below:

Actions announced as of Dec. 31, 1962

	Total
Number of locations	330
Acres to be excessed	274,000
Acquisition cost (millions)	$1,922
Personnel to be released	44,923
Annual savings when action completed [1] (millions)	$270

[1] Many actions require 2 or 3 years to complete.

In an organization as large as the Department of Defense, efforts to simplify procedures can yield surprisingly large savings. Therefore, we are examining our contractor reporting requirements, our requisitioning and transportation procedures and other types of logistics paperwork with the aim of eliminating unneeded or overlapping procedures and achieving the greatest degree of standardization where elimination is not practicable. Substantial success has already been achieved, and we expect to make even greater progress in the coming years.

Another area where increased management effort can yield significant monetary savings, as well as greater combat readiness, is equipment maintenance for which we spend about $11 billion a year. Actions which we have already taken and plan to take through fiscal year 1965 should produce savings of about $300 million a year. But this is an area in which we have barely scratched the surface. To insure top level attention to this function and to coordinate the efforts of the entire Department a full-time Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Equipment Maintenance has recently been appointed.

One of the key ways in which we can make savings in the operations of the Department is through the consolidation of like activities. I have already mentioned the Defense Supply Agency but I am sure you will agree that the underlying principle applies to other areas of Defense activity as well. The swiftly expanding requirements for modern military communications, for example, and their even more swiftly rising costs have made departmentwide management of certain portions of the communications system both militarily necessary and financially imperative. Accordingly, a new Defense Communications Agency has been established to guide the development of unified long-line communications systems for use by all elements of the Department. This Agency is also responsible for other important functions such as the development and support of the National Military Command System and the supervision of the military communications satellite development program.

Still another area where consolidation appeared to be a necessity was in headquarters intelligence activities. For this reason, we created the Defense Intelligence Agency not so much, in this case, to reduce costs but rather to utilize more effectively our resources in this vital area.

Real property management, including military family housing, provides another area for reducing operating costs. We have now brought family housing under centralized management in each Department and established a new cost accounting system to facilitate better management. And with the cooperation of the Congress, we hope to bring together in a single appropriation all funds for construction, operation, maintenance, improvement and leasing of family housing.

Our efforts to improve the management of the entire logistics spectrum have resulted in some important changes, not only Department of Defense-wide, but also within the military departments. The Air Force in 1961 substantially realined its organizational structure to meet better the management requirements imposed by the radical change in the nature of modern weapon systems. The Army has virtually completed its reorganization started last year, and has significantly reduced the operational complexity and administrative overlapping of the former Technical Services. And now the Navy, too, is considering a substantial realinement of its organization to fit it better to the demands of modern warfare.

Mr. Chairman, the task of management in the Defense Department is never done. New problems arise as old ones are solved, as evidenced by the constant flow of GAO reports. I can assure you that these reports, as well as constructive criticism from any other source, receive top level attention in the Defense Department. For example, I examine all GAO reports as they come into the Department and all of the written replies are reviewed and initialed by either Mr. Gilpatrick or me, in terms of approving their substance, before they go back to the GAO.

I am sure that the logistics management improvement program, which I have outlined here this morning will not prove to be the final word. But I am equally sure that this program will correct many deficiencies of long standing and result in savings of several billion dollars per year.

Department of Defense procurement and logistics cost-reduction program

[Dollars in millions]

	Recurring annual savings to be realized from actions in fiscal years 1962 through current year				
	As estimated Jan. 15, 1963			As reported to President	
	1963	1964	1965	1963	1967
1. Buying only what we need:					
a. Refining requirements calculations:					
(1) Major items of equipment	(1)	(1)	(1)	0	0
(2) Initial spares provisioning	$104	$157	$210	0	0
(3) Secondary items	420	502	550	$150	$300
(4) Technical manuals	8	25	30	0	0
Total from refinement of requirements	532	684	790	150	300
b. Increased use of excess inventory in lieu of new equipment:					
(1) Equipment and supplies	189	284	394	225	450
(2) Idle production equipment	2	10	21	0	0
(3) Excess contractor inventory	20	20	20	0	0
Total from increased use of excess inventory	211	314	435	225	450
c. Eliminating "goldplating"	$64	$100	$100	$64	$100
d. Inventory item reduction	$1	$4	$5	0	0
2. Buying at the lowest sound price:					
a. Shift from noncompetitive to competitive procurement:					
Total percent competitive [2]	(37)	(38.4)	(39.9)		
Amount of saving	$281	$402	$494	$160	$480
b. Shift from cost-plus-a-fixed-fee to fixed or incentive price:					
Total percent cost-plus-a-fixed-fee [3]	(25.8)	(19.1)	(12.3)		
Amount of saving	$322	$502	$684	$100	$600
3. Reducing operating costs:					
a. Terminating unnecessary operations	292	357	442	257	600
b. Standardizing and simplifying procedures:					
(1) Consolidation of 16 requisition systems into 1 on July 1, 1962	10	20	20	20	20
(2) Consolidation of 81 transportation documents into 1	0	22	32	30	30
(3) Reduction of contractor reports	1	4	25	30	30
c. Consolidating and increasing efficiency of operations:					
(1) DSA operating expense savings	31	33	42	28	50
(2) DCA and communication system savings	16	20	25		30
(3) Improvement of transportation and traffic management	17	23	23	40	65
(4) Improvement of equipment, maintenance and management	108	199	297	48	300
(5) Administrative vehicles	3	9	11	0	0
(6) Improvement of military housing management	6	11	19	3	27
(7) Improvement of real property management	24	34	45	0	0
Total program	1,919	2,738	3,489	[4] 1,155	3,082

[1] Savings will be reported as identified. In fiscal year 1962 requirements for major items of equipment were reduced by $24,000,000,000. In fiscal year 1963, the Army reduced 1964 pipeline requirements by $500,000,000; and substituted an expanded production base for a mobilization reserve inventory, saving a net of $36,000,000, a total saving of $536,000,000.

[2] Fiscal year 1961 was 32.9 percent; total annual conversion from sole source of $1,900,000,000; savings are 25 percent per dollar converted.

[3] For the 1st 9 months of fiscal year 1961, cost-plus-fixed-fee was 38 percent; a reduction of $6,000,000,000 is required to reduce that percentage to 12.3 percent; savings are 10 percent per dollar converted.

[4] Fiscal year 1963 goal reported in July 5, 1962 memo to President, on a conservative basis, as $750,000,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the distinguished majority leader on a very important statement insofar as the general welfare of this country is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the distinguished majority leader [Mr. ALBERT] on the budget appear in the RECORD immediately following my remarks on the Youth Corps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. O'BRIEN of New York). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

THE TWO-PRICE COTTON SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today to express my continuing concern for the economic well-being of our Nation and those individuals who earn their livelihoods in the great American textile industry. On many occasions I have called to the attention of my colleagues the plight of American textile workers and employers as a result of the inequitable two-price cotton system.

A great American, commenting upon this problem on September 6, 1962, made this statement:

> Thus, the inequity of the two-price system of cotton costs remains as a unique burden upon the American textile industry, for which a solution must be found in the near future.

The great American who uttered those words was the President of the United States when he commented upon this question immediately following the Tariff Commission's rejection of the Department of Agriculture's recommendation of an import fee of 8½ cents per pound on the raw cotton content of textile imports as authorized under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended.

When this statement was made great hope was engendered in the minds of those of us who have been so concerned about the problem. Today, after the passing of approximately 6 months, we seem no nearer a solution of this tremendous problem. As a matter of fact, it appears that we are further away from the desired solution than we were at the time the President uttered the truth which I have just quoted.

Since the two-price cotton system is bringing great injury to the domestic textile industry, I would like to review with you briefly some of the basic economic facts relating to the importance of the textile industry to my home State of North Carolina and to the United States.

Because of my desire to give to my colleagues an unbiased picture of the importance of the textile industry to Americans, I asked the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to make an objective study of the importance of this industry to the economy of our Nation. The report, even though based on the census of manufactures taken in 1958 by the Bureau of the Census, revealed many interesting facts. I will now undertake to briefly state the basic facts reported by the experts in the Industrial Organization and Corporation Finance Economics Division of the Library of Congress.

Textile manufacture is North Carolina's leading industry, and North Carolina ranks first among all 50 States in the production of textile goods. North Carolina's textiles find their way into the marketplaces of the Nation and throughout the free world.

Because it provides clothing and contributes so extensively to shelter, the textile industry is basic to our American economy. Furthermore, textile production is essential to the national security. In this new era of space exploration, textiles are indispensable. As American men and vehicles whirl through space, textiles are playing an ever-expanding role, from the rocket nose cone to the astronaut's protective clothing and his recovery chute.

The annual value of all textile manufactures in the United States is well over $13¼ billion. Although the industry is concentrated in the Southeast, its 8,000 plants are scattered throughout 44 States. With more than 950,000 employees the textile industry has a payroll of at least $3½ billion.

Textile mills in the United States consumed 8,131,756 bales of cotton in 1958. Other raw materials important to textile production are wool and manmade fibers.

Each year the textile industry utilizes about $85 million in fuels, and almost $120 million in electricity.

Estimates place expenditures on new plant and equipment by the textile industry during 1962 at about $620 million.

Furthermore, outlays on research in the combined textile and apparel industry totaled $29 million in 1959, the latest year for which such data are available.

These then are the broad dimensions of the American textile industry.

The annual value of textile manufacture in North Carolina amounts to well over $3.1 billion, or one-fourth of the total value of American textile production. The textile industry of North Carolina produces in value almost a fourth of all broad woven cotton goods in the United States; more than a third of the manmade fiber fabrics; and almost 10 percent of all woolen and worsted goods.

North Carolina's spinning mills turn out nearly half of all cotton sales yarn produced in this country while its knitting mills produce about half of the Nation's entire hosiery output.

In 1958, according to the Census of Manufactures, value added by manufacture of textiles in North Carolina's plants amounted to more than $1 billion—$1,012,404,000—or about one-third of total value added by manufacture of products in all North Carolina's manufacturing establishments. Furthermore, the figure for the textile industry was approximately two-thirds higher than the corresponding data for cigarette production—$604,165,000.

For other industries important to North Carolina's economy the value added by manufacture in 1958, in order of magnitude, was as follows: food and kindred products, $235,207,000; furniture and fixtures, $210,457,000; chemical and allied products, $150,565,000; electrical machinery, $143,130,000; apparel and related products, $115,244,000; paper and allied products, $102,679,000; and lumber and wood products, $101,720,000.

Wages and salaries paid out by North Carolina's textile industry totaled $609,740,000 in 1958. Second to textiles in that same year was the furniture and fixtures industry, with a payroll of $122,958,000; followed by food and kindred products, $99,370,000; cigarette production, $73,837,000; apparel and related products, $69,742,000; lumber and wood products, $65,654,000; electrical machinery, $59,621,000; chemical and allied products, $53,364,000; and paper and allied products, $52,171,000.

North Carolina's textile industry and its employees pay more than $29 million annually in corporate and individual income taxes and sales taxes. This amounts to almost one-third of the State's total collection from these three sources.

North Carolina's textile industry is essential to the State's agricultural economy, tied to the cotton producers of the entire South.

Currently, more than 2.5 million bales of cotton are utilized a year by North Carolina's textile plants. This is almost nine times the total crop of 280,000 bales of cotton grown on the State's 4,827 commercial cotton farms in 1961.

According to the Census of Manufactures, in 1958, consumption of raw cotton by the textile industry of North Carolina totaled 2,387,000 bales. Of this aggregate, cotton weaving mills accounted for 1,163,000 bales and cotton yarn mills, 1,136,000 bales. The remainder was used by synthetic weaving mills, thread mills, and mills manufacturing miscellaneous textile goods.

The woolen and worsted mills consume many more pounds of fibers than are produced from the State's woolen clip.

The North Carolina textile industry is also a major source of income for other sectors of the State's economy.

Capital expenditures by the textile industry of North Carolina totaled $48,666,000 in 1958. Such outlays benefit especially the textile machinery manufacturers.

Other important industries in North Carolina which her textile production helps to boost are chemical and dyestuff manufacture, corn starch production, utilities and transportation.

In the present 10th Congressional District of North Carolina consisting of Gaston, Cleveland, Rutherford, Avery, Catawba, Mitchell, and Burke Counties, there were 344 textile mills in 1958, or 32 percent of the State's total.

Gaston County is the leading textile manufacturing county in the Nation. It consumes more cotton and has more active spindles than any other county.

The entire American textile industry faces the crucial problem of severe competition from low-priced textile imports, especially cotton goods. The agricultural subsidy on our cotton crop is in large part responsible for this situation. The two-price system for American raw cotton imposes an unfair strain upon the domestic cotton textile industry. Let us see how this cotton subsidy operates. In order to bolster cottongrowers, the U.S. Government subsidizes exports of raw cotton in the amount of 8½ cents per pound to make American cotton competitive on the world market. However, the American textile manufacturer then pays 8½ cents more for cotton than the foreign purchaser. Consequently, the foreign textile manufacturer gains a double advantage over his American counterpart. In addition to cheaper labor abroad, the foreign textile manufacturer benefits from lower raw materials costs. No wonder, then, that the American textile industry has been plagued with heavy competition from imports of inexpensive cotton goods.

Furthermore, on September 6, 1962, the Tariff Commission rejected a proposed increase in duties on foreign-made cotton textiles. This proposal would have raised the levy on imported cotton textiles by 8½ cents a pound, thus offsetting the price advantage that oversea manufacturers now receive on cotton purchased from the United States.

Bills were then introduced during the last session of the 87th Congress to remove the injustice of the two-price system for domestic cotton. No final action was taken.

During the present session of the 88th Congress similar legislation was again introduced into Congress. If this proposed measure is enacted into law it will provide an "in-kind subsidy" to cotton traders. For example, traders or middlemen would receive surplus cotton from the Government stockpile, thus enabling them to sell more cotton to domestic textile manufactures at a lower price.

Other measures have already been instituted to deal with the threat of imports of cheap cotton textiles. A short-term arrangement covering the year ended September 1962 was agreed upon in Geneva. This arrangement was designed to limit imports of cotton textiles and apparel into the United States to about the level of imports during the base period, that is, the year ended June 30, 1961.

During the short-term arrangement actual imports into the United States were the equivalent of 187 million square yards, or 33 percent in excess of the planned limit.

The temporary arrangement was then followed by a 5-year international arrangement. Import quotas were set under the terms of this long-range agreement with all textile importers to the United States.

The textile industry is fundamental to the economy both of the United States and North Carolina. Textiles supply us with clothing and much of our household furnishings. Their role in the national security is crucial. Moreover, textile manufacture boosts sales of countless other industries.

The textile industry of the United States, including that of North Carolina, has been adversely affected by extensive imports of low-priced cotton goods. Steps have already been undertaken to assist the textile industry. First, the 5-year international arrangement, limiting imports of cotton textile goods into the United States, should prove to be helpful to the American textile industry. Congressional action providing for import fees on cotton products would overcome the inequities of the present two-price system in our domestic cotton market. This seems to be the very least that an American textile worker could receive at the hands of his own Government.

Mr. Speaker, another segment of our population has an interest in a fair and equitable cotton pricing program which, in my judgment, is as vital as the interest of the domestic textile worker and his employer. I refer to the cotton farmer and his family.

In testimony before the House Agriculture Cotton Subcommittee I have tried to persuade my brethren of the necessity for the elimination of the two-price cotton system as a necessary step if the cotton agricultural economy is to survive. On several occasions I have brought this to the attention of my colleagues in speeches that have been made here in the House of Representatives. The same representations have been made by me to officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I see evidence of belief on the part of all except those in the Agriculture Department who have a responsibility in this area. Apparently they, even today, do not understand the seriousness of this situation as it relates to the American cotton farmer. A casual consideration of recent experience should be adequate warning to all who profess an interest in either our agricultural economy or the textile industry.

For the year ending August 1, 1961, domestic consumption and exports of cotton amounted to 14,757,000 bales; whereas it is estimated that on August 1, 1963, this figure will have dropped to 12,625,000 bales. CCC stocks of cotton for the year ending August 1, 1961, were reported to be 1,484,000 bales; whereas it is estimated that on August 1, 1963, there could be as much as 8,200,000 bales unless the recent action of the Secretary of Agriculture in his dumping operation lowers that figure.

As we recently saw in the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, the Commodity Credit Corporation investment in cotton is skyrocketing, and it may well be that the figure will approach $2 billion for the cotton program in its various aspects before the end of this fiscal year. These facts point to some of the dangers that confront the agriculturalist who is dependent upon cotton.

Another and equally important threat to the cotton agricultural economy has been pointed out on many occasions as we have discussed the matter here in the House of Representatives. I refer to the rapid conversion of textile production equipment from the processing of cotton to the processing of manmade or synthetic fibers. I will not dwell upon that in any detail today except to call to your attention a typical news story which I have recently read with great interest. On Saturday, March 2, 1963, there appeared in the Southern Textile News a story under the heading "Cotton Pricing May Force New $7 Million Plant to Synthetics." I make that news story a part of my remarks:

Cotton Pricing May Force New $7 Million Plant to Synthetics

Graniteville, S.C.—The president of the Graniteville Co., one of the oldest producers of cotton cloth in the South, Thursday, told a group of Texas cotton farmers that its new $7.5 million plant, now being constructed, might turn out blends or synthetic fiber fabrics rather than cotton cloth.

Francis A. Townsend made the remarks before a group from the Lubbock, Tex., area, an area in which the Graniteville Co. is one of the largest single buyers of cotton.

He told the touring group that initially the company had hoped the new spinning and weaving plant would help us maintain and improve the position we have gained in cotton textiles.

But, he said, the company felt it had to hedge our bets because of the pricing policies that control the purchase of American-grown cotton by American textile manufacturers.

He referred to the two-price system which forces American textile manufacturers to pay one-third more for American cotton than their foreign competitors have to pay for the same cotton.

"The Graniteville Co., which began operations as a cotton textile manufacturer in 1845, was an all-cotton operation until 2 years ago," he said.

"The competitive price of raw cotton will determine how large a proportion of our production will be in blends next year and the year after," he said.

The new plant is being designed so that it can turn out blends and manmade fiber fabrics as well as cotton with few machinery adjustments.

"We feel that we owe this versatility to our stockholders, to our employees, and to the communities in which we operate," he said.

COTTON PRICING

The Texans, 48 strong, were on a 2-day tour of textile operations in the Horse Creek Valley area of South Carolina, just north of Augusta, Ga. The tour was sponsored by the American Textile Manufacturers Institute and the Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., of Lubbock.

The group toured manufacturing facilities at Graniteville Thursday after a day of touring facilities of the United Merchants & Manufacturing Co. at nearby Clearwater on Wednesday.

There V. O. Roberson, U.M. & M. vice president had illustrated the price disadvantage of cotton by comparing manufacturing costs of two competitive fabrics, one of cotton only and one about half cotton, half synthetic fiber. The filling yarn in the half-and-half fabric had a manufacturing cost 17 cents a pound below that in the all-cotton fabric.

The startling announcement made by the president of the Graniteville Co. was made to a group of some 40 large acreage cotton growers who were being conducted on a tour of United Merchants & Manufacturers textile operations at Clearwater, S.C., and Graniteville Co., Graniteville, S.C.

The tour was designed to give major cotton producers an insight into textile operations in order to bring about a better understanding between the segments of the cotton industry. They were to see firsthand how the raw fiber they produce is converted into yarn and cloth.

Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1963, a story appeared in the same publication quoting a prominent official of the textile industry with reference to the encroachment of manmade fibers upon the cotton farmer's domestic market. As a part of my remarks at this time I would like to include the story which is entitled "Rapid Switch to Manmade Fibers Foreseen by Lowenstein Official":

Rapid Switch to Manmade Fibers Foreseen by Lowenstein Official

New Orleans.—America's present two-price cotton system may be more detrimental to farmers than to the textile industry, the president of a major textile chain's cotton buying operation said here Monday at the annual meeting of personnel of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's cotton division.

Robert W. Smith of Anderson, S.C., president of Lowenstein Cotton & Storage Corp., pointed out that the Government's two-price policy requires U.S. mills to pay $42.50 more per bale than foreign buyers pay for American-grown cotton.

"It is inconceivable to me that the textile industry will continue to try to operate in the face of such a staggering inequity as two-price cotton," he said. "The end effect, I believe, will not be so much of a question of what the textile industry will do as what the farmers will do," Mr. Smith added.

MILLS SWITCHING OVER

Textile mills, Mr. Smith said, are "switching to manmade fibers on an increasingly broad basis, and the effect has been dynamic for some of the manmade fibers. Rayon has been received in the past 5 years and is booming along at record levels—and at prices from 8 to 11 cents cheaper than cotton. Nylon has been similarly revived and is in the midst of a striking boom, with its low-waste characteristic offsetting a slightly higher price. Other manmade fibers are prospering."

On the other hand, he added, cotton's domestic market is deteriorating and its export market is disappearing.

"The Commodity Credit Corporation is becoming more and more the real 'market' for U.S. cotton," he said. "A distressingly large proportion of our crop is going into government warehouses, where it is of absolutely no value to anyone. Cotton is good for only one thing, and that is to be processed into a textile product."

Mr. Smith also called for stricter classing cotton to conform more closely with the fiber's spinning characteristics. He said inconsistent classing practices affect the price of cotton by failing to reflect spinning values and, also, by varying basic loan values.

Mr. Speaker, further indication of the dangers that the American cotton farmer will continue to lose great portions of the domestic textile industry market is apparent when one considers the rapid decline of the export market for American cotton cloth. In the Southern Textile News of March 16, 1963, a report by John W. Murray, secretary-treasurer, Textile Export Association of the United States, set forth most interesting data on this subject. As a part of my remarks I include that report at this point:

Exports of American Cotton Cloth Hits Alltime Low as Imports Hit a New High

(By John W. Murray)

Exports of American cotton cloth last year dropped to an alltime low as imports rose to an alltime high. Shipments to oversea markets amounted to 417,393,000 square yards as against 437,794,000 square yards in 1961. The alltime peak was reached in 1947 when close to a billion and a half yards were rushed to a war-stricken world famished for textiles.

Following is the chronology of exports in thousands of square yards since the removal of wartime emergency restrictions early in 1947:

1947	1,478,000
1948	940,440
1949	880,204
1950	557,595
1951	802,479
1952	760,709
1953	621,006
1954	604,788
1955	539,466
1956	511,614
1957	553,386
1958	500,501
1959	472,602
1960	437,794
1961	469,676
1962	417,393

This steady decline in shipments is rather easy to explain. In the first place, many countries have rebuilt their textile facilities to the point where they are not only able to provide basic clothing necessities but produce a surplus for export. These same countries for the most part have succeeded in sheltering their industries within invulnerable fortresses composed of exorbitant tariffs, license requirements far more strict than the surveillance regulations of the toughest criminal parole board, hidden surtaxes and a thousand and one customs vexations.

Over the last several months, in order to prevent the dissolution of the domestic industry, the U.S. Government, in conformance with the International Cotton Textile Agreement, has seen fit to impose restraints on imports from a number of foreign suppliers who regard such actions as a violation of their vested, sovereign interests. In this connection, it may be interesting to compare shipments from these whining suppliers with their purchases from the American industry.

CHIEF SUPPLIERS

Chief suppliers of cotton goods to the U.S. market in 1962 were: Japan, 134,769,300 square yards; Hong Kong, 110,206,900 square yards; Taiwan, 44,053,500; India, 32,775,300; Portugal, 25,987,700; France, 19,219,200; Egypt, 17,171,800; Pakistan, 15,097,200; Yugoslavia, 13,767,200; Korea, 8,316,300; Spain, 7,911,700; West Germany, 7,511,500. Total—436,787,600

In the same period these same countries purchased from the American industry these meager quantities: Japan, 490,742 square yards; Hong Kong, 206,891; Taiwan, 30,771; India, 69,991; Portugal, neg.; France, 16,833; Spain, 4,975; West Germany, 2,040,733. Total—8,517,073. Neg. means negligible, that is too small to be recorded.

These restrictions have caused world trade in cotton textiles to languish. Shipments from the main non-Communist exporting countries in the third quarter were about 4 percent less than in the corresponding period of 1961 following a decrease of about 7 percent in the first half of the year. Shipments from the United Kingdom, most of the continental European countries except Portugal, the United States, and Hong Kong were smaller than a year earlier while exports from Japan, India and Pakistan were greater.

Most of the drop in American shipments last year came as a result of restrictions imposed by Canada, the Philippines and Venezuela. Exports to Canada, far and away the industry's most important market, amounted to 189,690,076 square yards in 1962 as compared with 216,444,399 square yards in the previous year, a loss of 26,754,323 square yards. Faced with a financial crisis and a tumbling currency, the Canadian Government last June imposed surtaxes and other restrictions on imports which they promised to remove once the emergency was surmounted. Canada now is in the throes of a general election and it is unlikely that any action along these lines will be taken until the new government is chosen and settles down.

BOOSTS TARIFF

In August the Philippine Government boosted tariffs about 400 percent on cotton piece goods. The trade could not help but note that this action was taken only after Congress approved war claims payments to Manila of about $68 million. As a result, exports to this longtime traditional market dropped from 35 to 28 million square yards.

Increased exports to a number of markets such as South Africa, Dominican Republic, Australia, and the Congo failed to offset losses in other directions.

On the other hand, world trade in manmade fiber piece goods continued to improve. Shipments from most of the main exporting countries were larger than in the previous year. Exports from the United States of America, amounting to 139,590,409 square yards as against the postwar low of 138,684,698 square yards in 1961.

Following is a comparison of shipments in square yards to major markets, with 1962 given first, followed by the figure for 1961:

Canada 29,112,505, 1962; 28,460,056, 1961; United Kingdom 11,391,802, 1962; 14,764,968, 1961; South Africa 10,490,277; 1962; 8,583,110, 1961; Australia 8,083,948; 1962; 4,641,072, 1961; Hong Kong 6,941,983; 1962; 4,290,816, 1961; Sweden 6,540,627; 1962; 6,206,033, 1961; West Germany 6,275,290; 1962; 4,926,807, 1961; Switzerland 5,742,475; 1962; 3,714,236, 1961; Belgium 5,631,672; 1962; 10,755,066, 1961.

Mr. Speaker, the National Cotton Council has also sounded a warning that synthetic fibers constitute a serious threat to the future of cotton agriculture in this country. No other organization in the Nation has been so fully dedicated to the cause of the promotion of cotton and all facets of the cotton economy as has the council. In testimony before the Cotton Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives the council made a strong case for the preservation of our domestic cotton economy in all of its facets by the elimination of the inequitable two-price cotton system.

Had the Department of Agriculture heeded the warning of the experts from the National Cotton Council and the industry, as they testified upon the legislative proposal to eliminate the two-price cotton inequity, I believe that we would today have had legislative relief. Unfortunately, the Department officials did not accept the superior knowledge of those who sought to give them guidance through their testimony and recommendations.

The reversal of form which surprisingly occurred during the course of the hearings before the House Agriculture Cotton Subcommittee came as a tremendous shock to all of us who had been dealing with that Department in connection with the section 22 application which the Department had filed with the Tariff Commission. In that application the Department made out an excellent case for an 8½-cent offset fee to be imposed upon all foreign-made cotton textiles coming into this country. The sudden and indefensible shift of position in testimony at the Cotton Subcommittee hearings constituted the first public contention by Department officials that equality could be obtained at a lesser figure than 8½ cents per pound. If it had been the thought of the spokesmen of the USDA that less than 8½ cents per pound, or $42.50 a bale, would constitute equality in the pricing of cotton as between our domestic industry and foreign industry this was the first expression of that thought. This, however, was not the last jolt to be administered to domestic textile people by the Department.

The Secretary of Agriculture thereafter fixed the support price for cotton at 32.47 cents per pound, thereby holding the support price at the level of the previous year. This meant that notwithstanding previous testimony by the Department spokesmen that less than 8½ cents per pound might bring about equality in pricing as far as industry was concerned that they were not going to reduce the differential by lowering the support price for the current crop. Whether this support price was proper or necessary when considering the welfare of the cotton farmer is not relevant to this discussion. Whether the support price was fixed at a proper or improper level, the fact remains that there was no reduction of the differential which existed last year with the price paid for American-grown cotton by our domestic textile industry as compared to the price paid by the foreigner.

So, we see that the Department was not willing to reduce the differential through the means of a lower price support. But this was not all that the Department did to further confound and disturb the American people who depend upon the textile industry for their jobs and their livelihood.

On March 29, 1963, the Department of Agriculture announced a cotton sales-for-export program. At this point I make the news release issued by the Department of Agriculture on March 29 a part of my remarks:

[Released by U.S. Department of Agriculture, Mar. 29, 1963]

Upland Cotton Export Sales Program Announced

The U.S. Department of Agriculture today announced a cotton sales-for-export program. Cotton purchased under the new program must be exported during the 1963–64 marketing year (August 1, 1963–July 31, 1964). Because of the relatively high proportion of cotton stocks now in Commodity Credit Corporation inventory and under price support loans, a new export sales program is deemed necessary to assure that adequate stocks of American cotton of all different grades and staples will be available for export, U.S. Department of Agriculture officials said.

Under the cotton export sales program announced today, stocks of Commodity Credit Corporation cotton in inventory will be offered for sale periodically on a competitive bid basis. Final settlement for the cotton will be subject to adjustments based on the reclassification of cotton by boards of cotton examiners and the reweights of the cotton. Substitution will be permitted. A quantity of cotton equal to that purchased from Commodity Credit Corporation under the new program must be exported without any export equalization payment.

Cotton covered by offers accepted on and after August 1, 1963, will be delivered to the purchaser as soon after acceptance as possible. Cotton covered by offers accepted prior to August 1, 1963, will, upon the purchaser's request, be delivered to him as soon after June 30, 1963, as possible.

The Department also announced that the payment-in-kind export program will be continued during the 1963–64 marketing year. The payment-in-kind rate will be established periodically at a level calculated to make such program supplement the cotton sales-for-export program. The initial rate of payment under the 1963–64 payment-in-kind cotton export program will be 8½ cents per pound. This rate will apply to sales made under such program on and after date of this release and registered with Commodity Credit Corporation in accordance with the provisions of such program. The rate of payment will be subject to change without prior notice.

Under the export sales program, the cotton will be sold and exported under the terms and conditions of Announcement Nos. NO–C–22 and CN–EX–18, respectively. These announcements together with the payment-in-kind program announcement are currently being developed and should be available for distribution within the next few days.

The ASCS Commodity Office, New Orleans, La., will distribute copies of the announcements to all persons on its mailing list, and copies of the catalog listing cotton available for sale to its catalog subscribers as soon as they are available. Others desiring copies of the announcements and catalog may obtain them from the New Orleans office.

Mr. Speaker, immediately upon the issuance of the news release spokesmen for the domestic textile industry again expressed well-founded alarm at the attitude of the Department toward the preservation of the domestic textile industry.

I have talked to a great number of knowledgeable textile leaders since this announcement was made by Secretary Freeman's office. Without exception they tell me that this announcement came to them as a complete surprise, notwithstanding the fact that representatives of the industry had been in constant contact with the Department of Agriculture in an effort to bring order out of the chaotic cotton economy situation. As far as we have been able to ascertain, no representative of the textile industry had any indication that the Department of Agriculture was about to make such a move.

This auction plan offered by the Department, in the judgment of textile people with whom I have talked, merely serves to give foreign cotton buyers an added bonus on the purchase of American cotton. The present export subsidy of 8½ cents, plus carrying charges, has been sufficiently severe upon our domestic industry, but this new brainchild of the Department of Agriculture will seem to make the differential from 9¾ cents to 10 cents per pound, since carrying charges on the cotton would be wiped out. There is a probability that the net effect of this unfortunate decision may be a subsidy equaling 11 cents to 12 cents per pound to the foreign competitor of American mills.

This new program could have the effect of inducing a greater wave of exports of cotton textiles from foreign mills into the United States.

Another possible result of this surprise program could be a charge by cotton-producing nations in other parts of the world that the United States is engaging in a dumping operation in unloading American cotton on the world market in a precipitous manner. This, obviously, could result in a further reduction in the world price of cotton as foreign cotton-growers seek to preserve their markets in the textile-producing countries outside of the United States. This, in turn, could result in the necessity of a further reduction of the price of American cotton on the world market in such a way as to broaden the subsidy enjoyed by foreign textile manufacturers in their competitive pursuits with the domestic textile industry.

A very interesting newspaper article dealing with this export sales program appeared in the Kannapolis, N.C., Independent on Sunday, March 31, 1963. Since this article points out clearly some of the results of the new decision by the Department of Agriculture, I make it a part of my remarks at this point in the Record:

Foreign Mills' Cotton Price Advantage Widened

(By Bill Workman)

U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman has dumped American cotton on the world market at prices foreign mills are willing to pay for it. He calls it a competitive bid basis. It is really an auction.

This action, which caught the domestic cotton and textile industries completely by surprise, made it apparent that the Department of Agriculture had panicked under the combination of declining exports of cotton and the diminishing domestic consumption of cotton. Since 1961, the Government's stockpile of cotton has increased from 1.5 million bales to 10 million bales. It will be an estimated 8.5 million bales by the end of this cotton year next August. The storage cost has climbed from $17 million in 1961 to $70 million this year.

The immediate effect of Freeman's action is the widening of the price advantage foreign mills have over U.S. mills in the purchase of American cotton. This difference has been 8½ cents a pound; there is no telling what the margin will be now, but informed sources are guessing it will be in the neighborhood of 10 cents. The availability of this cotton at competitive prices is certain to affect the world market price.

This action may also increase the cost of the export subsidy from $200 million to $240 million. This cost is borne by American taxpayers. The Agriculture Department sets the subsidy rate at a figure designed to make up the difference between the world cotton price and the U.S. support price.

Secretary Freeman took this costly step during the weekend in spite of the fact he recently requested—and got—$508 million to buy and carry the excess cotton in the Government's stockpile.

At the same time Secretary Freeman was getting that $508 million, he was turning down a proposition by American mills that he sell American cotton to them for $600 million to help maintain employment in the textile plants and to give farmers a chance to plant more acres in cotton. The mills' proposal would have meant that $600 million would have been pumped into the U.S. Treasury instead of $508 million being taken out to finance the further building of the stockpile. This would have meant a real saving of more than $1 billion to taxpayers.

It had been a foregone conclusion that panic would eventually hit the Agriculture Department, because of the steady buildup of the cotton stockpile.

Last year, the Agriculture Department's export program supplied one bale out of eight that was consumed in the world cotton market outside the United States. This year, the United States is supplying 1 bale out of 20 needed in the world market. Historically, the United States should supply one bale out of every five the world market needs; it should export about 20 percent of world needs.

Even while exports of American cotton were dropping sharply and the Government's stockpile was increasing at a frightening rate, the Agriculture Department torpedoed every approach to make American cotton available to American mills at the same prices that foreign mills purchase the same cotton. Officials have claimed repeatedly the cost of this one-price system for cotton would be too great. However, the Government has given away, this year, $75 million worth of cotton to foreign countries under Public Law 480 and has shipped an additional $50 million worth of cotton to foreign lands under long-term credit or barter conditions (it is doubtful this cotton will ever be paid for).

This action by the Secretary of Agriculture was announced late Friday afternoon in face of a conference called by the Department for Monday to consider American mills' request for a one-price system for cotton.

Also, this action follows the Department of Agriculture pattern of torpedoing President Kennedy's statement of September 1962 that the inequity of the two-price system for cotton should be removed.

On more than one occasion, when it appeared there might be some possibility of putting the President's statement into action, the Secretary of Agriculture has taken precipitate action, without notice to the trade, which has made more difficult every approach to solution of textile problems.

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that a bewildered domestic textile industry is having difficulty understanding the gyrations of the Department of Agriculture at a time when all persons seem to agree that simple justice requires that the American textile worker and his employer are entitled to a fairer treatment at the hands of our Government?

The President of the United States has often taken note of the absolute necessity that something be done to equalize the situation existing in the world textile picture if we are to preserve our domestic industry. Certainly, the Department of Agriculture, as a branch of the Executive Department of our Government, has a duty and obligation to discontinue policies which are contrary to the expressed desire of the Chief Executive about a solution of this vexatious problem.

Mr. Speaker, the leaders of a great industry and the thousands who work in that industry are crying out for fairness and equity. I believe that it is the responsibility of the Congress to see that that plea is heard and acted upon. I urge my colleagues to join me in demanding that the two-price cotton system be eliminated without further delay or debate.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I want to commend the gentleman very much for his again bringing to the attention of the House in a very thoughtful manner the situation in regard to the two-price cotton system.

I also want to commend the gentleman for his vigilance and the frank and heroic manner in which he has fought and is now fighting to see that something is done about this most inequitable situation.

Recently I have received in the mail several letters from constituents. I would like at this time to read two of them to you. Here is one that was sent to me on March 21, 1963.

MARCH 21, 1963.

Congressman HORACE KORNEGAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am an employee of Pickett Cotton Mill and have been since June 9, 1941.

We have been on short time since the last of August 1962 in our opinion. Our short-time operation is a direct result of the flood of unfair foreign imports of cotton textiles into this country. The cotton textiles that are entering this country in 1 year would run Pickett Cotton Mill at least 50 years full time.

It is impossible for us to feed, clothe, and educate our children on 3 days a week—24-hour pay amounts to $27 after tax deduction:

Sir, if there is anything on your part that you can do to help this matter, it would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Here is another letter, a thought-provoking letter, Mr. Speaker, which I received on March 28, 1963.

It reads:

DEAR SIR: We are running short time and according to what I read in the papers and hear on radio and television it is mostly because the mills have to pay 8½ cents a pound extra for their cotton.

This doesn't seem right to me. Looks like to me I have to pay too much for shirts and socks and also underwear because of this.

I don't see any reason why we should have to pay more for our own cotton than anybody else in the world. Looks silly to me.

Please stand up and be counted real loud for correcting this mess. We ought to pay the same price as anybody else for our own cotton—if not a little less.

And also the other countries don't pay wages as high as ours. Looks like our tariffs might go up a little to help even up that score.

Please help get it all straightened out.

These two letters, Mr. Speaker, come from people who work in the cotton mills. They ask thought-provoking questions.

Mr. Speaker, I have one other letter that I would like to call to the attention of the House. This does not come from one who actually works in the mill, but from one of the officials of a mill in my area.

He says:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KORNEGAY: What should I tell our employees when they ask me why the Japs can buy cotton raised here in North Carolina for less money than North Carolina textile manufacturers? If the two-price cotton system costs them their jobs, how do we justify it? We have a feeling of frustration.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the gentleman has a feeling of frustration just as I have and just as many others who have been greatly concerned over this problem. I would like to do as I have done on many occasions before, and taking the admonition from the lady who wrote me saying that she worked in the cotton mill, to speak out loud and, I hope, clearly in protest against this inequitable system of two-price cotton.

The other day I received a picture in the mail showing a bale of cotton in the lobby of the bank in my hometown. I only wish that this picture could be reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but of course we have no pictures in the RECORD. This picture shows a big bale of cotton with a sign on it that says:

This bale of U.S.-grown cotton costs a local mill	$182.50
This same bale can be bought by a foreign mill for	140.00
You, the American taxpayer, pay that difference of	42.50

Is this fair to: A million textile people? Every American taxpayer? You?

Of course it is not fair, and it is about this unfairness that my colleague from North Carolina, and on certain occasions myself associating with him, have risen on the floor of this House to urge upon the President, the Department of Agriculture, the Tariff Commission, and many other agencies of our Government to do something about it.

We now have legislation pending before the Agriculture Committee of the House. There have been hearings held, and it is certainly my hope and earnest belief, Mr. Speaker, that the Agriculture Committee backed up by the appropriate agencies of the Government will come forth as soon as possible with some solution to correct this highly unfair and inequitable situation which now exists, in order that we may have a clear and loud answer to these people who are losing their jobs, whose hours are being cut back.

I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me and again congratulate him on making this presentation.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] for his usual fine contribution to this discussion. I may say to the gentleman that I, too, have received a great number of letters similar to those which the gentleman read. Our people in North Carolina who work in the textile industry are gravely concerned about the inequitable situation with reference to domestic mills buying cotton, and I know that if we can get the message to the Nation as to the unfairness of the situation, that the basic sense of fair play and justice which all Americans have will demand that something be done immediately to eliminate this inequity.

Were I in the district of the gentleman who has just spoken I should say to the ladies and to the other people who have written to him that I could give personal testimony of the effective contribution that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] has made and is making in this battle for North Carolina and American jobs.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield.

Mr. KORNEGAY. As to the point that the gentleman from North Carolina has so ably made about the effect of two-priced cotton on the cotton producers, I would simply like to say that 30 years ago—and I am quoting this from an article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star today written by John Bacon, staff writer:

Thirty years ago cotton had about 93 percent of the total fiber market. Today it has about 67 percent. In the past 12 years the consumption of cotton per person in the United States has dropped from 30 to 22 pounds.

A most significant fact, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WHITENER. Well, I again thank the gentleman for his contribution and say to him that I have already today asked that the article by Mr. Bacon which appeared in today's Washington Evening Star be made part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this date. I know that it will be read with great interest by many of our colleagues and many others who read the RECORD.

Candor compels me to state, however, as I have already stated in the body of the remarks heretofore made, that I fear that Mr. Bacon in writing his article was not aware of the unfortunate experience which we have had with the Department of Agriculture in recent days, as I have indicated heretofore the Department's variance occurring when they testified before the Committee on Agriculture that less than 8½ cents would be an equalization of the cotton pricing situation. Then that was followed by fixing price support of cotton at the same level as last year, 32.47 cents per pound. This action, as I have already said, whether we think it was to the best interests of the farmer or not, certainly indicated that the textile manufacturer and the folks working in the mills were still going to be faced with at least an 8½ cents disadvantage in their competition with foreign markets.

Then this was followed on March 29 by the order which I have already referred to by the Secretary of Agriculture setting up the so-called export sales program which certainly holds out no promise of a reduction in the differential in the cotton price paid by our domestic people, as compared to the foreign manufacturers. So this, I think, is something that Mr. Bacon has overlooked, but it was not overlooked by the author of the article in the Kannapolis, N.C., Independent, which I made a part of my remarks earlier today.

Mr. Speaker, I could only say again to the gentleman and to my colleagues that this is a matter of great interest in the State of North Carolina. But even more so it is one which is of great interest to all the people who are familiar with it.

Just last Sunday Mr. John Knight, publisher of the Knight Newspapers, in his weekly letter which is carried by the Charlotte Observer and other newspapers owned by the Knight organization, said in effect that it seemed to him to be just elementary that the textile people should be given what they have asked for when they say that we are only asking for an opportunity to buy cotton grown in America at the same price that our Government sells it to foreign manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY] and say to the gentleman that I welcome him and all the others into this battle which seems to be a continuing one, but which we hope will result in a victory for the American people in the not-too-distant future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ANDREW JACKSON, SOUTH CAROLINIAN

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. O'BRIEN of New York). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I feel most fortunate in the fact that accurate historians record the birth of Andrew Jackson as having taken place in my district. I am sure that I exhibit here the understandable pride that any Congressman would have in having a man, so near and so dear to the people of his generation and those of succeeding generations, claim birthplace in his congressional district. I am sure that North Carolina would prefer to continue the abortive claim that Andrew Jackson was born in North Carolina but such is not the fact, and we cannot afford to rely upon false claims of such an important event.

On Friday, March 15, 1963, the author of a new and intriguing book entitled "Andrew Jackson, South Carolinian," made a significant and timely presentation of his new book at Lancaster, S.C., under the auspices of the Lancaster County, S.C., Historical Association. The occasion was a day honoring the 196th anniversary of the birth of Andrew Jackson in Lancaster County, S.C.

At the same time, Dr. Daniel W. Hollis, professor of history at the University of South Carolina, delivered an address at the birthday celebration at Lancaster. His speech emphasized the participation of President Jackson in the nullification crises of another day. I pause to remind you that Dr. Hollis is a native of my district, and succeeding generations will accord him praise of permanent and significant accolade because of his magnificent effort to research and record the history of South Carolina, of its sons, its daughters, and its contributions to the growth and permanence of a great Nation.

I had hoped to be present at the celebration but was unable to leave Washington in time to attend the various events which the patriotic citizens of Lancaster County had scheduled. I was able to get from the papers some of the stories which I think are significant. Of particular interest is the story of the apathy of North Carolina on the occasion of the anniversary birthday.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the newspaper accounts as follows: From the Columbia (S.C.) State of March 15, 1963; from the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer of March 16, 1963; from the State, Columbia, S.C., of March 16, 1963; from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C.; from the March 16 edition of the State, Columbia, S.C.; from the Lancaster News, March 14, 1963; from the Kershaw News-Era, Kershaw, S.C.

Not only do I commend Author E. Don Herd for a magnificent contribution to the literature and history of my own native State, but I salute those fine citizens of Lancaster County who gave of their time and efforts to make this birthday anniversary a significant recording of the history of our great President.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Mar. 15, 1963]

CELEBRATION SET TODAY—STATE HAS SOLID CLAIM ON JACKSON—SENATE COMMITTEE HAS JACKSON HOLIDAY BILL

(NOTE—A bill which would make Andrew Jackson's birthday, today, a legal South Carolina holiday, is being considered by a senate committee. The measure is now in the senate judiciary committee for study. The bill was introduced by Senator Frank L. Roddey, of Lancaster.)

(By Ron Wenzell)

LANCASTER.—The author of a new book entitled, "Andrew Jackson, South Carolinian," is convinced beyond all doubts that the seventh President of the United States was born in Lancaster County, S.C.

The book by E. Don Herd, director of the University of South Carolina at Lancaster, goes on sale Friday in conjunction with the celebration of Jackson's 196th birthday at Andrew Jackson State Park in Lancaster County.

EIGHT MONTHS' WORK

Herd spent 8 months gathering information and writing the 70-page defense of South Carolina's claim to the fabled Revolutionary War hero and Chief Executive known affectionately as "Old Hickory."

"I took every claim to Jackson, and there are several, and tested them against the facts surrounding his birth," Herd told the State Thursday, "and there is no doubt in my mind that South Carolina has the only valid claim."

Contrary to popular belief, South and North Carolina aren't the only States at odds over where Jackson was born.

According to Herd, Virginia and West Virginia have filed claims to the hero of the Battle of New Orleans and even more surprising, Scotland, England and Ireland have at one time or another claimed to be Jackson's birthplace.

OFF THE COAST?

"One of the strongest hearsay claims has Jackson born at sea off the coast of North America," Herd said.

Herd dismisses North Carolina's claim to Jackson as one of the easiest to "disprove."

"None of North Carolina's affidavits will stand up because none of them are signed by an eyewitness to Jackson's birth. They are all secondhand accounts," he said.

The author also sheds some light on what he terms "important errors in North Carolina's claims to Jackson and the Tar Heels have made three separate claims."

The hard-bound editions of the book, which is being limited to 500 printings, includes pictures. There is also a paperback printing.

OVERWHELMING

"The evidence is overwhelming for South Carolina in the controversy," Herd said, "and some of the most conclusive evidence I present in my book are 16 letters written by Jackson in which he refers to Lancaster County, S.C., as his place of birth."

Both the hardback and the paperback editions of Herd's book will be on sale Friday at the State park. The hardback sells for $3, the paperback for $1.50.

An autograph party will be held from 2 to 4 p.m. at the Lancaster branch of the University of South Carolina.

The Jackson celebration at the State park begins at 10 Friday morning with Dr. Daniel Hollis, professor of history at the University of South Carolina, the main speaker. Hollis' topic is "Andrew Jackson and the Nullification Crisis."

The program is under the direction of the Lancaster city schools, the South Carolina State Commission of Forestry, and the Lancaster County Historical Commission.

LARGE CROWD

One of the largest crowds ever is expected for the annual event with thousands of South Carolinians anticipated and hundreds of tourists from other States.

In honor of Jackson's birthday, the Carolina Museum at Lancaster will be open from 2 to 6 p.m. Friday and will feature exhibits of the Jacksonian period.

The festivities end Friday night with a concert by world-famous David Rubinoff at the Lancaster Senior High auditorium beginning at 8:15. The concert is being sponsored by the Lancaster Rotary.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Mar. 16, 1963]

TAR HEELS IGNORE THEIR ANDY BUT THAT FELLOW BORN IN SOUTH CAROLINA GETS A ROUSING BIRTHDAY PARTY

(By Dwayne Walls)

LANCASTER, S.C.—South Carolina ended a week of historical billing and cooing over

President Andrew Jackson Friday on Jackson's 196th birthday.

A couple of hundred history buffs and another 800 school pupils attended an hour long birthday ceremony in Andrew Jackson State Park 10 miles north of here.

Later there was a luncheon and autographing party for Don Herd of Lancaster, author of a new book proving again that Jackson was born in South Carolina.

The birthday ceremony was held at the site of Jackson's disputed South Carolina birthplace—a windswept hilltop hard by the North Carolina State line.

A couple of miles away, at Jackson's equally disputed North Carolina birthplace, there was no celebration and only one visitor to the stone monument.

The lone visitor snaked over rough unpaved roads from Waxhaw into South Carolina and back into North Carolina to make sure the Jackson monument was still standing.

It was. The visitor also reported that he found a lot of tall weeds, one rusty beer can and two sardine cans gracing the monument grounds.

Obviously that is one reason the South Carolinans are proud as peacocks of their 360 acres of Jacksoniana, which includes a picnic area and a two-story museum built 8 years ago and stocked with historic oddments.

One of the speakers at Friday's ceremony apologized for the fact that the lawn was wet and muddy in places.

He blamed it on a bad weather front that swooped down from North Carolina—one of several polite hee-haws the crowd got off at the expense of the Tar Heels.

University of South Carolina history Prof. Daniel W. Hollis noted in a speech that Jackson threatened long before the Civil War to use the Nation's troops to uphold Federal law in South Carolina.

Jackson's political views were so unpopular with South Carolinians, Hollis said, that the State refused to support him in his bid for reelection in 1832.

Now, however, the State has laid out upward of $50,000 to build a Jackson shrine. Lancaster County schools have been observing his birthday all week, and the South Carolina General Assembly is considering a bill to make Jackson's birthday a legal State holiday.

The Carolinas have been feuding with one another for more than a century over Jackson's birthplace.

The North Carolina version has it that Jackson was born at the home of a sister, Mrs. George McCamine on Waxhaw Creek in North Carolina, while Jackson's mother was traveling to the home of another sister, Mrs. James Crawford.

South Carolinians claim that Mrs. Jackson continued on to the Crawford home a couple of miles away before delivering.

The controversy will be around for several years yet.

Meanwhile one wag suggested another interesting possibility Friday.

"It's obvious," he said, "Ole Andy was twins."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Mar. 16, 1963]

Dr. Hollis Speaks on Seventh President's Term—Andrew Jackson's Birthday Is Celebrated at Lancaster

Lancaster.—An audience that came to honor Andrew Jackson on the 196th anniversary of his birth Friday heard how the controversial President threatened long before the Civil War to use the Nation's troops to uphold Federal law in South Carolina.

Dr. Daniel W. Hollis of the University of South Carolina told the assembly in Andrew Jackson Historical State Park how Jackson's support of protective tariffs and strong Central Government and his uncompromising opposition to nullification made him so unpopular that South Carolinians withheld their support from "Old Hickory" in the presidential election of 1832.

The Andrew Jackson celebration had the three-way sponsorship of the Lancaster City Schools, S.C. Commission of Forestry, and Lancaster County Historical Commission.

C. West Jacocks, director of State parks, presided at the patriotic and historical ceremony.

SHARP CONTRAST

Dr. Hollis' discourse on Jackson and nullification provided a sharp contrast in South Carolina attitudes toward the pre-Civil War President—then a Unionist who outraged his fellow South Carolinians now a revered memory as one of the Nation's all-time great statesmen and soldiers.

The University of South Carolina history professor explained the enigma of Andrew Jackson by quoting James Parton, first biographer of the general and President, who said he was both "a patriot and a traitor * * * one of the greatest of generals and wholly ignorant of the art of war," a brilliant and "elegant" writer who couldn't set down a correct sentence or spell four-syllable words.

There was more to the Parton list of Jacksonian contradictions, but History Professor Hollis turned to later evaluations:

"Historians were long similarly divided in their interpretations of Jackson. Depending upon whether they had an anti-Jackson Whig bias—as did Richard Hildreth—or a pro-Jackson Democratic bias like George Bancroft.

"In later years, however, they have agreed in ranking Jackson high among American Presidents."

GREAT PRESIDENT

Dr. Hollis said a 1948 survey of "75 distinguished historians" placed Jackson in the category of "great presidents" with Lincoln, Washington, Jefferson, Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt.

But a similar survey last year dropped Jackson a notch to "near-great." Nevertheless, his name appeared among the seven leading presidents of the United States, Dr. Hollis said.

In the South Carolina of his day, Jackson first disappointed the majority by failing to carry the banner for low tariffs, then drew the wrath of Palmetto leaders and voters by his Proclamation of December 1832, which rejected nullification and warned the "deceived and deluded" South Carolinians that the nullification road would lead to "ruin and disgrace."

Jackson's native Lancaster District—along with Greenville, Spartanburg, Chesterfield and other districts—was unionist in sentiment, but this "strong minority" was faced by the larger contingent composed of nullifiers led by Calhoun and Hayne.

ANTI-JACKSON FEELING

In 1832 the voters showed their anti-Jackson feeling at the polls when the South Carolina elector choice was John Floyd of Virginia in what Dr. Hollis called a "futile protest" against candidates Jackson, the Democrat, and Henry Clay, the Whig.

Dr. Hollis finds it "interesting to note" that although U.S. Senators Calhoun and Hayne of South Carolina bitterly protested the high import duties of 1828 and 1832, the State's present Senators, Johnston and Thurmond, are asking for higher tariffs.

The difference in viewpoint is attributable to the State's transition from an economy based almost entirely upon farming to one in which industrialization has grown in importance.

Where once South Carolina had a "cotton economy" that could profit from a low-tariff policy, it now has a textile industry that seeks higher tariffs as protection against low-wage foreign competition.

JACKSONIAN DEMOCRACY

"Andrew Jackson is remembered today chiefly because of his association with the movement known as 'Jacksonian Democracy,' for his destruction of the second U.S. Bank, and for his stanch advocacy of the Union in the Nullification Crisis," Dr. Hollis said.

"His name is linked to other issues such as the Mayesville Road veto, the removal of the Indians to west of the Mississippi, and the liberalization of Federal land policies.

"Yet, in each of these his role is not altogether clear, and many historians assert that Jackson came to office in 1829 with no program whatsoever."

Whether or not Jackson had a program, Dr. Hollis made it clear that Old Hickory could hardly have made himself more unpopular in his native South Carolina if he had preplanned every move—particularly his indifference toward tariffs, opposition to Nullification and threatened use of Federal troops in this State to enforce the high tariff of 1828.

CELEBRATION MUSIC

Music for the Jackson celebration was provided by the Lancaster Senior High School Band directed by Ben L. Watkins and the school's Sextet directed by Mrs. Esther M. Graves.

Lancaster National Guard units performed the flag-raising ceremony; Eagle Scout Robert H. Mobley, Jr., of South Junior High School, led the Pledge of Allegiance; Superintendent G. T. Myers of the Lancaster schools and Chairman Joe H. Croxton of the Lancaster County Historical Commission welcomed the audience; Miss Nancy Crockett, principal of H. R. Rich Elementary School, introduced Dr. Hollis; and ushers were Chris Benton, Emil Emanuel, Dixie Faulkenberry, Laurie Gardner, Sue McCaskill, Lee Montgomery, Bobbie Revels, and Iris Rutledge.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Mar. 16, 1963]

Jackson Had Saber Scar From War

Lancaster.—Andrew Jackson got an early start in learning about the facts of war and life.

Throughout his adult life he bore a scar on his cheek which he received during the Revolutionary War from the saber of a British officer.

Viola C. Floyd writes in "Lancaster County South Carolina Tours:"

"As a lad of 13 Andrew Jackson took up arms in the Revolutionary War in defense of his own country. He was permitted to accompany his kinsmen to the Battle of Hanging Rock where he said he took part in the fighting.

"He helped his mother nurse the wounded soldiers who were carried to Old Waxhaw Church. He was captured following the skirmish at Waxhaw Church and was carried by the British to Camden.

"There he was thrown in prison where he received scant attention even though he had a saber cut across his face as the result of an argument with a British officer. Jackson had refused to polish the officer's boots.

"He contracted smallpox while in prison and was finally returned to his family in an exchange of prisoners."

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Mar. 15, 1963]

Twenty North Carolina Schoolchildren Visit Jackson Celebration—Join 1,000 Others

(By Ron Wenzell)

Lancaster.—Some 20 elementary children from North Carolina crossed over into South Carolina Friday to help Lancaster County celebrate the 196th anniversary of the birth of Andrew Jackson.

The youngsters were from Jackson Elementary School in Jackson Township, just inside the North Carolina State line, and their visit to Andrew Jackson State Park, where more than 1,000 South Carolinians gathered Friday to commemorate the birth of Jackson in 1767 in Lancaster County, came as something of a surprise since North Carolina has disputed the Palmetto State's claim to the seventh President of the United States in a controversy that dates back more than 100 years.

"North Carolina schools teach that Jackson was born in North Carolina, but I thought our students would enjoy South Carolina's celebration," School Principal J. R. Taylor, who chaperoned the group, told the State.

Asked how he personally handled the controversy surrounding Jackson's birthplace when teaching history to pupils in a border community, Taylor said:

"I try not to make an issue of it. I tell the boys and girls that it's not too important whether President Jackson was born on this hill or that one, but most historians agree he came from around these parts."

While some North Carolinians still contend that Jackson was born near Waxhaw, N.C., no formal observance of his birth date was held in the Tarheel State and the vast majority of historians now accept South Carolina as Jackson's birthplace.

Some 770 students from Lancaster's South Junior High School attended the ceremonies as well as students from the senior high and other schools around the State.

Also in attendance were Lancaster State Senator Frank L. Roddey, Representatives Garrett Mobley and Tom Mangum and officials from the State forestry commission.

The program was sponsored by Lancaster city schools, the forestry commission and the Lancaster County Historical Commission.

[From the Lancaster (S.C.) News]

One Hundred Ninety-Sixth Anniversary—Andy's Birthday Celebration Bigger and Better Than Ever—Enthusiastic Crowd Honors Native Son

Red, white and blue, green, pink and gold, band music, blue skies, the precise order of National Guardsmen in flag-raising ceremonies, solid ranks of pink-cheeked school students, sung prayers, relaxed dignitaries, pleasant adults. These formed the background and set the mood for the 1963 celebration of Andrew Jackson's birthday, held at the site of his birthplace in Andrew Jackson State Park near Lancaster.

But the celebration was compounded of more than sound and music and color. It was a ceremony of loyalty that stems from the hearts of people who play an important role in keeping the name of Andrew Jackson ringing down through history.

Although the announcement was not made in so many words, officials indicated that the stiff breeze which swept the hillside was an ill wind blowing from across the North Carolina border where discomfited diehards were fuming while the celebration at Jackson's birth site was in progress.

Welcome visitors from North Carolina, however, were some 20 students from Jackson Elementary School in Jackson Township, just across the North Carolina State line, and their chaperon, the school's principal J. R. Taylor, who doesn't make an issue of the seventh President's birthplace.

The audience that came to honor Andrew Jackson on the 196th anniversary of his birth, Friday, March 15, heard how the controversial President threatened long before the Civil War to use the Nation's troops to uphold Federal law in South Carolina.

Dr. Daniel W. Hollis, of the University of South Carolina, told the assembly how Jackson's support of protective tariffs and strong Central Government and his uncompromising opposition to nullification made him so unpopular that South Carolinians withheld their support from "Old Hickory" in the presidential election of 1832.

The celebration Friday was sponsored by the Lancaster city schools, the South Carolina Commission of Forestry, and the Lancaster County Historical Commission, and climaxed a period of special commemorative programs produced by the Lancaster city schools. High praise is heard for these programs, arranged by teachers and historians, with special music and scripts.

Providing spirited music for the celebration was the Lancaster Senior High School Band, under the direction of Ben L. Watkins. The invocation and the benediction were sung by the Lancaster Senior High School Sextet, directed by Mrs. Esther Graves.

Lending added color in their pioneer costumes were the ushers, Chris Benton, Emil Emanuel, Dixie Faulkenberry, Laurie Gardner, Sue McCaskill, Lee Montgomery, Bobbie Revels, and Iris Rutledge.

Lancaster National Guard units performed the flag raising ceremony and Eagle Scout Robert H. Mobley, Jr., of South Junior High School led the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. West Jacocks, State park director, presided at the patriotic and historic ceremonies. Dr. G. T. Myers, superintendent of the Lancaster city schools and Joseph H. Croxton, chairman of the Lancaster County Historical Commission, welcomed the assembly. Miss Nancy Crocket, principal of H. R. Rice Elementary School, introduced Dr. Hollis.

Dr. Hollis' discourse on Jackson and nullification provided a sharp contrast in South Carolina attitudes toward the pre-Civil War President * * * then a Unionist who outraged his fellow South Carolinians * * * now a revered memory as one of the Nation's all-time great statesmen and soldiers.

ENIGMA

The University of South Carolina history professor explained the enigma of Andrew Jackson by quoting James Parton, first biographer of the general and President, who said he was both a patriot and a traitor * * * one of the greatest of generals and wholly ignorant of the art of war, a brilliant and elegant writer who couldn't set down a correct sentence or spell four-syllable words.

There was more to the Parton list of Jacksonian contradictions, but history Professor Hollis turned to later evaluations:

"Historians were long similarly divided in their interpretations of Jackson. Depending upon whether they had an anti-Jackson Whig bias—as did Richard Hildreth—or a pro-Jackson Democratic bias like George Bancroft.

"In later years, however, they have agreed in ranking Jackson high among American Presidents."

Dr. Hollis said a 1948 survey of 75 distinguished historians placed Jackson in the category of great Presidents with Lincoln, Washington, Jefferson, Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt.

But a similar survey last year dropped Jackson a notch to near great. Nevertheless, his name appeared among the seven leading presidents of the United States, Dr. Hollis said.

In the South Carolina of his day, Jackson first disappointed the majority by failing to carry the banner for low tariffs, then drew the wrath of Palmetto leaders and voters by his Proclamation of December 1832, which rejected nullification and warned the deceived and deluded South Carolinians that the nullification road would lead to ruin and disgrace.

Jackson's native Lancaster District—along with Greenville, Spartanburg, Chesterfield, and other districts—was unionist in sentiment, but this strong minority was faced by the larger contingent composed of nullifiers led by Calhoun and Hayne.

ANTI-JACKSON

In 1832 the voters showed their anti-Jackson feeling at the polls when the South Carolina elector choice was John Floyd of Virginia in what Dr. Hollis called a "futile protest" against candidates Jackson, the Democrat, and Henry Clay, the Whig.

Dr. Hollis finds it interesting to note that although U.S. Senators Calhoun and Hayne of South Carolina bitterly protested the high import duties of 1828 and 1832, the State's present Senators, Johnston and Thurmond, are asking for higher tariffs.

The difference in viewpoint is attributable to the State's transition from an economy based almost entirely upon farming to one in which industrialization has grown in importance.

Where once South Carolina had a cotton economy that could profit from a low-tariff policy, it now has a textile industry that seeks higher tariffs as protection against low-wage foreign competition.

"Andrew Jackson is remembered today chiefly because of his association with the movement known as Jacksonian Democracy, for his destruction of the second U.S. Bank, and for his stanch advocacy of the Union in the nullification crisis," Dr. Hollis said.

"His name is linked to other issues such as the Mayesville Road veto, the removal of the Indians to west of the Mississippi, and the liberalization of Federal land policies.

"Yet, in each of these his role is not altogether clear, and many historians assert that Jackson came to office in 1829 with no program whatsoever."

Whether or not Jackson had a program, Dr. Hollis made clear that Old Hickory could hardly have made himself more unpopular in his native South Carolina if he had preplanned every move—particularly his indifference toward tariffs, opposition to Nullification, and threatened use of Federal troops in this State to enforce the high tariff of 1828.

ATTENDANT EVENTS

Following the park ceremonies, out-of-town guests and dignitaries were entertained at a luncheon at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph H. Croxton, and from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. the public was invited to an Autograph Party at the Lancaster Center, University of South Carolina honoring Elmer Don Herd, Jr., author of the important new book "Andrew Jackson, South Carolinian."

Members of the Waxhaws chapter, DAR, Mrs. P. H. Emanuel, regent, were hostesses for the party which attracted a number of guests both from Lancaster and from out of town.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Mar. 16, 1963]

Nullification Crisis Created Friction—Jackson Once Unpopular in South Carolina?

(By Ron Wenzell)

Lancaster.—While South Carolina is vigorously defending its claim to Andrew Jackson as a native son now, the Palmetto State hasn't always been so anxious to have its brand on the seventh President of the United States.

According to Daniel W. Hollis, professor of history at the University of South Carolina: "There was a time back in 1832 and 1833 when President Jackson was as unpopular with most South Carolinians as President John Fitzgerald Kennedy is now."

Hollis drew the parallel between the two Democratic Chief Executives during his remarks Friday at a celebration in honor of Jackson's 196th birthday at Andrew Jackson State Park in Lancaster County.

"The position taken by President Jackson in the nullification crisis of 1832 and 1833 was directly opposed to the stand taken by the majority of South Carolinians," Hollis, said, "and Jackson and John C. Calhoun engaged in a bitter personal controversy on the issue of whether the States had a right to nullify acts of the Federal Government.

"Despite the nullification crisis, however, South Carolina never completely forgot its pride in Jackson nor did he ever lose his love for his native State," Hollis said.

Hollis described Jackson as a "strong President, one who supported the Union on most issues, but did at times strike a blow for States rights."

By way of poking fun at North Carolina's claim to the man, Hollis told the more than 1,000 persons gathered at the State park, "It's not much of a controversy any longer. I think South Carolina has pretty much repelled North Carolina imperialism," he chided good naturedly.

[From the Lancaster (S.C.) News, Mar. 14, 1963]

Andrew Jackson: Orphan of the Revolution—The War for Independence Left Indelible Marks on the Personality of the Great, and Controversial, South Carolinian—Andrew Jackson

(By Willie Llew Griffin)

(Editor's Note.—This story, "Orphan of the Revolution," by Willie Llew Griffin, appeared in the Sunday, March 10, issue of the News & Courier, Charleston. It is used by the Lancaster News through the courtesy of the News & Courier.)

Andrew Jackson, even today, remains one of the most controversial figures in American history. One historian, writing of Jackson more than a hundred years ago, when many who knew him were still alive, stated that after years of research in Washington, the Carolinas, and Tennessee, he was bewildered at the conflicting mass of reports. Jackson was pictured as a patriot; a brilliant writer who could not spell a four-syllable word; a democratic autocrat; the greatest of generals and as a man totally ignorant of the art of war.

That he was ignorant of the art of war is to be questioned, for war came at an early age to Andrew Jackson. Nine years old when the Declaration of Independence was signed, he was 13 when the war reached to Waxhaw settlement in South Carolina where he lived. To this community the war brought hardships and terror and left a path of desolation in its wake. Before he was 16, Andrew Jackson was a hopeless orphan of the Revolution.

Hugh Jackson, Andrew's older brother, had joined Col. William Richardson Davie before the war reached Waxhaw and died after the battle of Stono. Robert Jackson, another brother, died of smallpox contracted while a British prisoner in Waxhaw stockade. His mother died after a mission of mercy to help the suffering prisoners confined in the British prison ships in Charleston.

Andrew Jackson survived but the years spent in this war-charged atmosphere molded the boy into the man he was to become.

Jackson's first war service was helping care for the wounded after Tarleton's massacre at Waxhaw in 1780. One hundred and thirteen patriots were killed here and 150 wounded and left to be cared for. The old Waxhaw meetinghouse was converted into a hospital and here Andrew and his brother Robert helped their mother care for the wounded. High-spirited Andrew, it is said, worked more in anger than in pity, burning with fury and vowing vengeance for the wounded and for the death of his brother Hugh. Tarleton had surprised a detachment of militia in the Waxhaw settlement and his ruthless attack kindled the flames of war in that region of the Carolinas.

When Sumter made his gallant attack on the British post of Hanging Rock, near Waxhaw, both Andrew and his brother were present. This attack which began so favorably was later lost when the patriots unfortunately captured a supply of rum which they consumed too early, thereby losing the engagement. In this engagement the Jackson boys were led by Colonel Davie, the same colonel who commanded the troops to which Hugh Jackson had belonged at Stono. With the rest of Davie's men, the Jackson brothers retreated before the British force.

Being only 13 at the Battle of Hanging Rock, it is doubtful if young Andy was actually a member of the company. More probably he just went along to observe. Attached to the company or not, it is generally conceded that being with the troops and hearing their discussions and comments on war he received a firsthand lesson in the art of war. It is said that Colonel Davie always remained General Jackson's ideal of a model soldier.

After the Battle of Hanging Rock the boys returned to Waxhaw. When General Cornwallis moved toward Waxhaw after General Gates' defeat in August 1780, the Jacksons were forced to move north out of the path of war. There seems to be no information on how Robert and his mother made the journey, but, according to an eyewitness, on a hot September afternoon 5 miles below Charlotte, N.C., Andrew passed, riding on a grass or swamp pony, long legs dangling, covered with dust and with a big, worn hat flapping over his face. The story is told that years later when the fame of Andrew Jackson reached the little town of Charlotte, it was hard for this witness to reconcile the gangling apparition to whom she had talked that September day with the hero Andrew Jackson.

In 1781 the Jackson family and many of their neighbors returned to their ravaged homes in Waxhaw. A small fierce warfare of Whig against Tory continued—brother against brother and father against son. In this charged atmosphere Andrew Jackson and his family lived during the formative years of his life. Andrew and his brother now began in earnest to become a part of the small parties of militia that went out on many reprisal engagements.

Lord Rawdon, whom Cornwallis had left in command, hearing of the activities of the Waxhaw Whigs, sent a body of dragoons to the neighborhood. The Waxhaw settlers, hearing of this hostile force, decided to meet them in open fight. Forty armed and mounted Whigs, among them Andrew and Robert, assembled at the old Waxhaw meetinghouse to await reinforcements of neighbors. The British were apprised of their move by a traitor and surprised the gallant band before help could arrive. Eleven of the patriots were taken prisoners and the rest escaped. Andrew and Robert escaped to the home of a Lieutenant Crawford, a cousin but, again, a traitor hearing of their presence set a party of dragoons on their trail. The house was surrounded and Andrew and Robert were taken prisoners. Mrs. Crawford and her small children were completely helpless but in spite of this the soldiers destroyed the entire contents of the house, even the clothes of the family.

It was in this house that occurred the incident that left Andrew with scars that he carried to his grave and a wound to Robert from which he never recovered.

The British officer ordered young Andrew to clean his boots, but Andrew refused, saying that he was a prisoner of war and expected to be treated as such. The officer slashed at his head with his saber. Seeking to ward off the blow with his left hand, Andrew received severe wounds on both his head and hand. Robert also refused to clean the officer's boots and also was disabled with a sword blow on his head.

All prisoners captured at Waxhaw were taken to the British depot at Camden. Although only 40 miles distant, accounts of brutality to the miserable prisoners on the march and the wretchedness of the prison at Camden form a revolting chapter of history at that time. Two hundred and fifty prisoners were confined in a small enclosure with no beds. No medicine or medical attention was provided, and a small amount of stale bread was their only food. Here, Parton says in his "Life of Andrew Jackson," Andrew spent some of the most wretched days of his life. Smallpox broke out among the prisoners and only the dead were not miserable among the sick and the well and the dying.

Andrew Jackson's second lesson in the art of war came when he watched the engagement of General Greene's brave little army attempting to rescue them and Lord Rawdon's forces on Hobkirk's Hill. Knowing that there would be an engagement the next day, young Andy had carved out a knothole in the prison fence with a razor during the night so that he and the other prisoners could witness the conflict. When General Greene's forces were routed and put in full retreat, the prisoners despaired.

Andrew Jackson, soon after the Hobkirk's Hill disaster, came down with smallpox. Soon Robert also showed symptoms of the dread disease. Mrs. Jackson, on hearing of the condition of the prisoners, journeyed to Camden, and here the heroic mother succeeded in effecting an exchange of prisoners: the Whigs gave up 13 captives for the Jackson brothers and five neighbors. By now Robert and Andrew were wasted with disease and near death. Andrew dragged himself home barefooted and with his garments filthy and torn. Robert rode one of the two horses, supported by the other prisoners. Mrs. Jackson rode the other horse.

Robert died 2 days after reaching home and only Mrs. Jackson's medical skill and nursing saved Andrew from a similar fate.

In the summer of 1781 a cry of despair came from the Charleston prison ships where some of Mrs. Jackson's kin and neighbors were prisoners. Again this good woman set out on a mission of mercy, one from which she never returned. Andrew was now out of danger and Mrs. Jackson set out on the 160-mile journey. General Jackson, it is said, always thought that his mother and two companions made the trip on horseback, but according to neighborhood tradition, the three women were supposed to have walked. It is known, however, that they did reach Charleston safely and brought much joy to the prisoners. She died shortly thereafter with "ship fever" at the home of a relative near Charleston and was buried nearby.

In 1782, when peace was restored, those of the Waxhaw settlers who had survived, among them Andrew Jackson, returned to their homes. Young Andrew had now completely recovered in health and his high spirits and love of life returned in spite of the fact that he mourned the loss of his heroic mother and his brothers.

An orphan at 16, he had lived years of war, had all but given his life and his sanity for the cause of freedom—all this even before becoming of age to be a soldier. While still in his teens he had seen and endured more suffering and hardships than most men experience in a lifetime.

[From the Kershaw (S.C.) News-Era]

Original Andrew Jackson Day Program at Flat Creek Schools

Weeks of preparation in memorizing speeches and choral music went into the presentation of an impressive assembly program by the seventh grade at the Flat Creek Elementary School, March 15, under the guidance of Mr. John Bunyan Faile, the seventh grade teacher, and Mr. Mack Israel, choral director. The theme of the program was "Andrew Jackson Day."

The stage was decorated by the students with native cedar and wild magnolia foliage. The auditorium was darkened and as the program began, the stage lights were turned

on and the curtains opened slowly to the singing of an early American frontier religious song, "The Promised Land." This was followed by the Lord's Prayer led by Della Jane Sims, the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States led by Marvin Starnes, and the Flat Creek Schools alma mater sung by the entire elementary student body.

Della Jane Sims spoke on "South Carolina Files New Claim to Andy" and Stanley Hinson presented a long and well-memorized biographical sketch entitled "Life and Boyhood of Jackson." These speeches were followed by the patriotic song, "This Land Is Your Land."

Next on program was Joanna Kennington who spoke on the topic "Andrew Jackson's Family" and Wanda Catoe who spoke on the topic "Analysis of Jackson." These interesting historical sketches were followed by an original poem, written by Mrs. Oleen T. Hinson, mother of seventh grader Ann Hinson. The poem "The Great Patriot" was recited by Ann Hinson and Linda Robinson as Della Jane Sims played a soft piano accompaniment of "The Star Spangled Banner."

The poem, in recitation included, "There are conflicts, some great, some small; About who claims good, old Andrew Jackson, or his birthplace, least of all, North Carolina claims him, South Carolina gives proof of clues; As if Andrew Jackson had a chance to choose.

"As to where he would be born, in Carolina, North or South; could it be one State is jealous? They want no historic doubt. There's one thing for certain, he was a patriot true-blue; so, as for me, I'll make a choice and say, 'Andy, here's South Carolina for you.' "

Following the poem, the seventh grade sang "Land of Hope and Glory."

In conclusion, Brenda Payne delivered "The Political and Public Activities of Jackson" and Dianna Kennington, "Andrew Jackson as President." The seventh grade sang "America" and the Flat Creek schools' fightsong, "Cheer, Cheer for Old Flat Creek High," paraphrasing the "Notre Dame Victory March."

Morris MacDowell, principal, congratulated the seventh grade on a job well-done before dismissing the students.

EXPENDITURE REFORMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy that the Democratic leadership and many of the Members of the House on the Democratic side have taken seriously the question of expenditure reforms. I am going to read with a great deal of interest all the material that has been placed in the Record so that we can get an orderly story as to what they say is going on. I wish that we had been notified on our side of the aisle that this endeavor was going to be undertaken. I am sure more of the Members on our side would have been present to participate.

Mr. Speaker, the primary comment that I think needs to be made at this time, even without the complete record, on the basis of what was said that not once was the point of the revenue side of the budget mentioned; not once was there any attention directed to the limitation of our taxing power and our ability to gather revenue. Not once was there any mention of the Federal debt.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed] is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and he pointed out that in the last Congress many bills were passed, appropriation bills, and they would expect, of course, the Congress would expect the administration and the executive branch to carry out these expenditures and, would we not? As a matter of fact, this is exactly the issue I presented to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, when he testified before the Committee on Ways and Means about 4 or 5 weeks ago at which time he told us that in November 1962 on their semiannual review the executive department found that their revenue estimates had fallen $7.5 billion short of what they had anticipated when they sent the budget for fiscal year 1963 to the Congress.

I said, "Mr. Secretary, what did the President do when he found out that his revenue estimates were $7.5 billion short?" And the answer is, "Nothing was done—nothing was done."

In fact, the Secretary gave the same answer that the gentleman from Oklahoma presented; "Well, after all," he said, "Congress voted these appropriations."

And I said, "But, Mr. Secretary, the Congress did not have this knowledge that your revenues were falling $7.5 billion short." As a matter of fact the Congress had been presented with a balanced budget and when they passed these appropriation and authorization bills they did so in the context of a balanced budget which was presented to us last year. I am satisfied that had the Congress realized that the budget was out of balance and that the revenue estimates were $7.5 billion short, a great deal more care would have been taken on the expenditure side of the ledger. It is this issue that has been completely neglected in the presentation by the Democratic leadership, this issue of revenues, because when we do not collect the taxes there is only one thing we can do and that is to try to sell more U.S. Bonds. And when we go to marketing additional Federal bonds we run into serious difficulties. The problems involved in debt management from the standpoint of inflation, in context with our balance-of-payments picture today and the gold flow situation, are such that it behooves us all to view this situation with considerable concern and I would say considerable alarm.

It just passes belief that a responsible political party would spend 2 hours, with all these statements discussing the expenditure side of the ledger without any reference at all to what our income might be. Yes, indeed, there seems to be an issue for the people of this country to consider; the puritan ethic, whether or not it is important for Government as well as individuals, corporations, businesses, to live within their budget and what are the consequences when you continually overspend and overspend.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman think that politics in the worst connotation of that term and the use of that word had anything to do with the delayed announcement of the unexpected budget deficit of the last Congress, recalling the time that that announcement came after the November 6 election?

Mr. CURTIS. This question was raised and the Secretary of the Treasury assured us that this was a coincidence, that they had discovered this on November 15, after the election. I do note, though, that in a previous November, in 1961, this was after the same semiannual review, the President with a great deal of publicity announced that he had called his Cabinet together and told them that they had to exercise economy. I asked Secretary Dillon about this. I said, "What was the result?" He said, "Well, we were able to cut $1 billion back in our expenditure rate."

But I would note this, that this semiannual review is for the end of October and knowing enough, as I do, about how one collects these statistics, I am certain that the knowledge was well within the purview of the executive branch of the Government before election day in November last year.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. It is true that in the past 8 plush years there has been a majority on the Democratic side of the House and I like to exercise the thought that the timing of the Cuban quarantine and the announcement of the $500,000 that was expected up to the time of the election as a $7.8 billion deficit after the election, and the reversal of those two might have had a great effect on the majority side of the House.

Mr. CURTIS. It could be. However, I think we have got enough here for the future for the public to consider in this matter of fiscal responsibility.

I want to go on and point out that here is a political party, that is advocating a tax cut at this time without any concern, apparently, and I say that in the light of what has gone on here this afternoon, with the imbalance between expenditures and revenues. In light of this, the administration, and backed apparently by its leadership in the House, is willing to go along and create further deficits, which I might point out are not just for fiscal 1964. Even under the administration's own theory the budget will not be balanced under this fiscal program until 1967, and under better estimates, I might state, those that are based upon the increased expenditure rate that has occurred under this administration, and projecting it out instead of cutting it off, as the administration does, instead of getting that balance in 1967 the budget will not be balanced until 1972. The additional deficit will be $75 billion at the most conservative estimate. Others estimate it at over $100 billion. Yet to this very minute neither the President nor his Council of Economic Advisers nor any one of the leaders in the Democratic Party have discussed the implications involved in the management of the debt and the consequences to the country in the light of the gold flow.

Just last week the Secretary of the Treasury came before the Committee on Ways and Means requesting that we amend or repeal the Silver Act of 1934. What is the significance of this? In repealing the Silver Act of 1934 we are going to release $2 billion of silver bullion, which is the reserve behind $2 billion of silver paper certificates, leaving our gold, which is already a reserve for the currency we have outstanding, to be the sole reserve for an additional $2 billion of the currency. In other words, we are withdrawing from the metallic base, the precious metal base that backs up our currency, $2 billion.

I regret to say that the fiscal situation of this country is such that there is no other course but to do this, but the implications are quite clear that this is the first step that is necessary in order to devalue the dollar, which some people close to the President are already saying must come about. I must say this, whether we devalue it officially or not, if we pursue this kind of economic and fiscal policy that has been so clearly demonstrated by the majority here on the floor this afternoon that is the only course that will follow, and we will then be one other has-been Nation that at one time had its preeminence and its place in the sun.

This is why those on our side of the aisle have said that expenditure reform is so badly needed. You can see from this demonstration on the floor today why we regard carefully our itemization of where these cuts are going to come. The display, if I may use such a word, and I think I can back it up, of demagogery, saying we were trifling with the lives of people if we were going to cut here, here, or here, wherever it might be proposed, if we were going to cut out the school lunch program, one could immediately get the picture that was in the minds of the democratic leadership to immediately stir up every pressure group in the United States so that they would be asking what this country can do for them, not what they can do for this country.

Yes, that is what would happen in the process of trying to get on top of our expenditures and bring this thing into line.

But let me now relate this a bit to expenditures, because there is a lot of confusion in the public's mind, and I can tell confusion exists in the minds of some of the Democratic Congressmen who were speaking. When we talk about cutting the budget, we are talking about fiscal 1964, we are talking about the $108 billion new obligational authority. Now that is not obligational authority even if approved, which would be spent in fiscal 1964. A good bit of it will be, but much of it will be spent in fiscal 1965 and some of it in fiscal 1966 and some of it in fiscal 1967. This is a new authority to spend. On June 30, 1963, the administration will have $87 billion of previous obligational authority to spend that has not been used, and that will be added to the $108 billion, if it were granted to them to make a total of $195 billion authority to spend in fiscal year 1964. It is only the President who says his expenditure rate would be $99 billion. Note the big difference. The expenditure rate for fiscal 1964 is presumed to be $99 billion. The request for new obligational authority which tells us where we are going to go on in the future is $108 billion. The $10 billion to $15 billion cut that has been talked about relates to the $108 billion, and if we did cut it by what I happen to think is the right figure, about $13 billion, this would cut back the expenditure rate of fiscal 1964 by about $4 or $5 billion to hold to the expenditure level of fiscal 1963.

Incidentally, there is a good way to look to see where we can trim because this is not blocking out items from various programs or chopping it out, as has been described. This is taking a look at the way these programs have grown and the way they are predicted to continue to grow. But I again point to the figures: $81 billion was our expenditure rate the last year in which Eisenhower was President.

The first year in which President Kennedy took over was $87 billion. Next year which ends June of this fiscal year is $94 billion, and for the next year is $99 billion, an increase of $18 billion in the expenditure rate in the period of 3 years contrasted to an increase of about $13 billion the previous 6 years. Now this is what is alarming—it is this increased rate of expenditure. Let me say this, and I put this in the minority views of the Republicans of the Joint Economic Committee. These increases in expenditures have not been in defense primarily. The tables that I put in there for 1961, 1962, and 1963 show a total increase of Federal expenditures of 15 percent while defense showed an increase of only 8 percent. HEW was an increase of 38 percent, as I recall the figures. Agriculture was an increase of around 30 percent. And, yet, the public is being hoodwinked into thinking that these increases that have occurred under the Kennedy administration have been in the defense area. This just does not happen to be the case, any more than the statement of the majority whip that the years under President Kennedy particularly last year had shown the greatest price stability of any period in our history since World War II. The record is there for anyone to see in the President's Council of Economic Advisers own statistics.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I certainly want to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and an outstanding member of the Joint Committee of the House and Senate. He has pointed out beautifully here the difference between legislative authority and the actual act of appropriation; the problem of gold flow and remonetization and of the spending rate as differentiated from the obligational authority to spend. I think we have pretty well established that we do not have a meat ax approach or a shotgun approach, but in fact we have a rifle pointing at this, and we are just holding our ammunition until we see the whites of the eyes.

I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman what he thinks, No. 1: About whether or not maybe this is not why the leadership is holding up this legislation to the point where we have been dubbed as a do-nothing Congress as well as that side of the aisle being more interested in physical conditions than in the fiscal condition? And, No. 2: I would like to ask, What about this debt ceiling and the legality of it, if the gentleman cares to comment on that?

Mr. CURTIS. I will take the second point first, for I do not know that I can answer why there has been a holdup in these bills other than to say that we saw this afternoon in our first appropriation bill the details of where cuts can occur, and no one was advocating a straight percentage cut across the board. I simply was pointing out that here there was a 10-percent cut, and this carried across the board would mean $11 billion.

There is another bill I happen to know about, carrying much larger sums than the billion we dealt with today, because it deals with several billions, where the cut is going to be around 25 to 30 percent. Some of them will be below 10 percent, because this is not a meat-ax approach. But, here is a very interesting thing. With all the Democrats here on the floor today we did not hear from the Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee where the responsibility lies to raise the revenue. I did not hear them speak out here because they know where the pinch is; and the administration, I am happy to say, knows that there is a pinch, because about 6 weeks ago they came before the Ways and Means Committee and asked them to continue the debt ceiling at $308 billion. After public testimony—and I talked about some of it—even Secretary Dillon pointed out that they find out they are 7.5 billion short of their anticipated revenues, and after public hearings the Ways and Means Committee in its wisdom refused to go along with the administration, and on yesterday the debt ceiling went down to $305 billion. I have always said that the debt ceiling is a very cumbersome way in which to exercise discipline in expenditures by the Congress because we have already appropriated the money and have given the President the authority to spend it. However, the Executive does have considerable flexibility. As has been pointed out, he will have $195 billion if he gets his $108 billion, which I do not think he will, but if he were to have it in fiscal 1964 he himself has anticipated only a $99 billion expenditure rate. Every Executive has cut back on programs, held them down, accelerated some more than others, just as the President said he did in November of 1961, that he held down expenditures by $1 billion.

This is bringing about discipline in the White House right now, the $305 billion ceiling, and this is going to be with us for the month of April and the month of May, and I think the administration realizes that there is a will on the part of the Congress to do something about expenditures. I know there are many members of the Democratic Party who feel just as strongly as I do on this business of the need for fiscal responsibility. But they were not party to this operation that the administration requested the administration congressional leaders be put on here because they understand that we have to have the revenues to make expenditures.

If the gentleman will permit me one other line of thought, because I do want to get this across.

A lot of mockery was made of those who are trying to cut the budget. A Wall Street Journal article, by Mr. Otten, was mentioned. I thought this was one of the most unfair and poorly timed articles I have read, although I do have a high respect for Mr. Otten. I was sort of pleased in a way to see him needle the "economy but" boys. That is, when it comes to something in a Member's district, they want to run away. Here is why I say the article was unfair and why the comments on the other side of the aisle about these men who are in the forefront in trying to bring about expenditure reform were unfair. Of course, we all have public works projects in our districts, we all have post offices and other expenditures that are legitimate. We are not talking just solely about programs which are wasteful and foolish. Many of the programs we feel we have to cut back on are good programs. It is a question of establishing priorities. How much can we afford in this particular year, how much can we afford next year? We have always done that in public works and in post offices. We scheduled them as we can build them so that we get them within our revenues. We have established, over a period of years, established lines of procedure whereby we get our programs authorized.

Mr. Otten did not mention the fact that most of these proposals of the Congressmen he was talking about were adhering to the regular lines of procedure, taking their turn, as it were, and that these economy-minded Congressmen would subject the projects in their districts to the same kind of discipline that we seek to subject all of the projects.

This business of cutting the budget is difficult because every program has its sponsors: sincere people. Many of these are good programs. You could say if we have the money they certainly would be desirable to be pushed forward. But there is only one way to go forward in this business of getting discipline into expenditures and that is to set the standards and apply them to all Members of Congress, all communities, all kinds of projects, then just recognize the fact that we must confine our total expenditures to our anticipated revenues.

Yes, we can talk about how our country could use these things and where our defense would be. And when we might get on the moon. But I remind all of you of what Lenin and other Communist leaders have said, that they are not going to defeat America on the battlefield. We will get America to spend itself to death.

And, indeed, if they succeed we will then go down the same trail of oblivion so many other nations in history have gone. We will not go out in a blaze of glory but in a whimper.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I think the gentleman has demonstrated beautifully that the Republicans do in fact have real muscle and the rifle approach rather than a meat-ax or shotgun approach. I say he has demonstrated there is sense in the budget, not from a biased point of view, and that the fishing expedition has been fruitless.

A FISHY CASE OF "PAID AID"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL], is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I feel a little like I should have on my hip-boots and Ozark fishing hat, as I stand here today. You see, I am here to cast out another episode in the "piscatorial paddy mystery."

I think my investigation now has hooked all the details about this project which the United Nations calls aid to the United States.

I have learned that U.S. taxpayers paid a Chinese expert exactly $5,663.26 for 3 months during which the expert advised the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Arkansas rice farmers about how to grow fish in rice paddies. The U.S. payment went to the United Nations associated agency, the Food and Agriculture Organization—FAO. The payment included salary, transportation, and expenses.

This is the same Food and Agriculture Organization that receives about one-third of its financial support from American taxpayers.

As my colleagues know, I have spent a month reeling in slippery details about this project because U.N. officials cited it to me as a prime example of how the United States of America has received U.N. aid.

In fact, U.S. taxpayers paid for that aid.

But the U.N. does not mention that. And, I am sorry to say that our own bureaucracy liked the arrangement so well, it wants to venture yet again into the same deep waters.

The Department of Interior tells me it is now exploring the possibility of hiring the expert again this summer. The U.N. probably will call that aid to America, too.

The Department of State has told me that it feels it is "not appropriate for the United States to take U.N. aid since we are not an underdeveloped country." The merit of that policy is for U.S. taxpayers to decide.

They are the ones who pay 40 or more percent of most U.N. expenses. But I, for one, insist that the United Nations must immediately cease its citing of this paddy project as aid to the United States—unless the U.N. wants to clearly and carefully point out that the loaning of the expert was only a favor for which Americans paid a high price.

I finally have been able to obtain information about the expert—a Dr. Shao-Wen Ling, of Formosa. I have asked for unanimous consent to include a biography of Dr. Ling in the RECORD.

And, I have landed these details about the hitherto mysterious and mislaid project:

Dr. Ling conducted a field study in Southern States for 3 months in early 1959. His advice was utilized by the Fish and Wildlife Service at a research station at Stuttgart, Ark., and led to construction of a substation at Kelso, Ark.

My colleagues, so that this piscatorial project will not slip back beneath the murky paddy waters, I have asked for unanimous consent to fully document it for history in the RECORD. I direct your attention to these supporting documents:

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Whereas the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (hereinafter designated FAO) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior (hereinafter designated the Service) have common objectives in the development of scientific fish husbandry and the increased production of animal protein food for a growing population; and

Whereas Public Law 85–342 of the United States directs the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program of research and experimentation to develop methods for the production of fish on flooded rice acreage in rotation with ricefield crops; and

Whereas FAO has on its staff recognized experts in the field of scientific fish husbandry; and

Whereas the Service has need for consultation with such an expert in the development of the facilities and program contemplated by Public Law 85–342:

Now, therefore, the parties to this memorandum agree, as follows:

1. Beginning on or about February 1, 1959, FAO will, in accordance with its own applicable rules, regulations, and procedures, send its fishery expert, Dr. Shao Wen Ling, to headquarters of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service at Washington, D.C., and such other points in the United States as may be necessary to give technical assistance and consultation on establishment of a fish husbandry laboratory. The period of the detail shall not exceed 3 months, including travel time between Dr. Ling's headquarters and Washington, D.C., provided such travel is by air.

2. The Service agrees to reimburse FAO for all direct costs of Dr. Ling's assignment, including salary, transportation, subsistence costs en route and while in the United States, and incidental and miscellaneous costs incurred as a result of the assignment.

3. FAO agrees to such post-assignment consultative correspondence between Dr. Ling and representatives of the Service as may be deemed necessary and desirable.

4. The Service agrees to provide FAO with periodical reports of progress on the fish husbandry research.

BIOGRAPHY OF DR. SHAO-WEN LING

Dr. Ling was born in Changchow, China, in 1907. He gained his bachelor's and master's degrees in biology at Yenching University, Peiping, in 1928 and 1930. In 1933 he gained a Ph. D. in limnology (the science of freshwater biology) at Cornell University in the United States. He then returned to China as assistant professor of biology at the University of Amoy. In 1935 he moved to the University of Shantung, in Tsingtao, as professor and head of the department of biology.

The Japanese invasion in April of 1937 led to his evacuation and the following year he was one of the founders of the National Medical College at Kweiyang, where he served as head of the department of biomorphics (developmental biology). In 1939, the Hong Kong Government invited him to join its fisheries research institute as fisheries biologist. He also served concurrently as guest lecturer at the University of Hong Kong.

When Hong Kong was occupied by the Japanese, Dr. Ling returned to Kweiyang and joined the medical training center of the ministry of national defense. He also was director of the Kweiyang Provincial Science Institute.

With the coming of V–J Day, he was asked by the Ministry of Agriculture to organize a national fisheries research institute in Shanghai, and served as its director.

Dr. Ling joined the staff of FAO in the spring of 1949, and was assigned to the FAO Far Eastern regional office in Bangkok. While in Thailand he was instrumental in interesting His Majesty King Phumiphon Aduldej in fish farming—so much so that the latter converted an abandoned swimming pool on his palace ground for the purpose of raising Tilapia, which were then distributed to the Thai farmers. The interest shown by His Majesty gave a great impetus to fish farming in Thailand, resulting in the creation of a new industry in that country.

Dr. Ling has recently completed an assignment in Ceylon assisting in the development of inland fisheries in that country. He will shortly go to Malaya to help that country with its inland fisheries problems.

Food and Agriculture
Organization of the United Nations,
New York, N.Y., June 1959.

Fish Farming Could Be Big U.S. Industry, Says FAO Expert

A world authority on fish culture recently told correspondents at United Nations Headquarters, in New York, that there were very great possibilities for fish farming in rice-growing areas of the United States.

He was Dr. Shao-Wen Ling, who had been assigned for 3 months to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). He had been advising on the establishment of a research station which is to be established in Arkansas to investigate fish farming problems in the United States.

Dr. Ling said the United States was a food surplus country, but consumption of fish was very low; an average of about 11 pounds per head per year. With some increase in fish consumption levels and with the population increase expected in the next few decades the country would need to increase food production and would find it worthwhile to look to inland water areas for more fish and to scientific fish culture for the most efficient production of this protein food.

Already, said Dr. Ling, a number of Arkansas rice farmers were experimenting with fish farming. They were using farm reservoirs and unplanted fields to raise fish to edible size. But their experiments were haphazard and yielding results which were mostly disappointing. To make a commercial success of these experiments the whole operation would have to be lifted on to a more systematic and scientific plane.

For successful and profitable fish farming, Dr. Ling said, a suitable combination of fish would have to be worked out which would have complementary food habits so that some would live on aquatic weeds, some on the minute organisms in the water, and others off the sediment on the bottom. Thus they would utilize fully all the nutritional substances found in the pool and grow to edible size without eating one another. There was need for research to determine kinds and quantities of fertilizers which should be added to the ponds to encourage the production of fishfood and what supplementary foods, like corn and soya bean brans, should be added to round out the range of nutrients available to the fish. There were also problems of health to be considered. Fish raised under the crowded conditions of fish culture were susceptible to infectious diseases and attacks by parasites and health measures would have to be planned. On top of these came harvesting, processing, and marketing problems.

And when all these preliminary problems were solved, provision would have to be made to supply the tens of millions of tiny fish which the new industry would require. A big problem was how to induce fish to spawn in captivity, said Dr. Ling. "In their wild state they only spawn when they are happy," he said. "Our problem is how to make them happy in captivity. We might have to feed them special vitamins, make sure they get their calories and even give them hormone injections to make them more peppy."

Dr. Ling said the U.S. Congress had passed a bill authorizing establishment of a research and experimental station to investigate all these problems. He had been assigned by FAO, at the request of the U.S. Government, to advise on the selection of a site and on the layout of the new station now being drawn up. Dr. Ling said there was no shortage of American workers in the various biological sciences connected with fish culture but there was a shortage of experience in the coordination of these various sciences in the unified field of fish culture and there would be a growing need for training even more scientists to carry on extension service as the program developed.

Dr. Ling said fish farming in the United States could produce not only considerable quantities of food fish, like catfish and buffalo fish, but also game fish like bass. The Soil Conservation Service in Arkansas had calculated that more than half a million acres in ricegrowing areas would be suitable for the industry, he said. He had met many farmers during a 6-week field trip who were ready to invest heavily in the industry when it was put on a scientific basis.

Department of the Interior,
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,
February 14, 1959.

FAO Loans Fish Farming Expert to FWS

Upon request of the Department of the Interior's Fish and Wildlife Service, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations has assigned Dr. Shaowen Ling, one of the world's leading pond-fish culturists, to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for a 3-month period.

Dr. Ling, who has his doctor's degree in limnology from Cornell University, is a native of China. He will act as consultant for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife on the establishment of a research laboratory and experimental station which is to be built in Arkansas to study fish propagation problems in rice-growing areas.

His main task will be to visit possible experimental sites, recommend pond layouts and develop plans for research in the fields of warm-water fish diseases and parasites, genetics, selective breeding, nutrition and other physiological requirements, and to make recommendations on fish-crop rotations.

Before beginning his assignment in the rice-growing area, Dr. Ling will survey research stations and warm-water fish hatcheries in the South and will consult with one of America's leading fish culturists, Dr. H. S. Swingle of Alabama Polytechnic Institute at Auburn.

In spite of the widespread practice of fish culture in foreign countries, the idea never took hold in the United States until in recent years when the rice farmers of Arkansas became interested in fish-farming almost by accident. In bringing new rice acreage into production it was customary to build levees around a tract of land, filling the resulting reservoir with water and letting it stand for a couple of years until the timber died and the decaying vegetation enriched the soil.

Following the procedure, farmers soon found that the water in the reservoirs always contained abundant supplies of the local species of fish. Presently the question arose as to whether better breeds of fish might be raised to bring a greater yield and a more lucrative cash crop to the farmer.

To find the answer to this question, the Congress has authorized the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to establish a laboratory and experiment station.

Dr. Ling has just completed an assignment in Ceylon assisting the Government of that country in the development of its inland fisheries. When he completes his task in America he will go to Malaya to help that newly created independent nation with its fishery problems.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.

Hon. Durward G. Hall,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Hall: Your understanding as stated in your letter of March 15, is correct; the Fish and Wildlife Service did request and receive for a period of about 3 months in early 1959 the services of Dr. Shao-Wen Ling, under the terms of a memorandum of agreement with the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. As indicated in this agreement (copy enclosed), Dr. Ling's expert assistance was solicited in planning the research program and experimental facilities authorized by Public Law 85–342 to develop methods for the production of fish as a supplementary or rotation crop in the reservoirs and flooded lands primarily used for rice and other agricultural crops in several Southern States.

Dr. Ling conducted a field study in Southern States and his analysis of the problems and his recommendations were very valuable in the design of our research laboratory, experimental ponds and program. The research station is located at Stuttgart, Ark., with a substation now under construction at Kelso, Ark. In our opinion, the investment in Dr. Ling's services (we reimbursed FAO in the amount of $5,663.26) has been highly profitable.

We have recently heard that Dr. Ling plans to be in this country on leave this summer. The possibility of again obtaining his aid is being explored. He could be most helpful as a participant in a tentatively scheduled review of the "fish farming" programs and objectives. We would be pleased to reimburse FAO for Dr. Ling's salary and expenses within the United States for a period of perhaps 2 weeks if this second use of his exceptional talents can be arranged.

We appreciate this opportunity of explaining our activities and hope that this letter, together with Commissioner Pautzke's letter to you dated March 18, is fully responsive to your interest.

Sincerely yours,
Robert M. Paul,
Deputy Assistant Secretary
of the Interior.

FRANK WOLFE LOSES HIS JOB BUT KEEPS HIS SELF-RESPECT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from

Illinois [Mr. Michel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, "I know they'll get me for not going along. But all I've got to lose is a job. I'm not going to lose my self-respect."

Mr. Speaker, these are the words of Frank E. Wolfe, formerly an electrician at the Dixon State School, Dixon, Ill., when he rebelled at a blackmail attempt by E. M. Sullivan, Democratic chairman of Lee County in my district, prior to the elections last fall. I reported in a speech on the floor on August 2, 1962, that Mr. Sullivan had ordered all patronage jobholders in the county to contribute 2 percent of their salaries to the party under threat of losing their jobs.

Mr. Wolfe was the spokesman for the group of about six employees who decided to fight the Sullivan order. Mr. Wolfe reported that the blackmail payments would amount to $13 a month in contributions in addition to $184 in retroactive payments. The protesting employees charged that Sullivan threatened there were 150 more Democrats just waiting for the jobs of noncontributors.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we see that Mr. Wolfe's prediction was accurate—they finally got him. He was fired March 22, 1963. My colleagues will recall in my speech last August I quoted Mr. Wolfe as saying that although he had been a Democrat since the days of Al Smith and he intended to make voluntary contributions to the party, "I don't like someone to point a gun at me."

I was moved by the fighting statement of this honest man to investigate further into the matter. I found that the Dixon State School was a regular recipient of Federal research grants and would continue to receive Federal funds. Since the Federal Government was, and to my way of thinking, still is involved, one would assume that the Department of Justice would investigate in order that justice might be upheld. Mr. Robert Kennedy has always indicated a great interest in this sort of thing.

I wrote to the Attorney General on August 6, 1962, indicating that in my opinion Federal law had been violated and that section 600, just to mention one, of title 18, United States Code, was germane to the instant case.

Mr. Speaker, sections 600 and 601 of the aforementioned title of the United States Code are very explicit in the punishment to be inflicted on those involved with the promise or deprivation of employment or other benefit for political activity.

On August 17, 1962, Mr. Burke Marshall, assistant attorney general for civil rights, wrote to me the following letter which I will include at this point:

Hon. Robert H. Michel,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Michel: This refers to your letter to the Attorney General of August 6, 1962. With your letter you enclosed an excerpt from the Congressional Record of August 2, 1962, with your remarks under the title, "Kickback From Patronage Jobholders." Your comments concern a chairman of a county political organization who allegedly threatened local patronage jobholders, including an electrician at a State school which receives some Federal funds, with loss of their jobs unless they contributed a percentage of their salaries to the organization.

Based upon this information, 18 United States Code 600 would not be applicable. You express the view that there are "any number of other Federal provisions" which would apply. Though some States might have statutes which would apply to the alleged activity, we know of no Federal law which does.

Sincerely,
Burke Marshall,
Assistant Attorney General,
Civil Rights Division.

Mr. Speaker, the nonchalance with which the Department of Justice approaches civil rights matters of this nature is appalling. Section 601 states in part:

> Whoever * * * threatens to deprive any person of any employment * * * made possible by any act of Congress * * * on account of support to any candidate or any political party in any election, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

I do not think there is any doubt as to the intent of Congress in this or similar sections dealing with elections and politicial activities.

In Mr. Marshall's letter he indicated that Mr. Wolfe was "allegedly threatened" and I am wondering what he will say in his next letter now that Mr. Sullivan's threat to get Mr. Wolfe's job has become a reality. I intend to write the Attorney General and request that another attempt be made to initiate an investigation. I assume that I will hear from Mr. Marshall in about 2 weeks, as was the case last year, but I hope in that time he will have read through the aforementioned sections and will indicate that he is now cognizant of the intent of Congress in these matters.

Mr. Speaker, if the reply from the Department of Justice is identical to one which I received last year, Mr. Kennedy surely will have "pulled the trigger" on Mr. Wolfe, and in order to prevent this from happening again, the Congress will have to spell out in new legislation, language that the Department of Justice can understand.

TAX CUT HAS ONLY MINOR EFFECT ON NATION'S GROWTH RATE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the dispute between the two schools of economics both advocating Federal income tax reform, the press has tended to emphasize the agreement and to neglect the disagreement. Ironically, this can bring about no tax reform because the areas of disagreement will not have been resolved.

The disagreement about Federal expenditures has received only a modicum of exposure. The public is aware that one school states there must be expenditure reform before there is tax reform. However, the rationale of the expenditure reformers has been reported mostly through the mouths of those who oppose it. And, therefore, it has not had the proper emphasis or accuracy. It is time the press began reporting directly not vicariously what the opponents of President Kennedy's fiscal policies based upon a tax cut have been saying.

Another area of basic disagreement, however, has hardly been mentioned. President Kennedy's statement that a tax cut is the most important step that can be taken by the Federal Government to stimulate the economy is contradicted. The opposition says that a tax cut based upon expenditure reform or not based upon it, will have little impact by itself upon economic growth. Other economic factors are more important and more basic.

The press has pictured the tax cut debate as a struggle between those who want the tax reduction to go to beef up consumer demand and those who want it to beef up investment funds. This is what the Kennedy spokesmen say is the point of dispute. The opposition says this is relatively minor. The economic facts are that both consumer purchasing power and investment liquidity are relatively high today. Putting more money into either category will only increase an already fairly liquid condition.

Tax reform is needed because of its long-range impact, not its short-range impact. Its impact upon incentive to invest and incentive for the consumer to spend is the key. In our present liquid situation as far as the consumer is concerned the $100 a year to each Federal income taxpayer which the administration tax cutting bill proposes will do little to his incentive to purchase. The same is true about the incentive to invest whatever money might be released to increase investment dollars.

Incentive will be helped only by the permanency of the reform and in context and in conformity with other reforms. The immediate impact should be designed primarily to give our people reassurance that the administration believes in, understands, and wishes to promote the private enterprise system. To put it bluntly the people need to know whether the administration believes in the morality and efficacy of profits. Right now there is a question in every businessman's mind as to whether this is an accepted ethic of our society in the eyes of the Kennedy administration.

Consumer purchasing power is helped by getting an unemployed person a job more than by a tax cut. One job puts about $5,000 into consumer purchasing power annually in contrast to a $100 tax cut. Provide the proper incentives to create new jobs and unemployment can be reduced from 4,200,000 to 3 million thus adding $6 billion to consumer purchasing power, plus cutting Federal expenditures in welfare and increased Federal revenues.

Incentive to invest is helped by increasing the rate of return on capital invested. We have been in a profits squeeze for some time. Taxes, important as they are, remain a minor item in the cost-price squeeze. Annual rate of profit after taxes on stockholder equity dropped from an average of 14.2 percent in 1947–51 to a 9.4 percent in the 1957–61 period. Tax reductions will help this picture in tenths of percentage points, labor costs, governmental penalties and subsidies, foreign and domestic, and other economic forces deal in full percentage points. It is the areas other than taxes which must receive much of our attention.

Today it requires around $20,000 of new capital investment to create one new job. The money is there ready to invest. The new and better goods and services have been invented and are ready to be offered to the public. Why then is not the money risked to produce and market these goods and services so that these new jobs are created, so that $5,000 units not $100 units are injected into the aggregate of consumer purchasing power?

The problem is not easy. President Kennedy is talking off the top of his head when he says that tax reform will either make or break this country's prosperity in the ensuing months. He is hiding the real economic problems facing our people with this kind of distraction.

PATRONAGE AND DEFENSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Record an excellent editorial appearing recently in the St. Louis Globe Democrat entitled: "Patronage and Defense."

I do not know the merits of the specific case at point, the TFX fighter plane contract awarded to the General Dynamics Corp. I do know that the Kennedy administration has been inviting just this kind of blowup by the cynical approach it has taken at the highest level toward the handling of all Government business, not just defense.

I have pointed out in public speeches the dangerousness of permitting Congressmen to announce executive department awards of governmental contracts, projects, appointments, personnel moves, and so forth to the people. What, indeed, are the people supposed to think other than that political influence helped to bring about the Government action, rather than the merits involved? This kind of operation encourages the improper procedure of going to the legislative representatives instead of directly to the governmental agency which has the responsibility for making the decisions. It creates a disrespect for law, Government, and politics.

Recent political campaigns have been conducted brazenly on the innuendo of subverting the orderly process of Government by law with Government by influence.

The Kennedy administration for 2 years now consistently has sought to obtain congressional votes by threats and promises involving Government contracts, appointments, and installations.

Last year the techniques became so outrageous that several of us took the floor of the House to protest against them. In this instance high officials in the Defense Department threatened to withdraw contracts from businesses in certain congressional areas if the Congressmen representing those districts did not vote to increase the debt ceiling to $308 billion.

We have always had a modicum of government by men not by law; indeed history reveals that the graveyards of nations are filled because of the virulence of this disease. The real difference in the United States today in contrast to the past when we had open spoils politics is that this kind of activity is receiving a strange sort of smug and cynical accolade instead of censure by people in high places upon whom we formerly could rely to help set our moral tone. President Kennedy is being praised for his astuteness as a practical politician but the kind of astuteness for which he is praised was nothing new even in Machiavelli's times. Many Republicans and Democrats, regardless of our differing views on other matters, are dedicated to fight against this kind of astuteness. It is the simple issue of corrupt government against good government.

We are seeing in Washington today what I saw in Missouri as a young man under the regime of "Boss" Pendergast and what Time magazine cynically praised last week in Mayor Daly's operations in Chicago.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Globe-Democrat, Mar. 13, 1963]

Patronage and Defense

The administration, specifically the Defense Department, is under the gun and yelling "foul" as Senator McClellan's investigating committee probes the $6,500 million TFX fighter plane award to the General Dynamics Corp..

The award was made despite the fact the Boeing Co. submitted a bid some $100 million less and offered a craft the Air Force and Navy military chiefs recommended as better.

The deal has aroused loud cries of favoritism from Democrats and Republicans. It has been layered with a thick suspicion that defense politics has been played in the grant of this huge contract.

With a $52 billion annual defense budget to disburse, obviously the opportunity for solid-gold patronage cannot be ignored. Dwight Eisenhower warned against "unwarranted influence of the military-industrial complex" when he left the Presidency. Political largesse in billions has been a suspicion in Capitol corridors for years.

Now it is out in the open.

Senator Henry F. Jackson, a pro-Kennedy Democrat called the contract "an amazing operation in unrealism." Boeing is in Seattle, Wash., the Senator's State, and Mr. Jackson is riled.

Republican Congressman K. W. Stinson of Washington State flatly hollered "politics." He said it would be more apt to call the plane LBJ instead of TFX. He referred to Vice President Lyndon Johnson, of Texas. The General Dynamics plant is in Fort Worth.

Secretary of Defense McNamara released a letter yesterday to Chairman McClellan of the Senate committee asserting the selection of General Dynamics to build the TFX was proper and in the public interest.

And he leveled a blast at the investigation committee which he charged was undermining public confidence "in the integrity and judgment of the highest officials in the Department of Defense." These "highest officials," all civilians, rode roughshod over the advice of Navy and Air Force experts, who will be responsible for use of the powerful new plane.

Mr. McNamara's outburst came on the heels of an apology by a Defense Department spokesman, Arthur Sylvester, for his comment questioning the fairness of the McClellan committee, which has a top-flight reputation for integrity.

The Nation has every confidence in Senator McClellan. He should probe this contract—perhaps others by the Pentagon—with exhaustive vigor. Complete scrutiny is impressively due.

Rumors, now open charges of political manipulation in defense contracts, have been rife for so long, only the naive in Washington think there is no truth in the reports.

Campaigning Kennedys, as well as other politicians of both parties, have implied or actually promised their election would reap more defense industry for particular areas. John F. Kennedy made precisely such pledges in stumping West Virginia. After he became President, new contracts went to West Virginia.

When Gov. Pat Brown was beating the hustings in California against Richard M. Nixon he boldly asked, "How could the State expect a GOP Governor to get as many contracts and projects for California as a Democratic intimate of the Kennedy administration?"

Senator Case of New Jersey recently asked from the Senate floor, "Is national interest the sole criterion in awarding Government contracts?"

Washington rumor is that certain Congressmen are seeking to trade votes for major administration legislation—in return for defense or other jobs in their bailiwicks.

Secretary McNamara will testify before the Senate committee later. Perhaps he can justify the highly controversial TFX contract. He certainly will have full opportunity. His explanation should be bared to the Nation.

No one wants arbitrarily or in partisan spleen to sap "the integrity" of Mr. McNamara and discredit the administration. But it has become too pat a gambit of the New Frontier whenever criticism or policy dispute arises, to wrap itself in a mantle of righteousness and howl persecution.

The country has a perfect right to know whether the administration is playing political touch football with multi-billion-dollar defense funds.

WOOL IMPORT THREAT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the entire New England delegation was saddened by an announcement that the Marland Plant of the J. P. Stevens Co. in Andover, Mass., was closing down operations. Over 453 persons will lose their jobs. The New England delegation to Congress has repeatedly asked President Kennedy to take action to help New England's wool business.

We have sent him telegrams.

We have written letters.

We have made telephone calls.

On February 20, I wrote President Kennedy asking him to take immediate action to save our wool business.

HE HAS DONE NOTHING

I urged him to immediately impose quantitative restrictions on the importation of woolen goods to the country. He has done nothing.

President Kennedy's replies have become increasingly vague. As things stand now, no one in Washington knows whether or not President Kennedy intends to help the wool business.

Here in Congress, we have been besieged by Presidential message. The problems that have concerned the President have ranged from the purely local to State, national, international, and, indeed, outer space. What I want to know and what the Nation wants to know, is when the Presidential concern is going to evidence itself with some tangible and practical action.

COMMUNITIES ARE SUFFERING

People are losing their jobs and their livelihood. Whole communities are suffering. The Kennedy administration has repeatedly promised to help the wool manufacturing industry just as it did for cotton. Equal treatment, fairplay, and the keeping of promises is all the wool industry is asking. Is this too much to ask?

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw the attention of my colleagues to the reason for the closing of the Marland plant. Fabrics coming in from Japan, similar to those made at the Marland plant, are being offered for sale at 40 cents per yard under the Marland plant's actual cost.

Someone will probably suggest that the Marland plant has gone out of business because it is marginal. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The J. P. Stevens Co. has spent $1,550,000 to improve the Marland plant since the Korean crisis. By international standards, it is a modern plant.

During the Korean war, this plant was largely engaged in the production of uniform materials and blankets for our country's Armed Forces. Should we face another Korean-type war, we would have to look to foreign countries to provide the material formerly produced by the Marland plant.

Andover is losing a large payroll. This loss will affect other areas of our great country which supply consumer goods to Andover. When a plant in New England goes out of business, inevitably all sections of our country are affected. On March 27, 1963, Mr. John P. Baum, vice president of the J. P. Stevens Co., made the following statement about the closing of the Marland plant. It says:

Text of March 27, 1963, Announcement by Col. John P. Baum, of J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc.

After many months of painstaking appraisal and after exhausting all other alternatives, we have reluctantly reached the conclusion that we must discontinue operations at our Marland plant in Andover, Mass. Work now in process there will be run out and the plant will then be closed down. It is with the deepest regret that we have reached this decision, as it affects the current employment of 453 people.

This decision is unavoidable in view of the losses which the Marland plant has sustained over the last several years due to the disastrous effect of imports from low-wage countries. As an illustration, fabrics from Japan similar to those made in the Marland plant were offered freely in the domestic market at prices approximately 40 cents per yard under our actual cost.

The losses of the Marland plant have occurred despite the fact that the machinery and equipment is thoroughly modern. Capital expenditures of $1,450,000 have been made in the Marland plant since the Korean crisis.

The closing of the Marland plant with the resultant loss of textile employment is another example of the excessive burden of foreign imports on the American textile industry and its employees. This steadily increasing volume of imports of woolen products reached an all-time high during 1962, when imports were approximately 20 percent of domestic consumption. We, as well as others in the American woolen and worsted textile industry, have hoped for some time that positive action would be taken to correct these inequitable foreign trade problems. To date no such action has been taken.

This action constitutes a further erosion of the textile industry's capability to supply the Armed Forces in the event of an all-out national emergency—for example, during World War II and the Korean crisis, the Marland plant was largely engaged in the production of uniform materials and blankets for our country's Armed Forces.

It is hoped that responsible Federal Government officials will take the necessary corrective action to solve the woolen and worsted import problem before additional American mills are forced to close.

It is our intention to exert our maximum effort and to utilize our fullest resources to maintain full operations in all of our remaining plants.

The closing of the Marland plant is just the beginning. As sure as night follows day, we can expect other plant closings.

In 1960, Candidate Kennedy did a lot of talking about "getting this country moving again." The people of New England are getting fed up with President Kennedy's brand of "moving" that means closing plants and increased unemployment.

POLITICAL ASYLUM

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Utt] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the United States has always had particular pride in its tradition of political asylum. Right now we are sheltering over 100,000 refugees from Castro's Communist rule, and rightly so. Even though the guests whom we have sheltered have not always been of our choice, we have consistently maintained this right of sanctuary. It has been an inviolable part of the American tradition.

In the whole history of the United States, there is no instance of a refugee President or ruler of a foreign country whom we have sent back to his political enemies to be butchered.

Unhappily there are indications that we are about to break this tradition.

Responding to some imperative of the New Frontier foreign policy, there are unmistakable signs that the administration is contemplating the turning over of former President Perez Jimenez of Venezuela to vengeance and probable death at the hands of Romulo Betancourt. The fact that Betancourt and Perez Jimenez are bitter political enemies and that it was Perez Jimenez who upset Betancourt's leftists' timetable by 10 years, by turning him out of the Venezuelan Government in 1948, does not give pause to those in high places who are clamoring for the former President's deportation. The fact that Perez Jimenez, while President, was decorated by President Eisenhower for his stanch support of the United States and for his leadership in the hemispheric fight against communism is disregarded. The demand of the hour is to please Betancourt. And the price which Betancourt has demanded is the life of Perez Jimenez.

The long legal case for Perez Jimenez' extradition, which was initiated immediately after Betancourt came to power, is now entering its last lap. The former President's lawyers have filed papers with the U.S. Supreme Court, for the final legal recourse, an appeal to the Supreme Court. Within 30 days, the answer will come. If it is adverse, Perez Jimenez will be turned over to the State Department for deportation. Only President Kennedy's intervention can save him. And President Kennedy is the man who told Betancourt on February 19 that: "You are the kind of President whom the United States wants to have in Latin America."

What is behind this case? Certainly there is more than meets the eye in this vengeful determination of those high in this administration to destroy Perez Jimenez. It has been brought out that Betancourt's lawyer in this country, who has been permitted to conduct the legal extradition proceedings against Perez Jimenez, is the firm of Covington and Burling, of which Dean Acheson is the senior partner. But there are other influences.

First of all, let us be honest with ourselves. Perez Jimenez is not in danger of extradition because he has embezzled money, the technical charge. Anyone with the slightest acquaintance with Latin America knows that the corruption-in-office charge against his predecessor is routine procedure by every successful revolutionary newcomer to discredit his opponents. Perez Jimenez used this leverage against Betancourt himself, and with some justification, when he deposed him in the coup of 1948. We may disregard this charge as only a convenient pretext. If it had not been embezzlement, it would have been something else.

I have in my possession a copy of an affidavit by Miguel Silvio Sanz Anez, now a prisoner—if he is still alive—in the Venezuelan political prison, San Juan de los Morros. It was smuggled out of the prison and witnessed by his lawyer, Dr. Benjamin Nunez Escobar. It is dated February 8, 1963.

Mr. Sanz Anez was a section chief of the Ministry of Interior under Perez Jimenez. Imprisoned in 1958, he is still waiting for trial. In his affidavit he makes the following illuminating statement:

> The same judge of arraignment who had issued the warrant of arrest to obtain my deliverance from the Embassy of Colombia had me transferred at midnight one day to the Department of Indicted Military Personnel and told me that the Government had authorized him to make the following proposal: If I signed a statement accusing ex-President General Perez Jimenez of ordering the death of several political leaders of the opposition, I would be given a substantial sum of money and would be released and taken to the neighboring island of Curacao, Dutch territory, acquitted of all accusations. Upon my negative answer, I was ordered to be secluded in a place of disciplinary punishment called the "tank."

Since Mr. Sanz Anez risked his life, and that of his lawyer, to make this statement, it is certainly reasonable to believe that he told the truth. The affidavit throws a flood of light upon the way in which the Betancourt government has whipped up its extradition case against Perez Jimenez. When it was unable to get a witness who would perjure himself by charging murder, the government settled for the milder charge of embezzlement. The important thing was to get Perez Jimenez back to Venezuela to one of the notorious Betancourt political prisons.

Of the possibility of a fair trial for Perez Jimenez, once the United States turns him over to Betancourt, Mr. Sanz Anez makes a significant comment. He is to be believed because he has spent 5 years in Betancourt's political prisons and knows the score:

> If this is the treatment and nature of proceedings accorded me and those mentioned, what treatment would be accorded to Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez and what would be the nature of the proceedings against him should his extradition be granted and he be delivered to Venezuelan authorities? It is evident that there would be no guarantee for his defense, that the proceedings would be surrounded by all kinds of irregularities and violations of the law that would permit its delay and indefinite paralyzation, that there would not be an impartial and just trial and that his life would be in jeopardy and the danger of death would hover about his head. And if his murder is consummated, it will be disguised in such a form as to permit Venezuelan authorities to excuse themselves and show the U.S. Government that it was all an accident.

If this warning that Perez Jimenez would not receive a fair trial if returned to Venezuela seems unconvincing, the surmise has had grim confirmation in the last 2 months. To test the fairness of Betancourt's Venezuela courts, the lawyers for Perez Jimenez, on February 13, 1963, filed an action with the Supreme Court of Venezuela to annul the embezzlement charge on the ground that the proceedings had not conformed to Venezuelan law.

What was the answer?

Instead of handing down a ruling in the annulment plea which had been entered, the court declared that, inasmuch as Perez Jimenez had not been arrested in Venezuela, he had no right to file or participate in any legal proceedings in Venezuela.

This was a barefaced and naked violation of Venezuela law.

It happens that in 1928 Venezuela was one of the nations which signed the "Code of Bustamente" on extradition at the Sixth Congress of American States at Havana. This code specifically states—article 369—that:

> The person detained may also thereafter use the legal remedies which are considered proper in the state which requests the extradition against the qualifications and resolutions upon which the latter is founded.

In other words, the code which Venezuela has signed specifically covers the situation in which Perez Jimenez now finds himself, and gives him the right to sue in the courts of Venezuela.

In refusing to accept the suit, Betancourt's supreme court plainly shows that it proposes to conduct the trial of Perez Jimenez, if he is extradited, without regard to the law of Venezuela. If he goes back, he returns to be tried in a kangaroo court. His fate is certain.

Can the United States afford to be a party to any such proceedings? Have we sunk so low that we have accepted the role of hangman for Romulo Betancourt? I cannot believe that, upon sober second thought, President Kennedy wants to have such a blot upon his administration.

The United States has gone far in its abject pursuit of the good will of Betancourt's leftist government in Venezuela. Many Americans believe that we have made a major mistake in placing all our Latin American eggs in the Betancourt basket. Many informed people believe that Betancourt, with the help of such leftist and crypto-Communist allies as Haya de la Torre, Arevalo, Bosch, and Paz Estenssoro, is erecting a third force of untrustworthy leftist nations in this hemisphere which will someday be even more dangerous to America's future than is Fidel Castro himself.

Let there be no illusions. Gen. Perez Jimenez, if he is extradited, will have been liquidated because Betancourt regards him as the only Venezuelan of sufficient prestige to rally the conservatives of Venezuela into a dangerous opposition to his permanent rule in that unhappy nation.

His extradition case is a specious political plot. The United States must not play the jackal role for Betancourt in these proceedings.

CUBA AND THE ATLANTIC ALLIANCE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in our preoccupation with the problems of Cuba and the Atlantic alliance, we must never let our attention drift too far from the brave peoples of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia. These gallant souls have been subjected to Communist domination without free elections, without any of the legal processes of a democratic system. Overwhelmingly anti-Communist, these nations deserve a chance to choose their own form of government. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am again introducing a concurrent resolution asking the President to raise the question of the Baltic States before the United Nations and ask that body to request the Soviet Union to withdraw their troops and agents from the three nations, to return the Baltic exiles from Soviet exile and slave-labor camps. The United Nations should then conduct free elections in these three nations.

MINUTEMAN NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is proud of the part it played in the struggle of our Nation for independence. Many of the communities that are a part of what is now the Fifth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, witnessed the first Revolutionary battles.

In order that the battle sites might be preserved, the Minuteman National Historical Park has been established in Concord, Lexington, and Lincoln, Mass.

The National Park Service has recommended an appropriation of $500,000 for fiscal year 1964 for land acquisition within the park and I am pleased to note that my colleagues on the House Appropriations Committee recognize the historical significance of the area and have approved the appropriation request for the bill which is before us today.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues will support this program. Approval of the appropriation request will allow the Service to preserve the proper facilities for the visiting public in accord with Mission 66 launched in 1956. As you know, this is the Service's long-range comprehensive national park protection and use program scheduled for completion in 1966, the golden anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service.

The Service, with the help of Congress, will be allowed to continue to make headway in preserving our Nation's great past.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Cooley], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H.R. 4997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COIN CLUB REQUESTS RECOINAGE OF SILVER DOLLAR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the Copper City Coin Collectors Club of my home town of Butte, Mont., is the first, I believe, organized coin club in the United States to request recoinage of our de facto domestic unit of value, the standard silver dollar. Following is a resolution submitted by the above mentioned club:

> Whereas we are U.S. citizens and members in good standing of the Copper City Coin Collectors Club of Butte, Mont., and are students of coins and currencies of other nations as well as our own and standard silver dollars are a prerequisite as media of exchange in our daily trade; and
>
> Whereas the standard silver dollar of 412½ grains, 900 fine or 371¼ grains of pure silver, has not been struck since October 1935 nor has a new design been issued since the December 1921 Peace Dollar and average of major periods for not coining the silver dollar since 1794 has been 26 years and average between new designs has been 42 years; and
>
> Whereas over 60 million standard silver dollars have been withdrawn as uncurrent during last 20 years for an 11 percent reduction of total stock without replacement, nor has there been any allowance made for a 50 percent population increase during last three decades even though standard silver dollars in circulation have risen 1,275 percent to an alltime high; and
>
> Whereas end of December 1962 there were over $2 billion in bullion on deposit with our custodian in the Treasury of the United States which are now securing working representative certificates, redeemable on demand, with only 76.3 million silver dollars acting as certificate security for one of the smallest coverages of representative paper since 1883, and over 38.5 million silver dollars were reclaimed during year for the largest total redemption in the history of that coin; and
>
> Whereas the Secretary of the Treasury has been authorized by the Congress under section 5 of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 to coin the standard silver dollar and no further authority is required for recoinage nor for a new design as 25 year waiting period between new designs has elapsed; and
>
> Whereas section 4(b) of the act of July 6, 1939 makes standard silver dollar coinage mandatory on all newly acquired domestic silver under that act, excepting seigniorage bullion, and there are over $80.6 million in representative silver purchase certificates secured by unstruck bullion, so acquired, and delivery of standard silver dollars in that amount is mandatory to owners, who are certificate holders: Be it therefore
>
> *Resolved*, That we, the members of the Copper City Coin Collectors Club in our regular monthly meeting assembled, do hereby respectfully and unanimously request the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of America to resume immediate coinage of our legal standard silver dollar from bullion now on hand using the Peace Dollar design to be followed as soon as practical by a new design reflecting the period and times we are living in such as the space age.

UNITED STATES SHOULD MAKE IT CLEAR THAT ITS POLICY IN RESTRICTING EXILES WHO PARTICIPATE IN RAIDS ON COMMUNIST CUBA IS NO GUARANTEE OF PROTECTION FOR CASTRO

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the United States should not interfere with foreign based operations against Communist Cuba. While enforcing our neutrality laws we should not deny Cubans the right to leave the United States for any other country of their choice. The United States should support the desire of Cubans to restore Cuba to a democratic society by recognizing a provisional government of free Cuba.

ARMY TANK-AUTOMOTIVE CENTER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was extremely interested in the remarks of my able and hardworking colleague from Delaware [Mr. McDowell] concerning a report from the General Accounting Office "on ineffective repair parts support for combat and combat support vehicles by the Army Tank-Automotive Center." I believe that steps should be taken to correct the conditions described in the GAO report and pledge my support to the gentleman from Delaware in an effort to do so.

The GAO report indicates that ineffective repair parts support results from the failure of the Army Tank-Automotive Center to follow certain parts procurement and reordering procedures which GAO believes would be more conducive to efficient operations.

The Army Tank-Automotive Center is located in Metropolitan Detroit. It is a successor to the Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command which was likewise based at Detroit. This Army Ordnance unit has been located in the Detroit area for many years. To the best of my knowledge it was never located in any other place.

During 1961 the Army undertook to dispose of underutilized Government-owned production facilities. As part of that program the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center at Newark, Del., was closed and declared surplus to Army needs. The production that had been performed at Lenape Ordnance Modification Center which had been under the supervision of the Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command was transferred to other points but was still under the supervision of the Ordnance Tank-Automotive Command. There is no indication in the report of the General Accounting Office or elsewhere, that the closing of the Lenape Ordnance Modification Center or production of the M–60 tank at the Detroit tank plant had anything to do with the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of ATAC's repair parts support function.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Curtis, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. Hall, for 15 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Lindsay (at the request of Mr. Hall), for 30 minutes, on April 4.

Mr. Ford (at the request of Mr. Hall), for 30 minutes, on April 4.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Saylor and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Philbin.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Hall) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Morse.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dent.

Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Willis in two instances.

Mr. Shelley in two instances.

Mrs. Hansen to revise and extend her remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

> S. 1089. An act to authorize the sale, without regard to the 6-month waiting period prescribed, of cadmium proposed to be disposed of pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 1, 1963, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

> H.R. 1597. An act relating to the tax treatment of redeemable ground rents.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 3, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

629. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that two appropriations to the executive branch agencies for the fiscal year 1963 have been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for supplemental estimates of appropriation, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665); to the Committee on Appropriations.

630. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting the 15th Annual Report on the National Industrial Reserve, pursuant to Public Law 883, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

631. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize certain amounts received by way of reimbursement for medical supplies and equipment to be used to purchase other medical supplies and equipment"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

632. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend for 3 years the provisions of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

633. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the overpricing of target seeking systems under Department of the Air Force negotiated contract AF 33(600)-38098 with the Boeing Co., Seattle, Wash., for the production of Bomarc missiles and related spare parts and support equipment; to the Committee on Government Operations.

634. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to submitting a draft of a contract relating to proposed drainage work exceeding a total cost of $200,000 on the Crooked River project, Oregon, pursuant to the act of June 13, 1956 (70 Stat. 274); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

635. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

636. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

637. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, transmitting the first annual report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, pursuant to Public Law 87-256 (H. Doc. No. 93); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

638. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to enforce constitutional rights and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

639. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, entitled "A bill to provide for the stockpiling, storage and distribution of essential foodstuffs, including wheat and feed grains, to assure supplies to meet emergency civil defense needs, and other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 4997. A bill to extend the feed grain program; with amendments (Rept. No. 180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H.R. 5367. A bill to designate the Bear Creek Dam on the Lehigh River, Pa., as the Francis E. Walter Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 5368. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge in the political, psychological, economic, technological, and organizational areas to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States in the global struggle between freedom and communism, to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this body of knowledge, and also to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge under appropriate conditions; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 5369. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act to the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 5370. A bill to establish a Commission on the Organization of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 5371. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 5372. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of natural resources and recreational areas; and to authorize State and community youth employment programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 5373. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt silver-plated holloware from the retailers excise tax if sold for use in the purchaser's trade or business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 5374. A bill to provide for the appointment of certain qualified substitutes of record to positions of regular carrier on vacant rural routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5375. A bill to allow credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act to certain Federal employees for service in Federal-State cooperative programs in a State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5376. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5377. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act to the Architect of the Capitol and the employees of the Architect of the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KNOX:

H.R. 5378. A bill to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to liberalize the income limitations and rates of pension for veterans of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 5379. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code relating to highways, in order to permit States having toll and free roads, bridges, and tunnels designated as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to designate other routes for inclusion in the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 5380. A bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to provide for the use of counterpart funds for international agricultural conferences; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 5381. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to provide special pay for combat duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARTIN of California:

H.R. 5382. A bill to amend the Social Security Amendments of 1960 to provide old-age, survivors, and disability insurance coverage for certain additional hospital employees in the State of California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 5383. A bill to amend the Area Redevelopment Act to clarify the areas which may be designated as redevelopment areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

H.R. 5384. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5385. A bill to bring certain holders of star route and other contracts for the carrying of mail within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 5386. A bill to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, N. Dak. and Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 5387. A bill to amend section 409 of title 37 of the United States Code, to provide for payment for the costs of commercial transportation of trailers or mobile dwellings owned by members of the Armed Forces on the same basis as now authorized by law in the case of trailers or mobile dwellings owned by civilian Government officers and employees; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5388. A bill to amend section 202(i) of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of lump sum death benefits where the deceased individual had six or more quarters of coverage at the time of his death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 5389. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 5390. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to permit the recovery by the municipal government of the District of Columbia of amounts due such government in the adjudication of claims under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 5391. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow income tax deductions for certain payments made and expenses incurred in providing or securing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 5392. A bill to amend section 302 of title 37, United States Code, to provide special pay for optometrists on the same basis as such pay is provided for medical and dental officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 5393. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Johnstown flood; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5394. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the depletion allowance for coal and lignite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 5395. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt a corporation from the corporate income tax where its operations are carried on in an economically depressed area and provide employment for a specified minimum number of persons in that area; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 5396. A bill to authorize establishment of the Fort Union Trading Post National Historic Site, N. Dak. and Mont., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 5397. A bill to permit the State of Michigan to obtain social security coverage, under its State agreement entered into pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, for State and local policemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5398. A bill to assist States in combating mental retardation through construction of research centers and facilities for the mentally retarded; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 5399. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a fully insured individual may qualify for the disability "freeze" and for disability insurance benefits with 20 quarters of coverage, regardless of when such quarters occurred; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 5400. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from the highway use tax motor vehicles used by certain nonprofit organizations for disaster relief work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 5401. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require use of articles, materials, and products of the United States in performing contracts for the construction, conversion, alteration, or repair of vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 5402. A bill to declare that certain land of the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma is held by the United States in trust for the Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 5403. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to authorize the issuance of subpenas by the U.S. Civil Service Commission in connection with hearings under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 5404. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to the applicability of benefits under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5405. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 5406. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other nonagricultural use areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 368. Joint resolution to reimburse uncompensated leave to Government Printing Office employees earned during the fiscal year 1932; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.J. Res. 369. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim October 6, 1963, as German Shepherd Dog Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. Con. Res. 126. Concurrent resolution that the President of the United States be requested to bring up the Baltic States question before the United Nations and that the United Nations conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, under its supervision; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE:

H. Con. Res. 127. Concurrent resolution to request the President of the United States to urge certain actions in behalf of Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H. Res. 303. Resolution relating to a salary increase for the Superintendent of the House Folding Room, Office of the Doorkeeper; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H. Res. 304. Resolution to amend clause 4 of rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that introduced bills include an estimate of cost, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALGER: Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 of the Texas State Legislature requesting prompt review of the present Federal two-price-support program on cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRISON: Joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to prevent by legislation, the curtailment, by departmental regulation, of the acquisition of rights-of-way across Federal lands in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THORNBERRY: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Texas memorializing the Congress of the United States to promptly review the present Federal two-price-support program with a view to providing the same assistance through a subsidy or otherwise to American cotton mills, as foreign mills now enjoy, it being our opinion that this action would bring domestic cotton to a competitive price level on world markets and also to a competitive price level with synthetics in the home market, thereby avoiding the prospect of a situation that would ultimately, seriously, and perhaps permanently impair the whole economic structure of our country; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting enactment of legislation authorizing flood control appropriations to the Yuba County Water Agency; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to taking necessary steps to restore the historic freight rate formula that has existed between westbound livestock to the broad based livestock industry in Oregon which is threatened by undercutting freight rate practices now permitted by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to commending the personnel, military and civil, of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton, Wash., for their past and present contributions, their dedication to the security of the Nation, and a performance in speed, efficiency, and economy unmatched elsewhere in these United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 5407. A bill for the relief of Mary Horalek, Blue Rapids, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.R. 5408. A bill for the relief of Jackie Bergancia Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 5409. A bill for the relief of the Mutual Benefit Foundation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 5410. A bill for the relief of Elias Iambrinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 5411. A bill for the relief of Edward Berger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 5412. A bill for the relief of Lee Jung Ae; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 5413. A bill for the relief of Edward P. Drake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 5414. A bill for the relief of Delfina Sanz-Marinas and Antonia Sanz-Marinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 5415. A bill for the relief of Dante Giovanni Nomellini, his wife, Lina Nomellini, and their minor children, Adolfo Nomellini and Rosella Nomellini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 5416. A bill for the relief of Irene N. Halkias and Constantine N. Halkias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 5417. A bill for the relief of Mario Menna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 5418. A bill for the relief of 2d Lt. Albert A. Matson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5419. A bill for the relief of Calogero Calco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York.

H.R. 5420. A bill for the relief of Mauro Vescovi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 5421. A bill for the relief of Jose Marques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 5422. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Sgt. John D. Savercool against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 5423. A bill for the relief of Mr. Antonio Baiardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 5424. A bill for the relief of Youssef Michael Ayoub, his wife, Yvette Maria Michaela Ayoub, and their minor children, Cherif Youssef and Wafih Youssef Ayoub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 5425. A bill for the relief of Andrew Angelopoulos Karas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 5426. A bill for the relief of Mario Rossi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 5427. A bill for the relief of Henry Armstrong, administrator of the estate of Ella Armstrong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 5428. A bill for the relief of Theophilos Bouglas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

79. Mr. HANNA presented a petition of the board of directors of Associated Chambers of Commerce of Orange County, Calif., and Orange Typographical Union No. 579, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hon. Gordon H. Scherer and Hon. Morgan Moulder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the recently released 1962 Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities contains a resolution of commendation for the Honorable Gordon H. Scherer and the Honorable Morgan M. Moulder, both of whom retired at the end of the 87th Congress after serving in an outstanding manner for a decade or more as Members of the House and of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

At an executive meeting of the committee on September 26, 1962, this resolution was unanimously adopted by their colleagues who expressed the desire not only that it be included in the committee's annual report, but also that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that all Members of the House and the public as well would know the esteem in which Mr. Scherer and Mr. Moulder were held by their colleagues. It is a pleasure for me to place this resolution in the RECORD:

Whereas the Honorable Gordon H. Scherer has announced his intention to retire from the House of Representatives of the United States after serving the First Congressional District of Ohio with distinction for 10 years; and

Whereas he is the able and ranking minority member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, on which he has served faithfully and well during his entire tenure in the Congress; and

Whereas he has at all times revered, defended from all enemies and tirelessly promoted those characteristics of freedom which have given this Nation the most cherished and lasting independence the world has ever known; and

Whereas his indomitable spirit and wise counsel will be sorely missed by the 88th Congress; and

Whereas the Honorable Morgan M. Moulder declined to seek reelection to the House of Representatives after serving the 11th District of Missouri with distinction for 14 years; and

Whereas he brought to the committee valuable experience gained by years of work as a judge and also a keen insight into the aims of the Communist conspiracy; and

Whereas his loss to the committee will be keenly felt: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities extend their deep appreciation to Gordon H. Scherer and Morgan M. Moulder for their many years of truly outstanding service to this committee and wish them a most rewarding future in all endeavors they may pursue.

Vice President Tells of Need for Big Brothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a few nights ago many of the Members of this body and our colleagues in the House, attended an affair at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington. The event was the Big Brother dinner, and it is the dream come true of our friend, the renowned columnist, author, and newscaster, Drew Pearson.

Mr. Pearson has done our country a great service in calling to our attention, the need for us to adopt a young boy and to him become a big brother.

The guest speaker at the Big Brother dinner was the Vice President of the United States LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who, in his remarks, illustrated how he, as a big brother to his own brother and sisters, helped them to become useful citizens. But more than that, Vice President JOHNSON made other comments with the great humility which he possesses, that are deserving of the attention of us all.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address of the Vice President at the Big Brother dinner be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON JOHNSON AT THE BIG BROTHER DINNER, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 29, 1963

If a fellow could choose his own big brother, I think most would choose one just about the size of Sonny Liston.

Sonny was doing fine in the world until he took up the Republican game of golf. While we all regret what happened to the champion's leg when he swung at the golf ball in Florida and missed, I can't help thinking how much better that golf ball must feel.

I am grateful to Drew Pearson for asking me to come here tonight. The Big Brother program is one of the finest activities of its kind in America, and I think the work he is doing with this program shows the real character of our friend, Drew Pearson.

I feel a strong personal attachment to the concept of this program because in my childhood, I was the big brother for a large family, a family that was both large and poor. There were times when I had to do some of the scrapping to take care of my younger brother and sisters. There were also many times when, as the big brother, I had to sit with my father and mother and talk about the things I could help do to make sure that my younger brother and sisters had the shoes they needed, the clothes they needed, and the food on the table that the whole family needed.

Many years, many miles, and many events have passed since those days. But I never forget them. I never forget that a boy born and raised in such circumstances—working as a bootblack, a goatherder, a highway construction gang laborer—could, under our system, rise to the second highest office of public trust in the strongest and most powerful nation of the world.

Remembering the great distance that has been spanned by my own career, and remembering how great the odds seemed against any opportunity at all when I was a boy in grade school and high school, I live with constant thanksgiving and gratitude that I am an American. I hope that through programs like these we can help many young Americans in our cities and on our farms, to keep the hope they ought to have for their own future and keep the faith they must

have in the justice and greatness of our country and our system.

Nowhere else in the world does the circumstances of a boy's birth, who his parents are, where he was born, what his religion is, or any other such factor matter less to determining what he should be in life than here in America. Opportunity must be open to all, and to all alike. Every day we are swinging those doors of opportunity a little wider. We are approaching the reality of equal opportunity a little more each passing year. The key to success for every young American is education and faith and determination.

I would say to each of the young guests tonight stay in school, because that is where your country needs you. Keep your faith, because you need that. Set your goals high, because you cannot afford to set them lower. Remember that if you may not entirely fulfill every aspiration in your heart, your own determined effort to reach your highest goals will make it easier for your sons and your daughters to enjoy after you a better childhood and a better life than you have known.

Crime in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., has printed an editorial which I feel is particularly appropriate for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as it is concerned with the need for curbing the crime rate in the District of Columbia. This editorial entitled "Marine Help for District of Columbia Police?" was printed in the March 29, 1963, issue of the Greenville News. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD, together with my newsletter for April 1, 1963.

There being no objection, the editorial and newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARINE HELP FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE?

A Member of Congress has suggested in a speech that the Federal Government should bring in two companies of Marines to augment the Metropolitan and Capitol Police forces in an effort to control at least a little, if not stamp out, the rampant crime in the Nation's Capital.

And the blindest New Frontiersman should be able to see the need even through the rose-tinted glasses used in viewing every act of the administration and projecting the image to the public.

Washington, D.C., has become the most lawless city outside of the remotest jungles. Robbery, mugging, beating people up just for kicks, aggravated assault, stabbings, shootings, criminal assaults, and just plain rape are commonplace, even in broad daylight and within shouting distance of the Capitol itself.

It isn't safe for individuals, with or without an escort, or for parties to visit the national monuments which abound the Capital.

It is bound to be more than mere coincidence that the crime rate has gone up proportionately, or at a higher rate, with the increase in the Negro population of the District. The whites are fleeing to outlying communities not only to escape integration but seeking safety for their persons and their property.

The number of crimes charged to Negroes is far out of proportion to their number among the population and a high percentage of the crimes are committed by Negroes against whites.

Perhaps two companies of marines as suggested by the Congressman might be enough, or two companies of any other group of the Nation's elite combat troops. But only if they were well commanded, given a free hand to be as tough as necessary to make arrests and to defend themselves from mobs of cophaters.

And the courts would have to learn to deal realistically enough with the accused criminals, especially the repeated offenders, to enable the supplemented police force to obtain convictions and make them stick on the inevitable appeals.

Even so, there is something ironical about the fact that a Congressman has suggested only two companies of troops to cope with the Washington violence problem, while the administration sent more than 20,000 troops (something like 10 combat companies with supporting troops) and hundreds of U.S. marshals to Oxford, Miss., last fall.

Perhaps what Washington really needs is a period of outright martial law with the authorities using, instead of regular troops, a few detachments of guerrilla warfare specialists who could beat the muggers and the attackers at their own game of stealth, the sudden and unexpected attack, silent mayhem and, in self-defense, a quick and clean job of legal killing.

That last phrase may shock our liberal friends, but whose life is more precious, that of the vicious attackers and killers or those of the innocent victim and her or his protector? And the choice all too often boils down to just that.

THE NATION'S PILOT MODEL

The Nation's Capital City, once described as the "pilot model for the Nation" and as "integration's show window," has become a cesspool of conflict, corruption, and crime within the past decade. For several years all evidence that the "show window" was falling apart was well suppressed. Attempts to point up Washington's troubles, such as the 1956 investigation of the District of Columbia school system by the House District Committee, were scoffed at and played down. In the past 2 years, however, the evidence has been bursting out at the seams.

Crime statistics, especially street crimes such as yokings, rape, and robberies continue to soar and highlight national crime statistics. Last year Senator ROBERT BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, a liberal and a friend of the District, conducted an investigation of the administration of the District's public welfare program. The Senator found in a fair investigation of 236 cases selected at random that approximately 60 percent of those receiving aid were not even eligible.

Then, the boiling undercurrent of an atmosphere of lawlessness in the public schools—where "fear rages through many school buildings" and there are acts of "violence, assaults, disrespect of teachers"—burst into the open in the Thanksgiving Day race riot at District of Columbia Stadium. The facts on the riot were brought out by a biracial citizens committee. It showed that hundreds of white persons were attacked—as were some Negroes who sought to defend the whites—after a high school football game. The investigation uncovered the problems teachers have been having since the District of Columbia school system was suddenly desegregated to serve as the "pilot model for the Nation." Many of the committee's recommendations and findings were very similar to the ignored 1956 House investigation. In one recommendation, the committee suggested that the schools be given a code of conduct "to allow teachers to return again to the field of teaching instead of fulfilling the role of policemen."

The continuous increases in criminal acts, which the Attorney General now describes as explosive, certainly cannot be attributed to a lax police effort or capability. The Washington police force's record for solving crimes is among the Nation's best. Chief Robert Murray attributes the crime statistics to court decisions which protect and pamper criminals. He has said: "Our convictions are constantly being reversed by 5-to-4 decisions in the U.S. Court of Appeals on technicalities—not on the evidence. The criminal is being afforded more protection than the ordinary citizen."

District of Columbia police have been greatly hampered in their work by the court rulings which limit drastically the time a suspect can be held for questioning, which require proof that the defendant is free of mental disease or defect, and which prohibit investigative arrests. Then there is the large number of cases which are never prosecuted because of pressure from the NAACP, CORE, and other Negro groups. In fact, politics is the key to the entire mess in which the District finds itself today—it is the play for the Negro bloc vote, and this has been going on under the Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy administrations.

Political pressures and the national policy of creating a welfare state are responsible for the public welfare cheating by the recipients and the overly generous administration of the program. Beyond any doubt, the pellmell rush to desegregate Washington schools has been responsible for many of the District's school problems. In fact, desegregation has now brought on resegregation, not only in the schools, but in residential Washington as well. In 1953, the year before the desegregation decision, the District of Columbia schools were 57 percent Negro. Now they are almost 84 percent, as whites continue to move to the suburbs.

National administrations have demonstrated that they will not face up to the basic causes of Washington's problems. The play for the 18 million Negro votes will not permit this, no matter what the facts show. So, the Congress must act, under its constitutional authority and responsibility to get at the root causes of District of Columbia problems by investigations void of political overtones and approval of legislative proposals which can extricate our National Capital City from the blackboard jungle into which it has been permitted to sink.

Sincerely,

STROM THURMOND.

Congressman Clyde Doyle's Message to Mr. Bart Lytton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of our colleagues one of the last letters written by our fellow Congressman, and my fellow Californian, Clyde Doyle. I wish to insert his letter in the RECORD for it conveys the warm, friendly, and genuineness that were so truly the marks of Clyde Doyle. In reading this letter addressed to Mr. Bart Lytton we can only be but reminded that the death of Clyde Doyle spelled sad days not only for California, but for the Nation as well.

Mr. Speaker, in a real sense, his 16 years of congressional service was a career which served as a continuing source of betterment of our land. Those back in his home district, and for that matter those across the Nation who were fortunate enough to have known Clyde—and all who knew him were his friends—will recognize in this letter the qualities that so well mark the quality of his character: humility, gentleness, and honor.

The letter follows:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1963.
Mr. Bart Lytton,
Dinner Chairman, Seventh Annual F.D.R. Dinner, Los Angeles, Calif.

My Dear Friend Bart: I would surely love to be able to have the great joy and inspiration, which it certainly would be to me, to be present on the evening of March 14 when you friends have the seventh annual F.D.R. dinner and honor Gov. Edmund G. Brown for his recent gubernatorial victory, but of course, friend Bart, I cannot make it.

I will have to be right here on the job in the Nation's Capitol, but I do want to express my appreciation to you and all the people of the great 23d District for the support you gave to the reelection of our great Governor.

With best wishes, I remain,
Cordially,
Clyde Doyle.

Rising Shoe Imports—A Great Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the New England Shoe & Leather Association has been in touch with me concerning the impact of shoe imports on the Massachusetts shoe industry.

It is pointed out that in 1962, Massachusetts production was 14.8 percent of the U.S. total production, and that the shoe industry is the second largest manufacturing employer in Massachusetts with a total employment in 1962 of 37,625 people. It paid to all employees about $124,100,000.

However, it is stated that total imports of leather type footwear for the year amounted to 55,057,457 pairs valued at $80,263,816 in 1962, and that total 1962 U.S. shoe imports equaled 8.9 percent of U.S. shoe production, as against 6.2 percent in 1961.

These figures standing by themselves show clearly what is happening to the Massachusetts and American shoe industry.

It is being overwhelmed with cheap foreign imports and its markets abroad are suffering the same fate.

Obviously, if this trend continues, the time is not far distant when the American shoe industry may be facing extinction.

I am bringing this matter to the attention of the President urging that early consideration be given to remedial action to check the dangerous trend of shoe imports which is causing such a dire threat to the U.S. shoe industry.

If this appalling situation is not soon remedied, the great American shoe industry will be prostrate at a relatively early date and its faithful workers will be placed on unemployment rolls. It is high time for corrective measures.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Address by Vice President Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN

OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, Saturday, March 30, 1963, was an outstanding day for North Carolina and the Democratic Party everywhere.

On that date, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson delivered one of the most inspiring speeches I have ever heard. The occasion was the annual North Carolina Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner.

I think it is most significant that more people turned out to hear Vice President Johnson than have ever before turned out for a Jefferson-Jackson dinner in our State, and the tremendous speech the Vice President delivered gave all of us not only new faith in the Democratic Party but also new faith in our State and in our Nation.

I hope that those who are entertaining any thoughts that our part of the country is going to be easy pickings for the opposition will take the time to read the newspaper accounts of last Saturday's activities, of the thousands of Democrats who came hundreds of miles, and of the enthusiasm with which the Vice President's speech was acclaimed throughout the State. They will find that the Democratic Party is not going to be cut up into pieces like a pie and passed around the table for those who would divide and conquer us.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Vice President's speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, Raleigh, N.C., Saturday, March 30, 1963

When I come to North Carolina, I never come as a visitor. I am just "back home," because many of my ancestors came from your State.

Some of my forebears first settled in the Albemarle Sound section. Others lived in Rowan County in the Piedmont. Eventually, they grew restless and began moving westward. As my father told me, they went two directions, some of them went up in the world, the others went to Texas.

If I can't claim close relatives in North Carolina now, I do claim as some of my closest friends the wonderful North Carolinians, past and present, whom you have sent to Washington.

There are no men I have met in public life whom I respect more, or whose friendship I value more highly, than Luther Hodges, Sam Ervin, and Everett Jordan. I am privileged to work closely on the space program with one of the ablest administrators in the Nation, another North Carolinian, James E. Webb. Two of the most valuable Members of the House of Representatives are your distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Harold Cooley, and the Chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Herbert Bonner.

These fine Americans serve your State and the Nation today in the outstanding tradition of such great North Carolina public servants as O. Max Gardner, Uncle Bob Doughton, Clyde Hoey, Josiah Bailey, Frank Graham, Melville Broughton, Kerr Scott, and many others.

I must say, also, that I am especially fond of, and highly privileged to know as a friend, the man whose outstanding service is winning new respect throughout the Nation, your Governor, Terry Sanford.

For many generations, North Carolina has stood, as it stands today, tall among the States. The respect you enjoy is respect won by the quality of leadership, progressiveness, and integrity so long offered by men and women of North Carolina who have been proud to call themselves Democrats.

Some years ago, I asked a North Carolina friend what the Latin motto of your State means. He told me that it means, "to be rather than to seem." I think that motto captures not only the spirit of North Carolina but the spirit of your national leadership in the United States today. If I may, I would like to borrow that motto as the theme for my remarks tonight.

Since the days of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, the people of the United States have, in every period of great national challenge and peril, entrusted the national leadership to the Democratic Party.

That was true under Cleveland and Wilson. It was true under Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman. It became true again 2 years ago under John F. Kennedy.

Why? Why, at the great and decisive moments in the history of our land, has the Nation's leadership most often been entrusted by the people to Democratic hands?

I believe the answer lies in the spirit of the words of your own State motto, that it is better "to be rather than to seem."

America is young. America is strong. America is not an old and aging country. The cause of America is not a worn and fading cause. America is not on the downhill side of greatness, staring disaster or ruin or oblivion in the face.

America is a nation still climbing upward toward the summit of its destiny. America is a nation of hopeful and resourceful and confident men and women. When there is a time of trial, when there is a time of testing, when there is a challenge to be met, the people want leadership of hope and resourcefulness and confidence—leadership which expresses the true strength of America. That quality of leadership Americans have found for 163 years in the party of all the people, the Democratic Party.

The leadership afforded by great Democrats is leadership which expresses the real America, America as it is, not merely America as some would have it seem. This is the kind of leadership America needs now, and it is the kind of leadership America is getting.

America is getting courageous leadership. When the Communist tyranny attempted to plant its weapons of destruction in the Western Hemisphere, the Communists found themselves face to face with resolute, decisive and unhesitating American leadership which left no doubt about the will or the ability of this Nation to eradicate that

threat to the peace of the world. The result as all the world knows was one of the historic turning points of the cold war and one of the most decisive victories in history over armed aggression.

America is getting confident leadership. Even as the military strength of a prepared and vigilant nation has been and is being kept at the ready, American leadership has displayed the confidence to continue pressing in the forums of the world for agreements which will bring peace to all nations. Through such confidence, American leadership has demonstrated that this generation of Americans is not afraid to stand against aggressors nor is it afraid to stand up and be counted for the cause of peace.

America is getting resourceful leadership. While our responsibilities to freedom have required continuous attention to the great and grave questions of world security and peace, America's leadership at home has been both able and willing to give the attention needed to overhauling outmoded and burdensome tax structures. It has been able and willing to give attention to those things necessary for strengthening American economy, to improving the life for all our people at home, young and old.

As this American leadership has shown courage against our enemies abroad, it has not failed to show compassion for America's needs at home.

In saying these things, I realize that I speak to a partisan assembly. I realize that it is expected that I should, or any speaker should, use this occasion to make claims of partisan success. But that is neither the spirit nor the purpose of my remarks tonight.

The problems confronting your national leadership at this time are not partisan problems. There is not a Democratic side or a Republican side to the threat of Cuba, to the hopes for world peace, or to the urgent necessity of domestic tax reform and economic growth. There is only an American side.

Today, in our Nation and in our individual States, we need to remember that example. We need to remember that party does not come first. We need to remember that the problems we face as a nation are not created for us by our parties, and we will neither solve those problems nor make them go away by switching allegiance and support from one party to another.

At this particular moment in our Nation's history, and in our destiny as leaders of the free world, we must not allow ourselves to be persuaded that partisanship is patriotism.

Our system would soon cease to function at all if the debate between our two parties were permitted to degenerate into a dispute over which party is the more patriotic. Individual parties may "seem" bolder, may "seem" more wise, may "seem" to be many things. What matters, all that matters, is what our Government actually is, not what our parties appear to be.

In our Nation today, many more Americans are preoccupied with politics than are occupied with government. In every State where I go, I find Democrats and Republicans, and even, once in a while, members of the press, asking questions about the nominees and the elections of 1964 and 1968. Yet, the real question always is not who is going to occupy what office, Federal, State or local, but, rather, what are we, the people, going to do together about the problems and challenges with which we are faced.

Politics, in the highest sense of that term, is never a spectator sport. We are not going to get the kind of politics or the kind of government these times require by sitting on the sidelines and watching with fascinated amusement and detachment to see who emerges as winners of political free-for-alls. The test of our parties, the test of our own partisanship, is not the public show we stage politically but the accomplishments we make together in serving the people's needs.

Here in North Carolina your State has made remarkable progress. The Tar Heel State, where the weak grow strong and the strong grow great, has been a leader of a vital region of America because you have never allowed partisan politics to obstruct nonpartisan good government. You have held to your motto.

You have shown the world that deeds speak louder than words. You have used your resources prudently and progressively to support education and agriculture and industry.

You have invested in your youth. You have built outstanding State universities. You can be very proud of the fact that last year the largest single source of scientists and engineers hired for the national space program by NASA was North Carolina State College.

In agriculture, where once your total farm income was limited to tobacco and cotton, today no State has a more diversified range of farm commodities, from apples to soybeans, bringing in $1¼ billion in cash income annually.

While North Carolina is still, as it has long been, the Nation's No. 1 textile producer, your growing industrial complex now turns out everything from processed chickens to chainsaws and you are building major basic industries in chemicals, electronic equipment, and paper products.

The quality of governmental leadership you have had, and have now, in North Carolina, has made this progress possible because partisanship and politics have not come ahead of service to all the people, all the time.

Democrats and the Democratic Party have meant good government in North Carolina, at the State level and the local level.

Through the Democratic Party, North Carolina has won respect and influence at the national level. Few other States can claim three major committee chairmanships in the Senate and House today or the influence in the Cabinet and the executive agencies that is held by North Carolinians.

We say these things with justified pride. But we never claim that the past holds a mortgage on the present. Democrats are never Democrats by inheritance, they are Democrats by conviction.

We of the Democratic Party hold the conviction that our national interest and the interest of each of our regions is served by maintaining a responsible, united and effective national party which truly represents the diversity of America. America is stronger when there is a party which speaks for the farmer and the businessman, for the wage earner and the professional people, for the producer and the consumer, for the northerner and for the southerner, for the easterner and the westerner.

In the past and in the present only the Democratic Party fills this role. Together we are strong. Divided we are weak. Always there are those who would take strength away from all of us by false and fleeting promises of special strength for some of us.

In politics as in any other endeavor which involves the concept of contest—there are two ways in which a victory may be won.

The first is to render service to the people and attract to the banner of the party such overwhelming numbers that success is assured.

The second is to provoke quarrels among the opposition in the sure knowledge that if such quarrels are allowed to spread, the opposition forces will be divided, permitting a minority to work its will.

Looking at the days that lie ahead of us, I can predict that we, as Democrats, are going to be subjected to the second type of campaign. A certain political party, and I see no reason to dignify it by giving it a name, realizes full well that it cannot possibly attract the majority that is necessary to win an election. But at least some of its leaders hope that we Democrats will be sufficiently softheaded to succumb to a strategy as old as the Roman empire, divide and conquer.

I suspect that we will hear a great deal of conversation from members of another party seeking to pit one Democrat against another.

I suspect we will be subjected to charge after charge that one branch of the Democratic Party is seeking to drive another branch out of the fold.

I suspect that very loose language will be thrown around concerning the ambitions of individual Democrats and the desires of some to dominate others.

I suspect that as election day draws near and desperation mounts, some mud will be hurled in the hope that it will stick.

I just want you to remember one thing. The source of the charges and the accusations is not one which can be considered either objective or friendly. And if we Democrats make the mistake of paying attention to the partisan charges of the opposition, we will snatch defeat out of the jaws of victory.

I do not believe that we Democrats can be defeated unless we defeat ourselves.

As Americans first, and as Democrats second, we must demand that those who would sway us from tested loyalties offer performance instead of promises. The southerner is proud to be a southerner, as are residents of each of the great regions of our land. But regional pride does not equal—and certainly does not excel, the greater pride of being an American.

Our country's interest is not served by those who indulge in special appeals to divisive regional interests. Partisans who obstruct or resist or delay the solution of national problems for the sake of their partisanship are not likely to bring solutions to our problems of regional or State concern. Certainly, we of the Democratic Party welcome the contention of other parties in every region and every State. There are no one-party regions in America. But there are regions where one party has served the people and won their trust while the other party failed to serve and did not deserve the trust.

Let those who would make special appeals to the South understand one thing. Nobody lives in these States and in this historic region but Americans.

The appeal which is most persuasive to southerners or westerners or easterners or northerners is the appeal of effective service to build our Nation's strength and unity and success in the world and at home.

In Cuba, communism has established a showcase of failure within the Western Hemisphere. Communism has proved in Castro's Cuba that it does not have the answer to the problems of the New World. No small part of that failure of communism off our shores is the result of the unity of the Republics of this Hemisphere. The Americas united are causing communism to fail without plunging the world into nuclear devastation.

This is only another example of the convincing evidence of history that the greatest strength of freedom lies in the unity of free men. In our own country, we must not permit partisanship to deny us that same unity which will make our strength, our resources, our abilities more forceful and more effective in answering the challenges we face.

As we would not tolerate partisanship seeking to exploit religious and racial histories in a divisive way, so we must not permit partisanship to exploit regional histories against the essential unity of our land. Our parties must be instruments of service, as the Democratic Party has been in North Carolina and in the Nation. Our parties must not be instruments of division, bias or prejudice. As responsible partisans ourselves, let us at home as in Washington put service to the people first. If we do, the people will, in the future as in the past, put the Democratic Party first at the polls.

The Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I noted with interest in the March 18 Congressional Record the results of an annual opinion poll conducted among her constituents by the distinguished gentlewoman from the 22d Congressional District of Ohio. The tabulated replies to Mrs. Bolton's questionnaire should be especially meaningful to Members on both sides of the aisle, because the registered Democrats and registered Republicans in her district are approximately equal in number.

It was particularly gratifying for me to observe that 73 percent of the more than 16,000 replies favored continuation of the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which I am proud to be a member. Only 14 percent opposed its continuation, while 13 percent expressed no opinion. In short, 84 percent of those who expressed an opinion on this question gave their complete support to the committee.

Numerous other Members of the House poll their constituents from time to time on matters of national and international importance. Over the years I have noted that whenever a question about the Committee on Un-American Activities is included in these polls, the answers reflect overwhelming support for the committee and its operations in the grass roots of America, and that this is true no matter what section of the country is represented in the poll.

Thus, it is evident that what many people mistakenly believe to be a "controversial" committee enjoys overwhelming popular support and is really not so controversial at all. It is also apparent from these polls that the drive to abolish the committee, though powerful and well organized, is a distinctly minority movement, albeit a loud and frenzied one. In this light, I call the attention of my colleagues to the following statement which appeared in a column by attorney and author George N. Crocker, published in the San Francisco Examiner, of March 10, 1963:

> One of the noisiest, most phrenetic, and most hopeless demonstrations of sheer doggedness on the American political scene for 25 years has been the opposition to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which investigates the Communist apparatus of subversion and espionage in this country. "Abolish House Un-American Activities Committee" has been scrawled on so many signs hoisted above picket lines and marches, and appeared in so many paid advertisements, that many people believe the committee holds a precarious tenure.
>
> This is a delusion, fostered by experts in the techniques of mass agitation. The clamor has been like that of barking dogs in a tunnel; the crescendo of echo upon echo raises a tumult far out of proportion to the source.
>
> Whenever abolition of House Un-American Activities Committee has had to meet the test of a practical issue, it has fizzled out. Congress has never seriously thought of abdicating its duty to investigate. The American people would not tolerate it.

Twice in this Congress, the move to abolish the committee has, to use Mr. Crocker's words, "had to meet the test of a practical issue"; and in each case, again to use Mr. Crocker's words, "it has fizzled out."

The Rules Committee carefully considered a resolution to transfer the Committee on Un-American Activities' functions to the Judiciary Committee and rejected the proposal by a vote of 12 to 1.

The House gave equally careful consideration to the committee's appropriation request for the year 1962 and approved the appropriation by a vote of 385 to 20.

Rights-of-Way Over Federal Lands for Electric Transmission Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, during the latter part of January 1963 I learned that the Secretary of the Interior had inserted in the Federal Register of December 29, 1962, a set of proposed new regulations relative to the granting of rights-of-way for electric transmission lines over Federal lands under the jurisdiction of his Department.

I was astounded by the arbitrary and unreasonable restrictions in the proposed regulations. I also questioned the constitutional authority of the Secretary to place such restrictions in the proposed regulations.

On February 5, 1963, I wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the U.S. House of Representatives, asking that he schedule public hearings on the matter at the earliest possible time.

Much to my surprise, I received a letter of reply 10 days later which not only denied the request for a public hearing but which indicated support for the Department's proposal, with such a play on semantics that one might well believe the letter had been prepared by the Department itself.

Apparently part of the reason advanced by the chairman for not having hearings by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee relate to his statement that, after all, these proposed regulations just reinstated procedures which were in effect from 1949 to 1954 and which were changed on August 11, 1954, without notice to the public and without any opportunity for interested groups or individuals to express their views.

What the chairman failed to point out in his letter was the fact that the 1954 change in the regulations relative to right-of-way permits over Federal lands resulted from an opinion of the Interior Department's Solicitor that many of the regulations in effect from 1949 to 1954 were "beyond the legitimate power of the Secretary to issue."

The chairman's letter to me of February 15, 1963, points out that:

> Interested persons and groups are being given an opportunity to present their views to the Department on the proposed reinstatement of the language and the period for accepting such views has now been extended to March 15.

It is fully evident that this extension of time was merely a sop to dull the opposition to the proposed regulations, which were put into effect on March 23, 1963, through publication in the Federal Register.

The regulations as promulgated are, with very minor exception, identical to those proposed on December 29, 1962. These minor changes, if anything, make the regulations worse.

As I have so forcibly pointed out before, these regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior and the similar regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture relative to Federal lands under their jurisdiction, are ambiguous, capricious, and confiscatory and without authority in law. Of course, it is not the first time the New Frontier has assumed power way beyond those granted by the Congress and the Constitution. However, the time has come, for those of us who believe in the Constitution of the United States, to protest these attempts by the executive to take unto itself powers not delegated to it by the Constitution or the Congress.

The matter should be thoroughly investigated by the Congress and action taken to curtail this unwarranted assumption of power by the executive bureaucracy. The matter should also be taken to the Federal courts if the Secretaries involved attempt to enforce these patently illegal assumptions of power.

My letter of February 5, 1963, and the chairman's reply of February 15, 1963, follow:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1963.

Hon. Wayne N. Aspinall,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: The Secretary of the Interior placed in the Federal Register of December 29, 1962, proposed new regulations relative to the granting of rights-of-way over Federal lands under his jurisdiction.

These proposed regulations astonish me no end. I cannot understand how any fairminded American would dare issue such arbitrary and unreasonable restriction on the granting of rights-of-way over Federal lands.

These proposed regulations and restrictions are ambiguous, capricious, and confiscatory, and without authority in law. Certainly, by no stretch of the imagination, can anyone read into the laws, which the

Secretary claims as his authority, a congressional intent to grant him or any other Secretary of the Interior the unbridled power he is now attempting to assume. I believe further, that certain of the actions which he could take under the regulation or restriction proposed would be completely unconstitutional in character. It is noted that the proposed regulations would apply equally to both public and private non-Federal electric utilities.

I again say I am astonished that he would propose such an unconstitutional assumption of power unto himself. One illustration of such power is the provision for denying a right-of-way permit for a non-Federal transmission line if he considered such a line was not consistent with the Federal power marketing program as determined by him. I cannot believe that Congress ever intended such a grant of power or that it could grant such power under the Constitution.

Another illustration would be an application for a right-of-way permit over a strip of Federal land of less than a mile wide, where the total length of the proposed transmission line would be 200 miles. Under the proposed regulations, the applicant could be required to agree to permit Federal use of any surplus capacity that might be available initially, and/or permit the Interior Department to reconstruct and enlarge the applicant's transmission lines and related facilities, not only on that portion of the line which would be on Federal land but also on the 99½ percent of the line not on Federal lands.

A third illustration is the provision in the proposed regulation under which the Secretary could require the applicant for a right-of-way permit over Federal lands to agree to the transmission of electric power to serve non-Federal public utility loads and Federal loads now being served by the applicant. Certainly this would constitute a destruction of non-Federal assets without due process of law. No good man should want and no bad man should have such unlimited and unwarranted power to destroy segments of the free enterprise system under which this Nation has prospered.

It seems to me that these new regulations proposed by the Secretary of the Interior and the similar proposal by the Secretary of Agriculture covering the Federal lands under his jurisdiction, are part and parcel of a continuing attempt to socialize the entire electric utility industry of the Nation.

In view of the indicated lack of congressional authority and constitutionality, I ask that you schedule a public hearing on the matter at the earliest possible time. Not only should the Secretary be heard on the matter, but all other interested parties should be given an opportunity to testify on these regulations.

Sincerely,

John P. Saylor,
Member of Congress.

Committee on Interior
and Insular Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., February 15, 1963.

Hon. John P. Saylor,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear John: This will acknowledge your letter of February 5 regarding the proposed changes in regulations covering rights-of-way for transmission lines across Federal lands.

I do not agree with your analysis of the proposed changes or share your concern as to what will happen if the proposed changes are put into effect. While the revised regulations would require applicants for new rights-of-way permits to agree to allow the Federal Government to utilize excess capacity in their lines, any such capacity that was used by the Federal Government would be returned to the permit holder upon request. The revised regulations would also permit the denying of a permit if the proposed non-Federal line is determined to be in conflict with the Federal power marketing program. To me, this is different from your phrase, "not consistent with," and I believe its purpose is to protect the Federal power system and the Federal investment therein. We must remember that the Federal Government is itself a large supplier of electric power and the Congress has authorized a large network of transmission lines for the marketing of this power.

I view these proposed changes as involving the administration of both the public land laws and the Federal power marketing program. I believe that the decision as to whether to put them into effect will be made on the basis of what is determined to be in the best interest of the United States. It is my understanding that, in addition to providing the means for protecting the Federal power system and the Federal investment therein, the provision for possible Federal use of excess capacity in a non-Federal line might effect some economies in the marketing of Federal power.

The proposed changes in the regulations would reinstate procedures which were in effect in the Department of the Interior from 1948 to 1954 and which were changed on August 11, 1954, without notice to the public and without any opportunity for interested groups or individuals to express their views. All interested persons and groups are being given an opportunity to present their views to the Department on the proposed reinstatement of the language and the period for accepting such views has now been extended to March 15. At the present time it is my view that, in order to assist the Secretary of the Interior in making his decision, it is he who should receive the views and comments of interested parties and not our committee.

I do not know whether these proposed changes in the regulations will be put into effect or not, but, if they are, I do not want to try to prejudge their administration. I have no reason to believe that the administration of the regulations, if they are revised, will not be in the best interest of the United States, or will not be entirely fair and equitable from the standpoint of the non-Federal electric utilities seeking permits over public lands.

On the basis of the above expressed views, I do not believe it would be appropriate for the committee to hold hearings on this matter at the present time.

Sincerely yours,

Wayne N. Aspinall,
Chairman.

A Living Memorial to the Men Who Died Aboard the U.S.S. "San Francisco"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives a remarkable project that is now underway in my home city of San Francisco. The project was started and organized by the men of the Naval Reserve unit at Treasure Island. In cooperation with them, the mayor of San Francisco has proclaimed the months of February, March, April, and May 1963 as U.S.S. *San Francisco* Months. During this period the reservists will create a living memorial to the men who died in action in World War II aboard the great fighting cruiser, the U.S.S. *San Francisco*. A total of 218 men lost their lives, most of them in the battle of Guadalcanal, and the naval reservists intend to recruit one new man for every one who made the ultimate sacrifice for his Nation.

At the end of the recruiting period the names of the men who make up the living memorial will be placed on the battle-scarred bridge of the U.S.S. *San Francisco*, which was preserved as a permanent monument and placed at Lands End, a point of land outside the Golden Gate overlooking the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, a plaque bearing the names of the new men will remain on the bridge until November 13—the 21st anniversary of one of the most ferocious battles in the history of naval warfare. Some of the men who have already responded by joining the Reserve unit actually served during World War II in the South Pacific. Some of the others who are joining the living memorial had not been born when the U.S.S. *San Francisco* went into action on that fateful night of Friday the 13th, November 1942.

This was a crucial battle in the Pacific war. American ground forces had a precarious foothold on one end of Guadalcanal Island and were under constant enemy ground and air attack. The Japanese decided on a major counterattack to recapture all of the island and sent a powerful fleet of 18 to 20 ships to bombard the American transports, ground positions, and airfield.

An American task force of 13 ships under the command of Rear Adm. Daniel J. Callaghan went straight into the enemy fleet in a single line, making contact at 1:48 a.m. of a black, moonless night. Admiral Callaghan, a native of San Francisco and a graduate of St. Ignatius High School there, was aboard the U.S.S. *San Francisco*, which was second in line and commanded by Capt. Cassin Young. In the furious give and take of big guns, the Japanese fleet was stopped and had to abandon its mission in order to deal with the outgunned American task force.

It was during this battle that Admiral Callaghan issued one of history's most famous combat command orders, "get the big ones first." This statement ranks high among notable orders issued by a naval officer throughout recorded naval history.

In 34 minutes the engagement was over and the enemy was in retreat. The cost was high. Five American ships had been sunk and the other eight were badly damaged, including the U.S.S. *San Francisco*, which at one time had to fight it out on both sides with a battleship, a cruiser, and a destroyer. Admiral Callaghan was killed in the first 15 minutes and Captain Young was mortally wounded when an enemy salvo crashed into the bridge. When it was over the ship had been riddled by shell fire, 25 separate fires were burning, and the sick bay had been knocked out.

But the U.S.S. *San Francisco* stayed in the war and saw more action before receiving a hero's welcome on returning to her home city. The citizens of San Francisco are justly proud of this great record, and the reserve unit at Treasure Island is making a fine constructive effort in memory of the 218 men who spent their last days on the U.S.S. *San Francisco.* Lt. (jg.) Arthur Hodgdon, himself a veteran of Solomons naval action, is to be commended for spearheading this living memorial project in his role as Reserve recruiting officer at Treasure Island Naval Base.

Having been a personal friend of the late Admiral Callaghan, his distinguished brother Vice Adm. William Callaghan, retired, and Judd Callaghan, it is my great pleasure to bring this program to the attention of our colleagues.

American Agriculture: Our No. 1 Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on March 22 I spoke in Moorhead, Minn., on the occasion of Greater Moorhead Days. Moorhead is located in the heart of the Minnesota-North Dakota Red River Valley.

Much of my talk dealt with what the farmers of America have done and are continuing to do for the people of our country and those in other nations throughout the world. Among other things, I pointed out that the 188 million men, women, and children of the United States have more food of better quality in greater variety than any people in any country in all the recorded history of man.

I also emphasized that the $6.5 billion budget estimate for the Department of Agriculture is not a farmer's budget, but a budget for all Americans. Nearly three-fifths of the expenditures proposed for fiscal year 1964, about $4 billion of the $6.5, will go for programs which clearly benefit consumers, business, industry, our foreign policy and national defense, and the general public.

Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues this speech and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREATER MOORHEAD DAYS, MOORHEAD, MINN.—SPEECH OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

I tired a long time ago of those who make critical comments and talk at length about what the country is doing for farmers.

The truly great story of our time is a factual report on what farm families have done and are doing for our country.

The 188 million men, women, and children of the United States have more food of better quality in greater variety than any people in any country in all the recorded history of man.

The hunger which haunted civilization since its beginning has been driven from the land. This doesn't mean everyone is getting enough to eat every day, but it means when hunger does exist it is due to failure to distribute production; not lack of production.

In the last 2 years the proportion of consumer income required to purchase food has dropped to the lowest ratio in history, 19 percent of take-home pay.

If Washington, D.C., has room for one more statue, it should be one that expresses a nation's gratitude to the men, women, and children who live and work on the Nation's family farms.

While producing more and better foods, farm families have been sending workers from the land into other areas of the Nation's economy, in manufacturing, transportation, business, and the professions and services.

Americans are familiar with the growth in industrial productivity.

A fact too often overlooked is that it hasn't nearly kept pace with agricultural productivity.

In the last decade, production per man-hour in agriculture increased by 77 percent, as compared with a 32-percent increase in manufacturing.

A century ago one worker on the farm supplied food and fiber for less than five persons. By 1940 the figure had risen to only 10. Now, just 23 years later, each farmworker supplies food and fiber for 30 persons.

Unfortunately, those who feed us so well do not themselves live "too high on the hog." It is true that farm incomes have improved substantially the past 2 years, but they still average only 60 percent of nonfarm incomes. The farmer is subsidizing consumers.

There are fewer than 15 million people living on our farms, only about 8 percent of the country's population. The population of the State of California exceeds our total national farm population.

Yet farmers create millions of jobs for fellow Americans. Ten million people have jobs storing, transporting, processing, and merchandising the products of agriculture. Six million have jobs providing the supplies farmers use. Thousands in rural communities across the land make their living providing services required by farmers.

The investment in agriculture exceeds $200 billion. That figure is comparable to about three-fourths of the value of current assets for all corporations in the country. It represents three-fifths of the value of all corporation stocks on the New York Stock Exchange.

The investment in agriculture represents $21,300 for each farmworker as compared with a manufacturing investment of $16,000 for each worker.

In 1961, when our farmers had a gross income of nearly $40 billion, they spent over $27 billion to operate their businesses.

Farmers spend over $2 billion a year for trucks, tractors, machines, and other equipment.

Farming uses more petroleum than any other single industry, more than $3 billion is spent by farmers each year for fuel, lubricants, and equipment maintenance.

You could provide Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, Portland, San Diego, and Chicago with electricity for a year and the kilowatt consumption would be about the same as the total needed to keep our farms going.

The next time someone starts to tell you what the country is doing for agriculture, just ask what would happen if this Nation lost three-fourths of the assets of all corporations, or three-fifths of the market value of all corporation stocks on the New York Exchange, or more than 16 million nonfarm jobs.

The answers to these questions are, in part, the answers to what farm families do for the country.

American agriculture also is exerting an influence felt throughout the world.

Our productive capacity supplements the efforts of farmers in countries which pay cash for our food, and in the underdeveloped countries where food for peace not only combats hunger but strengthens our foreign economic development efforts.

Another major export is the know-how developed by our farm families, through informational and technical assistance programs.

Likewise, events abroad affect U.S. agriculture.

In fiscal year 1953, exports of farm products from the United States amounted to $2.8 billion. By fiscal year 1962 the export figure had jumped to a record $5.1 billion. That year we harvested 305 million acres of cropland and the products of 63 million of those acres were shipped abroad.

The $5.1 billion worth of farm products went to two general types of destinations. About $1.6 billion worth of our food and fiber, 30 percent of our total agricultural exports, went to underdeveloped countries under the food-for-peace program.

The big share of the food and fiber exports, some $3.5 billion worth, or 70 percent of the total, was sold for dollars. Most of these shipments went to the industrialized nations such as the United Kingdom, the European Common Market, and other Western European countries, and Canada and Japan.

In recent months the European Common Market has been receiving increased attention in the agricultural export area. This is understandable, because the Common Market is our largest single foreign outlet for farm production.

In fiscal year 1962, U.S. exports to the Common Market had a value of $1.2 billion, representing about a fourth of total agricultural shipments and over a third of the volume sold for dollars.

We are uneasy about the development of tariff protectionist patterns in the Common Market. It represents the largest economic merger ever attempted.

Suppose high fences separated Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, and North and South Dakota. Suppose these fences had gates so small they limited movement of goods, services, and labor among the five States.

Now, tear down the fences between these States, but leave the outer fence separating them from the other States of the Union.

That, in effect, is what the Common Market is; the fences are being torn down between France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg, but the outer fence that separates this merged area from other countries still stands.

Because of the resulting free movement of goods, services, and labor between the six countries, spectacular economic growth has occurred. Employment, wages, and purchasing power are at record highs.

When agriculture in the Common Market countries saw what economic merger had brought to the industrial sector, it started pushing for development of a common agricultural policy. In January of last year the Common Market announced agreement of these six points:

1. Control of farm products through common marketing authorities.

2. Establishment of common prices and abolition of trade barriers within the area during a transition period.

3. Control of imports from outside countries through variable levies, fees, minimum prices, and, in some instances, quantitative restrictions.

4. Use of funds to finance market operations and subsidize exports.

5. Establishment of quality standards.

6. Harmonization of veterinary, plant health, and similar regulations.

Implementation of these points has had some favorable and some unfavorable results for U.S. agriculture.

We can be optimistic about future export prospects for commodities the Common Market does not produce at all or produces in small volume, commodities like cotton, soybeans, protein meal, tallow, hides and skins, and certain fruits and vegetables. These products had a value of $578 million in fiscal year 1962 and made up about 50 percent of that year's shipments.

We did not do as well on tariffs negotiated for tobacco and vegetable oils. Common Market tariffs on these products, value of which accounted for $123 million or 10 percent of our fiscal year 1962 exports, are too high.

We didn't do well at all in keeping access to Common Market countries for those products Common Market farmers want to produce more of—wheat and wheat flour, feed grains, poultry, and rice. The Common Market is developing for these commodities a protective system based primarily on variable import levies. The variable levy always keeps the cost of imported commodities to at least the level of Common Market-produced commodities. Because price competition is canceled, traditional importers tend to do their buying locally. In the case of poultry, the variable levy is already in operation. Altogether, wheat and wheat flour, feed grains, poultry, rice, and a few other products in that category had a value of $483 million in fiscal year 1962, representing 40 percent of our exports to the Common Market that year.

The United States has vigorously protested the decisions that are taking the Common Market in the direction of restrictive trade policies. The Common Market has agreed to reconsider tariff decisions on wheat, corn, sorghum grain, rice, and poultry. These will represent a takeoff point for the United States during the next bargaining rounds.

The Common Market's agricultural exports to the United States are relatively small, but it has been shipping us a sizable volume of industrial goods and would like to sell us more. We can use them, and the Common Market can use more of our farm products.

We must keep in mind, however, that all of our agricultural export future isn't wrapped up in the Common Market. Those countries have been taking only about a third of the farm products we export for dollars.

The other two-thirds of our sales are outside that area. In fiscal year 1962, our sales to the EFTA countries, including the United Kingdom, amounted to $719 million; to Japan, $485 million; and to Canada, $430 million. Japan could use more of our feed grains and soybeans. Canada could use more of our poultry; the United Kingdom more of our citrus fruits and feed grains.

A glowing potential for future cash sales of U.S. farm products abroad rests with the so-called underdeveloped countries that we are now assisting through our food-for-peace program. As our food helps improve their economic and social structures, we are also utilizing useful outlets for our agricultural abundance and providing additional income for our farmers.

Since 1955, food-for-peace exports have amounted to about $12.5 billion. Feeding the hungry is sufficient reason for these contributions to human health and happiness. Yet we are realizing substantial economic and national security benefits. Our foreign policy is strengthened. People who have to make a choice between the free world philosophy and that of the Communist world are given a graphic comparison of the efficiency of the family-owned farm under a free enterprise system with the inefficiency of the state-owned farm under a totalitarian system.

The friends we are making now can well be friendly cash customers for American farmers in the future.

Earlier this month, when the Senate was considering an appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, I repeated a plea I had made many times before, a request that the Department of Agriculture budget accurately reflect farm and nonfarm expenditures.

When the President's budget estimate for this coming fiscal year included $6.5 billion for the Department of Agriculture, the old cry that farm programs cost too much money was again heard across the land. This is not a farmer's budget. It is a budget for all Americans.

Nearly three-fifths of the expenditures proposed for fiscal year 1964, about $4 billion of the $6.5 billion, will go for programs which clearly benefit consumers, business, industry, our foreign policy and national defense, and the general public.

More than $2 billion, or 31 percent of the total, will go to programs vital to our foreign relations and national defense. Most of this will be spent on food-for-peace activities. As an instrument of peace, this program is a significant part of American foreign policy, not just farmer foreign policy.

Another $499 million, 8 percent of the total budget, is to be spent for domestic food distribution programs for our needy at home.

About $994 million, around 15 percent, will go for long-range programs for disease and pest control, meat inspection, protection of soil and water resources, forest and public land management, and market development and services. These activities benefit every one of our citizens.

Then there is a budget item of $446 million for Rural Electrification Administration and Farmers Home Administration loans for which the repayment record by cooperatives and farmers is excellent. This is sound business.

Right down at the bottom of the proposed budget expenditures is an item of about $2.5 billion for the support of programs directed primarily to the farm economy, price-support activities including those for feed grains and wheat, agricultural conservation, the conservation reserve, and the sugar and wool programs.

Realistically, the Department of Agriculture budget should show $2.5 billion for farm programs and $4 billion for foreign aid, for food distribution, for public welfare and health services, for the maintenance of our forests and public outdoor recreation facilities, and for research carrying major benefits to business and industry.

Triggered by the feed-grains program, which was the first major farm legislation offered by the Kennedy administration, farm income has risen substantially the last 2 years.

Net farm income in 1961 was $12.7 billion, a rise of a billion dollars over the figure recorded for 1960.

Net farm income in 1962 moved up to $12.9 billion. While these figures do not represent the fair share of national income farm families earn and should have, a billion dollar improvement is a welcome step in the right direction.

The benefits of the feed grains and wheat programs have not all moved into the farm sector. Taxpayers are major beneficiaries, too. Like farmers, they haven't been happy about having unneeded, unwanted supplies in storage that put an unnecessary drain on the Federal treasury.

Government holdings of wheat and feed grains were better than a billion bushels less on February 15 of this year than the peak quantities held in 1961 before new programs became effective. Total stocks at the end of the 1963 marketing year will be 2.5 million bushels less than they would have been if the pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue.

The fact that Government doesn't now own the billion bushels of grain it formerly owned is saving the taxpayers $770 thousand a day in carrying charges, $280 million a year.

The 1964 Federal budget includes $246 million less for carrying charges on these grains than was spent in fiscal year 1961, and $813 million, or $2.2 million a day, less than the annual rate that would have occurred by 1964 if the pre-1961 programs had been allowed to continue.

The 1961 and 1962 feed grains programs have been successful. The 1963 program, which contains the new feature of a direct payment to cooperators, is an improvement. I suggested this revision for the 1963 crop year and it is this type of program, a permanent, voluntary, direct payment program, that I will propose and support for the 1964 and subsequent crop years.

The Nation's wheat farmers, in the wheat referendum will go to polling places to make a significant decision.

They will be voting on more than approving, or rejecting, a wheat program developed in the last session of the Congress.

They will be deciding, in substantial measure, the future of farm legislation. They will be deciding between a wheat price of around $1 a bushel or $2 a bushel. They will be deciding on how effectively we can negotiate in the European Common Market.

The 1964 wheat program carries these potentials for farm families if approved by more than two-thirds of those voting in the referendum: Farmers will receive $2 a bushel or more for nearly all of their 1964 wheat marketings.

Prices will be stable and predictable. Consumer prices, as they reflect the cost of wheat, will be the same as in 1962.

The total value of wheat production and the farm value of wheat production will be more than $2.3 billion.

World markets, influenced by the International Wheat Agreement, will be stable. Negotiations leading to satisfactory trade agreements can proceed without the uncertainties attached to unstable U.S. wheat prices.

Wheat surpluses will be reduced, and the cost to the taxpayer will be cut in comparison with recent years.

Should our wheat farmers reject the proposed 1964 wheat program we can expect:

A drastic reduction in the market price for wheat; a sharp reduction in farm income despite a rise in wheat acreage; an unfavorable impact on the total economy as wheat farmers necessarily reduce expenditures for goods and services.

The Congress of the United States, to which rural voters elect a distinct minority of the Members, is keeping a sharp eye on the wheat referendum.

The wheat referendum result will doubtless play a part in determining congressional attitudes toward a 1964 feed grains program, and in the succeess of efforts to modernize the cotton program in a way that will maintain producer income while facing realistically the relationship of domestic and world markets.

Yes, the wheat referendum decision will have impact far beyond the wheat acres.

The American Host Program Call

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the American Host program is a nonprofit, people-to-people type project which makes it possible for teachers from the free nations of Europe to spend a month in the United States living as the guests of American families in order to gain a true understanding of our way of life.

Each of us who has traveled in any foreign country is well aware of the false and distorted image of our Nation which is prevalent in most foreign countries. Movies such as "The Blackboard Jungle," novels dealing with the problems of our society, and the usual sensational press items carried in the international press have given European teachers, and others, a very false and distorted picture of the United States.

In addition, each year millions of dollars are spent to print and distribute Communist inspired anti-American propaganda in Europe.

The American Host program was started in order to give our European teacher friends an opportunity to visit with us and to see for themselves the true meaning of the American way of life by spending their time with American families in typical American communities.

Hundreds of American families from every walk of life have opened their homes to act as host families for the visiting teachers. Doctors, businessmen, educators, mechanics, truck drivers, lawyers, all having in common a concern for the future of the free world, have become a part of this dynamic program.

The program is administered by The American Host Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit foundation which is supported by contributions from individuals who are interested in the success of the program. No Government funds have been expended nor solicited for this program.

The mechanics of the program are not complex. Teachers in the free nations of Europe are contacted through their teachers associations and informed about the American Host program. Those teachers who are interested in taking part in the program then make application to do so, specifying if there is a particular area of the United States which they would like to visit. Host families are then matched with teachers as well as possible. Once host families and teachers have been matched, they are given each other's name and address so that they may correspond prior to the visit.

The European teachers travel together from Europe to New York City by aircraft. After 3 days in New York City, each teacher proceeds to the city of his or her host family. During the next 4 weeks, the visiting teacher spends his or her time with at least two different host families in the same general geographic area. At the end of the 4-week period, the teachers reassemble in New York and return to Europe by air.

In addition, a host family is expected to meet the visiting teacher when he or she arrives in the city of the host family; provide a room and meals for the visitor while he or she is with the family; treat the visitor as one would any other guest in one's home—a host family is not expected to entertain the visitor 24 hours a day; see that the guest has an opportunity to meet friends and neighbors of the host family; and arrange for the guest to be taken to the train, bus station or airport when he or she is ready to leave the city.

Host family accommodations are usually for 1 or 2 weeks' duration; only in unusual circumstances are the visiting teachers scheduled to spend longer than 2 weeks with the same host family.

The part being played by the American Host program in correcting the many false and distorted impressions of our Nation which are held by many in foreign lands is indeed worthy of commendation. What could be better for our Nation than to have an ever increasing number of teachers in foreign lands who are armed, able and anxious to refute the falsehoods and misconceptions being spread about the United States?

The total cost to the participating European teacher is less than $400, and in some cases, up to 50 percent of this amount is paid by sponsoring groups here in the United States.

The responsibilities of a host family are not extensive; the main qualification is a desire to further the primary objective of the program—to increase understanding between ourselves and our European friends.

The program was founded by a Garden Grove, Calif., teacher, Tom Murphy, and his wife, Frances. I commend them for their tireless efforts in making their wonderful plan a reality.

I considered it a great honor to be named to the board of directors of this fine organization, and to have its national headquarters located in the district I represent.

Strip Mining on National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the following correspondence was sent to the President, with an information copy to the Secretary of Agriculture:

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

Mr. PRESIDENT: I have today introduced a resolution calling upon the Secretary of Agriculture to stop any further development of plans for strip mining national forests in Pennsylvania.

It appears that my State is being selected for a guinea pig experiment on strip mining by the Department.

Mr. President, Pennsylvania has had many years of experimentation in this field. Some has been good, but a lot has been bad.

We do not need more experiments; we need cooperation from the Federal Government in helping us to take the bad features out of strip mining by leaving us alone while the issue is being debated in the general assembly of our State.

Right this moment the question of strip mining is the number one issue before the general assembly.

For the Department of Agriculture to interfere in this debate by announcing a contract to strip 60 acres atop a knob in the Allegheny National Forest near Kane, Pa., is poor timing if indeed not poor judgment.

Allow our legislators to come up with controls that will guarantee our State against damages in the future and then if coal is needed in excess of supply, there will be time enough for the Federal Government to start ripping open national forest lands.

From my knowledge of the coal industry, I would hazard a guess that coal removed from Federal parks and forests would further depreciate the already overproduced coal supply.

I especially request consideration for this resolution before the reported contract between the Department of Agriculture and Westmore Coal & Construction Co. can be consummated.

The following news items show the feelings of our Pennsylvania conservationists and sportsmen as well as the citizens in general.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

H. J. RES. 363

Joint resolution to prohibit the strip mining of coal in the Allegheny and other national forests.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all strip mining of coal being carried on in the Allegheny National Forest, or in any other national forest, on the day this joint resolution becomes effective shall be terminated forthwith. The Secretary of Agriculture shall not hereafter enter into any contract for, or otherwise authorize, the strip mining of coal in any national forest.

[From the News-Herald, Franklin and Oil City, Pa., Mar. 4, 1963]

DON'T TRUST THEM

A new business venture was launched in the great Allegheny National Forest, a few miles west of Kane, this year.

It was given about the same kind of fanfare demanded by an international jewel thief about to move into a new territory.

The Wetmore Coal & Construction Co. was authorized by the U.S. Forest Service to conduct an experimental strip mine operation on an inconsequential 60-acre tract.

W. W. Wentz, supervisor of the vast 700,000-acre public forest, is a bit miffed at the number of complaints he has been receiving from sportsmen, conservationists and others denouncing the project.

"This is a little odd," Mr. Wentz observed last week in a Pittsburgh Press news article, particularly since it is just these people we are trying to help and protect.

"We want to prove, once and for all," the stern Mr. Wentz states, "that strip mining doesn't have to pollute streams, that the land doesn't have to be turned into a desolate wasteland, and that strip mined areas can be restored economically."

It strikes us that this is something Mr. Wentz and the U.S. Forest Service do not have to prove.

We believe the burden of proof is on the strip miner—not the taxpayer. We also believe these experiments can just as well be conducted on land already under lease to the coal companies in areas outside the public domain.

Forest Service officials admit coal stripping interests have made repeated attempts to invade national forest lands, particularly in West Virginia and Kentucky.

They have bravely stated they will fight any attempt to expand the experimental strip mine in Allegheny National Forest.

That is like inviting termites onto your back porch and then threatening them to go no further.

It is well to note this tiny, insignificant operation near Kane is expected to yield 350,000 tons of coal with a current market value of well over a million dollars.

A million dollars from a worthless 60-acre slice of a 700,000-acre forest. Now there is a real argument.

Make no mistake about it. This is not a penny ante game. The stakes are high for both coal stripper and the public.

All the coal interests need is a "model case" to show the mineral can be extracted without water pollution and that the land can be reasonably restored.

Once the wraps are off, larger and larger slices of public land can be opened up to bigger operations. Mistakes can happen, rules can always be changed, fines can be paid. The foot in the door is the important thing.

There is no indication the extraction of this coal is imperative to the safety or economy of this country, or even this section of the State.

There is every indication this operation will provide a dangerous loophole for ravaging what few acres of untouched land we still possess.

We grant strip mining its position as a fairly important Pennsylvania industry. It will not, however, last as long as its scars and can certainly not compete with the timeless value of clean streams and wooded hills.

[From the News-Herald, Franklin, Pa., Feb. 28, 1963]

STRIPPING ALLEGHENY FOREST

(By Steve Szalewicz)

Many local sportsmen are not holding their tongue or bearing with tolerance a recent announcement by the U.S. Forest Service at Warren that Wetmore Coal & Construction Co. will soon strip a 60-acre knob in the forest as a "test." They have thought forest lands to be the last verdant forts, unassailable by land and water despoilers.

The test on public land, according to Forest Supervisor W. W. Wentz will provide "full safeguards for soil and water resources." Furthermore, says Wentz, this rip-out of trees and terrain will be watched with "utmost care and responsibility." He adds, "a daily analysis of water quality of runoff will give immediate indication of changing conditions and permit corrective action to be taken before damage can occur."

Local, vocal conservationists can't buy those definite promises easily when they look around at dead Scrubgrass, East Sandy, and Hemlock Creeks. Beautiful streams they are, flowing through scenic gorges of hemlock, but floating nauseating water. Their purity was once assured by definite State laws. While they may agree that test projects involving strip mining may be desirable and progressive, why in the frying fires of torture conduct them on land that has, more or less, been enshrined and endowed as America's future playground? And besides, private, responsible operators have already proved abundantly that stripping for coal can be done economically and with a result that returns land to production, play, and pro rata.

A POISONED POOL AT KINZUA?

What local conservationists dread basically is the added load on the Allegheny River, which at Warren has already in recent times tested "acid." Could it be that stripping, if continued on private lands and encouraged in the forest draining into the Allegheny above the Kinzua Reservoir will ruin that impatiently awaited playwater before the pool fills? Such a fisherman-thwarting fate once befell Pennsylvanians at the Johnsonburg Reservoir, according to reports.

But it does little good to carp and cluck about this experiment in mixing morals and methods, unless the complainants contribute imaginative and hopeful alternatives. Perhaps the least hackneyed and most tolerant from the outdoorsman's approach is put forward by Roy Frank of Deep Hollow Road, Venango County's conscientious watchdog of western Pennsylvania's natural resources, and by Representative Harry Gramlich, of Franklin, equally interested in a solution least painful to operators and coal owners and pleasing to outdoorsmen.

CREATE A COAL RESERVE

Frank suggests that since coal is already overproduced and both Federal and State Governments are allocating funds with which to study other possible uses for the unrestrained abundance, why not have coal deposits bought up by Government agencies as reserves? This should be done where it is determined the strip mining would ruin water supplies or bring on local destitution. If governments can reserve forests, seashores, and sand dunes, swamps and moraines, and oil deposits, why not coal?

The "reserves" proposition is the one solution which could stop experiments which imperil our soils and our cold, clear springs which feed the few remaining good fishing streams in Pennsylvania. There is no doubt that with the Forest Service as watchdogs, the stripping in McKean County will be conducted with regardful responsibility. And while it is uncomforting to know it's being tried at all, let's hope, to use the President's recent words, it turns out to be a "milestone of conservation progress."

SPORTSMEN POLLED ON STRIP MINING

What do outdoorsmen think of the proposal to strip 60 acres of hilltop in the Allegheny National Forest near Kane as a test project to determine how open pit mining can be conducted so as to conserve both land and water?

Six delegates to a meeting of the Northwest Division, Pennsylvania Sportsmen's Clubs, when polled Sunday replied:

"Man cuts timber for lumber. He takes the sand and gravel from the shores. He pumps oil, gas and water, mines ore, gold, silver and coal. All these things he takes from the earth and then uses them to cover the earth with wide bands of concrete and steel. Man returns nothing for all that he takes. He only does more damage. Man must be stopped. Someday nature will revolt. Perhaps we can prolong the time till nature revolts by stopping unnecessary waste and unnecessary scars upon the earth. No one will freeze next winter if these 60 acres are left to nature," James F. Donahue, secretary of Erie County Council of Sportsmen Clubs.

"I do not think public land should be open to strip mining," Mrs. Eleanor Donahue, past Secretary, Gem City Outdoorsmen Club of Erie.

"I am not in favor of the stripping in the American national forests. I feel that past practices of some of the more conscientious strip miners have proven that restoration can be accomplished reasonably. Further tests are not needed," George H. Land, Sr., clean streams chairman, Crawford County.

"I am not in favor of any commercial interests destroying our natural resources. Everyone knows that coal can be stripped in most locations and the land restored, but no one wants to do it. I am sure that the Federal and State Governments can stop this if enough interest is shown by the majority of people," William A. Adams, president, Springfield Sportsmen Club.

"The national forest should be conserved as is. Strip mining should be contained for private acres," Robert Wank, secretary, Corry Rod & Gun Club.

"I think that is an opening wedge to subject our national forest to an additional onslaught of strip mining. In the case of Wetmore Coal & Construction Co., Inc., these lands were sold under the Weeks law, and in this case were subject to a mineral reservation which did not permit removal by strip mine operations. Why strip that property?" Roy Frank, Venango County delegate to Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs.

Potential for Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 2, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, on March 27, I was privileged to attend one of the most outstanding civic events in which I have ever participated. Six hundred men and women of my home city assembled at the fourth annual dinner of the Greater Lowell Chamber of Commerce. An inspiring program, directed by Chairman Arthur C. Antonopoulas, was focused on the theme of Greater Lowell's "Potential for Progress."

Following the national anthem and a solemn invocation by Rt. Rev. Raymond L. Hyder, pastor of St. Margaret's Church, the immediate past president of the chamber, Mr. Thomas J. Hickey of Chelmsford, reported on his stewardship. The newly installed president, Mr. Walter C. Wilson, Jr., of Tewksbury, then delivered a short but inspiring inaugural message.

High point of the evening was the superb address delivered by a distinguished Member of the other body, Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia. The illuminating and timely remarks of Senator RANDOLPH, calling for greater citizen participation in public affairs, deserves wide circulation, and I ask unanimous consent that his splendid message be included in the RECORD.

The evening closed with benediction by Rev. Victor F. Scalise, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church.

The entire affair, directed by the capable general manager of the Greater Lowell Chamber of Commerce, Donald A. Cook, provided solid evidence of the fact that Greater Lowell is indeed on the march, that it in truth has a great "potential for progress."

Mr. Frank Makarewicz of the Lowell Sun provided a superb description of the event in the March 28 issue of that newspaper, and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Makarewicz's story be included in the RECORD following Senator RANDOLPH's inspiring address.

The address and article follow:

THE BUSINESSMAN AND HIS GOVERNMENT

(Address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, Chamber of Commerce of Greater Lowell, Lowell, Mass., March 27, 1963)

In meeting with numerous and varied professional and business groups, I have detected a common denominator in a new note of seriousness and gravity of purpose. It is doubtless related to some extent to the generally sombre atmosphere of world affairs and the crossroads at which we find ourselves today.

Yet this feeling is not solely in response to any temporary emergency condition. Rather, it stems from the growing awareness of the need for reappraisal in all sectors of our society. It is as though we know that we are approaching, or have already reached, one of the great watersheds of history and that it is now time for us to take stock of ourselves, to reexamine our basic assumptions, and clearly to define our individual and national goals.

Let us then discuss the role of the businessman in public affairs.

This is a subject which has long been of interest and personal concern because I have been a businessman as well as one professionally interested in public affairs.

During the 1960 political campaign an incident occurred which highlights an aspect of our thinking. As I was walking along the street in my home community of Elkins, W. Va., talking with the voters and outlining the issues, I was stopped by a citizen who directed me into a doorway to discuss the election. After finishing our conversation, I asked him why he had drawn me off the street and into such privacy. He replied: "You know I am in business and I must be very careful of what I do and say."

Though this man may have dramatized his fears somewhat, he does not represent an isolated state of mind. The rule of prudence, the precautionary attitude against speaking one's mind on controversial problems, has taken seed among too many of us. It is a measure of the failure of the democratic process when anyone, whether he be businessman, farmer, professional man, or teacher, fears to participate in the political dialogue.

It is appropriate to refer also to our national attitudes toward the Soviet Union. Russia seems at one and the same time to have become our national demon and gage by which we measure our own progress. We are too frequently confronted with such questions as these:

Are we behind the Soviets in space exploration?

Are American schools as advanced as those of Russia?

Do we offer enough support for basic research in science and technology compared with our adversary?

Thus, in recent years, we have too frequently approached our problems not in terms of finding the best possible solutions, but in terms of the cold war with Russia and communism in general. This is unfortunate because the solution to any problem is determined, in large degree, by the questions which one addresses to the problem.

I devoutly hope, therefore, that the political actions of men in private enterprise will not be restricted, that they will ask questions not in terms of whether a particular policy will circumscribe this or that power, but, rather, whether it is in the best national interest as well as their own legitimate self-interests.

This is only an instance, however, of the need to avoid the general tendency of interpreting public problems in terms of opposite solutions. Our political discourses, and hence the solution to political questions, is too often restricted by the use of polar or opposite terms, liberal and conservative, radical and reactionary, labor and management, farmer and consumer, socialist and capitalist.

We are all familiar with the old platitude: "There are two sides to every question."

Such a polarization of public problems, however, falsifies the realities of political life. There are, in fact, as many sides to every question as there are parties or interests involved. And the great genius of the democratic process is that it offers a wider variety of solutions than can be encompassed by mere opposites.

Politics in a democracy is the art of the possible, the serious effort of compromise and conciliation. We reach consent by mutual concessions. This understanding offers us a clue as to how the citizen can make one of his chief contributions in the arena of public affairs. We know that the life of business and commerce is, in large measure, a life of offering mutual concessions, of arriving at a mixture of interests whereby each party gains some satisfaction.

Wise decisions in business require not only a knowledge of how to conduct a commercial transaction, but, also, knowledge of personnel relations, of community relations, and of the whole process of communication. From this point of view, therefore, a businessman, the modern businessman, is peculiarly well gifted to contribute to public affairs. He must be willing to commit himself beyond the confines of the immediate community, and cause his voice to be heard in the broader arena of representative government.

In this regard, he acquires new responsibility. As a respected and successful member of society he is an opinion maker, one whose words and thoughts are heard and heeded. It follows then, that his must be an educated, informed, and sincere voice; one whose convictions are the product of study and thought, and one thoroughly familiar with the institutions and processes of government. In short, the businessman must know his government. This knowledge must cover not only areas which bear on his own economic interest, but must include a familiarity with the entire progression through which proposed legislation moves before becoming law. Unless he is conversant with the dynamics of the legislative system he cannot hope to serve effectively in formulating public opinion; he cannot generate and stimulate informed opposition or intelligent support for a given measure.

An experienced Washington correspondent for a leading weekly news magazine has expressed to me strong personal concern over the lack of familiarity with the processes of government which is found among average citizens. He has noted a widespread and appalling ignorance of governmental operations among those citizens who are generally accepted as educated and well informed.

This newsman reports that shortly before the congressional elections of 1962 a researcher for one of the large broadcasting networks telephoned a campaign office and asked, "How many Members of the House are up for election this November?"

This question despite the fact that for 174 years a constitutional requirement has been that the entire membership of the House of Representatives seek election every 2 years. A fundamental and elementary fact of our electoral process had escaped this researcher entirely.

Another example is this:

I recently heard of a $14,000 a year correspondent with a national publication who had insisted that no law passed by Congress can go into effect until it is first ruled on by the Supreme Court.

Unfortunately, these incidents are hardly exceptions.

Our first task is therefore to seek a thorough understanding of Government, and then to strive to make ourselves heard on issues in which we have special knowledge.

In this regard, I would offer comment on the relations of businessmen with Congress, and these observations apply as well to all individuals and professional and trade associations. The legislative process is an involved and intricate one, and the drafting and enactment of any bill of national significance requires the reconciliation of many interests and often many conflicting points of view.

It is vital that all legitimate interests be represented and all important opinions be expressed early in the legislative process. Your Representative or Senator receives little assistance or guidance from a last minute telegram requesting a "yes" or "no" vote at the time a bill reaches the floor. By then, if it is a proposal with which he has been personally identified, he has participated in the hearings or read the testimony, he has examined the committee report and conferred with staff members and his colleagues. And he has usually made his decision before the day the measure comes to a vote.

Therefore, if you desire your conviction to count in the legislative process, on matters affecting your own enterprise or in other areas, I urge you to initiate early and maintain continuing contact with your Representative and your Senator. I assure you that constituent conviction is a powerful influence in the halls of Congress. But it is best offered in a manner and at a time when such counsel is of value. None of us gives the weight to a deluge of last minute form letters or telegrams that we give to the correspondence that clearly reflects independent thought and considered evaluation of governmental problems. If these suggestions are followed, the citizen-businessman can become a very valued counselor to his Congressman.

An editorial in the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette included a thought-provoking paragraph. Its central theme was this: In a democratic nation it is fair to assert that the people get in their government—local, State, and national—precisely what they themselves represent. If, in their own personal lives, our people are wasteful (and most Americans are); if they tend to be arbitrary (which is another American trait); and if they are relatively undisciplined in private affairs, then their government is certain to demonstrate to a marked degree exactly the same traits.

I feel that I have a duty and responsibility in a discussion of this nature to express the admonition that organizations such as yours have an obligation to help develop and promote the best possible understanding between government and business, between government and the financial community.

It has been appropriately said by an authoritative observer and commentator that the business outlook today would be much better than it is if the gap in relations between government and business could be closed or so substantially narrowed that there might develop a cooperative and constructive team effort.

The American economy, during significant periods, has shown a capacity to grow at an average annual rate between 4 and 5 percent without inflationary strain during periods other than depression or war. This growth rate is measured by changes in total national production, stated in uniform dollars.

But during the period 1953–61, the average annual growth rate was only 2.5 percent, or hardly better than half the rate required, in view of the ever-accelerating technology, to absorb increases in the labor force and in productivity per man-hour.

This deficient record has been compounded of a fairly rhythmic succession of booms, periods of stagnation, recessions, and inadequate recoveries.

The deficient growth rate has led to a chronically rising level of unemployed manpower. Indeed, the peak of each boom thus far reached since 1953 has found us with more unemployment than the peak of the immediately preceding boom, and the trough of each recession has found us with more unemployment than the trough of the immediately previous recession.

It is my privilege to be a member of the Senate Labor Committee's Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower. I assure you that the facts reaching us demonstrate very clearly that unemployment, far from being concentrated in a few, has become very generally distributed throughout most of the important sectors of the economy. And we

find, too, that very large and consistent increases in the chronic level of idle plant capacity have accompanied the chronic increases in idle manpower.

For the period 1953–61 as a whole, the aggregate forfeiture of total national production, resulting from the low growth rate, is estimated at about $344 billion, measured in uniform 1960 dollars. The forfeiture of employment opportunity aggregated almost 22½ million man-years. Practically all types of income earners and all major types of business activity suffered accordingly.

President Kennedy has correctly indicated that chronic unemployment is the country's No. 1 economic problem and has expressed regret that there does not seem to be the sense of urgency and awareness that there should be on this subject. In February some 4,918,000 men and women were unemployed, 6.1 percent of the total work force, seasonally adjusted. And, projected annually, this unemployment represents a loss in potential American production of between $30 and $40 billion in goods and services; goods and services that our Nation will never see.

How serious is this economic waste? Need we be alarmed? Economist Gunnar Myrdal, former Swedish Minister of Health, has been quoted as saying:

"I am inclined to believe that the most important problem in the world today is how to get America out of the automatism of relative economic stagnation. A continuation of the present trend means frustration in its foreign relations as well as in its internal life, which, because of the size and weight of America and the role it has to play is extremely dangerous."

The challenge cannot be ignored. By 1975 our total work force will increase from its present level of approximately 75 million to a staggering 93 million, a growth which will be far more rapid than in any other 15-year period in our history. Economic acceleration must therefore include a speedup of the rate in which jobs are created.

Since World War II, 10 million jobs have been opened in the United States, and throughout 1962 total employment hit new highs month after month. The gain in jobs from 1947 through 1962 was 17 percent, but the corresponding growth in the labor force amounted to 22 percent, hence unemployment.

Business volume as a whole is breaking records. Profits and incomes are up, though the rise has recently slowed, and yet the unemployment problem persists. It becomes obvious that if we are to open more jobs we must inject new life into our economic structure, we must speed the rate of business expansion.

Responsible and experienced leaders of the administration are convinced that a cut in taxes, to release new billions for spending, is the most effective way. Such a cut in taxation, however, cannot be regarded as a panacea which will automatically cure the financial ills of the Nation, and bring prosperity to its poorer citizens. It can be but a step, albeit an important one, toward achieving a healthier financial climate throughout most segments of our society.

Income taxes at their present level appear to act as an automatic brake on business upturns. As activity rises, taxes siphon off so large a share of the rising incomes that demand for goods fails to reach the level at which industry could produce profitably.

Surplus capacity discourages business investment, a major ingredient in any strong rise in economic activity. Recovery slows down, and the groundwork is laid for another recession. Through a reduction in taxes, new impetus can be injected into demand and investment, and stepped-up growth thereby stimulated.

This effort to induce expansion is not the sole responsibility of government. The private sector of the economy cannot be content to assess blame while waiting calmly for "someone to do something" All can take part. Specifically, business and organized labor must exercise self-discipline in order to prevent an evaporation of those benefits gained through a tax cut. Increased prices or wages would necessarily divert funds made available through tax reduction, and would tend to counteract beneficial effects on unemployment levels. Restraint is essential to insure that the desired results are achieved.

And, as we face current economic challenges we must maintain a flexibility and a willingness to meet change with change. Experience is said to be the best teacher, and yet our experiences of the past may not necessarily provide clear indications of the path we must follow, or the steps we must take.

For example, we are just beginning to feel the impact of automation. Until now, our belief has been that technological advances create a sufficiency in new jobs, perhaps at some other area or level of production. By and large this was true when rapid restructuring was taking place in isolated segments of the economy, and where changes brought on price reductions or increases in quality naturally resulting in increased demand.

Today, however, we are facing technological change of a rapidity and scope never before encountered. Throughout the entire spectrum of our industry the effects of automation are being felt. Change is now moving in geometrical rather than arithmetical progression, and imaginatve and resourceful responses must be found. You, as informed and responsible citizens, will be called on to participate in the search for answers to these, and other questions. I am confident that your response will be one of intelligent inquiry and dedication in the building of a better America.

Yes, the role of the individual businessman in public affairs is a significant one. His primary obligations are those which square with the general responsibilities of all citizens, namely, those of keeping informed, participating in determinations on vital issues, and voting in elections at all levels of government.

Inasmuch as viable democracy depends on an informed electorate, the businessman should function as a source of information on matters which affect his livelihood and on which he is especially knowledgeable. The Congress and the executive branch need your reasoned counsel. Do not withhold it.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, Mar. 28, 1962]

CALLS FOR CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

(By Frank Makarewicz)

LOWELL.—Nearly 600 persons of all walks of life in the Greater Lowell community turned out to attend the 4th annual dinner of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Lowell at the Memorial Auditorium last night and to hear a U.S. Senator sound a call to citizen participation in government.

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, who is on the Senate Subcommittee on Labor, Employment, Welfare, and a Special Committee on Aging, warned his listeners that there must be a greater urgency to solve the growing unemployment problem in the country. He also warned of the serious consequences of a lack of interest in government by the people.

"We will not be driven into dictatorship, but we can drift into it," Senator RANDOLPH declared. Lack of a thorough understanding of government is a serious handicap, he said, because issues require compromise and conciliation often that must include ideas from a wide range of thought, not only from the extremes.

"The modern businessman is peculiarly well gifted to contribute to public affairs," he said. "He must be willing to commit himself beyond the confines of the immediate community, and cause his voice to be heard in the broader area of representative government. He must be an educated, informed, and sincere voice whose convictions are the product of study and thought."

Urging the public to accept a greater responsibility in giving counsel to its governmental representatives, the Senator said, "It is incumbent on individuals and professional and trade associations to express your convictions. It is vital that all legitimate interests be represented and all important opinions be expressed early in the legislative process."

"The national interest is composed of special interests," he said.

The speaker then discussed with emphasis, the growing and serious problem of unemployment. He said that while there were more people working today there was also greater unemployment, due in part to automation. Senator RANDOLPH predicted the situation would worsen unless steps were taken to find ways to accelerate the economy by creating new jobs.

"By 1975," he said, "our total work force will increase from its present level of approximately 75 million to a staggering 93 million, a growth which will be far more rapid than in any other 15-year period in our history."

He told his audience that they as business people will be called on to participate in the search for answers to the problems facing the country, and said that by being informed and by participating in the determinations of vital issues and voting in elections at all levels of government they will be assuming the responsibilities of citizenship.

The Senator was introduced by Lowell's Congressman F. BRADFORD MORSE who spoke of Senator RANDOLPH's many achievements in diversified careers. He noted that RANDOLPH had been a college professor, a dean, an industrial executive, and an editor and publisher as well as an author and had served as a Congressman from 1933 to 1947.

MORSE listed the many Senate committees and subcommittees RANDOLPH is working with and pointed out that he was the coauthor of the Randolph-Sheppard Act which established small business stands operated by the blind.

The program for the dinner opened at 7 p.m. with the playing of the national anthem and an invocation by Rt. Rev. Raymond L. Hyder, pastor of St. Margaret's Church.

Arthur C. Antonopoulos, who presided as toastmaster, introduced the guests at the head table, who included Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Tellier, Rev. and Mrs. Victor F. Scalise, Rt. Rev. Raymond L. Hyder, Mr. and Mrs. Donald A. Cook, Mr. and Mrs. Walter C. Wilson, Jr., Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Hickey, Mayor Joseph M. Downes, Mrs. Antonopoulos, Congressman MORSE and Senator RANDOLPH. Mr. and Mrs. Edward N. Lamson were unable to attend.

In addition to offering the official greetings of the city, Mayor Downes made a few remarks as the first speaker.

Thomas J. Hickey, retiring president of the chamber, who was introduced and praised by the dinner chairman as a distinguished leader of the community and the chamber, offered the president's report before turning over his gavel of office to the newly elected president of the organization, Walter C. Wilson, Jr.

In accepting the token, Wilson promised to continue efforts to bring to a fact Lowell's "Potential for Progress," the theme of the chamber's program. His remarks were followed by the presentation to the retiring president of a plaque for distinguished service. Besides the plaque presented to Hickey, two retiring board members, who were unable to be present, Matthew J. Brown and

Walter B. Reilly, Jr., were awarded certificates for their service to the organization and the community.

The next speaker who was introduced was Donald A. Cook, general manager of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Lowell. Cook praised the members and officers for their support and participation in the activities of the chamber which, he said, made progress possible.

Cook named, in special appreciation, the officers who include Edward N. Lamson, vice president, James P. Curran, vice president, Eugene Tellier, treasurer, and Arthur C. Antonopoulos, immediate past president. He also praised the members of the board of directors who include Sheppard Bartlett, of A. G. Pollard Co.; Matthew J. Brown, of Scott Jewelry Co.; Donald A. Caswell, of Bon Marche, Inc.; David F. Connors, of Lowell Sun Publishing Co.; James F. Conway, Jr., of the Courier-Citizen Co.; Albert P. Gaumont, of Gaumont Bros., Inc.; J. Russell Havey, of Educator Biscuit Co.; Dr. Brendan D. Leahey; Allan L. Levine, of Towers Motor Parts; Harry J. Patterson, of the Lowell Gas Co.; Walter B. Reilly, Jr., of the Courier-Citizen Co.; Daniel E. Walker, of the Union National Bank; Harold E. Wright, Sr., of Wright Trucking Co., as well as the retiring and the new president.

The general manager also singled out for praise Errington A. Brigham and Henry Gaumont who headed the retail division. He also presented to newly elected board members, Joseph Alyibrandi and Michael DeMoulas, and recognized the services of several committee chairmen who include John F. Gleason, Richard R. Flood, Robert H. Goldman, Dr. Costas Kokinos, Kenneth Harkins, Vincent P. Morton, Jr., Raymond E. Noiseux and Harold Hirsch who was not able to be present because of illness.

At the conclusion of Senator RANDOLPH's address, Rev. Victor F. Scalise, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church delivered the benediction to conclude the meeting.

Dinner committee chairmen included Edward F. O'Dea, attendance; David F. Connors, publicity; Joseph Sullivan, Jr., program; Hans H. Schliebus, banquet; John H. Gardiner, hall; James C. Shannon, Jr., decorations; Joseph M. McDonough and Cortlandt J. Burkinshaw, reception.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Romans 14: 19: *Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace.*

Almighty God, as we daily pray and labor for world peace, may we be eager to extend the overtures of friendship and good will to all freedom-loving nations who are now being drawn together by a common peril and common ideals.

Grant that we may see clearly that our thinking and acting in terms of all humanity and right relations between the members of the human family are matters of life and death for our world of today.

May we understand that the democracy which we are seeking to establish, and its freedom which we believe is inevitable for all mankind, is one that must be coordinated with discipline and a sense of interdependence, but above all one that has spiritual significance and is ruled by love for God and man.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution to make correction in the enrollment of S. 1035.

THE CONFUSING WORLDWIDE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I know of no program that is any more complex and confusing than the worldwide foreign aid program.

It is estimated that on June 30 there will be on hand, unexpended, but obligated, far in excess of $7 billion. This is sufficient to meet every legal obligation that we have outstanding to other nations with respect to foreign aid.

If the Congress, in its wisdom, refused to appropriate another dollar for the foreign aid program, remember, every purely legal obligation we have made will have been met, unless it is assumed that the Executive can obligate money without the prior approval of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the Gallup poll shows that 58 percent of the people approve foreign aid. The Passman poll shows that 98 percent of the people oppose foreign aid. What a contrast. Evidently Mr. Gallup had a carefully worded question that did not deal with the program as it really is.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1963.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: This is the ninth year it has been my privilege to provide you with a recapitulation of foreign aid funds available to the mutual security program. This report covers funds available for fiscal 1963 and covers only the amount of the aid program handled by the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations. Other types of foreign assistance are available under eight other statutes.

The amounts listed on the attached sheet have been verified. These funds are available for obligation and expenditure in the present fiscal year. Funds not disbursed during fiscal 1963 will remain available in either an obligated or reserved status, or as we often say, in the pipeline.

Is it really the desire of Congress to permit AID to continue pyramiding funds and fund programs years in advance of the actual expenditure? This practice accounts for the annual increase in unexpended funds. The certified information presented below indicates there is something wrong with the present system of pyramiding aid funds. Certainly the actual annual expenditures do not justify this practice.

The three brackets of figures cover (a) funds available covering 4 fiscal years—observe the annual increase, (b) actual expenditures for 3 years—fiscal 1963 not yet available, and (c) unexpended funds on hand at the end of the last 3 fiscal years—1963 not yet available:

(A) Total available for expenditure:	
1. Fiscal year 1960	$8,111,521,750
2. Fiscal year 1961	8,551,215,000
3. Fiscal year 1962	10,078,319,114
4. Fiscal year 1963	11,141,987,000
(B) Actual expenditures:	
1. Fiscal year 1960	3,265,400,000
2. Fiscal year 1961	3,276,600,000
3. Fiscal year 1962	3,198,100,000
(C) Unexpended funds:	
1. Unexpended funds June 30, 1960	$4,830,549,000
2. Unexpended funds June 30, 1961	5,975,397,000
3. Unexpended funds June 30, 1962	6,889,186,000

I hope the information contained in this letter and the attached sheet will be of some service to you. It is a pleasure to furnish you the information developed by the subcommittee of which I have the privilege to be chairman. Personally, I am concerned about the ever-increasing cost of this program.

Sincerely yours,

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Chairman, Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations.

(Enclosure.)

FOREIGN OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

OTTO E. PASSMAN, chairman

Foreign aid funds by program and amount (available for expenditure in fiscal 1963)

1. Military assistance:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	$2,784,637,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	1,325,000,000
New funds, other	39,985,000
Subtotal	4,149,622,000
2. Development loans:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	2,127,005,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	975,000,000
New funds, other	920,000
Subtotal	3,102,925,000
3. Development grants:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	430,252,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	225,000,000
Subtotal	655,252,000
4. Development grants, special programs: New funds, fiscal 1963	2,800,000
5. Surveys of investment opportunities: Unexpended, June 30, 1962	1,500,000
6. Investment guarantees:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	235,659,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	30,000,000
Subtotal	265,659,000
7. International organization and programs:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	79,009,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	148,900,000
Subtotal	227,909,000
8. Supporting assistance:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	452,374,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	395,000,000
Subtotal	847,374,000
9. Contingency fund:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	223,438,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	250,000,000
Subtotal	473,438,000
10. Alliance for Progress:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	519,445,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	525,000,000
Subtotal	1,044,445,000

Foreign aid funds by program and amount (available for expenditure in fiscal 1963)—Continued

11. Administrative expenses, AID:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	$11,233,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	49,500,000
New funds, other	8,383,000
Subtotal	69,116,000
12. Administrative expenses, State:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	87,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	2,700,000
Subtotal	2,787,000
13. Other: Unexpended, June 30, 1962	5,500,000
Subtotal, funds available for expenditure for foreign assistance program	10,848,327,000
14. Peace Corps:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	10,815,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	59,000,000
Subtotal	69,815,000
15. Ryukyu Islands:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	3,044,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	8,900,000
Subtotal	11,944,000
16. Cuban refugee program:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	2,687,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	70,110,000
Subtotal	72,797,000
17. Migrants and refugees:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	2,501,000
New funds, fiscal 1963	14,947,000
Subtotal	17,448,000
18. Inter-American Development Bank:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	(1)
New funds, fiscal 1963	60,000,000
Subtotal	60,000,000
19. International Development Association:	
Unexpended, June 30, 1962	(1)
New funds, fiscal 1963	61,656,000
Subtotal	61,656,000
Subtotal, funds available for other foreign assistance	293,660,000
Grand total, funds available for expenditure in fiscal year 1963	11,141,987,000

RECAPITULATION

1. Unexpended funds (from prior fiscal years), June 30, 1962	$6,889,186,000
2. New funds (appropriated), fiscal 1963	4,203,513,000
3. New funds (reimbursements, sales receipts, etc.), fiscal 1963	49,288,000
Total funds available for expenditure	11,141,987,000

[1] $513,500,000 unexpended funds for IDB and IDA not included in above totals.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1963.

To Whom It May Concern:

Gold holdings (free world countries):	
U.S. gold holdings on Dec. 31, 1952	$23,252,000,000
U.S. gold outflow to foreign countries, 1952 through 1962	−7,195,000,000
U.S. gold holdings on Dec. 31, 1962, reduced to	16,057,000,000
Gold holdings, other countries,[1] Dec. 31, 1952	13,028,000,000
Gold holdings, increase, other countries, 1952 through 1962	+11,630,000,000
Gold holdings, other countries, Dec. 31, 1962, increased to	24,658,000,000
U.S. dollars owned by foreign countries (free world):	
Foreign dollar holdings on Dec. 31, 1952	10,546,100,000
Increase in foreign dollar holdings, 1952 through 1962	+14,437,900,000
Foreign dollar holdings on Dec. 31, 1962, increased to	24,984,000,000
U.S. balance of payments position:	
1950 net deficit	−$1,912,000,000
1951 net deficit	−578,000,000
1952 net deficit	−1,100,000,000
1953 net deficit	−2,100,000,000
1954 net deficit	−1,500,000,000
1955 net deficit	−1,100,000,000
1956 net deficit	−1,000,000,000
1957 (only credit in 13 years)	+500,000,000
1958 net deficit	−3,400,000,000
1959 net deficit	−3,700,000,000
1960 net deficit	−3,800,000,000
1961 net deficit	−2,400,000,000
1962 net deficit	−2,200,000,000
U.S. deficit, 1950 through 1962, inclusive	−24,290,000,000
Gross public debts:	
U.S. public debt on Dec. 31, 1962	303,470,080,489
Other free world countries (latest available figures)	201,500,000,000
U.S. debt exceeds debts of other free world countries by	101,970,080,489
U.S. debt exceeds all other countries of world by	24,000,500,000

[1] Does not include Sino-Soviet bloc.

The above indicates clearly what the foreign aid program is doing to our gold reserves and our balance of payments position (trade).

Sincerely yours,

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Chairman, Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations.

SUNDAY TELEPHONE RATES SHOULD BE EXTENDED TO SATURDAYS AS WELL

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection?

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, at midnight tonight anyone will be able to place a telephone call to any part of the country, station to station, for the sum of $1 for the first 3 minutes. This is a very fine move. I would, however, suggest an additional step which should be taken. Now would be a good time to extend the evening and Sunday rates on telephone calls to Saturdays as well as Sundays. A great many businesses are closed on Saturdays and millions of people all over the country would benefit by this reduction of rates and the extension of the Sunday and evening rates to Saturdays.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that I may be able to generate some sentiment on Capitol Hill and throughout the country for this move.

ALLIANCE FOR VIOLENCE

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the House Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, of which I am chairman, issued a report on "Castro Communist Subversion in the Western Hemisphere."

In the March 30, 1963, edition of the Washington Evening Star there appeared the following editorial on the subcommittee's hearings and report:

ALLIANCE FOR VIOLENCE

In its excellent report on Fidel Castro's captive Cuba, the House Subcommitee on Inter-American Affairs has made a number of somber points about how Moscow and Havana are organizing an alliance for violence against the free Americas. One of the most significant of the report's observations is the following:

"Communist Cuba's dependence on the Soviet Union is complete. The Castro Communist movement, although claiming to represent indigenous Latin American interests and aspirations, is in fact controlled and operated by trained professional agents from the Soviet bloc. The Soviet Union must be held accountable for * * * subversive aggression in the Americas. * * *

"Castro communism is the instrument of Soviet aspirations for the Americas. Thus subversive aggression emanating from Cuba is Soviet directed and represents (in the words of CIA Director McCone) a 'far more sophisticated, more covert, and more deadly' effort than the hastily organized and ill-conceived raids conducted by the Castroites during the early months of the regime.

"International Soviet agents, experts in the field of revolutionary propaganda, terrorist tactics, and guerrilla warfare, are operating schools for violence in Cuba, training and indoctrinating Latin American subversives. The Soviet Union as well as its Cuban puppet regime must bear the responsibility and consequences for subversive attacks on nations of the Western Hemisphere."

This is but one of the many sobering findings of the House subcommittee. The report of the group—a unanimous one, which is relatively rare—is greatly oversimplified in these paragraphs. The full text well deserves the attention and study not only of the Kremlin but of every American, including the President, interested in hemispheric security and the alliance for violence against it.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. David Lawrence, in his syndicated column of March 19, 1963, also commented on the subcommittee's report.

Mr. Lawrence's column follows:

[From the Washington, (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 19, 1963]

CONGRESSIONAL PLAN TO STALL REDS—REALISTIC VIEW OF HEMISPHERIC THREAT SEEN IN HOUSE GROUP'S ACTION PROPOSAL

(By David Lawrence)

Members of Congress of both parties have for months expressed serious concern over the possibility of open military aggression by Communist forces against the nations of this hemisphere. A realistic appraisal of the present situation and a recommendation as to what should be done have just come in a unanimous report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. All nine members of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs—both Republicans and Democrats—signed the report.

The committee findings are that, even though the Castro Communist forces in Cuba are incapable without outside assistance of successfully mounting an offensive blow, this "does not minimize the Communist threat to inter-American security." The committee then says bluntly that "no plan for collective action against Communist subversive aggression has been put into effect" by the countries of the hemisphere.

The report points out that, because no clear and unified hemispheric policy dealing with the Castro Communist subversive aggression has been developed, some of the members of the Organization of American States "have not devised effective internal methods of controlling subversive traffic in and through their territories."

It is asserted emphatically that Cuba's dependence on the Soviet Union is complete and that the regime "is in fact controlled and operated by trained professional agents from the Soviet bloc." The House subcommittee report states flatly that "the Soviet Union must be held accountable for such subversive aggression in the Americas."

It adds that the "violent overthrow of existing governments remains the unified aim of Communist forces in Latin America," which include both the "Soviet and Chinese branches of international communism."

But what to do about it? The subcommittee makes four principal recommendations, as follows:

"1. In accord with the joint resolution of Congress, October 3, 1962, section (A), immediate steps should be taken by the United States 'to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of the hemisphere.'

"2. The United States should be prepared to act with military force, if needed, in response to the request for help and assistance of any nation of the hemisphere in danger of being overthrown by Castro Communist subversive aggression. This recommendation is in no way to be considered as a substitute for or a bar to unilateral action by the United States in defense of its own security.

"3. Every effort must be made by the United States to assure collective action by the Organization of American States, and by OAS member states individually, toward the curbing of Castro Communist subversive activities and traffic in the hemisphere.

"4. The United States should seek the complete diplomatic and economic quarantine of Communist Cuba by other nations of the hemisphere."

Recommendations of a House committee are influential but do not necessarily mean concurrence by the executive branch of the Government. But it is significant that Members of Congress are setting forth explicity what they think should be done in Latin America. They have, in fact, stated in much more vigorous terms what American policy should be than has either the White House or the State Department.

The report shows a sympathetic attitude by the committee's members toward economic aid for Latin America, but it is clear they feel that this will not solve the problems of the hemisphere unless stern measures are taken to eliminate the threat of Cuban-based subversive aggression.

There are indications that the Latin-American governments themselves are under heavy internal pressure from radical groups, some of which are not unsympathetic to the Communists, and that this is complicating the whole problem of collective action in the hemisphere. The Soviets have spent hundreds of millions of dollars not only to supply funds, guidance, and technical assistance to train guerrillas and terrorists brought into Cuba from throughout Latin America, but to infiltrate organizations in various countries. They are leaving no stone unturned to gain a political following inside the countries of the hemisphere. Many organizations are infiltrated by Communists, and the majority of the members are not aware of this underground activity.

The whole Latin-American problem is becoming more and more complicated, largely because the United States has not acted decisively and forcefully in dealing with the Communist base established under the Castro regime in Cuba.

POLICY OF INACTION AGAINST CUBA

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased, indeed, to note that one of America's most respected journalists, Mr. David Lawrence, has come to the defense of the Cuban exiles, who are attempting to regain their homeland and rid that island, just 90 miles from our shores, of the Communist menace. As you all know, these efforts are now being thwarted by the latest action of the administration and Great Britain by the enforcement of a blockade around that Communist-infested island, and, which for all practical purposes, would seem to be a protective measure for the welfare of Castro.

I want all of my colleagues to have the benefit of Mr. Lawrence's sound judgment in this matter, and for this reason, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his article entitled "Policy of Inaction Against Cuba," which appeared in the April 2 edition of the Evening Star:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 2, 1963]

POLICY OF INACTION AGAINST CUBA—U.S. EFFORTS AGAINST ANTI-CASTRO ATTACKS DESCRIBED AS RESULT OF CONFUSION

(By David Lawrence)

Confusion, if not frustration, today characterizes the policy of the administration toward Cuba.

Nearly 2 weeks have passed since President Kennedy told a news conference that the Soviet Government had withdrawn only 3,000 troops out of the 17,000 stationed on Cuban soil. He then added:

"We are waiting to see whether more will be withdrawn, as we would hope they would be. The month of March is not finished yet, and we should have a clearer idea as to what the total numbers should be in the coming days."

The month of March has passed, but the "clearer idea" has still not materialized. The only action that has been taken by the administration is a sharp warning—not directed to the Russian Government—but to the poor Cubans who have bravely attempted to raid ports and start guerrilla action such as Fidel Castro himself employed when he fought his way into power.

It seems to be regarded as legitimate for the United States to encourage and assist in guerrilla-type warfare in South Vietnam against Communists there, but somehow the effort by the Cuban patriots to rescue their own country by similar tactics is frowned upon officially in formal announcements from the Department of State and the Department of Justice. Neutrality laws are cited as standing in the way. It is announced that such laws will be enforced by the arrest of those Cuban patriots who attempt to launch from American territory any expeditions to wrest their homeland from Mr. Castro and the Soviet troops.

Contradiction after contradiction, moreover, has emerged to becloud the statements issued by the U.S. Government. To take refuge in the neutrality laws seems to be in conflict with the following declaration on March 12 by Secretary of State Dean Rusk:

"Then we have felt, along with many others of our allies, that the kind of Cuban regime that we have today not only is not fit to participate as a regime in the activities of the inter-American system, but that with its declaration of subversive and other types of war upon the hemisphere, it is not entitled to normal economic or other relations with the free world."

The neutrality laws were plainly designed to apply to expeditions started on U.S. territory against countries with which the United States maintains friendly and normal relations. But a state of war now exists, for all practical purposes, between Cuba and the United States. Also, a blockade was undertaken last autumn, and foreign ships were intercepted by the U.S. Navy. In recent weeks Soviet-built Mig's, flying from Cuba, have attacked unarmed American ships.

In the last several months, moreover, a hostile military operation, involving the erection of bases equipped with missiles as well as bomber planes, had been carried on inside the territory of Cuba. This was aimed at the United States. One wonders what more proof the Government here needs that any steps taken by this country to protect itself are proper under international law and that so-called neutrality laws do not apply in the present circumstances to Cuba.

Actually, the constant use of air surveillance by the United States over Cuba territory is not really in line with the customary interpretation of the concept of neutrality. The continuous presure by the Government here upon other governments to boycott all trade with Cuba is also hardly neutral.

Secretary Rusk, in his March 12 speech, said:

"Now, we are discovering with regard to Cuba that, having failed to take the steps that might have prevented in years past the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, that the problem of finding a cure is more difficult."

The foregoing might well be paraphrased and applied today as the administration, instead of finding a cure, permits the Soviets to strengthen their hold inside Cuba. It has even enlisted the help of Great Britain's Navy to keep Cuban patriots from attempting to regain their homeland.

Mr. Rusk also said in his speech that "the presence of Soviet forces in this hemisphere cannot be accepted as a part of the normal situation in this hemisphere."

But the Soviets not only have been infiltrating Guatemala and Brazil, but they are still maintaining a military force in Cuba, less than a hundred miles away from the coast of this country.

Senator STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Subcommitee on Military Affairs, said in a speech the other day that, "without positive action on our part, our neighbors to the south may fall one by one until the entire hemisphere is lost to us." He added that he was convinced that "the Cuban situation is the most immediate, pressing, and important problem facing our Nation today."

Yet the administration is using its influence to discourage a counterrevolutionary movement against the Castro regime, which deliberately invited the Soviet government to send troops and build missile bases in Cuba. How can the United States justify a policy of inaction against the Havana regime and invoke neutrality laws against the only individuals who wish to risk their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to overthrow a tyrannical dictatorship?

BACK-DOOR FINANCING

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, about a week ago we learned the Democratic leadership was conducting a secret poll to see if its majority membership would support the action of the House Banking and Currency Committee in reporting out a bill authorizing a $2 billion increase in lending authorization for the Export-Import Bank with such increase to be financed on a back-door financing basis.

I commend to the attention of the Democratic leadership another poll, an open poll, taken yesterday on the floor of the Senate on the question of back-door financing. The newspaper report in the April 2 Evening Star, over a three-column headline, reports "Transit Bill Is Stripped of Back-Door Financing." The article reports the Senate yesterday, by unanimous action, struck out the back-door financing provision in the reported mass transit bill and substituted therefor the financing of the program under the regular appropriation process. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this should make clear to the Democratic leadership on this side that back-door financing is a "dead duck" in programs to be considered by this Congress.

When the Export-Import Bank bill was considered by our committee in executive session I offered an amendment to place the additional $2 billion of lending authority under an appropriation process similar to that adopted by the House last year with respect to the $2 billion increase in authorization for the International Monetary Fund. This amendment was defeated on a straight party vote and the bill was reported with the financing on a back-door basis.

When the Export-Import Bank bill is brought to the floor of the House I shall again offer my amendment to knock out the back-door financing for the increased authorization and subject it to the regular appropriation process. I full well realize, Mr. Speaker, that I may be denied the opportunity of offering this amendment purely because under parliamentary procedure a member of the majority may be recognized to offer the amendment. However that may be, I predict that when the House acts on the Export-Import Bank bill an overwhelming majority of this body will vote to strike the back-door financing provision from the bill and substitute in lieu thereof the language of my amendment, which is the Republican position, to place the financing of the increased lending authorization under the regular appropriation process.

DEMOCRATIC BUGABOOS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, Monday was April Fools' Day, but to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning, one might think Halloween somehow had already arrived on April 2.

Certainly the Democrat leader on the other side of the aisle paraded the weirdest assortment of ghosts, goblins, and horror stories within my memory.

The purpose was obvious: to scare the daylights out of the country with trumped-up threats of what will happen if we in the Congress are successful in bringing some semblance of sanity into the Kennedy administration's spending proposals.

Fortunately, there was no more substance to this witch's brew of speculation on what we have in mind in the way of budget cuts than there is in a spook.

And I might add that the timing for this presentation was just about as far off as Halloween itself.

This body had just demonstrated that our position on budget cutting is sound and responsible by chopping something in the neighborhood of $100 million from the budget of the Department of Interior and related agencies. This figure substantially vindicated the Republican task force projection of this bill, the first we have considered in the current session.

Moreover, President Kennedy had just sent the Congress a message on foreign assistance in which he backed down $400 million from his original proposal.

I cannot help but wonder what terrifying results our friends on the other side imagine the President's reduction in this program may have on our economy and our foreign relations.

Or does it make a difference just who suggests economy?

Let me again assure my colleagues from the other side of the aisle: We are not going to be frightened off by bugaboos—and I do not think the American people are going to panic, either.

Quite obviously, the administration has been getting a taste of unfavorable public reaction to the idea of planned deficit spending and is responding with some moves of its own in the direction of economy.

This we applaud as at least a step—however reluctantly it may be taken—in the right direction.

As Republicans we do not care who cuts down on excessive spending, just so it is cut.

Meanwhile, we intend to stick by our guns and fight, item by item, for appropriations levels that meet the needs of our economy and our military security and against appropriations levels for which no real justification can be established.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. May I ask my friend if he will not please take the Members of the House and the American people into his confidence and tell them just where these $15 billion in cuts can be made?

Mr. HALLECK. In due time you will find out. Our projection on the first proposals we had for reduction in the Interior Department appropriation was a little over $100 million. That projection was proved substantially correct, and I hope it will be proved correct as we go along.

I cannot quite understand the concern of my very beloved friend, the majority leader, who, with a 3-to-2 majority, is so concerned about what we in the minority are going to do in respect to saving money, but we have kept this on a bipartisan basis and we want it kept that way. I must say that, from reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning, the folks downtown must have been working nights conjuring up some of those hair-raising yarns.

Mr. ALBERT. Does not the gentleman think the American people ought to know and want to know what kind of operation my friends are going to try to perform on the budget?

Mr. HALLECK. We have said we are going to do our best to cut this budget. We obviously cannot do it unless we get some help from the gentleman's side of the aisle, but I am inclined to believe that a lot of people around here, including some folks downtown, are hearing from the country. Beyond that, as I say, we will be responsible in our efforts. I just hope that the people of the country reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning, where you have listed the projects that will be gone and the jobs that will be lost and the contractors who will be thus affected—I trust these readers realize that you have already projected these things to come, so we will just go along and prove that projection was far wide of the mark.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. May I say to the gentleman from Indiana that the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], has estimated that our committee has reduced the new obligational authority by some $10 billion. Our committee is not putting out the exact figures on the House Appropriation bills in advance. Those committee reports will be released after action by the House Appropriations Committee. I think it would not be wise even for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to release item by item his breakdown before the committee actually takes action. I would hope that the gentleman from Indiana would not release any information until the House Appropriations Committee has had an opportunity to act on each individual bill in executive session.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, that was indicated by the chairman of the task force sometime ago.

Mr. ALBERT. May I ask the gentleman one more question: Does not the gentleman feel that the American people are entitled to have the gentleman take them into his confidence?

Mr. HALLECK. I happen to believe that the American people have a little confidence in their Representatives. The people out in the Second District of Indiana have indicated they have. I would certainly hope the people have some confidence in the Congress of the

United States as holder of the purse strings of the Nation as to how we go about achieving the end that I think is desirable, the consideration of our business. I do not think there is any lack of confidence on the part of the American people. I know why hearings of the Appropriations Committee are held in executive session, and they do not have people in there to hear the testimony. They do not have them in there as they are marking up the bills. The gentleman from Oklahoma knows as well as I do why that is, and I do not need to draw any blueprint.

COURTBOUILLON A LA U.N.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I mentioned to the House at its last meeting that U.S. officials are anxious to pay the U.N. again this summer—for more aid from that Chinese "piscatorial-paddy" expert.

I am glad to report there are some Americans who do not think that will be necessary, and I invite your attention to an editorial in the Shreveport, La., Times of March 25, 1963.

Now, these good folk of Caddo Parish consider that they know a little something about fish in their ricefields—they have had fish there for years. They seem to doubt that the U.N.'s Chinese expert can make their fish any happier than they already are.

But, they do suggest that they can teach the U.N. a thing or two about getting some good edible use out of the fish.

I commend this witty but pithy editorial to my colleagues attention; and under unanimous consent, I include it at this point in the Record.

Our Own U.N. Project

There's a story going around that a Congressman, angered by U.N. grants to Cuba, wanted to know why the United States was never eligible for aid. He was told very gravely by the U.N. that we are and that there's an actual U.N. project underway in this country.

It turned out to be a lone Chinese (this is no joke) who somewhere in this broad land is teaching someone how to grow fish in rice paddies. The search has been narrowed down to Louisiana, and the Congressman is asking mystery lovers please to spot this (presumably non-Red) Chinese and find out where his project is and how it's coming.

Whether or not this U.N. emissary really has got to Louisiana or does intend ultimately to come, we have news for him: We already know how to grow fish in our rice fields. We don't call them paddies, though—probably because Irish are scarce in the rice-growing areas—but come to think of it they aren't called pierres either; so maybe race hasn't anything to do with it.

But, anyway, about those fish: Louisiana rice fields are full of carp and buffalo after the fields are flooded. It happens in this wise: The fields are flooded from canals which are equipped with floodgates. The canals themselves draw their water from the bayous. The bayous abound in fish. When the floodgates are opened, the canal water comes into the fields bringing the fish with it.

In the shallow water, the scales of the buffalo and carp sometimes turn red. It's a pretty sight, but carp and buffalo are coarse fish and are good only for a Cajun delicacy called courtbouillon (meaning short soup, probably because it's short on meat).

We are willing to admit that carp came originally from China, which they did, and we suppose they came here via England which used to have a rhyme saying, "Carp, turkeys, and beer came into England all in a year." That was sometime in the 17th century.

Since we already know how to grow fish in our rice fields, we think it only fair that some sort of grant be made to enable a Cajun or two to show this Chinese when he shows up how to make courtbouillon. Even if we sold the recipe for $5, we'd be getting something back for all those U.N. grants that other countries are getting out of U.S. money.

FOREIGN AID AND THE CLAY REPORT

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, foreign aid, the huge temporary program which has ballooned into a tremendous and seemingly permanent burden for the American people, is in the center of the Washington stage with the publication of the Clay Committee report. The unbiased look at the huge program, requested by the President, will be discussed for some time. Its conclusions that the $100 billion program has been wasteful and often lacking in focus and direction confirms what, I believe, a vast majority of the American people have thought for some years.

Clearly, a program geared to real objectives of mutual security for the free world is not the root of the argument. Spendthrift schemes sprawling all over the world costing billions are the issue. There is a limit to pure generosity which adds little or nothing to our national interests or to the fight against Communist penetration, and there have been too many instances of this kind of operations. The Clay report is not binding upon the aid program. However, its conclusions that "we are indeed attempting too much for too many"; that "a higher quality and reduced quantity of our diffuse aid effort in certain countries could accomplish more"; and we cannot believe "that our national interest is served by indefinitely continuing commitments at the present rate to the 95 countries which are now receiving our economic and/or military aid" have long needed to be said forcefully in our high councils of government. Congress will surely take its most stern look in many years at this program, and this look will be overdue and by popular demand.

The Clay Committee report reserves special comment for Indonesia, saying:

We do not see how external assistance can be granted to this nation by free world countries unless it puts its internal house in order, provides fair treatment to foreign creditors and enterprises, and refrains from international adventures.

This is a good example of a situation where we have poured in scores of millions of dollars with very questionable results. Following a zigzag course promising little stability in the battle against Communist expansion in southeast Asia, Indonesia's leadership takes on the look of an international troublemaker. In 1958, when Western nations refused to provide military equipment, the Indonesians wandered off to Moscow, which set up a crash program to furnish naval equipment, jet fighters, and the most modern arms. The obvious purpose was to build a war machine so that Indonesia could bully its way into Dutch New Guinea. By last summer, a thousand Soviet military technicians were on hand to instruct in the use of the billion dollars worth of military equipment. With the New Guinea campaign over and essentially won, Indonesia seems to find territory in Borneo intended to be part of the new country of Malaysia very attractive. For several months it has been threatening to send "volunteers" into this territory to keep it from becoming part of Malaysia.

In view of these events, and the official support our Government has given to the formation of Malaysia, it was a shock to read an Army press release that Indonesian officers had been invited to observe "Operation Water Moccasin," our big military maneuver in Georgia several weeks ago testing the latest in guerrilla warfare tactics and operations. Why the Indonesians were invited in the first place I am now trying to find out, but there is no doubt that this instruction in advanced jungle warfare could add up to real trouble if the Indonesians decide on new military adventures to put their Soviet-made weapons to work against their neighbors.

The activities of the Indonesian Government are receiving well-deserved attention for its efforts to obtain aid from both sides in the cold war. The Daily Independent of Kannapolis, N.C., commented on this situation recently and I wish to recommend to the Congress the following thoughtful editorial which appeared in the newspaper on March 13, 1963:

Beggars Don't Rate Cadillacs

Do you know of any banks or loan agencies that would lend $5,000 to an individual for the purchase of an automobile if that individual's family were short of food and clothing and he was already in debt up to his ears?

If there is such a bank or loan company, it is a pretty safe bet that it will not be in business long. Yet, one of the nations to which the United States is lending money is in a condition comparable to a tattered beggar buying a Cadillac.

Indonesia, short of food and clothing, is buying three luxury jet airliners for its profitless passenger service. The cost will be $3 million more than the $17 million it is borrowing from the United States to shore up its crippled economy. At the same time it is threatening American oil companies with confiscation of their properties. And Indonesians in this country are discussing with the International Monetary Fund a

stabilization program to ease their nation's staggering foreign debt.

Under President Sukarno, Indonesia is showing a remarkable knack for living in the best of two worlds. She has managed to become a client of both the Soviet Union and the United States. A cold war neutral, Indonesia has built up an army of 400,000 men. After much musclefiexing, Indonesia, with U.S. aid negotiated a United Nations agreement last year to gain control of West New Guinea. Sukarno now is threatening the British scheme for a Malaysia Federation, but it is not believed that he's about to risk a military showdown with a major power.

Bung Karno, as he likes to be called—the "Bung" is for brother—has used the army to distract popular attention from gnawing poverty and, in west Java, actual starvation. In his flight from fiscal reality the Indonesian President has indulged in other costly toys, including a $40 million stadium for the Asian games in Jakarta last August.

Indonesia is in hock to the Soviet Union for about $1 billion, of which more than half was spent for military equipment. Aside from the new loan agreement, U.S. aid since 1949 comes to about $773 million, about $402 million of this in loans.

The Indonesian economy has deteriorated steadily since the Dutch left in 1949, as the Dutch and almost everybody else except the featherbrained striped pants wearers in the U.S. State Department predicted it would. Exports last year were off about 15 percent from 1961. Of the $570 million total, $90 million came from three Western oil companies that Indonesia is now threatening to confiscate.

If she does, the United States might treat her pretty rough—by our State Department standards. Section 620 of last year's Foreign Assistance Act says that recipients of U.S. foreign aid have only 6 months after expropriating American private property to take "appropriate steps" to compensate the owners or face loss of aid funds.

Real tough, isn't it?

This seems like another example of the cross-purposes that are so familiar in Washington—the kind we have also seen in the two-price cotton program—where one policy contradicts another. The contradictions abound often in details. Another could be seen in our allowing top officers of the Yugoslav Army to attend the Army's crack Command and General Staff School at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. Still another is the permission we have granted for several millions of dollars worth of heavy industrial equipment to go to Yugoslavia at the same time the Yugoslavians are furnishing strategic goods to Russia. As in the case of foreign aid, there is much tightening of projects and policies to be done in this colossus on the Potomac.

KATYN FOREST ATROCITY

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is at this time of the year that we remember with great sorrow the infamous blood bath of Katyn Forest. As I have on numerous occasions, I again remind this House that this is one of the most atrocious examples of Communist bestiality. I am revolted, Mr. Speaker, whenever I think about this tragic occurrence to the Polish people. You will remember that 10,000 Polish officers were murdered at Katyn Forest, and I repeat that this ranks with some of the world's worst atrocities. It was a frightening example of "man's inhumanity to man." I think it is fitting at this time that we pause and pay tribute to these Polish officers. We should keep before us at all times the memory of these men and remember how vicious the Communist cancer can be. Let us also never forget that we cannot, indeed must not, ever allow a similar occurrence.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION SHOULD NOT BE CUT

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I first learned of the proposed appropriation for the Post Office Department. I must say I am gravely concerned. The appropriation was cut some $91 million from the Department budget, and $69 million of that cut is in operations. I think all of my colleagues should know that this is a really grave problem for every one of us. It is not the Post Office Department that determines the program of the Post Office and it is not the Congress that determines the program. The program is determined by the citizens of the United States—the people who use the mails. The business people and the housewives and all others who use the mails are the ones who determine the program of the Post Office Department. They determine the volume of the mail. The entire population of the country and the business of the country determine the program of the Post Office Department.

Sixty-nine million dollars in operations applies to personnel—to postal clerks, to letter carriers, letter carriers who by law are not to carry more than 35 pounds of mail at any one time. Therefore, there will not be enough postal clerks and letter carriers to go around, to handle and to deliver the mail in the manner, and to give the service that the people have come to enjoy and to expect of our Post Office Establishment. I want to give notice now, Mr. Speaker, that tomorrow there are several of us who are going to sponsor amendments to the proposed appropriation of the Post Office Department and we are going to attempt in every way that we can to bring to you the facts so that you, too, will join with us and restore these cuts.

NEW YORK—THE NATION'S NO. 2 DAIRY STATE—AGREES ON A 1963 DAIRY LEGISLATIVE PACKAGE PROGRAM

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, Congress probably will enact dairy legislation this year. The President has requested it in his farm message, and the Agriculture Committees of both the House and the Senate have begun hearings on several bills pending before them.

As a Congressman from New York, in fact as the one member of our delegation who, so I have been advised, has the honor to represent more New York dairy farmers than anyone else, I have been deeply concerned that any dairy legislation we enact here this year should certainly be tailored to the needs and wishes of our New York State dairymen.

After all, Mr. Speaker, New York State is the second largest dairy State in the entire Nation, and our delegation in Congress—41 Representatives and 2 Senators—is the largest single bloc in the Congress.

Surely we New Yorkers have every right to be heard. And yet, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we have not always had an impact in the shaping of Federal dairy legislation commensurate with our position. Perhaps part of this is because New York is not usually regarded as an agricultural center, but rather as an urban and an industrial area. And perhaps it is also partly because our dairy farmers and our dairy farm organizations in New York State have all too rarely agreed on their own approach to national legislation. When New York's dairy voice was divided the trumpet gave forth an uncertain sound, and hence New York's impact on Federal dairy legislation was correspondingly diminished.

Why only the other day, Mr. Speaker, when I was testifying before the Committee on Agriculture of the other body, the distinguished chairman of that committee reasserted his conviction that New York State farmers could not get together on Federal dairy legislation and he indicated that the committee would therefore have to go ahead with its deliberations without much regard for New York State.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to advise the House today that this kind of division and disagreement on Federal dairy legislation among New York State dairy farmers is no longer the order of the day. Last Friday afternoon in Syracuse I met with leaders of seven major dairy cooperatives and farm organizations in New York State in an effort to see whether we could in fact work out some area of real agreement on dairy legislation. And I am happy to advise this House that as a result of that meeting five of these seven organizations—including three of the four major dairy cooperatives in New York—reached a very substantial measure of agreement on a dairy package legislative program.

This package—which can now expect support as legislation reflecting the wishes and interests of New York State dairy farmers—includes, first, legislation to create a so-called two-price plan for milk, such as is contained in H.R. 3552, introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], **H.R. 963, by the gentleman** from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND], and in the other body, S. **900**, by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and S. 953, by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

The second part of this package is H.R. 4745, which I had the honor to introduce in this House the other day, an emergency milk surplus reduction bill under which dairy farmers would receive incentive payments for reducing their milk production below their 1962 figures. This bill would be a purely temporary measure, lasting for a year, and, as envisioned by the Syracuse agreement, would provide a transition from the present situation to the actual operation of the new two-price plan arrangement.

Together these two bills, therefore, do meet the needs and wishes of an overwhelming majority of our New York State dairy farmers. So if our great delegation in this Congress is to serve these farmers it would seem to be our job to support this package program actively in both the House and the Senate.

After all, we in New York are still the largest single bloc in Congress. If we vote and work together we can certainly guarantee that New York interests will no longer be ignored when a 1963 dairy bill is considered. For years it has been generally assumed here in Washington that New York State's interests in connection with farm legislation could be safely ignored simply because of the popular myth that New York State farmers and farm groups could never agree on any specific legislative proposals. Accordingly, when it came to dairy legislation, New York State, although the Nation's second greatest dairy State, has let the leadership go elsewhere simply by default.

Now as a result of the remarkable measure of agreement we achieved in Syracuse last Friday, this particular myth has been knocked into a cocked hat. When their interests and indeed their very survival is at stake New York dairymen can and will pull together. Now it is up to us who have the honor to represent these dairymen in the House and the Senate to see that their wishes are vigorously and effectively pushed in this Congress.

Within the near future, Mr. Speaker, I propose to invite these New York State farm leaders to come to Washington to meet with our full delegation. In this way the agreement which we reached last Friday in Syracuse can be passed along to each Member of the House and Senate from New York.

And to this meeting, Mr. Speaker, I also propose to invite Members of this body and of the other body who represent States or districts which include dairy farmers who regularly sell their milk in the New York milkshed area—which would mean chiefly New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Their interests, within this common milkshed, would seem to parallel ours in New York State.

Mr. Speaker, this Syracuse dairy agreement represents, in my judgment, a significant milestone in our New York State dairy history. The myth that New York State dairy farmers can never get together on Federal dairy legislation has now been effectively shattered. Our great State of New York, as the Nation's second greatest dairy State, will from here out most certainly be heard and listened to in the development of any future national dairy legislation.

Enactment of this New York State package dairy program by this Congress this year will ease the plight of our New York dairy farmers and will open up the opportunity for a stable and more equitable income for them. This must be our goal, and in its pursuit New Yorkers can no longer lag behind or let the leadership slip by default into other hands. We must lead the fight ourselves in these legislative halls, working effectively together without regard for partisan lines.

THE COLD WAR AND CHILDREN

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that Dr. Benjamin Spock, upon whose advice many of our Nation's children have been raised, has written a vitally important article entitled "The Cold War and Children." The article incisively discusses the effects of nuclear testing on the physical health of our children and the effect of the cold war on the mental health of our children. Dr. Spock, professor of child development at Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, has devoted a great deal of study to the impact of our military situation on child development. It is encouraging to see such an illustrious member of the medical profession actively concerned with the pressing problems of peace. It is hoped that his example will be followed by many others in the medical and other professions. I highly recommend the following article to all my colleagues:

THE COLD WAR AND CHILDREN

(By Benjamin Spock, M.D.)

Two aspects of the cold war are having a harmful effect on our children, one physical, the other emotional.

The testing of nuclear weapons creates about two dozen radioactive substances which fall from the air, contaminating the foods we eat and subjecting us—particularly our children—to what is called low level radiation. No one knows for sure how dangerous it is. We know definitely that high level radiation such as was produced by excessive X-raying in former times has fairly frequently produced cancer of the skin and thyroid, for instance, and has caused babies to be born with physical abnormalities or mental deficiency. At these high levels there is a direct relationship between the dosage of radiation and the percentage of those people exposed to it who will be harmed. So we have to assume that low levels will cause damage to at least small percentages of those exposed. But all the estimates of danger from low level radiation are derived by arithmetic from the results of high level radiation. Three substances often discussed are strontium 90, carbon 14, iodine 131.

Strontium 90 is deposited in the actively growing areas in bones, just as calcium is, so it will be much more concentrated in these particular areas in babies and children than it would be in adults. Here the radiation will persist actively for life. In mice high level radiation causes bone cancer and also leukemia, a disease which starts in the bone marrow. So there is the danger that a sufficient accumulation of low level radiation will cause these diseases in some susceptible children.

Carbon 14 is one of the radioactive materials that is distributed evenly through the body. So it may, in sufficient concentration, cause harmful mutations (changes) in germ cells in the testicles and ovaries. When a sperm and an ovum with similar mutations combine, an abnormality is produced. It may be an insignificant one or it may be a serious physical or mental defect. It may be sufficient to cause the death of the embryo or the newborn baby. So we must go on the assumption that abnormalities will appear in some of the children of the children who are being exposed to fallout.

Iodine 131 is concentrated in the thyroid gland, particularly in babies and children. High level radiation of the thyroid may cause cancer so it is believed that low levels can be dangerous to at least a small percentage of those sufficiently exposed. Iodine 131 loses its radioactivity in a few weeks. But in periods of frequent nuclear testing such as 1961–62 it reached concentration in cows' milk—for several months at a time in parts of the Midwest—which the Federal Radiation Council had previously designated as calling for control measures. Unfortunately the Council had established no national system of countermeasures, and quibbled about the need for them in 1961–62.

What kind of estimates have been made about the damage from fallout? A United Nations Scientific Committee in 1958 calculated, for example, that if tests were continued for a prolonged period they would eventually be producing somewhere between 5,000 and 60,000 cases of leukemia per year around the world. A U.S. Atomic Energy Commission report estimated the total future effects from carbon 14 from the tests carried out before 1958 as 100,000 serious birth defects and the death of a million embryos and newborn babies. Those who believe that continued testing is justified for national defense can point out that these figures are not large compared to worldwide deaths from other diseases. But these cases will be tragedies in the families in which they occur. A test ban treaty would prevent a further increase in these numbers.

Several recent studies have shown that many of our children have become anxious about the cold war—between a quarter and a half of them, depending on age and other factors. The younger ones worry about poisoning by fallout, about being separated from their parents in a disaster, about the death or injury of members of their families. Adolescents speak with some bitterness about the possibility there will be no future for them or that they may give birth to deformed children. Some of them ask what is the use of studying hard. Perhaps more unhealthy in the long run is the development of exaggerated suspiciousness. A group of fifth graders, for instance, were looking at pictures of the Russian countryside, one of which showed a tree-lined road. A child ask what the trees were for and two other children immediately suggested, "So that people won't know what's going on beyond the road" and "It's to make work for the prisoners."

In the past we Americans have thought of ourselves as indomitable. With the help of great natural resources and a population drawn from all over the globe we built the strongest and more resourceful nation. Our influence on the rest of the world steadily increased up through World War II and the rehabilitation of Western Europe with the Marshall plan. But in recent years we have run into a series of conflicts with the Soviet Union in which we had to be satisfied with stalemates. We have reacted in an unhealthy way to these setbacks. Instead of calmly pursuing a course that would advance our own long-term interests many of us have become obsessed with the fear of what the Communists would do to us.

In past generations we have imbued our children with optimism. We have brought them up with the conviction that they could cope with almost any problem that confronted them; consequently they have usually been able to do so. We have encouraged them to trust people and to trust their ability to deal with people; as a result, they've impressed the world with their self-assurance and their friendliness.

But to the degree that we adults succumb to passive attitudes of fearfulness and suspicion we pass these on to our children, in whom they become accentuated in the process of growing up. When children learn to be afraid of other people it impairs their own personalities. This is why intelligent parents no longer try to control a child with a fear of bogeymen or policemen. If an older youth is taught that members of another ethnic or religious group might get the better of him—scholastically or occupationally or physically—it will impair his ability to make his own way, even if he thinks he's superior to the other group.

If we bring up our children half convinced that the Communists are going to outwit them, or outstrip them, or bomb them, this will seriously impair their future resourcefulness and self-confidence as adults. Furthermore, an unstable future leader will be able to push them into war or to arouse in them a wholesale suspicion of fellow Americans far more disastrous than what occurred during the McCarthy period.

In order to raise our children with a healthy attitude toward the world I think we must offer them at least the hope of something beyond an endless balance of terror. One solution would be progressive nuclear disarmament, starting with a test ban. We see how difficult it is for East and West to overcome their mutual suspicion enough to make even the first small step, and what resistance there is in the armed services, the Atomic Energy Commission, and certain Members of the Senate and the House to putting the slightest limitation on the armament spiral. It will probably be the ordinary citizens who will decide this issue, if they express their opinions about the relative risks of proceeding with or without control of weapons.

But even disarmament would be somewhat lacking as a total program because it is only negative. More effective in changing the spirit of this country would be a vigorous positive campaign to solve on the one hand our own problems of unemployment, poor housing, the demoralization of the slum population, and, on the other hand, the ever-deepening poverty of the underdeveloped world. We could tackle these challenges by utilizing our idle productive capacity and the savings from a cut in our $50 billion arms budget.

If we could find the way to lead in a bold movement for world betterment we would force the Communist countries to follow suit, just as they had to follow in developing nuclear arms. And competition in aid, unlike competition in arms, could be accompanied by a gradual building of mutual trust.

It's my belief that if there is to be a better future for our children—or perhaps any future at all—it must come somehow through decreasing the hostility and increasing the good will in the world.

THE CONTINUING AND UNSOLVED PROBLEMS OF THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise again to speak on a subject of which I have spoken on many occasions here, the continuing and unsolved problems of the textile industry of the United States of America.

On yesterday my distinguished and beloved colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] and his dedicated associate, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY], placed in the RECORD verbally what I consider to be significant statements concerning the continuing problems of the textile industry, arising from the two-price cotton system as presently practiced by the United States of America. They evidenced the growing concern not only of the working people of their areas which are predominantly textile—not only this segment—but of all of the people in the industry, manufacturers, investors, and the people whose livelihood is dependent upon that industry.

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that as I speak today there is concern throughout every textile area of this country. What is going to happen to the cotton textile manufacturing institutions, the people who work there, and to the related businesses which are dependent upon the prosperity of that industry for their livelihood? We have been talking about this problem for many years, but there has been no relief as yet. Every month we have some new hope, every year we seem to have some new promises that something is going to be done in a realistic way and in a significant way to relieve the textile industry of the horrors and inequities of the two-price cotton system.

On yesterday, in the Washington Evening Star—and I want to compliment that newspaper for its treatment of the news—I read with a great deal of interest on page A–23 an article entitled "Cotton Mills Seek Equality in Subsidy." At the top of that particular article in a subheadline I found this to be written: "Congress Due To Act."

Congress is due to act, and I think Congress is going to have to act. As I said here on the floor of the House in discussing this problem with my colleagues, I have introduced two pieces of legislation, one to do away with the two-price cotton system. Someone said that is not going to be acted on. I do not know whether it is or not.

I have also introduced legislation to provide an import fee, such as was refused us by the Tariff Commission decision, which decision has been discussed heretofore.

What is the condition today? Unfortunately I must tell you that the condition has not only not improved but the prosperity of the textile producing areas of the country, as well as the producers of synthetics, is being dissipated. There has been a rise in imports; there has been a slump in the use of cotton; there has been a loss of confidence in the people of the Government of this country to do something for the textile industry of the United States. Synthetics have been affected. Mill after mill has announced either it is going to cut its production or it has changed its operation to include synthetic production in part, or that in its long-range look at the future it finds it not only necessary but profitable to turn to synthetics, thereby reducing costs, to go to the manufacture of synthetics.

I have no quarrel with synthetics. Certainly they have a great and useful place in the textile picture, certainly they are to be commended for the fine American fibers that they have produced and which go into the garments of the finest people in the world, the American people. But when we are talking about textiles, we are talking not only about the people who work in the textile mills, management and investors, but we are talking about the farmers who are getting ready now to suffer, if they have not already suffered, from the two-price system.

Mr. WHITENER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, and I want to compliment him on his continued and dedicated interest in these problems.

Mr. WHITENER. I commend the gentleman for again bringing this important problem to the attention of our colleagues, particularly those of our colleagues who are interested in the welfare of the farmer.

Yesterday afternoon, during a colloquy here between Members of the House with reference to the course we are taking in our Government, a great deal was said about the budget and its relationship to the welfare of the farm people of the country. What the gentleman is saying about the situation of the cotton farmer is accurate. I think it is so accurate that some of the contention about the budget and its relationship to the welfare of the farmer may become of less importance as time goes on.

Certainly, we are all interested in preserving the economic stability of our agricultural economy, but as the gentleman from South Carolina has suggested, we may well be entering into an era in which money will not solve the problem of the cotton farmer of this country.

I join the gentleman in saying that the remarks which he and I have made from time to time have not been made for the purpose of criticizing that great segment of the textile industry and its suppliers who are producing and processing synthetic fibers. Many of the mills in the textile areas can produce textile products out of synthetic fibers and stay in business in the future. The farmer, however, cannot stay in business unless the textile plants are running cotton on their machines. This, I think, is the thing that so many people are overlooking. The figures which are available to anyone in the hearings before the Cotton Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture given by experts from the National Cotton Council shows clearly that the per capita use of cotton in America is falling very rapidly. This, to me, is a red flag or should be a red flag to all of us who represent not only textile-producing areas but cotton-producing areas.

The gentleman from South Carolina, in his district, has many splendid cotton farmers. I have in my district the second largest cotton-producing county in North Carolina. So, it cannot be said that we do not have an abiding interest in the welfare of the farmer.

Now, if the gentleman will permit me to suggest this to him, I believe that it would be well for us to again today, as we did yesterday, discuss this recent sales-for-export program announced by the Secretary of Agriculture.

On yesterday, when I was discussing this matter, I put into the Record a very splendid article written by Mr. Bill Workman, a staff reporter for the Kannapolis, N.C., Independent. A few moments ago I read in the Charlotte, N.C., News of Tuesday, April 2, a splendid article on the same subject written by Lamar Gunter, staff writer for the Charlotte News, which I ask be made a part of the Record at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

Textile Picture Darkened by Cotton Dumping Action

(By Lamar Gunter)

Textile leaders who had hoped that the industry was at least moving in the direction of a one-price cotton system, now feel that recent action by the Agriculture Department has brought about a reversal that may be disastrous for the industry.

Members of the cotton policy committee of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute will be in Washington tomorrow to discuss the bleak industry picture which has been further darkened by Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman's action designed to sell Government-owned cotton on a bid basis.

Industry spokesmen have said vehemently in private that the secretary's action amounts to dumping American cotton on the world market since the present export of 24 cents a pound is not low enough to sell all the export supplies.

The spokesman said that selling the cotton on a bid basis means it will most certainly go for less than 24 cents a pound and this price is already 8½ cents less than American mills can purchase American cotton.

Industry leaders have charged in private since Freeman's action Friday that the Agriculture Department has panicked, but are reluctant to talk publicly before the Cotton Policy Committee has a chance tomorrow to see what can be done about the situation.

One industry leader said that the State Department would probably be tossed into turmoil since foreign countries will protest the action as dumping. He said that Freeman's action looked like another case of poor coordination between Government agencies concerned with the problem and that this situation already has plagued the industry's efforts to obtain a one-price cotton system.

He explained that President Kennedy had asked publicly that the inequity of the two-price system be corrected, but that the Agriculture Department had taken the position that partial solutions such as equalization payments of 5 cents a pound were the solution.

Industry leaders speculate that the department's latest action will have the effect of increasing the spread between what the foreign mills pay and what American mills pay to 10 or more cents a pound.

The industry has contended all along that it wants nothing more than to achieve Mr. Kennedy's stated objective—elimination of the inequity of the two-price cotton system.

Mr. WHITENER. Now I call to the attention of my friend that this article points out that today, in Washington, the Cotton Policy Committee of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute is meeting to discuss this recent order. This news article says that they are here for the purpose of discussing this new program as it affects the industry. Now, in the article it is referred to in this manner:

> Members of the Cotton Policy Committee of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute will be in Washington tomorrow to discuss the bleak industry picture which has been further darkened by Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman's action designed to sell Government-owned cotton on a bid basis.

Madam Speaker, the program announced by the Secretary may be construed by some as a dumping operation and many of us are apprehensive that this new program comes about by reason of panic on the part of some in the Department of Agriculture. Certainly, we see that what happened with last year's crop has shocked the country with the cost to the Government. As I remember the figure, there is $1,079 million being spent in the stabilization program or in the Commodity Credit Corporation program on cotton alone. This would indicate that perhaps one can pardon them for their panic.

I believe all of us who have been faced with this 8.5-cent-per-pound differential which the foreign manufacturer enjoys on the price of his cotton as compared to the price paid by American textile people for American cotton, would agree that this new program can bring about a wider differential. If the industry people are correct in their prediction that, as a result of this unloading operation, the world price on cotton may fall to such an extent that in order to compete on the world market we will have to sell our American cotton at as much as 11 to 12 cents per pound cheaper to the foreign manufacturer, it would seem to me that rather than solving our problem the Department of Agriculture is taking us down the other side of the hill.

Madam Speaker, this is a serious matter to many, many thousands of people who work in the industry which furnishes employment to the second largest number of people in any industry in America.

Madam Speaker, I commend the gentleman. I apologize for having taken so much of the gentleman's time. However, this subject is so important to the gentleman and to his district and to the district which I am privileged to represent, as well as to the people of America, I feel we cannot overspeak ourselves on the subject.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I want to say to the gentleman that I welcome the gentleman's colloquy and I want to thank the gentleman for his significant analysis of what is happening and what is going to take place. I also want to tell the gentleman again that I had hoped to be with him on yesterday when he gave the Congress and thus to the Nation significant figures on imports, and other significant statistics in connection with the cotton textile program. I say to the gentleman that I agree with him and I hope he will continue to participate from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, because it is significant, I would like to put into the Record an article from the State newspaper of Thursday, March 14, 1963, which is entitled "Two-Price Cotton Program Seen Detriment to Farmers."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

Two-Price Cotton Program Seen Detriment to Farmers

New Orleans.—America's present two-price cotton system may be more detrimental to farmers than to the textile industry, the president of a major textile chain's cotton buying operation said here at the annual meeting of personnel of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's cotton division.

Robert W. Smith, of Anderson, S.C., president of Lowenstein Cotton and Storage Corp., pointed out that the Government's two-price policy requires U.S. mills to pay $42.50 more per bale than foreign buyers pay for American-grown cotton.

"It is inconceivable to me that the textile industry will continue to try to operate in the face of such a staggering inequity as two-price cotton," he said. "The end effect, I believe, will not be so much of a question of what the textile industry will do, as what the farmers will do," Mr. Smith added.

Textile mills, Mr. Smith said are "switching to manmade fibers on an increasingly broad basis, and the effect has been dynamic for some of the manmade fibers. Rayon has been revived in the past 5 years and is booming along at record levels—and at prices from 8 to 11 cents cheaper than cotton. Nylon has been similarly revived and is in the midst of a striking boom, with its low-waste characteristic offsetting a slightly higher price. Other manmade fibers are prospering."

On the other hand, he added, cotton's domestic market is deteriorating and its export market is disappearing.

"The Commodity Credit Corporation is becoming more and more the real 'market' for U.S. cotton," he said. "A distressingly large proportion of our crop is going into Government warehouses, where it is of absolutely no value to anyone. Cotton is good for only one thing, and that is to be processed into a textile product."

Mr. Smith also called for stricter classing of cotton to conform more closely with the fiber's spinning characteristics. He said inconsistent classing practices affect the price

of cotton by failing to reflect spinning values and, also, by varying basic loan values.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I would like to point out to the gentleman that on last Saturday at Raleigh, N.C., the distinguished Vice President of this Nation at a meeting with people from all segments of industry from over the State of North Carolina very graciously and generously suggested to the group that they submit to him questions and at this luncheon gathering he would undertake to answer those questions. As we had our meal, the various guests were writing questions. As the Vice President read those questions and answered them very fairly and very frankly, about 80 percent of them I would estimate related to this question of the two-price cotton.

Madam Speaker, the President of the United States has on numerous occasions expressed an understanding of this problem and has expressed the intention of bringing corrective action to it.

I know all of us in the textile area are appreciative of those splendid things which have been done both by the President and by the Congress.

My apprehension now is that there are those subordinate to the President who have not gotten the message; there are those who are making decisions which they feel are to the best interests of the farmer which in my judgment are going to ruin the cotton farmer. That was the thing that concerned me about this recent decision.

Now we have recently had another decision by the Department of Agriculture, and that was to support the price of cotton at the level at which it was supported during the past year, 32.47 cents per pound. This, of course, looks good for the farmer, and I am sure that those who made that decision were conscientious in trying to make a decision which they thought was in the best interests of the farmer. But we know from experience that at that price support level we cannot compete in the foreign market if we cannot furnish our people in this country American cotton at the same price that we furnish it to the foreigner.

And so this web we are in is one which I think is not understood by some of those who are conscientious about the matter. They are just lacking in understanding of the net effect of the action which they take. I hope that through the efforts of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Hemphill] and others, in the executive department, in the legislative department and in industry at all levels, we can bring some ray of understanding to these people who have authority to make these decisions.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina again and assure him that except for the fact that I had some people from my district to whom I was extending hospitality on yesterday, I would have joined him then.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from the Second District of South Carolina. I welcome him to the battle lines of the textile industry on this vital matter.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend my senior colleague from South Carolina for his continuing effort in behalf of the cotton farmer and the cotton manufacturer.

Perhaps there are some Members of Congress, as is evidenced by the lack of attendance at this moment, who are not sufficiently aware of the vital importance of the textile industry. I want to associate myself with the gentleman from South Carolina in his effort, because I am sure that not only the people of South Carolina, one of the leading textile States, but the people, indeed, of the South and of the Nation are grateful to him and to others who have been leading the fight in this particular matter.

I notice the gentleman said just a moment ago that there is a tremendous increase in the use or in the development of synthetic products which, indeed, impairs the use of cotton fiber. May I ask the gentleman whether it is his judgment that the elimination of the two-price cotton system in accordance with the bill which he has introduced, and which I wholeheartedly support, would make cotton more competitive—that is, natural fiber cotton—and would encourage the mills actually to decrease their research, which they are presently carrying on, in the use of synthetics?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I certainly do. Also I want to say to the gentleman that not only will the consumer be able to get our goods cheaper and the mills keep running in competition, but that we could turn, as we are going to have to turn, to the problem of the import of synthetics, because this is what we find.

As our mills turn to synthetics more and more to try to compete, the Japanese and others turn to synthetics. The imports of synthetics into this country have risen just as the imports of cotton textiles have risen. Correspondingly, there has been a decline in the export of synthetics and a decline in the export of cotton textiles. So it is the picture of a whole industry. We are concentrating today on the two-price cotton system only because that is the most significant problem which we think can be solved by legislation or could have been solved by the Tariff Commission. This does give us a better chance to keep our mills and our cottons and our synthetics and our combinations running and our people working.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WATSON. Did I correctly understand earlier that instead of there being a reduction in the volume of textile imports from foreign countries there has actually been an increase in the volume of imports?

Mr. HEMPHILL. There has been a constant increase not only of cotton imports, but of other textiles, both cotton and synthetic textiles.

Mr. WATSON. I find it difficult to reconcile in my mind where we are going to allow the increase of exports from these various countries, many of them former enemy countries. As a result of the increase in the volume of these cheap imports we are having men in South Carolina and other places losing their jobs. I suggest to this House that it is inconceivable to me that those in positions of responsibility do not place equal, if not more importance, on our situation; that many of our textile workers in South Carolina who actually faced the enemy in battle now are threatened with loss of their jobs in the textile industry because this Nation refuses to do anything in curtailment of the cheap imports from former enemies such as Japan and other countries. Again I want to underscore my support of the continuing efforts of my distinguished senior colleague from South Carolina.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman.

I might say to the gentleman and to the Congress that someone said to me on one occasion, "Aren't you textile people crying 'Wolf'? Aren't you textile people crying 'Wolf' when the wolf is not at the door?" I wish that were so. I wish that the truth of the matter were that they were not suffering. But I have seen mill after mill go out of business. We have statistics on the bankruptcies. Just recently, in the 28th of March issue of the Charlotte, N.C., Observer, in the "Business World" section there appeared an article which explains in detail just the kind of problem we are faced with constantly. This article is as follows:

Why Is Textile Industry Crying Wolf?—These Items May Explain

(By Harry Snook)

If anyone still thinks the textile industry is crying "wolf" without reason over two-price cotton and import competition, here are two items that help translate the fight into terms of dollars and jobs:

Kimberly Yarn Mills, Inc., of Mount Holly, which went into operation in 1960 as one of the most modern in the world, has proven less than a success despite special efforts by more than 100 employes.

We learned Wednesday that the mill had been sold to a big textile concern, unidentified as yet, that makes and uses its own yarn in a consumer product enjoying some tariff protection against imports in the domestic market.

President P. J. Baugh, in a letter of gratitude to employees, explained why the mill was sold.

During the past 2 years, he said, government-regulated cotton prices had gone up as much as 5 cents per pound, "which represented a weekly cost increase of $5,000 for us."

"Foreign mills, buying U.S. cotton for about one-fourth less than the price paid by domestic mills, increased shipments into this country to the point that the average sales price of our yarn has dropped from 66 to 61 cents, and in some cases to 60 cents," Baugh said. "This is a drop of $5,000 to $6,000 per week for our product.

"This decision in the market price of our product plus the increase of our cotton cost has made us labor under a $10,000 to $11,000 per week differential since 1960," he added. "This is a total of $500,000 to $550,000 per year."

The other item: An announcement by Cone Mills of Greensboro that certain "unprofitable activities" probably will be liquidated this year.

In the annual report for 1962, Cone Mills showed an increase in net sales from $214.4 to $219.7 million, and an increase in earnings per share from 73 to 81 cents,

But, said President Ceasar Cone and Chairman Benjamin Cone, elimination of unprofitable operations for the year would have increased earnings 25 percent while reducing sales 25 percent.

Cone Mills is known as a big producer of coarse gray goods, such as denims, which have a high cotton content. The higher the cotton content, the greater the effect of the 8½-cent-a-pound advantage enjoyed by foreign mills selling in the American market.

The proposed liquidations will be made "as it becomes evident that these particular products will be unable to show a profit under the legislation and governmental policies (particularly in cotton) now in effect," the Cones said.

They declined to predict what the liquidations would mean in number of jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I never like to turn back the clock. I like to look forward. But unless you look back to see where you have been, sometimes you do not have the capacity to see where you are going.

Now, turn back to October of 1960, at which time I was engaged in campaigning for the Democratic Party and actively interested in the textile industry.

During that time I found in the Lancaster News of Lancaster, S.C., of Thursday, October 27, 1960, some significant statements. The first statement that I will refer to is a statement on page 2 which I include in the RECORD at this point under consent previously granted.

The article is as follows:

FOREIGN TEXTILES MADE UNDER CONDITIONS WHICH WOULD BE ILLEGAL IN THIS COUNTRY

The 26th annual meeting of the southern Governors, held last September at Hot Springs, Ark., adopted a resolution asking that quotas be established promptly by the United States to control imports of textiles, apparel and other products now damaging the domestic economy.

The action of the Governors' conference followed a statement on the effect of imports by W. C. Daniel, vice chairman of the National Affairs Committee of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute and assistant to the president of Dan River Mills.

"For our part," said Mr. Daniel in the course of his statement, "we are perfectly willing to compete with off-shore manufacturers on a basis of production efficiency, on quality, durability, style, design or any other criteria of manufacturing and management performance.

"But if basic textile fabrics and garments made from these fabrics are imported and sold on the U.S. market only because they are cheaper and cheaper only because they are manufactured under conditions that are illegal in this country, our position is that we are being subjected to unfair treatment under unwise foreign trade policies."

Mr. Daniel cited trends in the textile industry pointing up the need for a drastic revision of U.S. trade policies. These included:

"The United States is no longer a large net exporter of textiles but a large net importer.

"Cotton yarn imports are currently running at an annual rate of about 15 times greater than they did in 1959.

"Wool woven fabric imports also are running at levels far above 1959 and 1958 marks.

"Manmade fiber fabric imports are currently behind the 1959 mark but almost double the 1958 level.

"Cotton cloth imports presently are running at a rate more than double the 1959 figure which was up sharply from 1958.

"And apparel items are coming into this country at a rate estimated at $198.4 million.

"It is our conclusion that the present structure of U.S. laws, policies, and programs dealing with world commerce is in dire need of being remodeled and brought up to date."

Mr. HEMPHILL. The reason I have referred to the above article is that the two-price cotton system is not the only problem. The fact is that we are allowing to be imported into this country cotton textiles, synthetic textiles, woolen textiles or other combinations which are made by people whose wages are insignificant when compared to our wages and whose wages are totally insufficient to keep an American man, woman, or child alive to say nothing of keeping a family alive.

On the front page of the October 27, 1960, issue of the Lancaster News is an article entitled "Let's Face the Facts: We Need the United States on Our Side."

LET'S FACE THE FACTS: WE NEED THE UNITED STATES ON OUR SIDE

Continuing its policy of growth in spite of unsettled market conditions and a cloudy international picture, the Springs Cotton Mills is in the midst of another $5 million expansion. White Plant's $2 million addition will be completed in January. We hope for a similar addition to follow shortly in Chester.

We have just spent $400,000 for new Roberts Arrow spinning frames for White Plant and we are about to take delivery on 115 wide Draper XP-2 looms costing in excess of $300,000.

These new buildings and their machinery will mean more jobs and larger payrolls. They should bring more prosperity to the hometowns in which Springs plants are located. They will mean more taxes for local, State, and Federal Governments.

These are the benefits of growth. We will continue to grow unless the trade concessions granted foreign nations by the United States make it impossible for the Springs organization to earn enough profits to pay its bills.

Much has been said and written on this subject. It is discussed again in this special issue of the Springs Bulletin because we must plan for improvements in our jobs and in our communities. We are compelled to recognize the dangers of tomorrow and to find some way of meeting them.

Of immediate importance is our national presidential election. On pages 4 and 5 of this section appear the statements and promises of the two candidates on the subject of textile imports as they affect the American textile industry. Take your pick.

In the meantime and without letup after the election, all of us must constantly remind our Senators and Representatives in Washington of the perils facing the textile industry from uncontrolled imports. We must use our best efforts to persuade them to action.

In the American tradition of free enterprise, we must be allowed to compete fairly for our share of the textile markets.

The Springs Cotton Mills has grown steadily for more than 60 years. Today we stand at the top of the industry in quality and efficiency of operations. We have worked hard as a team to create profits which could be put back into more buildings, machinery, and jobs.

This reinvestment of profits has built prosperous communities and has helped all of us to healthier, happier lives. It has benefited South Carolina and, in some measure, the whole United States.

Profits are necessary under a free enterprise system; they are the muscles of growth. But nothing will take away profits faster than uncontrolled competition with low-wage foreign manufacturers. When our leaders in Government forget this, we are in trouble.

The Springs Cotton Mills can meet any challenge from within the industry. But we can't compete with giveaway programs. We can't lick the U.S. Government.

What we need for healthy, competitive operations is the United States on the side of the American textile industry.

Is it not a terrible thing when people have such a lack of confidence and such a loss of hope that they have to blazen in headlines in a southern paper, in a community where so many people volunteered that they hardly had any draft call, where tombstones in the graveyards bear the names of heroes from the Revolution down to the present day cold war; in a place whose people are descendents of the people who formed some of the original colonies; in a place where generation after generation has worked in the textile plants and generation after generation has sent their sons and daughters to war to save this country and to save the industries and homes of the entire country? Is it not a horrifying thing that they have to say "We need the United States on our side"? This article is written by the president of the Springs Cotton Mills, a plant that employs 15,000 people in my district and which has the best profit sharing system in the Nation, and which I do not think is second to any, and an industry which has recently built in the garment district of New York a magnificent building as evidence of its hope and its confidence in the America of the future.

The article is as follows, and I include it at this point in the RECORD:

SENATE GROUP RECOMMENDS LIMIT ON TEXTILE IMPORTS

The report and recommendations of the Pastore committee to the U.S. Senate in February 1959, represent the most important effort made in the postwar years to save the American textile industry from being sacrificed to political expediency.

In their discussion of textile industry problems, both Senator John F. Kennedy and Vice President Richard M. Nixon have referred to this report and quoted from the recommendations. The next administration may be guided by it in tariff and trade negotiations.

What was the Pastore committee and what, actually, did it recommend?

In an effort to find out what was ailing the American textile industry, the U.S. Senate in 1958 authorized a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to make an investigation.

Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, was chairman. Members included Senators ALAN BIBLE, of Nevada, STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, WILLIAM PURTELL, of Connecticut, FREDERICK G. PAYNE, of Maine, and NORRIS COTTON, of New Hampshire.

More than 200 textilists, union representatives, Government officials, and trade experts were called before the committee in a series of hearings lasting from July 8 to December 2, 1958. The committee report was made to the Senate in February 1959.

The important points of the 16,000-word report were these: Textile employment in the 10 years from 1947 to 1957 declined from 1,325,000 to 1 million workers, an overall decline of 24 percent. In the yarn and thread mills this decline was 34 percent, and in broadwoven fabrics this decline was 30 percent. From February 1951 to April 1958, there was a loss of 438,000 textile jobs in the United States.

During this same period the average price of cotton cloth, based on 17 constructions, declined 31 percent while the price of raw cotton rose more than one-quarter of a cent per pound.

From 1946 to 1957 exports of cotton cloth declined 29 percent while imports went up 175 percent. Since 1957 this import figure has doubled and redoubled.

Between 1947 and 1958 expenditures for new textile plant and equipment declined from $510 to $252 million, a drop of 50.6 percent, creating, in the words of the report, "a serious problem of obsolescence in the textile industry."

This was taking place in an industry which had been ranked second only to steel in terms of military essentiality during World War II.

The effect of the decline in textiles has spread to other sectors of American economy. The cumulative effects are greater than the statistics relating to textile production and employment alone would suggest.

The efficiency of American mills is not questioned. They can outproduce foreign competitors but they cannot undersell products from countries where wages are one-half to one-tenth those paid in American mills.

"It is our view," said the committee report, "that the impact of the decline of textiles upon the domestic economy is a sufficient reason for the Congress and the administration to carefully review all public policies which have contributed to this decline."

The policy which our Government expects to follow has been spelled out in the Trade Agreements Act. But we urge that Government agencies administering this policy recognize that the problem of declining employment in the domestic textile industry has been aggravated by rising imports and the loss of export markets.

"We recognize that tariff adjustments cannot be used to regulate the flow of textile products into this country. Therefore, we recommend that quotas be established which will permit foreign producers of textile products to sell in our markets within limits which will not further endanger our existing textile capacity."

Other recommendations included interagency and watchdog committees to keep close check on textile affairs; improved reports and statistical data; a study of world textile capacity; more realistic interpretation of peril-point provisions of tariff and trade agreements; an expanded research program for the textile industry; more realistic depreciation of textile machinery for tax purposes; and the elimination of the two-price cotton subsidy program.

In that particular issue, they gave certain tariff facts and figures which caused them to say that, and I want to quote them:

(1) Since 1934 American tariffs have been reduced 75 percent.

(2) U.S. tariffs average 5 percent.

(3) Average British tariffs are six times those of the United States.

(4) The United States admits more than 50 percent of all imports duty free.

(5) Among the 36 leading trading nations of the world, 28 have higher tariffs than the United States.

(6) On the basis of the first 6 months, value of Japanese imports admitted into the United States in 1960 would exceed $1 billion.

(7) The U.S. tariff on foreign cars sold in this country is only 8½ percent.

(8) The British tariff on American cars admitted to this country is 30 percent.

(9) Approximately 75 percent of all watches sold in the United States are imported.

(10) Average hourly wages in manufactures in the United States exceed average hourly European wages by 400 percent.

If we are going to compete and we must compete if we are going to survive, then either the Congress or the Executive is going to have to give some relief.

I want to include at this point the statements by the leading candidates for the President of the United States, at that time Senator Kennedy and then Vice President Nixon. These articles show that this is not a partisan problem. They show that this is a national problem.

The articles are as follows:

TEXTILE IMPORTS SHOULD BE LIMITED, SAYS SENATOR KENNEDY

COLUMBIA.—In a letter to Gov. Ernest F. Hollings, of South Carolina, on August 31, 1960, Senator John F. Kennedy, the presidential nominee of the Democratic Party, recognized the danger of foreign imports to the American textile and apparel industries.

"Imports of textile products, including apparel," he wrote, "should be held within limits which will not endanger our own existing textile capacity and employment and which will permit the growth of the industry in reasonable relationship to the expansion of our overall economy.

"There are now 400,000 less jobs in the industry than there were 10 years ago," he continued. "It is no longer possible to depend on makeshift policies and piecemeal remedies to solve the problems which the industry faces."

The presidential nominee pointed out that he had supported the Pastore Special Senate Subcommittee for the Textile Industry and felt the report of this group outlined a remedy for the ills of the industry.

"The Office of the Presidency carries with it the authority and the influence to explore and work out solutions within the framework of our foreign trade policies for the problems peculiar to our textile and apparel industry. Because of the broad ramifications of any action and because of the necessity of approaching a solution in terms of the total needs of the textile industry, this is a responsibility which only the President can adequately discharge.

"I can assure you that the next Democratic administration will regard this as a high priority objective.

"Additionally, we shall make vigorous use of the procedures provided by Congress, such as section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the escape clause in accordance with the intention of Congress in enacting these laws.

"Lastly, I assure you that should further authority be necessary to enable the President to carry out these objectives, I shall request such authorization from Congress."

AMERICAN TEXTILE INDUSTRY NOT EXPENDABLE, SAYS NIXON

CHARLOTTE.—Vice President Richard M. Nixon conferred with a group of American textile leaders in this city on October 3, 1960, and told them unrestricted imports of textile products into this country had created a situation requiring "high priority attention" in Washington.

The nominee of the Republican Party for the Presidency said, "This pressure from competing textile industries in countries where wage scales and other economic standards are far below ours is a matter of concern, not only to an important industry, but to the health of our economy as a whole."

The Vice President pointed out that America was the world's largest exporter and importer and must have strong trade relations with the rest of the free world.

"But I emphatically do not believe," he continued, "that this national trade policy means marking certain industries, such as the textile and garment industries, as expendable. It doesn't make sense to me to require one or a few industries to bear the whole burden that foreign policy decisions may require. Nor does it make sense to me that an industry like cotton textiles bear an inequitable burden as a result of efforts to adjust wartime agricultural policies to peacetime needs.

"To the end of assisting the textile and garment industries and their workers to meet the problems ahead, I am determined to explore every constructive line of action.

"I strongly support the platform of my party which calls for 'effective administration' of the escape clause and the peril point provisions of our trade legislation 'to safeguard American jobs and domestic industries against serious injury.'

"I favor more vigorous and imaginative efforts through diplomatic channels to make greater and more effective use of voluntary limitation of shipments by other countries whose penetration of the American market is proceeding at a pace which threatens the orderly development of those markets by domestic producers.

"I regard the plight of these industries as a special situation requiring high priority attention," he concluded.

We have had some discouraging days in our effort to do away with the two-price cotton system, and the industry has reflected that. I include here an article—with which I do not agree—from the Textile Reporter of March 17, 1963, saying it is time for the textile industry to abandon its efforts in behalf of a one-price cotton system. I do not believe that, for some of us will still be on the frontlines struggling for many months, and if we do no more than sound our voices to let the world know our problem, certainly we will at least keep the country aware of what is happening to our textile industry.

The article referred to follows:

It's time for the textile industry to abandon its efforts in behalf of a "one-price cotton" bill and to concentrate instead on legislation imposing an "equalization fee" on cotton textile imports.

Even among those who believe that "one-price cotton" legislation is the salvation of the industry, it should be obvious by now that the administration has no intention of meeting demands for an 8.5-cent-a-pound subsidy. It should be equally clear it sees no need to compromise above its 5-cent-a-pound offer.

At the risk of being wrong, we interpret House Agriculture Committee Chairman HAROLD COOLEY's, Democrat, of North Carolina, statement that he is pessimistic about prospects for new cotton legislation this year as meaning there will be no "one-price cotton" legislation this session.

After discussing the cotton situation with Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman for 2 hours, Mr. COOLEY told newsmen: "At the moment, it looks as if there will be no cotton legislation at this session."

The North Carolina Democrat said the cotton industry and the Kennedy administration are as far apart as ever on the size of the payment the Government should offer to make cotton available to domestic mills as cheaply as foreign mills are able to buy it. He said the administration refuses to offer a payment of more than 5 cents a pound. The cotton industry, he said, insists on 8.5 cents a pound.

Obviously, the North Carolina Democrat did not say there is absolutely no hope for a compromise this session. He qualified his "pessimism" with the phrase, "at this moment."

But we believe it is time for the industry to abandon its "hopes" and face the political reality that there is no compromise. Anything less than a full 8.5-cent-a-pound subsidy would be cheating American mills. It matters not that foreign buyers must pay shipping and other additional charges. American mills should have the right to buy American cotton at the same price as foreign competitors. On a free market, this would be accepted as a "fact of life."

But cotton is a political rather than a free market, and this should be accepted as a fact of life. As a political commodity, its value must be judged in political terms. Right now, it has very little political worth.

Last year, when the President's Trade Expansion Act was pending in Congress, cotton had political value. Then, the two-price cotton problem was being studied by the Tariff Commission and hopes were high that it would recommend an import fee to offset the raw cotton export subsidy. But when it was clear the bill would pass anyway, the Commission vetoed the appeal for help.

It would be a simple thing to criticize the Commission for its decision. But the basic fault lies with the law which it is asked to enforce. A clear discrimination against Americans, such as exist under the two-price cotton system, should easily be remedied under whatever trade law—liberal or protectionist—is in force.

Aside from complete elimination of the cotton price support program, which obviously is impractical or, at least, impolitical, the only right solution to the two-price cotton problem is an import fee which would require foreign manufacturers to compete fairly in the U.S. market. This, at a minimum, would have the virtue of equalizing the cotton costs of all competitors.

It will be argued forcefully that an equalization fee bill has little chance of passing Congress. Undoubtedly, it would be a struggle to get such a bill past the many liberal trade hurdles in the House and the Senate. But would it be any more difficult than enacting the two-price cotton bill which so far is stuck on dead-center in the House?

The price of a political commodity is political coin. In this case, it is a demand by the industry for redemption of the pledge made early in the Kennedy administration for elimination of the two-price cotton burden. If it cannot be redeemed by a subsidy, there should be no objection to a money-raising tariff increase.

However, it would be a fatal mistake to use this as a strategy ploy to win the 8.5 cents subsidy. Even if offered as a compromise, the industry should insist on the equalization fee. Actually, the offsetting fee is the only equitable solution to the problem since it would affect all manufacturers—domestic and foreign—alike.

I have previously included in remarks made here the first of a three-part article in the Textile Reporter entitled "Cotton Textiles—A Square Industry in a Round Economy?". I do not believe that to be the fact, but I believe that the advocates of any interest should be fair and present all sides of an issue. Therefore I include part 2 and part 3 of this article in my remarks:

COTTON TEXTILES—A SQUARE INDUSTRY IN A ROUND ECONOMY?

(This is pt. 2 of a three-part article by Peter M. Strang. The first part appeared in last week's issue of the Reporter, Feb. 28, 1963.)

LESSONS FROM WORLD WAR II

When the United States entered World War II the Norden bombsight, developed by the Navy, was this country's most cherished secret weapon and its production in quantities of great national concern. The original bombsights were equipped with ball bearings from an American subsidiary whose parent company in a neutral nation also had factories in Germany. As some of the bearings for this delicate mechanism were of intricate design, the Navy was disturbed to find that the parent company required copies of the drawings and specifications of all special bearings made by a subsidiary to be filed in the home office. (Ultimately a member of the War Production Board was appointed managing trustee of the American branch which thus became an independent bearing producer for the duration of the war.)

Under a high priority rating the Navy then organized its own bombsight bearing facility, the Barden Corp., to reduce the possibility of espionage and to assure a constant supply. The Nation's large bearing manufacturers hesitated to tie up equipment for the extended time necessary to obtain the precision required in the sight. At that time Danbury, Conn., was a depressed industrial area. This town, the center for hatmaking, was in the doldrums, because many men in civilian life had begun to go hatless and many others had entered the Armed Services. Since the War Production Board had restricted new factory construction, the Barden Corp., converted a hatband factory into a precision ball-bearing facility. Before production could commence, unskilled workers were trained at Government expense to staff this company which within 18 months was supplying the major part of the specialty bearings for the sight.

The Barden Corp. has continued in business since the war but a recent article in the New York Times magazine (May 27, 1962) shows that the officials of this company and the citizens of Danbury are worried about the future for the same reasons that plague the textile industry. If the GATT agreements should cause the demise of the Barden Corp., as it has already caused the liquidation of several cotton mills, for what trade are the displaced workers to be trained? It would be just as ridiculous to teach displaced Barden workers to become spinners and weavers as it would be to teach displaced textile workers in a mill town how to make precision ball bearings or to become hatters. However, as a practical matter this Nation needs factories which manufacture precision ball bearings as well as mills which produce cotton textiles.

Programs relating to the production and supply of ball bearings revealed both positive and negative results when appraised after the war. Some findings are mentioned which may have significance today. The Navy and the War Production Board, approaching their problem in a businesslike manner, had successfully established a new industry in a depressed area of the country, an industry which became an asset to the community after the war. An attempt to curtail the supply of ball-bearings to the Nazis by the preemptive purchase of the production of companies in neutral countries, although good in theory, was unsuccessful. These foreign manufacturers proved more interested in making money than in aiding the allied cause and extended their plant capacity sufficiently to supply both contestants. The mass bombing attacks upon enemy ball bearing factories were discovered to have been far less destructive than had been estimated. It was found that men and machines were unable to function in combat with the precision demanded by statistical theory.

ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS

These findings warrant careful study today because statistics are termed the "lifeblood" of economics and economists appear to hold influence in the Government. Because young men have made great advances in the physical sciences by means of modern mathematics and rigorous statistical analyses, others in the same age group assume they can achieve similar advances in a social science by using the same techniques. Forgotten are the vast differences between the two types of science; namely, that the physical sciences deal with inanimate objects and forces whereas the social sciences deal with living people.

On the one hand, the statistics used in the physical sciences are accumulated from observations or measurements made under controlled conditions upon material objects which are without life and behave accordingly. On the other hand, the statistics available to economists summarize accomplishments or conditions involving the beliefs, surroundings, and actions of people at a time in the past. Since living people can, may, and do change their minds, alter their surroundings, and modify their customs, unmeasurable factors are always present which cast doubts upon the value of rigorous statistical analyses of these data. Bias between scientists who perform similar experiments on similar apparatus may be determined from statistical comparisons of their data but no valid judgment of this type may be made about economists who may draw differing conclusions by mathematically juggling the same data.

Statistics is a science of more recent origin than economics, and statistical mechanics has become a valuable tool for physical scientists and engineers. However, statisticians who have applied their techniques indiscriminately to forecast the outcome of questions dealing with the public have records for being wrong which equal those of economists. No man over 40 will ever forget the Literary Digest's prediction of the election of Landon to the Presidency in 1936 or the defeat forecast by pollsters for Truman when he ran against Dewey in 1948. Consequently, when young economists and young statisticians join forces to solve the Nation's ills, older conservatives have forebodings.

MEASURING THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Gross national product, national income, and economic growth are concepts which have been developed to indicate the status of the Nation's economy by economists and statisticians through the clever adaptation of accounting and double entry bookkeeping to the country's overall business and have become fetishes which politicians and commentators discuss glibly in diagnosing the ailments of business and in prescribing remedies for its improvement. Gross national product, by definition,[1] represents the value of all goods and services produced in the Nation in a year. National income represents the amounts which pass through the hands of the Government, business firms, and individuals after deductions have been made for such items as deficits, indirect taxes, depreciation, etc. To eliminate fluctuations in the value of the dollar, the Department of Commerce now presents the gross national product and national income in "current dollars" and in "constant 1954 dollars." Economic growth is considered as the yearly increase in gross national product and is frequently expressed as a percentage of the gross national product for the preceding year. Economic growth is a mystical agglomerate which supposedly includes the development of new industries, technological improvements in manufacture, new products, added production required to meet

---

[1] "Statistical Abstract of the United States—1962," p. 310.

the demands of the growing population, the value of more and better services, etc.

In theory the gross national product and the national income are obtained by procedures which parallel those of large corporations in making annual statements. However, corporate statements are audited and cost accounting systems afford many cross-checks. Auditing and cross-checking are not possible in compiling the gross national product or national income because of the magnitude of the task and because in addition to the Government, unrelated independent sources furnish data. The data from each independent source have been collected to meet the needs of a specific group. It is evident that the current indicators of national economy have limitations.

Kuznets,[2] one of the pioneers in national accounting, realized the limitations by stating:

"The treatment of margins of error is most difficult for the national income and product statistics. The totals are the composite of a great variety of data, which differ in reliability from sector to sector of the economy, and within any one sector from year to year. The margin of error in the composite totals is thus an amalgam of errors in the parts whose magnitude is not easily determined."

Realization that there are numerous undetermined errors of statistical nature in the basic compilation creates suspicion as to the validity of the concept that an annual 2.5 percent increase in the gross national product signifies economic growth. While a statistical error plus or minus 2.5 percent would not be large in this huge computation, such an error if negative could nullify the desired growth or if positive could indicate excessive growth especially since the statistical error may vary from year to year.

There are other factors which make a small annual percentage increase in the gross national product a dubious measure of economic growth. In official reports the classification, "services," has comprised about one-fourth of the gross national product in "current dollars" and about one-third in "consent 1954 dollars" for the last decade. Receipts from "barbershops" constitute a small part of total "services." Estimates indicate that haircutting for men produces around 90 percent of the income of barbers. Today in Boston, the same barber, using the same tools with the same skill in the same length of time—approximately 15 minutes—receives $2 for cutting a man's hair, a service which cost 50 cents in 1940. A tabulation shows how the price changes for this service have been included in the gross national product in both "current and constant dollars" and also what the price would have been to accord with Consumer Price Index of the Department of Labor.

TABLE 1.—*Relationship of cost of a man's haircut in Boston to the GNP and to the cost of living*

Year	Price [1] (current dollars)	Price (constant 1954 dollars)	1940 price [2] (adjusted to cost of living in current dollars)
1940	$0.50	$1.02	$0.50
1947	.85	1.02	.80
1948	1.00	1.13	.86
1950	1.15	1.29	.86
1952	1.25	1.28	.95
1955	1.50	1.49	.95
1959	1.75	1.97	1.04
1962	2.00	------------	1.07

[1] Price data furnished by E. Moscardelli, proprietor, Parker House Barber Shop, Boston, Mass.

[2] Based on Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Indexes.

Since there has been no change in technology or in output per man-hour it is difficult to rationalize that quadrupling the price of a haircut has aided the Nation's economic growth although each increase has added to the gross national product. Due to the present high price fewer customers have a weekly haircut and in addition do-it-yourself kits used at home have greatly reduced the patronage, especially of children. In spite of the exploding population business has dwindled. Of course higher rents, more expensive supplies, higher wages, shorter working hours, and difficulty in obtaining help have made increases in price inevitable, but there seems to be a large amount of inflation included in the present price. This industry is in the precarious position of gradually pricing itself out of business. As wages and fringe benefits rise at regular intervals to keep abreast of those in other trades, prices must continue to rise. As prices increase, business will decrease further, and simultaneously innovators will find it profitable to produce better do-it-yourself kits.

Since "services" measured in "constant dollars," were 23.2 percent of the gross national product in 1955 and 26.8 percent in 1961, the question arises. "Does similar inflation exist in other trades and professions?" It is evident that the trend for annual price or wage increases in the service industries may add to the gross national products although no technological change or improvement in quality may have occurred in a service.

The gross national product can grow in other devious ways. The Federal Government is able to add $500 million to the gross national product merely by raising the salary of each of its employees $200 a year. A recent congressional investigation exposed conspiracy and corruption in the Federal aid highway program. Parcels of land on a new right-of-way rocketed in value through fictitious appraisals and members of the committee stated that irregularities in land taking did not scratch the surface of the total fraud and dishonesty. This program operates with an annual budget of $3,500 million so that if its costs have been inflated only 10 percent, through fraudulent manipulation, the gross national product will contain an unwarranted increment of $350 million. Inefficient, spendthrift government is encouraged if economic growth is to be gained merely because higher salaries and greater costs in Federal, State, and local governments have increased the gross national product.

According to old-fashioned ideas, economic growth may take place without adding to the gross national product. Manufacturers and engineers believe they strengthen the Nation's economy when they make a better product to sell profitably at the same or lower price. The attempts of the railroads to eliminate featherbedding practices exemplifies this point. Although better service should accrue to the public at no increase in price and the financial status of the roads should improve, the gross national product will decrease by an amount equal to the salaries and wages of the superfluous employees.

Since national accounting theoretically copies the procedures of huge corporations, it may be advantageous to apply other corporate practices to national accounting. Corporations use accounting to weed out inefficient branches, to find unprofitable products, and to determine policies which will best serve the interests of the whole organization. Therefore it should be possible for the Government to weigh its policies and the relative merits of industries by means of national accounting.

To illustrate this possibility, national income statements are given for "Cotton manufacturers and cottongrowers for the year 1959" in table 2. Admittedly there were difficulties in obtaining suitable data for this rough comparison which has been made from statistics gleaned from various Government publications and in some cases adjusted on a reasonable but arbitrary basis. However, it is doubtful that more precise data would materially alter the situation depicted.

TABLE 2.—*National income statement for cotton manufacturers and cotton growers, 1959*

(Showing value of product with deductions for direct subsidies)

[In millions]

Cotton manufacturers:	
Value of product [1]	$4,406
Total value	4,406
Less direct subsidies:	
Export payments made on cotton grown and processed in the United States	1
Total of subsidies listed	1
Net gain to Nation	4,405
Cotton growers:	
Value of cotton	2,120
Value of cottonseed	222
Total value	2,342
Less direct subsidies:	
Price support CCC loss	169
Export 7.39 million bales at 6 cents per pound	222
Conservation [2]	43
Rural electrification [2]	28
Marketing service and research [2]	4
Total of subsidies listed	466
Net gain to Nation	1,876

[1] Estimated from 1958 Census of Manufacture.

[2] Estimated 1959 Census of Agriculture which showed cotton growers to be 13.5 percent of all farmers.

Indications are that policies of the Government threaten the existence of cotton manufacturing, which added $4,406 million to the economy in 1959 at a cost of $1 million in direct subsidies, in order to salvage another industry, cotton growing, which added $2,342 million to the economy at a cost of $466 million in direct subsidies. Each group also has an indirect subsidy from tariff protection and although that of the manufacturers may be the greater, allowances for tariffs will not radically change the relationship shown. Paradoxically without the manufacturers, the Nation would have had to find new consumers for $1,358 million worth of cotton or would have had to increase the subsidy to growers by that amount for them to have received the same income. The combined output of the manufacturers and the growers is a very small part of a 520,000 million gross national product, but when the present unemployment rolls may be increased by 343,000 directly employed plus many others indirectly employed by cotton manufacturers, the problem warrants national attention.

All manufacturers, including cotton manufacturers, in the United States contribute 30 percent of the gross national product, employ 16 million workers, and are supervised by the Department of Commerce which operates with an annual budget of $511 million and a staff of 32,224; whereas the agricultural interests contribute only 4 percent of the gross national product, furnish employment to about 5 million, including both owners and hired men, and are supervised by the Department of Agriculture which operates with an annual budget of $5,739 million and a staff of 97,920. Would a successful corporation allow policies to continue which create such disparities?

---

[2] Kuznets, S., "National Income, a New Version," The Review of Economics and Statistics, August 1948, p. 176.

Textile men engaged in research and development soon find that rarely are they able to organize a test to completely satisfy the requirements of a theoretical statistician. They also learn that judgment tempered by textile experience is of great importance in drawing conclusions even when elaborate statistical analyses are available.

Without doubt limitations in the use of statistics have been found in other industries. A practical background gained in this manner makes men skeptical when they see mathematics and statistics applied willy-nilly to economic problems and places them in complete agreement with the statement of John Kenneth Galbraith,[3] U.S. Ambassador to India and an economist with international repute.

"The recent discussion of development has also differed from the earlier in being remarkably more sophisticated. We now have growth models—hypotheses as to the nature of economic growth—some of considerable mathematical refinement and a few that are wholly incomprehensible. * * * Yet it would be a mistake to identify complexity with completeness and sophistication with wisdom. There are some serious shortcomings in the modern discussion."

Due to the advances in mathematics and the ease with which modern machines make complicated computations, there seems to be a vogue of constructing models to demonstrate economic growth. A model may consist of a group of equations which depict development according to the hypotheses and assumptions of the builders. Nevertheless there have been no radical changes in the characteristics of the human race, which is the main component in all social sciences, in spite of the great advances in the physical sciences.

In a recent text, W. J. Baumol,[4] a professor of economics at Princeton, points out the difficulties and shortcomings of model building.

"Any situation in the business world is compounded of a bewildering variety of major and minor elements, and unless, important features are erased, rigorous analysis becomes hopelessly complicated or impossible. The decision to omit an element from a model must therefore be a matter of balancing off the loss of realism against the gain in reduced computation difficulty. In any event, the model builder must be aware that what is left out is often as important as what is put in. Moreover, he must remember that there is no magic in mathematics. The results of the mathematical computations cannot be expected to be any better than the model on which they are based.

"He should therefore never allow himself to be misled by the aura of mathematical rigor which surrounds the calculations of operations analysis."

NEW CONCEPTS ARE NEEDED

When ranking economists question current discussions of development and indicate limitations both in the construction of mathematical models and in the interpretation of the calculations derived from models, the Nation should begin to examine economic growth with wider perspective from several different angles. Just as the democracies, during World War I, reaffirmed Talleyrand's opinion, "War is too serious a thing to be left to military men," they may discover today that economic development is too serious a thing to be left to economists and statisticians. Just as nations have had to broaden their concepts of war to include studies of their own capabilities and limitations in planning campaigns with the smallest expenditure of men and material, this Nation must attack the problem of economic growth with practical as well as theoretical concepts. Some ideas about development which have popular acceptance may have to be revised to accord with facts. Ingredients for growth can be observed from the prodigious development of the United States in the past while factors now can be seen which hamper growth.

This country has been developed by men with pioneering traits who had the will to work and who gained satisfaction in their ability to produce tangible objects for the benefit of themselves and their communities. Personal aggrandizement and security were not the prime motivating influences for men such as Bell, the Wright brothers, Edison, Henry Ford, and many others who have made major contributions to this Nation's growth.

When economic growth is measured as the yearly increment of the gross national product, the need for a will to work is completely overlooked. The phenomenal increase in the gross national product of West Germany in spite of its devastation during World War II has received no explanation which meets general acceptance among theorists. Other countries obtained as much aid as Germany under the Marshall plan without achieving equal progress. According to one explanation, which seems very reasonable, the Germans possessed little of value after the war except the will to work and consequently they made full use of each assistance dollar. Evidently the will to work to produce things of value to the community, things in which the workers and the community take pride, is an important ingredient of growth.

COTTON TEXTILES—A SQUARE INDUSTRY IN A ROUND ECONOMY?

(This is the third and final part of a three-part article by Peter M. Strang. The first part appeared in the February 28 issue, and the second part was published last week, March 7. Reprints are available upon request.)

BACKWASH FROM GOVERNMENTAL SPENDING

The large annual expenditures for defense and space projects may be partially responsible for the constant demand for higher wages throughout the country. In matters of defense the Government is the sole purchaser and developer of new weapons and there are no market criteria by which to gage production costs. Similar conditions exist for the space program.

A Senate Investigating Committee[1] found that strikes had been arranged to delay the progress of missile installations so that overtime at double and even triple rates became necessary. In one instance an apprentice electrician was paid $748 for a week's work which consisted of 4 hours straight time and 80 hours overtime. Even though competition may impose restrictions upon the amount which can be paid for their work, experienced mechanics in other trades quite naturally conclude that they are being underpaid when they hear that an apprentice has drawn these wages on a Government contract.

Most workers in the United States have the will to work but many are having this will blunted partly from faulty indoctrination and partly from the belief that annual wage increases and additional fringe benefits should be gained without compensating improvements in the quantity or quality of their own production or the need to keep manufacturing costs at a competitive level. Of course higher wages each year will add to the gross national product as long as the volume of production does not decrease.

Government spending is causing a like situation to develop among the Nation's scientists and engineers. Contractors engaged in defense and space projects, in their quest for qualified men, offer enticing inducements. As a result, commonplace manufacturers must increase their costs by giving higher salaries and other benefits to retain employees in these categories.

These conditions have side effects which hamper growth. When wage rates increase at regular intervals without a corresponding increment in either the quantity or quality of production, costs reach the point at which manufacturers are compelled to reduce their payrolls in order to remain in business. Automation is their one solution. The creative efforts of these manufacturers and their suppliers are then concentrated on the development of laborsaving machines.

Dr. James Killian, chairman of the Corporation of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has stated that between 60 and 70 percent of the Nation's scientists and engineers are engaged directly or indirectly on Government projects. Many of the remaining 30 to 40 percent must be striving to reduce manufacturing costs by means of labor-saving devices. Although automation does create some new jobs, the overall employment opportunities will never meet the needs of an exploding population if industries, in order to survive, are forced to devote their research and development activities to labor-saving devices rather than to new processes and new products. While new processes and new products may lead to expanded trade both at home and abroad, the chief market for labor-saving machines will be in the United States. When wage rates and fringe benefits are about 40 percent of those in this country, a foreign manufacturer has less incentive to adopt automation, and labor-saving machines would require a much longer time to pay for themselves. In addition foreign producers may be able to lower their costs without automation merely by adopting other American management techniques.

It should be emphasized that, when the termination of a defense or space project frees engineers and scientists for other research, these men may have to spend several years acquiring knowledge and experience in an unfamiliar industry before they can contribute much toward its advancement. They may find that industrial research demands less specialization and greater application of cross field engineering than in their previous assignments. Futher complications also arise when American concerns parcel research abroad because of the growing costs and the scarcity of qualified men here.

INGREDIENTS FOR GROWTH

Study of economic growth in the United States during the last century reveals that industries such as the telephone, automotive, aviation, radio, and television, to mention a few, grew gradually and in the course of time gave employment to more and more people. These industries did not materialize overnight but took from 10 to 20 years to reach maturity. They usually germinated from the efforts of one man or a small group of men, original thinkers with creative minds, in whom an urge to explore the unknown and to produce something of value for the community, kindled persistent, unflinching drudgery to complete a self-assigned task in spite of difficulties and discouragements. They were dedicated industrial pioneers who would risk everything—even their lives—to attain their goal. The acquisition of wealth was not their chief objective in life, but, being human, they fully appreciated the advantages that money could provide. These innovators often lacked resources and teamed up with other adventurous spirits who were pioneers with capital. Frequently the man who furnished the money for a project also supplied the business acumen to carry the enterprise to a profitable conclusion.

---

[3] Gailbraith, J. K., "Economic Development," Harvard University Press, 1962, pp. 2, 3.

[4] Baumol, W. J., "Economic Theory and Operations Analysis," Prentice Hall, Inc., 1961, p. 413.

[1] McClellan, Senator J. L., "Crime Without Punishment," Duell, Sloan, and Pierce, 1961, p. 261.

The entrepreneurs who sparked the early progress of this country possessed characteristics and training rarely found in a single person. Original thinkers with creative minds, they were courageous, independent, diligent craftsmen often with attributes of the virtuoso. They had little patience with bluffers, pettyfoggers, or officiousness. An incident in the career of the electrical wizard Steinmetz is typical.

When a newly appointed official preemptorily issued a "No smoking or else" order, Steinmetz reportedly picked up his hat and went home with the comment, "No cigar, no Steinmetz." Needless to say the order was changed with alacrity. The men with capital who financed the new ventures also had unusual characteristics. They had the vision to see great opportunities in a nebulous mist and they had the courage to risk funds, for which they could have received a regular income from a safe investment, for the dual purpose of producing something new of value to the community and of gaining a sizable profit at a future date. The risk involved may be judged from the statement of an elderly financial pioneer in the 1920's to the effect that only 4 percent of the good projects he had handled were very successful. It must be admitted that there were times when the capitalist took everything and froze out the inventor.

Do conditions in the United States foster the characteristics found in the older industrial pioneers? Educators teach children the blessings of adaptability and conformity. In business many modern managers lay emphasis on these traits in making promotions. Labor unions keep their members in turmoil with demands for annual increases in wage rates and fringe benefits without consideration of production costs. To many in all walks of life, security and the acquisition of a "fast buck" appear primary goals.

Sir Oliver Franks,[2] when retiring from Lloyd's Bank in 1961, made this challenging observation:

"Distributive justice is a vital part of social morality. But to ensure the life of the community it is equally important to recognize that world trade is not a handicap event: in export markets, payment is strictly by results.

"When we separate ethics from economics and desire to do the decent thing without at the same time thinking what is the efficient thing, this produces static policies designed to impede change when only by change and adaptation can we hope to live. There has been too general an acceptance of the idea that the economic system exists to produce jobs rather than goods."

GROWTH FACTORS

A reappraisal of the factors necessary for growth is imperative. What advantage will be gained by cotton manufacturers in modernizing their buildings and machinery even with the aid of larger depreciation allowances, when foreign competitors can acquire equal facilities to produce the same goods at wage rates less than 50 percent of those in the United States and from cotton 25-percent cheaper in price?

However new construction at a fairly constant rate is essential to maintain the building trades and the suppliers of construction materials at full employment. New construction adds to the gross national product and every project creates jobs. In each case the number of jobs and their duration depend upon the size of the project and the required completion date. Again there is the old bugaboo of costs. The adage, attributed to Henry Ford, "Buildings alone do not make money," is applicable today. The manufacturers and the producers of services, who occupy the buildings, furnish the jobs which are permanent. When an old concern builds a new plant, the move is usually made to reduce costs by streamlining operations, by eliminating excess labor, and by lowering upkeep charges.

In new buildings high construction costs mean high rents so that new enterprises, which have to watch every penny closely, are apt to locate in older low-rent buildings. Because of the high wage rates in the building trades, many home owners are making their own home improvements and repairs, thus drying up a secondary source of jobs for construction workers. If the Nation should start a crash program to build fallout shelters, unemployment would decrease, especially in the building trades, and the gross national product would grow but upon completion of the program, unemployment would increase with a vengeance and few new permanent jobs would have been created. Those interested in the economy of the future could profitably study the experience of the textile industry in the 1930's when the operating time was restricted by the NRA in order to give jobs to more workers.

Research is often considered to be the salvation of the Nation. Although huge expenditures for defense are necessary and it may be imperative to be the first to land on the moon, the priorities assigned to these programs already are affecting this country's present and future research. Not only have research costs climbed because of competition for personnel and facilities but many engaged in the profession appear to have lost their perspective. With the Government footing the bills, costs are forgotten. As a result contact with reality is lost. In industry projects must be selected with care, having in mind the costs, the money available, the men and facilities required, and the prospects of ultimate success. The prevalent idea that anyone with an advanced degree is qualified for research should be modified. Just as medical men must serve a long internship before they begin medical practice, research men, regardless of their previous formal education, must gain experience and knowledge in an industry before they can contribute much of value to that industry.

Future industrial research is also being handicapped by the manner in which the faculties and facilities of educational institutions have become absorbed with Federal projects and the tendency for native students to enroll in courses leading to the more lucrative positions offered by defense and space programs in government and industry. In some courses oriented to the less spectacular industries foreign students predominate. Professor Backer of the Textile Division of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has found that during the last 5 years 77 percent of his graduate students working for advanced degrees have come from abroad. As a result, unspectacular but necessary home industries may find themselves plodding along in the same gait 10 years from now while their foreign competitors may have made great progress on the basis of the present advanced American know-how. At a textile exhibition last fall, some machines from Japan attracted more attention than did competing equipment made in the United States. After World War II, Japanese scientists and engineers devoted themselves to rebuilding their textile industry with noticeable results. Is it not possible to gain a Pyrrhic victory if the United States reaches the moon first but fails to develop new industries and sacrifices old industries through neglect and too much altruism both at home and abroad?

There are many reasons why research conducted by the Government fails to aid industry. Civil service regulations tend to dampen the enthusiasm of creative thinkers. Although the Department of Agriculture has been successful in research concerned with farm production, thus benefiting the farmers, some of its programs have added to the difficulties of the cotton manufacturers.

Is a small percentage of inflation needed each year to obtain growth? There are economists who advocate this course. The question may be important when comparisons are made concerning growth in Russia and in the United States. It is doubtful that the gross national product in Russia is augmented each year by inflation or spiraling wages. When comparisons are made of the gross national product in various countries or plans are devised to assist the growth of an undeveloped nation, differences in national characteristics present obstacles which are difficult to evaluate. The fact that there are people who do not want the advantages of Western industrial civilization thrust upon them suddenly, is being currently illustrated. By an overwhelming majority, the people rescued from the volcanic island, Tristan da Cunha in the South Atlantic, voted to return to their devastated island rather than to remain in England.

THE FUTURE

While careful attention should be paid to the thoughtful opinions of men who have dedicated their lives to the sicence of economics, contemporary history should teach Americans that too great credence should not be placed on the plans and precepts of young theorists with reference to the immediate economic future. The rulers of Russia, where individual freedom is greatly curtailed, claim to adhere to the doctrines of Marx and Lenin. Yet Djilas,[3] a former Communist leader in Yugoslavia who now languishes in jail because of his revisionism, has written:

"The Communist leaders really believe that they know economic laws and that they can administer production with scientific accuracy. The truth is that the only thing they know how to do is to seize control of the economy. Their ability to do this, just like their victory in the revolution, has created the illusion in their minds that they succeeded because of their exceptional ability.

"Convinced of the accuracy of their theories, they administer the economy largely according to these theories. It is a standard joke that the Communists first equate an economic measure to a Marxist idea and then proceed to carry out the measure."

Will the United States avoid the examples set by the doctrinaire economists of Russia? Can the United States profit from the experiences of its cotton manufacturers and cottongrowers? Is it too late to establish practical goals for industrial development in the United States without too great a sacrifice in the present in order to attain an anticipated ideal situation sometimes in the indefinite future?

SAYS JAPANESE USE "ECONOMIC BLACKMAIL"

Japan's bid for international support of its stand against U.S. import restrictions constitutes "economic blackmail," South Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association President Robert S. Small declares. Mr. Small, president of Dan River Mills' Woodside unit, Greenville, S.C., cites reports that Japanese manufacturers have asked, in a "confidential" memorandum, for backing from participants in the international cotton textile agreement when that country asks the GATT Textile Committee to investigate so-called "unilateral and arbitrary" restraint actions proposed by the United States. He asserts the Japanese were caught offguard by the fact that the United States "has made them live up to an agreement for the first time." Japan is "simply not satisfied with her quotas and this move is just political pressure designed to blow up the long-term agreements," Mr. Small charges. He sees Japan's move as an effort to force the United States to increase that country's imports quota.

---

[2] Franks, Sir Oliver, "Lloyd's Bank, Ltd., 1961 Report and Accounts," p. 16.

[3] Djilas, M., "The New Class," Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1956, pp. 103, 104.

Now we have here an article in which a very wonderful friend of mine in my home town of Chester made a significant statement. He is dean of textiles in Clemson College, and he is a leader in the education of young men for the textile industry, and throughout this Nation men trained at that marvelous institute, and in that department, are dependent on the textile industry for their livelihood. They give their time and their talent to the upbuilding of the industry.

I include here an article written by this gentleman entitled "Clemson Dean Says Textile Industry in South Carolina Is Very Much Alive."

The article referred to follows:

Clemson Dean Says Textile Industry in South Carolina Very Much Alive

Clemson.—The textile industry in South Carolina is far from dying.

So says Dean Gaston Gage of Clemson College's School of Industrial Management and Textile Science.

Dean Gage cites these facts:

The Stevens Co. is doubling the capacity of Delta Finishing and expanding Utica Mohawk to more than 20 acres of floor space; Chemstrand is building and expending at Greenwood.

Also, Woodside Mill is starting to build a $12 million plant at Fountain Inn; Graniteville Manufacturing, a $7½ million plant at Graniteville; Inman Mills is completing a new plant at Inman; Greenwood, two new plants at Ninety Six; Allied Chemical, a nylon plant at Irmo.

Springs is building two plants and a tremendous warehouse at Fort Lawn. "And," adds the Clemson dean, "everybody was buying new equipment."

Pacolet Industries, Inc., a group of Milliken Mills, incorporated recently. Of the seven officers, four—including the president—are Clemson graduates.

South Carolina has nearly 40 percent of the spindles in the United States and about half the finishing capacity. Often overlooked is the production of manmade fiber. Its crop, in the raw state alone, is valued at about 5 times the cotton crop and about 80 percent of the sale value of all agricultural crops—peaches, cotton, tobacco, lumber, livestock.

The textile industry, Gage says these facts show, is alive, in good health, and still growing. Textile schools can, but don't, turn out enough graduates. They have the means—but not the students.

"What the textile industry needs today," says one top drawer representative, "is a new generation of young men with enough vision to realize that it takes more than cutting a price or underbidding a competitor to gain stability and profitability for textiles.

Ralph J. Bachenheimer, chairman, textile section, New York Board of Trade, is a guest contributor to the winter edition of "Bobbin and Beeker," student publication of the Clemson School of Industrial Management and Textile Science. He writes:

"Few industries as large and as basic as ours have consistently shown returns on an investment as poor as the textile industry. Textiles today are selling at levels below those of 10 years ago, while the rest of our economy has undergone a continued period of inflationary price increases.

"What we need, and need badly and quickly, is a new approach—stop apologizing for our products; go out and promote forcibly the many new fabrics produced in our mills. Bold and imaginative selling, and a willingness to attract a larger share of the consumer dollar from other industries," invites Bachenheimer "can easily change the mistakes of the past."

Last spring, the time when young men were choosing college careers, however, headlines heralded the two-price cotton and import problems.

Enrollment in textile curriculums of the Clemson school this fall increased nervously, by 11. The recruiting season is here again and Dean Gage has a crisp message for both mill executives and high school seniors, especially those interested in staying in South Carolina among the home folks: "Help yourself by helping us."

We have had difficulties but we are very much alive. I do not know that our health is as good as we would like to have it in the textile industry, but I do know that we are still alive.

What do we want? We want an increase in the production and consumption of cottons, synthetics, wool, and combination textiles in this country. What will that mean? It will mean lower prices for the consumer, and certainly every Congressman who has problems of employment and other industrial problems as unemployment and his responsibility knows that one of the problems of the industrial consumer is the problem of getting the best possible product for the lowest possible price. If legislation is the avenue of approach, let us have the necessary legislation.

We want also to help the cotton producer. The American people are gathered here in representation. The American people can voice their wishes at the ballot boxes of this Nation. We are going to have to stop the stockpiling of cotton and the sale of cotton in the manner in which it is being done now. These problems will continue as we continue into the mechanization of agriculture. These problems will grow. The producing farmer must be able to make long-range plans, must be able to get credit. Markets must be open to him to save the present and insure the future.

I could talk about cotton and what it means to people who are dependent upon it in the various phases of its production, processing, and sale. I could talk about the decline in exports and the rise in imports, for we recognize all the facets we must face. But what we want to do is to revitalize the textile part of the industry of this Nation. The textile industry is a great industry. Its problems continue, their gravity continues to grow; but we intend to survive and we invite the help of the administration in solving these problems, the worst of which is the two-price cotton system.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

UNFAIR PENALTIES FOR ACCIDENTS WHILE ON OFFICIAL DUTY

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform the Members of the House of a bill which I have introduced that will remedy, in my opinion, a most unfortunate and shocking situation.

At the present time the Department of Defense including the Army, and I believe the Air Force also, have a system whereby they dock the pay of a serviceman for damages to property that happens to be in his possession. If a serviceman gets involved in an accident with a jeep, for instance, without any trial or without counsel, his salary can be docked for the damage.

I had called to my attention the following set of facts: A serviceman was a passenger in a truck in Germany. He was on official business for the U.S. Army. Due to an accident, this truck overturned and the young man suffered a fractured skull and a laceration of the brain. As the result of this accident, he has practically no vision in his right eye, he has a plate in his skull, and a very severe neurological condition. He was awarded a 70-percent disability rate by the VA. He went back home, and much to his chagrin, he subsequently received a letter telling him that he was responsible to the U.S. Government to the tune of $1,600 for damage to this truck in the accident.

Very frankly, I thought this was an error, an administrative mistake. I wrote to the Department of Defense and asked how possibly could this young man be held pecuniarily liable for damage to the truck when he was only a passenger.

I received a letter back from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense saying that this was not a mistake. This was a policy of the Government.

I was informed that if a passenger in a vehicle was senior to the driver it was his duty to see that the driver exercised due care.

Therefore, $1,600 was charged to this young man.

I know that we have to economize, but I can think of dozens and dozens, I may say hundreds, of places in the $50 billion that the Department of Defense got in fiscal 1963 where better economy could be practiced than in the case of these young people who are least able to afford it.

Of course it is ridiculous to charge a passenger for lack of care on the part of the driver. I will say it is very wrong for us to charge the driver, even, unless his negligence was willful or wanton.

My bill provides that if the damage to the vehicle was caused by the willful or wanton negligence of the serviceman, he can then be held pecuniarily liable, but even in that case I would insist on a hearing or trial and the assignment of counsel to the serviceman.

Servicemen have no control over their assignments. They must work on equipment as directed. Why then should they be charged for damage which is not willfully or recklessly caused. Most employ-

ees in private industry are not so charged. Why take it out on the serviceman?

ON NOT RAISING HOGS

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Foreman] very kindly sent me a copy of a letter from one of his constituents, Mr. J. B. Lee, Jr.

I think this letter will interest a number of my colleagues. It is a devastating commentary on our present system of farm subsidies. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his courtesy, and I include Mr. Lee's letter in the Record at this point:

March 20, 1963.

The Honorable Ed Foreman,
House of Representatives
Congressional District No. 16,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: My friend over in Terrebonne Parish received a $1,000 check from the Government this year for not raising hogs. So I am going into the not-raising-hogs business next year.

What I want to know is, in your opinion, What is the best kind of farm not to raise hogs on and the best kind of hogs not to raise? I would prefer not to raise razorbacks, but if that is not a good breed not to raise, I will just as gladly not raise any Berkshires or Durocs.

The hardest work in this business is going to be in keeping an inventory of how many hogs I haven't raised.

My friend is very joyful about the future of his business. He has been raising hogs for more than 20 years and the best he ever made was $400, until this year, when he got $1,000 for not raising hogs.

If I can get $1,000 for not raising 50 hogs, then will I get $2,000 for not raising 100 hogs? I plan to operate on a small scale at first, holding myself down to 4,000 hogs which means I will have $80,000 coming from the Government.

Now, another thing: these hogs I will not raise will not eat 100,000 bushels of corn. I understand that you also pay farmers for not raising corn. So will you pay me anything for not raising 100,000 bushels of corn not to feed the hogs I am not raising?

I want to get started as soon as possible as this seems to be a good time of the year for not raising hogs.

One thing more, can I raise 10 or 12 hogs on the side while I am in the not-raising-hog business just enough to get a few sides of bacon to eat?

Very truly yours,

J. B. Lee, Jr.,
Potential Hog Raiser.

PROCUREMENT PRACTICES OF DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY ASSIST CONTRACTORS IN PADDING COSTS TO THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pillion] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, in 1959 and 1960 the Department of the Army awarded three fixed-price contracts to Burroughs Corp., Detroit, Mich., for spare electronic parts.

In its review of these contracts, the General Accounting Office disclosed that the Government incurred unnecessary costs of about $556,000.

The Comptroller General, in his report to the Congress, cited the Burroughs Corp. for charging the Government for labor costs far in excess of those which would have been justified under the circumstances. In addition, the GAO disclosed that the U.S. Army Procurement Office, Fort Meade, Md., failed to adequately review Burroughs' proposed labor cost estimates before accepting them.

In such fixed-price contracts, the contractor charges the Government for anticipated labor costs, which are estimated on the basis of the number of hours each specific job should require according to engineering studies.

On the three contracts in question, Burroughs charged the Government for 111,789 hours. Based on available information and performance data reviewed by the GAO, proper chargeable labor hours would have been 53,818. Burroughs charged the Government, then, a total of 57,791 excess labor hours.

The excess cost to the Government, including overhead and profit, was $556,150.

On the most recent of the three contracts, the contractor wrongfully certified to the Government that it had considered and made known to the contracting officer all available cost data in preparing its proposal. Despite this certification, however, Burroughs neither disclosed to the Government the existence of lower and more current labor cost data nor justified to the Government its failure to use this data in its estimate of labor costs.

The Comptroller General repeatedly discovered items upon which the Burroughs Corp. had padded its labor costs.

The Comptroller General pointed out that the failure of the U.S. Army Procurement Office to adequately review the contractors' labor cost estimates contributed materially to these deficits. The GAO further disclosed that:

First. The U.S. Army Procurement Office personnel, in evaluating total estimated labor hours for spare electronic parts, failed to consider the higher labor efficiencies in similar contracts.

Second. The U.S. Army Procurement Office failed to request the services of an available audit agency to review the contractors' charges.

The Comptroller General made the following recommendations:

1. It is recommended that the Department of the Army, if it is unable to recover substantially all the overstated costs identified in this report, refer the case to the Department of Justice for appropriate action to assure maximum recovery by the Government.

2. The Department of the Army should bring to the attention of its contracting officers the need to obtain pricing certifications from contractors on all contracts.

Mr. Speaker, this contract was an unconscionable extraction of Federal funds by the contractor. It was a willful, fraudulent misrepresentation by the contractor.

I trust that the Department of the Army and the Department of Justice will thoroughly examine into and investigate this transaction for possible criminal violations.

The U.S. Army should fix responsibility for this loss and for this disgraceful betrayal of trust. Appropriate disciplinary action should be taken immediately against the responsible procurement officers.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to highly commend the Honorable Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, and his staff for their outstanding public service in uncovering the wastages and quasi-criminal malfeasance that exist in many areas of our Federal Government.

REELECTION OF MAYOR RICHARD J. DALEY OF CHICAGO

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had our mayoralty election in the city of Chicago. It was a beautiful day with a record temperature of 83; clear skies. We registered a 73-percent turnout of voters, which is certainly a very large vote for an off-year municipal election. And, I am very happy to advise my colleagues in the House on both sides that under these ideal weather conditions, Mayor Richard J. Daley was reelected yesterday to a third term by an impressive majority of 150,000 votes. Mayor Daley has certainly written an outstanding record in the last 8 years of his administration. He is today hailed not only throughout the United States but throughout the world as one of the outstanding administrators of a large city government. Mayor Daley has brought to the people of Chicago a new dimension of leadership which yesterday was certainly rewarded by this spectacular reelection. I daresay that the overwhelming victory experienced by Mayor Daley in Chicago yesterday, carrying with him his running mates, John C. Marcin, city clerk, and William Milota, city treasurer, reflects the high regard that the people of our community had for the record that the mayor has written and, I think, also reflects the high regard our people have for President Kennedy who was a visitor on an official visit to Chicago a week earlier when he participated in the dedication of the terminal facilities at O'Hare Field. President Kennedy could not help but take advantage of the opportunity to say some very inspiring words about Mayor Daley's impressive record. In reelecting Mayor Daley yesterday by this very sizable majority of 150,000 votes, I believe the people of Chicago at the same time registered what high respect they have for President Kennedy who supported the mayor.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished dean of the Illinois delegation.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the dean of the Illinois delegation, it gives me great pride to be able to join today in this tribute to Mayor Richard J. Daley.

I have known Mayor Daley since he was a very young man, and have watched him rise to the very important position which he now holds as chief executive of America's second largest city. Through all of his years in public office, Richard J. Daley has always maintained the highest respect of the community for his dedication to public service, his devotion to Chicago, and his profound integrity.

During the last 8 years, he has given Chicago a completely new look, and I am not surprised that municipal administrators all over the world are pointing to Mayor Daley and his administration as a model of good government.

I am proud of the people of Chicago in this exciting demonstration of good judgment which they registered yesterday when they elected Mayor Daley to a third term. His reelection is the best assurance that the people of my city could have of continued growth and progress.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I am happy that the gentleman has taken this time on this subject. I want to personally join him in extending congratulations to the distinguished mayor and other officials of the city of Chicago and to congratulate the city of Chicago on the type of leadership it has had.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. I am delighted to join our colleagues in commending the people of the great city of Chicago for their wisdom as displayed yesterday. It has been my good fortune over the years to have had the pleasure to meet with and talk to the great mayor of that city, Richard J. Daley. Anyone visiting Chicago can readily see the great improvements and changes that have taken place during his administration. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished mayor of Chicago is indeed a real political leader of America, and that is a tribute that I am proud to attach to one, for I become increasingly impatient with people who think you can take politics out of politics, that you can take government out of government. The tribute that was paid to the mayor of the city of Chicago is well deserved, well merited, and justified, and the people are to be congratulated.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very happy to join my colleagues in conveying to Mayor Daley my hearty congratulations on his reelection and on the splendid vote that he received, showing the confidence that the people of Chicago have in him. Mayor Daley is one of the outstanding Americans of this era. He is one of the great students of the art and science of government. He is a man whose leadership has made a profound impression not only on the people of Chicago but upon the people throughout the country. Chicago is a great city. I like Chicago. I think it is one of the great cities of our country. I also think that the problems of city government are very challenging.

It is my opinion that no one in public life has more challenging problems, except the President of the United States, on the domestic level than the mayor of a city, particularly the mayor of a great metropolitan city.

Mayor Daley has given to the people of Chicago outstanding leadership, evidencing not only great ability and vision but extraordinary courage.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the people of Chicago on the election of Mayor Daley, and I wish for him every success and happiness during his next administration.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely grateful to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], and others who have joined in this tribute to Mayor Daley, including our majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh], and the dean of the Illinois delegation [Mr. O'Brien].

I would make this observation. The Speaker has certainly touched upon one very important aspect in his remarks. In yesterday's tremendous victory for Mayor Daley there was, of course, an affirmation of the splendid record he has made in his 8 years as mayor of Chicago, and there was an expression of confidence that under his leadership in the next 4 years we will resolve some of the problems that have been besetting the large cities. However, in this election one cannot help but detect the fact that the people of a large urban community such as Chicago are becoming increasingly aware of these problems and particularly of the cost to local governments to meet these problems.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we shall be able in this Congress to pass some of the legislation which has been proposed by President Kennedy to help the large cities of America meet their mounting problems. Our great problem in America today is the tremendous immigration of American citizens from the rural communities of the Nation into large cities. Today 78 percent of the population of this entire Nation resides in metropolitan areas of America. The problems of these areas are mounting. It is my opinion that many of the programs which have been proposed by the President would reflect the deep concern that the President has for the problems that are being created in these large cities.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it would be my hope that this Congress, certainly before we adjourn in this first session, will be able to marshal enough support to help the large cities. I have been one who has supported agricultural legislation. However, I think the time has come when our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have to recognize that we have some deep-rooted problems in our urban areas. Mayor Daley during his campaign has spoken out frankly in support of legislation which is designed to assist in the correction of some of these problems facing large cities. It is my opinion that one reason why he won the election so handily yesterday, besides the great record he has made, is the fact that he has come out for the legislative program proposed by President Kennedy, a program designed not only to help the large cities but to help America. Certainly, as we have said many times on the floor of the House, when we approve farm legislation to help the farmers of America, we are helping the entire country. We are not only helping the scant 22 percent of the rural communities but the entire American population. The same argument applies to our large cities.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that in this Congress we will receive sympathy and understanding from our colleagues, particularly those of our colleagues who come from the rural areas. Today the pendulum has almost swung and today we have some real serious problems in the large cities of America which cannot be resolved with their own resources. We must have some assistance from the Central Government.

Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute today to a greater mayor of Chicago, Richard J. Daley, on his reelection, we have had an opportunity to discuss the problems of the large cities. With guidance from men such as Mayor Daley, I am confident we can find solutions to many of these problems.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like again to compliment the gentleman from Illinois on his presentation and to add that I see on the floor of the House at the present time one of the most influential, one of the most beloved men ever to sit in this Congress. The man who has been at the side of Mayor Daley during his great rise in Chicago politics and government, our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Tom O'Brien], is one of the greatest men this Nation has ever produced. We love him and are happy to have him back with us.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I share the high sentiments of the gentleman from Oklahoma about the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Brien].

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 5389.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DUAL RATE CONTRACTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 36.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87–346, relating to dual rate contracts, to make the following correction, viz: On line 4, change "76 Stat." to "75 Stat."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until tomorrow, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ATTACK ON REPUBLICAN OBJECTIVE OF BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, after the vote yesterday on the Interior appropriations bill, when almost all of the Members of this House from this side of the aisle had returned to their offices, a few Members from the other side of the aisle, quite evidently by prearrangement, engaged in an attack on the Republican objective of a balanced budget.

Their proposition was, to quote the majority leader, that "the only way a $15-billion cut could be made is to cut into the real muscle of indispensable functions of Government."

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] then proceeded to take up some 20 pages of the Congressional Record to propagandize against a balanced budget by describing in detail just what would be the impact of a $15 billion cut in the overall budget on the functions of each department and each agency.

Everything calculated to arouse public interest, State by State, to fan the fires of personal prejudice and individual greed was set forth in depth, with the usual dire predictions of disaster to flow from such cuts. State by State, community by community, function by function, it was suggested by the gentleman from the other side of the aisle that pet projects would be lost if the budget was to be balanced. Ranging from the abandonment of Weather Bureau stations to discontinuance of air safety measures, to wholesale job reductions and rising unemployment, the administration's propagandists continued to distort and misrepresent.

Mr. Speaker, what has been done here by the administration spokesmen is a gross and palpable disservice to the public interest. By creating a bogeyman of a mythical meat-ax they have then proceeded to attempt to agitate our people in favor of further deficit spending by picking out of the departments the most controversial popular projects and the impact of appropriations reductions. Yet, all the time they must do this with tongue in cheek, for they know that it is within the power of the Appropriations Committee itself to specify where the cuts shall be made. If this is done by the Appropriations Committee all of the propaganda figures of yesterday's harangues disappear into the vacuum of hot air that they belong in to start with.

But beyond the slyness of the propaganda is the suggestion that to balance the budget would be to shift the country into reverse gear at a time when it needs to rush forward with—to use the President's pet phrase—"vigor." Our people should realize that the Democrat administration seeks to rush us forward into bankruptcy.

The majority leader has also implied that the cuts that must be made in defense to keep the budget in balance will ruin our defense posture. He seeks to charge those who would do this with responsibility for letting the Russians get ahead of us.

This is the same old bucket of tripe that we have heard for years.

Mr. Speaker, the worst thing that can happen to this country is to undermine its currency to a point where we cannot meet our obligations. As a favorite of the President, the famous economist, Keynes, has so well stated, the surest way to ruin a country is to debauch its currency.

I am convinced that the welfare and strength of this Nation and its people require that in the coming fiscal year Government spending be confined to Government receipts. To do this is going to mean that there will have to be cuts in defense and cuts in space. I am satisfied that both of these agencies, were they to be completely candid in the backroom, would admit that they can absorb the necessary cut to produce budgetary balance without wrecking the defense or space posture.

Because of the extremity of the remarks and the positions taken by the gentlemen from the other side of the aisle yesterday in my absence, I am anxious that the record should show that this is one member of the Appropriations Committee who will not vote further deficit financing for this country, even if it means substantial reductions in defense and space spending. I am particularly anxious in view of the somewhat hysterical propaganda of yesterday's administration spokesmen that it be very clear upon this record that the reason that I shall so vote is because I am convinced that in the long run the surest way to wreck the United States is to destroy confidence in its currency, to undermine the savings, earnings and incentive of its citizens, and to weaken its capacity for any sustained retaliatory effort in the event of a national emergency.

The siren song of the false appeal of the materialist pork barrel which this administration sang loud and clear yesterday is still the road to ruin for America because, if followed, it is the road to bankruptcy.

We cannot have everything now, leaving nothing for tomorrow in the bank. Just because the shadows of the horrors of atomic destruction lurk in the background of an uneasy and unsettled future is no reason for us to allow the executive branch to recklessly squander America's inheritance by profligacy and waste.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have courage. They have strength. They have determination. When they are challenged they have got it. We are challenged now and we know it. The sop offered in the name of a continuation of critical governmental functions is in fact and theory further evidence of weakness and dry rot within America's leadership. This Nation deserves better than such a diet. The country will rally behind a Congress that, not niggardly but reasonably and firmly, cuts out the frills, puts our fiscal house in order, holds this budget in balance and makes a token payment on the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, this is the last thing the Communists want because if this is done it is evidence of the resurgence of American character and determination that spells the beginning of the end for communism throughout the world.

I hope and trust that Americans everywhere will understand the truth of what I have said here today. I hope that as they understand it their youngsters will be looking over their shoulder realizing as they do that it is their legacy and their future that the gentlemen from the other side of the aisle would fritter away just to stay in office a little while longer.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is not suggesting that the Committee on Appropriations is the final word on cuts in the budget?

Mr. WYMAN. Not at all.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The House itself will work its will on these items just as it did yesterday in cutting below the

Appropriations Committee report on several items.

Mr. WYMAN. I hope so.

Mr. EDMONDSON. So the gentleman is misleading and distorting rather than the gentleman who spoke yesterday.

Mr. WYMAN. The gentleman is not misleading and distorting. The Appropriations Committee makes selected cuts. Thus the harangues made yesterday were absolutely inaccurate because it is then up to the House to decide whether the cuts are applicable or not. The gentleman's party is in control, so he and they are then in a position to vote for or against exactly the same things his party leaders objected to yesterday on this floor.

Being in control both of the executive branch and of this House it becomes obvious that the list of projects and Federal services to be cut out if appropriations are reduced is in reality at the discretion first of this House and second of the Departments themselves if Congress does not select. So it is the barest of flim-flam to list these as the majority leader did yesterday.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRISON. I congratulate the gentleman on his remarks. I join with him in his thoughts as far as expenditure of public money is concerned and the necessity of making reductions in the proposed expenditures. In checking over this list, and I might say I left the floor before the colloquy took place yesterday, I am a little surprised by the number of so-called projects included in that list, which is in the Record following the statement that if a budget cut was made these projects would either be put off or eliminated. Under insert No. 5, on page 5507 of the Congressional Record, it says that these are Interior projects that would be blocked by the proposed budget reduction of $153 million. The Interior Department and related agencies appropriation bill was passed by the House yesterday. The original request of the Department was $1,028 million, which was a 14½-percent increase over the 1963 budget. This was cut $99 million through the action on a bipartisan basis of the committee and by the House of Representatives. At no time was it ever suggested nor was any attempt made to cut $153 million from the Department of the Interior budget either by the committee or here on the floor of the House. I might say these projects listed by States cover practically two pages of the Congressional Record and give no indication of the status of the projects listed—whether they have been authorized or whether any money has been appropriated for them or what their present status is as far as completion is concerned. Nor does the list of projects say whether they have been authorized or if any money was asked in the budget this year for that particular project.

I think if it is checked out very carefully, you will find that many of these projects and when I say many I mean by far the greater proportion of them, were not even mentioned in the budget request of the Department of the Interior for the 1964 budget. Therefore, to have these projects in the record, leaving the impression that our committee deliberately cut money out of these listed projects, is completely unfair and completely erroneous. I think the record shall be cleared up to show exactly what projects would be hurt if any are hurt and what projects the committee actually turned down and what money has been eliminated for the use of any particular project. I think to have a record such as this without pinpointing the details is completely unfair and certainly does not present a true picture of the situation at the present time without doubt is intended to mislead the general public as to what the House of Representatives is doing.

Mr. WYMAN. I am glad the gentleman from Wyoming, who is also a member of the Appropriations Committee, has pointed out that, as far as Interior is concerned, and I might say that the projects to which he has referred are extended all the way through to page 5520 of the Record in which the very blatant attempt has been made to influence and mislead the American people by telling them they would lose their jobs or projects will be withheld if there is a balanced budget.

What has been done here is the same old propaganda trick, a snow job, to justify the spending of our money at continued deficit levels, something that has been going on for too many years now. It is high time that some of us in this House stood on our feet and pointed out to the American people some of the savings that need to be and can safely be made so that we can continue to have a strong country and a future for our children.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYMAN. I yield.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Am I correct, may I ask my friend from New Hampshire, that several weeks ago the President of the United States characterized his 1964 budget as an austere budget?

Mr. WYMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MacGREGOR. And did not the President of the United States make recommendations to us yesterday in the field of foreign aid which would cut $400 million from the original budget estimate for fiscal year 1964?

Mr. WYMAN. I think the President has seen economic light to that extent.

Mr. MacGREGOR. And may I ask further of my friend from New Hampshire if it is not true that since the budget was submitted to the Congress in January the President of the United States has cut almost $200 million, in areas other than foreign aid, from what was described as an austere or uncuttable budget?

Mr. WYMAN. I agree with the gentleman. I am not aware of the exact amounts, but what has been done is further evidence of the need for reexamination. The people of the United States are looking to this Congress to do this for them. This is what we are here to do—and the gentlemen from across the aisle are putting up smokescreens.

Mr. MacGREGOR. One concluding question, if the gentleman will permit. The gentleman is correct, that the people of the United States of America must look to the Congress of the United States, not to the executive branch, for such cuts as can be reasonably made in this budget before we finish our work this year.

Mr. WYMAN. I agree with the gentleman. I resent the implications from the other side of the aisle that Congress is injuring the economy by an examination into Democrat policies, suggesting that we Republicans are taking the country back to an 1892 economy by standing firm for a strong currency. As a matter of fact, the truth is that the present administration is taking us on the road to bankruptcy by piling up deficits and at the same time proposing reduced tax revenues by a tax reduction without a corresponding reduction of Government expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE BUDGET

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there are just two points I think should be mentioned by way of refutation of the remarks just made on the floor. In the first place, the suggestion that the administration has been irresponsible in its budgeting may be supported in the mind of the gentleman, but I do not think it can be supported by the record. A single illustration, of course, is what happened in terms of the military authorization in which this Congress, at least the House, voted to increase very substantially the recommendations of the administration in the field of military authorization.

The second point is the big snow job, the big propaganda job the gentleman says has been done, was certainly not done by our majority leader on the floor of the House yesterday. The real snow job has been done over a period of some weeks on the other side of the aisle and by the spokesmen of the members of the party who sit on the other side of the aisle when they talk in terms of $10, $12, or $15 billion in budget cuts, without being specific as to where it can be accomplished. The effort yesterday to smoke them out and to get them to be specific about some area where they would actually advocate cuts was, I think, a bona fide effort and an entirely justifiable effort by the majority leader.

If there was someone who did not know about that, someone who did not respond, it is the responsibility of every Member to be on the floor of the House when it is in session. It is not the obligation of any Member to send individual notes to other Members to be on the floor because "I am going to make a speech tomorrow." This falls on very empty ears, as far as the general practices of the House are concerned.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. In connection with the vote in the U.S. House of Representatives—this body—on the military authorization bill, I should like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma whether it is not true that of the 33 votes which sustained the President's position and that of the Defense Department, all of those votes except 1 were Republican votes?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman may be accurate about that. I think the Republicans got 15 percent of their membership to stand up for economy when it came to an actual showdown, but so far as the great majority of the other side were concerned, you did not have any more of a consistent economy position on that than had the folks on this side. It is proper for us to exercise our judgment on what should be done. I do not yield to anyone in an honest desire to get the best defenses we can get. I am just saying it is one thing to talk about a $15 billion cut, it is another thing to vote for specific cuts. Certainly the other side has a very sad record on that score when we talk about military authorizations.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the gentleman from Oklahoma that he, being a Member of the majority party, certainly should be in a very excellent position, in fact even more so than the minority party, in finding spots in governmental operations and in the budget where specific cuts can be made and where they should be made. It would seem to me that rather than criticize the minority party for its efforts, which I believe are very fair, very fine, and follow the desires of the people of this country, it would be far better for the gentlemen on the other side to make an effort themselves to find where these budgets can be cut, because surely they can come up with specific instances. If they cannot and we do, they should not criticize us for our efforts.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman was here yesterday when the Interior Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee brought in a bill which was approximately 9 percent below the budgetary recommendations of the administration. Those cuts were brought in by a committee which was dominated by Democrats, as the gentleman well knows. This is an example of responsible legislation in an area where the committee found that cuts could be made without getting into the muscle field and without getting into the meat-ax approach. They have recommended these cuts. I think the House acted wisely in following their lead in this regard. But if you are going to talk about a $15 billion cut, let us see where it is going to be. Let us see some facts, let us see some particulars.

Mr. HARRISON. I think the gentleman is in a far better position than I am to pick out these spots. I am a member of that subcommittee, and I want to say it was a nonpartisan effort on the part of our committee in making those reductions, an effort supported by the minority members of the subcommittee, because if we had not made the cuts, and I am happy that the majority members of the committee went along, you would have had a minority report on that bill, because I would have filed one myself. But, because they were openminded and very fine people and believed that there should be cuts and they were justified, we came in with a unanimous report. And, that is the way it should be. I hope that in the days to come Members on both sides of the aisle will join in a program to try to get this country of ours back on a sound financial basis and quit deficit spending, because we cannot go on forever improverishing the American people. And, it is your responsibility just as much as it is on this side of the aisle to pick out spots in the recommended budgets of the departments to see where they can be reduced, because it is, after all, the responsibility of this Congress to see how much money shall be spent and how much money shall be appropriated, and we have no right to put that responsibility on anybody else's shoulder but our own.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I have before me a line-by-line proposal for budget cuts by a member of the Democrat Party. This was issued as recently as Friday, March 29, 1963.

To break this down in broad categories: Foreign aid, $3.3 billion; Federal-civilian payroll cost, $1.9 billion; proposed new construction, $2.2 billion; waste, extravagance, inefficiency, and so forth, $5.1 billion. So, there are individuals on both sides of the aisle that are interested in cutting this fantastic budget that has been proposed, so I would suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma that he check with members of his own party that have made suggestions for cutting the budget. Also, here in the Congressional Record of March 7 is another budget-cutting proposal by another member from the gentleman from Oklahoma's party. So, there are people on both sides of the aisle in the Congress that are still responsible individuals and would be very interested in seeing that the budget is brought down to a reasonable level.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. When the gentleman from Oklahoma referred to the B–70 program the other day it had to do with increasing the authorization bill, and he raised the same false picture that is characteristic of what I just referred to. This is just what was done in this House yesterday by the majority leader and others on his side. There is all the difference in the world between authorization bills and appropriation bills. It is the practice of many people to vote for authorizations and then, in turn, vote for appropriation bills that are considerably less than the authorization. Is the gentleman familiar with that practice?

Mr. STINSON. Yes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. When the gentleman who just took his seat will be around here a little longer, he will discover that appropriation bills follow authorization bills, and when you want to stop expenditures, the place to stop them is in authorizations, and if you do not put a stop on authorizations, you are not going to put brakes on appropriations. Furthermore, I have never made the statement on this floor that the effort to cut is a partisan effort. I do not know who picked that language up over there. I think that there are sincere people on both sides who put in an awful lot of time in committees, both authorizing and appropriating, working to keep down expenditures, and when that ceases to be a bipartisan effort, I think we have a very bad state of affairs.

Mr. STINSON. I would like to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire has been around Capitol Hill here for a good many years, even though he has not been a Member of the Congress. He has had a good deal of experience working around Congress, and with appropriations, and I believe that he is very well acquainted with what is going on around Capitol Hill. I might also point out that he was so highly regarded by the Republican Party that he was the only freshman appointed to the Appropriations Committee this year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Stinson] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations. About a week ago I offered my services. I said that each Member knows his own district the best, and I suggested that that Member advise me where we could cut in his district: Those of you who feel you are getting too excessive defense contracts, flood control projects you want discontinued, hospital grants, if the gentlemen will let me know, I will be glad to pass them on to the chairman.

I would like to get an answer.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. If I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey, you will have to look on your own side of the aisle rather than over here. With the propensity for the political distribution of public funds which has been shown by this administration in terms of these Federal programs, as was demonstrated in the food-stamp program, I think that on the other side of the aisle lies the opportunity for the saving of substantial amounts of money.

Mr. JOELSON. If the gentleman will yield further, I am looking at both sides of the aisle, and I have not gotten any answers from anyone on either side of the aisle.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, the point I was trying to make is this: Reference was made yesterday to the effect that cuts proposed by Members on this side of the aisle were going to wreck the economy, throw people out of work, and put the country in a bad situation. The point I was trying to make is that here we have Members from the other side of the aisle who have proposed very substantial cuts in the Federal budget.

Would the gentleman suggest that perhaps the Members of his own party are irresponsible and are trying to throw the country into a state of chaos and cause unemployment as a result of these proposals to cut the budget?

Mr. JOELSON. No; I do not suggest that to those on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to contribute this: It seems to me that there is a popular misconception, especially on the other side of the aisle, with regard to the respective functions of the legislative and executive branches with regard to this subject of the budget. We know that the Bureau of the Budget is in the executive department and that the budget is prepared by the executive department, a department which has 450 employees.

I think the function of the legislative branch is not to write the budget and not rewrite the budget, but to maintain control of the purse strings, to determine how much money shall be appropriated, how much in taxes shall be raised. Those are the things which we must inform the Executive about. Then the function becomes that of the Executive to determine in what manner in the conduct of the executive branch he wants to expend the money.

Mr. Speaker, it certainly is not the legislative branch's responsibility to determine the number of employees in each executive department of the Government. It is my opinion that we must and should specify the amount of money which the Government shall spend and then determine the amount of revenue which shall be provided in order to take care of those expenditures. If we do not now have the machinery for performing this necessary legislative function, and I do not believe we now have it, we should proceed at once to provide the machinery.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman to yield for the purpose of making one final observation. The gentleman from Illinois has just pointed out so well the entire thesis of my remarks of a few moments ago in regard to what the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have said in the way of dire predictions of what will happen in these various governmental departments and what will happen all around the country with respect to the loss of jobs and facilities if we confine Government expenditures to receipts. This is crying wolf with a vengeance. It is a blatant propaganda gesture in an effort to increase these appropriation bills. That is all it is. It is a misrepresentation to scare the Members of this House to put appropriations back into these bills. It is important that not only Republicans be concerned about this but responsible Members on the other side of the aisle also in order to alert our people to just what is going on. This has happened before and it will happen again unless we alert our people to the greater danger that exists today from these years of overspending.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McClory] and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman] be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Alger, for 1 hour, on April 10, 1963.

Mr. Wyman, for 15 minutes, on April 3, 1963.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Burkhalter and to include extraneous material.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Harrison) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Findley.

Mr. Short.

Mr. Morse.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Zablocki.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4374. An act to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; and

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week,' and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 4, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

640. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the first segment of the report of the special study of securities markets, relating to the adequacy of investor protection in the securities markets, pursuant to section 19(d) (Public Law 87-196) (H. Doc. No. 95) was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4549. A bill to amend section 4103 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the appointment of the Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 5389. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 1492. A bill to provide for the sale of certain reserved mineral interests of the United States in certain real property owned by Jack D. Wishart and Juanita H. Wishart; with amendment (Rept. No. 181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON:

H.R. 5429. A bill to amend section 104(s) of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, to require that 5 percent of the foreign currencies hereafter acquired by the sale of U.S. surplus agricultural commodities be set aside for the sale of dollars to American tourists abroad; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 5430. A bill to provide for the humane treatment of vertebrate animals used in experiments and tests by recipients of grants from the United States and by agencies and instrumentalities of the U.S. Government and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 5431. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the remarriage of a widow, or widower, or parent shall not prevent the payment of benefits if such remarriage is annulled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 5432. A bill relating to the retirement of judges of the territorial district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5433. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of October 11, 1949, 63 Stat. 759, ch. 672 (32 D.C.C. 417) to authorize the commitment of persons of unsound mind found on Federal reservations in Loudoun County, Va., to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5434. A bill to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 5435. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 5436. A bill changing Memorial Day to the last Monday of May; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5437. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act with respect to the compensation of hearing examiners and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5438. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 5439. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to replace the existing retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage, etc., with equivalent manufacturers excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 5440. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 5441. A bill to require an annual audit of each bank insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5442. A bill to amend section 5155 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to branches of national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 5443. A bill to require that 90 percent of the net earnings of Federal Reserve banks be paid into the Treasury, and that the financial transactions of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Reserve banks be audited by the General Accounting Office; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 5444. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to conduct research and development of precision equipment and systems for utilizing radio signals from space satellites to improve navigation of nonmilitary vessels at sea; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 5445. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to permit freight forwarders to acquire other carriers subject to such act, to place such transactions under the provisions of section 5 of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.J. Res. 370. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the establishment of a Court of the Union, which shall review the exercise of power or jurisdiction by the Supreme Court in certain cases upon demand of the legislatures of five noncontiguous States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.J. Res. 371. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the establishment of a Court of the Union, which shall review the exercise of power or jurisdiction by the Supreme Court in certain cases upon demand of the legislatures of five noncontiguous States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H. Con. Res. 128. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to present before the United Nations the question of the enslavement of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia with a view to obtaining their independence and the return of their peoples; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRISON: Joint memorial of the House of Representatives, 37th State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the U.S. Congress to oppose Federal legislation which would encroach on State-administered workmen's compensation programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama: Senate Resolution No. 3, of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, commending Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and all members of the Alabama congressional delegation for their concern for the cotton economy of Alabama by endorsing the 1963 cotton price support program and making recommendations toward ending the inequities of the two-price structure on cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, House Joint Resolution No. 13, of the State of Alabama House of Representatives, petitioning the Congress of the United States to call a convention to consider an amendment to the U.S. Constitution to establish a Court of the Union, which would sit upon demand of five States, not having any common boundary, the proposed court's sole function being the determination of whether power exercised by the United States is granted to it under the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 5446. A bill for the relief of Brian Richard Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 5447. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Wiswell, E. G. Haberman, Willard S. Bacon, and Robert L. Geisler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5448. A bill for the relief of Maria Josefa Pariente; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5449. A bill for the relief of Halina J. Admaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5450. A bill for the relif of Evadna Lal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 5451. A bill for the relief of the E.L.K. Oil Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 5452. A bill for the relief of Vittoria Italia William and Mario Alfanso Felice William; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 5453. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Denise Jeanne Escobar (nee Arnoux); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 372. Joint resolution to authorize the appointment of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur as General of the Armies of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

80. By the SPEAKER: Petition of R. E. Bream and others, Pittsburgh, Pa. Petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to taking whatever steps are necessary to withdraw from the United Nations for 24 important reasons set forth in their petition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

81. Also, petition of Fred Chiles and others, St. Louis, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting the impeachment of Chief Justice Warren and others in the Supreme Court for a recent decision in outlawing the name of "God" in public institutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in these awakening days of leaf and bud and flower, thrilling and throbbing with the vernal loveliness of April, we thank Thee for every sacrament of beauty of which our enraptured senses drink as we bend in wonder to the petaled cups held up by bushes aflame with Thee.

May the new glory of the arousing earth be but a parable of the things that are excellent, blooming in our risen lives as by the alchemy of Thy grace they become the gardens of the Lord.

Steady us, we pray, with the realization that beneath all the ugliness which hides the truth and beneath all the dark tragedy now plaguing the world, which could be so fair, there is the permanent good of Thy redemptive purpose for all mankind, to which we must be loyal if, at last, life is to be saved from frustration.

Whatever the future holds, may we face it calmly and in confidence, with the assurance that there lives the beauty that man cannot kill. May we hold that faith, and hold it fast. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 2, 1963, was dispensed with.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order of yesterday, the question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed on yesterday by the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] to the so-called Magnuson substitute for Senate bill 6, the Urban Transportation Act of 1963, beginning on page 26, in line 17, after the word "rights", to insert "to the extent not inconsistent with State or local law."

On the question of agreeing to this amendment, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if it is in order, I now ask unanimous consent, despite the agreement of yesterday, that I be allowed to suggest the absence of a quorum, and that the roll be called in that connection, with the rollcall to be concluded at the end of 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the quorum call will now be terminated.

Under the order entered yesterday, the question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] to the so-called Magnuson substitute for Senate bill 6, on page 26, in line 17, to insert, after "rights", the words "to the extent not inconsistent with State or local law."

The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are absent on official business.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 56, as follows:

[No. 30 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Allott
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hayden
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
McIntyre
Mechem
Miller
Monroney
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—56

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Engle
Fong
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McNamara
Metcalf
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Smith
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—3

Hickenlooper
Moss
Smathers

So Mr. Tower's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

REQUESTS FOR COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to meet today during the session of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I believe there are presently pending about six requests for committee meetings today. I have received several objections to some committee meetings. In consequence, I cannot make fish of one and fowl of another; and therefore I am constrained to object.

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely wish to make the observation that this committee is working hard and diligently on a most serious undertaking, with a most serious responsibility. The request has been made to expedite the committee's work. The committee is attempting to expedite its work. Under the circumstances, we shall have no alternative except to obey the declination of the Senate to grant us our request to proceed. We inevitably, I assume, and unavoidably, will be delayed with respect to progress we had hoped to make.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the same observation can be made with respect to the work of the entire Senate. The Senate is being taken to task editorially for the slowness of the Senate and the failure to accomplish something. That can be done only if Senators are in the Chamber. In consequence, I am distressed about it, but I must object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I feel that, despite the objection which has been made by the distinguished minority leader to the request made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, I must, perforce, ask unanimous consent that the following subcommittees be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, to hold hearings on the insurance industry.

The Subcommittees on Labor and Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Business and Commerce Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I must object to every request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of Senators.

A number of Senators—proud fathers, may I say, in most instances—find that duties appropriate to the season will necessitate their absence from the Chamber this morning. At the same time, they are anxious to make progress on the pending bill.

Therefore, it seems wise to the leadership to proceed with debate on amendments to the bill, while postponing rollcall votes until later in the day.

Therefore, with the concurrence of my distinguished colleague, the minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcall votes which may be ordered on amendments be postponed until not earlier than 2 o'clock, with the understanding that debate on the amendments may proceed from now until that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, may I ask my friend, the distinguished minority leader, in what way it would hurt the Senate if the Committee on Government Operations, now working on a matter I know we all want to see expedited, should meet this morning? Senators could come to the Chamber to vote after the bells ring and when the votes were taken.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how could I very well concur in that request and then say "No" to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] with respect to the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee hearing; to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible] with respect to the Subcommittee on Public Lands; and to the interested Senators with respect to the Subcommittee on Business and Commerce of the Committee on the District of Columbia and other subcommittees?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. The Senator will suspend until the Senate is in order.

The Senator from Montana yields 3 minutes from the time on the bill to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], who is in charge of the bill, yields 3 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, to conclude the observation, I cannot very well object in behalf of Senators who register objection with me as to some committees and subcommittees, and let other committees and subcommittees meet.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as the work of the Senate builds up, does the able minority leader believe we shall not be allowed to have committee hearings at the same time the Senate is meeting at an hour earlier than noon. If this is going to be the practice it will create grave problems for Senators as to scheduling of their time. I do not see how we can do committee work and Senate work at the same time under such a policy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not generalize the matter. We are trying to complete consideration of the pending bill today. I think it can be completed today. I am not going to subject Senators to having to trot back and forth from the Chamber to the New Senate Office Building and to the Old Senate Office Building on rollcall votes, and that sort of thing. In addition, Senators do wish to be present, I am sure, to hear some of the discussion on the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The amendments are to be disposed of today. I think it is in the interest of the committees and in the interest of the Senate that they be disposed of. If, for any reason, the majority leader feels the Senate can go over a day, Senators will have an entire day in which to catch up.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the minority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This is an unusual circumstance, as the Senator understands. He knows it is not normal policy for the Senate to operate on this basis, except in an unusual situation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I say, with great respect to the majority leader, that I have known of many cases in recent years when it became the practice, for various reasons, for one or more Senators not to want committee meetings when the Senate was in session. It seems to me we get hoisted by our own petard under such procedure, if the premise is we want to expedite the business of the Senate.

The first year I was in the Senate, 1953, we voted some 10 times in one afternoon on the tidelands oil bill, walking over from committee to vote. It seems to me that this action, especially when we have a matter as important as that currently before the Government Operations Committee, means we are all cooperating to hinder the work of the Senate. I say this with great respect to the majority leader and the minority leader; but that is the way I feel about it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has a point there. It happens now and then, but it is not the normal procedure most of the time. I point out further that any Senator can at any time object to any regular committee meeting during the session of the Senate, except, I believe, the Appropriations Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri may have 1 more minute.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK. I ask my friend the Senator from Missouri whether the colloquy we have just had does not convince him, as it has convinced me again, that we had better change the Senate rule which permits one Senator to prohibit committees from meeting when the Senate is in session, if we are to proceed with the pending measure and other business of the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not want to commit myself by a general statement on the rules this morning, but, under the circumstances now existing, especially inasmuch as the primary reason for pushing this bill through today was that certain Senators had dates out of town, I feel we are all cooperating in hindering the work of the Senate by not allowing committees to meet. That is my point.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 1 minute?

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is there an amendment at the desk? I believe the Senator from Colorado has an amendment at the desk, and I think it ought to be brought up and stated.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk numbered 29.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed to amend section 13, subsection (c), on page 17, as follows:

> Starting with the word "Thereafter" on line 13, page 17, strike all through line 21, page 17.

Mr. DOMINICK obtained the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just 30 seconds.

Mr. DOMINICK. Thirty seconds.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senate will be in order, I would like to clarify my position.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will suspend until the Senate is in order. Time will not run until the Senate is in order. Senators who desire to converse will please retire to the cloak rooms.

The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senate rules provide that any Senator can object to a committee meeting while the Senate is in session. If this body wants to change the rules, that is perfectly all right with me. I am entirely within the rules, and when Members on this side file objections, I shall honor the objections and assert them on the Senate floor. It is that simple.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The 30 seconds yielded to the Senator from Illinois have expired.

THE MYTHOLOGY OF NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT—LECTURE BY DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] for 30 seconds.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I have read with great interest a lecture by David E. Lilienthal on "The Mythology of Nuclear Disarmament." The author, who was the first Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and formerly Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, is now chairman of the board, Development & Resources Corp., New York City. I commend this lecture to all my colleagues as a realistic analysis and major contribution to the discussion of current arms control and disarmament issues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the lecture be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MYTHOLOGY OF NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

(By David E. Lilienthal)

Spring comes early in Washington. The 15th of February in 1950 was a warm, shirtsleeve day; the green that touched the willow trees told you spring had come. I walked out of my office, the office of the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, down the marble stairs, handed my security badge to the officer at the door for the last time, and went out into the late afternoon sunshine. For the first time in years, the atom was off my shoulders. I said to myself: "Now I've left the atom behind, for someone else to worry about."

But I soon found that I couldn't leave the atom behind; the atom stayed right with me. It is a part of my life, as a private individual, as it is part of your life, of everyone else's life.

And so, in these lectures—a kind of "atom revisited"—I shall try to look at the atom as a part, an integral part, of the life of men on earth today.

To examine the place of the atom as a part of the way men order their lives in the world of 1963 we need first of all to take a broad look at what is bigger than the atom and of which the atom is an important part, but only a part: the world we live in today, the world of men and nations of 1963.

What kind of a world is it, this world of 1963?

Certainly it is a world of swift, radical change—change at an unprecedented tempo. It is a world of creativity, of new ideas, new ambitions, new projects, new cruelties, and new compassion; a world where outworn ideas are being discarded. A world in transformation. It is a world of men who are uniting, quarreling, fighting, rebelling, building, but constantly on the move toward something different. A world that is fluid and exciting. Of evil and violence there is plenty; of standing still there is little. Movement and change of a scale and intensity never before known are the keynote of the world of 1963.

I have seen or sensed these changes out of my personal observation and experience, as each of you have out of yours. Since the day 13 years ago that I once again became a private citizen I have observed or been a part of change in the course of my work. In Latin America and Asia I have seen evidence of perhaps the greatest migration of human beings in history, the tidal movement from the land to the cities. I have seen the ancient power of the great landlords weakened beyond restoration in the south of Italy, in many parts of Asia and South America. I have seen vast physical changes, ancient deserts made green, great rivers put in harness, mountains moved. I have seen Africans, now rulers of tiny new republics, feted and honored by General de Gaulle in Paris and the President in Washington, not as wards but as equals, as heads of state. As a layman I have caught the excitement in the community of scientists of new concepts and discoveries in physics, in biology, in medicine, in mathematics. And in the area of political alinements, tremendous change. The little island of Cuba a threat to the Western Hemisphere. Stalin gone. India freed of Britain, her freedom now endangered not by Britain but by her ancient brothers, other Asians. Most impressive and far-reaching of all changes, within hardly more than a decade you and I have witnessed the building of a European community, and despite all setbacks we have seen the evidence of growing awareness of interdependence among the peoples of the world.

And yet, over this picture of a world in motion, confident, restless, there hangs the dark cloud of the atom; what the President has called the "nuclear sword of Damocles."

This part of the world of today—the atom—is what most troubles men's minds. It is this part of the world of 1963 I propose to discuss first in these lectures, but in the context of a world in motion.

Everyone recognizes what a terrible disaster the use of nuclear weapons can bring to the whole world. Here there are no important differences of opinion. The area of difference of opinion lies in answers to the question: What can be done about this threat of disaster, and how?

There are at least three different points of view among us:

First, there are those who find that the answer lies in the question itself: First we get rid of the weapons. Universal disarmament, not unilaterally but by the process of negotiated treaty with the Soviet Union, is a life-and-death imperative. Press the negotiations at Geneva as a primary and urgent and overriding objective. We are told on high authority that disarmament is "the most seriously pressed proposal for the achievement of peace"; our President has admonished the world that, "The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us."

The classic pronouncement of the view of the primacy of disarmament is that of an eminent man of letters, a scientist and expositor of science as a culture, Sir Charles Snow. In an address to the American Association for the Advancement of Science on December 27, 1960, Sir Charles said: "We are faced with an 'either-or' and we haven't much time. Either we accept a restriction of nuclear armaments," and he adds that such a course involves risks, "or the nuclear arms race between the United States and the U.S.S.R. not only continues but accelerates * * * within at the most 10 years, some of these bombs are going off * * * on the one side, therefore, we have a finite risk. On the other side we have a certainty of disaster. Between a risk and a certainty, a sane man does not hesitate. It is the plain duty of scientists to explain this 'either-or.' It is a duty which seems to me to come from the moral nature of the scientific activity itself."

With Sir Charles' concept of absolutes in human affairs—"either-or"—I profoundly disagree. In these lectures I shall seek to make plain some of the reasons, both philosophical and practical, why I disagree with such an "either-or" approach. Great as are the hazards of nuclear weapons, I do not believe this fact can materially alter the way by which from time immemorial mankind has confronted and adjusted to change.

Second, the second course to avoid nuclear disaster embraced by many can be summarized in this way: Give the negotiation of a disarmament agreement the top priority, even while recognizing that the prospects of complete agreement immediately are not bright. But concurrently seek other ways as well by which tensions and animosities between the great powers can be reduced and relieved.

This is far from an unreasonable view, but it is not one which I can share. In my opinion this course does not give proper weight to the dangers to peace that lie in the very process of negotiating disarmament, in the present state of animosity between the great powers. Moreover, this course, I fear, does not adequately recognize that such a preoccupation with disarmament distracts and dilutes our faith, our energies, and our spiritual and physical resources in pursuing other more hopeful and realistic roads toward peace, outside the area of disarmament.

I ask you to consider with me still another concept, one that represents my own conviction, reached after a painful reassessment of my earlier views of the road to peace in an age of nuclear weapons.

My view of the best course is founded on my belief that in human affairs the only thing that is inevitable is change: that there is no single great dramatic step, neither disarmament nor sole and increased reliance on weapons, that will or can solve the problem of nuclear weapons. I find the great hope for peace to lie not in a single panacea but in diversity, in pursuing the ends of peace in thousands of areas of human life, a theme upon which I shall enlarge in my second lecture.

Tonight I invite you to consider with me the hazards to the very peace we seek that lie in the disarmament negotiating process under present conditions.

I believe it to be fundamental that it is the causes of war that must first be ameliorated before we can safely make progress toward eliminating or even limiting substantially these terrible weapons of war. The reason nuclear weapons are a threat to the world lies not primarily in the inanimate weapons themselves, but in the animosities, the suspicions, the conflicting drives and ambitions and ideologies of the nations who possess the weapons: that while the very existence of such awesome weapons increases tensions, it is more than futile, I believe it is courting disaster to negotiate for general disarmament in the present atmosphere of distrust and hatred.

With this as a summary of what I ask you to consider, let me proceed to an outline of the thesis upon which my views rest.

Atomic energy was the creative product of many different kinds of specialized knowledge. This achievement represents a very high order of imagination and creativity indeed. But this achievement is also a high point in the fragmentation of knowledge and of responsibility for knowledge. So complex an achievement as atomic energy, with so many ramifications, coming so suddenly, required a high degree of compartmentalization. The scientific, the technological, the military, the diplomatic, the political—even the grave ethical implications were customarily often dealt with as a separate kind of expertise. The technicians and experts and specialists took over the atom. They took it over in pieces, not as a whole. To this day no one has ever been able—or tried very hard, I think—to put the pieces together in an overall way. There has been too little effort to understand the whole, to see the whole, meaning, the values involved, and their place in our scheme of values. The preoccupation has been with bits and pieces. In such a circumstance the alienation from the fabric of the rest of life today was inevitable. That alienation now is almost complete.

The place of the atom in the life of the world cannot be understood, much less dealt with creatively in its military as well as its nonmilitary aspects so long as we continue to think of it as the exclusive domain of the experts, fragmented and compartmentalized into a score or more fields of expertise.

The theme of what I shall say throughout these lectures then is this: that a basis for understanding atomic energy in the life of mankind is not the mastery of physics or abstract mathematics or diplomacy or military science or the exotic nuances of some of the disarmament expertise. To understand the atom we must reassert what through the ages wise men have come painfully to know of the condition of men in a changing world, how human affairs are conducted—and misconducted.

The majestic scientific discoveries that—in a kind of shorthand—I have simply called the atom have not changed the inner springs of man's life. Man's emotions, his fears, his hopes, his motivations, good and evil—these basics of the very nature of man himself are still decisive in the shaping of events growing out of the atom, as they continue to be in the rest of that world we live in, of which, sooner or later, we must come to see the atom is an integral part.

Man is not obsolete. Neither the atom nor any other scientific or military or diplomatic development can make him obsolete. Man is the center, the motive force, as he was before the atomic revelations, as he will be when we get the atom fitted into the ways of men and nations, making the worst or the most of the miracle of life itself.

We must apply to our fears and hopes and plans and policies about the atom what we have learned over the centuries about the affairs of man. The recesses of man's heart, his passions, his emotions, ugly and mean, sublime and noble, are the source and the driving force of all change: physical changes such as the blooming of the once-arid Persian Desert; political changes, such as that now sweeping a uniting Europe, or the revolution moving across the landlord-dominated countries; cultural changes that are permeating our own society and that of the Soviet Union. The decisive "winds of change" have their origins in the emotions and inner drives of men.

Boundless change, individual restlessness and movement and creativity, the surge of new ideas and new energies—this then is the picture of the world of 1963. Yet in that part of the world scene which we call the atom the dominant mood is not of daring, not affirmation, not change and challenge. The dominant mood is negative: fear, anxiety, a monumental sense of frustration in which the hope is a negative static one, a hope of sheer survival.

The reason I have made a point of stressing what we all know, namely, that man is the source of change is this: many people act as if the ordinary rules of life can be suspended as far as the atom is concerned, as if the problem—the overriding problem—of the atom can somehow be dealt with on a basis contrary to other human experience—in short, the short-cut "either-or" approach, which we would reject as unrealistic in any other area of human affairs, somehow can be made to apply with success to the atom.

In effect, haven't we given the atom a separate status—or, rather, tried to? We have placed the atom outside of the current of human affairs. Is it any wonder, then, that we have been frustrated? Is it any wonder, then, that the current of change and movement which you and I have seen transforming all other human affairs has seemed not to have touched the atom at all?

With the atom, time is suspended. The bombs have grown bigger and far more numerous, and the daily confrontation of antagonist nuclear forces therefore more terrifying. But I do not see that there has been any essential change in thinking about the atom since the end of World War II—change of the kind that—for good or bad—has revolutionized so many other areas of human activity.

First we had the bomb, and then—rather quickly—the Russians had it, too. And so we produced a superbomb, a thermonuclear bomb: the Russians were not slow to respond with their own superbombs. As E. B. White, our greatest essayist, puts it: "Bomb begets bomb. A begets H. Anything you can build I can build bigger." And so the story has gone.

The story of nuclear weapons is not one of change in a world of change, but essentially one of repetition—a circle in which we and the Russians have gone round and round, chasing each other's tails, year after year after year. This is the source of our despair, of our frustration, of our fear. We seem to remain locked in the same cell of circumstance—the Russians and ourselves together—with only a remote hope of emerging ever.

Now, of course, I do not pretend to have any final answers or solutions to the terrible frustrating question that the explosive atom poses for all civilization. Indeed, I do not believe that there are any such satisfying and complete answers. What I am going to try to do in these discussions, essentially, is to suggest that there is hope—but we have been looking for it in the wrong places.

I propose with you to examine our basic outlook and policies, and if we find we are clinging to what is irrelevant in 1963—in short, rubbish of another time and world—I say we should face up to that fact. A new approach, a new perspective fitted to the world as it is, is sorely needed. And one of the first steps, surely, toward such a new outlook is for the world to begin to own up to its failures, to jettison its outmoded ideas.

As to most of our atomic ideas, inherited almost intact and unchanged from another epoch, the words of President Kennedy at Yale last spring have a terrible relevance: "Mythology distracts us everywhere * * * we must move on," he said—about economics, but with even greater pertinence to our outlook on the atom. "We must move on from the reassuring repetition of stale phrases to a new, difficult but essential confrontation with reality."

Let us then try to confront the realities of the atom. Let us question our basic assumptions about nuclear weapons and peace.

In such confrontation we shall find, as I shall seek to show later, that a whole series of the basic premises that only a few years ago were considered beyond challenge or question have already been abandoned; that they are now part of the mythology of the atom which only serves to distract us from the realities. I propose that we also examine and challenge our current assumptions and premises, to see if some of them, too, should not be relegated to the limbo of outmoded or unsound ideas.

Now is the time—perhaps the first time for more than a decade—when it is possible to undertake such a reexamination in an atmosphere in which fundamental questions can be asked with a fair chance that they will be treated with an open mind. Why do I say this? Because the cocksureness has gone out of most of us. Our mounting frustration with the course we have taken and the assumptions on which it is based makes us now ready, even eager to reconsider and think afresh. Whether this may not also be true of the Russian leaders I have of course no way of knowing, but it is always a possibility.

The basic atomic weapons policy of the United States almost from the beginning days of Hiroshima has been based upon a fundamental but quite understandable misapprehension.

What is the essence of this great misapprehension? It is this: that because the Atom is such a uniquely powerful force for destruction, a revolutionary kind of destructive power, that in dealing with it we must divorce it, set it apart from everything the human race had previously learned about man's behavior, about war and peace, about our institutions, about foreign policy, about military matters, about science. This simply isn't so. Bit by bit, and case by case, as I shall remind you later in these lectures, we have already learned, the hard way, that it isn't so. But being misled by this belief in the special status of the powerful Atom we have increasingly brought upon ourselves frustration after frustration.

Why did this misapprehension take so firm a hold of us? Perhaps it was the dramatic, destructive, sudden way in which we first learned of this new force. We know that the more gradual advent of electricity revolutionized our entire way of life; that the automotive engine has brought a revolution in our way of living; that the electron revolutionized our whole scheme of communication, and with it our culture. And yet in these and similar cases these new discoveries were not divorced from all previous experience. They were somehow adapted and incorporated into the whole fabric of the life of man. Not so the atom.

The fantastic destructive power of the atom is a reality. The conclusions drawn from this fact are myths.

Those myths are still at the foundation of our policies and our outlook.

It is time to challenge our basic premises and the corollaries which flow from them. I want specifically to challenge the premise which has become common to our policy of the ways to avoid and avert nuclear war.

I would state that underlying policy in this way: That the chief and indeed the only solution to the problems raised by nuclear weapons lies within the field of nuclear weapons.

How badly this has worked out we know only too well. First we placed our faith in our U.S. monopoly of the A-bomb.

Then, when the monopoly vanished—and vanish it did all too soon—and the hope of international control became ever more remote, we still put our faith in bombs, but they had to be bigger and bigger: the H-bomb. Then this reliance upon even bigger bombs failed us when the Russians duplicated our H-bombs. Weapons proved a source of frustration, not an answer, a stopgap, perhaps, but not the once fervently embraced "solution" of an American pax atomica.

All these positions, I think, had essentially the same foundation—a preoccupation with atomic weapons themselves as the key to world peace, to world government, to the containment of communism, or to the maintenance, if not of peace, or peace of mind, to a kind of world stability.

Let us take a look at our present policies. They are also founded on that same major premise: That the primary answer to the dangers of nuclear warfare are to be found almost exclusively within the area of nuclear weapons.

The first of these current premises is this: We must maintain a powerful nuclear force; this should be combined with a strengthening of overall conventional military forces, but with the predominant emphasis by all odds upon nuclear weapons. This includes weapons in large numbers, and of very great power (although here the H-bomb euphoria of 1950 about the virtues of increasing the destructive power of individual weapons seems to be declining). It now certainly emphasizes delivery systems capable of putting these weapons on targets and keeping them as nearly invulnerable to enemy attack as possible.

A nuclear shield does not by any manner of means provide a complete answer, for security or peace. But it is the only military alternative that, at the present, is open to us.

Our present thinking lays great stress on the idea of mutual deterrent; that is, that peace can be kept by nuclear weapons where each of the antagonists is strong enough in these weapons to destroy the other. To put it more explicitly, the argument is that nuclear weapons are a step toward peace if the United States and the Soviet Union are both so strongly armed that it is too hazardous to their objectives for either side to make use of them. Under this doctrine neither antagonist can allow the other to outdistance him in nuclear weapons; otherwise the deterrent or stalemate may not be effective.

There would seem to be something of an anomaly here; namely, that vast effort should be put into the development and production of weapons so powerful that they can never be used. Anomalous or not, I myself see no present alternative to maintaining our nuclear shield. In any case the premise of building up nuclear arms so great as to be unusable as an instrument for the waging of war is basic in the West, and it would appear one equally firmly held by the Soviet Union.

Here again the premise is that we avoid nuclear war by what we do with nuclear weapons.

The second basic premise upon which we now erect our hopes for peace moves in what would appear to be the opposite direction, though paradoxically parallel and concurrent to the first premise or policy. It too is preoccupied and centered upon nuclear weapons.

The best hope, so this premise states, of preventing worldwide nuclear war is by putting an end to the arms competition, through a negotiated program of disarmament with the U.S.S.R. The current proposals by both the United States and the Soviet Union have been couched in language of a program of general and total disarmament, but the crucial phase deals with nuclear weapons.

Eliminating nuclear weapons and the means to carry them is now held out as the great last chance.

Giving higher priority to disarmament through negotiation rather than priority to the diverse multiple means of ameliorating the causes of distrust and animosity is a doctrine that I feel is not only quite unrealistic but dangerous to the goals disarmament negotiations seek to reach. It is a doctrine that rests upon the mistaken premise of the isolation of the explosive atom from the rest of human affairs, its elevation to some almost mystical special status. This separation of the atom from the whole range of human affairs has resulted in a narrowing of our outlook, so that we do not clearly see the broad spectrum of rapid human change going on in the world. A world of change is a world of hope, if we do not allow our preoccupation with nuclear weapons to chill our creativeness and weaken our will in other areas outside weapons.

The road to eliminating war using nuclear weapons then is said to be disarmament.

I say "said to be" because this is the official verbal position of the great powers, and the great tranquilizer for the anxious lay citizen, on our side and perhaps both sides of the curtain of iron. Draft treaties by the United States and the U.S.S.R. calling for such general disarmament lie before the negotiators at Geneva; in this country dozens of technical studies to support our proposal are underway.

The Russians for years have lost no opportunity to propose in general terms the early goal of general disarmament, as years ago they initiated the transparently unacceptable ban-the-bomb cure for world tensions. The United States, following this lead, has also put forward a proposal for step-by-step general disarmament. A special agency in our Government on disarmament is in existence. For several years the Russians and ourselves (as chief parties) have been at the conference table at Geneva on what is described as a first step in disarmament, that is, an attempt to agree not to test nuclear weapons.

It is not decisive—and not a bit surprising—that these disarmament efforts have not thus far produced agreement, though it is possible that some form of agreement on testing—or a de facto suspension—may be within reach. What is more significant, I suggest, is that the discussions themselves have increased, and are likely to continue to increase rather than diminish ill will and distrust. Our willingness to negotiate (and to make one concession after another, as we have) has not increased the Russians' confidence in us. It has certainly not increased our confidence in their intentions. Our representatives have been forced openly and explicitly to say that the Russians are using disarmament talks to gain time for military advantage, and we say much the same thing about their good faith and aggressive intentions.

From time to time—as in the past—Chairman Khrushchev will make some dramatic disarmament move, couched in conciliatory terms. This will, if the past is any measure, encourage a belief among many people that disarmament is in truth a real hope. As a consequence, there will once more be a diminution of vigor and faith and public interest in those more prosaic measures for peace that lie outside the area of weapons. The Russians have done this more than once before, Chairman Khrushchev coming to the United States at one time for that purpose. It is bound to happen again in a somewhat different form, perhaps at Geneva and possibly soon.

But it is my opinion that, whatever the motive, such proffers, while they will stir hopes in an anxious world, will prove to be another source of disillusion, another diversion and dilution of the priority that should go to other means of bringing peace, and a cause of added frustration and anger. The underlying animosities will not be diminished thereby; on the contrary. The negotiations at Geneva, although conducted by able and patient men, have not, in my opinion, improved the prospects for avoiding nuclear disaster, but have subtracted from the prospects of peace.

Why should we continue the official rhetoric that the U.S.S.R. or the United States seriously expects major disarmament in the near future? The acts of rearmament of both our governments look the other way. We were never farther from a peaceful mood than in the midst of this disarmament rhetoric, on both sides. This is not necessarily for lack of sincerity as to goals. Certainly neither the United States nor the U.S.S.R. wants war or wants to go on spending vast sums on armament. But in any case the formal position of both governments places serious steps in disarmament highest on their officially stated priorities, so we must consider it a major premise.

But there are other reasons why we must consider the current negotiations for disarmament with the utmost seriousness, and question them if we feel, as I do, that they should be challenged. For whether the negotiators believe there will be consequential affirmative results of their efforts or not, they are necessarily prisoners of a commitment, an emotional commitment to their premise which I regard as a mirage, a myth, the myth that hope for eliminating war lies chiefly or solely in eliminating weapons of war. This premise may sooner or later pervade American public opinion and reach the minds of average men and women who are, as compared to the disarmament negotiators and experts, uninformed and unsophisticated in the realities of his issue. (That the Russians may be counting on this very gambit can be reasonably drawn from a reading of the views of a man long familiar with Soviet military thinking, Prof. P. M. S. Blackett, in a recent issue of Harper's Magazine.)

The average American may regard Geneva and the endless meetings as a necessary propaganda fix we are in, since we cannot allow the Russians to say that we do not want disarmament and that, therefore, we do not want peace. The average man and the conscientious realistic public servant may fully realize that the negotiations at the time are futile. Yet the feeling is widespread, I would judge, among very well-motivated people that such negotiations are the only hope, so must be continued, however slender the prospects. But here, I fear, is the heart of the danger. That adherence to the myth that the only hope is disarmament (or "arms control" as it is sometimes called) becomes such an emotional fixation as to blind us to what other things there are to do that are do-able.

We got into this negotiating fix about arms I suggest, because of our adherence to the basic premise that cause the confusion and frustration, the premise that the roots of the problem of war are the weapons of war, that to eliminate them is the primary road to peace.

I know of nothing in modern experience and history that supports the thesis that disarmament in itself brings peace. Nor do I believe that it is "inevitable" that a continuance of the arms race must lead to nuclear war. This is a kind of "either-or" outlook that to me is at odds with everything we know or ought to know about human affairs. In this world nothing seems inevitable—good or bad—except the process of change. And, more affirmatively, I ask you to consider whether the prospects for changes that will make nuclear armaments less relevant, that will minimize the risk that they will be used, or any arms used, is not far greater if we give the highest priorities of statesmanship and public attention to those changes which further the slow, but I believe, sure growth of community among men, for here is the true disarmament.

I repeat, it is not the nuclear weapons that are at the center of our problems. It is man. Nuclear weapons in Canada, say, are no threat to us; the same weapons at the same distance, in Cuba, are a desperate threat. The difference is not in the presence of weapons but the purposes of the men behind them—their motives, their grievances, the desperation of their leaders because of internal pressures, the poverty of their people, and so on—in short the whole bundle of human emotional combustibles which cause war.

I have a deep confidence that in time the world will find ways of composing most differences and conflicts without war. But conflicts and competition and struggle and the impulse to use force we shall always have to contend with: they are built into the nature of man himself. Even the followers of Ghandi are forced to see this. After the Chinese invasion, Prime Minister Nehru is reported to have said of the Indians: "We were getting out of touch with realities in the modern world. We were living in an atmosphere of our own creation and we have been shaken out of it." But built into the nature of man himself are also God-like qualities of reason, of compassion, of compromise and of love, not only for his own family but for the family of men.

The crucial question is not whether we are for or against disarmament, for or against peace. What we must ask ourselves carefully and critically is whether negotiation about disarmament at this time is for or is against the interests of peace, for or against the ultimate prospects of true disarmament.

There are four chief concerns I have about continuation or resumption of general or nuclear disarmament negotiations at this time with the Soviet Union; they can be summarized in this way:

First. High priority given to negotiations for disarmament treaties at this time, such as those pending in Geneva add to the risks

of disaster. For they provide the tinder for an increase rather than a decrease in acute animosities, distrust, tensions, and confrontations, at almost the worst possible time, with no likelihood of an offsetting gain for peace to balance against the taking of such added risks.

Second. A disarmament treaty, now, between the Soviet Union and the United States and the West would leave the warlike Chinese in a position of power dangerous to world peace; even a serious prospect that both the great powers might disarm could be disturbing to peace-loving peoples in Asia, under the shadow of China.

Third. Disarmament negotiations, that is a preoccupation with weapons, distract and dilute our energies and attention from those multiple, diverse ways and means of strengthening bit by bit the sense of community and commonalty of interest in the world in which lies the real hope of making weapons less relevant. This is a concern I shall address myself to more fully in the second lecture.

Fourth. If negotiations for disarmament are undertaken seriously under current conditions they are unrealistic. Therefore, they have the infirmities and dangers of any escape from reality in a tough and changing world. And if they are not undertaken seriously, but as propaganda moves, they have the risk of any transparent maneuver: little hope of gain for peace, and real danger of moral injury.

A few comments on my first stated concern: That negotiations now, at the wrong time and under the wrong circumstances, can and do increase the very anxieties, tensions, and animosities they are designed to diminish.

No need to get into the technicalities of the months and years of the negotiations. Take one instance only. Ironically, this instance arises out of the sole issue of principle on which the United States and the U.S.S.R. have reached verbal agreement.

In September 1961 Ambassadors McCloy and Zorin agreed for their Governments—and I quote a portion of the central clause—that "all measures of general and complete disarmament should be balanced so that at no stage of the implementation of the treaty could any state or groups of states gain military advantage," as a consequence of disarmament measures.

How can these bitter antagonists discuss a balance of military force, as between them, so that the discussion will make any sense at all, without disclosing to the other what is the state of their arms at the time of the balancing process? And information, in sufficiently revealing detail to mean anything, about the state of their arms, inevitably discloses to knowledgeable men their war plans and military policies. War policies and plans are a nation's most sensitive area, making the controversial "on-site" inspection of underground tests seem innocuous indeed by comparison. And how can discussion of balance make any sense unless the disclosures and representations of the two parties of their present arms are subjected to verification by the other side? The incentive for lying, or saber-rattling to impress the other side, would be brought to a new high point if such a discussion got very far. What a bagful of furies the specific discussion of such propositions might unleash. What acute anxieties it would stir. How much nearer this could bring us to the point of no return.

There are more than a few instances growing out of the negotiations of disarmament and of the test ban that have led to, and will continue to lead to, provocative and dangerous charges of bad faith, on both sides. These are directed not just against the negotiators, but inevitably challenge the honor and intentions of the heads of state and their chief civilian and military officers. Repeatedly calling into question the honesty and intentions of a great power, in the ugly temper of the present, inflicts wounds that fester. When the dispute in negotiation is fishery rights, say, that is one thing. But where the questions are those of life and death that are involved in disarmament discussions, that is quite another matter; for, while these talks go on, the very subjects of discussion—their nuclear missiles, and ours—are pointed toward each other night and day. Under these conditions an accusation that impugns an antagonist's basic intentions about those very weapons increases the risk that the trigger will be pulled by design or in panic, since such an accusation may well be construed as the signal for attack, forcing what a military man might readily justify as anticipatory retaliation.

Thus the very discussions intended by both sides to diminish distrust and promote better relations can produce mutual crises of confidence—grave, acute, and even explosive.

Turning to a discussion of my second stated concern, the absence of China from the conference table.

The discussions about disarmament have assumed two antagonists. A commitment, therefore, on the part of the Soviet Union for disarmament is presumed, under this doctrine, to encompass wholly one side of the balance of power, and the same is to be said of the West. But the fluidity of the world is such that the Soviet Union may not even now be able to speak for the countries that are or may be major threats to peace. It is almost certain today that the Soviet Union would be unable to commit China to disarmament. With the West and the Soviet disarmed the Chinese could make a mockery of the very objective of disarmament: peace in the world. If the Soviet did in fact disarm, and China did not, would the peace-loving Indians regard this as a step toward peace? Of course not.

If any further evidence of the unreality of Geneva were needed, the absence of China would supply it. Can one conceive of the U.S.S.R. disarming, except as a token, without China included? Can anyone expect us to do that, either? Of course not. Would any person now want the United States and U.S.S.R. to disarm, with the warlike Chinese on the move?

On the other side (but to a lesser degree) it is far from clear that the United Kingdom and the United States could now speak for the Republic of France on a disarmament program, perhaps even on a test ban, certainly not until France fully establishes herself as a nuclear power.

Disarmament now, as a principal reliance for peace, has the inherent defect: that unless it is well-nigh universal it increases the power for mischief of those who are unwilling to disarm, or who change sides, from being friends to being enemies. In our own time we have seen almost overnight, shifts in who is enemy and who is friend. On one day the strongest military nation in Europe, the German Reich, was on the friendliest terms with Russia, and on the following day, waging war with her. For hundreds of years the people of China and the people of India regarded themselves as brothers. As I speak to you, they are engaged in war. Ten years ago we, the United States, insisted on a provision in the Japanese constitution against a Japanese military establishment. It was not long thereafter that we were complaining bitterly that the Japanese were slow in rearming themselves.

If the pieces on the armament chessboard are moving with such unpredictable rapidity, is this not a dangerous time to engage in serious negotiations with the Soviet Union about complete and total disarmament; is this a time when anything but continued futility, frustration, and increased hostility can come out of such negotiations?

My third category of concern I have reserved for the succeeding lecture on change and hope.

My fourth concern is that negotiation is unrealistic, if it is founded on the belief, on either side, that general and total disarmament, or even major reduction in arms can come out of negotiations at this time.

Suppose it is clearly futile; what harm does it do, one is asked, to negotiate with the Soviet on their offer of peaceful coexistence and their offer to negotiate for an immediate general and total disarmament?

The chief harm is that this preoccupation with getting rid of weapons, as I have said, is a basically wrong premise. But there is the harm that inheres in the fact, as I believe, that disarmament now is not realistic.

We have been through just such periods of unreality and wishful thinking in recent years—the spirit of Geneva, the spirit of Camp David, the illusions of the summit meeting formula for peace. The spring of 1960 we had just been through 2 years of this fantasy. What I wrote at that time, unchanged, expresses as well as I can today the risks of unrealism.

In an article in the New York Times for May 15, 1960, I said: "The sure road to war is to live in fantasy, in a world that does not exist * * *. It is through such a dream world that the West has been passing. During this incredible period, however, the hard-bitten, realistic and aggressive Communists were softening up our American resolution—their prime target.

"They flooded us with horror stories of mutual suicide by atomic warfare and alluring but empty offers of peaceful coexistence, total disarmament and an end to nuclear weapons.

"There is a wealth of impressive evidence that the American people can face hard, cruel, and disappointing facts, and can act with vigor, toughness, tenacity, and firmness.

"It was American firmness and readiness to face up to facts that helped get the Red Army out of Iran, that rebuilt our Armed Forces and thereby kept the Chinese out of South Korea, that saved Greece and Turkey, that helped produce a peace treaty for Austria, that saved Berlin by amazing airlift. On almost any of these acts of resolution the Soviet might have gone to war. They didn't."

If I were writing this today rather than May 1960 I would not change this language except to add the crises of Cuba to the list.

Resuming: "A peace that is no peace, a thaw that is no warming up * * *, this is not the road to peace. On the contrary, it is the road to disaster."

And then this final paragraph of that article. "There is as yet no evidence that facing up to reality in dealing with the Soviet adds to the risks that already exist. My own opinion is that the greatest risk of all would be to continue to nurse the illusion that international tension is relaxed because we ourselves have been relaxing."

I find that there are not a few thoughtful people who say to justify futile and ill-timed negotiations: "While you are talking you're not shooting."

I wonder. I recall that the Japanese emissaries were still talking to Secretary Hull while their bombardiers were blasting our fleet at Pearl Harbor.

Or take a very recent case. On October 30, 1962, the Indian Ambassador to the United States issued a statement to his countrymen here concerning China's attack on India. "From the very beginning of this (border) dispute we had never stinted any effort to arrive at a peaceful solution through negotiation. While talking of negotiations China has prepared for aggression and has now launched a totally unprovoked massive armed invasion against us."

Talking is not always synonymous with not shooting, by any means.

Talking around a conference table unless the parties have something specific to say, something that is feasible and that will be supported by their people back home has little to commend it.

Suppose there were agreement with my thesis that general disarmament negotiations now cannot produce a treaty, and that to continue them is to incur risks with no direct offsetting gains. Still the question remains, can we withdraw from these negotiations without giving the Soviets a propaganda victory? Aren't we stuck with these negotiations indefinitely, however futile, however risky, because there is no way to get out? Wouldn't our withdrawal adversely affect our status with the so-called neutral or inbetween nations and peoples?

These are questions that only the President and the Secretary of State can competently judge, looking at the scales upon which all the factors have been weighed.

The critical question, as I see it, is not immediate withdrawal, or an indefinite recess of the Geneva Conferences. What is crucial, I believe, is that we should not allow our participation in disarmament discussions to become such a deep preoccupation, such a strong emotional commitment, that it blinds or beguiles the average man so he cannot face the facts of how utterly remote and dangerous these negotiations are at this time. What is of central importance is that whether these talks continue or not, they do not distract our attention and dilute our energies away from the less dramatic, the multiple, diverse and far more realistic roads to peace, which have nothing directly to do with disarmament.

We should guard against the not inconsiderable risk that we shall be wedded to a disarmament doctrine evolved by technical experts whose deserved prestige as technical men obscures the underlying issues, which are not technical. Laymen are too readily impressed and feel inferior in the presence of specialists whose concepts and even whose words we cannot comprehend. A scientist, reviewing a book by a high priest of the emerging cult of disarmament technical experts recently reminded his readers, "That Department of Defense consultants back to the Delphic Oracle and before have consciously or unconsciously commanded respect by emphasizing the subtlety of their expertise and the dignity of their research organizations."

At the close of the Second World War in complete good faith we occupied ourselves with programs for the nuclear disarmament of the victorious alliance, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the U.S.S.R. How adversely this preoccupation with weapons—continued since that time—eroded the relations between the members of that alliance no man can yet assess. But we can say that the disarmament movement after the First World War did produce disastrous results. One of the brilliant apostles of disarmament after World War I was the man who is now America's most respected political analyst, Mr. Walter Lippman. In a book written in 1943 [1] he explained why he had been wrong in crusading for disarmament. I ask you to ponder Mr. Lippman's words and decide for yourselves whether or not they are relevant to the problem we have faced ever since the end of World War II:

> "In the interval between the two Great Wars the United States sought to promote peace by denouncing war, even by outlawing it, and by disarming itself, Great Britain and France * * * the disinterested and idealistic theory of disarmament was that if everyone had less capacity to wage war, there would be a smaller likelihood of war. Big warships meant big wars. Smaller warships meant smaller wars. No warships might eventually mean no wars * * *. On the theory that disarmament could promote peace, laborious negotiations and elaborate diplomacy and splendid international conferences were promoted in Washington, Geneva, and London. * * * It soon transpired that though the premise of these conferences was that smaller armaments would banish war, the working premise of all the Governments was that each of the former allies was now the rival, and therefore the potential enemy, of all the others. The disarmament movement was, as the event has shown, tragically successful in disarming the nations that believed in disarmament. The net effect was to dissolve the alliance among the victors of the First World War, and to reduce them to almost disastrous impotence."

We must deal with the world as it is, we must begin from there, and thence move toward the noble goals of peace to which we all aspire. Competition, passion, hate, love, imagination—all the factors that make up everyday living—are among the essential components of the most sensitive human problem man has ever sought to solve.

What I have to say about the dangers and risks of disarmament, highly controversial I know, are necessary to weigh before we can think clearly about an affirmative alternative to these current risks of negotiations toward disarmament. It is only then we will be ready to think in new terms and new dimensions.

Therefore, even if I had no affirmative suggestions to offer, I would hope that calling attention to the mythology of disarmament negotiations serves a useful purpose.

I have said that our chief hope for peace is not in an attack on weapons but in other areas of life in the fluid world of 1963. To an elaboration of the basis of this thesis I shall return in the succeeding lecture.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. One minute will be sufficient.

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I want to reinforce what the distinguished minority leader has said. Any Member can object to any committee's meeting during the session of the Senate with the exception of the Appropriations Committee. I would do exactly the same thing on this side, if I were requested by Members on the Democratic side of the aisle, as he has done in compliance with the request made by the Members on his side of the aisle.

In view of the situation which arose prior to the end of the debate on yesterday on the pending bill, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Dominick amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, in my opinion, the amendment I am presenting today, which deals with a subject different from the ones discussed yesterday and voted on this morning and on yesterday, is probably as important as any single provision in the bill. As the bill is now written, as it came out of the Commerce Committee, it contains a provision in subsection (c), on page 17, which states that before a grant may be given to a transit company, the schedule of rates to be approved by the Administrator must be submitted and agreed to. This is fine. There is no objection to this, I am sure, by most of the membership here.

The language then provides that if the rates are thereafter changed and the Administrator in his own discretion determines that is going to be adverse to repayment of the loan or grant or revenues that may be involved in the transit company, he has the right to notify the body that has put the rates into existence and cut off all further loans to this particular body, or grants, as it may be—but not only to cut them off on the transit authority, but cut off further commitments under the Housing and Home Finance Agency within the particular area so affected.

I think every Senator ought to know what it means. This means that one man, the Administrator, could cut off all urban planning grants, urban studies, housing research, transportation activities which are involved in the Housing and Home Finance Agency, urban transportation assistance, open space land grants, low income housing demonstration programs, farm housing research, public facilities loans, public works planning, urban renewal funds, community disposal operations, the Federal National Mortgage Association, and all the operations which it conducts, the Federal Housing Administration and all the operations it conducts, and the Public Housing Administration.

So, in effect, if this bill is permitted to remain in its present form, it makes the Administrator in the mass transit program the complete arbiter of all other Federal programs in the area where a grant has been made and where rates may thereafter be changed.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator be good enough to state what his amendment does, and then permit me to make further comment?

Mr. DOMINICK. My amendment would strike out, on page 17, the last sentence of subsection (c), which would eliminate the power of the Administrator, but which would still let him appear in any public utility hearing there might be on a rate change in order to present his viewpoint and what the rate change

---

[1] "U.S. Foreign Policy," Little Brown & Co., 1943.

might involve so far as a future loan or grant to this agency is concerned.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Colorado that, as a member of the Commerce Committee, I voted against the amendment in the bill, as did one other member of the committee on this side of the aisle, who is not at the moment present on the floor, because I felt, as the Senator did, that the language of the amendment that was adopted in committee virtually makes a czar of the Administrator, and permits him to have penal power, in effect, far beyond what is necessary or relevant to the particular measure now pending. I did support other amendments in committee, such as the one which forbids back-door financing, and sends the bill through the normal process of authorization and appropriation.

I would rather see the entire amendment stricken from the bill. What I am not entirely clear about is how far the amendment of the Senator from Colorado goes.

Mr. DOMINICK. I appreciate the question of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. What I would strike out is the last sentence which reads as follows:

> Thereafter the Administrator shall not extend any assistance under any law administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency—

And so forth, down to the end of that sentence.

Therefore, what I am trying to do, and what would be accomplished if the amendment were adopted, is, in effect, to eliminate the power that is given to the Administrator by the Commerce Committee amendment to cut off all other programs in the area.

Mr. SCOTT. I would go even further; but I approve of what the Senator seeks to do, and I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. As I understand the language as it now exists in the bill, the Administrator has one sanction, the sanction not to provide funds if the rates are changed. The sanction against which the Senator's amendment is directed is the sanction which to me seems to be quite coercive, and which is a coercive power the Administrator could exercise against a municipality with respect to any decision he might make about the adequacy or appropriateness of rates.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct in part. However, if my amendment is adopted, it would also remove his right to completely cut off any future grants to a transit company merely because of a rate change.

Mr. COOPER. I support the Senator's amendment, because the present language gives the Administrator a power which does not seem to be related in any way to the program, and a power which I believe is coercive.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator. I believe it is a little bit like killing a mosquito with a meat ax, if we leave the language in the bill.

There is one other point, which I discussed with the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] on the floor the other day, that this section, if the last sentence of it is left in the bill, in effect gives to the Administrator an indirect veto right over the public utilities commissions of the various States.

Any proposed rate change of a transit body that I know of must go before the public utilities commission of the State affected. All the financial conditions of the public transit authority are gone into by the public utilities commission of that State, and the commission determines whether the proposed new rates will be adequate. These facts would include the provisions for the repayment of any loan or any future subsidies it felt it could get from the Government. All these facts would be presented to the commission. If the commission rendered a decision to the effect that the proposed rate schedule was acceptable, it does not seem to me that thereafter if the transit authority should go to the Administrator he should have the power to say that the public utilities commission of that State was wrong in making the determination that the commission made in the case being considered, and that he should have the right to say, "We will not only cut off future grants to this transit authority, but also all future grants coming under the HHFA in connection with all the other programs involved in that area."

As I understand, what the Commerce Committee was trying to do in its wisdom was to give a weapon to the Administrator to try to make sure that once a grant had been given, the rates would not be changed so as to put the company in the same bad financial position it was in at the beginning.

However, the language in the bill, in this section, goes far beyond the aims and purposes of what was in the mind of the committee, I am sure. This creates a czar with power not only over transit but also over public housing, slum clearance, urban renewal, farm housing, low cost housing demonstration programs, and everything else under the jurisdiction of the HHFA Administrator, because the language provides that the Administrator "shall not extend any assistance under any law administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sympathetic toward the Senator's amendment insofar as it seeks to restrict the ambit of the Administrator's authority to qualify assistance to public mass transit systems. I would support the Senator's amendment if it were limited to eliminating the coercive power of the Administrator over housing and other grants and loans. I am concerned about an inability to do anything about a diminution of security for a loan. The rate schedule represents the dollars and cents basis upon which a loan or grant is made. If this is swept away through action of a State or municipal agency, how do we protect what seems to be the honest and best judgment in these situations?

Mr. DOMINICK. This language applies to grants, not to loans. What it does now is to say to the Administrator that he cannot give any further assistance if they have made a change in their rates so that in the opinion of the Administrator the company will not be able to operate properly in the future. This would mean that the transit company, if it came back to the Administrator and said, "We want further grants, because we have not received all we want," he could say, "No, we will not give it to you."

What it does is to say that the transit company is required to abide by the judgment of the Administrator regardless of what the PUC of the State has done, if they want to get any further assistance after they put into effect a rate schedule which has been approved by the State agency.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not believe that the Senator has described the classic case. I believe the classic case would be an agreement by the Administrator to give annual grants to enable a mass transportation system to function. Let us assume that one grant had been made for the year 1963. Let us assume that the rate schedule was changed by the Public Utilities Commission for the year 1964, and that a contractual obligation exists for the Administrator to make a grant in 1964, which contractual obligation he undertook based upon a previous rate schedule.

Would the Senator's amendment prevent the Administrator from denying the additional advance because the contract for the rate schedule was changed to the detriment of the operation of the whole system?

Mr. DOMINICK. As I interpret this language, it would not make any difference whether my amendment were adopted or not, because if a firm commitment had been made, the Administrator could not cut it off.

What I am trying to do by eliminating the last sentence is to provide that the Administrator may not overrule the decision of the PUC; nor can he say that he is the determinator of whether wholly different programs will go into effect in the area involved.

Mr. JAVITS. Then what does the Senator construe this section to mean? Does he construe it to mean that it gives the Administrator punitive power, even though he is not committed to make any loan or advance anyhow?

Mr. DOMINICK. It gives him punitive power because of the power of the Federal dollar. The Senator from New York knows, I know, and the rest of us know, that a large number of programs are now in the planning stage. If the Administrator can say, "Unless the transit body changes its rate schedule to fit my particular ideas—I being the Administrator—the community will not get any programs or any type of help, such as urban renewal or slum clearance," then, in effect, we shall have given to the Administrator power far beyond what I understand the bill originally intended.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope the Senator will reserve enough time so that when the explanation is made by the Senators in charge of the bill, he may be able to comment upon the contingencies which they will allegedly be trying to set forth.

I thank the Senator for his answers.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, I do not know how much time I have remaining, but I should like to reserve the rest of my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for a question?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. I understood the Senator to say that in the event the bill were passed in its present form and the Administrator made a determination as specified in the part which the Senator would omit, then every other commitment that might be made under the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or any law administered thereunder, could be cut off.

Mr. DOMINICK. If I did, I misspoke. I certainly did not intend to say that. I intended to say that if the Administrator made a determination that a new rate schedule was adverse, he could then say to the city or area involved, "You will not get any future assistance for any program in this area unless you help us to require the transit body to change its rate schedules."

Mr. CANNON. The Senator from Colorado is correct. I am glad he has corrected the record to show that the proposal would not cut off any other commitment; because, if commitments have been made, they are specifically excluded.

Did I understand the Senator correctly to say that this section would prohibit any other relief being granted under the farm housing program?

Mr. DOMINICK. That is one of the laws administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. CANNON. Did the Senator also say that the section would preclude any further assistance under the FNMA program and the Federal housing program?

Mr. DOMINICK. No, I do not believe I said that.

Mr. CANNON. The record discloses that those three programs were in the list enumerated by the Senator. I should like to ask him if it is his understanding that assistance would be discontinued under the farm housing program, the FNMA program, and the Federal housing program, if the bill in its present form were passed?

Mr. DOMINICK. The farm housing research program, as I understand; the low-rent housing program; the Federal Housing Administration; and the special assistance functions fund under the Federal National Mortgage Association. I have before me a list of the new obligational authority for expenditures by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. It does not give in detail, to the extent I should like to have it indicate, the actual laws which are administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which is my understanding of the laws to be covered by the provision I am seeking to strike.

Mr. CANNON. May I ask if the Senator has in mind making the record clear that this would not include programs not referred to as area programs involving local governments or agencies thereof?

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, perhaps the distinguished Senator from Nevada should use his own time. Then I could ask him some questions, and we would not run out of time so fast.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, does the Senator from Colorado yield the floor?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield the floor, but I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CANNON. By way of explanation, the section recommended by the Committee on Commerce is, in effect, a control measure to insure that a local public body which comes before the Federal Government for assistance does not make a project recommendation and then go back and renege on its representation to the Federal Government. That is purely and simply what the provision states, as we have drafted it in subsection (c). If the amendment of the Senator from Colorado were adopted, there would be no control of the local public body once they had got their grant on notification by the Administrator, if the local public body should renege on the program they had presented.

We feel that this is the minimum that could be required. In the explanation as set forth in the report of the Committee on Commerce, page 10, we state:

> This is a new section which would require the local governing bodies to adhere to the project justification which they presented to the Administrator, and on the basis of which a grant was authorized.

If the transit authority does not ask for a Federal grant and represent that it is going to do certain things, this section would not apply to it at all:

> The applicant would have to include in its justification a proposed schedule of fares, under which the transit system would be able to continue to operate on a sound economic basis.

The Senator's amendment simply provides that if a plan is presented which shows that their schedule of fares would not permit them to operate on a sound economic basis, but on that basis a grant was made to the local body, and it then cut back and said, "We are not going to follow this schedule of fares which we have presented to the Federal Government, and on which our grant was based," the Administrator would notify it that it was proceeding on an uneconomic basis. If this were factually determined, and were not a finding at the whim of the Administrator, as some have indicated, thereafter, unless the Administrator had notified the local public body that it had been granted compensatory relief, the local public body might elect to lower the fares and grant a direct subsidy, which could be done under the bill, which would not justify the Administrator in withholding further action.

The report is clear in that it states:

> If corrective action (which might involve various forms of relief including a direct local subsidy) is not taken, the Administrator shall cut off all future assistance administered by the HHFA (except pursuant to prior commitments) for projects in the area involved.

I note that exception specifically because of the question which was raised by the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits].

If continued, I submit that this would not authorize the Administrator to discontinue any commitment that had heretofore been entered into on a contractual basis or any other basis.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. As the Senator knows, I favor the bill. I have fought to help to bring it out of committee. I must say that I am not very happy about the punitive aspects of the bill.

As the Senator has said, "Thereafter, the Administrator shall not extend any assistance" under the act "to finance in whole or in part" such projects. I think that is entirely justifiable. I would be with the Senator on that point.

But I must say that the idea of extending the ambit of punishment to the laws with respect to housing and community facilities and other matters is a little unusual, under our law. I think it places a strain upon the bill which is really more than it ought to bear.

For instance, on the next page of the bill, there is provided a possibility to qualify for additional grants after 3 years. That is the kind of thing I would want to cut off. But I am very much concerned about extending the ambit of this power to other laws because they happen to be administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. We might just as well include any other Administrator; they are all under the same Federal Government.

Can the Senator tell us what was the rationale in extending the provision and going so far afield?

Mr. CANNON. I am advised that the HHFA does exactly this at the present time when it is a matter of administrative determination rather than a matter of law.

We are attempting to write the practice into law. If an applicant comes before the HHFA and makes a representation and then does not follow out the representation, and then comes in under another law administered by HHFA, the first thing the HHFA will do will be to check to see if the local public body is living up to the agreements it made in the first instance. If it is not, I am advised that the HHFA at present would withhold further assistance.

But we felt that as an insuring provision, this should be written in, as a matter of law, in order to put the local public bodies on notice, so they would not say, "We are going to represent that this is our project plan, and we will carry out the plan until we get the money. But once we get the money, if we then decide, for any reason, that we want to reduce the fares, we will do that, even though it makes our operation uneconomical, and even though we may not take other compensatory action."

If they took other compensatory action—for example, such as a direct grant—then, as I have indicated, the Administrator would have no concern, because we would wish to be sure the operation was economically sound. But that responsibility would be imposed on them before the grant was made.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Administrator has that authority now, on an administrative basis, this measure would be changing it, because it would be making it mandatory. The Senator from Nevada is well aware of the legal maxim, "Special cases make bad law." In short, I think the fact that the Administrator now has that flexibility is good, rather than bad; and I would hate to see the Administrator straitjacketed in such a way that he would have to deny all forms of relief, even if justified in a particular case.

Mr. CANNON. This matter has been tested, from the point of view of whether the Administrator of the HHFA now has that legal authority; and he is doing this.

Mr. JAVITS. But this provision would be improved by using the word "may," instead of the word "shall." The use of the word "shall" would be a mandate; and I must say that I cannot agree as to that.

Mr. CANNON. Would the use of the word "may" remove the Senator's objection? We are not particularly wedded to the use of this language. But I would be unalterably opposed to removing all limitations from the local public bodies, once they obtained the grants, and thus let them use the Federal funds in a fashion which might not be economically sound.

If the Senator from New York would accept the word "may," rather than the word "shall," I would be inclined to give that consideration.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to consider that for a few minutes.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I should like to ask several questions.

We have been assuming that the grant will have been given under representations made by the local public body. Then the provision reads as follows:

> If, at any time after the making of such grant with respect to such project, a change is effected in such schedule—

And so forth.

How long will that remain in effect? How long will the Administrator have the right to say, "This is a frozen schedule, and any change you make will be adverse, in my opinion, to the original plan."

Mr. CANNON. It would remain in effect for the period of the justification which had been presented by the local public body in applying for the grant.

Mr. DOMINICK. Could that be 20 years?

Mr. CANNON. If the local body said so in applying for the justification, it could be 20 years.

Mr. DOMINICK. But if the Administrator does not like it——

Mr. CANNON. That is not the way this provision reads. It states that if the schedule of fares is so altered, after the grant has been received, that the Administrator finds, as a matter of fact, that the transit system will not thereafter be able to operate on a sound and economic basis, then he will give the notification. In other words, the basis throughout is that if the local public body takes action which is not economically sound, then it will be jeopardizing further grants under the HHFA. If it takes action that is financially or economically sound, it will have no problem. If it reduced the rates because, it said, "we can operate on a financially sound basis with a lower rate in effect," that would be fine, and it would not jeopardize the program or its economic soundness.

This is a very clear limitation. It is dependent on economic soundness or unsoundness, which is a matter of fact; and the public bodies determine that fact every day.

Speaking of the public bodies, the Senator said this is an attempt to supersede the public utility commissions of the various States. However, it is not such a provision; and in my opinion it would not affect them one iota. I say that for the reason that many States do not require the local transit bodies to go before the State public service commissions in connection with rate matters; second, this envisions an operation of a local public body, and most of the local public bodies are specifically exempt from having to make application to State public service commissions or public utility commissions in connection with rate matters.

Again I say to the Senator that certainly in carrying out a program, if a local body or a city had to apply to the public service commission, I presume it would submit to the Administrator a schedule of proposed rates, and would say, "We think this is economically sound," because I have never seen a public service commission which would permit rates to be put into effect if it thought them not economically sound. Therefore, we are talking about two roads to the same thing.

Mr. President, for the moment, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I should like to make a few other points because I believe this matter is extremely important.

First of all, the discretion to be given to the Administrator is not limited at all by the wording used. It states:

> If, at any time after the making of such grant with respect to such project, a change is effected in such schedule which the Administrator determines will substantially reduce revenues from the project and lessen the chances for an economically sound operation—

Then these things will go into effect.

Let us consider the words "If, at any time." That could mean, as the wording now stands, that indefinitely in the future the Administrator would have the question of the control over the public assistance would be given to that entire area under any law administered by the HHFA.

Second, I do not agree with the distinguished Senator from Nevada as to the question of the control over the public utility commissions. I, myself, do not happen to know of any State which does not regulate the rates of transit companies, particularly intrastate companies. Based on my experience, it seems to me that most of the States do this. The Senator from Nevada may have in mind some specific examples about which I do not know.

But if a public utility commission has said that in its judgment the particular schedule of rates will be sufficient to create a reasonable return on the transit operation which is then in effect, it does not seem to me proper to put the pressure on the mass transit body—the local agency which is running it—and on the public utility commission to deny the schedule of rates solely because of what will happen to other programs in the area served by the transit body.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. In listening to this debate, I thought perhaps the idea advanced by my colleague [Mr. Javits] should be pursued, and that perhaps that would be a solution of the problem and would be acceptable to all sides; namely, to limit the application of this sentence to assistance under this act, rather than assistance under any law administered by the HHFA.

First, of course, it would be necessary for the sponsor of the amendment to approve of that change; but I wonder what would be the attitude of the floor manager of the bill. Would not the inclusion of these words satisfy the objective the Senator is seeking to attain?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yielded to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I have asked the question with some deference because the bill was not reported from my committee. All I know about it is what I have heard while listening to the debate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I shall be happy to answer the question.

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield to the Senator from Nevada so that he may answer.

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to answer the question. The proposed language would not be acceptable for two reasons. First, the aid would already have been granted under the act at the time application of the penal provision—if we can describe it as such—was put into effect. Second, the Administrator exercises that authority now. By use of the proposed language, I would not desire to have it appear that we were limiting his authority specifically, because he exercises broader authority now in his administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency Act. As I have indicated earlier, so far as I know, that authority has not been tested. But we would not want to make it appear that we were placing any such limit on his authority. Therefore that language would not be acceptable. It was considered by the committee in that context, and the committee was not willing to accept it.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. It seems to me that the funds proposed in the bill would be protected because, as the Senator from Nevada has pointed out, the Administrator possesses discretionary power to deny assistance under the terms of the act. But I do not think we should give him a huge bludgeon to use on local transit authorities who may be seeking to revise their rates in an effort to stimulate more traffic. In the case of an increase in rates to produce more revenue, he might feel that such a raise in rates would result in reduced traffic to the extent that there would be less revenue. I do not believe we should give him a big bludgeon to use on communities which are trying to devise transportation plans.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Texas.

I should like to point out one other feature of the bill. Under the "bond" section of the bill, on page 15, there appears a specific section which provides:

> That no provisions of this act shall be construed to authorize the Administrator to regulate in any manner the mode of operation of any mass rapid transit system or the rates, fares, tolls, rentals, or other charges fixed or prescribed by any State, local public body, or agency thereof.

That is in a wholly different section.

On page 13 of the bill there is exactly the opposite provision. In the next section the Administrator would be authorized, not actually to fix fees, but to use indirect pressure to arrive at the same result. That is a point we failed to recognize when that provision was originally inserted. So there is a conflict within the bill itself. I do not know what the eventual court interpretation of a provision of that kind might be. In any event, it seems to me that an amendment which would merely strike out the sentence on page 17 would be inadequate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I was about to suggest that we be allotted a few minutes on the bill.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I would appreciate it if the Senator in charge of the bill would hear me on this point. I ask him to consider the following proposed amendment:

> Thereafter, the Administrator may in his discretion refuse to extend any assistance under this or any other law administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency (except pursuant to a commitment entered into prior to such notice) to finance in whole or in part any project to further the purposes of this Act to be undertaken in such area—

I should like to explain very briefly my reason for that proposal. What I am seeking to do is to limit the discretion of the Administrator to housing or any other project which has a relationship to the development of the mass transportation system. That is not a light matter, because a great portion of community facilities, housing, and so forth, could very well be tied in with the effort to create a viable mass transportation system. My aim would then be to give him the maximum latitude possible consistent with what he has a right to do, that is, with the assistance which is contemplated under his act. To leave it so that an Administrator could select a low-cost housing project perhaps 10 miles away, and say, "I am going to deny funds to that project because of the rate schedule," would offend my sense of the balance of statutory law and the kind of authority that we want to have administered. I make that suggestion only because the Senator invited me to see what I could suggest.

Mr. DOMINICK. I should like to have the Senator in charge of the bill answer the proposal on his own time. However, I should like to make some comments to the distinguished Senator from New York on the proposal. The proposal, as he said, would be a compromise, but still it would not eliminate the basic evil of the section, which is the indirect power which the existence of Federal spending programs in those areas would give to a person who would be about to determine whether or not assistance should or should not be given in that area.

The Administrator might retain power of the kind proposed for a period of 20 or 50 years, or whatever time it may be, or for as long as the project was conceived in its original form when the grant was given. Then, in effect, we would further federalize the country and put additional power into the hands of an Administrator to determine the future course of what is essentially local enterprise. I do not think the amendment of the Senator from New York would solve that particular problem.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe the amendment would confine the authority which would be given to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and would further the purposes of the act. The act has a rather limited life. Projects under it similarly have a limited life. Therefore it would meet the valid objection that power in perpetuity should not be granted. I think it is an effort to give some sanction, without giving a sanction which is out of reason.

Mr. DOMINICK. I know that the Senator from New York is far too intelligent to believe that the measure would have a limited life if it were passed. We still have in effect emergency taxes enacted at the time of World War I. If the bill is passed, we know it would be in effect for many years to come.

Mr. JAVITS. It may or it may not. But at any rate, we could reach the provision again and could remove it if we so desired. If we should decide to continue the program, we would have the option to deal with that provision if, as, and when we decided to extend the measure and the punitive provision beyond the ambit of the act.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I should like to ask one procedural question. If I leave the floor of the Senate now and the debate is concluded, at the time a vote is reached at 2 o'clock, will there be an opportunity to refresh the memories of Senators who will then be ready to vote on the pending question?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado time on the bill for that purpose prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado now has left 4 minutes of the 10 minutes yielded to him by the Senator from Texas on the bill. That 4 minutes could be used by the Senator from Colorado at 2 o'clock. Otherwise, the question of available time would depend upon whether the Senator from Texas would yield additional time to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Then, if I may, I shall reserve the 4 minutes until 2 o'clock.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Colorado whatever time he needs.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes on the bill. I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Colorado as well as the Senator from Nevada. I wish very much that we could bring the debate on all the amendments to a conclusion so that we shall not open the debate again at 2 o'clock, or immediately prior to 2 o'clock, if that is possible. I was hopeful that whatever time remained when we finish the debate might be yielded back so that the vote would be the next step effective at 2 o'clock.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it occurs to me that perhaps the Senator from Colorado could use his time immediately before 2 o'clock—say at 1:45 or 1:50.

It is a very difficult situation when Senators must come in to vote. one after another, without really getting an understanding.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; it leaves the situation rather ragged to have amendments pending and not completed. However, I shall not raise any further question.

Mr. TOWER. I think raggedness is inherent in the situation when we debate this morning and vote this afternoon.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree. I shall not insist upon that.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Presiding Officer. I yield myself 4 minutes at this time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I listened to the exchange between the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] with reference to changing the word "shall" to "may." I had to leave the Chamber for a few minutes, and I am not sure that that change was agreed upon.

I should like to have the Senator from New York listen to a suggestion. Instead of merely changing the word "shall" to "may", since it reads "shall not extend any assistance" or something to that effect—we might make a little change such as "may deny assistance to."

Mr. JAVITS. In his discretion?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. It would have the same effect, but be smoother language.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have been thinking through my own vote on this question. I believe I shall vote for the Dominick amendment; and I will tell Senators why. If we should strike out the language, we would leave Mr. Weaver with the discretion which he is now asserting. That is the way he is asserting it. I can vote for the Dominick amendment, instead of tinkering further with the language, and that will be the end of it.

I think there is something inimical to the spirit in which we generally write these bills. If the Administrator is asserting the authority, at least we can beat him over the head if he abuses his discretion. I think perhaps we should not write into the bill a discretion which the Administrator is now asserting, so I shall support the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes from the 19 minutes remaining.

I was about to answer by saying that I could not accept the suggestion made by the Senator from New York, because of the language with respect to furthering the purposes of the act, shown on page 2 of the amendment in the nature of a substitute. That proposal would limit the discretionary authority specifically to the provisions of the act.

As a part of the overall bill the Congress is making certain determinations, "Findings and Purposes," as set forth in section 2. As our justification for enacting any legislation of this type we are saying, in section 2:

> That the welfare and vitality of urban areas, the satisfactory movement of people and goods within such areas, and the effectiveness of housing, urban renewal, highway, and other federally aided programs are being jeopardized by the deterioration or inadequate provision of urban transportation facilities and services, the intensification of traffic congestion, and the lack of coordinated transportation and other development planning on a comprehensive and continuing basis.

This brings all these programs together as a part of the determination of the Congress as to the reason why we need to provide assistance. We should not turn around and say, "We are going to bring them all together—we are going to use a bad situation which may exist in these areas as a justification for passing the bill—but, when anyone presents a plan under the bill, if we should approve it and grant money, if the plan is not followed, and rates are reduced so as to produce an economically unsound operation, in the determination of the Administrator, we are not going to penalize him."

I cannot go along with that philosophy. That is exactly what the amendment of the Senator from Colorado would make possible. It would allow a public body to change the situation, after the Congress had made a specific determination that aid should be granted on the basis of a local public body needing the help, because of the justification which had been set forth—that certain rates would be charged which would be economically sound. Then, if they did not follow the purpose of having a plan which was economically sound, they could still get help and we would permit them to engage in an unsound operation, under the proposed change.

This language would provide some insurance. I point out that many of the local public transit bodies are governed, insofar as rate structures are concerned, by local commissioners or local city boards. Then it becomes a political matter. We would not wish to see a local governing body reduce rates for political or other reasons, if it would result in an economically unsound operation. We are trying to insure against that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The testimony given dealing with the purposes which are embraced in the introduction of the bill was rather uniform that inasmuch as the Federal Government went into metropolitan communities with housing, urban renewal, highway, and other federally aided programs, and created a condition of congestion and trouble, it now ought to help solve the problem which it created by the granting of financial aid in connection with what is called mass transportation. The reason for giving aid, if there is any reason, is that the Federal Government created the problem and the Federal Government ought to cure it.

The language as it is now written in the bill contemplates insuring that there will not be looseness in the management and operation of transit sytems. It proposes that when the guarantee is made the Administrator shall not make the grant unless there is some assurance that the transit system will operate on a sound fiscal basis. The entire committee felt that that was essential.

We should not allow the Administrator in his discretion to say, "You may reduce fares, you may endanger the fiscal structure of the transit company, and though we will reprimand you, you will in no way be punished."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded by the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 2 more minutes, please?

Mr. CANNON. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think the bill as now written grants the Administrator powers too great. The bill now constitutes an abdication of congressional direction and action. To insert the word "may" or to strike this language from the bill would mean that the Administrator, whoever he might be, would become a czar. He could do whatever his mind told him to do.

I cannot subscribe to that policy. I think the language ought to remain in the bill.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. COOPER. Only a minute.

Mr. CANNON. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I wish it to be clear at the beginning, so that my position will be known, that I do not intend to vote for the bill, but I wish to raise a question which might shed some light on the issue which is now before the Senate.

I believe that to provide a sanction against programs which are not connected with the transit program sets forth a wrong principle for any kind of legislation. I suggest that in section 13(a) the Administrator does not have a remedy. It provides that grants shall be made to meet deficits which cannot be reasonably financed from revenue.

I ask whether, under that section, it would be possible, if a rate were established which enlarged the deficit, for the Administrator to say, "I will not pay to you any larger grant than would be necessary under a proper rate structure"?

Would not that have the effect—and properly so—of inducing the transit company to provide proper rates? That seems to me to be the legal and proper and judicious way to approach the problem, under a contract relating to the mass transit program itself, and which would not reach out into other areas. I think the principle is bad.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. TOWER. How much time remains to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 10 minutes left.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I say to the Senator from Kentucky, in reply, that section 13(a) now requires the local body to make a presentation of how much it can finance out of the fare box. The rest of the cost is called net project cost, which represents the portion which cannot be financed from revenues.

Those bodies may say, "This is what we propose to do." Then grants are made on the basis of the determination of what can be financed out of the fare box and what will be the net project cost.

By subsection (c) we are saying as follows: If those bodies started today as they had represented they would, and then reduced rates so that the project was not economically sound, so that they could not get the correct proportionate part of the cost out of the fare box that they represented they would get, the Government would withhold assistance under the HHFA, so far as those public bodies are concerned, until corrective action was taken. That, in a nutshell, is what the provision does.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the yeas and nays having been ordered on this amendment, I ask unanimous consent that the vote be taken at 2 p.m. I have consulted the majority and minority leaders with relation to this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CANNON. I ask whether or not the Senator from Texas would include as a part of his request that I may use the 10 minutes I have remaining immediately prior to 2 p.m., starting at 1:50 p.m.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I have no objection. I do not think any consent agreement is necessary for that.

I am sure that the Senator in charge of the bill, and I as manager of the opposition, will be glad to cooperate with the Senator in seeking recognition immediately prior to 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is not necessary. The only unanimous-consent request is that no vote take place before 2 o'clock. Whatever transpires before 2 o'clock depends on how much time remains to Senators controlling the time on the bill.

Mr. TOWER. I will cooperate with Senators who wish to continue the debate prior to 2 o'clock.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I will join in that cooperation.

Mr. TOWER. The unanimous-consent request I have propounded is that the vote be set for 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas realize that the time to be taken in having a quorum call will come out of his time?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed in the quorum call be not charged against my time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk certain technical amendments. I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The amendments will be stated.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be not read, but that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The proposed amendments are as follows:

> On page 25, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:
>
> "(g) The first sentence of section 814 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1434), is amended by—
>
> "(1) inserting after 'grant,', the first place it appears, the following: 'guaranteed revenue bond issue,';
>
> "(2) inserting after 'grant,', the second place it appears, the following: 'guaranteed revenue bond issue (including the revenues from which the bonded indebtedness is to be repaid),'; and
>
> "(3) inserting after 'grant,', the third place it appears, the following: 'guaranteed revenue bond issue,'."
>
> On page 9, line 3, after "contracts" insert "of guarantee".
>
> On page 14, line 20, after "Act" insert "relating to the guarantee of revenue bonds".
>
> On page 15, line 1, after "with" insert "the guarantee of revenue bonds under".
>
> On page 22, line 17, strike out "Funds" and insert "Subject to the provisions of section 10, funds".
>
> On page 4, line 22, insert "(b)" before "No".
>
> On page 5, lines 24 and 25, strike out "grant or loan shall be made under this section" and insert "Federal assistance shall be extended under this Act".
>
> On page 6, line 12, strike out "7(b)" and insert "16(b)".
>
> On page 7, line 4, strike out "3(c)" and insert "3(d)".
>
> On page 16, line 25, strike out "364B of the Revised Statutes" and insert "3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529)".
>
> On page 17, line 9, strike out "with respect to such project" and insert "while any revenue obligations issued to finance the project are outstanding".
>
> On page 18, line 3, strike out "4(a)" and insert "4".
>
> On page 18, line 11, strike out "4(a)" and insert "4".
>
> On page 22, line 24, strike out "or grant" and insert "grant, or guarantee".
>
> On page 24, line 15, strike out "7(b)" and insert "16(b)".
>
> On page 24, line 20, strike out "4(b)" and insert "13(b)".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the amendments offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I understand these are technical amendments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. These are the purely technical amendments; yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer my amendment No. 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

> On page 3, line 12, insert the following:
>
> "ESTABLISHMENT OF DIVISION OF URBAN TRANSPORTATION
>
> "SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation a Division of Urban Transportation.
>
> "(b) The Under Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Division of Urban Transportation, shall—
>
> "(1) assist in the development of overall policy recommendations with respect to Federal urban transportation programs and activities;
>
> "(2) assist in the development of means for achieving a greater coordination in the administration of Federal urban transportation programs and activities;
>
> "(3) undertake a program of continuing research and planning, in cooperation with private industry, the National Academy of Sciences, and other research organizations, for the development of urban transportation equipment and systems to meet present and future needs, such research to include studies relating to the financial, legal, employment, and social problems, as well as the technical aspects, of urban transportation matters; and
>
> "(4) perform such other functions relating to urban transportation as the Secretary of Commerce may, from time to time, prescribe.
>
> "TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS
>
> "SEC. 4. (a) There are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Commerce all of the functions, powers, and duties of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, (1) under section 103(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 with respect to the mass transportation demonstration grant program, and (2) under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 with respect to the mass transportation loan program.
>
> "(b) All assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, authorizations, allocations, or other funds held, used, arising from, or available or to be made available in connection with, the functions, powers, and duties transferred by this section are hereby transferred with such functions, powers, and duties.
>
> "EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS
>
> "SEC. 5. The Secretary of Commerce shall, in undertaking the functions, powers, and duties transferred to him by section 102, evaluate (1) the results of any project approved for assistance prior to such transfer under the mass transportation demonstration grant program, and (2) the effectiveness of the mass transportation loan program as it exists on the date of such transfer. The Secretary shall submit his findings to the Congress, together with his recommendations with respect to the expansion or discontinuance of such programs, at the earliest practicable date."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the amendment, if adopted, would transfer the administration of the business contemplated by S. 6 from the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to the Department of Commerce.

Under the existing situation, the Department of Commerce has the primary responsibility in administering the Federal highway program. In 1950 Congress enacted a law directing the Secretary of Commerce, through the Division of Highways, to make a study of urban transportation in cities having a population of more than 50,000. That law is now on the books. I assume that the Secretary of Commerce is performing his duty in making that study.

We now have the very injudicious situation of two departments of Government dealing with highways and transportation in cities, namely, HHFA and the Department of Commerce.

Through the years the Department of Commerce has been in charge of Federal activities dealing with highways. In the approximately 18 years that I have been connected with city, State, and Federal governments, I have heard the argument made about the duplication of work and the unjustified expense involved. In this situation there is definitely a duplication of work. Under existing law, directions are given to the Department of Commerce and to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to coordinate their efforts. I have been in the Government long enough to know that there is always the jealous purpose in every branch, division, and department to preserve for itself what has been initially assigned to it. I believe that leads to expense, and that it ought not to be countenanced when, by the simple enactment of a law, all the activities dealing with one subject can be placed in one centralized division.

Mr. President, I shall not speak further on my amendment, but will make some remarks dealing with the bill now pending before us. I shall want to discuss the genealogy of the bill, its inception, its birth, its subsequent mutations, and the form in which it comes before the Senate today.

The initial thought about subsidized railroads came to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in 1958, when studies were made of the plight of the railroads. That study cost more than $350,000. It was conducted for a protracted period of time. Labor leaders, railroad presidents, and shippers came before the committee and gave their testimony about the difficulties that the railroads were having in surviving and competing with truckers, inland water carriers, and airplanes, industries which were subsidized.

The railroad operators uniformly objected to subsidies. Two of them argued that subsidies ought to be given to the railroads. One was the president of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Mr. Symes; the other was the then president of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co.

At the conclusion of those hearings, held in 1958, the decision was unanimous that the Government should not enter into the subsidy program of the railroad system. It was at that hearing that this thought was conceived, and the question of how the railroads might be helped was considered in various forms.

In 1959 the Interstate Commerce Commission had a case pending before it in which it had to make a recommendation as to how the railroads of our country might be given aid. I read from page 4 of the opinion filed on May 18, 1959, by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It recommended, first, that the 10 percent Federal excise tax on passenger fares be repealed. That has been done.

Second, that Federal tax laws be amended to encourage local and State relief, at least to the extent of disregarding State and locally provided pretax net income for Federal tax purposes.

Third, that State and local governments take such steps as may be required to effect a greater degree of equity with respect to tax burdens on railroad property in relation to taxpayers generally, and consistent with the desire of their communities for retention of commuter and other passenger train service.

Fourth, that where the railroads were unable to operate a particular local or commuter service at a profit, and where such service is essential to the community or community served, steps be taken by State or local authorities, or both, to provide this service, paying the carrier the cost plus a reasonable profit.

That was in 1959. I shall later discuss how and to what extent that program was implemented.

On January 20, 1961, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce likewise conducted a study of the problem of mass transportation in the large communities. On page 6 of the report, known as "Commuter Transportation," these recommendations were made:

> The Federal Government should make available at the lowest possible interest the capital funds necessary to save and improve commuter rail service. This would be less burden on the taxpayer than providing alternative commuter facilities. The investment should be used as a lever to move the railroads toward a modern and efficient commuter rail system.

Another recommendation, identified as recommendation No. 25, states:

> Should the state and local governments grant tax concessions to the railroads, recommended below, the Federal Government should not dilute the concessions by maintaining full income taxes on the railroad corporations.

Recommendation No. 27 stated:

> State and local governments have already demonstrated their recognition that they have a stake in maintaining service on the commuter rail lines. It should be their responsibility to recommend the level of fares, to set standards of frequency of service, to determine the type and location of passenger stations, and to make up any operating deficits. The railroads should be relieved of real property taxes on commuter service.

Subsequent to that study and those recommendations, there was created by the Senate a Committee on Special Study of Transportation Policies in the United States. The report filed with that committee was known as the Doyle report. It was filed on December 29, 1960. It studied and dealt with commuter service. It did not recommend subsidies.

Thus, until December 29, 1960, four studies were made and completed, not one of them recommending subsidies either to the mass transportation systems or to the railroads.

On February 16, 1960, the following persons came to Washington in a body: Hon. Raymond R. Tucker, mayor of St. Louis, Mo.; Hon. Richardson Dilworth, mayor of Philadelphia, Pa.; Hon. Robert F. Wagner, mayor of New York; Gov. David Lawrence, of Pennsylvania; Hon. Anthony Celebrezze, mayor of Cleveland; Mr. James M. Symes, president of the Pennsylvania Railroad; and Mr. George Alpert, president of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad.

I shall read what was said by those men in their appearance before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Mr. Tucker initiated the discussion. After telling of the supposed plight of the railroads, he made this statement, speaking for the mayors of the United States:

> We have a program consisting of four points, and they are: First, that a national policy should be established by the Congress for a balanced, coordinated transportation system.
>
> Second, that Federal, State, and local governments be asked to develop rational tax policies for the railroads.
>
> Third, that Federal loans be made available, where necessary, to municipalities or publicly constituted bodies for new commuter equipment and improved facilities, and for the improvement of intracity mass passenger transportation facilities, these to be long-term, low-interest loans.
>
> Fourth, that a study be made of grants-in-aid by the Federal Government to the communities or duly constituted public bodies which have a sound plan for the permanent improvement of commuter or other intracity transportational facilities, this to be modeled on the present urban renewal program.

Hon. Anthony J. Celebrezze, then the mayor of Cleveland, now the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, testified as follows:

> We are not coming here asking for direct subsidies. All we are saying under the bill that we propose or will present is to set up some sort of lending agency where we can borrow money over long terms to maintain commuters to extend the present transit facilities.

Also testifying, as I indicated yesterday, was Mr. George Alpert, president of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad. In my judgment, Mr. Alpert gave some amazing testimony dealing with the unwillingness of local governments to try to help to solve their own difficulties. He testified:

> The municipalities find it difficult, some of them, to do a great deal for us. Take taxation, for example. The city of Boston taxes us to the queen's taste. Our south station, one of the two terminals in Boston, is assessed at $12,200,000. It was built in 1897 for about $15 million; and here, 60 years later, it is still assessed for $12,200,000, which is supposed to be its fair value.
>
> The fact that we have been trying for 3 years to get somebody to buy it for $4 million does not seem to be relevant. But it is assessed for $12,200,000.
>
> This is a statement that I know you will find hard to believe: Our tax rate in Boston is $101.20 per thousand dollars.
>
> So on an assessment of 300 percent of value, at the rate of $101 a thousand, this is confiscatory. We are spending so much money on taxes that we have to make a loan,

> and most of that is used for commuter services. If Boston were not in such deplorable condition, we might apply to Boston for help on taxes. As a matter of fact, I have applied to Boston, and I have received no satisfaction at all. I received a little satisfaction from the New York mayor, but not an awful lot.

Mr. President, these are the five documents that constitute the preliminary to the adoption of the program in 1961. What was that program? $12,500,000 to make studies of mass transportation; $30 million to make loans. Both of these provisions were in conformity with the recommendations made by the mayors, by the Governor of Pennsylvania, and by Mr. Symes and by Mr. Alpert. The $30 million available for loans has been available for about 2 years. $11 million has been borrowed under that authority; $19 million has been unused; and we have the interesting spectacle—which I described yesterday—of communities not wanting to borrow, because word came from Washington, "Instead of borrowing, wait, and we will give you the money for nothing."

Two instances referred to in the testimony show that minds were changed, that delaying tactics were adopted against borrowing, because they were waiting to see what Congress would do on the grant program.

In the city of Cleveland, they were ready to extend the rapid transit system a distance of about 5 miles, I believe. They adopted the resolution to proceed. The taxpayers voted certain assessments and authorized certain highway changes for the rapid transit. The initial vote was 3 to 2 in favor of having Cleveland do that on its own. Then came the word that the money would come from Washington, as a gift. So a meeting was called and the vote was changed—this time, 3 to 2 not to go forward with the project. One of the members of the board said, "If we can get this money for nothing, why should we spend our own?"

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that the Senator's point is that it is essential to maintain local initiative and local enterprise, in order to make this improvement; and that if there is a straight Federal grant, local enterprise will wait for the grant to be made. Do I correctly understand the point the Senator is making?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, that is exactly what I have in mind.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I further understand that the Senator from Ohio is addressing his remarks to the amendment to change the administration from the HHFA to the Department of Commerce. Is that correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I also understand that the Senator from Ohio favors that because the Maritime Administration and the Bureau of Roads are under the Department of Commerce, and because he believes this to be really a Department of Commerce matter, rather than a Housing Administration matter.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, definitely.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And, further, that if it is handled under the Department of Commerce, its various agencies and commissions will be working on this whole transportation problem, rather than to use an outside agency.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that the other point the Senator from Ohio is making is that local initiative must be retained if local transportation is to be kept moving.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I understand that the bill as approved by the Commerce Committee requires that before any grant or loan is made, the application must be considered under the guarantee provisions.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. And that the loan or grant would be made only if a guarantee is not possible under this legislation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I respect the Senator's judgment as to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I have asked that question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I know the language that is used in the bill; but it is written so loosely that the net result would be grants, and only grants. I shall be glad to discuss this point when we reach the major part of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a further question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is not the guarantee program proposed by the Commerce Committee tailored after the one proposed by the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, substantially.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I trust that that is not the part the Senator from Ohio suggests is loosely drawn.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I did not participate in its preparation. The provision that he shall require the doing of certain things compatible with the fiscal ability of the local government means nothing. I shall discuss that later. Those are mere words; they are balderdash.

Mr. President, to proceed with my argument, let me say that in the HHFA is a Mr. Cole, the Deputy Administrator. In dealing with the loan program, I questioned him. I asked him, "Was $30 million appropriated for loans?"

He replied, "Yes."

Then I asked how much of the $30 million had been borrowed.

He mentioned two loans, aggregating $11 million, leaving $19 million unused.

I said, "Did you have any other applications?"

I believe he answered, "Thirteen. A number of them were ineligible."

I said, "What has happened to those that were possibly eligible?" He said, "They are lying dead." I said, "Why?"

His answer was that when the grant program was mentioned, all applications came to an end.

I regret to say that our dignified U.S. Congress, in whose Chambers have stood heroes who have spoken for their country, is more and more—and tragically—being used in such a manner as to corrupt the morals of the people of our Nation.

The willingness of people to be self-sustaining, independent, and desirous of solving their own problems back home will be destroyed. I wonder how strong our country will be, regardless of our military posture, if, as a result of what we do in Washington, the character of the people is bereft of those attributes which made our ancestors strong and vigorous, willing to fight and willing to take care of themselves.

I want to be elected. But I do not wish to be elected on the basis of buying votes. The present proposal is nothing more than a vote-buying device.

Later I shall discuss the source of the pressure and the urging that has been applied to procure adoption of the proposed subsidy program. If Senators will read the evidence taken before the Committee on Banking and Currency, they will observe that those who testified are the ones who would profit by the bill. They include the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad.

Labor leaders opposed the measure until they were yielded what they desired. Nowhere in the bill is there assurance that the rank and file of the Nation desire the bill passed.

A rather astounding situation exists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bayh in the chair). The Chair has been advised by the Parliamentarian that the Senator from Ohio has utilized his available time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 10 minutes on the bill?

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Much has been said about the many communities throughout the United States which, in the past 5 years, have lost their transportation service. Ohio is identified as a State in which communities have been denied service. A very strange situation exists.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, or would he prefer to continue?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield for one question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator take the position that if these grants are made, ultimately the Federal Government, through the Commerce Department or through the Housing Agency, will determine how railroads shall be operated, and ultimately the direction will lead to Government ownership of the various commuting lines? Does he go that far?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I predict that the bill is the beginning of the nationalization of the railroads. If we start subsidizing, we shall have gone a considerable distance in the direction of final nationalization. That is one of the reasons why I am opposed to the grant. I have heard words spoken by the leaders of the railroad unions to the effect that unless certain things are done, nationalization will be urged.

When that occurs, we had better quit talking about the glory of the flag that flies over our country and the heroics of our men who made possible the life that we now enjoy.

Returning to my previous point, two of the systems that have been abandoned were in Cleveland. It was said that 497 systems had been abandoned. I looked up the Ohio situation. There may be three; there are at least two. Those systems were purchased by the Cleveland Metropolitan Transit System. As the hearings state, they were sold and closed down. In Lakewood and in Parma the bus operators sold to the city of Cleveland. The system in Marion, Ohio, is mentioned as having been sold, but it is operating.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I wonder if the Senator can tell us why the private operators sold their companies to public authority?

Mr. LAUSCHE. They sold their system to the public authority. I cannot answer why, but I will say that they could not operate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Why?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Automobiles have come into existence. With due respect to the Senator from New Jersey, neither he nor I nor the Congress will change the habits of the people.

I use my automobile. Countless thousands of others use their automobiles. In Chicago, the Northwestern Railroad spent millions of dollars to install modern equipment. It attracted passengers. Then the State built a parallel highway, and with the same speed that motorists left the highways and went to the trains, they left the trains and went back to the highways.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I should like to observe that Mr. Robert Jenney of the Jenney Oil Co., testifying on the bill before the Committee on Banking and Currency, is a man whose livelihood is bound up with gasoline and automobiles. He said, "The automobile will take care of itself. We have to have balance in transportation. We need the bill to improve mass transportation."

Mr. LAUSCHE. My favorite answer to that statement is, Why should the Federal Government subsidize mass transportation? Do we not already have a backbreaking responsibility in doing the things which the Federal Government must do in the maintenance of our national defense?

What makes these men in the Senate, supposedly of infinite wisdom, think that the Federal Treasury can do the financing and that therefore the local governments and State governments ought to be spared the responsibility?

At the risk of being a bit harsh, I wish to say that is another one of the deceptions which is being practiced. We are asked to tell the people of this Nation, "The Federal Government has no financial responsibilities. It has the money which is needed."

That is not true, Mr. President. State after State is in a better position financially to do the job than the Federal Government. Yet, putting a blindfold on the eyes of the people, we are asked to say to them, "Come to us. We will give you the money. You will not have to pay any taxes. We will deal with you with abundance and generosity."

Mr. President, subsequently, with respect to other amendments, I shall speak at greater length on this subject. In closing this thought, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to what was done in Canada on an underground railroad which is now being built. Bonds were issued, in a multimillion-dollar project, and those bonds were guaranteed by the local government.

I am willing to go along on a bond guarantee program in the Senate. I am not willing to go along on the gift proposition.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator's last statement is based on the fact that he believes a grant would destroy local initiative and local undertaking to such a degree that the grant itself would turn the operation of the railroad over to the Federal Government, ultimately.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Massachusetts is completely correct in his interpretation of my understanding of what would happen. Local people, private companies, governmentally operated companies would quit trying to solve their own problems and would depend upon Washington to do so. I think that is wrong. I am quite certain the Senator from Massachusetts, since I know his thinking, will agree with me on that subject.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have one other question. If the bill does pass—whether a guarantee bill or a grant bill—the purpose of the amendment which the Senator has offered is to make the Federal Government carry out its obligations more efficiently, is it?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What is the Senator's understanding of the grant program under the bill and the amount of local contribution which would have to be made before there would be a Federal grant?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bill provides for a study as to what extent the local people can finance the project. Then I think that part which they could not finance would be known as the net project cost, which would become eligible for a grant at the rate of 2 to 1, $2 of Federal money for $1 of local money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. To the net project cost there would be a one-third local contribution, and in addition there would be a fare-box contribution. Is that correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As I understand the guarantee provision as it appears in the substitute, the guarantee would run to 75 percent of the loan, and 25 percent would have to be taken care of locally, through local initiative.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator refer to the committee bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. To the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Will the Senator tell me what that would be in his guarantee proposal?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is to be a full guarantee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. A full guarantee, with no local contribution?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded by the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time necessary for the call of the roll not be charged against either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF SECURITIES MARKETS

During the delivery of Mr. Lausche's speech:

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair) laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a preliminary report of a study and investigation of the adequacy, for the protection of investors, of the rules of national securities exchanges and national securities associations, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Cora M. Smith to be postmaster at Lost Creek, W. Va., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1230. An act for the relief of Nicholas E. Villareal;

H.R. 1535. An act to amend section 2 of Private Law 87–673;

H.R. 1544. An act to authorize David H. Forman and Julia Forman to bring suit against the United States to determine title to certain lands in Maricopa County, Ariz.;

H.R. 2291. An act regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass;

H.R. 2294. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz;

H.R. 3626. An act for the relief of Ronnie E. Hunter; and

H.R. 5279. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1230. An act for the relief of Nicholas E. Villareal;

H.R. 1535. An act to amend section 2 of Private Law 87–673; and

H.R. 3626. An act for the relief of Ronnie E. Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1544. An act to authorize David H. Forman and Julia Forman to bring suit against the United States to determine title to certain lands in Maricopa County, Ariz.;

H.R. 2291. An act regarding a homestead entry of Lewis S. Cass; and

H.R. 2294. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land situated in the vicinity of Unalakleet, Alaska, to Mrs. William E. Beltz; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5279. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 4374. An act to proclaim Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States of America; and

H.J. Res. 282. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning April 15, 1963, as "National Harmony Week," and for other purposes.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from New Jersey would like to make some response to the Senator from Ohio, after which time I will call up my amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to suggest to the Senator that I have a matter of interpretation of the bill. We are waiting to hear from the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON]. If we do hear from him, I wonder whether the Senator would accommodate me before we get into the vote at 2 o'clock, at some time before then.

Mr. TOWER. I am sure that can be arranged.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is the Lausche amendment No. 17.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. What is the time situation with respect to that amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponent of the amendment has used all his time. The opposition has 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. How much time has been used under the 4-hour limitation on the the bill itself?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents of the bill have used 4 minutes; the opponents have used 14 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I wonder if I could inquire of the Senator from Ohio whether it is his intention to remain on the floor for the next few minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I wish to speak briefly now to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, amendment No. 17, which, as I understand, would create in the Department of Commerce a Division of Urban Transportation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The measure speaks for itself.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The amendment provides:

> There is hereby established in the Office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation a Division of Urban Transportation.

I do inquire of the Senator, as the author of the amendment and as the proponent of the establishment of a Division of Urban Transportation, what he envisions in terms of the bureaucracy that would be set up and how large a Division of Transportation would be set up, and how many new employees would be required to man the division, and how big this part of Government would have to be to undertake the broad purposes of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the Department of Commerce there is already a Division dealing with transportation. The fact is that in the Department of Commerce there are divisions dealing with every one of the modes of transportation; that is, pipeline, truck line, railroad, rail line, inland waterway, and so forth. This Division would be established in the Department, and most of the personnel which it now has could be coordinated into doing this one job. We could definitely, in my opinion, streamline this matter better by having all of the functions in one department than by having them in two departments.

Let us see what I have in mind. The 1962 measure directing the Department of Commerce to make a study of mass transportation in cities of 50,000 or more demonstrates that the general intent of the Senate is that that ought to be in the Department of Commerce. I cannot agree with the Senator from New Jersey that by keeping it in HHFA we would economize. It would be better to put all of the Department of Commerce in HHFA, or all of HHFA activities on transportation into Commerce. One or the other ought to be done.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is the Senator suggesting that the present staff, the personnel, now employed by the Department of Commerce would be adequate to staff the newly proposed provision of urban transportation?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I cannot answer that question, any more than the Senator from New Jersey can say that HHFA would not need additional employees.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I should like to deal with that. We have now existing a mass transportation program administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Agency administering this existing program has been able to capably administer the existing program, with not a division, not a battalion, not a regiment, but an office of transportation. It is my understanding that there are employees there, perhaps 20, but I believe less than 20. I would suggest to my friend, who is so admirably prudent with the taxpayer's dollar, that I believe we can approach this really national problem far better than he suggests with a new Division of Urban Transportation in the Department of Commerce.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe that the Secretary of Commerce Mr. Hodges, if he is given a free hand, and if he will exercise his authority, will do the job with less money than it will be done with by HHFA. For myself I say to the Senator that if I were in charge, we would not have added 170,000 more employees to the payroll in the last 2 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator is not talking about HHFA now, is he?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator is talking about the entire Federal establishment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is not germane to our issue here. Let me ask the able Senator from Ohio whether he would not agree that an agency that has spent the money and time and the effort and has recruited a staff, and whose staff has spent its energies and time in acquainting itself with the problem, and has coordinated experience in the problems we are dealing with here should not be told that we will scrap all that experience and all that time which represents so much energy and money. The Senator would not advocate such a course, would he?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Where is the experience? I can enumerate the transactions they have had. They have loaned $7 million to one institution, and $3½ million to another, and they have engaged, I believe, in five studies. Where is the experience that HHFA has had on this transportation problem?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Let me advise the Senator that since we enacted the program in 1961, there have been in this transportation area 250 applications or serious inquiries made of the agency, and 44 States are represented in these 250 applications. They have had to look at these and evaluate them and study them. I would call dealing with 44 applications, experience.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to identify what they have done by way of work. They have engaged, since March 29, 1962, five agencies to make studies: the City of Detroit, the University of Washington, the Mass Transportation Commission of the State of Massachusetts, the Southeasterly Compact in Pennsylvania, the City of Memphis, and tristate transportation—New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

In addition to that, they have made two loans, one of $7 million and one of $3½ million. They have received 280 letters asking when the money would be available.

Humbly I say that I employ in my office two girls who could answer all those letters in 3 days.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am sure the Senator would be the first to condemn the agency if it did not carefully evaluate the programs and applications submitted to it, and also to make a record, perhaps, of the accomplishments, for Congress to consider, willy-nilly, the number of applications.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bureau in the Department of Commerce which deals with highways has been in existence for many years. It has dealt with townships, counties, cities, and States. It is their job to deal with transportation. This is a new undertaking in the HHFA—completely new, less than 2 years old.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Whitten, the Administrator of the public highway program, testified in favor of the urban transportation bill. I know the Senator from Ohio desires to see greater coordination in transportation. Both Dr. Weaver and Mr. Whitten testified that they now have achieved the closest working relationship.

I believe the Senator would have to agree that not only must coordination be within the area of transportation, but that mass transportation must be coordinated with all the other programs in the urban area of which the Federal Government is a sponsor and makes a large measure of contribution.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad the Senator has answered that question, because Mr. Whitten has made that statement. He testified, and there was a close examination of his testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which the distinguished Senator from New Jersey is a member, and before the Committee on Commerce. He at least implied that before we begin to spend any new tax money on mass transportation, we ought to wait until the highway program is completed. He pointed out that a meager percentage of the city highway program has been completed; therefore, we do not know to what extent the transportation problem will be solved.

I have the highest regard for Mr. Whitten. I venture to say that if he were asked in private, he would say confidentially that the programs ought to be handled together, not in separate departments.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I should think that if a man testifies at a hearing before Congress and says one thing, it is really treading on thin ice to suggest that he is thinking something else. I suggest that I do not see how the Senator can ascribe to a man thoughts which are different from those which he expresses.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has seen it happen; I have seen it happen. It is happening every day.

I am aware of one man who appeared before our committee 2 weeks ago and testified that after a decision was made, he was asked to subscribe his name to the document approving the decision, and he regretted that he did so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That has nothing to do with the bill under consideration.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The principle is involved.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. On the point of creating a new bureau in the Department of Commerce and taking the present program away from experienced personnel in the HHFA and transferring them to the Department of Commerce, or from the Agency that can relate transportation in the urban areas to community facilities, to urban renewal, to the Federal housing, to public housing, and all the other housing programs, it seems to me that to do so would be unwise, indeed. Not only would it be uneconomical, it would be administratively dividing what is one; and the oneness of this is that in urban areas all Federal programs have a relationship one to the other.

If these programs are now administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, as they are, it would be a desperate mistake to take from them the opportunity to weave the circulatory system of transportation system into other urban areas concerned.

Mr. President, so that we will be on a parity in terms of time, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the Lausche amendment be postponed until a time subsequent to the vote on the Dominick amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CHANGE IN ENROLLMENT OF SENATE BILL 1035

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I submit a concurrent resolution authorizing a change in the enrollment of S. 1035, relating to dual rate contracts, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK read as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87–346, relating to dual rate contracts, to make the following correction: viz on line 4, change "76 Stat." to "75 Stat.".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) was agreed to.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 15 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, it is proposed to strike out lines 1 through 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> (4) the term "urban area" means any urbanized area according to the most recent available classification of the Bureau of the Census; and

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it is my considered opinion that the whole bill is loosely drawn. One of the most ambiguous aspects of it is the section which defines terms. I have always been very much opposed to leaving too much to the arbitrary will, whim, and discretion of one man. We should state our definitions as comprehensibly and precisely as possible, so that the intent of Congress will be clear.

Under the terms of the bill—and I am reading directly from the bill—

> The term "urban area" means any area that includes a municipality or other built-up place which is appropriate, in the judgment of the administrator, for a public transportation system to serve commuters or others in the locality taking into consideration the local patterns and trends of urban growth.

To me, that sounds vague and ambiguous. Under that language, the administrator could declare almost anything to be an urban area. I am really intrigued by the term "built-up place." If that is not a jerry-built word, I have never heard one. What is a "built-up place"?

If one has visited the King Ranch, in my State, he has seen the ranch headquarters, which comprise a cluster of buildings, houses, barns, and other structures. That is a built-up place. However, I do not believe the owners of the King Ranch desire to qualify under the terms of the bill for mass transportation aid. In any case, any crossroads could be determined to be an urban area for the purpose of qualifying as an applicant for assistance under the terms of the bill.

My amendment is a simple one. It prescribes a definition:

> The term "urban area" means any urbanized area according to the most recent available classification of the Bureau of the Census.

The Bureau of the Census is a Federal bureau. It has been in the business of defining terms for a long time. I know that a number of Senators have been somewhat curious as to why these blue-covered publications have been placed on their desks. The one I hold in my hand, entitled "U.S. Census of Population," relates to Texas. As I entered the Chamber the other day, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] asked, "What do I want with this booklet? I know what the population of Arizona is."

However, I thought perhaps the Senator from Arizona might not know the definition of "urbanized area," so I suggested that he avail himself of the document on his desk and examine it.

They are published for every State, and each Senator has on his desk one pertaining to his State.

From page vii of this fine document, I should like to read the portion under the heading "Urbanized Areas," as follows:

> **Urbanized areas:** The major objective of the Bureau of the Census in delineating urbanized areas was to provide a better separation of urban and rural population in the vicinity of the larger cities, but individual urbanized areas have proved to be useful statistical areas. They correspond to what are called "conurbations" in some other countries. An urbanized area contains at least one city of 50,000 inhabitants or more in 1960,[1] as well as the surrounding closely settled incorporated places and unincorporated areas that meet the criteria listed below. All persons residing in an urbanized area are included in the urban population.
>
> It appeared desirable to delineate the urbanized areas in terms of the 1960 census results rather than prior to the census as was done in 1950. For this purpose a peripheral zone around each 1950 urbanized area and around cities that were presumably approaching a population of 50,000 was recognized. With the unincorporated parts of this zone small enumeration districts were planned,[2] usually including no more than 1 square mile of land area and no more than 75 housing units.
>
> Arrangements were made to include within the urbanized area those enumeration districts meeting specified criteria of population density as well as adjacent incorporated places. Since the urbanized area outside of incorporated places was defined in terms of enumeration districts, the boundaries for the most part follow such features as roads, streets, railroads, streams, and other clearly defined lines which may be easily identified by census enumerators in the field and often do not conform to the boundaries of political units.
>
> In addition to its central city or cities, an urbanized area also contains the following types of contiguous areas, which together constitute its urban fringe:
>
> 1. Incorporated places with 2,500 inhabitants or more
>
> 2. Incorporated places with less than 2,500 inhabitants, provided each has a closely settled area of 100 dwelling units or more
>
> 3. Towns in the New England States, townships in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, and counties elsewhere which are classified as urban
>
> 4. Enumeration districts in unincorporated territory with a population density of 1,000 inhabitants or more per square mile (The area of large nonresidential tracts devoted to such urban land uses as railroad yards, factories, and cemeteries, was excluded in computing the population density of an enumeration district.)
>
> 5. Other enumeration districts in unincorporated territory with lower population density provided that they served one of the following purposes:
>
> (a) To eliminate enclaves
>
> (b) To close indentations in the urbanized area of 1 mile or less across the open end
>
> (c) To link outlying numeration districts of qualifying density that were no more than 1½ miles from the main body of the urbanized area.
>
> Contiguous urbanized areas with central cities in the same standard metropolitan statistical area are combined. Urbanized areas with central cities in different standard metropolitan statistical areas are not combined, except that a single urbanized area was established in the New York-northeastern New Jersey standard consolidated area, and in the Chicago-northwestern Indiana standard consolidated area.
>
> The boundaries of the urbanized areas for 1960 will not conform to those for 1950, partly because of actual changes in land use and density of settlement, and partly because of relatively minor changes in the rules used to define the boundaries. The changes in the rules include the following:
>
> 1. The use of enumeration districts to construct the urbanized areas in 1960 resulted in a less precise definition than in 1950 when the limits were selected in the field using individual blocks as the unit of area added. On the other hand, the 1960 procedures produced an urbanized area based on the census results rather than an area defined about a year before the census, as in 1950.
>
> 2. Unincorporated territory was included in the 1950 urbanized area if it contained at least 500 dwelling units per square mile, which is a somewhat different criterion than the 1,000 persons or more per square mile of the included 1960 unincorporated areas.
>
> 3. The 1960 areas include those entire towns in New England, townships in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, and counties that are classified as urban in accordance with the criteria listed in the section on urban-rural residence. The 1950 criteria permitted the exclusion of portions of these particular minor civil divisions.
>
> In general, however, the urbanized areas of 1950 and 1960 are based on essentially the same concept, and the figures for a given urbanized area may be used to measure the population growth of that area.
>
> An urbanized area may be thought of as divided into the central city, or cities, and the remainder of the area, or the urban fringe. Any city in an urbanized area which is a central city of a standard metropolitan statistical area is also a central city of the urbanized area. With but two exceptions, the names of the central cities appear in the titles of the areas. The central cities of the New York-northwestern New Jersey area are the central cities of the New York, Newark, Jersey City, and Paterson-Clifton-Passaic standard metropolitan statistical areas. Likewise, the central cities of the Chicago-northwestern Indiana area are the central cities of the Chicago and Gary-Hammond-East Chicago standard metropolitan statistical areas.
>
> Data for the entire urbanized area are shown in this report in table 10 for each State in which a central city of the area is located. If that part of an urbanized area that extends into another State does not include a central city, data are shown only for that part within the State.

I think that is very excellent. I also think that in the event we do not reach a vote on the measure today, each Senator will have an opportunity to see that this is an adequate definition, one which is specific and precise; and certainly it is more satisfactory than the nebulous thing in the bill.

As was pointed out by the Senator from Ohio, I think there is too much of a tendency for Congress to abdicate its responsibilities. I do not see why we cannot assume the responsibility to do such a little thing as define an urban area. But, instead, we think we have to vest this authority in an administrator, as a way of washing our hands of the matter. We want to establish broad policy lines; but we do not want to spell out the legislative intent, which I think we should do and must do if we are to fulfill our responsibilities as representatives in a representative democracy.

So I do not see why we cannot adopt a specific definition—rather than give this broad, discretionary power to the administrator—to show that we are facing up to our responsibilities and that we are not afraid to legislate in some detail if that is necessary.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How does the Senator from Texas propose to change the definition of "urban area"?

Mr. TOWER. As stated in my amendment:

> (4) the term "urban area" means any urbanized area according to the most recent available classification of the Bureau of the Census;

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would mean that it must have at least one central city with a population of at least 50,000?

Mr. TOWER. Yes; at least 50,000. And, of course, several criteria are established by the schedule for the determination of what is an urban area, figuring the population density, and so forth, and determining parts of unincorporated areas as being parts of urban areas, or incorporated places of 2,500 or more or 2,500 or less. All these factors are taken into consideration. A very complicated set of criteria are used by the Bureau to determine what an urban area is.

---

[1] There are a few urbanized areas where there are "twin central cities" that have a combined population of at least 50,000. See the section below on "Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas" for further discussion of twin central cities, neither of which has a population of 50,000 or more.

[2] An enumeration district (ED) is a small area assigned to an enumerator which must be canvassed and reported separately. In most cases an ED contains approximately 250 housing units.

Yesterday I distributed these Bureau of the Census booklets to the desks of Senators, in order that they could see what the urban areas of their States are, as defined in these booklets.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me point out that I said that in 1962, Congress gave the Department of Commerce the direction and authority to study transportation problems in cities with a population of 50,000 or more; and in a measure that act corroborates the argument the Senator from Texas is making.

My own interpretation of the language of this bill defining an urban area is that it means any community, practically anywhere.

Mr. TOWER. I call the attention of the Senator to this language in the bill:

> (4) The term "urban area" means any area that includes a municipality or other built-up place.

Would the Senator from Ohio care to give me his interpretation of the words "built-up place"?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Of course I could not do that.

Mr. TOWER. And I do not imagine that anyone could.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As to the matter of municipalities, I have on my desk a letter from the municipal association. In the letter it states that it represents 15,000 municipalities. Does that language of the bill mean that each of them would be allowed to request money with which to purchase buses, parking lots, and terminal stations?

Mr. TOWER. Well, will the Senator from Ohio try, in his imagination, to place himself in the position of the Administrator, and will he imagine that a delegation came, hat in hand, from a very small community, and became very emotional, and gave him a good sob story?

I know that the Senator from Ohio, being a very softhearted man, would, out of the kindness of his heart, declare the people of that little crossroads community to be a part of an urban area and municipality or other built-up place, and would probably hand them a great deal of money that would not go to New York, New Jersey, or such places, that really need the money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I do not know why the Senator always stops, in reading the definition, after the words "built-up place," because that is not the end of the sentence. It is not the end of the definition. The remainder of the sentence reads—

> Which is appropriate in the judgment of the Administrator for a public transportation system to serve commuters or others in the locality, taking into consideration the local patterns and trends of urban growth.

Mr. TOWER. I know that the Senator from New Jersey has always been opposed to the inclusion of redundant language in legislation. I point out that because of the language "to serve commuters or others in the locality, taking into consideration the local patterns and trends of urban growth," it could be assumed from the very nature of the bill that that was what was intended. Of course, it does provide "in the judgment of the Administrator." It leaves it to the arbitrary will and discretion of the Administrator. Does the Senator have any other construction of the term "in the judgment of the Administrator"?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Can the Senator suggest some other individual or group of individuals who ought to make the judgment? The Administrator is the individual who administers the program and makes the final decision as to what applications shall be accepted. Does the Senator desire a committee of Congress to sit with him?

Mr. TOWER. Why not accept an established definition, that set forth by the Bureau of the Census, which is a Federal agency?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There are many good reasons. I know that many Senators feel very bad because under the provisions of the bill rural or less populated, poorer parts of our country would be contributing taxes to the large rich cities. I am merely saying that there is opportunity in the bill for the poorer and smaller cities to receive consideration; and to cut off a city because the population of that city had not reached 50,000 would be most unjust.

Wherever there is an urban transportation problem, the people of the particular area should be in a position to be assisted under the bill if they can meet all the other qualifications. Why say that a city whose population is 49,000 cannot obtain the benefits, but must wait until the population reaches 50,000?

Mr. TOWER. I point out to the Senator that the criterion established is 50,000 or approaching 50,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The word "approaching" is a great one. When does a city start approaching a population of 50,000?

Mr. TOWER. I should say that 49,000 is approaching it rather rapidly. I note also, that included in the urban areas would be very small incorporated towns, and even unincorporated areas. The provision does not mean that only cities of 50,000 or more population would benefit. It means that satellite towns would also benefit. They are included as a part of the urban areas under the census definition.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I should like to have the Senator's judgment as to whether Garland, Tex., with a population of 38,501 people, perhaps there are a few more people there now, since that was the population in 1960, is approaching 50,000.

Mr. TOWER. Does the Senator know where Garland, Tex., is located?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I have no idea.

Mr. TOWER. It is located in Dallas County, a metropolitan area. Garland City is a dormitory and satellite town. It is not really a satellite town. Garland was there, I believe, when Dallas was not. At any rate, it has grown in a period of time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator has said that Garland is a dormitory town. I cannot speak with authority in relation to mass transportation in Garland, Tex.

Mr. TOWER. The people of Garland have a very fine expressway to get them to and from downtown Dallas in a very short period of time.

As I stated the other day, there are skyscraper apartments with facilities to accommodate automobiles. There are traffic problems, but those problems would not be solved by obtaining money under a mass transportation bill.

Proponents of the bill have been talking about the jurisdiction of the cities. The cities are choking and strangling. If it is primarily the intent of the bill to help solve the transportation difficulties of cities in the large urban areas, why do we not spell it out in the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Is that question addressed to me?

Mr. TOWER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If the purposes are to serve or to meet the most critical problems in urban transportation, there must be priorities, I am sure, because of the limitation on the funds available, although with the guarantee provision added, the opportunity of meeting the problem is broadened. Particularly with a guarantee provision which is most feasible for cities with bus transportation, I feel that we can reach cities in the 25,000, 30,000, and 35,000 population range that have critical problems.

For example, consider the city of Pensacola, Fla., which might be termed a bus city. I am not sure of the population of that city. Bus operators came to us from that city and said they were losing money at an anual rate of $8,000 a year. They felt that with 15 new and improved buses, less maintenance and repair, they could improve their service. Their operating expenses relatively would decline, and they could make money. I do not know whether Pensacola meets the urbanized area definition or not.

The same situation exists in Hattiesburg, Miss., which is about to lose its transit service. Hattiesburg, Miss., is a city of 34,000 population.

Consider Laurel, Miss. The mayor of Laurel City, whose population is between 27,000 and 30,000 people, came before the House committee last year and said,

> We have no mass transportation. We need it. I will tell you why. Three companies have come to me looking for properties so that they could locate within Laurel, Miss. When they discovered that there was no mass transportation, they did not come into the city.

Those are cities that we must think of, as well as Dallas, Houston, and other large cities.

Mr. TOWER. I say to the Senator from New Jersey that I am not anti-small-towns. Although I was born in Houston, I have grown up in small towns. I really prefer small towns to large cities. But we are considering an urban bill. It is designed to help urban people. We have estimated a $10 billion need over a period of a few years. The amount of money will be spread pretty thin, anyway.

It seems to me that the bill would actually be improved and made more effective if we could tighten up the definition of an urban area. Then the gravy would not be spread quite so thin. Taking into consideration also the number of small towns in the United States, if many of them are encouraged to apply under the terms of the bill, funds that ought to go to the big urban areas will be sapped, or the money will be spread out so thin over the country than no area will be greatly benefited by it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I might be inclined in some measure to agree with the Senator if the bill provided merely a grant program and the funds were small, indeed. They are very modest. But with the guarantee provisions added——

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a statement at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. TOWER. I did not mean to imply that the appropriation authorized is a modest one. I am thinking of it in terms of relationship to the total need. I would never imply that the bill is a cheap one.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It is modest for the need.

Mr. TOWER. A great deal of money is involved.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. With a guarantee provision, why should not a town have its bonds guaranteed even if its population has not reached 50,000? I do not understand why we should say that Hattiesburg, Miss., cannot obtain a guarantee of its bonds because there are not enough people in Hattiesburg.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I did not raise the urban versus rural argument in this body. That was raised by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] in his very eloquent and closely reasoned presentation. I do not regard this as an urban-rural argument.

As a matter of fact, I think more cities are opposed to the bill than are for it. At least, that is the indication given by the testimony by representatives of the National Chamber of Commerce.

Will not the Senator concede that the aim of the bill primarily is to aid in the congested strangulation of the big cities? Most of the testimony has been by people from these big city areas, has it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I cannot agree to that. Where there are concentrations of people, where there are areas so large that a person cannot walk to all his missions—to work, to church, to school, and all the rest—transportation is needed. Perhaps 40 percent of our people are not automobile drivers, yet they live in areas where they have to move farther than walking distance. What are they to do? Youngsters cannot drive cars. Older people cannot drive cars. Those who are poor often do not have cars. Some people are disabled. Some people are afraid to drive a car.

Why should all of the people not have an opportunity to be more than hermits in homes?

Mr. TOWER. Why should not the people who are 64 years old have an opportunity to collect social security?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Some can.

Mr. TOWER. Some can, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If totally disabled.

Mr. TOWER. Some small towns, under my definition, would be able to qualify for aid.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Only if they are like Garland and happily situated within the shadow of Dallas.

Hattiesburg, Miss., would not qualify.

Anderson, Ind., with 49,060 people, would not qualify.

Hagerstown, Md., with 36,000 people, would not qualify.

Cumberland, Md., with 33,000 people, would not qualify.

Bangor, Maine, with 38,000 people, would not qualify.

Lawrence, Kans., with 32,000 people, would not qualify.

New Castle, Pa., with 44,000 people, would not qualify.

All of these cities have transit troubles. The companies are almost on the rocks.

Mr. TOWER. Have all of those cities evidenced some support for the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If they are part of the U.S. Conference of Mayors or the American Municipal Association they have, through representative action, come to us every year in support of the mass transit bill. The American Municipal Association speaks for 13,000 cities and towns in this country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. An enumeration has been made of cities which are in distress. If the Senator from Texas will look at page 268 of the transcript of the testimony for 1963——

Mr. TOWER. The hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, or before the Committee on Commerce?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Arizona is listed as having within it Phoenix, with transportation problems. In Phoenix the lines were sold; one in 1955 and the other in 1959. So when one looks at that book one would assume that Phoenix has not solved its problem.

The mayor of Phoenix appeared before the Commerce Committee and told about the transportation services there. He opposed the bill. Yet if one looks into this tabulation one would say, "Phoenix is in distress."

I invite the Senator's attention to Kansas. Wichita is mentioned as being in trouble. It is said that it was necessary to dispose of their system. The owner of the Wichita transportation system appeared before the Commerce Committee and said that their problem has been solved.

I refer to Cleveland, Ohio. Under Ohio, Cleveland is mentioned. It is shown that the Broadview Bus Line on July 1, 1961, was transferred. Yes, it was transferred to the Cleveland transit system.

Going further down, to Lakewood, Ohio, it is shown that Lakewood is in trouble. The Lakewood system was taken over by the Cleveland transit system.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Where does it show that Lakewood is in trouble?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is listed. Four hundred and sixty-seven transit systems, it is pointed out, had to be abandoned or transferred.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We did not use the word "trouble." We said that in most cases there has been a diminution of service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry of the Senator from New Jersey?

The time on my side has expired. May we use time from the Senator's side?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. A full hour has been used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 30 minutes allotted to the Senator from Texas have been used. There are 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I would be less than generous if I did not allow some time, having used so much of the time of the Senator from Texas.

I will yield, from time to time, as much time as is needed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Texas to his own State. Houston is listed. The Houston operator appeared and told about making money in Houston. He is now in charge of this system.

The Senator from Texas will remember that in the hearings I was asked by the Senator from New Jersey about Upper Arlington and Findlay, Ohio. Those are communities in which families normally have two cars. That is true practically everywhere in the area. Certainly they do not have a bus system, and they will not have one.

I merely point that out to show how fallacious is this report, when one looks at it and concludes that these places are in distress and are going to need the money they will receive to run their systems.

Why should the Federal Government buy buses and subsidize local transportation systems for the people of those areas, for the young people, for those of medium age, and for those who are old? Since when has that become a responsibility of the Federal Government?

If we go into this field, how many fields will we stay out of?

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, at this point I wish to say that under the proposed legislation there is to be no grant of Federal money, of course, until the applying local governing authority has found that it cannot feasibly use a local guarantee to borrow the money and pay it back. The grant will follow only the most rigorous series of qualifying hurdles.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is a weakness in that answer. There are 13,000 municipalities in the country. Some of them have tried to solve their own problems. Others have done nothing. The ones which have done the least are the ones crying the most for help.

There are different tax rates in the various States.

In some places subsidies are given. Those which are operating successfully, because of their efforts to solve the problem, will get nothing.

Those that have done the least will be in the most formidable position to apply for aid; and I say that in spite of the language that has been quoted by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I believe most of the observation I wanted to make on the limitation of the legislation to apply only to cities of at least 50,000 population have been made. I think it is one that is most unjust, because we know there can be a critical problem in transportation in a city of 30,000 or 35,000 as easily as in a city of 50,001 persons.

To ask all the country, large cities and small cities, to raise the money from taxation for this program, and then to arbitrarily deny these benefits to people, even though they can demonstrate they have a problem, is cruel indeed.

I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on my amendment be postponed until subsequent to the vote on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be terminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 6, line 2, to delete the words "its operations" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the operations of such public mass transportation company".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present this amendment only because there seems to be in some quarters some question as to what is meant by the language at the top of page 6 of the revised bill as submitted by the Commerce Committee, which this amendment would affect.

The word "its" in line 2 of page 6, refers to the public mass transportation company or any division or segment thereof which is operating profitably. This is the general theory that I am seeking to reach.

I have specifically in mind the Port Authority of New York, which is operating in many areas, and the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority in New York, which is also operating in many ways. For instance, the port authority operates parking garages, bridges, tunnels, airports, and may very well take under its wing a trade center, as well as a transportation system, to wit, the particular system we call the Hudson Tubes, the Hudson & Manhattan Railway. The Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority operates bridges, as well as a coliseum which is a great show place for trade shows, as well as an office building.

As I understand the intent of this section, and I have discussed this matter with the aides of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], it is to prevent a public body which operates in the mass public transportation field from starving one of its entities which may seek aid from the Government, while at the same time it is making money from its other entities.

The reason why I have submitted the amendment is to sharpen the discussion on the question. I understand what I have in mind and what the Senators in charge of the bill have in mind, and I do not think the amendment is needed, but, in order to highlight this point, I thought it was necessary to have this discussion in order to understand what was intended.

As I understand the situation, it comes down to this: Where a public body operates many facilities, and some of them make money, and there is a transportation system that it wishes to get qualified under this bill, which company is not making money, that company is not automatically disqualified from coming in under the bill, but the Administrator, under the bill, has a perfect right to give them money for the elements they do operate which he thinks properly belong in a mass public transportation system.

In short, I want to be sure such a public body is not ipso facto, as we lawyers say, by some strained construction of the language, excluded from the provisions of the bill because some elements of its operations make money.

As I understand the intent, the Administrator could say to the Port Authority of New York, "I do not care whether the Hudson and Manhattan does or does not make money. A public mass transportation system which would command my interest so that I would give you money under this bill has got to include other things, such as A, B, and C."

I would not want, on the face of the bill itself, to bar that public authority from coming under the bill because it happened to have some operations, which might be completely unrelated to a mass public transportation system, which made money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If the Senator will yield, of course this part of the bill was brought to us from the Commerce Committee. Of course, the Senator from New York and I, sitting in the Banking and Currency Committee, wrote the other part of the bill; but it seems to me the clear, plain meaning of the language is that only the mass transportation activities of an authority would be considered, in this connection, in what is profitable and what is not profitable.

Mr. JAVITS. That is, what the Administrator would insist should go into the mass public transportation operation to qualify for a grant or whatever aid he wished to give. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. In my judgment, that is the plainest, clearest, and most manifest meaning of the language of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I wonder if the Senator from New Jersey will join me in the mode of procedure I shall now suggest. I would like to ask the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] to read this colloquy and if, when he returns, he agrees with it, I will be prepared to withdraw the amendment. I do not think it is at all needed, but I think, in view of the fact that some persons believe there is some ambiguity in the language—although I do not—that question ought to be resolved now while we are discussing the question. So I am prepared to reserve any time I have left so that, when the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] returns, if he agrees with this interpretation, I shall be prepared to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before that?

Mr. TOWER. I yield the Senator from Kansas 5 minutes.

THE ARMS CONTRAL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the last session of Congress approved legislation which established the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

This legislation was enacted after extensive hearings in both the House and Senate committees and after general debate in both bodies. The legislation was approved by a vote of 290 to 54 in the House of Representatives and a vote of 73 to 14 in the Senate.

Congress established the Agency to explore, develop, recommend and, if approved by the President, negotiate possible alternatives to the arms race in order to enhance our national security. A strong military establishment, of course, remains essential. But as the President has said, "in a spiraling arms race a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase."

In today's world a strong military establishment is essential. It does not follow, however, that our security can be maintained indefinitely by continuing the present arms race. Our defense budget is so large and modern weapons of war are so devastating that safeguarded alternatives must be explored.

Realizing this, Congress charged the Agency with carrying out an extensive research program in the field of arms control and disarmament and using the results as a basis for informed negotiations in this field.

Most people will recognize that if a safeguarded international disarmament treaty could be effected—if the war-making capabilities of all nations could be eliminated and effective machinery could be set up to keep the peace, this would certainly be in our national interest.

If this is true, it follows that somebody or some group should work out disarmament proposals for appropriate consideration by the executive branch and by Congress. This is what the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was set up to do.

The major proposal on disarmament worked out by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—and the one that has been the subject of so much misunderstanding—is the "Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World." This outline has not even reached the stage of a draft treaty, but it represents the most comprehensive and thoroughgoing series of proposals ever made on disarmament by this or any other country.

The overall goal is defined as the establishment of a "free, secure, and peaceful world of independent states adhering to common standards of justice and international conduct and subjecting the use of force to the rule of law."

It is claimed that we could never negotiate such an agreement with the Communists because their goal is world domination and they cannot be trusted. Maybe we cannot conclude an agreement under present circumstances, but it should be kept in mind that there are other alternatives to war which the Communists may believe they can use to achieve their objectives, such as political and economic means.

Anyone who has met a dedicated Communist knows that he exhibits a fanatical belief in the ultimate success of the Communist ideology. We would show a surprising lack of faith in our own system if we did not believe we could meet the Communists successfully in the political and economic fields.

It should also be kept in mind that we would not accept anything less than a treaty which would safeguard our national security precisely because we realize the Communists cannot be trusted—that is why we would insist upon adequate means to verify that they were complying with any agreement.

The U.S. program does not, of course, call for unilateral disarmament only by this country; it specifically requires that the arms and armed forces of all parties to the agreement be reduced "in a manner that will not affect adversely the security of any State," and it proposes an effective system to verify compliance.

It also contemplates appropriate changes in our economy so that all of the billions of dollars now being spent on defense could be utilized in other ways. Continuing studies are being sponsored by the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency on the economic impacts of disarmament and the alternate utilization of human resources for those now employed in the defense effort.

Congress provided for cooperation in arms control and disarmament policy formulation among all interested agencies. Test ban or disarmament recommendations of this Agency are considered by the Departments of Defense and State, and where appropriate, by the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and other agencies. Negotiations are never undertaken on an important measure until the President has consulted with his key national security advisers and given his approval.

Congress also provided that no action could be taken that would obligate the United States to disarm without the prior approval of Congress.

The President, the Secretary of State, and the Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency have all said that a test ban agreement would be submitted in the form of a treaty to the Senate for the traditional two-thirds vote.

Under section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, a disarmament agreement must either be approved in this fashion or by a majority in both Houses. The American people are thus assured that no disarmament agreement could be put into effect without the approval of their elected representatives.

Finally, the executive branch could not—as some people assert—operate independently in this area through the United Nations by putting us under a United Nations military dictatorship and destroying our national sovereignty. The executive branch disclaims any intention of doing this either through a disarmament treaty or under the United Nations Charter, but even given the impossible assumption that it wanted to, the United Nations Charter is a treaty and it cannot be changed in any way affecting the United States without undergoing the treaty procedures set forth in the U.S. Constitution.

In other words, our relationship to the United Nations under the United Nations Charter could not be altered unless the U.S. Senate approved of such a change.

I hope, Mr. President, that these few observations will help to clarify some of the more glaring misconceptions that have arisen over the activities of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. If I have the time I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have some time on my amendment. I am glad to yield a minute to the Senator if he needs it.

I wish to congratulate the Senator on the statement he has made. He is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. He is considered a man of reasonably middle-of-the-road and perhaps even somewhat conservative views. A statement of this character by him is of the greatest importance at this time, when so much obfuscation exists on the question of disarmament, so dear to the hearts of the people.

I found myself in a somewhat similar situation in my last campaign, and made a statement which the Senator and I might have written together.

The important point the Senator has emphasized is that in no case is there the remotest chance that the Senate will not pass on any disarmament treaty. There is no misconception, in my view, and I am sure the Senator agrees with me in this respect, and the whole world knows by now that the Senate is not bound merely because the President or his negotiators have agreed, but that our hands are perfectly free. This represents the ultimate sanction to the people. They have no reason to fear that something will be done in the dark. I am delighted to hear the Senator say that. I again congratulate him.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate what the Senator from New York has said. He has spent a great deal of time in this field. I made the statement today for the reason that the Senator has mentioned; namely, the concern that some people have in connection with this matter. The final vote will be determined by Congress, or by the Senate, because it is a treaty. I thank the Senator.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call may not be taken out of the time controlled by either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Colorado has 4 minutes remaining on his amendment. The Senator from Alabama has 9 minutes remaining in opposition.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I wish to review again the terms of the proposed amendment, so that the Senators who are here may keep it in mind. There was some discussion this morning between myself and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] as to what programs would or would not be covered by the language which is now in the proposed Commerce Committee bill, particularly with respect to the program which would be subject to being cut off in the event my amendment should fail of adoption and the language which is now in the bill should remain in it.

For the purposes of the record I should like to outline again—and I call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Nevada the fact what I am about to outline—the programs that will be involved and in jeopardy unless my language is adopted. These are, under the Office of the Administrator of HHFA, urban planning grants, urban studies, and housing research, mass transportation demonstration grants, urban transportation assistance, open space land grants, low income housing demonstration grants, college housing programs, public facility loans, public works planning, urban renewal programs, housing for the elderly program. In addition, if the words "assistance to finance" any project administered by the HHFA should be broadly interpreted by any court, it could also very easily mean insurance under the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration, and the programs financed under the Federal National Mortgage Association. In addition, the Federal Housing Administration is within the HHFA compound, and it would include all financing and insurance programs under that administration.

It would also include the low-rent public housing program under the Public Housing Administration.

The point I have tried to make is that what we are trying to do is to give the Administrator some power, but it does not seem to me that we ought to give him a meat ax in order to kill a mosquito.

If we provide that, because he does not like a new rate schedule which has gone into effect, no area which is involved in the mass transit program can any longer receive assistance for financing any of the programs as outlined in that list, it seems to me we have gone awfully far in the way of giving control to this Federal Administrator.

There is one more point that I wish to make very clear. As it is now written, not only does the bill give the Administrator discretion within a stated area over a short space of time; but the discretion will continue so long as any project to which a Federal grant has been given is still in the process of proving or disproving itself.

For example, if the grant were a part of a local matching program, under which the municipality was to raise one-third of the funds over a period of 20 or 50 years, the power would remain in the hands of the Administrator for that length of time. It does not seem to me that the Senate should be giving to any person the degree of power which is implicit in the language now in the bill. That is the reason why I have offered my amendment to strike the last sentence of subsection (c) on page 17 of the Magnuson substitute for the original bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, it seems anomalous to me that those who have favored the granting of funds by the Federal Government to aid in this particular problem are those who are now supporting this type of amendment, which would remove any restrictions, and which provides, in effect, that if the money is to be given, let it be given to permit inefficient operation. The amendment would permit inefficient operation with no type of Government control over the funds. The opponents of S. 6 call it a "giveaway," which it certainly is not at this time; but when you cut off all the controls, then you make it a "giveaway." That is the anomaly.

All the bill seeks to do is to tighten the control, so that if a municipality or other local governing body applies to the Administrator and submits a plan which the Administrator believes is sound and feasible, and has several facets to it, one of them calling for the financing of the plan from the fare box, the Administrator may make the grant from the Federal Government.

The Administrator would review the plan and the proposed schedule of rates. He would ascertain the amount of revenue the proposal would bring in. That would be done on the basis of the representations of the applicant, not on the basis of any decision by the Administrator.

The Administrator would then determine the net project cost, of which amount the Government would finance two-thirds by way of a grant, and the local body would finance one-third by way of a grant. Why? Because the rates proposed to be put into effect would not finance the whole project. Unless the applicant made that representation, it could not qualify at all. Once they made that representation, they could secure the approval of the Administrator and get a grant.

But the supporters of the amendment are in effect saying, "Once the applicant gets the grant, we propose that the Administrator keep his hands off. If the applicant wishes to reduce the fares below what it has represented are needed to be charged for an economic operation, and if the operation is thus made uneconomic, the Administrator will have no control over it. It is tough, but the Administrator approved the grant of money, and that is it."

I say again that the bill simply provides an insurance policy for the Federal Government. The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] said this would be a never-ending problem; it could continue ad infinitum or indefinitely. I say it would continue only so long as the project for which the applicant made a request to the Federal Government for assistance was economically sound. Their determination would affect their application, not the Administrator's. The applicant itself would present the schedule of fares or rates, not the Administrator. Once that were done, it is felt that it would be only fair and right to assume that they had committed themselves, and on the basis of that representation had committed the Federal Government to a course of conduct.

If thereafter they took action which resulted in an uneconomic operation—which would be a question of fact—then the Administrator would have the authority to say that further aid would not be given under programs administered by the HHFA, because the applicant had violated the plan or had not followed the plan presented to the Administrator.

If Congress passes the bill, it will have determined certain practices as a matter of public policy, so far as findings of purposes are concerned. Those findings will specifically include that the only reason relief can be granted in the first instance is that the program is an overall program to assist in the various areas which are administered by the HHFA.

Private aspects have been eliminated; as a matter of fact, they were never in the bill. The areas which would be involved are Federal National Mortgage Association loans, Federal Housing Administration loans, and Farm Housing loans. Those are individual applications; they are not projects in the nature of public projects which are administered by local governing bodies.

Those who wish to insure some responsibility in the use of funds at the local level should vote against the Dominick amendment. Those who wish to grant funds to a public body on the basis of representations made, and who then say that if the applicant changes its mind, the Federal Government will have no control over it, and the applicant can do as he will with the money, should support the position of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on the bill.

I urge the Senate to support the eminently sound amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. It remedies a flaw in the bill which was not discovered until the Senator from Colorado sought to correct it by his amendment. He has rendered a worthwhile service. I hope the Senate will support his amendment.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Lausche amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, before the roll is called, let me state that I have an amendment pending, but I intend to withdraw it. It is now at the desk. On the basis of colloquy with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], I intend to withdraw the amendment; and I should like to do so now, so that the only amendments which will be before us will be those on which we shall actually vote. So, if it is agreeable, I shall now withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe it would be better for the vote on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] to be taken now.

Mr. JAVITS. However, on the basis of colloquy with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon], I intend to withdraw my amendment, rather than have it voted on.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, let me point out that in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered into, the Senate is to vote at 2 o'clock on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick].

Mr. JAVITS. In that event, Mr. President, I shall wait.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is detained on official business and, on this vote, is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 58, as follows:

[No. 31 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Aiken
Beall
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fong
Goldwater
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Long, La.
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Robertson
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—58

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Ellender
Engle
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Holland
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kefauver
Kennedy
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—3

Allott
Moss
Smathers

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on amendment No. 17 of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CANNON. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on amendment No. 17 of the Senator from Ohio. On the amendment the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is detained on official business. On this vote, he is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Engle]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 62, as follows:

[No. 32 Leg.]

YEAS—33

Bartlett
Bennett
Boggs
Carlson
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ervin
Fong
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Jordan, N.C.
Lausche
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—62

Aiken
Anderson
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dodd
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, La.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Robertson
Russell
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

NOT VOTING—5

Allott
Engle
Hart
Moss
Smathers

So Mr. Lausche's amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the agreement, the question now is on the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, may the clerk read the amendment before we have the rollcall?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objections, the amendment will be read.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed, on page 23, to strike out lines 20 to 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

> (4) the term "urban area" means any urbanized area according to the most recent available classification of the Bureau of the Census; and.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott] is detained on official business, and on this vote, is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Engle]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 68, as follows:

[No. 33 Leg.]

YEAS—27

Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Fong
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Mundt
Pearson
Proxmire
Robertson
Simpson
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower

NAYS—68

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Ellender
Ervin
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf

Monroney
Morse
Morton
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—5

Allott
Engle
Hart
Moss
Smathers

So Mr. Tower's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 10 minutes. We debated this amendment previously in the absence of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon]. I am sure the Senator has read it.

The amendment relates to the definition of terms which are used in subsection (c) of section 3 at pages 5 and 6 of the bill as it is brought to us by the Commerce Committee. I hope very much that the meaning of the section is so clear as not to need an amendment. However, I believe the question of interpretation would best be raised by my proposing an amendment.

The meaning of the section, as I understand it, whatever may be its worth—and I will come to that in a moment—is that a public body which has as one of its activities a public mass transportation company or system may nonetheless qualify under the pending bill, if it becomes law, in the sense that it will be able to make an application, notwithstanding the fact that it may be engaged in operations related to something outside of a public mass transportation system.

For example, we could point to the storage of grain, or the operation of an office building, or the operation of a public body like the Coliseum in New York, which is a place where exhibitions and trade shows are held. In other words, notwithstanding the fact that it does have some other operations which make money, it nonetheless will qualify under this law even if this public mass transportation operation does not make money.

The entity to which I have specific reference is the Port of New York Authority. All we are trying to do is to provide that that entity will qualify. That does not mean that it will get a grant or any other assistance; it means merely that it may seek funds, and will not be disqualified from so doing.

On the other hand, the Administrator may determine, and, indeed, it would be his duty, to determine what he considers to be a public mass transportation system, and he may very well turn to this public body and say, "I do not agree with you as to what you are putting into the mass transportation system. I think you could put in there A, B, C, or D."

I wish to be sure that such a company, notwithstanding the fact that it has some operations which make money, is nonetheless considered a proper applicant, whatever the result of its application may be, or whatever may be the conditions which are set by the Administrator before he will give it any aid under this bill, if it is enacted into law.

The word "its" in line 2 on page 6 refers, in my judgment to the term "public mass transportation company." If it does, then my interpretation of the meaning of the section is, in my opinion, correct. Therefore I have offered the amendment really to spell out these words that I have sent to the desk by way of amendment with respect to the word "its." I have offered the amendment to make clear what I consider to be the interpretation of this section as it was drafted and as it comes to us from the Commerce Committee.

I would greatly appreciate it if we could have an expression of view from the Senator who is in charge of the Commerce Committee.

I hope that the amendment will not be necessary.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I assure the Senator that his amendment is not necessary. The understanding he has of the word "its" is the understanding the committee had; namely, that it refers to a public mass transportation company. Certainly an applicant would be qualified to apply as an applicant even though there might be other segments that were operating independently from that mass transit company. I therefore assure the Senator from New York that his interpretation is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I withdraw the amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CANNON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn. All time on the amendment is yielded back.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 16, in lines 18, 19, and 20 it is proposed to strike out "$100,000,000 for fiscal years 1963 and 1964; $200,000,000 for fiscal year 1965; and $200,000,000 for fiscal year 1966," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$75,000,000 for fiscal years 1963 and 1964; $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1965; and $150,000,000 for fiscal year 1966".

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The amendment cuts $25 million from the years 1963 and 1964 with respect to the grants. It cuts $50 million from the year 1965, and $50 million from the year 1966. Therefore, it is a cut from $500 million for the total period of the grants to $375 million.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri asks for the yeas and nays on his amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If it is desired to offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri, is it in order to offer it after the yea-and-nay vote has been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, it is.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the mass transit bill will help many cities, including some in my own State; but I believe that as a nation, we are running into increasing fiscal problems.

The Federal debt is now over $300 billion.

The planned Federal budget for this fiscal year is $98.8 billion.

To stimulate the economy, the administration is now asking for a heavy reduction in taxes; and estimates the Federal deficit will be $11.9 billion. Some say it will be more.

More worrisome to me than any of these considerations, however, and even though this is not entirely relevant to the bill in question, is the problem of balance of payments—the steady loss of gold from this country. In the last 14 years, or thereabouts, we have lost $8,737 million in gold, over 35 percent of our total; and it is still running out.

I believe in the principles of this transportation bill, and am anxious to support an effort to alleviate this growing problem characteristic of many of our towns and cities. But based on the aforementioned fiscal facts, I also believe there must be some retrenchment in our Federal expenditures.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. So far as the operation of the bill is concerned, would the bill in any way affect the overall operation of the program as to the amount of money which would be utilized for grants?

Mr. SYMINGTON. It would not. The amendment simply provides a reduction in the $500 million for grants provided in the bill. It does not affect the guaranteeing of the $500 million.

Mr. HARTKE. So far as the overall concept of trying to alleviate the very serious problem of mass transportation is concerned, the offering of the amendment is not intended to detract in any way from the merits of the bill itself?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Not at all. It does not take away from the principle. It would simply reduce the amount of money that would be made available in this new field.

Mr. HARTKE. The whole concept of the bill is a recognition of the need for a new approach; but instead of approaching it to the tune of $500 million, the amount would be reduced to $375 million. If the amendment shall be agreed to, that is well and good. It will be possible at a later date to come forward with a request for additional funds.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe that would be a fair interpretation of the intent of my amendment.

Mr. HARTKE. I desire the Senator to know that I support his amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Indiana for his contribution and his support.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the able Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. If the Senator's amendment were adopted, and it actually turned out to be the fact, either during the periods of 1964 or 1965, that the amount of money authorized in the bill was insufficient, would it be permissive or proper for Congress to take action at that time to provide additional authorization, if the need were actually determined?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would think so, if I follow the thinking of the able Senator from Nevada. That is the reason I reduced the amount originally scheduled for the first 2 years.

Mr. CANNON. Personally, I think this is a good amendment. When the bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce after it had been considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency, the figure $500 million was in the bill. But since that time, as the Senator knows, the Committee on Commerce added the guarantee loan provision, so perhaps that would reduce the need somewhat. Perhaps even the guarantee loan provision may be high for the first few years of operation, because it will take some time to get the program underway and actually determine who can qualify.

I agree with the Senator that we should take every step possible not to authorize or not to appropriate more funds than are actually needed for a particular program. In view of the fact that this is a new program and that the action proposed by the Senator from Missouri would not preclude a return to Congress if the need were actually demonstrated over the period authorized in the bill, I join in support of the recommendation of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am especially grateful to the Senator from Nevada, because he studied the bill carefully and he and his committee suggested many constructive amendments—five to be exact—in the recent debate. I appreciate his support.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished assistant minority leader.

Mr. KUCHEL. At what amount would the loan or grant provision be diminished?

Mr. SYMINGTON. For the first 2 fiscal years—1963 and 1964—the first of which has almost been concluded, the reduction would be $25 million. For the next 2 years, the reduction per year would be $50 million. Therefore, the total grant request in the bill—$500 million over the period in question—would be reduced from $500 million to $375 million.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SPARKMAN rose.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, does the Senator from Alabama wish to have me yield time to him?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall speak in my own time.

Mr. President, I am in accord with the proposal of the Senator from Missouri. Since the Committee on Commerce has added the loan guarantee provision, there certainly should not be much requirement for grants. Therefore, I think it is entirely reasonable—and I may say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that I have had this feeling all along—that the amount provided in his amendment as a loan guarantee was too high, and that the figure should be reduced somewhat along the same line as that proposed by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. When I originally proposed the loan guarantee provision in the Committee on Commerce, I proposed it in the amount of $100 million rather than $500 million. The $500 million was included by reason of a recommendation of another member of the committee. I am hopeful that a reduction in that amount could be considered because I hold no brief for the $500 million figure.

On the other hand, I agreed that so long as the loan guarantee provision is only a limitation on the authorization of guarantees and does not mean that there will be the expenditure of that amount of money over the original period, I did not oppose the inclusion of that amount. It was simply for the purpose of fixing the maximum period of the loan guarantee authorization rather than the prospective spending of that amount.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It seems to me that, standing alone, the high figure for either the grant program or the loan guarantee program would be justified. But when both are included in the same bill, then I think both items can stand a reduction. For that reason, I intend to support the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I agree with the statement of the chairman of our subcommittee. With the addition of the loan guarantee program, there is not the need for an extended grant program. I know that in both the committees and on the floor there has been a very large measure of accommodation by Senators to the efforts of the members of the committees on the bill. There have been earnest reservations about budgetary situations. Therefore, I, too, am happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri. I ask that the substitute amendment be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair inquire whether the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Alabama yield back the remainder of the time available to them, in order that the substitute may be in order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me on the Symington amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me state that in case I do not favor the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, I presume I shall have time to discuss it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time in opposition will be in the control of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the majority leader tells me that if I yield back the remainder of the time available to me, I shall be able to obtain some time on the bill. Therefore, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The remaining time available on the amendment is yielded back by the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Alabama; and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is my amendment in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; and it will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 3, in line 9, it is proposed to strike out, after the word "bonds," all of the provision down to and including the word "otherwise," in line 13.

And on page——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the amendment is not in order, because it is drafted as a substitute for another part of the bill.

Will the Senator from Ohio be willing to have the Symington amendment disposed of, and to offer his amendment later?

The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the amendment is not in order as a substitute for the Symington amendment; but after the Symington amendment is disposed of, the Senator from Ohio can offer his amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I offer it as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then does the Senator from Ohio wish to redraft the amendment, so it will have that effect?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Two bills are before us; both are identified as S. 6. One is a substitute, and the other is the original bill. That situation is somewhat confusing. Perhaps the Senator from Ohio drafted his amendment as an amendment to the other bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that the Senator from Ohio either redraft his amendment or consent to the taking of the vote on the Symington amendment, and then offer his amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then, Mr. President, I should like to have time to speak on the Symington amendment, inasmuch as the Chair has ruled that my amendment is now out of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Parliamentarian makes it abundantly clear that the amendment, as drafted, is not in order, because it is not an amendment to the Symington amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the event the Symington amendment is agreed to, will an amendment to strike from the bill all the provisions dealing with grants then be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. Engle], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. Engle] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 8, as follows:

[No. 34 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—8

Case
Clark
Dodd
Ellender
Kefauver
Kennedy
McCarthy
Ribicoff

NOT VOTING—3

Engle
Moss
Smathers

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 22, after line 21, it is proposed to insert a new subsection (b)—and to reletter succeeding subsections—as follows:

> (b) To insure that small business concerns are given an equitable opportunity to share in all procurement aspects of any project for which a loan or grant is made under this Act, the Administrator shall cooperatively develop with the Small Business Administration within four months after the effective date of this paragraph a small business contracting program to be applicable to all such projects. The program shall contain such provisions as may be necessary to (1) enable small business concerns to have an equitable opportunity to compete, either directly or as subcontractors, for contracts and procurements for property and services awarded in the implementation and effectuation of the purposes of this Act, and (2) enable the Small Business Administration to obtain from the local public bodies and mass transportation companies such reasonably obtainable information concerning contracts and procurement, including subcontracts thereunder, awarded in the implementation and effectuation of the purposes of this Act.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, my amendment would provide that the Small Business Administrator, jointly with the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, would promulgate regulations for the purpose of assuring a fair and equitable opportunity for small concerns to compete for contracts awarded under the program which this bill establishes. The proposed Mass Transportation Act provides for a worthwhile and needed program in helping the urban communities of this Nation to meet their transit problems. I am confident that this program will be helpful. We are hopeful that the program will stimulate increased private investment in transportation facilities in our urban communities. I believe that it will.

If this is the case, we can expect a dramatic increase in procurement activity with respect to these facilities and research and development directed towards the improvement of existing facilities. Indeed, we may be opening new opportunities for the business community by means of this Federal program. I believe that the small and independent business community of this Nation should have an opportunity to participate. It is patterned after a similar program which the Congress approved in 1961 to assure small concerns an equitable opportunity to compete as subcontractors in Government procurement. This was Public Law 87–305, the subcontracting amendment to the Small Business Act. In addition, legislation is pending in the Senate with strong bipartisan support to establish a similar program as a part of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962.

Mr. President, for these reasons I strongly recommend the adoption of my amendment.

I have advised the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] of the nature of the amendment. I understand he has no objection to it. It is quite similar to an amendment which the Senator himself offered in connection with another bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have read the Senator's amendment. My understanding is that it is the usual form already provided in the law with reference to Government procurement and Government contracts.

Mr. SCOTT. Substantially so. It would merely provide for consultation to alert the Administrators who have responsibility to the necessity for recognizing the plight of small business.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think it is a good amendment. I am glad to accept it.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. I, too, support his amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Alabama has accepted the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin desire recognition?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] yield to me for a question, from the time on the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator wish to offer an amendment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I had not intended to offer an amendment for the time being. I shall call up an amendment in a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin desire to have time yielded to him?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator, from the time on the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 26 and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, line 16, after "(c) (2)" it is proposed to insert the following: ", (c) (7),".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I shall probably withdraw the amendment, but I wish to make some legislative history with respect to the bill.

On page 45 of the hearings—and I invite the attention of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] to that page—in the next to the final paragraph of the letter written by the Comptroller General of the United States, Joseph Campbell, Mr. Campbell said:

> We believe that the insurance provision should not be incorporated in the bill because the Government usually has followed the policy of self-insuring its properties.

The amendment would provide for bringing the bill into accord with the recommendation made by the Comptroller General, to give the Administrator discretion. If he should feel that self-insurance was the economical way to proceed, he could act in such a way that self-insurance would be secured.

It is my understanding that the committee report expresses the same intention. From my conversations earlier with the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], it is my understanding that the bill now provides discretion for the Administrator to provide for self-insurance if this, in his judgment, is the most economical way to proceed.

Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator is correct. This language appears on page 30 of the committee report:

> The Administrator will review the adequacy of the provision for insurance, or self-insurance, as a part of the review of the application for assistance.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, with that in mind I withdraw my amendment No. 26, and call up my amendment No. 28.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is withdrawn. The new amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, line 15, after the period it is proposed to insert the following:

> No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to section 3 unless the Administrator determines that (1) there exists a commitment from non-Federal sources to supply the remainder of the net project cost, and (2) the Federal Government's interest in the project is adequately protected in the event of a default or a failure to complete such project.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment is in accord with the recommendation made by the Comptroller General, as it appears on page 43 of the hearings. I quote the one sentence which requests the chairman of the committee to include this kind of provision in the bill.

> We believe also that the bill should contain provisions to require (1) legally enforceable commitments to the Administrator for local grant contributions, and (2) appropriate controls to protect the Federal Governments' interest in the event of default or failure to complete a project.

It is true that in the committee report, on page 22, there is vague and general language to try to achieve the same end, but it seems to me that the clear suggestion of the Comptroller General is not really provided for anywhere in the bill, or even in the committee report.

The bill would provide, after adoption of the Symington amendment, for $375 million of Federal grant money. This is a new program. It is a program which has never been tried in this way before. Under these conditions the recommendations of the Comptroller General, it seems to me, should be given real consideration. Hundreds of millions of dollars are involved.

Why should anyone object to this kind of requirement? In view of the clear language of the Comptroller General and the reasonableness of specifying that there should be legally enforceable commitments for local grant contributions, to protect the public money, and considering the recognition by all of us that there will be a great demand for the $375 million, I hope that the amendment will be agreed to. I have talked with a very considerable number of Senators who have told me that they expect the cities in their own States to qualify for the $25 million maximum amount. It seems to me that the bill should safeguard the Federal Government, so that it can be sure these provisions will be carried through.

Therefore, without taking any further time, unless the opposition wishes to take time, I express the hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I hope that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] will give consideration to accepting this amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Iowa for a question.

Mr. MILLER. The question is asked with a view of trying to clear up the meaning of the language, and possibly to help clarify the legislative history of this proposal.

I should like to ask the Senator what he has in mind by the words "adequately protected"? Is it envisioned that there will be a bonding arrangement of some kind, or will there be some kind of formula according to the amount of property or the fair market value of the property which is perhaps to be subject to lien, in favor of the Federal Government? I was wondering if any recommendations were made by the Comptroller General on that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. No. The Comptroller General's language, as I read it, was explicit, but limited.

It seems to me that both the suggestions made by the Senator from Iowa are sensible and appropriate. They would not be the only ones to be made. There might well be other ways in which the Government interest could be protected. Those certainly would be two sensible ways in which that could be accomplished.

Mr. MILLER. May I say that I feel the two suggestions I have made would preserve the Government's interests satisfactorily, but I would be very hesitant to give the Administrator discretion to use something that would not stand up in the ordinary business type transaction, let us say. It has been my experience that the Federal Government, when it is interested in preserving its rights in property covered by tax liens, for example, uses a certain formula to make sure the Government's tax interests will be maintained.

Might we say that it would be the intention of the proponent of this amendment that the Administrator, in carrying out this provision, would follow the standards used by the Treasury Department, let us say, which have been of long standing, in making sure the Government's interest is protected?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. I think that statement is an excellent contribution. I think it makes very useful legislative history.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Let me say, first, that this suggestion of the General Accounting Office was one of many that were made last year. Again, it was suggested to our committee this year. We thoroughly considered this proposition last year and this year, and while we did not use the language suggested by the General Accounting Office, the Senator will see in the committee report, on page 22, that the committee's attention was drawn to the question of enforcement. The Senator will find that reference at the bottom of the page.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. I called attention to that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. We feel this meets the hope of the Senator from Wisconsin. I will say that to use the language as he does in the amendment would create administrative legal questions of great complexity back at the community and urban level.

Hypothetically, a city wants to get into the program. It has a 5-year construction program. Part of the money is being taken from the city treasury by vote of the mayor and the common council. To use this language would straitjacket any council. It would require it to bind its suggestions down the line. It would be just as if we in this Congress tried to bind the 89th Congress. We do not do that. We not only have the question of enforcement spelled out but, as was developed in the debate on the Dominick amendments, we know that where there is a default the Administrator of the program knows of the agency's other obligations.

I hope the Senator will not press his amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I feel I must press it, because this is a new program. We have not had experience under the program before. The language in the committee report is as follows, and I read this one short paragraph:

> The committee further believes that no loan or grant should be provided under this section unless the Administrator, at or prior to the time the loan or grant contract is executed, shall have obtained reasonable assurance of performance under the contract by the applicant, including assurances of timely repayment of loans, continuing construction as a condition of eligibility for grants, and such other items as may be necessary to safeguard the interests of the Federal Government.

I submit that is extremely loose and nonspecific language. It would seem to me, in view of the recommendations by the Comptroller General in a field in which he is expert, in which his competence has been demonstrated again and again, that we would have nothing to lose by adopting this language.

The Senator from New Jersey spoke of city councils who would have to bind their successors. It seems to me when we put this much of the Federal Government's money into a program, that is something we should insist upon. After all, the Federal Government is making a grant or gift under this program, and it seems reasonable to me that the very least we should expect is that we have this kind of legally enforceable requirement.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. In connection with the Senator's statement that the Comptroller General had made a recommendation, I point out to the Senator that on page 22 of the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency on this very bill is the following statement:

> The committee further believes that no loan or grant——

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator will permit an interruption, I just read that language. My argument on that point is that while that is reassuring and nice language, it is extraordinarily general and vague, and there is nothing in the bill itself to provide any kind of legal protection for the Federal Government under this subsection.

Mr. MILLER. I recognize that. The point is that if this is the intention of the committee, there should not be any objection to writing it down on a piece of paper for all to see.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator's logic is irresistible.

Mr. MILLER. I cannot see any objection to it. I would say the failure to write it into the language of the bill might lead one to doubt whether that is the intention of the committee. They have a chance to put it in the bill. The Senator from Wisconsin is giving them that opportunity, and we trust that they will accept it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, could the Senator from Wisconsin indicate to us any problems which now exist in that area, where there have been community defaults on Federal programs? I wonder whether we are imagining something or whether he has evidence of such defaults.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator has brought up a very good point. What is this program? This is a program to help out an area of our economy which, on the basis of testimony lasting over a period of years, is in trouble, and the funds for projects are provided primarily where they cannot finance the operations out of the fare box. We have been told again and again on the floor of the Senate that there is a crisis and that they need this assistance. It seems to me, under economic circumstances with transit companies going broke, there should be safeguards written in the bill.

I would say the testimony we have had in the hearings this year and last year suggests that in community after community there is real difficulty and there are going to be situations where they could easily become overextended and the Federal Government could lose millions of dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As the language appears now in the amendment, I earnestly suggest again its first effect will be to afford employment for lawyers all over the country in trying to figure out ways by which they can advise their city governments to do something they cannot do now; namely, commit them over a period of years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from New Jersey is telling the Senator from Wisconsin that the language on page 22 of the report does not really mean very much. He is telling me, I believe, that the Administrator is not going to be able to provide any legal enforcement which is going to require payment and that under this program we can expect, where the communities or transit systems are in trouble, the Federal Government to lose money and have no legal recourse.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, without burdening the city treasuries with lawyers' fees to figure out the Senator's amendment, perhaps it could be altered, to strengthen the assurance of honoring the legal obligation, by, in part 1, saying that there exists a commitment from non-Federal sources to supply the remainder of the net project cost, and in the second part to provide that the Federal Government's interest in the project is adequately protected in the event of a default or a failure to complete such project.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Under that commitment; yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Does the Senator accept the amendment as I suggest it be modified?

Mr. PROXMIRE. As modified; yes.

Mr. President, I modify my amendment accordingly, and I move its adoption.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, may we have the modification read?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa requests that I read the amendment as modified. I shall do so.

On page 16, in line 15, after the period, I would insert the following:

> No grant shall be made for any project pursuant to section 3 unless the Administrator determines that (1) there exists a commitment from non-Federal sources to supply the remainder of the net project cost, and (2) the Federal Government's interest in the project is adequately protected in the event of a default or a failure to complete such project.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment numbered 27.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, line 15, after the period insert the following:

> In determining net project cost for any project to be assisted under section 3, any estimate of revenues shall not be reduced by any amount to be allocated as a reserve for replacement of equipment or facilities.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This amendment is also offered to carry out the recommendations of the Comptroller General. I am convinced that if the amendment is not adopted, the bill's enactment will result either in a substantial enhancement of the net worth of a number of transit companies around the country, an enhancement which Congress does not intend, or it could result in an artificial subsidy of low fares on the basis of the result of this particular provision in the bill which my amendment would correct.

The Comptroller General at page 41 of the hearings, in the next to the last paragraph, states:

> With regard to the term "net revenues," we understand from HHFA officials that it is their intention that a fund for replacement of equipment shall be derived from "fare box revenues." In such a case, the Federal Government would, in effect, be paying for a significant portion of this fund because such an accumulation would increase net project cost, two-thirds of which is to be borne by the Federal Government.

Then on page 42, in one sentence, the Comptroller General says:

> If the reserve for replacement is not allowed as a deduction from revenues, the cost to the Federal Government would be decreased.

This is exactly what the amendment would do. It would disallow the depreciation cost as a deduction from the net project cost. Of course, this is technical, and it is difficult to understand, but I believe anyone who follows this matter closely can see how unfair this bill is going to be, if enacted without this provision to the Federal taxpayer.

Let me give an example. Let us assume there is a particular proposal for a $10 million project for buses and street railways, and so forth. Let us assume that this money is going to be spent primarily for depreciable property, instead of rights-of-way. Let us assume also that the reserve for replacement of this property would be about a million dollars a year. It would depreciate over a 10-year period. Let us make one other assumption, namely, that the net revenues available, if we exclude depreciation, would be a million dollars. The fact is that if the Senate adopts my amendment, it will be possible for the community to finance the $10 million project out of fare box revenues without any assistance from the Federal Government, because it would have a million dollars a year, enough to finance a $10 million project. They could do that.

However, if my amendment is not adopted, then the depreciation costs would be deducted from the operating revenues, and we would arrive at a situation in which there would be no net funds available with which to finance a program.

Under those circumstances the community could come to the Federal Government and get a grant of $6⅔ million.

It seems to me that the depreciation cost should not be deducted. If my amendment is adopted after the $10 million loan has been amortized and serviced over a period of 10 years, the transit company is in the position of having its stock completely depreciated and the loan paid off. It will then be in precisely the same position it is in today. It can then finance an additional $10 million purchase with its million dollar annual net income.

But if my amendment is not adopted, the transit operation receives in effect a $6⅔ million gift from the Federal Government of depreciable property. It depreciates this property with a cash reserve and ends up with a multimillion dollar enhancement of its net worth.

It seems to me that we should heed the recommendations of the Attorney General, who recognized this loophole in the bill and recognized the fact that the computation of the net project cost to include depreciation deductions would result in enhancing the worth of a transit company; or, if it were regulated closely, would result in a reduction of fares, subsidized by the taxpayer.

This is a completely valid objection. I hope the distinguished Senator from New Jersey will recognize its validity. If not, I should like to hear why it is not a valid objection.

I apologize for the complications of this subject. It is a complicated accounting problem.

(At this point Mr. KENNEDY took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The pending amendment, offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, surprises me most of the series of amendments he is offering. I say that quite frankly, because it comes from a Senator who, of course, is a man of unusual acumen in business and finance. What a prudent management accomplishes or attempts to accomplish with annual setting aside of reserves, of funds for later equipment needs, is one of the best business practices.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I approve of it 100 percent. My amendment would not prevent management from doing that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It would not prevent it, but it would discourage it to the point where it might find it difficult to put away money in reserves for equipment needs later on.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I point out to the Senator that my amendment provides for that. In other words, if they have the income available, it seems to me that they must set it aside in computing their net project cost.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Would the Senator say that if that is done, the local share would be larger by way of contribution to the net project cost, and that the Federal share would be smaller?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; that is what the Comptroller General clearly states.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. That is what I am saying; that the money will have to be taken out of reserves, to be applied to the project, and that to that extent the reserve fund of a prudently run company will be reduced.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe the Senator can argue that; however, I believe that the Federal Government should not finance operating costs, the costs of wages and salaries, and so forth, or depreciation of equipment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. While a lower Federal contribution and a higher local contribution would occur at the inception of a program, down the road if these prudently run companies cannot put away reserves, then the Federal contribution will be increased, because the companies will not have been able to reserve money for equipment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If that is the situation. However, if the Senate does not adopt my amendment, the fact is that the transit company will enhance its net worth at the cost of the Federal taxpayer; or, if the regulatory body prevents excessive profits, the fares will be reduced at the cost of the Federal taxpayer.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I have been following the colloquy with much interest. I would appreciate having the Senator from Wisconsin point out how a transit company would have increased its net worth to an undue degree without his amendment. It seems to me that depreciation is a proper business expense, going to diminish the value of equipment, so that after 10 years it will be down to zero value. That would not add to net worth, so far as I can see, and it would be offset exactly by the $10 million reserve of money in the bank, which balances out. So it appears to me the company would be right where it started.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As I understand, this is the way it operates. Under the bill, if my amendment is not adopted, it would be possible for a transit company to set aside a million dollars a year out of its income and build up, over a period of 10 years—the example I gave—a $10 million reserve. At the same time, the reserve is against equipment which was to the extent of two-thirds a gift of the Federal Government. So what has happened is that there is a reserve on the asset side of the balance sheet which is built up, on a Federal gift. The net effect on the bookkeeping is that the net worth of the transit company would be enhanced unless fares were reduced.

Mr. MILLER. But what the Senator forgets in that computation is that while the company is paying off the loan, and is therefore reducing its liability, it has an offsetting reduction in the value of its equipment in the amount of the depreciation reserve. They balance out. So I cannot see how the net worth has increased, according to the example which the Senator gave, which was $1 million a year revenue, exactly equal to the depreciation amount.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Our difficulty is that we have to decide whether or not we should require transit operations to buy their own equipment when the fare box in fact provides them with enough income after operating costs to do so. If we do not require this, we make a Federal gift that enhances net worth.

Mr. MILLER. When we talk about net worth, we are talking about true assets and liabilities; and the depreciation reserve can be a fiction unless it is supported by money in the bank. The Senator said the money would not go into the bank but would go into the repayment of the loan. So there would not be any money in the bank to back up the depreciation reserve, but there would be a diminution in the loan. That would balance out with the diminution in the value of the rolling stock. Based on the facts which the Senator has given us, I believe the net worth would not be enhanced at all.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The description which the Senator gave would apply to the bill as the Senator from Wisconsin would amend it. But the bill under the present circumstances would provide a grant from the Federal Government. The grant would be a gift, and the transit company would not be under any obligation to reduce or pay back to the Federal Government the amount of that gift. Therefore, there is a situation in which, on the liability side, there is no obligation which has to be repaid.

Mr. MILLER. Then, does the Senator's argument come down to this, that his amendment would, in effect, result in a smaller grant?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. In the form of depreciation?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct; that is exactly what the Comptroller General says in his letter.

Mr. MILLER. If that is the true impact of the Senator's amendment, it is something which I think merits much careful consideration. I am sorry I have not had a chance to think this proposal through; but I believe the Senator has a point.

I believe that what he is trying to do is to avoid having one community obtain discriminatory treatment, more favorable treatment, in the form of a better grant from the Government merely because it happens to use a higher depreciation rate than another community which is operating in the same circumstances. If that is so, it may be that the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from New Jersey can be brought together by providing a uniform depreciation rate which will be taken into account. Otherwise, there will be discrimination between communities. Community A and Community B might have identical problems, but Community A, in coming before the Administrator to

compute a project cost, might use a 10-percent depreciation rate, while Community B would use a 20-percent depreciation rate. One would obtain a better deal and a better grant than the other.

If I may ask him the question, how does the Senator from New Jersey propose to cover that situation?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Iowa has a proposal for uniform depreciation, and I would support it if it were in the form of an amendment; but I prefer to speak to my amendment, which is already so complicated that we are having considerable difficulty with it.

Let me see if I can persuade the Senator from New Jersey along this line: I recognize that the problem is extremely difficult. The Comptroller General sincerely proposed this plan on the basis of a very careful analysis. I have gone over it. I suggest to the Senator from New Jersey that he might be willing to take the amendment to conference, so that there will be a period in which to study it over a couple of weeks, then decide, on the basis of careful study, whether it is not true that there is a situation in which there would be an unintended benefit either to the transit company or to the fare riders, based on the fact that the depreciation should not be deducted before arriving at the funds available for the project cost.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield on that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I do not believe the problem is quite so complicated as the Senator from Wisconsin fears it to be. The Senator from New Jersey or the conference committee could submit an amendment comparable to what the Senator's amendment calls for, namely, that in computing the project cost, a cost of depreciation not in excess of a certain rate shall be taken into account. I think that would bring the two Senators together. I urge the Senator from New Jersey to let this amendment go to conference, because I believe there could be discriminatory action and treatment between communities having identical problems, and in very large amounts, because the depreciation on transit equipment runs into millions of dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I may say to both the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Iowa that I did very poorly in accounting in college; but on my personal balance sheet the good will for each Senator is carried at a very significant figure. Perhaps it is bad accounting practice, but I feel that way. Just as the last amendment, or the amendment before it, would make hundreds of man-hours for lawyers, so this amendment, I daresay, would make hundreds of man-hours for accountants.

I really would be reluctant to accept an amendment which is so complex and which has not been heard and about which we do not truly know much.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my view that although the subject is complicated to explain, because accounting procedure can be complex, this proposal would not complicate the bill and would not complicate the administration of the act. It is a very simple provision that in computing the project cost, the depreciation cost shall not be included. It seems to me that that can be applied.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Do both Senators agree that if this were done, then back home the local transit companies would be discouraged from following one of the best business practices with which I am familiar; namely, the prudence to reserve money as they go along, so that there will be a fund for replacement when the equipment has to be replaced?

Mr. MILLER. The point made by the Senator from Wisconsin about discrimination between communities, relating to depreciation, is well taken. The point made by the Senator from New Jersey, that the impact should not be quite so severe as the Senator from Wisconsin would have it, because this is good business practice, is a point well taken. It is not a difficult problem at all. All that would have to be done would be to provide for uniform treatment in accordance with Bulletin F of the Treasury Department, which sets forth standards of depreciation rates on transit equipment.

I do not believe this is the time to make a decision on this question. I suggest that the committee of conference, with the assistance of its staff, in the interim, can reach a conclusion which will be simple and readily enforceable, without getting into many complexities.

As I recall, Bulletin F of the Treasury Department, which contains new depreciation rates, provides about 10 percent as the standard depreciation rate on transit equipment. I do not think we have any accounting problems. We could follow the uniform standard of the Treasury Department.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senator is making a good point. However, I am not the floor manager of the bill. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is the floor manager of the bill, and he has been following very closely the statements of the Senator. Perhaps we can have a moment to confer.

Mr. President, from the time available to me on this amendment, I yield such time as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee needs. He is in charge of the bill, and has done an admirable job.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the presentation which has been made by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. I know he has given a great deal of time and attention to this matter, as well as to others.

We received from the Comptroller General a letter practically identical with the letter we received last year. In the 1962 letter from the Comptroller, 26 points were made. The committee made nine changes in the bill itself. Seven of the points were recognized by changes in the report. After due consideration, six of the points were considered to be invalid. The committee felt that the four remaining points did not come within the jurisdiction of the General Accounting Office.

We have given this matter considerable consideration, and a whole page of the report is devoted to it.

The Senator from Wisconsin has another amendment, which is pending. I should like very much to have him agree not to offer the third amendment, which I think is already covered by the Renegotiation Act. In fact, the amendment pertains to a subject which comes within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee, not our committee; namely, renegotiation.

So if the Senator from Wisconsin will withhold his last amendment—the one relating to renegotiation, I shall be willing to take this amendment to conference, because I think the Senator from Wisconsin has made a convincing presentation. Frankly, at first I was rather negative to the idea he has presented.

So I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference; but in the interest of time, and also because I do not believe we should consider the third amendment, I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin to withhold his third amendment. On that basis, I shall be willing to recommend that we take this amendment to conference.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I recognize the difficulty, particularly in view of the lack of time and the desirability of taking final action soon on this bill. So I think the Senator from Alabama has made an excellent case, and I would be willing to agree to what he proposes.

However, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Comptroller General stated:

> We suggest that section 10 be amended so as to require all such contracts to contain a clause providing for periodic renegotiation in the event any residual profits are earned.

I also point out that in these cases there can very well be very large amounts of residual profits, and great loss to the Government.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But I believe the Senator from Wisconsin will agree with me that renegotiation matters come within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee. So if this matter is not already covered by the Renegotiation Act—although I believe it is already covered by it—it is clear that this matter should be considered, not by the Banking and Currency Committee or by the Commerce Committee, but by the Finance Committee, of which the Senator from Wisconsin is a member.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand; and, therefore, I shall not press for Senate action on the amendment, even though it is, in my opinion, a sound and sensible proposal.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to vote on my amendment numbered 27.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well, Mr. President; in that event we are willing to accept this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). Is the remaining time yielded back?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield back the remaining time under my control.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield back the remaining time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the amendments, as follows:

On page 3, line 9, strike out all after the word "bonds" down to and including the word "otherwise" in line 13.

On page 4, line 5, strike out "bonds, grant or loan" and insert "bonds".

On page 4, line 22, strike out "bonds, grant or loan" and insert "bonds".

On page 5, line 5, strike out "bonds, grant or loan" and insert "bonds".

On page 6 strike out all in lines 9 through line 10 on page 7.

On pages 16 through 19 strike out all of section 13, section 14, and section 15.

On page 20, lines 15, 16, strike out the word "grants" and insert "guaranteed revenue bonds".

On page 22, line 24, strike out "loan or grant" and insert "guarantee".

On pages 24 and 25, strike out subsection (e).

On pages 25 and 26, strike out section 16 (a) and 16(b).

Renumber sections accordingly and make technical conforming changes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to consideration of these amendments en bloc? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, my amendments contemplate striking from the bill all the provisions which deal with grants. In addition, the amendments direct changing the parts of the bill which must be changed in order to conform to my principal amendment.

I propose that the grant provisions be stricken out—for two reasons: First, because an adequate study has not been made as to how the mass transit problem can be solved in the various metropolitan communities; second, because the Federal Government should not enter into a program of subsidizing local mass transportation.

In 1961, we passed the original bill on this subject; and $12,500,000 was appropriated for the purpose of making studies and tests in regard to how to solve the local problems.

In 1962, six studies were made. Two of them have been completed, but no tests were connected with them.

The first study which was completed dealt with the city of Detroit. It involved a total expenditure of $366,000, with two-thirds being posted by the Federal Government, and one-third by the city of Detroit.

In June 1962, the University of Washington was engaged to make a study—at a cost of $15,000—of the Seattle monorail. That study has been completed.

But now we come to the significant ones which are still pending: The Mass Transportation Commission of the State of Massachusetts was engaged on October 6, 1962, to make a series of experiments in the urban areas of Boston, Fitchburg, Worcester, and Pittsfield, with the project to last for a period of 18 months.

While the contract was made on October 6, work was not begun until December of 1962. The Federal Government has posted $3,600,000 on that project, and the Massachusetts Transportation Commission has posted $1,800,000, making a total of $5,400,000 to be used in paying to the Boston & Maine Railroad $2,200,000 in 1 year to subsidize the railroad to counterbalance the reduction of fares that it charges. That test has proceeded. The test shows that, by reducing fares from $1.99 to $1.10—a reduction of 89 cents per passenger—the Boston & Maine has attracted about 7,000 passengers a day. But the cost to the taxpayers has been $1 a day per passenger. The Boston & Maine is receiving $7,000 a day to reduce passenger fares from $1.99 to $1.10. The study on the Boston & Maine has been in progress for about 3 months, and has 15 more months to go. The result will not be known until 18 months expire.

Another important study that is in progress is in the city of Memphis. The contract was made on December 11, 1962. The study contemplates a determination of the pattern and volume of ridership in the area by establishing full scale mass transit service. The duration of the project is 2 years. Only 3 months of the experiment have been completed. Twenty-one more months must pass before the result of the study and test is determined.

On December 22, 1962, another engagement was entered into with the tri-state transportation committee, which includes New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. That study contemplates an expenditure of about $256,000. Its purpose is to find out whether people will ride commuter trains if a suburban station is located outside of the central business district, it is easily accessible, and has ample parking facilities. A new station will be built for the Pennsylvania Railroad in New Brunswick, New Jersey, and it will be determined whether, by building the terminal away from the downtown area, passengers will be taken off the highways and put on the Pennsylvania Railroad.

I submit to Senators that when, in 1961, the $12½ million bill was passed to make tests and studies, there was no purpose to enter into a subsidized program until those tests and studies indicated what should be done.

I should like to repeat the status of those studies. The three main contracts were entered into on October 26, 1962, December 11, 1962, and December 22, 1962. No adequate test has been made. No one can tell whether those reductions in fares will take passengers off the highways and put them on the railroad trains.

Mr. President, in connection with those studies, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a study made by the Bureau of Economic and Business Research of the University of Illinois which was concluded in November 1962.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN APPRAISAL OF THE URBAN TRANSIT SITUATION

(By Robert L. Rivers)

In the past few years, the urban transit question has been the focus of many studies and reports pertaining to the problems of the industry and the related problems of urban traffic congestion. Federal funds are now being made available through the Federal Housing Administration for improvements in urban transit systems. It is felt in some circles that a thoroughgoing rehabilitation and modernization of transit facilities is mandatory in order to resolve urban transportation difficulties and to provide for balanced transportation systems in urban areas.

The purpose of this inquiry is to present an analysis of metropolitan transportation with reference to those factors which have contributed to the growth and decline of mass transit. Since there is much agitation on the part of planners to try to restore public mass transit to its former status as a major passenger carrier in metropolitan areas, an appraisal of the trends over the past decade is made in order to determine the future prospects for mass transportation.

THE TRANSIT FUNCTION

Metropolitan transit, as the term is ordinarily used, is the conveyance of people within a metropolitan area with a regularity of frequency between readily identifiable points. This function can be accomplished by any means of transportation available. In the past it was most commonly accomplished by street railway and rapid transit. However, as new means of transportation became available, substitutions by the motor vehicle with expressways, and more recently, air commuter service has broadened the modes of transit available to the individual. Hence, the transit function can be performed by mass transportation facilities, the private automobile, and more recently by the airplane.

FACTORS OF URBAN CONCENTRATION

Before the appearance of the motor vehicle, street railways and commuter railroads were the primary means of mobility in urban areas. In their capacities as concentrators of traffic, they carried people to points of economic agglomeration, such as civic, retail, financial, wholesale, administrative, manufacturing, and recreational centers. As traffic distributors they performed their functions equally well in returning people to their points of origin. Even though much of the routing was indirect as a result of the general practice of having routes converge on the central business district, urban transit provided the highest known degree of efficiency for the movement of people from one place to another.

The agglomeration of economic functions operated as a centripetal force in attracting new business and in the expansion of existing ones. As land values increased in these areas, the land became more intensively utilized, and the less productive users relocated on less expensive land away from the core area, but usually on or close to transit routes in order to retain the greatest degree of accessibility. In like manner, people considered the availability of public transportation in choosing their dwelling sites. Hence, transit route patterns were sharply oriented toward the city core areas. These elements, along with many others, resulted in a high degree of concentration of people along transit routes, which provided the required density of traffic per mile of route for profitable operations.

Under the stimulus of economic concentration in urban areas, the demand for efficient public transportation increased. Expansion of transit facilities occurred rapidly to meet the increased demand, in many cases to the point of oversupply. As equipment and operating techniques improved, street railways and commuter railroads provided a quality of service which could not be equaled or surpassed by any other form of transportation. Since there were no adequate substitutes, people had no alternative but to use them; hence, they possessed a virtual monopoly on local passenger movements.

THE DECONCENTRATION MOVEMENT

Transit traffic peaked in 1926 at slightly over 17 billion passengers where it hovered until 1929 when it began a progressive decline.[1] Because of wartime restrictions on the use of the automobile, transit travel revived and reached its highest peak in 1946 when more than 23 billion passengers were carried.[2] Following the resumption of motor vehicle production in 1946, transit traffic began a second decline which has continued to the present day. Although the automobile may be regarded as the primary cause of transit difficulties, there are other factors of technical, social, and economic change which have exerted and are continuing to exert strong pressures in molding the nature of future urban transportation patterns. These factors include, among others, industrial location and relocation, urban deconcentration, changing patterns of land use, urban redevelopment programs, and the trend to the suburbs.

THE RISE OF THE AUTOMOBILE

Local transit operators felt the influence of the automobile at about the same time that the railroads began to sense the impact of the motor truck. The high degree of convenience and flexibility of operation of the motor vehicle permitted a reorganization of personal transport functions to best suit the origin and destination needs of the individual and no longer required conformance to rigid route patterns and schedules. In terms of service, the competitive efficiency of the automobile as compared with local transit was felt fairly quickly by the public carriers.

From somewhat humble beginnings in the late 19th century, automobiles increased rapidly in numbers, as indicated by registration data. In 1900, only 8,000 motor vehicles were registered in the United States. The number of registrations rose in succeeding years until just before World War II when 29.5 million private passenger cars were registered. Following the war, automobile production resumed and the total number of privately owned passenger cars more than doubled by 1960.[3]

The period of postwar prosperity along with generous credit terms stimulated much automobile buying, and riding on public transit systems dropped. As people moved beyond the range of transit and commuter lines, the automobile became an almost indispensable accessory to human living. In fact, in many places the automobile is a basic necessity because of the lack of any public transportation.

With the increasing number of motor vehicles, improved and new highways to and from the cities were sought in order to facilitate contact with jobs and other social and economic functions. The shift of much freight tonnage from railroads to trucks added additional pressure to the demand for an expanded and improved system of streets and highways.[4] After much study Congress came to grips with this problem in 1956 when it passed the Interstate Highway Act, which provides for a system of limited access highways and their urban extensions. The cities have benefited most from the urban extension provisions, inasmuch as the Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost of constructing expressways through urban areas.

INDUSTRIAL RELOCATIONS

The increased technical efficiency of the motor truck and improvements and expansion of the highway system have reduced industry dependence on the railroads to serve a large portion of their transportation requirements. The ubiquitous motor truck has made possible the location of industrial activity at less congested locations, especially along newly built limited-access highways. In many cases, moreover, the problem of gathering together at existing sites a sufficient number of land parcels whose titles rest with a number of owners has discouraged expansion in the central city. The difficulty is further compounded since the land is usually broken up by a pattern of city streets, and the problem involved in obtaining closings and titles is at best a costly and long-drawn-out process.[5] In addition there are the factors of technological improvement in industrial processes where heavier machinery and modern materials-handling equipment have been installed, which, because of increased weight and operating considerations, require the use of monitor-type buildings in lieu of older multistory structures. Hence, a company can expand or relocate at less cost on a parcel of vacant land, which is ordinarily not available in sufficient size within the central city. In one recent year more than one-half of the factories, over two-fifths of the retail stores, and one-fourth of the office buildings were built in the suburbs.[6] Between 1929 and 1954 the number of manufacturing jobs in urban areas dropped from 67 percent to 57 percent of the total jobs, and the number of retail jobs dropped from 78 percent to 63 percent.[7]

People will tend to go where the jobs are, and the retail trade will follow the population. Hence, new housing developments arise in the suburbs, followed in turn by the construction of shopping centers. These shopping centers have a tendency to generate more shopping traffic and to create a practically new downtown district. One common denominator present in these business locations and relocations outside of the core area is the emphasis on the provision of adequate parking spaces for both customers and employees.

URBAN REDEVELOPMENT

One purpose of urban redevelopment is the clearing of areas containing slum housing and of abandoned or marginal industrial plants and reclaiming the land for public low-cost housing or for industrial parks. The land may also be taken over for the construction of an expressway. In appraising urban redevelopment programs two factors stand out: (1) there is less intensive utilization of the land, thereby tending to foster deconcentration; and (2) emphasis is placed upon access by motor vehicles.

THE TREND TO THE SUBURBS

In the postwar years the suburban trek has accelerated at a rapid pace. Vacant lands at the peripheries of and just beyond the city limits have been converted into housing developments, characterized chiefly by single-family homes with land plots ranging, on the average, from about one-fourth to one-half acre in size. The result is a low-density sprawl. The desirability and success of these developments is primarily dependent upon their being accessible by automobile. Attempts to extend metropolitan transit lines to these areas have met with little success because of the low traffic density and the fact that the automobile had already preempted this transport function. It is in these areas where the majority of the two-car families are to be found.[8]

The trend to the suburbs has depleted central city populations. Census reports indicate that many cities have lost a number of inhabitants over the past decade.

TABLE 1.—*Changes in population of central cities and their suburban areas, 1950–60*

Locality	Population (in thousands)		Percentage change
	1950	1960	
Boston:			
Central city	802	697	−13.1
Suburbs	2,043	2,412	+16.4
New York City:			
Central city	7,892	7,782	−1.4
Suburbs	5,526	7,631	+38.1
San Francisco-Oakland:			
Central cities	1,160	1,110	−4.3
Suburbs	1,347	1,673	+24.2
Pittsburgh:			
Central city	678	604	−10.9
Suburbs	1,443	1,801	+24.8
Baltimore:			
Central city	949	939	−1.1
Suburbs	388	699	+80.2
Washington, D.C.:			
Central city	802	764	−4.7
Suburbs	657	1,238	+88.4
Minneapolis-St. Paul:			
Central cities	833	796	−4.4
Suburbs	284	633	+122.9
St. Louis-East St. Louis:			
Central cities	940	832	−11.5
Suburbs	742	1,162	+56.6
Portland, Oreg.-Vancouver, Wash.:			
Central cities	415	405	−2.4
Suburbs	289	417	+44.3
Cleveland:			
Central city	914	876	−4.2
Suburbs	551	921	+67.1

Source: Computed from standard metropolitan area tables in Donald J. Bogue and Calvin L. Beale, "Economic Areas of the United States" (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961).

Table 1 shows the effects of population shifts on 10 central cities in the United States. Over the period from 1950 to 1960, the central city populations declined 1 to 13 percent, whereas their suburbs increased 8 to 123 percent.

Although there are some indications of a return to the cities, the evidence is currently fragmentary and inconclusive. The Wall Street Journal has reported that owners of new office buildings are finding it harder to attract tenants. Concessions are being offered in the form of free rent for 3 months, free carpeting, and the payment of moving expenses.[9] A similar situation prevails in the case of new apartment buildings and similar concessions are being made. The vacancy rate has increased from 5 to 20 percent in the past year, and rents are being reduced.[10] This is in sharp contrast to the situation which prevailed a year or two ago when new apartment buildings under construction in the cities were fully rented prior to completion. It should be noted that these new structures provided for the storage of the occupants' automobiles.

---

[1] "Transit Fact Book," 1944 (New York: American Transit Association), p. 15.

[2] "Transit Fact Book," 1951, p. 15.

[3] "Automobile Facts and Figures, 1961" (Detroit: Automobile Manufacturers' Association), p. 18.

[4] From 1947 to 1961, the share of railroad ton-miles of freight declined from 66 percent of the total to 43.3 percent, whereas that of motor trucks, over the same period, increased from 10.1 percent to 22.6 percent of total ton-miles. "Yearbook of Railroad Information," 1961 and 1962 editions (New York: Eastern Railroads Presidents Conference), p. 4.

[5] These and other problems faced by urban businesses are discussed by Raymond Vernon in "What Is the Business of Cities?" Ch. 2. of "The Little Economies: Problems of U.S. Area Development" (New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1958), p. 14.

[6] John Christie and Melvin J. Goldberg. "The Crisis of Cities: Industry Heads for the Open," Dun's Review, February 1960, p. 36.

[7] Raymond Vernon, loc. cit., pp. 14–15.

[8] Automobile Facts and Figures, 1962, states that 40 percent of the households with two or more cars are in the suburban areas. P. 35.

EFFECTS ON TRANSIT OPERATIONS

The pressure of increasing numbers of motor vehicles, parking facilities, and expressways, along with other centrifugal forces exerted upon central cities, has had a strong adverse effect upon transit operations. Table 2 indicates a 10-year trend in revenue passenger-miles for rapid transit and for surface operations. There was a continued decline in rapid transit riding from 1950 to 1958 of 32.6 percent; however, between 1958 and 1960 there was a slight recovery in rapid transit riding which increased revenue passenger-mile by a little more than 3 percent.

TABLE 2.—*Trends in revenue passenger miles, 1950–60*

Year	Revenue passengers (millions)	Vehicle miles (millions)	Revenue passenger-miles (millions)
RAPID TRANSIT			
1950	2,113	443.4	936,904
1951	2,041	424.0	865,384
1952	1,982	400.4	793,593
1953	1,903	391.1	744,263
1954	1,781	376.3	670,180
1955	1,741	382.8	666,455
1956	1,749	387.1	676.038
1957	1,706	388.0	661,928
1958	1,635	386.5	632,928
1959	1,647	388.7	640,189
1960	1,670	390.9	652,803
SURFACE LINES			
1950	11,732	2,564.2	30,083,194
1951	10,840	2,489.4	26,985,096
1952	10,040	2,414.1	25,106,640
1953	9,133	2,304.4	21,046,085
1954	8,077	2,172.5	17,547,283
1955	7,448	2,064.7	15,377,886
1956	7,007	1,979.5	13,870,357
1957	6,632	1,901.5	12,610,748
1958	6,143	1,814.5	11,146,474
1959	6,003	1,770.2	10,626,511
1960	5,851	1,751.9	10,250,370

Source: Computed from "Transit Fact Book," 1951 and 1961 editions (New York: American Transit Association).

For surface operations, revenue passenger-miles decreased by 65.9 percent over the 11-year period. This figure is subject to qualification because it includes operations in small cities as well as large and reflects service abandonments; both factors would tend to accentuate the decline percentagewise. If transit operations are broken down according to population groups (table 3), it may be noted that the attrition in numbers of passengers in surface operations has been highest in cities under 500,000 population. In contrast to rapid transit operations, the figures do not indicate any recovery in traffic for any population group between 1958 and 1960. However, the decline has been smallest for cities of over 500,000 population.

TABLE 3.—*Percentage change in revenue passengers by population groups, 1950–60*

Population group	Revenue passengers (millions)		Percentage change
	1950	1960	
Over 500,000	5,207	2,977	−42.8
250,000 to 500,000	2,007	911	−54.6
100,000 to 250,000	1,585	691	−56.4
50,000 to 100,000	1,323	554	−58.1
Less than 50,000	728	230	−68.4

Source: "Transit Fact Book," 1951 and 1961 editions (New York: American Transit Association).

Another aspect of the current transit situation is gleaned from the statistics on the number of companies which have abandoned service. From January, 1954, to April, 1960, 288 transit companies abandoned all or part of their operations. Of these, 17 were engaged in suburban service. As a result, about 65 cities and towns were left without any transit service. These abandonments of service occurred in centers of less than 25,000 population. In 19 cases, the service was resumed by a local governmental agency; in the remainder, new private operators instituted service or existing companies expanded their operations to fill the void.[11]

In appraising the prospects of the transit industry, expected developments must be considered. The trend of automobile ownership will not be reversed. Metropolitan areas will tend to become increasingly important and their suburban areas are likely to continue to grow. If the centripetal forces exerted by the central city are strong enough, there will be substantial movements of people in and out of the core areas. Whether or not transit service will be justified will depend largely on the circumstances peculiar to each area.

SOME THEORETICAL LIMITS TO DECONCENTRATION

It would be erroneous to assume that the process of deconcentration will continue indefinitely. There are practical and possible theoretical factors which may operate to circumscribe this tendency, and consequently permit the operation of transit services in certain cities for some time in the future. Some of these factors are advantages of location, social and economic costs, and other strong centripetal forces.

Some cities, such as New York and San Francisco, have experienced a low rate of deconcentration (table 1). These cities are important gateways for commerce. Their strong economic advantages of location, good harbor, well-developed land transportation, and the presence of financial and other important services provide strong centripetal forces for these cities.[12]

Social and economic costs may tend to check the rate of deconcentration. Travel time between the central city and the suburbs will place effective limits on both population and business deconcentration. If a business moves too far out in the suburbs, the increased travel time for some employees may cause them to seek alternative sources of employment. Too, no business unit is completely self-sufficient. It must depend often upon the efficiency of contact for the products and services of other companies in order to operate effectively. It should be observed that these limitations to deconcentration are relevant to the present state of the arts. Improvements in the technology of transportation and communication, on the other hand, would permit a greater degree of decentralization.

There are other centripetal forces which will act to retard decentralization and which exhibit concentration tendencies. Studies indicate that cities with a high degree of office-oriented employment are a significant factor in the flow of commuters in and out of central cities. This type of activity appears to be resistant to the forces of decentralization.[13] For the most part, these workers live in the suburbs and commute to and from work. Further evidence of this fact may be found in a study by the Civil Defense Administration in 1955 which compares the daytime versus resident populations of selected cities. Although more recent figures are unavailable, these data indicate the degree of strain which is placed upon transport facilities during the commutation periods. The continued decrease in transit passengers and the increasing rate of motor vehicle registrations show the strain to be most severe on the highway system.

Generally speaking, central cities with low rates of deconcentration and with strong centripetal forces are likely to suffer from increased traffic congestion and to find that the problem becomes increasingly difficult to solve. Certain assumptions may be made on the basis of the figures in table 1. Some cities may have lost population in the 1950–60 period because they were overconcentrated. The centrifugal forces may have been responsible, or the city (and even the entire area) may have lost some of the economic advantages which it had at one time. However, where a city shows a low rate of population decline but a high rate of suburban growth, it may be assumed that this peripheral cluster of economic activity has a significant economic relation to the central city and, therefore, is strongly oriented toward it. If such is the case, the amount of commuter traffic in and out of the central city will be increasing sharply. Under such circumstances, depending upon the nature and characteristics of the city involved, economically feasible mass transit operations may be possible.

TABLE 4.—*Comparison of daytime and resident populations in selected cities* [1]

City	Resident population	Daytime population	Percentage increase
Baltimore	949,708	1,071,104	13
Boston	801,444	1,075,107	34
Cleveland	914,808	1,085,830	19
Minneapolis	521,718	593,477	14
St. Paul	311,349	346,267	11
Pittsburgh	676,806	1,011,618	49
New York	7,891,957	8,201,842	4
Portland, Oreg	373,628	468,699	25
St. Louis	841,000	1,002,200	19
San Francisco	775,357	1,012,145	31
Oakland	384,575	491,670	28
Washington	859,000	980,100	14

[1] Based on 1950 census.

Source: Federal Civil Defense Administration, Annual Report, 1956 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957), pp. 13–15.

TENDENCY TOWARD A NEW EQUILIBRIUM

It is evident that there are two sets of forces at work which are shaping future city patterns: one is centrifugal in nature, and the other is centripetal. The centrifugal forces are exemplified by the requirements of the motor vehicle for space for movement and parking facilities (frequently causing displacement of land from other uses), relocations of industry, the population movement to the suburbs, and the rise of shopping centers away from the core areas.

Centripetal forces are characterized by urban renewal programs for housing and industrial parks, new luxury apartment house construction, and urban shopping centers.

---

[9] "Business Bulletin," Wall Street Journal, July 12, 1962, p. 1.

[10] "Business Bulletin," Wall Street Journal, June 28, 1962, p. 1.

[11] Data furnished by courtesy of the American Transit Association.

[12] For a good generalized coverage of this area, see Jean Gottman, Megalopolis (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1961), ch. 1.

[13] Ibid., p. 639.

The interactions of the centripetal and centrifugal forces are exerting strong influences which are remolding the physical and economic structures of central cities. These forces will continue to operate until a new equilibrium in population density and in economic activity is reached. The new equilibrium is likely to be conditioned to a considerable degree by the number of motor vehicles in urban areas. It is estimated that by 1972, the United States will have 101 million registered motor vehicles of all types, and that 70 percent of these will be concentrated in urban areas.[14] Thus, it appears at the present time that the centrifugal forces are the stronger ones and that for some time to come most central cities will continue to deconcentrate. Measured against the prospective needs of this new equilibrium, it appears that an imbalance of transportation facilities exists at present, namely, an oversupply of mass transit facilities brought about by a shift in preference for the automobile, while on the other hand, there exists a shortage of facilities to handle motor vehicle requirements.[15]

In the determination of the new equilibrium for cities, it is at this point that the work of planners is most critical. Account must be taken of both the centrifugal and centripetal forces in planning future land uses, especially in redevelopment projects, utilization of vacant lands, and the provision of adequate transportation facilities in order to maximize the productivity of urban lands.

NEW MASS TRANSIT PROPOSALS

Proposals have been advanced for the construction of new rapid transist systems for Atlanta, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Pittsburgh, and Miami, and for extensions and improvements to existing systems in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago. The proponents of these programs have received encouragement from President Kennedy's $500 million program of Federal aid for establishing new rapid transit systems and improving existing facilities. A bill to carry out these recommendations failed to pass the 87th Congress in the closing days of the session. It is expected that a revised bill for Federal aid to rapid transit will be introduced at the next session. However, two of the above proposals for new transit systems were submitted to the voters in San Francisco and Atlanta. In San Francisco the proposal passed by a margin of 0.7 percent of the required 60 percent affirmative vote; in Atlanta the electorate voted against the rapid transit proposal.

Advocates of rapid transit urge that such facilities are necessary for the preservation of the central city and the relief of traffic congestion, and that such transport systems are more efficient in terms of land utilization, are less expensive to construct than expressways or freeways, and will reduce the necessity for the construction of such a large number of the latter facilities.[16]

Although the claims in support of new rapid transit may be meritorious, they are subject to criticism. In the first place, transit will not necessarily help to preserve the central city, since transit is no longer the prime mover of people but is now a supplemental and specialized form of transportation. Furthermore, there is no valid reason for the preservation of an outmoded and inefficient central city core area any more than there is for the perpetuation of an antiquated and high-cost manufacturing plant. It is reasonable to assume that cities must modernize and improve along with social and technological progress. Secondly, even if rapid transit facilities are constructed, it is not likely that they will have a very high degree of utilization. The forces of deconcentration have caused the relocation of much business activity and personal services outside the core area, and in many cases outside the central city. Travel patterns now take on a pattern of multiple lateral movements rather than a concentrated focus upon the central city. Hence, origin and destination patterns have become scattered, with the result that there has been a deterioration of the traffic density necessary for successful transit operation. All that is left at present is largely the journey-to-work movement which results in a very low degree of utilization of the facilities.

In the final analysis, it may be said that costs are relative to the general level of income. Even though automobile transportation is more costly, in all respects, than public transit, the average American has found these costs to be bearable and he has become accustomed to them. He will use his automobile in preference to public transit, and he is willing to pay additional amounts in the form of taxes and tolls for new facilities in order to ease his travel problems.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Central cities are tending toward a new equilibrium in terms of density of population and density of business activity. As a result, central cities are showing varying rates of deconcentration, but the growing suburbs are not exhibiting a tendency toward a high degree of concentration which was characteristic of the central cities more than a decade ago.

2. The present rate of urban deconcentration places mass transit operations in a transitional stage. The increasing rate of automobile ownership gives more emphasis to this means of transportation and less to public transit.

3. As a result of increased motor vehicle utilization in urban areas, the existing supply of streets and parking spaces has become inadequate. The basic problem is a shortage of necessary expressways and parking facilities to expedite motor vehicle operation. Until these facilities are provided and properly coordinated with the existing street system there will continue to be a high degree of urban traffic congestion which will impair the operation of all forms of urban transport.

4. The tendencies to deconcentration and the increases in the number of motor vehicles in the number of motor vehicles and their rate of use have raised the operating costs of all forms of urban transport, especially surface mass transit. Congestion restricts movements and results in an increase in running time and in the utilization of an additional number of vehicles to maintain established headways. Furthermore, the movement to the suburbs has not only depleted the traffic base in the central city, but has created many lateral movements for which mass transit is not adapted. Since most fixed-rail rapid transit facilities are generally core oriented, they do not provide for these lateral movements. It is in this area that the automobile has demonstrated superiority. Also, the construction of expressways, both of a lateral and of a direct type, has facilitated direct movements to destination by automobile rather than inducing transfer at some point to a rapid transit line.

5. As a result, the number of motor vehicles in metropolitan areas has continued to increase. Strong proposals in favor of constructing elaborate rapid transit systems are being presented as a solution to the congestion problem. New rapid transit facilities or additions and improvements to existing systems may be justifiable if the economic and social benefits to be gained thereby are in excess of the costs of providing them. These benefits, however, are incapable of objective measurement.

Any proposals for new or expanded rapid transit should be able to demonstrate that (a) the central city has strong or increasing centripetal forces; (b) there are significant points of concentration at both origin and destination points which can generate a substantial volume of traffic, and that there are readily identifiable movements between these points; (c) social costs can be reduced, such as a cut in travel time to work; (d) the system can cover its direct operating expenses; and (e) the transit system will enable the present level of economic activity of the area to be maintained or increased.

6. In the overall picture, expressways have reduced the travel time from the suburbs to the central city; but it is the distribution of the motor vehicles in the core area which is the current problem. Depending upon the city in question, the problem may be solved through the construction of additional motor vehicle distribution facilities to maximize and to ease internal circulation, and thereby to stimulate the economic activity of the area by making it more easily accessible. In other cities, such procedures might result in the disassembly of efficient economic operating areas and bring losses to the entire community, possibly to the point of destroying its economic advantage of location. In such cases, the provision of adequate rapid transit would forestall this result and would provide for a balanced transportation system in the area. Each city presents a separate problem involving varying considerations.

7. No elaborate fixed-rail rapid transit system for a metropolitan area should be contemplated without regard to the utilization of existing and less expensive alternatives, such as the operation of express buses over present and proposed freeways or expressways. In this case, relatively inexpensive rapid transit is readily available since these roads are constructed between known population densities with known travel desires. Inexpensive modifications can be made for the expeditious transfer of passengers at important junction points.

8. Prior to making financial commitments for rapid transit facilities, many cities are in an enviable position to test the feasibility of a rapid transit system at a minimum cost. Existing railroad lines within the metropolitan area may be used with self-propelled equipment on a trial basis in order to evaluate the future prospects of such an operation. Temporary platforms may be constructed for passenger handling at selected locations. The financial arrangements could be handled in a manner similar to those in existence with the Passenger Service Improvement Corp. in Philadelphia. The results of such operations after a trial period could be used as a yardstick to determine whether the arrangement for a limited rapid transit service would be adequate and satisfactory, or whether a more elaborate rapid transit system is required, or whether no rapid transit at all is required for that particular city. The experimental costs would be small in comparison with a large

---

[14] "25 Million More Cars Coming," U.S. News & World Report, July 30, 1962, p. 40.

[15] For a different, but interesting approach to the equilibrium distribution of commuter traffic with relation to highways and expressways, surface transit, and rapid transit, see Anthony Downs, "The Law of Peak-Hour Expressway Congestion," Traffic Quarterly, July 1962, pp. 393 ff.

[16] The various arguments in support of construction and extension of rapid transit facilities are presented in detail in the hearings of the House and Senate in 1961 on urban mass transportation. See U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Banking and Currency, hearings before Subcommittee No. 3, on H.R. 7787, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961); and U.S. Senate, Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, hearings on S. 345, 87th Cong., 1st sess. (1961).

capital investment which would tend to be unutilized.

9. Rapid transit facilities are not the ultimate answer to urban traffic congestion. Even in cities such as New York, where substantial investments are being made to improve rapid transit, the number of motor vehicles in the core areas is increasing rapidly. The number of motor vehicles entering midtown Manhattan on business days has increased from 382,000 in 1948 to 519,000 in 1956.[17] At the same time, rapid transit passengers have increased by more than 40 million from the 1958 low.[18]

In order to achieve a balanced urban transportation system in some cities, additional rapid transit facilities may be required; but also, as in the case of New York, additional facilities for the expeditious handling of motor vehicles are almost imperative.[19]

10. Urban transportation plans must be carefully formulated.

Transportation studies and plans must indicate in detail the need for facilities and their type, location, size, and cost * * * [They] must give consideration to all transportation media, both public and private, existing and proposed, if the most effective and economic overall system is to be obtained. Transportation systems will make provision for substantial automobile commuting and will also utilize railroad and other transit facilities if total transportation needs in most large cities are to be met successfully.[20]

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the person in charge of that study was Robert L. Rivers. The study covers completely the development of automobile usage from 1900 to 1962. It shows the evolution of use. In 1900, 8,000 automobiles were used. There are now probably 60 million automobiles on the highways. The humblest family feels it can use an automobile. It will not use a streetcar or railroad. A family desires an automobile because of its flexibility.

Each morning when I come to the Capitol I go by the Army Map Service Building of the U.S. Government on MacArthur Boulevard. Automobile after automobile moves into those buildings, and each contains only one person. It is expensive travel, but the employees will not ride the buses. They desire their automobiles so that they can step out of their houses, into the machines, drive to their place of business, leave it, step into their machines, and return home.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will yield in one moment. The study of Professor Rivers concludes with the statement that adequate knowledge upon which to establish a permanent program is not available.

At this point I also desire to call to the attention of Senators a study and report made by Dr. Herbert Mohring and Oswald Brownlee of the Department of Economics of the University of Minnesota.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the comments relating to the Urban Transit Development Act of 1963, and the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963, by Herbert Mohring and Oswald Brownlee, of the Department of Economics, University of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Comments Relating to the Urban Transit Development Act of 1963 and the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1963

(By Herbert Mohring and Oswald Brownlee, Department of Economics, University of Minnesota)

The proposed Urban Transit Development Act and the Urban Mass Transportation Act raise three very important questions: (1) Are subsidies to urban transportation activities desirable? If so, (2) what role should the Federal Government play in providing these subsidies and what form should they take? (3) What agency of the Federal Government should administer whatever programs dealing with this subject may be adopted?

To state our position on these questions briefly, a decline in patronage, particularly during periods other than morning and afternoon rush hours, has brought about marked deteriorations in the financial positions of many mass transit systems. Taken by itself, this financial deterioration does not, in our view, justify any type of temporary subsidy program. Even if transit subsidies were deemed desirable, the effects of a temporary program probably would not be lasting. In large measure, the decline in public transit patronage reflects a basic shift in consumer tastes—a shift that is likely to continue in the absence of permanent countervailing action. The very serious inadequacies that presently do and perhaps inevitably must exist in transportation pricing procedures—might provide a sound economic basis for a permanent subsidy program. Even if an economic justification for transit subsidies could be found, however, it would seem preferable to have local rather than Federal Government agencies assume responsibility. Communities can reasonably be expected to be less profligate in their use of dollars that cost them a dollar each than of dollars which, as is the case with the Urban Mass Transportation Act, would have a direct cost to them of only 33 cents. Furthermore, the residents of say, Houston, have little interest in the transit system of New York and vice versa.

Any Federal action as may be taken in support of mass transportation should, we feel, not be taken in isolation but rather within the broader framework of metropolitan transportation as a whole. The specific agency that should be made responsible is not a matter that we feel ourselves competent to judge.

To elaborate, greatly increased real incomes and technological improvements have combined during the last half century to change the automobile from an expensive toy into a convenience well within the reach of the great majority of American families. For a growing proportion of the population, the convenience and time savings associated with automobile transportation have more than made up for its higher dollar costs. As a result, mass transportation patronage has declined.

Two further ramifications of the increase in auto ownership have been detrimental to mass transit service, patronage, and financing. First, the automobile has led to profound changes in the structure of urban areas. Residential population densities have diminished—the much commented upon phenomenon of suburban sprawl. In relative if not absolute terms, commercial and industrial activity has become decentralized. As a result of these changes in urban structure, the demand for service along individual mass transit routes has diminished. Service frequencies have therefore declined. Further shifts from mass to private transportation have therefore inevitably resulted.

Second, the financial problems of mass transportation systems have been compounded by the uneven character of the shift from public to private transportation. Indeed, there is good reason to argue that the financial crisis currently besetting mass transportation systems stems not so much from a decline in patronage per se as from a decline in patronage at the wrong time of day. On most transit systems, the loss in patronage has been concentrated mainly during offpeak hours. Indeed, on many systems, patronage during morning and afternoon rush hours has experienced little if any decline. As a result, the average load factor on mass transit vehicles has declined steadily—a growing proportion of the capacity necessary to meet peakload demands goes unutilized during the remainder of the day.

Clearly, a substantial permanent subsidy program would eliminate the financial plight of public transportation systems. Indeed, by enabling provision of more frequent service at lower prices, subsidies might serve to halt and perhaps even to reverse the decline in mass transit patronage. A substantial research effort might succeed in devising vehicles that could provide rapid, frequent service on low density routes at low cost. Barring this seemingly unlikely possibility, however, it seems doubtful that the effects of a temporary subsidy program would prove lasting. After all, the mass transit crisis is not of recent origin, but has been developing for the better part of half a century. It seems likely that the conditions responsible for this crisis could be reversed, if at all, only by committing substantial resources to the task over a substantial period of time.

Furthermore, even if there were some way of assuring that these conditions could be reversed, there is serious doubt in our minds that doing so would be socially desirable, for the source of the crisis is the various ramifications of an apparently growing preference for the speed and convenience—flexibility—afforded by private passenger vehicles. Consumers are willing to pay for such flexibility.

There is, however, one attribute of metropolitan transportation and, indeed, transportation in general, the ramifications of which might serve to justify permanent subsidies to mass transit systems. This attribute is the fact that both presently employed and, very likely, feasible alternative means of charging for the use of transportation facilities do not adequately reflect the costs of providing these facilities. The capacity requirements for transportation facilities in urban areas are determined by morning and afternoon rush-hour demands. If these two peaks did not exist, capacity requirements and hence the costs of providing transportation facilities would be substantially lower than is presently the case. For this reason, if each traveler were to be charged the costs incurred in serving him—the costs that would be saved if his trip were not made—peak hour travelers would pay substantially higher prices for trips than would offpeak travelers. Clearly our present system of transportation-user charges does not possess this seemingly desirable characteristic. Public transportation fares typically do not differentiate between peak and offpeak loads. Similarly, the level of such highway user charges as gasoline

---

[17] Jean Gottman, op. cit., p. 634.

[18] The New York City Transit Authority reported riding as follows: 1958, 1,319 million passengers; 1959, 1,324 million passengers; 1960, 1,345 million passengers; 1961, 1,363 million passengers.

[19] For a discussion of the necessity of providing adequate motor vehicle facilities in large cities, see Eugene Maier, "Urban Transportation Planning Can Succeed," Traffic Quarterly, July 1962, p. 325.

[20] U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Banking and Currency, hearings before Subcommittee No. 3, statement by Robert C. Weaver, Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, 87th Cong., 1st sess., p. 4.

taxes and license fees is not appreciably affected by the time at which private passenger vehicle operators make trips.

The imposition of higher peak than offpeak transit fares and highway user charges would very likely make a substantial contribution toward alleviating the present crisis in mass transit financing. Also, by discouraging nonwork trips at peak hours and encouraging car pools and perhaps the staggering of business opening and closing hours, such a pricing system would reduce the highway expenditures required to alleviate peak-hour congestion problems.

Charging peak-hour mass transit patrons approximately the cost of providing them with service would be a comparatively easy task. Levying cost-based user tolls on private passenger vehicle operators would be considerably more difficult, however. A very imperfect approximation to cost-based charges is perhaps the most that could be hoped for. If this is in fact the case, a permanent mass transit subsidy program might well prove economically justifiable. That is, a permanent subsidy for peak-hour mass transit service might be required to minimize the money and time costs of metropolitan transportation. Unfortunately, the word "might" must be emphasized. To our knowledge, no one has as yet undertaken the substantial research effort required to determine the nature of optimum metropolitan transportation systems and user charges on these systems when cost-based tolls cannot be levied.

Whether the organization responsible for administering the research and other programs that may develop out of these acts should be the HHFA, the Department of Commerce, or yet a third agency is not a matter about which we feel competent to make recommendations. We do, however, strongly recommend that the agency given responsibility for these programs be authorized to deal with urban transportation as an integrated whole rather than exclusively with public transportation. In dealing with any problem, an integrated rather than a piecemeal approach seems preferable. In this case, the desirability of an integrated approach is reinforced by the great difficulties involved in establishing a genuinely cost-based system of user charges.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Both those men state that we should not enter into a program of subsidies with the meager knowledge at our command.

First, as I have said, we have not had enough experience.

Second, I come to the question of the wisdom of the Federal Government entering into a program of financing local mass transportation. An effort was made to salve the consciences of Senators. Bravely they rose in defense of the taxpayers and voted for the reduction of the subsidy bill from $500 million to $350 million in 3 years.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to conclude my statement. If Senators wish to adopt an economic program and act frugally and prudently on the measure, I ask that they reawaken the remorse which they had within themselves and join me in an amendment that would really result in an economy move.

Mr. President, at this point in the Record I ask unanimous consent to have printed a table showing the status of mass transportation demonstration grant program as of January 1963.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Status of mass transportation demonstration grant program as of January 1963

[Authorized by the Housing Act of 1961]

A. Total amount of funds authorized for this program: $25 million.
B. Total funds appropriated: $12.5 million.
C. Grants approved by HHFA during 1962:

Date	Recipient	Purpose	Federal grant	Local contribution	Total cost of project
(1) Mar. 29	City of Detroit, Mich	Increasing bus service to determine effect on traffic, and transit use. Project duration: 2 months.	$224,400	$112,200	$366,600
(2) June 29	University of Washington, Seattle	Study of monorail system at Seattle's World Fair. Project duration: 5 months.	10,000	5,000	15,000
(3) Oct. 6	Mass Transportation Commission, State of Massachusetts.	Series of experiments in urban areas of Boston, Fitchburg, Worcester, and Pittsfield. Project duration: 18 months.	3,600,000	1,800,000	5,400,000
(4) Oct. 26	Southeastern transportation compact (SEPACT) made up of Bucks, Chester, and Montgomery Counties in Pennsylvania.	Increase and improve train service (at lower fares); improve parking facilities at stations; initiate feeder-bus service to stations. Project duration: Not determined.	3,116,000	1,558,000	4,674,000
(5) Dec. 11	City of Memphis, Tenn	To determine pattern and volume of ridership in area by establishing full scale mass transit service. Project duration: 2 years.	194,950	----------	----------
(6) Dec. 22	Tri-State Transportation Committee, New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut.	To find out if people will ride commuter trains if the suburban station is located outside central business district, easily accessible, and having ample parking. New station will be built for the Pennsylvania Railroad in New Brunswick, N.J. Project duration: 22 to 24 months.	170,790	85,395	256,185

D. Total Federal funds officially expended on mass transportation demonstration grant program as of Jan. 15, 1963: $7,316,140.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. My question is: Did not the Senator take a little encouragement from the reduction in the amount of the appropriation on the theory that it reflected something of an inclination to save a part of the deficit for later appropriation to other worthy causes?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I found some comfort in it. But, to repeat, I could see standing out within the consciences of my colleagues a remorse and feeling that we must send back home the word that we tried to economize. We reduced the amount authorized in the bill from $500 million to $350 million.

It was a facade. There was no essence to it. In substance it was deceit.

I suppose the newspapers at home will say, "$150 million cut," but what will that mean when we are opening the doorway, establishing the precedent, and setting in motion the train of extravagance which will finally cost the taxpayers in subsidies at least $6 billion and, in all probability, $10 billion?

I have been with this subject for the past 3 weeks, and I have studied it. The mayor of Boston, when he was told that the study showed that the estimated cost would be $9.6 billion said, "That is not so. Who came forth with those figures?" The Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon] said they were officially prepared by the Government, which is sponsoring the bill. The estimated cost is $9.6 billion. Two-thirds of that would be $6.4 billion, and that is what Mr. Weaver, the Administrator, said might be the cost, but he brought it down to possibly $4 billion.

If it was estimated to cost $9.6 billion 3 years ago, I think we can safely say that if it were estimated today the cost would be up to $11 or $12 billion.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, is the Senator prepared to yield now?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will yield for one question to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. No, Mr. President. I will wait and obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Since the Senator from Pennsylvania wants the floor I shall give him an opportunity to answer.

I have read the Record. The proponents of the bill are New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and, in a measure, Connecticut. Those are the States asking for it. The thought was initiated by Mr. Symes of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and by Mr. Alpert, of the New York, New Haven & Hartford.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Twenty-three Senators are cosponsors of the bill, and they represent almost every geographical region of the country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that there are 23 sponsors. I heard the argument made yesterday by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff]. He said, "We will give to the Mountain States so that they can impound waters. We will give to the Southern States so that their cotton can be subsidized. But give something to us in return for what we are giving to you."

That is not the method used by the Senator from Ohio in performing his duty. Someone can scratch my back with all the pleasantness and generosity he can find, but that will not induce me to scratch his back, when it is wrong.

Let us take a look at the fiscal situation prevailing. While I am on my feet I wish to state that although the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] is now carrying the ball, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] initially sponsored this movement. He has been in it for the past 4 years, and I think he was present when President Symes came in, for the Pennsylvania Railroad, and asked for these subsidies.

We shall be asked to raise the ceiling on the national debt to $320 billion before we conclude this session. The purchasing power of the dollar is down to 45 cents, compared to what it was in 1941. Since World War II the national debt has increased $35 billion.

After former wars we paid off the debts in the course of two decades. Nineteen years have now passed, and instead of the debt being paid off, it is larger than it was.

American gold is fleeing to foreign nations. Citizens of the United States are taking their money into Switzerland. They are taking it there because they do not know what is going to happen in our country with respect to the dollar.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question about economics?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I have been reading what Dr. Heller has had to say, but I read something the other day on economics which I think is far sounder than what Dr. Heller has to say on the subject, and I wonder if the Senator from Ohio agrees with me.

I read that "one has a deficit when what he has is less than he had when he had nothing."

Does the Senator agree with me on that improbable definition?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. The Senator speaks of Dr. Heller, who, with derision, spoke about the puritanical attributes of the modern American. I looked up the meaning of the word "puritanical." It describes a person who adheres to rigid morality. But that is a vice, according to Dr. Heller. That is a course which should not be followed. One should adapt himself to the expediency of the time, even though it is in discord with what a genuine conscience tells an individual to do.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I believe the Senator knows that I concur strongly in what he has been saying. I recall that yesterday the Senator pointed out how incongruous it is for us to be legislating a new, very costly program while at the same time we are holding out to the American people the thought of a tax cut.

I came across an article yesterday which might provide a possible answer for the Senator. I detect from this article, and from other things I have been hearing lately, that the effort toward a tax cut may be diminishing.

For more than 2 years we have been striving to get the economy moving again by spending more than we have been taking in. That policy having failed, the thought was to try for a tax cut, but the tax cut idea is not catching on, because too many people recognize that a $2.7 billion tax cut for fiscal year 1964 would be eaten up by at least that much inflation—though probably greatly in excess—resulting from the $12 billion deficit in the same time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I limited my other yieldings to questions. I shall have to limit the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. May I finish one observation?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. This proposal will not do the job.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article referred to printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 2, 1963]

Spending Drive: Democrats in Congress Seek Big Public Works Outlays To Aid Economy—Move To Collide With GOP Economy Efforts—Kennedy Fears Swelling of Deficit—Tax Cut: Too Little, Late?

(By Paul Duke)

Washington.—Democratic leaders in Congress, fearing tax cuts will be too little and too late, are quietly starting a campaign to fuel the economy with a big extra shot of public works spending.

Their push will collide head-on with Republican economy drives, and it also will clash with White House reluctance to support new deficit-deepening outlays at this time. But the effort could gain enough steam to succeed anyway.

Such leading Democrats as Senate Majority Whip Humphrey, of Minnesota, and House Majority Leader Albert, of Oklahoma, are helping lead the campaign. House Majority Whip Boggs, of Louisiana, indicated to a home-State AFL–CIO convention yesterday that the Democrats would seek extra funds beyond the $900 million authorized last year for special employment-boosting public works projects during the following 2 years or so; President Kennedy's budget makes no such provision.

Bills already have been introduced in both House and Senate to double, even triple the $900 million ceiling. And the House Public Works Committee is set to launch public hearings after Easter to generate support for expansion of this seemingly popular program.

FEAR OF DISGRUNTLED VOTERS

These plans mirror the deep-seated fears of many Democrats that the Kennedy administration's tax-cutting program won't do enough to reduce unemployment before the 1964 elections. A cut of the size and timing now expected, they complain, will put only mild zip into the economy by then. If the jobless rolls remain high, they fear many voters may turn against the Democrats in next year's voting.

"I just don't think a tax cut is going to give enough jobs to people in my district to do much good any time soon," is the plaint of a northern House Member from one high-unemployment area.

Hence, Democratic chieftains now contend it's essential to adopt new antiunemployment spending measures this year. Their No. 1 preference is an enlargement of the "temporary" 1962 program whereby Federal funds are channeled into surplus labor areas for park and recreational improvements, water and sewer projects, and the building of local fire stations, libraries, jails, civic centers, and hospitals.

Unlike large public works requiring lengthy advance planning, these lesser projects can swing into job-creating action quickly. Hundreds of communities are eligible to get in on the program, and dozens of Congressmen of both parties have been turning the heat on its managers to win a share for their districts. Though the program began only 5 months ago, the first installment of $400 million appropriated by Congress has been completely allocated and pending applications total about $1.5 billion. The all-important House Appropriations Committee is expected to OK second installment funds this week; as a gesture to economizers it may approve only $450 million instead of a possible $500 million, but the cut would be subject to reversal on the House floor.

GOP CRITICISMS

Despite the program's wide appeal, the attempt to increase the $900 million ceiling is certain to provoke a superheated battle. Republican leaders, who fought the original bill as a "budget buster," will be even more opposed on this go-around. They can hardly look with favor on another big boost in spending at a time when they are shouting for multibillion-dollar reductions in administration fund requests.

Apart from budget considerations, many Republicans contend these public works allotments are little more than sops to troubled areas and really don't get at underlying causes of unemployment. False hopes raised by the program's advocates, say the GOP critics, create tremendous pressures to perpetuate the outlays. In the end, they argue, a permanent depression-days WPA-type program will be spawned if the current program is permitted to continue and expand.

The White House has qualms of a different sort. Mr. Kennedy is hesitant about pushing any plan that might swell by $1 billion or more the $11.9 billion deficit predicted for the fiscal year starting in July. Besides, the administration already is plumping for a $456 million increase, from this year's planned $394 million, in the affiliated program for longer term aid to bring new industry into chronically depressed areas; Commerce Secretary Hodges laid this request before the House Banking Committee yesterday.

An added administration concern is the damaging impact a new public works drive might have on congressional chances for the tax program. If Mr. Kennedy should give the spending push a rousing endorsement, he might suddenly find some of the support for lower levies withering away. And the tax bill still leads the administration's list of most wanted 1963 legislation.

But the White House can scarcely throw cold water on the public works drive. For one thing, many proadministration stalwarts are in the van of the movement. Mr. Albert, for example, has personally appealed to the President to go along with the drive; in his southeast Oklahoma district, 12 of the 13 counties are classified as depressed, with 6 percent or more of the labor force jobless.

SENSITIVE TO REPUBLICAN TAUNTS

Furthermore, the administration is sensitive to Republican taunts that it has failed to make an appreciable dent in unemployment. Although Mr. Kennedy has set a goal of reducing joblessness to 4 percent of the labor force, it has dropped only from 6.7 percent to 6.1 percent since he took over in early 1961. Among other barbs, Republican Representative McDade, a freshman from Pennsylvania, has taken to sending the White House monthly statements on mining unemployment in his Lackawanna County district and lambasting the administration for "doing nothing to solve this unconscionable problem."

Faced with these political realities, the White House is inclined to assume a standoffish stance toward the public works drive. The present indication is that it will neither

encourage nor discourage the effort to increase outlays. At the coming House hearings, administration witnesses probably will support the expansion proposals, but in a way that will leave the initiative entirely in the hands of congressional Democrats.

"They'll take the money if we give it to them but they aren't going to fight for it," concludes one Democratic strategist.

Even if administration support is lukewarm, the extra spending plans will have powerful backing from other directions. Labor unions, mayors, conservation groups, and others are certain to rally behind the campaign. With State and localities confronted with an estimated 160 billion backlog of various public projects, many communities view Uncle Sam's help as a convenient means for easing their financial loads. The program's backers claim the $900 million already authorized will directly generate 110,000 man-years of work (the equivalent of employing 110,000 men for one year), plus an equal additional amount of off-site work needed to supply building materials and other essentials for the projects; extra funds could presumably yield similar stimulus.

The program's extensive potential has gained it lots of boosters. Some 1,200 towns, cities and counties covering about one-third of the Nation's land area are eligible for assistance. Any locality with a prolonged unemployment rate of 6 percent or more may receive grants totaling up to 75 percent of a project's cost so long as the bulk of the work occurs in the first 12 months and new job opportunities are created.

The 3,756 projects approved thus far have covered all 50 States, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands; men are actually at work on some 1,300 of these projects now. Moreover, program administrators deliberately have spread around the initial allocation of $400 million in an effort to refute last year's accusations that a political slush fund was being set up to help the administration and friendly Democrats.

While most awards have gone to such problem States as Pennsylvania, Michigan and Kentucky, every State has benefited and nearly every Congressman has received one or more allocations for his district.

One of the first Indiana awards was a $282,922 grant toward construction of a $1.7 million new Jasper County hospital in the district of House Republican Leader Halleck, who's an avowed opponent of the program. Some $3 million in forestry, road building, sewer, and other construction funds have been funneled into the northern Wisconsin district of GOP Representative O'Konski. A total of $1.4 million has been set aside for access roads and other improvements to the Ottawa National Forest, in the district of Michigan's Republican Representative Bennett, an area of serious mining unemployment.

Nor have conservative Southern Democrats been overlooked. A $600,000 grant for a bridge at Gulfport went to the district of Congressman Colmer, of Mississippi, a fervent anti-Kennedy Democrat. Other anti-administration Democrats in South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Texas have gotten grants for their districts.

But undoubtedly the most influential factor in rallying support will be the nearly 6,000 applications now awaiting action. Even States with below-average unemployment have been pouring in petitions. One example: Louisiana, which has been allocated $12 million in grants thus far, has submitted requests for an additional $108 million.

"We've got seven people doing nothing but answering phone calls and replying to letters asking about the status of the applications," reports an aid to Program Administrator William Batt.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, this is an article from yesterday's Wall Street Journal entitled "Democrats in Congress Seek Big Public Works Outlays To Aid Economy."

I ask the Senator from Ohio if this program does not fit into that pattern. Is not the spending of $350 million in grants for a new program in the same pattern of spending to try to get the economy moving again, which we have been going through for the past 2 years?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree with what the Senator has said.

Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the Senator from Ohio has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much time does the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] wish?

Mr. COTTON. I would rather reserve a few minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 minute?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I hope this amendment will be adopted, because in my opinion it is a very crucial amendment. First, it will test what is going to happen to this bill. All Senators who vote against cutting the amount of money provided in the bill are going to vote for the bill. It is as simple as that. If Senators vote for this amendment, they will have protected the budget from new spending and perhaps it will be a little easier for us later in the session to vote for a tax cut. They cannot vote for new, unnecessary spending, running into a deficit of perhaps $12 billion, and then put a tax cut on top of that.

The second test of this vote is, Do we mean economy when we continue to talk about economy, or are we going to postpone it to some future date? The forthcoming vote will put every Member of the Senate on record for or against economy. A vote for this amendment is a vote for economy, and a vote against it is a vote against economy. The issue is that simple.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I will close now. The argument is made that we should serve the people of the country and enter into the proposed new subsidy program. My answer to that argument is that, if the Congress wants to serve the people of this country, it should recognize that the Federal Government's fiscal problems are heavy. They are far heavier than is generally understood. If this were a $350 million program and it was to come to an end, I would not be so concerned, but it is a $6 billion program. When the President submitted the budget about 2 months ago, he made the statement that there are items in the budget which cannot be cut, such as an item of $10 billion for interest. This program would increase the interest obligation. It would increase the national debt. When are we going to build up a reserve, so that if we do get into trouble we will have some "fat" to draw upon? It will not be by this type of program.

I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] the remainder of my time.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, may I ask how much time is left to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I had 45 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that there are 6 minutes left.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much time was assigned to me? I had 45 minutes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I believe under the consent agreement the Senator had 45 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the Senator has 30 minutes remaining.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to this precise amendment. The Senator from New Hampshire was seeking recognition to offer an amendment, sometime before the Senator from Missouri offered his, which was adopted.

The pending amendment is crucial. In the first place, remember that when the bill came from the Banking and Currency Committee—and it was the President's bill—it was a $500 million bill. When it came to the Committee on Commerce, of which I am a member, I am sorry to say the Committee on Commerce added $500 million in guaranteed loans, making it a $1 billion bill.

It has been the purpose of the Senator from New Hampshire for the past few days, at the proper time in this contest, to let the Senate go on record, and have every Member of the Senate go on record, as to whether we shall cut out all of the $500 million grants and keep in the bill only the $500 million guaranteed loans.

Do not misunderstand me. I am still against the bill, because it is a foot in the door for a long, weary course of spending; but if this amendment is adopted, the bill will go back to the amount the President first called for.

Mr. President, I ask for some time on the bill.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. The bill would go back to the $500 million that the President first called for, but it is a better bill because that $500 million is in guaranteed loans. Senators will remember that the Commerce Committee's version, which is now in the bill, provides that an additional one-fourth of 1 percent shall be paid as interest by the grantees, the cities, the communities, the recipients, which shall be used for administration of the program, and such part of the money as is left over shall be used to indemnify the United States for any loans that are defaulted by the recipients. In other words, it minimizes the impact of the bill. I grant that I dislike building up the contingent liabilities of the Nation, but it removes the impact on the current budget that we are going to adopt in this session of Congress.

Of course, a gesture was made—I am sure, with great sincerity—by our friends who reduced the amount by $125 million, but it leaves $375 million in grants and $500 million in contingent loans. The attitude of most Senators on both sides of the aisle this afternoon indicates that they are equally conscious of the fact that we are fast approaching a showdown in the 88th Congress as to whether we can be firm, ruthless, and courageous, in cutting the budget, and holding back new programs, in order that the President's recommendation for a tax cut as a stimulant to the economy of the country may be something we can do practically and successfully.

The vote on the pending amendment is the first battle to decide that question. This amendment is crucial, because it brings the bill back to something like its original size, and it removes the impact on this year's budget and still gives us a chance to reduce it.

Bear in mind that, even with the adoption of the amendment, I must still oppose the bill because of what it opens up and what it leads to, but when the roll is called on this amendment we shall come pretty near knowing whether there is prudence left in the country today or whether we still think we can have our cake and eat it too; increase our expenditures, and at the same time reduce taxes, and by some magic formula succeed in keeping the Nation solvent. At least if the amendment is adopted we will not be adding a single dollar to the budget. If it is not adopted, we will be taking the first step toward busting the budget wide open. That is why this is a crucial vote, and our votes will indicate whether we are willing to go the whole way in holding the line on the budget.

I hope, on this crucial vote, that the Senate will vote a real, bona fide reduction in the bill, rather than one that just salves our consciences and gives us something to talk about when we go home.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it is my plan to speak very briefly on the subject. As a matter of fact, I strongly urge that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] not be agreed to, because it would strike out a great part of the heart of the bill.

Let us remember that as the bill now stands, assuming that the amendments offered by the Commerce Committee are agreed to, there is a duplicate plan of financing. One is a provision for grants, and that amount has been cut now from $500 million to $375 million over a period of 3 years. The other is the loan guarantee program.

I am sorry that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] is not on the floor at the present time, because I wish to point out that the Senator from Ohio offered a bill for mass transportation that did have in it the loan guarantee program. The Commerce Committee has added it to the pending bill. We have agreed to accept it. That supplements the grant program that was provided in our bill.

I stated earlier in the day that I thought, due to the fact that we do have the two-headed method of financing, we could very well cut the amount authorized in the bill for the loan guarantee program, although, as the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon] has pointed out, it is not too important that we do so, because it is merely an authorization to use that much for guaranteeing the loans, and does not necessarily call for the appropriation of the full amount.

I regret that the Senator from Ohio made some of the statements that he made relating to the amendment that was offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], and the vote by the Senators on that particular amendment. First of all, I do not impugn the motive of any Senator at any time on any vote he casts. I believe his motive is something for him to understand himself. I am sorry the Senator from Ohio used the term "deceit," or that there was an element of deceit in connection with the almost unanimous vote of the Senate in favor of that cut. I believe the cut was justified. As a matter of fact, I had it in mind from the beginning of the debate on the bill, after it appeared that the loan guarantee provision was going to be put into the bill. It is simply a matter of some amount not being needed for the grant program. I believe the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], was a wise amendment. I believe that the heavy vote in favor of it was a good vote, and well considered, and that no one need explain or apologize for his vote. Certainly I cannot believe that the Senator from Ohio, had he reflected upon the matter a little further, would have implied that there was an element of deceit in connection with the vote.

I believe that the two-headed system of financing that we have in the bill now strikes a very good balance. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio should be defeated. I hope it will be.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio. As the Senator from Alabama has stated, we now have a two-method approach. I should like further to point out that it is not one or the other approach, but it is an approach which requires an applicant first to apply under the guarantee loan provision. If he can qualify under the guarantee loan provision, he would not be eligible for a grant.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is rather absurd to argue that this is a giveaway type of program, that it is a grant program where grants are not needed. If a grant is not needed an applicant cannot qualify for the grant in the first instance. An applicant must first make application for a guaranteed loan. The Administrator must determine whether the plan is economically feasible, so that it can be financed under the guarantee loan provision. If it can be so financed, that type of assistance will be given.

In committee it was determined that a serious problem exists in this area and that something must be done to relieve it.

Criticism was made that the local governmental agencies have not done all they should at the local level. That is perhaps true. We know it is true in some instances. However, we have inserted a provision in the bill which requires that these steps be taken before an applicant is eligible for either a guaranteed loan or a grant.

Therefore we have tried to write into the bill a safeguard, to make sure, first, that there is a need and, second, that an applicant exhausts every possible method at the local level and tries to solve the problem at the local level and, third, that he tries to get a guaranteed loan first, if he can qualify the project through the guaranteed loan provision. If he cannot, he would be eligible for a grant. Therefore, I wish to assure Senators that this is a bill which does not permit an indiscriminate use of the grant program. It may be used only when the tests are adequately met. It is a good bill which will attempt to meet the needs which certainly are pressing many of the municipalities throughout the country. I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Ohio will be defeated.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, whether or not the pending bill has the so-called two-way stretch to which the Senator from Nevada refers lies wholly within the volition and the discretion of the Administrator. It is he who determines whether or not there is a qualification for a loan. If he decides that it merits a grant, it is going to get a grant.

Insofar as I have seen bureaucratic liberality with grant money, there is not any question as to whether this grant money is going to be used.

I had hoped that this general economy feeling which is now surging in the Nation's Capital and in the country would catch on and go further and further.

First of all, the distinguished President himself has set the pattern. A week ago he submitted a little over $125 million in cuts in the fiscal 1964 budget. The day before yesterday he sent us a foreign-aid message, and there he said he thought the aid program could be cut back, not by $120 million or by $200 million, but by $400 million.

The President is aware of the mood of the people today. We ought to take counsel from what he was doing to his own budget before we even pass upon the items.

The Senate suddenly succumbed, modestly, I would say, to the urge that is beginning to manifest itself, because the monitor of the bill accepted the amendment offered by the frugally minded—and I say this reverently—Senator from Missouri, when he suggested that there be a $125 million cut in the bill, $25 million during the years 1963 and 1964, $50 million in 1965, and $50 million in 1966. That is a start, but it is a modest start.

As the Chinese say, the longest journey begins with a single step. We took a modest step this afternoon. The President has taken a modest step. I am glad that he is embracing the doctrine and the philosophy that we have been tirelessly belaboring for quite some time. We have been hearing from the country. There is even a more impelling reason than that, and that is the solvency of this

country. We keep talking about a $99 billion budget. We ought to stop it. It is not a $99 billion budget. It is a $108 billion budget.

The bill provides $9.2 billion of new obligational authority, and $100 million for fiscal 1964 as a part of the new obligational authority. It is a new step for a new expenditure which, in the belief of the Administrator himself as he testified before the committee, will require more than $9 billion to do the job. He was very sanguine about it. Everyone might know that inflation is in the air. It is going to be there. Just as we know it costs much more today to accomplish a job than it did 5, 10, or 15 years ago, we can go right on through the lesson book and look down the future to other fiscal years, where we will find that the job cannot be done with $9 billion. I should say, conservatively, that before we get through, knowing the avidity for free money, we had better start talking about $20 billion.

I am not unmindful that the country grows and that the budget has to grow to some extent; but it does not have to grow to insane proportions and jeopardize the very solvency of our country. If we do not manage the budget, I do not know how we will stir confidence in the banking world abroad, which holds more that $20 billion of our obligations which can be converted into gold, if it wishes to do so. I do not know how we can stir confidence at home and constantly try to invite private capital to do a job and assume responsibilities, if we put power into the hands of a Federal agency which can only destroy that confidence.

The amendment ought to be adopted in the interest of fiscal sanity for this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] are absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 57, as follows:

[No. 35 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Aiken
Allott
Bennett
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fong
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Jordan, N.C.
Lausche
McClellan
Mechem
Miller
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—57

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Ellender
Engle
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kefauver
Kennedy
Kuchel
Long, La.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfleid
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—2

Moss
Smathers

So Mr. Lausche's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 9, in line 5, it is proposed to strike out "$500,000,000", and to insert in lieu thereof "$375,000,000".

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I shall make a brief explanation of the amendment.

The Senate has already taken action to reduce the provision for grants from $500 million to $375 million. In adding the amendment covering the guarantee loan provision, the Commerce Committee established a limit of $500 million for which the Government could guarantee the payment of bonds. My amendment would reduce that figure of $500 million to $375 million and would make the amount consistent with the amount provided in the direct grant provision. I again point out, as I pointed out earlier, that this is only a maximum guarantee. It would not require the appropriation of funds at this time, and would mean only a limit on the contingent liability for which the Government might commit itself.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to join the distinguished Senator from Nevada in sponsoring the amendment. That particular provision of the bill was not in the bill when it was considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I am a member. As the Senator has suggested, it would create a contingent liability and not a direct burden upon the Treasury. But it would create the liability in an area in which we have had little or no experience. So there would be danger of default, which could create a direct liability upon the Government. It would be appropriate to reduce the provision of the bill so that it would be consistent with the cut which has already been made in the grant program. So I am happy to join the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I was much impressed with the amendments which the Senator from Nevada presented to the Senate as a representative of the great Committee on Commerce. For the reasons that I have already presented briefly in the Record today for reducing the grant from $500 million to $375 million, I commend the Senator for the proposed amendment. I intend to support it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There has been the highest degree of cooperation and accommodation between the two committees that brought the measure to the floor of the Senate. It seems to me that with the guarantees added, we have a well-balanced program; and that the grants together with the guarantees at the proposed level are realistic in meeting the needs of transportation.

Speaking for the Senator in charge of the bill, the Committee on Banking and Currency will accept the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield about 2 minutes to me?

Mr. CANNON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I subscribe to the proposed reduction. That is obvious on the basis of what I have said in the past 3 days. However, I feel that the Senate ought to learn how the matter was handled in the Committee on Commerce. My measure provided for a $50 million guarantee loan fund. Some Senator said, "Make it $100 million." Another voice said, "Make it $500 million." Those were not the words, but it sounded like an auction to me. I decided that I was lucky to get off with a $500 million provision.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, as the Senator from Ohio has said, there was no provision requiring a contribution at the local level. We require a contribution of 25 percent. We have removed the tax-exempt provision relating to the bonds. In my opinion, that action removed many of the objections to the guarantee loan provision.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. The Senator mentioned a tax-exempt provision. I understand that there is no question that this is not an opening wedge to do away with the tax-exempt provision on State and municipal bonds.

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is absolutely correct. It is specifically provided that there will be no attempt to invade the field of tax-exempt municipal bonds. This is an area in which the Federal Government is asked to guarantee the bonds, and in so doing, one of the conditions is that the local body, in making application, would waive its right to the tax-exempt provision.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the guaranteed bond program recommended by the Commerce Committee should provide a sound method to help some local communities in the development of mass transportation systems. However, there is one feature of this program which causes me grave concern.

The proposal requires the State, local public body, or agency thereof, to waive the income tax exemption normally enjoyed by such revenue bonds as a condition for the bonds to qualify under the program.

Some of our tax experts have been trying for a long time to destroy the income tax exemption enjoyed by municipal bonds. I am concerned that someone may attempt to use this bill as a precedent to attack the exemption of municipal bonds generally. Therefore, I believe the colloquy between the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Nevada relating to this matter should be reprinted in the debate today to emphasize the point that this bill should not be considered a precedent.

The exemption of the interest on municipal bonds from the Federal income tax has enhanced the marketability of such bonds. Thus, this exemption has contributed substantially to the ability of local communities to cope with some of the complex problems facing them. It should be clearly understood that the waiver of exemption required by this bill in no way reflects on the soundness of the exemption as a general rule.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the appropriate part of the colloquy between the Senator from New Jersey, who has worked so diligently for adequate legislation in this field, and the Senator from Nevada, who presented the Commerce Committee amendments, be printed at this point in the RECORD. The colloquy originally appeared on page 5336 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 1, 1963.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am very grateful to the Senator for his amplifications and observations. In connection with the provision that the bonds would not carry a tax exemption there might be fear that a precedent would be established that would cut deeply into the historical pattern of financing at the local level. I know that such is not the intention or expectation of the Senator, and that he sees the situation as a case sun generis.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Senator for bringing up that point. I had not completed my explanation. I intended to cover that one particular provision. One of the other features of the guaranteed bond proposal is a provision that they would not be tax exempt. That provision departs from the usual and customary theory of tax exemption in dealing with municipal bonds. That is in nowise intended to be a precedent for the taxation of municipal bonds, and I, for one, would oppose entering into the field of taxation of municipal bonds generally.

That is a different area entirely. The Federal Government would be asked to guarantee the bonds of the local transportation authority. They might therefore be able to market their bonds at a lesser interest rate than would be possible on the open market today. In my opinion, the private investment segment of our country would be induced to come in under that type of proposal. Such participation is necessary if we are to solve the overall problem, because of its magnitude. But again I say that that is nowise intended to be a precedent. It is intended to be exactly the opposite. A non-tax-exempt provision would be established solely by reason of the fact that the Federal Government would be coming into the picture as a guarantor, just as the Federal Government enters into the picture in FHA and VA guarantee provisions. In both those situations, interest is not exempt from taxation. That is the specific reason why we are trying not to get into that area in the present case.

Also, if a guarantee provision were allowed on tax-exempt bonds, in effect it would place the bonds in a better position from the standpoint of salability than those of the Federal Government.

That, of course, would place the local agencies in an unfair competitive position insofar as the sale of Government securities is concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. If they were tax exempt?

Mr. CANNON. If they were tax exempt.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I commend the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] for the amendment. I should like to ask the Senator whether he intends to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CANNON. I had not particularly intended to do so.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CANNON. I support the Senator from Wyoming in that request.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is an occasion when at least a word ought to be interposed with respect to the amendment now before the Senate and certain other amendments. As the bill came from the Committee on Banking and Currency, it provided $500 million in grants. As the bill came from the Committee on Commerce, it contained grant and loan provisions. The version of the Committee on Commerce was accepted on the floor of the Senate.

The spirit of frugality then began to hover over this great body. This afternoon the grant money authorized was reduced by $125 million. So at this good hour, with the cherry blossom princesses waiting for everyone, the grant money authorized has been reduced by $125 million.

Salvation, it seems to me, is coming. But it comes so slowly. I remember that old spiritual—

> I am inching along, I am inching along,
> I am inching along, my Lord.

We are inching along, but progress is extremely slow.

Why did not the Senate "go the whole hog" and knock out all the grant money and place the measure on the beam and the frequency to which we can tune and hear the voice of the country? I commend the Senate for cutting out $125 million in guaranteed loans. But the amount is not enough for fiscal salvation.

We will vote for the amendment. We only hope and wish that we could embrace all salvation and cut it all out.

Mr. CANNON. We are very happy that the distinguished Senator from Illinois sees at least in part the error of his ways, and we shall be happy to have him with us on the forthcoming vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it still will not save me.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Am I correct in my assumption that one of the prices for obtaining a guaranteed loan provision in the bill would be that the local subdivision of government must waive its exemption from taxation?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is not correct in that respect. Under one section of the bill, in order to obtain the advantage of the guaranteed bond provision, the local body would have to waive any rights it might have to claim that the bonds which the Government guarantees are tax exempt. Those bonds and those only, would be affected. The amendment would affect no other municipal bonds in any way. The amendment relates only to municipal bonds which the Federal Government would guarantee.

Mr. ERVIN. In order to obtain the benefit of the proposed largesse from the Federal Government, would not the local governmental subdivision be required to waive any exemption from taxation on the bonds that would be covered by the guarantee?

Mr. CANNON. On the revenue of the bonds covered by the guarantee. If they failed to do so, bonds issued under those conditions would be given a preferred position over general obligations of the Treasury.

Mr. ERVIN. I was hoping that I could vote for the amendment, but to me the proposal would put the camel's nose under the tent, and, pro tanto, would require the surrender of what has been conceived to be a constitutional right in part. For that reason, although I should like to protect to some extent the unborn generations of our taxpayers from the obligations they will have to pay under the bill, I cannot vote for that provision.

Mr. CANNON. I say to the Senator that the amendment would only reduce the amount. The amendment would not change the tax-exempt provision at all. The amendment now before the Senate would merely reduce from $500 million to $375 million the amount authorized for guarantees.

The provision to which the Senator referred is in the bill, as the amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 6 has been agreed to.

Mr. ERVIN. With that assurance from the Senator I can vote for the proposed reduction in the amount of the guarantee, because an affirmative vote would manifest some willingness of the Senate to at least temporarily withhold an imposition of an obligation of $125 million on yet unborn generations of American taxpayers. I think that is very nice.

Mr. CANNON. I would certainly help the Senator to keep the camel's nose out from under the tent. I, for one, would oppose any attempt to get into the area of tax exemption with respect to bonds now granted to municipalities.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think there is some misunderstanding in the Senate. We would not touch the right of any city or State to issue all the bonds it wished to issue, tax exempt. The city of Cleveland could issue a billion dollars worth of bonds, tax exempt, and use them for transit purposes, if it wished to do so.

All we would say would be, "If you are going to issue some revenue bonds for transit purposes and if we are to guarantee them, we will ask you to forgo any privilege you might have for tax exemption."

Senators have talked about people to be born in the future who will have to pay the bill. The reason the Committee on Commerce did exactly what it did with respect to the bonds is that the committee did not anticipate that taxpayers in the future, with respect to the bonds, would have to pay anything, unless some city should default. I do not think that is going to happen.

We provided for a revolving fund which would adequately take care of any risk the Government might encounter.

If we wanted to put everybody in this country into the transit business—every bank and every investment house—all we would have to do would be to guarantee the bonds and make them tax exempt. Then the Treasury would not be able to sell any other bonds. We thought that would involve a little fiscal irresponsibility, too.

We could sell billions of dollars worth of those bonds now, if they were tax exempt and also guaranteed.

Any city can proceed as it wishes. Any urban center, any State or county, any transit authority, can issue all the bonds it desires to issue, tax exempt, but if we are to guarantee them we will say, "You must forgo that privilege."

We think that is a sound approach.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have great faith in the prophetic powers of my good friend from Washington, and I hope his prophecy will come true. Notwithstanding my great faith in the distinguished Senator from Washington, I have more faith in the declaration in the Scriptures to the effect that:

> He that is surety for a stranger shall smart for it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, that has not been the case in respect to many programs of this nature. It would not be, unless the country itself should turn out to be economically unsound. We do not anticipate that such will happen.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query the distinguished majority leader concerning the program for the remainder of the day and what he expects for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, I express the hope that within the next minute or two the Senate can get to the yea-and-nay vote which has been ordered on the Cannon-Muskie amendment.

After that the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] will offer an amendment, on which he will ask for the yeas and nays, but the Senator is willing to limit the debate to 10 minutes, to be divided 5 minutes to each side.

After the yea-and-nay vote is taken on the Tower amendment, I understand the next amendment to be offered will be one by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], but the vote to be taken on the Tower amendment would be the end of voting for today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations tonight it stand in adjournment to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce, with the concurrence of the minority leader, that there will be no objection to committee meetings tomorrow morning.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will our committee be free to meet tomorrow morning?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent now that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations may meet tomorrow while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations may meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada if he will include me as a cosponsor of the amendment. I am running for election next year, too.

Mr. CANNON. I am very happy to do so.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Cannon-Muskie-Goldwater amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 5, as follows:

[No. 36 Leg.]

YEAS—88

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—5

Clark
Dodd
Kefauver
Kennedy
Ribicoff

NOT VOTING—7

Hartke
Miller
Moss
Robertson
Smathers
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So the Muskie-Cannon-Goldwater amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 13 and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The amendments offered by the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 16, line 9, to strike out "two" and insert in lieu thereof "one".

On page 16, line 10, to strike out "third" and insert in lieu thereof "half".

On page 18, line 10, to strike out "one-half" and insert in lieu thereof "one-third".

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that debate on these amendments be limited to 10 minutes, 5 minutes to a side, 5 minutes to be controlled by the Senator handling the bill [Mr. Sparkman] and 5 minutes by myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendments.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly to me?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to make a brief announcement. For the information of Senators, I reiterate that the vote on the Tower amendment will be the last vote today.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am delighted to note that the pending bill has now been reduced from a $1 billion bill to a three-quarter billion dollar bill. However, I associate myself with the distinguished minority leader who said that this is far from enough.

In light of this circumstance, since we have reduced the total authorization, I believe there should be a reduction of the Federal participation. My amendment would reduce that Federal participation.

I believe we should reduce the Federal participation in the grant program from two-thirds of the net project cost to one-half of the net project cost, and in the emergency program from one-half of the project cost to one-third of the project cost.

The net project cost is arrived at by figuring the total cost of the project and then deducting the amount expected to be applied on the amortization of the project cost by farebox and other revenues.

If farebox revenues in some situations go merely to pay the operating cost, there are no farebox revenues remaining to apply to the net project cost, and it could result in two-thirds of the total project cost being paid.

Therefore, I believe it is proper to reduce the Federal participation to one-half of the net project cost. For one thing, I believe it would provide a greater incentive to local communities to exercise their own initiative and responsibility in raising the money. I therefore urge the adopton of my amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the purpose of the amendment is to stimulate the initiative of the local people in their own projects and to persuade them to do something to reduce their reliance on Washington. Is that correct?

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator for his statement. He has stated exactly the purpose of my amendment; namely, to stimulate local initiative.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I believe just as strongly as do the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Massachusetts in stimulating local interest and initiative. I believe that the formula under which this bill is drafted will do just that. I admit that 50–50 sounds good, and it is good. However, I call attention to the fact that ever since 1949 we have been operating in urban renewal and slum clearance programs under this same formula. There are a great many local costs that a locality must figure on meeting, and which are not deducted when they come to figuring the net project cost. We have learned from experience in urban renewal that under the two-thirds formula, when all accounts are settled, it is approximately 50 percent; it breaks just about half and half. We have had testimony many times in our committee in which the representatives of the cities told us about the large part of the total cost borne by the cities.

This formula has worked well in urban renewal. It has been well tested over the 13 years it has been operating. We merely propose to apply here to another similar program. The formula is not two-thirds of the gross cost. It is two-thirds of the net project cost. The city makes an estimate of the income from the farebox, and after the operating expenses have been computed, the net project cost is arrived at, and that cost is then divided, two-thirds Federal and one-third local. As I say, many local costs are not taken into consideration in the net project cost.

Mr. TOWER. The net project cost might prove to be the total cost. All we are doing is anticipating the part of the total project cost which would be amortized by revenues. It is possible that there would not be sufficient revenues to amortize that portion of the total cost; therefore the project cost and the total cost might in some instances be the same figure.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower]. The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 47, as follows:

[No. 37 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Aiken
Allott
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
Mechem
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—47

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Cannon
Case
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Engle
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Sparkman
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—9

Bennett
Hartke
Kefauver
Magnuson
Miller
Moss
Smathers
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. Tower's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have printed. I understand that it will be taken up tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 4 beginning with line 22, strike out all through line 14 on page 5, and insert the following:

"(b) (1) No financial assistance shall be made available under this Act to any State or local public body or agency thereof for the purpose, directly, or indirectly, of acquiring any interest in, or purchasing any facilities or other property of a private mass transportation company, or for the purpose of constructing, improving, or reconstructing any facilities or other property acquired, after the effective date of this Act, from any such company; unless (A) such company has, prior to such acquisition, been declared bankrupt or placed into receivership by a court of competent jurisdiction, or (B) the Administrator finds that such assistance is essential to a program, proposed or under active preparation, for the acquisition of mass transportation facilities or property which are supplementary to the service provided by an existing publicly owned or operated mass transportation system, and (C) in either situation under A or B, the Administrator and the Secretary of Labor, acting jointly in accordance with the provisions of section 19(c) of this Act, find that the project to be assisted complies with the requirements set forth therein.

"(b) (2) No financial assistance shall be made available under this act to any State or local public body or agency thereof for the purpose of providing by contract or otherwise for the operation of mass transportation facilities or equipment in competition with, or supplementary to, the service provided by an existing mass transportation company unless (A) the Administrator finds that such assistance is essential to a program, proposed or under active preparation, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area, (B) the Administrator finds that such program, to the maximum extent feasible, provides for the participation of private mass transportation companies, and (C) the Administrator and the Secretary of Labor, acting jointly in accordance with the provisions of section 19(c) of this Act, find that such program complies with the requirements set forth therein."

On page 26, strike out lines 6 through 23 and insert the following:

"(c) It shall be a condition of the granting of any assistance or the financing of any project under this Act that fair and equitable arrangements are made, as determined jointly by the Administrator and the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees affected by such assistance or financing. Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary for (1) the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including the continuation of pension rights and benefits of all beneficiaries) under existing collective bargaining agreements or otherwise; (2) the continuation of collective bargaining in any situation where it now exists; (3) the protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment which shall in no event provide benefits less than those established pursuant to the provisions of section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act; (4) assurances of employment to employees of acquired mass transportation systems by the acquiring or operating entities, and priority of employment or reemployment of employees terminated or laid off; and (5) paid training or retraining programs. The contract for the granting of any such assistance shall specify the terms and conditions of such protective arrangements."

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment is as follows:

Amend the proposed amendment offered by Senator Morse by striking "company." at the end of subparagraph (b)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "company; unless such company has, prior to the acquisition, been adjudged bankrupt or placed into receivership by a court of competent jurisdiction."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, how much time remains available on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has 109 minutes remaining; the minority leader has 94 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Chair.

INCORPORATION OF THE ELEANOR ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL FOUNDATION, INC.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily set aside so that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of a measure of some urgency, which will take but a moment. The time which is under control on the mass transit bill will not be affected.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 87, H.R. 4715.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending business will be temporarily laid aside. Calendar No. 87, H.R. 4715, will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 4715) to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, line 23, after the word "Foundation", to strike out the comma and "Incorporated"; on page 3, line 17, after the word "welfare", to strike out "and"; in the same line, after the word "health", to insert a semicolon and "and the furtherance of international good will"; on page 4, after line 8, to strike out:

(5) to solicit, prior to January 1, 1965, and to accept, receive, hold, invest, reinvest, and to use, administer, expend and otherwise dispose of, in the sole and absolute discretion of the board of trustees, gifts, legacies, bequests, devices, grants, funds, money and property of every kind and description, and to apply the income and principal thereof exclusively for the purposes of the corporation by such agencies and means as shall, from time to time, be found appropriate therefor, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limited or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State;

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(5) to take by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest from any public body or agency or any private corporation, association, partnership, firm, or individual, and to hold absolutely or in trust for any of the purposes of the corporation any property, real, personal, or mixed, necessary or convenient for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of the law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State;

And on page 11, line 4, after the word "Foundation", to strike out the comma and "Incorporated".

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there are a number of amendments to the bill. All of them are certainly desirable. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc, since the bill is not controversial. It provides for incorporation of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brewster in the chair). Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this matter was considered by the Judiciary Committee. The bill has already been passed by the House. Those who are directing the Roosevelt Foundation have suggested various amendments which the committee thinks are desirable and necessary; and the amendments also keep the measure in line as regards the issuance of a Federal charter. Therefore, there is agreement by the committee with the purpose of the charterers.

Therefore the bill comes to us with the agreement of the committee; and I am glad to support the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report on the bill. The excerpt deals with the amendments and with the purpose of the amendments and the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 105) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AMENDMENTS

Amendment No. 1: On page 3, line 1, strike the comma and the word "Incorporated".

Amendment No. 2: On page 3, line 18, strike the word "and".

Amendment No. 3: On page 3, line 18, after the word "health" change the period to a semicolon and add the following: "and the furtherance of international good will."

Amendment No. 4: On page 4, commencing on line 9, strike all down to and including the word "State;" on line 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(5) to take by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest from any public body or agency or any private corporation, association, partnership, firm, or individual, and to hold absolutely or in trust for any of the purposes of the corporation any property, real, personal, or mixed, necessary or convenient for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of the law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State;"

Amendment No. 5: On page 10, line 11, after the word "Foundation" strike the comma and the word "Incorporated".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation".

PURPOSE OF AMENDMENTS

The purpose of amendments No. 1 and No. 5 is to remove the word "Incorporated" from the title of the foundation inasmuch as the committee was advised that in the judgment of officials of the Roosevelt Foundation the word "incorporated" is not appropriate in the name of the foundation.

The purpose of amendments No. 2 and No. 3 is to add to the objects and purposes of the foundation the furtherance of international good will.

The purpose of amendment No. 4 is to conform the section relating to acceptance and disposition of property and realty to the standards in all charter bills.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to confer a Federal charter on the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation.

STATEMENT

The Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation is to be a charitable and educational foundation. The foundation is to devote itself to continuing certain major interests with which Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt was deeply concerned, the relief of the poor and distressed and the underprivileged, the promotion of economic welfare and of public health. The foundation is to be financed from private sources.

The committee is advised and notes the fact that the foundation will limit any solicitation of funds from the public at large to a single campaign and that such campaign will terminate no later than November 7, 1965, the third anniversary of Mrs. Roosevelt's death.

The committee is of the opinion that the creation of this foundation is a worthy tribute to a woman of tireless energy and devotion to her principles and to humanity. Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 4715, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation."

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, routine business was transacted.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) to make correction in the enrollment of S. 1035.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87–346, relating to dual-rate contracts, and it was signed by the Vice President.

THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 119); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, for obligations incurred during the 87th Congress, $300 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

REPORT ENTITLED "NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 106)

Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 266, 87th Congress, 2d session, as extended, submitted a report entitled "National Penitentiaries," which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 107)

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 267, 87th Congress, 2d session, as extended, submitted a report entitled "Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights," which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 108)

Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 256, 87th Congress, 2d session, as extended, submitted a report entitled "Administrative Practice and Procedure," which was ordered to be printed.

WILDERNESS ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 109)

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 4) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask that the report be printed, together with minority views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. ANDERSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I am advised that the minority report on S. 4, the wilderness bill, is not yet ready. Earlier today, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] on my behalf, filed the majority report, and obtained permission for publication of the report, together with minority views.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to delay the printing of the report on S. 4 a day to permit the minority to complete their statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. Clark):

S. 1261. A bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Javits):

S. 1262. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least 20 quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1263. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1264. A bill to amend title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1265. A bill to amend section 453 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the status thereunder of certain types of installment plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1266. A bill to amend section 2276 of the Revised Statutes in order to extend the right of selection granted therein to the States to unsurveyed unappropriated public lands; and

S. 1267. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $80,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway in Utah connecting the national parks and monuments in the southwestern part of Utah and northwestern part of Arizona with the national monuments and recreation areas in the south-central and southeastern parts of Utah and southwestern part of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BENNETT subsequently said: Mr. President, today I introduced Senate bill 1266 and Senate bill 1267. At this time I ask that the bills be held at the desk until the close of the first day of business of the Senate next week, so that other Senators may have an opportunity to join in sponsoring the bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Javits):

S. 1268. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A CHANGE IN THE ENROLLMENT OF SENATE BILL 1035

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for Mr. Magnuson) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) authorizing a change in the enrollment of S. 1035, relating to dual rate contracts, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Williams of New Jersey (for Mr. Magnuson), which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION—ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 119) to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Eastland, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, RELATING TO REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN VESSEL CONSTRUCTION EXPENSES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for reimbursement to certain U.S. shipping lines of all additional costs incurred by the lines by reason of the allocation by the Secretary of Commerce, as a matter of public policy, of construction contracts on their vessels to shipyards other than that of the lowest responsible bidder.

This proposed legislation, in somewhat different form, was considered and reported favorably by both Senate and House committees during the 87th Congress, but too late in the closing session for final action.

Present law provides that in the event of such allocation of vessel construction, if the contract made with the nonlow-bid shipyard provides for a price in excess of the lowest responsible bid which otherwise would have been accepted, that excess cost shall be borne by Government as part of the cost of national defense. However, this provision, as interpreted by the Secretary of Commerce, does not apply to expenses incurred by the shipowner for inspection and supervision of the vessel during construction, and for delivery of the vessel, in excess of the estimated expenses for the same services that he would have incurred if the vessel had been constructed by the lowest responsible bidder. The proposed bill would make clear that such additional costs should not devolve upon the shipowner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1263) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

IMPROVEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS STUDIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to broaden the National Defense Education Act to provide for training of students and teachers for work in international affairs at home and abroad.

This amendment is required to meet the growing national need for expertise in international affairs. The bill is an outgrowth of a Library of Congress survey of 32 universities and colleges in the United States, conducted at my request, which emphasized the need for expanding and improving programs in international affairs studies.

The amendment would, first, provide grants to colleges and universities to help in the establishment and operation of international affairs programs to train individuals for oversea business or government work, for work in the U.S. in international affairs, or for teaching or research work in international affairs; second, provide stipends for students undergoing advanced training in order to reach international affairs in colleges; and third, provide grants to colleges to help in the establishment of short-term institutes on international affairs for high school teachers, with stipends for those participating in the program.

The bill would add less than $3½ million to the $229 million appropriation request for the National Defense Education Act in fiscal 1964.

A greater number of students, teachers, businessmen, professional people and government officials must be better prepared to deal with the growing challenges and opportunities in the international field. The increasing responsibilities inherent in U.S. free world leadership require additional efforts to improve the quality and expand the scope of international affairs studies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1264) to amend title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CLARIFICATION OF STATUS OF CERTAIN TYPES OF INSTALLMENT LOANS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, there is presently a practice in retail selling to installment sales which has been accepted by Internal Revenue in connection with tax liability. The seller prorates in a tax year that portion of the gross profit on an item which is in direct ratio to the relationship between amount paid in that year and total contract price.

This bill would simply define installment sale for the purpose of this section of the Internal Revenue Code, and I now introduce it for appropriate reference, and ask that the bill be printed at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1265) to amend section 453(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the status thereunder of certain types of installment plans, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Hartke, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND DISABILITY INSURANCE PROVISIONS FOR THE BLIND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference two bills that would make certain adjustments in the disability insurance cash benefits of title II of the Social Security Act of 1935. The objective of both bills is to provide a more adequate floor of financial security for our blind fellow citizens.

The distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] have joined with me as cosponsors of these bills.

Several years ago I had the privilege of attending a convention of sightless men and women in Minnesota. Through such meetings and personal friendships with sightless men and women, I have gained much deeper insight about the nature and condition of blindness.

I have learned that blindness is a physical loss, a loss of the physical ability of a person to see. Severe as this loss is, it should be accepted as this. But I have learned that it is much more.

Unfortunately blind persons are still confronted by barriers of prejudice, misinformation, and misconceptions about their loss and its effects on their lives. These barriers, unreasoned, and reasonable, deny to the blind the opportunity to compete on the basis of equality with their sighted fellows, even though many are able, qualified, and desirous of doing so.

The greatest loss resulting from the occurrence of blindness is an economic loss. My bills are designed to minimize the disastrous economic and social consequences which follow the occurrence of blindness. They are designed to assure a blind person a degree of minimum financial security to free him from the severe pressure of unpaid bills and necessities of life.

The bills I have introduced would include in the Federal disability insurance program the generally recognized, a commonly accepted and used definition of blindness; that is, blindness is central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with correcting lenses, or visual acuity greater than 20/200 if accompanied by a limitation in the field of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than 20°.

My first bill would provide that those who meet this definition of visual loss and who have been employed in covered employment for a year and a half—six quarters—would be entitled to collect disability insurance cash benefits, and their entitlement to draw such cash benefits would continue so long as such individual remains disabled by blindness.

To make cash payments available to the blind after working for six quarters in covered employment is to recognize that the usual kinds of jobs they are able to secure are such that reducing the number of quarters of work required to establish a right to claim benefits is fair and reasonable.

Allowing blind persons to continue to draw cash benefits so long as they remain blind, even though they may be employed, is to place entitlement to receive benefits where it belongs, upon the existence and the continuing existence of a physical disability, the very existence of which results in a sustained economic loss.

To base entitlement to receive benefits upon the disability of blindness is to recognize that extra expenses are incurred when people without sight live in a sighted environment, when they must function in a society run by and for those with vision.

I have offered this proposal in two previous Congresses. I am most hopeful that this bill will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

However, Mr. President, if Congress is not willing to make such a reduction in the number of quarters from the presently required 20 to 6, that is, if it is not willing to lessen the length of time required for entitlement to receive cash benefits, I reluctantly introduce an alternative bill providing that a person who meets the generally accepted definition of blindness and who has worked for the presently required 20 quarters be allowed to qualify for payment of cash disability benefits so long as he remains blind.

Both of my bills do nothing more than make the disability insurance program under social security in fact a program providing financial protection against the economic hardships, yes, the economic inequities, resulting from blindness.

I believe that those who are blind should be permitted to draw cash benefits so long as they remain blind even though they may be working and earning, for they must meet additional costs to offset the handicapping consequences of their disability—they must pay certain "equalizing" costs when they would live and compete with men with sight, when they would function without sight in a sighted economy.

Mr. President, another provision which is identical in both of my bills would delete the present requirement that an applicant for or recipient of disability insurance cash benefits must accept vocational rehabilitation services or forfeit his cash payments.

This provision of Federal law, I think, is a refutation of the disability insurance program as social insurance, offering protection to participants against the economic consequences of a physical or mental disability. Rehabilitation results from aroused desire, awakened hope, stimulated ambition, it does not, nor can it, result from threats or coercion. The provision of law which would require rehabilitation "under the gun" is retrogressive and a contradiction of the very meaning of the term "rehabilitation."

This provision should be deleted from the existing law.

Mr. President, passage of either bill would diminish the serious economic disadvantage resulting from loss of sight. With this floor of financial security, sightless Americans will be better able to use and develop their talents and abilities for the benefit of the entire Nation.

As each person functions fully in our democratic society, as each contributes in accordance with his true capacities, the entire Nation is the ultimate beneficiary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of both bills be printed in the RECORD at this point. I also ask unanimous consent that the bills remain at the desk for 3 days for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD, and will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Senators RANDOLPH and JAVITS) were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1268. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a)(1) section 223 (a)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(B) in the case of any individual (other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in subsection (c)(2)), has not attained the age of sixty-five,".

(2) Subsection (a)(1) of section 223 of such Act is amended by striking out "the month in which he attains age sixty-five" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the case of any individual (other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in subsection (c)(2), the month in which he attains age sixty-five".

(3) That part of paragraph (2) of section 223(a) of such Act which precedes subparagraph (A) thereof is amended by inserting immediately after "(if a man)" the following: ", and (in the case of any individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in subsection (c)(2)) as though he were a fully insured individual,".

(b)(1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 223 of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in paragraph (2))" after "An individual"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "An individual whose disability is blindness (as defined in paragraph (2)) shall be insured for disability insurance benefits in any month if he had not less than six quarters of coverage before the quarter in which such month occurs.".

(2) Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 223 of such Act is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The term 'disability' means (A) inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration, or (B) blindness. The term 'blindness' means central visual acuity of twenty/two hundred or less in the better eye with the use of correcting lenses, or visual acuity greater than twenty/two hundred if accompanied by a limitation in the fields of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than twenty degrees".

(c)(1) The first sentence of section 216(i)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "(B)" and all that follows, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(B) blindness (as defined in section 223(c)(2))."

(2) The second sentence of such section 216(i)(1) is hereby repealed.

(d) The first sentence of section 222(b)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting "(other than such an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in section 223(c)(2))" after "an individual entitled to disability insurance benefits".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after the month in which this Act is enacted, on the basis of applications for such benefits filed in or after such month.

S. 1262. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least 20 quarters of coverage, and for other purposes:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) section 223(a)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(B) in the case of any individual (other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in subsection (c)(2)), has not attained the age of sixty-five,".

(2) Subsection (a)(1) of section 223 of such Act is amended by striking out "the month in which he attains age sixty-five" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the case of any individual (other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in subsection (c)(2)), the month in which he attains age sixty-five".

(3) That part of paragraph (2) of section 223(a) of such Act which precedes subparagraph (A) thereof is amended by inserting immediately after "(if a man)" the following: ", and (in the case of any individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in subsection (c)(2)) as though he were a fully insured individual,".

(b)(1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 223 of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in paragraph (2))" after "An individual"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "An individual whose disability is blindness (as defined in paragraph (2)) shall be insured for disability insurance benefits in any month if he had not less than twenty quarters of coverage before the quarter in which such month occurs.".

(2) Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 223 of such Act is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in

lieu thereof the following: "The term 'disability' means (A) inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration, or (B) blindness. The term 'blindness' means central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with the use of correcting lenses, or visual acuity greater than 20/200 if accompanied by a limitation in the fields of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than twenty degrees.".

(c) (1) The first sentence of section 216 (i)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "(B)" and all that follows, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(B) blindness (as defined in section 233(c)(2))."

(2) The second sentence of such section 216(i)(1) is hereby repealed.

(d) The first sentence of section 222(b) (1) of such Act is amended by inserting "(other than such an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in section 223 (c)(2))" after "an individual entitled to disability insurance benefits".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after the month in which this Act is enacted, on the basis of applications for such benefits filed in or after such month.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963—AMENDMENT

Mr. RIBICOFF submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the amendment proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations I desire to announce that the Senate today received the nomination of David Elliott Bell, of Massachusetts, to be Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 3, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87-346, relating to dual rate contracts.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Statement entitled "A Message for Our Senior Citizens."

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

Article entitled "The Government and U.S. Agricultural Exports," written by Senator MUNDT and published in the Aberdeen American News, Aberdeen, S. Dak., on March 24, 1963.

TRIBUTE TO HORACE M. ALBRIGHT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Mr. Fred J. Martin, of the Park County News in Livingston, Mont., has called my attention to an article in the March issue of Fortune magazine entitled "Businessmen Who Love the Land." It summarizes the outstanding work which businessmen are doing to preserve our great natural and irreplaceable heritage of wood, water, coast, and wildlife.

My attention was drawn particularly to the contribution of Horace M. Albright, the retired president of the U.S. Potash Co., who is listed as the "Dean of American Conservationists," and who simultaneously led two great conservation fights, one for the redwoods in the West, and the other for the Hudson River palisades in the East. This type of quiet service to present and future generations of Americans warrants national recognition, and I ask unanimous consent that the brief description of Mr. Horace M. Albright's life and work which is contained in Fortune magazine be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the description was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Horace M. Albright, retired president of U.S. Potash Co. (a predecessor of U.S. Borax & Chemical Corp.), might be called dean of American conservationists. Born in the shadow of California's High Sierra, he joined the legal staff of the Secretary of the Interior in 1913, and helped draft the legislation that created the National Park Service. He became Assistant Director of the Service, Superintendent of Yellowstone, and finally Park Service Director in 1929. Though he had his hands full as vice president and general manager of U.S. Potash after 1933, he raised funds for California's save-the-redwoods movement on one coast while serving as a member of the New York-New Jersey Palisades Interstate Park Commission on the other. He advised on the 1962 ORRRC report. Albright is pictured in a favorite natural setting, a grove of California redwoods named for Naturalist John Muir.

WEST VIRGINIANS PRESENT AS VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS HOLD ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL BANQUET—LEWIS BREWER REPRESENTS STATE IN VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST—SENATE VETERANS COMMITTEE ADVOCATED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 2, the Veterans of Foreign Wars held their annual banquet honoring Members of Congress who have served in the Armed Forces. With other of my colleagues, and members of the West Virginia delegation, I was privileged to be a guest of our State's servicemen at the event attended by national officials, local VFW delegates, and respected persons who are active in veterans' programs.

Representing West Virginia on this significant occasion were: Departmental Commander James R. Fawcett, of Grafton, W. Va.; Leo C. Shuck, senior vice commander, from Keyser; John L. Frazier, State junior vice commander, of Morgantown; and Ralph Stump, quartermaster-adjutant, from St. Albans.

Other delegates from the Mountain State were: E. Nelson Berd, Martinsburg; C. S. Collier, Jr., Charleston; Leonard E. DeWitt, Wellsburg; Charles Dodson, Martinsburg; Wayne Feist, Sistersville; Claude W. Hedges, Martinsburg; Joseph C. Hess, Martinsburg; Richard Homan, Sugar Grove; Ralph Honaker, Huntington; Kelton E. Houghton, Huntington; Roland Lex, Grafton; Mel Linton, Huntington; Lonzo Lockard, Martinsburg; Dave Lowery, Weirton; Don S. Maupin, Moundsville; Lee McDonald, Martinsburg; and Richard Weidlich, Weston.

Also at this gathering was Maj. Harry T. Chapin, formerly of Charleston, and now residing in Virginia, who has been an active VFW member for 50 years. When introduced, Mr. Chapin was given a lusty cheer. He is now 89 years young, served as West Virginia Departmental Commander during 1930–31. For 30 years he lived in our State, and was connected with the U.S. Naval Ordnance Works in the Kanawha Valley.

One highlight of this inspiring and entertaining evening was the presentation of scholarship awards to the high school students adjudged winners in the National Voice of Democracy essay contest, sponsored annually by VFW. I was gratified that Lewis Brewer, of Mannington High School, was present to receive his scholarship, and the congratulations of those assembled. This lad was one of 2,000 young men and women who entered the contest in West Virginia, and after being selected as 1 of the 10 district finalists, his essay was chosen as the outstanding one from our State. He is a junior, and an "A" student interested in chemistry, and a future leader who will doubtless continue to bring credit to himself and his family, his community, and to his native State.

Mr. President, the event of the Veterans of Foreign Wars was especially meaningful to me because it provided an excellent opportunity to confer with knowledgeable Americans on certain of the problems which today confront veterans. Earlier in the day these citizens had visited the offices of many of the Members of Congress, including my own, to talk over particular areas of legislative interest.

Among those proposals discussed and which has elicited wide support throughout the country was Senate Resolution 48, a bill to amend the Rules of the Senate to provide for a permanent Committee on Veterans' Affairs. As a cosponsor of this measure, along with several other Members, I am convinced that the magnitude and scope of problems and interests now facing veterans requires the establishment of a full-time and qualified Senate committee to administer to their needs. Likewise, I am confident that after thorough examination of the situation as it exists today, my colleagues will be moved to agree, and we will proceed to expeditious and favorable action on Senate Resolution 48.

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the greatest blessing we have as Americans is the wonderful gift of personal freedom which is denied over half the world.

A senior at the high school in Lander, Wyo., Miss Valerie Goss, expressed in beautiful and compelling prose the meaning of freedom in an essay that won for her State honors in the Voice of Democracy contest.

Freedom is—as Miss Goss so accurately describes it—an intensely personal thing that all of us as Americans possess at birth. We will pass it on to our children only as long as we dedicate ourselves to preserving it.

With the consent of the Senate I should like to place Miss Goss' award-winning essay, "What Freedom Means to Me," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

An intensely personal thing, freedom.

I'm not going to tell you what freedom isn't.

With my own eyes I see freedom around me. It is a quiet thing generally. Young people in a library, or listening attentively to a teacher lecture. It can be as beautifully silent as people praying in a church, or as noisy as political campaigns with brass blaring, cheering and fiery oratory.

Freedom is security—not stocks, bonds, dividends and interest, but security. The right to wake up in the morning and feel alive. The right to experience and feel all the wonders and sorrows of living. I said that freedom is an intensely personal thing, and it is.

Freedom is as small a thing as being able to leave your home in the morning. It grows as the morning grows. A person gets into a car and drives away on a trip crossing State lines and boundaries uninterrupted by police inspection or a demand for identification. Certainly, this is freedom.

I work—have worked. I have had a number of jobs. I quit one when school started and was able to choose another that interested me. The freedom to work as one wants to work. When I collect my pay I am free to spend it on the ample bounty that freedom provides. When I pay for a thing, it is mine. I own it. The thing becomes a part of the meaning of me.

There, that's it—the meaning of me. The meaning of me and freedom are so closely allied that it becomes impossible to separate the identities. Most of all, I think that freedom is me. I live in a state of unhampered abundance of myself and my mind. No, not in any conceited or egotistical way, but in a manner that permits me to become, if I accept the responsibility, a fully developed and knowledgeable person.

Laws are made, have been made giving me the right to be myself. I can get angry and criticize the police, the Government—there will be no reprisals, no violence done to me. Sometimes I tend to abuse this privilege and forget the enormous responsibility which accompanies it. If I have this right, then those whom I criticize also have the same right. Their opinions and beliefs are to be respected—by me. I tend to forget it in the complete security that freedom becomes.

And when I realize this, I realize that perhaps the greatest threat to freedom is selfishness.

It is a sobering thought. The kind of a thought that makes me wonder if I have been damaging freedom, my own freedom and sense of security in other ways. I must ask myself, what other freedoms do I enjoy?

I have beliefs. I am entitled to them.

I have ambitions. I am obligated to them.

I have needs and desires, fears, and worries. Yet I am positive that my life will find a way to fulfill and overcome them.

What are the instruments of freedom that allow this? I am safeguarded by law. Laws which are closely and carefully scrutinized for their fairness, for their complete consideration of the individual living the law. No one shall be favored; no one shall be deprived. What a perfect, yet simple and sensible thing is the law. Despite its complexity, it can be reduced to a statement of principles. No one shall be favored; no one shall be deprived. Even those small and annoying representatives of the law, such as stoplights, are there to prevent me from infringement of the security of others' freedom. They, in turn, are respecting me and my rights in such a small thing as stopping for a traffic signal.

When I study at the library on week nights, I often get a great impression of the stacks of books—sentinels of knowledge. Knowledge guarding me and my rights. I have a sense of heritage before so much knowledge. The more I study it, the greater is my sense that all knowledge seems to reaffirm and convince that freedom is the inevitable course of good and right.

I think one of the places most Americans stop and get a sense of freedom is in our massive accomplishments, cities with skyscrapers, gigantic dams, and hydraulic stations—on Mount Rushmore with those serene faces. It takes something massive and big to commemorate the vastness and amplitude of freedom.

And yet, it is so completely a personal thing. Quiet, noisy, small, in any size—freedom is the person who is free. Freedom is the guarantee of the person. To someone like me who is in the process of becoming an adult citizen—freedom is thoroughly linked with the process of maturation of personality.

Yes, freedom is such an intensely personal thing.

CUBA

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in the face of the administration's utterances on behalf of the cause of Cuban freedom the weekend action in restricting Cuban exile leaders, together with announcement of the U.S. role in the capture of an exile ship in the Caribbean must make pretty frustrating and unsavory fare for the American public.

The Justice Department has invoked the Neutrality Act to justify a halt to refugee attempts to encourage guerrilla activity in Cuba by showing that there still exists an anti-Castro resistance effort.

It is not hard to imagine the frustration of the quarter million exiles as they watch their nation being raped and ravaged by a Communist regime dominated by European communism, in direct violation of the Monroe Doctrine and every moral tenet to which this Nation has ever subscribed.

The Cubans watched the United States ramrod the half-planned Bay of Pigs invasion and then refuse even to pick the wounded off the beaches. They watched the United States vacillate, and make indecisiveness the cornerstone of its Cuban policy, and last month they saw the issue of Communist Cuba quietly brushed under the rug at Costa Rica.

It now seems to those Cubans—who owe much of their misfortune to the ineptitudes of this Government—that we have done an about-face in even the simple concept of right and wrong.

The blockade of which the White House is in such fear has again been imposed, only this time it is a blockade around the exiles themselves while the bearded dictator of Cuba languishes in the safety of our protective coexistence policy.

A realization of the admissions inherent in the administration's antiexile action was not long in coming. The restrictions, at first praised by both parties and the press, are now being strongly questioned.

Yesterday's press carried two excellent editorials which presented some valid political and moral arguments favoring the refugees' position and giving the United States—as the Nation which once symbolized freedom to the world's oppressed people—something to think about.

I recommend to my constituents a Washington Star editorial by publisher and columnist David Lawrence, and an article by Virginia Prewett in the Washington News, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 2, 1963]

POLICY OF INACTION AGAINST CUBA—U.S. EFFORTS AGAINST ANTI-CASTRO ATTACKS DESCRIBED AS RESULT OF CONFUSION

(By David Lawrence)

Confusion, if not frustration, today characterizes the policy of the administration toward Cuba.

Nearly 2 weeks have passed since President Kennedy told a news conference that the Soviet Government had withdrawn only 3,000 troops out of the 17,000 stationed on Cuban soil. He then added:

"We are waiting to see whether more will be withdrawn, as we would hope they would be. The month of March is not finished yet and we should have a clearer idea as to what the total numbers should be in the coming days."

The month of March has passed, but the clearer idea has still not materialized. The only action that has been taken by the administration is a sharp warning—not directed to the Russian Government—but to the poor Cubans who have bravely attempted to raid ports and start guerrilla action such as Fidel Castro himself employed when he fought his way into power.

It seems to be regarded as legitimate for the United States to encourage and assist in guerrilla-type warfare in south Vietnam against Communists there, but somehow the effort of the Cuban patriots to rescue their own country by similar tactics is frowned upon officially in formal announcements from the Department of State and the Department of Justice. Neutrality laws are cited as standing in the way. It is announced that such laws will be enforced by the arrest of those Cuban patriots who attempt to launch from American territory any expeditions to wrest their homeland from Mr. Castro and the Soviet troops.

Contradiction after contradiction, moreover, has emerged to becloud the statements issued by the U.S. Government. To take refuge in the neutrality laws seems to be in conflict with the following declaration on March 12 by Secretary of State Dean Rusk:

"Then we have felt, along with many others of our allies, that the kind of Cuban regime that we have today not only is not fit to participate as a regime in the activities of the inter-American system, but that with its declaration of subversive and other types of war upon the hemisphere, it is not entitled to normal economic or other relations with the free world."

The neutrality laws were plainly designed to apply to expeditions started on U.S. territory against countries with which the United States maintains friendly and normal relations. But a state of war now exists, for all practical purposes, between Cuba and the United States. Also, a blockade was undertaken last autumn, and foreign ships were intercepted by the U.S. Navy. In recent weeks Soviet-built Mig's, flying from Cuba, have attacked unarmed American ships.

In the last several months, moreover, a hostile military operation, involving the erection of bases equipped with missiles as well as bomber planes, had been carried on inside the territory of Cuba. This was aimed at the United States. One wonders what more proof the Government here needs that any steps taken by this country to protect itself are proper under international law and that so-called neutrality laws do not apply in the present circumstances to Cuba.

Actually, the constant use of air surveillance by the United States over Cuban territory is not really in line with the customary interpretation of the concept of "neutrality." The continuous pressure by the Government here upon other governments to boycott all trade with Cuba is also hardly "neutral."

Secretary Rusk, in his March 12 speech, said:

"Now, we are discovering with regard to Cuba that, having failed to take the steps that might have prevented in years past the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, that the problem of finding a cure is more difficult."

The foregoing might well be paraphrased and applied today as the administration, instead of finding a cure, permits the Soviets to strengthen their hold inside Cuba. It has even enlisted the help of Great Britain's navy to keep Cuban patriots from attempting to regain their homeland.

Mr. Rusk also said in his speech that "the presence of Soviet forces in this hemisphere cannot be accepted as a part of the normal situation in this hemisphere."

But the Soviets not only have been infiltrating Guatemala and Brazil, but they are still maintaining a military force in Cuba, less than a hundred miles away from the coast of this country.

Senator STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Military Affairs, said in a speech the other day that, "without positive action on our part, our neighbors to the south may fall one by one until the entire hemisphere is lost to us." He added that he was convinced that "the Cuban situation is the most immediate, pressing, and important problem facing our Nation today."

Yet the administration is using its influence to discourage a counterrevolutionary movement against the Castro regime, which deliberately invited the Soviet Government to send troops and build missile bases in Cuba. How can the United States justify a policy of inaction against the Havana regime and invoke "neutrality" laws against the only individuals who wish to risk "their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor" to overthrow a tyrannical dictatorship?

[From the Washington News, Apr. 2, 1963]

U.S. POLICY ON CUBA DEPLORED

(By Virginia Prewett)

The U.S. State Department spokesman who called the daring and gallant Alpha 66 raids on Cuba "irresponsible acts" that helped Castro's cause reached an alltime low in pronouncement of U.S. foreign policy.

In Biblical times, the authors of this statement would have assailed young David for going up against Goliath. They'd have said his inspiring victory of right over might "helped the Philistines." And they'd probably have taken away his slingshot.

In colonial times, these spokesmen would have condemned the Boston Tea Party as "irresponsible"—and said it helped the British.

They would have deplored the French maquis' harassment of the Nazi occupation troops while Hitler ruled Europe.

OFFICIAL

For years, U.S. cold war propaganda has failed the gallant Hungarian freedom fighters who challenged Communist power. Yet last week, the world's greatest democracy officially chided Cuba's dedicated young patriots for proving that the fortress Cuba is not invulnerable.

When the State Department calls these raids "irresponsible," by inference they repudiate every freedom fighter who takes up arms against communism.

In Vietnam, young Americans are being killed by Communists with Russia-supplied arms. Yet in Caribbean, when young Cubans harass their betrayer, Castro, and the Russian occupation, the U.S. State Department deplores it.

STANDOFF

Why? Will the nuclear set now tell us that unless we stop the Alpha 66 raids against Communist Cuba, there'll be nuclear conflict?

This will sound fairly thin, since Defense Secretary Robert McNamara himself last week told Congress that we are in a "nuclear standoff" with Russia.

The U.S. State Department knows very well that the Alpha 66 raids are part of a strategy aimed at overthrowing Castro. Every raid is followed by a burst of sabotage against the Russian occupation. Does our State Department not want this occupation harassed?

Responsible members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee tell me they cannot believe the Department spoke seriously against the Cuban patriots. They believe this is an another example of our Government's use of the forked tongue—as advocated in the managed news policy. If this is true, the authors of this latest managed lie ought to be taken out of their fear-distorted environment and subjected to the influence of ordinary people who respect courage and hate tyranny.

The U.S. Information Service Chief Edward R. Murrow, last week pleaded with Congress for a 25 percent increase in his operation's budget. So long as the U.S. State Department's spokesmen are too terrified to stand behind the principle of freedom and to help our friends, as President Kennedy promised in his election pledges, then all the money spent for U.S. propaganda will be so much paper and tarnishable silver down the drain.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE ELDERLY

NEED FOR ACTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the need for a fiscally sound method of financing health care in old age has become severe in the past decade. In part, the problem is due to the spectacular progress that has been made in medical technology, which has been a principal reason for the greater numbers of people who live to suffer the illnesses that accompany old age. Changing technology has also rapidly increased the cost of medical care. For the aged, the increasing cost of health care and the increasing need for it have not been matched by an adequate method of financing it.

The crux of the problem of paying for health care in old age can be summed up in a few words. The average health costs of people age 65 and over are twice as high as those of younger people while the incomes of the older group are only half as high. A look at the facts is enough to show that there can be no doubt about the magnitude of the problem.

First. Nine out of ten elderly people go to the hospital at least once between age 65 and death. Most people who reach age 65 go to a hospital two or three times before they die; an elderly couple can expect about five hospital stays during their later years.

Second. When a person aged 65 or over goes to a hospital he stays, on the average, 15 days, twice as long as does the average younger person.

Third. Only half of the couples headed by an elderly person have incomes of as much as $2,500 per year; the comparable figure for younger couples is $5,300 a year.

Fourth. Only about half of the people 65 or over who live alone have incomes of more than $1,000 a year; half of the younger people who live alone have incomes exceeding $2,500 a year.

Fifth. About one-half of the elderly have no health insurance; and much of the health insurance that the other half has is worth very little to them in the event of a serious illness.

Sixth. The cost of a day's care in a hospital more than doubled from 1951 to 1961; during those 10 years the average daily costs went up from $16.77 to $34.98. In Minnesota, hospital costs are running slightly ahead of the national average.

PRIVATE INSURANCE ALONE IS NO SOLUTION

Only about half the aged have any kind of health insurance. And much of it is inadequate. For example, many health insurance policies for older citizens pay only $10 a day for no more than 30 days of hospital room and board and even less adequate amounts toward other hospital costs. The obvious reason that more older people don't have fully adequate private insurance protection is that they cannot afford the premiums for plans that offer sufficient protection against their inordinately high hospital costs.

The national health survey shows how closely having health insurance in old age is related to the person's ability to continue working, his income and the state of his health. In 1959, for example, the survey found that only 42 percent of the nonworking aged had any kind of health insurance, and only 30 percent of the aged in poorer health had hospital insurance. In addition, the survey showed that only one-third of the

The proposal requires the State, local public body, or agency thereof, to waive the income tax exemption normally enjoyed by such revenue bonds as a condition for the bonds to qualify under the program.

Some of our tax experts have been trying for a long time to destroy the income tax exemption enjoyed by municipal bonds. I am concerned that someone may attempt to use this bill as a precedent to attack the exemption of municipal bonds generally. Therefore, I believe the colloquy between the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Nevada relating to this matter should be reprinted in the debate today to emphasize the point that this bill should not be considered a precedent.

The exemption of the interest on municipal bonds from the Federal income tax has enhanced the marketability of such bonds. Thus, this exemption has contributed substantially to the ability of local communities to cope with some of the complex problems facing them. It should be clearly understood that the waiver of exemption required by this bill in no way reflects on the soundness of the exemption as a general rule.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the appropriate part of the colloquy between the Senator from New Jersey, who has worked so diligently for adequate legislation in this field, and the Senator from Nevada, who presented the Commerce Committee amendments, be printed at this point in the Record. The colloquy originally appeared on page 5336 of the Congressional Record for April 1, 1963.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. Williams of New Jersey. I am very grateful to the Senator for his amplifications and observations. In connection with the provision that the bonds would not carry a tax exemption there might be fear that a precedent would be established that would cut deeply into the historical pattern of financing at the local level. I know that such is not the intention or expectation of the Senator, and that he sees the situation as a case sun generis.

Mr. Cannon. I thank the Senator for bringing up that point. I had not completed my explanation. I intended to cover that one particular provision. One of the other features of the guaranteed bond proposal is a provision that they would not be tax exempt. That provision departs from the usual and customary theory of tax exemption in dealing with municipal bonds. That is in nowise intended to be a precedent for the taxation of municipal bonds, and I, for one, would oppose entering into the field of taxation of municipal bonds generally.

That is a different area entirely. The Federal Government would be asked to guarantee the bonds of the local transportation authority. They might therefore be able to market their bonds at a lesser interest rate than would be possible on the open market today. In my opinion, the private investment segment of our country would be induced to come in under that type of proposal. Such participation is necessary if we are to solve the overall problem, because of its magnitude. But again I say that that is nowise intended to be a precedent. It is intended to be exactly the opposite. A non-tax-exempt provision would be established solely by reason of the fact that the Federal Government would be coming into the picture as a guarantor, just as the Federal Government enters into the picture in FHA and VA guarantee provisions. In both those situations, interest is not exempt from taxation. That is the specific reason why we are trying not to get into that area in the present case.

Also, if a guarantee provision were allowed on tax-exempt bonds, in effect it would place the bonds in a better position from the standpoint of salability than those of the Federal Government.

That, of course, would place the local agencies in an unfair competitive position insofar as the sale of Government securities is concerned.

Mr. Williams of New Jersey. If they were tax exempt?

Mr. Cannon. If they were tax exempt.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I commend the Senator from Nevada [Mr. Cannon] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie] for the amendment. I should like to ask the Senator whether he intends to ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CANNON. I had not particularly intended to do so.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CANNON. I support the Senator from Wyoming in that request.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is an occasion when at least a word ought to be interposed with respect to the amendment now before the Senate and certain other amendments. As the bill came from the Committee on Banking and Currency, it provided $500 million in grants. As the bill came from the Committee on Commerce, it contained grant and loan provisions. The version of the Committee on Commerce was accepted on the floor of the Senate.

The spirit of frugality then began to hover over this great body. This afternoon the grant money authorized was reduced by $125 million. So at this good hour, with the cherry blossom princesses waiting for everyone, the grant money authorized has been reduced by $125 million.

Salvation, it seems to me, is coming. But it comes so slowly. I remember that old spiritual—

> I am inching along, I am inching along,
> I am inching along, my Lord.

We are inching along, but progress is extremely slow.

Why did not the Senate "go the whole hog" and knock out all the grant money and place the measure on the beam and the frequency to which we can tune and hear the voice of the country? I commend the Senate for cutting out $125 million in guaranteed loans. But the amount is not enough for fiscal salvation.

We will vote for the amendment. We only hope and wish that we could embrace all salvation and cut it all out.

Mr. CANNON. We are very happy that the distinguished Senator from Illinois sees at least in part the error of his ways, and we shall be happy to have him with us on the forthcoming vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But it still will not save me.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Am I correct in my assumption that one of the prices for obtaining a guaranteed loan provision in the bill would be that the local subdivision of government must waive its exemption from taxation?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is not correct in that respect. Under one section of the bill, in order to obtain the advantage of the guaranteed bond provision, the local body would have to waive any rights it might have to claim that the bonds which the Government guarantees are tax exempt. Those bonds and those only, would be affected. The amendment would affect no other municipal bonds in any way. The amendment relates only to municipal bonds which the Federal Government would guarantee.

Mr. ERVIN. In order to obtain the benefit of the proposed largesse from the Federal Government, would not the local governmental subdivision be required to waive any exemption from taxation on the bonds that would be covered by the guarantee?

Mr. CANNON. On the revenue of the bonds covered by the guarantee. If they failed to do so, bonds issued under those conditions would be given a preferred position over general obligations of the Treasury.

Mr. ERVIN. I was hoping that I could vote for the amendment, but to me the proposal would put the camel's nose under the tent, and, pro tanto, would require the surrender of what has been conceived to be a constitutional right in part. For that reason, although I should like to protect to some extent the unborn generations of our taxpayers from the obligations they will have to pay under the bill, I cannot vote for that provision.

Mr. CANNON. I say to the Senator that the amendment would only reduce the amount. The amendment would not change the tax-exempt provision at all. The amendment now before the Senate would merely reduce from $500 million to $375 million the amount authorized for guarantees.

The provision to which the Senator referred is in the bill, as the amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 6 has been agreed to.

Mr. ERVIN. With that assurance from the Senator I can vote for the proposed reduction in the amount of the guarantee, because an affirmative vote would manifest some willingness of the Senate to at least temporarily withhold an imposition of an obligation of $125 million on yet unborn generations of American taxpayers. I think that is very nice.

Mr. CANNON. I would certainly help the Senator to keep the camel's nose out from under the tent. I, for one, would oppose any attempt to get into the area of tax exemption with respect to bonds now granted to municipalities.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I think there is some misunderstanding in

the Senate. We would not touch the right of any city or State to issue all the bonds it wished to issue, tax exempt. The city of Cleveland could issue a billion dollars worth of bonds, tax exempt, and use them for transit purposes, if it wished to do so.

All we would say would be, "If you are going to issue some revenue bonds for transit purposes and if we are to guarantee them, we will ask you to forgo any privilege you might have for tax exemption."

Senators have talked about people to be born in the future who will have to pay the bill. The reason the Committee on Commerce did exactly what it did with respect to the bonds is that the committee did not anticipate that taxpayers in the future, with respect to the bonds, would have to pay anything, unless some city should default. I do not think that is going to happen.

We provided for a revolving fund which would adequately take care of any risk the Government might encounter.

If we wanted to put everybody in this country into the transit business—every bank and every investment house—all we would have to do would be to guarantee the bonds and make them tax exempt. Then the Treasury would not be able to sell any other bonds. We thought that would involve a little fiscal irresponsibility, too.

We could sell billions of dollars worth of those bonds now, if they were tax exempt and also guaranteed.

Any city can proceed as it wishes. Any urban center, any State or county, any transit authority, can issue all the bonds it desires to issue, tax exempt, but if we are to guarantee them we will say, "You must forgo that privilege."

We think that is a sound approach.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have great faith in the prophetic powers of my good friend from Washington, and I hope his prophecy will come true. Notwithstanding my great faith in the distinguished Senator from Washington, I have more faith in the declaration in the Scriptures to the effect that:

> He that is surety for a stranger shall smart for it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, that has not been the case in respect to many programs of this nature. It would not be, unless the country itself should turn out to be economically unsound. We do not anticipate that such will happen.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query the distinguished majority leader concerning the program for the remainder of the day and what he expects for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, I express the hope that within the next minute or two the Senate can get to the yea-and-nay vote which has been ordered on the Cannon-Muskie amendment.

After that the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] will offer an amendment, on which he will ask for the yeas and nays, but the Senator is willing to limit the debate to 10 minutes, to be divided 5 minutes to each side.

After the yea-and-nay vote is taken on the Tower amendment, I understand the next amendment to be offered will be one by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], but the vote to be taken on the Tower amendment would be the end of voting for today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations tonight it stand in adjournment to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce, with the concurrence of the minority leader, that there will be no objection to committee meetings tomorrow morning.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will our committee be free to meet tomorrow morning?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent now that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations may meet tomorrow while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations may meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada if he will include me as a cosponsor of the amendment. I am running for election next year, too.

Mr. CANNON. I am very happy to do so.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Cannon-Muskie-Goldwater amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 5, as follows:

[No. 36 Leg.]

YEAS—88

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Edmondson
Ellender
Engle
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Jordan, Idaho
Jordan, N.C.
Keating
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Mechem
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Russell
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—5

Clark
Dodd
Kefauver
Kennedy
Ribicoff

NOT VOTING—7

Hartke
Miller
Moss
Robertson
Smathers
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So the Muskie-Cannon-Goldwater amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 13 and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kennedy in the chair). The amendments offered by the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. It is proposed, on page 16, line 9, to strike out "two" and insert in lieu thereof "one".

On page 16, line 10, to strike out "third" and insert in lieu thereof "half".

On page 18, line 10, to strike out "one-half" and insert in lieu thereof "one-third".

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that debate on these amendments be limited to 10 minutes, 5 minutes to a side, 5 minutes to be controlled by the Senator handling the bill [Mr. Sparkman] and 5 minutes by myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendments.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly to me?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to make a brief announcement. For the information of Senators, I reiterate that the vote on the Tower amendment will be the last vote today.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am delighted to note that the pending bill has now been reduced from a $1 billion bill to a three-quarter billion dollar bill. However, I associate myself with the distinguished minority leader who said that this is far from enough.

In light of this circumstance, since we have reduced the total authorization, I believe there should be a reduction of the Federal participation. My amendment would reduce that Federal participation.

I believe we should reduce the Federal participation in the grant program from two-thirds of the net project cost to one-half of the net project cost, and in the emergency program from one-half of the project cost to one-third of the project cost.

The net project cost is arrived at by figuring the total cost of the project and then deducting the amount expected to be applied on the amortization of the project cost by farebox and other revenues.

If farebox revenues in some situations go merely to pay the operating cost, there are no farebox revenues remaining to apply to the net project cost, and it could result in two-thirds of the total project cost being paid.

Therefore, I believe it is proper to reduce the Federal participation to one-half of the net project cost. For one thing, I believe it would provide a greater incentive to local communities to exercise their own initiative and responsibility in raising the money. I therefore urge the adopton of my amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the purpose of the amendment is to stimulate the initiative of the local people in their own projects and to persuade them to do something to reduce their reliance on Washington. Is that correct?

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator for his statement. He has stated exactly the purpose of my amendment; namely, to stimulate local initiative.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I believe just as strongly as do the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Massachusetts in stimulating local interest and initiative. I believe that the formula under which this bill is drafted will do just that. I admit that 50–50 sounds good, and it is good. However, I call attention to the fact that ever since 1949 we have been operating in urban renewal and slum clearance programs under this same formula. There are a great many local costs that a locality must figure on meeting, and which are not deducted when they come to figuring the net project cost. We have learned from experience in urban renewal that under the two-thirds formula, when all accounts are settled, it is approximately 50 percent; it breaks just about half and half. We have had testimony many times in our committee in which the representatives of the cities told us about the large part of the total cost borne by the cities.

This formula has worked well in urban renewal. It has been well tested over the 13 years it has been operating. We merely propose to apply here to another similar program. The formula is not two-thirds of the gross cost. It is two-thirds of the net project cost. The city makes an estimate of the income from the farebox, and after the operating expenses have been computed, the net project cost is arrived at, and that cost is then divided, two-thirds Federal and one-third local. As I say, many local costs are not taken into consideration in the net project cost.

Mr. TOWER. The net project cost might prove to be the total cost. All we are doing is anticipating the part of the total project cost which would be amortized by revenues. It is possible that there would not be sufficient revenues to amortize that portion of the total cost; therefore the project cost and the total cost might in some instances be the same figure.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower]. The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Kefauver] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Bennett] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 47, as follows:

[No. 37 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Aiken
Allott
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fong
Fulbright
Goldwater
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, La.
McClellan
Mechem
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.

NAYS—47

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Beall
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Cannon
Case
Clark
Dodd
Douglas
Edmondson
Engle
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hayden
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Johnston
Keating
Kennedy
Long, Mo.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Monroney
Morse
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Sparkman
Symington
Williams, N.J.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—9

Bennett
Hartke
Kefauver
Magnuson
Miller
Moss
Smathers
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. Tower's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have printed. I understand that it will be taken up tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 4 beginning with line 22, strike out all through line 14 on page 5, and insert the following:

"(b) (1) No financial assistance shall be made available under this Act to any State or local public body or agency thereof for the purpose, directly, or indirectly, of acquiring any interest in, or purchasing any facilities or other property of a private mass transportation company, or for the purpose of constructing, improving, or reconstructing any facilities or other property acquired, after the effective date of this Act, from any such company; unless (A) such company has, prior to such acquisition, been declared bankrupt or placed into receivership by a court of competent jurisdiction, or (B) the Administrator finds that such assistance is essential to a program, proposed or under active preparation, for the acquisition of mass transportation facilities or property which are supplementary to the service provided by an existing publicly owned or operated mass transportation system, and (C) in either situation under A or B, the Administrator and the Secretary of Labor, acting jointly in accordance with the provisions of section 19(c) of this Act, find that the project to be assisted complies with the requirements set forth therein.

"(b) (2) No financial assistance shall be made available under this act to any State or local public body or agency thereof for the purpose of providing by contract or otherwise for the operation of mass transportation facilities or equipment in competition with, or supplementary to, the service provided by an existing mass transportation company unless (A) the Administrator finds that such assistance is essential to a program, proposed or under active preparation, for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area, (B) the Administrator finds that such program, to the maximum extent feasible, provides for the participation of private mass transportation companies, and (C) the Administrator and the Secretary of Labor, acting jointly in accordance with the provisions of section 19(c) of this Act, find that such program complies with the requirements set forth therein."

On page 26, strike out lines 6 through 23 and insert the following:

"(c) It shall be a condition of the granting of any assistance or the financing of any project under this Act that fair and equitable arrangements are made, as determined jointly by the Administrator and the Secretary of Labor, to protect the interests of employees affected by such assistance or financing. Such protective arrangements shall include, without being limited to, such provisions as may be necessary for (1) the preservation of rights, privileges, and benefits (including the continuation of pension rights and benefits of all beneficiaries) under existing collective bargaining agreements or otherwise; (2) the continuation of collective bargaining in any situation where it now exists; (3) the protection of individual employees against a worsening of their positions with respect to their employment which shall in no event provide benefits less than those established pursuant to the provisions of section 5(2)(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act; (4) assurances of employment to employees of acquired mass transportation systems by the acquiring or operating entities, and priority of employment or reemployment of employees terminated or laid off; and (5) paid training or retraining programs. The contract for the granting of any such assistance shall specify the terms and conditions of such protective arrangements."

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment is as follows:

Amend the proposed amendment offered by Senator Morse by striking "company." at the end of subparagraph (b)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "company; unless such company has, prior to the acquisition, been adjudged bankrupt or placed into receivership by a court of competent jurisdiction."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, how much time remains available on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has 109 minutes remaining; the minority leader has 94 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Chair.

INCORPORATION OF THE ELEANOR ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL FOUNDATION, INC.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily set aside so that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of a measure of some urgency, which will take but a moment. The time which is under control on the mass transit bill will not be affected.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 87, H.R. 4715.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending business will be temporarily laid aside. Calendar No. 87, H.R. 4715, will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 4715) to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, line 23, after the word "Foundation", to strike out the comma and "Incorporated"; on page 3, line 17, after the word "welfare", to strike out "and"; in the same line, after the word "health", to insert a semicolon and "and the furtherance of international good will"; on page 4, after line 8, to strike out:

(5) to solicit, prior to January 1, 1965, and to accept, receive, hold, invest, reinvest, and to use, administer, expend and otherwise dispose of, in the sole and absolute discretion of the board of trustees, gifts, legacies, bequests, devices, grants, funds, money and property of every kind and description, and to apply the income and principal thereof exclusively for the purposes of the corporation by such agencies and means as shall, from time to time, be found appropriate therefor, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limited or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State;

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(5) to take by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest from any public body or agency or any private corporation, association, partnership, firm, or individual, and to hold absolutely or in trust for any of the purposes of the corporation any property, real, personal, or mixed, necessary or convenient for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of the law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State;

And on page 11, line 4, after the word "Foundation", to strike out the comma and "Incorporated".

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there are a number of amendments to the bill. All of them are certainly desirable. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc, since the bill is not controversial. It provides for incorporation of the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brewster in the chair). Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this matter was considered by the Judiciary Committee. The bill has already been passed by the House. Those who are directing the Roosevelt Foundation have suggested various amendments which the committee thinks are desirable and necessary; and the amendments also keep the measure in line as regards the issuance of a Federal charter. Therefore, there is agreement by the committee with the purpose of the charterers.

Therefore the bill comes to us with the agreement of the committee; and I am glad to support the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report on the bill. The excerpt deals with the amendments and with the purpose of the amendments and the purpose of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 105) was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AMENDMENTS

Amendment No. 1: On page 3, line 1, strike the comma and the word "Incorporated".

Amendment No. 2: On page 3, line 18, strike the word "and".

Amendment No. 3: On page 3, line 18, after the word "health" change the period to a semicolon and add the following: "and the furtherance of international good will."

Amendment No. 4: On page 4, commencing on line 9, strike all down to and including the word "State;" on line 22, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(5) to take by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest from any public body or agency or any private corporation, association, partnership, firm, or individual, and to hold absolutely or in trust for any of the purposes of the corporation any property, real, personal, or mixed, necessary or convenient for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of the law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of property which may be held by, or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of property by, a corporation operating in such State;"

Amendment No. 5: On page 10, line 11, after the word "Foundation" strike the comma and the word "Incorporated".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation".

PURPOSE OF AMENDMENTS

The purpose of amendments No. 1 and No. 5 is to remove the word "Incorporated" from the title of the foundation inasmuch as the committee was advised that in the judgment of officials of the Roosevelt Foundation the word "incorporated" is not appropriate in the name of the foundation.

The purpose of amendments No. 2 and No. 3 is to add to the objects and purposes of the foundation the furtherance of international good will.

The purpose of amendment No. 4 is to conform the section relating to acceptance and disposition of property and realty to the standards in all charter bills.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation, as amended, is to confer a Federal charter on the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation.

STATEMENT

The Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation is to be a charitable and educational foundation. The foundation is to devote itself to continuing certain major interests with which Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt was deeply concerned, the relief of the poor and distressed and the underprivileged, the promotion of economic welfare and of public health. The foundation is to be financed from private sources.

The committee is advised and notes the fact that the foundation will limit any solicitation of funds from the public at large to a single campaign and that such campaign will terminate no later than November 7, 1965, the third anniversary of Mrs. Roosevelt's death.

The committee is of the opinion that the creation of this foundation is a worthy tribute to a woman of tireless energy and devotion to her principles and to humanity. Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 4715, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to incorporate the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation."

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, routine business was transacted.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) to make correction in the enrollment of S. 1035.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87–346, relating to dual-rate contracts, and it was signed by the Vice President.

THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1963

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to enforce constitutional rights, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 119); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, for obligations incurred during the 87th Congress, $300 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

REPORT ENTITLED "NATIONAL PENITENTIARIES"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 106)

Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 266, 87th Congress, 2d session, as extended, submitted a report entitled "National Penitentiaries," which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 107)

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 267, 87th Congress, 2d session, as extended, submitted a report entitled "Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights," which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 108)

Mr. LONG of Missouri, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 256, 87th Congress, 2d session, as extended, submitted a report entitled "Administrative Practice and Procedure," which was ordered to be printed.

WILDERNESS ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 109)

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 4) to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask that the report be printed, together with minority views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. ANDERSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I am advised that the minority report on S. 4, the wilderness bill, is not yet ready. Earlier today, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] on my behalf, filed the majority report, and obtained permission for publication of the report, together with minority views.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to delay the printing of the report on S. 4 a day to permit the minority to complete their statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. Clark):

S. 1261. A bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Javits):

S. 1262. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least 20 quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1263. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1264. A bill to amend title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1265. A bill to amend section 453 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the status thereunder of certain types of installment plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1266. A bill to amend section 2276 of the Revised Statutes in order to extend the right of selection granted therein to the States to unsurveyed unappropriated public lands; and

S. 1267. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $80,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway in Utah connecting the national parks and monuments in the southwestern part of Utah and northwestern part of Arizona with the national monuments and recreation areas in the south-central and southeastern parts of Utah and southwestern part of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BENNETT subsequently said: Mr. President, today I introduced Senate bill 1266 and Senate bill 1267. At this time I ask that the bills be held at the desk until the close of the first day of business of the Senate next week, so that other Senators may have an opportunity to join in sponsoring the bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Javits):

S. 1268. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Humphrey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A CHANGE IN THE ENROLLMENT OF SENATE BILL 1035

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for Mr. Magnuson) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) authorizing a change in the enrollment of S. 1035, relating to dual rate contracts, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Williams of New Jersey (for Mr. Magnuson), which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION—ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 119) to provide additional funds for the Committee on the Judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Eastland, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, RELATING TO REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN VESSEL CONSTRUCTION EXPENSES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for reimbursement to certain U.S. shipping lines of all additional costs incurred by the lines by reason of the allocation by the Secretary of Commerce, as a matter of public policy, of construction contracts on their vessels to shipyards other than that of the lowest responsible bidder.

This proposed legislation, in somewhat different form, was considered and reported favorably by both Senate and House committees during the 87th Congress, but too late in the closing session for final action.

Present law provides that in the event of such allocation of vessel construction, if the contract made with the nonlow-bid shipyard provides for a price in excess of the lowest responsible bid which otherwise would have been accepted, that excess cost shall be borne by Government as part of the cost of national defense. However, this provision, as interpreted by the Secretary of Commerce, does not apply to expenses incurred by the shipowner for inspection and supervision of the vessel during construction, and for delivery of the vessel, in excess of the estimated expenses for the same services that he would have incurred if the vessel had been constructed by the lowest responsible bidder. The proposed bill would make clear that such additional costs should not devolve upon the shipowner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. Ribicoff in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1263) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

IMPROVEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS STUDIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to broaden the National Defense Education Act to provide for training of students and teachers for work in international affairs at home and abroad.

This amendment is required to meet the growing national need for expertise in international affairs. The bill is an outgrowth of a Library of Congress survey of 32 universities and colleges in the United States, conducted at my request, which emphasized the need for expanding and improving programs in international affairs studies.

The amendment would, first, provide grants to colleges and universities to help in the establishment and operation of international affairs programs to train individuals for oversea business or government work, for work in the U.S. in international affairs, or for teaching or research work in international affairs; second, provide stipends for students undergoing advanced training in order to reach international affairs in colleges; and third, provide grants to colleges to help in the establishment of short-term institutes on international affairs for high school teachers, with stipends for those participating in the program.

The bill would add less than $3½ million to the $229 million appropriation request for the National Defense Education Act in fiscal 1964.

A greater number of students, teachers, businessmen, professional people and government officials must be better prepared to deal with the growing challenges and opportunities in the international field. The increasing responsibilities inherent in U.S. free world leadership require additional efforts to improve the quality and expand the scope of international affairs studies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1264) to amend title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CLARIFICATION OF STATUS OF CERTAIN TYPES OF INSTALLMENT LOANS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, there is presently a practice in retail selling to installment sales which has been accepted by Internal Revenue in connection with tax liability. The seller prorates in a tax year that portion of the gross profit on an item which is in direct ratio to the relationship between amount paid in that year and total contract price.

This bill would simply define installment sale for the purpose of this section of the Internal Revenue Code, and I now introduce it for appropriate reference, and ask that the bill be printed at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1265) to amend section 453(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the status thereunder of certain types of installment plans, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Hartke, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND DISABILITY INSURANCE PROVISIONS FOR THE BLIND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference two bills that would make certain adjustments in the disability insurance cash benefits of title II of the Social Security Act of 1935. The objective of both bills is to provide a more adequate floor of financial security for our blind fellow citizens.

The distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph] and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] have joined with me as cosponsors of these bills.

Several years ago I had the privilege of attending a convention of sightless men and women in Minnesota. Through such meetings and personal friendships with sightless men and women, I have gained much deeper insight about the nature and condition of blindness.

I have learned that blindness is a physical loss, a loss of the physical ability of a person to see. Severe as this loss is, it should be accepted as this. But I have learned that it is much more.

Unfortunately blind persons are still confronted by barriers of prejudice, misinformation, and misconceptions about their loss and its effects on their lives. These barriers, unreasoned, and reasonable, deny to the blind the opportunity to compete on the basis of equality with their sighted fellows, even though many are able, qualified, and desirous of doing so.

The greatest loss resulting from the occurrence of blindness is an economic loss. My bills are designed to minimize the disastrous economic and social consequences which follow the occurrence of blindness. They are designed to assure a blind person a degree of minimum financial security to free him from the severe pressure of unpaid bills and necessities of life.

The bills I have introduced would include in the Federal disability insurance program the generally recognized, a commonly accepted and used definition of blindness; that is, blindness is central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with correcting lenses, or visual acuity greater than 20/200 if accompanied by a limitation in the field of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than 20°.

My first bill would provide that those who meet this definition of visual loss and who have been employed in covered employment for a year and a half—six quarters—would be entitled to collect disability insurance cash benefits, and their entitlement to draw such cash benefits would continue so long as such individual remains disabled by blindness.

To make cash payments available to the blind after working for six quarters in covered employment is to recognize that the usual kinds of jobs they are able to secure are such that reducing the number of quarters of work required to establish a right to claim benefits is fair and reasonable.

Allowing blind persons to continue to draw cash benefits so long as they remain blind, even though they may be employed, is to place entitlement to receive benefits where it belongs, upon the existence and the continuing existence of a physical disability, the very existence of which results in a sustained economic loss.

To base entitlement to receive benefits upon the disability of blindness is to recognize that extra expenses are incurred when people without sight live in a sighted environment, when they must function in a society run by and for those with vision.

I have offered this proposal in two previous Congresses. I am most hopeful that this bill will receive prompt and favorable consideration.

However, Mr. President, if Congress is not willing to make such a reduction in the number of quarters from the presently required 20 to 6, that is, if it is not willing to lessen the length of time required for entitlement to receive cash benefits, I reluctantly introduce an alternative bill providing that a person who meets the generally accepted definition of blindness and who has worked for the presently required 20 quarters be allowed to qualify for payment of cash disability benefits so long as he remains blind.

Both of my bills do nothing more than make the disability insurance program under social security in fact a program providing financial protection against the economic hardships, yes, the economic inequities, resulting from blindness.

I believe that those who are blind should be permitted to draw cash benefits so long as they remain blind even though they may be working and earning, for they must meet additional costs to offset the handicapping consequences of their disability—they must pay certain "equalizing" costs when they would live and compete with men with sight, when they would function without sight in a sighted economy.

Mr. President, another provision which is identical in both of my bills would delete the present requirement that an applicant for or recipient of disability insurance cash benefits must accept vocational rehabilitation services or forfeit his cash payments.

This provision of Federal law, I think, is a refutation of the disability insurance program as social insurance, offering protection to participants against the economic consequences of a physical or mental disability. Rehabilitation results from aroused desire, awakened hope, stimulated ambition, it does not, nor can it, result from threats or coercion. The provision of law which would require rehabilitation "under the gun" is retrogressive and a contradiction of the very meaning of the term "rehabilitation."

This provision should be deleted from the existing law.

Mr. President, passage of either bill would diminish the serious economic disadvantage resulting from loss of sight. With this floor of financial security, sightless Americans will be better able to use and develop their talents and abilities for the benefit of the entire Nation.

As each person functions fully in our democratic society, as each contributes in accordance with his true capacities, the entire Nation is the ultimate beneficiary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of both bills be printed in the RECORD at this point. I also ask unanimous consent that the bills remain at the desk for 3 days for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD, and will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Senators RANDOLPH and JAVITS) were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1268. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a)(1) section 223 (a)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(B) in the case of any individual (other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in subsection (c)(2)), has not attained the age of sixty-five,".

(2) Subsection (a)(1) of section 223 of such Act is amended by striking out "the month in which he attains age sixty-five" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the case of any individual (other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in subsection (c)(2), the month in which he attains age sixty-five".

(3) That part of paragraph (2) of section 223(a) of such Act which precedes subparagraph (A) thereof is amended by inserting immediately after "(if a man)" the following: ", and (in the case of any individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in subsection (c)(2)) as though he were a fully insured individual,".

(b)(1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 223 of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in paragraph (2))" after "An individual"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "An individual whose disability is blindness (as defined in paragraph (2)) shall be insured for disability insurance benefits in any month if he had not less than six quarters of coverage before the quarter in which such month occurs.".

(2) Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 223 of such Act is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The term 'disability' means (A) inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration, or (B) blindness. The term 'blindness' means central visual acuity of twenty/two hundred or less in the better eye with the use of correcting lenses, or visual acuity greater than twenty/two hundred if accompanied by a limitation in the fields of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than twenty degrees".

(c)(1) The first sentence of section 216(i)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "(B)" and all that follows, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(B) blindness (as defined in section 223(c)(2))."

(2) The second sentence of such section 216(i)(1) is hereby repealed.

(d) The first sentence of section 222(b)(1) of such Act is amended by inserting "(other than such an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in section 223(c)(2))" after "an individual entitled to disability insurance benefits".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after the month in which this Act is enacted, on the basis of applications for such benefits filed in or after such month.

S. 1262. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least 20 quarters of coverage, and for other purposes:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) section 223(a)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(B) in the case of any individual (other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in subsection (c)(2)), has not attained the age of sixty-five,".

(2) Subsection (a)(1) of section 223 of such Act is amended by striking out "the month in which he attains age sixty-five" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the case of any individual (other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in subsection (c)(2)), the month in which he attains age sixty-five".

(3) That part of paragraph (2) of section 223(a) of such Act which precedes subparagraph (A) thereof is amended by inserting immediately after "(if a man)" the following: ", and (in the case of any individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in subsection (c)(2)) as though he were a fully insured individual,".

(b)(1) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 223 of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(other than an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in paragraph (2))" after "An individual"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "An individual whose disability is blindness (as defined in paragraph (2)) shall be insured for disability insurance benefits in any month if he had not less than twenty quarters of coverage before the quarter in which such month occurs.".

(2) Paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 223 of such Act is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in

lieu thereof the following: "The term 'disability' means (A) inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration, or (B) blindness. The term 'blindness' means central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with the use of correcting lenses, or visual acuity greater than 20/200 if accompanied by a limitation in the fields of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle no greater than twenty degrees.".

(c) (1) The first sentence of section 216 (i)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "(B)" and all that follows, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(B) blindness (as defined in section 233(c)(2))."

(2) The second sentence of such section 216(i)(1) is hereby repealed.

(d) The first sentence of section 222(b) (1) of such Act is amended by inserting "(other than such an individual whose disability is blindness, as defined in section 223 (c)(2))" after "an individual entitled to disability insurance benefits".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after the month in which this Act is enacted, on the basis of applications for such benefits filed in or after such month.

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1963—AMENDMENT

Mr. RIBICOFF submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the amendment proposed by Mr. MORSE to the bill (S. 6) to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to provide additional assistance for the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems, both public and private, in metropolitan and other urban areas, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations I desire to announce that the Senate today received the nomination of David Elliott Bell, of Massachusetts, to be Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 3, 1963, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1035) to extend the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 87–346, relating to dual rate contracts.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Statement entitled "A Message for Our Senior Citizens."

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

Article entitled "The Government and U.S. Agricultural Exports," written by Senator MUNDT and published in the Aberdeen American News, Aberdeen, S. Dak., on March 24, 1963.

TRIBUTE TO HORACE M. ALBRIGHT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Mr. Fred J. Martin, of the Park County News in Livingston, Mont., has called my attention to an article in the March issue of Fortune magazine entitled "Businessmen Who Love the Land." It summarizes the outstanding work which businessmen are doing to preserve our great natural and irreplaceable heritage of wood, water, coast, and wildlife.

My attention was drawn particularly to the contribution of Horace M. Albright, the retired president of the U.S. Potash Co., who is listed as the "Dean of American Conservationists," and who simultaneously led two great conservation fights, one for the redwoods in the West, and the other for the Hudson River palisades in the East. This type of quiet service to present and future generations of Americans warrants national recognition, and I ask unanimous consent that the brief description of Mr. Horace M. Albright's life and work which is contained in Fortune magazine be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the description was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Horace M. Albright, retired president of U.S. Potash Co. (a predecessor of U.S. Borax & Chemical Corp.), might be called dean of American conservationists. Born in the shadow of California's High Sierra, he joined the legal staff of the Secretary of the Interior in 1913, and helped draft the legislation that created the National Park Service. He became Assistant Director of the Service, Superintendent of Yellowstone, and finally Park Service Director in 1929. Though he had his hands full as vice president and general manager of U.S. Potash after 1933, he raised funds for California's save-the-redwoods movement on one coast while serving as a member of the New York-New Jersey Palisades Interstate Park Commission on the other. He advised on the 1962 ORRRC report. Albright is pictured in a favorite natural setting, a grove of California redwoods named for Naturalist John Muir.

WEST VIRGINIANS PRESENT AS VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS HOLD ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL BANQUET—LEWIS BREWER REPRESENTS STATE IN VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST—SENATE VETERANS COMMITTEE ADVOCATED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 2, the Veterans of Foreign Wars held their annual banquet honoring Members of Congress who have served in the Armed Forces. With other of my colleagues, and members of the West Virginia delegation, I was privileged to be a guest of our State's servicemen at the event attended by national officials, local VFW delegates, and respected persons who are active in veterans' programs.

Representing West Virginia on this significant occasion were: Departmental Commander James R. Fawcett, of Grafton, W. Va.; Leo C. Shuck, senior vice commander, from Keyser; John L. Frazier, State junior vice commander, of Morgantown; and Ralph Stump, quartermaster-adjutant, from St. Albans.

Other delegates from the Mountain State were: E. Nelson Berd, Martinsburg; C. S. Collier, Jr., Charleston; Leonard E. DeWitt, Wellsburg; Charles Dodson, Martinsburg; Wayne Feist, Sistersville; Claude W. Hedges, Martinsburg; Joseph C. Hess, Martinsburg; Richard Homan, Sugar Grove; Ralph Honaker, Huntington; Kelton E. Houghton, Huntington; Roland Lex, Grafton; Mel Linton, Huntington; Lonzo Lockard, Martinsburg; Dave Lowery, Weirton; Don S. Maupin, Moundsville; Lee McDonald, Martinsburg; and Richard Weidlich, Weston.

Also at this gathering was Maj. Harry T. Chapin, formerly of Charleston, and now residing in Virginia, who has been an active VFW member for 50 years. When introduced, Mr. Chapin was given a lusty cheer. He is now 89 years young, served as West Virginia Departmental Commander during 1930–31. For 30 years he lived in our State, and was connected with the U.S. Naval Ordnance Works in the Kanawha Valley.

One highlight of this inspiring and entertaining evening was the presentation of scholarship awards to the high school students adjudged winners in the National Voice of Democracy essay contest, sponsored annually by VFW. I was gratified that Lewis Brewer, of Mannington High School, was present to receive his scholarship, and the congratulations of those assembled. This lad was one of 2,000 young men and women who entered the contest in West Virginia, and after being selected as 1 of the 10 district finalists, his essay was chosen as the outstanding one from our State. He is a junior, and an "A" student interested in chemistry, and a future leader who will doubtless continue to bring credit to himself and his family, his community, and to his native State.

Mr. President, the event of the Veterans of Foreign Wars was especially meaningful to me because it provided an excellent opportunity to confer with knowledgeable Americans on certain of the problems which today confront veterans. Earlier in the day these citizens had visited the offices of many of the Members of Congress, including my own, to talk over particular areas of legislative interest.

Among those proposals discussed and which has elicited wide support throughout the country was Senate Resolution 48, a bill to amend the Rules of the Senate to provide for a permanent Committee on Veterans' Affairs. As a cosponsor of this measure, along with several other Members, I am convinced that the magnitude and scope of problems and interests now facing veterans requires the establishment of a full-time and qualified Senate committee to administer to their needs. Likewise, I am confident that after thorough examination of the situation as it exists today, my colleagues will be moved to agree, and we will proceed to expeditious and favorable action on Senate Resolution 48.

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the greatest blessing we have as Americans is the wonderful gift of personal freedom which is denied over half the world.

A senior at the high school in Lander, Wyo., Miss Valerie Goss, expressed in beautiful and compelling prose the meaning of freedom in an essay that won for her State honors in the Voice of Democracy contest.

Freedom is—as Miss Goss so accurately describes it—an intensely personal thing that all of us as Americans possess at birth. We will pass it on to our children only as long as we dedicate ourselves to preserving it.

With the consent of the Senate I should like to place Miss Goss' award-winning essay, "What Freedom Means to Me," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

An intensely personal thing, freedom.

I'm not going to tell you what freedom isn't.

With my own eyes I see freedom around me. It is a quiet thing generally. Young people in a library, or listening attentively to a teacher lecture. It can be as beautifully silent as people praying in a church, or as noisy as political campaigns with brass blaring, cheering and fiery oratory.

Freedom is security—not stocks, bonds, dividends and interest, but security. The right to wake up in the morning and feel alive. The right to experience and feel all the wonders and sorrows of living. I said that freedom is an intensely personal thing, and it is.

Freedom is as small a thing as being able to leave your home in the morning. It grows as the morning grows. A person gets into a car and drives away on a trip crossing State lines and boundaries uninterrupted by police inspection or a demand for identification. Certainly, this is freedom.

I work—have worked. I have had a number of jobs. I quit one when school started and was able to choose another that interested me. The freedom to work as one wants to work. When I collect my pay I am free to spend it on the ample bounty that freedom provides. When I pay for a thing, it is mine. I own it. The thing becomes a part of the meaning of me.

There, that's it—the meaning of me. The meaning of me and freedom are so closely allied that it becomes impossible to separate the identities. Most of all, I think that freedom is me. I live in a state of unhampered abundance of myself and my mind. No, not in any conceited or egotistical way, but in a manner that permits me to become, if I accept the responsibility, a fully developed and knowledgeable person.

Laws are made, have been made giving me the right to be myself. I can get angry and criticize the police, the Government—there will be no reprisals, no violence done to me. Sometimes I tend to abuse this privilege and forget the enormous responsibility which accompanies it. If I have this right, then those whom I criticize also have the same right. Their opinions and beliefs are to be respected—by me. I tend to forget it in the complete security that freedom becomes.

And when I realize this, I realize that perhaps the greatest threat to freedom is selfishness.

It is a sobering thought. The kind of a thought that makes me wonder if I have been damaging freedom, my own freedom and sense of security in other ways. I must ask myself, what other freedoms do I enjoy?

I have beliefs. I am entitled to them.

I have ambitions. I am obligated to them.

I have needs and desires, fears, and worries. Yet I am positive that my life will find a way to fulfill and overcome them.

What are the instruments of freedom that allow this? I am safeguarded by law. Laws which are closely and carefully scrutinized for their fairness, for their complete consideration of the individual living the law. No one shall be favored; no one shall be deprived. What a perfect, yet simple and sensible thing is the law. Despite its complexity, it can be reduced to a statement of principles. No one shall be favored; no one shall be deprived. Even those small and annoying representatives of the law, such as stoplights, are there to prevent me from infringement of the security of others' freedom. They, in turn, are respecting me and my rights in such a small thing as stopping for a traffic signal.

When I study at the library on week nights, I often get a great impression of the stacks of books—sentinels of knowledge. Knowledge guarding me and my rights. I have a sense of heritage before so much knowledge. The more I study it, the greater is my sense that all knowledge seems to reaffirm and convince that freedom is the inevitable course of good and right.

I think one of the places most Americans stop and get a sense of freedom is in our massive accomplishments, cities with skyscrapers, gigantic dams, and hydraulic stations—on Mount Rushmore with those serene faces. It takes something massive and big to commemorate the vastness and amplitude of freedom.

And yet, it is so completely a personal thing. Quiet, noisy, small, in any size—freedom is the person who is free. Freedom is the guarantee of the person. To someone like me who is in the process of becoming an adult citizen—freedom is thoroughly linked with the process of maturation of personality.

Yes, freedom is such an intensely personal thing.

CUBA

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in the face of the administration's utterances on behalf of the cause of Cuban freedom the weekend action in restricting Cuban exile leaders, together with announcement of the U.S. role in the capture of an exile ship in the Caribbean must make pretty frustrating and unsavory fare for the American public.

The Justice Department has invoked the Neutrality Act to justify a halt to refugee attempts to encourage guerrilla activity in Cuba by showing that there still exists an anti-Castro resistance effort.

It is not hard to imagine the frustration of the quarter million exiles as they watch their nation being raped and ravaged by a Communist regime dominated by European communism, in direct violation of the Monroe Doctrine and every moral tenet to which this Nation has ever subscribed.

The Cubans watched the United States ramrod the half-planned Bay of Pigs invasion and then refuse even to pick the wounded off the beaches. They watched the United States vacillate, and make indecisiveness the cornerstone of its Cuban policy, and last month they saw the issue of Communist Cuba quietly brushed under the rug at Costa Rica.

It now seems to those Cubans—who owe much of their misfortune to the ineptitudes of this Government—that we have done an about-face in even the simple concept of right and wrong.

The blockade of which the White House is in such fear has again been imposed, only this time it is a blockade around the exiles themselves while the bearded dictator of Cuba languishes in the safety of our protective coexistence policy.

A realization of the admissions inherent in the administration's antiexile action was not long in coming. The restrictions, at first praised by both parties and the press, are now being strongly questioned.

Yesterday's press carried two excellent editorials which presented some valid political and moral arguments favoring the refugees' position and giving the United States—as the Nation which once symbolized freedom to the world's oppressed people—something to think about.

I recommend to my constituents a Washington Star editorial by publisher and columnist David Lawrence, and an article by Virginia Prewett in the Washington News, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 2, 1963]

POLICY OF INACTION AGAINST CUBA—U.S. EFFORTS AGAINST ANTI-CASTRO ATTACKS DESCRIBED AS RESULT OF CONFUSION

(By David Lawrence)

Confusion, if not frustration, today characterizes the policy of the administration toward Cuba.

Nearly 2 weeks have passed since President Kennedy told a news conference that the Soviet Government had withdrawn only 3,000 troops out of the 17,000 stationed on Cuban soil. He then added:

"We are waiting to see whether more will be withdrawn, as we would hope they would be. The month of March is not finished yet and we should have a clearer idea as to what the total numbers should be in the coming days."

The month of March has passed, but the clearer idea has still not materialized. The only action that has been taken by the administration is a sharp warning—not directed to the Russian Government—but to the poor Cubans who have bravely attempted to raid ports and start guerrilla action such as Fidel Castro himself employed when he fought his way into power.

It seems to be regarded as legitimate for the United States to encourage and assist in guerrilla-type warfare in south Vietnam against Communists there, but somehow the effort of the Cuban patriots to rescue their own country by similar tactics is frowned upon officially in formal announcements from the Department of State and the Department of Justice. Neutrality laws are cited as standing in the way. It is announced that such laws will be enforced by the arrest of those Cuban patriots who attempt to launch from American territory any expeditions to wrest their homeland from Mr. Castro and the Soviet troops.

Contradiction after contradiction, moreover, has emerged to becloud the statements issued by the U.S. Government. To take refuge in the neutrality laws seems to be in conflict with the following declaration on March 12 by Secretary of State Dean Rusk:

"Then we have felt, along with many others of our allies, that the kind of Cuban regime that we have today not only is not fit to participate as a regime in the activities of the inter-American system, but that with its declaration of subversive and other types of war upon the hemisphere, it is not entitled to normal economic or other relations with the free world."

The neutrality laws were plainly designed to apply to expeditions started on U.S. territory against countries with which the United States maintains friendly and normal relations. But a state of war now exists, for all practical purposes, between Cuba and the United States. Also, a blockade was undertaken last autumn, and foreign ships were intercepted by the U.S. Navy. In recent weeks Soviet-built Mig's, flying from Cuba, have attacked unarmed American ships.

In the last several months, moreover, a hostile military operation, involving the erection of bases equipped with missiles as well as bomber planes, had been carried on inside the territory of Cuba. This was aimed at the United States. One wonders what more proof the Government here needs that any steps taken by this country to protect itself are proper under international law and that so-called neutrality laws do not apply in the present circumstances to Cuba.

Actually, the constant use of air surveillance by the United States over Cuban territory is not really in line with the customary interpretation of the concept of "neutrality." The continuous pressure by the Government here upon other governments to boycott all trade with Cuba is also hardly "neutral."

Secretary Rusk, in his March 12 speech, said:

"Now, we are discovering with regard to Cuba that, having failed to take the steps that might have prevented in years past the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba, that the problem of finding a cure is more difficult."

The foregoing might well be paraphrased and applied today as the administration, instead of finding a cure, permits the Soviets to strengthen their hold inside Cuba. It has even enlisted the help of Great Britain's navy to keep Cuban patriots from attempting to regain their homeland.

Mr. Rusk also said in his speech that "the presence of Soviet forces in this hemisphere cannot be accepted as a part of the normal situation in this hemisphere."

But the Soviets not only have been infiltrating Guatemala and Brazil, but they are still maintaining a military force in Cuba, less than a hundred miles away from the coast of this country.

Senator STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Military Affairs, said in a speech the other day that, "without positive action on our part, our neighbors to the south may fall one by one until the entire hemisphere is lost to us." He added that he was convinced that "the Cuban situation is the most immediate, pressing, and important problem facing our Nation today."

Yet the administration is using its influence to discourage a counterrevolutionary movement against the Castro regime, which deliberately invited the Soviet Government to send troops and build missile bases in Cuba. How can the United States justify a policy of inaction against the Havana regime and invoke "neutrality" laws against the only individuals who wish to risk "their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor" to overthrow a tyrannical dictatorship?

[From the Washington News, Apr. 2, 1963]

U.S. POLICY ON CUBA DEPLORED

(By Virginia Prewett)

The U.S. State Department spokesman who called the daring and gallant Alpha 66 raids on Cuba "irresponsible acts" that helped Castro's cause reached an alltime low in pronouncement of U.S. foreign policy.

In Biblical times, the authors of this statement would have assailed young David for going up against Goliath. They'd have said his inspiring victory of right over might "helped the Philistines." And they'd probably have taken away his slingshot.

In colonial times, these spokesmen would have condemned the Boston Tea Party as "irresponsible"—and said it helped the British.

They would have deplored the French maquis' harassment of the Nazi occupation troops while Hitler ruled Europe.

OFFICIAL

For years, U.S. cold war propaganda has failed the gallant Hungarian freedom fighters who challenged Communist power. Yet last week, the world's greatest democracy officially chided Cuba's dedicated young patriots for proving that the fortress Cuba is not invulnerable.

When the State Department calls these raids "irresponsible," by inference they repudiate every freedom fighter who takes up arms against communism.

In Vietnam, young Americans are being killed by Communists with Russia-supplied arms. Yet in Caribbean, when young Cubans harass their betrayer, Castro, and the Russian occupation, the U.S. State Department deplores it.

STANDOFF

Why? Will the nuclear set now tell us that unless we stop the Alpha 66 raids against Communist Cuba, there'll be nuclear conflict?

This will sound fairly thin, since Defense Secretary Robert McNamara himself last week told Congress that we are in a "nuclear standoff" with Russia.

The U.S. State Department knows very well that the Alpha 66 raids are part of a strategy aimed at overthrowing Castro. Every raid is followed by a burst of sabotage against the Russian occupation. Does our State Department not want this occupation harassed?

Responsible members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee tell me they cannot believe the Department spoke seriously against the Cuban patriots. They believe this is an another example of our Government's use of the forked tongue—as advocated in the managed news policy. If this is true, the authors of this latest managed lie ought to be taken out of their fear-distorted environment and subjected to the influence of ordinary people who respect courage and hate tyranny.

The U.S. Information Service Chief Edward R. Murrow, last week pleaded with Congress for a 25 percent increase in his operation's budget. So long as the U.S. State Department's spokesmen are too terrified to stand behind the principle of freedom and to help our friends, as President Kennedy promised in his election pledges, then all the money spent for U.S. propaganda will be so much paper and tarnishable silver down the drain.

HOSPITAL INSURANCE FOR THE ELDERLY

NEED FOR ACTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the need for a fiscally sound method of financing health care in old age has become severe in the past decade. In part, the problem is due to the spectacular progress that has been made in medical technology, which has been a principal reason for the greater numbers of people who live to suffer the illnesses that accompany old age. Changing technology has also rapidly increased the cost of medical care. For the aged, the increasing cost of health care and the increasing need for it have not been matched by an adequate method of financing it.

The crux of the problem of paying for health care in old age can be summed up in a few words. The average health costs of people age 65 and over are twice as high as those of younger people while the incomes of the older group are only half as high. A look at the facts is enough to show that there can be no doubt about the magnitude of the problem.

First. Nine out of ten elderly people go to the hospital at least once between age 65 and death. Most people who reach age 65 go to a hospital two or three times before they die; an elderly couple can expect about five hospital stays during their later years.

Second. When a person aged 65 or over goes to a hospital he stays, on the average, 15 days, twice as long as does the average younger person.

Third. Only half of the couples headed by an elderly person have incomes of as much as $2,500 per year; the comparable figure for younger couples is $5,300 a year.

Fourth. Only about half of the people 65 or over who live alone have incomes of more than $1,000 a year; half of the younger people who live alone have incomes exceeding $2,500 a year.

Fifth. About one-half of the elderly have no health insurance; and much of the health insurance that the other half has is worth very little to them in the event of a serious illness.

Sixth. The cost of a day's care in a hospital more than doubled from 1951 to 1961; during those 10 years the average daily costs went up from $16.77 to $34.98. In Minnesota, hospital costs are running slightly ahead of the national average.

PRIVATE INSURANCE ALONE IS NO SOLUTION

Only about half the aged have any kind of health insurance. And much of it is inadequate. For example, many health insurance policies for older citizens pay only $10 a day for no more than 30 days of hospital room and board and even less adequate amounts toward other hospital costs. The obvious reason that more older people don't have fully adequate private insurance protection is that they cannot afford the premiums for plans that offer sufficient protection against their inordinately high hospital costs.

The national health survey shows how closely having health insurance in old age is related to the person's ability to continue working, his income and the state of his health. In 1959, for example, the survey found that only 42 percent of the nonworking aged had any kind of health insurance, and only 30 percent of the aged in poorer health had hospital insurance. In addition, the survey showed that only one-third of the aged whose family income fell below $2,000 had hospital insurance.

Not only are the aged a low-income, high-risk group, but they usually cannot buy group health insurance through a place of employment, as younger people can. Older people must ordinarily buy insurance on an individual basis. This adds greatly to the cost compared with group policies.

HIGH COST OF NEW BLUE CROSS PLANS

Last year there was a great deal of talk about the announced Blue Cross intention to offer special plans for the elderly. Such a plan has been set up in the State of Minnesota. The Minnesota plan pays for 75 percent of the costs of a hospital stay for a maximum of 70 days; if admitted to a nursing home within 3 days of discharge from the hospital, a member could have 75 percent of the cost of his nursing home care paid for on the basis of 2 days of care for each unused day of available hospital care; there are also limited provisions for payment of ancillary hospital services other than room and board and general nursing care.

The premiums for the Blue Cross plan cost $150 a year per person and $300 a year for a man and his wife. This is nearly double the premiums required under previous Minnesota Blue Cross plans.

The new premium payments amount to about one-eighth of the average aged couple's income and about one-seventh of the income of the average single person. And even with the new Minnesota Blue Cross protection, a member would still have to pay all nonhospital health costs—or purchase additional insurance to cover part of them—plus the noncovered 25 percent of their hospital bills. Comparatively few of the retired aged can afford such total outlays for major illnesses.

Private insurance carriers and Blue Cross have made most commendable efforts to meet the staggering problem of financing the health care costs of our elder citizens. Their inability to cope fully with the problem is not for lack of effort. It is a matter of simple economics.

DRAWBACKS OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE METHOD

Some persons believe that the State-Federal public assistance programs should be the basis for providing the medical care which the aged need but cannot pay for themselves. But the facts also suggest that these programs do not provide the full solution to the medical problems facing the great majority of the elderly.

The problem of high health costs in old age does not only concern the very poor, for whom public assistance is intended. The problem of paying for medical care in old age hits hardest at the great majority of older people—those of average or above-average financial circumstances, who are neither rich nor very poor. Giving assistance to people who are already reduced to poverty is necessary, but of equal importance is preventing dependency among elderly who are financially independent in normal circumstances.

Furthermore, few people willingly give up their independence, privacy, and personal dignity in order to secure public health assistance. Some people have said that public welfare investigations are similar to investigations made when a person negotiates for a loan or makes a major purchase on the installment plan.

There is a significant difference. The purpose of the credit investigation is to find out whether he is financially dependable and likely to remain dependable. The purpose of the welfare investigation is to determine whether he is a financial failure who is unable to provide for himself and his family. For a person who has been financially independent all his life, such an investigation to prove his indigency can be a shattering and demoralizing experience.

Unless some new method of financing health care in old age is adopted, even the very poor aged will not be able to look to public assistance for the help they need. It is now 2½ years since the enactment of the Kerr-Mills legislation which made Federal grants available to help the States establish medical assistance programs for the so-called medically indigent. Only half of the States have established any kind of a program of medical assistance for their aged residents under this legislation. Many of the programs that have been set up do not meet the crux of the problem.

In January 1963, only 116,000 elderly people were getting help under these programs. This is a small portion of the aged who had high medical costs in that month and lacked adequate financial resources. Three-quarters of the payments were paid in three large industrial States—California, Massachusetts, and New York.

Very little has been done in the States with lowest income and greatest need. These poorer States do not have their part of the matching funds necessary to do an adequate job and in some instances not enough to do any job. The financial burden on the States, if all were to develop full-fledged MAA programs under the Kerr-Mills legislation would be enormous.

NO MEDICAL AID FOR THE AGED PROGRAM IN MINNESOTA

While my own State of Minnesota has done fairly well by its impoverished elderly residents, I regret to say that it is not one of the States that has set up a program of medical assistance for the aged provided for by the Kerr-Mills legislation. A bill that would have put such a program into effect was introduced late in the 1961 session of the State legislature. Hearings were held in both houses, but no bill was reported out of committee in either house and the session adjourned without further action. What will be accomplished during the 1963 session remains to be seen. I sincerely hope that positive action will be taken and that a good program for the medically indigent in Minnesota will go into operation.

SOCIAL SECURITY: THE ONLY SENSIBLE SOLUTION

In summary, neither public assistance nor private health insurance offers the solution to the problem of paying health costs in old age. What is needed is a mechanism whereby persons can provide in advance—when they are working and can afford to do so—for the health costs they will face in old age. Private health insurance organizations cannot sell adequate health insurance policies on this basis. Furthermore, the health cost protection should be provided in a way that is consistent with our traditional American concern for the dignity and privacy of the individual—without the extensive investigation of one's personal affairs that is built into our welfare programs.

The social security system, under which people pay during their working years toward the benefits they will receive when they retire, offers the only mechanism that satisfies both these basic conditions. Moreover, a social security hospital insurance plan would benefit from all the economies which lower the cost of group health insurance coverage. Since much of the administrative machinery already is functioning in carrying out the present social security program, social security hospital insurance could be administered at a cost of about 3 percent of benefits.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL

It is with great pride that I joined with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and many other colleagues in sponsoring the President's program of hospital insurance for the elderly through the social security system (S. 880). The proposed program would benefit virtually all of the elderly—social security beneficiaries, railroad retirement annuitants, and the elderly people who have not had an opportunity to earn protection under these programs or under the health benefits plan for active and retired Federal employees.

First, hospital insurance protection would be provided for all the aged now on the social security benefit rolls, whether or not they have paid any of the additional taxes to be allocated to the hospital insurance trust fund. One of the important features of social insurance is that improvements in the program—benefit increases as well as broadened protection—can be and are provided to all those who are already beneficiaries and are no longer contributing to the program. The cost of making hospital insurance benefits available to those people who are already age 65 or over and eligible for cash social security benefits is relatively small. The employer contribution to the proposed hospital insurance program would more than meet the cost of these payments. Thus, future workers will not be hurt; in fact they will get in hospital insurance protection more than the value of their own contributions since they too will benefit from the employer payments.

In addition, hospital benefits would be made available to people who are not eligible for monthly social security or railroad retirement benefits. The provision for such people would be transitional—that is, it would take care of everyone who had been born too soon to earn full eligibility under social security. The effect of the provision would taper off; that is, eventually all persons who reach age 65 will have to be eligible for social security or railroad retirement benefits in order to qualify for hospital insurance. In the future, about 95 out of 100 will be able to satisfy this requirement.

Many of those who would not qualify for the proposed hospital insurance would be people who are eligible for health insurance under programs for active and retired Federal employees. Physicians and other groups who have rejected coverage under social security would also be excluded.

The payments that would be made for people who are already old and who are outside the social security and railroad retirement systems would be paid out of the general funds of the Treasury. Neither social security nor railroad retirement funds would be involved. Thus the principle that social security benefits are reserved for contributors would be preserved.

WHAT PROPOSED PROGRAM WOULD PROVIDE

Under the President's proposal, health insurance protection would be provided against the cost of inpatient hospital, outpatient hospital diagnostic, skilled nursing facility, and visiting nursing facility, and visiting nurse and related home health services. These benefits go to the heart of the problem the aged face in meeting the cost of their health care. Payment for the costs of hospital care will provide substantial relief where health costs are highest. The illnesses that are usually the most expensive are those that involve a period of hospitalization. Skilled nursing facility benefits would be valuable to the hospitalized beneficiary who can be given satisfactory care in a skilled nursing facility after the acute stage of his illness has passed.

The payment for outpatient diagnostic services would encourage early diagnosis. Early diagnosis, as we all know, is an important way of reducing the length of an illness and of enhancing the chances of recovery. Moreover, the availability of payment for such services removes an incentive to receive such services as an inpatient with the higher cost involved.

PROGRAM WOULD BE ADEQUATELY FINANCED

The President's proposal to provide basic hospital insurance for the aged carries with it a carefully developed plan for financing. The program will be financed in an orderly manner that will be no hardship on anyone. The benefits would be financed by increasing social security contribution rates—effective with January 1965—by one-fourth of 1 percent on employers, one-fourth of 1 percent on employees, and four-tenths of 1 percent for the self-employed; also, the amount of annual earnings subject to the tax and creditable for social security monthly benefits would be raised from $4,800 to $5,200 beginning with 1965. As a result of increasing the amount of earnings creditable for benefits, the maximum monthly cash benefit for a worker would rise to $134 instead of $127 and the maximum monthly benefit for a family would rise to $268 instead of $254. Further, the increase in the earnings base would provide additional income which together with the income from the contribution rate increase would fully meet all the costs of the hospital insurance program. A separate hospital insurance trust fund would be established for the program.

THE TRADITIONAL SOCIAL SECURITY APPROACH

Quite obviously, the proposal would not meet all the health insurance needs of the elderly. Nor do I think that the whole job should be done through social insurance. The program recommended by the administration is intended to be a basic program—with a complementary role for private insurance and a lesser, but nevertheless important, backup role for public assistance.

If hospital insurance for the aged is provided under social security, the effects on the voluntary health insurance effort will be comparable to the growth of private retirement insurance that occurred after passage of the social security program. This point has been made by others. For example, in a statement before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, Robert A. Rennie, vice president in charge of research of the Nationwide Insurance Companies, said, referring to hospital insurance under social security:

> Some people say it will interfere with the growth of private, voluntary insurance. As indicated earlier, all of the evidence is to the contrary. A tremendous growth of private insurance has accompanied the development of social security. In our opinion, private insurance carriers would have a broader, sounder market for voluntary insurance among our older people by building on the basic provisions of social insurance legislation.

ROLE OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Just as private insurance will play an important role in providing needed protection, public assistance also will need to play its historic role in meeting the extraordinary needs of the indigent aged. If the administration's proposal is adopted, the financial problems faced by the States in implementing programs of medical assistance for their aged residents will be greatly reduced. It seems reasonable to expect that States will then be able to move in the direction of a more meaningful and effective health care program for those among the aged who would need further help in meeting their health care costs. Neither social insurance, private insurance, nor public assistance can do an adequate job alone. Together they can establish a new level of health security for all our present and future senior citizens.

CONCLUSION

The proposed hospital insurance benefits would be a logical—as well as greatly needed—addition to the present social security program. As the President said in his special message on aiding our elderly citizens which he sent to the Congress on February 21:

> Health insurance for our senior citizens is the most important health proposal pending before the Congress. We urgently need this legislation—and we need it now. This is our No. 1 objective for our senior citizens.

GENERAL WILSON'S BLUEPRINT FOR WATER RESOURCES CONSERVATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on rare occasions a speech is made with such depth and perception that it withstands the test of time and becomes a valued document.

Last May 18, 1962, a speech was delivered before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, on the board of which organization I serve, by Lt. Gen. W. K. Wilson, Jr., Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army.

General Wilson's speech dealt with the interweaving of our water resources future, and the future of our national defense. Because it is an excellent speech on a vital subject, I ask unanimous consent that General Wilson's remarks, titled "Water Resources Development and National Defense," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

You have dealt generously in giving me this opportunity to talk about water resources development and national defense. It is a happy occasion when a man gets a chance to expound in public on his favorite subject. National defense has been my career since entering the U.S. Military Academy and water resources have occupied a large share of my time since entering the Corps of Engineers upon graduation.

One soon learns, in the corps, that water development and defense are two sides of the same coin. The Nation's military strength is inseparable from its economic strength; its economic strength in turn depends upon the wise use of natural resources; and among natural resources, the conservation and control of water are absolutely basic.

Thus broadening and acceleration of water development of all kinds becomes a matter of primary national importance, which President Kennedy has stressed twice in his messages to the Congress during the past 2 years.

What this country needs now, and needs badly, is fuller realization of the great scope and size of the water-resources development task confronting it, and an absorbing dedication to an all-out, generation-long, water development effort.

How big is this task? I am going to cite some figures, derived in part from studies inspired by our work with the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources a couple of years ago. I shall put them forward very tentatively, because in looking far ahead as we have to do in planning large-scale construction programs—the estimates of needs must necessarily be very rough.

Resources for the Future, Inc., made a monumental study for the select committee which indicates the magnitude of the reservoir storage capacity we shall need just to keep the rivers flowing adequately to meet all demands for water. The Corps of Engineers has completed the picture by taking into account a nationwide inventory of additional needs. The outstanding conclusion reached by combining the results of the two studies is that by 1980—only 18 years from now—the Nation will need to add more than 400 million acre-feet of reservoir capacity to its existing systems. This is 2½ times the capacity of all the reservoirs the Corps of Engineers has built in the past—mainly in the last two decades. And it somewhat exceeds the aggregate capacity of all reservoirs that have been built in the United States since its beginning.

And this is only the basic part of the job necessary to provide the high degree of conservation of water and control of streamflow to assure dependable supply for such requirements as domestic and industrial use and to maintain satisfactory stream conditions generally. Add to it the navigation improvements, local flood protection works, hydroelectric power, recreation, and other related tasks of comprehensive development and the overall undertaking looms quite large.

When we in the Corps of Engineers try to size up our projected part of the task we find ourselves contemplating programs in the next two decades ranging from $1½ to $2½ billion a year for new construction alone.

Figures like these are startling. But when we look realistically at our national future, the scale of the projected development to meet water needs falls into proportion. The United States faces a big future—big in every aspect—big in strength, big in accomplishments, and therefore big in its needs.

To meet these needs, as we see them now, would require a corps program growing at a rate of about 6 percent each year. As a national goal is an annual growth rate of at least 4.5 percent for the gross national product, and as attainment of this goal depends upon prior development of basic natural resources, a growth rate of 6 percent in developmental programs appears entirely reasonable. Moreover, we have some catching up to do in the development of water resources.

We have made an analysis of how the demands projected by various authorities for the Senate select committee would, in all probability, affect those parts of the overall water resources responsibility to which the Corps of Engineers' efforts are normally directed. Our concern has been to ascertain where we have to raise our sights, how we need to sharpen our procedures, and in general, line out our work so as to make headway toward helping to meet future requirements.

I might add that we were interested in finding out where any bottlenecks might be encountered, so we might take early action in effort to avoid them.

Beginning with the reservoirs, let me pass along to you some of the facts our analysis revealed. The Senate select committee's report indicated that a total of well over 300 million acre-feet of reservoir storage space would be needed by 1980. This storage was projected just for regulation of the Nation's rivers to increase low water flows for purposes such as water supply, water quality control, power, navigation, recreation and the like. Additional storage reserves for flood control, most of which would be combined in the same reservoirs with water supply, would also be needed, making the total requirement about 400 million acre-feet of reservoir capacity.

Our estimates indicate that the Corps of Engineers should be prepared to build about three-fourths the total storage requirement, and that the cost would be something like $15 billion, figured at 1960 dollars.

Now where is the space to store this water effectively and economically to come from? In many respects, this is going to be a harder problem to solve than that of expanding the capability to build the reservoirs, or finding the money to pay for them. I think we will have the construction capacity, all right, but we will have to find many more able planning engineers to carry out programs of the magnitude indicated. I don't want to minimize the money—but if we've got to have the water, the question boils down to the hard fact that we've got to get it, through reservoir construction, and do it at the cheapest cost we can. But as to land on which to store the water, that is something else again. In some of our river basins, such as the Ohio, for example, the amount of feasible reservoir space which can be acquired without major disruption of existing development such as communities, highways, industries, railroads, and the like, is nowhere near adequate. And it is getting less every day. This is one of the aspects of the water resources job where the country is going to feel the pinch of the lack of enough highly capable and experienced planning engineers who can help give us the most water for the least sacrifice of either land or money.

Even when all these problems are solved—money, planning, capability, space and efficiency—we still will face the problem of time. If the challenge is to be met, and if construction programs of the scale we are talking about are to be carried out within only 18 years, we must start working on them much faster and quite soon.

To meet Federal flood control responsibilities properly, the multipurpose reservoir program should be supplemented by about 11,000 miles of levees, floodwalls, channel improvements, and related works costing about $2 billion. Also, some 3,000 flood-plain studies, costing about $80 million, should be undertaken to encourage local regulation in effort to minimize the flood risk and reduce the cost of building protection for property that should not be located in the flood plain.

Meanwhile, the augmented reservoir program would make feasible the installation by 1980 of about 33 million kilowatts of new power-generating capacity, costing over $5 billion.

Any forecasts must recognize the phenomenal increase in the public demand for water-based recreation. In 1961 the attendance at Corps of Engineers reservoirs alone totalled about 120 million. Fifteen years earlier it had only been about 5 million. In view of this growing demand, and in anticipation that new reservoirs will continue to be built and will be better adapted for recreation than older ones, an estimated 300 million attendance by 1980 is conservative.

We believe that State and local entities should be encouraged to develop the recreational potentialities of Federal reservoirs to the greatest possible extent. However, the Federal Government can and should acquire land for recreational development at reservoir areas and should also provide such basic facilities as access roads, picnic grounds, boat-launching ramps, sanitation, and the like. We contemplate that perhaps $700 million might be spent for such purposes at corps projects by 1980.

The national inland waterway system embraces some 20,000 miles of improved channels in commercial use. We have estimated that about 10,000 miles of these channels need improvement, and that about 1,000 miles of new waterways merit serious consideration for possible future development. The total cost of this possible future work would be about $8 billion. The urgency with which this additional construction should be carried out depends upon factors which are difficult to predict. In addition to possible modifications in national transportation policy, the main determining factors are the growth of transportation needs, and the future cost of alternative forms of transportation. At present we can only assume that needs will develop at about the same rate in the future as in the past. On this basis we should anticipate investing about $2.7 billion in the improvement or construction of waterways by 1980.

Also, construction of 14 new deep-draft harbors on the seacoasts and the Great Lakes, and improvement of 46 existing harbors are expected to become justified over the next two decades. The estimated cost of this work is about $2 billion.

The Atlantic coastal storms early this March have emphasized the need for expanded programs to protect against loss of life and property and destruction of beaches along the national shoreline. Without taking into account changes that may occur in Federal legislation and policy, we feel reasonably sure that we will be called on to undertake more shore protection, including hurricane protection projects, than has been contemplated before this year. A very rough order-of-magnitude estimate might be in the neighborhood of $1 billion by 1980.

To get the big, overall, comprehensive water resources development job done on time and economically, we shall have to accelerate river basin planning and project surveys. Increased emphasis is being placed on this activity in my own office. And, as a first step in avoiding a bottleneck, special river basin planning units have been established in each of our divisions. These units will carry on continuing studies of reservoir needs and potentialities for each river basin similar to those prepared for the Senate select committee. These studies will help provide the detailed data needed to further refine the estimates of needs set forth by the committee. They will also help the Corps of Engineers develop more dependable timetables for providing additional storage capacity, will help locate reservoir sites, and will determine the river flows needed at key points along the main rivers.

We expect our basin-study units to help us cooperate effectively with other river-basin planning agencies such as those recommended by President Kennedy. Pending completion of comprehensive basin plans, they will help us to make sure that our proposed projects will fit well into future plans and help us give proper consideration to selecting the best of alternative means of meeting resource needs.

Let me repeat that our estimates are necessarily based largely on meeting those requirements for which the Corps of Engineers has primary responsibility. But I might point out that many different water-resource programs tend to converge on those of the corps, particularly with respect to basic streamflow regulation. Our basin-study assignments, from the late 1920's to date; the nationwide scope for our programs, and our involvement not only on rivers but on lakes and seacoasts; the many contacts we have established at community level all over the United States through both our military and our civil missions—all these bring us into contact with the Nation's overall water-resource needs and problems. And I hope that by telling you candidly how big the job ahead appears to us, it may help organizations such as the National Rivers and Harbors Congress to gear up their own efforts to help get the water-resources job done well and on time.

What we are dealing with involves the total future welfare of our Nation. Water-resource development must be undertaken not merely because it is profitable, or so that we may live more comfortably. It must be undertaken to preserve our national economy, our security, and our way of life. It is one of the foundation stones of national defense and of our country's future greatness. No task is more urgent. It is a challenge to us all.

ALL AMERICA CITIES OF 1962

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I am pleased to learn that the city of San Diego, Calif., has been selected as 1 of the 10 All America Cities of 1962.

San Diego is in the midst of solving a problem more and more cities are faced with. It is the problem of a declining downtown area. Traditionally, the downtown area has been the center of commerce, the hub of government, the seat of culture.

But an all too common 20th century disease called urban sprawl can change all that. Allowed to run its own undisciplined, unplanned course, urban sprawl saps a city's downtown, lures business away from the city's center to its fringes. The downtown becomes little more than a museum piece from an earlier day, a day when all roads did, indeed, lead to the city—not away from it.

The people of San Diego, seeing their downtown area failing to keep pace with the demands of a rapidly growing population, combined public and private forces to breathe new life into their downtown. They formulated a plan which called for a 5,000-seat convention hall, a 3,000-seat civic theater and an exhibition hall, and parking space for 1,000 cars. They raised funds. And they started building. They have launched a $75 million project. Theirs is an investment in the city and it will pay dividends to them, to their children, and to future generations.

I want to publicly extend congratulations to San Diego for winning this award.

I wish to extend congratulations, too, to the city of Pomona, Calif., which was named among 10 runnersup in this nationwide competition.

The selections were made by an All America Cities jury, consisting of Dr. George H. Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion and former president of the National Municipal League; Mrs. Hazel Blanchard, president of the National Education Association; Albert C. Boyd, president of the American Chamber of Commerce Executives; William T. Gossett, former vice president of Ford Motor Co.; Mrs. Herbert E. Hawkes, president of the American Association of University Women; Leo Kramer, assistant to the president, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL–CIO; Roy B. Martin, Jr., mayor of Norfolk, Va.; William V. Merrihue, board chairman, Effective Citizens Organization; Vernon C. Myers, publisher, Look magazine; James M. Osborn, research associate, Yale University; Mrs. Robert J. Phillips, president, League of Women Voters; Dr. Donald H. Webster, director of the Bureau of Government Research and Services, University of Washington.

This month Look magazine is presenting a series of articles and pictures about the All America selections. I ask unanimous consent that the lead article and the article on San Diego be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From Look magazine, April 1963]

Every 11½ Seconds, Our Cities Must Meet the Needs of a New American

A baby is born, and an American city has a new citizen—and a new problem. As this child matures, he will require schools, hospitals, police protection, and a host of other community services. His city government is nominally responsible for providing these services, but the final responsibility for maintaining a good city rests with his parents and other private citizens like them. As novelist and poet Jan Struther put it, "A city's as great as the little people that live there." Effective citizen action, not merely good government, is the basic criterion for the All-America City citations, which are awarded annually by Look and the National Municipal League. The size and wealth of a city do not matter. For instance, this year's smallest winner, Grafton, W. Va. (5,700), won because of its citizens' efforts to remedy a staggering unemployment problem.

In the years since the All America Cities contest began, over a hundred communities have received awards for such diverse achievements as getting rid of a corrupt city administration or building a school. Some problems are common to many cities: providing services for a rapidly expanding population, renewal and rehabilitation of blighted areas, changing the machinery of government as adjacent municipalities grow together to become one city, and, always a danger, citizen apathy. Cities learn from each other in solving these, and other, problems. Falls Church, Va., a 1961 winner, learned about citizen political activity from Rockville, Md., a winner in 1954 and 1961. This year's 22 finalists were selected from almost 70 applicants by a committee of experts. Last November, the finalists presented their cases to the All America Cities jury during the National Conference on Government at Washington, D.C.

[From Look magazine, April 1963]

San Diego, Calif.

San Diego, third largest metropolis on the Pacific coast, is getting a new heart: Centre City. Centre City is the local answer to downtown deterioration, a common ailment of American cities. Working closely with local officials, San Diegans, Inc., a nonprofit corporation formed by 50 community leaders, financed 4 economic studies of the downtown area. The city government, guided by these surveys, produced a plan of rehabilitation that called for downtown construction of government buildings. Centre City's Community Concourse will include a 5,000-seat convention hall, a 3,000-seat civic theater, an exhibition hall and parking space for 1,000 cars.

When the city found it would need additional funds for the Community Concourse project, volunteers raised $1,600,000 in just 6 weeks. Businessmen joined in and began construction of commercial buildings with 1,500,000 square feet of space. The Centre City plan will provide, by 1965, an efficient, modern downtown area at a cost of nearly $75 million in public and private funds. With Centre City, San Diego lives up to the new slogan: "City in Motion."

THE OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE BEAUFORT COUNTY LIBRARY

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that the Beaufort County Library has won the 1963 Dorothy Canfield Fisher Award.

This award is presented to the outstanding library of the Nation as a signal recognition of achieving outstanding library facilities and services in municipal areas not exceeding 25,000 people. The Beaufort County Library won this award in competition with comparable libaries throughout the United States.

The library program in South Carolina and in each of our counties and cities is one of the most progressive in the Nation. This is not the first time a South Carolina Library has won the Fisher Award. In 1961 it was awarded the Greenwood City and County Public Library, and in 1962 the Oconee County Library.

In connection with this, the South Carolina General Assembly passed two resolutions, one commending Miss Estellene P. Walker, director of the State Public Library Association, and the other commending the Beaufort County Library board and staff for having won this $5,000 library award, which will be presented to the library on Sunday, April 21.

Mr. President, I ask that these resolutions be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution H. 1415

Concurrent resolution commending Miss Estellene P. Walker for her services as director of the State Public Library Association

(By Messrs. Addis, C. A. Mitchell, Graves, W. Brantley Harvey, Jr., and Carnell)

Whereas Miss Estellene P. Walker has served as director of the State Public Library Association for more than 16 years; and

Whereas under Miss Walker's leadership and direction the public libraries in our State, especially those in the smaller towns and rural communities, have experienced a tremendous growth both in number and quality; and

Whereas the superior quality of the public libraries in our State has been evidenced by 1961 and 1962 Dorothy Canfield Fisher Awards being won by the Greenwood City and County Public Library and by the Oconee County Library, and by the Beaufort County Library's earning of the 1963 National Dorothy Canfield Fisher Award: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Miss Estellene P. Walker, director of the State Public Library Association, is hereby commended for her outstanding public service in promoting the extension and development of public libraries in this State; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Miss Walker.

Resolution H. 1416

Concurrent resolution to commend the Beaufort County Library Board, the county librarian and his staff, upon the Beaufort County Library's winning of the 1963 National Dorothy Canfield Fisher Award

(By Messrs. Graves, W. Brantley Harvey, Jr., Addis, C. A. Mitchell, and Carnell)

Whereas the Beaufort County Library has been chosen the national winner of the 1963 Dorothy Canfield Fisher Award; and

Whereas competitors for this award were libraries recommended by the State library boards or similar agencies of 48 States; and

Whereas this award is presented annually in signal recognition of outstanding library facilities and services provided for counties or cities with municipal populations not in excess of 25,000; and

Whereas this national honor reflects with distinction not only the caliber of the library facilities of Beaufort County but of all the similar libraries throughout our State; and

Whereas the general assembly wishes to commend the Beaufort County Library Board, the county librarian, Mr. T. Ray Peppers, and his staff upon earning this highly coveted recognition of distinguished public library service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Beaufort County Library Board, the county librarian, Mr. T. Ray Peppers, and his staff are hereby commended upon the Beaufort County Library's winning of the 1963 National Dorothy Canfield Fisher Award; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Mr. Larry J. Rogers, chairman of the Beaufort County Library Board, Hilton Head Island, S.C.

WINSTON CHURCHILL, CITIZEN OF AMERICA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I share the pleasure of the Senate at its having been able to complete action yesterday on the resolution granting honorary American citizenship to Winston Churchill. As a cosponsor of one of these resolutions, I am proud to have been associated with this fitting recognition for one of the greatest men in the world in this century. None of us who were adults at the time of World War II can ever forget what this man meant to the world in rallying the forces of democracy. It is entirely fitting that we grant him an honor that is unique, for his character and deeds have been unique. Winston Churchill, a citizen of the British Empire by birth and loyalties, is now a citizen of America by congressional action, as indeed, he is a citizen of the world by his life and deeds.

An editorial in the Washington Post of this morning well expresses the affection we feel for Sir Winston Churchill. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZEN CHURCHILL

By its unanimous vote, the U.S. Senate has fittingly and appropriately concluded congressional action upon the resolution which directs the President to declare Winston Churchill an honorary citizen.

There is no action that this Government could take that would be more in harmony with the sentiments and feelings of the American people who will welcome with joy into the fellowship of this new and formal association one who long has been united to America and Americans by bonds that no political body could either devise nor dissolve.

This unanimous act of the Senate will gladden the hearts of all Americans. A great legislative body has as its primary duty the affirmation in the statutes of those resolves already confirmed in the minds of a free people; but it has an equal duty to affirm by solemn enactment the sentiments that stir the hearts of citizens. This is such an enactment.

It is to be hoped that it will also gladden the heart of Winston Churchill. There is reason to think it will. Like Henry V, he could always say: "I am not covetous for gold * * * but if it be a sin to covet honour, I am the most offending soul alive." Such men may have a surfeit of everything else upon this fair earth, but of honor they can never have enough. And so, there is reason to hope that his honor, heaped high although it is upon a life already filled with honor, will find the taste for more not staled by all that has befallen him, the appetite for honor undiminished. And may the savour of this honor stay sweet upon his tongue in all his days to come, comforting him in the hours of his old age and nurturing to brighter recollection the memory of his great deeds.

To construe this act as a mark of that special relation which exists between this country and England would be to underestimate the honor and overestimate that historic bond, for the special relationship out of which this action springs is that between these greatly led and those who greatly lead them. Free men everywhere shared for a while in the greatness of this man, reveled in his glorious phrases, roused to his brave sentiments, rejoiced in his bold challenges. This is the special tie that binds us all to him and him to us. It is good to have it unanimously affirmed by the U.S. Senate.

ADDRESS BY NEWTON N. MINOW

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, yesterday Newton N. Minow, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, made a speech to the National Association of Broadcasters in Chicago. In that speech he covered, with great insight, several areas of concern to both the broadcasting industry and to the viewing and listening public.

Since these networks use the public airways and since they are a potent force in shaping our society and in the education or lack of it for our children I hope that we in this body and those concerned for the future will read carefully his remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY NEWTON N. MINOW, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, TO THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS, CHICAGO, ILL., APRIL 2, 1963

Governor Collins, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, during the past few months, you may have seen some speculation in the press about my leaving the Commission. I've even received some mail as a result of these rumors. One Hollywood television producer wrote me a kind letter, and said, "Mr. Minow, you've been chairman of the FCC since 1961. Anyone in the business can tell you that 2 years in television is a long run."

The quantity of mail has also been instructive. Several months ago, one network announced it was going to drop the program "It's a Man's World" in light of, if you'll pardon the expression, low ratings. The network quickly received thousands and thousands of letters of protest. In the weeks since the rumors began about my leaving the Government, I received eight other letters concerning that possibility. Seven were from applicants for my job, and the eighth one said, "It serves you right for letting 'It's a Man's World' go off the air."

Apparently, these rumors have also stimulated some conversation in the industry. One network vice president said to his boss: "If Minow leaves, I only hope he leaves permanently, and that they're not just going to get a summer replacement for him." His boss replied: "And we don't want any reruns either."

Ladies and gentlemen, I shall make no announcements or statements today about these rumors, except to suggest to you that you continue to do business at the same old stand in our office at 12th and Pennsylvania Ave. To turn to business, I begin today with a public service announcement for another regular customer of the FCC. Many people erroneously think that the FCC is concerned only with broadcasting. Among our other modest assignments is the regulation of communications companies in the telephone and telegraph industries, including the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

Through FCC action, a reduction in telephone rates goes into effect this week. For $1 or less, you will be able after 9 p.m. to make a 3-minute station-to-station call to any place in the continental United States. I hope that you will all call your mothers, wives, sweethearts, sons, and daughters at college, or your station managers at this reduced rate.

Unofficially, I've suggested that the telephone company might try commercial spot announcements—not loud ones—on radio and TV at 9 p.m. every night to promote use of this new rate. When I mentioned this to several broadcasters to show them how we were promoting their business, they were not too enthusiastic. They feared that when people heard the announcements, they would turn off their sets to rush to the phone. Perhaps the FCC can't win.

As you know, this is my third annual talk with you as FCC Chairman. Let us review together some of the more important developments of the past several years.'

First, in 1961, it was predicted that international television "will be with us soon." Soon came much sooner than expected, on July 10, 1962. Less than 1 week after the celebration of our national Independence Day came the beginning of what promises to be the most vital instrument for international interdependence—the birth of a common market for the free exchange of ideas. An active communications satellite was launched through the joint efforts of Government and private initiative, with a license from the FCC.

Already we have seen, live, the Ecumenical Conference, the midnight sun in Sweden, fishermen in Sicily, night life in Paris. Europeans have glimpsed the Statue of Liberty, the United Nations, the Rio Grande, and a big league baseball game. The day was brought closer when billions of people on this planet will be linked through instantaneous sight and sound. And on July 10, because of this magic, the powers of darkness retreated while light advanced across oceans and over mountains. We were not the first nation to launch a man into space; but we were first to launch an idea into space. American science and technology built for the world, not a wall sealing in ignorance and prejudice, but a window opening toward truth and freedom.

Second, educational television. You were promised that if there is not a nationwide educational television system in this country, it will not be the fault of the FCC. A strong national educational television system is steadily developing because educational TV now is receiving more of the necessary support from leaders in education, in government, in business, and in the general community—and I'm proud to say from many of you.

Since January 1961, we have reserved 56 additional channels for educational use, and laid the basis for a number of statewide systems. Twenty-three more educational TV stations are on the air now than 2 years ago, bringing the total of today's stations on the air to 77. This is only the beginning. The educators have estimated that over 1,000 assignments could be required to serve educational needs in the next decade.

Educational television must have outlets in the major communities, with their varied resources and large populations. The transfer of channel 13 to the educational interests of New York and New Jersey benefits not only the immediate area, but the entire national educational service. And an operating station at the other end of the East-West line in Los Angeles is on the drawing boards under the leadership of distinguished, public-spirited citizens in California. We actively supported the passage of Federal legislation to help the construction of educational stations. We created a special unit in the FCC to work with the educators and other interested agencies and State officials. We have placed educational TV in the mainstream of Commission activities and it will stay there.

Third, as you were promised, renewals of broadcast licenses have not been automatic. I remind you that before the New Frontier arrived, former Attorney General Rogers recommended to President Eisenhower in 1959 that the Commission undertake "regular

spot checks in depth each year (just as the Internal Revenue Service spot checks individual tax returns) of the renewal applications of a number of licensees or of the licenses in a particular community."

In the last 2 years, 14 licenses were revoked or denied a renewal; 15 more are now in the hearing process on the question of revocation or renewal; 26 licenses were granted on a short-term basis. Notices of apparent liability for fines have been issued in 21 cases. In 14 hearing cases involving license renewal or revocation, the hearing was ordered held in the station's own community.

Some hearings have also been held in the field to give the public a chance to express views on local service. These hearings have been conducted without regard to renewals of licenses. The public—your real ownership—has had an opportunity to give its views—some good, some bad—and to participate to a fuller extent in your decisions on broadcast service. I believe that with broadcasting stations as with income tax returns, the practice of making an occasional audit in depth is an effective though sometimes painful way of finding out whether the public interest is being served. I cannot understand how local expression about broadcasting service can be interpreted as governmental interference with freedom. The public's right to insist on having a voice in your decisions will be honored and maintained.

Some people in this industry, whom you so colorfully call "schlock" operators and whom we call law violators, have been finding out that when they promise public service to obtain a valuable license, they will be held to their promise. And the large majority of you, who do regard the public interest as a way of long broadcasting life instead of a quick commercial break, silently, I repeat, silently endorse our efforts.

Fourth, we have encouraged you to take positions on issues, to be unafraid of controversy, to editorialize, to help mold and lead public opinion. More and more of you are beginning to use your voices and to take a stand. The issues you examine are slowly shifting from pallid controversies about mother love and canoe safety to such adult themes as foreign aid, Cuba, civil rights, narcotics addiction, and the tax program.

Where there have been complaints, the Commission has backed you up, provided that you afforded a reasonable opportunity for the presentation of opposing views. Whether the complaints were about "Biography of a Bookie Joint" or the "Battle of Newburgh" or the much-discussed program about Mr. Nixon, we have repeatedly protected you against those who would water down your convictions through pressure group intimidation or suppress your freedom through commercial reprisals. And, I might add, that when the going gets rough on true issues of freedom of expression, many of you otherwise stanch defenders of free speech are conspicuously silent and absent from the fray.

Fifth, you were promised that we would press the FCC network study to a conclusion with useful results. This study, which began in 1955, and reached a halfway point in 1958, has now been completed. Our staff has made a report on network policies and practices, which the Congress is printing and distributing. We now have a clearer picture of the function, the power, and the problems of television network operations.

The basic issue before us can be stated quickly. The networks are an indispensable part of television. Our three networks have furnished to the people of this Nation informational and entertainment programing which could not otherwise have been achieved. Strong networks, and I hope one day there will be more than only three, are essential to successful television broadcasting. But when does strength become all-embracing dominance? Not long ago, an executive of one of the country's largest television advertisers, David J. Mahoney, of Colgate-Palmolive, said: "While the number of men who comprise the television industry may be relatively small, there is nothing small nor unimportant about the power this body wields. The networks today not only determine what gets on the air, but they own practically all of the shows. I believe there are about a dozen exceptions, but even in some of these, the networks have partial or controlling interests."

Power inevitably carries with it grave responsibility. We presently look to the stations, not the networks, while we know that it is generally the networks and not the stations which make the crucial decisions about what the public sees and hears. The responsibility for what goes out over the air cannot be left up in the air. And those who are making a buck from television must stop passing the buck.

Our problem is to maintain a free market for ideas in television, while preserving and encouraging essential services which only the networks currently provide. Frankly, I had hoped to be closer to a resolution of these issues than we are today. The ultimate solutions may rest with the Congress. Our staff's recommendations are under active study now by the Commission, and we intend to move.

Next radio. Let me once again express publicly the appreciation of your Government for the extraordinary cooperation and dedicated public service provided by you radio broadcasters at the time of the Cuban crisis last fall. Because of necessary security measures, there could be little advance notice given of President Kennedy's intention to speak to the Nation on October 22, 1962, or of the nature of his address. It was imperative that the President's message be heard by the people of Cuba.

In the hours prior to 7 p.m. on October 22, a study was made by the Voice of America and the Commission of the American stations which provided a strong signal to Cuba. Each was then asked to stand by for an important request from the White House. Between 6 and 7 o'clock, our Defense Commissioner Bob Bartley and I were with Pierre Salinger to help him reach seven broadcast stations and two short wave stations. In each case they immediately agreed to make their facilities available to carry the President's message. These stations, together with two more which volunteered their services, carried programs fed directly via land lines from Voice of America studios for several weeks thereafter. As the President has said, this unprecedented use of American private broadcast facilities effectively aided an important national defense effort. It is a remarkable demonstration of the cooperation our broadcast industry stands ready to give in times of emergency, and your Commission is proud of you and grateful to you.

Last year, we concluded that the time had come to give radio a long, hard look—to find out whether we were helping radio to make its own unique contribution to the public or whether we were stifling and warping the efforts of this oldest of our broadcast services to meet the newest of challenges. You responded promptly and constructively. In a friendly spirit, the Commission and all parts of the radio industry held a major conference. In the interim, we have imposed a freeze, declining, with few exceptions, to act on any new AM radio applications.

Where do we stand now? What have we found? And what do we propose?

Well, it's no secret that we've found a lot of people who don't find radio freezes as tasty as lime or lemon. We don't like freezes any more than they do. We're doing our best to restrict this freeze to the minimum period required. We will shortly propose some new rules for radio; rules which will tighten engineering standards. We hope to eliminate a great many unnecessary hearings which have eaten away the time, money, and energies of both the Commission and applicants for new or changed facilities, and which have created little in the long run except uncertainty, expense, delay, and exasperation.

I shall not discuss these proposals in detail today. I do assure you that the Commission views the competitive system of radio as basically sound and healthy. But it must proceed under clearly defined minimum standards of qualification and performance—standards that all know and understand and which will channel rivalry between stations into a striving for better service to the public.

Personally, I believe the Commission should adopt fundamentally different approaches to radio and television. In radio, we have abundant facilities. In a community with numerous stations on the air, I believe we should encourage more flexibility and specialization. I also believe that FM and AM should be considered together as one aural service. FM is coming into its own, and we are delighted with the splendid growth of FM stereo service and the advances of FM generally. The time to preserve FM ability to make its own unique contribution is now. There are glimmerings of a return to drama on the radio, and there are healthy increases in news coverage. Last year, more radios were purchased in the United States that ever before and we will do what we can to help, and not obstruct, radio's continuing growth and service to the public.

Finally, there are basic developments in UHF television. Our technical tests in New York are completed, and UHF passed with flying decibels. In this country, we are committed to a competitive enterprise system. We believe that the more free the competition the better the chance for growth, development, quality, and a kind of balanced productivity where there is something for everyone according to everyone's taste and pocketbook. We have a deep and committed faith in an open society, where talents are free to compete, to succeed, or even to fail. Under this system, the public is given the widest range of choice. Initially, the limitations of channels severely restricted television's opportunity to become a part of our free enterprise system. We could make available only 12 TV channels on a fully competitive basis, which meant in some communities that the channels were down to 2 or 1, or none.

However, last year, the Congress adopted legislation which over the long run will help put television back in the free enterprise picture. The all-channel receiver legislation cannot, by itself, guarantee quality; it can only guarantee the widest possible opportunity to achieve quality and to widen the viewer's choice.

More channels of opportunity open up at least four new dimensions of television service. By lighting up 82 channels instead of just 12, the country has a chance for: (1) A truly nationwide educational television system, with stations offering classroom instruction by day and broad, cultural programing in the evening; (2) a nationwide system of pay television if the public is willing to support this alternative to an advertiser-supported system; (3) a new commercial network attempting to provide more diversity for the public; (4) new stations to meet local needs in many communities without local service.

Some people sincerely believe that overall TV quality may suffer by added channels. But our free competitive system is an act of faith, and in the long run we have faith that new dimensions of television service will broaden the range of choice, will upgrade instead of degrade, will inspire instead of stultify, will liberate instead of suffocate.

As we move in this decade into the second round of UHF television's growth, we should ask ourselves some basic questions. Where do we go from here? Where do you go from here?

Not long ago, I read an extraordinary article entitled "Renewal in Societies and Men," by Dr. John W. Gardner, president of the Carnegie Corp. Poking beneath the surface and superficial, Dr. Gardner ponders the ingredients needed to keep a society alive and "relatively immune to decay." Dr. Gardner wrote: "When we talk about revitalizing a society, we tend to put exclusive emphasis on finding new ideas. But there is usually no shortage of new ideas; the problem is to get a hearing for them. And that means breaking through the crusty rigidity and stubborn complacency of the status quo. The aging society develops elaborate defenses against new ideas—'mind-forged manacles,' in William Blake's vivid phrase."

Dr. Gardner observes that as an organization becomes older, there comes to be a rule or precedent for everything. Men become prisoners of their procedures. And, he reminds us that "the last act of a dying organization is to get out a new and enlarged edition of the rulebook."

It is time to review the ever-enlarging rulebooks to see whether, even in this exceptionally young medium and industry, we are already in danger of becoming prisoners of our own procedures. By "we," I mean not only you broadcasters, but also those of us on the regulatory side.

I would like today to make several suggestions for all of us concerned with television.

We can all agree that one of TV's basic problems is the insatiable appetite of the medium for programing material. Given the best talent, the best intent, and the best financing, it is difficult for TV to create quality programing at the fantastic rate programs are consumed. One of the tragedies of television today is that most of our great programs, just like our not-so-great, disappear after one fleeting hour or half hour, never to be seen again. The rule with some exceptions, appears to be: "See it now—or never." Unlike other media of information and entertainment, television says flatly to the viewers: "Turn the dial to our station, now, at our convenience, or miss it ever afterwards." One thoughtful observer, Father John M. Culkin, notes that arranging your schedules to see a must program is like arranging for a plane flight, except there is no second time around if you miss it.

This becomes even more regretful when we examine what the television critics had to say and when we hear word-of-mouth reaction which advises us on Tueesday what we missed Monday night. As Goodman Ace once observed: "The job of a TV critic is to write 'Don't watch that lousy program that was on last night.' "

To be serious, our critics often tell us of the fine program we missed. Our friends and neighbors tell us of the special program we could not see. And our children often miss some of your better efforts which are scheduled after their bedtime.

This is a situation which is easily rectified through new technology. Few programs are live today. Although I am among those who mourn the dearth of live TV, there is comfort in the fact that programs on film or tape are easy to repeat at other times convenient for those who missed the first telecast.

A great deal of superlative TV fare, though it cannot be matched every hour, can certainly be repeated on the new UHF channels for the public. With some imagination and enterprise, UHF in the future can, among its other useful potentials, provide the ideal second-and-third opportunity for the great hours and half hours of TV.

This possibility, I believe, makes good sense and good economics. Even the special programs which reach the largest TV audiences still leave a residue of nonviewers in every community which is at least equally large; and this audience, kept from the first viewing by other plans, or by competing TV, or by lack of foreknowledge, could tune in the next night, or week, or month, or even several hours later, if given the opportunity. The heavy cost of producing much of our top TV demands residual uses to amortize production expenses, uses over and above the some time syndication or sale of foreign rights. The present system often produces a colossal waste, of money, of talent, and dedicated work. It results in a shameful deprivation, a needless withholding of information and entertainment from what is probably the majority audience who missed the first showing.

What can UHF do to help?

Quite a bit. UHF could make it possible for the networks to have two affiliates in some communities, a first-run and a second-run affiliate. The second affiliate would be a UHF station which would have access to the network's programs on a delay or repeat basis. The public would then have a second chance to see the best the networks have to offer within a week or so for timeless drama, music, and entertainment programs, and perhaps a shorter time in the case of news or informational programs.

Consider the benefits. New, less affluent advertisers could enter television; program costs could be better amortized; participants could receive some additional income.

Even as I point out these pleasant economic consequences, I am aware that there are a lot of cloudy problems. You will wonder about competing with yourselves. What about sponsors? What about ratings? About unions? As cloudy as the problems are, equally clear is one overriding consideration: Your responsibility to the public.

That responsibility, I say with John Gardner, can be met by shaking those mind-forged manacles, and by breaking through the crusty rigidity and stubborn complacency of the status quo. Perhaps you have some better ideas to accomplish the same purposes. How about some experiments? UHF in the future offers a rare second chance, an end to the scarcity of air time that has plagued television in the past. Let us use this exceptional opportunity to try out some new ideas. You are too young, too vigorous, too creative to be bound by this year's rule book or last year's balance sheet. The enemies of progress, the twin ghosts of fear and habit, must not imprison you in your own procedures.

The new channels also provide fresh opportunities to see programs from other lands. Fine television fare is being produced all over the world, and their producers are eager to make these programs available to the American audience. Variety shows, serious drama, documentaries of high quality are created in England, France, Italy, Canada, Japan, to name only a few countries. With UHF channels, program exchanges can be vastly increased. As TV Guide said recently: "We might see a British play one week, vaudeville turns from half a dozen countries the next week, bits of political debates, quiz shows, mysteries, science programs—the whole world of television could be our oyster.

"Foreign viewers see many American shows. Isn't it time that we had an opportunity to see some of theirs?"

That's a fair question, and I refer it to you ladies and gentlemen for a fair answer.

Another subject we should discuss is commercials, a matter of debate in broadcasting since 1922. It was in 1922 that Herbert Hoover, then responsible as Secretary of Commerce for the regulation of broadcasting, said, "It is inconceivable that we should allow so great a possibility for service, for news, for entertainment, for education, and for vital commercial purposes to be drowned in advertising chatter."

Forty-one years later, the American public is drowning, and calling for help.

A television commercial is broadcast somewhere in the United States every 1.7 seconds.

To figure out how often a radio commercial occurs would give a computer a nervous breakdown.

At the FCC, we have a policy against overcommercialization. If you ask us what that means, we would have to confess that in all its years, the FCC has never established ground rules defining it.

However, at the National Association of Broadcasters, you have a code of brodcasting practices. In the code is a specific and detailed provision for time to be devoted to commercials. The code was written by this industry and represents the thinking of responsible broadcasters about advertising practices. In your view, it establishes a fair standard under which "revenues from advertising" can support "the free, competitive American system of broadcasting" and at the same time "make available to the eyes and ears of the American people the finest programs of information, education, culture, and entertainment." Those quotations are from the preamble to the code itself.

The trouble with that code provision is that it is not complied with and is not adequately enforced. According to your own Bob Swezey, the head of your code authority, "It is virtually impossible for us to maintain industry standards in any practical sense. The public is still being victimized by the poor programing and shoddy practices of a large element of the industry which has no interest in standards and no compulsion to observe them."

The NAB itself says that only 1,750 radio stations subscribe to the code, approximately 38 percent of the radio stations on the air. In television, the figures are 405 subscribers, approximately 70 percent of the television stations.

And even those who subscribe to the code do not always adhere to its provisions.

One trade magazine summed up the situation recently by saying "As things stand now, a broadcaster can keep the code barefoot and knock it around the house as long as nobody from the National Association of Broadcasters' code authority is looking. Even if he gets caught, the neighbors aren't apt to hear of it."

Last year, I quoted the head of your own code authority, Mr. Swezey, who said to you that the time had come "to put up or shut up about self-regulation."

I submit you have succeeded in doing neither.

In another field, the Wall Street Journal recently urged greater self-regulation by the stock exchanges and observed "that the way to keep any neighborhood from crawling with policemen is for the community to insist upon good behavior all along the street."

That is sound advice. Yet, as Mr. Swezey remarked only 2 weeks ago, the interest broadcasters have "in self-regulation is * * * in direct proportion to the threat of government regulation." Self-regulation is clearly the best regulation just as self-discipline is the best discipline. Yet, though you have established reasonable standards for yourselves, you have demonstrated neither the capacity nor the will to enforce them. You can no longer have it both ways. You cannot subscribe in principle and ignore it in practice. Self-regulation cannot become self-deception.

That is why a majority of the Commission is inviting public comment on how best to solve this problem. One proposal we will consider is whether your own standards on commercials be adopted as Commission standards.

I wish I could persuade you and my colleagues to go to the Congress together to

urge that broadcasting legislation follow the principles of the Securities Exchange Act. I would urge that the law require that every broadcaster belong to the National Association of Broadcasters, just as most bankers belong to the National Association of Securities Dealers. You should be professionals, a status which many in your ranks already deserve. But this demands that you maintain high standards and that you discipline those among you who repeatedly cut corners.

My friend and teacher, Bill Cary, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, recently said this about the SEC, "This Commission is in no mood to expand, to seek growth for growth's sake. Government steps in to fill an evident public need; we urge, indeed, entreat, the industry to acknowledge this need and fulfill it." I say to you today the same things about the FCC.

I would personally urge that you have the lawful authority to enforce your own commercial standards, with an appeal to the FCC, just as is done in the securities field with the SEC. I cannot understand why you do not see the wisdom of taking such a course instead of requiring further action from the Government. Those of you who live honorably by fair rules should insist now that your competitors adhere to them too.

Again, with Dr. Gardner, this requires shaking up the crusty rigidity and stubborn complacency of the status quo. But I believe that the long-suffering patience of the viewing and listening public has worn thin, and that in the long run, you had best shake up your own status quo before you are shook up by a fed-up public.

Finally, as we reexamine the status quo, I must confess that I have found the FCC, too, a prisoner of its own procedures. The Commission is a vast and sometimes dark forest where we seven FCC hunters are often required to spend weeks of our time shooting down mosquitoes with elephant guns. In the interest of our governmental processes, and of American communications, that forest must be thinned out and wider, better marked roads have to be cut through the jungles of red tape. Though we have made many substantial improvements in recent years, the administrative process is a never-never land which we call quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial. The results are often quasi-solutions.

The recent work of the Federal Communications Bar Association in reviewing our structure, has been useful, and some of its recommendations are most constructive. Though I am probably alone at the Commission in this view, I believe deeply that the judicial and the other so-called administrative functions of the FCC should be split. I do not think it wise, or even possible, that we can be simultaneously regulator and judge. Mr. Donald C. Beelar, the president of the Federal Communications Bar Association, once said that, "It is not possible for a man to be a good judge on Monday and Tuesday, a good legislator on Wednesday and Thursday, and a good administrator on Friday." I think Mr. Beelar is right.

I have studied the report of the Hoover Commission of 1949 and the 1959 report to President Eisenhower by Mr. Louis Hector, who served as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board from 1957 to 1959. I agree basically with the views of the Hoover Commission and Mr. Hector. On this principle of separation of regulatory and judicial functions, I recognize that most of my colleagues disagree with me. I respect this majority view and recognize, of course, that I could be wrong. However, I sincerely believe that this basic reform could materially improve the effectiveness and value of the FCC to the public and to the industries under FCC regulation. On some appropriate occasion, I will spell out these views in detail.

Your annual meeting is a fitting occasion to pay tribute to many of you active in the day-to-day work of the National Association of Broadcasters, above all, to Governor Collins, a leader you, too, have grown to recognize as a man of principle, of conscience, and of wisdom. If you've seen the Broadway play, you will know what I mean when I say he is your man of all seasons. He commands respect and confidence of the public and your government. He is a man to heed, to follow, and to treasure.

There have been improvements in broadcasting. Many of you are doing a better job of serving the public than was the case several years ago. Still, in television entertainment, too many of you still take too literally the advice of H. L. Mencken when he said, "Nobody ever went broke underestimating the intelligence of the American people." With Hubbell Robinson, I hold that far too often, television entertainment reduces its audience to the ranks of the emotionally and mentally underprivileged. I hope the congressional examination of the ratings systems may encourage you to put more trust in the people, and more faith in your own judgments of the public's capacity to respond to the best that is in you.

In the area of informational programing, there are many reasons to be proud. A comparison of today's television schedules with those of 3 years ago will indicate there is now slightly more than three times as much informational programing in evening hours. And much of it is done with skill and courage.

You are helping the Nation to know more about the Supreme Court, about juvenile delinquency, about mental illness, about communism, about education, and about ourselves. You are effectively carrying on the good fight to win access for broadcasting to more public proceedings so that it can enlarge its informational service to the public. I salute your efforts, and I will continue to help to the best of my ability.

I have been urging you to see if there was not more room on television to teach, to inform, to stretch, to enlarge the capacities of our children. You have found a bit more room for some exceptional programs. Some of you may ask now in the words of the familiar political slogan, "Had enough?" The answer is positively "No." Nothing is enough, nothing is too good for the children who spend 70 million hours a day with you. You're beginning to demonstrate what television can do, but it is only a beginning. In the last year a first-rate study of television for children was completed by the Foundation for Character Education in Boston. To quote from it: "Knowing * * * about children, a writer who can resolve a plot only by killing the villain is incompetent; a producer who employs violence and brutality to attract an audience is unscrupulous; a network which encourages such material, even by default, is irresponsible; and a sponsor which accepts such said sadism if it produces sales is unethical."

Every American parent trusts you to continue your improvement. You are not merely babysitting electronically. You are molding, by the hand and the heart and the mind, America's future.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, you chose a hard life when you chose broadcasting. You volunteered for public regulation and public pressure. In return, the people have placed in your hands and hearts the greatest gift possible in a free country, the extraordinary privilege of using the public airwaves to the exclusion of others who would welcome, and indeed have fought for, that privilege. Under our broadcasting system, as I have repeated so often, your Government does not decide what goes on the air. Acting as trustees for all of us, you private citizens make the decisions. We will continue to prod your consciences, to goad your ideals, to disturb your sleep. For as Ed Murrow once said of television: "This instrument can teach, it can illuminate; yes, and it can even inspire. But it can do so only to the extent that humans are determined to use it to those ends. Otherwise, it is merely lights and wires in a box."

It is your responsibility to make certain that broadcasting is more than lights and wires in a box. As you meet that responsibility, you will remember to provide more news and public affairs programs where ideas are rubbed against other ideas into the friction of controversy. On such informational programs may rest the strengthening of an enlightened electorate, critical to the survival of freedom. But you will also remember that you need to do more than feed our minds. Broadcasting must also nourish our spirit. We need entertainment which helps us to grow in compassion and understanding.

Certainly, make us laugh, but also help up comprehend. Of course, sing us to sleep, but also awaken us to the awesome dangers of our time. Surely, divert us with mysteries, but also help us unlock the mysteries of our universe.

Above all, heed the wisdom of Judge Learned Hand who once penetrated the heart of the meaning of liberty when he wrote: "By enlightenment men gain insight into their own being, and that is what frees them."

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR SUPPORT OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I have indicated upon earlier occasions it is my belief that the helpful background material contained in the publication of the National Committee for Support of the Public Schools entitled "Changing Demands on Education and Their Fiscal Implications" is worthy of serious consideration by every Member of this great body.

Carrying out my objective I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the chapters entitled "School Dropouts—A Major Threat," "Scope and Quality of Education," "Counting the Cost," and "Fiscal Implications" be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the chapters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGING DEMANDS ON EDUCATION AND THEIR FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

VIII. SCHOOL DROPOUTS—A MAJOR THREAT

The amount of schooling of different individuals varies enormously. Some children do not continue in school even to the fifth grade. In succeeding grades, the attrition is higher than most people realize.

According to the U.S. Office of Education, the high school graduating class of 1954 contained only 553 of each 1,000 pupils who had reached the fifth grade 7 years earlier.

Just how long each child should continue in school is a matter of opinion. There is wide agreement, however, that the many pupils who drop out of school at 16, or at whatever earlier age the law or circumstances permit, constitute a major problem. One study concludes that school dropouts create an explosive situation and are a serious threat to our society.

School dropout rate

For example, the number of high school graduates in 1962, as a percent of eighth grade enrollment in 1957–58, varied from 92.3 percent in Wisconsin to 51.8 percent in Georgia. The median for 50 States and the District of Columbia was 70.6 percent.[1] (See table II for data on all States.) The average dropout rate between eighth grade and high school graduation is approximately 32 percent.

---

[1] National Education Association, research division. "Rankings of the States, 1963." Research report 1963–R1. Washington, D.C.: the association, 1963, table 47.

It should not be assumed that these 32 percent who quit school in the 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grades are incapable of learning. Many are the victims of inadequate schooling in one form or another.

Age of school dropouts

The greatest percentage of withdrawal occurs at about the age when attendance is no longer compulsory, which is 16 years in most States. In October of 1959, 929,000, or 17.1 percent of youths aged 16 and 17 years were not enrolled in schools.[2]

Grade reached by school dropouts

Less than 60 percent of the boys and girls who reach the fifth grade stay in school through high school. Out of every three reaching the ninth grade, one fails to get a high school diploma.[3]

The first major drop occurs between the 9th and 10th grades when many pupils are making the transition from junior to senior high school. * * * Another significant drop occurs between the 10th and 11th grades. Many of these pupils have obviously tried the secondary school and found it wanting for their needs.[4]

Current trends indicate that about 7.5 million of the young people entering the labor force during the 1960's will not have completed high school, and that 2.5 million will not have completed even the eighth grade.[5]

Reasons for dropping out of school

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, pupils who drop out from the 8th, 9th, and 10th grades most often do so for reasons closely related to their school experiences, such as grade retardation, academic difficulties, and failure to participate in pupil activities. Dropouts from the later grades, however, are chiefly accounted for by other well-defined reasons such as marriage, or the need to work.[6]

TABLE II.—*1962 high school graduates as percent of 1957–58 8th-grade enrollment*

	Percent
1. Wisconsin	92.3
2. Minnesota	88.2
3. California	86.4
4. Nebraska	84.8
5. Illinois	84.5
6. Washington	84.2
7. Hawaii	80.6
8. New Jersey	78.8
9. Iowa	78.6
10. Michigan	78.4
11. Kansas	78.1
12. South Dakota	78.1
13. Pennsylvania	78.0
14. Oregon	77.9
15. Utah	77.2
16. North Dakota	76.8
17. Indiana	74.1
18. New York	74.1
19. Montana	73.3
20. Rhode Island	73.3
21. Connecticut	73.1
22. Wyoming	73.1
23. Missouri	73.0
24. Colorado	72.9
25. Idaho	72.5
26. Ohio	72.4
27. Delaware	72.0
28. Arizona	71.1
29. Alaska	70.1
30. New Hampshire	69.3
31. Massachusetts	68.2
32. Oklahoma	67.9
33. Maryland	67.5
34. Nevada	63.7
35. Florida	62.9
36. New Mexico	62.2
37. Maine	61.0
38. Texas	60.6
39. Arkansas	57.8
40. Louisiana	57.8
41. Mississippi	57.8
42. North Carolina	57.4
43. Vermont	56.4
44. West Virginia	55.5
45. Tennessee	55.1
46. Alabama	55.0
47. South Carolina	54.2
48. Kentucky	52.6
49. Virginia	51.9
50. Georgia	51.8
50 States and District of Columbia	70.6

Source: National Education Association, Research Division. Rankings of the States, 1963. Research Report 1963–R1. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1963. Table 47.

Lack of guidance counselors and courses of study to meet the widely varying capacities and goals of high school pupils today are among the major factors causing pupils to quit school. Parental and community attitudes are also influential. After visiting public schools in "two totally different neighborhoods," Conant concludes:

> One lesson to be drawn from visiting and contrasting a well-to-do suburb and a slum is all important for understanding American public education. This lesson is that to a considerable degree what a school should do and can do is determined by the status and ambitions of the families being served.[7]

Children of migrant workers

It is estimated that 400,000 migrant workers, accompanied by more than 100,000 children, travel from community to community and from State to State each year in search of agricultural employment.

Educationally, these children are the most deprived group in the Nation. Frequent moves force them to fall further and further behind in their studies. When they drop out of school for good, their average achievement is below the fourth grade level.[8] A few States are attempting to deal with this problem, but it is an extremely difficult one.

Characteristics of school dropouts

The National Education Association project on school dropouts is studying intensively the characteristics of school dropouts.[9] The following are some of the findings:

1. The average dropout is not uneducable. He does tend to score lower on IQ tests than his inschool counterpart, but a nationwide study conducted by the U.S. Department of Labor showed that 70 percent of the dropouts surveyed had registered IQ scores above 90, clearly in the educable group. An intensive 6-year study in the State of New York revealed that 13 percent of the dropouts had IQ scores above 110.[10] This rating should permit high school graduation and some post-high-school training.

2. The average dropout is at least 2 years retarded in reading ability by the time he quits school. Reading remains the fundamental educational skill; without it no student can perform adequately in school. The consequences of retardation in reading are obvious: dropouts fail 3 times as many courses as stayins, and 9 of every 10 dropouts have been retained in some grade at least 1 extra year.

3. The majority of dropouts are from lower socioeconomic families. They often come from families where the father is missing, where cultural background and horizons are limited, where education is viewed with indifference, distrust, or open resentment. Any redemptive or preventive effort of the school will have to take account of the student's total environment and will depend heavily on the school's staff of guidance counselors and school-community coordinators.

4. There is a high percentage of dropouts among minority groups. This fact was detailed as follows at the 1961 Conference on Unemployed, Out-of-School Youth in Urban Areas: Estimates of the number of Mexican-American youth who leave school before getting to high school range as high as 50 percent in the major cities.

Today, two-thirds of all Negroes live in urban areas, one-third in urban areas outside the South.[11]

In a slum section composed almost entirely of Negroes in one of our largest cities the following situation was found. A total of 59 percent of the male youth between the ages of 16 and 21 were out of school and unemployed. They were roaming the streets. Of the boys who graduated from high school, 48 percent were unemployed in contrast to 63 percent of the boys who had dropped out of school.

An even worse state of affairs was found in another special study in a different city. In a slum area of 125,000 people, mostly Negroes, a sampling of the youth population shows that roughly 70 percent of the boys and girls ages 16 to 21 are out-of-school and unemployed.[12]

The problem of unemployed youth in the large cities is in no small part a Negro problem. We do not facilitate its solution by trying to find phrases to hide this fact.[13]

5. Dropouts are not entirely from minority groups. Of the four special surveys made for the Conference on Unemployed, Out-of-School Youth in Urban Areas, two dealt with racially mixed urban school districts where the majority of the dropouts interviewed were white. Like the minority group dropouts, however, most of these white boys and girls belonged to lower income families who had recently arrived in the city. Theirs were families who had left subsistence farms, families said to be among the Nation's least educated, with a lack of motivation no less deadening than that of darker skinned families from depressed areas. But the problem of school dropouts is not confined to the big cities. It exists in small towns. It is particularly acute in rural areas, and the problems of the rural areas and the big cities are closely related.[14]

---

[2] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. School Enrollment: October 1959. Current Population Reports, Population Characteristics, Series P–20, No. 101. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960, p. 8.

[3] Lambert, Sam M., director of research, National Education Association. Testimony before U.S. 87th Cong., 1st sess., House of Representatives, Committee on Education, and Labor, March 1961, p. 173.

[4] National Education Association, Research Division and Department of Classroom Teachers. High School Dropout. Discussion Pamphlet No. 3. Washington, D.C.: the association, 1959, p. 6.

[5] U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. From School to Work. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960, p. 1.

[6] National Education Association, Research Division and Department of Classroom Teachers, op. cit., p. 7.

[7] Conant, James B. Slums and Suburbs: "A Commentary on Schools in Metropolitan Areas," New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961, p. 1.

[8] Janson, Donald. "Migrant Pupils Miss Schooling." New York Times, July 22, 1962. Copyright by the New York Times. Reprinted by permission.

[9] Schreiber, Daniel. "School Dropouts," NEA Journal 51: 51–52; May 1962.

[10] Ibid., p. 52.

[11] National Committee for Children and Youth. Social Dynamite. Report of the Conference on Unemployed, Out-of-School Youth in Urban Areas. Washington, D.C.: the Committee, 1961, p. 16.

[12] Ibid., p. 26.

[13] Ibid., p. 32.

Statewide study of dropouts

A statewide study of dropouts by the Illinois Office of Public Instruction revealed the following:

"Approximately 54 percent of the students who took more than 8 years to finish elementary school became high school dropouts.

"Only 2 percent of the students who took college preparatory courses became dropouts, while 38 percent of those who studied general curriculum left high school before graduating.

"About 60 percent of the students who were absent more than 25 days out of the normal 185-day school year became dropouts.

"Over 30 percent of the dropouts occurred before the end of the freshman year; another 30 percent occurred during the sophomore year.

"High school graduates held more part-time jobs than dropouts held.

"Dropouts had more frequent access to family cars and owned more cars than did those who graduated.

"Students who finished high school engaged in more extracurricular activities than did dropouts.

"A large percentage of dropouts came from broken homes."[15]

What happens to school dropouts?

A number of studies have been made to discover what happens to young people who drop out of school. Among the more important findings are these:

1. A large percentage is unemployed. The U.S. Department of Labor in October 1960 surveyed the employment status of June 1960 graduates and pregraduation dropouts. The survey found that—"about three-fourths of the male dropouts, but almost nine-tenths of the high school graduates (those not enrolled in college), were working. About two-thirds of the unmarried female dropouts, but three-fourths of the graduates, were working. Futhermore, the unemployed dropouts had been unemployed for longer periods than the unemployed graduates.[16]

Conant stated that, "in the slums of the largest cities * * * the great need is for reduction of unemployment of male youth under 21.[17]

"The present (1960) unemployment rate nationwide is roughly 7 percent for all age brackets, but unemployment among youth under 20 years of age is about 20 percent, or nearly three times greater than the nationwide rate for all workers."[18]

A survey made in New York City in the summer of 1962 showed that 45,000 youths needed work but were unable to find it. Many of these were Puerto Ricans and Negroes, the groups which have the most difficulty in finding jobs. Many are school dropouts, and their lack of education and training further hampers them.

Ewan Clague, Director of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, stated at the Conference on Unemployed, Out-of-School Youth in Urban Areas that 300,000 boys and 115,000 girls between the ages 16 and 20 reported themselves out of school looking for work in October 1960.

2. Most school dropouts when employed work at unskilled jobs. Unskilled and immature, the dropout finds himself abandoned in a labor market where he has little to offer.

"Casual jobs and work requiring little in the way of skills training typify the employment activity of most 14- to 17-year-olds. Job opportunities for youth in this age group are concentrated mainly in the trade and service industries and in agriculture."[19]

The jobs available to school dropouts are usually of the lowest order. Frequently they offer irregular employment and are the least open to advancement. Also, employers are loathe to employ and to provide on-the-job training to youths in the 16-to-21 age group, since they may be subject to call for military service.

"Two-thirds of the Nation's force of service workers and operatives and laborers are former dropouts. Two-thirds of the unemployed men and women in the United States possess less than a high school education."[20]

3. Dropouts face keen competition. Because of the rapid rise in births in the 1940's and 1950's, the population reaching age 18 will shortly increase especially fast—from 2.6 million in 1960 to 3.8 million in 1965, up nearly 50 percent in only 5 years. The 1965 rate will continue through 1970. Because of this increase, the number of new workers entering the labor force will mount steadily. Altogether, 26 million young people will enter the labor force during the 1960's, almost 40 percent more than during the 1950's.[21]

The estimated 7.5 million youths who, according to recent experience, will drop out of school during the 1960's may glut the labor market, already overcrowded with unskilled workers, at a time when the number of unskilled occupations is declining.

4. The life earnings of school dropouts are low. During his lifetime, the average boy who drops out of school before high school graduation will earn much less than the average high school graduate. "The typical male high school graduate can be expected to earn over his lifetime (from age 25 to death) $72,000 more than the typical male elementary school graduate."[22]

School dropouts and delinquency

Exact numbers and percents of school dropouts who become delinquent are not known. It is claimed that they are relatively large. Out-of-school, unemployed youth are more apt to become delinquent. A youngster out of school and out of work is a potential source of trouble to himself and to the community. A youth who drops out of school and cannot find a job, which gives him a sense of belonging to the community and of purpose in life, is apt to feel at odds with society and is more likely to become delinquent.

Careful studies of juvenile delinquency show that this problem is not confined to communities and families of low socioeconomic status. It occurs in favored communities and families, although at a lower rate of incidence. Nor is juvenile delinquency a peculiar problem of the United States. It is worldwide. These facts call for fundamental study of this disturbing problem and incisive action by responsible agencies, including the schools.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Today, for most youths under 18, work should be secondary to getting education and training appropriate to their abilities and needs.

2. Lack of basic education seriously complicates the retraining of the long-term unemployed.

3. A substantial percentage on relief rolls are those who lose their jobs and lack the training for other employment.

4. Out-of-school, unemployed youths commit a disproportionately high percentage of juvenile crimes.

5. Full development of each youth's talents and abilities is the key to meeting future manpower needs. To assure such development, youths must have protection and guidance, jobs that provide productive experience, and, perhaps most important, the kind of education needed in our modern, complex, and technically oriented economy.

The above conclusions raise many questions about the adequacy of today's public elementary and secondary schools. Is the guidance program adequate? Is the curriculum or program of studies broad enough to meet the present needs of America's children and youth? Are adequate provisions made for the children of disadvantaged Americans,[23] i.e., parents with low socioeconomic status, language handicaps, lack of vocational skills with resulting unemployment, and little interest in having their children continue in school? Are the quality of teachers and their training and teaching equal to the demands of a rapidly changing society?

The powerful impacts of our dynamic economy upon all Americans hold fundamental implications for public schools. The next section identifies some of the improvements required in these schools if they are to meet changing demands.

IX. SCOPE AND QUALITY OF EDUCATION

Earlier parts of this report list demands that our dynamic society is making on the public schools and that are not being fully met. What changes and improvements in public education are necessary to meet these demands?

Adequate schooling for all

There should be decisive action so that no child will reach adulthood lacking the basic schooling essential for successful living in our complex and changing society. This requires that there be good schools in all communities, not just in some communities. There must be enforcement of school attendance laws. Inadequate schooling should no longer be a major cause of millions of functional illiterates who suffer the disabilities described in section VII of this report and who are the source of some of our most serious social problems.

Quality schools in every community

There should be a stepping up of the quality of instruction throughout the public schools of the United States. The facts of this report urgently demand quality schooling to meet the insistent needs of a technological society which continually requires more and better schooling.

Just what quality schooling is will be left to the vigorous and discordant voices who are now debating this question. Rather, let us look at some of the prerequisites for a quality school.

Quality Teachers

A quality school must have well-prepared teachers. Some schools do not have such teachers. There has been and is a continuing shortage of new teachers—those members of the current class of college seniors who will meet the requirements for the standard certificate in September of each year. The prospective 1962 supply from this source was approximately 106,000, while the estimated demand for all public school needs in September 1962 was 240,000.

---

[14] Ibid., pp. 17–18.

[15] Overview, "Late News." Overview 3: 22: August 1962. Copyright 1962, Buttenheim Publishing Corp.

[16] Cooper, Sophia. "Employment of June 1960 High School Graduates." Special Labor Force Report No. 15. Monthly Labor Review 84: 463–70; May 1961.

[17] Conant, op. cit., p. 35.

[18] Conant, James B. "Social Dynamite in Our Cities." Social Dynamite, p. 27.

[19] White House Regional Conferences. Young Workers Under 18. Fact Sheet. Washington, D.C.: the Conferences, 1961.

[20] Schreiber, op. cit.

[21] U.S. Department of Labor, op. cit.

[22] Lambert, op cit., p. 171.

[23] National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, Educational Policies Commission. Education and the Disadvantaged American, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1962, 39 pp.

The 106,000 was not sufficient even to replace the 125,000 teachers leaving teaching service and the additional 35,000 required by the annual increase in public school population of approximately 1 million. The prospective supply also failed to meet the estimated need for 80,000 additional teachers (a) to relieve overcrowded classes and to eliminate part-time sessions, (b) to provide instruction and services not now provided, and (c) to replace teachers not fully prepared for their assignments.[24]

The conclusion of the study that released the above statistics is the following:

"The increase over the preceding year [in the supply of new teachers] is not proportional to the increased needs; the prospect for substantial relief from the chronic shortage is not in sight."[25]

Several factors account for this chronic shortage. Among them is the fact that only about 83 percent of the prospective new elementary schoolteachers and about 68 percent of the prospective new high school teachers actually seek teaching positions.[26] This is due, in part, to the fact that teachers generally receive lower salaries than are received by those with equal degrees of preparation in other professions.[27]

Accordingly, school officials cannot secure qualified teachers for all classrooms. With such funds as they have, they seek to do so. When enough fully prepared teachers are not available, the best to be found are employed, even though they fall short of what is required for quality schools.

The shortage of teachers is exaggerated by the imbalance between those preparing for elementary and secondary school posts. The most severe shortage by far is at the elementary level, where almost one-half of the new supply of teachers has to be drawn from miscellaneous sources in the general population.

At the secondary level, the problem is one of achieving a better "distribution of the newly produced supply among the teaching fields. In a few fields (such as men's physical education and the social sciences) the concentration is far beyond the possibility of employment as high school teachers."[28] At the same time there is a shortage of teachers of mathematics and physical sciences and of women's physical education and home economics.

Preparation of Teachers

Much energy has been wasted in recent years in debating about which is more important: mastery of subject matter or professional preparation concerning how best to teach it. Both are essential. The issue is one of emphasis and means.

Some would provide teachers with training in the content of the field they are to teach and then place them in classrooms as apprentice teachers or teacher aids. They would postpone or eliminate professional preparation dealing with such matters as child growth and development, the significance of wide differences in individual aptitudes of pupils, and the methods whereby motivation can facilitate learning.

A rounded point of view would seek to provide teachers who know their subject, understand their pupils, and know how best to teach them.

Physical Facilities

There is a shortage of classrooms and other physical facilities required for quality schools, due to rising school enrollments and costs of building construction. The fall 1961 report of the U.S. Office of Education described the situation thus:

"The accumulated shortage of instruction rooms from past years remains high despite the fact that in the last 6 years (1955–56 through 1960–61) an annual average of 69,100 rooms were completed.

"Although 62,700 rooms are scheduled for completion in 1961–62 only a small part of the total can be applied against the reduction of the backlog of 127,000 rooms. This is due to the fact that thousands of rooms will be needed by the fall of 1962 to provide for population shifts, the estimated annual enrollment increase of over a million pupils, and replacements of rooms abandoned during the year for various reasons."[29]

Teachers and Teaching Machines

One of the open questions regarding the number of teachers needed for quality schools concerns the use of various mechanical devices such as teaching machines. Some say that these machines can be used to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio, that is, that teachers are to be replaced to a certain extent by educational television and teaching machines. Others claim that mechanical teaching devices should aid rather than replace teachers. Additional experimentation and research are needed to find answers to major questions about the role of programed instruction.[30]

Curriculums to meet needs of all groups

The public elementary and secondary schools should provide educational opportunities to meet the special needs of all groups in the widely diverse population they now enroll.

Our schools should not merely enroll all children and youths. They should also offer programs which meet the special needs of all groups. The high schools, in particular, have undergone a revolution since the turn of the century. In 1900, they enrolled a small, selected, and relatively homogenous population preparing for the higher walks of life. Now they enroll youths who represent the full range of socioeconomic status, motivation, educability, and occupational destination.

The problem is to devise curricula, types of school organization, and community cooperation that come to grips with current social and educational realities. The difficulties of achieving this transformation will be increased if some of our so-called better informed citizens continue to reveal a shocking ignorance of the social problems with which the modern school is confronted.[31]

Conant, one of the few who has taken the trouble to visit a substantial sampling of the vastly differing 21,000 high schools of the United States, defines the issue thus:

"Without an understanding of the complexities of public education resulting from the diversities of American communities, there can be no productive discussion of the shortcomings of our tax-supported schools."[32]

The immediately following pages pinpoint some of the groups that in all communities should have schooling appropriate to their capacities and life objectives.

Development of the talented

More attention should be given to the early identification and development of talented youth.

Greater effort on a broader scale should be made to identify talented youth in elementary and secondary schools as well as in college and to provide programs commensurate with their abilities. Many talented high school students today are not working to capacity. They are not sufficiently challenged by present courses to develop their talents to the maximum. The result is that too large a percentage of our brightest high school graduates do not enter college, and of those that do, too many leave before graduation.

Studies have shown that due to lack of funds or lack of incentive to attend college, a large fraction of our brightest youth are failing to get the education that would permit them to work at the levels for which they are potentially qualified. It was found that fewer than one-half of the best 25 percent of all high school grauates graduate from college. Only 6 out of 10 of the potentially most promising 5 percent of high school graduates earn college degrees.[33]

A nationwide survey of 1959–60 high school seniors showed that plans for attending college depended, to a large extent, on the following factors:

1. Fathers occupation: Of those whose fathers were white-collar workers, 66 percent were planning to go to college as compared with 37 percent whose fathers were manual or service workers and 34 percent whose fathers were farmworkers.

2. Family income: Of the 1959–60 high school seniors, 68 percent of those whose family income was $7,500 or over planned to go to college as compared with 52 percent of those whose family income was $5,000–$7,499; 40 percent, when it was $3,000–$4,999; and 23 percent when it was under $3,000.

3. Sex: More boys than girls indicated their intention to enroll in college, despite a larger number of girls than boys among high school seniors in 1959–60.[34]

4. Educational status of parents: Parents' education plays a decisive role, according to the U.S. Bureau of the Census:

"The proportion of sons who attended (or completed) college increases dramatically according to the level of schooling completed by their fathers. These proportions ranged from nearly 55 percent of the sons of fathers with a high school diploma (but no college) to 70 percent of the sons of fathers with some college, and 88 percent of the sons of fathers who were college graduates. Fewer than one-fourth of the sons of fathers without a high school diploma has either graduated from college or had some college attendance."[35]

Of the more than 1 million high school seniors in late 1959 who had no plans to attend college or were undecided, the largest number gave one or more of these reasons: money, home needs, poor grades, and no desire to continue in school.

Each year in the early 1960's, nearly 3 million young people will reach age 18. By 1965, this number will rise sharply to nearly 4 million. If present trends continue, about two-thirds of these young people will graduate from high school, and about one-half of the graduates will enter college.

It is doubtless true that the percentage of talented children correlates with such factors as family income, educational status of parents, and father's occupation. It is also probably true that a considerably larger number of youths qualified for higher education would be discovered among the socioeconomically average and below-average families if a more intensive search were made to find them.

The early identification and development of talented youth have long been a concern of educators. The Educational Policies Commission, for example, in its 1944 and 1948 reports urged that special attention be given to youth with superior intellectual capacity and to those who possess special talents.[36]

It highlighted this concern in its 1950 report, "Education of the Gifted":

"The American people must invest a larger portion of their economic resources in the education of individuals of superior talent. Such an increase in investment will result in a disproportionately large return in social dividends."[37]

The time has come when halfway measures to identify and develop talented youth will not suffice. A nationwide effort is called for.

In recent years, the National Science Foundation and other agencies have responded to the call for the full development of gifted youths, but efforts in this direction need to be increased. When considering the cost involved, perhaps heed should be given to this advice: To make money immortal, invest it in men.

Quality schools for average students

Better education for those of average ability is essential. The quality of education provided the great middle group, those of average and of slightly below and above average scholastic ability, should be improved by general education courses, suited to individual and social needs, and opportunities for training in a variety of skilled and technical fields as well as in some semiprofessional occupations.

One of the distinctive features of American public education has been its role in upgrading the occupational status of the labor force of the United States. Generally, the son, with better access to educational opportunity than his father, has qualified for a job requiring higher training and permitting higher earnings. This has both lifted the economic status of the individual worker and supplied the additional trained manpower required by a growing economy.

This highly significant role of American education can be clearly seen as it affects immigrant families. Released from the socioeconomic stratification and class structure of education in Europe, the son and grandson of the immigrant have had opportunity to secure the general and vocational education that permitted them to rise above the lower socioeconomic levels to which their forebears were chained.

There are those who would sharply restrict against mass education. They would limit educational opportunity beyond the junior high school to a selected few. This would be a reversion to a class-structured system of education, formerly characteristic of Europe, but which is now being modified toward a more democratic pattern.

The United States should not turn back educational opportunity. They inveigh the clock in education. Rather, it should continue the policy of making its schools more effective for all, at both the elementary and the secondary school levels. Several States have extended public education through grade 14 by establishing junior or community colleges. These institutions offer opportunity for continued general education and for technical training in accord with the abilities and goals of the students. Many continue in colleges and universities, and others complete their full-time school attendance at the end of grade 14.

Special programs for those of lower ability

A high priority should be the development of effective programs for those below average in scholastic ability and accomplishment.

The most neglected group in the public schools are those students, approximately 30 percent of the total enrollment, who have little aptitude for academic studies or even for courses which lead toward skilled and technical occupations. Eliminated from the lower secondary school grades or earlier, they compose the core of the unemployed and untrained school dropouts described in section VIII of this report.

If society is to deal with these youths intelligently, there must be much exploration of local, State, and National employment needs at the less-than-skilled levels. Employers, labor, and school officials, through cooperative effort, should develop the kinds of training, both in and out of school, that will permit these pupils to become responsible citizens, employed in semiskilled and service jobs.

The operatives and kindred workers group, according to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, during the 1957–75 period, is expected to decline from about 19.5 percent to about 17.5 percent of the total employment. Nevertheless, about 3 million workers will be added to the operatives group, and they will still remain the largest occupational group in our labor force.[38] In the service industries, employment will continue to grow faster than in the production industries; in fact, faster than in the labor force as a whole.[39]

Vocational education programs, as well as most education programs, have done little for the youth of low academic aptitude. The schools should accept some responsibility for making these youths competent for employment. This will require that the vocational educator be less selective as to those admitted to some type of occupational training.

Below are excerpts from one proposal concerning the kind of education that should be provided for those of below-average academic ability and achievement:

"Everyone should have an opportunity to prepare for some socially useful occupation at whatever level.

"There is no suitable universally accepted pattern for preparing high school youth for semiskilled, operative, and nonapprenticeable service occupations. As a result, we do not truly practice what we preach concerning the need for universal vocational education.

"We know the make-up of today's and tomorrow's work force, but we have not designed our educational programs according to the great opportunities available.

"A new approach to vocational/industrial education must be explored which might bring together realistic labor force requirements, individual aptitudes and needs, and the tragically high dropout rate of our schools. The compelling purpose of such an approach should be to prepare average and less-than-average pupils for a variety of semiskilled and service jobs that exist in industry.

"Much study and experimentation will be required before a thoroughly satisfactory program can be developed."[40]

All students—the gifted, the average, and the less than average—must be educated and trained to be contributing members of our American democracy. While the need for social integration of America's diverse and mobile population is large, it by no means demands a common curriculum for all. Differentiated curricula can serve both social integration and technical specialization, whereas a common curriculum cannot.

Counseling and guidance services

More extensive counseling and guidance services should be provided for each student. Guidance in the elementary school, as at all other school levels, requires knowing pupils as individuals—not merely as a group studying reading or arithmetic. Adequate counseling and guidance services should include identifying the gifted and planning work commensurate with their abilities; seeing that slow learners have a chance for success and encouraging them to get as much education as they can; discovering the special needs of children from disadvantaged homes; seeing that pupils in the lower 30 percent in ability are not merely marking time but, insofar as possible, are acquiring a basic education and are looking forward to some form of vocational training; and helping pupils who have special problems of educational, social, and emotional adjustment.

This means discovering, in their incipient stages, the causes of such problems as failure in schoolwork, inability to get along with other pupils, and more or less serious delinquency when it occurs. It means cooperation of the pupil, his teachers, and his parents in solving the difficulty. When such problems are ameliorated in elementary school, they are less apt to become deep seated by the time the pupil reaches junior and senior high school.

---

[24] National Education Association, Research Division. "Teacher Supply and Demand in the Public Schools, 1962." Research Report 1962–R8. Washington, D.C.: the association, 1962, pp. 5, 21.

[25] Ibid., p. 7.

[26] Ibid., p. 5.

[27] National Education Association. "Professional Salaries for Professional Teachers." Washington, D.C.; the association, 1961, p. 8.

[28] National Education Association, Research Division. "Teacher Supply and Demand in the Public Schools. National Education Association Research Bulletin 40: 95; October 1962.

[29] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. "Fall 1961 Enrollment, Teachers, and School Housing." Circular No. 676. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962, p. 6.

[30] Cronbach, Lee J. "What Research Says About Programed Instruction," National Education Association Journal 51: 45–47; December 1962.

[31] American Academy of Arts and Sciences. "Report of the Committee of the Teaching Profession." New York: American Council of Learned Societies.

[32] Conant, James B., "The Child, the Parent and the State." Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959, p. 64.

[33] Wolfle, Dael. "America's Resources of Specialized Talent." Report of the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training. New York: Harper & Row, 1954, p. 8.

[34] "Occupational Outlook Quarterly," 6: 11–14; May 1962.

See also U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, and U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. "Educational Status, College Plans, and Occupational Status of Farm and Nonfarm Youths." Series Census–ERS P–27, No. 10, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962.

[35] Ibid., pp. 11–12.

See also U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. "School Enrollment and Education of Young Adults and Their Fathers." Series P–20, No. 110. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.

[36] National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, Educational Policies Commission. "Education for All American Youth." Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1944, 402 pp.

National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, Educational Policies Commission. "Education for All American Children." Washington, D.C.: National Educational Association, 1948, 292 pp.

[37] National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, Educational Policies Commission. "Education of the Gifted." Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1950, p. 88.

[38] U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Division of Manpower and Employment Statistics. "Manpower Needs and Resources of the United States, 1960–75." Preliminary report. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960, p. 17.

[39] Ibid., p. 17a.

[40] Eddy, Max, and Moss, Jerry, Jr. "Out of School and Ready to Work." Overview 3: 42–44; August 1962. Copyright 1962, Buttenheim Publishing Corp.

See also Magnifico, L. X., and Doll, Eugene E. "Out of School and Self-Supporting." Overview 3: 33–34; September 1962. Copyright 1962, Buttenheim Publishing Corp.

See also Goldstein, Herbert. "The Educable Mentally Retarded Child in the Elementary School." What Research Says to the Teacher Series, No. 25. Prepared by the American Educational Research Association in cooperation with the Department of Classroom Teachers. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, May 1962, 32 pages.

Secondary school pupils need help on problems that occur during adolescence. Counselors in all high schools, especially in large comprehensive schools, play a particularly vital role. On the basis of previous academic accomplishment in the lower schools, tests of mental ability, statements of former teachers, and the student's interests and future plans, in consultation with his parents when possible, the student is helped to select his high school courses. His progress is checked at regular intervals, and adjustments are made, designed to prevent failure and dropping out of school.

High school and junior college students and college freshmen and sophomores are at critical stages in career choices. With little experience and limited backgrounds, they need facts about the occupations they are considering. Bad decisions at this point may result in serious wastes of human talent.

These are the years when the school counselor supplies the student with vocational information. On the basis of his present and past school records, work experience, aptitude tests, information from teachers who know him best, and deep-seated personal interests, the counselor confers with him regarding possible careers—training needed, personal qualities necessary for success, and possible opportunities, financial and otherwise.

With this help, the student is in a better position to understand himself—which is the central purpose of all guidance—to establish personal goals, to meet personal problems, and to tentatively choose a suitable vocation and the college or institution where he can best continue his education.

To aid in this latter choice, the school counselor supplies college catalogs, giving such information as entrance requirements, courses offered, and cost of attendance; he also gives information about major occupational requirements and trends. Counselors should ever be on the alert to discover gifted pupils who because of low socioeconomic status may not be planning to continue their education and to help them to find means to do so. A case-record file of each student and an up-to-date library of college catalogs, studies of occupations, and similar reference materials are among office needs. The counselor must also have the ability to enlist the cooperation of such groups as faculty, parents, management and labor, and social agencies.

The work of the counselor or guidance officer is of critical importance in the lives of many students. This work requires special personal qualities and graduate training.

Size of school and range of offerings

Small high schools should be consolidated to permit the offering of a wider range of courses to meet the needs of all students.

Only about 4,000 of the 21,000 senior high schools in the United States are large enough to provide adequately for a typical student body. One-third of high school seniors are attending high schools that are too small to provide, except at excessive cost, the range of offerings that should be available. Able students do not have a chance to study physics, advanced mathematics, or a third or fourth year of a modern foreign language because these courses are not offered. Nor is it practical for such schools to offer several choices of technical courses for those of lesser ability. A few high schools must remain small. Many can be consolidated, however, under modern conditions of transportation. The movement in this direction needs to be accelerated.[41]

The foregoing pages list some of the basic improvements required in the scope and quality of public education if it is to meet changing and new demands made upon it. The proposed improvements are already being initiated in some of our better developed and better financed schools and school systems. What needs to be done is to lift the scope and quality of education in all schools to the level now found in a few of the best schools and school systems of the United States. Action to this end will require additional expenditure. The next section deals with this problem.

X. COUNTING THE COST

To capitalize the full power of education in developing our human resources will require additional funds. It will cost something to provide schools in every community able to meet the new and changing demands of a technological age. It will cost something to develop curriculums that are effective in capitalizing the widely varying talents of all youths—the gifted, the large group of average ability, and those of low scholastic aptitude. It will cost something to eliminate the inadequate schooling that is in part the cause of continuing illiteracy and the problems originating among youths who are neither in school nor employed. It will cost something to recruit and hold a sufficient number of well-qualified teachers. It will cost something to eliminate the shortage of school buildings and other necessary facilities for a mounting school population.

Money is, therefore, one of the essentials if these and other educational improvements outlined in previous sections are to be achieved.

"Money isn't everything"

In securing adequate support for public schools, opposition is often met in the statement, "Money isn't everything." This is true. But it is also true that money is something, and a very important something in obtaining quality schooling for all.

The issue is not one of the sequence of money and quality. Rather the problem is one of making additional funds count the most in buying the amount and quality of schooling demanded by the United States. The evidence now available indicates that there is substantial correlation between quality of schools and their level of expenditure.

A number of lines of research indicate that higher per pupil expenditure is a major and essential factor in achieving quality education, regardless of one's definition of quality.[42] This appears to be true even among favored school districts, all of which are well above average in financial support. Apparently, adequacy of support as a factor in increasing educational quality has not reached the point of diminishing returns among schools with the highest levels of cost.[43]

Quality and variations in school support

One who has visited schools in the United States financed at the lower levels, as compared with others financed at higher levels, will need no further evidence that money makes an enormous difference in the quality of educational output.

There is abundant evidence on this point. The first study that revealed the full range of expenditures per pupil of school districts in the United States was for the school year 1939 to 1940. It showed that the top-financed school districts were spending 60 times as much per pupil as those with lowest per pupil expenditure.[44] The social liabilities, such as illiteracy, low educational attainment, and low-earning capacity, which accompanied meager expenditures for schools in some school districts, were described to Congress and other groups many times between 1918 and 1962. It was emphasized that substantial increases in funds would be required to correct the situation.

Per pupil average expenditure in 1962 for current expenses ranged from over $500 in three States (New York, New Jersey, and Illinois) to under $250 in three States (South Carolina, Tennessee, and Mississippi). These figures are State averages; they do not reveal the full extent of unequal financial support of public schools within States. Approximately as many children in each State get a better or less well-financed schooling than these averages indicate.

Some progress has been made in closing the enormous gap in financial support between lower and higher expenditure school districts, but there are still grossly indefensible differences. These are associated with wide ranges in educational opportunity and attainment.

The States with low levels of financial support have low levels of educational attainment, high illiteracy, high rejections for military service, and other socioeconomic liabilities associated with inadequate schooling. For example, in 1960 the rejections in different States in preinduction and induction examinations for military service, based on mental tests composed largely of educational material, ranged from 4.7 percent to 56.5 percent.[45]

The correlations between levels of financial support and educational status in some States are reduced by heavy migrations from regions with low per pupil expenditure to those with high per pupil expenditure. For example, States such as California, New York, and Illinois, with comparatively well-supported schools, rank near average on such items as percent of population 14 years and older unable to read and write and rejections for military service, because of heavy migrations to these States from regions where low financial support of schools and educational attainment have long existed.

Inequality between slum and suburb

Conant has recently dramatized inequality in educational opportunity from another angle. He has pointed out shocking differences in educational opportunity in different school districts within great metropolitan areas. He concludes: "The contrast in the money spent per pupil in wealthy suburban schools and in slum schools of the large cities challenges the concept of equality of opportunity in American public education."[46]

He lists a series of improvements urgently needed in the schools of great cities, and emphasizes that "more money is needed in slum schools."[47]

The existence of slum school districts in some rural areas, those which provide inadequate or no educational opportunity for children, has been repeatedly pointed out in congressional hearings since World War I. Now Conant points out the tragic inadequacy of the financial support of schools and of the schooling provided many youth in city slums. He labels the situation prevailing there "social dynamite."

---

[41] Conant, op. cit., pp. 36–39, 173–174.

[42] Norton, John K., "Does Better Education Cost More?" Washington, D.C.: Committee on Educational Finance, National Education Association, 1959, pp. 41–44.

[43] Associated Public School Systems, "Does Money Make a Difference?" New York: Institute of Administrative Research, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958, 16 pp.

[44] Norton, John K., and Lawler, Eugene S., "Unfinished Business in American Education." Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and American Council on Education, 1946, p. 4.

[45] National Education Association, Research Division. "Rankings of the States, 1962." Research Report 1962–R1. Washington, D.C.: the Association, 1962, p. 32.

[46] Conant, James B., "Slums and Suburbs: A Commentary on Schools in Metropolitan Areas," New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961, pp. 145–46.

[47] Ibid., p. 146.

The conditions in rural and in city slums are related. Many residents of festering city slums are migrants from poverty-stricken rural slums. Those who have balked every effort to provide an adequate minimum of financial support for the education of every child regardless of his residence are now having to face the much more difficult and expensive problem of dealing in our great cities with these victims of educational denial.

Changes in agricultural production and other factors are taking away even the meager wages earned by many who formerly lived in rural slum school districts. They and their children are flocking to great metropolitan areas in which their problems are multiplied by conditions they encounter there.

A recent report of the Educational Policies Commission points out that this "large scale migration" fails to improve the situation of the "disadvantaged American." The report summarizes the situation thus:

"Millions of disadvantaged Americans are congregated today in congested sections of the large cities and in the rural areas. It is valid to ask what America means to these millions of people. Certainly it has not been for them a land of equal opportunity. The schools present the best hope for overcoming their cultural handicap. This has been demonstrated repeatedly wherever the efforts of skillful educators and the support of an understanding community have combined to make schools the mighty instruments which only schools can be. If the public fully backs its schools—and only if it does—the time may come when no American is culturally disadvantaged.[48]

There are several reasons why the financial support of public schools is wholly inadequate in most school districts in the United States. One of these is the inflexibility of school expenditures as related to educational need.

Response of expenditures to demands, 1900–1958

There has been a great increase in school expenditure since the turn of the century—from $238 million to an estimated $18 billion in 1962. The significance of this rise can be appraised only when it is weighed against the demands placed upon the schools. In short, in recent years did the typical board of education in the United States have greater or less ability to provide every child in school with the kind of schooling he should have?

This is a highly complex question. It requires that account should be taken of such factors as:

1. The enormous increase in number of public school pupils, especially at the more costly high school and junior college levels.
2. The substantial lengthening of the school year throughout the United States; in some districts summer school is now also provided.
3. The great depreciation in purchasing power of the dollar since 1900.

The foregoing and other factors must be taken into account before financial ability to improve the quality of a given unit of schooling is increased. To provide for increased quality such factors as these must be considered:

1. Increase in the scope of the school program to meet new needs—general education for all and technical and vocational education for many, not merely college preparation for a few; guidance and health services; and other extensions of the school program in response to general need and demand.
2. Increase in the preparation of teachers to teach a wider range of more difficult subjects at a higher level of performance.
3. Increase in teachers' salaries to compensate for longer periods of training, to keep pace with the rapid increase in buying power of other workers, and to meet the mounting competition in the labor market for persons of ability and extended education.

Financial ability

A recent study for the Joint Economic Committee of the 86th Congress sought "to measure the cost of an education unit, so standardized that its variety and scope are held reasonably constant, and expressed in per pupil in average daily attendance terms."[49]

The result of the study was an estimate of daily per pupil expenditure in 1954 dollars. In other words, what was the purchasing power of the expenditure for the schooling of one child for one day expressed in dollars of equivalent purchasing power? The figures are given in table III.

The figures in table III are, according to the study, quite appropriate to indicate the cost of a given bundle of public primary and secondary education in constant terms. The study concludes that "costs [of public schools] in real terms exhibit amazing stability during 1900–58. For the years for which data are available, 1922 was the low year with $1.37 daily expenditure per pupil, and 1913 was the high year with $1.60. Over the 58 years in overall decline of about 3 percent was registered."[50]

It appears that boards of education had less ability to buy first-rate education for each child for every day he was in school in 1958 than they had in 1900.

TABLE III.—*Daily per pupil current expenditure for public primary and secondary education*

[Daily per pupil expenditure in 1954 dollars]

1900	1.48
1902	1.47
1910	1.48
1913	1.60
1920	1.50
1922	1.37
1930	1.43
1932	1.42
1940	1.39
1942	1.49
1946	1.44
1948	1.39
1950	1.40
1952	1.42
1954	1.41
1956	1.45
1958	1.45

Source: Hirsch, Werner Z., "Analysis of Rising Costs of Public Education," U.S. Congress, Joint Economic Committee, Study Papers 4 and 5, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959, p. 34.

Equating expenditures and demands

The congressional study cited above dealt with the income elasticity of public primary and secondary education. Complex estimates in this regard were made on the basis of two concepts. The conclusion was that "no matter which of the two concepts is used, there can be little doubt that the income elasticity of public education is quite low."[51]

"It [income elasticity of public education] is low in comparison to income elasticities of other public services and in particular such consumer amenities as air conditioning, automobiles, golf, speedboats, etc. It is also low compared to what it must be if public education in the United States is to be improved."[52]

This study summarized the significance of its findings as to the income elasticity of expenditures for public schools as follows: "Such low income elasticity of public education must be of deep concern to all those who are convinced that improvements in education are essential if the United States is to remain a leading world power."[53]

Apparently, the financing of public education in the 1960's started from a base of expenditure that allowed little or nothing for improvements in education, essential for economic growth and for other requisites for internal progress and effective leadership in the world scene. What amounts will be required to finance the requisite improvements?

Cost estimates to meet demands

A number of responsible citizens groups have estimated the financial support necessary for the public schools to meet the rising demands being made on them.

Estimates by citizens commissions

In 1954, the finance committee of the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools (Beardsley Ruml, chairman, formerly head of the Federal Reserve Bank, New York City) noted the need for an unremitting effort to meet the growing deficit in equipment, in school buildings, and in teachers.[54]

The Committee for the White House Conference, sponsored by former President Eisenhower, reported in 1956 as follows: "We recommend that a new look be taken at the entire question of how much money this society should spend on education. In view of the recommendations of this Committee concerning the objectives of education, teachers, and buildings, it seems obvious that within the next decade the dollars spent on education in this Nation should be approximately doubled. Such an increase in expenditure would be an accurate reflection of the importance of education in this society. * * * Good schools are admittedly expensive, but not nearly so expensive in the long run as poor ones."[55]

The special committee dealing with the financing of education at the White House Conference emphasized that the American people want and need not only more schools, but better schools. To meet these needs we must spend more money.[56]

A 1958 estimate of the future cost of education is that of a panel of 15 prominent citizens working under the auspices of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund. The Committee analyzed various factors that place increasing burdens on education. They concluded: "Even allowing for considerably greater efficiency in the use of educational funds, it is likely that 10 years hence our schools and colleges will require at least double their present level of financial support to handle our growing student population. In other words, by 1967 the entire educational effort is likely to call for expenditures on the order of $30 billion, measured in today's prices."[57]

---

[48] National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, Educational Policies Commission, "Education and the Disadvantaged American," Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1962, p. 33.

[49] Hirsch, Werner Z., "Analysis of Rising Costs of Public Education," U.S. Congress, Joint Economic Committee, Study Papers 4 and 5, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959, p. 33.

[50] Ibid., p. 34.

[51] Ibid., p. 38.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Ibid., p. 1.

[54] National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools, Public Education Finance Committee, "Financing Public Education in the Decade Ahead," New York: the Commission, 1954, foreword.

[55] Committee for the White House Conference, "A Report to the President," Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956, pp. 6–7.

[56] Ibid, p. 51.

The foregoing estimate seems conservative, since the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimated in August 1962 that total expenditures for education (public, private; elementary, secondary, and higher) would be $25.2 billion in 1962.[58]

Conant refers to various measures of the deficits of current expenditures per pupil. One calculation reports a deficit between educational needs and actual expenditures for 1958–59 of $8.2 billion.[59]

Another study under the auspices of the Committee for Economic Development comes to this conclusion: "The public schools have not, thus far, been engulfed by the wave of school-age children. The resources going into public education have, in fact, been increasing somewhat faster than enrollments, although clearly less than is necessary to meet widespread desire for excellence."[60]

The foregoing study stated: "We estimate that if resources per pupil were held constant, the cost of public schools, with prices in the private economy stable, would rise 31 percent from 1958–59 to 1964–65. From 1958–59 to 1969–70 the increase would be 47 percent."[61]

The conclusions of the Committee for Economic Development were not accepted by all members. William Benton, in dissent, stated:

"I feel strongly that the recommendations in this report do not match the national emergency. But I commend the C.E.D. for a report on education more courageous and forthright than any issued by an organization representing the business community. The statement is to be applauded for recognizing the acute crisis in education."[62]

Recently an estimate was made of the cost of implementing the proposals of the Commission on National Goals appointed by former President Eisenhower.[63] Education was one of the areas considered. It was estimated that an increase of $13 billion per year in public expenditures for education would be necessary to finance the higher goals set for education.[64] This estimate was based on an improvement factor in financial support per year of just under 5 percent to achieve the desired standards.

Estimates by National Education Association

The most recent study of needed current expenditures for public schools to provide for quality education was made by the National Education Association and estimates a cost (in 1959–60 prices) of $33.6 billion in 1969–70, as compared with $12.3 billion in 1959–60.[65] The basis of this estimate is summarized as follows: This cost projection sought to estimate the price of quality education in 1969–70 under the assumptions of near maximum enrollment in kindergarten through high school, of a professional staff of adequate size, and paid at the national market rate of other professional workers with equivalent training and experience.

A number of statements have given considered views concerning future responsibilities and financial needs of education. One such statement was made by Walter Lippmann, who was a member of the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools. He asked in 1954:

"Can it be denied that the educational effort is inadequate? I do not mean that we are doing a little too little. I mean that we are doing much too little.

"We have to do in the educational system something very like what we have done in the Military Establishment during the past 15 years. * * * We must measure our educational effort as we do our military effort. That is to say, we must measure it not by what it would be easy and convenient to do, but by what it is necessary to do in order that the Nation may survive and flourish."[66]

The panel of prominent citizens referred to earlier reached this general conclusion concerning what it would take to achieve excellence in education:

"It will not be enough to meet the problem grudgingly or with a little more money. The Nation's need for good education is immediate, and good education is expensive. That is a fact which the American people have never been quite prepared to face.

"Perhaps the greatest problem facing American education is the widely held view that all we require are a few more teachers, a few more buildings, a little more money. Such an approach will be disastrous. We are moving into the most demanding era in our history. An educational system grudgingly and tardily patched to meet the needs of the moment will be perpetually out of date. We must build for the future in education as daringly and aggressively as we have built other aspects of our national life in the past."[67]

Ability to finance quality schools

Whether one accepts the lower or the higher estimates of future public school needs and costs, they involve amounts that will not be easy to raise. Success in financing whatever level of support is decided upon for public education will depend on two major factors that are closely related: The first is the understanding and attitude of the people toward public education. The second factor is the means which the people adopt in raising the revenues for school support and for its equitable distribution among the public school systems of the United States. The next section of this report deals with these two matters.

XI. FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

Basic to adequate financing of public schools in the United States is acceptance of the fact that such support is an investment that brings economic as well as other returns to our society.

Ability to finance public education

One need not credit a high percentage of the income of our affluent society to the effects of education to rate this public service as a productive investment. The gross national product of the United States, according to the latest available estimate for the middle of 1962, had reached $552 billion.[68] In the light of recent economic research it would seem a low estimate to credit 10 percent of this figure, or $52 billion, to the economic effects of education. Less than one-half of this figure, or $25 billion, is being expended this year by educational institutions, from kindergarten through university, both public and private. Total expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools in 1961–62 were $18 billion—for current expenses and for school building construction and other capital outlays.

There can be no question of our economic ability, whether considered from the view of our unequaled opulence or of the significance of education as a factor in production, to pay for the amount and quality of public education necessary to meet our needs.

The Issue of Choice

The issue is one of choice. If we choose to give public education reasonably high priority among our public and private expenditures, then no child need suffer the consequences of inadequate schooling, nor will the Nation as a whole lack development of its human resources because of insufficient investment in education.

The choices involved in this process will often not be easy. Human capacity for consumption is almost limitless. The mechanisms that have been developed to increase the desire for public and private expenditure are both pervasive and powerful. Even our fabulously productive economy is not able to fulfill every fleeting desire for more and more goods and services.

But assuming that we place expenditure for public education above some of our private luxuries and take due account of its importance in budgeting public expenditure, there are still difficulties to be overcome.

Removal of fiscal obstacles

There has grown up a series of obstacles that frequently balk people's desire to pay for education. These have accumulated over the years due to (a) inaction in the face of changing conditions and (b) ill-considered action intended to keep public expenditures for schools at a scarcity level.

Local Blocks

A number of blocks to action at the local level are of especial fiscal significance since 56 percent of the cost of public schools is raised in the locality.

Most local school money comes from a tax on property. This has been a mainstay of public school support and should continue to pay a just share of school costs in the future. It is well suited for local use. It is important as a fiscal factor in continuing substantial control of schools in the locality.

However, the local property tax has its limitations as a principal source of school revenue. Some States place unduly restrictive limits on local property-taxing powers. These restrict the amount that a board of education and the people may raise from this source. The upper tax limit placed on local property may be reasonable, but this is often lowered, in effect, by assessment of property far below its real value. A tax limit of 15 mills on full value of property, when property assessments are dropped to one-third full value, is only 5 mills.

In some States there is excessive exemption of property from taxation. This may place an undue share of the cost of public education on taxable property. Also, in many localities inequalities in assessment of property are rife. Different types of property may be assessed at widely differing rates, even though uniform assessment is required by State law. Thus, resistance to taxation is enhanced by feelings of injustice.

---

[57] Rockefeller Brothers Fund, "The Pursuit of Excellence—Education and the Future of America," panel report V of the special studies project, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1958, p. 34.

[58] The estimates of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and those of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are only approximately comparable in scope of educational activities included.

[59] Conant, James B., "The Child, the Parent and the State," Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959, p. 183.

[60] Committee for Economic Development, Research and Policy Committee, "Paying for Better Schools," New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1959, p. 14.

[61] Ibid., p. 20.

[62] Ibid., p. 6.

[63] President's Commission on National Goals, "Goals for Americans," Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1960, 372 pages.

[64] Universities National Bureau, Committee for Economic Research, "Public Finances: Needs, Sources, and Utilization," Report of the National Bureau of Economic Research, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1961, 512 pages.

See also Hazard, Leland, "Can We Afford Our National Goals?" Harvard Business Review 40: 10; May–June 1962.

[65] National Education Association, special project on school finance, "Financing the Public Schools, 1960–70." Washington, D.C.: the association, 1962, p. 133.

[66] Lippmann, Walter, "Education for Leadership," "Citizens and Their Schools," New York: National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools, 1954, pp. 24–25.

[67] Rockefeller Bros. Fund, op. cit., p. 33.

[68] Federal Reserve System, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve Bulletin, Washington, D.C.; Government Printing Office, October 1962, p. 1356.

Property valuations per pupil in local school districts vary greatly—in some States as much as 100 to 1. Some localities can provide substantial local revenue on nominal tax rates. Others could not provide such revenue even if they levied confiscatory rates on property. The result in the latter districts may be denial of adequate schooling for some if not all children.

Local Tax Reform

Reform of the local tax picture as it concerns public schools lies in such actions as correction of arbitrary limits on rates of property taxation, assessment of property at full value, avoidance of excessive exemption of property from taxation, and recognition that the financial support of schools cannot rest solely upon taxes on property. Nor can other forms of local taxation do the job, even when schools are allocated revenue from these new sources. Realization of this fact accounts for recent increased State action in financing public schools.

State Action

This action has taken a number of directions. One of the essential State actions is to correct, by appropriate State legislation, defects in the structure of local school finance such as those identified above.

Substantial amounts raised through State taxation are being allocated to the localities for school support. These State funds are raised by a broadening of the sources of tax revenue to include such State taxes as those on sales and gross receipts, individual and corporation net incomes, motor vehicle fuel and registration fees, and such various miscellaneous taxes as those on tobacco and alcoholic beverages.[69]

Currently, 40 percent of public elementary and secondary school revenue comes from the State level of government. This percentage varies widely, from as much as 81 percent in Delaware to 6 percent in New Hampshire.

State funds for public school support are distributed to the localities on several bases. Some State money is usually distributed on a flat grant basis—so much per pupil in daily attendance. Additional funds are allocated on an equalization basis, that is, the State sets a foundation or minimum level of cost per pupil to be available in every school district. The State then provides the difference between (a) what can be raised in each locality by an equitable and reasonable tax effort and (b) the amount required to finance the prescribed State minimum. Localities are permitted and encouraged to raise more than is required to receive State funds.

Bases of State Action

State action in providing public school support is based on a number of considerations: First, State constitutions make the maintenance of public schools that are open to all a responsibility of the State legislature. Second, educational opportunity is the right of every child. Third, education of all children is more than a matter of local concern. Mobility of population quickly spreads the effects of good schools as well as of poor schools. A State cannot afford to have the quality of its human capital diluted by lack of financial ability or willingness to maintain effective schools. Fourth, since communities differ so widely in ability to finance schools, State support is essential if gross inequality in the financing of public schools and inequitable tax rates, in different school districts, are to be prevented.

Limitations of the States

The State level of government has an indispensable role to play in financing public schools. However, the States have met their responsibility for providing adequate schooling for all with varying effectiveness. Several factors are responsible.

The States differ markedly in taxable capacity. This has resulted in a wide range in average expenditure per pupil in public elementary and secondary schools. In 1961–62 this average varied from $220 per pupil in the State of lowest expenditure to $615 in the State of highest expenditure. This latter average figure is much below that of well-financed schools. Also, an average expenditure hides the extremes in financial support of schools in a State, and these are usually wide. Furthermore, average expenditure per pupil in attendance takes no account of those not in attendance. Irregular attendance and early elimination from school account for much of the functional illiteracy and inadequate schooling described earlier in this report.

Federal Tax Collections

Two developments at the Federal level have had heavy impacts on the financing of public education. First, during this century, Federal taxes have risen from a minor to a major percentage of total taxes—Federal, State, and local (see figure 4). The rapid rise in Federal tax collections has increased the problem of the schools in securing sufficient financial support from the State, and especially from the locality where more than one-half of school money is raised.

Second, the impact on local and State support of public education of the rapid rise in Federal tax collections has been compounded by discrimination against the schools by the Federal Government in the allocation of funds to the States.

FIG. IV.—*Total tax revenue and percent collected by local, State, Federal Governments, 1902–60*

[Millions of dollars]

	Percent
1902, $1,372:	
Local	51.3
State	11.3
Federal	37.4
1922, $7,387:	
Local	45.5
State	12.8
Federal	45.7
1932, $7,977:	
Local	53.6
State	23.7
Federal	22.7
1942, $20,793:	
Local	22.0
State	19.0
Federal	59.0
1952, $79,066:	
Local	12.0
State	12.0
Federal	76.0
1956, $91,593:	
Local	14.2
State	14.6
Federal	71.2
1960, $113,120:	
Local	16.0
State	16.0
Federal	68.0

Sources: For tax revenue, 1902–56: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, "Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1957," Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960, p. 722. For tax revenues, 1960: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, "Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1962," Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962, p. 415.

Federal grants to the States for such undertakings as highway construction, housing, hospitals, relief of unemployment, and other forms of relief have been greatly increased. These Federal allocations have usually required matching appropriations by the State. This practice, regardless of merits in itself, influences the States to match the Federal allocations for the services aided.

The public schools have received comparatively small grants from the Federal Government. It has aided a scattering of special educational undertakings in the States, but Federal revenues are a small and decreasing factor in financing public schools. School revenue derived from Federal sources reached a peak of 4.6 percent of total school revenue in 1955–56 and declined to 3.7 percent in 1961–62.

One of the Federal allocations is for school support in "federally affected areas," that is, localities where undertakings of the Federal Government have been responsible for large increases in school attendance and expenditures for school buildings. The provision of $200 million for a few school districts in 1958–59 takes no account of the fact that Federal taxation has profoundly affected the ability of all areas in the United States to finance public schools.

Federal Support of Education

The proposal to provide Federal funds for general support of public education has become a perennial and controversial issue. National aid to education antedated the Constitution of the United States in the form of commitment to a policy of allocating public lands for public schools. In 1862, the Morrill Act provided for the establishment of the land-grant colleges. Other federally financed educational undertakings affecting agriculture are described in an earlier section.

The modern period of Federal interest in education began early in this century and was given great impetus by the low educational status of an alarming percentage of our young men, revealed in the examination of recruits during World War I.

The Federal Government now finances scores of special educational undertakings. These include grants for specific programs, some administered by the States and some by the Federal Government. Federal funds for these educational programs totaled $2.4 billion in 1958–59.[70]

The demand for general financial aid for public education has come up in every Congress for more than a generation. Thus far this demand has not been met. Consideration of such action has been overriden by opposition from various interest groups.

An extensive library of publications dealing with the issue of Federal support of education has accumulated over the years. Examples of some of the more comprehensive works are listed in the footnote.[71]

---

[69] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, "Detail of State Tax Collections in 1962," Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962, p. 3.

[70] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, "Federal Funds for Education," Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office. 1961. p. 29.

[71] Norton, John K., "Federal Relations to Education," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (edited by Chester R. Harris), third edition, New York: Macmillan Co., 1960, pp. 522–544.

U.S. 87th Congress, 1st session, House of Representatives, "Federal Aid to Schools: Hearings, Parts I and II," Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961.

Suffrin, Sidney C., "Issues in Federal Aid to Education," Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1962, 64 pp.

Quattlebaum, Charles A., "Federal Educational Policies, Programs, and Proposals," U.S. 86th Congress, 2d session, House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960. Part I, 192 pp.; part II, 372 pp.; part III, 234 pp.

Whether public education can be adquately financed without Federal funds to meet the changing and growing demands being made on it is a moot question. That Federal aid for education will continue to be an issue in future sessions of the Congress of the United States appears to be certain.

Today the Federal Government preempts the greater part of tax revenues. It has allocated substantial sums to the States to aid in financing a widening range of public services, yet nothing has been appropriated for the general support of public elementary and secondary schools. Many consider this situation the principal fiscal obstacle to the adequate financing of public education in the United States.

Conant analyzes the situation as follows: "In the next decade, one of three things seems to me inevitable. Either our State taxing machinery will have to improve drastically in many States, or Congress will have to start large annual appropriations for public schools, or public education in many States will deteriorate or, at best, stand still at the present unsatisfactory level. If education is as vital to our survival in this deeply divided world as I have portrayed it, leaders of opinion throughout the land, to my mind, should be pondering these alternatives." [72]

If it should become the policy of the Federal Government to allocate funds to the States for the general support of the public schools, we have experience to guide us in distributing these funds so as to achieve effective educational results.

Technical procedures have been developed whereby State funds can be distributed to the localities equitably and effectively to provide desired amounts for the education of each child, with a minimum of central control. This experience plus that already gained in the distribution of Federal special aid grants would be applicable to the distribution of Federal funds to the States for the general support of public schools.

DAIRY PRODUCTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, today is a great day for the dairy farmers. It has been a long time since we have been able to obtain any sort of agreement between the representatives of the dairy farmers, the administration, and the members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but I think today is a milestone in that connection.

Today, the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles S. Murphy, came before our committee and recommended the principle of a bill introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], another bill introduced by me, and a third bill introduced by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. In addition, Mr. Murphy set forth a comprehensive program for the dairy farmers, and I think it is very, very encouraging.

In the first place, it is wholly voluntary; there is no compulsion about it.

Second, there is no cut below the 75 percent of parity which the farmers now receive, although it was feared there might be a cut below that. This is very encouraging.

Third, it will cut the Government costs. I think that all persons who understand dairy legislation realize that the result is sure to be a cut in dairy production, and, therefore, a cut in commodity credit corporation acquisitions.

Fourth—and this is most important in connection with such legislation—it will permit the producer of Class 1 milk in the milkshed area to receive an allotment for his Class 1 milk; and it also will permit producers not in the market area to have access to that fluid market. I think that is absolutely essential.

It is most important to point out that—as I have said—the farm legislation proposed by the Under Secretary of Agriculture, in behalf of the administration, is not mandatory in any sense. Quotas are out; and I think this fact in itself will help reduce the production, because I think many dairy farmers, anticipating future quotas, had been building up their production, in some cases uneconomically, feeling that they would like to have that record for the future. The announcement made today by the Under Secretary of Agriculture should put their fears to rest and should help a great deal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement by the Under Secretary of Agriculture and the attached table showing what will be the consequences of his proposal.

There being no objection, the statement and the table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF CHARLES S. MURPHY, UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, ON S. 398, S. 900, S. 953, RELATING TO THE 1963 DAIRY PROGRAM, APRIL 4, 1963

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am very happy to have this opportunity to appear before your committee with respect to dairy legislation.

It is clear to all of us that the present dairy situation is unsatisfactory in two respects:

1. The income of dairy farmers is too low, and

2. Too much Government money is going into building up excessive inventories of dairy products.

We believe legislation can be enacted that will improve the present program in both of these respects. We believe the hearings you have held suggest the form this legislation might take. I will comment specifically on some of the provisions of the three bills—S. 398, S. 900, and S. 953—which are pending before your committee and on some of the proposals that have been presented to you in these hearings. First, however, I would like to review the background of the problem.

Over the past 2 years, the volume of surplus dairy products acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the existing dairy price support law has increased very substantially. In 1960, CCC purchases amounted to less than 3 percent of the butterfat in milk marketed by farmers and about 7.7 percent of the nonfat solids.

But during 1962, the CCC acquired 9 percent of the butterfat and 13 percent of the nonfat solids in all of the milk marketed by farmers. Annual CCC expenditures under the dairy price support program, which averaged less than $300 million from the beginning of the program in 1949 through the fiscal year 1960, jumped to approximately $600 million in the fiscal year 1962, and current projections indicate they will remain near, or in excess of, $500 million even with the support level at 75 percent of parity—the minimum level at which we are required to support milk prices.

The most significant factor in the rise in CCC purchases in 1961 was the decline in the consumption of both fluid milk and manufactured dairy products. While per capita consumption of many dairy products has been falling steadily in recent years, total milk consumption has still increased at the rate of about half a billion pounds a year because of our growing population. But in 1961, instead of increasing, total milk consumption declined by about 1.6 billion pounds. Milk production also began to increase late in 1960, but if milk consumption had not declined there would have been little cause for concern over the increase in production. We had anticipated some increase in the amount of surplus, and we were prepared to accelerate our use of dairy products in both foreign and domestic outlets in order to prevent stocks from accumulating. But with consumption at a lower level than expected, the CCC was forced to acquire under the price support program twice as much butter as could be utilized through available disposal outlets. This was the case even though we expanded domestic distribution through the various authorized outlets to a rate almost 50 percent greater than that of the years immediately prior to 1961. We have also offered 200 million pounds of surplus butter for foreign donations, but to date outlets have been found for only 52 million pounds.

Last summer, the amount of butter in storage approached the limit of available freezer capacity. It became necessary to ship butter to locations far removed from the production areas, resulting in additional transportation costs of from 1 to 4 cents per pound. Some butter in storage was also approaching 2 years of age—the maximum length of time butter can be stored without some danger of spoilage. To relieve this situation, 100 million pounds of butter were converted into butter oil for possible foreign distribution. This relieved some of the pressure on freezer space, because butter oil can be held in coolers at above freezing temperatures without deteriorating.

While butter purchases have declined slightly in recent months, acquisitions are still running substantially above distribution levels and adding to the quantities already in storage. The present CCC inventory of butter is about 369 million pounds and will continue to increase. While this quantity is slightly smaller than anticipated earlier, it remains a critical problem. Purchases of butter are still running at an annual rate of 350 million pounds while our distribution programs are using only about 260 million pounds.

I have noted that some observers are taking the decline of milk production during December, January, and February to be an indication that milk supplies will continue to decrease with price supports at only 75 percent of parity. I believe this judgment is a little premature. There is strong reason to believe that the recent decline is largely the result of unusual weather conditions and that production will turn up again with a return of normal weather. Last summer, the entire northeastern quarter of the country was hit by a severe drought. Pasture conditions were very poor, and milk production was down by as much as 3 percent in some of the major dairy States of the Northeast. Since recovering from the drought, however, those States have again started to increase their milk production and in recent months their output has been running as much as 4 to 6 percent above levels of a year ago.

The winter which has just ended was one of the most severe on record, particularly in the Midwest area where temperatures

---

[72] Conant, James B., "The Child, the Parent, and the State," Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959, p. 57.

---

stayed in the below-zero range for weeks at a time. These conditions were reflected in a decline in milk production, but with the coming of spring, it is quite likely that the downtrend in production will reverse in the Midwest as it did in the Northeast.

Over the years, the most important factor affecting milk production statistics has been the rise in production per cow. During the 5 years prior to 1962, milk production per cow increased by 200 or more pounds each year. But in 1962, production per cow increased only 147 pounds. This rate of increase is 26 percent less than in previous years. The only apparent explanation for this smaller increase in productivity is the adverse weather. Assuming normal weather this coming year, it is quite possible that we will again have at least a 200-pound increase in output per cow. With lower livestock prices in prospect in the coming months, it is not likely that the rate at which farmers cull their herds will increase. Therefore, an increase in milk production which would force the CCC to maintain or even increase its current level of purchases is a definite possibility.

It is an extremely difficult task to devise legislation which will solve the problem of dairy surpluses without impairing the income of the dairy farmer. The incomes of dairy farmers are already among the lowest for any form commodity group. In 1962 net annual farm incomes on typical commercial family-operated dairy farms in important producing areas ranged from $3,118 to $6,221. These incomes are lower than the incomes on most other types of commercial family-operated farms. When allowance is made for the large capital investment on these farms by figuring a capital charge at current interest rates, returns to operator and family labor range from $667 to $2,551 per year.

Moreover, dairy farmers are faced with constantly increasing costs in the production of milk to meet the high standards of sanitation required. Expensive bulk cooling tanks and advanced types of milking equipment are becoming requirements in more and more areas. In order to fully utilize this equipment, yet keep production costs down, farmers are forced to expand their output. But when they expand output, the extra milk they produce adds to our surplus problems and further depresses milk prices. Under these circumstances, there is great need for an effective means of supporting the dairy farmer's income at reasonable levels while at the same time bringing production into balance with demand.

Our present dairy programs do not provide those means. The Agricultural Act of 1949, under which manufacturing milk prices are supported, provides no mechanism for dealing with surplus problems other than reducing the level of price support. The law requires that the Secretary of Agriculture provide price support for milk and butterfat at such level between 75 and 90 percent of parity as will provide an adequate supply. Current surplus problems have prevented maintaining price supports above 75 percent of parity. On the other hand, when price supports are held at 75 percent of parity, dairy farm income is extremely low. Yet, dairy farmers find it difficult to reduce their output because of the large investment they have in facilities which can be used only for the production of milk. It seems to me that simply to reduce the price-support level to cut the income of dairy farmers whenever surpluses increase would be inconsistent with the basic objective of price-support programs. The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, under which the fluid milk marketing orders are established, is likewise limited to price cutting as the only authority available to deal with problems of oversupply.

To illustrate the injustice of the price-cutting approach, consider the case right now in most of the big fluid milk markets of New York-New Jersey. The blend prices received by farmers in these markets are presently the lowest they have been in several years because of the surplus. Yet we are required under the New York-New Jersey order to initiate proceedings before very long to review the prices in these markets and presumably consider a further reduction in prices paid to producers. This is the only recourse the law gives to us when surpluses increase.

A year ago, the Administration recommended enactment of a new dairy program which would have provided for the use of marketing allotments on a national scale to keep milk production in line with demand. This proposal was one which had been discussed within the dairy industry for 4 or 5 years and which many people agreed was an economically sound approach to our dairy farm income and surplus problems. However there was not last year—and does not appear to be now—enough support for this proposal to achieve its enactment. Recognizing that government is the art of the possible, it would appear that the most constructive course now is to concentrate on the type of legislation for which there is widespread support and which does promise to improve the present situation.

One approach, which is incorporated in one or another form in each of the bills under consideration, and which has wide support within the industry, is what is called a base-excess plan, to be applied in markets covered by milk marketing orders. Under the existing marketing orders, a producer is paid a single blend price for all of his milk sold in his market, that price being the average of the higher price paid for milk sold for fluid use and the lower price paid for "surplus" milk, which is sold for manufacturing purposes. The blend price tends to provide an incentive for increased production, since it offers the producer who expands his production the higher blend price for milk which returns only manufacturing value to the pool. The base-excess concept proposes to remove this incentive, by separating his base—or share of the fluid milk market—from his excess—which goes into manufacturing uses or into CCC storage—and pay him the fluid milk price for the former and only the surplus value for the latter. Thus, if he reduces production, he will lose not the blend price but the lower excess price; and if he increases production, he will gain not the blend price but the lower excess price. The incentive to produce surpluses would be greatly reduced.

A second approach is the one which has proved to be successful in the feed grains program—a payment to producers who voluntarily reduce their output. A payment at the proper level will compensate the producer for any loss of net income, but at the same time cost the Government less than buying and storing the entire output at the support price. At present, it costs the Government over $4 to purchase, transport, and handle 100 pounds of milk in the form of manufactured dairy products. Producers might be willing to not produce this surplus milk for a payment substantially less than this $4 cost.

We believe that a bill embodying these two approaches can go far toward achieving the following objectives:

1. Increase in the income of manufacturing milk producers.

2. Increase in the income of fluid milk producers.

3. Reduction in costs of the dairy program to the Government.

4. Reduction in excessive inventories of dairy products.

Progress toward these results can only be gradual, but we believe progress can be made—and the sooner we begin, the sooner we will get somewhere.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on some questions raised by provisions that are found in one or more of the three bills.

1. Reduction in the minimum support price for manufacturing milk: We believe that it would be wise, at least for the present, to retain the 75 percent of parity price support minimum.

2. The base-excess plan in Federal orders: As I have indicated, we favor such a plan. We believe the base should include a necessary reserve above actual fluid milk requirements.

3. Entry into the market by other producers: We believe the establishment of a marketing base plan should make it neither harder nor easier for established producers and handlers outside the market to gain entry into the market. We believe that the plans can and should contain definite provisions having that result. Special provisions will be necessary to permit entry for new producers, who had no marketings anywhere during the base period, and to take care of abnormal or hardship situations.

4. Prices below the support price: If any marketing order is to provide a return to producers for "excess" milk lower than the manufacturing support price, we believe this lower return should apply only to marketings that exceed the producer's total marketings during the base period. The difference between the manufacturing value of such milk and the price paid to the farmers should be prorated among all producers in relation to their fluid milk bases.

5. Procedure for introducing base-excess plans: We believe the law should require the Secretary to hold hearings on base-excess plans in each Federal order market where marketings are in excess of necessary reserve requirements. If such a plan, when submitted to a referendum, is defeated, the marketing order should be terminated unless the producers request the Secretary to hold further hearings under the order with a view to adjusting the class I price so as to remove incentive for excessive supplies. The Treasury of the United States also has a substantial stake in reducing, by one means or another, these excessive supplies; in view of that fact, these alternatives do not seem unreasonable.

6. Incentive payments for reducing production. We agree with the recommendations of a number of witnesses in these hearings—that the legislation should authorize payments to producers for voluntarily reducing their production. The Secretary should have authority to use such payments when and to the extent needed, and only when he estimates they will result in net savings to the Government. Since participation by producers to earn these payments will be purely voluntary, it can be assumed that they will improve producer net income if there is to be any participation. Such payments should be made available to producers both within and outside of Federal order markets. We believe such payments would reduce Government costs by speeding up the adjustment of supply to demand. It is probable that such payments would be needed for only 1 or 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, we believe legislation embodying the provisions indicated above—which would be for the most part a composite of the three bills before this committee—would provide a means for substantial improvement in the dairy situation.

It would bring supply into closer balance with demand.

It would sharply reduce the cost of dairy programs to the Government.

It would directly improve the net income of farmers producing for fluid milk markets.

It would benefit farmers producing for manufacturing milk markets, by removing from those markets much of the surplus from fluid milk markets which now finds its way into manufacturing uses. After a short time, this should result in improvement in manufacturing milk prices.

The proposed program would provide flexibility. Its provisions would be used only when and to the extent required by supply and demand relationships.

We have prepared some estimates of the results that might be achieved under such a program. These estimates indicate that net income of milk producers might be increased 6 percent at the same time Government costs are being reduced by $175 million a year. We believe these estimates are not unreasonable; and, even if the results achieved were only half that good, they would still be well worth while. These estimates are set out in more detail in the attached table.

We recommend the enactment of legislation along the lines I have indicated. We will be glad to give the committee every possible assistance in drafting the specific provisions of such a program.

Estimated 1963–64 program results of present program; composite base plan with no payments; composite base plan with $1 and $2 hundredweight payments

Item	Unit	Present program		Composite base plan [1]		
		1962–63 marketing year	1963–64 marketing year	No payment	$1 per hundredweight payment	$2 per hundredweight payment
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Support level: By purchases	Hundredweight	3.11	3.14	3.14	3.14	3.14
Milk production	Billion pounds	125.5	126.5	123.1	121.8	119.8
Marketings (milk equivalent):						
Fluid milk and cream	do	54.0	54.4	54.4	54.4	54.4
Manufacturing milk and cream	do	64.0	65.0	61.6	60.6	58.3
Total	do	118.0	119.4	116.0	114.7	112.7
Commercial demand (milk equivalent):						
Fluid milk and cream	do	54.0	54.4	54.4	54.4	54.4
Manufacturing milk and cream	do	55.1	55.2	55.2	55.2	55.2
Total	do	109.1	109.6	109.6	109.6	109.6
Surplus [2]	do	8.9	9.8	6.4	5.1	3.1
CCC purchases:						
Butter	Million pounds	355	370	239	185	110
Cheese	do	140	200	140	125	80
Nonfat dry milk	do	1,270	1,300	1,065	970	740
CCC purchase price:						
Butter	Cents per pound.	58.0	58.0	58.0	58.0	58.0
Cheese	do	34.6	35.6	35.6	35.6	35.6
Nonfat dry milk	do	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4
CCC net expenditures: Purchases (gross)	Million dollars	511	539	391	337	229
Reduction payments:						
Quantity (milk equivalent)	Billion pounds				[3] 2.3	[3] 1.8
Rate per hundredweight	Dollars				[3] 1.00	[3] 2.00
Total	Million dollars				[3] 23	[3] 36
Retirements payments:						
Quantity (milk equivalent)	Billion pounds				4.3	7.1
Rate per hundredweight	Dollars				[4] 1.00	[4] 2.00
Total	Million dollars				[3] 22	[3] 71
Total outlay	do	511	539	391	382	336
Sales proceeds	do	31	31	31	31	31
Total net expenditures	do	480	508	360	351	305
Dairy farm cash receipts:						
From marketings	do	4,760	4,854	4,654	4,605	4,586
Payments	do				45	107
Total receipts	do	4,760	4,854	4,654	4,650	4,693
Net income	do	1,123	1,145	1,098	1,132	1,189

[1] Containing features of S. 900, S. 953, S. 398, and Department provisions.

[2] Milk equivalent milkfat basis.

[3] Payment on reductions below base.

[4] Payment for six months of retired production.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on the statement the Senator from Wisconsin has made. I think all of us who serve on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and who have shared the concern in recent years in regard to the need for the development of stability in the dairy industry and in the fluid milk markets, but not at the cost of the dairy farmer, take great heart in the report the Senator from Wisconsin has made.

All of us recognize that the problem is extremely difficult.

The statement made today by the Under Secretary of Agriculture demonstrates, I believe, that much progress has been achieved.

I believe we should particularly commend the spokesmen for the dairy interests, who faced up to an extremely complex problem, and have arrived at—although with much grinding of teeth, I am sure—a means of dealing adequately with it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, this proposal, the base price plan, which is the heart and soul of the proposal made by the Under Secretary of Agriculture, is based on a great deal of work done by the dairy farmer leaders in New York, Michigan, Wisconsin, Washington, Utah, Florida, and many, many other States. Their leaders came to see us and to discuss this program. I think it will tend to reduce the cost to the Government; and I hope it will be considered favorably, not only by the committee, but also by the Senate.

I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding this time to me.

DISARMAMENT AND A NUCLEAR TEST BAN: THE NEED TO INFORM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have long been disturbed by the misinformation and some downright lies that are being disseminated among the American people concerning the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and overall U.S. policy on arms control and disarmament problems. Accordingly, I have asked the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for short, simple, and direct statements designed to clarify these issues in the minds of the American public. I have already received two letters from Director William C. Foster, of the ACDA, and I take pleasure in asking unanimous consent that they be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. They are admirable statements of U.S. policy in the field of disarmament and arms control. The first letter, dated March 22, 1963, is addressed to the question of the present functions and operating methods of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The second, dated April 2, explains why it is in the national interest of the United States to seek agreement on a nuclear test ban. I commend Mr. Foster's letters to the attention of all Senators and their constituents.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ARMS CONTROL
AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., March 22, 1963.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. *Senate.*

DEAR HUBERT: Questions are being asked: What are the present functions of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and how does it operate?

Congress established the Agency to explore, develop, recommend and, if approved by the President, negotiate possible alternatives to the arms race in order to enhance our national security. A strong Military Establishment, of course, remains essential. But as the President has said, "in a spiralling arms race a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase."

Congress provided for cooperation in arms control and disarmament policy formulation among all interested agencies. Test ban or disarmament recommendations of this Agency are considered by the Departments of Defense and State, and where appropriate, by the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and other agencies. Negotiations are never undertaken on an important measure until the President has consulted with his key national security advisers and given his approval.

Congress also provided that no action could be taken that would obligate the United States to disarm without the prior approval of Congress. As you may know, the President, the Secretary of State and I have all said that a test ban agreement would be submitted in the form of a treaty to the Senate for the traditional two-thirds vote. Under section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, a disarmament agreement must either be approved in this fashion or by a majority in both Houses. The American people are thus assured that no disarmament agreement could be put into effect without the approval of their elected representatives.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL
AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., April 2, 1963.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR HUBERT: A matter of concern to all Americans is whether it is in the national interest to seek agreement on a nuclear test ban.

The issue is not alone whether a test ban would involve risks but whether the risks would be substantially outweighed by the advantages. Advantages would include: (1) inhibiting the further development of nuclear capabilities by other countries, a development which would increase the chances of nuclear devastation; (2) preserving for a longer time our present nuclear superiorities; (3) eliminating radioactive fallout, and (4) slowing down the nuclear arms race. Against these advantages must be balanced two risks: (1) secret testing or "cheating" and (2) surprise abrogation of the treaty. The latter risk would be greatly minimized by our announced policy of maintaining our own readiness to test even if a treaty went into effect.

The primary concern of those objecting to a treaty has been whether the Soviets could cheat by secret underground testing of small nuclear devices. Most objections are directed at possible secret tests with a magnitude of less than one-quarter the size of our first nuclear explosion in New Mexico almost 20 years ago and less than 1/10000 the size of the largest recorded Soviet explosion. No test ban treaty could give us complete assurance of catching every possible violation. But neither could a potential violator ever be sure he would escape our detection system.

It is the view of the State Department, the Defense Department, the AEC, and this Agency that significant Soviet advances would require a series of tests; that the probability is high that any meaningful series would be discovered by seismic and intelligence means; and that such occasional small tests as might evade detection, if the Soviets were prepared to risk getting caught, would not have a damaging impact on the military balance. Weighing the advantages of a test ban treaty against its risks, both this administration and the Eisenhower administration concluded that such a treaty would be in our national interest.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, April 4, 1963, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 3, 1963:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Leland J. Haworth, of New York, to be Director of the National Science Foundation for a term of 6 years.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Gerald F. Tape, of New York, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1966, vice Leland J. Haworth.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

David Elliott Bell, of Massachusetts, to be Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 3, 1963:

POSTMASTER

Cora M. Smith to be postmaster at Lost Creek, in the State of West Virginia.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Statistics "Management" or Manipulation of Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, overlooked in the discussion of news management—Government control of news—is the fact that the Federal Government itself has become the Nation's principal statistical source. This makes it easy for officials to manipulate statistics to tell the story they want. Old-fashioned bushbeating news coverage is becoming a lost art.

To win political points in agriculture, for example, Secretary Freeman used statistics unfairly to show an erroneous achievement in stockpile reduction—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 4024–4033, 4570–4571. Secretary of Labor Wirtz did the same thing last fall in attempting to show employment gains which did not exist. In handling the Cuban affair, the administration even claimed the right to misinform the public.

Withholding information is one thing. Twisting facts and telling falsehoods is quite another. To an alarming degree the American people are dependent on Government interpretations for vital information.

Helen Harriman Keith, Massachusetts' Cherry Blossom Princess for 1963

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is proud to take part with delegations from every section of our great Nation in the annual Cherry Blossom Festival here in Washington.

I am especially delighted that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts will be represented by Helen Harriman Keith, 18-year-old daughter of my good friend and colleague from Massachusetts, Congressman HASTINGS KEITH and his wife.

Congressman KEITH's daughter, as you know, Mr. Speaker, has been selected by the Massachusetts Society of Washington, D.C., as the Commonwealth's cherry blossom princess for 1963. I commend the society for its good judgment. Helen is a natural and I am certain she will brighten the festival with her charm, beauty, dignity, and poise.

Helen is a freshman at the University of Vermont. The pretty, blue-eyed, brown-haired daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Keith, of West Bridgewater, Mass., is the older of two daughters. She is a graduate of the Northfield School for Girls and her interests include riding, swimming, and skiing. She hopes one day to follow her father into the field of government, and is majoring in political science at the University of Vermont, his alma mater.

Massachusetts is proud and fortunate to have such a lovely representative in this year's Cherry Blossom Festival activities.

Dr. Stafford L. Warren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT G. BURKHALTER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. BURKHALTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with the utmost pleasure that, as a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of California, I welcome to Washington a very prominent former member of the University of California's faculty at Los Angeles, Dr. Stafford L. Warren. I use the term "former" knowing full well the loss this signifies to our great university in Los Angeles. Dr. Warren resigned from his position as vice chancellor of health sciences at UCLA to accept an appointment in Washington, D.C., as special assistant to President Kennedy to aid in the development and coordination of various programs in the field of mental retardation.

Since I served on the city council in Los Angeles I am well aware of the many contributions Dr. Warren has made toward the curtailment of the smog problem, as he was instrumental in having measures enacted into local law. Through his voluntary work, the citizens of Los Angeles are rewarded by the fact that over 5,000 tons of pollutants are banned from contaminating the atmosphere of Los Angeles County every single day. In accepting the new Washington assignment, Dr. Warren also resigned from the air pollution control district's scientific advisory committee, where he will be sorely missed. This committee was largely responsible for the 64 rules and regulations concerning the control of the stationary sources of smog.

Dr. Warren also resigned as a member of the Los Angeles County Atomic Energy Development and Radiation Protection Committee.

In recognition of his many achievements, Dr. Warren was presented with a scroll at a local civic program. The scroll states in part, "deep appreciation for outstanding contributions to his community in the long struggle for cleaner air." The scroll also cited his long record of accomplishments since he received his doctorate in medicine at the University of California in 1922; these included his outstanding work as medical chief of the Manhattan A-bomb project and chairman for radiological safety in the Bikini nuclear tests.

A Message for Our Senior Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Annual Report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for 1962 devoted only a paragraph or two to the operation of the Kerr-Mills Act passed by Congress in the Eisenhower administration to help our senior citizens who are in need of medical care and who are unable for financial reasons to provide such care. It is not a little astonishing that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has failed to give this program the attention it merits so that its benefits might be brought to the atttention of every senior citizen over 65 throughout the land. This statement is an endeavor in the shortest compass and in the simplest way to tell our senior citizens about medical care for the aged in the State of Illinois.

ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

If you are over age 65 and if your yearly income as an individual is not over $1,800, or in the case of a married couple not over $2,400, and if the value of the property of any kind, excluding your home, is not over $2,400 and if you need major medical care, you are eligible for such care under Illinois law.

HOW IT CAME ABOUT

In 1960 Congress passed what is known as the Kerr-Mills Act, named after Senator KERR of Oklahoma and Congressman MILLS of Arkansas. This act provided that if a State legislature would pass a law to provide the benefits of Kerr-Mills for the people of the State, those benefits would become available. The Illinois Legislature did pass such a law in July 1961, and hence Illinois senior citizens are entitled to the benefits of the Kerr-Mills Act. These benefits became available to Illinois residents on August 1, 1961.

BENEFITS AVAILABLE

The benefits made available by this action include first, unlimited hospital care; second, physician care in the hospital and for 30 days after leaving the hospital, the decision with respect to physicians care in Cook County to be made by the Illinois Public Aid Commission.

WHERE TO APPLY FOR BENEFITS

Any citizen can go to the Illinois Public Aid Commission office in the county where he resides, or he can write to the Illinois Public Aid Commission, Room 2000, 160 North La Salle Street, Chicago 1, Ill., and ask for information relating to benefits under this program.

THE RECORD IN ILLINOIS UP TO JANUARY 1, 1963

The State of Illinois began operations under the Kerr-Mills Act on August 1, 1961, and this record runs to January 1, 1963. More current figures will show that the record is even more impressive than this. However, as of January 1, 1963, first, the number of applications received was 10,721; second, applications disposed, 9,670; third, applications approved for payment, 5,907; fourth, applications denied or withdrawn, 3,763; fifth, applications pending for further disposition on January 1, 1962, 1,051; sixth, total amount paid, $2,429,980; and seventh, average amount paid per case, $626.

MAIN REASONS FOR REJECTION OF APPLICATION

First, the medical costs involved were estimated at less than 10 percent of income; second, relatives were able to meet these costs; third, the income or assets of the applicant exceeded the limits set out in the Illinois law; fourth, refusal to comply with Illinois Public Aid Commission policies; fifth, the applicant applied for services which were not offered; sixth, applicant died; seventh, applicant had not yet reached age 65; eighth, applicant was eligible for assistance under some other State program; ninth, the applicant's medical needs were met by insurance; tenth, applicant's needs were met in other ways.

GENERAL INFORMATION

The Illinois program under the Kerr-Mills Act does provide for medical care for our senior citizens who need such care and is financed by the Federal Government and the States about half and half and is administered at the State level. Any State can avail itself of these services by having its State legislature enact the appropriate legislation. It is intended for you, the senior citizens of the country, who need medical care and who can qualify in respect of age and need. One wonders why the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington has not made a greater effort to bring all this to the attention of our citizenry.

Farmers Want Program That Will Enable Them To Compete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, our Democrat friends are fond of accusing Republicans of not being sympathetic with the economic problems of farmers. The record, of course, does not justify such a ridiculous contention and the voters in the principal farm States have indicated in the past couple of elections that they believe their economic well-being is best served by Republicans. Farmers in farm States have indicated with their votes that they do not buy the Kennedy-Freeman and company, economist-conceived supply-management idea of farm legislation. Farmers want a program that will enable them to compete in an economy that contains built-in price protection for other segments of our economy, but retains for the farmer a maximum degree of opportunity to exercise initiative and utilization of their land and management capability. This administration gives lipservice to this concept in farm legislation, but every major farm bill sponsored by this Democrat administration has provided for more strict production controls and price management.

I do not have time here, Mr. Speaker, to go into all the failures of this administration so far as farmers are concerned, but just to keep the record straight, I want to point out some recent results of Mr. Freeman's professed effort to help farmers.

The Department of Agriculture, in a release dated March 29, 1963, reveals that the parity ratio of prices received by farmers on March 15 was 77. The report says:

> The parity ratio slipped off 1 point to 77, the lowest since 1959.

This is hardly a solid achievement in the area of improving conditions for agriculture in general.

Let us look at cattle prices. The USDA report referred to above states:

> Beef cattle, at $19.60 per hundredweight were the lowest for the month since February 1960.

It is a well-known fact that fat cattle have suffered a decline in price of 7 cents per pound since December. This is a loss of $70 per head or more on every fat steer or heifer a farmer is sending to market. If this is a side effect of Mr. Freeman's management of feed grain prices, I doubt that cattle feeders are impressed with the results.

Now let us take a look at hogs. The USDA reports that at $13.70 per hundredweight hogs were lower than in any month since 1960. I am advised today hogs are selling for $13.10 at country buying points in Iowa.

This March report of the Crop Reporting Board of USDA is reporting facts as it traditionally has for many years. These facts must not be a great comfort to Kennedy, Freeman and company and we could perhaps wonder how long before the White House news management policy will be applied to the Department of Agriculture's role of providing factual statistical information for farmers.

Let us look briefly at some other direct quotations from the report:

> The commercial vegetable index dropped 8 percent during the month.
>
> The March index (for dairy products) was 3 percent below a year earlier and lowest for the month since 1956.
>
> Lower prices for eggs and commercial broilers dropped the index 1 percent during the month to 155.

I point out these instances of declining farm prices as a means of explaining the continued decline of the farmer's parity ratio and more specifically, the farmer's income. I do this for the purpose of keeping the record straight as to the real effect of the administration's farm policies.

The Government and U.S. Agricultural Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by Senator KARL MUNDT, for the Aberdeen American News, Aberdeen, S. Dak. Portions of the article were published in the farm edition of that paper on March 24.

The article, as written by Senator MUNDT, presents a great deal of information about the operations of our Public Law 480 program and I commend it to the reading of all my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOVERNMENT AND U.S. AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS BY HON. KARL E. MUNDT, REPUBLICAN, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

With the beginning of this session of the 88th Congress, and at the request of the leadership of the Republican Party I was advanced from the Agriculture Committee of the Senate to the Foreign Policy Committee. This has now given me an opportunity to look back to my service on the Agriculture Committee with some degree of perspective.

In my opinion the single most important piece of legislation approved during my 14 years, service on the Agriculture Committee is the Agriculture Trade and Development Act of 1954 of which I was cosponsor. I feel that the single act known all over the world as Public Law 480—or the food-for-peace program—has done more for U.S. foreign relations and for U.S. agriculture than any other single piece of agriculture legislation. It is a potent instrument in our search for a better world in which to live.

When the 83d Congress authorized, and President Eisenhower signed Public Law 480 into law not one of us could have envisioned the long list of major accomplishments of this legislation. Neither could we foresee the variety of interests this act would serve.

Among current U.S. operations are foreign currency sales under title I and other activities under Public Law 480, which represent for the United States an unusual but effective opportunity to use our bounty as food for peace. We turned to foreign currency sales when we found that many friendly countries needing and wanting our products were unable to buy them. It wasn't that the United States was short of farm products—far from it. Neither did the difficulty trace to prices, because we had reduced the export prices to the world level for our surpluses. The trouble was dollars—or, rather, a lack of them. Under laws and regulations existing prior to 1954, we could sell our excess products only for dollars. Countries lacking dollars couldn't buy.

Section 2 of Public Law 480 spelled out the policy of the Congress. It follows:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to expand international trade among the United States and friendly nations, to facilitate the convertibility of currency, to promote the economic stability of American agriculture and the national welfare, to make maximum efficient use of surplus agricultural commodities in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States, and to stimulate and facilitate the expansion of foreign trade in agricultural commodities produced in the United States by providing a means whereby surplus agricultural commodities in excess of the usual marketings of such commodities may be sold through private trade channels, and foreign currencies accepted in payment therefor. It is further the policy to use foreign currencies which accrue to the United States under this act to expand international trade, to encourage economic development, to purchase strategic materials, to pay U.S. obligations abroad, to promote collective strength, and to foster in other ways the foreign policy of the United States."

Under Public Law 480 four different means are authorized for the disposal of the bounty of our farms into useful avenues abroad. The most important in terms of volume is the sale for foreign currencies under title I to friendly countries. Title II authorizes grants of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of farm products for famine relief and other assistance, including economic development. Under title III, CCC-owned commodities are authorized for domestic and foreign donation programs and for barter for an equal value of strategic or other materials. Title IV provides for long-term sales of agricultural commodities on a long-term dollar credit basis.

This law has been amended seven times and in each case has provided for additional authorization. The most recent amendment, approved August 8, 1961, extended the legislation until December 31, 1964.

It is important to note that these foreign currency sales represent extra marketings for the United States and extra consumption for the recipient countries. That's because the bulk of the commodities sold for foreign currencies go to underdeveloped countries, which lack funds to buy in the world market. In the absence of a foreign currency sales program, the underdeveloped countries would be unable to buy as much food and fiber as at present and American farm product surpluses would be very much larger than they are now. The whole operation fits in with the food-for-peace concept.

This program is tangible recognition that availability of food and fiber are basic essentials if underdeveloped countries are to move upward to becoming economically developed. This food-for-peace program reflects our outstanding ability as the world's greatest agricultural producer. This is a field in which the Soviets cannot compete. With the fruits of our soil, climate, industry, science, and technology we are giving expression to our ability to help meet human needs and promote human development both at home and among friendly neighbors abroad.

To American farmers who are producing quantities of food and fiber in much greater quantities than can be consumed here, this program has provided additional export outlets for over $9 billion worth of agricultural commodities. More wheat has moved under this program than the combined harvests of the last 2 years. The equivalent of over 300 million bushels of soybeans has been exported in the form of vegetable oil. Exports under this law have accounted for 27 percent of total agricultural exports in the last 8 years.

Every major commodity is represented in these sales—wheat, feed grains, edible oils, cotton, tobacco, dried milk, fruits, meat, poultry, and many more. This program has been in operation in dollar-short countries having a total population of 1.4 billion persons. The biggest participant is India which has entered into agreements to purchase commodities valued at over $2 billion. Other large purchasers have been Pakistan, Yugoslavia, Spain, Poland, the United Arab Republic, Turkey, Brazil, and Indonesia.

Over the years this program has enabled countries to purchase with their own currency far more than would have been possible if payment with dollars had been necessary. These currencies have been used in many ways beneficial to both the United States and the purchasing country. The United States has used a portion of the funds to finance its expenses in these countries including military assistance, market development and research. Good use has been put to the funds in developing and expanding markets for U.S. agricultural products.

The poultry market in West Germany was developed through the initial use of sales of poultry under Public Law 480, and subsequent expenditure of funds for market development purposes. Foreign trade, fair exhibits and trade centers showing U.S. products have been utilized as a means of advertising our products.

Also, experience has indicated that countries that have begun to use and know U.S. products as a result of the foreign currency purchase, later on become good dollar customers when their foreign exchange situation makes this feasible. For example, Japan which started out as a purchaser under title I of Public Law 480 is our biggest dollar market for farm products. Soybean oil was originally purchased by Spain from the United States for pesetas. It has now become the largest dollar buyer of this commodity. Italy, similarly, has become a leading commercial outlet for U.S. Hard wheats.

This special export program enables us to help meet the food needs of the developing nations, and at the same time permits us to find a useful outlet for our abundant production. This is all to the good. Public Law 480 is such legislation. It is no discredit to the surplus disposal aspect of the law that it also meets the needs of our friends abroad. And it is no discredit to its foreign policy attributes that it also helps move our heavy inventories. That the law serves two purposes rather than one does not diminish the importance of either.

This program has helped turn our large supplies into an asset. At one time we looked upon our agricultural surpluses almost wholly as a problem. Now we can see that part of the abundance made possible by our efficient agriculture is serving us well in the area of foreign policy.

With respect to the food-for-peace program, I must conclude:

First, the program has been a success in improving the diets of millions of people living in poverty.

Second, the program has prevented an internal explosion or complete collapse of several of the farm programs as they affect certain commodities. The outstanding example of this is with respect to wheat. We all may ask ourselves with candor what the explosive impacts of an additional 2 billion bushels of wheat in Government hands would have been. What type of farm and area reorganization would have been necessary?

Third, farmers are getting higher per unit prices in the open market as a result of Public Law 480 program, and

Fourth, finally, our abundant food supply is the most potent weapon available for intelligent and constructive use among the developing nations in the cold war.

For the Nation as a whole, the equivalent of 1 acre out of every 5 harvested moved into export channels. The production from 63 million acres of U.S. cropland moved abroad in 1961–62. Exports accounted for over half the output of wheat; about 40 percent of the tallow and nonfat dry milk production; about one-third of the soybeans; one-fourth the rye, and one-fifth of the barley production.

The bounty produced by the American farmers, who are the most efficient in the world, enables us to be the world's largest exporter of farm products. By moving an average of 12 ships a day, U.S. farmers were able to export over $5.1 billion worth of farm products in 1961–62. For South Dakota, the value of exports was about $46 million. This is of great significance to the people of South Dakota.

Of the $5.1 billion of U.S. agricultural exports in 1961–62, a record of $3.5 billion were commercial sales for dollars, and $1.6 billion moved under Public Law 480 and AID programs—foreign currency sales, donations, barter, and long-term supply and dollar credit sales. Recent export gains stem mainly from dollar sales.

Our major commercial markets in fiscal year 1962 were the European Economic Community, Canada, Japan, and the United Kingdom. These areas took 76 percent of all agricultural exports for dollars, while other West European countries, excluding the United Kingdom, bought another 8 percent. The Common Market countries took $1.2 billion, about one-third of all dollar sales.

For several years I have been studying the progress of the Common Market, especially as it moves toward a common agricultural policy. I am deeply concerned by the growing evidence that the EEC is leaning toward protectionist trade restrictive policy oriented toward itself. In the last tariff negotiations the EEC refused to give fixed tariff bindings on agricultural imports of many competitive products. These include wheat, wheat flour, poultry, and most meat items. These commodities comprise about 40 percent of the exports to the Common Market. Furthermore, EEC is in the process of developing a protective system based on variable import levies. In the case of poultry the variable levy is linked with minimum import or "gate" prices.

The variable levy system equalizes the value of the imported product by bringing its price up to the price of competing items produced in the Common Market. For example, a German importer may want to buy corn from an American exporter. However, the importer must pay the German Government a levy that brings the importer's total cost of imported grain to at least the level of German produced grain. Because this system cancels out any price advantage to the importer of U.S. corn, he tends to buy German grain to the extent that it is available. Under such a system there can be no price competition from imports with grain produced in the Common Market.

For an important group of U.S. farm products such as soybeans, meal, cotton, tallow, hides and skins, and fruit and vegetable products, we fared well in the negotiations. Many of the duty-free or low tariff bindings, previously existing in individual EEC countries, were carried over into the Common Market, and, for the group, the tariff levels fixed were generally satisfactory. For these items which comprise about half our exports to the Common Market last year, we can look forward to a growing volume of exports in the years ahead.

High-level internal target prices implemented by variable levies and minimum import prices give EEC producers a degree of protection which is detrimental to all. This situation is serious. The poultry regulations are illustrative of this fact. They combine excessive minimum import or gate prices with variable levies. Germany is our most important poultry customer in the Common Market. Through a combination of levies made up of the difference between the offering price and the minimum import price, and a series of other levies, there are collected total import charges which have nearly trebled the import levies. Our markets are shrinking fast.

U.S. flour millers have been adversely affected by Common Market regulations through loss of exports. Practically all U.S. flour exports to the EEC have been going to the Netherlands. This was valued at about $7 million in 1961–62. Here is what happened. First, there was set a threshhold price. Then, there was added a margin for milling plus an additional amount to protect EEC millers, less an allowance to offset returns from bran sales, minus a consumer flour subsidy. Quite a complicated formula, isn't it? What did it mean? First, the Common Market levy which had been $14 per ton was more than tripled. Second, it practically shut off this export business.

Also, I am greatly concerned about the proposed increase in import duty on crude soybean and cottonseed oil entering the Common Market. The proposed levy will double the rate from 5 percent to 10 percent ad valorem. European oilseed crushers have access to U.S. soybeans with no import duty. This provides them with a basic source of raw material which can be converted into both oil and meal. It would appear equitable that no special favors should be made for European crushers, and that soybean and cottonseed oil should enter free of duty, just as soybeans are.

The crucial elements are the internal target prices or support prices to be established for grains by the Community. These prices will give us the signal as to the direction which agricultural policies of the Community take. If these price targets are established at unreasonably high levels, then uneconomic production within the Community will be substituted for imports from friendly supplying nations. Consumer prices for animal products within the Community will be unnecessarily increased and imports of feedgrains, dairy, and livestock products will gradually disappear.

If the United States and other agricultural exporting nations are to be assured an opportunity to sell in the EEC markets, it is of major importance that these price goals be set at moderate levels.

The United States will bring a new tool in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, to future negotiations with respect to trade matters with other nations. This act provides the framework for U.S. participation in trade negotiations. One of the mandates of this law is to maintain access to export markets for all our products—industrial as well as agricultural.

This Congress stated its purposes in passing the Trade Expansion Act, as follows: "Through trade agreements affording mutual trade benefits, to stimulate the economic growth of the United States and maintain and enlarge foreign markets for American products, to strengthen economic relations with foreign countries through the development of open and nondiscriminatory trading in the free world, and to prevent Communist economic penetration."

Section 252 of this act directs the President to take all feasible and appropriate steps to eliminate unjustifiable import restrictions maintained by any country against U.S. agricultural products. Such steps may include retaliatory action against imports from the country in question and withholding of concessions and most-favored-nation treatment from that country.

Fundamentally, I am opposed to an apparent increase in agricultural protectionism by the Common Market. I believe that it is essential that the EEC fully understand our determination to hold on to our traditional markets.

While the Common Market takes about a third of the farm products we sell for dollars—we should not forget that other free world countries take two-thirds. We should review and strengthen our trade ties with the rest of the free world.

In fiscal 1962, sales to the Outer Seven countries of Western Europe amounted to $719 million, including $460 million to the United Kingdom. Sales to Japan totaled $485 million, and to Canada $430 million.

There are substantial opportunities for expansion in our trade with most of these areas. Japan, for example, is a rapidly growing market for our feedgrains and soybeans. She could take more if her tariffs were cut further. Canada could take more of our poultry, especially turkeys. Recent events have emphasized the need for strengthening all our trade ties, so that our eggs are not all in one basket.

In my opinion, we must be completely realistic in our approach to Common Market trade. I think that we can obtain access to the Common Market, but it requires shrewd, tough negotiating. In my new position as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I will insist that this be done.

Greendale's Milwaukee County Development Corp. Celebrates 10th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 3, 1963

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, it was my distinct pleasure to be present in Greendale, Wis., for the 10th anniversary celebration of the Milwaukee County Development Corp. Milwaukee County Development Corp. is a private corporation which was established in 1953 to administer the sales of land from the previously Government-owned and operated village of Greendale, Wis.

The occasion was a fitting one on which to review the progress that has been made in that model community

since Greendale was transferred from Federal to private ownership.

As the speaker for the evening, I was most pleased to be introduced by Mr. Louis Quarles who became temporary president of the civic corporation 10 years ago and has served admirably in the post ever since. Mr. Quarles' introductory statement and my remarks of the evening follow:

STATEMENT BY MR. LOUIS QUARLES

Ten years ago it was brought to the attention of some Milwaukee citizens that the U.S. Government was about to sell its holdings in Greendale as a single package. They got together a few people, including persons who expressed an interest in the venture, and they held their first meeting at the Allis-Chalmers clubhouse at West Allis. They formed a corporation, made a bid which was accepted by the Government. I was asked to pinch-hit as president until they could elect a permanent one—I am still pinch-hitting, much to my surprise, but I find it interesting and stimulating.

The invited guests in 1953 included the three clergymen and the members of the village board and school board, it was a relatively small group. Tonight we have the clergy with us again—which is only proper in a residential community—but the number has now grown to five. Thank you for coming tonight.

As the village problems expanded so have the various elements of government grown; so that in addition to the village board members, and members of the school board, we have the former and present members of the plan commission, the zoning board of appeals, the building board, the development commission, the village officials, and also the six candidates for the village board, thus including the officials to be.

I am not going to bother you with history. You are more familiar with developments here than I am, but to borrow a phrase from a former Governor of Wisconsin I'll try briefly "to reminisce a little bit about the future."

I want to thank the candidates for coming, and we cannot introduce them because Milwaukee County Development Corp. being a corporation can only talk about issues. But the candidates are vitally important to you and to us because they represent the future. While a 10th anniversary get together is basically historical, we in Milwaukee County Development Corp. always look ahead, and are primarily interested in continued development. Having six candidates for the three trustee positions on the village board represents citizen interest, and without constant interest by good citizens, continued good village government is not possible.

We wish the candidates well, and may the best three men be elected.

And speaking further about development, I am sure you all know that Milwaukee County Development Corp is primarily in business in Greendale—to go out of business. We want to finish what we have started and close up the company. We will fold our tents like the Arabs and silently steal away.

In planning primarily for long range development of Greendale as contrasted with a quick turnover, it may be that our group was not true to the general concept of the ordinary businessman. We were primarily interested in doing a good job for the future. It has been said: "Why should I do anything for posterity, posterity never did anything for me." We did not and do not subscribe to that point of view.

We would be less than honest with you if we claimed that neither profits nor losses are a consideration in our business, or of interest to our stockholders. When we started in Greendale 10 years ago, we intended to found neither a nonprofit nor a quick-profit institution. Our primary interest was to assure a proper and outstanding development in the community. Incidentally, we intended to fairly reward our shareholders in the long run for the risks which they assumed and their continuing efforts to improve Greendale.

The pace of development over the past 10 years shows that expansion of Greendale has built up considerable momentum during the past few years.

We believe this reflects an awakening of people throughout the Milwaukee area to the many desirable features of life in your community. Recently this momentum has leveled off, in part because of problems whose final solution awaits construction of the metropolitan interceptor sewer. Our experience since 1953 makes us very skeptical about the ability of ourselves—or the community—to turn on or shut off progress at will, and particularly to turn it on. We are concerned about preserving the momentum which has been built up. Since good planning can best be achieved under conditions of steady, organized growth, we are equally concerned that, if the stream of progress is once dammed up, disorganized conditions will surely follow once the dam has been opened.

We hope that Greendale's growth over the next several years can progress in a steady, well organized and well planned manner. We conceive it to be our job to assist, to the best of our ability, in achieving this type of growth. We earnestly solicit the help of all of you in working toward that objective.

And so with those comments about history, and Milwaukee County Development Corp., and with the progress that has been made in the past 10 years—I am sure that you all can well understand there is not likely to be a 20th anniversary dinner given by Milwaukee County Development Corp.—and perhaps not even a 15th anniversary dinner. We are looking forward to the time when our task will be completed.

So much for Milwaukee County Development Corp. and history, which easily brings me to our guest tonight—the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, a man well known to all of you.

We asked him to be our guest to greet the past and present officials of the village of Greendale because we know that during the congressional years before 1952–53 he was very active when legislation was being enacted to determine the policy about the sale of Greendale—he has said he often felt as though he was almost the mayor of Greendale. His interest in the village and its development has been a continuous one up to the present date and I am sure will continue well into the future.

It is my pleasure to present the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. My friends, it is a distinct honor and privilege for me to be here tonight to join in the 10th anniversary banquet of the Milwaukee Community Development Corp. As one who has been vitally interested in this organization, its aims and aspirations, I feel privileged to have this opportunity to express my words of praise and commendation for the work that has been done here.

Through the efforts and cooperation of countless individuals—some of them no longer with us—Greendale has become the thriving community we know today. My efforts on behalf of this village at a time of flux and crisis over 10 years ago have been dwarfed by the accomplishments which you have made over the ensuing years. In a joint effort that bespeaks the best in our American way of life, you, as directors, with the cooperation of the householders and residents of Greendale, have maintained and improved what surely must be singled out as one of the most unusual communities in the United States.

Greendale, as I am sure you know, was one of the Greentown triplets. It was born with its sister towns, Greenbelt, Md., and Greenhills, Ohio, during a crucial decade in our Nation's history; the decade of the Great Depression. The depression was a crucial period chiefly perhaps for the vast social and political changes which were experienced in two key nations of the world. One of those nations was German. The other was our own country.

In Germany the changes took the form of Fascist totalitarianism. In that land hopelessness and despair were galvanized by a madman into one of the most horrible demonstrations of man's inhumanity to man that the world has ever seen.

In our own country the social revolution came about as our forefathers had meant it to—through the free choice of free citizens. In 1932 the people of the United States went to the polls and elected Franklin Delano Roosevelt to be their President. The country gave him a clear mandate to do what he could to cure the sickness which had stricken a once healthy nation. Franklin Roosevelt's answer was the New Deal.

No matter what our political beliefs, no matter what we think of F.D.R. and what he did or didn't do, we must admit that a social revolution was accomplished in this country. It was a sweeping revolution that came about without gunfire and without bloodshed. It was a revolution that, for better or worse, left an indelible imprint on our history and our way of life.

Although it was only 30 short years ago, somehow those New Deal days seem far away now. Perhaps it is because we have experienced so much since then. Even the names of those who engineered the New Deal have a faraway ring: Rexford Tugwell, Harold Ickes, Frances Perkins, Harry Hopkins, Robert Sherwood, Walter Borah, Hiram Johnson, George Norris.

Greendale was a child of the New Deal. It was conceived as one of innumerable projects to combat the great depression. The reasons behind its development were mainly two. First, the construction project gave work to men who otherwise would have been on the relief rolls. During the 2 years it took to build the town, an average of 2,000 men were employed per day.

Second, the homes offered low-cost housing to families with modest incomes. Rents ranged from $19 to $36 a month, averaging $29. Occupancy was restricted to families within the income range of $1,000 to $2,200 a year. In special cases individuals with less than $1,000 were accepted. Consideration also was given to large families with slightly higher incomes.

But to the technocrats who were the driving force behind the creation of this community, Greendale primarily represented planning. Greendale and its sister towns were to be planned as no other American cities had ever been. They were to be models for the future.

Greendale was the brainchild of men who believed that social evils were for the most part the result of unwholesome environment. They believed that if men put their minds to creating a healthy environment, that environment would, in turn, make healthy, happy, good people. Whatever flaws we might find in this philosophy, we cannot deny that planning was a startling concept in those days.

Not that it should have been. Many ancient cultures had consciously set out to build their cities according to a preconceived blueprint. The ancient Egyptians, the Aztec and Mayan cultures planned their cities and towns. There was, in addition, an American precedent. Washington, D.C., was a tract of swamp and forest land along the Potomac River when Charles L'Enfant first saw it and convinced President Washington that it should be the seat of the new government. L'Enfant's genius is still evident there. His planning has given us one of the world's truly beautiful cities.

But most American cities and towns, like Topsy, "jus' growed." Some, like Milwaukee, sprang up where navigable rivers flowed into larger bodies of water. Others, like Hales Corners, grew where main highways crossed. Still others were established as central points for farmers to bring their products and do their trading. A few, like West Allis, arose near industrial firms. How little planning went into the average American community is evident. Houses are piled one on top of another. There is little open space for trees and shrubs and foliage. Commercial enterprises are scattered in and among homes.

There was to be none of that in Greendale. Its planners drew their basic idea from the English garden villages. It is perhaps ironic that the English villages which appealed so much to the planners were not themselves planned. They were established according to social and practical considerations of their time that dictated that the farmers live in villages and go out each day into the surrounding fields.

The farms, gardens and wooded groves which surrounded the English villages became a "green belt" to the planners. This belt of green was to prevent unsightly developments from encroaching on the town.

Thirty years ago, the planners emulating the British concept, looked around for a suitable location for their green town. They selected the 3,400 acre tract of rolling terrain along the Root River Valley in southeastern Wisconsin, 8 miles from downtown Milwaukee. As we know, the choice of this location was a good one.

Then the planners began designing Greendale:

Each of the housing units was to be surrounded by approximately 5,000 square feet of ground providing space for gardens, trees, and shrubs.

The houses were to vary in size but were to be of similar architectural design. In addition to its own yard, each family was to have additional ground in gardens located within easy walking distance of the dwellings.

Streets and sidewalks in Greendale were planned to minimize traffic hazards. The town was to have access to three major roads, yet be situated far enough from them that traffic would go around, not through, the village. Most of the streets were to dead end in order to eliminate through traffic. The underlying principle was to promote safety. After all, the people of Greendale were expected to have families.

Greendale was to own and operate its own electrical distribution system which would be entirely underground. The subsurface wiring system was to assure a more complete continuity of service, free from interruption of storms, and eliminate the unsightliness of poles and overhead wires.

Greendale's business center, operated partly on a cooperative and partly on a privately owned basis, was to have all the services any villager could expect. Each business was to be housed in its own proper place.

Every foot of land within the area of Greendale was to be put gradually to its best possible use. The 74 farms and rural home units which were originally on the land were to be improved. Almost every building was to receive a new roof. Those without electricity were to be electrified.

A community building was to be constructed. It would house the school, but at the same time provide a place for the adult population to meet for games, meetings, and class instruction. Even Greendale's gardeners were to have the aid of a town agricultural guidance director.

Sounds like paradise doesn't it? And actually most of the plans were realized. But here and there the planners seem to have forgotten reality. In the Greendale of the Federal planners, no one's roof would ever leak or plumbing clog or furnace go on the fritz. But more particularly they sometimes seemed to have overlooked the human element.

For example, let me quote directly for a moment from a brochure on Greendale which the Public Housing Authority released about a year after the town had been occupied. A section is devoted to describing the numerous parks and play areas where children could be sent for supervised games and instruction. One sentence reads, and I quote, "Mothers send their children to these small neighborhood playgrounds where they know they will be safe and happy."

Only planners think that every child on a playground is happy. Certainly mothers don't. Or anyone who has ever had anything to do with a playground. Children cry, fight, pout, scream, and get bloody lips and black eyes on playgrounds. But to most planners, a playground is a place where the lion lies down with the lamb.

If I may find one more fault with the planners, it is that they left out of their scheme for Greendale a building which was a central point of the English village which they copied. That, of course, was a church. The Federal Government could not, of course, have financed a church for every denomination. Our Constitution forbids that. Yet the Government has successfully conducted interdenominational chapels on its military installations for years. However, the New Deal planners chose not to emulate this precedent. They were more interested in creating a paradise on earth than in suggesting that there could be one after death.

Yet, lest you think me too hard on the Government planners, let me hasten to add that I think they created a model town here in Greendale. They proved the value of planning to a community. Theirs was a tremendous achievement and a solid contribution to our society.

You will not hear from me any criticisms of Greendale as a "socialist real estate project" or "collectivist-inspired community." We have had enough of that from other quarters. But we would be remiss if we did not question Greendale as it was originally conceived.

Does the Federal Government have any business owning and running a town? Is it good for individual citizens to be dependent upon the Federal Government for their housing, schooling, for their children, recreation facilities and the like? Is individual initiative and freedom to a large extent stifled in this kind of environment?

These are serious questions, but today they are moot ones as far as Greendale is concerned. For with the end of World War II came a new political climate. The New Deal and its revolutionary fervor declined. There was growing disillusionment with Soviet Russia and its socialist experiment. This fact contributed much during the Truman administration of our country's swing back to the middle of the road. With the changes on the political scene came the determination to sell the Federal "Green" towns.

Two were sold to private developers. Greendale was not. We all know the reasons why. It has been a great source of personal pride to me to have helped in the preserving of the character of this community. In Greendale—unlike other Federal housing projects which were sold—the people had full opportunity and first chance to purchase the homes in which they were living, for a reasonable price. At the same time, the plan used in selling Greendale saved the Federal Government over $2 million. The work of the Milwaukee Community Development Corp. cannot be over estimated in this regard.

Under the guidance of this cooperative, free enterprise organization, the work of planning, begun by the Federal Government, was carried on. We can see the results around us. Residential areas have expanded into the once rural portions of Greendale. New homes have been constructed, utilities have been extended, and new roads have been built. Yet, the essential character of Greendale as a model community has been retained.

I am informed that foreign visitors and American community planners still visit Greendale. And well they might—for two reasons.

First, it has a historical significance as one of the first truly planned communities in our country. Methods which were originated for, and demonstrated in, this town have been used ever since. One thinks of the three Levittowns or Lake Park, Ill. These communities and their planners owe much to what had been done here almost 30 years ago. Near Washington, D.C., in Virginia, a new town is even now taking shape out of what was once farmland. It will be called Reston.

I recently saw represenations of what Reston will look like when it is completed and was struck with its resemblance to Greendale.

But more than being a prototype for the planned communities of this Nation, Greendale was a testing place for the underlying concepts of planning. Urban renewal, urban redevelopment, strict zoning, traffic control—all these concepts which now are so familiar to us—have been inherited, at least in part, from Greendale and its sister cities, and the men that planned them.

But there is a second good reason for modern community planners to visit Greendale. That is to witness the fine accomplishments which have taken place here since 1952.

We all know that Greendale faces problems. The rapid increase in population which the village can expect in the next few years is certain to cause problems. Moreover, if the tax base is to be expanded, some attempt must be made to attract light industrial plants and commercial enterprises. Yet these must, at the same time, conform to the essentially residential character of the village. Yes, this community has continuing problems.

It has had problems before—certainly very serious ones. However, through the cooperative effort of the citizens of Greendale, past difficulties have been successfully resolved. I am confident that the problems of the future will be met and resolved.

The New Deal planners who created Greendale are no longer with us. But their ideas remain. Planning must still be an integral part of the life of this community. Undoubtedly you will continue in the path of village planning and cooperation in the future. And so, we look forward to the 20th anniversary banquet, for we will find Greendale even more flourishing than it is today.

This is your challenge. This is your goal.